UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 7

APRIL 2, 1969, TO APRIL 21, 1969
(PAGES 8379 TO 9826)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1969

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, April 2, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit.—John 15: 8.

Almighty God, by whose spirit men of old were guided in their decisions, direct, we beseech Thee, the deliberations of Congress this day. Help us to do well the work we have to do and may it be for the good of all.

To our President, our Speaker, and to all who share with them the responsibility of planning the program for our beloved country, grant spiritual strength, wise counsel, and an adventurous faith that they may continue to lead our people toward the high goal of one nation, under Thee, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 191. Concurrent resolution providing that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, April 3, 1969, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 14, 1969.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Mills), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 355

Resolved, That Ed Jones, of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Agriculture.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ELECTION

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the people of the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin on their election yesterday of Dave Obey, Democrat, to Congress.

Dave Obey, an outstanding young legislator, has a proven record of accomplishment in the State assembly. He was first elected to the Wisconsin State House in 1962 and is today the assistant minority leader. Last year he was named America's outstanding education legislator for 1968 by the National Education Association's rural division.

Legislation authored or coauthored by Dave Obey included mainly the areas of conservation, education, law enforcement, social justice, senior citizens, mental health, highway safety, and agriculture.

Honors include: In 1964, named one of three outstanding freshmen assemblymen by several State newspaper writers; in 1966, recipient of a Legislative leadership award by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University; in 1968, named the outstanding education legislator in the Nation by the National Education Association's rural division.

Once again the people have spoken and I must congratulate their exceptional choice—a candidate so well qualified to serve them in the U.S. Congress. It must be remembered that this district was just vacated by the gentleman who now serves as the Secretary of Defense who won this district in 1968 by 64.2 percent of the vote.

To say "On Wisconsin" would be most appropriate. As many of you will recall, it was in 1953 when another special election was held in Wisconsin, a Democrat, Lester Johnson, pulled an upset and the Democrats went on to recapture the House of Representatives in 1954.

It will be the first time in this century that a Democrat will represent the 15-county district in Congress and with all but eight of the precincts counted, Obey had 60,666 votes and Chilsen 58,170.

Congratulations again to Dave Obey and I say to you: "On Wisconsin."

DEMOCRAT DAVID OBEY WINS ELECTION IN SEVENTH DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

(Mr. REUSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the distinguished majority leader in his modest and controlled feeling of elation at the results of the election in the Seventh District of Wisconsin yesterday.

Crowing is unbecoming, and we do not crow, but we are very proud of the forthright and refreshing campaign conducted by Congressman-elect David Obey. It has the additional effect, I believe, of putting to rest rumors that the Democratic Party is no more.

This is the first time in history that a Democrat has carried this Seventh District of Wisconsin. It is significant that Congressman-elect Obey in his campaign made a major issue of the need for tax reform, and the plugging of loopholes. I believe the tremendous response he received from the electors of the Seventh District of Wisconsin shows the mood of the people.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I join the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Albert), in his praise for the aggressive and vigorous campaign of Mr. Obey. We shall all welcome him to the House of Representatives, and I am sure we shall find him a most honorable and dedicated colleague.

HONORING OUR LATE PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

(Mr. HOWARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, during the month of January the District of Columbia Armory Board determined that it would honor the late Senator from the State of New York, the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, by renaming the District of Columbia Stadium the "Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium." They are presently using this name on their stationery, and a dedication ceremony is to be held during the month of June.

Yesterday in the House legislation was introduced which would strip away this honor to a great American, and by legislation change the name of the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Stadium.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which will, by law, name the District of Columbia Stadium the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium to protect this honor to a great American. I have also introduced legislation which will have the President appoint a commission which will spend 6 months discussing with the family of former President Eisenhower and other interested persons a suitable memorial to our former President.

The commission will report their recommendations to the Congress within 6 months. I would hope that both the resolution and the bill will pass the Congress during this session.

I invite the support of as many of my colleagues who feel inclined to agree with my position, because I believe we can honor former President Eisenhower without doing it at the expense of another great American, the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that last year the House Committee on Education and Labor reported out a bill which the Congress approved and which I understood was, at the request of the Eisenhower family, to appropriate, if my memory serves me right, $5 million for the Eisenhower College in Kansas.

I believe it was the expressed will of the former President that this would be a monument or memorial, or call it what you like, and which the Congress had appropriated funds for the memorial for Mr. Eisenhower. At least I think we should know that there is an Eisenhower College in existence in memory of a great President.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I believe there are many ways to honor the former President, but I think it is rather ill timed and uncalled for to try to take away an honor to another great American.

LAWRENCE KUYKENDALL HONORED BY ARMY FOR MERITORIOUS CIVILIAN SERVICE

(Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend a few days ago a ceremony at the Pentagon in which the Under Secretary of the Army, Mr. Thaddeus R. Beal, honored a citizen of the Fourth District of Oklahoma, Mr. Lawrence Kuykendall of Anadarko, for meritorious civilian service.

Mr. Kuykendall has some 20 years of Federal service, and in the last 3 years has been a recreation specialist at Fort Sill, receiving five promotions during that period.

In addition to his citation by the Army during his recent visit here he was one of 10 finalists who received awards from the Civil Service Commission in the National Handicapped Employee of the Year citation.

Lawrence Kuykendall lost both hands in an accident that occurred when he was 10 years old. He fell off a fence while watching a polo match and was burned when he grasped a high-voltage electric wire.

He did not let this handicap stop him from a record of remarkable achievement. His first job was that of a delivery boy for his hometown paper, the Anadarko Daily News.

In a recent article the Daily News recalls:

> It happened this way. The paper's circulation manager came by his home. Mrs. Kuykendall asked about a job for her son. The deal was made that Lawrence could have a route, if he established one for himself. With this in mind, he started out. The first day he picked up 10 papers, and by nightfall he had 10 customers. The second day, he picked up 20 papers, and so it continued until he developed his own route of 145 customers. He held this job seven years, or until he entered Langston University.

A natural athlete, Kuykendall was captain of his high school football team, and also lettered in basketball and softball. At Langston he played football and basketball while majoring in history.

During World War II he started work at Fort Sill as a summer employee. He became a truck driver and eventually a driver's test examiner.

While holding his job at Fort Sill, he acted as a part-time member of the Harlem Magicians, flying to take part in key games.

At the same time he was a disc jockey for a Lawton radio station and with the help of his family operated a grocery store.

Mr. and Mrs. Kuykendall's two oldest sons also have made athletic records for themselves.

It is good to see due recognition given to a man with the outstanding record of Lawrence Kuykendall.

OUTDOOR RECREATION INVESTIGATION

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take much pride in the fact that the New York State College of Forestry at Syracuse University is located in my congressional district. My pride is for both the institution and the faculty. The faculty is blessed with the services of a number of our Nation's outstanding Forest Service scientists. A program now underway at the college is especially impressive to me, and that is the investigation of the outdoor recreation supply and demand in New York State and the Northeastern States. I fully recognize the immense importance of this activity as it affects our Nation's recreational program.

Yesterday, I was privileged to join Prof. Russell Getty, chairman of the Department of Forest Management at the college, and I might add an outstanding authority, in support of his testimony before the House Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations. I would like to share his statement with my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY MR. GETTY

> The Forest Service conducts a very modest forest recreation research program located at the New York State College of Forestry campus, Syracuse, New York. Forest Service scientists there are investigating outdoor recreation supply and demand in New York State and elsewhere throughout the Northeast. This program is designed to provide the information needed to insure that public demands for forest recreation opportunities are efficiently met. Particular attention is being given to the development of guidelines to assist in establishing financially successful recreation businesses on privately owned woodlands.
>
> The Forest Service program is conducted cooperatively with the College of Forestry. College and Forest Service recreation research scientists work together to the public benefit and are building an expertise in forest recreation research that promises to yield great public benefit. The College provides offices, utilities, computer services and other facilities for the Forest Service staff. In turn, the Forest Service provides funds for cooperative research, assists in graduate studies, provides lecturers for special occasions and participates in other ways in the College program.
>
> Currently the Forest Service has a staff of three scientists at the College financed by an appropriation of $80,000. A reasonable program in keeping with the complex problems and the economic and social values at stake, would require an additional $250,000. These additional funds would be used to: (1) increase cooperative research with the College of Forestry; (2) increase the staff of Forest Service scientists at Syracuse and provide adequate supporting employees; (3) furnish the funds needed to conduct a more aggressive field and laboratory research program.
>
> Groups that seek and use results of this research include: National Campground Owners Association, Eastern Ski Area Owners Association, Adirondack Mountain Club, National Recreation and Park Association, New York Forest Landowners Association and the National Ski Areas Association as well as recreation and conservation departments of all of the states in the Northeast.
>
> Nationwide, demands for outdoor recreation have been increasing at an annual rate of 10 percent per year since the end of World War II. Demands have outstripped the current development of facilities and a tripling of demand is forecast by the year 2000 The Northeast, as a whole, is in a particularly unsatisfactory position in this situation with 25 percent of the population but less than 5 percent of the public recreation land acreage. Also, in the Northeast about 94 percent of all forest land is privately owned. As a result, many opportunities exist for financially successful recreational enterprises on private forest lands.
>
> However, little is known about the requirements for successful income-producing outdoor recreation enterprises on privately owned forests and farm woodlands. Analysis made by the Forest Service and others indicates that about one-third of the private forest recreation businesses in the Northeast are operating at a loss. Still another one-third are marginal and only the remaining one-third are earning a net return on their investments. Research has discovered some of the factors that contribute to profitable businesses. But much remains to be determined before private woodland owners can be given dependable guidelines for the establishment of recreational enterprises that are profitable and meet public recreation needs.
>
> Outdoor recreation on privately owned areas is expanding rapidly in the Northeast. In the last 5 years the number of private campgrounds has quadrupled and in the State of Pennsylvania alone, 37 new privately owned ski areas have been developed. In New York the total recreation expenditures are estimated to be in excess of $2.2 billion annually. Much of this expenditure is made for recreation directly or indirectly oriented to forest land resources.
>
> The development of a larger and more successful private forest recreation business in New York and adjacent states would make rural living more appealing and help slow the migration of rural citizens to the cities. These businesses would enhance employment and income opportunities for rural people and attract them to their own communities. Furthermore, they would provide a more abundant and a greater variety of opportuni-

ties for our urban citizens to reduce the stresses of city living.

New York and other Northeastern States are recognizing the tremendous importance of outdoor recreation. For example, in 1961 a public bond issue was authorized in New York which included 50 million dollars solely for the acquisition of non-urban wildland. And in 1965, a 200 million dollar bond issue was passed by the people of New York State to develop previously acquired lands for outdoor recreation.

With so much public and private money being spent for outdoor recreation development, we should be deeply concerned that the optimum benefits accrue from these expenditures. The optimum allocation of land and capital resources and the coordination of recreation with other uses for our land resources call for systematic and intensive research into our recreational needs and demands.

Specific areas of research that should be vigorously pursued include:

(1) Determination of present demand for particular recreation activities.

(2) The role of management in the successful operation of recreation enterprises.

(3) Factors affecting participation patterns of recreationists.

(4) Development of a mechanism or model that predicts future demand and provides needed knowledge for planning and decision making.

(5) Development of guidelines for the planning, installing, and operating privately owned forest recreation enterprises.

The Northeastern Forest Experiment Station's forest recreation research unit at Syracuse is making progress in solving the forest recreation problems, but this progress is not keeping pace with the expanding problems. The full implementation of the Federal research program described above at a level adequate to meet the current management needs of recreation enterprises will require additional appropriations. We recommend that $250,000 be added to the Forest Service budget for this purpose.

This sum would represent only 1/1,000th of 1 percent of the annual recreation expenditure in the state of New York alone. Expressed in terms of the $250,000,000 recreation bond issues already approved in the state the increased research recommended means 1/100 of 1%. The expansion of research recommended would provide a sound scientific basis in support of the recreation business and the public bonds in the state of New York and thus would be an excellent public investment.

THE LATE VITO ROMANO

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago my home community was shocked by the sudden death of one of its truly outstanding citizens, a man whose friendship I cherished, Vito Romano. He was loved and respected by all who knew him. He enjoyed a splendid reputation in the practice of law and made his talent always available to the best interest of our community.

His love for community and Nation was so deep and abiding. I believe that the story of Vito Romano is best told in the following article authored by an editor of the Syracuse Herald-Journal who obviously possesses great talent, Mr. Mario Rossi. I am so impressed with his account that I felt it appropriate that I share it with my colleagues:

POST SCRIPTS: A REAL MAN

(By Mario Rossi)

Since we are only human, it is our tendency to largely consider death a cruel and inconsiderate machination of fate and to rail against its inevitability, especially when it takes away someone as youthful and vital as Vito Romano.

In calmer and more retrospective mood, we are more inclined, of course, to accept even that which we cannot understand, and to also find a measure of solace; we turn now to the man worth remembering and begin to feel that his passing, however untimely, has endowed us with a rich heritage.

Vito Romano cannot help but be a vivid memory.

He did not fade away; he did not slip from our midst by degrees.

He was with us; then, quite suddenly, he was gone

RESPONSIVE SMILE

In this context, the man still stands tall, slender and impeccably groomed. His air of refinement and breeding remains reassuringly intact, and one can yet see the responsive smile and hear his pleasant laughter.

There is, too, the stunning portrait of Vito and his beloved wife, Edith, as they moved up James street on a Sunday morning, homeward bound after services at St. Peter's Church.

They were a brilliant and beautiful couple, so much a picture of grace and elegance that they almost seemed anachronistic in an age of speed and madness. Hand in hand, they were a rotogravure pair out of a Fifth Avenue Easter tableau every Sunday of the year, radiating the sheer happiness of being alive and together.

DETERMINED COMBAT

Beyond the imagery, however, there lingers the strength of a man who saw duty on the political front as part of his personal commitment to city and country. In this, one of the roughest arenas of all, he engaged in determined combat without shedding an iota of principle or a trace of dignity.

What he taught his fellow citizens in this respect is that one need not compromise any of his ideals of rules of conduct in following a course of action which is as difficult and challenging as it is necessary to the survival of our democracy.

To look at Vito—cultured, quiet, almost sedate—one would be inclined to rate him as a political observer. But he was not. He was an active participant, and the fact that he was a fair and gentlemanly fighter did not diminish his stature as an adversary to be reckoned with.

REASSURING MANNER

While Vito had achieved much in his career as an attorney and his avocation as a civic leader, there can be no doubt he would have reached many other bright goals had he been granted a longer span of life. His quiet charm, his reassuring manner and his personal capabilities certainly point to that.

But it is futile to speculate on the impossible.

It is better to recall that while Vito Romano would never be able to achieve his full potential in terms of professional and political success, he managed in his half century to write a most eloquent and complete chapter as a human being. In this reference, our impulse is to call attention to the great respect and affection in which he was held by all who knew him; yet this is not the really important story.

CONCERN FOR OTHERS

The true message of his existence lay in the regard which he felt for his fellow man. He was ever concerned with the welfare of others, and the courtliness of his conduct was a sincere reflection of his entire nature. He was the essence of nobility, and he made all within his sphere feel they were the beneficiaries of a largesse of spirit.

And he was ever thus.

I asked an old neighbor what he was like as a boy.

"The same," she said, "always the same."

THE B-52 SORTIES REDUCED

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I strongly object to the announced decision to cut back the B-52 sorties from 1,800 to 1,600 a month, particularly since the decision was made for fiscal and not military reasons. Not only this, the decision imperils our troops, which is my primary concern, and also may give encouragement to the enemy not to agree to settle the war at the Paris peace talks. We have everything to lose and nothing to gain by this decision. Insofar as I am able to influence the matter, I shall do my best to see that a reversal of the decision takes place.

On a related issue, I believe time is running out on the bombing halt—first, because there has been no indication that our forbearance has produced any peace directed actions by Hanoi and its allies. Second, because the enemy has violated its terms in numerous instances.

PESTICIDE POLLUTION AND OUR FOOD SUPPLY

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, high levels of the pesticide Dieldrin have required impounding of 22,555 pounds of frozen Coho salmon produced by a Michigan firm and shipped to two other Midwestern States. The Food and Drug Administration impounded the fish.

In addition, we hear that spring releases of salmon fingerlings in Lake Michigan have been temporarily suspended as a precaution.

Here again we see handwriting on the wall. The environment we depend upon has finite amounts of pure air, water, and wildlife. Blindly we are destroying the balance of our environment. We are toying with the ecology of our continent and world.

Whenever something on this order occurs, and individuals stand up to protest and call for action, there is a sidling away on the part of those who are responsible and those who can act.

No one wants to step on any toes. No one wants to become involved. No one really wants to understand. Someday it will go away if we leave it alone. Someday, in every way, we shall awake to find that the good Lord has waved his hand and made everything well again.

There is no womb for us to retreat to. There is no escape from the consequences of our actions. We shall pay the bill in full for allowing pesticides to pollute our environment. We shall suffer in full for damage we are doing to wildlife, air, and water we depend on. If we, ourselves, do not sicken or die, then it shall be the horrible fate of our children to do so as a result of our laxness and inability to face up to our responsibilities.

We are not controlling the fruits of science. Pesticides are silent killers. They do not murder with noise or in a sickening way. They kill quietly—over a period of time. We are all carrying DDT residues in our bodies right now—all of us.

I have, in the past, introduced a bill to control America's use of chemicals. Today I am also introducing a measure that will prohibit the sale or shipment for use in the United States of the chemical compound known as DDT. The bill follows:

H.R. 9868

A bill to prohibit the sale or shipment for use in the United States of the chemical compound known as DDT

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (61 Stat. 163; 7 U.S.C. 135–135k) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"Sec. 17. Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other Act, after June 30, 1970, it shall be unlawful for any person to distribute, sell, or offer for sale in any territory or in the District of Columbia, or to ship or deliver for shipment from any State, territory, or the District of Columbia, to any other State, territory, or the District of Columbia, or to receive in any State, territory, or the District of Columbia, from any other State, territory, or the District of Columbia, or a foreign country the chemical compound dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane, commonly known as DDT.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PODELL. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I happen to know something about the situation in Michigan to which the gentleman refers. Let me point out that there is not a scintilla of valid or solid evidence that the residue has any serious effect whatsoever on any individual, and there is not one bit of evidence that any individual has suffered any serious effects from the residue in salmon or in any other fish. The Federal Food and Drug Administration has produced various chemical analyses of the alleged amount of chemical residue in these salmon and in other fish. It would be just as rational for the Federal Pure Food and Drug Administration, if any amount of DDT residue is harmful in fish, to make the same kind of charge and allegation against canned salmon from other parts of the country. I can imagine the hue and cry from people all over the United States if all fish that have any DDT residue in them were prohibited from being caught or consumed.

What I am saying is that the Federal Pure Food and Drug Administration must come up with some very specific information as to possible ill effects from such a residue. This is not a case of botulism, where an individual ate something and died as a result. This is pure speculation on the part of the Pure Food and Drug Administration—pure speculation. They have a responsibility to find out—and as yet they do not have a scintilla of evidence, not one iota of evidence—that the residue has caused any ill effects to a single person.

Mr. PODELL. I thank the gentleman. I would like merely to point out that there is another fish coming out of Lake Michigan called a chubb. It has been impounded by the Food and Drug Administration so far as its admission into the State of New York is concerned. It has been claimed that there has been some botulism, or perhaps residue from an insecticide of some kind. Authorities were not sure, but they did impound quantities of this fish because it did cause serious illness to some people who consumed it. They do not know the answer. Finally, in regard to DDT, when scientific proof exists that animal life is being harmed by DDT—when levels of its residue rise in watersheds—we can reasonably be apprehensive over its possible threat to people.

I agree with the gentleman that the Food and Drug Administration should and must find the answer to this problem.

ABM—OR—WITH MESSRS. NIXON AND LAIRD IN NEVER-NEVER LAND

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has come out four square for the limited ABM against a Red Chinese threat that really is not there. Mr. Laird huffs up to Capitol Hill to argue on behalf of Safeguard. His view of the world is frightening, indeed. Protect us from the demons, Mr. Laird sees. Chinese hordes, Soviet blockbusters, little green dragons, and puce horned toads. Does the good Secretary of Defense look under his bed before retiring? I wonder.

Still, we must realize that he has been on the defensive for a long time. If only Safeguard sounded more manly. It sounds more like a soap than a missile. Perhaps an advertising agency would be helpful to Mr. Laird. Procter & Gamble has a good one, I am told. Now Sentinel sounded hairy-chested, even though it was worthless. It sounded reassuring. Perhaps the agency might come up with a television program entitled "Melvin in Wonderland," or "How I Learned To Ignore Social Problems and Love ABM." Nor would the show lack for sponsors. The Cannon Kings would thump down their cash. Then, at least, the people paying the bill would get to see some peachy keen simulations of how it would work.

Also, the program would be able to sell the Air Force's ABM version. It only costs $16 billion, and is called MODS—missile offensive defensive system. Of course, the Navy now is rushing into the lists with its Sabmis—seaborne antiballistic missile.

Just think of how some of the exciting chapters would come across on the screen. "How the Russians Are Building a First Strike Force To Attack Us and Wipe Out All Our Retaliatory Forces," or, "How To Provide Minimum Protection at Maximum Cost."

Mr. Laird is frightening a good many people with his rumblings of Russian ICBM's and Chinese ICBM's. I wonder if it has ever dawned on him how frightening his comments are to a good many other people all over the world—including the Soviets. When people are frightened, they start to react. If they react by escalating the arms race, not even Safeguard will be any help.

Still, it is a consolation to the hungry, the poor, and the overtaxed that at least the Cannon Kings will die rich in the unavoidable holocaust that will inevitably follow. Generals and admirals will die arguing merits of their respective ABM's of the different services. The rest of us will die poor, in ignorance of the merits of their hardware—and in unspeakable agony.

OIL BARONS PLAY GAMES, TOO, AT THE EXPENSE OF THE CONSUMER

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record).

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, lo and behold, the oil barons are down to their last billion, and as a result, they must play games—at consumer expense. You need no talent or skill to play them. All you have to be is a sucker consumer, and you are fair game for the oil barons who lure you into retail outlets by promising something for nothing.

Of course, this is a farce. Pity the retail gasoline dealers of the Nation, who are often bludgeoned into buying these games from the seller at the pointed request of the oil company whose franchise he happens to hold. After purchasing the games, which up his overhead, the retail gasoline station operator naturally passes the cost of the games on to his customers. The retailers who operate these stations at minimal profit for terrible labor and long hours are relatively blameless. Only the oil barons are to blame. It is merely another way to move gasoline at the greater expense of the public.

Numbers of real winners are quite low, with evidence pointing to the fact that some few areas are "salted" with a few flashy winners in order to build a publicity campaign around further promotion efforts. Only the consumer loses along with the gas station operator. Promoters and the oil barons emerge as eventual victors.

I am not saying that the oil barons would rob a child's piggy bank and leave I O U's. I am saying, however, that to the unbelievable list of exploitations of the public by the oil industry, we now may add games of chance.

We have now reached a point where even the original bulldog with rubber teeth, the Federal Trade Commission, has begun to make noises of regulation aimed at the games. Wonders, I suppose, will never cease.

Delight is piled upon delight. Oil barons take the 27½-percent depletion allowance, prohibit cheaper foreign oil imports, pollute our environment, raise gasoline prices at will, and drive gasoline station operators to the wall with games that only delude the public and raise prices.

It seems the oil barons are many-sided men. Taxpayers might keep these little nuggets of fact in mind as they fill out their tax returns.

THE UNITED STATES AND UNITED NATIONS HINDER MIDEAST PEACE

(Mr. OTTINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Security Council's one-sided condemnation of Israel for her retaliatory air attack on Jordan is deplorable and destructive of chances for peace in the Middle East.

The Security Council had and continues to have an obligation to prevent the Arab terrorist attacks against Israel and to make retaliatory attacks unnecessary. But the Security Council has ignored repeated guerrilla attacks against Israel—attacks which have taken the lives of nearly 300 Israelis, many of them civilians, since the 6-day war of 1967. It has ignored the persecution and public hangings of Iraqi Jews. It has ignored Arab attacks on Israeli civil airliners.

How can the United Nations justify condemning Israel for defending herself when the U.N. has failed to meet its obligation to defend Israel?

Failure of the United States to veto the condemnation resolution is equally deplorable and destructive of the chances for peace. The United States cannot sit on the sidelines while U.N. action in effect encourages continued Arab terrorism. Is this evidence of the more "even-handed" Middle East policy Governor Scranton hinted the Nixon administration would adopt? If so, the likelihood of full-scale war between Israel and the Arab States has markedly increased, and with it the imminent danger of U.S. involvement in a major war.

It is not enough to stand pat in the Middle East. The status quo is just too perilous. We need new initiatives toward peace. We need U.S. action through the U.N. and directly to help Israel stop Arab terrorism, to assure Israel's invulnerability to attack in the short run and in the long run to reduce Middle East armaments and to reach a settlement of the raging Middle East disputes. The time is now.

BACONE COLLEGE EARNS NATIONAL ATTENTION

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the very real privileges in representing Oklahoma's Second District in Congress is the honor of representing Bacone College at Muskogee.

The Oklahoma Teacher, the magazine of the Oklahoma Education Association, recently featured Bacone College in an article entitled "The Uniqueness of Bacone," and Bacone is truly unique.

It is a 2-year college with fewer than 800 students enrolled, yet its reputation is nationwide. It was established as an Indian College in 1880, and more than half its students are Indian today. Its students have represented all 50 States during the last 5 years. Its sports program, concentrating on basketball and baseball, is nationally known. I hope some of you here have had the opportunity to hear the college's fine and colorful choir during one of its annual visits to Washington.

This is a proud institution, and I am proud to represent it. I place this article on "The Uniqueness of Bacone" in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIQUENESS OF BACONE

At the close of the 1968 school year at Bacone Junior College, a letter, written by an anonymous student, was slipped under the office door of Dean of Students Bill Burgess. Entitled simply "From Me to You," it sums up how students past and present feel about Bacone.

"Each year hundreds of Indian, Negro, and White students pour from every corner of the United States into a small college in eastern Oklahoma. What draws them there?

"It isn't new buildings or expensive furniture. It isn't the tremendous variety of social activities on campus. The answer goes much deeper than the surface of buildings or furniture or social events.

"Bacone doesn't have much to offer the athlete, yet just last year it ranked 18th in the nation in basketball and "Number One" in baseball. * * * Why is it found at Bacone?

"At the beginning of each year kids pour into the chapel basement with no singing talent but with a hunger to share with others a song from their hearts. With these Miss Rainwater works and creates a singing choir which moves and inspires the hearts of those who hear. Why? And Dr. West, who not only opens our eyes to the things around us but causes us to love and appreciate this beauty—how is this done? And why? Why?

"This small college tucked away in the hills of eastern Oklahoma has something very wonderful and special to offer and share to anyone who seeks it. Bacone has many different cultures, faces, and religions. These differences are not kept separate, but there is a mixing and sharing of them. Baconeons have a tendency to become "color blind." You are not accepted by the money or looks you have, your prestige, or your popularity. Instead you are accepted by what you are inside. This isn't as easy as it sounds. It is a soul-searching process, one which takes time, but one which gives in return respect for each other and for yourself.

"At Bacone you share many things. You share biology notes and feelings for Mr. Weaver. You share Life of Christ and P. E. Class. You share hopes and ideas. You share joy and heart-break. You share your clothes. But as you begin to do this you'll discover something very special—you begin to share yourself.

"At Bacone many ideas are changed and many dreams are built. Many friendships are built, and a set of lifetime standards are beginning to be shaped and molded. Many cultures—one mankind—this is what Bacone is all about. This is what keeps miles no barrier between Bacone and her former students.

"All this and much more—this is Bacone."

As the student's letter indicates, Bacone Junior College is a unique educational institution for many reasons:

The college is willing to provide financial assistance to students on need rather than academic performance;

Most students are bilingual and have not adapted to white middle class values;

A congenial campus atmosphere exists because a student is accepted as he is and is encouraged to know himself, accept himself and develop himself;

A disciple program that concerns itself with "why" something happened rather than "what" happened;

Students communicate, study and develop in a Christian non-denominational setting.

Not so unique, perhaps, but very true is the statement from Dr. Garold D. Holstine, Bacone President, "the entire United States is our neighborhood." Although only 771 students are enrolled at Bacone, they came this year from 33 states, and over the past five years, students from all 50 states have been on the rolls of the college.

Primarily thought of as an Indian school, one-half of the college's students are Indian descent from 49 different tribes. The remaining 40 percent of Bacone's population is caucausian and 10 percent is Negro.

It is evident that Bacone serves both Indian and non-Indian students. However, all scholarship funds are awarded to Indian students. Bacone enables Indian students to combine their rich heritage with the academic skills that will fit them for leadership either among their own people, or in the merging society of modern day America.

As Dean Burgess is quick to relate, "Bacone seeks primarily the students who need the college, not the student who may be high in academic standards. Bacone's faculty and administration follows the precept of 'give me the I will, and to heck with the I.Q.' "

Bacone was founded in 1880 by Professor Almon C. Bacone, and was originally located in Tahlequah. It remained there for five years before moving to the more centralized area of the five civilized tribes and its present site two miles east of Muskogee.

From its beginning to now, the record of Bacone's history is one of response to changing conditions. During its early years, Bacone offered primary education all the way to a college degree. Bacone today emerges as a church-related college, a liberal arts junior college and a growing community college with a deep concern for Indian education.

President Holstine sees "the new Bacone" entering into and serving the community. The college works closely and cooperates fully with civic and community organizations and is well aware of its task of making its students capable of continuing their higher education in the four year colleges and universities.

Accredited by the North Central Association of College and Secondary Schools in 1965, Bacone is particularly proud of four areas in their liberal arts program.

The Art program, under the supervision of Dick West, offers painting, wood sculpturing, metal work and weaving. Dr. West is recognized as one of the most outstanding Indian artists in the nation and his teaching talents are of the same quality.

Bacone College music has become known nationwide. The Bacone Choir recently completed an 18 concert trip with an appearance on the steps of the Nation's Capitol. The choir, under the direction of Miss Jeannine Rainwater, has also appeared on national television.

Bacone's athletic program, concentrating on baseball and basketball, has produced much notoriety for the school and state. Bacone's baseball team won the national junior college championship in 1967 and had more athletes sign professional baseball contracts in 1966 than any other college in the nation. Bacone basketball teams are always outstanding and have finished high in the national rankings in recent years.

The school's Associate Degree program in Nursing is a course of study designed to prepare fully qualified nurses.

In keeping with its charge to serve the community, Bacone also has 185 students enrolled in off-campus courses through "Operation Headstart" supplementary training programs.

Bacone's 35 faculty members are teachers who have concern for young people who need help. The college faculty works for salaries that are considerably less than those of comparable colleges. "Bacone teachers are to be commended for their dedication to a kind of task that is so apparent," Dr. Holstine emphasizes. "Our staff, highly successful in their efforts, works long hours and deprives themselves of many of their own pursuits to educate our students in an inter-racial, interculture situation."

Faculty homes are always open to students, whether it be for entertainment or personal counseling. Dean Burgess's home, complete with color television, has hosted as many as 50 students. Many faculty members set aside specific days of the week to invite students over for companionship. Many Bacone students would rather stay at the college than go home on holidays—a tribute to the faculty and other students of the college.

It should be noted here that Bacone students are not catered to unnecessarily, "given" grades or pampered. As Dean Burgess says, "we call our students men and women and expect them to conduct themselves as such. We do not have a lot of policies and students have freedom as long as they don't infringe on the rights of others."

It is also Bacone tradition that students behave in a manner befitting the college or face a stern lesson from the rest of the student body.

The true test of Bacone's mettle is revealed by the following fact:

Out of every 100 students who enroll for the two year program, only 10 fail to make it. The college has a significant 90 percent holding power for their two year program, despite the fact that many students arrive from all over the United States not knowing if they have been accepted in the college, coming from a different culture than they will be exposed to, and many lacking adequate educational backgrounds!

Bacone is a private institution in that it is fully supported by church foundations and civic organizations. Under a new concept, Bacone will eventually become a four-year school, with four new dormitories to be constructed and plans to make full use of the college's 230 acres with centers for Humanities, Nursing Sciences, Sports, Languages, History, Applied Arts, Social Sciences and Economics.

Professor Bacone, seeing his dream come true nearly 90 years ago, said: "A Christian school planted in the midst of a people becomes one of the most powerful agencies in the work of civilization."

Today, Dr. Holstine says, "Bacone never wants to be large enough to require an IBM card system where students will get lost in the multitude. The principle of a quality education in a Christian environment will always be retained in the future."

Bacone Junior College is indeed unique.

COTERMINOUS REGIONAL AREAS FOR AGENCIES OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Mr. MARSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the President made a decision to follow certain recommendations which I understand came from the Bureau of the Budget for coterminous regional areas for agencies of the Federal Government in various parts of the United States.

One of the results of this decision was to move from Charlottesville, Va., to Philadelphia the regional headquarters for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that for a number of years had been serving the States of Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, North Carolina, and Kentucky. Over 400 experienced personnel of this agency will be directly affected by this change. The decision has been made to move the headquarters to a State that was not in the region.

Difficult to fathom is the economics and the efficiency of the move. It is hard to understand the rationale that dictates, simply you create coterminous boundaries for the service areas of various agencies, that you should then move established regional headquarters that are still central to the regions they serve.

In the last 5 years, to accommodate the regional headquarters for HEW at Charlottesville, a modern, five-story building was erected—planned for HEW purposes and authorized to be constructed for their use at a cost of $2 million. This building was dedicated less than 3 years ago.

Now HEW will be vacating their modern, 3-year-old, multimillion-dollar regional headquarters to find new quarters—probably rented—in a city where I am sure we can expect space to be limited and costs to be high.

At a time when everyone is concerned about inflation and rising costs of government, this does not seem to be a step toward reducing Federal expenditures.

For the reasons outlined above, it is my hope that President Nixon will review this decision and reconsider the action that was announced last week.

REQUEST TO ACTIVATE MOUNTAIN VIEW HOSPITAL, TACOMA, WASH.

(Mr. HICKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, today I am presenting for the consideration of the Congress a proposal which affords us a unique opportunity to help 58,000 veterans.

The proposal is in the form of a memorial from the Washington State Legislature asking that Mountain View Hospital at Tacoma, Wash., be activated as a Veterans' Administration hospital.

This is a fine facility, already functioning as a general hospital and a tuberculosis sanitorium. It includes a complete surgery, obstetric section, and all the other facilities of a licensed general hospital. In the three-county area which such a hospital would serve, there are some 58,000 veterans, with the hospital virtually in the geographic center.

Although the Veterans' Administration hospitals' patient load has decreased nationwide, Washington State still has more veteran patients than it has facilities for their care. I am informed that the VA is considering expanding its hospital at Seattle to care for the State's veterans. How much more practical, Mr. Speaker, to use this existing hospital instead.

At present veterans from this area must drive through the heaviest traffic in the Northwest to the Seattle hospital, and the parking situation is almost hopeless. Such extreme conditions would not obtain at Mountain View.

The Seattle hospital is a good one. There are few complaints from people treated there. The complaints come from those who are not able to obtain treatment because of overcrowding. Mountain View would alleviate this.

There is no doubt in my mind that to use Mountain View as a hospital for veterans would be a most prudent and effective manner to help us meet our responsibilities to the men and women who have defended our country.

But time is of the essence. Pierce County is deactivating its general hospital on June 30, and the tuberculosis patients are being moved to another facility. Understandably, the county wishes to turn the hospital to use as soon as possible, both for the usefulness of the facility and to avoid expenditures for maintenance.

I respectfully and urgently request that the proper committee, the Veterans' Administration, and the Congress act favorably and as swiftly as possible to take advantage of this opportunity.

I include here House Joint Memorial 3 as adopted by the Washington State Legislature:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

To the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas, an unprecedented opportunity exists for the immediate direct benefit of fifty-eight thousand veterans of the Pierce, Kitsap and Thurston county area of the State of Washington; and

Whereas, the need for veterans hospital facilities exceeds the availability of facilities in the State of Washington; and

Whereas, the Mountain View Sanitorium, operated for the benefit of tuberculosis patients originally, is now being phased out; and

Whereas, disuse of this facility will result in a direct economic loss to the community; and

Whereas, a minimum federal expenditure would reactivate Mountain View as a three hundred-bed veterans hospital facility; and

Whereas, the Mountain View Sanitorium would provide direct hospital services for fifty-eight thousand veterans near their families and loved ones and specifically would provide for an estimated one hundred twenty aged, sick and needy veterans for this immediate area; and

Whereas, the three-county area is the second largest concentration of veterans in the State of Washington and is completely without veterans administration hospital facilities;

Now, therefore, Your Memorialists respectfully pray that the Congress of the United States enact legislation to provide a federal grant for activation of Mountain View Sanitorium as a veterans administration hospital; and

Be it resolved, That copies of this Memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington.

Passed the House March 4, 1969.

DON LISUDGE,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the Senate March 10, 1969.

JOHN A. CHERBERG,
President of the Senate.

THE STORY OF THE IAPA—VIGILANCE FOR FREEDOM

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most informative articles I have seen on the freedom of the press in Latin America was published in the March 1969 issue of Nieman Reports. Titled "The Story of the IAPA," the article discusses the history and accomplishments of the Inter-American Press Association. The article was written by Mr. Lee Hills, president and executive editor of Knight Newspapers, Inc., and immediate past president of IAPA.

As Mr. Hills points out, IAPA is largely responsible for the fact that the Western Hemisphere is one region of the world whose people—96 percent of them—have been living under varying conditions of press freedom. Comprised of more than 1,000 publications and individuals from news media throughout the hemisphere, IAPA has been a strong bulwark against the threat to freedom represented by many of the new Latin American dictatorships. By using its pressure against censorship, IAPA has helped maintain the editorial independence of major news media in some countries—and at times, it has even saved the lives of courageous editors imprisoned or "questioned" by military authorities.

IAPA's job has not been easy; Mr. Hills notes that in some Latin American countries, "people seem to be willing at length to accept limitations on their democratic freedoms in return for some economic well-being." Yet, he adds:

> The association protests every restriction of freedom of the press. This may consist of suppression of free newspapers, their direct or indirect control by a government, the imprisonment or arrest of newspapermen, official subsidies, discrimination in the release of news, the existence of official news agencies, any interference in the management's freedom to run a newspaper, discriminatory taxes, government control of newsprint imports or sales, or any other restrictive measures.

The article sets forth IAPA's forceful and effective actions on behalf of freedom of the press in this hemisphere—a record of dedication to this high ideal that has won the association the respect of believers in freedom everywhere. I commend the article to my colleagues' attention. Mr. Hills declares:

> Inch by desperate inch, the Western Hemisphere is yielding to the fact of life that only truth can make and keep it free.

The article follows:

THE STORY OF THE IAPA

(By Lee Hills)

(NOTE.—Mr. Hills is president and executive editor of Knight Newspapers, Inc., and immediate past president of the Inter American Press Association. He is also a former president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Sigma, Delta Chi, and the Associated Press Managing Editors Association.)

We journalists in the United States are often tempted, I think, to believe that the fight for freedom of the press is over and that we have won.

Consistently, these days, our courts are ruling in favor of concepts of press liberty freer than ever before of legal shackles and restrictions. More and more states are adding laws to protect newspapers and reporters against coercion, intimidation and source disclosure. Even the campaign for greater freedom of information is progressing, though much remains to be done.

So the temptation to conclude that the war is over is understandable, but it must nevertheless be resisted. Perhaps Chicago will be valuable for the memory it leaves with us: Proof that freedom of the press, like all freedoms, exists only so long as we are capable of defending it.

Despite the Chicago experience, freedom of the press exists in the United States to a greater degree than virtually anywhere else in the world. In this atmosphere, it is not surprising that few of us are familiar with the Inter American Press Association, known to its friends as IAPA or "Yapa."

Perhaps the best introduction to I-A-P-A is to acknowledge to you that there are newspapermen in the Western Hemisphere today who are indebted to IAPA for their newspapers, their freedom and, in some cases, for their very lives. If that sounds dramatic, let me assure you that it is no more than the truth.

Despite its relative anonymity, IAPA has an impressive string of accomplishments.

1. IAPA is beyond doubt the most effective international group fighting to maintain and advance freedom of the press.

2. IAPA originated the concept of an inter-American professional organization, self-sufficient, unencumbered by government, and living off its own resources. No other profession has tried this and made it work so well.

3. IAPA is largely responsible for the fact that the Western Hemisphere is the one region of the world whose people—96 percent of them—have been living under varying conditions of press freedom. When I say "varying" I have in mind that less than 45 percent of the people of the world enjoy any real vestige of freedom.

4. IAPA has openly fought for the freedom of newsmen tyrannized by dictators such as Argentina's Peron, Trujillo of Santo Domingo, Colombia's Rojas Pinilla, Haiti's notorious "Papa, Doc" Duvalier, and many other enemies of liberty.

5. IAPA created a Technical Center, a Scholarship Fund and other services to help raise the newspaper standards, mechanical and editorial, of Latin America. As standards rise, so does the independence of the press.

The achievements of the Technical Center alone are worth special mention.

Created as a non-profit organization almost seven years ago, the center is the forum for the exchange of information, ideas and friendships which form the core of IAPA's efforts. Its chief task is to bring together working newspapermen from throughout the hemisphere to share equally in the development of newsgathering techniques and production technology. Seminars and round table meetings have been held in the United States and eight Latin American countries, in which more than 800 news executives have participated. The center offers a consulting service for Latin American newspapers and has published a series of books, monthly bulletins and the only complete Spanish language style manual available.

Growth of the IAPA has been slow. Could you imagine the Associated Press Managing Editors Association or the American Society of Newspaper Editors enduring, much less existing, if they had the bitter opposition of a militaristic national government?

When, however, IAPA's General Assembly met last October in Buenos Aires, I was happy to report that we had more than 1,000 publications and individuals on our membership rolls, a gain of 200 in one year and of 400 in five years. Certainly these inter-Americans cannot be intimidated.

Taken together, these publications have a circulation of 50 million copies daily. Most of them espouse freedom. This is a powerful voice.

Yet we must look at the dark side of our rediscovered moon of hemispheric liberty. So soon after the exhilaration of the Argentine meeting we find freedom under attack on new fronts. Three of every four Latin Americans now live under some kind of military rule, sometimes benign but in theory always potentially repressive. Anyone can tick off the countries. But in every one of them the IAPA presence for freedom is being felt.

Since 1930 there have been 39 military coups in Latin America. Some of them have been engineered by officers trained—supposedly in democratic ways—by the United States. A third of these coups have occurred since the Alliance for Progress got shakily off the ground in 1961, leaving behind it a doubt that now is growing because of suspicions of the Alliance's eventual failure.

We cannot judge Latin America, if indeed we should sit in any kind of judgment, by our own standards. A good example is Brazil, President Arthur da Costa e Silva, who ousted the extreme left wing Goulart in 1964, is a moderate who in December, 1968, lost control to radical, hard-line younger officers. They forced him to suspend congress, arrest political critics and some journalists, and introduce the trappings of dictatorship without, perhaps, fancying them himself.

These hard-line officers fear the press and are in awe of its power. They have confiscated newspaper editions and jailed editors and publishers. They currently enforce an enigmatic "self-censorship" that has destroyed the freedom of the press in Brazil.

Leading Brazilian editors who oppose military dictatorship are considered "subversive." They have been arrested and subjected to prolonged and repeated interrogations. In the course of the interrogations the officers conducting them have often displayed a tragically simplistic view of the press. "In the past year your newspaper has published one or more editorials generally favorable to . . . the U.S. . . . West Germany . . . Israel . . . Russia. Were you paid to publish these editorials by . . . the U.S. . . . West Germany . . Israel . . . Russia?"

When I talked with President Costa e Silva in Rio de Janeiro in late October he assured me there would be no infringement of press liberties. Yet that has occurred as the military dictatorship lets itself be drawn into political excesses alien to Brazil.

In Argentina, a nation of such great economic potential that its lack of leadership moves one almost to tears, there is yet no real recovery from the rapacious dictatorship of Gen. Peron. To a degree, however, Lt. Gen. Juan Carlos Ongania has brought the country back from ruinous inflation and is establishing some stability. So far, he has tolerated a free press and open criticism, something relatively rare among the outcroppings of military dictatorship in the last decade.

The Argentine press is free, but cautious. And the warning flags are flying. A recent law decreed by the Ongania regime despite widespread opposition from responsible public opinion calls for prior censorship of films.

Under the guise of protecting the public from "immoral" movies, government-appointed censors can ban any film on moral, social or political grounds. The editorial comment of one Argentine magazine was typical of press opposition to the law. The magazine termed the law "a bold and dangerous advance against the freedom of expression."

In Peru, too, the press lives under the cloud of a military dictatorship born last October even as we were meeting in Buenos Aires. Criticism of the government is tolerated in Peru, but not encouraged. An example comes from the editor of a moderately left magazine who was jailed for twitting the generals and questioned by a military officer.

"I tried to talk about the importance of a free press, the press as the fourth branch of government," the editor said after his release. "He reminded me that now Peru has only one branch of government."

Last October's second coup occurred in Panama, where the National Guard overthrew an elected government on its 12th day in office. One of the Guard's first actions after taking power was to crudely, and completely, censor the press. The Panamanian press now functions under "Guidelines" published by the National Guard. One of the "guidelines" warns editors "there shall be no insinuations that there is censorship." Editors are "asked" to observe the "guidelines," and one of the "guidelines" says: "This is the last time you will be asked to cooperate."

In much of Latin America today—too much—freedom of the press is as vulnerable as democracy. Newsmen in a number of countries ruefully share the views of a Peruvian editor who observed "It's easy to militarise the civilians. It takes longer to civilize the military."

Cuba, of course, is a special and most tragic case of its own. Avowedly a Communist nation under Castro's dictatorship, its control of the Cuban press is complete. Ten years after Castro's ascendency, many Cuban newspapermen still languish in Cuba's jails. Against the absolute tyranny of Castro, pressure from IAPA seems to be of little help but the task of rallying and maintaining public opinion against his oppressive measures continues to have top priority in our efforts.

These are just examples of what is happening in Latin America, and particularly in South America. People seem to be willing at length to accept limitations on their democratic freedoms in return for some economic well-being.

In Latin America as elsewhere when you come right down to it, the best of a working democracy is freedom of the press. Or, as American newsmen are more fond of calling it, freedom of information—the people's right to know.

The conservative and strongly nationalistic military regimes of Latin America believe they must maintain the status quo, protecting it against the discontent of youth who are reacting there as elsewhere in the restless search for some special identity.

The dangers to a free press in this kinetic atmosphere thus are obvious. Even in Chicago, newsmen were clubbed. It is no surprise that they are the first to be jailed in any political uprising. It was the elimination of press censorship by Alexander Dubcek in Czechoslovakia that, paradoxically, led to the Soviet occupation. Far from lying down, the Czech newspapers lambasted their Soviet neighbors and compelled the Kremlin to move against them.

We all know that the Russian game in the East is a loser. When young Czechs immolate themselves by fire, we sense the depths of the desire for freedom and certainty that it will be achieved.

The urge for freedom is even stronger in Latin America. That is why I want to tell you the story of the Inter American Press Association which I mentioned in the beginning.

Bear in mind that IAPA was not always robust, or effective, or independent. At the outset it was pitiably weak.

One of the most inspiring stories in the book of journalistic freedom is how it became, overnight, sinewy and strong. That transformation is one reason why I believe that other Latin American countries will not go the way of Cuba, and why I think that the flourishing new military regimes south of the border are less likely to follow the totalitarian footsteps of the Perons and the Trujillos.

Mary A. Gardner in her book on IAPA tells how the "First Pan American Congress of Journalists" meeting in Washington in 1926 called for creation of a permanent inter-American organization.

Sixteen years later the Mexican government organized and financed the next meeting, in Mexico City in 1942, with Communists trying to manipulate the sessions. Few journalists attended from the U.S.

A permanent organization was established at the Second Pan American Congress in Havana in 1943, and it was given the Spanish name we still carry, Sociedad Interamericana de Prensa.

From its very start the old SIP was infiltrated by Communists. They were particularly strong in the executive committee.

Only 12 United States publications sent delegates. These included Tom Wallace, Julio Garzon, Eugene B. Mirovitch, William P. Carney, Herbert Corn, Ralph McGill, Robert U. Brown and myself.

We were fascinated but dismayed by the proceedings. Cuba and Mexico were then the centers of Communist power in Latin America, and between them sent delegates from 130 publications. The Cuban government paid all the bills. Delegations sat and voted by countries. Many of the delegates were not journalists, but simply propagandists.

Numerous resolutions were strictly political, having nothing to do with the press. The Communist thrust was openly directed at the United States. The enthusiasm of Latin American newspapermen for an inter-American organization was obvious, however, and the dedicated work of Tom Wallace, Farris Flint, Joshua Powers and a few others made possible the new IAPA which later emerged.

The reaction began in 1945 at the Caracas congress against the way the SIP was constituted—political, non-professional, government-subsidized, Communist-infiltrated. The revolt grew at the 1946 Bogota meeting and jelled into action in Quito in 1949. With the aggressive backing of North Americans and a group of influential Latin American publishers, the Quito congress voted to reorganize the association.

This was done at an historic meeting in New York in 1950 which changed the basic character of IAPA, made it totally independent, sustained entirely by dues of its own members. For the first time it occupied itself predominantly with freedom of the press. This marked the end of government-sponsored congresses. The freedom of the press report that year denounced repressive measures against the press in 15 nations in the Americas.

Thus the Western Hemisphere learned a classic lesson in the frustration of Communist intrigue. The reorganized IAPA, its treasury empty and limited in membership, had a tough new start from scratch. The struggle against Communist infiltration had sapped its strength.

It needed the prestige and financial support of United States publications, and most of them were not interested. Clearly, IAPA needed a cause.

Suddenly, it was handed one by Juan Domingo Peron in 1951. Peron harassed, closed and finally expropriated the great newspaper La Prensa in Buenos Aires. Its widely revered publisher, Alberto Gainza Paz, escaped into exile in Uruguay.

A number of leading United States newspapers joined IAPA and helped rally public opinion in the hemisphere against Peron. As a result, IAPA gained enough strength to hand Peron his first defeat in the international field.

This came at the annual meeting of IAPA in Montevideo in October, 1951, only a few months after La Prensa's confiscation. Peron sent a delegation of 53, more than half the total attendance. Only 16 came from the United States.

The Peronistas applied for membership and tried to take over the meeting. Many of them wore guns into the meetings. The Board of Directors refused to be intimidated. It rejected all but 10 of the Argentine applications on the grounds that their newspapers were not democratic.

With that, the Peronists stormed out en masse along with eight other Latin Americans. They announced that they would form a Latin American Press Association, but it never got off the ground.

Press freedom was at a low ebb in Latin America during this period, and dictators were riding high. The re-born IAPA took them on, in country after country. It marshalled public opinion with a vigor that caused growing alarm among the dictators. They reacted with violent attacks on the IAPA.

After their defeat in Montevideo, Peron's bully-boys wrote a 437-page book assailing IAPA. The late Demetrio Canelas, of Los Tiempos, Cochabamba, Bolivia, saw his newspaper destroyed by government-inspired mobs, and then he was thrown in prison and threatened with execution as a traitor for not bowing editorially to the government. IAPA protests saved him.

Canelas thus expressed his gratitude: "I owe not only my freedom but my life to the Inter American Press Association." And so we have our theme.

IAPA has helped extract other editors and publishers from prison. It has fought to reopen newspapers closed by tyrants. It has aided in restoring confiscated newspapers to their rightful owners. Perhaps it has saved other lives.

Besides La Prensa of Argentina and Los Tiempos of Bolivia, the successful freedom campaigns include those for Pedro Joaquin Chamorro of La Prensa of Managua, Nicaragua; the late Hernan Robleto of La Flecha, also of Managua; El Intransigente of Salta, Argentina, and its editor-publisher David Michel Torino, also dead now; El Tiempo and El Espectador of Bogota; El Comercio of Quito; La Prensa of Lima and El Imparcial of Guatemala.

The IAPA cannot take credit for Peron's fall in 1955, but it has played a major role in creating the public opinion that helped topple dictatorships, and it can take credit for the return of newspapers to their legitimate owners.

The association protests every restriction of freedom of the press. This may consist of suppression of free newspapers, their direct or indirect control by a government, the imprisonment or arrest of newspapermen, official subsidies, discrimination in the release of news, the existence of official news agencies, any interference in the management's freedom to run a newspaper, discriminatory taxes, government control of newsprint imports or sales, or any other restrictive measures.

It is difficult for a North American to have the same appreciation of these efforts as do the Latin Americans. And the courage of our Latin colleagues in fighting for the principles of freedom is something we are not called upon to match.

As one friend said, "If they are willing to go to jail for freedom of the press, the least we can do is to give them moral and financial support through the IAPA."

Pedro Beltran of La Prensa, Lima, who was thrown into Peru's equivalent of Alcatraz and was freed through the help of IAPA, put it this way:

"I wonder whether those of you who have not seen this sort of thing at close range understand the great significance of IAPA and the place it will hold in history when the story of the democratization of the Americas is told. When a government stamps out liberty, when it closes newspapers and denies freedom of expression, the voices from the outside, the voice of an authorized institution like the IAPA, open up new possibilities of hope; we have seen this clearly in Peru.

"I would even say . . . that if it had not been for the invaluable help of the IAPA there would not be a regime of freedom today in my country, nor would I be here addressing you." Sr. Beltran is former prime minister of Peru, and a former president of IAPA.

While the IAPA's front line has been in Latin America, it does not hesitate to skirmish in the United States against recurrent attempts to muzzle the domestic press.

For example, it opposes the Reardon report and other proposals which would unduly restrict crime and court reporting. It fights vigorously against secrecy in governmental operations and any move that would deny citizens the right to information.

Perhaps the most powerful, and certainly the most newsworthy, arm of IAPA is its Freedom of Press Committee. Today it is opposing the resurgent censorship in Brazil, the confiscation of newspapers—including The Miami Herald and The New York Times—in Panama, a proposal to punish legislative reporters in the Bahamas if their stories are not to the liking of parliament, the harassment of reporters by travel restrictions and deportation, and censorship in Cuba and Haiti.

IAPA's Freedom of the Press Committee is keeping an eye on recurrent proposals to tax newsprint, printing machinery and other instruments of a free press. One of the new weapons of this committee, initiated in my term as IAPA president, is what might be called the task force operation. The task force is sent into countries where there is a press freedom problem. It investigates the dimensions of this problem and consults respectfully with the authorities. Commissions have visited Guatemala, Honduras, which restored freedom of the press shortly after the visit; Panama, Brazil, and Paraguay, where longtime restrictions on the press recently were lifted.

In the meantime the committee operates through a regional vice chairman and members who immediately notify our New York headquarters at the first sign of censorship or violation of the freedom of the press. Often the Freedom of Press Committee takes over from there and the matter is quickly ended without fanfare.

For North Americans complacent in the freest society in the world, few stop to think that this takes courage. The honor role of Latin Americans who have gone to jail and even to tortue for their beliefs is long. The honest North American cannot but admit that the dedication of these brave men is almost beyond belief.

Sometimes suffering much, they have accomplished even more. Inch by desperate inch, the Western Hemisphere is yielding to the fact of life that only truth can make and keep it free.

We have far, far to go in the quest with the brave banner, "The People's Right to Know." But it is being held strongly aloft. It is the guidon of freedom. In good time it must dominate the battlefield of the human mind.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 33, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "nay."

PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM NECESSARY TO ECONOMY

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, recent talk by the administration of freezing funds for public works programs to curb the rising tide of inflation disturbs me greatly. As a member of the Public Works Committee and as the Representative from the Fourth Texas District, I have seen the vast improvements to my State and to the country which have come about through public works programs.

It is my belief that in assuming that the moratorium on these programs would prevent inflation, we would be taking quite a gamble—a gamble which could prove to be very costly.

I do not think there is one of us who would argue with the old adage "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." I have seen countless instances where public works programs have provided that ounce of prevention in the control of flooding, in providing adequate water to vast areas, in accommodating the health needs of communities, and so forth.

By suspending public works programs we would severely limit our capacity for growth and development. In short, we would be taking a backward step.

Many programs of public works which are already underway would be rendered almost totally ineffective by the interruption of the program. I know that the reduction of public works programs would very definitely hurt my district.

The Lavon Reservoir, located in the Fourth District, serves the water needs of the 10 member cities of the North Texas Municipal Water District. Included in the water district are portions of Dallas County and a number of rapidly growing suburban areas and expanding communities. As it presently stands, the reservoir is barely meeting the demands of the member cities. If public works funds are arrested, a critical water problem will be the inevitable result.

The safe yield of the reservoir is estimated to be 25.5 million gallons per day, shortly after 1970. By then, the estimated needs of the North Texas Municipal Water District will be 35 million gallons per day. As you can see, the reservoir is essential to the area and we have been depending on this completion of the project to insure an adequate water supply for the area.

Eighty-six percent of the Federal funds invested in the Lavon Reservoir will be paid back by the locality. Just since last year the estimate for this project has been raised by $4½ million due to rising construction costs. It seems to me that withholding of funds from the project, as with other like it, is just another case of being "penny wise and pound foolish."

The Lavon Reservoir is not an isolated example of the danger in freezing public works funds. Rather, it is indicative of programs all over the country which would be crippled by the moratorium on public works projects.

Public works represent capital improvements that cannot be deferred without having serious consequences on this and future generations.

JET SET TAX FINAGLE

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I read recently an instance of tax abuse which I found to be as vulgar as it was shocking.

The Music Corp. of America, one of Hollywood's wealthiest and most influential entertainment corporations, staged an extravagantly costly display of public relations entrepreneurship on behalf of its movie production of the Broadway musical, "Sweet Charity."

MCA flew 600 members of the so-called jet set from New York and Paris to Los Angeles. MCA then provided what could charitably be called lavish accommodations for the jet setters' 3 days in the movie capital.

The kind of comment this action makes on the movie industry's sense of taste or economic value seems so obvious as to make further judgments on that score unnecessary. What does require comment is MCA's intention to charge this jet set extravaganza as a business expense deductible from MCA's tax liabilities.

I call the attention of Congress to this indefensible instance of tax abuse in order to emphasize the pressing need for tax reform. I consider this example of the jet set and the entertainment industry combining to escape taxes as additional evidence of the need for my minimum income tax proposal—H.R. 7744—on behalf of which I recently testified before the House Ways and Means Committee.

An appropriately titled editorial "And Grossness in Los Angeles," containing pertinent and pungent comment, follows:

And Grossness in Los Angeles

If the news from Albany made life seem drearier yesterday for New Yorkers who must subsist on public assistance, they could cheer themselves up by turning to the society pages and discovering how much they have to look forward to with a little upward social mobility. A report from Los Angeles described the three-day extravaganza given by Dr. Jules Stein, chairman of the Music Corporation of America, and Mrs. Stein to launch the movie version of the Broadway musical "Sweet Charity."

In this case a good part of the charity appears to be coming from that ardent philanthropist, Uncle Sam. The Times story said that at least part of the bill for one of the country's longest, biggest and most opulent parties will be chalked up as a business expense deductible from the M.C.A. tax account.

The House Ways and Means Committee, exploring tax reform as one means of combating inflation, may be a little less than overjoyed at the thought that tax money may have helped to provide 600 members of the jet set with free roundtrip flights from New York and Paris—to say nothing of room and board at something a mite above relief levels. Anyway, as Marie Antoinette might have said, it was a grand party and it certainly should reassure those who have lost their perspective about the state of American society.

BEWARE OF THE MARIHUANA MENACE

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Director J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has today called my attention to a very compelling article entitled, "Beware of the Marihuana Menace," which was written by Police Chief John G. McNamara, of Cheshire, Conn. Chief McNamara is a friend and constituent of mine. In the words of J. Edgar Hoover:

> His report on this subject will be of great interest to other police officers throughout the country.

Moreover, it is of great interest to me for in my studies of this problem and in my conversations with Federal enforcement officials, including John E. Ingersoll, Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs of the Department of Justice, I have learned to my great concern that despite our current control efforts, the traffic in dangerous narcotics is increasing.

According to Mr. Ingersoll, the last 18 months has brought a noticeable increase in heroin among white middle-class and upper middle-class young people particularly. I have met on several occasions with Mr. Ingersoll and with Mr. James Dow, Assistant Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, at Hartford, Conn., and I have assured them and other agents of my full cooperation in the essentially continuing program to curb drug traffic and to corral those responsible for the traffic.

With that thought uppermost in mind, I include here the article, "Beware of the Marihuana Menace," by Police Chief McNamara. It is a very clear report of the splendid efforts of a Connecticut community to encourage parental concern and to delineate that the proper objective is not simply arresting teenagers but a primary aim to prevent them from harming themselves.

My letter from Mr. Hoover and the article follow:

U.S. Department of Justice,
Federal Bureau of Investigation,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1969.

Hon. John S. Monagan,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Congressman: The FBI offers cooperative services and assistance to local and state law enforcement agencies in all areas of police responsibility. One vital phase of such cooperation involves the dissemination and exchange of information on successful law enforcement programs and investigative operations. The FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, a monthly publication distributed without charge, is an example of our efforts in this regard.

Enclosed are two advance copies of the April 1969 issue of the Bulletin. I thought you might like to see the splendid article, beginning on page nine, entitled "Beware of the Marihuana Menace," by Mr. John G. McNamara, Chief of Police, Cheshire, Connecticut. His report on this subject will be of great interest to other police officers throughout the country.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover.

Beware of the Marihuana Menace

(By John G. McNamara)

"Alcohol is out; marihuana is in!"

This response to a question asked at our drug and narcotics symposium held in Cheshire, Conn., on January 22, 1968, became the headline in the three major newspapers serving our community.

That a chief of police would make this statement at a public meeting of adults and teenagers made our community aware of the police department's dilemma. The threat of widespread use of drugs and narcotics came upon us almost unnoticed, and, truthfully, we were not prepared to cope with the threat.

This situation came to our attention when we received requests for medical assistance. One youngster seemed to be intoxicated, but we took the necessary precautions and had the boy examined at a hospital for possible drug overdose. The youth later admitted taking a drink made of milk and a nonprescription medicinal preparation for individuals suffering from asthma. Up to this point the problem centered around drug abuse.

Suddenly, word came to our department that marihuana was being sold in Cheshire.

Cheshire is a small residential town, inhabited by more than 16,000 people and situated between the heavily populated cities of New Haven and Waterbury in southern Connecticut. Bordering Cheshire are the communities of Hamden, Wallingford, and Meriden.

Marihuana could be carried in from any of the surrounding towns. Our problem was to locate the source of this marihuana inflow, but we felt we were not prepared to handle this problem because we knew too little about drugs and narcotics.

ACQUIRING LITERATURE

As chief, it was my responsibility to see that my 18 men became familiar with drugs and narcotics, the terminology or nicknames given them by users, and the apparatus used by addicts. My first step was to contact drug companies and ask for literature describing the various drugs used for "getting high" and the symptoms and effects associated with their misuse. Then, turning to other law enforcement agencies, I acquired extensive literature on narcotics, together with addresses of companies selling teacher's kits which illustrated and described the more popular narcotics.

TEACH OFFICERS

I gave each sergeant literature, pictures, and plastic replicas of narcotic-producing plants with the request that he teach each man under his command what to look for, what to listen for, and, particularly, how to distinguish the odor of marihuana.

Later, we surveyed the physicians in our town and found that between 90 and 100 people had been treated recently after taking an unprescribed drug or narcotic.

We had a dilemma: We knew we had drug users. We knew marihuana was being used, but we did not know that so many people were involved.

In looking for a plan to protect the townspeople from the harm of drug and narcotic use, I asked our detective sergeant for his ideas.

The sergeant said, "Chief, the best place to control this problem is in the homes. Let us tell the parents the dangers of marihuana and drug abuse and how widespread the problem has become."

Certainly the idea was sound, and we began drafting a plan to help educate our residents. After discussing the plan with our first selectman, who gave us his full support, we decided to bring people knowledgeable in the narcotics field to Cheshire and have them conduct a symposium for the townspeople. Fortunately, we were able to obtain the services of the following: The chief of the Narcotics Control Section of the Connecticut State Department of Health, the head of the Connecticut State Police Narcotics Squad, the head of the Hartford City Police Narcotics Division, and the Chief Prosecutor of Connecticut's Seventh Circuit Court.

We next appealed to our local service and fraternal organizations to help create an interest in the symposium we were sponsoring. Without hesitation the clubs helped publicize the town meeting through advertisements and personal contact. Each group, in its own way, displayed readiness to back its police in conducting the attempt to unite the community against the growing threat of drug abuse.

When we announced the panel members for our planned symposium, the regional and local newspapers, as well as radio and television stations, gave wide coverage to our conference. Our only concern was whether the townspeople would attend.

On the scheduled evening, the adults and teenagers did indeed come. While the people were filing into the auditorium, a few officers passed out literature describing the types and effects of the drugs and narcotics that were to be discussed. The 800-seat high school auditorium was completely filled.

SYMPOSIUM FORMAT

We began the symposium by showing the film, "Narcotics—Pit of Despair." The movie depicted a young student-athlete who began smoking marihuana which led to his using the addictive drug, heroin. Following a scene showing the youth suffering from withdrawal pains, the movie concluded with the "cured"' young man revisiting his buddies, the "pushers," which suggested the never-ending cycle of narcotic addiction.

Following this, the chief of our State Health Department's Narcotics Control Section described the various categories of drugs and chemicals. The expert told of narcotics, sedatives, depressants, stimulants, tranquilizers, hallucinogenic substances, and organic volatile solvents. After giving the common trade names and nicknames of the compounds that compose each category, the officer described the dangers of abusive use of the materials and concluded his talk by telling of a 16-year-old boy who died from excessive inhalation of cleaning fluid fumes.

Next, the State trooper presented statistics concerning the number of crimes committed by drug addicts. He mentioned such violations as car thefts, shoplifting, and rape, and suddenly he was interrupted by loud applause that followed his telling of 145 pushers arrested in the act of selling narcotics to his undercovermen.

The Hartford police narcotics expert described the changes to watch for in addicted young people: a loss of weight, a change in the texture of the skin, and an inability to cope with normal, everyday matters. The detective shocked the audience with the statement that, of the 18 people in the Greater Hartford area who died of drug abuse, 13 took overdoses, three developed chronic hepatitis, and two committed suicide.

The chief prosecutor concluded the formal portion of the symposium by suggesting reasons why teenagers turn to drugs. He said they cannot cope with pressures; they protest against the hypocrisy of adults; they attempt to avoid the difficulties of impending adult life. Therefore they seek security and self-esteem from using drugs or narcotics.

The prosecutor described the almost unbelievable actions of boys who had taken a mixture of milk and a patent medicine. He said the boys had to be forcibly removed from the police station and taken to a hospital.

QUESTIONS ASKED

When I, as moderator, asked for questions after the talks, the concern of those present was obvious by the response received. Set forth below are some questions which arose during the discussions and are typical of those which officials should be prepared to answer before becoming involved in a program of this nature.

If "pot" is available in Cheshire, how can the pusher be exposed?

Can an arrest be made by an officer if he merely hears of someone who is using a narcotic, such as pot or "speed," or does the individual *have* to have the drug on his person?

You have stated that marihuana is the start of something more dangerous, but do you have any conclusive evidence that pot, smoked occasionally, is harmful to the human system?

What is meant by a psychotic condition?

Is not alcoholism a greater problem in Cheshire?

Although alcohol is sometimes misused and can be physically more harmful than marihuana, the use of alcohol is permitted. Is not this a contradiction?

When you use the words, "controlled drugs," do you mean only narcotics, or drugs that require prescriptions?

Is it being a bit rash to conclude that the use of heroin results from marihuana? Is there any evidence of this? Cite the facts.

Is it true that much of the reaction against marihuana is the result of a middle class prejudice against a drug that was largely used in the past by lower income groups?

How do you draw the line between simple sleeping pills and pain relievers that might lead to addiction to other drugs?

Do many of the people who are dependent on drugs have records of previous psychiatric help?

One assumes that none of the panelists tonight have taken any of the drugs just discussed. In this sense, how do you know what it is like to be high on pot, except from observations? Some authorities claim that in controlled dosage it is not harmful for an individual who can restrain himself.

How does it *feel* to take a "trip"?

Would someone on the panel outline the possible long-term effects of lysergic acid?

Has there been an increase in homegrown psilacybin?

The scope of ideas presented by the panel and the serious concern shown by the audience made this conference a valuable evening for all. This was only the beginning of a community action program designed to protect young people from the dangers of drugs and narcotics.

SERIES OF MEETINGS

In the days that followed our symposium, the headmaster of a local private school began in his office a series of meetings with concerned residents in an attempt to search for answers. A priest, a minister, a nurse, a teacher, a reformatory guard, and interested adults and teenagers joined in the exploratory meetings to exchange ideas about marihuana control.

High school students who attended the symposium and the meetings at the private school conducted a survey within their school. As a result of their survey, they and their principal asked the board of education to incorporate educational programs on drugs into biology courses.

The finest response to our educational symposium was the cooperation of our townspeople. They came to our station to ask questions. They called us when they suspected the use of marihuana. The assistance they gave was far beyond our expectations. This cooperatiotn resulted in the arrest of two young people possessing marihuana and one "mainliner," a term for an individual who uses a syringe to administer drugs to himself.

We continue to tell our townspeople that we are not interested in simply arresting teenagers, but however, our aim is primarily to prevent them from harming themselves.

Today, in Connecticut, addiction is considered an illness, and the arrested addicts are not jailed if they prove dependency on narcotics and that they sought medical help. Why arrest an addict possessing narcotics if with parental cooperation you can prevent a youngster from reaching the addictive stage?

Fortunately, our townspeople believe in our sincerity and many do not hesitate to openly discuss their suspicions concerning the possible use of narcotics or drugs by their youngsters. This open communication between parents, teenagers, and policemen has been a most important result.

Following the symposium, our detective sergeant received invitations to speak before the high school student body, the students of a private school, discussion groups, and some service and fraternal clubs in Cheshire. His message is basic: The police are aware of the drug and narcotic activity occurring in public places, but it is up to the parents to become aware of the activity taking place within the home.

Just recently, on two separate occasions, a parent approached our desk sergeant, handed over an envelope, and asked "What is it?" In both instances the sergeant replied, "Looks like marihuana." In both instances the sergeant was correct.

The drug and narcotics problem still persists, but the problem is diminishing in Cheshire because it is being attacked by both the police and concerned citizens.

THREE COURAGEOUS DOCTORS LEAD BLACK LUNG FIGHT

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, one of the most inspiring developments of recent times has been the work of three courageous doctors in the State of West Virginia who have focused national attention on the problem of health in the coal mines.

As a result of the efforts of these three heroes in the medical profession, action in a modest way has been taken by the State legislature in West Virginia. The attention of the Nation has been directed at the terrible ravages of pneumoconiosis suffered by coal miners, a progressive and incurable disease which can be prevented only through limiting the amount of coal dust in the mine.

Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to these three concerned and courageous physicians: the cardiologist, Dr. L. E. Buff of Charleston, W. Va.; the lung specialist, Dr. Donald Rasmussen, of Beckley, W. Va.; and the pathologist, Dr. Hawey Wells, of Morgantown, W. Va. The story of their inspiring campaign is very well told in the March 21 issue of Medical World News, which I include in the RECORD at this point:

DOCTORS PUSH BLACK LUNG FIGHT TO SURFACE

In an unprecedented wildcat strike, 43,000 angry West Virginia coal miners walked off their jobs late last month to push for a bill before the state legislature. The bill would allow them, for the first time, to collect workmen's compensation for "black lung." Although it is recognized as a coal-related disease in Great Britain, Pennsylvania, and Alabama, black lung has been largely ignored by West Virginia coal operators and lawmakers.

The mass walkout was the first time in recent memory that the miners, often noted for their fatalism and rural isolation, banded together for a common cause. What finally united them was not their union, but the militant crusading of three concerned physicians: cardiologist I. E. Buff, lung specialist Donald Rasmussen, and pathologist Hawey Wells.

The medical trio barnstormed the state, warning coal workers of the perils of black lung, or pneumoconiosis. When speaking in local union halls or trekking into mine shafts, the team often crumpled sections of autopsied black lung to startle their audiences. These tactics enraged some colleagues, who denounced their "medical sideshow." And they were rebuked by two county medical societies. But to the miners they are trying to help, they are the next best thing to walking saints.

Inspired by the three physicians, the miners sidestepped their own union to form an ad hoc group called the Black Lung Association. And, once all the state's mines were shut down, they held their first rally in Charleston's Civic Center.

Wearing a white miner's cap himself, Dr. Buff showed them an ashtray and a license plate his miner friends had carved him out of coal. "This is a coal operator state," he warned his listeners, who were dressed in ill-fitting suits and coveralls. "And it's about time you stopped being the forgotten people!"

To drive their point home to the legislators, the miners decided to march the two miles to the capitol. But they had neglected to get a parade permit, and some local politicians had marked them for arrest.

When a police official tipped Dr. Buff off to their plans and urged him to send a man at once to pick up a permit, Dr. Buff was puzzled. The official volunteered: "My father died of black lung."

Dr. Wells warned the miners not to march "if you think you might fall out." But the miners poured out of the auditorium doors in boisterous full force. Following them in cars, members of the press soon made room for those who could not keep up. One miner was breathless after only a block, and had to lean against the car for a few moments to catch his breath before he could get in.

On reaching the capitol, several members of the group met with the legislators inside. Gov. Arch Moore came out onto the capitol's steps, promising strong legislation. When he had finished speaking, one miner jubilantly nudged another, whispering, "We did it!"

The miner's optimism was justified. Just nine minutes before the mandatory end of its annual session on March 8, the legislature passed a black lung compensation bill. In effect, the bill recognizes pneumoconiosis as an occupational disease and provides for disability benefits.

A man is presumed to have black lung if he has been exposed to "the hazard of inhaling minute particles of dust" for ten of the previous 15 years. Diagnosis is based on the performance of the lung, as well as its appearance on x-ray. And emphysema and right heart failure are considered complications.

But the miners' Black Lung Association is not altogether satisfied, and plans to push for "more decisive" action this summer. An association spokesman points out that a man with pneumoconiosis still gets no hospital or medical benefits. And the same people who have denied virtually all black lung claims in the past will continue to rule on payments under the new law. Still, the spokesman concedes, the bill is "a faltering but not-insignificant step in the right direction." The miners say they will remain on strike until the bill is signed into law.

To help the miners' cause along further, the Nixon Administration has proposed a federal law aimed at correcting the conditions that cause black lung and at reducing accidental deaths. Safety expert Ralph Nader has also enlisted in the miners' cause.

The three physicians who inspired the West Virginia proposal also focus their efforts on getting strong federal legislation. And Dr. Buff lectures at high schools, trying to get "equal time" with the coal company recruiters, to warn students of the dangers of the coal mines. But in all but one county, high school officials have refused to let him speak.

An ardent foe of pollution above and below ground, Dr. Buff became interested in black lung after seeing some miners who thought they had heart disease. Instead, their problem was pneumoconiosis.

Shortness of breath, says Dr. Buff, is the key symptom of black lung. And many miners suffer from it for several years before they become severely incapacitated. When their disease reaches this stage, the miners are usually in their early fifties. But since the introduction of continuous mining machines, which kick up a lot of dust, Dr. Buff relates that "we are now seeing them in their thirties and forties."

When inhaled coal dust accumulates in the lungs, it clusters around the small arteries, eventually choking them off. Because the oxygen-exchange mechanism of the lung is then impaired, the right ventricle works harder to pump more blood. As a result, the right ventricle often becomes enlarged and right-sided heart failure can occur.

The only sure way to diagnose black lung disease is at autopsy or by biopsy, points out Dr. Rasmussen, who operates a pulmonary laboratory financed by the United Mine Workers at the Beckley Appalachian Regional Hospital. Clinically, the disorder is almost indistinguishable from silicosis. Sometimes the two diseases exist simultaneously. But silicosis is widely recognized as an occupational disease, while pneumoconiosis is not.

After examining over 3,000 bituminous miners in his laboratory, Dr. Rasmussen is convinced that x-rays offer no key to diagnosis. "Some miners whose lung function tests show them to be seriously impaired have only minimal evidence of fibrosis on x-rays. But in other miners, x-rays will show the nodular lesions indicating dust retention for a long time before there is any shortness of breath or functional abnormality."

Dr. Rasmussen prefers to base his diagnosis of pneumoconiosis on lung function tests and the miner's work history. Among the men he has studied, he has found some lung disease in 90%. And in approximately half, lung impairment has been severe enough to "interfere with the capability to work.

"After he has gone through all our tests and is convinced we aren't out to 'do him in,' a miner will often tell us about how he feels when he goes out to bring in a little bit of wood, or a bucket of coal, or water from his well," says Dr. Rasmussen. "God knows, he isn't trying to convince you he's sick. He's telling you that something that's so easy—so much taken for granted—has now become almost impossible to perform."

Very few of the miners want to stop working, even when tests show severe impairment, he adds. He himself stopped advising miners to quit work when one replied, "Doc, I got one more kid to get through college. After that, it don't matter what happens to me."

But internist Rowland Burns disagrees with Dr. Rasmussen's findings, and claims that they have not been duplicated in other laboratories. The Huntington, W. Va., physician has represented coal companies in at least ten disability cases, and has done a study on black lung for the West Virginia Coal Association.

Evidence of nodular lesions on x-rays, he feels, is essential for a diagnosis of pneumoconiosis. In Britain, he adds, miners must have nodular lesions to collect disability for black lung. "Lung function tests are nonspecific," he reasons, but also admits that nodular lesions "can be indicative of a hundred different disorders."

Of the 2,000 miners he has examined, he has found nodular lesions in only 10% to 15%. Of these, only 2% to 3% "were severely impaired." He concedes that he has found severe lung impairment in many miners who did not have nodular lesions, but adds that "you can also find a lot of emphysema in the general population."

Cigarette smoking, he continues, has also been linked with emphysema. "Smoking must be considered as a cofactor in deciding whether a miner with all other evidence of black lung can collect compensation. We are now compensating hundreds of people in this country for cigarette smoking."

Dr. Burns opposes the Buff-Rasmussen-Wells campaign to inform miners about the disease, claiming that "they are creating hysteria and frightening these poor people. And, you know, anxiety can *cause* shortness of breath. They are creating a second disease."

Undaunted by this criticism, the three physicians plan to continue their campaign, and to focus on correcting the conditions that lead to black lung. Dr. Buff would like to see more frequent removal of coal dust and more hosing down of the mine face during cutting.

"The only way a miner can keep from getting coal dust into his lungs is by not breathing the air in the mines!" he thunders. The respirators now used by some companies are useless, he says, because they permit dangerous tiny particles to get through. He proposes that each man be equipped with a mask connected to a tank of compressed air, like the apparatus used by scuba divers. But coal operators feel that such equipment would be too expensive and cumbersome.

Bureau of Mines Director John F. O'Leary is the first to admit that the outlook for coal workers is bleak. He cites statistics showing that a man who spends his life working in the mines faces one chance in ten of being killed in an accident. A miner can also figure on suffering at least three injuries severe enough to keep him off the job. And the chances are one in five that he will die of a fatal lung disease.

"If a miner begins work at the age of 20," O'Leary concludes, "the chances are one in four that he will be killed in an accident or die of a fatal lung disease." These figures, he adds, make coal mining the most dangerous occupation in the U.S. for which statistics are available.

CALL FOR PROCLAMATION DESIGNATING DECEMBER 1969 AS "NATIONAL WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE AND EQUALITY STATE MONTH"

(Mr. WOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, it is my profound pleasure to introduce a resolution calling upon the Congress to authorize the President to issue a proclamation, proclaiming December 1969 as "National Women's Suffrage and Equality State Month" in honor of the 100th anniversary of the birth in the territory of Wyoming of the constructive principle of women's suffrage.

It was in the fledgling territory of Wyoming during the winter of 1869 that the territorial legislature, itself but a year old, passed one of the shortest but most historic acts ever to emanate from a council of men.

The simple two-section act granted to the women of Wyoming territory the right of suffrage and to hold office.

The heart of the matter, section I, proclaimed:

> Every woman of the age 21, residing in this territory, may at every election to be holden under the laws thereof, cast her vote. And, her rights to the elective franchise and to hold office shall be the same under the election laws of the territory, as those of electors.

Gov. John Campbell signed the world's first women's suffrage law into existence December 10, 1869. The great suffrage leader, Susan B. Anthony, would say 2 years later in Laramie:

> Wyoming is the first place on God's green earth which could consistently claim to be the land of the free.

Wyoming nearly paid the price of statehood for this act of ultimate justice for womanhood. When in 1890 the Congress debated statehood for the territory of Wyoming the reality of women's suffrage—clearly a condition that had to be mentioned in admission—militated strongly against statehood. But, we made it, with our forests, our rivers, our wildlife, and our ladies.

The history of women's suffrage is almost as interesting as its consequences. The historic bill was introduced in the territorial legislature by the president of the council, William H. Bright, at the instigation, popular history has it, of the woman who was to become the world's first lady justice of the peace and holder of judicial office, Esther Hobart Morris.

Thus, Colonel Bright and Mrs. Morris have the distinction of being the "father and mother of woman suffrage." The book "Women of Wyoming," compiled and edited by Mrs. Alfred H. Beach of Casper, records the genesis of Wyoming's women's suffrage bill in a vignette attributed to Capt. H. G. Nickerson, of Lander, Wyo., a one-time resident of South Pass.

Captain Nickerson in an affadavit made by him and in the official files of Wyoming asserts:

> To Mrs. Esther Morris is due the credit and honor of advocating and originating woman suffrage in the United States. At the first election held at South Pass (then Carter County, Wyoming), on the 2nd day of September, 1869, Colonel William H. Bright, Democrat and myself, Republican, were candidates for the first Territorial Legislature. A few days before the election, Mrs. Morris gave a tea party at her residence at which there were present about forty ladies and gentlemen, Col. Bright and myself being invited for a purpose, for while seated at the table, Mrs. Morris arose and stated the object of the meeting. She said, "There are present two opposing candidates for the first legislature of our new territory, one of whom is sure to be elected and we desire here and now to receive from them a public pledge that whichever one is elected will introduce and work for the passage of an act conferring upon the women of our new territory, the right of suffrage."
>
> Of course we both pledged ourselves as requested and received the applause of all present. There were no Republicans elected at this first election; the legislature was solidly Democratic. Col. Bright, true to his promise, introduced the bill and it became a law.

Subsequently, Mrs. Morris, of South Pass City, and Mrs. Caroline Neil, of Point of Rocks, received the first two commissions ever granted to women to be justices of the peace and although history is vague at best of Mrs. Neil's service, Mrs. Morris is recognized as the first woman ever to hold a judicial post in any government anywhere in the world.

Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper in 1870 reported:

> Mrs. Morris and Mrs. Neil continued to exercise their functions as Justices of the Peace in Wyoming. They are the terror of all rogues and afford infinite delight to all lovers of peace and virtue.

Rogues and lovers of peace and virtue alike agree, however, that Mrs. Morris was an eminently qualified justice of the peace and demonstrated beyond all doubt that her sex was hardly an impediment to the effective exercise of the office.

She held the office with distinction and other Wyoming women followed by serving on grand and petit juries in Laramie. The principle of women in such service was clearly established.

Of Colonel Bright who made a massive contribution in introducing and fighting for the first woman's suffrage bill, we know little. We know he was supported by the Secretary of the Wyoming territory, Edward M. Lee, who some say actually authored the bill. He left the Wyoming territory after his service in the legislature and is known to have died in Washington, D.C., in 1912.

Mrs. Morris, following her service and death, was voted the most distinguished deceased Wyomingite and is memorialized in bronze in two identical statues, one of which reposes in the Chambers of the U.S. Capitol in Washington. It was commissioned during the service of my valued and distinguished friend, former U.S. Senator Milward Simpson, when he was Governor of Wyoming. The other rests on the soil of Wyoming at the site of our State capitol in Cheyenne.

As the direct consequence of having been the first territory to grant women suffrage, the ladies of the future Equality State gained other distinctions. Mrs. Eliza A. Swain, "a gentle white-haired housewife, Quakerish in appearance," became the first woman in the world to vote in a general election.

The principle that these proud ladies—and the Susan B. Anthonys and the Lucretia Motts, Elizabeth Cady Stantons, Lucy Stones and Anna Dickinsons and thousands of unnamed others who contributed to the woman suffrage struggle—established was not to end with jury duty and voting in Wyoming. It was to spread throughout the world wherever democracy and constitutional government reigned.

It was in 1869, the year of Wyoming's territorial legislature, that opposition to the movement made its last ditch stand with the publication of a singularly gloomy epistle entitled "Woman's Rights, Wrongs and Privileges."

The book maintained that women were well represented in politics by their husbands and their fathers and prophesied darkly that once women were given the vote the sexes would be at war.

The breakup of marriages over political disagreements was predicted and indeed the implication was that the whole institution of marriage was under a dire threat. The argument rested on the candid philosophical opinion that women were too emotional for political matters and that exposure to politics would cause them to lose their charm.

We know just the reverse to be true now that the stabilizing influence of women in politics and in public office has been seen to have a complimentary and catalyzing influence in their opposite members.

It was the experience of World War I which finally turned the tide in favor of the ladies. Women all over the Nation stepped in with the men to help out with the war effort. Their contributions could not be ignored and a reward came in the form of universal suffrage at the end of the war based on the splendid beginning in Wyoming a half century before.

On the eve of the passage of the 19th amendment, nearly 18 million women in 15 States had already been enfranchised. The final victory of the suffragettes in 1920, gave the vote to an additional 9½ million women.

I respectfully urge the Congress to act with dispatch on this resolution which would request the President to recognize officially and nationally the 100th anniversary of the action which heralded the birth of women's suffrage in America and the world.

VIETNAM

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, there was extensive debate in the House last week on the subject of the U.S. commitment in Vietnam. The speakers made a great number of points—about our pressing domestic needs in the United States, about the evils of the military-industrial complex, about the history of the war under the previous administration and the first 2 months of the present one, about the Government of Vietnam, and about the winability or the unwinability of that war. The ultimate conclusion of many of these speakers is embodied in a resolution which states simply:

> It is the sense of Congress that the United States should begin to reduce this military involvement in Vietnam.

I submit that the goal of reducing and indeed eliminating the U.S. military involvement in Vietnam is the goal of this Congress, of this administration and of the American people as a whole. There can be no doubt of the administration's determination to reduce the military involvement of the United States in Vietnam just as soon as it becomes practicable to do so. Ambassador Lodge, representing the United States in the meetings at Paris, has repeatedly called on the other side to undertake prompt discussion of the mutual withdrawal of United States and North Vietnamese forces from the territory of South Vietnam. For his part, President Nguyen Van Thieu of the Republic of Vietnam has referred frequently to his hope and expectation that some U.S. forces can be withdrawn before long as the armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam assume an ever-greater share of the military effort.

The commitment to a reduction of U.S. military involvement is there; there can be no doubt of that fact. But this is only a part of the total picture. There are other vital considerations. At the present moment, on the territory of South Vietnam, there are 80,000 to 100,000 regular troops of the army of North Vietnam. There are other North Vietnamese regular units immediately north of the so-called demilitarized zone and in the territory of other countries in close proximity to South Vietnam; namely, Cambodia and Laos.

The key to a possible solution, the best hope for a reduction of the level of violence, lies in mutual action by the two sides. Such a principle, and the commitment of the United States to that principle, was firmly established 2½ years ago in the joint communique of the Manila Summit Conference:

> Allied forces are in the Republic of Vietnam because that country is the object of aggression. . . . They shall be withdrawn, after close consultation, as the other side withdraws its forces to the North, ceases infiltration, and the level of violence thus subsides (par. 29).

The other side continues to maintain its forces in the south, it continues its infiltration, and the level of violence obviously remains very high. Some speakers in this Chamber have argued that some North Vietnamese units did in fact withdraw from the battlefields of South Vietnam last fall, to sanctuaries along the Laos and Cambodian borders, even outside South Vietnam itself, and that this development represented an act of deescalation by the other side. Unfortunately, that was not precisely the case. Some enemy units did retire from the battlefield, indeed, but they did so out of necessity. They had been badly beaten in the three unsuccessful offensives of 1968, and they needed to regroup, retrain, and resupply themselves. Some commentators have tried to tell us that these moves had political significance; but in fact the enemy was merely making a virtue of necessity. Almost simultaneously with these so-called withdrawals, our commanders began to find evidence that a new offensive was being planned, and there were good indications that the new offensive was in fact planned first for early December, then for the beginning of January, as enemy units began to return to their traditional operating areas. The preemptive measures or spoiling operations undertaken by Vietnamese and allied forces caused postponements each time, but finally the offensive came, some 5 weeks ago.

On the 23d of February, North Vietnamese troops, together with the indigenous southern forces known as the Vietcong, began their fourth round of concerted offensive activity in little more than 1 year. In the course of this offensive they have indiscriminately shelled many of the major civilian population centers of South Vietnam, including the three most populous cities: Saigon, Hue, and Da Nang. They have attacked installations of United States, South Vietnamese, Korean, and other allied forces. They have inflicted increased casualties on our own forces and those of our allies, and of course on the innocent civilian population of South Vietnam.

This new round of offensive action came at a time when a new U.S. administration was making clear its intention to proceed with diplomatic efforts at Paris—efforts which are designed to determine whether some basis exists for a reasonable settlement of the Vietnam war. Clearly, this offensive by the enemy has hampered those efforts and has cast serious doubt on the enemy's professed desire for a settlement of the war. But the administration is going ahead prudently and is avoiding precipitate action that would complicate those efforts still further.

In this context, it is difficult to understand appeals for the unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces which make no demand for comparable action—or even a degree of restraint—by the other side. We cannot simply initiate the withdrawal of our own forces without regard for the consequences of our action; we cannot at the present moment withdraw some of our forces and expose those which remain to greater danger or leave the people of South Vietnam, whom we have pledged to protect, with less protection than they now have.

This is a brief sketch of the current situation. It is a situation that does not permit us to act unilaterally, without thought to the consequences of such action. As the very distinguished Secretary of Defense, a Member of this House until a short time ago, said recently, it is not an appropriate time to discuss the reduction of U.S. force levels in South Vietnam, though I might add that he, like all of us, is hopeful that such a time will come.

It is, rather, a time for us—and particularly for our new administration—to proceed along the course it has already charted; the administration will not allow any realistic possibility for the achievement of a genuine peace to be jeopardized, but neither will it permit our troops or the people of South Vietnam to be further endangered.

If I may be permitted, I should like to quote the testimony of the equally distinguished Secretary of State before a committee of this Congress last Thursday. In setting forth the policy of this administration, the Secretary said:

> In support of this policy of peace, we are seeking to achieve agreement with North Vietnam on mutual withdrawal of forces. We are prepared to bring withdrawal of our forces simultaneously with those of North Vietnam. Withdrawals would reduce the scale of hostilities and would be tangible and visual evidence of the professed desire of both sides to negotiate a peace settlement.

This is the goal of the incumbent administration, and I think it is one that we can and should wholeheartedly endorse. As the administration proceeds with this difficult and delicate task of seeking agreement, let us refrain from actions and from statements which, at least in their appearance, demand everything of ourselves and our allies and nothing of the other side, and which ignore the responsibility of the other side for the present situation in South Vietnam. Let us remember too that the consequences of our actions in Vietnam have implications for the future security of literally hundreds of millions of people in Asia, and in other countries around the world whose security and well-being are inextricably linked with our own.

THE PEOPLE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SHOULD BE PROTECTED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my office has received a tremendous number of calls and appeals from merchants and other citizens of the Nation's Capital. The calls reflect a climate of fear that has developed here. I am being asked for advice and assistance as to whether or not people should close their businesses or take leave from work on April 4, Good Friday, to commemorate the anniversary of the death of Martin Luther King. The callers tell of threats, blackmail, and intimidation. The situation is deteriorating.

Mr. Speaker, if the businesses in our Nation's Capital are forced to close and employees forced to take a holiday against their wishes out of fear of loss of life and property, then Friday, April 4, will be indeed a sad page in the history of this great Republic.

Never in the history of the world has appeasement brought about a lasting peace. Nor has supine surrender to blackmail resolved any problem. Appeasement will merely encourage the bullies and agitators in the District of Columbia.

I have therefore, Mr. Speaker, advised stores, businesses, and industries in the District of Columbia to remain open, and all employees to report to work, unless for personal or religious reasons of their own they desire to either commemorate Good Friday or the anniversary of the death of Martin Luther King.

Mr. Speaker, the merchants and citizens of the District of Columbia are entitled to the full protection of their lives and property. This is the Capital of the United States of America, not the campus of a controversial college. In light of these notorious threats and as a result of the fact that we are well informed about such threats in advance, the merchants and other citizens should be publicly assured in advance by the highest authority, the President of the United States, that ample protection will be provided for lives and property by whatever additional means are necessary. I would include the deployment of additional policemen, National Guard, and Federal troops.

I have been advised that security preparations are quietly—even secretly—being made for this protection by the proper authorities. But the problem is that the merchants and citizens are unaware of these preparations—and so are the agitators. The merchants and citizens are in urgent need of some word of advice and recommendation from high authority. Last year, as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, they received neither assurance nor protection until it was too late.

Would-be rioters and blackmailers shoud be warned that any attempt toward the destruction of property and civil disobedience will be put down promptly and the violators severely and swiftly punished. I know of no other way to prevent a holocaust in the District of Columbia on April 4, short of rewarding the blackmailers by knuckling under and thereby encouraging the antisocial and lawless elements here.

STONE MOUNTAIN, GA., MONUMENT

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to represent the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia in which is located one of the truly great wonders of the modern world. In the geographic center of De Kalb County, Ga., is located a gigantic rock which we know as Stone Mountain. On the side of this mountain there has been carved a sculpture which is only equaled in size by the great Buddha carving in China which was completed in the year 700 A.D. Next year, in April, the first sculpture of a similar size in the United States will have been completed. This will be the first sculpture of this size completed in some 1,200 years. It is my privilege today to introduce a resolution sponsored by myself and all of the Georgia delegation, including our Senators, in which we request the Postmaster General, on the date of the completion of the Stone Mountain Monument, to issue a special stamp in commemoration of the completion of this work of art. The State of Georgia has recognized the artistic value of this piece of sculpture. It has organized an authority pursuant to State law under which we have completed the construction of a lake, recreational facilities for family boating, camping, and fishing, as well as the construction of a building to house historic memorabilia which make this truly an outstanding place of beauty and recreation throughout the Southeast.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of my resolution.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE 1964 CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT

(Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill, cosponsored by the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), nine Republican members of the House Committee on the Judiciary, and four fellow Ohio Republicans, that would amend the 1964 Criminal Justice Act. This act embodied into law three basic fundamental principles of justice:

First, that a person accused of a Federal crime, other than a petty offense, who was financially unable to obtain adequate representation could secure the assistance of a skilled counsel;

Second, that the interest of justice and adequate representation requires that appointed counsel be compensated for their services; and

Third, that in order to assure an adequate defense, eligible defendants should also be provided with necessary defense services other than counsel.

The Criminal Justice Act of 1964—18 U.S.C. 3006A—grew out of a study and draft bill submitted by the Attorney General's Committee on Poverty and the Administration of Federal Criminal Justice chaired by Prof. Francis A. Allen. The act became effective August 20, 1965.

The legislation recommended by the Allen committee, and originally passed by the other body, included a public defender system among the alternative representation arrangements that could be adopted by the individual Federal districts. Our version of the bill omitted this alternative. The conference committee recommended passage of a bill without the public defender option—House Report 1709. However, the conferees recommended that it is their "firm conviction that the Department of Justice should revive its recent study on the need for a Federal public defender system throughout the entire Federal judicial system."

To give effect to this request of the 88th Congress, the Department of Justice and the Judicial Conference of the United States in 1967 commissioned Prof. Dallin H. Oaks, of the University of Chicago Law School, to undertake a review of the operation of the Criminal Justice Act with particular attention to the need for Federal public defenders. This study, entitled "The Criminal Justice Act in the Federal District Courts," was commenced in the summer of 1967 and completed in January 1968.

When the 88th Congress passed the Criminal Justice Act, we chose not to include therein a provision for a public defender system, but rather we thought it wise to devote more time and study to the idea. Now, better than 3 years have passed and Professor Oaks' study has been completed. Today, I bring before the House a bill which embodies the recommendations of this study.

The maximum hourly compensation paid assigned counsel under the present act is $10 per hour for time spent on the case out of court and $15 per hour for time spent in court. In 1963, the Allen committee suggested that $15 per hour was "the lowest statutory limit consistent with the objectives of reasonable compensation for the assigned lawyer and adequate representation for his client." Professor Oaks concluded that it simply is "not possible to pay experienced criminal lawyers a decent salary, and support an office on the $10 and $15 per hour Criminal Justice Act fee scale." This bill would raise the maximum hourly compensation to $20 per hour in order to be consistent with the basic theory of the act; that the interest of justice and adequate representation requires that appointed counsel be fairly and reasonably compensated for their efforts.

A basic change in the present law is contained in subsection (h) of this bill. This new addition to the Criminal Justice Act of 1964 would authorize the creation, in busy Federal districts, of public defender organizations. This provision would permit, but not require, a district or part of a district in which 200 or more defendants are required to be represented annually by appointed counsel to create one of two types of defender organizations: a Federal public defender or a community defender organization. The main difference between the two is that the Federal defender plan would be drawn up by the district court furnishing the representation with the approval of the judicial council of the circuit. The judicial council would then appoint one or more full-time attorneys for a 4-year term and salaries paid to the defenders would be comparable to those paid the U.S. attorney's office in the district. Fiscal supervision of such public defenders would be in the hands of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

The plan for a community defender on the other hand, would be drafted and administered by the local bar. This plan would have to be approved by both the district court wherein services were rendered and the judicial council of the circuit. This organization would be financed in whole or in part by an initial Federal grant for expenses necessary to establish the organization and periodic sustaining grants to provide representation and other expenses necessary for the maintenance of the organization. It is important to note that these two plans are optional and their purpose is to supplement the appointment of private counsel that now takes place under the present Criminal Justice Act, thereby providing a "mixed" defender system. That is to say, that the use of private counsel is supplemented with and not replaced by an organizational defender plan. Exhaustive research and study indicate that it is essential to maintain the interest and participation of the local attorneys and at the same time provide a full-time defender organization that would augment resources and efforts of the private assigned counsel systems in overburdened jurisdictions.

The purpose of the Criminal Justice Act of 1964 is to secure an adequate defense for impoverished defendants. Since its effective date, August 20, 1965, more than 60,000 defendants have received assistance from its provisions; annually, there are about 24,000 defendants represented by counsel appointed under the act with a total cost of about $3.5 million per year. The addition of the public defender organizations to the present system would complement it by increasing the effectiveness of the act from the standpoint of efficiency and quality of representation.

A public defender, for example, would reduce the Criminal Justice Act's administrative burden on courts, magistrates, clerks, and other court personnel. It would provide highly experienced defense counsel who would promote the efficiency of the Federal criminal justice system. A public defender could render more complete or more comprehensive service because he could be available to assist a needy defendant and commence preparation of his case prior to his appearance before the U.S. magistrate.

Also in accord with recent developments in the criminal law this bill would expand the present act's coverage to include probation revocation proceedings and certain arraignment proceedings. (*Mempa* v. *Rhay,* 389 U.S. 128. 1967):

> In addition, where the court appoints counsel for an evidentiary hearing on a habeas corpus petition or to represent a material witness, compensation would be authorized.

Mr. Speaker, a bill identical to the one that I introduced today was introduced in the other body on March 10 of this year—S. 1461. It is my conviction that the genuineness of a "mixed" defender system lies in the fact that it allows each Federal district with a busy criminal docket to provide adequate defense representation in the manner most efficient and effective in light of its local conditions, and establish a criminal defense program with a minimum of interference with local bar programs and circumstances.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FINANCING

(Mr. HALPERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today as a cosponsor of a bill to improve the financing and funding practices of the civil service retirement system, in order to assure that the necessary money is available when needed to pay the annuities of Government's retirees and survivor annuitants in full and on time.

The bill also will provide limited improvements to the benefits structure of the system.

I want to compliment the able gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) for initiating the sponsorship of this measure. I am privileged to be associated with him toward this goal. The measure exhibits the recognition of the many problems resulting from the past and present funding practices.

It is disquieting to realize that Federal employees have contributed the full amount set by law, but the Government has failed to appropriate regularly and systematically, on a concurrent basis, sufficient funds to meet the ultimate costs not covered by employees' contributions. Indeed, I am astonished to learn that it is expected that shortly the system will be only 25 percent funded and, eventually, totally unfunded.

This is a shocking state of affairs which threatens the retirement security of our public servants. It should be corrected.

The law proposed today would have a six pronged approach to improved financing, and contemplates a system which will ultimately be 50 percent funded. The bill would increase employee and agency contributions, require the Government to fully finance costs of future unfunded liabilities created by new benefits, provide present direct appropriations, require the Department of Defense to reimburse the system for costs attributable to crediting military service, and require other agencies to bear retirement costs of crediting unused sick leave.

Now is the time for this reform, before the problem grows any larger, and I trust we will enact this bill as soon as possible.

THE "POVERTY" FIASCO

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an article by Clark Mollenhoff in the Des Moines Register of March 30, 1969, which spells out some of the incredible goings-on in the misguided and mismanaged Office of Economic Opportunity.

Many of us have long suspected that the unbelievable was true when it concerned the OEO under the Johnson administration, and now, thanks to an Executive order by President Nixon, the real story is beginning to unfold.

The evidence set out by Mr. Mollenhoff is more than enough reason for the President to abolish this program and conduct a wholesale firing of those responsible for this disgraceful and in all too many respects highly expensive sham.

I include the newspaper article for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

REVEAL U.S. FINANCING OF BLACK GANGS—"SECRET" FILES SHOW THREATS, BLACKMAIL

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A presidential order has forced the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) to open secret files disclosing evidence of top level knowledge of federal financing of Black Panthers, black nationalism, and black revolution.

Those secret files show that in virtually every major city in the country, the most extreme black nationalist groups were able to grab control of the poverty war funds and the jobs through political manipulations and threats of rioting.

Local political figures were "unable or unwilling to resist these tactics," said one inspector's report on a summer program in San Francisco.

LOCAL FIGURES

When the local political figures were willing to take some strict action to resist the blackmail of those threatening violence, they were often bypassed by either regional or Washington officials.

The reports stated that even the inspectors from the Washington office ran into unusual hazards because the OEO was "a security sieve" that made it dangerous for inspectors to write reports on the crime, corruption and mismanagement they found.

One inspector complained bitterly that information from his report on "the activities of violent black racists" had been leaked to some of the most violent groups who had threatened "physical danger if he (the critical inspector) engages in any more inspections in these areas."

That report complained that no steps had been taken to punish a Community Action Program (CAP) official from Washington who "had compromised a criminal investigation" in the Pacoima Street Scene social action project in Los Angeles by discussing the details with the subjects of the investigation while the investigation was in progress.

The new information indicating that high level OEO officials tried to protect the criminals and the mismanagers is now available to the McClellan permanent investigating subcommittee for the first time because of a Nixon directive.

CONVICTED CRIMINALS

These stacks of inspection reports will permit McClellan's subcommittee to establish for the first time the full role of Washington officials of OEO in pushing for federal financing of convicted criminals who were continuing to preach violence, revolution and draft evasion.

For months, OEO director Bertrand Harding and his legal office stoutly resisted the McClellan subcommittee efforts to obtain access to the OEO inspection reports on controversial programs in Philadelphia, Chicago, New York, Washington, D.C., Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles and other cities.

It was necessary for Senator John L. McClellan (Dem., Ark.) to talk to President Nixon to arrange for the White House directive to OEO ordering co-operation with McClellan's investigators. Even the first Nixon directive did not result in full co-operation.

Only under continual prodding from the White House and from McClellan's investigators did the OEO deliver the inspection reports to McClellan committee counsel Jerome Adlerman and assistant counsel John Walsh, a former Des Moines man.

Some White House advisers are hopeful that McClellan's investigations and hearings will create the kind of a climate in which it will be possible to dismantle the OEO as President Nixon has wanted to do.

The reluctant Nixon decision to continue OEO was the result of some pressure from within the holdover ranks in OEO that included warnings that the sudden collapse of OEO would knock hundreds of militant advocates of violence off the payroll in dozens of major cities and could set the stage for more violence.

In the past, the supporters of OEO have continually challenged the congressional committee investigators over the facts and the conclusions that were drawn by OEO critics.

One of the most significant files now open involves inner agency squabbling over James Sherman, a firebrand leader in the controversial Pacoima Street project in Los Angeles.

Sherman was identified in the reports as a convicted burglar with a dozen arrests for assault with intent to murder, statutory rape, assault and battery and robbery.

Even as Sherman was being pushed for a continuing role in a leadership position in the poverty war program, the reports of the OEO inspectors set out his background.

Some poverty war officials praised Sherman for his "leadership" qualities, and in internal reports had glossed over his criminal background with the following comment:

"His experiential understanding of the problems and opportunities of the delinquent culture and of its interdependence with minority problems and opportunities (particularly those of the Negro and Mexican-American) is perhaps his major qualification."

POLICE RECORD

Commenting critically on this, an inspector had stated that "the expression 'experiential understanding of the problems and opportunities of delinquent culture' refers primarily to Sherman's long police record."

The inspector noted that Richard Saul, a Washington CAP official, had misrepresented the comments of a Los Angeles human relations commission field representative by praising the Sherman-dominated Pacoima summer program as "terrific."

The inspector quoted the field representative, John Hamby, as having told him that the program was operated in such a manner that "the Mexican-Americans felt they took a back seat to the Negroes."

"Negroes and Mexican-Americans were split into different work groups," Hamby was quoted as telling the inspector. "Last summer's project was a failure. There was a lot of goofing off."

The inspector said that Hamby told him the Mexicans felt that Sherman and other militants had talked the program managers into giving them favored positions.

The reports went into some detail in allegations that Sherman had been managing a string of prostitutes prior to his work on the poverty war summer project, and that he continued this activity during the period he took part in the Pacoima Street Scene project.

JOHN BIRCH TYPES

The inspection reports related that two high OEO officials interrogate inspectors in "a very unfriendly way" and tried to picture Sherman's police record as "a figment of the imaginations and evil machinations of John Birch-type police officers.

The OEO inspector's report stated that while the high level OEO official was seeking to portray Sherman as innocent of criminal activity, the reports of the police identified Sherman as involved as "a fingerman" in a number of robberies.

The inspector's report related that a woman who was arrested passing travelers checks seized in a $25,000 Giant Food Store robbery, said she obtained the travelers checks from Sherman.

The OEO inspector's report said the woman admitted she was a prostitute, and told police that she worked for Sherman.

INACCURATE REPORTS

The inspector contended that high level OEO officials disregarded the hard evidence, misrepresented the firm record of Sherman's crimes, and wrote extensive, inaccurate reports in an effort to discredit the inspection reports and to sell Sherman as "a leader."

The McClellan subcommittee investigators are following up the reports that the Pacoima project and Sherman continued to be supported with direct aid from Washington even though California Gov. Ronald Reagan and some local social agencies tried to kill the project because of the evidence of continued criminal activity by Sherman and others.

The reports by the inspector on the San Francisco program gave a detailed account of how local OEO officials permitted Black Panthers leader Bobby Seale to speak before a Hunters Point-area youth group, and then lied about it when questioned by local officials and the press.

The inspector's report related that Seale, one of those recently indicted in connection with rioting in Chicago last summer, had advised the young Negroes to get guns and to be prepared to shoot it out with whites.

In reviewing the San Francisco program, the inspector's report related that essentially all of the hundreds of thousands of dollars spent on the summer program in San Francisco went for salaries for the black militant organization.

There was much complaining from Spanish-American groups over the Negro domination of the program and the best jobs.

According to the inspection reports, many of the Black Panthers and other militants stated they would not survey the job opportunities in white-owned businesses because they did not want to place young Negroes under white bosses.

Even among the Negro business owners who were surveyed for job opportunities, there was little follow through and placement with Negro businessmen who said they wanted to hire young people.

A few businessmen who hired young men for the summer gave the OEO inspector discouraging reports of a disorganized program in which the OEO supervisor did not see that the young people got to the job, was unavailable for telephone complaints, and in general made the whole program valueless.

The inspection reports included details of the harrowing experiences of an OEO official with payroll duties who found his offices invaded by young hoodlums who threatened to beat him because of payroll delays.

In other instances, groups of young summer program enrollees were taken on picnics that turned into looting sprees in downtown and suburban stores.

Key black nationalists were in charge of these programs at the time of the looting, but did nothing to stop it.

The patterns in San Francisco involved some of the same Black Panthers who have been key figures in the most recent riots at San Francisco State College, according to the inspection reports.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FEDERAL FINES AND IMPRISONMENT FOR THE SALE OF MAILING LISTS USED FOR DISSEMINATION OF PORNOGRAPHIC LITERATURE TO MINORS

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation that would make it a Federal offense, punishable by Federal fines and imprisonment, for the sale of mailing lists that would be used for the dissemination of pornographic literature—in interstate commerce—to minors.

I confess that this legislation is introduced in a sense of desperation. We have tried for some time now various methods designed to deal with this mounting problem of traffic in filth and pornography being disseminated in this country. Most of our efforts have been struck down by the Surpreme Court under the free speech and free press—provisions of our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation attempts to get at the mailing lists which have become big business in this country. By barring the sale of these lists for immoral purposes, we can, perhaps, get around the constitutional protection which has shielded traffic in pornography through the court's interpretation of free speech or a free press.

I do not know of any constitutional provision which would protect the sale of these mailing lists for immoral purposes.

These lists are being sold today throughout the entire country.

I am sure every Member of this House would agree with me that never before in the history of this country and, perhaps, in the history of any country in the world, have we seen such a tidal wave of pornographic mail being distributed as we are witnessing today.

Almost never a day goes by that I do not receive from some of my constituents, and I am sure other Members receive the same, complaints about unsolicited mail and filthy literature as well as unwanted books and various other paraphernalia they receive through the mails. In almost every instance, they wonder how they got on the list.

We have already passed legislation which permits a postal patron who is a recipient of such literature to advise the Post Office Department that he does not want to receive any more mail from the sender. But, that is a sort of ex post facto approach that comes too late. This mail is coming unsolicited. It is quite clear to me as we look over the method of the distribution of this mail, that mailing lists have become a big business in ths country. These lists are made up from credit lists, credit cards, and various other types of activity on the part of the public and are then compiled for the distribution of pornography.

Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that by at least considering this type of legislation we can move ahead to put some brake upon the tidal wave of filth that is now being mailed and distributed throughout the country and which too often finds its way into the hands of minors.

Using the New York definition of obscenity, my bill will give our law-enforcement officials broad latitude in curbing the merchants of slime who are willing to make money by corroding our youths as long as they are able to be once removed from the actual assault. I have used the New York statute's definition of obscenity because it is broader than the standard laid down by the U.S. Supreme Court in Roth. This definition, however, has been approved by the Supreme Court in Ginsberg against New York.

My bill follows:

H.R. ——

A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the sale of mailing lists used to disseminate through the mails materials harmful to persons under the age of 19 years

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 71 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 1466. Sale of mailing lists.

"(a) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'minor' means any person under the age of 19 years.

"(2) The term 'nudity' means the showing of the human male or female genitals, pubic area, or buttocks with less than a full opaque covering, the female breast with less than a fully opaque covering of any portion below the top of the nipple, or the depiction of covered male genitals in a discernibly turgid state.

"(3) The term 'sexual conduct' means acts of masturbation, homosexuality, sexual intercourse, or physical contact with a person's clothed or unclothed genitals, pubic area, or buttocks or, in the case of a female, physical contact with her breast.

"(4) The term 'sexual excitement' means the condition of human male or female genitals in a state of sexual stimulation or arousal.

"(5) The term 'sadomasochistic abuse' means (A) flagellation or torture by or upon a person clad in undergarments, a mask, or bizarre costume, or (B) the condition of being fettered, bound, or otherwise physically restrained on the part of one so clothed.

"(6) The term 'harmful to minors' means that quality of any description or representation, in whatever form, of nudity, sexual conduct, sexual excitement, or sadomasochistic abuse, which—

"(A) predominantly appeals to the prurient, shameful, or morbid interest of minors;

"(B) is patently offensive to prevailing standards in the adult community as a whole with respect to what is suitable material for minors; and

"(C) is utterly without redeeming social importance for minors.

"(7) The term 'knowing' means having general knowledge of, reason to know, or a belief or ground for belief which warrants further inspection or inquiry.

"(8) The term 'mailing list' means any list containing the names and addresses of two or more people.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to sell or offer for sale any mailing list knowing that such list will be used to sell, offer for sale, loan, or deliver, through the mails to any minor—

"(1) any picture, photograph, drawing, sculpture, motion picture film, or similar visual representation or image of a person or portion of the human body which depicts nudity, sexual conduct, or sadomasochistic abuse and which is harmful to minors; or

"(2) any book, pamphlet, magazine, printed matter however reproduced, or sound recording which contains explicit and detailed verbal descriptions or narrative accounts of sexual excitement, sexual conduct, or sadomasochistic abuse and which, taken as a whole, is harmful to minors.

"(c) Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both."

(b) The table of sections for chapter 71 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"1466. Sale of mailing lists."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. LIPSCOMB) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the late great President Dwight D. Eisenhower on January 17, 1961, just prior to leaving office after 50 years of service to our Nation delivered his farewell address to the American people.

President Eisonhower delivered the message, he said, "to share a few final thoughts" with his countrymen. As he discussed the need to work for peace and human betterment, he discussed the challenge we face from communistic ideology and the need to be fully prepared. He discussed problems for our Nation as he saw them and called for caution, balance, and reason as we meet the challenges ahead.

In the intervening years, there have been many references to Mr. Eisenhower's farewell address. Unfortunately, however, it seems most commentators and speakers have concentrated on only one term used by the President in that talk, and that term is "military-industrial complex."

It is not that the term "military-industrial complex" as used by the President does not deserve attention, for it clearly does. But what is unfortunate is that at the same time so many other of the President's thoughts contained in that farewell address are glossed over or neglected.

I believe it would be well for Americans of all ages to refresh their memories as to what President Eisenhower said just a little over 8 years ago because so many of his thoughts are as valid today as when delivered.

In that address, he prayed "that the coming years will be blessed with peace."

But tragically in the 8 years which followed, we have not been blessed with peace.

President Eisenhower on January 17, 1961, also reminded us how essential is our Military Establishment in keeping the peace:

> A vital element in keeping the peace is our Military Establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

The President stated why an American armaments industry is required:

> We can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions.

President Eisenhower recognized that the total influence of an immense Military Establishment together with a large arms industry was felt in governmental offices throughout the land and he stated:

> We recognize the imperative need for this development.

It was at this point, having recognized the need for this development, that the President quite properly expressed the need for caution. He said:

> In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex.

These words are, of course, still valid and pertinent today.

But at the same time we should not overlook the important warning contained in President Eisenhower's farewell message concerning the danger communism poses to achieving freedom and progress in the world. He said:

> We face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. To meet it successfully, there is called for, not so much the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle—with liberty the stake.

With our Nation now actively engaged in war against forces nurtured and sustained by the Soviet Union and others, those words of warning were all the more prophetic and timely.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the frequent references we have been hearing about the phrase "military-industrial complex" as contained in Mr. Eisenhower's final message, I believe it is important that the entire message be available for study and consideration. I am, therefore, including at this point the full text of President Eisenhower's farewell address of January 17, 1961:

FAREWELL RADIO AND TELEVISION ADDRESS TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, JANUARY 17, 1961

(Delivered from the President's Office at 8:30 p.m.)

My fellow Americans:

Three days from now, after half a century in the service of our country, I shall lay down the responsibilities of office as, in traditional and solemn ceremony, the authority of the Presidency is vested in my successor.

This evening I come to you with a message of leave-taking and farewell, and to share a few final thoughts with you, my countrymen.

Like every other citizen, I wish the new President, and all who will labor with him, Godspeed. I pray that the coming years will be blessed with peace and prosperity for all.

Our people expect their President and the Congress to find essential agreement on issues of great moment, the wise resolution of which will better shape the future of the Nation.

My own relations with the Congress, which began on a remote and tenuous basis when, long ago, a member of the Senate appointed me to West Point, have since ranged to the intimate during the war and immediate post-war period, and, finally, to the mutually interdependent during these past eight years.

In this final relationship, the Congress and the Administration have, on most vital issues, cooperated well, to serve the national good rather than mere partisanship, and so have assured that the business of the Nation should go forward. So, my official relationship with the Congress ends in a feeling, on my part, of gratitude that we have been able to do so much together.

II

We now stand ten years past the midpoint of a century that has witnessed four major wars among great nations. Three of these involved our own country. Despite these holocausts America is today the strongest, the most influential and most productive nation in the world. Understandably proud of this pre-eminence, we yet realize that America's leadership and prestige depend, not merely upon our unmatched material progress, riches and miltary strength, but on how we use our ower in the interests of world peace and human betterment.

III

Throughout America's adventure in free government, our basic purposes have been to keep the peace; to foster progress in human achievement; and to enhance liberty, dignity and integrity among people and among nations. To strive for less would be unworthy of a free and religious people. Any failure traceable to arrogance, or our lack of comprehension or readiness to sacrifice would inflict upon us grievous hurt both at home and abroad.

Progress toward these noble goals is persistently threatened by the conflict now engulfing the world. It commands our whole attention, absorbs our very beings. We face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. To meet it successfully, there is called for, not so much the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle—with liberty the stake. Only thus shall we remain, despite every provocation, on our chartered course toward permanent peace and human betterment.

Crises there will continue to be. In meeting them, whether foreign or domestic, great or small, there is a recurring temptation to feel that some spectacular and costly action could become the miraculous solution to all current difficulties. A huge increase in newer elements of our defense; development of unrealistic programs to cure every ill in agriculture; a dramatic expansion in basic and applied research—these and many other possibilities, each possibly promising in itself, may be suggested as the only way to the road we wish to travel.

But each proposal must be weighed in the light of a broader consideration: the need to maintain balance in and among national programs—balance between the private and the public economy, balance between cost and hoped for advantage—balance between the clearly necessary and the comfortably desirable; balance between our essential requirements as a nation and the duties imposed by the nation upon the individual; balance between actions of the moment and the national welfare of the future. Good judgment seeks balance and progress; lack of it eventually finds imbalance and frustration.

The record of many decades stands as proof that our people and their government have, in the main, understood these truths and have responded to them well, in the face of stress and threat. But threats, new in kind or degrees, constantly arise. I mention two only.

IV

A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

Our military organization today bears little relation to that known by any of my predecessors in peacetime, or indeed by the fighting men of World War II or Korea.

Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But now we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in the defense establishment. We annually spend on military security more than the net income of all United States corporations.

This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every State house, every office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

Akin to, and largely responsible for the sweeping changes in our industrial-military posture, has been the technological revolution during recent decades.

In this revolution, research has become central; it also becomes more formalized, complex, and costly. A steadily increasing share is conducted for, by, or at the direction of, the Federal government.

Today, the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers.

The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present—and is gravely to be regarded.

Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

It is the task of statesmanship to mold, to balance, and to integrate these and other forces, new and old, within the principles of our democratic system—ever aiming toward the supreme goals of our free society.

V

Another factor in maintaining balance involves the element of time. As we peer into society's future, we—you and I, and our government—must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering, for our own ease and convenience, the precious resources of tomorrow. We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow.

VI

Down the long lane of the history yet to be written America knows that this world of ours, ever growing smaller, must avoid becoming a community of dreadful fear and hate, and be, instead, a proud confederation of mutual trust and respect.

Such a confederation must be one of equals. The weakest must come to the conference table with the same confidence as do we, protected as we are by our moral, economic, and military strength. That table, though scarred by many past frustrations, cannot be abandoned for the certain agony of the battlefield.

Disarmament, with mutual honor and confidence, is a continuing imperative. Together we must learn how to compose differences, not with arms, but with intellect and decent purpose. Because this need is so sharp and apparent I confess that I lay down my official responsibilities in this field with a definite sense of disappointment. As one who has witnessed the horror and the lingering sadness of war—as one who knows that another war could utterly destroy this civilization which has been so slowly and painfully built over thousands of years—I wish I could say tonight that a lasting peace is in sight.

Happily, I can say that war has been avoided. Steady progress toward our ultimate goal has been made. But, so much remains to be done. As a private citizen, I shall never cease to do what little I can to help the world advance along that road.

VII

So—in this my last good night to you as your President—I thank you for the many opportunities you have given me for public service in war and peace. I trust that in that service you find some things worthy; as for the rest of it, I know you will find ways to improve performance in the future.

You and I—my fellow citizens—need to be strong in our faith that all nations, under God, will reach the goal of peace with justice. May we be ever unswerving in devotion to principle, confident but humble with power, diligent in pursuit of the Nation's great goals.

To all the peoples of the world, I once more give expression to America's prayerful and continuing aspiration:

We pray that peoples of all faiths, all races, all nations, may have their great human needs satisfied; that those now denied opportunity shall come to enjoy it to the full; that all who yearn for freedom may experience its spiritual blessings; that those who have freedom will understand, also, its heavy responsibilities; that all who are insensitive to the needs of others will learn charity; that the scourges of poverty, disease and ignorance will be made to disappear from the earth, and that, in the goodness of time, all peoples will come to live together in a peace guaranteed by the binding force of mutual respect and love.

LEGISLATION TO REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Farbstein) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation for myself and for Messrs. Addabbo, Brown of California, Burton of California, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Diggs, Edwards of California, Feighan, Halpern, Hawkins, Joelson, Madden, Mikva, Moorhead, Nix, Podell, Powell, Rees, Reuss, Ronan, Rosenthal, Roybal, Tiernan, Scheuer, and Whitehurst, to extend eligibility for grants and loans, for public works and development facilities to central cities, under the Economic Development Act. Compact and contiguous census tracts containing at least 50,000 persons which have a 6 percent or greater unemployment rate would be eligible. An additional authorization of $250 million would also be provided.

The legislation has been endorsed in the strongest terms by the HUB council, the national organization of economic development officials of cities.

Although the Kerner Commission pointed to unemployment as the major problem of our central cities, and the followup study released recently by the Urban Coalition and Urban America revealed that it remains central, we have no Federal financial assistance specifically designed for the creation of new jobs in the central city. Extension of the EDA would provide such a mechanism.

The great needs of our central cities can be met through massive Federal subsidization along the lines of the current poverty and welfare programs; but the Federal Government can also undertake programs to stimulate job-creating businesses in our central cities. The latter approach would have the advantage of requiring only short-term Federal subsidization and leaving in its stead an increased urban tax base, capable of strengthening the financial position of our cities and an increased rate of ghetto resident employment. It would also alleviate much of the current demand for welfare and welfare-related services. This is the type of program EDA is.

While the requirement that a jurisdiction's overall unemployment rate be over 6 percent has prevented broad assistance to central cities, the EDA has, through application of special criteria, proved itself able to deal effectively with central cities in some instances. These include: First, limited technical assistance under title III of the act for which the Secretary of Commerce enjoys discretion as to eligibility; second, loans for public works and development facilities to a part of a city declared eligible for "special impact funds" under the OEO—EDA loans to Watts announced recently fall under this category; third, grants and loans for public works and development facilities to a part of a city which has lost a major source of employment in the last 3 years; and fourth, grants and loans for public works and development facilities to one jurisdiction located in a State where no other jurisdiction meets the 6 percent unemployment criteria.

These experiences have demonstrated that inclusion of central cities under the overall authority of the Economic Development Act could make a major impact on unemployment by stimulating job-related public works and public services; by establishing programs to identify areas of labor demand and provide job training in those areas; and by establishing programs to stimulate ghetto entrepreneurship by providing technical assistance and the design of entrepreneural plans under an umbrella development corporation.

The present administration appears to be moving in the direction of this legislation by creating an Office of Minority Business in the Department of Commerce. Enactment of this legislation would put some teeth in the administration's promises to do something about ghetto business and employment. I expressed this to the Honorable Daniel P. Moynihan, Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs, in a recent letter calling his attention to this legislation and calling on him for his support.

Extensive hearings were held on an earlier version of this legislation in 1966 with support coming from Eugene P. Foley, then Assistant Secretary of Commerce. The hearings resulted in a favorable report by the Committee on Public Works, but, unfortunately, the bill died with sine die adjournment of the 89th Congress before the full House could vote on it. The 90th Congress saw no significant action of the proposal, although it gave me the opportunity to refine the boundary and size criteria to the present concept of the compact and contiguous census tract, decreasing the size of the areas from 200,000 to 50,000 to bring in more communities throughout the country.

I believe that the time for this legislation has finally come, and with the sympathetic consideration of the measure by the Congress and by the administration I believe that the 91st Congress will see the establishment of this program to bring employment to the central cities.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 9832

A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to make certain metropolitan areas eligible as redevelopment areas, and to increase certain authorizations

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States *of America in Congress assembled,* That section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 522; Public Law 89–136) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b)(4) thereof is amended by striking out "or" and by inserting immediately after "two hundred and fifty thousand," the following: "or an area composed of compact contiguous census tracts containing at least fifty thousand persons,".

(2) Such section is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary is authorized to provide assistance under sections 101, 201, and 202 of this Act to a project located adjacent to a redevelopment area if he finds that the assistance to such project will primarily or substantially benefit the residents of such redevelopment area."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 105 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 522; Public Law 89–136) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 105. There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title not to exceed $500,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, June 30, 1967, and June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $665,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970."

(b) The proviso in subsection (c) of section 201 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows: *"Provided,* That annual appropriations for the purpose of purchasing evidences of indebtedness, making and participating in loans, and guaranteeing loans, shall not exceed $170,000,00 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, June 30, 1967, and June 30, 1968, and $225,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970.".

(c) Section 302 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 302. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $25,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, June 30, 1967, and June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $35,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970."

(d) Subsection (g) of section 403 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

"(g) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, June 30, 1967, and June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $65,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970, for financial assistance extended under the provisions of subsections (a)(3) and (a)(4) of this section."

(e) Subsection (c) of section 505 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not to exceed $15,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, June 30, 1967, and June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $20,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970."

A VERY BRIEF BUT MEANINGFUL RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined with others of our colleagues in cosponsoring, with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD), a concurrent resolution asking that it be a sense of Congress that the United States "should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam."

It was almost 1 year ago on March 11, 1968, when press reports indicated that the military was requesting an additional 206,000 troops in Vietnam. Then the gentleman from Pennsylvania, joined by several of his colleagues, of which I was one, cosponsored the following resolution:

> *Resolved,* That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should not increase its military involvement in Vietnam.

Many believe that this resolution made a contribution to the decision against further escalation in Vietnam. It was less than 3 weeks later that the decision was made to restrict the bombing and the initial steps were taken which led to the opening of the Paris peace talks.

The peace talks have been in progress for 10 months; yet the level of the war and, more importantly, the level of American participation in it continues virtually unchanged.

The time has come again for Congress to take the initiative to make its influence felt in the war in Vietnam. The time has come for the representatives of the American people to express to the administration the desire of their constituents to begin the process of deescalation of the American military effort.

Accordingly, I am privileged to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania in introducing a very brief but very meaningful resolution which provides:

> *Resolved,* That it is the sense of Congress that the United States begin to reduce its military commitment in Vietnam.

INTERNATIONAL DAIRY AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, on behalf of my colleagues from Wisconsin, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, and New York—Messrs. SCHADEBERG, THOMSON of Wisconsin, O'KONSKI, ZION, KYL, CEDERBERG, BROWN of Michigan, HARVEY, RIEGLE, ROBISON, RUPPE, and HASTINGS—a concurrent resolution urging the President to seek an international dairy agreement to resolve the world marketing problems facing the dairy-producing nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret to anyone from a dairy-producing State, or I am sure, to any of the Members of this body, that our domestic dairy industry has its share of problems.

Between 1950 and 1964 domestic milk production increased steadily. The increased production resulted primarily from improved farm technology. It kept heavy pressure upon milk prices and the number of farmers selling milk and cream was reduced at a drastic rate. Beginning at mid-1965 the per cow and per farm increases no longer were adequate to offset losses in the number of farmers, and the total production began to decline rapidly.

Milk production in the United States has dropped nearly 10 billion pounds in the past 8 years. At the same time, production worldwide has increased more than 70 billion pounds. In Western Europe alone, milk production has increased 30 percent in the last 10 years. World milk consumption has not, however, increased at an equal rate and much of Europe's surplus is dumped on the American market at highly subsidized and sharply reduced prices, thus undermining the domestic market; cutting into the livelihood of thousands of American dairy farmers; and driving more farmers off the farm.

It is obvious that our present methods of dealing with this situation are inadequate.

Let me cite an example.

In the early 1960's, even though butter imports were under controls set by the Federal Government, imports of butteroil began to undermine the domestic dairy industry. When an import quota was placed on butteroil, a butterfat-sugar mixture called exylone was introduced. When these imports were barred by a regulation applying to mixtures containing 45 percent or more butterfat, almost immediately Junex, containing 44 percent butterfat, started to pour into our country. In 1967, dairy imports reached a crisis stage when colby cheese and Junex-type mixtures threatened to wreck our domestic price support program. Even though the wheels began to turn to use existing law, section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, to curtail these imports, by the time action was taken, imports had increased to 2.9 billion pounds—an increase of 2 billion pounds since 1965.

Twice since 1967 the President has had to take action to further curb dairy imports, but even this action was not enough to help one of the major domestic manufacturers of milk crumb, who resides in my district, from being forced to begin closing his business.

Those from nondairy States may think that the less expensive foreign imports are beneficial to the residents in their districts and thus should perhaps be encouraged, not curtailed. The facts, however, do not bear this out. The import explosion of 1967 cost the taxpayer an estimated $131,177,198 through the dairy price support program to buy surplus American products driven out of the marketplace by imports. More importantly, fluid milk is exceptionally perishable. If domestic producers are driven out of business, we will soon find that the price of fluid milk will greatly increase as demand exceeds supply.

The situation is so critical today that the Government has been asked to enact strict curbs on dairy imports and impose countervailing duties on subsidized dairy products that are shipped into this country from Western Europe.

It seems to me that the time has come

for the major dairy producing countries of the world to work out better ways of distributing dairy surpluses without disrupting world markets and driving down dairy prices.

Our domestic dairy producers would surely benefit, as would the international dairy community, through a program that distributed surplus dairy products outside the normal commercial markets.

In addition, nutritious dairy products could be distributed in areas of the world where hunger and starvation are an everyday fact of life, without weakening the world market for dairy products. Instead of nations spending vast sums of money for export subsidies and surplus storage costs, funds could be directed toward alleviating hunger.

Dairy products are a mainstay of the diets of Americans, and an important part of our efforts to eliminate hunger and malnutrition in this country. It is imperative that our domestic industry remain strong so that these vital foods can be readily available to all our citizens.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Bush (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for the balance of the week, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group meeting.

Mrs. May (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for the period of April 14 through April 21, 1969, on account of official business for Department of Agriculture.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Hogan), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. Hogan), for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Dulski and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Whitehurst and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hogan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Findley.
Mr. Keith.
Mr. Gubser in two instances.
Mr. Foreman in three instances.
Mr. Wyman in three instances.
Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Coughlin.
Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. McKneally in two instances.
Mr. Button.
Mr. Duncan in two instances.
Mr. Horton.
Mr. Watson in two instances.
Mr. Shriver in two instances.
Mr. Derwinski in two instances.
Mr. Ashbrook in two instances.
Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Morse.
Mr. Halpern in two instances.
Mr. Hosmer in two instances.
Mr. Devine.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Howard) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Brasco.
Mr. Matsunaga.
Mr. Lowenstein in 10 instances.
Mr. Shipley.
Mr. Downing in two instances.
Mr. Ryan in three instances.
Mr. Podell in three instances.
Mr. Kee in two instances.
Mr. Fraser in two instances.
Mr. Gonzalez in three instances.
Mr. Annunzio.
Mr. Kyros in three instances.
Mr. Olsen in five instances.
Mr. Biaggi.
Mr. Dulski in six instances.
Mr. Lennon in two instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Basil Rowland Duncan;

S. 586. An act for the relief of Nguyen Van Hue; and

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to extend the time for the making of a final report by the Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, April 3, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 91st Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948; Ed Jones, Eighth District, Tennessee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

638. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a report on the adequacy of pays and allowances of the uniformed services, pursuant to the provisions of 37 U.S.C. 1008(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

639. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of February 28, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

640. A letter from the chairman, Communications Satellite Corp., transmitting the annual report of the corporation for 1968, pursuant to the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (title 4, sec. 404(b)); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

641. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Jack W. Herbstreit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

642. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found inadmissible to the United States under the provisions of section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

643. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

644. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice; transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

645. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

646. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the collection of the Federal unemployment tax in quarterly installments

during each taxable year, to make status of employer depend on employment during preceding as well as current taxable year, to exclude from the computation of the excess the balance in the employment security adminstration account as of the close of fiscal years 1970 through 1972, to raise the limitation on the amount authorized to be made available for expenditure out of the employment security administration account by the amounts so excluded, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 9821. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 9822. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 9823. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work, and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 9824. A bill to provide for uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by Federal and federally assisted programs, and to establish uniform and equitable land acquisition policies for Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Olsen, Mr. Udall, Mr. Nix, Mr. Hanley, Mr. Charles H. Wilson, Mr. Waldie, Mr. White, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Purcell, Mr. Corbett, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Button, Mr. Scott, Mr. McClure, Mr. Meskill, Mr. Lukens, Mr. Hogan, and Mr. Buchanan):

H.R. 9825. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9826. A bill to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 to require repayment of amounts paid for the training of merchant marine officers who do not serve in the merchant marine or Armed Forces; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 9827. A bill for the relief of the village of River Forest, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9828. A bill for the relief of the village of River Forest, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9829. A bill to amend section 218 of the Social Security Act to provide that a policeman or fireman who has social security coverage pursuant to State agreement as an individual employee and not as a member of a State or local retirement system may elect to terminate such coverage if he is subsequently required to become a member of such a retirement system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 9830. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if certain relatives of such member died while serving in the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services:

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 9831. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that when a beneficiary dies he and his dependents shall (if it would increase the total family benefits) be entitled to prorated benefits for the month of his death, with corresponding adjustments in any survivor benefits which may be payable for such month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN (for himself, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Feighan, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Joelson, Mr. Madden, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Nix, Mr. Podell, Mr. Powell, Mr. Rees, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Ronan, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Scheuer, and Mr. Whitehurst):

H.R. 9832. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to make certain metropolitan areas eligible as redevelopment areas, and to increase certain authorizations; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 9833. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code with respect to U.S. district court courtroom facilities in the western district of Texas; to the committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 9834. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9835. A bill to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 9836. A bill to prevent vessels built or rebuilt outside the United States or documented under foreign registry from carrying cargoes restricted to vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 9837. A bill to rescind the pay increases for Members of Congress and other Federal officials pursuant to Presidential recommendation to Congress in the budget for the 1970 fiscal year, to abolish the quadrennial Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9838. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the benefits payable thereunder shall be exempt from all taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9839. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 50-percent, across-the-board increase in monthly benefits thereunder, with the resulting benefit costs being borne equally by employers, employees, and the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9840. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligiblity of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 9841. A bill to provide equitable treatment to purchasers of U.S. savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 9842. A bill to increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans and to increase the income of the national service life insurance fund; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 9843. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the trade or business deduction allowable with respect to travel by automobile; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9844. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 9845. A bill to exempt from the antitrust laws certain joint newspaper operating arrangements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 9846. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937 to extend to 20 days the period during which a motor vehicle or trailer may be operated under a special use certificate and special use identification tag; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. Adams, Mr. Minish, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Bingham, Mr. MacDonald of Massachusetts, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Edwards of California, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Hanley, Mr. Burke of Massachusetts, and Mr. Hicks):

H.R. 9847. A bill to establish a commission to investigate and study possible permanent memorials to Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Johnson of California, and Mr. McCarthy):

H.R. 9848. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 9849. A bill for the relief of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 9850. A bill to provide workmen's compensation protection to coal miners and their surviving dependents denied benefits under State law for disability or death from pneumoconiosis caused by exposure to coal dust during their employment, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide or make provision for payment of supplementary compensation to persons receiving workmen's compensation benefits under State law for such disability or death, to reimburse States for the payment of certain workmen's compensation claims, to provide grants to States for research and planning with respect to occupational injuries and diseases in coal mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9851. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.R. 9852. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 9853. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 9854. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the East Greenacres unit, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 9855. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCULLOCH (for himself, Mr. Gerald R. Ford, Mr. Poff, Mr. Cahill, Mr. MacGregor, Mr. McClory, Mr. Smith of New York, Mr. Sandman, Mr. Railsback, Mr. Biester, Mr. Dennis, Mr. Betts, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Minshall, and Mr. Taft):

H.R. 9856. A bill to amend section 3006A of title 18, United States Code, relating to representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9857. A bill to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, to authorize an increase in license fee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 9858. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9859. A bill to provide that the days on which presidential elections are held shall be legal public holidays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 9860. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NICHOLS (by request):

H.R. 9861. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide for the advancement of certain former members of the Armed Forces on the retired lists; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9862. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 9863. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full old-age insurance benefits shall be payable at age 60 to individuals with 20 years or more of employment in coal mining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9864. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9865. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer (including the exemptions for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Dent, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. O'Hara, Mr. Carey, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. William D. Ford, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Meeds, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Gaydos, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Clay, Mr. Powell, and Mr. Reid of New York):

H.R. 9866. A bill to set forth a congressional statement on a national educational policy and to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate a comprehensive study on the formulation of a plan to implement such policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 9867. A bill to exempt from the antitrust laws certain joint newspaper operating arrangements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 9868. A bill to prohibit the sale or shipment for use in the United States of the chemical compound known as DDT; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9869. A bill to amend Public Law 85–905 to provide for a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9870. A bill to encourage the involvement of youth in federally financed programs and projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9871. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false invoicing, and false advertising of decorative wood and simulated wood products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9872. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9873. A bill to permit a compact or agreement between the several States relating to taxation of multistate taxpayers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9874. A bill to incorporate College Benefit System of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9875. A bill to allow credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain Federal employees for service in Federal-State cooperative programs in a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9876. A bill to modify the reporting requirement and establish additional income exclusions relating to pension for veterans and their widows, to liberalize the bar to payment of benefits to remarried widows of veterans, to liberalize the oath requirement for hospitalization of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9877. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 9878. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9879. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9880. A bill to require mailing list brokers to register with the Postmaster General, and suppliers and buyers of mailing lists to furnish information to the Postmaster General with respect to their identity and transactions involving the sale or exchange of mailing lists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 9881. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore to individuals who have attained the age of 65 the right to deduct all expenses for their medical care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida (for himself and Mr. Haley) (by request):

H.R. 9882. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in certain lands in Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 9883. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 9884. A bill to provide for the establishment of an additional national cemetery in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9885. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide for the payment of an additional amount of up to $150 for the acquisition of a burial plot for the burial of certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 9886. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H.R. 9887. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize a tax credit for certain educational expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 9888. A bill to enable consumers to protect themselves against arbitrary, erroneous, and malicious credit information; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9889. A bill to safeguard the consumer by requiring greater standards of care in the issuance of unsolicited credit cards and by limiting the liability of consumers for the unauthorized use of credit cards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9890. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 9891. A bill to permit State and local policemen and firemen who do not have coverage pursuant to State agreement under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to elect coverage under such system as self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9892. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the credit against tax for retirement income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9893. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to terminate the credit for investment in certain depreciable property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9894. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize for all taxpayers the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. Dent, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Edwards of California, and Mr. Vigorito):

H.R. 9895. A bill to establish a pollution disaster fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. Annunzio, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Boland, Mr. Brademas, Mr. Brown of California, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Farbstein, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Gaydos, Mr. Giaimo, Mr. Gibbons, Mr. Green of Pennsylvania, Mrs. Griffiths, Mr. Halpern, Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Hungate, and Mr. Long of Maryland):

H.R. 9896. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that percentage depletion shall not be allowed in the case of mines, wells, and other natural deposits located in foreign territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. Madden, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Moss, Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts, Mr. Price of Illinois, Mr. Podell, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Schwengel, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Sandman, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Vigorito, and Mr. Wolff):

H.R. 9897. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that percentage depletion shall not be allowed in the case of mines, wells, and other natural deposits located in foreign territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 9898. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,500 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 9899. A bill to authorize the lease of burley tobacco acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 9900. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit the furnishing of assistance to countries in which individuals are receiving training as members of the so-called Palestine Liberation Army; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 9901. A bill to provide for better administration of the National Park Service and of the electric power marketing programs of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9902. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 622. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. Brinkley, Mr. Davis of Georgia, Mr. Flynt, Mr. Hagan, Mr. Landrum, Mr. O'Neal of Georgia, Mr. Stephens, Mr. Stuckey, and Mr. Thompson of Georgia):

H.J. Res. 623. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the completion of the carving on Stone Mountain, Ga.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. Adams, Mr. Minish, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Edwards of California, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Hanley, Mr. Burke of Massachusetts, and Mr. Hicks):

H.J. Res. 624. Joint resolution to designate the stadium constructed in the District of Columbia under authority of the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 as the "Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.J. Res. 625. Joint resolution expressing the support of the Congress, and urging the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private, for the international biological program; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.J. Res. 626. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.J. Res. 627. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLD:

H.J. Res. 628. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating December 1969 as "National Women's Suffrage and Equality State Month" in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of women's suffrage in Wyoming and the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Con. Res. 195. Concurrent resolution relative to Citizens Radio Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. Brown of Michigan, Mr. Cederberg, Mr. Harvey, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Kyl, Mr. Riegle, Mr. Robison, Mr. Ruppe, Mr. Schadeberg, Mr. Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin, and Mr. Zion):

H. Con. Res. 196. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to an international agreement among major dairy product producing countries providing for orderly and equitable disposal of surplus dairy products; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Res. 356. Resolution relative to the hijacking of U.S. aircraft; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 357. Resolution providing for an additional clerk for all House Members; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

99. By Mr. HICKS: Memorial of the Washington State Legislature recommending use of Mountain View Hospital at Tacoma, Wash., as a veterans hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

100. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma, relative to financial qualifications for veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 9903. A bill for the relief of certain Philippine nurses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9904. A bill for the relief of Marlies Soraperra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9905. A bill for the relief of Shlomo Levy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 9906. A bill for the relief of J. Burdette Shaft and John S. and Betty Gingas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 9907. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal for Merit to Oskar J. W. Hansen in recognition of his extraordinary artistic achievement in the execution of the sculpture Liberty at Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9908. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Acierno and her children, Regina, Giuditta, and Diana Acierno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9909. A bill for the relief of Fulvo DeRosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 9910. A bill for the relief of Mr. Hannibal B. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

87. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Terpon Hriston Sarron, Varna, Bulgaria, relative to a veteran's pension, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE SERVICE AND CHARACTER OF DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, my service in the Congress during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration carry with it many cherished memories of Dwight David Eisenhower. These memories of my President and my leader are personally very dear and are historically significant chiefly because in essence they bear out the character and integrity of this great American.

From the time General Eisenhower visited Seattle and I had the privilege of presenting him to a huge audience during his first presidential campaign, until now, when his service to the Nation is completed, I have associated his life and achievements with the line of Alfred Lord Tennison describing Sir Galahad, "His strength is as the strength of 10 because his heart is pure."

No man I ever met, save only my own father, represented so much in the way of personal integrity.

Today I cannot add to what has been said during the past few days when a grateful and grieving nation, and indeed the world, paid tribute to the general's life and service. But, in all humbleness as an American, I do honor and pay my respects to him and to his family.

In addition, my greatest sympathy goes to his devoted wife, Mamie, who has given us strength during these past few trying days.

Meanwhile, in our hearts Dwight D. Eisenhower will live while we live, and after we are gone, his monumental achievements will live throughout history.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER, 1890–1969

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, Dwight David Eisenhower, the wartime leader of the Allied Forces in Europe during World War II, the 34th President of the United States, passed on to his Heavenly reward after a long battle against an overwhelming illness.

He was a great patriot and as a soldier and statesman has earned our thanks and our respect. America's heart is heavy with sorrow because of its deep affection for this man, and mankind owes a massive debt to his memory for he has left a legacy of devotion to duty and to his fellow man.

The historian of the future will have to assess the many accomplishments of Dwight Eisenhower; however, we do not have to wait for some future date to determine his strong character and his determination to complete the tasks to which he was assigned.

When "Ike," as he was known throughout the world, left the United States for Europe on an assignment that led to his choice as the Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces, he was unknown to the American people. When he came home several years later he was known to everybody. He was then a world figure, winning fame during the war which carried over into the peacetime years and into the political arena as our President.

What would have been the future of Dwight Eisenhower if he had entered the Naval Academy instead of West Point cannot be assessed by any living mortal. It was only by a quirk of fate that "Ike" entered West Point. He had taken competitive examinations for both academies; finishing first in the Annapolis test and second in those taken for West Point. He was appointed to the Naval Academy, only to find out that he would be over the age of 20 years before the term started and which age was the limit for the new naval cadets. As fate would have it, the first man on the West Point list was unable to accept the nomination and it went to Dwight Eisenhower.

His military achievements alone would have given him the greatness he gained throughout the world, but a brief portion of his civilian life added much to it, the office of the President of the United States.

Elected in 1952, and reelected in 1956, he served his Nation during a predominantly relaxed state of mind of the American citizens, which became known as the "Eisenhower years."

President Eisenhower was consulted many times by the two men who followed him into the White House—President John F. Kennedy and President Lyndon B. Johnson. In this way he showed the American people his continued interest in politics and in the affairs of our Nation.

A grateful Congress restored to General Eisenhower the title he once held—before assuming the office of the Presidency—General of the Army, again, a grateful Nation paying its respects to a great man.

Dwight David "Ike" Eisenhower always marched in the ranks of honor; he will always live in the minds of men as one of character and honor.

A great man, an American-minded citizen, a truly honorable man has answered the final rollcall. The Nation has paid homage to his memory and the spirit of this outstanding American should rekindle in the hearts of the people of this Nation, a dedication to our country, which was the foremost quality of our former President, and soldier.

"Ike" is gone. May he gain his reward promised to us all who serve, and serve well.

Today, Mr. Speaker, my sorrow and prayers are with his family and loved ones. My deepest sympathy goes out to the Eisenhower family for their loss is shared by the entire country—yes, even the entire world.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March, 31, 1969

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of General Eisenhower we all feel that we have lost a personal friend, whether we really knew him closely or had just read about him and seen his pictures. His passing comes as something of a surprise because in these past few months Dwight Eisenhower had made such a valiant and vigorous fight against recurring illness that all of us had come, I am sure, to regard him as virtually indestructible. His passing makes us sad, and yet there is also a feeling of quiet pride in the very full and very rich life which he lived, and the great inspiration and leadership that we were able to benefit from during the years that he occupied positions of great responsibility in our Nation. The sadness that we feel today is not so much the sadness of what has been left undone, what might have been accomplished, that we felt in the sudden passing of John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and Robert F. Kennedy; but instead a certain sadness for ourselves that we should henceforth be left without his wise counsel and encouragement, and sadness for our country and the world in realizing that with the departure of Dwight Eisenhower a unique and brilliant era in our history has finally come to an end.

Though I first saw General Eisenhower in the summer of 1952 when he returned from Europe to run for the Presidency; stood on the fringes of the crowd in January 1953 at his inauguration; and served in the Congress during the last 2 years of his administration, it was not until September 1965 that I actually met the general personally. He came to Seneca Falls, N.Y., in my district, to turn the first shovel-full of earth in the construction of the new Eisenhower College, named in his honor. The general's close friend, Bob Hope, was on hand for that historic occasion and Mr. Eisenhower joined in the laughter and applause when Bob Hope quipped:

> Where but in America could a poor Kansas farm boy grow up to be a 5-star General and President of the United States, and then end up as a ditch-digger in Seneca Falls!

I had another opportunity to chat with the general at his office in Gettysburg in 1967. At that time he was considering an invitation to fly to Vietnam to see the situation there at first hand, and I encouraged him to go, because I knew he would be a tonic to the troops out there, and his personal appraisal of the war when he returned would be valuable to all of us. The general told me he was eager to go if his doctors would permit it, and I believe he would have gone, but unfortunately, only a couple of weeks later, he was rushed from Gettysburg to Walter Reed with the first of several acute stomach upsets.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially proud of the fact that I was the original author of the legislation, enacted last year in the 90th Congress, to establish Eisenhower College, now in full operation, as the living national memorial to President Eisenhower, and to extend to that new college some $5 million in matching Federal funds in tribute to the former President. I was pleased to notice that Eisenhower College was one of the five charitable causes which members of the general's family had specifically urged friends who so desired to send their contributions to in lieu of flowers.

Eisenhower College will, I am confident, keep alive the magnificent buoyant spirit of Dwight Eisenhower that we honor today, so that in years to come he may continue to be for succeeding generations of young Americans as great a source of inspiration and encouragement as he has been to ours, to those of us who served in uniform with him, if not directly under him, during the historic days of World War II.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, America has lost one of her greatest sons. His legacy of personal warmth, exemplary leadership, and religious and family devotion will live forever as an inspiration not only to Americans but to people throughout the world.

Having served under him in the military and with him as our President, I am saddened by his passing, but inspired by his life.

No greater honor, privilege, or inspirational experience could befall any American citizen anytime in the history of our country, than to have served in Washington under the Eisenhower administration, and in the military during World War II under Dwight Eisenhower's watchful and guiding hand.

Having attended numerous conferences at the White House during his administration, I recall many discussions about the future of our country, the necessity of a balanced budget, and the tough decisions on preserving peace. The ever-present compassion for the people of this country stood out as the touchstone of his convictions and of his administration. He was a man who practiced what he preached and during his 8 years in office set the highest moral tone of this century for the National Government.

His philosophy, which supported the federal system through a strengthened local-State-Federal relationship, was clearly enunciated when he proposed in his famous Williamsburg address that certain taxing powers be turned back to the States in an overall attempt to strengthen State and local government and to preserve and strengthen the true federal system.

The depths of his convictions were clearly evidenced by his vetoes of bills which could have had a budget-busting effect. In particular he vetoed numerous public works bills. He vetoed them because he believed they were too costly, yet knowing full well that sustaining vetoes in the area of pubic works is extremely difficult. He succeeded in removing the unnecessary fat from public works appropriations until the last year of his administration, when the only Eisenhower veto ever overridden was one relating to public works. Even though the votes sustaining his veto became closer and closer, he never wavered from his deep conviction on this subject and was willing to run the risk of being overridden in order to try to control inflation through responsible Government spending. This is just one example of the dedication and firm convictions which President Eisenhower displayed as our Nation's leader.

Despite what some historians have already suggested as their judgment of the Eisenhower administration, President Eisenhower proved to be a man of action, compassion, and a man who was loath to make unattainable promises or to propose programs he knew could not succeed. I believe history will record the Eisenhower administration as the administration which not only kept the peace but brought a period of stability and reasoning to America.

During his first 2 years in office he brought the Korean war to an end, reduced taxes substantially, increased social security payments and coverage significantly, and provided needed leadership to bring our country together. His administration also created the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; provided statehood for Alaska and Hawaii; started the most significant highway program in the history of the country, the Interstate Highway and Defense System; began the water pollution control fight; and even though a military man himself, constantly strived to keep military programs and budgets within reason. He commenced the Nation's efforts in outer space, successfully met the challenges of the uprising in the Middle East, and refused to permit the United States to get dragged into the confrontation in South Vietnam. These monumental accomplishments undoubtedly came about largely because of the nature of the man himself, resulting from his basic honesty, unquestionable sincerity, and gentle friendliness, tempered with a firm decisionmaking capability and backed by the love and affection of the people of this country and throughout the freedom-loving world.

No one could be on the scene during his life of service without being impressed by him as a leader.

No one could attend the services in the rotunda of the Capitol where his body lay in state, or the funeral services at the National Cathedral and see the outpouring of love, affection, and respect by the leaders of the countries of the world, as well as by his fellow citizens at home, without realizing that one of the great men of history had passed away.

SECRETARY FREEMAN'S PROPOSALS FOR IMPROVING FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STYMIED BY SENATE-IMPOSED LIMITATIONS

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, almost daily for the past 2 months I have been reading or hearing a steady drumbeat of criticism of former Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman's administration of the food stamp program, coupled with extravagant praise of the new administration's breakthroughs in fighting hunger. Most of the praise of the new administration in this area has evolved around ideas which some reporters and commentators say they understand from reliable sources are being considered, and may be about to be adopted, in the Department of Agriculture. The only breakthrough so far, apparently has been the much-advertised pilot program in two South Carolina counties to give free food stamps to a handful of very, very low-income families.

FREE STAMPS A MISTAKE

I firmly believe the free stamp idea is a mistake. However, I am willing to give it a chance to operate long enough to see what the results are. My understanding is that despite the widespread poverty and malnutrition in the two counties involved, only a tiny percentage of families eligible for the food stamp program is eligible for the free stamps. This is because the free stamps can go only to those families with incomes of less than $30 a month. Such families normally would pay only 50 cents per person, up to a maximum of $3 a family, for the same quantity of food stamps they now receive free.

It seems to me that the State, the county, and the civic or charitable organizations in the local community—no matter how low its per capita income—should be able to find some way to help such a family scrape together the pittance required under the food stamp program to purchase a full month's supply of food. This is the best food bargain anywhere in the world—even better than CARE. A family of four, for instance, with income of less than $30 a month, pays only $2 a month for $58 worth of food, under the food stamp program operating elsewhere in the South. In the North, a family of four with an income under $20 pays $2 for $60 worth of food stamps, while families in the North with incomes between $20 and $30 a month pay $6 for the same $60 worth of food coupons.

SHOULD ALL NECESSITIES BE GIVEN FREE?

To relieve participating families of any obligation to pay anything whatsoever for $58 to $60 worth of food purchasing power in the grocery store would, I fear, lead to consequences which could undermine and destroy the whole food stamp concept. I do not mean that the added cost of 50 cents per person or $3 per family would have such a far-reaching consequence if restricted to the very lowest income families. But once you give free food stamps to those with incomes under $30 per month, the pressures would mount, and soon be irresistible to make them free for all whose incomes are under $50 or $100, or $150, or whatever—and the idea of supplementing what people normally spend for food with an added amount of purchasing power to enable not only very low-income families, but large families of modest income to enjoy an adequate diet would turn instead into a general free food program for all.

Why not free rent? Why not free shoes? Why not free clothing? Why not free bus transportation? Why not free handouts of every necessity? Food is essential, but so are the other things.

And how long would middle-class attitudes in this country stand for a system of free necessities to every family of low income without even a token payment to show it is trying to help itself at least a little?

Just remember, Mr. Speaker, how bitterly and agonizingly hard it has been to extract the authorization, and the funds, from a narrowly divided Congress to get the food stamp program to its present inadequate level of $280,000,000 for this fiscal year. Certainly, the program is not adequate. Certainly, it is underfunded. Certainly, the purchase requirements for most families participating in the program are higher than they should be, and the value of the bonus coupons given to participating families is not enough to assure what the law actually calls for: an adequate nutritious diet.

LITTLE WRONG WITH FOOD STAMP PROGRAM THAT SUFFICIENT FUNDS COULD NOT CORRECT

To correct these deficiencies is the simplest thing in the world. All it takes is the removal of the present, cruelly restrictive ceilings on appropriations—ceilings imposed not by the House but by the Senate—and the appropriation of sufficient funds to enable the food stamp office to put into effect the liberalizing policies former Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has intended to establish last year until the Senate conferees insisted in writing into the bill the present restrictive ceilings on appropriations.

The House last year overturned our Committee on Agriculture to pass a 4-year authorization with no ceilings on appropriations. That was a historic and bitter battle. But in conference, this genuine breakthrough in the program was rejected. And so we have these limits in the law of $315,000,000 for the current fiscal year, $340,000,000 for the 1970 fiscal year, and $170,000,000 for the first 6 months of the 1971 fiscal year. Then the Appropriations Committee approved only $280,000,000 for this program for this year. That is the history. That is why Secretary Freeman could liberalize the program only for families with incomes of less than $70 a month.

It would take no earth-shattering Executive decision by the new administration to recommend in the pending supplemental appropriation bill additional funds for this fiscal year. It has not yet done so. If it were to do so, however, and if Congress were to provide additional funds for the remainder of the 1969 fiscal year, then the ceiling in the food stamp law on 1970 fiscal year funds would probably be too low to permit annualizing of the expanded program during fiscal 1970.

HOUSE VOTED LAST YEAR FOR OPEN-END AUTHORIZATION

I trust that Secretary of Agriculture Hardin will see the necessity of recommending what the House passed last year—with the sponsorship of 130 Members— and that is, the removal of arbitrary ceilings in this program so that Congress each year can appropriate whatever is necessary to fund the program at the level commonsense and an enlightened and humane attitude require.

Many of the Members have been asking me in recent weeks what I intend to do this year about the food stamp legislation. When Secretary Freeman was in office, I could offer suggestions for which I would then take legislative responsibility for trying to get through. I think Secretary Hardin, who now has responsibility for a program his party never wanted, should have the opportunity to study the program and discuss it within the administration, and, if he wants to expand it, and make it more effective, I will certainly be glad to assist him in eliminating the ceilings and providing more funds.

IS TRANSFERRING PROGRAM THE ANSWER?

But if he wants to get rid of the program, or turn it over to another Department, as has been suggested, I would want to know why. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare never demonstrated any interest in, or affection for, this program when I first began the effort to enact it into law, and from everything I have been able to learn, the people at HEW have always felt and still feel that if you want to help poor people, you just give them more money, and let them spend it for whatever they think they want to spend it for. This is the policy on public assistance—if a family uses the welfare check foolishly, that is their business, according to HEW.

The food stamp program was placed in Agriculture because its purpose is to increase the consumption of food by low-income families at less cost to the Government than the cost of removing surplus food from the market, processing it into storable form—powdered milk, powdered eggs, dried beans, peanut butter, and so forth—and then giving it away. It is infinitely better to enable poor families to buy fresh milk, fresh eggs, fresh fruits, and vegetables, and fresh meats than for the Government to buy up these products under price support, process them, and give them out in far less appetizing or nourishing form. And the food stamp program, as I said, is far cheaper than the direct distribution program. But hand in hand with giving people an opportunity to buy a better diet goes the necessity to help many families to spend their food coupons—their food dollars—intelligently. This is an area in which the Department of Agriculture has always had expertise.

SECRETARY FREEMAN'S FINAL REPORT ON THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, many of the widely publicized ideas said to be circulating in the executive department for improving the food stamp program are actually suggestions made by former Secretary Freeman in a report he made to Congress on January 20, 1969. Such an annual report was first required under the food stamp amendments we passed last year. I have not seen a word in print about this Freeman report. I never saw the report itself until I called over to the Department to ask for a copy. Perhaps few of the other Members have seen it. I am, therefore, including it below as part of my remarks.

I do not agree with all of Secretary Freeman's final recommendations.

SHOULD THE PROGRAM BE INSTITUTED WITHOUT STATE AND LOCAL COOPERATION?

For instance, I do not agree with his suggestion that the law be changed so that food stamp projects can be initiated in States or counties which refuse to institute it, and which will not accept responsibility for it.

This is apparently a rather popular idea among some of the individuals and groups now waging a rather belated campaign against hunger in the United States. Better late than never—but this battle over malnutrition in a rich, abundant country has been raging since 1954, and some of those now issuing the strongest statements about the problem were not giving us much encouragement in the Benson days when we could not get any help whatsoever in passing a food stamp law, and when the Benson regime would not put a food stamp program into effect even after the 1959 Food Stamp Act was passed. President John F. Kennedy and his Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, had the courage to start the food stamp program, and to expand it, and President Lyndon Johnson backed me 100 percent in getting through the 1964 act—which every Republican Member of the House Committee on Agriculture opposed.

Congressman JOHN SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, is the only Republican Member of the House who voted for this program on every vote since 1957. Perhaps 35 other Republican Members have supported it in recent years, and I am grateful to them. But this program was initiated, expanded and developed almost entirely as a Democratic effort.

To the extent that we have obtained funds, and improved the law, it has been a tremendously successful program. But it requires State and local participation, encouragement, and responsibility, to make it work. It is not self-administering.

So I do not think it should be initiated in any area where the Federal Government has to step in and certify the eligibles, investigate their income every three months, handle the stamps which are the same as money, and do what is essentially a local enforcement and administration job.

We do not establish public housing where the local communities will not assist and participate and take responsibility. We do not provide public assistance in any categories where the State and county or municipality will not participate and guarantee to administer it carefully and fairly.

Through legislation we have passed assuring every American the right to vote, people who live in areas which refuse to shoulder their responsibilities to the poor can overturn the policies of their local officials by replacing them with officials more attuned to the needs of the public.

So I do not agree with this particular proposal of Mr. Freeman.

FREEMAN PLANS FOR EXPANDING THE PROGRAM

Most of the other suggestions in the Freeman report of January 20 are worthwhile and should be put into effect. To carry them out, more money is needed. At least $500,000,000 would have to be appropriated in the coming fiscal year, according to Secretary Freeman's final report, to reach more of the poor people who need this food assistance in the areas which now have the program. But under present law—thanks to the Senate's position last year—only $340,000,000 can be appropriated in fiscal 1970.

And, I might add that, because of a Senate amendment to the food stamp bill of 1967—unanimously agreed to by every member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, according to the debate in the other body that year—no section 32 money can be spent on the food stamp program. I think Secretary Hardin may perhaps be in violation of that restriction for using a section 32 item to institute the pilot free food stamp program in the two South Carolina counties—but if so, that is the Senate's problem. It was their amendment which prohibits use of any section 32 money for food stamps.

I applaud the attention now being given in the other body to the hunger issue. But I resent any implication that

Secretary Freeman was responsible for the food stamp program's shortcomings. Those who make the charge should read the debates in the Senate on the food stamp bills and note the restrictions on funds voted there.

TEXT OF SECRETARY FREEMAN'S REPORT TO CONGRESS OF JANUARY 20, 1969

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit Secretary Freeman's final report on the food stamp program as follows:

A REPORT ON THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM SUBMITTED TO THE CONGRESS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED

INTRODUCTION

P.L. 90–552, approved October 8, 1968, amended the Food Stamp Act of 1964. Among other provisions, it requires that on or before January 20 of each year, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Congress a report setting forth operations under the Food Stamp Act during the preceding calendar year and projecting needs for the ensuing calendar year.

This is the first annual report submitted to the Congress under the provisions of P.L. 90–552.

PROGRAM OPERATIONS DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1968

Number of Food Stamp Areas: There was a substantial increase in the number of areas operating a Food Stamp Program in the calendar year 1968.

In January 1968, a total of 848 food stamp areas were in operation in 41 States and the District of Columbia. In December 1968, a total of 1,219 food stamp areas were in operation in 42 States and the District of Columbia.

At the end of calendar 1968, an additional 334 areas had been approved for participation and USDA representatives were working with State and local officials to help them finalize their plans for the opening of these new programs.

If State welfare agencies are able to meet their schedules, a total of 1,553 food stamp areas will be in operation by June 30, 1969.

The designation of additional areas for participation in the latter part of calendar year 1969 will depend upon the level of funding authorized for the program for the fiscal year 1970.

Program Participation: At the beginning of calendar year 1968, a total of 2.2 million persons were participating in the Food Stamp Program.

By October 1968, participation had increased to 2.7 million persons. When information is available on the level of participation in December, it is expected to be at least 100,000 more than in October.

Participating Retailers and Wholesalers: The number of participating retailers and wholesalers increased from 72,000 at the beginning of calendar 1968 to 90,000 in December 1968.

The substantial participation of retailers provides participants with a wide choice in the selection of the store or stores in which to purchase food with their coupon allotment. The Consumer and Marketing Service individually authorizes each store that wishes to accept food coupons to insure that store owners understand their obligations under the program. C&MS will authorize any retail food store in the area that wants to accept food coupons and almost all food stores do elect to participate.

Food wholesalers are authorized by C&MS to act as an intermediate coupon redemption agent for a retailer if the wholesale firm wishes to provide this service to retailers. Most retailers redeem their coupons through the commercial banks in the area. Through the cooperation of the commercial banking system, retailers are able to promptly redeem for cash (or for deposit) the coupons they accept from participating families.

C&MS is also directly responsible for the supervision of participating food retailers and wholesalers. Personnel located in field offices—each office covers an average of four or five operating areas—carry out this responsibility at the local level. Every effort is made to obtain voluntary compliance with regulations and restrictions on the use of the food coupons. However, if store owners do violate these regulations, the Act provides that they may be disqualified.

A high level of cooperation is obtained from retail food stores. Since the passage of the Act in 1964, it has been necessary to disqualify only 480 stores for periods ranging from 30 days to three years. Another 1,345 stores have received a official warning because of the minor nature of the violations that took place. On the other hand, a total of 1,152 stores for which available evidence indicated violations might be taking place, were found to be free of violations.

Funding Limitation: During the calendar year 1968, funding limitations made it necessary to defer the opening of 136 new food stamp areas. These areas had been approved for participation in December 1967, and were scheduled to open during the summer of 1968.

This deferment action was necessary because actions, taken in July 1967, to increase participation in operating areas were more effective than had been anticipated.

The deferment of the opening of these 136 areas was lifted by the Department in October 1968, when final action of the 1969 fiscal year appropriation for the program was completed.

Program Modifications: The two major program modifications which helped to extend the program to more needy people early in calendar year 1968 were announced by the Department in July 1967. These modifications were:

(a) Reduction in the minimum purchase requirement to 50 cents per person per month (up to a total of $3 a month for a family of six or more). The previous minimum purchase requirement had been $2 per person per month, with a family maximum of $16 a month.

(b) Reduction in the first month's purchase requirement for all families entering the program for the first time to half the regular monthly purchase requirement. This reduction applied to new families purchasing coupons on a semi-monthly or weekly basis as well as to those who purchased coupons on a monthly basis.

In addition to these program changes, the Department had intensified its efforts to assist State and local welfare agencies in an outreach program to bring more eligible families into the program. In addition to field personnel of the Consumer and Marketing Service—the Department agency responsible for administration of the program—the resources of the State and county Technical Action Panels were used in this outreach effort. In selected areas, low-income people were employed on a part-time basis to work with other low-income families in their own communities.

During the calendar year additional modifications were made to increase program effectiveness. The two principal administrative modifications were:

(a) authority was provided to State welfare agencies to provide a prompt and preliminary certification to obviously needy families, with a 30-day time period in which to make the final eligibility determination;

(b) increased authority to States to issue coupons by mail. The Department agreed to underwrite the value of any coupons lost in the mail if the State observed minimum security standards. These minimum standards required that the coupons be mailed under the first-class postage rate.

A major program modification was announced by the Department in December 1968—to be effective not earlier than February 1969. The timing of this modification was designed to provide the necessary lead time to State welfare agencies to plan for the local implementation of the modification.

This program modification reduced purchase requirements and increased bonus coupon allotments for families with less than $70 a month in income. It resulted from an intensive review within the Department of current purchase requirements and total coupon allotments authorized for participating families. The group undertaking the review concluded that low-income families will spend less for food than we had previously assumed if their expenditure patterns were considered over time.

This review, together with our program experience, indicated that month after month, most of the poor would be able to allocate about 24 to 33 percent of their income for food, depending upon family size and level of income. It was also concluded that bonus coupons allotments for families in the lowest income ranges should be increased in order to increase the total food stamp purchasing power of such families. The recommended increase was to be the first in a series of increases which would be necessary to insure that the stamp purchasing power of all participating families was in line with the full cost of a low-cost adequate diet.

When the cost of full implementation of the recommended issuance schedule changes were projected, it was estimated that an additional one million people could be brought into the program. It, therefore, would have required the program to be funded at its authorized level of $315 million in 1969 and over $500 million would have been required to provide full-year financing of the recommended modifications in 1970.

A total of $280 million was appropriated for the program in 1969 and the maximum authorization for the program in 1970 was established at $340 million. Within these funding levels, the modifications announced in December 1968 represented a partial implementation of the recommended changes and the changes were limited to families with incomes of less than $70 a month.

Table A which accompanies this report shows the specific changes that were authorized in the December announcement.

PROGRAM FUNDING—CALENDAR 1969

The Food Stamp Act now authorizes a maximum appropriation of $340 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and a maximum authorization of $170 million for the six months of July–December 1970. Action by the Congress to further amend the Food Stamp Act will be necessary to authorize appropriations for periods subsequent to December 1970.

It is now estimated that it will require about $325 million in fiscal 1970 to finance the program scheduled to be in operation by the end of the fiscal year 1969, i.e., June 30, 1969. If the full $340 million appropriation authorized for fiscal year 1970 is appropiated, some additional areas can be approved for participation in fiscal 1970. In the absence of any amendment to the Food Stamp Act, the number of additional areas that could be designated in the latter half of calendar 1969 would need to be limited to those that could be funded at an annual rate of $340 million during fiscal 1970 and the first half of fiscal 1971.

As an alternative in 1970, no new designations could be made—using the unallocated fund of approximately $15 million to make additional program changes. That amount would not be sufficient to make any major modification in the program in fiscal 1970.

FUTURE PROGRAM NEEDS

Action should be taken now to place the Food Stamp Program on a sound legislative base—one on which concerned Federal, State and local agencies can plan for the future expansion and improvement in the program.

The Food Stamp Program should be operated in every county in the 50 States, replacing the Commodity Distribution Program for needy families.

The cost of the coupons should be reduced as soon as possible.

Bonus levels should be progressively increased until all participating families are provided with the full purchasing power for a low-cost diet.

National minimum eligibility standards should be authorized in the Food Stamp Act.

Authority should be provided to the Secretary of Agriculture to directly operate the program in an area when State or local authorities will not accept responsibility for it.

Consideration should be given to the increased sharing by the Federal Government of the costs of intrastate program administration, especially for the lowest income counties. If such increased Federal payments were provided States and localities should be required to offer certain minimum levels of certification and issuance services to eligible households and should be required to undertake a continuing outreach effort to maximize the participation among those that are in need of food assistance.

Supportive foods and nutrition education program for poor families should be expanded and strengthened.

In addition to the specific legislative changes outlined above, the uncertainties of Federal financial support should be eliminated. Permanent appropriation authorities should be provided similar to those provided in the National School Lunch Act. Congress should also be free to determine during each annual appropriation process the actual level of funds required for the program in the ensuing fiscal year. Limiting several years in advance the maximum amounts that may be appropriated in specific fiscal years substantially limits the ability of the program and its Federal, State and local administrators to meeting the evolving food and nutrition needs of the poor.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

MODIFICATIONS IN THE BASIS OF COUPON ISSUANCE ANNOUNCED IN DECEMBER 1968

4-PERSON HOUSEHOLD IN THE NORTH

Monthly net income	Current			Effective Feb. 1, 1969		
	Purchase	Bonus	Total	Purchase	Bonus	Total
Under $20	$2	$50	$52	$2	$58	$60
$20 to $29.99	8	44	52	6	54	60
$30 to $39.99	14	42	56	10	52	62
$40 to $49.99	20	40	60	14	48	62
$50 to $59.99	24	40	64	20	44	64
$60 to $69.99	28	38	66	26	40	66

4-PERSON HOUSEHOLD IN THE SOUTH

Monthly net income	Current			Effective Feb. 1, 1969		
	Purchase	Bonus	Total	Purchase	Bonus	Total
Under $30	$2	$46	$48	$2	$56	$58
$30 to $39.99	10	42	52	8	50	58
$40 to $49.99	16	40	56	12	48	60
$50 to $59.99	22	36	58	18	42	60
$60 to $69.99	26	34	60	24	38	62

CHARLES SOLDIER DIES IN VIET WAR

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. J. K. Carroll, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

CHARLES SOLDIER DIES IN VIET WAR—PFC. J. K. CARROLL, 22, WAS DRAFTED IN SEPTEMBER

A Charles county soldier who was the father of a 2-year-old boy, died in combat February 26 in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

He was PFC Joseph K. Carroll, 22, the only son of Marian T. Carroll, of Pomonkey, Md.

Private Carroll was a lifelong resident of Pomonkey until he was drafted into the Army September 10.

A 1965 graduate of Pomonkey High School, he worked as a machine operator for three years at a Navy explosives plant in Indian Head, Md.

Private Carroll was sent to Fort Bragg, N.C., for basic training.

Besides his mother, he is survived by his son, Victor Glasgow Carroll, of Pomonkey.

A requiem mass will be offered at 10 a.m. today at St. Joseph's Catholic Church in Pomfret, Md.

THE LUMBER PRICE CRISIS: MEETING NATIONAL HOUSING GOALS

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Denby Mackie, with Oregon's Timberlane Lumber Co., has written to me with suggestions concerning the problems of wood supply for meeting out Nation's housing goals, and for responsive action to the present price crunch in lumber and plywood.

His letter to his customers and the article to which he refers in the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard are presented herewith:

TIMBERLANE LUMBER CO.,
Eugene, Ore., March 5, 1969.

To Our Customers:

"Allowable Cut"—These words mean life to the independent producer of lumber in the West and strike fear in the hearts of the ardent conservationist. But . . . What does allowable cut mean to you? As a practical matter, we in the lumber business have been existing in a state of an uneasy truce with the conservationists. Many of them seem to feel it is a sacrilege to cut any trees for any purpose. We in the industry feel our National forests should be managed for the ultimate welfare of the whole country with a special consideration given to the residents of the producing area.

In the year 1969, and in the immediate years ahead, one of the most pressing needs for our nation will be housing. An estimated 1,900,000 units for normal construction and up to 500,000 units (50,000 in 1969) for Government-sponsored low-income housing. In order to meet these goals, we will need increased lumber production. The key to lumber production is *logs*. The key to logs—*allowable cut*.

The best minds we have consulted indicate the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service could increase the allowable cut enough to meet the demands of the housing industry and . . . still *not* rob future generations of their share of our Western forests. This would take a new and dynamic approach by those Federal agencies. This would take an increase in budget for these agencies. *Here is where you come in.*

Please write to your Congressman and Senators giving them an outline of the problems you have experienced in obtaining adequate supplies of forest products and suggest to them they support a budget increase for the Forest Service and BLM for the express purpose of investigating the maximum allowable cut consistent with the broad National interest.

For your information, we are attaching a letter we received from Schneider Lumber Products and Hult Lumber Products, divisions of American Can Company, outlining their log problems, a cartoon expressing the attitude of the arch-conservationist and an article from the Eugene Register Guard indicating the campaign has already begun.

Please act *now!*

Enclosed is a letter we sent you last month. We don't know how many of you have written to your Congressmen and Senators; but if you haven't, *do it now.*

During the month of February, two sales of Federal timber were bid up to a figure over $200.00 a thousand. And . . . one of the bidders was a stud mill! (These prices were over three times the appraised value.) These high stumpage costs must eventually reflect themselves in higher lumber prices.

The only way we in the industry can avoid higher prices for lumber is to put pressure on the Federal Government to end the artificial shortage of softwood timber. This could be done in 4 ways:

(1) A temporary ban on all softwood log exports (except Port Orford and Alaska Yellow Cedar). These exports could resume when the domestic emergency has abated.

(2) An immediate release, for harvesting, of all wind thrown (blow-down) timber. This would salvage potentially wasted timber since blow downs are susceptible to rot, fire, and insects, as well as increase available timber for prompt cutting.

(3) A temporary 10% increase of allowable cut in the softwood forest of the Western states. The 10% figure is a minimum increase. (We have heard of experts predicting the possibility of a 60% increase being a potentiality while still maintaining a perpetual yield.)

(4) A complete inventory of the softwood forests in the control of the Federal agencies. With this in hand, the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management could then set new allowable cut figures consistent with due consideration for future generations.

There is a predicted demand for 26,000,000 new housing units by 1979—an average of 2,600,000 a year! (Last year we built 1,500,000 units.) Two million of these units to be built by private enterprise each year. This will take more lumber and this means more timber. The timber can only come from Federal forests.

Please write your representatives in Washington, D.C. outlining the problems and what has happened to prices in the last year or two. In order to accomplish any of the above steps, budget allowances must be made by House of Representatives, who are considering budget items now.

[From the Eugene Register-Guard, Jan. 22, 1969]

Forest Industry Vows New Drive for Bigger Log Cut

(By Dan Wyant)

The forest industry will make a renewed effort in 1969 to convince the American public more trees must be made available for lumber and plywood products.

Wendell Barnes, executive vice president of the Western Wood Products Association (WWPA), told a gathering of lumbermen in Eugene Tuesday night that the nation's housing goals can't be reached if the raw material base continues to shrink.

He said housing starts are expected to double annually over the next decade while increasing acreages of forest lands are being withdrawn from the timber supply for such "single purpose" uses as wilderness preservation.

Barnes spoke to a district meeting of WWPA members where new officers were named for the coming year. Arthur Lindley of Kimball Bros. Lumber Co. at Dexter was renamed district chairman; S. E. Pittman of Bohemia Lumber Co. at Culp Creek was named vice chairman, and Clark Miller of I. P. Miller Lumber Co. at Monroe was named secretary. The district includes Lane, Douglas and northern Coos counties.

Barnes said the annual allowable cut from federal timberlands must be increased by a "reasonable and scientifically justified amount," increased funds must be made available for access road construction and intensive forest management, and the trend toward withdrawing forest lands from timber cutting must be slowed down.

Right now, he said, there are 177 proposals to "fence off" forest land for the "single use of recreational or sterile wilderness."

Barnes said the forest industry is finding a new ally in the National Association of Home Builders. The association is alarmed at the skyrocketing price of lumber and the lack of availability of many items, he said.

"They now realize we must have a timber supply to meet their housing goals," he said.

The home builders have political power in the nation's metropolitan areas, where most of the members of Congress come from, Barnes said. This can be helpful to the forest industry, he said, which has been hampered in the past by lack of numerical strength in Congress because of the sparse population of the West.

Barnes also reported that various trade groups in the forest industry are joining together in a new promotional program called FACE (Facts, Action, Communication and Evaluation) to help convince the public that "sound" timber harvests are essential to the nation.

Barnes expressed confidence that Gov. Walter Hickel of Alaska will be confirmed as secretary of the Interior and will be a "spokesman for wise use of our natural resources."

In fact, Barnes said, several members of the new Nixon cabinet have backgrounds in the construction industry "so that we should have a sympathetic ear for some of the problems we face on land withdrawals, reforestation and proper land use."

Other speakers were Paul Ehringer of Edward Hines Lumber Co. at Westfir, district director, who said half of a new 10 cent per thousand board feet dues assessment increase to WWPA members will go for wood promotion programs through the American Wood Council, and L. L. "Stub" Stewart of Bohemia Lumber Co., a past-president of the WWPA.

Stewart is scheduled to take over as president of the National Forest Products Assn. at mid-year. He said the three biggest problems facing the industry are the continuing fight against export of logs to Japan, work for increases in the allowable cut on national forest lands, and to "help the American Forest Institute educate the public that to cut a tree is good—instead of a sin."

INHERITED BUDGET

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, when President Nixon took office on January 20, he inherited a budget for fiscal year 1970 which had been in preparation for over a year. The new administration has been engaged in an intensive effort to cut the budget in order to counter the serious inflationary pressures that now affect the economy. The initial results of that effort have now been presented to the Congress, and I would like to make sure that all of my colleagues appreciate the difficulty and the magnitude of that accomplishment.

In judging the Nixon administration's actions, we must take care that we are measuring them against the reality of the Johnson budget as of this date rather than the situation as it appears in the document submitted to the Congress last January.

I want to make it clear that I imply no dishonesty on the part of the previous administration. However, the Johnson budget document does not accurately portray the fiscal reality that now exists. To a great extent this has been the result of increases in uncontrollable items beyond the estimates presented in January.

The January budget assumed that interest rates would not rise in the remainder of fiscal years 1969 and 1970. Higher interest rates will cause interest on the public debt to rise by at least $500 million; a lower level of collections of premiums from savings and loan institutions and higher claims against the Federal Home Loan Bank Board will cost an additional $150 million; and a shortfall in sales of agency assets will affect net spending and particularly so with respect to HUD where the shortfall will approximate $200 million.

Receipts were sometimes overestimated in the January budget. For example, income from rental of offshore oil lands—used as an offset to Interior Department expenditures—could fall off as much as $350 million.

Farm price supports as estimated in the budget appear too low. Payments for feed grains, wheat, and soybeans are higher than expected, which will raise costs $200 million. Erroneous accounting of certificates of interest for CCC will increase expenditures $500 million.

Additional claims and judgment payments will be required. Payments for Indian tribal claims and other similar assessments could exceed the budget estimates by as much as $175 million.

There have also been some downward estimates, but the overall net effect at this date has been to add at least $1.7 billion to the $195.3-billion expenditure figure contained in the Johnson budget. The Nixon administration, therefore, was faced with a minimum estimated expenditure total of $197 billion when it began its reexamination of the fiscal year 1970 budget. And, even this sum does not account for possible overruns in defense and other individual programs.

For example the Farmers Home Administration and VA are having difficulty selling agency assets and their shortfalls may be as much as $500 million.

Welfare programs may have been underestimated. For example, medicare outlays could be up as much as $150 million above the budget estimate. Estimates of the States were used for the medicaid program. As has often been the case in the past, the States' estimates may very well be too low.

Moreover, it now appears that estimates for other programs were held at minimum levels of expectancy—mandatory VA readjustment benefits may be $150 million greater; accident claims for Federal employees and unemployment compensation for ex-servicemen will likely exceed the budget by $24 million; AEC weapons program will probably increase $23 million; and disaster relief $2 million.

There can be no doubt that any expenditure figure substantially greater than $197 billion is too high and if left untouched would contribute greatly to the inflationary pressures now existent in the economy. The Nixon administration must therefore make cuts of several billion dollars just to arrive at an expenditure total only slightly below that projected in the January budget. Yet, such cuts are vitally necessary if inflation is to be stemmed.

Following is a table that summarizes the various over and underestimates that I have mentioned:

Revised 1970 January budget estimates

[In millions of dollars]

January estimate	195, 272
Adjustments:	
Increases:	
Disaster relief	+2
Farm price support	+194
Certificates of interest	+510
Housing and urban development (shortfall in asset sales)	+200
Offshore oil receipts	+355
Claims and judgments	+178
Justice	+3
Unemployment compensation	+19
Accident claims for Federal employees	+5
Interest on the public debt	+500
Atomic Energy Commission (overrun in weapons programs)	+23
Veterans readjustment benefits)	+150
District of Columbia	+36
Federal Home Loan Bank Board (claims and premium income)	+150
Subtotal increases	(+2, 325)
Decreases:	
Economic assistance	−22
Advance feed grain payments, 1969	−168
Timber sales	−100
Operating—differential subsidies	−11
Housing subsidy payments	−30
Redwood National Park—cash to liquidate	−20
Unemployment trust	−220
Contributions to international organizations	−1
General Services Administration (surplus real property)	−5

Revised 1970 January budget estimates—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Decreases—Continued	
Civil Service Commission	−18
Subtotal decreases	(−595)
January budget less above adjustments	197,002
Other possible adjustments:	
Farmers Home Administration and VA (shortfall in asset sales)	+500
Medicare	+150
Medicaid	?

FREEDOM TALK

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. R. F. Gearhart, 209 East Uhler Avenue, Alexandria, Va., a friend and constituent of mine, has called my attention to two commentaries by Melvin Munn, of Life Line, Freedom Talk, Dallas, Tex., which he feels should receive the wide attention which can be obtained by publication in the RECORD.

As I believe our colleagues and all who read this RECORD will benefit by consideration of the commentaries Mr. Gearhart brought to my attention, with permission, I insert them in full at this point in the RECORD:

[From Life Line, Feb. 6, 1969]

DEBUNKING THE GHETTOS

This is Life Line, Melvin Munn from Dallas.

Each generation, or each decade, perhaps, would appear to have its own unique group of people who are presented to the public by writers and the mass news media on a nationwide scale as most in need of help from the perennial "do-gooders."

Right now, we are reading and hearing the sad story of the "inner cities," or the ghettos, as they are often called. They are the same things which were referred to as slums until a couple of years ago.

It is true that the population of most of our cities has increased tremendously over the past two decades. But much of the population increase can be found in suburban America, and not in the "inner city."

Heart-tug stories which stir the sympathies of people make excellent reading. They stir the imagination. They appeal to the humanitarian instincts of the human race. They sell subscriptions and boost TV ratings. Therefore, it is expedient for the "do-gooders" to have some group about which they can appeal to the public with tear-jerking, heart-rending tales of hardship and disillusionment.

Only a little more than a quarter of a century ago the South was described as "the nation's number one economic problem."

This section of our country, which had been treated ever since the Civil War much like a "red-headed stepchild," was pointed out in newspapers, radio programs, and magazine articles as the prime example of what a portion of our country should not be like.

Pictures were used in magazines depicting the deplorable condition of the sharecropper on the farms of the South. Many of these were Negroes, but many were also low-income whites.

The South was held up to ridicule, and impassioned speeches were made in the halls of Congress regarding the plight of the poor in the South.

All the while, laws remained on the statute books which had been placed there with the aim of stifling any growth that the South from the rest of the nation, the South might make.

Slowly, and in spite of continued ridicule launched a program of growth and expansion. Today the sharecropper has almost disappeared—having no place in mechanized farming where most farms are tended by the owners. Industry has moved in, offering jobs and regular payrolls.

The area which but a few years ago was the "number one economic problem" has recently been more accurately described as "our number one economic opportunity."

And it must be emphasized that much of the progress which was made has been achieved without outside aid and in spite of attempts at outside ridicule.

Just a few years ago the "do-gooders" went to great pains to describe the miseries of "the aged," and claimed that they lacked proper care, particularly in the field of health and medicine. The result was the passage of "Medicare," which today is helping many but is still in the age of "growing pains," and costing vastly more than forecast.

At other times, sob sisters and welfarists have sought to give to the public visions of other groups which were called "disadvantaged" or discriminated against. Included have been migrant workers and the Indians.

With regard to migrant workers, it should be said that they choose this type of work and this type of life. Most of them know there are disadvantages when they join the migrant crew, but here in America they have the right to choose.

Many migrant workers in the United States earn more and live at a far higher standard than most of the people of other nations.

Right now the hue and cry is over the problems of the people who dwell in the inner cities, in the so-called ghettos. We are told that ghettos breed crime and riots and disorders, and the sociologists go to great lengths to describe the despair they find.

On the one hand, because so much crime is presumably committed there, we are inclined to get the impression that all slum residents are criminally inclined. On the other hand, those who make excuses for criminals, rioters, and lawbreakers keep insisting that the slum people are subjected to police brutality, that the residents hate the police and want no part of them, and that these areas are filled with an air of despair and hopelessness.

Often we are given the impression that the only people living in slums are nonwhite, but any honest statement of the facts will show that this is not the case.

We have long maintained that the criminal element, like the tiny minority of our youth which gains most of the headlines, constitutes only a small percentage of the people, no matter what race is involved, and whether it be in the slums or elsewhere.

But a study made by Senator Winston L. Prouty has failed to achieve widespread publicity. It was very carefully prepared and carried out in three slum areas of Washington, D.C. Polls of this sort are very tricky things, and can be said not to represent the average people or to be controversial. However, Senator Prouty's survey consisted of personal, detailed interviews with 447 people. While this may not seem like many, do not forget that this study was conducted in three areas in a single city, whereas some of our pollsters claim they can get indications of nationwide attitudes with surveys taken among just a few thousand people in a nation of 202 million.

Senator Prouty did not conduct the interviews himself. They were carried on by a team of Negro interviewers on the sound theory that slum residents would be more likely to reply honestly to questions coming from members of their own race.

Here are just a few highlights of Senator Prouty's survey results:

First, about that "despair and hopelessness" that is supposed to be so prevalent in slum areas. Eighty-two per cent of those interviewed by Senator Prouty's questioners declared that they thought an individual can earn almost anything he wants if he tries hard enough. Most of those surveyed said they thought opportunities for jobs, as well as life in general, were improving.

On the question of financial need, the majority felt their most important need was money for education and housing.

Incidentally, Senator Prouty, who is from Vermont, noted a most interesting fact—that these answers in slum areas in Washington were strikingly similar to the answers he got from a similar survey in a predominantly white, middle-class city in his native state of Vermont.

This survey, then, would seem to bear out the idea that the problems of the city—and they do exist—are being exaggerated all out of proportion by the bleeding hearts and do-gooders who find it absolutely essential to keep the sympathies of our people stirred up about some area, group, or class at all times.

Today it is the slum dweller. Who or what will be their favorite subject tomorrow?

OUR UNCERTAIN FOREIGN POLICY

The question is being asked many times these days as to why the United States is supporting communism in Africa while at the very same time sacrificing thousands of lives and billions of dollars in South Viet Nam.

This question should be aimed at the State Department, that portion of the executive branch of government which deals most directly with foreign affairs and the making of policy regarding relations with other nations.

A large portion of the southern half of Africa is under attack by the communists. Included are Rhodesia, Angola, and Mozambique. Terrorists are threatening the peace and tranquility of these nations, and the best information available is that this terrorism is being incited or supported by Red interests.

But the United States has refused to support independent Rhodesia, preferring to bow to the wishes of the numerous emerging states of black Africa and the demands of Britain.

Rhodesia, incidentally, offered to send troops to fight alongside Americans in Viet Nam.

To our everlasting shame, as one writer put it, we continue to participate in what is becoming the physical dismemberment of our African friends—both black and white—by black hordes armed and guided by our enemies.

The story of our perfidy in this situation should arouse the indignation of every citizen, black or white. Here is the United States stabbing good friends in the back, even going against our allies, as we go along with the United Nations in imposing sanctions against Rhodesia.

An American, recently returned from a safari in southern Africa, said: "The countries of Angola, Mozambique, South Africa, and Rhodesia are being invaded by organized bands of communist terrorists trained in Cuba, Russia, and China; armed by Cuba, Russia, and China with the most advanced automatic weapons."

He paid tribute to the progress being made in South Africa, and reminded Americans: "The soldiers of southern Africa died by the side of the American and Allied soldiers in World Wars I and II. Rhodesian and South African fliers were among the most prominent in the Battle of Britain. Today we refuse to sell them a single shell, a single gun, a single plane—no, not even a single 4-wheel-drive jeep with which to defend their beloved countries against the terror of communism, though we do supply armaments to their communist enemies."

It will be remembered that on July 29, 1968, President Johnson signed an executive order that prohibits any and all trade between the United States and Rhodesia. The reason for this act was the support of the illegal and unprincipled sanctions instituted by the United Nations at the insistence of Britain.

The sanctions against Rhodesia are aimed at producing conditions which will cause the downfall of Premier Ian Smith's government and the Rhodesian leadership which is struggling for freedom.

Actually, in supporting these sanctions, we are becoming in a very real sense partners with the Red-supported hordes of terrorists seeking to invade Rhodesia's borders.

Here is a former colony and commonwealth of the former British Empire, seeking independence in an orderly manner by the expressed will of the people and by peaceful declaration. In most other new and emerging nations accorded independence since World War II there have been strife and bloodshed—but Rhodesia has had a stable government supported by its people.

Oddly enough, the United States leads in the ban on trade with Rhodesia, a nation with which we are at peace. But our government does not demand that sanctions be applied against North Viet Nam, whose communist forces have inflicted heavy casualties on American military forces. And we are buying chromium from the Soviet Union instead of Rhodesia, where we once secured most of our supply.

Such treatment of friends, nations with which we are at peace, miserably fails to make sense while we are trading with nations sworn to bury us.

Surely, in the cold light of world opinion, our policies must seem naive and strange indeed!

[From Life Line, Feb. 28, 1969]

GOVERNMENT WASTE

This is "Life Line," Melvin Munn from Dallas.

Inflation has been a problem of this country for a number of years now, and the dangers of continued inflation were brought dramatically to the attention of the people of the United States last year.

We awoke from a long period of complacency and smugness with regard to our dollar to find that it was no longer the power in world finance that we had believed it to be.

One of the reasons for inflation in the United States has been the continuation and acceleration of deficit spending. It has been so many years since we ended a fiscal year in the black that it seems improper, somehow, to discuss it.

The fact is that a return to a balanced budget and fiscal responsibility is a must.

One of the principal factors, however, in the inability of the government to balance its budget has been waste and inefficiency in some of the government programs. One of the worst in this respect has been the Agency for International Development, which handles our foreign-aid appropriation and has spent many billions of dollars.

Some years ago Congressman Alvin O'Konski called our foreign-aid prorgam "Operation Rathole," meaning that the money which we were spending on foreign aid was being utterly wasted.

Certainly we know that the money we have given away in aid, plus the interest on the money we borrowed to give away, is approaching the staggering figure of $150 billion.

This has been strewn around among more than 100 nations, both friend and foe.

Roads have been built into jungles. Industrial plants have been constructed where nobody knew how to operate them and where products could be transported to market only with extreme difficulty.

Our laxness has often allowed our communist foes to claim credit for projects which were entirely or largely constructed with American foreign-aid dollars.

The American people would be shocked to learn some of the items which have been purchased for petty rulers in Africa and elsewhere, solely for their own gratification.

Let us make no mistake. It was your money and mine which was thus spent in foreign lands. You and I paid it to the federal government in taxes, or we will have to pay it yet. The federal government does not produce or create wealth. It obtains its funds from taxing the productive efforts of its citizens. It digs deep into the pocketbooks of every American family.

Americans have always supported in a very fine way the essential government programs and services enacted by their representatives.

But they do not and they should not be asked to support government waste and inefficiency.

Senator Stephen M. Young of Ohio gave to the Congress some revealing information in an address printed in the *Congressional Record*, following a personal visit to Viet Nam. Here is a portion of his address:

"Last January while in Viet Nam, I encountered many hundreds of civilian officials. They were all over the place, enjoying high salaries and allowances and doing little, if anything, to earn them. Never have so many been sent so far at such great expense who have done so little.

"The fact is that of AID (Agency for International Development) officials in South Viet Nam, the Director receives in excess of $44,000 per year; 26 receive in excess of $41,700 per year; 82 receive $35,500; 262 receive in excess of $30,000; 409 receive in excess of $24,600; and 76 receive more than $19,000 per year.

"This is outrageous. What justification is there for the AID head in Viet Nam to receive almost $5,000 a year more than the Chief Justice of the United States? What possible reason can be given for paying 110 other AID officials a greater salary than that received by members of the Cabinet, Senators, and Congressmen? What excuse for paying 262 additional AID officials salaries the same as received by Members of Congress?

"It is scandalous that 782 AID officials in Viet Nam are now being paid $25,000 a year or more. In addition to their base salaries these officials are given a 25 per cent hardship allowance, a $3,000 separate maintenance allowance, and fringe benefits including air-conditioned housing, and medical care, and all PX and commissary privileges.

"There is evidence that many sell cigarettes, whiskey, radios, and other PX and commissary merchandise to the South Vietnamese. . . .

"Many of these overpaid and underworked AID officials are expected to work in refugee camps, so-called, and some have refused to remain in refugee camps because of 'lack of security.'

"A typical example of AID maladministration concerns five forestry experts, so-called, each with an annual salary including fringe benefits exceeding $38,000. They live in air-conditioned, high-rent apartments paid for by our taxpayers; and they work—or supposedly work—in an area where there has been no timber for many years."

The situation as cited by Senator Young regarding the AID operation in Viet Nam is but one of almost countless examples of gross government waste and inefficiency which have been uncovered and made public at one time or another.

When we hear of such waste, such maladministration, we realize that it is no wonder our government has not been living within its income.

Some bureaucrats have become "fat cats" at the expense of the Amercan taxpayer.

There can be no justification for paying these AID workers, experts though they may be, larger salaries than are received by members of the Cabinet and many highly placed and responsible government officials. Nor do we need timber experts in areas where there are luxurious apartments—but no timber.

It is time for a government housecleaning. We need to get rid of the bureaucrats who have been feeding at the public trough without paying their way, those more interested in building little empires for themselves within our government than they are in rendering the services for which their agencies were created.

We know there are many conscientious government employees and officials. But far too many of these, like Otto Otepka, have been sidetracked or persecuted because they sought to do their duty.

Our government cannot continue to operate in this fashion. Our inefficiency will make us the laughingstock of the world or our deficit spending will cause such runaway inflation that the value of the dollar will collapse. One of the answers to our dilemma is to streamline our governmental operations, cut out all nonessential programs, eliminate duplication of effort, and put our government on a businesslike basis.

If we fail to do this we are courting disaster as a nation and endangering the cherished freedoms we claim to want preserved.

REFORM ELECTORAL COLLEGE

During the Presidential campaign last fall, when it became obivous there was a possibility the election might end in a deadlock among the three candidates, a wave of concern and confusion swept across the nation—and the world. After all, the Presidency of the United States is the most important single office in the world, and the prospect that there might be confusion or delay in naming the man to succeed President Johnson caused widespread concern.

Under the machinery by which our Presidents are now elected, an election stalemate could conceivably leave the country without a President or Vice-President-elect for an indefinite period. As the election turned out, an inconclusive result was avoided.

In our age, when tensions are very evident around the world and nuclear war a possibility, the hazards of a vacuum in national leadership hardly need elaboration. More than ever, authorities believe constitutional changes in national election procedures are a must.

For most people, electing a President appears no more complicated than marking an X on a secret ballot. But the polling booth merely sets off a chain of events beginning with the voters and ending in Congress, as prescribed by law and custom to insure, as far as possible, a free and wise choice of a fellow citizen to occupy the highest office in the land. The reason for the existence of what we call the Electoral College goes back to a day when choice of a President through popular vote was virtually impossible—due to difficulty of travel and communication.

It was felt there was no way for people to determine the character or qualifications of candidates. Thus, a method was worked out whereby voters chose Presidential Electors from each state—supposedly citizens of high standing in the local community—and they in turn selected a President.

In practice, as the years went by, the Electors have cast their ballots in accordance with the wish of the voters.

But this is not legally required, as can be illustrated by an incident in the 1968 election. North Carolina cast a majority of its popular vote for President Richard M. Nixon.

North Carolina's Electors did the same—all except one, who decided he would cast his vote for George Wallace, the candidate of the American Independence Party. Not being bound by the vote of the people, the Elector was free to do this.

While it is not likely that many Electors will stray from the vote as expressed by the majority of the people, it obviously could happen.

Many now favor a change in the system of electing the President and Vice President. Many bills will be offered in the Congress this year to effect this change. Those in favor of change say the present system—popular vote in November, Electoral College vote in December, and Congressional canvass in January—is cumbersome and confusing.

They also say the present system gives the large states excessive leverage in Presidential elections. At present, it is possible for the 12 largest states to carry Presidential elections over the remaining 38 states.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has adopted a policy declaration supporting an amendment to the Constitution that would abolish the Electoral College and provide for the election of the President and Vice-President of the United States on either a nationwide popular vote which would provide direct election of a President, or by the district method which would preserve the principle of the electoral vote.

While only once under the Electoral College system—in 1876—did the candidate receiving a majority of the popular vote fail to win the Presidency, there have been many anxious moments.

It has been evident for years now that changes are needed in the system under which our two highest offices are filled. We need to simplify the process so that no doubts linger in the world after the election by the people has been held.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March, 31, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, this is a time of sadness for America. With the passing of our beloved former President Dwight David Eisenhower, our Nation has lost an outstanding leader and a great man.

General Eisenhower will be remembered for many things. He was highly successful both as a soldier and as a statesman, achieving the ultimate of success in our Nation by being elected our 34th President.

He was a devoted family man, a man of religion, and a stanch patriot. He was passionately dedicated to achieving and maintaining peace. Above all, he will be remembered as a very warm and compassionate human being.

I feel greatly honored to have had the privilege of serving in the Congress during the Presidency of Dwight Eisenhower. His terms in office were marked with many accomplishments.

Ike's life and achievements and the high principles he stood for will continue to serve over the years as an inspiration to us all.

To Mrs. Eisenhower and their son John and family we express our deepest sympathies.

SPECIAL STUDY PROPOSED ON NEED FOR RESEARCH ON USE OF BEES FOR MOST EFFICIENT CROP PRODUCTION

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed article by Mr. Glen Gibson, of Minco, Okla., executive secretary of the American Honey Producers Association, ably points out the need for research on the use of bees and other pollinating insects for the most efficient production of food, feed, and fiber crops.

This proposal for a study and report by the Department of Agriculture on the nature and requirements of an adequate research program is timely and significant.

The article follows:

Agriculture is usually regarded as the production of honey and beeswax. In the U.S. 4,770,000 colonies of honey bees produce 200 million pounds of honey and 4 million pounds of beeswax with a total value of $36 million.

However, bees are much more important for pollination of crops than for the production of honey and beeswax. About 90 crops grown in the U.S. valued at $1 billion are dependent on insect pollination. Additional crops valued at $4 billion are benefited to some degree by insect pollination.

Currently a few beekeepers rent their colonies to farmers for the pollination of numerous fruit, vegetable, oilseed, and legume seed crops. Many colonies that are not rented also inadvertently contribute to the pollination of nearby crops. Nevertheless, rental and use of bees strictly for pollination has been relegated to a secondary position in the minds of most beekeepers and researchers. However from the standpoint of benefits to the nations economy as a whole, bees perform a greater function as pollinators of crops than as producers of a desirable food item.

The beekeeping industry in the United States is in a declining condition. For the last 20 years the number of colonies in the United States has declined consistently at the rate of 1% per year. Many beekeepers are finding it an unprofitable enterprise and are going out of business.

Rental of bee colonies for crop pollination has not stopped this decline. Primarily because of incomplete information on pollination there has been poor communication between the grower and the beekeeper on the value of bees for pollination and on the expense involved in maintaining and supplying strong colonies. As a result most pollination fees are "starvation wages" for beekeepers and some colonies supplied for pollination have been of inferior quality.

Management of two species of wild bees for pollination has developed into a small industry within a few areas of the Pacific Northwest. The use of other species of wild bees on different crops may be feasible and profitable if adequately studied. However the bulk of the pollination load, because of the versatility of the honey bee, will fall primarily upon its shoulders.

The honey bee can be moved into an area in mass numbers when desired. In addition honey bees consistently visit flowers from early spring to late fall, they visit a wide variety of plants, and their biology is well known as a result of studies by amateur and professional apiculturists for centuries.

The basic pollination requirement of most crops has been determined with bagged or caged flowers. However, the practical, exact need and proper use of pollinating insects on those crops that require such pollination is not known. Knowledge is needed on the number of insect visits to the flower that are required for its best pollination, the time the visits should be made, and the influence of the inadequate number of visits on quantity and quality of fruit or seed produced. For example research has shown that the highest production of market-quality cantaloups is obtained if each flower receives about 12 bee visits between 9 a.m. and noon. The number of colonies of honey bees, their relative strength, their distribution in the field, and their general condition necessary to give this desired visitation is unknown. Similar information on the various varieties of some 90 of our agricultural crops is also unknown. Also new crop varieties are being developed and introduced each year. New crop introductions from abroad are being made. Information on the value of honey bees and other pollinators needs to be kept current as crop varieties and growing practices change.

We propose that appropriate agricultural committees in Congress request the U.S. Department of Agriculture to undertake a special study and make a report to Congress on the nature and requirements for an adequate research program on the honey bee and other pollinators to assure maximum use of these valuable insects for the benefit of our nations agriculture as well as the beekeeping industry.

The study should consider but not necessarily be limited to the gathering of information on the following:

1. Pollination needs for various crops.
2. The potential value of different species of wild bees as pollinators.
3. The proper management and selective breeding of honey bees and different manageable species of wild bees as pollinators for maximum utility in crop pollination.
4. Methods of increasing populations of pollinators when and where desired.
5. The economics of providing adequate pollination service.
6. The regions in the U.S. where such research should be conducted.
7. Factors affecting crop attractiveness to pollinators with a view to improving pollination.
8. The value of grants to Land Grant Institutions to conduct research on crop pollination with bees and other insects.
9. The facilities, personnel and research support needed to provide for the type of program outlined.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, an unofficial press report from Saigon points out that the number of U.S. men killed as a result of hostile forces in Vietnam has today exceeded those of the Korean war, and this is not to speak of those young men who have been killed as a result of an accidental attack by their allies or those who have died of sickness. The Vietnam war now ranks in deaths only behind the Civil War, World War I, and World War II. Vietnam has drawn the strength of our men not for a mere 3 or 4 years, but for at least 8, with no real end in sight. It is time now to escalate our efforts for a negotiated political settlement. Today's report underlines the urgency of the peace talks, for any delay will surely mean more casualties and a further loss of life.

MICHIGAN NEWSPAPER SPEAKS OUT AGAINST HIGH INTEREST RATES

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Muskegon, Mich., Chronicle, has spoken out in unmistakable terms for an end to the high interest policies of the Federal Reserve Board.

In its lead editorial, the Muskegon Chronicle says:

> The Reserve Board's policy—until now a sanctioned administration policy—patiently has not worked. And we don't think it will. Worse, it carries with it the seeds of disaster. The fiscal vise should be loosened now, before its threads are stripped—and with it the vulnerable gears of the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, the comments in the Muskegon Chronicle are part of the growing concern about the excesses and the misguided policies of our Federal Reserve System. The Members of the 91st Congress, I hope, will realize that the tide of public opinion has turned against the Federal Reserve Board and its Chairman, William McChesney Martin.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of the editorial from the Muskegon Chronicle:

UNTIE FISCAL STRAITJACKET BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE

Well, it happened. As had been forecast for weeks, major banks across the country have raised their prime rate from 7 to 7½ per cent—the highest in American history.

But don't blame the banks.

The action was inevitable, the result of a designed and deliberate government response to the pressures of inflation.

The bankers' move was defensive, related to their own financial positions. The cost of money the banks borrow has been rising sharply in recent weeks due to pressure from the credit-restraining policies of the Federal Reserve Board.

The board has been trying to dam off the inflationary surge at the same time that business demand for loans to finance inventories, buy equipment and build plants has been running at fever pitch. Despite a series of prime rate increases, the pinch on bank profits has been intensifying. Last Dec. 2 the prime rate was 6¼ per cent. By Dec. 18 it was 6¾. It hit the 7 per cent level Jan. 7, and Tuesday it broke through the ceiling.

The Federal Reserve believes that tightening measures, including bigger reserve requirements for commercial banks, will rein in an inflation that became almost runaway during the last two years of the Johnson administration. President Nixon is aware of the crisis and, for the present at least, he has "bought" the board's counterinflation tactic—making money hard to get.

But is it working?

We doubt it.

Is it dangerous?

We think it is.

A gentleman we have disagreed with rather strenuously in the past—Rep. Wright Patman, the Texas Democrat who is chairman of the House Banking Committee—has urged the President to force a roll back of the record-shattering interest rates. He says he believes that if the interest rate spiral is not stopped, this nation will be "plunged into depression."

We're very much afraid he is right.

John R. Bunting, president of the First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co., of Philadelphia, one of the nation's largest banking institutions, says he doubts that this week's hike in the interest rates will do much to slow inflation.

"These increases haven't done a thing so far, and I don't think the latest increase will have the desired effect either," he said, "Borrowers feel that inflation is here to stay and that it's better to borrow now than later."

"Better now than later." That's the nitty gritty of it—a predictable response which reveals the flaw in governmental tinkering which affects interest rates.

The Federal Reserve, only 24 hours after the prime rate skyrocketed to 7½ per cent, talked of applying new turns of the screw to the nation's credit. Businessmen CAN read. If they didn't get the money they needed when it cost 6 or 6½ per cent, and it's now at 7½ and pressing toward 8, they are going to get it today before it blows completely out of sight.

Where will it end?

Congressman Patman—and we're inclined to agree—fears it will end in a thunderous crash, leaving millions of people owing huge debts at high rates of interest and, perhaps even worse, leaving the government holding the bag on a $350,000,000,000 debt (the taxpayers' debt), financed at interest rates twice what they were a decade ago.

And if the taxpayer—Mr. Little Guy—is caught up in the maelstrom of a monetary mess which makes it impossible for him to shell out 25 to 45 per cent of his earnings in federal income taxes—where; we repeat, where—is government going to get money enough even to cover the interest on its debt, let alone finance day-to-day operations currently budgeted at close to $100,000,000,000 a year?

When a major corporation wants to borrow money badly enough, it will do so—even at today's astronomical rates. The "interest"—whether it be yesterday's 4 per cent or the 7½ or 8 per cent of today—is a "cost of operation" which is charged off in the corporation's annual tax accounting to the government. The result, of course, is reduced tax revenue unless the cost has been passed on to the consumer by way of increased prices.

Mr. Little Guy? He can't turn the trick so easily.

If he and the Mrs. had planned a 1969 start on that "dream house" they immediately face a small army of problems—virtually all of them created, or permitted to exist, by the government. Borrow money? Even if he is willing to pay the prime rate (and he should be prepared to have to pay more) can he get the money? Mortgage money is not abundant—for the reason that government continues to soak up most of the available funds for the financing (or refinancing at higher rates) of its own operations.

The whole chain of events—including the soaring interest rates designed to curb inflation—fuels demand for even greater compensation for the services of men. The cost of the Little Guy's home goes up, not down. And if a lot of families like his decide not to build, they add to unemployment. This does nothing to end the demand. It is still there; just deferred. Experience would indicate it won't be deferred forever. Eventually, the dam will burst and Little Guys, first one-by-one, later in droves, will build "at any cost." With this kind of pressure in the home building industry, inflation could run rampant—a "monster" created instead of controlled by government policy.

A principal reason advanced by the government's fiscal experts for a "tight money" policy was to put the brakes on industrial expansion. There is precious little evidence of deceleration. One after another, corporations have announced 1969 and 1970 expansion programs described as the largest in their history. It should be pointed out that many of these corporations are able to do this without turning to the money markets and paying those sky-high interest rates.

Not so for most of the nation's utilities—which are facing one of the worst fiscal crunches in their history. But theirs is a crunch which will be passed onto the consumer—thus heating up instead of dampening the fires of inflation. Utilities must expand to meet the constantly growing needs of the areas they service with power or natural gas. No one can reasonably contend they should stand still, denying service to new customers in a growing nation.

A few years back these utilities could operate profitably within the framework of a 6 per cent return on their investment, and carry out expansion programs from reinvested profits or by way of low-yield bonds generally floated at returns ranging from 2½ to 4 per cent. Now we have the unprecedented spectacle of bluechip utility companies floating bond issues with yield rates exceeding 7 per cent—with a likelihood that the 8 and 9 per cent bond is near at hand.

Who pays for this financing? The utility customer, of course, sooner or later, through higher rates for power, light and heat.

Is this how to halt inflation?

Hardly!

Also to be considered is the effect on the stock market—which, in its turn, could have a withering effect on Washington. A sharp decline in security values, widely expected by market observers early this year, opens the door to widespread tax-loss selling. Thus, even though market values could return, within the year, to their highest points, the trader wins a government-offered opportunity to dump "loss" stocks and obtain tax-cut advantages when reporting 1969 income.

All of this means reduced income for the government, and the irony—no, the tragedy—of it is that the government will have brought it about itself.

The Reserve Board's policy—until now a sanctioned administration policy—patently has not worked. And we don't think it will. Worse, it carries with it the seeds of disaster. The fiscal vise should be loosened now, before its threads are stripped—and with it the vulnerable gears of the American economy.

GEN. DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those who have already publicly expressed their sorrow at the passing of Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower. His death is a time for national mourning and also for renewed idealism.

We who knew him both in time of war by serving under his command in Europe and in time of peace as a Member of Congress during his administration know well how he fully committed himself to the United States of America. He constantly endeavored to make the words "individual freedom and liberty" in the Declaration of Independence meaningful both to Americans and to nations of the world which were threatened with outside aggression or internal subversion.

Although we are saddened by the passing of this friend and great leader, we

can be heartened by the inspiration which his life will be for today's and tomorrow's leaders. His unselfish devotion to the service of his country will serve as a constant reminder of the quality of leadership required to preserve freedom. The decisions which he had to make both in war and in peace were oftentimes "hard" decisions requiring thoughtful answers. General Eisenhower's courage and ability to make such decisions, rather than take the easier or more politically expedient way out, marks him as a true patriot.

THE VULNERABLE RUSSIANS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the book on "The Vulnerable Russians," has received extensive reviews in the past year, most of them favorable, some unfavorable. Regardless of the criticism, all reviewers have agreed that the book reveals a type of analysis and a course of action with regard to the Soviet Union that are new to most Americans.

Authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, "The Vulnerable Russians," is available at Georgetown University Bookstore, White Gravenor Building, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. As to why the book is challenging and forward-looking, the following reviews by Twin Circle publications and one by Prof. Joseph S. Rouck in the Political Scientist Journal, Randhi, India, stress certain highlights of the book's general thesis:

THE VULNERABLE RUSSIANS

(By Lev E. Dobriansky, Pageant Press, $5.95)

Dr. Dobriansky's latest book fills a gap found all too often in one's approach to the Soviet Union. He bares the USSR for what it is: the unwilling union of many once-sovereign states, some of whom have their own distinctive language, customs, and heritage.

Dr. Dobriansky points out that the Soviet Union is not Russia. When the Captive Nations are mentioned, too many people think only of those countries absorbed by Russian expansionism after World War II. Those non-Russian nations within the borders of the Soviet Union are captive nations in the truest sense of the term. Ukraine, White Ruthenia, the Baltic states, and Turkestan are just a few. The author notes that of the total population of 230 million in the USSR only 110 million are Russians. Moscow thrives on these non-Russian colonies within the USSR. They form her greatest strength, as well as her greatest weakness. The industry, the resources, and the people form the strength; the flames of nationalism, which still burn in the hearts of these once-free, still proud people, form the Soviet Union's major weakness.

The surest way to emasculate the Soviet Union, asserts the author, is to detach these Captive Nations from the grip of Moscow. To do this the flames of healthy nationalism in these states must be fanned. Dr. Dobriansky maintains that emphasis should be given to psycho-political warfare, an area in which the United States lags far behind the Russians. The U.S., which for too long has held a continuously defensive posture in the Cold War, must take the initiative.

We must make no mistake, emphasizes Dr. Dobriansky, that we are at war, a Cold War, yet one directed toward the goal of our final subjugation. We must approach this war with a view towards victory. Explaining the nature of this war and the nature of the enemy—an indispensable element toward any victory—becomes the prime task taken on by the author. He traces the threads of Russian imperialist expansionism back to the early days of Muscovy. (Even then Moscow was master of psycho-political warfare, propaganda, and power diplomacy.) Dr. Dobriansky concludes that it is not the ideology of Communism we are fighting, today in Vietnam, yesterday in Korea, Greece, Turkey, China, or the Philippines. It is the new wave of the old Russian imperialism that lies masked under the banner of ideological "communism."

THE VULNERABLE RUSSIANS

(Review by Joseph S. Rouck)

Although this book is frankly on the anti-Russian side, its academic approach and quite an impressive erudition make it one of the best current volumes on "what goes on" in Soviet Russia. Here Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky exposes the hoax that Soviet Russia, under the guise of Marxism, has united the captive nations within its imperialistic framework, using this claim to attack the free nations, whether in Europe, Asia, Africa or Latin America. As a matter of fact, these "captive nations," although they have a total population of 123 million, are held in a constant checkmate by the classic Red weapons of deceit, lies, subversive propaganda, and the myth of "peaceful coexistence."

The pawns are represented by the rest of the world, which the Red power nibbles on, devours, or casts away. One of the pawns is the mightiest nation of the world—the United States. Unwilling to fight the Cold War the Soviet way, unable to convince itself of the heartlessness of the Russian Bear, the U.S., according to Dr. Dobriansky, allows itself to be fooled, used, and thus loses more ground every day in a war which can never be won by lack of involvement.

After all, the author states, why should Soviet Russia start a nuclear war, when she gets what she wants without it? This shows the lack of positive reaction by the world against the continual Soviet Russian aggression; it points out the fallacy of the words "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." There is no Soviet Union, per se—only Russia and her prison of nations.

Dobriansky is firm in demanding that the only way to stop the Russian empire from its continued expansion is by using their own tactics against them and he puts down point after point, showing the ways and means in which this can be done. He covers such varied but related instances as Nixon's ill-fated Russian visit, the vulnerability of the Voice of America, the devastating effect of Captive Nations Week on the Soviets, the opportunities which are bypassed by the State Department, and implements his writing with cold, hard facts.

There are many books on the Soviet Union and on the Cold War. Dobriansky's presentation, one can safely say, supersedes them all. And its "References and Bibliography" is invaluable.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, few men have ever enjoyed such universal respect from their countrymen as Dwight David Eisenhower.

He was beloved because of his great accomplishments, of course—accomplishments which, with the perspective of time, we are beginning to appreciate even more.

But he was also beloved because of his noble character which inspired trust and belief. No man had a deeper love for his country or a stronger desire to do what was "right" for all of us. And I think most of us instinctively recognized this.

Even those who did not always agree with his views or actions did not question his integrity or sincerity. Because of his character he had the unique ability to inspire the best in all of us. As Field Marshall Lord Montgomery said last week, "He had only to smile at you and there was nothing you would not do for him."

As others have pointed out, as a general and as President he fought to defeat tyranny and to achieve lasting peace in the world. These efforts arose from the depth of his character. I can personally testify that his intense dedication to freedom and peace was apparent in his private discussions as well as in public.

I am grateful, therefore, not only for his accomplishments but also for the spiritual inspiration and example he has given us.

I feel a great personal loss and I join the Nation in mourning the death of a great hero and patriot.

SELF-DEFEATING MANDATORY CONTROLS

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the overseas investments of American corporations have resulted in great economic benefits for our own country and for our free world friends and trading partners. The United States has been the leader in committing capital, technology, management skills, and other private resources to world development.

These foreign investments have created and expanded foreign markets, strengthened the competitive position of American companies and increased the flow of exports. At the same time they have contributed to the growth and prosperity of other members of the free world community. American business ventures in Latin America and in the less developed countries have been of critical importance in establishing the conditions for stability and progress.

Due to serious balance-of-payments difficulty, temporary restrictions were reluctantly imposed on U.S. foreign direct investments in February of 1965. Businessmen rendered magnificent cooperation in the voluntary program to reduce capital outflows as did the American banking community in limiting foreign lending.

It was evident to everyone, however, that these emergency measures must be of brief duration because U.S. exports and the foreign income received from our dollar-earning assets abroad are the mainstay in our balance of payments.

Restrictions on American overseas investments and lending are now in the fifth year. The temporary measure is being extended into the long term. This will result in serious damage to the Nation's economic interests and reduce the inflow of foreign earnings needed to sustain our worldwide commitments.

Gen. George H. Decker, retired, president of the Manufacturing Chemists Association, addressed himself to this question in an appearance before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy. He spoke for the great American chemical industry which, both as an exporter and foreign investor, is one of the largest sources of our foreign earnings.

He impressively has stated the case for removal of these self-defeating mandatory controls and under the leave to extend my remarks, I wish to enter his comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 85 PRESENTED BY GEN. G. H. DECKER, USA, RETIRED, ON BEHALF OF THE MANUFACTURING CHEMISTS ASSOCIATION BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 27, 1969

My name is George H. Decker. I am President of the Manufacturing Chemists Association (MCA), a nonprofit trade association of 180 United States company members representing more than 90 percent of the production capacity of basic industrial chemicals within this country. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before your Committee today and acquaint you with our members' views concerning mandatory controls on foreign direct investments by U.S. corporations.

The member companies of the MCA have been surveyed to determine their attitude toward the present restrictions on overseas investments. Those engaged in foreign operations are overwhelmingly in favor of eliminating mandatory controls as rapidly as practicable. They point out that continued restraint on investment abroad will have a serious adverse impact on the U.S. balance of payments by limiting the potential earning capacity of foreign affiliates and by limiting expansion of the export market for chemicals.

BENEFITS DERIVED FROM FOREIGN INVESTMENT

The rapid growth of international investment has been one of the most dynamic forces at work in developing the world's economy in the years following World War II. It has opened up new fields of production, employment, and income. It has increased the flow of technology and trade. It has enhanced the wealth of nations and the prospects for a more durable peace. United States industry, and particularly the chemical industry, has been a leader in international investment.

Foreign investments by U.S. corporations have contributed materially to the U.S. balance of payments by return of earnings and by the creation of overseas markets for U.S. exports.

Historically the return flow from U.S. investments abroad has exceeded considerably the level of new capital movements from the United States.

Table I sets forth the relationship between outflow of funds on direct investment and income or dividends returned to the United States.

TABLE I.—U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—OUTFLOW, INFLOW, AND NET ON DIRECT INVESTMENTS[1]

[In billions of dollars]

	Outflows from United States	Remitted to United States[2]	Net balance of payments impact
1958	1.2	2.4	+1.2
1959	1.4	2.6	+1.2
1960	1.7	2.8	+1.1
1961	1.6	3.2	+1.6
1962	1.7	3.6	+2.0
1963	2.0	3.8	+1.8
1964	2.4	4.4	+2.0
1965	3.4	4.9	+1.5
1966	3.5	5.1	+2.0
1967[3]	3.4	5.3	+1.9
1968[3]	2.8	6.4	+3.6

[1] "Maintaining the Strength of the United States Dollar in a Strong Free World Economy," U.S. Treasury Department, January 1968.

[2] Includes direct investment fees and royalties.

[3] Statement by Charles E. Fiero, Director, Office of Foreign Direct Investments, U.S. Department of Commerce, before the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee, Jan. 15, 1969.

CONTRIBUTION OF U.S. EXPORTS TO BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Exports are the cornerstone of a favorable balance of payments and there is a direct and positive relationship between foreign investment and the flow of exports to support such investment. About 25 percent of all U.S. manufactured exports are shipped to overseas subsidiaries. Over two-thirds of the exports of some chemical companies are shipped to their overseas affiliates. These exports involve raw materials, intermediates, and certain other materials marketed directly by these affiliated companies. It is our opinion that mandatory controls, if continued much longer, will have serious adverse effetcs on U.S. exports, which would more than offset any short-term benefit to the balance of payments stemming from the curtailment of direct investment.

Table II indicates the contribution of the chemical industry to the balance of payments and balance of trade.

TABLE II.—BALANCE OF PAYMENTS AND BALANCE OF TRADE

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Year	Balance of payments	Balance of trade		
			U.S. chemical	
		Balance of trade (total)	Amount	(Percent) total
1960	−$3.9	+$4.4	+$1.4	31.8
1961	−2.4	+5.2	+1.4	26.9
1962	−2.2	+4.3	+1.4	32.5
1963	−2.7	+5.0	+1.5	30.0
1964	−2.8	+6.6	+1.8	27.3
1965	−1.3	+5.0	+1.8	36.0
1966	−1.4	+3.7	+1.8	48.6
1967	−3.6	+4.5	+1.8	40.0

ESTABLISHMENT OF CONTROL PROGRAMS

Due to the persistent balance of payments deficit and the resultant drain on the Nation's gold reserves, American companies were asked in 1965 to cooperate in a voluntary program of restraint in direct foreign investment. Nearly 700 companies, including many chemical companies, voluntarily acted to curb the dollar outflow, modifying or postponing overseas projects, financing through foreign borrowings, accelerating the repatriation of earnings, and taking other measures to meet the short-term need of the United States to balance its international accounts.

At the outset, the voluntary program was recognized and described as a stopgap measure which would only temporarily interrupt the process of direct foreign investment which so successfully served the economic interests of the United States and its free world friends and trading partners. The positive contribution of direct foreign investment and the export growth it generates constitute one of the more significant factors in our international transactions. As a result of serious deterioration in our international accounts in the fourth quarter of 1967, when the deficit reached an annual rate of nearly $7 billion, the President announced on January 1, 1968, a mandatory investment control program. Its implementation has provided some temporary relief on dollar outflow, but at the expense of mortgaging our future balance of payments.

PROBLEMS GENERATED BY IMPLEMENTATION OF MANDATORY CONTROL PROGRAM

The imposition of mandatory direct investment controls has had various detrimental effects on the foreign operations of our member companies. For example:

The controls have required them to take certain financial actions which are unsound from a business viewpoint and which otherwise would not have been taken. These include foreign borrowing at rates higher than in the U.S. and restricting of trade credits to foreign affiliates. Under the controls as they presently exist any increase in export receivables (particularly in Schedule C countries) requires local borrowing to finance any increase in working capital. Often this either proves to be impossible or the costs are prohibitive. Euro-Dollars and other local currencies are becoming increasingly scarce and the interest rate continues to rise.

The regulation requiring return of dividends is particularly troublesome. Under certain circumstances plants must be built in foreign countries. Many of our companies have followed the practice of putting in the minimum amount of equity capital and the maximum amount of loans in the currency of the country involved, obtained from local lending institutions. Regardless of how profitable a given company may be, the loans must be paid off before there can be any significant flow of dividends to the stockholders. Our members report that this particular facet of the problem became worse in 1968 and will be more so in 1969. It should be recognized that repatriation of foreign earnings is influenced to a very great degree by the laws and regulations of the foreign country. It is anticipated that situations will arise wherein a corporation will be placed in a position of violating either U.S. Control Regulations or foreign law.

In certain foreign countries a patent of a foreign producer must be worked within a limited period after granting of the patent. This means that the company concerned must manufacture the product within the country or lose its patent protection. Construction of facilities to do this involves the corporation in the kind of financing problems I have just mentioned.

In 1968 one of the effects of the mandatory investment controls has been the curtailment of overseas acquisition programs. The net balance-of-payments results of an acquisition through exchange of shares become positive rather early, since the common stock exchanged for the acquired company is generally held abroad for investment whereas the flow of royalties, management service fees, and dividends to the U.S. parent as well as induced export begin immediately. In other words, from a balance-of-payments point of view, we exchange long-term liabilities for an immediate cash flow which seems highly desirable in the light of our balance-of-payments problems.

Imposition of mandatory controls has made it necessary to forego or postpone exploration operations in certain countries due to the limited exemption allowed under the regulations. This is because there is no assurance that the Government will permit the large investment necessary to bring a newly discovered deposit into production. In addition to the high-cost, high-risk factors involved in exploration operations, the Government has placed an additional risk factor on exploration operations, through the restrictive provision contained in the regulations.

The excessive costs and time—clerical, accounting, financial, and executive—required to meet the periodic reporting requirements of the Office of Foreign Direct Investments and the time and costs required to prepare, submit, and defend specific authorizations impose a heavy burden on corporate management and prevent prompt, flexible responses to opportunities in the marketplace. One of our member companies reports that in December 1968 OFDI requested an estimate of the year's position; in January it requested an update of the estimate; in January it also requested a forecast of 1969; and by April an actual report for 1968. Our members feel that the management time spent in coping with the control program could have been better spent on furthering the growth and profitability of their businesses, all of which would contribute to the Nation's economic position.

In addition to the counterproductive characteristics of the controls, it is significant to note that insofar as direct investors bid for foreign borrowing these funds are no longer available to contribute to the U.S. balance of payments in other areas such as for the purchase of goods and services from the United States or for investment in U.S. securities.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I express the opinion of our members that continuation of mandatory controls will weaken the chemical industry's competitive position in the world market and inhibit normal growth and sales potential of foreign affiliates of U.S. companies, thus detracting from the long-term interests of the United States. Over the long run market positions in most foreign countries must be protected by manufacturing within the country. If controls impede the efforts of U.S. corporations to establish facilities abroad, the effect will be far reaching since it is most difficult to regain a favorable competitive position once it is lost. Timing is increasingly important in this fast-moving technological world.

The chemical industry cooperated willingly with Government in the Voluntary Program and has worked with the Department of Commerce to facilitate the Mandatory Program. But we have assumed—and we were assured—that the control program would be of temporary duration. Although our member companies have been able to continue their overseas operations within the limitations imposed upon them, they have been faced with many vexing and costly problems which will become increasingly serious and weaken their competitive positions if the mandatory program is continued. They consider it feasible and highly desirable, not only from the viewpoint of the chemical industry but from that of the Government as well, to establish now a firm date for termination of mandatory controls. Rules and procedures should be established to provide for phasing of the liquidation of foreign debt to avoid a massive outflow of dollars once the program is terminated.

Finally I would like to express the opinion that the underlying principle of imposition of mandatory controls of any kind on investment is a dangerous precedent as it impedes the most efficient natural distribution of capital consistent with economic realities.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the country has lost one of its great leaders. Much will be written about his accomplishments, his life, and his service to the Nation. Anything I add here would be redundant.

However, I am deeply conscious that he was a man of his time. No man on the political scene of America could have filled so well the role of leadership which this country needed after the trials of World War II. His great sense of purpose, his overpowering devotion to duty, his perfect sense of integrity brought our country through some difficult times. The struggle for life during his last weeks typifies the character of this great man.

With every American I share deep sympathy for his family in this their tragic hour. Also with every American I share a great sense of gratitude for the life which this native Kansan gave to his fellow man in public service.

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently compiled a report to my constituents in Pennsylvania's 16th Congressional District. It contains the results of a poll I conducted at the beginning of the 91st Congress and some observations as follows:

A NEW LOOK

Beginning with this issue, my newsletter adopts a new name and a new format. Its new name, I think, is more reflective of the general content of these reports to you—a coverage of thought and opinion about the Washington scene. The new format, I hope, will make each newsletter a little more readable. Furthermore, this design will permit me to utilize pictures in issues to come which should add extra interest for those of you who are regular recipients of the newsletter.

AGE OF DISSATISFACTION

The present time has been called the "age of anxiety." It has also been referred to as the "age of dissatisfaction." Perhaps, the "age of paradox" might be yet another description. Never has this Nation been so powerful; yet never have we been so uncertain and anxious. Never, as a Nation, have we been so prosperous; yet, the welfare rolls in our major cities mount each week and bring costs of welfare to unprecedented heights. Never have we had so much; yet, never have we been so discontented. Youths privileged to go to college rebel against the established order. Some people, with just causes to promote, let their enthusiasm lead to grave injustices that threaten the historic principles of our society. The dissatisfactions and the results of the dissatisfactions call for legislative response and in many ways chart the course for the 91st Congress.

GOALS NOT SO DIFFERENT

Too often, we hear about those areas where various segments of our society are at odds with each other. Too seldom, we are reminded of our views that show basic similarity. Especially in the efforts to combat poverty, the antagonisms between the taxpayer and the welfare recipient have been stressed over and over again. A recently completed study suggests that the goals of the two groups are not so different. The report concluded that there remains in America a shared belief in the value of work. The poor themselves were repeatedly shown to express a preference for jobs at adequate pay over dependency and public handouts. That finding certainly should inspire some thinking toward welfare reform for it points us in a most promising direction. It is regrettable that Government, after assembling unemployment statistics for so many years, is only now beginning to collect information on job opportunities. Besides aiding job seekers, this information could provide guidance for private and public job training programs. And, at least, we are beginning to turn away from the proven failures in attacking poverty, and starting anew with people themselves.

IMPORTANT WORK AHEAD

The House Education and Labor Committee, the one on which I serve, has some of the most important work of the 91st Congress within its jurisdiction, especially in the field of education. A great American faith is faith in education as a means to a rewarding life. Endowed with that faith, recent Congresses have adopted a whole series of landmark Acts to provide young people with education from the preprimary years (Project Head Start) to graduate training after a student has obtained a bachelor's degree. For young people who are not academically inclined, the Congress has broadened the scope of the Federal vocational training program. The entire educational program will be studied thoroughly in this Congress in an effort to permit every American youth with the capacity and interest to get a college education, or vocational training at work that interests him. Some of the general questions, as we proceed with this work, will be: How can legislation influence the overall environment of young people across the land to make them interested in higher education or job training? How can a chain of dependency on relief from one generation to the next be broken? How can stagnation, crime, and militancy be made less attractive to young people as a career? How can youths be influenced to seize and appreciate the many opportunities in this country?

NOTABLE QUOTE

From philosopher Will Durant: "Civilization begins with order, grows with liberty, and dies with chaos."

TAXES

Tax matters have wide public interest, and the subject is one that Congress is investigating right now. The House Ways and Means Committee is looking into broad areas of tax reform and my hope is that they will be able to plug some of the tax loopholes which now allow some millionaires to escape payment of personal income tax. Congress has not revised the tax structure in over fifteen years, and there are reforms that are long overdue. In addition, the First Session of the 91st Congress must decide what to do about the 10 percent surtax imposed on corporate and personal income which is due to expire June 30, 1969. Congress must decide whether to: (1) allow the 10 percent surcharge to lapse; (2) continue at the 10 percent rate; or (3) continue at a reduced rate. That decision will be based primarily on what Vietnam needs are projected, and the amount of overall spending reduction which can be accomplished.

CHOICES AND PRIORITIES

With limited resources to meet great problems, the Federal Government must make choices among various courses of action. The whole range of problems facing the Congress cannot be met in one year not even in the four years of the new Administration. The problems, it seems, can be met only over a generation with long-range plans covering the next decade. The necessity is to pinpoint the priority areas. In the foreign sphere the Government is confronted with decisions as to the roles we undertake around the world. Are we to assist our friends anywhere in the world when they are threatened by Communism? Shall we assist them only where our vital interests are at stake? What is to be the nature and scope of our assistance—military, economic, or both? In our domestic affairs, Congress must set forth a definition of the problems which demand a concentration of effort and indicate the nature and scope of the programs to meet those problems. Certainly the crisis of the cities, crime, education and taxes will be among the subjects receiving Congressional scrutiny.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

The results from the poll published in the last edition of my newsletter are in, and I believe you might find them as interesting as I did. If nothing else, the questions brought forth a wide range of comment from the 16th District on issues of importance. I was interested particularly in your responses regarding Vietnam. As you can see from the figures listed below, no one option received overwhelming support and the greatest percentage of you chose to give me an indication of your personal theory for resolving the Vietnam conflict. Many of those personal viewpoints were quite well thought out, and I appreciate the time you spent letting me know how you would go about ending the war in Southeast Asia.

The final figures looked this way:

(1) Vietnam:

(a) 12% of you felt the United States should withdraw its troops from Vietnam and let South and North Vietnam fight it out themselves.

(b) 18% of you favored resuming the bombing and trying to get a military settlement of the conflict.

(c) A policy similar to the present one of limited fighting while negotiating was favored by 13% of the respondents.

(d) 18% wanted the United States to assume a more forceful negotiating role, but begin a gradual pullout of troops.

(e) 9% felt the United States should turn most of the talking and most of the fighting over to the South Vietnamese.

(f) The proposal to have the United States talk about troop withdrawals with the North Vietnamese while letting the South Vietnamese work out the political settlement with the Viet Cong was the choice of 6% of those responding.

(g) 24% of you offered your own thoughts about resolving the Vietnam War.

(2) Social Security:

(a) 51% of the respondents favored providing for automatic cost-of-living adjustments to Social Security benefits.

(b) 9% said that benefits should be increased overall by 13 percent and the minimum amount raised from $55 a month to $80.

(c) An enactment of both of the above proposals was called for by 23% of you.

(d) 17% wanted none of the above ideas put on the books.

(3) 65% of you were not in favor of the pay raise for government officials. 32% of you indicated that the pay hikes were justified, although many of those respondents felt that the percentage of increase was a little high. No opinion was registered on 3% of the questionnaires received.

(4) A reorganization of the Postal Service drew a "Yes" response of 73%. 19% said no and 8% stated no preference.

(5) 55% registered an opinion that the tax surcharge should be extended to meet Vietnam needs, while 42% opposed the extension. 3% had no opinion.

(6) 59% of the respondents said they did not want the first class postage rates raised even with the guarantee of air mail delivery. The people favoring that proposal came to 36% of the total while 5% expressed no choice. On this question, quite a few people commented that "junk mail" rates should be pushed upward.

(7) A partial dismantling of the Office of Economic Opportunity with a transfer into Cabinet-level Departments of some of the more effective anti-poverty programs drew favorable opinion from 81% of you. 10% did not want such a move and 9% had no preference shown.

(8) 74% would like to see tax credits used as an incentive for involving private industry in social problems and 19% do not feel that the tax credit program should be enacted. 7% registered no opinion.

(9) Reform of the Electoral College system was favored by 81% of those responding. 15% said "No" on this question and 4% indicated no choice.

(10) 66% of you agreed with substituting a runoff election process for the present system of the House of Representatives choosing the President in deadlocked contests. 28% of you did not agree and 6% did not respond.

(11) A more "evenhanded" approach by the United States in the Middle East was favored by 82%. 11% said "No" and no preference was indicated on 7% of the questionnaires received.

My thanks to the over 2200 of you who let me know your views and made the above results possible. While I could never, and would never, claim that these polls are a complete indication of the opinions of the 16th Congressional District, I do think they provide a valuable way of letting me determine the feelings of a pretty good cross-section of the people in Lancaster, Lebanon and Lower Dauphin Counties. As we get into the summer months, I plan to send out another questionnaire, and I am hopeful that as many of you as possible will see fit to respond at that time.

A REMINDER

I try to remain completely accessible to you to talk about problems you are facing with the Federal Government or about your views on the issues before the Congress. If you want to talk to me, I am available almost every Friday in the Congressional Office in Lancaster. In addition, I travel to Lebanon and Middletown to meet with constituents on two Saturday mornings out of each month. You can call my Lancaster office to make sure that I will be there when you want to see me, or you can just drop by. When I'm in Washington, a "hot line" telephone is at your service in my office on the second floor of the Lancaster Post Office Building. Feel free to stop in and place a call about those matters that demand my urgent attention.

VOLUNTARY ARMY IS THE ANSWER

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Senator Mark Hatfield has improved the quality of the debate over the conscript-volunteer question by a penetrating analysis of the case for returning to a voluntary Army.

In an article written for the New York Times Magazine on Sunday, March 30, 1969, Senator Hatfield uses an impressive array of facts to deal with the wobbly opinions that have been levied against the volunteer Armed Forces concept.

Specifically, he pins down the contentions that the voluntary system would be too expensive, would result in a black army, and would breed a mercenary armed service. Under his analysis, these fears prove to be groundless.

After arriving at basically the same general conclusion, the Nixon administration has taken the initiative—as promised in the President's campaign—to return to our national heritage of basically voluntary recruitment. In addition to ordering a Department of Defense study called "Project Volunteer," the President has created a commission to prepare a plan of action. Like Senator Hatfield, the administration is moving ahead on the belief that "A Voluntary Army Is the Answer," the title of the mazagine article.

The article by Senator Hatfield follows:

Senator Hatfield Argues That the Draft Is Wrong—A Volunteer Army Is the Answer

(By Mark O. Hatfield[1])

I have always been somewhat annoyed by people who consistently look disaster in the eye and announce that "something good will come of it in the end." I generally suspect that such people either do not comprehend the nature of the calamity or are callous to tragedy.

So it is with certain misgivings that I assert that something positive may result from our involvement in the senseless and unpopular war in Vietnam. Without the war I doubt that opposition to our system of conscription would have gained the momentum it has, momentum which may eventually lead to the abolition of the draft and the establishment of a volunteer military, the only system that allows the maximum personal liberty and eliminates the major inequities inherent in conscription.

The draft has forced young men who abhor the war to make difficult choices. My files are filled with letters from troubled youths who must reconcile their duty to their country with their duty to their consciences. They have desperate alternatives: choose to move to Canada, to declare themselves conscientious objectors, to go to jail, or choose to kill men they do not hate in a war they cannot justify for a cause they do not believe in.

This horrible dilemma is very much a part of the tragedy of Vietnam. The pain and suffering of this war are not limited to the battlefields or the orphanages and refugee camps of Southeast Asia. They are felt by young men like Peter Danielson, a 19-year-old philosophy major at the University of Michigan who was quoted in this magazine: "If I was on the battlefield, would I justify killing, or would I go crazy? Wrecking my career by trying for C.O. [conscientious objector status] scares me. Five years in Leavenworth for refusing to serve scares me. But if becoming a soldier means killing innocent people, that scares me, too. The choices are so big I can't handle them."

Sensitive young men like Peter will be forever haunted by the choices they must make on the draft. But opposition to the system is by no means found only among its primary victims. Greater and greater numbers of people are joining me in the conclusion that we must end the draft, we must have a volunteer professional army. I believe that conscription cannot meet the requirements of an effective military manpower-procurement system: (1) to preserve individual liberty and freedom as much as possible from unjustified intrusion by the Government; (2) to insure that every young man receives equal treatment and no one is required to make sacrifices that are not demanded of his peers; (3) to provide the maximum national security with the greatest efficiency and economy.

It can be shown, I believe, that the Selective Service program now in use does not meet these criteria. First, the draft denies individual liberty. As The Wall Street Journal pointed out editorially in March, 1967: "We should recognize that [the draft] is about the most odious form of Government control we have yet accepted. We should not forget that it is a basic violation of our traditions of freedom and individualism."

---

[1] Mark O. Hatfield, Republican Senator from Oregon, has introduced a bill embodying the proposals he sets forth in this article.

I feel strongly that each man has a moral obligation to serve his country, but he must be granted the freedom to accept his responsibility and the right to determine the form his service shall take. Individual liberty is not a concession that can be withdrawn or that must be paid for by military service. It is the ultimate right in a democracy.

The draft also fails to meet the criterion of fairness, for it is not equally applied. There has been a great deal of resentment because the Selective Service System is not administered uniformly throughout the country, because of the uncertainty young men must live with and because of the many inequities of the deferment system. But the most basic inequity is the fact that a smaller and smaller minority of our young men is carrying the burden of national defense. Even under today's crisis conditions, the military services draft only about 350,000 men out of a draft-eligible pool that totals 12 million. We should not tolerate a system that capriciously requisitions two years out of the lives of some youths while allowing the majority their liberty.

Even the third criterion, that of efficiently providing the necessary quantity and quality of men, is beyond the system of conscription. Why? Because the Selective Service System is designed only to provide *large numbers of men;* it is inherently incapable of supplying *well-qualified* personnel.

The nature of military needs has changed dramatically since World War II, when our conscription process was designed. In the nineteen-forties it was necessary to maintain a large "generalist" army. But today the need for great numbers of combat troops has been reduced by modern weapons capable of undertaking assignments formerly performed by men and by the changed nature of warfare. It is highly unlikely that we shall ever again be engaged in nonnuclear hostilities similar to World War II. Future military engagements will probably be guerrilla or counterinsurgency operations such as the one in Vietnam, where a small, highly trained and experienced army is more effective than a large, inexperienced and transient force. Conscription, designed to provide great numbers of men, cannot supply men with the technical know-how to operate modern weapons or the training and experience to be effective guerrilla fighters.

Draftees, who have been taken from civilian life against their wishes, spend their two years of military service counting the days until they get out. As soon as the required period is over, the vast majority of them return to civilian life—producing an average yearly turnover rate of 90 percent. This high rate prevents specialized training during a period when, in the words of one observer, "the new demands imposed by warfare suggest that what we need is not only superweapons but supermen in uniform." Lieut. Gen. Ira Eaker, a retired Air Force officer, commented: "Weapons are now so complicated and require such technical competence and skill for their operation and maintenance that it is absurd to expect short-term trainees to man them effectively."

The draft, based as it is on compulsion, not free choice, aggravates the turnover problem; inasmuch as it does, it must be counted a negative factor in national security. It continues to amaze me that the public officials most vigilant in seeing that every defense request is met (from F-111's to the costly and questionable A.B.M.) are often the very men who most adamantly defend the draft—which is clearly the most vulnerable aspect of our national security.

It is easily demonstrable that the draft is not a just and effective method of procuring military manpower. And there is no way of making *procedural reforms* in the Selective Service System that will enable it to meet the three basic criteria. For instance, the lottery approach, under which draftees would be selected on a random basis from a pool of eligible 19-year-olds, fails on all three counts. Substituting Lady Luck for General Hershey does not alter the fact that young men are forced into service and denied their individual liberty. The random selection process does not alleviate the *basic* injustice of the draft—the fact that a few serve while many escape—though it could reduce some of the inequities in the deferment system and the lack of uniform administration by the 4,000 draft boards. I find it very difficult to think—as those who support the lottery system must—that injustice handed out by a machine is more tolerable than injustice handed out by men. As Bruce Chapman points out in his book "The Wrong Man in Uniform," the lottery "would be a supremely callous, a dehumanizing, a frivolous Government-sponsored game of Russian roulette."

And, finally, the lottery system would not improve the quality of servicemen or the efficiency or economy of the system. Men would still be serving against their wills and the turnover rate would be no different. Our military forces would still be composed of inadequately trained, inexperienced men and would remain a liability to our national security.

The lottery approach should not be made to represent anything more than it is: a limited reform in the *operation* of the conscript system, which would still be undemocratic, inequitable and inefficient. The lottery is a patchwork proposal designed to cover some of the gaping holes in the fabric of military conscription, but it does little to retailor the flaws in the basic design of the draft.

I am convinced that the only solution to our problem is the abolition of the draft and the return to a voluntary military. This is the system that would allow maximum personal liberty and freedom from Government interference, for no one would be forced to serve in the armed forces against his will. A volunteer military would eliminate the inequities of the Selective Service System and end the injustice of forcing some to serve while allowing the majority to escape. And, with its reduced turnover, it would provide a more efficient and effective military establishment.

An all-volunteer force is usually first challenged on the ground that it would never provide the armed services with the number of men needed. The evidence indicates otherwise. We are talking about rather small numbers of men. In peacetime, according to the economist Walter Oi, a volunteer military, with its reduced turnover, should need to recruit only about 333,000 young men into the enlisted ranks each year. Statistically, this comes down to less than 2 per cent of the draft-eligible pool—young men between 18 and 26. Even if this pool were limited to men 18 through 20—the ages at which the majority of youths are making career decisions—the military would need to recruit only about 6 per cent of the group into the enlisted ranks each year.

Even more relevant are statistics on the difference between the total number of men needed annually and the number of true volunteers the military can expect to recruit without improving the conditions of service: the difference between supply and demand. This difference is astonishingly low. Professor Oi—who served as a consultant to the Pentagon during a 1964 study of military manpower and who uses Defense Department statistics in developing his estimates—points out that by 1970, with a peacetime force of 2.65 million men, the shortage would amount to only 75,000. In other words, all but 75,000 of the men needed to maintain the armed services would volunteer anyway if pay levels were not changed.

Let me point out parenthetically that President Nixon has pledged to move toward an all-volunteer force and the Defense Department is conducting a study called "Project Volunteer." Nixon's plan to request a military pay raise—recently dropped in an effort to insure a budget surplus—represented a step in the right direction, but the increase, if it does finally come, will have a delayed rather than an immediate impact for it will be spread over all ranks. Very little of it or the $1.8-billion Congress has already approved will filter down to new recruits, and the increase that will do the most to encourage a volunteer army is the one that will give substantially more money to the first-term enlistee.

The task of making a military career attractive and rewarding enough to induce 75,000 men to volunteer is not insurmountable. We could, for instance, raise the pay scales considerably and improve such fringe benefits as educational and recreational facilities. We might also try to increase the social status of the career military man, ease rigid promotion schedules and raise re-enlistment bonuses. Professor Oi has concluded that salary increases alone, totaling about $4-billion, would supply all the incentive needed to maintain the peacetime armed forces (Dr. Harry Gilman, who took part in the 1964 manpower study and later headed an investigation of compensation and reenlistment problems for the Pentagon, is even more optimistic. He believes that the extra budget outlay would be only $1-billion). According to Professor Oi's figures, the price for maintaining an all-volunteer military establishment would double, to about $8-billion, in wartime. Oi ridicules the Defense Department's estimate that a volunteer system might cost an additional $17-billion in salaries. Such a pay increase would result in an average annual salary of well over $8,000 for first-term enlistees—an absurd estimate of the economic reward necessary to attract an additional 75,000 men.

The budgetary increase of $4 billion represents only a 5 per cent increase in our national defense budget and does not reflect the reduction in force levels—and corresponding economies—that can be achieved under a voluntary system or the savings that would be produced by the increased efficiency of a professional military.

The head of the Army's enlisted personnel directorate has stated that "the current strength of armed forces could actually be reduced if the annual turnover of men was reduced," and a professional military would experience less turnover. An all-volunteer force, Professor Oi estimates, would have a 30 per cent reduction in turnover. That means 30 per cent fewer men would have to be recruited and trained each year, and that means fewer men would be needed to train them—resulting in the reassignment of approximately 80,000 of the 265,000 men engaged in training functions at peacetime manpower levels. Thus, force levels could be reduced by 80,000 men without any reduction in defense capability. (It should be noted that this reduction in personnel would more than compensate for the 75,000-man deficit predicted for a voluntary military operating under present pay scales and enlistment rates.)

An armed service of professionals would perform much more efficiently than one composed of conscripts. Robert Lekachman estimated in an article in Challenge in 1967 that the productivity of the draftee or reluctant volunteer averages about 20 per cent less than that of a professional soldier. A voluntary military composed of about 2.43 million men would therefore be the effective equivalent of a peacetime armed force of 2.65 million men, 40 per cent of whom were draftees and reluctant volunteers. (These statistics suggest that reductions totaling nearly three times the 75,000-troop deficit could be made with no loss in defense capability.)

As force levels are reduced, the cost of maintaining the military is reduced. But other economies growing out of lower turnover rates would be realized with an all-volunteer military: smaller expenditures for veterans' benefits, savings in the maintenance of complicated equipment now mistreated by inadequately trained men and reductions in the cost of maintaining boot camps. In fact, five Congressmen estimated in "How to End the Draft," a book published in 1967, that a voluntary system would have saved more than $1.7-billion in personnel costs alone during 1966. This represents almost half of the $4-billion Professor Oi calculates would be needed in increased salaries for a professional armed force.

But to discuss the price of a voluntary military establishment in terms of its increased *budget* costs is to miss the point. In real economic terms, an all-volunteer force would not be any more expensive than our current Army of conscripts, but the bill would be sent to a different party. Under a voluntary system all taxpayers would share the true cost of supporting our armed forces. Under the draft system the young men we force into the military subsidize their own service. When a youth is capable of earning $350 a month in civilian employment and is drafted and paid, at a conservative estimate, only $210—including tax benefits and allowances for room and board—the lost income is his extra contribution for the maintenance of the armed forces. We must remedy this injustice by placing the financial burden of our national defense where it belongs—on the general taxpayers rather than the hapless young men we force into uniform.

On the basis of 1964 statistics, Professor Oi has estimated that the difference between what a young man could earn as a civilian and his pay as a draftee is $1,680 a year. But during that year taxpayers over 21 paid an average Federal tax of only $633. In Professor Oi's words: "The typical draftee [was] thus saddled with a hidden tax that [was] over twice as high as the Federal income-tax burden of an individual taxpayer."

If we paid young men salaries high enough to induce them to volunteer, we would merely be paying the true value of their service; the added budgetary cost would be only a reflection of the *actual* cost of our armed services. The argument that an all-volunteer force would cost too much is not, in reality, an argument for conscription but an argument against the extent of our military commitment. This point was most effectively made in "Why the Draft?" a book by seven young political economists:

"The volunteer army forces taxpayers to recognize the true cost of military activity. If they would be unwilling to pay this cost, it must be because the benefits from such activity are less than its cost. In such a case, the activity should be curtailed, and not, as under a draft system, merely have its cost concealed. . . . The volunteer army does not increase the real cost of national defense; if anything, because it is more efficient, it reduces that cost. What it does do, however, is make the cost apparent while distributing it more evenly."

A second common criticism of the proposal for voluntary military service is that it would produce an all-black army. (Sometimes the charge is that it would be a *poor* black army; the fact that the draft system produces a poor army is overlooked. It is the upper-lower class and the lower-middle class that are drafted in disproportionate numbers. A volunteer army, because of improved pay, status and conditions, would be much more a middle-class army.)

I will defend the volunteer military service against the charge that it would be disproportionately black at some length—not because the argument has any validity, but because it is an emotional issue raised by men who evidently have not taken the time to discover whether their charges have any basis in fact. I submit that they have not.

Simple arithmetic establishes that a volunteer armed force would not result in a "black army." The argument of the critics is that since black youths don't have many economic opportunities they would flock to recruitment offices if the military offered them a decent wage. What is overlooked is that 2.5 times as many white youths as black youths are classified "poor" by the Government. So if you accept the critics' assumption that salary and poverty levels alone would determine the enlistment rate, there would be 2.5 white volunteers for every black one.

There is little reason to believe that black men would join the military in great disproportion to the number of white young men who would be drawn to this career. In fact, the national advisory commission on the draft stated in its report, "In Pursuit of Equity," that qualified white and black youths volunteer at rates about equal to their over-all proportion in society. (Blacks between 18 and 26 represent about 12 per cent of their age group and they voluntarily enter the service in approximately the same proportion.) I find it difficult to anticipate any reason for this pattern of equal enlistment rates to change under a totally voluntary military, and would expect, therefore, the proportion of blacks entering the armed forces to be in the neighborhood of 12 per cent.

It just cannot be logically argued that an all-volunteer force with higher pay rates and improved benefits would be disproportionately attractive to blacks. Economist Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago argues convincingly that present pay levels are "comparatively" more advantageous to the Negro than would be the increased wages of a professional military. For, even as low as military pay is, it still offers more than 50 per cent of draft-age black youths higher incomes than they could earn in civilian life, according to the Census Bureau. But only about 33 per cent of the white youths are earning wages below what they could get in the military. What it means, then, is that more than 50 per cent of the black youths who would be attracted to the military because of pay have already had the financial incentive to join. Higher pay would be a potential incentive to less than 50 per cent of young blacks, but would be potentially attractive to about 70 per cent of young whites.

Even in the unlikely event that a professional military *did* produce unequal racial enlistment rates, it would not cause an unacceptable imbalance. Prof. Thomas Schelling, an economist and defense analyst at Harvard's John Fitzgerald Kennedy School of Government, has estimated that if black men *should* find military service to be three or four times as attractive as whites did, their high rejection rates would mean that they would still represent only 20 per cent of the armed forces.

Critics may attempt to argue that the re-enlistment rate for blacks is considerably greater than it is for whites, and assert that this will eventually cause a significant racial imbalance as more blacks elect to remain in uniform. This possibility exists, however, whether men are drafted into the service or volunteer. And Army figures show that the re-enlistment rate for blacks who were *drafted* is 30 per cent higher than the re-enlistment rate for white draftees. But the black re-enlistment rate of first-term *volunteers* was only 25 per cent above the white volunteer re-enlistment rate. Furthermore, as the conditions of military service more closely approximate what the white young man can expect to enjoy as a civilian they will provide greater incentive for him to re-enlist; the comparative advantages of military life already provide this incentive for most black young men. A voluntary military, then, could be expected to produce more comparable racial re-enlistment rates.

While converting to a voluntary system, the military should provide greater flexibility in enlistment standards so that young men with slight educational or physical inadequacies could be accepted and given special training and appropriate assignments. Although the rejection rate for blacks is double the rate for whites, this would not result in the acceptance of twice as many Negroes. Army figures show that for every black youth who attempted to volunteer and was rejected in 1968, three white youths were rejected. In other words, under the flexible enlistment standards, 75 whites would be accepted to 25 blacks.

Another factor which will temper any trend toward a black army is our national commitment to improving the economic opportunities of our black citizens. As we expand the opportunities in the civilian job sector, fewer black men will find the military to be the most attractive road to higher economic and social status, and this will tend to place an effective ceiling on the proportion of blacks who enlist.

Finally, I believe it is difficult to argue convincingly that it would be undesirable for the United States to have a military establishment in which the ratio of black men was two or three times that in society. The five members of Congress who wrote "How to End the Draft" put it this way:

"There is nothing wrong with the fact that military service in an all-volunteer army might offer some Negroes better living conditions, better education, more secure employment, a better chance of assuming responsibility and a more dignified life than the civilian economy can offer. It is not our military system which should be condemned for offering a chance to the Negro, it is the civilian sector of our society which should be condemned for failing to allow the Negro to share fully the fruits of America's prosperity."

Another charge brought against the voluntary-military proposal is just as fallacious and emotional as the predictions of a black army. This is the argument that a professional military would be composed of "mercenaries"—men who would join the service only for the money and whose loyalty would therefore be questionable.

This line of reasoning presupposes that young men would choose military careers solely because they were well-paid. But young people who pick careers as teachers or carpenters certainly don't reach their decisions purely on the basis of economics, and there is no reason to think that those who enlist in the military would be motivated entirely by good pay and improved benefits. John Mitrisin, a former research associate at the Institute for Policy Studies, recently pointed out in an article in Current History: "Monetary gain, training and veterans' benefits are not the only reasons men join the armed forces; if they were, there would be almost no true volunteers today. Men join because of patriotism, family tradition, the military's image of manliness and the chance to travel. These attractions are strong . . ."

Our military officers have traditionally been well-paid and they have not been characterized contemptuously as "mercenaries." Indeed, as the prestigious magazine Science asked editorially in January, "Why is a volunteer officer a 'dedicated career man' but an enlisted man a 'mercenary'?"

The conclusion that a well-paid military would be less loyal than an army of conscripts is questionable. Is it really logical to expect that a man whose service is adequately compensated, whose status is enhanced by a new professionalism and whose contribution is recognized and appreciated will be *less* loyal to his nation and its ideals than a man who is forced into service, is inadequately compensated and who enjoys all too little esteem from the general public?

A volunteer force will not be an exclusive, stable body of men isolated from all contact with civilian society and influences. (After all, we don't demand that volunteers take vows of celibacy or renounce their parents.)

Between 1960 and 1965, an average of 520,000 men entered the service each year. Under a voluntary military, there would still be more than 360,000 entering and leaving the force each year to maintain a "civilian" influence and dissipate any tendency toward military elitism.

Yet alarmists have gone so far as to predict military coups if we move to a professional army. Their predictions, however, are not accompanied by any evidence. They certainly can't point to history. Except for the last 30 years and brief periods during World War I and the Civil War, our nation has relied almost exclusively on a volunteer or professional army. Civilian control of the Government has never been threatened. And the experience of other nations does not verify the predictions of military takeovers. There is, historically little correlation between the method of recruitment and the frequency of military coups—and, incidentally, civilian rule was overthrown recently in two countries that rely on conscription, Greece and Argentina.

Those who are determined to find a direct relationship between militarism and a voluntary recruitment system should look closely at what is happening to our two closest allies, Canada and Britain. Both have volunteer programs and it can be argued that militarism is *declining* in these two nations. Both countries are reducing their international military commitments, and Britain has significantly reduced the size of her forces.

Frankly, I believe that the method of recruiting enlisted men is unrelated to the possibility of a rise in militarism. Draftees, who are only in the service for two years and who are at the very bottom of the military power structure, have very little ability to exert a "civilian" influence on the military hierarchy. The danger of military élitism comes primarily from the officers, who are and almost always have been volunteers or "professionals." We should continue our tradition of drawing officers from widely divergent social, economic and geographic backgrounds. We should also continue our Congressional selection of the student bodies at our military academies, maintain voluntary R.O.T.C. programs on college campuses and provide for expanded opportunities for enlisted personnel to attend officer-candidate schools.

If we want to protect our nation from the threat of militarism, our primary concern should be to exert civilian influence at the top, not the bottom, of the military power structure. The office of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy and Air Force should remain in the hands of civilians.

A volunteer military would inherently provide an effective check against a loss of civilian control over the military because it would take a bigger bite out of the tax dollar. My nearly 20 years as a public official have convinced me that there is no more effective way to interest the voters in Government policy than through their pocketbooks. Taxpayers and elected officials can be expected to watch closely and to debate rigorously attempts by the military to expand. (The heated controversy over the passing of the 10 per cent surtax to finance the war in Vietnam substantiates this conclusion.) In the words of the economist Robert Tollison: ". . . one could speculate that the increased financial costs of the volunteer army would lead to even greater civilian activity in the conduct and direction of military operations such as in Vietnam. In general, therefore, this closer scrutiny of military personnel arising from an all-volunteer force would serve to establish even more effective civilian control over the military and guard against the dangers of militarism."

In fact, civilian control over the military should be extended a step further. The Government's authority to draft young men into uniform should be ended and it should be possible to reinstate it only by an act of Congress upon the recommendation of the Commander in Chief. This provision would modify the President's unilateral ability to involve us by administrative decree in military adventures abroad. The assured ability to put young men into uniform is vital to any major commitment to war. One man—The President—now has this ability and there exists no effective check on it. The Executive Branch of Government has declared that the President, as Commander in Chief, has the power to send American men, in any number he chooses, to any spot in the world without the approval or even the consent of Congress. A volunteer military would force the President to rely on persuasion rather than conscription in committing us to long-term conflicts. Since the armed services would fill their ranks with volunteers rather than draftees, it would be difficult for the President to commit us to an unpopular war—such as the one in Vietnam—and still induce the necessary number of young men to volunteer. Before intervening in a conflict, the President would be forced to consider very carefully whether our involvement could be justified to the public.

A further check would be the President's awareness that if he couldn't sell the war to the American public, he would have to sell it to Congress. If insufficient numbers of young men believed in the commitment enough to volunteer, the President would have to ask Congress to reinstitute the draft. (Only at this point, if a voluntary system proves inadequate, should we explore such reforms of the conscript program as the lottery, the draft, whether by lottery or through the Selective Service System, should be used only as a last resort, not relied upon as the easy way out.) Before the President decided to intervene in conflicts he would be sure that he could justify his action to Congress; this would reduce the possibility of an ill-considered commitment of troops.

Peacetime conscription is essential to the President's self-proclaimed, singular ability to involve our country in war by administrative decree. The draft allows him to bypass and nullify the constitutionally defined role of Congress to declare war. The story of how we became involved in Vietnam demonstrates the necessity to correct this imbalance of power and to place checks on the President's unilateral ability to involve our nation in long-term conflicts. Aside from a constitutional amendment, I know of no other effective means of restoring to Congress its power role in committing us to war than by placing in the hands of the House and Senate the authority to conscript armies.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, so many tributes have been paid General Eisenhower that it is difficult to add anything new. But I do want to be among those who have expressed their deep appreciation of the life and character of this great man.

To me, the lasting impression I have is that in a world that questions some basic beliefs such as religion and clamors for the leisure life and a permissive society he was a steadfast Christian gentleman who rigidly believed in discipline—including self-discipline. To him the rules of the game were made for some good purpose and should be followed without complaint or equivocation.

Loyalty was bedrock in his character. Whether it was West Point, his country, his church, or his party, he felt that his association with these institutions demanded allegiance and loyalty.

These virtues of loyalty and discipline are part and parcel of America's greatness, and for that reason make Eisenhower one of the great men of our day and give him a place of prominence in the history of our country.

Possibly above this, or at least part of it, was his personal and family life. Here he was an example of the kind of man Americans want to see in their leaders.

All of these qualities made him a great soldier and a great President. His passing has emphasized them in the tributes that have been paid him during these recent days. But they are enduring virtues which will fill a place in the hearts of Americans for all time.

JUDGE PEREZ' PEOPLE

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the other day I inserted in the Record my statement and a New Orleans newspaper article about the death of my longtime friend, Judge Leander H. Perez, Sr.

Friend and foe alike will not soon forget Judge Perez, and I want to include at this point in the Record a story from the Plaquemines Gazette, the newspaper from Perez' home parish.

This story gives an indication of what his own people thought of him and demonstrates the love and respect which the judge enjoyed from his friends and neighbors. And he loved and respected them.

Mr. Speaker, here is the article, which speaks for itself.

[From the Plaquemines Gazette, Mar. 28, 1969]

Thousands Mourn Death of Judge Perez—Half Century of Dedicated Service Ends

The thousands of mourners who attended the funeral services and burial of Judge L. H. Perez March 21st were eloquent in their manifestations of grief, love, devotion and admiration, for a man who they believed to be a true friend, a leader of vision and compassion, a noble statesman, an astute lawyer, a defender of the people's rights and one of the greatest American patriots this country has known, a man who had the courage and ability to dissent when principles and his convictions were in jeopardy.

Judge L. H. Perez, revered in Plaquemines as not only the leader but the father of the Parish, died Wednesday evening, March 19 at six o'clock in his Idlewild Ranch home—but only after he had fulfilled his promise to rebuild Plaquemines after it had been devastated by Hurrican Betsy in 1965. He was 77.

He was alone in his study when he breathed his last, when his stout heart stopped, causing him to topple from a chair where he was found within a few short minutes by his late wife's sister, Mrs. Marguerite Foret.

Like his beloved wife, Judge Perez had been told that day by his doctor that he could plan resuming his activities in moderation. He had even stopped off at his New Orleans office. Returning to Idlewild, he enjoyed his dinner—and then it happened.

He had been under treatment following a heart attack January 10th.

DEATH IS SHOCK

Word of his death shocked his relatives, friends and associates and the countless thousands who looked upon Judge Perez as their protector, their friend.

The following evening, thousands stood in line to pass the silver casket where their silver-haired friend lay. A funeral director of the House of Bultman, New Orleans, said it was the largest funeral he had known of in the city during the past 30 years.

The next day for the services, thousands again came and formed the procession to the Holy Name of Jesus Church where a Requiem Mass was said. The procession was over 200 cars long.

Adding to the tribute of their presence, it appeared that every Catholic in the church during the Mass received Communion. The 1000 seat church overflowed into the streets.

In addition to relatives, dignitaries, parishioners and other friends, there were school children who carried a heart-shaped floral arrangement; a group of scouts, and even a cab driver was said to have locked up his cab and attended Mass.

HEAR US OH LORD

The faces of the mourners were grief stricken as Father Peter Boerding of St. Thomas Church in Pointe-a-la-Hache, celebrant, intoned many times during the Mass, "Hear us Oh Lord . . . answer our prayers for Leander." Father Boerding, sprinkling the casket with holy water, said of Judge Perez, "God has taken him to Himself from the trials of this world." He entreated, "Make him a companion of Your Saints and grant to him everlasting rest and happiness."

Father Boerding was assisted by Father Stanley Gootee, pastor of Our Lady of Perpetual Help Church, Belle Chasse.

The reconciliation of Judge Perez with the church was done quietly about a year ago.

INTERRED BESIDE HIS WIFE

Following the Mass, the long procession of cars wound its way across the Greater New Orleans Mississippi River bridge to below Belle Chasse where Judge was placed next to his wife in the family Chapel at Idlewild. Judge Perez had built the Chapel for his wife in her death.

As the thousands in cars drove down the Belle Chasse Highway, the business places closed and people lined the highway to pay their respects as this, "once in a century man" made his last trip.

BIRDS SING REQUIEM

It was a beautiful day. The sun came out from behind the morning clouds as if to throw light on this man's soul as his casket was carried by his seven grandsons—J. Douglas Eustis Jr., Thomas P. Eustis, Geoffrey Eustis, Richard J. Carrere Jr., Thomas A. Carrere, Chalin O. Perez Jr., L. H. Perez III and Harold (Dutch) Asevedo, loyal friend and aide of Judge Perez.

They carried his casket blanketed with red roses along the stone path that leads to the chapel in the rear of the ranch home. The flowers were bursting with fullness. The moss from the giant Oak trees tossed in the gentle breeze. The birds sang like in a Requiem in his honor. Otherwise there was silence, a dignity befitting this great man.

The mourners stood numb as the last ritual was performed by the priests attended by altar boys. Then the scraping of the coffin being put into the crypt, cut into the hearts of those who stood by helplessly.

The rose blanket was placed in front of the crypt and the entourage passed through the Chapel to see where their loved one and friend was lain.

It was the end. The end of a full and fruitful life, so well acknowledged that governors, statesmen, judges and other dignitaries and people from various walks of life, came from other parts of the country to pay their last respects.

Among those officials from out of the Plaquemines, St. Bernard and New Orleans area who attended, were former Governor George C. Wallace of Alabama, Mississippi Gov. John Bell Williams, La. Gov. John J. McKeithen, U.S. Senator from Miss. James Eastland, Senator from La. Allen J. Ellender, Miss. Supreme Court Justice Tom P. Brady, La. Lt. Gov. C. C. (Taddy) Aycock and La. Speaker of House, Rep. John Garret.

The family of Judge Perez set the example of the quiet dignity of the funeral and burial. They greeted each of the mourners at the funeral home and led the funeral procession. They are the two sons of Judge Perez, Leander H. Perez Jr., Chalin O. Perez; his two daughters, Mrs. J. Douglas Eustis and Mrs. Richard J. Carrere. In the procession with the family were Judge Perez's sisters Mrs. A. M. Walker, Mrs. W. E. Anderson and Mrs. Olympe P. Giordano; Mrs. Foret and all of his 19 grandchildren.

The deceased relatives of Judge Perez are his wife Agnes Octave Chalin; brothers Rosellus E., M.S., B. J. Eldridge and sisters Mrs. Edwige Switzer, Mrs. Frank Eloise Giordano, Mrs. Ollie Pujol. Judge Perez was the son of the late Gertrude Solis and Rosellus Perez.

THE PRYING CENSUS

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of H.R. 4791, a bill which would restrict the Census Bureau's ability to snoop into the private lives of our citizens, I was pleased to read a recent editorial of support for the bill in the Leader-Times of Kittanning, Pa.

The editorial points out that support for this proposed legislation transcends ideological and partisan positions, and that there is support for the measure by approximately one-fourth of the House membership.

I agree completely with the conclusions of the editor when he says:

> It (the Betts bill) deserves support from other Members of Congress and the public whose privacy it is intended to protect.

I present the editorial to be reproduced here:

THE PRYING CENSUS

Concern over the increasing invasion of the individual's privacy by the government transcends ideological barriers. Both liberals and conservatives fear the incessant prying of Big Brother into private affairs of the average citizen.

Republicans and Democrats alike have expressed distaste for such measures as wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping and have tried to restrict such evidence-gathering to cases involving organized crime and national security.

Too often government snooping has had no other purpose than harassment, as in the case of the Internal Revenue Service, or simple bureaucratic nosiness, as in the case of the Census Bureau.

The Census Bureau over the years has expanded its constitutional role by counting heads every 10 years in a general information quest which has nothing to do with its assigned duties.

In an unusual display of bipartisan togetherness, 109 members of the House of Representatives have co-sponsored a bill which would reduce the Census Bureau's power to pry.

Rep. Jackson Betts, R-Ohio, author of the bill, has for several years been concerned about the questionnaire which the bureau has prepared for the 1970 census. Betts doesn't believe the government has any right to demand to know a person's marital situation, for example, or how many television sets or bathtubs he owns.

The Betts bill would remove the compulsion presently attached to questions not relevant to learning how many people are living in the United States. The proposed legislation calls for "repeal of the jail sentence entirely (now 60 days) and removal of the $100 fine from all but a few subjects essential to the population count."

A person could answer the other questions voluntarily.

The bill has the initial support of one-quarter of the House. It deserves support from other members of Congress and the public whose privacy it is intended to protect.

PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today we mourn the loss of another great American leader, President Dwight D. Eisenhower. But our sorrow is tempered by the knowledge of the fullness and richness of his life; a life that was devoted entirely to the service of his country.

Involvement and service were the hallmarks of his life which encompassed all of the great trials and the great victories of this Nation in the 20th century.

From his early manhood at the time of World War I, Dwight Eisenhower moved inexorably to the leadership of the most powerful military forces ever assembled in the history of the world. He led those forces with valor and devotion and presided at their victory in World War II.

One might have expected that to be the end and the zenith of a great general's career, but for Dwight Eisenhower, it was only the beginning. The unprecedented faith and affection which he inspired in his fellow Americans moved the Nation to call him to still further service in the highest office in the land where he served as long as the law allows.

He was a great leader in war and a great leader in peace.

Today we grieve at his passing, but we rejoice in his life which is an inspiration and an example for all of us.

His words as he ended his second term as President of the United States shall continue to be of particular significance to me. Let us never forget that being a great military leader, and as a President leaving office, he still warned us against the dangers he saw ahead:

> In the councils of Government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.
>
> We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals so that security and liberty may prosper together.

I join the multitudes to pay him homage and tribute that he so justly deserves.

MARXISM-LENINISM AND SDS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, Communist direction in student youth movements is becoming increasingly clear. This is particularly so with reference to the more violent of student groups labeling themselves of the "new left" type. Among such is the so-called Students for a Democratic Society—SDS—which actually is anything but a movement for democracy.

In this connection I find the report by Robert Krim appearing in the Washington Post entitled "SDS Philosophy Edges Toward Marxism" to be revealing and I commend its reading to all who seek to recognize the forces arrayed against American social order for what they are.

The article follows:

SDS PHILOSOPHY EDGES TOWARD MARXISM

(By Robert Krim)

AUSTIN, TEX., March 30.—"Our primary task is to build a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary movement," declared Michael Klonsky, executive secretary of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), in his report to the SDS National Committee meeting at the University of Texas today.

Klonsky's belief in revolutionary communism is typical of the political beliefs of most of the leaders and many members in SDS today.

During this three-day conference with 1000 SDS leaders from across the country, delegates have phrased their arguments in Marxist terms. "Imperialism," "the working class," "class oppression" and "wars of liberation" had been continually referred to in debate.

NEW SDS TERMS

This Communist rhetoric and philosophy is relatively new to SDS. Two or three years ago virtually no student radical seemed to believe in Marxism.

"The revolution" was still a joke to most of the new left in 1966. The new left of that period was anti-ideological.

Only three years later "the revolution" is far from a joke. There is an ideology now which all factions in SDS adhere to. It advocates a Marxist analysis of classes in America. It attacks the United States as a capitalist, imperialist, and racist state that is ruled by a small elite. American involvement in Vietnam is seen as a natural extension of the elite's "capitalist imperialism."

The debate within SDS at this conference centers on the future of the nine-year-old radical movement. The student radicals feel they must broaden their constituency if they are to bring about "the revolution."

TWO DIFFERENT FACTIONS

At least two different factions in SDS advocate different approaches to the problem. The "worker-student alliance" believes that the students should consider themselves "oppressed people" like white and black workers. The second group, commonly referred to as the "New Left," endorses the principle of an alliance between workers and students.

The New Left faction within SDS (known as "the Right") retains much of the humanism and individualism of the mid-1960s. Many of its members are pacifists who, though intellectually accepting the need for revolution, will not accept violence as a means.

For the New Left group the style of life is still an important factor in their radical beliefs. The student subculture from marijuana to the new sounds in rock, underground movies and the underground press is all part of the "radical life style."

This group accepts Marx as an economist who is relevant to the society for which he wrote, but not completely applicable to the modern American society.

Said one SDS leader in the New Left, "Mao, Che and Lenin were all very relevant to the Chinese, Cuban and Russian societies, respectively. They each won a revolution. That was a good thing to happen." But he goes no further in applying them to American problems.

MARX, LENIN, MAO

This is not the case among the members of "the worker-student alliance." Marx, Lenin and Mao are the theorists—"all others are revisionists." This group makes no bones about it; they accept the Marxist-Leninist political philosophy.

The members of the worker-student alliance are not members of the Communist Party, however. Many of them are members of the Progressive Labor Party (PL). They ally themselves with "the revolutionary communism" of Mao Tse-Tung and Communist China.

The worker-student alliance faction does not go along with the radical life style of the New Left. They wear their hair short, their clothes are "straight" and they refuse to use drugs. This faction's resolution at the SDS conference here to condemn the use of drugs by students was defeated.

The New Left faction accuses PL of being controlled by Peking. PL, while admitting that they are Maoists, replies that the New Left is made up of "fascists" and employs the fascist rhetoric of "anti-communism."

FIGHTS BREAK OUT

The battle between these two factions has come several times to fist fights in local campus SDS meetings and at this conference in Austin. Many believe that SDS eventually will split apart along these factional lines.

In fact, the New Left spread rumors at this SDS meeting that they would withdraw if their resolutions were defeated by the worker-student alliance faction. The New Left faction won all the votes at the conference.

As is the custom, the delegates at the December SDS conference rose at their last session and sang the old trade union hymn "Solidarity Forever." This year, however, the song was interrupted by the chant "Defeat Faults Unity." It will probably become nearly impossible for SDS to sing "Solidarity Forever" in the not too distant future.

GENERAL EISENHOWER: AN AMERICAN SAGA ENDS

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, Dwight David Eisenhower has passed away and America is much the poorer because of it. Reared in its heartland, he personified traditional virtues. Born to service, he lived his entire life on behalf of his country. Inured to sacrifice, he gave unstintingly of himself whenever his country asked anything of him. Altruistic to the core, he set an example for the entire Nation.

Leading America's military forces to victory in World War II against Germany, he was an exemplary soldier in a democracy. Standing firmly against the Soviet menace in the cold war, he lent his strength to our international role. Stepping out of the service, he answered the call of his country as its President.

In all of these endeavors, he showed what the American spirit and fiber were really made of. Through every challenge and crisis, he maintained his courage, bringing honor to our country. Never was that courage better displayed than during his last illness.

History will treat him kindly. America will always be in his debt. He left us many legacies. That of courage in combat, honesty in office, and devotion to country.

He also left us a warning—one that it would do us well to heed. It stays in my mind always. He warned us of the military-industrial complex, and what dangers it poses to our society. Never was he more correct than when he delivered that warning.

His message has been taken to heart along with his other legacies. May God give him peace and receive his soul.

HALT, BIG BROTHER

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, while I am not a cigarette smoker, I feel that much more is involved in the recent FCC proposal to ban cigarette advertising on radio and television than the issue of smoking or not smoking. I feel that the FCC is going too far in banning advertising of a product, the manufacture and sale of which is legal. It is proper to require that advertising fairly represent a product, but until such time as there is a legal ban on the sale and use of the product, it should be legal to advertise it, and I feel that the FCC has no right to arbitrarily ban such advertising.

I include editorials from two newspapers with wide circulation in the Ninth Congressional District of Wisconsin:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel, Feb. 7, 1969]

HALT, BIG BROTHER

Step by step, America appears headed away from freedom and toward regimentation. One of the steps in fateful march will be taken if the federal communications commission is authorized by congress to ban radio and television advertising of cigarets.

What disturbs us about this proposed new prohibition is the effect it has on American principles of government. It cuts down the principle of voluntary rule and promotes in its place the principle of compulsory rule.

There has been, to be sure, a growing tendency for government to tell people what they can and cannot do. One would have thought that the nation's experience with the 18th amendment would have taught it something. But if it did, the lesson has been forgotten. Big Brother is coming on with a vengeance.

So after cigaret advertising on radio and television has been prohibited, then what? To stay in the area of the specific concern, suppose that it is established—and perhaps it already is—that air pollution, particularly from the internal combustion engine, is as much of a cause of lung cancer as cigaret smoking. Then shouldn't gasoline advertising be banned? In the end such laws and regulations could make life in America as safe as a burial vault.

Congress should reverse this trend toward having government run every aspect of our lives. A good place to start would be by denying the FCC the authority to prohibit cigaret advertising on radio and television.

[From the Waukesha (Wis.) Freeman, Feb. 14, 1969]

BAN ON CIGARETTE ADS CAN'T BE DEFENDED

Senator Frank E. Moss (D Utah) has urged the nation's cigarette manufacturers to abandon voluntarily all broadcast advertising in a Senate speech that was, in reality, an ultimatum. Moss said the broadcast industry has made efforts to "counterbalance cigarette advertising with public service announcements on the dangers of smoking" but he noted that nothing less than a full ban on TV and radio cigarette advertising is acceptable.

While many share the Senator's concern over the harmful effects of cigarette smoking, congressional action of the sort suggested by Moss would be improper if not unconstitutional. Educational programs on the use of cigarettes fall well within the government's responsibility. These have been carried out for many months and should continue. But for Senator Moss or anyone else to dictate what products may or may not be advertised and sold is still another question.

On the heels of Moss' ultimatum the Federal Communications Commission proposed a ban on radio and TV cigarette advertising on the grounds that cigarettes cause "an epidemic of death and disabilities." The next logical step, of course, would be to ban the sale of cigarettes. From there the do-gooders could perform a public service by banning the advertising and later the sale of motor vehicles because of the "epidemic of death and disabilities" they are causing.

ANOTHER DERAILMENT

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the rash of railroad accidents and derailments is continuing.

Despite the yeoman efforts of the undermanned Federal Railroad Administration to make the fullest use of the laws and jurisdiction at its command, the incidents continue to increase.

Remedial legislation is essential and thorough study by the appropriate congressional committees is mandatory.

Just this past weekend, there was another serious derailment in the backyard of my home city of Buffalo, N.Y. Fortunately, there were no injuries, nor was there any volatile or other dangerous cargo involved.

The industry is not policing itself, so it is necessary that Federal officials be given the tools to impose and enforce adequately safety regulations.

Following are articles from Buffalo newspapers reporting the latest derailment:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Mar. 28, 1969]

THIRTY-SEVEN OF FREIGHT'S 85 CARS JUMP TRACKS IN HAMBURG

Thirty-seven cars of a 50 mph, 85-car Norfolk & Western freight train jumped the tracks just off Rogers Rd., a half mile south of Route 75 in the Town of Hamburg's Mt. Vernon section, about 3:45 this morning. No one was hurt.

Preliminary reports by Hamburg police said at least a half mile of track was torn up. Officers blocked off Rogers from Cloverbank Rd. to Route 5 because two auto part carriers crashed onto the highway.

Other cars stayed on the five-track railroad right of way or came to rest in Lakeside Cemetery on the other side of the tracks, Police Chief Robert G. Williams and Lt. Patrick Foose reported.

Nineteen of the cars were grain carriers and three were auto carriers, officers said. Others were box cars and auto parts carriers.

The auto carriers remained upright, just off the tracks. Patrolman Paul H. Zuppinger discovered the wreck at 3:53 a.m. while checking the source of a momentary power failure in that area. The train came from Ohio and was bound for Buffalo.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Mar. 29, 1969]

THIRTY-SEVEN CARS DERAILED IN HAMBURG

The last 37 cars of an 85-car Norfolk & Western freight train jumped the tracks near the Rogers Rd. crossing in the Town of Hamburg shortly before 4 a.m. Friday. No one was hurt.

The train, bound for Buffalo from Chicago, was traveling at 50-m.p.h. when the wreck occurred. The cause of the derailment was not immediately known.

CARS OVERTURN

About half of the derailed cars overturned, spilling their contents of grain, cantaloupes and other merchandise. Three cars carrying new autos remained upright. A half-mile of the railroad's east line was torn up.

The adjacent west line, which had been blocked by the spilled merchandise and overturned cars, was back in operation Friday night.

Railroad officials estimated it would take about two days to repair the damage to the east line. Trains were being re-routed on Penn Central tracks.

COL. WILLARD F. ROCKWELL HONORED

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and honor to attend the 83d annual meeting of the Trade Relations Council at the Mayflower Hotel, March 26, 1969.

Col. Willard F. Rockwell, chairman of the board, Rockwell Manufacturing Co., and honorary chairman, North American Rockwell Corp., was presented the Distinguished Service Award, "For Distinguished Service to American Business in Foreign Trade Policy."

I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the splendid introduction of Colonel Rockwell by Mr. George P. Cheney, Jr., counsel, government affairs, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Industries, Inc., and chairman of the 83d annual meeting and I commend to the attention of my colleagues Colonel Rockwell's timely and superb address:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY GEORGE P. CHENEY, JR.

Our next guest is the founder of two major U.S. manufacturing corporations. One is a leading producer of electronic and mechanical equipment and systems for measuring and controlling the flow of liquids, gases, and solid materials, and of power tools. The other is the world's largest producer of mechanical elements for vehicles, of industrial gears and power transmission devices, and of textile machinery.

Colonel Willard Frederick Rockwell is Chairman of the Board of the Rockwell Manufacturing Company, the first of these companies and the Honorary Chairman of North American Rockwell Corporation, with which his second company, the Rockwell Standard Company, merged in 1967 to form one of our Nation's largest corporations.

Colonel Rockwell is a pioneer in the automotive industry having invented many of the engineering improvements embodied in today's vehicles. Colonel Rockwell has served his Nation in many capacities. He was a specialist in the Motor Transport Division of the Army in World War I, and the Director of Production of the Maritime Commission in World War II, in which capacity he contributed to the recordbreaking production of ships required to support U.S. military operations overseas.

He was a member of the Executive Committee of the Munitions Board and acted as chairman of the Board during the Korean Emergency. He served as Deputy to Governor Stassen in the Mutual Security Agency in 1953, serving in Europe and in NATO until nominated Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of logistics by President Eisenhower.

Colonel Rockwell has been decorated by the Governments of Belgium, Brazil, Italy, and Venezuela. He has been honored by countless organizations for distinguished leadership in many areas of American life. He is a Fellow of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers. He is a director in a long list of manufacturing corporations, insurance companies, the former New York Central Railroad System, and has served as president or director of many trade associations.

Colonel Rockwell was one of twenty-one American industrialists chosen by Time, Inc., to make a trip to Moscow and visit political and military leaders in many European nations in 1963. His interests know no horizon. In 1965, he was a scientists observer on the recordmaking polar flight on which for the first time a single flight around the world by way of both the North and South Poles was achieved.

Colonel Rockwell has long served as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Trade Relations Council. His broad experience and service to our Nation in many capacities and his magnificent industrial leadership richly qualify him for the honor which we are privileged to present to him this evening.

REMARKS OF COL. WILLARD F. ROCKWELL

Thank you for your generous statement of my background, and for this handsome award. I am glad to be here.

The United States has a full agenda of momentous policy issues, some so urgent that it may seem strange for the perennial issue of foreign trade policy again to be competing for recognition. My experience in matters affecting the national security has given me strong interest in the related topic of foreign trade policy.

My companies, and I am sure the companies of every executive in this room, have important responsibilities in the mobilization preparedness to support our country's efforts in resisting aggression and meeting any emergency which threatens our national security. One cannot carry these responsibilities as the chief executive officer of a manufacturing corporation without being concerned about the impairment to those capabilities which can be caused by adverse foreign trade developments.

The Rockwell companies have 120 manufacturing plants in the United States and 81 in foreign countries. We have a major interest in the United States market, but we have also staked out a major claim to the foreign market through the establishment of plants operated by affiliates, subsidiaries, and licensees in every part of the free world. In the United States, our plants are producing goods which are classified in 25 major industries under the Standard Industrial Classification.

Reviewing the impact of foreign trade on these industries and on the Rockwell companies is quite an undertaking. Fortunately, the computer analysis of employment, output, and foreign trade by Standard Industrial Classifications which has been carried out by the Trade Relations Council makes such an analysis possible.

The study which the Council is releasing tomorrow at this annual meeting contains such data for 13 of the industry sectors in which we are active. In many of these, imports are insignificant and the United States is enjoying substantial and growing exports. In others, a once-favorable export experience is being turned around with declining exports and increasing imports. In a few, increasing imports dominate the foreign trade picture.

Examples of the latter category include steel springs, where imports have captured 11% of the domestic market; textile machinery, where the import penetration of the domestic market has jumped from 5% in 1958 to 18% in 1966; and private and commercial aircraft, where imports have now captured 11.5% of the domestic market.

Examples of the second category of industry in which we are involved, where a once-dominant export position is being turned around with a decline in the pace of the exports and a sharp increase in the pace of imports, include internal combustion engines other than those for motor vehicles, where imports have increased at ten times the rate of our exports and import penetration, which was less than 1% of the market just a few years ago, is now over 3% of the domestic market. In electrical measuring instruments, imports had risen steadily to claim 4.5% of the market in 1966, with a further increase in 1967. There has also been a great surge in the imports of electronic communications equipment in the past few years.

These specifics concerning imports, however, are not the major matter which concerns me. Our experience in overseas markets has made us very much aware of the fact that other nations in their own self-interests pursue a foreign economic policy which gives primary emphasis to fostering the strength of their domestic industries rather than the pursuit of free trade objectives regardless of the cost in jobs and investment at home.

It may interest you to know that the primary reason the Rockwell companies have established so many manufacturing plants abroad through subsidiaries and invested in other plants with affiliates, and licensed still other plants in situations where we have not taken a capital investment, is in recognition of the practical impossibility for U.S. exports to enter those markets on a sustained basis.

The Rockwell companies make in their product categories the best that the world has to offer in construction equipment, automotive parts, industrial control equipment, and production machinery. Our products are needed in every nation that is industrialized or seeking to become industrialized. Given equality of opportunity, we can compete with producers in any country.

But in the real world, equality of opportunity in the sense in which I use the term is not available. Other nations recognize that products of basic importance to the functioning of an industrial economy such as we manufacture are essential to their own economic well-being and their national security. They, therefore, encourage manufacture of these articles in their own countries through investment and tax incentives and through an affirmative policy for the regulation of imports consistent with the growth needs of their home industries.

As a practical matter, we learned that if we were to serve foreign markets with our products, we must establish foreign manufacturing plants inside of those markets rather than depend upon access through the practice by such countries of a liberal foreign trade policy.

The tragedy is that the art of propaganda has been used so effectively to make the United States feel ashamed when it considers reasonable means to regulate imports consistent with the interests of its own industries and their workers. If we did nothing more than to practice the type of policy which our companies have found to exist virtually everywhere else in the world, our Nation could not be fairly criticized. My business associates in other countries may publicly support their governments by viewing with alarm the rise of protectionism in America. But privately they express to me their puzzlement that the United States is so reluctant to act in her own interest in those cases where vital American industries are being badly damaged or even forced out of the country by an inundation of imports.

The cause of those industrialists who seek some realism by our Government in this area I have found to be grossly misrepresented. The very suggestion by some industries that the Government should impose quotas or adopt other means to bring the rapid rise of imports under some reasonable control seems to excite a barrage of criticism which is eagerly repeated by the public press in a fashion which demeans those industry executives who are attempting to protect the welfare of their employees and their shareholders.

The caliber of the men who have been honored here this evening and the many other spokesmen for reasonable import regulation in the steel, textile, footwear, and electronic industries should in itself command respect within Government circles for their point of view. The studies of the Trade Relations Council of the impact of foreign trade on manufacturing industries show that we have lost our favorable balance of trade in manufactured products, that we are suffering a net loss of employment due to the growing trade deficit in manufactured articles, and that many industries, highly labor intensive in the character of their manufacturing operations, have already suffered the penetration of their markets by imports to such a degree that action is required.

I should like to add my voice to those which have been raised here this evening urging the chief executives of American manufacturing corporations, regardless of their present circumstances in the foreign trade area, to join forces to secure from the Congress legislation which will at least provide the machinery to make it possible for seriously affected industries to secure some reasonable regulation of imports in the future. In my opinion, the long-range national security interests of our Nation require constructive action by the Government on these requests.

LETTER FROM CHARLES B. CHRISMAN, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE AGENTS, TO PRESIDENT NIXON

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE AGENTS, INC.,
New York, N.Y., February 27, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I feel a special urgency at this time to voice the very deep concern of our 36,000 member agencies and, I am sure, of hundreds of thousands of other agents throughout the country, about the increasing involvement of banks in the insurance industry through the holding company device.

This urgency has developed from the realization that certain persuasive forces within the banking industry are seeking to influence the passage of legislation which will aid them in this involvement.

We are deeply alarmed by some of the implications of this trend, not the least of which is that the purpose of a bank to extend credit could give it a forceful opportunity to coerce a borrower in placement of his insurance. This constrictive channeling of business cannot serve the best interests of the insurance-buying public nor of the insurance industry itself.

We have always attached great significance to the Congressional mandate of 1916, wherein national banks were restricted to the sale of insurance only in the small communities of up to 5,000 population. This attitude of an earlier Congress was reemphasized by the Congress in 1958 and as recently as 1967–68 was held by the courts to be valid.

We who provide our experience and knowledge of the market, as well as our finances, to meet the personal and commercial needs for security are truly frightened by the prospect of banks eliminating competition in the sale of insurance. Most particularly are we concerned about the entrance of bank conglomerates and congenerics into the business of insurance.

All of us recognize the firm resolve of your office and of your Administration to promulgate meaningful legislation in the public interest. The public press has voiced your awareness of the problems in point and we applaud and rely upon your dedication to grasp the full and complete impact of this most important economic development in the lives of our people. Our association, therefore, requests only an opportunity to offer its views as an aid toward the right decision.

The officials and representatives of independent insurance agents are ready to submit their views, opinions and knowledge to any and all governmental agencies and legislative committees before final action is taken on legislation affecting this involvement of the banking industry in insurance.

Such thorough airing of the issues involved will, I know, be in the best interest of the public whose interest we all serve.

Respectfully,
CHARLES B. CHRISMAN,
President.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

SPEECH OF

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March, 31, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, Americans throughout the Nation and free people the world over join together in mourning the passing of a great American, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

His was a full and fruitful life dedicated to the services of his country as Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces when the drums of war sounded in World War II, and later as a leader for peace as Chief Executive of our Nation. He was blessed with an inherent ability to unite people and infuse in them the spirit of mutual assistance and collective action under the most trying circumstances.

He had about him a very sincere and genuine love for his fellow man and though he walked with kings, he never lost the common touch. It was this common touch that endeared him to his fellow Americans. This faith, trust, respect, and admiration accorded him by the American people was a reflection of the deep love and respect he had for his country.

His brilliant and illustrious career has come to a close. A Nation grieves, the world mourns, and people of all nations join together in final tribute to Dwight David Eisenhower; general, President, statesman, patriot, and above all, a most remarkable human being.

NILS V. "SWEDE" NELSON AWARD DINNER, GRIDIRON CLUB OF BOSTON

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Nils V. "Swede" Nelson Award for sportsmanship is one of the outstanding awards of its kind in the Nation.

In fact, there is not another athletic award precisely like it, since it stresses character qualities, as emphasized by exceptional, instinctive reactions of football players, having to do with conduct on the gridiron, personal judgments, and attitudes toward competitors in the game.

This year's Nelson Award was presented by the superb, extraordinary "Swede" Nelson himself, at a largely attended, enthusiastic reception and dinner marking the award.

As I indicated, the award is not given for performance on the gridiron alone, but, commendably, also for posture, talent, achievement, and leadership, not necessarily totally associated with the playing of the game itself.

The famous recipients, without exception, are outstanding football players, inspiring leaders—sterling young Americans, representing the very best of their generation.

The 23 young men who have received this award since it was originated, in most instances, have combined outstanding football ability, with scholarship, curricular distinction, concern for their fellow athletes and humankind, and deep devotion to the tenets of equality, fairness, and justice for all that are at the very heart and essence of our American society, even though they are not always observed.

Football players are known for their skills, their gameness, quick thinking, courage, and unfaltering spirit. They follow the code that any game worth playing is worth winning, that they must never give up, that they must work as a team, and that they must demonstrate loyalty and consideration for their fellow players, in turn, for their friends, their commitments, and, above all, they must always play the game fairly, honorably, and with due regard for the rules and for others.

To men schooled in the football code of sportsmanship exemplifying the virtures, the loyalties, the civic spirit, the patriotism, the sense of justice, and love of all their fellow men, it follows logically that the boys selected for this award are, without exception, boys who reflect and adhere, not only to an athletic code, but to a code of human relations and social concern for others that we need more of in our society.

When the Boston Gridiron Club in its wisdom founded the Nelson Award, they made a great enduring contribution to football and athletics, but it made a much greater one to our young men, and to the country, because it furnished example, encouragement, inspiration, and recognition for all boys who strive in athletic contests to hold to highest standards of conduct. This is something that is of inestimable benefit to the Nation.

Even a casual look at the long career of "Swede" Nelson and his outstanding service to football, education, business, community relations, human brotherhood, and the greater togetherness of people of every race, rank, class, and creed, demonstrates the great worth and value of this cherished award.

To emulate the standards and sportsmanship of such a great American as "Swede" Nelson is indeed a lofty goal for any young athlete, young scholar or young man, whatever his calling.

The most recent Nelson Award was conferred upon a young man who played a leading role in what was perhaps the greatest 42 seconds in football history, Capt. Victor E. Gatto, of Harvard.

For it was in the last 42 seconds that he and his teammates in the 1968 Harvard-Yale game scored 18 points to tie the score in an unforgettable and, doubtless, an unprecedented achievement of its kind.

Great as that is, it is only one of the many striking incidents that marked the brilliant football and college career of this fine, outstanding young American from Harvard, Vic Gatto.

As the Boston sportswriters and Baron Pittenger, director of sports information at Harvard, agree, "the name of Vic Gatto will be indelibly transcribed on Harvard's athletic records."

Ranking second only to the legendary Charlie Brickley, the greatest of all dropkickers, he scored 120 points in three years as Harvard's backfield ace. He excelled also as a passer, pass receiver, and as a punt return and a kick return specialist.

As his famous, beloved trainer, Jack Fadden, says: "Some players perform with injuries; Gatto played against them; he can ride against pain and overcome it."

As the writers point out, it is in the realm of these character qualities defying measurement that Gatto's impact is the greatest, his sportsmanship instinctive, and his leadership ability truly inspirational.

His concern for the health, welfare, and comfort of the players both on and off the playing field, his sterling leadership in numerous organizations working to improve the overall welfare of the student body, the university, and the community, his unselfish work with deprived youngsters, most of them black, as well as disadvantaged youth—all these attest to the fine qualities of this wonderful young man.

As usual, it remained for the incomparable "Swede" Nelson, peerless raconteur, wit, and humanitarian, to put the frosting on the cake. Nelson said:

> Vic may only measure 5 ft, 6 in. in height, but on the football field, he is nine feet tall, and in life he will be a giant.

I take great pleasure, pride, and honor in heartily congratulating Vic Gatto, and his devoted family and Coach John Yovicsin and staff, and Harvard College, upon the award of this highly merited, outstanding Nelson Award to Vic Gatto.

It would be difficult to find words that would adequately express our admiration for this fine young man, inspiring leader, and promising young American.

The illustrious Nelson Award Committee, comprised of highly gifted experts and leaders, in making the award to Vic Gatto, have done themselves proud, because he is in the highest traditions of the precious Nelson Award and American college football.

We are confident that purposeful, dynamic, committed Americans like young Vic Gatto, moved by loyalty to American institutions that gave them their chance, devoted to every good cause for the people will provide the leadership, dedication, and courage we need to preserve our freedoms and solve the challenging problems of today and tomorrow.

Meanwhile, it is for the rest of us, inspired by the unquenchable spirit, talents and bright promise of the leaders of this young generation, to confirm our determination that this country and its freedoms shall survive every test.

Under unanimous consent I include background information about the award and the remarks of "Swede" Nelson delivered at the 23d annual Nelson Award dinner:

"SWEDE" NELSON SPORTSMANSHIP AWARD DINNER, GRIDIRON CLUB

President Jack Daly—reverend clergy—guest of honor—Vic Gatto—your lovely mother—beautiful bride—dad and all the wonderful family—all our distinguished head table guests—beautiful ladies—members of our own Gridiron Club family. The Harvard senior football players—the Harvard Club—the incomparable Harvard Band—and all the Phi Beta Kappers in double-breasted coats.

I am proud to extend to you nice folks the warm Gridiron Club welcome.

This award could truly be named for many men in this room. I want to share this 23rd national award with all of you—made possible—by my life long friends—the incomparable Gridiron Club—my family join me in our sincere thanks.

It is so pleasant to have all the clergy with us—my life long great friend—Bishop Minihan—Rabbi Shubow—Reverend Rankin. Their contribution was kindly, significant and wonderful.

In the interest of genuine sincerity and time—I want to thank these distinguished speakers—all of whom were great—and everyone who helped in this dinner honoring this fine young Harvard captain—Victor Emanuel Gatto.

Thanks must include Kenny O'Donnell—President Jack Daly—our toastmaster Charles Fitzgerald—John Carver—John Kelleher—Joseph Blumsack—Murray Lewis—Tom Lynch—John Cavanagh—and Arthur Barry.

Thanks to Bob Coyne—the famous cartoonist—all the newspaper men, radio and television. Thanks to everyone who helped.

To all the Gridiron Club family—our appreciative thanks are warm and many.

We will forever miss all our immortal Gridiron Club members and we welcome many of their devoted families, who are with us tonight.

All of our six grandchildren are here—together with my lovely Esther—my great son-in-law George Red Hill and sweet Natalie.

If the Hill family gets any larger—next year I'll be sitting on the fire escape—on the Boylston Street side.

Tonight we happily honor Vic Gatto—and in honoring him—we honor one of the best—he is the 23rd name to be added to this distinguished list of American athletes—great—not alone for football ability—but great for the dedication and devotion to all that is decent and dignified in our system of sports.

He is a symbol of service and sacrifice and tonight his unselfishness is gratefully recognized and rewarded.

His command presence—his concern for the welfare, health, and comfort of players both on and off the field—his kindly interest in the sick and unfortunate—Vic, at times injury ridden—he could rise above pain and still lead with his inspirational example—this young man is very real and genuine.

Moreover—off the field—he always had time to help the young folks with student involvement in the urban crisis.

It was a complete success—you didn't have to measure the height of these youngsters on the wall—they had started to grow up straight.

We all know of his records—an excellent captain and a brilliant half back he will live forever in Harvard history and he belongs with our football greats.

This outpouring of friends clearly indicates—both by right—and example—that Vic is one of Harvard's most highly respected sons.

He is truly representative of his loving parents and lovely bride—and he too has had the inspirational example of extraordinary men—gifted John Jovicsen—a truly wonderful coach—and his able staff—athletic director Dolph Samborsky—one of the outstanding athletic directors in this country—leads the whole successful Harvard system—Jack Fadden—one of America's greatest trainers who has a tremendous understanding of all athletes—thanks to distinguished Harvard University—all Vic Gatto's terrific teammates.

Our local college teams had fine seasons—Boston College—Tufts—Northeastern and Boston University—all this made us happy.

Harvard had an undefeated season—their quarterback was always great—their defense and offense was highly developed—and their leadership was also extraordinary—it produced winners.

The sixteen points in 42 seconds will always linger in my memory—Harvard played like Charleston defending Bunker Hill from the British—and while I couldn't get on my feet as fast as my wonderful teammate Phil Philbin—he kept me fully informed—he said—Swede—we are going to take it all—Gatto has just scored—and 25,000 Harvard rooters joyfully swarmed on the field—sang Fair Harvard—and half of them knew the words.

Vic—you are a complete success as a human being and you never took a backward step. Vic may only measure 5'6"—but on the football field he is nine feet tall—and in life he will be a giant.

Distinguished Harvard demands the best of her selected sons.

This son in giving his brilliant honest best—receives the respect of Harvard University—her great alumni—the entire student body—and community—as he now marches in the long crimson line of great men.

Vic Gatto—you are a credit to your wonderful family—your great coach and your fine teammates—your dedication is clearly told in these pages and to paraphrase from one of the greatest and beloved Americans of all—the late President—John F. Kennedy—it was not what Harvard could do for you—it is what you could do for Harvard.

I am proud to present to you the Gridiron Club trophy—signifying that the Gridiron Club considers you one of the greatest sportsmen of them all—ladies and gentlemen—Vic Gatto.

THE AWARD

"The Nils V. Nelson Award for Sportsmanship" is presented annually by the Gridiron Club of Boston on a basis of the following requirements:

"To the player who, by his conduct on or off the gridiron, demonstrates a high esteem for the football code and exemplifies sportsmanship to an outstanding degree."

In selecting a committee to decide the winner of the "Nelson Award" great emphasis is placed on the knowledge and experience of its members with respect to the American game of football over the years. Numbered among our committee this year are men who have played in both college and professional ranks. Others are presently engaged in collegiate or professional officiating, coaching and physical education pursuits at the college level. The serious manner in which all nominations are studied, combined with the wealth of experience possessed by the individual members of the committee, insures a selection which may readily be accepted as the best.

The Nelson Award for Sportsmanship has aroused the interest of leaders in the World of Sports throughout the entire nation. Nominations for the Award have been received from every state in the Union, having been contributed by college coaches, sports writers, radio announcers and others. This widespread source of information and the enthusiasm expressed by the contributors points to the Nelson Trophy as being firmly established as one of the nation's outstanding football awards.

We of the Gridiron Club of Boston are confident that the objectives of the Award will ever serve as an inspiration for all that is praiseworthy and good wherever the game of football is played.

THE COMMITTEE.

COMMITTEES—TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL DINNER, THE NELSON AWARD FOR SPORTSMANSHIP

John J. Daly, *President*.
John F. Kelleher, *General Chairman*.
John J. Cavanagh, *Treasurer*.
Joseph Blumsack, *Secretary*.
Charles S. FitzGerald, *Toastmaster*.

AWARD COMMITTEE

Arthur J. Barry, *Chairman*, John J. Carver, William I. Cloney, John J. Daly, D. Leo Daley, Mark H. Devlin, John J. Donahue, Harry Downes, Clarence E. Dussault, Charles S. FitzGerald, E. A. Flumere.

Andrew Gaffey, John L. Heaphy, George H. Hill, Robert W. Hotin, John F. Kelleher, LeRoy J. Kelley, Herbert M. Kopf, Murray Lewis, Thomas E. Lynch, Jr., Gerald S. Maloney, Robert McCabe, Joseph McKenney, Thomas H. McNamara, William H. Ohrenberger, David J. Lucey, John Pesky, William A. Regan, Robert Whelan, Joseph Zapustas.

DINNER COMMITTEE

Co-chairmen: Dr. Francis X. Maguire, Joseph Blumsack, John Bane.

PUBLICITY COMMITTEE

Murray Lewis, *Chairman*, John Ahern, Timothy J. Horgan, Joseph J. Shortall.

RECEPTION COMMITTEE

Co-Chairmen: John S. Keohane, Charles Meirick, George Ellison, Edward J. McCarthy, Richard E. Blumsack.

John J. Carver, *Program Coordinator*.

EULOGY TO DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, many words have been spoken in honor of Dwight David Eisenhower, but few of us will ever realize how much we asked of him as a man. We should indeed mourn his passing but also be grateful for his life as an American. He rose through the ranks of the service and led us through a world crisis as Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Europe in World War II. We turned to him again and asked for his leadership as President of the United States. His great deeds and efforts toward the fight for peace in his capacity as both Commander and President will long be remembered.

"Ike" will not merely be a figure for future generations to recall as just the 34th President of the United States; he was a part of the history of our Nation. Throughout the world he gained lasting friendships for America as was demonstrated by worldwide leaders attending his funeral services.

In his retired life "Ike" was referred to as the "father image." Many leaders and politicians turned to him for his advice and wisdom. His unique leadership qualities assisted in uniting clashing political views, and he was loved and respected by all. His warmth and sincerity can only be measured by those who knew him personally; but Americans at home will always be indebted to him for his contributions as a great leader.

WHAT ABOUT A DIPLOMACY OF EXTRICATION?

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, at present, a military solution to the Vietnamese war seems to remain prevalent in the thoughts of the administration. We are bent upon preventing formation of a coalition government in which the NLF would have a role. Recent reports indicate that they are not yet defeated, nor does military victory seem imminent. Our generals have, to put it kindly, misjudged realities of the military situation. Nor are they likely to be more accurate in future, for that would require admission of failure. Therefore, the military solution is unworkable and is not a direct road to an end to American involvement there.

We must allow the NLF a role in the

regime, and show we mean this by some type of military withdrawal, even if it is a token one. This and only this will serve notice upon military rulers in Saigon that they must act to effect meaningful changes in the situation. By this act, we would pave the way for actual discussions between all Vietnamese factions involved. The only route to a meaningful settlement lies in this direction. We cannot and should not seek to impose a solution. It would not be viable, for it would not last beyond a few months after our military presence there ceased.

Today jails of South Vietnam bulge with critics of the military regime. These people may or may not be anti-Communists, yet we have been a party to their imprisonment by the military regime.

From all elements a meaningful and broad coalition government could be constructed. Then a resultful dialog could begin. Yet, as long as we show no sign of withdrawing soldiers and allow jails to fill without protest, the Saigon generals will feel they do not have to compromise. One result will be a prolongation of war, further fragmentation of Vietnamese society, and greater eventual power for the Communists.

Therefore, we require a new type of diplomacy—that aimed at extrication, not military triumph. This would require candor on the part of the administration. Why does Government not have a little more faith in the maturity of the American people? Winston Churchill began one of his most memorable addresses to the people of Britain by stating:

> The news from France tonight is very bad.

Britain prevailed and her people triumphed in part because of honesty.

Following such truthfulness and an avowed abandonment of the diplomacy of military triumph, the administration could follow a policy aimed at one goal—extrication and disengagement. Instantly the Saigon military would note that the game was up, ease inner terror, allow some opposition elements freedom, and governmental participation and significant discussions would commence. A meaningful NLF role would guarantee honest talks between all sides, and, without a sense of outside imposition of a settlement, progress should be meaningful.

The major requirement is a forthright statement of a goal of disengagement and extrication by the United States. Only such a policy would serve notice on the Saigon generals that the military game is up, and the American soldiers will soon be coming home.

THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION'S YOUTH ACCOMPLISHMENT PROGRAM

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to be a member of the Federal Bar Association, an association of lawyers who are or were employed by the Federal Government.

One of the association's most ambitious and worthwhile projects is the work of its law observance committee, which is engaged in a year-round program of promoting respect for the law.

Among the variety of approaches the law observance committee believes that respect for the law is best learned when one is young. To implement this view, the committee operates a youth accomplishment program.

This program has been tried in various parts of the country and has been noticeably successful in my own home city of Philadelphia. One of the reasons for the program's success has been the vigor and dedication of a fellow Philadelphian, Harry D. Shargel, who is national chairman of the Federal Bar Association's Law Observance Committee.

I would like to include in the RECORD a recent talk given by Mr. Shargel to the Philadelphia Board of Education which explains how the youth accomplishment program works in my city:

> Youth Accomplishment is designed to direct the energies of youth into constructive channels and to instill in them a sense of civic responsibility. We take into consideration the fact that outstanding children can usually find means of securing recognition, whereas the average child or the retiring child goes unrecognized and unrewarded and is therefore susceptible to seeking recognition in anti-social activity. We say to the children: "Each of you has ability which you should develop. It doesn't matter whether or not you are better than your colleagues. What does matter is that you are doing your best with the ability you have. Do your best in a project of your own choosing and we will reward you." The quality of the result is measured, not competitively, but against the child's own best effort.
>
> The first reward is a certificate evidencing the fact that he has done his best in his own project. Other rewards based on chance selection rather than competitive accomplishment are trips to places of interest which develop respect for our government and the law. The major trip is a day in Washington. Chartered buses take the children to Congress where they meet Congressmen from this area, have lunch in the Congressional cafeteria, visit the House and Senate, get a behind the scenes tour of the Supreme Court and the F.B.I., meet high officials of the Department of Justice and then have dinner on the way home.
>
> The Youth Accomplishment Program is not a separate youth activity but rather a tool made available to existing youth serving organizations to help them to accomplish their own objectives in serving youth.
>
> This program has been adopted by District One of the Philadelphia Public Schools, under the leadership of Dr. Marechal-Neil E. Young. Each year since 1966 about 10,000 students in 14 schools have been involved in the project, with about 2,000 students completing projects under the guidance of about 300 teachers. Dedicated teachers and principals have created a special lesson guide for teachers related to social studies in order to explain the place of the child in society, the rule of law and the law enforcement process. They have stimulated discussions, debates, and essays. Students have also been encouraged to utilize their capabilities in such diverse fields as arts and crafts, public speaking, literature, poetry, and public service. Of special interest is a project of the Cary School, which developed a project in conjunction with a home for the aged (the Stephen Smith Home) where the boys helped spruce up the Home and the girls acted in a capacity similar to the candy stripers. In addition, they invited the aged to their school, engaged in discussions with them, and repaired their clothes. They learned to work and were offered jobs. The Catto School developed programs involving arts and crafts and discussion groups. At another school, the Holmes School, pupils, under the guidance of their teachers, set up panels to discuss gangs and arranged discussions on this subject in a church, in the presence of students, parents, and school and police officials.
>
> Last May, some of the visible products of the children were exhibited at the Civic Center Museum. Children also read and spoke about their projects which could not otherwise be exhibited. Of great importance was the fact that the parents, too, were stimulated to take an interest in the children's activities and to take pride in their accomplishments. All this was made possible by the dedicated efforts of Dr. Young and her colleagues.
>
> One important aspect of this program is that it has required no additional expenditure of public funds. It is a community project supported by lawyers, the Philadelphia police and other law enforcement officials, service organizations, labor, and business. Norris Harzenstein and other volunteers of the F.B.I., the U.S. Attorney's Office, and other Federal agencies have devoted their own time and efforts to provide the necessary tools and promote the community interest to make this possible. We have had support from various sources, but I want to especially mention the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL–CIO, which has participated most generously. James Gassaway of Strawbridge & Clothier administered the program in its formative stages. The Sears Roebuck Foundation and service organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Kiwanis, Optimists, Boosters and others have provided funds, as have Atlantic-Richfield, Abbotts, and other business firms. General Electric Re-Entry Systems, Drexel Institute, and the West Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce are participating in planning for the future.
>
> The Curriculum Office of the Board of Education through the former Community Relations Coordinator, Mr. Byron Lukens, has given excellent cooperation. Norris Harzenstein is now working to expand the program into other school districts. We are happy that the school officials have recognized the value of the program and desire to expand it. We will endeavor to marshall the resources of the community to provide the wherewithal to make the project work. I want you and everybody else to know that in all our dealings with the superintendents, principals, teachers, and staff of the Philadelphia School System we have always been impressed with their ability and their dedication to the best interests of the pupils.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues and all Americans in the expression of my sorrow and heartfelt sympathy on the death of a truly great American—Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower will be remembered by all as a man of high integrity, a man of great determination and, most of all, a man of such loyalty and patriotism that he will stand out for centuries to come as one of the greatest of American patriots.

We who have been fortunate enough to have lived in his lifetime will not forget this great general, who epitomized the American ideal of a devoted public servant. We will also remember him as our Chief Executive—and we will look back in years to come on his earnest devotion and loyalty during his tenure of office which will in no way diminish as time goes by.

We have indeed lost a great American, but we can proudly recall his name and the principles he represented with deep and everlasting pride.

America is sadder today—but we should also give thanks that we were fortunate to have had Dwight David Eisenhower in our midst—for he now "belongs to the ages."

Although mere words at such a time are grossly inadequate, I believe the following sensitive and expressive editorial and accompanying articles from the Savannah Morning News come close to perfection in describing the man we affectionately thought of as "Ike":

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News, Mar. 29, 1969]

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Death came finally for the General. He had suffered too long, bedridden for months at Walter Reed Hospital, victim of at least seven heart attacks in less than 15 years. One marveled at his endurance.

Dwight David Eisenhower, much loved, reflected an image which was comprehended by every American, and yet the whole man seems to be beyond our understanding.

We liked Ike. So did millions of his countrymen who twice elected him to the nation's highest office by an overwhelming number of votes. As Washington, Jackson, Grant—he, too, had won his honors on the battlefield and did not need the presidency for his page in history. He smiled, and that was all that was needed, and in a certain era it was all that most of us wanted. We trusted him. There were ignominious embarrassments during his second term and the country despaired, but if the postwar Republicans had not fought so hard for the 22nd amendment, his tenure of office might have equalled Franklin D. Roosevelt's.

He had his critics. Douglas MacArthur, his former chief, disparaged his abilities and saw him first as an equal in Europe and later as a rival for the Republican nomination. He was a man of the people, and this, of course, earned him the enmity of intellectuals.

But the people liked Ike. If the public came closer to having a common love for a President, without the opposing hatred which also was directed toward FDR, it was with this man they entrusted it. Lyndon Johnson was also a man of the people, but his mistakes were never forgiven. For the most part, Mr. Eisenhower's were. If he, unlike Washington, was not first in the hearts of his countrymen, he was close by, particularly to a generation which yearned for a proud America.

His success which led him to the highest office has been waved aside by some as political charm first recognized while he was an Army officer. There were intricate maneuverings by politicians on all sides of the Allied cause during World War II. Charles de Gaulle wanted immediate action to recover France from the Nazis. Winston Churchill, wary of a second front which would aid the Russians, and mindful that a premature invasion might be defeated and thus injure British morale, differed with Gen. George C. Marshall who also preferred a cross-Channel invasion early in the war. Mr. Churchill wanted instead to move through the "soft underbelly of Europe." A compromise resulted, but it also led to Gen. Eisenhower being named commander in chief of Allied forces. The General, whom many were to call apolitical later on, led this often haggling Allied army to victory.

If he served also as a mediator during the war, bringing opponents around and making true allies of the Allies, he is still best remembered as the President. And it is this which poses the problem of what the man was really like.

It was something basically American in his makeup, a certain honor which most of us yearn to see in the leaders of our country. It was a quality rare enough to cause us to forgive his errors, his stumblings in foreign affairs because many of us still think we have no business being in such things and that the rest of the world is out to despoil us. He was native American who made good. He was, to Americans, "There but for the grace of God go I—but I'm rather pleased that it's he."

We admired his honesty. Through his administration, Mr. Eisenhower seemed above politics rather than incapable of understanding. He was a man grasping at the straws of peace, at a time when the Communists wanted anything else but. If he had any political coloration, it was that of a moderate, unwilling to turn the clock back and yet steady enough to sound warnings about government plunging into areas previously unknown.

This was how many saw him. Whether he was always thus, or whether he became this, matters little. Perhaps for the first and only time a contemporary politician and his image were true to each other.

Mr. Eisenhower, in truth, represented America as much as the Stars and Stripes in his time. It is a decency, a reverence in fact, that finds constant belittlement today. It is feared that he may one day represent in the minds of many something of a vital cog in the machinery of war, just as some today take the flag to represent all that is deplorable about this country rather than all that is represented as the hope of free men. It is a vile twisting of history to meet ideologies that are currently in fashion, and the damage is never completely repaired.

But today, in our own hearts, the man stands tall. The critics are stilled. The country has halted momentarily, to go forward again within a few days. What Dwight Eisenhower bequeathed us was his unblemished honor, and we must protect it. It is the key to what we continuously reach for, and to lose it, to lose him entirely, is to open the door to an existence which we have long fought against, which is the obituary of the American nation.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News-Evening Press, Mar. 30, 1969]

IKE'S EXAMPLE: WILLINGNESS TO LISTEN: A STERLING QUALITY

(By Tom Coffey)

A few months back when General Eisenhower was fighting (and for the moment winning) one of his battles to stay alive, I wrote a column about Ike's smile, his strong point.

We alluded to that smile in yesterday's beautiful editorial tribute, written by Dave Hardin—"He smiled, and that was all that was needed, and in a certain era it was all that most of us wanted."

But the General was not one who made his way just by smiling. There was more to the man than his countenance.

So many have attempted to fathom Dwight Eisenhower. We have read reams about his organizational ability, his perception of the big picture, how he could rise above politics, etc., etc.

But I think one who was close to the General summed it up best of all. "His willingness to listen" was the Eisenhower quality cited by Maj. Gen. Henry B. Sayler, who lives here in retirement, during an interview he granted me Friday afternoon, about an hour after General Eisenhower had died.

General Sayler was in the famous West Point Class of 1915, eighty per cent of whom became generals. Eisenhower, Bradley, names like that, General Sayler became Eisenhower's ordnance chief in Europe. He passed the ammunition in the biggest single fight the nation ever waged.

There's something almost of a virtue in a willingness to listen. General Sayler said this was why Eisenhower was a great organizer, why he could bring differing factions together. He listened to what they had to say, then made his decisions based upon what he had heard.

Don't all of us wish that we could? Aren't so many of us so headstrong, so pre-conceived in our notions that we fail to listen?

I couldn't help noting a similarity between what General Sayler said about his former chief and what President Nixon said in his inaugural speech.

The President said that for too long we have been shouting. He exhorted us to listen—to one another, and to learn, each from the other.

I am certain now that President Nixon listened to his former boss—and learned.

It might well be that if Nixon sensed Eisenhower's willingness to listen, and identified it as a sterling quality, it was the most important single piece of the basic training that our present President received during his eight years as Vice President under Eisenhower.

Surely it was the most important piece of advice that he could give to the nation when he took office.

I pass this along, and note the similarity aforementioned, merely through circumstance of General Eisenhower's death and my acquaintance with a Savannahian who knew him better than a great many people did.

But I consider it highly significant, not only in offering a keener insight into Dwight Eisenhower but its sobering impact as an example by which we can profit.

Coincidentally, this column makes print at the beginning of Holy Week, a period when solemnity dictates, and four days before Passover, which involves the historical ideal of freedom.

We can solemnly contemplate the idea of listening.

It might enhance our freedom.

[From the Savannah Morning News, Mar. 29, 1969]

B-17 CREW RECALLS IKE

(By William H. Whitten)

For two Savannahians the news of former President Eisenhower's death Friday came home much more personally than perhaps for the millions to whom "Ike" was mostly a public figure.

To V. J. Romagosa and William G. Nelson the news brought memories of many hours of close association with Eisenhower as members of the crew of his World War II Flying Fortress plane.

Both men described their former commander as one of the finest officers and nicest men with whom they had ever served.

MYSTERY ASSIGNMENT

Nelson, a flight engineer who served with Eisenhower for 14 months, recalled Friday the day in 1942 when he learned he was assigned to the Allied commander's crew.

"I thought I was coming home," he said. "We had taken off from England with sealed orders not be opened until we were airborne. Heading into Gibraltar I learned instead I was assigned to Ike's crew with headquarters in Algiers.

"I was with him during the North Africa

campaign and the landings in Italy. At the Italian surrender some newsreel cameramen photographed all of us together but I didn't know it until my wife saw the newsreel at the Lucas Theatre and recognized me," he said.

ROMAGOSA CALLED IN

It was through the action of Nelson that Romagosa was assigned to the crew.

"We needed an expert mechanic because of all the flying he had to do so we got Romagosa on the team. I had never met him before the war," Nelson said.

"I sort of fell into the job," Romagosa recalls. "I flew about 500 hours with Gen. Eisenhower over 18 months. When the general went back to England he chose a B-25 to fly in, that became the plane that took him first to the battle in Normandy.

"The general spent most of his time at the rear of the plane. There he would work on plans and maps. To relax, he'd read wild west stories, which I understand he enjoyed a lot."

WELL-PROTECTED GENERAL

Asked about protection for Ike and the crew, Romagosa said, "our plane was always well escorted. We had gunners in the crew while in Africa but not after that. We were never bothered by Jerry (German) fighters. They wouldn't have had a chance anyway," he said.

Nelson, however, remembers at least one incident where there was immediate danger.

"It was in Africa," he said. "The officers had left the plane and gone off in three staff cars. We saw two cars returning and Eisenhower came aboard and told me to get that plane up in a hurry—the Germans were coming.

"Sure enough, just after we took off the field was bombed."

There was more to the crew's responsibilities than maintaining the plane, Nelson recalled Friday.

EMERGENCY RECALLED

"We were on our way to the Casablanca Conference," he said, to meet President Roosevelt when a propeller shaft broke. We were afraid the engine would catch fire (it didn't) so I put a safety harness on the general. I remember him saying, 'I hope I don't have to use this thing.' I told him I hoped he didn't have to either."

Being that close to the Supreme Allied Commander meant that most of the top-ranking generals of the war were seen close-up by these men. One of the most remarkable was "Blood and Guts"—Gen. George Patton, tank commander, innovator, egotist and always controversial.

"When the Germans started getting too close Eisenhower would say 'Sergeant, bring me my steel helmet.' Patton fined men $25 if he caught them without their protective helmet.

"When I didn't have mine on Eisenhower would remind me that Patton wasn't above fining a member of the commander's crew."

IKE GOT MEDAL

This was during the dark days of the war when the outcome was still in doubt. As victories came and D-Day moved closer to a reality Sgt. Romagosa's mother in Savannah attended a nine-day Solemn Novena for Peace and about a week before the invasion of France sent a letter and Miraculous Medal to Eisenhower. His personal reply came on the 29th of May, seven days before the Allies swarmed into France.

After the war, when Eisenhower began visiting Augusta to play golf and later as President, Nelson and Romagosa had an open invitation to see Ike.

"We did see him one time," Nelson said, "and spent about three hours with him but he was so busy as President that we did not want to bother him."

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, America and the world lost a great leader, a great man, in the death of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. His name will live in history as the architect of a great crusade for freedom, an apostle of peace. He was universally loved. He was respected alike by friend and foe.

The life of General Eisenhower is an inspiration to all. Born of poor, humble parents, he proved again to what heights a man can rise on his own strength of character, hard work, ambition, and perseverance.

For his efforts as a world military leader, educator, an outstanding President, and elder statesman, he added beyond words to the strength of America and the free world.

It was my very great fortune to meet and visit with this extraordinary citizen. It was a privilege I will never forget.

His valiant fight against the ravages of ill health typified his courage and tenacity. His death brings an end to the "Eisenhower era."

The entire world is saddened by his passing.

My prayers and sympathy go to his bereaved family.

THREE MARYLAND GI'S DIE IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Benjamin J. Rawlings, Sp4c. William E. Price, and Pfc. William J. Schaaf, three fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memories by including the following article in the RECORD:

THREE MARYLAND GI'S DIE IN VIETNAM—B. J. RAWLINGS, W. E. PRICE, W. J. SCHAAF ARE KILLED

Three more Maryland Army men have been killed in action in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

The dead are:

Spec. 4 Benjamin J. Rawlings, 22, of Upper Marlboro, who was killed by enemy bullets March 4 while he was trying to extinguish a fire near Saigon.

Spec. 4 William E. Price, 22, of East Pines, in Prince Georges County, who was killed February 24 in an enemy attack on Pleiku.

Pfc. William J. Schaaf, 20, of 4637 Hazelwood avenue, who was fatally wounded February 27 in an enemy ambush in the Central Highland.

Specialists Rawlings and Price had served more than a year in Vietnam and were scheduled to return home when they were killed.

Specialist Rawlings was thinking of buying a house and wanted to become a sheet metal worker when he received his discharge in September, his wife said yesterday.

Mrs. Linda L. Gardiner Rawlings said their married life consisted of a two-week honeymoon. When asked if her husband had any hobbies, she said: "I guess I never had a chance to find out."

NEVER SAW SON

He had never seen his baby son, Benjamin.

Born in Upper Marlboro, Mr. Rawlings attended Frederick Sasscer Senior-Junior High School and worked on his uncle's tobacco farm before enlisting in the Army.

Besides his wife and son, he is survived by his mother, Mrs. Blanche Richards Rawlings, of Upper Marlboro; a sister, Mrs. Ann Turner, of Waldorf and his maternal grandmother, Mrs. Florence D. Richards, of Upper Marlboro.

Specialist Price, whose regular one-year tour of Vietnam duty was to have expired in February, was a tank driver with the 40th Infantry Division, his brother said yesterday.

A motorcycle enthusiast, Mr. Price enjoyed riding his motorcycle on hill climbs. He was a member of St. Bernard's Catholic Church in Riverdale, where a requiem mass for him will be offered tomorrow at 10 A.M.

Beside his brother, he leaves his father Clyde K. Price, and his mother, Mrs. Mildred J. Kotur Price.

Private Schaaf had been in Vietnam about five months when he was fatally wounded while on patrol in the Central Highlands.

In a letter written to his parents two days before the ambush, he said he was in good spirits because of the lack of enemy activity, his aunt said yesterday.

He died March 3, a week after being wounded.

He is survived by his father, Elmer L. Schaaf and his mother, Sophia Ustaszewski; a brother, David J. Schaaf, of Baltimore, and his paternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. William J. Schaaf, of Baltimore.

THOUSANDS IN HONOR TO ATTUCKS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on March 30, as Representative of the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey, to observe and participate in the Crispus Attucks Day festivities in Newark.

In this day and age when the battle for freedom from tyranny and oppression still marks our world, it is well to recall our first Negro hero, Crispus Attucks, and his role in our struggle for freedom from English tyranny during colonial times. For Crispus Attucks was the first to lose his life during the Boston Massacre in 1770. It was this courageous act that places him among the great patriots of American history.

Many historians believe that Crispus Attucks was born into slavery in Framingham, Mass., and later ran away to become a seaman on a whaling vessel. It was as a seaman that Crispus Attucks was swept into the tides of the colonial struggle for independence from England.

In the middle of the 18th century, the American colonies in effect existed solely for the purpose of profits for England. Consequently, taxes were heavily levied on all colonial products. British troops were sent to enforce tax regulations and the colonists were required to support the royal troops.

Unrest marked the Colonies. Taxation without representation and the presence of the Crown's troops enraged the colonists. Finally, in 1770, Samuel Adams, prominent leader of the movement to free the Colonies from British tyranny, called upon the dockworkers and seamen of Boston to demonstrate against the English troops guarding the customs commissioners. Crispus Attucks responded to Adams' plea.

On March 5, 1770, Attucks, with 40 or 50 other patriots, led an attack upon the British guards stationed at the customhouse. Suddenly there was an order—"Fire," and the British troops responded with a barrage of rifle fire. Crispus Attucks was the first to fall in the battle now known in our history as the Boston Massacre of 1770. The Boston Massacre was the first act of violence which was to lead to the American War of Independence. Crispus Attucks, in death, thus became one of the first martyrs in the cause of American independence.

Crispus Attucks gave his life for freedom. His death is even more significant when viewed as a demonstration of loyalty to a country in which he was not actually free. He was a Negro slave—and yet the first to fall for American independence.

Today a monument stands in Boston as a tribute to Crispus Attucks and his fallen comrades who, on that still night in 1770, laid the seeds for the formation of a new nation founded on freedom and justice. It is because of men like Crispus Attucks that we stand in the world as a nation dedicated to independence and self-determination for all mankind. And so today it is a privilege to pay tribute to Crispus Attucks—the first American who gave his life for our country. At this point I would like to have an article from the Newark Evening News of March 31, 1969, describing the fourth annual Crispus Attucks Day Parade, included in the RECORD:

THOUSANDS IN HONOR TO ATTUCKS

(By Robert C. Ruth)

Thousands braved the cold yesterday to watch bands, cheerleaders and decorative floats pass along Broad Street in the fourth Crispus Attucks Day parade.

The parade, honoring the Negro patriot who was one of five killed on March 5, 1770, in the Boston Massacre, lasted three hours. The unseasonably cold temperatures probably kept the size of the crowd down.

Although spectators lined the sidewalks 15 deep for about a block on either side of the grandstand in front of City Hall, the crowd thinned out at either end of the mile-long parade route from Lincoln Park to Washingington Park.

But in front of the grandstand there was no lack of enthusiasm from the residents that lined the streets as 27 bands, 14 drill teams and dozens of small floats filed by.

This year's parade was dedicated to the late Dr. Martin Luther King and the late Timothy Still, who was president of the United Community Corp., Newark's anti-poverty agency. John A. Thomas, founder and president of the Crispus Attucks Society, referred to Dr. King's philosophy in pre-parade ceremonies. He said he could envision the same "ethnic togetherness" in future parades that "brought so many of us to walk with the late and sainted Dr. Martin Luther King in the March on Washington.

"In my vision, I see Black Panthers walking side by side with members of the NAACP. I see Joe Louis striding with Muhammud Ali (Cassius Clay, former heavyweight champ). I see black Americans, young and old, affluent and poor, all joining in a spirit of unity like this nation has never seen before."

Jackie Robinson, baseball Hall-of-Famer, was the guest speaker. He noted that Crispus Attucks represents Negro America's desire to learn more about its heritage. He said this desire does not result from "hate for anyone but from love for black people.

"Some may ask, what do you want?" Robinson said. "All we want is what everyone else wants, education and employment." He added that yesterday's parade was a way of honoring not only Attucks but all Negroes who "have sacrificed for and contributed to" this country.

The only sad note in the day's festivities was noted by Capt. Roscoe F. Jennings of the New Jersey National Guard and general chairman of the parade committee. In the pre-parade ceremonies, he asked for a moment of silence in honor of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The floats included one sponsored by the Newark Pre-School Council featuring a large red basket with children dressed as bunnies inside. A large bronze Liberty Bell hanging from a blue and white arch was supplied by the UCC.

The wind obviously had its effect on the marchers. Many of the girls manning the floats and convertible autos wore overcoats. The temperature caused concern among parents of some marchers. "Tell Jimmy to pull his collar up," one worried mother said from a sidewalk as her young Cub Scout passed by.

Special marchers included Army Sgt. Dwight A. Johnson of Detroit, a Negro Medal of Honor winner; Miss Gail Fisher, co-star of the CBS-TV series "Mannix," and Negro chiefs of police from Lawnside, Palmyra, Salem, Rahway and Manchester Township.

REA TELLS HOW TO GET MOST OUT OF AN AUDIT

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration was one of the very first agencies to pioneer the concept of using independent, community-based auditors to audit Federal borrowers, under agency-established requirements. REA's program, for example, has greatly assisted this agency's overview of the loans made to electric and telephone borrowers over the years. Certified public accountants, from the borrower's own area, perform nearly 1,800 independent audits of REA borrowers each year, subject to final agency review. Over the years, some 80 programs in more than 30 other Federal agencies have also made use of independent auditors. I was recently pleased to run across a column, which I would here like to insert in the RECORD, based on an address by Mr. Leslie Surginer, Director, Borrowers Financial Management Division, REA, to the 15th annual meeting of the National Telephone Cooperative Association. Mr. Surginer's subject, "Getting the Most Out of Your CPA Audit," I am sure has application to the many other Federal programs which utilize independent auditors. This insert appeared in Mr. Lyman Bryan's "Washington Background" column in the March issue of the Journal of Accountancy, as follows:

WASHINGTON BACKGROUND

(By Lyman Bryan)

One of the real "old-timers," among federal agencies requiring use of certified public accountants, is the Rural Electrification Administration. Its electric co-operatives and telephone borrowers engage independent auditors in 1,800 instances each year.

"Getting the Most Out of Your CPA Audit" was, therefore, a particularly logical subject for a recent address by Leslie Surginer, CPA Director of REA's Borrowers' Financial Management Division, before a seminar for members of REA Boards of Directors prior to the 15th Annual Meeting of the National Telephone Co-operative Association.

Noting that REA requires an audit acceptable to it, as a part of its loan agreements, Surginer said that the audit was one of the major means of assistance to borrower boards of directors in carrying out their own responsibility. To assist in this, Surginer said borrower boards must:

1. establish clear-cut written responsibilities, goals and policies for boards, and for operating management;

2. see that good accounting records and procedures are adopted and maintained.

"I cannot," said Surginer, "over-emphasize the responsibility the board has to the co-operative membership for establishing and maintaining strong and effective internal control procedures. This is a matter of closing the barn door before, and not after, the horse is out."

Two simple things, Surginer stated, could help prevent "irregularities": (1) maintain an atmosphere that discourages questionable practices and (2) devise and maintain an adequate system of internal control.

On the latter front, Surginer commented bluntly: "Fundamentally what is required is that the duties of one employee serve as a check on the duties of another employee. It is dangerous for any single employee to have (1) sole access to cash and securities, (2) sole responsibility for making bank deposits and for confirming bank statements, (3) sole responsibility for originating and billing accounting entries, (4) sole responsibility for making cash disbursements, or (5) sole control over inventories.

"The independent public accountant is the keystone to effective internal control," Surginer stated.

"An audit does not guarantee that irregular practices on the part of employees will not occur nor does it assure that such practices will in every instance be detected," noted REA's top accountant. "However, closely related to this matter, and of vital interest to the board of directors, is the auditor's review of the co-operative's system of internal controls. This review covers the co-operative's arrangements and practices to accomplish its daily activities. Good internal control reduces to a minimum the opportunity for irregular actions by employees. Irregularities are never expected but occasionally do occur. Any irregularity found by the auditor should be reported immediately to the board president and REA."

Surginer then spoke of engagement and relationship aspects, noting that, "to meet our objectives of good internal control the auditor and the arrangements for the audit should be reserved to the board of directors. Under no circumstances should this very important responsibility be delegated to the manager or to any employee. Mr. Seidman, a former president of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, has suggested that auditors be selected and fees fixed by a committee of stockholders. As you know, in many of the large corporations management picks the firm and the selection is approved by the stockholders. Mr. Seidman believes that the selection by stockholders would negate management's influence on the auditors.

"We recommend the selection of the CPA and the audit arrangements be made by an audit committee composed exclusively of members of the board. In making its arrangements, the committee should assure that an open avenue of communication is maintained at all times between the chairman of this committee and the CPA.

"As in the selection of any consultant, other key personnel or procurement of a critical component of plant, the choice of an auditor should be made with great care. The committee should assure itself the auditor is truly independent and of high professional standing. It should use the same care in selecting the CPA as it would a doctor [or] attorney. The committee should seek to obtain integrity and know-how. The selection should be made on the basis of known competence and independence. The auditor selected must feel his obligation for full disclosure to REA as an interested third party. As in . . . other professional services, fees should be of secondary consideration. . . .

"We strongly urge that at the conclusion of the audit," continued Surginer, "the audit committee ask the auditor to meet with the board and present his report. If the committee has not restricted the scope of the audit, the auditor should be able to report to the board that he has examined the balance sheet of the co-operative as of the audit date as well as the related statemetns of revenue and expense and patronage capital and other equities for the period audited. He should be able to assure the board his examination was made in accordance with the generally accepted auditing standards and that his audit included such tests of the accounting records and other such auditing procedures as he considered necessary in the circumstances.

"Also, the auditor should be able to report without reservation that in his opinion the co-operative's balance sheet and statement of revenues and expenses, and patronage capital and other equities, present fairly the financial position of the co-operative at the audit date and the results of its operations for the year then ended in conformance with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year."

DISABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE BLIND

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide improved disability insurance for the blind.

In spite of the numerous provisions of the social security system, the blind in this country are still largely unprotected by disability insurance. Under current regulations, in order for a blind person to qualify for benefits, he must have worked for 5 of the last 10 years at a social security-covered job. His earnings must not exceed $140 per month.

The inequities of this arrangement are obvious. Immediately after the tragedy of blindness occurs—during the period when assistance is most needed—many people are denied aid because they lack the requisite job tenure. Blind people unable to obtain regular employment are often disqualified for this same reason. Blind with annual incomes above a meager $1,680 are refused benefits even though their disability necessitates extra expenditures.

This bill would relax the stringent requirements for disability insurance for the blind. The tenure requirement would be pared from 5 to 1½ years. The income ceiling would be eliminated.

The disability insurance for the blind was introduced in the 88th Congress by Senator Humphrey and in the 89th and 90th by Senator HARTKE and others. Although never explicitly rejected, the measure has never been passed. I hope that a bill so critical to the livelihood of our blind citizens will not again be ignored.

THE UNSAFE ATOM

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I would strongly recommend for my colleagues' consideration an article appearing in the March 1969 issue of Natural History which discusses the dangers to humanity through the so-called peaceful uses of atomic energy. The authors, Richard Curtis and Elizabeth Hogan, warn us of the potentially catastrophic dangers to human life through a major nuclear plant accident and the slow saturation of our environment with radioactive wastes.

Many distinguished scientists are convinced that nuclear powerplants represent an incredible and unique hazard for human life. Radioactive substances emanating from these plants into the air and water have been called an evil of an incomparably greater dimension than anything mankind has known before and that this radioactive pollution poses the greatest threat to man's survival on earth.

The potential hazards from nuclear power production include the emanation of radioactive substances into the air and the water of streams used for cooling the nuclear plants, the handling of waste material which remains after the useful life of the nuclear fuel has been exhausted, and the possible sudden release of large quantities of radioactive material into the atmosphere.

Although only a dozen or so nuclear powerplants are now in operation, more than 100 are being planned. In view of the warnings from the scientific community, the entire question of the safety and the desirability of these reactors is a most disturbing one and it demands the attention of the Congress.

The article follows:

THE MYTH OF THE PEACEFUL ATOM

(By Richard Curtis and Elizabeth Hogan)

"What is past is past, and the damage we may already have done to future generations cannot be rescinded, but we cannot shirk the compelling responsibility to determine if the course we are following is one we should be following."

So said Senator Thruston B. Morton of Kentucky on February 29, 1968, upon introducing into Congress a resolution calling for comprehensive review of federal participation in the atomic energy power program. Admitting he had been remiss in informing himself on this "grave danger," Morton said he had now looked more deeply into nuclear power safety and was "dismayed at some of the things I have found—warnings and facts from highly qualified people who firmly believe that we have moved too fast and without proper safeguards into an atomic power age."

Senator Morton's resolution on nuclear power was by no means the only one before Congress in 1968. Indeed, more than two dozen legislators urged investigation and reevaluation of this program. This fact may come as a surprise to much of the public, for the belief is widespread that the nuclear reactors being built to generate electricity for our cities are safe, reliable, and pollution-free. But a rapidly growing number of physicists, biologists, engineers, public health officials, and even staff members of the Atomic Energy Commission itself—the government bureau responsible for regulation of this force—have been expressing serious misgivings about the planned proliferation of nuclear power plants. In fact, some have indicated that nuclear power, which Supreme Court Justices William O. Douglas and Hugo L. Black described as "the most deadly, the most dangerous process that man has ever conceived," represents the gravest pollution threat yet to our environment.

As of June, 1968, 15 commercial nuclear power plants were operating or operable within the United States, producing about one per cent of our current electrical output. The government, however, has been promoting a plan by which 25 per cent of our electric power will be generated by the atom by 1980, and half by the year 2000. To meet this goal, 87 more plants are under construction or on the drawing boards. Although atomic power and reactor technology are still imperfect sciences, saturated with hazards and unknowns, these reactors are going up in close proximity to heavy population concentrations. Most of them will be of a size never previously attempted by scientists and engineers. They are, in effect, gigantic nuclear experiments.

As most readers will recall, atomic reactors are designed to use the tremendous heat generated by splitting atoms. They are fueled with a concentrated form of uranium stored in thin-walled tubes bound together to form subassemblies. These are placed in the reactor's core, separated by control rods that absorb neutrons and thus help regulate chain reactions of splitting atoms. When the rods are withdrawn, the chain reactions intensify, producing enormous quantities of heat. Coolant circulated through the fuel elements in the reactor core carries the heat away to heat-exchange systems, where water is brought to a boil. The resultant steam is employed to turn electricity-generating turbines.

Stated in this condensed fashion, the process sounds innocuous enough. Unfortunately, however, heat is not the only form of energy produced by atomic fission. Another is radioactivity. During the course of operation, the fuel assemblies and other components in the reactor's core become intensely radioactive. Some of the fission by-products have been described as a million to a billion times more toxic than any known industrial chemical. Some 200 radioactive isotopes are produced as by-products of reactor operation, and the amount of just one of them, strontium-90, accumulated in a reactor of even modest (100–200 megawatt) size, after it has been operative for six months, is equal to what would be produced by the explosion of a bomb 190 times more powerful than the one dropped on Hiroshima.

Huge concentrations of radioactive material are also to be found in nuclear fuel-reprocessing plants. Because the intense radioactivity in a reactor core eventually interferes with the fuel's efficiency, the spent fuel assemblies must be removed from time to time and replaced by new, uncontaminated ones. The old ones are transported to reprocessing plants the contaminants are separated from the salvageable fuel as well as from plutonium, a valuable by-product.

Since no satisfactory means have been found for neutralizing or for safely releasing into the environment the radioactive liquid containing the contaminants, it must be stored until it is no longer dangerous. Thus, reprocessing plants and storage areas are immense repositories of "hot" and "dirty" material. Furthermore, routes between nuclear power plants and the reprocessing facility carry traffic bearing high quantities of such material.

Even from this glimpse it will be apparent that public and environmental safety depend on the flawless containment of radioactivity every step of the way. For, owing to the incredible potency of fission products, even the slightest leakage is harmful and a massive release would be catastrophic. The fundamental question, then, is how heavily can we rely on human wisdom, care, and engineering to hold this peril under absolute control?

Abundant evidence points to the conclusion that we cannot rely on it at all.

The hazards of peaceful atomic power fall into two broad categories: the threat of violent, massive releases of radioactivity or that of slow, but deadly, seepage of harmful products into the environment.

Nuclear physicists assure us that reactors cannot explode like atomic bombs because the complex apparatus for detonating an atomic warhead is absent. This fact, however, is of little consolation when it is realized that only a *conventional* explosion, which ruptures the reactor mechanism and its containment structure, could produce havoc on a scale eclipsing any industrial accident on record or any single act of war, including the atomic destruction of Hiroshima or Nagasaki.

There are numerous ways in which such an explosion can take place in a reactor. For example, liquid sodium, which is used in some reactors as a coolant, is a devilishly tricky element that under certain circumstances burns violently on contact with air. Accidental exposure of sodium could initiate a chain of reactions: rupturing fuel assemblies, damaging components and shielding, and destroying primary and secondary emergency safeguards. If coolant is lost, as it could be in some types of reactors, fuel could melt and recongeal, forming "puddles" that could explode upon reaching a critical size. If these explosions are forceful enough, and safeguards fail, some of the fission products could be released outside the plant and into the environment in the form of a gas or a cloud of fine radioactive particles. Under not uncommon atmospheric conditions such as an "inversion," in which a layer of warm air keeps a cooler layer from rising, a blanket of radioactivity could spread insidiously over the countryside. Another possibility is that fission products could be carried out of the reactor and into a city's watershed, for all reactors are being built on lakes, rivers, or other bodies of water for cooling purposes.

What would be the toll of such a calamity?

In 1957 the Atomic Energy Commission issued a study (designated Wash. —740), largely prepared by the Brookhaven National Laboratory, that attempted to assess the probabilities of such "incidents" and the potential consequences. Some of its findings were stupefying: From the explosion of a 100–200 megawatt reactor, as many as 3,400 people could be killed, 43,000 injured, and as much as 7 billion dollars of property damage done. People could be killed at distances up to 15 miles and injured up to 45. Land contamination could extend for far greater distances: agricultural quarantines might prevail over an area of 150,000 square miles, more than the combined areas of Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey.

The awful significance of these figures is difficult to comprehend. By way of comparison, we might look at one of the worst industrial accidents of modern times: the Texas City disaster of 1947 when a ship loaded with ammonium nitrate fertilizer exploded, virtually leveling the city, killing 561 people, and causing an estimated $67 million worth of damage. Appalling as this catastrophe was, however, it does not begin to approach the potential havoc that would be wreaked by a nuclear explosion occurring in one of the plants now being constructed close to several American cities.

The scientists and engineers who produced the Brookhaven Report optimistically ventured to give high odds against such an occurrence, asserting that the structures, systems, and safeguards of atomic plants were so engineered as to render it practically incredible. At the same time, though, the report was replete with such statements as:

"The cumulative effect of radiation on physical and chemical properties of materials, after long periods of time, is largely unknown."

"Much remains to be learned about the characteristics and behavior of nuclear systems."

"It is important to recognize that the magnitudes of many of the crucial factors in this study are not quantitatively established, either by theoretical and experimental data or adequate experience."

Even if the report had been founded on more substantial understanding of natural and technical processes, many of the grounds on which the Brookhaven team based its conclusions are shaky at best.

For one thing, all of us are familiar with technological disasters that have occurred against fantastically high odds: the sinking of the "unsinkable" *Titanic*, or the November 9, 1965, "blackout" of the northeastern United States, for example. The latter happening illustrates how an "incredible" event can occur in the electric utility field, most experts agreeing that the chain of circumstances that brought it about was so improbable that the odds against it defy calculation.

Congressional testimony given in 1967 by Dr. David Okrent, a former chairman of the AEC's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, demonstrated that fate is not always a respecter of enormously adverse odds. "We do have on record cases where, for example, an applicant, appearing before an atomic safety and licensing board, stated that a mathematical impossibility had occurred; namely, one tornado took out five separate power lines to a reactor. If one calculated strictly on the basis of probability and multiplied the probability for one line five times, you get a very small number indeed," said Dr. Okrent, "but it happened."

A disturbing number of reactor accidents have occurred—with sheer luck playing an important part in averting catastrophe—that seem to have been the product of incredible coincidences. On October 10, 1957, for instance, the Number One Pile (reactor) at the Windscale Works in England malfunctioned, spewing fission products over so much territory that authorities had to seize all milk and growing foodstuffs in a 400-square-mile area around the plant. A British report on the incident stated that *all* of the reactor's containment features had failed. And, closer to home, a meltdown of fuel in the Fermi reactor in Lagoona Beach, Michigan, in October, 1966, came within an ace of turning into a nuclear "runaway." An explosive release of radioactive materials was averted, but the failures of Fermi's safeguards made the event, in the words of Sheldon Novick in *Scientist and Citizen*, "a bit worse than the 'maximum credible accident.'"

The atomic industry has attempted to design components and safeguards so that failure of one vital system in a plant will not affect another, resulting in a "house of cards" collapse. However, two highly regarded authorities, Theos J. Thompson and J. G. Beckerley, in a book on reactor safety advise us not to place too much faith in claims of independent safeguards: "A structure as complex as a reactor and involving as many phenomena is likely to have relatively few completely independent components." Many manufacturers and utility operators have resisted the idea of producing "redundant safeguards" on the grounds of excessive cost.

Investigations of reactor breakdowns usually disclose a number of small, seemingly unrelated failures, which snowballed into one big one. A design flaw or a human error, a component failure here, an instrumentation failure there—all may coincide to contribute to the total event. Thompson and Beckerley, examining several atomic plant accidents, pinpointed 13 different contributing causes in three of the accidents that had occurred up to the time of their 1964 study.

Among the many factors contributing to reactor accidents, the human element is the most difficult to quantify. And perhaps for that reason, it has been largely overlooked in the AEC's assessments of reactor safety. Yet, a private researcher of nuclear accidents, Dr. Donald Oken, M.D., Associate Director of the Psychosomatic and Psychiatric Institute of Michael Reese Hospital in Chicago reported: "A review of reports of past criticality and reactor incidents and discussions held with some of the health personnel in charge reveal a number of striking peculiarities in the behavior of many of those involved—in which they almost literally asked for trouble."

AEC annuals are full of reports of human negligence: 3,844 pounds of uranium hexafluoride lost owing to an error in opening a cylinder; a $220,000 fire in a reactor because of accidental tripping of valves by electricians during previous maintenance work; numerous vehicular accidents involving transport of nuclear materials. None of these accidents led to disaster, but who will warrant that, with the projected proliferation of power plants and satellite industries in the coming decade, a moment's misjudgment will not trigger a nightmare? Perhaps worse, the likelihood of sabotage has scarcely been weighed, despite a number of incidents and threats.

It should be apparent that if men are to build safe, successful reactors, the whole level of industrial workmanship, engineering, inspection, and quality control must be raised well above prevailing levels. The more sophisticated the technology, the more precise the correspondence between the subtlest gradations of care or negligence and that technology's success or failure. When meters, grams, and seconds are no longer good enough, and specifications call for millimeters, milligrams, and milliseconds, the demands made on men, material, and machinery are accordingly intensified. Minute lapses that might be tolerable in a conventional industrial procedure will wreck the more exacting one. And when the technology is not only exacting but hazardous in the extreme, then a trivial oversight, a minor defect, a moment's inattention may spell doom.

While there is little doubt that American technology is the most refined on earth, there is ample reason to believe that it has more than met its match in the seemingly insurmountable problems posed by the peaceful atom. Societies of professional engineers, and others concerned with establishing technical and safety criteria for the nuclear industry, have described between 2,800 and 5,000 technical standards that are necessary for a typical reactor power plant in such areas as materials, testing, design, electrical gear, instrumentation, plant equipment, and processes. Yet, due to the rapidity with which the nuclear industry has developed, as of

March, 1967, only about 100 of these had been passed on and approved for use.

It is not surprising, then, to learn that serious technical difficulties are turning up in reactor after reactor. At the Big Rock Point Nuclear Plant, a relatively small reactor near Charlevoix, Michigan, control rods were found sticking in position, studs failing or cracked, screws jostled out of place and into key mechanisms, a valve malfunctioning for more than a dozen reasons, foreign material lodging in critical moving parts, and welds cracked on every one of sixteen screws holding two components in place. A reactor at Humboldt Bay in California manifested cracks in the tubes containing fuel: in order to keep costs down, stainless steel had been used instead of a more reliable alloy. The Oyster Creek plant in New Jersey showed cracks in 123 of 137 fuel tubes, and welding defects at every point where tubes and control-rod housings were joined around the reactor's vessel. Reactors in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Connecticut, Puerto Rico, New York, and elsewhere have experienced inumerable operating difficulties, and some, such as the $55 million Hallam plant in Nebraska have been forced to shut down for good, owing to plant malfunction.

Chilling parallels can be drawn between failures in nuclear utility technology and in the nuclear submarine program. In October, 1962, Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, Director of AEC's Division of Naval Reactors, took the atomic industry to task in a speech in New York City:

"It is not well enough understood that conventional components of advanced systems must necessarily meet higher standards. Yet it should be obvious that failures that would be trivial if they occurred in a conventional application will have serious consequences in a nuclear plant because here radioactivity is involved. . . ."

Rickover went on to cite defective welds, forging materials substituted without authorization, violations of official specifications, poor inspection techniques, small and seemingly "unimportant" parts left out of components, faulty brazing of wires, and more. "I assure you," he declared, "I am not exaggerating the situation; in fact, I have understated it. For every case I have given, I could cite a dozen more."

The following April, the U.S. atomic submarine *Thresher*, while undergoing a deep test dive some 200 miles off the Cape Cod coast, went down with 112 naval personnel and 17 civilians and never came up again. Subsequent investigation revealed that the sub suffered from many of the same ailments described in Rickover's speech. "It is extremely unfortunate," said Senator John O. Pastore, chairman of the joint congressional committee that held hearings on the disaster, "that this tragedy had to occur to bring a number of unsatisfactory conditions into the open." We must now ask if the same will one day be said about a power plant near one of our large cities.

If a major reactor catastrophe did occur there is good reason to believe that the consequences would be far worse than even the dismaying toll suggested by the 1957 Brookhaven Report, for a number of developments since then have made the threat considerably more formidable.

The Brookhaven Report's accident statistics, for instance, pertained to a reactor of between 100 and 200 megawatts. But while the 15 reactors currently operating in the United States average about 186 megawatts, the 87 plants going up or planned for the next decade are many times that size. Thirty-one under construction average about 726 megawatts; 42 in the planning stage average 832; 14 more, planned but without reactors ordered, will average 904. Some, such as those slated for Illinois, California, Alabama, and New York anticipate capacities of more than 1,000 megawatts. Con Edison has just announced it intends to build four units of 1,000 megawatts each on Long Island Sound near New Rochelle in teeming Westchester County—four nuclear reactors, each with a capacity five to ten times that of the reactor described in the Brookhaven Report.

These facilities will accordingly contain more uranium fuel, and because it is costly to replace spent fuel assemblies (this delicate and dangerous process can take six weeks or longer), the new reactors are designed to operate without fuel replacement far beyond the six months posited in the Brookhaven Report. As a result, the buildup of toxic fission products in tomorrow's reactors will be far greater than at present, and an accident occurring close to the end of the "fuel cycle" in such a plant could release fantastic amounts of radioactive material.

Most serious of all, perhaps, is that tomorrow's reactors are now slated for location in close proximity to population concentrations. While the Brookhaven Report had its hypothetical reactor situated about 30 miles from a major city, many of tomorrow's atomic plants will be much closer. Although the AEC has drafted "guidelines" for siting reactors, the Commission has failed to make utilities adhere to them. In 1967, Clifford K. Beck, AEC's Deputy Director of Regulation, admitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that nuclear plants in Connecticut, California, New York, and other locations "have been approved with lower distances than our general guides would have indicated when they were approved."

Also, we must remember that while a reactor may not be near the legal boundaries of a metropolis, it may lie close to a population center. Thus, while Con Edison's Indian Point plant is 24 miles from New York City (two more plants are now being built there), it is within 10 miles of an estimated population of 155,510. It need only be recalled that the Brookhaven Report foresaw people being killed by a major radioactive release at distances up to 15 miles to realize the significance of these figures.

In a recent study of nuclear plant siting made by W. K. Davis and J. E. Robb of San Francisco's Bechtel Corporation, the locations of 42 nuclear power plants (some proposed, some now operable) were examined with respect to population centers inhabited by 25,000 residents or more. Their findings are unnerving: only *two* plants in operation or planned are more than 30 miles from a population center. Of the rest, 14 are between 20 and 27 miles away, 15 between 10 and 16 miles, and 11 between 1 and 9 miles.

Is it necessary to build atomic plants so big and so close? The answer has to do with economics. The larger a facility is, the lower the unit cost of construction and operation and the cheaper the electricity. The longer the fuel cycle, the fewer the expensive shutdowns while spent fuel assemblies are replaced. The closer the plant is to the consumer, the lower the cost of rights of way, power lines, and other transmission equipment.

On a few occasions an aroused public has successfully opposed the situation of plants near population centers. When the Pacific Gas and Electric Company persisted in trying to build a reactor squarely over earthquake faults in an area of known seismic activity—the site was Bodega Head, north of San Francisco—a courageous conservation group forced the company to back down. It has been suggested, though, that the group might not have won had not the Alaskan earthquake of 1964, occurring while the fight was going on, underscored the recklessness of the utility's scheme.

Announcement by Con Edison at the end of 1962 of its proposal to build a large nuclear plant in Ravenswood, Queens, close to the center of New York City brought a storm of frightened and angry protest. Although the utility's chairman noted, "We are confident that a nuclear plant can be built in Long Island City, or in Times Square for that matter, without hazard to our own employees working in the plant or to the community," David E. Lilienthal, the former head of the AEC, had a contrary opinion, declaring he "would not dream of living in Queens if a huge nuclear plant were located there." Outraged citizens and a number of noted scientists prevailed.

For the most part, however, the battle has been a losing one. Con Edison, for example, after its defeat in the Ravenswood fight, has just announced an interest in building a reactor on Welfare Island, literally a stone's throw from midtown Manhattan. Also, New York's Governor Nelson Rockefeller has gone on record advocating an $8 billion electric power expansion program based extensively on nuclear energy. The state legislature approved of the program, and in 1968, voted to bolster the plan with state subsidies.

Some of the deepest concern about the size and location of atomic plants has been expressed by members of the AEC themselves. "The actual experience with reactors in general is still quite limited," said Harold Price, AEC's Director of Regulation, in 1967 congressional hearings, "and with large reactors of the type now being considered, it is nonexistent. Therefore, because there would be a large number of people close by and because of lack of experience, it is . . . a matter of judgment and prudence at present to locate reactors where the protection of distance will be present."

Price's statement is mild compared to that made in the same hearings by Nunzio J. Palladino, Chairman of the AEC's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards for 1967, and Dr. David Okrent, former Chairman for 1966: "the ACRS believes that placing large nuclear reactors close to population centers will require considerable further improvements in safety, and that *none of the large power reactors now under construction is considered suitable for location in metropolitan areas* [our italics]."

The threat of a nuclear plant catastrophe constitutes only half of the double jeopardy in which atomic power has placed us. For even if no such calamity occurs, the gradual exhaustion of what one scientist terms our environmental "radiation budget" due to unavoidable releases of radioactivity during normal operation of nuclear facilities, poses an equal and possibly more insidious threat to all living things on earth.

Most of the fission products created in a reactor are trapped. Contaminated solids, liquids, and gases are isolated, allowed to decay for a short period of time, then concentrated and shipped in drums to storage areas. These are called "high-level wastes." But technology for retaining all radioactive contaminants, is either unperfected or costly, and much material of low-level radioactivity is routinely released into the air or water at all reactor sites. These releases are undertaken in such a way, we are told, as to insure dispersion or dilution sufficient to prevent any predictable human exposure above harmful levels. Thus, when atomic power advocates are asked about the dangers of contaminating the environment, they imply that the relatively small amounts of radioactive materials released under "planned" conditions are harmless.

This view is a myth.

In the first place, many waste radionuclides take an extraordinarily long time to decay. The half-life (the time it takes for half of an element's atoms to disintegrate through fission) of strontium-90, for instance, is more than 27 years. Thus, even though certain long-lived isotopes are widely dispersed in air or diluted in water, their radioactivity does not cease. It remains, and over a period of time accumulates. It is, therefore, not pertinent to talk about the safety of any single release of "hot" effluents into the environment. At issue, rather, is their duration and cumulative radioactivity.

Here then are clear illustrations of the ways in which almost undetectable traces of radioactivity in air, water, or soil may be progressively concentrated, so that by the time it ends up on man's plate or in his glass it is a tidy package of poison.

That nuclear facilities are producing dangerous buildups of radioisotopes in our environment can be amply documented. University of Nevada investigators, seeking a cause for concentrations of iodine-131 in cattle thyroids in wide areas of the western United States, concluded that "the principal known source of I-131 that could contribute to this level is exhaust gases from nuclear reactors and associated fuel-processing plants."

In his keynote address to the Health Physics Society Symposium at Atlanta, Georgia, early in 1968, AEC Commissioner Wilfred E. Johnson admitted that the release into the atmosphere of tritium and noble gases such as krypton-85 would present a potential problem in the future, and that, as yet, scientists had not devised a way of solving it. Krypton-85, although inert, has a 10-year half-life and tends to dissolve in fatty tissue, meaning fairly even distribution throughout the human body. Krypton-85 is particularly difficult to filter out of reactor discharges, and the accumulation of this element alone may exhaust as much as two-thirds of the "average" human's "radiation budget" for the coming century, based on the standards established by the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurement.

Further, many radioactive elements taken into the body tend to build up in specific tissues and organs to which those isotopes are attracted, increasing by many times the exposure dosage in those local areas of the body. Iodine-131, for instance, seeks the thyroid gland; strontium-90 collects in the bones; cesium-137 accumulates in muscle. Many isotopes have long half-lives, some measurable in decades.

Two more factors controvert the view that carefully monitored releases of low-level radioactivity into the environment are not pernicious. First, there is apparently no radiation threshold below which harm is impossible. Any dose, however small, will take its toll of cell material, and that damage is irreversible. Second, it may take decades for organic damage, or generations for genetic damage, to manifest itself. In 1955, for example, two British doctors reported a case of skin cancer—ultimately fatal—that had taken forty-nine years to develop following fluoroscopic irradiation of a patient.

Still another problem has received inadequate attention. Man is by no means the only creature in whom radioactive isotopes concentrate. The dietary needs of all plant and animal life dictate intake of specific elements. These concentrate even in the lowest and most basic forms of life. They are then passed up food chains, from grass to cattle to milk to man, for example. As they progress up these chains, the concentrations often increase, sometimes by hundreds of thousands of times. And if these elements are radioactive. . . .

Take zinc-65, produced in a reactor when atomic particles interact with zinc in certain components. Scrutiny of the wildlife in a pond receiving runoff from the Savannah River Plant near Aiken, South Carolina, disclosed that while the water in that pond contained only infinitesimal traces of radioactive zinc-65, the algae that lived on the water had concentrated the isotope by nearly 6,000 times. The bones of bluegills, an omnivorous fish that feeds both on algae and on algae-eating fish, showed concentrations more than 8,200 times higher than the amount found in the water. Study of the Columbia River, on which the Hanford, Washington, reactor is located, revealed that while the radioactivity of the water was relatively insignificant: 1. the radioactivity of the river plankton was 2,000 times greater; 2. the radioactivity of the fish and ducks feeding on the plankton was 15,000 and 40,000 times greater, respectively; 3. the radioactivity of young swallows fed on insects caught by their parents near the river was 500,000 times greater; and 4. the radioactivity of the egg yolks of water birds was more than a million times greater.

That "low-level" waste is a grossly deceptive term is obvious. In his book *Living with the Atom*, author Ritchie Calder in 1962 described an "audit" of environmental radiation that he and his colleagues, meeting at a symposium in Chicago, drew up to assess then current and future amounts of radioactivity released into atmosphere and water. Speculations covered the period 1955–65, and because atomic power plants were few and small during that time, the figures are more significant in relation to the future. Tallying "planned releases" of radiation from such sources as commercial and test reactors, nuclear ships, uranium mills, plutonium factories, and fuel-reprocessing plants, Calder's group came to a most disquieting conclusion: "By the time we had added up all the curies which might predictably be released, by all those peaceful uses, into the environment, it came to about 13 million per annum." A "curie" is a standard unit of radioactivity whose lethality can be appreciated from the fact that one trillionth of one curie of radio active gas per cubic meter of air in a uranium mine is ten times higher than the official maximum permissible dose.

Calder's figures did not include fallout due to bomb testing and similar experiments, nor did they take into account possible reactor or nuclear transportation accidents. Above all, they did not include possible escape of stored high-level radioactive wastes, the implications of which were awesome to contemplate: "what kept nagging us was the question of waste disposal and of the remaining radioactivity which must not get loose. We were told that the dangerous waste, which is kept in storage, amounted to 10,000 million curies. If you wanted to play 'the numbers game' as an irresponsible exercise, you could divide this by the population of the world and find that it is over 3 curies for every individual."

Exactly what does Calder mean by "the question of waste disposal"?

It has been estimated that a ton of spent fuel in reprocessing will produce from forty to several hundred gallons of waste. This substance is a violently lethal mixture of short- and long-lived isotopes. It would take five cubic miles of water to dilute the waste from just *one* ton of fuel to a safe concentration. Or, if we permitted it to decay naturally until it reached the safe level—and the word "safe" is used advisedly—just one of the isotopes, strontium-90, would still be damaging to life 1,000 years from now, when it will have only one seventeen-billionth of its current potency.

There is no known way to reduce the toxicity of these isotopes; they must decay naturally, meaning *virtually perpetual containment*. Unfortunately, mankind has exhibited little skill in perpetual creations, and procedures for handling radioactive wastes leave everything to be desired. Formerly dumped in the ocean, the most common practice today is to store the concentrates in large steel tanks shielded by earth and concrete. This method has been employed for some twenty years, and about 80 million gallons of waste are now in storage in about 200 tanks. This "liquor" generates so much heat it boils by itself for years. Most of the inventory in these caldrons is waste from weapons production, but within thirty years, the accumulation from commercial nuclear power will soar if we embark upon the expansion program now being promoted by the AEC. Dr. Donald R. Chadwick, chief of the Division of Health of the U.S. Public Health Service, estimated in 1963 that the accumulated volume of waste material would come to two billion gallons by 1995.

It is not just the volume that fills one with sickening apprehension but the techniques of disposing of this material. David Lilienthal put his finger on the crux of the matter when he stated: "These huge quantities of radioactive wastes must somehow be removed from the reactors, must—without mishap—be put into containers that will never rupture; then these vast quantities of poisonous stuff must be moved either to a burial ground or to reprocessing and concentration plants, handled again, and disposed of, by burial or otherwise, with a risk of human error at every step." Nor can it be stressed strongly enough that we are not discussing a brief danger period of days, months, or years. We are talking of periods "longer," in the words of AEC Commissioner Wilfred E. Johnson, "than the history of most governments that the world has seen."

Yet already there are many instances of the failure of storage facilities. An article in an AEC publication has cited nine cases of tank failure out of 183 tanks located in Washington, South Carolina, and Idaho. And a passage in the AEC's authorizing legislation for 1968 called for funding of $2,500,000 for the replacement of failed and failing tanks in Richland, Washington. "There is no assurance," concluded the passage, "that the need for new waste storage tanks can be forestalled." If this is the case after twenty years of storage experience, it is beyond belief that this burden will be borne without some storage failures for centuries in the future. Remember too, that these waste-holding "tank farms" are vulnerable to natural catastrophes such as earthquakes, and to man-made ones such as sabotage.

Efforts are of course being made toward effective handling of the waste problems, but many technical barriers must still be overcome. It is unlikely they will all be overcome by the end of the century, when waste tanks will boil with 6 billion curies of strontium-90, 5.3 billion curies of cesium-137, 6.07 billion curies of prometheum-147, 10.1 billion curies of cerium-144, and millions of curies of other isotopes. The amount of strontium-90 alone is 30 times more than would be released by the nuclear war envisioned in a 1959 congressional hearing.

The burden that radioactive wastes place on future generations is cruel and may prove intolerable. Physicist Joel A. Snow stated it well when he wrote in *Scientist and Citizen:* "Over periods of hundreds of years it is impossible to ensure that society will remain responsive to the problem created by the legacy of nuclear waste which we have left behind."

"Legacy" is indeed a gracious way of describing the reality of this situation, for at the very least we are saddling our children and their descendants with perpetual custodianship of our atomic refuse, and at worst may be dooming them to the same agonizing afflictions and deaths suffered by those who survived Hiroshima. Radiation has been positively linked to cancer, leukemia, brain damage, infant mortality, cataracts, sterility, genetic defects and mutations, and general shortening of life.

The implications for the survival of mankind can be glimpsed by considering just one of these effects, the genetic. In a 1960 article, James F. Crow, Professor of Genetics at the University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and president of the Genetics Society of America, stated that for every roentgen of slow radiation—the kind we can expect to receive in increasing doses from peacetime nuclear activity—about five mutations will result per 100 million genes exposed, meaning that "after a number of generations of exposure to one roentgen per generation, about one in 8,000 . . . in each generation would have severe genetic defects attributable to the radiation."

The Atomic Energy Commission is aware of the many objections that have been raised to the atomic power program: why does it continue to encourage it? Unfortunately, the Commission must perform two conflicting roles. On the one hand, it is responsible for regulating the atomic power industry. But on the other, it has been charged by Congress to promote the use of nuclear energy by the utility industry. Because of its involvement in the highest priorities of national security, enormous power and legislative advantages have been vested in the AEC, enabling it to fulfill its role as promoter with almost unhampered success—while its effectiveness as regulator has gradually atrophied. The Commission consistently denies claims that atomic power is heading for troubled waters, optimistically reassuring critics that the plants are safe, clean neighbors.

The fact that there is no foundation for this optimism is emphasized by the insurance situation on atomic facilities. Despite the AEC's own assertion that as much as $7 billion in property damage could result from an atomic power plant catastrophe, the insurance industry, working through two pools, will put up no more than $74 million, or about one per cent, to indemnify equipment manufacturers and utility operators against damage suits from the public. The federal government will add up to $486 million more, but this still leaves more than $6 billion in property damages to be picked up by victims of a Brookhaven-sized accident. And no insurance company—not even Lloyds of London—will issue property insurance to individuals against radiation damage. If there is so little risk in atomic power plants, why is insurance so inadequate?

The knowledge that man must henceforth live in constant dread of a major nuclear plant accident is disturbing enough. But we must recognize that even if such calamities are averted, the slow saturation of our environment with radioactive wastes will nevertheless be raising the odds that you or your heirs will fall victim to one of a multitude of afflictions. There is no "threshold" exposure below which we can feel safe.

We have little time to reflect on our alternatives, for the moment must soon come when no reversal will be possible. Dr. L. P. Hatch of Brookhaven National Laboratory vividly made this point when he told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: "If we were to go on for 50 years in the atomic power industry, and find that we had reached an impasse, that we had been doing the wrong thing with the wastes and we would like to reconsider the disposal methods, it would be entirely too late, because the problem would exist and nothing could be done to change that fact for the next, say, 600 or a thousand years." To which might be added a sobering thought stated by Dr. David Price of the U.S. Public Health Service: "We all live under the haunting fear that something may corrupt the environment to the point where man joins the dinosaurs as an obsolete form of life. And what makes these thoughts all the more disturbing is the knowledge that our fate could perhaps be sealed twenty or more years before the development of symptoms."

What must be done to avert the perils of the peaceful atom? A number of plans have been put forward for stricter regulation of activities in the nuclear utility field, such as limiting the size of reactors or their proximity to population concentrations or building more safeguards. As sensible as these proposals appear on the surface, they fail to recognize a number of important realities: first, that such arrangements would probably be opposed by utility operators and the government due to their prohibitively high costs. Since our government seems to be committed to making atomic power plants competitive with conventionally fueled plants, and because businesses are in business for profit, it is hardly likely they would buy these answers. Second, the technical problems involved in containment of radioactivity have not been successfully overcome, and there is little likelihood they will be resolved in time to prevent immense and irrevocable harm to our environment. Third, the nature of business enterprise is unfortunately such that *perfect* policing of the atomic power industry is unachievable. As we have seen in the cases of other forms of pollution, the public spirit of men seeking profit from industrial processes does not always rise as high as the welfare of society requires. It is unwise to hope that stricter regulation would do the job.

What, then, is the answer? The only course may be to turn boldly away from atomic energy as a major source of electricity production, abandoning it as this nation has abandoned other costly but unsuccessful technological enterprises.

There is no doubt that, with this nation's demand for electricity doubling every decade, new power sources are urgently needed. Nor is there doubt that our conventional fuel reserves—coal, oil, and natural gas—are rapidly being consumed. Sufficient high-grade fossil fuel reserves exist, however, to carry us to the end of this century; and new techniques for recovering these fuels from secondary sources such as oil shale could extend the time even longer. Furthermore, advances in pollution abatement technology and revolutionary new techniques, now in development, for burning conventional fuels with high efficiency, could carry us well into the next century with the fossil fuels we have. This abundance, and potential abundance, gives us at least several decades to survey possible alternatives to atomic power, select the most promising, and develop them on an appropriate scale as alternatives to nuclear power. Solar energy, tidal power, heat from the earth's core, and even garbage and solid-waste incineration have to some degree been demonstrated as promising means of electricity generation. If we subsidized research and development of those fields as liberally as we have done atomic energy, some of them would undoubtedly prove to be what atomic energy once promised, without its deadly drawbacks.

Aside from the positive prospect of profitability in these new approaches, industry will have another powerful incentive for turning to them; namely, that atomic energy is proving to be quite the opposite of the cheap, everlasting resource envisioned at the outset of the atomic age. The prices of reactors and components and costs of construction and operation have soared in the last few years, greatly damaging nuclear power's position as a competitor with conventional fuels. If insurance premiums and other indirect subsidies are brought into line with realistic estimates of what it takes to make atomic energy both safe and economical, the atom might prove to be the most *expensive* form of energy yet devised—not the cheapest. In addition, because of our wasteful fuel policies, evidence indicates that sources of low-cost uranium will be exhausted before the turn of the century. Fuel-producing breeder reactors, in which the nuclear establishment has invested such high hopes for the creation of vast, new fuel supplies, have proven a distinct technological disappointment. Even if the problems plaguing this effort were overcome in the next ten or twenty years, it may still be too late to recoup the losses of nuclear fuel reserves brought about by prodigious mismanagement.

The proposal to abandon or severely curtail the use of atomic energy is clearly a difficult one to imagine. We have only to realize, however, that by pursuing our current civilian nuclear power program, we are jeopardizing every other industry in the country; in that light, this proposal becomes the only practical alternative. In short, the entire national community stands to benefit from the abandonment of a policy which seems to be leading us toward both environmental and economic disaster.

Man's incomplete understanding of many technological principles and natural forces is not necessarily to his discredit. Indeed, that he has erected empires despite his limited knowledge is to his glory. But that he pits his ignorance and uncertainty, and the fragile yet lethal technology he has woven out of them, against the uncertainties of nature, science, and human behavior—this may well be to his everlasting sorrow.

CHALLENGES CONFRONTING THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN FOREST INDUSTRY

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the Rocky Mountain Forest Industry started a 2-day conference at the University of Wyoming in Laramie. In a keynote speech delivered by John F. Buchanan, manager of Douglas Studs, Inc., of South Fork, Colo., Mr. Buchanan asserts that there is a burden of understanding that must be borne by the forest industry with respect to the use of our public lands—but not exclusively so. It is a burden, he continues, that must be shared by all actual and potential users of our national forests. The role of education in bringing about this understanding is clearly indicated and I recommend this speech to my colleagues:

CHALLENGES CONFRONTING THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN FOREST INDUSTRY

We are fortunate that Governor Hathaway had the perception to realize our forest industry is but one facet of the environmental inter-relationship of all the factors involved, this is more than a forest industry conference because I see before me many conservationists, preservationists, recreationists, wildlife people, fish and game representatives, government people, and people from the communications media. We are pleased that there are more of you than there are of us.

We thank Governor Hathaway for this broad participation. We of the forest industries extend to all of you a most hearty welcome. We welcome you because we realize your myriad attitudes and the attitudes of your counterparts nationwide, will emerge, in the end, as the public attitude toward our industry.

It is, indeed, a privilege to address you at the outset of this conference in order to convey to you the determination of this Region's timber industry to contribute a more meaningful participation in the areas of environment, education, and communication.

Today, not only in the Rocky Mountains, but in the whole of the West, we are a troubled industry. Troubled and confused, because we have not understood the rapid shift in public attitudes regarding the use of natural resources. Not abreast of this shift in public attitude, we find ourselves the target of some deserved and some undeserved public criticism. We are determined to alter this situation.

We are faced with a seemingly unsolvable paradox. Mandated by Congress, the home building industry is required to build 26.0 million family living units in the next ten years. Jobs, food, homes are the social imperatives of our ever-increasing urban society. It is specious to argue that this overwhelmingly-accepted goal can be met without substantial, increased production of softwood building materials. Others, today and tomorrow, will give you the specifics of the supply-demand imbalance, its causes and suggested solutions.

Compelled to increase the domestic lumber production by urban society's demands, we are confronted with this same urban society's demands that vast increases be made in public land withdrawals for wilderness preservation, national parks, wildlife sanctuaries, recreation areas, and other restricted land uses. Not only are these demands levied on public lands, but on private lands as well.

It is not strange that our industry is somewhat bewildered by these conflicting demands when, in simplest terms, we are told, "Give us more and better housing but stop cutting trees."

A review of the past is necessary to an understanding of our present unfavorable situation.

At the turn of the century, "Cut out—move on" was the dictate. "Let daylight in the swamp and the devil take the hindmost" was the social philosophy of that day.

I have seen it all—from horse logging to balloon logging. Share with me the nostalgia of standing with my father on his mill dock, almost sixty years ago, watching the loading of a sailing schooner; or going with him on a week-long journey, by boat and buckboard, to his Shelton logging camp to see, for the first time, a 9x10 single-drum Tacoma yarder (a horse pulled the line back to the woods).

At that age, little did I realize I was witnessing the passing of the era of the ox and the horse in the woods and sail on the seas, and the beginning of the era of steam in the woods and on the rails.

The Panama Canal opened. Tacoma was the "Lumber Capital of the World." Unheeded was the pall of smoke that hung over Puget Sound, summer long, from fire in the slash and forest alike, for the forest seemed inexhaustible and the smoke smelled like money.

Heavy capitalization, burden of high fixed-charges, forced liquidation of cheap stumpage, glutted markets, was the name of the game, on the Pacific Coast, from 1910 to World War I.

Production was the god of the woods and mills—from the 9x10 yarder to the giant Lidgerwood Skyline; from the 50m a day mill to the 500m a day mill; from the ox to the railroad—take the best and leave the rest. This was the order of the day.

The conservationists of that day could well cry "devastation." There for all to see was the wasted wood, the abandoned, cut-over lands of that migratory age. This was the legacy of free land and free timber. Little chance for conservation in this time of boom and bust. It's easy, today, looking back, to condemn the liquidation philosophy of those years. How, with a free economy and cheap stumpage, could a stable base be achieved?—the stability so necessary for the practice of conservation forestry.

Seemingly, we, alone, are the unenviable inheritors of that migratory age with its cut-overs and its ghost towns. Yet we were not alone. The free land farmer and the placer miner shared in the devastation of that era. Yet, they opened the West—spanned a continent in two generations—were not those giants of free land, free timber, free minerals, truly the children of manifest destiny?

Concurrently, with those days of exploitation were the rising ground swells of conservation. Loud was the cry of "Timber Famine." The era of free land and free timber was passing. Out of the controversy over federal regulation of all timber lands came the compromises of McNary, Clarke and Sweeny; came the adjustment from ad valorem to harvest-yield taxes; came a new determination to "keep the fire out of the woods."

Out of the depths of the depression, the NRA Lumber Code gave birth to industrial forestry conservation in Article X, which committed the industry to leaving "its cut-over lands in good condition for reforestation."

The "American Tree Farm" and "Keep Green" movement, started in Southwestern Washington in 1939, has spread to 48 states, with over 33,000 tree farms having over 75 million acres under the certification program. Farm wood lots to huge industrial forest holdings now have a common purpose of continuous production of forest crops.

No longer does the haunting cry of "timber famine" echo through the woods. The billions in invested capital in the wood processing industry is the best assurance that our available, private land will be kept in trees.

So the saga of "cut-out and move on"—"free land and free timber"—has come to an end, to be replaced by "grow and cut"; "keep the fire out"; "keep the land green." We have passed from "timber mine" to "timber crop." It could not have been otherwise—and all of it in the span of one man's life.

Our past ties us to the present. As an industry we have been engrossed with production. Crude, wasteful production at the turn of the century, more sophisticated production today. We think and act in terms of man-hours per thousand board feet; product and market development; harvest and mill machine improvement; by-product utilization; and the production of trees and suppression of fire. The ethic of private enterprise, private property, and the concept that hard work brings its own rewards is bred in the very bones of our generation, who manage our western forest industries.

We believe, as an industry, that we have been doing a reasonably good job, the last quarter century, in growing what we cut, in doing our part to house the nation, and in increasing our utilization and protection of the forest crop. We cannot understand, in the face of what we believe to be our worthwhile accomplishments, why, today, we are in disfavor with the public. Make no mistake about that. Today we wear a black hat. If you believe anything I say, today, you better believe this.

Today, the public believes little of the good and all of the bad. We believe that, on the whole, we have done a creditable job.

There are others that do not. The large mass of the public, particularly the young public, is neither interested in nor involved with economic issues. They don't care, this public, about the gross national product. Furthermore, they are not at all impressed, that in importance, economically, we are the fourth largest industry; and they are not at all interested in what we tell them is good for them.

Do you realize that of all the people who ever lived in the United States, half of all these people are alive today; that the median age—that middle age today—is 27 years old?

This future public, the public we raised under a permissive philosophy, is not an unintelligent public. Yet, these people are filled with misinformation about our industry. They believe the old myths and some new ones as well. An eminent behaviorist scientist called it the "frontier syndrome." It is the gut feeling on the part of this new public that they inherit the forests; that the frontier is part of their birthright. It puts the people of our industry, particularly those harvesting public lands, in the role of interlopers and trespassers. Logical? No. Things don't have to be logical to be believed. The belief is the essence of reality.

I sympathize with this feeling of the public, that when things get too tough, and too over-crowded in their urban hives and cement ghettos, they can move out to some frontier.

There is another problem we face. The mores of the old days allowed a terrible waste of natural resources. Only recently have people begun to take a real interest in environmental affairs; now, the winds of change blow strong. So it is that the "environmental isolationists" exploit the "frontier syndrome" and "environmental desecration" to strike fear that we (we the forest industry) will destroy the last frontier. The fear that we will deplete the forest for all time, deplete and destroy the frontiers which are the last natural inheritance of the American people. You and I know that nothing is further from the truth, but the public doesn't know this.

I am saying that we are facing a problem to which there appears no solution, as yet. We are confronted with this dilemma; we are squarely up against the incompatibility of a fixed land base needed by a seemingly endless multiplication of users. A hopeless situation? Yes, unless we as an industry can face up to the realities of what threatens us. They are:

First, a rapidly growing population.

Second, a changing ethic.

Third, a lack of information about us and the good as well as the bad things we do.

Fourth, an attack from many sides—"Don't cut a tree, but give us lumber at reasonable prices."

Fifth, groups which perpetuate the old and new myths that we are the plunderers, rapers, destroyers who would deny the American public the use and enjoyment of the last frontier.

What can and must we do?

First, we must relate to our emerging public, the young generation. It matters little whether you disagree with them, their campus riots, their obscenities, their lack of real knowledge and real experience; the fact is it exists! It is there! Like it or not, agree or not, that is our public.

We must, I believe, accept one of the good things that emerges from all their clamor. We must accept and understand that they are concerned. That concern is the key that we may use in getting their attention so we may inform them. To do that, we must also be concerned. They don't think we are. They don't think we are concerned about the right things.

We must relate to this new public, we must inter-react with them.

Today, people do not care about our industry, they don't care about the abstracts of economics, nor do they care about wood. They say, "So who needs lumber?" They say, and with some truth, "half the things in our lives, today, were only in the test tube twenty years ago."

But they do care about trees. They couldn't care less about lumber, but they do care about trees. To relate, then, we have got to let them realize that in producing wood, we are taking care of their trees.

We must inform them that we want the same things they do. They want clean air, so do we. They want clean water, so do we. They want green, open spaces for their use—this expanding, crowded public which must have some escape from the increasing urban pressures—we, too, want this open space environment. They want responsive, workable programs for decent dwellings, the 70% of the people who live and work on 1% of our land, so do we. This is one of our basic commitments. These, then, all of them, must be our goals in the future. We must try to understand that future so our place in it will have a relevance to the needs of all the people in that future.

What, then, have we begun, as an industry, in Colorado, Wyoming, and South Dakota (Region II of the Forest Service), and what more can and should we do to demonstrate our honest concern for the welfare of the environment, a concern for both the inner cities and the open spaces.

Our first and paramount concern is the total open space environment. A proper perspective is essential to an understanding of the timber harvest impact on the open spaces. Almost 100% of our harvest comes from the National Forests. There are over 11.0 million acres of National Forest commercial timber lands in Colorado, Wyoming, and South Dakota, with an inventory of over 45.0 billion board feet of commercial timber.

We are harvesting approximately 350 million board feet annually, from less than one-half of 1% of the commercial timber area. At any given time, our harvest is leaving untouched over 99½% of the timbered area.

Notwithstanding this small percentage of harvest-disturbed land, in the shared forest area, we are commencing to do a better job. Starting a year ago, the harvest pattern in the Spruce sub-region was changed from block clear-cutting to block over-story cutting, with emphasis being placed on leaving undisturbed young and advanced reproduction.

The timber operators in the Spruce areas are cooperating with the Forest Service in this new harvest method to the extent practical within the economic limitations imposed by the Forest Service sale appraisals for felling, skidding, and roading.

This method of over-story harvest partially screens the unavoidable logging debris and shortens the time it takes for new growth to heal the harvest scars. The land is returned to a forest cover more rapidly than by the previous method of pile, burn, and replant.

In our three states the annual tree disease and insect losses are over 500 million board feet, half again as much as is harvested by the wood-using industries. Some way must be found, with an economically realistic harvest program, to prevent this staggering loss. Without such a program the forest environment will continue to suffer a needless blight and will return less than it should to the recreation users who want and are responsive to a forest cover of green, flourishing, growing trees.

A joint committee representing the Colorado Open Space Council and the timber industry has agreed to a policy of less permanent road intrusion in the multiple use area, with a corresponding greater mileage of temporary roads for use in timber harvesting. We have agreed that most of these temporary roads should be blocked off on the completion of harvest, so that the temporary road areas will be quickly returned to growing trees. We have agreed that a limited mileage of these temporary roads be kept open and restricted to use by four wheel drive and tote goat vehicles. We are hopeful that the Forest Service will agree to and implement this suggested road policy as a major step in enhancing the open space environment.

Our industry has taken a third significant action, one in the area of air pollution. The Colorado operators have sponsored a state legislative act entitled "An Air Quality Improvement Fund." This act, if passed, will create a research fund through a self-imposed tax of $0.15 per m feet on all Colorado lumber production. The funds are to be used by the appropriate Colorado State University research facilities, to conduct market and product research in the exclusive field of wood waste. Such research of wood waste creating new products could end plant air pollution and increase rural employment. I am confident the Colorado Act will be the forerunner of similar legislation in the other Rocky Mountain states.

If we are to relate to people, their needs, their aspirations, if we are to still their fears and uncertainties about the future of the open timber lands, we must broaden their opportunity to a more meaningful share in them.

It is well to look at what the owners of the private industrial forests have done in sharing their private lands with the public. A 1968 "Forest Industry Recreation Survey" highlights these statistics. Companies surveyed, 234; over 65.0 million acres surveyed. Over 85% of these lands were open free of charge to berry picking, picnicing, hiking, swimming, camping, winter sports, boating, and organized recreation. Company facilities included 1,832 overnight tent or trailer camp sites, 2,300 picnic tables, 19 ski areas, for a total expenditure of over $7,000,000. Over 95% of these lands were open to hunting and fishing.

Do not we operators on public timber lands also have some measure of social responsibility to the public who seek recreation on these shared lands? I am sure you will agree with me that we do. May I suggest some criteria concerning our industry's involvement in expanding the recreation opportunity for the general public: First, the initiative and action must come from local communities—must come from the grass roots. Second, the project must involve a local citizens' group such as a rod and gun club, an Izaak Walton club, a local wildlife group, or a service club; it must also involve the public land agency and a local operator. Third, the projects should be located on state or federal lands. Fourth, upon completion, maintenance and supervision should be the responsibility of the public agency involved. I envision projects such as community picnic grounds, modest overnight camp sites, stream improvement, demonstration denuded-site tree plantings, boat launching sites, etc. Modest signs should identify the participating partners.

Improved logging practices, less permanent road impact, reduction of forest cover blight caused by insects and disease, control of air pollution through wood-waste research, and involvement at the local level in expanding the shared land recreation opportunity, these are the continuing and enlarged commitments our industry makes to the open space environment.

We are facing the fact that our many publics do not yet understand that the forest harvester opens the way through roads; through harvest of an ever renewable resource, keeps the forest green; through involvement will improve their opportunity of sharing these lands.

Only through the public's understanding that timber harvest is essential to the perpetuation of their heritage will come the realization and appreciation that we are protectors, not despoilers. Only if we reach this degree of understanding will the public realize that timber harvest, not preservation, is the best way to protect and improve these shared lands.

Contrary to the misinformation and propaganda being spread by the Sierra Club, our industry has no thought of dismembering the areas now under the Wilderness Preservation System. I will go further, our industry will not oppose the incorporation of the remaining, existing primitive, or wild areas (subject to minor boundary additions or deletions), into the Wilderness Preservation System. We, too, recognize the place and purpose of wilderness as defined under the Multiple Use Act.

We would be less than honest, however, with that great majority of the American people, if we acquiesced in the withdrawal for wilderness preservation of double or triple the acreage now in the wilderness, wild, or primitive areas. For the present and, yes, for the future, the road to escape from urban pressures, for the many, runs to the shared forest lands, both public and private. For the hardy few, the wilderness lies beyond.

We know that the root cause of today's unrest in our urban centers is the denial of equality, social, economic, and cultural benefits to the dwellers of the inner city. The impenetrable suburban wall is an effective barrier to equal opportunity and participation in the whole of the city's life, a wall that will not soon, if ever, be breached by the inner city's disadvantaged people.

Surely, we do not want to perpetuate this pattern of social injustice in our western forest lands. Not for long will we have the option of making socially acceptable judgments regarding future people-use of these lands.

Doubling or tripling the areas in wilderness, wild and primitive classification will close and lock the door to equality. Wilderness, by its very nature, imposes restrictions on equality of use. Why? For the simple reason that wilderness imposes barriers that are as real as the suburban barriers. The wilderness creates, if not a social barrier, at least an economic and physical ability barrier to the full sharing of use.

The wilderness is restricted in use to the affluent few who can afford the guided horseback tour and the sturdy few physically able to backpack in. Wilderness will not be used by the average urban family seeking a recreation escape from inner city pressures.

Rather than expansion of wilderness, should we not strive toward improving the shared land environment, open and accessible to all? Compatibility of uses, each use contributing meaningfully to the total welfare of the open spaces, is the goal we should seek. Only through attainment of that goal will we be responsive to the desires, needs, and dreams of the American people.

Let us turn to education, the second major area in which our three-state industry will participate with renewed purpose.

At the local grade and high school levels, we must become involved in creating a conservation conscience in tomorrow's citizens. We shall arrange plant and woods tours of our operations. We will see that American Forest Institute educational aids are made available to the local schools.

We must become involved with and participate in joint meetings with conservation oriented scholars and teachers who will do so much in the shaping of a sound conservation policy.

We propose to fund a non-profit natural resource educational foundation. The main purpose of the foundation will be to grant scholarships to junior and senior college students majoring in timber management and wood science. These scholarship awards will be based on merit and should increase the number of students graduating in these disciplines.

Coupled with these scholarship grants will be summer work programs, not only for the scholarship recipients, but also for other students in the general field of natural resource education.

And finally, we are determined to do a better job of communicating with the public. Our local public, the state, and the national public. First of all, we will communicate the truth. We are going to recognize problems. We are going to practice disclosure. We are going to recognize the bad as well as the good.

We've got to make people, a lot of people, realize that we do have a comprehension of the values that they place on our public lands.

Through communication we can and will inform these publics that we are concerned about the open space environment, that we will try and relate our activities to their concern about the future of our western forested lands, that we, too, want to protect the good things we hold dear to our way of life.

Our only defense and protection is the armour of good performance, publically appreciated. Our real potential will only come through our profound understanding of this country, and our accurate assessment of how

to relate to the American public which needs us so much, but which knows it so little.

We have another responsibility that we must meet if we are not to be sidetracked from the mainline of social opportunity. Not only must we be increasingly responsible to the forest environment, to education, to communication, we must also do our part in providing decent homes for the American people.

These commitments are not lightly made, nor will they be easily come by. Not all of the Region's mills will participate in all of these programs, but most of them will. With honesty in our hearts, with firmness in our purpose, with a better understanding of the goals we seek to attain, we as an industry, pledge ourselves to a better future for the American people.

TAX REFORM: THE EQUITABLE PATH TO INCREASED REVENUE

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the April 15 deadline for the payment of Federal income taxes is approaching. As that date draws near, the issue of tax reform once again is placed squarely before Congress. It is an issue we can no longer ignore. Threats of a taxpayers revolt were transformed to action in many cities throughout the year, as evidenced by the school bond issues defeated by voters. Whether by oversight, error, or silent protest, some 30 percent of all incorrect tax returns already filed for 1968 failed to show the addition of the 10 percent surcharge.

Americans are angry, and rightfully so, over the vast loopholes in our tax system and our failure to correct them. The average taxpayer is incensed by the fact that he must pay hard-earned money to support Government spending while 155 Americans with incomes of over $200,000 paid no Federal income taxes at all last year. He is upset that an estimated $50 billion a year of possible tax revenue is not collected because of loopholes in the system. Dissatisfaction is compounded when, in addition to the Federal tax, he is required to pay ever-increasing State and local taxes.

The President and Congress have talked about the need for tax reform for years. Congress has been seriously considering tax reform for a decade, yet the average taxpayer sees little improvement in our laws. When President Johnson asked for approval of the 10-percent surtax, I, in a Congressional Record speech of August 17, 1967, called on the President to couple tax reform with the measure. When the tax measure was enacted I insisted that the President be required to submit reform proposals before his term expired. This requirement was made law. However, the President chose to cavalierly ignore it. Hopes for reform were raised again this year when the Ways and Means Committee initiated hearings on tax revision. However, the chairman of that committee has stated that so much reform is needed, Congress may not have time to act this year.

Congress should not take full responsibility for the failure to revise our tax laws. President Nixon has recommended extending the 10-percent surtax for at least another year. He has also expressed some desire for granting tax credits to business. Such a practice would create more loopholes faster than Congress can correct the inequities that already exist. To our Nation's 110 million taxpayers who are assured every year that tax reform is high on the Government agenda, revision is a myth. The time has come for the administration to make reform a reality.

Today I will outline a bill I will introduce to close 15 loopholes in our present system and raise approximately $17 billion. Changes in individual and corporation taxation are included, as well as changes in gift and estate taxes. Restrictions on the operation of tax-exempt foundations and modification of tax laws regarding them are also included.

Eight revisions of the individual income tax structure will raise approximately $1.5 billion by increasing the taxes of the wealthy. A minimum income tax will assure that the 21 persons with incomes of over $1 million who escaped taxation last year will be taxed in the future. Preferential treatment of capital gains and losses will be stopped. Hobby farmers will not be permitted to deduct all farm losses from nonfarm income. The unlimited charitable deduction will be phased out over a 10-year period, and the $100 dividend exclusion and special tax treatment of stock options will be repealed. The many wealthy who obtain large sums of tax-free income will no longer be permitted to subtract all their deductions from taxable income. Instead, the deductions will be allocated between the taxed and untaxed income.

Four revisions in the corporate tax structure will yield over $4 billion. Most of this sum will be raised by eliminating the tax-free status of industrial development bonds, repealing the accelerated depreciation on speculative real estate, and the revoking of the 7-percent investment tax credit.

Three revisions of estate and gift taxes will eliminate existing disparities and will increase Federal revenue by $2.7 billion. My bill will discontinue the separate treatment of gift and estate taxes and will collect taxes on capital gains which now are untaxed at death. In addition, it will repeal the provision that permits government bonds to be redeemed at par value for the payment of estate taxes.

Finally, the treatment of tax-exempt foundations will be modified. Each will be required to pay a nominal income tax, but it could yield the Government around $10 billion. Regulations regarding the operation of foundations will be tightened to assure that the institutions are not used for personal gain or self-dealing.

A section-by-section analysis of the proposed bill follows:

ESTABLISH A MINIMUM INCOME TAX

This provision would require everyone with an income above the poverty level to pay taxes, including the 155 persons with incomes over $200,000 who escaped Federal taxation last year. It would help assure that people in similar income brackets pay similar tax rates on their total income, irrespective of the source of that income. Existing laws give tax breaks to some because they treat different sources of income in different ways. Interest on State and local government bonds is not taxed; one-half the profits of capital gains are not taxed, and the remainder is taxed at a low 25 percent. Persons receiving most of their income from these sources may still have some taxable income. However, this sum can be reduced by giving an unlimited amount to charity, by deducting farm losses from nonfarm income, and by deducting depletion costs in excess of the cost of drilling. After all of these deductions, the amount of income on which taxes are levied may be small or nonexistent. Persons who receive most of their income from a salary do not benefit from these tax loopholes. Most of their income is taxed.

The result is grossly inequitable treatment for persons with equal total incomes. Some of them pay 65 percent of their total income to the Federal Government; others pay only 2 percent. The minimum income tax would restore equity. It would guarantee that most individuals with total incomes of $500,000 or more would pay taxes at the rate of 30 to 40 percent.

The minimum tax would be imposed on a base broadened to include all sources of income. The income would be taxed at rates ranging from 7 to 35 percent, roughly one-half the current rates. No one would be required to pay more than 50 percent of their total income to the Federal Government.

This tax will raise $420 million in Federal revenue.

ALLOCATION OF DEDUCTIONS BETWEEN TAXABLE AND NONTAXABLE INCOME

Tax laws give individuals with large incomes a double benefit: first, much of their income, because of its source, is not taxed; second, all deductions are subtracted from the taxable portion, even though they may be assigned more properly to the nontaxed income.

The effect of the law is evident by this illustration: An individual receives an income of $1,284,718. Of this sum, $74,292 represents a salary and $1,210,426 represents long-term capital gains. One-half of the capital gains is deducted, reducing the income to $679,405—allowing for the $100 dividend exclusion. Personal deductions of $616,419 and personal exemptions of $1,200 are subtracted, reducing taxable income to $1,786. He pays a tax of $274.

Allowing persons to reduce their tax bill substantially in this fashion cannot be justified. Deductions should be apportioned between both taxable and nontaxable income.

This provision would eliminate the present inequity. It would require taxpayers to allocate all deductions for nonbusiness expenses between taxed and nontaxed income.

Closing this tax loophole would increase Federal revenue by $405 million. Most of this sum would be paid by approximately 40,000 persons with incomes of over $50,000.

REVISE THE TREATMENT OF FARM LOSSES FROM NONFARM INCOME

Those who farm as a hobby receive tax advantages under a provision enacted to aid genuine farmers. They use liberal accounting procedures, designed to ease the task of computing income for the genuine farmer, to realize considerable tax savings. They deduct from taxable income farm losses which usually represent investment in farm assets, not true economic losses. Then, the gentleman farmer often sells the investment and it is taxed at low capital gains rates. This creates another savings. Under such a practice, the Federal Government loses taxes and the farm economy is distorted, at the expense of those who farm for a living.

My proposal would help remedy this situation by limiting to $15,000 the farming expenses that can be deducted from nonfarm income in one taxable year. Additional losses could be carried over to the following year. Only farmers using cash accounting methods would be affected by the $15,000 limit.

REPEAL THE UNLIMITED CHARITABLE DEDUCTION

The unlimited charitable deduction provision offers another tax haven for the wealthy by permitting them to further reduce an already low taxable income.

They may deduct an unlimited amount from taxable income if, in 8 out of 10 years, their contributions to charity plus income tax exceed 90 percent of their taxable income. At first sight, it would appear that the wealthy should be rewarded for giving away so much of their income. Yet, the inequity of the provision is revealed when one remembers that a substantial percentage of the income of the wealthy is obtained from capital gains, State and local bonds, and oil depletion allowances, all of which are taxed at low rates if they are taxed at all. For the wealthy, the 90-percent requirement for the unlimited charitable deduction is not difficult to meet.

The unlimited charitable deduction provision should be phased out over a 10-year period. The Federal Treasury would receive $25 million in 1980, when the proposal takes effect. This sum would be collected from the wealthiest, those with incomes in excess of $1 million.

REVISE CAPITAL GAIN AND LOSS TAX LAWS

It is illogical and inequitable to tax capital gains at 50 cents on the dollar and permit the full amount of capital losses to be deducted from taxable income. Such a provision grants unfair advantage to those who are able to realize their gains and losses in alternate years. For example, if a property is sold one year and $1,000 capital gain is realized, the taxpayer would be required to pay $500 capital gains tax on the transaction. If, in the next year, a property is sold for a $1,000 capital gains loss, the entire $1,000 could be deducted from taxable income. In such a situation, the taxpayer over a 2-year period would realize a considerable tax advantage. Compare this treatment with the situation where the property owner sells both properties in the same year. Then the $1,000 capital gains would be offset by the $1,000 capital loss, with no net tax effect. By realizing the capital gains and losses in alternate years, a clear tax advantage is offered.

This section of the bill calls for equal treatment of capital gains and losses. Capital gains would be treated as they are currently. However, only 50 cents of capital loss would be permitted to offset $1 of gain.

This provision would increase Federal revenue by $60 million the first year. The ultimate level of increased income will be $100 million, which will be reached after 6 years.

REPEAL SPECIAL TAX TREATMENT FOR STOCK OPTIONS

Companies often reward top executives with stock options instead of salary increases. The option gives the executive the right to purchase company stock within a specified time, at the price for which the stock was selling when the option was granted. If the stock increases in value, and he exercises the option, the capital gains is taxed at the low 25 percent rate. Other executives who are rewarded with salary increases and bonuses instead of the stock option are required to pay income taxes at the regular rates. The stock option privilege has no rational or equitable basis. It should be eliminated.

My proposal would continue the efforts begun with the Revenue Act of 1964 to tighten the terms for qualifying for this privileged treatment. As the result, the Treasury would receive $150 million.

ELIMINATE THE $100 DIVIDEND EXCLUSION

Special treatment is granted to those who invest in stocks which is not granted to citizens who keep their money in savings accounts or invest in Government bonds. The stockholder can deduct the first $100 in dividends from his taxable income. People investing in other ways are required to pay income tax on the interest received. There is no justification for favoring investment in corporation stock. The ostensible reason for the privileged treatment is to compensate for double taxation of dividends. However, the logic of this reasoning falters when one remembers that corporations and their stockholders are separate legal entities. The purpose of incorporation is to limit the owners' liability by separating his income from the company's assets. The law should continue to separate the corporation from the stockholder.

My proposal would repeal the $100 dividend exclusion, and raise $225 million.

RESTRICT THE DIVISION OF MULTIPLE CORPORATIONS FOR TAX PURPOSES

Big corporations now take advantage of differential income tax rates which were enacted to assist small businesses. The situation arises because corporate income is taxed at 22 percent for the first $25,000 income and 48 percent for the remaining income. Although the law passed in 1950 was designed to give a tax break to small businesses, many large corporations have abused it by carrying out their activities through a series of small separate corporate units, each of which declares the 22 percent rate for the first $25,000 income.

This provision would limit the surtax exemption to one per business entity, regardless of whether the corporation is operated as one or a series of businesses. To give the corporations time to adjust, the provision would not take effect for 8 years.

The revenue increase from this provision will be $200 million.

REMOVE THE TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS

Tax-exempt municipal industrial development bonds merely subsidize plant construction for large corporations, most of which are capable of absorbing the building costs themselves. The situation arises because municipalities, in an effort to attract industry, issue bonds to construct plants to the company's specifications. The plant is then leased to the corporation, and the rent is used to retire the development bonds.

Issuance of the tax-exempt industrial development bonds serves no public purpose. The practice would be outlawed. Repeal will yield $50 million.

ELIMINATE THE ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION ON SPECULATIVE REAL ESTATE

Real estate speculators take unfair advantage of accelerated depreciation provisions and use the higher-than-normal deductions to offset ordinary income. They deduct more than their normal amount of depreciation during the early life of the building and then frequently sell the property before the lower-than-normal deductions go into affect. The next owner in turn begins with the higher-than-normal deductions and repeats the process. If the property is sold at a profit, the speculator pays the low capital gains rates on the entire amount, including the profit on the "book profit" resulting from accelerated depreciation. The advantages brought about by accelerated depreciation should be eliminated. The repeal would increase Federal revenues by $150 million.

REPEAL THE 7 PERCENT INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The credit, enacted in 1962, permits business firms to deduct 7 percent of the value of eligible new equipment installed during the year. It was designed to stimulate the economy, and should be repealed in light of today's inflation, and overstimulated economy. Three billion dollars would be added to the Treasury by this action.

DISCONTINUE PAYMENT OF ESTATE TAXES BY REDEMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BONDS AT PAR

Government bonds are an attractive investment to those who want to reduce their estate taxes. This is true because the Government allows the bonds to be redeemed at par value in payment of estate taxes. Thus, a person can buy $60,000 worth of U.S. bonds, and, if his estate redeems them later at $80,000 the estate tax bill will be cut by $20,000.

This provision would close the tax loophole, and increase Federal revenues by $50 million.

UNIFY GIFT AND ESTATE TAXES

Estates of comparable size may be treated differently for tax purposes. The inequity arises because gifts distributed from the estate and the estate itself are taxed at different rates. A person with a large estate may give at least $30,000 in gifts during his lifetime without being taxed, and gifts exceeding this amount are taxed at low rates. The amount of the gifts is subtracted from the estate, and thus is not taxed as a part of it when the donor dies. Estates, on the other hand, are taxed at higher rates.

Because the gifts are actually part of the estate, it is unfair to tax them at lower rates than those imposed on the estate. The inequitable practice would be eliminated by taxing both gifts and estates at the same rates. This would be accomplished by imposing a single transfer tax. Under the transfer tax, lifetime gifts and transfers at death would be combined to determine the total wealth subject to taxation, and a single exemption and rate schedule would be applied to the total. In addition, the base of the gift tax would be broadened.

The Federal Government would receive $150 million.

TAX CAPITAL GAINS UNTAXED AT DEATH

Wealth from wages, salaries, and other sources of ordinary income is taxed as it is accumulated. Appreciation of capital assets is also taxed when the assets are sold. However, some capital gains are never taxed. This occurs when the stockholder whose assets have appreciated in value dies and the property passes to an heir. The heir does not pay taxes on this increase in value; his only responsibility for taxes is on any future profit they earn. This loophole favors the wealthy who can afford large estates. It also freezes the assets of older persons who would rather pass on their money to relatives than to the Federal Treasury.

This provision would impose a capital gains tax on the assets just as if they had been sold immediately before death. The gains would be taxed as ordinary capital gains are now taxed, and this amount would be deducted from the estate before the estate tax would be computed.

An additional $2.5 billion would be added to the Treasury by closing this loophole.

PROHIBIT "GENERATION SKIPPING" IN THE TAXATION OF ESTATES

The wealthy can preserve their family's favorable financial position by transferring their property to a second generation instead of to the next succeeding generation. These arrangements allow the estate to be transferred without being taxed. If the practice is continued throughout the years, taxation could be avoided for generations.

Normally, accumulated family wealth is passed from one generation to the next succeeding generation, and a tax is paid with each transfer. However, our laws permit property to be transferred to a second generation through elaborate gift and trust arrangements that are designed to avoid the transfer tax. Under certain trust arrangements, the middle generation can escape taxation while maintaining virtual control over the trust and enjoying its income.

The proposed law would impose a transfer tax even though the estate was passed to the second generation.

The donor or the next succeeding generation would have the option of deciding which one of them would pay the tax. The next generation could elect to pay a substitute transfer tax as if the property had actually been transferred to it and then retransferred to the succeeding generation. The donor could elect to pay the normal transfer tax plus an additional fee to represent the payment by the skipped generation.

This scheme would make the transfer tax more equitable and would eliminate tax differences in alternate methods of distributing property. No estimate can be made of additional Federal revenue to be generated.

TIGHTEN CONTROLS OVER TRANSACTIONS BETWEEN TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS AND THEIR DONORS

The assets of some foundations are being diverted to the advantage of the donor or his relatives. Such a practice does not advance the charitable or tax-free purposes of the institution, and should be outlawed. This provision would prohibit foundations from lending their income or corpus to the donor or his relatives. It would prohibit foundations from purchasing or leasing property from the donor or his immediate family, and would not allow the tax-free organization to sell or lease property to the donor or his family.

PROHIBIT ACCUMULATION OF FUNDS

In many cases, a lot of time elapses between the transfer of gifts to charities and their use by the tax-free foundation. To prevent this delay, the proposal would require tax-exempt foundations to distribute all their net income annually to charity. The contribution would have to be made to publicly-supported charitable organizations or to privately supported operating charities. The foundation could also decide to use the income on its own charitable programs or to buy assets devoted directly to charitable activities. Provision would be made for the foundation to accumulate some income for more expensive, long-term charitable projects.

RESTRICT INVOLVEMENT IN UNRELATED BUSINESS ACTIVITIES

Many tax exempt foundations engage in business activities unrelated to their tax exempt functions. This activity gives the foundations unfair competitive advantages over privately owned businesses, and wield important, unchecked weight on the American economy. The unfair practice would be restricted under the proposed law. It would not permit tax-free foundations to own directly or indirectly more than 30 percent of the total combined voting power or equity of an incorporated or unincorporated business, if that business were engaged in activities unrelated to the charitable functions of the foundation.

REQUIRE DONORS TO RELINQUISH INTEREST IN CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS BEFORE A TAX DEDUCTION IS ALLOWED

Some persons who donate property to charitable foundations deduct the contributions from their income tax, but retain controlling interest in the gift. This practice should not be permitted. My bill would not grant the income tax deduction on the gift until one of three events occurs: First, until the foundation disposes of the contributed asset; second, until the foundation uses it for an active charitable operation; and third, until the donor ceases control of the asset.

BROADEN THE BASE OF FOUNDATION MANAGEMENT

To further guard against using tax-free foundations for private advantage, the bill would require the institutions to broaden their management. It would limit the degree of permanent control a donor or his descendants could retain. After the foundation had been in operation for 25 years, the donor and certain relatives would be required to give up all but 25 percent of the control of the managing board.

RESTRICT FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS OF TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

Foundations should not be permitted to jeopardize their funds by making risky loans and investments. This provision would restrict the lending operations of foundations. It would require that foundation loans to third persons unrelated to the donor be limited to charitable purposes or to activities that are safe. It would require that all loans made by foundations for purposes unrelated to tax-exempt functions be clearly safe and necessary.

IMPOSITION OF A 20-PERCENT INCOME TAX

Foundations are receiving tremendous amounts of income from capital gains and other sources in addition to their charitable gifts. In 1966, 596 foundations studied by the House Small Business Committee had a gross income of $1,089,627,732, including capital gains. A substantial portion of this sum would be subject to taxation if it had been received as income by businesses, individuals, and other taxable institutions. By allowing tax exempt foundations to get income from businesses they control, from capital gains, from interest, and other sources, the American public is being cheated out of much Federal revenue. This unfair practice would be curtailed by requiring that foundations pay a tax equal to 20 percent of their gross income. The gross income would be computed to include revenue from business activities, interest, dividends, gross rents, gross royalties, and gain or loss from the sale of assets. Income related to charitable purposes would not be affected. Money from contributions, gifts, and grants would not be taxed.

The income tax would yield $200 million annually from 596 foundations. The total yield from all 29,666 foundations could well be nearly $10 billion.

These reforms will show American taxpayers that Congress is serious about restoring equity to our tax laws. Equal treatment for all must be the keystone of our tax system. We expect 110 million Americans to compute their tax bills voluntarily. Our revenue-raising scheme would be reduced to chaos if taxpayers refused or could not be trusted to do this. Yet, inequities in the laws reduce the willingness to comply. A person does not like to make out a check to the Internal Revenue Service when he thinks his neighbor is getting an undeserved tax break. Congress must act now before dissatisfaction with taxes becomes more widespread. The reforms I have outlined will help restore fair treatment and confidence.

PHILIPPINE SUGAR QUOTA

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention an item that appeared in the March 8, 1969, issue of the Manila Times. The news item points out that the U.S. AID mission chief, Wesley Haraldson, is "boiling mad" that Philippine orders for new sugar mills are being placed with Japan and not with U.S. suppliers despite the fact that the Philippines earns large amounts of foreign exchange from its preferential sugar market in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I want to applaud Mr. Haraldson's efforts, and I sincerely hope he is successful in changing the current Philippine pattern of buying their sugar mills from Japan.

After reading this news item, I made several inquiries of the executive departments concerning the Philippine sugar quota and its plans for expanding the sugar milling industry. I find Mr. Haraldson's position essentially correct.

The Department of Agriculture informs me that the current sugar quota for the Philippines is 1,126,000 short tons, all but 59,000 tons to be filled in raw sugar. Under the Sugar Act, the preference rate paid for raw sugar is 7.78 cents per pound. If you adjust the preferential rate for duty and freight of about 1 cent per pound for comparison to the world market rate, you find that the direct benefit to the Philippines under the Sugar Act is $60 a short ton, or $67.5 million annually.

Chiefly to assure the fulfillment of the Philippine raw sugar quota under the U.S. Sugar Act, 15 new centrals have either been approved for construction or are in the process of approval. The overall cost of these new sugar centrals is estimated to be in the neighborhood of $200 million. Ten projects, costing about $136,000,000, were approved for construction prior to March 1968, and five additional applications have been favorably recommended to the President for approval. The mill machinery for nine of the initial projects currently in operation or under construction was purchased from: Japan, six; France, one; United Kingdom, one; and Puerto Rico, one. Negotiations for the 10th mill were under way with a U.S. supplier, but were broken off because the proposed millowner died.

It is my understanding that U.S. equipment is price competitive when performance and expansion capacity characteristics are fully considered, although financial terms are somewhat tighter. It is also my understanding that U.S. companies have not been entirely excluded from participation since U.S. construction companies operating in the Philippines have obtained contracts for the erection of the mills. Also, some U.S. equipment, such as a turbine driver and generator, has been used in the expansion or modernization of old sugar centrals. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty discouraging picture for U.S. equipment suppliers.

Mr. Speaker, in approving new sugar centrals, I believe greater consideration should be given by the Philippine Government to the United States as a source for future milling equipment. There are obviously great advantages to both countries where sugar quotas are involved to have, in part, U.S. machinery and equipment milling the sugar. I would hope that the U.S. Congress, as well as U.S. officials administering the act, might so consider this factor in the allocation or reallocation of future quotas.

THE EISENHOWER LEGACY

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, many have been the words of tribute written and spoken these last few days to honor the memory of Dwight David Eisenhower. Standing out among them is a statement by Dr. John Wickman, director of the Eisenhower Center in Abilene, Kans. In carrying out his duties at the center, Dr. Wickman has probably been exposed to more of the many-faceted greatness of General Eisenhower than anyone outside the Eisenhower family. I find his words particularly appropriate at this time and consider it my obligation to bring them to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

THE EISENHOWER LEGACY

We can do no better, I believe, than ponder the words with which former-President Eisenhower began his address upon his homecoming to Abilene, Kansas, on June 22, 1945. Looking back over the ordeal and triumph in his role as Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, he said, "Every boy dreams of the day when he comes back home after making good. I, too, so dreamed, but my dream of forty-five or more years ago has been exceeded beyond the wildest stretch of imagination."

Today we look back over a career which spans 24 additional years after that warm, soggy June day in Kansas, and nod our concurrence. Few men came from such humble beginnings to rise to such heights. Few men have been able to make the journey as did Dwight D. Eisenhower, and still preserve, as he did, the affection and respect of his fellow citizens.

In General Eisenhower's life there was a concept which is still appealing to young and old in this country. It was the concept of service. Not a self-negating service, which so easily slips into the servile; but rather service performed for country and family, and accomplished out of the genius and strength of the individual.

Where did that concept come from? Was it born out of a necessity dictated by a large family living on modest means in an Abilene, Kansas, at the turn of the century? Was it the result of loving and devoted parents who understood that character development in the young is neither easy, nor necessarily enjoyable, for both teacher and pupil?

Whatever its source, there is no question that President Eisenhower had it throughout his adult life. In choosing pathways, whether through the maze of organization which is the Army, or the complications and intrigues of the Supreme Allied Command in Europe, or through the politics of his party and country, he always chose those roads which lead to duty and honor.

Such choices were not easy for him, any more than they are easy for any of us. That they were not more difficult may be attributed to strengths of practicality, perseverance, intelligence, and self-knowledge which came from his inheritance, and his early development in America's heartland. It is too easy to wish away the influence that his early environment had on this man. He was not the product of what the America of his day deemed the best education, nor favored with the best of economic circumstances, nor thrust forward by reason of his parents' social standing. Yet the shaping forces, so necessary and so mysterious in their combinations, were there. The positive strengths were there for life's greatest challenges.

At the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library in Abilene there is a slide-sound show which all visitors to the Center may see. For a portion of it General Eisenhower recorded these words which seem especially fitting today:

". . . As you enter these buildings do not think of them as a monument to one man, or to one family. Rather, regard them as a tribute to our nation and to those who have defended it throughout its history. These structures are above all a tribute to what America gives to its children, no matter what the circumstances of their upbringing—the opportunity to aspire and achieve."

Dwight D. Eisenhower took hold of his opportunity, and his aspirations and achievements have become his monument. That monument is a full measure, and measuring up to it is the legacy he has left to each of us.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I join in deep sympathy with my colleagues and my fellow citizens as we mourn the death of one of our greatest American leaders, President and General Dwight David Eisenhower. In my eulogy to the general, I want to state that his heroic and lengthy struggle to live these past days exemplifies the life the great general lived during his years as a soldier, military commander, and President of the United States. He dedicated himself to every job he took on.

On behalf of my State of Nevada, Mrs. Baring, myself, and fellow Members of the House of Representatives, I am honoring the life of Dwight David Eisenhower.

It was always President Eisenhower's integrity and dedication to duty and mankind that guided him then and for which he will be remembered forever.

Another note about the general is the statement I recall him making regarding how much he detested war and the killing that regretfully always comes with war. Mr. Eisenhower said, as he spoke referring to his rank in the military, that he hoped someday soon people in his own type of employment would be permanently out of work. He hoped then as we all do now, that there will nevermore be a need for our country or other nations to maintain great armies.

So, as the general now is history, it will be remembered that, despite his distaste for war, his leadership as a military commander will be well marked when he directed allied armies to put an end to the terrorism and devastation of countries and mankind during World War II.

Then too, his role as peacemaker in the Korean war shall not be forgotten when he served as President of the United States.

And, at all times, President Eisenhower felt deep compassion for his fellow man and wanted the best for everyone.

Truly he was a leader and truly will he be missed.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT DELAYS "LOOPHOLE" HEARINGS

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Thomas Talburt in the Washington Daily News of April 1 reveals that the Ways and Means Committee is not receiving much cooperation from the Treasury Department in the committee's drive to close tax loopholes.

The American smaller taxpayers are aroused and demanding that tax reform succeed in the first session of the 91st Congress.

The executive department should aid the Congress in this important legislation.

TAX REFORMERS TO EXAMINE RETURNS

(By Thomas Talburt)

The Treasury Department's slowness in discovering and telling Congress about intricate new income tax dodges that may cost the government millions of dollars in revenue has emerged as a key issue in tax reform hearings now entering their seventh week.

Chairman Wilbur D. Mills, D-Ark., of the House Ways and Means Committee and Rep. John W. Byrnes (Wis.), the committee's ranking Republican, both have zeroed in on what they view as a clear-cut communications gap between Congress and federal tax law administrators.

While the tax-burdened public feels Congress already has an abundance of well-identified loopholes that have long needed closing, Rep. Mills and Rep. Byrnes make it clear they do not want to zip up one tax loophole only to have another replace it and go for years undetected.

WANT QUICKER TIPOFF

"What concerns me more than anything else that has come out of these hearings is why the red flag is not raised earlier on some of these newly developed tax gimmicks," Rep. Byrnes told Sheldon Cohen, former internal revenue commissioner, who testified at the hearings.

Rep. Mills expressed the same concern. He noted that, as new patterns of legal tax avoidance emerge, word of them should be relayed to Congress with reasonable promptness.

This is one reason Rep. Mills intends to have the committee examine in closed session later this month the tax returns of 155 persons with annual incomes of $200,000 or more who paid no incomes taxes in 1967.

"I want to know precisely how it happens that these individuals avoided paying federal taxes," Rep. Mills said.

AVOID PUBLICIZING LOOPHOLES

He added, however, that he will not make the information public to avoid advertising tax loopholes.

Rep. Mills and Rep. Byrnes also intend to ask newly named Treasury officials in the Nixon Administration to set up some kind of precise information-relaying system with Congress when these officials appear before the committee in mid-April.

Some of these new officials already have told reporters they are trying to devise methods to spot quickly "what the current tax gimmicks are . . . new gimmicks that spread like rumors at the lunch table or the golf club."

Some of the mysterious loopholes worrying the congressmen are devised by attorneys for corporations and wealthy individuals. They are intricate methods of combining special tax benefits voted by Congress to enable their clients to avoid all or most income taxes.

PREPAYMENT DEVICE

A far simpler device, spotted by Treasury officials in the Johnson Administration and apparently closed by the issuance of a new IRS regulation, involved prepayment of interest in one year for the entire life of a long-term loan.

By using this tax escape route, a wealthy individual could subtract from his taxable income for one year all the interest he normally would pay over, say, a 25-year period and thus bring his taxable income for that year virtually to nothing.

ANOTHER YEAR OF SURTAX

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very concise and objective commentary on the request of President Nixon to extend the 10-percent surtax was carried by the Chicago Daily News, Thursday, March 27.

In my opinion, this editorial in its clarity and preciseness was as sound in its explanation of the need to extend the surtax as any commentary I have seen.

The editorial follows:

ANOTHER YEAR FOR SURTAX

Hardly less important than his expected request for a year's extension of the 10-per cent surtax was President Nixon's promise to lop more billions of dollars off Lyndon Johnson's proposed budget.

So clearly necessary was the surtax extension and so nearly unanimous was opinion in its favor that the President's formal request caused barely a ripple of public reaction. With interest costs, house prices and the costs of food and other necessities spinning upward there is broad awareness of the need to cool inflation by whatever means are needed.

There will, of course, be outcries when the President's broad promise of economies begins to be translated into cuts of specific programs. Mr. Nixon proposed to trim the spending level "significantly below" the figure of $195.3 billion estimated in the 1969–1970 budget prepared by his predecessor. That suggests that every facet of governmental operation—foreign spending, defense, welfare, education—will have to feel the ax, and some of the programs will fall short of meeting the needs.

But a still more distasteful prospect is the alternative—runaway inflation that would finally bring the economy down in ruins.

GENERAL EISENHOWER, 1890–1969

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Talcott and I feel inadequate to eulogize General Eisenhower. We can merely express our gratitude to have lived in his era and to have known him.

His appeal was almost universal—which is quite extraordinary for a military or political figure.

When we contemplate what contemporary times or our future might be without his influence, we could shudder with forboding or tremble with trepidation.

The most his small, miniscule detractors could say was that "the Nation took no bold new courses during his Presidency." Perhaps, but he held us on course during perilous, troublesome times. He rescued us from the ravages of war in Korea and returned us to peace—a most welcome new course for us—and he avoided new wars for the world—no mean accomplishment. We enjoyed domestic tranquillity. We had pride in ourselves. We believed in the worth of the individual human being more than in the power of government. We can ask little more of leadership.

A few writers who excel in turning a phrase more than reporting the facts or drawing logical conclusions from correct premises, suggested that "as a general, he was a good politician and as a politician, he was a good general." We believe he had the unique, superior qualities of both and used them appropriately in each role. He also had the attributes of an ordinary man which affected and moderated his every decision, including those at the summit.

We like a general who can lead a coalition of nations yet who is compassionate and cares about each individual in his command. We like a politician who is straightforward, honest, and humble. We liked Ike.

We liked and admired his basic honesty. This may be his greatest, most impressive contribution to politics, diplomacy, and societal living. We believe it will endure.

We remember the U–2 incident. All nations spy; they must. The diplomatic code among spies was simple and well known. If a spy was caught, everything was denied. Our State Department initially followed the conventional universal rules of spying and denied the incident. When President Eisenhower learned the facts he admitted them straightforwardly—a diplomatic first and a strong leap forward in returning integrity and mutual confidence to diplomacy and international relations.

General Eisenhower was a humble man. This characteristic made him beloved. His life and service demonstrated that humility contributes to greatness.

As Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe and as President of the United States, he possesed more power than any individual in history. He used that enormous power prudently. He carefully matched responsibility with power. He made many momentous and delicate decisions, but he always assumed full responsibility for his decisions. He was so universally respected and his decisions so nearly always correct, simply because he was basically such a good man.

Because of his basic honesty he evoked trust; because of his genuine humility, he was beloved by all regardless of nationality, age, or station in life; he understood the meaning and demands of duty and was therefore one of our greatest patriots; he applied the full dimension of responsibility to himself, his family, his countrymen, his fellow man.

From an obscure background and an ordinary childhood, he developed into one of the world's most uncommon leaders. I trust his simple virtues of decency, honesty, humility and responsibility will be his legacy to future generations. No greater legacy could one man leave to posterity—in his day or ours—to us as individuals or to nations.

We extend our condolences to his Mamie and his family.

THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY ITSELF MUST GUARANTEE THE PEACE AND STABILITY OF THE NATION'S CAMPUSES

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as we view with alarm and dismay the disorders which have spread to so many academic institutions in the past few months, it is easy to lose sight of the fact that they are caused by only a very small minority of students. The publicity which attends each sitin, riot, or administration building capture is so blatant that one begins to think the entire student body of a given college is in revolt.

This is not the case, and I believe we should always keep in mind that beneath the headlines there is a much larger group of students who are striving to attain that which they came to college for—an education.

This was effectively brought home to me by a letter to the editor of the Binghamton, N.Y., Sunday Press, which I present to be reprinted at this point:

"Over-Thirties" Asked for Support

Binghamton.

To the Editor:

I am a student at Harpur College. I do not riot. I do not take drugs. I do not write obscenities on walls. I go to school because I want an education.

The vast majority of students are like me but we rarely make news. We have faith in people over 30 and we look to our elders for guidance and help. We need your help now.

They are threatening to turn our campus and others like it into bootcamps for their revolution.

While we study, they conspire to destroy our liberty.

At Harpur they deface our student center; deny freedom of speech to all who don't agree with them, preventing students from talking to recruiters and shouting down speakers who oppose them; they claim immunity from punishment for their acts and threaten violence if they are not given their way.

President Dearing and other administrators can not stand alone in the face of threats from howling barbarians.

They need and must have, strong backing from students and the community. Some of the students have the courage to speak up but we must have public support.

You, the over 30 generation, can bolster our faith in you by giving us your support.

You can write your congressman and legislators demanding strong action be taken against members of the academic community who use force to gain their ends and show no respect for common decency and the rights of others.

You can help by speaking up in your churches and organizations to express support for courageous administrators.

You will be defending freedom of speech and the rights of majority and minority alike from those who would rule by the fist.

Expelling rebellious students will not be denying the poor an education. The poor are not the rebels. The agitators are over privileged, upper middle class youths who know nothing of poverty and very little about work.

America's free and open, public and private educational systems have made our country the land of equal opportunity.

If the rebels are allowed to close or subvert our schools they will be closing the door of opportunity and hope on the poor, for it is the poor who need a good education the most, to escape from poverty.

I know, for I am as poor as anyone. Don't let us down, please.

Konrad B. Langlie.

Quite naturally, Mr. Langlie's letter prompted a goodly number of my constituents to write me, expressing support for him and the many serious students he represents. Many of the writers asked for congressional action to penalize campus disrupters. The fact that they did not know of the two provisions which Congress passed last year to withhold NDEA and other Federal benefits from students who disrupt is not surprising. I would be amazed to find of many, or any, cases where such laws have been invoked, because of reluctance by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to do so, and because of the unwillingness of college administrations to report the names of students who have rioted, or otherwise disrupted the teaching processes of their colleges. In short, the two provisions of the 90th Congress are unknown, unenforced, and, therefore, ineffective in stemming campus disorders.

The real answer, it seems to me, lies, not with the Congress but right back where the trouble is, on the campus. College administrations and boards of trustees must realize that it is their major responsibility to provide an education, in an orderly atmosphere, to those large numbers of students who want it, and to take firm steps to rid themselves of the bad apples who are spoiling the barrel.

At colleges where this basic fact has been realized, there has been little or no violence. Some of the student suggestions are good, and they have been recognized as such by administrators and adopted. Others are patently ridiculous, and offered only to goad, annoy, or produce a "confrontation," and they have been given the short shrift they deserve.

College administrations in institutions now may face another group of adversaries—the law abiding, education-seeking students who demand that the college live up to its part of the bargain by providing them with the education they seek, unhampered by the antics of radical rioters.

I was interested to note a recent news story reporting that 12 students whose education at Columbia University had been disrupted by the outbreaks at that institution have banded together to sue the trustees of Columbia, basing their case on the contractual relationship which exists between the university and themselves. They maintain that the university contracted with them to make an education available to them, and that by coddling the rioters and permitting them to halt classes at Columbia, the university has failed to keep its part of the contract.

So let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that the worm is beginning to turn, that the majority of students who do not riot but who have, to date, sat on the sidelines of the battle between the rioters and the colleges are now ready to mobilize to fight for the education they, and we as taxpayers, are paying for. Let us give our support to the Konrad Langlies who call for our recognition of their sincerity and worthiness and, further, let us let college administrators and trustees in our congressional districts and throughout the country know that we will back them with further legislation if need be, but that the basic need is a firm policy in dealing with those who would destroy the colleges they attend.

It is also encouraging to note that President Nixon has made a statement on this problem which is moderate in tone, but which also stresses that Federal involvement is only a part, and a rather small part in my view, of the solution. As the New York Times editorialized on March 24:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1969]

President Nixon was well-advised to resist his earlier impulse to send the Federal Government charging headlong into the troubled college and university scene. His sound restraint, however, makes it still more essential for the academic community itself to oppose any lawless acts within its own domain. Immunity from Government sanctions must not turn the campuses into sanctuaries for disorder.

The provocations by a small but destructive group of adolescent revolutionaries, aided by some camp-following teachers, have been severe; but after a week's consideration, the President has now reaffirmed the principle of campus independence from governmental interference . . . it . . . leaves the initiative to the campus authorities.

It would be irresponsible in the extreme for the academic world merely to approve of Mr. Nixon's hands-off statement, without heeding the second principle reaffirmed by the President. This is that violence or the threat of violence cannot be permitted to influence campus life. "Once it does, the community . . . ceases to be a university," the Chief Executive warned accurately.

The academic community—through a consensus of law-abiding and freedom-minded faculty, students and administrators—must now match the President's wise restraint by its own determination to guarantee the peace and stability of the nation's campuses.

Mr. Speaker, unless the academic community can curb these disruptions, government—Federal, State, and local—will be forced to do it for them, and I for one do not feel this should be necessary, nor will it be desirable.

ANOTHER INDICATION OF MOUNTING ANTI-ABM SENTIMENT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the opposition to development of an anti-ballistic-missile system by some of the Nation's most outstanding scientists and academicians has become apparent through testimony at recent congressional committee hearings and conferences.

The growing extent of this opposition, is making itself felt also in the increased volume of mail that is coming into my office and, I am sure, into the offices of other Members. One of the most impressive pieces of mail I have seen came from the University of Minnesota, which is located in my district. It was a petition of opposition to the construction and deployment of an ABM system by the United States, and it was signed by more than 400 students and faculty members.

A covering letter from the university's ad hoc committee of concerned scientists stated:

> The more than 400 signatures were gathered in less than a week through an informal effort centered in, but not confined to, the Institute of Technology and a few other scientific departments of the University of Minnesota. It is worth noting that, while no attempt was made to poll the entire staff, about a third of the IT faculty (including its Dean and most of its department chairmen) signed the petition. On the other hand, we found little evidence of support for ABM deployment.
>
> We believe that opposition to the ABM is rapidly growing on the nation's college campuses, and urge your active support of this movement.

It is obvious from this statement, Mr. Speaker, that a concentrated signature-collecting effort could have produced thousands more signatures at the University of Minnesota, which is one of the largest universities in the country. The message of the petition deserves the most serious consideration of every Member of Congress, because it is indicative, I think, of informed sentiment in the Nation today. The petition and its signers follow:

> We, the undersigned members of the faculty and staff of the University of Minnesota, strongly oppose the construction and deployment of anti-ballistic-missile systems, including Sentinel. This opposition results from our scientific interpretation of many published arguments. Each of us has his own individual reasons for taking this stand. Without going into all the well publicized details, we are convinced that the national security would be decreased by deployment of ABM systems. Among the more compelling reasons for this conviction are:
>
> 1. These systems will inevitably reactivate the arms race and increase the danger of preemptive war.
>
> 2. The ABM concept is technically unsound from a system viewpoint and cannot be tested.
>
> 3. The deployment of thousands of missiles throughout our country and their maintenance in instant readiness creates a serious risk of accidental nuclear explosion.
>
> 4. The ABM system is an unwise use of resources urgently needed to solve social and environmental problems at home.
>
> Many distinguished scientists and engineers, some of whom are or have been associated with the government, and including two recent Presidential Science Advisors, have already come out in opposition to the deployment of ABM systems. Some of these people have had access to classified information that we do not have. We join them in opposing the deployment of ABM systems.

SIGNATURES

W. L. Adams, Department of Physiology.

John A. Johnson, Department of Physiology.

Richard L. Purple, Department of Physiology.

H. Suura, School of Physics.

J. W. Halley, School of Physics.

Earl Peterson, School of Physics.

Walter Jackson McClure, School of Physics.

R. H. Stuewer, School of Physics.

E. Marquit, School of Physics.

Donald A. Geffen, School of Physics.

Benjamin F. Bayman, School of Physics.

Keith Ruddick, School of Physics.

Peter Roll, School of Physics.

Alfred O. C. Nier, School of Physics.

Phyllis S. Freier, School of Physics.

Timothy F. Cleghorn, School of Physics.

W. Robert Scarlett, School of Physics.

Philip Debenham, School of Physics.

Yousef Makdisi, School of Physics.

Gregory C. Alvord, School of Physics.

Peter Kriesman, School of Physics.

Francis M. Gasparini, School of Physics.

Javed Aslam, School of Physics.

Carl H. Smith, School of Physics.

David C. Black, School of Physics.

James G. Bradley, School of Physics.

Leo R. Lake, School of Physics.

Michael A. Oothoudt, School of Physics.

James A. Riley, School of Physics.

Ralph H. Hofmeister, Department of Economics.

Peter Gregory, Department of Economics.

Francis M. Boddy, Department of Economics.

Alban D'Amours, Department of Economics.

Lowell W. Johnson, Department of Economics.

N. J. Simler, Department of Economics.

Gestur Davidson, Department of Economics.

Barbara S. Zoloth, Department of Economics.

Charles A. Rambeck, Department of Economics.

Allan Maslove, Department of Economics.

James D. Likens, Department of Economics.

Edward Foster, Department of Economics.

Malcolm Burns, Department of Economics.

Perry L. Brown, Department of Economics.

Preson J. Miller, Department of Economics.

Ken Tiedemann, Department of Economics.

James Pella, Department of Economics.

David L. Sjoquist, Department of Economics.

Paul B. Manchester, Department of Economics.

F. Scott Wilson, Department of Economics.

John Hause, Department of Economics.

Eileen Yumibe, Department of Economics.

Marjorie C. Gritzke, Department of Economics.

Frank Slesnick, Department of Economics.

Francisco F. Thoumi, Department of Economics.

William C. Myslinski, Department of Economics.

H. David Crain, Department of Economics.

Jeffrey B. Miller, Department of Economics.

Albert Kuhfeld, School of Physics.

Michael R. Moldover, School of Physics.

Heinz Horner, School of Physics.

William Zimmermann, Jr., School of Physics.

Walter H. Johnson, School of Physics.

Peter Rauen, School of Physics.

Carl H. Poppe, School of Physics.

Wayne A. Stein, School of Physics.

James H. Werntz, Jr., School of Physics.

Richard C. Chase, School of Physics.

Javed Aslam, School of Physics.

Paul D. Lane, School of Physics.

Homer T. Mantis, School of Physics.

Morton Hamermesh, School of Physics.

Norton M. Hintz, School of Physics.

Nancy Strebe, School of Physics.

A. R. Barnett, School of Physics.

Hajime Ohmuma, School of Physics.

Dietrich Dehnhard, School of Physics.

J. M. Blair, School of Physics.

William Makofski, School of Physics.

Russel K. Hobbie, School of Physics.

D. L. Watson, School of Physics.

R. J. Holliday, Chemical Physics.

Robert L. Lipnick, Department of Chemistry.

Ken M. Johnson, Department of Zoology.

A. K. Ahmed, Department of Biochemistry.

Gilbert Atkinson, Department of Psychololgy.

Ronald C. Haglind, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Ernest Eckert, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Thomas N. Meyer, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Warren E. Ibele, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

A. O. Wood, Jr., Department of Mechanical Engineering.

M. J. Kaluza, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Donald A. Frohrib, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

John S. White, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Stanley C. Johnson, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

James L. Reynolds, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Richard C. Jordan, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Rodney G. Loper, Office of the Dean of Students.

C. J. Waddington, School of Physics.

Wentworth Quast, Department of Psychiatry.

Anne W. Oren, School of Social Work.

Paul T. Steen, School of Public Affairs.

R. E. Comstock, Department of Genetics and Cellular Biology.

R. B. Holloway, School of Business Administration.

H. Berman, Social Science Program.

C. Robert Morris, Law School.

Elaine R. Parent, Bureau of Institutional Research.

Peter J. Reed, Department of English.

Leonard H. Unger, Department of English.

Daniel Levine, Department of Mathematics.

Louis T. Safer, General Arts.

Jacques R. Chipault, Hormel Institute.

Alan H. Roberts, Medical School.

Auke Tellegen, Department of Psychology.

Franz J. Roehmann, Department of Music Education.

B. Robert Froehlich, Department of Economics.

E. Scott Maynes, Department of Economics.

Ronald I. Rainey, Department of Economics.

Donald John Roberts, Department of Economics.

Susan Edelman, Department of Economics.

John Buttrick, Department of Economics.

Marvin Kraus, Department of Economics.

Dennis Olson, Department of Economics.

Jeff de Bevac, Department of Economics.

Yuki Kiyokawa, Department of Economics.

Wayne Stevenson, Department of Economics.

John Tillman, Department of Economics.

Lorraine Wise, Department of Economics.

Richard Towber, Department of Economics.

Thomas Pinfold, Department of Economics.

Thomas J. Muench, Department of Economics.

Maurice B. Visscher, Department of Physiology.

Irwin J. Fox, Department of Physiology.

Jui S. Lee, Department of Physiology.

Eugene D. Grim, Department of Physiology.

Nathan Lifson, Department of Physiology.

David G. Levitt, Department of Physiology.

Richard E. Poppele, Department of Physiology.

James Bloedel, Department of Physiology.

John E. Burton, Department of Physiology.

N. Paul Rosenthal, Department of Physiology.

Thomas A. McKean, Department of Physiology.

Ernest A. Greene, Department of Physiology.

Rodney B. Haney, Department of Physiology.

Warren Stenberg, School of Mathematics.

Hillel H. Gershenson, School of Mathematics.

Robert C. Sine, School of Mathematics.

L. N. Argabright, School of Mathematics.

Daniel Fife, School of Mathematics.

Hans F. Weinberger, School of Mathematics.

Mario Miranda, School of Mathematics.

David S. Kindersbhur, School of Mathematics.

Edward Cline, School of Mathematics.

Charlotte Striebel, School of Mathematics.

John O. Kiltinen, School of Mathematics.

Eugene Fabes, School of Mathematics.

Joseph G. Rosenstein, School of Mathematics.

Peter A. Rejto, School of Mathematics.

George H. Knightly, School of Mathematics.

Walter Littman, School of Mathematics.

Robert Ellis, School of Mathematics.

Harvey Keynes, School of Mathematics.

Gordon Keller, School of Mathematics.

B. V. Haxby, Department of Electrical Engineering.

F. N. Bailey, Department of Electrical Engineering.

R. Y. Kain, Department of Electrical Engineering.

V. D. Albertson, Department of Electrical Engineering.

B. A. Shenoi, Department of Electrical Engineering.

L. M. Chanin, Department of Electrical Engineering.

T. S. Lee, Department of Electrical Engineering.

W. F. Brown, Jr., Department of Electrical Engineering.

G. K. Wehner, Department of Electrical Engineering.

D. E. Speliotis, Department of Electrical Engineering.

D. F. Pindar, Department of Microbiology.

Paul A. Chapman, Department of Chemical Engineering.

Howard J. Hickman, Department of Chemical Engineering.

Peter B. Moyle, Department of Zoology.

David W. Gimmestad, School of Mineral and Metallurgical Engineering.

Sarat C. Praharaj, Department of Aeronautical and Mechanical Engineering.

Ved P. Gupta, Department of Aeronautical and Mechanical Engineering.

John Osborne, Department of Aeronautical and Mechanical Engineering.

H. K. Prasad, Department of Aeronautical and Mechanical Engineering.

Gary Stroebel, School of Mineral and Metallurgical Engineering.

Wendel Maegley, Department of Aeronautical and Mechanical Engineering.

David L. Sippel, School of Mineral Metallurgical Engineering.

Lajpat Utreja, Department of Aeronautical and Mechanical Engineering.

Vinod P. Gupta, School of Mineral and Metallurgical Engineering.

John Wells, Department of English.

Bill Heath, Departmentof English.

Robert J. Reddick, Department of English.

Charles V. Stone, Department of English.

James A. Houlding, Department of English.

Donald Vanouse, Department of English.

Richard R. Malmsheimer, Department of English.

Philip D. Noer, Department of English.

K. Starosciak, Department of English.

J. Wetzel, Department of English.

Nigel J. Potter, Department of English.

Harry Foreman, Office of International Program.

Lawrence F. Merl, School of Social Work.

A. K. Wickesberg, School of Business Administration.

George R. Sell, School of Mathematics.

C. L. Vaughan, General College.

Gover Maxwell, Department of Philosophy.

I. M. Kolthoff, Department of Chemistry.

R. M. Dodson, Department of Chemistry.

R. F. Borch, Department of Chemistry.

Marvin L. Stein, Computer, Information and Control Science.

K. S. Frankowski, Computer Science Department.

Jay A. Leavitt, Computer Science Department.

Edwin C. Thiede, Department of Electrical Engineering.

Frederick M. Waltz, Department of Electrical Engineering.

Walter J. Maier, Department of Civil Engineering.

Keith S. Champlin, Department of Electrical Engineering.

Larry L. Kinney, Department of Electrical Engineering.

Warren B. Cheston, School of Physics.

John S. Dahler, Department of Chemical Engineering.

S. R. Hibarger, Department of Chemical Engineering.

Richard W. Coyne, Department of Chemical Engineering.

Theodore A. Wilson, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

Herbert S. Isbin, Department of Chemical Engineering.

Rutherford Aris, Department of Chemical Engineering.

Michael R. Overcash, Department of Chemical Engineering.

Robert W. Carr, Jr., Department of Chemical Engineering.

Patrick Meagher, Department of Economics.

John P. Moran, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

John W. Hayden, Department of Civil Engineering.

John T. Hanley, Department of Civil Engineering.

Lawrence E. Goodman, Department of Civil Engineering.

Walter K. Johnson, Department of Civil Engineering.

Paul P. Christiano, Department of Civil Engineering.

Daniel L. Gerlough, Department of Civil Engineering.

Lyle P. Pederson, Department of Civil Engineering.

Jesse E. Fant, Department of Civil Engineering.

Matthew J. Huber, Department of Civil Engineering.

Larry W. Gubbe, Department of Civil Engineering.

Ronald M. Kohner, Department of Civil Engineering.

John K. Arntson, Department of Civil Engineering.

Barry Whiteaker, Department of Civil Engineering.

Douglas M. Mattich, Department of Civil Engineering.

Thomas A. Sturm, Department of Civil Engineering.

James A. Moudry, Department of Civil Engineering.

Gary Lee Bowen, Department of Civil Engineering.

Don Wetlaufer, Department of Biochemistry.

James W. Bodley, Department of Biochemistry.

James F. Koerner, Department of Biochemistry.

Nelson D. Goldberg, Department of Pharmacology.

Joseph Larner, Department of Biochemistry.

Finn Wold, Department of Biochemistry.

R. D. Edstrom, Department of Biochemistry.

Peter Shaw, Department of Psychology.

Sid Reichelson, Department of English.

Bennett Carriere, Department of English.

Sharon Rubin, Department of English.

Robert E. Steller, Department of English.

E. W. Gibbs, Department of English.

Anne G. Munro, Department of English.

Catherine J. Keane, Department of English.

Dorothy Lamberton, Department of English.

Judith Galt, Department of English.

Elizabeth Foster, Department of English.

Carole Becker, Department of English.

Toni McNaron, Department of English.

Elsa Greene, Department of English.

Maeve B. Beck, Department of English.

William Stephenson, Department of English.

John Cole, Department of English.

Sandra Holstein, Department of English.

Martin Dworkin, Department of Microbiology.

R. W. Bernlohr, Department of Microbiology.

K. G. Brand, Department of Microbiology.

Dennis W. Watson, Department of Microbiology.

David E. Peterson, Department of Microbiology.

E. L. Schmidt, Department of Microbiology.

James R. Bolton, Department of Chemistry.

Starke R. Hathaway, Division of Clinical Psychology.

Bruce E. Balow, Department of Special Education.

Robinson S. Abbott, Division of Science and Mathematics, Morris.

Henry Borm, General College and College of Education.

Thomas Bender, School of Architecture.

H. J. Oskan, Department of Electrical Engineering.

A. Nussbaum, Department of Electrical Engineering.

R. J. Collins, Department of Electrical Engineering.

LeRoy T. Anderson, Department of Electrical Engineering.

M. Riaz, Department of Electrical Engineering.

C. M. van Vliet, Department of Electrical Engineering.

S. C. Larson, Department of Electrical Engineering.

J. Freudenthal, Department of Electrical Engineering.

R. F. Lambert, Department of Electrical Engineering.

Stephen J. Kahne, Department of Electrical Engineering.

Larry D. Schmidt, Department of Chemical Engineering.

H. M. Tsuchiya, Department of Chemical Engineering.

A. G. Fredrickson, Department of Chemical Engineering.

Frank Verbrugge, Computer Services.

Kenneth H. Keller, Department of Chemical Engineering.

Arnold Walker, Radio and TV.

L. Hurwicz, Department of Economics.

Mark Daniel, Department of Economics.

Susan L. Smith, Department of Economics.

Edward Coen, Department of Economics.

James L. Weatherby, Jr., Department of Economics.

John Simpson, Department of Economics.

Harlan Smith, Department of Economics.

Jan R. Parkinson, Department of Economics.

William C. Miller, Department of Economics.

Russell Hill, Department of Economics.

George L. Perry, Department of Economics.

Walter W. Heller, Department of Economics.

J. E. Anderson, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

J. L. Smith, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

William J. Pennell, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

W. H. Scheffler, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Dennis Kreid, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

John C. Anderson, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Keith McIntire, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Robert M. Redden, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

George J. Slechta, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Victor B. John, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Sylvester E. Gross, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Eugene Hanson, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Rubin H. Falldin, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

John H. Rogness, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Patrick J. Starr, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Kent D. Wall, Control Science.

S. C. Nayak, Division of Industrial Engineering.

E. Griffith, Control Science.

Mohammad Jabbari, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Roger Schmidt, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Nicholas J. Barsic, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Steven Deneroff, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Edvard A. Fletcher, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Layne E. Fuller, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

William F. Pohl, School of Mathematics.

Jonathan Brezin, School of Mathematics.

Jesus Gil de Lamadrid, School of Mathematics.

Donald W. Kahne, School of Mathematics.

Henry Romer, School of Physics.

K. P. S. Menon, School of Physics.

Thomas R. Lindquist, School of Physics.

George K. Parks, School of Physics.

David G. Cartwright, School of Physics.

Robert A. Windsor, School of Physics.

Thomas W. Lezniak, School of Physics.

Richard W. McEntire, School of Physics.

Richard A. Hendrickson, School of Physics.

John R. Winkler, School of Physics.

Charles Reinert, School of Physics.

Thomas W. Jones, School of Physics.

Harry H. Zeman, School of Physics.

William W. Dykoski, School of Physics.

George B. Burnett, School of Physics.

Jurgen Fohlmeister, School of Physics.

Thomas Walsh, School of Physics.

Richard C. Fuller, School of Physics.

Robert M. Saenger, School of Physics.

Rufino H. Ibarra, School of Physics.

Michael Chandler, School of Physics.

Steve Landowne, School of Physics.

Jonathan L. Rosner, School of Physics.

Robert K. Snyder, School of Physics.

Allan Sourkes, School of Physics.

Jerry S. Sievers, School of Physics.

Daniel H. Fitzgerald, School of Physics.

Jones W. Chien, School of Physics.

Thomas S. Lundgren, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

Robert Plunkett, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

P. R. Sethna, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

A. S. Berman, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

A. A. Blatherwick, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

Jack L. Dais, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

D. D. Joseph, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

William H. Warner, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

Sandra Spear, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

T. Y. Chu, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

E. M. Sparrow, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Cesare Boffa, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Joachim Heberlein, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Win Aung, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Jeff Swanson, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Fateh Sakkal, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Luciano de Socio, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

David J. Wilson, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Dietmar K. Hennecke, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Dean R. Pedersen, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Manuel Ruis, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

C. T. Dorner, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Gren Yuill, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Paul W. Bullen, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Lewis G. Palmer, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

John T. Anderson, School of Physics.

David L. Roohk, School of Physics.

Clayton A. Gearhart, School of Physics.

Stephen Kral, School of Physics.

Brian B. Sabo, School of Physics.

Frederick Schaer, School of Physics.

Clayton F. Giese, School of Physics.

Paul Kintner, School of Physics.

Janet Rae Smith, School of Physics.

Philip E. Pooley, School of Physics.

Jonathan Cole, School of Physics.

John S. Lesko, School of Physics.

William R. Hitchens, School of Physics.

Daniel N. Bell, School of Physics.

Glenn Dahlbacka, School of Physics.

Everett Harvey, School of Physics.

Rod Britten, School of Physics.

David Kayser, School of Physics.

Jim Thompson, School of Physics.

Wes Petersen, School of Physics.

David Dayton, School of Physics.

Irving B. Crandall, School of Physics.

Rick C. Fultz, School of Physics.

James C. Solinsky, School of Physics.

Roger Jones, School of Physics.

Carole Williamson, School of Physics.

Kenneth G. Dzugan, School of Physics.

Donald W. Strecker, School of Physics.

Tycho von Rosenvinge, School of Physics.

GOD IS NEAR, DO NOT FEAR, FRIEND, GOOD NIGHT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, tributes from dignitaries the world over have left little unsaid. Perhaps the most eloquent and fitting expression of gratitude and farewell to former President and General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower is embodied in the words which accompany that simple but chilling melody of "Taps," the final Godspeed of military men:

Day is done,
Gone the sun,
From the lake,
From the hills,
From the sky;
All is well,
Safely rest,
God is nigh.

Then goodnight,
Peaceful night,
Till the light,
Of the dawn,
Shineth bright;
God is near,
Do not fear,
Friend, good night

LT. PAUL S. TOMPKINS AWARDED BRONZE STAR MEDAL

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it always gives me great pleasure when a soldier from the First District of Massachusetts is recognized for bravery on the battlefield. Such is the case with Lt. Paul Stuart Tompkins, U.S. Navy, of Worthington.

Last year Lieutenant Tompkins was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for meritorious achievement while serving in Vietnam. I would like at this point to submit the Navy citation which describes in greater detail the courageous actions of Lieutenant Tompkins:

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Bronze Star Medal to Lieutenant Paul Stuart Tompkins, United States Navy, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For meritorious achievement while serving with friendly forces engaged in armed conflict against Communist insurgent forces in the Republic of Vietnam from 2 May 1967 to 22 December 1967. Lieutenant Tompkins was, from October 1966 to 22 December 1967, assigned as Officer-in-Charge of the USS *Benewah* and USS *Colleton* pre-commissioning details at Little Creek Amphibious Base Norfolk, Virginia. During this nine week period, he performed invaluable and exceedingly professional services toward preparing both commands for combat operations in the Republic of Vietnam. Immediately upon arrival in the Republic of Vietnam, the *Benewah* became flagship of Commander River Assault Flotilla ONE and Commanding Officer 2d Brigade Ninth Infantry Division, which formed the Mobile Riverine Force. The demands placed on the *Benewah*, as flagship and as a major supporting unit of a newly organized force involved in a new and different concept fo warfare, were tremendous. On 29 June 1967, Lieutenant Tompkins assumed the duties as Executive Officer and Navigator of the USS *Benewah*. His organizational and leadership abilities and overall outstanding performance were prime factors in creating a highly efficient administrative and combat organization. Lieutenant Tompkins was a major contributor to the overall outstanding success of the Force with his participation in each of the Coronado Operations. During these operations, the USS *Benewah* was required to move in coordination with operational commitments up hostile enemy rivers of the Mekong Delta often under cover of darkness for close support of the river squadrons attached. Lieutenant Tompkins unselfishly volunteered his professional services in order to further enhance his knowledge of riverine warfare and to more closely assist the combatant forces in the Delta. During Operation Coronado III, conducted in the Rung Sat Special Zone and Dinh Tuong Province, the monitor he was riding came under intense enemy small arms fire. Through his calm and collected manner and without regard to his own personal safety, he assisted the boat captain in properly positioning his boat and suppressing the enemy machine gun fire. Lieutenant Tompkins consistently demonstrated the most outstanding professionalism and extraordinary dedication to his duties. His performance was in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service."

Lieutenant Tompkins is authorized to wear the Combat "V."

For the Secretary of the Navy.

JOHN J. HYLAND,
Admiral, U.S. Navy,
Commander in Chief U.S. Pacific Fleet.

FINAL TRIBUTE TO GENERAL EISENHOWER

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Dwight D. Eisenhower served his country nobly both in times of war and peace.

As one of our Nation's few five-star generals, he was instrumental in leading us to victory on the battlefield in World War II, a crucial time in our history.

As one of our most popular Presidents, he devoted his best efforts to achieving peace, progress, and prosperity at home.

For his magnificent contributions, a deeply sorrowful nation can only express its humble appreciation of a man who became a legend in his own time. He stood with the giants of our history.

I join with all Americans who now are personally saddened by the loss of so great an American, and call to the attention of our colleagues the editorial tributes paid to General Eisenhower by the Miami Herald, the Miami News, the Key West Citizen, and the Miami Beach Sun:

[From the Miami Herald, Mar. 29, 1969]

GREAT HEART AND GRIN AND IKE HAVE LEFT US

Ike and his grin are gone. And a great nation mourns.

If the American people had one authentic, consistent hero in the 20th century he was Dwight David Eisenhower. A superb soldier, he was no politician. A man of instinctive common sense, he had little finesse as a statesman. A very human person, he could not bear the minutiae and red tape which every successful administrator must master.

He was simply Ike, an antidote to the political boredom of the postwar years and pacifier of a people weary of government bureaucracy.

President Eisenhower's first term was distinguished by budget reductions, economy and an income tax cut. His second appeared inconsistent with his first, for there then emerged "Modern Republicanism." An element in the party had succeeded in beating its way back to the 19th century, and it was critical of Ike. Many forgot his credo:

"We will be liberal in programs that affect the lives and welfare of people, and conservative in the handling of their money."

Both are possible. The Eisenhower administrations proved it. A budget can be balanced. The needs of people who cannot help themselves can be met.

If there was any slippage it was in foreign policy under the unfortunate aegis of the late John Foster Dulles. As generals must do, Gen. Eisenhower delegated authority—too much of it. Surely he must have been privately appalled by the course of history which has led to a hapless land war in Asia.

The people, however, will remember the man—big, genial, straightforward, amusingly wrathful, tender, word-boggler, loyal and courageous.

Countless times men sat down as we do now to write his obituary in momentary expectation of his death. Then that great heart rallied to the amazement of medical science. At last it has worn itself out. The 34th President, the Ike everyone loved and none could hate, the President whose popularity exceeded Washington's (a man often reviled, as an examination of history will show)—Ike is gone.

The lines written on Gladstone's retirement seem appropriate:

"Behold him in the evening time of life . . .
By imperceived degrees he wears away, yet like the sun, seems larger at his setting."

[From the Miami News, Friday, Mar. 28, 1969]

ABLE PRESIDENT: EISENHOWER SERVED HIS COUNTRY WELL

Dwight D. Eisenhower didn't want to be President of the United States. He was talked into it. As with every President, General Eisenhower had his pluses and his minuses, but the former far outweighed the latter.

When the historians finally get around to writing about the years of 1952 to 1960 in the United States, they will surely record that the most important event of the Eisenhower Administration was the beginning of the end of racial segregation.

The General had a special talent in the complex business of matters military, and one of his greatest achievements was in commanding, with success, the likes of Field Marshal Montgomery, Charles de Gaulle and George S. Patton, among others. He was able to create an order which successfully concluded World War II, and in turn this led to the general being talked into a campaign for the Presidency.

As President, Mr. Eisenhower was very much aware of George Washington's Farewell Address in which the first President warned the nation against unnecessary foreign entanglements. Mr. Eisenhower accented his understanding clearly when he refused, despite pressure from his friends and his own Secretary of State, to send American combat soldiers to Vietnam.

This was a difficult decision for the President because his old friends were Generals and members of the Chiefs of Staff with whom the President had served in the European conflict.

Mr. Eisenhower was a popular General and a popular President who suited the happier mood of the American people in the '50s.

[From the Key West Citizen, Mar. 30, 1969]

IKE WAS THERE

If the essence of Dwight David Eisenhower could be summed up in a one-word epitaph, it would be simply: "Ike."

Here was the professional soldier who rose from relative obscurity at the beginning of the greatest war in history to supreme command of the greatest assemblage of armies in history, who later served his country for eight years in the highest position of responsibility any man can attain.

Yet he was always "Ike."

Looking back from the turbulent present, the years of the Eisenhower administration seem calm and stable. They were not, but if they seemed so then as well as now, it was only because of the presence of this immensely popular president in the White House. There was something about this most uncommon common man that inspired confidence and faith that no matter how beset the nation was by crises and challenges, nothing dire would happen as long as Ike was there.

Beset the nation was:

Those were the years when the cold war was really frigid—when a man named Khrushchev came to power in Russia to strut the world's stage for a time with his rhetoric of nuclear diplomacy and ballistic blackmail; when a man named Ho Chi Minh was mauling the French in Indochina; when a man named Joe McCarthy was finding Communists in every State Department closet and setting neighbor suspiciously against neighbor; when a man named Faubus in Little Rock, Ark., was fomenting the gravest federal-state crisis since the Civil War; when a U.S. vice president was being spat upon in South America; when the world hovered on the edge of Armageddon as war broke out in the Middle East; when freedom-loving men everywhere agonized as Hungary was ground under the heel; when the nation plunged briefly into its worst recession since the 1930's; when Americans indulged in an orgy of self-doubt because Russia had launched something called a Sputnik into space; when words like "agonizing reappraisal," "brinkmanship," "U-2," "summit" and "missile gap" were part of the vocabulary of reproach against the administration.

Yet they seemed like calm years, because Ike was there.

Now the general has lost his last battle, after beating the scythe-bearer in encounter after encounter. He went down fighting, he surrendered reluctantly. More than that can be asked of no soldier.

Dwight D. Eisenhower is not rated as one of America's great or even strong presidents, and it is not likely that another generation of historians will differ with this estimate. Of one thing we can be certain, however:

If, in their study of this man, his life and his accomplishments, Americans of the future can come at all close to knowing him as his contemporaries did, they will call him "Ike."

[From the Miami Beach Sun, Mar. 30, 1969]

AN EDITORIAL

Dwight D. Eisenhower will be remembered by his fellow Americans and a multitude around the world for whatever endeared him to them personally.

In history, however, there will stand out the fact that he devoted a full lifetime—from youth to old age—to this land of ours.

The fact that he rose, on moment's notice, from a desk-bound lieutenant colonel in Washington to the general in London who welded together the manpower of some 24 free nations and forged that striking force which sailed across the British Channel to storm the fortress of tyranny and man's bestiality to man.

The fact that there came, in the history of this nation, the day when the need to fill the White House with a man of stature became so dire that both Republicans and Democrats tried to claim him.

And, beyond all that, this other one: That in the final days of his Presidency he had the courage and the vision to warn America and Americans of the ever growing, overpowering influence of the "military-industrial establishment" on its domestic and foreign policy. Of the threat that has since become reality!

It is for these marks left behind—marks that will stand as tall tomorrow as they stood yesterday and thus remain indelible in the annals of American and world history—that this newspaper salutes him and bids him farewell.

FAREWELL TO GENERAL EISENHOWER FROM AN INFANTRY SOLDIER

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, as the family of General Eisenhower travel with their memories and our beloved Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower to Abilene, our hearts and our deepest sympathy are with them.

I feel a special sense of loss at the passing of this old soldier who indeed will never fade away.

It was my privilege and honor to serve under General Eisenhower when he commanded the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Forces—SHAEF—and I was an officer in the 104th—Timberwolf—Infantry Division.

As we attended the services in National Cathedral I looked around me at the general's officers and others who were his pallbearers and I heard again the sounds of armor and small arms fire and the thunder of artillery as they once sounded in Normandy and along the Maas River in Holland, along the Rhine, over the bridge at Remagen, and the dash to the encirclement at the Ruhr, and the sudden silence of V–E Day. Through all of this I was with General Eisenhower and down to the last man in every squad we felt his presence, his guidance, and his comradeship. Not only did we all wear the Eisenhower jacket but as trained, determined soldiers we wore the Eisenhower breastplate which meant cool courage under fire and the eye constantly on the objective of driving tyranny from the fields of Europe.

Under his command I was privileged to be advanced in a battlefield promotion and when I received his orders advancing me to the rank of major I suddenly aged from a man in his 20's to one with a sense of the full responsibility for the lives and leadership of men which he managed to instill in all his officers by his own example.

Once again from his life I take this example that a great general is as much known for finding ways to peace as he is for the winning of wars. During his time as President he found that uneasy and unsettled peace but it was peace of a sort. In his memory I hope our generals of this day and all others who lead us will have his courage to seek the ways of peace for I know this would be his wish for all of us as he leaves this world for his eternal reward.

PRE-SENTINEL MEMOIR: AN UNMISSED MISSILE

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, many of us here in the House and on the Senate side are engaged in resisting the efforts of President Nixon and his administration to impose the ABM system heretofore called Sentinel and now called Safeguard upon this country. I am one of those who accepts the reports of the scientific community which state that the anti-ballistic-missile system does not and will not work.

An article recently appeared in the Village Voice dated March 20, 1969, authored by Clark Whelton and relating to the Nike-Ajax system. The material is so well presented with respect to an earlier system touted at the time to be as effective as President Nixon now claims for the ABM, that I feel it is an instructive parallel to be pondered.

I am bringing the article to the attention of this House with the thought it could have an effect upon the decision ultimately to be made by my colleagues:

PRE-SENTINEL MEMOIR: AN UNMISSED MISSILE

(By Clark Whelton)

In the autumn of 1953, with the Korean armistice signed and sealed and American economy experiencing a classic case of the post-bellum blues, the Department of Defense announced the birth of the Nike-Ajax anti-aircraft missile. It was welcome news. Things hadn't been going too well for the military establishment up to that point. The U.S. Army's inability in Korea to do anything other than rearrange the wrinkles in the battle line had angered and frustrated the Pentagon. American prisoners of war had proven alarmingly vulnerable to brainwashing techniques. Morale was low. Worst of all, with the fighting stopped, the defense budget was certain to be slashed.

But the Nike-Ajax promised to provide an answer to many of their worries. Deployed in a nation-wide network of more than 200 sites, the Nike-Ajax would shield over 40 per cent of the population from hostile aircraft and help keep out foreign enemies while Joe McCarthy tracked down the ones who were already here. The Nike-Ajax program would also restore a rosy, billion-dollar glow to the pale cheeks of the defense budget. So bunkers were built for the missiles and towers were built for the radar and all through the Eisenhower hiatus the army honed its rockets and waited for the bombers that would never come.

"They work fine if the target flies nice and steady at a medium altitude and if the pilot doesn't know how to avoid them," Sergeant Shoback answered. "Sure, they break down a lot—1,500,000 parts in the system and they all have to work at the same time."

Sp-5 Simmons, who marked time with us in the acquisition radar van, confirmed that the Nikes often seemed to be out of whack at the various sites where he had been stationed. "But what the hell," he cautioned, "if war breaks out you'll be stationed right here in this country, sitting on your ass in an air conditioned van like this one. Would you rather be lugging a rifle? Then don't make waves. The officers get invited to parties by the guys who manufacture these things and we get to sit here in the shade and watch the scopes. Everybody's happy."

In February, we were bused up into the New Mexican desert to observe the actual firing of a Nike-Ajax missile. We sat in grandstands and watched a Nike roar off its launcher, streak toward an R–CAT target drone, and explode, just like they told us it would. But the R–CAT kept flying, heading across the desert toward Arizona and happier times. The loudspeaker said: "Had that been a real aircraft it would have been destroyed." We looked at each other. The R–CAT vanished over the horizon.

In March our six months active duty came to an end. We assembled in the company street. The captain addressed us.

"Men," he said, "you'll be going home in a few days and naturally you'll want to tell your families about your experiences here. But let's not go home and tell your folks that these missiles don't work. That could only lead to misunderstanding. So when you leave here, stress the positive aspects of your training." We looked at each other again. The captain wasn't kidding.

And now, with the specter of peace looming large in Vietnam, the Pentagon has rolled out another expensive cure for which there is no disease: the Sentinel Anti-Ballistic Missile. While Nixon and Congress debate what the ABM will do for the country, it might be interesting to take a closer look at the founding father of the defense missile family, the Nike-Ajax. Nike-Ajax missiles are obsolete now. Very soon they will probably appear as Washington's Birthday specials in Army-Navy stores. But once they were king of the guided missiles and I was taught how to fire them.

In 1960 I joined a National Guard Nike unit in central Connecticut. In case the commies ever wanted to zap the insurance companies in Hartford with an A-bomb, our rockets stood ready to intervene. It was a highly visible defense. Motorists driving along a state highway on their way to work in the insurance companies could look through a chain-link fence and see the underground missile bunkers. In the middle of the base, on top of the Launch Control Van, was a standard three-color traffic light. It indicated the alert status of the unit. It also indicated the mood of world politics so the passing motorists could also get an idea of how good their chances were of making it through the day. Green light: Eisenhower was teeing off at Augusta. Amber light: Khrushchev was banging his shoe in the U.N. Red light: head for the cellar. The status light was amber the day I left for basic training at Fort Dix and advanced training at Fort Bliss (El Paso) Texas, as a Nike-Ajax radar fire control crewman.

At Fort Bliss the trainees were housed in cinderblock barracks on the scorched, stony slopes of Logan Heights. Every morning we were marched down to the radar and missile area for instruction. We sat in the darkened radar vans and listened to the sergeants explain what to do if the Russians came. We were shown films of a Nike-Ajax missile destroying an old B-17 target plane. We learned how to operate the three radar systems and the command guidance computer. We learned how to track a target and launch a missile. Then, toward the end of January, 1961, we began to learn something new about the Nike-Ajax missiles: they didn't work.

"It's not that they don't work, exactly," Sergeant Shoback said one afternoon. "It's just that they work best under certain conditions." We were sitting in the greenish glow of the target tracking scope. The training cycle had ended earlier than expected and for two weeks there was nothing for our class to do except keep out of sight. Sleeping in the vans was permitted provided you could remain upright in your chair and get your eyes open in a hurry if an officer dropped in unexpectedly. We did a lot of talking with the cadre sergeants. We asked questions. How come the three radars never seem to be in a state of repair at the same time? If the missiles work, how come we keep hearing stories that they don't? What are the conditions they work best under?

In April I reported to my National Guard unit in Connecticut. My first night I was in the Launch Control Van during a practice alert. The commanding officer, up in the radar site on a nearby mountain, was running through the pre-launch check list. "Are you getting a green light on the board?" he asked through the intercom. "No, sir," I said. "A red light?" "No, sir." "What are you getting?" "Nothing, sir." "Nothing?" "No, sir." Twenty minutes of mumbling, then: "All right, we blew another condenser. We're coming down."

"You'll get used to that," a sergeant said. I got used to it. In the time I spent with that unit, I never met a man who honestly thought a Nike-Ajax could shoot down a plane that didn't want to be shot down.

In May I spoke with an old friend who was a navigator on a B-52. "We used to run training missions over Nike sites to give them practice tracking a target," he said. "But they could hardly ever find us. We usually had to turn on our IFF (Identification Friend or Foe) signal to give them a clue."

A year later the Nike-Ajax was declared obsolete. The Nike site in Connecticut was abandoned. One night someone drove up in a truck and stole the plumbing and toilets. That same year, 1962, the Pentagon tried to sell the anti-missile Nike-Zeus to John Kennedy. They almost succeeded but finally managed to sell him involvement in Vietnam instead.

Now, with that war slowly running out of steam, President Nixon has judged that the nation's gravest dangers can be warded off by an electronic amulet of radar and rockets. But if high Washington officials visit the cities this summer they may wish they had spent less money on anti-missile missiles and more on developing a good anti-rock rock.

Or perhaps, in the grand design of things, these officials may at last discover a use for those 3000 Nike-Ajax missiles. The slums should be easy to hit. They're big enough.

FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, an American hero has passed from this world to his reward after a last fight as gallant as any of those he waged before. His death reduces further the dwindling band of those who led the forces of the free world in World War II. All of us owe an immeasurable debt to those men who led us to victory in those dangerous times, and to no one do we owe more than to General Eisenhower, the supreme commander of our military forces. His is an American success story—from a poor boy at Abilene to our President and Commander in Chief—and General Eisenhower carried all his honors with a modesty possible only to a great gentleman. The Nation and the people he served, and the world he did so much to save, join in mourning his passing.

IN THE HOUSE THAT ADLAI LOVED

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, there is a whole generation of Americans who like to think of themselves as Stevensonian Democrats, for Adlai Stevenson was above all else an inspirational man.

Those of us who come from Illinois feel a special pride that his idealism continues to attract and inspire people throughout the world.

John Bartlow Martin, biographer and friend of Governor Stevenson—and himself a distinguished public servant—has captured some of the poignant essence of Adlai Stevenson in a Life article entitled "In the House That Adlai Loved."

I insert it in the RECORD:

IN THE HOUSE THAT ADLAI LOVED

(By John Bartlow Martin)

The house in Libertyville—Adlai Stevenson loved it more, probably, than any place else on the earth he wandered; and in the winter of 1965–66 when I began research for his biography, my family and I lived in it for a few months. We had visited him there often during his lifetime, and that winter it was at first hard to realize that we would not see his slightly dumpy figure waddling up the sloping field from the Des Plaines River, picking up dead tree branches as he came; to enter through the sun porch, blue eyes wide, cross the living room and, looking slightly perplexed, hesitate by the fireplace; then, grumbling about "this appalling task," go into his study to work on a speech.

The place was not quite the same that winter as when he left it. For one thing, the sheep were gone. He had raised sheep on his 70 acres (to save the cost of cutting hay and grass, I suspected), and they used to sweep across the lawn, scattering distinguished guests. Adlai III, his eldest son, had had the sheep butchered and given to his father's friends that first Christmas of his father's death, a hard thing for him.

Well, to work. A researcher and I catalogued his library. It was a working library—reference books and bound copies of his own speeches nearest his desk. But genealogies and family histories were not far away, nor were the Lincoln shelves. He was a man of Illinois, always; even after he belonged to the world, Illinois history, the Illinois prairies, and above all these 70 acres held him. The other books were a disorderly assortment of old and unread "sets" of such writers as Byron and books on politics and world affairs by Lippmann, Finletter, Bowles, Byrnes, and other of Stevenson's associates. Many were inscribed to him; few showed much sign of having been read. He was not a reader, he learned by listening. Scattered about were gorgeous pictures of a cruise on a private yacht during the U.N. years; a bust of President Kennedy and an autographed photograph of President Johnson; plaques and awards, gavels and a collection of plaster donkeys; exotic mementos of his travels. (He used to have a basement room full of travel mementos and at Christmas gave them to friends—stuffed alligators, keys to cities, spears, Oriental bric-a-brac.) Under his desk blotter was a scrap of paper containing in his handwriting a notation that Artie, his Dalmatian, was buried by a tree outside his study window.

The living room, like the study, was comfortable. The upholstered chairs and sofa that flanked the fireplace were frayed; the lamps were rickety. Yet it, and the whole house, was light and airy, filled with sunshine, cheering. The house was bigger than it looked from the outside, where trees and shrubbery screened it. It sat far back from a gravel road. When he was a young lawyer and not long married, he used to drive down the long lane and on to Lake Forest, drop his children off at school, park his car at the railroad station, and take the commuters' train to his La Salle Street law office. In later years hundreds of tourists found their way here, and even if he was working in seclusion, he received them courteously. The north 30 acres were planted in soybeans; the south 40 was all lawn, hay, big old trees, a tennis court. Nonetheless, he always called the place "the farm," and dutifully reported its profit or loss on his income tax returns. We searched the house, a search, really, for Stevenson. And, using it, found traces of him, too—his highball glasses were decorated with Princeton's orange and black tiger and " '22," his class. He was only somewhat less a Princetonian than an Illinoisian. The freezer was full of lamb and mutton. Over the big double bed in the master bedroom hung two gilded cupids, melancholy when one reflected on his disastrous marriage. On the night table beside his bed lay a book—the Social Register. So many of his Social Register friends voted against him for President. In a drawer of the night table was an envelope; on it he had written, "Tender Bits"; inside it were scraps of poetry, much of it love poetry. He was a lonely man.

Off the bedroom was a sundeck; Stevenson loved sun-bathing. The dressing room suggested luxury—vast initialed towels, a shoe shiner, a silent valet, a full-length mirror, leather cases and silver brushes embossed and engraved "AES," oval pictures elegantly framed of himself; Bill Blair, his aide; Ernest Ives, his brother-in-law; Mary Lasker, Hubert Humphrey, Chet Bowles, Jane Dick, his friends. (They were gifts of a friend, who made her own selection of his friends.) More leather-framed pictures—of Eleanor Roosevelt and Marietta Tree. And family pictures too—an old one of his sister or his mother (they looked quite alike), and pictures of Adlai III and his wife Nancy and their children. Stevenson used to return from the U.N. at Christmastime, and Adlai III and Nancy would bring the grandchildren out from Chicago, and Stevenson would romp with them, delighted—for a time.

On a telephone note pad Stevenson had written "Penelope is 21," a reminder. Lifelong he was good to his friends' children, helped raise them, in a way. He was thoughtful, and affectionate. Forgetful, too—we found nine identical trench coats in a downstairs closet, bought no doubt while traveling, having forgotten to bring a coat.

On the wall of the basement stair was a lithograph from the campaign of 1892, when Stevenson's grandfather and namesake, Adlai E. Stevenson, was elected Vice President, the running mate of Cleveland. And another from the campaign of 1900, when he lost with Bryan. Stevenson's father, too, had gone into politics and, dying, had advised Stevenson to shun politics, it was an ungrateful business. In the basement, we found an old filing cabinet. One drawer was stuck tight. I finally pried it open—and found Stevenson's daily appointment books covering his entire four years as governor.

It was quiet here at Libertyville. Time and time again, harassed by official duties, chasing around the nation on political errands and, later, caught in the U.N. vortex, Stevenson said how much he "pined"—a favorite word—to escape to the peace and serenity of Libertyville. But when he did manage to come here, in a few days he would become restless, would be telephoning friends around the country, and soon he would plunge back into the world. Lifelong he declared he sought serenity, peace, time to think, time to write. He never found it; never really, deeply, wanted it. He loved Libertyville but could stand it only in small doses.

One wintry day Adlai III and I sat in front of the fireplace with my agent and publisher and worked out the contract for the biography. As a writer and lawyer, Stevenson would have enjoyed it. Then we had a drink, and he would have enjoyed that too. Soon I moved on, to Washington, and he would have approved.

When we left, the flag that had draped his casket still lay on a bookshelf in his study. Since then, everything has been removed and the house is for sale. This year the military proposed to install an ABM site at Libertyville. It seemed an odd monument to a man of peace.

LUMBER AND PLYWOOD PRICES

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, my very able colleague, Congressman JOHN DELLENBACK, of Oregon, recently presented a very important and very articulate statement before the House Banking and Currency Committee, on the subject of lumber and plywood prices.

The views expressed are, in my judgment, the most conclusive, comprehensive, and constructive views, thus far offered in testimony before any of our congressional committees.

My congressional district on the north coast of California is immediately contiguous to Congressman DELLENBACK's Fourth District of Oregon. Many of the same factors affecting his area are identical to those of my heavily forested redwood country. Therefore, as I said to the committee, I want to associate myself completely with the content of his testimony because it accurately portrays the situation of my area as well as the State of Oregon.

Because of the concern of our colleagues on the lumber question and the relevancy of Mr. DELLENBACK's remarks, I felt these comments should be brought to the attention of the entire Congress—thus permitting all Senators and Congressmen to have immediate access to these very accurate and descriptive comments and suggestions.

For a number of years, I have pleaded with the Appropriations Committees and the administrations to increase the funds for forest access roads and trails development—in order to permit intensified management of our federally owned timber lands.

As a member of the House Roads Subcommittee, I can testify to the fact that we recognized the upcoming problem and actually increased the authorization to $170 million.

I am firmly convinced that we could have avoided this so-called lumber price crisis, if the previous administration had adhered to our request and provided the required funds.

In fact, the tight timber management policies of the past have contributed to the tight money policies of the present.

I strongly suggest that every Member of Congress read Congressman DELLENBACK's remarks because it tells the full story and I can testify to its accuracy. The suggestions contained therein could provide the blueprint for action necessary to bring about realistic and stabilized timber management policies and lumber prices that will benefit the worker, the consumer, and the manufacturer—all of whom are concerned with this perplexing problem.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN DELLENBACK BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, MARCH 27, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I appreciate very much the opportunity to testify before you this morning. I have also appreciated the Chairman's and the Committee's courtesy in permitting me to sit with you during the last three days of testimony.

May I preface my testimony by indicating to you why I take such a deep interest in these issues of lumber and plywood supplies and prices, and demand for these products. I represent the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon, within whose borders is situated roughly 10% of the standing commercial softwood timber in the entire United States, including Alaska. The vast public and private land holdings from which our timber resource is harvested in my District account for a very significant share of the economy of Southwestern Oregon. No other part of the United States has as much at stake in any issue involving lumber and plywood as does the area comprising the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon. This holds true in the short run, but it also holds true in the long run, for the heart of the problem into which this Committee is conducting its very worthwhile investigations is the question of the availability or unavailability of softwood timber in sufficient amount to meet the needs of this nation. It is my District which can make that timber available to the nation. It is my District which suffers most when, as is the case at the present time, it is not allowed to make that timber available.

A crisis in lumber and plywood prices has brought about these hearings. Just as blessings are often a mixture of bad and good, so the curse and trouble of this crisis is also a mixture of bad and good. The bad is obvious. The good lies in the very fact of the attention that has finally been focused, on a nationwide basis and in this Congress, on the deeper and much more critical crisis underlying our troubles of the moment. Lumber and plywood mill operators are, quite frankly, delighted to have the opportunity to present to you ladies and gentlemen the facts underlying the present critical situation. You have heard the warning ring out in testimony these last three days. The warning that, unless this nation makes a radical change in its present practices and procedures in the management of its forests, we will not have the absolutely essential lumber and plywood required to meet such national goals as those set in the Housing Act which came forth from this Committee last year. Lumber and plywood are not only a good building material; they are an almost essential building material. But present practices and procedures simply will not yield lumber and plywood in the right places at the right times and at the right prices to make possible the attainment of our essential national objectives.

There are special short-range factors which, added to the basic underlying causes, have helped bring on the crisis of the moment. These special factors include:

Weather—Severe and most unusual storms have helped bring on a serious slowdown in logging operations and a bad downdrain on timber inventories at mills.

Boxcar and flatcar shortages—A perennial problem in the Pacific Northwest almost every year, a shortage has been acute in recent months, and has helped prevent the timely shipments of lumber and plywood to the market place.

Longshoreman strike—The strike on the East coast aggravated the transportation situation by tying up railroad cars and ships carrying lumber to East coast ports.

Expectation of rising demand—The imminence of the early arrival of the building season, coupled with expectation of increased demand and a simultaneous expectation of short supply, coupled with continued inflationary pressures, helped shoot prices up to an abnormal and all-time high.

But underlying these short-range factors have been the basic forces which are moving us steadily toward a time of major disaster in this field. These forces are affecting both the demand side and also the supply side of the scale.

On the demand side lie the factors of a steadily expanding and increasing population, high mobility in this population calling for an abandonment of the old and construction of the new, and a steadily expanding economy calling for steady construction of new facilities and bringing prosperity.

The Housing Act of 1968 in setting a goal of 26 million residential units to be built during the next 10 years was both recognizing a fact of what these steady pressures will call for and at the same time setting challenging goals for us as a people to see and to be prepared to meet. And the *residential* demands for lumber and plywood account for only 35% and 50% respectively of the national demands for these products. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development sounded the alarm before this Committee just the other day when he expressed his own grave fear that even the goals of the Housing Act of 1968 will not be met unless an additional output of 15 billion board feet of lumber is forthcoming. The demands are all around us, steadily rising and raising the spectre that the supply will not be sufficient.

The critical and essential point for this Committee and for the Congress to understand is that these demands *can* be met. We have in the national treasury at this moment the necessary supplies of standing timber, coupled with the necessary acres of fertile land to grow replacement for cut timber, to meet these demands. *But not under present practices and procedures.* If practices and procedures of timber management of the nation's forests be changed and improved, we can continue to meet expected demands of the future on a continuing and sustained yield basis, a principle which we dare not abandon.

The burden of doing what is necessary in the way of changing practices and procedures to meet rising future demands really falls upon both private and public sectors. In our primary concern with Federal resources, we should not forget that private ownerships comprise some 72% of the approximately 500 million acres of commercial forest land in the United States. While some 61% of the recent harvest of softwood saw timber has come from these private ownerships and an estimated 71% of the saw timber growth has taken place on these private ownerships, these same private ownerships embrace only approximately 35% of the present inventory of standing timber, and they embrace approximately three million individual ownerships. So while in the long run much needs to be done with private ownerships for the sake of the nation's future, initial and principal action on the part of the national government should and indeed must relate to the National Forests. It is here that more than 50% of the present inventory of standing softwood saw timber is and it is here that we have the greatest opportunity for intensive forest management on a sustained yield basis.

The Chief of the U.S. Forest Service has cited in his testimony before Congressional bodies the present rate of timber losses due to fire, insects, and disease. The majority of the approximately 10 billion board feet of timber annually being lost to these causes can be salvaged—if the proper investment is made in the way of increased appropriations. Present funding of the Forest Service permits necessary salvage operations only of an estimated 5% of this dead and dying timber. The remaining 95% is pure waste, which the nation cannot afford.

The Chief of the Forest Service has also described how the allowable timber cut from public lands has been doubled over the past 20 years (rising from approximately 5.6 billion board feet per year to some 11.4 billion board feet per year). But he has also estimated that at present levels of timber management this country will face a lumber deficit of about 10 billion board feet per year by 1985. These present levels of timber management are, in part at least, a result of inadequate past investment policies on the part of the Congress. The testimony of the Chief of the Forest Service is to the effect that, for Fiscal Year 1970, the Forest Service will receive approximately 30% of what it needs for reforestation and stand improvement, and approximately 60% of what it needs for access roads and trails. Without adequate access roads and trails in particular it is impossible to reach the resources which are available to be cut and which indeed in many instances if not cut soon will be lost forever. And he has made it abundantly clear that this level of funding by the Congress has been the rule rather than the exception during recent years.

Several witnesses during the last few days have testified before this Committee on the log export situation. After watching the export of unprocessed logs, largely to Japan, rise from a relatively modest few hundred million board feet just a few years ago to more than 1.6 billion board feet in 1967, the Congress finally acted in 1968 to place a limitation on allowable exports from Federal lands. This was the so-called Morse Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968. Without seeking to repeat the testimony on this point, let me alert the Committee to a few points of concern in this area. First, this amendment places a mandatory limitation on exports only on logs coming from Federal lands, the discretionary authority in the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to prevent substitution of logs purchased from Federal lands for logs exported from private lands has not yet been exercised by either Secretary and the basic amendment itself expires at the end of 1971. Unless the Act is extended before that time, its definite but limited value will expire and our problem will be that much more acute.

Questioning by members of this Committee of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce just the other day made clear that no decision has yet been made to utilize the available provisions of the Export Control Act to further increase supplies of logs for domestic use by limiting exports, in full or part, even though the "short supply" criteria of the Act have apparently been met for approximately one year. Admittedly there are complications of a serious nature involved in the application of this Act, but we should not forget that it is on the books and available for use.

This Committee, and indeed the Congress, should not forget that the National Forests are expected to be managed on the declared principle of multiple use. While there are good and sufficient reasons why areas of the great timbered lands of the nation should be withdrawn for single purpose wilderness uses, we dare not forget the fact that every such withdrawal further accentuates our position of short supply of standing timber for commercial purposes. Any proposals for further withdrawals should certainly be measured against recreation and aesthetic needs, but they should also be measured against the other great needs of the nation.

But whatever is done in the areas of further limitation of exports or of the exercise of great care in permitting any further withdrawals of timber lands from multiple purpose use, the really great potential for vastly increasing our future supply of softwood timber lies in intensified forest management. And if this is to be accomplished, the Congress must do two essential things. First, it must make additional appropriations available to those who manage the National Forests in order to make possible the construction of an adequate system of forest roads, reforestation of current cutover lands and other nonstocked or poorly stocked lands, commercial and noncommercial thinning of the forests, increased salvage of timber killed by fire, insects, or disease, and enhanced research to develop new ways to grow timber faster, use wood more efficiently, and reduce the cost of production. And second, some method must be devised to give to the managers of our National Forests a certainty of the continued availability of funds in these increased amounts for the indefinite future. The Congress must realize that expenditures for these purposes really constitute an *investment*, proven to be economically sound and certain to yield revenue to the Federal Treasury far more than the amounts expended for these purposes. Mr. Greeley, Associate Chief of the Forest Service, has testified before this Committee that for some few years it would be necessary to invest in these purposes more than the increased revenues that would be yielded to the Treasury from enhanced sales of timber. But the testimony is also clear, from industry spokesmen and from officials of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, that, after some few years of this level of expenditure, when the backlog of need in these areas has been brought current, a substantial *excess of revenues over expenditures* would very definitely accrue to the government.

The return on the investment would be two-fold. First, this way and only this way do we have any chance of assuring to the nation the supplies of softwood lumber and plywood which it needs in order to reach our great national goals. And second, to have our cake and to eat it too, there would end up being a direct and steady economic surplus accruing to the Treasury from these stepped-up and improved operations.

I have been disturbed by some of the concern I've heard expressed in questions from members of the Committee about the possibility of price fixing being involved in the present escalation of prices on lumber and plywood. Let me make brief comment on two levels on this question of control of prices. First, on the factual level of the existence or nonexistence of illegal price fixing by producers. We should not forget that there are still about 10,000 lumber producers and about 170 plywood producers throughout the nation. Certainly there are some giants, but there are far too many individual producers to make effective any concerted attempt to agree upon prices. In addition, the Justice Department, asked to investigate this matter by the President, has indicated that it finds no evidence of violation of any Federal laws in this area. But second, and more importantly, on the broad scale policy level of Government control of prices, certainly the Congress ought not to consider opening the Pandora's box of attempting to establish selective price controls in any field under present circumstances. If we were once to begin such action, our troubles would be certain to be legion. And, when our basic problem is one of insufficient supply, and when our efforts should be directed toward encouraging *increased* production, the establishment of price controls would certainly be disastrous.

I am sure that I join the members of this Committee in being pleased at the announcement by President Nixon and his Cabinet-level Committee of recent decisions to improve the short-term situation in this time of crisis. The most significant action proposed and decided upon was, of course, the authorized additional sale of 1.1 billion board feet of timber in the next 15 months. This calls for an additional $450 thousand in this fiscal year's budget for the Forest Service and a little over three million dollars additional in Fiscal Year 1970. Some of us concerned about the problem feel strongly that this is not enough. Representatives of the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management testified before the Senate recently that they could meet these additional requirements for sale of timber. But there is an immediate requirement of an annual increase of from two or three billion board feet, the amount of estimated present deficit in lumber and plywood supply, and this is the minimum increase in this area which must be met if the pressure is to be taken off the present high-price situation. But this action is at least a beginning, and for it we are grateful.

But if the basic underlying crisis is to be met, then this Congress must take some basic action. The underlying causes must be dealt with, and not merely the symptoms. May I propose for this Committee's consideration the following specific actions by the Congress:

1. Legislation which would establish for the United States Forest Service, manager of the greatest amount of commercial softwood saw timber in the United States, a special funding program committing all or a substantial portion of the receipts from the sale of timber from U.S. Forest Service lands to assure to the Forest Service long-term guarantees of the increased funds that would be necessary to permit intensified forest management of the National Forests.

2. Increased appropriations immediately for forest roads and trails, with a goal of $205 million annually within the next few years. This is the amount testified to by the Chief of the Forest Service as being in order, is the most critical immediate need and, because of necessary construction time delays, should be implemented without waiting for funds to begin to accumulate under the special funding program called for under point one above.

3. Congressional insistence that the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management make a complete and early report to the Congress on present timber management policies, short and long-range projections and goals in all areas of multiple use, including amounts of timber that could be made available for commercial purposes under levels of funding potentially providable under the procedures outlined in point one above. These reports should include a full and complete inventory of all forest lands at present used for multiple use purposes as well as all such lands, set aside under either Congressional directive or by administrative rule and regulation, used for single use purposes. In the event that such projections of allowable cut do not indicate yield of sufficient quantities of lumber and plywood to meet other national goals, the Congress should consider re-studying these plans and procedures on an independent basis.

4. Extension of the log export limitation amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968 and insistence that the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior issue the regulations permitted thereunder to prevent substitution

of timber purchased from Federal lands to replace timber exported from private lands. This amendment is due to expire at the end of 1971 and should be extended at the earliest possible opportunity so as to eliminate any question about the intention of the Congress to continue it and enforce it.

5. Legislative modification of the Jones Act, perhaps in the form of a product exemption, so as to allow forest products to be shipped from one United States port to another on a competitive basis that will enhance the supply of forest products fed into domestic markets from Alaska.

6. Study of possible additional legislative action as well as of present Interstate Commerce Commission policies intended to put an end once and for all to the boxcar and flatcar shortages suffered by West coast producers and shippers of lumber and plywood.

The nation and the Congress face a problem of supply of lumber and plywood which *must* be solved. It is one which *can* be solved if we move swiftly and wisely. I commend this Committee for the important contribution to which these hearings can lead in the way of necessary Congressional action.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, once again Washington prepared and the Nation participated in another large "state" funeral. This time it occurred because of the death of former President Eisenhower. These proceedings were not made with shock, but with sober reverence and appreciation for a giant of a man that had played a dominant role in world affairs for the last generation.

During this period of time "Ike"—as he was affectionately known—represented the best qualities of America. His compassion, humility, and friendliness made him beloved, by millions throughout the world. His ability to disagree without being disagreeable, contributed to his success in dealing with both quarreling allies and the conflicting interests in American society. That big Eisenhower smile served for nearly 30 years, as one of the best prescriptions for a troubled and sick world.

Beyond this, Dwight Eisenhower represented men's aspirations for individual freedom, justice, and peace with honor. He certainly believed in the worth and merit of the individual. He knew the enormous qualities and capabilities that the individual possesses, and he knew the accomplishments they can produce. In this regard, he spoke frequently of the "uncommon man." He perceptively observed that it is the "uncommon man" that produces a better life and world, and he quite correctly discovered this quality in every man. He further knew that these qualities could only be developed in an atmosphere of freedom.

Coupled with this individual freedom, President Eisenhower believed that justice was an essential ingredient to development of man's aspirations. His "crusade in Europe" was just such a quest for restoring justice and freedom—from the Nazi tyranny.

He realized that peace could not exist without justice. His entire term as President was dedicated to this quest. As a successful warrior he knew too well the horrors of war. This prepared him as a "warrior for peace." Not peace at any price, but a peace where the weaker nations would be protected from the stronger; a peace where men would not be subjected and forced to live under a government that was not of their own choosing.

As in war, Dwight Eisenhower waged a successful fight for peace. His years in the Presidency were marked with a period of stability unseen since the days following the First World War. Communist aggression was curtailed, the Korean war was ended, and the letting of American blood on foreign soil all but stopped.

The lack of strife and conflict on the domestic scene was also quite apparent during the Eisenhower years. There was no exploding racial antagonism nor were our cities in flames. General "Ike" showed that economic and social progress could be made without violence and demonstrations.

Much more could be said concerning this man who had a humble beginning on the Kansas plains. His life was lived as a classic example to all. I doubt that there is a mother and father who would not want their son to emulate Dwight Eisenhower's personal qualities and life. He is no doubt our greatest soldier-statesman since George Washington. There is no doubt that like George Washington, "he is first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, Friday, March 28, 1969, was a bright and sunny day in the Nation's Capital. The brightness suddenly turned to gloom at 12:25 p.m., with the announcement that General of the Army and former President Dwight David Eisenhower had passed away.

Probably no President in history received greater recognition as an "all-America American." The phrase "I like Ike" was a three-word testimonial to the great affection which people had for him, not only in his native land but throughout the world. He remains both at home and abroad one of the most beloved American figures of all time.

His was a remarkable life in that he served in so many capacities, all of them marked with distinction—as a military man, as an educator, as President of the United States and, finally, after a full life of public service, as a private citizen. Few men in history could match his profound dignity or his deep sense of humility.

Some men seem to have been born for a distinct purpose. Dwight D. Eisenhower was such a man. He will forever be associated with the great Allied effort to free the European Continent from tyranny brought about by a madman. He was chosen because he possessed the qualities of humanity, tolerance, and an outstanding ability to work with others and win their trust and cooperation. History shows this selection was a wise choice.

While he was supreme commander of the largest body of fighting men and the greatest army of armament ever assembled, Dwight D. Eisenhower will always be remembered by those who knew him best as a man of peace.

I was privileged to know Dwight David Eisenhower. He was my best known constituent. "Ike" had that unique blend of friendliness and competence that is too rarely found in men today. Against the background of these rare traits he had the distinction of living to see himself become a legend, certainly a fitting reward for his outstanding service.

This is an hour of great sadness because Adams County has lost a true friend and neighbor, Pennsylvania has lost a grand citizen, America has lost a great leader, and the world has lost a man it loved, respected, and revered.

We can take consolation, however, from the realization that as Dwight D. Eisenhower gave so generously and unselfishly of himself, so, too, did he succeed in weaving himself into the fabric of America and into the hearts of all men. As we mourn his passing, we should recall his strong spirit which can guide and sustain us in whatever troubled days might lie ahead. This man was an inspiration to untold millions, and ours is a better world because he walked among us.

To paraphrase the poet's words, "Dwight David Eisenhower has joined the innumerable caravan that moves to that mysterious realm. He went sustained and soothed by an unfaltering trust. He approached his grave like one who wraps the drapery of his couch about him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

COST OF LIVING INCREASES FOR SOCIAL SECURITY ANNUITANTS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which should greatly improve the social security system by providing for annual increases in benefits tied to the upward movement of the consumer price index.

At the present time, about 25 million people are receiving over $2 billion per month in social security benefits. Congress has increased the benefit level periodically in the past. Only last February we raised the benefit level across the board by 13 percent. However, since that legislation was enacted, the cost-of-living has increased by 4½ percent and it appears as though the earliest that the Congress will be able to take action to maintain the buying power of social security beneficiaries will be next year. By then, it is conceivable that the cost-of-living will have increased by almost 10 percent. I believe that something must be done to speed up the process. Therefore, I have introduced legislation today which will provide that each December, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine exactly what the increase—if any—in the cost-of-living has been during the previous calendar year and then make this increase applicable to benefits paid in the following January.

Studies by the Social Security Administration have shown that social security beneficiaries, as a group, have little other income besides their annuities. This means that, when the cost-of-living goes up 4½ percent as it has since last February, each recipient must lower his standard of living by just that much. This may mean one less slice of bread when the cost-of-living increases by only a small percentage but it could mean another meatless day if the inflationary spiral is not brought under control.

Because of the lag between benefit increases and increases in prices, social security beneficiaries are probably the group that is hardest hit by inflation. The civil service retirement program has a provision which provides for cost-of-living increases when the Consumer Price Index increases by 3 percent and remains over this figure for 3 consecutive months. Legislation which passed the House last year and which will hopefully pass again this year and be enacted will provide that, in addition to this annuity increase, civil service retirees will receive another 1-percent increase to cover the increase in the cost of living that occurs between the time that the 3-month Consumer Price Index increase period occurs and the time that the annuity increase is reflected in retirees' checks. I believe there is no good reason why social security benefits should not also be increased when the cost of living goes up.

The bill which I have introduced today does not follow the procedure provided for the civil service retirement system. I have adopted the yearly increase instead because of the time involved in recomputing benefits and the size of the social security program. I do not think any other approach is feasible.

The expense of providing for annual increases in social security benefits cannot be foreseen with any degree of accuracy because we have no way of knowing exactly what the cost of living will do from one year to the next. Therefore, my bill provides that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare must submit to the Congress his recommendations for any additional financing that may be necessary to meet the cost of providing additional benefits.

Whether any additional financing will be needed will depend entirely on the relationship of increases in wages to increases in prices. When wages rise, the income of the social security program also increases because the program is financed by a payroll tax. In some years this additional income may not be enough to finance the needed cost-of-living increase and in other years it may be necessary to adopt other measures. By requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to warn the Congress when any additional funding is needed, we will be able to have the lead time necessary to take appropriate action to avoid any financial strain on the program.

The idea of cost-of-living increases in social security benefits was endorsed by both the Democratic and Republican party platforms last year. The measure I have introduced today should have bipartisan support and I am hopeful that enactment of this legislation will be achieved in the shortest possible time so that we can insure that social security beneficiaries will no longer be second-class citizens.

IN MEMORY OF DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the death of General Eisenhower removes from this Nation, the world, and all of us a towering and noble figure.

General Eisenhower led the most powerful military machine that has ever existed in the history of this world. From north Africa, through the "great crusade" at Normandy on June 6, 1944, and on to the unconditional surrender of Germany at Rheims, France, on May 7, 1945, he gallantly led and inspired his forces.

But above all, he was a "soldier of peace." His foremost desire and hope was to witness the establishment of peace upon this earth. His Presidency was characterized by a fervent belief in the goodness of man, and therefore in the possibility of man achieving this peace.

He stood out magnificently above the frictions that existed during his administration. His humility and honesty defied the efforts of his most ardent critics. His character earned the respect and admiration of all humanity.

As a previous generation looked back upon the pre-World War I era, so we look back nostalgically to "the Eisenhower years." They were the last great period of peace this country has enjoyed.

Peace did not just come. President Eisenhower worked to achieve and maintain it. He worked with all that was at his disposal. Foremost among these "weapons" for peace was he, the human being, deeply concerned about our Nation and about all of us.

It was during the last 2 years of his Presidency that I came to Congress. I then had the privilege and honor of getting to know him personally. This was one of the truly great experiences of my life. I shall treasure the memory not only in these days of national mourning but also in the years to come. And in those years, I hope that we will all work to achieve the goals he set for himself and our country.

The general told President Nixon just the other day that "understanding" is the most needed thing in the world today. He knew that understanding, and not the "acquisition of unwarranted influence by the military-industrial complex," was the key to the survival of this Nation and of the human race.

Let us all strive toward this understanding. The future may well depend upon our achieving it.

I speak for all the people of the First Congressional District of Massachusetts in extending my deepest sympathies to his beloved widow, Mamie Eisenhower, to the entire Eisenhower family, and to all his close associates. May they be comforted by the knowledge of our great love and affection for Dwight D. Eisenhower.

THE LUMBER PRICE CRISIS: INCREASES IN SUSTAINED-YIELD TIMBER SUPPLY

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the House and Senate hearings on the high price of lumber and plywood, and the Presidential task force now reviewing this matter, I call to the attention of my colleagues and all parties interested an article which recently appeared in the Portland Oregonian on this subject, written by our respected business editor, Mr. Gerry Pratt.

In this article he describes how one company, with visionary and effective leadership, has increased its timber production markedly, and within the important concept of sustained yield.

This program could serve as a model for the Federal agencies charged with management of the U.S. huge timber resources. Such intensified management would not only solve our supply and price crisis, but would return many additional dollars to the Government for every single dollar invested.

Here then is Mr. Pratt's excellent article:

MAKING THE DOLLAR: FAST GROWTH MARKS GEORGIA-PACIFIC RISE

(By Gerry Pratt)

Georgia-Pacific Corp. has come a long way from the days when the old-style timber operators used to fold hands on their belly lines, chuckle quietly to themselves and tell each other with knowing glances: "Just watch, they will fall like a deck of cards."

Those were days when Owen Cheatham and a quiet understudy, Robert P. Pamplin, were paying prices for timber that spelled pure ruin in the eyes of any legitimate timber operator.

G-P bought the big Boeing tract that way and the C. D. Johnson Lumber Co., and then in a fantastic $90-million proxy battle, the old Booth-Kelly timber out of Springfield and ruin seemed to go glimmering in a flurry of profit and growth figures that made G-P stockholders better off than had they got in on the ground floor of International Business Machines.

And the skeptics stopped chuckling; many of them have since gone out of business, while this week Georgia-Pacific brought out an annual report that shows the upstarts are doing more than $1 billion a year in business.

It would have been presumptuous perhaps in those years for a G-P officer to become a spokesman for the timber industry, though Pamplin was even ten years ago trying to convince people his was not a cut-and-run company, but one that believed in a new concept in sustained yield.

NEW TREE-GROWTH CYCLE CONSIDERED

G-P's cutting cycle disregarded the old style sustained-yield concept of 14 years and more, and moved into a 60-through-90-year cycle that increased raw material production beyond what anyone else had planned. I can remember Pamplin back in the mid-'50s standing on the executive floor of the G-P headquarters explaining with the ornamental butt end of a log how a tree grows faster in its younger years and slows down in the years of old growth.

Once, back then when he did venture out as a spokesman, I told Pacific Northwest Trade Association members, and with candor and courage, that they should forget Canadian-American borders and begin to consider their mutual interest and develop an English-speaking community of nations for an economic as well as a secure future. The Canadians in particular ridiculed the very idea government statesmen in both countries are now repeating as original concepts in future planning.

But G-P's image and the reputation of the company's executives have developed to where no one is disparaging the remarks of R. B. Pamplin this week on the new crisis, the imbalance of supply and demand in the wood products industry. The recent recovery from near-record lows of plywood prices. Pamplin says, "has been too rapid for builders' construction programming."

But, he points out, "the largest part of the industry's plywood production is still selling at mill prices slightly below the level of 20 years ago. However a worse and more permanent shortage faces us in the future if remedial action is not taken now," he warns.

"An increase in the allowable harvest of overripe federal timber is urgently needed, but it must be done within long-term sustained yield timber growing programs to assure a continuous supply of raw material," he says.

Pamplin points to U.S. Forest Service studies indicating demand for timber will double during the next 30 years. He says two temporary factors are blamed for the current shortage. They are the worst winter logging weather in over half a century, coupled with log exports from federal lands.

EXECUTIVE HITS TOO MANY RESERVES

Pamplin has never been known for a reluctance to tackle the hornets, either the built-in "establishment" of the timber industry or zealous "wilderness" exponents. And he says bluntly now:

"We must not lock up too much timber growing land in single use, wilderness-type withdrawals. With the long-range demand for forest products expected to increase sharply, a permanent supply-and-demand squeeze will develop soon if federal timberlands are not brought up to their full growth and harvest potential."

Federal lands comprise 65 per cent of all commercial timberlands in the nation. Pamplin points out. "Industry owns only 15 per cent of the total.

"As the basic supplier, the federal government must assume basic responsibility. This means Congress should reinvest more federal timber sale revenues to grow more and better trees and to provide access roads into overripe timber stands. This is a necessary part of our nation's multi-purpose wood fiber, watershed and recreational improvement program," he contends.

In defense of current prices, the G-P chairman points to current price lists that show sheathing plywood $6 a thousand below what prices were for the same items 20 years ago. Yet he leaves the idea that this may not continue.

"The next 20 years will see much more pressure on raw material supplies to meet the nation's needs. Unless federal timberlands, not vitally needed for other purposes, are geared to growing more and better trees faster, as modern timber management can, we face much more serious supply-demand-price problems."

Pamplin is perhaps the one industry spokesman who can talk like that today and be accepted as knowing what he's talking about. He has been right before.

STATEMENT BY DR. ISAAC LEWIN ON BEHALF OF THE AGUDAS ISRAEL WORLD ORGANIZATION, BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Commission for Social Development discussed, at its recent session, a report by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—UNESCO—on the role of education in economic and social development.

In this report, UNESCO dealt with such topics as educational planning, the quantitative expansion in education, the cost and yield of educational systems, the structures and content of education, higher education and youth problems, and research. The report examined how educational planning can best be geared to the needs of development. It emphasized the need for high-quality and continuing education at all levels.

In the discussion participated the representatives of the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France, Canada, the Netherlands, Greece, Pakistan, the United Arab Republic, India, Spain, and, as the only representative of a nongovernmental organization with consultative status with the Economic and Social Council, Rabbi Dr. Isaac Lewin, of the Agudas Israel World Organization.

I have known Dr. Lewin for many years. He is a highly respected member of the West Side community in Manhattan. He is a very learned individual, is the author of several books in the field of medieval and modern Jewish history, and a professor of history in the Bernard Revel Graduate School of Yeshiva University. Dr. Lewin has contributed greatly to the work of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights and its subsidiary, the Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, over the last 21 years.

In his statement, delivered on February 18, 1969, Dr. Lewin suggested that the United Nations call on all governments to include in the school curriculums on primary and secondary levels special courses on international understanding and peace, stressing simultaneously the need of elimination, in the future, of war and of racial and religious conflicts.

The text of Dr. Lewin's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY DR. ISAAC LEWIN ON BEHALF OF THE AGUDAS ISRAEL WORLD ORGANIZATION, BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, FEBRUARY 18, 1969

In the very valuable report of UNESCO on the role of education in the economic and social development, one chapter has to be singled out as particularly important. This is the chapter called "The Objectives of Education." May I be permitted to say a few words in connection with this chapter, as well as on the chapter called "Problems of the Content of Education: The Adaptation of Education to Life."

UNESCO rightly emphasized the fact that "all education is intended to prepare students for life." Indeed education and life cannot be separated. Only if the life and daily practices of individuals as well as entire groups conform to the teachings received in school, can one say that education has achieved its purpose and its aims, and that education has been integrated in the social structure.

The report mentions that "originally . . . education handed down a set of moral and cultural values bequeathed by preceding generations. These enabled the individual to find his place in a relatively stable ethical and spiritual universe."

How is it today? We live in times of almost unprecedented tensions. The danger of war—and probably of a more destructive war than ever before—is greater today than it was at any time since World War II. Millions of innocent lives were destroyed in the last war due to Nazism and its unbelievable social and cultural retrogression. Unfortunately, however, the racial and religious conflicts have not been diminished today.

In such times the United Nations should give guidance to all nations by urging them to include in the education of the young generation the moral principles based on the teachings of the Bible and the Prophets, and to call all human beings to mutual understanding and peace.

It is not enough to say, as the UNESCO report concludes in its chapter on "The Objectives of Education," that "most governments and educational authorities, whatever their political and social systems or beliefs, are attaching not less but more importance to the teaching of morals, ethics, spiritual values, international understanding and cooperation, love of peace, and solidarity with the rest of mankind." Rather, I would suggest that a more definite step be taken by this Commission and later by the Economic and Social Council—namely, that a resolution be adopted calling on all governments to include in the school curricula on primary and secondary levels special courses on international understanding and peace, stressing simultaneously the need of elimination, in the future, of war and of racial and religious conflicts.

This would undoubtedly be an important step in the march toward social development of mankind for three reasons.

First of all, it would integrate education into the social structure of the world.

Secondly, such action could certainly be considered as an improvement in the quality of education.

Thirdly, it would also mean that the United Nations is taking part in educational planning, which is essential for social and economic development.

The grave crisis demands immediate action.

THE NEW CARDINAL

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the death of Francis Cardinal Spellman was a great loss to New York, to the Nation, and to the Roman Catholic Church. Fortunately, his successor, Archbishop Terence J. Cooke, just recently elevated to the College of Cardinals, possesses the same qualities of compassion, understanding, perception and initiative which distinguished his predecessor.

A perceptive profile of the new cardinal appeared in last Saturday's New York Post. It merits the attention of all of us and I present it herewith for insertion in the RECORD:

TERENCE J. COOKE: THE NEW CARDINAL

(By Anthony Mancini)

Now the scarlet mantle falls to Terence J. Cooke and, with it, an extra dimension to an already burdensome and influential ministry. As one of the youngest of the 134-member College of Cardinals, the 48-year-old Archbishop of New York will participate in the highest councils of the Roman Catholic Church. The College helps the Pope to govern and, as the occasion arises, chooses a new Pope from within its ranks.

Yesterday Cooke greeted the news of his elevation with the humility and directness that has become his trademark: "Just to be a good priest," he said of his goals.

Word that he was designated by Pope Paul as one of the four new American cardinals came to him in Washington, where he was attending a meeting of the National Commission on the Cause and Prevention of Violence.

"I thought I was much too young," he told newsmen, flashing his buck teeth in a ready smile. "And I know of others through the world I felt more deserving."

It is safe to say—despite the expressions of modesty—that the man who last year took over the spiritual stewardship of nearly 2 million Catholics in one of the richest sees of the Church will approach this fresh challenge with the quiet confidence that has marked the first year of his reign here.

Innovation without fanfare has characterized his administration so far and there is hope in both the liberal and conservative wings of the local Church that Cooke, as cardinal (his elevation takes place at a secret consistory in Rome on April 28), will prove something special, indeed.

He has proved a masterly conciliator. The conservatives, while recognizing the need for social change, are heartened by his traditional views on matters of faith and dogma. The liberals, on the other hand, while respecting his sense of tradition, are encouraged by his avowed interest in social justice and some of the steps he has taken in that direction.

"We sincerely hope," said a liberal priest here, "that now that he's got the red hat, he will be even more free to be his own man. It's still a waiting game for us and he is still very much an unknown quantity."

While some of the liberals are ever mindful of Cooke's apprenticeship under his conservative predecessor, the late Cardinal Spellman, they gave him fair marks for his first year.

Although little substantive change has been made during the Archbishop's short tenure, there is widespread satisfaction with the gestures and his establishment of liberal organizations whose goal is the attainment of social and racial harmony and equality.

For example, they cite his generally progressive action in the fields of race relations and Church democratization. But—and this is a real sore point—they also cite his quick endorsement in a pastoral letter of Pope Paul's unflinching encyclical on birth control.

Some of the steps the Archbishop has taken to liberalize the traditionally conservative Archdiocese recently have included:

Setting up a Social Justice Task Force to explore the problems of race, poverty and urban renewal.

Appointing the Archdiocese's first Negro pastor, Father Harold Salmon of St. Charles Borromeo parish; Salmon was also named Vicariate Delegate of Harlem, with authority over all parishes in Harlem.

Cooke's endorsement of the Kerner Report on civil disorders.

The institution of new scholarship programs to train more Puerto Rican and Negro priests.

Urging "a careful study" of New York State's proposed abortion reform laws, instead of condemning them outright.

His cautious but encouraging response to a memorandum of priorities by an organization of priests calling for sweeping reforms in democratizing the Archdiocese.

Aside from the substantive issues, Cooke's warm personal style and his pastoral emphasis have impressed many prominent laymen and priests.

"He is a very communicative Archbishop and very close to the people," said John Sweeney, president of the Guild of Catholic Lawyers. "He always has a willing ear for us and is most accessible. He's really very easy to reach and talk to."

The Guild supports the Archbishop's stand in backing the Papal Encyclical on birth control and many of his other conservative positions in matters of dogma.

There is general pleasure among conservatives and liberals alike in the Archbishop's pronounced habit of soliciting advice from laymen and low-ranking priests before making decisions.

"His advocacy of the parish council is quite heartening," said one layman who counts himself among the conservatives. "And we like the idea that, soon after he took office, he sent his priests from the chancery around to everybody in the archdiocese asking our opinion on all matters, particularly education."

To grapple with the urgent problems of the parochial school system—plunged into financial crisis by the flight of middle-class whites to the suburbs—Cooke last April set up an elite panel of educators and civic leaders, including such prominent laymen as Schools Supt. Donovan and former Deputy Defense Secretary Cyrus Vance.

"He's moving surely with the tide of secularization which is sweeping the Church," one priest said.

In the meantime, Cooke—whose political, prowess was once a question mark—has shown a definite flair in this realm. From a relatively obscure start, he has begun to carve out a national reputation for himself.

Some of his success here can be attributed to tragic coincidence. On the night of his investiture as Archbishop on April 4, 1968, Martin Luther King was slain in Memphis. In the succeeding days, Cooke's solemn countenance was flashed across the nation, hands clasped with James Farmer and Mayor Lindsay, singing "We Shall Overcome" at a ceremony in King's honor in Central Park; and later at the Memphis funeral.

Two months later, he delivered before the nation a eulogy for Robert F. Kennedy.

Then, after the Kennedy assassination, President Johnson named him to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

Father Joseph Fitzpatrick, S.J., a sociology professor at Fordham University, has been assisting the Archbishop in his work with the Commission.

"He has made a great contribution here," Fitzpatrick said yesterday. "He made an impressive and effective intervention in having special hearings on the role that the private sector, namely schools, churches and welfare agencies might play in the effort to correct violence in the United States. I think this is in keeping with his sense of a pastoral mission."

His pastoral approach has impressed others as well.

"He is more available to the people of the archdiocese—his flock—than any other archbishop in the history of the archdiocese," said James E. Foley, state deputy of the Knights of Columbus. "Shortly after his installation he visited every county in the archdiocese. You can sit with him, explain your problems and get answers."

His main accomplishments, in the view of many, have been in the field of race relations.

"I really think it's quite an improvement over the kind of attitudes there used to be" in the Chancery, remarked a spokesman for the Catholic Interracial Council, a civil rights organization.

Specifically, the spokesman pointed out that on April 23, Cooke will present the Father John LaFarge Award for Interracial Justice to Urban League director Whitney M. Young Jr. (Previous recipients have included Nelson Rockefeller and George Meany.) He also cited Cooke's appointment of Father Salmon as spiritual adviser of the Council and encouragement to add more black persons to the organization's board.

"It's a beginning, a step," the Council spokesman concluded. Cooke's apparently genuine concern for the plight of the underprivileged was forged in the crucible of his own poor origins and early labors as a priest in social work and Catholic Charities.

"Clearly, he knows the social problems," said a prominent Catholic lawyer-layman, Dr. John Connorton. "He is a professional social worker."

His official biography unfolds almost like a parody of the poor-boy-makes-good stories.

Terence James Cooke was born in Manhattan on March 1, 1921, the son of an Irish immigrant from Galway. His father, Michael Cooke, was at first a chauffeur whose employers included the actor John Barrymore.

In the early 1920s, the family moved to the Throgs Neck section of the Bronx where Cooke was reared while his father worked as a tile layer. The family eventually bought a stucco house at 2897 Coddington Av. From his earliest years, young Terry is remembered by his neighbors as a studious and devout boy with a passion for music. He studied and played the violin.

"Yes, I loved the violin," he told a Post reporter last year. "I won't say how well I played, but I played—and thank heavens we weren't living in an apartment house with neighbors all around to lodge complaints." Later the Cookes escaped the city to a ranch house in Rockland County, where the father stayed until his death at 75.

Cooke's mother Margaret died when her son was 10, but her place was taken by his aunt, Mary Gannon, who helped raise him and his brother and sister. Miss Gannon is now a retired salesclerk living in Stuyvesant Town.

The Cardinal-designate's sister Katherine, who is unmarried, lives with the elderly aunt and his brother Joseph lives in Niagara Falls with his family.

The seed of young Terry's vocation to the priesthood was planted when he was a student at a Benedictine elementary school in West Nyack. He went on to Cathedral Prep and St. Joseph's Seminary in Yonkers. Ordained in the priesthood by Cardinal Spellman on Dec. 1, 1945, he was assigned to parish work at St. Athanasius in the Bronx. Despite his pastoral approach now, Cooke's experience as a parish priest was short. After two years, he was sent to Catholic University for graduate work in social sciences and later took a Master's degree in sociology at the University of Chicago.

In 1949, he took up duties on the staff of Catholic Charities, giving part of his time to St. Jude in Manhattan, his final parish assignment.

Teaching assignments followed at Fordham and St. Joseph's until Spellman appointed the young priest his personal secretary in 1957.

From that time on, Father Cooke's rise in the hierarchy was rapid. He was consecrated an auxiliary bishop in 1965 after handling all the arrangements for Pope Paul's visit to this country. Before then, his promotions had included vice chancellor of the archdiocese (1958), chancellor (1961) prothonotary apostolic (1964) and Archdiocesan vicar general (1965). And it was Spellman himself, according to reports, who told Pope Paul that Cooke would be a worthy successor as Archbishop of New York.

Now, less than a year after that elevation, he has—as expected—reached the pinnacle of Church ranks, just below the papal office itself.

How will he fare in the near-Byzantine byways of Vatican politics?

"He has been sitting for years at the feet of a man (Cardinal Spellman) who was a consummate expert on the Vatican," one close associate said.

"If he has had anything to do with New York City and its political and social life," added Sweeney of the Catholic Lawyers Guild, "he comes well-equipped to handle the political relationships of the Vatican. If you wanted to really sum it up—he is a diplomat."

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OF NEW JERSEY

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues and Americans everywhere in mourning the loss of a great man, a great leader, and a great American, Dwight David Eisenhower.

I was temporarily assigned to General Eisenhower's command during World War II, and it was my personal pleasure over the years to meet him on several occasions. I knew him to be a man of high moral character, impeccable integrity, and possessed of a rare quality; namely, wisdom, born of inherent compassion for his fellow man, an understanding of the times in which he lived, a depth of insight known from experience, and a capacity to apply the lessons of history to contemporary realities.

As the 34th President of the United States, General Eisenhower was to deal with yet another war whose conclusion was a prelude to an era of peace, prosperity, and stability. He brought to this Nation the highest respect among the free nations of the world, the confidence of its people, and a renewed faith in our American heritage as set by his own example. His courage and leadership were dedicated to the moral right that men everywhere might live in peace and freedom, and his memory will live on in our hearts as an inspiration to give us the spiritual strength to meet the challenges both present and future. He once said:

> Faith is our surest strength, our greatest resource.

Mrs. Hunt and I extend our deepest and heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and her devoted family.

THE 1968 NATIONAL REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION NATIONAL CONFERENCE

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Federal regulations governing the application of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1968 became effective. The way is now cleared for the administrative implementation of those significant amendments which comprise one of the most constructive products of the 90th Congress. I am proud to have been a part of the House Committee on Education and Labor, which, under the able leadership of its chairman, CARL D. PERKINS, and the subcommittee chairman, ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, developed this legislation. These amendments were a fitting climax to the public career of Senator Lister Hill, who headed the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare handling this matter and who for decades gave magnificent leadership to health and rehabilitation public policy.

I mark this occasion because the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments, unanimously approved by Congress, call for a very significant expansion of the rehabilitation program. VRA at all levels is called upon to adapt its excellent services to the socioeconomically disadvantaged, to the poor in the ghetto, to the delinquent youth, to the undereducated, and to others whose employability has been severely limited by their status in our society. There is a new mandate to the rehabilitation system to serve the long-term hard-core jobless.

Of course, I am personally especially gratified that these new amendments call for a new careers program to be developed both to meet manpower needs in rehabilitation and to provide new job opportunities for the handicapped. The new careers provision in the VRA legislation of 1968 is patterned on the new careers provision of the Economic Opportunity Act which I sponsored in 1966 and reflects the promise and success of that program.

I am hopeful that Congress will adequately enlarge the appropriation for the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration to permit the full development of the new dimension Congress added in 1968. Under the distinguished leadership of Miss Mary Switzer and Dr. Joseph V. Hunt the VRA has been one of our most successful public service programs and deserves our full funding support in its new responsibilities.

Congress and the administration have been greatly assisted in their program development in this area by the professionals, experts, and program operators working in rehabilitation. They are largely and well represented by the National Rehabilitation Association led by its executive director, E. B. Whitten.

The NRA at its recent convention in New Orleans, La., gave special attention to this new dimension in rehabilitation. The opening address at the NRA convention was prepared by one of our country's outstanding experts in the manpower and anti-poverty fields, Prof. Russell A. Nixon, of New York University. Dr. Nixon's address very clearly analyzes and describes the significance of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and should be of great interest to my colleagues:

THE 1968 NATIONAL REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION NATIONAL CONFERENCE

(Address by Russell A. Nixon, Ph. D.)

The decision of the National Rehabilitation Association to focus its 1968 conference on "Rehabilitation in a Troubled World" reflects alertness and sensitive concern for the significantly changing setting in which vocational rehabilitation is to function and develop in the period ahead. This is characteristic of the progressive and enlightened leadership long given in the field of rehabilitation by the Association, by its membership, and by the Federal, State, and local officials, and the Congress with which NRA works. Implicit in this focus on our "troubled world" are two other relevant descriptions of the present stage setting of efforts at "human reenforcement" as we enter the last third of the 20th Century: It is not only a troubled world, but it is a changing world—and it is a challenging world. It is within this troubled, changing, challenging scene that rehabilitation must define its enormously growing and increasingly central role in the development of human services to meet the needs of our nation and its people.

You who are so sensitive to the "human condition" and concerned with the state of our society, need hardly to be told that these are "troubled times". Our most thoughtful men are constantly underlining the urgency and the danger of what is now generally referred to as *a crisis* in our society:

At the beginning of this year, the then Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, John Gardner said "I cannot speak with assurance, only with concern . . . (people fail to see) the alarming character of our domestic crisis . . . we are in deep trouble as a people . . ."

We are told by Mollie Orshansky, the Social Security Board's expert statistician, that at last estimate for 1966, there are 50 million persons—25 percent of our population—who are "economically deprived". The Office of Juvenile Delinquency tells us that "at any given point in time, there are approximately 2 million young men (aged 10 to 17) who are either currently or have recently been delinquent."

The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders concludes that "Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal." This distinguished Commission of responsible men studying the violent and bloody disorders of 1967 emphasized that these "disorders are not simply a problem of the racial ghetto or the city . . . They are symptoms of social ills that have become endemic in our society and now affect every American . . . and the resulting discontent and disruption threaten democratic values fundamental to our progress as a free society."

We have lagged in "cleaning up the hideous legacy of the industrial revolution" and of our slave system, and in building a genuinely humane and equitable society. A huge gap exists between our enormous technological and social potential and our achievement. Our actions have not matched our promises. We are being told by a restless and dissatisfied people "Today is yesterdays' tomorrow, and you promised." Our society, our institutions, are being called to account by a "revolution of rising expectations", not in Asia or Africa, but right here within our own nation, a "revolution" which cannot and should not be evaded.

But if these are troubled days, it is also true that as the poet-singer Bobby Dylan says "The times they are a 'Changin' ". As never before, the social and economic ills of our time are acknowledged and are declared unacceptable. The facts of poverty and the ghetto were well known long before the so-called "War on Poverty" was declared—but they were conveniently put aside and largely out of sight insofar as public policy and attention was concerned. Now, regardless of the limits or even failures of that "War", out of the complex developments of this decade it seems certain that as long as poverty and slums and discrimination remain in our society they will be on the main agenda of our public policy and programs.

As Marshall McLuhan writes in *The Medium is the Message*

"The shock of recognition! In an electric information environment, minorities can no longer be contained—ignored. Too many people know too much about each other. Our new environment compels commitment and participation. We have become irrevocably involved with, and responsible for, each other."

The focus shifts from degrees of progress and service to the *unmet needs*, to the things still to be done. This is the significance of the Declaration of the Urban Coalition representing major industrial, financial, labor and civil rights forces led by Henry Ford and Davd Rockefeller which sounds an alarm and calls for a million new human service jobs. This is the meaning of the finding of the National Committee on Civil Disorders—a bipartisan Commission which included the Governor of Illinois, the Mayor of New York City, the head of Litton Industries Inc., and the Chief of Police of Atlanta, Georgia—that "only a greatly enlarged commitment to national action—compassionate, massive and sustained, backed by the will and resources of the most powerful and the richest nation on the earth—can shape a future that is compatible with the historic ideals of American Society."

For rehabilitation, this changing focus and emphasis is acutely relevant for it is increasingly clear that rehabilitation of the disabled cannot advance in isolation from the social and economic strains, problems and convulsions which challenge our country today. These new developments are significantly reflected—as we shall see—in the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and in the splendid *Report of the National Citizens Advisory Committee on Vocational Rehabilitation*. These changes arising in these troubled times add to the traditional mission of rehabilitation in several very difficult and very challenging ways:

First.—New quantitative dimensions shift emphasis from satisfaction that 207,000 persons were rehabilitated in fiscal 1968—the long waited 200,000 barrier was broken—to the fact that over 300,000 new physical and mental disability cases needing vocational rehabilitation went unattended and a backlog of over 5 million unserviced mentally and physically handicapped persons continued to grow.

Second.—A new emphasis and a new mandate is given to reach and service adequately the toughest cases, develop on-the-job training and employment contacts with private industry for handicapped workers, to extend followup services and attention after initial job placement, to provide services to families of the handicapped, and to raise to a new level the vocational and work adjustment services of rehabilitation.

Third.—The experience, processes and resources of vocational rehabilitation are now to be extended beyond the traditional physically and mentally disabled to serve the needs of those suffering socio-economic handicaps which limit employability.

Fully implemented, this new legislative mandate will make vocational rehabilitation a central factor in the toughest and most intractable part of our national manpower, urban, and anti-poverty problem—the vocational rescue of the hard-core unemployed. This is a new ball game for VRA with new rules, and new methods of scoring. Is VRA ready—if not, what needs to be done to get ready?

Finally, a significant new approach to the manpower needs of rehabilitation is opened by the provision for "new career" employment and training projects aimed at increased utilization in a radically new way of nonprofessional workers recruited from the handicapped of all categories and from the general working force. Building on the existing experience in rehabilitation in the utilization of support personnel, this new Amendment adds an important new qualitative and quantitative dimension to the manpower supply program of the rehabilitation services.

These enormous enlargements of the rehabilitation mission have been gestating in the developing work of vocational rehabilitation during the recent years—they are now made specific and formal in the 1968 Amendments. They suggest that a major transformation under way for rehabilitation:

In size—from a program which spent $116 million five years ago to a program already authorized by Congress in three years, in 1971, to start spending around $1.25 billion annually.

In content—from a well conducted but relatively small program performing magnificent services for a special group of especially needy persons, to a major program in the center of the socio-economic storm, significantly involved in the labor market, in the antipoverty, ghetto, minority participation, and urban decentralization problems that stir our society.

This expanded and changed role of vocational rehabilitation is not the product of any special bureau or service agency drive for expansion—in spite of the fact that distinguished Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service of HEW, Mary Switzer is the most legislatively charismatic government official appearing before Congressional committees. It is growth that has not been sought and certainly not contrived, but is rather the inevitable consequence of public policy and program experiences which have validated the rehabilitation philosophy and process as the best way to meet many of our most difficult human problems. This growth is, really, a price paid for success.

There is a gratifying inner consistency between the developments I have briefly outlined—they are rooted in the same social developments and needs and reinforce each other. Let me illustrate by discussing two of the most significant new provisions in the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968—

Sec. 15—which provides "vocational evaluation and work adjustment services" to "disadvantaged individuals" and their families; and Sec. 4 (a–1–6) which provides grants for programs to utilize "New Career" nonprofessional manpower in vocational rehabilitation.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION FOR THE SOCIO-ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED

In an entirely new provision, Section 15, Congress has authorized $50 million during the current fiscal year ($75 million next year and $100 million for fiscal 1971) for grants to the states to cover 90 percent of the cost of "evaluation and work adjustment services furnished to disadvantaged persons." This new term "disadvantaged persons" has long been familiar in manpower and anti-poverty programs. Here it is defined to add to the familiar VRA target population of "individuals under a physical or mental disability" the following:

"Individuals disadvantaged by reason of their youth or advanced age, low educational attainment, ethnic or cultural factors, prison or delinquency records, or other conditions which constitute a barrier to employment." In addition, services are to be furnished "other members of their families" whose needs affect the rehabilitation prospects of the client.

The services to be provided are for both a preliminary and a thorough diagnostic study to determine service needs, an appraisal of the individuals' vocational potential including work sample testing, "any other goods or services necessary to evaluate employability," and finally "outreach, referral, and advocacy."

Two basic observations can be made regarding this new legislative provision:

First. The definition of disadvantaged persons now included in the VRA program is a complete and clear description of what is generally referred to as the "hard-core" unemployed—the residual section of the counted or potential labor force remaining unemployed after 9 months of economic upswing with the official unemployment rate at 3.5 percent and 2.8 million reported as unemployed. It is the employability and employment—the vocational rehabilitation—of this residual group which is the main problem and the main purpose of existing manpower and human resource programs. It is this "hard core" unemployment which is described by the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders as "the most persistent and serious grievance" in the urban ghetto.

Second. The services to be provided—outreach, recruitment, employability and vocational diagnosis, work sample testing, and referral—are the essential and very major initial steps of any manpower program aimed at the "hard core" unemployed. They prepare the way for training, job development, and placement to complete the manpower process.

There was an enlightening written exchange in the Senate VRA Amendment Hearings this year between Senator Jacob Javits of New York and Commissioner Joseph V. Hunt of the Rehabilitation Services Administration. The Senator raised a question based on the observation of two of the nation's most expert manpower authorities, Dr. Sar A. Levitan and Dr. Garth Mangum that "It becomes increasingly difficult to differentiate vocational rehabilitation, either in clientele or services, from other manpower programs." Commissioner Hunt very appropriately described the difference between the manpower and the vocational rehabilitation programs, particularly as they have operated in the past. But Mr. Hunt also described the developments, especially in the manpower programs, which have moved them towards the vocational rehabilitation process. When these manpower trends are added to the trends, and now the legislative mandate, in vocational rehabilitation it becomes clear that the Levitan-Mangum description of the tendency towards the convergence of VRA and manpower is increasingly accurate.

There can be no doubt that the extension of vocational rehabilitation services to the socio-economically disadvantaged is a highly significant and calculated expansion of VRA by Congress. The *Report* of the House Committee on Education and Labor—*Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968*—states:

"The Committee would like to emphasize its strong endorsement of the extension of services to additional people in ghettoes as well as to the rural poor. The committee believes that it is extremely important that the program of vocational rehabilitation be expanded in this direction. Now, especially in the light of the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, it is vital that these disadvantaged people receive increased attention. They should be able to look to the rehabilitation program as one of the resources available to them and to know that it is ready to serve them whenever possible. This includes the full range of vocational rehabilitation services to disabled ghetto and impoverished rural people, and evaluation and work adjustment services to all such persons. Broadening our capability to serve all the disadvantaged will make rehabilitation evaluation services available to individuals in the several multiagency programs in order to determine a plan of action through vocational rehabilitation or through other programs."

After emphasizing the entire range of vocational disabilities, the House Committee said:

"The vocational rehabilitation agency, with long and successful experience in providing comprehensive (vocational evaluation and work adjustment) evaluation services to its clients, is the best equipped by working philosophy and experience to provide these kinds of services."

If underlining is necessary, it should be noted that the Committees of Congress, the House and Senate Labor Committees, assigning this increased responsibility to Vocational Rehabilitation are the same committees which handle all national manpower and anti-poverty legislation.

It should be noted that the treatment of socio-economic disabilities in the 1968 legislation is significantly different than in the VRA Regulations which applied the 1965 VRA Amendments and defined "behavioral disabilities" as "deviant social behavior or impaired ability to carry out normal relationships with family and community which may result from vocational, educational, cultural, social, environmental, or other factors." For one thing, the new extended definition is now spelled out in the law and the legislative history of the law. Moreover, as Commissioner Hunt effectively pointed out to Senator Javits in the 1968 Hearings "new language is needed in order to allow evaluation services to disadvantaged persons." That language is now supplied.

If any confirmation is required to establish the fact that this vast new thrust for VRA is a profoundly serious and deeply rooted development, it is furnished by the *Report of the National Citizens Advisory Committee on Vocational Rehabilitation*. Headed by Dr. Howard Rusk and including in its membership, its subcommittees and its collaborators, the most authoritative persons in vocational rehabilitation, this *Report* states

"Vocational rehabilitation, with its history of service to handicapped people, needs a law and implementing regulations which are straightforward in their intent to serve all those who are vocationally handicapped, regardless of the course. Many of our citizens, in addition to the physically and mentally disabled, are socially and culturally disadvantaged, the public offender and the illiterate are included in this larger group. Vocational rehabilitation has always had a vocational focus and should continue to do so. The major thrust of the program should be assist individuals to achieve a measure of economic independence commensurate with their potential, regardless of the nature or origin of the handicapped condition."

To this end, the *Report* calls for "a substantial increase in Federal funds" to permit State agencies to enter this new field of services "without doing it at the expense of the severely physically disabled."

The "die is cast." A whole new and radically different dimension has been added to vocational rehabilitation. Now the tough questions—and the tough challenges—have to be faced!

Is vocational rehabilitation ready to take on this new obligation—at the Federal, State and local levels, at the governmental and the voluntary agency levels? Are the traditional resources and processes of rehabilitation "ready, willing, and able" to deal with a new target population that is drastically different in background, motivation, and handicap?

To what extent are the attitudes of rehabilitation staffs "middle class", oriented to well motivated handicapped individuals, and to a case by case psycho-therapeutic approach rather than to poor, ghetto, black, Puerto Rican, and Mexican Americans with socio-economic disabilities that have destroyed motivation and created deep alienation to work and society? How ready is rehabilitation to apply what C. Wright Mills called "the sociological imagination" to the treatment of the hard core poor and unemployed, the slum youth and delinquent, the "career" welfare case, the dope addict? How much bias and prejudice, subtle and even unconscious, will have to be rooted out of rehabilitation staffs in order to really do this new job?

How does rehabilitation proceed so as to not diminish in any degree—actually to increase greatly—its traditional service to the physically and mentally handicapped while at the same time assuming this huge new responsibility that Congress and "the march of time" have thrust on all of you and your colleagues?

What changes have to be made? What research is necessary—what new planning—what new demonstration and pilot efforts are required to chart and take this new course? What has to be done?

These questions have to be asked. They are easy to ask, but hard to answer. Looking for some answers is a major goal of this NRA Conference. While I can join you in posing these problems, I must be very modest about my ability to provide answers. I must be modest for the reasons suggested by Winston Churchill who responded to a remark that his political rival Clement Atlee was "a very modest man" with the observation "He has much to be modest about." But let me make a few comments which relate to these questions.

The present developments reflect trends and changes *both* in the anti-poverty and manpower programs, and in the rehabilitation program.

The manpower programs have slowly learned some basic lessons. They have learned that the socioeconomic wounds of ghetto, racist, and poverty life are deep wounds, traumatic injuries which cannot simply be wiped away by traditional manpower training, superficial refresher courses, and the employment opportunities that come with "national prosperity." This lesson has been painfully taught by the failure of existing manpower programs to meet the problem of "hard core" unemployment. It is a point emphasized in 1964 by Gunnar Myrdal in *Challenge to Affluence* when he said that an important part of American unemployment was structural resulting from the fact that poverty, poor training and education, and previous unemployment had "destroyed" a part of the labor force.

A second lesson is that the "hard core" jobless have multiple wounds, that poverty, physical deficiencies, low education, lack of training, alienation, psychological disabilities, age and race and cultural problems, are all bound up together.

As a consequence of these experiences, manpower programs have increasingly had to move to more intensive and continuing attention to the unemployed on a case by case basis.

Moreover, it has been necessary for manpower programs to provide comprehensive and integrated services to the jobless, to add a whole range of remedial and supportive services to the traditional activities of training and placement. These are basic service moves by manpower toward vocational rehabilitation methods and content of service. These moves have been forced by experiences. As Dr. Mangum and Dr. Glenn observed in their recent report *Vocational Rehabilitation and Federal Manpower Policy* the manpower and antipoverty agencies "were largely unaware of SRS's existence . . . Until attempts to attack the employment problems of the various disadvantaged groups reached deeply enough to demonstrate how entwined ill health and mental and emotional maladjustments were with social and economic handicaps."

Similarly, vocational rehabilitation is called on to change—or perhaps it is better said "to add to"—its arsenal of services. While preserving the quality of its case by case multiservice case, VRA now must move into an area where the usual psychological tests do not apply—indeed they may be perverse—where the usual physical therapy and some aspects of counseling will not apply. It now becomes necessary to go beyond attention to "individual pathology and personal failure" or handicap into consideration of social and political factors.

The views of John Martin, Father Firzpatrick, and Dr. Gould in the new HEW Office of Juvenile Delinquency publication *Analyzing Delinquent Behavior: A New Approach* suggest the needed change, and what they say applies to the entire area of socio-economic disability.

"A revolution is stirring in national thinking about crime and delinquency. Instead of the old emphasis on changing the individual offender, the new movement stresses changing the manner in which various social institutions relate . . . to him . . . Leaders of the new movement . . . see the need to reform social institutions through community action, and to win fair decisions for the poor as just as important as the use of therapy, casework, and counseling . . . (they) take a structural view of causation and seek to introduce at the individual case level an interdisciplinary perspective with a heavy social science emphasis." This suggests a new approach for vocational rehabilitation in its new mission.

Both private industry and government agencies have learned some important lessons in the recent experience with the hard-core unemployed—the socio-economically deprived. For one thing, new human resources have been uncovered. Once initial handicaps are uncovered, private employers are reporting amazement that workers previously looked upon as "beyond the pale" for employment have exceeded expectations and come up with work and turnover records about the same as regular new hires.

It has been found necessary to change personal methods of operation and to struggle against biases and bureaucratic inflexibilities in hiring and training. Companies have found that old hiring standards were unrealistic, unrelated to actual work requirements, and grossly discriminatory. They have found that commonly accepted tests were totally unsatisfactory. A struggle has been necessary to change the attitudes of supervisory staff, personnel staffs, and even other workers in order to make it possible to utilize the "hard-core" jobless. The Federal and State Employment Services have had to devise new tests, new personnel, new methods, and decentralized service locations in their effort to relate to the poor, minority, slum population.

The experiences of the Office of Economic Opportuntiy especially in its Community Action Program, have illustrated the great potential for "human reenforcement" amongst the poor, as well as the need for new methods of work to realize that potential. There is a powerful drive both for increased participation of the clients—the poor, the handicapped, the disadvantaged—in planning their own and their families "rehabilitation" and in having a major part in its realization. The drive for decentralization to bring human services closer to the people has deep roots and will inevitably be a major factor in the development of rehabilitation's new programs.

Experience has shown that the socio-economically deprived present a complex and varied problem. Some of the "hardcore" dissolves when washed with opportunity, some of it dissolves when the solvent of more care and new methods is applied, but for some of the "hard-hardcore" we have yet to discover the solvent formula.

Obviously, VRA cannot deal with this huge problem alone. The new mandate for rehabilitation makes imperative a new level of linkage with other human resource and service programs, agencies, and departments at Federal, State, local, and neighborhood levels. Much will depend on how well this coordination can be effectuated. This new challenge calls for new relationships with the new services from the voluntary agencies which so often represent the increasingly crucial community tie. With this enlarged effort there is an increased urgency for each State to raise its sights, to go beyond simple matching of Federal funds, and create the ways and means for VRA to play a major role in State plans for human resources, for elimination of poverty, and end the human blight of the ghetto.

NEW CAREERS

The New Careers amendment to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act is intimately related to the new dimension of rehabilitation service. The new supply of manpower which the New Career program can open up is absolutely necessary if vocational rehabilitation is to meet its new service obligations. This is true, obviously, because more people will be necessary. But even more important than numbers, a new type of rehabilitation staff recruited from the disabled and disadvantaged is now required and can be supplied by the New Careers program.

The Special Projects section of the 1968 Amendments:

"Authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to '(C) make grants to State vocational rehabilitation agencies and other public and private nonprofit agencies to enable them to develop new programs to recruit and train individuals for new career opportunities in order to provide manpower in programs serving handicapped individuals and to upgrade or expand those services.' And (D) specifically calls for such grants 'to recruit and train handicapped individuals to provide them with new career opportunities in the fields of rehabilitation, health, welfare public safety and law enforcement, and other appropriate public services employment.' "

The *Reports* of both the Senate and the House Labor Committees discuss this New Career provision and significantly establish the legislative intent of the New Career amendment as follows:

"New Career opportunities—The committee recognizes the outstanding work being accomplished by the professionals in vocational rehabilitation. It also acknowledges that a disproportionate amount of their time is occupied by routine and clerical duties. In order to alleviate this condition and at the same time upgrade and expand existing services for nonprofessionals, funds have been authorized to be made available through grants to agencies working with the handicapped. In meeting their manpower needs, agencies should not be limited to employing handicapped individuals but should draw from the entire population of potential workers.

Furthermore, with this provision the committee seeks not only to fill manpower needs but to promote job development which offers new career opportunities and the promise of advancement. Grants should be allotted on the basis of the degree to which the new positions enhance an agency's capacity to improve services and the employee's potential or vertical progression.

The committee in recognizing the further needs of the handicapped has also included a new grant proposal for the recruitment and training of handicapped individuals in order to provide them with new career opportunities in the varied fields comprising public service employment."

It is essential to recognize that this "New Career" provision has a very special and well defined meaning—initiated and defined by the Congress itself and by these particular committees in other legislation. "New Careers" is not just an added program of utilization of more numbers of non-professional, para-professional, auxiliary, or supportive personnel. "New Careers" is a phrase of art—legislatively validated—which describes a program of major change in the recruitment, training and education, occupational advancement, status and utilization of non-professional personnel—it has profound implications for the entire system of service delivery, for the definition and reconstruction of occupations, for the conventional requirements of degrees and licenses as credentials necessary to work, and for change and enhancement of the role of the professional.

The New Career program was initiated legislatively in the 1966 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. The New Career Amendment was sponsored in the House Education and Labor Committe by Congressman James H. Scheuer of New York City. In 1967 Congress reconfirmed the Scheuer Amendment and refined the language of the law providing for work and training programs which included:

"Special programs which provide unemployed or low income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including without limitation health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, which give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement;"

This is the basic, and official, statement of what Congress means by "new careers." It is the definition spelled out by the committees which wrote the Vocational Rehabilitations Amendments of 1968 and the New Career provisions they contain. The House and Senate Labor Committee *Reports* on the *1967 Economic Opportunity Act "Amendments"* underline the very special and particular meaning Congress has given to its "New Careers" legislation. The Senate Labor Committee *Report*, emphasizes its concept of New Careers in a special section:

"Primary emphasis is upon training which will lead upward on a career ladder. The first step would be work under professional supervision at an entry level job with supplementary education, including basic education if necessary and enrollment in courses at training institutions. The second step would be the performance of work assignments requiring greater skill, emphasizing on-the-job training. The third step would be a permanent position on an agency staff, with certification as necessary, such as for a practical nurse, an occupational therapist, an assistant teacher, a patrolman, and other civil service positions . . . It will not be easy to break down traditional barriers, such as civil service regulations and professional "standards," which block the disadvantaged from moving into public service occupations, but considerable effort must be made in this regard if the program is to succeed."

The House *Report*, somewhat critically, states "The need to create new careers with advancement opportunities was additionally stressed in the 'new careers' program. The committee notes that 'new careers' projects have been funded which provide only the most superficial attention to the career ladder concept of the requirement that permanent jobs be available at the end of training. The committee expects the Labor Department to act decisively in correcting these situations." The Labor Department which administers the Scheuer New Career program, responding at least in part to this admonition, early this year issued tough new guidelines for its "New Career State Plans" designed to enforce the Congressional intent by assuring that the plans provided clearly specified "Career ladders and lattices for upward and diagonal job mobility," restructured job specifications of both professionals and non-professionals, guaranteed "career development training resources" including on-the-job training and "compensated time for other career advancement training," and permanent employment.

I have gone into this detail purposely at some forensic risk to make perfectly clear that in the New Career provision "something *new* has been added"—in VRA something very important, very big, very difficult, and very promising has been added.

New Career program is responsive to three major aspects of vocational rehabilitation:

First. It is essential to help meet the enormous manpower shortages in the rehabilitation services. These shortages are well documented and well known. They have already limited the necessary expansion of rehabilitation and promise—unless drastic action is taken—to gravely curtail work in the future. As the Advisory Committee says in its excellent summary "Finding and Training the Manpower," the "quantitative (training) accomplishments . . . seem . . . at a dangerously low level in view of the estimated numbers needed." Perhaps anticipating the New Careers legislation not then enacted, the Advisory Committee called for "recognition of the tremendous need to augment health manpower shortages through training of auxiliary personnel;" and for "intensive recruiting efforts to minority and economically deprived groups, emphasizing opportunities for status and advancement in the professions associated with rehabilitation."

Second. The new careers program fits into efforts to direct rehabilitation services increasingly into the ghetto, to the non-English speaking population, into the community and neighborhood on a decentralized basis, and to the socio-economically disadvantaged. Dramatic experiences in other human service fields are revealing the enormous capacities represented by "new careerists" and their ability to bring new and unique levels of communication, understanding, and service. We are finding that offenders can be used effectively in corrections and juvenile delinquency programs, that former narcotics addicts can help other addicts, that a person who reads at the eighth grade level can teach someone who reads at the 4th grade level—and incidentally learn himself in the process—that a welfare mother can serve well in the welfare system. The time has come when human services can no longer be given a simple "do good to the poor", on a "for them" basis—but must proceed on a "by them" basis with professionals serving as partners rather than as commanders. New Careers meets this need. We are learning that New Career personnel can be more than helpful—New Careerists are proving essential to meet the new quantitative and changing qualitative demands of the human services.

Third. The New Careers program can and should open new vocational opportunities for the physically handicapped and for the socio-economically deprived. We are uncovering enormous human thrusts of ambition, selfesteem, and mobility when given opportunities for meaningful "New Career" employment.

"New Careers" is of special significance for the Social and Rehabilitation Services of HEW, since SRS integrates the Department's concern with welfare, juvenile delinquency, children, the aging, and rehabilitation. Welfare recipients have already proven to be one of the most fruitful sources of New Career personnel. SRS can expect effectively to combine its interest in jobs for welfare recipients and delinquents with the job opportunities which can be opened by the New Career program in rehabilitation.

It should be noted that there is an enormous growth under way generally in the New Careers program. Since the concept was originally popularized in 1965 in Frank Riessman and Arthur Pearl's *New Careers for the Poor*, and since the original Scheuer Amendments in 1966, some type of "New Careers" amendment has been added to most major legislation in the human service area. Much research, analysis, evaluation, and experimentation is under way on the many problems and alternatives confronted in implementing New Careers programs. A national organization of professionals and nonprofessionals active and concerned with New Careers has been set up. Within HEW, explorations proceed regarding the closer coordination of New Career developments in education, health, welfare, corrections, and surely now, rehabilitation. Just a short time ago, the Federal Inter-Agency Committee on Manpower Research established a subcommittee on New Careers research with Dr. Bernard Yabroff of the HEW office of Education as Chairman to enhance inter-departmental coordination as this program expands.

Of course, there are many problems connected with New Careers. It cannot be an "instant" program. Careful research, planning, and experimentation are essential to make sure that "New Careers" enhances human services and validates the role of the professional. There has been enough experience to temper the early euphoria and excessive expectations some New Career advocates have expressed. But that experience has also confirmed the enormous potentialities and the vital contributions which New Careers can bring to the human services and to the workers involved. In the 1968 New Career amendment to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, Congress has directed the rehabilitation services to a new undertaking of crucial importance to their expanded mission.

Passing reference must be made to several other important areas of new emphasis where vocational rehabilitation relates in a larger role to this troubled world:

1. Rehabilitation becomes much more concerned and related to the general labor market. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee concerning rehabilitation counseling curriculum was for "greater emphasis on nature and content of jobs, job families, interrelationships of jobs, structure of industry, techniques of placement, practical aspects of the world of work, how to get labor market information and selective placement techniques." This really applies to all levels and phases of vocational rehabilitation.

Vocational rehabilitation, as its target population grows in number and complexity, becomes increasingly dependent on a high general level of economic activity—on prosperity and a "tight labor market." As the perceptive Dr. Rusk wrote in the New York *Times* early in 1962 the generally high unemployment rate then had a grave effect on jobs for the handicapped in spite of progress in the service itself. A return to jobless rates of 5 or 6 percent would have a disastrous effect on vocational rehabilitation.

It is significant in this connection that powerful and responsible influences are increasingly advocating that the government must become the "employer of last resort" to guarantee jobs for all. It is important to analyze how this trend can and should relate to sheltered workshops and subsidized employment for the physically handicapped—especially given the new interest of rehabilitation in the "hard-core" unemployed.

2. Increased critical and analytical attention must be given to the *quality* of vocational placements and to the longer range follow-up. Significantly, a research report just completed by the Jewish Occupational Council has effectively demonstrated that "a continued counseling process after completion of work adjustment training adds significantly to the ability of handicapped clients to secure and maintain employment." In the manpower programs we have learned that "a job" is not enough. What kind of a job? under what conditions? how close to the workers capacities? What chances for advancement? These become crucial job development and placement questions. We know that the activists in ghetto disorders mostly have not been unemployed, but rather underemployed in menial, frustrating, undesirable jobs. We have learned that manpower training programs have proven futile, dropouts excessive, and placements transient where the quality of the job was disregarded. Can we be sure that greater care in this respect is not necessary to avoid the danger of locking handicapped persons with their relatively limited vocational mobility into such deadly and unnecessary occupational frustration?

But to conclude—

Vocational rehabilitation moves into this troubled and changing world with a significant new legislative mandate given by a unanimous Congress. No social program has commanded such legislative approval so consistently. But the Advisory Committee *Report* says that "in this time of social crisis and upheaval, rehabilitation should become controversial." I am sure we all hope that the purposes and the quality of the work done by the rehabilitation services will continue to have the unanimous support of every responsible person in and out of Congress. But advocacy—and with advocacy, controversy—will surely be required to meet the new challenges rehabilitation now confronts.

It is necessary to become an advocate in the battle of resource priorities—of appropriations and program size. Would it not have been better this year to have had a doubled VRA appropriation with a vote in the House, let us say, of 250 to 185 rather than to have the actual unanimous vote for the allotted $369 million?

As suggested earlier, it is gratifying that in fiscal year 1968 207,918 persons are reported as rehabilitated in VRA's programs. In 1962, Mary E. Switzer wrote:

"Looking ahead to the day when 200,000 men and women will be made whole in 1 year and will be functioning members of our society in the fullest sense is like looking through a telescope to the most distant star—like the dream of scientists planning for the conquest of the moon, or even the more mysterious dream of starting plant life on Venus. We know we can and will reach that 200,000 goal because we are halfway to it."

So here we are—beyond 200,000—but Miss Switzer's statement appropriately appeared in an article titled "The Work Is Never Done." It is sobering to remember that the goal of 200,000 rehabilitants was set by President Eisenhower in his 1954 health Message—and that goal was to be achieved in 1959, not 1968. Today our goal is that *all* handicapped persons will be served by 1975. Yet there is a backlog of 5 million persons plus a yearly addition of some 300,000 persons needing rehabilitation who are not now being served. To dissolve this backlog and serve all the new cases during the next 7 years to 1975 will require that approximately a million persons be rehabilitated each year. This is five times the present program. To achieve the stated goal by 1975 will require annual expenditures of about $2 billion for vocational rehabilitation. These are rough calculations which make no adjustments for new services to the socio-economically disadvantaged.

Two billion dollars a year for vocational rehabilitation? Impossible—inconceivable—unrealistic—visionary! But is it—can it be permitted to continue that our goals are merely fantasies and dreams? We are in the midst of spending $43 billion to beat the Soviets to the moon—and over $30 billion each year is spent in the war in Viet Nam. The U.S. Ambassador to India, Mr. Chester Bowles, recently worried in the New York *Times* about our failure to come to grips with our domestic crisis and called for "a new economic order of battle" with new priorities for use of our "stupendous national income to fight our grave contemporary social problems." And speaking for the Urban Coalition before the Republican National Convention Resolution Committee, John Gardner called for the resources programs, and commitment necessary for "a far-reaching effort to build a better America, not just to the emergency measures that we surely must take immediately but to the long-term task of transforming our society."

In this setting and in this spirit, vocational rehabilitation confronts the challenge to enlarge its services to new numbers and classes of needy Americans, to build its skills and resources for the task, and to advocate the priorities for our country which will make full rehabilitation by 1975 a reality. Shall we duck this challenge and stick to the safer, more comfortable, and splendidly popular traditional role of vocational rehabilitation? Or shall we grasp the moment with all its import?

The effort will be worthy of the better natures of us all:

As professionals and nonprofessionals eager to use our talents, training, and energy to confront the difficulties and urgent needs of our people;

As citizens seeking to aid our country as it confronts tough dangerous problems;

And above all, as human beings concerned and compassionate about the well being of our fellows in the society of man.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all deeply touched over the passing of one of our country's greatest leaders. The entire world is paying tribute to the late

Dwight Eisenhower for the great leadership he gave, not only the United States, but the entire world during the time we were giving our lives to preserve peace in the world. I think General Eisenhower was unanimously liked by the generals of all the armies in the world when he was the commander in chief during World War II when armies from many countries served under his command. We all know that he did the best he could to solve some of the numerous problems confronting this country during the time he was President of the United States and his service shall be long remembered. As a Member of Congress during the time he was President, I did not always agree with everything suggested by the Eisenhower administration. However, I never at one time doubted the President's sincerity and his extreme desire to keep this country solvent and at peace with the world.

We must all admire the great fight he has made over the years in conquering numerous heart attacks and other types of illness which would have taken the life of an ordinary citizen. His fight to live was equal to his fight to keep peace throughout the world during the time he was serving as commander in chief of all the armies and as President of the United States. I am certain that everyone will agree that this country is a better place to live by having General Eisenhower serve as one of our military leaders and statesman. My heart goes out to his wife and son and his brothers.

THE PASSION OF GREECE TODAY

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, on March 11, 1969, I placed in the RECORD an article by George Anastaplo entitled "Greece Today and the Limits of American Power." That article dealt with the present realities in Greece, and the foreign policy options with which the internal political situation in Greece presents the United States. Since placing that first article in the RECORD, I have been fortunate enough to obtain two additional articles by Mr. Anastaplo. One short piece consisting of selections from an address to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. It is useful for the brief glimpse it gives of the situation which existed after 1 year of military rule in April 1967. The second and longer article, "Retreat From Politics: Greece, 1967," gives an excellent, balanced presentation of how Greece appeared to an experienced and knowledgeable American observer who saw it firsthand during 1967.

The articles referred to follow:

THE PASSION OF GREECE TODAY

(By George Anastaplo)

"So Moses hearkened to the voice of his father-in-law, and did all that he had said."—Exodus 18: 24.

We find ourselves this Wednesday afternoon at midpoint in the Great Week—the *megali evdomada,* the Holy Week—of the Greek Orthodox church year. This coming weekend, on April 21, the Greeks celebrate not only the first anniversary of the seizure of power by a handful of Army colonels but also the "fair and radiant festival" of Easter Sunday; "the first of Sabbaths, the Queen and Mistress, the feast of feasts, and the festival of festivals."[1]

On Wednesday of Holy Week, in the services of the Greek Church, events still hang in the balance: much has already happened this week to Jesus and His disciples, but the worst is yet to come. The precarious uncertainty of things is reflected in two markedly different stories which are brought together and emphasized in the traditional Wednesday service: the betrayal of Jesus by one of His disciples is anticipated in today's service; but it is also remembered in this service, "as it has been ordained by the Holy Fathers, that there should be commemoration made on Wednesday in Holy Week of the anointing of the Lord with myrrh by the woman who was a sinner, for this occurred shortly before the Passion of the Savior."

These two stories—of the anointing woman and the conspiring disciple: of joyful liberation and impending disaster—are explicitly compared in the church service for this day of crisis:

"When the woman who was a sinner was offering the myrrh, then the disciple was making terms with the lawless men; she rejoiced in emptying out that which was all-precious, he hastened to sell Him who was above all price: she recognized the Master, he severed himself from the Master: she was set free, and (he) became a slave of the enemy. . . ."

The Greeks have, over the centuries, compared the passion of their Country with that of their Saviour: Greece is often regarded by them, with both dread and hope, as the distinctive ethnic embodiment on Earth of the Christian drama.

Indeed, it sometimes seems that it is the nature of Greek life to be constantly in crisis, and even at that very moment of the crisis when everything hangs in the balance. It is this sense of drama that makes Greek politics both exciting and fatiguing, both tedious and engaging: it is constantly changing and yet always the same: again and again, supreme liberation beckons and ultimate disaster threatens.

Thus, the "today" of Greek life often turns out to be the Wednesday of Holy Week.

It is particularly appropirate that this be the occasion for our review of how things stand with Greece today.

Here, then, is a summary of my impressions—one American's impressions—at the end of the first year in power of Greece's military government. (I refer you, for my extended discussion of this subject, to the winter 1968 issue of the *Massachusetts Review.*)

We should not be surprised to learn that the military governors of Greece are, despite their good intentions, no more competent to assess and run the political and economic affairs of their country than twentieth century Greek politicians have been to conduct the military campaigns in which they have meddled from time to time. One curious result of the past year is that the army of Greece, our faithful NATO ally, has been seriously damaged by a handful of junior officers who consider themselves entitled to dismantle the army in their effort to retain power. (This development should move conscientious officers to try, hereafter, to keep the army out of Greek politics. In any event, the colonels have now shown civilians how an unruly army can be brought under control, even when most of it remains unfriendly to the government in power. These two lessons could contribute to the eventual political stability of the country.)

No one denies that there continues in Greece vigorous suppression of civil liberties. It seems from afar that there continue as well the serious economic disturbances resulting from mismanagement of and loss of confidence in the economy which were evident last summer. Certainly, there is in Greece today a situation in which no one knows what to believe of what the government says and permits to be said. The longer the colonels stay, the more apparent it should be that they had no business seizing power in the first place. Even when desirable corrections of long-standing abuses have been made by the colonels, they have often been made in such a way as to induce people to remember the abuses as less significant than they had once been thought to be. The visitor is reminded of the tone and effects of a mild Communist regime.

It should be noticed, in assessing the military intervention of April 21, 1967, that during the two years of unduly publicized demonstrations and crisis prior to that coup, the gross national income of Greece continued to rise at a remarkably high rate (to the very eve of the coup), law and order were maintained throughout the country (only one Greek, a student, was killed as a result of these political agitations, and he accidentally by the police, during that 1965–67 period), and elections (not a resort to organized violence) were obviously regarded by practically everyone as the only legitimate way to resolve the constitutional crisis brought on in July 1965 by the imprudent confrontation between the King and his liberal Prime Minister.

Nothing that happened before the coup justified, in my opinion, that fear of the triumph of Communism which the colonels have made so much of to defend what they have done in subjugating the army and the country, in dismissing their political leaders and their generals, and in suppressing the King and the Constitution they had sworn to uphold. Nothing discovered since the coup supports the colonels' claims about the dangers from which they would have us believe they have saved Greece and the free world. Instead, the colonels stand revealed as patriots entangled in the Civil War slogans of a generation ago, a time for them of great sacrifice and little recognition.

The failure of the King last December to displace the colonels testifies not to the popularity of the current regime but rather to its effective use of that minority of the officer corps loyal to it. The colonels have had the advantage of a virtual monopoly of communications facilities within Greece, so much so that we here in Chicago probably knew of the King's short-lived attempt long before most of the Greek army, to say nothing of the Greek people, suspected anything was going on. The wild spontaneous reception given the King even in anti-royalist Kavalla on December 13, when he appeared there during his well-intentioned but badly-timed campaign to return Greece to constitutional government, suggests how much the silenced Greek people resent their military rulers.

Where do the colonels and their country go from here? What should the United States, which has had to be deeply involved in the affairs of Greece for a generation, do now? One's answer to such questions can further indicate how one understands the situation.

I have made, ever since my visit to Greece last summer, the suggestion that the most prudent immediate resolution of the current Greek crisis would be the return to power of Constantine Karamanlis. Mr. Karamanlis, who served as Prime Minister from 1955 to

---

[1] The four quotations in the text are adapted from *The Services for Holy Week and Easter Sunday* (published by The Greek Orthodox Theological Institute Press, Brookline, Mass., 1952), pp. 281, 272, 82, 86.

1963, is a conservative politician of proven effectiveness, a man who has shown he can exercise power vigorously without having to silence his critics. He is more apt than anyone else today to secure the support of all factions in Greece, to be received by genuine public approval (not merely by the tolerant apathy or by the silent resentment found among many Greeks today), and to be respected by his country's invaluable ally, the United States. He is remembered as the disciplined architect of the great task of reconstruction needed in Greece after the terrible destruction of both the Second World War and the even crueller Civil War which followed.

The United States should, therefore, encourage the King to call upon all Greek political personalities, both in that country and abroad, to unite behind Mr. Karamanlis. We should use our remaining influence with the colonels to induce them to surrender power, as bloodlessly as they seized it, to the one Greek politician who can still establish a stable government made up of major figures from all parties, including supporters of both the Army and the colonels. Mr. Karamanlis is equipped to get the economy back on its feet even as he promotes the social and economic reforms he recognizes his country to require. He is politician enough to know when and how to let bygones be bygones. Indeed, he can do for Greece what General DeGaulle did, in like circumstances, for France.

I do not know what is going to happen in Greece in the next few years. Nor do I know anyone who might know. It has been my opinion since last August that the early months of 1969 should see Mr. Karamanlis return as Prime Minister of his country. We may now be, that is, at midpoint of the colonels' regime: it remains to be seen which way the balance will be tipped in the effort, by us as well as by the Greeks, to dislodge the colonels from the place they have usurped in their sincere but misguided attempt to serve their country. One alternative to an anticipated return of Mr. Karamanlis to power during the coming year is the beginning of a desperate, even bloody, conflict which can do neither Greece, her friends nor the world community any good.

No one can know what would happen if such conflict should come, and it is not in our interest to find out.

CHICAGO COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.
CHICAGO, ILL., *April 17, 1968.*

RETREAT FROM POLITICS: GREECE, 1967

(By George Anastaplo)

I am very little inclined on any occasion to say anything unless I hope to produce some good by it.—Abraham Lincoln (1862).

I have noticed in the "1968 Program for Trips Broad" sponsored by Americans for Democratic Action that "Greece which is normally included in the [Mediterranean] tour was omitted [for 1968] because of the repressive policy of its Government." I think it only fair to observe, after spending the summer there, that Greece today is no more repressive than almost a dozen of the countries that are included in the tours described in that "1968 Program": Bulgaria, Portugal, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Spain, Poland, Rumania, Taiwan, Russia and perhaps Turkey and Yugoslavia.[1]

Bad as things have been in Greece this year, they can become far worse. It became evident, during the summer of 1967, that the only safe way back from the precipice at which Greece finds herself is one that both permits supporters of the present regime a sense of security and provides their opponents a sense of freedom. I have therefore made the suggestion from time to time that Constantine Karamanlis be returned to power early in 1969 as head of a government of national unity.

I set forth here how things look to me at year's end. I draw primarily on what I learned in Greece during my summer of intensive study of that country's affairs. I trust that what I have to say does not draw too much on the ephemeral, even as I reserve for the book I am preparing an examination of what lies beneath the surface of Greek life. One is reminded of the unpredictability of political developments, and especially those of Greece, when one finds virtually overnight that the King is an exile from a country governed by "his" army while Andreas Papandreou (that army's "nemesis") walks again the streets of Athens.

Greeks today, I have said, stand at a precipice. They have gotten there mainly because of their folly. They are in danger of being trapped, as we Americans have foolishly allowed ourselves to be, in a costly, ugly and ultimately purposeless conflict for which brave young men will be required to make unnecessary sacrifices.

II

It had been evident from early in the summer—I suspect it was evident in the spring—that the current rulers of Greece would not surrender power after six months or even a year. Consider, for instance, the obvious implications of the rigorous purges of the armed forces, as well as of the ministries, begun in the spring and continued during the summer. My own opinion upon leaving Greece in late August was that the colonels would stay a couple of years. I also believed that the King had handled himself reasonably well since April and that he would be useful in easing out the colonels when the opportunity came to return to constitutional government.

King Constantine tried from the beginning to secure from the colonels a promise of an early return to constitutional government. (I refer to the governing revolutionary council as "colonels," even though at least one of them was a recently-promoted brigadier and others of them were majors and perhaps captains at the time of the April 21st coup.) The colonels did concede that a constitutional revision committee appointed in June would submit its draft constitution in six months. Nothing was said, however, about a schedule thereafter for approval of the constitution and, even more vital, for implementation of its provisions. Whether such implementation would be a return to constitutional government must remain in doubt: one would have to see, for instance, what provision is made in the new constitution both for the qualification of candidates for public office and for the composition of the electorate, to say nothing of how elections are conducted.

The sometimes quixotic character of the regime's activities did induce some to believe the colonels did not intend (or, in any event, would not be able) to stay long. There was not about their measures the mark of assurance and continuity. Decrees announced one day would be withdrawn on another (or, even more likely, simply not implemented for months, if at all). Arrests and releases from confinement would come and go in waves. This instability was dramatized in August by the five-year sentence meted out to a former foreign minister and withdrawn the morning following.

Suggestive of this instability were the press conferences conducted almost daily during the summer by Brigadier General Stylianos Pattakos, Minister of the Interior and now Deputy Prime Minister as well (perhaps the most personable member of the Government). These were informal affairs (sometimes five minutes long, sometimes an hour), conducted for the benefit of however many of us showed up in his office at six o'clock of a weekday afternoon. It was not unusual in these meetings to have announcements made which corrected what other ministers had said. The most memorable visit with Mr. Pattakos was when he (in response to an inquiry whether Andreas Papandreou had been moved from Averoff Prison) finally decided to resolve our doubts, and perhaps his, by telephoning the prison and asking to speak personally to his most notorious prisoner. The dozen reporters present edged close to the desk for the bizarre conversation that followed.

It is difficult for anyone accustomed to professionalism in the conduct of public affairs to take seriously men who carry on in this way. But one should be put on notice by this very naïveté: the usual rules of the political game are not being observed by the colonels. Certainly, their predecessors knew how the game was played—and conduct such as this from them would have been a sure sign of disintegration and imminent collapse. But disregard of the usual rules by the colonels (except perhaps in the conduct of foreign affairs) suggests, it seems to me, what is suggested by other signs as well, the intrinsic (although not even yet generally evident) radical character of this regime.

Opponents of the regime were encouraged as well by the economic difficulties encountered by the colonels during the summer. Most obvious of all, because it was there for all who know the country to see, was the marked decline in tourist trade. This was not exclusively the colonels' doing: the Israeli-Arab War and the financial restrictions in Great Britain had reinforced the effect of a coup which had taken place at the very time in the spring when large-scale bookings are made by travel agencies. Not only did people in the tourist service industries fail to enjoy the substantial increase they had come to expect from one summer to the next, but they failed even to match their receipts of the previous summer. Business was bad in many consumer industries as well: Greeks were holding onto their money, waiting to see what would happen. The same was also true in the construction industry, which had been so vital to Greek economic life since the Civil War: I talked with several engineers who reported that they and their colleagues had had little to do since April 21. These developments, which may have begun in late 1966 and which may eventually require massive foreign financial assistance (especially if the significant decline in the net inflow of capital in 1967 is not reversed), had been reinforced by a recession in Germany which affected the remittances that could be sent home by Greeks working there.[2]

---

[1] I have visited since 1960 all these countries except Taiwan, Rumania and Portugal. See *London Observer*, August 14, 1960 (Letters to the Editor); *University of Chicago Law Review*, Vol. 30, pp. 717–718 (1963).

Certain of my publications on the subject of civil liberties may be useful to consider in assessing this article: [1] "Closing Argument," *Lawyers Guild Review*, Vol. 19 (Winter, 1959), pp. 143–164 (see 366 U.S. 82 [1961]; see, also, *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 61, p. 783 [Sept., 1967]); [2] Book Review: Leonard W. Levy, *Legacy of Suppression* (Cambridge, 1960), in *New York University Law Review*, Vol. 39 (June, 1964), pp. 735–741; [3] "Freedom of Speech and the First Amendment," *University of Detroit Law Journal*, Vol. 42 (October, 1964), pp. 55–73; [4] "Due Process of Law—An Introduction," *University of Detroit Law Journal*, Vol. 42 (December, 1964), pp. 195–216; [5] Book Review: Shri D. Gopalakrishna Sastri, *The Law of Sedition in India* (Bombay, 1964), in *Law Library Journal*, Vol. 58 (May, 1965), p. 197; [6] Book Review: Harry V. Jaffa, *Equality and Liberty* (New York, 1965), in *New York University Law Review*, Vol. 41 (May, 1966), pp. 664–677; [7] *The Constitutionalist: Notes on the First Amendment* (a book to be published by the Southern Methodist University Press).

I am grateful to my University of Chicago colleague, Professor William H. McNeill, a long-time student of Greek affairs, for his informed review of this report.

[Dozens of unauthorized editorial changes (some major, some minor) were made in this article before its publication in the *Massachusetts Review*, several of which it has been convenient to correct in this reprint.—G.A.]

It is, however, easy to overestimate the effects of economic conditions on political life. The coup itself took place at an unlikely time, in economic terms—at a time of general prosperity and in the face of prospects that encouraged businessmen to plan for increased business in the year ahead (no matter who won the elections scheduled for May 28). Political developments *are* immediately affected by economic conditions when public opinion is readily translated into either parliamentary maneuvers or electoral returns But in the colonels' regime there is obviously much less sensitivity to public opinion than formerly. Besides, the colonels could claim with some plausibility that their measures were such that it would take time to exhibit the results intended.

One difficulty for the colonels, however, is that the talents that are effective in conspiracies may not be useful in more pedestrian enterprises. (The career of General George Grivas illustrates this.) One cannot successfully conspire to make an economy prosperous or a bureaucracy efficient. One cannot organize the daily life of a people the way one organizes a coup (where all must be ready before anything public can begin). In directing an economy, one must allow provisional decisions to be made, to help keep things moving. Otherwise, the machinery can grind to a halt (as happened in the construction industry this year in Greece), with long-run repercussions much more serious than the defects (such as bribery, waste and favoritism) which may be avoided by detailed preparation and supervision.

III

An appraisal by an American of the regime in Greece today cannot rest solely on his response to the suppression there of civil liberties—but neither should such suppression be neglected.

I have since 1962 made annual summer visits to Greece. (I had been in the country in the winter of 1946–1947, while still a United States Air Force flying officer, as well as in the summer of 1960.) There was this past summer a great change with respect to civil liberties. I had not thought, when Greek friends complained before 1964 of the suppression of civil liberties under Mr. Karamanlis, that they were realistic. Certainly, one felt more free in Greece at that time than in Yugoslavia. But in summer 1967, for the first time, one could feel upon moving into Yugoslavia that one was moving from more repression to less: perhaps it had something to do with the fact that Yugoslav repression is now familiar.

I should add, however, that I myself was not interfered with this summer. I applied immediately upon arrival in Athens for accreditation as a foreign correspondent (on the basis of commission for articles received from the Chicago *Sun-Times* and the *Massachusetts Review*). I came with introductions to a number of people in all walks of life, including several ministers in former governments, whom I was able to engage in conversations several hours in length. I saw as well a number of officials in the current government. I have no reason to believe I was ever followed. I know of no one having been molested for having talked to me (although several of the people I had talked to were arrested in the days following the King's December rebellion). When I left the country, on a ship sailing by way of Yugoslav ports for Venice, I did so with a dozen large canvas bags filled with research materials I had gathered during my two-month stay. (I had been as free to move about the country last summer as during my previous visits to Greece.) Care was taken on my departure from Piraeus to make sure my name was not on a master list at Immigration—but no examination was made of my luggage. Finally, I do not anticipate that what I say here will prejudice my ability to return to Greece, and to conduct myself as I did this past summer.

There can be no doubt, however, that there is severe repression among Greeks, especially with respect to political matters. People would talk frankly to me, an American academician, but not publicly and usually only upon being assured that I would respect their confidence. (I recall only three people among the many dozens I approached who would not speak to me at all about political matters.) Anyone familiar with Greek outdoor social gatherings would have been struck as I was by the lack of any political discussion—indeed, of any reference at all to political matters—even by supporters of the regime. It was as if the life had gone out of the country.

What may be special about repression in Greece today is not its intensity but its unpredictable character; the colonels had not decided last summer just how severe they wanted their measures to be. The confusion about the recent Christmas amnesties suggests that this uncertainty continues, reflecting perhaps a deep division among the colonels themselves. It should also be observed that a number of repressive measures publicized abroad since the April usurpation were the revival of measures previously enacted by Greek governments and still on the books. There have always been features of Greek life casually accepted by citizens which seem oppressive to an American: the identity card requirements, the price control regulations, the officiousness of the police, the arrogance of bureaucrats, the callousness of army officers toward enlisted men.

One must nevertheless say, despite such qualifications, that the supression of civil liberties by the colonels is harsher than anything the Greeks have known since the Civil War. It is not as harsh as what the Germans did—everyone would admit that. One would hear arguments, however, as to whether it was as harsh as the Metaxas regime just before the Second World War.

The press has been rigidly controlled since April. Not only has all copy had to be submitted for official examination each night before publication the following morning, but government handouts have had to be printed as news. The censors of the press have gone so far as to prescribe to editors precisely where various articles should be run, how much space should be devoted to them, even what size headlines should be used. Before the coup Athens had more than a dozen daily newspapers; by the end of the summer the number had been cut in half.[3]

---

[2] Statistics from the Bank of Greece, for the period of January–September 1967 (as reported by the Greek Embassy Press and Information Service in Washington, in its release of December 5), compare for the same period in 1965 and 1966 several items bearing on Greece's chronic balance of payments problems:

[In millions of dollars]

	January–September		
	1965	1966	1967
Imports	745	841	851
Exports	220	259	292
Deficit in commercial transactions	−525	−582	−559
Surplus in invisible transactions	298	353	352
(a) Invisible earnings	(401)	(467)	(486)
(b) Invisible payments	(103)	(114)	(134)
Deficit on current account	−227	−229	−207
Net inflow of capital	191	217	135
Final (net balance on external) transactions	−36	−12	−72

One can see here that although the 1967 deficit in commercial transactions (line 3) shows a marked improvement since 1966, the surplus in invisible transactions (line 4) shows almost no change (compared to a sharp increase between 1965 and 1966 and in previous years). Exports and invisible earnings (receipts from shipowners', seamen's and emigrants' remittances and from the tourist trade) now seem to cover in Greece about three-quarters of total imports: this leaves the capital inflow critical with respect to balance of payments. Line 6 shows a sharp reduction (by about one-third) of capital inflow since 1966 (even less than the capital inflow in 1965), putting the country (despite the improvement in the deficit in commercial transactions) sixty millions of dollars further behind (for January-September 1967), with respect to net balance on external transactions, than it had been the year before.

Ominous as this set of figures seems to be, they may look better than they really are, since almost half of the nine months of 1967 here referred to are before the coup of April 21 (during which business, enjoying a steady improvement, was probably much better than it has been since). In addition, the more rigorous tone of the colonels' government may have induced Greeks to turn in to banks whatever foreign exchange they had been holding (as had been required by law under the previous regime as well), thereby permitting the government to credit to this year's account both remittances from abroad and receipts from tourists which may have been accumulated before the coup. The year-end and subsequent statistics could be instructive in this respect.

Thus, repercussions of the colonels' first year in power may be felt in the Greek economy for at least a decade. Foreign aid of perhaps one hundred to one hundred and fifty millions of dollars may be necessary in 1969 or thereafter. Unless capital inflow can be dramatically increased or massive foreign aid can be anticipated, austerity (which may already be evident in lines 1, 2 and 3) will become the order of the day. The political consequences of such austerity, and of the rise in unemployment or underemployment which would likely accompany it, could be serious and enduring.

Greece remains a good country for foreign investment, especially now that the government is so eager to attract capital that it processes applications more efficiently than did its predecessors. (I understand that it does have fewer applications to consider than did its predecessors.)

The foreign investor should be cautioned not to take advantage of present circumstances: those long-term contracts which are fair and reasonable are the ones most likely to survive reconsideration by the government that succeeds the colonels. The investor should, in his own interest, be more careful to protect the interests of Greece than might be the desperate Greek officials with whom he deals.

[3] Two of the suspended newspapers are the conservative journals of Helen Vlachou (who has recently escaped to London from house arrest in Athens). Her refusal to publish a precensored newspaper aroused first the concern and then the hostility of the colonels: her papers had been precisely the ones that many of the potential supporters of the colonels would certainly have respected before

The number of newspapers no longer matters, since they have become for practical purposes virtually identical politically. This does ease the task of any student of current Greek affairs: he now need only look at one newspaper—and even one of the two English-language newspapers will do—to learn what is being said in the daily press of Athens. But, on the other hand, the task of the student is complicated by the fact that what is presented in the press is merely the officially-sanctioned surface of things. I was again and again struck by the ignorance in which previously well-informed Greeks, even prominent politicians, found themselves as a result of the control by the government over the press. Since they had to be much more careful than I about whom they talked with—I let it be known, for instance, that I was interested in talking with Greek Communists, something very hard to arrange these days—they were often unaware of the most obvious developments.

Some uncensored information about the affairs of their country could be secured by Greeks able to read the foreign press. One could freely and regularly purchase in Athens last summer newspapers and magazines published in England, France, Germany, Italy and the United States (including a number of publications appealing merely to "prurient interests"). Dealers sometimes advised customers they knew as to which newspaper had that day a long article on Greece. Information in Greek was available from radio broadcasts originating in England, Rumania, Russia and, I believe, France. But none of these sources can match, either in detail or in interest, the information about one's own country available in one's local press.

Even more disturbing than these features of the regime were the arbitrary imprisonments, both in the first few days and during the course of the spring. Everyone has heard of the detentions on the island of Yaros, the difficulties of life there, the lack of both of specific charges and of the prospect of trials. I visited the home one day of an artist who had been fearful of possible detention: his work consequently had suffered, as had his family, for three months: Guests happened to drop in while I was there, including someone who had had a spouse on Yaros since the last week in April. These were all people in their fifties—they had been active Leftists a generation ago: it was from the records of that period that most of the six to ten thousand people picked up the first few weeks (out of a population of eight and a half millions) were evidently selected. I was able on that occasion to listen in on a conversation that must have been repeated thousands of times throughout the country during those months: Has Christos been picked up? Where is he? Can medicine be gotten to Maria? Who is taking care of her children? How are you explaining all this to your own children? It was evident that the anguish resulting from these imprisonments was severe, whereas the danger thereby averted was trivial. It should be noted that these people were prosperous, middle-aged, quite successful in their professions, quite different (if left alone) from the radicals they might have been in their youth. It may be difficult to restrain such people should an opportunity for revenge come to them. Even an ordinary Athenian shopkeeper, who had told me on several occasions how much he liked things to be orderly and quiet, unexpectedly exploded one day: "This government is trying to make soldiers out of citizens. I have already served my time in the army. They are treating me—and I am 44 years old—as a recruit. . . . When this government falls, it will fall hard. What right do five or six people have to take over a country and tell everybody what to do?" I do hope that the colonels will be able to give up power as bloodlessly as they seized it, and that the families which have the bitterest grievances will be satisfied by monetary compensation for their deprivations. I also hope, however, that if resistance and revenge come, they will not be condemned abroad as merely Communist-inspired.

On several occasions during the summer I visited the court-martial conducted in Athens. One could see here the regime at its most callous. Five army officers, in uniform, would constitute the court. (The presiding officer I saw most of displayed the "sense of humor" one associates with Russian prosecutors during the Purge Trials of the 1930's.) These were run-of-the-mill cases. The offenses charged were often trivial; the self-righteousness of the court, oppressive; the sentences, savage. For every notable prisoner who attracted the attention of the European press, there must have been scores of ordinary people who came, appeared briefly in court, and were then hustled off to prison. Defendants were brought in from miles around: the jurisdiction of the Athens court-martial extended throughout Attica, into Boeotia, and to several distant islands. An old *souflaki* seller had charged a drachma too much for each stick of meat he sold; a young man, celebrating in a village near Levadia, had gotten too exuberant late one night and had assaulted the police who had been summoned to make him share the dance floor with others; a taxi driver had asked too much for a fare, compounding his error by having previously passed on to his vindictive customer what he had heard about Greece on the B.B.C. that day; some teenage boys, out fishing and swimming, had written forbidden political slogans on their caps (the court was filled on this occasion with a number of villagers who had come down to Athens to do what they could for "these good boys" who were to draw sentences ranging from two to five years); a lady had reciprocated earlier hospitality by taking in overnight an out-of-town guest without notifying the police. Little, if anything, was made of these trials even in the local papers. (Almost all Greeks I talked with were surprised that the proceedings were open to the public. I was, on the occasions I was there, perhaps the only observer present, certainly the only one taking notes.) But the effect of the court-martial on the general public was evident: people heard that infractions of various rules, old as well as new, would draw the harsh attention of the military. The year before, I had sat in on a number of trials in Athens and had found them most interesting, especially the effectiveness of the examinations conducted by the presiding judges. But the court-martial last summer was something else: I found these military proceedings most disturbing, so much so that I decided I should not spend much time there: I was afraid the trials would so anger and depress me as to make me unable to examine adequately other features of the regime. I should add that these public exhibitions have made more plausible for me the reports of secret torture one has heard from time to time since April 21.

In any event, I can understand why so many Greeks spoke to me last summer of feeling both suffocated by this regime and humiliated at the thought that Greece, at a time when the rest of Europe is at peace and becoming more liberal, should be governed in this way. They did not even have, they reported, the high spirits and great hopes of the Occupation, but rather the despair and resignation of the Civil War. The impressions of the regime I formed while still in Greece are reflected in the exchange I had, midpoint in my visit, with Mr. Pattakos, the Minister of Interior (and effective commander, now as then, of the armored corps that had been critical in the taking of Athens on April 21). This exchange, conducted in both Greek and English, took place at his press conference of August 1 (and was published in the Chicago Sun-Times, September 3, 1967). Mr. Pattakos began the conference on that occasion by asking what the correspondents present thought of the regime. The Greeks he called upon said they did not consider themselves in a position to reply at that time. He then turned to me for an exchange which went something like this:

"Would you, if you were a Greek citizen, approve of what we are doing here?

"Do you really want to know?

"Yes. Would you approve?

"Probably not.

"No?

"No.

"Why not?

"First, I don't like the censorship you have here. Second, I don't like what you have done in putting those people on Yaros. Third, I don't like the quite disruptive effects of what you have done in changing so many employees in the Ministries——

"I will take care of each of your points.

"I have other objections, as well as some points in your favor.

"As for the censorship. What do you know about Greece? Have you been here before?

"Yes.

"How many times?

"Seven.

"You must know then what our newspapers were like before April 21st?

"I have some idea.

"They were full of lies and slanders, stirring people up and promoting disorder. It was a terrible thing.

"I know that. But what you have now is even worse.

"You have newspapers in America provoking Negroes to kill and burn. Is not that terrible?

"Yes, it is.

"Censorship is better than that, isn't it?

"Those are not the only alternatives.

"But you admit that what is happening in America now is bad?

"Bad as that is, and good-intentioned as you are, what you have here is worse.

"Now, for Yaros. What is better, that those people out there be killed by us or that they be kept alive and allowed to return home if they sign the required declaration?

"That they be kept alive is certainly better.

"Then why do you complain about that?

"Because for this, too, the alternatives you present are not the only ones to be considered.

"If you were to go to Yaros—

"I have been trying, as you know, to get permission to go.

"You can go, if you like, any time you wish.

"For two or three days?

'No, if you go, you will have to stay.

"I wouldn't like that.

"I tell you the people we have out there would have killed us.

"I have seen nothing to support that charge.

"Do you know everything?

"No, but I have been looking hard the past month for evidence of what you say. I have found none.

"Do you know that the Chief of Police of Athens is missing an ear because of those people?

"An ear?

"Part of an ear.

"Whatever may have happened to the Chief of Police does not mean the 2,000 people still on Yaros would have killed you.

---

the coup. But, Mrs. Vlachou told me, she was, with this censorship, in effect, "like a ship whose water has been taken away."

A couple of newspapers that had been associated with the extreme left in Greece were promptly closed down by the colonels.

There has been considerable comment abroad on the censorship by the colonels of classical plays produced in Greece—but the evidence in support of this charge is uncertain.

"That was what they were saying, that they would kill us.

"It hasn't been shown, so far as I can tell, that they were even saying that. Where are the weapons they planned to kill you with?

"We found some.

"Where are they?

"At the police station.

"Why have we not been shown them?

"You can see them.

"Did you find any tanks among those weapons?

"No, there were no tanks; nor were there any cannons or airplanes or atomic bombs.

"Then how could they kill you with the army you have?

"One doesn't need guns to make a revolution. We didn't have to fire the guns on our tanks when we made our revolution.

"But you did have all the tanks.

"Don't you Americans remember how you criticized the English in 1945 for giving guns to the Communists here?

"You are talking about something that happened more than twenty years ago. I am asking about what those people on Yaros have done today.

"It is all right for you Americans to fight Communists in Viet Nam——

"A good many Americans don't think it is all right. That's another problem, though.

"But you Americans won't let us stop Communists here, so that we do not have such a war also. Which is better, to have calm as we have here now, or war as in Viet Nam?

"This is better. But I must say again, those are not the only alternatives.

"We are stopping Communism.

"You may think that is what you are doing.

"You Americans may not like what we do, but we like it.

"You personally may like it.

"We Greeks like it.

"You," Mr. Pattakos, not "we."

"How can you know what people here like? Have you taken a Gallup poll? Have you spoken to all the Greeks?

"No, but I have gotten some idea of what people here think.

"We will have to talk together. You have a lot to learn yet.

"That is what I am here for.

"But I can tell you this now. I know what Greeks think. And they like what we are doing.

"No, General Pattakos, you cannot know and that is dangerous for the country. People dare not talk to you as they talk to me. This I do know."

Mr. Pattakos was for some reason obliged to concede ten days ago. "I do not say that the people want us, but they do tolerate us because the situation makes it necessary." [4]

IV

It is important, for the future of Greece, that the country (and with it the Army) learn a lesson. The story that has come down since 1949 is that the Army could not win the Civil War until the politicians were induced to stand aside and allow the military to do their jobs. Equally salutary, it seems to me, should be the story that the politicians could not properly govern the country until the Army learned from bitter experience that it is not equipped to run a modern state or even to preserve military efficiency. By the end of 1968 this should be evident to every intelligent army officer; the colonels will then have seen the result of their second year in power, the crucial period (it seems to me) for testing their social and economic efforts. This is one reason why I have thought the return of Mr. Karamanlis might better come after there has been time for this lesson to be driven home even to the Army itself.

No modern European state can prosper, especially one which requires sensitive economic and financial guidance, without the extensive cooperation of intellectuals. But Greek intellectuals are, even if only superficially, Westernized and hence liberal. They have heretofore felt that they belonged in the Government, in the banks, in the academic institutions of their country. They had seen the quality of their contribution constantly improving and the standard of living steadily rising. They had seen the country prosper for several years and they had hopes for even more progress in the years ahead.

The intervention of the Army could be seen—and indeed should be seen today in many countries of Africa and Asia—as an effort by disciplined, trained and technically-competent personnel to bring order and rationality to primitive conditions. But this view of the Army's role is difficult for the Greek intellectual to accept for his own country. Greece is certainly poor; but she is not primitive. The army officer is not regarded by the intellectual as particularly well-endowed: the social origins of the officer are suspect, his training is no more than technical, and he is anything but sophisticated.

The early pronouncements by the colonels, some of them puritanical in tone, did not help matters; the colonels not only made mistakes; they made themselves look ridiculous, which (in Greek eyes) is far worse than mere mistakes. This confirmed for intellectuals what they had "always known" about the army officer. The colonels made their task more difficult by the measures they took in various ministries: wholesale suspension of civil service employees, many of them veterans of the Karamanlis Administration, not only disrupted public business but also confirmed the intellectuals' expectations about how army officers would behave. Even when desirable corrections of long-standing abuses were made, they were often made in such a way as to induce people to remember the abuses as less significant than they had once been thought to be.

I found that people who were tolerant of the colonels the last week of June had become disillusioned by the end of August. Significant in this respect was the resignation early in August of the Governor of the Bank of Greece, and of the Deputy Governor, both of them respected in European banking circles. The Governor's defection—they had remained in office as long as they did, I was told, only at the insistence of the colonels—was merely the most conspicuous of the breaks between the regime and the intellectuals of the country.

The Cyprus crisis of November suggests the extent to which the regime has made the country vulnerable. It was thought, when the coup came, that Cyprus might be exploited by the colonels to solidify behind them public support. Considerable effort was made by the colonels during the summer to arrive at a permanent settlement with the Turks, one which would permit them to go to the people and show that they had been able to do what previous governments had not. But this proved unsuccessful: Archbishop Makarios evidently would not concede enough to interest the Turks. When the November crisis came—provoked by the slaughter of twenty-four Turkish Cypriots by General Grivas's men—the colonels realized that Greece could not stand up to the Turkish threat; that is, they must have realized they could not fight Turkey with the purged army they had at their disposal.[5] Full-scale mobili-

---

[4] New York *Times*, December 19, 1967, pp. 1, 13. Important members of the government often did not know what was going on in other ministries: they had no ready access to information that would ordinarily be available in the local press. Chance and rumor become much more important, while efficiency suffers, in such circumstances.

My last encounter with Mr. Pattakos was at a press conference a couple of days before I left. I had to insist several times that afternoon, on the basis of what I knew from my contacts, that Andreas Papandreou (about whose health in prison some question had been raised in the foreign press) had not been examined by his own doctor. Mr. Pattakos had heard otherwise from his sources, but was finally moved by what I had said to check with the warden of the prison.

The alleged abuses which justify the coup of April 21 have been picturesquely described in the [Athens] *Estia* of December 12 (as translated in the Athens *News* of December 13, 1967): "It is necessary that a book [be] printed, as soon as possible, in English, in French and in German, where all the crimes that have been committed against the country since 1944 will be listed, as briefly as possible, but without any omissions: Naturally, precedence would be given to Mr. G. Papandreou's frauds against Winston Churchill and King George II, and then would follow the bloody orgy of Communism and its fellowtravellers, the unconstitutional and illegal imposition of the 1952 constitution, the scandals of Karamanlis and of Papandreou, the betrayal of the Cyprus struggle by the three authors of the Zurich agreements, the scandalous sinecurism of Andreas Papandreou, at the request of his father, his subsequent assault on Greece, though he was an American citizen, the systematic violations of the military rules by the two big parties, the orgy of favoritism under Papandreou's regime of virtue and science, the campaign of G. Papandreou and his urchins against the top officials of justice, the disgraces revealed during the ASPIDA trial and the two Papandeous' abusive behavior towards justice, the statements of them both in favor of Moscow and against NATO, the constant violations of the constitution at the time of both Kamamanlis and Papandreou, the best known samples of illegal enrichment of people close to the previous regimes, and so many other things which, of course, we cannot remember all as we write this comment impromptu today."

A competing (but much calmer) description of this same period, by an American friendly to Andreas Papandreou, may be found in Maurice Goldbloom's "What Happened in Greece," *Commentary*, December 1967, p. 68. Another account, even more partisan on Mr. Papandreou's behalf, is Stephen Rousseas's *The Death of a Democracy* (Grove Press, 1967). Cf. Eliot Fremont-Smith, "Good Cause, Weak Book," New York *Times*, Dec. 18, 1967, p. 45.

[5] Navy and Air Force officers, who are considered somewhat better travelled, more sophisticated and less scarred than Army officers by old struggles and intraservice feuds, were not involved in the coup. I understand that the officer corps of the Navy has been thoroughly demoralized by the purges and that the Air Force officers are considered by the colonels to be completely unreliable.

Richard Eder's long front-page story from Athens in the New York *Times* of December 18, "Upheavals Shake Greek Military," began with the report, "After two bitter convulsions in eight months, the Greek armed forces have been damaged to the extent that foreign military observers believe they have lost much of their effectiveness." The report continued, on page 3, "The other day, speaking with deep distress, a senior Western military man said: 'What has happened is quite simple. A modern Western army has been turned into something on the level of what was used in the Balkan wars at the turn of the century.' He went on to say that there were not more than two or three officers left in significant command positions who had received the long, intensive training provided by service in the Korean war and in NATO staff courses. 'The men running things now,' one observer said, 'are the officers who were zation of the reserves, which would have been ordered by their predecessors in such circumstances, would have required the colonels to arm and put in positions of trust many officers and men decidedly unfriendly to the regime. This the Turkish government evidently appreciated as it drove home a bargain which humiliated the Greeks, calmed the Turks and forestalled a possible military coup on Cyprus against the Archbishop. (The bargain itself was not unreasonable, if the Turks do not press further their present advantage, but the Greek government's moderation came from weakness, not from strength.) The humiliation, and consequent dissatisfaction, among Greeks must extend as well to some of the officers who had participated in the April coup. I found among the younger officers this summer both a readiness to identify Greece with Israel and Turkey with the Arabs and a reckless eagerness to put this identification to the test. These officers, too, may have to be either purged or safely diverted by a revival of the "Northern Epirus" question. (One should not be surprised now to see the Albanians begin to reestablish better relations with the Yugoslavs.)

What has happened in the Army—the sacrifice of military efficiency for perhaps a decade to an effort to insure the loyalty of the Army to the colonels—is merely a dramatic version of what has been evident in various (but not all) government services since midsummer. I had occasion, just before I left Athens, to ask a team of economists at one of the Embassies what programs and policies of the new government had been successful. Their mood was by then so gloomy that they could insist that nothing had been done right by the colonels. Two of the men were Greeks—all of them had been critical, prior to the coup, of the politics of Andreas Papandreou—but they were unanimous in this assessment. What is important is that they should be this disillusioned by the efforts of the colonels—for some of them had had hopes at the beginning. Such disillusionment, and consequent disaffection, was evident among professionals and intellectuals throughout Greece.

In short, people suspected that the colonels really did not know what they were doing. But then, why should they? Mrs. Vlachou made the decisive observation on this point at the very beginning, upon closing down her press: "I cannot drive their tanks; they cannot edit my newspapers."

V

I myself believe, however, that certain measures taken by the colonels have been salutary. Whether they have been worth the price paid for them—in the suppression of civil liberties, in the long-run distortion of the economy and of the civil service, and in the weakening of Greece militarily and politically—is another matter.

I begin with the Post Office. Strikes and slow-downs had seriously impeded the delivery of mail. Service had gotten so bad (in December, 1966) that the central post office building in Athens was said to be in danger of collapse under the weight of accumulated parcels. Mail service is now very good, the best Greece has had for several years.[6] Much the same can be said of public transportation services and, indeed, of all services that had been affected by the sporadic strikes that had accompanied the political crises of 1965–1967. Thus, there has been an improvement with respect to all services that could be improved by the mere prohibition of strikes, demonstrations and disruptive labor union practices. Such improvement is not, of course, permanent, depending as it does upon the prospect of a ruthless exercise of power by the central government. The same may be said of the colonels' suppression of bribery of civil servants.

Some of the announced reforms have been with respect to matters that political governments had not ventured to touch, but which had been generally regarded as desirable to correct. Prominent among these matters are agricultural subsidies and monopoly licenses. One cannot yet regard the announced reforms as permanent: the abuses they address may reflect Greek conditions. That is, such preference are likely to return in some form or other when political life returns, as will the quarrels and even the corruption among deputies which gave Parliament a bad name. Indeed, it is far from certain that the more critical of the announced economic reforms have in fact been implemented. It should also be observed that the colonels and their followers have in some cases substituted their form of preferment for that of their predecessors. I recall sitting at the desk of one of the officers of the government—an army major associated with the conspiracy for several years—and watching him dispense jobs in his department. Loyal officers were rewarded, either directly or through relatives seeking jobs. There was something natural and even innocent about these transactions: certainly, no attempt was made by the major to hide from me the business he had to transact before we could go out for the luncheon we had arranged. Several key appointments by the colonels, even to the highest posts in critical ministries, did not make sense until blood and marriage ties to influential army officers had been traced.

The reforms brought about either by fear among the people or by lack of concern among the colonels for the usual political considerations are not likely to endure when normal conditions return. Furthermore, the colonels have not been innovating in these matters but rather have been doing what everyone has long agreed should be done. This was more evident in the spring, which means that the colonels had their greatest effect during their first few months in power: people could immediately acknowledge certain government measures as long overdue. It is comforting, if you are a small shopkeeper, to know there will be a bus to take you home for lunch; it is comforting to find that civil servants are not as arrogant as they used to be (even though you take care to be more respectful than you have been toward the neighbor who is related to an Army officer); it is also comforting to notice that consumer prices have stopped rising (and in some cases have even been cut, by government decree), even though you doubt that employment opportunities are as good as the government keeps insisting they are.

The colonels have declined in influence as they themselves have had to innovate and as political considerations began to undermine even the obviously needed reforms they had endorsed. They recognized from the outset the need, for instance, for decentralization of government administration. But, it seems to me, effective decentralization is possible only in circumstances where the central government is essentially of one mind with many people throughout the country, not when a handful of men holds power by force. There was evident in Greece this year the concentration of more and more power in Athens as all kinds of local civic, professional, industrial and agricultural councils (many of them elected) have been suspended or completely reconstituted. Perhaps the only one of such actions by the colonels which will be approved by their successors is the reform of the Church hierarchy, a reform long overdue, one that previous governments did not consider themselves strong enough to effect. The Synod was reorganized. The feeble Archbishop was replaced by a much younger, vigorous man who will be much more inclined than was his predecessor to modernize the Church and to come to terms with the ecumenical movement as represented by the Patriarch of Constantinople.

There remain the distinctive reforms proposed by some of the colonels, the moral and constitutional regeneration of Greece which the more radical element among the military intends to establish if the opportunity presents itself. This radical element, which seems to me egalitarian in tendency, has its roots in the people at large. It is this element which has sustained Greek Communists since the Second World War, despite all their blunders. It is this element which Andreas Papandreou, perhaps inadvertently, exploited in his meteoric career in Greece. This radical element goes deep in Greek life: it is a kind of negativism, a centuries-old longing, a fundamental dissatisfaction with the established order. It came to the surface, if only for a moment, in a remark made on April 27 by Colonel George Papadopoulos, long before he became Prime Minister in speech as well as in deed:

"As far as concerns us, we are not influenced in our actions by anyone. No one knew us. No one was known to us. No one knew who we were facing. Nowhere did we look. Nowhere did we seek help."

VI

The opportunity for such a coup as this presented itself as the result of the efforts of practically every political figure of consequence working in Greece during the past decade. To list the principal figures of this period is to list those who played a part in creating the conditions out of which the colonels could emerge.

The figures I refer to are members of the Royal Family, leaders of the National Radical Union (which is immediately right of center), leaders of the Center Union (which is immediately left of center), and "the Americans." If any one of these had played a more prudent part, things would have been far different in 1967. It should be noticed, by the way, that all these groups are now clearly aligned against the regime of the colonels. It has seemed to me that they have been thus aligned since April.

The Royal Family made two major mistakes in recent years. King Paul (who was encouraged in this matter by Queen Frederika, a lady of considerable intelligence and energy, but not of judgment) insisted in 1963 against the advice of Prime Minister Karamanlis that the Queen and he should visit London. King Constantine insisted in 1965 that Prime Minister Papandreou could not replace his Defense Minister by assuming the portfolio himself. King Paul's action removed from office (and, in effect, from the country) the most successful Greek prime minister of recent decades. King Constantine's action attempted to capitalize upon, and may have instead impeded, the impending collapse of George Papandreou's support

---

left behind and whose main experience is 15 years of plotting.' " The article concluded, "This is not only a question of the reduced ability of Greek troops to fight a shooting war. It is also a fear that the Greek Army [of about 160,000 men], having lost many of its Western-trained officers and most of its morale, can no longer provide much of a stabilizing force in Greece, especially if opposition to the junta results in a rebirth of the once-powerful Communist guerrilla organization." Compare Dean Acheson's letter-to-the-editor, published in the Washington *Post* of December 20, 1967.

[6] There was for a few weeks after the coup censorship of foreign mail. One heard often this summer of "politically unreliable" professionals and tradesmen summarily "punished" (with no charges, trial or appeal) by being deprived of telephone service. I believe several thousands may have been treated in this manner.

It was generally assumed this summer that one's telephone might be tapped.

in the Center Union Party. In both cases, questions were provoked about the power of the monarch under the Constitution. In both cases, also, the underlying difficulty may have ultimately been the question of the proper relation between the monarch and the armed forces. And in both cases, the action of the monarch precipitated a constitutional crisis. (It should be noticed, that is, that the constitutional issue raised by Mr. Karamanlis was essentially the same as that raised by Mr. Papandreou two years later. It should be further noticed that the colonels are taking virtually the same position that Mr. Karamanlis and Mr. Papandreou had in turn taken as prime ministers, that the monarch "should reign but not rule," that he should not interfere in the formulation and execution of the policies and programs of the Government, and that the Government should control the Army. The colonels have now shown civilians how the Army can be brought under control, even when most of it remains unfriendly to the government in power.)

We turn now to the mistakes of the National Radical Union leaders, particularly Mr. Karamanlis and thereafter Mr. Kanellopoulus. Mr. Karamanlis permitted overly-zealous supporters to organize on his behalf military interference ("The Pericles Plot") with the elections of 1961, elections which Mr. Karamanlis's party might otherwise have won honestly but against which plausible charges of fraud could be made. These charges, which led to another election in 1963, left behind sufficient bitterness to poison Greek politics for several years. (It is difficult to see how any elections conducted while the colonels retain power can escape similar charges and repudiation.) Mr. Karamanlis failed to impress upon his colleagues the fact that, in a modern democracy, it is almost as important to seem to be fair and competent as it is to be fair and competent. One cause of his difficulty in this respect may have been the remarkable fear of Communism that otherwise responsible Greek politicians (as well as the King) retain: it has clouded their judgment again and again, and has contributed to the loss of civilian control over the Army. Mr. Karamanlis's second mistake may have been to leave the country when he did without having prepared Greeks devoted to him to accept with grace the government of his critics. (Just as Mr. Papandreou seems to be made primarily for opposition, Mr. Karamanlis seems to be made primarily for ruling. No doubt, Mr. Karamanlis was exhausted from his eight years at the head of a Greek government.) One cannot know what he might have been able to do in Greece since 1963: but we do know that the most successful and generally respected Greek politician today—one might even say the only Greek *politician* to emerge since the Second World War—has not been available in Athens for four years. (The colonels might have been obliged to defer their coup if it had been known that Mr. Karamanlis would return for the May 1967 elections.) But, however that may be, his absence can now be turned to advantage, since he has not been associated with the passions and failures of recent years.

Mr. Kanellopoulos was the one man in Greece about whom everyone spoke respectfully to me last summer, men of the left, center and right, as well as his captors of April 21. It was generally recognized that he (as Prime Minister in April) had had nothing to do with the coup, that he had resisted it when it came, that he continued to speak harshly of the colonels (it was even said that he had reminded them on one occasion that he was "still the Prime Minister of Greece"), and that he had conducted himself honorably in the face of military usurpation. One must wonder, however, whether he conducted himself strictly as he should have when confronted by the earlier usurpation, that of the King in the summer of 1965. Should he have refused to throw the support of his party behind the handful of deputies (popularly known as "the Apostates") who left the Center Union to form the governments called into being by the King? Should he, that is, have insisted that a respect for parliamentary government, and hence for the protection of parliamentary processes against royal interference, required his party to support (or, at least, not to attack) Mr. Papandreou in his confrontation with the King? (Mr. Kanellopoulos, it can be said in his defense, did no more in this respect than Mr. Papandreou himself had done in 1963 when Mr. Karamanlis confronted the King.) In any event, it was not good for Greece's political health that it should have been ruled for eighteen months by a handful of deputies, sustained by shoddy deals, who were neither of the majority nor even of the principal minority party but who were, at most, of what could be called the King's party. Mr. Kanellopoulos would have done better, considering the political passions in the country and the posture in which things found themselves, to have called publicly (in the summer of 1965 as well as in the winter of 1966–1967) for a government of national unity in which both major parties would be represented. (I have been told on the highest authority that there was some understanding, behind the scenes, between Mr. Papandreou and Mr. Kanellopoulos as to what would happen after the May elections—but the political depends in great part on the apparent, and the apparent was that of possible strife, something which the politically naive took more seriously than was justified.)

The most dramatic recent leaders of the coalition now known as the Center Union have been the Papandreous, father and son. (One cause of trouble within that party has been the sudden eclipse by the talented son of others who had regarded themselves as likely successors to the old man.) Should Prime Minister Papandreou have insisted in 1965, against the King's strong resistance, upon himself assuming the Defense Ministry, especially when his son was implicated (however unfairly) in the "Aspida" military conspiracy? In any event, it was a mistake on Mr. Papandreou's part to permit himself to be maneuvered out of office: for had he not threatened to resign, but had instead remained Prime Minister and addressed himself with his absolute majority in Parliament to other problems of the country (leaving the Defense Ministry problem for more favorable circumstances), the King could not have done much to dislodge him without, at the same time, providing for new elections. It seems that Mr. Papandreou overestimated the power of public demonstrations and underestimated the capacity of the King eventually to come up with a viable Parliamentary alternative (without resort to elections). To allow the issue to become one simply of the royal power, and to do so through the use of demonstrations that sounded much more fearsome at a distance and in the press than they in fact were (I saw what they amounted to in the summer of 1965), was to frighten impressionable people unduly concerned with the maintenance of order. (It should be said for Mr. Papandreou that upon being arrested he asked for Thucydides, and not for playing cards as did other politicians.)

Andreas Papandreou has had a remarkable effect on politics in the few years he has been active in Greece. He was revered by some as "the Greek Kennedy," and dreaded by others as an agent of international Communism. It should have been clear to every thoughtful observer that he was neither: he was not yet enough of a politician to be the former, nor enough to the left to be the latter. Indeed, his politics, and in some respects even his temperament, seem to be those of the Hubert Humphrey of 1948. He managed to win the adulation of a number of people, particularly among the young and among intellectuals; he managed also to frighten a number of people in the Army and close to the throne. He spoke of curtailing Greece's reliance upon NATO, of subjecting the monarchy to review by the people, and even of forming a government (when the May 28 election returns were in) at Constitution Square, rather than having to wait on the King's mandate. He said a number of things of this tenor that appealed to the dispossessed and to the ambitious, things which were not necessary to say and which he himself probably did not take as seriously as did his enemies. He predicted the people would smash any attempt by the military to seize control of the government—and this, too, was mere talk, for there seems to have been nothing prepared to counter military intervention. He had been considered by some an agent of America, or at least too American for Greek conditions, and this he tried to refute. He managed, in the process, to alienate a number of Americans in the Embassy, people no more to the right than he is in their politics and in their economic policies. Perhaps, indeed, he was too American for Greek conditions: he did not seem to realize what the effects were of what he was saying. A more political man, one who had had to work his way in Greece to the eminence at which he so quickly found himself, would have had to learn while still young how to curb careless speech. What I have heard about his prison reflections suggests that he is now more prudent than many of his admirers abroad.

The Americans, too, have played their part in bringing things to such a pass as we find them. Not that I find it necessary to believe that the United States, or any of its agencies, had anything to do with the coup of April 21. Many, perhaps most, Greeks believed last summer that the United States (and especially the C.I.A.) was involved, partly because they thought the coup was carried off too efficiently for Greeks alone to have run it. A NATO contingency plan, to be used in case of Communist or other uprisings, *was* evidently exploited by the colonels.[7] I could not find anything anywhere, however, to suggest immediate American involvement. More important, I could not find anything that requires such an explanation: the story is complete without that. We have now seen, in the efficient way in which the King's rebellion

I have heard from a number of sources that the King and the officers loyal to him initially regarded the coup as a Communist uprising. The failure of the colonels to find any Communist weapons at all, although the Communists were caught completely by surprise, reveals how misinformed the King and his officers (loyal and disloyal alike) had been about what was going on in Greece. One unexpected result of the colonels' well-planned and superbly executed coup was to make a farce of the dreaded "Aspida" enterprise. (Greek Communists seem to me to be tired and demoralized people. One should remember that many of the enterprising young men who might once have been recruits into the Communist Party, or into the Resistance, have been for years gainfully employed in Western Europe. Many of them will no doubt express their opposition to the Colonels by reducing the money they send home to Greece and by discouraging tourists from visiting the country. *Autres temps, autres moeurs.*)

---

[7] I was told by one of the officers associated with the conspiracy for some time prior to the coup that the military takeover began to move the evening of March 23, 1967, but was stopped for some reason at nine o'clock that night. I was also told that the April coup was timed to catch the principal military leaders of the country in Athens for a conference: they were thus not in immediate command of their units.

was put down by the colonels (clearly without American aid), that what certain of the colonels *are* good at is conspiracy (and hence, counter-conspiracy).

It was impolitic for the United States to have allowed itself in recent years to be identified in Greece as determined to impede a more equitable distribution of the growing wealth of the country. It was unfair that Greeks should have come to see the United States as interested in Greece primarily as part of its bulwark against Communism in the Eastern Mediterranean. It was shortsighted for the United States to have permitted many Greeks, and particularly the Army, to retain such an unrealistic view as they have of what Communism is today and in what the Communist threat consists. This may be how the colonels have been most influenced by the United States. Colonel Papadopoulos did proclaim on April 27:

"And we hope that by our actions and through economic progress we'll find ourselves in the position of Western European governments where Communism plays an insignificant role in the country's political life."

He should have been instructed long ago by the Americans that Greece was already on her way toward an effective neutralization of Communism. He should know that the government of Metaxas made more dedicated Communists than it suppressed.

I am sure that most Americans in the Embassy in Athens recognize that Greece's problems today have little to do with any Communist threat, either domestic or foreign. I am persuaded that they were not seriously alarmed at the prospect of Andreas Papandreou returning to power. (It should be recognized that the Government of the United States intervened honorably on his behalf when his life seemed in danger last spring.) But Embassy personnel allowed it to be rumored about that Andreas Papandreou was someone the Americans would not be able to work with and that Communism was an immediate threat to the country. Experienced politicians no doubt took such speculations for what they were worth. One could say that the imprudence displayed by Andreas Papandreou was exhibited by the very Americans among whom he had grown to maturity.

I suspect that the underlying cause of difficulty for the United States in recent years has been the lack of a clear policy for Greece. Even as late as August several officials I talked with in the American Embassy in Athens were honestly puzzled as to just what the policy of the United States Government was toward the government of the colonels. I suspect also that the United States has less influence in Greece today than at any time since the Second World War, certainly less influence than it would have had if the rumored generals' coup (which, some say, awaited only the King's consent) had seized power in the spring. When the colonels begin to exploit publicly their relative independence of American influence, and thereby to profit from the sporadic resentment among Greeks against foreign interference in their affairs, they will then have a better idea of why Andreas Papandreou spoke as he did about the United States.

There is no reason to believe that the colonels consulted with any responsible American officials about their coup. They were evidently confident that what they were doing to save and regenerate the country would meet the approval of the men who had trained them as soldiers. One found, again and again during the summer, bewilderment and resentment when Americans did not respond as the colonels thought they would.

The leaders among the colonels received their commissions around 1940, just in time to endure the cruelties of the German Occupation and the even bitterer cruelties of the Greek Civil War. They were, so far as I could gather, men who conducted themselves honorably during the Occupation, associating themselves with legitimate resistance activities in Greece or with their country's forces in the Middle East. Most of them had come into military life from the small towns and villages of Greece, from poor, respectable families. The Army provided them an opportunity for a career, one in which both technical training and advancement according to merit seemed available. The opportunities afforded by the Army seemed to them much more sensible than those in civilian life. There is for the Greek career officer from the villages something American—that is, modern and rational—about the way the Army works. What America itself means to certain Greeks today is suggested by a conversation I had a few years ago during the course of a tour of archaeological sites. I had gone into a small town bank to cash a traveller's check—and had been struck by a majestic photograph over the manager's desk of a prosperous, self-confident and vigorous businessman. The manager, noticing my curiosity, took great pride in announcing:

"That is the greatest mind in Greece.

"Really?

"Yes. He owns three bank chains, more than one hundred boats and much valuable real estate. And he made most of it himself.

"Where does he live?

"In Athens; but he has homes all over the world—in Paris, London, all over.

"Do you ever see him?

"One can see him only in Athens—and even there it is very difficult.

"Does he not ever come here?

"Why should he come here? He has a thousand men to do his bidding.

"But can they do his looking? What about the ruins you have here from ancient times—does he not come to see them?"

"I would not know if he came for that."

"How do you know he is the greatest mind in Greece if you never talk to him?"

"By his deeds. You see, it is like America in this country."

"In what way?"

"A smart man can make money and become very rich."

The Army, too, is seen by the career officer as a community in which virtue is most likely to be rewarded.

The colonels heard dangers magnified. They saw governments fall with ease. They had little confidence in the ability of politicians to deal with the dangers about which they had heard so much. Their attitudes had been influenced by their memories of the Civil War. These officers had fought as young men in the mountains of Northern Greece: they bled and suffered; their comrades died; and all the while their leaders back in Athens were getting what they could for themselves. They learned during that cruel war to respect and to be wary of the Communists (whom they outnumbered, but whom they barely defeated despite superiority of firepower). They also learned to despise the professional politicians and the wealthy (but untaxed) cosmopolites—and the crisis of 1965–1967 gave them the opportunity and incentive to do what they thought the country needed.

The colonels—and in this they are like many other Greek army officers—believe they are the only true patriots, the only citizens (beside the great body of inarticulate, exploited poor) who truly care for Greece, who are willing to sacrifice for it. They believe that only they are capable of bringing order and moral regeneration to the country. One principle guides their thinking about constitutional reform: as Mr. Pattakos said in the spring, when asked what he would change in the Constitution. "We want to change those parts of the Constitution which permit politicians to make mistakes."

It was perhaps inevitable, given their temperament, experience and training, that the colonels should have taken as seriously as they did what politicians said about each other. (Inexperienced civilians, on the other hand, would no doubt be terrified by battle noises that the colonels would ignore.) Matters were not helped by the Greek press, which is (with a few exceptions) about as irresponsible and certainly as inaccurate a press as one can find in the Western world. The colonels have seen rural life disintegrate, the family weakened, the customary way of doing things seriously challenged. They are determined to preserve in themselves and revive in others the virtues of their grandfathers. But they are "American" enough to want, also, to further the economic development of the country through the encouragement of foreign investment and the attraction of tourists. They reflect, in their attempt to aline themselves with Western European developments and to come to terms with the modern world, the mood that drove Andreas Papandreou and his allies. They do not appreciate that the very measures they are eager to promote (including Church reform) prevent moral regeneration of the kind they long for. It is curious, moreover, that their program for infusion into the body politic of the military spirit should have had, as its corollary, the weakening of the army itself by making it far more politically organized than even the Greek army normally is.

One further anomaly should be noted: if the officer corps is to be regarded as the source of regenerative power for Greece, how can one justify the mutiny within the army by these colonels? That is, why should colonels and not the generals they overpowered lead the revolution? If the Army can be depended upon to shape true patriots, if the Army is the source of legitimacy, if the Army is (unlike the community at large) rationally ordered and appreciative of merit, why should not the leaders of the country be those whom the Army has selected and raised to the very top? If the colonels justify themselves as entitled to what they can take, then they are merely doing (despite their self-righteous talk) what the politicians they despise have done.

VIII

The truly political man knows that he must take into account the prejudices of his people. He takes account of prejudices both by changing them when he can and by conforming to them when he cannot change them. The Army's, and to a lesser extent the people's, fear about the present Communist threat to Greece has to be moderated. This, at least, can be altered, even though the memory and hence the effects of the fierce Communist atrocities of the Civil War (prepared for by the harshness of Metaxas and by the bestialities of the Germans and their collaborators) cannot be erased for generations. The Greek politician who seeks to contain politically the Greeks' blinding anti-Communism should exploit domestically the NATO assurances. That is, politicians of the Left should consider the advantages for them of the fact of such protection for Greece: properly explained, the NATO arrangement can be used to persuade Greeks that they are free to take domestic reconstruction far more seriously than any threat, foreign or domestic, from Communism.

The Army needs reassurance. The relation between the Army and the Government needs to be redefined. The colonels themselves may need the guarantee that nothing will be done to them personally upon the surrender of power: assignments abroad as military attachés might be good for those who wish to stay in the Army. It would probably be healthy for the appropriate authority to promise a general amnesty for all offenses associated with the coup, for the Aspida and Pericles conspiracies, as well as for other activities of like nature.

I do not believe that any reforms by the colonels or by their successors will make basic changes in the Greek character or in

Greek conditions for many decades, and perhaps even for a century or two. But certain constitutional and political reforms can make that character and those conditions less serious in their immediate effects. (Various of these reforms are likely to be included in the constitution the colonels will offer the country: the reduction of the size of Parliament, the establishment of an executive power somewhat insulated from the vagaries of Parliament, the limitation and more precise definition of the King's power.) Perhaps the economic development of the country and its gradual incorporation into European life will have a moderating effect on Greek political life, even though such Westernization would be partly at the risk of obscuring in the process what is now attractive about the country and its people.

The status of the monarchy is likely to be questioned after the colonels go. Many will see the monarchy merely as an expensive prejudice of the Greeks. But it is the mark of a liberated man that he can recognize and take due account of the prejudices of those less fortunate than himself. Educated "democrats" would do better to "capture" and, in effect, direct the monarchy rather than to attack it: for no matter what they do, a substantial minority in support of the monarchy will remain in Greece for many years. It was apparent, before the ill-conceived campaign by the King earlier this month, that the King can provide a restraining influence upon men inclined to excess. The King's misadventures of July 1965 and December 1967, on the other hand, display essentially the same failings. It should now be apparent to the King that he can do his best when he is subject to the direction and has the confidence of ministers and a parliament responsible to the people.

The Left—if the liberal Center Union can be called that!—was on the verge of a major victory at the polls in 1965–1967. The colonels have certainly blocked that for awhile. But if Mr. Karamanlis does his job well, a peaceful acceptance thereafter by the country of rule by the responsible Left (perhaps in the form of Archbishop Makarios) should open a new era in Greek politics.

IX

The colonels will go—and while they remain they may even be employed to make useful changes with which no politician would care to be identified—when it is apparent that the country has united behind leadership endorsed by the King and anticipated by everyone in Greece and out, in the Army and out, as the colonels' successor. Some would prefer to have Greeks fight (with what, it is not clear) to throw off their oppressors—but this is irresponsible romanticism, an imitation of the colonels' approach to the political problems confronting Greece today. It is impossible to foresee the consequences of such resistance today.

Mr. Karamanlis's government could prudently employ in key positions the services of George Papandreou (perhaps as Deputy Prime Minister), of Panayiotis Kanellopoulos (perhaps as Minister of Defense), of George Mavros (of the Center Union, perhaps as Minister of Coordination), and of Andreas Papandreou (perhaps as Minister of Education, the post which his father did so well in many years ago and in which imagination and experience are so much needed today in Greece). Such a coalition could be announced in advance of the restoration of constitutional government, with the understanding that it would be submitted to the people for ratification in due course. Anyone familiar with Greek politics knows that a coalition of this character would be neither as difficult to establish nor as easy to maintain as it might seem to an outsider: there is really very little difference between the policies of Panayiotis Kanellopoulos and those of George Papandreou (after all, they like others, have shifted back and forth among political parties over the years); nor is there likely to be very much practical difference between the policies of Andreas Papandreou and those of Constantine Karamanlis. It was Mr. Karamanlis, it should be remembered, who brought Mr. Papandreou back to Greece and established him in the Center for Economic Planning. My impression of Mr. Karamanlis's social program is that he has deliberately moved (during his self-imposed Paris exile) toward such an explicit concern for the development of social services and welfare programs as would satisfy the typical supporter of the Center Union.

The influence which Mr. Karamanlis continues to command in Greece (and which I should like to see utilized in a peaceful transition from the colonels) is indicated by the fact that the colonels were obliged on December 5 to allow newspaper publishers to print Mr. Karamanlis's perceptive (though somewhat impolitic) denunciations of the government (which had appeared in *Le Monde* on November 29 and in the *Times* on November 30). His influence was evident this past summer in the respect I heard tendered him from even his former critics. Mr. Karamanlis, I suspect, would enjoy and perhaps even endorse in its entirety, the tribute of one liberal foreign correspondent of many years' experience in Greece: "Karamanlis was a right-wing S.O.B., dictatorial, and not cultured. He ran the only effective progressive government Greece has ever had." "We would upon his return spread flowers in his path," one longtime Leftist critic of his admitted to me in Delphi.

An awareness of political realities seems to me to require a public mustering behind Mr. Karamanlis of all political personalities within Greece and all friends of Greece abroad. And this in turn should induce the colonels to believe that they can safely surrender the power they have seized for the good of their country. Certainly, such a truly national government, supported as it should be by all the men and institutions that count in contemporary Greece—including the bulk of the Army, as well as the King—would then be the only legitimate government available to the country, one that could properly call upon and expect the other NATO powers, especially the governments of the United States and of Great Britain, to render all possible aid toward the reestablishment of a constitutional regime.

No matter what happens now, problems will remain and crises will return. Neither reform nor revolution can yet settle permanently the difficulties that both threaten and enliven Greece. But a breathing space can be gained, during which men would have an opportunity to make repairs, to reflect on what has happened, and (most important at the moment) to avoid the senseless killing and enduring bitterness that Greece has already had too much of.

Thus, the colonels should be induced to withdraw, taking with them the assurance that they have united all of Greece behind a government of sobriety and progress.

CHICAGO, ILL., *December 28, 1967.*

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower we are witnessing also the passing of an era, and we are all the less for it.

This great general, this beloved man represented a time in our history in which men spoke with unabashed pride of their love for our country, in which men professed Christian moral codes because they were proud to be called Christians, in which men had no hesitancy to stand up for right because they were taught that honorable men did not deal in expediency.

He was the epitome of that era, as much the exemplification of all that makes a man great as was George Washington in his time. He ennobled mankind with his simple honesty and his strength of character.

The Nation was fortunate to have had this man as its son. He discharged with full honors every obligation imposed upon him by God, family, and country. We have stood in the shadow of a noble man and I am grateful for the opportunity.

God rest you now, Mr. President.

COMPUTERS CAN HELP IMPROVE CONGRESSIONAL SERVICES

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House of Representatives were privileged recently to see in the Rayburn Building a demonstration of a computer operation featuring speedy retrieval of information essential to Members of the Congress. This exhibition provided occasion for Warren Weaver, Jr., feature writer for the New York Times, to compose a news article discussing interest on Capitol Hill in the use of computers to improve the quality of our legislative services.

Among the forward-looking computer-orientated programs referred to by the author of this article is the legislation offered by my colleague from Pennsylvania—Representative WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD—a measure in which I have been pleased to join as a cosponsor.

The advantages of utilizing the new computer techniques in facilitating and improving our work in this body is presented in the following illuminating article:

COMPUTER SYSTEM IS EXHIBITED FOR POSSIBLE CAPITOL HILL USE

(By Warren Weaver, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 30—The belated dawn of the computer age on Capitol Hill is threatening to put knowledge—if not necessarily wisdom—literally at the fingertips of Congress.

In a fourth-floor room of the Rayburn House Office Building, curious Representatives and apprehensive aides were lining up last week for a few minutes at the console of a computer that is a sort of hybrid television set, typewriter and duplicating machine, activated in part by touching the screen.

This $13,500 unit is part of a demonstration authorized by W. Pat Jennings, the clerk of the House, to interest members in the whole range of new services that a broad computer system could bring.

By pressing key words on successive printed message on the screen, any operator in search of a bill can move, for example, from "legislation" to "armed services" to "combat assignment" to Representative Spark M. Matsunaga's H.R. 2098 to a concise synopsis of that measure.

SYNOPSIS IN 11 SECONDS

A rank amateur was able to produce a synopsis of the bill on the screen in 11 seconds, plus three or four seconds more for the duplicating section to disgorge a copy on paper. If the machine were fully programed, the same could be done in the same time for any of the 29,000 bills introduced during a Congressional session.

By contrast, a request by Representative William S. Moorhead through conventional channels for a copy of a bill from the House Document Room in the Capitol produced one in 43 minutes. His staff called this unusually fast service.

The demonstration computer, called a Digiscriber by the manufacturer, Control Data Corporation, could also flash on its screen in a few extra seconds a lot more facts about the bill, including its status in Congress, its history and a list of related measures.

The growing band of computer-conscious leaders on the Hill—Mr. Jennings, Representative Moorhead, a Pennsylvania Democrat, and a number of others—are hopeful that the almost magic facility of the Digiscriber will build more support for an extensive installation of automatic data processing equipment to assist Congress.

Currently, Congress is far behind. The executive branch of the Federal Government is operating some 4,600 electronic devices of varying degrees of sophistication, but there are just three computers on Capitol Hill: one in the Senate, one in the House and one in the Library of Congress.

USED FOR HOUSEKEEPING

So far, the machines are largely restricted to pedestrian housekeeping functions. The Senate restricts its I.B.M. 360 to addressing the members' outgoing mail. The House's N.C.R. 500 makes out the payroll and keeps an inventory of mechanical equipment.

At that, the results of computerization have been dramatic. According to Mr. Jennings, the House payroll, which took three weeks to prepare by hand, can be completed in 40 hours by the present computer and will take only three hours when a newer model is put into service.

The potential services that computers could offer to legislators are far more impressive. Representative John Brademas, an Indiana Democrat who is also a computer promoter, sees a future system providing:

Legislative research reports transmitted from the Library of Congress to members' offices in seconds.

Schedules of committee meetings and hearings automatically printed or flashed on screens in committee rooms and members' offices.

Status information on all Federal contracts.

A full index of all the information on file in the executive branch data banks, which could then be tapped by Congress.

Detailed analysis and background on the President's budget proposals, now almost totally lacking.

Although it may be a long time before the touch-controlled television screens appear in Hill offices, a less exotic information retriever is already in use by the House Banking and Currency Committee. It is an I.B.M. printer hitched to the Library of Congress computer system.

With this machine, the committee staff records titles, digests and the status of all bills under its jurisdiction. The printer will produce any of this information in seconds after receiving an order like "GHBCHR2," which translates as "get, for House Banking Committee, status of House Resolution 2."

COST IN MILLIONS

What would a real computer system cost? Representative Moorhead, who is working for a single compatible coordinated system for all of Congress, estimates up to $45,000 for design, $1.7-million to $2.7-million for equipment and an annual operating cost of $1.4-million to $1.7-million.

Pressure for action on the computer issue is considerably heavier in the House than in the Senate, apparently because Senators have much larger staffs to dig out information.

The Senate, in fact, was only provoked into acquiring its computer when the old Addressograph machine became so overburdened with lead nameplates that the mail room floor buckled.

A serious obstacle to a real computer program is political jealousy over jurisdiction. Some Congressmen want the system directed by the General Accounting Office, others by the Government Printing Office. Mr. Jennings is anxious that the House proceed to meet its needs, not wait for the Senate.

Mr. Moorhead, joined by Representative Robert McClory, Republican of Illinois, is pressing for creation of a new legislative data processing center, operated by professionals and administered jointly by the Senate and House.

There are other problems. Some committee chairmen are privately concerned that total access to information will weaken the importance of seniority, making a diligent freshman with data retrieval equipment just as knowledgeable as his superiors in the hierarchy.

Then there are the Congressional staff workers who see their status going the way of the quill and pen and the snuff box. On his way to the computer demonstration, Mr. Jennings asked one such senior clerk if he had seen the touch-controlled television apparatus.

"You know what that's going to do," the House employe replied sourly. "It's going to take my job away."

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, Dwight David Eisenhower lived a full human life; he used his great abilities in long and successful service for his fellow Americans. We have mourned other heroes in recent years: President John Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Senator Robert Kennedy. How different it is when death cuts off men whose work is not yet done, whose potential is not fulfilled. While we are saddened at the death of Dwight Eisenhower, we are grateful for his long and full life among us.

He rose from obscurity in a time of crisis when leadership was needed to direct the military forces of threatened nations against a common foe. The peoples of Europe remember with gratitude how he united and organized American, British, French, Canadian, and the other Allied forces in that mighty and victorious campaign against Nazi oppression. After the war, Eisenhower continued to serve this Nation at Columbia University, at NATO, as President of the United States; a world-famous leader and a remarkable man.

He was a man of inner strength. Resolute and determined in the cause of peace and justice, he held unequaled power as Supreme Allied Commander of the greatest military force ever put in the field, and again as President of the greatest Nation in mankind's long history. Yet his strength of character was such that military and political power did not corrupt or distort his moral power—his integrity, his humility, and his respect for his fellow man.

He was a man men trusted. There was no question about his motives. He was not self-serving. His fellow Americans knew that he was totally dedicated to the service of his country and its people. His straightforwardness earned respect and admiration both at home and abroad.

He was a man of compassion; a man of heart and of conscience determined to bring peace and freedom to mankind. He believed firmly in the dignity of man; and because of this, in spite of the awesome power at his command, he kept a gentle spirit and displayed that extraordinary comradeship with his subordinates that made him so beloved.

It has been said that Eisenhower embodied the American ideals, that the American people felt that his virtues were somehow the virtues of the Nation as a whole. His death may remind Americans to ask if the strength of character which was so strong in him to the end, and which he symbolized for the Nation, has somehow weakened in our land. How we need his strong and compassionate spirit in today's world. Our greatest tribute will be to maintain and, where necessary, to restore in full measure for our Nation the strength and spirit of Dwight Eisenhower.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our Nation and our people mourn the passing of General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States.

If one word were used to describe General Eisenhower, I believe that word would be "dedication." Dedication to his country, dedication to his duty, and dedication to his family.

His military career spanned the victorious conclusion of the greatest world conflict in history.

His political career was climaxed with the ending of hostilities in Korea, the first direct armed conflict our Nation faced with Communist aggression.

He was truly a man of peace.

Personal integrity and honor marked his years as our Commander in Chief, and its impact was so profound that those years have been designated the "Eisenhower Era."

General Eisenhower, through his example as a leader, as a father, and as a man, exemplified those values we cherish most highly. He was a symbol of the best our country can produce.

From the heartland of our Nation, at his birthplace in Kansas, he acquired his basic sense of values of honesty, integrity, love of family, respect for authority, reverence for God, and dedication to country. These were his contributions to the highest office of the land, the Presidency of the United States.

As a patriot, a leader, as a father, and as a man, General Eisenhower exemplified our most cherished values. He was a symbol of the best our country can produce.

He will be missed, and he will be long remembered.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, everything that can possibly be said about the life and accomplishments of the late President Dwight David Eisenhower has already been said so I cannot hope to add anything new. But I could not allow the occasion to pass without joining my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying a final tribute of respect to his memory.

General Eisenhower has now passed from among us and the entire world mourns his passing. And I predict that he will live throughout all time in the hearts of his countrymen and in the hearts of millions around the world who love liberty and pray for peace.

While in my book President Eisenhower was a great statesman, I shall prefer to remember him as a man of understanding and good will. He was entirely without guile. Although he occupied the exalted position of the Presidency, millions of people in this country always referred to him by his nickname.

While I had the privilege and pleasure of meeting General Eisenhower on numerous occasions before his inauguration as President in 1953, it was not until he came to Charlotte, N.C., to help the people of Mecklenburg County celebrate Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence Day that I came to realize the impact his personality had on people in every walk of life. Riding with him from the airport to Freedom Park on that occasion, I was struck by the attitudes of the thousands who lined the streets.

In the crowds were business and professional people, workers in overalls, and many mothers holding small children in their arms. All were smiling, waving and uttering such expressions as: "Hello, Ike" and "I Like Ike." In the course of that ride I did not hear a single formal salute. The people who lined the streets were uniformly informal, which I considered to be a personal tribute to the warm personality of this man who walked with kings yet never lost the common touch. "Ike" loved it and responded to the informal salutations with a wide grin and a cordial wave of the hand.

Since that day I have had numerous opportunities to spend time in his presence, to hear him speak on many formal occasions, and to observe his superb conduct of the affairs of state during his 8 years in the Presidency; but I think I shall always remember him as he was that day in Charlotte—so warm, friendly, and responsive to the multitudes who stood on the streets and who assembled in the park to give him an official greeting and hear him speak.

In my judgment General Eisenhower will be remembered as one of our most beloved Presidents. To the cynics who sneer at the accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration, I would respond that our country has not in modern times enjoyed 8 more peaceful and prosperous years than during his Presidency. His was a decade of good will among men and I dare say that millions of Americans will always praise him for giving us that kind of an administration.

We have been told that, as the end neared, after expressing his love for the members of his family, General Eisenhower said:

> And I have always loved my country.

As we remember Dwight David Eisenhower and mourn his passing, we all realize that—just as he always loved his country—his country loved and will always love him.

THE HOUSTON POST: EDITORIAL ON BUSING

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, an excellent and comprehensive discussion on the issue of school busing appeared in the March 26, 1969, edition of the Houston Post. Because of the many questions raised by a local school board in trying to determine an integration solution able to satisfy the civil rights arm of the Justice Department, the argument put forth by the Post is especially valuable:

> The Houston Independent School District is the defendant in this case which is yet to be heard in federal court.
>
> In Houston, the last Negro member of the school board—now resigned—and the last liberal member of the school board—still in office—stated that they did not believe Houston's best solution to integration lay in busing.
>
> Though they and other liberal school board members have urged further integration for a dozen years, they join the conservative majority in the belief that busing is impractical.
>
> To bus children six to 13 miles away from home poses obvious difficulties for children and parents of all races and all financial levels.
>
> If an elementary school child is 10 miles from home, he cannot go home if he gets sick during the day. He cannot stay after school to rehearse school plays, take part in athletic events, or have special tutoring on weak subjects because he would miss the bus. He and his parents find it hard to come back to school for evening events. His parents find it hard to attend PTA meetings or come to private conferences with teacher or counselor. It adds to their work toward Halloween carnivals or May fetes.
>
> The entire experience of being in school would be diminished for the bused child, and he would have his school day tediously lengthened by the long bus ride.
>
> The annual cost of busing thousands of children would be astronomical.

DAMAGE SUIT HITS BOGUS FARM UNION

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the vicious battle antiunion groups are waging against the struggle of the Nation's farmworkers for decency, fairness, and dignity has taken a new turn. Now they are trying to dupe the workers—and dupe the public—with a phony union. This phony union was formed and financed by the grape growers and others who stop at nothing in their attempt to kill the legitimate union the workers themselves formed—the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL–CIO. Charging violation of California law, the UFWOC has now filed suit against the front group, naming among the defendants, the California Right to Work Committee, the John Birch Society, and a number of growers and farm suppliers. Under unanimous consent, I include a story about the lawsuit, which appeared in the AFL–CIO News, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I recommend it to the careful study of all of our colleagues. The article is as follows:

> DAMAGE SUIT HITS BOGUS FARM UNION
>
> BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.—A $10 million damage suit has been filed by the AFL–CIO United Farm Workers Organizing Committee against an organization shown to have been formed and financed by grape growers to fight the union.
>
> Named in the suit, filed in a state court here, are the Agricultural Workers Freedom to Work Association, its officers, a long list of growers and farm suppliers, California for Right to Work, and the John Birch Society.
>
> The National Right to Work Committee recently sponsored Jose Mendoza, general secretary of AWFWA, on a nationwide tour to denounce UFWOC, its president, Cesar Chavez, and the boycott of non-union California grape growers.
>
> Jerome Cohen, UFWOC attorney, said the John Birch Society is named because its members were involved in helping to form AWFWA and later supported it.
>
> The court action, an amendment to a suit filed against AWFWA last September, is based on new information revealed when the organization's two top officers filed a report with the Labor Dept. to comply with the Landrum-Griffin amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.
>
> "We had some information as a basis for the original suit, but the report gives us more information," Cohen said. "We have named a number of new defendants."
>
> While the federal labor law's reporting requirements apply to all organizations in the labor-management field, its protective provisions do not cover farm workers.
>
> A California law, however, specifically forbids employers to finance, dominate or control organizations ostensibly formed to represent workers. It provides for payment of damages to legitimate unions harmed by such bogus organizations.

In the Landrum-Griffin report, AWFWA Pres. Gilbert Rubio and Sec.-Treas. Shirley Fetalvero said their organization was formed at a meeting attended by Mendoza, Rubio and about 10 employers at a restaurant here last May.

Listed among those attending were John Giumarra, Sr., and John Giumarra, Jr., treasurer and general counsel respectively of Giumarra Vineyards Corp., which has led grower opposition to farm workers' unionization.

Others attending the meeting, according to the document, included Paul Marrufo, head foreman for Sabovich Bros. grape growers; Jack Pandol, another grower, and a number of accountants for growers.

"We were to tell workers not to be afraid of Chavez, to be united . . . and oppose UFWOC efforts to organize and boycott," Rubio and Miss Fatalvero said.

"This meeting and other meetings," they added, "decided AWFWA would also try to enlist workers and obtain information on UFWOC's plans and activities."

The document brought out that Mendoza and Rubio were to be paid $120 a week and that "the Giumarras" would furnish office space and supplies for Mendoza.

Arrangements were made to pay Mendoza and others in AWFWA through another organization called Mexican-American Democrats for Republican Action (MADRA).

The document lists dozens of checks ranging up to $500 which were deposited in bank accounts maintained by MADRA and AWFWA during 1968.

Among those identified as issuing the payments were California for Right to Work, many growers' corporations and a number of agricultural suppliers.

Rubio and Miss Fetalvero also reported that Giumarra Vineyards paid a salary directly to Mendoza in "an unknown amount," made "loans" to other AWFWA leaders, and provided them with gasoline for automobiles.

These were some of the activities AWFWA was set up to perform, according to the document:

Counter-picket and "try to drown out" UFWOC members when they picketed grape growers; hold rallies for workers "to listen to speeches against Chavez;" picket advertisers of the Catholic Register which supported Chavez.

Appear on radio, TV and the news with attacks on Chavez; "take action to halt or disrupt" UFWOC activities such as parades and picnics; circulate literature attacking UFWOC and the boycott.

Picket stores selling New York made products after markets in that city decided not to handle California grapes and picket news media in Los Angeles for "biased coverage for Chavez."

"Use all of the above methods to get headlines, newspaper and TV coverage with statements farm workers are not on strike and the boycott is just another trick to force the union on the workers."

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the Nation mourns the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower, soldier, statesman, and humanitarian; a great American, a great and gentle man whose life and works will stand as a monument to all that is good in 20th century America.

By any measure, he must be counted among the giants of his age. History will recall him as a great leader; as the brilliant Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe during World War II and as a President who gave our Nation a pause from strife, a period of tranquillity and dignity.

Our grief that he is dead is profound, but we are consoled by a rising sense of gratitude that he lived among us and in the service of our Nation.

DWIGHT EISENHOWER: 1890–1969

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I join in the national mourning for a great leader, a man who placed his country above all else in times of war as well as of peace. President Eisenhower's life and devotion to his Nation will be a permanent guide for the leaders of future generations.

The Long Island Press editorial sums up the Nation's loss in the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower. The text of the editorial follows:

DWIGHT EISENHOWER: 1890–1969

In mourning Dwight David Eisenhower, the sorrow is eased by the fact that his 78 years of life mirrored a glowing picture of all that is best in American life.

His initial impact upon his countrymen was as a military leader, but his first achievement as President was as a man of peace, fulfilling his campaign promise to go to Korea to end the slaughter.

Born in Denison, Tex., he grew up in near-poverty in Abilene, his mother a pacifist who wept when her boy was appointed to West Point. Perhaps that is why he was a warrior who hated what he called "this damnable thing of war," and as a President, he wielded power sparingly.

He was also a politician who told a news conference: "I think in the general derogatory sense you can say . . . that I do not like politics."

As a soldier he commanded the greatest military machine in the history of mankind and led it to victory over the most infamous enemy in memory.

A measure of this man was his popularity with the troops. Traditionally generals are fair game for the men in the ranks, but not General Ike. One of the reasons may have been his "enlisted man response" to the ingrained "chicken" of Army life.

For example, at the end of the war soldiers on leave flocked to Berchtesgaden, Hitler's Bavarian retreat. Only one elevator was available to take visitors to the top of the mountain fortress. The alternative was a long, winding climb up a path. The elevator bore a sign: "For Field Grade Officers Only." When Gen. Eisenhower saw it, he yanked the sign off and scaled it down the hillside. After that, field officers stood in line with privates to ride the elevator.

As President, he gave America no ringing slogans and made no glowing promises, but he was elected by majorities matched previously only by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The same warmth that existed between Gen. Eisenhower and his troops carried over to civilian life. "I like Ike" was more fact than slogan, and his appeal was so magnetic that the Democrats sought him as a candidate before he identified himself as a Republican.

As he rode in an open car through Long Island—as in other parts of the nation—tens of thousands turned out to see the tanned, fit, hero, and to smile back at his famous grin.

Under the Eisenhower Administration the Korean War was brought to an end, the hydrogen bomb was developed and America entered the space age.

It was President Eisenhower who appointed Earl Warren Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and later sent federal troops to enforce the court's order to integrate the schools in Little Rock, Ark. He sent Marines into Lebanon at that country's request, but he avoided massive involvement in French Indo-China when Dien Bien Phu fell.

The cocktail party psychologists talked glibly of the "father image" when he was in the White House. And there may have been some truth in the trite phrases because he came at a time when America yearned for the comfort of a fatherly leader.

Although he was of the military, his outlook was never narrowly militaristic. The generals and admirals enjoyed no special influence over policy or budget decisions while he was President.

His military leadership made him aware of the parallel interests of the makers of arms, and military careerists. When he left the Presidency, he warned the nation to beware of an alliance between these parallel forces, and to guard against the danger of inertia in the defense establishment.

History may not rank him as our most brilliant general or our most extraordinary President, but history occasionally does not measure the quality of integrity or nobility in a man.

He was as popular when he left office as when he entered it, and there is little doubt he could have won a third term had he not been barred by the Constitution from running again.

The affection the nation felt for Ike did not diminish in the years afterward. He was always the elder statesman of the nation more than of his party.

His typically American optimism was deeply rooted in his firm faith in the strength of America. In his last public address—via television to the 1968 Republican convention in Miami—he said: "Let us first remind ourselves of the greatness of this nation and of its people. Let's not waste time this year searching out someone to blame, even though some seem more disposed to concede rather than to stand firmly for America."

A gentle man and a patriot has left us.

AMERICAN LEGION 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Congress and the American people the excellent and provocative speech made at Savannah, Ga., on Saturday, March 22, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the American Legion by my good friend and colleague from the First District of Georgia, the Honorable G. ELLIOTT HAGAN.

This speech, I feel, typifies all of our sentiments about this great civic-minded organization, whose very existence and cause is looked on with pride and appreciation for the wonderful service done on behalf of every American.

Congressman HAGAN's remarks, which follow, merit attention by young and old,

and his personal observations and possible solutions during these troubled times are indeed worthy of consideration:

REMARKS BY HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN AT AMERICAN LEGION 50TH ANNIVERSARY, MARCH 22, 1969, SAVANNAH, GA.

It is a real privilege and honor to be here with you this evening.

I had the pleasure last week of attending several of the functions in Washington in connection with the 50th Anniversary celebration of the American Legion, including the annual "Quail & Grits" dinner. Now, in spite of what my good friend Frank Kelly may have told you, I only had three helpings. . . .

I also had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Efrem Zimbalist, Jr., who does such an excellent job in the ABC–TV series, "The FBI." He was honored for the work he has done for the American Legion, both as an actor and as a Legionnaire.

From the moment of that now-historic gathering of men of the AEF in Paris in March of 1919, from which the American Legion was born, there began an almost overnight change in the course of American history. . . .

Born of the chance remark of a convalescing soldier to his commanding officer, the idea to form an organization for mutual assistance of veteran to veteran, later instilled in millions of Americans a sense of obligation to community, state and nation.

Never before in the history of man, had such an organization of war veterans banded together for such noble purposes, as those set forth in the Preamble to the American Legion Constitution.

Only once before in the history of our nation, at the time of the drafting of the Declaration of Independence, had men of such keen insight into human nature, such a grasp of the future course of history, and with such a feeling for their fellowman, come together for a common purpose.

The First World War brought them together: Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Thomas Miller, Eric Fisher Wood, Bennett Champ Clark, Hamilton Fish and the other great men who were truly the first in modern American history to "sacrifice their all" to preserve the peace and freedom of the Western World.

Seldom in the course of history, has one organization so influenced the shape of human events—and the world may never again heir to deeds such as those of the Legion during the past half-century.

Now we are celebrating the 50th Birthday of the founding of the American Legion.

It is a milestone which recalls vivid memories of service and self-sacrifice to the one-million, seven-hundred thousand remaining World War 1 veterans, and is an observance of some magnitude for all American Legionnaires, most of whom will never again be privleged to take part in so historic an event.

Spanning the period of September 1968, to November 1969, the Legion's 50th Birthday observance brings to mind the robust days of the organization's infancy, when the passing of the word, "The Legion's in town" brought a new sense of patriotic pride and comradeship to young and old alike.

From its inception, the American Legion has been known for its spirit; for its sense of fairness to all men; for its ability to accomplish whatever job that needs done—and do it properly and efficiently.

That the Legion has been and remains both vibrant and stable is attested to by its many accomplishments down thru the years: the establishment of a Veterans Administration; aid to the sick and handicapped (whether veteran-connected or not); programs for the protection and well-being of the nation's children; advanced education and training for America's war veterans, under the Legion-sponsored and supported *GI Bill of Rights*.

After twenty-five years, the GI Bill has gained rightful recognition as one of the most forward-looking pieces of educational legislation ever enacted.

These are but a few of the services rendered the American public by the American Legion in its fifty proud years of history.

Add to these the Legion's role as "watchdog" of our nation's security; its many programs which seek to instill in all Americans a spirit of 100% Americanism, thru a love and respect for country, and its many character-building services for our youth, and you begin to get a feeling of the strength from which flows the American Legion force for good.

For the past fifty years, the American Legion has made its influence felt on the American scene as a force for good; a force for the betterment of not only the veteran population, but for every man, woman and child.

We have a proud heritage and one which must be preserved by continuing and expanding upon the good works on which the reputation of the American Legion is based.

If we fail to accomplish the tasks which the Legion must undertake in the years ahead, we will, by our own omission, have failed those far-sighted men who founded the organization.

We who comprise the American Legion today must dedicate ourselves to a far-reaching program of assistance in the search for real solutions to the problems of our society.

We must draw the initial blueprint which future generations of American Legionnaires can follow in striving to attain a better society for posterity.

One of the most serious problems facing our country today is the breakdown of law and order. And one of the most glaring examples is the campus disorders at many of our colleges. We have been blaming the students for these disgraceful incidents, which, if left unchecked, could completely destroy our system of higher education. But apparently some of the teachers have been more responsible than we thought.

Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, president of San Francisco State College, revealed recently that some of the radical teachers at the college have been intimidating some of the students, threatening them with retribution if they did not participate in demonstrations on campus.

I certainly cannot speak for all parents, but I for one do not pay out several thousand dollars a year for my two sons in college to major in revolution and anarchy!

Have you ever wondered why our colleges and universities in this state are not plagued with disorders and riots?

In my opinion, we don't have these problems because our young people feel a sense of participation in our political processes . . . because the State Legislature had the foresight over twenty years ago to pass laws allowing our young people to register at age 17 and vote at age 18.

And I don't mind telling you that as a young member of the Georgia legislature, Elliott Hagan supported and voted for that legislation. . . . I'm proud of it, proud of the fact that my beloved Georgia is one of only two states with such laws.

As a Legionnaire, I want to throw out a challenge to this gathering tonight . . . since Georgia led the way in giving the vote to eighteen-year-olds, I think it would be appropriate and fitting for the American Legion in the First District to lead the way in getting the American Legion, as a national organization, behind the effort to give the vote to all 18-year-olds in this country.

And I can't think of a better time and place to start the ball rolling, than at the Legion's national convention here in Savannah in August.

I predict that if the time ever comes when all Americans can vote at eighteen, we will see a younger generation that is far less susceptible to negative leadership from groups like the Students For A Democratic Society . . . because no one can really feel they are taking part in our political processes, unless they can go to the polls and indicate their choice in an election.

Look at it this way; if the President can draft a young man and send him off to be maimed or even killed, shouldn't that same young man be able to vote for or against that President?

During its first half-century of existence, the American Legion has maintained a young, vibrant outlook on the major problems with which our nation has been confronted. The Legion has played a major role in helping solve many of those problems.

Of its past accomplishments, the Legion is justifiably proud. This pride is not of a boastful nature; rather, it is born of a record of offering a helping hand to those in need of assistance.

In this year of 1969, as the American Legion ends its first half-century of service to God and Country, we find ourselves at a crossroad.

Will the organization move forward into another fifty years in which it can be of invaluable service to the whole of American society—or will it lean heavily on past accomplishments?????

This is a crucial issue faced by the American Legion on its 50th Birthday.

The answer rests with the "blue cap" Legionnaires of every walk of life, who man the Legion's more than 16,000 posts, which are the backbone of the National Organization.

Are these two million, six-hundred thousand Legionnaires willing, literally, to roll up their sleeves and come to grips with the down-to-earth problems of our nation at the community level?

I firmly believe that the American Legion can make its presence felt across this nation, by tackling the problems facing Americans at the local level; education, civil disobedience and the attendant breakdown of law and order; the "Permissive" atmosphere which is threatening to destroy our nation's youth.

All are areas in which the American Legion, thru its individual members at all levels can become involved in the coming months and years.

It is time for the American Legion to assume even more civic responsibility.

We must let ourselves become more involved in projects for community and, from this involvement, we will have exhibited the concern of the American Legion for the need for orderly social improvement, through helping solve some of the nation's more pressing community problems.

The Legion's awareness of the need to continue to provide effective service to God and country is evident in the move which led to the naming of a "Task Force for the Future," a seven-member group charged with the responsibility for studying the existing programs of the Legion and establishing guidelines for the years ahead.

A review of our programs in the light of modern-day social, economic and political problems, with projections into the future based on past experience and present knowledge, should provide us with a blueprint for tomorrow, a star by which to chart our course to new heights of service.

The American Legion prides itself in never having failed America when the chips were down.

The American Legion takes the occasion of this golden anniversary observance to pledge anew to our countrymen that as long as the need for our services exists, we stand ready to serve.

MARTIN LUTHER KING

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, Senator Robert Kennedy stepped off a plane in Indianapolis, Ind., and was told the tragic news that the Reverend Martin Luther King had been shot and killed. On the anniversary of that tragic death, it is well to remember the extemporaneous words Senator Kennedy spoke:

> Aeschylus wrote: "In our sleep, pain that cannot forget falls drop by drop upon the heart and in our own despair, against our will, comes wisdom through the awful grace of God."
>
> What we need in the United States . . . is love and wisdom and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our own country, whether they be white or they be black.
>
> Let us dedicate ourselves to what the Greeks wrote so many years ago: to tame the savageness of man and make gentle the life of the world. Let us dedicate ourselves to that, and say a prayer for our country and for our people.

Just 2 months from that date, Senator Robert Kennedy himself was to be struck down by an assassin. Within two months, the nation was to lose two great and heroic men of vision.

Both had sought peace.

Both had rejected violence.

Both sought to overcome injustice and enslaving poverty.

Both sought to overcome bigotry and prejudice.

Both sought to overcome the vestiges of hatred in our society.

Both of these men had very much in common. Both shared a dream.

Martin Luther King, standing on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in 1963, gave expression to his dream when he said:

> I say to you today, my friends, even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal."

Robert Kennedy spoke also of his dream repeatedly when he said:

> Some men see things as they are and ask why. I dream things that never were and ask why not.

On this occasion, the first anniversary of the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, it is for us to rededicate ourselves to his dream, to the dream of one America. To the dream of peace. No greater monument can be erected in his memory than that which we must all erect daily, as we toil to build the society which he advocated, and for which he gave his life. It is well that we pause today, remembering our great loss, but being ever more mindful that we and our society have been made better because men like Dr. Martin Luther King and Senator Robert F. Kennedy have walked this path before us.

The ancient Greek Euripides wrote, and it can be said of both of these great men:

> When good men die their goodness does not perish but lives though they are gone.

REMARKS OF PHILIP HANDLER, PRESIDENT-ELECT, NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, MARCH 3, 1969, WESTINGHOUSE TALENT SEARCH AWARD DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, just recently a 17-year-old from Dallas, Lane Palmer Hughston, was awarded the first prize in Westinghouse's annual science talent search.

All of us in Texas are extremely proud of Mr. Hughston and congratulate him for his achievements.

I should also like to point to a remarkably fine commentary which was made on this same occasion by Dr. Philip Handler, chairman of the National Science Board and president-elect of the National Academy of Sciences. I invite the attention of all Members to Dr. Handler's remarks which follow:

> It is both a happy privilege and a rather awesome experience to be here this evening to participate in honoring this extraordinarily talented assemblage of young scientists. Awesome because of the recognition by my generation that yours is so much better prepared than were we to embark upon careers in science, and awesome also because of the magnitude of the challenges which confront you. Although you are surrounded by your admiring elders, my words are largely intended for your ears. They may listen, and I shall direct to them an occasional aside, but my message is for your ears.
>
> Among your fellows, you are fortunate, indeed. For most of you, the path of life is clear. You have been invited to enjoy a career dedicated to expanding the frontiers of knowledge or harnessing that knowledge for the betterment of mankind. But it is abundantly evident that you shall do so in a turbulent setting wherein many of your colleagues seek new goals, new directions and new values for our society. Despite the ever increasing pace of science and the expanded opportunities for what Norbert Wiener called "the human use of human beings," many of your colleagues have foresworn the high adventure of science and share with some of their elders misgivings concerning the benefits to be derived from the public support of science. There is a growing disenchantment which has led to disturbing losses of contact, separating science from the general social consciousness, a separation, which, in some instances, has become outright alienation.
>
> This point of view was forcefully thrust upon me in a recent letter from a reader of an account in the *New York Times* of my vision of how biological science might serve our country. Let me quote:
>
> "So, you are promising a biological revolution? Big deal. What have all the scientific revolutions accomplished? See Biafra . . . See the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia . . . See malnutrition across America . . . See our ghettos . . . See the ravages upon the mind by organized religion . . . See the Middle East hangings . . . See the vulgarity of American doctors and dentists . . . See the humanistic illiteracy of our teachers . . . See the narrow-mindedness of our scientists . . . See the naïveté of our philosophers . . . See Vietnam. . . ."
>
> His despair is a measure of the frustration engendered by the fact that we have been unable, as a Nation, to bring our knowledge, wealth and manpower to bear on those very social problems we most wish to solve, problems arising out of the condition of perhaps one-fifth of our citizenry. Yet, I submit that our current awareness of these long-standing problems reflects not the failure of science and technology but, rather, their wholesale success. The revolution of rising expectations stems directly from widespread recognition of the benefits which the scientific revolution has brought to the more fortunate four-fifths of our society.
>
> This state of affairs is all the more ironic in that the greatest contribution to human affairs which science has made in the last several centuries is the new "Enlightenment," the belief that the world and its creatures can be understood, that evident problems have less evident causes which can be identified and analyzed, and that intelligent diligence can then find solutions—in short, that, by understanding, man can hope to control and improve both himself and his environment. In the corrosive atmosphere of our day, that faith is threatened. It is well that the scientist should be reminded occasionally of his tendency toward intellectual arrogance; but the case for the use of rationality in human affairs must also have its hearing lest we lose much that is precious in our heritage and endanger our national future. Accordingly, it is particularly important that a network of trust between scientists and non-scientists be nourished, else our national frustrations may lead some falsely to conclude that new scientific knowledge cannot help us to understand and to control our affairs.
>
> Many young people seem to be telling us that we are self-deluded in the meaningless world. My contemporaries, in turn, have been impelled to ponder on the purpose and meaning of human life—as we had not done in decades. Similarly, you who are rapt in the joys of your initial encounters with science are not free to turn your backs upon either our humanistic traditions or our social problems. If truly you are to appreciate and enjoy science, you must see it in proper perspective as John Tyndall did a century ago:
>
> "The world embraces not only a Newton but a Shakespeare—not only a Boyle but a Raphael—not only a Kant but a Beethoven—not only a Darwin but a Carlyle. Not in each of these, but in all, is human nature whole. They are not opposed but supplementary—not mutally exclusive but reconcilable."
>
> On our campus, two weeks ago, an exasperated body of police used tear gas to disperse a crowd of our students gathered about a building held by an armed band of their black fellows. You will admit that it is difficult to remain disciplined when healthy youngsters call you "pig" and hurl obscenities and brickbats. This unhappy incident will remain a painful memory in the annals of our University. But it was not as illuminating as the performance, one week later, on campus, of "Man of a Mancha." I winced at the cheers our students gave to that deathless line "Facts are the enemy of truth" which seemed to encapsulate their search for a moral truth outside the catechisms of the traditional disciplines. I understood what they meant, and so do you. Even more easily understandable was the starry-eyed reception accorded the song called "The Quest." "to dream the impossible dream, to reach the unreachable star . . . ."
>
> For a few poignant moments these students joined in a glorious expression of their own

longing to joust with that which is ugly in a world they had not made.

Those of us who give our lives to study of the cosmos, the origins of life, the nature of matter or that of man, or the creation of those myriad devices which enrich and simplify everyday life or permit man to reach for the stars, must not turn our backs on an entire generation of youth whose ideals represent the best that mankind has yet produced, who reject the crass and the venal and seek for a better world. You young scientists, whose lives are already more sharply focussed than those of your contemporaries, can help. It is true, as Machiavelli noted, that "there is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct or more uncertain in its success, than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things, because the innovation has for enemies all who have done well under the old conditions and lukewarm defenders in those who may do well under the new," but if desirable goals and specific programs are to be formulated and brought to fruition, you must remind your colleagues of Whitehead's aphorism,

"The art of progress is to preserve order amid change and to assure change amid order."

I bid you reject the illegitimate use of force but to join your idealistic contemporaries in persuasion as, tomorrow, they attempt to order our national priorities so as to improve the condition of our fellow men. But when, in self righteousness and moral indignation they are tempted to take the law unto themselves, explain to them that, whereas they may judge themselves by their motives, the world must judge by their actions and react accordingly. In a confused world, anger comes easily—but it obscures the vision, even the idealistic visions of the most rational of men. As the clouds darkened in our Nation in the middle of the last century, James Russell Lowell said,

"Once to every man and Nation comes the moment to decide, in the strife of truth with falsehood, for the good or evil side."

Our Nation passed through that crisis but presently is confronting one which may prove to be greater still. For the moment, it may have the appearance of blacks against whites, of youth against their elders, even of haves versus have-nots. And there is no dearth of discussion of these matters in the communications media. For some thoughtful participants and observers, however, underlying the more obvious issues is a renewed concern with such ancient questions as Why am I here? Is there purpose to human life? What value should be placed on an individual human life? I would not venture, this evening, to attempt answers—but soon you must. However, you engage in this national colloquy, let me call to your attention a passage from The Art of Judgment by Geoffrey Vickers:

"We have all some responsibility for action, some area, however small, in which each of us and he alone can play the part of agent. There is a second field, wider and not congruent with the first, in which each of us can contribute to the making of policy. There is a third, wider still, in which each of us has power to give or withhold assent to the policy decisions of others. There is a fourth, yet wider, in which the only responsibility of each of us is the neglected but important responsibility of giving or withholding the trust which supports or inhibits our fellows in the exercise of their inalienable responsibilities, as their trust or distrust supports or inhibits us. There is a fifth field, the creative function which shapes the work thus and not otherwise whether the work be a building or an institution, a nation's history or a human life. Here lies the possibility for the vision that is manifest, for good or ill, whenever a 'state of art' is imposed on a 'state of nature' . . . the authentic signature of the human mind."

Let us turn to science itself. The very fact that the corpus of scientific knowledge has been doubling with the passage of each decade indicates that our ignorance exceeds our understanding. Each of you has given evidence that he is well qualified to take his part in that most exciting of all adventures, the exploration of man and nature. By now you will have discovered that, for the scientist, the means—the doing of science—is at least as important as the end—the ultimate research findings. Someone once said,

"Success is a journey, not a destination."

And so it is in science. You may wonder that the world at large should choose to support the efforts of the scientist if that be the case. Indeed, it has been necessary to defend the conduct of fundamental research for some centuries. In a history of the Royal Society published in 1722, Thomas Sprat wrote

"It is strange that we are not able to inculcate into the minds of many men the necessity of that distinction of my Lord Bacon's, that there ought to be Experiments of Light as well as of Fruit. It is their usual word, 'What solid good will come from thence?' They are indeed to be commended for being so severe exactors of goodness. And it were to be wished that they would not only exercise this vigor about Experiments, but on their own lives and actions; that they would still question with themselves, in all that they do; what solid good will come from thence? But they are to know, that in so large, and so various an art as this of Experiments, there are many degrees of usefulness: some may serve for real and plain benefit, without much to light; some for teaching without apparent profit; some for light now and for use hereafter; some only for ornament and curiosity. If they will persist in condemning all experiments except those which bring with them immediate gain and a present harvest, they may as well cavil at the providence of God that he has not made all the seasons of the year to be times of mowing, reaping and vintage."

And so it continues to this time. Fortunately, the nature of the dialogue between scientists and non-scientists has now altered. The qualitative case for science as the wellspring for the generation of new wealth—if we may define wealth as the cumulative capacity to improve the condition of man—is no longer challenged but there will ever remain the necessity rationally to establish the magnitude of the scientific endeavor. It is a feckless exercise to set limits on that enterprise. Historically it has been autocatalytic. Just as science raises more questions than it answers, the technology which it breeds so enriches society as to generate yet more opportunity for the conduct of science. There are those who will insist that, today, science is not "relevant." How, they ask, can you be concerned with pulsars, quasars or the mechanism of enzyme action when there are Americans starving in Mississippi and Harlem and dying in Vietnam? My answer is simple—science and social actions are not mutually exclusive alternatives. It is precisely because of our science-bred technology and the wealth it has provided that we cannot, in good conscience, live with dire poverty, hunger and malnutrition, not only in the United States but on this planet. This society, wealthy beyond the imaginings of man in any previous age can easily afford both the righting of ancient wrongs and the loftiest exercises of the human imagination. And we must undertake both.

Let it not be thought that I am suggesting that each of you pursue a career in fundamental research rather than in more applied aspects of the scientific endeavor. Science is no less scientific or rewarding for being practical, and it may well be as applied scientists that some of you can make your greatest contributions to the well being of your fellow men. I say this particularly in my capacity as a concerned biologist. Let me explain.

Application of our understanding of the physical world may already have been pushed to the limit of how it may affect our lives. I do not mean that there is not yet much to do both in exploration of the physical world and in application of that knowledge. Far from it. But already a large fraction of this planet's population enjoys communication at the speed of light—an increase in communication velocity by a factor of 10^8 since the days of the Pony Express. Jet planes carry us at the speed of sound—only about one hundred times faster than that Pony Express—and a few of us can expect to achieve orbiting or escape velocity. The computational speed of the modern computer has reached the point where it is almost limited by the speed of light, although our society has much to learn with regard to the utilization of this resource. With the advent of nuclear power, particularly when fast breeder reactors are perfected and become commonplace, human endeavors will not again be limited by power requirements. When our society is willing to pay the price, we can restore our physical environment almost to that which our ancestors found on this continent and that abundant power supply will permit us to recycle water so that, in effect, it should be available in infinite supply. The arts of chemistry already provide us with a cornucopia of enormous variety.

Although the ultimate structure of matter remains elusive, understanding of the physical universe is astonishingly orderly. And of all the physical technologies unavailable but in prospect, only management of our weather seems likely to alter our lives in the future as dramatically as the events of the recent past. In contrast, most of the primary problems of biology are unsolved as are those aspects of biology most applicable to human affairs. The greatest threat to the future of the human race is man's own procreation. Hunger, pollution, crime, despoliation of the natural beauty of the planet, irreversible extermination of countless species of plants and animals, over-large, dirty, over-crowded cities with their paradoxical loneliness, continual erosion of limited natural resources, and the seething unrest which creates the political instability that leads to international conflict and war all derive from the unbridled growth of human populations.

Informed demographers tell us that, regardless of any efforts which can be foreseen, the population of this planet will somewhat more than double by century's end. If, even then, when babies born this year will be at the height of their breeding potential, we are to stabilize the earth's population, it is imperative that we understand much more than we do today about human reproductive physiology, that we explore a wide variety of new approaches to contraception, that we find entirely innocuous reversible procedures such that the penalty for carelessness will be failure to conceive a child rather than the reverse, as is now the case. Contributing to that solution would be a boon to humanity of the highest order.

Second only to the problem of overpopulation is the problem of feeding the world. If we are to survive the crisis of the next two or three decades and avoid massive famine, it is imperative that the advanced nations of the world join the underdeveloped nations in markedly expanding and upgrading their agricultural productivity. No event in recent history has been quite as heartening as the successful cultivation, on a substantial scale, of new strains of wheat and rice which have very significantly increased per acre productivity of these crops in India, Southeast Asia, the Philippines and Mexico. All of us are indebted to those at the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations who made this development possible. But the task has been barely begun and we have much to do to assure that food production will keep pace with human reproduction. What could be more noble a calling than joining this crusade?

Meanwhile, the life sciences offer you their time-honored questions, albeit in increasingly sophisticated forms. The functioning of enzymes, the regulation of metabolism, the operation of the genetic apparatus, the chemical bases for the process of differentiation in multi-cellular organisms, the phenomena which integrate animal life, etc., offer research vistas almost without end. Ecology is but an infant science. And man must still contend with almost every one of his most ancient enemies, the diseases to which he is subject. As our country, rightfully, struggles to provide to all citizens the quality of medical care now enjoyed by the privileged few who find their way to university medical centers, be not content with what even the best of medicine has to offer. Tissue transplantation is a great technical triumph, but it cannot be the wave of the future. We must learn to treat and prevent the degenerative disorders which lead to the seeming necessity for such *tours de force*. Patently, we cannot look forward to half-million heart transplants per year. Nor are we very far ahead in the fights against cancer, nephritis, rheumatic disease, or a hundred other disorders. Even the triumphs of the antibiotics become hollow victories as resistant strains of microorganisms emerge. In each instance, we lack fundamental understanding and we have insufficiently equipped our physicians for their taks. Those are not windmills; they are genuine dragons, well worthy of your lance. But because we have, here, been concerned with the ethics and morals of our society, there are some special problems in biology to which I would direct your attention, problems which are highly challenging scientifically and which pose complex and challenging ethical questions as well.

In consequence of the increasing success of those medical procedures which Joshua Lederberg has called "euphenics"—successful treatment of individuals with otherwise incapacitating or lethal genetically transmitted disorders—for the first time man has knowingly taken a hand in his own evolution, but unfortunately, by reducing the historical power of natural selection. By assuring survival of the unfit, we are accelerating the spread, through our population of otherwise deleterious genes.

In the long term, this is not in the best interest of humanity, but how shall this process be regulated? Moreover, there are more than five hundred known genetically transmitted diseases which cannot yet be clinically managed in equivalent fashion. Hopefully, one day, many will be. Each of us is the carrier of perhaps a dozen defective genes such that, were any one of them expressed in homozygotic offspring, the result would be a serious disorder. Already, perhaps six percent of all babies are patently defective for hereditary reasons. As euphenics becomes more successful, and more and more genetically defective youngsters survive to have offspring of their own, this percentage will increase substantially. How should our society cope with this problem, the deterioration of our gene pool by virtue of our own scientific success coupled to our traditional ethics?

Much has been written in the lay press concerning the prospects for genetic engineering. It is too soon to assess those prospects and it would be foolhardy to indicate that success is just around the corner. But perhaps one day it will be: if so, it will raise ethical problems of the highest order. It is not too soon to go about finding the answers.

One day we shall consider deliberately guiding our own evolution in a positive manner. This could be done by deliberate breeding, an unlikely notion in our society, or by artificial insemination using sperm from distinguished men as Muller suggested. More dramatic is a possibility familiar to some of you. It rests on the fact that one can remove the cell nucleus of a fertilized frog egg and replace it with the nucleus from a somatic cell of another frog. The egg then develops into a perfect carbon copy of the frog which donated the second nucleus. If we can do that with frogs, one day we will do it with chickens or cattle and mankind's food supply will be the richer.

But if we learn to do it with cattle, surely it will be but a matter of time before we can do it in man. And then what? For my part, I rather hope that this line of experimentation will fail. I dread to think of the power of that tool in the hands of an authoritarian government. Mankind, as I know it, is just not ready! For now it seems more appropriate to go on sampling the rich variety of the human gene pool.

Only now does it seem possible that, in the reasonably near future, we shall begin to make progress in understanding the human brain and relate its attributes to its cellular and molecular architecture, thereby achieving insight into the underlying bases for our behavior. In all likelihood, this will generate the capacity to design chemical or physical processes to alter behavior in defined ways. But then what? The imagination boggles at the possible consequences. Indeed, they are already posed for us by the dilemma of how to live with marijuana. We already have tranquilizers and mood elevators. Soon, surely, we will have the "soma" described by Aldous Huxley. Accordingly, I call your attention to a letter I received recently from an articulate biochemist. He says,

"It seems to me that we are rapidly closing in on a crucial problem of scientific ethics. Do we have the right to make scientific discoveries, just any kind of discovery simply becaues we see the problem and its possibilities? Can we in good conscience and truly enlightened self-interest do that without most carefully pondering the political power structure, the maturity of the social organization and the historical age of society? Do we have the right to put an unparalleled new stress on the fiber of the social structure just as a byproduct of our curiosity and intellectual appetite? Perhaps society will not be able, all the time, to learn to deal adaptively and constructively with advances in knowledge particularly in knowledge about man's own nature, at any rate certainly not at the present rapid pace, since even for a highly educated person 'cultural evolution' is proceeding with a dizzying acceleration. We scientists have a historic responsibility and this will not disappear as by magic by denying it or forgetting about it. Would it not be a sad irony of cosmic fate if man's large and richly convoluted brain, his pride and glory, would prove in the long run just as much an evolutionary disadvantage as the huge bulk and brutish force of a dinosaur? Who knows? Maybe there is an optimum brain size to assure maximum adaptability to the environment and so a maximum life span for the entire *species* rather than the individual. I do hope that we are not too clever for what is truly good for us!"

The writer has raised cogent and legitimate questions—but I reject his conclusion. Our society can no more tolerate censorship in the laboratory than in communications media. A free society must be free to think, to seek, to explore. What it finds may not always be comfortable, but we have already survived earlier shocks. The Copernican Revolution placed us on a small planet revolving about an obscure star somewhere in a great cosmos. Darwinian evolution related us to all the brute creatures, plant and animal, about us and traces us back to the inanimate. Having yesterday lost our special place in the universe, surely, tomorrow, we can tolerate understanding ourselves. To be sure, we have not always managed our science and technology with foresight and wisdom. Tomorrow we must, if we are to survive and surrender a decent world to succeeding generations. Meanwhile, let no one frame constraints delimiting which segments of the endless frontiers of science may be explored. No one has the requisite wisdom and foresight to make such decisions and to do so most assuredly would imperil the national future. But it is clear that it behooves our Nation to sharpen the sluggish mechanisms by which we rest political and social decisions on technical information. Tomorrow is none too soon.

And so, I bid you welcome to the scientific fraternity. Hopefully, some of you will join us in the biological quest. Whichever path you choose, within or without science, I commend to you Emerson's admonition that "Nothing is sacred but the integrity of your own mind."

MEMORIAL FLAG HONORING SAILOR LOST AT SEA DURING WORLD WAR II

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Veterans' Administration began making available a memorial flag to eligible survivors of servicemen whose remains were lost at sea after May 27, 1941. Apparently not eligible for one of these flags is one of my constituents—a delightful grandmother who now lives in Chapel Hill, N.C., where at least one of her grandchildren is a college student. Upon hearing of the Veterans' Administration flag offer, she wrote me as follows:

> I lived in Rutherfordton, N.C. during World War II and my own son was on a PT boat in the Navy with duty in the Pacific area. The messenger boy for our local Western Union office was Charles Prince, the oldest child of a widow with other children. I think he had to drop out of school to help support the family. He was homely, awkward, shy, and courageous. I worked in the district health department, and when he delivered messages to us I chatted with him and we became friends, exchanging greetings as we passed each day.
>
> I could see nothing but hard work and limited rewards ahead for Charles, and friendly interset was the only thing I could give him, since I was supporting three children of my own and financially poor myself. As I recall, he was proud of his involvement in the war; I suppose it offered a certain escape, perhaps a glamor he had never dreamed of experiencing; and then there was the pay and the family allotment. He came to see me to tell me about his new life, and the first Christmas of his term of service he sent me a Christmas card from the Aircraft Carrier Lexington, signing it "Charles Prince, the Western Union Boy," as if I might not remember him!
>
> Well, he was lost when the carrier went down in the Battle of the Coral Sea on May 8, 1942. Now I do not know about Charles' survivors since I have not been in his home area for many years. Nor do I know if they will learn of the offer of the memorial flag or if they will apply for the flag. But I should like very much to acquire Charles' flag and display it on national holidays.

I am today asking that a flag be flown over the Nation's Capitol and sent to this lady And I would like for her to know that it comes from many Members of Congress who are deeply moved by an unusual request from one who loves her country and the memory of those who have served to keep it free.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I think little more need be said about the nature and character of Dwight David Eisenhower than that when death came to him, it found his stature undiminished in the eyes of the American people—his countrymen who had lived intimately with him for more than a quarter of a century.

In those years, the people of this Nation had known General Eisenhower in many roles, as a man of war and a man of peace, as an educator, an author, as a President, and as an elder statesman. And it is nothing less than a tremendous monument to him that the man Eisenhower, known to millions as "Ike," commanded from his fellow Americans the same respect, the same confidence, the same affection he had known at the peak of his public years.

Americans began recognizing the name Eisenhower in 1942 after he was named to direct the free world's first major offensive action of World War II—the invasion and ultimate liberation of North Africa. It was a task demanding more than the talents of a soldier, for the human problems posed by the occupation of North Africa were very nearly as difficult as the military problems. The task required tact, patience, the ability to induce men of divergent backgrounds, views, and personalities to work together for a common end.

It was General Eisenhower's exercise of that tact and patience that marked him as unlike any other military figure in World War II—and these were the qualities that put him in command of the invasion of Western Europe, the most ambitious and elaborate operation in human history. These also were the qualities that accounted for his recall to active duty to command the military arm of the North American Treaty Organization—and, ultimately, these were the qualities that made him President of the United States.

Dwight Eisenhower went into that office with the same purpose with which he approached his military assignments in North Africa and Western Europe. He aspired to unite. He sensed, accurately, I think, that the American people had been wearied by the exertions of two wars abroad and by a long series of conflicts at home, that they wanted more than anything else to pause, to catch their breath, to see how far they had come and how far they had yet to go.

Some will say that the 8 Eisenhower years were years of inaction, and in a sense they were. But they were the kind of years the American people had earned. And this is not to say that the Eisenhower years were empty, for they were not. They were years of repeated American testing on the world scene—years that found the United States reacting, in Lebanon, in the Formosa Straits, in Berlin, in Southeast Asia, with charity, courage and force.

They were the years that produced the concept of massive retaliation, the most effective instrument yet devised for arresting the forward thrust of international communism. They were years that formulated, more clearly than ever before or since, the great moral issues at stake in the confrontation between communism and freedom.

At home, they were the years that saw the launching of the Interstate Highway System—the most elaborate highway-building program in world history. A program without which much of the Nation would be close to transportation paralysis today.

Dwight Eisenhower was moved by the passionate dedication to peace that only one who has known war can have. To build understanding, to avert conflict, to relieve tensions, he was invariably willing to go the second mile—in the spirit that took him to Geneva and Paris, that brought Nikita Khrushchev to America.

The legacy that Dwight David Eisenhower leaves to the people to whose service he devoted his entire adult career is a legacy of devotion to duty, a legacy of leaving America a happier and sounder and spiritually stronger land. As his deeds are weighed in the scales of patriotism and integrity and humanity and duty, Americans know that he was a giant.

And because he was the personification of that which is good in America and in Americans, there is in the Nation this week a universal mourning, universal sharing, in which I humbly join, in the grief of Dwight Eisenhower's wife and of the entire Eisenhower family.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Dwight David Eisenhower established a truly remarkable record of accomplishments in his career as soldier and statesman. Editorials published last weekend in the Springfield, Mass., Union, the Springfield Daily News, and the Springfield Republican outline the former President's historic contributions to his Nation and to the world. With permission, Mr. Speaker, I include these editorials in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican]

A GREAT AMERICAN

Dwight D. Eisenhower was a great American; he was also a typical American, in the best sense of the term, perhaps to a larger degree than any other President of modern times.

In family background, boyhood and youth, in his West Point days and the first part of his Army career, Eisenhower generally resembled thousands of other Americans following the same sort of pathway in life.

Although he had the exceptional qualities of leadership which enabled him to take effective command of the most successful military operation in history, Eisenhower was typically the average American.

In his favorite pastimes, in his buoyant spirit, his progressive outlook, his forthright warmth and unfailing optimism, Ike personally summarized all the qualities that Americans most admire and appreciate.

And while Eisenhower was a professional soldier, he was also a man of peace. Like countless millions of Americans who have served in the armed forces, he fully knew the terrible horrors, agonies and human wastes of war; like millions of servicemen, he was dedicated to the proposition that the nation should never be an aggressor, should fight only for the defense of freedom, and should do all it could to advance the cause of worldwide peace.

Historians may well catalogue Ike for his genuine contributions toward peace as well as for his military achievements.

He typified the best of the American spirit.

He aimed for the general improvement of all people. He sought an elusive peace for the brotherhood of man . . . and he warmed the world with a grin.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Mar. 29, 1969]

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Dwight D. Eisenhower, as soldier and statesman and public figure revered in the hearts of his countrymen, came closer to the hallowed tradition of George Washington than any man in American history.

Certainly no other personality made famous by the glory of military victory went so deeply into the civil-political life of the nation and emerged with his popularity still so wide, his record of service still so clean that his critics could do no more than scratch the surface and admit in the process that they "liked Ike," too.

The images of Gen. Eisenhower, President Eisenhower, and Citizen Eisenhower (author of books, once president of Columbia, raiser of cattle) blend into a composite whole, even considering that without the first, the others might well never have evolved. It is, then, all the more remarkable that the career was marked with distinction in one or another degree in each of its undertakings.

Of the military phase, there are no doubts. Gen. Eisenhower was at the top of the small pyramid of Allied strategists in World War II to whom the free world owes its salvation. His genius for military organization was the touchstone of the successful drive for the Continent and the eventual engulfment of the German war machine. Later, as NATO commander, he headed the Allied force designed not to win wars but to keep peace in Western Europe when one old ally, Russia, threatened to disturb it. The Western world's debt to him thus was increased.

Of the political phase, criticism is easier to find. Gen. Eisenhower brought his Crusade in Europe home to a virtually assured presidential victory when he agreed to run in 1952. His innate distaste for politics seemed to grow in the next eight years. His popularity grew, too, enhanced if anything by his conquest of illnesses, but so did political opposition charging in vague and loose terms a standstill at home and ineffectiveness of policy abroad. It is a modern paradox that the Democrats gained against his party in Congress while Mr. Eisenhower himself could have won an easy third term had he chosen to seek it and had the Constitution permitted.

Part of the explanation lies in the sense of national security engendered by the man Eisenhower in the White House. But the fact also is that under the Eisenhower policies the free world was holding its own securely against Communist designs. A common complaint was that it was not doing more than that. But the cycle of events was not then conducive to breakthroughs. Whether the Eisenhower years might have been crowned by significant progress toward world peace had the summit conference of 1960 not been aborted by the U2 incident is still a matter of conjecture.

History will assess the Eisenhower presidential years in better perspective than is possible now. But one great domestic failure the general admitted himself occurred in his efforts to stem the trend toward federal centralization and to return more power and responsibility to the states. The political system, and the political figures who ran it, were the insurmountable obstacle.

Gen. Eisenhower's unswerving personal integrity was the hallmark of his presidency and doubtless what sustained his immense personal popularity, while that of many around him declined. It encompassed the impeccable patriotism of a great soldier, a sense of duty transcending personal welfare, physical and otherwise, a massive belief in the greatness of the United States, an aversion to war but the will to wage it if need be, and a dedication to moderation.

The respect and love of many millions, in the United States and in the far corners of the earth, were held by this immensely human man, who could wield the awesome power of D-Day force and also exude warmth and friendliness through the famous smile that the world had hoped to continue seeing often for many more years.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Mar. 29, 1969]

GENERAL EISENHOWER

When they assess the life of Dwight David Eisenhower, historians will quite likely differentiate between Eisenhower the military man, Eisenhower the educator, and Eisenhower the President.

While these three distinct phases in his life must be considered separately by those who will assign him a place in history, there is no such compulsion for categorization on the part of people the world over who knew him best as Ike and made him one of the most popular figures in the 20th Century.

Perhaps as no other man in this century, with the exception of Winston Churchill, Dwight Eisenhower was the right man for the moment. During World War II, he gave Americans the military hero they so desperately needed. As commander of the Allied Expeditionary Forces in Europe, he was the tactician who shaped D-Day strategy and turned military togetherness into the formula for victory.

It can be said that Eisenhower—the general—was the most successful of the three Dwight Eisenhowers and that nothing he did afterwards — even as President — quite matched his World War II exploits.

His life—from the day he entered West Point in 1911—was oriented to military standards and thinking. However, it has become axiomatic in American life that military men do not translate well to other careers.

As president of Columbia University for several years after World War II, Gen. Eisenhower was not particularly at home as an educator.

As President of the United States for eight years, the military man never quite seemed comfortable in the new world of politics. The politics which is an integral part of the presidency was obviously foreign to his forthright nature and his military background.

Yet, the Eisenhower record during his eight years as President had no direct relation to his personal popularity. Almost certainly, had he been eligible and chosen to run for a third or fourth term, he would have been reelected by large margins.

Whether he was president of a large university or President of the United States, he was still Gen. Eisenhower—the foremost military hero of our times.

In this sense, it is unfair to measure Dwight Eisenhower's place in history in anything but a military context. This was his special cup of tea. As Winston Churchill—despite his many other accomplishments—is primarily remembered as the World War II inspirational leader of Great Britain, so Dwight Eisenhower is inexorably cast as the great American general of this war.

He served his country well—with a full measure of devotion. He was a firm believer in—and a champion of—the ideals of democracy. He was—most of all—a champion for the people and the country he loved so much.

Whatever his eventual place in history, Ike will always be remembered with esteem and affection by countless millions.

THE PRESIDIO STOCKADE

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on March 12 I expressed my concern on the floor of the House over the severity of the charges against those 27 prisoners at the Presidio who were peacefully protesting against the conditions under which they were living.

In the course of my remarks, I noted that I was writing to Secretary Stanley Resor of the Department of the Army and asking for a detailed reply to the allegation that the charge of mutiny was unfounded.

The following is the response I have received from Robert E. Jordan III, General Counsel of the Department of the Army:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1969.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: Secretary Resor has asked me to reply to your request for information concerning the recent court-martial trials arising out of an incident which occurred last October at the Presidio of San Francisco.

I am enclosing a fact sheet which sets forth in detail the background and current status of the Presidio cases, including the facts concerning the recommendations made by Captain Millard and the other two officers who conducted pre-trial investigations of the cases pursuant to Article 32 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. As noted in the fact sheet, each of the three officers among whom the twenty-seven investigations were divided made a different recommendation as to the nature of the offense with which participants in the demonstration should be charged.

Under the military justice system, these recommendations are advisory only; ultimate responsibility for determining the nature of charges to be brought rests with the authority convening the court-martial, in this case Lieutenant General Stanley Larsen, Commanding General, Sixth U.S. Army. The commanding General's decision to refer the cases for trial by general court-martial on a charge of mutiny was thus fully within his authority. It was made only after such action was recommended by intermediate commanders and the Sixth U.S. Army Staff Judge Advocate, who had carefully reviewed the entire matter, including the reports and recommendations of the investigating officers.

The legal correctness of this decision is tested not only in each trial in which the law officer and the court must be satisfied that the evidence supports the offense of mutiny, but also at each stage of the review process which I describe below.

In order to place the current status of the Presidio cases in proper perspective, it may be helpful to describe the process of post-trial review available to a convicted military defendant. In the military justice system the sentence adjudged by a court-martial, as well as the validity of a finding of guilt, is subject to review at several levels. In this regard, the military justice system differs from the practice of civilian appellate courts, which ordinarily have only the power to affirm or reverse a conviction.

The convictions and sentences in the Presidio cases will be reviewed in the first instance by the Commanding General, Sixth U.S. Army, who convened the court-martial. He will act only after receiving the advice of his Staff Judge Advocate. In addition to the power to approve or disapprove the court's actions in toto, he has the power to reduce the finding of guilty of mutiny to a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense, such as willful disobedience of a lawful order, which carries a maximum punishment of five years' confinement. He also has the power, even if he approves the findings of guilt, to reduce the sentence or the finding in his discretion, even if he finds no error of law in the court proceedings.

If the sentence approved by the Commanding General, Sixth U.S. Army, includes either a punitive discharge or confinement of one year or more, the cases will then be referred to a Board of Review consisting of three military judges. The Board also has the power to reduce the sentence or the crime for which the accused was convicted.

Following action by the Board of Review, an accused may petition the Court of Military Appeals, composed of three civilian judges, for discretionary review limited to questions of law. The Court of Military Appeals has the power to approve or set aside the findings and sentences or to approve a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense which carries a lesser penalty.

Finally, apart from the process of appellate review I have just described, the Secretary of the Army and certain of his delegees have the authority, under Article 74 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, to remit or suspend all or part of the unexecuted portion of any sentence as a matter of clemency.

In the only Presidio case to reach the review stage thus far, The Judge Advocate General, after the convening authority had reduced the court imposed sentence from 15 to 7 years, exercised clemency power delegated to him by the Secretary of the Army to further reduce the sentence to two years. This case, as well as all of the other cases in which sentence has been or may be imposed, will continue through the normal military appellate process in which sentence may be decreased, but cannot be increased.

All of the Presidio cases are being followed closely by the Secretary of the Army. If, after the various stages of appellate review are completed, the Secretary concludes that any of the sentences are unjust or excessive in relation to the offense committed, he is prepared to exercise his power of clemency under Article 74 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. I hope that the action already taken in the initial case to reach review, together with the information in this letter, will allay your concern that unjust or excessive sentences may be imposed.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. JORDAN III,
General Counsel.

FACT SHEET, MARCH 19, 1969

Subject: Stockade, Presidio of San Francisco, California.

1. Prior to 11 October 1968, several inquiries were received concerning alleged brutality, poor sanitary conditions, and insufficient medical treatment for prisoners at the Presidio. These inquiries were based on newspaper accounts in March and July 1968.

Each inquiry was investigated and, in each instance, the allegations were not substantiated.

2. Contrary to the allegation that the Presidio stockade has a 40 prisoner capacity, the fenced in portion of the stockade can accommodate 103 men. A weekly check of the prisoner population for the same day of the week from 15 August 1968 to 31 January 1969 revealed that the population of the fenced in portion of the stockade exceeded 103 men on 6 occasions; these were: 5 September 1968—105; 12 September 1968—110; 19 September 1968—108; 10 October 1968—111; 16 January 1969—112; 30 January 1969—111. As the population fluctuates, the Sixth US Army Commanding General takes continuous action to reduce the population to a maximum of 103 men any time this population is exceeded. The Provost Marshal General has had an investigation made into the conditions at the Post Stockade, Presidio of San Francisco. This investigation revealed that the segregation cells were smaller than the measurements required by DOD directives, i.e., 5' wide x 6'3" long x 8' high as opposed to 6' wide x 8' long x 8' high. A waiver had been granted to allow the Presidio stockade to use these cells as an exception to the standards established. The investigation further revealed that in all other requirements, the stockade meets the required standards set forth by the Department of Defense. The Inspector General, Sixth United States Army has also investigated the conditions at the stockade. This report is being forwarded to Department of the Army for review.

3. On 16 September 1968, Private Richard Bunch was confined at the Presidio, having been charged with absence without leave (three specifications), and breaking restriction (two specifications). At the time of his death, he was awaiting trial by court-martial. On 11 October, Bunch was a member of a 4-man prisoner detail, working under armed guard at Letterman General Hospital. At 0955, he attempted to escape from the detail and was shot by the armed guard from a distance of approximately 60 feet. He was transported to the hospital, but he expired en route and was pronounced dead at 1007 hours.

4. The weapon used by the guard was a 12 gauge shotgun, loaded with number 4 shot (commonly called bird shot). The guard involved related that, prior to the shooting, Bunch had asked what would happen if he ran and he asked the guard to shoot him if he ran. The guard believed Bunch was joking as prisoners will often harass guards in this manner. Another prisoner in the work detail heard this conversation and has also stated that he believed Bunch was joking. Shortly thereafter, Bunch began running. After calling halt two times the guard fired to disable Bunch. Two witnesses heard the guard shout to Bunch, one other witness did not hear the warning. The three prisoners state that they did not hear the guard give warning. Test firings of the weapon after the shooting revealed that it consistently fired higher than the aiming point.

5. At 0730, 14 October 1968, a work formation was assembled at the stockade. When the first prisoner's name was called, 28 Prisoners left the formation, walked away, sat down, and began singing and chanting such things as "We Want Freedom, We Want Hallinan." One prisoner left this demonstration when he heard an officer state that the action constituted mutiny. Despite repeated orders by an officer to desist, the demonstrators continued. Twenty-five military policemen entered the stockade and escorted the demonstrators from the scene. No force was required other than physically carrying some prisoners off.

6. The prisoner who voluntarily left the scene of this activity later related that he was asked to join this demonstration and told that a group of civilian lawyers were backing the sit down. He was told that the sit down was a demand to end work under armed guards, for better food and conditions, and for less harassment. He was also told it was in connection with a GI and veterans peace movement. One other demonstrator stated he joined because he thought all prisoners were involved. He states he wanted to leave the sit down but was forced to remain by the other prisoners. He stated the sit down was in protest of the shooting of Private Bunch and he had been promised free legal counsel.

7. As a result of this demonstration, 27 of the prisoners have been charged with mutiny in violation of Article 94 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The charges were referred to three separate pretrial investigations in compliance with Article 32 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. These investigations were conducted by disinterested officers. The accused were all represented by civilian counsel of their own choosing or assigned military counsel or both.

8. One of the three investigating officers, Captain Richard N. Millard, recommended reduction of the charges against the prisoners to willful disobedience and a trial by special court-martial. He recommended further that four of the six prisoners subject to his investigation be administratively discharged on the basis of psychiatric examination. A second investigating officer, Captain James Bradner, Jr., recommended that the prisoners be tried by general court-martial on the lesser charge of willful disobedience. The third investigating officer, Captain Howard McElhattan, recommended trial by general court-martial on the charge of mutiny. Under Army procedure, the reports of the investigating officers are routinely made available to military and civilian attorneys for the accused.

9. The investigating officers' recommendations were carefully reviewed and considered by the Sixth US. Army Staff Judge Advocate who, based upon the complete investigation, the allied papers and the intermediate commanders' recommendations that the cases be referred to trial by general court-martial on the offense of mutiny, recommended to the Commanding General that the accused be tried for mutiny by general court-martial.

10. On 10 January 1969, Lieutenant General Stanley Larsen, the Commanding General, Sixth United States Army referred the charge of mutiny in the cases of Privates Osczpinski, Zaino, Reidel, Yost, Colip, and Dodd to a joint trial by general court-martial.

11. On 20 January 1969, the Commanding General referred the charge of mutiny in the cases of Specialist Four Blake, Privates Duncan, Gentile, Marino, Pulley, Rowland, Sood, Trafethan, and Wright to a joint trial by general court-martial. This trial was tentatively set to begin on 6 February 1969. Also on 20 January, the Commanding General referred the charge of mutiny in the case of Privates Murphy, Rupert, Sales, Schiro, Seales, Shaw, Stevens, Wilkins, Hayes, and Swanson to a joint trial by general court-martial. This trial was tentatively set to begin on 17 February 1969.

12. Privates Mather and Pawloski, also charged with mutiny on 14 October 1968, escaped from confinement in the stockade on 24 December 1968 and have not been apprehended. No further action in their cases has been taken.

13. Although Article 94 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice provides a person who is found guilty of mutiny may be punished by death, the Commanding General has referred each case for trial as non-capital, and it will not be possible for the courts-martial to adjudge a death penalty if the accused are found guilty. The general courts-martial may acquit the defendants of the charge of mutiny and may instead find them guilty of the lesser included offenses of willful disobedience (maximum punishment 5 years) or failure to obey lawful order (maximum punishment 6 months) or disorderly conduct (maximum punishment 4 months).

14. On 28 January 1969, the joint trial by general court-martial in the cases of Osczpinski, Zaino, Reidel, Yost, Colip and Dodd commenced at the Presidio of San Francisco.

15. On 28 January 1969, the law officer granted a motion for a continuance until 17 February 1969 in the case of Private John Colip. On 30 January the law officer granted motions for continuances until 5 March 1969 in the cases of Privates Ricky Dodd, Edward Yost and Larry Zaino. Privates Louis Osczpinski and Lawrence Reidel did not move for continuance, and presentation of evidence in their court-martial began on 3 February 1969. On 5 February, after presentation by defense counsel of psychiatric testimony, the law officer suspended the trial for a complete psychiatric evaluation of the two defendants. This evaluation has been completed and the conclusion of the physicians is that the two accused were mentally responsible for their acts and suffered no significant diminished mental capacity to obey orders. On 14 February the court-martial of Privates Osczpinski and Reidel resumed and both of the accused were found guilty of mutiny in violation of Article 94 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. On 15 February the court, after hearing mitigation and extenuation presented by defense counsel, Captain Brennan Sullivan and Captain Joseph Choate, sentenced Private Osczpinski to a dishonorable discharge, confinement at hard labor for 16 years, and total forfeitures and sentenced Private Reidel to a dishonorable discharge, confinement at hard labor for 14 years, and total forfeitures.

16. On 6 February 1969 the joint trial of Specialist Four Blake and Privates Duncan, Gentile, Marino, Pulley, Rowland, Sood, Trafethan and Wright commenced at the Presidio of San Francisco. The law officer granted continuances until 18 March for all defendants except Private Sood. In addition, on 6 February, the trial of Privates Murphy, Rupert, Sales, Schiro, Seales, Shaw, Stevens and Wilkins, originally tentatively scheduled for 17 February, was rescheduled for 18 March. On 13 February Private Sood was found guilty of mutiny in violation of Article 94 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The court, after hearing mitigation and extenuation presented by his defense counsel, Mr. Paul H. Hallvonik and Captain Emmitt F. Yeary, sentenced Private Sood to a dishonorable discharge, confinement at hard labor for 15 years, and total forfeitures.

17. In December, Mr. Terence Hallinan, who is the civilian attorney for 17 of the soldiers accused of mutiny, filed a petition in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California at San Francisco. Mr. Hallinan requested a writ of habeas corpus and mandamus and injunctive relief be granted, alleging confinement in the stockade of the Presidio of San Francisco is cruel and unusual punishment in violation of Amendment VIII of the United States Constitution. The District Court dismissed the petition on the basis that the petitioners had not exhausted administrative remedies available to them. Petitioners have recently renewed their habeas corpus action in the District Court, contending that administrative remedies have now been exhausted.

18. On 9 December, Mr. Hallinan, again representing the same 17 of the accused, filed a petition with the United States Court of Military Appeals, requesting that Court grant a writ of habeas corpus and mandamus and other injunctive relief. The petition alleged that the confinement of his clients in the stockade of the Presidio of San Francisco is cruel and unusual punishment in violation of Amendment VIII of the United States Constitution. On 27 December 1968, by memorandum opinion, the court denied the petition.

19. Lieutenant General Stanley Larsen, Commanding General, Sixth United States Army, has declined to meet with Bishop Meyers, Bishop Golden and others. The basis for this decision was the fact that General Larsen is a party litigant in habeas corpus actions filed in the United States District Court, and he regards it as inappropriate to discuss the matters in issue in the pending litigation. General Larsen has indicated that the Staff Judge Advocate, Sixth U.S. Army, would be available to meet with the Bishops and to discuss any matters of concern to them.

20. The records of trial are now being prepared on those cases that have been completed. When the records are completed they will be reviewed by the Staff Judge Advocate at Sixth United States Army. He will concern himself not only with whether there were any errors during the trial which might adversely affect the legality of the findings or sentence, but also with whether the sentence is suited to the circumstances of the case. The Staff Judge Advocate must then prepare written reviews of the cases and must specifically recommend to the convening authority—the Commanding General, Sixth United States Army—the actions which are appropriate in the cases. These written reviews, with the records of trial, will be considered by the convening authority, who may approve only so much of the findings of guilty as he determines to be legally and factually correct, and only so much of the sentences as he finds to be lawful, appropriate and just.

21. Should the convening authority approve the findings of guilty and a sentence including a punitive discharge from the Army or confinement at hard labor for one year or more, the records of trial will be reviewed by a board of review in the Office of The Judge Advocate General. This board—composed of three military judges—will weigh the evidence and determine whether the findings and sentences are legally correct and, if so, whether the sentences are appropriate. The board may set aside the findings and sentences or may reduce the sentences, but it cannot increase the severity of the punishment. Upon appellants' request, qualified appellate defense counsel will be assigned to represent them free of charge before the board of review. They may also retain civilian counsel at their own expense.

22. Should the board of review affirm the convictions, the appellants may petition the Court of Military Appeals—composed of three civilian judges—for a review of matters of law. They are also entitled to be represented before that court by legally qualified military counsel at no cost or by civilian counsel obtained at their own expense.

23. If after completion of appellate review a sentence, including some term of confinement should be affirmed in their cases, the individuals would still be entitled to participate in the Army's clemency program. Through this program deserving individuals are given opportunity to apply for restoration to full duty in the Army, and to demonstrate through excellent conduct and performance of duty that they are fully rehabilitated and deserving of being allowed to complete their military service honorably. If restoration to duty is not appropriate, when eligible, they may apply for parole.

24. On 18 February the trial in the case of Private John Colip was terminated when the law officer ruled that publicity concerning the Stockade mutiny and concerning previous defendants made it impossible for Private Colip to receive a fair and impartial trial in the San Francisco area. The law officer further ruled that the court members assembled to try Private Colip were disqualified as a group to sit in judgment in this case due to the influence of the publicity upon them. A mistrial was declared. Sixth Army made the necessary arrangements to change the location of the trial. The trial of Private Colip resumed at Fort Irwin, California, on 24 February, using the same law officer but with a different panel of court members. Counsel for Private Colip concurred in these arrangements.

25. On 28 February, at Fort Irwin, California, Private John Colip was convicted of mutiny in violation of Article 94, Uniform Code of Military Justice. The court, after hearing mitigation and extenuation, sentenced Private Colip to a dishonorable discharge, confinement at hard labor for 4 years, and total forfeitures.

26. On 5 March the trial of Privates Zaino, Murphy, Swanson, Hayes, Yost, and Dodd began at the Presidio of San Francisco. All court members were drawn from officers stationed at Fort Lewis. On 11 March the law officer ordered a psychiatric examination for Private Zaino and continued his case until a later date. On 14 March a motion for change of venue was granted. The trial will resume for the remaining five men at Fort Lewis on 19 March.

27. On 18 March The Judge Advocate General of the Army upon review of the complete trial record in the case of Private Nesery D. Sood, one of 27 soldiers charged with mutiny at the Presidio of San Francisco, reduced the sentence to 2 years confinement at hard labor. The Commanding General, Sixth United States Army had previously reduced the sentence from 15 years to 7 years. The Judge Advocate General exercised clemency in this case through powers delegated to him by the Secretary of the Army under Title 10, United States Code, Section 874. Private Sood's case is the first of 27 mutiny cases to reach the appellate stage under established military appellate procedures. No change was made in that portion of his sentence which included dishonorable discharge and total forfeiture of pay.

EULOGY TO FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved as I join my distinguished colleagues who eulogize today the life and accomplishments of one of America's greatest soldiers and statesmen, Dwight David Eisenhower. Words alone cannot adequately delineate the omnibus contributions that this great man gave freely to his countrymen as well as to all the people who have inhabited this planet.

Few men in the annals of our civilizations have experienced so fully and deserved so entirely the public trust and confidence placed in Dwight David Eisenhower as General of the Armies, Supreme Allied Commander, and 34th President of the United States. He has held more positions of public responsibility than most all of the great men of history who have preceded him. But perhaps more significantly, former President Eisenhower was revered both at home and abroad not only for the offices that he held but for the man that he was.

Gentle of spirit, pillar of strength, and dedicated to liberty and justice for all, General Eisenhower was the epitome of the American dream. Born under the Texas stars, and raised in the open Kansas plains, his was a vision of a world without walls to contain the creeping ambitions of petty tyrants. He dreamed rather of a world where individuals could build their own future, free from the domination of others. It is to his great credit that the worst tyrant of the 20th century was smashed by the allied forces in 1945.

Of General Eisenhower, I believe, it may truly be said that although good men must die, death cannot kill their names.

AVAILABILITY OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on March 4 I introduced a bill to increase the availability of postsecondary education to all segments of the population by establishing a program of Federal grants to the States for the purpose of strengthening, expanding, and improving comprehensive community college. Even though community colleges represent about one half of the institutions of higher education and enroll about one third of the students pursuing a higher education, the Federal Government has failed to encourage these colleges to expand their efforts. Recently, I received a letter from Mr. Allen T. Bonnell, president of the Philadelphia Community College and chairman of the Council of Pennsylvania Community College Presidents, indorsing my bill.

The thoughts Mr. Bonnell expressed in his letter about the need for the Federal Government to recognize its responsibility and provide a fair share of higher education assistance to community colleges are applicable not only to the situation in Pennsylvania but all across the country. Therefore, I would like to insert Mr. Bonnell's letter in the Record:

Community College of Philadelphia,
Philadelphia, Pa., March 24, 1969.

Hon. Joshua Eilberg,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Eilberg: As Chairman of the Council of Pennsylvania Community College Presidents, and in their behalf, I should like to express appreciation for your sponsorship of the recently introduced Bill H.R. 7957.

While the Community Colleges of Pennsylvania are comparative newcomers in the field of educational service, they have already made their impact felt. The Enabling Legislation for the Colleges was passed late in 1963. The first college became operative in 1964 and the second and third in 1965. There are now 12 in operation, one of which has three campuses.

Three of the Pennsylvania Community Colleges have already earned full accreditation by the Middle States Association and the remainder are on their way toward such accreditation. In 1968/69 they enrolled, during the regular terms. over 24,000 full-time and part-time students. All of the Colleges offer evening and summer programs. Enrollments of over 32,000 are projected for 1969/70 and over 40,000 for 1970/71. In the next six years it is anticipated that the opening of additional Community Colleges will bring the total number in operation to at least 25.

Because of their financial and geographic availability and the types of counseling and educational programs offered the Community Colleges have been particularly effective in reaching and opening opportunities for disadvantaged students. Their capacity to fulfill their mission will depend on the availability of adequate funds to develop plant, facilities, faculty and programs. The bill you have introduced is long overdue.

Members of the Council of Pennsylvania Community College Presidents has asked that I pledge, on their behalf, full support of Bill H.R. 7975. We urge that hearings be conducted at the earliest possible date and would welcome an opportunity to present testimony, collectively and individually.

With all good wishes,

Cordially,

ALLEN T. BONNELL,
Chairman, Council of Pennsylvania Community College Presidents.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, the most popular President of several decades and probably of the history of our country, Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower, has passed away. But his popularity, great as it was with his infectious smile and his down to earth, "one of us" manner, is relatively unimportant when compared with his many and tremendous contributions to our Nation, and to the world.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of beginning my congressional service at the same time that "Ike" took over as our 34th President. I was honored to be a part of the Republican 83d Congress which helped to smooth the rocky path that faces new Chief Executives and which is especially obstacle-ridden for one who assumes the country's leadership without previous experience in the Congress.

With our help, his success came easier, but with or without it, "Ike" was bound to succeed since this was the pattern of his life. He never learned the definition of failure.

President Eisenhower had a deep and abiding faith in the Supreme Being and did not hesitate to admit his reliance upon Him. As every mortal man does, he made mistakes but these were not prompted by selfishness or greed. He did what he truly believed was in the best interests of the country he had served so many years. He led the Nation to victory in war and thereby brought to a close a bloody and shameful period of history. As Commander in Chief, he was called upon again to stop a conflict that had taken thousands of lives. His policies and his philosophy then allowed peace to continue through the rest of his two terms in office.

General "Ike" has now gone to his just reward. He sleeps in peace and no tears need be shed for him, but rather for his beloved wife Mamie and his family, who will personally miss him so intensely, and for the rest of the Nation who will now be deprived of his great wisdom, his sound advice and counsel.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my most sincere sympathy to his wife and family and know that the good Lord, whom Ike served so devotedly, will give them added strength of acceptance and joy that their loved one is now free of troubles and hardships and is resting in the House of the Lord.

THE DEATH OF GENERAL EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, the Nation, and the world have eulogized Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower. Words are never fully adequate, but they can be truly noble if men live by them. The general has passed on, but he has left us a legacy. Part of that legacy is the words he uttered and by which he lived. I believe they would be an inspiration to us and to our children also. Therefore, I have introduced a resolution to have the Librarian of Congress, in cooperation with the Committee on House Administration, publish the speeches of General Eisenhower.

Our grief and that of the world is unbounded. But it is lit by the hope and faith that the man, Dwight Eisenhower, inspired in the hearts and minds of men everywhere.

We pray for the comfort of those who were near to him at this time of bereavement.

He was, as has been said of our first President, George Washington, first in the hearts of his countrymen and in the hearts of the world—both in peace and war.

Who can forget this man who led the forces of freedom onto the shores of Nazi "fortress Europe" on June 6, 1944, with the knowledge that he alone bore the awesome responsibility for their success or failure? Who can forget this man who twice laid down the gauntlet of arms to take on the burdens of peace—first as the president of Columbia University and then of the United States? Who can forget the man who laid down a challenge in his farewell address as inspiring and far reaching as that laid down by President Washington in his farewell?

The man is gone—but not his spirit. We could do no better in these days of eternal crisis and challenge than to live by the ideals he stated in his second inaugural address:

> May we pursue the right without self-righteousness.
>
> May we know unity without conformity.
>
> May we grow in strength without pride in self.
>
> May we, in our dealings with all peoples of the earth, ever speak truth and serve justice.
>
> And so shall America—in the sight of all men of good will—prove true to the honorable purposes that bind and rule us as a people in all this time of trial through which we pass.

My district, the great State of Wyoming, is still very much a frontier place, similar to that where General Eisenhower was reared to hold great love for his God, country, and family. Therefore, I think it especially appropriate to have published in the RECORD the following editorial by Mr. James Flinchum, editor of the Wyoming State Tribune:

WHY THEY LIKED IKE

In the hindsight of death, every man looms larger than life, miraculously purged of his sins and with his best qualities magnified. Only in rare instances do the eulogies match in the departed the individual in real life. In Dwight D. Eisenhower, there is such an exception.

The General was such a plain and simple man that his almost universal acceptance amounting to near reverence, seems an incongruity. His innate simplicity was manifested in many forms, many of them minor.

One of the highest ranking American military officials of all time, exceeded only by John J. Pershing, General Eisenhower studiously avoided trappings of rank. One small symbol of this was that he refused to wear gilt braid—"scrambled eggs"—on his visored military cap.

He constantly viewed himself as merely one of the millions of Americans who contributed to the winning of World War II; and when the Korean War began, he dismissed himself in one brief, typical statement when someone suggested that he consider himself for active duty in that conflict: Korea needed young soldiers, said Eisenhower, not old generals.

Eisenhower, both as a soldier and as President, was so markedly unostentatious that it was like a silence in a great hall filled with people.

One of his great and enduring qualities was that he was so simple, so approachable and so possessed of the ability to not only put a stranger immediately at ease, but to establish a communion with that stranger at once.

This mystical quality that is not always obvious except on direct contact, somehow emanated from Eisenhower by indirect contact; so that he projected this image of simplicity and of simpatico from a great distance.

So in a sense he was everyman, and identified himself with all persons of all ages and backgrounds, races and creeds; and it is very possible that every person saw himself in the General, the person he thought he might be, or desperately desired to be.

UN Secretary-General U Thant said yesterday that Eisenhower was a good man, and he projected this image of goodness. Walter Cronkite, employing what now has become a cliche, said he was a man for all seasons. Someone else said to many women he provided a father symbol; to many old men the sort of son they would like to have had; to others the kind of leader they most admired.

It is best to remember that all of these things were true, simply because people believed them to be so; and that perhaps is the essence of truth.

Ultimately, the historians shall one day—possibly commencing a half century from now—get around to accurately assessing Eisenhower's place in history and the origin of his exceptional personal influence on others.

For our own part, we can point to the birth of the General, Oct. 14, 1890, and the place and circumstances—a humble home in what remained Frontier America.

Although Eisenhower's father was a railroad worker in Denison, Tex., when the future President and commander-in-chief of the Allied Forces in World War II was born, the time and place still were a part of the Frontier which did not end by agreement of most historians until a few years later.

Dwight David Eisenhower thus was a product of westering, pioneer America, an essentially simple and unsophisticated place with a value system founded on what may be termed loosely the Puritan Ethic.

While basic virtues were not always observed by any means, and there was much lawless and wrongdoing in Frontier America, nevertheless the basic virtues represented chiefly by God, Home and Country were idealized.

People did not put on airs or assume exaggerated notions of their individual importance in the Denisons and Abilenes of the 1890's, and early 1900's, the milieu in which Eisenhower grew up.

If they were notable individuals it was because they were persons like Theodore Roosevelt, himself an easterner but who adopted the ways of the Frontier, an epitome of the direct actionist and the vigorous, simple and wholesome life. Or so it seemed.

Soldiering was an honorable and much-admired profession for that age was still influenced not only by a developing America that had been in vogue since Jefferson's time, and not only by the Spanish-American War just past, but also by the Civil War. Veterans of both these conflicts including such notables as Fighting Joe Wheeler, still lived in that era. Americans universally remained almost without exception, a proud people.

Essentially, then, General Eisenhower was a product of that age, a very different one from that in which we presently live in vast confusion, an era in which values were clear and definite and there was no obscuring of purpose either nationally, famililally or individually.

Dwight David Eisenhower related that era to the present; he was a remarkable product of its virtues.

Despite what has happened in America in the past two decades and particularly in the past one, this nation was built on an ethical system best represented in such an individual as General Eisenhower.

For the older people he hearkened back to all that was good in an earlier America and what they liked to see in the present.

For the younger, he represented a solidity that the present fails of achieving.

In every respect, then, the General symbolized an ideal that seldom makes its appearance so notably in single individuals; he belonged to an America of heroic tradition, vested in such individuals as Washington, Lincoln, Lee and Pershing; startlingly similar to these persons in many respects, and yet different too in his own way.

Eisenhower was his own man, and yet he also was every man because he symbolized of the best in this country. That is what made him so unique—the very commonness of him, yet uncommon, too.

He was every American, or what every American really wants to be.

And so the man and the country that found such common identity, and a sharing of admiration and love, have come to the physical parting, as it must to all living persons.

It is a sad moment as on all such occasions whether the latter be one involving the great or the small; and as in these latter too, it may be said of General Eisenhower that the greater recognition must be that although death is sorrowful, the life that preceded it is so much more infinitely greater that the ultimate act is lessened thereby.

America and the world are fortunate to have had among its people such as Dwight David Eisenhower and we who lived during his life, have been particularly favored by his presence.

MILLIONS OF NATION'S STUDENTS STILL HAVE EDUCATION AS MISSION

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, all of us have heard much in the past months from and about the discontented on our college campuses. A great deal of what we have heard has been so unpleasant that we are in danger, I believe, of indicting an entire college generation for the acts of very few. If this is true, we may, in our reaction to the unconscionable acts of a small group fail to hear the legitimate comments of the many. One of the outstanding newspapers in my State, the Burlington Daily Times News recently published an editorial which gives proper distinction to the differences between our college students in general and the few who have received far too much publicity in recent times.

The editorial follows:

MILLIONS OF NATION'S STUDENTS STILL HAVE EDUCATION AS MISSION

On this day, as on all days of a school year, millions of students in higher education across the nation and world failed to make a significant imprint on thoughts of the adult world.

They went to their classrooms, prepared for their professors. They took notes, entered into discussions, listened intently, spent hours in a scientific laboratory, read from their books, wrote their papers, and found themselves constructively accepting these new thoughts and opportunities which had come to them.

They went through the processes of learning, and it was an enlightening experience for them. They were gaining new strength, because they were finding new knowledge.

Back at home, there were parents, brothers and sisters who thought about them on this day. A son, daughter, brother or sister was at college or the university learning and preparing for later life. Yes, there were sacrifices in most of the homes. What may have been a new car had become a payment to the college. What may have been a party had become an extra check for some clothing.

On this day, too, millions of students probably have written a letter home, or received a letter from home. There is a closeness and respect maintained, a love expressed, a pride felt. There is no breakdown as any of them feel it. They don't know much about the "gaps", for they have never felt them. They only know that they love one another, work for one another, respond to opportunity, and accomplish together. Parents work for their children, and the children don't take it for granted.

If many of these students happened to look out the window of a classroom or dormitory, they may have seen some strange sights. Groups assembled. Maybe a soapbox. Possibly a few television cameras around. If they had listened, they may have heard something about protest. They may have heard words like "burn", or "pig", or something similar.

But they didn't listen nor keep looking. They kept going about their business of education and making time count in the days available to him.

They were on the campus to learn, and they were learning many things, not merely from books and their professors. They were learning that in their young lives they could make a choice, and they were placing a priority on the mission that had taken them to the campus in the first place.

They didn't accept all that was a part of the "establishment" without question. We can be proud that they don't, for improvements come from constructive participation in orderly process.

But they had made a decision. They were seeking an education.

And sometimes we may overlook these millions of students who are doing this as we recognize other students who aren't.

They're not in the limelight.

But they're there. They're there every school day.

They're almost our forgotten people in higher education today as we refer to students, colleges, universities and their involvements. They really deserve better than they're getting, for they are the ones who, through their disciplines and placement of values, keep showing us what higher education is all about.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, an era in the history of our country has ended with the passing of a great American, Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower. Born of sturdy pioneer parents, in humble circumstances, by his ability and determination he reached the pinnacle of success and popularity. He possessed an intuitive faculty of assessing the movements and motives of our enemies in combat, which was recognized by our allies. His was a life filled with accomplishments.

I had the privilege and honor of meeting General Eisenhower during the close of World War II and on many occasions thereafter.

Just to be in his company one could recognize his dynamic personality and his superlative aptitude for leadership. His brilliant direction of our Armed Forces in World War II won for him world renown. Not only our country but the entire world stood in proud salute to acclaim this able and remarkable man whose dramatic career will long live in the archives of our country.

General Eisenhower will be remembered and revered by all who have stood for the rights which our forefathers sought and those who have fought and are fighting for peace, freedom and justice.

To his family and especially to his widow who has shared his triumphs and who has stood bravely by him in sadness and sorrow, I extend my deep and profound sympathy.

A SERMON ON THE FREEDOM OF MAN: PART I—AN INTRODUCTION

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, a minister of outstanding courage and foresight, and a constituent of mine, was one of this year's winners of the Valley Forge Freedom Foundation Awards.

He is the Reverend Charles Hubbard, pastor of the First Methodist Church of Wilson, N.C.

His award was based on a series of sermons he delivered on "The Freedom of Man." The award was well founded.

I have read those sermons. They are inspiring and enlightening. More than that, they reveal an outlook on the part of the author that is found far too seldom in many of the pulpits of our churches today.

Feeling that Mr. Hubbard's message should not be confined to just his pastorate and believing that all of us here will be inspired by his thoughts as revealed in his words, Senator ERVIN and I alternately plan to insert in the RECORD his series of sermons. The first follows:

A SERMON ON THE FREEDOM OF MAN—INTRODUCTION

(By the Reverend Charles Hubbard, pastor of the First Methodist Church of Wilson, N.C.)

I will say at the outset that sometimes I preach by compulsion and the subject matter is forced upon me. I will also admit in advance that some of you may say, "Preacher, sometimes you go a little deep and I don't understand you." Before you say it, I want to quote John Erskine, a realistic and progressive thinker. He said, "You have a moral obligation to be as intelligent as you can." Furthermore, I think we had *better* make up our minds about our philosophy of life, our basic belief concerning man—or else it will be planned for us by somebody else. I admit I am preaching for conviction, and I am preaching for action. I hope that from this series, you will do something about it—here in Wilson, in the state, and in the nation.

I am deeply concerned about the freedom of man. Freedom has many enemies today, and through softness or impatience or selfish thinking or lack of thought and will, we can lose this precious inheritance for our lifetime and for generations to come. My concern is based upon the best of classic theology. St. Augustine wrote in *The City of God* that God willed that man, who was endowed with reason and made in His image, should not rule over men, but over cattle. Thomas Aquinas, in his *Summa Theologica* insisted it is a grievous matter for anyone to yield to another what ought to be one's own. He admitted man's social nature requires legal attention to the common good, but that all law should be a ministration and not domination.

Nevertheless, some will accuse me of being reactionary. In one sense, at least, they will be right. I am reacting.

I am a liberal under the classic definition of liberality, which grew from the basic Latin root, "liber", to be free. I do not believe that my love of freedom is compatible with the "new" liberality. But at best, labels are inaccurate and misleading.

I think Christian leaders would do well today to re-examine their faith and honest convictions on the point of *what* they call themselves. One of our modern tragedies is that many well-meaning Christian leaders have allowed their names, their position, and their good social intentions, often unwittingly and naively, to be made an instrument of an extreme position which, if that position prevailed, would betray every basic Christian principle necessary for the salvation of man.

Those who champion the position of the "far cultural left" today think of themselves as liberals and suppose they are leading a great revolution—some magnificent "wave of the future." An unprejudiced study of history will show the exact opposite is true. Socialist and communist propagandists have twisted liberalism from its true meaning into a contemporary symbol of authoritarian government, which is one of the oldest and most reactionary ideas of *all* times. It is as old as slavery is old; and it is no better for the soul of man.

The point is—and I want to make it here—that the vast body of honest and responsible lay Christian conviction is moderate. By no means reactionary, this majority is kindly and tolerant, but it is inarticulate and frustrated. This is so, largely because in official church circles there is a distortion at the point where church or denomination or interdenominational committee makes its statements to the press or to television and radio. The committees and commissions who issue statements on social and political matters are largely dominated by the clergy. Busy laymen find it difficult to attend extended and distant meetings, or to study reports in advance. The average clerical delegate is a gentle person and is often inarticulate before the violent tirades of the modern "liberal." The attending delegate is repeatedly victimized by block voting and parliamentary hocus-pocus. Thus points are forced and radical reports are written, and the impression is made that the "liberal" viewpoint is the official position of the church. The true church, back home, is horrified.

So, in sweeping, self-righteous statements knotty theological and social problems are glibly "solved." It is tragically funny. For these are the same enigmas of human sin that have tortured the best brains of the past and will continue to trouble man in the ages to come.

I am sure that humble Christians sometimes have the same thoughts as the anonymous poet who wrote:

"I don't pretend to know the things
That's hid from most of folks;
Of which came first, the hen or egg,
Or why the eggs have yolks.

"Or who the Lord was speaking to
When He said, "Let's make man."
If woman was an after-thought
Or part of His first plan.

"I don't pretend to know too much,
I'd like to know enough;
When some wise guy comes flashing by,
To simply call his bluff."

Now, the Christian position, of course, is not determined by a vote of any majority, and the glorious thing about an enlightened faith is that we are free to think as we will. The "liberal" Christian claims that freedom for himself; and then often proceeds to denounce other opinion as not Christian or reactionary. I claim freedom for everybody—everybody! I claim freedom of speech for people who are conservative as well as for people who are modernly liberal. I claim the same freedom for myself, and I use it now.

I claim the right to believe in a limited Constitutional government as was organized in the United States of America by one of the greatest groups of geniuses ever to appear upon the scene of history. I do not desire a "big brother government" that forces its control in all my affairs. Does not such a government assume the image of God and the power of God? I believe it does. And I do not believe it has the right to do this. I don't care by what democratic name you call it, I oppose it.

I claim the freedom to recognize and be grateful for the record and progress of all the people in the United States, including our Negro citizens. Today this is a free land in which Negroes were held in abject and deplorable slavery a little more than a hundred years ago. I insist there is much unfinished business for any Christian in America at this point and every person of goodwill knows it.

Nevertheless, we should declare to the entire world the achievements of the Negro in America, a record that is unparalleled in modern times and is vastly superior to that of any other colored people anywhere else in the world.

I thank my God that my nation cares for the old, the poor and the sick, but I claim the freedom to believe in responsibility and in self-reliance as two of the chief means to secure my personal economic security. I also recommend them to you.

I claim the freedom to oppose those who would have the United States to disarm and cease fire unilaterally, and, if necessary, to surrender abjectly to Communist subversion in Viet Nam, in Cambodia, in Laos, or anywhere in the world. My Christian faith is not such a nebulous or disembodied idea that it believes that human dignity and freedom are expendable qualities in this world. Do you think for a minute that they are expendable?

Right here in America I claim the right to protect and defend our most precious national possessions, the dignity and freedom of the individual citizen. I claim the right to search out and oppose by every honorable and legal means all subversive influence in this great nation. Intelligent Americans do not have to resort to "witch-hunting" to recognize a thinly disguised hammer and sickle behind many a "peace march" or black-militant demand. I reject the deliberate effort of many "liberals" today to associate responsible anti-communists with cranks and superpatriots. A God-fearing Christian should be totally opposed to what may well be the most treacherous and dangerous outside enemy—atheistic communism—and any of its parts.

I will not be so ungrateful that I shall not claim the right to believe in and honor in my pulpit the greatness and hope I see in my country today. I will humbly confess our national sins, but I will not apologize for our national achievements before other nations who first scorn us, then look to us for help, and then are largely sustained by our charity. I claim the freedom to point out that many of those nations bear a huge guilt of injustices.

They harbor unspeakable poverty in the midst of a rich elite. They sustain iron-bound caste systems, racial deprivation, and the restriction of human rights and opportunities far beyond anything that has ever existed in the dimmest history of the United States. Why should I be ashamed of the plenty and prosperity that has come to this nation through the genius of the private enterprise system? The current failures of communistic and socialistic economies around the world prompt me to pray that the major business and industry in America shall always be private, competitive and free.

Finally, I claim the freedom to challenge all who hold that the saving message of the gospel has no place to work today except in coercive social reforms. Does Christianity have nothing to say anymore about morality and integrity and honesty and faith and love? Is our total church program to be poverty and job placement and welfarism? Responsible citizenship demands the solving of our social problems of race and poverty and injustice and unemployment and peace, and every Christian has got to be deeply committed. However, I insist that history has shown this can best be done in a climate of political, economic and religious freedom. I say, *freedom!* I realize that the gospel is revolutionary and I want it to be revolutionary; but the revolution has got to come from within man. It has got to revolutionize our hearts and our minds first. I tell you the Kingdom of God is not going to be superimposed on anybody by Federal law! It can't be done that way. We will correct our inequities within the framework of freedom or we will lose our souls while we juggle our material and social structures.

So much more I would say, but this homily is only an introductory statement on freedom. Permit me to emphasize how necessary it is for you and for me and for all free men and women of God to learn the disciplines of freedom and to beware the pitfalls of Utopianism. America must re-learn the lessons of history, and submit itself to the disciplines of human experience. America must, at all costs, maintain free inquiry; and must learn again the virtue of patience. America must humbly be willing to accept unflattering truth; and must subject itself to the spiritual laws of love and growth and faith and understanding.

There are going to be no short-cuts to a better world. We must renew our allegiance to the laws of God; and we must accept the gospel of our Lord. "I will walk at liberty, for I seek Thy precepts," said the Psalmist. I claim that a responsible Christian position holds that the human spirit finds its highest fulfillment in the framework of personal, economic and political freedom.

Man's struggle for freedom has been a long and wearing thing, and we cannot now lightly cast it aside. Throughout history man has been confronted by a never-ending struggle against tyranny, and we are desperately fighting this battle today. However, history clearly witnesses that free societies have invariably proved to be more adaptable, more creative, more fulfilling than any under totalitarian yoke. The ultimate guarantee against authoritarian encroachment is a deep and abiding awareness on the part of every Christian citizen that freedom is not expendable. Freedom has no price!

Respect for the freedom of the individual is the one value which underlies and is an inherent part of all other values. Only under such freedom do other human values acquire any real purpose. Only under this value can other values grow. Without freedom, all other virtues lose their luster; some, in fact, lose all meaning. Try to find the meaning for democracy in Russia or China today! It has no meaning. What value is there in prolonging human life through medical science if that life is to be lived in semi-slavery? What value is there in achieving a high rate of literacy if an individual is not free to read or write what he chooses? What value is there in a high rate of voter participation if there is no choice of candidates? What value is there of advanced scientific inquiry if that inquiry must be channeled to the support of pre-determined political and social position?

Our ancient faith upholds us when we believe that in a complicated society such as ours we must, through our elected representatives, make certain political, social and economic agreements that become respected laws for the common good; and these laws must always protect the greatest freedom for all. A wiser man than I, John Stuart Mill, said this: "The only freedom which deserves the name is that of pursuing our own good in our own way, so long as we do not attempt to deprive others of theirs, or impede their efforts to obtain it." This I believe. This I will live for. I hope and pray you will, too.

A CASE OF SMART STAFFING

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the new administration has made an outstanding choice for Director of the Peace Corps in the selection of Mr. Joseph H. Blatchford. I am delighted that he has agreed to serve in the field of public action after being so highly successful in his private effort, Accion International. His experience and expertise will be extremely valuable in furthering the Peace Corps and its role of service. For others who will be interested I insert the excellent article by John Chamberlain which appeared in the Boston Herald Traveler on March 26:

A Case of Smart Staffing

(By John Chamberlain)

Paradox, with the Nixon administration, is the name of the game. To head the Peace Corps, which is public action, Nixon has picked a "voluntarist," Joseph H. Blatchford, who has perhaps done more for providing the case for the superiority of private action in the foreign aid field than any other man living.

Blatchford, a former touring tennis champion who had been horrified by poverty in Latin America, started something called Accion en Venezuela back in 1961 on a shoestring, with the intention of getting people in the Caracas slums interested in doing something for themselves.

I have written about him from time to time as Accion en Venezuela grew from something working on a $150,000 annual budget, raised chiefly in the United States, to a $1,500,000 budget, most of it coming from local sources in Venezuela itself.

Blatchford, in turning Accion en Venezuela into a larger organization called Accion International with affiliates in Brazil and Peru, has never had the taxpayer behind him; he has had to scrabble for every nickel that his self-help organizations have spent.

So, in running his own "private peace corps," Blatchford has had to apply a strict "cost-benefit analysis" to the business of spurring individuals to organize self-improvement on their own behalf. He has now put himself on the spot, taking over a government venture in which he will be relieved of the necessity of drumming up his own cash.

But if Blatchford is true to every precept which he has followed in his thirty-four years of action-packed life, he will do with the public Peace Corps what he already has done with Accion International.

The choice of Blatchford is an example of brilliant staffing by the Nixon administration. Last Autumn Blatchford was one of the casualties of the Republican election campaign. He had gone back to his home state of California to run for Congress from the Los Angeles harbor district, an area which traditionally goes heavily for Democrats. Nixon's friend, Bob Finch, knows this part of the world well, for he himself had lost elections there.

Blatchford organized his campaign as he had organized the slum barrios in Caracas, Lima, Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo to go to work on community projects. He lost the election by a hair. But by running ahead of Republican Senatorial candidate Max Rafferty and Nixon in his district he established himself as a political comer in addition to being a go-getter in the field of private foreign aid.

As head of the Peace Corps Blatchford starts with tremendous good will in Latin America. Working through slum leaders his Accion en Venezuela organized 400 separate improvement projects last year. In Brazil, Acao Comunitaria built bridges and schools. Ironically, Blatchford will now be competing with his own Accion International for talent.

He is leaving a vital young man named Terry Holcombe, a college football player who was graduated from Yale in 1964, to run the various Accion affiliates in Venezuela, Brazil and Peru. Holcombe has made Blatchford promise to refrain from raiding Accion, which derives its name, incidentally, from the acronym standing for Americans for Community Cooperation in Other Nations. Since Accion under Blatchford has helped train workers for the Peace Corps in the past, Blatchford is in a position to get service from his old organization without raiding its existing personnel.

Accion's own idea has been to use North Americans as sparingly as possible in doing its Latin American work.

If Blatchford remains true to his philosophy, he will try to make the Peace Corps self-liquidating over the long term, using North American volunteers to bring skills to developing nations that will, in time, learn to go it on their own.

It is up to Blatchford to keep his sense of paradox alive. The only justification for the Peace Corps is to end the need for a Peace Corps.

ELECTORAL REFORM

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, shall we repair the old wreck, or buy an entirely new model?

That is the question editorialist Merlo J. Pusey poses regarding reform of the system for electing our President.

Pusey, writing in the Washington Post, likens the current congressional deliberations on alternatives for electoral reform to a motorist who checks over his old wreck of a car and attempts to decide whether he should pay for extensive repairs—and still have a potentially defective vehicle—or buy a new model.

In the case of the electoral system, mechanical changes, such as abolishing the electoral college but retaining the electoral vote system, would be tantamount to repairing the wreck.

Approval of the direct popular election of the President would be the equivalent of buying that brand new model.

In his discussion of proposals for repair, Pusey examines the proportional system, most lately espoused by President Nixon and Attorney General Mitchell.

Under the proportional system, a State's electoral votes would be divided in proportion to the popular vote each candidate received.

Acknowledging that the President and Mr. Mitchel did propose some valid corrective changes in the mechanics of the system, Mr. Pusey concludes:

For with all the "mechanical" changes outlined by the Attorney General, it would retain critical weaknesses.

What are they?

Foremost of these—

Says Pusey—

is the possibility that the so-called proportional system . . . might hand defeat to the candidate winning the highest popular vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is the fatal weakness of the proportional plan and the so-called district plan.

Only the direct popular election of the President would absolutely guarantee that the people's choice would be elected President.

In recent testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, voter research expert Richard M. Scammon said that the purpose of a desirable reform plan "is to make a winner a winner and a loser a loser and not to make a loser a winner."

I agree wholeheartedly.

The direct popular election of the President is the only way to insure that the winner of the popular vote is the winner of the Presidency.

I place the article "Is the Old Wreck Worth Patching Up?" by Merlo J. Pusey, in the RECORD at this point:

IS THE OLD WRECK WORTH PATCHING UP?

(By Merlo J. Pusey)

The dilemma of Congress as it surveys the weaknesses of our electoral system is not dissimilar to that of a motorist as he contemplates the 1958 wreck in his driveway. Shall he have it repaired at substantial cost and disregard the fact that it would still be a risky means of transportation? Or shall he recognize that it is obsolete as well as badly worn and fork out the price for a new model?

Some eminent witnesses before the House Judiciary Committee are contending that only mechanical repairs to the electoral system are essential. The extravagance of ordering a new model might offend the folks back home and cause the whole thing to be rejected. This was essentially the argument of Attorney General Mitchell the other day.

There will be little if any quarrel with the repairs that Mr. Mitchell and President Nixon wish to make. First, they want to do away with individual electors. Last November George Wallace took the country much closer than it wanted to be to the possibility of third-party electors actually selecting the President of the United States. There can be no doubt about it. The dummies who, under the present system, stand between the President and the people must go.

The second repair for which Mr. Mitchell spoke is that the Presidency go to the top man if he receives 40 per cent of the vote—instead of the electoral-vote majority required at present. Third, the Administration plan calls for a run-off in case no candidate receives as much as 40 per cent.

Then there are a number of repairs designed to reduce uncertainties under the present system. If a presidential candidate who had received a clear electoral-vote plurality should die before the votes were counted, the successful vice presidential candidate would become President. If the winning vice presidential candidate should die before the votes were counted, the incoming President could fill the vacancy under the terms of the Twenty-fifth Amendment.

If both the winning presidential and vice presidential candidates should die before the electoral votes were counted, Congress would be authorized to order a new election. Congress would also be given power to provide for the possible death or withdrawal of a presidential or vice presidential candidate prior to the election.

Undoubtedly these would be useful repairs. But the question remains as to whether our ancient tottering electoral system is worth the time and effort that would be necessary to patch it up in this fashion. For with all the "mechanical" changes outlined by the Attorney General, it would retain critical weaknesses.

The foremost of these is the possibility that the so-called proportional system, which both the President and Mr. Mitchell regard as a satisfactory alternative to direct popular election of the President, might hand defeat to the candidate winning the highest popular vote.

There are some who believe that the danger of elevating the popular vote loser to the White House would be increased under the proportional system. With all its defects, the electoral college system, as it is currently employed, gives an advantage to the large states as well as to the small states. The small-state advantage is readily apparent. Alaska and Delaware, for example, have three electors each (one for each Senator and Representative) although a distribution of electors on the basis of population would give them only one apiece, or less. They would keep this advantage under the proportional system, and all electoral votes would be divided among the candidates in accord with their standing in the popular vote.

Under the present system this favoritism of the small states is offset in some measure by the general-ticket arrangement which gives the winning candidate in each state all the electoral votes of that state. A candidate may, for example, win only a slight plurality in New York and California, but the result is to give him all the 83 electoral votes of those states. Candidates from the big states thus have an inside track, and the presidential campaigns tend to center in the large states favorable to them.

Under the proposed proportional system, this big-state advantage would be largely gone, for electoral votes would be divided to reflect each candidate's popular strength. The small-state advantage would remain. So it would be possible for a candidate with special standing in the small states to obtain a winning electoral percentage without a popular majority.

Several studies indicate that Richard Nixon would have won in 1960 over John F. Kennedy if the proportional system had been in effect. In 1968 the proportional system would have given Mr. Nixon a fairly substantial edge, in part because most of the small states were in the Nixon column. It is interesting to note that a gain of 1.6 per cent in the votes for Vice President Humphrey would have made him the popular vote winner, but it would have taken a 2.74 per cent gain in his electoral vote under the proportional system to make him a winner.

This point calls for more detailed analysis. To what extent would the elimination of the big state advantage through the general ticket system magnify the effects of the little-state advantage? If the splitting of electoral votes would indeed increase the likelihood of electing a President who is not the choice of the people, the proposed amendment would, to that extent, be moving away from electoral reform, not toward it.

This critical defect in the proportional system, even though the risk has not been precisely measured and may not be susceptible to precise measurement, has turned most of the reformers to the proposal for direct popular election of the President. It might be better to work a little harder a little longer for a new model that is sound in every particular before resigning ourselves to costly repairs to an obsolete mechanism that would never be satisfactory.

THE WORLD OF MELVIN LAIRD REVISITED

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the March 26 Washington Post contains an editorial which issues a timely challenge to Congress which I hope will be accepted by my colleagues during the coming weeks of this session.

The editorial expresses the concern of the Washington Post over the lack of balance in Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird's comments before both the Armed Services Committee and the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Senate. As the editorial points out, while the opinions of the military were extensively quoted and discussed by Secretary Laird, the opinions of other nonmilitary experts in the Government who are familiar with the aims and postures of both China and the Soviet Union were sadly lacking. Moreover, Secretary Laird gave no indication of the views of the President himself with respect to such vital issues as the long awaited negotiations with the Soviets on mutual reductions of armaments and weaponry, or the war in Vietnam itself.

As the Washington Post says, the lack of balance in Secretary Laird's testimony makes it "all the more incumbent upon the Senate committees currently studying our armament needs to balance out this presentation" with other views. I am sure the Washington Post would agree that that statement must apply to the House as well. We have seen this Nation dragged further and further into an ill-conceived and tragically wasteful war at the urgings of our military planners. If we are to avoid future involvements of this nature, it is imperative that we not rely solely upon the opinions of the military but rather seek out the broadest possible range of advice and testimony.

I hope my colleagues will heed the warning of the Washington Post and balance out the one-sided views so far received from the Department of Defense.

The editorial follows:

THE WORLD OF MELVIN LAIRD REVISITED

We return, reluctantly but compulsively, to the world of Melvin Laird (and David Packard, to be quite fair about it), to the Defense Secretary's annual "posture statement," to the testimony of the Pentagon's two top civilians before the Senate, and specifically, like a moth to a flame, to Mr. Laird's apocalyptic estimate that "never have the challenges of our National Security exceeded in number and gravity those which we found upon taking office."

There is something about this and other rhetoric in the "posture statement," something about the tone as well as the content, that makes it sound like a senior thesis, written, one might surmise, almost wholly on the basis of an intensive interview with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Tasks are "monumental," threats are "grave," challenges are of "serious import." The incomprehensible jargon of the professional military man is passed along by a civilian Defense Secretary as if it were the stuff that Senators, not to mention ordinary folk, deal in every day ("The

Soviets may configure their SLBM's for depressed trajectory launch"). And there is, finally, the mark of the deeply partisan politician, and the former Congressman, self-conscious about his new position on the other side of the table, defensive about the "tremendous and complex problems" he inherited, gratuitous in his effort to downgrade his Democratic predecessors for the organizational and functional shambles these supposed efficiency experts left behind them.

The move from the relative obscurity of a "posture statement" to the public stage of a televised Senate committee hearing had something less than a sobering effect. As the going, and the questioning got rougher, the Secretary got tougher and the world of Melvin Laird became a still less congenial place. For example, the details of the new Soviet SS9 supermissile, which apparently was not thought to be a proper subject to include in a formal "posture statement" were abruptly declassified and trotted out as Exhibit A in the case for Soviet aggressiveness as it was presented live for all to see and hear. By this time, with the ABM selling sluggishly, it was apparently thought necessary to state as a simple fact that the Soviets were beyond a doubt moving to a first strike capability with the potential wherewithal to knock out substantially all of our 1000 Minutemen missiles, which comprise a significant part of our retaliatory force.

All this may be true, of course, or at least the military experts at the Pentagon may sincerely believe it to be true—that this country has never been more gravely menaced, that the Russians are embarking on a recklessly provocative new nuclear strategy, that Communist China "still constitutes the most dangerous potential for threatening the peace in Asia." In any case, there is nothing wrong with military men taking the darkest possible view of things in the interest of eternal vigilance. We pay them to be prepared to defend us and they deserve better than to be assailed or ridiculed for their preoccupation with the intricacies and complexities of a level and a form of warfare which most of us find almost impossible to contemplate, let alone countenance.

But we also pay civilian leaders in the Defense Department to weigh the always exorbitant demands of the military against other evidence—political estimates of realistic enemy intentions, for example—in reaching some measure of our needs which can be reconciled with our other priorities. And that is what is so disquieting about what we have been listening to the past week or so; there is no sign that the anxieties of the military about the theoretical *potential* of our adversaries has been balanced off against the political realities as assessed by the Kremlinologists and the Sinologists. The opinion of MACV in Saigon is recorded, but not that of the many civilian experts who are known to have a different view. The dire projections of the Joint Chiefs are faithfully set forth. But where is the indication that other views have even been heard—the dissents of a John Fairbanks on Red China's aggressive intents, for instance, or the thinking of a Llewelyn Thompson or a Charles E. Bohlen on the nature of the long-range Soviet threat. When, for that matter, are we to hear what one would take to be the view of the President himself on the prospects for constructive negotiations with the Soviets.

Perhaps we misconceive the purpose of a "posture statement" or even that of a Secretary of Defense. If so, it is all the more incumbent upon the Senate committees currently studying our armament needs to balance out this presentation, so to speak; when billions of dollars and the Nation's security are being discussed live and in color, the public is entitled to hear other witnesses, with other perspectives about a different world than the one portrayed by Melvin Laird.

SUBSTITUTES MUST GO

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. postal service is beset with many problems, and many people have offered many suggestions as to how best to solve them.

One of the soundest ideas I have seen recently was proposed by James H. Rademacher, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, in the April edition of the NALC publication, the Postal Record.

Mr. Rademacher puts his editorial finger on the substitute employee, and declared simply and bluntly:

> The substitute must be eliminated from the postal service.

I wholeheartedly agree with Mr. Rademacher, and with unanimous consent, I place this editorial in the RECORD, and recommend its reading and careful consideration by my colleagues:

SUBSTITUTES MUST GO

Regretfully we must admit to a growing suspicion that offering advice to the new administration of the Post Office Department is a little like shouting down a well. Occasionally, when the wind is right, an echo is heard, but never a meaningful response.

However, one must try. The National Association of Letter Carriers has been in business for 80 years, and from the beginning we have been pledged to the primary objective of the improvement of the postal service, the fundamental and essential means of communication available to the citizens of the United States. We feel an obligation to preach the concept of service, even when we feel the congregation of new managers exhibits symptoms of endemic surdity.

Our recommendation for the improvement of the service this month is simple and sweeping: the substitute must be eliminated from the postal service!

The postal substitute is a anachronism in a modern-day industrial-type operation. At a time when jobs are plentiful and pay is good in the private sector, it is ridiculous to believe that talented and ambitious young people will apply for postal employment as long as the present system prevails.

A letter carrier substitute, once he gets on the rolls, is paid at the rate of less than $3 an hour *when called upon to work*. He has no guarantee that he will be paid anything at all, except for the provision that, if he *is* called for work, he will receive pay for a minimum of two hours. His life is completely at the service of the post office, since he is technically on call twenty-four hours every working day. This condition makes it extremely difficult for a substitute to supplement his income with a second job, since he has no idea when he will be called for postal work.

There is no way for a substitute to know how long he will have to wait before becoming a regular. In some communities the turnover is fast, as career regulars, in increasing numbers, quit the service to take easier and more remunerative jobs elsewhere. In other communities, the wait is interminable. We learned last month of a substitute carrier in the thriving community of "96," South Carolina, who is still "subbing" after 21 years of employment. We also know of cases in other areas of the country where men have retired with full annuity after spending their entire postal careers as substitutes. Thirty to thirty-five years without ever becoming a regular! What kind of a career inducement is this?

Old-line postal supervisors claim that the substitute system is necessary because it gives them the flexibility necesary to assign manpower to handle volume peaks or to deal with unexpected conditions. We doubt that this is true. Many industries in the civilian world have problems similar to those in post offices, and they solve them through intelligent scheduling, through modern systems and procedures, through skillful mechanization. Why should the Post Office be unique among the industrial operations of America in finding the employment of substitutes a necessity?

The new administration of the Post Office contains many men who have most impressive histories of accomplishment in private industry. We think that some hard and imaginative thinking by these men, and their staffs, could develop practical methods of eliminating this archaic system from the Postal Establishment, thereby folding every substitute into the career regular service.

The National Association of Letter Carriers in several of its conventions has passed resolutions demanding the elimination of the substitute system. The national officers of the N.A.L.C. have made vigorous presentations to postal management, all to no avail. Now we have a new management team in the Post Office composed of men to whom the employment of substitutes must seem the ultimate absurdity. We strongly urge that they attack this absurdity with vigor and determination.

The quality of the postal service depends upon the quality of those who work in it. It is no secret that the quality of applicants for postal jobs is deteriorating with each passing year. (The wonder is that the Post Office gets as many desirable new employees as it does.) This steady erosion of quality, combined with the catastrophic percentage of turnover among those who do take postal employment, can only add up to serious service degeneration in the near future.

When a talented, bright young man today is in the process of choosing a career, he walks right by the Post Office door without giving it a second thought. He will continue to ignore the postal service as long as he knows that he must work as a substitute, at low pay and uncertain hours, for years before he can expect to be placed on the roster of regulars. There are simply too many better career opportunities available to him.

The Post Office is not truly competitive in the American labor market today. This is because of many reasons, but one of the most important is the survival of the substitute system. It has got to go.

THE NEED FOR SPECIAL PAY FOR CERTAIN NUCLEAR QUALIFIED SUBMARINE OFFICERS

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my firm and wholehearted support for H.R. 9328, which provides a special pay incentive for the reenlistment of certain qualified officers of the U.S. Navy who have experience with naval nuclear propulsion plants.

Our nuclear submarine officers are confronted with long, potentially hazardous, and demanding tours of duty beneath the surface fo the seas. They are unable to communicate with their families for days and weeks on end. With the increasing number of attractive civilian employment opportunities available to these men, it is not surprising that there is a growing resignation rate among junior officers in the nuclear submarine program. As this resignation rate increases, those remaining on duty are even less able to obtain occasional shore assignments, thus compounding one of the very conditions which is producing the current shortage of these officers.

The past experiences of the U.S. Navy with reenlistment bonuses indicate that enactment of this legislation will successfully retain a considerable number of officers who would otherwise resign from active duty upon termination of their obligated service. Given the extremely high training costs for nuclear qualified submarine officers, the granting of a bonus for reenlistment should actually result in cost savings.

I would like to stress the importance of our nuclear submarine program as a highly significant means of preserving world peace. The invulnerability of these vessels insures our Nation a potentially devastating second-strike power, deterring any potential aggressor from the temptation of a military attack upon our Nation. While international stability remains a precarious matter, our missile-armed nuclear submarine force remains one of the foremost guardians of the peace. It is obviously necessary to man these ships with the most competent and dedicated officers and crews available. As it appears necessary to provide certain incentives to satisfy these demanding manning requirements, H.R. 9328 should be approved without delay.

HIGH JINKS ON THE HILL

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post which stresses opposition to the appropriation for the House Internal Security Committee.

The editorial follows:

HIGH JINKS ON THE HILL

In its present lavish mood followings its own recent lavish pay raise, the House of Representatives is liable to spend money—public money, that is—for almost anything, even for the House Internal Security Committe. HISC but lately had its name changed from HUAC; but nothing has changed the ardor of its swollen staff for being supported in the style of indolence and arrogance to which it has grown accustomed. For this purpose, HISC asked the House to grant it an allowance of $425,000. The House Administration Committee, stern but never stingy, cut this request back to a nice, round $400,000. And this morning the House itself is scheduled to vote on the proposed appropriation.

There are people so passionate in their distaste for HISC as to declare extravagantly that is the idlest, most useless and most mischievous instrumentality in the whole Federal establishment. That is unfair, of course. It is foolish to employ such superlatives as long as the Subversive Activities Control Board remains in operation. One should really say no more about HISC than that it is idle, useless and mischievous.

You can get an idea of what HISC will do with that $400,000 if the appropriation is approved. It has already announced that it intends to investigate campus disorders. For some time now, hearings on campus disorders have been in progress before a House Education and Labor subcommitte under the chairmanship of Rep. Edith Green; and, indeed, Mrs. Green has pretty clearly indicated her intention to introduce legislation designed to deal with these disorders. That campus disorders have a relationship to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor can hardly be disputed. But why does HISC need to muscle into the act?

The House of Representatives is apparently not yet ready to abolish the roving inquisition now called HISC. But it really ought to cut it down to some sensible size. If the money saved can be employed to pay for one new school building, it will contribute far more to the country's internal security than all the pillories HISC has ever been able to contrive.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian people. I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to these brave people, whose courage and determination are inspiring.

Since the beginning of the 13th century, the people of this nation have struggled to preserve their nation's identity. During the 19th and early 20th centuries, the concept of Byelorussia as a distinctive national entity emerged, first as a cultural manifestation, later in a more political form.

The outbreak of World War I created unique opportunities for the Byelorussians to establish their own national independence. After the Russian March Revolution and the breaking up of czarist Russia, this much aggrieved nation enjoyed a brief respite from foreign domination. On March 25, 1918, the Rada solemnly proclaimed the independence of Byelorussia in the following words:

> A year ago, the peoples of Byelorussia, together with all the peoples of Russia, threw off the yoke of Russian tsarism which, taking no advice from the people, had plunged our land into the blaze of war that ruined most of our cities and towns. Today we, the Rada of the Byelorussian National Republic, cast off from our country the last chains of the political servitude that had been imposed by Russian tsarism upon our free and independent land. From now on, the Byelorussian National Republic is to be a free and independent power. The peoples of Byelorussia themselves, through their own will decide upon the future relations of Byelorussia with other states.

We know that the Byelorussian Government was soon toppled by the power of the Red army, and divided between Poland and Russia, later reoccupied by Germany and then again by Communist Russia. But on this anniversary of the proclamation of independence of these brave people, we wish to reassert our encouragement and our sympathy. We hope that one day their aspirations for independence will be realized.

GOODWILL INDUSTRIES OF ST. PAUL, MINN., CELEBRATES THEIR FIRST HALF-CENTURY OF COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, this year Goodwill Industries of St. Paul, Minn., celebrates its 50th anniversary of service to our community. This golden anniversary is significant on a number of counts and I wanted to bring this to the attention of my distinguished colleagues.

Two men were chiefly responsible for the formation of the St. Paul Goodwill Industries back in 1919. The first of these was Dr. Edgar J. Helms, a Methodist minister. Dr. Helms had begun the first Goodwill Industries in Boston. Seventeen years later, in 1919, Dr. Helms arrived in St. Paul. During the intervening years he had seen his idea blossom and grow in other States and he was determined to begin a branch in the great Upper-Midwest.

Shortly after his arrival he met Dr. Frank A. Cone, a trustee of Hamline University, one of St. Paul's fine private colleges. Dr. Cone was a person dedicated to helping his fellow man and in Goodwill Industries, he found an outlet for such dedication. A charter was granted the fledgling organization with Dr. Cone serving as president of the board of directors. He continued to serve in that capacity for 34 years until his death in 1953 at the age of 93.

Operations were begun in the Episcopal Church of the Good Shepherd in St. Paul, Minn. In this small parish the young organization occupied just one room. Some 40 to 60 workers occupied this cramped space, without complaint, as they were trying to prove their ability to take their place in the community.

After a temporary shift to larger facilities at the House of Hope Church, the organization was forced to return to its original site with its inadequate accommodations. Thus, a growing group was forced to curtail activities because of space limitations.

When everything looked bleak another of those endowed with the spirit of will, necessary to the challenge, took over as superintendent of St. Paul Goodwill Industries. Mr. A. F. Carlyle gave the kind of leadership that resulted in new community involvement and interest. Soon new, expanded facilities were available to provide more space for more people to help themselves by helping each other.

In quick succession the organization opened three health clinics plus a day nursery, which illustrates the depth of their concerns. Within 1 year there was established the Goodwill Chiropody Clinic, a dental clinic, and a health service for mothers concerned with baby care. In addition the Goodwill Day Nursery was established and the Goodwill Community House for many employees and others who could not afford high rental fees.

Americanization classes were instituted as many of the people in need were immigrants. An employment service was begun to aid the new Americans in gaining eventual employment when the language barrier was overcome.

The St. Paul Goodwill Industries suffered through the great depression along with other groups and individuals. However, this fine organization survived through that crisis plus World War II and the Korean conflict. Survive they did with ever increased efforts to do good and deal justly with all.

Dr. Helms, Dr. Cone, and A. F. Carlyle would scarcely recognize their great handiwork were they to see it now. Today, the St. Paul Goodwill Industries has a seven-story plant with modern machinery, plus five Goodwill stores in St. Paul, Thompson Grove, and Austin, Minn. More important than the brick and mortar were the increased numbers of people helping themselves through the good offices of Goodwill Industries.

Today some 300 people are employed and the income in 1968 was $674,000. Not content to consider this dramatic growth sufficient, plans are afoot for a new building to accommodate at least twice as many handicapped workers and several new stores.

John Metz, the executive director of St. Paul Goodwill Industies has continued in the inspiring tradition of his predecessors. Of course, his efforts have been supported and vastly strengthened by the voluntary board. The officers, executive committee and the board of directors reads like a who's who of concerned citizenry in our great area.

I know that all the citizens of my congressional district join me in saluting this great organization on the occasion of their 50th anniversary. I am certain too that we can look forward to another half-century of dedicated service on the part of St. Paul Goodwill Industries.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, during the past sad week I have shared the sorrow of all Americans at the loss of Dwight D. Eisenhower. General Eisenhower very literally gave his life to his country; first as a soldier who became one of our Nation's greatest military leaders, and then as a President who sought daily to bring peace to this troubled world.

General Eisenhower was a man to whom the words "Duty, Honor, Country" were more than just a slogan. He was a man of great stature, integrity, and patriotism. He will be justly remembered as one of our most beloved Presidents.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the world mourns the passing of a great American, Dwight David Eisenhower. To freedom-loving peoples everywhere, he was the symbol of the surge of a united world to eliminate the viciousness, the barbarism, the antihumanism. His reknown as an astute and victorious military commander was later succeeded by appreciation of his outstanding personal qualities as a man and leader for peace.

It is a measure of his strength that he was able to translate his wartime experience as a general into an earnest desire for peace matched by few national leaders in our generation. As one who has served at the United Nations, I recall particularly the speech he delivered while President before the United Nations in 1953. It made a profound impact. As President, it was Mr. Eisenhower's duty to preside over the assemblying of our nuclear arsenal, and he understood well the awesome implications of that activity. At the United Nations that day he made explicit the moral challenge confronting nations armed and capable of destroying the world. He was appalled at the prospect and urged a turning back before it was too late. His words were eloquent. He declared:

> But for me to say that the defense capabilities of the United States are such that they could inflict terrible losses upon an aggressor—for me to say that the retaliation capabilities of the United States are so great that such an aggressor's land would be laid waste—all this, while fact, is not the true expression of the purpose and the hope of the United States.
>
> To pause there would be to confirm the hopeless finality of a belief that two atomic collossi are doomed malevolently to eye each other indefinitely across a trembling world. To stop there would be to accept helplessly the probability of civilization destroyed—the annihilation of the irreplaceable heritage of mankind handed down to us generation from generation—and this condemnation of mankind to begin all over again the age-old struggle upward from savagery toward decency, and right and justice.
>
> Surely no sane member of the human race could discover victory in such desolation. Could anyone wish his name to be coupled by history with such human degradation and destruction.

Now, he said:

> There was no longer any alternative to peace.

One of the world's great military leaders, he knew the importance of peace, more important in the nuclear age than ever before.

I will remember Dwight D. Eisenhower as a man of peace.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE: A TOTAL LANDSCAPE

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of the House the most urgent park conservation issue facing us this year.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes region is a magnificent area along the northeastern shore of Lake Michigan. It encompasses a great diversity of natural values and recreational opportunities. It is a region of values which should be protected in the public interest as the heritage of all the people of this and future generations.

As I have said before, Sleeping Bear Dunes offers us a legacy—the best remaining—of the unspoiled Great Lakes scene.

A LAST LANDSCAPE

The means of fulfilling our public trust and preserving these important public values is the proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. As embodied in S. 1023 and H.R. 4287 this proposal has been carefully refined to assure the preservation of those key elements of the landscape which make the areas—as a whole—attractive and indeed, nationally significant.

Thus, what we need to preserve is the total landscape. This idea is a new emphasis, reflecting the broadening and maturing of conservation thought in recent years. For if we do assure the protection of this landscape—as a whole—it will serve, as few other areas in the region can, the recreational needs and the simple needs for green and open spaces when, in the not too distant future, the Midwest is twice as populous as it is today.

Recently Senator PHILIP A. HART, who has led this Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore campaign, expressed this new, total landscape concept in an article in American Forests magazine. Here Senator HART has outlined the history of the proposal and the delays it has faced. And he points out that these delays have meant the loss of important public values:

> The delay from year to year has not been cheap—it never is. Postponement has cost us all in the quality of the landscape and in escalating land prices. With the pressures now redoubling on this land, further delay will cost us the entire proposal. We all stand to gain much if the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore comes into being; and we stand to lose a great deal if it does not.

I believe this concept of protecting a total landscape is a major thrust of the new conservation, and I commend Senator PHIL HART and the American Forestry Association for expressing it. For the information of my colleagues, I include this fine article at this point in the RECORD:

THE TOTAL LANDSCAPES OF SLEEPING BEAR DUNES

(By Senator PHILIP A. HART)

What is a landscape? It is more, I think, than a collection of objects and visits of natural beauty. A landscape is a whole; it tells a story. A landscape is a total environment composed of many elements, yet more, somehow, than the sum of its parts.

I have thought of this increasingly as I have worked to secure establishment of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan. This unit of our National Park System, would consist of 61,000 acres along the northwest coast of Michigan's Lower Peninsula. Here a secession of forces, natural and cultural, has contributed to a landscape of remarkable diversity. To the extent that an area's landscape is diverse, the opportunities for its appreciaiton are multiplied; and diversity is the crowning feature of the Sleeping Bear region.

The basic framework was created by the glaciers which once covered all the Lake States region. As the ice retreated northward, a "recent" 15,000 years ago, it left a molded landscape of glacial deposits. Where today the northern end of Lake Michigan bends to the east, the individual lobes of the glaciers piled up a series of great moraines, forming headlands extending as parallel fingers into Lake Michigan. Shallow bays extend between these high ridges.

As the level of Lake Michigan changed over the centuries, small, clear inland lakes were created in these lowlands. Here are some of the most spectacularly beautiful lakes in the world, set in an intriguing landscape as if for deliberate comparison with the Great Lake just beyond.

CONSPIRACY OF WIND AND WATER

The dunes which characterize the area have resulted from a conspiracy of Lake Michigan waters and Lake Michigan winds, prevailing from the northwest. As the level of ancestral Lake Michigan varied, its waves cut at the headlands, sharpening their western faces into 350-foot bluffs dropping almost vertically into the Lake. These exposed bluffs are now being eroded by the winds off the Lake which carry the sands up across the headlands. In the lee of the moraines this sand is dropped, to form ever-moving dunes. Thus, the currents wash the headlands away, carrying the debris to the north to fill the bays, and the winds move the sands eastward, carrying the eroding headlands in that direction in a slow progression. The land here is unfinished, on the march.

Plants and animals too have worked on the face of the land, varying its texture and giving it a coat of hardwoods. A fascinating variety of species and communities has developed. In the lowlands, pines alternate with low, grassy meadows. On the high moraines, beech-maple woods shelter colorful spring blooms—baneberry, yellow trout lily, and magnificent large white trillium. Most of the forest is second-growth, leaving few hints of the great white pines which were the source of great fortune before the turn of the century.

This is the character of the landscape on the mainland. It is further enhanced by two great islands lying just offshore, South Manitou and North Manitou. These were once fueling stops for the wood-burning Lake Michigan steamers working the Chicago run. South Manitou harbors three of the AFA's record tree specimens, including the largest Northern White Cedar in the United States.

Sleeping Bear is a young landscape, a land still in the making. There is a succession of human history, too. Man has had his impact on the land, and has given it visible aspects of his own character—the good, the bad, and too often the ugly. Here the fur trappers gave way to the lumbermen of the last century. Field agriculture was tried, but in the lowlands the sandy soils were not productive. Fruit production has been a notable industry, and apples and cherries have been raised in orchards in this climate. Even so, it is an economically depressed area now turning more and more to recreational uses. In particular, it has been a favorite summer home area, and cottages line the shore of the inland lakes.

And so, a landscape. A whole. A total landscape with immensely captivating beauty in its broad stretches of inland lakes, forests, shining dunes, and the Great Lake beyond.

Here is something special, a landscape of unusual diversity, yet its elements are concentrated in a unified area. Here is the story of the landscape, written on the land, awaiting interpretation to the visitor. Here, too, is a wealth of opportunities to enjoy the outdoors. Here, in short, are public values of a nationally significant character.

And this is what we want to perpetuate as a National Lakeshore—the right mix of natural and pastoral beauty, the story-telling capacity of this landscape, and the opportunity of the public to know it through recreational visits.

LEGISLATION PENDING SINCE 1961

In 1958 the National Park Service identified the Sleeping Bear area as a "paramount" remaining shoreline opportunity on the Great Lakes, our "fourth shore." On the basis of detailed surveys and natural history studies, a National Lakeshore plan was drawn up, and I introduced legislation to implement it in 1961.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore proposal has gone far since then, but it has not yet become a reality.

The original proposal raised concern among local residents. They themselves had been drawn here by the beauties of the area, yet many felt threatened by the prospect of a National Park unit. Some 1,600 summer homes were included in the original proposal. The early field hearings in the Sleeping Bear Dunes area were lively exchanges, but they helped us air the differences.

Since 1961 the sponsors of the bill and the Park Service have worked to meet the reasonable objections of local residents. Strong guarantees are written into the bill, providing perpetual protection for the property rights of owners of improved properties within the boundaries. The only condition is adherence to local zoning standards or to the standards set forth in the bill.

Studies undertaken by Michigan University have shown that the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore will be a major economic boost to the region, and this has helped allay fears of depleting local tax revenues. In the balance, all will gain from the proposal: the local residents through special property protections and careful planning to handle increasing recreational use without disrupting established patterns; and the public through assurance of the opportunity to visit the area, knowing that its special values are being protected.

My bill has made progress. It passed the Senate in both the 88th and 89th Congresses. In the 89th, the House Interior Committee favorably reported the bill, after adding important additional lands at the urging of Senator Robert Griffin, who was then the Congressman representing that district in the House of Representatives.

But the bill has never passed the House. The landscape remains unprotected, for only minimal zoning regulations have been applied locally. Thus, with the pressures of land speculations and second-home subdivisions, the quality of the area is coming under increasingly serious threat.

The delay from year to year has not been cheap—it never is. Postponement has cost us all in the quality of the landscape and in escalating land prices. With the pressures now redoubling on this land, further delay will cost us the entire proposal. We all stand to gain much if the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore comes into being; and we stand to lose a great deal if it does not. And so, early in the 91st Congress, Congressman James G. O'Hara of Michigan and I, and others, will again introduce the legislation needed to bring the proposal into being. With the help of America's conservation-minded citizens, we will make a major effort for its enactment.

GREAT LAKES MEGALOPOLIS

In the not too distant future—and the signs are all around us—there will be a Great Lakes megalopolis, merging the urban centers of Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, and Chicago into a concentrated urban zone extending from Buffalo to Milwaukee. We cannot hope to avoid this, but we can plan for it. There will be a tremendous need for open spaces and natural areas for people to enjoy.

The need is great now—it will be greater in the future. The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore can be a major part of our efforts to meet it. The proposal stresses protection of the existing scene, to serve these needs. Neither a complete return to a wild condition, nor complete dominance by more and more of man's activities is desirable here. What we seek to maintain is a proper mixture of wildness, natural beauty and man's influence; and while protecting existing private rights, to provide public recreational opportunity—the opportunity to enjoy this spectacular landscape—the total landscape of Sleeping Bear Dunes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to especially note Senator HART's closing statement about the purpose of this 61,000-acre Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore for the public:

> What we seek to maintain is a proper mixture of wildness, natural beauty and man's influence; and while protecting existing private rights, to provide public recreational opportunity—the opportunity to enjoy this spectacular landscape—the total landscape of Sleeping Bear Dunes.

AMERICA ALMOST ADOPTED GREEK AS OUR OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, my attention has been called to an article in the American magazine, the Reporter, which throws an interesting footnote on American history. I am grateful to Attorney Constantine G. Economus, noted American scholar of Greek-American history, for calling my attention to the fact that but for a single vote in the Continental Congress, America's native language would have been Greek instead of English.

The Reporter article follows:

> Well, what do you know? If it was not for a dissenting vote by Benjamin Franklin, the United States would have adopted the Greek language instead of the English. And here is the story as it has been written in a current issue of the American Magazine The Reporter by the well known author George Bailey: Shortly after the American Declaration of Independence, a motion was introduced in the Continental Congress to adopt Greek as the national language. Many of the Founding Fathers considered Greek to be the most fitting form of expression for the direct successor in spirit to the Athenian Republic. The motion was defeated by one vote. Benjamin Franklin, one of the dissenters, explained that he considered it more practical for the Americans to keep English and let the British learn Greek.

USE OF FOREIGN MARBLE ON GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the plans for the proposed Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden to be constructed at Seventh Street, Independence Avenue, Ninth Street and Madison Drive, and to be under the administration of the Smithsonian Museum call for the use of foreign marble.

At this time, particularly when our country is faced with a serious balance-of-payments deficit, how can our Federal Government even consider using the tax moneys to buy imported marble? Our policy is well known to those who are responsible for this decision.

We have always supported the theory that all Federal, State, or Government buildings using tax moneys in their construction should and must use domestic materials whenever and wherever these materials qualify, particularly in a depressed industry.

I cannot speak for the other marble producing States, and I would not profess to when my able colleagues from those States are so well versed on the matter.

At best, however, I can support the dean of my own Georgia delegation, the Honorable PHIL LANDRUM, who knows better than anyone, and who has informed me that the State of Georgia can furnish the marble of superior quality to that of a foreign market. And, in addition, it is a known fact to anyone familiar with the marble industry in our country that it is a depressed industry.

In accordance with the Buy American Act of 1954, I just do not believe that any producer could bring in rough foreign stock and finish this job within 6 percent of foreign-finished prices delivered. For purposes of clarification I would like to cite here the provisions of the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a–10d):

19. BUY AMERICAN ACT

(a) Agreement. In accordance with the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a–10d) and Executive Order 10582, December 17, 1954 (3 CFR Supp.), the Contractor agrees that only domestic construction material will be used (by the Contractor, subcontractors, materialmen, and suppliers) in the performance of this contract, except for nondomestic material listed in the contract.

(b) Domestic construction material. "Construction material" means any article, material, or supply brought to the construction site for incorporation in the building or work. An unmanufactured construction material is a "domestic construction material" if it has been mined or produced in the United States. A manufactured construction material is a "domestic construction material" if it has been manufactured in the United States and if the cost of its components which have been mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States exceeds 50 percent of the cost of all its components. "Component" means any article, material, or supply directly incorporated in a construction material.

(c) Domestic component. A component shall be considered to have been "mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States" (regardless of its source in fact) if the article, material, or supply in which it is incorporated was manufactured in the United States and the component is of a class or kind determined by the Government to be not mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available commercial quantities and of a satisfactory quality.

If the Congress stands by and allows this proposal for the use of foreign marble to become effective, we will not only have begun an extremely dangerous precedent, for I remind my colleagues that never before has a Federal building been built with foreign marble, but we will have set this precedent at a time when our balance-of-payments deficit can ill afford another blow.

How then can we ask our private citizens as we have, to spend their private moneys in this country on American products, when we as their representatives allow their tax moneys to be spent on foreign products which are of no better quality than what we can find right here in our own country.

BUT YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT IT'S LIKE OVER THERE

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, many poignant and heartbreaking things have been recorded about the Vietnam war, as we all can testify. One that comes very close to home was printed in the News Tribune of Tacoma, Wash., on March 16, 1969. It expresses a point of view which I believe is quite widely held among the men serving in Vietnam. The News Tribune explains it as well as anyone could, and I commend the explanation and the poem to my colleagues.

For some reason, men at war frequently express their thoughts as poems.

A great deal of poetry has come out of the Vietnam War. Most of its rhyme is amateurish; its meter worse. But the thoughts expressed usually are uniform, and make us reflect on what these young men are doing for us—in contrast to what we are doing for them.

The poem which follows was written by Pfc. Grover C. (Skip) Bowen, a 20-year-old graduate of Mount Tahoma High School.

Bowen, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Bowen, of 3409 S. Monroe St., wrote and sent the poem to his parents a few days before Feb. 21—the day he was killed in a helicopter crash.

"LIVING AND DYING

"Take a man, then put him alone,
Put him 12,000 miles away from home;

Empty his heart of all but blood,
Make him live in sweat and mud.

This is the life I have to live
And why my soul to the devil I give;

You 'Peace boys' pout from your easy chair,
But you don't know what it's like over here;

You have a ball without near trying,
While over here the boys are dying;

You burn your draft card and march at dawn,
Plant your flags on the White House lawn;

You all want to ban the bomb;
'There's no real war in Vietnam.'

You use your drugs and have your fun,
Then you refuse to use a gun;

There's nothing else for you to do,
And I'm supposed to die for you?

I'll hate you to the day I die,
You made me hear my buddy cry;

I saw his arm, a bloody shred,
I heard them say: 'This one's dead.'

It's a large price he had to pay:
Not to live to see another day;

He had the guts to fight and die;
He paid the price, but what did he buy?

He bought your life by losing his,
But who gives a damn what a soldier gives?

His wife does, and maybe his son,
But they're just about the only ones.

So you put this man there, all alone,
And he died for you—12,000 miles from home."

L. S. STEGINS, SR., PASSES AWAY

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of my good friend, L. S. Stegins, Sr., publisher of the Screven County News, Sylvania, Ga., an era in journalism passed on also.

At a time when the character of journalistic methods is being questioned all over the land, it is inspiring to reflect on a man who has served the people with both integrity and truth.

He believed that the most important thing in his work was to chronicle what is happening among the people in his community. He had a love and appreciation of the people regardless of their station in life. He would give his precious time and personal attention to their letters, discuss their problems with them, and yet somehow find time in his busy schedule to give himself in service to his community as an active church member, a member of the city council, membership on various boards, and service in many other positions of civic responsibility.

The warmth of the expressions with which he heralded the accomplishments of his fellow citizens and the tender words he used in the chronicling of their passing were heartwarming to read. Indeed, there is a void which cannot be filled and an institution has passed away.

I was 22 years old when I was given the privilege of taking over the editorship of the Sylvania Telephone which he had served several decades before we began our association, prior to his establishing the Screven County News. I shall never forget the long hours "Stig" gave me in the painful, early stages of my becoming a newspaperman. A warm friendship developed between us over the years that was of such a fiber it could not be breached by occasional political differences or other diversions.

During my years in the Georgia House and Senate and during my years in the Congress of the United States, I have never known him to waiver in his support, backing, and encouragement of the principles I espoused. We had many talks together and his commonsense ideas were always good!

I shall long remember L. S. Stegins. A leader with compassion for his people, a human being who believed in the dignity of man; an individual whose very existence personified goodness, the most noble quality of all mankind.

DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of attending a Virginia State Leadership Conference in the field of distributive education.

I was impressed not only by the conscientious interest of educators and employers who attended this conference, but, particularly, by the outstanding qualities of potential business leadership manifested by the students present.

Because of the importance of this element of the vocational education program in our free enterprise system, I should like to share with colleagues the remarks made at the conference by Mr. Robert V. Guelich, vice president and public relations director of Montgomery Ward & Co.

REMARKS BY ROBERT V. GUELICH, VICE PRESIDENT AND PUBLIC RELATIONS DIRECTOR, MONTGOMERY WARD & CO. BEFORE THE VIRGINIA DECA STATE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE, ARLINGTON, VA., MARCH 22, 1969

It's an honor to be a participant in your Annual Leadership Conference. The excellent panel of vocational education students and graduates, as far as I am concerned, was good enough to be the finale.

Of the many DECA Leadership Conferences being held this month, I believe your conference is the most challenging for several reasons: (1) The State of Virginia has the largest DE program of any state. This is a tribute to the leadership and diligence of many dedicated adults, particularly Jim Horan, and your outstanding supervisors and teacher-coordinators. This team has boosted your Virginia program to the top in quality and quantity. (2) This meeting brings together the right people—DE students, educators, employers, and legislators and congressmen—all the people who hold the magic key to the future of education, business, government and American democracy.

All of us are advocates of one "cause"—constructive vocational education. Being a native of Dayton, Ohio, I became aware of educational co-op work many years ago, as Antioch College and the University of Cincinnati pioneered in this field. My personal interest for the past eight years has been related to Distributive Education through the National Advisory Board of the Distributive Education Clubs of America.

As a member of Montgomery Ward management, I can assure you of our Company's strong interest in and support of vocational education. A full spectrum of career opportunities is available in the retail industry for young people, particularly those who get their head starts through DE programs.

Finally, I have a personal conviction that one of the great shortcomings of our educational systems for young people in an affluent society is the lack of opportunity for constructive work experiences—and cooperative vocational education can help solve this problem.

We've been so enamored by Ph.D.'s since Sputnik that too many personnel managers have overlooked the thousands of students who already have made up their minds to work for companies like those represented here today.

Distributive Education is the fastest growing program of all cooperative vocational education programs. Although DE has a history of accomplishment, I believe its true significance is as a pioneer and pacemaker of the future. I believe it is the harbinger of the direction that urban education should take.

While others may talk about campus-industry relationships and the difficulty of getting young people interested in business, in DECA we are partners in a program in which 90,000 high school students and 7,000 junior college students already have declared themselves as being interested in *business as a career.*

As employers, we find that these young men and women are proving to be better employees and management trainees than many college graduates. And, as president of the Board of Education of a high school system with close to 6,000 students, I know that today's high school graduates are better educated than many college sophomores and juniors of the 1950's.

Because of good teachers, good business training experience and good curricula, students of Distributive Education are mature in their judgments, actions and ideals. They have found their personal identities; they have confidence in themselves and they are eager to build careers in the personalized people-to-people business of retailing. They respect hard work, achievement and leadership; they are not cowed by the size or complexity of our world; they are not satisfied with mediocrity in either their personal or their business lives. They are the type of men and women who will be running our business and the world in a few years, whether or not they earn college degrees.

Although about 2,000 high schools are providing instruction in Distributive Education to about 200,000 students, the potential is for DE courses to be offered in 20,000 high schools to 2 million high school students.

The challenge for businessmen, educators and legislators is to build on the foundation of success that you already have established. And the principal responsibility of retailers is to provide effective on-the-job training for all DE trainees. By doing so, (1) we are helping the employees who work with the students; (2) we are helping the students; (3) we are earning the appreciation of the community and the school teachers and administrators; and (4) of primary importance, we are preparing young men and women to be gainfully employed citizens in our community—possibly, as permanent employees of our companies and stores.

The list of DECA's donor organizations is a blue ribbon list of major youth-oriented corporations: General Motors, General Electric, Firestone, Goodyear, most of the major oil companies, J. C. Penney, Sears Roebuck and 50 others. My employer, Montgomery Ward, employs approximately 1,000 DE students throughout the country.

In one of our largest metropolitan markets, we currently employ 128 high school and 10 post-secondary distributive education students in 11 stores. I hope we can match this record in this area soon. We do have 8 DE students in our store in Winchester, 9 in Hampton, 9 here in the D.C. area, and several in Staunton and Charlottesville.

Nationwide, we have many store managers who are former DE students as well as staff executives of our large metropolitan districts. The vice president who heads the largest of our company's four regions. Don Ward (no relation of the founder of the Company) is a graduate of a cooperative education program in retail selling—a direct forerunner of the DE program.

Having told you how wonderful we think you are, let's ask ourselves a provocative question: "If DE students are such fine employees, why do we employ so few of them?"

One of the principal reasons is that too many retailers persist in those practices and policies that, in the past, have proved successful in discouraging or preventing aggressive and knowledgeable young people from entering or staying with the retail business. We know the criticisms:

Initial salaries are not competitive with the manufacturing and service industries.

Job satisfaction often is missing because responsibility is not delegated to trainees.

Early jobs are uninteresting and menial; students should be moved faster up to their levels of capability.

We should spend more time helping those young people already working with us part time.

I conducted an informal survey among corporate members of the National Advisory Board of DECA to find an answer to the question: "What can be done about the problem of recruiting and holding qualified young people?"

Here are some of the answers: Stores should (1) develop better relationships with high school and college counselors; (2) establish closer working relationships with students interested in retailing; (3) do a better job of "selling" the strong points of careers in retailing.

Action is needed by retailers to (a) pay higher *starting* wages; (b) higher salaries to junior store executives upon completion of initial training; (c) provide more compensation and corollary benefits to management employees to keep them from jumping jobs.

We retailers, acting individually and collectively, must take those actions that will make us competitive with other industries, including appropriate salary differentials, regularly scheduled working hours, good working conditions and well-planned job training programs with scheduled promotions to positions of increasing responsibility.

With a little bit of encouragement, most major retailers can be persuaded to establish more DE training stations, employ more students in existing training stations, and pay wages according to local competitive practices.

Looking ahead, most retailers foresee the need for an increasing proportion of part-time employees in 1970 and 1971, with most guesstimates approximating a need for a 10 percent increase of such employees. This means there will be many more job opportunities available for the increasing number of high school students who will be enrolling in DE programs this year.

A cooperative vocational education program means cooperation in building the career of a young person. Let us remember we are co-operating. It is more than a student-teacher or employee-employer relationship. It is a commitment to cooperation between student, school and employers. And, all of us need to do a better job.

It is easier to get to our destination when we know where we are going, and when we have a road map, than when both destination and pathways are unknown. This is a trite way of restating that employers and teacher-coordinators must continually reemphasize the objectives of their programs. We offer more than a part-time job. A career training program must be constantly monitored and adapted to each student. It isn't a contract you can sign in September and accept payment for in June. Students are trainees, not part-time job fill-ins. We must keep our eyes focused on the ultimate objective of building tomorrow's managers from today's students.

And we must keep in mind that the primary goal of each program must be to serve young people. If they are well served, the school fulfills its responsibility well and the employer gains vital new talent for his business. In serving the student, the first essential is to find out his vocational and career interests, then help him attain them through both curriculum and work experience. I am less concerned with the right choice of the right vocation than I am that the student will be enthusiastic about the type of study and work he or she is doing. We must do our best to develop and preserve interest and enthusiasm. They, along with integrity and responsibility, are more important in the jobs of the future than are skills that are qiuckly obsolesced in our business system.

Young people are asking basic questions about their futures—and their careers. I believe that the world of business generally—and retailing in particular—can provide positive answers to their questions and concerns.

Many of today's students—and this applies to most DE students—want a challenge—a challenge that includes opportunities for personal growth, career advancement and meaningful contribution.

Many are concerned about social problems. It is becoming increasingly evident that business can—and is—working effectively to help meet social challenges in basic areas—including education, employment, training, housing, community betterment.

As an example of this type of action, Montgomery Ward, in cooperation with the National Alliance of Business and the U.S. Government, has hired—and is training—some 300 hard core unemployed people. Those trainees have very little education, are unskilled and not oriented to a work situation. The results to date are most encouraging; the trainees, for the most part, want to learn, want to do a job, want to advance. Other businesses are engaged in similar programs. This type of effort can have a significant impact in meeting a key area of social and economic challenge.

A different type activity—and one in which any of our Chicago headquarters employees can take part—is our tutoring program. A group of employees, on a volunteer basis, spend one evening each week helping boys and girls who are residents of public housing improve their reading and communication skills.

Our college cadet program, although not cooperative education in the sense that school-job coordination is required, is proving increasingly effective in developing future management. In this program, college juniors and seniors work 20 hours per week and full time during summer vacations. Upon completion of their college work, they move into junior management training programs that prepare them for key positions in merchandise, operating or personnel departments.

An example of the potential, and actual, inter-relationship of programs is provided by one young man who began with us as a DE student six years ago. He progressed through the high school program, four years of college (during which he was in our college cadet program), the junior management training program—and is now a key department manager in a multi-million dollar retail store—all while working in the same store (Maryville) in his home town (Phoenix).

In increasing value and effectiveness of vocational education, national youths organizations have made major contributions. The Future Farmers of America and Distributive Education Clubs of America, to mention only two, have been extremely important in instilling challenge, drama, competitive spirit and long-range career relevance. As job opportunities increase, these organizations will be increasingly important in expansion of co-operative programs to meet our ever-increasing needs. Educators and employers must provide increased support for such groups, at all levels.

We are pleased with the progress being reported in vocational education, but cannot be satisfied.

Young people want a *chance* to prove themselves, to move up quickly. In retailing, because of its growth and its dynamism, the *chances* are excellent. We live, work and play with our neighbor customers and we are personally interested in the youth of each community. We know that the future of our businesses is completely dependent upon the type of young people we can attract, hold and advance to leadership positions.

So, what is our message to you young people?

It is, in the words of well-known business management expert Peter Drucker, that "Retailing is one occupation where the things that count are character and temperament; that is, qualities rather than things one learns at school."

Professor Drucker also makes the poignant and stinging observation that: "The greatest opportunity for any business in America today lies in organizing a systematic advancement program for able young people in its employ who has not sat four years on their backsides in college, but have instead gone to work when eighteen or nineteen . . . and the retail business seems to be particularly well suited to do this."

Education can be broadly classified in two categories—education for living and education for making a living. Those of us here believe and are committed to the principle that education for living, alone, is not enough.

Since World War II, our economy has become increasingly mechanized, automated, technology-oriented. The past is fast. Demands on employees' skills, knowledge, expertise and adaptability are increasing. Education must be relevant to those demands—not for jobs, but for careers for young people.

Today's age of abundance is an abundance of career choices. And it is this very abundance that distinguishes retailing.

There are 1,540,000 retail establishments in our country—six times the number of all manufacturing establishments. Each of these retail units employs managers who are selected from the eleven million men and women who work in the retail industry. It is a conservative estimate to state that more than one million men and women are rated and paid as executives in our industry.

With such a high ratio of executives to employees, and being a fast-moving business that must adapt almost daily to the changing attitudes and needs of customers, there is a constant demand for aggressive and alert executives at all levels, so promotions are rapid.

Junior executives make from $7,500 to $11,000; managers and buyers earn from $12,000 to $30,000—plus bonuses. Division heads commonly earn in excess of $30,000 in large organizations.

This brief sketch should give you a picture of what this business actually can be worth to young people. It also explains why we find more *young* executives in retailing than in any other industry.

Retailing is a "people business." If you like working with people, with customers, with fellow employees, retailing provides this *in abundance*. As our president, Edward S. Donnell, stated in an article in the DECA Distributor last year: "The most important key to the future is *people*. In terms of consumers, our nation's population continues to increase; personal incomes are increasing; more people have more discretionary income. As the complexity of retailing increases, employees must be better educated. The other key element in the people equation is *employees*. Ours is a people business, and it is the enthusiasm of our people that is the prime ingredient in producing the extra sales that are the base for better profits as well as for continued expansion. We want employees who are people oriented, who are sensitive to merchandise and to market problems, and who have fun in getting their daily quota of sales and profits."

I believe there no longer is any question that reputable retailers believe in serving the consumer—with *integrity* and with *efficiency*.

The concept of consumer protection dates from our "Satisfaction Guaranteed or Your Money Back" policy first stated in the Montgomery Ward catalog of 1875. And this marked the beginning of the end of the centuries-old maxim of "caveat emptor"—let the buyer beware.

As stated in Montgomery Ward's most recent annual report, "We firmly believe that well-informed consumers are Montgomery Ward's best customers. For this reason, Wards is in favor of well-written laws that are designed to help consumers make sound buying decisions.

"We supported the step forward which Congress took in acting upon 'truth in lending' legislation and will continue to work for workable state laws which provide customers with accurate information on the cost of credit, so long as such laws are applied uniformly to all who are offering credit services."

Currently we are supporting efforts to pass Uniform Consumer Credit Code legislation in the respective states. The code serves to bring uniformity and order to the complex field of consumer credit—to the good of *both* business *and* consumers.

But, our concern must go far beyond the laws. We must adopt a program of action to seek out, educate, train, and then, year by year, reeducate and retrain the young men and young women who will be needed to adapt our businesses to the rapidly changing economic and social environment of every community.

It is not important to review at this time the growth of vocational education in this country. It is important, though, to recognize that we have not kept pace with changes in job and career requirements. Our vocational education in this country is fine for the 50's, no longer satisfactory for the 60's, and totally inadequate for the 70's—not 1979 but 1970, the school year that begins six months from now.

It is gratifying to note that the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 did not draw a single dissenting vote in either the Senate or the House. It is more gratifying to see this Conference in action to urge even greater changes in this session of Congress.

Having quoted from thought and opinion leaders of the business and academic worlds, let me also quote from our third partner—government.

The chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education in the House of Representatives is Congressman Roman C. Pucinski. In recent remarks about our common concern of educating young people, he stressed that cooperative education helps break down artificial barriers between school and life. In pointing out that a very small percentage of our schools have cooperative vocational education programs, he advocated that "Less than 15% of the nation's high schools and junior colleges offer cooperative education, programs. We must double, or even triple, this percentage during the next two years. . . . And I (the Congressman) predict that because of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, a large percentage of this increased enrollment will come from vocational education."

Congressman Pucinski further stated he advocates that, through such devises as advisory councils on cooperative programs, businessmen, school administrators and teachers can be drawn closer together in their common concern: the balanced education of our young people.

Now let's take a few minutes to discuss some topics that employers are concerned with:

I don't believe I am divulging any top secret information when I call attention to the challenge that *either* the government *or* the retail industry is going to chart the future course of our business. Because of the lack of aggressive leadership by the retail industry as well as colleges and universities, our industry today is oversaturated with employees whose productivity is below the minimum standards of most other industries. Because we have not kept pace with other industries in the transfer of routine, repetitive functions to machines and automated systems, our employment and wage costs have continued to rise and our profit margins have continued to narrow.

Strange as it may seem, a major by-product effect of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1966 has been to force the retailing industry to accelerate the automation and mechanization of many of its functions because many retailers are not able to afford the higher costs of the 1967 and 1968 minimum wage rates for manual labor on such functions. This, in turn, has placed greater emphasis upon the productivity of those employees whose results depend upon their competence in handling person-to-person relationships, primarily selling and managing.

To restate this proposition in the words of government administrator and educator, John Beaumont, who recently retired from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare after a lifetime of service to vocational education, *"Retailing must impersonalize low-level jobs into machine systems and concentrate on the personalizing of all other jobs so they will be more attractive to men and women and students who have better-than-average talents and education."*

In speaking of Federal legislation, I should mention the extensive Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 which authorize greatly expanded efforts in cooperative vocational education programs.

In representing business at the National Conference on Cooperative Vocational Education in Minneapolis last month, I suggested that all possible encouragement should be extended to members of Congress to assure that *appropriations* for vocational education be consistent with funding *authorized* through the Amendments of 1968.

State legislators can be most helpful in working for expanded state financial support of vocational education in order to provide matching funds for increased federal money in implementing programs authorized by the 1968 Amendments.

Funding of Vocational Education represents wise use of public moneys—and is far less costly than the likely alternative—funding of "retrieval" programs for unskilled and unemployed.

I believe all of us should work to assure that the administration and operation of vocational education remain in the public schools rather than be taken over by other local, state and federal agencies.

As the term "vocation" stems from the Latin "voco" and thus suggests "a calling," let us work to assist the great numbers of today's young people in finding their "callings" and then in "doing their thing" so it will be meaningful, constructive and rewarding for them as individuals and as citizens of our ever-changing nation.

I really am fearful that we are allowing a large new group of culturally deprived individuals to grow up in our midst. As the University of Minnesota's Dr. Henry Borow recently pointed out, "College-bound, upwardly aspiring students are being denied access to opportunities for learning about the world of work or about themselves as potential workers."

Statistics of the failure of college graduates to adjust to jobs point up the fact that they have not been oriented to the world in which we live. They are almost as disoriented from occupational awareness and occupational literacy as the young people at the opposite end of the economic and educational scale upon whom we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to salvage them from being permanently unemployable.

You who are combining your education with work experiences are indeed the most fortunate of your generation. You are well adapted and experienced in the social and economic environment in which you will be living as a breadwinner or homemaker. You have not been detached from the world of work. Although still in adolescence, you already are gaining vocational maturity and, because of your self-confidence, you are able to raise your educational aspirations and broaden your perspectives of new and more challenging careers than the economically deprived—both high and low—are able to comprehend.

It is obvious that many adults also need retraining for shifts into new vocational and career interests, and this is a most important service of the educational-business relationship.

Counseling of students is all-important as we help them find their career interests; this is primarily the responsibility of the school through supervisors and teachers; a student who adjusts to good counseling at school can also adjust to good counseling on the job. And let us not overlook the fact that the majority of our students now go into white-collar jobs where people-to-people relationships are all-important.

It is increasingly difficult to evaluate the complete work-study program as job specifications become more volatile. I'm not sure that it is better to train a person for a job and then be proud of your performance because he is in the same job 10 years later. I would rather evaluate the income he has attained and his progress as a citizen, even if he has moved through several unrelated jobs. In evaluating programs, let us not depersonalize the rating scale so it looks good on a chart.

One question frequently asked of employers is "What kind of competencies are you seeking?" Implicitly, I have already made the point that a well-motivated and interested worker can be more important in the long run than a person with specialized skills. If we can have both, so much the better. And sometimes we must tailor programs to specific skills because of the nature of an employer's business. So, help them develop excellence in whatever skills they may have. With excellence, comes confidence and maturity and adaptability to changing work situations. Our objective should be to help the student excel in his present job situation as a foundation on which to build broader vocational competence and progress.

To improve the "image" of retailing, we must upgrade the competence of our managerial employees. We must improve educational curricula; we must improve management training programs; we must improve pay, hours, and working conditions. Retailing offers the greatest opportunities of any industry for young people who want to work with and serve the needs and desires of others. It is the biggest establishment in the world that specializes in person-to-person relationships. This is the type of job satisfaction our young people are seeking today—in the Peace Corps, in tutoring programs, in education, and the professions.

We—businessmen and educators—must not neglect our responsibility to improve the quality of vocational education programs so they will attract better students and lead to better preparation of students for the better jobs which retailers must fill.

While we recognize the point of view of those who advocate the education of "A Man For All Seasons," all professions and all careers, we also are aware that most of the "thinkers," the "philosophers," and the liberal arts students must accept the responsibility of being breadwinners early in their lives.

Educators and businessmen have no difficulty in recognizing the need for greater investments in the buildings, machines and systems of our economy. There must be a similar enthusiasm for investments of time, talent and money in the education and training of people because people are our most essential form of managerial capital.

Above all, we need to train leaders. As many of you will recall, John Gardner, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, has pointed out that some parts of our educational establishment seem to be inoculating our students against leadership. This revolt against leadership seems to be evident in some of the school demonstrations we are witnessing.

Again borrowing thoughts from psychology professor Borow, you are being trained to assume responsibility for the rational and effective planning and management of your own careers. Your outlook must be realistic but, above all, it must reflect your belief that your actions in your environment will make a significant difference in your life. . . . You can be, in the words of a young Korean student, the kind of person who, when the days get windy, will yearn for wings instead of shelter.

Today we are encountering a dichotomy of idealism and cynicism, of dedication and despair, and these moods pose a challenge to all segments of our society and economy. Education should be the key to meet such challenges—and it is my hope that mature idealists, such as many of us in this Conference, can make impossible things happen.

Together, we must increase our investments in the vocational educational of young people. Only by doing so can we expect to increase the productivity of retail workers, improve the competence of men and women in managerial positions and, as a result, restore to the retailing industry a new vitality in its jobs and its services to our American consumers.

It is our task, our responsibility and our opportunity to help make your Impossible Career Dreams come true. In the spirit of togetherness, this is our calling for the 70's.

CONGRESS OPENED 180 YEARS AGO: REFORM INFREQUENT

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Eric Sevareid, concluding a CBS news broadcast one evening, suggested that among the several qualities needed by a President of the United States, two were really indispensable: a sense of history, and a sense of the ridiculous.

Perhaps these qualities are only slight less important to a Member of Congress.

It is with a mixture of humility, seriousness of purpose, and a sense of irony that I call the attention of my colleagues to the following news item in the New York Journal of Thursday, April 2, 1789:

> Important Intelligence. We have the satisfaction of informing the respectable public, that yesterday the hon. the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States *formed a quorum*—when the hon. Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, member from Pennsylvania, was elected Speaker; after which the house proceeded to choose a Clark (sic), when John Beckley, Esq. of Virginia, was appointed to that office. *No other business was transacted yesterday.*

The italics are not mine. The New York Journal apparently felt that these two portions of information deserved emphasis.

The first Congress was supposed to convene, in New York City, on March 4, 1789. An editorial in the New York Daily

Gazette of that date welcomed the first arrivals as follows:

> The corporation of this City having appropriated the City Hall for the accommodation of the Congress of the United States; and the same having been elegantly improved and repaired for that purpose, the Common Council have resolved that the Recorder communicate the same to the Congress of the United States accordingly.
>
> Yesterday evening the guns at the Battery were discharged, as a farewell to the old Confederation, and a welcome of the new general Government. Willing to adopt on this occasion the good old adage, "*De Mortuis Nil Nisi Bonum,*" * we wish repose to the ashes—for good.
>
> she expired in a blaze of eloquence—of this venerable Phoenix, once the glory of the western world; and fervently expect in her blooming offspring a revival of those graces and virtues which rendered her parent both respectable and lovely. So deeply are her charms engraved on the hearts of many, that for years to come, "her glorious and immortal memory will be celebrated by thousands, who, whilst they lament her death, will gratefully transfer their respect and tenderness to her worthy heiress."

Unfortunately, only 13 Members of the House appeared on March 4 to take their seats in the new Congress. Others were delayed by bad roads, at least one shipwreck, and in the view of some historians, a certain lack of interest on the part of some of the new Representatives.

So the first House met and adjourned from day to day until a quorum finally was assembled, 180 years ago today, on April 1, 1789.

I include at the end of my remarks the record of the first House of Representatives, from March 4 through April 1, as set forth in volume 1 of the Annals of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is not difficult to appreciate the failure of the first House of Representatives to get to work on the appointed meeting day, and I think we can sympathize with the delay of the first appropriation bill until Thanksgiving of that year.

Today, on the 180th anniversary of the first business meeting of the House of Representatives, I am introducing still another duplicate copy of the "Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969." Today's bill brings the total cosponsors of this legislation to more than 100 Congressmen.

I would like to remind my colleagues that in the nearly two centuries of our existence only once have we undertaken a comprehensive reorganization of our operations and procedures, and this was more than 20 years ago, in 1946. Additional delay on the reorganization bill in the 91st Congress is indefensible on any grounds.

Again, I extend an invitation to Members of the House of both political parties to cosponsor H.R. 6278.

ANNALS OF CONGRESS, VOLUME 1

> **Proceedings and Debates of the House of Representatives at the first session of the first Congress, begun at the City of New York, March 4, 1789.**
>
> **Wednesday, March 4, 1789: This being the day fixed for the meeting of the new Congress, the following members of the House of Representatives appeared and took their seats, viz: From Massachusetts, George Thatcher, Fisher Ames, George Leonard, and Elbridge Gerry. From Connecticut, Benjamin Huntington, Jonathan Trumbull, and Jeremiah Wadsworth. From Pennsylvania, Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, Thomas Hartley, Peter Muhlenberg, and Daniel Heister. From Virginia, Alexander White. From South Carolina, Thomas Tudor Tucker. A quorum of the members not being present, the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11 o'clock.**
>
> Thursday, March 5: Several other members attended, viz: from New Hampshire, Nicholas Gilman; from Massachusetts, Benjamin Goodhue; from Connecticut, Roger Sherman and Jonathan Sturges; and from Pennsylvania, Henry Wynkoop; and no other members arriving, a quorum not being present, the House adjourned, from day to day, until the 14th instant.
>
> Saturday, March 14: The following members took their seats, to wit: James Madison, Jr., John Page, and Richard Bland Lee, from Virginia. A quorum not being yet present, the House adjourned, from day to day, until the 17th instant.
>
> Tuesday, March 17: Samuel Griffin, from Virginia, took his seat.
>
> Wednesday, March 18: Andrew Moore, from Virginia, took his seat. No other members appearing, the House adjourned, from day to day, until the 23rd instant.
>
> Monday, March 23: The following members appeared, to wit: From New Jersey, Elias Boudinot; and from Maryland, William Smith. No additional member appeared on the 24th.
>
> Wednesday, March 25: Jonathan Parker, from Virginia, appeared and took his seat. No additional member arrived until the 30th instant.
>
> Monday, March 30: George Gale, from Maryland, and Theodorick Bland, from Virginia, appeared and took their seats. No additional member on the 31st instant.
>
> Wednesday, April 1: Two other members appeared, to wit: James Schureman, from New Jersey, and Thomas Scott, from Pennsylvania, who forming a quorum of the whole body, it was, on motion:
>
> *"Resolved, that this House will proceed to the choice of a Speaker by ballot."*
>
> The House accordingly proceeded to ballot for a Speaker, when it was found that a majority of the votes were in favor of Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, *one* of the Representatives from Pennsylvania. Whereupon, Mr. Muhlenberg was conducted to the chair, from whence he made his acknowledgments to the House for so distinguished an honor.
>
> The House then proceeded in the same manner to the appointment of a Clerk, when it was found that Mr. John Beckley was elected.
>
> On motion, *Ordered*, that the members do severally deliver in their credentials at the Clerk's table.

FARSIGHTED COMMUNITY PLANNING BY ALLEN PARK, MICH.

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the city of Allen Park, in my congressional district of Michigan, recently received a $927,749 Federal grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to construct a two-story apartment building for senior citizens.

Approval of this grant was the culmination of many months of work by Allen Park city officials working with my office and with the Chicago regional office of HUD.

I would like to take this opportunity to publicly express my congratulations to the city of Allen Park, its officials, and its citizens for their farsighted community planning.

I would like, also, to bring Allen Park's plans to the attention of my colleagues, to show them how one typical American city is utilizing one of the many programs that we have authorized to help communities solve their local problems.

Allen Park is a city of some 40,000 persons, with an area of 7.16 square miles. It lies just south of Detroit, and is bisected by several of the metropolitan area's major thoroughfares. Incorporated as a village in 1927, and as a city in 1957, Allen Park has won acclaim for intelligence and foresight in its municipal planning. The result has been a community of fine homes, a conveniently located shopping district, and a well-planned industrial sector.

Several years ago, the need became apparent for low-cost housing to serve the community's elderly residents. City officials contacted my office, and application was made for Federal funds to begin planning a senior citizens housing project.

A program reservation was approved in September 1965, and a $7,600 preliminary loan was granted in June 1966. Approval of the final grant last month has brought the project to the construction stage. Ground is to be broken in about a month, and completion is scheduled for next February.

The general contractor, M. Herbert Construction Co., will erect the 62-unit apartment building, and then turn it over to the city under the turnkey concept.

The apartment building will be located adjacent to the city's public library, on a 2.2-acre site near the intersection of Allen and Champaign Roads. It will have 61 one-bedroom apartments, and one two-bedroom unit. Rental costs will be about $50 a month, including utilities, which will enable retired persons to have adequate housing, at a cost they can afford.

Each apartment will have a fully tiled bathroom, sound-proof walls, nonskid vinyl floors to eliminate the need for carpeting, and an entrance vestibule. The building will have a large sitting room, a community room, lobby, meeting room, outside terrace, and some outdoor recreational facilities, including a shuffleboard court.

Eligibility requirements for renters will be established by the locally appointed housing commission, which will set up criteria based on income, length of residence in Allen Park, and other factors.

The apartment project was conceived and brought into being by a dedicated city administration headed during the past 4 years by Mayor Leo Paluch. Other present members of the administration are Clerk Sal Scarpace, Treasurer George Moore, and Councilmen Osborne Pat Dunn, Frank Bodnar, Ralph C. Cunningham, Anthony Foresi, Frank J. Lada and Ronald E. Weston. Others who have served as city officials during the 4-year period include Frank Rodwell, clerk, and Clarence Harold Duda, Omer O'Neil and Lawrence Murphy, councilmen.

Kenneth Maher is now acting housing director and city controller. Barrett Lafferty was formerly housing director, and is now assessor.

---

* About those who are dead, nothing but

Members of the housing commission are Edward Wagonsomer, chairman, and Joseph Chetcuti, Lorell M. Ford, Mrs. Elvira Machinsky and Francis Peck. Others who have served on the commission in the past 4 years include Foresi, Elvie R. Adcox, Mrs. Rosemarie Herbert, Alfred L. Johnson and Mrs. Elizabeth Klopfer.

To this outstanding group of public servants I offer my sincere congratulations for a working example of how enlightened cooperation on the local and Federal level can help progressive communities plan for the future and put Federal tax dollars to work on local projects benefitting our citizens.

POPE PAUL VI NAMES BISHOP JOHN J. WRIGHT OF PITTSBURGH, CARDINAL

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we in Pittsburgh, Pa., are especially proud that Bishop John J. Wright of the diocese of Pittsburgh was named a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church by Pope Paul VI on Friday, March 28, 1969.

A man of exceptional talents, Bishop Wright is the first American to advance directly from bishop to cardinal without first having been an archbishop, and he is the first Pittsburgh bishop ever elevated to cardinal.

It is a pleasure to congratulate Bishop Wright on this high honor and fine recognition from the Vatican of his eloquence, intelligence, and competence.

We in Pittsburgh also want to salute Archbishop John F. Dearden of Detroit, former bishop of Pittsburgh, who was another of the four Americans named as cardinals.

I want to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Robert Schwartz, religion editor of the Pittsburgh Press, on Bishop Wright's elevation and his long career of contributions to the Catholic Church, as well as editorials from the Pittsburgh Press and the Pittsburgh Post Gazette praising this most recent recognition of Bishop Wright's abilities, and Bishop Wright's own statement on learning of the appointment.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Mar. 28, 1969]

"NEWS TO ME"—WRIGHT: RISE IN CHURCH RAPID

(By Robert Schwartz)

Bishop John J. Wright today was designated a prince of the Roman Catholic Church.

He became the first Pittsburgh bishop ever elevated to Cardinal, a fact of which he was notified in a telephone call at 6 a.m. by Apostolic Delegate Luigi Raimondi of Washington.

"This is news to me as much as it is to anyone else," he said shortly thereafter. "I'm bewildered by it. I'm not sure what it means in terms of future work and I have no letter, or detailed information concerning it."

This is the first time that an American has advanced directly from bishop to cardinal without first being an archbishop.

The bishop, who observed his 10th anniversary here just last week—March 18—had often been rumored as a prospective successor to Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston, under whom he once served.

[*Vatican sources said there is a "good possibility" Bishop Wright will be transferred from the Pittsburgh post and made president of the Vatican Secretariat for Christian Unity.*

[*The Christian unity post has been vacant since the death of German-born Augustin Cardinal Bea last Nov. 16.*]

A Pittsburgh Press reporter was accidentally cut in on Bishop Wright's private phone line later this morning.

"I'm doing a few double-takes here today," the bishop said. "I'm not sure what I'm doing.

"I'm still waiting for a letter. I'm watching for the mailman . . . If you see him tell him to hurry, will you?"

Bishop Wright wrote the American bishop's pastoral letter in support of the Pope's encyclical on birth control last July.

The Pope had reaffirmed the church's opposition to birth control, specifically the birth control pill, and the bishop's letter underpinned his position, under attack by some laymen.

Bishop Wright's predecessor here—Archbishop John F. Dearden of Detroit—also was among four Americans selected to become Cardinals.

Bishop Dearden presided over the Pittsburgh Diocese for nine years before he was succeeded by Bishop Wright in March, 1959.

At a news conference, the Cardinal-designate said one of his first phone calls earlier today was from Archbishop Dearden, with whom he served on Vatican Council II.

He said Archbishop Dearden and he were happy to be teaming up again.

Bishop Wright said his schedule is so tight in the next month that it will be difficult to prepare for his new assignment.

Always quick with a quip, he added, "I might go Downtown to see the 'Shoes of the Fisherman' to learn how to behave."

Bishop Wright, the eighth bishop of the diocese, became a dominant figure in this City's life as prelate, educator, ecumenist, civic leader and civil rights protagonist.

Erudite, witty, a top scholar and an intellectual, he was regarded as a conservative theologian, and a political and sociological liberal. But he dislikes labels.

He has been active in virtually every phase of the poverty war and equal opportunity struggle here. He was not averse to appointing black militants to assist the church in its participation in this struggle.

Among the early congratulations was a message from Mayor Joseph M. Barr, who said the Pope had selected "a man of remarkable talents . . . a man of great warmth, understanding and passion.

"Those of us in public life who have been privileged to be closely associated with this distinguished church leader are well aware of the exceptional qualities which obviously prompted this pronouncement from the Vatican."

Bishop Wright's elevation to the College of Cardinals had long been forecast in church circles.

His rise to the top of the church's hierarchy has been relatively rapid.

BISHOP AT 37

The Pittsburgh prelate became a bishop at the age of 37, which is young for that rank in the church.

Bishop Wright, born July 18, 1909, in Lawrence, Mass., was named the first bishop of the Diocese of Worcester, Mass., when it was formed in 1950.

He was installed as head of the Pittsburgh diocese nine years later.

An Irishman who dispenses wit and wisdom in balanced proportion, he is equally at ease before a football banquet or divinity class, a firemen's parade or a solemn liturgical procession.

His associates recall the time he flouted tradition and arrived at an interfaith breakfast wearing a green skullcap along with the normal black-and-scarlet trappings of his office as bishop."

"It's St. Patrick's Day," he told the crowd while doffing the green skullcap.

In Boston, where he attended St. John's Seminary at the start of his career, he quickly was recognized as "a bright young Catholic priest headed for bigger and better things" in church affairs.

Studious, eschewing athletic Latin School as a boy, was graduated from Boston College, then entered the seminary. In 1932, he was sent to the North American College in Rome and attended classes at nearby Gregorian University.

In 1935, he became a priest in ceremonies at the North American College, then spent four more years in the Eternal City, except for summers as a parish curate in England, Scotland and France.

EARNED DOCTORATE

He earned a doctorate in theology during this time.

Returning to the U.S. in 1939, he taught philosophy at St. John's Seminary.

He became assistant to William Cardinal O'Connell of Boston the same year.

Cardinal O'Connell recognized the young priest's talents. The youthful churchman became the cardinal's personal secretary.

Following Cardinal O'Connell's death a year later, the priest became secretary to Richard Cardinal Cushing, O'Connell's successor.

In the following years, promotions came rapidly—papal chamberlain in 1944, auxiliary bishop in 1947, and full bishop by 1950.

RIGHTS LEADER

His Pittsburgh career is notable for achievements in the civil rights field.

One of his oft-quoted comments was made at a discussion of interracial community problems in Hazelwood. He said:

"All persons are members of the single, human race. I cannot understand a discussion of race except as it concerns the human race."

An eloquent speaker with a Boston accent, his schedule of personal appearances is rigorous.

Commenting recently on his 10-year tenure here, he observed that the tuggings for his time, either as a speaker, a traveler for peace, or in connection with his duties as a prelate, create a "tension" within him.

He noted that one of his biggest problems is budgeting the use of his time, then added wistfully that every person has only "so much energy" and that this "precious commodity" must be dispensed with great care.

He was one of the leading figures at the church's Second Vatican Council, a group which debated Catholicism's basic philosophical concepts during the early 1960s.

He recalls that he made 41 round trips to the Rome sessions in 1963 and 1964, a distance of about 415,000 miles.

Reflecting on this activity, he recently commented:

"Shortly after I came to Pittsburgh, beginning in 1960, I had to spend weeks on end in Rome and elsewhere working on affairs of the Ecumenical Council.

"This was a very great worry to me, particularly in view of the fact that I was still new to Pittsburgh. But the worry was greatly diminished . . . by the way the priests of the diocese and members of the staff kept things going."

He said he quickly discovered that the Pittsburgh Diocese is a tight-knit, strong, cohesive unit.

"Then I began to worry that perhaps a diocese as strong and cohesive as this one would not be responsive to things coming out of Vatican Council," he said.

"It's one of the major consolations of my 10 years here that stability in this diocese is not synonomous with immobility.

"I feel comfortable about the way things have worked out."

This is an apparent reference to the fact that Pittsburgh Catholics refrained from joining in protests which swept through many cities on the heels of pronouncements stemming from Ecumenical Council's deliberations.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Mar. 30, 1969]

CARDINAL WRIGHT

Pittsburghers of all creeds will take special pride in the elevation of Bishop John J. Wright to the College of Cardinals of the Roman Catholic Church.

The Catholic Church has been here since Colonial times, and Bishop Wright is the eighth head of the Pittsburgh Catholic Diocese.

Now he becomes the first bishop of the six-county diocese to rise to cardinal. And the first American to advance directly from bishop to cardinal without first becoming an archbishop—which many will interpret as a sign of special recognition by the Vatican.

To add to Pittsburgh's honor, Bishop Wright's immediate predecessor here—Archbishop John F. Dearden of Detroit, who served this diocese for nine years—also has been named a cardinal.

Both of these churchmen have been active in the ecumenical movement initiated by Pope John XXIII and advanced by Pope Paul VI. In recent years, both have been active in Vatican deliberations and both have played key roles in the affairs of the American bishops.

Bishop Wright is well-known among leaders of all denominations for his all-embracing interest in humanity.

He recognizes only one race—the human race—and he views his diocese here, as he said on the occasion of his elevation, as "America on a small scale," embracing every culture, nationality and ethnic group and reflecting an infinite variety of God's children.

These are times that generate problems and issues for the Catholic church and for religion generally, no less than for government and secular organizations.

It should be reassuring to Catholics and inspiring to others that a man of Bishop Wright's caliber has been elevated to a position where his learning, wisdom and love of humanity will find even wider application.

[From the Pittsburgh Post Gazette,
Mar. 29, 1969]

PRINCE OF THE CHURCH

Friends of Bishop John J. Wright will rejoice in his elevation to the College of Cardinals. In the Roman Catholic hierarchy, a cardinal ranks just below the Supreme Pontiff and participates in the election of a new pope. As advisers to the pope, members of the cardinalate have a powerful influence on ecclesiastical policy. Bishop Wright's immersion in community affairs has qualified him as a persuasive force for progressive change.

Bishop Wright combines political liberalism with theological conservatism. He is not the aloof prelate who chooses to stand above the battle. His courageous espousal of civil rights has drawn the fire of those who believe a clergyman should confine himself to broad general endorsements of an abstract virtue. The democratic ruler of the Pittsburgh Diocese has not merely given lip service to the cause of social justice. He has allowed latitude to activist Roman Catholic priests who have chosen to plunge into the dust of the political arena.

Admiration of the personable Bishop Wright is not denominational. He has striven to serve all sectors of the community—especially the barely visible poor. Assumption of the scarlet hat and robes of the cardinal confirms an eminence which Bishop Wright owns by nature. His scholarship, sagacity, courage and humor should prove priceless assets for the guidance of his church in a disoriented time.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Mar. 28, 1969]

"A LOT OF PEOPLE BETTER DO A LOT OF PRAYING," TEXT SAYS

Here is the text of a statement by Cardinal-designate John J. Wright:

"This news is bewildering. As of this minute, I am not sure what it means except that a lot of people better do a lot of praying. As a priest I can already do everything that I could possibly do as a cardinal. In the way of that which chiefly matters, like the sacramental service of souls and the preaching of the glory of God.

"HELP EVEN MORE

"As a bishop I can do special works for peace, for the defense of the faith, for social justice, for the intellectual life, for the reconciliation of God's people.

"I hope that as a cardinal I can help even more. Certainly not less.

"Knowing Pope Paul on the basis of all the things he says and does, I am sure he intends that his cardinals do more, not less. He will always get a ready response from me.

"A cardinal has special ties with the Holy Roman Church. But no scarlet cords could possibly tie me more closely to Rome and the Church universal over which the Bishop of Rome holds the presidency of charity, and to all the loves I have shared all my life with the parents, family, brother priests, devout nuns, lay associates and friends whom God has given me so generously.

"Many of the dearest among these friends and co-workers are not at full communion with Rome, but as much as any, they have shared the intellectual and spiritual pieties which have made me glad through the years of my priesthood, to echo Christ with a Roman heart.

"PROTESTANT TRIBUTE

"One of my most cherished Protestant teachers introduced me to the Latin poem from which I took my motto as a bishop.

"I particularly hope that people in the area served by the Diocese of Pittsburgh—and all of them without exception—my own people and their neighbors of every color, ethnic culture and creed, who have been so generous, so good to me—are grateful that the Holy Father thought of this corner of the world when he was choosing members of his College of Cardinals.

"Pittsburgh deserves a salute implicit in this news. Our diocese is the church in miniature. Our six counties are America in small scale. Every culture is here, every nationality, every ethnic group, every kind and condition of Adam's breed, of God's children, of Christ's brethren.

"And the plain fact is that, despite occasional family tensions, we all love one another.

"Moreover, we all know it.

"Now we must pray for one another, all of us in the whole community, with greater love and more than ever.

"Ten years have taught me the strength that comes from the prayers of Pittsburgh priests, Pittsburgh's sisters, Pittsburgh's lay people—Catholic, Protestant, Jewish and kindly skeptics, all included."

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened at the passing of the late President Eisenhower. His death leaves a great void in the minds and hearts of the American people. He was a courageous man, one who I believe, truly reached heroic stature.

He will always stand in my mind as one of our greatest Americans. His record and accomplishments are all a matter of public knowledge and history. In a time of national disaster, Ike was there, leading his country with a moral force and courage unparalleled in our country's history. His decisiveness and brilliant leadership swept our Nation to victory during World War II, banishing the deplorable tide of nazism, and giving freedom-loving people, both at home and abroad, new hope for a better life.

It was fitting that a deeply grateful country would bestow its highest honor on this man. Following the mandate of his people, he restored his beloved country to a period of new calm and confidence.

The late President Eisenhower was all that was virtuous and fine in a human being. From a humble beginning, a glorious career ensued, one filled with faith in his fellow man, a great love of country, hard work and determination. This was the measure of the man. I cherish my memories of him. We shall not forget him soon.

LAWRENCE LESSER, CELLIST, NATIVE OF CALIFORNIA

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, as many of my distinguished colleagues know, I represent a district which includes Beverly Hills, West Hollywood and West Los Angeles, the home of some of the most gifted and creative people in our entire Nation.

On April 23, 1969, one such gifted musician, Lawrence Lesser, will play cello in an important concert at town hall in Los Angeles. Mr. Lesser, although young in years, already has distinguished himself in a very difficult field and will bring great honor to all Americans who appreciate fine music.

Lawrence Lesser has been hailed by music critics throughout Europe and the United States for his compelling artistry and extraordinary virtuosity. He has been the recipient of outstanding honors, including a prize at the prestigious Tchaikovsky Competition in Moscow.

A native of Los Angeles, a 1956 graduate of Beverly Hills High School, Lawrence Lesser exhibited talent at an early age. He graduated with honors from Harvard University in 1961 and then went to Europe under a Fulbright Fellowship. Mr. Lesser won the cello prize in Siena in 1962 and concluded his year with an enormously successful concert tour in Germany, Italy, and Spain.

He was a guest performer in the 1966 Heifetz-Piatigorsky concerts at Carnegie Hall, and again in the 1968 Los Angeles series. While in Russia in 1966 he recorded for "Melodiya", and his recording of the Schoenberg Cello Concerto for Columbia Records has recently appeared.

Lawrence Lesser is a protege of Gregor Piatigorsky, and Pablo Casals has hailed his artistry. His repertoire is extensive, ranging from standard classical and romantic music to most of the important contemporary works. He plays a Stainer cello of rare beauty, made in 1670.

I know that the distinguished Members of the House of Representatives join me in praising this fine young American who shows great promise in the field of music.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker:

> Soldiers, rest! Thy warfare o'er,
> Sleep the sleep that knows not breaking;
> Dream of battled fields no more,
> Days of danger, nights of waking.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Soldiers, rest! Thy warfare o'er,
> Dream of fighting fields no more;
> Sleep the sleep that knows not breaking,
> Morn of toil, nor night of waking.
>
> —SIR WALTER SCOTT.

Destiny reaches out her hand and with unerring accuracy places her finger on the man equipped by character and training to carry out her purposes. As the war clouds gathered over Europe in the late 1930's there was dire need for a man of uncommon virtues. In the armies of the United States there was an inconspicuous colonel. Who could have predicted that this colonel would be selected to lead the armed might of the free world against the violence of a military machine in the hands of a mad man? We must say that destiny—or shall we say, Divine Providence—interposed to save the world from slavery.

The record of General Eisenhower's achievements is placed clearly before the scrutinizing gaze of history. His judgment in military action, his skill in manipulating men and materials, his statesmanship in dealing with the complex problems arising from diverse personalities and independent governments, all have been analyzed in detail. Today they stand approved, without a dissenting voice. No such universal acclaim has ever been attached previously to any military figure in all history.

More than two centuries before the Christian era, Asia was the arena in which ambitious kings struggled for dominance. Out of the confusion of the times came an astonishing figure, little known to the Western World. His name was Asoka, and it is written of him that—

> He is the only military monarch on record who abandoned warfare after victory.

After uniting what is now India into a stable society, he put his genius to work in promoting the arts of peace. His accomplishments in economic advancement, in education, and in social welfare seem almost modern in scope and in application to the needs of the day.

Somehow the career of General Eisenhower seems curiously to rehearse that of this ancient and benign monarch. For with the general, after war came peace, and the reestablishment of stable societies in Europe, and the restoration of economic strength, and education, and political leadership.

Supported by the adulation of the millions, at home and abroad, he might indeed have been a monarch. The ego of a lesser man, fed on the approval of his countrymen, must surely have responded to the promptings of ambition. But he was not that lesser man. He chose not "pomp nor show, nor lofty place, not boast above the least." Clothed in the "majesty of humility, his scepter was his kindliness, his grandeur was his grace."

At this hour, a caravan of trains carries his mortal remains toward a little country town in the Midwest. There, in a shrine as unpretentious as his life has been, the general will be laid to rest. But it is not the all-conquering general, but the wise and gentle and simple "father-figure" who will live in the hearts of his countrymen.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the whole world mourns the passing of Dwight D. Eisenhower. We are fortunate to have had him as one of our country's foremost military and political leaders. We are all the richer to have been able to share him with his family.

Ike's boyhood ideals, supplemented by his strict family training and West Point's 4 years of emphasis on devotion to duty, all stood him in good stead for the rest of his life.

The puritan ethic was constantly an important factor in his life which resulted in his chief motivation: "to do good." His driving dedication pushed him forward into higher and higher responsibilities, so that he could implement the ideals which he held—to improve the welfare of his fellow man.

This ambition came into prominent focus at the height of World War II when the greatest military forces of the world were placed under his command, and he led them to ultimate victory.

It is no small wonder that this position of successful leadership led logically to a call from a grateful people, to pull this country together from the ravages of a war and to become President. He likewise served ably in the White House. Ike always remembered the strict precepts of his youthful upbringing. He was a God-fearing man, religious to the core, and motivated by only the highest ideals.

Despite his militaristic background, General Eisenhower was a patient, kindly, and humble man. His personality was warm and friendly. To know him, was to admire and love him. He was a special American and an exceptional world leader. Not only has he earned the respect and admiration of our citizenry, but citizens from all ends of the earth.

His fighting spirit was evident to the end. He fought valiantly despite countless odds, so that he could continue with his pursuit to "do good." We shall miss him.

Mrs. Schneebeli joins me in extending prayers and heartfelt sympathy to his grieving family.

ENDANGERED SPECIES LEGISLATION

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, legislation to protect species of animals which are in danger of extinction is an important matter on which this session of Congress must act. We must protect and preserve the species not only during our generation but during ones to come.

Hearings on the legislation were recently held by the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. An important statement on the legislation was delivered to our subcommittee by a spokesman for the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL–CIO. The statement was applauded by subcommittee members from both parties.

The significance of the testimony is that this labor union, which represents leather tannery and fur workers, as well as food industry employees, greatly feared the endangered species legislation last year. It was afraid the legislation, as written last year, would threaten its members with further job losses in two already declining industries. At the same time, the union felt that the objectives of the legislation should be achieved.

The Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL–CIO, set about trying to find a common ground with conservation groups and the sponsors of the legislation. It not only succeeded, but it also bridged much of the gap between the fur and leather industry managements and the conservation groups. The amendments which the union proposed not only would ease its fears, but also further the goals of the conservation groups.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL–CIO, and its two executive officers, President Thomas J. Lloyd and Secretary-Treasurer Patrick E. Gorman, for their imaginative, considerate, and statesmanlike approach to this problem. They certainly deserve congratulations.

The testimony presented to the subcommittee gives a forthright and frank account of the union's position in the past and today, the actions it took and the recommendations it made to our subcommittee. Under unanimous consent I include the statement in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement by Arnold Mayer, Legislative Representative, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL–CIO, Concerning Endangered Species Legislation, Before the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, February 20, 1969

My name is Arnold Mayer. I am the Legislative Representative of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL–CIO).

The Amalgamated is a labor union with 500,000 members organized in about 700 Local Unions throughout the United States and Canada. The Amalgamated and its Local Unions have contracts with thousands of employers in the meat, retail, poultry, egg, canning, leather, fish processing and fur industries.

About 35,000 of our members work in the fur and leather tanning industries. Some of these members are involved with the endangered species legislation.

Appearing with me is Henry Foner, President of the Joint Board, Fur, Leather and Machine Workers Union in New York. The Joint Board combines some of our fur processing and leather tanning Local Unions.

REASONS FOR PAST CONCERN

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee, we appear today to offer strong support for legislation to conserve endangered species. As you know, our Union was quite concerned about this legislation last year. We should like to explain what our concern was and what has happened to ease our anxieties about the legislation.

When the endangered species legislation was moving through Congress last year, some of our fur and leather Local Unions greatly feared that the bill's ban on the importation of certain animal skins may cause job losses. Three background factors made that fear very real and very pressing. They are:

(1) Both the fur and the leather tanning industries are declining in employment. Virtually every year, additional companies close plants and shops. Men and women who have worked in these industries for decades are without jobs. Because of the nature of the work these employees have done most of their adult lives, it generally is not easy for them or the Union to find substitute employment offering them an equal standard of living.

Therefore in these two industries, any possible threat to present employment is looked upon with special fear and special anxiety.

(2) Because of past Congressional actions, the fur industry has suffered the export of some of its work and business to other countries. The most notable of these experiences is the result of a provision in the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1951 which bans the importation into the U.S. of seven Russian and Chinese furs.

The stated reason for this action—taken during the height of the Cold War—was to deny the Soviet Union and Red China an American market for their furs. But manufactured garments made of these furs continued and still continue to come into the U.S. freely. The skins are processed and the garments made in Western Europe. The finished product is then imported into the U.S. and sold here. The only result of the legislation is that perhaps thousands of U.S. jobs have been lost by an already declining industry.

Because of this and some other experiences, the Local Unions are especially sensitive to new legislation concerning fur importation bans.

(3) The provisions of H.R. 11618, the legislation which passed the House of Representatives last year, actually heightened these fears. For example, that bill did not specifically provide any hearing procedures on the listing of endangered or banned species. It did not provide for action to assure that other nations will pass similar legislation. The bill could have made illegal those skins which were already on hand and on which work might be done. And so on.

We know there was no intention by the legislation's drafters or sponsors to do any harm to the jobs of our members. That is obvious. But our Local Unions fully realize that laws are written to be enforced for a very long time. The determinant of what the legislation will do in the distant future lies entirely in its provisions and its legislative history. The existing provisions of H.R. 11618 provide no protection against job losses and exportation and therefore contributed to the already existing anxiety.

UNION'S DILEMMA

Obviously, our Union has an obligation to deal with any job loss danger which our members face. On the other hand, we also found the objectives of the endangered species legislation to be desirable and action to implement these goals to be necessary.

We faced a dilemma. We felt quite uncomfortable.

We decided that we must find a solution to the dilemma. We decided to work with the conservation groups, the industry groups, Interior Department officials, members of Congress and their staffs to discover ways in which the objectives of the legislation could be achieved, but at the same time, possible job losses would be curtailed.

We realized then and we realize today that this legislation will cause some job losses under any circumstances. Some may argue that these losses may be comparatively few and that the jobs would disappear anyway when the animals become extinct. That point may be quite true. But even a few jobs held only for a year or two are important in a declining industry.

The point is we will undoubtedly lose some jobs. But we want to limit that loss. And that is what we set out to do.

DISCUSSIONS AND MEETINGS

We have held several dozen meetings with various individuals and groups involved with all or different aspects of this legislation. We have frankly discussed our problems with them and we have sought solutions.

These discussions began during the Congressional session last year. They got underway when we joined fur and leather management representatives in a conference with Interior Department officials. As a result of this conversation, some subsequent talks and various discussions held only between the management representatives and Interior officials, the Department proposed very important changes in the legislation.

Although these amendments did not provide the solution, they were a great step forward. They came at the end of the Congressional session when time was running out for more conversations and further action could not be assured.

We continued the talks with conversation groups after the Congressional adjournment. In mid-December, we invited as many of the interested conservationists as we could reach, representatives of the two Congressional Committees, Interior Department officials, fur industry representatives and leather industry representatives to a January 6 meeting to discuss the legislation fully. It was the first time that management representatives from the affected industries and conservation leaders had ever met.

That meeting and a subsequent one held on February 7 were very successful. I do not mean that everyone agreed with everyone else. But fears were fully aired and efforts made to deal with them. Anger was expressed and cleared up. And most important of all, differences were narrowed.

In these meetings, our Union found itself in the middle between the industries and conservationists. This is true literally, because we had called the meeting, chaired it and tried to serve as a bridge in them. This is true figuratively because we found that our views were somewhere between the two sides.

Our own position—the way out of our dilemma—jelled during the meetings and the conversations. It is to support H.R. 4812, to propose one major amendment, two minor ones and to suggest a provision for the Committee's report.

Our position and our proposed amendments do not come as a surprise to any of the groups. We made our proposals clear during the February 7 meeting and other conversations. We found much support for our position and—as far as I know—no opposition.

SUPPORT OF H.R. 4812

We strongly support H.R. 4812. This measure was proposed by the Johnson Administration before it left office and was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the full Committee, Rep. Edward A. Garmatz. It reflects some of the changes sought by our Union and other organizations last year when we complained about provisions of H.R. 11618.

Some of the improvements of H.R. 4812 over previous House bills are:

1. It provides interested groups and persons opportunities to comment on the actual determination to list specific endangered species. Organizations and individuals can make their views officially known to the Secretary both before he compiles the list and when it is published.

2. It encourages agreements between the United States and other nations to conserve and protect the endangered species. Such action is absolutely essential to prevent the export of fur and leather jobs and business to other nations as a result of this legislation.

Frankly, we believe this provision needs some strengthening and will suggest an additional section later in this statement.

3. It makes clear that the threat of total extinction must apply to the entire species or subspecies wherever found and not merely a species or subspecies in a particular country.

4. It provides for hardship cases in which a firm contracted for skins before a particular species was banned. The firm must prove its case to the Secretary before it is permitted to import the skins.

This provision may be important to some firms which are poorly capitalized and cannot afford the loss of the money paid in the contracts. In these industries, where many firms are shaky, such a hardship provision could avoid a job jeopardy.

5. It provides for delisting if a specie is found by the Secretary to have increased in numbers to a point where it is no longer threatened with extinction. If this were to occur with some species commercially useful in the fur and leather industry, work could begin again and jobs would increase.

FOREIGN ACTION ON ENDANGERED SPECIES

During the meetings with the various interested groups, the two points discussed most were: (a) the need to get other nations—particularly other fur processing and leather tanning nations—to join in the conservation effort on endangered species and (b) the need for standards on how a species is determined to be endangered. We have some recommendations in both areas.

Concerning other nations, we believe some stronger language is needed than now exists in Section 5 of H.R. 4812. Obviously, the goal of conserving the species will not be met if the U.S. bans the importation, but other nations do not. Also, we greatly fear that unless other nations provide a similar ban, fur and leather jobs may be exported, as occurred in the previously mentioned cases of the Soviet and Chinese furs.

Another important factor is that the State Department—involved with a series of world crises—may not give a high priority to the negotiation of a worldwide convention, bilateral or multi-lateral agreements concerning endangered species. It will need some prodding by Congress.

One approach to the problem could be to make the effective date of the bill dependent upon similar actions by the major fur processing and leather tanning nations. This move would assure the protection of American jobs from export. But it might also greatly delay the effort to conserve the endangered species. We do not want to hold back that work and we shall therefore *not* ask for or support such an amendment.

We understand, however, that the Department and various conservation groups have sought and are seeking an early international conference concerning wildlife and fish. Such a governmental meeting could include the signing of a convention which would be binding on the signatory nations. It would provide an early solution to the problems posed by other nations.

We therefore urge that the Committee amend H.R. 4812 by adding a subsection (b) to Sec. 5. This subsection should instruct the Secretary of the Interior, working through the Secretary of State, to seek an international meeting of governments in 1970 on the problems of wildlife and fish and this meeting should specifically include the signing of a convention concerning endangered species.

Our discussions with various persons knowledgeable in the field of international conservation indicate that such a meeting could be held in 1970. The advance work apparently can be done in the intervening time.

STANDARDS FOR THE LISTING OF SPECIES

Great fear has been expressed by some parts of the fur and leather industries and by some of our Local Unions concerning the absence of specific standards for determining what species are endangered. In our various discussions, we have tried to arrive at some standards which would both conserve rare animals and also provide a guarantee against any arbitrary action by a Secretary sometime in the future.

Very frankly, we have been unable to come up with any such provision. Existing species are so varied that a standard to fit all has escaped us.

We do have several suggestions to make for decreasing the fear which still exists concerning the relative absence of standards. These suggestions do not limit the power of the Secretary in listing endangered species, but they would provide some recourse against possible arbitrary actions.

We urge that:

1. The Committee report accompanying the endangered species bill specifically instruct the Department that in the case of any specie which is used in U.S. manufacturing, the Department must be especially careful that the evidence concerning the danger of its extinction fully justifies its listing.

2. The bill again specifically mentions the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources in Sec. 3 of H.R. 4812 as an organization to be consulted.

Other bills specifically named this very prestigious and knowledgeable organization. For some reason, its mention was dropped from H.R. 4812. Since this international group has the greatest amount of data and compiles the Red Data Books, it should again be named in the legislation.

3. Either the bill or the Committee report should provide that no species or subspecies will be listed that is not considered rare and endangered in the Red Data Books of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.

During the February 7th meeting of the various organizations, Interior Department officials were asked whether any species which was not in the Red Data Books would be listed. They answered, "No."

These volumes are the main worldwide source of information in this area. The Committee can thereby ease fears about the possible listings in the future without sacrificing any authority of the Secretary by writing the Red Data Books into the legislation or report.

SPEEDY ENACTMENT

In closing we again want to voice our support of H.R. 4812. We urge your approval of this bill with the suggested amendments. We hope Congress will enact this legislation shortly.

Thank you very much for giving us this opportunity to present our views.

THE MAGNITUDE AND ECONOMIC IMPACT OF GENERAL AVIATION

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 1, 1969, the Utility Airplane Council of Aerospace Industries Association released the results of an important study on the impact of general aviation, now and in the future. General aviation is making sizable and significant contributions to our way of life and to the national economy. The findings of the study were discussed at a briefing in Washington yesterday and followed by a summarization by Joseph T. Geuting, Jr., manager of the Utility Airplane Council entitled "The Magnitude and Economic Impact of General Aviation."

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Geuting's address made on occasion of the public release of the research study commissioned with R. Dixon Speas Associates by the Utility Airplane Council:

Aviation has changed the face of business in the United States—in truth, in the world—in little more than a generation. Air travel is no longer an adventure, it is a necessity.

The airlines have made great strides, as they have developed the finest system of scheduled air transportation in the entire world. America's commercial airlines provide service for millions of people and tons of cargo between major metropolitan centers in the United States and around the globe. General aviation strengthens and completes the nation's air transportation system. Whereas the airlines provide service to about 600 places, general aircraft fly to and from all of the nation's civil airports—numbering about 10,000—located in many places in all of the fifty States.

The most expensive camera will produce a clear picture only if the subject is in focus. The varying views expressed about today's air transportation problems often result in a fuzzy image. Due to the urgency of the problems, it is time to trade in our distorted lenses and look at the subject with high resolution, wide angle equipment.

To better focus in on what the real problems are, let's acknowledge that our viewfinder sees that the basic subject, our nation's great air transportation system, is composed of the scheduled airlines and general aviation. While on the one hand they are two distinct elements of the nation's total air transportation system they are identical in one very fundamental respect, their objective is satisfying the total requirements of the air traveler.

Their combined strength, however, is the sum of their different functions. While the airlines operate over specified routes at specific times, general aircraft move when and where they must in order to conform to times set by the air traveler. Thus, the needs of the public are served through two separate systems each interdependent upon the other and together forming one complete system.

This is the true picture of the air transportation system which exists today. It is the same successful system which will exist ten years from now—although it will then be greatly expanded. Its continued success, and its concurrent ability to greatly contribute to the national economy, depends on understanding and cooperative efforts by the public, public officials, and aviation industry leaders.

Since general aviation provides 98 percent of the aircraft in the total air transportation system, has 91 percent of the licensed pilots, flies 79 percent of all airplane hours and 71 percent of all air miles, carries 50 percent of all passengers and is making a continually growing impact on the national economy, there should be no doubts that general aviation is a full partner in America's National Aviation System.

And, in realizing that by 1980 the present fleet of more than 122,200 general aviation aircraft will have more than doubled, that there will be 1,400,000 pilots as opposed to 600,000 today will fly 63 million hours (nearly three times the total hours in 1967) and further realizing that the direct contribution of general aviation to the national economy will have increased from $2.2 billion in 1967 to $7.1 billion, it is vitally important that the planners of the National Aviation System have adequate information on which to base their plans.

Certainly some of the information set forth in the study prepared for the Utility Airplane Council by R. Dixon Speas Associates is startling—startling, that is, in the light of previous proprietary industry and other studies which past experience shows have on the whole been conservative. Frankly, we have a nagging feeling today that these new projections—though soundly based—may well prove conservative. The past performance of the general aviation industry has caused us to so think.

There have been several great strides made by general aviation in the past two decades:

The introduction of the light twin-engined aircraft greatly broadened the utility of light aircraft for business and corporate use;

Modern low cost aircraft particularly suitable for training has broadened the base and opened the field for a whole new generation of private pilots to learn to fly in aircraft essentially identical to those they will use as they increase their flying skills and put aircraft to work in their day to day activities;

The advent of the small turbined powered aircraft, pure and prop jet, with pressurized cabins, has further increased utility for corporate and business use;

Air taxi and commuter type service to supplement and feed airline service is now accelerating rapidly using typical general aviation aircraft; and

Not the least of the strides, in fact, a giant stride, is the availability of a wide variety of highly reliable, low cost, electronic navigation and communication equipments which places general aviation on a par with the airlines in the ability to fully use the National Aviation System. In fact it was a general aviation aircraft which was first certificated for CAT II Operations.

Growth is evident in other ways. In 1954 the general aviation industry produced 3,071 aircraft with a manufacturers' net billing value of $43.4 million; in 1956 the industry produced 6,738 aircraft valued at $103.7 million; and in 1968—13,698 aircraft were shipped with a value of $425,682,000. 1980 domestic sales alone are projected to have a value of 1.6 billion dollars. When it is pointed out that more than 20 percent of today's production is exported and export sales have also shown a strong and continuing growth trend, the 1980 sales outlook becomes even more significant.

The trend-line shows strong and continuing growth which has been greatly accelerated within the most recent past. Faced with the facts of past growth and the future potential, it becomes increasingly important that planners have adequate information. The members of the Utility Airplane Council, as well as other elements of the aviation industry and government, have long been concerned about the evolving problems. We have known for many years that the complexities facing a National Aviation System were increasing by quantum leaps as the expansion and improvement of the nation's airports and airways was lagging behind—at an increasing rate—the introduction and use of more and better equipped aircraft in both the airline and the general aircraft fleets.

The UAC study not only indicates an already significant contribution to the nation's air transportation economy by general aviation but a future of much greater significance and national impact.

Unfortunately some of the ways that the problems of the National Aviation System were brought to the general public's attention tended to cloud the basic issues and needs and caused some to cry out for constraints. The solution to air transportation problems will not serve the public interest through constraints on any portion of civil aviation. There has to be a better way.

We believe the information contained in the Utility Airplane Council-R. Dixon Speas Associates study adds substantially to the knowledge of general aviation and its overall importance as an integral part of the nation's transportation economy. In recent months there has been an emergence of a broader public understanding that air transportation is an essential national asset. If the general public is to benefit from air transportation it must understand it in its total sense, commercial airline plus general aviation operations.

Planners particularly must have detailed knowledge of this totality. A principal objective of the study was to provide new information to assist responsible planning bodies at national and local levels in assessing the requirements of the airport/airways system, and for planning related facilities adequate to match growth patterns.

These factors influenced the Utility Airplane Council in its assignment to R. Dixon Speas Associates. In preparing the study, Speas Associates were given freedom as to methodology and reporting techniques. They were also to assume that no unusual constraints would be placed on any segment of civil aviation.

It is our belief that "The Magnitude and Economic Impact of General Aviation" presents a new spectrum in the study of general aviation. It provides information of a nature and in a form not previously available from any source, exclusive of proprietary studies conducted by members of the industry for specialized segments of various markets. It should also be clearly stated that the study was not made with any thought of either discounting or displacing previous industry or government studies. The sole objective was to provide new and additional information so vitally needed by government and industry planners for an adequate airways/airports system.

The study provides factual support to the strong belief long held by the general aviation community that general aviation is making sizeable and significant contributions to the national economy; and a high positive relationship was found between Gross National Product and the changing levels of general aviation activity permitting more accurate forecasting based on highly developed available forecasts of GNP.

Overall, the fleet is forecast to grow from 122,200 units in 1967 to 260,000 in 1980, an increase of 112.8 percent.

Whereas growth will occur in all forms of general aircraft, the highest growth rate will occur in turbine powered units—both turboprop and pure jets. Please note, I said rate. The piston powered aircraft, in great variety; will dominate the general aircraft fleet for many years to come.

In the same vein, the UAC study places general aviation hours flown at 24.4 million. The forecast of hours flown projects a 7.6 percent annual compound growth rate through 1980 going from 24.4 million in 1967 to 63.4 million in 1980.

This is carried over into aircraft movements estimated to be 98 million in 1967 and projected to 242 million in 1980.

Flight hours and aircraft movements are based on counts at some 300 airports where the FAA has control towers. This then can only be an approximation of the total number of general aviation flights and flight hours since there are nearly 10,000 airports in the United States.

One might add that of the top ten airports in the nation in the number of movements, three are general aviation airports with no airline service at all. Of these, Opa-Locka, Florida has as many or more operations as O'Hare which is considered the busiest airport in the world.

Movements are indicative of the number of people carried. Studies suggest that general aviation now carries 50 percent as many passengers in inter-city travel as do the nation's certificated airlines. This can also be expected to grow as can the use of general aviation aircraft for cargo and mail. The Utility Airplane Council-R. Dixon Speas Associates study indicates that where 100 million people were carried in 1967, this number will increase to 317 million by 1980. Cargo will increase from 250,000 tons in 1967 to one million tons and, as we mentioned earlier, the number of pilots will more than double from 617,000 today to more than 1.4 million by 1980.

While the growth of the fleet, numbers of pilots, flying hours, people and cargo carried are themselves demonstrative of explosive growth, the economic impact is also very great.

Utilizing the statistics supplied by the R. Dixon Speas Associates report, the Utility Airplane Council prepared a somewhat more comprehensive analysis of the economic impact both in a direct and in an indirect sense. Utilizing standard procedures and an input-output matrix of a type which is readily available to economists, it has been determined that in the time period 1967 to 1980 general aviation direct and indirect economic impact will grow to approximately 15 billion dollars. This growth will also be at a more rapid rate than the total Gross National Product. GNP is expected to increase by 143.1 percent, while general aviation increase will be on the order of 220.4 percent. General aviation's contribution to Gross National Product as a proportion of total GNP should increase from .62% to .82%.

The rapid growth of both airline and general aviation is outstripping and out-pacing the capacities of many of the nation's airports and portions of its air traffic control system. This growing lack of adequate capacity, which the government has publicly stated is *not* a safety problem, could have a serious effect, unless corrected and corrected quickly, on realizing the maximum economic potential of this industry.

It is an economic problem because if the airport and air traffic control system is not continuously improved and expanded it will constrain the growth potential of all forms of air transportation and the nation will suffer economic penalties.

But, with proper national attention to adequately support and improve the nation's airports and airways—or the National Aviation System as it is now called—the beneficial growth projected will easily be attained. The performance of the general aviation industry in the past decade is ample proof of this.

Unlike transportation conducted on the surface with rivers, oceans, and mountain ranges imposing natural barriers, air transportation moves in a mighty ocean of air which encompasses the entire world. This air ocean connects every place with every other place. It touches all people from the most primitive to those living in advanced centers of civilization. How this ocean of air is used will mark man's progress in the next year, the next decade, the next century.

Progress is man's distinctive mark. But progress is not accidental. It must be planned for and paid for. The members of the Utility Airplane Council believe that air transportation today—all air transportation—is the distinct mark of progress, and is vitally necessary to the economic well-being of the United States.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep personal loss that I rise today to pay tribute to a great man, a man whose dedicated service to his Nation in the military, as a civilian leader, and finally as President of the United States, offers to all of us in public life an outstanding example for each of us to follow to the full extent of our capabilities.

Dwight David Eisenhower was born on the Texas frontier and reared in the midst of a pioneer environment in the Middle West. He was a member of a family of limited financial means but of unlimited ideals and family spirit. This background and the strength of his family, provided the foundation on which he grew to become one of the greatest men the world has known this century.

Eisenhower, the general, earned a unique place in the history of this Nation because of his tremendous ability to mobilize not only the forces of our own country but the forces of our Allies for the greatest amphibious assault the world has ever known, crossing the English Channel on June 6, 1944, to commence the long march which he led to return freedom to Europe.

Eisenhower, the statesman, after World War II, served the free world as organizer and Supreme Commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Through his wisdom and guidance, General Eisenhower in this capacity contributed to the rebirth of free Europe. The healthy societies and economies these liberated nations enjoy today, especially as they are compared to their counterparts still behind the Iron Curtain, stand as a monument to the job which he undertook after achieving victory in World War II.

Eisenhower, the President, served all the people of this Nation, putting aside any thought of partisan differences. I can say personally that I felt it a privilege and a pleasure to work with this man who sat in the White House during the first 2 years that I was a Member of the House of Representatives. President Eisenhower, a soldier by education and profession, was truly a man of peace. His honesty, his open, warm personality, generated trust and faith in him as a leader not only on the part of of the people of this Nation but on the part of the military and political leaders and individual citizens throughout the world. This confidence in his personal ability and integrity, I believe, were in large measure responsible for the fact that the Eisenhower years represent the longest period of peace this Nation has known for many decades.

Mrs. Johnson and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and the members of the family.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, 1969 is the 51st anniversary of Byelorussian independence and I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the brave and freedom-loving people of Byelorussia.

During the 19th and early 20th centuries a distinct Byelorussian culture asserted itself within czarist Russia. Despite strong opposition and constant harassment by the central government, books and newspapers were published in the Byelorussian language, a Byelorussian theater was established, and Byelorussian political parties took shape.

World War I provided the Byelorussians with the opportunity to establish their national independence. Shortly after the Russian March revolution of 1917 a Congress of the Byelorussian Socialist Hromada was called in Minsk, Byelorussia's major city. The Congress called for the reorganization of the Russian empire as a federative state with Byelorussia enjoying autonomous status. On December 5, 1917, an all-Byelorussian Congress met in Minsk. It was attended by 1,872 democratically chosen delegates representing all Byelorussian organizations and political parties. This Congress took another step toward complete independence from Russia when it adopted a resolution endorsing the right of self-determination for all peoples.

Before the Congress adjourned, however, the Bolsheviks, who had seized power in Russia in November, 1917, surrounded the building where the meeting was being held and disbanded the Congress with a display of armed power. By this action Byelorussia became one of the very first victims of Communist aggression.

More favorable conditions prevailed when the Germans occupied Byelorussia after February 1918. On March 25, 1918, the Rada of the Byelorussian National Republic solemnly proclaimed their independence and published an official decree of independence.

Despite great difficulties imposed by the war and its consequences, the Byelorussian Government made significant advances in the fields of education, culture, and social welfare. The new Government was also active in the international sphere, and sought and received recognition from numerous countries.

Byelorussian independence, sadly, was short-lived. With the dissolution of the German Armed Forces after the armistice of November 1918, and the advance of the Red Army into Byelorussian territory, the small and ill-equipped military forces of Byelorussia were unable to protect their beloved homeland. On December 10, 1918, the Communists seized Minsk and established a puppet government. With the Treaty of Riga in 1921, Byelorussia was divided between Poland and the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, to this day the Byelorussian people have not been subdued by their Communist overlords. Tactics of deportation, executions, purges, and terrorism have failed to dampen their belief in freedom and self-determination. I salute the brave Byelorussian people and pray that their goal of national liberation will not be long in coming.

GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to a great leader—a man whose life and devotion to our Nation will continue to inspire people throughout the world for all times.

The people of the Ninth District and the State of Missouri share this period of mourning with all Americans and with all friends of freedom in every corner of the world.

As Commander of the Allied forces in Europe, General Eisenhower liberated millions from Nazi oppression and as the 34th President, he gave strength and courage to millions who recognized his smile and upraised arms as symbols of freedom.

Words are inadequate either to describe our loss or to retrace his contributions to mankind. History will have to record the full scope and significance of Eisenhower's deeds.

We can take comfort in knowing that the principles for which Ike stood have become more permanent as a result of his life and the future generations will not forget this great leader.

SOUTH-WEST AFRICA RESOLUTION PASSES U.N.

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in 1966, soon after the assassination of South African Prime Minister Verwoerd, I joined with six of my Republican colleagues in calling strong American leadership "toward nondiscriminatory development and nonviolent transition" in Africa. In a letter to President Johnson, we pointed out that the assassination was testimony to the extraordinary tensions which exist throughout southern Africa, and called the administration to task for failing to exercise the effective leadership that the United States is in a position to provide "to channel the energies of the African people in nonviolent policies dedicated to the ultimate growth of a peaceful and integrated society in southern Africa."

The letter also urged constructive initiatives by the United States in the United Nations to deal with the problem of South Africa's refusal to terminate its mandate over South-West Africa, and I am pleased to note that the Nixon administration has taken a step in this direction. Over 2 years ago, the U.N. General Assembly called an end to this mandate, the unjust and discriminatory nature of which has led to a dangerous degree of tension throughout the African continent, and on March 20, 1969, the Security Council took its first action to put the declaration into effect. With strong U.S. support, the Council adopted a resolution, 13 to 0, calling on South Africa to withdraw immediately from the neighboring territory of South-West Africa.

By thus going on record in support of the cause of self-determination in southern Africa, the new administration has taken an important step in our commitment to the achievement of a just, stable, and progressive peace throughout Africa. Although two members of the Security Council abstained from the vote on the grounds that the U.N. could not insure the implementation of the resolution, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., Charles Yost, stated that the resolution "wisely does not commit the Council to the narrow path of mandatory sanctions." There are, indeed, a number of alternative actions open to the United Nations which do not involve direct physical or economic confrontation, and which are due careful study in our search for effective means to deal with the problem. I am presenting here for the consideration of my colleagues an article from the Washington Post which briefly describes the recent U.N. action, and a policy statement from the American Committee on Africa which suggests a number of possible steps which the U.N. could take. Although I question the value of some of the recommendations offered by this paper, I think it is, in general, a useful demonstration of the creative thinking and constructive approach from which we may develop the diplomatic efforts that can be effectively implemented and that will allow progress in this complex and difficult situation.

The material follows:

[From the Washington Post]

SOUTH-WEST AFRICA RESOLUTION PASSES U.N.

UNITED NATIONS, March 20.—With U.S. support, the U.N. Security Council called on South Africa today to withdraw immediately from the neighboring territory of South-West Africa.

The 15-nation Council adopted a resolution to that effect 13–0, with two abstentions. Britain and France abstained because they believed the United Nations cannot insure its implementation and it would only encourage false hopes.

It was the first Council action to put into effect the General Assembly's 2½-year-old declaration that South Africa's League of Nations mandate to govern South-West Africa, a former German colony, was terminated.

Before the vote, U.S. Ambassador Charles W. Yost said the United States was able to support the resolution "because it wisely does not commit the Council to the narrow path of mandatory sanctions."

Many black African nations have been demanding at least economic sanctions against South Africa for defying the U.N. declaration. Zambian Ambassador Vernon Johnson Mwaanga, who introduced the resolution, contended it was broad enough to encompass mandatory sanctions.

IS THERE NOTHING WE CAN DO ABOUT SOUTH WEST AFRICA?

(By Elizabeth S. Landis, American Committee on Africa)

Re: Action which could be taken by the United Nations General Assembly and Council for South West Africa to assert international jurisdiction over South West Africa without direct physical confrontation with the Republic of South Africa.

First, the UN General Assembly should declare the South African government to be an illegal "occupying power" in South West Africa and so refer to it in all official documents and speeches. (Since South Africa "occupies" South West Africa to the exclusion of the UN itself, its occupation can be distinguished from other occupations—e.g., Tibet, the Middle East, etc.—which the UN might not want to stigmatice in that way.) The United States should also employ this terminology.

The UN Council for South West Africa should:

(1) (a) Issue passports for South West African citizens and visas permitting the entry of aliens into South West Africa.

(b) Request all UN member states not to acknowledge passports issued by the occupying power to South West Africans and to mark the passports of their own citizens "not valid for travel in South West Africa unless this passport bears visa issued by the United Nations Council for South West Africa."

(2) (a) Direct all persons (natural or corporate) subject to general taxation (primarily income, sales, and excise taxes) to pay such taxes to the Council. The Council could request all UN member states to collect such taxes from their own nationals subject thereto, on behalf of the Council; and it could grant such states a collection fee for the service.

(b) Request all UN member states to deny foreign tax credits or otherwise to penalize their nationals if they pay such taxes to the occupying power; foreign tax credits should be granted for taxes paid to the Council.

(3) (a) Record all existing land titles (including mineral rights, etc.) and keep an official register of all future transfers of title. It should investigate all transfers made under the Odendaal Plan, the "Development of Self-Government for the Native Nations on South West Africa" law, and related legislation; any such transfer should be deemed presumptively invalid in the absence of a showing that it was in the interest of the indigenous nonwhite inhabitants of South West Africa.

Request all UN member states to accept the Council register as the valid register of land titles, and to act accordingly. The United States, for example, should require all securities registration statements filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission by companies having interests in South West Africa to indicate whether they have valid land title according to the Council register.

(4) (a) Issue South West African postage stamps.[1]

(b) Call on the International Postal Union and its members to treat as if it were unstamped mail, all mail originating in South West Africa, which does not bear a stamp issued by the Council.

The UN might issue one or more of its own stamps commemorating its assumption of the South West African Mandate.

---

[1] This would have the additional advantage of raising substantial revenue for the Council through the sale of such stamps to philatelists.

THE WORLD'S SEABED: PREVENT ITS MILITARIZATION

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I have cosponsored a resolution dealing with the prevention of militarization of the world's seabed. We have reached a point of saturation as far as armaments are concerned. As I gaze about the world today, I am struck by the marked resemblance between it and Europe before World War I struck. There is the same proliferation of armaments, built in the name of peace. There are the same vast armies, assembled in the name of peace. There are the same beplumed, helmeted, and glittering assemblages of generals and admirals, all atwitch with an urge to find out how good their armed forces, schedules, and weapons really are. Further, they are rapidly seeing to it that geographical areas technology opened up to man are first reached and strategically overseen by the Military Establishment. This today is true of the oceans and seabeds of the world.

As science allows us to penetrate further into the depths of the planet's waters, it is already easy to discern another trend of military thought. Oceans are merely another sphere of influence and military operations in the eyes of the general staffs of the world's great powers. I believe it is essential to prevent swift militarization of the seabeds of the world.

Ample precedent exists for such an agreement. We have previously entered into treaties providing for demilitarization of outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies. We have done the same as far as Antarctica is concerned, and scientific cooperation flowering there is a monument to the spirit of that agreement.

We can and should move immediately to keep the world's seabeds free of militarization. By so doing we would eliminate a potential source of conflict among nations of the world.

As of today there is no major militarization of the seabed because technology has not become fully sophisticated enough to allow it. There is travel through the depths on a military basis, though, and we must act now.

JACK JOUETT'S GAMY RIDE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on June 3, 1781, Capt. Jack Jouett, of Virginia, outwitted the British and saved the lives of Thomas Jefferson and his family, and of members of the legislative assembly who had moved for safety from Richmond to Charlottesville, Va.

Captain Jouett observed the move of the Red Coats from the window of the Cuckoo Tavern in Louisa Court House Town, Va., and guessed they were going after "big game." He immediately mounted his horse to make a fast ride by moonlight at midnight taking a short cut through the wilds to give warning to Jefferson and the others before the enemy could arrive.

His mission was successful. Jefferson sent his family by carriage over the mountain to the Carter Place, and he later followed on horseback. The legislators, after Jouett's warning, adjourned to assemble down the valley at Staunton Hall.

A constituent of mine, who is also an accomplished poet, Lena G. Doll, has composed an account of Captain Jouett's ride, which I commend to all who read this RECORD for careful attention. Captain Jouett was an authentic, and largely unsung, American hero. His feat should prove an inspiration to Americans, young and old.

The poem follows:

JACK JOUETT'S GAMY RIDE

(By Lena G. Doll)

Jack Jouett's momentous midnight ride
Through the wild Virginia country side
From Cuckoo Tavern through Albemarle
To Monticello and Charlottesville

Saved Thomas Jefferson and other great men
By the British invaders from being taken.
June third, seventeen hundred eighty one,
Jack Jouett rode hard through the woods alone.

The Virginian law-makers had already signed
The Declaration of Freedom of Albemarle
From authority of England's King George III
And were hard at work to write their own laws,
The vanguard of thinking in Freedom's just cause,

"We'll take the heart and the very life pulse
Of Virginia; we will thus quench the source
Of rebellion in these colonies", the British agreed,
Germaine and Cornwallis, to do so was prime need.

Cornwallis then said to Banastre Tarleton,
His most active and resourceful partisan,
"Get Jefferson and his men at Charlottesville,
The advance thinkers of Freedom's will.
That will scotch the idea, put an end to the war.
These Colonies are well worth fighting for.
Now what will you need to accomplish the task?
Yours for the taking, whatever you ask."

"A hundred dragoons from your veteran staff
And seventy-five Welsh Fusiliers is all I ask."

"Choose from the Legion the dragoons you deem able,
For Welsh mounts, pillaged horses from Virginia's best stables.
Be hard at it now, there is no time to lose
Lafayette's now in Virginia with a token of troops
And Wayne is approaching with a thousand fresh men,
'Tis reported he is on this side of the Rapidan.
Now, even now, is the propitious time—
Go, get the Legislators and Tom Jefferson.

Both men were pleased with this bold novel strategy
Both felt assured of a quick easy victory.

Tarleton's wild thinking gave him a sense of delight,
King George himself would dub him a knight
When the chained captives were stood in his sight.

Tarleton was an egoist with a one-channel mind.
He thought not of failure, to that he was blind,
He had not full reason, he was of that kind.
He had just failed at Cowpens, but that was behind,
Here and now was his chance to pick the prize plum,
He would surely be a General when that feat was done,
He thought not at all of his superiors three,
Of British Colonial Secretary, Germaine,
Of Cornwallis in charge of the Virginia Campaign,
Of Sir Henry Clinton, Commander, of Forces of the King.
'Twas only himself and the self-glory he'd win
On which his thoughts dwelt, that he kept well within.

He made a salute and a most gracious bow,
"Yes, Sir, General, I will do that right now.
Hanover to Charlottesville is near seventy miles
My men can ride it in the span of a day,
Surprise, and seize the captives, and return without delay."

Then Tarleton made plans for his daring exploit,
To take Jefferson and the Legislators at one fell swoop.

The Legislators had withdrawn from Richmond to Charlottesville,
Not to be deterred from high purpose, or will,
At stake was their freedom from an arrogant King
Their death, if it please him, their capture could bring.

In Tarleton's mind they were already his take,
From his trained and equipped cavalry, how could they escape!

About ten o'clock in the evening of the third day of June,
Tarleton's uniformed equipage rode into Louisa Court House Town,
Under the charm and splendor of a brilliant moon; the townspeople only guessed—
Was this another rapid raid, or was it a big game quest?
Providentially, Jack Jouett's sharp eyes and alert mind descried their bold intent
As he spied from a small rear window the Cuckoo Tavern lent,
They took the road to Charlottesville, forty miles to the west,
Instantly, Jack Jouett knew they were out on a big game quest.
They would be there by early morn to sack Freedom's seed and sprout,
To get his good friend Jefferson, and the Legislators, too, no doubt.

They hadn't seen Jack Jouett, but Jack Jouett had seen them.
They did not know Jack Jouett was an unusual dare-devil horseman,
Of Virginian militia, a Captain, with his own horse at his call,
Or that he would get there ahead of them, their big game quest to foil,
That he would have given warning to his fellow country-men
That the British were fast coming, and to leave before they came.

Not waiting to settle his account for his Cuckoo Tavern food
He rushed to the stable and saddled his horse to take a cut-off ride
To get ahead of Tarleton and his splendid equipage
Making their trip to Charlottesville by way of the common road.

Jack Jouett, on Prince Charley, plunged into the wilderness,
Goaded by the need to save good lives for Freedom's sake, no less.
More or less familiar with terrain of Albermarle
Where he had been on fox hunts o'er many a rugged mile
Of mud holes, of gullies, of small and unbridged streams,
Of thick undergrowth, of thorny bush, of long lush twining vine
But here and now was a different ride, significant through-out all time.
Jack sensed the situation, heeded not his wounds from thorn,
But pressed with spur his superior steed into the early morn.
And just as grey dawn was breaking over Albermarle's rounded hills
Jack forded the Rivanna, and galloped with a will
Up the wind of "Little Mountain" while everything was still.

Before Monticello's stately portico, he reined his panting steed
And called out through the quietude "Red Coats are coming; take heed."
Like a shot Jack was off again for another two-mile pace
When he would be in Charlottesville, the end of this hard race.
There he would warn the Legislators who were sleeping at the Swan,
Since his father was its keeper, Jack knew well every room,
"Up, up, my friends!" he called to them; "Up, up, my friends, and away!
The Red Coats on horse are coming, they'll be here by early day!"
At Monticello Jefferson was in meeting with Legislators as his guests,
After a hurried breakfast, for Charlottesville they left.

He put his family in his coach under trusted servant care
To go over the mountain to the Carter place; they would be safe and secluded there.
He then ordered his favorite horse to be shod, and concealed on a mountain trail
In readiness to follow them when advantage should avail.
While his servants were concealing his valued treasures there,
He was bundling his documents to be transported elsewhere.
After he saw them off the place, he went up on a near-by hill
To his favorite look-out where he trained his telescope direct on Charlottesville.

The streets there were deserted, that was one good sign,
His friend Legislators had made it there, all in one good time.
He thought the Red Coats would be in Charlottesville before they came to "Little Mountain",
But in that the sly Tarleton out-witted him, and divided his forces at Rivanna.

The dragoons he started to Charlottesville, then when that was done,
The Fusiliers to Monticello for the great prize, Jefferson.

Thomas Jefferson had remembered an important paper he had overlooked in his haste,
And started to the library to get it when he made a right about face.
For all of a sudden he noticed that he had dropped his sword,
And to be without that in any event, no gentleman could afford.
He made a search and recovered it up on his favorite hill,
Then he turned to look through his telescope at the Square in Charlottesville.

The streets were swarming with Red Coats, it was now nearly mid-forenoon,
Jack Jouett had been there three hours before, and that was none too soon,
For the Legislators had assembled in the Courthouse for roll call
And adjourned on fresh mounts for an undisturbed flight.
Down the valley to Staunton hall.

At Staunton, both Houses voted that to Jack Jouett
The Governor should present, two pistols and an elegant sword,
As memorial to the high sense they entertained
For his enterprise in watchfulness, and for the aid he lent.

As Jefferson saw the Red Coats swarm the streets of Charlottesville,
He was amazed at a glance to see Red Coats, also, riding up "Little Mountain" hill.
Through the quivering aspens he saw them approaching for their take;
By a margin of minutes, on his readied horse, Jefferson made narrow escape.

After the Red Coats had made certain that the big prize bird had flown
They toasted the health of George the Third with Monticello's wine.
For eighteen hours they delayed to leave, milling thereabout,
At midnight they took their departure, dispirited, no doubt.

The dragoons, after they had crossed the Rivanna, on way to Charlottesville,
Had taken a "delayed" breakfast with Doctor Walker "for good will".

When they finally reached Charlottesville, and learned that their game was gone
They tarried to harry a day and a night before their march to join
Cornwallis, anxiously waiting, at his camp far north of his Portsmouth base.
The General would be disappointed at the facts that he would face.

What of Tarleton, with his troops, burning with chagrin
At the non-attainment of his task, he had caught none of his big game—
With one hundred, and seventy-five mounted men
The very best of the British best corps—

To return to base with empty hands, this would not end the war.
The idea of Freedom had not been killed, not even scotched, in fact,
It had new impetus to thrive, and be clarified, intact.

And what of Jack Jouett in Charlottesville, he had a task to perform
To have the townspeople conceal for safe keep needed stores and some small arms.
He with General Stevens, invalided home with wounds from the war,
Hadn't fully completed the task when spied by the British corps.
The General was not recognized in his garb of one from the farm,
But strapping Jack in uniform, red feather in cap, had instant need of alarm.
He sprang into his saddle, dashed away in the woods on a trail
Pursued by the eager Red Coats, but to no avail;
They were soon out-distanced, eluded, and lost on that difficult devious trail.

History tells us what later happened to each, but we will leave them all here, alack,
For Jack Jouett's ride is finished, and recorded on a plaque
Set on the site where the Swan Tavern stood, as memorial to Captain Jack.

The very fact that Jack Jouett's grave can not be found today
Is witness to the circumstance that his work will live alway.
His noteworthy ride made history; it occurred in seemliest time
To help raise the light of Freedom aloft, that it could forever shine.

The greatest luxury we have today, as we well know,
Is the Freedom for which Jack Jouett rode one hundred eighty years ago.

In all the annals of history no other by night or day
Like the memorable ride by moonlight through the wilds by Jack Jouett.

SUITLAND GI DIES OF WAR INJURIES

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. James R. Taylor, an outstanding young man from Maryland, died recently of wounds he received in Vietnam. I should like to commend the courage of this fine soldier and honor his memory by including the following article in the Record:

Suitland GI Dies of War Injuries—Pfc. James R. Taylor Was In Walter Reed Hospital

A Suitland (Md.) soldier who would have celebrated his 19th birthday yesterday, has died from injuries received in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Pfc. James R. Taylor died March 2 in Walter Reed General Hospital in Washington, from wounds he received during an enemy mortar attack February 5 near the Cambodian border.

Private Taylor had enlisted in the Army in January, 1968, while in his senior year at Suitland Senior High School. He received his basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C., and then completed paratroop training at Fort Benning, Ga., and Fort McClellan, Ala.

He was originally attached to the 173d Airborne Division but was transferred to the 4th Infantry Division when he arrived in Vietnam in August, 1968.

While in high school he was active in many sports and was on the varsity track and football teams. He completed high school while in the Army and planned to go to college when he left military service.

LEAVES WIFE, SON

His wife, Mrs. Brenda L. Taylor, said that her husband felt that he should "fight for freedom" or if necessary "died for it."

"He wanted those people to be free," she said, referring to the South Vietnamese.

Besides his wife, he is survived by a son, James R. Taylor, Jr.; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. O. T. Taylor; and three brothers, Robert A. Taylor, of Norfolk, John R. Taylor, of Annapolis, and Guy W. Taylor, of Washington.

INCREDIBLE ARMY EDICT FORBIDS CHAPLAINS FROM MENTIONING GOD IN LECTURES TO TROOPS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a most incredible order has been issued by the Department of the Army to its chaplains forbidding them to mention God in their lectures to the troops.

I was shocked to learn of this order—a reaction which I find is widely shared, particularly in my home city.

I have urged Secretary of Defense Laird to initiate an immediate investigation of this unprecedented directive resulting from a complaint made by the American Civil Liberties Union.

If the chaplains cannot mention God, how can they be expected to accomplish the work which they have been assigned? Indeed, if the order is allowed to stand, what is the justification for having chaplains on duty at all?

This action is of great concern to the people of my congressional district in western New York State.

Following is the text of a telegram sent to Secretary Laird by the commander of the Erie County, N.Y., Council of AMVETS:

Secretary of Defense,
Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.:

Recent action of ACLU to prevent chaplains' reference to God is felt by this organization to be ridiculous, if not appalling. We are shocked to note Army order in compliance thereto. Erie County AMVETS respectfully urges Department of Defense to countermand this. We firmly believe America to be—One nation under God.

Erie County Council of AMVETS,
Charles D. McClure, *Commander.*

Rev. Raymond J. Kozlowski, chaplain of Adam Plewacki Post No. 799 in Buffalo, one of the largest American Legion posts in the country, has written to President Nixon as follows:

March 29, 1969.

Hon. Richard M. Nixon,
President of the United States

Dear Mr. President: It is with great concern that I write to you about the order issued by the Army to their chaplains to eliminate all reference to God and philosophy in lectures aimed at instilling moral responsibility in its soldiers.

I ask you, Mr. President to consider this apparent contradiction. How can any chaplain, whose sole responsibility is to bring soldiers closer to God, not use the name of God? Suppose you, as our President were ordered by the Senate and Congress never to use the words United States, ever. It certainly does stagger the imagination. Yet, this in fact, is what the American Civil Liberities Union has succeeded in doing because of the objection of one soldier!

It is the same American Civil Liberties Union which sponsored the abolition of Bible reading in the Public Schools. The nation has indeed suffered because of this.

I feel that the minority groups of this nation have infringed on our rights and the rights of all God fearing men in our country, which represents the majority. This great country of ours was established with the recognition of God. Has fought and built, and constantly sought His intercession.

As chaplain of the American Legion Adam Plewacki Post #799, which represents the largest Post in the State of New York, feel that it is my duty to appeal to you in this cause. Please be informed that this matter will be pursued to the National level within the next four months, and that the majority of our voices will be heard throughout the land which we have fought for.

I appeal to you, Mr. President, to please reconsider and rescind this order issued by the Dept. of the Army. It does great disservice to our country.

Presently, the American Legion is celebrating its 50th Anniversary. Its motto is Fifty years for God and Country. It is with heavy heart that all of us in the Legion should learn, that on our anniversary, orders are issued by the Armed Forces to eliminate any possible mention of the word God.

Sincerely Yours in the American Legion,
Rev. Raymond J. Kozlowski,
Post Chaplain.

A newspaper editor's view on the issue is given in the following editorial:

[From the Buffalo, (N.Y.) Evening News, Mar. 29, 1969]

"In G-d We Trust"

Just when several public school districts in Pennsylvania have boldly defied the U.S. Supreme Court by reinstituting daily prayers and Bible readings, comes now the Army with a weird and wondrous directive to its chaplains to make no mention of God or religious philosophy in lectures aimed at instilling moral responsibility in its soldiers.

The Army order was prompted by an American Civil Liberties Union complaint to the effect that lectures intended to instill moral responsibility were used for religious indoctrination. And so, no doubt, some of them were in the hands of overzealous chaplains. But to go so far as to forbid an ordained man of God to mention God—in a country whose very credo of nationhood invokes divine Providence—is carrying the banning of religious indoctrination to a pretty silly extreme.

Especially absurd, it seems to us, is the attack on such references as that in the foreword of the Army's long-used character guidance manuals, which says that the philosophy of American freedom "regards man as a creature of God" and "as such, every soldier is . . . accountable to his Creator for the way he performs. . . ."

If this be religious indoctrination, then so would be a Fourth of July reading of the Declaration of Independence, for that great document starts right off invoking "the laws of nature and of Nature's God" and goes on to shamelessly declare that "all men are created equal" and "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." If that in itself is not justification for the assertion, as a plain statement of historical fact, that this nation's philosophy of freedom "regards man as a creature of God," then those Founding Fathers who asserted their firm reliance on "divine Providence" just before mutually pledging their lives, fortunes and sacred honor, must be whirling in their graves.

After all, we don't really have to make ourselves ridiculous in order to maintain the hallowed wall of separation between church and state. No court has told us yet that we have to remove "In God We Trust" from our coins or "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance. Nor is any court ever likely to forbid the Army to assert in any guidance manual the simple historical truth that this nation's philosophy of freedom "regards man as a creature of God."

The kind of flat defiance of law which those Pennsylvania school districts have indulged in, however, is an offense of a very different color. Here these adult leaders of their communities, in the name of indoctrinating their children in religious values, are actually deliberately indoctrinating them in disrespect for the U.S. Constitution as interpreted by the nation's highest court.

Whatever they may think of the Supreme Court's decision banning prayers in public schools, their open defiance of that edict is no different in spirit or effect from the earlier defiance by many Dixie communities of the school desegregation decision, or the more recent defiance by many college students of the draft laws. A school board more than most public agencies, after all, has a duty to exemplify respect for law, not teach contempt for it by indulging in flagrant acts of defiance.

THE EMERGENCY SMALL LOAN PROGRAM: ITS BENEFITS IN ST. LOUIS

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, throughout American history, the demands of justice and equity have moved us, as a nation, to embark upon projects which truly serve to fulfill the American dream to those who have been denied participation in it for one reason or another. We have responded in the decade of the 1960's with energy and determination to fulfill this goal with greater Federal direction and involvement than ever before. The 1960's have been an extremely prosperous decade and our affluence alone could have easily blinded us to the urgent needs of so many of our citizens. The sincerity of our efforts can easily be seen in the vehicle of our war on poverty; namely, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The results of the Economic Opportunity Act are too numerous for me to detail on this occasion, but I would like to point out the successes of that part of the act with which I have been most intimately connected. I am speaking, of course, of the emergency small loan program which was added to the act as an amendment in 1966. The purpose of the program has been quite simple: to make available small loans to persons in low-income families to meet immediate and urgent family needs. It sounds simple, but in my judgment, exemplifies, as well as any other facet of the Economic Opportunity Act, the basic spirit of the act; the emergency loan program sets itself to the task of maintaining the dignity of the poor man by enabling him to extricate himself from those emergency financial problems which all of us are beset by from time to time; by preserving his dignity and thereby enhancing it; by encouraging the use and development of his own initiative. In this way the emergency small loan program provides the spark to impel the poverty-stricken person above the threshold of poverty and toward the achievement of self-sustaining citizenship. We would be remiss in our duty toward the poor if we merely alleviated their condition without offering them the hope and the means to effect a qualitative change in their lives.

In recent weeks I have been surveying local establishments, all over the country and in all kinds of poverty situations, in order to assess the accomplishments of this emergency small loan program to date. Some responses have come in and without exception attest to the great need which the program meets, the single-minded attention to those needs by the administrators involved, and the gratitude of the recipients for the services no one else would provide.

As a case in point, let me briefly describe the efforts of the Human Development Corp. of St. Louis, Mo. The Human Development Corp. located in the Third Congressional District of Missouri, which is represented so ably by that champion of the consumer, Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan. As of January 31, 1969, the basic statistics are as follows: With an original loan fund of $103,405, the Human Development Corp. was able to make 2,725 loans for a total of $109,987.42. At present 1,011 loans, accounting for $28,672.35 are outstanding. Collections have been good, amounting to $42,025.60; in this respect it should be kept in mind that all of these loans repaid represent small loans, not exceeding $300, so that the number of people helped and the number of people strengthened and encouraged by the sense of accomplishment is quite significant. Seven hundred fourteen loans are overdue, totaling $26,335.95. This amount would be lower were this a normal loan program. But it is not; borrowers are not unduly pressured, nor is legal coercion brought to bear to enforce collection.

What purposes have these loans served? We should not be surprised at how basic the needs of the poor are. The loans have prevented evictions, enabled evicted families to come off the street and to find housing, provided food, medicine, job tools, funds for a new job, training expenses, and provided funds for fuel and light in homes.

The report of the Human Development Corp. from St. Louis further analyzes the type of loans according to frequency. Rent requests have been the most frequent, followed by loans for food, most of which have been used in the food stamp program. Next are loans for job maintenance, either for new jobs or for interim funds until a new payday. Utility bills are a constant concern of the poor; they have needed loans to prevent disconnection of essential services and to restore services discontinued because of delinquent bills. Other types of loans have been made for school clothing, furniture, job clothing, funeral expenses, tuition for training courses, and funds for college dormitory fees, and the prevention of foreclosures, garnishment, and repossession of furniture.

This list alone demonstrates that there are a multitude of basic needs which the poor are forced to go without because of emergencies and dislocations of their meager incomes. These needs, generally for either subsistence or self-improvement, could not be more worthy of our attention.

The manager of the St. Louis program has indicated his willingness to continue the program as long as funds last and has wholeheartedly endorsed the proposal to supplement the project with new funds.

There is ample evidence of poverty in St. Louis to make the continuing need for this loan program self-evident. I am pleased that St. Louis was selected as a participating area in the emergency loan program and I am convinced that our efforts there are showing progress and must continue.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of the great men of American history, Dwight David Eisenhower.

How proud we citizens of Pennsylvania were when Dwight Eisenhower decided to spend his days of retirement in Pennsylvania. He chose the area of the historic Battle of Gettysburg. The American people literally plowed a furrow to his new door in our State. They not only visited his farm in large numbers, but also called on him at his office on the campus of Gettysburg College. How fitting that a great man like Dwight David Eisenhower would choose the area where Lincoln delivered his now immortal Gettysburg Address. Lincoln fought to free the body of man from slavery. Dwight Eisenhower, the hero of World War II, fought to preserve for free men that freedom won not only on the field at Gettysburg but also at Runnymead and at Belleau Wood.

I was one of those thousands who called on "Ike" at his office in Gettysburg. I was then a candidate for my first term in Congress. I had called for an appointment and was told to be there at 7:30 a.m. The General was always at his office in the early morning hours. He was most cordial and was especially nice to Mrs. Johnson. He said the only advice he could give me was to always campaign with my wife at my side. He said that Mamie was his constant companion and one of his greatest political assets.

In these last years of the life of our great President he was a tremendous force for good in this country. He had known happiness and love. He had suffered great sorrow, when he lost his 3½-year-old son through scarlet fever. He had known great anguish and uncertainty as he planned the great invasion on "D" Day. He had experienced the joy of having been elected President of the United States by the biggest majority in history up to that time. And he had the great satisfaction to know that he had a warm place in the hearts of his countrymen.

Dwight David Eisenhower has departed from this earth, but the principles for which he stood will be long remembered.

Dwight Eisenhower gave both strength and dignity to our Nation in both war and peace. He was a courageous man who deeply loved our country.

Eisenhower was the Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe during World War II, and later Supreme Commander of NATO. In both capacities he proved himself to be a great administrator and leader.

As our country longed for peace in the early 1950's Dwight Eisenhower again accepted a call to duty. He was elected the 34th President of the United States. During his two terms in office America experienced 8 years of peace, progress, and prosperity.

With a deep sense of loss we mourn his passing.

THE ELEPHANT IN THE ROTUNDA

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot is fortunate to have on its editorial staff Mr. Guy Friddell. The genius of Mr. Friddell is his ability to express life in a gentle satirical way. Few men are so endowed with this gift.

On March 30, Mr. Friddell wrote an editorial in the Virginian-Pilot entitled "The Elephant in the Rotunda." It is a marvelous and poignant essay on man's destruction of the wildlife around him. This editorial ought to be read by millions of Americans. I take pride in offering it for inclusion in the RECORD:

THE ELEPHANT IN THE ROTUNDA

(By Guy Friddell)

Bill Cox once wrote that all he ever wanted was an elephant.

Little enough to ask of life, you'd think.

I gave away my last one, a year or so ago. But I can pass along a couple of new books on the vast subject.

"Elephants Across Border," by C. Burke (Simon and Schuster, $4.95), is about a rich sportsman's safari after a magnificent ancient elephant, a moving monument to time, that has strayed out of the sanctuary of an African park and is fair game as long as he's across the border. It is an adventure yarn, the kind to be read at one sitting, not because it's brief but for the suspense that holds until the last page. I was pulling for the elephant.

The elephant also occupies a sizable segment in "Animals of East Africa," by Louis B. Leakey (National Geographic Society, $4.25). It has an array of fine pictures, including one of a herd of zerba, splashing and churning around in a rain-pool, a swirling duplication in the wild of Rosa Bonheur's famous picture, "Horse Fair," as if though, all the horses had put on striped summer seersuckers.

But the most impressive photograph is an airview of a heard of 500 or so elephants moseying across a green plain while a flock of white cattle egrets wheel over them. It catches, as well as any picture could, untrammeled might, and life. Dr. Leakey writes that elephants tend to be very destructive in their feeding. They push over a small tree and then eat only a few of its leaves. They break off branches and rip so much bark from a larger tree that it will die. They amble on and repeat the process, again and again. An area devastated by elephants may not recover for several years. This problem affects many East African parks, and specialists are carrying out intensive studies of the numbers and activities of these great creatures."

I wish them well, teaching elephants manners.

I know one old rogue that no one could have schooled. Ten years ago I came upon him unexpectedly. (That, unexpectedly, is the most dramatic way to meet an elephant. One minute the path is clear, the next he is towering over you, tornadic.)

We had started out to drive to the zoo in Washington, but, what with a blowout and breakdown, our time was short, and we had to settle for a quick run through the Smithsonian Institution, that national attic of oddities. I wished the three boys might see at least one compelling object that could lift its head above history's detritus.

I steered them to the natural history museum housing the skeleton of a great dinosaur, but when we walked into the rotunda, a new exhibit stopped us, the biggest elephant I ever saw, dominating the center of that great round room, his trunk curled high in a trumpet call, his triangular ears spread broad as sails, his eyes red with hate, caught in just the moment of his swinging stride through the brush.

I was accustomed to see placid elephants sweeping the ground with languid trunks for peanuts. The boy was wild. His trunk was gnarled as an oak, crusted as a barnacled timber, and his tail had a great brush on the end of it. Nothing sagged in his bulk. The taxidermist had restored the streamlined might of him. Like a massive mountain, he offered a new aspect at every turn. He was at once, both compact of wonder and huge.

The placard said simply he was the largest elephant on earth, standing 13 feet 2 inches at the shoulder, a foot higher than any other ever captured or shot. He approached the dimensions of the legendary mammoth.

He was killed in the Cuando River District (an area, by the way, that I know like the back of my hand, was there in '32 with Frank Buck) of Southeast Angola on November 13, 1955, by a hunter from Madrid, J. J. Fenykovi. He weighed 12 tons and took two years to stuff.

I read statistics to the others, pointing out this and that stupendous detail of the great beast, and, at last, the youngest, then 4, had a question.

"If it was so big," he asked, "why did they kill it?"

THE SUSPENSION OF THE INVESTMENT CREDIT

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the unrestrained continuation of the inflationary spiral makes it absolutely mandatory to suspend the 7-percent investment credit which continues to fuel inflation.

Latest figures indicate that capital improvements are soaring at a rate of 14 percent ahead of last year. This is in every respect a business expansion inflation.

The consumer has not overindulged. In fact consumer sales are leveling off because of higher prices. It is difficult for the consumer to adjust his affairs to weekly price increases on everything. Our senior citizens and those on fixed income are cruelly assaulted by soaring prices.

This tide must be reversed. Suspension of the investment credit is the only prescription for immediate relief. Time is running out.

The 7-percent investment credit is the most troublesome tax loophole in existence today. There is no better way to "modify the inflationary psychology" of which the President complains. The closing of this tax loophole will save the Treasury over $3 billion annually. Along with one or two other simple tax reforms, the need for the harsh 10-percent tax surcharge will be eliminated.

OHIO AND KENTUCKY'S 83D U.S. ARMY RESERVE COMMAND CELEBRATES FIRST ANNIVERSARY

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, during this session of Congress, one of the largest U.S. Army Reserve Commands in the Nation is celebrating its first anniversary. The 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command, headquartered at Fort Hayes in my hometown of Columbus, Ohio, assumed active command of approximately 144 units and 12,000 men April 1, 1968, after the reorganization of the Reserve Forces.

All of Ohio is proud of the men who serve both their country and their community as citizen-soldiers. Many of them served during World War II, Korea, and the Berlin crisis as well as in the Vietnam conflict.

The hundreds of years of valuable experience the officers and enlisted men have accumulated, together with their strong dedication to the Army and their love for their country have resulted in a superior and economical force, and has brought great credit to every facet of the Army Reserve program.

Commanded by Maj. Gen. Robert C. Tyler of Columbus, the ARCom commands and supervises the U.S. Army Reserve units in the western two-thirds of Ohio and all of Kentucky, except for the 100th Training Division. It was one of the first of the new ARCom's to become operational after the reorganization of the U.S. Army Reserve in early 1968.

A primary mission of the 83d ARCom is to insure the mobilization readiness of all its assigned or attached units. Despite the difficulty of taking over the administration of units from a large area, the reservists attained that level in a short time. Previously, the administration of Reserve troops was borne by full-time active Army personnel in the 20th U.S. Army Corps with approximately 400 service and civilian personnel.

Members of the 83d ARCom, both in the field and in the headquarters itself, wear the shoulder patch formerly worn by members of the 83d Infantry Division. The division, which had a proud history since it was organized at Camp Sherman, Ohio—near Chillicothe—in 1917, served in France during World War I and was known as the Ghost Division because of its great mobility. During World War II, the 83d Infantry Division saw action in the European Theater of Operations and was known as the Thunderbolt Division due to its great striking power.

The officers and enlisted men assigned to the 83d Arcom headquarters have spent hundreds of extra hours on the job in addition to their regularly scheduled 4-hour weekly drill in order to successfully accomplish their mission and in a very professional manner. They continue to meet their obligations and have received congratulations from their superiors after learning of their full and never ending accomplishments.

General Tyler, the last commander of the 83d Infantry Division before its inactivation, now serves as the commanding general of the 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command. He together with the members of his command have forged a strong link in the proud history of the U.S. Army Reserve. The members of the 83d, and like others in the program, will never allow this important program to die so long as we have free Americans to willingly serve and die if necessary for our country.

I am, including, Mr. Speaker, proclamations from the Governor of Ohio, James A. Rhodes, and the mayor of Columbus, M. E. Sensenbrenner, together with the personnel roster:

PROCLAMATION, 83D ARCOM ANNIVERSARY, APRIL 1, 1969

Whereas, citizens of this state have selflessly served as members of the U.S. Army Reserve for many years, answering the call to active duty during World War I and II, the Korean conflict, the Berlin crisis and the Vietnam action; and

Whereas, these citizen-soldiers continue to give up weekends, vacations and evenings to maintain a high state of combat readiness so that they will be prepared when called upon to defend our beloved nation from external threats to its security; and

Whereas, the 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command overseeing about 12,000 troops approximately 145 units in Ohio and Kentucky is headquartered at Fort Hayes in Ohio's capital City; and

Whereas, these citizen-soldiers of the U.S. Army Reserve are observing their first anniversary as members of the new 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command and the people of this state owe so much to these patriotic fellow citizens:

Now therefore, I, James A. Rhodes, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby designate April 1, 1969, as 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command Day and the month of April as U.S. Army Reserve Community Month and call upon all citizens of Ohio to join in a tribute to the U.S. Army Reserve citizen-soldiers of this state who have given so much of themselves so that this country could remain the greatest democratic society in the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the Great Seal of the State of Ohio to be affixed at Columbus, this 25th day of March, in the year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-Nine.

PROCLAMATION, 83D U.S. ARMY RESERVE COMMAND, APRIL 1, 1969

Whereas, many residents of Columbus have selflessly served as members of the U.S. Army Reserve for many years, answering the call to active duty during World War I and II, the Korean conflict, the Berlin crisis and the Vietnam action; and

Whereas, these citizen-soldiers continue to give up weekends, vacations and evenings to maintain a high state of combat readiness so that they will be prepared when called upon to defend our beloved nation from external threats to its security; and

Whereas, the 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command overseeing about 12,000 troops approximately 145 units in Ohio and Kentucky is headquartered at Fort Hayes in Ohio's capital City; and

Whereas, these citizen-soldiers of the U.S. Army Reserve are observing their first anniversary as members of the new 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command and the people of this city owe so much to these patriotic fellow citizens;

Now, Therefore, I, M. E. Sensenbrenner, Mayor of the City of Columbus, do hereby designate April 1, 1969, as 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command Day and the month of April as U.S. Army Reserve Community Month and call upon all citizens of Ohio to join in a tribute to the U.S. Army Reserve citizen-soldiers of this city who have given so much of themselves so that this country could remain the greatest democratic society in the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the Great Seal of Columbus to be affixed at Columbus, this day of March, in the year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-Nine.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, HEADQUARTERS, 83D U.S. ARMY RESERVE COMMAND,
Fort Hayes, Columbus, Ohio.

Tyler, Robert C., MG.
Cree, Edward I., Col.
Lane, Robert C., Col.
Lawrence, Lee, Col.
Russell, Robert C., Col.
Fisher, Charles E., Ltc.
Groseclose, Jack W., Ltc.
McConnell, Clyde, Ltc.
Heidman, Richard L., Ltc.
Nelson, William, Ltc.
Haynie, Harold C., Col.
Nicol, Gerald E., Ltc.
Pfeifer, Robert B., Ltc.
Stilson, Jerry, Ltc.
Wilkins, Stanley V., Ltc.
Boden, Richard N., Maj.
Brant, Charles E., Maj.
Brause, Paul R., Maj.
De Long, Paul W., Maj.
Doyle, Lawrence, Ltc.
Gerhardstein, Leo H., Maj.
Grimm, Robert R., Maj.
Leister, Robert W., Maj.
Leslie, Henry A. Jr., Maj.
Martell, Norman W., Maj.
Paoletti, Karl P., Maj.
Porter, William E., Maj.
Walters, Jack D., Maj.
Walters, Jack D., Maj.
Chapman, Ted M., Maj.
Balogh, Jack C., Cpt.
Harvey, Samuel J., Cpt.
Healy, Francis A. C., Cpt.
Losekamp, Bernard F., Cpt.
Roberts, Donald J., Cpt.
Sensenbrenner, Edward W., Maj.
Spradling, Georgem, Cpt.
White, Norman R., Cpt.
Brown, Carter N., 1Lt.
Severson, Layton C., Cpt.
Uhl, Robert W., 1Lt.
Chieffo, Dominic J., 2Lt.
Mackey, William G., CW4.
DeLorme, Thomas A., CW3.
Logan, James F., CW3.
Scott, Madison H., Sgm.
White, Alexander, Sgm.
Cobb, James M., 1Sg.
Cole, James G. Jr., Sfc.
Fannin, Ronald L., Sfc.
Goodrich, James R., Msg.
Grubb, Robert A., Sfc.
Kotlarchik, Robert A., Sfc.
Kramer, John, Sfc.
Logan, Richard A., Sfc.
Mansfield, Donald M., Sfc.
McFee, Raymond A., Sfc.
Trump, Harold E., Sfc.
Williams, Ronald E., Sfc.
Althoff, Davis G., Ssg.
Dollimatsch, John D., Ssg.
Drum, Kenneth L., Ssg.
Goodin, Larry L., Ssg.
Karshner, Glenn A., Ssg.
Moots, Phillip R., Ssg.
Oleksa, Thomas M., Ssg.
Scott, Gene D., Ssg.
Vellani, Albert J., Ssg.
Wolfe, James F., Jr., Ssg.
Buckingham, Melvin P., SP5.
Creagon, Thomas E., SP5.
Geese, Ronald L.Q., SP5.
Kerlee, Ronnie L., SP5.
Levering, Rex R., Sgt.
Markstrom, Richard L., SP5.
Ricci, Robert A., SP5.
Sollie, Robert C., SP5.
Stoffel, Stephen W., SP5.
Thayer, Richard D., Sgt.
Almond, Bernard L., SP4.
Clutter, Vaughn D., SP4.
Bennett, John M., SP4.
Gantner, Joseph, SP4.
Green, Jon M., SP4.
Husse, August, SP4.
Kramer, Joseph, SP4.
Lynn, David A., SP4.
McClain, Otis M., SP4.
Smith, Thomas C., SP4.
Ongaro, Ronald M., SP4.
Starn, Michael W., SP4.
Trott, Paul D., SP4.
Wells, Joseph L., SP4.
Wilson, Robert N., SP4.
Witzel, James A., SP4.
Armstrong, Craig S., Pfc.
Cassady, Michael H., Pfc.
Henning, Daniel J., Pfc.
Henwood, Thomas L., Pfc.
Herman, Mark P., Pfc.
Lane, Terry L., Pfc.
Lehring, Larry L., Pfc.
Manecke, Jeffrey, Pfc.
Merz, Ronald A., Pfc.
Przybiski, Careth R., Pfc.
Weiskopf, Thomas D., Pfc.
Williams, Richard L., Pfc.
Nootesting, James, Pvt.
Porterfield, Ralph, Pvt.
Wirthman, Thomas, Pvt.

POVERTY IN THE SPACE AGE

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, Dan Vichorek, editor of the Montana Kaimin, is one of Montana's most gifted student newspapermen and, in today's jargon, he's not afraid "to tell it like it is." Mr. Vichorek recently pointed out to his readers that, although some refuse to recognize it, poverty abounds in the United States. He further revealed that more than 10 million Americans are unable to provide an adequate diet for their children. Ten million is not a small figure in any circumstance and, when more than 10 million of our fellow citizens are unable to subsist decently or adequately because they are too poor, then poverty does indeed abound in this country.

Mr. Vichorek questions our priorities. While this country was spending $500,000 to postpone the last Apollo space mission the Senate was allocating but $250,000 to investigate the existence of poverty. Of course there are many Federal programs that deal with poverty but it seems, so far, that they have not been able to make a significant impact on the hard core of poverty. And, lest we forget, these are the first programs to suffer appropriation cutbacks.

Mr. Speaker, this country is blessed with a plethora of natural resources but the greatest natural resource of any civilization is its young. Because of poverty and war a not unsubstantial portion of that resource is lost yearly because of death and injury or, as is the case of many of poverty's children, because of brain damage caused by lack of protein in the diet. Our society cannot continue to absorb these losses in our young people. Are we so hung up on our technological accomplishments that we would rather have a man on the moon than healthy children in our society?

I insert Mr. Vichorek's editorial at this point in the RECORD:

MORE POOR SPACE TRASH

(By Dan Vichorek)

In the twelfth year of the space age the United States Senate discovered poverty in America.

At least it admitted there might be such a thing, and allocated a whole $250,000 last week to finance an investigation to find out for sure.

Meanwhile, three Americans orbited overhead, and it had only taken $5 billion a year for the past few years to get them there. In fact, when the three caught cold prior to the launch it took only $500,000 to delay the shot until they recovered.

Meanwhile, observers on earth speculated what the Senate investigators might discover about poverty in America. Will they manage to discover, for example, the well-known fact that at least 10 million Americans are unable to provide an adequate diet for their children? Will they learn that the inadequate diet leaves thousands of children, particularly black, Indian, and Mexican-American children, with permanent brain damage from protein deficiency?

Is it possible the Senate will discover that the surplus foods so generously distributed by the government consist almost entirely of heavy starches, which don't do anything for protein deficiencies? Is there any chance that even Strom Thurmond will be convinced that poverty does not always result directly from laziness? May he even concede that the laziness of the fathers should not necessarily result in the unavoidable mental retardation and hopeless situation of the sons?

From past performances, we know that few if any of these things will come to pass. We also may continue to assume that Congress will continue to vote its multi-billion dollar allocations for our space program.

Those who support the space program the most vociferously speak mainly of enhancing the national prestige and ennobling men's minds.

Strangely enough, the folks in Watts don't seem to feel much of an upsurge when they see Apollo 9 pass over.

Then when astronaut Wally Schirra is asked in Europe about the inequity of poverty and the space program, Navy Captain Schirra says the poverty problem has been "greatly exaggerated," which seems something of an exaggeration.

What do we get for the billions we put into the space program? We are assured we are getting a plethora of highly trained technical and presumably necessary, hardware. For example, worldwide communications are supposed to be greatly improved.

We're in favor of communications, but we think short range communications should be improved first. For example, we would like to see the poor and starving of South Carolina communicate directly with Strom Thurmond when he says "We'll always have some people who are not willing to work."

It is quite obvious why we must continue to finance the space program. After all, the Vietnam war can't last forever, and after it's over, the government will need a new means of pumping funds into the faltering economy.

And obviously, as Mr. Thurmond notes, the poor are a bad investment.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in the history of this Nation there have been many individuals who have gained respect and admiration by virtue of their moving to high office. The admiration and respect sometimes goes with the important job. And there have been cases in which a good public servant has been overshadowed by the office. Dwight Eisenhower offers a different example.

In the typical mind's-eye picture, conjured by people here and abroad, Eisenhower the man stood before the uniform of Eisenhower the general. He was Eisenhower the general. He was not a general named Eisenhower. Similarly, they saw Dwight Eisenhower the President, standing before the White House. Conversely, Dwight Eisenhower considered himself to the end not a general, but a soldier; not President, but servant.

The President of the United States is always a symbol of America. And this is good, because he is the elected leader of our people. He was chosen to lead free men, by those who are served. But when the people can see in the President a man of integrity and honesty and strong moral convictions, they can identify with the man. They can take him for an example. They can draw confidence for themselves. They do not expect such a man to be infallible, yet they know that the decisions made, right or wrong, are made with the right processes, the right considerations.

Dwight Eisenhower showed us a lesson which we do well to recognize in these times. As General of the Army, as President of the United States, he demonstrated that there is but one moral code for all men at all times—for work and play, for government and those outside government, for those who serve and those who are served. No matter how spectacular are our accomplishments, or how great our affluence, we are reminded that it is the integrity of individual citizens which counts. There can be no truly worthwhile goals or movement to those goals without a deep spiritual strength. Any government which does not know this, which thinks there is a special code for itself, will perish in weakness. Dwight Eisenhower knew this truth. He lived this truth.

It is our belief that writers in some future age will echo Macaulay's prose in reference to Dwight Eisenhower:

> What a singular destiny has been that of this remarkable man! To be regarded in his own age as a classic, and in ours as a companion! To receive from his contemporaries that full homage which men of genius have in general received only from posterity; to be more intimately known to posterity than other men are known to their contemporaries!

FCC BAN ON CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

HON. ALTON LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the hearings on cigarette advertising scheduled by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I would like to bring to attention the following editorials from North Carolina papers, the Wilmington Star News and the Fayetteville Observer. These editorials correctly point out that the FCC ban is discriminatory, unjustified, and usurps legislative authority.

The editorials entitled "A Dangerous Proposal" and "Ad Ban Unjustified" follow:

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) News, Feb. 7, 1969]

A DANGEROUS PROPOSAL

The Federal Communication Commission's proposal to ban cigarette advertising on radio and television is one of the most dangerous suggestions to come out of a Washington bureau in years.

This absurd move is based on the FCC's assertion that smoking is "a most serious, unique danger to public health." Obviously, six of the seven members of the Commission have accepted as a fact a highly controversial report. The Commission points to statistics of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare which blame smoking for the deaths of many Americans. These statistics have been challenged since the time they were issued. But this is not the major aspect of the deplorable proposal by the FCC. What it wants is to compromise the principle of free speech, as represented by advertising and, in doing so, encourage the restraint of legitimate trade.

The point we wish to emphasize is simply this: Commodities or articles which are legal in the eyes of the laws of our Republic—and cigarettes certainly are legal—should not be subjected to any restraint as to their advertising in any form their makers wish.

After all, the principle the FCC is following as to cigarettes could be applied to many other products. And if and when it is applied, then advertising—one of the major assets of the free enterprise system—would be entirely under the control of bureaucrats and politicians.

Thus, when one looks ahead, the danger of the FCC proposal is magnified greatly.

Chairman Hyde has said he is confident

his agency will have the legal authority to enforce a cigarette advertising ban when the 1965 Cigarette Labeling and Advertising act expires on July 1. Under this law, both the FCC and the Federal Trade Commission are prohibited from taking any action to regulate cigarette advertising.

Expecting a full congressional review of the smoking controversy after July 1, Mr. Hyde said "it is a matter in which Congress will be the final arbiter."

When the time comes for Congress to make its decision, its answer would be a wholehearted and emphatic "No!" to the latest FCC proposal. Otherwise American freedom of speech and free enterprise will suffer one of the most serious setbacks in modern times.

[From the Fayetteville (N.C.) Observer Feb. 7, 1969]

AD BAN UNJUSTIFIED

The Federal Communications Commission's proposed ban on cigarette advertising on radio and television seems an extreme step at this point in the continuing smoking and health controversy.

One reason, of course, is that public health authorities obviously haven't proved to the satisfaction of the great majority of Americans that smoking does indeed cause all the lung cancer and emphysema deaths being attributed to it.

At least it seems safe to assume that if the overwhelming majority of Americans did take the "statistical evidence" against smoking as hard proof, the tobacco industry might well be tottering on the brink of disaster.

At the same time, though, some of the outcries against the FCC's proposal seem a little bit extreme and hysterical to. "A supreme example of bureaucratic tyranny," said Sen. Sam J. Ervin of North Carolina.

No tyranny, bureaucratic or otherwise, has been exercised in this matter. The FCC may be wrong but it is moving within its jurisdiction and, as required by law, has given official notice in ample time for Congres to overide it in this matter of great importance to the tobacco-growing and tobacco-manufacturing state of North Carolina.

Cigarette advertising is, of course, big business to the television and radio networks. Tobacco firms now spend almost $227 million or about 75 per cent of their advertising budgets on TV and radio commercials. This is about 10 per cent of the broadcasters' revenues. And the industry has not only a large stake in this proposal but a legitimate argument that there should be no outright ban on the advertisement of products that can be legally sold.

If there is any justification for the FCC's new proposal, it hasn't yet been advanced. And the present health warning on cigarette packages, which in effect streses the need for moderation in cigarette smoking as in other things, is strong enough medicine at this time.

Meanwhile, in its own self-interest, the tobacco industry might be well-advised to look to the content of some of its TV advertising, which at least some parents find objectionable because of its clear pitch to young people.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with other colleagues in paying tribute to Dwight David Eisenhower, a true patriot, a great hero, a natural leader of men.

As General of the Army and as President, he served with distinction and honor—but with humility and compassion. It is said that as he bade farewell to a contingent of young paratroopers boarding planes for a landing behind the Normandy beachhead in World War II, tears trickled down his cheeks as he turned away.

"I knew some of those boys would never return," he said later.

It was General Eisenhower, Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe during World War II, who welded together from allied nations a fighting force that spelled defeat for the aggressor.

His generalship of this multination force marked the first time that an American general had headed an army that included troops from many nations.

It was my good fortune as a soldier to serve in General Eisenhower's command in Europe—and later as a Congressman to serve in President Eisenhower's "command" in Washington. I served in the Congress while he was President.

I met General Eisenhower in southern France in World War II while I was a major in the U.S. Army. Again, in Washington I had occasion to meet him on several occasions during his Presidency.

Dwight D. Eisenhower—as general and as President—was always a warm, genial person. He was loved by the people, and he loved the people.

As general this great leader fought the fight for freedom in his generation and won. Later as he stood near the fields of white crosses marking the battlefields in France he said that nations of the world simply must discover a way to reconcile their differences without resorting to war and bloodshed.

He deplored the tragic waste of young men who gave their lives in the battles of World War II and in other wars.

As President he stood firm and yet he maintained the peace—he "waged" peace. His Presidency was noted for its tranquility—the quieting of the frustrations and fears of our people. Among his domestic achievements as President was the initiation of the great interstate highway program which is continuing. This great limited access system of highways is comparable to the autobahn highway system in Europe.

Dwight David Eisenhower was a giant among giants, a man among men. The fact that both major political parties sought him as their presidential nominee testifies and attests to his greatness as a natural leader.

We do not yet have the full historical perspective on the administration of President Dwight David Eisenhower—time will write this story.

However, we do know that his warm personality drew people to him. We do know that the American people felt comfortable and safe with Dwight Eisenhower in the White House. He will be greatly missed.

I want to extend to Mrs. Eisenhower, Col. John Eisenhower, and other members of the family this expression of our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

DEEDS, NOT WORDS

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the battle cry for the revitalization of our sinking merchant marine which has been sounded through the years by those of us on the Committee for Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been taken up by still another able advocate. On March 19, 1969, before the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of Washington, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, our esteemed colleague, L. MENDEL RIVERS, warned most eloquently that the time has come for deeds rather than words in the building of not only a new Navy but a new merchant marine.

I consider Chairman RIVERS' remarks most pertinent in that he addressed himself to the need for total seapower. I applaud him for his forthright stand, and I commend his text to all who desire to see our great Nation survive:

DEEDS, NOT WORDS

(Remarks of L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman, House Armed Services Committee)

Speaking earlier this month, the President of the United States said that our policy in Vietnam would be judged by deeds and not words. We can all applaud that approach—to Vietnam or any other problem. And I hope the President is prepared to have his Administration judged by deeds and not words in its response to the problems of our maritime industry.

If he is going to do that, he is going to have to depart from the pattern of inaction of his predecessors. Up to now what Mark Twain said about the weather has been true about our maritime problems—"Everybody talks about it, but nobody does anything about it." The problems of our commercial fleet today parallel the problems of our combatant Navy fleet. Fifty-eight percent of the ships in the U.S. Navy are 20 years old or older. Likewise, the ships of our commercial fleet are on the average over 20 years old.

By contrast, the Soviet Navy, which is growing by leaps and bounds, has only 2 ships which are more than 20 years old—less than 1% of the Russian navy. Likewise, in the Soviet commercial fleet 50% of the ships are less than 5 years old. In a few short years the size of the Soviet commercial fleet has increased many times, while the U.S. commercial fleet has been steadily dwindling. Today the two fleets are just about the same, but the Russian fleet is growing steadily and ours continues to decline.

The parallel between the serious obsolescence in our Navy fleet and the steady decline of our merchant fleet is not just coincidence. They both derive from the same source. And that source is the failure to have a total, integrated, national program of sea power and the failure to give sea power its proper place in the ordering of national priorities. This total national program should cover all aspects—naval combatant power, commercial shipping, fishing fleets, oceanography, and a revived ship-building industry.

It should not be necessary at this late date to have to convince people of the importance of sea power—but it still seems to be necessary. I know I do not have to explain it to an audience such as this. But let me give just one example: Today 95 to 98% of the logistics support for all of our forces in Vietnam is delivered by sea—the largest and longest sealift operation in history. (This operation, incidentally, represents only one-half of the world-wide business of the Military Sea Transportation Service.) Some 533 ships are operated by the MSTS, most of them old cargo ships, Victory and other such ships built during World War II. In addition, the MSTS ships almost as many measurement tons monthly of cargo, in less than full shiploads, in ships providing scheduled berth service.

The head of the Military Sea Transportation Service, Vice Admiral Lawson P. Ramage, told a subcommittee of our Committee that our old transport ships, at the point where they reach 30 years of age, will be of questionable usefulness in supporting future military operations. He said, "I would say generally ships built 30 years ago, although not in active service throughout, have come to the end of their useful life."

The American merchant ships on which we send additional measurement tons to Vietnam each month are, of course, largely in the same old-age category.

In other words, while the present Merchant Marine of the U.S. has been able to support the military campaign in Vietnam, there is still a question as to whether it will be able to do as much 5 years from now.

Just a moment's reflection will indicate to you what a profound effect this could have on our foreign policy.

The hazards of shipping in foreign-flag lines, particularly for shipping in support of military operations in line with our national policy, does not have to be spelled out for this group. Our policy could be at the mercy not only of those who own the foreign-flag ships, but of those who might have some influence with the crews. A few years ago, for example, the MSTS chartered a certain ship and the crew flatly refused to sail when they were informed they were going to Vietnam. There are other instances of foreign-flag ships chartered by American operators on which the crews refused to sail or delayed the ship when they found it was going to Vietnam.

Let me repeat once more—sea power in all of its manifestations is an integral part of our national security power and our commercial shipping capability is an integral part of American sea power.

It is because our Committee recognized the serious nature of our sea power problem that I appointed a Subcommittee on Sea Power last September. And because I recognized the totality of the involvement of all forms of sea power in our national security, I gave that Subcommittee the broadest charter. In addition to Naval power, I asked them to ascertain the steps necessary to overcome the glaring deficiencies in the cargo and troop carrying capabilities of ships owned by the United States Government or by U.S. industries. And I asked them to study the capacity of the privately-owned shipyards to meet the need of both combatant and noncombatant ships crucial to our national security.

The Subcommittee has just released its first report on the Status of Naval Ships. I would commend it to you for careful study. It can be best described in one word: "Shocking."

The discussion in this report of the advances made by Soviet sea power will chill your blood. The advances are no accident. While we have been throwing words at each other about sea power, the Soviets have taken the lessons of Admiral Mahan to heart and have pursued sea power in all of its aspects. They have simultaneously improved their naval, commercial, and fishing fleets to exert more and more power over the oceans and to use the seas to have a greater influence around the world. They are exerting power further and further away from their homeland. They have expanded their shipbuilding industry. They have 7 major shipbuilding yards capable of constructing a total of 20 nuclear submarines each year, as well as meeting their growing program of new surface ships. They have the largest shipbuilding yard in the world. They have 7,000 students enrolled in schools for naval architects and marine engineers—23 times as many as we do. They graduate almost twice as many engineers and scientists a year as the colleges in the United States. They can build ships with greater horsepower and higher sustained speed capabilities than current U.S. ships. They have begun to make their new sea power felt in the oceans of the world, with a large group in the Mediterranean and more ships than the U.S. in the Indian Ocean. Their fishing fleets dot the horizon.

The U.S. Navy has 106 ships 4 years old or younger. The Soviets have 431. We have 96 ships between 5 to 9 years old. The Soviets have 486.

In commercial shipping, the Soviets are establishing trade routes to African nations and have opened up routes between Australia and New Zealand and Europe for wool. They have opened a trade route between Western Canada and Japan.

This report of the Subcommittee also makes clear in shocking detail the terrible ravages of age upon American naval ships, the unstoppable corrosion, the great limits on habitability for crews, the great difficulties in getting needed repair parts because some ships are so old the original parts manufacturers have gone out of business.

Now, what can be done?

How can we get American sea power back on course?

The first ingredient—we might as well admit it plainly to ourselves—is money. We have provided inadequate funds for new naval ship construction and for ship maintenance and repair for years. We are going to have to increase the annual rate of spending markedly to get results. I don't mean a crash program. I mean in increased level of funding sustained over a period of years. I have introduced legislation to provide a shipbuilding program in the coming fiscal year of $3.8 billion. In my view that would be a beginning step. By contrast, the program in the last fiscal year was only $1 billion, and the program submitted in the final Johnson Administration budget was $2.6 billion.

In one of his campaign speeches, President Nixon suggested that we should ship at least 30% of our commerce in our own ships. The goal is a good one. It would not seem to be extraordinarily high. But the simple fact is that at present we carry only 6% of our foreign commerce in our own ships. Now, I realize that we cannot jump to the President's goal of 30% all at once and that even on a gradual basis some difficult adjustments might be necessary. I don't like any more than you do the idea of a Washington bureaucrat dictating to shippers when they can use foreign ships. But we might take a leaf from the pages of those who run our air carriers. This might require some fundamental changes in maritime thinking, and I know it would create some difficulties. But I think it is something at least worth debating and studying. The U.S. carries a far higher percentage of its own cargo in its own planes because it has a series of bilateral agreements with other nations that all commerce of those nations will be carried on flag lines of the two nations. If this principle has worked so well in the air, might it not help turn the tide on the oceans?

Naturally the conversion would have to be on a gradual basis so as not to upset our allies who are presently carrying a large portion of our commerce. Various offsetting arrangements might be necessary. And the cost implications would have to be studied closely. But I do suggest that those in the maritime industry at least examine the possibility of such an approach.

Another step we should take is to devote funds to new technology applicable to shipping. In the years between 1963 and 1969, the Department of Defense has spent about $1 billion on research and development for airlift. In that same time it has spent only $46 million for sealift—and the major portion of that was for the ill-fated FDL's. And my attitude toward the FDL program has not changed since last year. I am opposed to including any FDL's in a Navy ship construction program. There are so many other ships we need so much more than a government constructed experiment which could only end up competing with what is left of our privately-owned merchant marine.

Certainly, the DOD has a major interest in seeing that our shipping is carried on as efficiently and effectively as possible. But it has not done much for research and development in the area of sealift. It just keeps going back to the FDL program, somewhat like a broken record.

At the same time, I cannot help but believe that many of the things designed for the Navy would be of value to our commercial shipping. And I cannot help but believe that there is a more effective way of turning these ideas loose to our free enterprise system than has been done in the past. This is what gave us the development of diesel power. The Navy brought it over here for submarine use and the contractor then continued on his own until the diesel was available for all sorts of other uses, including trains and trucks. Many of our commercial airlines have benefitted from engine and air frame work done for the Air Force, and I keep thinking the same should be true for merchant ships in relation to the Navy.

I am aware, of course, that many great developments have been achieved by the private shipping industry on its own without Federal funding or interference. The great container revolution is just one example. It is progressing with such momentum that it is almost completely changing our commercial shipping industry. Without blunting any of the initiative on the part of industry, I do think much more help and encouragement could be given to our merchant ship development by the Maritime Administration.

Commercial shipping as it relates to the Nation's defense requirements is the next item on the agenda for our Sea Power Subcommittee. I hope those of you here who have worthwhile suggestions will not hesitate to communicate them to this Subcommittee. After that, the Subcommittee will make a study of U.S. shipbuilding capacity, both for naval ships and for commercial ships which contribute to national defense requirements. But we do not have to wait for that study to tell you that our shipyards need to accelerate their modernization at a faster rate. A determination to increase our naval and our commercial fleets will make available new financial support to give our shipyards the new tools of expansion they need.

We need to have above all a determination to work together—Congress, the Administration, industry, and the unions. But needed as much as anything else is leadership from the Administration—leadership backed by an awareness that we must have the total package—covering our naval forces, our commercial ships, our fishing fleet, and our shipyards. We will get this leadership only if this Administration—and the President—are willing to give sea power a high national priority. We have had promises from the Administration and past administrations that we would get a new Navy and a new Merchant Marine. The time has come for more than words. As President Nixon said, "I believe that it is far more effective to use deeds rather than words . . . in order to accomplish objectives."

Words have been used up till now. Mr. President, we are waiting for some deeds.

COAL MINERS COMPENSATION ACT OF 1969

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives a bill, entitled the "Coal Miners' Compensation Act of 1969."

The purpose of this bill is to authorize Federal assistance to provide adequate workmen's compensation benefits for disability and death resulting from coal miner's pneumoconiosis.

It is the intent of this bill to provide workmen's compensation protection to coal miners in the event of disability or death from pneumoconiosis resulting from exposure to coal dust during their employment. Eligibility depends on exposure in the course of coal mine employment, irrespective of the time when the disability or death occurs. A cutoff date for assistance is provided because it is assumed that with increasing knowledge of the incidence of pneumoconiosis among coal miners and methods of prevention, that workmen's compensation insurance actuarial factors will be worked out on a more realistic basis than has been possible in the past and that the hazards will be materially reduced. The concurrence of these two contingencies will tend to obviate the need for Federal assistance in behalf of coal miners.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

SUPPLEMENTAL COMPENSATION PAYMENTS

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to pay benefits to miners or their survivors for disability or death from pneumoconiosis arising from exposure to coal dust, supplementary to benefits they are receiving under State workmen's compensation law. The amount of the supplement shall be the difference between the benefits payable under the State law and compensation as measured by the Longshoremen's and Harbor Worker's Compensation Act.

Benefits are to be paid retroactively to the date of disability or death.

When benefits under a State workmen's compensation or occupational disease law cease because of time or monetary limitation in such law, payments of the compensation formerly paid by the State will also be assumed by the Secretary.

No supplementary payments may be made in a State which diminishes programs or benefits related to occupational injuries and diseases.

COMPENSATION AND DEATH BENEFITS

The Secretary is also authorized to pay benefits to coal miners or their survivors if benefits for disability or death from pneumoconiosis have been denied, there is no coverage under State workmen's compensation law, or indemnity has not been received from any person liable for damages. Benefits may be paid retroactively from the date of disability or death.

Benefits shall be paid in accordance with those of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, which the Department of Labor administers. Insofar as retroactive benefits for surviving dependents are concerned, except as to widows during widowhood, payments may be made only to those persons who qualify as dependents at the time the claim is filed.

GRANTS TO STATES

Under plans approved by the Secretary, subject to certain specified standards, the Secretary may make grants to the States in which coal mining is carried on to conduct studies and to carry out other programs to improve workmen's compensation benefit programs as they relate to coal dust exposure in employment.

MISCELLANEOUS

The Secretary is given power to make rules for the administration of the Act including the specifying of the degree of proof necessary to establish compensability of claims for benefits when State workmen's compensation benefits are not available.

Benefits authorized under this proposal will be paid from the Employees' Compensation Fund established by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that can be said about Dwight David Eisenhower that can in any way add luster to his name. It has all been said. It has been said on the battlefields of World War II and in the councils of peace during his years as President of the United States.

And it has been said in a thousand different ways by millions of people around the world who have looked upon him as the dignified, much-loved former leader of the free world living out the twilight of his life as the world's elder statesman and fighter for freedom.

It is in periods of national grief such as this that our Nation's better qualities become evident. We seem once again to be willing to acknowledge some of the eternal verities that in this age are all too often shoved aside for cynical vulgarities. And the measure of our love and affection for General Eisenhower can be measured, I believe, by the fact that no assassin's bullet was needed to elevate him or to trigger our response. He is of heroic proportions because of what he was and not because of the manner in which he died.

It was my pleasure to serve in the Congress for 6 years while Dwight Eisenhower was President of the United States. Though he was not of my party, he was my President, as he was President of all Americans. I am truly saddened at his passing and extend to Mrs. Eisenhower and all of their family my most sincere sympathy. We have all lost a great leader and true friend of peace.

PROJECT TEKTITE

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, the four aquanauts working on Project Tektite completed one-third of their planned 60-day mission beneath the surface of Lameshur Bay early in March. The multiagency scientist-in-the-sea project began February 15 and is scheduled to end April 17.

The aquanauts, Rick Waller, John Van Derwalker and Connie Mahnken are with the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Department of the Interior, and Ed Clifton is with Interior's Geological Survey.

In addition to Interior; the Navy, NASA, and General Electric are the sponsors of Project Tektite. GE constructed the habitat at its Missile and Space Division Headquarters in Valley Forge, Pa.

Tektite's primary objectives are to conduct an extensive marine science program, and to study the physiological and psychological reactions of a group of men working and living under stress for an extended period of isolated condition.

As of March 9, the aquanauts have logged collectively more than 150 hours of work outside the habitat. During the past week, their activities included tagging a number of spiny lobsters, sonar and fauna studies, fish population studies and geological mapping.

Among the many behind-the-scenes workers on Project Tektite are three alternate aquanauts, Ian Koblock, an aquatic biologist with the College of Virgin Islands; Gary Davis, an aquatic ecologist with the National Park Service; and Larry Phillips, a geologist with the U.S. Geological Survey. The alternate aquanauts perform scientific work on the surface and under water in support of the primary team.

Lt. Comdr. Thomas Markham, Tektite chief medical officer from the Naval Submarine Medical Center, New London, Conn., says the aquanauts have been in excellent health since the project began except for a minor ear infection incurred a few days ago by Aquanaut Mahnken. Mahnken was limited to work inside the habitat until the infection cleared.

When the aquanauts are in the habitat, a team of scientists headed by Dr. James Miller, of the Office of Naval Research, monitor all their activities from the command barge on the surface. Closed-circuit television and open microphones enable the topside scientists to monitor every move and sound in the four-chamber habitat—from the amount of food consumed to the subtle changes in mood of the aquanauts at different times. All activities are coded on IBM cards and officials said that to date more than 120,000 bits of information have been recorded. The behavioral data, according to NASA and Navy spokesmen, will be applied to selection, training and composition of crews for future long-term space missions and underseas projects. The data should also be valuable to future marine biological and oceanographic studies.

One of the highlights of a recent week of Tektite was the observance of the 27th anniversary of the Seabees. A detachment of the construction organization had built the base camp, and emplaced the habitat on the ocean floor. The Tektite detachment sponsored a barbecue featuring beef, pork, and native goat. Portions were sent to the aquanauts who in turn sent best wishes to the Seabees.

Another message went from the habitat on the ocean floor March 7 when Chief Aquanaut Waller sent a greeting to his wife on their 12th wedding anniversary. The message said, in part, "Wish you were here." The greeting was relayed by Comdr. Frank Looney, operations commander for Tektite.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE LAIRD INTERVIEWED BY U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration was presented with many far-reaching and serious problems affecting our national security when it assumed the duties of office.

Some of the most serious problems such as the Vietnam war, the Soviet military threat, and the need for the antiballistic missile were discussed in depth by Secretary of Defense Laird in an interview which appeared in the April 7 issue of U.S. News & World Report.

The information and comment which Secretary Laird presents will be of interest to all Americans concerned about the welfare and security of our Nation. I am therefore including the text of the interview as part of my remarks at this point in the **Record**:

What's the Answer to ABM and War?

Q. Mr. Secretary, what do you regard as the No. 1 problem of the Defense Department today?

A. The No. 1 problem is ending the war in Southeast Asia.

Q. How much time do you have?

A. We're hopeful that we will meet with success in the peace talks in Paris. This has to be our objective for a period of time.

This Administration has had only two months to negotiate in Paris. For another two months prior to that, I believe, the other side wasn't too anxious to get down to real negotiations because they felt that a new Administration was coming in on January 20, and they would wait for that.

Q. These peace talks have been going on now for almost a year, and they don't even have an agenda yet, do they?

A. The Administration would be severely criticized if it did not give a reasonable amount of time to negotiations, hoping for success and trying to work out a settlement.

But we should be prepared and will be prepared, in event that the Paris talks are not successful, to have an alternative plan to follow as far as the conduct of the war is concerned, and in bringing that war in Vietnam to an end.

Q. Has the other side been escalating the war in this two-month period?

A. There is no question about that. I think that is what part of the bargaining is all about in Paris. Since I have been Secretary of Defense, the only escalation of the war in South Vietnam has been on the part of the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese.

Q. How much more time should be allowed for talking?

A. I would not want to set a timetable on the Paris talks. That is something that should be determined by the Secretary of State, and he can make his recommendation to the National Security Council. Then the President will make the decision as to how much time we are going to give to the talks in Paris.

Q. During this interval, do we have to go on taking casualties of 300 to 350 Americans a week in Vietnam?

A. I would hope not. I would hope that the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese would realize that this offensive of theirs—where they've taken tremendous casualties—has not been a successful operation.

Q. We heard the same thing after the *Tet* offensive a year ago—

A. Yes.

Q. And war still has gone on for another year—

A. I know. We get this argument that we should break off in Paris now. I really feel this is not the time to break off the Paris talks. I am concerned about those casualties in South Vietnam, but I do feel we have to give some more time to negotiations before we move forward on an alternate course.

I want you to know, however, that we are preparing alternative courses of action to follow, in the event that our efforts for mutual troop withdrawal, for re-establishing the Demilitarized Zone and for the release of prisoners are not successful in the not-too-distant future, as far as the Paris talks are concerned.

At that time, if Paris fails, we will announce the alternative course of action that we plan to follow. We are not going to follow the same course of action as the previous Administration if we do not meet with success in Paris.

Q. How long do you think the public will allow before people decide that "Johnson's war" has become "Nixon's war"?

A. I think the people of this country will understand that the new Administration should have adequate time in Paris. The last Administration had about eight months in Paris, and not much happened. I do not want to be in the position of setting a timetable.

Q. Could you indicate what alternative war plans might be possible?

A. No. I do not think it would be prudent to do this.

Q. There are a million and a half troops in South Vietnam—540,000 Americans and nearly a million South Vietnamese. Why can't a force that size do more than it is doing?

A. It is an unrealistic situation when you stop and realize that the enemy—the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese—can move in and out of that country at will. They have privileged sanctuaries in Cambodia, in Laos and in North Vietnam.

Also, the level of violence is controlled by the other side. They have a safe haven any time they want it. Some of their retreats and bases are within 26 or 30 miles of Saigon. They're across the border in Cambodia or Laos or North Vietnam.

It is a most difficult war to fight under the terms and conditions, the understandings and arrangements that have been set forth in the past.

Alternatives certainly have to be considered. I think we have to go forward with the phase 2 modernization program for Vietnam which I outlined in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee. We should go forward with a program to "Vietnamize" the war. In the past, we have not carried out a very successful program in this area.

SHIFTING BURDEN OF WAR

Q. What needs to be done now?

A. We have to change the emphasis so that American forces in Vietnam can move forward to train and modernize the South Vietnamese forces, rather than fighting so much of the war themselves.

Q. Wasn't that supposed to be the program?

A. I am concerned because most of the past planning has been based on having a South Vietnamese force capable only of handling guerrilla-type operations in case the North Vietnamese pulled their regular forces back to the North. Past policy was not based on turning over full combat duty to the armed forces of Vietnam—"Vietnamizing" the war.

Q. What do you mean by "Vietnamizing" the war? Is that the same thing as "de-Americanization" of the war?

A. It is the same thing, only I think it has a little different impact. To many people, "de-Americanizing" the war means that we would give up our objective, which is self-determination for the people of Vietnam. I would like to see that objective achieved by the Vietnamese people. That is why I think this military-modernization program for the forces of South Vietnam is so important.

Q. What is involved?

A. It involves immediately an additional 156 million dollars, so far as equipment is concerned, for the South Vietnamese forces. It would shift the emphasis for our forces toward becoming training forces, rather than combat forces.

Q. Is that a long-range program?

A. It is a long-range program, but it's one that I think we can do much more about than we have in the past.

Q. What is your position on the possibility of any American troop withdrawal from South Vietnam now?

A. My position is very clear: We are faced with an offensive in South Vietnam that is being conducted by the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese. Secondly, we're engaged in very important peace talks in Paris. A key item on the American agenda for those talks is mutual troop withdrawal of U.S. and North Vietnamese forces. This is not the time for us to talk about unilateral troop withdrawal.

Q. Do you believe the South Vietnamese forces can be trained and equipped to take over most of the ground combat duty in Vietnam?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. In what period of time?

A. Well, I would say within a reasonable period of time. I would rather not get into the timetable now.

Q. Are we giving them some kind of navy?

A. They will have a naval capability in the Mekong Delta and elsewhere, including small monitor gunboats and patrol boats.

Q. Are we giving an air force to the South Vietnamese?

A. Yes, we are.

Q. Why can't they do something against the North if they have these things?

A. The North Vietnamese have one of the most sophisticated air-defense systems in today's world. The SAM missiles and the antiaircraft equipment they have are very sophisticated. Without the most modern equipment, the South Vietnamese Air Force would not last very long in that environment.

Q. With no bombs falling on the North, what pressures are there on the Communists to come to terms in Paris?

A. It is difficult to believe that the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong can consider taking for a long period the kind of casualties they have been taking. We also are taking heavy casualties. They have been replacing their casualties by infiltration from North Vietnam and limited recruitment in South Vietnam.

The purpose of my trip to Vietnam was to look at the situation from our country's point of view: first, to assess the safety of American forces; second, to see that they had all the equipment and support that they needed.

Where the South Vietnamese forces are concerned, the purpose was to see if they could, through their own efforts, achieve the objective of self-determination and self-defense.

Third, it was to see how soon we could reduce our commitment from the standpoint not only of reducing casualties by reducing dollars, matériel and manpower.

TERMS OF BOMBING HALT

Q. Was there any real agreement that accompanied the halting of bombing of the North?

A. When I became Secretary of Defense on January 21, I was informed that there was no written agreement, but there were understandings.

Q. Was it understood on both sides?

A. It was understood, I was told, on both sides.

Q. Is it possible to state what were those understandings?

A. The understandings, as related to me, were that the U.S. would halt the bombing, and the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong would not use the Demilitarized Zone. Furthermore, they would not indiscriminately shell the major population centers in South Vietnam, and they would permit the South Vietnamese to take part in the talks in Paris.

Q. Has the Communist shelling that has gone on for the last four weeks violated that agreement?

A. In my opinion, it has violated the understandings.

Q. Are the Communist forces in South Vietnam stronger now than before the bombing halt?

A. There is no question that they are stronger. There has been increased infiltration from North Vietnam into Laos, Cambodia and into South Vietnam. That infiltration has increased to a very great extent since October 31, when the bombing halt went into effect. There has been an increase in the number of people, the amount of matériel, supplies, ammunition that has been brought down from the North.

Q. Are the Communist forces more capable of fighting the war now than they were before?

A. Any army is more capable when it has more supplies and more men, but perhaps less capable when it suffers heavy losses of trained people.

Q. Has there been any slackening whatsoever in the Soviet supply of matériel to North Vietnam?

A. No.

Q. Or of China's supply?

A. No—but the Chinese have not been the major suppliers. The Soviet Union is continuing to supply the forces of North Vietnam and the Viet Cong. Almost 80 per cent comes from the Soviet Union and its satellite countries. Red China makes up approximately 15 per cent.

Q. How much do our allies provide—the additional 5 per cent?

A. Indirectly, you could say that some of our allies do some trading with North Vietnam.

Q. Does most of that arrive by sea?

A. As far as the military equipment is concerned, most of it is arriving by land.

Q. Across China?

A. Across China. But, as far as tonnage is concerned—if you limit it to tonnage—with the petroleum and the other supplies that come in through the ports of the North, you'd probably have a greater tonnage coming by sea.

Q. You said that in the eight months the Johnson Administration was talking in Paris, there was no progress. Does that still hold true at this date?

A. I would be less than frank with you if I said that there had been substantial progress made in the two months since the Nixon Administration took office. As far as substance is concerned, these talks merely dealt with procedures, up until the first of November or shortly thereafter.

Q. Are the Russians helping in these talks?

A. Well, there has been some evidence, we have been told, that when it came to settling the question of the table and some other items, they were helpful.

Q. But not on substantive matters——

A. We would certainly hope that they would be helpful, but——

Q. Why do you think that the Communists are staging a new offensive in South Vietnam at this particular time?

A. It seems to be tied in with the Paris negotiations. It is probably an effort on their part to influence public opinion in the U.S., hoping for an effect on negotiations in Paris. They feel this is important from a psychological standpoint in the U.S. I think it has a greater effect on American opinion, really, than it does in South Vietnam from a military standpoint.

The enemy has learned from their last three offensives how to use their sanctuaries to hit and run, and not to stand and fight. They used their resources to better effect than they did in the last three offensives.

TESTING SOUTH VIETNAM

Q. Does it seem as if this whole thing is hopeless?

A. I don't think that it is hopeless to maintain our objective of self-determination for the people of South Vietnam, if the people of South Vietnam want self-determination and the right of self-defense. But the time has come when we had better test that and make sure that this is what they do want, and not just some objective we've set for them.

Q. How do you determine that?

A. That's what this modernization program is all about. I think the time has come to see whether they will accept this responsibility—whether, if given the opportunity for training and given the equipment, they are in a position to carry forward on their own to maintain the objective of self-determination.

Q. Are they in a position to do that?

A. I believe they are. I believe they will. But if they are not, it shouldn't be up to us to do it for them.

The No. 1 objective of this Administration is to stop the war in Vietnam and to see that the American involvement in that war is brought to a halt. This is our main objective, and that is what we're working toward right now.

Q. Have the South Vietnamese ever been told precisely and exactly what we expect them to do?

A. I think they knew what was expected of them in the event that the North Vietnamese withdrew and the Americans withdrew, say, under the terms of the Manila communiqué [signed Oct. 25, 1966, by the U.S. and its allies]. The past planning has all been based on that kind of a limited responsibility for the forces of South Vietnam in the context of a Manila-type withdrawal. In other words, the North Vietnamese will not be present and the Americans will not be present in any substantial number. The planning for that kind of a situation, I would tell you very frankly, has gone forward in a rather effective manner.

But the planning for the other kind of responsibility for the forces of South Vietnam, as I outlined them before the Senate and House committees, has not gone forward as effectively as it should. My testimony as far as the modernization program is concerned was not based on a complete withdrawal of the armed forces of North Vietnam. That's the difference.

Q. Would we accept a coalition government in the South including the Viet Cong's National Liberation Front?

A. If it were up to me, I would certainly accept a coalition government if it was elected in a regular election and if it was a free and independent election. We have always talked about the right of self-determination. If they go that route, and they take Communists into the government, and they are elected in a free election, I do not think that is an area where we should prescribe the standards.

I am not one who believes that it is necessarily like putting a fox in a chicken coop, as long as we do not force the South to put Communists in their government. I do not believe that should be our responsibility—to force them to put Communists there. But if they elect them, that is a different matter.

Q. Could a coalition be agreed upon in the Paris negotiations?

A. In negotiations, a free and open election would be, perhaps, the extent of our moving toward any kind of coalition. A coalition would have to be the result of free elections. I do not believe we would be a party to force a coalition.

Q. Would you expect to see all American troops out of South Vietnam in the next 10 years?

A. I would hope that we could see all of them out of there in the next 10 years. I hate to make a broad statement like that. I mean, we still have troops in Korea. We still have troops in Europe, and World War II has been over since 1945. Here it is 24 years later, and we still have troops in Europe. I wish it wasn't necessary to have troops in Korea.

This is one of the important things that we are going over in the National Security Council at this time—a review of all of our commitments around the world. This is something in which we are very interested in the Department of Defense, because I think we may be overcommitted worldwide. We should review our commitments very carefully to make sure that we do not commit ourselves to more than we can deliver.

Q. How do you go about pulling back without someone else moving into the vacuum?

A. This is what we're going into in these National Security Council studies. These are the most important studies that have been conducted by the Government since World War II. Not only are we studying our total strategic-force commitment, but our conventional commitments. This kind of study has not been performed in this depth for some time, as far as our country is concerned.

Q. Have any conclusions been drawn?

A. No, we will not have our strategic study completed until about May 15. Our conventional study, based on the commitments we have, will be completed sometime in October. So I don't want to give you the impression that the studies have been completed.

WHY THE ABM IS NEEDED

Q. Mr. Secretary, why did you decide that it was necessary to go ahead with deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile defense system?

A. Because this is necessary for the safety and security of our country. Originally it had been felt necessary to give this country the protection of the Sentinel system of missile defense, primarily against the possible development of a Chinese missile threat to the U.S. in the decade of the 1970s.

The plan in the budget submitted to Congress by the previous Administration provided for an authorization of 1.8 billion dollars for ABM development for fiscal year 1970. We have decided to cut that total back to 800 million dollars—a reduction of a billion dollars in the budget requests to Congress for the year to start next July 1. This modified system gives the same protection, as far as a small Chinese threat is concerned, as the original Sentinel system.

However, as we assessed our intelligence information on what the Soviets are doing with their missile deployment and the increased Soviet missile deployment that has been going on over the last 24 months, we became increasingly concerned. We found that as recently as December they were still going forward with the deployment of the SS–9.

Q. What is this SS–9?

A. The SS–9 is the largest intercontinental ballistic missile that the Soviet Union has in its inventory. It has a capability of carrying a warhead of up to 25 megatons. I felt that the American people should know that the Soviet Union was going forward with deployment of this weapon. Two years ago, and again a year ago, our best intelligence was that the Soviet Union would probably not go forward with further deployment of the SS–9. Deployment of offensive missiles was expected to level off.

POWER OF RUSSIAN MISSILE

Q. Is this Russian missile more powerful than our intercontinental ballistic missiles?

A. It is much more powerful than anything we have. You do not need this kind of megatonnage in those numbers to destroy cities. For a retaliatory strike, you would not need the large nuclear capability of the SS–9. If we were developing a missile like this, I am sure the Soviet Union would assume that we were developing it to take out underground missile sites and to destroy the deterrent force of the Soviet Union.

As Secretary of Defense, I must try to assess why the Soviets are deploying this very powerful weapon. One of the conclusions that a defense planner must come to—if he is looking out for the security of the United States and wants to deter a nuclear war—is that this particular Soviet system has the capability to knock out our hardened missile sites. Now, it is possible for us to save many of our missiles—but not our cities—from a massive Soviet attack.

Q. Why defend missile sites and not population centers?

A. The way to save our cities is to protect the credibility of our deterrent nuclear power, so that we have a balanced deterrent, a protected deterrent—assuring that no nation will ever choose to strike the U.S. in a nuclear attack.

Q. But you are proposing to defend only two of our missile launch areas.

A. We're going forward with deployment at two missile sites in phase 1 in the 1970 budget. The over-all program has 12 sites in the continental U.S., with an option to add two more at a later date in Hawaii and Alaska.

But in the 1970 funding, there only is construction proposed on two sites—the two missile bases in the northern part of U.S. These two ABM sites when fully deployed will provide a relatively "thin" cover over all of our Minuteman capability and a heavier cover over approximately 30 per cent of our Minutemen. It will also give some protection for our bombers in that area.

Q. Will this Safeguard program be an effective system?

A. Yes. We have had successful tests of the Spartan, which is a long-range interceptor missile. We have had successful tests with the Sprint short-range missile. We have had successful tests of the missile-site radar. We've had successful tests of all components of the PAR radar.

Q. What is PAR radar?

A. PAR is the perimeter acquisition radar that goes out and searches for missiles on the horizon. It is a long-range radar. We are going to put two of these PAR installations in phase 1. These are costly radar installations. Now, we haven't installed a PAR radar anyplace, but I have been assured by the most competent people in the scientific community that this radar will work.

Q. Can PAR be tested when put in place?

A. That is what we propose to do. This radar will be an effective instrument as far as our defense establishment is concerned, even if research and development lead us to believe at a later date that we can use some type of new developments to destroy incoming missiles.

If our work with advanced radar techniques and lasers, and some of the other things we're working on, should prove to be successful at a later time, there is no reason why parts of this Safeguard system cannot be used. We have to go forward with an acquisition type radar for the detection, not only of submarine-launched missiles, but also of missiles that might be launched from China or from Russia, and to keep a close watch on the FOBS [fractional-orbit bombardment system]. These are fractional-orbiting space vehicles which have a capability of firing nuclear weapons against the U.S.

Q. Can ABM weapons be used to destroy space platforms armed with nuclear weapons?

A. Yes, we will have that capability with the Safeguard system.

Q. Some scientists now contend that the entire system could be knocked out easily by striking at the radar heart of the system with a very small nuclear explosion. Is this true?

A. No. The system will intercept the incoming nuclear weapons whether they are high or low yield. In addition, we have designed the system so that there is no advantage to the attacker to concentrate on the Safeguard radar.

Q. Some Congressmen claim that a strong offense by the U.S. is the best defense—

A. The President of the United States should have the option of using this defensive-weapons system before he used all of our offensive capability.

It is going to be very difficult for any President to be sure that a missile attack coming over the horizon is a full-scale assault. He would have to make this determination within a very few minutes, giving the order to unload our silos, and to fire our offensive-missile force, and to have all our bombers on the way, in a very short period of time.

Q. About how long a period?

A. This would depend on the type of enemy attack, whether ICBM, SLBM [submarine-launched ballistic missile] or FOBS. We could have less than 15 minutes in which to make a full evaluation—and to react. I want to be in a position where our deterrent force can survive a first strike, if necessary, and still deliver a devastating blow to any potential enemy. That is what will keep this country from getting into a nuclear war. That is what is going to protect our people, and that is what is going to keep the peace. That is why it is so important to protect our second-strike capability.

Q. Do you consider this an investment in peace?

A. That is what this all about. I hope that the ABM system is never used. But if it is never used, the money will not have been wasted. It will be a small price to pay if we keep the peace by preventing a nuclear exchange between the U.S. and any other country.

We have to prevent that nuclear exchange. The way to prevent it is not only with a balanced deterrent force, but a credible deterrent insofar as our second-strike capability is concerned.

Q. Are we committed to accept the first strike in a nuclear war?

A. We could accept the blow now.

Q. But are we committed to that as a matter of policy?

A. No, we're not committed to that—but I think it is important that we be in a position so that, if a surprise attack comes and we do not fire our missiles, we still have the capability to deliver a second strike. Any potential enemy must know that we can deliver that second strike. The timing of our retaliatory strike must, however, be a command decision of the President, based on the situation as he sees it.

I do not worry about this eventuality in the time period of 1969, 1970, 1971. But when we get into the period of 1972 and later—then, as Secretary of Defense, I do have some concern. I know we could take the first strike today and retaliate with devastating strength.

We have our Polaris fleet of nuclear submarines. I've been very active in the Polaris program. I cosponsored the amendments in Congress which provided for accelerating the Polaris program. Some members of the scientific community were telling us that the Polaris system would not work.

I was convinced by Admiral Raborn [head of the initial Polaris program] and Admiral Rickover [pioneer in the development of nuclear submarines] that the system would work. Their scientific advisers were convinced it would, and I was willing to take the chance that it would. This system is today virtually invulnerable. It cannot be attacked successfully by the Soviet Union, and it increases the credibility of our deterrent tremendously, as far as our second-strike capability is concerned.

Q. But will the Polaris fleet remain an invulnerable system?

A. I cannot give that assurance for the long-range future. I know what can be done scientifically. I know some of the things we are working on. And I do not downgrade the scientific capability of the Soviet Union to the extent of saying that our Polaris submarine fleet would always be invulnerable.

REDS' SUBMARINE BUILDUP

Q. Are the Soviets now developing their own Polaris-type submarine fleet?

A. Yes, they have the capacity to produce one Polaris-type submarine a month. Last year they produced seven.

Q. With 16 nuclear missiles each?

A. With 16 missiles.

Q. So they could catch up with us, then, in about 3½ years in numbers of Polaris submarines——

A. Yes. But we're talking here about the credibility of our Polaris as a deterrent force. I don't want to give the impression that the Polaris-type fleet being turned out by the Soviet Union is an attack fleet against our own Polaris submarines. That is not correct. But the Soviets are going forward with other developments in the attack area which do raise questions.

Q. So they have seven Polaris-type submarines with 16 missiles each that could approach our coast——

A. There's no question about that. The number that they have deployed at the present time, however, is not a significant figure.

Q. But in the next few years——

A. In the time period 1974–75, they could equal or surpass the number of Polaris-type submarines which we presently have. That number is 41.

Q. Could our land-based missile sites survive an attack from those submarine-based Soviet missiles?

A. I would think that they might use their Polaris-type submarines with their missiles primarily against other targets, including our bomber force. I think that their Polaris submarine would, however, be more of a second-strike weapon. The major missile-site weapon, as I see it, is the one they are deploying at the present time—the powerful SS–9.

Q. You testified in Congress that the Russians have about 200 of these——

A. More than 200.

Q. And these 200 Soviet ICBM's could destroy 55 per cent of the population of this country——

A. We do not have 200 cities which are large enough to be a good target for the SS–9. The Soviets have large numbers of a smaller ICBM, the SS–11, which is clearly suited for city destruction. It could destroy half of the population of our country.

Q. Some people seem to feel that there is no possibility of any country challenging us——

A. Well, I hope that we can go forward with meaningful arms-control talks, and that we will be successful in working out an arms-control agreement. But this may take months or years. In the meantime, we have to protect the credibility of our deterrent force.

When you talk about the sufficiency of the U.S. nuclear forces, you must take into consideration the fact that we in the U.S. live in an open society, and the Soviet Union is a closed society. You must also recognize that we are preparing a retaliatory-type force, which could survive any first strike, and still deliver a devastating blow to any potential aggressor. It is this second-strike capability that is going to keep the peace. This deterrent capability is going to prevent nuclear war with the Soviet Union in the decade of the 1970s. One of my primary responsibilities is to see that such a capability exists. The ABM is only part of the program to insure the credibility of our deterrent power.

Q. What is the total cost of this ABM investment?

A. The total cost in dollars is between 6 and 7 billion, plus about 2 billion more in projected ABM-component research and development.

Q. So you know something about effectiveness of an ABM system already—

A. We know quite a bit about it. We've been firing these missiles on a regular basis. We know exactly whether we have made an intercept, by the manner in which we work this into our computers with the firing of the missiles—and we are firing the missiles.

Q. With no warheads, though—

A. No, we are not testing warheads in the atmosphere.

Q. What about underground?

A. We are going forward with tests of the warheads underground. We have the capability of carrying out these tests underground without any violation of the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty.

Q. How far out can this intercept be made in your tests?

A. With the Spartan missile, at a distance of several hundred miles. That's the long-range missile. The Sprint missile is of much shorter range—a few tens of miles. You use the Sprint for close-in defense as a back-up to Spartan.

Q. Can you tell us anything about the Russian system?

A. The Russians have deployed an ABM system around Moscow.

They slowed deployment of this system about a year ago, and have been going forward with tests of a more sophisticated ABM system in their test grounds. We think for that reason they probably will not deploy many more of the Galosh missiles which they have around Moscow at this time.

Q. Don't the present Russian ABM's concern you much?

A. I wouldn't say that they do not concern me, because we have to assume that they have a capability. I think you would have to take that system into consideration, and you would have to target a certain number of your second-strike weapons against the Russian ABM system, particularly if it were expanded to cover more cities. Otherwise you would not be able to penetrate as you should. You would not have the kind of credibility that the second strike force must have.

Q. If the Soviets were willing to freeze their development of ABM's is our Safeguard system negotiable, too?

A. ———

Q. Has there been any indication that the Soviet Union wants to move ahead with arms-control talks?

A. I can only say that it is most important if we get into arms-control talks, that we discuss defensive as well as offensive weapons. The system that President Nixon has outlined is an added incentive for effective arms-control talks. It is not provocative in any way, because it is truly a defensive system to protect our second-strike capability.

Q. Why should the Russians want to place their ABM missile sites around Moscow and other cities, while we now want to put our defensive weapons around missile bases and defense installations?

A. I believe it is rather provocative to put your ABM sites around your cities. In that way, under the program outlined by the previous Administration, it could be said that we were trying to protect our cities from Soviet missile attack and thus be in a position to launch a first strike. What we're trying to do with the Safeguard system, as it relates to the Soviet Union, is to insure the reliability of our second-strike capability. We believe that we can protect our people better in that way.

Q. Did some of the uproar—Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles and other places—have something to do with the shift from defense of cities?

A. It did not have anything to do with the recommendation that the Deputy Secretary of Defense, David Packard, and I made to the President and the National Security Council. I can assure you of that. It did demonstrate, however, how a system deployed at cities can be misinterpreted. Many of those protesters thought the previous Administration was attempting a heavy city protection against a massive, Soviet-type attack.

The biggest factor influencing us in our decision—and the American people should know why we made the decision that we did—is the fact that the Soviet Union is going forward with deployment of the SS-9, which has the capability of carrying a huge warhead, and has the capability of carrying multiple warheads of large capacity that could be targeted on our retaliatory-missile sites.

Q. When did this become known to you?

A. The key information was gathered by our intelligence sources during the month of December. It became known to me after I became Secretary of Defense in January. But this December deployment was not known to the previous Administration—I want that made very clear—at the time they prepared their defense budget.

Q. Was that intelligence information the reason the Nixon Administration called a halt to the Sentinel system?

A. The only thing we could call a halt to was one site that was going forward near Boston. I ordered a review of the entire ABM program—a review which was headed up by Deputy Secretary Packard.

Q. How much protection will this revised ABM system provide against the Chinese threat?

A. As far as complete area protection against a Chinese threat is concerned, it would not be completed until late 1975. We do not anticipate, as of today, that the Chinese Communists will have a significant ICBM capability before that time.

However, should the Chinese test-fire an ICBM—and I think they might within the next 18 months—the program can be accelerated, and we could have an effective system completed at an earlier date. I think we can have sufficient protection against a Chinese threat through the 1970s, if the measured Safeguard system is completed through all of the phases as outlined by President Nixon.

Q. And after that?

A. It could be modified at a later time in the period of the 1980s. We may be into some other sophisticated types of antimissile defenses by that time. We are not stopping research and development in other areas, such as lasers and sea-based ABM's.

We are hopeful that we can have successful arms-control negotiations and an agreement. But we want to be in the position—if we do not have an effective agreement—that we will be able to maintain the credibility and effectiveness of our nuclear deterrent, our second-strike capability.

Q. Do you feel that Congress will give you the money and authority to proceed with this ABM in fiscal 1970?

A. I am confident that the Congress—with the full facts in hand—will approve this modified program. In view of the activities of the Soviet Union in the strategic-arms field during the last 24 months, particularly the accelerated deployment of the SS-9 missiles, Congress will want to protect our deterrent forces so that we can prevent nuclear war in the decade of the 1970s.

Q. We do not want to be in a position where the Soviet Union could pull a Cuban missile crisis on us in reverse—

A. That is correct. It is important for everyone to understand that at the time of the Cuban missile crisis in 1962, the U.S. was in a position of vast strategic nuclear superiority. We are not in that same position today. The Soviet Union is now in a position where it has more ICBM's on launch pads and under construction than the U.S. does. It has the capability in the next few years of going ahead of us in submarine-launched missiles. It has a tremendous capability in intermediate-range missiles, which are targeted against our allies in Europe.

We must have a credible deterrent so that the Soviet Union knows that if they use these weapons, if they make that kind of mistake—and I don't think they will—then they will surely suffer the consequences. We want to maintain that kind of deterrent until we can be assured that we have an arms-control agreement that will work—one that will protect our people.

SOVIET VERSUS UNITED STATES OUTLAYS

Q. We've spent 50 billion dollars on antiaircraft defenses in the U.S. since the end of World War II. Why all the opposition now to spending 6 or 7 billion on ABM defenses?

A. It is difficult for me to understand except that this atitude is connected somehow with the frustrations that people have over the war in Vietnam. Understandably, our people are concerned not only about our casualty tolls but also the amount of money we have been forced to spend in recent years. This year—the current fiscal year which ends June 30—our total expenditures on Vietnam will be almost 30 billion dollars. This is a massive amount of spending.

The Soviets, with their policy, have been successful in getting by with an annual expenditure, I say, of about 4 billion dollars in Vietnam. The previous Administration and our intelligence community say the cost to the Soviet Union is lower than that—that the Russians have been able to supply about 80 per cent of the war materials used by the Communists in Vietnam at a cost of around 2 billion dollars.

Q. A year?

A. A year. So here is a 2-billion-dollar investment, according to our intelligence community. And that is a tradeoff against 30 billion dollars being spent by the U.S. The Soviet Union has been able to use this period to go forward with a massive strategic-arms build-up of offensive and defensive weapons inside the U.S.S.R.

Q. While we couldn't—

A. We could not because of our vast commitment in Southeast Asia.

So, really, when you ask me why the opposition to the ABM, I think it has become more or less a symbol of some of the frustration we all feel over the tremendous tie-down of our assets in Southeast Asia.

The ABM is a very insignificant issue as compared with the war in Southeast Asia.

THE CALL FOR A NEW GOVERNMENT-INDUSTRY PARTNERSHIP

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on March 21 the Western Electronic Manufacturers Association held its annual congressional luncheon in the Rayburn Building. The Members of Congress who attended were privileged to hear a very excellent address entitled "The Urban Crisis Calls for a New Government-Industry Partnership," by Mr. Richard A. Campbell, president of Western Electronic Manufacturers Association.

The subject matter of this address is so important that I recommend it as "must" reading to every Member of the House of Representatives. The address follows:

THE URBAN CRISIS CALLS FOR A NEW GOVERNMENT-INDUSTRY PARTNERSHIP

(Remarks of Richard A. Campbell, president of Western Electronic Manufacturers Association, at WEMA's annual Congressional Luncheon, Washington, D.C., March 21, 1969)

Ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, I am Richard Campbell, President of the Western Electronic Manufacturers Association. In behalf of the 96 industry executives who have crossed the country to be here today, I want to welcome you to our Congressional Luncheon.

This is our eighth annual reunion, and this year we decided it was time to use the occasion to learn *from* you as well as to talk *to* you. This morning we were privileged to hear from Senator Bennett, Chairman Holifield, Congressman Gubser and Chairman Miller. I'd like to express our deep appreciation to these gentlemen for giving so generously of their time. We are especially indebted to Chairman Miller since he arranged for us to meet here in the halls of Congress today.

We spent considerable time at our morning conference discussing "The Government-Industry Partnership." Since many of our companies have long served the needs of the country's defense and space efforts, we have a substantial interest in the ground rules and operating policies that have evolved over the years to govern the relationship of buyer and supplier.

That is a special relationship, born of the nation's decision to mobilize its resources for such top-priority objectives as defeating the Axis in World II or beating the Russians in the race to the moon.

Those undertakings had the support of the American public because of the great stakes involved and the clear case for plunging into these efforts. We in Western electronics have been deeply involved in providing the wherewithal—both the "hardware" and the technological capability that lies behind it—to carry out those commitments. Only the Government could embark on such undertakings in behalf of the people of this country, and only industry could quickly and abundantly meet the need for increasingly more sophisticated and precise equipment.

The United States has other challenges to meet, however, and I want to shift focus to these because it casts our traditional relationship in quite a different light.

The nation today faces an urban crisis so complex and so urgent that no one would assert that it will resolve itself if left alone to subside with the passage of time.

One of the things that distinguishes this crisis from those we have met before is the fact that the issue *is* so complex. The response is not at all clear. When Pearl Harbor was bombed and when Sputnik was thrust into orbit, we had no difficulty identifying the challenge. The urban crisis is not so readily characterized. Racial strife is only one aspect of the urban crisis. It is tightly interlocked with other elements such as structural unemployment, inadequate housing, widespread lawlessness, deficient schools, pollution of our air and water and congestion of highways and airways.

One does not have to be a systems analyst to recognize that these problems all interact—that solutions for one or a few of the problems are bound to fail if allowance is not made for the way they will affect the other elements of the problem.

Because of the complexity of the crisis, responsibility cannot be readily fixed. We are accustomed to looking to the Federal Government for direction in responding to external threats, but the snarl of domestic problems has left us uncertain of how we should proceed. Often we hear it said, for example, that "if we can put men into outer space, why can't we find a way to bring people to work in our cities?" Denver, Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, San Francisco—really, every major city—is confronted each morning with a tide of slow-moving, exhaust-producing automobiles on highways and freeways that reached their capacity twenty years too soon. The system isn't working. It's getting worse. The complaint, however, neatly sidesteps the question of *who* is supposed to take charge of the problem.

In many cases we find that a cobweb of various governmental jurisdictions is itself the chief barrier to problem solving. The engineering challenge of designing an effective, low-cost rapid transit system for the Los Angeles Basin is minor, for example, when compared to the tangle of rivalries posed by 1,056 cities and special districts in that area which may assert their special interests in the choice of alternatives, financing, rights-of-way or other factors.

There is clear need for leadership in all these areas, but the urban crisis is not just the government's problem. It is not just industry's problem, nor is it the problem of any given element of society. It is everybody's problem.

Government and industry must work in partnership to cope with it, sometimes with government as the buyer and industry as the supplier, but often as two independent partners working simultaneously toward a common goal.

Our Western electronics industry, with the technological capacity it has developed and its systems approach to solving problems, has increasingly turned its attention toward applications in the domestic, civilian market. Wherever there are needs to be filled and money available to pay for them, the intelligently-run company is going to find the investment money and manpower necessary to produce the wares required. That is a marvelous way to meet the needs, and I submit that it has the staying power needed for the long pull.

Certainly, as a first order of business, we must achieve a turnabout in the lives of the people in the ghetto. The overriding single need is to reverse—not merely ameliorate—the generation-to-generation inheritance of defeatism and poverty.

While putting people to work clearly will go far to diminsh the crisis, the crisis is not unemployment itself. Giving jobs to men and women may alleviate discontent and improve morale, but it will not end the crisis. The Kerner and McCone Commissions found that many of the looters and rioters in Watts and Detroit, for example, were people who had jobs.

In and of itself, employment does not bring the ghetto person into the mainstream of society. To be sure, the efforts made to date in training and employing the unskilled are impressive.

In cooperation with the National Alliance of Businessmen and the Urban Coalition, our companies have made substantial contributions to the national crash effort. We estimate that, since January of 1966, western electronic firms have trained and hired 7,000 unskilled men and women. In most cases, the cost of training and low productivity of new workers has been borne by the companies themselves. The added special training required was carried on in the plants, for the most part. In the remainder of the cases, skills have been taught in a variety of community training centers, like the Seattle Opportunities Industrialization Center, or vocational schools with curricula tailored to meet specific needs of industry today. Often, equipment for teaching has been donated by companies. Federal programs—notably those under the Labor Department's Manpower Administration—have helped mightily toward shouldering costs, but the case is rare that a company is spared risk and expense of its own.

We think it would be a very unfortunate mistake to conclude that realization of the goal of putting 500,000 people to work will end the crisis. In their press to meet NAB quotas, a few companies have hired ghetto people without regard to whether there was work for them to do. As heart-warming as that may be, it is difficult for us to see how such actions make any real contribution to ending the crisis. Yet, it would seem from much of the pressure exerted on our companies by various governmental agencies that this is what is expected of us. We submit that gauging progress by the single standard of quantity is very risky indeed.

Those of us who have been involved in defense and space contracting vividly recall how, at various junctures, thousands of people—regardless of their skills—have suddenly been needed to meet the government's wartime needs. Between 1940 and 1965, for example, Los Angeles' Negro population soared from 75,000 to 650,000, chiefly in response to the promise of jobs. But as contracts were filled or cancelled, many of these people—the least skilled and the least senior—were laid off. Without a doubt, the disillusionment that these people suffered contributed to the Watts insurrection of 1965. I don't think any of us cares to see that cycle repeated, and yet we must recognize that over-hiring without economic need is bound to lead to layoffs again in a short while. The fact is, it's already happening.

One of the most hopeful signs we see of the *qualitative* change in economic opportunity is the emergence of Black Capitalism. Admittedly, it is not "the answer," for there is no single answer, but it is a movement that deserves all the encouragement and help we can give it. The phenomenon is important not merely for its symbolic value for the black community; Negro-owned and Negro-managed business simply makes sense. We are familiar with a number of these new ventures. Indeed, western electronics executives have played key roles in capitalizing a number of these companies and there are now several company presidents from the ranks of our own engineers. Some of our companies are forming teams of volunteer management consultants to help these firms through their "shakedown" periods and, I might add, one bit of advice they usually give is "avoid reliance on government business."

It is three-and-a-half years now since the Watts riots and one year since the Kerner Commission rendered its report. That is not a long time, but it is long enough for us to form some conclusions on the basis of our own experience with the urban crisis generally, and the problem of expanding economic opportunity specifically.

First, we have found that, despite flaws in their education and years of forced idleness, the people of the ghetto can be trained to do exacting, precision work in our plants. Further, with thoughtful attention to the special problems they must contend with during the early period of their employment, they do in time perform very well indeed.

Second, although we must train and absorb all the people we can *now*, we must be wary of repeating the "one step forward, two steps backward" routine of the past. As we look into 1969, we find that sales projections for western electronics indicate very little growth, and we don't expect to have as many new jobs as we did in 1968 when our employment grew by only 1%. It would be disastrous to buoy the hopes of people by training them for jobs that don't exist.

Finally, we believe that new approaches to urban problems must take precedence—creative, imaginative ideas must be put forward and tested by the standard of what they will do to bring about fundamental change.

Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, who is well known for his research into the black ghetto, has said:

"Business and industry are our last hope. They are the most realistic elements of our society. Other areas in our society—government, education, churches, labor—have defaulted in dealing with the Negro problem. It is now up to business."

I am not sure but what Professor Clark gives us more credit than we deserve. While it is true that industry provides more than two-thirds of the jobs in this country, it does not follow that dependence on the business community's ability to solve urban problems, to the exclusion of other sectors of society, is realistic or sensible. In truth, we *do* look to government to provide leadership, mobilize public opinion and marshal resources to deal with this crisis as it has with others.

No useful purpose is served by asserting that industry, infused with evangelical fervor, can single-handedly cope with America's greatest crisis since the Civil War. But industry, *in partnership with government*, can help mightily to find the solid, economic approaches that *will* bring about solutions in all areas of the nation's unfinished business.

THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, quite recently, on March 11 to be exact, this body adopted House Resolution 302 commending the American Legion on its 50th anniversary. Because of my close association with the American Legion, I was gratified by this display of affection for a great American institution.

We all know that the Legion earned its reputation as a result of the dedicated efforts of millions of loyal, patriotic citizens organized in local community posts throughout the Nation. As an example of this dedication to God and country, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this body an editorial from the Delaware Republican-Express, Delhi, N.Y., concerning the Donald W. Gleason Post of the Legion in Delhi:

AMERICAN LEGION—GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

"Fifty years of 100 per cent Americanism—a Commitment to Freedom," is the theme adopted by the 2,600,000 members of the American Legion as they observe the 50th year of organization.

American Legion national commander, William C. Doyle, explains the meaning of the theme as "a reasoned approach and concern with major problems which confront America; an earnest effort to seek sound solutions within the framework of the law; a love of country and respect for its institutions; respect for the rights of others; concern for the freedoms of men, as God-given rights, but a recognition that every right carries its own responsibilities."

These are basic generalities which the American Legion in every community is charged to translate into service within local boundaries. Whatever needs doing to improve social and economic life, provide better schools, and local government are opportunities for legion concern.

Donald W. Gleason Post of the American Legion, Delhi, is a leader in projects for community improvement. The pavilion which it plans to erect at Legion Park this spring, is a recent example of its concern for community well-being.

To legion members and their commander, Richard E. Wickham, we, as a community and small segment of the America we love and revere, express appreciation for the sacrifices and devotion extended in our behalf.

ESPERANTO: INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, a new worldwide language is being developed called Esperanto. Actually the language was first created by a Polish physician in 1887. Recently an article on the subject appeared in the Gallup Independent. Mrs. James Stone, of Gallup, N. Mex., informed me that the national office of the Esperanto League for North America was so impressed with the news story by Mrs. Martha Zollinger that they requested I bring this story to your attention.

The story follows:

JET-AGE LANGUAGE SHOWN IN VIP WINDOW AT PAPER

A language for the jet age, Esperanto, will celebrate its formation during international friendship week, Feb. 16–22. In connection with this, the VIP window at the Gallup Independent will feature Esperanto articles belonging to Mrs. James Stone, 504 N. Fifth.

"Breakfast in New York, lunch in London, dinner in Rome" has become commonplace to many travelers. European television comes to us live via satellite. The crust of isolation that used to shield Americans from overseas contacts has been broken. Esperanto, the international language, is becoming a necessity.

Mr. and Mrs. James Stone and Mr. and Mrs. Richard Feeney have started an Esperanto Club in Gallup. Anyone who is interested in becoming a member may contact them at 863–5023 or 863–9235.

The time-worn cliche that "wherever you go, people speak English" just is not true. Less than 10 per cent of the world's people speak it. Esperanto, an international language, was created by Dr. Ludwig Samenhof, a Polish physician, in 1887. It has been found easy to learn, is politically neutral and is a great practical value in everyday use.

The spelling is based on the phoenic principle of one letter, one sound. Consequently, the pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary are easy. There are only 16 rules with no exceptions or irregular verbs.

Esperanto is not the property of any one nation, it has no historical or political implications to hinder its acceptance. As one of the new countries to join the United Nations stated regarding the use of English as the international language, "It is humiliating for the small nations to be obliged to learn the language of the larger ones. Only a neutral language like Esperanto can eliminate that cultural dependency."

One of the most important reasons for the success of Esperanto is that it offers exceptional practical advantages:

The Universal Esperanto Association, with headquarters in Rotterdam, maintains a network of over 3,000 representatives in 65 countries, sponsors many international activities, and issues a Yearbook which gives the addresses of its representatives and information on current international activities. There are more than a dozen international professional associations of, for example, teachers, scientists, journalists, doctors, lawyers, etc., which sponsor meetings, publish journals, and otherwise promote the technical use of Esperanto. Other international organizations serve the interests of esperantists who share the same religious affiliations—Catholics, Protestants, Quakers, Buddhists, etc.—or the same hobbies, such as stamp collecting or chess.

The traveller who knows Esperanto is not confined to talking with hotel clerks, cab drivers, waiters, guides and travel agents. By writing to the Esperanto representative in each place he visits, he can be sure of being met and helped. Wherever he goes, he knows he will find friends who speak the same language and share his interests. He will meet and talk to the people of the country, instead of merely looking at its monuments. At international meetings where Esperanto is used, he can be sure of clear and animated discussions, free of earphones and interpreters, as well as much friendly conversation in corridors, lobbies, and nearby cafes.

Many esperantists get to know other countries and their peoples without ever leaving home. Books and magazines in Esperanto bring the news and culture of other countries to your door.

The value of Esperanto for international relations and the reapprochement of peoples was recognized by the General Conference of UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) in a resolution passed in 1954. This came as a result of a world-wide petition, with signatures representing more than 16 million people, asking the UN to encourage the spread of Esperanto throughout the world. UNESCO has maintained a consultative relationship with the Universal Esperanto Association ever since 1954.

Mrs. Stone's parents were immigrants who spoke Yiddish and lived in the French section of a city in Vermont. When they wanted to communicate, with townspeople, translator speaking French, English and Yiddish was needed. It was frustrating, states Mrs. Stone, so she eagerly contacted a group in Boston when she was 15 years old and read about the Esperanto activities in a local newspaper. She became a member of that group and has been speaking Esperanto ever since.

Mrs. Stone has been asked to translate literature for several thousand delegates to use at the Universal Esperanto Congress when it meets in Portland, Oregon, in 1972. She is also helping update the multivolume Esperanto encyclopedia and has been instrumental in disseminating information about the southwest Indian culture to European peoples.

Among Mrs. Stone's personal advantages coming from the use of Esperanto are the following: Giving hospitality to visiting Esperanto members (she is listed in a universal address book as the Gallup representative); a Hungarian doll as a wedding gift from a couple in Budapest that she met through correspondence; a tapestry purse from Yukiko Isobe, who lives in Japan, and visited in Gallup about three years ago; meeting a prophet of the Bahai religion when he came to Gallup; being a cultural link around the world when traveling and using Esperanto; and similar experiences.

A baby's life is also credited to Esperanto. Mrs. Stone was corresponding with the baby's father who lives in an isolated section of Brazil. The man told of his daughter's sickness and stated he did not know what to do. Mrs. Stone translated the Esperanto into English and told her physician about the circumstances. It was a routine matter for the American doctor who prescribed medicine which eventually saved the child's life.

Among articles displayed in the window will be literature concerning the religion, science, travel and people living in many of the countries where Esperanto is spoken. Also included is a copy of "The Prophet" by Gibran which was translated by Mrs. Stone from English into Esperanto. The book is now a best seller in language circles.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today with much sadness, I join the rest of my very distinguished colleagues in eulogizing our very beloved late President, Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower. Like many in this House of Representatives, I well recall the grim days of June 1944 when he led our allied forces through D-Day to victory. He became a symbol then of courage, tenacity, and a symbol of our freedom and our desire for the freedom of man in a world that had been too long held under the Fascist and Nazi heel. I know others here today remember those days while free nations of the world held their breath—and I may add these were not "simpler, easier times."

General Eisenhower later served with great distinction under President Truman as Director of SHAPE to keep the peace in Europe where it had been so painfully won. Those of us who recognize the inherent difficulties of working not only with people but with crowned heads, generals, and sovereign nations, give a special salute to General Eisenhower for his ability to deftly weave together from rather frayed threads a fabric that has become enduring. From some newspaper accounts, one might get the impression that courage, duty and honor today have become old-fashioned. I am glad that Dwight David Eisenhower never felt this way.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I am proud to salute a courageous soldier, a calm politician, and a President of all Americans. To his wife and family, my deepest sympathy.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER, 1890–1969

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Dwight David Eisenhower, general of the Army, President of the United States, is gone, and with him goes a small part of each of us. His career as one of this country's great leaders spanned both the tragedies of war and the challenges of peace. The continuing pageant of history calls upon few men to bear the awesome responsibilities for the fortunes of both men and nations. General Eisenhower was among these few, not only as a defender of his country at war but, ultimately, of the free world at peace. His experience in battle—the violence, the destruction, above all the intimacy with the pain and suffering of death—led him not to the belligerency of a warlord but, rather, to a deep and lasting commitment to peace. For this, above all, he will be remembered.

An origin of simple but strongly principled beginnings propelled Dwight Eisenhower to the highest levels of military and civilian leadership. Often he described his boyhood home as a place of quiet tranquillity where the realities of an increasingly complex world seemed vague and distant. The values he held were not the compromising, coldly reasoned values of the intellectually cynical or the easily rationalized, unthinking values of the morally expedient. They were, instead, the basic human values which touch the heart of man's continuing effort to learn to live with his fellows in peace and security. It was his firm belief in and knowledge of what life could be and ought to be which sustained him through the infinitely complex and pressured trials that marked so much of his public career.

It can truly be said of General Eisenhower that he loved, above all, this country and his fellow man. In a world increasingly marked by cynicism and mistrust of established values, he maintained a remarkable example of principle, understanding, and warm humor. He cautioned his countrymen against indulging in self-satisfaction because of our successes during and since World War II. The demanding responsibilities of world leadership, he warned, and, especially, the maintenance of peace and freedom must summon the best that is in us.

He recognized also the serious implications of the intricate, new partnership between our vast military establishment and the modern industries which sustain it, saying that this situation was new to the American experience and warrants our attentive concern. His overriding desire for peace once led him to remark that, as a military man, he would like nothing better than to see the necessity for his own job eliminated. He viewed war not as the expedient tool of politics, but as the tragic social phenomenon of mankind.

So we bid farewell to this good and decent man who served us both as a great leader and a warm friend. May he find now the enduring peace and brotherhood which eluded his countrymen and himself for so many of his years; let us hope that the qualities he exemplified and the virtues he defended will guide our efforts to live together in peace and freedom throughout this troubled world which General Eisenhower has now departed.

CHEAP IMPORTS CLOSE ANOTHER SHOE FACTORY

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, again I wish to bring to the attention of the membership of this body the continuing threat which faces the domestic footwear industry in the United States because of the influx of cheaply produced foreign footwear which somehow enjoys an unfair edge over domestic production because of imbalance in import quotas.

A few days ago, I pointed out the necessity for immediate action to counterbalance this deteriorating situation. It is questionable how long our footwear industry can stand up to these imports. Today I read an answer, in part, to that question.

The following article from the March 29, 1969, edition of Foster's Daily Democrat, a newspaper in Dover, N.H., points out vividly the destructive course we are allowing by inaction to continue. The paper reports that the Newmarket branch of the Pittsfield Shoe Co. has been closed—shut down without any indication that it will ever reopen. As a result, 250 persons have been displaced in their livelihood. This in a community of only some 3,200 to 3,500 persons is a sad situation.

The company, a manufacturer of lady's dress shoes, has found that their customers are filling almost 40 percent of requirements in Europe where the end product is cheaper because labor costs are much less than in New Hampshire. And, Mr. Speaker, the cost of labor in New Hampshire is well down on the national scale of wage rate averages. The effect of this is obvious, and the reason is explicit.

This Congress has an obligation to effect relief to the shoe industry in this situation. We should take action before remedial action cannot be taken. We should protect the industry before there is no industry left to protect.

I again urge consideration of H.R. 7696 as a constructive step toward the promotion of equitable competition in this field.

The article mentioned above follows:

PITTSFIELD SHOE CO. CLOSES IN NEWMARKET

NEWMARKET.—Pittsfield Shoe Company of Pittsfield, N.H., closed the firm's Newmarket branch today, but will maintain its warehouse and office in this town.

The firm was operating one shift in the Newmarket plant and had about 250 persons employed here.

Arthur Hirshberg, executive vice president, reports that the reason for the closing is the competition from imported shoes. The firm makes a lady's dress shoe and according to Hirshberg, their customers for this type of shoe are "filling 30 to 40 per cent of their requirements in Europe."

Hirshberg says that as far as can be foreseen the closing is permanent, that no further operation in Newmarket can be anticipated at this time. He states that the firm will absorb as many of its Newmarket workers as possible in the main plant in Pittsfield.

THE NEED FOR REGIONAL WATER PLANNING BETWEEN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST AND THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, within the past 10 days I have called to the attention of my colleagues a significant article in the U.S. News & World Report and an important economic study of the 11 conterminous Western States.

It will be seen upon reading both that the story in the March 31 issue of U.S. News & World Report—"As Floods Threaten in the United States, the Colorado Runs Low"—and the so-called McCann Report—"Economic Interdependence of the Western States"—have some very definite interconnection.

While the magazine story expertly describes the water supply problem of the seven Colorado River Basin States, the McCann report furnishes extensive evidence why the 11 Western States, the water-rich Pacific Northwest and the water-short Pacific Southwest, should approach their problems with a common viewpoint.

The reason why the Southwest States are facing such a serious water supply dilemma is underscored in a companion article in the same issue of U.S. News & World Report. Citing the latest census estimates on the Nation's "Fastest Growing Cities," the article shows that five of the first 13 areas experiencing the most rapid growth are in California.

In introducing the McCann report to fellow Members I dwelt in the main on its general conclusions and findings, detailing the overall economic interdependence of the two principal western regions. Today, I would like to show the relationship enjoyed by just one Northwest State, Washington, with the Colorado River Basin States. I draw my remarks from a press release issued in connection with the public disclosure of the study:

Washington's economic ties with the seven-State Colorado River Basin region are perhaps greater than any of the other three Pacific Northwest States.

Apples, beer, butter, and insurance are just a few of the commodities and services which Washington-based firms market in the Pacific Southwest and Rocky Mountain area.

Conducted by an independent Los Angeles economic consultant, Wilbur McCann, the report was published by the Colorado River Association of California. Details were discussed at a luncheon meeting of the Portland Chamber of Commerce by Philip F. Walsh, vice president of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

Drawn from official Federal and State agencies, the report reveals that:

The latest available figures from the Interstate Commerce Commission—1962—shows that 27 percent of the 82 million tons of commodities shipped out of Washington that year went to the Colorado River Basin States. In toto, about 39 million tons went to other Western States.

During 1966, Washington apple shipments to just California totaled some 4.8 million bushels. In fact, Los Angelenos consume more Washington apples than Chicago, New York, and Detroit combined.

The second favorite beer in the 3 million household Los Angeles-Orange County region is that sold by the Olympia Brewing Co., of Tumwater, Wash.

Washington provided 1,825,000 pounds of butter for Los Angeles housewives in 1966.

Twelve Washington-domiciled insurance companies sold or earned premiums in California alone, in 1965, of some $84.5 million; that figure represented 30.7 percent of those companies' total business.

California depends almost entirely on the West for its supplies of sheep and lambs and Washington shipped 13,000 head in 1966. Total livestock shipments, including beef and dairy cattle, from Washington total about 21,000 head in that year.

In 1966, the Seattle-Tacoma airport reported more than 2 million non-Washington air passengers and 998,400—or 49 percent—of these were going or coming from points within the Colorado River States.

And then there is the outstanding current example of interregional exchange—the Pacific Northwest-Southwest intertie, which allows for the interchange of surplus electrical energy between the two areas. The Bonneville Power Administration estimates that its net revenues will increase by as much as $20 million a year through its intertie arrangement with the Southwest.

AN APPEAL FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the fact that I and five of my New York congressional colleagues have asked the President to press the Soviet Union immediately to fulfill its commitment and allow Russian Jews to be reunited with their families in other nations.

I ask all of you to join us on this mission of mercy to free the 3 million Jews of the Soviet Union who are being deprived of the basic legal right of repatriation. It is a right that has been affirmed and reaffirmed under international law, by the League of Nations, the United Nations, and the World Court.

The Declaration of Human Rights incorporated into the charter of the United Nations guarantees the free choice of national domicile and the unrestricted freedom of movement to all people. The Soviet Union is a signatory to that document and is legally and morally obligated to honor it.

The International League for Repatriation of Russian Jews has provided me with a copy of a letter that was smuggled out of the Soviet Union by the Jewish Youth Committee of Russia, an underground group. The letter is a shocking exhibit which states that the aim of the Soviet government is to "liquidate" Jews in Russia.

The letter states that "the Soviet Government's entire attitude toward Jews is built from beginning to end upon the aim to liquidate our people, to dissolve it in the huge mass, to destroy it."

The letter emphasizes that "only due to our instinctive national resistance to the brutal anti-Semitism of the Bolshevist powers were we saved from national annihilation up to this day."

This letter—dated March 1969—expresses the strong desire of Russian Jewry to leave the Soviet Union and contains a fervent appeal to the free world for help.

The letter offers conclusive proof that Russian Jews are living in virtual slavery and fear cultural extinction.

On December 3, 1966, Soviet Premier Kosygin made this statement:

> For those who want to leave the Soviet Union the door is open. If there are some families divided by war, who want to meet their relatives outside the U.S.S.R. or even to leave the U.S.S.R., we shall do all in our power to help them.

The Soviet Government, however, has failed to keep this pledge and has taken no action to expedite the many requests for visas. Justice and decency demand that the Soviet Union open the door to the emigration of those many thousands of Soviet Jews who wish to be reunited with families living in the United States, Israel, and elsewhere—families that were shattered in the ghettos and extermination camps of the Nazi era.

In the past, as president of the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service, an organization of 80,000 Americans of Italian origin, I have spoken out about the plight of Soviet Jews, and I will continue to do everything within my power to alleviate the terrible burden that these people are enduring.

It is my hope that everyone in responsible positions—both in and out of Government—join in this mission of mercy for the repatriation of Soviet Jews.

EMERGENCY IN THE COURTS

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, recently we were reminded by the Honorable Earl

Warren, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, of the distress experienced by the Federal courts because of a shortage of judges, prosecuting attorneys, probation officers, legal clerks, and administrative operating funds and even messengers. The Chief Justice, who, incidentally, is one of my most distinguished constituents, made his evaluation in a speech to the District Bar Association, and stressed how seriously the delay in court action undermines justice and the confidence of the public in their courts.

Congress must face the responsibility it shares in contributing to this distressing situation. Appropriations for the entire judiciary lag behind even those of the FBI and the CIA. The time between indictment and trial can be shortened only if the courts are adequately funded. This is our job in the Congress. As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I pledge my support to this endeavor. For those of my colleagues who are in doubt on the necessity of this effort, I commend a review of several recent articles in the popular press.

The distinguished jurist, the Honorable J. Skelly Wright, Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, in a stirring reminder of how unfairly justice is meted to the poor of our own Capitol City, underscores Chief Justice Warren's complaint.

And the able young columnist, Mr. William Raspberry, bears further witness to our courts' inadequacies in a recent column in the Washington Post.

Mr. Speaker, I insert an editorial comment on Chief Justice Warren's speech—which was delivered extemporaneously so is not available in its entirely—Judge Wright's article, and Mr. Raspberry's column, with an earnest request that my colleagues in Congress give them the careful attention they so richly deserve:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 18, 1969]

Emergency in the Courts

We are glad that Chief Justice Warren spoke candidly about congressional neglect of the courts even though he is not yet in retirement, as he thought he would be when he consented to address the District Bar Association. In a very direct sense the Federal courts are at the mercy of Congress. Unless Congress appropriates ample funds to keep them functioning efficiently, the quality of justice is unavoidably impaired, and the courts can do little about it.

The Chief Justice noted that the caseload of the Supreme Court has increased 2½ times in the last 16 years, but not more than five or ten employes have been added to the Court's staff during those years. Many specific requests for additional personnel in the courts have been ignored, while numerous executive agencies have proliferated.

The relationship between this lag in supplying judicial needs and the rising crime rates is unmistakable. A shortage of judges, prosecuting attorneys, legal clerks, probation officers and so forth creates a backlog of stale cases and undermines the confidence of people in the law. Congress seldom authorizes the creation of new judgeships until a desperate situation has developed, and then it takes months to get the law passed and more months to get qualified judges appointed and confirmed.

Last January the President sent a message to Congress asking for the creation of 10 more judgeships in the courts of the District of Columbia as an integral part of the war on crime here. Fortunately, bills for relief of the local courts have been introduced in both houses, and hearings are anticipated soon. But it would be surprising indeed, if any judges are ready to sit under this legislation before October.

Congress cannot, of course, act on the spur of the moment. But the present delay of 12 months between indictments and jury trials in the District Court here should never have been permitted to develop before remedial action was initiated. Chief Justice Warren has merely brought to public attention a critical deficiency in our judicial system that has been the subject of many complaints in the past. In Washington as in many other cities the problem has now assumed emergency proportions.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 21, 1969]

Study of Civil Courts Shows They Also Require Reform

(By William Raspberry)

There has been a good deal of discussion in recent months over the ways to strengthen reform and speed up the court system.

That most of the talk has been about *criminal* courts is not very surprising in light of what may be the first genuine "crime wave" in recent memory. But the emphasis on criminal court problems has all but eclipsed the need for reform of our civil courts, particularly as they involve the poor.

Two things, primarily, are wrong with the civil courts. The first is how they function. Landlord and tenants courts, for example, too often act as agents for the landlords. Small Claims courts are frequently little more than collection agencies for businesses.

Sit through a few hours at one of these courts; the impression is of speed, but hardly of justice. Lawyers representing businessmen regularly win judgments against the bewildered, intimidated "little people" who account for a good deal of the court's business.

The "little people" who believe the landlord to be in the right, or the alleged debt to be just, usually don't bother to show up. Those who do come to court often think they have a good case. Too often they leave the courtroom as losers but without any feeling that justice has been done.

This is the first target of reform. A second is discussed by Thomas E. Willging, law professor at the University of Toledo, in the current issue of the Georgetown Law Journal. Willging deals with the "heavy financial barriers" between poor litigants and justice.

He notes the constitutional guarantee of free access to civil courts for all citizens but charges that for poor people, justice may be "sold at a prohibitive price."

For not only are poor people frightened of the court system, which they view as rigged against them; the unsuccessful litigant, as the poor man is likely to be, faces loss of time and money as well, since judgments often include court costs.

Willging goes so far as to say that the summer riots of the past few years "can be construed as violent petitions for redress of grievances" made necessary by society's failure to provide the machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes.

He suggested a number of ways to encourage poor people to make wider use of the civil courts.

He would eliminate "court costs" entirely, letting the government pay for clerical and judicial personnel the same way it pays for police or garbage-collection service.

The services of Landlord-Tenant and Domestic Relations courts would be free.

He would end payments by litigants for services provided by marshals, sheriffs, court reporters and stenographers by bringing these services within the court system. "These are necessary services," he said, and "should in no way depend on a personal or economic relationship with the litigant."

Willging would also provide, without cost to the litigant, such things as expert witnesses, property appraisals and blood tests (in paternity cases).

He is less conclusive, however, with what is perhaps the major barrier between poor people and justice: expert legal counsel. He notes that while adequate counsel is a necessity for successful litigation, our efforts to provide good counsel for poor people have not worked very well.

Willging proposes the establishment of a national commission to study this problem, considering such alternatives as a "judicare" system, based on the British Legal Aid plan, or simply imposing the costs of litigation on the losing party, with the government paying if the loser cannot.

Solutions, however, may turn out to be the easy part. The more difficult task is to get across to the public just how unjust our system of justice can be for ordinary folk and to sell our leaders on the importance of doing something about it.

If they thought court reform would prevent riots, they'd reform them tomorrow.

[From the New York Times Magazine]

The Courts Have Failed the Poor

(By J. Skelly Wright)

The twin problems of racism and poverty have converged in our society to become the problem of the inner city itself. Where once our cities were cultural meccas, they are now miserable slums. Where once the immigrants to our cities came from abroad with hopes for a better, happier life, now they come from the South, despairing if not desperate. And after they arrive they find no escape from the cycle of poor health, substandard housing, disoriented family relationships, interrupted schooling and joblessness. There are 35 million hard-core poor who, in the richest nation the world has ever known, earn less than $3,000 a year, the income level defined by the Federal Government as constituting poverty by American standards. And, particularly in the inner city, a vastly disproportionate number of the poor are Negroes; in addition to the misery of poverty, they must bear the psychic brunt of the white racism that is eating away our society.

Ignorance, discrimination, slums, poverty, disease and unemployment—these are the conditions that breed despair and violence. Is it any wonder that our cities, once melting pots, are now powder kegs? The causes of these conditions are too many and varied for condensation here. I shall discuss only one aspect of the general problem: how the law and the courts have failed the inner-city poor.

The words inscribed over the entrance of the Supreme Court Building in Washington are "Equal Justice Under Law." And surely one of the proudest boasts of American lawyers is that all men stand equal before the law. But too much of that equality turns out, upon analysis, to be of the sort that prompted Anatole France's sarcastic remark: "The law, in all its majestic equality, forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges on rainy nights, to beg on the streets and to steal bread."

The point is simply that a law may be consistently and evenly applied, yet systematically work a hardship on a particular class. In our society, the law has worked a hardship on those least able to withstand it. Rather than helping the poor surmount their poverty, the law has all too frequently served to perpetuate and even exacerbate their despair and helplessness. And now we are reaping as we have sown. The civil disorders which have racked our cities demonstrate an alarmingly widespread disrespect for law among those ghettoized in the inner city.

But if the law is to gain respect, it like everything else, must earn respect. This it has not done. While to us, in the words of former Attorney General Nicholas deB.

Katzenbach, "laws and regulations are protections and guides, established for our benefit and for us to use," to the poor they are "a hostile maze, established as harassment, at all costs to be avoided." As Senator Robert Kennedy put it, the "poor man looks upon the law as an enemy . . . For him the law is always taking something away."

At first glance this may seem strange or even mistaken. Has not our Supreme Court made great strides in equalizing the rights of rich and poor? After all, in the landmark case *Gideon v. Wainwright* it announced that in all felony trials the indigent defendant has the right to free legal counsel. And more recently, in *Miranda v. Arizona*, the Court has tried to assure equal justice at the station house as well as in the courtroom by requiring the police to warn a suspect of his right to free counsel before interrogating him.

Though these decisions are certainly legal milestones, they bear on only an infinitesimal percentage of those instances in which the ~~innercity~~ slum dweller confronts the police ~~and the~~ criminal law process. *Gideon* assures the right to assigned counsel only in felony cases—those that may result in a sentence of more than one year in prison. And *Miranda* cannot stop abusive treatment by the police. All the Court can do is overturn convictions if proper and humane procedures have not been followed. It cannot assure that these procedures will be followed in the thousands of investigations of innocent people that never reach court. Ironically, then, those subject to the indignity of illegal search, harassing arrest or police brutality gain nothing from the Supreme Court's decisions unless they are found guilty.

Nor can the Court do very much about the inner-city residents' other major complaint about the police—that they do not provide adequate protection. The Court cannot undertake to assign policemen to different sections of a city. This is the function of the city government and of the police department itself. But the evidence bears out the observation that frequently more policemen than necessary are assigned to the wealthy parts of a city, where the crime rate is low, while relatively fewer are assigned to the ghetto areas, where the crime rate is much higher. Could it be that we regard an assault as more serious when it is perpetrated on one of "us" than on one of "them"?

There are other areas where the local criminal courts can play a positive role but have failed miserably. I am referring to the magistrate and police courts, which, as their names imply, frequently serve as virtual arms of the police department, dispensing their own brand of justice wholesale. For example, a study of the magistrate's court in a large Eastern city said that, in 13 minutes on the morning after a local newspaper ran an editorial under the title "Get Bums Off Street and Into Prison Cells," 60 persons were tried and convicted of vagrancy by a single magistrate. In several cases, a defendant was committed after the magistrate simply called his name, looked at him and pronounced sentence—usually three months in the city jail.

Despite the presumption of innocence, the defendant in these police and magistrate courts is, prima facie, guilty. The burden is placed upon him to give a satisfactory answer to the question, "What have you got to say for yourself?" He is almost always uncounselled and sometimes he is not even informed of the charges against him until after the so-called trial. Often no records are kept of the proceedings, and in the overwhelming majority of cases these courts are, in practice, courts of last resort. The careful provisions for appeal, certiorari and habeas corpus, which look so fair in the statute books, are almost a dead letter as far as indigent misdemeanor defendants are concerned. Thus, according to Prof. Caleb Foote of the University of California at Berkeley, the "magistrate is given an almost unchecked opportunity for arbitrary oppression or careless cruelty."

And of course these police courts—not the Federal or state courts—are those with which the poor are most likely to come into contact. Consequently, it is these courts that form the image the poor will have of our system of criminal justice. This is why the criminal law is perceived by the poor not as protection for life and property, but as the establishment's tool of oppression, designed to keep them shackled to their poverty and imprisoned in the inner city. The vagrancy and public-drunkenness laws serve primarily the aesthetic function of removing from the sight of the establishment the wretchedly poor, whose condition we do nothing about but cannot bear to see. As one study points out, the only reason for many vagrancy arrests is apparently that "the appearance of the victims was not attractive."

It is in these police courts that those accused of the crimes most often associated with poverty—vagrancy, disorderly conduct and public drunkenness, the modern counterparts of sleeping under bridges or begging on the streets—are tried. In essence, these laws and the courts that administer them have made it virtually a crime to be poor in public; and to make the condition of poverty criminal is not simply uncivilized, it is also futile and self-defeating. Instead of trying to find the vagrant a means of support, we brand him a criminal, throw him in jail, then release him. His criminal record makes it even more difficult for him to find a job, and he soon winds up in jail again. The cycle of oppression continues.

Moreover, it is not only on the criminal side that the law as it bears on the poor man is foolish and self-defeating. If anything, the cards are even more formidably stacked against him in our petty civil courts. To begin with, where property rather than liberty is at stake, the indigent, under prevailing legal doctrine, has no right to a lawyer and consequently is likely to go unrepresented. Even the indigent fortunate enough to have a lawyer and win his lawsuit will be the loser in many cases because his legal fees will swallow up his modest recovery.

The concerns of the poor do not reflect this sharp distinction between civil and criminal litigation on the right to counsel. Poverty only magnifies the importance of protecting one's meager property from seizure by legal process.

A case that the Supreme Court recently declined to review provides an example of the indigent's problem. Matias and Teresa Sandoval, a poor and illiterate Mexican-American couple in Texas, were sued by a mortgage holder and lost the two-room house in which they and their nine children had lived since 1945. Two weeks before the trial, their lawyer withdrew because they could not pay his fee. They sought help from the county legal aid attorney, who apparently did not attempt to confer with them because he spoke only English and they spokes only Spanish. The lawyer never discovered that the so-called deed on which the plaintiff had based his claim to the Sandovals' land was in fact only a mortgage, which could not confer title under Texas law. If they had had a conscientious lawyer, the Sandovals might not have lost their home.

To ameliorate the indigent's lack of counsel, many states have established special tribunals, commonly termed small-claims courts, to enable the poor to prosecute and defend minor claims—generally for not more than $200 or $300—without counsel and at minimal cost. Rules of evidence and procedure are informal and filing fees are nominal. But the promise of the small-claims courts has not been fulfilled, for in actual operation there is little correspondence between the professed aims of these courts and the ends they serve. Those who have studied them have observed that they are primarily used, not by the poor, but by business organizations seeking to collect debts. A number of these organizations handle such a large volume of claims that they have established collection departments which make routine use of the courts. Thus it is primarily the businessman, not the poor man, who reaps the advantage of the inexpensive and speedy small-claims courts.

Why has the initial purpose of these tribunals been subverted? Primarily because business concerns are aware of their rights and the poor are not. Consequently, the poor are usually the defendants, rather than the plaintiffs, in small-claims courts. The poor lack the security and capacity to assert their rights, even when they recognize the rights. Indeed, most low-income consumers are unaware of the existence of the small-claims court. They simply do not think in terms of invoking legal processes on *their* side. They have no confidence in courts. Where the low-income consumer is irate enough to take action, he is likely to stop payment as a form of retaliation and thereby worsen his position. Finally, the poor are essentially unorganized and therefore lack the unity required to exert the sort of political pressure that would force these courts to remain true to their principles.

A recent Federal Trade Commission report concerning the practices of District of Columbia retailers bears out the observation that small-claims courts have become virtual collection agencies. The report noted the freqency with which the small group of retailers catering to the poor utilized the courts to enforce their claims under installment contracts. In 1966, 11 ghetto retailers reported 2,690 court judgments, one for every $2,200 of sales. The report concluded that, while retailers generally may take legal action against delinquent customers only as a last resort, many of those who cater to the poor depend on such action as a normal order of business. And in many instances sales are made pursuant to unconscionable installment contracts with the expectation and hope that the goods sold will be repossessed so they can be resold.

Even where the small-claims courts have not been captured by business interests, the poor person is likely to be victimized by prevailing legal doctrines, which our judges have been unduly reluctant to overhaul.

Consider, for instance, the facts of *Williams v. Walker-Thomas Furniture Company*. Beginning in 1957, Walker-Thomas, a store in Washington, D.C., sold to Mrs. Ora Lee Williams, an indigent mother on relief with seven children, about $1,800 worth of appliances and furniture. These had been purchased from time to time on installment contracts, and Mrs. Williams had been paying the debts as they became due. Then, in 1962, Mrs. Williams purchased from Walker-Thomas a stereo set with a stated value of $515. At this time she had paid back all but about $170 on the $1,800 owed for goods already purchased. When Walker-Thomas sold her the stereo, they were aware of Mrs. Williams's financial straits, for on the reverse side of the contract of sale the store's manager had noted the name of Mrs. Williams's social worker and the amount of her monthly welfare stipend—$218—as her credit references. Nevertheless, with full knowledge that Mrs. Williams had to feed, house, clothe and support herself and her seven children on this amount, the store sold her the $515 stereo set.

But this is not all; when Mrs. Williams failed to make her payments on the stereo, the store did not seek simply to repossess it. It sought to take back all the other appliances it had sold her, most of which she had already paid for! The contracts under which Mrs. Williams had bought all her goods from Walker-Thomas provided, in an obscure, almost unintelligible fine-print provision, that until the balance due on *every* item had been paid in full, the unpaid balance on a single item would be distributed among all the previous purchases. In other words, the debt incurred for each item was secured by the right to repossess all the items previously bought by the same purchaser.

Perhaps it was more than coincidence that Walker-Thomas sold Mrs. Williams a stereo just when she was nearing the final payment on all her previous purchases and would then own the goods outright. But even if the sale was no more than happenstance, contracts such as Walker-Thomas's, when foisted on ignorant and helpless customers, are grossly unfair and one-sided and should not be enforced by the courts. Yet both the trial and lower-appellate courts enforced the contract and ordered Mrs. Williams to return all that she had purchased since 1957. The lower courts condemned Walker-Thomas's conduct but felt that they lacked the power to refuse enforcement of the contracts because the legislature had done nothing to protect the unwary public from such one-sided bargains.

Our court reversed. We pointed out that ordinarily one who signs an agreement without full knowledge of its terms might be held to them. But we felt that when a party of little bargaining power, and hence little real choice, signs a grossly unfair and commercially unreasonable contract with little or no knowledge of its terms his consent has not even been implied and the contract should not be enforced. The failure of the legislature to live up to its responsibility was no reason for the courts not to live up to theirs. Yet our opinion in *Williams v. Walker-Thomas* was, shockingly, one of the first to hold that the courts had the power to refuse to enforce such unconscionable contracts.

And Mrs. Williams's path to judicial relief would have been even more difficult if, rather than holding her contract, Walker-Thomas had sold its rights under the agreement to a finance company. For if the finance company, rather than Walker-Thomas, had filed suit, it might have been shielded under the legal doctrine of holder in due course. One judge has termed the doctrine "the mask behind which fraud hides," and this can be an apt description. In most jurisdictions, a financial agency can purchase installment contracts free from responsibility for fraudulent or unconscionable practices perpetrated by dealers; even if the dealer skips town and never delivers the purchased goods, the consumer may be required to pay. To prevail against the finance company, the defendant who has signed a contract waiving defenses against assignees must prove that the company knew that the underlying transaction was fraudulent—a requirement almost impossible to meet.

While the holder-in-due-course doctrine may thwart the defrauded rich man as well as the poor, its effects hit the indigent much harder in many ways. When the working poor man falls behind on his installment payments, the legal machinery, which one commentator has remarked is "geared for, and used for the benefit of, the manufacturer-seller-financier complex," is likely to put him out of work and back on the relief rolls. The recurring pattern has been outlined this way:

Mr. Smith, who can barely afford to feed, house and clothe his family, is persuaded to buy a second-hand car with $500 down and three years to pay. But because Smith does not have the $500, the dealer arranges for a loan of that amount from a finance company, which takes Smith's furniture as security. After making payments for several months, Smith finds that he cannot keep them up. Besides, the car may not be running all that well. So he stops making payments. After the dealer writes Smith a few letters, Smith is likely to find one morning that his car is gone. It has not been stolen; the dealer or his agent has legally repossessed it.

But Smith is not off the hook. The dealer, after the car is resold for less than the balance due, can secure what is known as a deficiency judgment against him. In addition, Smith may still owe the finance company, which may take his furniture and when that is sold, secure a second deficiency judgment.

The lawsuits in which people lose their cars, their furniture and their money and have deficiency judgments taken against them are not likely to come to trial. The overwhelming majority of merchant-initiated suits—97 per cent in the case of Harlem merchants—end in a default judgment for the plaintiff because the defendant never appears or answers the summons or complaint. In many cases, this is because he never receives the summons. A common procedure of process serving has come to be called "sewer service" because, rather than serving the defendant with notice of the action against him, the merchant's process server deposits it in the nearest sewer. Of course, if the defendant is sufficiently wary, informed and resourceful, he will be able to set aside the default judgment because he has not been given adequate notice and the court has not acquired jurisdiction over him. But in the real world, where an indigent defendant is involved, the default judgment is likely to stand. In fact, the purchaser may not even be entitled to notice before judgment, for when making his purchase he may have signed a card authorizing what is known as a "confession of judgment." This card provides that as soon as he misses a monthly payment the unpaid balance becomes immediately due and any attorney or court is empowered to obtain a lien and execution on his property without even notifying him.

Once the creditor has secured his deficiency judgment, he will proceed as quickly as possible to garnishee the debtor's salary. Garnishment, of course, means that the court orders the employer to withhold a certain amount from an employe's earnings—as much as one-half in many states—and turn it over to the creditor to satisfy the judgment. The employe often learns about the judgment when he receives his first diminished paycheck.

The process of wage garnishment has been termed "a modern parallel to debtors' prison." And it is, in many ways, not only as iniquitous, but also as ridiculous and self-defeating as the debtors' prisons were. The employe whose salary is being garnisheed is not simply going to be taking home less money; he is also likely to find himself without a job. This is because employers find the procedure of withholding employes' wages such a bother that many simply fire the employes. Just as the debtor in prison is not going to be able to pay his debts, neither will the unemployed indigent subject to garnishment be able to get and hold a job. Unless he can discharge his debts in bankruptcy—and for a number of reasons this may be impossible—his salary will again be garnisheed if he finds other employment. Again the oppressive pattern of joblessness and relief.

There are several things that could be done to break this debtor spiral, but I will mention just one: eliminate wage garnishments altogether. Three states—Florida, Texas and Pennsylvania—have already done just this, and experience shows it has helped not only debt collections but business in general. Moreover, as one commentator concludes, the elimination of wage garnishments would provide "a new kind of security to millions of Americans who live in dread of being fired. They would know that their job was safe from creditors and that the money needed to feed their families [would] be there. The welfare rolls would be reduced by the number of families forced into unemployment because their bosses wanted to eliminate [bookkeeping] expense."

It is not only in his role as consumer that the poor man finds the courts oppressive rather than redemptive. Consider the plight of the indigent tenant. To begin with, his apartment, even though it will probably be rundown, dirty and lacking in adequate services, will not be cheap. The inner-city Negro who is forced by segregation to live in the overcrowded slums may pay as much as middle-class white tenants pay for garden-type apartments in the suburbs. And public housing is not nearly adequate to meet current needs.

Yet there is no effective mechanism for change. In view of the appalling housing shortage in our major cities, slumlords feel little economic pressure to keep their low-income housing repaired and habitable or to rehabilitate badly deteriorated buildings. They are able to make enormous profits, even on unfit and dilapidated units.

And the housing codes have not proved a spur to reform. Where housing inspectors discover violations, the landlord is notified and given a grace period to remedy defects. In a report commissioned by the Office of Economic Opportunity, Mrs. Patricia Wald, a former member of the District Crime Commission in Washington, said that in New York "the average wait for cases examined by the building department was almost five months." In the District of Columbia grace periods and extensions may postpone repairs up to a year and a half. If the problem ever reaches the prosecuting authorities, they try what Mrs. Wald calls "friendly collaboration and gentle persuasion," which may delay matters three months more. The ultimate coercive weapon in the District is a sentence of 10 days in jail or a $300 fine. But in no case has a landlord spent even one day in jail. Though the landlord's crime is far more detrimental to society than a poor man's vagrancy, as a "white collar" criminal he is handled with kid gloves by our courts. The indigent does not fare so well.

Poor tenants, even if they are somehow able to find out where and to whom they should complain, hesitate to do so, for if the landlord finds the source of the complaints "retaliatory evictions" may follow. Slum tenants are usually not protected by a lease, and their tenancies can be terminated in a summary procedure on 30 days' notice without cause. Here, then, is another area where the courts have failed the poor; they have in effect become parties to persecution by aiding the landlord in his retaliatory and antisocial purpose.

A case decided by our court is illustrative. In March, 1965, Mrs. Yvonne Edwards rented an apartment in the District of Columbia. Shortly thereafter she complained to the Department of Licenses and Inspections of sanitary-code violations which her landlord had failed to remedy. The ensuing investigation uncovered more than 40 such violations, which the department ordered the landlord to correct. Instead of fixing them, the landlord told the department to forget about the violations because he was going to evict Mrs. Edwards for making her complaint.

The landlord then gave Mrs. Edwards who did not have a lease, 30 days' notice to vacate the premises. Mrs. Edwards fought the eviction on the ground that the notice to vacate had been in retaliation for her complaints to the housing authorities. The court ruled that evidence of retaliatory motive was irrelevant. It ordered Mrs. Edwards to vacate. The lower appellate court affirmed. As in the Walker-Thomas Furniture Store case, it deplored the plaintiff's actions but felt that the task of protecting indigent tenants seeking to exercise their First Amendment right to speak freely and to petition the government for redress of grievances belonged to the legislature, not the courts.

Our court reversed the judgment of the lower court and for the first time denied a landlord's right to evict a tenant for invoking the help of housing authorities in having her premises repaired. The fact that this is a landmark case shows that the courts have preyed on the poor. Until now the courts in every jurisdiction have not merely refused to intercede to halt retaliatory evictions, but have actually placed their imprimaturs on such evictions by enforcing them.

And not only when he is evicted will the indigent tenant find the courts of no avail. He will meet with little or no judicial success when he is displaced by the burgeoning urban-renewal programs prevalent in most of our major cities. Here displacement is likely to be on a grand scale. For example, the Detroit Housing Commission Quarterly reported in 1964 that 5,530 families had been uprooted by Detroit's 10 redevelopment projects.

Relocation typically brings no amelioration of the overcrowded living conditions common among the urban poor; in many cases the situation is made worse. Instead of replacing the slums with low-cost public housing which the poor can afford, the projects often lead to the construction of luxury-apartment buildings for the benefit of the affluent. Even worse, the slums may not be replaced with housing units at all; the sites may be used for highways, parking lots or office buildings, again for the benefit of affluent suburban commuters. As a consequence, there is likely to result a substantial rent hike in the remaining slums as low-income housing is bulldozed away.

Yet when, contrary to the promise of the Housing Act of 1949, the slum dweller is threatened with permanent displacement and turns to the courts for help, he is likely to be rejected without even a hearing. His remedies in the state courts are agreed to be inadequate and, to date, the Federal courts have denied the private citizen the right to enforce the relocation requirements of the Housing Act. It is now past time for the courts to begin to hear these cases. Newark and New Haven—two cities which have large urban-renewal programs—were among those hit by ghetto riots last summer. In both, urban-renewal projects have been cited as factors contributing to the frustration and outrage which finally exploded.

Under these circumstances, judicial review could serve a valuable and creative function. Today most cities have the resources to continue redevelopment *and* honor our national promise of relocation. Judicial review would assure that the resources were in fact used for rehousing to the fullest extent possible. Where such resources are not available, judicial review would force into the open the contradictions within the program. "By enjoining displacement where adequate rehousing was not available," said a recent article in the Yale Law Journal, "the courts not only would be supporting a sound public policy, but also would be generating pressures that could lead to a legislative solution."

The last area I shall discuss in which the courts have failed the poor is welfare. For too long our welfare programs have embodied the degrading theory that welfare is a form of charity and that dependency is the fault of the individual. Welfare recipients are watched with suspicion and their use of welfare money is hedged with limitations. There are frequent investigations to prevent the misuse of public funds. "In their zeal," says Prof. Charles Reich of Yale, "public agencies have claimed and exercised the privilege of entering recipients' homes at any hour of the day or night—the law literally pursues recipients into the bedroom." There is an insistence that, because a man is on welfare, the authorities have a right to concern themselves with his family's affairs and morality. But as Professor Reich has pointed out, "such invidious laws and the general pattern of bureaucratic supervision, investigation and control conspire to increase dependency by preventing those who need welfare from leading normal lives or achieving independence and self-esteem." The program is self-defeating in that its effect is too often to destroy rather than restore the dignity of the recipient.

Now a new philosophy of social welfare is struggling for acceptance in this country. This modern school of thought considers dependency a condition ordinarily beyond the control of the individual and seeks to establish the status of welfare benefits as rights, based on the notion that everyone is entitled to a share of the common wealth. This conception of welfare seems justified in view of all the others in our society who receive government subsidies and largess, not as a matter of privilege or charity but as a matter of entitlement. For example, the transportation industry is dependent on public assistance; airlines are subsidized on short hauls; shipping is directly subsidized and indirectly aided by laws favoring American-flag vessels; trucking is aided by public roads. Second-class mail rates are essentially a subsidy to the magazine industry. Homeowners are given many types of financial guarantees and assistance, while farmers have been beneficiaries of public-assistance programs for many years. Other subsidies are less obvious. Docks and airports are supplied to the shipping and airline industries at public expense; channels of the radio and television spectrum are given without charge to the broadcast industry. Intellectual activity, especially scientific research, is also subsidized. Perhaps the biggest subsidies of all are some of our tax exemptions.

Despite the pervasiveness of public assistance throughout our economy, only the welfare recipient is singled out for special, degrading supervision and control. When a farmer receives Government subsidies, the payments are not presented as relief but as an attempt to restore an imaginary balance in the economy, thrown out of kilter by large anonymous forces depressing agricultural prices. In some instances the payments are made to appear as "transactions" in which the Government has purchased commodities from the farmer. Once payments pass to the farmer, they cease to be public funds whose use the Government is entitled to investigate and supervise. The farmer's private life remains his own. Thus in broad outline the payments are designed to preserve the farmer's self-esteem and independence. Throughout our economy, business subsidies follow this general pattern.

It is absolutely essential that we cease treating the welfare recipient as society's child and, instead, bring him back into the mainstream so that he and society can be relieved of the burdens of welfare. Legal recognition and sanction of this emerging philosophy could be one of the most significant advances of our time. But it has not happened. And the courts are again partly to blame. For they, like society in general, have adopted a double standard, one for aid to business and the farmer and a very different one for welfare. Says Reich: "It is a double standard from the moral point of view and a double standard from the legal point of view. There is a law for the poor and a law for the rest of us. Receipt of government aid by the poor carries a stigma, whereas receipt of government aid by the rest of the economy has been made into a virtue."

The effect of this double standard has been to deny welfare recipients the values and protection that the rest of the publicly supported private economy enjoys. The courts could provide some of that protection but, for the most part, have not. Because they continue to view welfare as a gratuity rather than a right, courts have refused to enjoin governmental invasion of privacy, which would not be tolerated except for our degrading conception of the poor as second-class citizens. In disputes involving welfare recipients, the courts have refused to enforce the procedural safeguards long established in connection with many other types of public benefits. A free television license can be revoked only after the most scrupulous observance of due process in a hearing and review procedure, but a poor man's welfare payments can be cut off without any hearing whatever.

While the courts have not created the problems of the inner city, they have not acted to alleviate them and, in many instances, have actually exacerbated the plight of the poor. They have had a hand in what Richard Nixon has called white America's attempt to buy off the Negro and keep him out of sight in the ghetto. As the concensus report of the Assembly on Law and the Changing Society concludes, the cluster of problems known as the urban crisis "arises partly from basic weakness in social, economic and political institutions and partly from weakness in the machinery of justice itself." Even if the courts cannot solve the problems that beset the inner city, they and the legal system as a whole can and should play a significant part in that endeavor. Professor Reich of Yale has put it this way: "All too often, law is used as an excuse for maintaining an unjust status quo. . . . But no form of law is ever necessary or inevitable. Law is the servant of social policy, not a determinant of it. It is our policy that must change." The courts can and must participate in bringing about that change by changing the law, at least in the areas where judges made the offending law in the first place.

As Roscoe Pound said, law is social engineering, "and it must be judged by the results it achieves . . . not by the beauty of its logical processes." I have suggested a number of areas in which, by this criterion, the law must be judged a failure. Though our most pressing social, moral and political imperative is to liberate the urban poor from their degradation, the courts continue to apply ancient legal doctrines which merely compound the plight of the poverty-stricken. These doctrines may once have served a purpose, but their time has passed. They must be modified or abandoned.

HIS COUNTRY WILL ALWAYS LOVE HIM

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Dwight David Eisenhower is gone, but as long as men love freedom he will live.

He began as a soldier of war and completed his life as a crusader for peace. Perhaps only a man who has seen the terror and destruction which General Eisenhower saw could fully understand the ravages of war.

There is much to be said about the man that he requested to be interred in the simple metal coffin provided for a soldier. Perhaps this act of humility and devotion speaks much of the man.

He wore the five stars which only nine other men in the history of our Nation, which includes Pershing of World War I, have been entitled to wear. Who can know the agony he suffered as the final decision had to be made to invade Europe. He knew that thousands of lives rested in his hands.

One statement by a friend said that General Eisenhower was always the calmest when the tempest was at its height.

He served as the President of the United States. Twice the American people bestowed upon him the highest trust in the land. He served in a critical period of American history.

He followed the administrations of Roosevelt and Truman when this Nation was engaged in the greatest struggle for survival in the history of the world. At home, the Nation had undergone a peaceful revolution during the 20 years of these administrations.

Eisenhower brought a calm to the Nation. It was a period of reflection as we consolidated the programs of a hectic period. There was no looking back, only looking forward. I will have to leave to history to judge his Presidency. My feeling is that he was a man of the times—that he gave to the American people a sense of stability after such a hectic period in our history.

It has been 8 years since he has held any office, yet the heart of America went out to the general at his passing. There have been few men in the history of our Nation where the American people gave the affection they felt for Ike.

He was laid to rest in his "Eisenhower jacket" with his campaign hat at his side. He fought the good fight. His had been a rich and full life. While a Nation mourned his passing, there was also a sense of fulfillment and a deep note of gratitude.

As President Nixon intoned so eloquently, it was not so much the honors that came in such abundance that endeared him to the American people, it was his character.

Whatever historians may say in the future about the life and work of Dwight David Eisenhower, there is one thing for certain today. We liked Ike.

And his final words to Mrs. Eisenhower speak so much of the man.

"I have always loved my country."

His country will always love him.

TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation this week mourns the death of a great American patriot, Dwight David Eisenhower. I would like to reminisce a bit about this warm and sunny personality, who made so many contributions to our country.

I came to know President Eisenhower rather well during the period I served as Administrator of the REA. He was always most gracious, very kind, and easy to talk to. He was pretty much the kind of a guy that people naturally like. He was surrounded by capable people and relied on them for the background and facts he needed to arrive at decisions. He seemed to decide questions easily.

My most delightful meeting with Ike occurred after I had decided to leave the REA and return to our farm near Hutchinson. It was necessary to visit the White House to submit a formal resignation, so I took along our daughter, Miriam, who was 10 or 11 at the time. The President could not have been nicer to our little girl. He was attentive to her conversation, jovial and fun to be with. He dug into one of his desk drawers, rummaged around for a little paperweight and presented it to her. He also gave her a silver dollar, minted in the year of his birth, and framed so that she could wear it as a locket.

I had brought along a camera, and asked the President if it would be alright to take a picture. He said, "Oh, yes, go right ahead." The photos we took that pleasant day are among the prized possessions in the Nelsen family scrapbook.

The incident tends to illustrate what were among the President's finest qualities—his genuine goodness and humility. These are among the qualities that define the very great among leaders in history.

I recall another incident that is somewhat revealing about Mr. Eisenhower. We had been having great difficulty settling an electric power controversy that had arisen between the Interior Department and some REA interests. Things had reached an impossible point. Finally, I suggested that the southern unit send up some new faces to Washington for discussions, feeling that the disposition of those arguing so stubbornly would never permit any kind of agreement. The new people came, and we went to the White House for some meetings with advisers. In short order, these lifetime Democrats from the Deep South—who held some pretty stout convictions about Republicans in general—were ushered right into the President's office. They seemed flabbergasted. When they found this Republican President to be reasonable and just, of course, the problem was quickly worked out amicably.

This story illustrates another of Eisenhower's great strengths. He was not a mean political partisan and he would not, for the sake of politics, do something cheap or wrong. His first and overwhelming concern was always for his country.

Few Americans in history can match Ike's many and varied accomplishments. He was a popular President, and his two terms were stable years of quiet peace and harmony. He was an outstanding wartime general. As Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe, he launched the biggest invasion in history and played a leading role in Hitler's defeat. He was an educator of note, serving for a time as president of a leading university. He was also a farmer and took a keen interest in his Gettysburg land and stock. He will be remembered for all such reasons. But he will be remembered, too, for his friendly ways, his infectious grin and his splendid spirit. These attributes of character will remain among Ike's greatest legacies to all of us.

I include at this point a further tribute to the late President, an editorial which appeared March 29 in the Mankato Free Press, Mankato, Minn.:

AMERICANS LIKED IKE

It can be said with considerable justice that Dwight Eisenhower was the most universally loved of all American presidents.

Lincoln and Franklin Roosevelt, perhaps, were revered in a more emotional way by their adherents—and, most certainly, were "greater" presidents—but they were also heartily despised by fairly substantial numbers. John Kennedy was achieving something of a love affair with Americans, particularly the young and the intellectuals, but the affair never really had to stand the test of election and time.

Ike was unique in generating the affection of all classes and parties. There was no shading. Americans just "liked Ike." And so did so many others, all over the world.

Eisenhower will not, in history's view, appear as a great man. He wasn't spectacular or political or responsible for great change.

He did his job.

He won World War II as Supreme Commander and he held the Alliance that fought that war together. He won election to the presidency on a plea for a "return to normalcy" and the ending of the Korean war and he accomplished both his objectives. He felt it was not a time for a political administration and he was, perhaps, the most unpolitical of our presidents.

It might be because of this, or because he embodied almost all the old, honorable American virtues that the people followed him and respected him so very much. In an age of fetish for charisma in leadership, he was calm and really quite colorless.

Maybe this is why the people trusted him and believed in him.

They heeded his advice with consideration and it is, indeed, a mark of the man that his last official statement to his nation, his farewell warning about the dangers of a military-industrial complex, is becoming, nine years later, the catchword of an increasing national debate. The old soldier's syntax was involved but his thinking was clear and direct.

He is gone now, almost the last of the great figures of the 20 years that saw such a great upheaval of war and reconstruction. Only Charles de Gaulle and Chiang Kai-shek remain of those who fought and led in the war and only Harry Truman, who had so much to do with the peace and the rebuilding, are left.

However, history records his immense carreer, most people will mourn his passing not as a great figure but as a friend in high places and this may, indeed, be the finest epitaph of all.

DEACON ROBERT WILLIAMS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the selfless efforts of a "good Samaritan" and a good citizen of his city, his State, and his Nation, Mr. Robert Williams, of Alexandria, Va.

I have known Mr. Williams, who is a deacon of the Beulah Baptist Church in Alexandria, for as long as I have been a Member of Congress. I first met him when he brought men and women to me for assistance with some problems they may have had concerning their employment, their social security, or some other area in which I could assist them as their Representative in Congress. There are few men anywhere for whom I have greater respect than Deacon Williams, and I believe our colleagues should know of his most recent efforts to promote better understanding between the races, not only in his home city, Alexandria, but elsewhere in the Nation, by designating the first week in each year as "Black Citizenship Week"; and to help the needy, regardless of race, creed, or color, through his newly established black citizen's action program.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of two articles concerning Mr. Williams and these programs, from the Alexandria Gazette of January 4, 1969, and the Washington Star of March 16, 1969. I know our colleagues will agree that men like Deacon Williams deserve the thanks and admiration of their fellow Americans.

The articles follow:

[From the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette, Jan. 4, 1969]

MAYOR BEATLEY PROCLAIMS BLACK CITIZENSHIP WEEK

An effort by members of the Negro community to unite further those of the black and white races came to a climax Thursday morning when Mayor Charles E. Beatley Jr., proclaimed the week of Jan. 5 as Black Citizenship Week.

Present for the signing was Deacon Robert Williams who spearheaded the effort. The date was set as the first week following January 1, 105th anniversary of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation. The event is expected to be marked annually in the City of Alexandria.

A special service of worship conceived by Deacon Williams and led by the Rev. R. B. Strong of the host Community United Presbyterian Church honored the forthcoming week. A special collection of more than $300 will be used to assist the needy, regardless of color or creed, Deacon Williams said. Mayor Beatley was among those attending the service.

Assisting Deacon Williams were Mrs. Pearlie May Lynch, Mrs. Mary Abraham, Dawson Earl, Mrs. Jimmie May Earl and Mrs. Williams, who also assisted her husband in research on the project.

The official text of the proclamation follows:

Whereas, the contribution of each individual and each group in his community is vital to the progress and growth of this nation; and

Whereas, the black citizens of this community and nation have made many contributions in various fields in sharing the responsibility of securing the rights of all men to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; and

Whereas, the black citizens of this community have been highly active in serving with their neighbors on City boards, committees, commissions, and authorities, as well as on civic groups, educational endeavors, and social activities to the benefit of this City;

Now, therefore, I, Charles E. Beatley, Jr., Mayor of the City of Alexandria, Virginia, and on behalf of the City Council, do hereby proclaim the week of January 5 as Black Citizenship Week in Alexandria and call upon all persons and groups in this community to consider the significance of this week and the need for further enlightened citizen action to preserve and extend the goals of liberty and justice through the pursuit of individual and collective responsibility and brotherhood.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the City of Alexandria, Virginia, to be affixed this 2nd day of January in the year of our Lord, 1969.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Mar. 16, 1969]

SO MANY NEED HELP: A SAMARITAN BRANCHES OUT

(By Thomas Crosby)

A 66-year-old furniture mover who has been a good samaritan to the poor in Alexandria for almost 30 years has set up a local organization to help the needy.

Robert Williams, energetic, and youthful looking has formed the Black Citizen's Action Program with the help of his wife, Ethel, who is 60, and several friends. In spite of its militant-sounding name, the group is applying ideas of help for other people which Williams has served since 1940.

Although admitting there are many organizations already in existence to fight poverty, Williams said he still sees "so many people that need help."

WILL SOLICIT HELP

The group, which helps both Negroes and whites, started collecting funds in late December and in January distributed small amounts of cash to about 20 persons. Since then it has raised $75 and hopes people will continue their donations. Williams said he plans to visit several Alexandria churches soon seeking contributions.

Williams, whose program will operate from his apartment at 1532 Princess St., already is a familiar figure to city officials, patients at Alexandria Hospital and Rep. Joel T. Broyhill, R-Va., who represents the city.

Williams began giving his time to people after he was a patient at the hospital in 1940. He said at that time he saw patients that needed haircuts, shaves or were "just plain lonely."

Now every day when he finishes his work of moving furniture at the Main Navy Yard, Williams takes a bus to the Duke Street branch of the hospital. There he makes his daily rounds, saying hello to the patients and reading the Bible and praying with them.

"He really boosts the patients' morale," said a nurse.

HAD OWN BLOOD BANK

Back in 1956 he set up his own blood bank at the hospital with the help of Miss Jean Morse, a blood bank technician.

Called the Beulah Baptist Church Blood Bank after his church, it allows a patient to borrow blood on a one-for-one basis. The hospital's regular blood bank charges two pints for every one given a patient.

Williams also is a frequent visitor to Broyhill's office. The two have been friends since Broyhill was elected 16 years ago and Williams started to bring people with employment and Social Security problems to see "their congressman."

Mrs. Elizabeth McCann, Broyhill's research assistant, said it is "amazing how many people he helps. He is always trying to straighten someone's problems out."

Broyhill intends to read into the Congressional Record a tribute to Williams for his efforts in getting Alexandria to hold a "Black Citizenship Week" Jan. 4–11 this year.

AIDED CITY OFFICIAL

Williams also aided Harry Walmer, a city housing official, when Walmer visited Negro churches to talk about the voluntary open housing law the City Council passed last year.

"He went to all the meetings with me to help me gain some rapport and communication," Walmer said.

The son of a South Carolina sharecropper, Williams only has a fourth grade education and has always had to work at jobs requiring physical labor. He says he is happy.

"God has been good to us." he said. The Williams' apartment in Jefferson Village is neat and filled with religious pictures.

Devoutly religious, he has been a deacon at Beulah Baptist Church since 1957.

He was honored by the city in 1967 when he received a recognition award for his work as a member of the Citizen's Advisory Committee for Community Improvement and he still serves as a member of the Economic Opportunity Commission.

Also a member of the Elks and Masons, Williams said the friendships he has formed in these clubs have often helped him get lawyers and professional advice for people in trouble.

Williams has a philosophy that differs from most charitable organizations which he said will apply to his new program.

"Some people say a person doesn't need because he led a bad life in the past but if you don't have it, you need it," he said.

Helping in the program are his wife, Mrs. Pearlie May Lynch, Mrs. Mary Abraham, Mr. and Mrs. Earl Dawson and Mrs. Dorothy Boggins.

His wife said, "Pray for him to be successful. There are a lot of poor people who need help."

THE CASE FOR THE REPATRIATION OF RUSSIAN JEWS

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, knowing that the following will be of deep interest to my colleagues in the House, I take pleasure in submitting it for your consideration:

THE CASE FOR THE REPATRIATION OF RUSSIAN JEWS

The Jew is history's exile—not its expatriate. His dispersion began with the Babylonian conquest of Judah in 586 B.C. It was completed six centuries later when Hadrian erected Aelia Capitolina on the shattered hulk of Jerusalem and forbade the Jew from reentering the city on punishment of death. For 1,878 years thereafter, he sat as an uninvited guest at the table of others—despised, driven, decimated . . . occasionally tolerated.

The 13 million Jews now living are the descendants of these exiles. In every legal and historic sense they were themselves exiles until the reestablishment of a Jewish State in 1948.

The State of Israel was the first to recognize this fact. Virtually the first order of business of the first Jewish parliamentary body to convene in 19 centuries was the enactment of the "Law of Return." It granted to all Jews everywhere the unqualified right to enter Israel as free and equal citizens. The very name "Law Return" was implicit recognition of the involuntary nature of the dispersion that had scattered these Jews and their ancestors to the far corners of the globe. They did not have to become citizens because they had never ceased to be citizens of the Jewish State. They might choose to continue their domicile outside the confines of that state; they might prefer the citizenship of other states; but surely they could no longer consider themselves exiles.

Of the 13 million Jews given the choice of repatriation to Israel, only 10 million have thus far been free to exercise that option. Three million have been denied that freedom. These are the three million Jews of Soviet Russia.

I. JEWISH NATION

There is no need to create a "case" for the repatriation of Russian Jewry. The "case" already exists within the context of Soviet policy and precedent. Its documentation can be found in any Soviet library from Moscow to Vladivostak.

To begin with, any Jewish claim to repatriation must be based on the existence of a definable "Jewish nationality." The concept of Jewish nationality is not in dispute today even in anti-Semitic Poland. In the midst of the worst paroxysm of anti-Semitism since the end of the Second World War, Warsaw keeps the door to Jewish emigration ajar because—as Wladyslaw Gomulka put it last spring—Jewish nationality is a fact of life even in Communist Poland and Jews who feel a national allegiance to Israel should be permitted to go there. The Russians, whose expertise in this area derives from the presence of over 130 nationalities and subnationalities within their borders, have formally recognized Jews as a nationality since the Bolshevik Revolution. Jews were never Russians, Ukrainians, Bielorussians or Uzbekians. They were always Jews, no matter where they lived, or what language they spoke.

This fact is totally exclusive to the peripheral issue of anti-Semitism. Rather, it has to do with the political and cultural nature of the Soviet system. The modus vivendi of that system is the very corollary of the "melting pot" theory popular in the United States and other Western countries. Lenin accused Czarist Russia of being a "prison of nations." It is noteworthy that after 50 years of socialism, they boast not of having transformed it into a melting pot, but into a place "where all nationalities thrive."

If Marxism-Leninism is the philosophical blood and bone of Soviet life, nationality is its outer covering. It determines the language one speaks, the literature one reads, the history one is proud of and the identification one carries in his internal passport. It is indelible and intransmutable.

As an officially recognized nationality, Soviet Jews for a period of 20 years after the revolution were accorded virtually every cultural, religious, educational and communal right guaranteed other nationalities in the U.S.S.R. It is true that Hebrew was suppressed as a vestige of "reactionary clericalism," but Yiddish flourished.

Until the purges of 1936–1938, Russia could boast of scores of Yiddish language newspapers, periodicals and magazines. Yiddish books rolled off the government presses in the hundreds of thousands. There were nearly 20 professional and amateur Jewish repertory theatres. Hundreds of Jewish primary and secondary schools taught everything from mathematics to Marxism in the Yiddish language. There were several distinguished academies for the training of Jewish teachers and a number of outstanding Jewish university departments, as well as graduate research institutes for the study of Jewish history, social sciences, literature and language.

It is no accident that 50 years after the Revolution, a half million of Russia's three million Jews still designate Yiddish as their mother tongue. They learned it in Russian schools.

II. JEWISH AUTONOMOUS PROVINCE: BIROBIZHAN

The Soviets didn't stop at a mere legal definition of Jewish nationality. They attempted to expand it into a concept of Jewish nationhood. Out of the whole sorry history of the abortive Soviet attempt to create a Jewish autonomous province in the Asian reaches of Birobizhan, one fact stands forth clearly: the U.S.S.R. was the only sovereign state outside of England to recognize that the Jews represented a special cultural and historical problem that could only be solved through the legitimization of Jewish nationhood and territorial integrity.

Moscow's current attacks against Israel ring rather hollow when contrasted with the glowing accounts of Jewish national fulfillment presumably being achieved in Birobizhan during the 1930's. An August 29, 1936 report on the Jewish Autonomous Province by the Central Committee of the Presidium proudly declares that "for the first time in the history of the Jewish people, its burning desire for the creation of a homeland of its own and for the achievement of its national statehood has found fulfillment . . ."

"The Presidium of the Central Committee of the U.S.S.R.," the report goes on, "is firmly convinced that workers and kolkhoz farmers of the Jewish Autonomous Province, all Jewish toilers of the Soviet Union, and the organizations of the Soviet Union, and the organizations of the Soviet public, will bend every effort for the speediest accomplishment of the tasks connected with the further development and strengthening of national Jewish statehood in the U.S.S.R."

Birobizhan was in its death throes by August 1936 and the leadership that was to bring Jewish statehood to the U.S.S.R. was already marked for liquidation by Stalin's secret police. But this does not obscure the fact that a Sovietized version of Zionism figured most prominently in Moscow's plans to dispose of its Jewish problem.

The idea of Soviet-Jewish statehood was being discussed in official circles as early as 1925. In October of that year, Aleksandr Chermeriskii, first secretary of the Central Board of Jewish Sections and a reliable government sounding board, told a White Russian Conference of Jewish Sections in Minsk that "the idea of a Jewish Soviet State has never been denied." A year later in a respected book entitled "The Communist Party and the Jewish Masses," Chermeriskii amplified his remarks with unusual clarity:

"In large measure the national problem in the U.S.S.R. is solved by means of national territorial autonomy, the establishment of autonomous national provinces, national republics, etc. The question is whether the possibility of national territorial autonomy is closed to the Jewish masses of the U.S.S.R. By no means. Politically it is possible in our Soviet country to establish Jewish territorial autonomy whenever a considerable Jewish majority is established in some continuous territory."

"The question then is whether such an opportunity can materialize, whether such a territory with a Jewish majority can emerge in our country. Most certainly, yes. The rural placement of the Jewish masses now under way can provide this opportunity, for if we succeed in settling on continuous territory not even all of the 100,000 families but only half that number, it would already mark the beginning of a Jewish autonomous province."

Birobizhan failed—but not because it was impossible to ruralize the Jewish masses or to organize them into a politically autonomous unit—Israel proved it was. Birobizhan foundered in the Jewish soul. That soul rejected a blatant attempt to substitute a contrived panacea for a 2,000 year-old dream. No amount of dialectical arguments could turn Birobizhan into the Promised Land and not even the most ignorant Jewish peasant in Soviet Russia was likely to mistake the Armur River for the River Jordan. . . .

Characteristically it was another Jew, Commissar for Jewish Affairs Mr. Semen Dimanshtein, who inadvertently sounded the death knell for Birobizhan back in October, 1918, when the Revolution still had most of its ideals intact and Josef Stalin had more important things to conjure with than a Jewish Autonomous Province.

"Why dream of tilling the land far off in Palestine," Dimanshtein declared, "when you can have a Palestine in Moscow? Why remember Zion, the vassal of British imperialism, when Jewish farm labor communes can be set up right here in socialist Russia to the immediate advantage of the destitute and the unemployed?"

Mr. Dimanshtein should have known better, artificial Palestines have been attempted in other places than Soviet Russia and they haven't worked.

III. REPATRIATION

If the concept of Jewish nationhood is firmly rooted in the Soviet past, even more so is the concept of repatriation. Following the Second World War, the U.S.S.R. voluntarily repatriated thousands of nationals from Spain, Poland, Hungary and Rumania. By the time they got around to Armenians, the Russians had transformed repatriation into an article of Marxist faith.

For almost 20 years following World War II, Moscow waged a tireless campaign to persuade one million overseas Armenians that their rightful place was not in the lands of their birth, but in the Autonomous Soviet Republic of Armenia. In promulgating that campaign, the Russians employed what can only be termed a form of "Armenian Zionism." The Soviet propaganda tracts and radio broadcasts directed at the Armenian overseas communities during those years would have been thoroughly familiar to Herzl and Nordau. They wrote them. One had but to substitute "Jewish" for "Armenian" and "Israel" for "Armenia" to compile a complete primer on the four W's of Zionism—What, Where, Why and When.

Nothing it has ever said or done so damningly exposes Moscow's standard as its attitudes toward Jewish and Armenian nationalism. One has literally to turn language and semantics upside down to appreciate it. Yet, the history of no two peoples has ever been more strikingly analogous.

Jews and Armenians have both been the objects of centuries of persecution. Their ancient homelands were repeatedly overrun. As a result, they became dispersed throughout the world. Some have undergone assimilation. Some have clung tenaciously to their language, culture and historic traditions. Many have a profound religious attachment to the soil of a country they have never seen. In both instances, the majority have lived outside their national homelands for generations.

Despite these historic parallels, when Moscow speaks of Jews and Armenians, it speaks in two different tongues. The return of dispersed Jewry to Israel is "treason." The return of overseas Armenians to Armenia is the height of patriotic virtue. Consider the following statement in the March 31, 1964 issue of Komosolskaya Pravda:

"The Armenian People endured much suffering throughout its centuries-old history. Hunger and despair compelled many to leave the land of their fathers and seek salvation in foreign lands. These were later paths of suffering and humiliation. Only in the years of the Soviet regime has the cherished word "return" crossed the Wandering Armenian's lips . . ."

Izvestia put the case in even stronger terms in an article on April 1, 1964:

. . . "Tens of thousands of Armenians abroad who live under an alien and not always hospitable sky still strive to return to their Motherland, to Soviet Armenia. . . It is well known that love for the Motherland, the constant craving for unity, for life in the land of their ancestors have upheld the Armenian nation."

Have the Soviets ever considered what force upheld the Jewish nation through centuries of even greater travail?

The Soviet duality of mind becomes even more apparent in discussing the question of assimilation. For Russian Jews it is a "normal, desirable process" to be hastened by the denial of cultural rights. For Armenians the same prospect is nothing less than "a white massacre." The U.S.S.R.'s Erevan Radio puts it in the most chilling perspective:

"It is difficult to overestimate the political and historical significance of the newly organized repatriation of overseas Armenians. It is a matter of eliminating the consequences of the Turkish barbarian atrocities against the Armenian people and of saving our brothers and sisters in the diaspora from the brutal reality of capitalism and the danger of assimilation that hangs over them like the sword of Damocles. The new repatriation has caused a wave of enthusiasm and joy in the diaspora."

The use of the word "diaspora" is grimly amusing. It is a Zionist slogan that has been denounced from every propaganda pulpit in the U.S.S.R. In employing it, Moscow apparently takes no cognizance of the fact that one man's "Motherland" might be another man's "diaspora." The Kremlin's schizophrenic approach to Jewish and Armenian repatriation raises an intriguing paradox. By the fate of history, Armenia is situated within the present borders of the U.S.S.R. while Israel is in the Middle East. One is tempted to ask what Moscow's policies on the repatriation of the two peoples would be if the geographical locations of the two countries were reversed. Would Jewish repatriation then become a categorical imperative? Would Armenian repatriation become a crime?

The Russians did more than borrow the phraseology of Zionism. They even copied its administrative machinery. Beginning in 1961, Soviet embassies in Turkey, Greece, Cyprus, Lebanon, Egypt, France, and the United States included Armenian emigration departments that were nothing less than replicas of Jewish Agency offices. Through these departments, the Russians organized the repatriation of some 150,000 overseas Armenians.

Nor did Moscow hesitate to pressure foreign governments for aid in facilitating its Armenian repatriation scheme. In a note to the U.S. State Department dated April 21, 1947, (the text of which was carried by the New York Times of December 5, 1947) the Soviet ambassador declared:

"The government of the U.S.S.R. with a view to satisfying numerous requests of Armenians residing abroad has given permission for the Government of Soviet Armenia to arrange for the return of Armenians who desire to go back to their Motherland, Soviet Armenia, from a number of countries, including the United States of America.

"In this connection the embassy requests the Department of State to render assistance to those Armenians who desire to return to their Motherland by permitting them to take export property which belongs to them, relinquish their foreign citizenship, etc."

The State Department, of course, informed the embassy that American citizens and alien residents of the U.S. were free to emigrate anywhere they chose and to take their personal property with them.

Moscow's language was somewhat less polite in dealing with French recalcitrance on the Armenian issue. The New York Times of December 23, 1947 reports of a note sent to Paris by the U.S.S.R. bluntly telling the French government to stop putting "obstacles in the way of the repatriation of Armenians wishing to go back to the Soviet Union."

The French Foreign Ministry denied it was doing any such thing. But informed sources in Paris admitted that the government was withholding visa applications from such prospective Armenian emigrants in the hope of negotiating an agreement for the return of a number of French nationals still in the Soviet Union.

The Armenian campaign was duplicated on a somewhat smaller scale in Moscow's drive to repatriate a colony of Cossacks that had been living in Turkey for 250 years. Again, fear of assimilation and a return to the Motherland were the principle propaganda lures. In short, as far as Moscow was concerned, Zionism had everything to recommend it, so long as it wasn't applied to Jews.

IV. THE JEWISH STATE

The Soviets had no compunctions about deviating from this hard-line when it suited their political purposes. Moscow's chief political purpose in the Middle East during the early fateful months of 1947 was to weaken British influence in that area. If it took the creation of a Jewish State to bring an end to the British Mandate in Palestine, the Russians were more than willing to turn Zionism back to its original authors, the Jews. Contrast present Soviet policy toward Israel, the Jewish people and Jewish nationhood with the moving words uttered by Andrei Gromyko in his speech before the General Assembly of the United Nations on May 14, 1947:

"In considering the question of the tasks of the Committee which is to prepare proposals on Palestine, our attention is inevitably drawn to another important aspect of this problem. As is well known, the aspirations of an important part of the Jewish people are bound up with the question of Palestine, and with the future structure of that country. It is not surprising therefore, that both in the General Assembly and in the meetings of the Political Committee of the Assembly a great deal of attention was given to this aspect of the matter. This interest is comprehensible and completely justified.

"The Jewish people suffered extreme misery and deprivation during the last war. It can be said, without exaggeration, that the sufferings and miseries of the Jewish people are beyond description. It would be difficult to express by mere dry figures the losses and sacrifices of the Jewish people at the hands of the Fascist occupiers. In the territories where the Hitlerites were in control, the Jew suffered almost complete extinction. The total number of the Jews who fell at the hands of the Fascist hangmen is something in the neighborhood of six million. Only about one and a half million Jews survived the war in Western Europe. But these figures, which give an idea of the losses suffered by the Jewish people at the hands of the Fascist aggressors, give no idea of the situation in which the great mass of the Jewish people find themselves after the war.

"A great many of the Jews who survived the war in Europe have found themselves deprived of their countries, of their shelter, and of means of earning their livelihood. Hundreds of thousands of Jews are wandering about the various countries of Europe, seeking means of livelihood and seeking shelter. A great many of these are in the camps for displaced persons, where they are continuing to suffer great privations.

"This was all clearly stated in the discussions of the Assembly's Committee by the representative of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

"It may be asked whether the United Nations, considering the very serious situation of hundreds of thousands of Jews who have survived the war, should not show an interest in the situation of these people who have been uprooted from their countries and from their homes. The Organization of the United Nations cannot, and should not, remain indifferent to this situation, because such an attitude would be incompatible with the high principles which are proclaimed in our Charter—principles which envisage the defense of the rights of men, irrespective of race, religious convictions and sex. This is a time to give help, not in words, but in deeds.

"It is necessary that we concern ourselves with the urgent needs of a people who have suffered such great hardships as a result of the war, in connection with Hitlerite Germany; it is a duty of the United Nations.

"Regarding the necessity of concerning ourselves with the situation of the Jewish population, which is without shelter and without means of livelihood, the Soviet delegation considers it necessary to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the following circumstances. The experience of the past, particularly during the time of the Second World War, has shown that not one state of Western Europe has been in a position to give proper help to the Jewish people and to defend its interests, or even its existence, against the violence that was directed against it from the Hitlerites and their allies. This is a very serious fact, but unfortunately, like all facts, it must be recognized.

"The fact that not a single Western European state has been in a position to guarantee the defense of the elementary rights of the Jewish people or compensate them for the violence they have suffered at the hands of the Fascist hangmen explains the aspiration of the Jews for the creation of a state of their own. It would be unjust not to take this into account and to deny the right of the Jewish people to the realization of such an aspiration."

Gromyko was more persuasive than he intended to be. His sudden passion for Zionism caused Syrian Ambassador Faris Bey El-Khouri to remark that "If Jews are to start coming to Palestine they might also want to leave Russia, where they have been persecuted since the Seventh Century." The General Assembly proceedings carry no record of a reply by the Soviet ambassador.

V. 1948–1968

When the Jewish Agency attempted to match Gromyko's words with deeds two and a half years later, it found that Moscow's passion for persecuted Jewry had cooled considerably. The Agency reported on November 10, 1949 that the Kremlin had totally ignored a request that repatriation bars be lifted for 1,000,000 Russian Jews and 600,000 Rumanian and Hungarian Jews who wanted to come to Israel.

The events in Soviet Russia during the 20 years that followed Gromyko's historic speech are well known to every student of Jewish history. They include the destruction of the last vestiges of Jewish cultural and educational life; the imprisonment and execution of Jewish writers, poets and journalists; the infamous Stalinist "doctors' plot;" the vicious denigration of Jewish history, religion, language in the Soviet communications media; the Jewish "economic trials" of the early 1960's; the unrelenting campaign of hatred and slander against Israel, and, finally, the unabashed attempt to obliterate the identity of three million Soviet Jews through enforced cultural assimilation.

The only significant break in this chain of events came on December 3, 1966. Premier Alexei Kosygin, then in Paris, was asked by a correspondent for United Press International whether there was any possibility of reuniting Soviet Jews with families from which they had become separated during World War II.

Kosygin's reply went well beyond the terms of reference of the question. He declared, in part:

"We on our side shall do all that is possible for us if some families want to meet, or even if some among them would like to leave us, to open for them the road. And this does not raise here, naturally, any problem of principles and will not raise any."

The Kosygin statement had an electrifying effect on Jews and non-Jews alike. Here, indeed, was concrete evidence of the flexibility of Russia's new leadership and its ability to put humanitarian principles above politics. Israel National Radio termed the statement "a marked departure from the policies of Mr. Khrushchev." The London Jewish Chronicle called it "a pledge" and the New York Times said it would "give encouragement to many thousands of Russians, Ukrainians, Soviet Jews and others, whose families were broken up by the dislocation of World War II."

Seven months later, the dream of Jewish family reunion was ground under the boots of an Egyptian army advancing up the Sinai Peninsula. Since then an ominous silence has fallen over Soviet-Jewish affairs. A world waiting to hear the joyous sounds of families reuniting has awakened instead to the ugly clatter of a renascent anti-Semitism in Poland.

VI. INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

It is the view of an increasing body of learned opinion—both Jewish and non-Jewish—that the three million Jews of the U.S.S.R. are being deprived of the basic legal right of repatriation. It is a right that has been affirmed and reaffirmed under international law, by the League of Nations, the United Nations and the World Court. The Declaration of Human Rights incorporated into the charter of the United Nations guarantees the free choice of national domicile and the unrestricted freedom of movement to all people. The Soviet Union is a signatory to that document and is legally and morally obligated to honor it. To this end, an ad hoc committee has summoned leading jurists, legislators, scientists, economists, writers and industrialists from many countries to attend an International Conference on the Repatriation of Soviet Jewry to be held in Geneva, Switzerland.

It will be the purpose of this conference to establish itself as a permanent world body with headquarters in Geneva to strive for the implementation of the right of Soviet Jews to repatriate to their national homeland.

We believe the single greatest challenge facing contemporary World Jewry is the rescue of three million Soviet Jews.

There is a fundamental relationship between the return of these Jews to their homeland and their continued existence as Jews. Soviet Jewry is a people in search of nationhood. Israel alone offers them the chance—perhaps the last chance—to replant their cultural and religious roots in hospitable soil. Unless they are permitted to grasp this opportunity for national self-realization, Jewish history will have taken a tragic and perhaps irrevocable step backward.

It will be the major task of the Geneva Conference to assemble and present to the Russian Government documentary evidence of the existing desire of Russian Jews to repatriate. We wish to provide a forum from which a silent and exiled people may be heard.

We are witnessing the climax of a human drama that began 2,000 years ago with the enforced exile of the Jewish people. The circle of Jewish history is now being closed. The Jewish State has been reestablished. Its children are being called home. Destiny has given us no time-table. We do not know when the Call to Zion will be heard in the free Western Jewish communities, except that it will be heard. We do know that it has found an echo in the hearts of three million Russian Jews.

Since the 1967 War in the Middle East, repatriation has become a moving force among Soviet Jews. It is particularly strong among the younger generation, but its appeal cuts across all economic, social, religious and age distinctions.

This fact is confirmed almost daily from independent sources throughout the globe. It has been echoed by virtually every Western visitor to the Soviet Union during the past two years. Those who have had even the most peripheral contact with the Soviet Jewish community testify that repatriation is the only subject Russian Jews deem worthy of serious discussion. All other subjects have become irrelevant.

During a recent fact-finding tour, members of the committee had ample opportunities of interviewing a group of young Russian Jews who repatriated to Israel during the past years. These young people reject any contention that Judaism is languishing in the Soviet Union. It is more vibrant and alive than ever. They reject any contention that repatriation sentiment is limited to any one group of Russian Jews. They insist that no Soviet Jew be written off . . . that virtually the entire Russian Jewish population, including many of those still occupying positions of authority, would be prepared to come to Israel if the bars to repatriation were lifted.

These young people, born, schooled and indoctrinated under the Soviet system, have no quarrel with that system. Most of them remain staunch socialists. They want neither prayer books nor matzoths nor sympathy. They want to come home. They tell us that tens of thousands of other Jews study Hebrew and Yiddish and immerse themselves in Jewish history and literature. They have rejected assimilation. They see their destinies outside the borders of the Soviet Union. Their eyes are turned to the Promised Land.

It will be the function of the Geneva Conference to spell out the legal and humanitarian rights of these people in terms the entire civilized world, including the Soviet Union, can understand and accept. It is not our purpose to engage in a debate with the Kremlin over its treatment of the national Jewish minority or to demand of it an easing of restrictions on Jewish life. Such debates belong to the past. We doubt that any liberalization of Soviet Jewry policy can solve the ultimate dilemma confronting Russian Jewry.

The only long-term solution for Soviet Jewry is repatriation. At the same time repatriation represents for the Russian Government and people a truly genuine solution of the Jewish problem in a just and humane form. The International Committee for the Repatriation of Russian Jews will undertake the burden of that solution. In that spirit of humility, purpose, and faith, we ask God's help for its success.

ONE-SIDED U.N. RESOLUTION ON MIDDLE EAST

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deep concern with the resolution passed by the U.N. Security Council yesterday condemning Israel for its attack on Jordan last week. This resolution, which passed the Council by an 11 to 0 vote, with the United States and Britain abstaining in opposition, virtually ignores the guerrilla actions that endanger the lives of Israel civilians and provoke Israel's retaliation. It is a one-sided measure and is in every respect counterproductive to our efforts for a settlement of the Arab-Israel strife.

French and Soviet support for this resolution splits the major powers at the very time when plans for beginning the big four talks on the Middle East are being completed. These talks were originally proposed by Paris and Moscow some months ago, and have involved arduous efforts to reach the delicate stage we are at now, and all four of the powers have a responsibility to maintain the atmosphere in which progress can continue.

The censure resolution adds weight to Israel's charges of bias by France and the U.S.S.R., and will make any of the proposals for settlement or promises of guarantees that may come out of the impending talks even more suspect in Israel's eyes. It is of even more immediate concern, furthermore, that the resolution will encourage the Arab terrorist groups that are openly determined to renew the conflict and bring us closer to the conflagration we have been working to prevent.

All violations of the cease-fire are counterproductive to peace and must be deplored if we are not to further polarize hostilities and make any progress in solving this potentially explosive situation.

I am presenting here an article and editorial comment from today's New York Times on this urgent problem for the consideration of my colleagues:

ISRAEL CENSURED BY U.N. COUNCIL—RAID ON JORDAN CONDEMNED BY A VOTE OF 11 TO 0—UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN ABSTAIN

(By Juan de Onis)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., April 1.—The major powers split in the Security Council today on a resolution condemning Israel for an air attack against Jordan, but plans to open Big Four talks on the Middle East this week remained unaltered.

The Soviet Union and France indicated they would vote for the draft resolution sponsored by Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia, which condemned the Israeli air attack on the town of Salt on March 26 in which 18 civilians were killed.

Charles W. Yost, the United States delegate, said that the attack was "in the highest degree counter-productive" for peace talks, but that the United States could not vote for a resolution that took no heed of Arab terrorist attacks on Israel.

Despite the split among the Big Four, there was no change in their plan to open talks on the Middle East this week.

"Death is just as final and as shocking if it comes from a bomb in a supermarket or from a bomb from the air," Mr. Yost said.

BRITAIN VOICES OBJECTION

Sir Leslie Glass, the deputy representative, said that his country could also not support a resolution that condemned Israel without encompassing all violations of the Middle East cease-fire of June 10, 1967.

"The outside world as a whole would surely scratch its head as to why the Council cannot at this delicate and important stage, in the most general terms and without any specific reference to either side, recognize the general state of violence, which undeniably exists, and deplore all violations of the cease-fire," Sir Leslie said.

Jordan, pressing her complaint against Israel, and the supporters of the Arab cause on the 15-member Security Council, contended that they had the necessary nine votes to carry the resolution. Since all Arab-Israeli war of 1967, all Security Council decisions on cease-fire resolutions have been adopted unanimously, with some reference to violence on both sides.

The split between the major powers, which are scheduled to open talks on the Middle East here Thursday, came despite arduous consultations during the day in which Max Jakobssen of Finland succeeded in winning minor modifications in the three-nation draft.

But the Arab refusal to accept any language that would label actions against Israel by Arab commando organizations as cease-fire violations thwarted any accommodations.

Agha Shahi, the Pakistani delegate, said in introducing the resolution that the three sponsors had "gone a long way in diluting the resolution" to prevent a "division among the permanent members of the Security Council on the eve of the projected four-power talks."

"While anxious to prevent any division, we could not possibly disregard the fact that the situation, which is at present being considered by the Council, has deteriorated," he said.

The key operative paragraph of the three-nation resolution said that the Security Council:

"Condemns the recent premeditated air attacks launched by Israel on Jordanian villages and populated areas in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the cease-fire resolutions and warns once again that if such attacks were to be repeated the Council would have to meet to consider further more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to insure against repetition of such attacks."

BLOW TO MIDEAST PEACE

The Soviet Union and France undercut their own initiative for Middle East peace yesterday when they voted for a United Nations Security Council resolution which condemns Israel for its attack on Jordan last week but virtually ignores the guerrilla actions that provoke Israeli retaliation.

French-Soviet support for the one-sided resolution—one the United States and Britain rightly refused to go along with—compromises their position just when arrangements are being completed for starting the Big Power peace meetings, originally proposed by Moscow and Paris months ago. It adds weight to Israeli charges of bias by the two powers, and tends to encourage truce violations by Arab groups blatantly bent on renewed conflict.

Despite this new handicap, the Big Four search for a new path to peace must not be abandoned. The primary responsibility for forging a final settlement remains with the contending Mideast nations, as Israeli and Arab leaders have taken pains to point out. But the Arabs and Israelis thus far have made no progress toward peace on their own. The Jarring mission is at a dead end.

In the face of rising violence that could envelop them all, the major powers have an obligation to themselves and to the world to make a new effort to promote a settlement through the U.N. The Russian and French have a special obligation now to undo the effect their vote by demonstrating that they recognize the rights and security requirements of the Israelis as well as those of the Arabs.

A LEGACY OF DECENCY

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, on this day of burial for Dwight David Eisenhower, we pay our final respects.

In the passing of General Eisenhower, Pennsylvanian and American, we have lost a great leader and a beloved President.

His death, as his life, reflected courage and determination, calm and cheer.

Just as the Eisenhower years were a time of strength and peace, prosperity and good will, so they reflected the man for whom they were so warmly named.

Few men will soon forget the hearty smile, the outstretched hand, and "We like Ike." May many long remember the man, the strength, and the love that gave the world those peaceful, prosperous years.

While our 34th President leaves so much for us to remember him by, perhaps one of the finest legacies was his elemental decency as a human being.

This thought is expressed in the lead editorial of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin on Monday, March 31, 1969, and I insert it for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A LEGACY OF DECENCY

Most men who make their mark upon the world and who die in greatness leave behind as their legacy some specific deed or thing, or some words expressing inspiring or profound thoughts.

Dwight D. Eisenhower has given more. He has left behind, for all who will accept it, a legacy of decency.

As 34th President of the United States, as most respected citizen in retirement, as General of the Army, Mr. Eisenhower held to a strong and basic faith in his country and its people.

There was, he was certain, a strength, a resolve and a basic goodness in the land and in its people. To him the qualities of honesty, tolerance, self-reliance and patriotism were not to be described as old fashioned. They were part of each day.

When Mr. Eisenhower saw these qualities held up to ridicule he became concerned. He saw the young people of today as perhaps the finest the nation has ever produced. But he expressed fear that so many of them have been taught nothing of responsibility and self-discipline or the real meaning of life.

"You accepted hard work and a concern for others as a way of life," Mr. Eisenhower once said in describing his formative years. "We would have sneered at anyone who said we were underprivileged or anything like that."

Mr. Eisenhower was indeed, as President Nixon said yesterday, a product of America's soil and America's ideals. Mr. Eisenhower was, as he said in his London Guild Hall speech in 1945, from the "heart of America."

There is a tendency today to brush aside the qualities that were so much a part of Mr. Eisenhower as something of value only in a past, unsophisticated and simplistic era. But in truth they are as relevant and more needed today than ever before in the nation's history.

And, despite the cynicism and the skepticism that is part of America today, the vast majority of the nation holds to the same beliefs that Mr. Eisenhower held—a faith in themselves and in their country and a respect for their fellow man.

The difficulty today, as it has been in other periods of this country's history, is that it is difficult to hear the voice of this majority above the shrill shouts of those who seek confrontation rather than conference and conciliation.

President Nixon, in the eulogy delivered yesterday in the Rotunda of the United States Capitol said that these days of national mourning should also be days of gratitude for the inspiration and the strength which Mr. Eisenhower has given his countrymen.

These days can be something more. They can be days of rededication to the basic beliefs and the truths that were Mr. Eisenhower's. They can be the time of acceptance of Mr. Eisenhower's legacy of decency.

Nothing, in a nation so divided and torn by dissent, could be a finer tribute to a man who believed that his nation's future rested upon its moral strength.

THE MONEY TREE: NEW JERSEY GETS SMALL SLICE OF U.S. PIE—I

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Passaic Herald-News of Passaic, N.J., recently carried a series of eight articles by Staff Writer Mike Stoddard, entitled "The Money Tree."

In these articles, Mr. Stoddard casts a critical eye at the Federal grant-in-aid programs, pointing up the difficulties encountered by local governments in applying for the various forms of Federal aid.

While the series deals primarily with Morris County, N.J., in my congressional district, the problems described are common to many areas.

I insert these articles in the RECORD and commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

THE MONEY TREE: NEW JERSEY GETS SMALL SLICE OF U.S. PIE—I

(By Mike Stoddard)

Graftsmanship—The art of eliciting funds for specified uses from federal, state, foundation or private sources.

The foregoing definition, however, is not to be found in any of the current dictionaries since it has only become a recognized practice in the last few years, and even its practitioners are ready to argue that it may be science rather than art.

Historically, the roots of grantsmanship may be traced back to 1862 when the federal government, under the Morrill Act, established the first grant-in-aid program to states by giving them aid to education in the form of land grants.

The land grant colleges, as the primary national effort to utilize this country's resources to effect the nation's goals, set the pattern for today and unwittingly, perhaps, hardened for all time the uses to which grants of any type may be put.

From the land grants, national policy extended itself to aid to agriculture and as the nation became industrialized, a slow shift took place as the farmers' need for roads brought about the first major shift in policy in the 1920s when the federal aid programs for highway construction became a reality.

The roads and highways were not all the farmers received, for as industrialization forced the smaller farmers to bankruptcy, new skills were needed to cope with a world that could no longer afford to support the marginal farms and farmers.

The next step of vocational training funded by federal grants was only a short distance from the massive welfare and public works programs of the 1930s where the Great Depression shattered the economy of the United States.

The clock spun faster after the 1940s and the aid programs grew in scope, until today the spectrum of grant-in-aid encompasses, by one count, 1,271 programs which cost almost $21 billion a year.

A federal government reluctantly admits having slightly more than 400 grant-in-aid programs citing the "bible" of grantsmen, "The Catalog of Federal Assistance Programs" as the authority.

The catalog compiled by the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity for the President lists a bewildering array of programs in its 700 pages, which in addition to a brief description of the programs, tells who may apply and to whom.

Testimony to the confusion rising from the catalog may be deduced from a second book published under the seal of the vice president of the United States entitled, "Handbook for Local Officials" which in 300 pages explains how to use the first catalog.

To the experienced grantsman, however, the catalogs are so much window dressing, for a specific program and its funds are the target and that information is not easily available.

A new breed of public official, the grantsman, has been born to cope with the multiplicity of programs for local government up to and including state level civil servants lack the expertise and sophistication needed to stick their thumb into the federal pie and come up with plum.

In most cases, local officials, aware of an available supply of money, have no difficulty in dropping their system of priorities to run after a grant-in-aid, simply because "the money is there."

To the professional grantsman, the bumbling approach is painful and to the sophisticated federal official administering a grant program, the rush of an outstretched hand is a sure guarantee of a turndown.

FOURTEEN CATEGORIES

The key to the grant-in-aid programs is not in their diversity but in their limited applications for while there are more than 1,300 "money pots" they each fall into one of 14 categories.

The major criticism of the grant-in-aid programs is their "categorical" nature which is a severe drawback to those communities which may want something not specified in the federal guidelines.

The 14 over-all categories supply the clue to the national goals which shape the type and amount of assistance available.

New Jersey's inability to reflect the national goals is shown in its participation in the federal grant-in-aid programs where the over-all system of priorities is rearranged to put state highway spending ahead of all the other categories.

The New Jersey numbers, in addition to restructuring the national goals, show the state is paying a high penalty for refusing to comply, since it receives the least amount of money from the federal government of all the 50 states.

For the fiscal year ending July 31, 1968 New Jersey received only 1.95 per cent of all federal grant-in-aid funds, $416,105,000, and tracing that amount to Morris County shows practically none of it ever gets home.

The national order of priorities established by the amounts of money appropriated for various categories according to latest information compiled by the state Department of Community Affairs is:

FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS FOR 1967–68

Program category	Total, all States	Total, New Jersey
Public assistance	$4,201,019,000	$70,169,000
Highways	4,021,980,000	103,756,000
Agriculture	3,501,239,000	6,278,000
Education	3,086,528,000	72,845,000
Public health	1,406,221,000	20,165,000
Antipoverty	1,377,264,000	51,808,000
National Guard	842,802,000	14,860,000
Food distribution	686,554,000	10,020,000
Unemployment insurance	614,797,000	24,884,000
Urban development and public housing	538,077,000	25,041,000
Veterans' benefits	306,916,000	7,141,000
Conservation practices	289,223,000	1,239,000
Vocational rehabilitation	266,821,000	4,578,000
Child care	233,172,000	3,313,000
Miscellaneous programs	491,865,000	1,053,000

The Money Tree: $12 Will Get You $1 in Federal Funds—II

(By Mike Stoddard)

Out of the more than $20 billion in federal grant-in-aid funds spent last year, New Jersey ranked last in the amount given all the 50 states plus Puerto Rico. Morris County, without any firm statistics, ranks among those which got the smallest slice of the federal melon.

In the jungle of federal statistics, the Office of Economic Opportunity in its annual survey of federal outlays states Morris County received $146,494,071 during the last fiscal year.

The information derived from the new federal information exchange service, however, is preceded with the caution that the numbers shown are "obligations of government administered funds" and then proceeds to lump every penny spent in or outside the county on programs which may be pro-rated on national programs which have no effect upon the county.

The federal government with a broad brush includes the money spent on defense programs, including the Picatinny Arsenal payroll as one of its major expenditures in Morris County.

That the federal government is not above coloring its largesse is indicated by the inclusion of $218,920 from Coast Guard, marine, harbor and shore services and $49,608 as the county's share of participating in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Morris County also gets $39,114 for feed grain direct payments to the owners of its nonexistent farms and receives $1,536 in wheat direct payments for those same farms.

The Department of State, the report indicates, spent $51,316 in Morris County for salaries and expenses of what must be assumed are foreign service officers, while the U.S. Information Agency put another $18,988 in the local economy possibly for broadcasts behind the Iron Curtain.

The meat of the issue of how much Morris County gets from the federal government to aid local programs is carefully obscured behind the overwhelming numbers but it breaks down to very little.

The clue to Morris County's participation is found again in the state statistics using the per capita return to the state.

With New Jersey's getting the lowest per capita return of all the states, $59.60 each, against the national average of $105.81, the population of the county at 350,000 could only net about $20 million.

The announcements of grants over the past year from the office of Rep. Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, R-5th, show that less than $6 million was allocated to Morris County including the expenditure of more than $1 million for additions to Picatinny Arsenal.

One argued statistic released earlier this year by the New Jersey Taxpayers Association said it cost New Jersey $1.70 for every dollar it received from the federal government.

SPEND $12 FOR $1

The truth is that for every dollar New Jersey received in grant funds, it paid more than $12. Morris County with a larger than average per capita income, effectively paid its $12 and got nothing.

That the county showing is so bad is not because the system of national priorities has no room for fitting the county's needs into the federal system of priorities for national goals but a local view that ignores those goals.

Freeholder Norman Griffiths, acknowledged to be Morris County's student of government, reaches back into as a county official to summarily dismiss the entire federal grant program as "a waste of time and effort."

Griffiths, who is quick to point out he has no political bias against having the county get federal, grant-in-aid funds, remembered his years of activity as a local official, a state legislator and of trudging to Washington, New York and Philadelphia looking for the elusive dollars so sorely needed by the growing county.

Now in his 80s, Griffiths' voice shakes with indignation as he tells of the countless trips and snarls of red tape which frustrated his efforts to do something for his home county.

His indictment of the federal grant-in-aid program is encompassing for he could find no hope that something could be done for his constituents.

WASTE OF TIME

"It is a waste of time," Griffiths said. "The bureaucrats only use that money to make their empires bigger and give more jobs to their friends."

County participation in some programs, Griffiths quickly pointed out, was more onerous than "doing it ourselves."

He said the federal regulations on strings attached to the grant programs made them unworkable from their inception. The federal government handbook to local officials in language more tempered, warns, "In a sense, a 'no strings attached' program does not exist."

The federal government also warns officials to be prepared to face "red tape, which may cause frustrations and delays for local officials."

Griffiths disgustedly said the major drawback to the federal grants was that "they cost you more in the long run than if you had done it without federal help."

Last year the Morris County freeholders defended their refusal to ask for federal funds to help build the new county library. The money made available to the state through a block grant was not requested by the freeholders because the library design would have had to be changed to meet a floor space requirement exceeding those planned.

Griffiths agrees that the county should be eligible for additional federal funds. But he once more pointed at the requirements which make the funds a small part of any problem.

He recalled one example of a federal program where the grant, after being used in one year, left the county with the same amount to budgeted yearly.

The project, Griffiths said, was the desnagging of the Pompton River, where the U.S. Corps of Engineers gave the county a grant of $50,000 the first year, then carefully wrote into the contract a provision that Morris County would maintain the river bed after the initial work was completed.

He said the maintenance item was estimated to cost as much each year as the original grant since the rived bed changed course with each new rainfall.

Griffiths was especially bitter at the cost to the county of carrying on programs after the "feds and state pull the rug out from under us."

He and the other freeholders have publicly taken the state to task for failing to fund a program aimed at improved dental health in school age children which is being phased out, but not by the county which has assumed the cost with only a token payment from the state pot.

The Money Tree: Officials Indifferent to U.S. Goals—III

(By Mike Stoddard)

Morris County officials, while aware of the federal grant-in-aid programs, have at best reluctantly partaken in the fiscal feast. In their now indifference to the national goals spelled out by the grant-in-aid programs, the officials led by the Morris County Board of Freeholders may have jeopardized the future of every one of the county's 39 municipalities.

In 1967 Congress passed legislation which stated that no municipality in a given section, such as a county, will be given any federal financial aid unless a comprehensive plan for the entire county was completed.

The cutoff date for federal aid was set at last October but it was recently amended to October 1969, giving those municipalities engaged in federal programs a year's breather.

This year the Morris County Planning Board began working on a three-year comprehensive plan, funded in part by a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The county's reluctant involvement in the future of its municipalities stems again from the federal requirements which place a large measure of influence on statistics.

The federal government uses what it terms the "PEN" formula as determining its criteria for assistance. "PEN" stands for population, financial ability and need for any program. As the least meaningful number to assess a program, the county population is used as the base.

The financial ability of the county to pay for its share of any program is usually derived from the per capita income of the residents, which in turn leads to a slanted view of the county's ability to pay for its needs.

An unwritten criterion on federal aid programs on which all the experts agree is to measure the degree of poverty affecting the area. Morris County's poor, mainly blacks and Puerto Ricans, can attest to the minimal antipoverty funds which have been channeled into their lives because of the literal application of the "PEN" formula.

The municipalities, like the county, have lost their impetus to develop their own body of experts and fall further behind in their ability to solve the problems forced by the explosive population growth they are all experiencing.

In New Jersey, James Alloway, director of the Division of Local Finance of the Department of Community Affairs, oversees the financial health of the state's 567 municipalities and 21 counties.

Alloway is both sympathetic to the municipalities and highly critical of their performance.

"We're still running our towns from the hip pocket," Alloway said. "The feds are sophisticated and the towns are not. With the federal government staffed by skilled technicians, they expect the towns to come up with equally sophisticated approaches to their problems."

He compared the federal categorical grants to "laser beams" which cut through the many layers of government to focus on one aspect of one problem, ignoring all the other factors and problems affecting the municipality.

"The most grossly overignored aspects of the federal programs are the strings attached to them," he said. "Often the grants interfere with the orderly development of a municipality because of the strings."

Alloway pointed out that the allocation of local funds to complete a federal grant-in-aid contract could, in some instances, leave the municipalities short of funds for its local needs and lead to the creation of "artificial priorities."

As a first step to establishing a system of priorities for municipalities, Alloway called for greater state participation in the federal grant process to assure the attainment of common goals.

"The state has to assume its proper responsibility so it will have a say in how it develops, instead of allowing the municipalities to keep going in directions dictated by Washington," he said.

The state's contribution to directing the efforts of municipalities, Alloway said, may lie in new legislation, with one effort made to insist upon the regular submission of realistic capital budgets.

He said of the 588 five-year capital improvement budgets supposed to be submitted each year by every municipality and county, only 60 appeared to have any realistic basis. The others are either not submitted, he said, since the law allows their omission, or are submitted as "pie in the sky" dreams without any hope of realization.

Congressman Key to Federal Grants—IV

(By Mike Stoddard)

Grantsmen, the experts on tapping the U.S. grant-in-aid programs for local uses, all agree that a district's congressman is the key man to the Washington hierarchy.

Morris County shares with Somerset County the services of Rep. Peter B. Frelinghuysen, R-15th Dist., who has allied himself with Rep. William Roth of Delaware on the new legislation which would catalog every one of the existing federal grant-in-aid programs on a regular basis.

Roth, a relative newcomer to Congress, spent eight months last year compiling an up-to-the minute listing of all federal aid programs and, in comparison to the announced 400 or so programs supposed to be active, found 1,271.

Roth also discovered that the federal government was spending $21 billion instead of $17 billion on those programs.

The monumental detective job performed by Roth and his staff has been recorded in the June 25, 1968 issue of the Congressional Record, which overnight became a new "bible" for the grantsman.

The Roth Catalog, as it has become known, sliced away the governmental verbiage hiding the programs and clearly defined who may apply for aid, to whom and how much money each program sheltered. The task was complicated by the fact that the aid programs are given in a variety of ways which include loans, advances, shared revenues, technical assistance and outright grants. Most of them require cost sharing and contributions from the affected municipalities of the states in which they are located.

Frelinghuysen calls the overlapping programs and lack of information from any one source "incredible."

He cites the existence of more than 470 educational programs spread among 20 different agencies and departments as areas of "possible waste and duplication."

Under the "program information act," Roth, Frelinghuysen, and 23 other congressmen are asking for a monthly catalog.

The bill, according to Frelinghuysen, would require that each assistance program listed in the catalog submitted to Congress would include a description of the program, the restrictions, level of funding, the costs and actual mechanics of applying for aid.

"As more and more programs of federal assistance are established, the amounts of bureaucratic red tape and paper work increase proportionately," he said. "It is therefore, not surprising to hear of incidents in which local officials have given up in frustration attempts to obtain federal assistance for local projects," Frelinghuysen added.

Another aspect of the federal programs which annoy him was noted in the OEO catalog of federal programs. He said the feds list a program under which consultants will be provided by the government to municipalities seeking federal aid. Ironically, Frelinghuysen noted, the consultant program was never funded.

Morris County's failure to take part in the federal aid programs has not gone unnoticed by Frelinghuysen, who said he has received "very few requests for help, either on a county or local level."

The machinery of his office, he said, has always been available to help steer passage through the Washington shoals, but there have been almost no takers.

Part of the reluctance he ascribed to the multiplicity of programs offered by the government and the lack of grantsmen on the county or local levels who have some familiarity with the programs offered.

He also blamed the paucity of the amounts granted as deterring factors in the never-ending search for funds. "The money is distributed in such small packages," Frelinghuysen said, "that it loses whatever effectiveness it may have had."

One answer he conjectured may be the reassessment of all federal grant-in-aid programs to channel large amounts to the states instead of through the present categorical approach.

Terming the present system "chaos" the congressman said the re-evaluation would be "an enormous job" but added it had to be done.

The county's failure to get more money, Frelinghuysen noted candidly, in addition to the reluctance of the local officials to get involved, was based upon purely political considerations.

Frelinghuysen said the county, as a Republican stronghold, often received a deaf ear in a capital that was run by a strong Democratic organization.

He said the change of political climate would undoubtedly be reflected in the future dealings of the county with the federal establishment, since it had registered a strong pro-Nixon vote.

The Money Tree: Some Fear Aid Bypasses States—V

(By Mike Stoddard)

There is a growing suspicion among government experts that the federal grant-in-aid programs have been distorting the face of America by fostering an unnatural relationship between the federal establishment and municipalities which completely bypasses the state.

Among those students of intergovernmental relationships is Rep. Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, R-5th Dist., who predicts a new role for state government under the incoming Republican administration.

He said the state would probably be given a larger part to play in the decision-making process, especially on how to make more effective use of federal funds for local programs.

On the state cabinet level, Treasurer John Kervick's interest in new state-local relationships may be the harbinger of the new direction.

As the custodian of all federal funds which are distributed to local governments through his office, Kervick and his accounting staff serve somewhat as historians for the grant-in-aid programs of the past.

Kervick's office in its yearly preparation of the budget and its fiscal report which accounts for those funds allocated to the towns, counties and cities is as sorely pressed as the local governments for exact information on who got how much and for what.

He said his office is now exploring methods of keeping the accounts which would reflect federal funds spent in the state, information he admits the state does not now have.

The formula funds given states are noted in the yearly fiscal reports, Kervick said, but individual grants to local jurisdictions in some cases never pass through the state coffers.

"We would like to know what each program is when an application is made by anyone," Kervick said. "Right now the first time we know of many applications is when the federal government sends us the money."

Kervick's understanding of the reluctance of many jurisdictions to participate in the federal assistance programs is based upon a longtime exposure to the realities of home rule and the political complexities of grants and aid.

He admits the state of New Jersey as a whole has not taken full advantage of federal funds and said he did not advocate "tapping the federal government" for a larger share of the available funds.

His reluctance to urge in-depth grantsmanship is based upon his evaluation of the state as a "prosperous, growing, industrial and commercial state," as opposed to those which have none of New Jersey's resources or wealth.

In contrast to others who would hit the federal government for any aid over normal expenditures, Kervick expects New Jersey to keep getting a very small per capita return because of its relative affluence and finds no fault with the concept of helping the less fortunate states.

That local governments have not taken part in the programs, Kervick said, was understandable.

"Many municipalities never wanted to participate," Kervick said. "They did not want to for political reasons in some instances and many just did not want to subject themselves to the prying audits required by the federal government as part of the contract."

BLOCK GRANTS SEEN

The future of federal grants, Kervick said, will rest with the new federal administration. He echoed the predictions of Rep. Frelinghuysen that some form of block grants issued to the states would probably replace the existing categorical grants.

He predicted a tightening of funds, although pointing out that no tightening of federal money was being experienced by New Jersey at the moment.

The concept of federal income sharing, Kervick said, has been advanced by the incoming administration but details on what is involved have been lacking.

"We definitely would be interested in how the federal government would handle income sharing," Kervick said, "but we would want to know the details and that means everything."

"Most important," he said, "we would want to know how it affects the state and its people. Once we know we would be able to consider it and its application to our problems."

The one point on which Kervick was certain was that no matter what method the federal government employs to distribute its aid funds, the taxpayer "will not be relieved of his federal taxes."

His view of federal aid is limited to greater efficiencies in distribution of existing funds since income sharing and block grants are still limited to theoretical applications and methods.

The most pressing need for federal relief, Kervick said, is in the field of welfare costs which have an impact on every state and municipal government.

He said the federal assumption of all welfare programs would probably save many local governments now reeling under the costs. Part of the saving would be realized, he said, from the elimination of substructures to administer the funds which are apportioned to the states and then to its governmental subdivisions.

Other than priority on welfare programs, Kervick opined there were not other areas which were in dire need of immediate change.

For those municipalities still out in the cold and wanting to obtain federal funds for local projects, Kervick said the state wanted to help.

"The door is open," Kervick said, "all the machinery is there. We have all the programs, all they have to do is ask."

He said the establishment of the Department of Community Affairs was the single most important step taken to give the state a larger part to play in the development of the municipalities.

John Gleeson, head of the Office of Community Services, simply states his function saying: When this department was set up March 1, 1967, "grantsmanship was to be our major function."

THE MONEY TREE: GRANTSMEN HURDLE ROADBLOCKS—VI

(By Mike Stoddard)

In marked contrast to many officials, the staff members of the Office of Community Services of the Department of Community Affairs have no reservations about the rights of municipalities to seat themselves at the federal table and partake of the fund feast.

John Gleeson, head of the division, notes the founding of the new state Department of Community Affairs in March 1967 was a clear mandate from the legislature to make grantsmanship work for the benefit of the state and its political subdivisions.

The Office of Community Services is staffed by the new breed of official, the grantsman, and every roadblock erected by the federal agencies to protect their limited funds is viewed as a challenge to their ingenuity.

The staff is composed primarily of people who have been on both sides of the grantsmanship game and now work for the state. Road blocks which would discourage local officials are hurdled almost without effort.

Since the department was established a year and a half ago, the office has obtained grants worth more than $100 million—money, Gleeson and his assistant Herbert Rosen are quick to point out, which has been used by New Jersey municipalities to further their programs.

The bulk of the money received to date is earmarked for the construction of the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry now being built in Newark. The school will take about $75 million while another $30 million is allocated to other projects spread across the state.

Even though the new department's success is startling in view of what has been accomplished before its birth, Gleeson and his staff view their efforts as "marginal" because of federal funds locked up by the war in Vietnam.

At a roundtable conference a few weeks ago, Gleeson, Rosen and William Bamka, a community service officer of the division, analyzed the federal grant-in-aid programs, their successes and their failures.

The financial condition of New Jersey obviously pained them for their future is closely tied to the state's fiscal health.

Under the existing tax structure of the state, local property taxes take the biggest bite, leaving only 29 per cent of all money collected to finance the entire state and its programs.

The paucity of state funds for needed programs, Gleeson said, was the final factor in directing their grant efforts to the federal programs.

The outward directed effort at Gleeson's "one-stop shopping service," however, is a state counterpart which also works out of the same office.

THIRTY-ONE PROGRAMS

In its most recent catalog the Department of Community Affairs lists 31 assistance programs funded by the state either solely or in co-operation with the federal government.

Many of the programs, while not paying off in money grants, are designed to give municipalities services which would otherwise act as a drain on their limited treasuries.

In contrast to the federal catalogs of assistance which only sketch the highlight of a given program, the community affairs catalog tells what the program is, its purpose, the nature of the program, who may apply and whom to contact.

Many of the state programs are aimed at upgrading the professional status of municipal employes and some funding is involved in others which pay the salaries of municipal employes loaned by one town to another for specific professional tasks.

The bureau of training and recruitment has just embarked on a series of courses in co-operation with state institutions of higher learning, all aimed at upgrading the municipal employes.

As another contribution to local governments, Michael Herbert, director of the bureau, conducts far ranging employe searches for municipalities at no cost.

STATE PROGRAMS

Gleeson said the state plans programs to aid the municipalities. How far the services can go will depend on the generosity of the Legislature and its view of how state money should be spent.

For the present the Office of Community Services has a clear-headed view of how to tap the federal fund pot, even listing guidelines on how. To the municipalities wishing to get federal aid, Gleeson and his staff say, "Call us. Just pick up the phone and call us."

Under the federal capital program review, the department will help steer any applicants for federal aid through the proper channels after making certain the application is in proper form for submission.

Beyond the application, Gleeson and his staff have a hard view of what is needed for successful grantsmanship.

The first requirement, they say, is "a good staff, well paid and able to keep abreast of what's happening."

Keeping abreast is the gathering of intimate knowledge of what is taking place in Washington as new grant programs are passed into law and old ones are updated.

Next in importance, Gleeson said, is the reading of the law and building a case to present to the feds.

"What you have to do," he said, " is make the law work for you."

Successful grantsmen, Gleeson recalled, almost as soon as a law is passed which authorized a new grant-in-aid program, would be on the doorstep of the administering agency with their own programs and would help write the guidelines which would govern the future programs of other applicants.

In some instances, Gleeson said, demonstration projects could be coaxed out of the federal government simply because someone was inventive enough to think of a new approach to solving an old problem.

The faults of the federal programs, according to Gleeson, Rosen and Bamka are echoes of every complaint voiced by other officials, but the Trenton group is more keenly aware of the national goals shaping the federal programs.

The interest in the future direction of federal aid is masked by their overwhelming concern to do what can be done under existing restrictions.

Rosen, voicing their concern said, "every year it is costing the municipalities more and more to stay where they are. They have to be helped now."

That other means of aiding municipalities and other levels of government exist are not overlooked but there the approaches are more unusual.

STATE SKILLED AS GRANTSMAN—VII

(By Mike Stoddard)

The Department of Commuity Affairs, interpreting its formation as mandate to show its skills in grantsmanship, has returned more than $100 million to the state in less than two years.

Part of its success is attributable to its aggressive enthusiasm and another part to its up-to-the minute flow of information.

Elmer Reinthaler, deputy to Assistant Commissioner Gregory Garrell, surrounded by masses of statistical information, waves most of it into oblivion calling it, "propaganda."

Reinthaler, although endorsing the state's enlarged role in aiding the communities, is doubtful of its future success unless the entire tax structure of the state is changed.

He cited the state's small income as 29.7 per cent of all local collections and said the money compounded the difficulties of administering any large scale programs since New Jersey, in addition to receiving the smallest amount of federal aid of all the states, also had the fewest number of employes per capita of any of the states.

He said the municipalities in their search for outside financial assistance usually overlooked private sources, such as foundations and voluntary agency funds accumulated by United Fund and Red Feather drives.

He noted that the entire public health budget for the United States was about $1 billion, while thousands of voluntary fund-raising organizations collected more than that every year.

In Morris County alone the current United Fund drive to support in part some 34 agencies is over the $1 million mark.

The nonprofit foundations, Reinthaler said, have been overlooked by most governmental units as possible sources for funds. "The money is there, it's simply that no one goes after it," he said.

Reinthaler's assessment of the situation is a reflection of the current interest in foundations which, according to the Foundation Center of New York, have assets of more than $20 billion spread among more than 20,000 foundations.

The largest of them all, the Ford Foundation, has drawn a great deal of attention in recent headlines because of its financial contributions to New York City's educational system.

Grants to New Jersey for studies and programs aimed at education from Ford are to be found in the pages of the annual fiscal report and a key to foundation grants can be found in the words of one spokesman who said it must fill two conditions, "experimentation first and visibility second."

Robert Seaver of the Ford Foundation disclaims any ability to speak for his foundation but years of grantsmanship practiced on both sides of the fence give him some authority on foundation thinking.

STRESSED DIVERSITY

Seaver initially stresses the diversity of the foundations, noting that by underwritten agreement many limit their grants to prevent competition for any one program from a variety of sources.

On the use of foundations by local governments, Seaver smiled as he recalled, "local people don't appear to take advantage of all the opportunities available to them."

Part of their reluctance, Seaver said, may be traced to corporate structures of the governmental unit, but recalled again that most proposals emanating from governments were "not" experimental or could serve as pilot projects which could have widespread applications in other areas.

Another key to foundation grants, Seaver pointed out, was the prospect of it being successfully duplicated by others without additional foundation funds.

"A foundation is not able to fund all worthy causes," he said, "so it looks for maximum leverage on minimum resources and is interested in those programs which will avoid permanent dependency."

One of his recommendations for obtaining funds for local projects, Seaver said, was for the municipalities to broaden their partnerships with local universities.

The universities, Seaver explained, have years of experience in grantsmanship, deriving almost all their funds from private and government sources.

They also have the ability to utilize the services of their faculties with high levels of expertise on most pressing social problems, and finally view problems in their area-wide context, he said.

The financial structure of the university, Seaver noted, in sharp contrast to most governmental units, is set up to spend money for specific programs.

The plus factor of municipal-university programs, Seaver * * * municipalities which make it difficult for them to take grants for specific uses, since their finances must all come through their general funds.

THE MONEY TREE: LOCAL GOVERNMENTS MISS HARVEST—VIII

(By Mike Stoddard)

The consensus at practically every source of funds for aid to local governments is that the local governments themselves have not utilized the resources available to them.

Their inability to cope with their growing problems, the experts agree, again is due primarily to the local governments' failure to attract and pay well-trained, enthusiastic staff members.

In Morris County, the local governing bodies have been carrying the added burden of a county government which has turned its back on outside help, preferring to pay for all its needs out of the tax moneys collected from the resident property owners.

On the state level, the past years of inactivity in fiscal matters left the state understaffed, unable to pay civil servant salaries out of the small percentage of money which reaches the state treasury.

The federal government, now writhing in the coils of serpentine grant-in-aid programs which overlap to the point where they are unresponsive to local needs, is about to make a dismaying survey of its own inability to help the states which pay the taxes to support those programs.

The last untapped resource, private capital, is slowly being brought into the vortex of government, for those confronted with the problems of urban living believe the business community of the country has helped create many of the problems and at the same time has disclaimed any responsibility for them.

As the population has moved to be close to its jobs, the problems of every community have grown in direct ratio to the number of people clustering inside the communities.

Functional disbanding of arbitrary municipal boundary lines has been advanced by some as one method of achieving better performance for a given tax dollar, while others have called for more regionalization of all facilities affecting the health, welfare and safety of the residents.

Commissioner Paul Ylvisaker of the Department of Community affairs has been on both sides of the fence in the field of grantsmanship, as an officer of the Ford Foundation and as a public official.

His opinion of local governments' failure to obtain funds from the federal grant-in-aid programs or other sources is that the local governments have not failed but rather have been failed by higher echelons of government which possess the expertise local officials lack.

Ylvisaker, pointing at the tax structure of New Jersey, calls for a complete overhaul which would give the state a tax base capable of growing with the economy so the rate paid by the taxpayer would remain stable.

The federal grant structure, Ylvisaker said, will have to be changed to allow the states to have a larger voice in how it will develop.

The method of grants would increase the state aid allocations and make the state a more equal partner in the never ending battle to solve the growing problems of population pressures.

SOME ELIMINATED

States which have not taken any substantial positions to improve their own tax efforts and insure performance would be eliminated from any further participation, he said.

"The state would have to demonstrate its competence to stay in the partnership," he said. "There would be no point to giving more money to states which do not make any effort to increase their own effectiveness."

He, like many others, was critical of the existing grant-in-aid programs of the federal government which sent "bureaucrats to talk to bureaucrats."

Ranging across the wide spectrum of programs, Ylvisaker said a major effort will have to be made to "flush out the inaccuracies" of federal statistics and discover the "arbitrary allotments," hidden in the federal programs.

MORAL OBLIGATION

The new partnership with private industry is based, Ylvisaker said, upon industries' "moral obligation," to help solve some of the problems.

Its most important obligation, he said, was for industry to take action to add to the housing stock of the state.

He pointed out that many of the suburban housing units could only be afforded by high-paid employes and the lower paid employes were forced to live in the already short supply of low and middle income housing, most of it clustered in the state's decaying cities.

The new housing would give new life to the suburbs, Ylvisaker opined, and coupled with a new tax structure for the state, make the coming years good ones in which to be alive.

TRANSATLANTIC DIALOG

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the eminent Senator of the French Republic, Georges Portmann, also distinguished as one of Europe's eminent physicians and presently serving as President of the French Association for the Atlantic Community, recently wrote in the March 8 issue of Le Figaro the following comment about President Nixon's relationship to Western Europe.

Coming as it does from a longstanding delegate to the North Atlantic Assembly and one of the most eloquent spokesmen for the spirit of liberty, Senator Portmann's remarks have special meaning for the United States.

Here is the text of his comments:

[From Le Figaro, Mar. 8, 1969]

NIXON REOPENS TRANSATLANTIC DIALOG

(By Georges Portmann, Senator from the Gironde, President of the French Association for the Atlantic Community)

At the height of a serious controversy in Europe on the Common Market and the Atlantic Alliance, President Nixon came to tell the old Continent that "the United States is determined to listen to its NATO partners with a new attentiveness." This is, no doubt, one of the most positive results of Mr. Nixon's trip to the principal European capitals and should encourage the allied countries of Western Europe to unite and to open a dialog with the United States profitable to all of them.

The speech delivered by Mr. Nixon to the Permanent NATO Council at Brussels deserves to be studied and analyzed. It gives the Europeans the guarantees they had a right to request, and it implies that the United States no longer wants to lay itself open to certain types of criticism on the part of its allies. So the President of the United States said he was convinced that his country should—in his own words—lecture its European partners less and give greater attention to what they think.

Continuous political consultation among fifteen allied countries has been, and is, one of the essential features of NATO. President Nixon did not hesitate to allude to the feeling which exists in some European quarters that too often the United States informs its partners only of what it has decided to do, instead of consulting them before hand. The new "master" of the White House stated that genuine consultation consisted in cooperating before acting, and not in securing the approval of a unilateral action. He added that this consultation should take place in both directions.

To concretize his words, Mr. Nixon undertook the pledge that he would consult the NATO countries thoroughly before and during any negotiation directly affecting their interests. That is enough to reassure those who are afraid of direct negotiations between Washington and Moscow. Some will say that these are only words, but nobody can deny that the United States is seeking to reestablish an atmosphere of trust. It is up to the Europeans to take up the dialog and to make use of it for the future of the Western World.

President Nixon's trip to Europe is an act of faith in transatlantic cooperation. The distinguished visitor summed up his thinking as follows:

"As NATO is entering into its third decade, I see for it a possibility of being, even more than before, a rampart of peace, the maker of new ways of association and a dynamic forum for new ideas and new technologies appropriate to enriching the life of our people."

No peace-loving European can remain indifferent to this appeal for intensification of the bonds among countries defending the same freedoms. The President of the United States emphasized that the Atlantic Alliance must pool not only its weapons but also its brains. Though the French Government decided no longer to have its armed forces form an integral part of NATO, we can hope that he will appreciate the need for stepped-up political consultation among allies. As President Nixon said: "No nation has a monopoly of wisdom."

ROTARY CLUB BULLETIN

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the Rotary Club of South Knoxville, Tenn., produces a club bulletin for its members to keep them informed of club activities; and featured in the bulletin for this week is an excellent statement which I would like to share with my colleagues:

Those of you who read your newspapers probably saw where the film "I Am Curious (Yellow)" has just completed a smash-run off Broadway and is now scheduled to be shown in Washington, D.C. This film, apparently sanctioned by the sick minds of the Supreme Court, which shows a young couple in various acts of sexual relations, is being sponsored and promoted by Grove Press. Grove Press, one of the world's greatest purveyors of pornography, has been flooding the newstands in the past several years with pornographic publications. They are apparently immune to prosecution due to decisions rendered by said Supreme Court.

Without viewing the film, one needs only to examine their publications, such as, Evergreen Magazine, the paperback entitled "The Pearl", etc., to know that they would not sponsor anything unless it were pornographic. If I were a dedicated Communist, I would channel every dollar I could get my hands on to support these people in their magnificent efforts to destroy morality and therewith, religion.

The permissiveness and apathy of the American public is permitting this scum to promote the Kremlin's planned takeover from within by destroying the moral fiber of our society and with it the will to resist. At this point in history, the greatest service that Rotary International could render would be a vigorous program aimed at exposing this degenerate philosophy, eliminating its purveyors, and strengthening the moral fiber of our youth through the God and Country concept. Otherwise, there will soon be no Rotary International, Kiwanis, et al.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE CHARLES H. SILVER AT THE 1968 ALFRED E. SMITH MEMORIAL FOUNDATION DINNER

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the 23d annual dinner of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation occurred on October 16, 1968, under the chairmanship of the Honorable Charles H. Silver. This annual non-political event, always held shortly before election day, has become a tradition in offering a unique opportunity for major candidates to be seen and heard. Last fall's dinner was attended by Presidential candidates, Hubert H. Humphrey and Richard M. Nixon—now our President. The then President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, made an unannounced appearance at the dinner.

It was indeed appropriate that in a Presidential election year the guest of honor was former Postmaster General James A. Farley whose own career spans the period from the days of the "Happy Warrior" to the present.

The Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation Dinner, which raises funds to aid the poor, sick and underprivileged, was organized originally at the urging of the late Francis Cardinal Spellman who, in the manner of Governor Smith, was deeply concerned about human suffering. The tradition was carried on last fall by the Most Reverend Terence J. Cooke, Archbishop of New York, who has recently been designated as Cardinal by Pope Paul VI.

I include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address which the Honorable Charles H. Silver, the chairman, delivered at the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation Dinner on October 16, 1968:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER, CHAIRMAN, AT THE ALFRED E. SMITH MEMORIAL FOUNDATION DINNER, OCTOBER 16, 1968

His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, has entrusted to us a magnificent heritage and a sacred mission which we carry on tonight.

At this time, my friends, I ask that you please rise in silent prayer and tribute to His Eminence. Thank you.

It was His Eminence who initiated this annual convocation of minds and hearts to recall, from the perspective of our times, the "Happy Warrior" whose bright memory inspires us to continue his crusades of hope and courage against ignorance and hate—the dream he cherished—impossible in his time—still unreached in ours—of brotherhood and peace among men.

The years have dimmed none of the lustre of his love for those he called the common people—the victories against bigotry he won, even in defeat—the covenant he made, without compromise, to lift the heads and hearts of men higher than the orbit of the ordinary . . . so that they might walk tall—equal with all—and humbly—and justly—in the sight of God.

Today, many decades beyond, we look back with admiration and wonder—we "Look at the record" of that great American in whose name this foundation was born—and in whose deeds we can take pride—yes—more than pride—example—and inspiration.

Ideals—as lofty as those for which he lived—will never die as long as we gather to honor the name of Alfred E. Smith.

This is our twenty-third annual dinner.

Time has turned many a momentous page in the last quarter century. The world has rolled through blood and flame, tragedy and triumph. We have smelled the stench of genocide. We have heard the screams of the innocent. We have seen rockets rise to nudge the moon.

And even as our world totters on the brink of destruction, we witness the struggle of civilization to redeem itself in areas of social justice, health, education and intellectual emancipation.

What years they have been!

And what men have emerged from them! Such leaders of thought and action as grace our dais tonight—President Johnson, Vice President Humphrey, Vice President Nixon, Senator Javits, Governor Rockefeller, Mayor Lindsay—and, most particularly, our guest of honor, that noble humanitarian and notable citizen of the world, the Honorable James A. Farley.

They are leaders in the human parish that fuses men of all faiths in search for a way of life to ease the tensions of today and to meet the trials of tomorrow.

They are leaders—and followers, too, of those who minister to the human spirit—those men of God who give us the strength to carry on despite seemingly overwhelming odds—despite the rage and riot in our streets and the bitterness and bloodshed between men and nations.

If there is hope at all, it is the shining symbol of our beloved host who stands in the place of a departed prince and wears well the mantle of his office—that man of untiring strength and exalted vision—guide and friend and guardian of the faith—His Excellency, Archbishop Terence J. Cooke.

We can look to the wisdom and integrity of such men to draw a firm, clean line between the frontiers of freedom and the borders of bigotry and say to the fear-makers, the war-mongers, the rabble-rousers and the demagogues . . . "So far shall you go—but no farther."

Yes, whether it be a distant outpost in Saigon—or the smoldering barricades of Prague—or the bloodstained pavements of our cities—let us not shirk our duty. Let us peer into the gathering darkness to discover the causes and motives, the good and the evil—and to take our stand and say: "So far shall you go—but no farther."

The time has come for us to choose between progress and extinction. The time must not pass without our making that choice.

The atomic age has produced a deadly power which our faith can convert into the salvation of mankind. If we fail now, we condemn the future to chaos and fear.

We have seen the fruits of violence on every hand. We have lived with terror, created by weapons of unimaginable consequences for which no adequate defense exists.

And yet, this fearful force can be made a stepping-stone to the ultimate exaltation of humanity.

Be not deceived. The days ahead will damn the world to destruction or deliver it to peace.

And when peace comes again, let us be sure that the billions which went for planes and guns will go into medical research and housing and schools and every worthwhile project to keep men at work and replace poverty with health, opportunity and prosperity for all.

Our first obligation is to create a universal merging of minds and hearts.

Brotherhood must become something more sincere than mere words—and politics.

Education must become something more than the helpless victim of violent men and constant strikes—and politics.

Foreign policy must become something more than wasteful subsidies—and politics.

Against the degradation of crime and war—the dissolution of morality—we must erect barriers of reason, intelligence and understanding—so that a day may come when each of us in every land carries his own mirror of conscience reflecting hope rather than despair—courage—rather than fear—decision rather than doubt.

There is a famine in the world today more serious than lack of food. Men's bodies are starved in many places, yes; but the greatest hunger is in the soul of man.

And there is a hunger in the soul of America.

Our nation was conceived by men of vision to be an example of the better life that liberty and democracy can offer.

Today's frustrations and anger—today's injustice and insecurity—should remind us that America is what we make it—for ourselves—and for our children.

It must again mean the better life. It's a big job—and not an easy one—but it is time we got busy making this country what it was meant to be . . .

We have strayed far from our ideals.

It is time to revive the impossible dream of America.

It is time to protect the pride and reverence that nourished this nation's birth of freedom . . . to fight, if need be again, to beat back the unbeatable foe . . . to right the unrightable wrong . . . to strive with our last ounce of courage to reach the unreachable stars.

QUICK MARCH TO THE REAR BY NIXON ADMINISTRATION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, of late a highly disturbing trend has surfaced in the manner in which the Nixon administration is enforcing existing legislation in the area of human rights. These advances were so dearly bought, so painfully gained. So many good men and women gave their substance, efforts, and even their lives for laws now on the books. Their names are enshrined in the hearts of millions now enjoying these freedoms. Generations yet unborn will have cause to bless their names.

For these reasons I am much disquieted at what seems to be a deliberate policy of erosion being carried forth by the Nixon administration in the area of full enforcement of these laws.

It began with awarding Army textile contracts to companies in the South with highly questionable records of fair employment and promotion practices. These corporations also had severe antilabor records as well. Protests from many quarters brought murmurings of compliance and promises of activity but no performance. So much for Department of Defense contributions to this policy.

Next came a series of slowdowns in the pace of school desegregation in the South, as civil rights compliance sections of laws were not pushed with accustomed vigor by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Encouragement was lent to other school districts to delay cooperation or submission of their plans to desegregate. That has been HEW's share.

A third chapter has been written by the Department of Transportation. Working with major construction companies and constriction trade unions which have often barred certain elements of American society from participation, major highway contracts were used to force compliance with the laws. Before acquiring such contracts, major firms had to show compliance with these laws. This restriction has recently been removed.

Now the Chairman of the Equal Opportunity Commission is grilled and threatened because he seeks to hold open the door to economic opportunity to those most in need of a chance.

So many have huffed and puffed for so long about jobs and regular income bringing new dignity, that I find these recent acts puzzling in the extreme. If we slam the door to employment shut in the faces of these citizens, then we are truly blighting their hopes and denying them their share in our American dream.

THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF PEARY EXPEDITION

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, April 6 marks an anniversary which is deserving of special recognition. Easter Sunday is the 60th anniversary of Adm. Robert E. Peary's successful expedition to the North Pole.

The last surviving member of that expedition is Rear Adm. Donald B. MacMillan, who at 95 years is enjoying his retirement by the waters of Cape Cod Bay in Provincetown, Mass. In his own right a remarkable man, Admiral MacMillan has filled his life with the challenge of exploration—the lure of the unknown that brought him to join Peary's expedition. It spurred him to lead polar expeditions on an almost annual basis until he was 84 years old.

There is something we can all learn from the triumph that was the Peary expedition's when they became the first men to set foot on the North Pole.

Many men had set out before them but had faltered when the going became too difficult. Some paid for their efforts with their lives. Peary, who had attempted the feat twice before, had failed, but persevered and was the first to reach the Pole.

Peary and his men set out to do what other men had been unable to achieve. The elements were harsh, men suffered the agonies of severe frostbite. At times it seemed that they, too, were to be turned back. Of the 24 men who started out from the S.S. *Roosevelt* at the Arctic staging point on March 1, 1909, only six reached the North Pole on April 6, 1909. They included Peary, four Eskimos and a Negro, Matthew A. Henson.

Each was inspired by his own motives and by their common bond of courage and perseverance. They had to overcome adversities and achieved what many others could not.

Each American should take notice of the bravery, courage, determination, perseverance, and strength of spirit displayed by Admiral MacMillan and other members of the expedition. We must apply them to the challenges of today.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the legacy and the challenge that Admiral MacMillan and the Peary expedition have given to us all.

EULOGY TO DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, we mourn the passing of a great and beloved American, a victorious general and a President who strove for peace. We honor Dwight David Eisenhower for a lifetime of devotion to the ideals of "duty, honor, and country."

President Eisenhower, a son of America's heartland, touched the hearts of the people of the world with the American vision of tolerance, freedom, and compassion.

His memory will be honored as much for his character as for his deeds. The qualities which made him a great man were those that have made America a great Nation: Courage, integrity, vision, compassion, and loyalty.

He was a President above partisan politics; a general whose main concern was peace; a man at once kind, gentle, and stern in his pursuit of the right. He was calm, judicious, determined, hopeful, idealistic. Americans trusted and loved him, not because he was a great man, but because he was a good man. Thoroughly American, he elicited pride in America.

He enjoyed more widespread popular support than any public figure in modern American history.

His simple nobility never left him. His humor and humility were constant. First and foremost he was a down-to-earth American who treated everyone alike, whatever their station in life. This unique humility graced his enduring warmth and friendliness. It was as if everyone of us were a member of his closest family for whom he had a fatherly concern.

We will cherish his memory for as long as the qualities he possessed are valued by men of goodwill.

We citizens of Hawaii have even more reason to honor his memory, for it was President Dwight D. Eisenhower who signed into law that bill which made Hawaii the 50th State of this great Union.

To his grieving widow, our former First Lady, Mrs. Eisenhower and to members of his family, I extend deepest sympathy and heartfelt condolences for the people of Hawaii and for myself personally.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, over a million Americans of Lithuanian descent observed the 51st anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. For over two decades after independence, in 1918, the Lithuanians made tremendous strides toward improving their nation; but, their freedom was short lived. Since 1940, 3 million Lithuanians have lived under the oppressive rule of communism and while these people cannot celebrate their own day of independence it is for us to remember and commemorate their cherished day of freedom.

I have as a part of my constituency many fine American-Lithuanians who enjoy the freedom of our country. They are faithful to publicly mark their homeland's day of independence. In this connection I am pleased to share with my colleagues a letter to the editor of the Schenectady Gazette titled "Lithuania's Tragedies Recalled."

It is also my pleasure this year to have nominated two fine young men of Lithuanian descent to the U.S. Military Academy. I am honored to include a resolution concerning those nominations presented at this year's Lithuanian Independence Day celebration in Albany, N.Y. which was signed by 89 American-Lithuanians.

The letter and resolution follow:

LITHUANIA'S TRAGEDIES RECALLED

EDITOR, GAZETTE:

As one looks over the pages of history of Russia, it becomes quite obvious that the rulers of that country have always prevented the people of eastern Europe from enjoying peace, freedom, and a better way of life. As an example, let's see how they treated the people of Lithuania.

From the time the Lithuanians were forcefully put under Russian rule in the late 18th century, until a few years before the outbreak of war in 1914, the Czars did nothing but take repressive measures against them. The Roman Catholic Church was persecuted, the Lithuanian language was forbidden to be taught in public schools, and all publication of newspapers and books in the Lithuanian language was forbidden. Despite the risks involved, Lithuanian books and periodicals were printed in East Prussia and the United States, and then smuggled into Lithuania. Homes became hidden schools where parents taught their children how to read and write their native language.

Two uprisings against the Czars ended in failure, but it was not until the end of the First World War, that their hopes and dreams became a reality.

On Feb. 16, 1918, with their homeland occupied by the German Imperial Army and Russia torn apart by political turmoil, the people of Lithuania declared their independence. They were not alone in their fight for freedom as the people of Poland, Finland, Latvia, and Estonia joined in the struggle to break away from Russian rule.

Despite all treaties made to respect the integrity and independence of Lithuania, the masters of the "new" Russia, the Soviet Union, launched a massive invasion on June 15, 1940, and quickly occupied the country. The expression, "man inhumanity to man," would be the best way to describe the attempts of the Soviets to convert the Lithuanians to communism and the Soviet way of life.

The Communist Party became the only political party permitted to function. To strengthen their grip on the population, mass arrests of those who opposed the "new order" quickly followed. Since the Communists do not recognize the existence of God, a ruthless attack on religion was initiated in order to convert the people to atheism.

The German invasion of Russia on June 22, 1941, temporarily halted the Soviet plans for Lithuania. Captured documents of the Soviet Secret Police revealed that 34,260 people were arrested and deported to Siberia, during the two-week period just prior to the German attack.

The Russians also perpetrated atrocities before fleeing Lithuania. In a forest near the city of Kaunas, for example, piles of unburied corpses numbering 5,740 were found. Among them were 15 priests.

As the Nazi Army began their retreat to Germany in 1944, the Red Army once again occupied Lithuania. The 10-year period from 1944 to 1954 must be considered as the most horrifying in the entire 1,000-year history of Lithuania. During this time, about 300,000 people were either executed or deported to Siberia. The drive against the Roman Catholic Church and its clergy was renewed with greater fury than ever before. As a result of these terror tactics, 100 priests were imprisoned, and another 180 were sent to Siberia, including three bishops. One bishop was shot to death after being convicted as " an enemy of the state."

Have the Russian rulers mended their ways since the death of Stalin? Have they learned to treat people of other nations with compassion, respect, and dignity? I find no evidence of this. The events that took place in Hungary in October of 1956, and in Czechoslovakia in August of 1968 certainly offer positive proof.

What does the future hold in store for the people of Lithuania? Nothing encouraging, I'm afraid. In 1964, orders came from Moscow, that the campaign against religion was to be so intensified that the Roman Catholic Church would be wiped out by 1980. In 1966, the Kremlin sent its special emissary, a man named Pomeransev, to survey the progress of its anti-religious war.

May the millions of innocent victims, their blood, and their suffering serve as a warning to the United States to be vigilant and to resist the hypocrisy and the lies of communism. Let us always be on guard to protect our freedom, so that we may guarantee its blessing, not only for ourselves, but for all mankind.

EDWARD W. BARANAUSKAS.

SCHENECTADY.

RESOLUTION PRESENTED AT THE 1969 LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION, ALBANY, N.Y.

Whereas, on this 16th day of February, 1969, at Albany, New York, the Lithuanian community in said city, together with its friends, is celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day; and

Whereas, even though Lithuania may no longer be free, her fine and honorable heritage lives on in the hearts of her countrymen, descendants and friends in the United States; and

Whereas, the Lithuanian community in Albany is very pleased that Hon. Daniel Button, our Congressman, through his Selection Board, has been kind enough to nominate, among others, as candidates to the United States Military Academy at West Point, two fine young men, brothers, of Lithuanian (and Scottish) descent, namely, James Russell Mackay and David Bruce Mackay, sons of Mr. and Mrs. David S. Mackay, respected members of our community; and

Whereas, said young men, James Russell Mackay and David Bruce Mackay, long known to us, do honor to their Lithuanian (and Scottish) heritage, by their exemplary conduct and achievements;

Now, therefore, be it resolved:

1. We thank Hon. Daniel Button, our Congressman, and his Selection Board, for their interest in our Lithuanian youth and for giving them the utmost opportunities; and
2. We thank Hon. Daniel Button, for his interest in our Lithuanian community, our people, our young people and all the problems that pertain to us; and
3. As a token of appreciation for his past, present and future interest in the Lithuanian cause, we sign this petition which will be sent him, as a friend of Lithuania and matters Lithuanian.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower prompts people the world over to contemplate the outstanding career of a distinguished American, affectionately known as "Ike."

This great leader whose death we mourn today was in life the personification of all that is so dearly cherished by free people everywhere. As a soldier, he was a brilliant military strategist and inspirational leader during a period of great crisis. As a statesman, he was a cohesive influence at a time when certain forces were placing in jeopardy the democratic institutions we prize. As a general and then as our President, he earned our respect, confidence, and even love but it will be as a true patriot that he will be long remembered.

The personal struggle for survival against illness so valiantly waged by General Eisenhower was characteristic of his conduct through life. He was not one to back away from a challenge or to lose heart when the going got rough. It was this spirit that sustained him and permitted him to cling to life despite great physical attacks, attacks which would have long ago claimed men of less determination.

It was John Donne who said "any man's death diminishes me because I am involved in mankind." Today, I have that feeling. As one who proudly served in the Army under General Eisenhower in time of war and as one who was privileged to serve in the Congress during the final years of the Eisenhower Presidency, I prize the honor of having been personally so identified with this soldier, statesman, and patriot.

It is difficult to realize that Dwight David Eisenhower is no more. The loss is not ours alone, it is that of all mankind.

ADDRESS BY C. FRED KLEINKNECHT, JR., 33D DEGREE, GRAND SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE SUPREME COUNCIL, ANCIENT AND ACCEPTED SCOTTISH RITE OF FREEMASONRY

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. C. Fred Kleinknecht, 33d degree, grand secretary-general of the supreme council, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, recently delivered an important address before the Topeka, Kans., Scottish Rite bodies, marking the conclusion of their spring reunion. Mr. Kleinknecht discussed the problems of unrest and violence which have plagued many of our Nation's colleges and universities. In view of current interest regarding these problems in the Congress and throughout the country, I want to bring Mr. Kleinknecht's remarks to the attention of my colleagues.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of his speech before the Topeka Scottish Rite bodies:

During the past year, college campuses across the United States from Columbia to San Francisco State erupted with violence, bloodshed, and arson. Although various groups and individuals participated in the campus unheavals, an organization of self-proclaimed radicals ironically called the Student for a Democratic Society was in the thick of this disruption. The irony of this organization is that, in spite of the promise of its label, its members are doing everything they can to destroy both democracy and society. For example, 70 persons were injured at the University of Wisconsin after the SDS organized a riot against Dow Chemical Company recruiters. At the University of Georgia, SDS-led demonstrators occupied the administration building, demanding that women students be allowed to drink and stay out all night. At that hot-bed of dissent, the University of California at Berkeley, the SDS deployed walkie-talkie-directed students as shock troops, erected barricades, and fought pitched battles with police in an assault on the Oakland induction center. In light of this very disturbing situation on our campuses, I think it would be of interest to you to dwell on the background and causes of today's campus disorders and the evils produced by the likes of the Students for a Democratic Society. After having shown you the depth of the problem facing us, I will make some proposals which I feel must be enacted if we are to preserve academic integrity and higher learning in this country.

The past two decades have witnessed a transformation in the makeup and attitudes of America's collegiate student body. The courageous young men who survived the Second World War and the Korean conflict took advantage of the G.I. bill to further their education. They were a serious lot who already had, in many cases, a wife and family. They were anxious to learn and study in the classical tradition in order to attain a degree or more and go out into the competitive society to carve a career. Due, in part, to the efforts of these graduates our economy grew by leaps and bounds and our technology entered the space age.

However, as a result of the post-war baby boom and our greater affluence, America's college population has skyrocketed from approximately 2 million, six-hundred thousand in 1955 to over 7 million in 1969. Thus, at our larger universities, freshman and sophomore classes are conducted by inexperienced teaching assistants whose average age is 26. The large state universities often, have lecture classes bloated to 1500 or more. Thousands of our students arrive on a campus expecting a close and intellectually enriching contact with experienced and well qualified professors. Instead, they find themselves facing the increasing impersonality and regimented demands of today's mass universities.

Facing such an obstacle, it is not surprising that some of these students began looking for a scapegoat. From the overwhelming majority, a minority of activists has emerged. The members of this minority have what psychologists call a "protest-prone personality." A former Berkeley professor who quit in disgust after campus totalitarians took over, found this group to be "possessed by a terrible, compulsive irrationality that corrupted their idealism." The famous longshoreman-philosopher, Eric Hoffer, puts it more simply: "They find waging revolution easier and more fun than writing a term paper."

Some among this "protest-prone" minority met in June 1962 in Port Huron, Michigan, to produce the SDS manifesto, which was a Marxist economic critique of America. By 1968, SDS claimed to have 6300 dues-paying members and another 35,000 unregistered participants in 250 chapters, all under the direction of SDS headquarters in Chicago. Although SDS began as an idea group, the activists soon took over. What are some of their tactics?

Using typical Marxist rhetoric to harangue an audience, SDS National Secretary Greg Calvert recently boasted, "We're working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment. We're actively organizing sedition." A typical tactic of the SDS is to rally the student body around a flimsy but popular issue such as dorm rules and then politicize the issue into a protest against the university's relations with the nation's defense establishment. Specific tactics to cause a school to be disrupted are.

Starting trash can fires and activating fire alarms;

Making hundreds of appointments with deans and registrars, thus overloading university machinery;

Checking out an excessive number of books to disrupt libraries and study programs.

Having become acquainted with the all-too-familiar tactics of these campus insurrectionists, one wonders just how "pink" the SDS is. After repealing a constitutional stipulation barring Communists from membership, SDS chapters abound with Maoist, Stalinist, and Trotskyite Communist Party representatives. Tom Hayden, an SDS founder, visited Hanoi in 1965 with the top U.S. red strategist, Herbert Aptheker. Other leaders went to Havana recently for Castro's international cultural congress. SDS organizer Bernadine Dohrn, an admirer of Che Guevara, says "I consider myself a revolutionary Communist." Yet, not all activists are Moscow or Peking-oriented Communists. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover sees a further menace: "Their common bond is a passionate desire to destroy, to annihilate, to tear down. To put it bluntly, they are a new type of subversive, and their danger is great."

As a result of the tactics of these groups such as SDS, Black Panthers, and the Mobilization to End the War in Viet Nam, our great universities are in danger of being irreparably damaged. In order to combat these dangerous trends on our campuses, the following courses of action are suggested:

Students and faculty must support prompt action to maintain campus peace. Dissident students and faculty are a present day version of Hitler's storm troopers and must be met with strict enforcement of the law.

College administrators must not appease or temporize with totalitarian minorities using coercion and anti-democratic tactics. If police are needed to quell a campus riot, so be it.

We must all support basic university reforms that are genuinely needed. We must do what is necessary to alleviate the impersonal atmosphere of the school systems and attend to the legitimate orderly expression of student grievances.

We must encourage our press and media to tell the story of the bright and responsible majority of our students as well as the disruptive actions of the minority but with more emphasis on the former.

It is necessary that we revere and love the god of infinite beneficence, labor for the good of the human race, strive to acquire a knowledge of the wonders of nature and the sublime truths of sound philosophy, and practice the virtues taught in freemasonry.

Many of our Masonic brethren helped establish this free country and I am convinced that, if we lack the will to thus defend our academic institutions against illegitimate disruption and takeover our future as a free society is doomed.

LET US KEEP "GENTLE BEN"

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in this modern day of protest against everything, it is refreshing to find a protest for, a protest for a wholesome, positive program on television, and against the powers that be who have arbitrarily decided to cancel the weekly show, "Gentle Ben."

At a time when we are seeing more and more violence on television and at a time when we are investigating violence on television, I think a campaign in south Florida to save a particular TV program is worth bringing to the attention of my colleagues in the House and Senate.

I would like permission to reprint in the RECORD a newspaper editorial written by Mr. George Radosevich, and a column by Mrs. Joan Bucks Hansen, both of which appeared in the North Dade, Fla., Journal. I commend these articles to the attention of my colleagues with the request that they read the same and assist, to the extent possible, in retaining this worthwhile television program:

"GENTLE BEN" SHOULD BE KEPT

It is a sad commentary on our society when a television show that is gentle, wholesome and moralistic—such as "Gentle Ben," can't stay on the air while countless shows of violence prosper.

"Gentle Ben" is more than a 600-pound black bear, or a television performer. He represents something that too often is left by the wayside in this era of drama and violence, hippies and riots, nudie plays and draft dodgers.

"Wholesome" is a word that in this day is too often sneared at. But that's what "Gentle Ben," is. Maybe that's one reason for his banishment.

And that is why we think his banishment is a mistake.

The majority of television viewers are just as wholesome as "Gentle Ben." They are concerned about the violence, and raw character of much of what is seen on the television screen.

"Gentle Ben" is not a goody-goody and neither is his friend Mark Wedloe, the warden's son. Ben and his family live in a real world with real dangers, and face them in a completely human fashion. Ben teaches the lesson that a 600-pound brute can be gentle and that implies a great deal more.

We hope our readers and television viewers across the country will take up pen or pencil to let CBS know that "Gentle Ben" is the kind of wholesome entertainment that should continue.

It is time for everyone who has been unhappy with the other kind of television entertainment—too frequently seen—to strike a positive blow for wholesome TV by helping to save "Gentle Ben."

Letters on behalf of "Gentle Ben" should be addressed to John Schneider, vice president, CBS, 51 W. 52nd St., New York, N.Y.

And if you belong to a church or civic group it would be a good idea to interest your members on a national level to help keep "Gentle Ben."

"GENTLE BEN" NEEDS YOUR HELP TO STAY ON

(By Joan Bucks Hansen)

"Gentle Ben," that 600-pound modern day version of Winnie the Pooh, will lumber away into the Everglades forever and not be seen again unless something happens to change CBS's corporate mind about dropping the program for the 1969–70 television season.

As children's fare, I don't think anything else on the TV screen can top it. Nine-year-old Mark Wedloe, the Everglades warden's son, lives out all the problems and puzzling situations that confront every child growing up.

Almost every show in the "Gentle Ben" series has represented a worthwhile lesson for both children and parents.

Most little boys don't have a 600-pound pet bear to back them up when the going gets rough. But they have big dogs. They don't have the Everglades to play in, nor alligators to avoid—but the everyday world of our city streets can be every bit as hazardous as the Everglades, and it is often inhabited by hazards that are just as real as the jaws of a gator.

"Gentle Ben," as a children's television show, is wholesome without being saccharine-sweet, and it is real in the sense that its nine-year-old hero is confronted with problems that are identical to those faced by most children.

It is difficult to see why a show of this type should be cancelled. Perhaps competing with Walt Disney, which is on at the same time, is expecting too much of the bear.

The show has all the elements that "Lassie" has—and more. Lassie has left the children's world she once inhabited for the adult world of the forest ranger, and the plots get thinner and thinner all the time. Yet the furry old girl goes on and on, without any real message or appeal to children except her soulful face and furry coat.

I'm fond of Lassie myself. But she doesn't have the kind of special child-appeal that the "Gentle Ben" series has.

I think that "Gentle Ben" is worth saving. Perhaps a deluge of letters to CBS and their local affiliates might keep "Gentle Ben" around for another season.

It would be a good way to strike a blow for wholesome television entertainment. It would be a positive approach.

It seems at times that it is easier to find people who are ready to crusade against something—against obscene literature, TV violence, drugs, and a multitude of other undesirable items—than it is to find people ready to crusade for something.

I think that a crusade to save "Gentle Ben" would be a good, and positive step toward encouraging wholesome television entertainment.

WASHINGTON OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I recently obtained some information about a voluntary group that is making an effective contribution to the Washington area. The group is Washington Opportunities for Women, Inc., or WOW.

WOW came about because of answers to a vocational questionnaire circulated among local alumnae of 50 women's colleges in 1965. These answers indicated that educated women are eager to work, but most of them are married and unable to work outside their homes full time. The needs expressed repeatedly on the quesitonnaires were part-time employment, serious volunteer work, and part-time education.

Several points seemed obvious to the women who circulated the questionnaires: trained talent is in perennially short supply everywhere; one of the best sources of manpower is womanpower; because most women are married, they require flexible scheduling in their part-time activities; family life can be enriched, rather than weakened, by a mother who is occupied outside her home part time; employers of part-time workers receive full value for each hour worked, since the employees have other hours for extraneous calls and errands; "pairing" of part-time with full-time teachers and other workers, and building flexibility into standard workweeks, require considerable thought and promotion before being widely accepted.

WOW was incorporated in 1966 as a nonprofit organization "to develop and encourage more flexible and imaginative opportunities for educated women—to enable the community to utilize the skills and talents of its women." Since then WOW has bridged the gap between the unused reservoir of able women and the unmet needs of the Washington community in several striking ways:

First. The WOW Information Center: Since 1964, in cooperation with the Professional Placement Center of the District of Columbia office of the U.S. Employment Service, WOW volunteers have staffed a hitherto nonexistent desk to serve women seeking part-time employment, productive volunteer work, or continuing education. Trained volunteers have interviewed more than 1,300 women, individually or in groups. Simultaneously, efforts have been made to develop more part-time jobs and training programs, particularly in fields with critical personnel shortages.

Second. A book, "Washington Opportunities for Women: A Guide to Part-Time Work and Study for the Educated Woman": This publication was researched and written by more than 100 WOW volunteers and published in 1967. The study is available at local bookstores.

Third. A part-time urban teaching project. WOW is in its second year of this 3-year demonstration project, in cooperation with Washington's Trinity College, to develop new teacher resources for urban schools. About 20 qualified women, unable to work as full-time teachers, are trained each year to meet the needs of inner-city schools. Then they are placed as part-time teachers in those schools. The first year's trainees are giving ample proof of the contribution to be made by part-time teachers. Initially funded by private sources, this project is now being supported by the U.S. Office of Education.

Fourth. Social work project: Since 1968, WOW has been devising methods of augmenting the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare staff by cooperating with the department in a new part-time professional and preprofessional placement program. To alleviate the damaging shortage of social workers, trained workers are now being recruited through WOW for less than the traditional 40-hour week. And competent women who do not have their master of social work degrees are being placed in the Department on a part-time basis and will be given on-the-job orientation, training, and in-service support. For those who wish to work toward their MSW degree, WOW has been exploring arrangements with both the University of Maryland and Catholic University. The part-time workers in the city's Welfare Department may receive field work credit toward their degrees. A pilot program of extended part-time graduate study leading to the MSW is being considered. Scholarship funds may be available at both universities.

In a noteworthy move, the Civil Service Commission has agreed, along with the Public Welfare Department, to count relevant volunteer work as qualifying experience for these social service jobs. WOW volunteers are working now with the CSC to simplify and speed the rating process for applicants for part-time social service jobs. For those women who lack sufficient working experience in the social service field, WOW volunteers are striving to place them at a qualifying level.

Envisioned as WOW's next step is a training and employment program combining the talents of professional and disadvantaged women.

WOW makes no charge for its services. It is an example of what can be accomplished with imagination and volunteer effort. It has recruited qualified workers for Federal agencies desiring to set up model programs demonstrating new and flexible ways to hire and utilize people. WOW's projects in Washington have trained many women who have moved or will move to other parts of the Nation, so that these women can carry their training into other areas.

The women behind WOW, Mr. Speaker, are the type of people who look at the troubled world around them, roll up their sleeves and think up solutions involving their own, not someone else's, hard work.

RESIGN, MR. FARMER, FROM SOMETHING

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is with demonstrable difficulty that most straightforward people are able to play, simultaneously, on two opposing teams. For some, on the other hand, it is easy. We can witness such an act of political agility at the present time in the case of James Farmer.

The Nixon administration has hardly fielded a team, and certainly had called few plays, yet one of its members has swapped sides and is playing for the opponents.

Of course, it will hopefully only be for one play. And I am sure he was sincere in not liking the play the coach called, and he did just move to the big leagues, and from the opponents camp anyway. Maybe it is to be expected. But some think the whole ball game could depend on this one play. Some even think that team spirit and a united effort are important. Some do not.

The player in question, Mr. James Farmer, was recruited and signed to be a member of the Nixon administration. Mr. Farmer was not, to the best of my knowledge, under any coercion or compulsion when he joined the administration. Neither, as far as I know, was he forced to join the board of directors of SANE.

Now it is time for Mr. Farmer to resign from one or the other. Personally, I would prefer his choosing to resign from the administration. The two are not compatible but it should be his decision.

One of the few plays called by the administration is the decision to deploy the "safeguard" ABM system. As a member of the administration, it seems only reasonable that Mr. Farmer either say nothing about the decision or support it. Actually, one can only wonder what credentials Mr. Farmer presents to indicate his expertise on the ABM decision. I know of his past pursuits and remember no mention of his being an expert in the fields of national defense, foreign policy, nuclear armament, or rocketry. But by the same token, I can think of little to recommend him for a position in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

He is, however, a member of this Department, and also a member of SANE. His double duty came recently when SANE sponsored a full page ad in the New York Times, an ad which among other things stated that "President Nixon, Secretary Laird and their advisers in the Pentagon seem to have lost touch with reality." "They're mad, they're absolutely mad," the ad starts out. Mr. Farmer was, of course, listed appropriately at the bottom of the page.

Mr. Speaker, I have never taken SANE very seriously. SANE has more than its share of crackpot leftists and I'm sure they have a good time of it all but it does become a bit ridiculous.

But the point is this. Mr. Farmer cannot support both and he should resign from SANE or from the administration—preferably from the administration. Or even both.

I include the text of the advertisement from the March 24, 1969, edition of the New York Times, and the list of directors and staff, in the RECORD at this point:

FROM THE PEOPLE WHO BROUGHT YOU VIETNAM: THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

They're mad.

They're absolutely mad.

Everyone can see that things at home are getting worse all the time, and that little or nothing is being done about it.

The last thing in the world we need is to spend six or seven thousand million dollars for the down payment on an anti-ballistic-missile system.

But what can you expect from the type of mind that got us into Vietnam in the first place, and that keeps plunging us back in for one-last-victory-try every time it looks as though we might finally extricate ourselves.

Mr. Nixon and Secretary Laird and their advisers in the Pentagon seem to have lost touch with reality.

There are bombs going off in our cities, but they're not coming from China or the U.S.S.R.

The air we breath is being poisoned, but it's not being done by enemy agents.

Many Americans no longer believe what the Government tells them, but it's not because they listen to Radio Moscow.

The gold in Fort Knox is, for all practical purposes, no longer our own—but the job wasn't done by Goldfinger or Smersh.

The war and weapons people have become so obsessed with International Communism, they fail to see that they themselves are laying the groundwork for a state of homegrown anarchy.

A few observations on the A.B.M.

The figure they use is six or seven billion dollars. But this is just the well-known foot in the door.

Experience with Pentagon procurement in the past indicates that actual costs run two or three times the original estimate.

Furthermore, there is every likelihood that the "light" ABM system will get heavier and heavier as it goes along, and would ultimately cost over fifty thousand million dollars.

All this for a "Maginot Line in the Sky" (as the N.Y. Times described it in a recent editorial), that would most likely be obsolete by the time it is operative, and wind up as surplus electronic junk on Canal Street.

Meanwhile, back in the U.S.S.R., do you think "their" hawks would be standing still for this?

What can we do about it?

Unfortunately, the Pentagon doesn't seem to be able to learn from experience, but we wouldn't give up hope for the U.S. Senate.

There are a lot of Senators—including conservative Republicans—who feel they were "had" by the infamous Gulf of Tonkin resolution, and this time they don't seem to be buying the Pentagon's big public relations campaign on the A.B.M.

This thing can be stopped in the Senate. But it will take the kind of grass roots' effort that did so much to change the political climate on Vietnam last year.

Our marching song has come again.

LIST OF DIRECTORS AND STAFF

SANE: a citizens' organization for a sane world.

Board of Directors: Prof. H. Stuart Hughes, Chairman; Roy Bennett, Vice-Chairman; Herbert A. Brandon, Treasurer; Robert Alpern, Dr. Paul Bechtel, Robert D. Bloom, Prof. Robert Browne, O. Edmond Clubb, David Coplon, Prof. William Davidon, John F. Delury, Dr. Harold DeWolf, Prof. James Dinsmoor, James Farmer, Jerome Frank, M.D., James B. Frankel, Philip Graff, Michael Harrington, Rabbi Isidor Hoffman, Prof. Irving Howe, Prof. Thomas Hutto, Prof. David R. Inglis, Dr. Homer Jack, Mort Junger, Arnold Kaufman, Betty Goetz Lall, Marilyn Langner, David Livingston, Rep. Allard Lowenstein, Lenore Marshall, Prof. Seymour Melman, Joseph Miller, Dr. Paul Miller, Valerie Mullen, Rev. Richard J. Neuhaus; Dr. Orlie Pell, Stanley J. Romaine, Prof. Milton Rosenberg, Doris Salzberg, Marjorie Schell, Robert Schwartz, Prof. Bennet Skewes-Cox, Sarah Smith, Benjamin Spock, M.D., Samuel Tucker, Prof. John Ullmann, Dr. Maurice Visscher, Prof. Michael Walzer, Rabbi Jacob Weinstein, Herman Will, Prof. David Wurfel, Rev. Andrew Young, Prof. Gordon Zahn, Betty Zemel, Isidor Ziferstein, M.D.

Staff: Sanford Gottlieb, Executive Director; Tudja Crowder, Program Director.

Honorary Sponsors: Lord Boyd-Orr, United Kingdom; Martin Buber, (1878–1955) Israel; Pablo Casals, Puerto Rico; Brock Chisholm, Canada; Cannon L. John Collins, United Kingdom; Gunnar Myrdal, Sweden; Martin Niemoller, Germany; Philip Noel-Baker, M.P., United Kingdom; Clarence Pickett (1884–1965); C. Rajagopalachari, India; Albert Schweitzer (1875–1965) Gabon.

SANE, 381 Park Avenue South, New York, New York 10016. Telephone (212) 889-3442.

GEN. DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to a great American, Dwight David Eisenhower.

A statesman among generals, Dwight Eisenhower's military leadership during World War II brought him the profound gratitude and respect not only of Americans, but of citizens throughout the world. This ability to lead men of diverse nationality and varying viewpoints came naturally to General Eisenhower, as a result of his character and dedication. No graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point has ever better exemplified the creed with which Academy graduates are instilled: duty, honor, and country.

Dwight Eisenhower later sought and attained our Nation's highest leadership not as a war hero, although this he was, but as a man dedicated to true world peace. His ultimate quest was for that day, as envisioned by Tennyson, when "The war drum throbbed no longer, and the battle flags were furled." As our Nation yet continues to search for realistic relationships with allies and adversaries alike, it may be that history will regard as General Esenhower's greatest accomplishment those steps which he took in furtherance of peace.

General Eisenhower inspired us, not only because of what he did, but because of his personal beliefs. He loved our country by loving its people. He sought to bring out in us those qualities which are most noble, and those ideals which he himself held dearest. In doing so, he summoned forth a unique affection among us.

Few Americans have served their country as long or as well as did Dwight David Eisenhower. We shall miss Ike.

THE LUMBER PRICE CRISIS: RESEARCH TOWARD NATIONAL CODE

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a genuine crisis in the forest products industry. Everyone is now aware of the great concern over the high prices of lumber and plywood. There are both short- and long-term solutions to this problem, which is principally one of supply, since nothing really can or should be done about demand.

If we are to achieve our national long-range housing goals, to build 26 million housing units during the next 10 years, and still keep up with demand after that period—which, if anything, will be even greater—we now must adopt a national policy to cope with this demand.

Research is an essential and integral part of any long-range solution. This is spelled out in detail in a letter which I have received from Ernest L. Kolbe, a consulting forester in Oregon.

Mr. Kolbe has long been active in forestry, and is one of the truly outstanding experts in the Nation on timber supply. I commend his letter to anyone interested in the price of lumber and plywood, and in making it possible for us to meet our long-range housing goals:

WILSONVILLE, OREG., *March 7, 1969*.

Hon. WENDELL WYATT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WENDELL: With hearings on Federal appropriations for Fiscal Year 1970 rapidly approaching, I am calling to your attention again a forestry research need that I know you regard as critically important—construction of Phase II of the U.S. Forest Service Forest Sciences Laboratory at Corvallis.

You have worked long and hard with us since 1965 to obtain this most important facility. It was in large measure through your efforts that funds were appropriated in July 1966, to plan a $2.5 million addition to the laboratory. The plans were completed in June 1967, and we were most pleased to review them with you last August in Portland at the meeting sponsored by the Northwest Forest Pest Action Council and the Forestry Committee of the Portland Chamber of Commerce.

But architectural plans in themselves obviously do not provide the needed working space for scientists to move ahead on solving critical forestry problems. Almost two years have passed and no construction funds have been appropriated. Because of spiraling building costs, estimated funds needed to complete the laboratory addition, if begun in 1969, are now $2.7 million. Building costs seem certain to increase even more in the months ahead. Thus, it would seem extremely unwise to further delay appropriations to construct this critically needed investment in the forest economy and well-being of the Northwest.

I would like to review for you again some of the specific kinds of high priority forestry research that are being held up or seriously handicapped by lack of facilities at the Corvallis laboratory:

Forest Genetics Research—The ultimate solution to many forest protection problems is to develop genetic resistance in the trees. Some examples include the need for strains of sugar pine and western white pine resistant to blister rust, strains of Sitka spruce resistant to the Sitka spruce weevil, strains of Port Orford cedar resistant to the deadly phytophthora root rot, and true-fir hybrids resistant to attack by the balsam woolly aphid.

Forest Insect Research—In the limited facilities now available, strong emphasis is being placed on research to develop biological and other alternatives to chemical control of forest insects, which kill several billion board feet of timber annually in the Pacific Northwest. For example, scientists at the laboratory appear on the verge of developing a practical means of using a virus to control the Douglas fir tussock moth, one of the most destructive insects in the West. To the extent possible, work is also in progress on use of sex attractants for controlling the European pine shoot moth, and methods of manipulating beneficial parasites to control pest insects. But these efforts are all seriously handicapped by lack of space and facilities.

Pesticides Research—An important nationwide project was begun at the laboratory in 1964 on the impacts of pesticide residues in forest soil and water. The research of this project has a strong bearing on progress toward reaching national goals of abating water pollution. Some excellent work has been done, but the scientists in this project are scattered in improvised space wherever it can be found on the Oregon State University campus. This detracts seriously from research production.

Forest Disease Research—Diseases that kill and damage trees are even more difficult to control than insects, and their impacts on forest production are nearly as great. Working in existing, badly crowded space and temporary trailers, scientists have discovered that certain beneficial organisms in the soil secrete antimicrobial substances that are antagonistic to tree diseases, such as highly destructive root rots. These leads have most promising practical value, but cannot be pursued aggressively with the limited facilities now at hand.

I could cite many more examples of high priority research that is being hampered by lack of adequate laboratory space and facilities. But when we need so urgently to move ahead in our timber management in Oregon and other parts of the West, I do not think we can afford any longer to have the outstanding forestry research units at Corvallis operating at half speed. In all our timber growing efforts we are working to save time. We have already lost two years on the Corvallis laboratory and will lose a third unless the budget is revised to get things moving again.

I want to thank you again for the important and extremely effective assistance you have given the Northwest Forest Pest Action Council and many others in improving the benefits from our great forests. I am hoping you can help further in the upcoming Congressional Appropriation Hearings by requesting the needed funds for construction of Phase II of the Corvallis Forestry Sciences Laboratory. This is a key investment in the future well-being of Pacific Northwest forests and the millions of people who depend upon them, daily use their essential products, and many other opportunities they provide.

I am sending copy of this letter to various members of the Northwest Pest Action Council because of their long-standing support of the Corvallis Laboratory.

Sincerely,

ERNEST L. KOLBE,
Consulting Forester.

WHAT IS "NEUTRALITY"?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the article which I hereby place into the RECORD from the March 7, Elgin, Ill., Daily Courier-News, by Dumitru Danielopol of the Copley News Service, is certainly a stimulating commentary on the Communist propaganda activities in Sweden:

WHAT IS "NEUTRALITY"?

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—"Neutrality" is a word the Communists don't understand, not even in Sweden.

For more than 150 years Sweden has been a country that has tried to stay aloof from disputes. It has avoided wars and in turn its neutrality has been faithfully respected. But the cold war is a different matter.

Today Sweden has become a hotbed of Communist propaganda and a most important platform for Moscow, Peking and Hanoi in carrying out their attacks against the West, against Saigon and against the United States.

The choice of Sweden was natural. Her geography, her neutrality, her democratic and liberal policies carried on for generations made her a perfect spot to give respectability and credence to Communist vilifications.

Besides Sweden has a modern communication system which permits rapid and widespread distribution of the propaganda.

The social structure of the country also played a part in this choice.

The older generation of this richest of all Scandinavian countries tends to be disinterested in world affairs. It is fundamentally anti-Communist and therefore immune to leftist propaganda.

It is not the same with the younger generation, especially the students.

Natural idealism, enthusiasm and a desire for adventure has made them a fertile soil for Communist infiltrators.

They are "manipulated by foreign and Swedish Communists who impregnate the innocent minds with beautiful visions of theoretical Marxism, Maoism and Castroism," says Lars Eric Nyman, the youth secretary of the Swedish chapter of the World Anti-Communist League and vice president of the Democratic Alliance, an anti-Communist youth and student organization.

The mathematics student of the University of Stockholm, now visiting this country, is a tough and efficient organizer.

In Saigon, where he visited recently, he convinced the government to establish a South Vietnam Information Center in Stockholm.

"Whereas the Communists spare no money and effort to flood Sweden with propaganda, the West, South Vietnam and especially the United States do very little, if anything at all," he says.

The Communists he says, work openly and stage frequent "peace conferences."

"Young delegates from African and Asian

countries are being invited in large numbers to listen to 'the views of neutral progressive' Sweden," he says.

"The well-known Moscow-financed 'World Peace Council' is the main organizer and agent behind these conferences."

Nyman says four Communist front organizations work full time in Sweden through the so-called Swedish Peace and Arbitration Society. They also have organized the "Vietnamese NFL Information Bureau in Sweden" which specializes in anti-American propaganda.

"They have convinced a majority of Swedish students and young people that the Viet Cong are a coalition of democratic groups in Vietnam, who would organize a democratic society if they were left alone—by the 'Fascist' Saigon regime and the American 'imperialist'," he says.

"The great majority of Swedes are still staunchly democratic, but when pro-Communist Swedish activists prevent the American ambassador from making a public speech, our democracy is in danger, too. Democracy cannot survive without the freedom of speech."

Nyman's 1,500-youth organization needs all the help it can get.

"We get from the Peking Embassy in Stockholm more literature in perfect Swedish than the American Embassy distributes in English," he says.

"We need more, much more accurate information from the United States—to explain your position in Vietnam."

Nyman's words are more evidence that the U.S. Information Agency has sorely neglected Western Europe.

EULOGY—DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as I ponder the life and passing of Dwight David Eisenhower, I am drawn to our great seal of the Presidency and the American eagle with its claws clenched on the sharpened arrows and a fragile olive branch.

It reminds me as I am sure it has served to remind the men who have held that office of the conflict of power and peace.

Dwight David Eisenhower dealt with power and peace as few other men ever have. He was first a military man whose career was culminated on the 6th day of June in 1944 when he led with daring and skill the most devastating army in the history of mankind. Our Nation had given the arrows of the eagle to Dwight Eisenhower. Use them, we said, so that we may have peace, and he did.

Can the fist that once clenched the arrows ever hold the delicate flower of peace without crushing it? I suspect not often.

Yet the United States found in Dwight Eisenhower a man who in war had learned to cherish peace and the 8 years of his Presidency and the remaining years of his life found him an untiring missionary for that cause.

The enormity of having held both the arrows and the olive branch of the American eagle in his lifetime left its mark on Dwight Eisenhower. So a devoted man of peace, he safeguarded his country with the most powerful military force in the world. A devoted soldier, still he warned his country of the great dangers he recognized in that force.

In fact, his warning against the power of the military-industrial complex is more timely at his passing than it was even at its uttering.

Dwight Eisenhower struck the balance of the American eagle and his passing must sorrow us all.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER: 1890–1969 — CONGRESSMAN WYDLER PRAISES IKE—CALLS FOR APPROPRIATE MEMORIAL IN NASSAU COUNTY

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, first in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his freedom-loving fellow men—was the perfect description used by President Nixon to characterize the greatest American of our generation, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The passing of "Ike" was expected, and yet his presence is still with us and his spirit lives on in our Nation.

More than any other man, he typified what is best in the American dream. His basic decency as a person and his great moral character overshadowed his exploits as the Supreme Commander in the greatest war in history and also the fact that he was President of the most powerful nation in the world. He will be remembered as a person who was all man.

It is altogether fitting that we in Nassau County should pay a special tribute to this great man. I have recommended that the Nassau County Park, called Salisbury Park, be renamed "The Dwight David Eisenhower County Park" as an appropriate memorial. It lies in the fabulous Fourth Congressional District, in the heart of Nassau County. It is filled year round with people who loved "Ike" and whom "Ike" loved. Appropriately, it has four golf courses, "Ike's" favorite form of recreation.

I am pleased this recommendation has received the support of the Nassau County Board of Supervisors. It can quickly be made a reality.

No tribute, of course, can repay the debt of our Nation to this humble and honest man. His final measure will be God's judgment, but here on earth his warm personality and character will be remembered longest.

History may call him General Eisenhower and President Eisenhower; but to this generation of Americans he will be "Ike."

RACE AND AMERICAN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the least noted but most important repercussions of America's racial problems is the negative impact which they have had upon our country's international relations. When we consider that the nonwhite peoples constitute two-thirds of the world's present population, we should not be surprised when discrimination against nonwhites in the United States seriously damages our national posture in foreign countries.

In a speech at Stetson University on March 10 of this year, Franklin H. Williams addressed himself to the issue of "Race and American Foreign Affairs." Mr. Williams is one of the most distinguished and articulate spokesmen for the cause of equal opportunity in America today. He served as U.S. Ambassador to Ghana from 1966 to 1968, and is currently the director of the Urban Center at Columbia University. His thoughtful remarks are worth the consideration of all who are concerned with the conduct of American foreign policy.

I insert the text of his speech at this point in the RECORD:

RACE AND AMERICAN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(By Franklin H. Williams)

Despite the paramount importance of race in our domestic life very little has been written of its role in American foreign affairs. But every now and then something appears that gives some insight into this important subject.

A small news story in the center pages of the February 23rd issue of the New York Times graphically demonstrates Africa's place as a continent of concern in shaping American foreign policy. The article reads:

"Chelsea House Publishers announced last week that Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., the historian, will be general editor of a five-volume 'Documentary History of American Foreign Affairs, 1945–1970'."

Few events have more influenced the form and character of international relations during this period than the emergence into independence of more than 30 African states. Yet note the titles of the volumes to be included in the history:

"East Europe and Soviet Union . . . Asia . . . Western Europe . . . United Nations . . . and Latin America."

Africa? Apparently, as far as American foreign affairs is concerned, the second largest continent in the world, with millions of people, has not existed from 1945 to the present. This to me is especially upsetting since for almost three years I represented our nation as Ambassador to a Black African country. It seems that in the view of Chelsea House and Professor Schlesinger, it either wasn't there or somehow did not count.

THE INVISIBLE CONTINENT

Ralph Ellison has characterized the plight of the Black man in America as that of the "invisible man". He is simply ignored as a living, breathing, sentient person. This tendency to treat Black people as if they weren't there also seems to apply to Africa, and to the problems of race in international affairs generally. If you look at practically any textbook on international relations published in recent years, there is virtually no discussion of racial factors. In eleven texts published in America since 1960, the entry "race", or its equivalent, can be found in only five of their indexes, and in three of the five the index refers the reader to less than three paragraphs of text. Yet with the possible exception of the Western European colonial empires, no nation's foreign affairs have been more influenced by racial considerations—positive and negative—than America's.

Domestically, race is a matter of deep national concern and divisiveness, and inevitably, our resolution of this national problam will directly effect our role in world affairs and our influence as a world power. Though we often refer to our country as an ethnic melting pot, America is invariably seen and sees itself—as a white Anglo-Saxon Christian nation. As a result, our policies towards non-white peoples have been marked by what can fairly be called "white imperialism", on a political level, and "benevolent racism", on an ethnic level.

Domestically, our immigration laws, from the early Oriental Exclusion Acts to our present statutes, have established national immigration quotas in direct proportion to the whiteness of the country of origin. Further, the internment of the Nesei—but not citizens of German descent—during World War II reflected a national uneasiness with citizens of darker hue.

DOUBLE STANDARD IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

It should be noted that these are matters of contemporary history: Asians were barred from naturalized citizenship until 1946. Finally, the long continued almost total absence of Black, brown or yellow Americans from our foreign policy-making councils not only supports this uneasiness but invariably influences our policy-making decisions relative to the world's majority.

Externally, the Boxer rebellion; our economic support of racist South Africa; our military alliance with colonial Portugal, and our apparent readiness to resist colored in contrast to white communist aggression suggest the existence of a double standard in our international relations. It appears, indeed, that we have a bi-partisan ethnic foreign policy: one operating favorable for countries most similar to our own—predominantly white—and the other taking a more negative posture toward those countries whose inhabitants are predominantly non-white.

Over a hundred years ago, in 1854, Martin R. Delaney, a physician, author and Negro leader, spoke these prophetic words:

"The white races are but one-third of the population of the globe—or one of them to two of us—and it cannot much longer continue that two-thirds will passively submit to the universal domination of this one-third."

By 1900, Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, a distinguished Black scholar and intellectual, was no longer predicting. He stated unequivocally that "the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line."

Contemporary history validates this prediction. The two great white nuclear powers, locked in a battle for world supremacy, are attempting to win the allegiance of the uncommitted nations. But the uncommitted—with few exceptions—are colored—and China's entry into the nuclear fraternity, with its unabashed effort to speak for the non-white peoples of the world, has complicated the struggle. Russia's advantage flows from its revolutionary and supposedly non-colonial history. Ours comes also from our revolutionary history, as reflected in the language of our basic documents and the rhetoric of our founding fathers. But this advantage has been eroded if not totally offset by past practices of slavery and segregation and the fact that America is still dominated by essentially racist institutional structures.

Black Americans, who suffered and still suffer from this condition, have always known that American life was permeated with racism; but it took the Kerner Report to drive this point home. At one point the report states: ". . . White racism is essentially responsible for the explosive mixture which has been accumulating in our cities since the end of World War II . . . What white Americans have never fully understood—but what the Negro can never forget—is that white society is deeply implicated in the ghetto. White institutions created it, white institutions maintain it, and white society condones it."

Today we run the risk that our immersion in day-to-day crises may blur our memory of the past, and that the press emphasis on Black demands may gloss over the systematic and cruel exclusion of the non-white American from the mainstream of national political and economic life throughout our history.

A WORLD SAFE FOR RACISM

Let me refresh your recollection just a little.

In 1901, President Wilson, the man who was to make the "world safe for democracy", described the colored American as a "homeless class, unpracticed in liberty, unschooled in self-control; never established in any habits of prudence, bewildered and without leaders, and yet insolent and aggressive: sick of work, covetous of pleasure—a host of dusky children untimely put out of school."

The treatment of Black Americans—including 360,000 soldiers—during and after the war to make the world safe for democracy, proved that Wilson did not have them in mind when he talked of defending freedom. The last six months of 1919 saw 25 bloody race riots, and in that year more than 70 black people were lynched, including ten soldiers in uniform.

The despair that gripped the Black ghettos following the war spawned the Garvey Back to Africa movement, which attracted over 2 million dues paying members. His goal was similar to that of some advocates of Black power today: economic and political control by Black people over their own Black communities. But in 1933 it was estimated that two-thirds of the Harlem labor force was unemployed. World War II created jobs, of course, but institutional racism insured, as usual, that they were on the bottom of the ladder of opportunity. The President of the North American Aviation Company, for example, stated in 1941 that "while we are in complete sympathy with Negroes, it is against company policy to employ them as aircraft workers or mechanics, *regardless of their training*. There will be some jobs as janitors for Negroes".

After the war, returning Black veterans were expected to fall back into their traditional inferior places. The same old conviction, rooted in slavery, was still in general currency: "Black people are inferior, and we're going to keep it that way." In the armed services itself, Black volunteers and draftees had to fight for the right to fight. For example, Black soldiers overseas were assigned to unskilled non-combat duties until the Battle of the Bulge, when they were organized into platoons and assigned to the front, one platoon to a white company. It was not until 1950, when our segregated army landed in South Korea to defend a colored nation, that harsh military necessity forced President Truman to order the elimination of this embarassing contradiction.

It cannot be denied that there have been major modifications of our domestic racial policies since that time. Some have been fundamental; for example, the judicial rejection of the constitutionality of enforced racial segregation. In the main however, such changes have affected more the form of our behavior than the content of our racial ideologies. From the day our founding fathers—some of them slave holders—committed the nation to the achievement of a domestic society within which all men shall be free and equal, to the present where Black Americans still live in substantial insulation and isolation, it would be fair to say that racism based on color differences has been an incipient, if not indigenous characteristic of our country. As James Conant phrased it, slavery has been the "congenital defect" in the making of the country, for it built self-deception into the very matrix of the American image.

The descendants of the more than 500,000 Black Americans who survived the voyages from Africa still seek the "promised land" of freedom and unrestricted opportunity. Mutiny aboard ship, unremitting slave rebellions, the underground railroad, experiments with resettlement in Africa, sit-ins, riots, and alternative present-day schemes for Black status and Black communities with Black capitalism all mark unrelenting efforts on the part of Black Americans to find some solution to their American condition.

MORE BLACK DIPLOMATS NEEDED

Unless we bring the Black American fully into the main-stream of live in our nation, this important body of nationals—12.5% of the population—will be able to contribute little to our international relations. Unfortunately, we seem to be making little progress in this direction. A new administration has recently assumed leadership without a single Black person in a key State Department post. On the international scene, we have dropped from seven Black Ambassadors, including two in Europe, one in the Middle East, three in Africa and one at the United Nations to a total of four: one in Malta and three in Africa. Though there has been a small increase in the number of non-whites in the Foreign Service at the junior level, the number of senior grade Black officers is at a standstill, with less than a dozen based in Washington or abroad.

The mounting domestic racial crisis has emerged, next to Vietnam, as the major inhibiting factor in achieving respect, communication and support for America and its policies not only throughout the non-white world, but in Scandinavia and elsewhere as well. The gravity of race as a United States domestic problem and as an international crisis is summarized in a recent statement of the Institute of Race Relations in London:

"It is no longer necessary to emphasize the importance of race as a domestic issue in the United States. In Britain, too, this has become a national issue; we may still be in time to learn from American experience and prevent the problem reaching the gravity it has in the United States, but only if exchange of ideas is urgently sought and quickly translated into action.

"It is less generally recognized that ideas about race play a part in every major confrontation of the world today. World poverty, world hunger, world population, and the operation of aid programmes, are all affected; efforts for peace, the activities of the United Nations, the working of international agencies are frustrated by the suspicions and resentments which arise from race. Failures to solve the domestic problem in the United States and Britain; failure to enforce the views of the United Nations in South West Africa and in Rhodesia, failure to achieve peace in Vietnam—all increase the sense of frustration among the developing nations. The line between rich nations and poor and the line between white and non-white are dangerously near coinciding and the polarization of the world into camps divided by these lines become increasingly serious. In the power struggle between the United States, Russia and China, political use is made of this polarization and it is a major contribution to instability. There are influential people who speak of a 'race war' on a world scale as inevitable if not already in progress. But surely more reasonable courses are open if men apply their minds to the possibilities".

Dr. James Moss of the University of the State of New York has found that in spite of the long tradition of African students studying in the United States most African students experience some form of racial discrimination during their stay in the United States. Indeed, he reported that one group of African students studying in the midwest became more disaffected the longer they stayed in the United States. When we consider the history of discrimination towards African diplomats and other distinguished visitors during their stay in this country, coupled with the documented evidence that some of the most damaging effects upon our American-African relations derive from experiences with racially and culturally unsophisticated white Americans on varying assignments in Africa, is it any wonder that we are so disliked in that continent? Dr. Joseph Kennedy's research findings and conclusions five years ago are just as relevant today as then:

"Today, the entire world is caught up in a great twopronged struggle—a struggle for material and human equality. The American Negro quest for civil rights, the independence of nations, world revolutions, are a part of this larger struggle. For most countries the dissolution of old alliances and the formation of new friendships and relations will be determined by the outcome of this great struggle.

"Where this struggle takes on racial overtones, as it must in Africa, (for the African, like the American Negro, has lived with minority status within the concept of white superiority and Black inferiority) the United States finds itself in an extremely sensitive, tenuous position—much more so than the Soviet Union or England, or any other country in the world. The United States is the major force in the 'free world' standing for democracy, individual expression, and human rights. The United States has the largest Black population any place in the world outside Africa itself. Yet, the United States has an extremely negative racial image in Africa and around the world."

If our country therefore is to alter its image as one of the most hated nations in the world by non-white peoples, nothing short of a major transformation in our racial posture and priorities domestically and internationally will suffice.

The United States and our Western allies must begin to deal with the reality of an international community of non-white peoples, bound together in a common struggle against white racism and imperialism, in which our country is one of the major protagonists. I must here confess my own doubts on this score. Far too many of our policymakers seem to consider that, in the context of world wide priorities, non-white peoples are of too little consequence to merit the kinds of activities on the massive scale that I believe are essential if racial polarization is to be reversed.

BLACK MAN'S STRUGGLE IS STRUGGLE OF AMERICA

From our founding this nation and the Black man have been inextricably committed to each other. America's commitment rose out of the contradictions of slavery and democracy—a contradiction which had to be resolved if the republic was to endure. "Indeed, I tremble for my country," Thomas Jefferson told the Virginia House, "when I remember that God is just." Recognizing the contradiction inherent in his plight, and using the Christian ethic and democratic rhetoric as his tools, the Black man hewed his way out of first slavery then enforced segregation. He looked upon his activity as self-liberation; the deeper truth is that the Black man's struggle is the struggle of America itself seeking its *true* identity.

It was not by accident that as America came into its own as a world power during and after World War II, the Black man came to represent the conscience of the nation and he advanced in direct proportion to his ability to embarrass America in times of international crises. My point is clear, I hope;—The fate of America and the fate of the Black man are one and the same. The challenge to the one is mirrored in the increasing freedom of the other. I submit that with the advent of national independence abroad and increasing racial opportunity at home the question of color will steadily dissolve into a question of economics. The residual issue then that will have to be faced during the remainder of the 20th century is the struggle between the haves and have-nots.

The danger lies in the fact that the historical events of the past 350 years have doomed the majority of the non-white peoples of the world to the category of the have-nots. Our domestic danger is that we may lack sufficient national concern or commitment to make of our Black minority an asset rather than a liability. It would be a pity if the United States, which held out such hope for the world's needy and oppressed, found itself isolated and alone because of its own inability to root racism out of its national body at a critical point in its own survival. Where then would we turn? How impregnable would our white defense be?

TRAFFIC IN PORNOGRAPHY

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a national crisis in the spread of pornographic literature and films to the youth of America.

The inexorable flow of noxious, hard-core pornography continues to fill our newsstands, pours unsolicited into our homes, and threatens to contaminate young and impressionable minds. We must do something about it.

Since the vast majority of traffic in smut is interstate, and since the mail is the prime mover of the material, it is imperative that we pass effective Federal laws to crack down on this.

I have introduced a bill to prohibit the dissemination of books, magazines, movies, and other materials in interstate commerce which are harmful to those under 18 years of age.

It is patterned after a New York State statute which would make it a Federal crime to knowingly sell, offer for sale, loan, deliver, distribute, or provide to a minor in interstate commerce or through the mails material which is defined as "harmful to minors" under the bill.

It would also prohibit the exhibition to a minor of a motion picture, show, or presentation which falls in the "harmful to minors" category.

In April of last year the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of this New York State statute prohibiting sale to persons under 17 years of age of materials defined as obscene to them, even though the same material might not be obscene to adults.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that the Federal Government must follow the lead of New York State and pass a similar law. The health and well-being of our children depends on it.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO URGES ELIMINATION OF DEPLETION ALLOWANCE ON OIL PRODUCED OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable CHARLES A. VANIK, in cosponsoring H.R. 9896, a bill designed to eliminate the oil depletion allowance on oil produced outside the United States.

I commend my able colleague (Mr. VANIK) for taking the lead in proposing this legislation, and I am delighted to extend my support by cosponsoring this bill.

Rarely if ever in our Nation's history has the importance of reforms to our tax structure been as clear as they are today. We have just learned that the President is requesting an extension of the surcharge on our income taxes for another year. In view of the continuing inflation, this extension may indeed be necessary. But it makes clearer than ever the need to examine the various elements in our tax law that enable hundreds of millions of dollars that should go into the Federal Treasury to escape into the hands and pockets of wealthy individuals and prosperous corporations. Probably none of the loopholes, so called, has received more attention than the oil depletion allowance.

In spite of the wide-scale denunciation of this depletion allowance, however, it would be reckless in the extreme to abandon it altogether. Clearly, as those engaged in the exploration and drilling for oil have rightly pointed out many times, the depletion allowance has served an important role in providing a needed incentive for the finding and exploitation of new sources of oil. In this age of the internal combustion engine and its myriad offspring, we cannot afford to take a chance of a depletion of our oil resources without steps to compensate for what we remove from the ground.

But it is an entirely different matter to allow our giant oil corporations to undertake this oil development anywhere in the world and to be able to take the full percentage depletion allowance, enabling them to pay taxes at a far lower rate than most other major corporations, as the House Ways and Means Committee in its recent hearings on tax reform has so amply demonstrated.

In an era when we still cannot be assured of guaranteed access to other parts of the world on a permanent basis—and this holds particularly true of the vulnerable Middle East, one of the most important sources of petroleum outside the

United States—it is reckless and unwise to encourage our oil companies in their extensive exploration in these areas by means of what amounts to a public tax subsidy.

In other words, while there is an important case to be made for developing our petroleum resources within our own boundaries, so that no matter what the world situation, we will be fully assured of an ample supply of domestically produced petroleum, these arguments should not be applied to petroleum exploration overseas. This is all the more true with the promising developments for oil exploration in Alaska and other parts of the Western United States.

I therefore strongly urge the adoption of my bill, H.R. 9896, which will retain the oil depletion allowance for that portion of oil companies' production that derives from domestic sources, sources which must be developed in the interest of American security and the adequate functioning of our entire economy, but which will put a halt to this percentage depletion allowance on production from foreign sources. This is too urgent a matter to brook delay. I hope that the Congress will respond promptly and positively.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Emerson once wrote that there is in reality no history, only biography. There is a sense in which the lives of great men who move on the stage of world history do constitute the history of our times. This was unquestionably true of the life of Dwight David Eisenhower, General of the Army, and 34th President of the United States. For almost two decades his commanding presence was felt first in the councils of war and then in the councils of civilian government. For countless generations to come schoolboys will become familiar with the role that he played during the years that the fate of Western civilization literally hung in the balance and Nazi barbarism threatened the world. His contributions in melding together the forces of freedom and marshaling the necessary unity that was necessary to achieve victory were truly enormous. Through it all he maintained the essential humility and nobility of character that is the hallmark of greatness.

His achievements as our 34th President were to further illuminate his already illustrious record. Although schooled in war, his passion was peace, and a grateful Nation will never forget that he ended the bloody and tragic episode known as the Korean war. His open-skies proposal and his atoms-for-peace proposals were further impressive evidence of his complete willingness to subordinate the principle of military supremacy to the far nobler goal of achieving true international amity and understanding.

The record of Dwight David Eisenhower's life will serve as a reminder to coming generations that liberty is something which we must sometimes fight to preserve. Perhaps even more significantly his life of service to his country will serve to asseverate the proposition that the very future of our democratic institutions depends for its maintenance upon men who will also live by the same principles which others die to defend.

These words by Goethe would constitute a fitting epitaph to the life and times of one of America's greatest heroes:

Yes, This thought I hold with firm persistence;
The last result of wisdom stamps it true;
He only earns his freedom and existence
Who daily conquers them anew!"

AMERICA'S PAST AT MYSTIC SEAPORT

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a very interesting article which appeared in the April issue of Today's Health. The account, written by Alan Rosenthal, dealt with the historic Mystic Seaport on the coast of southeastern Connecticut in my congressional district.

This restored village captures the spirit of a great era in U.S. maritime development, and provides a fascinating history lesson of value to those of all ages. More than 400,000 visitors come to Mystic each year to climb aboard the half dozen old square-riggers and inspect more than 100 smaller craft. In all, the exhibit covers 37 acres and includes cobblestone streets, shops, and homes just as they were when Mystic was a bustling 19th-century port.

Easily reached by all means of transportation, a trip to Mystic is an adventure into America's past, and as one observer noted: "It's a rare visitor who leaves without a touch of sea fever." The article follows:

MYSTIC SEAPORT

(By Alan Rosenthal)

A short drive from the bustle of New York or Boston lies an easygoing New England seafaring village of another century. Tall-masted ships rock gently at piers; carpenters repair wooden fishing boats at the shipyard; a smithy fashions harpoons at a fiery forge; youngsters eye penny candy in the general store; musicians tune their instruments on the village bandstand.

This is Mystic Seaport on Connecticut's southeastern shore. Each year, more than 400,000 visitors journey to this living memorial to America's maritime heyday. The tourists clamber around a half-dozen old square-riggers and more than 100 smaller craft. They stroll down cobblestone streets and visit the restored shops and homes of a 19th-century Yankee coastal community. In a single day, a family can examine the 37 acres of exhibits designed to rekindle an appreciation of America's colorful nautical history. (Those especially interested in history and the sea might even want to devote two days to Mystic Seaport.)

The wooden-hulled whaler *Charles W. Morgan* dominates the waterfront, her stately mainmast rising some 110 feet above her main deck. Constructed in 1841, this restored sailing ship carried the U.S. flag to every ocean on the globe as she tracked the wily whale for more than 80 years. Her ship's log contains tales of hair-raising sea chases, battles with South Sea cannibals, an encounter with a giant squid, and the rigors of tropical hurricanes.

Even modern landlubbers—and youngsters, especially—may sense the romance of the sea as they trod the *Morgan's* oak decks, view harpoons and whale-oil casks, and squeeze through the cramped quarters once used by seamen on cruises that lasted as long as four years.

Nestled against another pier is the sleek square-rigger *Joseph Conrad*, a vessel that has borne the flags of three nations. Launched in 1882 in Denmark, this 110-foot-long sailing ship boasts an iron hull, teakwood decks, and the rigging to carry some 12,000 square feet of canvas. For more than 50 years she sailed the seven seas under the name *Georg Stage*, operating as a training ship for the Danish merchant marine. Next she was rechristened the *Joseph Conrad* and sent to sea under the British flag.

In 1936, the ship was purchased by American sportsman George Huntington Hartford and entered in Atlantic Ocean races flying the Stars and Stripes. During World War II she again operated as a training ship—this time for the U.S. Maritime Commission. In 1947 the *Conrad* was nosed into her final berth in the Mystic River and formally assigned to the Marine Historical Association, operators of Mystic Seaport.

Among the other historic vessels in the harbor is the *L. A. Dunton*, a 124-foot-long Gloucester fishing schooner. This two-masted craft is one of the last descendants of the era when fishing was a leading American industry. Mystic's waterfront also features a flotilla of smaller craft, including cargo vessels, racing schooners, sloops, fishing boats, ice boats, oyster harvesters—even kayaks and outriggers from faraway Alaska, Hawaii, Samoa, and the Philippines.

Near the tip of the Seaport peninsula, just east of the lighthouse, is one the community's busiest enterprises, Greenman Brothers Shipyard. In this working exhibit, visitors can watch skilled craftsmen restore and repair vessels of the Mystic fleet.

In nearby buildings, artisans demonstrate the trades practiced in a typical 19th-century coastal village. In the shipcarver's shop, a carpenter restores old figureheads from wooden ships. His store also contains an impressive display of wood carvings, gilded eagles, fancy nameboards, and other reminders of the age of sail. In the shipsmith's shop, the forges are still used to form miniature harpoons for the tourist trade, as well as shackles, cable, and fittings used in the restoration of Mystic Seaport's navy.

Other buildings around the shipyard recreate the shops where fittings, sails, ropework, barrels, and provisions were supplied for mariners of the 1800's. At most of Mystic Seaport's exhibits, attendants in period costumes are on hand to demonstrate equipment and answer questions.

In the weavers' shop on Seaport Street, hand-operated looms and spinning wheels hum as they did a century ago. Next door is the old firehouse, containing a display of 19th-century firefighting gear that entices boys of all ages.

Just down the street is the village tavern, a vital structure in the old coastal community. Here, visiting seamen and townspeople gathered to eat, drink, play cards or checkers, tell tall tales, and plan new voyages.

The taproom of Schaefer's Spouter Tavern originally stood at Stoddard, New Hampshire. Rebuilt and enlarged at Mystic, the tavern is nautically fitted out with ship models, sea chests, harpoons, pewter mugs, and paintings of seafaring scenes.

Just off the waterfront are other restored town buildings, including homes, a chapel, schoolhouse, clock shop, and woodcarver's store. In the general store—which formerly performed the functions of a combination social club, supermarket, political soapbox, and department store—tourists may view an old potbellied stove, cracker barrels, hand-operated coffee mill, penny candies, and shelves full of items rarely seen in 20th-century stores.

The doctor's office and apothecary shop provides another fascinating glimpse into New England life a century ago. The store adjoins the physician's quarters, since the 19th-century doctor compounded and dispensed his own prescriptions. The office and reception room contain the medical collection of Dr. Joseph Bringhurst, who practiced in Wilmington, Delaware, around 1800. The pharmaceutical collection dates back as far as 1793, with such items as alum for dressing wounds, leech jars, and bleeder knives.

Buckingham House, now located on Mystic's Village Street, was first constructed at Saybrook, Connecticut. In 1951, the house was floated by barge to the Seaport. The main portion of the two-story home was built in 1768. The kitchen ell, moved from an older building and attached to the main house, dates back to about 1690. Rooms were expertly restored and furnished in the 18th-century manner. The great kitchen fireplace is flanked by iron cauldrons, fireplace cranes, and pewter dishes. This is just one of the town's residences fitted with antiques and nautical appointments.

In addition to restored village buildings, Mystic Seaport features numerous small museums devoted to America's maritime tradition. The largest of these, the Stillman Building, contains fully rigged ship models, ship figureheads, whaling implements, whale-oil lamps, and scrimshaw—etchings and carvings on whale teeth and bones, made by sailors to relieve the monotony of shipboard routine. Walls of the Stillman Building are decorated with nautical paintings, prints, and murals created by such noted artists as George Wales and Currier and Ives. Other formal display buildings feature additional relics of sea lore.

A worthwhile stop for the tourist family is the Pynchon Junior Museum, designed with children in mind. Exhibits include diving equipment, artifacts brought back from the Orient, and ship models. In the museum's back yard is a play area resembling a ship's bridge. Youngsters can take turns at the wheel, peer down river through binoculars, even scramble up a miniature mast.

In the planetarium, visitors of all ages get an idea of astronomy's important role in navigation. An expert lectures as a projector recreates the heavens on the dome-shaped ceiling. Sundials and sextants are among the celestial navigation instruments on exhibit.

Other formal displays include the Mystic River Diorama, which provides a bird's-eye view of the area as it appeared 100 years ago, and the Aids to Navigation Building, housing such items as buoys and lightship models.

Service buildings are set well apart from exhibit areas, divorcing commercialism from the 19th-century atmosphere. But hungry tourists can find vittles to fit any mood or pocketbook at the Seamen's Inne. Distinctive dining is available in the Whaler Room or Tap Room; a more informal atmosphere may be found in the Sailor's Room or cafeteria. During the summer, food and beverages may be purchased at the Pantry or Clam Shack near the south parking lot. There's also a pleasant picnic area nearby. The Variety Store and Seaport Store are stocked with gift items and souvenirs.

Among the educational services offered at Mystic Seaport are college-accredited courses in American maritime history and classes in astronomy and navigation. Basic seamanship and sailing instruction is provided for young people on weekends and throughout the summer. Participants in the Mariner Training Program serve a short tour aboard the *Joseph Conrad*, living in seamen's quarters, learning to swab decks and. polish brass between classes. Advanced students may cruise open waters aboard the schoonr *Brilliant*.

Special-interest tours are conducted year around for school children, scouts and other groups. These youngsters are admitted to the Seaport at reduced group rates.

Mystic Seaport's facilities are open to tourists every day of the year except Thanksgiving and Christmas. Hours are from nine a.m. to five p.m., except in the winter, when closing time is four in the afternoon.

The Seaport is easy to reach by car, bus, rail, air, even boat. (However, if you are coming by sea and need dock accommodations be sure to make reservations well in advance.)

The village is located about one mile south of Interstate 95—the major highway between New York City and Boston. Road distances are about 135 miles from Manhattan, 95 miles from Boston, roughly 50 miles from Providence, Rhode Island. New London, Connecticut, lies about 10 miles due west. Ample parking lots are adjacent to the grounds, and motels and hotels are nearby.

Spring is an especially inviting time to visit Mystic Seaport. Greenery is beginning to decorate trees and lawns; flowers in gardens throughout the village are adding color to the scene and fragrances to the scent of the sea. According to one observer, "It's a rare visitor who leaves without a touch of sea fever."

TRIBUTE TO LEWIS E. TURNER

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, many of us on the Hill have known for years of the sterling qualities and outstanding contributions to America's defense effort by Lewis E. Turner. He has been a tower of strength to the Air Force secretariat throughout his service in that Department. He is presently serving as Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations. It is gratifying to note that Mr. Turner was the recipient recently of two of the highest honors which can be bestowed on a Government employee.

On February 15, then Secretary of the Air Force Harold Brown presented Mr. Turner the Air Force's highest decoration for public service, the Exceptional Civilian Service Award, for displaying "an unusual capacity to assume demanding responsibilities" and for exhibiting "rare managerial talent in directing the Air Force installation program." Specifically cited was Mr. Turner's "exemplary leadership in meeting the urgent construction needs engendered by combat operations in Southeast Asia," and recognizing his "substantial contribution to the security of the United States."

The following month, on March 21, Mr. Turner was one of eight Government employees honored by the Air Force Association at its convention in Houston, Tex. He received a special citation recognizing his "exceptionally outstanding service to the U.S. Air Force, active and reserve, in the timely provisioning of facilities to support mission requirements of a rapidly changing military force."

Prior to appointment in February 1964 to his current position, Mr. Turner was executive vice president of the H. C. Smith Construction Co., Los Angeles, Calif. His Government service, however, dates back to 1940 when he began his civil service career. From 1947, when he joined the Air Force, to 1952 he was that service's budget officer, later serving as Chief of the Military Personnel and Construction Division from 1952 to 1959. He became Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management in 1959, serving in that capacity until he left in 1961 to assume his position with the Smith Co.

As Deputy Assistant Secretary for Installations, he is responsible for policy matters in connection with installations planning and programing, acquisition and disposal of Air Force real estate, construction of bases and facilities, family housing, and maintenance of real property.

Born in Radford, Va., Mr. Turner received his early schooling there. His mother, Mrs. O. B. Turner, is still a Radford resident. He married the former Kate Pettus, daughter of Mrs. Ed Pettus of Hope Hull, Ala. The couple have three children, Michael, Barbara, and Jo Ann. They live at 3539 North Valley Street, Arlington, Va.

I am confident that my colleagues in the House join me in extending warmest congratulations to Mr. Turner on these highly merited awards.

CASSIDY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I speak today in praise of a man who has lent his dignity to the term "bureaucrat" and who through almost 30 years of service has used his humanity to make more human an often impersonal Federal agency.

He is John Joseph "Jack" Cassidy, head of the San Jose office of the Social Security Administration, since the doors were first opened in that office on October 18, 1938.

"Jack" Cassidy will retire this October, a retirement welcomed only by those who have felt his might and just wrath as he fought for the defenseless. For many thousands of the citizens of my district who have been served by "Jack" Cassidy, his retirement, deserved as it is, will be a time of regret, as well as pleasure. "Jack" Cassidy has always fought for the individual, not the system.

A mark of his service is that in the almost 7 years I have served in Congress I have never received a complaint about "Jack" Cassidy or the office he heads—a unique record for any bureaucrat. Instead he has been praised and I would add my praise and that of my staff for the time, the effort, and incredible effectiveness of "Jack" Cassidy. He has served well.

I would like to include in the RECORD an article by Harry Farrell of the San Jose Mercury on the retirement of this remarkable public servant:

THAT'S "JACK" CASSIDY: A "DIFFERENT" BUREAUCRAT

(By Harry Farrell)

Let's start off today with a little quiz for the old-timers.

What major public administrator in this area has been in office continuously longer than any incumbent member of the San Jose City Council, of the Board of Supervisors, of the entire State Assembly, or the entire State Senate?

What local public official has held his job longer than any Californian now serving in either house of Congress?

What official has a span of service covering the federal administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and Richard M. Nixon?

What official has held his job during the governorships of Frank F. Merriam, Culbert L. Olson, Earl Warren, Goodwin J. Knight, Edmund G. Brown and Ronald Reagan?

REILLY?

If you've been around a long time, you may think we're talking about George Reilly, the perennial 1st District member of the State Board of Equalization.

If so you're wrong, because Reilly, although meeting almost every test encompassed in the foregoing quiz, flunks on one of them. According to our records, his term of office is exactly matched by one state senator, Randy Collier from Yreka. Both Reilly and Collier first took office in January, 1939.

The gentleman we're thinking about was on the job here about three months earlier than that.

He is John Joseph (Jack) Cassidy, who has headed the San Jose office of the Social Security Administration since it opened on Oct. 18, 1938.

This October, after 31 years on the job, Cassidy will retire, on reaching the mandatory quitting age of 70.

DIFFERENT

In the traditional definition of the word, we suppose, Jack Cassidy is a bureaucrat. But from here to Washington, he is recognized as a bureaucrat with a difference.

Too often in dealing with a public official, the citizen feels he is in a losing fight against overpowering forces of government boondoggling. This has been true with the Social Security Administration as well as other agencies.

But here in San Jose, when a genuinely aggrieved citizen is fighting the system, he finds Cassidy fighting on his side—not the bureaucracy's.

We have not been on our job as long as Cassidy has been on his, but over the years we remember him in the newspaper office time after time, always to spread some bit of publicity that would unsnarl red tape, speed up official action, or right a wrong.

Cassidy's superiors know him for the fighter he has always been.

A few years ago we had occasion to deal with Social Security Administration officials all the way up to the headquarters in Baltimore, in connection with a news story. We found that all of them knew Cassidy. Many had felt his wrath.

When Cassidy took over Social Security here in San Jose, he had a staff of three, working out of the Post Office Building at First and St. John streets.

EXPANSION

He originally had a four-county jurisdiction—Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, San Benito and Monterey.

Today, with geographic responsibility that does not even embrace all of Santa Clara County, he has 53 employes working at 500 S. 1st St. The advent of Medicare enormously enlarged his operation.

Just a few days ago, Cassidy gave us permission to divulge his role in tipping off the papers a couple of years ago when Medicare payments were hopelessly snarled. The result was a major publicity blast that shook the Social Security Administration from top to bottom, and achieved at least temporary improvement.

"I don't care who knows it now," Cassidy said. "I only have six months to go, and even if they wanted to fire me, it would take 'em six months to prepare the papers."

There's one great irony in the approaching retirement of Jack Cassidy. He has a government pension, of course, but as a U.S. employe—he isn't eligible for social security.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, April 13, will be the anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest Americans, Thomas Jefferson. I want to say a few words in tribute to the author of the Declaration of Independence.

While Jefferson is chiefly remembered as a statesman, he was also a diplomat, a scientific farmer, a successful lawyer, the foremost American architect of his time, a linguist, an accomplished violinist, the man who devised our decimal system of coinage, the author of a "Manual of Parliamentary Practice," which is still used by Congress, a compiler of Indian vocabularies, the man whose books started what is today the greatest collection in the world—the Library of Congress—and, last, but by no means least, the inventor of the dumbwaiter and the swivel chair.

Thomas Jefferson was an eldest son who inherited a large estate, but he helped to outlaw primogeniture, the system whereby the oldest son got everything when his father passed on. He was an aristocrat, but he promoted democratic government. He was a slaveowner, but he tried to abolish slavery. He was an Anglican, but he introduced legislation that led to the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Virginia.

America has been a great nation for almost two centuries, not only because it has guaranteed its citizens political freedom, but because it has guaranteed them religious freedom as well. When we pay tribute to Thomas Jefferson for the services that he rendered during the long struggle for political independence, let us also remember that he helped to disestablish the State church of Virginia. This was an act that had far-reaching consequences, as Virginia then covered a much greater area than it does today, as it included what are now the States of Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, West Virginia, and Wisconsin, as well as part of what is now Minnesota.

Jefferson considered the disestablishment of the State church as one of his greatest accomplishments. This erudite and versatile Virginian served the infant Nation as its third President, but when he penned his epitaph he neglected to mention his 8 years in the White House. These are the words that he did write:

> Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom, and father of the University of Virginia.

While the responsibility for drafting the Declaration had been entrusted to a five-man committee, the actual writing was done by Jefferson. It is one of the most amazing coincidences of all time that Jefferson and John Adams, one of his associates on the drafting committee and his predecessor in the Presidency, both died on July 4, 1826, the 50th anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. The last words of John Adams were:

> Thomas Jefferson still survives.

But he was mistaken, as Jefferson had passed away a few hours earlier, soon after the arrival of the golden jubilee of our freedom. Let us hope, however, that Adams' words were a prophecy and that he spoke truly when he said:

> Thomas Jefferson still survives.

"GREECE OF THE FUTURE"—AN ADDRESS BY ORESTIS E. VIDALIS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1969, marks the 149th anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

One of the most eloquent addresses I have read to mark this occasion was delivered on March 30, 1969, at the Greek Orthodox Church in Toledo, Ohio, by Gen. Orestis E. Vidalis, who served the Greek Army with very great distinction for many years.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I insert a biographical sketch of General Vidalis:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF ORESTIS E. VIDALIS

Graduated from Greek Military Academy in March, 1937, with the rank of Second Lieutenant of Artillery.

Participated in World War II as First Lieutenant Battery Commander.

In November, 1942, he escaped from occupied Greece and joined the Greek Forces in Middle East.*

He fought against the Communists during the Greek Guerrilla War as a Major commanding an Artillery Battalion.

He commanded Artillery units at all levels from Battalion through the Divisional Artillery as a Colonel.

He served in staff position with:

(a) The Hellenic Army General Staff (Lieutenant Colonel).

(b) The Standing Group NATO (Lieutenant Colonel and Colonel).*

(c) The Hellenic National Defense General Staff (Colonel).

(d) As Chief of Staff of "C" Army Corps (Brigadier General).

He graduated from all Greek Military Service and Staff Colleges and also served as an Instructor at the three Senior Service Schools of Artillery, Army War College, National Defense College.

He graduated from the U.S. Artillery School (Ft. Sill, Oklahoma) and the Command and General Staff College (Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas).*

While serving in the Standing Group NATO, he attended Postgraduate studies and received his Master's Degree in Political Science from Georgetown University.*

In addition to his Greek Decorations which include the Hellenic Medal of Valor (Greece's highest combat military decoration) he holds British, French and a Libyan Decoration.

He was a Brigadier General and Chief of Staff of the "C" Army Corps, one of the major units which supported the King in December, 1967.

He returned to the United States on November 1, 1968, and is a member of the Corporate Planning Division of Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation in Toledo, Ohio.*

Mr. Speaker, I now include General Vidalis' address of March 30, 1969, entitled, "Greece of the Future":

GREECE OF THE FUTURE

(By Orestis E. Vidalis)

National celebrations are appropriate occasions for reflection. They assist us in reshaping in our minds and in our hearts the "IMAGE" of the Nation. They might also guide us to ask ourselves the question: "Are we consistent with the "personality" of the Nation, as it has been developed and shaped by each generation?"

I feel greatly honored and moved for this invitation to join you, in this opportunity for meditation.

We Greeks today celebrate one of the most decisive landmarks of our history. We honor the memory of Greeks whose struggle and sacrifices offered to the Greek Nation the continuity of its historical course.

This is the deeper significance of the revolution of 1821. It joined together the Greece of antiquity with the Greece of the future. It put the nation in command of its destiny, it conveyed to future generations the mission and therefore the responsibility to perpetuate Hellenism.

THE GREEK IMAGE AND PERSONALITY

The "image and personality" of the Nation as shaped by our ancestors, enlightened the enslaved Greeks, as it should enlighten and guide today all modern Greeks.

Let us recall the main characteristics of this image and personality of the Greek Nation. Five hundred years before Christ, in a little town on the far western border of the settled and civilized world, a strange new power was at work. Something had awakened in the minds and spirits of the men there, which was so to influence the world, that the slow passage of a long period of time would be powerless to wear away that deep impression. A new civilization has arisen in Athens, unlike all that had gone before.

The civilizations of the ancient Orient were dominated by absolutism, by the denial of mind and by the subjection of the individual to the powerful group. Their political regime was the reign of force.

Hellenism laid the foundations of new ideals. It projected truth and virtue. It glorified the mind. It preached high regard for the dignity and value of the individual man. It conceived freedom as an end. Freedom, in accordance with the Greek definition, is opposed to both blind obedience and anarchy.

HELLENISM AND DEMOCRACY

Hellenism combined these new ideals together and discovered democracy, which was offered to man as a supreme good. And Hellenism rendered man "Free" and therefore "Responsible."

Our ancestors believed these ideals apply to all men, irrespective of race or gender. And they developed the concept of "Humanity."

This is the substance and the spirit of the Hellenic national "Personality."

This has been a powerful force which constantly incited the enslaved people to attempt the regeneration of the Nation. This people fanatically believed in the enlightening power of Hellenism and they remained optimistic throughout 400 years of oppression. The folk singer kept singing, "Do not cry Despina, they will again be ours," and in 1821 the National Regeneration became a reality.

THREE ELEMENTS OF GREEK REGENERATION

Three basic elements cooperated, struggled and won in 1821. First: the spiritual labor of the Church and of the intellectuals of the Nation, who helped keep alive in the Hellenes the consciousness of their obligation for the restoration of their Nation's freedom and sovereignty.

Secondly: the contribution of Philhellenes who believed in "Hellas" as a "spiritual necessity" of mankind. They sacrificed comforts, wealth, and even their lives in order to restore Greece in a free and Hellenic environment.

Thirdly: the determination of the simple people, who dared and won, with no means, no organized hierarchy, without assistance, and with an unfriendly Europe. The Greek Revolution was primarily the result of moral causes which enlarge a nation's intelligence and awaken its feelings. Individual improvement accelerated. The consequence was an increase of moral energy, a desire for action, and a longing for national rebirth. The simple Greek felt he was prepared to climb the rugged paths of virtue and self-sacrifice.

The vast majority of these Greek people were plain men, priests, peasants, shepherds, sailors, etc. They were educated by the secret Greek school, which operated despite Turkish occupation, in a sense of mission and obligation. They were a mature—and a dedicated people. They did not mature under captivity. They were always mature, because they believed they had the right to be free.

As free individuals and as Hellenes, contrary to adversities, and in spite of the toleration by the then Great Powers of the use of force to deprive the Greeks of their freedom, they continually progressed in their struggle for liberty and they were finally successful.

And during the last days of March 1821 Bishop Germanos, incarnating the will of the captive Nation, raised the flag of the revolution, that broŭght the Cross and the symbol "Freedom or Death."

With these two simple words, the Greek people of the 19th century, reconstituted the continuity of Hellenism.

"Freedom or Death" are indeed two symbolic words meaning in substance that "Greece enslaved, under any form, is not Greece." This is the message of the revolution of 1821 to the Greeks. This was the contribution of the uprising of 1821 in the reconstitution of the image of the Hellenic Nation.

GREECE OF THE FUTURE

And now, how can these reflections be connected with the future? What does this message of 1821 imply and what are the obligations of all Greeks for the future?

I will not concern myself with the present image of Greece. I will attempt to visualize Greece in the future, since I feel, we all have a primary duty to contribute to the creation of the proper environment, for our children and our children's children.

What can and what should Greece of the future be, in a world where "man" conflicts with "force". Force has now, as it had then, when the classical Greek spirit intervened, the form of Totalitarianism. The various shades or colors of Totalitarian regimes do not change their basic similarity. They are carried through by the same techniques and by the same resort to force. All assume that the individual man in comparison with the state has no significance; except as an instrument to be used, with whatever degree of brutality may be necessary, for realizing ends which the ruling minority judges to be good. They all identify right with naked force as an instrument of will. They are all alike, at war with the fundamental values and principles of democracy.

All totalitarian regimes have no relationship whatsoever with the "image and personality" of the Hellenic Nation.

In this world, therefore, where man is facing naked force, in a world where the war of ideas endlessly continues, in this decisive transitional period of humanity, Greece should remain Hellas and offer once again the ideals of Hellenism to mankind.

MAN THE SUPREME VALUE

No nation will escape the fate of ultimate disintegration, if it does not believe in itself and in its mission. No nation will avoid this destiny if it continues to disregard "man" as the supreme "value". In order to survive in this competitive world, all nations, irrespective of size, should contribute in a concrete and substantial manner in the successful evolution of this great struggle of man for a better and more humane future.

Greece, of course, is not a big country today. But it is not small either, since none is small in the world of ideas.

Ancient Athens was a small town when her spirit prevailed.

Rome conquered Greece by force, yet eventually she was conquered by the Greek spirit.

The enslaved Greeks of 1821 were powerless to face the massive Ottoman Empire, yet the Greek spirit led them to resurrect the Nation.

The Greeks were few, and practically alone, when they faced Fascism and Nazism.

And last but not least, the Greek people, exhausted from a long enemy occupation during World War II, were again the first to check communist expansion in Europe in 1949 with the assistance of this country.

Therefore, the contribution of each country in the struggle of man against force is not proportional to its size. It is in direct relationship to its devotion, as a "National personality" to this great cause.

The American Professor Gilbertsleeve, in the beginning of our century, comparing Hellenism with Americanism, stated: "Like the Greeks, we are the heirs of the ages . . . The American, like the Greek, has proceeded to realize his inheritance and his inheritance is the democratic form of government . . . We cannot well think of Greece as anything else but a democracy . . . A 'safe slavery' is as abhorrent to us as it was to the Greeks."

This is an excellent description of the "personality of Hellenism". It is a description of a scholar who labored intellectually in this great new land, "The second homeland of all Free Men" as a great Hellene has recently described America.

"BIGNESS" YIELDS TO "GREATNESS"

In this image of Greece the meaning of "bigness" yields to the sense of "greatness". Bigness is a measure of material power which was never an element in Greek life. Greatness is an element of spiritual achievement which has always been a part of Hellenism.

The problem of modern Greece is to regain its "National personality," maintain it at all cost and improve it. If Greece solves this fundamental problem, despite world competition in the field of "bigness," she will be able to contribute her part in bringing mankind closer to the "greatness of the ideals of the Free World."

---

*Service outside Greece.

This will occur only if all decide to respect the Greek people as the only responsible sovereign authority for the preservation of the destiny of the Greece of the future.

This will occur only if we, the Greeks, stop imitating prototypes foreign to Hellenism. Copying examples foreign to Hellenism is a tragic over-simplification in the process of solving very complex problems, connected with our race. And while imitating others does not solve our long range problems, it does serve as an argument of those who maintain that there is no continuity in Hellenism.

THE GREAT CHALLENGE OF MODERN GREECE

We certainly cannot survive relying on the achievements of our ancestors while disregarding the "unique Hellenic ideals" created by them.

This is the Great Challenge of modern Greece to transform the Hellenic ideals into reality without forgetting in this process that the idealists should not have too many illusions when they face realists who have too little respect for ideals and idealists.

Then, Greece can become an example of a society of free and responsible men.

Then Greece will recover its own "personality" and will be able to fulfill the mission of Hellenism.

Then the "image" of this democratic society will reflect itself beyond the iron curtain, beyond deserts and seas.

If Greece becomes an example of a successful free society, for the people of new and old countries that are now trying to reach political freedom, then she will have decisively accomplished her mission in the world today. This will be a tremendous contribution in the efforts of our Free World.

It is this Greece of the future, for which all free men dream.

It is this Greece that all mankind loves and respects.

It is this Greece that you should feel proud of, as bearers of the same ideals and traditions in another land.

It is this Greece we should all insist on and strive to recreate.

It is this Greece that the warriors of 1821 had visualized.

And it is this Greece they had in mind, when they wrote on our first flag "Freedom or Death."

NEGRO NEWSPAPER WEEK

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following proclamation made by the Governor of the State of Indiana and a copy of the letter to Governor Whitcomb for O. L. Tandy, the publisher of the Indiana Herald:

PROCLAMATION OF NEGRO NEWSPAPER WEEK, MARCH 23–29, 1969

To All to Whom These Presents May Come, Greeting:

Whereas, slightly over 142 years ago John Russwurm, a Negro, published Volume 1, No. 1 of Freedom's Journal; and

Whereas, this was the first Negro-owned and Negro-published newspaper in the entire American continent; and

Whereas, it was 108 years after a Dutch slave vessel appeared off the coast of Virginia with its human cargo of black men, women and children; and

Whereas, thirty-eight years hence the Emancipation Proclamation would sound the trumpet of freedom; and

Whereas, from the days of the Journal, throughout the brief life of Fred Douglass' North Star until now the Negro Press has been the tallest and brightest beacon in an era of darkness; and

Whereas, in view of the long and prodigious effort waged and being waged by the Negro Press for increased and full freedom for all mankind irrespective of race, creed, religion or ethnic origin,

Now, therefore, I, Edgar D. Whitcomb, Governor of the State of Indiana, do hereby proclaim March 23 through March 29, 1969, as Negro Newspaper Week in Indiana.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Indiana, at the Capitol, in the city of Indianapolis, this 27th day of March 1969.

EDGAR D. WHITCOMB,
Governor of Indiana.
WILLIAM N. SALIN,
Secretary of State.

INDIANA HERALD,
Indianapolis, Ind., March 23, 1969.

Hon. EDGAR WHITCOMB,
Governor, State of Indiana,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR GOVERNOR WHITCOMB: Slightly over 142 years ago John Russwurm, a Negro, published Volume 1, No. 1 of Freedom's Journal. This was the first Negro-owned and Negro-published newspaper in the entire American continent. It was 108 years after a Dutch slave vessel appeared off the coast of Virginia with its human cargo of Black men, women and children. Thirty-eight years hence the Emancipation Proclamation would sound the trumpet of freedom. Between these two epochal dates, 1865 and 1969, the Black Man's stock as a commodity has soared. His fertile brain has brought forth magic from the laboratory test tube and his valor on the battlefield has never been questioned.

The names of Black Men are on the scrolls of the Academy of Science and they are listed as recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor. But always in the forefront, fighting for more opportunities for these second-class citizens has been the Negro Press. From the days of the Journal, throughout the brief life of Fred Douglass's North Star until now the Negro Press has been the tallest and brightest beacon in an era of darkness.

Today there are over 300 Negro newspapers scattered from rural Mississippi to metropolitan New York, and the nation's capital. The archives of the Library of Congress contain copies of Negro newspapers blurred with age, but containing gems of historical value. In view of the long and prodigious effort waged and being waged by the Negro Press for increased and full freedom for all mankind irrespective of race, creed, religion or ethnic origin, I respectfully request that you honor and salute the Negro Press of Indiana and the Americus by declaring the period extending from March 23 through March 29, 1969 as official Negro Newspaper Week. I request further that you affix the great seal of the State of Indiana to a proclamation above your signature and that you make this public by instructing your press secretary to forward the original copy to me and carbon, duplicate or photostatic copies to newspapers, TV and radio and other news media within the geographic periphery of the Hoosier State.

This will be the first time to my knowledge that an Indiana Governor has so honored the Negro Press, and I shall dispatch facsimiles of your proclamation to Senators Vance Hartke, and Birch Bayh also all Indiana Congressmen and beseech them to make permanent records of the same.

With deepest thanks for myself and all members of the fourth estate, I am,

Sincerely yours,

O. L. TANDY.

HAWAII IDEAL SITE FOR TROPICAL AGRICULTURE RESEARCH CENTER

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues a resolution which was recently adopted by both the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, urging the U.S. Department of Agriculture to establish a tropical research facility in Hawaii.

For nearly 4 years this matter has been a deep concern of mine. It was my own proposal in the Food for Peace Act of 1966 which provided for the establishment of a Center for Research in Tropical Agriculture. It is my fervent hope that funds will soon be appropriated for the establishment of this Center.

Mr. Speaker, Hawaii, in addition to its strategic location in the Pacific Basin, is the only State with a frost-free tropical climate. Its soil has been found to approximate that of many tropical countries which would benefit from this research program.

The Federal Government has already acknowledged the suitability of Hawaii as a research site by establishing facilities which specifically deal with projects relating to the tropics: the Fruit Fly Investigations Laboratory, the Tropical Fruit Laboratory, the Hawaii Research and Development Irradiators, and the Hilo rat study project.

Mr. Speaker, Hawaii, in a very real sense is the throbbing heart of the Pacific, where East and West do meet and are the better for it. I am convinced that the island State is the best site in the United States for the establishment of the Tropical Research Center.

For these reasons, I submit the resolution of the Hawaii State Legislature for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

S. CON. RES. 27

Concurrent resolution urging the Department of Agriculture of the United States of America to locate the proposed tropical agriculture research facility in the State of Hawaii

Whereas, the Congress of the United States in the Food for Peace Act of 1966 and the President's Office in the 1970 budget proposed the establishment of a Tropical Agriculture Research Facility to increase our knowledge in this field and to provide this knowledge to friendly developing nations; and

Whereas, Hawaii is strategically located in the center of the Pacific Basin, closer than any other state to many of the world's developing nations; and

Whereas, the International outlook of Hawaii's people as well as their Asian ethnic and cultural background creates rapport between the people of Asia, the Pacific, and America; and

Whereas, Hawaii is the only state having agricultural land with a frost free, tropical climate; and

Whereas, Hawaii's unique ecology offers a natural laboratory with fully two-thirds of the major soil types found in tropical countries with the associated climate and rainfall features which produced them; and

Whereas, the Federal Government has previously recognized Hawaii's tropical climate by establishing here the following facilities which deal specifically with programs related to the tropics: Fruit Fly Investigations Laboratory, the Tropical Fruit Laboratory, the Hawaii Research and Development Irradiators, and the Hilo rat study project; and

Whereas, Hawaii's agriculture has for over a century been an example of a successful mainstay industry supported by continuing extensive research; Hawaiian agribusiness can build on a decade of experience in successfully applying this agricultural, managerial, and operational knowledge in over fifty foreign countries; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1969, the House of Representatives concurring, That the Department of Agriculture of the United States of America be urged to locate the proposed Tropical Agriculture Research Facility in the State of Hawaii; and

Be it further resolved, That duly certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States of America; the Honorable Hiram L. Fong, U.S. Senator; the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, U.S. Senator; the Honorable Spark M. Matsunaga, U.S. Representative; the Honorable Patsy Mink, U.S. Representative; the Honorable John A. Burns, Governor of the State of Hawaii; the Honorable Clifford M. Hardin, Secretary of the Department of Agriculture of the United States of America; Dean Robert W. Hiatt, Acting President of the University of Hawaii; and Dr. Kenneth K. Otagaki, Chairman of the Board of Agriculture of the State of Hawaii.

David C. McClung,
President of the Senate.
Seichi Hirai,
Clerk of the Senate.
Tadao Beppa,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
Shigeto Kanemoto,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

THE NOBILITY OF GENERAL EISENHOWER

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the significance of a man's life often emerges in clearer and more compelling perspective in the aftermath of his death, in the effect which that life and death are seen to have had in the lives of others.

The distinguished editor of the New York Times, Mr. James Reston, has captured one aspect of this truth about the life of our beloved former President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his column in this morning's New York Times.

Because it says so much and in so few words both about General Eisenhower and about our country, I want to bring it to the attention of our colleagues by including Mr. Reston's column as a part of my remarks in the Record.

The column follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 2, 1969]

"Faith of Our Fathers, Living Still"?

(By James Reston)

It is hard to believe after the reverent public response to the Eisenhower funeral services that America is quite as indifferent to relligon as the modern prophets and publicists say.

You can hardly pick up a paper these days without being told by somebody that God is dead. In fact, the Pentagon is now wondering whether it should banish Him from its instructions to the troops in Vietnam, which is scarcely surprising, considering the Pentagon's expansionist tendencies in all other fields.

Still the substitute gods of the modern age don't seem to be very satisfactory. The trend toward a secular society in America is clear, but when television demonstrates on a great occasion that it has the capacity to bring the whole nation into a common experience—almost to make us all part of a single congregation—then we find that at least the remnants of a common faith still exist.

FAITH AND DOUBT

The choir at the National Cathedral in Washington sang the old hymn. The opening line is: "Faith of our Fathers, living still," and despite all the modern denials of the point, it is probably still true. The first line of the chorus, however, is different: "Faith of our Fathers, Holy Faith, we will be true to thee till death"—and that is clearly not true for most Americans.

Nevertheless, for believers and unbelievers alike, some facts are plain. The political life and spirit of this country were based on religious convictions. America's view of the individual was grounded on the principle, clearly expressed by the Founding Fathers, that man was a symbol of his Creator, and therefore possessed certain inalienable rights which no temporal authority had the right to violate.

THE RELIGIOUS FOUNDATION

That this conviction helped shape our laws and sustained American men and women in their struggle to discipline themselves and conquer a continent even the most atheistic historian would defend. And this raises a question which cannot be avoided: If religion was so important in the building of the Republic, how could it be irrelevant to the maintenance of the Republic? And if it is irrelevant for the unbelievers, what will they put in its place?

"The liberties we talk about defending today," Walter Lippmann wrote in 1938, "were established by men who took their conception of man from the great central religious tradition of Western civilization, and the liberties we inherit can almost certainly not survive the abandonment of that tradition. . . .

"The decay of decency in the modern age, the rebellion against law and good faith, the treatment of human beings as things, as mere instruments of power and ambition, is without a doubt the consequence of the decay of the belief in man as something more than an animal animated by highly conditioned reflexes and chemical reactions. For unless man is something more than that, he has no rights that anyone is bound to respect, and there are no limitations upon his conduct which he is bound to obey. This is the forgotten foundation of democracy. . . ."

THE COMMON FAITH

What the Eisenhower services suggested, maybe ever so vaguely to some and ever so strongly to others, is that the religious foundation of our common life—no matter how much we divide over creeds and sects and their relation to the state—is not "forgotten." It may be ignored or challenged or defied, but it is not lost. We may not believe, but we believe in believing, and the reaction to the old soldier's death dramatized the point.

It did something else. It demonstrated how national television can bring before the people the things that touch their noblest instincts, and in the process reminded us of how seldom we use their remarkable power for this purpose.

THE UNIFYING FORCES

Eisenhower and the church and television were unifying forces of tremendous power for good in America in the last few tragic days. They touched some old and worthy echo in the American spirit which politics, religion, and television usually repel.

These are very old questions but they are still with us. Plato saw man's problem as that of the charioteer driving a pair of winged horses: "One of them is noble and of noble breed and the other is ignoble and of ignoble breed" . . . and "the driving of them of necessity gives a great deal of trouble to the charioteer."

This is as true now as it was in Plato's time, but the old soldier gave us a glimpse of nobility, and through this remarkable instrument of television, the people responded to it with a solemnity and sincerity no cynic could deny.

BLOW TO MIDEAST PEACE

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly disturbed at the one-sided approach which the United Nations has shown toward the sources of the continuing conflict in the Middle East. The Security Council's condemnation of the Israel retaliatory raid on Beirut Airport last December reinforced the Arab governments' belief that they can sponsor terrorist raids and attacks upon the territory and population of Israel without fear of condemnation from the United Nations. As I pointed out in a statement with my colleague from New York (Mr. Celler) on January 3, this kind of "diplomacy" can only result in an aggravation of tensions in the Middle East and renewed truce violations by Arab groups clearly bent on provoking more violence.

The Security Council's April 1 condemnation of Israel for the raids she has conducted on Jordan-based guerrilla units—raids conducted for the sole purpose of protecting Israel's population and territory from the terrorist violence which these groups have inflicted upon her—is yet another example of this one-sided U.N. diplomacy. While Israel was condemned for her raids on Jordan, no mention was made of the continuing guerrilla raids which provoked the Israel retaliations. The effect of this resolution, supported by France and the Soviet Union and acquiesced to by the United States and Britain, will be to embolden the terrorist groups and their Arab sponsors and prolong the Arab governments' refusal to conduct direct negotiations with the Israelis.

Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed that the U.S. delegation to the Security Council abstained on the vote to censure Israel. The United States has a long-standing and clear commitment to Israel which must be honored in our policies at the United Nations. Moreover, it is imperative that the United States take the lead in developing a more balanced United Nations policy toward the sources of conflict in the Middle East if a lasting peace in that troubled area is to be secured. So long as the United Nations continues to censure Israel, while ignoring the Arab governments' sponsorship of the terrorist organizations, the Arab states will maintain their fanatical determination to destroy Israel, and the prospects for peace will continue to be thwarted.

I enclose at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the April 2 New York Times which underlines the effect which the Security Council's ill-considered reprobation of Israel will have on the Middle East conflict. I urge my colleagues to make their own views known on this resolution and to demand that our policies at the U.N. fulfill the commitment which the United States has to the State of Israel.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 3, 1969]

BLOW TO MIDEAST PEACE

The Soviet Union and France undercut their own initiative for Middle East peace yestreday when they voted for a United Nations Security Council resolution which condemns Israel for its attack on Jordan last week but virtually ignores the guerrilla actions that provoke Israeli retaliation.

French-Soviet support for the one-sided resolution—one the United States and Britain rightly refused to go along with—compromises their position just when arrangements are being completed for starting the Big Power peace meetings, originally proposed by Moscow and Paris months ago. It adds weight to Israeli charges of bias by the two powers, and tends to encourage truce violations by Arab groups blatantly bent on renewed conflict.

Despite this new handicap, the Big Four search for a new path to peace must not be abandoned. The primary responsibility for forging a final settlement remains with the contending Mideast nations, as Israeli and Arab leaders have taken pains to point out. But the Arabs and Israelis thus far have made no progress toward peace on their own. The Jarring mission is at a dead end.

In the face of rising violence that could envelop them all, the major powers have an obligation to themselves and to the world to make a new effort to promote a settlement through the U.N. The Russian and French have a special obligation now to undo the effect their vote by demonstrating that they recognize the rights and security requirements of the Israelis as well as those of the Arabs.

IKE, IDEAL IDOL FOR YOUTH

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to the sincere outpourings of affection and esteem from my colleagues regarding Dwight David Eisenhower, but I would like to express my belief that he is uniquely suitable as an idol for our young people.

As President, he unified the Nation. Perhaps the solidarity of those Eisenhower years was due in large measure to the fact that he himself was the synthesis of America, the epitome of what our Nation can produce.

He possessed the qualities we all should nurture: courage, integrity, decency, humility, compassion, sincerity, selflessness, warmth, and patriotism. These qualities permeated his public and private life.

He was a farmer, an athlete, an artist, a soldier, a diplomat, an educator, a politician, a statesman, and a world leader. What an ideal hero to emulate.

He loved peace, but he fought valiantly in war. His brilliant leadership as Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe during World War II contributed tremendously toward our success in that conflict. He ended the war in Korea, a war rivaling Vietnam in unpopularity.

He had a toughness of character, but it was tempered with a human gentleness. He was a strong competitor in sports, but he enjoyed the quiet solitude before a canvas.

He was dedicated to civil rights, but he was equally committed to law and order. Under his leadership, the first civil rights legislation since the Civil War was enacted, and he used the full power of his office to quell the violence of those who opposed the exercise of civil rights.

President Nixon has said that two qualities about Dwight Eisenhower "stood out above all in both his public and his private life: one was his unwavering sense of duty; the other was that whatever he did, he did because he believed it was right."

When his country needed him in military service, he answered and served with distinction, rising to our highest military rank. When his country needed him in civilian service, he again answered the call and served in our highest civilian office, the Presidency.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was not a politician in the stereotype sense of that term. He was a citizen who involved himself in politics because he felt his country needed him in politics. He agreed to run for President on the Republican Party's ticket because he saw that party in such a weakened condition that he feared that the two-party system was in jeopardy. He involved himself in politics because he considered it essential to achieve a competitive balance between the two parties. He believed that, if the greatest form of government ever conceived in the history of the world is to be preserved, we must have two strong political parties to give the voters a meaningful choice at election time and to create a competition which will force both parties to be responsive to the needs and wishes of the people.

We mourn General Eisenhower's passing, but we pray that his spirit, his zest for life, his love of country will endure with us. We will honor his memory best by keeping these qualities alive and bequeath them to oncoming generations. These future generations should know the debt which we of this generation owe to him. They should know what a giant has lived among us.

There are no superlatives which any of us can utter which can add to the stature or deeds of Dwight David Eisenhower. We will miss him, but I hope and pray that we will continue to draw inspiration and guidance from the magnificent example of his life.

TWO MARINES, FOUR GI'S KILLED IN WAR

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Leon Coit, Pfc. Willard A. Wimmer, Sp4c. Thomas G. Turner, Sp4c. George A. Demby, L. Cpl. Michael DiGenno, and Pfc. Thomas C. D. Moffitt, six outstanding young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO MARINES, FOUR GI'S KILLED IN WAR

The Defense Department reported yesterday that six more Maryland servicemen—two Marines and four Army men—have died as a result of recent combat in Vietnam.

Listed as dead in hostile action were:

Spec. 4 Leon Coit, son of Mr. and Mrs. Willie Coit, of 2716 Baker street, who was killed in a skirmish March 10.

Pfc. Willard A. Wimmer, son of Mrs. Etta J. Wimmer, of 1610 Cereal street, who was killed March 3.

Spec. 4 Thomas G. Turner, son of Mr. and Mrs. Marshall Turner, of 4611 Sleaford road, Bethesda, who was killed March 9 in combat 22 miles west of Kontum, South Vietnam, near the Cambodian border.

Spec. 4 George A. Demby, husband of Mrs. Janice L. Demby, of Abingdon, who was killed in combat March 11.

Lance Cpl. Michael DiGenno (USMC), son of Mr. and Mrs. Henry DiGenno, of Thompson street, Hurlock, who was killed by enemy gunfire March 11.

Pfc. Thomas C. D. Moffitt (USMC), son of Mr. and Mrs. William M. Moffitt, of 12205 Braxfield court, Rockville.

Three of the soldiers, Private Coit, Private Wimmer and Private Turner, had earlier been listed as missing by the Army.

Specialist Coit, 19, the second of four children of Mr. and Mrs. Willie T. Coit, was a native Baltimorean who finished the 11th grade at Carver High School and worked at various factory jobs before enlisting in the Army in February, 1968.

He recently wrote his parents that he had "213 more days" before coming home next September to enroll in a vocational course or, perhaps, prepare for college.

Specialist Coit will have a military burial at Baltimore National Cemetery when his body arrives in Baltimore.

Besides his parents, he is survived by two brothers, Willie T. Coit, Jr., 22, a truck driver, and Edward Coit, 17, a student at Carver, and a sister, Olivia Coit, 9, a student at School No. 148, Rosedale Elementary School.

LITTLE LEAGUER

Private Wimmer, 20, one of seven children of Mrs. Etta J. Wimmer, was born in Annapolis and once attended Benjamin Franklin Junior High School in Southwest Baltimore, but he spent most of his life in the Curtis Bay area.

He was a Little League ballplayer who later worked at a carpentry job and a steel mill job, and finally enlisted in the Army last June.

"He was a fun-loving person," his mother said yesterday. "He had a lot of friends. They were always coming to the house . . . just loads of them," she said.

DETAILS WITHHELD

Private Wimmer was killed near Pleiku. His mother said yesterday that the Army has asked her not to tell the circumstances of his death.

Private Wimmer is survived by five sisters, Mrs. Mildred Jane Graham, Mrs. Carolyn V. Ashworth, Mrs. Cheryl Burdinski, Mrs. Wanda June Pittman and Bonnie Charlene Wimmer, all of Baltimore; a brother, Roger D. Wimmer, of Baltimore, and his paternal grandmother, Mrs. Viola Wimmer, of Olderson, W. Va.

Specialist Turner, 23, was a college senior who aspired to a career as a writer when he was drafted into the Army.

"WHAT HE HAD TO DO"

Specialist Turner's father, Marshall S. Turner, who works with the Public Buildings Service of the U.S. General Services Administration, said yesterday his son wrote "profusely" from Vietnam.

"He, like many other Vietnam soldiers, didn't want to be there. He just did what he had to do," Mr. Turner said.

Specialist Turner was killed during a mission to secure an enemy-held arms camp. One of his best friends, Spec. 4 Samuel A. Bond, also of Bethesda, is to serve as escort when Specialist Turner's body is flown to the United States.

Specialist Turner was a ground-fighter with Company B, 1st Battalion, 12th Infantry Regiment of the 4th Infantry Division.

ATTENDED UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

He attended the University of Maryland and Bellarmine College in Louisville, where he majored in English.

Specialist Turner had already started to learn the publishing trade at Newsweek, Inc., where he once worked for six months as a copy boy.

As a youth, he lived in Cambridge in Dorchester County, and he graduated in 1963 from Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School.

Besides his father and mother, Mrs. Myra H. Turner, he is survived by two sisters, Mary Ann Turner and Mrs. Marsha Turner Bonner, all of the Bethesda area.

DRAFTED LAST JULY

Specialist Demby was born in Havre de Grace and lived in Harford County all his life, until he was drafted into the Army last July.

In September, after basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C., the infantryman was married to the former Janice Harris, of Abingdon, Md. Mrs. Harris is expecting a baby this spring.

Specialist Demby was killed March 11 in Saigon in a skirmish with the enemy.

The son of Mrs. Evelyn Richardson and the stepson of Harold Richardson, he was the idol of his six stepsisters and many cousins, according to an aunt.

Specialist Demby, who turned 20 last August, was a track and basketball star at Bel Air High School, where he was a member of the Class of 1967.

Besides his wife and parents, he is survived by a brother, Alexander Demby, an apprentice electrician; and his stepsisters, Lenore Richardson, Vasessa Richardson, Teresa Richardson, Victoria Richardson, Doreen Richardson, and Donna Richardson, and a number of aunts, uncles and cousins, all in Harford County.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, April 3, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another.—John 13: 34.

Our Father God, as we continue our pilgrim way this holy week, entering an upper room, climbing the hill called Calvary, and realizing anew the glory of the Easter morn, we pause in Thy presence to lift our hearts unto Thee in praise and thanksgiving.

We thank Thee for Thy love revealed in the experiences of these days, for Thy forgiving love made known in the way of the cross, and for Thy strengthening power received in our response to Thy love and Thy forgiving mercy.

Bless us and our Nation in these crucial days that we may continue to be crusaders in the cause of human freedom, workers for an enduring peace, and cultivators of good will in the hearts of all people.

Draw Thou my soul, O God, closer to Thine;
Breathe into every wish Thy will divine.
Raise my low self above, won by Thy deathless love;
Ever, O God, through mine let Thy life shine.

In the spirit of Christ, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. DAVID R. OBEY, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with respect to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 358) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 358

Resolved, That the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Schwengel, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTAL REFORM HEARINGS TO BEGIN ON APRIL 22, 1969

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time at the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI), chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The gentleman from New York has asked me to announce that public hearings on postal reorganization will begin on Tuesday, April 22, before his full committee.

Several bills are pending before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service relating to the reorganization of the Post Office Department. The committee has decided, as a matter of policy, that this legislation is of such major importance that it will be considered by the full committee, rather than one or more subcommittees.

The gentleman from New York plans to hold hearings on 1 or 2 days each week, at least at the outset, in order that the subcommittees of his committee may continue with their own schedules.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF APRIL 14, 1969

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the week beginning April 14.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader we, of course, have finished the legislative business for the week and will go over for the Easter holidays upon adjournment today, pursuant to the adjournment resolution previously agreed to.

Monday, April 14, is District day. There will be no District bills.

Monday is also Pan American day.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day. Also for Tuesday and the balance of the week are the following:

H.R. 4148, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, will come up under an open rule with 3 hours of debate, waiving points of order against committee amendment;

H.R. 514, Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 4153, to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, subject to a rule being granted.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

COMPARABILITY IN POSTAL PAY

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which demands the serious attention and consideration of every Member of the Congress. It is a bill which, if enacted, will at long last establish wage comparability for the lowest paid employees in the Postal Establishment—those who occupy levels 1 through 7 in the pay structure. It also corrects inequities in supervising pay scales.

This bill will meet an obligation we have owed the postal employees of the Nation for 7 long years. I am convinced that Congress has had every intention of acting in good faith in this area, but that our intentions have been unsuccessful.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, we laid down certain policies to govern the postal and Federal pay schedules. In that declaration of policy we said:

> Federal Salary rates shall be comparable with private enterprise salary rates for the same level of work.

We also said:

> Salary levels shall be set and henceforth adjusted in accordance with the above principles.

We have never lived up to these policies.

In the Pay Act of 1967, we insisted that true comparability must be achieved by July 1, 1969. But, instead of offering a program which would meet this obligation, the national administration is recommending that low-paid postal employees be granted only a 4.1-percent pay increase—a token increase, an increase that will not only fail to achieve any semblance of comparability for the postal employees but which will not even match the increase in the cost of living over the past year.

The proposed 4.1-percent increase, I might add, is only one-tenth of the percentage increase we accepted for ourselves this year. This increase in pay is far greater than the total salary of a letter carrier or postal clerk with 25 years of service.

It is no secret, Mr. Speaker, that our postal employees over the country are in a restless and dissatisfied mood. For the first time in our history the word "strike" is heard in our post offices. The responsible leaders of the postal unions—who support my bill in its entirety—are opposed to the idea of a postal strike, but there is a limit to what they can do in restraining their restless members in high cost-of-living areas throughout the country.

It is also no secret, Mr. Speaker, that public dissatisfaction with the postal service is growing. The service is deteriorating month by month, year by year.

The quality of the service depends upon the quality of the people who work in it. The wage structure is so inadequate that the Postal Establishment is simply not competitive in today's labor market. Even if this puny 4.1-percent pay increase which the administration is offering were permitted to stand, the starting wage of a letter carrier or postal clerk would still be $3,000 less than the starting wage of a sanitation worker in New York City, or in many other large metropolitan areas. Policemen, firemen, busdriver—almost every American who performs a service for the public—gets more money by far than do our postal clerks and letter carriers.

The pay situation is even worse—by comparison—after a man has been in the postal service for a while. Under the present structure, new employees must work for a minimum of 21 years until he reaches the top pay in his level. Some postal employees have worked 25 years, and still have not reached the top pay level.

And once they do reach the top they are getting only $8,000 a year.

What kind of a career inducement is this? In almost every city in the land policemen, firemen, and busdrivers not only get more money at entrance to their careers, but they reach the top pay level in 3 or 4 years.

Is it any wonder that the Post Office is having great difficulty attracting and retaining topflight talent? There are thousands upon thousands of jobs in this properous country of ours which offer an ambitious young man better pay, better working conditions, better fringe benefits, better promotion opportunities, better career inducements. Why should anyone want to become a postal worker under present conditions?

I have talked to hundreds of postal workers—veterans of the career service—and almost to a man they have told me that if they knew the Government was going to drag its feet in the area of comparability, they never would have joined the service in the first place.

And, Mr. Speaker, thousands upon thousands of workers are simply refusing to take the inaction of their Government any longer. The turnover in the major post offices of the country is a national scandal—and it is usually the best and the most talented employees who are leaving to take easier and more lucrative jobs in the private sector. No wonder the postal service is deteriorating. The Post Office cannot recruit enough good employees and it cannot keep the good ones it has.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, a situation like this needs a bold and imaginative solution. I sincerely believe I have offered such a solution in my bill.

The real pinch is found in levels 1 through 7; that is where the money is needed; and that is where the erosion of quality in the personnel is taking place.

Under my bill no employee in the postal service will receive less than $5,000 a year.

All the lowest six levels of postal employment will be upgraded by one level.

In the heavily populated level 5—where 80 percent of the postal workforce subsists—the starting wage will be raised to $7,500 a year. There will be annual step increases of $500, so a man can reach the top salary of $10,000 after 5 years.

There will also be longevity pay increases after 8 years of service, after 11 years, and after 14 years. This will retain incentives and will make the prospect of remaining in the service more attractive than it is today.

My bill will also correct an inequity which was inadvertently written into the 1962 Pay Reform Act. This section of the bill has long been associated with the name of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and is familiarly known as the Dulski amendment.

Because of certain technical provisions of the act of 1962, many postal employees lost time they had earned toward their next step increase. They have been one step behind on the pay ladder ever since. My bill makes provision for the adjustment of this inequity and will place these employees into a pay step commensurate with their service.

My bill will also make appropriate and equivalent provision for our good friends and competent Government servants, the rural letter carriers.

There is another feature of my bill which, I think, should gain the favorable consideration of my colleagues.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, one of the unpleasant features of postal employment is the fact that a large body of men must work at night to prepare the mail for the next day's delivery. Not many men like night work and, even with the 10-percent nightwork differential being granted today, many will quit their jobs rather than accept a night job. My bill would raise that differential to 20 percent to make this irksome duty more palatable.

I sincerely believe my bill will go a long way to making the Post Office a modern employer, comparable with industries of similar size and importance in the private sector.

The Bureau of the Budget suggests that a 4.1-percent increase will bring the postal workers up even with their counterparts in private industry.

This simply is not true. The salary increase the employees received on July 1, 1968, was based on statistics gathered prior to April 1967. It was based, in short, on statistics almost a year and a half old. The statistics on which the disgraceful 4.1 percent suggested increase for this year is based are equally antique. The cost of living has gone up 10 percent in the past 2 years—and, in some areas, even more than that.

The Bureau of the Budget is not even willing to give postal workers comparability with workers in the other branches of Government. They have prepared an impressive chart on which they are basing their pay recommendations. But they have "cooked" their figures by drawing through the chart an arbitrary, curving line. As a result of this line they are offering to letter carriers and postal clerks $824 a year less than the average which the Bureau of Labor Statistics maintains is industrial comparability.

Mr. Speaker, we have decided consistently upon the policy of comparability in postal pay. The Bureau of the Budget just as consistently has used methods like the wavering line I have just mentioned to thwart the will of the Congress to insure comparability.

A letter carrier and a postal clerk, Mr. Speaker, have families to support. They are the breadwinners of their families. They have people depending upon their earning power—depending on this power for their food, their housing, their clothes, their education.

We can save the postal service from chaos and I believe this legislation is a step in that direction. We must pay these valuable employees a wage commensurate with their importance—a living wage which will permit them to rear their families in self-respect and security—a decent wage that will permit them to live with the same comforts that are enjoyed by their neighbors in comparable non-Government jobs.

I sincerely believe that my bill will right these wrongs which threaten the postal service in this country.

MILLIONAIRES DUCKING TAXES

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress returning to their districts for the Easter recess will no doubt discover that one of the real torrid issues on the minds of their constituents is high taxes. April 15 is the deadline for Federal income taxes and your constituents by great numbers have been startled, not only by the regular high Federal taxes, but also by the added 10-percent surtax. This is now hitting them right "bang" in their pocketbooks. For the first time they are becoming aroused to the fact that it it is the average small and middle class salaried and wage citizen who is paying the bulk of Federal taxes. They will ask you "What is the Congress going to do about it in this session?" Some of them will ask how so many large corporations escape with a small tax and some with millions in income pay no tax at all.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit with my remarks the following article by Tom Stewart of the Associated Press and which was printed in many newspapers over the country last week:

MILLIONAIRES DUCKING TAXES, 21 SKIPPED LAST YEAR

(By Tom Stewart)

WASHINGTON.—There are two kinds of millionaires in the United States: those who pay federal income taxes and those who don't. In the latter group there were 21 last year.

How is it possible, you ask as you reach for your checkbook after a losing bout with Form 1040, to have an income of more than $1 million a year and yet not pay any federal income tax?

The method most favored by untaxed millionaires is to give away things that have grown in value since they were acquired. Stocks, real estate, a share of the donor's business, art objects—all are good for this treatment.

The current value of the gift is deducted from income subject to taxation. So it's quite possible to reduce taxable income to zero.

One return cited in a recent Treasury Department study showed adjusted gross income of $10.8 million, contributions totaling $10.5 million and other deductions of $400,000 plus. No taxable income and hence no tax.

Another taxpayer's adjusted gross income of $4.3 million was erased by $4.5 million deductions, including $4 million in contributions.

Ordinarily, a taxpayer may deduct no more than 30 per cent of his income for charitable gifts. But it's not an ironclad rule.

A special exception allows the claiming of contributions without limit if in 8 of the past 10 years the taxpayer's contributions plus his taxes have added up to 90 per cent or more of income.

One aspect of these gifts that bothers those seeking reform of tax laws is that it is legal for Mr. Rich to make his donations to a foundation run by his family.

And perhaps the contribution to the Rich Foundation is a share of Mr. Rich's business. This kind of giving, a Treasury study says drily, "lacks the finality which characterizes a true parting with property."

Congress is thinking of throwing out the unlimited charitable contributions privilege, largely because it figures so often in stories about untaxed millionaires.

Another proposed change would make the untaxed superwealthy an extinct species by imposing a minimum tax on all-bracket incomes, with no exceptions.

Before he left office in January, Treasury Secretary Joseph W. Barr told Congress many middle-income taxpayers are losing confidence in the fairness of the tax system. His warning of a "taxpayer revolt" is still echoing on Capitol Hill. The new Treasury team is also pledged to a reworking of the tax laws.

If the unlimited charitable contribution rule is the favorite of untaxed millionaires, one of the runners-up would have to be the depreciation rules.

Depreciation is a great vanishing cream for taxable income. You don't have to be a millionaire to use it, but it helps.

Suppose you're a corporation executive poking along at $250,000 a year. Normally, you might figure on paying about $110,000 in income tax.

What you might do instead is borrow $15 million and buy a nice big apartment building. Figure an income from rents of $1 million, reduced by maybe $500,000 for upkeep and loan payments.

So far, you're $500,000 in black as a landlord, but don't worry about having to pay tax on it. Depreciation will bail you out.

While allowable amounts in succeeding years will be smaller, one accelerated method of figuring depreciation would permit you to claim your $15 million investment depreciated $750,000 the first year.

You get to deduct depreciation from income, even though no actual cash expenditure occurred. So the $500,000 you netted from operating the building becomes instead a paper loss of $250,000 and this cancels out that $250,000 salary. Result: no taxes instead of $110,000.

What makes it even more attractive is that the amount of cash that has passed through your hands—money you could put into other short-run projects—is $750,000. That's more than triple the cash you had to play with back before you became an apartment owner on borrowed capital.

Then there is the oil depletion allowance.

Suppose your wells are producing a before-taxes income of $1 million a year. It costs $450,000 to run the operation—deductible expense—so your net is $550,000.

But the depletion allowance, one of the most controversial tax breaks in the books, permits you to deduct 27½ per cent of the gross income from the wells. So off comes $275,000.

You still have another $275,000 in income. You can make it disappear this way:

You could spend $375,000 developing some other oil properties. This is deductible expense, so your black ink $275,000 becomes a red ink $100,000.

You are now theoretically $100,000 in the hole. Surprisingly enough, this is a position many of the superrich aim for, because paper losses are just the thing to shelter other income.

In your case, the $100,000 loss would enable you to have $100,000 in other income—stocks and bonds, for instance—and keep it all.

The net result of your year as a combination oilman and stock market dabbler is that you have paid no tax, and you come away with at least $275,000 clear. And though $1.1 million has passed through your hands, you have had, in the eyes of the law, no taxable income.

IDES OF APRIL

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, with the approach of April 15, which could be termed the "Ides of April," I hope that the beleaguered American taxpayer will not forget the struggle which must go on for tax reform in a substantial and effective manner.

Congress will act if the pressure stays on beyond the taxpaying deadline. Too often everything is forgotten after April 15.

I hope the taxpayer will not be taken in by "tokenism" instead of hard-hitting revenue-producing tax reform.

I am for tax reforms which require everyone to carry their fair share of the load including the tax-free, bondowning superrich, and the ungentlemanly farmer. I oppose the gimmickry of some tax-free foundations.

However, the real culprits which cause the vast Treasury losses include the oil depletion allowance, capital gains at death and the investment credit. Any tax reform proposal which fails to include these basic reforms constitutes a sham.

The American taxpayer must continue to be vigilant.

WE SHOULD HONOR COMMITMENTS MADE TO MICRONESIA

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Micronesia—the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—has been largely absent from the news headlines for about two decades. During World War II, millions of Americans read about Saipan and Tinian and Kwajalein. After the war, nuclear weapons tests made Bikini a household word. But since that time, the 90,000 people of the trust territory, and their 2,100 islands, have been pretty much out of sight, and out of mind.

I am very much afraid, Mr. Speaker, that Micronesia may be almost ready to capture some fresh headlines. They will not be attractive headlines for American readers. For if they do appear, they will record charges by the Micronesians of American neglect of their development, of American indifference to their welfare, and of American refusal to honor in full the commitments contained in the trusteeship agreement under which we administer the territory. These charges have already been set forth in a resolution of the Micronesian Senate which my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 25. Unless we respond promptly and meaningfully to their demand for self-determination, those charges will soon be aired before a world audience and our hopes for preserving close and friendly ties to Micronesia will be seriously compromised.

Two questions need to be posed, How have we come to this situation, and have we in fact reached the point where these headlines are inevitable? Let us examine them in order.

Few Americans are even aware that our formal governmental responsibilities extend across 3 million square miles of the Pacific Ocean. Fewer still are aware of the nature of those responsibilities, as defined by the trusteeship agreement we entered into in 1947. Among other things, we pledged to promote the economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants, and to promote their development "toward self-government or independence" according to their own freely expressed wishes.

Only in the last few years have we really begun to deliver on our promises, by substantially increasing appropriations and by encouraging the development of indigenous administrative and political structures, including the Congress of Micronesia itself. The pace envisaged for this development has been a gradual one, and ultimate authority in the trust territory has remained firmly in the hands of American officials. True self-government, as envisaged in the trusteeship agreement, remained something for a more distant future.

In this rapidly evolving world we live in, our efforts seem likely to prove too little, too late. The people of Micronesia were extraordinarily patient, even docile, through two decades of an American policy of relative inaction. Thus, the gradual approach to development would probably have been welcomed in the trust territory 10, or even 5, years ago. But meanwhile, the Micronesians have been touched by the same winds of change that are stirring so many others around the world, and gradualism is no longer enough. When I visited the trust territory in 1961, as U.S. Representative on the U.N. Trusteeship Council, the political objectives of its people were extremely limited. The language of the recent Micronesian Senate resolution to which I referred—language typical of the struggle against colonialism elsewhere in the world—was simply not in the Micronesian political vocabulary at that time. But this has been a decade of profound change, in Micronesia as elsewhere, and the pressures for full self-government and self-determination are near the point of explosion.

In this situation, can we still take action which would demonstrate to the people of the trust territory—as none of our actions to date have done—that we are willing to grant them the self-determination they were promised in 1947?

I believe we can. I believe there may still be a chance to seek a reasonable solution in full cooperation with the people of Micronesia, thus avoiding a harsh confrontation which would damage beyond repair our relationship with our long-time wards. But this opportunity is a fleeting one, for the trusteeship council will hold its next regular meeting in less than 2 months. At that time, the charges contained in the Micronesian Senate resolution will inevitably be given a full hearing. The Soviet delegate will gleefully seize on the opportunity to support—and to embellish—the Micronesian complaints, giving us a public black eye in the process. More serious may be the effect on the Micronesians, whose flexibility and readiness to compromise may be sharply curbed if they are prompted to take extreme public positions in an attempt to gain press attention in New York. In addition, we can be sure their charges will be aired in the strongly anticolonial committee of 24 and in the general assembly session which convenes in the fall.

As a first step in demonstrating our good faith, I hope the Congress will give prompt and favorable consideration to a resolution which I am introducing today. This resolution, virtually identical with one that I offered 2 years ago, would constitute a Commission of Americans and Micronesians to recommend within 1 year means by which the people of the trust territory could be enabled to express their wishes as to its future status. A similar resolution was also offered in the Senate at the last session, and one has recently been reintroduced in that body by the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota, Mr. BURDICK, and five cosponsors.

This resolution was offered 2 years ago, Mr. Speaker, in response to a specific request from the Micronesian Congress that just such a Commission be created. Had we responded affirmatively at that time, we would have given the Micronesians a concrete demonstration of our willingness to respond to reasonable requests advanced by their elected representatives. By so doing, we might have precluded the buildup of pressures which produced the recent Micronesian Senate resolution and thus kept the temperature of our entire relationship at a more normal, and healthier, temperature.

There will, inevitably, be opposition in this country to any exercise of self-determination by the Micronesians. Some will argue that the Micronesians are "not ready" to bear the full burdens of self-government. But this argument has become irrelevant in the world today, and indeed passed out of the vocabulary of such former colonial powers as Britain and France some 20 years ago. Others will contend that we must hold on to Micronesia because our troops fought and died for its islands in World War II—but this overlooks the fact that the enemy then was Japan, not the Micronesian people who are the claimants today. Finally, the argument will be made that these islands are strategically vital. There is, of course, some truth in this contention, but the broader issues of self-determination, and of the United States keeping its promises, should prevail. And there is, in any event, little likelihood that the Micronesians today would choose a status that would open the area wide to other nations.

Nevertheless, we must be prepared for the proposed Commission to put forward alternatives for the future of Micronesia which some in the country might consider unpalatable, including the option of independence. Unless our relations are permitted to worsen drastically, however, complete independence is not likely to be an appealing prospect for the Micronesians. They are far more likely to choose a status which will permit a continued close relationship with the United States. Two possibilities suggest themselves: a "free association" arrangement like that of Puerto Rico, or incorporation in the State of Hawaii. If the latter were to include appropriate protection for local autonomy and some assurance of future Federal funding for Micronesian development, it might well prove the most attractive alternative.

I would also like to call to the attention of my colleagues a bill introduced both at the last session and at the present one by my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), which would endow the trust territory with an organic act. This proposal, first put forward by President Eisenhower's Secretary of Interior in 1953, also merits prompt consideration. But I fear that an organic act would not alone provide convincing evidence of American willingness to face the key question of self-determination for Micronesia—and only if such evidence is swiftly furnished can we hope to induce the people of Micronesia to withhold such demands as are contained in their recent resolution.

In consequence, Mr. Speaker, I believe a commission created specifically to consider self-determination is also essential. My distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) commented last week that events seemed to have outrun such a commission. I would suggest, however, that we cannot proceed toward meaningful self-determination until we know what options should be offered the Micronesians in a plebiscite—and these options can only be defined in full consultation with the Micronesians themselves. It is for this reason that I have proposed that four of the nine members of the commission be chosen from the elected representatives of the Micronesian people. Only when their views are known can we in Congress legislate effectively in this area and thereby meet our responsibility to the trust territory. I believe the Micronesian leaders would recognize the validity of this argument and would gladly cooperate in the work of such a commission. I therefore urge my colleagues to give their support to the resolution which I am introducing today.

TRIBUTE TO "DOC" KLEIN

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending a dinner at Piccolo's Restaurant in Miami Beach—in my good district—on Sunday, March 16, put on by American Legion Post No. 85, Miami Beach, commemorating the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion. On this occasion special and affectionate recognition was given to the grand man of the American Legion of Florida, Maurice "Doc" Klein, a member of Post No. 85 of the American Legion of Miami Beach for 35 years, twice commander of the post, in whose term the splendid post home was built, and a leader in the American Legion not only in the Greater Miami area but in Florida and in the country for more than a third of a century.

"Doc" Klein symbolizes everything the American Legion stands for—reverence for God, love of country, and dedication to serving the veterans of our Nation's wars, as well as everything which is good for our country. I was privileged to pay my own heartfelt tribute of admiration and affection to "Doc" Klein on this occasion.

The Honorable Chuck Hall, mayor of Metropolitan Dade County, honored the occasion with his presence and read a proclamation honoring "Doc" Klein on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners of Dade County.

Mr. Speaker, I include this commendation following my remarks in the RECORD.

Also the Honorable Jay Dermer, mayor of Miami Beach, honored the occasion with his presence and read a proclamation bestowing the title of "Honorary Citizen of the City of Miami Beach" upon Maurice "Doc" Klein. I include this proclamation of the city of Miami Beach following my remarks.

Also present at this occasion was Capt. George Maines, the secretary of the founding group of the American Legion in the United States. I put in the RECORD sometime ago a list of those who attended this great convention and some of the resolutions adopted. A special honor was paid to Captain Maines by the awarding of a plaque to him commemorating his service to the American Legion.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to attest my friendship to Maurice "Doc" Klein and to commend him for all that he has done for America and for Americanism in his long and distinguished life. I pray that he shall have many, many more years to continue his great service.

The above-mentioned material follows:

METRO COMMENDATION

Whereas: Maurice Klein, affectionately known as "Doc," has made immeasurable contributions to the advancement of his community of Miami Beach, as well as all Dade County, much of it through his most loyal service to American Legion Post No. 85, now observing the 50th anniversary of the American Legion, and

Whereas: Mr. Klein, a member of the Post for 35 years, has nobly served twice as its Commander and during whose first tenure as Commander in 1940 witnessed the building of the Post home, and

Whereas: He has consistently remained as a mighty bulwark of South Florida, giving so generously of his time and energies on various committees, and also in such capacity as director of civil defense for Miami Beach during World War II and as director of the Miami Beach Serviceman's Center for 17 years, and as a former Councilman and Mayor of Miami Beach,

Now, therefore: The Board of County Commissioners of Metropolitan Dade County, Florida, takes great pride and pleasure in honoring years of dedicated service to his community, his state and his nation, by presenting this Certificate of Commendation to Maurice "Doc" Klein.

Signed and sealed in the office of the Board of County Commissioners of Metropolitan Dade County, Fla., this 12th day of March 1969.

The City of Miami Beach bestows the title of Honorary Citizen upon Maurice "Doc" Klein with full honors, privileges and courtesies attendant to this official recognition.

In deep appreciation of his friendship and outstanding contributions to our City, and as a token of the esteem and affection in which he is held by our citizenry.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the City of Miami Beach to be affixed this 16th day of March A.D., 1969.

JAY DERMER,
Mayor.

TIME FOR SUGAR ACT REFORM

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, while reading a Washington paper last month, the following article came to my attention:

MEXICANS HOARD SCARCE SUGAR

MEXICO CITY, February 24.—Mexican housewives were reported hoarding sugar today, hit by a shortage caused by pulling white sugar off the domestic market to meet sales obligations of the United States.

The National Union of Sugar Producers issued orders to its distributor member not to sell any more white sugar for home use. Instead, brown sugar will be made available to housewives and white sugar will be rationed to commercial users.

Industry sources said the sugar harvests have been late in some western states, forcing a cutback domestically to meet sales quotas abroad.

I call this article to the attention of my colleagues for the simple reason that I think it points up so clearly one unfair provision of the Sugar Act. The Sugar Act divides our total consumption between certain foreign sugar producing countries, offshore suppliers, and our domestic beet and cane farmers. In 1968, our mainland cane farmers were required to reduce their plantings by 5 percent. For 1969, our mainland cane farmers are having to reduce their plantings an additional 15 percent. At the same time they have had to build additional storage in order to store sugar already produced which cannot be marketed within their quota. To me, and I am sure to our American cane farmers, it is irreconcilable for our good neighbors to the south of us to be deprived of sugar in order for the Mexican Government to fill a quota to the United States which could be supplied by our American sugarcane farmers.

The Sugar Act resulted from a delicate balance between foreign policy considerations, beet-sugar States, cane-sugar States, and refinery States, which probably was not very satisfactory to any of them. Nevertheless, the last few years has proven that the present formula needs immediate revision.

I would like to call this situation to the special attention of my colleagues from wheat-producing States, or cotton States, or for that matter, all the other great producing areas of the Nation. Most of you operate under some form of Government regulation over production. But none, aside from sugar, suffers the added burden of foreign import quotas guaranteed by law. I wonder how the great Wheat Belt would feel if the U.S. Department of Agriculture were to say to you, as it does to our cane sugar producers, you must cut back production 20 percent in 2 years, not to achieve price stabilization, but to protect foreign import quotas which guarantees these foreign competitors a substantial portion of your American market. We are all aware of the particular problems in the cotton States, where cheap imported cotton competes unfairly with our own production. But even cotton does not face the threat of a guaranteed market for a set percentage of your domestic sales from foreign sources.

Congress must take a new look at the sugar situation. American farmers must not be forced to reduce their own production to satisfy foreign governments. As in the case of Mexico, many countries which benefit from this unfair treatment cannot even meet their quotas, but the foreign share is then simply divided among the other foreign sources.

Within the last few weeks the Department of Agriculture increased domestic quotas by 65,000 tons, but at the same time increased foreign quotas by 350,000 tons. The foreign increases were mostly due to shortages in production in Puerto Rico, which for purposes of the Sugar Act is considered a foreign source, and whose quota is then reallocated to other foreign countries when it is unable to fill its own. Thus we find that an allocation which was intended to assist the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, an actual partner of the United States, is divided among foreign countries who have no similar ties with our own country.

It is shocking to realize that even Peru, which has nationalized U.S. investments without compensation, and has seized American fishing boats on the high seas, also shares in this reallocation. In this regard, at the very time the United States enters into negotiations with Peru for the recovery of stolen property, the Department of Agriculture grants them an increased sugar quota.

U.S. producers are willing and able to meet the increasing demands of our own domestic markets. Congress should not deny U.S. citizens the right to participate more fully in our own Nation's food needs. We need not wait until the expiration of the current Sugar Act to grant relief. It should be done now.

CONGRESSIONAL INACTION ON CRIME CRISIS

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at the close of business today, Congress will begin its second recess of the year, without taking any affirmative action against the ever increasing crime problem.

In the Senate, the Tydings Committee has held hearings and made some recommendations including the call for a Federal grand jury investigation of the supply system which apparently floods the streets of Washington with hard narcotics. But no legislation has yet been cleared by Senate committees.

In the House, there have not even been hearings.

One reason for the delay may be the lack of a legislative program from the White House. The President has taken note of the drug situation by transferring more Federal agents to the Washington area, which may help, but presumably they will simply be pulled out of other areas of the country where the problem is also great.

The new administration undoubtedly needs time to work up its own plans on the problem, but the crime clock continues to run unabated. We know what is needed: increased manpower at the enforcement, prosecution, and judicial levels, new court facilities and added funds.

A look at the committee calenders in the House for the last few weeks shows that the District Committee has concerned itself with internal organization disputes and with Washington's parking problems, while the Judiciary Committee wrestles with electoral college reform. The importance of these matters speak for themselves, but compared to the crime problem the American people may well ask how priorities are set.

If a crime package has not come from the White House by the end of the spring recess, the committees of the House and Senate should proceed with hearings and write their legislation without further delay. Many Members have already introduced legislation, as I have done, to bring solutions to some of the problems. While the chairmen may want to wait on the White House out of courtesy to the new administration, the entire process of government cannot wait indefinitely to remedy a problem as serious as the current crime crisis.

LET'S CONTROL WELFARE PROGRAMS

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a Federal national minimum welfare system in all the States. The bill would give the Secretary power to prescribe:

First, the minimum amount of aid or assistance to be paid to eligible recipients in the various public assistance programs;

Second, the manner in which other income and resources should be taken into account in determining need for aid or assistance;

Third, uniform standards of eligibility for recipients of the various public assistance programs; and

Fourth, the financing relationship between the Federal Government and the various State governments.

The power of the Secretary to set minimum standards and uniform acceptance criteria for all the States, as authorized by this bill, would be subject to congressional review.

The principal aim of this legislation would be to abate the movement of needy families from State to State and from rural to urban areas in search of higher welfare payments. More specifically, the intent of this bill is to level out the inequalities in the present welfare structure which operate to penalize those States with the most humanitarian political systems, the most developed economies, the most progressive fiscal programs, and the most pressing urban needs. As for those States where standards of assistance and average payments are low, this legislation would be to their advantage in that it would act as a lever to upgrade the economic level of the whole population.

In more general terms, this bill would become a powerful force working toward a more healthy and stable population balance in the Nation. A comprehensive reform of public assistance programs would serve as a major factor in stemming the depopulation of America's towns and farms, in curtailing the burgeoning influx of the poor and the unskilled into the Nation's big cities, and in braking the alarming exodus of the urban middle-class to suburbia.

My State—Connecticut—embodies the very serious social and fiscal ills which this bill would redress. Connecticut is now in the throes of serious budgetary difficulty, much of it brought on by the State's deepening welfare crisis.

In the fiscal year of 1966–67, gross welfare expenditures in Connecticut amounted to roughly 20 percent of the State's gross general fund expenditures. Two years later in 1968–69, welfare costs were nearing 30 percent of a vastly increased general fund.

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Fiscal year	Gross welfare expenditures	Gross general fund expenditures	Percent welfare of tota.
1966–67	$99.5	$465.9	21.4
1967–68	126.1	568.6	22.2
1968–69	163.7	602.4	27.2

Connecticut's welfare problem is compounded—as it is in those other Northeastern States which are economically advanced and politically enlightened—by the steady influx of the very needy in search of increased public assistance. The public assistance program which provides aid for families with dependent children, known commonly as ADC, offers striking evidence of how Connecticut's welfare population is being augmented. Both the number of families and the number of recipients benefiting from the ADC program in Connecticut have increased by 40 percent from 1966 to 1968. The picture for 1969 looks still bleaker.

Year	Number families ADC	Number recipients ADC
1966	12,724	50,000
1967	14,600	57,800
1968	17,900	69,200
1969 estimate	22,342	
1970 estimate	25,665	

The costs of this particular ADC program to the humanitarian State of Connecticut represent the major welfare burden in the welfare budget and—increasingly—a critical factor in the entire Connecticut general fund. From 1965 to 1969 the amount appropriated for ADC in Connecticut rose on an annual average of approximately 20 percent; from 1967 to 1968, the year with the largest hike, the increase in ADC expenditures was a staggering 43 percent.

[In millions of dollars]

Year:	*ADC expenditures*
1965	29.4
1966	32.3
1967	42.7
1968	60.6
1969	71.8
1970 estimate	86.5

The explanation for the steep rise in Connecticut's ADC payments is a combination of two factors: the influx from other States of indigent families with dependent children and the high level of ADC payments in Connecticut in contrast to most other States.

Year	Average ADC payment per family		Average ADC payment per recipient	
	Connecticut	United States	Connecticut	United States
1966	180.37	149.91	45.51	36.29
1967	188.20	157.80	47.45	38.50
1968	232.70	166.25	60.00	41.35

Another way of looking at the ADC burden which is peculiar to Connecticut is to measure the degree of effort which Connecticut makes compared to the degree of effort in most other States. In this regard, Massachusetts, New York, and New Jersey are northeastern exceptions, since the welfare standards of these three States are as humanitarian as those in Connecticut. The table below indicates that Connecticut makes nearly twice the effort in ADC expenditures as do other States. The same approximate ratio holds for the effort which Connecticut makes compared to other States in the old-age assistance program—OAA—and the aid to permanently and totally disabled persons program—APTD.

1968 State funds for:	*Percent*
ADC in Connecticut	56.3
ADC in United States	31.7
APTD in Connecticut	52.3
APTD in United States	33.8
OAA in Connecticut	51.4
OAA in United States	28.5

Time is running out on the welfare crisis. The States and the cities in the Northeast with humanitarian welfare standards are slowly being brought to their knees by their crushing financial burdens. My bill would bring these areas protection from greater welfare burdens in the future. It is a means to bring order to the balance of our population between urban and suburban, north and south, needy and self-sufficient. It needs to be enacted.

WE NEED FAMILY SAVERS, NOT FAMILY BUSTERS, IN HEW

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I note with alarm a story on the front page of today's Washington Post indicating that President Nixon is considering the appointment of James J. Barry to a sensitive post in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It strikes me that now is a peculiarly inappropriate time—when we are groping for new answers to the age-old problems of welfare and public assistance—now is a peculiarly inappropriate time to propose appointment of a man whose greatest claim to fame is that he busted up more families than any other man on the east coast.

One of the things that our pitiful attempts to solve the problems of poverty and public assistance should have taught us is that the punitive approach will not work. It was only after years of "welfare investigations" and "midnight raids," such as Mr. Barry is famous for in New Hampshire, that we finally realized that all we had done was to break up more families than we had kept together. I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that society will continue to pay the price during the coming years for the lack of foresight with which we forced young people to grow up without fathers as a conscious policy of the State.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called hard-line approach to welfare, such as Mr. Barry appears to have followed in New Hampshire, is so thoroughly discredited among sociologists and welfare experts that it is hard to believe that President Nixon is seriously considering a man of Mr. Barry's inclinations for an important policymaking position in HEW. The hardline was discredited in Newburgh, N.Y., it was discredited in New Hampshire, and it has been discredited elsewhere.

One of the most pressing problems facing this Nation in 1969 is a rational restructuring of the entire public assistance and welfare effort. This kind of undertaking is going to require men of vision and men of compassion. It is going to require men who truly understand the ultimate goals of welfare—assist the disadvantaged, the old, the poor, the disabled, not to punish those who are unfortunate enough to require public welfare assistance. Mr. Speaker, the punitive approach to solving welfare problems will never succeed. It would speak well for Secretary Finch if he delayed his announcement of Mr. Barry's appointment. I hope that my colleagues are as concerned as I am about this unfortunate impending appointment. I hope that some of them will express this concern either on the floor or to the Secretary directly. All of us will be the losers if HEW, so long a progressive force in the welfare field, becomes a bastion of punitive welfarism.

The article referred to follows:

HARD-LINE WELFARE AIDE IS SLATED FOR HEW POST

(By Eve Edstrom)

A high Nixon Administration post in the sensitive area of shaping Federal welfare policy is scheduled to go to a man with a reputation for administering punitive welfare policies.

James J. Barry, former Health and Welfare Commissioner in New Hampshire, is expected to be named today as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare for Community and Field Services.

One of his primary responsibilities will be to develop alternatives to health and welfare policies affecting programs under his jurisdiction.

These include HEW programs related to Model Cities, neighborhood services and consumer affairs. In addition, Barry will study legislative proposals drafted elsewhere in the Department.

Barry was appointed New Hampshire's Welfare Commissioner in 1949 by then Gov. Sherman Adams.

Over objections of medical and socialwork professionals, he was appointed Commissioner of Health and Welfare in the early 1960s before former Gov. John W. King, a Democrat took office.

Barry left the commissionership in 1966 after numerous clashes with King, and with Health and Welfare subordinates, many of whom signed petitions to complain about his policies.

Barry, according to New Hampshire sources had the support of publisher William Loeb of the far-right-wing. Loeb once called President Eisenhower a "stinking hypocrite."

Barry said last night that the "differences of opinion" that existed between him and King began over "adequate appropriations" and that Loeb reported the differences "objectively."

Barry also said he rigidly enforced welfare rules but denied that he had ordered nighttime raids on the homes of welfare mothers.

However, welfare workers under Barry's supervision said that, contrary to officially stated policy, he "forced" workers to make such raids to determine whether there was an unrelated male in the household.

They also said that, contrary to then existing Federal rules, he made registration for employment a condition for giving aid to families with dependent children.

"It was very difficult, if not impossible, to give social-work services to families under Mr. Barry's regime," one worker said last night.

"It is unbelievable that he should be selected for a high HEW post when the Federal people were always after us for violating their rules."

Barry, 50, was defeated for the Republican nomination for New Hampshire Governor in 1966, and became minority counsel to the Senate Commerce Committee in 1967.

Barry's HEW appointment is scheduled to be announced by Secretary Robert H. Finch and Patricia Hitt, Assistant HEW Secretary for Community and Field Services.

There was speculation last night that Barry's selection was made to offset criticism that the Administration is filling too many HEW posts with liberals, such as Assistant Secretary for Education James E. Allen Jr., and Assistant Secretary for Administration James L. Farmer.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S VOLUNTEER ARMY COMMISSION

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIVKA. Mr. Speaker, when I first saw the announcement that President Nixon had appointed a study commission to review the present draft system and to investigate the possibility of a volunteer army, I was most encouraged. I have sponsored a draft reform bill that provides for such a commission. Then I read the list of appointees—and I was disappointed. Let me hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that I was not disappointed by the quality of Mr. Nixon's appointees. They are all men of character and achievement in their chosen fields of endeavor. Every one of the members would, I am certain, serve faithfully and would render his judgment on what was best for the Nation. Every one of them—save one—also suffers from the malaise known as "over 30itis."

Mr. Speaker, six members of the Commission are over 60 years old—one of the members is 70. The median age of the men on the President's new Commission is 56, and there is only one man under 40. Now my concern is not that these men are too old to perform the task asked of them—but simply that whatever their conclusion, it will be less credible to the young draft-age people of this Nation because their generation has not been represented. After all, Mr. Speaker, it is the turbulance and unrest among our young people which has focused the Nation's attention on the inequities of the present outmoded draft system. It is the conscientious objection by many of our students and young adults which has led to serious consideration of the volunteer army proposal. Why, then, we may ask, was only one representative of the generation under 30 included on the Commission? Why was there no representative of the 30-to-40 age group? Why, in short, was only one young person included on the Commission when the "generation gap," which already divides us, is recognized to be widening every day?

Are we saying that those under 30 are only good for doing the serving and fighting—because they are not smart enough to do anything else. Does your beard have to be gray to find the equitable way to resolve the draft dilemma—if the President thinks that, he is wasting his time in even appointing the Commission.

I emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that I do not question the integrity or judgment of the men chosen by President Nixon. But if events over the last few years have proven anything, they have proven that there are real and significant differences in view between the generations. The one subject on which there is probably more difference than any other is the subject of the draft and the nature of the obligation which citizens owe to the Nation for military service. It does, therefore, seem to me a source of legitimate concern that there is not a stronger representation on the Commission from the group which has the most to gain from a volunteer army recommendation—and the most to lose from a continuation of the present inequitable draft system.

For the information of my colleagues, I include a list of the appointees to the new Commission with their respective ages—as furnished by the Legislative Reference Service—and a brief biography of each:

Thomas S. Gates Jr.: Age, 63—Secretary of Defense in the Eisenhower administration, who is now chairman of the executive committee of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. in New York.

William Meckling: Age, 48—Dean of the College of Business Administration at the University of Rochester, will serve as the Commission's Executive Director.

Thomas B. Curtis: Age, 59—Former Congressman, St. Louis.

Frederick Friedman: Age, 65—Professor of economics, University of Chicago.

Crawford Greenwalt: Age, 66—chairman, finance committee, duPont DeNemours & Co.

Alan Greenspan: Age, 43—Economic consultant, New York.

Alfred Gruenther: Age, 70—Former Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

Stephen Herbits: Age, 27—Former House researcher.

Theodore M. Hesburgh: Age, 51—president, University of Notre Dame.

Jerome Holland: Age, 53—president, Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.

John Kemper: Age, 56—headmaster, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.

Jeanne L. Noble: Age, 42—professor of education, New York University.

Lauris Norstad: Age, 61—Former Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

W. Allen Wallis: Age, 56—President, University of Rochester.

Roy Wilkins: Age, 67—executive director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Average age: 55.

Median age: 56.

RENAME PENTAGON BUILDING "THE EISENHOWER CENTER"

(Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to insult the memory of one great American in order to honor the memory of another or to discuss the relative merits of their greatness.

There are enough public facilities to go around—to be named for each of our outstanding leaders.

Since General Eisenhower was one of our relatively few five-star generals and since the building now known as "Pentagon" not only has five sides but is at once a symbol both of General Eisenhower's noble military service against outside threats to our security, and still more noble service in warning against excessive military influence inside our country, I am introducing legislation to rename the Pentagon Building "The Eisenhower Center."

MEMORIAL TO REV. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago tomorrow, on April 4, 1968, the entire Nation was stunned and shocked to learn that the bullet of an assassin had struck down the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. That a man who had dedicated his entire life to securing justice and an equal opportunity for all Americans should have been so brutally murdered seemed inconceivable. And yet, the violence which has characterized America's response to the fight for equality and equal opportunity was all too common.

On the first commemoration of Dr. King's death, I think it is imperative that we not simply mourn his loss again—although the magnitude of that loss is beyond description. Let us view his life in the terms which he attached to it; namely, as part of the ongoing struggle to achieve justice for those millions of Americans—black and white—who continue to suffer from poverty and discrimination. But the challenges and goals which he set for America must be the urgent concern of all of us.

Martin Luther King, Jr., dedicated his life to the struggle for equal justice for all Americans. His inspirational leadership in the civil rights movement in both the South and the North helped make possible the enactment of the landmark Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Beyond that, his eloquent articulation of the plight of millions of Americans still living under abject poverty awakened the conscience of the Nation and laid the groundwork for the subsequent reordering of our national priorities which must follow that legislation.

Dr. King rejected the notion that hate and violence are inevitable and, instead, by appealing to America's conscience, tried to draw out our better instincts for justice and fairplay. In his own lifetime he became a symbol of the ideals of equality and equal opportunity. And it was as that symbol that he was struck down by the very hate and violence he had devoted his life to eradicating.

I was privileged to work with Dr. King on many occasions during the course of his career, and I never failed to be impressed by the magnitude of his commitment and the steadfastness of his courage. In an era of our national history marked by strife and racial intolerance, he was a man of all races; a man for whom color was irrelevant; a critic who never doubted that America could be redeemed.

At the moment of his death, Dr. King was making plans to lead the Poor Peoples' Campaign intended to expose and dramatize the plight of the millions of Americans trapped in the misery and hopelessness of the big city ghettos, as well as the condition of the poor in the rural areas of our country. It was in the midst of this drive—possibly the most important in his life—that he was brutally murdered. We will never know whether his leadership would have again moved the Nation to action. But we do know that his loss was a grievous loss for all of us, for we could ill afford to lose his understanding and compassion.

In all of the talk about the nonviolent methods of Dr. King and his followers, the fact that he used these means to confront radically the hypocrisy and injustice of the Nation has often been obscured. Dr. King believed that the evils and deprivations of our society must be confronted and uprooted, and he risked constant danger in order to confront those evils. It was typical of the man that his final efforts before his death were in behalf of striking sanitation workers in Memphis, and that the result of those efforts—even after his death—was an improved life for those to whom he had committed himself.

The urgency of the task before all of us was nowhere so eloquently and dramatically summed up than in the famous letter Dr. King wrote from the Birmingham jail. In that letter he said:

> I guess it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say wait. But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fathers at will and drown your sisters and brothers at whim; when you have seen hate-filled policemen curse, kick, brutalize, and even kill your black brothers and sisters with impunity; when you have seen the vast majority of your 20 million Negro brothers smoldering in an air tight cage of poverty in the midst of an affluent society; when you suddenly find your tongue twisted and your speech stammering as you seek to explain to your 6 year old daughter why she can't go to the public amusement park that has been advertised on television, and see tears welling up in her little eyes when she is told that Funtown is closed to colored children, and see the depressing clouds of inferiority begin to form in her little mental sky, and see her begin to distort her little personality by unconsciously developing a bitterness toward white people; when you have to concoct an answer for a 5 year old son asking in agonized pathos: 'Daddy, why do white people treat colored people so mean?'; when you take a cross-country drive and find it necessary to sleep night after night in the uncomfortable corners of your automobile because no motel will accept you; when you are humiliated day in and day out by nagging signs reading "white" men and 'colored'; when your first name become 'nigger' and your middle name becomes 'boy' (however old you are) and your last name becomes 'John,' and when your wife and mother are never given the respected title "Mrs."; when you are harried by day and haunted by night by the fact that you are a Negro, living constantly at tip-toe stance never quite knowing what to expect next, and plagued with inner fears and outer resentments; when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of nobodiness; then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait.

Martin Luther King, Jr., awakened the Nation to the reality of injustice and discrimination within our own society and ultimately sacrificed even his very life to the struggle which remains before hate and oppression are eradicated in America. It is up to us—particularly those of us here in Congress who have the power to end poverty and oppression—to carry on his work.

Three weeks ago, the National Urban Coalition, under the leadership of former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John Gardner, issued a report of the progress the country has made in meeting the challenges defined by the 1968 report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. In area after area—in education, housing, poverty, discrimination, employment, and pollution—the conclusion was: after 1 year, no progress.

If Martin Luther King, Jr.'s dream of redeeming America is ever to become a reality, this Congress must see to it that next year's report does not show another year lost in inaction.

THE NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter, including an editorial.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Evening Star, Columnist David Lawrence made an impassioned plea for congressional reorganization before it is too late. He argues that, as a coequal branch of Government, Congress should be assuming some of the leadership and initiative; but, as presently constituted, it is not capable of this. He attributes this incapacity to small staffs, heavy workloads, and lack of information. He concludes by observing that although most Members are aware of congressional shortcomings, few are willing to propose solutions.

I think Mr. Lawrence is to be commended on his perceptive analysis of what is wrong with Congress and what is to be done if we are to reclaim our rightful role in the Federal scheme of things. At the same time, I was a bit disappointed to note that Mr. Lawrence leaves the reader with the impression that "most Members of Congress are reluctant to offer remedies." This assertion completely overlooks efforts currently being made in both Houses and on both sides of the aisle to effect congressional reform during this session. This move has widespread bipartisan support in the true spirit of the Monroney-Madden Joint Committee on Legislative Reorganization that drafted the original reform package back in 1966.

I am proud to be one of over 100 Republican Members of the House cosponsoring the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969 (H.R. 6278) which calls for far-reaching changes aimed at streamlining congressional operations and strengthening the legislative role vis-a-vis that of the executive.

But time is running out. If ever there was a time and a need for action, this is it. We cannot countenance the further decline of Congress, for it is ultimately linked to the decline of our entire democratic system. I urge all my colleagues in this House to give this matter their immediate and most urgent attention and to join with us in this important task.

Edmund Burke once said, "Reform in order to preserve." It is obvious that if we are to preserve our democratic form of government we must, from time to time, reform its component parts. We have already given the President the authority to do so with the executive branch; the time has come for us to likewise set our own House in order.

At this point in the Record I wish to insert a list of those Republicans cosponsoring the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969; and, secondly, the full text of the Lawrence column to which I have referred:

Cosponsors of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969

Alabama: John Buchanan, Jack Edwards.

Arizona: Sam Steiger.

California: Don H. Clausen, Charles S. Gubser, Craig Hosmer, Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., Robert B. Mathias, Jerry L. Pettis, Charles M. Teague, Bob Wilson.

Colorado: Donald G. Brotzman.

Connecticut: Thomas J. Meskill, Lowell P. Weicker, Jr.

Delaware: William V. Roth.

Florida: J. Herbert Burke, William C. Cramer, Louis Frey, Jr.

Georgia: Benjamin B. Blackburn, Fletcher Thompson.

Idaho: Orval Hansen, James A. McClure.

Illinois: John B. Anderson, Harold R. Collier, John N. Erlenborn, Paul Findley, Robert McClory, Robert H. Michel, Tom Railsback, Donald Rumsfeld.

Indiana: David W. Dennis, Richard L. Roudebush, Roger H. Zion.

Iowa: John Kyl, Fred Schwengel.

Kansas: Chester L. Mize, Keith G. Sebelius, Garner E. Shriver, Larry Winn, Jr.

Maryland: J. Glenn Beall, Jr., Gilbert Gude, Rogers C. B. Morton.

Massachusetts: Silvio O. Conte, Hastings Keith, F. Bradford Morse.

Michigan: Garry Brown, Marvin L. Esch, James Harvey, Edward Hutchinson, Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Philip E. Ruppe, Guy Vander Jagt.

Minnesota: Clark MacGregor, Ancher Nelsen, Albert H. Quie, John M. Zwach.

Nebraska: Glenn Cunningham, Robert V. Denney.

New Hampshire: James C. Cleveland, Louis C. Wyman.

New Jersey: William T. Cahill, Florence P. Dwyer, John E. Hunt, Charles W. Sandman, Jr., William B. Widnall.

New Mexico: Manuel Lujan.

New York: Daniel E. Button, Barber B. Conable, Jr., Hamilton Fish, Jr., James R. Grover, Jr., Seymour Halpern, James F. Hastings, Alexander Pirnie, Ogden R. Reid, Howard W. Robison, John W. Wydler.

North Carolina: James T. Broyhill.

North Dakota: Thomas S. Kleppe.

Ohio: Donald E. Lukens, Charles A. Mosher, J. William Stanton, Robert Taft, Jr., Charles W. Whalen, Jr.

Oregon: John R. Dellenback, Wendell Wyatt.

Pennsylvania: Edward G. Biester, Jr., R. Lawrence Coughlin, Edwin D. Eshleman, James G. Fulton, John P. Saylor, Herman T. Schneebeli.

Tennessee: W. E. (Bill) Brock, John J. Duncan, Dan Kuykendall.

Texas: George Bush.

Utah: Sherman P. Lloyd.

Virginia: G. William Whitehurst.

Washington: Catherine May, Thomas M. Pelly.

Wisconsin: John W. Byrnes, Alvin E. O'Konski, William A. Steiger.

Wyoming: John Wold.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 2, 1969]

Congress Requires Reorganizing

(By David Lawrence)

Congress has been in session three months, but most people are hardly conscious of it. For very little of importance has been accomplished, and the general feeling here is that the legislators are waiting for the Chief Executive to map out programs for their consideration.

A variety of explanations for the inaction is being heard on Capitol Hill. Some of the veterans in Congress say it is customary to wait for an administration to lay out its plans and to submit its proposals. The newer members are a bit impatient and think more progress should have been made.

One interesting observation comes from a few Nixon supporters, who say the new President thinks the country wants a little rest from debate over such controversial proposals as were offered during the preceding administration.

But the obvious is being overlooked. What's wrong with Congress today has always been wrong. A legislative body which has been given co-equal responsibility with the executive might be thought to be organized well enough to assume some initiative and leadership on its own. But it really isn't.

Congress is very much in need of reorganization or "modernization." In the April issue of "Reader's Digest," there is an article entitled "Is Congress Destroying Itself?" It says that the attacks on Congress "come from worried citizens—journalists, political scientists, students of government, state and local officials, disillusioned voters."

What seems to be basically unsolved is the problem of how 435 members of the House and 100 Senators from 50 states can answer the mail from their constituents, satisfy their needs, and yet play a constructive role in shaping the laws that are presented for passage.

Staffs, of course, are inadequate. The people back home continue to ask lots of questions, seek assistance on personal and civic matters, and request help on local public and private projects. Many members maintain offices with a large personnel just to take care of the requests of constituents.

Entirely apart from demands on his office of a local nature, the representative or senator finds himself taking a great deal of time trying to understand the complex issues involved in proposed laws or appropriations. With many billions of dollars being spent in programs that run not merely a year but four or more years, it is necessary to study the background of each proposal, whether it is new or a continuation of a previous program.

Most of the legislators—78 percent of those responding to a questionnaire—said "lack of information" was the No. 1 problem which prevents them from executing their duties satisfactorily. Printed testimony of committees amounted to 250,000 pages last year, plus 27,000 pages of committee reports. But when is the representative or senator going to find the hours necessary each week to examine carefully all these documents?

Theoretically, Congress has delegated special subjects like banking, finance, appropriations, foreign relations, agriculture and judicial questions to committees which have small technical staffs of their own. Many members regularly attend the meetings of committees on which they serve and conscientiously endeavor to become familiar with the subjects presented to them, but they naturally are not able to obtain more than a cursory knowledge of the work of the other committees.

Congress has used the committee system effectively to conduct investigations on subjects of paramount interest and, on the whole, the work of the different committees has been constructive. But as the executive tasks of government grow larger and larger each year, the supervisory duties of the legislative branch also will be forced to expand substantially.

Perhaps the most disappointing phase of all is the tendency of members of Congress to avoid ticklish or delicate questions. There is, for instance, at present no more pressing need than to get a clear definition of federal power in relation to the exercise of authority by state and city governments.

Most members of Congress are well aware of the short-comings of the congressional system of today, but they are reluctant to offer remedies. This, it would appear, is regarded as primarily the obligation of the party leaders.

SOUTH AFRICAN AIRWAYS

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I notice that some of my colleagues here in the House yesterday called on the Nixon administration to revoke the award of the Civil Aeronautics Board to South African Airways granting landing rights to that airline to land its regularly scheduled flights at John F. Kennedy Airport in New York.

At a hearing yesterday before a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee, it was alleged that refusal by the Nixon administration to review this decision "encouraged apartheid."

Regardless of the fact that we have had an air agreement with South Africa since 1947 permitting Pan American landing rights in that country, it seems strange to me that no objections were heard here in the Congress when landing rights in this country were granted last year to the Soviet airline, Aeroflot. Members raising objections to the South African Airways privileges because of that nation's racial separation policies saw fit to remain silent when the Soviet agreement was signed. The Soviet Union, of course, does not subscribe to racial and religious separation of its citizens. Instead it has relied upon exclusion, removal, and extermination.

Americans should be reminded of another fact. The emblem of the South African Airways is the flying cheetah. That is a proud emblem, also used by the South African Air Force. In 1950, when the United States was fighting in Korea, one of the few countries who backed the United Nation's Korean resolution with men, equipment, and lives was South Africa. The South African Government sent a squadron of "flying cheetahs" to Korea, and the South African "2" Squadron fought valiantly with the men of the U.S. Air Force's 18th Fighter Bomber Wing for the entire duration of that war. Any U.S. airman who fought in Korea will remember well that the "2" Squadron was among the proudest and best fighting units to do combat with the Soviet and North Korean Air Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to recite a little forgotten history to a few of my colleagues.

UNIQUE AND DESIRABLE PATRIOTIC PROGRAMS

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, a number of concerned and patriotic citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., have recently instituted several unique and desirable patriotic programs. These citizens, primarily Mr. Ted Besser of WKJG radio and Mrs. Paul J. Peterink, initiated a procedure on Mr. Besser's "Talk to Ted" program on WKJG radio whereby each day a different listener calls in to give aloud the "Pledge of Allegiance" This idea has received warm response from the people of Fort Wayne. It has much merit and should be emulated by other "call in" radio programs around the country.

Another and equally successful effort made by these concerned citizens was the establishment of patriotic programs at various public gatherings. The first such program was held in late January in honor of the approaching birthday of George Washington. The program took place during a hockey game at the Fort Wayne Memorial Coliseum. The local Boy Scout troops distributed over 6,200 small flags, donated by a public spirited citizen, and thus decorated the Coliseum. It was an impressive program. The Concordia High School Color Guard posted colors, followed by the singing of "America the Beautiful" by the Concordia Choir. The "Pledge of Allegiance" was then led by John Larsen, an eagle scout. The program ended with the singing of the "National Anthem."

These efforts deserve special commendation. I hope that other communities will follow such fine examples.

PROPOSAL TO RENAME DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STADIUM AS THE DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER MEMORIAL STADIUM

(Mr. HOGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation cosponsored by Messrs. Blackburn, Camp, Don H. Clausen, Coughlin, Hall, Halpern, Michel, Montgomery, O'Konski, Pelly, Price of Texas, Schadeberg, Sebelius Watson, Wiggins, and Winn and Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, which calls for the renaming of the District of Columbia Stadium as the Dwight David Eisenhower Memorial Stadium.

It is particularly appropriate that the District of Columbia Stadium bear the name of our great former President. Because he was a great athlete, because he signed the legislation creating the District of Columbia Stadium, because he loved sports, because in 7 of his 8 years he threw the first pitch to ceremonially launch our baseball seasons, because it would be such a fitting memorial to his name, especially to our sports-minded young people, I have introduced this legislation.

Congress named the stadium the District of Columbia Stadium and legally it will take an amendment to the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 to change the name. After my election, I decided that, upon President Eisenhower's death, I would introduce legislation to rename the District of Columbia Stadium in his honor. I was, therefore, amazed when the former Secretary of Interior, Stewart Udall, 3 days before the inauguration of President Nixon on a Saturday morning called a special meeting of the District of Columbia Armory Board, which operates the stadium, and urged that the stadium be immediately named for the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy. This was done without any consultation whatsoever with the Congress of the United States which has authority over and responsibility for the stadium.

Since Congress passed and President Eisenhower signed the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957, the act has been amended twice. It is my position that the Secretary of Interior had no more authority to rename the District of Columbia Stadium than he would have to rename the Grand Canyon. This is within the legislative purview of Congress, not the Armory Board or the Secretary of Interior. The act creating the stadium requires the Armory Board to file with Congress in January of each year a report concerning its activities and to make recommendations to Congress as to future control and use of the District of Columbia Stadium. Since the act under which the Armory Board and the Department of Interior draw their authority over the stadium refers specifically to the "District of Columbia Stadium," it would appear that this act would have to be amended to reflect a different name.

With all due respect to the memory of the distinguished Senator, the Secretary of Interior's unilateral act was a source of regret to me, since, as I said, I had planned, upon President Eisenhower's passing, to propose legislation naming the stadium in his honor. Since it is my position, and that of several authorities on the subject, that the Secretary of Interior exceeded his authority, I have introduced this legislation anyway. I hope that it will be enacted.

President Eisenhower loved Washington. He loved sports. His signature created the District of Columbia Stadium. I feel that it would be a fitting tribute to his memory to name this stadium the Dwight David Eisenhower Memorial Stadium.

REMEMBERING THOSE WHO SERVE IN VIETNAM

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity today to remind my colleagues of something we, in this country, are too often inclined to overlook. I refer, of course, to our U.S. fighting men in Vietnam and the support and encouragement they are entitled to and so richly deserve from us here at home.

Certainly, it is true that each of us longs for a settlement of the war in Vietnam. That longing, however, should not result in overlooking those brave young men serving in that tiny war-torn country.

Much has been said and written about those who refuse or avoid service in Vietnam with our Armed Forces. Regrettably, however, too little is being said about or done for those who daily risk their lives far from home in the service of their country and in the uniform of our Nation.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from Mrs. Peggy Douglas of Arcata, Calif., who serves as president of the auxiliary of our Humboldt County

Cattleman's Association known as the Cow Belles. In her letter to me, Mrs. Douglas informs me of what her organization has done and plans to do for our fighting men in Vietnam.

I would like to share parts of Mrs. Douglas' letter with my distinguished colleagues:

> MY DEAR MR. CLAUSEN: In today's troubled times of protest marches, riots, and draft card burning; we, the Humboldt County Cow Belles, thought you might be interested in hearing about a project that we are trying to get started in our county.
>
> Last November, we packed, wrapped, and sent 48 gift packages to a unit of Marines in Vietnam. This program was an off-shoot of the annual hunting and fishing trips of amputees fostered by the Humboldt area Veteran Service Clubs.
>
> Due to the gratification of these boys and our own enjoyment from this endeavor, we are now trying to promote a county-wide "Adopt a Fighting Company" Week.
>
> We feel it is high time we started giving our boys some old-fashioned moral support and hope that the rest of our county feels the same. Who knows, perhaps we can start the ball rolling across the United States!
>
> Sincerely Yours,
>
> MRS. PEGGY DOUGLAS,
>
> *President, Humboldt County Cow Belles.*

Mr. Speaker, in one of the responses the Cow Belles have since received from a fighting man in Vietnam, this is what he had to say:

> All the fellows really enjoyed what you sent. We didn't think anybody worried about us and that we were over here to just end the war, but now we know different.

This testimonial, in my judgment, reminds us once again that our brave men in Vietnam need our support, our encouragement, our thoughts, and our prayers.

I sincerely hope this fine example of concern and commitment will be encouraged in each of your respective districts in every section of America.

GENERAL EISENHOWER LIKENESS ON 1969 FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

(Mr. McCLORY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, many suggestions have been made for appropriate recognition of the contributions made by the late Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower to our Nation and to the world.

The Lake County Coin Club, which is an active numismatic organization in my 12th Congressional District, has come forward with a resolution urging that the likeness of General Eisenhower be portrayed on the 1969 $1 Federal Reserve bank note. This proposal does not imply that the familiar portrait of our first President Gen. George Washington be replaced—but that, as a mark of respect and affection for our late, beloved General Eisenhower, the current 1969 series bear his likeness.

The Bureau of Engraving and Printing will soon produce a new series of $1 Federal Reserve notes to bear the facsimile signatures of the new Secretary of the Treasury and Treasurer of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem appropriate that the Eisenhower likeness be portrayed on this 1969 series. The likeness of General Washington will continue to appear on outstanding $1 notes and will be resumed, of course, following the final printing of the 1969 series.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to offer legislation to implement this suggestion and hope that the House of Representatives, after hearings by the appropriate House committees, will give speedy and affirmative approval to this proposal.

THE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AND BARGAINING ACT OF 1969

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Agricultural Marketing and Bargaining Act of 1969.

On April 16, 1969, Public Law 90–288 became law. Known as S. 109, this law establishes "standards of fair practices required of handlers in their dealings in agricultural products."

S. 109 prohibits handlers from using such tactics as coercion, "refusing to deal," discrimination, intimidation, and bribery against a producer in order to influence his decision with respect to joining an agricultural marketing-bargaining association.

The enforcement provisions of the law permit a producer or his association to go directly to Federal court and obtain injunctive relief when such prohibited practices occur. The law can also be enforced by the Secretary of Agriculture through the Federal courts when he has reasonable cause to believe that the prohibited practices have occurred. In addition, any person aggrieved can sue for damages caused by such prohibited practices.

The Agricultural Marketing and Bargaining Act of 1969, which I have introduced today, takes an additional step in protecting the rights of agricultural producers to bargain through their associations. It is an amendment to S. 109 with the purpose of encouraging "cooperative marketing and bargaining with respect to farm products by established standards of fair practices with respect to the relationship of handlers and agricultural bargaining associations."

S. 109 defined an "association of producers" as any association of producers of agricultural products engaged in marketing, bargaining, shipping, or processing as defined in the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929, and the act "to authorize association of producers of agricultural products," approved February 18, 1922—the Capper-Volstead Act.

Section 3(a) of the proposed bill recognizes the importance of encouraging bargaining association activities by defining it as an association of producers "which has as its principal function, as agent of producers, the negotiation with handlers of prices and other terms of contracts with respect to the production, sale, or marketing of agricultural products." The protection provided by this proposed bill would cover all such bargaining associations and would not be limited to one which had been "certified" by a Government agency.

Section 3(b) adds an additional prohibited practice to S. 109 that would make it unlawful for any handler knowingly to engage or permit any employee or agent to engage in an action which constituted a refusal to negotiate prices and other terms of contracts with agricultural bargaining associations. The request to negotiate would have to be at reasonable times and places and the bargaining association would be required to show written proof that it represented producers of agricultural products from whom the handler usually obtained agricultural products or who may reasonably and efficiently supply agricultural products to the handler.

Section 3(c) rewrites section 5 of S. 109 to make it clear that handlers are required to negotiate with bargaining associations. However, the new section 5 also makes it clear that the act does not—

Prevent handlers and producers from selecting their suppliers and customers for any reason other than a producer's membership in an association of producers;

Compel producers to join or belong to an association of producers;

Compel handlers and associations of producers to conclude an agreement with respect to any negotiations; or

Forbid the affiliation of an association of producers with other associations having similar objectives or with bona fide agricultural or horticultural organizations whose primary objectives are to promote, protect, and represent the business and economic interests of farmers and ranchers.

In summary, the Agricultural Marketing and Bargaining Act of 1969 states that, in addition to not interfering with a producer's right to join a bargaining association, the handler must also agree to honor the producer's decision and negotiate with his selected representative. In discharging this responsibility, the handler must treat individual bargaining associations with equal dignity.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE HONORABLE DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is distressing to me as I am sure it is to most Americans, that petty argument and conflict is already being heard over how this Nation should go about properly honoring the memory of our most authentic and revered hero, Ike Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower was too great a man, Mr. Speaker, his service to his country in war and peace too meaningful, for this Congress or our people to become involved in petty disputes over how to do justice to his leadership. His efforts and devotion to building and strengthening the character of the people he loved and the Nation he served so devotedly will be slandered if these arguments continue.

Within a few days, Mr. Speaker, I shall introduce legislation designed to quickly and adequately begin the erection of a suitable monument to Ike Eisenhower—a living tribute to him and the people of America who loved him. It will be called the Eisenhower National Memorial Arena, to be constructed near the reflecting pool in a prominent place among the cluster of great memorials on the Mall of the Nation's Capital, there to serve in his honor and in his memory as one of the great sports participants and enthusiasts of our time.

I envision, and I believe the Congress and the American people will endorse, an all-inclusive centrally located, crime-safe sports arena as a living memorial to Dwight David Eisenhower, who in his lifetime not only lived the credo of physical fitness but exemplified the best in character building which goes hand in hand with the love of sports.

It would be a full-time, year-around, indoor sports arena, designed to house the President's Physical Fitness Commission, with underground parking, to be operated by the Park Service and located in the Mall area where it would be accessible to all sports enthusiasts in the Metropolitan Washington area as well as to adequate police and enforcement officials so that our citizens who would flock to events there could be secure in their moments of relaxation. Many parents in the Washington area today are afraid to take their kids out in the yard to play, let alone to public events in the city.

The need is great for an adequate sports arena in the District, Mr. Speaker. The cause is just for the erection of a suitable memorial to a great American, and the desire in the hearts of our people is overwhelmingly present. Present sports facilities in the city are inadequate, especially at the high school and college level, and none can be described as a safe place to take our families at the present time, despite an overwhelming interest in Washington and the surrounding communities in athletic events at all levels.

I estimate the cost at $25 million. The arena would be multipurpose, seat from 18,000 to 20,000, both for summer and winter sports events. The legislation will call for the services of experts, both amateur and professional, in building, planning, and equipping the arena, as was done in the building of the new Madison Square Garden where the best brains in the sports world combined to construct a facility meeting the needs of every sporting group in that city. The arena would be adequate for national events, such as basketball tournaments, professional hockey, track, field events, athletic contests featuring the service academies, and even for national conventions.

Best of all, the Eisenhower memorial would not only keep alive the memory and love of sports of Dwight David Eisenhower, but would serve as a center for planning, activity, progress, and participation in local and national sporting events for every youth and sports-minded adult in America.

Mr. Speaker, I will seek the endorsement of the President of the United States for this legislation, and I urge all former athletes now serving in the Congress to join me in sponsoring the bill and back it to the hilt so that we can adequately and speedily build a decent and fitting monument to the memory of the most cherished citizen of our times, and let the rest of the world know that the people of America will not forget his services to mankind and the youth of our land who concerned him so much.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I could not agree with him more. It is very poor action on the part of anyone to be squabbling over one building or one structure and say whether we should honor former Senator Kennedy or former President Eisenhower with it. I wish to commend the gentleman for taking some affirmative action for former President Eisenhower without at the same time taking any action against anyone else.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the death of President Dwight Eisenhower leaves all Americans with a deep sense of grief and sorrow. He was a great leader, both in war and in peace. We shall miss him very much. General Eisenhower's basic philosophy and outlook on life was dramatically revealed to me one day when I had the privilege of attending a luncheon at the White House. During the luncheon, the general mentioned the fact that he had just purchased a farm near Gettysburg, Pa. My immediate comment was that for good farmland he should have gone to Iowa. The general responded by saying that it was his belief that every person should acquire something during his lifetime and leave that something in just a little better condition than he found it. He went on to explain that he could do this more easily on a farm at Gettysburg than he could on the rich farmlands of Iowa. This was a wonderful tribute to Iowa, but even more important it pointed up a basic attribute which made this man one of our greatest leaders. And, indeed, he has not only left the farm at Gettysburg in better condition than he found it but also this Nation of ours and the world. In the 1940's he came to leadership in a world torn by war. He led us through wars to victory, and peace.

Again in the fifties he was successful in restoring peace, this time in Korea. His quiet and effective leadership provided the tranquillity which we so badly needed in the 1950's to complete the transition from war to peace. In the 1960's he continued his service to the Nation in the role of elder statesman. Here, too, it could be said that by his counsel to Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon, he left our Nation in a better condition than that in which he found it. If all mankind were to subscribe to and follow this philosophy of General Eisenhower, what a far better world we would know and enjoy. About another great American, Edwin Markham once wrote, "Here is a man to hold against the world, to match the mountains and the sea"—this was a fitting tribute to Lincoln and it is also a fitting tribute for General Eisenhower.

Mr. Speaker, as might be expected several of the newspapers in eastern Iowa editorialized on the greatness of President Eisenhower. They expressed the high regard held for him by Iowans.

In addition, several of the newsmen recalled their own experiences with General Eisenhower. Somehow these recollections tell more about the greatness of the man and unique place he will always have in the hearts of all Americans.

Some articles follow:

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette, Mar. 31, 1969]

They'll Always Like "Ike"

This nation isn't in as bad shape spiritually as it sometimes seems, when the long-anticipated death of a former President brings tears to the eyes of millions of Americans young and old. And we suspect that there were few wholly dry eyes throughout the country Friday when the word came from Washington that Ike's long and gallant fight against repeated strains on a weakened heart had ended.

It is significant that to most of those millions Dwight D. Eisenhower was simply Ike, not President Eisenhower or Mr. Eisenhower or even General Eisenhower, the designation he reportedly cherished most. By no means all of his contemporaries rated him as a great President or a great general or a great anything else—although historians may some day agree that he merited such distinction.

The key word for Ike was "good." He came across to people as a good man, in a wide variety of ways. Millions of individuals of all types, in all walks of life—even though they never came in close contact with him—had an instinctive rapport with him and felt that they understood him, and that if they could have been close to him he would have understood them and they would have been at ease together.

It is not exactly that they looked upon him as a hero in a bewildering age when people desperately need and yearn for heroes and find few. Rather it was that many Americans saw in him the personification of what they think a good American should be—not necessarily a faultless paragon but a kindly person, well-intentioned, and trying hard to measure up to life's demands on the abilities God gave him. He made us all feel that we shared something with him.

Among all our public figures, no other projects that same sustaining image. And it is a time when we could use one.

[From the Burlington (Iowa) Hawkeye, Mar. 30, 1969]

Memo From Mac

(By John McCormally)

Remembering President Eisenhower, Burlington Republican leader Jim Schramm recalled Ike's triumphal return to Washington after VE day.

"We all turned out to watch him drive down (it was actually up) Pennsylvania Avenue with his arms high over his head and grinning," Schramm, who was an Army lieutenant colonel stationed in Washington, recalled. "It was one of the most moving sights of my life."

I didn't know Jim Schramm then. Or Eisenhower either, for that matter. But I recalled with a start, when I read Schramm's recollection in Friday's Hawk-Eye, that, by golly, I was in that parade.

For all I know, I was one of the "heroes" he cheered as we paraded up the historic avenue in honor of Ike.

It was one of those crazy episodes which can only happen in war. I'd been preoccupied with the other end of that war and was only a casual reader of Ike's exploits in Europe.

But in the Spring of 1945, I'd worked my way back through a succession of hospital ships, planes, quonsets and wards from the Pacific, and across the continent, until finally I was a patient at Bethesda Naval Medical Center outside Washington.

When Ike returned for his hero's parade and appearance before Congress, someone decided it would add color to the festivities to include a platoon or two of patients from Bethesda and Walter Reed in the parade.

And, in the normal military way of things, I was notified that I had volunteered to be part of the sorry sample of the nation's sacrifice. (Presumably, we were chosen on the basis of looking beat up enough to stir patriotic emotions, but not bad enough to make anyone sick.)

It was an absolutely gorgeous morning: the brilliant sun bouncing off the well-scrubbed avenue and off the marbe walls of the Federal Triangle; the flags whipping, the bands blaring, the troops clumping in splendid cadence.

We rode along, in our gray Navy bus, acknowledging the waves and cheers of the multitude with mock modesty, all the while cracking cynical jokes among ourselves about what the hell we, a bunch of Pacific Island dropouts, were doing in the celebration for the head dogface.

On the east steps of the Capitol, a platform had been erected, on which we were arrayed in our assortment of wheel chairs, crutches, slings and bandages.

When Ike arrived and got out of his car to go into the Capitol, he spied us. With a spectacular grin and a special grimace of recognition, he broke away from his escorts, mounted our platform and shook hands all around.

I remember that the high brass—political and military—stood fretfully waiting for him, while he chatted with several of the wounded, asking where they'd got it and how they were doing.

When he'd left, the mood of these wounded enlisted men had strangely changed.

"You know," someone said, and the others agreed, "he isn't a bad fellow. For a general."

And that, I suppose, is the kind of epitaph he'd like best.

[From the Davenport-Bettendorf (Iowa) Times-Democrat, Mar. 30, 1969]

Leader in War, Peace

Dwight David Eisenhower, dead at 78, led the nation with distinction in war and peace. And few if any Americans have won comparable love and respect in public life in our times.

The five-star general directed the World War II invasion of fortress Europe, then stood in a schoolhouse at Rheims to accept Germany's unconditional surrender.

He later became the nation's 33rd President, winning election on the Republican ticket in 1952 and again in 1956.

He finally succumbed after waging a long fight symbolic of the courageous life he lived in behalf of his country. His last, poignant struggles were reminiscent of his decision to seek the second term after he suffered first a heart attack and later a bout of ileitis.

Of his eight years in the White House, his "greatest disappointment" was what he considered a lack of progress in promoting better understanding in the world, particularly between the Communists and ourselves.

While this was his assessment, even critics would concede he expended an enormous amount of time and good will in pursuits of peace.

Having viewed war firsthand, he regarded it with abhorrence, but thought it could be avoided only if this nation remained powerful both militarily and economically.

Of war he said, "It is an evil whose outbreak is the result of human errors, human ignorance, human greed."

Of peace, he said, "An enduring world peace must be founded on justice, opportunity and freedom for all men of good will. It must be maintained in a climate of international understanding and cooperation."

And of his country, he said, "There is nothing wrong with America that faith, love of freedom, intelligence and the energy of her citizens cannot cure."

Mr. Eisenhower showed dislike for the rough and tumble of politics, but proved a formidable campaigner. Some disliked his unpolished syntax and his reluctance to step into party quarrels or to be stampeded on some public issues, among them civil rights. But even those who voted against him found it difficult, if not impossible, to dislike Eisenhower the man. He was an excellent, imaginative cook. His love for golf helped to popularize the game. His trademark was an infectious smile that often lighted his blue-eyed, ruddy face.

He became a national institution; he was cast in the classic American mold. Born to relatively poor people in a small community, he graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point and advanced through the ranks to become one of our greatest war heroes.

Persuasion was required to pull him into political life and the presidency, and there he did the best commonsense job of which he was capable, just as he contributed a sincere effort in whatever direction he turned.

His name will be etched in our history books as conqueror, liberator, educator, humanitarian, author, diplomat and President. He clearly strove with all his heart to promote better world understanding. It would be premature to try to assess all his achievements. But history will give him high stature as a man who dominated his era and gave greatly of his energies for both war and peace.

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Times-Democrat, Mar. 29, 1969]

He Could Cuss, Then Could Purr

(Editor's Note.—Philip D. Adler, of the Times-Democrat, who interviewed former President Dwight D. Eisenhower in Paris in 1951, recalls that day and other meetings with the five-star general in the accompanying article prepared after Ike died Friday).

(By Philip D. Adler)

Eisenhower's life had many facets. In June 1951, at NATO headquarters in the Hotel Astoria, Paris, I had an hour with Ike.

With me for this interview was Don W. Anderson, publisher of the Wisconsin State Journal. I discovered Ike could pound the table and cuss like a cavalryman, and next moment he could purr like a statesman.

It wasn't an illuminating interview, mostly an extension of the briefing we had received the day before from Brig. Gen. Anthony J. D. Biddle Jr., former ambassador to Poland and Ike's troubleshooter at NATO.

General Eisenhower at this point of his career was a caged lion. He had set up a counterpart of SHAEF in Paris, with open-end authority to organize a European coalition to stop the onsweep of Communism. It was a thankless job, and Ike knew it.

In the light of Korea, which had erupted only one year before, Ike and his team of generals were trying with the remnants of the 1944 invasion machine to stem the Soviet tide.

Anderson and I were well aware of the political pressures that were on Ike at that time to go for the Republican nomination for President. We put the question to him squarely, and he simply smiled and said he wasn't interested.

He had said that before we had seen him, to others with special missions, and he said it many times afterward, until friends practically kidnaped him to go to Abilene and announce.

Going back nearly 18 years in memory, I recall Ike as a restless, chain-smoking dynamo of a man. He paced the office constantly while he talked. Every time we would reach for our pads to make notes he would give us the wave-off and talk about Poland or Berlin. I got the impression of a one man NATO, because it was Ike's drive and personality alone which held NATO together.

Before 1951 I had the privilege of hearing and seeing Eisenhower on other occasions, as Columbia University president, and as a five-star general in retirement. There was no perceptible change in Ike in those years. He was always a fighter, and he was fighting back against odds which would have floored most men.

The Eisenhower we saw in the wartime newsreels, returning to London in triumph after D-Day and later as commander-in-chief in the Washington victory reception of 1945, was a strictly one-time phenomenon. He spoke easily then, with determination and conviction. Later as a political campaigner his speech in public was far from the rolling rhetoric of Franklin D. Roosevelt or the sparkling repartee of Harry Truman.

Out of uniform and in the tweeds of a Columbia University president before an Associated Press luncheon, Ike was ill at ease and straining for words. Somehow the direct, dynamic speech of a wartime commander never came through again.

But above all, Ike revealed himself to men who met him and spent time with him as a man endowed with special magnetism, a conscientious patriot doing his duty as he saw it. This is the Eisenhower I'd like remembered, and so would millions of other Americans who mourn him today.

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Times-Democrat, Mar. 26, 1969]

Ike Added Warmth to Grid Event

(Editor's Note.—Dick Lamb of Bettendorf, news reporter for the Times-Democrat, tells of his meeting with former President Dwight Eisenhower at a Football Foundation Hall of Fame dinner.)

(By Dick Lamb)

It was unseasonably warm that late October evening in New York City 10 years ago. Most who were in the Grand Ballroom of Hotel Astor remember that it was a Tuesday.

That same day, Oct 28, a beloved Italian named Roncalli had been elevated to a supreme position in his church.

Henceforth he would be Pope John XXIII.

For 2,000 of us, the spiritual message of that day was a warm prelude to the excitement of the evening.

President Dwight Eisenhower was to supply the emotional thrill.

Waiting, as I walked to the dais, was the man who had led Allied forces to victory in World War II and was now President of the United States.

The occasion was the annual Awards Dinner of the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame. My assignment as historian was to present the then President Dwight Eisenhower a program of the 1913 Army-Navy football game.

The presentation was in connection with Mr. Eisenhower receiving the first Gold Medal to be awarded by the foundation to persons prominently identified with the sport.

Mr. Eisenhower glanced over the program. His face broke into a smile as he recalled some of his teammates on that year's Army squad.

He turned to Gen. Omar Bradley, also at the speaker's table and a member of the same team. "You haven't gained a pound in nearly 50 years, have you?" he quipped.

Sitting nearby was Alexander Weyand, an All-American tackle that year.

"They wouldn't recognize you now, Babe," the President said. "You sure wouldn't make All-American to day."

I listened. The infectious warmth of the President was evident. He captivated everyone with his apparent genuine friendliness.

Mr. Eisenhower and I exchanged letters during the month following the dinner. He returned the football program to me for inclusion in the permanent files of the football Hall of Fame at New Brunswick, N.J.

Although Mr. Eisenhower's military and political accomplishments were monumental, it cannot be overlooked that an interest in sports through most of his 78 years also was very significant.

Golf provided most of his relaxation and physical exercise during the last 20 years, but a far more strenuous sport consumed his energies as a youth.

At the Hall of Fame dinner, the President told his audience, "No where is competition, in its very highest form, better expressed than in the uniquely American game of football.

"To understand football," he said, "is to have an insight into an essential part of life."

He stressed that "Morale—the will to win, the fighting heart—are the honored hallmarks of the football coach and player, as they are of the enterprising executive, the successful troop leader, the established artist and the dedicated teacher and scientist."

Football was hardly a refined game of precision, speed or close coordination of men and maneuvers in 1911 when 21-year-old Dwight Eisenhower entered the United States Military Academy at West Point.

He had played tackle for Abilene High School in Kansas, and distinguished himself to such an extent his coach called him "the most outstanding tackle in the valley."

At West Point he went out for the freshman team and was shifted to the backfield. Game accounts at the time accorded him "star" status.

Against Colgate as a sophomore he was unstoppable in leading Army to a 15-7 victory.

Two weeks later, however, in a game against Tufts, Cadet Eisenhower broke his kneecap, his varsity career condemned to comparative obscurity by the permanently disabling injury.

Not content to be entirely severed from the game he dearly loved, Eisenhower turned to coaching the Cullum Hall freshman team.

Although never removing himself from concern over the fortunes of football at Army, Eisenhower fostered a genuine interest in the game in general after his return from Europe following World War II.

But his concern and interest in athletics and its by-products extended beyond the boundaries of the gridiron.

"Fitness—in its deepest and broadest sense—is necessary," he said. "We know that it is far more than a healthy body. It is more than an alert and disciplined mind."

The White House, *Washington,*
Augusta, Ga., November 28, 1958.

Mr. R. M. Lamb,
Football Information Bureau,
Davenport, Iowa.

Dear Mr. Lamb: Thank you very much for remembering our conversation of the night of the National Football Hall of Fame dinner. As you suspected, I was much interested in looking over the Army-Navy program for 1913. My secretary will return the program to you with this note.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,
Dwight D. Eisenhower.

This is a reproduction of a letter sent by former President Eisenhower to Dick Lamb shortly after Lamb had presented the then President an official program of the 1913 Army-Navy football game. Eisenhower had been an Army football star. The presentation was made in 1958 at a Football Hall of Fame Awards Dinner in New York. Lamb was historian of the organization. The program now is in the Hall of Fame library archives.

"Fitness is the sum of all values which enable a man to act effectively in his nation's behalf. In this environment, fitness is man's maximum development to make all of us a stronger nation.

"Your fitness, in all its dimensions, is the proper concern of every American. To his task the inspirational coach is as dedicated as the most respected professor.

"And the whole field of sports contributes mightily toward that objective."

[From the Iowa City Press-Citizen, Mar. 29, 1969]

Dwight D. Eisenhower

During his life as a public figure—and it continued for more than a quarter-century, an unusually long time—Dwight D. Eisenhower had more than his share of critics.

He wasn't much of a general, said the generals. He wasn't much of a politician, said the politicians. He wasn't much of an intellectual, said the intellectuals. And so it went.

But the American people thought he was a great American. They not only liked Ike, they loved him. And today we all miss the man who remained Ike from the time he first came to public attention in 1942 until his heroic battle for life ended.

He was a professional soldier who rose from relative obscurity at the beginning of the greatest war in history to supreme commander of the greatest army in history; who later served his country for eight years in the highest position of responsibility any man can attain.

Yet he was always "Ike."

Looking back from the turbulent present, the years of the Eisenhower administration seem calm and stable. They were not, but if they seemed so then as well as now, it was only because of the presence of this immensely popular president in the White House. There was something about this uncommonly common man that inspired confidence and unshakable faith that no matter how beset the nation was by crises and challenges, nothing dire would happen as long as Ike was there.

Beset the nation was:

Those were the years when the cold war was frigid; when a man named Khrushchev came to power in Russia to strut the world's stage for a time with his rhetoric of nuclear diplomacy and ballistic blackmail; when a man named Ho Chi Minh was mauling the French in Indochina; when a man named Joe McCarthy was finding Communists in every State Department closet and setting neighbor suspiciously against neighbor; when a man named Faubus in Little Rock, Ark., was fomenting the gravest federal crisis since the Civil War; when a U.S. vice president was being spat upon in South America; when the world hovered on the edge of Armageddon as war broke out in the Middle East; when freedom-loving men everywhere agonized as Hungary was ground under the heel; when the nation plunged briefly into its worst recession since the 1930s; when Americans indulged in the orgy of self-doubt because Russia had launched something into space called a Sputnik; when words like "agonizing reappraisal," "brinkmanship," "U-2" "summit" and "missile gap" became part of the vocabulary of reproach against the administration.

Yet, they seemed calm years, at least in part because Ike was there and because the people trusted him, the people stayed calm.

The years of Eisenhower are still too close for historians to present a balanced and dispassionate summary. Dwight Eisenhower, as general, president and elder statesman, in time will become a historic personage, drained of his humanity, accorded his proper place—no more and no less—among the heroes of the past as determined by the consensus of historians. That's what happens to all presidents.

But today his contemporaries mourn a man called Ike who, because he was a part of our lives, always will be more than a remote figure in history.

RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES LEGISLATION

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great concern of mine that through the years we have neglected the plight of Federal employees on retirement. I have recently sponsored 10 bills dealing with a number of inequities which have developed over the years in our retirement system for Federal employees. Three other bills which I have introduced will affect almost all retired people. These bills constitute a legislative program designed to end these inequities and aid our senior citizens. Some of these bills are bills which I have sponsored in prior sessions, and some are new. One of my prime goals in introducing some of these bills in the past, and in particular this year, is to insure that our civil service retirees at least receive a fair hearing on their proposals. This past session, no hearings whatsoever were held on this type of legislation. This is a pretty poor record for the Congress in view of the obvious inequities which exist in so many areas of civil service retirement law. This field is deserving of the most careful and complete study by the Congress.

Another phase of this problem bothers me a great deal. That is the problem of inflation. It is not just the inequities in the retirement laws which hurt our retired personnel, but the inequities compounded by inflation. It is the racing inflation which makes reform in this area particularly urgent. While there has been an increase in the standard of living, and a rise in the general economy during the past several years, the standard of living for our Federal retirees and their survivors has remained almost stationary, and in many cases has been lowered due to the tremendous effect the inflationary trend has had on living costs.

Of an approximate 900,000 retired civil employees and their survivors, more than 279,000 receive a monthly annuity of less than $100, and 513,000 receive less than $200 per month. Using a poverty level income of $3,000 per year, 611,000 plus former employees and their survivors are now living in poverty. Of the 900,000 retired civil employees and their survivors, only 220,000 of them have a yearly annuity income of over $3,000. The only way we can correct this great injustice is to grant these former Federal employees a substantial annuity increase and provide a minimum annuity for them.

During the past 45 years there have been many changes in our civil service retirement system. For many years, most of the changes were retroactive to provide benefits for those previously retired commensurate with the benefits granted to those who would retire in the future. However, during the 1950's and 1960's, the liberalizations of retirement benefits have not been made retroactive, with the result that many inequities have arisen. There must be some measure of correlation between the benefits awarded prospectively during the past 15 years and the benefits now paid to those who retired prior to the effective dates of such prospective legislation. Otherwise, how can present Federal employees have any assurance that they, too, will not be forgotten as soon as they leave the active working force? How long can the morale of the present active working force be sustained under such conditions?

Specifically, my bills provide:

H.R. 7769 would change the rate of reduction in Government group life insurance at age 65 or date of retirement, whichever is later, from 2 percent a month to 1 percent a month, and halt the reduction at 50 percent, and finally would restore to 50 percent all insurance now reduced below that amount.

H.R. 7770 provides for increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act. The biggest increase would go to those receiving less than $200 per month, their increase would be $26 per month. The amount of the increase would be less for those receiving the largest annuities at the present time. Those now receiving less than $200 per month would receive a $26-per-month increase, those receiving between $200 and $300 per month would receive a 13-percent increase, those receiving between $300 and $400 per month would receive a 9-percent increase, those receiving between $400 and $500 per month would receive a 7-percent increase, those receiving $500 or more per month at the present time would receive a 5-percent increase under the provisions of my bill.

H.R. 7771 provides for minimum annuities for employee annuitants and spouse survivor annuitants. Two hundred and seventy nine thousand annuitants received a monthly income of less than $100, and in this minimum annuity bill a single person would receive an annuity of no less than $100 a month, and it provides that a retiree with a family would receive an annuity of no less than $200 a month. The bill which I introduced has for its purpose a guaranteed annuity for all of our Federal employee annuitants and survivors of at least $100 per month and $200 a month for an annuitant with a spouse or dependent. I am sure that my colleagues all agree that it is impossible for a single person to exist on less than $100 a month, and for a family to live on less than $200 a month in today's economy. It is embarrassing not only to Members of Congress but to American citizens, and this type of legislation has wide support. I trust that my colleagues will support me in this legislation to at least give a substance of this world's goods to those who have served this Government.

H.R. 7772 would equalize civil service retirement annuities in several respects.

H.R. 7773 provides that if an originally named survivor of a civil service annuitant passes away before the spouse who has provided for the annuity, the spouse can name a second survivor should he remarry. Under present law a survivor annuity means a reduction in retirement payments. This reduction is not lifted if the survivor expires before the retiree.

H.R. 7774 would amend the Social Security Act to include in the supplementary medical insurance program all prescribed drugs. The drugs would have to be prescribed by a physician participating in the medicare program before payment could be made for the drugs.

H.R. 7775 would amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the first $5,000 received as a civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof, will be excluded from gross income.

H.R. 7776 is an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code and would restore to individuals who have attained the age of 65 the right to deduct all expenses for their medical care.

H.R. 8618 would help remedy another inequity. With the multitude of grant-in-aid, and matching programs initiated by the Federal Government, a large number of employees, though technically employed by the United States, are for all practical purposes controlled by the Federal Government. If these employees, for one reason or another, qualify for coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act, the years they worked under the so-called Federal-State project should be credited for civil service retirement purposes and be applied retroactively to all now retired.

H.R. 7192 would amend the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that extended care services follow hospitalization in order to qualify for payment under the medicare program.

H.R. 7065 would amend the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage.

H.R. 220 is designed to equalize the retired pay of members of the uniformed services retired prior to June 1, 1958, whose retired pay is computed on laws enacted on or after October 1, 1949.

H.R. 663. One of the main provisions of this bill is an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code to permit individuals to claim a credit against their Federal income tax for taxes paid to State and local governments.

NEED FOR TARIFF RECIPROCITY ON IMPORTATION OF POULTRY LAYING CAGES

(Mr. NELSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill dealing with the tariff treatment of poultry laying cages. Briefly, the situation which has prompted the introduction of this legislation is this: Poultry laying cages enter the United States duty free under item 666.00 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States which covers farm machinery and equipment. This item has been duty free since the enactment of the Tariff Act of 1930. On the other hand, Canada at the present time is treating the entrance of poultry laying cages under their tariff item 44603-1 as a manufacture or article of iron and steel not otherwise provided for in the tariff, and as such dutiably at 22½ percent. There has recently been a large influx of these cages into the United States from Canada under these favorable conditions. The A. R. Wood Manufacturing Co. of Luverne, Minn., who manufactures this type of cage has informed me that while some cages being imported from Canada are of a slightly inferior construction, the prices they are able to charge are so low that the Wood Manufacturing Co. simply cannot compete.

Mr. Speaker, it is only just and fair that there should be reciprocity between countries as far as duties on like products are concerned. There is no arguable basis that on a single item such as this, American manufacturers should be charged a 22½-percent import duty in Canada, while their Canadian competitors can export this item to the United States duty free.

The legislation which I am introducing would do this: If any country restricts the importation of poultry laying cages by imposing an import duty or other charge, the President may then enter into negotiations with that country to secure the removal of the duty, and, if these negotiations fail, there will then be imposed on all cages imported into the United States from that country a duty or charge equal to that imposed by such country on like cages.

It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that following the negotiations provided for in this bill, that common agreement will be reached between the countries involved, and that agreement will provide for like treatment by both countries on this item, which is only reasonable, fair, and necessary for our domestic industry in this instance. I would urge early consideration of this measure by my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee in order to minimize the damage being done to the industry involved as a result of their being placed in the present adverse competitive position.

I place the text of my proposal in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

H.R. 9953

A bill relating to the tariff treatment of poultry laying cages

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That if any country shall restrict the importation of poultry laying cages by imposing an import duty or other import charge of any kind whatsoever, the President may enter into negotiations with such country to secure the removal of such duty or other charge, and if it is not removed he may, by proclamation, declare the failure of such negotiations, setting forth the facts. Thereupon and until such duty or other charge is removed, there shall be imposed upon poultry laying cages provided for in item 666.00 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, when imported into the United States either directly or indirectly from such country, an amount equal to the highest import duty or other import charge imposed by such country on poultry laying cages.

CALIFORNIA'S CLOACA MAXIMA

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the public in this Nation have taken up the cause and the purposes of conservation of late in an unparalleled display of concern for the preservation and protection of our natural resources and our environment.

In my State of California the publication Cry California is among the most outspoken and persistent voices reflecting the public's concern.

In the most recent issue of this publication, Frank M. Stead, former chief of the Division of Environmental Sanitation, California State Department of Public Health, has written a most incisive and thoughtful article on the real hazards posed in the San Francisco Bay-Delta and San Joaquin Valley regions by a proposed master drain that would empty the agricultural wastes of a large area into the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

The subject matter of this article is so important to all of California, if not the entire Nation, that I think that each Member of the House of Representatives would benefit by reading it. The article follows:

The San Joaquin Valley Master Drain—California's Cloaca Maxima

(By Frank M. Stead)

History is replete with tragic examples of the consequences of placing the short-range gain above any concern for environmental preservation in the management of water resources. From the Plain of Shinar, that cradle of civilization lying between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers, to the vast stretches of the high plateau of Rajasthan in India, only vestiges remain to remind us of past glories when these lands were fertile garden spots. For over 5,000 years in this great Fertile Crescent, man has tried to intensify the productivity of the land by irrigation without respecting the inexorable law of "salt balance," and the failure of civilization after civilization has resulted.

Unless California takes a hard look at the long-range effects of her own irrigation practices, mindful of the lesson of history, the great San Joaquin Valley could join the long parade of lost civilizations.

ROBBING PETER TO PAY PAUL

Probably no issue in recent years in California has aroused more acrimony than the joint determination of the California Department of Water Resources and the Federal Bureau of Reclamation to construct a huge agricultural drain in the San Joaquin Valley which would discharge waters heavily laden with chemicals into the western end of the delta near the Antioch Bridge. The outcry, coming from many diverse segments of society, unmistakably voices a conviction that a massive injustice is being perpetrated; that the problems of one area are simply being "thrown over the fence" into an unsuspecting neighbor's yard; that we are "robbing Peter to pay Paul."

The proposal *will* rob Peter all right, but the real tragedy is to be found in how well it will pay Paul. For by the analysis of its very proponents, the Master Drain will not solve the long-range drainage problem of the San Joaquin Valley. The most that can be said is that it will relieve an immediate problem, and by so doing avoid facing up to the real issue: establishment of a true salt balance in the San Joaquin Valley. (The term "salt" is used in this discussion to mean those chemical compounds formed by the bonding of sodium, potassium, calcium, magnesium and other metallic elements with chlorine or combinations of oxygen and nitrogen, sulphur and carbon. "Salt balance" is achieved only when the total amount of salt present in water entering the valley, or added to water during use, is matched by the amount of salt leaving the valley in its waste waters and, to a small degree, in harvested crops.)

But let us not jump to the quick and easy conclusion that, because the drain plan is environmentally unsound in the long haul, the engineers who propose this drain are incompetent or venal. I know this to be not true. The problem stems from the short-sighted basic precepts that guide our efforts in the management of environmental resources in both the public and private sectors.

If we want something better than the San Joaquin Master Drain, you and I are going to have to change the environmental management ground rules.

HYDROLOGY OF THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY

The San Joaquin Valley is a great trough, 50 miles wide and 300 miles long, closed on three sides by mountains and opening at the north into the delta. A low divide interrupts the gentle downward slope of the valley floor and deprives the southern one-third of the valley of any natural drainage outlet. Four major mountain streams on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada discharge into this landlocked basin (Tulare Basin) and historically they produced large lakes (Tulare and Buena Vista Lakes, mostly dry) in the trough of the basin.

North of the low divide, eight major streams (the San Joaquin River and seven tributaries) empty onto the valley floor and flow northward, as the San Joaquin River system, to the delta.

The broad, gently sloping floor of the San Joaquin Valley comprises over eight million acres of the most fertile land in the United States. It is underlain by deep, porous, water-bearing formations as a result of the occurrence in an earlier geological period of a great inland sea filling the entire Great Central Valley. The ground-water capacity under the floor of the San Joaquin Valley is far greater in quantity than all the surface reservoirs now built or proposed in the state.

A ground-water reservoir has three fundamental advantages over a surface reservoir: it does not use up valuable land surface; it does not lose water by evaporation, and by underlying vast areas it eliminates the need for a network of distribution conduits. Protection of the quality of this ground-water reservoir is therefore a matter of paramount importance.

The first water used for irrigation in the valley was diverted directly from the streams running across the valley floor. But supply from this source was undependable, especially during the summer, and farmers early turned to pumping of ground water to supplement surface sources.

Pumping was expensive, however, and the lure of surface water at low cost led in the 1870's and 1880's to the construction of diversion dams and canals to transport water considerable distances from the major streams.

By about 1930, the valley had reached its irrigation capacity using the "natural" system of streams and wells and a little over two million acres were under irrigation. It is interesting to note that at this time the bulk of the two million acres of wet lands spread throughout the valley deeded to the state by the federal government under the Swamp Land Act of 1850 was still intact. Each year the winter rains filled the tree-lined river bottoms, the tule sloughs, and inland lakes and overflowed onto these extensive flood plain marshes and grasslands to furnish a vast habitat for migratory wild fowl as well as a wide spectrum of other wild life, and to replenish ground-water basins.

In the 1940's man began his major transformation of the hydrology of the valley with construction of Shasta Dam on the Sacramento River and Friant Dam on the main stem of the San Joaquin. Two canals (Friant-Kern & Madera) were built to carry water from Friant Dam south and north along the east side of the valley for irrigation. Simultaneously, the Canal Delta Mendota was constructed along the west side of the valley to bring Sacramento River water south from the delta to replace waters taken from the San Joaquin River. The effect of these new features was to drastically change the water system of the San Joaquin Basin, which was naturally fed (and drained) by a river flowing down its centerline, and to establish a system of "rivers" on the outer edges of the valley for supply, still using the original river channel in the trough of the valley as a drain. But this changeover was only partial, and the San Joaquin River, although its flow was reduced to a fraction of its original magnitude, continued to serve as both a water supply and a drain.

In the intervening years most of the remaining flow in the San Joaquin River tributaries has been intercepted and new canals (the California Aqueduct and the Eastside Canal) are being completed to supply the valley with water. When these new "rivers" are completed and placed into operation, the transformation of the valley's water pattern will be complete.

What then of the San Joaquin River System? This natural water resource, once the chief water supply for the valley, has already become, de facto, a drain and the water in most of its length is too degraded for use in agriculture, but it has never been declared openly by the state or the federal government to have been dedicated to that use. The current plan is to construct an artificial drain to take the agricultural waste water from all the land to be newly irrigated on the west side of the valley, but only a portion of the waste waters from the currently irrigated lands now discharging waste water into the San Joaquin River. Under this plan the San Joaquin River will continue in a sort of twilight role, half river, half drain. It cannot be deliberately converted in the San Joaquin Valley to a simple conduit for agricultural waste water because when it reaches the delta it is still counted upon as an historic natural river. Neither the residents of Stockton nor the recreationists and sportsmen on the delta have agreed to give up this historic river as a natural waterway belonging to all the people.

THE QUESTION OF SALT

Water is the near universal solvent. It is capable of taking into solution most of the chemical compounds occurring in nature and made by man. Thus as rain falls, even before reaching the ground, it dissolves oxygen, carbon dioxide and nitrogen oxides. Reaching the ground it dissolves salts of sodium, calcium, magnesium and other elementary substances as it flows over and through the rocks and soil formations, so that in a natural state, both surface and ground waters become increasingly laden with dissolved mineral salts as they move from the mountains to the sea. The activities of man greatly accelerate this process. In homes, industry and agriculture, man uses a vast array of chemicals and a sizeable percentage of these chemicals becomes incorporated into the waste waters from these three theaters of operation.

It is simple logic that if these mineral salts are not removed from a basin as fast as they enter, thus maintaining a salt balance, they will build up in the surface and ground waters or in the soil, and this is exactly what has happened in the San Joaquin Valley. It is estimated that 400 million tons of salt have built up in the soils of the valley floor, and the ground water itself in some areas has a high enough content of dissolved salts to be toxic to plants.

Under natural conditions, salts from a basin are removed by large-volume-of-flow rivers draining to the ocean. The San Joaquin River once provided such a system for most of the valley, as mentioned, but its diluting volume has already been cut off so that it has become a waste-water conduit with insufficient flow to either dilute the salts or carry them to the ocean and is, in its lower reaches, too salty for use. Having destroyed the natural system of maintaining salt balance in the valley it is now incumbent upon us to substitute a new one. The proposed Master Drain is not such a system.

To understand the role intended for the Master Drain it is necessary to look a little more closely at the process of irrigation. Irrigation is a process that greatly intensifies the salt problem. In irrigation an attempt is made to keep the soil layers in the root zone of plants continuously moist and continuously supplied with nutrients. In effect then, in irrigation we are maintaining a "damp blotter" situation in the top few feet of soil. The unwanted result is that water from this "damp blotter" is continuously evaporating and leaving behind its dissolved salts. In an effort to "rinse" the salts out of the blotter we apply enough extra water so that some of it percolates down out of the root zone. This leaches salts out of the soil but carries them down into the ground water, from which there is no route of escape. The only way to avoid this trap is to intercept the percolating water before it reaches the ground water, and this is done by means of shallow drainage systems specially designed for this purpose. This procedure works because most of the valley floor is underlain by intermittent layers of relatively impervious materials which slow the downward travel of water leaving the plant root zone. In fact, in many areas the root zone itself would become flooded and waterlogged were it not for these drainage wells. It is only the brackish water from these drainage wells that the Master Drain is designed to remove.

THE PROPOSAL

In brief, the proposed Master Drain is a joint venture between the State of California and the federal government to construct a lined canal along the west side of the valley floor. The drain is proposed to be built in stages but would ultimately extend from the site of the old Buena Vista Lake near Bakersfield, northward for 280 miles until it reaches the San Joaquin River in the broad stretch just east of the Antioch Bridge. A detention reservoir capable of holding the total expected annual flow in the early years of operation would be constructed in the northern portion of the valley near Turlock. Provision would also be made to pump water from some convenient point in the delta into the drain for purposes of dilution just before discharge into the San Joaquin River at the terminus point.

The proposed drain would be the sole drainage outlet for lands soon to be irrigated by the California Aqueduct, and would also serve those presently irrigated lands where excess salt in the soil profile or high water tables currently threatens the production of high crop yields.

By no means would all surplus irrigation water be permitted to enter the drain. Both the excess irrigation water running off the fields and the water pumped from drainage wells would be required to be reused until the salt tolerance of crops is reached. Water, percolating downward and not intercepted by drainage wells, would of course reach the ground waters with its load of salt leached from the soil.

Seen over a long period of time, therefore, the proposed Master Drain cannot be considered as a master drainage system which will enable the valley to restore its vast ground-water supplies to their original high quality and maintain them so, but rather as a palliative measure which will slow down but not stop the present trend of degradation. Without considering any of the side effects, therefore, this must be the assessment of the proposal in terms of its central purpose. This conclusion raises the very crucial question of the responsibility of state and federal governments to posterity when they undertake massive rearrangements of natural hydrologic systems with no hope of anything except progressive degradation.

THE SIDE EFFECTS

Notwithstanding that we should be concerned about the ruination of the valley itself, virtually all of the opposition to the Master Drain has stemmed from its anticipated adverse environmental effects *outside* the valley. The central concern has been that the discharge of water from the drain would have a disastrous impact upon the ecology of the San Francisco Bay and the delta systems as a result of nutrients, pesticides and salts in the drainage water. These questions have received careful and extensive study by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration with findings set forth in a report in January, 1967. Whatever one might think of the objectivity of a report by the very agency (the Department of Interior) which houses one of the parties (the Bureau of Reclamation) to construction of the drain, certainly no one would expect the report to overemphasize the adverse effects. The following excerpts from the report's conclusions are therefore worthy of consideration:

"The nitrogen content of the master drain waters would, if discharged untreated at Antioch, stimulate the growth of large quantities of planktonic algae and other aquatic plants in the receiving waters. The presence of these plants in great density would have significant adverse effects upon the fishery of the Bay-Delta system. Their presence would also significantly reduce the recreation and aesthetic value of these waters and increase costs associated with their use for boating, navigation, industrial cooling, and other purposes. The monetary value of those detrimental effects for which costs can be estimated is placed at $11 million annually.

"Augmentation of Delta outflow would be relatively ineffective in reducing losses attributable to the nitrogen content of drain waters."

Nitrogen is one of the elements necessary to plant growth. It is frequently present in such small amounts that it is the limiting factor to growth. Deliberate addition of nitrogen in agriculture makes possible large crops and is therefore referred to as a nutrient. When large amounts of nitrogen are applied to irrigated land some of it washes off and shows up in the waste water.

Nutrients in the drainage waters are unquestionably a major problem. Californians are beginning to realize that the threat of nutrients, seldom discussed ten years ago, is a major one when the function of water environments in enriching the quality of living is taken into account. We do not expect Lake Tahoe transparency in San Francisco Bay and the delta, but we will not tolerate the conditions that have plagued Clear Lake, where masses of decaying algae kill fish, create odors, and pile up in unsightly windrows on shore.

The proposed drain is therefore utterly unacceptable to Californians unless the nutrient problem is adequately taken care of. So far solutions have been discussed in general terms but not actually built into the plan.

The problem of pesticides, which loomed large in the early discussions of the drain, appears now to be less serious than first feared. The plan to exclude surplus irrigation water running directly off the fields, and accept into the drain only pumped drainage water which has passed through the soil, to a large extent insures that the pesticides will be retained in the soil. Samples collected of pumped drainage water have shown levels of insecticides no higher than those now present in San Francisco Bay and delta waters.

The quantity of pesticides reaching the waters of the state will always be a matter of great concern. The point being made here is that this is a continuing statewide problem, requiring statewide solution, and the Master Drain in the San Joaquin Valley will probably not present any special problem in this regard. The ultimate solution of the pesticide problems will in any event be achieved, not by measures applied to waste waters, but by changes in the types of compounds used and by controls of the application practices themselves.

When one examines the question of the effect of the salt content in drainage water on the bay and delta, one finally opens up a really fundamental issue: namely, the disastrous consequences which will follow if the quality of delta water is permitted to drop to currently proposed state standards. The report just quoted contains the following very interesting conclusions on this subject:

"The effect of the dissolved mineral salts contained in the drain discharge on the waters of the Delta would be determined by the level at which the minimum outflow from the Delta is controlled in the future. At a minimum Delta outflow of 1500 cubic feet per second, as proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation, the drain discharge at Antioch would have a *beneficial* effect by reducing the mean total dissolved solids content of Delta waters used for agriculture, since at that level of sustained outflow the receiving waters would be of a *poorer* mineral quality than the drain waters." [Emphasis added.]

What this means, of course, is that the proposed management of the delta is to convert it to a waste-water system too saline to support agriculture and completely disruptive to the ecology. The rationale applied is that if this is to be done, then there is no possible drawback to emptying the Master Drain into these waters, in fact, if anything, there is a benefit. This tortured logic has never been presented to the people in straight-forward language.

How large an area are we talking about relegating to drainage purposes? Not only is the major portion of the 400,000-acre delta included, but the entire San Joaquin River, the Sacramento River below Hood and in fact the Sacramento ship channel clear to Sacramento itself, amounting to all of several hundred miles of river and slough.

The immensity of the area thus summarily denied of its fresh water heritage and assigned a brackish future dramatically illustrates the glibness with which far-reaching environmental decisions having impact on society for centuries to come can be made in our age of single-purpose, special-interest planning.

Certainly no objective person could accept this line of reasoning as justifying the discharge into the interior fresh waters of the state a waste stream so brackish as that anticipated here.

THE ALTERNATIVES

It is customary in large engineering projects, even those having unintended adverse effects on parties other than the "client," to examine the available alternative methods of accomplishing the objective and select the alternative of least cost to the client. This has been done for the Master Drain, and in this case the client is agriculture in the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. The alternatives considered were evaporation, desalinization, and exportation to San Francisco Bay proper or directly to the Pacific Ocean.

Two of these alternatives would have far-reaching benefits over and beyond getting rid of the waste water. Evaporation would entail extensive continuously flooded areas that could serve as wild-fowl refuge areas. Desalinization would not only salvage much of the water itself, but would stretch the available supply even further by blending the demineralize water with other water now too salty for use. These two methods were rejected early in the study on the grounds that either one would cost more than the construction of an export drain system.

Having, then, discarded the two alternatives which would have had no impact outside of the area to be served by the project, the proponents of the project placed principal emphasis on exploring the most likely routes to the ocean.

They discovered that the three most likely routes directly to the Pacific Ocean would cost from two to eight times as much as the valley route to Antioch, if pumping costs were included over the life of the project. The great fault in evaluation of alternatives was the failure to include the cost of damage to the quality of delta and San Francisco Bay water or the benefits of restoration of quality of ground waters of the San Joaquin Valley as a whole. All these routes were discarded.

The alternate of an initial discharge directly to San Francisco Bay proper was not seriously considered. Instead, estimates were made of westward extension (if ever needed) from Antioch to Martinez on Suisun Bay and Rodeo on San Pablo Bay at a total cost of a little over twice that of the route terminating at Antioch. The decision was then made to terminate the drain at Antioch and to wait and see how it worked.

The alternatives, evaporation and desalinization, which should have been pursued in depth were virtually ignored. And yet these logical solutions could be applied within the valley itself.

In the Tulare Lake Basin, presently unused land of low agricultural potential could be dedicated as a wildlife refuge and used as a sink to receive and evaporate agricultural drainage in the same manner that Salton Sea is used in the Imperial and Coachella Valleys. The area could be divided into a series of ponds so that progressively concentrated waters could be moved toward central areas for final evaporation in the same manner as is done in the salt ponds in San Francisco Bay. The final evaporation ponds would require lining or treatment of the bottoms to prevent percolation down to underlying ground waters. This proposal was acknowledged by the Department of Water Resources as entirely feasible technically. It is clearly the best long-term solution for agricultural waste water disposal for the southern half of the San Joaquin Valley.

In the San Joaquin River Basin to the north, the San Joaquin River is now the drainage facility, but as mentioned earlier, the drainage water has so deteriorated its quality that not only is it unsafe for agriculture in its lower reaches, it constitutes a threat to both ground waters in the basin and surface waters in the delta. Obviously, it would be a fatal mistake to drain the lands to be newly irrigated on the west side of the valley directly into this already degraded river. But there is an alternate solution that must ultimately be employed in any event. That solution is *desalinization of all drainage water in the San Joaquin River Basin.* By evaporating the Tulare Lake Basin drainage waters in the south valley, and by desalinating the river waters in the north, the need for the Master Drain would vanish.

Water resource people, and particularly agriculturists, have utterly rejected the idea of desalinization of inland waters, the reason given being unbearable costs for the water user. By this they mean that water might cost the user about twice as much as in the past. But let's examine the question of the worth of water a little more closely.

Water is by all odds the cheapest of salable commodities in our society. What other commodity can be purchased for a few cents a ton; yet, this is all that the city dweller pays for treated water delivered to his tap. The explanation is that no one really buys water. Traditionally the taking of water from natural surface or underground sources for "beneficial use" has been recognized as a right which, once established, entitles the taker to free perpetual ownership of a sizable portion of the great "common wealth." Only the cost of diverting, pumping, transporting, treating and delivering water is charged to the user; the water itself as a commodity is free. In recent decades the costs of treating the waste water (sewage and industrial liquid wastes) have been added to the delivery costs, increasing the charge by a modest amount.

How do these "marketing" charges compare with the real worth of water itself? Water is so essential to every part of our society that its real worth is never computed. Instead one merely looks for the "available" source that can be delivered at the lowest cost, knowing intuitively that this cost is but the tiniest fraction of the real worth. This relationship was cryptically articulated in the expression commonly voiced in water circles in Southern California in the 1920's—"Water is worth whatever it costs."

It is therefore a fundamental fallacy to say that we cannot afford the cost of desalinization of waste water even though these costs exceed what we pay for the water at point of use. The long-range cost of *not* preserving the quality of the natural waters of the state are infinitely greater than the token costs we are talking about here. We must determine true costs and then work out methods of assigning the costs according to benefits.

If we were starting with a clean slate in the San Joaquin River Basin, we would recycle the desalinated waste water back to the land directly, and ultimately this will probably be the pattern. But we don't have a clean slate. Both the river itself and the ground water in the lower (northern) portion of the basin must have their original high quality restored. The problem for the next ten years or so, then, is to desalinate all of the pumped drainage water from both the old and new irrigated areas and blend some of this high-quality water with the irrigation water supply itself, where it is highly mineralized, and blend the remainder with the reduced regular flow of the San Joaquin River. Whether this desalinization be accomplished by distillation, electrical dialysis or reverse osmosis (the three currently available methods), the resulting brines would probably be evaporated either in the areas previously discussed or in a separate wildlife refuge area in the San Joaquin River Basin itself.

Concerning wildlife refuge areas which are also evaporation facilities for waste water, studies conducted by the Department of Fish and Game not only point up the workability of this idea from a biological viewpoint, but clearly indicate that the value of such resources in preserving the integrity of the flyway for migrating fowl is unquestioned.

THE BASIC ISSUES

In summary, the basic issues involved in this whole controversy are not ones of engineering but of basic environmental principles. For a hundred years or more it has been the practice to base engineering decisions on the lowest cost of accomplishing a job for a "client." Environmental costs to society have not been taken seriously unless they could be converted to out-of-pocket expenditures. The tacit assumption has been that major transformations in the basic environmental system of a vast area can be evaluated and justified solely on what might be termed utilitarian values.

We have now reached the point in California when this approach will no longer do. The time has come when every major proposal to make environmental modifications must be subjected to the most searching scrutiny to determine its long-range effects on the environment, and long-range costs, under the controlling principle that *no* modification should be made which will impair the quality of the environmental system at large. In other words, instead of comparing several alternatives and selecting the one of lowest direct capital and operating cost to a client, no proposal should be considered in the first place until a determination has been made that it does not presage environmental impairment.

This idea, that the integrity of the environment comes first, has never been established as public policy because we have never seriously considered that the environment was threatened. Confronted with this prospect and really understanding it, would the people place environmental quality above material gain to a limited segment of the society? I believe that they would and that not to inform them that this kind of choice confronts them is irresponsible. In fairness to the people, not only the Master Drain proposal but the entire proposal for management of the delta and the San Joaquin Valley, indeed the entire California Water Plan, should be restudied. And this time, only those alternatives which will restore and fully preserve the historic environmental qualities of this great land and water resource area should be considered.

To this end, Congress and the state legislature must re-examine the entire program, and as a first, basic step, direct the federal Bureau of the Budget and the state legislative analyst to reassess the proposal from the standpoint of the total public welfare.

SECOND VIETNAM ROLL OF HONOR

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, On March 25 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names and hometowns of the 31,379 American soldiers killed by hostile action in Vietnam from the beginning of the war through the end of January of this year.

The listing, covering 121 pages, set forth the dimensions of the Vietnam problem inherited by President Nixon.

Today I insert in the RECORD the names of those killed in hostile action since then. They cover a 2-month period, February 1, 1969, to March 26, 1969, and total 2,148. They show the grim momentum of the war.

Since Friday there has been a genuine and justified outpouring of praise for General Eisenhower. We have been reminded that while there may be no indispensable man, some men are irreplaceable. Such a man was Eisenhower. As Ralph Waldo Emerson recalled:

> When nature removes a great man, people explore the horizon for a successor; but none comes and none will. His class is extinguished with him.

Eisenhower's was a complete human life, unmarred, unified by intelligent purpose and uninterrupted accomplishment, blessed by great talent, employed in the worthiest activities with a deserved fame never dimmed and always growing. He was blessed, too, with the Biblical three score and ten years, with several to spare.

The young American men who died in

Vietnam in February and March, whose names I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today, are also irreplaceable, like Eisenhower. They are irreplaceable to their families, their communities, and their Nation. Their lives, unlike Eisenhower's, were not complete; they were cut short. Most of them were under 24 years of age. There will be no unity of intelligent purpose—save what has already been spent—and no uninterrupted long-term accomplishment. Lost forever is the possibility that these men could have been employed in worthy activities with a deserved fame never dimmed and always growing. Few, of course, would likely have become great in the sense of national recognition. But, who knows, one of them might have been instrumental in discovering a cure for cancer. Another might have served in high office, or written great literature, or a symphony, or otherwise enriched our civilization.

These losses must weigh heavily upon those of us in the Congress. After all, we have the primary responsibility under the Constitution for fundamental war-making decisions and for the regulation of the Military Establishment. In all candor, we have neglected this responsibility in the past and do so today.

The second listing of the Vietnam roll of honor, consisting of the periodic announcements by the Department of Defense, beginning with the report of February 3, 1969, and ending with the report of March 28, 1969:

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 3, 1969

ARMY

California

John H. Gordon.
William R. Neville.
Mario M. Laguna.
Raymond W. Sullivan.
James A. Nicholson.
Lawrence M. Weiche.
Gregory C. Tucker.

Florida

James E. Taylor.
John F. Darby III.
Harry J. Cloud.

Illinois

Robert E. Miller III.

Indiana

Charles W. Richardson.
David E. Brookins.
James L. Woodworth.
Michael P. Biedron.

Kentucky

Lanny W. Banta.

Massachusetts

William G. LeClair.

Michigan

Norman A. Freda.

Missouri

Harold H. Hunter.
LaValle Walker.

New York

Irvin W. Prosser, Jr.
William P. Nogiewich.
Richard R. Bellwood.

North Carolina

Bobby D. Anthony.

Ohio

Carl D. Pipher.
Gary E. Collins.
John W. Eutsler.
Raymond F. Beauchamp.

ARMY—continued

Pennsylvania

Edward L. Eby.
Dennis C. Eshleman.

Texas

Charles D. Bullard.
L. C. Smith.

Utah

Alton D. Percival.

Virginia

Larry A. Stephens.

Wisconsin

Jerrald L. Bulin.
Ralph L. Blauvelt.

NAVY

Alabama

Larry F. Hunt.

Nebraska

Dennis L. Kurz.

New York

William R. Gray, Jr.
James W. Thomas.

MARINE CORPS

Alabama

Charles D. Drysdale.

Arkansas

Marvin Cook, Jr.
Michael W. Bailey.

California

Joseph Y. Ramirez.
James R. Russell.

Connecticut

Russell L. Equi.

Illinois

Ronald A. Vanwambeke.

Indiana

Cal T. Hammack.
Steven M. Steinbacher.
William M. Thomas.

Iowa

Philip B. Jones.
Gary L. Squiers.

Louisiana

Henry R. Broadtman, Jr.

Maryland

Bobby D. Rogers.

Massachusetts

Alvin R. Gale.

Michigan

Jerry R. Cole.
William J. Murphy.

New Hampshire

William R. Douillette.

New Mexico

Jesus Quezada.

New York

Charles A. Brezinski.
Bernard G. Purvis.

North Carolina

Dan L. Jenkins.
Robert M. Campbell.

Oregon

Donald G. Heider.

Pennsylvania

Samuel Rodriquez.

South Dakota

Douglas D. Janssen.

Tennessee

Larry R. Harris.
Edwin Blakley, Jr.
William L. Mott.

Texas

Samuel D. Reeves, Jr.
Thomas P. Duggan.

Virginia

Wallace T. Corbitt.
Martin J. Gimbert.

MARINE CORPS—continued

West Virginia

Frank M. Koerner.

AIR FORCE

Utah

Remi H. Greeff.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Illinois

William Daley.

New Jersey

John M. Lamanna.

Texas

William T. Robertson.

Wisconsin

David F. Cleereman.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Alabama

Richard Clark.

Iowa

Roger C. Beall.

Missouri

Edward Smith, Jr.
Robert A. Firebaugh.

New Jersey

George A. Baker.

New York

Andre R. Bellemare.

North Carolina

Gerald F. Apperson.

Texas

Juan E. Cortez.

Virginia

John D. Keel.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 4, 1969

ARMY

Arizona

Billy J. Simmons.

Arkansas

Ricky C. Bradley.

Georgia

William E. Finley.

Illinois

James W. Ambrose III.
Ronald L. Ostenson.

Indiana

Robert D. Cody.

Iowa

Norman R. Bettis.

Maine

Neil H. Mackillop.

Michigan

Donald M. Michels.
Henry L. Gutierrez, Jr.

New York

Henry G. Schulte.
John J. Senor.

North Carolina

Melville B. Rose III.

Ohio

Russell H. Ellis.

Oregon

Jon S. Rasmussen.

West Virginia

Rell Crigger, Jr.

Wisconsin

Tom R. Mueller.

Guam

George S. Sanchez.

NAVY

California

Robert M. Langslow.

Kentucky

Lloyd I. Luttrell.

NAVY—continued

Maine

Harvey J. Douglas.

Philippines

Ray L. Sharp.

MARINE CORPS

Hawaii

John R. Kaawa.

New York

Anthony M. Cusumano.

South Carolina

Alvin J. Derrick.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Indiana

Ronald Sabin.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Steven D. Bartman.

Kentucky

Joseph E. Greenwell.

Minnesota

Lyle W. Schroeder.

Washington

Robert D. Case.

Wisconsin

Frederick Schmitt.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 5, 1969

ARMY

California

Gordon D. Gardner.

Connecticut

Ronald L. Gagne.

District of Columbia

Calvin S. Day.

Illinois

Larry R. Maddy.

Maryland

Edward A. Lamb.

Michigan

James J. Morrison.

Mississippi

Jerry R. Davis.

North Carolina

Jimmy E. Abernathy.
James W. Tuck, Jr.

Ohio

John D. Freppon.
Stephen R. Kutschbach.

Pennsylvania

Lee F. Linch.

Tennessee

Larry W. Neill.

MARINE CORPS

Arkansas

Boyce D. Burgett.

California

Daniel P. Rose.
Paul G. Telles.

Colorado

Garland G. Whalen.

Maryland

Thomas R. Davis.

Ohio

Richard A. Moore.

West Virginia

Kenneth H. Shelleman.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

California

Edward P. Vandervort.

New Jersey

Richard Sincavage.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Delaware

Daniel A. Tressler, Jr.

Georgia

Allen D. Cheshire.

Michigan

Carl J. Andrus.

New York

David Rodriguez.

Tennessee

Larry G. Curtis.

Virginia

Joseph B. Rush.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 6, 1969

ARMY

Alabama

David Howze, Jr.
Larry E. Boyer.

Colorado

Clifford M. Gardell.

Florida

Dewey D. Ruis.
Clarence L. McKinnon.

Georgia

James E. Skipper.
John T. Walls.

Idaho

Glen L. Atkinson.

Illinois

Alan R. Ramsey.

Iowa

James D. Camp.

Michigan

William A. Tennant.

Minnesota

Ernest A. Spong.
Lee H. Harra.

Missouri

Gary L. Glear.

North Carolina

James M. Robinson.
Harold R. Richardson.

Ohio

Michael O. Cassidy.
William H. Miller.

Wisconsin

John R. Poff.

MARINE CORPS

Connecticut

Frankie R. Williams.

Illinois

Ronald C. Jensen.

New York

Malone B. Temple.
William R. Larkin.

North Carolina

Wayne R. Hoyle.

Vermont

William F. Lestage.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Michigan

Rickey C. C. McCoy.

Tennessee

Houston F. Thomas.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

New Jersey

Thomas R. Grover.

Oregon

Kenneth C. Clifton.

Pennsylvania

David F. Heiser.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 7, 1969

ARMY

Arizona

Dennis V. Lee.

California

Otis J. Darden.
Hildefonso M. Ramirez.

Connecticut

Russell T. Fant.

Georgia

Robert W. Hamlin.

Michigan

John R. Rebits.

Missouri

Dennis R. Whicker.
Charles E. Inlow.

New Jersey

William J. Pryor.

New York

Salvatore Mancuso.
Reginald M. Herbert.

North Carolina

Isiah Barnes Jr.

Ohio

Steven M. Britton.

Tennessee

Tony L. Griffith.

Washington

John W. Spafford.

NAVY

Massachusetts

Robert L. Blais.

MARINE CORPS

Alabama

Leonard H. Holmes.

Colorado

Joseph Romero.

Indiana

Ronald G. Baughman.

Kentucky

Donald C. Berry.

Tennessee

Leslie A. Jerstad.

Wisconsin

Dale W. Schwefel.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

California

Anthony L. Quinn.

Georgia

Thomas Clark.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Michigan

James T. Feeney.

New York

Arthur Watson.

Pennsylvania

Charles H. Watkins Jr.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 10, 1969

ARMY

Alabama

George E. Jackson.

California

Robert M. Davenport.
Dennis M. Keith.
Rodney D. Wise.

Florida

Edgar Lee.
James L. Ward.

Illinois

Daryl G. Scalf.

Louisiana

Roland L. Harris.

ARMY—continued

Nebraska

Robert L. Eaton.
Fred A. Neubauer.

New Jersey

James L. Francisco.

New York

Russell E. Reinel.
Robert E. Hendrix.
Orville E. Hill.
James R. Smith.
Juan Rivera.

North Carolina

James T. Edmonds.

Ohio

Thomas J. Gildow.
Terrence P. Kilbane.

Tennessee

James L. Clark.

NAVY

Ohio

John A. Durham.
Robert K. Hall.

MARINE CORPS

Arizona

Richard Andrade.

Arkansas

Raymond N. Rivera.

California

David B. Graham.
Michael S. Massone.

Florida

Russell E. Moke.

Kentucky

Homer West.

Maine

Rodney G. Shank.
Lewis C. Jones, Jr.

Minnesota

Robert A. Bye.

New York

John V. Kuchta.

Ohio

Dwain L. Bibey.
Dana L. Zaleski.

Pennsylvania

Lawrence E. Houck II.
Robert E. Sherlock.

Texas

Gerald L. Thomas.
Dennis W. Schonberg.

Virginia

Anthony A. Koster.

Washington

Gregory J. Niccoli.

West Virginia

Charles W. Miller, Jr.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

North Carolina

Linwood R. Cumbo.

Texas

James G. Brown.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Michigan

Glenn R. Urquhart, Jr.

Pennsylvania

Michael A. Barnes.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

James D. Stuessel.
Robert E. Beaumont.
Paris W. Montanez.

Illinois

Harry D. Brueske.

Louisiana

William H. Denney, Jr.

Massachusetts

Chester J. Kmit.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY—continued

Michigan

Wayne D. Groat.

Utah

Arthur A. Callister.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 11, 1969

ARMY

California

Christopher S. Smith.

Colorado

Lyman R. Ditson.

Connecticut

Bradford P. Sawyer.

Florida

Perry D. Johnson.

Indiana

Michael L. Mitchell.

Iowa

Richard B. Garrett.

Kansas

Arthur L. Klaus.

Michigan

Donald K. McLean.

Minnesota

Richard L. Skouby.

Nevada

James B. McKnight.

New York

Albert A. Davenport.
Gerald R. Carr.
James M. Skomski.

North Carolina

Richard L. Allen.
Alexander S. Peoples.

North Dakota

David P. Haegele.

Ohio

Robert D. De Board.

Oklahoma

Fred R. Frazier, Jr.

South Carolina

Lloyd J. Hucks.

Texas

Alvin L. Shadwick.
Kerry F. Wilson.

MARINE CORPS

Arizona

John D. Harrington.

Florida

William T. Cumbie.

Michigan

Gary R. Haley.

New Jersey

Otis Green.

North Carolina

Rodger D. Howard.

Ohio

Andrew M. Haglage.

Pennsylvania

Joseph H. Brubaker, Jr.

South Dakota

James D. Opsahl.

West Virginia

Kenneth E. Jackson.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Georgia

Frankie Young, Jr.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Peter L. Alagna.

Florida

William C. Hix, Jr.

Georgia

Thomas T. Staples II.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY—continued

Louisiana

Lonnie Bridges.

Michigan

David F. Head.

New York

Gary J. Coyle.

Texas

Otha L. Poole.
William M. Harrison.
Gary M. Johnson.

Virginia

George L. Kellam.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 12, 1969

ARMY

California

Miguel A. Puentes.
Andrew P. Garcia.
Philip A. Tritsch.

Connecticut

Albert Christy Jr.

Georgia

Russell B. Adams.

Iowa

Carroll P. O'Neill.

Kansas

William A. Phalp Jr.

Kentucky

Joe E. Hester.

Maine

Daniel A. Foss.

Nebraska

Milton A. Ross.

Nevada

Rick V. Jensen.

New York

Michael T. Decker.

Ohio

Larry Stevenson.

Pennsylvania

William S. Ogden.

Texas

Joseph K. Bush Jr.

NAVY

California

Bruce B. Bernstein.

New York

Walter R. Tyrell.

Oregon

Gary N. Young.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Washington

William C. Ingram.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Manuel G. Ulloa.
Alfred A. Gates.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—AIR FORCE

Colorado

Harper B. Keeler.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 13, 1969

ARMY

Arkansas

Chester E. Hill.

California

Linus R. Roe.

Connecticut

Thomas M. Neal.

Florida

James R. McNish.

Georgia

James E. McKee.
Billy G. Langley.

ARMY—continued

Illinois

Ronald E. Boyer.
Gary E. Reynolds.

Indiana

Charles K. Larkins.

Michigan

William D. Gouger, Jr.
Dennis A. Jeziorski.

Minnesota

Steven R. Bauer.

Missouri

Dale R. Jackson.

Nebraska

Dewey I. Struebing.

Ohio

John L. Wehr.

Oregon

Joel L. Gabriel.

Pennsylvania

Edward M. Holtzman.

South Carolina

Joseph O. Strickland.

Texas

Macario S. Banda.

Utah

Russell L. Harris.

Wisconsin

Michael W. Schumacher.

MARINE CORPS

Arkansas

Billy J. Curbow.

California

Wallace C. Bergstrom.

District of Columbia

Ronald J. Floyd.

Florida

Cesar R. Rodriguez.

Massachusetts

Robert W. McCluskey.

New York

Thomas P. Noonan, Jr.

Pennsylvania

William R. Prom.

Texas

Jose M. Trejo.

West Virginia

Raymond E. Glover.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Michigan

Michael M. Davidson.

Missouri

Larry H. Coleman.

Ohio

Daris W. Nickels.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Donald L. Kipp.

Colorado

Ward C. Evans.

Florida

Edward Clemons.

Georgia

James Gaines, Jr.

Illinois

Leonard A. Morse.

Indiana

Robert L. Howell.

Kentucky

Jerry D. Jones.

Louisiana

Gilton W. Johnson.

Michigan

Lee E. Burnor.
Theodore L. Gyulveszi.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY—continued

Missouri

Gayland E. Keroher.

Texas

Benito E. Conchola.

West Virginia

Michael J. Wilson.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 14, 1969

ARMY

Missouri

Robert B. Maddox.

Mississippi

Billy F. Harper.

Texas

Russell D. Woollard.
Salvador D. L. S. Rios.

West Virginia

Danny J. Dodd.

NAVY

Michigan

John A. Belford.

North Carolina

Lonnie E. Hooplaugh.

MARINE CORPS

Florida

Harvey E. Lott.

Illinois

Barry V. Detrempe.
William P. Weimer.

Illinois

Michael J. McGlothlin.

Massachusetts

Richard L. Cotter.

West Virginia

Carl E. Goldsmith, Jr.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

New York

Benjamin Maldonado-Aguilar.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Gregory M. Leinen.

Illinois

Johnnie W. Ator.

New York

George J. Canamare.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—MARINE CORPS

Illinois

John A. Prombo.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION

ARMY

Alabama

James T. Pence.

Arizona

Frank A. Jensen.

California

Dana R. Barker.
Antonino Ruggeri.
Allen D. Muller.

Florida

George K. Hamilton.
Richard M. Hilt.

Georgia

Walter N. Crawford.
Stephen C. Walker.

Hawaii

Alvin J. Ho.

Illinois

Michael J. Spear.
Phillip R. Frankiewicz.

Indiana

Fred D. Whitaker.

Louisiana

William E. Brown.

ARMY—continued

Massachusetts

David A. Hill.

Michigan

Richard A. Paton.
Gerry A. Polega.

Minnesota

Wesley P. Hendrickson.
Stephen L. Schumacher.

Nevada

Donald B. Schroeder.

New Hampshire

Vern C. Kelley.
David L. Bell.

New Jersey

Joseph J. Smith.

New York

Richard P. Gates.
Robert T. Hamilton.

Ohio

Thomas G. Fisher.
Roger D. Lewis.

Oklahoma

John D. Benien.
John M. Holloway.

Oregon

Norman A. Jensen.

South Carolina

Joe J. Miles.
Claude E. Bragg.
David W. Smith.

Tennessee

Robert D. Shoemaker.

Texas

Robert W. Hook.
Ruben Anguiano.

Virginia

Gary R. Reed.
Kenneth R. Sawyer.

Wisconsin

Richard D. Bartholomew, Jr.
William D. Bakken.

NAVY

California

Larry J. Luckett.

Indiana

Huger L. Phelps.

MARINE CORPS

Arizona

Dale E. Crick.
Larry A. Cochran.

Arkansas

Robert L. T. Ramsey, Jr.

California

Kevin L. Day.
Lynn P. Naylor.

Florida

Stanley H. Newman.
Mark F. Powers.

Georgia

Terry K. Jackson.
Larry K. Wheeler.
Wilbur L. Milam, III.

Illinois

James Palmer.

Indiana

Bradley E. Suchka.

Iowa

Steven L. Wissink.

Kentucky

Michael A. Shepherd.

Maryland

Mark L. Kline.
Michael P. Taylor.

Massachusetts

Thomas R. Dickey.

Michigan

Rodger C. Nesbit.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Mississippi

Garson F. White.

Nebraska

Lawrence C. Looby.

New York

Robert L. Johnson.
James W. Smith, Jr.

Ohio

Danny K. Crothers.

Oklahoma

Charles N. Bondi.

Pennsylvania

Thomas W. Kustaborder.

Tennessee

Larry G. Whitehead.

Texas

Donald N. Kennon.
Thomas E. Creek.
Calvin W. Wilkins.
Billy D. Roberts.

Virginia

Fred L. Pettigrew.

Wisconsin

Thomas L. Armitage.

AIR FORCE

New York

Vincent Colasuonno.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Ohio

James P. Witt.

Oklahoma

Reginald D. King.

Washington

Leldon E. Hock, Jr.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Florida

Lawrence C. Hawley.

Maryland

Robert L. Hettinger.

North Carolina

Bedford M. Morris Jr.

Oklahoma

John L. Hawkins, Jr.

Oregon

Jack E. Schultz.

Pennsylvania

Samuel D. Shimek.

South Carolina

Theus J. Pound.

Tennessee

Ralph Cannon.
Bobby G. Gamble.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 18, 1969

ARMY

Indiana

William S. Riggs.

Kentucky

Thomas S. Hamilton.

Louisiana

Edward E. Cox, Jr.

Ohio

Gary L. Dubach.

Texas

Jack D. Wadley.
Kurt L. Starkey.

MARINE CORPS

Arizona

Daniel L. Henry.

Ohio

Raymond J. Baldauf.

North Dakota

Roger D. Knudtson.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Texas

Lawrence H. Moore.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Massachusetts

Donald M. Ashton, Jr.

Pennsylvania

Kenneth C. Hess.
Lewis R. Valentine.

West Virginia

Thomas W. Bennett.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—AIR FORCE

Texas

Ludwig G. Baumann.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Illinois

Michael J. Wyman.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 19, 1969

ARMY

Minnesota

Vernon G. Knutson.

Ohio

Robert H. Parcher, Jr.

Virginia

Gary L. Miller.

MARINE CORPS

California

Jeffrey H. Foulke.

Massachusetts

Thomas M. Casey, Jr.
David O. Sullivan.

New Mexico

Juan J. Wilson.

New York

John V. Kuchta.

North Dakota

Ernest E. Bartolina, Jr.

Oklahoma

Benjamin F. Bolding.
Fred E. Pitts.

Washington

Bill "W" Gentry.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Florida

Marwick L. Kemp.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Juan R. Pequeno.

Illinois

Dennis E. Dawson.

Mississippi

Charles Boyd.

New Jersey

John W. Mendez.

Wisconsin

Clarence C. Adams.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 20, 1969

ARMY

California

Salvador O. Ricardo.

Georgia

Rodney R. Green.

Indiana

Gerald Q. Hancock.

Kansas

Harold H. Hladik.

Massachusetts

Arthur L. Brown, Sr.

Minnesota

Richard M. Kulavik.

ARMY—continued

Pennsylvania

Patrick J. Dugan.
Ronald L. Raker.

NAVY

Ohio

Cornelius A. McCafferty.

Oregon

Marlin M. Jones.

MARINE CORPS

California

Randolph Brown, Jr.

Illinois

Robert W. Whitney.

Massachusetts

Eric A. Fisher.

Ohio

Thomas W. Sander.

Pennsylvania

Dennis L. Riley.

Tennessee

Phillip E. Minton.

Texas

Michael R. Coon.

Washington

Craig M. Hemphill.

Wisconsin

William H. Farvour.
Kenneth G. Liebhaber.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Arizona

Lincoln Hardy.

California

John S. Pinney.

New Jersey

Harold J. Van Winkle, Jr.

New York

William Rivera-Garcia.

Oklahoma

Lonnie D. Loyd, Jr.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—NAVY

Texas

William C. Niedecken.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 24, 1969

ARMY

Alabama

Roy D. Stoffregen.

Arkansas

David G. King.

California

Robert G. Wimp.
Rick A. Oliver.
Michael T. Rowe.

Colorado

Robert J. Hall.

Delaware

Richard J. Curry.

Florida

Joseph H. Pierce, Jr.
Herbert H. Sweat, Jr.

Georgia

Edwin A. Ackerman, Jr.
Allen C. Yeomans III.
Allan B. Callaway.

Illinois

William W. Dickey.
Ronald J. Corbin.
Junior F. Roniger.

Kentucky

Billie J. McClure.

Louisiana

Charles M. Downs.
Howard L. Early.

ARMY—continued

Michigan

Cleveland E. Dykes.
Earnest L. Kauffman.

Minnesota

David H. Sundquist.
Raymond Suarez, Jr.

New Jersey

Charles Foulks, Jr.

New York

Robert I. Meeker.

New York

Richard R. Hurlihe.
John A. Kucich.
Duane C. Romeo.
Carl J. Tanzola.
Christopher W. Meagher.

North Carolina

Gerald Wrazen.

Ohio

Thomas R. Preston.
Thomas M. Blackwell.

Oklahoma

Virgil C. Combs.
James W. Pendergrass.

Pennsylvania

Frederick W. Kulicke III.
Herbert H. Stauffer.
Dan R. Byham.

Rhode Island

James V. Cavanaugh.
Ronald J. Wilkinson.

Texas

Michael D. Adams.

Utah

Quenton L. Christensen.

Virginia

Raymond W. Callahan Jr.
Donald W. Miller.
Charles R. Main.

Washington

Daniel L. Poff.

Wisconsin

Jon P. Robbins.

NAVY

New Jersey

Mack H. Wilhelm.

Pennsylvania

George D. Tinko.

MARINE CORPS

Arkansas

"E" "G" Mays Jr.

California

Clyde Callahan.

California

Ralph E. Ebbs.
John P. Cook.
Reginald J. Rodriguez.
Charles R. James.
Roy E. Pitts.

District of Columbia

Roscoe C. Gray, Jr.

Florida

Stephen Blann.

Georgia

Weldon G. Lynn.

Idaho

Ronald D. Shaff.

Illinois

James W. Bell.
Robert Dunbar.

Indiana

Dennis W. Cripe.

Kentucky

Dickie G. Keeler.
Steven D. Tanner.

Maryland

Howard E. Wright.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Missouri

Thomas M. Skally.

New Hampshire

Russell W. Wendler.

New Jersey

William O'Shea II.

New York

Dennis J. Kane.
Michael A. Clute.
Daniel J. Foster.
Frank R. Howe.
Abrael Maldonado.

Ohio

Eddie V. Oliver, Jr.
David A. Schneider.
Michael Wilson.

Oklahoma

Roger L. Elkins.

Pennsylvania

Roger L. Pifer.

South Carolina

Wesley E. Flanigan.
Nathaniel L. Johnson.

Texas

Alfredo J. Villanueva.

Washington

Donald L. Kujawa.

AIR FORCE

South Carolina

Charles L. McMahan.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

Maine

Alonzo W. Wight.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Illinois

Ronald M. Nowak.

Maryland

Barry W. Smith.

Minnesota

Rickie N. Gunderson.

Ohio

Edward W. Bolan.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Alabama

Ralph G. Dunn.

California

Larry T. Ross.

Florida

Dennis C. North.

Georgia

Harold R. Tyson.

Hawaii

Larry M. Alcos.

Kentucky

Edwin H. Hardesty, Jr.
Harold Sullivan.

Maryland

Normand P. Perron.

Michigan

Larry A. Bodell.
James T. Fields.

Mississippi

Arthur L. Papale.

New Jersey

Francis K. Kulbatski.

New York

Ismael Laureano-Lopez.
David Q. Patterson.
Ronald J. Hillman.

North Carolina

Richard L. Waycaster.

Ohio

James W. Dalton.

Pennsylvania

Jack L. Rightmyer.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY—continued

Texas

Alvin R. Fritz.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 25, 1967

ARMY

Alabama

De Wayne Taylor.
Nathan E. Hullett.

Florida

Arthur J. Anderson.
Randolph Eubanks.
Ronald L. Groves.

Georgia

Robert L. Jones.
Henry R. Strobo.
Charlie L. Wilder.

Illinois

James A. Azbell.
Richard J. Rochacz.
Randall F. Schwartz.
Kenneth E. Steinhebel.

Iowa

Guy F. Abbott.
Randall L. Brockway.

Kentucky

Robert J. Blaut, Jr.
Edwin D. Caswell.
Clarence D. Russell.

Maryland

James Berends.

Massachusetts

Kenneth R. Johnson.

Michigan

William J. Allen.
Robert L. Shiroda, Jr.
Jimmie S. Warren.
Lewis M. Forman.

Mississippi

Ronald C. Weems.

New York

Winford A. Nass.
Roberto Acevedo.

New York

John H. Davis.

North Carolina

Willie L. Williams.
Ronald L. Harkey.
John W. Thomas.
Roger M. Tyner.
Kenneth E. Wade.

Ohio

Robert R. Buck.
Jerry D. Spradlin.

Oklahoma

Ray G. Wilson.

Pennsylvania

Dennis J. Lorenzini.
Dale C. Fisher.
Richard S. Mark.

South Carolina

Bobby Sanderson.

Tennessee

Ernest W. Swoner.
Manfred W. Fitzgerald.

Texas

John S. Wilson.
Charles E. Wilson.
Jesse B. Montez.
Robert D. Law.
Earnest W. Graham.
Lee A. Keith.
Robert C. Mora.
Paul W. Motley.
Kevin E. Tweedle.

West Virginia

Marvin D. Canterbury.

Wisconsin

John A. Buschke.
Carl J. Riederer.

NAVY

Illinois

Warnell E. Aten.

MARINE CORPS

Arizona

George E. Dusch.

California

John R. Hill.

Florida

Thomas G. Stevenson, Jr.

Louisiana

Tommy L. Wyatt.

Ohio

James D. Snyder.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

California

William J. Levett.

Kentucky

Jimmy L. Myers.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

New Jersey

Nathan C. Lunapiena.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Indiana

Gary R. Genth.

Michigan

Philip A. Johnson.

Tennessee

Donald V. Saller.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 26, 1969

ARMY

Arkansas

Walter Sturgeon.

California

Adalberto R. E. Verdugo.
Christopher Casias.
Erskine L. Crump.

Colorado

Gilbert M. Chavez.

Florida

Kyle A. Addair.

Georgia

John W. Washington.
Morrie C. Barber.

Illinois

Michael T. Calandrino.
Robert D. Eickleberry.

Indiana

Jesse D. Carpenter.

Iowa

Byron D. McQuinn.

Kansas

Michael N. Hubert.

Massachusetts

Richard E. Olson.

Maryland

Richard L. Shuck.

Michigan

Daniel F. Cahill.
Douglas L. Hinkle.
Edward L. Griggs III.

Minnesota

James F. Uttermark.

Mississippi

Charles R. Ornsbey.

New Jersey

Andrew J. Kiefhaber.

New York

Kevin F. Cregon.
Theodore J. Pawlowski, Jr.

North Carolina

Myron E. Rhue.

Oregon

Edward L. Handy.

ARMY—continued

Rhode Island

Donald H. Sisson.

South Carolina

Reid M. Naney.

Tennessee

James C. Alderidge.
Freddie R. Guinn.

Virginia

Gerald W. Gwaltney.

Washington

Paul F. Clark.

West Virginia

David W. Dunford.

Wisconsin

Paul H. Tober.

NAVY

Ohio

Nichols I. Pyle.

MARINE CORPS

District of Columbia

Michael J. St Onge.
Wingfield Page, Jr.

Florida

Woots E. Wadkins.

Georgia

Ronald L. Smith.
James D. Tyus, Jr.

Illinois

Edward D. Powers.

Massachusetts

Michael J. Brady.

Michigan

Richard A. Penke.

New Jersey

Randall M. Carlton.

New York

John F. Walker.
Walter A. Joyce.
Richard E. Parker.
William R. Yaskanich.

Ohio

Duane M. Davis.
Leslie H. Shafer.

Texas

Henry L. Ashford.

Wisconsin

Gary R. Miracle.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

District of Columbia

Henry M. Robinson Jr.

Oklahoma

Jerry W. Stanberry.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Maryland

Franklin B. Gilbert.

New Jersey

Ralph E. Johnson.

New Mexico

Floyd S. Atole.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 27, 1969

ARMY

Arizona

Jose L. Gonzalez.

California

Xavier A. Arvizu.
Jay L. Robbins, Jr.

Georgia

Curtis Darrisaw.

Indiana

Rodger D. Holmes.

Kentucky

Charles E. Carpenter.

ARMY—continued

Maryland

Robert W. Hartsock.
James W. Leaf.

Michigan

Dale A. Nicholl.
Duane A. Downing.
Michael E. Sidor.

Michigan

Daniel W. Gleason.
Andrew M. Mattie.

Minnesota

Gene L. Salzer.

Missouri

Larry L. Brooks.

New York

Edward F. Barry.
Ronald A. Monish.
William C. Clinger III.

North Carolina

Steven J. Pastula.
George L. Davis, Jr.
Gary E. Johnson.

Pennsylvania

Donald W. Hallow.
Lemuel Isabelle.

Texas

Walter S. Hamner.

Virginia

Roosevelt Hardy, Jr.

NAVY

California

Jose A. Ollivier.

MARINE CORPS

Arkansas

Larry D. Staggs.

California

Robert D. Christiansen.
Donald M. Edwards.
Norman M. Harmon.
Robert A. Horcajo.
Kelly W. Weitzel.
Robert M. Ysguerra.
Stephen D. Facchini.

Delaware

Richard C. Stevenson.

Florida

Fred Butler III.

Georgia

Richard P. Hodges.
William R. Hodge.

Hawaii

Lawrence P. O'Toole II.

Illinois

John R. Baird, Jr.
Timothy L. Gilson.
Pete G. Heckwine.
Lester W. Weber.
Daniel Coleman.

Indiana

Fred L. Thomas, Jr.

Kentucky

Edward S. Gum.
Michael L. Cruse.
Ronald McIntosh.

Massachusetts

Robert W. Topham, Jr.
John J. Kenney.

Michigan

David J. Pellosma.
Richard J. Riker.

Minnesota

Victor A. Rabel.

Missouri

James B. Rice, Jr.

New York

John F. Dedek.
James E. Cummings.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Ohio

Bruce E. Robinson.

Oklahoma

Ronald G. Moss.

Pennsylvania

Paul J. Mitchell.
John P. Ziegler.

Pennsylvania

Norman P. Chittester.
Alfred A. Purvis.

South Carolina

Bobby D. Timmons.

Texas

George Meerdink, Jr.
Lee R. Herron.
Jessee M. Nunez.
Freddie L. Tipton.
Larry Boehm.

West Virginia

John L. Brumbauch.
Charles K. Nowell.
William E. Null.

Wisconsin

Thomas H. Crook.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Nevada

Gary D. Judd.

North Carolina

Andrew L. Belfield.

Texas

Larry A. Wessinger.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Kentucky

Ulysses Battle.

Nebraska

Douglas J. Winchell, Jr.

New York

Carl N. Kozma.

North Carolina

Hugh R. McKinney.

Oklahoma

Larry D. Barker.

Texas

Alan R. Graham.

Puerto Rico

Miguel A. Gonzalez-Rivera.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 28, 1969

ARMY

California

Robert L. Bennett.

Florida

Henry L. Quigley.

Indiana

Barry G. Sowders.

Kansas

Sammy E. Kinnamon.

Maine

Jon Bailey.

Maryland

Harold D. Biller.
Joseph F. Bauer, Jr.
Terrance L. Snyder.

Massachusetts

James E. Palmeri.

Michigan

Edward M. Ruditys.
James E. Scott.

Mississippi

Angus W. McAllister, Jr.

New Jersey

Stanley M. Reed.
Joseph B. Oliphant, Jr.

New York

Daniel A. Widomski.

ARMY—continued

North Carolina

Martin T. Batchelor, Jr.

Ohio

Larry L. Woolum.
Jerry L. Alferink.

Oklahoma

Larry R. Short.

Tennessee

James E. Wise.

Texas

Arthur W. Bartlett, Sr.
Jesse R. Ellison.

Wyoming

Richard J. Sweeney.

NAVY

Kentucky

Earl F. Houck, Jr.

California

Charles D. Jones.

MARINE CORPS

Arizona

James S. Reynolds, Jr.
Oscar P. Austin.

California

Thomas G. Price.
Jerry L. Taylor.
James E. Wells.

Colorado

David A. Chacon.

Florida

Robert M. Lough, Jr.
Adrian J. Smith.

Georgia

Daniel G. Ely.
Calvin L. Howell, Jr.
Tommy Johnson.

Illinois

John C. Odle.

Indiana

Victor L. Poor.

Maryland

William J. Christman III.
Joseph M. Van Daniker.

Michigan

Victor S. Schlichting.
James F. Laird.
James M. Root.

Minnesota

Christopher D. Prather.

Montana

Raymond A. Cole.

New Jersey

Michael R. McCabe.

New York

Gerard F. Paulsen.
Edward D. Merkle.

North Carolina

Billy L. Underwood.

Ohio

Jerry R. Howerton.
Samuel R. Wall.

Rhode Island

David E. Belver.

Tennessee

Ronnel L. Waugh.

Texas

Michael J. Drobena.
Bennye W. Cowley.
Wayne L. Thomas.

Virginia

Willard F. Prochaska.
Anthony L. Johnson.

Washington

Michael B. Duffy.

Wisconsin

Vasilios Demetris.
John A. Peterson.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Abel J. De La Paz.

Florida

Gregory T. Lindsay.

Hawaii

Earl C. M. Au Hoy.

Illinois

Robert M. Lee.

Pennsylvania

Thomas M. Brown.

Wisconsin

Dale E. Rauber.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 3, 1969

ARMY

Alabama

Franklin D. Bryan.

Arkansas

Mounce E. West.

California

Larry B. Curttright.
John C. Schiffhauer.
Charles E. Clay.
Robert P. Levin.
John Lopez.
Van H. Pearson.

Colorado

Jerry W. Gobbo.

Connecticut

Donald C. Le Blond.

Florida

Arthur L. Andrews.
Irwin Beyda.
Isaac Stringer, Jr.
Wilbur L. Hicks.

Illinois

James T. Fernandez.

Indiana

David C. M. Jackson.
Michael R. Rommel.

Iowa

Warren G. H. Lizotte, Jr.

Kansas

Phip D. Johnson.

Maryland

Donald M. Jennings.

Michigan

Gordon P. Gipner.

Minnesota

Keith C. Buckingham.
Larry C. Koski.

Missouri

Charles M. Hobbs.

Montana

Richard M. Johnson.

New Jersey

Rudolph Swoope.
Douglas J. Markovich.

New Mexico

Russell J. Holland.

New York

Christopher Brow.
Richard A. Carapezza.
Henry Madison, Jr.
Louis V. Marciano.
Burt J. Meyer, Jr.
William B. Wilson.
Walton G. Daley.
Vito Vitro.

North Carolina

James K. Sutton.
Clarence Robinson, Jr.

Ohio

James E. Titus.
Richard P. Ritzler.

ARMY—continued

Oregon

David G. Cummings.
Jim L. Dickson.

Pennsylvania

John E. Marpo.
Duane A. Hipple.
Howard Atkinson.
Thomas C. Warner.
Philip C. Miller, Jr.

South Carolina

John W. Massey, Jr.

Tennessee

Hobart E. Covington.

Texas

Gary L. Johnson.

Virginia

Thomas A. McAdams.
William S. Potter.
Wilford H. Alderman.
Thomas A. Garman.

Washington

Randal L. Rogers.
Carl F. Belding, Jr.

West Virginia

Howard T. Haught, Jr.
John R. Tennant.

NAVY

Arkansas

William A. Hanna.

Connecticut

Donald K. Walsh.

Florida

Eugene S. Hancock.

Illinois

Larry A. Hartigan.

Pennsylvania

Eugene J. Garrity, Jr.

Ohio

John J. Seery.

MARINE CORPS

Alabama

Marshall L. Calender.

Arizona

Steven V. Garcia.
Salvador L. Norzagaray.

Arkansas

Marion W. Lyons.

California

James K. Hall.
David K. Jacobsgaard.
Jeffrey M. Barron.
Richard W. Heim.
Douglas B. Bastyr.
George L. Silva.
Louis F. Griffin.
Edwin T. Keen.
James D. Peschel.
Calvin R. Prater.
Allen M. Sharp.

Connecticut

Kenneth A. Lavine, Jr.
Thomas E. Parker.
Norman R. Suprenant.

Delaware

Frank W. Nelson, Jr.

District of Columbia

Roosevelt Johnson, Jr.

Florida

Clarence S. Miller.
James E. Tucker.

Georgia

Wolfram J. Kretschmann.

Illinois

Tommy N. Miller.
William J. Brencich.
Charles O. Craig, Jr.
Johnny G. Williams.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Iowa

Samuel A. Eklofe.
Thomas J. Burgeson.
David L. Rutgers.

Kansas

William C. Matthews.

Kentucky

Kenneth R. Gilliam.
Donald R. Lewis.
Ronald T. Varney.

Louisiana

Richard Pollard.

Maryland

Henry D. Custen.

Massachusetts

Edward J. Wolfendale.

Michigan

James D. Logan.
Lawrence Poet.
Gerald Przybylinski.
Joseph G. Taraszkiewicz.

Minnesota

Roger M. Kittleson.
Douglas B. Forsberg.

Missouri

Walter L. Lamarr.

New Jersey

William H. Satterfield.

New Mexico

Raymond Yazzie.

New York

Woodrow W. Adams.
Albert Erskine.
Juan Gaston.
William B. Jones.
Robert A. McCarthy.
Robinson Santiago.

North Carolina

Fred L. Roach, Jr.
Odell Dickens.

North Dakota

Larry J. Sikorski.

Ohio

Gerald D. Zawadzki.
Keith T. Landers.
Robert H. Brogan.
Kenneth R. Heifner.
Randolph R. Ramsey.

Oregon

Peter S. Timmerman.

Pennsylvania

Edwin A. Keeble.
William D. Morgan.
John S. Shoemaker.
Lawrence G. Donaldson.
Dennis K. Millison.

South Carolina

William H. Hunt.
Garold R. Simmers.

Texas

Norman W. Kellum.
Manul Gonzales.
Porfirio M. Ovalle.
Willie F. Smith.
William B. Tarrance.
George W. Weldy, Jr.

Virginia

Bruce A. Saunders.
Michael L. Jenkins.
Joseph R. Schnell.

Washington

Harry D. C. Kellar.

Wisconsin

Gary W. Smith.
Rickey J. Whitehead.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

New York

Chris F. Brunn.

DIED OF WOUNDS—NAVY

California

Mike M. Godines.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Massachusetts

Michael C. Burns.

Missouri

James W. Simms.

Wisconsin

Michael A. Harvey.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Arlan L. Hahn.

Georgia

Harold K. Ring.
David E. Thomas.

Indiana

Wayne A. Wilcox.

Massachusetts

John G. Joyce.

Montana

Thomas N. Grose.

New Jersey

Howard S. Biesantz.

New York

Stephen A. Shortall.
Lawrence J. De Felice.

Oklahoma

Ronald L. Sanders.

South Carolina

Herbert R. Grant.
James Nickens.

Texas

Jimmie R. Tice.
Alfredo Rivera.

Virginia

Nathaniel Irving.

Washington

John C. Browning.
Ronald L. Quigley.

Wisconsin

Alan M. Royston.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 4, 1969

ARMY

Arkansas

Phillip E. Rosson.

California

William J. Bruce.
Larry G. Higginbotham.
Richard A. Burns.
Antonio M. Garcia.

Florida

James W. Wright.

Georgia

Frank Meszar III.
Dennis S. Coker.

Illinois

Eugene Couturiaux.
William D. Ryan.

Indiana

Donald L. Rhodes.

Kentucky

George F. Evans.

Massachusetts

Michael C. Whalen.

New Jersey

James P. Hanlon.

New York

Merle F. Butler II.
Bruce E. Reed.

Ohio

Steve Mirick, Jr.

Tennessee

Gary V. Hall.
Ronald J. Allen.

ARMY—continued

Washington

Orlan M. Nelson.
Alan C. Burtness.

Wisconsin

James T. Liebnitz.
Kenneth L. Strittmater.

Guam

Enrique S. Cruz.

NAVY

California

Manuel Martinez.
John M. Sullivan.

Illinois

Gregory L. Koupe.

Massachusetts

Robert E. Peschke.

MARINE CORPS

Alabama

Sam W. Busby.
Joel K. Watkins.

California

Jerry R. Frazier.

Connecticut

James P. Carney, Jr.

Florida

David W. Denlinger.
Michael G. Dinkins.
Samuel C. Macon.

Georgia

Freddie Usher.
Carey W. Smith.

Illinois

Thomas H. McGrath.
Michael J. Frencl.
Larry S. Rainey.

Kentucky

Robert A. Coffey.

Louisiana

Glenn B. Rao.

Maryland

John T. Hare.
Robert H. Trail III.

Massachusetts

Richard L. Desper.
Patrick J. Muraca.

Minnesota

John H. Erbes.

Missouri

Clifford D. Combs.

New Jersey

Charles J. Kurtz.

New Mexico

David A. Mallory.

New York

Craig N. Demichelle.

North Carolina

James J. Johnson.

Ohio

Timothy P. Bauer.

Pennsylvania

David A. Parker.
Fred L. Ricard, Jr.

South Carolina

Vincent N. Banks.

Tennessee

William H. Moore.
Robert L. Roebuck.
David S. Whitman.

Texas

Edward C. Sanchez.

Wisconsin

Royce E. Roe.
Donald C. Voltner.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Florida

George P. White.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Louisiana

Clarence J. Babin Jr.

Oregon

Robert A. Brothen.
Iria D. Barnett.
Francis W. Cody.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—NAVY

California

Bruno W. Damata.

Massachusetts

Albert C. Tavares.

Pennsylvania

Ronald P. Yuhas.

Tennessee

Charlie M. Ellison.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 5, 1969

ARMY

Alabama

Henry Caldwell, Jr.
Ralph E. Nathan.

California

Thamas D. Thompson, Jr.
Edward B. Steele.
Stephen S. Niederhause.

Illinois

Carter J. Freund.
Glenn A. Tompkins.

Michigan

Robert J. Frankowiak.

Minnesota

Jerry S. McDonald.

New Jersey

Joseph L. Biddle.

New York

Jose Crespo.

Ohio

Thomas V. Pilson.
George H. Riplie.

Oklahoma

Michael D. Hyatt.

Tennessee

Eugene Copeland.

Virginia

Alvin C. Toombs, Jr.

Washington

Marvin H. Brown.

Wisconsin

Dennis A. Groff.

NAVY

Montana

Russell D. Flanagan.

MARINE CORPS

California

Robert D. Calhoun.
John A. Burich, Jr.

District of Columbia

Jerome M. Jones.

Florida

Clyde W. Ganzy.

Georgia

Stanley E. Ur.

Illinois

David Ybarra.

Iowa

Michael L. Zappia.

Maryland

Billy H. Best.
Paul A. Cumberland.

Massachusetts

Clifton L. Broyer.

New York

Frank P. Evangelista.
Raymond L. Flint.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Pennsylvania

Vernon W. East.

Texas

Elroy Morris.

Washington

Daniel J. Minor.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

Georgia

Edward L. Gilliard.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Ohio

Frederick R. Ratliff, Jr.

Pennsylvania

Richard A. Wallick.

Rhode Island

Richard L. Lanctot.

South Carolina

Ernest C. Howle.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 6, 1969

ARMY

California

Carl L. Radtke.
Robert L. Heinmiller.

Illinois

Dean W. Moehring.

Kentucky

William O. Walters.

New York

Ryuzo Somma.
Kenneth R. Kent.
Marvin A. De Vault.
Gary L. Vanderbrook.

North Carolina

Warren L. Beacham.

Oklahoma

Vencen Ackerson.

Oregon

Marvin D. Barnes.

Pennsylvania

Robert E. Diehl.

South Carolina

Austin I. Edwards.
Willie E. Madden.

Virginia

Calvin Edmunds.

Washington

Jacob C. Laan.
Brian R. Estes.

NAVY

Colorado

Douglas F. Menard.

New Jersey

Walter P. Seel, Jr.

Ohio

Kenneth Davis.

Pennsylvania

Delbert L. Singler, Jr.

MARINE CORPS

Massachusetts

Robert M. Cookson.

Michigan

James C. Burks.

New Jersey

Gordon L. Sargent.

North Carolina

Joseph R. King, Jr.

Ohio

Joseph N. Decker.
Benjamin F. Stoffer.

Texas

Raymond R. Delgado.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Virginia

Byron L. Tennant.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

California

Ronald P. Russell.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Arizona

William R. Lawson.

California

Steven R. Segura.

Connecticut

Arthur A. Crosby, Jr.

Georgia

Gregory A. Marvin.

Kentucky

Ben H. Wilkins, Jr.

Minnesota

Harold J. Smith.

Mississippi

Charles Brown.
Frank Wilder.

Missouri

Donald R. Mayberry.

Pennsylvania

John P. Grimenstein, Jr.

Texas

Mario J. Mendias.

Virginia

Richard M. Donlan.

Killed as a Result of Hostile Action, March 7, 1969

ARMY

California

Clyde E. Rains.
Darryl W. Shuster.
Bruce W. Thompson.

New Jersey

Richard C. Brunn.

New York

Walter W. Rudolph.
Lauri Kangro.

South Carolina

Vernon E. Scott.

Wisconsin

Randy R. Mueller.
David F. Van Den Heuvel.

NAVY

Minnesota

George P. Collins.

MARINE CORPS

Alabama

Raymond E. Tolsma.

California

Richard A. Deleidi.
Clyde Callahan.

Florida

Gregory E. Hankins.

Illinois

Samuel N. Hart.

Indiana

Harold E. Musselman.
John J. Meyer.

Missouri

Robert P. Menninger.

New Mexico

Davis L. Guillen.

North Carolina

Arthur S. Hill.

Texas

Alfred M. Wilson.

Texas

Joseph B. McCartney.

Washington

Timothy J. Hall.
George V. Jmaeff.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

Maryland

James R. Taylor.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Massachusetts

John L. Pratt.

New York

Allan R. Gyore.

Virginia

Robert A. McGill.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Minnesota

Timothy J. Kapoun.

New York

Richard W. Kulpa.
Henry Pullum, Jr.

Ohio

Walter B. Tully, Jr.

Killed as a Result of Hostile Action, March 10, 1969

ARMY

California

Peter L. Gorvad.
Ronald L. Warnett.
James E. Kinnard.
Daniel W. Lawson.
Richard W. Ford.
Stanley B. Ziegler.

Connecticut

Richard W. Keithline.
Leon R. Goodale, Jr.

Florida

Frederic N. Ash.
Charles R. Outlaw, Jr.

Georgia

William R. Black.

Louisiana

Michael A. Clause.

Maryland

Peter L. Tripp.
Clayton E. Fraley.

Massachusetts

William J. McNamara.
Glenn R. Gordon.

Michigan

David P. Jacobs.
John A. Nowakowski.
Michael A. Dunneback.
Lavern M. Lamey.
Joseph J. Strucel.

Minnesota

Phillip E. Taylor.
Clayton A. Songle.

Mississippi

Victor Johnson, Jr.

Missouri

William F. Goodwin.

Nebraska

Terry L. Sayer.

New Jersey

George A. Callan.

North Carolina

Johnny L. Palmer.
Carl S. Douglas.
Steve E. Lowery.

North Dakota

Dale G. Helgeson.

Ohio

Walter B. Hoxworth.
Glenn R. Stair.

Oklahoma

Jerry C. Robbins.
Clinton L. Wheeler.

Pennsylvania

Richard L. Deimler.

South Carolina

Linnell Butler.
Joseph A. Goodson.

ARMY—continued

South Dakota

Daniel M. Noeldner.

Tennessee

Larry Murdock.

Texas

William W. Abshear.
Sanderfierd A. Jones.
Joe B. Stuart, Jr.

Utah

Michael R. Forck.

Virginia

David D. Layne.
Roy D. Wimmer.

West Virginia

Billy D. Thomas.

Wisconsin

Bruce J. Guex.
Larry G. Lacaeyse.

Wyoming

John W. Kobelin II.

NAVY

Alabama

Edgar A. Dees.

Massachusetts

John A. Sorrenti.

MARINE CORPS

Alabama

Ira M. Franklin, Jr.
William C. Northington.
Gerald B. Lane.

Arkansas

Harold E. Crower.
Jerry D. Harsson.
Carl W. Hill.

California

Anthony B. Curci.
Michael E. Angel.
Philip M. Hunt.

Connecticut

Stephen F. Kostanski.
Robert E. Goding.

Florida

Robert H. Jenkins, Jr.
Paul E. Strouse.

Illinois

William L. Gough.

Indiana

James L. Vroom.
Dandel D. Bruce.

Iowa

Ronald D. Duntz.

Louisiana

David A. Floyd.

Maine

James L. Avery.

Massachusetts

Phillip J. Taylor.

Michigan

Clarence A. Heckman.
Peter F. Dewilde, Jr.
Richard F. Dusseau.
John L. Heister.
Ronald J. Shier.

Minnesota

Thomas K. Schaefer.

Missouri

Gerald L. James.

Nevada

John I. Aleck.

New York

Nelson Bey.
Richard W. Riale.

Ohio

David C. Ferguson.
David A. Johnson.
Lawrence W. Porter.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Ohio—Continued

Frank Shartz, Jr.
Ray T. Shaum, Jr.

Oklahoma

Roy E. Lynn.

Oregon

Austin C. Lane.

Pennsylvania

Richard D. Coyle.
Leo J. Mangold.

South Carolina

Joseph L. Freeman, Jr.

Tennessee

Boyd L. Brake.
Eric T. Duffer.
Gene O. Merriweather.

Texas

Joe G. Rodrigues, Jr.
Arturo A. Cauble.
George Colunga.

Virginia

Philip N. Malone.

Wisconsin

Michael P. Malueg.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

Florida

Robert L. Harter.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

California

Larry W. Liss.

New York

Richard J. Leahy.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Arizona

Edward R. Hickey.

California

Ricardo J. Ortegon.
Peter A. Duperry.
Duane C. Paepke, Jr.

Connecticut

Donald J. Krajewski.

Georgia

Jerry Johnson.
Oliver K. Webb.

Illinois

Dennis E. Wisniewski

Indiana

John A. Grabbe.

Iowa

David G. Lovitt.

Louisiana

Carl D. Cain.
Jimmie L. Gordon.

Michigan

Ronald J. Vanden Berg.

New York

Lester R. Stone, Jr.

Ohio

John A. Petric.
Lowell R. Groves.

Oklahoma

Arlin W. Koehn.

Pennsylvania

Thomas A. Becker.
Harry B. Seedes III.

Tennessee

William T. Harris.
Victor R. Scheeler.
William E. L. Hart.
Johnny R. Lynn.

Texas

Raul Alvarado, Jr.

Washington

Lynn D. Anderson.

Wisconsin

Ronald C. Thiex.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY—continued

Puerto Rico

Jose R. Overman Rodriquez.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—NAVY

Alabama

Theodore S. Hamner III.
Melvin L. Sellers.

California

Donald E. Erwin.
Bert E. Burton.
Cecil F. Bush.

Florida

Earl T. Moore.

Illinois

Daniel L. Overright.

Kansas

Thomas E. Adams

Massachusetts

Milton Shapiro.

New York

Ronald J. Gebbie.
Craig E. Swagler.

Ohio

Marvin D. Avery.

Pennsylvania

David W. Hawryshko.
Joseph F. Burinda, Jr.

Texas

Earnest J. Buckelew.

Washington

Donald J. Fisher.
Lyle D. Zacher.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 11, 1969

ARMY

California

Richard L. Adcock.
Craig E. Williams.

Colorado

Edward L. Garcia.

Connecticut

David H. De Forge.

Illinois

John R. Hornsby.
George R. Lovellette.

Kentucky

Jewell C. Blankenship.
Paul D. Haydon.

Michigan

William T. Craig Jr.
James E. Ramsby.
Kenneth E. Miller.
Thomas J. Roach Jr.
Charles D. Snyder.

Missouri

Ralph D. Veale.

Montana

Truman J. Walsh.

Nebraska

Milo D. Clements.

Ohio

Nelson L. Smith.
Larry E. Evans.

Pennsylvania

Lee D. Thomas.

Utah

Jesse B. Stevenson.

Washington

Gary F. Rolfe.

West Virginia

Edward Duty.

Wisconsin

Glen O. Venet.

Guam

Vincent F. Guerrero.

NAVY

Michigan

Donald L. Rudd.

MARINE CORPS

California

Robert V. Jay.

Florida

Leslie Thompson.
Wilbur J. Miller, Jr.

Indiana

Charles W. Thomas.

Michigan

Dennis G. Merryman.

Oklahoma

Charles L. Smith.

Texas

Douglas R. Sledge.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Virginia

Drew J. Barrett III.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Illinois

Robert Jackson, Jr.

Oklahoma

Jimmie D. Cook.

Wisconsin

Jack P. Delange.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—NAVY

Pennsylvania

Donald M. Horton.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—MARINE CORPS

Indiana

Thomas M. Hiday.

Illinois

David E. Thaxton.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 12, 1969

ARMY

Alabama

Charles F. Sturma.
John L. Motley, Jr.

Arkansas

Randall L. Harvey.
Robert E. Grant.

California

Allen D. Mortensen.
Robert L. Sloan.

Colorado

Douglas R. Pollock.

Connecticut

Thomas J. Bowe.

Florida

Calvin Norman, Jr.
Willie L. Brown, Jr.

Illinois

James E. Janka.
Willie L. Wallace.

Indiana

David R. Morgan.

Kentucky

Leon Beard.

Maryland

Joseph E. Nohe, Jr.

Massachusetts

Steven C. Erbentraut.

Minnesota

James M. Norman.

New Jersey

Lester Danchetz.

New York

Joseph C. Russo.
Michael P. O'Connor.

North Carolina

James H. Wall.
Kenneth M. Lee.

North Dakota

Danny L. Hanson.

Ohio

Terrance L. Weant.

ARMY—continued

Pennsylvania

Jay B. Gilpin.
William J. Kolenc.

South Carolina

Leon Tisdale.

Tennessee

Cecil W. Tillman.

Texas

Roger W. Smelser.

Virginia

Kenneth G. Clarke, Jr.

Washington

Richard T. Forester.

Wisconsin

Robert J. Benedict.

NAVY

North Carolina

William L. McCormick.

Virginia

William C. Ninow.

MARINE CORPS

California

Michael A. Marshall.
Ronald F. Christianson.

Kentucky

Buford Hardy.

Massachusetts

Robert J. Costa.

New Jersey

Joseph Grassia, Jr.

South Carolina

Harrison Wine, Jr.

Texas

Nyman W. Stelter.

Virginia

Douglas O. Looney.

West Virginia

Michael S. Garrett.

AIR FORCE

New Jersey

Calvin E. Alexander.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Robert J. Campbell.

Florida

Carlton J. Johnson.

Illinois

George R. Avgerinos.

Indiana

William D. McAllister.

Iowa

Philip L. Baker.

Kentucky

John P. Emrath.

Louisiana

Paul D. Cooke.

Michigan

Kenneth Martin.

Michigan

Martin T. Scott II.

Missouri

Joseph Schmich Jr.

New York

Alfred Lallave.
Eugene Elder.

Oregon

Robert E. Leamen.

South Carolina

Dennis R. P. Isom.

Texas

Robert E. Griffith.

Virginia

George L. Brown.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY—con.

Puerto Rico

Lionel Maldonado-Torres.

MARINE CORPS

New York

John J. Stahl.

AIR FORCE

Iowa

Robert F. Rex.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 13, 1969

ARMY

Arkansas

Johnny P. Grisson.

California

Robert N. Sauls.

Colorado

Raymond J. Bechard.

Florida

Tommy L. Robinson.

Georgia

William C. Stinson, Jr.
Larry D. Carroll.
Charles D. Macken.

Hawaii

John S. Otake.

Illinois

Robert S. Gregg.

Indiana

Wayne G. Bernoska.
Joseph W. Wysong.
William T. Spearman.

Kentucky

Alfred E. Alvey, Jr.

Louisiana

Roger E. Denny.
Leonard C. Miller.
Huey Williams.

Massachusetts

Richard J. Bois.
Richard A. Lameiras.
Walter J. Lemieux.

Montana

John J. Petrie.

Nevada

Larry D. Brown.

New York

Roger J. Mazal.
Francis S. Oberson.
David J. Hordern.

Oregon

Clifton F. Wagner.

South Carolina

Clarence E. Nunnery, Jr.

South Dakota

Michael J. Gruenwald.

Wisconsin

William J. Stedl.

MARINE CORPS

Georgia

Elijah Herring, Jr.

Illinois

Freddie C. Pote, Jr.

Michigan

Larry M. Rodgers.

Missouri

William T. Prose.

Ohio

Earl E. Taylor
Glenn S. Wingenbach, Jr.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

North Carolina

Jimmy V. Smith.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Maryland

Calvin J. Childress.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Layne M. Santos.

Georgia

Michael England.

Maryland

Benjamin J. Rawlings.
William E. Price.
William J. Schaaf.

Michigan

Paul J. Buczolich.

New Jersey

Roger J. Spence.
Dennis J. Coll.

New York

Rodger D. Force.

Oregon

Melvin L. Applebury.

Pennsylvania

Earl W. Himes.
Richard L. Fry.

Tennessee

David A. Seiber.

Virginia

Willie J. Hudson.
Fred D. Burton.
William T. Rector, Jr.

Puerto Rico

Juan Ayala-Mercado.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—NAVY

Oklahoma

Jackie R. Morgan.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 14, 1969

ARMY

Alabama

Howard R. Thomas, Jr.

Arizona

Matthew E. Morton, Jr.

California

Clarence P. Burleson.
David B. Christianson.

District of Columbia

Samuel J. Izzard.

Florida

Clarence Nofford.
Julius A. Mitchell.

Georgia

James L. Yarbrough.

Idaho

Douglas N. Rowe.

Indiana

Stephen Harder.
Larry L. Rauscher.

Kansas

Blaine L. Honeycutt.

Kentucky

Kyle Waldrop.
John R. Jackson.
John W. Hill, Jr.

Louisiana

Donald C. Gillett.
Larry A. Jackson.

Maryland

Joseph K. Carroll.

Michigan

Richard H. Haag, Jr.

Mississippi

Bennie J. Graham.

Missouri

Timothy L. Hurley.

Nevada

Ronald E. Dedman.

ARMY—continued

New York

Joseph H. Mears.
Thomas Poldino.
John A. Rivera.
Joseph E. Neske.

North Dakota

Lawrence R. Esser.

Oklahoma

Bobby J. Rollins.

Pennsylvania

Robin B. Miller.
Antonio Garcia.

South Carolina

Jackie L. Crosby.

Tennessee

Jesse H. Archer.
Donald L. Shirley.

Texas

Buddy E. Channon.
Aaron L. Smith.

Puerto Rico

Juan E. Garcia-Diaz.
Daniel Irizarry-Acevedo.

NAVY

Iowa

Lewis C. Harris.

MARINE CORPS

California

Kenneth E. Gayer.
Lewis L. McDonald.

Illinois

Ronald D. Jewell.
David B. Arnold.

New Mexico

Freddie P. Chavez.

New York

Ramon J. Arroyo.

Ohio

Clarence E. Fetty.

Texas

Dale E. Greenwood.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Illinois

Lemond Richardson.

Michigan

Rick Yamashita.

Utah

Michael H. Yeates.

Wisconsin

Richard E. Matyas.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Alabama

Fulton B. Moore III.
John B. Gibson Jr.

Michigan

Earl T. Hoag.
Louis A. George.

New York

George R. Robinson.

Ohio

Kenton E. Henninger.
David E. Theobald.

Utah

Michael G. Brown.

Washington

Barry D. Horton.

Puerto Rico

Efrain Figueroa-Melendez.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 17, 1969

ARMY

Alabama

William H. Barksdale.
Bobby D. Clark.
James A. Franklin.

ARMY—continued

Alaska

Patrick M. McInerney.

Arizona

Archie H. Iyua Jr.
Randy R. Boykins.

Arkansas

Jean D. Martin.

California

Franklin A. Johnson.
Theophilus Bowles.
Perry L. Bozeman.
John F. Morris.
John A. Ramirez.

Connecticut

Whitney T. Ferguson III.

Delaware

James L. Ripanti.
Jeffrey T. Cassidy.

Florida

Morgan Thompson.
Alton L. Ellis.
Paul E. Irvin.

Georgia

Elbert J. Sauls.

Illinois

Milfred H. Dingman.
John P. Guttmann Jr.
Melvin Guyton.

Indiana

Dean R. Orn.
Kenneth M. Frain.

Iowa

Joel L. Miller.

Kansas

Michael G. Allendorf.

Kentucky

Gary L. Moore.

Louisiana

Aaron C. Smith.

Maine

Gordon C. Murray.

Maryland

George A. Demby.

Massachusetts

Robert E. Spires.

Michigan

James E. Fowler.
Thomas R. Gregson.
Fred E. Richards.

Minnesota

Daniel W. Lloyd.
Thomas J. Koob.

Missouri

Donald L. Fowler.
Robin W. Richardson.

Montana

Larry M. Smith.

New York

Lawrence Desmore.
Clarence A. Earley.
Richard M. Schmidt.
George J. Smith, Jr.

North Carolina

Charles D. Rogers.
Charles J. Revis.

Ohio

Cornell R. R. Clark.
James H. Horton.
Phillip R. Baily.

Oklahoma

Clarence L. Rouse.
Samuel L. Holder.

Pennsylvania

William L. McFarland.

Rhode Island

Charles V. Dupre.

ARMY—continued

South Carolina

Terrell T. Ham.

Tennessee

Jerry G. Ervin.

Texas

Henry Chamberlain.
Fidel J. Aguirre.
Walter L. Moore.

Utah

Robert A. Conley.

Virginia

Vanderbilt Elliott, Jr.

West Virginia

William T. Wheeler.

Wisconsin

Franklin J. Runge.

Guam

Gregorio L. Pangelinan.

NAVY

Ohio

William R. Lucas.

MARINE CORPS

Arizona

Richard L. Thompson, Jr.

Arkansas

William H. Brown.

California

James R. Harrison.

Colorado

Kenneth A. Pederson.

District of Columbia

Jean R. Clemencia, Jr.

Louisiana

Julio C. Weld.

Maryland

Michael Digenno.

Massachusetts

John E. Shiraka.

Michigan

Donald J. Spatafore.

Minnesota

Edward J. Haugen.

Mississippi

Henry C. Sanders.

Ohio

David C. Teutsch.

Oregon

Alvin L. Lowery.

Pennsylvania

Jeffrey C. Barthol.

Texas

Doyce G. Miller.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

New York

Robert T. Orr.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Alabama

Johnny G. Stamps.

California

Sydney C. Howard.

Florida

Donald E. Sizemore.

Georgia

Isieah Releford.

Illinois

James L. Smith.

Iowa

Randal L. Shackelford.

Maryland

Thomas C. D. Moffitt.

Michigan

Vern E. Root.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS—continued

Minnesota

William R. Mackey, Jr.

Nevada

Ronald C. Katz.

Oregon

Daryl C. Bauer.

Pennsylvania

Cyril T. Yeckley.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Arizona

Steven W. Dundas.
Charlie Fields.

California

Robert B. Protto, Jr.
Steven H. Johnson.

Colorado

Roy G. Zufelt.

Connecticut

William A. Beard.

Oregon

Ted Q. Reed, Jr.

Pennsylvania

Gary R. George.
Edward J. Millison, III.

Texas

Jerry C. McDonald.
Darrell W. Donaldson.

Utah

Leonard R. Caton, Sr.

West Virginia

Paul W. Shrewsbury.

Wisconsin

Wayne A. Bratz.

Puerto Rico

David Gomez-Badillo.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 18, 1969

ARMY

Alabama

Robert E. Spiegel.
Albert T. Glanton.

Arkansas

Tommy J. Dixon.

California

James P. Fullerton.
Vincent G. Lew.
Jack E. Williams.

Hawaii

Herman B. Hose, Jr.

Illinois

Thomas A. Zimmerman.
Gerald L. Tharp.

Indiana

Raymond E. Baumgarner.
Donnie J. Martin.

Michigan

Richard M. Pearsall.

New York

Berton Decker.

Ohio

Donnie W. Caudill.

Pennsylvania

Tyrone G. Thoman.

Texas

Hadley Foster.
Thomas E. Hacker.

NAVY

Mississippi

Terry E. Tharp.

MARINE CORPS

Georgia

Jeff Whitehead.

Massachusetts

Leonard P. Deinlein.
David J. Pugh.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Missouri

Henry R. Longston.

New York

Michael E. Brady.
Anthony J. Morina.

Ohio

James T. Anderson.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY—continued

Ohio

Don R. Brewer.

Pennsylvania

Andrew J. Kukuruda.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Timothy M. Carroll.

Michigan

Larry Strahan.
Douglas W. Bice.
Earl S. Snyder.

New York

Joseph M. Urbanczyk.
Michael W. Doyle.

North Carolina

Franklin M. Lanier.

Ohio

Jerry O. Young.

Texas

Harlan M. Craft.

Puerto Rico

Arthur George-Pizarro.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 19, 1969

ARMY

Alabama

Edgar G. McAdams.
Paul J. Peoples.

California

Thomas L. Vendelin.

Connecticut

Bernard A. Zambrano.

Georgia

John W. Camp.
Carl W. Hughes.

Illinois

Bruno Baran.
James A. Gazze.
James R. Pollard, Jr.

Kansas

Thomas Bright, Jr.

Kentucky

Fred E. Brown.
Dewey J. Ray.

Missouri

Dennis R. Hunsley.
Kenneth L. Watson.
Louis M. Beckmann.

Nebraska

Larry A. Stark.

New Jersey

John W. Price.
Paul Bonapart.
William Jackson.

New Mexico

Richard L. Duran.

New York

William J. Hillard, II.

North Carolina

Furnace Freeman, Jr.

Ohio

Ronald L. Pearl.
David A. Mitchell.

Pennsylvania

Francis E. Sievers, Jr.
Joseph A. Petrarca.

Rhode Island

Jay H. Manchester.

ARMY—continued

South Carolina

James Dollard.
Benjamin A. Smalls.

Texas

Harold P. Degner.

Utah

Kenneth J. Robinson.

Washington

Richard A. Brown.

MARINE CORPS

Georgia

William L. Tanner.
Ronald H. Howard.

Hawaii

Dalmacio P. Pascua, Jr.

Indiana

Steven D. Churchward.
Dale W. Coldiron.

New York

John McManus.

Washington

Adolf J. Kroisenbacher.

West Virginia

John E. Roberts, Jr.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Pennsylvania

Cyril T. Yeckley.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Joseph A. Lewis.

Georgia

Billy G. Creech.

Illinois

Louis W. Frericks.

Iowa

Edward T. Cooper.

Mississippi

Carlos L. Tartt.

New York

Ralph E. Mayers III.

North Carolina

Vernon E. Lail, Jr.

Pennsylvania

Paul H. Jackson, Jr.

Vermont

Dean H. Johnson.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—AIR FORCE

New Jersey

David T. Dinan III.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 20, 1969

ARMY

Alabama

Milford Looney, Jr.

California

John R. Thielen.
Michael J. Caputo.
John E. Lortz III.
Michael L. Paddock.

Connecticut

Barry Jackson.

Kentucky

Delmar V. Ashbrook.

Maryland

Robert L. Baldwin.

Massachusetts

Robert E. Green.

Michigan

Earl C. Rider, Jr.
Wesley Beaver.

Minnesota

Marion W. Troxel.

North Carolina

Robert G. Daniel.

ARMY—continued

Ohio

Firman A. Titus.

Oklahoma

Robert W. Patterson.

Tennessee

Earl T. Quillen.

Texas

Willie E. Malone, Jr.

Wisconsin

Lyle C. Hansbrough.
John L. Rueth.

MARINE CORPS

California

Dickie D. Koell, Jr.
Phillip H. Marks.

Idaho

Danny J. Maggard.

Maryland

Joseph C. Thorne, Jr.

Michigan

John L. Gawel.

New Jersey

Herbert M. Beaumont.

New York

Richard M. Rocco.

North Carolina

David W. Bazzle.

Ohio

Samuel Hope, Jr.

Pennsylvania

Joseph T. Chatburn.
Richard C. Chubb.
Dennis L. Moyer.
Terry L. Taylor.

Virginia

Ernest R. Franks.

Wisconsin

Vernon D. Jacobs.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Howard G. Webster.

Illinois

Walter A. Koehler.
Roger H. Howes.

Kansas

John E. Walters.

Kentucky

Donald R. Bledsoe.

Minnesota

Craig S. Mettling.

Missouri

Willie J. Kirksey.

New York

Raymond L. Bethea.
Brian F. McCarthy.

Tennessee

Larry L. Hodges

Texas

Edward R. Beasley.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 21, 1969

ARMY

California

Robert A. McIntosh.
Timothy C. Proudfoot.
Frank J. J. Mattera.

Kentucky

Dennis M. Groves.

Maryland

Edward C. Cofield.
David A. Russell.

Michigan

John C. Davenport.
Robert J. Regenhardt.

New Jersey

George T. Farawell.

ARMY—continued

New York

Julio Hernandez Jr.

Pennsylvania

Louis G. Wheeler.

Tennessee

Don Smith.

Texas

James C. Gilbert.
Margarito Fernandez Jr.
Manuel B. Alonzo.
Rolando G. Villarreal.

Puerto Rico

Raimundo Marquez-Quinones.

NAVY

New Jersey

Louis V. Romanelli.

MARINE CORPS

California

John A. Lestelle II.
Alan W. Thornton.

Iowa

James M. Lee.

Michigan

Earl L. Wilson.

Minnesota

Richard W. Smith.

South Carolina

Charles E. Davis Jr.
James A. Carpenter.

Texas

James M. Aston.

Washington

Henry A. Dye, Jr.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Rhode Island

Paul A. Cabral.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Michael L. Woodside.
Jeffrey L. Whynaught.
Charles W. Warrington, Jr.

Maryland

Willis F. House.

New York

Sigmond M. Sikorski.

North Carolina

William Reynolds.

Texas

Lyle J. Thompson.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—NAVY

Alaska

William J. Hutton.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 24, 1969

ARMY

Alabama

Louis H. Jones.

Arkansas

Harvey C. Avery.

California

Isaac E. Heath.
Michael Lynch.
Jesus C. Oleta, Jr.
Harold B. Johnson.
Billy D. Murphy.
Dennis A. Smith.

Colorado

Jackie L. Davison.

Florida

Tony L. Buholtz.
James D. Wright, Jr.

Georgia

John A. Swords.

Idaho

James J. Lister.

ARMY—continued

Idaho—Continued

Dean L. Moon.
Larry D. Greenhalgh.

Illinois

Robert C. Rogers.
Albert E. Smith, Jr.
Edward L. Shappell.

Indiana

Mervin R. Richter.
Larry M. Whitis.

Iowa

Eugene J. G. Kock.

Kansas

Richard L. Fiffe.

Maryland

Thomas M. Deitz.
Rodger L. Garlick.

Massachusetts

Simeon J. A. Bergeron.

Michigan

Iddie R. Kelley.

Missouri

Terry R. Monia.
William W. Sherman.

Minnesota

Donald L. Olive.

Mississippi

Joseph W. Hudson.

Montana

Richard D. Satterthwaite.

Nebraska

William W. Utts.

New Jersey

John B. Peterson, Jr.

New Mexico

Donald R. Alexander.
Filemon Serrano.

New York

Vaughn D. Connell.
David S. Pellew.
Larry R. Swisher.
Leonard Dodson.
Ricardo Lopez.

North Carolina

Mickey W. Hill.
Loren C. Jones.

Pennsylvania

Edward C. De Bow.
Dale L. Eisaman.

South Carolina

Adger E. Moody.

Tennessee

John W. Parham.
Clarence E. Smith.
Clifford M. Taylor.
Jackie J. Webb.

Texas

Victor D. Kahla, Jr.
William D. Overstreet.

Vermont

Kenneth D. Bailey.

West Virginia

Lawrence L. Smith.
Jack L. Rexrode.
Robert A. Tate, Jr.

Guam

Joseph M. Eustaquio.

NAVY

California

Thomas L. Hamman.

MARINE CORPS

Alabama

James L. Phillips.

California

Dennis F. Ellis.

MARINE CORPS—continued

California—Continued

Robert R. Highfill.
Emmett T. Pringle.

Florida

Ronald K. Battle.

Georgia

Floyd M. Keefe.
Dennis R. Lawrence.
Clyde E. Saxon.

Indiana

Donald R. Bartley.
Earl F. Falconbury.

Iowa

David L. Davis.

Kentucky

John F. Allen.

Maine

Loring W. Watson.

Massachusetts

John M. Burke.

Michigan

Barry L. Kopp.
Jerry E. Samson.
William R. Stolley, Jr.
Thomas J. Yolkiewicz.

Mississippi

James E. Smith.

Missouri

Charles E. Wheeler.
Larry W. Knox.

Montana

Gordon G. White.

New Jersey

Michael J. Hayes, Jr.

Ohio

Ernest F. Elders.
Charles E. Grooms, Jr.
Jeffrey S. Forry.
Lynn R. Krotzer.
James M. Pintola.
Antonio E. Ruiz.

Pennsylvania

Ward E. Homer.
Richard Gilliam.
Ronnie L. Eckenroad.
James M. Gonano.

Tennessee

George R. Ward, Jr.

Texas

Jose Torreros.

Virginia

John G. Osterhous.

Washington

David J. Sandvig.
Daniel G. Wessler.

West Virginia

Gene W. Somers, Jr.
Clifford M. Cork.
Joseph R. Vandehei.

COAST GUARD

Rhode Island

Morris S. Beeson.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

Illinois

Robert L. Mitchell.

Minnesota

Eddie L. Evenson.

Washington

Joseph M. Buchanan.
Richard H. Mehegan.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Maryland

Ronald B. Cassell.

New York

David B. Arnott.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS—continued

North Carolina

Mitchel T. Morton.

Pennsylvania

Frederick C. Miller III.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Stephen W. Lucia.
John R. Weir.

Florida

Thomas L. Robinson.
Brad D. Chriss.

Illinois

Herbert C. Spencer.

Michigan

Gary L. Hosko.

Ohio

Walter L. Moses, Jr.

Pennsylvania

Waymon L. Jones, Jr.

Tennessee

Ray R. Jowers.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—NAVY

Georgia

Richard C. Thum.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—AIR FORCE

California

William E. Cordero.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 25, 1969

ARMY

Arkansas

Barry W. Graf.

California

Frank Spiers.
John J. Valero.
Johnny L. Edwards.
Stephen L. Weigt.
Chris A. Souza.

Colorado

Robert L. Riggins.

Florida

Thomas J. Grindstaff.
Charles F. White.
James A. Walker, Jr.

Georgia

Larry D. Smith.

Illinois

Mose C. Hundley.
Alan F. Marschall.

Iowa

James G. Johnson.

Kentucky

Robert A. Osborne.

New York

Frank A. Krieger.

Ohio

Roger L. Phillips.

Tennessee

Danny E. Hubbs.

Texas

Tim L. Walters.
Patrick L. Blair.
Joe E. Demerson.

Virginia

Herman E. Lassiter.

Washington

Richard W. Anderson.

West Virginia

Billy W. Rapp.

Wisconsin

Karl J. Taschek, Jr.

NAVY

New Jersey

Edward W. Pawlowski.

NAVY—continued

New Mexico

Howard M. Meute.

Tennessee

David R. Ray.

MARINE CORPS

Arkansas

James H. Jeffries.

California

Charles D. Hendricks.
James C. Reed.

Indiana

Robert F. Whitten.

New York

Anthony A. Giretti.

South Carolina

George T. Sargent, Jr.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Connecticut

Johnnie R. Hanson.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—AIR FORCE

North Carolina

Charles K. Lovelace.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 26, 1969

ARMY

Alabama

Armin L. Blake.

Arizona

Albert M. Mendoza.

California

Bill A. Moschetti.

Connecticut

David D. Ouellette.
Donald S. Repaci.

Georgia

Larry Scott.

Illinois

Michael A. Gehl.
Alley O. Stephens.

Louisiana

Louis B. Waner II.

Massachusetts

Thomas W. Whitten.

Michigan

Jerry L. Ewing.

Minnesota

John R. Brandborg.

New York

Carl L. Di Nunzio Jr.

North Carolina

Richard F. Salazar.

Ohio

Thomas M. Struchen.

South Carolina

Clyde S. Sweatt.

Texas

Willis Cormier.

Wisconsin

Gregory E. Newman.
Michael E. Hermsen.

Puerto Rico

Hector M. Sanchez-Rohena

NAVY

Oklahoma

Gilbert E McDaniel.

MARINE CORPS

California

Paul Wilson.

Connecticut

Leon Sears.

Maryland

George M. Gorrera, Jr.

Ohio

John M. Goodwin.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Pennsylvania

Barry L. Eichelberger.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

Ohio

Carl H. Peters, Jr.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Ohio

Darrel G. Napier.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Larry K. Davis.

Colorado

Frank D. Saracino, Jr.

Georgia

Donald R. Johnston.
Richard B. Phillips.

Kentucky

Leonard L. Preston, Jr.

Maine

Thomas J. McMahon.

Missouri

Douglas G. Edwards.

Nebraska

Nigel F. Poese.

South Dakota

Richard R. Maynard.

Tennessee

Kelly P. Vaughn.

Texas

Jimmy F. Burchfield.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, MARCH 28, 1969

ARMY

Arizona

Antonio R. Morales.

Arkansas

William R. Wilson.

California

Robert P. Ilsley.
David J. Huffman.

Florida

Lewis E. Sampler.

Kentucky

James R. Gentile.

Massachusetts

Arthur J. McIntyre.

Michigan

Walter E. Brown, Jr.

Minnesota

Robert A. Holan, Jr.

Nebraska

Monty G. Lackas.

New York

Westley S. Kerr.
Robert T. Manning.
Benjamin R. Turiano.

Ohio

David S. Harris.
Gary L. Weekley.

Tennessee

James H. Watson.

Texas

Joe E. Holleman.
Johnny Young.

Puerto Rico

Jesus B. Encarnacion.
Angel Reyes.

NAVY

Pennsylvania

Nicholas Cancilla.
Donald R. Robertson.

MARINE CORPS

California

John M. Foster.

Indiana

Stanley M. Clingler.

Kentucky

Steve R. Whitaker.

Maryland

Walter Green, Jr.

Michigan

Robert M. Walkley.

New York

John Barca, Jr.

Texas

Bobby D. Jennings.

West Virginia

Gary R. Moss.

DIED OF WOUNDS

Ohio

Thomas L. Loan.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Robert L. Barrett, Jr.

Louisiana

James H. Moore.

Massachusetts

Earl M. Matthews.

Michigan

Mark F. Daniels.
Alan R. Hoenedle.

Missouri

Larry T. Moulder.

New York

Alan M. Bernstein.

North Carolina

Ronnie R. White.

Rhode Island

Robert E. O'Brien.

Texas

Joe S. Huston.

HUE AND KATYN—A TRAGIC SIMILARITY

The **SPEAKER**. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, the discovery of mass graves showing Communist atrocities against South Vietnamese citizens near Hue, South Vietnam, earlier this week is a tragic reminder that the same form of mass murder was committed by the Communists against our allies in the Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, Russia, at the beginning of World War II.

I was the chief investigator of the special congressional committee which in 1952 investigated the Katyn Forest massacre, and I was struck by the tragic similarity between the methods used by the Communists in the Katyn Forest in 1940, and the methods and techniques used by the Communists again earlier this week against the South Vietnamese in Hue.

There is no question in my mind that the entire free world should be shocked by this bizarre discovery of mass graves near Hue earlier this week.

The discovery was made by two South Vietnamese Army noncoms who were captured by the Vietcong during the Tet offensive of 1968. These two men were able to free themselves and found many of the graves by digging.

To date, the mass graves have produced a total of 350 bodies.

Digging is still going on, and the two military men who were witnesses to some of these killings are now trying to identify more of the areas.

These two noncoms are Sergeant Chau and Corporal Doi of the South Vietnamese Armed Forces. They actually witnessed some of the atrocities and mass murders inflicted upon their countrymen.

These men say that some of the victims were pushed down into the grave while still alive, and this has been confirmed by doctors who have examined the corpses.

The victims were killed with a single shot in the back of their head while their hands were tied behind their backs. They were pushed into mass graves. This is precisely the method used by Communist soldiers when they massacred 15,000 Polish Army officers in the Katyn Forest in 1940.

Among the 350 victims found, 25 have been identified. Many are women. The identified bodies have been returned to their families for funeral and the rest have been taken care of by the Government of Vietnam for burial.

The location of the grave is the village of Phu Thu, about a distance of 15 kilometers from Hue.

According to Corporal Doi there are still many other graves dug by the Vietcong along the seashore and the local authorities are now proceeding to investigate them.

Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the free world cannot overlook nor ignore the bizarre similarity between what happened in the Katyn Forest almost 30 years ago and what is now happening in South Vietnam.

I know that all of our hearts cry out for peace in Vietnam and we pray for the day when our troops can be brought home.

I know every resource of our own Government and every effort by the South Vietnamese Government is being made to find some way to resolve this conflict and to bring it to a victorious conclusion. The United States has offered to withdraw its troops from South Vietnam if North Vietnam would agree to a similar withdrawal.

But, certainly, Mr. Speaker, as we look at the discovery of the mass graves and at the brutal techniques being used in Hue in South Vietnam today against the innocent citizens of that country, and compare them to the techniques used against the 15,000 Polish Army officers who were brutally massacred by the Communists in the Katyn Forest 30 years ago, we see that nothing has really changed in the Communist design of mass execution for those who would stand in the way of their pattern for conquest.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, the world has really not given enough attention to the discovery of these mass graves in South Vietnam last week. This discovery of mass graves in South Vietnam, in my judgment, is a prelude to what awaits millions of South Vietnamese if they should falter in their struggle against the Communist Vietcong. I am sure that mass graves and mass executions and the whole business of Katynism, so thoroughly developed by the Communists 30 years ago, will be the order of the day in South Vietnam if the Communists were to emerge victorious.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that those who would today urge peace at any price in South Vietnam would think about these tragic consequences.

We want peace and I am confident we shall find peace only if we do not waver in our determination. The South Vietnamese Government has offered to seek a reconciliation with the Vietcong and such moves should be encouraged. But at this critical juncture, when victory is within reach, we must not waver in our defense of freedom in South Vietnam.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the very distinguished gentleman from Indiana who was chairman of the Select Committee To Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre here in this Congress in 1952.

I have had the highest admiration for the gentlemen since the days when he headed that committee because the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee demonstrated to the world the techniques used by the Communists in mass executions of those who would stand in the way of their aggression.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) has rendered a noble service in bringing before Congress the first indictments against the Soviet Union for those mass atrocities against the Polish Army officers who were murdered in Katyn.

Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for calling the attention of Congress and reminding us of the barbarous atrocities against their victims, the Communist leaders committed during and at the beginning of World War II.

The gentleman from Illinois was one of the real leaders in the work that was done by this committee. We held hearings not only in this country but in England, Germany, and other places in Europe.

The attention of the world was drawn during those hearings to the uncivilized brutality that is embedded in the Communist leaders' attitude toward humanity, generally. Their leaders crave for power. They have no respect for human life. I remember distinctly when we held our hearings in Frankfurt, Germany, back during the days of the 82d Congress when the television and newspaper reporters and radio communications media packed our committee hearing room.

They sent word all over the globe, revealing that Stalin's barbarity is embedded in the minds of all Communist leaders. That barbarity calls for the extinction of human life, if, in the form of individuals or masses, interferes with their program to enslave the world.

I think the gentleman from Illinois was present along with former Congressman Machrowicz, who is now a Federal judge in Michigan, and myself at the opening of the annual convention, in Berlin Germany, of Eastern and Western European journalists. The gentleman from Illinois, now speaking, Congressman Machrowicz, and myself spoke to the convention of about 200 journalists. There was a lot of opposition from the Communists in adjacent countries to the meeting there being held in Berlin.

At a luncheon at which the gentleman was present along with myself and Congressman Machrowicz, one journalist delegate revealed that the Communist propaganda machine daily published smears that the Katyn Committee was nothing but a tool of capitalism. Notwithstanding the fact that we had invited Stalin and all other Communist leaders to come to Frankfurt and testify—but we had received no answer from them—they proceeded to malign and blaspheme our committee.

These journalists, in speaking to those attending the luncheon, said that in the work of the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee, for the first time in the history of communism placed their propaganda machine on the defensive. They had no answer whatsoever to the avalanche of testimony convicting the Stalin soldiers of the mass murders of Polish leaders in the Katyn Forest.

The hard facts showed their method of human extermination, as the gentleman just stated: They shot almost 4,000 Polish patriot leaders of Poland in the Katyn Forest and two other slave camps. They followed the same pattern which they are using in Vietnam, they tied the victims hands behind their backs and shot them in the back of the head. We remind the people of America not to forget that the Communist technique has not changed one iota since those days at the beginning of World War II, when they massacred and killed millions of people through that method and also through mass starvation in the Ukraine. The people of the world should not become too forgetful of what will happen, God forbid, if ever the Communists succeed in their designs for world domination and to enslave humanity throughout the globe.

I want to thank the gentleman for his statement here today.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for his contribution. Certainly we cannot permit the world to overlook this frightening, striking similarity in techniques. I remember the discovery of the Polish Army officers' bodies in mass graves in the Katyn Forest. Their hands were tied behind their backs. There was a single bullet through the nape of the neck. Then these men were dumped, literally dumped, one on top of the other, in the mass graves. Today, 30 years later, we are discovering the identical technique. And who are the victims? Innocent people of South Vietnam, whose only wish, whose only desire is to be free. Those men and women were dumped into graves without the benefit of a trial, without the benefit of any charges, without the benefit of any defense, picked out by the Communists for only one crime: they are the leaders of the resistance.

And this is important, because here the similarity becomes truly striking. The 15,000 Army Reserve officers who were massacred in the Katyn Forest were the lawyers, the educators, the doctors, the ministers, and the businessmen of Poland. These were, for the most part, the intelligentsia of Poland. These were the people who would have led the resistance to Communist aggression. As early as 1939 the Soviet Union, which professed to be our ally, already was plotting the take-over of all of those countries of Europe. In 1939 and 1940, Communist troops methodically picked the intellectual leaders of Poland from within the Army Officers Reserve Corps whom they imprisoned when Russia invaded Poland on September 17, 1939, so they would not be around when the Communists overwhelmed Poland and destroyed her institutions of freedom.

This is the lesson we see now again in South Vietnam, where people are again being pulled out, picked out. These are the leaders of resistance to the Vietcong. These are the leaders, and these are the people who are holding together the spirit of freedom in South Vietnam.

I tell you this: The discovery of mass graves at Hue proves more than anything else that the Communists have on their drawing boards the blueprint for another Communist "cordon sanitaire" of captive nations in Southeast Asia, identical to the "cordon sanitaire" of captive nations that now remain in Soviet bondage in East Central Europe.

We have the right to ask: Where are the great liberal voices in this country, the great defenders of human dignity? Where are their voices in denouncing the kind of genocide—brutal mass atrocities being committed against the innocent people of Southeast Vietnam?

The American liberal has been in the forefront in denouncing genocide and urging a world treaty against mass murder of people. Where are their voices of protest against this genocide of South Vietnamese discovered in Hue last weekend?

There was the same kind of conspiracy of silence in 1940, when the Polish government in exile tried to sound the alarm about Katyn. The investigation of the Katyn massacre by the congressional committee clearly showed there were forces within our own country that did not want to talk about Katyn and the discovery of those mass graves because the Soviet Union was our "gallant ally," and any discussion of the Katyn massacre in the war years would have supposedly driven a wedge between the Allies.

I submit that had the free world been told of the infamy and the brutality of the Communists discovered in Katyn, perhaps the whole course of history could have been changed.

On Pennsylvania Avenue, in front of the National Archives Building are two monuments. One says:

> What is past is prologue.

And the other one says:

> Study the past.

I suggest to those who today seek peace at any price and who would let the Communists take over in Southeast Asia, ought study that wise admonition.

Look at Katyn, look at what happened after Katyn, and look at the way the Communists were able to take over 180 million people in Eastern and Central Europe, and then look at what we found in Hue.

We should ask ourselves how long America can remain free, how long can institutions of human dignity prevail in our country if the Communists' juggernaut continues to close in and in and in, as it is doing around the entire world?

The mass grave discoveries in Hue are of monumental importance. I am amazed the mass media and instruments of information have treated these discoveries with such meager attention.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I might say further that so many of the younger generation do not remember or have not had called to their attention in the schools of America the Katyn massacre and the facts regarding many other mass exterminations of humanity that the Communists inflicted upon central Europe during the dark days before World War II.

I might explain why Congress investigated the Katyn massacre. The congressional investigation of the Katyn massacre was brought about because for the first time in world history the guilt of an international crime was not established to the satisfaction of many people throughout the world. The Soviet Union, through its false mass propaganda, had millions convinced that Hitler had committed those massacres in the Katyn Forest. They were committed in the winter of 1939–40, when both armies were closing in on Warsaw.

When these massacres were committed, the bodies in the Katyn Forest were not found until 2 years later.

Immediately Stalin said that Hitler massacred the Polish leaders at Katyn. Hitler, of course, denied it and said that Stalin massacred them. That is why this Congress, through the pleading of the Polish American Congress throughout the United States, insisted that to settle the question for future history an investigation should be made. That is how the Congress became interested in investigating an international crime when one nation had accused another of committing it.

So we settled for all time that it was the Communists who committed that crime, although Hitler had a different method of exterminating people than Stalin had. There is no question, Hitler was the most brutal tyrant of our time. Nevertheless, the Katyn Forest Massacre Congressional Committee settled once and for all that it was the Communists who killed the Poles in the Katyn Forest.

Let me say something further. This is for so many of these agitators in our country today who are so enthusiastic about letting the younger folks know what a great millennium they would have if communism takes over. I might say it was revealed in our testimony that among some of the mass murders that were committed by the Communists were massacres and murders of some of their own Communist disciples who were taken in with the network that brought in these people from the satellite nations, and they did not have any regard whatsoever for the agitators who were preaching communism, or for their own Communist fellow travelers. Some of them, according to the testimony before our committee, were massacred along with the free victims who were massacred by Stalin and his Communist cohorts.

So I might state to some of the younger folks in this country who are becoming enamoured with this organized Communist propaganda in colleges and other places, if the Communists ever took over they also might be among those massacred. They care not what is the thought of the people they massacre or exterminate. That was proved by the evidence submitted in our committee, that some of the so-called super-Communist propagandists who happened to be wedged in the mass onslaught lost their lives the same as the other unfortunate prisoners in the Communist prisons and slave labor camps.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman would agree that the Katyn investigation, exhaustively conducted by the Congress of the United States, would be a hollow exercise if we failed to learn the lesson that investigation taught us.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The lesson is this: Today, while the Communist leaders are stalling in Paris and refusing to address themselves to the real issues and refusing to talk about peace and refusing to make any forward movement, they are methodically engaging in mass executions of those people in South Vietnam who would constitute resistance to communism if and when some rapprochement is reached. It is quite obvious to us that just as at Katyn, where they methodically destroyed potential opposition, we are witnessing in Hue and the other mass graves all over South Vietnam an identical pattern. They are stalling in Paris because they want first to methodically destroy through these mass executions those elements of resistance which might try to protect the institutions of freedom and dignity in South Vietnam when peace finally comes.

I think that is the lesson that Hue ought to teach us. Those who fail to see that lesson, I believe, have just not read the transcript of Katyn. More importantly, they are looking at the world through rose-colored glasses.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Illinois for yielding to me.

I want to express my appreciation to him for this timely reminder of the barbaric massacres at Katyn Forest. My colleague, like I, had a part in World War II. I am sure both of us were proud to have had that part and do look back with pride upon what small contributions, at least on my part, were made in that effort against the Nazi tyranny. My colleague and I do disagree on what ought to be done in Vietnam. I am sure this is not the place to go into the bases for a disagreement. However, I would like to enter this one thought here. I have always felt our Government has undertaken a very serious obligation to the people of Vietnam who have fought at our side. Should the day come when we do disengage and withdraw our forces from there, as I hope we will soon, I feel we must measure up to that obligation to those people and invite other nations to join with us in every possible resettlement of these people that can be undertaken.

After the Cuban episode our country opened its doors to refugees from Cuba. I think that was the right thing to do. Now because we have been involved in Vietnam we have a similar obligation there. I do not suggest that this would eliminate or perhaps even materially reduce the possibility of atrocities that might follow such a disengagement. Even so, we should do our best to provide safety and a future for the people who choose to leave their homes in the event that we should extricate ourselves from this position.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the gentleman's suggestion that we start a methodical withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. I would join him in that plea but I would also insist that the free world must insist that the North Vietnamese have a similar withdrawal of North Vietnamese troops from South Vietnam. Premier Thieu has said South Vietnam could carry on with its own army of 700,000 but it would need our continued Air Force support. I am hopeful we can withdraw American troops from South Vietnam but I believe our offer to withdraw our troops if North Vietnam similarly withdraws its troops today offers the best hope for disengagement.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope that the discovery of these mass atrocities against the innocent citizens of South Vietnam would now finally, at last, shock the sensitivities of those of our allies who have meekly sat back and let the United States and the handful of our allies fighting in Vietnam, including the South Vietnamese, carry the full brunt of the conflict.

The issues in southeast Asia and the issues in South Vietnam affect the whole free world. It is incredible to me that those free world rulers who espouse the doctrine of freedom cannot recognize what we are witnessing in South Vietnam today is a repeat performance of what we saw in World War II vis-a-vis the captive nations of Europe. If we learn nothing else from the discovery of the mass graves in Hue, it would be my fervent prayer that our allies would finally be shocked into a realization that nothing has really changed in the Communist world. Mass atrocities, mass murders, and mass assassinations continue to be their main stock in trade to be used against anyone or any nation which dares to interfere with or interrupt their plans for ultimate conquest.

I would suggest that those here in this country—sincere, honest, patriotic Americans who on many occasions have tended to falter in the fight in Vietnam—take a look at these mass atrocities. These were all innocent people. These were citizens. These were people who had no greater desire than to live and let live, and be free. These are people who are being massacred in mass numbers in a most brutal manner, with their hands tied behind their backs, shot through the head with a single bullet, dumped into mass graves.

This is the true picture of communism.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that my fellow Americans who have a tendency to waiver will look at this discovery and then ask themselves: "What can we do as Americans, as united Americans, to bring this war to a successful conclusion?"

Mr. Speaker, I say that the course of history is being written in South Vietnam--just as it was in the Katyn Forest. There is no question in my mind but that if the American people had known the full facts of the Katyn Forest massacre the whole course of history would have been altered.

Mr. Speaker, I was not here at that time. Like many others, I was in the armed services, fighting the war. We were helpless to say anything at that time. But now I say this: That so long as the good Lord gives me the strength I shall remain in the well of this House and try to point out the true and full, ugly consequences of compromise with communism, if we falter.

Mr. Speaker, I pray for the day when peace will return to Vietnam. I know what it is like to deliver a flag that has flown over this Nation's Capitol to a mother in my district who lost her son in Vietnam. I know the hardships our American boys are suffering in Vietnam.

I say that the tragedy of our time is that the free world wants the United States to carry this burden all by itself. This in itself is an indictment against the naivete of the leaders of the world. We saw those leaders here earlier this week. These are the men who have within their power the ability to call a halt to hostilities in Vietnam. But this they have not chosen to do; they have chosen to stand aside and watch this huge conflict develop.

It would be my fervent prayer, Mr. Speaker, that the discovery of these mass graves somehow or other will reach the conscience of the rest of the world, and that we can stand together united, and bring peace to Vietnam.

We can bring peace very quickly. Right now there are ships going into Hanoi. Many of our allies are continuing to do business with the Communists because the almighty dollar is more important to them than a principle. I am not surprised that the American people are asking more and more questions. I myself question the values of these fair-weather allies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DADDARIO). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(On request of Mr. MCCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. PUCINSKI was allowed to proceed for 10 additional minutes.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank our distinguished Speaker for this extension of time.

So it is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that out of this discovery the conscience of the entire world can be sufficiently aroused so that peace can come.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the words on the National Archives Building are very important. They state that—

> The past is prologue, study the past.

We cannot close our eyes to reality for the sake of expediency.

My colleague from Illinois who spoke a moment ago says that he wants to pull our troops out of Vietnam. Of course we want to pull our troops out. I want to pull the American troops out. I want to get our boys back home just as quickly as possible, but it would be a tragic mistake if, for the second time in recent history we, as a free people, overlooked and failed to understand the full design of the Communists. They are not quitting. There is not an iota of proof that they are in any way quitting. They are today holding fast in Paris. Why, Mr. Speaker, this war could be brought to a conclusion in 24 hours. What does the United States want in Vietnam? Nothing. Do we seek territorial gains? Of course we do not. Do we seek domination over any other nation or group of people? Of course we do not. All we want is for the South Vietnamese to have a chance to be masters of their own destiny as free people. Is this so difficult? Is this so impossible? Is our demand so outrageous?

I think if we could pull together the resources and the determination of the whole world to make it clear that we are not going to surrender South Vietnam to Communist infamy, this war could be brought to a conclusion very quickly. I do not think the Communists are made of such strength that they do not feel the impact of this war. I think the Communists are having just as much of a problem in Hanoi and in North Vietnam and that there is as much resistance to the continuation of this war over there among the people of North Vietnam as there is among the American people here.

So it seems to me that those who falter and those who would want us to waiver and those who would suggest that somehow or other we walk away before the job is finished, are really prolonging this war and inadvertently they are contributing to false hopes among the Communist rulers.

I hope that the President will look at these mass graves, marshal the forces of the free world in indignation against this form of genocide, and then use whatever means he deems necessary to bring this war to an end in Vietnam.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Hue and Katyn—they constitute a tragic similarity.

VIETNAM PERSPECTIVE: A GREATER LEGACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DADDARIO). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the death of Dwight D. Eisenhower serves to remind all America of the immense capacity this man had for bringing people together.

The theme which consistently runs through the many excellent eulogies of the past few days is that Eisenhower as Army general and as U.S. President, had a great gift for uniting people, for creating unity out of disunity in the work for major national objectives.

Today, in 1969, the need for unity in our Nation perhaps has never been greater. The need exists in several areas of public policy, but one issue is paramount, and that issue is the war in Vietnam.

In our consideration of this conflict we will most certainly profit from keeping in mind the unifying nature of Mr. Eisenhower's leadership and the significance of that unity.

We might even go so far as to conjecture that if Mr. Eisenhower's death at this time in history gives us the impetus for a greater degree of national unity on the Vietnam question then this could prove to be still another of his great services to his country and the world.

It would be difficult to imagine a greater legacy from any man.

What are the ingredients of unity in our considerations of Vietnam today?

The first is to recognize that the President of the United States wants at least as much as any American to bring the war to a satisfactory conclusion. Secretary of State Rogers on March 28 said the United States was prepared to negotiate a simultaneous withdrawal of troops "over a very short period of time." Can anyone believe this is not a sincere and valid position of the Nixon administration?

The second ingredient is to recognize that in the search to define what kinds of conclusions can be considered as "satisfactory" the President and his top policy people are looking very carefully at all the alternatives open to them.

The third ingredient is to recognize that private negotiations have far more potential for success than do public talks. This can be shown from many examples of recent history, particularly in cases of this kind in which the adversary clearly relies on influencing public opinion as a major strategy in the negotiating process.

The fourth ingredient is to gain and hold a reasonable perspective on the total Vietnam situation. This is not an easy thing to accomplish. Each and every one of us has been bothered by the lack of clarity in assessing the history of our Vietnam involvement and of the existing situation.

But I want to make some brief comments on this matter of a proper perspective.

FREE FROM COERCION

For 22 years, ever since World War II, our foreign policy has been guided in general by the concept which President Harry Truman set forth when he told a joint session of Congress, March 12, 1947:

> One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of conditions in which we and other

nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion.

Perhaps there are different interpretations which might be attributed to President Truman's statement. Perhaps we can say that conditions have changed so that no President could make a statement like that today with such high public acceptance as in 1947.

However, there can be no doubt that a large majority of the people and of the Congress were in accord with President Truman's statement in 1947 and, to a large extent, still are.

There may be variations in application of the principle, but most of us feel that the position of the United States in world affairs is such that when organized attempts at mass coercion develop, our attention is required, partly because our national security may be involved, and partly because a degree of responsibility falls to us however much we may prefer otherwise.

It is this feeling, right or wrong, which was a major reason for our involvement in Korea, in the Berlin disputes, in the Greek conflict, and in other situations of strife.

And after all the other verbiage is stripped away it is the reason why we became involved in Vietnam. Our effort in Vietnam was and still is motivated in accord with what President Truman said was our policy to create conditions in which we and other nations would be able to work out a way of life free of coercion.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is to emphasize that the basic reasons for our being in Vietnam were always valid, given the acknowledged morality of and the national concurrence in this overall concept.

The reason I believe it is so important to make this point now is that U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam is being advocated on the grounds that our involvement was wrongful in the first place.

Withdrawal is certainly one of the alternative courses of action our Government must consider along with others. However, to argue the case on the grounds that our rationale for being in Vietnam in the first place is wrongful is an unnecessary and unfruitful exercise.

It is unnecessary because if withdrawal is the wisest course of action today the best reasons will have to be based not on yesterday's events but rather on what the future holds. And it is unfruitful because if the case for withdrawal must rest on the validity of arguments designed to show U.S. policy in Southeast Asia as basically aggressive and Communist policy to be passive, then the case is very weak.

A few days ago a long statement appeared in the RECORD calling for withdrawal—without including a word on what kind of withdrawal, or when, or how, or from where besides South Vietnam—based wholly on an effort to destroy the basic rationale for our effort.

It alleges that in Vietnam from the start our policy sought to rely on power alone and not on law and reason, that South Vietnam more than Hanoi presented obstacles to the effective function of the International Control Commission, that the Vietcong had to be excused in its behavior because its "only future was in subversion," that Saigon under Diem was not interested in land reform while Ho Chi Minh championed land reform, and that Ho's reliance on Communist China and Russia was due to U.S. policies.

These and other allegations are highly questionable, at best. But the main point is that they are not relevant to the question at hand and merely serve to further embolden those who, through misrepresentation, seek to turn public opinion of the world against this country.

It is clearly on record that the U.S. involvement in Vietnam has always, since the beginning in 1954, sought to emphasize law and reason over military considerations, that Saigon in 1958 and 1959 was making very great efforts at land reform, and that Ho's ties with Communist elements in China, Russia and France predate by many years the first U.S. stirrings of interest in Southeast Asia.

Yes, the basic rationale for U.S. involvement in Vietnam is very much in accord with principles of U.S. foreign policy which have been accepted as valid for 22 years and more.

The real question, however, that U.S. policy planners must consider today is how to reconcile the military realities in Vietnam with the changing conditions of affairs in Asia and the world.

We have assigned to the military the task of waging a war in South Vietnam under real limitations. In the Korean war we talked of a sanctuary for the enemy. Today in Vietnam the adversary has not one sanctuary but three.

The war has brought tragedy to far too many Americans. Our Government must make a fresh assessment and determine without commitment to policies which have gone before, what course of action toward peace is now most likely to succeed.

As the President seeks these answers to difficult questions I believe it is incumbent on all of us to give him the unity, the time, and the encouragement he deserves.

TRADE: BEST HARDWARE IN THE ARSENAL OF OUR DEMOCRACY

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I have long deplored the failure of our country to fully utilize the nonmilitary tools which can lead to peace. Trade is the best hardware in the arsenal of our Democracy.

One of the most effective ways in which trade can further the cause of peace and stability is to encourage trade relations with the countries of Eastern Europe, whose economic independence is a source of strength which helps to stabilize these countries.

For these reasons, I am today introducing a bill which is cosponsored by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) to provide for trade with Czechoslovakia on a limited number of items to be negotiated between our two nations.

The countries of Eastern Europe look toward the West from the shadows of the East. It is my firm belief that trade initiatives would go far toward opening windows to the West which would otherwise remain sealed.

In this hour of crisis in Czechoslovakia, I feel that it is imperative for the Government of the United States to take some definite step to recognize the plea of the people of this beleaguered country for some sign of interest by America and the rest of the free world.

In a small way this bill will start our two nations upon the very long road toward a better and more fruitful relationship. The great traditions of independence and justice of the Czech and Slovak peoples require our support and friendship under every circumstance and especially at this time.

In January of this year President Johnson released a report—Future U.S. Foreign Trade Policy. This thoughtful analysis and set of guidelines for the future had been prepared by Ambassador William Roth, the President's Special Representative for Trade. It was the product of over a year's intensive efforts by the man who was in the center of U.S. trade and tariff work for over 5 years, but it was not just his own views and crystal gazing. It took into consideration extensive discussions and comments from a blue-ribbon panel of advisers from industry, commerce, banking, agriculture, and labor—people such as Fred Borch, David Rockefeller, Charles Shuman, and George Meany. It also reflected extensive public hearings by the administration and before committees of both Houses of the Congress.

The report contains a series of balanced and well-conceived recommendations, two of which are most important to my way of thinking. The first concerns our trade relations with the countries of Eastern Europe, the second concerns the steps which must be taken to assist our domestic firms, industries, and workers to adjust to increased worldwide competition.

In the field of relations with Eastern Europe, the report considers how to insure that U.S. companies and workers get a fair share of the growing markets of Eastern Europe, the conditions under which we can consider establishing trade channels, and how to balance all of this with our national security and international policy objectives. The adjustment proposals in Roth's report deal with how to make our adjustment assistance program for firms and groups of workers a true operating program and also contain a set of proposals for selective measures to deal quickly and effectively with import problems affecting entire industries or major portions of industries. Roth's report clearly recognizes that we have a responsibility both to cushion the adverse effect of sharp increases in imports and to find new ways to upgrade our economy and improve our skills and output.

The bill which I have today introduced deals with the first of these issues—the Czechoslovakian Trade Relations Act of 1969. The purposes of this bill are:

First. To use peaceful trade and related contacts with Czechoslovakia as a means of advancing the long-range interest of the United States in peace and freedom;

Second. To promote constructive relations with Czechoslovakia, to contribute to international stability, and to provide a framework helpful to private U.S. firms conducting business relations with state trading agencies in Czechoslovakia by instituting regular government-to-government negotiations concerning commercial and other matters of mutual interest; and

Third. To increase peaceful trade and related contacts between the United States and Czechoslovakia, and to expand markets for products of the United States in that country.

I recognize that a simple exchange of trade concessions between the United States and Czechoslovakia is nonsense. The organized state economy of Czechoslovakia makes meaningless our concepts of price and tariffs. With this in mind my bill proposes to give the President authority to work out constructive "deals" with Czechoslovakia in exchange for appropriate tariff concessions on our part. I do not propose that he give Czechoslovakia full most-favored-nation treatment on all products but rather MFN on individual products in exchange for meaningful concessions which will offer U.S. firms the chance to sell American goods in that country. These special deals can and have been worked out with other countries in the past. For example, when Poland joined the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—a year or so ago, she gave very specific guarantees with regard to the volume of imported goods she would purchase every year.

I am convinced that the more contacts we have with this country the more opportunities we will have to influence its citizens in our favor. We will also, by freeing some of the trade pipelines, show that we side with them in their bitter fight to maintain their self respect and be free of outside domination.

My bill will not weaken in any way the existing precautions against exporting advanced U.S. technology or strategic items. It contains a specific provision that it in no way may be deemed to modify either the Export Control Act or the Battle Act. I also provide that any agreement that the President may enter into shall in no event be for more than 3 years, at which time it must be fully reviewed before it can be extended. I also provide that the President shall report annually to the Congress on all aspects of any commercial agreements program he may enter into.

RACE HATE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater poison of mind and spirit than race hate. There is no greater evil among men than the irrational antipathy that is based in race and race alone. There is no greater injustice than to be labeled "inferior" or "undeserving" or "subhuman" or "second class" solely on account of race or descent; and there is no greater evildoer than the spreader of race hate. My colleagues know well the number of times I have spoken out against those who would discover some nonexistent plot among minority groups, or those who automatically assume that Negroes, or Jews, or Indians, or Mexicans are somehow sinister influences. My colleagues know all too well the sorrows visited on this House and this Nation because of the messages of hate. It is because I oppose this irrational, this pervasive, this debasing hate that I have joined my colleagues against it, and for human decency.

All my political life I have asked only that I be judged for my qualifications, for my policies, for my proposals, not on what I am, or what my name may be. I ask for every man that he be given that same privilege. Throughout my career I have been attacked repeatedly by right-wing extremists because I stand for equality for all men before God, before man, and before the law. I have been called a Communist, my life has been threatened, I have been castigated as a "nigger lover," and I am certain, denounced as a "dirty meskin." I have been branded a Fabian Socialist, denounced as a hater, and denigrated as a wrecker of stability and destroyer of harmony. Yet, I do not regret it; the people of San Antonio and Bexar County have repeatedly demonstrated that they do not care what I am or what I am called, as long as I make an honest effort to be an honest Representative. My faith has been affirmed time and again in the basic decency and integrity of the vast and overwhelming majority of the people of this land. I have seen it proved all over the country that there is far more decency than indecency, far more tolerance than intolerance, and far more honor than dishonor. That has made it worthwhile; that has removed the sting from the barbs of haters both professional and amateur alike; and that has enabled me to say truthfully that the haters are a small and contemptible minority.

Ironically, I now find myself assaulted from the left as well as from the right. Yet I do not hesitate to say now, as before, that evil is evil, that it is just as wrong for a member of an ethnic minority to succumb to hate and fear as it is for any one else to do so. A racist is no good either to himself or to his fellow man, be he black, white, brown, red, or yellow. I believe in decency, and I denounce indecency; and I serve public notice that my policy will not change.

Mr. Speaker, I have watched with alarm as new Mexican-American militant groups have formed, not because they have formed, but because some of them no matter how worthy their ideals may be, have fallen into the spell and trap of reverse racism. These few are themselves becoming the purveyors of the hate they denounce; they are themselves the personification of the unspeakable evils they declaim against; and they are themselves the ultimate tragedy of racism. If there can be no moral justification for racial antipathy on one side, neither can there be on the other; yet tragically these new racists seem utterly convinced of their moral rectitude.

I have heard and read and been shocked by violent denouncements of the so-called establishment and now of gringos and even of yankee imperialists. Whatever the title may be, the result is the same argument: the majority, the Anglo-Saxon American, is joined in a fantastic plot to subjugate and hold in poverty the Mexican-American citizen of this land. This new dogma is just as fantastic as the old cries about "Wall Street imperialists" of years back, and as xenophobic as the know-nothings of a century gone by. It is as evil as the deadly hatred of the Nazis, and as terrible in its implications as the rantings of demagogs warning against "mongrelization of the races" by white supremacists. I do not know, and defy anyone to find, any one race, any one ethnic group that is the personification and embodiment of evil; neither do I know of any that is the incarnation of good. Neither racism nor reverse racism is defensible.

I cannot stand silently by if an organization like the Mexican-American Youth Organization, or MAYO, as it is known, publishes hate sheets containing statements like:

> The gringo took your grandfather's land, he took your father's job, and now he's sucking out your soul. There is no such thing as "mala suerte" (bad luck); there is only malos gringos (bad gringos).

MAYO styles itself the embodiment of good and the Anglo-American as the incarnation of evil. That is not merely ridiculous; it is drawing fire from the deepest wellsprings of hate. The San Antonio leader of MAYO, Jose Angel Gutierrez, may think himself something of a hero, but he is, in fact, only a benighted soul if he believes that in the espousal of hatred he will find love. He is simply deluded if he believes that the wearing of fatigues and a beard makes his followers revolutionaries, or that the genius of revolution is in slogans.

As for the so-called older radicals who lend their assent and even support of the orators of race and hate, they need not wonder why their integrity is questioned. They cannot claim the support of all men, or the right to just consideration, if they denounce some men irrationally; one cannot espouse evil and not expect the favor to be returned. One cannot fan the flames of emotion, or turn on the streams of bigotry one moment and expect them to disappear the next.

I cannot accept the argument that this is an evil country or that our system does not work, or that it is foolish to expect redress of a just grievance. It may be wrong to expect miracles, but it is also wrong to expect no progress at all. I have seen too much proof that there is a residue of good will in this country, that there is a determination for progress, and I have seen, taken part in, and been the beneficiary of too much progress to deny its existence, or to say that we are incapable of it. I cannot find evidence that there is any country in the world that matches the progress of this one. For all our inequity, for all our admitted failings, for all the urgent unmet needs, this country is the living embodiment of a revolution that the so-called militants only play at. They may proclaim the romance of heroes dead and gone, but they do not know what the realities of those men were. The wearing of a Zapata moustache today does not mean that his "pan y tierra" ever came into being; and the bitter truth is that the true revolution is here, not somewhere else.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to despair, and it is not the time to give over to hate; it is still the time for faith. I believe that the majority of people in this land agree with me. I take my stand here, and against the kind of nihilism I now take the liberty of reading into the RECORD:

WORDS MAKE THE HACKLES RISE

The words are rough and tough. At times, history and facts are distorted to serve a purpose. Many of the words and phrases—in English and Spanish—are blistering hot, and the art work and slogans downright inflammatory.

The flag of Mexico, the bugle symbol of "no quarter," revolutionary symbols such as Emiliano Zapata, the clenched fist, and the upraised rifle seem chilling.

Words of hate lashing out at "blue eyed whitey" and the call of the chicano to battle the gringo makes the heart pump and the hackles rise.

These words, phrases, challenges, facts and distortions, are in the so-called "underground papers" circulating here, in the Southwest and in areas of heavy Mexican-American population.

Cheap printing, crude illustrations—but they pack a wallop.

The term Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez uses for these papers is "hate sheets."

In Washington this week, he said:

"It is incumbent on me to speak up about the hate sheets and literature that MAYO in Texas is putting out both in Del Rio and in San Antonio.

"These sheets reflect the language of Castro and incorporate language that is alien to our area of the country."

MAYO means Mexican-American Youth Organization. This group uses the term "Brown Power" and members like to costume themselves in brown berets, combat boots, serapes, rolled blankets slung over shoulder and chest in campaign style, moustaches and-or beards.

There are four of these papers in Texas: El Deguello, San Antonio; Hoy, published in the Valley; El Azteca, Kingsville; and La Revolucion, Uvalde. All are MAYO publications.

An editorial box in Hoy says it is published by the South Texas MAYO, of which Pan American College (Edinburg) is a member, and is dedicated to unity of the Mexican-American and the downfall of all forces that exploit them.

The local publication, El Deguello, takes its title from an ancient bugle battle call signifying no quarter, battle to the death. Reputedly, Gen. Santa Anna ordered this bugle call sounded as the Battle of the Alamo began.

Copies of all four of these publications made the rounds at the Del Rio demonstration Palm Sunday, an event in which Mayo played a prominent role.

Other similar type publications in Texas are La Justicia Mayorista which carries a "San Felipe del Rio" dateline, presumably meaning Del Rio; El Malcriado, McAllen; El Yaqui of Houston and El Compass of Houston.

Over the West are published La Raza of Los Angeles, El Gallo, Denver; Carta Editorial, Los Angeles; El Papel, Albuquerque; El Paisano, Tolleson, Ariz.; Inside-Eastside, Los Angeles; and Bronze, San Jose, Calif.

Outside the Southwest there are Lado, published in Chicago, and La Voz Mexicana, Wautoma, Wis.

While the objective is unity for Mexican-Americans to gain economic, education and fair treatment goals, the language of the papers is bellicose.

Polarization is seen in some of the statements, such as "Realization by all Chicanos that we cannot fit into the Gringo society and that we must not try."

As El Deguello of San Antonio declares in its February 1969 issue under the heading "Arriba Raza!":

"You may like it or hate it, but we can not remain silent any longer. There are things that must be said, problems that must be faced, a community that must be changed. There are goals, therefore, set up for this paper, and they are:

" 'An end to white supremacy and the City Council must be used as an example.

" 'An end to economic exploitation of the minority groups and unequal distribution of the economy.

" 'Realization by all Chicanos that we cannot fit into the Gringo society and that we must not try.

" 'Exposure of all those individuals who oppose La Raza.

" 'A lot less asking and a lot more demanding.' "

In a lead editorial, the paper explains it is named for the bugle call ordered by Santa Anna and declares:

"Just as that bugle rang out that quiet morning, so, too, must it ring in every Chicano's ears. As Chicanos we have given the gringo pleas, requests, and even demands. The gringo still refuses to hear our voices just like Travis did. Obviously gringos didn't learn much in 120 years.

"So El Deguello must again shout out its war cry to all Chicanos that we must rise up against the gringo again. He has had his last chance."

The term "chicano" probably originated as a regionalism on the border. It refers to a person of Mexican descent, but a citizen or resident on the northern side of the Rio Grande.

In another article "Dead End for Students," the implication is that, regardless of schooling, Mexican-Americans have no future. Then it points out "there's a movement afoot going on whether you like it or not. All over the Southwest in the United States, people like you are realizing that they can change this problem.

"I'm talking about the Gringo, I'm talking about blue-eyed whitey, with a hotter car, a better education, and a better job. I'm talking about what was taken from you and your grandfather.

"The Gringo took your grandfather's land, he took your father's job, and now he's sucking out your soul. There is no such thing as 'mala suerte' (bad luck); there is only 'malos gringos' (bad gringos). He's keeping us in slavery now through our jobs, through the lousy education you're getting at school, through everything that affects us."

Then the article hurls the challenge:

"Only those Chicanos with guts will be the ones that get in the movement, and if you're not man enough to take what's yours by right, then you don't have any business even being alive.

"If you don't want the same opportunity, the same education, the same respect, then you're not for the movement. If all you think about is your small little high school world, then you're not for the movement.

"If all you want is money out of this life, then just paint yourself white and change your name—cause you're not Chicano. Go back to sleep or better yet, go crawl in a hole and die."

Tone of articles in El Deguello is parallel with statements made in public Sunday in Del Rio by Jose Angel Gutierrez, San Antonio MAYO leader. They are similar to other utterances in public by MAYO members.

Among his declarations were "we have been oppressed for too long and we will tangle with the gringo anywhere he wants to."

It was Gonzalez' hand that helped post the "Del Rio Manifesto" on the Val Verde County Courthouse door, and it was the red and black MAYO flag that was hoisted to the top of the courthouse flagpole.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CULVER, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. MADDEN to revise and extend his remarks during Mr. PUCINSKI's special order.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RUMSFELD in two instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. CLEVELAND in three instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. TALCOTT.

Mrs. REID of Illinois.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in three instances.

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. BUCHANAN in five instances.

Mr. HARVEY.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. DELLENBACK in two instances.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAFFERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in four instances.

Mr. STEPHENS in two instances.

Mr. FARBSTEIN in four instances.

Mr. YOUNG in two instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. MARSH in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in six instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA in two instances.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. TIERNAN.

Mr. Diggs in two instances.

Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Fuqua in two instances.

Mr. Fraser in four instances.

Mr. Gonzalez in three instances.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. Rosenthal in five instances.

Mr. Pickle in six instances.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. Dorn in two instances.

Mr. Blatnik in two instances.

Mr. Olsen in three instances.

Mr. Ryan in two instances.

Mr. Mikva in two instances.

Mr. Pucinski in six instances.

Mr. Leggett.

ADJOURNMENT BY RESOLUTION TO A FUTURE DATE

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 191, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on April 14 next.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 191, the House adjourned until Monday, April 14, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

647. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report on Air Force military construction contracts awarded by the Department without formal advertisement, for the period July 1–December 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 804 of Public Law 90–110; to the Committee on Armed Services.

648. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1970 and 1971 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, and to amend the definition of "motor vehicle equipment" in the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

649. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 89–175; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

650. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third- and sixth-preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 9911. A bill to amend the act, entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon the railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon", approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATES (for himself and Mr. Burke of Massachusetts):

H.R. 9912. A bill to provide for the orderly marketing of articles imported into the United States, to establish a flexible basis for the adjustment by the U.S. economy to expanded trade, and to afford supplying nations a fair share of the growth or change in the U.S. market; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 9913. A bill to create a Department of Youth Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. Reuss, and Mr. Rosenthal):

H.R. 9914. A bill to establish a Commission to study the organization, operation, and management of the executive branch of the Government and to recommend changes necessary or desirable in the interest of governmental efficiency and economy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 9915. A bill to improve intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and the economy and efficiency of all levels of government, by providing Federal block grants for State and localities which take steps to modernize State and local government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9916. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 9917. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax for a portion of amounts paid for certain educational expenses incurred at an institution of higher learning or vocational training; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 9918. A bill to temporarily suspend the recent increases in fees for grazing of livestock on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9919. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 9920. A bill to improve the safety conditions of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9921. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9922. A bill to amend section 252 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to provide that the President shall impose reciprocal import restrictions whenever such action is necessary or appropriate to obtain the removal of foreign nonduty trade restrictions which are substantially curtailing U.S. exports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 9923. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECKHARDT:

H.R. 9924. A bill to extend Federal group life and health insurance benefits to Federal employees in the Canal Zone who are not citizens of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 9925. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the sale of mailing lists used to disseminate through the mails materials harmful to persons under the age of 19 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 9926. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 753(e), to eliminate the maximum and minimum limitations upon the annual salary of reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9927. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 9928. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 9929. A bill to amend the act, entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon", approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9930. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, relating to enrollment charges for Federal employees' health benefits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9931. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9932. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide an established workweek, a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. Long of Maryland, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Karth, Mr. Rees, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Evans of Colorado, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Nedzi, and Mr. Lowenstein):

H.R. 9933. A bill to provide equitable treatment to purchasers of U.S. savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9934. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys or other articles intended for use by children which present any electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazard; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 9935. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1966 to clarify the exemption accorded mechanics in certain nonmanufacturing establishments; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H.R. 9936. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the percentage standard deduction from 10 to 15 percent, and to increase the ceiling on such deduction to $3,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 9937. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record where that method of computation produces a higher combined benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 9938. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to exclude from consideration as income, for the purpose of determining eligibility for pension, all payments of any kind or from any source, including salary, retirement, or annuity payments, endowments or similar income, which a veteran receives or is entitled to receive after attaining age 72; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 9939. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Services.

H.R. 9940. A bill to amend section 320 of title 23 of the United States Code to increase the authorization for that section, and to earmark such increase for a bridge across Markland Dam on the Ohio River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOGAN (for himself, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. O'Konski, Mr. Price of Texas, and Mr. Wiggins):

H.R. 9941. A bill to designate the stadium constructed in the District of Columbia under authority of the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 as the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Stadium"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 9942. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 9943. A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.R. 9944. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 9945. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to increase the lowest induction age to age 21; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9946. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim retained rights in certain tracts of land to the Board of Education of Lee County, S.C.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.R. 9947. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 9948. A bill to enable honey producers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their markets for honey; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9949. A bill to establish the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9950. A bill to strengthen voluntary agricultural organizations, to provide for the orderly marketing of agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin):

H.R. 9951. A bill to provide for the collection of the Federal unemployment tax in quarterly installments during each taxable year, to make status of employer depend on employment during preceding as well as current taxable year, to exclude from the computation of the excess the balance in the employment security administration account as of the close of fiscal years 1970 through 1972, to raise the limitation on the amount authorized to be made available for expenditure out of the employment security administration account by the amounts so excluded, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9952. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to require the establishment of nationally uniform minimum standards and eligibility requirements for aid or assistance thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 9953. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of poultry laying cages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA (for himself, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. Brademas, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Gaydos, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Clay, Mr. Powell, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Pelly, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Whalen, Mr. Moss, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Farbstein, Mr. Cohelan, Mr. Conte, Mr. Dulski, and Mr. Halpern):

H.R. 9954. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to amend the definition of "employee" to include certain agricultural employees, and to permit certain provisions in agreements between agricultural employers and employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA (for himself, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Karth, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Corman, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Joelson, Mr. Nedzi, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Green of Pennsylvania, Mr. Leggett, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Charles H. Wilson, Mr. Adams, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Howard, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Rees, Mr. Wolff, and Mr. Eckhardt):

H.R. 9955. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to amend the definition of "employee" to include certain agricultural employees, and to permit certain provisions in agreements between agricultural employers and employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA (for himself, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Biaggi, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Koch, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Mollohan, and Mr. Podell):

H.R. 9956. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to amend the definition of "employee" to include certain agricultural employees, and to permit certain provisions in agreements between agricultural employers and employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9957. A bill to incorporate College Benefit System of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9958. A bill to amend section 702 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9959. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer who rents his home or apartment to deduct all or part of his rent payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 9960. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 9961. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9962. A bill to amend section 214(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that certain aliens who apply for a visa to visit the United States temporarily for pleasure or temporarily for business shall not be denied nonimmigrant visitor status by any consular officer or immigration officer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9963. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the sale of mailing lists used to disseminate through the mails materials harmful to persons under the age of 19 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9964. A bill, Veterans' Fair Treatment Amendments of 1969; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 9965. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9966. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 9967. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 9968. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 9969. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9970. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1950 relating to the Libby Dam, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 9971. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 9972. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish Federal standards on thermal pollution of water which will apply to all federally licensed activities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TAFT (for himself, Mr. Conable, Mr. Halpern, and Mr. Lujan):

H.R. 9973. A bill to provide appropriations for sharing of Federal revenues with States and certain cities and urban counties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 9974. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs prescribed for diabetes, or for chronic cardiovascular, respiratory, or kidney disease, among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. Adams, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Daddario, Mr.

HAWKINS, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ST. ONGE, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 9975. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that percentage depletion shall not be allowed in the case of mines, wells, and other natural deposits located in foreign territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself and Mr. REUSS):

H.R. 9976. A bill to promote the foreign policy and security of the United States by providing authority to negotiate a commercial agreement with Czechoslovakia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 9977. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a portion of the retirement benefits of a public employee shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 9978. A bill making an appropriation to the Office of Education to carry out the Bilingual Education Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 629. Joint resolution to establish the Commission on the Future Political Status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Micronesia); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.J. Res. 630. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.J. Res. 631. Joint resolution in honor of Joseph B. Ridder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 632. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.J. Res. 633. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.J. Res. 634. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.J. Res. 635. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.J. Res. 636. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H. Con. Res. 197. Concurrent resolution, it is the sense of Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 198. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 359. Resolution relative to the hijacking of U.S. aircraft; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

101. By Mr. OLSEN: Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, asking that Congress enact legislation permitting 25 percent of the gross sales of national forest products to be deposited in the funds of the county where the products are grown to replace the tax loss to the counties wherein these public lands are located; to the Committee on Agriculture.

102. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to Federal funding of public welfare expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

103. Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to changing the name of the Glen Canyon Dam to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 9979. A bill for the relief of Choi Sung Joo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL of California:

H.R. 9980. A bill for the relief of Mario Pineda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 9981. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio Racca Pizarro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9982. A bill for the relief of Doo Ok Kwang and Nam Soon Suh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9983. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Haim Moshe Groman and his wife, Berayne Groman, and their children, Nachman David Groman, Israel Groman, Abraham Groman, and Nechama Groman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9984. A bill for the relief of Domenico Marrone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 9985. A bill for the relief of Kim Dang Heng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9986. A bill for the relief of Orlando I. Agnir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9987. A bill for the relief of Girolamo Biondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9988. A bill for the relief of Francisco Cacciola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9989. A bill for the relief of Pietro DeSantis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9990. A bill for the relief of Antonio Inzillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9991. A bill for the relief of Michala Liotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9992. A bill for the relief of Romolo Marsiglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9993. A bill for the relief of Antonio Vitale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.R. 9994. A bill for the relief of Josephine Palazzolo and Michele Palazzolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 9995. A bill for the relief of Philip Antoun Morcos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Thursday, April 3, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, wilt Thou hallow the memories of this holy week. Make us mindful of our fallen leaders, of their service and sacrifice. But especially keep us mindful of the One who went by way of the cross, who taught us that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins," and that "whoever would be greatest among you, must be the servant of all."

O Thou who on a night long ago didst wash the feet of Thy disciples, wash from us the stains of our sin, that we may not fail Thee in the hour of danger, but follow Thee in true faith unto life eternal.

In all the worship and praise of the coming days make us to know where salvation is to be found for all men and nations. Give journeying mercies to all who travel, and return Thy servants to this place renewed in soul and mind, the better to serve Thee and this Republic. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 1, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1437. An act for the relief of Cosmina Ruggiero;

H.R. 1708. An act for the relief of Ai Bok Chun;

H.R. 1721. An act for the relief of William J. Hurley;

H.R. 1939. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie J. Hottenroth;

H.R. 1960. An act for the relief of Mario Santos Gomes;

H.R. 2275. An act for the relief of John Thomas Cosby, Jr.;

H.R. 2315. An act for the relief of Josefina Policar Abutan Fuliar;

H.R. 2335. An act for the relief of Enrico DeMonte;

H.R. 2876. An act for the relief of Beasley Engineering Co., Inc.;

H.R. 2948. An act for the relief of Maria Prescilla Caramanzana;

H.R. 3144. An act for the relief of Sung Nan Lee;

H.R. 3212. An act for the relief of Lee Ok Ja.;

H.R. 3379. An act for the relief of Sgt. 1c. Patrick Marratto, U.S. Army, retired;

H.R. 3464. An act for the relief of Maria Balluardo Frasca;

H.R. 3480. An act for the relief of the New Bedford Storage Warehouse Co.;

H.R. 3539. An act for the relief of Dr. Angela Zarbarte Fandino;

H.R. 3548. An act for the relief of Dr. Roberto de la Caridad Miquel;

H.R. 3990. An act for the relief of Harvey E. Ward;

H.R. 4064. An act for the relief of Ana Mae Yap-Diangeo;

H.R. 5072. An act for the relief of Demetroula Georgiades;

H.R. 5402. An act for the relief of Zumrut Sooley;

H.R. 6161. An act for the relief of Christopher Sloane (Bosmos);

H.R. 6583. An act for the relief of the American Journal of Nursing;

H.R. 6584. An act for the relief of Corbie F. Cochran, Jr.;

H.R. 6896. An act for the relief of Dr. Olga Concepcion Perez de Lanio; and

H.R. 9328. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide special pay to naval officers, qualified in submarines, who have the current technical qualifications for duty in connection with supervision, operation, and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants, who agree to remain in active submarine service for one period of 4 years beyond any other obligated active service, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Basil Rowland Duncan;

S. 586. An act for the relief of Nguyen Van Hue; and

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to extend the time for the making of a final report by the Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1437. An act for the relief of Cosmina Ruggiero;

H.R. 1708. An act for the relief of Al Bok Chun;

H.R. 1721. An act for the relief of William J. Hurley;

H.R. 1939. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie J. Hottenroth;

H.R. 1960. An act for the relief of Mario Santos Gomes;

H.R. 2275. An act for the relief of John Thomas Cosby, Junior;

H.R. 2315. An act for the relief of Josefina Policar Abutan Fuliar;

H.R. 2335. An act for the relief of Enrico DeMonte;

H.R. 2876. An act for the relief of Beasley Engineering Co., Inc.;

H.R. 2948. An act for the relief of Maria Prescilla Caramanzana;

H.R. 3144. An act for the relief of Sung Nan Lee;

H.R. 3212. An act for the relief of Lee Ok Ja.;

H.R. 3379. An act for the relief of Sgt 1c. Patrick Marratto, U.S. Army, (retired);

H.R. 3464. An act for the relief of Maria Balluardo Frasca;

H.R. 3480. An act for the relief of the New Bedford Storage Warehouse Co.;

H.R. 3539. An act for the relief of Dr. Angela Zabarte Fandino;

H.R. 3548. An act for the relief of Dr. Roberto de la Caridad Miquel;

H.R. 3990. An act for the relief of Harvey E. Ward;

H.R. 4064. An act for the relief of Ana Mae Yap-Diangeo;

H.R. 5072. An act for the relief of Demetroula Georgiades;

H.R. 5402. An act for the relief of Zumrut Sooley;

H.R. 6161. An act for the relief of Christopher Sloane (Bosmos);

H.R. 6583. An act for the relief of the American Journal of Nursing;

H.R. 6584. An act for the relief of Corbie F. Cochran, Junior; and

H.R. 6896. An act for the relief of Dr. Olga Concepcion Perez de Lanio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9328. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide special pay to naval officers, qualified in submarines, who have the current technical qualifications for duty in connection with supervision, operation, and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants, who agree to remain in active submarine service for one period of 4 years beyond any other obligated active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Kenneth E. Frick, of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

By Mr. HRUSKA, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Louis O. Aleksich, of Montana, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Montana.

Benjamin F. Holman, of the District of Columbia, to be Director, Community Relations Service.

George W. F. Cook, of Vermont, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Vermont.

James L. Treece, of Colorado, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Colorado.

Harold O. Bullis, of North Dakota, to be U.S. attorney for the district of North Dakota.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Glenn A. Olds, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Henry Loomis, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

COASTAL PLAINS REGIONAL COMMISSION

The bill clerk read the nomination of G. Fred Steele, Jr., of North Carolina, to be Federal Cochairman of the Coastal Plains Regional Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

FOUR CORNERS REGIONAL COMMISSION

The bill clerk read the nomination of W. Donald Brewer, of Colorado, to be Federal Cochairman of the Four Corners Regional Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

OTHER NOMINATIONS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I understand that there are nominations at the desk which were reported earlier today, too late to be included on the Executive Calendar. These nominations were reported unanimously from committee and have been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

In view of the pending recess until April 14, it is the intention to bring these nominations up for confirmation at this time, subject, of course, to the concurrence of all Senators. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of these nominations at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

U.S. MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Louis O. Aleksich, of Montana, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Benjamin F. Holman, of the District of Columbia, to be Director, Community Relations Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kenneth E. Frick, of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following the completion of business today until Monday, April 14, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized on Friday, April 4, and on Thursday, April 10, to receive and refer messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives, and that all committees of the Senate may be permitted on those days to file their reports, together with any minority, individual, and supplemental views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAR ON NARCOTICS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the efforts of the distinguished junior Senator from New York (Mr. Goodell) to prod the Federal Government into a recognition of its responsibilities to combat the increasing national traffic in narcotics recently drew recognition from the Washington Star, in a column by Crosby S. Noyes. Because I believe it will be widespread interest, I ask unanimous consent that the column, "It's High Time for All-Out War on Narcotics," be printed at this point in the Record:

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It's High Time for All-Out War on Narcotics

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

Everybody knows the chief cause of crime: Dope. Everybody talks about it, too. It has been asserted, for example, that if the traffic in narcotics could be halted, at least half the street crime in this country would stop. But in spite of all the talk, precious few are really trying to do anything about it.

One of those precious few is Sen. Charles E. Goodell of New York, who has launched a major campaign to prod the federal government into recognizing its obvious responsibilities. The campaign was kicked off by Goodell last week with a television appearance on a local New York City show. The show was a shocker that should have been seen nationwide.

The shock lay not in what the senator had to say about the relationship between narcotics and crime. That was old stuff; a recitation of the dismal facts about the multimillion-dollar profits, the agonized enslavement of hundreds of thousands of Americans and the billion-dollar appetite that drives the victims to crime.

What most people don't realize is just how incredibly little the federal government is doing to cut off the importation of hard drugs and to rehabilitate the users.

At present, according to Goodell, the feds spend $26 million a year trying to stem the flood of heroin, cocaine and morphine—estimated at 20 tons annually—that pours into the United States. This is less than the United States spends to enforce tobacco and alcohol regulations. It is the smallest budget of any major crime control effort. The figure of $26 million in the value of 250 pounds of heroin—an amount that has been confiscated in a single arrest. It is less than one-tenth the profit that organized crime makes out of importing narcotics. It is perhaps one-one-hundreth of the sum society pays in petty crime to keep addicts supplied.

And the result of this effort, which amounts to sending a troop of earnest Boy Scouts to turn back a tank assault, is just about what might be expected. About 10 percent of the hard stuff is intercepted at the border.

The government's record in rehabilitation is, if possible, even worse. Uncle Sam lavishes approximately $10 million a year on its treatment facilities in Lexington and Fort Worth. This is one-quarter of what New York State budgets every year in its effort to reclaim its narcotic victims.

In addition, some $4 million a year of federal money is available to state and local governments in grants for addict treatment programs. The unrehabilitated appropriate more than that from society at the point of a gun every day.

Sen. Goodell also makes an interesting argument that the narcotics industry is responsible for much of the present alienation of the black community.

Negroes are clearly the chief victims of the vicious crime that grows out of the dope users' limitless appetite. But their chief resentment is not directed at the human wreck who holds the gun at their heads and frequently pulls the trigger.

With unassailable logic, the victimized blacks place the blame on the white overlords of organized crime who import the hard stuff and who make it their business to see that thousands of children are converted every year into cash customers. And their distrust extends to the white "establishment" that finances flights to the moon and spends next to nothing to combat a chief cause of crime in the streets.

Goodell's proposal is simple and straightforward. He would double the number of investigative agents and triple the number of customs agents. In addition, he proposes that Congress should authorize grants of up to 75 percent for states and cities to build, staff and operate treatment facilities for addicts—treating the problem as the disease it is rather than as a crime. He would budget at least $40 million for the program.

The only criticism that can be leveled against the Goodell proposals is that they are too late and they may be too little. What is needed now, before any more time is lost, is a declaration of all-out war, by the administration and by Congress, on this clear and present danger to our society. And whatever the cost turns out to be, it will be the best investment the United States government ever made.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Air Force Military Construction Contracts

A report on the Air Force military construction contracts awarded by the Department of the Air Force without formal advertisement for the period July 1, 1968, through December 31, 1968 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Proposed Amendment of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1970 and 1971 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, and to amend the definition of "motor vehicle equipment" in the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Communications Satellite Corporation

A letter from the Chairman, Communications Satellite Corporation, transmitting pursuant to law, the report of the Corporation, for the calendar year 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Employment Security Financing Through Phased-Quarterly Collections

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the collection of the Federal unemployment tax in quarterly installments during each taxable year; to make status of employer depend on employment during preceding as well as current taxable year; to exclude from the computation of the excess the balance in the employment security administration account as of the close of the fiscal years 1970 through 1972; to raise the limitation on the amount authorized to be made available for expenditure out of the employment security administration account by the amounts so excluded; and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Admission Into the United States of Certain Defector Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Third- and Sixth-Preference Classifications of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reports Concerning Visa Petitions

A report from the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, pursuant to law, concerning visa petitions approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions third- and sixth-preference classification under the act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Jack W. Herbstreit

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Jack W. Herbstreit (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Report of the Smithsonian Institution

A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Institution for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"S. Res. 25

"A resolution memorializing Congress to amend the laws of the land regarding veterans, and directing distribution

"Whereas, those Americans who have served their country through active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States are among our most esteemed citizens; and

"Whereas, but for their steadfastness America would have fallen, a victim of the oppressor's heel; and

"Whereas, these men deserve special care and consideration by virtue of their service; and

"Whereas, in order to be admitted to a Veterans' Administration Hospital a veteran must attest to the so-called 'Pauper's Oath'; and

"Whereas, an annual income statement must be submitted for purposes of qualification for a veteran's pension, regardless of the age a veteran attains; and

"Whereas, Social Security and other Retirement Benefits must now be considered as income for the purpose of qualification for a veteran's pension, regardless of the age of the veteran.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the first session of the Thirty-second Oklahoma Legislature:

"Sec. 1. That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, memorialized to amend the laws of the land concerning veterans and veterans' affairs so as to eliminate the so-called 'Pauper's Oath' as a prerequisite to entrance by a veteran into a Veterans' Administration Hospital. The Congress of the United States is further requested to eliminate the annual income statement when the veteran reaches the age of seventy-two (72) years and to exempt Social Security and other Retirement Benefits from consideration as income after the veteran reaches the age of seventy-two (72) years.

"Sec. 2. That duly authenticated copies of this resolution, after consideration and enrollment, be prepared and sent to each member of the Oklahoma Congressional Delegation and to to the Chief Clerks of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

"Adopted by the Senate the 24th day of March, 1969.

"———— ————,

"President Pro Tempore of the Senate."

A joint resolution from the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"S.J. Res. 21

"A joint resolution of the 38th Legislature of the State of Utah memorializing the Congress of the United States to change the name of the Glen Canyon Dam to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

"Whereas, on March 31, 1953, the Interior Department made its report of findings on the proposed Upper Colorado River Storage Project, and

"Whereas, the following press release was issued by President Dwight D. Eisenhower on March 20, 1954:

" 'STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

" 'The White House.—I have today approved recommendations for the development of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

" 'The general plan upon which these recommendations are based has been prepared by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary's recommendations have been reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget. Legislation embodying the administration's recommendations are being prepared for introduction in the Congress.

" 'This is a comprehensive, well-planned development of a river basin. The close Federal-State cooperation upon which the Secretary's plan is based also carries out this administration's approach to water-resource development.

" 'The development will conserve water, enabling the region to increase supplies for municipal uses, industrial development, and irrigation. It will develop much-needed electric power.

" 'The development calls for sound financing. The legislation now being drafted will set up a fund for the entire project so that it will be constructed and paid for as a basin program.

" 'Construction of the Echo Park and Glen Canyon Dams, two of the large projects in the basin plan, is recommended. These dams are key units strategically located to provide the necessary storage of water to make the plan work at its maximum efficiency.

" 'The legislation being drafted will authorize a number of projects which will put to use the waters of the upper Colorado. This authorization will become effective following further consideration by the Secretary of the Interior, with the assistance of the Secretary of Agriculture, of the relation of these projects to the wise use and sound development of the basin.

" 'I am deferring my recommendation on the Shiprock unit of the Navajo project until the Secretary has completed his study.

" 'I hope the Congress will give early consideration to enactment of the administration's legislative proposal. I firmly believe development of the upper Colorado River Basin, in accordance with its provisions, is in the national interest.'

"Whereas, this was regarded as a precedent setting statement by the President: A strong opponent of the project wrote:

" 'No one in Washington seemed to recall that a President ever before had gone to such lengths to approve a western reclamation project. Many presidents had signed reclamation bills into law, but when, if ever, had a president given his personal endorsement to a single project with such unqualified support and in such a public manner? None could say.'

"Whereas, the President in a State of the Union message to Congress urged the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of the project and the appropriation of funds to get it under way.

"Whereas, fierce opposition to the project from some interests developed immediately and continued until they were finally defeated by the passing of the enabling legislation in 1956. Against all opposition, President Eisenhower steadfastly supported the proposed legislation until the fight for it was won. He approved it on April 11, 1956.

"Whereas, President Eisenhower's budget request for the project which was granted for the most part kept construction going during his two terms as President.

"Whereas, in view of the foregoing statements and other items not mentioned, it appeared that it was doubtful that this giant reclamation project would or could have been authorized without the President's hearty support.

"Whereas, the large body of water behind the dam has been named in honor of one of its most remarkable pioneers, explorer-scientist John Wesley Powell, who made a bold exploration of the upper Colorado River area in 1869. This year a national centennial will be held in his honor. It would seem to be highly proper to name the dam which helps create Lake Powell in honor of a distinguished war hero and leader of World War II, President, and statesman, who has done so much to help harness the turbulent Colorado and put it to work for the benefit and enjoyment of mankind.

"Whereas, former Senator Arthur V. Watkins in a letter to the President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and all members of the legislature, has recommended this resolution.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved that the 38th Legislature of the State of Utah, both houses concurring therein, does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to change the name of Glen Canyon Dam to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam.

"Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of State of Utah shall send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives representing the State of Utah.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah at Salt Lake City, this fourteenth day of March 1969.

"Clyde L. Miller,
"Secretary of State."

A telegram from the President of the Senate of France, expressing their condolences on the death of General Eisenhower, ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 89. Resolution to print additional copies of "The New Left" (Rept. No. 122);

S. Res. 169. Resolution to print a report by the Subcommittee on Roads, Committee on Public Works, entitled "Equal Employment Opportunity With Regard to Federal-Aid Highway Projects," as a Senate Document (Rept. No. 123);

S. Res. 171. Resolution to provide for the further printing of the annual report of the Special Committee on Aging (Rept. No. 124); and

S. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent Resolution to print as a Senate Document studies and hearings on the Alliance for Progress (Rept. No. 121).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 165. Resolution authorizing the printing of a report entitled "Crime Against Small Business" as a Senate document (Rept. No. 125).

DEVELOPMENT IN AGING, 1968—REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING (S. Rept. 119)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Williams), pursuant to Senate Resolution 223, adopted March 15, 1968, I submit a report from the Special Committee on Aging entitled "Developments in Aging, 1968," with minority views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HANSEN:

S. 1758. A bill to designate the Interstate System as the "Eisenhower Interstate Highway System"; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hansen when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH:

S. 1759. A bill for the relief of Maj. Louis A. Deering, United States Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1760. A bill for the relief of Ming Sin Yeung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARSON (for himself and Mr. Dole):

S. 1761. A bill to designate the Interstate System as the "Eisenhower Interstate Highway System"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1762. A bill for the relief of Filippos P. Balourdos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1763. A bill to increase certain loan limitations applicable to the regular business and the development loan programs of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONTOYA (for Mr. Talmadge):

S. 1764. A bill for the relief of Rosalie B. Bogash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 1765. A bill for the relief of Wong To Pan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. Mansfield):

S. 1766. A bill to provide for the disposition of a judgment recovered by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Flathead Reservation, Mont., in paragraph 11, Docket No. 50233, U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 1767. A bill for the relief of Lau Chun Piu; and

S. 1768. A bill for the relief of Angela Cordelia Villanueva-O; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 1769. A bill to assist individuals to obtain retirement benefits protected against increases in the cost of living by providing for the issuances by the Treasury of a new series of bonds containing adjustments, under certain conditions, in maturity and redemption values to compensate for increases in the cost of living which may be purchased by individuals and eligible institutions; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cannon when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE (by request):

S. 1770. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize payment of travel expenses of applicants invited by an agency to visit it in connection with possible employment; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGee when he introduced the above bill which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 1771. A bill to provide benefits for employees in the postal field service who are required in the interest of the Government to transfer to new duty stations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGee when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. Burdick):

S. 1772. A bill to provide that the Federal Government shall pay one-half of the cost of health insurance for Federal employees and annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGee when he introduced the above bill which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 1773. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a minimum income tax; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1774. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bills which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

S. 1775. A bill for the relief of Cora S. Villaruel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1776. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Griffin when he introduced the second above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE (for Mr. Pastore, and Mr. Pell):

S. 1777. A bill for the relief of Teresina Del Toro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1778. A bill for the relief of Denise R. Leclere;

S. 1779. A bill for the relief of Bogdan Bereznicki; and

S. 1780. A bill for the relief of Edward Anderson Mabin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the second above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. Baker, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Gore, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Schweiker, and Mr. Scott):

S. 1781. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Randolph when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Hart, and Mr. Mondale):

S. 1782. A bill to amend section 7(b) of the Small Business Act to provide for new interest rates on the Administration's share of disaster loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution to create a Commission To Study the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Burdick when he introduced the joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution expressing the support of the Congress, and urging the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private for the international biological program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Muskie when he introduced the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S.J. Res. 90. To enable the United States to organize and hold a Diplomatic Conference in the United States in fiscal year 1970 to negotiate a Patent Corporation Treaty and authorize an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1758—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL NAMING THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM AS THE "EISENHOWER INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM"

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to designate the Interstate Highway System of the United States as the Eisenhower Interstate System.

Dwight David Eisenhower was one of America's greatest leaders. He was a leader in war. He was a leader in peace.

A major accomplishment of the Eisenhower administration was the passage of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 which created the Interstate Highway System. This is reason enough for naming the Interstate System in honor of President Eisenhower.

However, unlike many of his predecessors in the Office of Presidency, Dwight Eisenhower never did represent a district or a State before he became President. Instead, he represented all of America. He was born in Texas; he grew up in Kansas. During his outstanding career, he had occasion to live in many parts of the Nation. He belonged to no geographic area.

Therefore, it is particularly fitting and proper that his memorial should be the magnificent Interstate Highway System which stretches the length and breadth of the United States.

Mr. President, similar legislation has been introduced in the other body, and I am honored to introduce this bill in the Senate to honor the 34th President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1758) to designate the Interstate System as the "Eisenhower Interstate Highway System," introduced by Mr. Hansen, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1769—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL ALLOWING THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT TO ISSUE CONSTANT PURCHASING POWER BONDS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill allowing the Treasury to issue constant purchasing power bonds, which could be purchased by individuals and certain institutional groups for retirement purposes.

Our senior citizens are facing a retirement income crisis unprecedented in the history of our country. An increasing number of retired workers living for longer retirement periods are discovering that inflation relentlessly nibbles away at their fixed incomes, until almost one-third of the 20 million Americans who are 65 years of age and over find themselves living in poverty. Conscientious, thrifty people who have saved throughout their working lives for a retirement of independence and dignity are dismayed by the realization that they may just as well have spent their income as they earned it because of the deterioration of the purchasing power of their savings.

It seems to me that the Federal Government has a responsibility to retirees who have productively contributed to the growth of our economy throughout their working lives. I do not believe that we should impose the burden of inflation on those whose income, with a purchasing power dependent on a past rather than a current economy, cannot absorb the shock of inflation.

To help solve this monumental problem, I recommend the enactment of legislation allowing the Federal Government to issue a bond that, if held to maturity, would be redeemed at face value, plus any increase reflected by the Consumers Price Index between the date of purchase and the date of redemption. Such securities could be bought in amounts not exceeding $10,000 in any 1 year or $60,000 in an individual's lifetime. They would not be transferable, would have a 20-year maturity period, and would have to be held to maturity for the cost-of-living adjustment to apply, unless the holder has reached the age of 60, died, or has become disabled.

In my judgment, a constant purchasing power bond would not only help to meet the urgent needs of our senior citizens, but also contribute to the reduction of inflation by drawing millions of dollars into savings. It is my hope that the Senate will give favorable consideration to this concept as a means of coping with an increasingly serious domestic economic problem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1769) to assist individuals to obtain retirement benefits protected against increases in the cost of living by providing for the issuances by the Treasury a new series of bonds containing adjustments, under certain conditions, in maturity and redemption values to compensate for increases in the cost of living which may be purchased by individuals and eligible institutions, introduced by Mr. Cannon, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1770—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL PROPOSING PAYMENT OF CERTAIN EXPENSES RELATED TO RECRUITMENT OF PROSPECTIVE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize Federal agencies to pay certain expenses related to recruitment of prospective Federal employees.

Under existing law, Federal agencies are not permitted to pay any of the expenses, not even a hamburger, for a young man or woman whom the agency wishes to interview for a job. This obviously puts the burden on the prospective employees to pay travel expenses, food, and lodging when he comes to Washington or some other city to interview with an agency. When the prospective employee is an honor graduate in the arts and sciences, whose talents are sought after by many employers, the Government is at a distinct disadvantage.

We now pay salaries which are comparable with private enterprise and we have revised some of the methods of recruitment to make Federal employment more attractive. This legislation is another step in the long journey of recruiting and retaining the best possible personnel for the Federal Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of purpose and justification by the Civil Service Commission be printed in the Record at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement of purposes and justification will be printed in the Record.

The bill (1770) to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize payment of travel expenses of applicants invited by an agency to visit it in connection with possible employment, introduced by Mr. McGee, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The material, presented by Mr. McGee, follows:

Statement of Purpose and Justification

PURPOSE

To improve the ability of Federal agencies to recruit well-qualified persons in shortage occupations.

JUSTIFICATION

The need for well-qualified professional and technical employees continues at a high level and shows no sign of diminishing. Department of Labor manpower estimates for the economy as a whole predict a 45% increase in employment in professional and technical occupations during the decade from 1965–1975. This growth has several major causes, including the rapid expansion in research and development activities, the tremendously rapid increase in application of technological improvements, and the increasing size and complexity of business organizations.

Current Commission projections of Federal manpower requirements indicate that by fiscal year 1971 agency needs for mathematicians, engineers, scientists and medical personnel will increase by at least 10%. Demand for social scientists and technicians will be equally high. Despite increased college enrollments, and even with greatly increased recruiting efforts, it is quite likely that Federal needs for top flight scientific and technical personnel will not be fully met.

To Federal recruiting officials, these forecasts can only mean that competition for highly trained and specialized personnel will remain very high. Our Federal laboratories must have technically trained and highly skilled employees if we are to be successful in such critical endeavors as medical research, military preparedness, and space activities.

The Federal Government should be able to attract its fair share of the best talent that our colleges and universities are producing. In occupations in which there are numerical shortages, there often are even more serious shortages of quality. Industry makes special efforts to attract the superior quality graduate. The Government as an employer must do all that it can to attract highly talented men and women.

Authorizing agencies to pay travel and transportation expenses of new employees to the first post of duty (Public Law 86–587) was a stride forward in placing the Federal Government in a more competitive position with industry. However, inability to pay interview expenses remains a serious obstacle. Therefore, major Federal employers of scientists, engineers and other personnel in short supply (Departments of Army, Navy, Air Force, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Veterans Administration, and Federal Aviation Agency) have recommended that legislation be sought to authorize payment for travel expenses of certain applicants invited to visit the agency to discuss employment.

Why is this authority needed?

(1) *To more nearly meet competition from private industry.* Private industry has recognized that the kind of equipment a man will have to work with, who his co-workers will be, and the kind of living conditions his family will have can all be important factors in selling him on a particular job. Twenty-five of twenty-six large AEC contractors pay the cost of travel to their plants or laboratories in connection with recruitment for important positions. Research and development contractors for the military services provide such travel expenses, and other private firms advertise that expenses of a visit to the company before employment will be paid.

A report of college placement bureaus compiled 3 years ago indicated that more than 80% of employers who recruit on their campuses provide for plant visits at company expense. A 1968 Prentice-Hall survey of 121 companies found that 87% of them pay some or all of an applicant's expenses for a plant interview. Of these 121 employers, 74% pay all expenses (including transportation, meals, lodging, and incidentals), 75% pay for meals, 76% pay for lodging and 85% pay for transportation. A recent CSC study of seven large private employers and two large public entities revealed that all nine of these pay the cost of transportation for plant visits in screening candidates for college level entry jobs.

(2) *To acquaint applicants with opportunities presented by Government employment.* In addition to the advantage of offering the rewards of public service—a factor which draws more young people to the Federal service each year—Government employment often provides unique challenges and opportunities.

This is especially true in the scientific and engineering fields. These benefits can be made so much more apparent in a plant visit that they can often more than compensate for the slightly lower starting salaries in the Federal Government. (The Army Materiel Command reports a difference of $2,253 per year at GS-5 and $1,000 per year at GS-7 with the average industrial starting salary for Bachelor level technical graduates in the 1967 fiscal year.)

(3) *To obtain a greater number of highly qualified applicants.* The demand for technical talent is such that the well-qualified scientist or engineer often does not have to go looking for a job—the job goes looking for him. Recruiting such a person often becomes a "selling" job.

In today's market most scientists and engineers will not make a decision on their professional career without personally visiting the place of employment. It is only natural to accept an offer from industry, where the applicant has visited the plant and met the officials, in preference to an offer from a distant and unknown Federal laboratory, even though the work at the Federal agency may appear to be more interesting and offer more challenge. Federal laboratories, equipment, and physical plant often surpass the best in private industry, and these things can be a powerful inducement for able scientists and engineers. But this advantage is lost unless we are able to bring qualified persons in to see them, and in appropriate cases to pay their travel expenses.

Similarly, applicants on civil service lists of eligibles who appear to be well-qualified, but who are not available for interview, are often passed over for persons not as well-qualified, but who were interviewed. Federal employers also do not want to buy without looking and this may result in the Federal Government not selecting the best available person.

It has been the experience of Federal employers in recent years that inability to pay these expenses is the governing factor in numerous declinations of job offers. To cite a few examples:

Navy reported 726 declinations out of the 945 offers made by 5 of their biggest labs. Without exception, the labs specified nonpayment of preemployment interview expenses as a primary reason for these declinations.

The Army Materiel Command reported that 32% of all those inexperienced scientists and engineers declining job offers listed the lack of opportunity to visit the work site at government expense as their *main* reason for declination.

One Air Force installation reported losing an average of 25 qualified research people per year to industry because of the inability to pay expenses for a plant interview.

All Naval recruiting activities—65 in total—mentioned inability to pay preemployment interview expenses as a major reason for declinations by qualified applicants in shortage categories.

74% of all Army Materiel Command applicants declining offers reported that they had visited the organization whose offer they subsequently accepted. Moreover, respondents visited an average of five companies each at company expense.

These illustrations are indicative of the need for authority to pay preemployment interview expenses. Total figures would undoubtedly be much higher. We can only conclude from such examples that the Federal Government has lost opportunities to obtain professional talent of high quality by inability to pay interview expenses.

(4) *To place the right man in the right position.* This is particularly important for the higher-grade, specialized, research positions, and is critical in the selection of a scientist to be a member of a research team where the ability to function in the particular working environment is extremely important. Such interviews enable a larger group to talk to the candidates and thereby provide a broader base for evaluating personal qualifications. Multiple evaluations may also result in consideration for alternative positions at the installation.

(5) *To eliminate misconceptions which we know exist in the minds of some applicants concerning Federal employment in general or employment at particular locations.*

(6) *To keep turnover at a minimum, particularly at isolated locations.* Despite agency efforts to give prospective employees complete and factual information about the working and living conditions at isolated installations, employees sometimes resign shortly after reporting for duty. This is very costly. Personal interviews at the work site will tend to uncover these sources of potential dissatisfaction before the appointment is made.

What are Federal agencies doing in the absence of authority to pay for interview expenses?

Federal recruiters, when visiting colleges and through telephone calls and correspondence, make every reasonable effort to encourage prospects to visit the work site at their own expense. The distance involved is an important factor in these efforts. Results are often disappointing.

One Naval activity reports: "We have in our files dozens of letters from applicants who have naively requested to visit the laboratory at Government expense. They assume that this is standard practice, as it is in industry. When we disillusioned them, their candiday, with rare exception, came to an abrupt end."

In the absence of authority to pay expenses for preemployment interviews, some agencies now conduct essential interviews near the applicant's home. Interviews are conducted by agency officials who may be traveling in the area for other purposes or who may be making the trip for the sole purpose of conducting the interviews. "Courtesy" interviews are conducted by officials of a nearby installation of the same agency as the prospective employer. However, both kinds of interviews have serious disadvantages. In addition to the absence of personal contact between employer and applicant:

(1) "Courtesy" interviews are usually not familiar with actual working and living conditions at the recruiting installation;

(2) Selecting officials are reluctant to depend on the judgment of a disinterested third party, particularly for high-level specialized positions;

(3) There is no opportunity to make multiple evaluations of a candidate;

(4) Time delays and some expense are encountered in arranging with third parties to conduct interviews and to furnish results to recruiting installations;

(5) There are travel costs for interviewing officials;

(6) In research organizations it is particularly desirable that interviews be conducted by key staff members who have a thorough knowledge of the research programs and can discuss them in terms of the technical knowledge of the candidates. When these key officials must travel extensively to conduct interviews, much of their time used for this purpose could otherwise have been profitably devoted to program duties at the work site.

What has been the experience of Federal agencies now authorized to pay these expenses?

Federal agencies are authorized to pay preemployment interview expenses when considering candidates for employment to positions excepted from the competitive civil service. The Comptroller General has ruled that in filling excepted positions, where the responsibility for determining the qualifications of applicants is vested in the agencies, the payment by them of any necessary expenses incident to the determination is proper if funds otherwise are available therefor.

Reports from the principal excepted agencies authorized paid preemployment travel show that this right has been used carefully and conservatively. No complaints of abuse have been made to the General Accounting Office.

Tennessee Valley Authority—All positions in TVA are in the excepted service. TVA policy is that payment for interview expenses may be authorized when deemed by the division incurring the expense to be necessary in the conduct of official business. Experience of TVA has disclosed no applicant abuse of the authorization to pay such expenses. In FY 1967, TVA hired 175 employees in shortage categories and authorized preemployment travel for 68 applicants.

Atomic Energy Commission—All positions in AEC are in the excepted service. AEC reports that the authority to pay these expenses has been used sparingly, but its use has been found necessary in the current competitive market for "quality" candidates. Invitational travel is not considered an additional cost. In most instances, in lieu thereof, AEC would have to send a representative to interview the candidate to accomplish an adequate evaluation of his qualifications. The cost then would include not only travel expenses for AEC's representative, but also his salary.

In FY 1967 AEC hired 277 shortage category employees and authorized preemployment interview expenses for 85 applicants.

AEC is not aware of any abuse on the part of candidates, such as travel for their own pleasure or convenience. Candidates who have accepted invitational travel for interview have usually accepted offers of employment.

Veterans Administration—Physicians, Dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery are in the excepted service.

VA uses its authority infrequently but regards it as an important recruiting factor in the cases where it is needed. In FY 1967, VA only used its authority to pay expenses for 46 applicants but it hired 5,195 employees in shortage categories.

How would the proposed legislation be administered?

Regulations governing travel under the proposed legislation would be prescribed by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, who now has the responsibility for prescribing other travel regulations.

The Civil Service Commission already determines those positions which fall into the category of "manpower shortages" for purposes of payment of travel and transportation expenses of new employees to first post of duty (Public Law 86–587). This responsibility is not treated lightly. There is a detailed procedure followed in making these determinations and the same procedure would be followed in authorizing payment of preemployment travel expenses.

Under this procedure agencies have to furnish to the Civil Service Commission *in advance* a statement showing the extent of the shortage by position and location. The agency justification must include such information as:

The total number of incumbents in the agency in the area in question;

The number of existing and anticipated vacancies in the next 12 months;

The length of time active but unsuccessful recruiting has been conducted;

The declinations because of lack of payment of travel and transportation funds;

A statement on the extent and nature of recruiting efforts and the results obtained from the use of paid and free advertising, contacts with schools, contacts with the local State Employment Service, etc.;

The extent to which it has been necessary to recruit outside of the area in which the vacancy exists;

Information on internal efforts to relieve the shortage such as job engineering and upgrading the skills of people already employed;

The general quality of recruits obtained and the prospects for obtaining better ones if travel costs are paid.

In evaluating agency requests the Commission independently examines existing registers to see how many qualified people are actually available, and how well qualified they are. As circumstances require, other pertinent sources of information are checked such as the U.S. Employment Service and the latest literature on the subject.

Funds to pay travel costs authorized by the draft bill would be secured by individual agencies through their appropriation requests to the Congress. Necessity for justifying funds to be used for this purpose and the generally limited amounts of agency travel funds in relation to travel needs will assure that individual agencies administer these provisions in the best interests of the agency and the Federal Service. The requirement that applicants must first be found qualified by a civil service examining office is added assurance that these interviews would come at a point just short of actual employment in the competitive service.

Students often express an interest in the Federal service some months before they are scheduled to complete their education. The proposed legislation has been drafted so as not to preclude from coverage this very important group of applicants who are considered "tentatively qualified." This means they have taken and passed any required test and have been rated qualified by an examining office. To be fully qualified they only need to finish the last few weeks of their education and receive their degree.

These applicants, still in school, but about to begin their working careers, comprise one of the Government's most important recruitment sources for engineer and scientific positions. Because of the intense competition with industry recruiters for this particular group of applicants, it is essential that Federal agencies be able to extend preemployment interview invitations to the students some weeks, or months, before graduation.

What will be the cost?

The estimated 6,250 payments to prospective employees would come out of agency travel appropriations and amount to about $970,000 per year. The actual amount, however, would be controlled by the Congress through its acceptance of agency requests for travel appropriations. Present estimates are based on the current list of "manpower shortage" occupations and agency estimates of cost and probably use of authority to pay preemployment interview expenses. These estimates do not take into account certain significant savings that can be expected, as for example:

Decreases in travel expenses of agency administrative officials who would no longer find it necessary to go to the applicant to conduct essential interviews.

Decreases in travel expenses and loss of working time of key scientists who would not be taken from their regular duties to travel about the country conducting interviews.

Decreases in turnover (especially at isolated locations) because applicants will have a clearer view of actual living and working conditions and can better decide whether or not they wish to accept the job offered.

Greater benefits from the funds already spent on recruiting because many applicants, who now go through the initial interview stage but drop out when they find no opportunity to visit the work site at Government expense, will go on to probable employment.

The present experience of the excepted agencies, TVA, AEC, and VA show their expenses to be under our estimate of about $155 per trip. The average cost reported for each preemployment interview traveler was for AEC $117.87, for TVA $67.81, and for VA $133.13. Therefore we feel our estimate is a generous one.

It is expected that costs would be absorbed in the regular travel budgets of the agencies concerned, and that no special appropriation would be needed.

The agency's ability to reimburse an applicant for his interview expenses might well tip the scale in favor of his accepting a "manpower shortage" category position. In this event, the money would be well spent.

S. 1771—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE CERTAIN BENEFITS TO EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide that the provisions of law which permit a "saved pay rate" for certain employees who have been reduced in grade through no fault of their own shall not be limited to just 2 years in the case of postal employees in the railway postal service whose jobs were abolished because of the discontinuance of railway postal service.

The proposed legislation is vitally important to former railway postal clerks whose pay rates were preserved for 2 years, but who now face a serious reduction in pay because the benefits of the law do not extend past 2 years. My bill, which received the very firm support of the Postmaster General in 1967, would waive the 2-year provision in this specific case.

The committee will schedule early action on this legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1771) to provide benefits for employees in the postal field service who are required in the interest of the Government to transfer to new duty stations, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1772—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO PROVIDE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHALL PAY ONE-HALF OF THE COST OF HEALTH INSURANCE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND ANNUITANTS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act to provide that hereafter the Government shall pay one-half of the cost of the high option health insurance plan carried by Federal employees. It is my hope that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service can schedule hearings in the very near future to consider this legislation.

The Federal Employees Health Benefits Act was a landmark piece of legislation when it was enacted in 1959. It provided the basic framework for a hospital and medical insurance protection program applicable to virtually all Federal employees without regard to their economic status and without a requirement that they pass a physical examination. In my opinion, it is one of the most successful and certainly one of the best administered programs in the Federal Government today. It is a monumental achievement for the distinguished members of our Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee who devised the program. Olin Johnston, who guided it through the committee and the Senate; Bill Langer, who made sure that the benefits provided would care for serious and lengthy illnesses; Dick Neuberger, Frank Carlson, Mike Monroney, and Ralph Yarborough, all of whom played a key part in its development.

One of the considerations in mind at the time the program was developed was that rank-and-file Federal employees cannot afford an expensive health insurance plan. The committee, therefore, provided that the Civil Service Commission would offer two levels of benefits, which have commonly been known as "high option" and "low option." Witnesses before the committee were virtually unanimous in their belief that the overwhelming majority of employees would choose "low option" because of the cost involved. Those who had the money could pay "high option" if they would pay all the difference between the "low option" cost and the "high option" cost.

That assumption was incorrect. Almost from the beginning, employees chose the "high option protection." They preferred to pay more in order to get more insurance protection. Today, nearly 90 percent of all employees covered by the program choose "high option" regardless of the carrier they select and apparently regardless of the cost. So it worked out that the presumption that the Government would pay one-half of the cost of the insurance provided was in error. When almost all employees covered behave differently than the way the committee, the Civil Service Commission, and even the employees themselves thought they would behave, it is fair to say the program should be reexamined.

From June 1960 until November 1964, the Government contribution of $6.76 per month for self-and-family coverage equalled 34.9 percent of the cost of "high option," and 47.6 percent of "low option" of the Service Benefit plan. When rates began to go up annually beginning in November 1964, the Government's contribution of $6.76 dropped from 34.9 percent to 28.4 percent of total cost through June 1966. After a statutory increase in the amount of the contribution in July 1966, the Government's share rose to 37.3 percent, and then dropped to a 1969 figure of 25.2 percent. All of that is under the Service Benefit plan, the euphemistic title of the Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a detailed analysis of the rate history of the health insurance program prepared by the Civil Service Commission which shows the cost to both the employee and the Government for high option and low option protection from the beginning until the present time. This is an excellent rate history of the program.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS PROGRAM

TOTAL ESTIMATED PREMIUMS FOR GOVERNMENT-WIDE PLANS AND SHARE PAID BY THE GOVERNMENT AND BY THE EMPLOYEES, 1968-69

Plan	1968		1969	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Service benefit plan (BC-BS):				
Total	$414,542,136	100.00	$495,313,692	100.00
Government contribution	130,768,344	31.55	132,150,276	26.68
Employee contribution	283,773,792	68.45	363,163,416	73.32
Indemnity benefit plan (Aetna):				
Total	138,311,604	100.00	179,733,972	100.00
Government contribution	46,433,280	33.57	48,322,008	26.86
Employee contribution	91,878,324	66.43	131,411,964	73.14
Both Government-wide plans:				
Total	552,853,740	100.00	675,047,664	100.00
Government contribution	177,201,624	32.05	180,472,284	26.73
Employee contribution	375,652,116	67.95	494,575,380	73.27

ENROLLMENT, DEC. 31, 1968, BY OPTION

	High	Low	Total
Service benefit plan:			
Total	1,308,650	166,864	1,475,514
Self only	354,313	44,550	398,863
Self and family	954,337	122,314	1,076,651
Indemnity benefit plan:			
Total	410,734	132,164	542,898
Self only	124,993	26,553	151,546
Self and family	285,741	105,611	391,352
Both plans:			
Total	1,719,384	299,028	2,018,412
Self only	479,306	71,103	550,409
Self and family	1,240,078	227,925	1,468,003

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS PROGRAM

[Total premium rates,[1] Government contribution rates,[1] employee contribution rates,[1] 1960-69, Government-wide plans, self and family coverage, by option]

Plan and option	June 1960–October 1961	November 1961–October 1962	November 1962–October 1963	November 1963–October 1964	November 1964–December 1965	January 1965–June 1966	July 1966–December 1966	1967	1968	1969
Service Benefit Plan (BC/BS):										
High option:										
Premium rate	$19.37	$19.37	$19.37	$19.37	$23.83	$23.83	$23.83	$28.30	$29.46	$35.23
Government contribution	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$8.88	$8.88	$8.88	$8.88
Percent of premium	34.9	34.9	34.9	34.9	28.4	28.4	37.3	31.4	30.1	25.2
Employee contribution	$12.61	$12.61	$12.61	$12.61	$17.07	$17.07	$14.95	$19.42	$20.58	$26.35
Percent of premium	65.1	65.1	65.1	65.1	71.6	71.6	62.7	68.6	69.9	74.8
Low option:										
Premium rate	$14.21	$14.21	$14.21	$14.21	$14.21	$14.21	$17.76	$17.76	$17.76	$18.07
Government contribution	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$8.88	$8.88	$8.88	$8.88
Percent of premium	47.6	47.6	47.6	47.6	47.6	47.6	50.0	50.0	50.0	49.1
Employee contribution	$7.45	$7.45	$7.45	$7.45	$7.45	$7.45	$8.88	$8.88	$8.88	$9.19
Percent of premium	52.4	52.4	52.4	52.4	52.4	52.4	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.9
Indemnity Benefit Plan (Aetna):										
High option:										
Premium rate	$17.46	$17.46	$17.46	$18.98	$23.51	$25.91	$25.91	$25.91	$29.03	$37.72
Government contribution	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$8.88	$8.88	$8.88	$8.88
Percent of premium	38.7	38.7	38.7	35.6	28.8	26.1	34.3	34.3	30.6	23.5
Employee contribution	$10.70	$10.70	$10.70	$12.22	$16.75	$19.15	$17.03	$17.03	$20.15	$28.84
Percent of premium	61.3	61.3	61.3	64.4	71.2	73.9	65.7	65.7	69.4	76.5
Low option:										
Premium rate	$13.52	$13.52	$13.52	$13.52	$13.52	$13.52	$13.52	$13.52	$15.16	$19.70
Government contribution	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$7.58	$8.88
Percent of premium	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	45.1
Employee contribution	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$6.76	$7.58	$10.82
Percent of premium	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	54.9

[1] Monthly.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there are other plans, and the statistical evidence on the Government's contribution to these have not been gathered. Some of the plans offered by Federal employee organizations are much broader and cost a good deal more than the Blue Cross-Blue Shield and Aetna plans. But in all cases the Government's contribution is exactly the same—$8.88 per month for self-and-family protection regardless of the plan or option chosen by the employee. The annual premium at the present time is more than $675 million for the Government-wide plans alone. Of this amount, the Government pays $180 million and the employees pay $494 million.

The bill that I introduce today will provide that from now on the agency contribution to the cost of health insurance will be adjusted at the beginning of each fiscal year to an amount equal to one-half of the cost of the least expensive Government-wide high-option insurance plan. This is a reasonable limitation. The budget people could estimate with some degree of accuracy in advance the amount of money necessary to pay additional costs arising from more expensive hospital and doctor bills. There would be a ceiling necessarily imposed because the Government would not pay more than one-half of the cost of either Blue Cross-Blue Shield or Aetna, whichever offered the least expensive "high option" plan. That dollar amount would be the Government's contribution to any plans offered locally or by a Federal employee organization. This would avoid any "blue sky" competition to see who could offer the most health insurance.

We started well ahead of the pack in 1959 when we created the health insurance plan. Today we are no longer out front. Although the Federal program is broad and offers some of the best health insurance plans available, it is not better than some plans in private industry and it is substantially more expensive for the employees than larger employers in the private sector of the economy offer. It is time to catch up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1772) to provide that the Federal Government shall pay one-half of the cost of health insurance for Federal employees and annuitants, introduced by Mr. McGee, (for himself and Mr. Burdick), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1773—INTRODUCTION OF FAIR SHARE TAX ACT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, today I introduce the Fair Share Income Tax Act of 1969. For many years I have been concerned that our income tax laws placed a heavy burden on those of small and modest means while at the same time providing the more affluent with special ways by which they can reduce—even escape—their tax load. These special provisions have made a mockery of the proposition that most citizens thought had been built into our tax structure, namely, that the more you earn the more income tax you pay.

Former Treasury Secretary Joseph W. Barr, testifying before the Joint Economic Committee earlier this year, made an eloquent plea for reforms in our income tax system when he said:

> Our income tax system needs major reforms now, as a matter of importance and urgency. That system essentially depends on an accurate self-assessment by taxpayers. This, in turn, depends on widespread confidence that the tax laws and the tax administration are equitable, and that everyone is paying according to his ability to pay.
>
> We face now the possibility of a taxpayer revolt if we do not soon make major reforms in our income taxes. Revolt will not come from the poor but from the tens of millions of middle-class families and individuals with incomes of $7,000 to $20,000, whose tax payments now generally are based on the full ordinary rates and who pay over half of our individual income taxes.
>
> The middle classes are likely to revolt against income taxes not because of the level or amount of the taxes they must pay but because certain provisions of the tax laws unfairly lighten the burdens of others who can afford to pay. People are concerned and, indeed, angered about the high-income recipients who pay little or no Federal income taxes. For example, the extreme cases are 155 tax returns in 1967 with adjusted gross incomes above $200,000 on which no Federal income taxes were paid, including 21 incomes above $1 million.

Secretary Barr spoke with deep conviction founded upon his experience as one of the Nation's leading fiscal officers. Since the date of his testimony before the Joint Economic Committee, January 17, 1969, we have heard and read much on the probabilities of income tax reform. A study is now being conducted by the House Ways and Means Committee which, hopefully, will result in meaningful and comprehensive reform. We also hear reports that the Nixon administration may delay implementing any tax reforms until 1971.

Certainly, there is no doubt that some of the areas marked out for reform will require additional thorough study to determine their effect on the Nation's economy. However, there are questions upon which we can all agree and in which reforms should be implemented as soon as possible.

The bill I introduce today, Mr. President, is, I believe, one of those upon which there can be a general agreement. What I propose is that we insure that those best able to pay income taxes do, in fact, pay income taxes. This, as my bill details, can be done by the imposition of a minimum tax. Stated simply, the proposal amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide new tax tables for those who under the existing law, by taking advantage of such provisions as the allowances for depletion, depreciation, and capital gains, have only minimum tax liability, or no tax liability at all. The rates would vary as they do now ranging from 7 to 35 percent. In addition, there is a provision for a minimum corporate income tax.

Mr. President, passage of this bill will not remove all the inequities in our present tax structure. It does not affect several defects, the correction of which I have supported in the past and will continue to support. For instance, it does not ease the burden of those with children in college, a matter which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Ribicoff) has dealt with in previous Congresses, and one on which I expect to support him again in the near future. It does not increase personal exemptions from $600; it does not exclude as gross income the first $5,000 of civil service retirement; it does not provide head-of-household benefits to certain single persons; it does not modify the oil depletion and capital gains allowances—all of these changes which I support.

Passage of my proposal, Mr. President, is intended to accomplish one simple result: to insure that those with the ability to pay would in fact pay their fair share of income taxes. It would be a start toward improving and perfecting the income tax structure, one of our country's strongest assets. The other changes which I have cited and which equity requires should be incorporated in the comprehensive reform being developed in the House Ways and Means Committee and adopted as promptly as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1773) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a minimum income tax, introduced by Mr. Hart, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1774—INTRODUCTION OF DESIGN PROTECTION ACT OF 1969

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, today the proposed Design Protection Act of 1969. The purpose of the legislation is to provide effective protection for original ornamental designs from unauthorized copying.

The need for the legislation has been established in hearings before the Patents Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. The legislation was approved by the Senate in previous Congresses but has been unsuccessful in the House of Representatives. In this Congress a number of bills similar to the one I propose have been introduced in the House, and it is hoped that they will be favorably considered. It is my belief that the equity of this proposal will again result in favorable action by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1774) to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying, introduced by Mr. Hart, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1776—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP IN THE HONOR OF THE LATE DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the life and service of the late Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

In 1811, Thomas Jefferson said:

> Politics, like religion, hold up the torches of martyrdom to the reformers of error.

In 1964, Martin Luther King said:

> The Negro is willing to risk martyrdom in order to move and stir the social conscience of his community and the Nation.

To the shock and sadness of millions, Martin Luther King's risk became a reality on that fateful day a year ago.

Mr. President, Dr. King died so that others of his race might live in freedom.

To millions of Americans, he was the prophet of the Negroes' quest for racial equality, their voice of anguish, their champion for human dignity.

While I offer this legislation today to memorialize this great civil rights leader, the measure of the man and his movement is already memorialized by the fact that his crusade goes on with a new sense of urgency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1776) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., introduced by Mr. Griffin, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1779—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL FOR RELIEF OF BOGDAN BEREZNICKI

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the bill I introduce grants authority to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to reopen the claim of Bogdan Bereznicki for compensation for family property confiscated in Poland during World War II. This legislation is necessary to right the wrong he suffered as a result of an incorrect ruling by the Immigration and Naturalization Service for which there is now no administrative remedy.

Mr. Bereznicki first approached me in early May 1967 for help in appealing the decision of the Immigration and Naturalization Service that he had forfeited his citizenship by his service in the Polish Army. On the basis of the Immigration Service ruling, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission was forced to deny his claim.

A series of court and administrative decisions relating to the supposed forfeiture of his citizenship led to a ruling that Mr. Bereznicki had, in fact, continuously been a citizen from the date of loss as required by the Claims Commission, but by this time the jurisdiction of the Commission had expired and it was unable to consider this new evidence.

While the bill does not presume to judge the merits of the claim, it does emphasize my conviction that equity requires that this lifelong citizen have the same consideration under the law as had other citizens who were unaffected by an erroneous decision by their Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1779) for the relief of Bogdan Bereznicki, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1781—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ALLOW DISABLED WORKERS TO RECEIVE BOTH SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS AND WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal section 224 of the Social Security Act. This legislation will correct a serious inequity resulting from the Social Security Act by the amendments of 1965. Section 224 provides for reduction in social security insurance benefits payable to a disabled worker and his family who are receiving workmen's compensation. Presently, this restriction applies if the total monthly benefits of the two programs exceed 80 percent of his average current earnings before he became disabled.

The unfairness of this provision is further compounded by its application only to those persons who become eligible for disability insurance benefits after December 31, 1965. It does not apply to those who were already receiving these benefits.

As of December 1967, 9,965 disabled worker families, involving a total of 29,796 beneficiaries, were affected by this section of the act. The average monthly reduction in social security benefits for a disabled worker with no dependents was $53.57. The reduction for a worker with one or more dependents was $158.42. In some cases a worker's social security benefits have been totally eliminated due to receipt of workmen's compensation.

The total number of persons subjected to the workmen's compensation offset provision may not be large. However, the effect of this reduction of a beneficiary's monthly payment is significant.

It is my belief that this provision places an unjust burden upon our workmen injured on the job and their families. These workers have encountered a serious financial setback by loss of their ability to participate fully in the employment market and, therefore, loss of potential income.

It is possible that in some cases beneficiaries may receive excessive benefits if this section is repealed. But this would be preferable to the continuation of a policy that results in insufficient payments in the majority of cases.

Mr. President, I am pleased to have as cosponsors of this measure the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the senior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1781) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 88—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION TO CREATE A COMMISSION TO STUDY THE BANKRUPTCY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I introduce today legislation creating a Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States. A similar measure, Senate Joint Resolution 100, passed the Senate in the second session of the 90th Congress, but too late for the other body to act.

The purpose of the Commission envisioned by Senate Joint Resolution 100 was to "study, analyze, evaluate, and recommend changes to the Bankruptcy Act, in order for such act to reflect and adequately meet the demand of present technical, financial, and commercial activities." Every witness testifying on the proposal indicated the overwhelming need for such a study.

The amazing 1,000 percent increase in the number of bankruptcies during the past 20 years and the jump in consumer credit from about $7 billion in 1939 to about $100 billion today demands that we give our full attention to the continuing validity of our Bankruptcy Act, which has not been significantly updated for 30 years. As chairman of the special Bankruptcy Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, I will make every effort to bring this proposal to the full Committee at the earliest possible date.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Senate Joint Resolution 88 be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 88) to create a commission to study the bankruptcy laws of the United States, introduced by Mr. BURDICK, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 88

Whereas the number of bankruptcies in the United States has increased more than 1,000 per centum annually in the last twenty years; and

Whereas more than one-fourth of the referees in bankruptcy have problems arising in their administration of the existing Bankruptcy Act and have made suggestions for substantial improvement in that Act; and

Whereas the technical aspects of the Bankruptcy Act are interwoven with the rapid expansion of credit which has reached proportions far beyond anything previously experienced by the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas there appears to be little experience or understanding by the Federal Government and the commercial community of the Nation in evaluating the need to update the technical aspects of the Bankruptcy Act and the financial policies pursued by the Federal Government and the commercial community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall study, analyze, evaluate, and recommend changes to the Act entitled "An Act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898 (30 Stat. 544), as amended (title 11, United States Code), in order for such Act to reflect and adequately meet the demands of present technical, financial, and commercial activities. The Commission's study, analysis, and evaluation shall include a consideration of the basic philosophy of bankruptcy, the causes of bankruptcy, the possible alternatives to the present system of bankruptcy administration, and all other matters which the Commission shall deem relevant.

(c) The Commission shall submit a comprehensive report of its activities, including its recommendations, to the President and the Congress within two years after the date of enactment of this joint resolution. Upon the filing of such report, the Commission shall cease to exist.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall be composed of the following members appointed as follows:

(1) three members appointed by the President of the United States, one of whom shall be designated as Chairman by the President and two of whom shall be active practitioners in the field of bankruptcy law;

(2) two appointed by the President of the Senate;

(3) two appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and

(4) two active full-time referees in bankruptcy appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States.

(b) Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(c) A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers. Any vacancy shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Referees in bankruptcy and any other employees of the Federal Government who are members of the Commission shall serve without additional compensation. Each member from private life shall receive $100 per diem for each day (including travel time) during which he is engaged in the actual performance of his duties as a member of the Commission. All members of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties.

Sec. 3. The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution. Such appointments shall be without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and such compensation shall be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

Sec. 4. To carry out the purposes of this joint resolution, the Commission shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations—

(1) to obtain any research or other assistance it deems necessary;

(2) to prescribe such rules and regulations as it deems necessary governing the manner of its operations and its organization and personnel;

(3) to enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, and such contracts or other arrangements or modifications thereof may be entered into without legal consideration, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5);

(4) to make advance, progress, and other payments which it deems necessary without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 529);

(5) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and reimburse them for travel expenses, including per diem, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code; and

(6) to acquire by lease, loan, gift, bequest, or devise, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real or personal property of all kinds necessary for or resulting from the exercise of authority under this joint resolution.

Sec. 5. Any office, department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive or judicial branches of the United States Government shall furnish to the Commission, upon a reimbursable basis, such advice, information, and records as the Commission may require for the performance of its duties.

Sec. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 89—INTRODUCTION OF JOINT RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF AN INTERNATIONAL BIOLOGICAL PROGRAM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, this Nation's efforts to preserve and enhance the quality of the environment are seriously hindered by our lack of knowledge concerning the operation of the natural system—the ecosystem—of which man is a part, and the effects of man's massive alterations of that system.

Some say that environmental degradation is the price of prosperity, but I contend that environmental quality and economic affluence are both possible. Indeed, the latter is impossible without the former. Our current dilemma results from our ignorance of the interrelationship between man and his environment.

A significant program, designed to provide information about man and his environment, is the international biological program—IBP. Today, the IBP pools the activities and talents of some 2,000 international scientists from 53 countries who are concerned enough to participate in a global research effort. It is an effort dedicated to the important task of acquiring vitally needed knowledge about the systems which support life, and where polluted degrade the quality of life.

The joint resolution which I offer today on behalf of myself and Senators Boggs, Cooper, Dole, Eagleton, Harris, Montoya, and Nelson, supports the U.S. participation in the international biological program through the National Science Foundation, the U.S. National Committee for the IBP, and the Inter-Agency Coordinating Committee. Working together, these agencies have the responsibility for planning, coordinating, and carrying out this program in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be referred to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the authorizing committee for the National Science Foundation, and that the text of the joint resolution be inserted in the Record at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received, and by unanimous consent, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 89) expressing the support of the Congress, and urging the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private for the international biological program, introduced by Mr. Muskie, was received, read twice by its title, by unanimous consent referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 89

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Congress hereby finds and declares that the international biological program, which was established under the auspices of the International Council of Scientific Unions and the International Union of Biological Sciences and is sponsored in the United States by the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering, deals with one of the most crucial situations to face this or any other civilization—the immediate or near potential of mankind to damage, possibly beyond repair, the earth's ecological system on which all life depends. The Congress further finds and declares that the international biological program provides an immediate and effective means available of meeting this situation, through its stated objectives of increased study and research related to biological productivity and human welfare in a changing world environment.

(b) The Congress therefore commends and endorses the international biological program and expresses its support of the United States National Committee and the Interagency Coordinating Committee which together have the responsibility for planning, coordinating, and carrying out the program in the United States.

(c) In view of the urgency of the problem, the Congress finds and declares that the provision by the United States of adequate financial and other support for the international biological program is a matter of first priority.

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress calls upon all Federal departments and agencies and other persons and organizations, both public and private, to support and cooperate fully with the international biological program and the activities and goals of the United States National Committee and the Interagency Coordinating Committee.

(b) For this purpose, the Congress authorizes and requests all Federal departments and agencies having functions or objectives which coincide with or are related to those of the international biological program to obligate or make appropriate transfers of funds to the program from moneys available for such functions or objectives and provide such other support as may be appropriate.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 90—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION TO ENABLE THE UNITED STATES TO ORGANIZE AND HOLD A DIPLOMATIC CONFERENCE IN THE UNITED STATES IN FISCAL YEAR 1970 TO NEGOTIATE A PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold a diplomatic conference in the United States in fiscal year 1970 to negotiate a Patent Cooperation Treaty.

The proposed joint resolution has been requested by the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific resolution to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this resolution, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the proposed resolution be printed in the Record at this point, together with the letters from the Assistant Secretary of State dated January 16 and March 17, 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and letters will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 90) to enable the United States to organize and hold a Diplomatic Conference in the U.S. fiscal year 1970 to negotiate a Patent Cooperation Treaty and authorize an appropriation therefor, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 90

Whereas all countries issuing patents, and especially countries such as the United States having an examination system, deal with large and constantly growing numbers of patent applications of increasing complexity; and

Whereas in any one country a considerable number of patent applications duplicate or substantially duplicate applications relating to the same inventions in other countries, thereby increasing further the volume of applications to be processed; and

Whereas a resolution of the difficulties attendant upon duplications in filings and examination would result in more economical, quicker, and more effective protection for inventions throughout the world thus benefiting inventors, the general public and governments; and

Whereas a treaty for international patent cooperation providing a central filing, search and examination system should provide a practicable means of resolving the difficulties arising out of the duplications in the filing and examination of patent applications; and

Whereas governments concerned with international patent problems have spent a number of years in consultation and in the development of a draft treaty for international patent cooperation to alleviate these problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with other concerned departments and agencies, are authorized to take all necessary steps to organize and hold a diplomatic conference to negotiate a Patent Cooperation Treaty in Washington, District of Columbia in fiscal year 1970.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum not to exceed $175,000 for the purpose of defraying the expenses incident to organizing and holding such an international conference. Funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for expenses incurred on behalf of the United States as host government, including without limitation personal services without regard to civil service and classification laws, except that no salary rate shall exceed the maximum rate payable under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code; employment of aliens, printing and binding without regard to the provisions of any other law; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under section 5707 of title 5, United States Code; rent or lease of facilities in the District of Columbia or elsewhere by contract or otherwise; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and official functions and courtesies.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, or either of them, are authorized to accept and use contributions of funds, property, services, and facilities for the purpose of organizing and holding such an international conference. For the purpose of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, any gift, devise, or bequest accepted by the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Commerce under authority of this Act shall be deemed to be a gift, devise, or bequest to or for the use of the United States.

SEC. 4. The head of any department, agency, or establishment of the United States is authorized on request, to assist with or without reimbursement the Department of State and the Department of Commerce in carrying out the functions herein authorized, including the furnishing of personnel and facilities.

The letters, presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT, follow:

MARCH 17, 1969.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: With my letter of January 16, 1969 to the Vice-President I submitted a proposed Joint Resolution which would enable the United States to organize and hold a Diplomatic Conference in the United States in fiscal year 1970 to negotiate a Patent Cooperation Treaty, which was referred to your Committee on January 17, 1969.

This proposed legislation has been favorably reviewed by the Department of State in the light of the policies of the present Administration. It would be greatly appreciated if this matter would be given early and favorable consideration.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that from the standpoint of this Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this letter reaffirming our support for the proposed Joint Resolution.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 16, 1969.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I submit herewith a proposed Joint Resolution which would enable the United States to organize and hold a Diplomatic Conference in the United States in fiscal year 1970 to negotiate a Patent Cooperation Treaty, and which further provides for an appropriation authorization to the Department of State for expenses incident to organizing and holding the Conference.

There is widespread recognition in the United States and abroad that a world-wide multilateral effort is necessary to deal with the pressing back-log problem of examining patent offices such as the United States, and to alleviate the financial and legal burdens imposed on American patent applicants who wish to file abroad in several countries. Quicker and lower-cost patent protection for American nationals is vital to the development and maintenance of important export markets for many U.S. products.

The proposed Patent Cooperation Treaty would have substantial benefits for patent applicants as well as patent offices. It would be the first significant world-wide step toward international patent cooperation to deal with pressing patent problems. If the negotiation of such a Convention is successful, it would, of course, be sent to the Senate for its advice and consent in accordance with the usual procedure.

I hope that the Senate will be able to give favorable consideration to this request during the present session.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department was advised by the Bureau of the Budget on January 15, 1969 that from the standpoint of the Administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MUSKIE. I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 309) to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, again in behalf of the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 335) to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1487) to extend to the personnel of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to combat pay of members of the Armed Forces.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1494) to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1519) to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1532) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make certain secondary boycotts, regardless of motive, an unfair labor practice, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the junior Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1612) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, to require that the label of drug containers, as dispensed to the patient, bear the established name of the drug dispensed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Nelson), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the senior Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1693) to establish a National Commission on Federal Tax Sharing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. Allen), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Ervin) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1706) to strengthen the antiobscenity laws in order to protect minors against the distribution or sale of obscene materials through the mails or interstate commerce, to establish the Division of Obscenity Control in the Department of Justice, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Griffin), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cook), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Dole), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Hollings), the Senator from Utah, (Mr. Moss), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Spong), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower) be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 84) to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF THE EULOGIES ON DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. MUSKIE (for Mr. Dirksen), submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) authorizing the printing of the eulogies on Dwight David Eisenhower, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Muskie, which appears under a separate heading.)

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO RECOGNIZE THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OPENING OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a Senate concurrent resolution to extend congressional recognition to this summer's 10th anniversary observance of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The anniversary will occur on June 26, 1969. During the 2-week period, June 26 to July 7, 1969, festivities will be held by the eight Great Lakes States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin, as well as by the Canadian Provinces of Manitoba and Ontario.

Joining with me in cosponsoring the concurrent resolution are the distinguished Senators from Illinois (Mr. Dirksen and Mr. Percy), the Senators from Indiana (Mr. Hartke and Mr. Bayh), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart), the Senators from Minnesota (Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Mondale), the Senators from New York (Mr. Javits and Mr. Goodell), the Senators from Ohio (Mr. Young and Mr. Saxbe), the Senators from Pennsylvania (Mr. Scott and Mr. Schweiker), and the Senators from Wisconsin (Mr. Proxmire and Mr. Nelson).

The conference of Great Lakes Senators, headed by Senator Proxmire; the Governors of the eight Great Lakes States; and the Prime Ministers of the Provinces of Manitoba and Ontario are currently in the process of planning appropriate programs and events to commemorate the Seaway's 10th anniversary.

A Governors' committee, 10th anniversary, St. Lawrence Seaway, has been formed; and the Great Lakes Commission has been designated to serve as the central coordinating agency for the event.

In addition, the Departments of State, Transportation, Commerce, and Defense are cooperating in planning and presenting the program.

Mr. President, the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway—formally dedicated on June 26, 1959, by President Eisenhower and Queen Elizabeth—represents a milestone of major progress in creating a stronger economic link between the United States and markets, people, and nations around the globe.

Authorized by the so-called Wiley-Dondero law in 1954, Public Law 83–358, the completed waterway also stands as a symbol of joint United States and Canadian efforts to build, improve, and modernize the St. Lawrence Seaway for the mutual benefit of the people of both countries.

Stretching 2,342 miles into midcontinent North America, the St. Lawrence Seaway has opened to the populous, resource-wealthy heartland vast, new opportunities of world commerce.

During its first 10 years, both in terms of tonnage and value of shipments, the Seaway has confirmed time and again the wise investment that it was.

Mr. President, I believe it is significant to note—at this time of national mourning—that the late President, General Eisenhower, considered construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway one of the greatest legislative accomplishments of his 8-year administration.

It is a tribute to this great American's foresightedness and confidence, that the 10th anniversary will be celebrated in an atmosphere of hope and optimism for the future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) which reads as follows was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Con. Res. 17

Concurrent resolution to recognize the tenth anniversary of the opening of the Saint Lawrence Seaway

Whereas the Saint Lawrence Seaway, as a joint project of Canada and the United States, has been of inestimable benefit to the United States and the entire North American Continent; and

Whereas the tenth anniversary of the official opening of the Saint Lawrence Seaway occurs on June 26, 1969; and

Whereas the Governors of the eight States bordering on the Great Lakes plan to sponsor appropriate ceremonies during the period from June 26, 1969, through July 7, 1969, to observe the tenth anniversary of the Saint Lawrence Seaway: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress recognizes the great benefits the Saint Lawrence Seaway has provided in stimulating economic development and prosperity not only within the region of the Great Lakes-Saint Lawrence Seaway system, but throughout the entire United States and the North American Continent, and commends the celebration, during the period from June 26, 1969, through July 7, 1969, of the tenth anniversary of the opening of the Saint Lawrence Seaway to all Americans.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 18—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE PROCUREMENT AND PLACEMENT IN THE CAPITOL OF A BUST OF DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. PEARSON (for himself and Mr. Dole) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Con. Res. 18

Concurrent resolution to authorize the procurement and placement in the Capitol of a bust of Dwight David Eisenhower

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Library is authorized and directed to procure a marble bust of Dwight David Eisenhower, and to cause such bust to be placed in the Capitol in a space the Joint Committee deems suitable.

Sec. 2. Expenses incurred by the Joint Committee on the Library in carrying out this concurrent resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers approved by the chairman of the Joint Committee.

SENATE RESOLUTION 177—RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF A MANUSCRIPT ENTITLED "THE FIRST ARMY IN EUROPE" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. THURMOND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 177) which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 177

Resolution authorizing the printing of a manuscript entitled "The First Army in Europe" as a Senate document

Resolved, That the manuscript entitled "The First Army in Europe," written by

Colonel Elbridge Colby, be printed with one map as a Senate document, and that fifteen hundred additional copies of such document be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE RESOLUTION 178—RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF THE PRAYERS OF THE CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE DURING THE 89TH AND 90TH CONGRESSES AS A SENATE DOCUMENT (S. REPT. NO. 91-120)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 178) authorizing the printing of the prayers of the Chaplain of the Senate during the 89th and 90th Congresses as a Senate document (S. Rept. No. 91-120) which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina which appears under a separate heading.)

SENATE RESOLUTION 179—RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE UNITED STATES SHOULD ACTIVELY PARTICIPATE IN AND OFFER TO ACT AS HOST TO THE 1972 UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on December 3, 1968, the United States joined with Sweden and 49 other member nations of the United Nations in supporting a resolution to convene, not later than 1972, an international conference on the human environment. Sweden and her able representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Astrom, are to be commended for taking the initiative in proposing this international conference, and for their offer to act as the host country. The world is facing an environmental crisis of constantly increasing proportions, and nothing short of an international effort can hold out any real hope for mankind in the face of that crisis.

The earth is only so large; it will not grow. Three and one-half billion people are in effect riding a spaceship—the earth. We are converting material and energy for our use, and generating wastes in the process. The total environment of the world—the rivers, the lakes, the land, and the atmosphere—is burdened with the byproducts of our consuming society. As a result, the delicate ecological balance on which our survival depends is in serious danger of being upset.

No nation can afford to consider its environment as though it were a private preserve. History has convinced us that peace and freedom are secure only when they are universal, and the quality of our environment demands the same perspective.

The nations of the world must develop ecological consciences, an awareness that we are all a part of a single ecosystem developed over eons of time. Our alteration of that ecosystem puts a heavy responsibility on man to manage the quality of the environment to assure his own survival and the survival of those other species essential to life on earth.

As the world's most highly industrialized nation, the United States has been guilty of environmental mismanagement, but we have developed significant programs to control and abate the degradation of our environment. We bear a special responsibility to exercise world leadership in this area.

The resolution which I introduce today authorizes the State Department to pledge the full support and participation of the United States in accomplishing the conference objectives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution, the United Nations' resolution, Ambassador Wiggins statement of December 3, 1968, and Ambassador Astrom's statement of July 19, 1968, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the resolution, and statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. RES. 179

Whereas air and water pollution, erosion, and other forms of soil deterioration, waste, noise, and the secondary effects of biocides greatly endanger the quality of the human environment;

Whereas the problems of human environment respect no international boundaries and are cause for the concern of all people;

Whereas the world's increasing population and accelerating urbanization continually enlarge the dimensions of the problems concerning human environment;

Whereas the United States, as the world's most highly industrialized and developed nation, suffers most acutely from problems affecting the human environment, has taken initial steps to deal with them, and bears a special responsibility to exercise world leadership in developing methods of preserving environmental quality;

Whereas the world community, and the developing countries in particular, can benefit from a sharing among the various nations of the experience and knowledge acquired about environmental problems and their solutions;

Whereas intensified action and cooperation among nations is clearly necessary to preserve and protect mankind against dangers to his environment;

Whereas the Twenty-Third Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, on December 6, 1968, in recognition of the urgent need for international cooperation in solving the problems of human environment, adopted Resolution 2398 (XXIII) which provides for the convening in 1972 of a United Nations Conference on Human Environment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States should actively support and participate in such Conference, and should undertake such preparation as may be necessary to enable the United States so to participate and otherwise to maximize its contribution to such Conference and the activities thereof.

The material, presented by Mr. MUSKIE, follows:

TEXT OF U.N. RESOLUTION[1]

THE PROBLEMS OF HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

The General Assembly,

Noting that the relationship between man and his environment is undergoing profound changes in the wake of modern scientific and technological developments.

Aware that these developments, while offering unprecedented opportunities to change and shape the environment of man to meet his needs and aspirations, also involve grave dangers if not properly controlled,

Noting, in particular, the continuing and accelerating impairment of the quality of the human environment caused by such factors as air and water pollution, erosion and other forms of soil deterioration, waste, noise and the secondary effects of biocides, which are accentuated by rapidly increasing population and accelerating urbanization,

Concerned about the consequent effects on the condition of man, his physical, mental and social wellbeing, his dignity and his enjoyment of basic human rights, in developing as well as developed countries,

Convinced that increased attention to problems of the human environment is essential for sound economic and social development,

Expressing the strong hope that the developing countries will, through appropriate international co-operation, derive particular benefit from the mobilization of knowledge and experience about the problems of human environment, enabling them, *inter alia,* to forestall the occurrence of many such problems,

Having considered Economic and Social Council resolution 1346 (XLV) of 30 July 1968 on the question of convening an international conference on the problems of human environment,

Bearing in mind the important work on some problems of the human environment at present being undertaken by organizations in the United Nations system, in particular the United Nations (including the Economic Commission for Europe), the International Labour Organisation, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the World Meteorological Organization, the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization and the International Atomic Energy Agency, as referred to in the report of the Secretary-General on activities of United Nations organizations and programmes relevant to the human environment,[2]

Aware of the important work being done on problems of the human environment by Governments as well as by intergovernmental organizations such as the Organization of African Unity and non-governmental organizations such as the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, the International Council of Scientific Unions and the International Biological Programme,

Bearing in mind the recommendations of the Intergovernmental Conference of Experts on the Scientific Basis for Rational Use and Conservation of the Resources of the Biosphere,[3] convened by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, with the participation of the United Nations, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the World Health Organization.

Convinced of the need for intensified action at the national, regional and international level in order to limit and, where possible, eliminate the impairment of the human environment and in order to protect and improve the natural surroundings in the interest of man,

Desiring to encourage further work in this field and to give it a common outlook and direction,

Believing it desirable to provide a framework for comprehensive consideration within the United Nations of the problems of human environment in order to focus the attention of Governments and public opinion on the importance and urgency of this question and also to identify those aspects of it that can only or best be solved through international co-operation and agreement,

---

[1] U.N. doc.A/RES/2398 (XXIII); adopted on Dec. 3 without objection.

[2] U.N. doc.E/4553.

[3] U.N. doc.A/7291.

1. *Decides*, in furtherance of the objectives set out above, to convene in 1972 a United Nations Conference on Human Environment;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Develop, to submit to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session, through the Economic and Social Council at its forty-seventh session, a report concerning:

(*a*) The nature, scope and progress of work at present being done in the field of human environment;

(*b*) The main problems facing developed and developing countries in this area, which might with particular advantage be considered at such a conference, including the possibilities for increased international co-operation, especially as they relate to economic and social development, in particular of the developing countries;

(*c*) Possible methods of preparing for the Conference and the time necessary for such preparations;

(*d*) A possible time and place for the Conference;

(*e*) The range of financial implications for the United Nations of the holding of the Conference;

3. *Further requests* the Secretary-General, in preparing the report, to consult Governments of States Members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies and of the International Atomic Energy Agency and appropriate organizations of the United Nations system, and to draw on contributions from appropriate intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations.

United States Joins in Proposing 1972 U.N. Conference on the Problems of the Human Environment

(Statement by Ambassador Wiggins)

(Note.—Following is a statement by James Russell Wiggins, U.S. Representative to the General Assembly, made in plenary session on December 3, together with the text of a resolution adopted by the Assembly that day.)

The United States is privileged to join with Sweden and 49 other nations in a resolution to convoke, not later than 1972, an international conference on the problems of the human environment. We join in this proposal with a deep sense of the importance of this subject for every nation, and with admiration for the initiative of Sweden and her able representative, Ambassador Astrom.

The evidence of mankind's gathering environmental crisis does not have to be sought in books or in scholarly documents. City dwellers on every continent of this crowded earth see it, hear it, smell it, absorb it, and suffer from it.

It is in our air—filled with the noxious fumes of factories, furnaces, builders, wreckers, trains, trucks, buses, boats, aircraft, and automobiles by the scores of millions.

It is in our lakes and rivers—suffocated by fertilizers that drain from our farmlands and polluted by an ever-growing flood of industrial, agricultural, and chemical wastes.

It is on our land—more and more of which is buried under the encroaching megalopolis or poisoned by pesticides or wounded by strip mining and timber cutting or strewn with the ugly rubbish of our fabulous productivity.

Despite tardy efforts to relieve these conditions, they pose a rising threat to human wellbeing in every nation and community, at whatever stage of development.

In the last century, a mere tick on the celestial clock, we have loosed upon the earth such a mass of humanity and such a torrent of energy as to transform much of it beyond recognition. For the first time, we are brought face to face with the stark facts that space upon this planet is finite, that the resources of this planet are exhaustible and not easily renewed. We are made aware that by his sheer numbers and his heedless ingenuity man can injure his environment so as to hasten his own extinction. We have not much time left in which to learn to proportion our population to available resources and to become good enough trustees of our inherited wealth of air, water, earth, and forms of life so that our posterity may hope to survive in a condition better than bestial struggle.

THE AMERICAN EXPERIENCE

The United States, as a highly industrialized nation, is well acquainted with these environmental problems and has begun, however, belatedly, to mobilize considerable efforts to attack them. It may be useful for me to give a few examples, not forgetting that our American problems are but illustrations of a world problem.

The extent of a people's capacity to transform their environment, for better or for worse, corresponds very closely with the amount of energy they consume. Since the middle of the 19th century, while the population of the United States has multiplied ninefold, this nation's consumption of energy has multiplied by about 25. It is still increasing and at an accelerating rate; in less than 20 years it will be half again what it is now. This rising expenditure of energy has brought our people many good results. It has relieved us of backbreaking drudgery, given us undreamed-of creature comforts, lengthened our lives and brightened them with books, pictures, music, travel, and recreation. But along with these blessings, a host of unintended and unwanted byproducts have made the word "pollution" a part of our daily vocabulary.

Every year in the United States 142 million tons of smoke and noxious fumes, over 1,400 pounds per capita, are dumped into the atmosphere.

Every year this nation discards 7 million automobiles, 20 million tons of paper, 48 billion cans, 26 billion bottles and jars. Much of this material, made of aluminum and plastics, is virtually proof against decay. One wonders what archeologists of some future age will think of us when they dig these things up.

Every year the American mining industry discards more than 3 billion tons of waste rock and mill tailings.

Every year American lakes, rivers, and estuaries receive some 50 trillion gallons of hot water, used for cooling by the power industry, and unknown millions of tons of organic and chemical pollutants from our cities, farms, and industrial plants.

POLLUTION OF LAKES AND STREAMS

A brief glance into American history reminds us of what a change we have wrought in our natural environment, especially our waters.

The Hudson River, which our Secretary-General can see as he looks west from his office window, was described by Henry Hudson, who first saw it in 1609, as "clear, blue and wonderful to the taste." In colonial days salmon were plentiful. A hundred years ago giant sea sturgeon were caught and stacked like cordwood on Hudson River wharfs, and their caviar, not yet popular in this country, was exported by the ton to Russia. Ten to twenty million pounds of oysters were harvested in the lower Hudson as late as 1880.

Today most of the lower Hudson, from Albany to the sea, is so polluted with the wastes of cities and factories that it is unfit for drinking or swimming and of little value for fishing or even boating. Oysters and clams have virtually disappeared. The worst stretches of the river have been described in such phrases as "a torrent of filth" and "one great septic tank." It will take a billion dollars and a 10-year program, only now getting underway, to restore this beautiful river. The Hudson, by the way, originates in the Adirondack Mountains in a lake called Tear of the Clouds. No wonder the clouds weep.

Other American rivers, with far less concentration of population and industry upon their shores, have also sunk into degradation.

When Captain John Smith, one of the earliest Virginia settlers, first saw the Potomac River, its waters were so clear that he could see the bottom in several fathoms. He described it as "fed with many sweet rivers and springs" and frequented by otter, beavers, martens and sables, and fish so thick that he and his men attempted to catch them in a frying pan. He wrote: "Neither better fish, more plenty or variety, had any of us ever seen in any place."

A description of that same Potomac 350 years later appears in a recent report of the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty:

"As the Potomac slowly flows through the nation's Capital, its load of silt, filth and acid from farms, mills and mines blends with discharge from overloaded sewers to nourish an algae bloom and a summer stink that rises from the river for miles below the metropolis."

There again, a long and costly program of rehabilitation will be required before the river is restored to health.

A similar story can be told about the pollution of Lake Erie, the Mississippi, the Androscoggin, and hundreds of other American lakes and streams.

POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS IN THE UNITED STATES

Such is the dark side of the story in America. There is a bright side, or brightening at any rate. In the past few years, the United States has seen a rapid acceleration of programs of conservation and pollution control at many levels of government and in private industry as well. The Federal Government has embarked on a 5-year, $3.5 billion program to help cities build modern sewage treatment plants. New York State voted 2 years ago to raise a billion dollars to clean up the State's rivers.

New York City alone plans to invest $2 billion in the next 10 years for clean air, clean water, and clean streets. Within 5 years it plans to complete its system of modern sewage treatment for the 1.3 billion gallons of the city's daily water supply. This will improve the waters around the city enough to open miles of new city beaches to public recreation.

In the fight on air pollution, city after city has tightened its regulations. New York City powerplants have drastically reduced the sulfur content of their fuels. A month ago this city began operating a computerized air monitoring system to warn against pollution crises and to gather knowledge for better controls. All such efforts are aided by nationwide limits, now being set by the Federal Government, on the amounts of harmful exhaust which new automobiles may emit, beginning with 1968 models and due to be further tightened by 1970.

American private industry also is spending increasing amounts to control pollution. Its controls on air pollution alone are estimated to cost $800 million a year. The American oil industry is spending $382 million in 1968 to combat water pollution.

Even these figures are small compared with probable investment in all forms of pollution control in the United States over the coming decades—a figure which has been estimated at well over $200 billion.

Our remedies are still several jumps behind the problem; in some cases we seem to be gaining on it; but we still have a long, long way to go, and there is much that we have yet to learn.

A WORLD CONCERN

Mr. President, I have cited these facts about the United States not because they are unique but rather because they are typical of the environmental predicament of every industrial society, especially those in a stage of rapid growth.

Pollution is no respecter of nations, cultures, or economic systems. Consider Lake Baikal, that almost sacred lake among the virgin pine and larch forests of Soviet Siberia, 420 miles long and the oldest and deepest body of fresh water on earth. The crystal-pure waters of Baikal contain a thousand species of plants and animals known nowhere else. It is famous the world over as a unique laboratory for the botanist, zoologist, and student of evolution. Over a year ago, despite protests from scientists in the U.S.S.R. and abroad, pulpmills began to discharge their sulfurous effluents into the waters of the lake. Similar pollution problems afflict other waters in the Soviet Union, such as the Angara River, with its vast electric power and manufacturing complex, and the sturgeon fisheries on the Volga River and the shores of the Caspian Sea.

In the heart of Western Europe, the story is much the same. There is no more sorrowful victim of industrial progress than the fabled River Rhine—that "valley of sweet waters" of which Lord Byron sang a century and a half ago. The Rhine in recent decades has had to struggle ever harder against the industrial wastes of the Ruhr, which have turned some of its tributaries into open sewers.

The prevalence of such conditions in industrial areas has, fortunately, not gone unnoticed by the developing nations. Their growing concern for problems of the human environment has been manifested in many ways—among others, by the large number of such nations that are cosponsors of the present resolution in this Assembly.

As we approach the second Decade of Development, these nations wisely desire to achieve the benefits of development at the least cost in damage to their natural environment. They can well take warning from the past mistakes of other countries, including my own.

The universality of these conditions is one reason why pollution of the human environment has become a world problem calling for the concerted efforts of the world community.

POLLUTION CROSSES BOUNDARIES

But there is another reason. Our cities, industries, and farms operate on such a scale that their physical environment is literally the whole planet, with its all-encircling ocean of both air and water. Manmade pollution crosses every boundary, riding the wind and rain, the rivers and ocean currents, the bodies of migrating fish and birds.

The Conference on the Human Environment is sure to have high on its agenda such global pollution problems.

What, for example, are we going to do about long-lasting pesticides, such as DDT, which are sprayed on crops at a rate of over 100 million pounds a year? Minute concentrations of them can be lethal to fish and birds and to the ocean plankton which are a vital link in the chain of life. DDT has been detected in places as remote as Antarctica. How can we prevent a rising level of such pollutants throughout the world?

What are we going to do about the rapidly rising quantities of inorganic nitrogen fertilizer which drain from the farmlands of the world into lakes, rivers, and estuaries and which combine with urban sewage to rob these waters of their oxygen and their ability to support life? How can this pollution be curbed without hampering the worldwide effort to grow more food?

What are we going to do to prevent contamination by radioactive wastes from the growing number of nuclear power stations throughout the world? In the present generation, for the first time since the world began, all of us have been exposed to manmade sources of radiation whose effects are still not fully known.

What steps should we take to preserve the immense diversity of the earth's plant and animal species? It is this diversity that gives stability to the intricate balance of living nature in every environment. In the industrial century just past, over 70 species of mammals alone have been exterminated—more than in the previous 2,000 years. Today some 100 other animals species face the same danger.

What are we going to do about the accidental spilling of oil from tankers and other ships? Since the *Torrey Canyon* disaster of 1967, there has been some advance in methods of combating this menace. But such accidents continue to occur with devastating effects. And with the giant tankers of yesterday being dwarfed by the 300,000-ton monsters now coming off the ways, the potential for future disasters is great.

And what are we going to do about the steadily rising burden of carbon dioxide in the earth's atmosphere? Already in the past 100 years, since fossil fuels began to be burned in huge quantities, atmospheric carbon dioxide has increased close to 10 percent. This increase will probably total about 25 percent by the year 2000, given the rapidly accelerating rate of fuel consumption. Will the resulting "greenhouse" effect cause a permanent warming of the earth's climate, and perhaps even a rise in the world sea level as the polar icecaps melt? No one is sure, though much of human destiny could depend on the answer.

One could mention many other problems common to industrial nations which will surely be considered by the Conference on the Human Environment, such as the safe and economical disposal of solid wastes; the preservation of forests and groundcover, whose loss has been a prime cause of catastrophic floods in many lands; the ever-rising clamor of noise that surrounds our cities, our factories, our highways and airports the world over; and not least important, the education of our children to respect and defend their environment—for without the support of public opinion nothing enduring can be achieved.

In this discussion I have sought to concentrate on the concrete and practical. But when we speak of the threat to our natural environment, we inevitably think also of a threat to our minds and spirits. As one Soviet conservationist, Miss V. Sagalova, recently wrote: "It is impermissible to consider forests only as a source of timber." In much the same vein our United States Supreme Court said a year ago in deciding against a proposed dam project: "A river is more than an amenity, it is a treasure."

It would be tragic indeed if man, in exchange for his fabulous power to mine and manipulate his environment for particular technical ends, should lose his more ancient power to relate to that same environment to feel his primeval kinship with it, to wonder at it, and draw strength and solace from it. This power is deep in our nature. We are incomplete if we do not express it. One American naturalist, Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, believes that in today's industrial-urban civilization "man is building his own zoo," a cage that cramps his nature as surely as the bear's nature is cramped as he paces behind the bars. I do not think it sentimentalism to include this among the unintended ill effects of our dazzling industrial progress.

STEPS TOWARD A SOLUTION

Mr. President, experience tells us that our manifold environmental problems are not going to be solved automatically by any economic system, whether that of the free market or that of the state planner. The hope for their solution lies in our own purposeful decisions to uphold, even at considerable cost, certain values that we cherish, such as respect for the beauty and vulnerability of our earthly surroundings and a provident regard for our posterity. These values can find effective expression only in the collaboration of natural and social scientists, governments, businessmen, engineers, and good citizens; people with the requisite knowledge and the requisite power to decide, mobilize, organize, and lead. To raise the efforts of all these people to a sufficient level and to organize them on a world scale will be the purpose of the Conference on the Human Environment.

Fortunately, there is already a momentum of action by many international bodies which bodes well for the conference 4 years hence. Ambassador Astrom ably described many of these actions by both governmental and scientific organizations in his address here this morning. It was these accelerating activities that led up to Sweden's initiative in the Economic and Social Council last July and hence to the draft resolution that now lies before this Assembly.

All this takes place at a time of rapid growth in the science and technology of environmental improvement. There is thus an increasing reservoir of knowledge and experience in many countries on which the proposed conference can draw. The conference should be able to bring to many nations a better knowledge of the processes of change in our living environment and the best and cheapest means of preventing its deterioration.

It should strengthen efforts to regenerate those environments already seriously impaired and, what is equally important, forestall the depredations that await the natural environments of those lands only now entering upon industrial development.

Indeed, let us all hope that governments will not wait for the conference of 1972 before taking energetic action to relieve and repair the wounds we have inflicted on nature and on ourselves. All in authority, surely, should act without delay to apply the correctives that are already known. The period between now and 1972 should be one of ferment, not only of preparation for the conference but of practical action in every field: new scientific work, technical and administrative development, training of qualified manpower, public education, and political decision.

Mr. President, I believe that the environmental problems we now ask the General Assembly to consider will appear, in the perspective of years, as of incomparably greater importance to the human species than those political dissensions to which, because they arouse such dangerous passion, we must devote such a great part of our days and nights at the United Nations. As one contemplates the future that will be in store for all the children of men if society does not address itself to these problems, one is struck by the irrelevance of many of the issues that have for so long engaged our close attention.

One morning recently, just at dawn, I stood at the window of the American Embassy on the 42d floor of the Waldorf looking eastward toward the rising sun, which lifted slowly above a great bank of cloud and smog. I thought of how the river and the land and the sky must have looked when Western man first came to these shores and how everything had changed. As I watched in gloomy contemplation, a great plane traversed the now brightening sky above the cloud bank. Then a morning breeze stirring in those high altitudes began to twist the vapor trails that it left behind until they slowly formed themselves into a vast interrogation point in the eastern heavens.

And I know the question that was asked in the skies. It was: "Can man on this planet survive his own fecundity and his own folly?" That is the question, Mr. President, and the time is at hand when the nations of the earth must answer it.

Statement by Ambassador Sverker Aströn, on the Question of Convening an International Conference on the Problems of Human Environment

We are now embarking on a debate which, by any reckoning, must be considered an important one. The quality of human environment is a matter of direct importance to all human beings. The air we breathe, the water we drink or use for various industrial purposes, the soil from which we draw our sustenance of life, the oceans which are the repositories of living organisms which produce food and oxygen, are the components of our environment. Their interaction determines the conditions of life on this planet of ours.

It is a hard and frightening fact that all these components, due to many factors, most of which have to do with rapid industrialization and urbanization, are undergoing deterioration at an ever increasing scale and at an ever accelerating rate. At the same time the need is growing to plan ahead, to try to avoid in the future the mistakes in the past which have made so much of our present environment unhealthy, unpleasant or ugly and which threaten, if not corrected in time, the wellbeing, the progress and, ultimately, the survival of man.

This is the first time that one of the principal organs of the United Nations tries to come to grips with this problem which, together with the necessity of rapid economic and social development, must be viewed as one of the compelling issues of our time. Indeed, these two are interrelated, inasmuch as due attention to the quality of environment is a prerequisite of sound economic and social development.

It may be said that human environment is too vague and too general a concept to allow for a comprehensive and cohesive discussion. We do not feel that this is so, and I will briefly indicate why.

History can be seen, from one aspect, as a process of continuous interaction between man and his physical environment. By using the natural resources around him, man changes his environment in order to improve his conditions of life. Many of the changes are lasting achievements which benefit everybody. Others are of short-term advantage, perhaps only to small groups, but make life difficult in the long run for the large majority and, ultimately, for all.

Conversely, man, as an individual and as a social being, is influenced by the natural surroundings. If these change, the impact is felt on the state of man's mental and physical health, on his total living conditions, be they related to food, work, housing or social relationships.

Never before has man possessed such powerful means to change his environment as today. Natural resources are used on a scale which could not be imagined only a few decades ago. Population grows at a rate unparalleled in history. Science and technology provide an ever increasing number of people with enormous opportunities to change the environment. The pressure on the natural resources increases.

In certain parts of the world the environment is, in fact, undergoing serious deterioration and, in some cases, destruction. This means that natural resources are depleted and that processes are set in motion which, if unchecked, will drastically change and damage the conditions for human life. This phenomenon is clearly visible in countries in an advanced stage of industrialization and urbanization. As more countries approach and enter this phase of development, the problem becomes more serious. A worldwide exchange of knowledge and experience is required to prevent repetition of mistakes made.

During previous historical epochs, when conditions for human life in a certain geographical region were destroyed through human action, civilization could flourish in another region, and movements of population could take place. When the natural environment is destroyed in the world of today, no emigration can solve the problem, neither from one part of the planet to another, nor to another planet. There is no escape from the problems created by the depletion of resources and by disturbances in the living systems on the thin surface of the earth between soil, water and atmosphere.

If the pressure against the natural resources increases beyond the point of regeneration, nature is ruined and cannot be restored. There is a point of no return. Determined efforts must be made to stop developments which bring this point nearer.

The facts are well known, and I will not tire you with repeating them in any detail. But I think it might be useful if I briefly review the dimensions of the problem.

The basic components of the physical environment of man are fertile soil, fresh water of high quality and of sufficient quantity, living oceans and air of the right composition and the right temperature. The quality of these four basic components is dependent on the living organisms—from the microscopic algae and soil microbes to the most developed forms of life and to man himself. The quality of environment is in other words dependent on the interaction of all these forms of life, on the maintenance of balanced ecological systems. In the last analysis, the continued existence of man is dependent upon how these four basic components continue to play their respective roles in the cycles of the living world.

Nature regenerates itself, but if man by the use of techniques, which are exclusive to man, intervenes in these processes beyond the limits that nature tolerates, nature is ruined and cannot be regenerated. There is a point of no return beyond which no meaningful life is possible.

Serious mistakes that have brought us close to, and sometimes beyond, this point have been made in the countries that are generally described as developed. It is of the utmost importance that they are not repeated in areas of the world that now undergo rapid industrialization and urbanization.

May I now say a few words about each one of the four basic components of the physical environment. It is a well known fact of history that many civilizations have been destroyed by the erosion of the soil. In old times when the number of men was comparatively small, new areas with virgin fertile soil could be found, when the old ones were destroyed. In our age the whole globe is populated, and no large new regions are available once the old regions have grown less fertile. It is more important than ever that soils are maintained as fertile as possible and, in particular, that none are being destroyed beyond the possibility of regeneration. However, in spite of this knowledge soil erosion continues on a global scale, as becomes clear from an examination of numerous studies made by scientific institutions, FAO and many other bodies.

The mechanism of soil erosion varies between the different climatic zones. In the temperate regions wind erosion and the lowering of the ground water levels constitute the most serious problems. When the cities and the industries use up too much of the ground water, the soils grow drier and the situation gets more serious.

In certain highly industrialized regions water is used to such an extent that rain and snow only replace one third of what is used. We already see the signs of water scarcity in these too densely populated and industrialized regions.

The same problems, although partly due to other factors, are found in the tropical regions. The situation there is complicated by the fact that many tropical soils are even more sensitive than the soils of the temperate regions. If such soils are left without cover, the hot sun changes the soil to a leathery surface.

The next step is that the soil grows hard as brickstone. This laterized soil cannot be used any more and must be left as a desert. No technique is known by which laterized soil could be made fertile again.

The second component of the physical environment is water.

In many temperate regions, where nature has supplied man lavishly with fresh water, this asset has been used as if it could never come to an end. The rich countries in those regions have for that reason treated the water resources in a careless way. Rivers and lakes are used as recipients for all the wastes and poisons of the cities and industries usually without any purification of the effluents. A particular problem in this field which is causing serious misgivings and has necessitated governmental action in my country is the spread of methylated mercury.

The degradation of the quality of the fresh water has accelerated even more than expected because of the introduction of phosphate-containing synthetic detergents, which fertilize the lakes to such an extent that they ultimately die. The situation rapidly develops in this direction. In many cases the degradation has reached the point where no self-purification is possible in the limited time span man has at his disposal. The end phase of the destruction of a lake is a hydrogen sulphide stinking body of water where the fish has died.

Simultaneously, due to the extensive use of water in cities and by industries, the ground water level sinks dangerously low.

The mistakes which have led to this situation should not be repeated in those countries that now enter the phase of industrialization and urbanization. These countries may still steer the development in a better direction.

The coastal waters are in many places used as dumping places for wastes from cities and industries. Often it is not the emitting industry or even the polluting country that is first hurt in these cases. Other nations, other population groups can get their life conditions changed and endangered. The water currents and the fish do not know any borders. International regulations are indeed badly needed if the problems are to be solved.

May I here also point to the dangers constituted by oil, dangers which have been dramatized by a well-known recent catastrophe and which are increasing at an alarming rate.

Furthermore, the disturbances created by man can lead to, and have lead to, the extinction of whole species of fish etc., thereby causing not only severe strains on the food situation in the world and great difficulties to the economy of the fishing nations. The extinction will also cause changes in the metabolism of the oceans which are difficult to anticipate. It is necessary that these matters are considered again internationally.

Still bigger disturbances of the living systems in the oceans seem to be impending.

Only one danger will be mentioned here. The pesticide DDT is very resistant to detoxification and degradation in nature. This was thought to be an advantage when DDT was introduced two decades ago. This substance is thus active for years after it has given the planned results. The winds, the waters and all their inhabitants have spread DDT to all the corners of the world, and is to be found in the body fat and nervous tissues of all living beings, including man. According to a scientific report from the spring 1968 1/1000 of a gram of DDT in thousand kg of water may lower the metabolism of the algae by 75 per cent. This is a direct threat to the life of the algae, since hundreds of thousands of tons of DDT are spread over the continents every year, and of which a major part ultimately finds its way to the oceans.

The algae in the oceans supply the atmosphere with three quarters of the oxygen. We may thus endanger even the vitally important oxygen content of the air.

The algae also constitute the basic food for all the marine organisms. If the existence of the algae is threatened, then all life of the kind we know is also threatened.

As to the third component, the air, I would like to make the following observations.

The air pollution that we now hear so much about is caused by the finely divided particles and the gases that are transported by the winds. A major part of these very small particles in the atmosphere are the result of human action in cities, in industries and in agriculture. In the air of the cities these finely divided particles become charged with the gaseous substances emitted in all kinds of combustion activities, like heating, motors, reduction of electric energy, burning of wastes, etc., polluted particles seem to be one of the major causes of the increase in lung diseases like cancer and chronic bronchitis. Careful planning and the strict observance of certain rules are necessary if these hazards are to be limited or eliminated. Again, past mistakes must be avoided when planning the future expanding cities, their traffic and industry.

The enormous emission of particles to the atmosphere may cause a cooling of the surface of the earth, because part of the sunlight is reflected away. A car driving at 35 miles an hour emits around 1 billion particles a second. The corresponding figures for aircraft flying at high speed are truly astronomical. Even if such an extreme situation is not impending, smaller changes in the climate of the world could be caused by the reflecting particles.

The increasing reflection of solar energy by the dust particles is counteracted by another process. Mankind combusts at the moment the reserves of fossil fuels that are stored in the earth crust millions of years ago. This combustion gives an increase in the atmosphere's content of carbon dioxide. Carbon dioxide counteracts the heat emission from the earth. This mechanism could thus cease an increase in the temperature.

No definite answers to which process may be the more important are available at the moment. What is evident, however, is that man has already rendered the temperature equilibrium of the globe more unstable.

In this context may I briefly refer to the problem of noise? In a near future this problem which in earlier times seemed to be limited to cities and industries, may become more general when supersonic aircraft are introduced also for civilian use. The medical experts know that large groups of people, exposed to strong intermittent noise for long periods, may be damaged physically and mentally. Hundreds of millions of people may be exposed to intense noise without being able to protect themselves—in order to allow relatively few people to reach their destinations a few hours earlier.

It is quite obvious that the totality of the problems that I now refer to are made immeasurably more difficult and complex as a result of rapid urbanization. The huge increase of the population in the cities invariably provokes an enormous pressure on the environment.

The cities of Europe increased at the highest rate at the end of the 19th century. The rate of increase seldom exceeded 2 per cent a year. In spite of this rather low rate on increase—low when compared to the rate of increase found in the now developing countries (approaching an average of 5 per cent a year)—the cities did not succeed in solving the waste and pollution problems in a rational way. The results of the lack of waste and pollution management now place the cities of the industrialized countries before problems that are exceedingly difficult to solve. A city which had from the beginning taken these problems into account would have kept the expenses for environmental monitoring and control down, expenses that are now necessary if these cities are to survive in the long run.

The cities have not been built to cope with modern traffic, even less with the industrial pollution and the environmental poisons. These problems are and will be increasingly facing the old industrialized nations during the next decades. The mistakes committed should not be repeated by the nations now entering the necessary path of rapid industrialization.

A high degree of planning in rapidly expanding cities seems to be an absolute necessity. Nobody can know exactly how a city should be constructed to suit the inhabitants in an optimal way. This depends, to a large extent, on political considerations and social value judgments. But there is general agreement that environmental destruction caused by deficient sewage systems and polluted air should not be allowed to occur. Such problems may be solved without too large expenditures if plans are made in time, but they cannot be solved inexpensively if the planning is delayed for too long a time, as has happened in many industrialized nations.

We firmly believe that political considerations and social value judgments are shared around the world to such an extent that there is, in fact, general agreement also on what should and could be done, in a positive manner, to plan the future development of cities in such a manner that the people living in them are spared the stresses and sufferings, alarming crime rates, and social disturbances of all kinds, characteristic of many cities at the present time.

What I have now said indicates the complexity of the problems involved, but it also, I hope, serves to define them. What we are concerned with here is, in the first place, how to limit and, if possible, to eliminate the evil side-effects which might follow upon the utilization of science and technology. It is obvious that if economic development is to take place at a rate and on a social scale adequate to meet the growing expectations of a growing world population, all natural resources will have to be used to the full and in the most economic manner. But it would be a mistake, and one with potentially momentous consequences for mankind, if we did not do our utmost to avoid the deleterious side-effects of such utilization. It is true that there can sometimes be a conflict, at least in the short run, between the interest of rapid development on one hand and the preservation of the environmental quality on the other hand, but if a price has to be paid, it should be done in complete knowledge of the facts and consequences, always keeping the long range interests properly in view. Everything should be done to avoid repeating mistakes that have already been committed and to plan for the future in such a way that the risk of mistakes is excluded or minimized.

The other equally important aspect is a positive one. Man is now in possession of scientific and technological resources which are truly spectacular. It can safely be assumed that further progress will follow in the years ahead. The achievements of science and technology must be geared to the improvement of the quality of human life. Economic growth is not an end in itself. It should serve ultimately to satisfy basic human needs and the furthering of human rights. Working and living conditions must be made safer and better suited to the aspirations of modern man. The cravings for spiritual and cultural satisfaction must be satisfied. Man is now in possession not only of the physical means of achieving this. He is also in possession of the knowledge allowing him, if he chooses to do so, to plan rationally his own environment in order to build a happier future. A famous modern writer has described our time as "the accidental century" to indicate that we have all too often let the miraculous changes in our environment, brought about by science and technology, just happen to us without proper foresight and without proper planning. This must not be allowed to continue.

What could the United Nations do in this field? First of all I wish to draw the attention on the important work that is being performed by many of the specialized agencies and other members of the United Nations Family. WHO has for some time been active in the field of water and air pollution. One important report on environmental pollution and its control (E/4457) has been prepared earlier this year by the WHO for ECOSOC. It has been carefully studied by my Government. The Swedish authorities concerned, and I am sure it is true about the authorities of many countries, have found it extremely valuable. The same goes for the report on conservation and rational use of the environment (E/4458) which has been prepared by UNESCO and FAO, also for the benefit of ECOSOC. UNESCO is organizing, with the participation of the United Nations, FAO and WHO, as well as with the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and the International Biological Programme, a Conference on the Biosphere this coming September. The conclusions and recommendations of this conference are eagerly expected. Various aspects of the total problem are under study by WHO, IAEA, IMCO and ILO. ECE is planning increased efforts on certain aspects and will organize a regional conference to take place probably in 1970.

I would like here to refer to the Secretary-General's report (E/4553) which gives an admirable account of the work done so far by the various United Nations Agencies. We are deeply grateful to the Secretary-General and his collaborators for the report.

All the work that is now going on deserves our active support and should be encouraged in every possible way.

The Swedish Government has come to the conclusion that valauble, indeed indispensable, as all these efforts are, there is a real need to provide a framework for a comprehensive discussion of them within the United Nations. Such a discussion would serve the purpose of encouraging the international organizations to intensify their efforts which should be seen as interrelated and mutually supporting. It would also serve to give these efforts a common outlook and direction so as to achieve maximal efficiency. It is for the Government Members of the United Nations to give this encouragement, this direction and this inspiration. So this should be one of the purposes of United Nations action.

Many national Governments are also devoting increasing attention to the problem.

Many of them have taken practical action of a legislative and administrative character to combat water and air pollution, soil erosion, etc.

However, although the urgency, gravity and complexity of the problems are more and more recognized by Governments and the various agencies and institutions which serve these Governments, it would nevertheless be highly desirable to draw the attention of Governments to the need for action, both on the national and international level, and to provide them with better and fuller knowledge about the means to cope with the problems.

Moreover, the scientists and technicians who are active in the various fields of the quality of human environment should be given an opportunity to present their views, their knowledge and their misgivings to selected administrators and leaders of public opinion whose collaboration is necessary if effective action is to be possible both nationally and internationally.

Finally, there is a need to identify those problems which can only, at best, be solved through international collaboration and agreement. This task requires a broad exchange of views in a comprehensive framework.

It is the conviction of the Swedish Government that all the purposes now mentioned would best be served by a decision taken by the General Assembly to call an international Conference under the auspices of the United Nations. We would hope that such a decision might be taken already at the 23d session.

The character of the conference that we have in mind emerges from what I have now said. We would thus not envisage it as a conference of government plenipotentiaries, authorized to pass resolutions or adopt conventions. Nor would it be a mere gathering of experts drawn from various scientific and technical institutions. It would rather be a meeting ground for both scientists, technicians, administrators, politicians and other persons engaged in work on various aspects of the matter. Obviously the participation has to be kept to the minimum compatible with the tasks set for the conference. We would attach special importance to the presence at the conference and the active participation of representatives of the specialized agencies and other organs members of the United Nations System as well as the interested MGO's.

Naturally if a Conference of this type is to be successful it will have to be very carefully prepared. In particular, the cooperation of both international agencies and national governments as well as non-governmental organizations will have to be enlisted. There are various methods that can be used to undertake these preparations, and it might be useful at some stage to ask the Secretary-General to present a study as to alternative suggestions. In line with our general thinking about the proper role of the Economic and Social Council as the main co-ordinating body of the United Nations economic and social activities, we further believe that the Council should be given a task in considering both the time and place of a Conference, the programme of work for a Conference, and other matters connected with the preparations. In particular, the conclusions and recommendations from the coming Paris Conference on the Biosphere will have to be carefully considered. I wish to say here that we attach very great importance to this particular conference. We do not feel that there is any reason to believe that the results of a conference will change our views as to the desirability of a conference of the character we are thinking of, but it is evident that they will have to be taken into account when considering the programme of work for the Conference.

The timing of the Conference is, of course, a matter for careful consideration. This matter will have to be studied and decided in the light of both the estimated length of the appropriate preparations for the Conference and of the calendar of conferences of the United Nations. I wish to recall that the General Assembly has expressed the wish that only one major international conference take place each year. In view of what is now known about the calendar for the United Nations, the year 1971 might be suitable. This date would also, it seems to us, allow for the necessary preparations. However, as far as the Swedish delegation is concerned, whether it is held a year or two later is not a decisive question. I wish to say, however, that the calendar of the United Nations must not be determined for the years to come in such a way that no place can be found for the consideration for this question, the importance of which will no doubt only become more obvious as time passes by.

Mr. President, it is easy to dramatize the issue now before the Council and to use apocalyptic words to describe the impending doom of humanity. I will refrain from doing so. I think that the cold facts and figures presented to us in studies and publications, many of them coming from United Nations organizations, speak eloquently enough in favour of early and energetic action. The Swedish Government is convinced that, under all circumstances, it will become imperative for the Member countries, separately and jointly, at some stage to take far reaching measures in order to prevent irreparable damage and to build a more harmonious and humane environment. Such action may be postponed but the price of postponment will be high.

PERFORMANCE RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO S. 543, THE COPYRIGHT BILL—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 9

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, some years ago Mitch Miller, a musician of some note, heard an old song on an album of Civil War songs. While the song had been around for some time, it had never been a big hit from the point of sales. But Mitch took the song, gave it the Miller touch and the "Yellow Rose of Texas" became a tremendous hit overnight. Since that time, the special arrangement has been played countless times on radio stations by disc jockeys without paying Mitch a penny. If the author and composer still lived—and I am sure they do not—they would be compensated through royalty payments.

This song always had the potential of becoming a popular piece but the words were never combined with the right style that guarantees success until the Mitch Miller accent was added to it. What this indicates is that the performing artist and the songwriter are dependent upon each other and either is incomplete without the other. In short, to create a hit the extra ingredient—call it style or "soul," if you may—that is peculiar to a recording artist must be breathed into the song to insure a hit. The present copyright law and the proposed revision, however, do not protect the creative work of the recording artist as they do the author and composer. The author and composer, for example, receive a royalty each time the composition is played by a radio station.

In the 90th Congress, I submitted an amendment to the then-pending copyright revision bill, amendment No. 131 to section 597, 90th Congress, first session, which would have accomplished three central objectives:

First. The statutory recognition in a new section 117 of a performance right in sound recordings enforceable against those who use records in public performances for profit. This amendment would correct the present inequity of denying such a right to record companies and performers, while granting it to composers and music publishers.

Second. Retention of the present statutory "mechanical rate" in section 115. This is the royalty that record companies pay to music publishers under compulsory licensing provisions. The proponents of a higher rate made no economic case for the increase; indeed, the economic data presented justified a reduction in this rate.

Third. An amendment to section 303 to insure copyright protection to recordings already released and now in the catalog of record companies.

No final action on copyright revision was taken in the 90th Congress. In the current session, the Senate Copyright Subcommittee is considering a new S. 543, again proposing general copyright revision.

Since the last session, proponents of the recognition of performance right in sound recordings have been attempting to devise a new, simplified proposal which could serve as the basis of a compromise, so that the Copyright Subcommittee could promptly and equitably resolve this issue. The amendment that I am introducing today on behalf of myself and other Senators is the product of that consideration.

The recognition of a proposed performance right in sound recordings has the unified support of the record industry, the performers and the musicians union. There can be no serious dispute as to the equity of granting such a right of public performance. A recent example of a user taking unfair profitable advantage of sound recordings is the New York radio station which programed 5 hours of a single recording group. Although the station attracted listeners—to its benefit and the benefit of its advertisers—solely on the basis of the records it was playing, the artists, the musicians, and the record companies received no compensation in the form of performance royalties.

The record before the Senate Copyright Subcommittee demonstrates conclusively that a sound recording is the creative product of the talents of performers, musicians, and the record companies. Nevertheless, S. 543 limits the copyright for sound recordings to exclude "any right of performance under section 106(4)" of the bill. This same bill recognizes rights of public performance in every other member of the creative community. Composers and publishers are granted performance royalties because radio stations and other users are making a profit on the use of the composer's talents. To deny similar rewards to the creative talent which produces a record is blatantly unfair.

The Register of Copyrights has recognized the equity of the record companies' case for performance rights, stating:

> I am wholly sympathetic with the testimony from representatives of performers and some record companies urging recognition of a performing right in sound recordings. There is much to be said for this point of view, and it is possible that this right will eventually be recognized in the copyright law of the United States as it is now in other countries. (House Hearings, p. 1863.)

The House Judiciary Committee in the last session also emphasized "the creativity and value of the contribution of performers and record producers to sound recordings." And, it noted, in reporting the copyright bill, "the possibility of a full consideration of the question by a future Congress." The Register of Copyrights also admitted that performers on records were equitably entitled to performing rights.

The record industry has developed a comprehensive analysis of the extent to which radio stations profit from the use of sound recordings. The study was introduced in the hearings before the Senate Copyright Subcommittee. This study demonstrated that in the top 10 markets, reporting radio stations indicated that 77.40 percent of their commercial time—that is, the time sold to sponsors which provide the station's revenue—was made up of playing records. Furthermore, that study demonstrated conclusively that the broadcasting industry can easily afford to pay a reasonable royalty for the commercial use for profit of sound recordings. For example, at a time when record industry profits were plummeting, the broadcasting industry has shown the following increases in their pretax profits over the prior year: 1962, 48 percent over the prior year; 1963, 26.2 percent over the prior year; 1964, 29 percent over the prior year; 1965, 9.9 percent over the prior year. Present data have continued this trend. Pretax profits for radio stations in 1967 were up 25 percent over 1966.

Sections 116 and 177 of the amendment constitute a new proposal for a simple and equitable system, under the regulations of the Register of Copyrights, for the collection and distribution of performance royalties. The salient features of this compromise proposal are as follows:

A. SIMPLIFIED PROCEDURES TO OBTAIN COMPULSORY LICENSE

First. A compulsory license to all potential users is available to play all sound recordings by filing notice with the Copyright Office—section 117(b) (1).

Second. Users must file annual reports and make payment of royalty fees to only one person, the Register of Copyrights—section 117(b) (2). Reporting for jukebox owners remains under the provisions of section 116 of the bill, as the bill was reported out of the House in the 90th Congress.

B. SIMPLIFIED, SPECIFIC ROYALTY FEE PROVISIONS IN STATUTE

First. Jukeboxes: There is no increase in total fee paid by jukebox operators. Record owners and performers will divide equally 25 percent of the agreed-upon annual $8 per box fee—section 116 (c) (1). Performing rights societies—which, without the added jukebox royalty revenues, are already enjoying record years would receive the remaining 75 percent of the $8 fee. There are no additional reporting requirements for jukebox owners—section 116(b) (1).

Second. Radio and TV: A blanket license fee will be available which is equal to present total performance royalties paid to performing rights societies—ASCAP, BMI, SESAC—that is, 3.5 percent of net receipts from sponsors—section 117(c) (1). A lower pro rata license is available for talk stations and others using less than the average number of sound recordings for programing. Ibid. There is an exemption for small stations with less than $25,000 in annual revenues. Ibid.

Third. CATV: The proposal provides for royalties identical to those granted to performing rights societies—section 117(c) (3).

Fourth. Suppliers of background music: A blanket license fee is set at 3.5 percent of gross receipts from subscribers—section 117(c) (2). A pro rata license is available for suppliers which own the copyrights of the recordings they use.

Fifth. Other users: A nominal fee of $25 per location is provided—section 117 (c) (4).

C. NEW COMPUTERIZED SYSTEM FOR DISTRIBUTION OF ROYALTIES BY COPYRIGHT OFFICE

First. One-half of royalties will be allocated for distribution to copyright owners—record companies—the other half, to performers—musicians and artists—section 117(e) (2).

Second. The distribution of royalties will be based upon samplings of relative use of records by users—section 117 (e) (3).

Third. The administration of the distribution system will be by the Copyright Office. The Office can require that all new records will be manufactured with inaudible identification signals—section 113 (e) (3). The Copyright Office will install newly developed, computerized, automatic monitoring and tallying devices, which will be triggered by the inaudible signal when a record is playing on radio or TV. Costs of administering distribution system will come from gross royalty receipts.

One industry source has described this system in the following terms:

> A system can be designed to encode a music track in such a way that in any manner of reproduction including broadcast, the code may be detected. Basically, by means of a timing device very short pulses of some mid-range frequency are filtered out and a signal inserted at the coded repetition rate. When monitored the music is passed through a band, past filters which filter out all the coded signal, and although some random music frequency may pass through the filters, the code may be detected because of its frequency.
>
> This may be monitored by a computer which may be energized by a definite note at the start of the music and may be shut off by another code at any point thereafter.
>
> A system is presently in use for identification of music by means of the code; therefore, its practicability has been established and its adaptation to automatic recording of the signal is quite feasible.

The remainder of my amendment deals with retaining the present statutory "mechanical rate" that the record companies must pay to music publishers each time they make a record. S. 543 proposes a 25-percent rate increase for popular songs and a 100-percent rate increase for classical music. I believe that the evidence demonstrates no justification whatsoever for such increases. Under the present rates, music publishers' revenues increased by more than 10 percent in the last reported year, and these publishers cannot provide the Senate subcommittee with any data to support their proposed rate increase.

There are numerous reasons why the recording artist and recording company should be protected by the copyright law. As I indicated earlier, the unique creativity of the performer is indispensable to a successful recording. Anyone who has heard Ella Fitzgerald's rendition of "How High the Moon" knows that it is as similar to the original version as the Washington, D.C., telephone directory is. This is what the public buys—her creation—not the original love song composed for a Broadway show. Since it is her talent and imagination that is being used, she should be rewarded just as are the author and composer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proposed amendment be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, appropriately referred; and, without objection be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 9) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, ordered to be printed, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the bill (S. 543) to amend title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights," is hereby amended in the following respects:

SECTION 1. In section 101, amend the definition of "perform" to read:

"To 'perform' a work means to recite, render, play, dance, or act it, either directly or by means of any device or process or, in the case of a sound recording, to make the sounds fixed in it audible, or in the case of a motion picture or other audiovisual work, to show its images in sequence or to make the sounds accompanying it audible."

SEC. 2. In section 101, immediately following the definition of "perform," insert the following:

" 'Performers' in sound recordings, as that term is used in connection with the exclusive right to perform publicly a copyrighted sound recording as provided in sections 106, 110, 114, 116, and 117, are musicians, singers, conductors, arrangers, actors, and narrators who perform literary, musical, or dramatic works to be embodied in phonorecords."

SEC. 3. In section 106, amend the introductory portion to read:

"Subject to sections 107 through 117,".

SEC. 4. In section 106, amend subdivision (4) to read:

"(4) in the case of literary, musical, dramatic, and choreographic works, pantomines, sound recordings, and motion pictures and other audiovisual works, to perform the copyrighted work publicly;".

Sec. 5. In section 110, amend subdivision (2) to read:

"(2) performance of a nondramatic literary or musical work, or of a sound recording, or display of a work, by or in the course of a transmission by a governmental body or other nonprofit organization, if:".

Sec. 6. In section 110, amend subdivision (3) to read:

"(3) performance of a nondramatic literary or musical work, or of a sound recording, or of a dramatico-musical work of a religious nature, or display of a work, in the coure of services at a place of worship or other religious assembly;".

Sec. 7. In section 110, amend subdivision (4) to read:

"(4) performance of a nondramatic literary or musical work, or of a sound recording, otherwise than in a transmission to the public, without any purpose of direct or indirect commercial advantage and without payment of any fee or other compensation for the performance to any of its performers, promoters, or organizers, if:".

Sec. 8. In section 112, subsection (a), delete the following: "or under the limitations on exclusive rights in sound recordings specified by section 114(a)".

Sec. 9. In section 112, subsection (b), delete the following: "or under the limitations on exclusive rights in sound recordings specified by section 114(a)".

Sec. 10. In section 114, amend subsection (a) to read:

"(a) The exclusive rights of the owner of copyright in a sound recording are limited to the rights specified by clauses (1), (3), and (4) of section 106.

Sec. 11. In section 114, amend subsection (c) to read:

"(c) The exclusive right to perform publicly, by means of a phonorecord, a copyrighted literary, musical or dramatic work, and the exclusive right to perform publicly a copyrighted sound recording, are separate and independent rights under this title.

Sec. 12. In section 115(c)(1), amend the second sentence to read: "The owner is entitled to royalties for phonorecords made and distributed after he is so identified but he is not entitled to recover for any phonorecords previously made and distributed."

Sec. 13. In section 115(c), amend subdivision (2) to read:

"(2) Except as provided by clause (1), the royalty under a compulsory license shall be payable for every phonorecord made in accordance with the license and distributed to the public. With respect to each work embodied in the phonorecord, the royalty shall be either two cents, or one-quarter cent per minute of playing time or fraction thereof, whichever amount is larger.

Sec. 14. Amend section 116 to read as follows:

"§ 116. Scope of exclusive rights in nondramatic musical works and sound recordings: Public performances by means of coin-operated phonorecord players."

"(a) Limitations on Exclusive Right—In the case of a nondramatic musical work embodied in a phonorecord, and in the case of a sound recording, the exclusive rights under clause (4) of Section 106, (i) to perform the work publicly by means of a coin-operated phonorecord player and (ii) to perform publicly a sound recording by means of a coin-operated phonorecord player are limited as follows:

"(1) The proprietor of the establishment in which the public performance takes place is not liable for infringement with respect to such public performance unless:

"(A) he is the operator of the phonorecord player; or

"(B) he refuses or fails, within one month after receipt by registered or certified mail of a request, at a time during which the certificate required by a subclause (1)(A) of subsection (b) is not affixed to the phonorecord player, by the copyright owner, to make full disclosure, by registered or certified mail, of the identity of the operator of the phonorecord player.

"(2) The operator of the coin-operated phonorecord player may obtain a compulsory license to perform the work publicly on that phonorecord player by filing the application, affixing the certificate, and paying the royalties provided by subsection (b).

"(b) Recordation Coin-Operated Phonorecord Player. Affixation of Certificate, and Royalty Payable Under Compulsory License.—

"(1) Any operator who wishes to obtain a compulsory license for the public performance of nondramatic musical works on a coin-operated phonorecord player shall fulfill the following requirements:

"(A) Before or within one month after such performances are made available on a particular phonorecord player, and during the month of January in each succeeding year that such performances are made available in that particular phonorecord player, he shall file in the Copyright Office, in accordance with requirements that the Register of Copyrights shall prescribe by regulation, an application containing the name and address of the operator of the phonorecord player and the manufacturer and serial number or other explicit identification of the phonorecord player, and he shall deposit with the Register of Copyrights a royalty fee for the current calendar year of eight dollars for that particular phonorecord player.

"(B) Within ten days of receipt of an application and a royalty fee pursuant to subclause (A), the Register of Copyrights shall issue to the applicant a certificate for the phonorecord player.

"(C) The operator shall affix to the particular phonorecord player, in a position where it can be readily examined by the public, the certificate, issued by the Register of Copyrights under subclause (B), or the latest application made by him under subclause (A) of this clause with respect to that phonorecord player.

"(2) Failure to file the application, to affix the certificate, or to pay the royalty required by clause (1) of this subsection renders the public performance actionable as an act of infringement under section 501 and fully subject to the remedies provided by sections 502 through 506.

"(c) Distribution of Royalties.—

"(1) After the first day of January in each year, the Register of Copyrights shall make an allocation of the royalties heretofore received by him under the provisions of subsection (b) and provide for the distribution of such royalties pursuant to the provisions provided herein. The allocation of the royalties shall be upon the following basis:

"(A) 25 percent of the royalties shall be allocated for distribution to the owners of the rights to perform publicly copyrighted sound recordings.

"(B) 75 percent of the royalty fees shall be allocated for distribution to the owners of copyrighted works which are publicly performed by means of a phonorecord.

"(2) The royalties allocated under subsection (c)(1)(A) shall be distributed pursuant to the provisions of section 117 (d) and (e). All such royalties are the property of the copyright owners and the performers, and shall be divided equally between them, pursuant to the provisions of section 117.

"(3) The portion of the royalty fees allocated under section (c)(1)(B) shall be distributed pursuant to the following procedures:

"(A) After the first day of January in each year, the Register of Copyrights shall file an action in the nature of an interpleader with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and shall turn over to the court the royalty fees deposited with the Register during the preceding year, for the purpose of having the court distribute them. The court shall distribute the royalty fees to copyright owners or their agents asserting claims thereto within the period of time to be fixed by the court, as follows:

"(i) To every copyright owner not affiliated with a performing rights society the court shall distribute the pro rata share of the deposited royalty fees to which such copyright owner proves his entitlement; and

"(ii) To the performing rights societies the court shall distribute the remainder of the deposited royalty fees in such pro rata shares as they shall by agreement stipulate among themselves, or, if they fail to agree, the pro rata shares to which such performing rights societies prove their entitlement.

"(B) Upon the filing of the interpleader and the turning over of the deposited royalty fees to the court, the Register of Copyrights shall be discharged from any further responsibility with respect to the collection, holding, and distributing of the royalty fees for the year for which the interpleader was filed.

"(C) With respect to the collection, holding, and distributing of the deposited royalty fees, the Register of Copyrights shall be a passive trustee, whose sole functions are to receive applications, issue certificates, receive deposited royalty fees, and turn the royalty fees over to the court in accordance with clauses (1) and (2), and to prescribe regulations relating to these functions.

(d) Criminal Penalties.—Any person who knowingly makes a false representation of a material fact in an application filed under clause (1)(A) of subsection (b), or who knowingly alters a certificate issued under clause (1)(B) of subsection (b), or knowingly affixes such a certificate to a phonorecord player other than the one it covers, shall be fined not more than $2,500.

"(e) Definitions.—As used in this section, the following terms and their variant forms mean the following:

"(1) A 'coin-operated phonorecord player' is a machine or device that:

"(A) is employed solely for the performance of nondramatic musical works by means of phonorecords upon being activated by insertion of a coin;

"(B) is located in an establishment making no direct or indirect charge for admission;

"(C) is accompanied by a list of the titles of all the musical works available for performance on it, which list is affixed to the phonorecord player or posted in the establishment in a prominent position where it can be readily examined by the public; and

"(D) affords a choice of works available for performance and permits the choice to be made by the patrons of the establishment in which it is located.

"(2) An 'operator' is any person who, alone or jointly with others:

"(A) owns a coin-operated phonorecord player; or

"(B) has the power to make a coin-operated phonorecord player available for placement in an establishment for purposes of public performance; or

"(C) has the power to exercise primary control over the selection of the musical works made available for public performance in a coin-operated phonorecord player.

"(3) A 'performing rights society' is an association or corporation that licenses the public performance of nondramatic musical works on behalf of the copyright owners, such as the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, Broadcast Music, Incorporated, and SESAC, Incorporated."

Sec. 15. Add a new section 117, reading as follows:

§ 117. Limitations on exclusive rights: Public performance of sound recordings.

"(a) Availability and Scope of Compulsory License.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 106(4) and except to the extent that the public performance of a copyrighted sound recording is controlled by the provisions of section 116, after a sound recording has been publicly performed by or under the authority of its copyright owner, any person may, by complying with the provisions of this section, obtain a compulsory license to perform such sound recording publicly.

"(b) Notice and Royalty Payment by User of Sound Recording for Public Performance.—Any person wishing to obtain a compulsory license to perform publicly all sound recordings subject to the provisions of subsection (a) shall fulfill the following requirements:

"(1) Record in the Copyright Office before the date of the public performance and in accordance with requirements that the Register of Copyrights shall prescribe by regulation, a notice including a statement of the identity and address of the user who intends to make the public performance, together with the name and address of where the public performance will take place.

"(2) Deposit with the Register of Copyrights, within one year after the date of the public performance and in accordance with requirements that the Register of Copyrights shall prescribe by regulation:

"(A) an annual statement of account specifying, as appropriate net receipts from sponsors, proportion of commercial time devoted to public performances of sound recordings, gross receipts from subscribers, the locations where public performances took place, and such other data and information as may be required by the Copyright Office;

"(B) a total royalty fee for the period covered by the statement of account, which fee is derived at royalty rates established in subsection (c) herein.

"(3) Failure to serve notice as provided by subsection (b)(1) or failure to file the annual statement of account and make payments as required by subsection (b)(2) renders the public performance of the sound recording actionable as an act of infringement under section 501 and fully subject to the remedies provided by sections 502 through 505.

"(c) Royalty Fees.—No copyright owner shall authorize the public performance of a sound recording at less than the applicable rate established under this section. The royalty fees for the public performance of a sound recording shall be as follows:

"(1) Radio and television broadcasters, AM or FM, single station or network, shall be entitled to secure a blanket license, entitling the user to perform publicly any and all copyrighted sound recordings which are subject to compulsory licensing under the provisions of section 117(a), provided that no royalty fee shall be required under the provisions of this Act of any radio or television broadcaster, AM or FM, single station or network, if its total broadcast revenues for the most recent calendar year were less than $25,000. Users shall pay a royalty fee established, at the user's election, as follows: for a full license, 3.5 per centum of the user's net receipts from sponsors for the last year, or for a pro rata license, a royalty fee which is determined by multiplying the user's net receipts from sponsors for the last year by the applicable royalty rate for a pro rata license. The royalty rate for a pro rata license shall be determined by multiplying 3.5 per centum by a fraction, the numerator of which is the percentage of the user's commercial time in the most recent year which is devoted to playing copyrighted sound recordings and the denominator of which is 75 per centum. The user's commercial time in the most recent year shall be determined with reference to a composite week and based on information which the user is required to maintain by the Federal Communications Commission. The Register of Copyrights shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary to the proper administration of this provision.

"(2) Suppliers of background music shall be entitled to secure a blanket license, entitling the user to perform publicly any and all copyrighted sound recordings which are subject to compulsory licensing under the provision of Section 117(a), and pay a royalty fee, at the user's election, as established in this subsection. Any person who subscribes to a background music service shall not be deemed to be a user under the terms of Section 117; for a full license, 3.5 per centum of the user's gross receipts from subscribers for the last year, or a pro rata license, which is available to any supplier of background music who owns the copyrights of any sound recordings it uses in supplying such background music. The fees for a pro rata license shall be—

"(i) a fee which is shared in equal part by the owners and performers. The fee shall be established by multiplying the supplier's gross receipts from subscribers for the last year by a royalty rate for a pro rata license. The royalty rate for a pro rata license is established by multiplying 3.5 per centum by a fraction, the numerator of which is the percentage of total playing time utilizing recordings whose copyrights are not owned by the supplier and the denominator of which is 100 per centum, and in addition,

"(ii) a fee which will be the property solely of the performers. This fee shall be established by multiplying the supplier's gross receipts from subscribers for the last year by a royalty rate. The royalty rate shall be established by multiplying 3.5 per centum by a fraction, the numerator of which is one-half of the percentage of total playing time utilizing records which copyrights are owned by the supplier and the denominator is 100 per centum.

"(3) Secondary transmission.—All users who are secondary transmitters, as that term is used in section 111 of the Act, shall pay a royalty fee in accordance with section 111.

"(4) Other users.—All other users who perform publicly copyrighted sound recordings, unless otherwise exempted by this Act, shall be entitled to secure a blanket license, entitling the user to perform publicly any and all copyrighted sound recordings which are subject to compulsory licensing under the provision of section 117(a), by paying a royalty fee of $25 per year for each location at which such sound recordings are performed.

"(d) Distribution of Royalties.—

"(1) After the first day of July in each year, following notice and hearing, the Register of Copyrights, after deducting his reasonable administrative costs under this section, shall make a determination as to an equitable distribution of the roaylty fees received during the preceding year under this section as well as the royalty fees retained by him pursuant to the provisions of section 116(c)(1)(a). This determination shall be made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (e) of section 117. Thereafter, in accordance with such determination, he shall distribute such fees to the copyright owners and performers entitled, or to their designated agents. As a part of such determination and except as herein specified, the Register shall decide upon the time of distribution.

"(2) The Register's determination is in all respects final unless, within sixty days after it is released to the public, any person claiming a right to share in the distribution institutes an action for review of the determination in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, which court has exclusive jurisdiction of said actions. In such an action the determination of the Register shall be sustained unless the court finds that it constituted fraud, malfeasance, or gross abuse of discretion.

"(3) While any such action as provided in subsection (2) is pending, the Register shall withhold from distribution an amount sufficient to satisfy all claims subject to judicial review, provided that the Register may proceed to distribute, in accordance with his determination, any amounts that are not in dispute and any amounts indisputed upon which an adequate supersedeas bond, the terms of which comply with the provisions of rule 73(d), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and in a form suitable to the Register, has been posted by the recipient of such amount.

"(e) Distribution of Royalty Fees Among Owners and Performers.—

"(1) To be entitled to receive royalties under section 117, the copyright owner must file the names and addresses of the owners and the performers in the registration or other public records of the Copyright Office.

"(2) All royalties received by the Copyright Office for the public performance of sound recordings under sections 116 and 117 are the property of the copyright owner and the performers. One-half of the royalties shall be segregated for distribution to the copyright owners and one-half for the performers, except that portion of the pro rata license paid under section 117(c)(2) segregated solely for performers.

"(3) The distribution of the applicable portions of the royalty fees among copyright owners and among performers shall be made upon the basis of an appropriate sampling of the relative use in public performances of each copyrighted sound recording. Pursuant to regulations promulgated after consultation with copyright owners and performers, including and not limited to requiring all new copyrighted sound recordings to carry inaudible signals to assist in identifying the records, the Copyright Office shall make such calculations and determinations as are necessary for an equitable distribution of performance royalties to copyright owners and performers. In the absence of a written agreement authorizing a representative or representatives to receive the performers' share of such royalties, the Register of Copyrights may make distribution to the performers entitled to such royalties as provided by regulations that the Register of Copyrights shall prescribe.

"(4) No agreement or hiring prior or after the effective date of this Act shall be operative to deny any performer his one-half interest in the royalties for the public performance of any sound recording after the effective date of this Act.

"(f) Failure of Copyright Owner to Perform Certain Acts.—

"(1) The willful failure of a copyright owner of a sound recording to comply with the provisions of subsection (e)(1) shall render such copyright owner liable upon the suit of any performer in the sound recording to the injunctive relief of section 502 and for the amount of public performance royalties to which such performer would have been entitled if the copyright owner had complied with such provisions.

"(2) The willful failure of a copyright owner of a sound recording to enforce the rights provided by section 111, section 116(b)(2) and section 117(b)(3) for payment of royalties hereunder, shall render such copyright owner liable upon the suit of any performer in the sound recording to the injunctive relief of section 502 and for the amount of public performance royalties to which such performer would have been entitled if the copyright owner had complied with such provisions. The copyright owner shall not be liable to any performer for failure to enforce the rights specified in this subsection (2) if he shall theretofore have provided notice to the Register, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Copyright Office, that the copyright owner has determined not to enforce such rights against a class of users or against any individual user. Such notice shall serve to assign the cause of action to the performer.

"(3) If any performer notifies the copyright owner of a sound recording of an alleged failure to enforce the rights provided by section 111, section 116(b)(2), and section 117(b)(3) for payment royalties hereunder, the copyright owner shall thereupon either enforce such right or assign the cause of action to the performer; thereupon, the copyright owner shall not be liable to any performer for failure to enforce that right. All such notices and assignments shall be in compliance with procedural regulations therefor that the Register of Copyrights shall prescribe. This subsection does not limit the rights and obligations created under subsection (2).

"(4) For the purpose of subsection (f), royalties shall include such actual and statutory damages and profits, if any, collected by the copyright owner.

"(g) Definitions as Used in Section 117.—

"(1) 'Gross receipts from subscribers' is the total amount paid to suppliers of background music for the privilege of having such music transmitted to their physical locations.

"(2) 'Net receipts from sponsors' is an amount equal to 85 percent of the receipts from time sales of an individual radio or TV station or network, less advertising agency commission.

"(3) 'Commercial time' is any program of a radio or TV station, the time for which is paid for by a commercial sponsor or any program of a radio or TV station which is interrupted by a spot commercial announcement at intervals of less than 14½-minute periods.

"(4) 'Composite week' is the composite week used by the Federal Communications Commission in the consideration of applications filed with it during the most recent year.

"(5) 'Total revenues' consist of the receipts from time sales of an individual radio or TV station or network less commissions plus receipts from talent and program sales."

Sec. 16. At the end of section 303, insert the following:

"A sound recording created before January 1, 1971, phonorecords of which have theretofore been distributed to the public, shall be deemed first published on January 1, 1971. Copyright in such a work and in any other sound recording created before January 1, 1971, shall subsist and endure as provided by this section for other works."

Sec. 17. In section 402, delete subsection (d), which reads:

"(d) Effective Date of Requirement.—The requirements of this section apply to all phonorecords publicly distributed on or after January 1, 1971."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement prepared by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Baker) relative to copyright revision.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Senator Baker

A major item of legislative action left undone in the 90th Congress was copyright revision. In the current session, the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary will be considering S. 543, which is a proposal for general copyright revision. Today the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Williams) has submitted an amendment to the copyright bill to correct an inequity that exists in the payment of royalties when recordings are broadcast.

At the present time, composers and recorders of songs are entitled to a royalty payment each time a recording of their composition is broadcast. The performing artist and the record company are not so entitled, even though the performing artist may take the original composition and work out his own arrangement which may be substantially different from the original. As we all know, the artist's arrangement and his name are often the primary attractions, and the success of the recording on many occasions is dependent on these factors. Nevertheless, both the recording company and the artist are denied the same economic benefit that accrues to the composer and publisher.

Composers and publishers are justifiably granted performance royalties because radio stations and other users make a profit on the use of their talents. To deny similar benefits to the creative talent which produces a recording is blatantly unfair. I commend the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey in his endeavor to correct this inequity.

While I am firmly in support of the principle embodied in Senator Williams' proposed amendment, I do have some reservation concerning some particulars of the measure. The copyright bill presently contains a provision which requires the payment of an annual fee of $8 for each jukebox in operation to the composer and publisher of a recording. The proposed amendment would not affect this overall amount but would require that 25 percent of this total fee be distributed to the recording artist and the recording company. I am not fully convinced that the better approach would not be to increase the overall amount rather than to divide the present $8 fee by a 75/25 percent ratio.

Further, I have some reservation concerning the amount of the royalty that should be made available by the radio and television industry to the recording artist and the recording company. I am not altogether sure that requiring payment of 3.5 percent of net receipts received from sponsors is the most equitable figure for all concerned. Finally, I have some difficulty with the provisions of the bill relating to CATV.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize that I am not necessarily opposed to these provisions to which I have referred, but I do, at the present time, have some reservation concerning them. In any event, I am in firm support of the attempt to entitle performing artists and record companies to the benefits to which composers and publishers are entitled, and I shall lend all assistance possible to correction of this existing inequity.

BROADENING THE DEFINITION OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 10

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on March 24 the senior Senator from Utah (Mr. Bennett) introduced for himself and for me a bill (S. 1664) to broaden the definition of bank holding companies and for other purposes.

The provisions of the bill were drawn by the Department of the Treasury. After S. 1664 was introduced, the Department of the Treasury discovered that its provisions did not accurately reflect the intentions of the Department. It was the intention to make the "grandfather" clause applicable only in those cases in which both the banking and nonbanking assets of a corporation owning both were owned prior to June 30, 1968. In other words, a corporation which owned a bank prior to June 30, 1968, and subsequent to that date acquired unrelated businesses, should be in neither a more nor a less favorable position than a corporation which owned businesses unrelated to banking prior to June 30, 1968, and subsequent to that date acquired a bank.

The draft legislation submitted by the Department inadvertently fails to make clear that in the latter situation the grandfather clause is inapplicable, and that if the company retains its banking interests, it must divest itself of its unrelated interests. The Department has now suggested that an amendment be offered to S. 1664 which would make its original intent clear, and I am today introducing that amendment for myself and for the senior Senator from Utah.

Mr. President, I submit the amendment to S. 1664 that I have just discussed.

The submission of this amendment, as well as the bill which we originally introduced, is not to be construed necessarily as our support of every provision in the bill or in the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 10) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Banking and Currency Committee will hold hearings on April 23, 24, 28, 29, 30. and May 1, 1969, on S. 813, a bill to extend the Export Control Act and related subjects.

The hearings will be held, beginning at 10 a.m., each day, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Persons desiring to testify before the subcommittee should contact Mr. Hugh H. Smith, room 5306, New Senate Office Building, telephone 225–7391.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS AND POSTPONEMENT OF PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED HEALTH HEARINGS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues and the press, I wish to announce that on April 15 the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will hold public hearings on the following nominations:

James E. Allen, Jr., of New York, to be Commissioner of Education and Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Robert D. Moran, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor;

Lawrence H. Silberman, of Hawaii, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor;

Arthur Fletcher, of Washington, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor; and

William Hill Brown III, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

I also wish to announce that due to the hearings before the Subcommittee on Health concerning drug abuse, including the proposed closing of the Fort Worth narcotic treatment facility, which are scheduled to begin on April 17, the general hearings on health which were previously announced to begin on April 15 have been postponed.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON INVESTMENT COMPANY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1969

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold hearings on the bills, S. 34 and S. 296, to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to define the equitable standards governing relationships between investment companies and their investment advisers and principal underwriters.

The hearings will be held on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday, April 15, 17, and 18, 1969, and will begin at 10 a.m. in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Persons desiring to testify or to submit written statements in connection with these hearings should notify Mr. Stephen J. Paradisè, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510; telephone 225-7391.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, April 16, 1969, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building on the nomination of John B. Hannum, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice Francis L. Van Dusen, elevated.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), chairman; the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), and myself

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Brian P. Gettings, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Virginia for the term of 4 years, vice Claude V. Spratley, Jr.

John W. Stokes, Jr., to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Georgia for the term of 4 years, vice Charles L. Goodson.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, April 10, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, April 15, 1969, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Otto F. Otepka, of Maryland, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 9, 1970, vice Edward C. Sweeney, deceased.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), chairman; the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), and myself.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator RIBICOFF I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization will hold a hearing on S. 293, S. 66 and S. 328 on April 15, 1969, at 10 a.m. in room 3302, New Senate Office Building.

In addition, hearings on S. 860 will continue on April 17, and 24, 1969. On the 17th, the hearing will be in room 3302, New Senate Office Building at 10 a.m., and on the 24th, it will be in room 6202, New Senate Office Building at 10 a.m.

ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS PROVIDING FOR PRINTING OF SENATE DOCUMENTS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of resolutions reported today by the Committee on Rules and Administration. These resolutions—Senate Resolution 171, Senate Concurrent Resolution 15, Senate Resolution 89, Senate Resolution 169, Senate Resolution 178, and Senate Resolution 165—authorize the printing of Senate documents, and their immediate consideration has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By unanimous consent, the resolutions were considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 171

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Special Committee on Aging two thousand nine hundred additional copies of its report to the Senate, "Developments in Aging—1968", pursuant to S. Res. 223.

S. CON. RES. 15

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of the studies on the Survey of the Alliance for Progress prepared at the request of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, Committee on Foreign Relations, and the hearings held relating thereto, with illustrations.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed three thousand additional copies of such Senate document. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. RES. 89

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a study entitled "The New Left," prepared at the request of Senator Thomas J. Dodd for the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security; and that there be printed three thousand eight hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. RES. 169

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the report by the Subcommittee on Roads, Committee on Public Works, entitled "Equal Employment Opportunity With Regard to Federal-Aid Highway Projects", relating to the implementation of section 22, Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968, and that there be printed two thousand additional copies of such document for use of the Committee on Public Works.

S. RES. 178

Resolved, That there be printed with an illustration as a Senate document, the prayers by the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Doctor of Divinity, the then Chaplain of the Senate, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate during the Eighty-ninth and Ninetieth Congresses, together with any other prayers offered by him during that period in his official capacity as Chaplain of the Senate; and that there be printed one thousand eight hundred thirty additional copies of such document, of which one thousand thirty would be for the use of the Senate and eight hundred would be for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. The copy for the document authorized in section 1 shall be prepared under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Senate Resolution 165, as amended by striking the words "in four parts" in line 4, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

"S. RES. 165

"*Resolved,* That a report of the Small Business Administration entitled 'Crime Against Small Business,' submitted to the Congress pursuant to Public Law 90-104, the Small Business Protection Act of 1967, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document; and that there be printed one thousand four hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business."

REV. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, tomorrow marks the first anniversary of the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., one of the great Americans of our time.

We have not recovered from the shock of his slaying, and I doubt that we ever shall. It should be a constant reminder of the terrible wages of hatred and the frailty of man and his society in the face of evil.

We should also remember at this time the title and the message of the Urban Coalition-Urban America report on the aftermath of the Kerner Commission report—"One Year Later."

One year later we have not done enough to correct the inequities Dr. King sought to correct in Memphis and in other cities and towns across the Nation.

One year later we have not done enough to insure the rights and dignity of full participation in our society for those Dr. King led.

One year later we have not done enough to bring the peace to which Dr. King was so passionately committed.

One year later we have not achieved a national commitment to a free and open society, for which Dr. King died.

One year later, Mr. President, and every day of every year ahead, we must remember Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., with deeds of compassion and commitment which are worthy of the leadership of this great American, who should be a leader for us all.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to join in the recognition of this anniversary and state that the example of all our fallen leaders, as prayed for by our Chaplain this morning, will always be an inspiration to all of us.

We have lost in this body, in the memory of most of us, two of our beloved colleagues. We have lost a great leader in Dr. King, and we have recently, this week, lost our beloved former President.

There is a common thread which runs through all our losses and that is not alone our personal experience with them but our recognition of what they meant to this country as they developed their leadership and appealed to that which is best in human nature.

Therefore, I speak with sympathy for the bereaved, for those who have gone, with respect for the memory of our fallen ones, with compassion for the things which they symbolized, and with the hope that their inspiration will live long with us and lead us to do those things the Republic expects of us, with honor, dignity, and all necessary dispatch.

J. GEORGE STEWART'S LATEST FOLLY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Architect of the Capitol has struck again. In the proposed legislative budget for fiscal year 1970, there is a $1,250,000 request for the acquisition of a 95,000 square foot parcel of urban property, the site of the old Providence Hospital, to be used as the site of a new headquarters for the Capitol Police force. Mind you, Mr. President, this is merely for the land and does not include the cost of the marble monstrosity that J. George Stewart, the Architect of the Capitol, who is in fact not an architect, plans to build on it following its purchase at the extravagant price. Architect of the Capitol Stewart was a one-term Congressman from Delaware who following his defeat for reelection acquired his present prestigious position.

This proposal is the most recent of a string of absurd follies recommended by Mr. Stewart. The fact is that the Capitol Police force does not need a building of its own, costing untold millions of dollars.

Our police force is already provided with numerous rooms in the Capitol and throughout the office buildings of the Senate and the House of Representatives. This proposal to spend millions of taxpayers' dollars is especially revolting at a time when thousands of Americans, many of them children, are living in slums, hungry, undernourished, and illclothed only a few blocks from the Capitol. Also, at a time when crime is prevalent in Washington, D.C., and adequate funds are apparently not available to hire additional policemen. The Capitol Police force is largely made up by appointees of Members of Congress. These in congressional parlance are referred to as "patronage jobs."

The absurdity of this proposal is compounded by the choice of the site requested. It is located between D, E, Second, and Third Streets in Southeast Washington—four very long blocks from the closest entrance to the Cannon House Office Building and a much longer distance to the furthest side of the Rayburn Building. The proposed "police academy" would also include classrooms, assembly halls, and physical development facilities for the Capitol Police force which is composed in large part of young men attending colleges and universities in the Washington area. Just what we need. Physical development facilities—in other words, a gymnasium—when adequate funds cannot be found for needed playgrounds and recreational facilities for the thousands of underprivileged youngsters crowded in the slums of Washington, D.C.

Assuming that this boondoggle were permitted, it would take about 10 minutes in traffic for our policemen to arrive at a Senate office building in event of an emergency, longer if they were enjoying the swimming privileges of the "physical development facilities." Furthermore, if they were compelled to walk to and from the Capitol, has thought been given to arrangements for Metropolitan Policemen to escort and protect them at nighttime?

Mr. President, the fact is that the land in question is owned by a large Washington parking lot company. The owners confronted with vehement objections by officials of local citizens' organizations could not receive zoning approval to develop their investment into a profitable parking lot nor for a high-rise apartment above garage space. In their effort to make a huge profit instead of operating simply as a parking lot, they turned to the Architect of the Capitol who was more than happy to oblige them by recommending that the land be purchased for a police headquarters and at more than four times the assessed value.

Mr. President, during the past 8 years we have witnessed the fruits of the imagination of J. George Stewart. One has only to look at the ugly, wasteful Rayburn House Office Building—quite possibly the worst building, costing the most money in the history of the construction of public buildings—to realize his ineptness. This Mussolini-type monstrosity, which cost at least $22 million more to complete than originally estimated has been termed the ugliest and poorest planned public building in the United States. It is the most stupendous architectural monstrosity of all time and a monument to the unbridled edifice complex of the Architect of the Capitol.

Then, in 1966 this same architect, so-called, recommended the defacement of the west front of the Capitol. His proposed alteration would provide additional offices for Members of Congress, two auditoriums, two cafeterias, and four dining rooms. In effect, it would make the Capitol of the United States into a king-sized Howard Johnson's.

The Capitol is a national shrine. Each day as I drive to my office I am no less thrilled with a sense of national pride and with a sense of the beauty and grandeur of this building than I was many, many years ago when I first viewed it. I am sure that the same is true for all Members of Congress, for all those who work and live in Washington, D.C., and for the millions of Americans who make the pilgrimage to Washington to visit this revered building, this symbol of the Nation.

Qualified engineers and architects have reported that the walls of the west front can be braced and strengthened without doing damage to the historic building. The Fine Arts Commission said that Stewart's proposal would be a national tragedy and stated that the old walls can be repaired in their present location. It would be virtual sacrilege to destroy the noble west front of the Capitol with its classic walls and its cascading staircases without the most impelling reasons for doing so. Americans can be thankful to date this proposed senseless vandalism on a national monument has been rejected.

What are the qualifications of J. George Stewart for the position in which he has supervised the spending of more that $200 million of taxpayers' money? He served in the House of Representatives from 1935 to 1937. This certainly does not qualify him as an architect. He attended the University of Delaware, class of 1911, and received his bachelor of science degree in civil engineering 47 years later. He served as a member of the staff of the Senate District of Columbia Committee from 1947 to 1951. Immediately prior to his appointment in 1954 by President Eisenhower as Architect of the Capitol, he was head of the Speaker's Bureau of the Republican National Committee. None of this experience qualifies him for the important post which he has held for the past 15 years, and in which he has supervised the spending of millions and millions of taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. President, if the old adage, "Experience keeps a dear school, but fools learn in no other," has any meaning, then it would be sheer folly to follow this most recent of Stewart's recommendations. His proposal to spend more than a million dollars of taxpayers' money for land for a building to house the Capitol Police force should be allowed to die unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S GRAVE MISTAKE IN PROPOSING ABM DEPLOYMENT—A SENSELESS PROVOCATIVE ACTION

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Americans are fed up with military mendacity. The public revulsion against

I also wish to announce that due to the hearings before the Subcommittee on Health concerning drug abuse, including the proposed closing of the Fort Worth narcotic treatment facility, which are scheduled to begin on April 17, the general hearings on health which were previously announced to begin on April 15 have been postponed.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON INVESTMENT COMPANY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1969

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold hearings on the bills, S. 34 and S. 296, to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to define the equitable standards governing relationships between investment companies and their investment advisers and principal underwriters.

The hearings will be held on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday, April 15, 17, and 18, 1969, and will begin at 10 a.m. in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Persons desiring to testify or to submit written statements in connection with these hearings should notify Mr. Stephen J. Paradise, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510; telephone 225-7391.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, April 16, 1969, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building on the nomination of John B. Hannum, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice Francis L. Van Dusen, elevated.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Eastland), chairman; the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McClellan), and myself

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Brian P. Gettings, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Virginia for the term of 4 years, vice Claude V. Spratley, Jr.

John W. Stokes, Jr., to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Georgia for the term of 4 years, vice Charles L. Goodson.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, April 10, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, April 15, 1969, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Otto F. Otepka, of Maryland, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 9, 1970, vice Edward C. Sweeney, deceased.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Eastland), chairman; the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McClellan), and myself.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator Ribicoff I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization will hold a hearing on S. 293, S. 66 and S. 328 on April 15, 1969, at 10 a.m. in room 3302, New Senate Office Building.

In addition, hearings on S. 860 will continue on April 17, and 24, 1969. On the 17th, the hearing will be in room 3302, New Senate Office Building at 10 a.m., and on the 24th, it will be in room 6202, New Senate Office Building at 10 a.m.

ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS PROVIDING FOR PRINTING OF SENATE DOCUMENTS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of resolutions reported today by the Committee on Rules and Administration. These resolutions—Senate Resolution 171, Senate Concurrent Resolution 15, Senate Resolution 89, Senate Resolution 169, Senate Resolution 178, and Senate Resolution 165—authorize the printing of Senate documents, and their immediate consideration has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By unanimous consent, the resolutions were considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 171

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Special Committee on Aging two thousand nine hundred additional copies of its report to the Senate, "Developments in Aging—1968", pursuant to S. Res. 223.

S. Con. Res. 15

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of the studies on the Survey of the Alliance for Progress prepared at the request of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, Committee on Foreign Relations, and the hearings held relating thereto, with illustrations.

Sec. 2. There shall be printed three thousand additional copies of such Senate document. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. Res. 89

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a study entitled "The New Left," prepared at the request of Senator Thomas J. Dodd for the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security; and that there be printed three thousand eight hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Res. 169

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the report by the Subcommittee on Roads, Committee on Public Works, entitled "Equal Employment Opportunity With Regard to Federal-Aid Highway Projects", relating to the implementation of section 22, Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968, and that there be printed two thousand additional copies of such document for use of the Committee on Public Works.

S. Res. 178

Resolved, That there be printed with an illustration as a Senate document, the prayers by the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Doctor of Divinity, the then Chaplain of the Senate, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate during the Eighty-ninth and Ninetieth Congresses, together with any other prayers offered by him during that period in his official capacity as Chaplain of the Senate; and that there be printed one thousand eight hundred thirty additional copies of such document, of which one thousand thirty would be for the use of the Senate and eight hundred would be for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Sec. 2. The copy for the document authorized in section 1 shall be prepared under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Senate Resolution 165, as amended by striking the words "in four parts" in line 4, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

"S. Res. 165

"*Resolved,* That a report of the Small Business Administration entitled 'Crime Against Small Business,' submitted to the Congress pursuant to Public Law 90-104, the Small Business Protection Act of 1967, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document; and that there be printed one thousand four hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business."

REV. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, tomorrow marks the first anniversary of the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., one of the great Americans of our time.

We have not recovered from the shock of his slaying, and I doubt that we ever shall. It should be a constant reminder of the terrible wages of hatred and the frailty of man and his society in the face of evil.

We should also remember at this time the title and the message of the Urban Coalition-Urban America report on the aftermath of the Kerner Commission report—"One Year Later."

One year later we have not done enough to correct the inequities Dr. King sought to correct in Memphis and in other cities and towns across the Nation.

One year later we have not done enough to insure the rights and dignity of full participation in our society for those Dr. King led.

One year later we have not done enough to bring the peace to which Dr. King was so passionately committed.

One year later we have not achieved a national commitment to a free and open society, for which Dr. King died.

One year later, Mr. President, and every day of every year ahead, we must remember Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., with deeds of compassion and commitment which are worthy of the leadership of this great American, who should be a leader for us all.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to join in the recognition of this anniversary and state that the example of all our fallen leaders, as prayed for by our Chaplain this morning, will always be an inspiration to all of us.

We have lost in this body, in the memory of most of us, two of our beloved colleagues. We have lost a great leader in Dr. King, and we have recently, this week, lost our beloved former President.

There is a common thread which runs through all our losses and that is not alone our personal experience with them but our recognition of what they meant to this country as they developed their leadership and appealed to that which is best in human nature.

Therefore, I speak with sympathy for the bereaved, for those who have gone, with respect for the memory of our fallen ones, with compassion for the things which they symbolized, and with the hope that their inspiration will live long with us and lead us to do those things the Republic expects of us, with honor, dignity, and all necessary dispatch.

J. GEORGE STEWART'S LATEST FOLLY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Architect of the Capitol has struck again. In the proposed legislative budget for fiscal year 1970, there is a $1,250,000 request for the acquisition of a 95,000 square foot parcel of urban property, the site of the old Providence Hospital, to be used as the site of a new headquarters for the Capitol Police force. Mind you, Mr. President, this is merely for the land and does not include the cost of the marble monstrosity that J. George Stewart, the Architect of the Capitol, who is in fact not an architect, plans to build on it following its purchase at the extravagant price. Architect of the Capitol Stewart was a one-term Congressman from Delaware who following his defeat for reelection acquired his present prestigious position.

This proposal is the most recent of a string of absurd follies recommended by Mr. Stewart. The fact is that the Capitol Police force does not need a building of its own, costing untold millions of dollars.

Our police force is already provided with numerous rooms in the Capitol and throughout the office buildings of the Senate and the House of Representatives. This proposal to spend millions of taxpayers' dollars is especially revolting at a time when thousands of Americans, many of them children, are living in slums, hungry, undernourished, and ill-clothed only a few blocks from the Capitol. Also, at a time when crime is prevalent in Washington, D.C., and adequate funds are apparently not available to hire additional policemen. The Capitol Police force is largely made up by appointees of Members of Congress. These in congressional parlance are referred to as "patronage jobs."

The absurdity of this proposal is compounded by the choice of the site requested. It is located between D, E, Second, and Third Streets in Southeast Washington—four very long blocks from the closest entrance to the Cannon House Office Building and a much longer distance to the furthest side of the Rayburn Building. The proposed "police academy" would also include classrooms, assembly halls, and physical development facilities for the Capitol Police force which is composed in large part of young men attending colleges and universities in the Washington area. Just what we need. Physical development facilities—in other words, a gymnasium—when adequate funds cannot be found for needed playgrounds and recreational facilities for the thousands of underprivileged youngsters crowded in the slums of Washington, D.C.

Assuming that this boondoggle were permitted, it would take about 10 minutes in traffic for our policemen to arrive at a Senate office building in event of an emergency, longer if they were enjoying the swimming privileges of the "physical development facilities." Furthermore, if they were compelled to walk to and from the Capitol, has thought been given to arrangements for Metropolitan Policemen to escort and protect them at nighttime?

Mr. President, the fact is that the land in question is owned by a large Washington parking lot company. The owners confronted with vehement objections by officials of local citizens' organizations could not receive zoning approval to develop their investment into a profitable parking lot nor for a high-rise apartment above garage space. In their effort to make a huge profit instead of operating simply as a parking lot, they turned to the Architect of the Capitol who was more than happy to oblige them by recommending that the land be purchased for a police headquarters and at more than four times the assessed value.

Mr. President, during the past 8 years we have witnessed the fruits of the imagination of J. George Stewart. One has only to look at the ugly, wasteful Rayburn House Office Building—quite possibly the worst building, costing the most money in the history of the construction of public buildings—to realize his ineptness. This Mussolini-type monstrosity, which cost at least $22 million more to complete than originally estimated has been termed the ugliest and poorest planned public building in the United States. It is the most stupendous architectural monstrosity of all time and a monument to the unbridled edifice complex of the Architect of the Capitol.

Then, in 1966 this same architect, so-called, recommended the defacement of the west front of the Capitol. His proposed alteration would provide additional offices for Members of Congress, two auditoriums, two cafeterias, and four dining rooms. In effect, it would make the Capitol of the United States into a king-sized Howard Johnson's.

The Capitol is a national shrine. Each day as I drive to my office I am no less thrilled with a sense of national pride and with a sense of the beauty and grandeur of this building than I was many, many years ago when I first viewed it. I am sure that the same is true for all Members of Congress, for all those who work and live in Washington, D.C., and for the millions of Americans who make the pilgrimage to Washington to visit this revered building, this symbol of the Nation.

Qualified engineers and architects have reported that the walls of the west front can be braced and strengthened without doing damage to the historic building. The Fine Arts Commission said that Stewart's proposal would be a national tragedy and stated that the old walls can be repaired in their present location. It would be virtual sacrilege to destroy the noble west front of the Capitol with its classic walls and its cascading staircases without the most impelling reasons for doing so. Americans can be thankful to date this proposed senseless vandalism on a national monument has been rejected.

What are the qualifications of J. George Stewart for the position in which he has supervised the spending of more that $200 million of taxpayers' money? He served in the House of Representatives from 1935 to 1937. This certainly does not qualify him as an architect. He attended the University of Delaware, class of 1911, and received his bachelor of science degree in civil engineering 47 years later. He served as a member of the staff of the Senate District of Columbia Committee from 1947 to 1951. Immediately prior to his appointment in 1954 by President Eisenhower as Architect of the Capitol, he was head of the Speaker's Bureau of the Republican National Committee. None of this experience qualifies him for the important post which he has held for the past 15 years, and in which he has supervised the spending of millions and millions of taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. President, if the old adage, "Experience keeps a dear school, but fools learn in no other," has any meaning, then it would be sheer folly to follow this most recent of Stewart's recommendations. His proposal to spend more than a million dollars of taxpayers' money for land for a building to house the Capitol Police force should be allowed to die unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S GRAVE MISTAKE IN PROPOSING ABM DEPLOYMENT—A SENSELESS PROVOCATIVE ACTION

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Americans are fed up with military mendacity. The public revulsion against the ABM should be taken by Secretary of Defense Laird and Pentagon officials as a warning of growing public disenchantment with military domination of American foreign policy and most particularly with deceptions, misrepresentations and outright lies which our military leaders have resorted to in their unconscionable effort to control our national destiny and shape the foreign policy of our Nation.

A year or so ago this was termed "credibility gap," but the actions of officials in the Defense Department and of the generals of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and their continuing fraudulent representations are such that the phrase credibility gap is too generous and kindly.

Initial funds for the anti-ballistic-missile system were obtained from the last Congress on a tide of falsehood. There was the pretext that this would be a "thin" ABM system simply aimed at the threat from Communist China which might come around 1974 after their present crude nuclear capacity had been developed into an ability to fire an intercontinental nuclear missile on target.

It is now perfectly clear that Secretary McNamara was opposed to construction of any ABM system and only reluctantly compromised for the thin system under great pressure from the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other powerful figures in the military-industrial complex. This was apparent at the time that Defense Secretary McNamara assured us that this "thin" system, the so-called Sentinel ABM, would cost no more than $5 billion and that if China had the capacity by the midseventies to hurl ICBM's at the United States to the extent of as many as 20, such a thin system would intercept and prevent all of them from striking on target except possibly one or two.

Officials of the Defense Department early this year, in February and early March, proposed ringing certain American cities with the anti-ballistic-missile-defense system. This was abandoned when Senators and Congressmen from Hawaii, California, Illinois, and Massachusetts spoke out sharply in the Congress and in their States denouncing this proposal. In Los Angeles, officials of the Defense Department were preparing to seize 250 acres of land valued at $100,000 an acre for an ABM site. This area was less than 9 miles from the heart of Los Angeles and about 4 miles from Watts. It was also proposed to take over 250 acres close to Boston, Seattle, and Chicago. Following the outcry and denunciation of Senators and Representatives from these States, and the violent protests of spokesmen for chambers of commerce and civic groups relative to the gigantic economic losses the various States would suffer in taking such vast areas close to large cities from productive use, the President and Pentagon officials precipitately backed up. Also, they were alarmed over the danger of an accidental explosion of a nuclear warhead. Then President Nixon announced the abandonment of plans to ring major cities with ABM sites. The Sentinel supposedly died at that time unhonored, upwept, and unsung.

However look what occurred almost immediately. Bright propagandists and clever public relations men in the Pentagon renamed the "Sentinel" the "Safeguard" ABM. Now, Safeguard was proposed for areas far from population centers except for the one proposed for Washington, D.C. That public relations pipsqueak who conceived the name Safeguard to replace Sentinel did not refer to Washington, D.C. by name. His Pentagonese phrase is "National Command Authority," a new euphemism for the District of Columbia. His cockeyed claim is that an ABM is necessary to protect the "National Command Authority."

Mr. President (Mr. HART in the chair), Defense Department officials now propose that 250 acres be seized close to Washington, probably near the Pentagon for establishment of an ABM site. Washington, D.C., is the only city to be so "honored." Of course, the District of Columbia is not represented in the Congress of the United States by any Senators or Representatives. Apparently Secretary Laird concluded that Washington is the only city in the United States where an ABM may be safely installed without a huge outcry from Congressmen and Senators. The outcry of protest has been tremendous from the first two ICBM sites scheduled to have ABM installations.

Public opinion has been loud and clear from the Grand Forks area in North Dakota, fairly close to some hard sites of our intercontinental ballistic missiles. The junior Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK) has spoken out loud and clear expressing his apprehension of the dangers to citizens of his State if this ABM is erected there. Malmstrom Air Force Base at Great Falls, Mont., is another projected site. Both Montana Senators take a dim view of an ABM to be located there. Majority Leader MANSFIELD spoke out loud and clear expressing his opposition. Among other wise statements he said:

> The ABM proposal is not just another public works project. It is not some trivial boondoggle, a minor item out of the military pork barrel. It touches questions which go to the structure of a free society and to the civilized survival of this Nation, the Soviet Union, and perhaps, of all nations. What local economic benefit can take precedence over these life and death issues? If the proposal is wasteful, dangerous, defective, and counterproductive to the peace of the Nation of what lasting value can be to . . . ?

Prime Minister Trudeau and all Canadian governmental officials are gravely concerned over these proposed ABM installations at bases in our States close to the Canadian border and they expressed fear over the danger over nuclear poison spread over some area in Canada should one of our ABM missiles intercept an oncoming missile from the Soviet Union coming in toward the United States over the northerly circle resulting in death and injury to thousands of men, women and children over wide areas of Canada.

Every reputable scientist in the United States with the possible exception of one who is on the payroll of the Defense Department has testified that the ABM would be utterly useless by the time it was installed. Other knowledgeable men in Congress and out of Congress know that the ABM would be valueless to stop any first strike in event the Soviet Union attempted to perpetrate a nuclear Pearl Harbor upon our missile bases or cities. Scientists who have studied this say that there is only a slight possibility that the President would have sufficient time to order our ABM's into action and that some minor official in our Army might be the one to trigger our ABM and the disaster of nuclear war could result from such officer's bad judgment. Also scientists state that there is always a real possibility of an accident causing devastation and huge loss of life. The stupidity of even proposing an ABM is so colossal as to be unbelievable.

Very definitely the construction and deployment of ABM bases in 12 different areas of the United States would lessen the security of our Nation. This it would do for the reason that these ABM bases could very readily be penetrated by the Soviet Union. Also, the facts are that if this latest proposal termed safeguard instead of sentinel by public relations men of the Pentagon should be located in the 12 areas of the United States, war contractors of the industrial-military complex would add to the already fat profits, but our relations with the Soviet Union would be worsened and the armaments race between this Nation and the Soviet Union would be escalated. The danger of coannihilation would be increased instead of decreased.

The deployment of a modified ABM system supposedly to protect our offensive ICBM sites may well trigger an escalation of the arms race that will cost taxpayers billions of dollars and in the end leave our Nation and the Soviet Union with no more security than each has today.

There is now evidence that the President's decision has commenced another arms race between the Soviet Union and the United States. Pravda, the official publication of the Soviet Union, recently denounced Defense Secretary Laird's statements supporting the deployment of the so-called safeguard ABM which were termed as "absurd assertions that the United States needs missile defenses against a potential Soviet threat." Pravda very clearly accused the U.S. defense industry of trying to create an "arms race psychosis among the American people." This was the harshest criticism made of the Nixon administration to date in any Russian newspaper. Up to this time, the Soviet press has been restrained on its comments on the new administration.

Mr. President, we should be encouraging arms cutbacks, not increases; encouraging disarmament negotiations, not a new arms race. We should be seeking a course toward coexistence with Communist Russia, as the only alternative is coannihilation.

The Pravada report followed by further adverse comment in the most recent issue of Pravada clearly indicates the alarm felt by the leaders of the Kremlin regarding our deployment of the so-called safeguard ABM and signals the intensification of the arms race between our Nation and the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, there recently appeared

in the Washington Star, and in other newspapers throughout the Nation, an excellent article by Max Lerner entitled "Nixon Faces Liberal Shouts on ABM." Mr. Lerner, one of the Nation's most perceptive journalists, clearly and concisely points out the absurdity of an ABM-oriented philosophy. I commend this column of Max Lerner to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIXON FACES LIBERAL SHOUTS ON ABM

(By Max Lerner)

The honeymoon is over, and the posted antihunting warnings have been ripped down. When Richard Nixon said that his decision in favor of a modified ABM system would be met by a "lively debate" nationally, it was the understatement of the year. Just in as tactical terms he blundered earlier by setting a definite time when he would announce his decision. The suspense buildup proved massive, and politically damaging.

Lyndon Johnson did it much better when he had Robert McNamara announce the original ABM thin-shield decision at San Francisco in September 1967, well insulated within a shield of its own in a speech that stressed an offensive-defense nuclear philosophy.

Since Defense Secretary Melvin Laird has a hawkish reputation, Nixon may have felt he could not delegate the announcement to him. He may also have wanted to show the people his willingness to make and announce the hard decisions himself. He fielded the questions well. Yet on the major problem of the wisdom of the decision he failed to convince most of the ABM opponents, which includes this writer.

Since the Cuban missile crisis, the debates on nuclear policies have been mainly between the technicians and have not become popular national debates, as this one has. Inside the Soviet Union, the decisions to expand the nuclear armory—as with the nuclear submarines and the ABM sites deployed around Moscow—have been in response to the combined pressure of the military leaders and the nuclear technicians.

The remarkable fact in America now has been the solid front of scientists and analysts against ABM deployment. This is one case where the deterrence establishment and the peace establishment have joined forces. In 1950, when President Truman had to make his crucial H-bomb decision, the scientists were split into the J. Robert Oppenheimer and Edward Teller camps. Today even the experts of the Eisenhower regime have joined those of the Kennedy-Johnson regimes against the Nixon decision.

It took hardihood for President Nixon to outface this united front and decide as he did. But to be hardy doesn't mean you have to be foolhardy. I have already heard people calculating how long John Kennedy was in office before he met his Bay of Pigs disaster. The answer is that it was on April 17 to 21 in his first year of office—only a bit later than Richard Nixon's current confrontation.

With his "modified base" for the ABM, President Nixon tried to show himself not as a nuclear hawk but halfway between hawk and dove. But to present the decision as a peace decision was too thin a ploy to be credible. It may be true that the Russians, as realists, had already discounted the decision, but that won't keep their nuclear hawks from using it as an argument for further escalation, nor will it keep their arms-control negotiators from raising doubts about American intentions.

By shifting from an ABM deployment around major cities to a deployment around Minuteman missile sites, Nixon tried to keep from too sharp a break with the McNamara philosophy. For McNamara had made it clear, in each of his major reports and speeches, that America's best nuclear defense lies not in the impossible task of building enough defense weapons, but in an overwhelming second-strike offensive power. Presumably, the long-range Spartan defensive missiles and the short-range, high-speed Sprints will be there to protect America's offensive weapons and will thus further strengthen America's credible deterrents.

But if McNamara was right, that power was already credible enough even without ABM's, and he yielded to the hawkish pressure for a "thin shield"—presumably facing toward China—against his own better judgment. Neither Nixon nor Laird shares that reluctance. They are shifting to an ABM-oriented defense philosophy, rather than a deterrent-oriented one.

This seems all the stranger at a time when many experts doubt the technical effectiveness of the ABM's and predict that the thin shield is bound to escalate into a heavy one, and the cost from $7 billion to something more like $70 billion. Nixon says there will be an annual review of everything, and an annual decision, but a decision is a decision, and it is this one we face. One remembers that Johnson's Vietnam involvement was subject to even more frequent reviews but that the escalation-thrust remained each time.

President Nixon may retrieve some of the right-wing support he has recently been losing, but at a single stroke he is in danger of losing all the liberal support he had seemed to gain. I am still open-minded about his larger policies, but on this front I mean to fight him.

U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have been constantly concerned over Supreme Court decisions in recent years which adversely affect both State and Federal criminal laws and procedures. Too often, these decisions have seriously impeded and impaired efficient law enforcement. One of the Court's most recent excursions in this area relates to the prosecution of cases involving conspiracies.

The attorney general of California, Mr. Thomas C. Lynch, who shares my concern, has just advised me that two recent Supreme Court cases will have a "devastating impact" on the State's administration of justice. I would like to point out, Mr. President, that Attorney General Lynch is one of this country's most respected attorneys. His distinguished career and exceptional ability were recognized by his appointment to the President's Crime Commission.

Mr. Lynch, in his letter of March 31, states that for over 70 years the U.S. Supreme Court approved the rule of evidence which permitted a confession of a defendant to be admitted against him in a joint trial when the jury was instructed not to consider it against his nonconfessing codefendant. Last year, the Supreme Court reversed this long-held precedent in *Bruton* v. *United States* (391 U.S. 123 (1968)), and held that such confessions violated the codefendant's rights under the sixth amendment. In addition to changing this rule, however, the Supreme Court went beyond all reason by making the Bruton rule retroactive in the *Roberts* v. *Russell* (392 U.S. 293 (1968)) decision.

The significance of these two decisions is stated by Mr. Lynch in his letter, and I quote:

> Thus cases which were conducted fairly, in accord with a rule of evidence specifically approved by the Supreme Court, and which have been closed as final for years, must now be reopened and possibly retried. Since it has been estimated that fully 20% of criminal jury trials have involved more than one defendant, reopening and retrying these cases will have a catastrophic effect on the administration of justice. Not only are these cases likely to involve the most serious crimes, and due to the passage of time afford difficulties of proof on retrial, but the required re-examination and retrial *will cost every state as well as the Federal Government millions of dollars.*

Mr. President, Attorney General Lynch has forwarded to my office suggested legislation which will, in his words, "avoid potential massive miscarriage of justice." The specific purpose of his proposal is to make the Bruton rule prospective rather than retrospective in application.

I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the letter and proposed legislation of Attorney General Lynch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have not yet reached a judgment as to whether I shall introduce this bill as proposed. However, it will receive my immediate attention. I have it under study, and I have directed the staff on the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures to review Mr. Lynch's proposed Federal reform of this adverse decision, and if appropriate, to approve Mr. Lynch's proposal or to draft remedial legislation along the lines he has suggested. Mr. Lynch has also supplied a very strong statement in support of this legislative proposal, which will be very helpful. Meanwhile, I hope that all of my colleagues will take the time to read Attorney General Lynch's letter and the proposed bill which he has submitted.

EXHIBIT 1

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, March 21, 1969.

Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McCLELLAN: For over 70 years, the United States Supreme Court approved the rule of evidence which permitted a confession of a defendant to be admitted against him in a joint trial when the jury was instructed not to consider it against his non-confessing co-defendant. In May of last year the Supreme Court changed this long standing rule in *Bruton* v. *United States*, 391 U.S. 123 (1968), holding that it violated the co-defendant's rights under the confrontation clause of the Sixth Amendment. While not agreeing with this newly established rule, I can see no insurmountable difficulties in applying it to current and future trials.

However, in addition to changing the rule, the Court made its change completely retroactive in the case of *Roberts* v. *Russell*, 392 U.S. 293 (1968). Thus, cases which were conducted fairly, in accord with a rule of evidence specifically approved by the Supreme Court, and which have been closed as final for years, must now be reopened and possibly retried. Since it has been estimated that fully 20 percent of criminal jury trials have involved more than one defendant, reopening and retrying these cases will have catastrophic effects on the administration of justice. Not only are these cases likely to involve the most serious crimes, and due to the passage of time afford difficulties of proof on retrial, but the required re-examination and retrial will cost every state as well as the federal government million of dollars.

In order to avoid potential massive miscarriage of justice, my office has drafted legislation to make the rule prospective rather than retrospective in application. There has been no attempt to alter any rule which the Court has established as constitutionally required. As the accompanying statement in support of the legislation sets out more fully, the Court has held that the time of application of a rule is not a constitutional question. See, for example, *Linkletter* v. *Walker*, 381 U.S. 618, 629 (1965). Thus, the Congress has full power to act in this area.

Because of the devastating impact of this rule if applied retroactively, I urgently request that the proposed legislation and statement be reviewed by your subcommittee and that action be taken to enact the bill as soon as possible. I will greatly appreciate your consideration of the problem and will attempt to provide any additional information you consider desirable.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS C. LYNCH,
Attorney General.

PROPOSED ACT OF CONGRESS

FINDINGS

SECTION 1. Congress hereby finds it necessary to establish by appropriate legislation the effective date of the rule for the admissibility of confessions, admissions, or statements in joint trials established by the United States Supreme Court in *Bruton* v. *United States*, 391 U.S. 123 (1968) and applied by that Court to the States in *Roberts* v. *Russell*, 392 U.S. 293 (1968) and upon consideration of the relevant factors, finds that in order to avoid massive miscarriage of justice, the rule must be applied only to those criminal cases, the trial of which commenced after the effective date of the decision, May 20, 1968. Specifically, Congress has considered the following factors and has made findings as indicated.

(a) The purpose to be served by the new standards: Accepting the view of the Supreme Court that the purpose of the rule is to enhance the reliability of the fact finding process, Congress finds that the former procedure did not create a substantial risk of convicting the innocent. Even assuming that a properly instructed jury could not completely disregard one co-defendant's admission implicating the other, such possible minimal consideration cannot be considered to create a widespread risk of miscarriage of justice when weighed against the equally valid assumption that it is common experience to distrust such an accusation to the extent that the person making the statement attempts to shift or share culpability.

(b) The extent of the reliance by law enforcement authorities on the old standards: Congress finds that reliance by courts and law enforcement authorities on the standard specifically approved by the Supreme Court in *Delli Paoli* v. *United States*, 352 U.S. 232 (1957), followed without question in that Court for over 70 years, and endorsed as recently as 1967 in *Spencer* v. *Texas*, 385 U.S. 554, 562 (1967), was fully justified and widespread. Despite the fact that a very small minority of state and federal courts, in very recent years, foresaw the change of rule, Congress finds that the overwhelming majority did not, and that prior to 1965, reliance on the rule was virtually without exception. The courts of the United States and of the states are required to apply the law of the land and are entitled to rely on the decisions of the Supreme Court.

(c) The effect on the administration of justice: Congress finds that the retroactive application of *Bruton* v. *United States*, 391 U.S. 123 (1968) would have a catastrophic effect upon the administration of justice in every federal and state court system. Congress finds that it is likely that a significant percentage of all criminal trials would require reexamination and possibly retrial; that these cases involve those persons who have acted in concert with other offenders, gang members and members of criminal conspiracies; and that those who would derive the greatest benefit from retroactivity are felons under long term sentences, who have been confined for extended periods for serious crimes, since their cases would afford the least likelihood of successful retrial. To require a general release of such prisoners would cripple the orderly administration of the criminal law.

TIME OF APPLICATION OF RULE

SEC. 2. In any criminal case tried in a court of the United States, the rule for the admissibility of confessions, admissions, or statements in joint trials, established by *Bruton* v. *United States*, 391 U.S. 123 (1968), applies only to trials commencing after May 20, 1968, the date of the decision.

In any criminal case tried in a state court, the rule for admissibility of confessions, admissions or statements in joint trials, established by *Bruton* v. *United States*, 391 U.S. 123 (1968), applies only to trials commencing after May 20, 1968, the date of the decision.

REVIEW

SEC. 3. In reviewing a state or federal conviction at any stage of the proceedings, whether on direct review, remand for reconsideration, or collateral attack, a court of the United States or of any state will apply the constitutional rule for admissibility of confessions, admissions or statements in joint trials established by *Bruton* v. *United States*, 391 U.S. 123 (1968), only to those convictions resulting from a trial which commenced after May 20, 1968, the date of the decision. To all other cases, the applicable constitutional rule for the admissibility of confessions, admissions, or statements in joint trials is that of *Delli Paoli* v. *United States*, 352 U.S. 232 (1957). In any case, the reviewing court shall determine if the error is harmless in accordance with the test set forth in *Chapman* v. *California*, 386 U.S. 18 (1967).

CONSTRUCTION OF STATUTE

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be construed to indicate approval of the rule for the admissibility of confessions, admissions and statements established by *Bruton* v. *United States*, nor shall this act be construed to require the application of the rule in any case unless it is required by the Constitution of the United States.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GENERAL DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there is little that anyone can say to add to the many statements already made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about the Nation's warm affection for the late General Dwight David Eisenhower. Each of us has many nostalgic personal memories about him. I have many such memories, some of them reflected in prized pictures on the wall of my office—some in cherished books on my bookshelf—some simply fond recollections.

His fame as a great national and world leader, the five-star general who, as Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces, led them to victory in Europe, and the 8-year President who brought back to our Nation relative serenity and greater confidence in our National Government, will always live in the annals of our Nation and in the lasting memories of our people. I have decided that the best contribution that I can make on this sad occasion is to insert in the RECORD three of the dozens of highly complimentary editorials which have appeared in Florida newspapers, which reflect, I am sure, the true feelings of most of our Florida people. I ask, therefore, that there be incorporated in the RECORD as part of my remarks the following editorials written by talented, knowledgeable, and patriotic editorialists:

First. I ask that an editorial from the Jacksonville, Fla., Times-Union of March 29 entitled "Dwight David Eisenhower" may appear in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

Second. I ask that an editorial from the Orlando Sentinel dated March 29 entitled "A Love Affair Ends" may appear in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

Third. I ask that an editorial from the St. Petersburg Times of March 29, entitled "An American's American," may appear in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

Mrs. Holland and I share the grief of Mrs. Eisenhower and other members of their family at this sad time and express to them our deep and affectionate sympathy.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union, Mar. 29, 1969]

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Dwight David Eisenhower, gallant to the end, was a man uniquely suited to his times and to the roles which life called upon him to fill.

The family into which he was born in 1890 was to become an outstanding example of the American dream—that of achieving success from humble beginnings through diligence and hard work. His parents were religious, hard working and poor and their six sons were called upon to work hard in their early years doing farm chores and odd jobs. All became successful in later life.

For Dwight David Eisenhower, the path to the White House was through a military career. He entered The U.S. Military Academy at West Point through an appointment achieved by competitive examination.

There followed a long period of slow but steady advancement toward his two early ambitions: to become a colonel before he retired and to have the command of troops.

It was not until after he had passed the age of 50 that he achieved either but then advancement, command and recognition came with lightning swiftness.

A temporary colonel in 1941, he was to become in slightly more than three years Commander of Supreme Headquarters, Allied Headquarters in Europe and achieve the highest military rank as a General of the Army and a year later he became Army Chief of Staff.

To be the architect of victory in Europe during World War II would have left an enduring place in history for General Eisenhower but his nation was to call upon him to play an even larger role.

His mother's comment on his success in World War II was to be prophetic of even greater things. "I knew we would win," she said, "for Dwight always got what he went after."

He went after the presidency of the United States of America and won overwhelmingly in 1952 and again in 1956.

Especially in these days of division at home and war abroad, his presidential terms evoke nostalgia for happier years.

During his retirement, President Eisenhower summed up the feeling himself when he said: "When I came to the presidency, the country was rather in an unhappy state. There was bitterness and there was quarreling and so on . . . I tried to create an atmosphere of greater serenity and mutual confidence, and I think that it . . . was noticeable over those eight years that that was brought about."

It was noticeable as was the truth of his statement that during his eight years, the nation was strong, prosperous and there were no wars.

We leave to historians and those with better credentials, the assessment of his greatness and his place in history.

Perhaps the reaction of the individuals in this nation on the occasion of his passing will never be recorded in the history books but it is the finest tribute that can be paid to the man himself.

The people of the nation which he served so well did not merely admire or respect him. They felt comfortable with him. They liked Ike. And they will miss him.

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, Mar. 29, 1969]

A Love Affair Ends

Dwight David Eisenhower has been a leader among us for so long the world will be not the same without him.

Unlike the martyred Kennedys, with us so briefly they seemed to flash like meteors across the political skies, we have known Ike in war and in peace; in the prime and vigor of his life and in its sunset years.

Throughout his distinguished career in the military and in government, he enjoyed a rare rapport with the American people. His popularity never dimmed.

There were, to be sure, critics of his military and presidential regimes but, when viewed in the light of the vilification heaped upon other leaders, they were mild and almost academic.

"I like Ike" was the slogan of his first presidential campaign and the American people did and they never stopped. No other national or international political figure enjoyed the sustained love and affection we conferred upon him.

He made a graceful transition from commander in chief of the largest and most powerful military force the world has ever assembled to eight years as president of the United States.

They were years which seem, in retrospect, tranquil.

His election as President continued an American tradition which began with George Washington, that of the all conquering military hero becoming the civilian leader when the battles stopped.

The battle of life itself has now stopped for Dwight Eisenhower, 34th president, and the nation which knew and loved and followed him mourns.

Yet it is mourning of a more gentle nature than that which has racked this nation in recent months for there is the knowledge that this was a life fully lived, a promise realized, a greatness fulfilled.

And however history will judge Eisenhower the soldier and the President, it must write him as a great patriot, a giant in his time.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Mar. 29, 1969]

An American's American

In life Dwight David Eisenhower achieved the pinnacles in what are certainly three of the most important walks of modern American life: the military, the educational and the political.

Yet in his death, Eisenhower probably will be best remembered and most mourned for a fourth, and more personal achievement. More than any other political leader of our time, he won the deep affection of his fellow countrymen of both parties, and of all walks of life.

With his amiable personality, his infectious grin, his dignity of bearing when dignity was demanded, his deep devotion to duty to his country, his brilliance and drive as a military leader, his love for sports and—yes—his sudden flares of temper, he was the very personification of many Americans' concept of what an American leader should be.

Although the policies and record of his administration were subject to partisan attack, it was a curiously impersonal sort of attack which rarely was directed at him as an individual. The stature of his personality was exemplified by the fact that all of his successors, Presidents Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon, freely consulted him in times of crisis and his counsel and cooperation were always freely given.

It has been said by his intimates that Eisenhower never felt completely at ease in the presidency; that in politics he was out of his natural element. As a military leader, he was accustomed to restricting himself to major decisions of strategy and allowing his field commanders to choose the tactics for achieving the strategic goals. And that was the way he ran his administration.

He continued intact all of the major social and economic reforms of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, despite strong pressure from some of his closest supporters to abandon them. His most far-reaching domestic decision was the appointment of Chief Justice Earl Warren.

In history, Dwight David Eisenhower will go down as one of the great military leaders of modern warfare. But when the somber cortege escorts the caisson bearing his coffin to his final resting place, when the traditional volleys are fired across his grave, he will be mourned and loved through the Western World as a leader who also was a warm and intensely human man.

"VIETNAM AND THE END OF THE AGE OF SUPERPOWERS"—ARTICLE BY PROF. ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, JR.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the March 1969 issue of Harper's magazine contains a very provocative article by Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., entitled "Vietnam and the End of the Age of Superpowers."

Professor Schlesinger has written a well reasoned analysis of the meaning of the Vietnam tragedy in terms of America's proper and most effective role in the world as it is today and as it is likely to be in the immediate years ahead.

I think this article will be of interest to my colleagues and readers of the Record, and I ask that it be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Vietnam and the End of the Age of Superpowers

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)[1]

(Note.—Neither the Soviet Union nor the United States can contain by military power alone the surge of nationalism sweeping the globe. A new American foreign policy must be developed to meet the demands of a new age and new international relationships.)

The contemporary crisis of American confidence comes in great part from a growing sense of our inability to manage violence. The rise of violence at home has done more than anything else to create doubt about the internal prospects of American life; while, ironically, it has been the failure of violence to achieve our aims in Vietnam which has created equal doubt about the prospects of our foreign policy.

When President Johnson spoke to the nation about Vietnam on March 31, 1968, he did more than suspend military escalation, intensify the search for negotiation, and remove himself from the impending Presidential contest. Though he did not of course put it this way, he announced the collapse of a policy and even perhaps the end of an era. His speech implied a rejection, or at least a drastic modification, of the premises which have governed American foreign policy since the end of the second world war.

Postwar American foreign policy grew from a series of legacies—Stimsonian collective security, Rooseveltian social evangelism, Dullesian anti-Communism. Each bequest had been tempted into universalism—by which I mean the belief that the United States has an active and vital interest in the destiny of every nation on the planet—and even into messianism by the power vacuums left in the wake of the second world war. It was this combination of factors which beguiled America into a course which much of the world today regards as imperialistic and which even Americans must concede as imperial—the course which reached its disastrous climax in Vietnam.

Yet, if there is an American imperialism, it is imperialism of a peculiar sort. The classical theories of imperialism derive from the European experience, and it is hard to fit American policy into the conventional categories. The attempts of pious Marxists, for example, to account for the American presence in Vietnam in Leninist terms—as the result of the need for investment outlets—is self-evidently absurd. The American government has already poured more money into Vietnam than American business could hope to get back in a century. Nor is it convincing to argue that we "needed" to spend $30 billion a year in Vietnam in order to preserve business profits at home. The effect of the Vietnam spending has been to overheat the economy, to stimulate inflationary pressures, and to require an unpopular tax increase. Except for firms specifically dependent on production for Vietnam, everyone would be happier if the war spending came to an end. Business leaders have not been notably enthusiastic about the war—especially once the Army stopped relying mainly on poor whites and blacks and started drafting their own sons.

A more sophisticated version of the Marxist thesis is that the United States must suppress revolution everywhere because, if revolution succeeds in a country without American investment, the contagion of success may lead to revolutions in other countries with American investment, the contagion of success may lead to revolutions in other countries with American investment. This Leninist version of the domino theory is faintly more plausible as an argument than the strict thesis, except for the fact that American policy in the Third World, while it has been uniformly anti-Communist, has by no means been uniformly anti-revolutionary. Nor do nationalist revolutions in the Third World invariably lead to Communist rule. Quite the contrary—the Communists have come to power in only three new nations in the last quarter century: China and North Vietnam, because they put themselves at the head of nationalist movements during the second world war, and Cuba, because Fidel Castro for reasons of his own led a revolution undertaken on other grounds into the Communist empire. Actually the American government has accepted nationalist revolutions in most countries which have had them; and it has given surreptitious assistance to progressive nationalist parties and even to non-Communist revolutionaries in a number of countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The objection to the Cuban revolution (at least within the Kennedy Administration) was not to Castro's program of internal reconstruction but to his potential role as an instrument of Soviet policy—an objection which, as the events of October 1962 showed, was hardly without point.

---

[1] Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., has been Albert Schweitzer Professor of the Humanities at the City University of New York since the fall of 1966. He was Special Assistant to President Kennedy, and his book, "A Thousand Days," won the National Book Award and the Pulitzer Prize for Biography for 1965. He is working on the fourth volume of his history, "The Age of Roosevelt."

Nor do other classical theories of imperialism work much better. Hanna Arendt's argument (in "the Origins of Totalitarianism") that imperialism was the result of "the alliance between mob and capital" does not apply here; there was no surging popular demand for the adventure in Vietnam. Nor do the theories tracing imperialism to the instabilities and temptations created by disparities in power explain why there were half a million American troops in South Asia rather than in South America.

THE RISE OF THE WARRIOR CLASS

But of the classical theories of imperialism the one which throws most light on American behavior is that proposed by Joseph A. Schumpeter, the economist. Schumpeter saw imperialism as "the objectless disposition on the part of a state to unlimited forcible expansion"—a disposition created and sustained by the habits and interests of a warrior class. There would always be, he said, rational pretexts for military action—national security, spoils, and so on—but the essential urge would come from the sheer momentum of the military machine in motion.

European imperialism of the late nineteenth century, in Schumpeter's view, was the work of martial and feudal elements surviving in bourgeois society. Believing that the instinct for physical combat was fading rather quickly in the industrial world, he felt that imperialism would be a passing phase in a society which had "neither warlike instincts nor structural elements and organizational forms oriented toward war." He was particularly optimistic about the United States, which among all capitalist countries seemed to him "least burdened with precapitalist elements, survivals, reminiscenses, and power factors" and would therefore be "likely to exhibit the weakest imperialist trend." But what Schumpeter omitted in his argument, though it was implicit in his theory, was the possibility that war among industrial states might produce new structural elements and organizational forms oriented toward war, a new warrior class and new forms of imperialism.

Has not something like this happened in the United States? The American imperialism of the turn of the century was a clear case of Schumpeterian atavism. Men like Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge, who as historians had celebrated the Federalist vision of the American role, reached back as politicians and strategists to the Federalist past in the hope of redeeming the new commercial society by giving it a martial purpose. But, lacking a serious institutional base in that society, neo-Federalist imperialism could not, and did not, last. Half a century later, however, two world wars had brought a great military establishment into existence, and the Cold War made it permanent.

During the war, Roosevelt relied more on military advisers like General Marshall and Admiral Leahy than he did on his State Department. After the war, the establishment of the Department of Defense and the National Security Council consolidated the military influence on national policy. For many years the military have absorbed by far the largest portion of the federal budget. Defense contracts have enlisted large sections of the industrial community in the military effort. With America predisposed to foreign involvement by the legacies of collective security and social evangelism and, in a sense, propelled into such involvement by the power vacuums of the postwar world, with, in addition, the unitary Communist movement of the age of Stalin posing a quite genuine threat and generating crusading absolutism in response, the new warrior class became the agency for both the militarization and the enlargement of our interventionist policies.

One must not overdo all this. The military machine suffered a succession of restraints—first, from within, by the second world war generals of the Marshall-Eisenhower-Bradley generation; then, from without, by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy as well as by civilian elements of the national security bureaucracy, by such men as Acheson (when he was in office, though not so much thereafter), Harriman, Lovett, and, in later times, McNamara.

The National Security Council was never very effective as a source of national decisions. Nor has the military caste always been united in its views. In 1954 the Navy and the Air Force favored American intervention in Vietnam; the Army, forcefully represented by Generals Ridgway and Gavin, opposed intervention and carried the day. In 1962 General Shoup of the Marine Corps dissented from the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs for a surprise air attack on the nuclear missile bases in Cuba. Secretary McNamara was engaged throughout his time at the Pentagon in argument with the Chiefs. By 1967 he had become the particular custodian of the negotiating interest within the government, leading to that peculiar exchange of roles by which the Secretary of Defense sat in his office trying to figure out how to start negotiations with Hanoi while the Secretary of State sat in his office picking out bombing targets (perhaps in part because, as Mr. Rusk revealed in an interview, he was "within three days" of taking his oath as a career military officer in 1946 when General Marshall offered him a civilian post in the State Department.) In the last years of the Vietnam war the CIA and the Secretary of Defense were far more skeptical than the Joint Chiefs or the Secretary of State about the effectiveness of American bombing.

Yet, if the national security bureaucracy is often divided in its views, the warrior caste, as a powerful element in that bureaucracy, has had increasingly behind it the power of sheer momentum—especially in a time when new military technologies, by making America vulnerable to attack from almost any spot on the planet, gave the argument of "national security" an unlimited application, and when duty required the military of one nation to advocate constant growth to forestall adversaries from gaining technological superiority. "Created by wars that required it," Schumpeter wrote of the military establishment in ancient Egypt, "the machine now created the wars it required."

In whatever sense America can be said to be an imperial state, the active carriers of that imperialism are not our bankers of our foreign investors or our traders—not any of the conventional Marxist villains. The carriers are our politicians, our diplomats, and, most particularly, our military leaders. It is our military leaders who—for military, not for economic reasons—have conned both the executive and legislative branches of the government into voting enormous military appropriations and into building enormous miltiary installations, largely irrelevant in the missile age, all over the world (and who, as the price we must pay, insist we must do nothing to offend such splendid countries as Portugal or South Africa). It is they who argue for military intervention. It is they who forever oppose the agreements, like the Test Ban Treaty of 1963, designed to slow up the arms race, and who forever demand new systems of offense and defense.

The forward role of the military has been notably evident in Vietnam. First, they succeeded in defining the problem in the terms stated by General Wheeler in November 1962: "It is fashionable in some quarters to say that the problems in Southeast Asia are primarily political and economic. . . . I do not agree. The essence of the problem in Vietnam is military." Subsequently, at every point along the way, the generals promised that just one more step of military escalation would at last bring the victory so long sought and so steadily denied. The Pentagon, in addition, has seen Vietnam as an invaluable training and testing ground for new weapons and new techniques.

Here surely lies a major cause of our imperial drift: the incessant pressure of the professional military in an age of international crisis. The warrior group, because of its own internal needs and preoccupations, constantly demands more money, more weapons systems, more military involvement, more military intervention. Its members invoke the emotions of virility and patriotism to strengthen their case. Their importunings affect the way choices are defined and the atmosphere in which decisions are made; the pressure is often effective in amorphous situations and with irresolute leaders. But this is not a question of bureaucratic determinism. The warrior group does not inevitably control United States policy, nor are the warriors evil men or war criminals. They are professional men trying to do a professional job and making exactly the arguments the nature of their profession requires. It is foolish to be surprised by the advice they give or to blame them for it. It is far more to the point to blame those who take their advice.

What matters is not that the military bureaucracy makes certain recommendations but that Presidents take these recommendations seriously. President Kennedy accepted the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on one major decision in his Administration—the Bay of Pigs. He rejected pressures for direct military intervention in Cuba twice—after the failure of the Bay of Pigs and again during the missile crisis. He was entirely skeptical of military plans for intervention in Laos. He declined to follow JCS counsel on Berlin in 1961 or on the Test Ban Treaty of 1963. President Johnson, on the contrary, seems to have flinched from overruling the Joint Chiefs, except on occasion by not giving them quite all the troops or bombing targets they wanted.

THE MESSIANIC PHASE

The tragedy of Vietnam is the tragedy of the catastrophic overextension and misapplication of valid principles. The original insights of collective security and liberal evangelism were generous and wise. But compulsive Stimsonianism and compulsive New Dealism, stimulated by the illusions of Superpowership, rigidified by an absolutist anti-Communism, and pressed ever forward by the professional demands of the new warrior class, brought American universalism in time into a messianic phase. "History and our own achievements," President Johnson said on February 12, 1965, "have thrust upon us the principal responsibility for protection of freedom on earth. . . . No other people in no other time has had so great an opportunity to work and risk for the freedom of all mankind."

This messianic phase led us to lose our

sense of the relation between means and ends. I do not see that our original involvement in Vietnam was per se immoral. What was immoral was the employment of means of destruction out of all proportion to rational purposes. The wreckage we wrought in Vietnam had no rational relationship to a serious assessment of our national interest or to the demonstrated involvement of our national security.[3] The messianic phase transcended and transformed the constituent elements of our past foreign policy. Yet the existence of these traditional elements gave the Johnson Administration a sense that it was executing a legacy and endowed it therefore with an overwhelming conviction of the rectitude of its mission, the purity of its motives, and the wickedness of its critics. It was this which must have led Secretary Rusk to say on February 9, 1968, "There gets to be a point when the question is, whose side are you on? Now, I'm Secretary of State of the United States, and I'm on our side!"

Given the perhaps excessive self-righteousness which could lead a Secretary of State to suggest that his critics must be on the side of Ho Chi Minh, given too the reluctance of proud and stubborn men to admit that they could possibly have made mistakes, only the abject failure of the policy could force its supporters to draw back. The failure of the Vietnam policy had long been evident to most detached observers. The evidence against the effectiveness of military escalation was just as strong, for example, on March 31, 1967, as it was on March 31, 1968; and if President Johnson had given his speech a year earlier, many Americans and many Vietnamese, now dead, would today be alive. But in the end the failure of the policy became so plain that even the President had to admit it—everyone had to admit it except, inevitably, General Westmoreland.

What was announced on March 31, 1968, was more than simply the collapse of the American policy in Vietnam. What was announced was the collapse of the messianic conception of the American role in the world—indeed, the end of the entire age in which two Superpowers dominated the planet. To understand the reasons for this collapse we must return for a moment to the Superpowers at high noon.

There were always decisive differences between the United States and the Soviet Union on internal values and policies. But their views of the world outside had remarkable similarities. Each Superpower saw mankind as divided between forces of light and forces of darkness. Each assumed that the opposing bloc was under the organized and unified control of the other. Each insisted that every nation line up on one side or the other and condemned neutralism as anomalous if not as immoral. Each expected its own side to accept its own ideas of political propriety and economic organization. Washington supposed that what was then known as the Free World should reshape itself on the American model, while Moscow, that the Communist World should reshape itself on the Russian model.

But the world itself did not sit still; it began to change. And the most basic change of all was the rise of a new force in revolt against the reign of the Superpowers—or rather the resurgence of an older force now endowed in the years after the war with new potency and purpose. That force was nationalism; and the rise of nationalism meant growing opposition to the United States in the Western bloc, growing opposition to the Soviet Union in the Communist bloc, and growing opposition to both America and Russia in the Third World.

Nationalism means, first of all, the determination to assert national identity, national dignity, national freedom of action. It can also mean, as the memory of prewar Germany, Italy, and Japan reminds us, the determination to assert these things at the expense of other nations; and in this sense nationalism has been and will be a source of tremendous danger to the world. But the nationalism which arose after the second world war was, in the main, not the aggressive and hysterical nationalism which had led nations before the war to try and dominate other nations. It was rather the nationalism generated by the desire to create or restore a sense of nationhood.

In the years since 1945 nationalism has redrawn lines of force around the planet. Take Europe, which Churchill described twenty years ago as "a rubble heap, a charnel house, a breeding ground for pestilence and hate." Economically shattered, politically demoralized, militarily defenseless, Western Europe in the Forties was absolutely dependent on America for social reconstruction and military protection. Then the Marshall Plan set in motion the process of economic recovery. Economic recovery led to the revival of political self-confidence, and political self-confidence to a determination to assert European autonomy. No doubt the turn given this mood in recent years by General de Gaulle is exaggerated and extravagant. But it would be a great error, I believe, to suppose that Gaullism does not spring from a profoundly real impulse in contemporary Europe: a deep pride in European traditions and capacities, a growing will to reaffirm European independence against the twin colossi. And even those who reject the narrow nationalism of de Gaulle do so in the name of the larger nationalism of Europe.

The contagion of nationalism runs everywhere. Today nationalism is seeking home rule in Scotland and Wales; it is dividing the country of Belgium; it is threatening Canada with the secession of French Quebec; in our own country it finds expression in the mystique of Black Power. And it has wrought even more spectacular changes within the empire which Stalin once ruled so calmly and implacably. The Yugoslav heresy of 1948 represented the first serious rebellion of national Communism against Russian primacy. In another decade China burst forth as an independent Communist state, increasingly determined to challenge Russia for the domination of Asia and for the leadership of the international Communist movement. With the clash between China and Russia, the unified Communist empire began to break up. Moscow long ago had to accept the Yugoslav heresy, and on Yugoslav terms. It has conceded a measure of national initiative to the once cowed and compliant satellites of Eastern Europe. Albania and Romania are going their own way. In a desperate effort to preserve the dominant Russian position, the Soviet Union had to resort to military intervention in order to discipline Communist Czechoslovakia. Even Poland, even East Germany may some day insist on national freedom. "Everyone chooses the truths he likes. In this way faith disintegrates." This was said by Pope Paul VI, but it might as well have been said by Brezhnev.

The unity of Communist discipline, the unity of Communist dogma—all are vanishing as international phenomena, crumbling away under the pressure of nationalism. In the contemporary age of polycentrism there is no longer any such thing as "world Communism." A Communist takeover no longer means the automatic extension of Russian, or even of Chinese power. Every Communist government, every Communist party, has been set free to begin to respond to its own national concerns and to pursue its own national policies. One Communist state, Cuba, has even performed the ingenious feat of being simultaneously at odds with both Moscow and Peking.

As nationalism has transformed the democratic and Communist worlds, so too it has transformed the Third World. After the war, many people—Communists and anti-Communists alike—supposed that Communism was the wave of the future and accepted the thesis of its inevitable triumph. In particular, it was anticipated that Marxism would sweep through the developing world like a prairie fire. With Asia, Africa, and Latin America shaken by the deep-running demands for economic development and social justice, new states everywhere, it was believed, would turn to Communism, if only as the most efficient technique for modernization. Some in the West became mesmerized by the notion that, when a nationalist revolution began in an underdeveloped country, Communism was bound to win out. This has not happened. There has been an abundance of nationalist revolutions in these years. But the striking fact is plainly the failure of the Communists to ride to power on nationalist upheavals.

The reasons for the failure of Communism in the developing world is the same as the reason for the expulsion of colonialism from that world: what the new nations want more than anything else is the assurance of their national freedom of decision. And this very fact too, while it has endowed the new nations with spirit and audacity, has prevented them from forming, as some once feared they might do, a unified bloc against the West. Today they are unified only in their determination to stay out of the Cold War—and in the hope of shaking down the developed countries, Russia as well as America, for all the economic aid they can get. Beyond that, they too are deeply divided by nationalist resentments and rivalries.

Nationalism has thus changed the relations between America and the Western world and Russia and the Communist world, and it has defeated expectations of Russian and American influence as well as of a unified neutralist bloc in the Third World. It has emerged as the most powerful political emotion of our time. The Age of Superpowers is coming to an end.

A COMMON FRUSTRATION

Or at least this is evident to everyone—except to the Superpowers themselves. A main source of trouble in the world today is, as often before, the failure of Superpowers to recognize a new historical situation. This is natural enough. England and France, though knocked out of the running after the second world war, continued to try and act like great powers as late as their attempt in 1956 to control the Middle East and humiliate Arab nationalism. Superpowers are always slow to realize the decline in their capacity to command events. So America and Russia, operating on the momentum of ideas generated in the immediate postwar years, have persisted, despite a new age and a changed world, in those habits of thought and action which worked more or less between 1945 and 1955. The illusion of Superpowership thus lay behind the long American attempt to determine the destiny of Vietnam. It lay behind the Soviet attempt to enter the Caribbean in 1962, as it lies behind current Soviet attempts to dominate the Middle East and dictate the future of Czechoslovakia.

In 1967 Chairman Kosygin visited the United State and had a meeting with President Johnson in New Jersey. He came at a moment when Russia and America were in sharp disagreement over the two most urgent items on the meeting's agenda—Vietnam and the Arab-Israeli war. Yet, in spite of this disagreement, the meeting itself was surprisingly cordial. This caused puzzlement at the time. In retrospect there is no great mystery why this should have been so. The two leaders were evidently brought together by considerations deeper than conflicts in Southeast Asia or in the Middle East. They were brought together by a common sense of international frustration and a common fear that their mutual interests in world management were under challenge. They shared most of all a deep perplexity and anguished exasperation over the inability of their two countries to run the world any longer. The partnership of Holly Bush was above all a partnership of irritation and chagrin.

---

[3] The total bomb tonnage dropped on Vietnam, North and South, through October 1968, was 2,948,057 tons. The total tonnage dropped during the second world war in both the European and Pacific theaters was 2,057,244 tons. This means that American planes dropped almost 50 per cent more tons of explosives on this hapless country than were dropped on Japan, Germany, and other enemy territories during the last world war. I owe these figures to the pertinacity of I. F. Stone who elicited them from the Pentagon press office and published them in his highly erratic but sometimes useful *Weekly*.

The world had for some time been approaching the point when the common American-Russian interest in global management was becoming more important than their disagreement on ideological issues or than the clash of their national interests. The irony, of course, is that these two countries were not at all concerned with collaboration during the Era of Superpowers—at a time when such collaboration might have gone far toward ordering the planet. But, as the recovery of national initiative in the rest of the world began to threaten the very idea of Superpowership, the tendency grew to consider it more important to share world domination with the other than to open up the game. So, like two cartels which have been competing bitterly against each other for the world's supply of a vital commodity—in this case, power—they now tend to prefer to divide the market between themselves as against the risk and uncertainty which would follow from the admission of new competitors.

The clearest expression of this drawing together can be seen in the attempt to limit the control and availability of nuclear weapons. I do not suggest that the Test Ban Treaty of 1963 and the treaty to stop nuclear proliferation are not excellent things in themselves. They are surely the greatest formal strides toward peace the world has taken in this generation. But it is important also to consider how these proposals look to the non-nuclear nations. Their obvious effect—and, some cynics have suggested, their secret intention—is to exclude the rest from the nuclear club and thus to preserve American-Russian nuclear dominance. This is why, of course, these treaties have been so bitterly denounced by the two great rebel states—France in the Western block and China in the Communist bloc.

Alas, the drift of the Superpowers toward collaboration, generally encouraging as this new mood may be, has come too late, at least too late to save their joint hopes of world domination. "What forces in the world could resist us?" Kosygin said to Life in February 1968. "Nobody." Kosygin is wrong. The pathos of the present situation is that, just as America cannot unilaterally impose its will on Southeast Asia and Russia cannot unilaterally impose its will on the Middle East, so America and Russia together, even if they agreed on very detail of policy and worked together to put a common policy over, can no longer settle affairs in Southeast Asia and the Middle East. The events in the rest of the world have developed a life of their own—a future as well as a past of their own—and they are passing beyond the reach even of joint American-Russian dictation.

Indeed, the very process of Russian-American rapprochement hastens the end of Superpowership by reducing the fear that independent national action is likely to provoke the great powers into nuclear war; it thereby increases every nation's sense of its own freedom of maneuver. Nothing exhibits more arrestingly the decline of Superpowership than the spectacle in recent years of Superpowers pushed around by their satellites—the Soviet Union by East Germany, Cuba, and North Vietnam; the United States by South Korea, South Vietnam, and Taiwan. Tocqueville's old forecast—America and Russia, each "marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe"—has had, in the end, an exceedingly short run.

Ordinarily it takes defeat in war to persuade a Superpower that it has been living beyond its means. Sometimes one defeat is not enough. It took two defeats, for example, to convince Germany it was not a Superpower; there are those who fear that the Germans may not have learned this lesson yet. Great Britain, on the victorious side in the second world war, persisted in the illusion until the defeat at Suez terminated her imperial dream. The American failure in Vietnam has produced a striking reassessment of the world position of the United States. Vietnam has been an expensive and horrible education; but no one can question the fact that most Americans are now determined to have no more Vietnams. Only the Soviet Union, sustained by a dogmatic faith in the infallibility of its ideology, still seems dogged in the pursuit of Superpowership, and this in spite of spectacular setbacks in Cuba and the Middle East. The world must hope that Czechoslovakia may in time have the same effect on Russia that Suez had on England and Vietnam on the United States.

A NEW AMERICAN POLICY

The last-ditch champions of the American Vietnam policy like to argue that the only alternative to universalism is isolationism. This, of course, is a self-serving definition of the issues; and the debate should not be established in these terms. A headlong dash from the world, a retreat to our own shores, even a retreat to our own hemisphere: all these are impossible options. An isolationist course would be as false to our interests as it would be false to our ideals. The United States cannot resign from the task of helping to build a rational world order.

But what form is this world order likely to take? As Franklin Roosevelt construed the universalist world a quarter of a century ago, it would be a world in which order would be enforced by the great powers. The decline of the Superpowers dooms this world. But it would appear equally to doom the sphere-of-interest world sought by Stalin. Thoughtful people still argue that spheres of influence offer the only alternative to universalism. But is it probable that, in the age after the Superpowers, the sphere-of-interest policy will be as easy to work as it was in the past? Confronted by nationalism in Czechoslovakia, Russia had to use military force to maintain its sphere of influence in Eastern Europe. Confronted by nationalism in the Dominican Republic, the United States had to use (or thought it had to use) military force to maintain its sphere of influence in the Caribbean. Both Superpowers got away with their military intervention in the short run. But both know that, where they are unwilling to use military force, they can no longer count on the automatic compliance of the countries of Eastern Europe or Latin America. It is highly doubtful whether China will be any more successful in putting together a submissive sphere of influence in East Asia.

My guess is that the most realistic evolution in the future would be along the lines of the proposal made by Churchill in 1943—a development of regional groupings within the United Nations, thereby merging universalist and sphere-of-influence conceptions, strengthening the "middle powers" and discharging the great powers from the supposed obligation to rush about putting down every presumed threat to world peace.

This would be a policy neither of universalism nor of isolationism but of discrimination. It would imply the existence of what President Kennedy called the "world of diversity"—"a robust and vital world community, founded on nations secure in their own independence, and united by allegiance to world peace." And it would imply the recognition of the limits of American power. As Kennedy put it in 1961:

"We must face the fact that the United States is neither omnipotent nor omniscient—that we are only 6 per cent of the world's population—that we cannot impose our will upon the other 94 per cent—that we cannot right every wrong or reverse each adversity—and that therefore there cannot be an American solution to every world problem."

Kennedy's profound insight was forgotten when his successor reinstated Dullesism and plunged ahead with the policy of overkill. But today, in the melancholy aftermath of Vietnam, we must at last understand more urgently than ever that "there cannot be an American solution to every world problem," and that we must therefore demand a sense of proportion and priority in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

In light of the Vietnam tragedy and of the current world mood, what would be the basic principles for a new American policy? What are the lessons of Vietnam?

First, that everything in the world is not of equal importance to us. Asia and Africa are of vital importance for Asians and Africans, and they are of some importance to us. But they are not so important for us as they are to Asians and Africans, nor are they as important for us as are Europe, Latin America, and Soviet Russia. In the last three years we have given most of our attention and resources to a marginal problem on the mainland of Asia while our position has steadily deteriorated in parts of the world far more indispensable to our national security.

Second, that we cannot do everything in the world. The universalism of the older generation was spacious in design and noble in intent. Its flaw was that it overcommitted our country—it overcommitted our policy, our resources, and our rhetoric. It estranged our friends without intimidating our enemies. Vietnam should teach us that in the last half of the twentieth century armed white men cannot determine the destiny of a nation on the mainland of Asia. It should teach us, more generally, that any American policies which involve the denial of local nationalism are doomed to failure.

Third, that we cannot be the permanent guarantor of stability in a world of turbulence. Violence is epidemic in the developing world; and we cannot regard every outbreak as a summons for the American fire brigade. "Every country," a wise Englishman said, "has a right to its own Wars of the Roses." Not every revolution, not every change in political and economic systems, not every assertion of belligerent nationalism is necessarily a mortal threat to the security of the United States.

Fourth, that all problems in the world are not military problems, and that military force is not necessarily the most effective form of national power. So long as we continue to define our world problems in military terms, so long will we strengthen our own warrior class and plunge the nation into further military intervention. This is a self-defeating course. We have never had more military power in the world than we have today—and we have seldom in recent times had less influence. As General de Gaulle observed to President Kennedy in Paris in 1961, the French had learned that exerting influence in Southeast Asia and taking military action there were almost incompatible. We should ponder this statement. And, as we free ourselves from the military hang-ups of our foreign policy, we can begin to combat the militarization of our domestic thought and institutions.

Fifth, that the basis for our international influence in the coming period will lie less in the power of our arms than in the power of our example. As the Superpowers themselves begin to realize that their time is over, then they will recognize that future world leadership will demand persuasion as well as power. Political ties, economic assistance, cultural relations: these we must strengthen as we can. But military intervention is another matter.

We should undertake military intervention only when the national security of the United States is directly and vitally involved, when the people whom we think we are supporting display a capacity for resistance themselves, and when there are reasonable prospects for success—all conditions rejected and trampled on by those who made American policy in Vietnam. We must take advantage of the fact that modern military technology—intercontinental missiles, nuclear submarines, rapid means of airlift—reduces the need for the physical presence of American troops and bases in foreign lands. The time has come for a policy of "selective disengagement."

Of course, it seems easier in the short run to throw military weight around like an international bully than it is to appeal to the reason and conscience of mankind and to validate that appeal by the values we display in our national community. Yet we have exerted our greatest influence in the world precisely when—as in days of Woodrow Wilson, of Franklin Roosevelt, of John Kennedy—American leadership, in great part because of its identification with progressive policies at home, has been able to command the confidence of ordinary people everywhere. Mr. Nixon's goal of "clear-cut military superiority" will never be a substitute for American idealism as exemplified in action.

THE PRICE OF PROGRESS

We can restore our influence only as we contract our military presence around the world and begin to display reason, restraint, and magnanimity in our dealings with other nations. Above all, we can restore our influence only as we live up to our highest ideals in our national community. "Those are not wrong," Carl Schurz wrote seventy years ago, "who maintain that the nation which would assume the office of a general dispenser of justice and righteousness in the world . . . should be held to prove itself as a model of justice and righteousness in its own home concerns." The industrial order is undergoing vast and fundamental changes as the mechanical society created by the first industrial revolution is evolving into the new electronic society. "Because your country is further on the path of industrial development than ours," Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber told a meeting of American intellectuals, "many of the crises you are living through today are the ones we shall increasingly have to face in the future." If America is in turmoil, he continued, this was not the proof of decay but the price of progress. America seems in crisis because Americans have reached the point in social transformation where they are raising and debating fundamental questions long buried in tradition and dogma: the relationships between rich and poor, between black and white, between parent and child, between structure and spontaneity. "From the answers that you will find to this new set of questions will come a new 'social contract,' a new definition of the relationship between man and society with this second industrial revolution."

The experience of Vietnam has shown that we cannot run two crusades at once—that we cannot wage even a small war against an underdeveloped country and at the same time move creatively to meet the problems of our own land. The policy of total involvement in the world is incompatible with the policy of social reconstruction at home. It would appear that in the years ahead America will exercise international influence less by trying to run the planet than by trying to solve the new problems of the high-technology state—the accelerating pace of technical change, the humanization of the city, the dilemmas of racial justice, the reform of education, the plight of the individual in a world of great organizations. In the years immediately to come, the world will follow us less because of our armed might than because of our capacity to heal the disruptions and fulfill the potentialities of the electronic society. If this is so, then we return to an earlier conception of the way America should seek to lead the world. "She will recommend the general cause by the countenance of her voice, and by the benignant sympathy of her example," said John Quincy Adams. ". . . But she goes not abroad in search of monsters to destroy."

"STAFFING WASHINGTON JOBS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE"—ARTICLE BY GEORGE C. DENNEY, JR.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the March issue of the Foreign Service Journal contains an article entitled: "Staffing Washington Jobs in the Department of State," by George C. Denney, Jr. Mr. Denney, a former staff consultant to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is presently a Deputy Director of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. In his article, Mr. Denney discusses the difficulties of staffing jobs in the Department of State that require continuity, difficulties which revolve around the problem of offering rewarding careers to officers who serve in specialist positions in Washington. He discusses the problem of staffing the Bureau of Intelligence and Research as a specific example and suggests, in conclusion, that the Department of State needs two career systems for its foreign affairs officers—the Foreign Service and a domestic service separately recruited, managed, and promoted.

For those interested in the complicated administrative problems in the Department of State, I suggest a close reading of Mr. Denney's article, and ask unanimous consent that the full text be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Comment on Policy: Staffing Washington Jobs in the Department of State

(By George C. Denney, Jr.)

(Note.—George C. Denney is Deputy Director of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. Mr. Denney worked on the staff of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for six years, in the General Counsel's office in the Office of the Secretary of Defense for two years, in the office of the Director for Mutual Security, Executive Office of the President for two years, and earlier, in the Executive Secretariat, Department of State, for two years, 1950–52.)

When the American Foreign Service Association held its mass meeting on September 6, 1968 in the Department of State auditorium to express alarm over the newly enacted provisions of law authored by Rep. Wayne Hays which would make it possible for some Foreign Service Reserve officers (FSR) to be granted "unlimited tenure," the greatest applause was registered when retired Ambassador Riddleberger cried, "There are already too many FSRs!!"

The Ambassador was commenting on a passage, intended to be reassuring to Foreign Service officers (FSO), contained in a statement by Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Idar Rimestad, which was handed out at the meeting. This passage, which was published on page 20 of the September Department of State News Letter, read as follows:

"The second objective, that of strengthening the personnel system of the Department of State, will be achieved through expanding and strengthening both the Foreign Service Officer Corps and the support staff at all levels. In so doing, it is believed that virtually all positions at the officer level falling within the following broad functional categories, except those which may be found to be excessively routine, will be designated for staffing by Foreign Service officers:

"Political.
"Political/Economic.
"Political/Military.
"Economic.
"Economic/Commercial.
"Consular.
"General Administrative.

"It is expected that Foreign Service Reserve officers will be appointed to the above type positions only in those few instances where a qualified Foreign Service officer is unavailable and the position must be filled."

It is the thesis of this article that the foregoing policy is not wise; that it is not in the best interest of the United States Government or the Department of State or the Foreign Service.

The policy in question, previously followed in the Wriston Program era, has been pushed in the Department since the fall of 1967. It was formally announced as part of the objectives of the new domestic staffing policy in the May 1968 issue of the Department of State's News Letter:

"1. To staff through the Foreign Service all of those positions in the United States which can be staffed properly through the worldwide rotational system."

The question as to what "staffing properly" was to mean—that is as to how hard the administrators would push to fill every position in the United States with rotating FSOs—was revealed in the next to the last paragraph of the June announcement in the Department of State News Letter:

"Recruitment under Civil Service should be discontinued, except when found necessary to fill a position designated as a Civil Service position. The number of positions so designated should be reviewed periodically for the purpose of gradual reduction, the ultimate objective being to staff all positions under the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended."

In a nutshell, the new policy is to fill every Washington job with a rotating FSO or FSS if he can conceivably do the job, and, by increased training and specialization within the Foreign Service, to continue this policy until virtually all Washington jobs are staffed by officers committed to worldwide service.

What rationale and necessity have been announced for this policy of squeezing out all domestic service employees? The May, June and September announcements are silent as to the reasons. Could it be BALPA? Could it be the "bulge?" Could it be budget cuts? Could it be simplification of administration? Could it be avoidance of the rigidities of employment under the Civil Service Act? The official announcements quoted above did not say.

A BETTER POLICY

The usual approach to personnel management is to analyze carefully the skills needed and the working conditions and then to devise hiring policies and career systems which will select the best person for each job. It is normally assumed that it is good to be able to choose employees from among *all* qualified Americans.

The serious weakness of the new policy as so far enunciated is that it would aim to recruit as many professionals as possible from a rather special group of Americans; namely, those who desire to spend half or more of their careers abroad and are willing to do so under the rotational assignment system. An inherent difficulty with trying to fill all or most specialist positions from the Foreign Service pool is that the pool is more restricted in quantity and variety of talent than the larger pool which includes all other intelligent Americans. Two determining considerations for the person who thinks of joining the Foreign Service are whether he wishes to spend most of his career abroad and whether he is willing to have his work assigned under the distinctive Foreign Service system. To forego hiring specialists who do *not* like these requirements is a big sacrifice for the Department to make if it wishes to ensure getting the best people for all its positions—a sacrifice damaging to the public interest.

SPECIALIZATION IS HERE TO STAY

The needs of the Department of State, both at home and abroad, but especially in Washington, call for more and more men and women with specialized skills: labor economists, monetary and fiscal experts, budget analysts, specialized lawyers, demographers, librarians, historians, intelligence analysts, physical and social scientists, educators, commodity experts, political-military advisers, linguists, security officers and many more. The trend is toward greater specialization and that in turn requires greater continuity in the same field of work. The growing demands for computer experts in the communications field and for management specialists in data and information handling are only the more dramatic and recent examples of the need for specialization in foreign affairs. When the specialist needs of USIA, AID, ACDA and the Peace Corps are added to those of the Department of State—as they should be for wise personnel system planning—the requirements are indeed formidable.

There was a time when it was thought necessary for the Foreign Service officer serving abroad to be able to do any professional task. Everybody was trained and assigned so that he would learn something about everything that might require attention by the head of a large mission. No one today believes that is possible or wise. Specialization even in jobs abroad is believed necessary. The Congress, dissatisfied with the rate of progress shown by the Foreign Service in rewarding officers who pursued specialist careers, imposed section 626 in the Foreign Service Act upon an unwilling Department. Section 626 reads as follows:

"The achievement of the objectives of this act requires increasing numbers of Foreign Service officers to acquire functional and geographic area specializations and to pursue such specializations for a substantial part of their careers. Such specialization shall not in any way inhibit or prejudice the orderly advancement through class 1 of any such officer in the Foreign Service."

The philosophy of section 626 is now accepted. The June announcement in the Department of State News Letter put it this way:

"We believe that the time has come when we must 'take the bit' and recognize in practice that Foreign Service officers, like other personnel, cannot be expected to acquire, by mid-career, a real expertise in every aspect of Foreign Service work in today's world. This concept simply does not promise the level of excellency required."

This principle is sound. No quarrel can be made with the concept of dividing Foreign Service officers into distinct functional groups for purposes of recruitment, assignment, training, promotion, and selection out. If this is wise for overseas jobs, how much more important it is to apply the principle at home in Washington, where the larger proportion of specialized positions is found. In Washington the trend toward specialization occurred more quickly and the proportion changed more dramatically.

Can the great variety of professional officer skills needed by the Department be obtained *best* by a system under which recruitment would be made almost entirely from persons willing to obligate themselves to serve most of their careers overseas or by a diversified system which offers a domestic service career as well as a rotating service career?

The answer of the administrators of the Department has been that the Foreign Service Officer Corps can provide a pool of talent that is at once big enough, varied enough, and expert enough.

This is a policy of wishful thinking when it is applied to domestic staffing. The Department has for years been torn between the theoretical advantage of a single personnel system and the practical fact that it needs personnel of two different kinds. No one denies that it needs a Foreign Service of persons who are prepared for a life of movement spent primarily abroad, under a system and a discipline and reward that permit staffing a certain number of quite undesirable positions. With this need as a starting point, the Department has tried various ways of blending in its other need for personnel with specialized skills. The simple expedient of eliminating any system outside the Foreign Service has, in both logic and practice, shown itself to be no answer to the problem.

NEED FOR DOMESTIC SERVICE CAREER OPPORTUNITIES

The Department of State, therefore, needs to be able to offer rewarding careers to officers who serve in Washington specialist positions if it is to obtain and retain recruits from one of the large pools of people best qualified for these jobs. We are competing, of course, for the bright college and graduate students whose services are sought by both private organizations and other government agencies. We have to offer young people at least 10 or 15 years of interesting work. Most college graduates are not thinking of the pros and cons of a full 30 years career, but they do need to have an idea where their first job may lead them for the first 10–15 years.

If we are to recruit the best specialists for Washington service, furthermore, there must be an adequate promotion ladder. An adequate ladder can be assured in two ways. One is to have a number of positions of similar kind but different levels, within the organization where the applicant would start. Another is to develop relations with other nearby organizations to which he could shift. Either way, he sees that the path ahead can be upward. Yet the policy aims to narrow down the number of domestic positions, apparently without regard to promotional requirements.

A college graduate looking at the recent personnel atmosphere in the Department and wanting opportunities for domestic service could only be discouraged. He would find out that for the last five years, with very few exceptions, there has been a series of freezes on any filling of jobs in Washington from outside the Foreign Service. He would see that some non-FSOs in Washington jobs have been able to win promotions but he would note that the rungs of the ladder below senior and middle grades in jobs customarily filled by domestic service employees are now frequently filled by junior FSOs because of the ban on outside recruitment.

How does the future look to a senior GS employee? He can stay where he is but movement to any other job is difficult. Certainly movement higher is difficult because 63 percent of the supergrade positions which the Department of State used to enjoy have been turned back to the Civil Service Commission as vacancies occurred, in anticipation of the passage of the 1967 Hays Bill. Since hope for that Hays Bill vanished, however, the senior GS has seen no sign of any effort to recover these supergrades, which would be the most obvious proof of an intent to make life and work in the Department adequately rewarding for him. These policies have locked out career domestic civil servants from almost all of the higher paying non-political jobs in the Department; nowadays an FSR appointment must be made or an FSO selected for the job.

THE HAYS COUP

When the original Hays bill was killed in the Senate the Department was left with unsatisfactory choices which it could, under the Foreign Service Act, offer to the college graduate interested in a *domestic* career in foreign relations. It was technically possible to offer a Foreign Service Staff appointment for work in Washington but the candidate had to be told of two difficulties. Eight years is the longest time that an FSO, FSR or FSS can work without an overseas assignment under present legislation, and no change in the Foreign Service Act was being contemplated. Even if the time limitations were not present, the applicant had to be told that the ceiling on his Foreign Service Staff salary is well below that of the Civil Service or Foreign Service officer ladders and that, again, no amendment to the existing legislation was being sought. Applicants had to be told that, whereas there was a time recently when specialists were appointed as Foreign Service Reserve officers with the hope that they might receive more permanent status under the original Hays Bill, that prospect seemed dead. Moreover domestic FSRs already on the rolls had to worry about their *status*. They were urged to convert from Civil Service status to Foreign Service Reserve (domestic) status in anticipation of the success of the original Hays Bill. Large numbers did so and, in almost all cases, received a boost in pay upon such conversion. They were now being asked to convert back again or to transfer to the FSS Corps.

It was at this stage, with the "guidelines" well on the way to implementation, with large numbers of additional positions in Washington having been designated for FSO occupancy, and with the only decent domestic professional career route being under the Civil Service Act, that Representative Hays made his move. On his initiative, but with the agreement of USIA and State, amendments were added in the House to the Senate-passed USIA career bill. The added package contained many essential features of the old Hays bill rejected by the Senate, but on the last day before the recess of Congress prior to the political party conventions the Senate concurred in the House amendments. Now there is authority to give FSRs appointments having unlimited tenure. Such a step would be *possible,* under regulations yet to be drawn, but not *required* of anyone. There are many questions to be studied and policy issues to be decided but, at least there is now a *possibility* of offering a college graduate a respectable domestic foreign affairs career under the Foreign Service Act. The eight year limit on assignment in Washington remains a legislative problem. The largest question remaining, however, is the subject of this article: the administrative policy of designating most positions for filling only by world-wide rotating officers.

HIGHLY QUALIFIED SPECIALISTS FORM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER RANKS?

The personnel concept paper issued in June says that all but a few specialist jobs in the Department can be filled with overseas career officers. No doubt many of these jobs *can* be filled by FSO and FSS Officers but how *well* will the work be done? How much sacrifice will there be of the objectives of finding and keeping the best possible man for each job?

The foundation of excellence in any professional work is a partnership of high quality men and long continuity. Other things being equal, the man who spends many years working on a given subject will be more highly skilled than one who spends two-four years, which is the typical FSO assignment. It has already been noted that there are fewer specialized positions overseas compared with the number in Washington. One should not be misled by labels. The kind of work done abroad by FSO "economic/commercial" specialists, as that term is used in the new concept paper, is seldom applicable to the way of, say the international monetary payments experts needed in Washington. Suppose you find the FSO who is willing to get additional university training in economics and suppose you keep him on for an extra year or two in a Washington specialist assignment: then where does he go? And how is he replaced in Washington—by another FSO who has spent a year in special training? In short, the result is a three-way waste: the FSO wastes career time in specialized training and activity which are unlikely to serve him fully in the System's concept of credit for promotion; the System itself wastes valuable officer time in training for a one-shot assignment; the Department wastes talent which, through training and practice, reaches full competence at just about the time it is snatched away to a less relevant assignment. Many difficulties would seem to lie ahead if the attempt is pursued to staff nearly all specialist positions in Washington with rotating FSOs.

LESSONS FROM THE WRISTON EXPERIENCE

Many have noted the similarity and analogy between the present period, when as many jobs as possible in Washington are being designated for FSOs, and the period of the so-called Wriston Program around 1954 when the shotgun marriage of the Civil Service and Foreign Service in the Department was carried out. Then, as now, the mold of every professional job was looked at to see whether an FSO could possibly fit into it; then, it may be said, as now, the effort was built upon a basic confusion between jobs for which experience abroad in some form was *helpful* and jobs for which it was *necessary* in the form of Foreign Service assignment.

Some lessons were learned from the Wriston experience, however. We shall apparently escape the embarrassing and even tragic developments of the years following adoption of the Wriston Program when many former highly specialized domestic service officers were "Wristonized," sent abroad and there failed to compete with the more "generalist" regular FSOs.

History may nonetheless repeat itself in other respects. In 1954, the Public Committee on Personnel, as the Wriston Committee was called, proposed that 1464 officer positions in Washington be designated for FSO occupancy. The ratio was about 2 to 1 in favor of FSO designation. By 1959, new surveys initiated in the Department resulted in the dedesignation of 284 of the FSO positions. From 1959 to 1967 the ratio of FSOs in Washington officer positions to non-FSOs has been close to 1 to 1. Pursuant to the new guidelines announced in May–June 1968, the bureaus of the Department have decided to designate about 2000 positions for FSOs and about 900 for non-FSOs. Thus the ratio is back to the 2 to 1 Wriston ratio.

LESSONS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

In the Pentagon and elsewhere in the Department of Defense there are four elite career military services whose officers are bound to serve anywhere in the world and who recruit, examine, assign, appraise, promote, and select out each other. Like the Foreign Service, these groups are largely self-managing and self-critical; they have an esprit de corps and an instinct for self-preservation. Military men have as good a sense of command and control as anyone, and it is useful to see how they cope with the proliferation of knowledge and the increasing specializations of functions which are common to all agencies. They have felt the need to train some of their number as scientists, information handling specialists, and financial experts, but, relatively speaking, only a few. They have not tried to fill all of the professional slots in Washington, just the key, higher jobs. Typically, alongside each of these jobs sits a talented longtime civilian deputy who will be there when the next colonel rotates into the top spot, and the next colonel after him.

Now, of course, this is not the whole story; two other factors come into play. One can be laid aside—the question of civilian control over the military. The balance between career military and other professionals in a given organization in the Department of Defense is closely related to this consideration, but it has no parallel in the Department of State.

The other factor is more subtle—the question of making allowance for a special point of view. A Secretary of Defense or a Secretary of State wants to insure that he gets a variety of viewpoints on any problem. Is there a "military mind?" Is there a "Foreign Service attitude?" Do elite, self-disciplining, peer-judged personnel systems based on mutual, detailed annual efficiency reports, tend to breed a predictable approach to problems? It is not necessary to say yes to these somewhat loaded questions to make the point that any Secretary of State should be on guard when he sees a plan to staff all positions in the Department with rotating FSOs and FSSs.

INR STAFFING AS AN ILLUSTRATION OF THE GENERAL POLICY QUESTION

It is appropriate to consider the experience and needs of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR) with respect to officer personnel as an illustration of the principles involved in proper staffing of the Department of State in Washington.

Most officers in INR are engaged in analysis of political, economic and social trends in foreign countries and in making forecasts of relevance to US policies. This function is clearly one for which Foreign Service officers have important qualifications. These research functions can also be performed by domestic foreign area specialists, who have in fact constituted about 50 percent of INR's regional research offices in recent years. Since November 1967, when the campaign began to designate as many Washington jobs as possible for FSO occupancy, INR has successfully fought off proposals to work toward staffing INR research offices fully with world-wide rotating FSOs, FSRs and FSSs. INR has resisted encroachment on the principle that a 50–50 ratio of FSOs to domestic service career specialists is ideal.

As an organization with both basic research as well as current intelligence responsibilities, INR must rely not only upon personnel generally acquainted with foreign service and international affairs but also upon a parallel group of officers who characteristically accumulate wide knowledge in a limited area of field. The professional analyst and the FSA tend not to be the same person. A senior career FSA has expressed the differing qualities of the two in the following way:

"Every FSO has some of the qualities of an analyst, and good analysts very often make effective FSOs. The honest-to-God analyst, however, has something more:

"The ability to deal day in and day out with paper—stacks upon stacks of ephemera and buckram-bound tomes, or speeches, newsprint, reports at first and third hand, and comments on comments—without losing touch with the reality behind it all. He must live with his head in a cloud of paper, yet keep his feet on the ground. He must have self-discipline the way an FSO must have a good liver.

"The ability to spot the truly novel and significant in a mass of the familiar and irrelevant. . . . The nugget of information that makes the whole story fall in place gleams for him where others see only sand. . . . The accumulation of facts and experience takes years that the FSO cannot supply.

"The ability to communicate the pattern he finds without taking the reader through the long trail of search and discovery that led him to it. The FSO, trained to report from abroad, is encouraged to tell in detail what he sees and hears so that it can be mined for information serving a variety of purposes. The researcher rarely does a favor in recounting his intellectual odysseys. He must keep a sharp pencil despite the dulling pressure of detail.

"The ability to expose reality without being influenced by what should be done about it. The good FSO begins to prepare specific policy recommendations early in his career. He soon finds it difficult to dedicate himself to what *is* without being haunted by what *should be*. He has found that recommendations without advocacy lose battles that could be won. The analyst must train himself to hold the future, like all else unproven, a bit in contempt. His pride is in creating order from a congeries of facts and inferences, changing or neglecting none of them. The FSO's pride is in having a hand in shaping the future; his is an actionist's kick rather than the researcher's faith that the truth shall set men—on the right path."

In a memo written in December 1967 to defend the principle of having a mix of professional analysts and FSOs in INR research offices, the question was argued in the following way:

"The reasons why we think the 50/50 mixture is ideal are these:

"1. The essence of INR's function is that it has an independent viewpoint. . . . How could a staff of exactly the same kind of people found in other areas—indeed, through the force of rotation, identical people—produce results different in character?

"2. *Some*where in the Department there should be at least a core of officers who are able to accumulate wide knowledge in a limited field, who have opportunity for comprehensive analysis and the long view, who acquire, together with practice in applying their skills to policy problems, the habit of depth research. Individuals of this sort grow by continuity, not rotation, and by work in the Department, not in the academic environment.

"3. Long-continued research is not one of the things people join a Foreign Service for—and it is a serious question whether they *should*. The scheme of loyalties involved in executing policy directives, the attitudes required for operating, the emphasis on rapid decision, among other features of FS life, run actually counter to the requirements of research. FSOs have much to offer—and receive—in a mix, but manifestly to staff INR with FSOs would in time dilute out of sight its research character.

"4. For the Foreign Service itself, service in INR gains its distinctive value from exposure to the research tradition embodied in the permanent staff. Otherwise INR would simply be another Mission or policy Bureau and would offer no new experience.

"5. The relationships which INR maintains on behalf of the Department, on the one hand with other intelligence agencies and on the other with private research groups all over the country, require continuity quite different from that which, in foreign capitals, is consistent with rotation of personnel. . . . In particular, INR's representation of the Department in the complex processes of producing National Intelligence Estimates would suffer seriously if it did not involve a good proportion of seasoned and familiar research officers.

"6. The fact that CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency have settled for staffing their headquarters with both rotating and permanent personnel means two things:

"(a) It serves as testimony to the Department that our associates in other agencies have perceived the need for specialization and continuity in the business which INR is supposed to carry on for the Department.

"(b) It would put INR at a serious disadvantage in representing the Department's interests if it could not match these agencies' experts in depth with similar experts of its own."

ORIGIN OF THE NEW PERSONNEL GUIDELINES

What are the sources and inspiration for the current policy of halting Civil Service recruitment except when inescapably necessary to fill a position designated for Civil Service, reviewing such positions periodically to try to reduce them, with the ultimate objective of staffing all domestic positions through the Foreign Service Act? Did the policy come out of a high-level public-Government committee like the Wriston Committee or the Herter Committee? No. Did the policy stem from Congressional initiatives or legislative requirements? No. Did the policy result from the deliberations of an interagency committee representing AID, USIA, and other parts of the foreign affairs community? No. Did the policy arise from a departmental committee representing the geographic and functional bureaus of the Department of State? No.

The new guidelines were fixed in the general Departmental memorandum of November 13, 1967. They were amplified by an ad hoc "Committee on Strengthening the Personnel System" composed, 9 to 1, of FSOs. It was their report which was announced in the June News Letter quoted at the beginning of this article. As far as is known, the ad hoc committee held no hearings, not even to receive advice from Civil Service or Foreign Service employee organizations.

WHAT HAPPENS NOW?

The June announcement said that working groups were being organized to examine in depth each aspect of the concept developed by the "Committee on Strengthening the Personnel System," but nothing has been heard from them. Meanwhile, however, the policy of easing out of the Civil Service and pushing in the Foreign Service in Washington jobs is being steadily implemented by an administrative hierarchy, controlling all assignments, composed from the top well down toward the working level entirely of Foreign Service officers.

It is to be hoped that the surprise enactment of the mini-Hays bill, giving a prospect of administering a domestic career foreign affairs specialist corps through FSR appointments of unlimited tenure, will be the occasion for rethinking the premises of the staffing patterns and position designations now being implemented.

RECAPITULATION

If a process of rethinking the present policy "guidelines" does take place it might usefully take into account these points:

1. The need for professional employees in Washington having specialized skills and long continuity of expertise is going to grow.

2. The Department should seek the best people for jobs requiring such qualities, wherever they may be found.

3. The nature of the job functions should determine whether it is to be filled by a rotating FSO or a domestic service officer.

4. The guiding approach should not be to see how many rotating FSOs can be assigned to Washington jobs but, through objective job content and organization analysis, to find that proper mixture of stay-at-home career officers and overseas career officers which will most creatively and efficiently do the Department's work.

5. The Department of State needs two career systems for its foreign affairs officers: the Foreign Service and a domestic service separately recruited at the bottom and at other levels and separately managed and promoted. The variety of means under Civil Service authority, or the new Hays FSR approach, or both, should make it possible to achieve a flexible domestic career system which will attract a steady influx of bright young foreign affairs graduates for domestic service as well as the mature scarce specialists needed from time to time.

DISSENT—"RESPONSIBLE" AND OTHERWISE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently there has been a good deal in the newspapers critical of those of us who have had something to say about the ABM.

The dissenters from dissent have taken up arms again, and, as before, it is not the right of dissent that is objected to, but the exercise of that right. Criticism is fine, we are told—the very stuff of democracy, a blessing of liberty, the true source of our strength—but, as the editorialists intone, it has got to be "responsible" dissent—"responsible" in time, "responsible" in place, "responsible" in form.

That is where all the dissenting about dissent begins. Applied to public criticisms of foreign policy, the term "responsible" usually turns out to mean: some other time, some other place, and some totally different form.

Take this matter of timing. When I criticized the Johnson administration for its intervention in the Dominican Republic, I was criticized not only for the "aid and comfort" I was alleged to be giving to some unnamed enemy, but also because I had waited until after the crisis had abated, with the result—so said my critics—that my observations were "gratuitous" and "irrelevant." Thus enlightened, I did not wait for the Vietnam war to end before revealing my objections to it, and for that I—and many other war critics—became targets for a rich array of epithets, among which "demagoguery" and "irresponsibility" are among the more charitable. What is a dissenter to conclude except that, in the minds of the dissenters from dissent, the only time when criticism is "responsible" is some other time?

Then there is the problem of the way in which you dissent. Mr. Rusk used regularly to invite the Foreign Relations Committee to try to repeal the Gulf of Tonkin resolution and the hawkish press also urged that, if Congress did not like the war, why did it not stop griping and just cut off appropriations. As a politician, and as a student of Br'er Rabbit, I must admit to a certain wariness of an opponent's suggestion as to the tactics I might use against him. I for one would gladly have tried to repeal the Tonkin resolution if I had thought the votes could be found for doing so. But I did not think the votes could be found—and I suspect the administration shared that assessment of the situation in the Senate.

The unwillingness of Senators to vote to repeal the Tonkin resolution did not mean at all that they supported the administration's war policy. What it did mean was that Senators were unwilling to express their dissent in a particular manner that seemed to them drastic or irresponsible. The same can be said, even more so, for voting against appropriations for the war, which seemed tantamount to taking the guns out of the hands of our fighting men.

The conclusion which I draw is that the proponents of a policy are not really reliable sources of advice on how best to criticize that policy. Just as their favored time for dissent is some time when it will be irrelevant, the forms of criticism which they consider "responsible" turn out to be those with the greatest promise of being ineffectual or self-discrediting.

In the light of this experience, I am not much distressed by recent editorial complaints about the alleged end of the alleged "honeymoon" between Congress and the Nixon administration. One of the leading newspapers of my State credits me with being the first to end President Nixon's honeymoon by jumping on the President "too hard and too fast" for reasons of my "long-standing irascibility about the Vietnam war." [1]

In fact, the Democrat does me an undeserved honor. Some days before I spoke out, the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) made an excellent speech in the Senate about Vietnam which sent the Washington Evening Star into transports of outrage about "demagoguery in the Senate." [2]

In similar, though less agitated vein, the Washington Post said that the "striking difference" between my position on Vietnam and that of former Vice President Humphrey was "largely a question of timing," thereupon congratulating Mr. Humphrey on his willingness to allow the Nixon administration the traditional 100 days before the Democratic opposition begins to criticize its war policies.[3]

I must confess that I just cannot seem to get the hang of this timing problem. Is it the Post's position that we should all keep quiet for 100 days and then let all hell break loose on the 101st? I note that the distinguished minority leader shares my feeling that there is something arbitrary about the hundred days' honeymoon to which a new administration is supposed to be entitled. In his opinion, it is unreasonable to expect the new Republican administration to resolve the war in 100 days when the old Democratic administration was unable to resolve it in 5 years. The distinguished minority leader did not indicate whether, in consequence of his well made point, he would favor extending the honeymoon to 5 years or eliminating it altogether.

---

[1] "Wrong man gets cut," *Arkansas Democrat*, March 19, 1969, p. 4A.

[2] "Demagoguery in the Senate," *The Evening Star*, March 19, 1969, p. A24.

[3] "Hubert Humphrey's Good Example," *The Washington Post*, March 25, 1969.

My own view is that the proper time for criticism of what you perceive to be a mistake is when the mistake is made, or when you become aware that it has been made. Mr. Nixon, after all, did not discover for the first time that there was a war going on in Vietnam on the day of his inauguration. He has been a keen observer and articulate commentator on events in Indochina for the last 15 years. With due allowance for the necessary period in which a new President organizes his administration and becomes familiar with the workings of the Federal Government, it must also be borne in mind that the policy questions involved in Vietnam are not new but drearily old and familiar ones; that the President has had long experience in foreign affairs, which, as he said in the campaign, he regards as his "strong suit;" and finally, that, even if it were justified on all other grounds, we can not afford the luxury of delay in ending the war because every week that the war continues some 200 to 400 young Americans lose their lives.

You cannot really win on this matter of dissent, anyway. On March 27 the Foreign Relations Committee had a harmonious public hearing with Secretary of State Rogers, and that occurrence turned out to be hardly more pleasing to the critics of criticism than if the committee had held a field day of polemical fire works. Dismissing the matter of "tone and emphasis"—which were at least as significant in the discussion with Secretary Rogers as the actual words which were uttered—the Washington Evening Star speculated archly and irrelevantly about new techniques for soothing "irascible" Senators.[4] On the other hand, one national reporter was heard muttering about the committee's lack of "courage" for its failure to launch an unbridled attack on the Secretary of State.

It is all very puzzling. "Responsibility," it seems, means silent acquiescence in a policy which you deplore, while "courage" seems to connote an undiscriminating, though highly entertaining, bellicosity. Lacking more reliable guidelines for the discharge of his responsibilities, what can a politician do except to rely on his own fallible judgment?

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at the conclusion of my remarks a letter from an old friend in Arkansas who was very upset by the hearing at which Mr. Laird was present.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPRINGDALE, ARK.,
March 26, 1969.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: I watched you on the National Broadcasting set the other night, badger Laird until I almost vomited, and then I turned over to Walter Cronkite to get something more pleasant.

Bill, as much as you and Gore and Church; Hatfield, Percy and Javits and Teddy boy, love the communists, why in the * * * don't you just move over to Russia and live there? You'd be a * * * sight more comfortable, although about the only television coverage you would get in this country would be on May Day.

Sincerely,

ULYS A. LOVELL,
Attorney at Law.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, may I say that I have listened with a great deal of amusement to the Senator's comment on the subject of dissent. The one reassurance I get out of it is that there is nothing in the record of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas to suggest that he is likely to be intimidated by these conflicting pieces of advice on how dissent ought to be conducted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from Maine. I hope he is correct, and that I will not be intimidated. It is encouraging to hear of the Senator's confidence.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Vice President, the appointment of the following Senators to attend the 18th Disarmament Conference in Geneva: Senators PASTORE, GORE, BURDICK, COOPER, BENNETT, and COTTON.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE PRINTING OF EULOGIES ON DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader (Mr. DIRKSEN), I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 16

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as a Senate document the eulogies on Dwight David Eisenhower, delivered in the Congress; the eulogy delivered by President Nixon and the benediction by the Reverend Dr. Elson in the Rotunda of the Capitol on Sunday, Mar. 30; and the text of the funeral service, including prayers and scriptural selections read by the Reverend Dr. Elson, at Washington Cathedral, on Monday, March 31, 1969.

Resolved further, That the copy shall be prepared and bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing may direct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) was considered and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I understand that two unobjected-to nominations reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations are at the desk; and, once again in view of the extended recess facing the Senate following the session today, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for their consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Glenn A. Olds, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, favorably reported earlier in the day from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry Loomis, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the U.S. Information Agency, favorably reported earlier in the day from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MUSKIE, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE CONTROVERSY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, over the past weeks I have listened with increasing concern to the controversy about the administration's proposal for the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system.

The American people are deeply troubled that tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union have come to this new turn. They are disturbed by the competition for more and more deadly weapons of destruction. They are distressed by any step to intensify the nuclear arms race and weaken the prospect of relief from the threat of nuclear war.

The administration's ABM proposal represents quantum changes in the weaponry on which the precarious balance of mutual deterrence rests. It represents a major commitment of resources, away from other vitally important national objectives. Its bargain price tag is made suspect by all our experience in weapons building and by the system's own built-in momentum toward a new arms spiral.

The administration's proposal must withstand exhaustive scrutiny before this Nation can accept its enormous risks. We must demand careful evaluation of the Safeguard system—of its premises, its effectiveness, and its likely consequences—before the recommendations of the President and his advisers can be accepted as a national decision.

---

[4] "Harmony on the Hill," *The Evening Star*, March 28, 1969, p. A–12.

The burden of judgment is on the Congress. We are hearing testimony from the administration before the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. We have also heard ringing denunciations from distinguished scientists and other experts familiar with the range of considerations bearing on the decision to construct and deploy an anti-ballistic-missile system.

In the weeks ahead, the Congress will have to determine whether an ABM is needed, whether it will work, and whether it will contribute in a useful way to American security. Only when these questions are resolved can the Congress decide whether we should go forward with an ABM program.

I have grave reservations about the merits of the Safeguard System. The administration's proposal has raised more doubts than it has cured. I had hoped, before the President made his announcement, that the opportunity he took to review the ABM program would yield a prudent, soundly premised decision, representing the best judgment of the Nation. But the administration's case to date has been utterly unconvincing, shedding not light but shadow on the most fundamental aspects of the program.

Mr. President, any decision to embark on such an important and risky course as the Safeguard program must satisfy four primary considerations. I offer these considerations now as the principal areas on which the Senate must base its best judgment in meeting its responsibilities to the American people.

First, we must know what is really proposed to be done within the so-called Safeguard program. To date, the intimations of what is intended have been confusing, contradictory, and ambiguous.

This year, Congress is asked to approve a start on two defense points at Minuteman bases in Montana and North Dakota. But we are also told that an additional 10 sites around the country, including one at Washington, D.C., are involved in the "program."

The President, in his announcement to the Nation, March 14, carefully stressed his options to restrict the Safeguard system according to the results of continuing reviews of the state of technology, intelligence, and arms control negotiations. But Under Secretary Packard's presentations have paid lipservice to the President's restricted concept. Mr. Packard justified the program primarily in terms of full deployment and its potentialities for redeployment to meet evolving threats.

The difference appears to be more than one of shades of meaning. It arises against a background of shifting positions by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military "requirement" for an ABM, and changing intelligence evaluations as to the nature of the Sino-Soviet threat. Thus far, those positions and evaluations seem to coincide more with the domestic political climate than with the real world of international security.

What lies in the poke that the Congress is now asked to buy? Is it two batteries of safeguard, 12 or many, many more in a steady evolution toward the thick ABM system which sends shivers down the spine of everyone concerned with the survival of mankind?

By underwriting a policy of "rolling options"—only one face of which the President revealed in his announcement—would the Congress place itself and the country in a position where the administration has unbridled discretion to "reorient" safeguard at will according to any suitable pretext? Nothing in the record to date reassures me on this point.

Mr. President, these are questions to which the Congress must find answers. These are the questions which may mark the difference between the quick and the dead.

Second, the Congress must determine whether the safeguard system is needed at this time.

We have heard considerable testimony from the administration about the growing Soviet threat to our retaliatory forces. The administration's judgment is based, in very large part, on the dotted lines on its charts, which project a steady deterioration in the security of our deterrent during the first half of the 1970's.

Any such projection of reciprocal actions is somewhat arbitrary, resting on the wisdom that goes into its assumptions. It cannot be accepted at face value. Before we can determine whether these assumptions should be accepted as a basis for decision, the premises of the administration's forecasts must be closely tested. To the extent these projections rest on classified information, these bases cannot be publicly explored. But the Senate must satisfy itself that the intelligence formulations and projections of options available to the United States to counter anticipated Soviet actions have been soundly formulated.

Mr. President, enough is known about the underpinnings of the administration's promotional package to make its reliability dubious. The central villain in the administration's piece is the Soviets' SS–9 missile, which is cast in the role of a deadly first-strike weapon. We know, however, that the SS–9 can serve a perfectly straightforward purpose in the Soviets' nuclear mix as a "city busting" retaliatory weapon, ideally suited to the destruction of very large urban areas, of which the United States has quite a number. We know that the SS–9, regardless of its warhead capability, would have to overcome severe problems of accuracy and be available in very large numbers before any nation in the position of the Soviet Union would stake its very existence on the ability of a weapon to serve effectively as a first-strike weapon—the role in which it is cast by our military publicists.

Grave doubt has arisen about the credibility of these projections. They are by no means universally accepted by the experts in a position to sift the evidence relied on by the administration. Before we could agree that the Safeguard is needed at this time, we would have to have a soundly constructed trustworthy justification on which to base our judgment. We have yet to see such a justification.

Third, we must also have confidence that the Safeguard will do the job for which it is designed, principally the protection of a significant core of our retaliatory force.

The administration has stressed that the Safeguard system will work, and it would have us stake billions of dollars on that optimistic forecast. That claim can only be thoroughly tested—within the limits of human ability to predict—by access to information we cannot openly discuss. However, the Senate has heard from experts, who have carefully reviewed the program, that Safeguard buys only marginal retaliatory protection in the face of the many capabilities of the offense to overcome an ABM defense.

I am particularly struck by the vulnerability of the system's missile-site radar—MSR—to destruction that would cripple the entire system.

The advocates of Safeguard say that dispersal of Minuteman is not enough to insure security of the force; to provide this security, they ask for an active ABM defense. But Safeguard rests on the functioning of the MSR to provide guidance and control for terminal interception, and to serve this role, the MSR must be above ground and unshielded, making it a prime target for an enemy strike.

How many missiles it will take to knock out the MSR is an unknown quantity, but it is obvious that a concentrated first-wave attack could blind an entire Safeguard battery and leave Minuteman virtually as unprotected as they would have been without an ABM.

This kind of protection strikes me as a very dubious investment.

Finally, Mr. President, we must be concerned about the likely consequences of a Safeguard deployment, both in weapons development and in the progress of arms control negotiations.

Secretary Laird refers to Safeguard as a "building block for peace," painting the system as not being provocative—a judgment that strikes me as illogical and illusory.

Envision, if you will, the following scenario of a likely Soviet reaction: Soviet generals appear before Messrs. Brezhnev and Kosygin and others to discuss the American Safeguard deployment, replete with extensive charts and other briefing aids. Their charts show the rate of predicted American ABM deployment between 1969 and 1973 rising from zero to two sites, and then sharply rising to a level six times greater in the next 2-year time period. A dotted extension rises thereafter to a level marked "First-Strike Capability" at some future year.

The Soviet generals note that the Safeguard system is seriously overdesigned for the defensive purposes stated by the Americans, in that Safeguard utilizes components—the MSR and the high-velocity Sprint—designed for distant terminal interception appropriate to protect cities far in excess of the close-in requirements appropriate for protecting the hardened Minuteman. They conclude that Safeguard is a building-block to a first-strike system.

Harkening back to the dangers of their country's unpreparedness at the time of the Cuban missile crisis, the generals express considerable alarm and request immediate authority to counteract the intensified "threat" which, they say, the United States is commencing to build.

Mr. President, we can fairly assume that such a scene will have taken place in the Kremlin not long after Safeguard deployment is begun. Can we, with confidence, therefore, conclude that Safeguard will be received as calmly as the administration suggests? Or must we conclude that Safeguard, resting as it does on the premise of an intensifying arms race, will be a prophecy that fulfills itself—at grave risk to all mankind?

It is altogether possible, on the other hand, that the administration is not, in fact, taken in by its own reassurance as to Soviet reactions. It may be that the Safeguard proposal is intended as a blunt challenge to the Soviets to come to the bargaining table and negotiate over strategic weapons, or else the United States will heat up the arms race, counting on our superior technology to protect us if negotiations fail. I cannot believe that this kind of bluster would have any rational justification, and I must caution the Senate and the country that such diplomacy is the very essence of provocation.

In this connection, I must note with some concern that the arms limitation negotiations, to which the United States and the Soviet Union are both committed, have not yet begun, although Secretary Rogers' assurance that the administration would soon be ready is indeed gratifying.

Mr. President, these four considerations about Safeguard—what is intended, why is it needed, how effective it would be, and what results it would produce for American security—are the tests to which the proposal must be put.

From the work of our committees and the debates in the Senate must come the answers. As any lawyer knows in making his case, the proponent of an argument has the burden of proof. In the ABM case, the administration must carry the burden of proof in the four areas I have outlined. In this vital area, the burden of proof requires thorough and prudent judgment, not presumptive reliance on cliche and illusion.

As of today, Mr. President, the administration has not borne its burden of proof.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ARMY'S ANNOUNCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS ON CHAPLAINS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it was most distressing and shocking to note the announcement made by the Army which restricted its chaplains. It is beyond my understanding that the Army would prohibit its chaplains from mentioning the word "God" in their character guidance training. Such a decision shakes the historic foundations of our Nation and its religious institutions.

Mr. President, it is reported the American Civil Liberties Union alleges that the mention of God in a chaplain's message interferes with a person's constitutional rights. In my view, this is another penetration to shatter our country in more divisiveness and disorders under the guise of religious freedom. What is our country coming to, when even the chaplains are forbidden to mention God when talking with recruits about morals? In the words of a distinguished South Carolinian, "evidently the inscription on our coins, 'In God We Trust,' is a big, bold, white-faced lie."

I should like to quote further from George H. Schultz, pastor of the Trinity Bible Church, Rock Hill, S.C. His concern reflects my feelings and millions and millions of other Christian Americans who have not forgotten what our country has stood for under God the last 193 years.

Pastor Schultz said:

> The Christians in our country are greatly disturbed at the trend in our country away from God simply because a few hippies, beatniks, demonstrators, or atheists under the guise of "civil rights" take away the rights of the law-abiding citizens.

Mr. President, I endorse this statement. To overcome such divisive forces, our commanders in the Armed Forces more than ever before have a special obligation to present an inspiring program of character guidance. Our weapons are useless without men of character and strong faith, courage, and obligation to our country and Creator. This includes the defense of religious freedom which the American Civil Liberties Union would have one believe is in jeopardy in the Army.

The Army decision to bow to the allegation of the American Civil Liberties Union that constitutional rights are being abridged reminds me of the Supreme Court's ill-advised decision to stop prayer in our schools. The Constitution is to protect the rights of our citizens when, in fact, a right is eliminated. I hold the view, and I am sure that 99½ percent of all clear thinking Americans agree, that the mention of the word "God" and a prayer in school are neither relevant to the charge of interferring with religious rights nor a merger of church and state. In my view, we are violating our Constitution if we continue to permit a few to steer the ship of state away from God.

Mr. President, there is one encouraging note. I understand that the Secretary of Defense is examining the Army decision. However, I believe immediate revocation, not examination, is the obvious decision. It is my firm hope that the order will not be issued as indicated by the Secretary. I have so informed the Secretary of Defense, and I urge my distinguished colleagues to recommend the same to the Secretary.

In my opinion, the President set the religious tone for our country at his inauguration. There was no doubt in the minds of millions who heard him and the prayers of our clergy that Mr. Nixon would seek to bring God and country closer together. As the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, I am sure he will use the word "God" in his messages to the troops whenever he feels it is appropriate. I see no difference in this than the chaplains so far as constitutional rights and religious freedom are concerned. No doubt the American Civil Liberties Union would charge that this is not allowed under the Constitution.

Mr. President, I call upon the Army to withdraw its proposed order immediately, and regain the respect of its military personnel and the American people.

NEW YORK ASSEMBLY BAN ON BUSING

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, if there is one domestic issue which is of deep concern to all sections of the country—North, East, South, and West—that issue is education.

There is a great fear throughout the country that the quality of education is declining and that the traditional standards of discipline and authority in our schools are being eroded.

Furthermore, there is a deep concern that the concept of the neighborhood school in which a child attends school with members of his own cultural and peer group is in danger of disappearing. There are many reasons why parents find it desirable to have their children attend neighborhood schools. In the first place, every parent wishes to see his children grow up in his own image and he carefully selects the environment in which his child is being formed. Parents select their neighborhoods with the view towards the kind of community which they want for their children, and they become deeply distressed when their desires and wishes are nullified by abstract ideological decisions made by bureaucrats far from the local problems.

Therefore, the action of the New York Assembly this past week was of great significance in voting overwhelmingly for the ban on busing of students to correct racial imbalance in the schools. The vote of this assembly was 104 to 41 and included members of both parties, Republican and Democrat. This vote obviously reflects the overwhelming sentiment of the people of New York State, and I believe a similar result would appear in any State in the Union. The people of this country ought to have some say over where their children go to school and with whom their children associate and how their own distinctive culture is to be preserved and extended.

This vote is even more significant when one realizes that it was aimed directly at the policy of the New York State Commissioner of Education, Dr. James A. Allen. Commissioner Allen has been trying to ram his policy down the throats of the people of New York State for many months, and this sharp rebuff should be construed as a repudiation of his policy.

Inasmuch as Dr. Allen has been also nominated to the office of U.S. Commissioner of Education, I hope that he will take this repudiation to heart and recognize that the policy of busing is not desired by the people of the United States, no matter in which area of the country.

Mr. President, the New York Daily News of Friday, March 28, 1969, carried an editorial entitled "Let's Drop Forced Busing." One must reflect that this is the largest newspaper in the largest northern city supporting the policy of the New York Assembly. Once again, it is clear that the people of New York do not want Dr. Allen's policy nor do the leaders of New York, such as the editors of the New York Daily News.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "Let's Drop Forced Busing" from the New York Daily News of March 28, 1969, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times of March 27, 1969, entitled "Assembly Passes a Ban on Busing for Integration" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News, Mar. 28, 1969]

LET'S DROP FORCED BUSING

After a hot debate, the Assembly day before yesterday passed by a 104-41 vote the bill to end compulsory busing of school children in the interest of integration.

Any school district whose citizens wanted such busing could go ahead and have it, under this proposed law.

But State Education Commissioner James E. Allen Jr.'s notion that black children should be shipped into white-majority schools and vice versa by order of Doc Allen would be junked.

The Allen idea sounds good at first hearing—mix the races early in life, get 'em to know one another, and so on.

It hasn't worked out that way in practice, and we doubt that it ever will or can.

Let's drop it, via State Senate passage and signature by Gov. Rockefeller of the no-compulsory-busing bill, and soon.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 1969]

ASSEMBLY PASSES A BAN ON BUSING FOR INTEGRATION

(By Bill Kovach)

ALBANY, March 26.—In an overwhelming protest against educational experiments involving integration, the Assembly voted 104 to 41 today to ban busing of students to correct racial imbalance in schools.

The bill was passed after three hours of debate during which Republican sponsors defended themselves against charges by Democrats that the bill was thinly disguised segregationist legislation. When the vote came, however, 32 Democrats joined the Republicans to pass the bill. Only four Republicans voted against the measure.

Senate passage of the bill is expected with little trouble, but Governor Rockefeller has voiced his disapproval of such legislation and is likely to veto the bill.

Assembly Speaker Perry B. Duryea was absent from the chamber during most of the debate as he and other Republican leaders worked on recommendations for Governor Rockefeller's budget of more than $6-billion. The Republican leaders announced late in the day that they would present the recommendations on budget cuts to a closed G.O.P. conference at 11 A.M. tomorrow, indicating the two-week impasse over the budget and tax proposal was nearing an end.

EFFECT OF MEASURE

As passed by the Assembly, the bill would prohibit the State Education Commissioner or local school boards from assigning students on the basis of race to achieve racial equality. It was sponsored by Assemblyman Joseph J. Kunzeman, a Queens Republican.

Assemblyman Arthur O. Eve, Democrat of Buffalo and a Negro, attacked the bill as the "worst kind of racism and a very dangerous bill."

Mr. Eve, whose 8-year-old son was with him in the Assembly chamber, told his fellow lawmakers:

"I am sorry I had my son with me here today because the speakers on the other side have given him the impression that if he moved into the schools of some neighborhoods the schools would be destroyed."

"It is hard for me to believe," he concluded, "that I am standing in the chamber of the Assembly of the Empire State and not Alabama or South Africa."

It was just the sort of attack the Republicans' supporters had attempted to head off. Mr. Kunzeman went to great pains to paint the bill not as a subject of race, but one of opposition to "orders imposed on local communities from outside" in educational experiments that had little or nothing to do with education.

Transfers, he said, "have proven ineffectual and detrimental to those transferred."

Both supporters and opponents of the measure argued the bill not so much on its content as on the whole concept of educational change—especially decentralization and community control.

"I only hope," Assemblyman Charles B. Rangel, a Manhattan Democrat, said, "that those of you who support this bill because you say local people should decide these questions will remember your arguments and your position when we ask later in this session to control our own schools."

The two leading Republican spokesmen for the bill, George Van Cott of Mount Vernon and George Farrell of Floral Park, L. I., represent areas where busing has been ordered by the State Commissioner of Education, Dr. James E. Allen Jr. They made clear their resentment of these orders from outside officials and Mr. Van Cott warned that if the program was implemented "whites won't stay in Mount Vernon."

As for the budget, indications today were that the Republican party was near its goal of 76 votes to pass the Governor's budget proposal and his requested one cent increase in the state sales tax.

Tentatively, it was understood, the leaders expect to have the budget and tax proposals up for debate in a Saturday session and then recess until April 14. Decentralization and several other controversial items would be taken up when the Legislature reconvenes after the Easter recess.

In other action, the New York State Catholic Committee urged the Legislature to pass a package of 12 bills to end the "inequalities and discriminations which migrant workers have suffered for years."

The committee, which speaks for Bishops of all Roman Catholic dioceses in the state, urged passage of bills that would to the following:

Extend workmen's compensation and labor relations laws to cover farm laborers.

Provide for farm workers written contracts, minimum wages, and unemployment insurance.

Require employers of farm laborers to obtain health certificates on imported laborers, provide adequate toilet facilities and partial pay for idle time caused by equipment failures.

Clearly establish the Attorney General's role to protect laborers from unfair practices by employers.

CUBA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in recent weeks there has been a rising tide of pro-Castro propaganda in our news media which alleges that things are better in Cuba than ever before and that we might as well accept Castro as a permanent fixture and recognize his government.

The object of this propaganda is to convince the American public and to apply pressures against the administration to legitimize the Communist government off our shores. Thus, 10 years of waiting is supposed to accomplish for Castro what he could not do by force and with the aid of the Soviet military power. I cannot see how the passage of time affects the legitimacy of a totalitarian government.

Two articles in the current issue of Human Events give able refutation to the thesis that Castro's revolution is a success and is welcomed by the people. An article by Paul Bethel entitled "The Rising Tide of Pro-Castro Propaganda" gives ample detail which shows how the pro-Castro elements in the United States are conducting this campaign, and which also shows what the current economic situation is in Cuba.

Of particular interest is Mr. Bethel's catalog of recent instances of arson and sabotage against the Castro regime. Within a period of 1 month, he cites at least eight significant cases.

Mr. Bethel points out that many of the totalitarian regimes of Latin America disappeared with lightning-like suddenness with less evidence of popular discontent and rebellion than exists in Cuba. Why is it then that Castro stays in power? I quote Mr. Bethel's conclusion:

> Castro owes his continued existence more than anything else to the fact that agreements made at the time of the missile crisis prevent his opposition from receiving either arms or encouragement.

The article by Mr. Lofton cites figures from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's periodical Foreign Agriculture. He shows how food production in 1968 was 10 percent less than the 1957–59 average. He points out that food production per capita has declined 25 to 30 percent.

Mr. President, I would like to congratulate Human Events for publishing these fine articles giving information which has seldom appeared in print. This is an example of fact-filled journalism which attempts to give an objective appraisal of a serious situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RISING TIDE OF PRO-CASTRO PROPAGANDA

(By Paul Bethel)

Only the deaf and the blind can be unaware of the rising tide of pro-Castro propaganda appearing everywhere in recent months. And it just happens to coincide with President Nixon's preoccupation with ending the war in Vietnam and shoring up our neglected NATO alliance. Apparently the main purpose of the propaganda is to pressure the new Administration into reopening relations with Communist Cuba. A secondary objective is to stay President Nixon's hand in dealing more effectively than in the past with the threat posed by the Soviet bridgehead in this hemisphere.

The February 14 issue of *Life*, for example, carried a long piece on Cuba written by Carl Oglesby, former president of Students for a Democratic Society. Oglesby is said by *Life* to represent a "radical American view." But FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover sees the political direction of the SDS in quite a different light. In his year-end report, Mr. Hoover notes that at the organization's conference last summer, "two of the newly elected national officers publicly identified themselves as Communists. . . ." The FBI chief also states that the SDS has been "moved from an anarchistic outlook toward a Maoist-oriented, Marxist-Leninist approach."

First-hand reports on Cuba appearing on the television networks and in such newspapers as the *Wall Street Journal* and the *Christian Science Monitor* have also tried to turn the clock back 10 years to revive the mythologies purveyed by Herbert Matthews of the New York *Times*. But Matthews' personal assessment that Castro wasn't a Communist nor even a Communist sympathizer suggests that on-the-spot reports can be tragically wrong in their conclusions.

Nevertheless, the myths remain; only the message has been altered to reflect the changes wrought by a decade of Castro-Soviet rule. That message is this: The "revolution" may not be a social or economic success, but it is unshakable.

Shortages and misery that cannot be hidden from view (the result of disastrous Communist economic planning and civic resistance) are often explained away as the vestiges of pre-Castro "Yankee imperialism." Reporters are quick to allege that the *campesino* is living better than before Castro came to power. This excuses everything else—the brutalization of both government and the Cuban people.

Huge, tax-free foundations are playing a key role in spreading myths about the Cuban regime. The Ford Foundation, for instance, is the principal source of funds for National Educational Television, whose programs on Cuba have been very favorable toward Castro's rule.

The Center for Inter-American Relations of New York, recipient of a $500,000 Ford Foundation grant, is also caught up in the resurging Castro myths. The Center is run by William D. Rogers, former deputy assistant secretary of state for Inter-American Affairs. His assistant is David Bronheim, who also served under Rogers at State.

At a meeting held on February 11, a study group of the Center was briefed by Lee Lockwood and Jose Yglesias on Cuba's cultural and economic advances. The commitment of these two gentlemen to pro-Castro causes is a matter of public record. Earlier, the forum had listened to the British ambassador to Cuba extol the virtues of Castro (he could hardly do otherwise and remain ambassador).

The most important meeting took place on February 25, when a "working paper" was presented on Cuba by Prof. Richard Fagan of Stanford University.

The group which was assembled to hear and approve Fagan's thesis seems to have been packed with members from the Left. Though he belonged to the forum, Jay Lovestone, head of the international division of the AFL–CIO, was not invited to attend. At a previous meeting Lovestone had discerned the conscious leftist purpose of the meetings and denounced them, saying that no such purpose could meet with the approval of the AFL–CIO. Former Ambassadors Robert C. Hill and Spruille Braden also did not receive invitations. Other members who were suspicious of softening our stance toward Cuba were also left out.

Suffice it to say that the composition of the February 25 meeting was not one to inspire confidence in its probity or objectivity. Among those attending were four members of the New York *Times* reporting staff (including Jose Yglesias), Lee Lockwood, three professors, a member of the Ford Foundation, an unidentified and silent observer and a lone businessman with widespread experience in Latin America. Thus the cards were all stacked on the Left. Prof. Fagan's paper, removed all doubt.

Here is what Fagan proposed:

1. Lift the ban on travel by U.S. citizens to Cuba;

2. Lift the U.S. economic blockade of the island;

3. Let the Organization of American States ease both travel and trade restrictions against Cuba.

A fourth point, which came up in the discussion in the context of trades which U.S. diplomats might be willing to make, was the return of the Guantanamo Naval Base to Cuba.

Points 1, 2 and 3 of the Fagan paper are a collective aberration. Fagan theorizes that if the Castro regime, in his words, "was to be enlaced throughout the hemisphere through trade, travel and diplomacy," then Castroite subversion would diminish. In fact, obviously, by extending aid in the form of trade and facilitating the travel of Castro agents (only Castro determines which Cubans may travel), subversion would not diminish, but increase.

In a transparent effort to gain the support of the U.S. business community, Fagan said: "Arrangements for trade fit well with the American business ethic," drawing a response from one of those present that Fagan's views represented a callous disregard for ethics as well as for American business.

Regarding any "diplomatic trade" of the U.S. Guantanamo Naval Base, only the stupid or naive could doubt that by handing the base over to Castro we would, in fact, be handing it over to the Soviet navy.

The intellectual community (in this instance, as represented by the paper of Prof. Fagan) and much of our news media gloss over the threat which is posed to our security by Fidel Castro and his Soviet masters. From the very beginning, Fidel Castro's goal was to seize and exercise uncontrolled power.

He has not changed. Indeed, his goal is to extend that totalitarian control, by means of his subversives and with Soviet help, to Latin America. For, from the Marxist-Leninist point of view, the Cuban "revolution" can be considered a success only to the extent that it succeeds in enveloping Latin America and isolating the United States in its own hemisphere.

The size and power of the United States always cast a shadow over Castro's ambitions. He hates the capitalist system which lies at the heart of our power and influence. Upon seizing power, capitalism, American and Cuban, became the subject of his fury and the object of his attack. Only by our submitting to Castro's wishes and whims would even a frail coexistence with Castro become possible; it would break whenever the United States refused to do so. This was true in 1959; it is true in spades in 1969.

What are the realities of Fidel Castro's supposedly "unshakable" regime? The current myth is that the people of Cuba, particularly its youth and Negro population, are solidly behind him. It is important to Castro that this message be accepted by U.S. news media and our intellectual community, since it justifies the argument that we might as well learn to live with Castro.

Some of the news media refuse to be moved by obvious facts, treating them in passing as mere irrelevancies. One fact is that 500,000 Cubans have fled into exile, 10,000 of them braving the cruel seas in 1,017 small boats, even rafts made of the inner-tubes of truck tires, in the greatest mass migration in the history of the Western Hemisphere. Another million and a half are waiting to get out. As applied to the population of the United States, this is the equivalent of the flight of between 40 and 50 million Americans.

Of the 87 Cubans who made it to freedom through a hail of Castro bullets last January 6, three-quarters of them were Negroes and mulattoes and most of those were youths. Almost exactly one year ago—on April 14, 1968—18 Cubans hijacked a train, drove it close to our Guantanamo Naval Base and, dodging machine-gun fire from Castro guards, made it to safety. *All were Negro youths.*

What is the root cause of these desperate flights, this mass migration? The answer is to be found in the lack of food and clothing, a stagnant economy, terror in the form of the most repressive policy apparatus known to this hemisphere and no future in a life being drained away in unending slogans dedicating the individual to the service of the state.

Using a scale of 100 for the year 1958, Cuban industrial production 10 years later stands at 63.9; beef and pork production stands at 46 per cent of the 1958 figure—and so it goes.

The much-touted youth support for the regime has been placed in doubt by none other than Fidel Castro. When 1.5 million youths were forced to work in the sugar cane fields, their reluctance to do so was scored by Castro, who accused them of "not having shown the revolutionary fervor expected of them."

They have been found by people tearing down or despoiling pictures of "Che" Guevara and have come under vicious and increasing attack in *Verde Olivo, El Mundo, Revolucion y Cultura* and other government organs for "capitalist corruption," "apolitical tendencies" and many other "crimes" in Castro's totalitarian Communist state.

Escapees from Cuba tell of anti-Communist slogans which appear with increasing frequency on the walls of high schools and at the University of Havana. *El Mundo* newspaper was burned to the ground a few weeks ago. Journalism students operated the paper and, in the aftermath of its destruction, many were arrested on suspicion of sabotage.

On January 5, Castro revealed that the malaise of youth had reached significant proportions. Students seem to have little interest in school and, according to the Cuban dictator, 621,000 elementary students out of a total of 1,444,000 failed to pass to the next grade. With only 172,000 students attending secondary (where is Castro's vast educational program, anyway?) Castro revealed that more than half failed to pass. Furthermore, he admitted, another 400,000 school-age children are not going to school at all.

Cuba's youths are becoming a serious threat to the Castro regime (as youths were to the Communist regime in Hungary in the mid-1950s). Despite the mobilization of spy cadres which operate within the school system and inform on "counterrevolutionary activities" of the students, and despite get-tough orders to the police in dealing with suspected sabotage activities, the defiance of Cuba's youth is growing, not diminishing.

Castro's reaction to this increasing opposition among Cuba's youths exploded in a March 13 speech at Havana University. So that he can punish minors under the adult penal code, he lowered the age of maturity from 21 to 16, an age, as he put it, "where they will face penal responsibilities." Minors who are "delinquents" (a term used to describe anyone who disagrees with him), he thundered, "raises the possibility that we'll have to eliminate them, radically!"

One means of controlling rebel youths, Castro continued, will be for the government to incorporate the military into the senior high school system (thus turning his propaganda line around, from "converting barracks into schools" to converting schools into barracks).

He said he would eliminate Havana University (a stronghold for anti-Castro student leadership) by splitting it up and scattering its various schools throughout the countryside where, he said "students can more easily fulfill their work and study responsibilities." In fact, he has eliminated the name "Havana University," in an attempt to destroy its tradition as a center for intellectual opposition. The resistance these recent changes will meet from aroused Cuban youths is not difficult to imagine.

Likewise, assertions made by "eyewitnesses" that the Cuban farmer is better off than ever before are open to serious challenge.

Why doesn't the on-the-spot reporter ask why it is necessary for the regime to empty schools, factories and shops and even close down whole cities and herd the population out to cut sugar cane, harvest rice and pick coffee? This massive and nonsensical dislocation of a precarious economy is often romanticized as "volunteer labor." But behind this phenomenon lie some facts that need exploring. Cuba has traditionally suffered from a *surplus* of farm labor, the *campesinos*. What it may logically be asked, has happened to them?

The answer is as simple as it is obvious. When Castro reneged on his promise, made back in 1959, to give each *campesino* his own piece of land, they rebelled en masse and have not worked for the regime in any significant number since. As a result, they are persecuted and harassed through every conceivable method available to the government. A typical monthly "ration" allowed to these stout rebels is 16 plantains (or the equivalent in sweet tubers) a month, supplemented by sugar mixed with water to give them energy!

Indeed, Cuba's *campesinos* provide the core of the anti-Castro rebels. Among their guerrilla leaders were Thondyke, "Machetero," "Yayo" Estevez, "Chungo" Ramirez, "Perico" Sanchez, "Cara Linda," Bernardo Corrales and others. As they were captured or shot, others took their places. Four of them were Negroes.

As late as July 22, 1967, Armed Forces Minister Raul Castro made this eye-opening statement regarding internal resistance: "To liquidate bands [of guerrillas], 179 in total, has cost us the precious lives of our youths and the equivalent of between 500 and 800 million U.S. dollars."

It is not known how many of the groups merely disbanded and still remained on the alert, as was the case with "Yayo" Estevez, and how many were actually "liquidated" in the literal meaning of Raul Castro's term. But by halving or even quartering the number of 179 anti-Castro guerrilla bands, it is obvious that organized resistance existed on a very large scale and may, in fact, exist today. Certainly, things are worse in 1969 than in 1967.

Further evidence of latent anti-Castro resistance came out at the famous trial of Anibal Escalante one year ago.

Escalante was accused of leading a coup against Castro. Russia's top security chief in Cuba, Rudolf Shliapnikov was quoted by Raul Castro in the course of the trial as follows: "In Cuba, conditions are present for a new Hungary . . . dissension is great," and, "in Hungary it was not the peasants that crushed the revolt . . . it fell on the State Security forces," which, in Cuba, Shliapnikov noted, was filled with "petit bourgoise."

There are two points here: One is that Cuban *campesinos* cannot be trusted (Raul Castro needed no reminder that this is so); the other is that Shliapnikov registered doubts about the loyalty of Cuba's police apparatus. Nothing could be clearer than that.

It may be significant, in this regard, that Castro's militia and his Vigilance Committees have had their arms taken away from them, while those conscripted into the Obligatory Military Service never even see a rifle. Described by most intelligence sources as "massively against the regime," conscriptees (about 150,000) are given only close-order drill. Their real job is to work in the fields doing only slightly disguised slave labor (they are paid $7 a month.)

Here is a partial list of recent sabotage, and government directives to deal with it:

January 23, a shipyard was destroyed by fire at the southern Camaguey port of Santa Cruz del Sur. Radio Havana placed the loss at $400,000.

January 25, the government announced "a 45-day revolutionary vigilante drive" against sabotage and mingled agents of the G–2 (secret service) into the civil population forced to cut sugar cane.

January 25, Havana Radio called "for information by revolutionary vigilantes leading to the discovery and unmasking of enemies of the revolution. . . ."

January 26, a warehouse containing machine parts was burned in Santiago. A Leyland bus (from England) was also burned.

February 12, a government machine shop at Macareno sugar mill was burned out. Two weeks later a warehouse filled with sugar bags went up in smoke. On March 1, Radio Havana revealed another fire in a warehouse at Senado sugar mill.

February 19, the government announced even more stringent measures "for intensifying collective revolutionary vigilance . . . the prevention of counter-revolutionary, anti-social and criminal acts against the state. . . ."

February 20, *El Mundo* newspaper burned to the ground.

Many small railway stations in the interior of the island have been burned down.

The point is that "evidence" produced by some reporters in on-the-spot investigations is not accompanied with more serious research to examine their conclusions that the Communist regime of Fidel Castro is solid. The regimes of Juan Peron, Rafael Trujillo, Marcos Perez Jimenez, Gustavo Rojas Pinilla, Fulgencio Batista, Joao Goulart and many others disappeared with lightning-like suddenness, typical in Latin America, with less evidence of popular discontent and rebellion than exists in Cuba.

Actually, Castro owes his continued existence, more than anything else, to the fact that agreements made at the time of the missile crisis prevent his opposition from receiving either arms or encouragement.

However that may be, the history of revolt in Communist countries warns us that even Cuba's status as a sanctuary against attack may not save Fidel Castro. The revolts in East Germany, Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia teach us that after a certain length of time, people under the heel of a Communist dictatorship *do* rebel.

At some not-too-distant date in the future, we can almost predict that the Cuban people will join their European brothers in trying to throw off the yoke of their oppressors. The point then will not be to lament how wrong we have been, but how well prepared we are to help them.

Now *there* is something positive that a huge, tax-free foundation might undertake to study! Or are they, and a certain element in our press, trying to forestall a revolt by salvaging Castro before it happens?

HOW CASTRO'S RECORD IS DISTORTED BY PRESS

(By John D. Lofton, Jr.)

In their stories about life in Cuba after 10 years under the dictatorship of Fidel Castro, most national news magazines told it as it is. But a couple did not and, just for the record, they ought to be corrected.

Both *Newsweek* and the New York *Times Magazine*, while acknowledging such things as a decline in per capita income from $422 a year in 1958 to $415 in 1968, felt constrained to point out that despite this drop in income the lot of the average peasant is better than ever.

Said *Newsweek:* "While the quality of life in Cuban towns has plummeted in the past 10 years, the lot of the *campesino* in the Cuban countryside has unquestionably improved. If nothing else, the country's small farmers and cane cutters are healthier today than ever before."

Echoed the New York *Times Magazine:* "Outside Havana everyone eats better and the students and farm workers are well fed."

The fact of the matter is that this is simply not so.

Writing in the Jan. 6, 1969, issue of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's periodical "Foreign Agriculture," food expert Wilbur F. Buck says: "When the Castro regime came to power in 1959 the Cubans were one of the best-fed peoples in Latin America. Excessive and indiscriminate livestock slaughter in 1959 and early 1960, however, caused a sharp drop in meat supplies. A decline in the out-put of food crops, especially rice, during Castro's early years in office was precipitated by rapid nationalization of farm properties and the shift in direction of trade.

"The past decade has witnessed a deterioration in the average Cuban's diet, particularly in its quality, as grain protein has replaced much of the animal protein.

"Food production in 1968 is estimated to have been about 10 percent less than the 1957–59 average. But food production per capita has declined some 25 to 30 per cent from that of a decade earlier, necessitating heavy imports of food products, such as wheat and wheat flour from Canada on Soviet account."

Castro's troubles at home, however, are not solely economic. For quite some time there have been indications of social and domestic discontent in Cuba. Castro himself confirmed these rumors in a speech last year marking the eighth anniversary of the establishment of his committees for the Defense of the Revolution. In this talk he spoke of a wave of sabotage and of the rising rate of prostitution among girls in the 14 and 15-year-old age bracket.

He spoke of the opposition of many Cuban university students to his policies, specifically his backing of the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia. He cited their destruction of photographs of Che Guevara and their burning of the Cuban flag.

And although the Cuban government officially announced only four acts of sabotage during the six-month period prior to Castro's speech, Castro himself admitted in this speech that there had been more than 70.

It is true that under Castro, illiteracy has been reduced. But what good will it do for one to learn how to read, then die of starvation or malnutrition?

This point was made most succinctly on a radio show in the Dominican Republic, "You Be the Jury," in which a Cuban exile asked about life under Castro replied: "Under Fidel's regime, despite what he says about the peasants, it is not so. Things are not the same as he tells the peasants. There is no clothing, no shoes, no nutrition, no entertainment. Then what does it matter if the literacy rate is increased? There is no

freedom, no money to spend and nothing to read but Communist propaganda."

OTTO OTEPKA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that a major newspaper is in the process of writing a lengthy article or articles on the nomination of Otto Otepka to the Subversive Activities Control Board. According to reports which have reached me from many sections of the country, it is obvious that this newspaper is leaving no stone unturned in a fruitless endeavor to find material which could be twisted somehow so as to reflect adversely upon Mr. Otepka's character and judgment. The scope of this effort, the length of time which the newspaper has allotted to it, and the number of reporters involved all suggest that this newspaper suddenly is attaching great importance to the Otepka case.

This same newspaper recently described the Otepka appointment editorially as "revolting," and said that his name "recalls immediately some of the worst abuses of the Joseph R. McCarthy era—particularly the reckless use of raw security files." This is a most remarkable statement from a supposedly responsible newspaper. Mr. Otepka was never in any sense an associate of the late Senator McCarthy, whatever one's opinion of that Senator's goals and methods. Furthermore, Mr. Otepka is the last person who might be charged with the reckless use of raw security files, since he was precisely the person in the State Department who was charged with the statutory responsibility of evaluating raw security files—which he did entirely within the closed confidentiality of the security system. Mr. Otepka has never at any time discussed security cases in public, nor did he ever testify or transmit information concerning specific cases to any unauthorized agency.

If anything, Mr. Otepka's name recalls another era and the problems associated with security in that period. Certainly no one would sanction calling our late colleague, Senator Robert Kennedy, a McCarthyite when, as is well known, he was a longtime associate and prominent staff member of the McCarthy investigating committee? Yet, how much more plausible it would be to refer to someone as an associate of Senator McCarthy who was actually an associate of Senator McCarthy, rather than someone like Mr. Otepka who never had any connection with Senator McCarthy in any respect whatsoever. There are some who define "McCarthyism" as "guilt by association," yet this newspaper finds Mr. Otepka guilty without any association whatsoever.

It is, therefore, disturbing when a newspaper that lacks common decency and truthfulness suddenly awakens to the need for "in depth" coverage of Mr. Otepka, and at the very moment when Mr. Otepka's actions have been vindicated by appointment to one of the highest security posts in the Government. This same newspaper never showed great interest when the substantive matters of the Otepka case were being played out in the drama before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. At that time, its coverage was perfunctory, or nonexistent, when matters of great concern to this Nation's security were being revealed. Instead of spending its money in transcontinental telephone calls and putting a crew of reporters to work, this newspaper would be better off examining the printed hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and making up for lost ground.

In these hearings, this newspaper would find much which should be of great concern to a newspaper which professes liberal attitudes. This newspaper would find there documented cases of wiretapping and eavesdropping, a practice which has been roundly condemned in its editorial columns on nearly any other occasion.

This newspaper would find documented cases of the statutory rights of civil service workers abrogated contrary to law, a practice which I doubt would find editorial approval.

This newspaper would find documented cases of apparent perjury by high Government officials, another situation which should raise its journalistic ire.

This newspaper would find documented cases of denial of due process, and other fundamental constitutional rights, a subject which has always caused its editorial writers to whet their lips.

This newspaper would also find documented cases of the collapse of the State Department's security system. However, judging from its recent editorial, the newspaper could not be better pleased. Its unreasonable prejudice on this issue seems to have caused blindness on every other aspect of the case.

Mr. President, Mr. Otepka has long suffered at the hands of those who believe our security systems should be destroyed, and it is time that he received the justice due to him as a faithful civil servant and loyal patriot. It is time also that his country makes good use of the special talents and loyalty which he has brought to Government service in the past. I am confident that, whatever attacks are made upon him now by irresponsible journalism, the Senate will speedily confirm him when his nomination is brought to the floor.

AMERICAN CASUALTY FIGURES IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it was 1 year ago this week that President Johnson ordered a halt in all bombing north of the 19th parallel in North Vietnam. In October he eliminated all bombing of North Vietnam.

President Johnson's reasoning for his April restrictions and his October prohibition was the hope that this would result in a negotiated peace.

Peace talks began in Paris in early May. It was only recently that the conferees came to agreement on the shape of the table. So far as is known, no other conclusions have been reached. There is no evidence that peace is any nearer today than it was a year ago.

Yet while this country has eliminated all aerial action against North Vietnam, American casualties continue to mount.

It has been my belief for some months that the Paris talks have lulled the American people into a false sense of security—and have caused our troops to become the forgotten men.

Let us look at the facts.

During the 1-year period beginning last April, the United States has suffered 95,879 casualties in Vietnam, of which 12,866 were killed.

This is 39 percent of all the casualties the United States has suffered during its long involvement in Vietnam.

To state it another way, of the total casualties suffered in Vietnam, 39 percent occurred during the past 12 months. Of the 33,641 who have been killed in Vietnam, 38.2 percent met their death during the past year.

During the first 3 weeks of the last month—as recently as that—the United States had more men killed in Vietnam, and more men wounded in Vietnam, than in any 3-week period during the history of the war.

From the beginning, I have felt that U.S. involvement in a ground war in Asia was a great error of judgment. But since our Government decided to draft men and send them to Asia to fight, I feel we must give them full support.

That is why I want to emphasize and reemphasize the severe casualty figures in the hope that this will focus attention on the difficulties facing our troops in Vietnam.

NATIONAL GOALS AND THE MILITARY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week, the Joint Economic Committee filed its report. I think it was a good report, one which has received substantial consideration by the press.

There is one segment of the report especially significant, which may easily be overlooked, because it was not emphasized in the releases, and because it is a long report and the segment appears back in the body of the report. I am referring to the defense-related recommendations in the committee's report which I think are the toughest in this field in the committee's entire 23-year history.

I rise today, Mr. President, to urge Congress to give special attention to those recommendations. The committee has called for a substantial increase in the critical scrutiny given the defense budget both within the executive branch and in Congress.

In our annual report, we urged the Council of Economic Advisers and the Bureau of the Budget increase substantially their efforts to analyze and evaluate issues related to defense spending. And we urged that the Executive Office of the President undertake ongoing and comprehensive investigations of defense procurement matters and submit their findings to the Joint Economic Committee as part of the annual economic report.

As our report states:

> The Bureau of the Budget should strengthen its defense review capacity so

that it can adequately scrutinize Defense Department budget requests. The Council of Economic Advisers should focus its attention on defense expenditures and their impact on the economy. Agencies such as the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce should begin studying the effects that defense spending is having on wages and prices. The annual economic reports to Congress should present the results of these analyses.

There is now substantial evidence that improved efficiency in defense spending could free much needed resources for reallocation to higher priority civilian programs.

In developing policy to resolve in a satisfactory way the collision of demands for investment in education, cities, labor retraining, and the elimination of poverty as against the unquenchable desire of the military establishment for more weapons systems and more sophisticated armaments, it is necessary that the Federal Government establish a meaningful set of national priorities. To do this Congress must have an explicit set of priorities and objectives to guide it in shaping new legislation and making appropriations.

That means Congress must have improved information on the economic effects of both existing programs and new proposals. Data on both benefits and costs and the distribution of these among groups in our society is now being generated on an ongoing basis by the planning-programing-budgeting system. But so far the Congress has not obtained access to this information.

It is obvious that this data is essential to Congress for distinguishing productive expenditures from those of little worth when all agencies and interests claim that their programs and projects are essential to the Nation and of highest priority.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the report on National Goals and Priorities be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Part IV—National Priorities and Effective Public Policy

NATIONAL GOALS AND PRIORITIES

The budget of the Federal Government accounts for over 20 percent of the Nation's total output of final goods and services. The allocation of this nearly $200 billion budget among the multitude of Federal programs has an enormous influence on both the structure of outputs produced by the U.S. economy and the distribution of the Nation's income. Because of this impact of Federal revenues and expenditures on the society, it is essential that allocation decisions be based on a clear statement of national goal and priorities. This necessity is reinforced by the rapid growth in Federal expenditures over the past several years.

* * * * *

We urge that the Congress, with guidance from its leadership, and the administration undertake a formal and comprehensive study of national goals and priorities with a view to establishing guidelines for legislation and expenditure policy.

We recognize the serious difficulties which plague efforts to seek general agreement on these basic questions of national direction. Indeed, the vitality of this Nation's political system stems from the diversity of opinions and values held by the populace. We have, however, recently witnessed a period of intensive study of a large number of issues which pertain to national goals. While many of these issues were related, the task forces which were responsible for the analysis and recommendations properly viewed their mandate as being limited in scope. It is now time to seek a broader perspective: an overview in which the urgency of the individual demands generated by these reports can be subjected to a comprehensive appraisal. We believe that the following considerations are basic to any serious discussion of national priorities.

1. The study of goals and priorities should determine the dollar costs required to attain each of the substantial number of objectives which are often cited as being primary social goals. It is important that public decisionmakers have before them an estimate of the costs of each item in the array of social objectives, all of which would be chosen if they could be afforded. This information, by demonstrating that the devotion of resources to one objective implies a foregone opportunity to support another, leads to improved public decisions by clarifying the real costs associated with any decision.

2. The study of goals and priorities should evaluate the output and financial resources which the economy and the Federal Government can call upon in attaining social objectives. It is now possible to project with some accuracy the future output of the economy and, given the existing tax structure, the budgetary resources which will become available to the Federal Government. Moreover, it is possible to estimate confidently the future expenditures in a substantial number of Federal governmental programs which, for all intents and purposes, are beyond the annual control of the appropriations process. By ascertaining the difference between these two flows—projected revenue increases and increases in unavoidable Federal outlays—we obtain what is sometimes called the fiscal dividend. This figure provides both the Congress and the executive branch with meaningful information on the future availability of resources which can be allocated among the various social objectives. Such estimates should be developed for a range of plausible assumptions and should be updated and published on an ongoing basis. This information, it should be noted, is the complement of the data on the total costs required for attainment of each of the objectives.

3. The study of goals and priorities should focus on the allocation of Federal revenues between the military and civilian budgets. Because the defense budget is substantially less visible than budgets for civilian programs and because of our past experience with national security costs which have substantially exceeded initial estimates, this allocation question should not be neglected in an analysis of national priorities. Information concerning the budgetary implications of a number of possible national security postures is essential to meaningful public policy decisions and a rational allocation of the Federal budget among its competing claims.

THE ECONOMIC APPRAISAL OF PUBLIC PROGRAMS

Quantitative information of the economic effects of the expenditures which we are *now* making is as essential to an effective and efficient government as a clear sense of priorities and objectives for future action. Because of the rapid rise in Federal expenditures in the last decade, the experimental nature of newly legislated social programs, and the current period of budget stringency, implementation of procedures for the accurate economic analysis of spending programs is most urgent. It is also essential that information on program effectiveness now possessed by the administration be transmitted to the Congress.

This committee welcomed President Johnson's Executive Order issued in August of 1965, establishing the Planning-Programing-Budgeting System. In our judgment, the PPB System provides a meaningful framework for improved policy analysis and program evaluation. From information presented to the committee's Subcommittee on Economy in Government, we judge that a substantial amount of valuable economic analysis and information has been generated by the operation of the system in the executive branch. Many expenditure programs can now be evaluated by decisionmakers in terms of the relationship between social benefits and social costs. Moreover, the social characteristics (race, income level, age) of the people who receive the benefits of Government programs are now known by decisionmakers in the administration in substantial detail. As President Johnson stated in his Directive, this information can assist the Government to: "choose among those goals the ones that are most urgent * * * search for alternative means of reaching those goals most effectively at the least cost * * * [and] measure the performance of our programs to insure a dollar's worth of service for each dollar spent."

We urge the new administration to make every effort to strengthen the PPB System, increase the capability of the Bureau of the Budget and executive agencies to implement this system, and provide incentive for its effective functioning.

While urging a renewed effort to make careful program evaluation an integral part of the budgetary process, we are aware of the complex and, to some extent, intractable problems which confront attempts to modify a process steeped in tradition. Nevertheless, we believe that there are a number of steps which can be taken to improve the effectiveness of program evaluation and to encourage the Federal budget to produce more of the kind of information essential for appropriate policy decisions. Because the Bureau of the Budget has been given responsibility for this program evaluation task, our recommendations are addressed primarily to it.

Currently, the PPB System is generating a substantial amount of data and information on the benefits of programs relative to their costs and on the distribution of the beneficiaries of these programs by their race, income, and region. To the decisionmaker who is interested in the objective appraisal of the impact of his program, this sort of information is essential. Yet it is widely recognized that substantial progress has yet to be made by the program evaluation system in bringing this information to bear on budget allocation decisions. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget should undertake wide consultation with those knowledgeable in the techniques of policy analysis in both academic and business life and with high-level decisionmakers in previous Federal administrations in a search for procedures by which to make program evaluation information more central to the budget allocation process. The impact of competent analysis is negligible if it is not brought to bear directly on the bargaining process through which public decisions are made.

The procedures for undertaking the appropriate economic analysis of public spending programs are still in an early stage of development. This fact has, in substantial measure, accounted for the unsatisfactory evaluation efforts undertaken by a number of executive agencies. Because of its responsibility for directing the PPB system, the Bureau of the Budget should, without delay, formulate more specific and detailed guidelines for agency analysis of their expenditure programs. One area in which guidelines are necessary is in the application of discounting analysis to public investments with benefits and costs which extend into the future. The committee is concerned with the erratic nature of the discounting analysis currently performed in the executive agencies and with the wide range of discount rates applied in such analysis. While recent changes in discounting policy in evaluating natural resource and defense expenditures are to be commended, there is much that can yet be done to improve discounting analysis throughout the Federal Government. We judge that the Bureau of the Budget can be of substantial assistance in improving the appropriate use of this technique as well as in developing improved procedures for measuring the national economic benefits and costs of various public expenditures.

* * * * *

We urge that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget develop proposals for submitting the results of program analysis and evaluation performed in the executive branch to the Congress.

Until now, analyses of the impact of programs on the economy and on program beneficiaries have been largely retained in the executive branch. Consequently, the Congress has made many of its decisions, especially as regards budgetary appropriations, without either the information on program benefits and costs or the information on the characteristics of program beneficiaries which these analyses provide. This problem is a serious one. Clearly, the quality of decisions in both the executive and the legislative branches depends upon the amount of information which is available to the decisionmaker. Significant improvements in the legislative and appropriation processes could be achieved if a sizable proportion of the information now available to the executive branch were available to the Congress as well.

The committee recognizes the effects which the publication of the results of program evaluation studies might have on the internal evaluation process in the executive agencies. Nevertheless, we believe that the flow of evaluative information to the Congress could be substantially increased without jeopardizing the evaluation system itself. In particular, the Congress should be provided on a regular basis with summary reports which analyze the value of project and program outputs relative to their cost and describe the social and economic characteristics of the beneficiaries of these programs. Without question, such information would generate the kind of discussion necessary to improved decisionmaking in the legislative branch.

In this same context, we recommend that the Congress develop its own capabilities to use such program evaluation information effectively. This would involve appraisal of staff skills required by the various committees, and addition of qualified personnel as recommended in the report of the Subcommittee on Economy in Government in December 1967.

* * * * *

VIETNAM COSTS AND THE DEFENSE BUDGET

This year's Economic Report of the President contains a separate report from the Cabinet Coordinating Committee on Economic Planning for the End of Vietnam Hostilities. The Cabinet Coordinating Committee, composed of the Secretaries of Treasury, Defense, Commerce, and Labor, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, was appointed by President Johnson in 1967. Its purpose was to coordinate post-Vietnam economic planning.

The report describes plans for sustaining prosperity during the period of post-Vietnam demobilization. On the basis of projection models, both Federal revenues and expenditures are forecast for the 1969–72 period. Because revenues are expected to expand more rapidly than built-in spending commitments, there is expected what the report described as a "peace and growth dividend." This dividend is smaller than many anticipate, largely because built-in expansion of existing expenditure programs is expected to pre-empt about one-half of the growth in revenues. While the decline of defense spending will provide some opportunity to reallocate manpower and material resources to peacetime uses, the size of the dividend is discouragingly small. Because of the increasing demands to begin new Government programs, strengthen existing ones, or reduce taxes, the key problem is establishing longrun priorities as a guide to important policy decisions.

* * * *

Analytical efforts of this sort are most useful. The administration is to be commended for undertaking the task of planning for reduced spending and analyzing the needs of the postwar economy. The kinds of projections presented in the report and the relation of these projections to the menu of alternative Federal spending alternative is a first step in the hoped-for national discussion of objectives and priorities.

This notwithstanding, we feel that there are some limitations in the analysis of defense spending and the allocation of the fiscal dividend in the reports submitted to Congress. The Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers, for example, confines its analysis of defense spending to less than 2 pages, in which problems of Government procurement, including military procurement, are discussed. The Economic Report of the President, itself, makes only a brief reference to financing military efforts in Vietnam and a short statement about the work of the Cabinet Coordinating Committee on Economic Planning for the End of Vietnam Hostilities. None of the Special Analyses of the Budget cover defense spending. This committee is concerned about the failure of the annual economic reports submitted by the executive branch to Congress to sufficiently analyze the present defense budget and its policy implications.

We urge that the Council of Economic Advisers and the Bureau of the Budget increase substantially their efforts to analyze and evaluate issues related to defense spending.

The outgoing Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, while urging continued fiscal restraints through 1969 and 1970, testified that the Council accepts, without questioning, the figure which the Bureau of the Budget "and the people in the Defense Department develop, present to the President, [and] get his approval on * * *" He also stated that the Bureau of the Budget and not the Council of Economic Advisers has jurisdiction over questions of efficiency in defense programs and in defense planning. This demurrer from the Council of Economic Advisers is accentuated by the admission that the Bureau of the Budget does not attend to defense spending matters with anything like the thoroughness given to civilian programs. Both the outgoing and incoming Budget Directors conceded that only limited critical attention is given to the defense budget. In view of the fact that about 80 percent of the $100 billion of relatively controllable Federal outlays is accounted for by national defense, the quality of this review is disturbing. In light of this evidence, there is a serious question as to whether the defense budget proposed by the Pentagon is adequately analyzed elsewhere in the executive branch.

While an important effort, it should be noted that the report of the Cabinet Coordinating Committee does not attempt to analyze the defense budget. Instead, its work with the defense budget is done largely on the basis of hypothesis and assumption. As such, it is a significant guide to macroeconomic planning, but of only minor assistance in meeting the needs of the Congress and the public in their attempts to frame critical judgments on national objectives and their relationship to defense spending. Effective policymaking requires information on matters such as the profitability of defense contracts, the movement of wages and prices in the defense industry, and the extent to which they contribute to inflation, the effects of defense procurement on small business, the influence of defense procurement on industrial concentration, and the "brain drain" on nondefense industries and universities and many other important economic problems related to the defense budget. The Executive Office of the President, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Bureau of the Budget have responsibility for undertaking this kind of analysis and presenting their conclusions to the Congress.

We would also emphasize that each of the economic reports to Congress assume implicitly that the present level of defense spending is the desirable minimum essential to maintain national security. However, we have been impressed by the evidence of widespread waste, mismanagement, and inefficiency in defense spending brought to light in recent months. It now seems clear that the present level of national security can be maintained on a substantially smaller defense budget.

Much of the inefficiency, it appears, is found in defense procurement. While over $44 billion was spent on the purchase of weapons and other military goods last year, only 11 percent of the contracts were awarded through formal advertising. Sole source procurement accounts for 57.9 percent. It is in the sole source procurement of major weapons systems where much of the problem of excessive costs and cost overruns have occurred. Cost increases of 200 percent and more over original estimates have been common.

One of the most serious problems, as shown by the recent hearings by this committee's Subcommittee on Economy in Government, is the absence of uniform accounting standards for the reporting of costs by defense contractors. Due to the fact that contractors must comply only with "generally accepted accounting principles," and the fact that they are not required to maintain books and records on most defense contracts, it is often not possible as a practical matter, for the Government to determine the accuracy or reasonableness of cost estimates.

We urge that the Executive Office of the President undertake ongoing and comprehensive investigations of defense procurement matters and submit their findings to this committee as part of the Annual Economic Report.

In the area of defense procurement, there are a number of matters about which we are especially concerned. The exercise of inventory and management controls by the Department of Defense over the property for which it is responsible appears inadequate. This is reflected in the fact that the DOD now holds $202.5 billion in real and personal property and, in fiscal year 1968, held 29 million acres of land. The Department of Defense has placed more than $13 billion of Government-owned property in the hands of defense contractors. The Subcommittee on Economy in Government has documented the existence of inadequate property accounting records, deficient inventory practices, absence of financial controls, and other serious departures from good property management practices.

Just as fiscal restraint must be exercised on the civilian budget, there is a need that fiscal restraint be exercised on the defense budget. The Bureau of the Budget should strengthen its defense review capacity so that it can adequately scrutinize Defense

Department budget requests. The Council of Economic Advisers should focus its attention on defense expenditures and their impact on the economy. Agencies such as the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce should begin studying the effects that defense spending is having on wages and prices. The annual economic reports to Congress should present the results of these analyses. There is now substantial evidence that improved efficiency in defense spending could free much-needed resources for reallocation to higher priority civilian programs.

HIGH INTEREST AND THE HOUSING SHORTAGE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we are in the middle of the most severe housing shortage in 20 years. The cumulative impact of tight money policies has severely depressed the homebuilding industry. While some observers point to the current level of housing starts as having increased over last year, when starts are measured against our needs it is clear that we are falling far below our needs.

Recent press reports have indicated the extreme difficulty home buyers have in finding new housing. In fact, the National Observer reports that in New York City prospective home buyers or apartment renters had even bribed employees of the New York Times in order to receive advance copies of the real estate classified section.

Chairman Preston Martin of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, in testifying before recent Senate Banking Committee hearings, gave further evidence to the housing shortage. According to Chairman Martin, the strength of our housing demands can be seen by a rental vacancy of 4.9 percent in the fourth quarter of 1968, the lowest since 1957. The homeowner vacancy rate, at 1.1 percent in the fourth quarter, was the lowest since 1960. The inventory of newly completed unsold homes has also been extremely small in recent months.

The leveling off of housing starts has come at a time when our household formations have been increasing and will continue to increase sharply in the future. Moreover, the deterioration of existing substandard housing creates an additional demand for new construction.

Milwaukee homebuilders have indicated to me that persons with incomes of less than $10,000 a year could simply forget about buying a new home in the foreseeable future. There just was not that much mortgage credit available, and in rationing the limited supply, those who make less than $10,000 are just out of luck.

Mr. President, this fact was confirmed by William McC. Martin, our leading financial expert. In recent Senate Banking Committee hearings, Mr. Martin, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, said that it was "entirely logical" that persons with incomes under $10,000 were not able to obtain mortgage credit.

While such a situation may be "entirely logical" to our money managers, I believe it is a deplorable situation for the American people. When one stops to think that the vast majority of our citizens earn less than $10,000 a year, the impact of monetary policy becomes clear. Tight money and tight mortgage credit mean that the vast majority of the American people are unable to realize the American dream of owning their own home.

While nearly everyone agrees on the need to cool off the economy, the essential question remains—at whose expense? The money managers of the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury seem to be taking the view that it shall be at the expense of the average home buyer. I think this is wrong and unfair. We must find a better way to fight inflation without placing all of the burden on the average American family earning less than $10,000 a year.

TIGHT MONEY CLOBBERS HOUSING

While monetary policy is an esoteric and difficult subject, the meaning of high interest rates is quite clear to the average home buyer or small businessman or consumer. When a home buyer borrows $20,000 on a 30-year mortgage at 8 percent interest, he must pay nearly $33,000 in interest over the life of the mortgage. This is a tremendous burden for a young couple to be saddled with over the next 30 years. In many areas of the country home buyers are paying 8 percent or even more.

In addition to the high cost of money, the availability of mortgage credit is also a serious problem. We all recall the disastrous credit crunch of 1966 when mortgage credit simply could not be had on any terms. Interest rates rose so high and so fast that thrift institutions were unable to obtain deposit inflows and were forced to bring their mortgage lending to a virtual halt. Governor Maisel of the Federal Reserve Board has estimated the housing sector accounted for about 70 percent of the drop in expenditures dictated by the 1966 tight money policy. When an industry comprising only 3 percent of GNP must take 70 percent of the cutback, something is wrong with the way monetary policy works.

Today we are faced with a potential repetition of the 1966 credit crunch. If the Federal Reserve Board mainatins the same policies it has thus far pursued, I do not see how we can avoid another disastrous year for the housing industry. Other borrowers highly dependent on credit are also likely to suffer, including small business firms and State and local governments. If the rapid rise in interest rates continues, funds may be once more siphoned away from thrift institutions.

Today, many interest rates have hit all-time highs. The Treasury bill rate is 6.108 percent, up 62 basis points from last November; the rate on Treasury bonds is 6.06 percent, up 70 basis points; triple A corporate bonds are 6.75 percent, up 56 basis points and tax-exempt municipals are at a record 5.30 percent, up 62 basis points. The commercial bank prime lending rate was raised three times since last December, when it was 6¼ percent, to an unprecedented 7½ percent, up 125 basis points.

The recent reports of the Kaiser and Douglas Commissions both highlight the importance of monetary policy in achieving the Nation's housing goals set forth by Congress in the 1968 Housing Act. Tight money not only frustrates the achievement of our total housing goals, but it hits low- and moderate-income housing the hardest. This can be shown by comparing the percentage change in new homes sold during the tight money year of 1966 with 1965. The sale of homes priced under $12,500 dropped 51 percent; homes priced between $12,500 and $15,000 dropped 42 percent; homes priced between $15,000 and $17,500 dropped 20 percent; but the sale of homes priced $30,000 or over actually rose 10 percent.

Not only does tight money discriminate against housing, but within housing, it discriminates against the poor. Just as minority groups are the first to be laid-off during a recession, so low-income housing is the first to be cut during a credit shortage. Another credit crunch will condemn thousands of low-income families to still another year of living in rat-infested slum tenements.

In theory, a tight money policy is supposed to cool down an overheated economy by raising the act of credit, thus discouraging new investment financed through credit markets. In practice, the corporate-business sector of the economy has been able to evade tight money and transfer the entire burden of adjustment to the housing sector.

THE INFLATIONARY BUSINESS INVESTMENT BOOM

This would not be so bad if corporations had a shortage of plant and equipment, and housing were overbuilt. But in 1969, just the opposite is true. We are in the middle of an unsustainable investment boom while housing markets are extremely tight, as evidenced by low vacancy rates and rising household formations.

The main inflationary component of our economy is not housing, but rather corporate spending on plant and equipment and Government spending on military and public works.

While other sectors have moderated inflation, business planned expenditures for plant and equipment have skyrocketed. A survey by the National Industrial Conference Board last October showed that corporations planned to increase their expenditures for plant and equipment in 1969 by 6.3 percent. Another survey by McGraw-Hill in October put the increase at 8 percent. Still another survey by the Department of Commerce and the Securities and Exchange Commission in November showed planned expenditures for plant and equipment rising by 9 percent in the first half of 1969. And the most recent Commerce-SEC survey of February shows a whopping 13.9 percent increase in planned business investment spending for 1969. In terms of dollars, this will add about $9 billion to final demand, and to inflation, or about as much as the surtax is taking out of the economy.

There are several points which should be noted about this inflationary business investment boom:

First, monetary policy has utterly failed to restrain corporate investment demand. During the period from November 1968 through February 1969 when monetary policy was tightening, corporations were more than doubling their planned percentage increase in investment spending. One reason for the increase in planned spending might be due to the expectation of even tighter credit conditions in the future. If this is true, a tight money policy is not merely ineffective it is perverse.

Second, the rampant increase in interest rates has no significant deterrent effect on corporate investment because the higher costs can always be passed on to the consumer. This in itself is inflationary. A recent article in the Wall Street Journal following the hike in the prime rate carried the following headline: "Businesses Indicate they Must, and Will Maintain Borrowing Pace Despite Price."

That was the very day on which the banks in New York, the big money market banks, announced they were increasing their prime interest rate to 7.5 percent.

Third, an increase in investment demand of the magnitude planned by corporations has serious repercussions on financial markets. Much of the added spending must be financed externally since corporate cash flow will not grow nearly as fast. In fact, corporations have been relying more and more on external financing in the last few years. In 1963 and 1964, only 20 percent of total corporate investment was externally financed. In the next 4 years, the figure jumped to 28 percent. The added pressure on credit markets will leave less credit available for housing, State and local governments, and small business.

Fourth, the inflationary investment boom seems completely unsustainable in view of the fact that we are only utilizing 84 percent of our industrial capacity.

In 1964, we cut taxes to get the economy working, and at that time we were operating at 85 percent of our capacity. Now we are operating at a lower level, and the reason is that we have so tremendously increased our plant and equipment. We are operating at far below the level at which we should operate.

This is why it seems so wrong for us to follow policies that encourage business to go ahead and invest so very much in plant and equipment. Because of the investment tax credit, we may have reached the saturation point for new business investment, but nonetheless, the boom goes unchecked.

LACK OF BANKING RESTRAINT

Part of the reason why the inflationary business investment boom has gone unchecked has been due to the ability of large commercial banks to circumvent the monetary policy established by the Federal Reserve Board. For example, during the last 3 months the Fed cut the annual growth rate in Federal Reserve bank credit to 0 percent compared to a 10.6 percent growth rate during the first 11 months of 1968. Likewise, the annual growth rate in the money supply dropped to 4.0 percent in the last 3 months compared to 6.4 percent for the first 11 months of 1968. But despite these tightening actions, commercial bank loans expanded at an annual rate of 12.0 percent during the last 3 months compared to an annual growth rate of 11.7 percent during the first 11 months of 1968. In other words, tight money has had absolutely no effect on bank lending.

How can commercial banks circumvent the Federal Reserve's monetary policy? The following figures will tell the story. During the period from December 4, 1968, to March 12, 1969, large commercial banks with deposits of over $100 million lost a total of $6.9 billion in deposits, both demand and time. This period roughly coincides with the period of tightening monetary policy. The deposit loss indicates the Fed's policy was partially effective. If all other conditions remained the same, these large banks would have had to curtail their lending by a similar amount.

But all other things did not remain the same. These banks were able to obtain $10.2 billion from other sources to more than offset the $6.9 billion deposit loss. Where did they get the money? One, they got $4.5 billion by dumping Treasury securities; two, they got $2.4 billion by borrowing in the Euro-dollar market; three, they got $1.6 billion by borrowing from others including the Fed itself; and four, they got $1.7 billion from all other portfolio adjustments.

The difference between the $6.9 billion deposit loss and the $10.2 billion offset is $3.3 billion. All of these funds were used to increase industrial and commercial loans. The ready availability of bank credit is one more reason why corporate treasurers are confidently planning to increase their investment spending by 13.9 percent in 1969.

I do not want to point the finger of blame at the large banks. After all, they are profitmaking institutions responsible to their stockholders and have no duty to carry out monetary policy. Instead, I am concerned as to how policy can be more effective. The argument is not between a tight versus easy money policy. Granted the need for a tight money policy, the question is, How can that policy be made more effective, how can it be more selective in its impact, how can it work to restrain the inflationary elements in the economy without sending interest rates skyhigh, without clobbering the housing industry and without creating a disastrous credit crunch similar to 1966?

There are a number of steps which the Federal Reserve Board could take to restrain commercial bank business lending so that more of the burden of adjustment falls on the corporate business sector of the economy. First of all, the Board could curb the inflow of Euro-dollars which permits commercial banks to continue their business lending even in the face of a restrictive monetary policy.

Second, the Board could ask for authority, as it once did in the late 1940's, to prevent commercial banks from dumping Treasury securities in order to maintain their volume of business lending.

Third, the Federal Reserve Board could adopt a tougher attitude with respect to banks and to deny access to the discount window on the part of those banks which fail to curb their business loans.

Fourth, the Federal Reserve Board could send a letter to commercial banks as it did in September of 1966, urging a cut-back in the volume of business lending, and

Fifth, the administration itself could call in top corporate executives in order to urge a policy of restraint with respect to investment spending.

This past week, when the Under Secretary of the Treasury in Charge of Monetary Affairs, Mr. Walker, appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency, I asked him, on each of these measures, whether the administration would support them, and his answer was "No."

The Federal Reserve Board indicates that it will not support any of these measures, not one. Unless some action is taken, however, Mr. President, the disastrous effects of the credit crunch we suffered in 1966 on housing may be repeated.

Mr. President, Federal deficit spending has been rightfully singled out as being responsible for inflation. But, today corporate deficit spending is the main cause of inflation in our economy. Unless we can restrain the business investment boom, we will continue to have inflation. If we continue to attempt to fight inflation through general monetary policy, the burden of adjustment will not center on the sector causing inflation; namely, large corporations, but rather on the home buyer, the small businessman, the farmer, and on State and local governments. It is time we adopted new techniques of monetary policy in order to curb inflation while at the same time achieving national goals laid down by the Congress and the American people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Pinch Tightens for Home Hunters," published in a recent issue of the National Observer, and an article entitled "The Housing Shortage," published in Newsweek magazine of March 31, 1969.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Observer]

THE PINCH TIGHTENS FOR HOME HUNTERS

(By Morton C. Paulson)

In desperation, Robert Popp ran this advertisement in a San Francisco newspaper:

"Newsman, wife, and impotent cat wish to rent one two-bedroom house at $175."

It worked. The Popps and their pet were soon sequestered in a cozy cottage in suburban Mill Valley north of the city.

The Popps' droll, eye-catching notice is by no means unique these days. A National Observer survey of housing conditions in a dozen areas turned up many examples of the resourcefulness displayed by many Americans—in San Francisco and elsewhere—in their frustrating search for a place to live. Today's homeseekers are faced in most areas with the worst housing shortage in two decades and the highest costs in history.

Hardest hit, in many areas, are middle-income groups. The wealthy have a wide freedom of choice. The very poor have no realistic hope for home ownership and can in some situations look to the Federal Government or to local housing agencies for rental-housing assistance. The rest are caught in an economic cross fire—inflation on one hand and on the other the surtax used to fight it.

Along with land and construction costs, mortgage-interest rates and property taxes are at record levels. The Advance Mortgage Corp. of Detroit, a major mortgage lender, reported following a recent survey that, in just the past year, home prices have risen about 10 per cent, mortgage rates are up 0.75 of a percentage point to a national average of 7.5 per cent, and property taxes have increased about 5 per cent. Thus, today's buyer may pay at least 15 percent more in monthly payments than he would have a year ago for a similar house. Moreover, Advance said, "builders keep moving to larger, costlier homes to compensate for the shortage of labor and high land costs. Apartment builders continue moving toward luxury units. Depending on the market, a medium-price home now costs from $30,000 to $50,000." Housing costs accounted for a good share of last month's 0.4 per cent rise in consumer prices.

Even if he can afford the sky-high costs, a prospective buyer may not be able to get a mortgage. Legal ceilings on home-loan interest rate have all but dried up the mortgage markets in some states. In areas where funds are more plentiful, many banks have made it difficult for individuals to get loans by raising interest rates and down-payment requirements, and by reducing the length of loans.

PINCHING THE POCKETBOOK

Rents are jumping too. In Chicago, buildings now under construction will charge $220 a month for one-bedroom apartments that are identical with units now renting for $180. In luxury high-rises now under construction, two-bedroom units are expected to cost $600 or more. A woman who rented a studio apartment for $152 in 1964 is now paying $160 and has just been notified of a $30 increase.

But while higher prices pinch the pocketbooks of the homeowner and renter, the home seeker is the one who must resort to the unusual and sometimes ingenious approach to escape his predicament. In metropolitan New York, tightest of all U.S. housing markets, the vacancy rate is 1 per cent, far below the national average of 2.4 per cent. Apartment hunters comb the obituary pages of newspapers for leads to forthcoming vacancies. Failing in this approach, they slip a few dollars to doormen, superintendents, mowing men—anyone who is likely to know about tenants who are planning to leave.

"There are simply many more clients than apartments," declares an agent in Greenwich Village, "and I can fill only one of every 100 applications. People are desperate. They come in here begging—even crying."

In the past, a few bold New Yorkers were able to get a head start over house-hunting rivals by buying bootlegged copies of the fat real-estate advertising section of the Sunday New York Times prior to publication. No more. After landlords and rental agents complained that people kept pestering them before their property was ready to show, the Times hired a guard to end the smuggling.

Adding to the difficulties of some searchers is the increasing selectivity being exercised by Manhattan landlords. "Most of them don't want hippies, singles, people with pets, musicians, and nonconformists," says one New Yorker. So many apartment-house owners don't advertise; they simply list their offerings with real-estate brokers.

In booming Houston, a young securities broker and his pregnant wife took to wining and dining their real-estate agent in hopes that he would think of them first when a suitable home went on the market. "This Sunday we're taking him to the best restaurant in town," said the wife, hopefully. The couple has scouted the suburbs every week end since September—to no avail.

INSTANT DECISIONS

"People who find an apartment here have to decide right away whether they want it," declares the secretary of The Key, a Houston apartment locator service. "If they wait, they will probably lose it."

In the affluent bedroom community of Darien, Conn., a young scientists from England signed a lease on a $35,000 house after sitting on the doorstep for hours waiting for the owner to show up. An hour later he moved in—with cots and blankets borrowed from the owner.

A Minneapolis realty dealer, P. C. Smaby, says housing in that city is in the "shortest supply I have seen in 23 years in business." Because houses are often sold before fact sheets on them can be printed for multiple-listing services, more and more brokers are using computerized house-finding systems to speed the search.

The housing crisis is causing anguish in corporate board rooms. Increasingly, promising executives have been turning down promotions to company headquarters because of reluctance to move to big cities. The high cost of housing is only one reason for this antipath, but it can be the one that tips the scales.

When C. R. Farnsworth, 43, was controller at Dresser Industries, Inc., in Bradford, Pa., he was offered a job as a financial executive with International Telephone and Telegraph Corp. in New York City.

WHERE MR. FARNSWORTH WOUND UP

"I came up to look for a house in [suburban] Connecticut," he relates. "What I needed cost about $35,000 in Pennsylvania, but I couldn't find anything comparable for less than $55,000 up there." Then, after checking the commuting time, and adding up other living costs, Mr. Farnsworth chose a job with the Pure Carbon Co. in northwestern Pennsylvania. He figured he would be better off financially—even though the starting salary with Pure was 20 per cent lower than ITT's offer.

In a few places, however, the situation is reversed. A buyers' market in single-family dwellings exists over much of Florida because of overbuilding in past years and a sharp increase in the number of apartment units. Houses in Jacksonville that sold for $20,000 eight years ago can be picked up today by assuming the mortgage, which may be for $15,000 or less.

But for most homeseekers elsewhere, the outlook is grim. What's the solution? Halting inflation would accomplish the most, of course. But the problems in housing are many and complex. The basic difficulty, says Advance Mortgage, is inadequate transportation. "The near-in land is almost completely built up, and transportation over long distances is unreliable or frustrating," the survey concluded. "In the long run, our housing problems may be insoluble until our transportation problems are solved." Whatever it takes to bring relief, it can't come too soon for the harried homeseeker.

[From Newsweek magazine, Mar. 31, 1969]

The Housing Shortage

On almost any sunny Sunday he and his wife can be found trudging through the pennant-draped model homes of any housing development. If he isn't doing that, he is roaming the streets with real-estate agents, ringing strange doorbells and shaking hands with smiling sellers. He is middle class—both in viewpoint and income—and never in U.S. history have there been so many like him. He is the harassed U.S. house hunter, and if he ever finds what he wants and can afford, he can consider himself lucky.

"We feel we've been bushwhacked," moans a young Midwestern husband whose year-long house-hunting efforts have produced only frustration. Small wonder. Last week bankers pushed their prime interest rate to 7½ per cent, the fourth increase in three and a half months and a move that certainly meant a continuation of tight money and the woes it produces—bigger down payments and even stiffer mortgage-interest rates. In some areas, down payments were hitting 30 per cent, with added 2 to 4 per cent service fees (sometimes called "points") amounting to $500 to $1,000 on a $25,000 mortgage. Mortgage-interest rates themselves hit a record national average of 7.39 per cent in February, bumping up against the legal usury ceilings in many states.

PRICES UP

Land prices jumped 7 per cent during the last half of 1968—an increase of more than 300 per cent since 1950. Plywood was selling for twice its price of a year ago, and increased lumber costs generally have boosted the price of a $25,000 home by $1,268 in fourteen months. Construction workers generally were receiving an average of more than $5 an hour, up 6 per cent in a year, and craftsmen such as carpenters were earning a whopping $7 in some areas. February housing starts showed an 8 per cent decline—modest enough in itself but taken by some as a sign of worse things to come by summer and early fall. Warned an official of the National Association of Home Builders: "I don't see any relief in the markets ahead."

It all bears a dismal message for the house hunter. Unless he is very rich, finding a place to live today is just about the toughest problem he can face. He must grapple with the worst national housing shortage in two decades—an unhappy phenomenon that includes not only single-family houses but apartments, co-ops and condominiums. The U.S. vacancy rate for all types of housing has, according to the Advance Mortgage Corp., dropped to a scant 2.4 per cent, with even lesser rates for such metropolitan areas as Philadelphia, Detroit, Cleveland and San Francisco. In New York City, hub of the tightest housing market in the nation, the rate is a nightmarish 1 per cent—and even lower for some types of new apartments.

NEW YORK MARKET

The result is a wild seller's market where supply and demand are totally out of equilibrium. Prices skyrocket but demand follows right along, and there appears to be no limit to what the traffic will bear. Nowhere is this truer than in the New York metropolitan area. In suburban Larchmont, N.Y., an executive accepted an offer of $65,000 on a 25-year-old Tudor house for which he paid $49,500 less than two years ago. Elapsed time between listing (at $67,500) and bid: 48 hours. In nearby Harrison, N.Y., a real-estate agent pointed to a $110,000 house the other day and said: "You'd be surprised how many people come in with cash to swing a deal that big." Manhattan, of course, is where all the pressures come to bear to an extent approaching the ridiculous. A house-hunting bride asked an agent last week if she knew of any three-bedroom apartments that could be purchased for under $60,000. "Well, I'll try dear," the agent said. "But I'm afraid you'll probably never hear from me."

It is proportionately the same in other major metropolitan areas. Rising construction costs have driven the price of new homes up as much as $4,000 to $6,000 during the last 24 months—and there is no lack of customers. The real-estate sections of major Sunday newspapers (above) show what has been happening. Plain, four-bedroom houses, in good neighborhoods but with few frills, are routinely going for $40,000, $50,000 and $60,000. Anything remotely special about a house—a pool, proximity to natural water—can drive the price to $100,000 and far beyond. In Manhattan, tacky brownstones with little to recommend them save a nice East

Side address, routinely go for well over $100,000. As for rentals, New York just concluded a bitter row with landlords who agreed to limit increases to 15 per cent over two years.

THE PINCH

Clearly, the going is rough for home seekers who can't afford the fat prices—and that appears to be the majority. Many are in the predicament of Catherine and John Trumbull of Royal Oak, Mich. They have outgrown their two-bedroom bungalow, bought five years ago for $14,000, and want, as Cathy Trumbull puts it, a "four-bedroom colonial, a nice size living room, a formal dining room, a small library and fireplaces." On the plus side; their house would bring about $20,000 now, and Trumbull's salary as a chemist for Chevrolet has increased from $8,500 to $11,500. But they find that the dream home they want now sells for not $29,000, as they had thought, but for $35,000 or perhaps even $41,000. By dropping out of GM's stock-savings plan and using the $6,000 or $7,000 they would clear from the sale of their present home, Trumbull figures he could swing something near his wife's dream by assuming a $25,000 mortgage and payments of $200 a month. But it would be a squeaker, especially with growing children who, as Trumbull acknowledges, can "eat you out of house and home." It has been tight all along on payments of $120. Says Trumbull: "We don't go out very often. We haven't been to a movie in two years. We've really been sacrificing." In any case, time is running out. Cathy Trumbull has given birth to her third child, and some sort of a decision must be made soon. Trumbull puts it bluntly: "We feel the walls closing in."

Similar pressures are felt by families earning more money. A Los Angeles lawyer, Irwin (Chip) Chasalow, 36, earns well over $30,000. His wife, Judy, 33, is expecting their third child. The family would like to move from their $37,500, three-bedroom home into something with more room costing $60,000. But even if they get the $47,500 they are asking for their present home, it will be rough going, perhaps impossible. First there will be the $15,000 down payment. On top of that comes $900 in mortgage "points," $50 for a salesman's special fee, $300 in tax-escrow fees, a $900 early-payoff penalty fee, a title-insurance policy fee of $125 and additional expenses of about $300. All of it means that to spend the first night in their new home, the Chasalows will have to scrape up, in cash a whopping $17,575. Says Chasalow: "I don't have the cash." The family spends every Sunday afternoon looking for something better that they can afford, but Chasalow is pessimistic. "All I can see," he says, "is more grief."

Most house hunters can look forward to the same. They find themselves in the uncomfortable position of being hurt not only by inflation but by the cures offered by Washington. The income-tax surcharge, designed to cool the economy and slow inflation, also has the effect of making it more difficult for many taxpayers to put together a down payment.

MAN IN THE MIDDLE

Moreover, the average house hunter is left largely to fend for himself. For the genuinely poor there is at least the promise of a new Federal program under the Housing Act of 1968—although even that is becoming bogged down in indecision and uncertainty. The rich, of course, already have the luxury of choice. But for the man in the middle there is only the occasional bone—such as the one President Nixon threw last week to cut lumber prices, which account for more than a third of construction costs. He told the Pentagon to keep lumber purchases to a minimum, ordered the Agriculture and Interior departments to soften the market with timber from government lands. Even the tool that in the past helped make Everyman a homeowner—the FHA-insured mortgage—has become almost snooty. In December 1967, an income of from $10,600 to $12,700 was needed to qualify for an FHA guaranteed loan on a $25,000 home. Now it takes an income of $11,150 to $13,400. And as always, there is nothing that says a bank must go along even if the requirements are met.

But the biggest problem remains the housing shortage. It persists in the face of production that has increased generally during the last year, despite recent weak signs. Currently in the U.S. there are 65 million dwelling units. But that will have to be doubled in the next 25 years. Says Joshua Muss, a Chicago builder: "Nationwide our capacity to sell exceeds our ability to produce. The only solution I see is the Pill."

Developers are working overtime to meet the demand. To the dismay of some planners, they have stacked people and building materials together indiscriminately and produced "slurbs"—a favorite term of former Housing Secretary Robert Weaver. But some builders and businessmen are more farsighted. In an effort to cut costs, some have turned to modular-construction techniques and assembly-line methods. Yet costs have not been reduced by as much as some had hoped. Techbuilt Homes, Inc., of Cambridge, Mass., pioneered "pre-engineered" houses, but prices for its homes in New England areas can hit $75,000. Currently the company is considering a new approach—cheap town houses for suburbia. Says Techbuilt president Franklin W. Hobbs, 44: "These are the type of homes that will help us get ready for the zoning changes that will have to come about because of the scarcity of land."

CHRYSLER'S ANSWER

Others are applying sheer economic muscle to the task. Chrysler Corp. has hired famed architect Minoru Yamasaki to oversee development of 1,700 acres of company land near Troy, Mich. The expected result: a self-contained community, with commercial, retail and research facilities, and some 4,000 housing units.

In North Carolina, Grover Cleveland Robbins brings a touch of evangelism to the job. His Carolinas Carribean Corp. is planning a 2,500-unit development on 3,120 acres near Charlotte. To skeptics who noted that Robbins was not building on the prestigious side of town, Robbins snapped: "We'll create it." He spent $3.5 million for the land alone. But the eventual price could hit $8 million to $10 million—with all the planned golf courses, swimming pools, clubhouses—and open areas for "just walking and meditating." Says Robbins: "There's a big sickness in the suburbs. And it's boredom."

Still, the critics moan that progress is only patchwork. The over-all problem, says American Builder magazine, is not the lack of money or the lack of credit or high prices or inflation. What's wrong, it says, is that nobody gives a damn about housing. It simply doesn't rank as a top national priority, as do the space program and the war in Vietnam. The magazine recommends a radical fourteen-point relief program—including a national land-use policy, removal of zoning powers from suburbs to permit more building, elimination of all local building codes and abolition of all local property taxes in favor of a "site-value" tax to discourage feverish land speculation. It also recommends organization of big multi-builder companies to spread construction risks and take on bigger projects.

Whether any of it becomes a reality remains anybody's guess. Meanwhile, the U.S. house hunter can expect only rough going, and lots of hectic Sunday afternoons.

S. 1782—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT TO PROVIDE FOR NEW INTEREST RATES ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S SHARE OF DISASTER LOANS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill to amend and modify the Small Business Act to provide for a more workable system of making Small Business Administration disaster loans available to those who need them.

Severe flooding has already taken place in California. Equally severe flooding is expected this spring throughout the Midwest and the Northern Plains States. It is essential that the Small Business Administration have a viable program for making loans to disaster victims. As a matter of fact, the latest estimate I have seen is that the floods this year are likely to be the worst we have ever suffered in the Midwest, particularly in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois, and Missouri.

We now have a limitation on loans to disaster victims, which could prove to be very serious. In the past, Small Business Administration disaster loans have been made across the board at a maximum interest rate of 3 percent. In an era of rapidly rising interest rates, such as we have now, this has put quite a squeeze on the Small Business Administration, since loans at a 3-percent rate involve a considerable loss to the Government.

In an effort to stem the outflow, the Administration last March adopted stringent restrictions on the availability of disaster loans—restrictions which virtually require a pauper's oath as a prerequisite to eligibility. Among other things, Small Business Administration required an applicant for a personal loan to use cash and liquidable assets down to $600 per dependent before applying for the Small Business Administration loan. Small Business Administration's definition of liquidable assets has been extremely rigid.

In addition, Small Business Administration requires the applicant to show that he has exhausted all avenues of available credit. A disaster victim may thus be forced to obtain private credit on highly disadvantageous terms in lieu of a Small Business Administration loan.

In adopting these regulations, the Administration bent over backward in an effort to stem the flow of SBA money. Unquestionably, the 3-percent rate for all SBA disaster loans is no longer feasible, and some adjustment is necessary. But by compensating for the too-low interest rate with restrictions such as these, the Government has deprived itself of the ability to remain responsive to the legitimate needs of disaster victims.

We have seen this in California, where a very small, I should say insignificant, fraction of the disaster victims have qualified for the kind of disaster loans which Congress designed for them.

The legislation I am introducing would remedy this situation. It would leave in effect the 3-percent interest rate for those applicants whose lack of available credit or liquid assets is determined by the Administrator to warrant the low rate. However, it would make other disaster victims also eligible for loan assistance at the average rate currently prevailing on U.S. Government interest-bearing obligations. This would allow the Government to make loans available to the many disaster victims who are now deemed ineligible by the SBA, but without any interest loss to the Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1782) to amend section 7(b) of the Small Business Act to provide for new interest rates on the Administration's share of disaster loans introduced by Mr. Proxmire (for himself and Mr. Bayh), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1782

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, as amended (15 U.S.C. 636(b)), is hereby amended by striking "The interest rate of the Administration's share of any loan made under this subsection shall not exceed 3 per centum per annum.", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The interest rate of the Administration's share of any loan made under this subsection shall not exceed 3 per centum per annum: *Provided,* That whenever the Administrator determines that an individual or a small-business concern is ineligible for such a loan on the basis of availability of credit or the existence of liquid assets, the Administrator may make a loan under this subsection at an interest rate not exceeding the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date of the loan and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Allen in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for the continued effort which he has made, and the interest which he has shown once again today, in behalf of the disaster victims of this country. He was one of the original 14 cosponsors of a major effort to revise the Nation's disaster laws, as he well knows, after the tragic series, first of tornadoes and then of floods, that seemed to dwell primarily on the midwestern part of our country.

About half of that measure, Mr. President, was passed. The other half has not yet been able to work its way through the legislative channels.

One of the particular inequities which remains on the books today is the matter of the small business loans to which the Senator from Wisconsin has referred. This inequity, it seems to me, exists not only in small business, but in FHA disaster loans. Of course, the Senator from Wisconsin is very familiar with the FHA problem also.

It seemed to me, from our study, patently unfair to have two businesses side by side—here we are talking about disaster loans, not normal loans—and to have a businessman who had worked hard, who had paid all his bills and managed, by following scrupulous and acceptable business practices, to maintain a pretty good credit rating at the bank, turned down at the bank and denied SBA disaster loan assistance; whereas his neighbor, who might have been a bad businessman and had no credit at the local banks, was given an SBA loan for disaster assistance.

I think the Senator from Wisconsin is to be complimented for his continued effort. If the Senator has any further suggestions as to what we can do together on this matter, I will certainly join him in the continued effort he is making.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Indiana. The Senator has taken the leadership in this matter.

The difficulty as I see it now is that the 3 percent interest rate is perfectly appropriate for people who have very low incomes, and people would pay it back. However, we recognize that at a time when the prime rate is 7½ percent so even the strongest business corporations have an effective rate of 9 percent on loans and mortgages already have a rate of 8 percent and 9 percent, we should recognize a 3-percent rate for SBA borrowers is not realistic.

So, the Senator from Wisconsin is proposing, in order to make it possible for people to borrow without discrimination, to maintain the present 3-percent rate so that those who would qualify as being in a virtual welfare status may have the opportunity to borrow from the Small Business Administration if they are disaster victims at the rate the Federal Government has to pay for its money. Based on a 20-year average, that would be in the area of 5½ percent.

That would mean that the Federal Government would not lose money on it. We know that the loans have been paid back in the past. This would meet the objection on the part of the Budget Bureau and others who feel that we cannot permit people to borrow money, even disaster victims, at a 3-percent rate because the cost to the Federal Government over the years would be too much.

This is a practical approach toward doing what we can. While we can make a strong case for making a 3-percent rate, we cannot get that through this year. The floods are threatening to break forth at almost any hour in the Midwest. We will need legislation that we can act on quickly.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, we certainly have had tragedies on the west coast.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BAYH. It seems to me that we will always have a disaster threatening one part of the country or another.

I think the approach of the Senator is a step in the right direction and that it has a better chance to pass. It would put everyone on the same basis.

I do not believe we want to get into the business of subsidizing those who have access to ready capital through the normal, commercial market under equal circumstances.

The example referred to a moment ago certainly concerns me considerably. I refer to the example where there are two businesses side by side, one of which has been scrupulous and has made his payments. If he were hit by adversity over which he had no control, he would be denied access to financial assistance, whereas his neighbor, who is not a good businessman, would be given financial assistance.

It seems to me that one should have an incentive to carry on a good, workable, and profitable business.

If the Senator is willing to accept cosponsors in this effort, I ask permission to have my name listed as a cosponsor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would be delighted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Bayh) be listed as a cosponsor of the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The argument of the Senator from Indiana is absolutely correct. Why in the world should we penalize efficiency? That is what we are doing under the present circumstances. It would mean that a good businessman, one who has been providential and careful in maintaining adequate credit, cannot get credit when it is needed, and the other man, one who has not worked as hard or not been as careful or efficient, can do so.

Everyone should be treated alike.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the validity for doing this is that normally the SBA and FHA loans are made on a business basis, and the arrangement we have discussed here would involve the borrowing of money in the event of disasters. Nobody can anticipate when acts of nature are going to lay someone low and make it impossible for him to continue business.

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Indiana for his contribution.

PLACEMENT OF ANTIBALLISTIC SYSTEM

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week the distinguished majority leader of the Senate (Mr. Mansfield) expressed his views on the proposed placement of an anti-ballistic-missile system in Montana. As a Senator from North Dakota, another State to have these nuclear weapons placed on her soil if this program is approved, I commend the Senator from Montana for succinctly expressing his views and the views of many Montanans on this issue. If I might humbly add, his address expressed my views, as well.

One Washington newspaper described the Grand Forks, N. Dak., area as an isolated area where the population was not likely to oppose placement of such a system. Could this possibly be the reason for construction of an ABM in North Dakota and Montana?

For months we heard of the thick and thin shields so necessary to protect our huge population centers. We needed to protect our cities from a future Communist Chinese missile attack. Then we were informed it was to protect our cities from a limited Russian missile attack, then an accidental missile attack. Finally, some advisers informed us we must protect our offensive nuclear capability. They contend the ABM must be placed near the Minuteman missile silos in North Dakota and Montana.

Is it any wonder the American citizen doubts the validity of these statements and of the system itself? Is it any wonder that what the late President Eisenhower termed the military-industrial complex worries clear-thinking men everywhere in this Nation, including many Members of Congress.

Now we are told that locating an ABM shield in North Dakota will bring an economic gain to the State through new construction, jobs, and purchasing of land and equipment. We need economic gain in North Dakota, but not through a system which cannot stand on its merits.

We need economic gain through an end to the rural-urban imbalance. We need a strengthening of our farm economy to end the decline in the number of family farms, with the resulting movement of farm families to the major urban areas. We need industry to provide long-term jobs for our young, not 1- or 2-year laboring positions that end as quickly as they start.

North Dakota is an agricultural State. We need help to raise agriculture from the bottom rung of the economic ladder. We do not need the short-term economic benefits from the placement in North Dakota of a nuclear system which many leading independent scientists believe is unworkable.

In conclusion, I should like to quote the closing statement of Senator MANSFIELD:

> The people of Montana do not put profits before peace.

As a Senator from North Dakota, I believe the people of North Dakota would agree.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I shall remember Dwight David Eisenhower as a general who brought war to an end and as a President who kept the peace.

What more could be asked of a man in service to his country? What more could be given?

For the misadventures he avoided, for the interventions he refused to undertake, for the foreign wars he decided not to fight, I shall remember this President as one who possessed the wisdom to temper power with restraint.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS RELATIVE TO USE OF PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS—RESOLUTION BY SOUTH PARISH CONGREGATIONAL FELLOWSHIP, AUGUSTA, MAINE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of my colleague from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution relative to decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States concerning the use of prayer in public schools.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH PARISH CONGREGATIONAL FELLOWSHIP,
AUGUSTA, MAINE

At its regular monthly meeting, March 13, 1969, the evening program of this fellowship was devoted to a discussion of the problems created by the 1962 and 1963 decisions of the United States Supreme Court relating to the use of prayer in public schools.

Col. Hibbard Richter reviewed these decisions and dissenting opinions, and also cited State of Maine laws covering the subject of prayer and Bible reference which had held for our schools up to the time of the handing down of these decisions:

"Whereas it was the considered opinion of the Members of the Fellowship that these decisions have had a seriously adverse effect upon attempts to maintain a school atmosphere conducive to holding spiritual values in high regard—

"That indeed they tend to foster among our youth the impression that concern for spiritual values are unimportant, thereby robbing them of an important part of that heritage to which they are entitled,

"That the U.S. Supreme Court treads on questionable ground when it assumes the power to make decisions in the area of how the People of the States shall decide whether or not they want to encourage their children to take part in any spiritual, nondenominational exercises,

"And whereas the Senator Dirksen Amendment, S.J. Res. 6, 91st Congress—already cosponsored by Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine and more than forty other Senators—appears to us to be a much needed step towards offsetting these adverse effects, and a means to put back into the hands of American citizens the powers that have to do with freedom of worship.

"Therefore it was voted, unanimously, that the South Parish Congregational Fellowship go on record as giving its full support to the passage of said Amendment, that the Secretary be instructed to send a copy of this Resolution to each of Maine's Senators and Congressmen in Washington, and that publicity be given to the action taken."

TRYGVE HEISTAD, *President*.

Resolved March 13, 1969.

SENATOR CRANSTON AND OUR WATER RESOURCES

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution has been considering legislation to deal with the general problems of oil pollution for several years. Unfortunately, our previous efforts to avert problems such as the recent disaster off the coast of Santa Barbara were defeated in the House of Representatives.

Hearings on this year's bill, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969—S. 7—have been completed, and the committee plans to report the proposed legislation to the Senate in April.

At this time I should like to commend the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) for the interest he has shown in the bill, particularly in the section dealing with oil pollution. His participation in the hearings and the perspective he has brought to the committee concerning the Santa Barbara incident have been invaluable.

In addition to its general consideration of the problem of oil pollution, Congress also has a responsibility to deal with the specific question of halting oil operations in the Santa Barbara Channel. There is significant evidence that suggests that the benefits from the oil operations may not be so great that they justify the risks inherent in these particular operations.

Senator CRANSTON has introduced a bill, S. 1219, which provides for the termination of all drilling in the Santa Barbara Channel and for a study of the methods of operation on all other Outer Continental Shelf leases.

I commend the Senator for his initiative in offering this approach, and I hope that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold hearings on the bill as soon as possible.

WEST VIRGINIA HAS TRADITION OF HIGH ELECTION PARTICIPATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am gratified to report that West Virginians once again took seriously their right to vote in last year's Presidential election.

In a recently published report, the U.S. Bureau of the Census listed the voting turnouts of the States and revealed that 69.9 percent of the eligible voters in our State voted for President last November. This record placed West Virginia ninth among the States and continues its tradition of active interest in the political process.

West Virginians have always shown a concern for their Government, and this concern is reflected in the large turnouts of citizens on election day.

A free election is not readily available in many parts of the world, and I am pleased that the people of West Virginia consistently take advantage of the accessibility of the ballot box in this country.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE—RESOLUTION OF BROCKTON, MASS., LITHUANIAN COUNCIL

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution relative to the observance of the 51st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Lithuania, adopted by the Brockton, Mass., Lithuanian Council.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution of the Brockton Lithuanian Council

A resolution adopted by Americans of Lithuanian descent, at a meeting held on February 23, 1969, at Brockton, Mass., to observe the 51st Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Lithuania, reads as follows:

"Whereas, the ancient Lithuanian nation proclaimed the restoration of the independence of its State after World War I, and thereafter led an orderly and exemplary independent State existence, having de jure recognition of all the Great Powers and diplomatic relations with all its neighbors; and

"Whereas, the Soviet Union, in violation of all its solemn treaties and agreements with the Republic of Lithuania, in 1940 invaded and occupied Lithuania by military force, through its occupation agents forced a mock parliamentary election, then claimed that Lithuania had of her own free will requested admission into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

"Whereas, the Soviet Union continues this military occupation of Lithuania to this day, and is systematically carrying out a planned program of annihilation of the Lithuanian nation by various means, including deportation of Lithuanians to Siberia and elsewhere in Russia, appropriating the real and personal property of the Lithuanians, and bringing in Russians and other citizens as colonial settlers in Lithuania;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the American Lithuanians attending this meeting unanimously decided to request the President and the Secretary of State of the United States to do everything in their power to investigate the situation in Russian-occupied Lithuania; to stop the genocide being perpetrated in Lithuania by Soviets to bring to a halt the present-day russification being carried out in Lithuania; to restore freedom and the rights to self-determination to the Lithuanian people and their territory;

"Be it further resolved, that we request the President and Secretary of State of the United States of America to use all the diplomatic and other peaceful means at their command to demand an immediate end of Soviet colonialism in Lithuania and territorial integrity of the Soviet Russian occupation and administrative agencies;

"Be it also resolved, that this Resolution be sent to the President of the United States, and copies thereof to the Secretary of State, Senators and Congressmen from our State, and to the Press."

Adopted at Brockton, on the 23rd day of February.

Bronius Burba,
Meeting Chairman.
Vladas Jakimavicius,
Secretary.

SUPPLY AND PRICE OF SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I address the Senate today on a subject which is vital to the success of our Nation's housing program—that is, the supply and price of softwood lumber.

Skyrocketing lumber prices in recent months have reached such serious proportions to threaten our basic housing program and our efforts to meet the national housing goal established by the 1968 Housing Act.

On March 19, 20, and 21, the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs held hearings to determine the reasons for the current crisis in lumber and what could be done about it. We received verbal testimony from a large number of witnesses representing all segments of private and government groups involved in producing and distributing lumber for homebuilding purposes, as well as consumer and conservation groups.

The witnesses were excellent, and I believe that the hearing record is the best ever recorded on this very involved subject. Although we do not pretend to be experts on the subject, we feel that we were able to get to the bottom of the issue and to understand it well enough to identify the problem and to make recommendations on its solution.

Mr. President, I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate because I believe that it is a nationwide issue covering not only those States having large timber resources, but every State in the Union involved in housing programs and the rebuilding of our cities. In my statement today, I will explain the issue briefly and make some tentative recommendations. Later on, the Housing Subcommittee will submit a report containing a more thorough explanation of the subject and final recommendations on the best course of action to take to remedy this serious problem.

The committee undertook the hearings primarily because of our concern that mounting lumber prices and shortages could frustrate our endeavors to meet the Nation's housing goals. A few days after we announced the hearings, I was pleased to see that the President had established a task force to make recommendations for a course of action to meet this serious problem. The day before our hearings started, the President announced a four-pronged program to relieve the current pressure on lumber prices. Also a few days after we announced the hearings, we learned that plywood prices had taken a 20-percent drop.

These actions may represent only temporary relief, and it is obvious that our problem is more than a temporary one. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that our hearing did prompt forthright action to help solve the current crisis.

In the past year, softwood prices have increased by 100 percent for plywood, and by 50 to 80 percent for 2 by 4's and other softwood lumber products used in homebuilding. The National Association of Home Builders reported that the increased lumber prices pushed up the cost of a $25,000 house by $1,268 on a national average. However, in one area, the homebuilders reported to us that the lumber increases have caused a $2,000 rise in a $20,000 house. Furthermore, we are told that, not only are the lumber prices exorbitant, but the entire marketing system for lumber is in a state of chaos. The lumber dealers will not commit themselves on advance prices and, in many cases, the homebuilders are unable to rely on deliveries of this essential product at any price. Obviously, such conditions cause serious delays in production schedules, disrupt labor forces, and place many small homebuilders in serious financial difficulties.

Not only is this a serious matter for industry, it is even more serious for the American people who are seeking decent housing at reasonable costs. Furthermore, it may represent a critical blow to attaining our national housing goals as spelled out so forcibly in the 1968 Housing Act.

To get to the bottom of the price issue, the Housing Subcommittee looked into the functioning of the entire marketing process of lumber from the forests to the mill and to the wholesaler, to the retailer, and to its use in the construction of a home. We learned that the final price was a product of each step in this process, but that the price rise to the consumer was basically the result of rising stumpage prices established by auction. Furthermore, because the government is by far the largest single seller of sawtimber, the current auction prices are those set in connection with the sale of Government-owned logs. The Government has a procedure for establishing an appraised value of logs and will not accept a bid for less than the appraised value but has no compunction about the bid going far above this value. In fact, in recent bids, the final selling price of Government-owned timber has been 2½ times the value established by the Government itself as the appraised value.

I understand that this system has been used for a long time and has years of experience behind it, but I believe that the appropriate committee should look into this process. The result is truly inflationary causing higher prices all along the line. Furthermore, now that our Government is committed to subsidizing housing, I wonder if we are not going around in circles. In the long run, the profits of one agency of the Government are borne by subsidies paid by another agency of the Government.

Another important factor related to the sharp price increase is the disappearance of many small lumber mills which traditionally have been the balance wheel in the lumber industry. For example, the number of lumber mills in western Washington and western Oregon, the center of softwood production, has dropped to about one-quarter of the number in existence 20 years ago. In previous periods of lumber shortages, these mills would quickly come to life because of the improved economic climate and often, with their increased production, would be very effective in making up the shortage.

Secretary Romney showed his concern about the high lumber prices and the closing of so many small sawmills and has requested the Department of Justice to determine whether there is a cause for action in connection with the absorption of so many mills by the giant lumber interests.

The Secretary's conclusion, however, in which I heartily concur, is that the solution to the problem does not rest on the issue of prices. The price structure is a product of supply and demand and the sure way of correcting excessively high prices is to increase the supply in proportion to the demand.

Last year, in the Housing Act of 1968 we established a 10-year goal of housing construction and thus have, in fact, established the level of demand for lumber products for the next 10 years.

The 10-year goal calls for an average of 2.6 million units built annually. This compares with current production of about 1.6 million units, so you can see that we need to increase production by more than 60 percent in the years ahead. This 2.6 million units goal was not haphazardly arrived at and should not be taken lightly. It is the law of the land to use this Nation's resources to meet this goal.

Unless we develop new substitute materials for homebuilding, the demands for lumber in the next decade must match the 60-percent increase in housing starts. I believe that we have no choice but to match the supply to meet this demand.

This can be done. It is not an impossible task. We have the basic resources and it is now a matter of aggressively working to improve the efficiency of these resources. It seems to me to be a simple matter of economics and good business practices to invest in our national forests the same kind of research and up-to-date cultural and management practices that we so successfully used in developing our agricultural lands.

Amazing success has already been demonstrated through the latest techniques of "tree farming" or "silviculture." The important thing is to use these techniques nationwide, particularly in Government-owned forests, and there would be no doubt about meeting our production goals.

The trees are there to produce the amounts of lumber and plywood we need but, for the most part, they are in national forests and other Federal timberland owned and operated by the Government. It was evident to us that the increased production required of our Federal timberlands is impossible under the presently restricted appropriations in the U.S. Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior.

Industrial forests operated by private companies, and the other timberlands in private ownership, are now producing to their full capacity, if not perhaps a little over their true capacity, under prudent forestry management. In fact, we were a little startled to learn that the forest industries, with ownership of 17 percent of softwood sawtimber, is harvesting 33 percent of the total softwood, that other private ownerships with 18 percent of softwood standing timber are producing 28 percent of the total output, but that the Forest Service, with ownership of 54 percent of all softwood timber in the Nation, is only producing 30 percent of total output.

To put it another way, the forest industries are harvesting 3.8 percent of their standing timber inventory annually; other private ownerships are harvesting at the rate of 2.8 percent of inventory, but the Forest Service, the greatest forest owner of all, is able, under present conditions, to harvest only nine-tenths of 1 percent of its huge inventory.

The imbalance in the harvesting between Government and private lands has many explanations. One is that many private owners are overcutting their forests and destroying their use for the future.

It is obvious that this condition cannot continue for long. Mr. Edward Cliff, of the U.S. Forest Service, said:

> The softwood resources in private ownership are being overcut. . . . Log supplies from these lands must decline substantially over the next few decades. . . . Any sustained increase in log harvests in the West thus must come from public lands.

There are many reasons why the National Forests, comprising the greatest reservoir of timber in the Nation, can account for only one-third of the production of softwood. Chief among them seems to be the fact that the Forest Service has been obliged to operate with insufficient funds to reach the necessary softwood output to support our housing programs.

I am not being critical of the Forest Service. It has some of the most dedicated foresters in the world. Within the limits of the funds made available, it has protected and managed the great forest empires under its jurisdiction. But it simply has not been given the funds necessary to meet our overall national wood requirements and, in particular, to make available and market the sawlogs required for the housing programs we have authorized.

It was because of the handicaps imposed on our housing programs by the critical shortage of softwood lumber and plywood and consequent price spurts that we conducted our hearings.

We heard a large number of witnesses, representing every element in the picture—homebuilders, contractors, Federal agencies, the forest industries, the carpenters' and sawmill unions, conservation groups, foresters and others concerned with the available sawtimber and housing dilemma confronting the Nation.

The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, George Romney, put the problem clearly in his appearance before our subcommittee. Secretary Romney told us that, in order to sustain the housing programs we have established, we will need an additional annual production of 15 billion board feet of softwood lumber and plywood by 1978. Softwood lumber consumption last year ran to a record 35.1 billion board feet.

The Secretary said that there are three ways to increase the supply domestically.

He would have the private companies do a more efficient job without jeopardizing the future supply. He gave the private companies credit for doing better with their harvesting practices than public managers, but believes there is further room for improvement. Furthermore, he recognized the vast areas of privately owned woods and forests in the hands of farmers and small plot owners which, if efficiently managed, would make a significant contribution to make up the shortage.

Secondly, Secretary Romney believes that we should look at the Alaskan supply which is now all going to Japan. This is a transportation problem complicated by the Jones Act, which requires the shipment of Alaskan lumber or logs in American bottoms.

Third—and this is by far the most important—Secretary Romney says we must take steps to make the harvest of our publicly owned lands more efficient. It is obvious that the 15 billion board feet that the Secretary reports is needed by 1978 can come out of the nationally owned forests without jeopardizing the protection of the natural resources necessary for recreation or conservation purposes.

Secretary Romney also informed us that the President, acting on the recommendations of the special White House task force on the problem, has directed the Departments of Agriculture and Interior to increase immediately the sales of Federal timber for manufacture into lumber and plywood by 1.1 billion board feet.

The President is to be commended for his prompt action. But, with a need for 15 billion more board feet per year, it is obvious that the President's action is only a first step, and that other actions are required to bring the production of softwood lumber and plywood up to the annual 15 billion additional feet required for housing for our people.

The Chief Forester of the United States, Mr. Edward Cliff, confirmed to our subcommittee his previous testimony before the Senate Committee on Small Business, on which I serve, last November, that on many national forest lands, production could be increased by two-thirds if the Forest Service were given sufficient funds, on a continuing basis, to build needed forest access roads and trails, and to employ sufficient personnel to intensify forest management. Many witnesses pointed out to us that forest management performance on industrial forest lands is superior to those presently possible on Federal lands, but that Federal management practices can be upgraded if assured long-term funding is provided.

The Chief Forester told us that, in response to the rapidly increasing needs for lumber and plywood, the Forest Service is seeking shortrun increases in timber sales through salvage and thinnings, but that this would require additional funds and personnel. It is worth noting that, in his directives to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, the President instructed both Departments promptly to present to the Appropriations Committees supplemental budget estimates to enable them to speed up their operations and make more sales of Federal timber possible.

Chief Forester Cliff indicated that appropriations for the work of the Forest Service have been running far behind authorizations. For example, in fiscal 1970, the Forest Service requested $170 million for access roads and trails, but only some $91 million had been appropriated.

He said that more access roads are needed to make increased timber harvest possible and that other management tools are needed, such as, use of genetically superior planting stock for reforestation; commercial thinnings which would utilize timber otherwise lost to mortality; noncommercial thinnings to release trees in stagnated stands: increased salvage of fire-and-insect-destroyed timber, and closer utilization of the timber that is harvested to use residuals not now used commercially.

Mr. Cliff reported that, in 1970, his budget would be only 29.5 percent of the level that he said was needed to carry out an effective reforestation and stand improvement program. With such limited funds, his agency could not nearly carry out the intense forest management program so badly needed.

Mr. Cliff, in answers to questions from members of the subcommittee, said that the reduced appropriations for his agency have had an adverse effect on the availability of timber. Furthermore, he said increased spending is absolutely essential to increasing the output. However, it is not money lost but is, in fact, an excellent investment. He said that for each $1 million invested in planting and timber culture, we can add 11 million board feet of annual production, worth $215,000 yield annually at current sales prices.

On the consumer level, the most significant witness appearing before us was Mr. Eugene Gulledge, president of the National Association of Home Builders, which represents 75 percent of all housing constructed in the United States.

The residential construction industry, of course, represents the largest single consumer of softwood lumber and wood products in the country. Shortage of supply and uncertainty of lumber and plywood deliveries, Mr. Gulledge stated, is seriously affecting the ability of the homebuilding industry to produce the volume of housing required by the ever-expanding demand for new homes. Other types of construction, he said, also are being held back by the crisis.

The problem of price increases and shortages of lumber and wood products in recent months, he said, have become the No. 1 problem of his industry. He also reported to us that the homebuilders have been working cooperatively with the forest industries in a joint effort to get at the facts and to develop possible solutions to the immediate and the longer range problems of timber supply and lumber production.

He informed us that, together with representatives of the forest industries, a Joint Coordinating Committee on Housing and Forest Products is at work to seek solutions. Interestingly, the homebuilders agreed with forest industry witnesses on the general short- and long-term actions that seem to be required. Mr. Gulledge estimated that, normally, 20 percent of the direct construction cost of the structure of a house is composed of various wood products derived from softwood lumber.

This fact, of course, is ample justification for the Housing Subcommittee to take a look at the overall picture. Without sufficient supplies of softwood lumber and plywood at a reasonable price, our housing programs are severly impeded, and we cannot reach the housing volumes we have set as national goals.

Mr. Gulledge also expressed apprehension that the present situation, bad as it is, will deteriorate further as we get into the spring building season.

While the housing industry's projection of private nonfarm housing starts for 1969 was, at the beginning of this year, in the range of 1.6 million new housing units as compared to 1.5 million starts in 1968, it now appears, according to Mr. Gulledge, that we may not reach the 1.6 million unit figure, which itself is one million units short of our national housing production goal.

This is a serious situation, when the need for new housing is at an historic peak.

The National Association of Home Builders declared that it appears that a shortage in available lumber of about 10 percent may already have developed. If this is true, Mr. Gulledge testified, then we are heading for even more serious price and supply problems as we undertake to reach higher housing production levels.

A clear, reasoned, and convincing case was presented to us by representatives of the Nation's lumber and plywood manufacturing and timber-growing industries. Spokesmen who formed a panel in presenting statements and answering questions included expert witnesses from the National Forest Products Association, Western Wood Products Association, American Plywood Association, Southern Pine Association, North West Timber Association, Industrial Forestry Association, Western Lumber Manufacturers, Inc., National Woodwork Manufacturers Association, and Western Forest Industries Association. In addition, we also received testimony from representatives of the Architectural Woodwork Institute, National American Wholesale Lumber Association, and the National Lumber and Building Materials Dealers Association.

We therefore had evidence from virtually every sector of the forest industries and the principal distributors and users of lumber and plywood. All expressed great concern about the problems we face, and made many suggestions for short-term and long-term solutions.

Basically, the forest industry spokesmen asserted that the current domestic situation can be blamed mostly on an inadequate supply of logs to meet growing domestic requirements and pressures for exports. Increased demand for lumber and plywood for house construction, they said, to meet needs for the 1.6 million new housing units projected for this year, plus a record export volume of 2.2 billion board feet of logs in 1968, have resulted in shortages of logs and timber available for immediate harvesting. They emphasized that the 1968 total softwood log production of about 38 billion feet, a record, was less than 2 percent of the total softwood timber inventory of more than 2 trillion board feet. Higher total log production to meet current demand levels, they testified, is justified by present timber inventory and growth rates.

Industry witnesses were unanimous in pointing out that since privately owned forest lands are now operated at peak capacities, the necessary increase must come from the great timber reservoirs of the Federal forests which are being operated at far below capacity. As one witness put it:

> The federal government holds the key to the log supply and to domestic wood prices in the way it chooses to manage this timber.

He declared that the additional timber required for our housing goals will not be available for cutting unless national timber policies are adjusted.

Testimony the committee received from industry witnesses and others about Alaskan forests as a possible source of some relief from the shortages was disturbing. There is a fairly extensive federally owned timber resource in southeastern Alaska, but it is unavailable to the domestic market because of the Jones Act requirements on intercoastal shipping.

The Jones Act requires that products moving in coastal and intercoastal shipping—see section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1927, as amended—between U.S. ports be shipped in American ships. This imposes a disadvantage of substantially higher freight rates than the rates prevailing for foreign registry shipping. The cost effect on lumber and plywood appears to be about a $20 per thousand board feet increase. The lack of a U.S. merchant fleet compounds the issue.

Consequently, the sizable amount of available Alaskan lumber that can be produced is unable to reach consuming markets in the United States without a prohibitive competitive disadvantage.

Consequently, Alaskan timbers and lumber are sold to Japan, thus depriving domestic users of this untapped domestic source of timber supply.

Suggestions were advanced by industry witnesses that the Jones Act should be repealed, or at least modified. Their objective is to allow Alaskan lumber to be moved to market in this country at the same rates, for example, as are enjoyed by Canadian lumber producers, who can, and do, move their lumber to Eastern United States markets in foreign flag ships.

The industry witnesses recommended six short-term proposals to relieve lumber and plywood availability problems:

First. Immediate sale offerings of the billion board feet of unsold allowable cut on national forests.

Second. Sale offerings of the full current annual allowable cut by stepping up road construction and timber preparation activities on national forests.

Third. National Forest timber sale offerings where little or minimum access road construction is needed.

Fourth. Exemption of Forest Service personnel from replacement restraints to assure the staff required for timber sale administration.

Fifth. Establishment of a team of specialists within the Forest Service to devise and execute an accelerated national timber sales program.

Sixth. Support for the Interstate Commerce Commission's recent general order for the return of boxcars suitable for lumber and plywood shipments, which has been a chronic to acute problem for forest products manufacturers.

On a long-term basis, the witnesses agreed that the only practical solution offering lasting relief from supply-demand crises is a national determination to utilize the Nation's forest resources in a way directly related to other national goals established in the interest of all the people—mainly, intensive and scientific management of our Federal timber.

They also emphasized that the Forest Service should have assurances of the long-term financing needed for roads and intensive management practices. In the past, they said, with ample or surplus availability of forest products, funds to apply intensive timber management on the national forests have been denied. Now, they pointed out, with untold millions of dollars in scarcity premiums at stake each year, a new look at providing the means for long-term financing for such intensive timber management is imperative.

The same point was stressed by the homebuilding industry in its presentation. The national goal of 26 million housing units over the next decade by new construction or rehabilitation, and a goal within this of 6 million units for low- and moderate-income families, as set forth under title XVI of the Housing Act of 1968, necessarily implies compatible and concurrent national timber policies and resource requirements. Mr. Gulledge, the housing industry representative also added that the current experience of lumber and plywood shortages shows the need for far more perceptive timber and resource management planning in conjunction with national housing needs. They are convinced, he told our subcommittee, that strong protection can be given to our conservation and preservation interests in the continued life of our national forests, which they fully support, at the same time that the forests are put to work much more usefully for the interests of all the people in the Nation.

Conservation interests were represented before our subcommittee by witnesses from the Sierra Club, a large organization devoted to preserving wilderness and scenic areas throughout the country. They raised no objections to the proposals that the Forest Service increase its output of sawlogs from the commercial forest areas, provided this increase is carried out within the limits of sound forest management. Mr. Brock Evans, the Club's Pacific Northwest representative, stated that it would approve Federal commercial forest lands development to a greater extent if the best type of intensive forest management was pursued.

Testimony was also received from a representative of labor, Mr. Peter E. Terzick, general treasurer of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. Mr. Terzick was forthright in his statement that wages have very little effect on the dramatic increase in lumber and plywood over the last year. In reply to a question he pointed out that the union's 3-year contract expires this year but that, based on past experience, labor's wage demands are very small in relation to other prices. He also replied that there is no shortage of labor for the mills nor for lumbermen who do the cutting and logging in the forests. He also urged a study of pricing policies and the development by the government of a mechanism for maintaining stability over a period of time.

A further suggestion was advanced by several witnesses that some way should be found to permit the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to plow back a substantial part of their receipts from timber sales into more intensive timber management. This, of course, is a matter requiring legislation that is within the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committee, but we are convinced the proposal has high merit. We feel that it should be done, that this is one of the basic, necessary steps to put the forest policies of the Nation into phase with our housing programs and national requirements for softwood products.

We therefore strongly recommend that Congress carefully study this matter and consider bringing about the necessary adjustments through legislation.

The conclusion is inescapable that our Federal forests, containing such vast amounts of sawtimber, are woefully under-producing the amounts of logs the Nation needs, and are perfectly capable of stepping up their outputs to the necessary levels if sustained, long-term funding for intensified forest management is made available—funding that can be repaid to the Federal Treasury from timber sales.

This is what is done in industrial forests and on certain State-owned timberlands. It is also the system used on Department of Defense forest lands. It has enabled them to reach excellent production levels far above the production levels of Federal forests. As I understand it, Senator RICHARD RUSSELL sponsored a provision in the Defense Department's 1961 Appropriations Act which authorized the Department to use a portion of its timber sales revenue to effect management costs. As a result of this authority which, in effect, provided assured funds for up-to-date management of Department of Defense forests, the income from these forests has increased 2½ times and has resulted in a substantial return to the U.S. Treasury.

Another unfortunate fact that was developed in our hearings is that lack of funds has hampered construction of access roads in the Federal forests, with the result that in many areas, overmature trees, or stands damaged by windstorms, fire, disease, or insects cannot be harvested or salvaged and simply go to waste, reaching an estimated annual loss of 10 billion board feet of timber, nearly as much as is produced. This is a form of gross waste of a valuable natural resource. Not cutting trees that are ready for harvest, or which have been damaged by natural causes, is much like not harvesting fruit, wheat or other valuable foodstuffs when they are ripe for harvest. Just like growing food, overmature timber rots, or salvageable timber decays and rots, and goes to complete waste.

Scholars have termed this type of waste "waste by underuse."

In some areas, Federal timber management agencies have not had a chance even to inventory their standing timber. Or personnel is not available to prepare necessary bid schedules for selling trees that should be harvested.

Our problem in the South is somewhat different from that in the West. The large amount of interspersed timberlands in private hands calls for an even greater degree of cooperation by all concerned.

The Southern Pine Association advised our subcommittee that the South produced, mainly through large producers, 7 billion board feet, which was higher than the average 10 years prior thereto. This amounts to more than 20 percent of the total softwood lumber and plywood produced in the United States. At the same time, the pulpwood industry in the South quadrupled its production, and this industry, of course, draws upon the softwood reserve supply.

Since much of the timber supply in the South is in private hands, large and small, there is need for progressive cooperation in projects such as the Southern Forest Resources Analysis, combining the interests of manufacturers, farmers, and producers toward the objective of accelerated tree planting and timber stand improvements. There is a need also for the Government to increase its efforts for cooperation between industry, government, and private landowners, sponsoring at the same time efforts that can take advantage of education and advances in procedures and technology that can come from our institutions of higher learning.

The problems involved in bringing about solutions to our demand-supply-price problems fall within the jurisdiction of other committees of the Congress, particularly the Committees on Agriculture and Appropriations. I am reviewing these issues in this manner to bring them to the attention of these most effective committees so they will be aware of the problems and can bring their outstanding expertise to bear on finding solutions so that our housing goals are not thwarted.

I should like to draw attention to the following recommendations:

First. The urgent needs of our housing programs, and the high goals we have established as national policy require that prompt action be taken to increase the timber outputs of our forests.

Second. The greatest source of timber is owned by the Federal Government and, thus, our shortage can be relieved only by a greater utilization of the forest resources owned and operated by the Federal Government.

Third. Increasing the allowable cutting from federally owned lands can be made without sacrificing the sustained yield principle provided there is proper funding and adoption of the latest silviculture techniques.

Fourth. Proper funding can only be effective if it is sustained over a long period of time. Sustained funding is an urgent necessity to enable Federal agencies to carry out a program of intense forest management without which we will never obtain the wood to meet our housing needs.

Fifth. Considerable more resources must be directed to developing advanced techniques for improving our knowledge of forestry. The Department of Agriculture should supply some of its great knowledge on increasing crop yields to the Nation's forests.

Sixth. More attention must be paid to

improve the efficiency of privately owned forests and wood lots. Fifty-nine percent of all forest lands are owned privately and, although such lands only have 18 percent of the inventory, I should think that a nationwide campaign to educate the private owners to the latest forestry techniques would bear fruit in future years.

Seventh. A thorough analysis should be directed to the pricing of lumber, starting at the Federal Government's own appraising and auctioning of sawtimber.

Eighth. The Commerce Committee should investigate the Jones Act in connection with shipping of lumber from Alaska and the Western States. As it is working now, the only beneficiary is Japan. Is there not some way to protect American shipping and still not deny domestic markets in the U.S. mainland from having access to Alaskan and Western lumber? Other transportation difficulties, including the shortage of boxcars, must be resolved also. I am pleased to note the action taken by President Nixon in this regard, but I hope this is not just a temporary measure.

Ninth. We should examine the import of lumber from Canada which, in 1968, amounted to 5.8 billion board feet. Considering the great potential untapped supply from our neighbor to the North, there is no reason why this could not be substantially increased. One impediment to increasing the import of plywood is the 20 percent tariff. I believe that we should study the tariff requirement and see whether our short supply of plywood needed to meet our national housing goals does not demand a repeal of this provision.

Tenth. The export of logs to Japan needs immediate attention. We have a major conflict of interests that must be resolved between Japan's housing plans, estimated at 1.9 million units for 1969, and the U.S. current production of 1.6 million units per year. This has both shortrun and longrun implications.

In the short run, witnesses before our subcommittee suggested that the United States explore with Japan the possibility of "borrowing" several million feet of logs it has purchased, but which are stockpiled in West Coast ports because of a shipping glut. This proposal suggests that the "borrowed" logs could be replaced later with other logs when a better flow of raw materials begins to come off the Federal forests. I feel this is a matter worthy of exploring, and could provide some temporary relief to our domestic shortage.

The Morse amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968, which I helped sponsor, has set a limitation of 350 million board feet on logs which can be sold from western Federal forests after January 1, 1969 for export to Japan. This figure is considered by most authorities to be a normal amount of export that could be supplied without serious effects on the domestic forest industries.

The Morse amendment also provides that logs not covered by the act can be prevented from being substituted for logs by covered logs within the discretion of the Department. Apparently it will be some little time before the relief envisioned by the amendment can become effective.

This is a complicated issue, I fully recognize, but I urge that the Departments of Agriculture and Interior consider the early implementation of the Morse amendment in relation to the Nation's housing needs and the recent crises in lumber and plywood price and supply.

Eleventh. Substitutes for lumber products in construction of both residential and nonresidential buildings must be developed. The plastic and concrete products, steel and aluminum industries have already come forth with many innovations that should be encouraged.

A fundamental issue we face lies in striking a proper balance between the management of our forest resources, and their production and sale of timber, and the requirements of the American people for forest products. The two elements—national needs and management and use of our natural resources—are utterly out of phase. They must be meshed and put into phase in order to accomplish our national housing goals.

DEATH OF HUGHES SPALDING, SR., ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE), I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him relative to the death of Hughes Spalding, Sr., of Atlanta, and articles and an editorial eulogy in connection therewith.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR TALMADGE

The State of Georgia and the city of Atlanta has lost one of the State's greatest business and civic leaders in the death of Hughes Spalding, Sr., last Sunday.

Hughes Spalding was a great man and a fine citizen, and I join his family, and his many friends and associates in expressing sorrow at his passing. The leadership he rendered his city and State for many years across a broad range of legal, business, civic and cultural endeavors, will be sorely missed.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mar. 31, 1961]

HUGHES SPALDING DIES—CHURCH, CIVIC LEADER

Hughes Spalding Sr., lawyer, devout churchman and one of the most forceful personalities in Atlanta's civic life for more than half a century, died Sunday night in a private hospital.

Mr. Spalding, senior partner in the law firm of King and Spalding, was 82.

He was born in Atlanta four years after his parents, Jack J. Spalding and the former Elizabeth Hughes, moved here from Kentucky. His father was an attorney, an organizer of the Georgia Power Co. and a prime mover in the New South movement preached by Henry Grady that resulted in this city becoming the capital of the Southeast.

Mr. Spalding is survived by his wife, the former Bolling Stovall Phinizy of Athens; three sons, Jack J. Spalding, editor of The Atlanta Journal; Hughes Spalding Jr., a partner in the firm of King and Spalding, and Billups Phinizy Spalding, a member of the history department at the University of Georgia, and two daughters, Mrs. George S. Craft and Mrs. Wallace Winbourne Jr., both of Atlanta.

Atlanta Mayor Ivan Allen Jr. said of the death of Mr. Spalding, "Since 1885, the Spalding family has been actively engaged in the practice of law in Atlanta. Mr. Hughes Spalding Sr., like his father before him, made great contributions to the city and the state in the fields of law, religion and education. Atlanta has lost a leading citizen and a great man."

Mr. Spalding's business activities were many.

He had been a member of the Board of Directors of The Coca-Cola Co. since 1949 and was a member of the finance committee.

He was on the board of the Trust Company of Georgia for 22 years before becoming an advisory director in 1962, serving during that time as chairman of the executive committee and also the trust committee.

He was chairman of the board and a director of Georgia International Life Insurance Co. from its founding in 1959 until 1963. Other directorships have included the Atlantic Co., Habersham Mills, Coca-Cola International Corp., the Atlanta Baseball Corp., Rich's Inc. and the Whitehead Holding Co. He was a trustee of the Emily and Ernest Woodruff Foundation and the Lettie Pate Evans Foundation.

Mr. Spalding was appointed to the original board of Regents by Gov. Richard B. Russell and served as its second chairman in 1933–34. It was during this period that the University System of Georgia assumed its present form via mergers of separate state schools and the abolition of many of the old agricultural and mechanical schools. He served as chairman again in 1949–51 during the governorship of Herman Talmadge.

For 13 years Mr. Spalding was chairman of the Fulton-DeKalb Hospital Authority, resigning after the completion of the $25,000,000 Henry Grady Memorial Hospital. The Hughes Spalding Pavilion, named for him, was built during those years to fill a need for private hospital care for Negro patients.

MARIST STUDENT

Mr. Spalding was educated at Loretto Convent on Washington Street and was one of Marist College's first students when that school opened. He was graduated from Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., in 1908 with an A.B. degree and received his law degree from the University of Georgia in 1910. He was admitted to the bar that year and after a period of independent practice joined his father's firm.

He served during the thirties as Fulton County attorney and in 1937–38 was chairman of the Fulton County Democratic Executive Committee.

At the University of Georgia, Mr. Spalding was a member of Chi Phi, Sphinx and the Demosthenians. He was one of the founders of the Gridiron Society.

He had served as president of the University of Georgia Alumni Society and as trustee and secretary of the University of Georgia Foundation. He was presented a Certificate of Merit by the university alumni in 1938.

In 1953 he received the John Carroll Distinguished Alumni award from Georgetown and the same university awarded him an honorary LL.D. in 1956. In 1951 Oglethorpe College awarded him an honorary LL.D. and in 1953 Georgia State College for Women presented him with its Distinguished Service Award. He has been a member of the Board of Trustees of Atlanta University.

Mr. Spalding was reared at Deerland, a small farm his father had bought on Peachtree Road and which is now the site of Piedmont Hospital.

He served as a first lieutenant in the field artillery during World War I.

He reared his own family at 2000 Peachtree Road, part of the old Deerland property, selling it to Piedmont when the hospital was built. In recent years, he and Mrs. Spalding had an apartment on Peachtree. Until poor health cut into his activities, he spent a lot of time on his farm on the Chattahoochee River near Sandy Springs.

Mr. Spalding was proud of the fact that he was the eighth American generation of an English Catholic family that came to Maryland in the middle of the 17th century to avoid the fines and forfeitures imposed by England in those days. He wrote two privately-printed volumes dealing with the histories of the Spalding and allied families in pre-Revolutionary Maryland and post-Revolutionary Kentucky, down to the present.

He was president of the Atlanta Particular Council of the St. Vincent de Paul Society for many years and a member of the Superior Council. He was co-chairman of the drive to raise funds to build the new building of St. Joseph's Infirmary on Ivy Street, and contributed to the construction of the Bishop John Lancaster Spalding Chapel of the Catholic Center of the University of Georgia in Athens.

In 1946 he was appointed Privy Chamberlain of the Sword and Cape, Supernumerary, by Pope Pius XII and was reappointed by Pope John XXIII.

He was a communicant of the Cathedral of Christ the King, where he was a close friend of its pastor, the late Msgr. Joseph E. Moylan.

Father Moylan was a casual dresser, too casual sometimes for Mr. Spalding to bear. On occasion, Mr. Spalding bought for the priest expensive suits to replenish his wardrobe. Every time he got such a gift, Msgr. Moylan would thank his benefactor graciously, then quietly exchange them for cash at the stores where they had been purchased. The priest then distributed the money to the poor.

Mr. Spalding was a member of the American Legion, the Military Order of World Wars, the Atlanta, Georgia and American Bar associations, the American Judicature Society, Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Delta Phi legal fraternity, the Piedmont Driving Club and the Capital City Club.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Apr. 1, 1969]

A MAN WHO CARED

When Grady Hospital was constructed at a cost of $25 million, there were many Atlantans who complained openly that it cost far too much. Hughes Spalding was chairman of the Fulton-DeKalb Hospital Authority at the time, and he defended the planners and administrators who spent the money. "You build one of these just once every hundred years, and it should be done right," he said.

And when the late Gov. Eugene Talmadge was interfering with the faculty at the University of Georgia—eventually costing the school much of its reputation for academic freedom—it was Spalding who stood up to the governor. He was not able to stop the events until much too late, but he made a great contribution to the Board of Regents when the University System needed building.

In dozens of less spectacular ways. Spalding stood for progress and commitment in the Atlanta community. In fact, he didn't seek the limelight. He was happier to move behind the scenes.

But he did move, and Atlanta and Georgia are the better for it. About the only public symbol is the Hughes Spalding Pavilion at Grady Hospital. It was built specifically to fill the need for private care for Negro patients. And it illustrates his concern for humanity.

Death came to Spalding Sunday night. He had lived to age 82, to see his law firm flourish, his city move toward human concern and his state profit from his concern for higher education.

A man can't be asked to make more of a contribution than that, although his death brings sadness.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, Mar. 31, 1969]

HUGHES SPALDING DIES AT AGE OF 82

Hughes Spalding, senior partner of the law firm of King and Spalding, died Sunday night in St. Joseph's Infirmary after a long illness.

There will be a Rosary at 8 o'clock Monday night at Patterson's Spring Hill. The funeral will be at 10 a.m. Tuesday at the Cathedral of Christ the King with the Rev. John F. McDonough officiating. Burial will be in Arlington Cemetery. The family has requested no flowers and those who wish may contribute to the Coronary Care Unit of St. Joseph's Infirmary.

Spalding, 82, has been a director of the Coca-Cola Co. since 1949 and was on the board of directors of the Trust Company of Georgia for 22 years before becoming an advisory director in 1962.

He was a member of the finance committee of the Coca-Cola board and had been chairman of the executive and trust committees of the Trust Company. He was one of the first appointees to the State Board of Regents when that body was established by Gov. Richard B. Russell Jr.

Spalding was born in Atlanta on Aug. 10, 1886, the son of Elizabeth Hughes and Jack J. Spalding, who had come here from Kentucky in 1882. His father, in company with Judge Alexander C. King, founded the law firm of which Spalding was a member in 1885.

Spalding was chairman of the Fulton-DeKalb Hospital Authority for 13 years, resigning after the completion of the $25 million Henry Grady Memorial Hospital building. The Hughes Spalding Pavilion was built during those years to fill a need for private care for Negro patients.

The first Spalding home in Atlanta was on the corner of 14th and Peachtree streets, now the site of National Service Industries. The hackberry and English elm trees there were planted by Spalding when he was a child and came from the farm of his grandfather, I. A. Spalding Jr., in Union County.

When the city grew in this direction, Spalding's father bought an 11-acre farm "Deerland," out Peachtree so his children could have the advantages of rural living and hard work in the garden and orchard. "Deerland" is now the site of Piedmont Hospital.

Hughes Spalding brought up his family on part of the old "Deerland" property, selling to Piedmont when that hospital was built. Since then, he and Mrs. Spalding had an apartment on Peachtree, and until the years slowed him down he spent a lot of time on his farm near Sandy Springs where he was one of the pioneers of permanent pastures and beef production in this part of Georgia.

He was educated at Loretto Convent on Washington Street, at Peacock School, and was one of Marist's first students when that school opened. He was graduated from Georgetown University in 1908 with an A.B. degree, received his law degree from the University of Georgia in 1910 and was admitted to the bar that year. He practiced for a period with Albert E. Thornton and Dan MacDougald then joined his father's firm.

At the University of Georgia Spalding was a member of Chi Phi, Sphinx and the Demosthenians. He was founder of Gridiron and one of the authors of its ritual.

He was active in the establishment of the University of Georgia Foundation and helped raise its initial endowment, serving as trustee and its secretary for many years. He was presented a Certificate of Merit by the University of Georgia Alumni in 1938, and in 1953 Georgia State College for Women gave him its Distinguished Service Award. Oglethorpe made him an honorary doctor of laws in 1951 and Georgetown University bestowed the same degree on him in 1956.

In 1953 he was honored with the John Carroll Award for distinguished service. He has been a member of the board of trustees of Atlanta University, and a president of the University of Georgia Alumni Society.

He served the board of regents as its second chairman in 1933–34, and it was during this period that the University System of Georgia assumed its present form with the abolition of several of the old A & M schools and the merger of the surviving, formerly separate institutions, under one governing body. He served as chairman of this board again in 1949–51 during the governorship of Herman Talmadge.

He was chairman of the board and a director of Georgia International Corp. from its founding in 1959 until 1963. Other directorships have included the Atlantic Co., Habersham Mills, Coca-Cola International Corp., the Atlantic Baseball Corp., Rich's, Inc., and the Whitehead Holding Co. He was a trustee of the Emily and Ernest Woodruff Foundation and the Lettie Pate Evans Foundation.

Spalding was a first lieutenant in the field artillery during World War I. He was a member of the American Legion, the Military Order of the World Wars, the Atlanta, Georgia and American bar associations, the American Judicature Society, Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Delta Phi legal fraternity, the Piedmont Driving Club and the Capital City Club.

During the '30s he was Fulton County attorney and in 1937–38 was chairman of the Fulton County Democratic Executive Committee.

Spalding was the eighth American generation of an English Catholic family which came to Maryland in the middle of the 17th century with a group of similar families to avoid the fines and forfeitures imposed by the British government of that period. He was proud of his line's fidelity to its church and of its members who became nuns and priests and provided the early American church with many of its leaders.

He wrote two privately printed books dealing with the histories of the Spalding and allied families in pre-revolutionary Maryland and post-revolutionary Kentucky down to the present.

He was president of the Particular Council of the St. Vincent de Paul Society in Atlanta for many years and a member of the Superior Council. He was cochairman of the drive to raise funds to build the main building of St. Joseph's Infirmary on Ivy Street, and contributed materially to the construction of the Bishop John Lancaster Spalding Chapel of the Catholic Center of the University of Georgia in Athens.

In 1946 he was appointed Privy Chamberlain of the Sword and Cape, Supernumerary by Pope Pious XII and was reappointed by Pope John XXIII.

Surviving are the widow, the former Bolling Stovall Phinzy of Athens; three sons, Jack J., editor of The Atlanta Journal; Hughes Jr., a partner in the firm of King and Spalding, and Billups Phinizy, a member of the history department at the University of Georgia; two daughters, Mrs. George S. Craft and Mrs. Wallace Winborne Jr., both of Atlanta, 22 grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, Apr. 1, 1969]

Hughes Spalding

Death has removed a man of great stature from the Georgia scene—Hughes Spalding. He was born in Atlanta nearly 83 years ago and throughout his life was an active participant and innovator here in the things that mattered.

He acquitted himself with distinction in the legal profession. But he did not limit his talents and time to the law. His was a full life. He was active in the business community and in undertaking civic responsibilities. He worked for his church and took pride in his family—both his ancestry and offspring.

Mr. Spalding preferred the direct approach. He had no use for pretense or sham. His way of doing things was to get to the point in the shortest possible time.

We join with his many friends in expressing our condolences to his family. His going is a loss to the community, made better for his having been here.

APPOINTMENT OF HILARY SANDOVAL, JR., AS ADMINISTRATOR OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower), I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement by him relative to the appointment of Hilary Sandoval, Jr., to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and an address delivered by Mr. Sandoval before the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity for Greater Washington.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Tower

With the great exodus of Texans from Washington last January, I was particularly gratified when President Nixon appointed a friend of mine from El Paso, the Honorable Hilary Sandoval, Jr., to the important post of Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I am fully aware of all SBA programs and the tremendous potential they have to contribute to our nation's economic growth and well being.

I know that we are all interested in Hilary Sandoval's operating concepts and the general policies he will adopt as he picks up the reins to guide this small but most significant Agency during his tenure. I believe that these concepts and policies were enunciated last Friday when my good friend from El Paso spoke before the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity for Greater Washington.

Statement of Hon. Hilary Sandoval, Jr.

There has been a lot of talk this week about big business. Talk about the growing concern that big corporations are becoming bigger. Concern over the fact this trend could have on our competitive system of free enterprise.

I want to talk to you today about small business. But I think it's important to mention at least briefly, the effect this big business trend could have on small business if it continues.

First of all, it would place too much economic power in the hands of too few people.

But aside from that, it could mean less competition.

Fewer firms from which to choose the kind of product you want to buy—a greater chance you'll pay a higher price than you would with more firms competing for your business—and a lesser chance to start a new business.

What's the answer?

I don't really know. I wish I did. I do have an idea that I think will help however.

And that is to increase the strength and effectiveness of the nation's small businesses.

That alone won't stem the tide of big companies becoming bigger. But it will strengthen competition and will, I think, help preserve our free enterprise system.

And that's my goal—the objective I've set for the Small Business Administration—to help increase the strength and the effectiveness of small business.

How do you reach that goal?

You know there are over five million small businesses in the country and they account for about 30 percent of all of the jobs and some 40 percent of the total output of the nation's businesses.

So it's a sizeable task.

Many of these firms don't need our help. Others don't want our help.

So one of our first jobs is to find out which firms need and want our help and then make certain they get the kind of help needed.

We also have to tell small business what kind of help they can get from SBA.

I think we can do a much better job than we have in the past in letting small businesses know what SBA is and what is does.

I suppose the great majority of people who do know something about SBA believe the agency is strictly a lender—a place to go and get loan.

We do make loans, when we have funds available but it isn't always as simple as walking into an SBA office and getting the money.

I know, because 13 years ago I walked into SBA for a loan and was turned down.

Today we have to be very selective about making loans. The prime interest rate has recently jumped to 7½ percent and that means banks have to be more selective in meeting their customers demands and may have less money to make loans with our guarantee.

Last year, SBA was one of several agencies that had its budget reduced as a result of the six billion dollar budget reduction. So our funds are limited.

But while we may find it difficult at times to make a small firm a loan, that doesn't necessarily mean we can't be of some assistance.

We may for instance, do small firms a service by advising them to forego expansion plans until the money market is most favorable or until the time is ripe for them to undertake expansion.

We also can do them a serivce if we try to find out what kind of loan the firms need—or thinks it needs—and guide them to the right sources of funds, a bank or a venture capital company.

I think that many times a firm fails to get the financing it needs simply because it doesn't know what type of money it needs.

Or, it doesn't know the right place to look for it. There are the right and the wrong places to look for short-term funds, capital expansion funds and equity money. The trick is to find out what kind of money is needed and go to the right sources.

I think what I am saying, is that probably the most important help we can give small business is management help.

I think one of the most important things the SBA can do, is to round up the very best counsel and advice we can find and make it available to small business.

We've already got a pretty good start in that direction.

I think we have useful and informative management publications. But we can use them to better advantage. And I do know something about the publications business.

I believe our workshops and seminars and training courses are helpful. But we can and will make them better.

Our personal counseling service is helping small firms but I think we can expand them so that we reach the very small and the new businessmen.

I would like to expand our SCORE program to include business executives at mid-career who have not yet retired but want to help.

Management advice from experienced businessmen is going to be vital in our efforts to help the minorities start their own businesses.

And in that regard, I'd like to say that in support of President Nixon's efforts, minority enterprise is going to have our special attention at SBA.

I do want to make it clear that we're not interested in playing the numbers game. We're not going to make loans for the sake of showing off our statistics.

We want a good track record but one with substance and foundation.

I think one of the worst mistakes we can make is to give false hopes by making loans to people who have no qualifications to go into business and no chance of succeeding in business.

I'd rather tell these people no at the outset. The fact that a person has been pushed aside whether it be in starting a business, receiving an education or some social reason, is not in itself a reason to expect Government money to go into business—and I know a little bit about people being shoved aside because of race or ethnic background.

But it's cruel and doesn't serve any constructive purpose to encourage people you are virtually certain are going to fail. We're going to make loans and give management help to minority groups but we want them to have a reasonable chance of success. A reasonable chance to build a strong competitive business that will provide them with a good living and make a solid contribution to the economy.

And we are not going to have just one special program for minorities. We are going to use all of the services we have at SBA to try and help encourage minority businesses.

And it won't make any difference if the person is black or brown or yellow or white.

I'm very proud of my heritage as a Mexican-American. And I know black-Americans, Chinese-Americans and other "hyphenated" Americans are proud of their heritage.

Personally I don't like labels. But I suppose it's inevitable that we have them. So if we have to have labels I would hope that I can say at SBA we are helping establish a new group—labeled "Successful-Americans."

If I can sum up I think it would be this way:

We can help small businesses that need our help if we improve the way we do our job at SBA. If we increase the efficiency of our own operation we will increase the strength and effectiveness of small business.

And then I hope we will hear more talk and see more concern about small business. More talk about the success small business is having—more concern about the contribution small firms make to a healthy economy and more awareness that small business is a cornerstone of our free enterprise system and the hope of many Americans to be their own boss and have a hand in guiding their own destinies.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER INTERSTATE HIGHWAY

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, immediately after the Easter adjournment, I intend to introduce proposed legislation to designate Interstate 70 as the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Interstate Highway."

Interstate 70 reaches from coast to coast through the very heartland of America. It passes just outside Abilene, Kans., General Eisenhower's hometown and final resting place. It is also the interstate route from Washington toward Camp David, the Presidential retreat which President Eisenhower named and enjoyed, in the Catoctin Mountains of Maryland.

President Eisenhower was the father of the Interstate Highway System and listed its creation among the great achievements of his Presidency.

Naming I–70 the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Interstate Highway" would be a particularly appropriate memorial to the General, who in a very real sense brought the entire Nation together in the cause of peace and freedom.

Before introducing the bill, I will invite cosponsorship of it by all Senators from the States through which Interstate 70 passes.

TRIBUTES TO MARVIN WARNER AND JOE KANTER

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a good many years ago now I knew a young man in Birmingham when he first came out of the University of Alabama. He had virtually no capital but rather than to accept a position that was offered to him by a good friend, at a salary which was not attractive to him, he ventured to join with another young man and go into the homebuilding industry in a very modest way. These two young men were successful and built house after house and finally moved to multiple housing units and to high rise apartment buildings. Still later, they expanded their operations into other cities of the United States in which they were highly successful and became one of the most outstanding building firms in the country.

I refer to Marvin Warner and to Joe Kanter, both of whom now live in Cincinnati, Ohio.

By the way, on April 26 Joe Kanter's hometown of Tarrant, Ala., is celebrating Joe Kanter Day.

Marvin Warner, during the past session of the United Nations General Assembly, served as a member of the U.S. delegation. All of the reports that have come to me are to the effect that he did a wonderful job. He is a public spirited citizen who can be counted upon to do a good job in every instance.

A few days ago the Enquirer wrote a very nice editorial about Marvin Warner. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARVIN WARNER: HUMANITARIAN

The designation of Marvin L. Warner as the recipient of the man of the year by the Cincinnati Committee, State of Israel Bonds, represents another distinction for one of the Queen City's ablest, most aggressive business and civic figures. The award—named in honor of Herbert H. Lehman, former governor of and senator from New York—will be presented to Mr. Warner at a dinner on March 30 at the Sheraton-Gibson Hotel. That occasion will be notably enhanced by an address by former Vice President Humphrey.

Mr. Warner's record in the Queen City includes identification with a wide variety of business and civic causes. Most recently, he has brought distinction to Cincinnati and to himself as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations General Assembly.

The Enquirer is pleased to join in saluting Mr. Warner as a humanitarian and a civic leader.

DWIGHT EISENHOWER WAS TRULY AN INSPIRATION TO AMERICANS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the world has been made poorer in recent days by the passing of Dwight Eisenhower.

So much has been said about General Eisenhower that it is difficult to speak of him without being repetitious, for such was the character of the man that he inspired warm affection and genuinely felt tributes.

Former President Eisenhower was a unique individual, particularly in this tormented age in which we live. His life was the embodiment of the virtues which we were taught in school as comprising the American character and which today seem too often to have been forgotten. He was a reminder that there is yet a place for honesty, virtue, hard work, good cheer, and simple faith. He proved that these values are compatible with our complex and troubled civilization of the late 20th century.

The continuing esteem in which he was held after his Presidency and the outpouring of feeling which we have witnessed since his death are proof that the American people, and people everywhere, yearn for an orderly and peaceful existence, not necessarily for a return to an earlier day.

Dwight Eisenhower's record as soldier, educator, and President can and will be debated for years. But the enduring memory of the man will rest not on what battles were won or what laws were passed under his guidance so much as on his ability to unite, inspire, and calm those who looked to him for leadership.

This was the true and unquestioned genius of Dwight Eisenhower.

HOW TO SAVE $9 BILLION

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, we have heard much in recent months, often in connection with the proposed ABM system or F–111 aircraft, about wasteful defense contracting policies. More recently we have been told by President Nixon that the 10-percent income tax surcharge will have to be continued in order to counteract inflationary pressures in our economy. The latest figure on cost-of-living increase was 4 percent last month.

However, most economists and many political observers have long argued that budgetary reductions are a more effective means for reducing or preventing inflation. At this time I wish to introduce into the RECORD a provocative article by Robert Benson published in the March issue of Washington Monthly which suggests how these savings can be realized. The article, entitled "How the Pentagon Can Save $9,000,000,000," directs its criticism at an apparent policy of slovenliness in the conduct of defense contracts. The author suggests that the budget cuts could be made without affecting either our national security or the war in Vietnam. As a former member of the Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense—Comptroller—Mr. Benson has a unique background in these matters that makes his comments especially knowledgeable.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW THE PENTAGON CAN SAVE $9,000,000,000

(By Robert S. Benson)

I have a modest proposal.

I should like to demonstrate, in as brief and as simple a way as the complexities permit, how $9 billion can be cut from the Pentagon budget without reducing our national security or touching those funds earmarked for the war in Vietnam.

Let me emphasize at the outset that this is truly a modest proposal, offered from an earnest belief in its practicality and with the conviction that savings from its adoption could be applied to our fiscally undernourished concerns for human opportunity.

The process by which the Pentagon budget—as well as the rest of the federal budget—is shaped and reviewed is a strange and not always wonderful thing. Any new program is usually given thorough scrutiny in Congress: debate rages over the program's purposes and over the level of funding required. Once it is accepted, however, only the funding level is certain to receive continuing Congressional attention. A nation's needs change, but rarely is a program's reason for existence ever challenged again, either in the executive branch or on Capitol Hill. On the contrary, its administering agency and its Congressional advocates, cheered on by its beneficiaries, strive to perpetuate or expand it, seldom pausing to ponder whether it is still worthwhile or whether something else is needed more.

The process can be insidious. Man, the social animal, takes comfort from acting in accord with the wishes of friends and associates. But over years of advocacy he loses some ability to discriminate to relate the particular to the whole. In the case of Pentagon outlays, the built-in protection inherent in established programs often achieves invulnerability.

Because a mystique of secrecy and complexity surrounds the Pentagon, most Americans feel uncomfortable, or even vaguely unpatriotic, if they question any part of the military budget. But the fact is that the federal budget's provisions for defense far exceed our national security requirements. Although not many Americans realize it, a great deal of information about the threats to our security (and the forces we procure to meet them) can be gleaned from unclassified papers: budget statements of the President every January, annual posture statements by the Secretary of Defense, transcripts of Congressional hearings, and articles in the newspapers. Any serious student will soon discover that items in the defense budget, as in any other, range from fundamental to marginal. The difference is that in the Pentagon budget (a) vastly larger sums are involved, and (b) far less Congressional scrutiny is applied to them.

I

Using the sources above, my two years of experience in the Comptroller's office of the Department of Defense, and my own judgment of the issues, I hope first to outline how the budget can be trimmed by $9 billion and then proceed to a discussion of the weaknesses in the system which allowed this fat to survive even in the cost-conscious regime of Robert S. McNamara.

In our budget-cutting exercise these ground rules will apply:

None of the cuts is related to the war in Vietnam.

None of the cuts would impair our national security requirements.

All of the cuts are in what the Pentagon calls ongoing core programs.

All of the cuts could be effected within the next 24 months, which would allow the savings to be applied rather quickly to unfilled domestic needs.

The focus is on areas where forces or weapons systems are either duplicated or outmoded, where an enemy threat is no longer credible in today's political and technological environment, or where money is being lost through grossly inefficient performance.

Perhaps the best place to begin is with the Manned Orbiting Laboratory, which receives half a billion dollars a year and ought to rank dead last on any rational scale of national priorities. The MOL, a carbon copy of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's spacecraft operation, is in the budget because the Air Force wants a piece of the extraterrestrial action, with its glamor and glory, and Congress has been only too happy to oblige.

Although there have been valiant attempts to make the MOL seem different, Pentagon space research is alarmingly similar to that of NASA. Listen as Dr. Alexander H. Flax, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development, tries to draw the distinction for members of the House Appropriations Committee:

"If you view the objectives of these programs as being simply to get data on humans exposed for some period of time, I think you have to conclude that there is a great deal of duplication, but I tried to make the point that our objective is primarily to test equipment, not humans. The humans interact with the equipment, of course."

True, there are potential military uses for space vehicles. But little thought appears to have been given to whether a separate program was required or whether the same results could have been achieved through slight adjustments in the parallel NASA activities. The MOL program is duplicative and wasteful. Of the $600 million requested for it last year, Congress approved all but $85 million. This year's budget calls for $576 million. I would strike all of it. Saving: $576,000,000.

As for grossly inefficient Pentagon performance, the most obvious example is manpower management and utilization. Manpower is the single largest commodity the Defense Department buys; this year, the Pentagon will directly purchase the services of nearly five million Americans. Assuming an average of $7,000 each in pay, allowances, and supplementary benefits, the department payroll is about $34 billion, of which about $22 billion goes to military personnel and $12 billion to civilians.

The Pentagon has little direct control over the costs of its civilian personnel, who are recruited mainly through a government-wide civil-service pool. But its control over military personnel is complete, covering not only the $22 billion payroll but also about $7 billion annually in training costs and nearly $2 billion in moving expenses for men changing assignments.

Most men enter the armed forces either because they are drafted or because they enlist in preference to being drafted. All enlisted men entering the service receive basic training, which in the Army takes eight weeks and costs about $1,000 per head. After advanced training in a specialty, these short-term new servicemen generally spend the rest of their hitches on assignments requiring that specialty.

A more flexible training policy would not employ such a lockstep approach. Some basic training is needed for everyone, and combat infantrymen certainly need the full eight weeks. But not all of the Army's 535,000 new soldiers this year will serve in combat, and four weeks would suffice for the others. The Navy and Air Force have already abbreviated their basic training; for the Army to do so would yield, in direct training savings alone, $50 million. Saving: $50,000,000.

Although the pattern of training and assignments for officers is far different, even greater economies are possible—and with a clear gain in individual job performance. After initial training, which is more diverse than it is for enlisted men, almost every officer is shuttled around through an amazing variety of assignments and further training designed to give him enough breadth of experience to become Chief of Staff some day, often at the sacrifice of obtaining no deep experience in any one field. The expectation is that every seasoned officer can lead an infantry battalion through a swamp on one assignment, promulgate personnel promotion policies behind a Pentagon desk on the next, and discuss black separatism with Ethiopians as a military attache in Addis Ababa a year later.

In this age of specialization, such a philosophy is anacronistic and expensive. No efficient business would move its men around in so illogical a pattern. By perpetuating the illusion that every officer can aspire to the top organizational position, rather than screening the candidates earlier in their careers, the services suffer from having an excessive number of men struggling to learn totally unfamiliar jobs. Moreover, today's technological and analytical complexities demand the development of specialists whose entire experience is focused on performing one particular function well. By attempting to fill the growing number of specialist slots with generalists, job performance diminishes for all.

If we were to reduce by a modest one-fourth the present number of assignment changes (whereby servicemen move almost once a year), the annual saving in transportation and moving costs alone would be slightly over $500 million, to say nothing of the improvement in work effectiveness. Saving: $500,000,000.

A further saving can be accomplished by changing the way the military calculates individual manpower requirements. Unlike business, which requires work units to absorb the impact of absences, the Pentagon includes a cushion to compensate for men absent on leave, in the hospital, in school, and en route to new assignments. And the military's 30 days of annual leave—which all servicemen get—is far more than the norm for civilian work forces of comparable age and experience, even acknowledging that the 30 days includes weekends. The military argues that this amount of leave time is compensation for being on duty 24 hours a day, seven days a week—but this is a myth long in need of explosion. Except for those at sea and in Vietnam, most military men work evenings or weekends no more and no less than civilians do. Cutting leave time to 20 days a year—with the exception of men on hardship duty overseas—would reduce the total armed forces manpower requirements enough to save $450 million annually. Saving: $450,000,000.

Thanks to Beetle Bailey, *Catch 22*, and the fact that so many Americans are veterans, the supernumerary theory of military staffing has had great visibility. But an area of far greater inefficiency—supplier performance on large weapons system contracts—draws almost no attention at all. This is especially serious because the same contractor who can be extremely efficient under the conditions imposed by the private competitive marketplace can waste millions when working under a government contract. Few Americans are aware that about 90 per cent of the major weapons system that the Defense Department procures end up costing at least twice as much as was originally estimated. Some of this cost growth comes from Pentagon-ordered changes in design or configuration, but much of it results from inefficient contractor practices or from his knowledge that the government will underwrite his excessive overhead.

It is up to the government, therefore, to impose on a non-competitive defense contractor the same cost discipline that the contractor would be forced to impose on himself in a competitive situation. Instead, the present procurement system is geared almost exclusively to securing timely delivery and good technical performance. Cost comes last.

The engine contract for the controversial F–111 fighter-bomber offers a classic illustration of what happens to costs after a decision is reached to proceed with procurement.

An aircraft of this kind has three major components: airframe (wings and fuselage), avionics (electronic navigation and weapons-guiding gear), and engines. For a technologically advanced fighter-bomber, the airframe will account for about 55 per cent of total cost, avionics 25 per cent, and engines 20 per cent. The initial F–111 contract for 2,053 engines was awarded to Pratt & Whitney on the basis of an estimated cost of $270,000 per engine. Today the engines are expected to cost more than $700,000 each.

In the F–111 case, and in general, four major factors account for such cost escalation:

1. The Buy-In. Our procurement system encourages contractors to play the game called "buy-in." The rules are simple. Contracts are awarded to the company which offers the lowest bid with a straight face. Later cost overruns may bring a mild reproach or a stern reprimand, but they will not prevent the contractor from getting enough money to cover all his costs and pocket a profit. A contractor rarely takes these reprimands seriously; he knows that his competitors have similar experiences. Besides, the procurement officials have told him to worry about performance and prompt delivery, not about cost. So the buy-in game produces initial cost estimates that everyone knows are unrealistically low.

2. Design Changes.—From the time bids are requested on a new weapons system until final delivery, a great many changes in design specification develop. These changes are often initiated by the Defense Department, although some reflect contractor production problems. In either case, the costs change—usually justifiably, but almost always upward.

3. Volume.—Changes in volume are even farther beyond the contractor's control. In large contracts, economies of scale are often achievable; if a weapons system is found highly useful, as was the F–4 fighter, and more units are ordered than were initially planned, the later unit costs are lower. In the case of the Air Force F–111, however, cancellation of British orders and the Congressional decision to kill the Navy version

reduced the number of aircraft to be purchased, thereby raising the unit cost.

4. Sheer Inefficiency.—These costs arise because a contractor has slipshod purchasing procedures, poor scheduling of men and machines, ineffective work standards, or other managerial deficiencies. Such extra costs would be a threat to a company's survival in the competitive private marketplace; they should not be tolerated in defense procurement.

In calculating how much of the F–111 engine's cost growth was due to this intolerable fourth factor, we need to begin by figuring how much the first three factors cost.

We know that the original $270,000 estimate was artificially low. Allowing for buy-in fibbing and for some early required changes in design, an initial figure of $450,000 would have been more realistic. Later design changes may have raised the allowable price to $500,000. But the contractor's final estimate of $700,000-plus, made after the British action but before the Congressional cutback, probably should not be adjusted for volume changes, because the British buy was to have been proportionately very small and there are good indications that this actually enabled Pratt & Whitney to disengage itself from some expensive subcontracts. So unjustifiable contractor inefficiency amounted to around $200,000 per engine.

It could have been worse. Past practice in such cases, where the government is dealing with a single supplier rather than with several competitors, has been to accept whatever price is commensurate with the costs the supplier has incurred, regardless of how efficient or inefficient he is. But, in an unprecedented action, the Defense Department ordered an investigation of Pratt & Whitney operations to determine how much such an engine ought to cost if produced under efficient manufacturing procedures. After that, the Navy—which had contract responsibility for all F–111 engines—took the further unprecedented step of unilaterally setting the price it intended to pay. Indications are that the Navy compromised its position somewhat after some hard bargaining, but the final contract did reduce by about 15 per cent the price proposed by the company, which customary procedure would have accepted outright. This saved the government roughly $200 million.

Two other good examples of spiraling costs were described in recent hearings before the Congressional Joint Economic Committee. A. E. Fitzgerald of the Defense Department reported that the C–5A transport may cost $2 billion more than the original contract ceiling of $3 billion; yet when Defense negotiated the contract with Lockheed, then-Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara described it as "a model method of doing Defense business . . . a damn good contract." In another case, retired Air Force Colonel Albert W. Buesking, a former financial officer for the Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile, said the Minuteman contractors received a 43 per cent pre-tax profit based on net worth, or about twice the normal industrial return; he estimated that defense contract costs are 30–50 per cent "in excess of what they might have been under conditions of competitive-type commercial environment."

Conservatively assuming that aerospace and shipbuilding contractors harbor an inefficiency of 15 per cent, and figuring that the average annual amount provided for research and procurement of such systems over the past three years is about $17.9 billion, then wiping out the inefficiency would annually save the government $2.7 billion.

This is no pipedream. It requires no dramatic breakthrough in management techniques. Such savings could be achieved quickly if the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the individual services resolved to focus the energies of their top financial and engineering men on procurement of these major weapons systems. What is needed is some truly independent cost-sleuthing into contractors' operations, with firm backing from top Defense management for appropriate follow-up efforts. Saving: $2,700,000,000.

The most fruitful way of all for saving defense dollars is to eliminate forces which no longer pack a credible punch or which were designed to meet a threat that is no longer credible.

The Navy's Polaris/Poseidon fleet ballistic missile program is vital to our national security. But the Navy's three primary and independent conventional warfare missions—tactical air, amphibious operations, and shipping protection—are overequipped, as are their associated support units. Current force levels cannot be justified by any potential threats. In my view, President Nixon was misguided when he decried America's loss of sea power during the campaign last fall. He made the mistake of applying the same argument the admirals use when they attempt to eternalize and expand their favorite programs: that the United States must have superiority in numbers, ship-type by ship-type, over the Soviet Navy. This is a legacy of late-1940's thinking, when it was assumed that we must always be ready to fight and win an extended war at sea. In the nuclear age, such thinking is highly unrealistic.

Fifteen aircraft carriers are presently assigned to the Navy's tactical air mission. Since the wallop they pack is purely the firepower of their aircraft, they should be compared with the alternative means of delivering that firepower—Air Force tactical aircraft. Carriers can deploy quickly to areas where we have no airfields, and they are safe from insurgent attacks (though they now appear to be vulnerable to Russian Styx missiles). But this flexibility comes at a high price. Independent studies place the cost of carrier-based tactical missions at three to four times that of similar missions flown from ground fields. Because of the many air bases we have built all over the world, we can rapidly deploy land-based aircraft to most areas. Carriers still play a necessary role in providing the potential to fight in a handful of otherwise inaccessible places and in meeting initial "surge" requirements for a non-nuclear war. But there is no justifiable reason to use them on extended deployments in major wars as we do now in Vietnam. Although the Defense Department will never admit it, the only reason we continue to employ carrier-based air strikes there is that the jealous Navy doesn't want to be shut out of some role in the war.

Tactical aircraft carriers could be cut from 15 to 10 without risk to the country's security. The average annual peacetime operating and modernization/replacement cost per carrier appears to be about $120 million. Assuming that the costs of expanding Air Force tactical missions to take up the slack were one-third as much, the net annual saving from the elimination of five carriers would be $400 million. Saving: $400,000,000.

Marine Corps amphibious assault tactics have been used in minor contingencies such as Lebanon and the Dominican Republic, but against a major power they would be highly vulnerable to a tactical nuclear weapon. Nor are Marine forces now structured logistically for sustained combat, the type of war that Vietnam would suggest is most probable. Without eliminating any Marine troops, we could—by restricting their amphibious training and equipment and phasing out a proportionate share of assault ships—save $100 million annually. Saving: $100,000,000.

A classic example of continued spending for protection against a no longer important threat is the third major area of Navy tactical forces—protection for shipping. The structuring of our anti-submarine and supporting anti-aircraft and fleet escort forces harks back to the post-World War II prospect of a sea war with Russia. If we ever do begin destroying each other's ships, there seems little prospect of avoiding escalation to nuclear war, which would make shipping protection irrelevant. Further, as various jumbo aircraft near production, the cost gap between a ton-mile of plane transportation and a ton-mile of ship transportation is narrowing. Yet instead of scaling down our protective forces, we are keeping them up and even expanding them, through last year's implausible decision to begin procuring VSX anti-submarine aircraft. Killing this program and reducing overall shipping defenses to a sensible level—four anti-submarine carriers and three air groups rather than the present eight carriers—would save an annual $600 million. Saving: $600,000,000.

Another major area in which our involvement is unreasonably large is our troop commitment in Europe. We have about 310,000 soldiers there now, accompanied by more than 200,000 dependents. Such a staggering share of the NATO burden was appropriate while our World War II allies struggled to get back on their feet, but they can now afford a larger load. Part of the thesis behind U.S. deployments is to make certain that any substantial attack by Warsaw Pact forces would engage American forces, thereby creating potential consequences that the Soviet Union would find untenable. But this could be assured with far fewer than 310,000 U.S. troops. Says Senator Stuart Symington (D-Mo.), a former Air Force Secretary recently assigned as chairman of a Foreign Relations subcommittee that will investigate the involvement of U.S. forces abroad: "Surely 50,000 American troops would be sufficient to make sure that no Soviet probe could succeed in Berlin or elsewhere in Europe without a direct confrontation with the United States."

In the event of a truly major Soviet attack, not even 310,000 U.S. troops plus the NATO allies' forces would be sufficient to thwart it. But both sides recognize that an assault of such proportions is likely to evoke a nuclear response.

Psychological reasons prevented us from making a major cut in our European forces close on the heels of the Russian takeover in Czechoslovakia last year. But that should not deter us from effecting the cut this year. If anything, our non-response to the Czech invasion simply reinforces the reality learned in Hungary in 1956—that the United States is not about to send troops into Eastern Europe no matter what the Soviet provocation.

Realistically, we could cut back to a total of 125,000 troops in Europe plus 50,000 at home earmarked for NATO contingencies, and cut by one-fourth the air power assigned to the European theater (a McNamara comparison shows that NATO air forces can deliver a payload more than three times greater than that of their Warsaw Pact counterparts). Altogether, these reductions would annually save about $1.5 billion. Saving: $1,500,000,000.

The final two programs of questionable value—the SAGE-Air Defense Command system and the Sentinel antiballistic missile system share some common characteristics. Both are defensive, in an age when the balance of terror rests on offensive missile strength. Both encompass a detection function and an intercept guidance function. And numerous technical experts express serious doubts about the potential operational effectiveness of either.

SAGE represents yesteryear's attempt to defend against the Soviet version of our Strategic Air Command. It is widely conceded that the Soviets have grounded their bomber development efforts and no longer pose their primary strategic threat in this area. Nonetheless we persist in trying to further refine our bomber defenses, when in fact we have already achieved a satisfactory capability in the detection sphere. Moreover, SAGE's role as a guide to interceptor pilots is rather superfluous, given its imperfections and our primary reliance on a strong offensive deterrent. Some reductions have already been effected in the Air Defense Command, but conversion from a full defensive system to purely a warning system ought to save $600 million annually. Savings: $600,000,000.

If SAGE is intended to sustain a mostly futile yesteryear system, the Sentinel ABM represents a misguided attempt to provide protection tomorrow. Against the destructive power of the missile, our best defense is a good offense. Particularly tragic is the staggering cost of a full-blown "thin" Sentinel system. Because it is so expensive, and the work is therefore parceled out to many Congressional districts, many politicians have favored it. It therefore may be difficult to stop before we have spent $40 billion. However, the Sentinel program faces increasingly fervent opposition in the Senate this year—partly because residents in four cities where ABM sites are being developed have objected so loudly.

Sentinel would make some sense if it truly promised blanket protection against strategic offensive missiles. But it doesn't. As Secretary McNamara said in a speech in San Francisco 18 months ago: ". . . any such system can rather obviously be defeated by an enemy simply sending more offensive warheads, or dummy warheads, than there are defensive missiles capable of disposing of them."

Secretary McNamara opposed the Sentinel but President Johnson overruled him and decided to proceed with the program. Today we are on the road toward building a $5 billion ABM system, ostensibly for protection against Chinese missiles—as yet undeveloped—should Peking miscalculate our potential response and attack us.

It seems unrealistic not to expect the Soviets to perceive the $5 billion "thin" Sentinel as a first stage in a $40 billion "thick" defense against themselves. Senator Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.) said as much last year when he was chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee: ". . . there is no doubt that this is a first step in a defense system against an atomic attack from the Soviet Union." Yet all seven of the men who have served over the past decade in the jobs of Science Adviser to the President or Director of Research and Engineering in the Defense Department have recommended against deployment of a "thick" ABM system designed to protect our population against a Soviet attack.

By halting the Sentinel now, before it acquires irreversible momentum, we could save $1.8 billion this year, not to mention vastly larger sums during the next decade. Saving: $1,800,000,000.

The items above do not exhaust the list of things to cut—there are other savings to be made in such areas as mapping operations, the reserve forces, logistics—but the total here will serve as a start. It amounts to: Total savings: $9,276,000,000.

II

If all these Pentagon budget cuts are so obvious, why didn't the cost-conscious McNamara regime push them through? Did the Whiz Kids fail? Were they really trying? I think a fair assessment would have to conclude that they were trying hard but were only partly successful, for five basic reasons.

First, McNamara's Band was greatly outnumbered by experienced adversaries bound together by a shared goal—more and bigger military programs. All the elements in this military-industrial-Congressional complex are served by an enlarged defense budget, though their motivations are different. Industry wants greater sales and profits. The military wants expanded power, plus the assurance that they will be on the forefront of technology. Congressmen respond to pressure from contractors and military employees in their districts, and those on the military committees yearn for the prestige and power that comes from presiding over a bigger slice of the federal pie. The combination made life difficult even for a man as strong and courageous as Robert McNamara.

Second, in selecting systems to analyze for effectiveness, the Whiz Kids chose to concentrate on the relatively uncluttered strategic programs instead of digging into such fat and messy activities as we have catalogued here. Within their selected framework, they generally performed technically sound, objective initial analyses. Once they arrived at a position, however, they too often "overdefended" their conclusions; that is, they were unwilling to reassess them against subsequent cost experience, technological advances, or a changing international political environment. For example, the current structuring of our programmed airlift/sealift needs emanates from a carefully developed linear programming model. This model attaches a high value to rapid deployment, stemming from an early 1960's Europe-oriented study which showed high benefits in terms of political bargaining power and casualty minimization. This analysis still makes good sense in Europe, but now appears grossly misapplied in Asia. Yet nothing has been done to revise the high value placed on rapid deployment. Such a change would point to a different desired mix of airlift and sealift.

Third, the Defense Department's budget review process concedes too much at the beginning. Last year's budgeted amounts are generally taken by everyone as this year's starting points. This practice ignores the possibility that fat crept into preceding budgets or that some of last year's activities are now outmoded. Consider, for example, the subject of training, in which the armed services have been pioneering for years by applying new technology to education. This area should be a prime candidate for frequent review from the ground up (what the managers call "zero-base" budgeting). Rather, the Defense Department budgeting process virtually concedes last year's amount and focuses on whatever incremental changes have been requested. The result, of course, is higher budgets, with past errors compounded year after year.

A fourth limitation also derives from the planning and budgeting system. Discussions about the desirable level of various forces are conducted in terms of numbers of things—missiles, carriers, fighter wings. This flows naturally out of intelligence estimates of enemy forces and subsequent analyses of how much counterforce the United States needs to nullify them. Approval is then given to the Air Force to buy 40 more fighters or the Navy to buy four more submarines, each with specified capabilities. But carrying out such purchases is not like walking into an automobile showroom and asking for a yellow Plymouth Belvedere sedan with power steering. As a submarine is built, many unanticipated choices present themselves; they involve different levels of effectiveness or convenience for different levels of dollars. Inevitably the generals and admirals want to buy as much capability as possible; it is almost always more than is required to meet the threat. For want of adequate follow-up by top procurement officials, the generals often have their way.

Finally, the President and the Budget Bureau have shied from making public any meaningful comparisons between military and domestic programs. Systems analysis, the technique that aims to measure the relative national worth of results obtained from alternative programs, cannot precisely compare the benefits to be gained from highly diverse activities. Yet inexact as such comparisons may be, the Budget Bureau does make them and present them to the President from time to time. If the President, for his part, were to discuss national priorities more frequently and candidly with the public, then Congressmen might be less likely to base their judgments on the only other available view—that the present balance of activities is about right.

The present balance of activities is anything but right. Unmet national concerns for human opportunity and the quality of life require an investment even larger than the amount that would be freed if all of the Pentagon reforms outlined in this report were carried out.

Perhaps the clearest, most thorough delineation of these high-priority social needs is found in the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. To redress root causes of despair and frustration, the Commission recommended a long series of measures which, if enacted in full, would cost between $13 billion and $18 billion a year over their first several years.

The only way to begin addressing these unfilled needs is to take money away from Pentagon programs that must rank lower on any rational national-priority scale. Examples provide compelling support for this argument. We have such choices as:

Funding the Manned Orbiting Laboratory—or providing Upward Bound summer courses for the 600,000 additional ghetto students who have the potential to go to college;

Spending this year's Sentinel funds—or training 510,000 more hard-core unemployed;

Continuing to operate one of the marginal tactical aircraft carriers—or training and supporting 20,000 more Teacher Corps members;

Maintaining our full troop complement in Europe—or diverting an additional $10 million to each of 150 Model Cities;

Permitting excessive contractor costs to flourish unchecked—or providing Head Start education for 2,250,000 more children, plus enough school lunches to feed 20 million children for a whole year.

These alternatives are real and immediate. They do not represent wishful dreaming. The choices are up to Mr. Nixon, to the Congress, and ultimately to ourselves.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL: THE EPITOME OF A U.S. SENATOR

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it has been only 3 months since the distinguished Senator from Georgia, Richard B. Russell, was elected to be the President pro tempore of this body. His long years of faithful service have made him richly deserving of this honor, but his election does not mean that those of us in the Senate were previously unmindful of his contributions in this Chamber to our country.

Indeed, the respect and affection we have held for Senator Russell in our day to day associations with him is indicative of the esteem in which we hold this Georgian.

Richard Russell is one of those rare individuals whose whole life is devoted to his work. He is totally immersed in the noble calling of public service as few citizens before him have been. The Senate is his life, and he serves it well.

As do many men, Senator Russell once aspired to even greater service. It was my privilege, as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1952, to vote for Senator Russell as my party's nominee for President. He was denied the opportunity to lead the Nation from the White House, but we are fortunate that he has continued to make his superb talents available in this legislative body. As a man wise to the ways of the world, he was not embittered but, to the contrary, has sought to take on even greater responsibilities in the Senate and discharge these duties with exceptional distinction.

If any new Member were to wonder whom among his more experienced colleagues he should emulate, I would, without hesitation point to Richard Russell as the model of a U.S. Senator. His wisdom and achievement; his understanding and character are preeminent, and I look forward to his continued leadership.

AMERICA'S YOUTH WALK FOR DEVELOPMENT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOODELL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. Goodell), I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement prepared by him on the constructive effort which young people are making to deal with the problems of welfare today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordere to be printed in the Record, as follows:

America's Youth Walk for Development

(Statement by Senator Charles E. Goodell)

If one were to pick up almost any recent newspaper, there would be, on the front page, a story about youth in America, and there would probably be a story about hunger in our country and abroad. It would not seem, upon first reading, that these two stories were in any way related. But they can be.

On May 4 in Buffalo, New York, and later in the month in Syracuse, the youth of the state of New York are going to identify with this problem of human hunger and youth's concern about it. They will be using a technique developed by the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation to channel the concern and energy of our young people for the betterment of mankind. The Youth Committee in Buffalo has chosen to support for their overseas projects a Biafra Rehabilitation Proposal and funds for a credit program among the Indians in the highlands of the Andes. Their domestic projects will be to assist a coop project in the inner city of Buffalo and support for a malnutrition project in Beaufort County, South Carolina.

In Syracuse the domestic project will be a day care center administered by a group affiliated with the Office of Economic Opportunity in Syracuse. Their overseas projects will be support of the Peace Corps School Partnership Program in Ghana and Botswana and they are presently narrowing their choice between several Food and Agriculture Organization projects probably involving rural youth leadership through 4–H Clubs either in Africa or Latin America.

It is important to repeat that while they rely for advice on the American Freedom From Hunger Staff, the meaningful decision-making is left in the hands of the committees in the communities themselves.

The Foundation has helped to organize high school and university students all across the country in a "Walk for Development" program. In a Walk for Development, young people demonstrate their concern over malnutrition and hunger by walking over a a predetermined route—normally 30 to 35 miles—through city and suburban streets. They walk to show their concern and to obtain sponsors in their home town. These sponsors agree to pay them so much a mile for every mile hiked during the Walk. Forty-two point five percent of the funds raised go to a domestic project, 42.5 percent goes to an overseas project, and 15 percent goes to the Freedom From Hunger Foundation to enlarge the nation's consciousness of the food crisis and deepen America's motivation to help. The projects to be supported are selected by the young people involved with the advice of the Foundation staff.

So far, these Walks have benefited such domestic causes as the United Tribes of North Dakota Development Corporation, the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Wild Rice Cultivation Co-op, the Mille Lacs Indian Reservation Project, the Southern Ute Community Action Program, a language improvement program for Mexican-Americans, several Child Day Care centers, a Community Center for an Inner-City Black Community and a Rural Mexican-American Community, and several consumer education and training programs. In other countries, the Walks for Development have aided food production and agricultural education projects in Dahomey, Ecuador, Liberia, Gabon, Madagascar, South Korea, and Peru. The Walks have also provided assistance to an irrigation project administered by the Meals for Millions Foundation in Peru and various agricultural development projects administered by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

To date, Walks have been held in Fargo and Grand Forks, North Dakota; Madison, Wisconsin; Duluth, Minnesota; Boulder, Colorado; Palm Springs, California; Eugene, Oregon; Hollywood, Florida, and Austin, Texas. Funds are still being collected, and the returns from the recent Walks in Austin, Texas and Hollywood, Florida (February 22) are not yet in. Nevertheless, these young people have already collected over $140,000.00!

How are these Walks received by the citizens of the communities where they are staged? Herschel Lashkowitz, Mayor of Fargo, North Dakota at the time of the Walk in that city said:

"I can state that the march was well planned and carefully executed and had the cooperation of the City officials of both Fargo, North Dakota and Moorehead, Minnesota. I also believe that it served to focus attention on the plight of those who are experiencing hunger and has a positive effect in reaching the minds and hearts of many people."

The Honorable Ben Boo, Mayor of Duluth, Minnesota was similarly enthused:

". . . I have never been so surprised or pleased with any project during my time in office. The program proved to be an exciting one for the teenagers and, indeed, even electrified the adults. We had no difficulty with control, had no injuries or damage and had a relatively small number of policemen patrolling the line of march.

"Our local teenagers were so proud of themselves and their success that similar programs are now being developed on a spontaneous note.

"Groups from various schools have already visited my office and suggested that they become involved in other civic endeavors.

". . . I have learned a real lesson in that a majority of our youngsters are dedicated to such programs and can be made proud of such accomplishments."

Lester E. Anderson, Mayor of Eugene, Oregon, wrote to the Students For Eighteen-Year-Old Vote Committee:

"Just recently I have had the opportunity to work closely with a group in Eugene involved in the "Walk for Development." It was just one more example of the great talent for work, organization, and obtaining results, based on a real interest in their community, held by most of our young citizens.

Governor Warren Knowles of Wisconsin personally sponsored a Walker in the Madison Walk:

"I feel it is especially significant that the young people of the Madison area have united in an effort to raise money for the hungry of the world. It shows that Madison teenagers *do care*. In my opinion, this walk is a constructive effort to show their interest and concern for the problems facing us today."

I wish to commend these young men and women all over America—and those who have planned with them and supported them—for this tremendous effort to do something constructive about the problems we face in this troubled age. I have been invited to be with the young people in Buffalo for the start of their Walk, and I take pride in identifying personally with this constructive program.

I think we need to be reminded that many times youth activity is not only useful, but, as demonstrated by the "Walks for Development," eminently dynamic and praiseworthy.

BACK TO SCHOOL FOR RETIRED PROFESSIONALS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, our physicians and psychiatrists have been telling us for some time that retirement too often brings with it retirement shock. The average retiree has to adjust to living on a much reduced income. But much more difficult is the psychological adjustment about which he knows little or nothing. He suddenly discovers what it means not to be engaged in productive work; not to have daily contact with work associates and friends; not to be involved. In a work- and youth-oriented society he learns what it means not to be needed, to lose status. Too often he finds himself cast off, and with nothing to keep him active; lonely and isolated.

A few years ago, Mr. Hyman Hirsch recognized the pitfalls of retirement for the professional man. He recognized that retirement for most came at a time of life when they were at the peak of their maturity and creativity; when they should be in a position to reap the harvest of a useful career. He saw it as a time of challenge, a time of educational opportunities. So in 1962 he founded the Institute for Retired Professionals in the New School of Social Research, and became full-time director in 1965. He received a bachelor of arts degree from the City College of New York, a master of arts in economics from New York University, and a doctor of laws from Fordham University. He gives us the benefit of some of his thoughts on the subject of a program for professional retirees in an interview published in the January 1969 issue of Geriatrics.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Retirement and the Individual of the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging, I ask unanimous consent that the article "Back-to-School Programs for Retired Professionals" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACK-TO-SCHOOL PROGRAMS FOR RETIRED PROFESSIONALS

Question to Hyman Hirsch, founder and director of the Institute for Retired Professionals: Mr. Hirsch, what do you think is the primary purpose of providing educational opportunities for persons who have retired from professional occupations?

Mr. HIRSCH. Any answers to retirement problems should take into account the person's former occupation, social status, and educational background. The composite picture of the senior citizen is a myth. The only thing all retired persons have in common is leisure time and the crux of the retirement problem is the creative use of this time. Unfortunately, most programs for the retired are merely stop-gaps and provide only diversions, such as arts and crafts, games, sports, and dancing. For the person of some education and skill, stop-gaps and diversions are not enough. I say that the answer to retirement leisure for the professional person is challenge. This type of person needs a chance for further development, for cultivating his mind, and for becoming a more skilled and more cultivated person than he was before.

Q. How does the Institute for Retired Professionals provide this challenge?

Mr. HIRSCH. Part of it is, of course, in the learning experience itself, because each semester the members take a regular course at the school and in addition attend as many of the forty groups or classes under the IRP program as they wish. More importantly, however, the institute members have the challenge of leadership.

Q. Do you mean leadership in the classroom?

Mr. HIRSCH. Partly. All discussion groups are conducted by the institute members themselves in a programmed manner. At the end of each academic year a list of topics to be discussed the following year is agreed upon by the group members, and individual members then volunteer to prepare papers on the topics or books for presentation. This is an aspect of leadership of vast importance to us. Another opportunity for leadership is within the framework of the institute's government.

Q. How does this framework operate?

Mr. HIRSCH. Even though the institute is part of the New School for Social Research, right from the beginning the development of the IRP program was left to the retirees themselves. The by-laws of IRP provide for a director, elected officers, and a council. From the onset the council has been not only a deliberative but an action group of retirees who are anxious to avoid the sterility of a governing body with a nonfunctioning membership.

Q. Has this democratic approach been successful?

Mr. HIRSCH. Definitely. I would say that self-leadership more than any other factor has been responsible for the institute's growth in six years from 65 to 500 members and from 5 to 40 discussion groups.

Q. What is the difference between traditional university courses and your groups?

Mr. HIRSCH. For adults, social relationships are of extreme importance. The usual course structure and lecture system offers little or no opportunity for socializing. The IRP continued learning groups function in a social climate. Discussions started in the classroom often carry over to the cafeteria as well as members' homes.

Q. Isn't the nation's present university structure adequate for retirees?

Mr. HIRSCH. No. The retired person returning to school does not need the same kind of school he attended forty years ago. This is not a return to second childhood and the old curricula won't do. The old concept of college only for the undergraduate and the young graduate must be abandoned and community needs reassessed.

Q. Haven't any universities made efforts to accommodate retired persons?

Mr. HIRSCH. We recently completed a study in which we learned that universities are doing very little during the day for older persons. Of course, I did not attempt to find out the courses offered in the evening or even those offered by community centers. However, the retired educated person's prime time is during the day and the prime locus is the university. As so many of us have suspected, universities have been notoriously negligent of community needs. Incidental courses now being offered to the community at large are useful, but they don't go far enough.

Q. Do you think that a university with an enrollment of two or three different generations would be successful?

Mr. HIRSCH. I may be idealistic, but I think this would be one way to close the generation gap, because all generations would meet on the basis of the pursuit of learning. As I've said, learning should not be restricted to youth, and there is mounting evidence that technology is preparing a world in which we will be life-long learners. To make our lives more meaningful we will have to recapture what George B. Leonard in *Look* (October 15, 1968) calls the "ecstasy of learning."

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, yesterday our Nation buried a great leader.

The flags are still at half-mast, but there is a strange sense of unreality about it all.

All Americans felt so close to President Eisenhower for so long, it is difficult to believe he is gone.

Of course, he is not gone in the real sense. His place in history and in the hearts of Americans is secure for all time.

We remember his brave leadership—his great contributions to his country in war and peace.

But we also remember his quick smile, his lack of pretense, his warm compassion, his special quality as a person.

He was a great leader, but above all he was a man of decency and good will.

He will be keenly missed, and our deepest sympathies are with Mrs. Eisenhower and the family.

But he will be remembered always as the prototype of the man of good will by people of all creeds and stations, the world over.

ADDRESS BY DR. GEORGE WALD

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, on March 4 a speech was delivered at the Kresge Auditorium of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology by Dr. George Wald, professor of biology at Harvard and 1968 recipient of the Nobel Prize for medicine. The occasion of the speech was a gathering of more than 1,000 scientists, students, and faculty who were demonstrating their concern over the increasing domination of scientific research and development by our Federal Government, particularly the Defense Establishment. Dr. Wald's speech was one of many delivered at what is known as the "March 4 movement," but his speech, above all, put into profound perspective the implications of a nation and a world whose principal tenets of government no longer seem to lie in the preservation, dignity, and well-being of mankind. Dr. Wald's extemporaneous speech raises basic questions about the priorities of our Nation and of governments throughout the world.

I recommend Dr. Wald's speech to anyone who feels, as I do, the pervading uneasiness and encompassing sense of fear which are becoming the basic characteristics of today's generation. We have become so completely absorbed in a frightening complex of misguided goals and misdirected power that we are in danger of neglecting our fundamental responsibility to preserve and enhance the life of every human being that inhabits this earth. As the Nobel Laureate has so forcefully stated:

> We've reached a point of great decision.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Dr. Wald's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GENERATION UNSURE THAT IT HAS A FUTURE

(By George Wald)

All of you know that in the last couple of years there has been student unrest breaking at times into violence in many parts of the world: in England, Germany, Italy, Spain, Mexico and, needless to say, in many parts of this country. There has been a great deal of discussion as to what it all means.

Perfectly clearly, it means something different in Mexico from what it does in France, and something different in France from what it does in Tokyo, and something different in Tokyo from what it does in this country. Yet unless we are to assume that students have gone crazy all over the world, or that they have just decided that it's the thing to do, there must be some common meaning.

I don't need to go so far afield to look for that meaning. I am a teacher, and at Harvard, I have a class of about 350 students—men and women—most of them freshmen and sophomores. Over these past few years I have felt increasingly that something is terribly wrong—and this year ever so much more than last. Something has gone sour, in teaching and in learning. It's almost as though there were a widespread feeling that education has become irrelevant.

A lecture is much more of a dialogue than many of you probably appreciate. As you lecture, you keep watching the faces, and information keeps coming back to you all the same. I began to feel, particularly this year, that I was missing much of what was coming back. I tried asking the students, but they didn't or couldn't help me very much.

But I think I know what's the matter, even a little better than they do. I think that this whole generation of students is beset with a profound uneasiness. I don't think they have yet quite defined its source. I think I understand the reasons for their uneasiness even better than they do. What is more, I share their uneasiness.

AN AMERICAN INVENTION

What's bothering those students? Some of them tell you it's the Vietnam war. I think the Vietnam war is the most shameful episode in the whole of American history.

The concept of war crimes is an American invention. We've committed many war crimes in Vietnam, but I'll tell you something interesting about that. We were committing war crimes in World War II, even before the Nuremberg trials were held and the principle of war crimes stated. The saturation bombing of German cities was a war crime, and if we had lost the war, some of our leaders might have had to answer for it.

I've gone through all of that history lately, and I find that there's a gimmick in it. It isn't written out, but I think we established it by precedent. That gimmick is that if one can allege that one is repelling or retaliating for an aggression—after that, everything goes.

And you see, we are living in a world in which all wars are wars of defense. All War Departments are now Defense Departments. This is all part of the double talk of our time. The aggressor is always on the other side.

And I suppose this is why our ex-Secretary of State, Dean Rusk—a man in whom repetition takes the place of reason and stubbornness takes the place of character—went to such pains to insist, as he still insists, that in Vietnam we are repelling an aggression. And if that's what we are doing—so runs the doctrine—anything goes.

If the concept of war crimes is ever to mean anything, they will have to be defined as categories of acts, regardless of provocation. But that isn't so now.

I think we've lost that war, as a lot of other people think, too. The Vietnamese have a secret weapon. It's their willingness to die beyond our willingness to kill. In effect, they've been saying, you can kill us, but you'll have to kill a lot of us, you may have to kill all of us. And thank heavens, we are not yet ready to do that.

Yet we have come a long way—far enough to sicken many Americans, far enough even to sicken our fighting men, far enough so that our national symbols have gone sour. How many of you can sing about "the rockets' red glare, bombs bursting in air" without thinking, those are our bombs and our rockets bursting over South Vietnamese villages?

When those words were written, we were a people struggling for freedom against oppression. Now we are supporting real or thinly disguised military dictatorships all over the world, helping them to control and repress peoples struggling for their freedom.

POSTWAR ABERRATIONS

But that Vietnam war, shameful and terrible as it is, seems to me only an immediate incident in a much larger and more stubborn situation.

Part of my trouble with students is that almost all the students I teach were born since World War II. Just after World War II, a series of new and abnormal procedures came into American life. We regarded them at the time as temporary aberrations. We thought we would get back to normal American life some day.

But those procedures have stayed with us now for more than 20 years, and those students of mine have never known anything else. They think those things are normal. They think we've always had a Pentagon, that we have always had a big army and that we always had a draft. But those are all new things in American life, and I think that they are incompatible with what America meant before.

How many of you realize that just before World War II, the entire American army, including the Air Force, numbered 139,000 men? Then World War II started, but we weren't yet in it; and seeing that there was great trouble in the world, we doubled this army to 268,000 men. Then in World War II, it got to be eight million.

And then World War II came to an end, and we prepared to go back to a peacetime army somewhat as the American army had always been before. And indeed in 1950—you think about 1950, our international commitments, the cold war, the Truman Doctrine and all the rest of it—in 1950 we got down to 600,000 men.

Now we have 3.5 million men under arms: about 600,000 in Vietnam, about 300,000 more in "support areas" elsewhere in the Pacific, about 250,000 in Germany. And there are a lot at home. Some months ago we were told that 300,000 National Guardsmen and 200,000 reservists had been specially trained for riot duty in the cities.

I say the Vietnam war is just an immediate incident, because so long as we keep that big an army, it will always find things to do. If the Vietnam war stopped tomorrow, with that big a military establishment, the chances are that we would be in another such adventure abroad or at home before you knew it.

As for the draft: Don't reform the draft—get rid of it.

A peacetime draft is the most un-American thing I know. All the time I was growing up, I was told about oppressive Central European countries and Russia, where young men were forced into the army, and I was told what they did about it. They chopped off a finger, or shot off a couple of toes; or better still, if they could manage it, they came to this country. And we understood that, and sympathized, and were glad to welcome them.

Now, by present estimates, 4000 to 6000 Americans of draft age have left this country for Canada, another 2000 or 3000 have gone to Europe and it looks as though many more are preparing to emigrate.

A few months ago, I received a letter from the Harvard Alumni Bulletin posing a series of questions that students might ask a professor involving what to do about the draft. I was asked to write what I would tell those students. All I had to say to those students was this: If any of them had decided to evade the draft and asked my help, I would help him in any way I could.

I would feel as I suppose members of the underground railway felt in pre-Civil War days, helping runaway slaves to get to Canada. It wasn't altogether a popular position then, but what do you think of it now?

A bill to stop the draft was recently introduced in the Senate (S. 503), sponsored by a group of Senators that ran the gamut from McGovern and Hatfield to Barry Goldwater. I hope it goes through; but any time I find that Barry Goldwater and I are in agreement, that makes one take another look.

And indeed, there are choices in getting rid of the draft. I think that when we get rid of the draft, we must also cut back the size of the armed forces. It seems to me that in peacetime a total of one million men is surely enough. If there is an argument for American military forces of more than one million men in peacetime, I should like to hear that argument debated.

There is another thing being said closely connected with this: that to keep an adequate volunteer army, one would have to raise the pay considerably. That's said so positively and often that people believe it. I don't think it is true.

The great bulk of our present armed forces are genuine volunteers. Among first-term enlistments, 49 per cent are true volunteers. Another 30 per cent are so-called "reluctant volunteers," persons who volunteer under pressure of the draft. Only 21 per cent are draftees. All re-enlistments, of course, are true volunteers.

So the great majority of our present armed forces are true volunteers. Whole services are composed entirely of volunteers: the Air Force, for example, the submarine service, the Marines. That seems like proof to me that present pay rates are adequate.

One must add that an act of Congress in 1967 raised the base pay throughout the services in three installments, the third installment still to come, on April 1, 1969. So it is hard to understand why we are being told that to maintain adequate armed services on a volunteer basis will require large increases in pay; they will cost an extra $17 billion per year. It seems plain to me that we can get all the armed forces we need as volunteers, and at present rates of pay.

But there is something ever so much bigger and more important than the draft. The bigger thing, of course, is what ex-President Eisenhower warned us of, calling it the military-industrial complex. I am sad to say that we must begin to think of it now as the military-industrial-labor union complex.

What happened under the plea of the cold war was not alone that we built up the first big peacetime army in our history, but we institutionalized it. We built, I suppose, the biggest government building in our history to run it, and we institutionalized it.

I don't think we can live with the present military establishment and its $80-100 billion a year budget and keep America anything like we have known it in the past. It is corrupting the life of the whole country. It is buying up everything in sight: industries, banks, investors universities, and lately it seems also to have bought up the labor unions.

The Defense Department is always broke; but some of the things they do with that $80 billion a year would make Buck Rogers envious. For example: the Rocky Mountain Arsenal on the outskirts of Denver was manufacturing a deadly nerve poison on such a scale that there was a problem of waste disposal. Nothing daunted, they dug a tunnel two miles deep under Denver, into which they have injected so much poisoned water that beginning a couple of years ago Denver began to experience a series of earth tremors of increasing severity.

Now there is a grave fear of a major earthquake. An interesting debate is in progress as to whether Denver will be safer if that lake of poisoned water is removed or left in place. (New York Times, July 4, 1968; Science, Sept. 27, 1968).

Perhaps you have read also of those 6000 sheep that suddenly died in Skull Valley, Utah, killed by another nerve poison—a strange and, I believe, still unexplained accident, since the nearest testing seems to have been 30 miles away.

As for Vietnam, the expenditure of fire power has been frightening. Some of you may still remember Khesanh, a hamlet just south of the Demilitarized Zone, where a force of U.S. Marines was beleaguered for a time. During that period, we dropped on the perimeter of Khesanh more explosives than fell on Japan throughout World War II, and more than fell on the whole of Europe during the years 1942 and 1943.

One of the officers there was quoted as having said afterward, "It looks like the world caught smallpox and died." (New York Times, March 28, 1968).

The only point of government is to safeguard and foster life. Our Government has become preoccupied with death, with the business of killing and being killed. So-called defense now absorbs 60 per cent of the national budget, and about 12 per cent of the gross national product.

THE FACTS OF DEATH

A lively debate is beginning again on whether or not we should deploy antiballistic missiles, the ABM. I don't have to talk about them; everyone else here is doing that. But I should like to mention a curious circumstance.

In September, 1967, or about 1½ years ago, we had a meeting of MIT and Harvard people, including experts on these matters, to talk about whether anything could be done to block the Sentinel system, the deployment of ABMs. Everyone present thought them undesirable, but a few of the most knowledgeable persons took what seemed to be the practical view, "Why fight about a dead issue? It has been decided, the funds have been appropriated. Let's go on from there."

Well, fortunately, it's not a dead issue.

An ABM is a nuclear weapon. It takes a nuclear weapon to stop a nuclear weapon. And our concern must be with the whole issue of nuclear weapons.

There is an entire semantics ready to deal with the sort of thing I am about to say. It involves such phrases as "those are the facts of life." No—these are the facts of death. I don't accept them, and I advise you not to accept them.

We are under repeated pressures to accept things that are presented to us as settled—decisions that have been made. Always there is the thought: Let's go on from there! But this time we don't see how to go on. We will have to stick with those issues.

We are told that the United States and Russia between them have by now stockpiles in nuclear weapons approximately the explosive power of 15 tons of TNT for every man, woman and child on earth. And now it is suggested that we must make more. All very regrettable, of course, but those are "the facts of life."

We really would like to disarm, but our new Secretary of Defense has made the ingenious proposal that one must be practical. Now is the time to greatly increase our nuclear armaments so that we can disarm from a position of strength.

I think all of you know there is no adequate defense against massive nuclear attack. It is both easier and cheaper to circumvent any known nuclear defense system than to provide it. It's all pretty crazy. At the very moment we talk of deploying ABMs, we are also building the MIRV, the weapon to circumvent ABMs.

THE DOOMED SURVIVORS

So far as I know, with everything working as well as can be hoped and all foreseeable precautions taken, the most conservative estimates of Americans killed in a major nuclear attack run to almost 50 million. We have become callous to gruesome statistics, and this seems at first to be only another gruesome statistic. You think, Bang!—and next morning, if you're still there, you read in the newspapers that 50 million people were killed.

But that isn't the way it happens. When we killed close to 200,000 people with those first little old-fashioned uranium bombs that we dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, about the same number of persons was maimed, blinded, burned, poisoned and otherwise doomed. A lot of them took a long time to die.

That's the way it would be. Not a bang, and a certain number of corpses to bury, but a nation filled with millions of helpless, maimed, tortured and doomed survivors huddled with their families in shelters, with guns ready to fight off their neighbors, trying to get some uncontaminated food and water.

* * * * *

How real is the threat of a full-scale nuclear war? I have my own very inexpert idea, but realizing how little I know and fearful that I may be a little paranoid on this subject, I take every opportunity to ask reputed experts. I asked that question of a very distinguished professor of government at Harvard about a month ago.

I asked him what sort of odds he would lay on the possibility of a full-scale nuclear war within the foreseeable future. "Oh," he said comfortably, "I think I can give you a pretty good answer to that question. I estimate the probability of full-scale nuclear war, provided that the situation remains about as it is now, at 2 per cent per year." Anybody can do the simple calculation that shows that 2 per cent per year means that the chance of having that full-scale nuclear war by 1990 is about one in three, and by 2000 it is about 50–50.

A DUBIOUS FUTURE

I think I know what is bothering the students. I think that what we are up against is a generation that is by no means sure that it has a future.

I am growing old, and my future, so to speak, is already behind me. But there are those students of mine who are in my mind always; there are my children, two of them now 7 and 9, whose future is infinitely more precious to me than my own. So it isn't just their generation; it's mine, too. We're all in it together.

Are we to have a chance to live? We don't ask for prosperity, or security; only for a reasonable chance to live, to work out our destiny in peace and decency, not to go down in history as the apocalyptic generation.

And it isn't only nuclear war. Another overwhelming threat is in the population explosion. That has not yet even begun to come under control.

There is every indication that the world population will double before the year 2000, and there is a widespread expectation of famine on an unprecedented scale in many parts of the world. The experts tend to differ only in their estimates of when those famines will begin. Some think by 1980; others think they can be staved off until 1990; very few expect that they will not occur by the year 2000.

That is the problem. Unless we can be surer than we now are that this generation has a future, nothing else matters. It's not good enough to give it tender loving care, to supply it with breakfast foods, to buy it expensive educations. Those things don't mean anything unless this generation has a future. And we're not sure that it does.

I don't think that there are problems of youth, or student problems. All the real problems I know are grownup problems.

Perhaps you will think me altogether absurd, or "academic," or hopelessly innocent—that is, until you think of the alternatives—if I say as I do to you now: We have to get rid of those nuclear weapons. There is nothing worth having that can be obtained by nuclear war: nothing material or ideological, no tradition that it can defend. It is utterly self-defeating.

Those atom bombs represent an unusable weapon. The only use for an atom bomb is to keep somebody else from using it. It can give us no protection, but only the doubtful satisfaction of retaliation. Nuclear weapons offer us nothing but a balance of terror, and a balance of terror is still terror.

We have to get rid of those atomic weapons, here and everywhere. We cannot live with them.

ALL ONE SPECIES

I think we've reached a point of great decision, not just for our Nation, not only for all humanity, but for life upon the Earth. I tell my students, with a feeling of pride that I hope they will share, that the carbon, nitrogen and oxygen that make up 99 per cent of our living substance were cooked in the deep interiors of earlier generations of dying stars.

Gathered up from the ends of the universe over billions of years, eventually they came to form in part the substance of our sun, its planets and ourselves. Three billion years ago, life arose upon the Earth. It seems to be the only life in the solar system. Many a star has since been born and died.

About two million years ago, man appeared. He has become the dominant species on the Earth. All other living things, animal and plant, live by his sufferance. He is the custodian of life on Earth. It's a big responsibility.

The thought that we're in competition with Russians or with Chinese is all a mistake, and trivial. Only mutual destruction lies that way. We are one species, with a world to win. There's life all over this universe, but we are the only men.

Our business is with life, not death. Our challenge is to give what account we can of what becomes of life in the solar system, this corner of the universe that is our home, and, most of all, what becomes of men—all men of all nations, colors and creeds.

It has become one world, a world for all men. It is only such a world that now can offer us life and the chance to go on.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) is in Cleveland today on official business. On his behalf, I ask unanimous consent that a statement with respect to the newly formed advisory council to the Subcommittee for Consumers of the Committee on Commerce be printed in the Record. The leadership Senator Moss, as chairman of the Consumers Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, will bring to this field will benefit every American and is welcome.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Frank E. Moss

Today, as the newly appointed Chairman of the Subcommittee for Consumers of the Committee on Commerce, I am taking additional and perhaps unprecedented steps to assure that the Subcommittee is *for* consumers. In our efforts to protect the rights of the American buying public, I am enlisting the dedicated support of five extraordinary consumer champions whose present and past efforts on behalf of the consumer make them uniquely qualified to advise my colleagues and me on consumer matters. The prominent Advisory Council I am appointing today bodes ill for those who prey on consumers, for who will be able to resist the force and persuasion of a consumer council composed of Esther Peterson, Betty Furness, Bess Myerson, Joseph Swidler and Dr. Henry Hill. Esther Peterson created and embodied the role of Consumer Adviser in the White House. Miss Furness was her dynamic successor. Bess Myerson, of course, known to all of us for her work in television, is now serving as Mayor John V. Lindsay's Consumer Consultant. Her dedication to the American consumer is longstanding. These three women bring to the Advisory Council a wealth of talent. Esther and Betty have served the nation as advisers to the President and Bess is presently serving the consumer interest in our nation's largest city.

The men on the Advisory Council are especially prominent and are persons whose professional interests have always considered the consumer. Dr. Henry Hill, a resident of Waltham, Massachusetts is currently President of the Riverside Research Laboratory and serves as a Commissioner on the National Commission on Product Safety. His technical competence and sincere dedication to the consumer's interest will add invaluably to the Consumer Council. Joseph Swidler was chairman of the Federal Power Commission where his vigilance on behalf of the consumer was notable. He is presently a prominent lawyer in Washington, D.C.

The Subcommittee for Consumers could have no better resource to advise the Committee members and give strength and voice to important consumer causes. The Advisory Council will aid the Committee in the formulation of issues which demand immediate legislative attention. Because they have access to the channels of communication which put them in touch with the American consumer, the Advisory group will help the Committee by presenting the consumer issues publicly.

The appointment of this Advisory Council may seem a rather novel approach to Congressional committee work. It is without direct precedent. But how many of us are daily visited by councils or associations representing interests other than consumers? It seems fitting to have a Consumer Advisory Council to put forth the consumer point of view with the same persuasiveness and fervor as do these other interest groups.

The Advisory Council will be in a unique position to protect a basic consumer fight—the right to be heard. By harkening to consumer complaints in their day-to-day activities, the Council will be able to inform the Committee as to the nature of consumer dissatisfaction. Information will flow from the consumer through the Council to the Committee and vice versa. Consumers will be heard—and they will receive answers.

THE LATIN AMERICAN CHALLENGE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on March 24 I placed in the RECORD five articles written by John M. Goshko, of the Washington Post, under the general title "The Latin American Challenge."

I have now received a letter from Hon. Hugo B. Margáin, the Ambassador of Mexico, taking issue with a paragraph of one of Mr. Goshko's articles concerning PEMEX, the Mexican Government's petroleum enterprise. Ambassador Margáin also enclosed a copy of a letter he wrote to the editor of the Washington Post commenting on this paragraph.

For the sake of completing the record, I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Margáin's letter to me as well as his letter to the editor of the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMBAJADOR DE MÉXICO,
Washington, March 26, 1969.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I have noticed that according to the Congressional Record for March 24, you requested that the five articles written by journalist John M. Goshko under the title of "The Latin American Challenge" in The Washington Post, be published.

As unfortunately, in referring to PEMEX, the writer mentioned made a statement that is completely erroneous, I sent a letter to The Washington Post in order to refute Mr. Goshko's statement. I am sending you a clipping from the March 26 issue of the Washington Post in which my letter was printed, as well as a copy of the complete text of the letter as I sent it, in which I have underlined in red a phrase which was omitted probably due to an error on the part of the linotypist.

If you do not have any objection, I would appreciate it if you would publish the text of my letter in the Congressional Record in order that the information regarding PEMEX be duly clarified.

I thank you in advance for your attention and send you my warm regards.

Sincerely yours,
HUGO B. MARGÁIN.

MARCH 13, 1969.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the article by journalist John M. Goshko which was published in your newspaper on March 11, there is a grave falsehood when refering to PEMEX, It states:

"Mexico's nationalization of the oil industry in 1938 provided the basis for the first important Latin oil monopoly, PEMEX. After 30 years, however, PEMEX has been a consistent money loser, riddled with graft and political patronage. It is quietly importing oil from Venezuela to meet domestic demand."

In 30 years Petróleos Mexicanos covered the full amount *of the petroleum debt and its interests, amounting* to 1,600 millions of Pesos (128 million Dollars) and has paid to the Federal Government and to that of the States, more than 17,000 millions of Pesos (1,360 million Dollars) to cover taxes.

It pays 12% of its gross income as taxes to the Federal Government and 2% also of its gross income, to the States.

For example, in 1967 it covered to the Federal Government 2,750,000 Pesos per day (220,000 Dollars) as advance payments on taxes, to be subsequently adjusted to the 12% figure.

Petróleos Mexicanos does not import crude oil from Venezuela nor from any other country. There was one single importation in 1964, due to an accident in one of our seaports.

This Institution, after covering taxes to the Federal Government and to the States has a profit of nearly 350 millions of Pesos per year (28 million Dollars), which does not include the reserves set aside for exploration expenses and depletion of fields, which is approximately double the amount mentioned.

Pemex had a reserve of 5,500,000,000 BBLS. of oil as of October 1968. Pemex's income from sales from October 1967 to October 1968 totalled 10 billion Pesos (800 million Dollars) of which 9,430,000,000 Pesos (754,400,000 Dollars) came from domestic sales and 570,000,000 Pesos (45,600,000 Dollars) was revenue from export sales.

Pemex has been a fundamental element in the economic development of Mexico, and its purpose has not been primarily that of making profits, but rather to cooperate in the industrial integration of the country and in its social development.

In the paragraph under comment, Mr. Goshko is in error.

Yours very truly,
HUGO B. MARGÁIN,
Ambassador of Mexico.

A TESTIMONIAL TO DR. HENRY B. NELSON

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a testimonial honoring Dr. Henry B. Nelson, dean of Sioux Empire College, Hawarden, Iowa, and pastor of the Big Springs Baptist Church, near Alcester, S. Dak. Dr. Nelson is leaving these positions to become pastor of the First Baptist Church, Cedar Falls, Iowa. At a recent celebration honoring Dr. Nelson, a testimony to him was delivered by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., president of Sioux Empire College. President Reuter's speech outlines the outstanding contributions which Dr. Henry Nelson has made to Christian education in the Midwest.

There being no objection, the testimonial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE THANK YOU DEAN NELSON

(By President George S. Reuter, Jr., Sioux Empire College)

INTRODUCTION

America has many privileges, but it also has great responsibilities, just as our freedom was obtained at great price. Our first responsibility is to God, but we are duty-bound to our beloved country. The Bible teaches patriotism, and patriotism was the light that burned in the hearts of the faithful in the midnight gloom of the dark ages. It was the torch that lighted the fires of the Reformation. It was the rock upon which the stones of Western civilization was founded. And if our civilization survives the onslaught of the Red scourge, it will be Christian patriotism that will fuel the lamps of truth, and provide moralè for the fight for freedom.

America stands today—a fortress of freedom. Loved by all free people. Respected by the liberty-loving peoples of the earth. Feared by the enemies of God and human liberty. And with the shadows of Communism deepening upon every continent America holds high the torch of faith and light and hope for the down-trodden peoples of the world. Yes, we should be grateful for our natural, industrial, and scientific resources with which we have been blessed. Because of our giving God His rightful place at the outset of our national life, God smiled, and gold poured from the rocky slopes of the Golden West. God smiled and wide acres of grain sprang from the soil of the Middle West. God smiled and the picturesque hills of the East yielded black gold in ample abundance to warm our hearths and turn the wheels of industry. God smiled and the automobile, the aero-plane, and a thousand and one industrial miracles took place before our very eyes. God smiled and has seen to it that Old Glory has never dipped her colors to any Atheistic, God-hating, man-enslaving country. God smiled and our scientists brought into being the atomic bomb, which is destined to be that paradoxical instrument of destruction to save men from destruction.

Yes, we live in times of both greatness and tragedy. Only a few weeks ago men for the first time moved out of the vast spaces where the pull of earth's gravity is strongest into the greater pull of another heavenly body, the moon. Three men orbited the moon ten times, then fired acceleration rockets and launched themselves back on the 240,000 mile voyage through space to a fiery re-entry into the earth's atmosphere. But there is also tragedy in our day. Crime is increasing at such an alarming rate that there are areas in most of our major cities where people dare not go at night. The world is not safe for democracy, and in spite of communication satellites, greater literacy, rapid universal air service, and all the other trappings of scientific achievement, human freedom is suppressed in many areas of the world and leads a precarious existence in other places.

GUIDEPOSTS

Dean Henry B. Nelson of Sioux Empire College has been honored many times and in many ways. Our college is young and the struggles have been great. One of our best influences for the past two years has been Professor Nelson. He has the vision of the founders of SECO and has expressed it often and wisely. The students, the faculty, the staff, the administration, the trustees, and the patrons owe him a deep debt of gratitude. I will attempt to review some of these principles as guideposts.

1. There is dignity in day-to-day progress whether the weather is fair or foul.

It is a striking phenomenon that more has been written about a current cancer, civil disobedience, in the last few years than in the entire period of American history which preceded it. But the nature of civil disobedience in the political democratic process has been radically misunderstood by many, and when these misunderstandings are applied to the academic world, the results border on the grotesque. Dean Nelson stresses mind over matter even though all of us have had an extremely difficult winter.

2. There is dignity in soberness regardless of the pressures of life.

Dean Nelson casts doubt on three well-accepted myths: that social drinking is a definable entity, that it is not harmful, and that it is helpful. He calls for a comprehensive objective study similar to the Surgeon General's report on smoking. If one looks down the row to the 15th person in an average audience, that person will be an alcoholic. If one counts down to the fifth person, this one's life will be adversely affected in one way or another by an alcoholic. If you now look at the intervening persons, the fourth will be an abstainer and the rest will drink varying amounts of liquor. Again, every fifth person will be a heavy drinker, and if the audience is composed of doctors, one in 100 will be lost to the profession because of drinking. Furthermore, an unknown number will be handicapped in their work because of drinking. SECO does not preach to her students but the proper teaching is ever present.

3. There is dignity in a balanced diet at college as well as at home.

Have you ever wondered about the health conditions at the time that Christ was born? History tells us that the average life expectancy was only 22 years. At the time of the Revolutionary War in America, we had gained 12 years in life expectancy. By 1900, it was up to 47 years and today it exceeds 70 years. It took about 1,860 years to gain 20 years in life expectancy, but during the last 10 years we were able to add more than 28 years on top of this. Dean Nelson often tells his students how lucky they are to have the Broughton Food Service to provide balanced meals three times a day as diet and health go hand-in-hand.

4. There is dignity for all concerned in being a part of a small college.

The idea that an educational experience is only acquisition of knowledge, a form of social and private capital to be received like an injection, the sheer weight of the numbers of people who must have more knowledge than they can gain in high schools has released forces that work against the interests of students from small high schools in Iowa, South Dakota, and the nation. SECO is here to help these students to adjust successfully to college life. If a student will go to SECO two years, he will have the necessary foundation to transfer and be graduated two years later in his chosen field from a senior college or university. To date, students have not lost a single hour in transferring to senior colleges and universities. Students have transferred credit to Abilene Christian College, Northwestern College of Iowa, Sioux Falls College, University of Northern Iowa, University of South Dakota, Wisconsin State University at Whitewater, Central College of Iowa, South Dakota State University, Indiana State University at Terre Haute, Southwest Minnesota State College, Northwest Missouri State College, Westmar College, Morningside College, Briar Cliff College, and Virginia Wesleyan College. Dean Nelson counsels the students to go the entire two years before they transfer so as to insure they will succeed the final two years, but there are always those who desire to transfer too soon and this is often fatal to the weaker student. Also, a student can save enough going to SECO for two years to pay for his final two years at the state university.

CONCLUSIONS

Fate has brought Dean Henry B. Nelson to SECO at a most critical time. He has stood foursquare. On one side, the forces of good have been gathering momentum for two years. SECO reflecting science and industry is a part of the educational process that is threatening to banish hunger and pain and injustice and the other age-old enemies of mankind from the face of the earth. On the other side, is the Herculean task we all face to put to confusion the forces of evil, and at the same time to maintain the onward surge of the good. One recalls the Greek philosopher's words "Before Virtue the immortal gods have put the sweat of man's brow, and long and steep is the way to it, and rugged at the first," and the view of the future as seen by Ibsen: "I hold that man is in the right who is most closely in league with the future."

Dean Henry B. Nelson, praise the Lord for your services here. We thank you Doctor Nelson!

UAW SUPPORT FOR SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to report to Senators the new, strong statement of support for Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore by the United Automobile Workers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a position paper on this important issue which I have recently received from the UAW. This statement, expressing the views of the UAW, comes from the energetic director of that organization's department of conservation and resource development, Miss Olga Madar.

There are two parts of this statement I wish to emphasize in particular. The first is the clear statement of fundamental principle on which the UAW bases its support for my Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore bill, S. 1023. They phrase this principle as follows:

> The American landscape must be treated as a common heritage, benefiting all of the people with its scenic beauty and refreshment. This is a fundamental principle inherent in our democratic ideals.

As Miss Madar points out, this fundamental principle is especially important as applied to "the unique and spectacular beauty spots that hold a special meaning for our people." Sleeping Bear is indeed such a place: a glorious corner of creation.

It is to preserve this spot of special beauty and public value that the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore proposal has been drafted. I welcome this strong support of the United Automobile Workers.

Let me call attention, secondly, to the UAW's explanation of why this Sleeping Bear Dunes area requires prompt conservation and protection as a National Lakeshore:

> Special attention is necessary because our children's children, more than we, will need to know that the American continent has beauty as well as grime, natural diversity as well as development. In their urban lives, more than in ours, places of quiet, greenery and peace will be sorely needed.

In welcoming this support from the United Automobile Workers, I take this opportunity to again express my anxiety that Congress address itself promptly to this issue. The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore proposal is a first priority conservation measure before Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The American landscape must be treated as a common heritage, benefiting all of the people with its scenic beauty and refreshment. This is a fundamental principle inherent in our democratic ideals.
>
> This principle applies especially to those unique and superlative areas of the American landscape which are identified as being of national significance because of their outstanding scenic values.
>
> Sleeping Bear Dunes is such an area. In 1959 the National Park Service, as a result of its Great Lakes Shoreline Recreation Area Survey, defined the Sleeping Bear Dunes area along the Lake Michigan shore as a "paramount" remaining public recreation opportunity.
>
> Since 1961 legislation has been before the Congress to establish a unit of our National Park System to protect the Sleeping Bear Dunes area as a special landscape and as a public recreational opportunity for all the people.
>
> The United Automobile Workers have consistently supported this legislative concept and urged its priority enactment in the public interest.
>
> In our testimony to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in 1963 we pointed out that—
>
> ". . . . the primary considerations in determining whether or not a national lakeshore should be established . . . . are the scenic, scientific and recreational features which are of national significance and of benefit to the people of this entire nation, now and in the future."
>
> There is no dispute, nor could there be, that the magnificently scenic Sleeping Bear Dunes area meets these criteria. The area has justly been called by Senator Philip A. Hart "a glorious corner of creation." It fully deserves Congressman James O. O'Hara's description as a "legacy of the unspoiled Great Lakes scene."
>
> The question now, as we of the United Automobile Workers see it, is whether the National Lakeshore will be established promptly, or whether further delay will allow the heedless destruction of the scenic, scientific and recreational features of the Sleeping Bear Dunes.
>
> We are not prepared to accept further delay unmoved, for we are aware of the very great and alarmingly increasing pressures which threaten this unique landscape. We are finding, here as so many other places, that our American landscape can be rapidly desecrated—for the profits of a few—while good men look the other way or lose themselves in other concerns. We are not satisfied with that situation.
>
> In 1965 Walter P. Reuther was privileged to attend the White House Conference on Natural Beauty. The United Automobile Workers has taken a great and continuing interest in that field. As he said during the Conference:
>
> "This conference is about how a free society, within its value system, can harness the rising star of science and technology to provide the higher and higher levels of economic abundance, but also use that abundance consistent with basic human values to satisfy both man's material needs and the needs of the human spirit."
>
> This, we believe is also what the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore proposal is all about.
>
> We need nothing less than a massive campaign to protect and preserve the beauty and character of our great American landscape in every area, along every roadside, and in every city.
>
> But we also need to give special attention to our special places—to the unique and spectacular beauty spots that hold a special meaning for our people. Sleeping Bear Dunes is such a place. Sleeping Bear Dunes requires such attention.
>
> Special attention is necessary because it is just these beauty spots which most quickly attract the speculators and developers, those whose personal gain blinds them to the public good.
>
> Special attention is necessary because our children's children, more than we, will need to know that the American continent has beauty as well as grime, natural diversity as well as development. In their urban lives, more than in ours, places of quiet, greenery and peace will be sorely needed.
>
> And this is why, for the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore proposal, we are not prepared to accept further delay. We

believe enactment of this legislation is urgently needed now.

We believe that S. 1023 and H.R. 4287 represent a reasonable approach. Great effort has been made, through the past eight years, to refine this legislation to protect the rights and interests of the local people.

Now, we believe, it is time to give an equal effort to protect the rights of all the people—and we do feel that all of the people have a right to know the scenic beauty and scientific fascinations of the Sleeping Bear Dunes. Future generations share that right—and we are obliged to protect it in their name.

For these reasons—and because the hour is very late—the United Automobile Workers urges prompt action by the Congress to immediately authorize the establishment of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. To that end we pledge our full efforts.

JOE E. MOODY, ABLE PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, we were sorry to learn recently that the General Services Administration will no longer have the experience and ability of an outstanding career public servant from Missouri, Mr. Joe E. Moody.

Although still a relatively young man, Mr. Moody retired last month as Deputy Administrator of the General Services Administration after 34 years of distinguished Government service.

A native of Macon County, Mo., Mr. Moody advanced through the ranks working in the General Accounting Office, the War Assets Administration, and, since its organization in 1949, with the General Services Administration. It is regrettable that his services are now lost to the agency where he has contributed so much since 1949, but we wish him well in his future activity as he enters private practice of law.

I ask unanimous consent to have the press release announcing Mr. Moody's retirement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GSA NEWS RELEASE, MARCH 24, 1969

Joe E. Moody has retired as Deputy Administrator of General Services after 34 years of Federal service.

Moody, who was born (9–26–14) in Macon County, Missouri, started his Government service in 1935. A lawyer, he served in administrative and legal positions with the General Accounting Office and the War Assets Administration before joining the newly-created General Services Administration in 1949.

Moody had served on the committee established to organize the new agency and later played a leading role in the formulation of recommendations for the Public Buildings Act of 1959—the modern charter adopted for the Federal Government's public buildings construction program.

His early years in GSA were spent in the General Counsel's Office. He then transferred to the Public Buildings Service where he rose to the rank of Assistant Commissioner. In 1961 he was appointed Commissioner of GSA's new Utilization and Disposal Service which since has become the Property Management and Disposal Service.

He was General Counsel of GSA from late 1962 until his appointment as Deputy Administrator of the agency in September of 1965.

Moody, who lives in Kensington, Md., intends to enter private law practice in Washington. He is married to the former Marion Walkley and they have a son, Michael.

EISENHOWER'S FAREWELL ADDRESS RECALLED

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, for the past week our Nation has paid tribute to Dwight David Eisenhower—a man who led his Nation in war and guided it along the paths of peace; a man of arms whose greatest concern was their elimination.

On January 17, 1961, President Eisenhower delivered to the American people his farewell address. The words he spoke at that time represent a confluence of the ideas he so deeply felt both as general and President. They are even more meaningful today than they were at the time they were spoken for, I fear, we have been derelict in heeding them.

Many agree that President Eisenhower's farewell address was his greatest gift to the American people. With that thought in mind, I ask unanimous consent that it be republished in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAREWELL RADIO AND TELEVISION ADDRESS TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, JANUARY 17, 1961

(Delivered from the President's Office at 8:30 p.m.)

My fellow Americans: Three days from now, after half a century in the service of our country, I shall lay down the responsibilities of office as, in traditional and solemn ceremony, the authority of the Presidency is vested in my successor.

This evening I come to you with a message of leave-taking and farewell, and to share a few final thoughts with you, my countrymen.

Like every other citizen, I wish the new President, and all who will labor with him, Godspeed. I pray that the coming years will be blessed with peace and prosperity for all.

Our people expect their President and the Congress to find essential agreement on issues of great moment, the wise resolution of which will better shape the future of the Nation.

My own relations with the Congress, which began on a remote and tenuous basis when, long ago, a member of the Senate appointed me to West Point, have since ranged to the intimate during the war and immediate postwar period, and, finally, to the mutually interdependent during these past eight years.

In this final relationship, the Congress and the Administration have, on most vital issues, cooperated well, to serve the national good rather than mere partisanship, and so have assured that the business of the Nation should go forward. So, my official relationship with the Congress ends in a feeling, on my part, of gratitude that we have been able to do so much together.

II

We now stand ten years past the midpoint of a century that has witnessed four major wars among great nations. Three of these involved our own country. Despite these holocausts America is today the strongest, the most influential and most productive nation in the world. Understandably proud of this pre-eminence, we yet realize that America's leadership and prestige depend, not merely upon our unmatched material progress, riches and military strength, but on how we use our power in the interests of world peace and human betterment.

III

Throughout America's adventure in free government, our basic purposes have been to keep the peace; to foster progress in human achievement, and to enhance liberty, dignity and integrity among people and among nations. To strive for less would be unworthy of a free and religious people. Any failure traceable to arrogance, or our lack of comprehension or readiness to sacrifice would inflict upon us grevious hurt both at home and abroad.

Progress toward these noble goals is persistently threatened by the conflict now engulfing the world. It commands our whole attention, absorbs our very beings. We face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. To meet it successfully, there is called for, not so much the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle—with liberty the stake. Only thus shall we remain, despite every provocation, on our charted course toward permanent peace and human betterment.

Crises there will continue to be. In meeting them, whether foreign or domestic, great or small, there is a recurring temptation to feel that some spectacular and costly action could become the miraculous solution to all current difficulties. A huge increase in newer elements of our defense; development of unrealistic programs to cure every ill in agriculture; a dramatic expansion in basic and applied research—these and many other possibilities, each possibly promising in itself, may be suggested as the only way to the road we wish to travel.

But each proposal must be weighed in the light of a broader consideration: the need to maintain balance in and among national programs—balance between the private and the public economy, balance between cost and hoped for advantage—balance between the clearly necessary and the comfortably desirable; balance between our essential requirements as a nation and the duties imposed by the nation upon the individual; balance between actions of the moment and the national welfare of the future. Good judgment seeks balance and progress; lack of it eventually finds imbalance and frustration.

The record of many decades stands as proof that our people and their government have, in the main, understood these truths and have responded to them well, in the face of stress and threat. But threats, new in kind or degree, constantly arise. I mention two only.

IV

A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

Our military organization today bears little relation to that known by any of my predecessors in peacetime, or indeed by the fighting men of World War II or Korea.

Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armament industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But now we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in the defense establishment. We annually spend on military security more than the net income of all United States corporations.

This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every State house, every office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. This potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

Akin to, and largely responsible for the sweeping changes in our industrial-military posture, has been the technological revolution during recent decades.

In this revolution, research has become central; it also becomes more formalized, complex, and costly. A steadily increasing share is conducted for, by, or at the direction of, the Federal government.

Today, the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers.

The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present—and is gravely to be regarded.

Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

It is the task of statesmanship to mold, to balance, and to integrate these and other forces, new and old, within the principles of our democratic system—ever aiming toward the supreme goals of our free society.

V

Another factor in maintaining balance involves the element of time. As we peer into society's future, we—you and I, and our government—must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering, for our own ease and convenience, the precious resources of tomorrow. We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow.

VI

Down the long lane of the history yet to be written America knows that this world of ours, ever growing smaller, must avoid becoming a community of dreadful fear and hate, and be, instead, a proud confederation of mutual trust and respect.

Such a confederation must be one of equals. The weakest must come to the conference table with the same confidence as do we, protected as we are by our moral, economic, and military strength. The table, though scarred by many past frustrations, cannot be abandoned for the certain agony of the battlefield.

Disarmament, with mutual honor and confidence, is a continuing imperative. Together we must learn how to compose differences, not with arms, but with intellect and decent purpose. Because this need is so sharp and apparent I confess that I lay down my official responsibilities in this field with a definite sense of disappointment. As one who has witnessed the horror and the lingering sadness of war—as one who knows that another war could utterly destroy this civilization which has been so slowly and painfully built over thousands of years—I wish I could say tonight that a lasting peace is in sight.

Happily, I can say that war has been avoided. Steady progress toward our ultimate goal has been made. But, so much remains to be done. As a private citizen, I shall never cease to do what little I can to help the world advance along that road.

VII

So—in this my last good night to you as your President—I thank you for the many opportunities you have given me for public service in war and peace. I trust that in that service you find some things worthy; as for the rest of it, I know you will find ways to improve performance in the future.

You and I—my fellow citizens—need to be strong in our faith that all nations, under God, will reach the goal of peace with justice. May we be ever unswerving in devotion to principle, confident but humble with power, diligent in pursuit of the Nation's great goals.

To all the peoples of the world, I once more give expression to America's prayerful and continuing aspiration:

We pray that peoples of all faiths, all races, all nations, may have their great human needs satisfied; that those now denied opportunity shall come to enjoy it to the full; that all who yearn for freedom may experience its spiritual blessings; that those who have freedom will understand, also, its heavy responsibilities; that all who are insensitive to the needs of others will learn charity; that the scourges of poverty, disease and ignorance will be made to disappear from the earth, and that, in the goodness of time, all peoples will come to live together in a peace guaranteed by the binding force of mutual respect and love.

CIVIL RIGHTS CONCERN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, five Senators—all members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—have written to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Finch to express their concern about the administration of the school desegregation program under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I share the concern of our colleagues and wish to associate myself with the position expressed in their letter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and a press release describing the contents of the letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

March 25, 1969.

Hon. Robert H. Finch,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: As supporters of the basic principle underlying Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—that Federal tax revenues collected from all Americans should not be used to support programs of activities which discriminate against some Americans—we are concerned about the way in which the Title VI school desegregation program will be implemented in the future. We believe you share our commitment to equality of opportunity, but we are concerned about the statements attributed to you in the March 10th issue of a national magazine, and the interpretations being applied to those statements.

Our concerns have been heightened by articles appearing in last Sunday's newspapers with titles such as "Finch Aide Urges Eased Guidelines." We are disturbed to learn that you are being advised to relax the school desegregation guidelines, and advised to relax them in a furtive and quiet manner. In our judgement, these guidelines accurately reflect the law of the land, and should be implemented openly and honestly.

Because of the confusion which now seems to exist in many parts of the country—particularly the South—about how this Administration plans to proceed in the school desegregation program, we urge that you issue a statement clarifying your intent. We urge you to make clear the commitment of the Administration to implement this program firmly and fairly in accordance with the existing school desegregation policies and consistent with the decisions of the Federal courts. We believe it would be unfair and unfortunate to change the existing requirements under which hundreds of schools are now desegregating.

Finally, Mr. Secretary, we hope that you will receive this letter in the same constructive spirit in which it is intended. We want to support you in the firm and fair enforcement of the Title VI compliance program. We believe, however, that a statement from you affirming your support for the program would help immensely to clear the air.

Sincerely,

Walter F. Mondale,
U.S. Senator.
Harrison Williams,
U.S. Senator.
Thomas Eagleton,
U.S. Senator.
Alan Cranston,
U.S. Senator.
Harold Hughes,
U.S. Senator.

In a letter made public today, five members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee urged HEW Secretary Finch to implement existing school desegregation guidelines "firmly and fairly."

Expressing their concern "about the way in which the Title VI school desegregation program will be implemented in the future" were Senators Mondale (D-Minn.), Williams (D-N.J.), Eagleton (D-Mo.), Cranston (D-Calif.) and Hughes (D-Iowa).

The Senators said "we believe you share our commitment to equality of opportunity, but we are concerned about the statements attributed to you in the March 10th issue of a national magazine . . . and by articles appearing in last Sunday's newspapers with titles such as "Finch Aide Urges Eased Guidelines."

Further, they stated in their letter, "in our judgment, these guidelines accurately reflected the law of the land," and "we believe it would be unfair and unfortunate to change the existing requirements under which hundreds of schools are now desegregating."

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.—TRIBUTE BY SENATOR GOODELL

Mr. SCOTT. On behalf of the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. Goodell), who is absent from the Senate on official business, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a tribute by him to the memory of Martin Luther King, Jr., on the anniversary of Dr. King's assassination.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tribute by Senator Charles E. Goodell to Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Memory on the Anniversary of His Assassination

April 4th marks the first anniversary of the physical death of Martin Luther King, Jr.

It is a time of sadness . . . it is a time of solemnity . . . it is a time of prayer . . . it is a time of dedication.

It is a time for all America to say "We share the dream."

What greater tribute could we pay to the humane thoughts of this gentle and valiant man than to show by actions rather than words that his immortal phrases have a place in our hearts.

One year has passed since Dr. King's assassination. In the days immediately following this tragedy, there occurred an immense shock reaction. People on all sides and of every color and in every walk of life bestirred their moral consciousness and pledged that this man shall not have died in vain.

Mrs. King recently said that she noted more awareness and understanding since her husband's death and that he has become even greater in death than he was in life.

Let us hope that this greatness continues to grow but let us also remember that it can only grow by our own efforts. We can and must make more rapid progress toward the ultimate fulfillment of Martin Luther King's dream.

Perhaps the coincidence of this anniversary falling on Good Friday will serve as a forceful reminder that Martin Luther King was more than a pulpit preacher of the principles of the Prince of Peace; he was a devout follower of those principles in every thought and deed.

His credo of non-violence was in fact a paraphrasing of the words of 2000 years ago spoken on the Mount, "Bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you."

How fitting it is that we devote a portion of our thoughts on this Good Friday to a beautiful human being, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.

I believe that April 4th in each year should be set aside not only as a day of special prayer of a few for Dr. King, but of special meditation by all the American people.

This day should serve as a rededication day to the principles that this nation rests upon; that "all men are created equal" and every man has an equal "right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

HIRING THE DISADVANTAGED

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, much has been said recently about the need to involve private industry to help the disadvantaged. I am pleased to report that some of this very worthwhile work is already underway in my State. An article published in the February–March 1969 issue of Manpower entitled "How Honeywell Took the JOBS Program to Heart," describes the efforts of one Minnesota firm. I am familiar with the work Honeywell is doing, particularly in regard to the Bryant Junior High School Learning Center. More of this very useful cooperation between private business and Government is needed if we are successfully to meet the challenges facing our country.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW HONEYWELL TOOK THE JOBS PROGRAM TO HEART

(By G. E. Morse, Vice President for Employee Relations, Honeywell, Inc.)

"We believe that it is vital to the successful conduct of business and to the long-range national welfare to promote economic, social, and educational equity for all citizens. Accordingly, all Honeywell employees are recruited, hired, trained, assigned, promoted, transferred, downgraded, laid off, recalled, and terminated based on their own abilities, achievement, and experience, without regard to race, color, creed, sex, or economic status."

With this policy statement on equal employment opportunity, Honeywell, Inc. publicly recognized the interaction between the social needs and the economic needs of all segments of American society.

Early in March 1968, shortly after announcement of the formation of the National Alliance of Businessmen (NAB), I told location managers across the Nation of Honeywell's intention to extend full cooperation to Alliance projects aimed at implementing the permanent employment of disadvantaged Americans.

Our managers responded positively. For example, in Minneapolis this resulted in a total commitment to NAB of 629 permanent jobs for the hard-core unemployed and an additional commitment of 483 summer jobs for disadvantaged youth. As of October 1, 1968, approximately 550 permanent jobs had been filled, and about 400 summer placements had been made.

The efforts at Honeywell are assisted by $2.1 million in U.S. Department of Labor funds provided under eight contracts through the Job Opportunities in the Business Sector (JOBS) Program. Five of the contracts are for projects conducted by the firm in Denver, Los Angeles, Tampa, and St. Petersburg. The remaining three contracts have provided nearly $1.6 million for projects in the Minneapolis area.

While Honeywell management recognizes that immediate employment for the disadvantaged minorities is important, it also recognizes that the roots of the problem lie deeper. Sensitivity training courses have been conducted for our supervisory personnel in an effort to improve the probability of success for the hiring programs.

Extensive use of the knowledge and experience of those intimate with the problems of the poor is being made in Honeywell's "awareness-sensitivity" programs. The programs include audio and video tapes made by and with the local offices of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Concentrated Employment Program, other agencies, and our own firm.

One of our plant managers in Minneapolis says. "This program is for real. We are going to make a success of it. The story is, we are going to develop all of our people into 100 percent performers, regardless of where they come from, and our supervisors will be expected to make it work.

"In years to come, I'm sure we'll see many of these people as some of the finest, most loyal employees we have, and we'll wonder why it took us so long to wake up."

Once industrially inexperienced persons have been identified and hired, some go directly on the job and others begin a 6-week orientation and skills training program conducted at Honeywell's downtown Minneapolis plant. Those employed under this program—"Operation Passport"—are paid a starting wage of $2.10 per hour, which is increased to $2.15 when they move from the training program into a factory position.

"Operation Passport" is run on a flexible basis responsive to the needs of the students—and to the needs of the Honeywell employees with whom the students will be working. The course matter of the "school" is in two parts. Orientation, which covers the relaxation of tension and motivation and familiarization with the company; and skills training, which acquaints the newcomers with the operation of power tools, soldering techniques, and other basic skills that are required on the job. At "Operation Passport," roughly 1 hour per day is devoted to orientation and discussion, and 7 hours per day to on-the-job skills training.

On graduation from "Operation Passport," employees are assigned only to Honeywell supervisors who have taken the company's sensitivity-awareness course. This new program has trained 79 employees for Honeywell plants in the Minnesota area.

Recognizing that traveling to work and returning home often pose seemingly insurmountable problems for these new employees, Honeywell appointed a full-time transportation coordinator in the Minneapolis area. One of the first things the coordinator did was to issue 12,000 questionnaires to Honeywell Twin Cities factory employees, asking them if they would be willing to assist their fellow employees living in or near their neighborhoods to get to work. In addition to the approximately 800 car pools the employees operate in the Minneapolis area, more than 200 other employees offered to participate in the program. The coordinator has also worked with the Twin Cities Rapid Transit company to get bus schedules changed and routes altered to provide public transportation for employees who do not drive.

In a move to motivate and assist needy youth in the Minneapolis area to continue their education, a joint task force consisting of three Honeywell executives and two teachers and a counselor from two Minneapolis core-city schools was formed to determine what the firm could do to cooperate with Minneapolis schools in support of education.

Before presenting its report, the task force met more than a dozen times to examine various possibilities for Honeywell and core-city school cooperation.

A Honeywell personnel employee who is also a former educator was assigned last May the full-time responsibility of manager of educational relations and a number of educational projects involving financial and manpower assistance from Honeywell have begun.

In cooperation with the Minneapolis School Board, Honeywell is cosponsoring the Bryant Junior High School Learning Center. The center, housed in the Minneapolis Junior Achievement Building, adjacent to Honeywell's general offices, is a new concept in education. One of two such centers in the United States, it was established to encourage junior high school students to stay in school and to give them some insight into the world of work. Its objectives are not only to give the students academic and vocational training, but also to relieve some of their many social problems. Minneapolis school teachers administer the program. Honeywell's contributions have taken the form of cash donations, equipment gifts, and the provision of consultants.

Through the Central High School Computer Program, Honeywell has provided computer equipment and is advising the school in the use of the computer as a teaching aid in a number of subjects. The company also conducts computer technology seminars for teachers and hires a number of teachers during the summer months to increase their knowledge of computer science.

Clinton Elementary School, adjacent to Honeywell's general offices, has received assistance during the past year in the form of guided tours and staff consultation, in addition to monetary help. We hope to strengthen our working ties with Clinton school next year.

Honeywell maintains contact with 17 government and community agencies involved in urban problems. We have added to our employment staff and have given specific training to our recruiters.

Active recruitment in community centers proved essential for us to reach the disadvantaged. The use of a recruiting van and the addition of employment staff people—white, Negro, and Indian—who relate effectively to the poor helped to establish greater credibility with the disadvantaged communities. In making our recruiting aggressive, we found it first was necessary to convince the hard-core that Honeywell was really willing to hire people with problems. Only then did applicants begin to respond.

We have eliminated old hiring criteria and have established more realistic ones. We no longer require a high school diploma. We slot people who are unable to read or write into jobs which do not require literacy. We used to reject automatically any applicant with a police record. Today we look to see what is in the record and what's in the man.

Employment procedures were streamlined by the use of a referral card system instead of the typical detailed application form. Offers of employment have been made and accepted without testing, reference checking, or criminal record investigations. Greater medical risks were accepted.

We thoroughly explained our training programs to the applicants to help overcome their fear of what work might be like and help them recognize their ability to succeed.

Special attention was given to keeping appointments on time with all applicants and particularly with those who were escorted by outside agency people. Nothing frightens away an already apprehensive applicant as surely as keeping him waiting.

Through a cooperative program with the Minneapolis public school system, employees who have not completed the eighth grade can receive 4 hours a day of elementary school work. This in-plant program is offered to those who need and will profit from further fundamental education in their efforts to become a more productive part of the labor force.

Special training is provided for those who do not have a successful work history, who are not familiar with the world of work, or who have no salable skills. During this period, trainees are on full pay. The program includes skill training and job orientation to introduce trainees into the work environment. Some 75 percent of those originally enrolled in the program have completed the training period. And of those who have completed their training, 72 percent stayed on their jobs as permanent employees.

We have found that once disadvantaged employees are on the job, counseling is an effective way to keep our retention rate up and to help the employee become a productive worker quickly. Counselors help employees adapt to their jobs by consulting with them on personal problems—problems which may show themselves on the job but not necessarily have their cause in the job itself.

In helping employees with financial problems, counselors frequently work through community agencies, such as the Legal Aid Society, and arrange credit plans for payment of an employee's debts. This often helps the employee avoid the discouraging experience of a flood of garnishments on assorted past debts just at the time when he earns his first real pay check.

Another vital element in motivation is evidence of an ability to distinguish between good performance and bad. The disadvantaged seek first-class citizenship. They strive for a real job, not a sham. Once their initial disadvantage is offset, therefore, they expect to be subject to the same production and quality standards and the same work rules and conditions as every other employee. Then, if they make it, they stay and hopefully advance. If they don't make it, they are fired. Any different approach makes the whole effort a farce, a handout, and a degrading experience.

In living up to the spirit and the letter of our pledge as an equal opportunity employer, we hired 871 minority people in our Minneapolis plants and offices last year. In the factory area, 20 percent of all the people we hired last year were minority members. Throughout our Minneapolis operations, 865—4.1 percent—of our employees are members of minority groups, almost double our company's minority population of a year ago. These figures, incidentally, do not include the 376 needy youths of all races hired for the summer by our Minneapolis plants and offices.

These examples are only a sample of the kinds of programs U.S. management is using in the fight against deprivation. Management is cognizant of its responsibility and is committed to accomplishment. Potentially capable but previously underutilized people must be hired, must be made productive, must be helped to earn and to participate in our economic system.'

This is a costly undertaking for business. Legislation has been enacted which will help to defray expenses of special employment programs—but half or more of the cost we face will have to be borne by the companies themselves.

This is a risk venture. There will be failures. We must expect that some people will be in a program for weeks or months and then resign and be lost to us. We have to recognize that entire programs may be planned, set up, and put into operation only to be washed out as earnest but misguided attempts. U.S. business management faces this risk investment in the spirit of pioneering that is traditional in American industry. We are prepared to accept the inevitable disappointments, yet continue to work toward success and the rewards it promises for our whole society.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, historians, gifted writers, heads of government, and others have said and will continue to say many fine things about General Eisenhower. General Eisenhower merits all of these praises. I cannot attemt to compete with what others have so well said about this distinguished soldier, President, and citizen.

Mr. President, I speak, however, as a Senator from Nebraska to have the Record show the high esteem, the great affection, and the profound respect that the people of the State of Nebraska had for our 34th President.

For many years writers who are qualified in the field of military strategy will find a rich source of material in studying the career of Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower. He was a soldier and a leader of men who now has taken his place with the greatest of men down through the recorded period of history.

When General Eisenhower was serving as President of the United States I thought that he was a good, wise, and just head of our Government. Somehow the qualities and accomplishments that are of real value grow as time goes on. While always a supporter of President Eisenhower, my high appraisal, my respect, and my admiration for his performance in the Office of President increased as years pass. One of the tests of greatness is that it stands the test of time. President Eisenhower was not merely another President, whose memory will fade with the years. His record as President stands out with greater brightness every passing day.

When a problem was presented to President Eisenhower, the whole world knew that it would be approached honestly, forthrightly, and intelligently. People everywhere knew that the problem would be considered in the light of the historic, religious, political and economic traditions of our country. They knew that the problem would be viewed by a man whose vast storehouse of knowledge and experience did not cause him to lose the viewpoint and the hopes and aspirations of the every-day American.

The people trusted President Eisenhower. There was nothing mean or small about him. He made a great President because he followed great principles.

Mr. President, the country is fortunate that General Eisenhower was permitted to live beyond his years of public service. It meant that the Nation had the opportunity to know and observe a man who represented the highest and best in citizenship. Not only was he a senior military officer and a senior political leader, but in retirement he was a senior citizen representing the highest and best and providing the noblest example for all mankind.

Mr. President, one of the able poetic writers of our day, Miss Mattie Richards Tyler, of Washington, D.C., has set forth her thoughts, which I consider as appropriate to close my remarks. I ask unanimous consent that her poem be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Last March of Our Five-Star General, President Dwight David Eisenhower, March 28, 1969

(By Mattie Richards Tyler)

The streets of Washington are lined with crowds . . .
Our Flag, half-staff, proclaims the Nation's sorrow;
But planes and dreams still soar above the clouds,
And he would bid us bravely face tomorrow.
Our Ike, America's loved president,
Is dead! Because he lived and passed our way,
The world is richer for his life—well spent.
"One Nation, under God,"[1] we march today.

He lies in state beneath the Capitol dome . . .
Triumphantly, our General met life's test.
Play on, O Service Bands, as he heads home—
This great American who gave his best.
While Stars and Stripes, unfurled, salute the sky,
We grasp his Torch of Faith as he goes by!

THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND PROGRAM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I recently received a letter from the Honorable W. W. McAllister, mayor of the city of San Antonio. Mayor McAllister writes in support of a very worthy program—the land and water conservation fund program—which the 90th Congress enacted as Public Law 90-401. Mayor McAllister makes three recommendations which I wholeheartedly support and to which I direct the attention of my fellow Senators.

Mayor McAllister is well-qualified to speak on the subject of outdoor recreation, for San Antonio has a fine parks system which is an object of justifiable pride for the Alamo city.

Perhaps the gemstone of this system is the Brackenridge Park. This 443-acre park contains the world-famous San Antonio Zoo, the beautiful Sunken Gardens and Sunken Gardens Theater, a golf course, and many other outdoor recreational facilities for the benefit of all of the citizens of the city.

---

[1] Pledge of Allegiance

For a number of years, an attempt has been underway to use a part of that land for an expressway. Happily, the attempt has not so far been successful. I hope it will not be so in the future and that this wonderful outdoor recreational facility will be preserved for use as originally intended for years to come.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mayor McAllister's letter printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

City of San Antonio,
San Antonio, Tex., April 1, 1969.

Hon. Ralph Yarborough,
Member, Senate Appropriation Committee, U.S. Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Yarborough: This is to advise you of my interest, concern and requested consideration for the Land and Water Conservation Fund Program.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 has been of great assistance to Texas in initiating an action program for providing much-needed outdoor recreation for the people of Texas and our visitors.

Texas voters recently approved a Constitutional Amendment authorizing the sale of $75 million in bonds for the acquisition and development of additional park lands to help meet the recreational needs at that level of government.

The political subdivisions of the State are accepting more of their responsibilities in providing outdoor recreation areas and facilities for their citizens. This awakening and emphasis have been brought about partially as a result of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Program. However, much more needs to be done and could be done on the local level if adequate funds, as authorized by Public Law 90–401, were available. In checking with the State Liaison Office concerning our local projects, we find that the State has eligible projects on hand from political subdivisions that could obligate over $2 million at this time, if matching funds were available.

The following recommendations concerning the Land and Water Conservation Fund Program are offered for your consideration and support:

a. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Program be funded to the full $200 million for the fiscal year 1970 as authorized by Public Law 90–401 as amended and approved by the President on July 15, 1968.

b. An expenditure ceiling placed on the Program has impeded our action program. The full apportionment allocated to the State and its political subdivisions should be available for use.

c. The original Act authorized a 60% State–40% Federal ratio of funds authorizing the President to vary this percentage by not more than fifteen points either way during the first five years. The budget request submitted to Congress on January 15, 1969 contains a ratio of approximately 50–50 between the State agencies and the Federal government. Emphasis of the Program should be people-oriented at the State level and the 60% State–40% Federal ratio reinstated to meet the State and local needs.

Your support in the full funding of the Program as authorized by Congress is solicited. Please be assured that we in Texas would utilize all the funds appropriated in an efficient and worthwhile manner.

Sincerely,

W. W. McAllister,
Mayor, City of San Antonio.

INCOMPATIBLE CONSTITUENTS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Washington Post last Sunday carried its second recent editorial on the civil rights compliance status of three Southern textile firms which have been awarded sizable contracts by the Department of Defense. The point made by the Post in its first editorial is reinforced by the second—that disregard of normal compliance procedures and regulations in favor of gentlemen's agreements between high level officials can only lead to trouble.

I thought the first Post editorial on this subject was a significant commentary on the actions of the Defense Department in administering its contract compliance program, and I had it reprinted in the Record. The second editorial is equally significant. It makes a general point about the posture of the new administration with respect to various civil rights compliance programs. The administration may have political problems in carrying out its civil rights responsibilities. This is nothing new; so did the last administration. The important point is that these responsibilities must be met, and the procedures which have been carefully developed should be adhered to regardless of the political problems. I invite the attention of Senators to the following passage from the Post editorial of Sunday:

> This mixed picture undoubtedly reflects the dilemma of an Administration trying to rationalize its own internal political differences, to keep the faith, as it were, with its various incompatible constituents. The point is that it can't be done.

I would add that any administration is making a mistake in trying "to play it both ways." The interests of all parties would be better served if the administration would make it clear, once and for all, that it fully intends to meet its responsibilities, in accordance with existing policies and regulations, in the various civil rights compliance programs. I hope the administration will do so without further delay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Contradictory Signals on Civil Rights

The Washington Post was guilty of nondiscrimination a while back on the subject of three Southern textile firms which were awarded new contracts by the Defense Department even though all three had failed to meet Government compliance standards in the matter of nondiscriminatory employment practices. The firms were J. P. Stevens, Dan River Mills, and Burlington Industries, Inc. Of these we might have said—and didn't—Burlington was the least offender. It had, as a letter from its chief executive, Charles F. Meyers, pointed out, substantially increased the percentage of its Negro employes in the past few years and also upgraded the levels of their jobs. Both in taking these steps and in calling them to public attention, Burlington had established a genuine and commendable distinction between its own approach and that of the other firms. Not surprisingly, Burlington was also the first of three firms to yield to the Defense Department's efforts to achieve a kind of retroactive acknowledgement of the terms of compliance. Thursday these terms were made public in a joint statement issued by Mr. Meyers and Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard. Negotiations with the other two firms to reach such an arrangement are still under way.

None of this is to say that Burlington—much less Dan River or J. P. Stevens—had met the test prior to the award of their new contracts. Mr. Meyers did not point out that as late as January his firm had failed to satisfy Federal standards on several counts and that there was (and is) no evidence that Burlington had submitted an acceptable plan on the points in which it was not in compliance or that the other firms had done so on their much larger derelictions. That—the manner of the granting of the contracts—was the subject of our complaint, and it still is. We would find it easier to commend the Defense Department for its belated effort to rectify the situation, were it not for the fact that Administration officials are now hailing the whole sorry business as if it were some sort of triumph of carefully designed policy, a precedent for future actions, and—into the bargain—the most hopeful thing that has happened in civil rights since *Brown* vs. *the Board of Education*. Hear Labor Secretary Shultz on the matter: "As you know, we had a little difficulty recently involving some textile manufacturers. We could have blocked their defense supply contracts, but David Packard . . . believed that we could get results from these contractors . . . David Packard's strategy is paying off."

There are numerous things wrong with this statement and with similar statements made by Administration witnesses on the subject before Sen. Edward Kennedy's Judiciary subcommittee in the past few days. One is that there is scant reason to believe the Defense Department's energetic effort to retrieve this situation would have been made without the prodding of Senator Kennedy, Sen. Walter F. Mondale, and various civil rights leaders. But what is most disturbing is the strong suggestion that this type of personal, special dealing with the company executives involved provides the basis for future activity in the field of compliance. That way lies real trouble.

The problem of compliance with civil rights standards is not only that of the Defense Department. At HEW and in the Department of Transportation, there have also been mixed and confusing signals as to the Administration's purpose and resolve. Clearly, there are profound differences of opinion among officials serving in the various Departments—as was demonstrated by the recent news account of the views of a prospective General Counsel at HEW, who took a negative stand on enforcing the guidelines in evident contrast with that of Secretary Finch. There have also been substantial differences between what is done and what is said, the verbal assurances of sweet reasonableness as far as the South is concerned being happily overridden in some cases by firm and forthright acts of enforcement. This mixed picture undoubtedly reflects the dilemma of an Administration trying to rationalize its own internal political differences, to keep the faith, as it were, with its various incompatible constituents. The point is that it can't be done.

AN END TO THE DRAFT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in recent months we have heard much debate and discussion on various proposals to reform, adjust, or eliminate the draft.

It has been suggested that an end to the draft and its replacement by a voluntary career force would somehow lead to a more belligerent American foreign policy. Others have contended that the

draft is needed to trigger the kind of public disenchantment that has developed over our involvement in Vietnam.

Such allegations seem to me to be a questionable defense of the draft. Clearly it did not keep us out of the war in Vietnam—and prior restraint is obviously what is most needed—nor has it yet brought about the policy changes which must come if we are to disengage from that tragic conflict. I do not think we can justify exposing young Americans to the uncertainty, the unfairness, and the heavy costs of compulsory service on an unproven and illogical claim that their sacrifice is needed if we are to maintain a responsible foreign policy.

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), with whom I am pleased to cosponsor proposed legislation to terminate the draft, has provided a very clear and persuasive analysis of this and other aspects of the issue in the March 30 New York Times magazine. He has studied the matter thoroughly, and his discussion is well worth the careful consideration of our policymakers. I commend it to the attention of each Member of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HATFIELD ARGUES THAT THE DRAFT IS WRONG—A VOLUNTEER ARMY IS THE ANSWER

(By Senator MARK O. HATFIELD)

I have always been somewhat annoyed by people who consistently look disaster in the eye and announce that "something good will come of it in the end." I generally suspect that such people either do not comprehend the nature of the calamity or are callous to tragedy.

So it is with certain misgivings that I assert that something positive may result from our involvement in the senseless and unpopular war in Vietnam. Without the war I doubt that opposition to our system of conscription would have gained the momentum it has, momentum which may eventually lead to the abolition of the draft and the establishment of a volunteer military, the only system that allows the maximum personal liberty and eliminates the major inequities inherent in conscription.

The draft has forced young men who abhor the war to make difficult choices. My files are filled with letters from troubled youths who must reconcile their duty to their country with their duty to their consciences. They have desperate alternatives: choose to move to Canada, to declare themselves conscientious objectors, to go to jail, or choose to kill men they do not hate in a war they cannot justify for a cause they do not believe in.

This horrible dilemma is very much a part of the tragedy of Vietnam. The pain and suffering of this war are not limited to the battlefields or the orphanages and refugee camps of Southeast Asia. They are felt by young men like Peter Danielson, a 19-year-old philosophy major at the University of Michigan who was quoted in this magazine: "If I was on the battlefield, would I justify killing, or would I go crazy? Wrecking my career by trying for C.O. [conscientious objector status] scares me. Five years in Leavenworth for refusing to serve scares me. But if becoming a soldier means killing innocent people, that scares me, too. The choices are so big I can't handle them."

Sensitive young men like Peter will be forever haunted by the choices they must make on the draft. But opposition to the system is by no means found only among its primary victims. Greater and greater numbers of people are joining me in the conclusion that we must end the draft, we must have a volunteer professional army. I believe that conscription cannot meet the requirements of an effective military manpower-procurement system: (1) to preserve individual liberty and freedom as much as possible from unjustified intrusion by the Government; (2) to insure that every young man receives equal treatment and no one is required to make sacrifices that are not demanded of his peers; (3) to provide the maximum national security with the greatest efficiency and economy.

It can be shown, I believe, that the Selective Service program now in use does not meet these criteria. First, the draft denies individual liberty. As The Wall Street Journal pointed out editorially in March, 1967: "We should recognize that [the draft] is about the most odious form of Government control we have yet accepted. We should not forget that it is a basic violation of our traditions of freedom and individualism."

I feel strongly that each man has a moral obligation to serve his country, but he must be granted the freedom to accept his responsibility and the right to determine the form his service shall take. Individual liberty is not a concession that can be withdrawn or that must be paid for by military service. It is the ultimate right in a democracy.

The draft also fails to meet the criterion of fairness, for it is not equally applied. There has been a great deal of resentment because the Selective Service System is not administered uniformly throughout the country, because of the uncertainty young men must live with and because of the many inequities of the deferment system. But the most basic inequity is the fact that a smaller and smaller minority of our young men is carrying the burden of national defense. Even under today's crisis conditions the military services draft only about 350,000 men out of a draft-eligible pool that totals 12 million. We should not tolerate a system that capriciously requisitions two years out of the lives of some youths while allowing the majority their liberty.

Even the third criterion, that of efficiently providing the necessary quantity and quality of men, is beyond the system of conscription. Why? Because the Selective Service System is designed only to provide *large numbers of men;* it is inherently incapable of supplying *well-qualified* personnel.

The nature of military needs has changed dramatically since World War II, when our conscription process was designed. In the nineteen-forties it was necessary to maintain a large "generalist" army. But today the need for great numbers of combat troops has been reduced by modern weapons capable of undertaking assignments formerly performed by men and by the changed nature of warfare. It is highly unlikely that we shall ever again be engaged in nonnuclear hostilities similar to World War II. Future military engagements will probably be guerrilla or counterinsurgency operations such as the one in Vietnam, where a small, highly trained and experienced army is more effective than a large, inexperienced and transient force. Conscription, designed to provide great numbers of men, cannot supply men with the technical know-how to operate modern weapons or the training and experience to be effective guerrilla fighters.

Draftees, who have been taken from civilian life against their wishes, spend their two years of military service counting the days until they get out. As soon as the required period is over, the vast majority of them return to civilian life—producing an average yearly turnover rate of 90 per cent. This high rate prevents specialized training during a period when, in the words of one observer, "the new demands imposed by warfare suggest that what we need is not only superweapons but supermen in uniform." Lieut. Gen. Ira Eaker, a retired Air Force officer, commented: "Weapons are now so complicated and require such technical competence and skill for their operation and maintenance that it is absurd to expect short-term trainees to man them effectively."

The draft, based as it is on compulsion, not free choice, aggravates the turnover problem; inasmuch as it does, it must be counted a negative factor in national security. It continues to amaze me that the public officials most vigilant in seeing that every defense request is met (from F-111's to the costly and questionable A.B.M.) are often the very men who most adamantly defend the draft—which is clearly the most vulnerable aspect of our national security.

It is easily demonstrable that the draft is not a just and effective method of procuring military manpower. And there is no way of making *procedural reforms* in the Selective Service System that will enable it to meet the three basic criteria. For instance, the lottery approach, under which draftees would be selected on a random basis from a pool of eligible 19-year-olds, fails on all three counts. Substituting Lady Luck for General Hershey does not alter the fact that young men are forced into service and denied their individual liberty. The random selection process does not alleviate the *basic* injustice of the draft—the fact that a few serve while many escape—though it could reduce some of the inequities in the deferment system and the lack of uniform administration by the 4,000 draft boards. I find it very difficult to think—as those who support the lottery system must—that injustice handed out by a machine is more tolerable than injustice handed out by men. As Bruce Chapman points out in his book "The Wrong Man in Uniform," the lottery "would be a supremely callous, a dehumanizing, a frivolous Government-sponsored game of Russian roulette."

And, finally, the lottery system would not improve the quality of servicemen or the efficiency or economy of the system. Men would still be serving against their wills and the turnover rate would be no different. Our military forces would still be composed of inadequately trained, inexperienced men and would remain a liability to our national security.

The lottery approach should not be made to represent anything more than it is: a limited reform in the *operation* of the conscript system, which would still be undemocratic, inequitable and inefficient. The lottery is a patchwork proposal designed to cover some of the gaping holes in the fabric of military conscription, but it does little to retailor the flaws in the basic design of the draft.

I am convinced that the only solution to our problem is the abolition of the draft and the return to a voluntary military. This is the system that would allow maximum personal liberty and freedom from Government interference, for no one would be forced to serve in the armed forces against his will. A volunteer military would eliminate the inequities of the Selective Service System and end the injustice of forcing some to serve while allowing the majority to escape. And, with its reduced turnover, it would provide a more efficient and effective military establishment.

An all-volunteer force is usually first challenged on the ground that it would never provide the armed services with the number of men needed. The evidence indicates otherwise. We are talking about rather small numbers of men. In peacetime, according to the economist Walter Oi, a volunteer military, with its reduced turnover, should need to recruit only about 333,000 young men into the enlisted ranks each year. Statistically, this comes down to less than 2 per cent of the draft-eligible pool—young men between 18 and 26. Even if this pool were limited to men 18 through 20—the ages at which the majority of youths are making career decisions—the military would need to recruit only about 6 per cent of the group into the enlisted ranks each year.

Even more relevant are statistics on the difference between the total number of men needed annually and the number of true volunteers the military can expect to recruit without improving the conditions of service: the difference between supply and demand. This difference is astonishingly low. Professor Oi—who served as a consultant to the Pentagon during a 1964 study of military manpower and who uses Defense Department statistics in developing his estimates—points out that by 1970, with a peacetime force of 2.65 million men, the shortage would amount to only 75,000. In other words, all but 75,000 of the men needed to maintain the armed services would volunteer anyway if pay levels were not changed.

Let me point out parenthetically that President Nixon has pledged to move toward an all-volunteer force and the Defense Department is conducting a study called "Project Volunteer." Nixon's plan to request a military pay raise—recently dropped in an effort to insure a budget surplus—represented a step in the right direction, but the increase, if it does finally come, will have a delayed rather than an immediate impact for it will be spread over all ranks. Very little of it or the $1.8-billion Congress has already approved will filter down to new recruits, and the increase that will do the most to encourage a volunteer army is the one that will give substantially more money to the first-term enlistee.

The task of making a military career attractive and rewarding enough to induce 75,000 men to volunteer is not insurmountable. We could, for instance, raise the pay scales considerably and improve such fringe benefits as educational and recreational facilities. We might also try to increase the social status of the career military man, ease rigid promotion schedules and raise re-enlistment bonuses. Professor Oi has concluded that salary increases alone, totaling about $4-billion, would supply all the incentive needed to maintain the peacetime armed forces (Dr. Harry Gilman, who took part in the 1964 manpower study and later headed an investigation of compensation and re-enlistment problems for the Pentagon, is even more optimistic. He believes that the extra budget outlay would be only $1-billion). According to Professor Oi's figures, the price for mantaining an all-volunteer military establishment would double, to about $8-billion, in wartime. Oi ridicules the Defense Department's estimate that a volunteer system might cost an additional $17-billion in salaries. Such a pay increase would result in an average annual salary of well over $8,000 for first-term enlistees—an absurd estimate of the economic reward necessary to attract an additional 75,000 men.

The budgetary increase of $4 billion represents only a 5 percent increase in our national defense budget and does not reflect the reduction in force levels—and corresponding economies—that can be achieved under a voluntary system or the savings that would be produced by the increased efficiency of a professional military.

The head of the Army's enlisted personnel directorate has stated that "the current strength of armed forces could actually be reduced if the annual turnover of men was reduced," and a professional military *would* experience less turnover. An all-volunteer force, Professor Oi estimates would have a 30 percent reduction in turnover. That means 30 percent fewer men would have to be recruited and trained each year, and that means fewer men would be needed to train them—resulting in the reassignment of approximately 80,000 of the 265,000 men engaged in training functions at peacetime manpower levels. Thus, force levels could be reduced by 80,000 men without any reduction in defense capability. (It should be noted that this reduction in personnel would more than compensate for the 75,000-man deficit predicted for a voluntary military operating under present pay scales and enlistment rates.)

An armed service of professionals would perform much more efficiently than one composed of conscripts. Robert Lekachman estimated in an article in Challenge in 1967 that the productivity of the draftee or reluctant volunteer averages about 20 percent less than that of a professional soldier. A voluntary military composed of about 2.43 million men would therefore be the effective equivalent of a peacetime armed force of 2.65 million men, 40 percent of whom were draftees and reluctant volunteers. (These statistics suggest that reductions totaling nearly three times the 75,000-troop deficit could be made with no loss in defense capability.)

As force levels are reduced, the cost of maintaining the military is reduced. But other economies growing out of lower turnover rates would be realized with an all-volunteer military: smaller expenditures for veterans' benefits, savings in the maintenance of complicated equipment now mistreated by inadequately trained men and reductions in the cost of maintaining boot camps. In fact, five Congressmen estimated in "How To End the Draft," a book published in 1967, that a voluntary system would have saved more than $1.7-billion in personnel costs *alone* during 1966. This represents almost half of the $4-billion Professor Oi calculates would be needed in increased salaries for a professional armed force.

But to discuss the price of a voluntary military establishment in terms of its increased *budget* costs is to miss the point. In real economic terms, an all-volunteer force would not be any more expensive than our current Army of conscripts, but the bill would be sent to a different party. Under a voluntary system all taxpayers would share the true cost of supporting our armed forces. Under the draft system the young men we force into the military subsidize their own service. When a youth is capable of earning $350 a month in civilian employment and is drafted and paid, at a conservative estimate, only $210—including tax benefits and allowances for room and board—the lost income is his extra contribution for the maintenance of the armed forces. We must remedy this injustice by placing the financial burden of our national defense where it belongs—on the general taxpayers rather than the hapless young men we force into uniform.

On the basis of 1964 statistics, Professor Oi has estimated that the difference between what a young man could earn as a civilian and his pay as a draftee is $1,680 a year. But during that year taxpayers over 21 paid an average Federal tax of only $633. In Professor Oi's words, "The typical draftee [was] thus saddled with a hidden tax that [was] over twice as high as the Federal income-tax burden of an individual taxpayer."

If we paid young men salaries high enough to induce them to volunteer, we would merely be paying the true value of their service; the added budgetary cost would be only a reflection of the *actual* cost of our armed services. The argument that an all-volunteer force would cost too much is not, in reality, an argument for conscription but an argument against the extent of our military commitment. This point was most effectively made in "Why the Draft?" a book by seven young political economists:

"The volunteer army forces taxpayers to recognize the true cost of military activity. If they would be unwilling to pay this cost, it must be because the benefits from such activity are less than its cost. In such a case, the activity should be curtailed, and not, as under a draft system, merely have its cost concealed. . . . The volunteer army does not increase the real cost of national defense; if anything, because it is more efficient, it reduces that cost. What it does do, however, is make the cost apparent while distributing it more evenly."

A second common criticism of the proposal for voluntary military service is that it would produce an all-black army. (Sometimes the charge is that it would be a *poor* black army; the fact that the draft system produces a poor army is overlooked. It is the upper-lower class and the lower-middle class that are drafted in disproportionate numbers. A volunteer army, because of improved pay, status and conditions, would be much more a middle-class army.)

I will defend the volunteer military service against the charge that it would be disproportionately black at some length—not because the argument has any validity, but because it is an emotional issue raised by men who evidently have not taken the time to discover whether their charges have any basis in fact. I submit that they have not.

Simple arithmetic establishes that a volunteer armed force would not result in a "black army." The argument of the critics is that since black youths don't have many economic opportunities they would flock to recruitment offices if the military offered them a decent wage. What is overlooked is that 2.5 times as many white youths as black youths are classified "poor" by the Government. So if you accept the critics' assumption that salary and poverty levels alone would determine the enlistment rate, there would be 2.5 white volunteers for every black one.

There is little reason to believe that black men would join the military in great disproportion to the number of white young men who would be drawn to this career. In fact, the national advisory commission on the draft stated in its report, "In Pursuit of Equity," that qualified white and black youths volunteer at rates about equal to their over-all proportion in society. (Blacks between 18 and 26 represent about 12 per cent of their age group and they voluntarily enter the service in approximately the same proportion.) I find it difficult to anticipate any reason for this pattern of equal enlistment rates to change under a totally voluntary military, and would expect, therefore, the proportion of blacks entering the armed forces to be in the neighborhood of 12 per cent.

It just cannot be logically argued that an all-volunteer force with higher pay rates and improved benefits would be disproportionately attractive to blacks. Economist Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago argues convincingly that present pay levels are "comparatively" more advantageous to the Negro than would be the increased wages of a professional military. For, even as low as military pay is, it still offers more than 50 per cent of draft-age black youths higher incomes than they could earn in civilian life, according to the Census Bureau. But only about 33 per cent of the white youths are earning wages below what they could get in the military. What it means, then, is that more than 50 per cent of the black youths who would be attracted to the military because of pay have already had the financial incentive to join. Higher pay would be a potential incentive to less than 50 per cent of young blacks, but would be potentially attractive to about 70 per cent of young whites.

Even in the unlikely event that a professional military *did* produce unequal racial enlistment rates, it would not cause an unacceptable imbalance. Prof Thomas Schelling, an economist and defense analyst at Harvard's John Fitzgerald Kennedy School of

Government, has estimated that if black men should find military service to be three or four times as attractive as whites did, their high rejection rates would mean that they would still represent only 20 per cent of the armed forces.

Critics may attempt to argue that the re-enlistment rate for blacks is considerably greater than it is for whites, and assert that this will eventually cause a significant racial imbalance as more blacks elect to remain in uniform. This possibility exists, however, whether men are drafted into the service or volunteer. And Army figures show that the re-enlistment rate for blacks who were *drafted* is 30 per cent higher than the re-enlistment rate for white draftees. But the black re-enlistment rate of first-term *volunteers* was only 25 per cent above the white volunteer re-enlistment rate. Furthermore, as the conditions of military service more closely approximate what the white young man can expect to enjoy as a civilian they will provide greater incentive for him to re-enlist; the comparative advantages of military life already provide this incentive for most black young men. A voluntary military, then, could be expected to produce more comparable racial re-enlistment rates.

While converting to a voluntary system, the military should provide greater flexibility in enlistment standards so that young men with slight educational or physical inadequacies could be accepted and given special training and appropriate assignments. Although the rejection rate for blacks is double the rate for whites, this would not result in the acceptance of twice as many Negroes. Army figures show that for every black youth who attempted to volunteer and was rejected in 1968, three white youths were rejected, in other words, under the flexible enlistment standards, 75 whites would be accepted to 25 blacks.

Another factor which will temper any trend toward a black army is our national commitment to improving the economic opportunities of our black citizens. As we expand the opportunities in the civilian job sector, fewer black men will find the military to be the most attractive road to higher economic and social status, and this will tend to place an effective ceiling on the proportion of blacks who enlist.

Finally, I believe it is difficult to argue convincingly that it would be undesirable for the United States to have a military establishment in which the ratio of black men was two or three times that in society. The five members of Congress who wrote "How To End the Draft" put it this way:

"There is nothing wrong with the fact that military service in an all-volunteer army might offer some Negroes better living conditions, better education, more secure employment, a better chance of assuming responsibility and a more dignified life than the civilian economy can offer. It is not our military system which should be condemned for offering a chance to the Negro, it is the civilian sector of our society which should be condemned for failing to allow the Negro to share fully the fruits of America's prosperity."

Another charge brought against the voluntary-military proposal is just as fallacious and emotional as the predictions of a black army. This is the argument that a professional military would be composed of "mercenaries"—men who would join the service only for the money and whose loyalty would therefore be questionable.

This line of reasoning presupposes that young men would choose military careers solely because they were well-paid. But young people who pick careers as teachers or carpenters certainly don't reach their decisions purely on the basis of economics, and there is no reason to think that those who enlist in the military would be motivated entirely by good pay and improved benefits. John Mitrisin, a former research associate at the Institute for Policy Studies, recently pointed out in an article in Current History: "Monetary gain, training and veterans' benefits are not the only reasons men join the armed forces; if they were there would be almost no true volunteers today. Men join because of patriotism, family tradition, the military's image of manliness and the chance to travel. These attractions are strong . . ."

Our military officers have traditionally been well-paid and they have not been characterized contemptuously as "mercenaries." Indeed, as the prestigious magazine Science asked editorially in January, "Why is a volunteer officer a 'dedicated career man' but an enlisted man a 'mercenary'?"

The conclusion that a well-paid military would be less loyal to an army of conscripts is questionable. Is it really logical to expect that a man whose service is adequately compensated, whose status is enchanced by a new professionalism and whose contribution is recognized and appreciated will be *less* loyal to his nation and its ideals than a man who is forced into service, is inadequately compensated and who enjoys all too little esteem from the general public?

A volunteer force will not be an exclusive, stable body of men isolated from all contact with civilian society and influences. (After all, we don't demand that volunteers take vows of celibacy or renounce their parents.) Between 1960 and 1965, an average of 520,000 men entered the service each year. Under a voluntary military, there would still be more than 360,000 entering and leaving the force each year to maintain a "civilian" influence and dissipate any tendency toward military elitism.

Yet alarmists have gone so far as to predict military coups if we move to a professional army. Their predictions, however, are not accompanied by any evidence. They certainly can't point to history. Except for the last 30 years and brief periods during World War I and the Civil War, our nation has relied almost exclusively on a volunteer or professional army. Civilian control of the Government has never been threatened. And the experience of other nations does not verify the predictions of military takeovers. There is, historically, little correlation between the method of recruitment and the frequency of military coups—and, incidentally, civilian rule was overthrown recently in two countries that rely on conscription, Greece and Argentina.

Those who are determined to find a direct relationship between militarism and a voluntary recruitment system should look closely at what is happening to our two closest allies, Canada and Britain. Both have volunteer programs and it can be argued that militarism is *declining* in these two nations. Both countries are reducing their international military commitments, and Britain has significantly reduced the size of her forces.

Frankly, I believe that the method of recruiting enlisted men is unrelated to the possibility of a rise in militarism. Draftees, who are only in the service for two years and who are at the very bottom of the military power structure, have very little ability to exert a "civilian" influence on the military hierarchy. The danger of military élitism comes primarily from the officers, who are and almost always have been volunteers or "professionals." We should continue our tradition of drawing officers from widely divergent social, economic and geographic backgrounds. We should also continue our Congressional selection of the student bodies at our military academies, maintain voluntary R.O.T.C. programs on college campuses and provide for expanded opportunities for enlisted personnel to attend officer-candidate schools.

If we want to protect our nation from the threat of militarism, our primary concern should be to exert civilian influence at the top, not the bottom, of the military power structure. The office of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy and Air Force should remain in the hands of civilians.

A volunteer military would inherently provide an effective check against a loss of civilian control over the military because it would take a bigger bite out of the tax dollar. My nearly 20 years as a public official have convinced me that there is no more effective way to interest the voters in Government policy than through their pocketbooks. Taxpayers and elected officials can be expected to watch closely and to debate vigorously attempts by the military to expand. (The heated controversy over the passing of the 10 per cent surtax to finance the war in Vientam substantiates this conclusion.) In the words of the economist Robert Tollison: ". . . one could speculate that the increased financial costs of the volunteer army would lead to even greater civilian activity in the conduct and direction of military operations such as in Vietnam. In general, therefore, this closer scrutiny of military personnel arising from an all-volunteer force would serve to establish even more effective civilian control over the military and guard against the dangers of militarism."

In fact, civilian control over the military should be extended a step further. The Government's authority to draft young men into uniform should be ended and it should be possible to reinstate it *only* by an act of Congress upon the recommendation of the Commander in Chief. This provision would modify the President's unilateral ability to involve us by administrative decree in military adventures abroad. The assured ability to put young men into uniform is vital to any major commitment to war. One man—the President—now has this ability and there exists no effective check on it. The Executive Branch of Government has declared that the President, as Commander in Chief, has the power to send American men, in any number he chooses, to any spot in the world without the approval or even the consent of Congress. A volunteer military would force the President to rely on persuasion rather than conscription in committing us to long-term conflicts. Since the armed services would fill their ranks with volunteers rather than draftees, it would be difficult for the President to commit us to an unpopular war—such as the one in Vietnam—and still induce the necessary number of young men to volunteer. Before intervening in a conflict, the President would be forced to consider very carefully whether our involvement could be justified to the public.

A further check would be the President's awareness that if he couldn't sell the war to the American public, he would have to sell it to Congress. If insufficient numbers of young men believed in the commitment enough to volunteer, the President would have to ask Congress to reinstitute the draft. (Only at this point, if a voluntary system proves inadequate, should we explore such reforms of the conscript program as the lottery; the draft, whether by lottery or through the Selective Service System, should be used only as a last resort, not relied upon as the easy way out.) Before the President decided to intervene in conflicts he would be sure that he could justify his action to Congress; this would reduce the possibility of an ill-considered commitment of troops.

Peacetime conscription is essential to the President's self-proclaimed, singular ability to involve our country in war by administrative decree. The draft allows him to bypass and nullify the constitutionally defined role of Congress to declare war. The story of how we became involved in Vietnam demonstrates the necessity to correct this imbalance of power and to place checks on the President's unilateral ability to involve our nation in long-term conflicts. Aside from a constitutional amendment, I know of no other effective means of restoring to Congress its proper role in committing us to war than by placing in the hands of the House and Senate the authority to conscript armies.

JOB CORPS IN OMAHA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have written a letter to Mr. Moynihan at the White House pertaining to the Job Corps in Omaha. I have sent copies of this letter to Chairman JOHN McCLELLAN, to the Job Corps, and to the Burroughs Corp.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1969.

Mr. DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MOYNIHAN: It is my understanding that you are advising the President on matters pertaining to the poverty program. There is no disagreement among the vast majority of people over the question of assisting the disadvantaged. There is wide disagreement over methods. Many people question the methods, the efficiency and the results of the poverty program. Many feel that for less dollars a better job could be done in reaching more people than the poverty program.

Currently the Burroughs Corporation appears to be negotiating to extend the Job Corps in downtown Omaha where they occupy two downtown hotels. Countless Nebraskans have petitioned their representatives in Washington against it. They do not want the Job Corps in downtown Omaha. This information has been given to the head of the poverty program, to the Job Corps, and to the Burroughs Corporation.

In addition to countless individuals in Omaha and elsewhere urging removal of the Job Corps from downtown Omaha, an organized group of retailers has expressed itself. The city council passed a resolution expressing the sentiment that before any more Job Corps were located in Omaha, their locations be approved by the city council.

The Job Corps instead of heeding their critics have countered with a political campaign. I have no way of knowing whose money they are using for the political campaign. I will give you an illustration. A memorandum was circulated bearing date of March 10, 1969. It read as follows:

"DEAR STAFF MEMBER: As communication during our current controversy we feel that it is important to establish a few links. A Task Force with specific assignments has been made"

At this point the name of Mr. Brandon M. Whistler, Director of Public Relations, is listed, together with the names of eight other individuals who make up the Task Force. I am not releasing the names of the other individuals because I do not know whether they consented to the use of their names or not. The letter goes on as follows:

"In your efforts to do your part, we request that you inform a member of the Task Force of the list of people you plan to contact, and then later the results of the contact, and any general information pertinent to the situation.

"The reason for this request is twofold. First, we do not wish to harass anyone unnecessarily if a contact has already been made with positive results. On the other hand if the result is negative then please harass. Second, we would like to record results of all efforts.

"Thank you for your cooperation.

"BRANDON M. WHISTLER,
"Director of Public Relations."

Some people have firmly believed that in some cities some of the Job Corps staff and some of the politicians and some of the landlords were more interested in the Job Corps than they were interested in the disadvantaged people who they are endeavoring to reach.

I realize that you have been left with a difficult problem. I thought this memorandum was significant and that is the reason I am writing you this letter.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
CARL T. CURTIS,
U.S. Senator.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR FOREIGN TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, on March 20, 10 Senators joined me in writing to the President expressing our concern over his apparent intention to shift responsibility for our foreign trade from a Special Trade Representative in the White House to the Department of Commerce.

As we pointed out in our letter, the Office of Special Trade Representative was created by Congress in 1962 for the specific purpose of insuring that all sectors of the American economy would be fairly represented in our trade negotiations. We do not feel that this purpose can be adequately fulfilled in the Department of Commerce. Our letter and several supporting documents were printed in the RECORD of March 24.

We have not yet received an acknowledgement or answer from the White House, which I take to mean that the issue is still under active consideration.

In this regard, I would like to call the attention of Senators to a background piece written by Mr. Joseph R. Selvin and published in the Washington Post of March 30, and also to an editorial published in the Washington Post on April 2. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 30, 1969]

BATTLE LOOMS ON STANS BID TO RUN FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans has touched off a boiling, intra-Administration row by trying to take over the job of running U.S. foreign trade policy.

It is the hottest squabble since the smoothly operating Nixon Administration took office just over two months ago. Secretary of State William Rogers and Secretary of the Treasury David Kennedy—the two ranking cabinet officers—are arrayed against Stans along with an influential assortment of top officials in the White House, Budget Bureau, and Council of Economic Advisers.

The Stans target is the Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, an independent White House Agency that now reports directly to the President. The efficient, conservative Commerce Department head leaves for a two-week swing through Europe April 11 and he would like to become the Government's chief trade spokesman.

President Nixon will have to decide the fate of the Stans bid. While it will be hard for the President to refuse Stans, in view of his devoted service as Nixon's chief money raiser, the opponents are vigorously pressing their case at the White House.

The Office of Special Representative was created under the 1962 Trade Expansion Act, the law that authorized the President to negotiate the historic Kennedy Round of tariff cuts. Trade policy responsibility had been lodged in an inter-departmental committee headed by the Secretary of Commerce. Congress decided against having a cabinet officer run the committee on the ground that the chairman should have a broad, overall view and should not reflect the prejudices of any one department.

The Stans opponents are receiving strong support from influential industrial groups such as the Automobile Manufacturers' Association. All of the major farm organizations have urged the President to retain an independent trade office for they fear that agricultural exports will suffer if they have to rely on the Secretary of Commerce to spearhead their continuing fight for greater access to European markets.

While Commerce officials argue that their Secretary speaks for all business, the Department traditionally has had a protectionist tinge. It took the side of non-competitive American electrical companies against efficient foreign producers in a celebrated series of "Buy American" cases and it led the campaign to force foreign countries to put so-called "voluntary" quotas on shipments of cotton textiles the U.S.

More recently, Stans has become the Administration's most outspoken advocate of winning similar "voluntary" quotas on synthetic textiles. A prime objective of his April trip will be to try to persuade reluctant European governments to join the U.S. in quota talks at Geneva.

This country's foreign trade now is approaching $70 billion a year. We have to chalk up further substantial export increases if we are to gain control of the balance of payments deficits that have been raising a constant threat to the dollar. The Stans opponents contend that it not only would be a mistake to give the major trade responsibility to an agency that has a protectionist history but that managing this country's foreign trade program is a full time task that rates the undivided attention of the ablest Special Representative for Trade Negotiations that Nixon can attract.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 2, 1969]

FOR A STRONG TRADE POLICY

Mr. Nixon ought not to abolish the office of the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations (STR) and turn over its duties to the Commerce Department, as strong rumor suggests he may. It was the clear intent of Congress, when it created the post in 1962, to protect trade policy from the vested interests of any one department and to give it the independence and stature of a separate high-level Executive office. The Commerce Department is widely suspect for its protectionist and pro-industry tendencies; these would keep it from giving all sectors of the American economy, particularly agriculture, the fair representation they have received from the STR. This is not to say that any other Executive department could be expected to do better than Commerce: It is to say that national policy, on an issue cutting sharply across departmental lines, is best made at a locus of its own.

Mr. Nixon has given no clear indications that he intends any major trade negotiations; textile agreements are hardly in that class. It is also being put about that he is looking for a trade-policy chief without pronounced views for or against freer trade. Either prospect, for a stand-pat policy or a neutral chief, would damage Mr. Nixon's chances for recruiting an able trade-minded official in the mold of the first two STR's, the late Governor Herter and William M. Roth. And not only a broad mandate and an effective chief are essential but a strong staff as well. Trade is too important to this country to be treated in a narrow bureaucratic way.

CUSTOMS INSPECTORS FACE INCREASED HAZARDS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on March 11, 1969, I again introduced a measure to include customs inspectors in the category of hazardous occupations. The bill is S. 1473. Upon introducing the bill, I cited a number of incidents pointing up the hazardous nature of this Government service. Since March 11, I have received a number of messages and letters thanking me for the introduction of this measure and, more importantly, bringing to my attention many additional examples that support my contention that the job of the customs inspector is one of the most hazardous in the Federal service.

One of the most informative letters I received was from Mr. Emilio A. Martinez, the president of the El Paso branch of the National Customs Service Association. Mr. Martinez also enclosed a number of news stories from recent issues of the El Paso newspapers, illustrating the daily hazards of our customs inspectors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the news items from the El Paso newspapers be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CUSTOMS SERVICE ASSOCIATION,
El Paso, Tex., March 20, 1969
Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Thank you for sending me a copy of the Congressional Record of March 11, 1969, containing your very interesting comments on your introduction of Senate Bill S. 1473, a bill to include Customs Inspectors in the category of hazardous occupations. I have posted it on our bulletin board so that all concerned can read it and be informed of your efforts on our behalf.

The considerable rise in international traffic has added to our enforcement problems. The increase in the number of narcotics seizures made on the Mexican border is the result of closer inspection of vehicles and baggage and more personal searches of suspects. Experience has taught us that these suspects do not willingly submit to a personal search, particularly if they are smuggling. If we could provide each Congressman with a sound film of an inspector conducting a personal search of a narcotics suspect, we would have no further need to convince Congress that ours is a hazardous occupation. I am enclosing newspaper clippings of recent incidents involving Customs at El Paso, Texas.

The potential dangers and hazards of Customs Inspectors in the performance of their duties have very definitely increased.

We appreciate the able representation you have given us in the Senate, and doubly appreciate your interest and concern with Customs problems and the welfare of Customs employees.

Sincerely yours,
EMILIO A. MARTINEZ,
President, National Customs Service Association, El Paso Branch.

CUSTOMS AGENTS GRAB BIG MARIHUANA HAUL WORTH AN ESTIMATED $814,000

Custom agents seized 814 pounds of marihuana, a haul estimated at about $814,000 and arrested seven persons north of Anthony, N.M. after trailing them through El Paso.

The marihuana smuggling conspiracy probe started here six months ago, according to Jack Salter, chief Customs investigator.

The marihuana was found in a pickup truck. There were three Volkswagen buses and a Volkswagen auto also involved in the arrests.

Arrested were three El Pasoans, Freida Ellen Daniels, 26, 4042 Santa Anita drive; Samuel Lloyd Krazthor, 30, 5000 Taylor avenue; and Fred Williams Daniels Jr., 24, 4042 Santa Anita drive. Also, Mike A. Jacobson, 22, Scottsdale, Ariz.; Mike George Young, Phoenix; Craig Robert Warner, 33, Scottsdale; and April Lea Covey, 21, Temple, Ariz. They were to be arraigned late today before U.S. Commissioner Fred Morton.

Mr. Salter said U.S. Customs Inspector Guillermo Perez became suspicious of two persons entering through the Cordova Port of Entry late yesterday. He notified investigators.

Later a truck entered the U.S. through Cordova and was followed to a point north of Anthony, where Customs investigators, aided by Department of Public Safety agents stopped a caravan of several automobiles and the truck.

A search revealed the marihuana in the bed of the truck covered with a tarp.

According to federal narcotics agents, good quality marihuana can be bought in Juarez for $40 a pound. A pound of the weed can be converted into 1000 cigarets at the most, depending on how it is used.

Marihuana cigarets in El Paso usually sell from 50 cents to $1 each.

The marihuana haul was termed as the largest in a number of years. No further arrests are anticipated according to Mr. Salter.

SOLDIER SHOT AS TWO RUN BRIDGE

Two Ft. Bliss soliders were faced with a number of federal charges Monday night following an attempt by one of them to flee from Customs officials at Cordova bridge. One of them suffered a gunshot wound in his left arm and was undergoing emergency surgery at Thomason General Hospital early Tuesday.

The incident occurred shortly after 9:30 p.m. when one of the soldiers, identified as Michael D. Avenna, 20, attempted to by-pass a Customs check in his car. Police said the vehicle lurched to a stop a short distance from Paisano after narrowly missing a Customs officer at the bridge check point.

Avenna, apparently not well acquainted with the immediate area of the bridge, stopped his car when he found himself confronted with construction barricades. Police were called to assist the federal officers and converged on the scene from all nearby points within one minute following the request.

Avenna jumped from his car and ran across Paisano followed by James R. Sanderson, a special officer employed by a security firm at the bridge. Sanderson, according to police, fired a warning shot into the air in an effort to stop the fleeing soldier, then chased him across Paisano.

Sanderson finally caught his quarry in the 3700 block of Findley, but was assaulted by Avenna, who continued his effort to escape. As the two men struggled, the soldier, according to police, nearly succeeded in taking Sanderson's gun from him. Sanderson fired at the soldier, hitting him in his upper left arm.

Meanwhile federal security guards placed Gary W. Rogers, 20, also of Ft. Bliss, in custody. Rogers, according to police, was a passenger in the vehicle driven by Avenna, but made no attempt to flee. A small amount of marijuana was found in the vehicle, police said.

Police said state charges of aggravated assault upon a police officer likely would be filed against Avenna for injuries reportedly suffered by Sanderson, and that a number of federal charges are involved with the incident, possession of marijuana, running the check point, and others mentioned.

NINE PERSONS ARRAIGNED AFTER LARGE WEED HAUL

Nine persons, seven men and two women, were arraigned before U.S. Commissioner Mario Martinez Wednesday night on conspiracy charges in connection with a shipment of 814 pounds of marijuana seized by U.S. Customs officials near Anthony early Wednesday. Four of the suspects are Arizona residents, one a Lower Valley farmer and the rest, El Pasoans.

A tenth suspect managed to escape arrest, reportedly fleeing unharmed in a hail of gunfire by federal agents as they closed in on the suspects. The suspect who escaped, an El Pasoan, was identified as Richard C. Semple. He is being sought by federal authorities and bond was set by Commissioner Martinez, in the event of Semple's arrest, at $75,000.

Agents aided by Department of Public Safety officers stopped a late model pickup near Anthony after following it from Cordova Island port of entry. The marijuana "bricks" were concealed under a tarp in the truck that was part of a caravan of four vehicles.

The marijuana was valued at a potential retail cost of $814,000 by veteran agents. Agent-in-Charge Jack Salter said the smuggling conspiracy had been under investigation for the past six months.

The complaints named Fred William Daniels Jr., 24, of 4042 Santa Anita; his brother, Frank, of the same address; Samuel Lloyd Krazthor, 30, of 5100 Taylor; Mrs. Freida Ellen Edwards, 26, a sister of the Daniels brothers and who resides at the Santa Anita address with her parents; Michael George Young, of Phoenix, Ariz.; Robert Warner, 33, of Scottsdale, Ariz.; April Lea Covey, 21, of Tempe, Ariz.; Mike Jacobson, 22, also of Scottsdale, Ariz., and Lower Valley farmer Rodolfo Vasquez, 36, of Fabens.

Commissioner Martinez, indicating what he considered as the seriousness of the charges and the evidence presented in each case, set bonds of $35,000 each for all but Frank Daniels, whose bond was set at $20,000, and Mrs. Edwards, at $25,000.

Attorney Lee Chagra, representing the El Pasoans, had asked Commissioner Martinez to display leniency in setting the bonds. When the bonds were read to each defendant, Chagra asked that a preliminary hearing be set for Thursday morning, denouncing the bonds as "unreasonably high." The request for a quick hearing was denied, and the nine defendants were transferred to County Jail.

EVERYDAY EVENTS

(By W. J. Hooten)

It had been thought by some that there would be an unprecedented rush of absentee balloting prior to the March 29 city election. That was because of the sad experience so many of our people had in the November general election by standing in line three and four hours to vote.

But, up to now anyway, that rush of absentee voters has not developed. Quite the contrary. I don't recall any slower start in absentee balloting in any previous city election. Through Monday, only 127 absentee votes had been cast.

I don't anticipate any crush at the polls March 29 like the one we had in several precincts in November.

But I would advise anyone who thinks he may be out of town March 29 to get down to the City Hall and vote absentee.

This is going to be a very important election. Anyone who has taken the trouble to watch what is going on sees that we have a number of cross currents.

RUNNING THE BRIDGE

Two soldiers found themselves in trouble Monday night for allegedly trying to run the Cordova Island Bridge. That sort of thing is strongly recommended against. Our federal officers don't like such a performance. And I don't blame them.

It is surprising to me, however, that there have not been more attempts to run the international bridges by persons operating stolen automobiles and others carrying contraband.

I would say federal officers on both sides of the border run a "tight ship."

THE DOWNTOWN AREA

I was talking with Times sports editor Chuck Whitlock who went to Albuquerque to cover the New Mexico state high school basketball tournament. I am always interested in Albuquerque because it is the first place I landed when I came west 51 years ago.

Chuck said Albuquerque seemed to be booming but that the downtown area has taken on the atmosphere of being deserted.

That is happening to a number of rapidly growing cities. The merchants are moving out of the downtown areas.

El Paso has every reason to be thankful in that respect. Our downtown district is still busy and active. Some say that the so-called "Mexican trade" is largely responsible for that.

I like to see activity in the downtown area. It means a city to me.

A GENERAL JOINS HIS TROOPS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, a great leader has passed. The entire free world mourns the death of President Eisenhower. He met the highest challenges of the 20th century, as a soldier and as a statesman. He served his people of the United States, on the battlefields of the world and in the White House.

As a general, he mourned the loss of comrades in arms who fell before the guns of the enemy. He survived World War II to carry on their quest for world peace. As President, he was praised as the "peacemaker." President Eisenhower was instrumental in bringing about a halt to the bloodshed in Korea.

His firm and positive decisions in the Middle East and other areas of the world, backed by a readiness to support words with deeds, kept the United States from war during the 8 years he served in the White House.

Yet, President Eisenhower, of modest origin in Abilene, Kans., was a practical and realistic man. He did not view the world through rose-colored glasses, and he had no illusions as to the ever-present threat to the freedom of the United States. We may recall words from his speech to the city of London on July 12, 1945:

> As long as there are sovereign nations possessing great power, war is inevitable.

Let us not forget this warning from General Eisenhower. And while we search for the road to peace, let us ever be mindful of the security of the United States of America and ascertain that no nation can lull us to sleep—that no nation will become more powerful than the United States.

Mr. Eisenhower's presence and counsel will be sorely missed by this country and the world. The words of those of us who have joined in paying tribute to him today certainly can do nothing to ease this loss. But we know that General Eisenhower has joined his troops, and that they welcome him into their heroic ranks.

AN UNFINISHED SYMPHONY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President—

> One of the most agonizing problems within our human experience is that few, if any, of us live to see our fondest hopes fulfilled. The hopes of our childhood and the promises of our mature years are unfinished symphonies.

These are the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, cut down by an assassin's bullet 1 year ago today. His fondest hope was that America would cleanse itself of all inequities based on racial, religious, and ethnic differences. He had dedicated his life to fulfilling this moral promise of our Founding Fathers. "Justice," "peace," "liberty," "freedom"—words that should have a clear meaning to all free men—were especially important to Dr. King. He believed fervently that every man has the capacity for love and compassion for his fellow men, regardless of color and economic circumstances. His energy and eloquence were pitted daily against the forces of bigotry and hatred that continue to litter the pathway to justice and true freedom for millions of our fellow Americans.

We should be especially mindful on the first anniversary of his assassination that Dr. King was a living testimony to the power of love and compassion. Time and again his speeches and sermons rang with a moral challenge to America. Time and again he sought to remind us of our responsibility to lift the burden of injustice borne by generations of black Americans, as he said:

> The time is past when Negro protest was a momentary emotional phenomenon and could be dismissed to peter out whether or not it was satisfied. Because it has hardened into a social force at the roots of American Society and now possess dynamic strength, it will move on inexorably until its demands are fulfilled.

Life for Martin Luther King was an unfinished symphony. I hope sincerely that his tragic death was not in vain, but rather a clarion call to our Nation to divest itself of injustice, and to demonstrate unequivocally that freedom and justice for all can be achieved.

BILL TO ESTABLISH AMERICAN FOLKLIFE FOUNDATION RECEIVES FAVORABLE RESPONSE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on March 20, 1969, I introduced a bill, S. 1591, to establish an American Folklife Foundation in the Smithsonian Institution. The foundation will operate under the direction of a board of trustees as an agency of the Smithsonian. It will sponsor programs for research and scholarship in American folklife, make grants, award scholarships, support presentation of programs on American folklife, and generally seek to promote greater knowledge and understanding of the American tradition.

The purpose of S. 1591 is "to develop and encourage a greater public awareness of American cultural diversity and the value of American traditional culture." I believe that my bill will correct the serious lag that exists in the study and development of the American folk traditions.

Mr. President, Alan Lomax is a person who is intimately connected with the broad field of American folk music. The names of John and Alan Lomax are well known to anyone who is acquainted with this portion of our national heritage. Mr. Lomax is also a fellow Texan. That is why I was especially pleased to receive a telegram from him supporting the folklife bill. His message is expressive of the support for this bill among those persons who are actively involved in the folklife field.

I have also received a letter from Mrs. Judith McCulloh in Urbana, Ill., that clearly outlines the need for such legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the telegram and the letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New York, N.Y.,
March 27, 1969.

Senator Ralph Yarborough,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

I am told that you have introduced a bill sponsoring a Folklife Foundation at the Smithsonian Institution. If this measure is properly constructed and implemented it can do infinite good in our American world of varied cultures. The mass systems of education and communications have tended to shout down and overshadow the hundreds of local and regional folk cultures that the pioneers developed and that make America actually the delightful and interesting country it is. Without the prestige and support of the National Government and without the platforms that this Foundation can provide we will lose even more of this cultural treasure. All good Americans can see how dangerous this is now that our culturally deprived black children are attacking the educational system and now that the culturally undervalued whites of the South are rallying around a vicious anti-American demagogue. Please let me know if there is anything I can do to help you in this effort. It is far, far more important than the National Arts Foundation because it enshrines and supports all the arts of all Americans. I am proud that it is a fellow Texan, companioned by an Arkansas hillbilly who have sponsored the bill.

Alan Lomax,
Director, Cantometrics Projects.

Urbana, Ill.,
March 29, 1969.

Senator Ralph Yarborough,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I am writing in support of your proposal to establish an American Folklife Foundation at the Smithsonian Institution. Your perceptive and sympathetic introduction of the bill is particularly encouraging.

Many of us have devoted our efforts and hours and skills to this kind of people-to-people concern, and we like to think that the world is a little better for it. But as individuals we can do only so much. Private and voluntary groups, by their nature, have not been able to sustain long-term study and activity. The Archive of Folk Song at the Library of Congress has done fine work despite limited support, and the various WPA projects, which branched beyond music, left us invaluable materials. The recent academic gatherings and folklife exhibitions at the Smithsonian have set excellent precedents which we hope can be continued. Still, this is random attention to random traditions.

That the richness in American life has been officially slighted is nonsensical, and the contrast with government support of folklife study in Europe is embarrassing. From its founding in 1831 the Finnish Literature Society sponsored collection and research in all aspects of folklore. The Irish Folklore Commission, established in 1935, has been equally vigorous and enthusiastic in recording folklife. So it goes in the other countries. Our own traditions are certainly as important, and deserve wider respect and documentation. People need to feel that they matter, that their life styles are worth examining, that their various heritages can be a source of pride and stability. The eagerness of the black power/black-is-beautiful awakening is just the most obvious case in point.

I would like to help this bill along, if I can. If you think it appropriate at this time, I will be glad to send similar notes to Senators Dirksen and Percy, or others you might suggest.

Thanks for your attention.

Sincerely,

Judith McCulloh.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Dwight David Eisenhower now takes his place in history—a victorious general, a man who knew power and used it wisely, a great and good leader of the American people.

In war, he cemented the Allies into the world's greatest invasion and provided the firm, resourceful, inspirational guidance that brought the evil forces of Nazi Germany to destruction and set Western Europe free.

In peace, he drew his fellow countrymen in respect and admiration of his achievements. It has been truly said that he was an authentic national hero. When an admiring and grateful nation rewarded him with the White House, he gave us 8 years of calm, marked by peaceful progress and unmarred by upheaval at home or overseas.

His distinguished service as a military man and as President, engraved on the hearts of his countrymen the depth of character—a man of sincerity and wisdom, moderate and conciliatory in guiding his administration, but always inflexible in his devotion to right.

We mourn his passing. He served his country with courage and devotion. He was one of America's finest sons.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I recently received a letter from the secretary of the "Ad Hoc Committee on the Human Rights and Genocide Treaties," Mrs. Betty Kay Taylor. In her letter, she quotes the endorsement by the Council of Catholic Bishops of the ratification of the Human Rights Convention outlawing genocide. The statement is a good one because it goes to the heart of the matter. It reads:

Apart from the question of war itself, we deem it opportune here to reiterate the Council's condemnation of Genocide, the methodical extermination of an entire people, nation, or ethnic minority for reasons connected with race, religion or status such as that undertaken by the Nazis against the Jews among their own citizens and later against all the Jewish people, as well as so-called "gypsies." We would urge United States ratification of the United Nations Convention on this subject and of every other sound implementing instrument by which the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights can be translated from the level of ideals to that of actuality.

Mr. President, there are two striking aspects of this statement that we should not avoid.

The first is found in the illustration of genocide as that "methodical extermination" practiced by the Nazis against the Jewish people of Germany. All of us in the Senate lived during this black portion of recent history. The unavoidable conclusion is that genocide is not a crime out of the dead and distant past. It is a tragic part of our modern age. Since the end of World War II, many people who lived in Germany at the time, have pointed to the fact that so many good people did nothing.

The second striking aspect of the resolution is found in the last sentence, in the words calling for a translation "from the levels of ideals to that of actuality." Certainly there can be no inspired leadership without ideals. Life would never be improved without a dream. Nevertheless, ideals are dead if they are not translated into actuality.

I again urge the ratification of the Convention outlawing genocide. For too long we have stood at the point of decision while the course we can and should take has been obvious.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, from the time Dwight David Eisenhower came to prominence during World War II, he was a symbol of integrity, sincerity, and warmth to the Americans he led in war and peace. Tributes paid here in Washington last Sunday and Monday and the final rites yesterday in Abilene, Kans., attest to the warm affection in which he was held.

Virginians feel a particular sense of loss because of General Eisenhower's family ties to our State. His mother, Ida Stover, was born and raised in Augusta County in the Shenandoah Valley. He was warmly received on his visits to Virginia, and spoke with pride of his mother having been a Virginian.

While General Eisenhower's tangible accomplishments as a military leader and statesman were visible to all, his contributions as a public servant far transcended the holding of a command, or an office. His legacy to the American people was the depth of his spirit, his unassuming manner and, most of all, his ability to instill in the people a sense of confidence and assurance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that editorials of tribute from Virginia newspapers—the Norfolk and Portsmouth Ledger-Star of March 28, the Virginian-Pilot of March 29, and the Roanoke Times of March 29—be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Norfolk and Portsmouth (Va.) Ledger-Star, Mar. 28, 1969]

Dwight David Eisenhower

The old gentleman whose syntax overwhelmed the purists is now no longer with us and the Crusade for Europe that started him on the road to immortality is something that happened a quarter century ago, an event whose significance is reduced by the dust of time and the fact that it is three wars back.

We mention Dwight Eisenhower's syntax for a particular purpose; for while it represented one of the points many chuckled about, it represented also one of the general's greatest strengths. People, upon hearing him on the air waves or in person, in reading his press conferences and spontaneous talks reported precisely as they occurred, felt a great empathy for the man. He, too, could make mistakes in the language—just as they.

He defeated for the Presidency one of the great purists of the language, Adlai Stevenson, a man of polish and erudition; an intellectual who knew his own faults and had his own doubts. Mr. Stevenson ran well, as we remember his campaign, but the people decided that the old general, the kind-faced, lovable father-figure of a man, was what they preferred. So overwhelmingly did the people prefer the general that it was just as though he had no opponent.

There are those who think of the Eisenhower years as years of the fallow fields, when America stood still. To a point, that is true; but it is also true that America needed to stand still for a time. America had had 12 years of Mr. Roosevelt's manipulations and eight of Mr. Truman's policies, and all they could see from 1941 to 1952 was war, trouble, and war.

We liked Ike because he promised something different; he really didn't believe that America's role was to make over the world, and he promised to end the war in Korea. He did, and despite the missionary urging of his Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, to go the brink of war in pursuit of policies, President Eisenhower kept us out of war. The fact is that the Korean War ended early in Eisenhower's first term and no others were started.

Since his departure from the White House, the record shows that 33,000 Americans have lost their lives in Vietnam—a place in which he did not become involved beyond the small involvement inherited from Mr. Truman. When President Kennedy was sworn in we had fewer than 1,000 advisers in Vietnam.

The movers and shakers criticized the Eisenhower years also because they seemed to produce no change of consequence in American directions. But the seeds of great change were being sowed at Little Rock and in the space race we now are leading. And now the stirrings and upheavals in the cities' inner cores and upon the nation's campuses are upon us in such great measure that no one knows where these things will all come out.

Except that as the eight years of Eisenhower take on the kind patina of history it may well seem to many that the general's hand guided the country through the happiest and most peaceful years in their memory.

And that, though we tend to forget it, is one of the chief reasons this government was established.

[From the Virginian-Pilot, Mar. 29, 1969]

Eisenhower the Unifier

Dwight D. Eisenhower will be remembered as a unifier in war and peace. He harnessed diverse temperaments of Allied generals during World War II, when he was Supreme Allied Commander. In 1950 as NATO's first European commander he led in integrating joint defense forces of the West to resist pressures from the East. With a distaste for "government by factions and fractions," he achieved a high degree of harmony in America during two terms as President. And he tried to unify the United States and the Soviet Union in a quest for peace.

Early in World War II Winston Churchill marveled at the way General Eisenhower not only allowed but encouraged his chief of staff, Bedell Smith, to disagree—and then won him to a decision as completely as if General Smith had got his way. Later, the Allied Commander practiced the same persuasiveness on the Prime Minister in allaying doubts in the invasion of Normandy.

After helping liberate and rearm Western Europe, he was persuaded to run for President. He was alarmed, he said later, by a drift toward Federal paternalism on the domestic scene and signs of isolationism similar to the wave that followed World War I. To a land tense and tired, he brought an era of good feeling. "We are just happier," the President said after his first term. "We are just a happier nation." The air of calm persisted despite one crisis after another—Korea, Formosa, Indochina, Hungary, the Suez Canal—during which he traveled 325,000 miles, endured three major illnesses, and became the oldest President in office. After threading his way through the Formosa trouble in 1955, he remarked, "The hard way is to have the courage to be patient."

The wish of the American voters coincided with his own instinct to keep to the middle way between extremists. He also moved the Republican Party nearer the center. If he disdained patronage and fence-mending and called himself a political novice, he showed a sure touch in advancing his career. But then, after all, the GOP rode his coat-tails and even made inroads in the South. (Five GOP Congressional seats in Virginia are largely an Eisenhower legacy.)

No other American in this century has been as widely beloved and trusted. The electorate had an unshakable faith in his decency and judgment. Columnists might deride his wondrous syntax; the voters understood. Some of his circumlocution was artful. "Far better to stumble or speak guardedly than to move ahead smoothly and risk imperiling the country," he said.

Out of office he wrote four volumes of reminiscences fully as readable as anything produced by most of the critics of his style.

His sense of duty was such that during his first illness he drew satisfaction from the thought that he couldn't have picked a better date for a heart attack—the economy was booming, Congress was out of session, no world crisis was pending.

If he was a horse for work, he was equally zealous at hunting, fishing, golfing, and bridge. (Vivid in the memory is an interview after a particularly good bag of quail. When you go out after a long lapse of time, explained the President, you revert to the first simple motions you learned as a boy.)

Like every man in office, he experienced controversy. At the height of Virginia's fling at Massive Resistance, he fell into such sharp disfavor with the State's leader that none of them turned out to welcome him on a visit to Stratford, Lee's birthplace.

But when the President left that Westmoreland County mansion at the close of the tour, he chuckled in surprise at the sight of 1,500 persons gathered on the far lawn. He waved, and smiled, rather abashedly; and with that, the crescent broke and came running toward him, a fringe of children on the front of the wave. As they reached him, he leaned down, caught a child in his hands, raised her over his head—and that was the photograph that rebuked churlish officials next morning: a child looking down and laughing at the beaming face of the President of the United States.

The people liked Ike.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times, Mar. 29, 1969]

Dwight Eisenhower: National Hero, Effective Leader in War and Peace

Dwight Eisenhower was an authentic hero, a soldier-president whose rock-like integrity, personal magnetism and infectious grin won him the votes of 35 million Americans and the lasting respect of all his fellow countrymen.

"I Like Ike" was more than a catchy campaign slogan. It accurately described a national mood, first in the Forties, when as allied commander in Europe Gen. Eisenhower directed the invasions of North Africa, Sicily and the Italian mainland, the cross-Channel invasion of France and ultimately the defeat of the German armies beyond the Rhine; in the Fifties, when as 34th President Ike put unity of country above partisan politics, provided steady, undramatic leadership that helped quiet the nation's post-Korea neuroses, and kept the peace in the face of continuing Cold War tensions and nuclear deadlock; in the Sixties, during which he was titular Republican leader, a loyal supporter of Kennedy-Johnson foreign policy and a tenacious battler against the ravages of old age.

Mr. Eisenhower ran the presidency with a light yet steady hand. He early settled on a policy of peaceful co-existence with the opposition-controlled Congress, narrowly defined his own powers, at times de-emphasized the role of the federal government and shunned for too long such national problems as McCarthyism and school integration. In the latter years of his eight-year term, he properly assumed a more activist role as chief executive.

His critics invariably characterize the Eisenhower years as a time of drift and indifference, a time when the nation was doing nothing to prepare for the social revolution that inevitably was to follow. But these critics do an injustice to Ike, for his low-key leadership was desperately needed by a country still trying to recover from the discord and frustration of the Korean stalemate, the paranoid fear of an imagined internal Communist threat, and the corruption of certain Truman Administration officials.

When Eisenhower was tested by crisis, he did not falter. Whether in putting down Gov. Faubus' expedient defiance of federal court orders integrating the Little Rock schools or in showing the flag in the face of Communist threats in Lebanon and the Formosa Straits, he displayed the necessary firmness.

He did not devise an enlightened fiscal and monetary policy to spur the greater economic growth that clearly was needed to deflate Nikita Khrushchev's tiresome boasts that the Soviet Union would bury the U.S., but neither had any President before him.

He did not commit the U.S. to space exploration until Sputnik shook the nation from its lethargy, but moved swiftly to get the U.S. into space once the Soviet challenge was laid down.

He did not saddle the country with a binge of social-welfare legislation, yet he began a prudent expansion of the central government's role in education, civil rights and other activities that the Republican party's dominant congressional leadership had too long ignored.

A war hero, and life-long military man, Mr. Eisenhower nonetheless was emphatic in insisting on subordination of the military to civil power. Significantly, he was one of the first to recognize the threat posed by the Cold War's "conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry. Neither an isolationist nor a mindless appeaser, he stressed the imperative need for strong national defense. Still he had the vision to speak out, shortly before he left the White House, of the "unwarranted influence" being gained by an arms industry-military complex. A decade later, the nation only now is coming to realize the full import of that warning.

President Eisenhower wrongly permitted his strong-willed secretary of state, John Foster Dulles, to commit the U.S. to cover most of the globe as a peacekeeper. But he vetoed a U.S. military rescue of the French colonialists in Vietnam. He questioned whether the nation should rely solely on weapons for its security. He laid the groundwork (despite Hungary and the U–2 blow-up) for an eventual U.S.-Soviet detente. He called the lack of disarmament progress in the Fifties his "greatest disappointment." And he once declared, "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed."

Historian Charles L. Mee, Jr., has called Ike's first campaign for the presidency "less a contest than a prolonged triumphal parade." In truth, his whole life was a triumphal parade. He remained to his death the nation's most admired citizen, even more so in his final days when a dogged will to live kept him alive and alert long after ordinary men would have given up the fight.

Ike was probably the last soldier-president. In the nuclear age no wars can be won, no military heroes can emerge. He grasped the new realities of nuclear deadlock; as speech writer Arthur Larson reminds us in a recent book, Dwight Eisenhower waged peace for eight years with the same effective leadership and impressive results as he waged against Hitler's Third Reich, and closed out the stalemated war in Korea. More could not have been asked of him, and a saddened nation today speaks with a single voice in mourning his death.

DR. KING'S DREAM: OUR NATIONAL OBLIGATION

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of New Jersey. Mr. President, tomorrow 12 months will have passed since the brutal and tragic assassination of one of our Nation's great leaders, Dr. Martin Luther King. Twelve months ago, a bullet stilled his magnificent voice, but it did not still his awesome message.

Martin Luther King, a man of God, was completely devoted to the principle that all men are equal in the eyes of their creator. Americans had long mouthed the phrase that all men are created equal but Dr. King strove to give it meaning. He showed the Nation that for millions of people; poor, black, and oppressed, there was no equality. Talk about equality was nothing less than an oppressive hoax.

Martin Luther King had a dream, but he was not a dreamer. He was a man of action. He dedicated his life to making equality a reality, and in the end he gave his life for that cause.

Now we, as Americans, are the custodians of that dream. It is our obligation to make that dream come true for those whose lives today are nightmares.

They are people who live in Harlem, in

Appalachia, in migrant labor camps throughout America, and in squalid slums of countless other cities in our Nation.

They are children who lack even a pair of shoes to go to school and who face schools which have not met their needs. They are young and middle-aged adults whose lives have been destroyed by a society that shut them out. They are old people whose incomes doom them to live out their lives in poverty. They are hungry and they are poor.

We are a nation that is faced with providing guns and butter. But in the battle for funds, the butter we have doled out to the needy has proven to be nothing but the cheapest lard.

We must alter our national priorities if we are to meet our responsibilities as the guardians of the glowing dream of Martin Luther King.

Fortunately, men and women have picked up the standard of Dr. King. His wife, Coretta, has proven to be a magnificently eloquent voice for the message left by her husband. She is a brave woman, and our deepest sympathies are with her as we approach the anniversary of that tragic event.

But the burden of furthering the dream of Dr. Martin Luther King must not fall on the few. It is a task for all of us.

We must labor with the dedication of Dr. King. He believed in nonviolence but he was a militant man, not the militancy of destruction but the militancy of spirit. Let us adopt the same militancy of dedication so that some day very soon we can honestly say that all men do share equally in the American dream.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: NO EASY SHORTCUTS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as one who has long advocated that our present policy with respect to South Vietnam does not resolve itself simply to the current generalization that the "issue" of the day is Vietnam, I would like to draw attention to a column authored by C. L. Sulzberger, which appeared in the New York Times of March 28.

Mr. Sulzberger makes the point that American involvement in Asia, in the Southeast quarter of that Continent in particular, is welcomed by many, and needed. Disengagement from Southeast Asia may take fully as long as the process of engagement took, he says in this column. In fact, in Thailand, he points out, the possibility of total U.S. withdrawal simply is not considered, because Thailand hopes we will not take such a move to penalize it and protect it after the risks it has run by joining the war effort in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column by Mr. Sulzberger, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: NO EASY SHORTCUTS

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

BANGKOK—The process of American military disengagement from Southeast Asia may take fully as long as the process of American military engagement. An exmple why is Thailand.

This country has been our ally fifteen years. It feels Washington's obligations here represent a separate undertaking from the commitment in Vietnam. No matter what settlement is eventually achieved at the Paris talks, Bangkok expects continuation of American responsibilities to Thailand.

There was no local exultation when Washington began negotiations with Hanoi on a basis plainly removed from any position of all-out strength. Nevertheless, Bangkok prefers to believe assurances that no Southeast Asian peace will be accepted which does not provide for this country's security.

UNGER'S STATEMENT

Ambassador Leonard Unger recently stated: "We want not only to re-establish peace in Vietnam but to end Communist violations of the 1962 settlement in Laos. We insist that the North Vietnamese cease their policy of aggression against their neighbors, and leave in peace the peoples of Laos and Thailand as well as South Vietnam."

The Thais interpret this statement and the tenor of their conversations with Washington as implying that any Paris agreement should transcend Vietnam and insure regional guarantees. Bangkok fears that Hanoi, relieved of heavy commitments in South Vietnam, might redirect its military thrust across Laos to Thailand.

AMERICAN PRESENCE

Certainly there isn't yet the slightest hint that Washington wants to reduce U.S. forces stationed here—despite the prospect of a cut in war-torn Vietnam. There are approximately 50,000 American soldiers in Thailand where some $200 million have been invested in bases operating under the Thai flag but used against Communists in Vietnam. At least half of the U.S. air missions in South Vietnam—including huge B–52 bombers—fly from Thailand.

Some Americans argue that its expensive military presence here could involve the United States in "another Vietnam" because of counter-insurgency operations by Thai forces against their own small guerrilla movement. But Bangkok insists it can handle this problem by itself and only wishes a continued U.S. umbrella to ward off the danger of direct foreign invasion.

If a Vietnam accord finally comes, Bangkok wants to feel protected while it studies the way peace is applied by both Hanoi and Peking. It sees this need for protection as especially desirable when Communist dynamism now dammed up in South Vietnam could suddenly be released.

Depending on how a postwar period in Vietnam might go, there is talk of initially keeping a maximum of perhaps 40,000 Americans here and possibly paring the figure down to 5,000 should regional stability develop. The 5,000 would care for Thai bases under the SEATO alliance.

Thus, despite discussion in the U.S.A. of total withdrawal from the Asian mainland—as ultimately desirable in the minds of a large "dove" faction—there is no such discussion here. Indeed, Thailand hopes no drive by an emotional American public opinion will penalize this country by eventually depriving it of protection after it had risked Chinese and North Vietnamese anger by joining the U.S. war effort in Vietnam.

Even the vague thought of such a pullout would have immense political repercussions in this country. Being wary and experienced, Bangkok is clearly considering minimal contingency plans of its own. It has indicated to neighboring Cambodia—neutral but hostile and a reluctant host to Hanoi's troops—a readiness to renew diplomatic relations and abandon previous territorial claims. It has also expressed willingness to meet with representatives of Peking.

FAITH IN WASHINGTON

Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman acknowledges the wisdom of reassessing Thailand's world position so that it need no longer necessarily "reckon with possible U.S. commitments." But it is simply not believed that Washington would abandon the formal undertakings it has assumed here. Unlike some other capitals, Bangkok thinks America meant the pledges it underwrote on the Asian mainland through SEATO.

Thailand is therefore not only ready but eager to have U.S. troops stay on its soil even if and when peace comes to Vietnam. This doesn't mean on the present large scale, but at least a symbolic caretaker force until it is certain Southeast Asia's political storms have blown past. Americans who wish we had never stumbled on to this continent are discovering there is no shortcut out that is both easy and honorable.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1969

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 191, that the Senate stand in adjournment until noon on Monday, April 14, 1969.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 14, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 3, 1969:

COASTAL PLAINS REGIONAL COMMISSION

G. Fred Steele, Jr., of North Carolina to be Federal cochairman of the Coastal Plains Regional Commission.

FOUR CORNERS REGIONAL COMMISSION

W. Donald Brewer, of Colorado, to be Federal cochairman of the Four Corners Regional Commission.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Kenneth E. Frick, of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

James L. Treece, of Colorado, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Colorado, for the term of 4 years.

Harold O. Bullis, of North Dakota, to be U.S. attorney for the district of North Dakota for the term of 4 years.

George W. F. Cook, of Vermont, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Vermont for the term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHAL

Louis O. Aleksich, of Montana, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Montana for the term of 4 years.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Benjamin F. Holman, of the District of Columbia, to be Director, Community Relations Service, for the term of 4 years.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Henry Loomis, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE U.N.

Glenn A. Olds, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE INFLICTION OF TORTURE AT CHILOCCO INDIAN BOARDING SCHOOL, OKLAHOMA

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I was shocked when I read a report on the Chilocco Indian Boarding School in Oklahoma, operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The report is a recitation of physical and mental torture administered to teenage children.

It is significant that the report was prepared by the Bureau of Indian Affairs officials. It is not a report by an outside organization or by a group of militants; rather, it is a report by responsible agency officials on an institution operated by their own agency.

There are accounts here of children with wrists scarred for life by handcuffs. There are indications of beatings administered to children for alcoholism, a treatment for this disease that has been notoriously unsuccessful because it merely reinforces the self-punitive attitudes that are a major cause of alcoholism. There are accounts here of the "failure expectancy syndrome" in teachers and administrators, the attitude that Indian children are hopeless and that punitive custody is thus the only possible expedient for dealing with them.

In short, this is a recitation of one of the most terrible failures of our society in dealing with human problems; specifically, the failure creatively and compassionately to bring our Indian people into the mainstream of American culture.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHILOCCO INDIAN SCHOOL PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

(By Charles N. Zellers, Assistant Commissioner, Education)

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

From November 22–26, 1968, a program review team visited Chilocco Indian School, Chilocco, Oklahoma. The team members were Dr. Desmond Phillips, Deputy Assistant Commissioner (Education); Mr. James Freelon, Education Specialist (School Management), who also served as Chairman of the group; Mr. Ray Sorensen, Assistant Chief, Division of Curriculum; Mr. Heinz Meyer, Education Specialist, Division of Instructional Services; Mr. Lloyd Watkins, Chief, Equipment and Training Section, Division of School Facilities; Mr. Floyd E. Stayton former Assistant Area Director (Education) for the Anadarko Area; and Mr. Frank Quiring, Education Specialist, Anadarko Area Office.

Chilocco Indian School is responsible for providing an educational program for 1050 Indian students. At present the student body is composed of youngsters from 93 different tribes coming from 23 States. The majority of the students at Chilocco have previously attended mission or public schools and are enrolled at Chilocco due to lack of school space in their home area or because of academic or social reasons.

According to Dr. Wall, Superintendent, the average student enrolled at Chilocco school is 3 years underachieving according to results from the California Achievement Test that was administered last year. The following is a breakdown of the average achievement level of students enrolled in the high school program: 12th grade 9.7; 11th grade 9.4; 10th grade 8.6; and 9th grade 7.8. This clearly indicates that the students at Chilocco school are in need of an educational program that will enable them to function at their present ability level and progress as rapidly as possible.

ADMINISTRATION

The school was allotted $1,640,000 for the 1968–69 school year. Of this amount $161,577 went to Plant Management for common services, leaving $1,478,423 to operate the school. Personal services required $1,232,714 so that $245,709 remained for textbooks and supplies, etc.

There is definitely a leadership problem in the administration at Chilocco. The Plant Management representative from the Area Office met with the review team one day and it appeared that he gives direction to the Superintendent that is not in his province. The fact that he is from the Area Office may cause school officials to accept his views.

There is a lack of program direction from the Principal to the department heads and teachers. They by-pass him and apparently he has little to say about the operation of the school. Each department appears to be operating as a separate school with little coordination of effort. The Principal does not decide which departments' requisitions are honored; the requisitions are submitted directly to the administrative manager who makes such decisions—and according to some staff members, his determinations are based on who are his friends and who has "pull." It is not clear whether the Principal is being by-passed because he has not exerted the necessary leadership or whether the Superintendent has covertly discouraged any initiative on his part. However, the Principal stated he would like to have the opportunity to make decisions affecting the program.

The administration has also failed to assure that students have a voice in the operation of the school and that the staff is involved in planning the school program, as will be discussed later in this report.

Another administrative problem concerns the school's goal and purpose. The Assistant Area Director for Education and the school Superintendent both request a policy statement as to what educational philosophy Chilocco school should follow. There seems to be a question as to whether Chilocco should provide a vocational, comprehensive, or academic program. Dr. Wall said that the present offerings in the business education field are very limited because a central office directive of several years past stated that the business education course offerings should be cut back and he did not have knowledge of this directive ever being rescinded.

PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES

The review team's strongest impression of Chilocco Indian School was the overwhelming aura of institutionalism that permeates this school. That the youngsters are relegated to a secondary position, with the highest priority going to administrative easement, is immediately obvious. While there are some things especially in the instructional program that are worthy of mention, the fact is that teachers and young people are both frustrated in their presence there.

The chasm separating the totality of guidance and instruction is reiterated constantly both by the students and the demoralized staff.

A negativistic attitude reflecting the "failure expectancy syndrome" permeates as seen in the statement, "Well, what can you expect, these are Indian kids."

Attitudinally, the youngsters of this school are viewed as socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed, as problem youngsters, chronic alcoholics, etc. In short, staff perceptions border on the reformatory concept of reaction rather than progression or even the minimal concept of rehabilitation. The lines of demarcation are steeply drawn between the antagonists (the students) and the staff. This is felt by all.

In addition, there is evidence of criminal malpractice, not to mention both physical and mental perversion on the part of certain staff members. Portraying ignorance of fact, the administration of the school implicitly has condoned these conditions, perhaps, as was stated, because of "the system." This is reflected in such comments as, "Well, we have alway done it this way."

Student involvement, nominal at best, was seen by the review team as a facade coverup, portraying pseudo-professionalism and a lack of interest in youth.

The following observations substantiate this account and illustrate the absence of a sound pupil personnel service philosophy or program at Chilocco:

1. While some psychometric data is evident, and this is fallacious, the entire testing program is extremely weak. Intelligent testing is non-existent, yet achievement scores are available. The latter result from the use of the California Achievement test which is notorious for highly spurious results. In short, any attempt to correlate, as is normal educational practice, achievement and intelligence is lacking.

2. Counseling is minimal at best; this involves little personal counseling and practically nothing in vocational and career advisement. Even though the staff is most loquacious in expressing their conviction that these students are "problem youngsters," less than even minimal psychological counseling is evident. What assistance there is of this type is given sporadically by a social worker and by a psychologist who visits the staff once or twice a month (sickness and other things have even minimized these attempts).

3. Introverted inappropriate behavior is overlooked completedy.

Extroverted inappropriate behavior is generally solved by physical punishment, placement in the Newkirk jail without guidance or any visitation, or expulsion to oblivion.

Students reported that the counseling room in the dormitory was used as a place "to work them over when they wised off." As can be seen in the attached student statements, many physical abuses resulted due to a session or two in the counseling room. In addition to this, youngsters are restrained by the use of handcuffs if they have been drinking regardless of their being violent or not.

Youngsters reported they were handcuffed for as long as 18 hours in the dormitory, handcuffed behind their back from above or around a basement pillar or from a suspended pipe. One team member was shown the restraining procedures by the personnel in the boys' dormitory and therefore verified the youngster's expressions. However, the permanent wrist scars on one youngster's arms, the deformed hand of another boy, and an obviously broken and misshaped rib on another tended to reveal the veracity of student statements.

These practices were not limited to the male students alone, but were also purported to be practiced on the female students. However, it seemed more common to jail any girl that appeared to have been drinking. For example, the evening while the team was on campus three girls were handcuffed (behind their backs) and placed in the Newkirk jail. Only one girl was reported as being violent and she did not want to leave her room. With the "help" of the male counselors, the same who were reported as using excessive force on the boys, these girls were bodily taken from the dorms and driven to jail in Newkirk.

Commonly expressed was the ruling that *any* drinking would result in loss of home visitation and town rights and possible expulsion.

The responsibility for these actions rests not only with the school administration, but also with the Area Office. For example, the Assistant Area Director for Education related that these conditions (e.g., lack of interest, poor administration and supervision, student punishment, etc.) were known to the Area Office and that they "have been trying to get rid of the Superintendent for years." One cannot help but wonder at the efficiency and sincerity of these remarks and efforts. For example, a social work report was turned into the Area Office several weeks prior to the site visit and for the most part, reiterated what was found by the review team. Yet no action had been initiated regarding excessive physical punishment.

4. While health services are not at this time a function of the school, these practices were reviewed. The nurse assigned by DIH to the infirmary was very concerned and actively seeking better ways to improve health practices. For example, she had initiated her own screening process in an attempt to identify various physical anomalies. The clinic operates from 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Ergo, any sick child must return several hundred yards back to the dormitory. On weekends the clinic closes completely. Both physical and dental care seem adequate with the exception of sick children having to return to their dorms nightly.

Mental health services by this clinic are limited to a rare psychiatric consultation or examination, the burden of this responsibility falling primarily on a visiting PHS social worker. Her caseload was minimal and limited to severe cases.

The hospital staff has little to do with the school, the program, the expulsion of students, etc.

5. With the exception of several classes designated for slow learners, no special education program is in existence. Yet some 61 children have been identified as exceptional by a very cursory record screening procedure.

6. With regard to food service, an acceptable master menu was posted and was being followed. The preparation and serving facilities were well-kept and appeared adequate. However, since the youngsters received prepared trays (to expedite feeding and administration) and had no choice as to item selection, much food was being rejected and therefore dumped. For most part, the female youngsters were throwing away the high caloric food such as bread, potatoes, etc. Concomitant with this, the Alaskan children's expressed dislike of Southwest regional food also accounted for excessive food waste.

Male and female youngsters are served from three lines having to wait outside the building regardless of weather. No mixing of the sexes is permitted during mealtimes. Guidance personnel supervise these lines and the feeding times. When questioned about this, one person stated they were on duty in case of a riot.

It was reported that the Boys' Guidance Director had presented a more appropriate feeding and serving plan allowing selection of food and mixing of students. This was rejected by the food service personnel and the Superintendent on the basis that it did not move the children through the cafeteria fast enough.

7. As for the dormitory situation, some dormitory personnel expressed attitudes of sincere intent and concern for the youngsters, while others expressed perverted behavior as explained previously.

In regard to facilities, the male dorm, now two years old, had several construction defects even when new. These have already been reported to the Central Office Engineering Division for their consideration. These items included such things as poor construction practices, inadequate drainage, misplaced outlets and utilities, etc.

The girls' dormitories, on the other hand, are antiquated. Modern shower and bathroom facilities had been added to these dorms, but these facilities leaked from one floor to another resulting in plaster falling and paint peeling. It was also noted that many of the utilities were broken.

The rooms were overcrowded in the girls' dorm, yet the boys were not. In several instances, it was noted that beds were not separated and this results in a youngster's having to stay in bed until her partner gets up. Also, walls had holes in them. In one bathroom the innards of one wall were exposed showing inner lathing, pipes, etc. One room contained exposed heavy duty electrical wiring at the head of one youngster's bed. The possibility of that girl being electrocuted in her sleep was evident.

However, it should be noted that much reading material (Title I Project) was evident in the dormitories and that the youngsters, while overcrowded, were allowed to hang their own pictures and decorate their rooms.

8. The guidance personnel/student ratio is one to 89. This reflects a minimal shortage of 11 people (includes recreational leaders, aides, supervisor). Combining this with the absence of other specialists (e.g., special education teachers, psychologist, social workers, etc.) makes apparent a great lack of pupil personnel specialists.

9. Student activities were minimal. The students claimed they had no voice in school affairs, that activities were dictated for them not by them. The student council was only a nominal facade and held no serious voice in school activities. For example, many students claimed to have requested a chance to sleep later on weekends, to establish their own dances, to have some say so with regard to expulsions, to voice their opinions on the educational program and their future adult needs, etc. (Student expulsion takes place after a secret ballot is taken by a committee comprised of the school Principal and the guidance staff. Teachers, school health personnel, and students do not take part in this process.) These responsibilities they felt were disallowed them. Because of such denials and the resultant attitude that no one on campus really cared and that they must really be bad, they drink, fornicate and act up. Students readily admitted to the review team (interesting, since the team members were all strangers) where and how these illicit activities took place.

It should also be noted that the student council was functioning without a president and a vice president because they had been removed from their elected offices for disciplinary reasons. Interviews with the two deposed officers revealed that a matron (instructional aide) had told them they were kicked off the student council. Impeachment proceedings had not taken place by the governing body of the student council and the staff adviser to the student council, and neither the Principal nor the Superintendent of the school had talked with them.

Student morale is poor; their attitude is that no one cares for them, never listens to them, never comes to their affairs, etc. With regard to the latter, it was voiced that the Superintendent had attended his first student party only because the review team was invited. However, the Principal did try to attend many functions.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

The problem of low morale seemed to prevail not just among the students but throughout the school staff. All the guidance personnel appeared demoralized or disinterested and the same condition was expressed by the teachers. The atmosphere of the majority of classrooms visited by the review team reflected poor teacher and student morale, disorganization, lack of supervision and lack of purposeful and meaningful direction. Many teachers do not have lesson plans or evidence that preplanning has taken place in relation to scope and sequence of classes being taught.

In most classes visited by the team members, students were doing written work at their desks. No interchange was taking place between teachers and students or among the students in most instances. In one classroom students were busy attempting to write the answers to questions at the end of a chapter. One student remarked to a team member that it was pretty hard because the class had not read the chapter yet. It was very evident that the staff and students had been prepared for the review team's visit and a very "canned" educational environment was reflected as the result.

Among the causes of the staff morale problem are the obvious lack of staff involvement in program planning, the poor communications within the school, and the absence of effective leadership.

Although much lip service is given to the fact that the students at Chilocco are in need of a strong, innovative educational program due to their underachievement, little evidence can be found indicating strong instructional leadership or involvement in curriculum development that will provide an instructional program to meet the needs of the students. The curriculum offerings and approach to teaching are very traditional in nature.

The lack of communication between administration and department heads, between departments and between staff members working in the same discipline area is very evident. Each discipline is an "Island unto itself" in relation to contributing to and being involved in the total educational program. Both the instructional staff and the guidance staff stated that they rarely communicate to each other. Problems in the dorm only get reported to the teachers via the grapevine and vice versa. No system of common reporting has been established. Staff members related at a meeting called by the review team that this was the first time members of each subject matter area had been able to get together to discuss their disciplines and exchange ideas with coworkers. These people were very positive in stating "we need more meetings like this."

Further comments concerning the instructional program at Chilocco school are as follows:

1. The buildings utilized by the instructional department are old and outdated; however, this is no excuse for the lack of adequate maintenance that is readily apparent. Classrooms are in need of paint, chalkboards are in need of refinishing and repainting, and in general, the housekeeping and repair of most classrooms leaves much to be desired in terms of a pleasant classroom environment.

2. The developmental reading program being taught by Mrs. Clark is innovative and is meeting the needs of 85 students. The utilization of several different kinds of read-

ing materials and devices plus the availability of a paperback library makes this classroom interesting and a challenge to the students. It is unfortunate that this program is not available to more students as low reading achievement was identified by the staff as being the basic academic problem of the students.

3. Mr. Paul Sward has visited Chilocco school and arrangements have been made to implement BSCS Patterns and Processes (Special Materials) by providing all books, manuals, supplies, materials, and equipment which are necessary for this program. This will upgrade the science curriculum.

4. Workshop classrooms (grades 9 and 10) reflect much more teacher and student involvement in this instructional area.

5. The fine arts curriculum should be integrated into the regular class schedule. At present teachers have to meet with students before and after the regular school hours. A situation of this kind creates too much outside competition for the fine arts program to cope with and puts undue demands on the fine arts teachers.

6. The basic textbooks in many of the discipline areas are outdated and short in supply. Supplementary materials for teachers and students use are practically non-existent and lack of teaching supplies and materials create hardships on teachers who are responsible for classroom instructional programs.

7. The present requisition system being utilized provides that requisitions go directly from the department heads to the Administrative Officer. The Principal, who is the director of instruction and curriculum development, is circumvented and has no knowledge as to what is being ordered to carry out the instructional program.

8. An excessive amount of equipment that is obsolete and inoperable is on campus (Example: 23 16mm projectors). It is most difficult to justify new equipment when property inventory shows an overabundance. Survey action is necessary to dispose of equipment that is not supporting the program.

9. Business education classes are in desperate need of calculators and adding machines for student use in bookkeeping.

10. The policy concerning department heads and teachers utilizing student cumulative folders is not clearly defined by the administration or understood by the staff. In any event, at a meeting with department heads, it was obvious that availability of and use of cumulative folders was not clear.

11. Students at Chilocco school are not involved in an extensive program of field trips to provide educational and cultural enrichment. Two 44 passenger GSA pool buses are available at 11.5 cents a mile with a minimum charge of $92.50 per month. Administration states that pool buses and funds available are not enough to meet the needs of the student enrollment.

Another significant observation was that 90 percent of the approved Title I Project was not in operation. There was little or no activity in getting any of the Title I components underway. For example, the swimming pool, the enclosing of which had been provided for by previous Title I funding, was not in operation, nor was the campus beautification program; the recreation program was at a standstill because there was no student activities coordinator; some materials for the science program, reading program, etc., were ordered but had not yet arrived. The personnel freeze was given as one reason for the inactivity, but another perhaps more significant comment was that there had been little or no input from teachers in Title I planning.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In total agreement with the Assistant Area Director for Education's recommendation, the Superintendent should be removed immediately. His successor should seriously consider the immediate replacement of the top echelon people if need be so that he can revitalize the entire school program.

2. An intensive investigation into the physical and mental abuse of the youngsters of this school should be initiated immediately and appropriate action taken against those guilty of such malpractices.

3. While financial deprivation appears to be a common characteristic, every effort should be made to stir the creative imagination of the entire staff in the utilization of the facilities they have. This could easily be done with the proper leadership and the involvement of both teachers and students. In conjunction with this, lines of communication must be established between all departments and staff members and with the students.

4. Intensive effort should be undertaken to rid the staff concept of the "failure-expectancy syndrome"—the concept that Indian students are stupid at best, troublemakers, and inferior to others.

5. Psychological services should be initiated immediately to attempt to rectify the serious damage done to these youth. A comprehensive testing program should be started, to identify the intelligence of youth, the correlated achievement status, the vocational and career potential, and any serious emotional upsetment, either present or potential.

6. As a result of the above, a worthy qualitative counseling program should be initiated, both on an individual and group basis. This program should be innovative and creative rather than operating only as a reactionary program.

7. A closer relationship should be established between the school (instruction and guidance) and the community. The latter should be viewed as including the DIH health center, the business community, mental and physical health specialists, recreational and other community activities.

8. DIH, in conjunction with the school personnel, should make arrangements for adequate staffing of the health center. It just does not make sense for a sick child to get up from bed rest at closing time, return to the dorm for the night, and come back to the health center in the morning.

9. The aforementioned testing program should coordinate with an intensive physical screening attempt in order to identify those youth in need of special education provision.

10. Special education programs should be established for the handicapped and exceptional child. In certain cases this would necessitate the transfer of youngsters back to communities providing services (e.g., deaf children to schools for the deaf, etc.).

11. The staff and students should study and resolve a more appropriate student feeding plan and student activity program which will permit student involvement in school affairs. The student council should function in accordance with established and approved constitution.

12. Campus security is a problem needing attention, in that county roads go through the school property and it is difficult to control speeding autos or unwanted visitors who pick up students or make alcoholic beverages available to them.

13. The staff at Chilocco should re-evaluate the Title I Program components through determining the needs of students in priority order and reprogramming apparent savings resulting from the late starting of the project to meet those needs. Future Title I proposals should have more input by teachers and students and should be more innovative.

14. It is advised that the area office investigate and survey the problems of the Chilocco school program and attempt to rectify them, while concomitantly initiating innovative programs.

CONGRESS MUST REFORM ITSELF OR CEASE BEING RELEVANT

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I shall join in sponsoring the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969.

America today has changed full circle from the American of even 30 years ago. We are an urban society, and the coming census and reapportionment in 1970 will sound the political knell of rural power. Vestiges of such power will linger on in various forms for some years, but the handwriting is on the wall. Those who refuse to adapt to change are destined to be left behind by it.

A nation is only as strong as its institutions of the most basic sort, of which Congress is certainly one. Those institutions endure only so long as a majority of our people maintain their faith in them. If an institution refuses to change in light of new realities, it ceases being able to cope with those realities, becoming irrelevant to the society in which it operates. This is the choice confronting the legislative branch of the U.S. Government.

Already power has flowed from the legislative branch to the executive branch in an almost unbroken stream. The stronger the President, the faster and greater is the flow of power to his branch. This was amply illustrated during the last few years. In previous eras, the pendulum has swung back the other way in the fullness of time, but this has been the case because our legislative branch has remained relevant. Now this is no longer the case in large measure, and there exists a danger of power remaining permanently on the executive side. Therefore, the legislative branch of Government must revamp itself to reflect new realities and to anticipate change that even now flows about, around, and over Congress in an unbroken stream.

Congress is bogged down in meaningless tradition which enshrines mediocrity and rewards only length of service. Individual Members are relatively helpless, particularly in earlier years of their service. Everywhere, committee meetings are closed—a trend that is growing. In the House of the people, the people are not allowed to see what is transpiring in their name. Committee reports are often delayed to an unconscionable extent. Proxy voting procedures in committees are often abused. Minority committee members are given minimal leeway in terms of staff and the right to call witnesses.

Faults of this branch of Government can be listed ad infinitum, ad nauseum. I know these remarks and the bill I am joining in sponsoring which accompanies them will be greeted by some with disagreement. It will make no difference. Vast conglomerations of people and resources in our society require relevant and flexible institutions. No major institution can long survive or function if it worships methods found wanting several generations ago.

Our cities grow. Our ghettos fester.

Our skies fill with planes, pollution, and noise. Our suburbs creep over the land, gobbling up green expanses. Megalopolis exists. Our population explodes and explodes and explodes. Sewage piles up. Taxes mount. Waters grow foul. Life becomes more of a struggle.

Do the powers that be imagine for one moment that we who represent these cities will suffer to be held in political bondage in this House for much longer? Do they actually think they can hold us back from power which holds a key to answers our constituents demand of us with ever louder cities? Do they imagine we shall sit humbly and be patronized for much longer? If they will not listen to us, then they shall have to listen to other sounds.

Congress can answer questions, solve problems, and help our Government remain relevant to our society—if it is willing to perform major institutional surgery upon itself. This bill embodies the reforms that are a minimum.

It may be this effort will fail. But we shall come again—and again—and again—and again—until we are heard—until we prevail. The realities of life are on our side.

EDITORIAL EXPLAINS ACTIVITIES OF CONGRESS—ASKS UNDERSTANDING

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, too often people misunderstand the operations of government and mistake the absence of open, visible activity for no activity at all.

Consequently, it is gratifying when the news media explains to the public some of the workings of government and calls for reason in viewing government.

For example, although the Senate will begin its Easter recess at the conclusion of business today, the Committee on Public Works, of which I am chairman, will conduct hearings on waste disposal and economic development during the recess.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial by Robert Earle on this subject in the Weston, W. Va., Democrat printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON GETTING THINGS DONE

The other evening national education television carried an hour program featuring former Vice President Hubert Humphrey conducting his first class in his new job as professor at MacAllester University.

It was a lively session and the students were sharp with the loaded questions they flung at him. But most of what they had going for them was knowledge newly-acquired, mainly through reading, little through living. They were attempting to confound a bright man who has been a liberal since his days as mayor of Minneapolis, who has served many years in the Congress and a term as Vice-president of the United States, a man who has sat down with the great men of the times.

It was easy to find fault with his part in the civil rights program but they overlooked the fact that much of what has been accomplished for civil rights was through his efforts and the same goes for the poverty programs. It is a tendency of the young to look at the peaks and to ignore the arduous ascent that is needed to reach them.

We once knew a young man who was terribly disillusioned upon his first visit to Congress. He watched a Senator speak to a virtually empty chamber, saw lawmakers sauntering in and out, and finally he left in disgust.

This week, Senator Jennings Randolph in answering allegations of inactivity in the 91st Congress had this to say: "The mechanics of making the laws under which we live is a complex and time-consuming process, and it is one which demands a large amount of unglamorous work," the senior West Virginia Senator declared.

This work, Randolph noted, is now going on in the committees and elsewhere. The 16 Senate standing committees have already spent some 550 hours in meetings and hearings, considering new laws, Presidential nominees and other matters, he added.

Randolph said this background work is like the large part of an iceberg that doesn't show above the water.

"Those occasions when there are not many Senators on the floor engaged in debate and voting may give the impression that the lawmaking process has ground to a standstill and the Senators are away from their jobs," Randolph said.

"Those familiar with the mechanics of government know, however, that action on the floor is only the very important end product of long hours, days and weeks of preparation," he emphasized.

The Public Works Committee, which Randolph heads, has spent 60 hours considering a wide variety of matters, and the Subcommittee on Labor, of which he is the ranking majority member, has devoted 22¼ hours of public hearings to coal mine health and safety proposals.

"The efforts in the Senate in which we are now engaged and in the House of Representatives as well, will flower in profusion in the weeks ahead but only because Congress is hard at work now," said Senator Randolph.

A NEW LOOK AT RELEVANCE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the subject of relevance in our high schools has been made controversial by a recent film produced by Frederick Wiseman. The film, "High School U.S.A.," deals with the modern, white, middle-class high school, and its subject is Philadelphia's Northeast High School located in the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I represent. Most of the parties concerned have not been given an opportunity to see this film, but have had to content themselves with reading its many reviews which appeared in the news media of several major cities. It is obvious to all concerned that an injustice has been committed by the producers of the film.

"High School U.S.A." purports to show the lack of relevance in Northeast High School. It ridicules certain minor idiosyncrasies, and questions the importance of other major endeavors. The school has a space research project, for example, which is the only one of its kind in the country, and has received official recognition. The unique learning experience which it provides for budding scientists is given little attention. Other facets of the school are misunderstood. A program of cooking instruction for boys, which has helped many previously maladjusted youngsters to find useful occupations, is shown as the height of irrelevance.

What is even more distressing is what the producers of the film chose not to include. Having photographed almost everything at Northeast for several weeks, they edited the film down to a 1 hour and 15 minute version. The many worthwhile and "relevant" aspects of the school seem to have been pushed aside. The school offers a variety of curriculums, for all types of students. Some study commercial subjects, while others prepare for college. There are even several college-level courses for the more gifted students. Virtually every extracurricular interest can be pursued at Northeast. Students participate in musical and athletic groups, and in debating and world affairs clubs. They publish a newspaper and a literary magazine. They even operate an amateur radio station. These are just a few of the many activities which satisfy the varied interests of a large student body. But the greatest test for "relevance" might well be the achievements of Northeast's alumni. About 70 percent of Northeast's graduates continue their education in some institution of higher learning. A large number of its students win scholarships by competitive examination. When one views the complete picture of Northeast High School, he may develop new ideas as to the true meaning of "relevance" in modern education.

I would like to include in the RECORD a review of the film written by Fred M. Hechinger, which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, March 23, 1969. I would also like to include two letters written to Dr. Mark H. Shedd, superintendent of Philadelphia's schools by an ad hoc committee of Northeast High School faculty members:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 23, 1969]

A LOOK AT IRRELEVANT VALUES

Who would want to see a documentary film on a modern big city high school with an almost entirely white middle-class enrollment? What could such a film possibly tell about the real urban probelm of the slums and of underprivileged youth?

Yet, this is exactly the kind of school chosen by Frederick Wiseman, the documentary film producer who uses the camera as a means of social reform and received widespread publicity for his controversial Titicut Follies, a film of a Massachusetts State Hospital for the criminally insane and whose documentary on the police was shown on the Public Broadcasting Laboratory earlier this month.

Although not yet released publicly, the Wiseman school film was shown recently to an audience in a course at the Center for New York City Affairs of the New School for Social Research. Last week it was evident that the film was raising questions in educational circles about the relevancy of some school programs.

Within minutes after the opening of the one-hour and fifteen minute film, it becomes clear that Philadelphia's Northeast High, the subject of "High School," is not intended as nostalgic escapism. When Edgar Z. Friedenberg, the social psychologist, saw the film recently, he said his first reaction was that high school personnel have not yet absorbed the basic lesson taught to the staff of every decent hotel: "Don't insult the clientele."

This may not be entirely fair; none of the teachers and administrators mean to insult the children—it is just that they do by virtue of a frightening gap between the two worlds. The intended—and effective—message is clearly that, if this gap is so wide in the placid, all-white middle-class setting, what must it be in the more volatile ghetto?

What are the values taught in the school? A bedraggled boy, who maintains that he is being punished for an offense he did not commit and that the teacher refused to hear his side of the story, is told by the dean of discipline to prove that he is a man by taking the punishment, especially since it is only an hour's detention.

When the boy, closer to tears than anger, finally agrees to "take it" under protest, he is told. "It's time you showed a little character."

"Thoughts for the day" are presented like remnants of Victorian primers. "The dictionary is the only place where success comes before worry," is a typical example.

ATMOSPHERE IS IRRELEVANT

In a dreary counseling session, a bright young thing is endlessly lectured for having "insulted" the school by wearing a short dress to a formal dance.

From folksy fashion and deportment demonstrations to cooking instruction for boys, the atmosphere is, in the purest sense of the current idiom, irrelevant. While there are sparks of life in the foreign language instruction, one wonders at the gap between affluent students and teacher when the latter, in French, explains that in France one dines in the dining room, while Americans usually eat in the kitchen.

There is a strange mixture of authoritarianism ("Don't you talk, you just listen," says the dean), blanket suspicion (in the manner students are asked to show their program cards in the hallway) and pseudo-psychology ("Don't you feel guilty for disappointing your father by not going to college," asks the guidance counselor in front of an overpowering father.)

Ironically, the only activities in the film that arouse the youngsters are a drum-majorette rifle drill and an eight-day simulated space flight in a capsule provided by the National Aeronautics and Space Agency for an expensive space biology project. Yet, both of these activities have little, if any concrete educational value.

The camera is perhaps too brutally selective. It might be argued that some more inspiring lessons could have been sought out to relieve the gloom. But Mr. Wiseman denies that he filmed anything that seemed extraordinarily bad, adding that he cut out much that was worse. Nor does the reaction to the film by many educators and parents indicate that they disapprove of the school.

After the showing at the New School, one teacher said that while the typical high schools in New York are not anywhere as placid and teacher-dominated, she wished at times that they were. But most in the audience disapproved of the teachers' dominant role.

After a Boston showing, Mr. Wiseman said, many parents and teachers praised the school's effort at inculcating values and respect.

Yet, the nagging question remains—what kind of values and respect for what? One of the school's few Negro students, chosen because of his interest in the space project, said that while some of the science teaching was competent, "morally and socially this school is a garbage can."

That, too, is probably excessively rough, but it would be difficult not to come away, at least, with the feeling of having seen an obsolete container for modern youth.

F. M. H.

Open Letter to Dr. Shedd

Northeast High School,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Dr. Shedd: The faculty of Northeast High School is distressed that you have shown the film "High School USA" to your university class as "a fair reflection of what is happening" in middle-class schools, and by implication that this film is a "fair reflection of what is happening" at Northeast High School.

We would like your reactions to the following:

Since you have never observed Northeast High in action; since you have never talked with our students, sat with our counsellors, or observed our teachers in class, how can you presume to say that this film or any film is a "fair reflection"?

We think that it is your responsibility as Superintendent of Schools to establish the conditions under which a film is to be made in a public school and under which it is to be released. It is not Mr. Wiseman who "should have been clearer with the faculty of Northeast as to what he had in mind." It is your responsibility to have informed the principal and faculty of what you permitted Mr. Wiseman to do. You negotiate for the school district, not we.

You are quoted as saying that this film shows the weakness of urban high schools and their "lack of relevance". By implication Northeast's program of studies is not "relevant". We think we are relevant, relevant to the needs and goals of our students and our community. Between 60% and 70% of our graduates go on to schools of higher learning. Year after year Northeast students are merit scholarship semi-finalists and with some frequency, finalists. An extremely high proportion of our students win *competitive* scholarships. Would you have us change?

Ad Hoc Committee:
Margery Braunstein.
Helen K. O'Boyle.
Philomena G. O'Hanlon.
Irene M. Reiter.
Frank Seidler.

Northeast High School,
Philadelphia, Pa., March 27, 1969.

Dr. Mark R. Shedd,
Superintendent of Schools,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Dr. Shedd: We look forward to viewing *High School, U.S.A.* "as soon as possible after the spring vacation" as you arranged in a telephone conversation with Dr. Haller yesterday. Let us remember that "as soon as possible after the spring vacation" should not be extended indefinitely.

Your telegram to our building representatives December 16 informed us that the single copy of the film would be shown to us "upon its delivery" in this city. We were chagrined to learn that you showed the film at the University of Pennsylvania while we waited patiently for the showing you promised us.

We would also like the answers to some relevant questions concerning the film:

1. Who authorized the film making?

2. Who negotiated with the film makers? What conditions were agreed upon governing the film making? What were the conditions agreed upon controlling the release of the film for national viewing? Were negotiations formalized in a written contract? If so, we would like to see a copy.

3. When Mr. De Lone instructed Dr. Haller to permit the film making. Was the principal informed of the restrictions or other conditions to govern the film making? Who was to inform teachers of their legal rights if the film shots were "candid"?

4. Was the Board of Education's legal department consulted? What was the opinion of that department concerning legal redress on the part of teacher, parent or student if presented in an unflattering or unprofessional posture?

5. Who are the film makers? Did they represent a *bona fide* educational organization? Were they a commercial organization making a film for profit?

We would appreciate receiving your reply as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

Ad Hoc Committee:
Frank Seidler.
Philomena G. O'Hanlon.
Irene M. Reiter.
Helen K. O'Boyle.
Margery Braunstein.

AMERICAN BASES IN SPAIN

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "American Bases in Spain," recently published.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

American Bases in Spain

With the deadline near for renewal of the agreement covering American military bases in Spain, the Pentagon has yet to produce convincing evidence that these bases will be crucial to American and Western security in the nineteen-seventies.

In the absence of such evidence, the Nixon Administration's consideration of what price to pay for an extension requires weighing the utility of three Air Force bases and a Polaris submarine station against the growing political liability of a major American military presence in Spain.

Even the Franco Government has become increasingly wary of having American nuclear weapons on Spanish territory since the "loss" of a hydrogen bomb off Palomares in 1966. The bases would almost certainly become a focus for anti-American sentiment if Spanish students and workers gained greater freedom of action after the death or retirement of Generalissimo Franco.

It is embarrassing enough to have the question of a five-year extension of base rights come to a head only weeks after the Franco regime has reverted to type with a "state of exception" that suspends even the limited freedom Spaniards have been able to exercise in recent years.

When the original agreement was signed with Spain in 1953, the Air Force stations were crucial as forward bases for strategic bombers of limited range. Their importance fell off sharply with the coming into service of B–52 bombers and intercontinental missiles based in the United States. The naval base at Rota facilitates deployment of the present Polaris fleet in the Atlantic and Mediterranean, but the submarines could be based on America's east coast at only slightly greater cost.

In the light of all these factors, it is dismaying that the Johnson Administration turned over renewal negotiations to an Air Force general last December. It is more dismaying that Gen. David Burchinal evidently went well beyond the present agreement in accepting expanded United States responsibilities for the defense of Spain.

Fortunately, these were not binding commitments. The new Administration has every right and responsibility to take an objective look at the whole question, including Spain's demand for $700 million in military aid as the price for renewal.

Unless the Pentagon can produce compelling arguments involving American and Atlantic security, the Administration should inform Madrid politely on the March 26 deadline that the United States no longer requires the bases and will evacuate them within the specified year. The political cost of renewal is likely to be greater than the military benefit.

PROFESSIONAL PAY FOR LEGAL OFFICERS IN THE ARMED FORCES

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4296, which has been introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New York, my good friend and colleague, the Honorable Alexander Pirnie. In short, this bill would authorize professional pay and a continuation bonus for judge advocates in the uniformed services. The object of the bill is to provide retention incentives for service legal officers similar to those now being received by doctors, dentists, and veterinarians in the Armed Forces.

The need for such legislation is reflected in the distressingly high dropout rate of legal officers in our armed services coupled with the growing need for qualified lawyers. The burden on legal officers has increased even more with the passage of the Military Justice Act of 1968 which extends to military personnel the right-to-counsel privilege currently enjoyed by criminal defendants in civilian courts. The figures indicate that the retention rate of legal officers in all four services is dangerously low as it is, but it is estimated that they will need an additional 700 military lawyers to meet the needs created by the Military Justice Act.

H.R. 4296 is aimed at increasing the retention rate of legal officers by making it more lucrative for qualified lawyers to remain with the Armed Forces. In addition to providing attractive monthly pay scales, the bill provides for a continuation bonus payable at the rate of 2 months' basic pay for each year for which a judge advocate agrees to remain in active service beyond any then outstanding active duty service obligation or service commitment.

This bill is not without precedent since similar privileges are already enjoyed by doctors, dentists and veterinarians in the armed services. The bill is receiving the active and vigorous support of the American Bar Association and the Judge Advocates' Association. I wish to add my full support for H.R. 4296 because I am convinced the retention incentives it provides will go a long way in overcoming the crisis situation which now exists.

WILD HORSE ANNIE

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, there is in the Western United States today a spiritual kinswoman to the hero of Romain Gary's moving novel, "The Roots of Heaven." She is Mrs. Charles C. Johnston, a respected citizen of Reno, Nev., and the president of the International Society for the Protection of Mustangs and Burros.

Westerners know her by an affectionate pseudonym. To us, she is simply Wild Horse Annie, and her chief estate is the high wilderness of creation where man seldom ventures.

Where Mr. Gary's protagonist waged a lonely battle to save from extinction the great elephant herds of the African savannas, Velma Johnston has crusaded with equal vigor on this continent to secure permanent sanctuary for America's wild horses and burros. Her tireless efforts, in concert with those of her organization, have rescued hundreds upon hundreds of animals from the savageries of man and nature over a period of nearly two decades.

This year alone, Mrs. Johnston already has organized and directed two separate "Operation Mustang Haylifts" to save herds of wild horses trapped without food in the deep snows of remote mountain ranges. Successful air drops were made in the Pine Nut Range east of Lake Tahoe and, more recently, in the Kawich Range of central Nevada.

Mrs. Johnston is a remarkable woman, renowned as much for her imagination and inventiveness as for her considerable warmth and charm. Lacking the substantial resources required for her ambitious works, she has marshaled an impressive volunteer auxiliary from government agencies and private enterprise. The Kawich haydrop, for example, was a joint venture involving men and equipment from the Bureau of Land Management, Nellis Air Force Base, and the Atomic Energy Commission. And for the earlier Pine Nut drop, helicopters and a special airplane were provided by Mr. Ed Court, of Lake Tahoe Helicopter, Inc.

While preferring direct action, Mrs. Johnston has carried her campaign to the high councils of Government. In 1959, she testified vigorously before a Senate committee on legislation to prohibit the airborne and mechanized pursuit of wild unbranded horses and burros. I was a cosponsor of that proposal, and took great satisfaction in its enactment.

Earlier this year, Mrs. Johnston was back in Washington to present a paper before the 34th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference. The subject, of course, concerned the latest developments in her efforts to protect these wild creatures of the West.

Mr. President, America today is a complex, urban-oriented society and there is a tendency to overlook or lightly dismiss the labors of those committed to the preservation of our natural environment and its precious resources. To some, perhaps, Mrs. Charles C. Johnston is a quaint figure tilting 20th-century windmills of progress. But to Nevadans and other westerners, she is Wild Horse Annie, and we hold her in the highest affection and esteem. We see her as a fierce champion and protector of nature's kingdom. We salute her remarkable achievements.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record significant portions of a report recently prepared by Mrs. Johnston.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report of Recent Developments on Wild Horses

(By Mrs. Charles C. Johnston—Wild Horse Annie)

On March 4, 1969, I presented a paper, "Public Pressure and a New Dimension of Quality—Horses and Burros," at the 34th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference in Washington, D.C. The paper was co-authored by Dr. Michael Pontrelli of the Biology Department of the University of Nevada, and was aimed toward proving that the opinion of the public must be considered in the determination of wildlife values.

The case history of the fight that has gone on for nearly two decades to obtain a permanent protection program for the wild horses and burros of the west was the subject of the paper, with the development of public interest through newspaper and magazine publicity, and the resulting step by step progress toward the ultimate goal highlighting the presentation.

A letter just received from Dr. Bruce Wilkin of the Department of Conservation of Cornell University, who was Chairman of the Program Committee, and at whose invitation the paper was submitted, contained these comments, "Just a brief note to express my deep appreciation and the thanks of those in attendance for your presentation at the 1969 North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference. I particularly appreciated your willingness to meet the various deadlines involved. Our session was the best attended of the technical sessions, reflecting the interest in your presentation and the comments of the other panel members. I know you were somewhat concerned over your presentation. Many commented to me on the value of hearing some facts on an issue that has been rather heated at times."

There was no lack of current and dramatic proof of the interest of the public in the wild horses, for "Operation Mustang Haylift" was in progress in the Pine Nut Range at the time of our departure for the nation's capital. Dr. Pontrelli accompanied me to Washington. The trapped and starving horses were the subject of nationwide news coverage, when the residents in the area of the Pine Nut Range, working on a volunteer basis, came to their rescue. Helicopters, and a special airplane, with pilots, were furnished by Ed Court, of Lake Tahoe Helicopter, Inc., with the only charge being for the gasoline consumed. Hay was donated by ranchers and cash donations were made for fuel.

Hardly had we removed our coats on our return from Washington on March 6th, when I received a telephone call from the District Manager of the Bureau of Land Management at Battle Mountain, Nevada, informing me that his field men had reported several bands of wild horses in the Kawich Range, that were trapped in the deep snow and without food. The Bureau of Land Management had made arrangements with Nellis Air Force Base to conduct a Haylift from the Las Vegas area, and a plane was standing by. Bureau of Land Management's District Manager in

Las Vegas had located 17 tons of hay, at $35 per ton, but there was no money available to purchase it. Since time was of the essence, I borrowed the necessary money from a fund of the International Society for the Protection of Mustangs and Burros, of which I am President, thus enabling the Haylift to get under way.

On Sunday, March 9th, a plane was sent in from Battle Mountain by the Bureau of Land Management, to pick up Dr. Pontrelli and me, for the purpose of a survey to determine the effectiveness of the Haydrop, and to assess the future requirements. It was gratifying to us to see that of the approximately 200 head that was discovered to be trapped, about 125 were already running free and able to get to feed; about 75 were still trapped, but every effort humanly possible was being made to reach them. With the mild weather on March 11, all but 4 or 5 had gotten into the open and were in good condition. Concentrated efforts are being made to get feed to those few remaining trapped, and it is expected that all will be saved.

The money I borrowed has already been repaid to the fund. On the evening of March 10th, Judy Lynn, whose Country and Western Band was being featured at Harrah's Club in Reno, handed me a check in the amount of $600 as a contribution for her and her husband, John Kelly. It is my hope now that a permanent emergency fund can be set up to meet other similar crises in the future, and an appeal has been launched in various parts of the country for that kind of help.

I have just received a call from the mother of a member of the Trailblazers 4–H Horsemanship Club, who invited me to be the guest of her and her husband at the Circus Room of the Sparks Nuggest on the occasion of the Sierra Nevada Sportswriters and Broadcasters Association's Annual Dinner, at which Horseman of the Year awards are made, and where a representative of the 4–H Clubs will give Wild Horse Annie a check for $200 to "take care of the horses in the future." It is this kind of interest by the children in our country that gives me goose bumps when I think about it.

* * * * *

About the crisis with the horses in Central Nevada in the Kawich Range: I have the highest praise for the cooperation of the Bureau of Land Management, of Nellis Air Force Base, of the Atomic Energy Commission that loaned the Sno-cat for the land crew to go in to see what could be done; for private enterprise, and for individuals far and near. It is a first in the history of our country that the wild horses have been given help. In years before they have been left to starve. I would like to label this little tale, "Haylift and Heartlift," but I want to save that title, because some day when I get through living this saga I can write a book about it and that is what I would like to title one of the chapters.

There are a few little human interest items I would like to add to this. The check that I made out was by the request of the Bureau of Land Management, made to the National Mustang Association, that has a branch in Las Vegas, and upon receipt of the check, or a guarantee, rather, that was telephoned to them by the local Bureau of Land Management officer, the hay was purchased from the ranch and it is gratifying to know that within five hours of the notification of the emergency, the hay was loaded on the flying boxcar and was on its way. In a report I had from an officer of the organization that evening, his people had sent out the word that help was needed and ranchers from far and near were bringing in bales of hay. Contributions of cash were being made, the Air Force men had passed the hat, gathered up all their coffee money, and a retarded children's school had collected $44. It's that kind of participation that gives you a warm, glowing feeling all over.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, General Eisenhower is dead. His passing, of course, was not unexpected, although the old soldier had fought with death and won so many times before that it was hard to believe he would not also win what proved to be his final battle. He died at age 78, his life full of both deeds and honors. And so his death was not tragic, not in the sense that his passing came before the essential part of his life's work was finished. General Eisenhower's was, indeed, a life fulfilled. As did Paul, he fought a good fight, finished the course, and kept the faith. Surely the supplication of Reverend Sayre, "remember Thy servant Dwight David, O Lord," will be heeded on high.

But the death of a man of the stature of Dwight David Eisenhower cannot occur without an accompanying sadness, whether he has completed his work or not. And truly we are sad, not only here in America, but throughout the world. He is gone, and we shall greatly miss him. His place cannot be taken by another. The famous Eisenhower grin, his strength of character, the easy charm, the essential goodness of the man are now but memories. But they are good memories and will, I am sure, cause the spirits of men everywhere to be uplifted for generations to come.

My generation remembers him as the peacemaker, a man trained for war who brought and maintained the peace. He led the most powerful military force in history to victory over a strong and evil aggressor enemy. It is doubtful that any man will ever again lead such a great army. General Eisenhower was already a hero, although the war was not yet over, when I became old enough to enlist in the Armed Forces in January 1945. I did not happen to serve under his command, but I have always been proud of the fact that I wore the uniform at the same time General Eisenhower did. All veterans of World War II, I am sure, share that same feeling of pride.

Having led our forces to victory in battle, General Eisenhower then fought to preserve the peace. After the war, he served as Army Chief of Staff, then later returned to Europe as Supreme Commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. As President he again served in the role of peacemaker, bringing an end to the hostilities in Korea. And during his 8 years in the White House, Dwight Eisenhower, the man of war, took the necessary steps that preserved the peace.

My generation, of course, participated in the Eisenhower years. We fought in battle with him, served under him during his terms as President, revered him as elder statesman. He was such a part of our lives and time—the hopeful, essentially happy, good period of years to which he contributed so much—that my generation cannot forget him.

My children and their friends of a younger generation have a less sure remembrance of him. Laurence Shupe, my youngest child, who was born in the last few months of the Eisenhower administration, is too young yet to understand fully why so much has been made of the Eisenhower passing. He will, of course, come to understand better as he grows older.

But to him and to those of his time I would say that what General Eisenhower did, important as it was, is not as important as what he was. And he was, in my judgment, one of the most genuine, honest, and deeply concerned men who ever served in public life. There was nothing hypocritical about Eisenhower, no phoniness, no posturing. He was as incapable of hiding behind an unreal facade as the Kansas countryside from which he came is incapable of hiding behind a mountain. Where some politicians are suspected of being devious, General Eisenhower was never suspect. Where some have been accused of being less than truthful, nobody ever seriously questioned "Ike's" honesty. When Dwight Eisenhower told you something, you could believe it. He was the diplomat, the conciliator, the leader who brought diverse personalities together and effected a working union. And, though mild in demeanor, he could be tough. It was Eisenhower who first moved in the direction of civil rights; it was Eisenhower who sent troops into Little Rock. When the situation became explosive in the Middle East, President Eisenhower didn't hesitate to send American troops there to restore order and prevent a Communist takeover. The deeds are many, and there is no need to recount them here. History will certainly note them.

I cannot say what place historians will assign General Eisenhower as a President, but I suspect that it will be high. There has been much speculation in this regard in recent days. I like what Newsweek Columnist Kenneth Crawford said the other day:

> He was the right President for a particular time.

Perhaps that is as fitting a judgment as any, at least until time allows for a better perspective.

Ike was the archetypical American hero, the poor boy who learned correct principles at home, practiced them in life and went on to accomplish deeds and win honors beyond the wildest of dreams. It is unlikely that my son will lead armies or be President. But though he may not emulate Dwight Eisenhower in deeds or vocation, I would hope that he would take him as an example, a model of the kind of man he wants to be. He could make no better choice.

DR. EDWARD HUGHES PRUDEN, A SERVANT OF MANKIND

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today marks the last service that a remarkable clergyman will conduct at a remarkable and historic church here in the Nation's Capital.

Dr. Edward Hughes Pruden will retire from the pastorate of the First Baptist Church at 16th and O Streets NW. He has served the congregation there for 32 years.

But Dr. Pruden has served a far wider congregation, too. He truly has ministered to men. He has reached far out from his own denomination, and sought to bridge the differences not only within Christian denominations but among religions and races. Dr. Pruden has been an important link between the Southern and Northern Baptist Conventions. He has been president of the American Baptist Conventions. He has been active in the religious and social community of the District of Columbia.

Dr. Pruden was born in Chase City, Va., and graduated from the University of Richmond. He took a master's degree at the Southern Baptist Seminary in Louisville, Ky., and a Ph. D. from the University of Edinburgh in Scotland. He held a pastorate of the First Baptist Church in Petersburg, Va., for 5 years, and then came to Washington First Baptist Church, where he has remained.

His pastorate has been eminently worthy of one of the oldest churches in Washington, D.C. The First Baptist Church at 16th and O Streets was founded in 1802. It has been the mother church of many others founded in Washington, and across the country. Its founders also established George Washington University in the District of Columbia. This church has provided a spiritual haven and inspiration for many of the Nation's leaders throughout the life of the Republic. In recent years, it was to 16th and O Streets that President Harry Truman often walked from the White House for Sunday worship.

In the stained glass windows of this church are portrayed religious leaders of the ages, St. Augustine, Martin Luther, Albert Schweitzer, among them. Other windows remind us of the outstanding Baptists of history—John Bunyan, Roger Williams, and Edgar Goodspeed. There are included three Texans in this group. They are Sam Houston, B. H. Carroll, of Fort Worth, and Dr. George Truitt, of Dallas.

These windows serve to link this mother church with Texas, and with Baptist congregations throughout the country.

They also serve to link this church with the other religions of the world and of history.

They remind us, as did Dr. Pruden, that the word of God and the message of Christ know no language, nor race, nor nation, nor denomination.

I salute Dr. Pruden for the contribution he has made to this great church.

I welcome his successor, Dr. John Howell, of Atlanta, Ga. I know he will continue to serve this church in keeping with its tradition and that of Dr. Pruden.

JIM WRIGHT TELLS F-111 STORY LIKE IT IS

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we all receive a lot of unsolicited mail, most of it not very helpful. An outstanding exception to this rule was the letter dated March 21, 1969, that I received, and I gather all Members of the House received, from Jim Wright. The letter tells, what I am willing to bet for the first time, the true story of the F-111. Never in my experience have I seen such a deliberate and determined and unending effort to demolish the reputation of an American combat aircraft as there has been in the case of the F-111.

Virtually without any shadow of a doubt, it is one of the greatest design successes in the history of combat aircraft. It has capabilities well beyond any aircraft in the inventory of any nation in the world, but to read about it and hear about it over the past 2 or 3 years you could hardly think of it as anything other than a complete failure. I do not expect to ever know why this campaign started and where it got the push to continue it, but I do know that it has been almost successful.

The F-111 is made in Jim Wright's district, and he, therefore, has a parochial interest in it, but what he also has, and gives us in his letter, is all of the information, in this case correct information, about this great airplane.

I thank him for his letter, which follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., ———, *1969.*

DEAR ———: You will be enormously pleased, I know, with the truly magnificent record which the F-111 aircraft has achieved in two years of actual flying. This record is a thorough vindication of the confidence and judgment of the Congress in authorizing this program and subsequently appropriating monies for its development and production.

Even previously critical news media—as evidence the enclosures—finally are recognizing that Congress was eminently right in authorizing the plane!

In view of the sensational news treatment which has accompanied every single accident suffered by an F-111—treatment never accorded to any other aircraft—it no doubt will come as a very pleasant surprise to many that *the F-111 actually has the very best flight safety record of any military aircraft of the Century Series.*

Here is the comparative record, in number of accidents, based in each case upon 5,000 hours, 10,000 hours, and 20,000 hours of actual flying.

NUMBER OF ACCIDENTS—ALL CENTURY SERIES AIRCRAFT

Aircraft	5,000 hours	10,000 hours	20,000 hours
F-100	7	14	29
F-101	9	16	18
F-102	9	12	22
F-104	14	17	28
F-105	8	12	14
F-106	7	8	11
F-111	[1] 3	[1] 6	[1] 10
F-4	6	8	11

[1] F-111 in each case has produced fewer accidents per hours flown.

In this connection, the following facts are extremely pertinent.

1. The *escape module* in the F-111, designed to throw the pilots free in event of a crash, is probably the best and most effective yet built. In most of the highly celebrated F-111 accidents, the pilots actually escaped injury. Unlike many escape systems, the F-111's is effective at the lowest altitude—and even over water.

2. The *short takeoff and landing* characteristic of the F-111 is in one sense a safety factor for emergency operations of various sorts. This aircraft will take off and land on shorter airstrips than any other Air Force model capable of such advanced speeds.

3. No other aircraft has such a *complete redundancy of systems*—in other words, a series of spare electric and mechanical systems designed to actuate and take over automatically if the primary systems should fail. So far as possible, these have been designed to protect even against pilot errors.

4. Undoubtedly the most significant—and most revolutionary—safety development of the F-111 is its *Terrain Avoidance system* which operates by radar. I've tested this system personally at very, very low levels over extremely mountainous country. It works! With this system actuated, it is just almost impossible for a pilot to fly the plane into a mountain or building even on the darkest night and in the worst of weather.

COMBAT TESTS IN VIETNAM

These particular innovations were given an extremely thorough testing in most adverse conditions in Southeast Asia, where the Air Force flew *854 missions* including training missions. *Fifty-five of them were actual combat strike missions.* The planes flew in at such low altitudes that *the enemy radar could not pick them up* and enemy antiaircraft weapons could not focus on them. They came back *without a single hole,* and Lt. Colonel Dean Salmeier, who flew some of these missions, has said:

"There is no question in my mind that on most missions the enemy did not even know we were there until we were gone . . . The aircraft is definitely capable of making strikes at night, in all weather, and with extreme accuracy."

The F-111 is the only aircraft in the arsenal which will do these particular things.

COMBAT RADIUS AND PAYLOAD

The F-111, in spite of its relatively small size, will carry a bigger bomb load over a longer distance than any interdiction aircraft in our arsenal. The next best is the A-7 and the third best is the F-4.

Compared with the A-7, the F-111 will carry 50% more 2,000 pound bombs for more than twice the distance. Or, it will carry 30% more bomb load for almost three times the distance.

Compared with the F-4, the F-111 can carry three times the bomb load for almost five times the distance, or 30% more bombs for better than three times the distance.

NAVIGATION PRECISION

The F-111 has the most accurate navigation system of any aircraft ever built. The figures below represent the error in nautical miles for each hour of flight when the Navy system is not updated to a correct position enroute.

	(Miles) Error per hour
F-105	8.0
F-4	2.3
F-111A	1.2
F-111D	0.5

It is particularly notable that, in the past several weeks, objective news stories in some of America's most responsible journals are now recognizing the undeniable positive and favorable facts demonstrated in the F-111 record, so long obscured by the earlier spat of sensationalist and negative comment.

You will be pleased indeed with the enclosed factual and objective stories which have appeared recently in *U.S. News and World Report* and *Aviation Week*.

Thought you would like to have these facts which so thoroughly and effectively vindicate the Congress.

Very best wishes.

Sincerely,

JIM WRIGHT.

TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Roll Call, Capitol Hill's own newspaper, contains an interesting and significant article on the tax exemption of foundations and organizations in the issue of March 13, 1969. Representative PATMAN's inquiry into the activities of foundations has revealed scores of inequities and discriminatory practices. Perhaps the worst case of discrimination was the abrupt withdrawal of the tax-exempt status of the Sierra Club immediately after the publication of an ad in the New York Times and Washington Post protesting construction of a dam or dams that would flood a part of the Grand Canyon.

As pointed out in the Roll Call article, all but four of the 26 biggest spenders in 1965 were tax-exempt organizations spending money for ads and literature trying to get Congress to enact the type of legislation that the Sierra Club was protesting. They were not successful in their legislative objective, the Grand Canyon proposal was not adopted, but they kept their tax-exempt status. The Sierra Club lost its tax exemption but won the war.

In view of the investigation currently underway and the inquiry into legislation, general in nature, clarifying the tax laws and the regulations, it would seem that the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service should recognize that an error was made in the case of the Sierra Club and restore its tax exemption. Then all the organizations would be equally bound by the new legislation, if any, that is enacted. The continuation of a bureaucratic blunder made by the previous administration should not be permitted by the new administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the attached article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS PROBES TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

The first comprehensive Congressional examination of tax-exempt organizations in nearly 20 years started last month as the House Ways and Means Committee, which writes the bills that specify who gets tax exemptions, began a series of hearings.

"Private tax-exempt foundations are frauds," snaps Rep. Wright Patman, the Texas Democrat. "They don't do much for the nation except serve as tax evasion devices for the very rich. But they're so loaded with money that no one dares touch them—except me."

The concept of maintaining foundations as tax-free enterprises relates to the public view that private philanthropy plays an important role in our society. They are able to provide financial aid to areas which government cannot or should not advance. They are uniquely qualified to initiate thought and action, and to experiment with new and untried concepts, often dissenting from prevailing attitudes.

Because we have viewed private foundations in this manner, we have established generous provisions for their tax exemptions and tax deductions for contributions to such foundations have been provided for in our laws. This treatment diverts large amounts from the public treasury to private foundations. It is, therefore, essential that the tax laws insure that these private foundations and organizations put these funds to philanthropic purposes that benefit the public, not to purposes which provide personal advantage to the donor, or which advance partisan political activities and causes.

An important example of an organization which was once granted such tax exemption but which later saw its exemption revoked is the Sierra Club.

The Sierra Club has for many years been a leader in the cause of conservation. It had more than a passing interest in legislation affecting the preservation of forests, parks and other natural resources. On June 9, 1966 the Sierra Club ran full page advertisements in *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, headlined: "Now Only You Can Save Grand Canyon From Being Flooded . . . For Profit." The ads opposed federal legislation to build two dams at the Grand Canyon.

The following day, the District Director of Internal Revenue in San Francisco wrote to the Sierra Club advising them that the Internal Revenue Service was no longer prepared to extend advance assurance of deductibility of contributions to the Club. In a letter dated December 16, 1966, the Internal Revenue Service held that the club was no longer exempt from federal income tax and that contributions to the organization were not deductible.

Many observers claimed at that time that the Sierra Club was being singled out as a scapegoat because it had opposed a favorite project of the Administration. But the point is much broader: is there a systematic method of legislative oversight to see to it that the tax exempt foundations do not engage in partisan political activity, or is there not?

Consider the expenditures of other organizations during the same period when the Sierra Club lost its tax exempt status. The American Medical Association spent by its own accounting $1,155,035.30 in an effort to defeat the Medicare Bill. Newspapers, magazines, and television screens were saturated with its anti-medicare ads. The money for all of this came from two sources, the tax-free advertising revenues of the *A.M.A. Journal* and other A.M.A. publications, amounting to about $10 million a year, and from the membership dues of doctors, deductible items on their tax returns.

Compared with the A.M.A.'s 1965 outlay for political propaganda, the Sierra Club's investment of $10,000 for ads in the *Post* and the *Times* was miniscule. It was minor in comparison with what other tax exempt lobbies spend in Washington every year to win political battles.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, to cite another example, supported the Grand Canyon dams. It had a $300,000 national advertising budget in 1966 to buy space in such magazines as Look, Harpers, and the Atlantic. Many of its ads were "institutional," aimed at arousing public support for the co-ops as a necessary element in the American power system. Others were open appeals for Congressional votes. Two months to the day after the Sierra Club ad appeared in Washington, the Internal Revenue Service could have read in the Washington Star or Post a three quarter page ad calling on Congress to create a Federal bank for rural electric systems.

During the year in which the Sierra Club lost its tax exemption, the *Congressional Quarterly*, in its annual report on spending by Washington lobbies, found that all but four of the 26 biggest spenders in 1965 were tax-exempt organizations, including the Central Arizona Project Association, which spent $74,065.02 in 1965 solely to get Congress to do what the Sierra Club was trying to prevent—build dams in the Grand Canyon.

Neither the Central Arizona Project nor any of the other 23 biggest spending lobbies on the *Congressional Quarterly* list had at that time had their tax-exemptions questioned by the Internal Revenue Service.

When asked why it had revoked the tax-exempt status of the Sierra Club but had not seen fit to investigate any of the others, I.R.S. Commissioner Sheldon Cohen said that the I.R.S. is limited in what it can do. It checks, he noted, only about 15,000 of the 500,000 returns filed by "charitable" groups each year and spends little time observing the political operations of such groups.

A brief look at the largest of the foundations, the Ford Foundation, shows how a foundation, under the guise of education and research, can consistently subsidize one political view over another.

In 1968 the net worth of the Ford Foundation was $3.1 billion and its gift commitments stood at $203.2 million. Were its activities educational and non-partisan, or were they often political and partisan, and did they sometimes have the result of stirring disorder and turmoil?

In 1967, the Foundation approved a $175,000 grant primarily to help a voter registration drive in Cleveland sponsored by the Congress of Racial Equality. Supporters of Republican mayoralty candidate Seth Taft criticized the Foundation for assisting the campaign of Democrat Carl Stokes, who subsequently won.

Last Fall the Ford Foundation helped to finance New York City's school decentralization experiments, including one in Ocean Hill-Brownsville that later became the focus of three city-wide teachers' strikes. Albert Shanker, who as president of the United Federation of Teachers led the walkouts, accused the foundation of undermining his union, tampering with the city's public schools, and exerting influence over key Board of Education members holding Foundation grants.

What the Ford Foundation was supporting in the New York schools, many observers believed, was the opposite of the policy of integration which the Courts have called for. In fact, the New York Board of Rabbis criticized the Foundation's school decentralization plan as "a potential breeder of local apartheid."

In 1962, Dyke Brown, then a vice president of Ford, wrote that the Foundation's interest had "shifted from management and public administration to policy and the political process." Only last month, Ford awarded eight former aides of the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy travel and study grants totaling more than $131,000.

It is essential that we have a clarification and tightening of existing tax laws. Foundations, it must be remembered, are creatures of the Congress. Thus, the Congress has a special obligation to oversee their activities. The inequities in the current law are clear, and the time for change is now.

U.S. SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE SPEAKS AT GEORGIA B'NAI B'RITH BANQUET ON MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, Georgia Senator Herman E. Talmadge spoke on March 15, 1969, to the Georgia State Association of B'nai B'rith Lodges on the Middle East situation.

My good friend, Maurice Steinberg, attorney at law, Augusta, Ga., sent me a copy of the speech with the following remarks:

> I had the pleasure last Saturday night to attend a banquet held in Decatur, Georgia, at which our friend Herman Talmadge was the guest speaker. The banquet was part of the convention of the Georgia State Association of B'nai B'rith Lodges. There were more than 200 people present and they were tremendously impressed by Herman's remarks. The subject matter of his talk is of extreme importance on the world scene, and it is my impression that good, sound thinking concerning the unrest in the Middle East is of great importance, particularly among members of Congress.

I think this speech will be of interest to all of the Members of Congress. I submit it, therefore, for insertion in the Record:

Remarks of U.S. Senator Herman E. Talmadge

I am honored and privileged to appear before this distinguished gathering. I salute your new president.

I know all of you are proud of Ben Hyman for what he has done for your organization, for his community, and for our great State. I am proud to call Ben my friend, and I want to wish him: *Mazzel Tov.*

You have my heartfelt congratulations.

It is also my distinct pleasure to commend B'nai B'rith for a job well done. I am aware of your humanitarian work and of the splendid contributions all of you have made—through this fine organization—to promote a better understanding of the complex world in which we live.

B'nai B'rith has a long record of distinguished service and meritorious accomplishment.

You have come through some very hard times. And, even yet, the people of this troubled world are still a long way from the promised land. Judging from the present state of national and world affairs, you still have your work cut out for you.

Strife and discontent seem almost to be constant companions, both at home and abroad.

All around us, we see manifestations of immorality and dissension . . . between regions of our country, between the races, between the religions, and between nations throughout the world.

Perhaps at no other time in history have we had more of a need for men of good will, and for leaders of unwavering devotion to God and country.

I am sad to say that there probably is more disorder and internal hatred within our country today than at any time since the War Between the States.

In many parts of the world, there is political strife that at any moment can erupt into armed conflict.

People in foreign lands are ravaged by poverty and disease that is beyond our comprehension here in America.

In short, the present domestic and world situation is not one to bring cheer to the minds and hearts of peace-loving men and women.

Even now, there is terrible tension in the Middle East and even continued bloodshed. I know this is a source of deep personal concern to you.

As the second year since the June 1967 war draws to a close, Israel and her Arab neighbors are still locked in the extremely dangerous stalemate of an armed cease-fire.

Despite efforts of the United Nations mediator, and the good offices of many other interested parties, not the least of which is the United States, there is still no substantial progress to report.

The Middle East, which has been a tinderbox for these last twenty years, still totters on the brink of disaster.

If anything, the situation in the area may have become even more fraught with danger than it was. In the interim, both sides have resorted to armed force on several occasions. The reasons for the reprisals and attacks may differ between the Arabs and the Israelis. But the result has been one of keeping the Arab-Israeli conflict simmering.

Border incidents and skirmishes have become more frequent. Arab guerrilla fighters, more organized than ever before, apparently have decided to intensify their aggressive action against Israel.

As the terrorists cross the borders into Israel or the occupied regions, the Israelis have been meeting them with a fierce resistance. This denotes an increasing determination to protect their homes and farms from bombs, mines, and attacks. This is as it should be. Self-protection of Israel is, of course, beyond reproach.

The Israelis must defend their nation from bandits that raid their land in the night. But last summer, the Arab terrorist attacks against Israel took on international consequences.

In July, a group of Arab guerrillas hijacked an Israeli commercial airliner on its way from Rome to Tel Aviv. They forced the pilot to fly the plane and its 45 passengers and crew to Algeria.

The ramifications of this act were immediately apparent to all. The Arab-Israeli war had now moved into neutral ground. The hijacking in Rome, except for the inconvenience and the consternation of the captives and their families, was not harmful. The people and the plane were returned to Israel in due time.

The next international incident in the Arab guerrilla war was the attack against the El Al plane in Athens, resulting in the death of one man, and injuries to a few others.

Israel retaliated by destroying 13 planes in the Beirut airport. This drew some criticism of Israel and a United Nations condemnation.

The world was faced with a rather difficult legal problem concerning the Beirut raid, as it had been faced with the same question on many of the other reprisal raids of the Israelis.

When the Arab terrorists conduct an attack, such as the Athens raid, they do so as men without a national status. That is, they are supposedly not acting as agents of an Arab government, at least so far as it can be determined.

When the Israelis launch their retaliatory attacks, they do so as Israelis.

On the one hand, the United Nations cannot officially condemn the Arab terrorists since they are not representatives per se of a recognized government.

On the other hand, the Israelis are a government, and the United Nations passed a resolution which condemned the Israeli action.

International lawyers and diplomats may find consolation in the fact that the law, in the strictest sense of the word, has been judiciously applied. But there is obviously much to be desired in their judgments.

No one can quarrel with Israel's right to protect its citizens and its property.

No one, with the exception of the Arabs, denies that Israel's retaliation against the terrorist attacks is a fitting payment for the barbaric behavior of Arabs who pursue a policy of terror.

In one sense, the UN condemnation of Israel is an acknowledgment of Israel's honesty, in that Israel admits that the raid was carried out by the Defense Forces of the country.

The absence of a similar condemnation of the Arab nations who give sanctuary to the terrorists is a recognition of their basic dishonesty for not admitting that they, the Arab nations, are responsible for the Arab terrorists.

Another aspect of the problem in the United Nations is that any attempt to offer an appropriate condemnation of the Arab states results in either a Soviet filibuster or a Soviet veto.

The record, taken at face value, shows the Israelis as the villains since the condemnations are approved by the Security Council and the General Assembly. At the same time, the Arab nations appear innocent since there are no condemning resolutions on record against them.

For whatever consolation it may be to the Israelis, most reasonable people recognize that the deck is stacked against the Israelis in the matter of United Nations resolutions.

As for other terrorism perpetrated against the State of Israel and her citizens, such as the bomb explosion in the Jerusalem market, or the bomb in the Tel Aviv bus depot, these acts are regarded with universal contempt.

They are only meant to harm, maim and kill. They are despicable. It is one of the great tragedies of the Middle Eastern situation that Israel must suffer these daily threats to life and limb.

There have been reports of several different peace plans offered by the Soviet Union, France, Egypt, Israel, the United States, and others. But the primary obstacle to a permanent peace still remains the Arab refusal to negotiate directly with the State of Israel.

If any of the proposals for peace will prove to be fruitful is a question that only time will answer.

But it is clear that the first stumbling block to any settlement is the Arab rejection of a peace conference. As President Johnson said before B'nai B'rith in Washington on September 10, 1968:

"The process of peace-making will not begin until the leaders of the Middle East begin exchanging views . . ."

The President also said at that same meeting that the United States has ". . . no intention of allowing the balance of forces in the area to ever become an incentive for war."

Since then the United States and Israel have concluded an agreement for the sale of Phantom jet aircraft to the state of Israel. It is hoped that these planes will preserve the current arms balance between the two sides, and therefore keep the Arab states from assuming that Israel is unable to defend herself.

Such an assumption could provoke new attacks and new aggressions in the Middle East.

And, judging from the heroic behavior of the Israeli armed forces in the June, 1967 war, it could well be another disastrous assumption on the part of the Arab nations.

By honoring the Israeli request for these planes and other armaments, it is hoped that the Soviet Union will realize that its policy of arming the Arab nations in the hope that they will be able to gain an arms advantage will be proven not only foolhardy but also unfeasible.

I fully support the United States' policy of assisting Israel in the acquisition of arms to keep the balance and thereby prevent another war. The strength of Israel acts as a deterrent until such time as real peace negotiations can be implemented.

The outcome of the peace negotiations, when negotiations finally do begin, will depend on the ability of both sides to compromise. In the end, both the Arabs and the Israelis will have to compromise if there is to be any meaningful agreements.

The current positions of both sides are apparently unreconcilable. Both sides must understand that they cannot possibly realize all their hopes and desires. New approaches may find ways around some of the present disagreements, and new tactics may be needed to break current deadlocks.

There are two examples of deadlocked questions that could be solved by accepting less than the full measure: so-called "Israeli expansionism," and the state of war.

According to the newspapers, President Nasser has offered to issue a declaration of peace instead of declaring an end of the state of war. Israel wants an end to the war, but perhaps the Israelis will have to settle for the compromise.

The Arabs have, for many years, been claiming that Israel has designs on Arab territory, that the state of Israel is going to expand until it reaches from the Nile River to the Euphrates. If the claim is true or not really doesn't matter so long as the Arab people believe that it is true.

We know that Israel is not going to push its borders to Iraq. But as long as the Arab leaders are able to convince the Arab masses that Israel intends to take more Arab territory, then there must be some way to try and tell the Arab people otherwise.

Israel could issue a declaration of nonexpansion and put it on file at the United Nations along with the Arab declaration of peace.

These concessions may appear petty and insignificant, but if the long-range goal is to be achieved, then maybe we will have to make such concessions.

The goal is peace. Israel wants only to be left alone, to have peace, to end the madness that has seized the Middle East for two decades.

We know what Israel can do if all the resources of the country were turned toward the full development of the Israeli nation.

I do not mean the natural resources of Israel. They are meager at best.

I mean the human resources of Israel. They are immense.

I submit that not since the founding of our own nation and the unprecedented development of the United States has a nation of people been possessed of such a wealth of human initiative, determination and inventiveness, as the nation of Israel.

Israel is given credit for "turning the desert into gardens." This is true. It is a miracle of the modern world that the nation of Israel has registered the amazing development that it has, in spite of the adverse conditions of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

In a peaceful Middle East, Israel would surpass any other example of achievement. Moreover, the Israeli leaders have said many times that they would share their wealth of knowledge with their neighbors.

One of the most impressive of the Israeli programs has been the international cooperation between Israel and the other developing nations of the world.

A Burmese government official was quoted as saying, in praise of the Israeli technicians who had come to his nation to assist in farming projects, that Israel "gives us what we want."

What he was saying was this: There were no "strings" attached to Israeli assistance. There were no political implications involved in Israeli help. The Israelis were showing his people, the Burmese people, how to help themselves.

Israel does not have a give-away program. They have a "show-how" program. They show how to build a nation.

In the four corners of the earth, Israelis have been demonstrating a new kind of international cooperation that reminds me of something I learned a long time ago by another name. It was called hard work.

In a day when it appears that half of the world is looking for something for nothing, how refreshing it is to see someone working.

In Israel they work now, for their own future and for the good of all mankind. Even in the dark hours, when Israel was threatened with destruction, they had time to offer a helping hand.

The most momentous and self-sacrificing gesture of this war-torn area of the Middle East is that Israel has offered to help the Arab states with their own development as soon as peace can be achieved.

For any who would doubt the good intentions of the Israelis, I think that their offer of help to their own enemies is sufficient proof that there is nothing devious in the Israeli program for the future.

The nation of Israel is truly a nation of peace. She wants only to live and grow in peace and freedom and help her neighbors do the same.

HOW RELIABLE THE ABM?

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial, entitled "How Reliable the ABM?" recently published.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW RELIABLE THE ABM?

A report from North Dakota, where President Nixon wants to start installing his ABM missile defense system, raises a new question about the whole fantastically expensive program on which United States security is built. That question involves the reliability of the intricate rocketry that powers the Minuteman missile and its projected ABM defenders.

Farmers who plow around the Minuteman are skeptical that it will ever fire when needed. That skepticism stems from repeated failures in test launches at the North Dakota base—the most embarrassing last Aug. 14 when high-ranking Pentagon officials and Congressmen waited in vain. Something always seems to go awry: a resistor proves faulty; a capacitor doesn't work; a pin misfunctions.

Such experiences with the Minuteman point up the more serious problems of dependability presented by the incredibly intricate ABM complex of radars, computers and Spartan and Sprint missiles. These problems apply not merely to the hardware but to the programing of the computers, a make-or-break element in the Safeguard system.

Many will argue that the flawless performance of Apollo spacecraft in the exacting flights they have made in preparation for the first landing on the moon erases any valid basis for doubt that the ABM system can fulfill its assigned mission. But quite apart from the fact that an Apollo rocket is simpler than the Safeguard complex, the project to put men on the moon benefits from a degree of care and checking that no long-lived ABM can expect to have.

An army of inspectors and testers keeps the Apollo units under microscopic watch at every step of the long road from manufacture through assembly and blast-off. And the mooncraft do not stand in silos year after year while generations of bored military nursemaids give increasingly routine attention to the myriad electronic components, every one of which must operate perfectly if the rocket is to work.

The whole intertwined program for building deterrents around the present grid of nuclear deterrents provides plentiful opportunity for the operation of what engineers call Murphy's Second Law: If anything can go wrong with a complex system, it will go wrong. An ABM system would be fired only once—on twenty minutes notice at the outbreak of nuclear war. The possibility of substantial, even catastrophic, failure requires close examination by Congress before it decides on a project for which there is little discernible justification in any event.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, mere words are always inadequate to express the deep feelings that flood over one in the loss of so great a man and so noble a leader as we have lost in the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower. And my words are more than inadequate to add anything to the stirring tribute delivered by President Nixon in his eulogy in the rotunda on Sunday.

The world has lost its most beloved and respected citizen. It is symbolic of the stature he attained that the world mourns the loss of this son of America's heartland and mourns him as deeply and sincerely as any in his native land.

Near the end of his eulogy, President Nixon expressed what to me is the most significant thing about the life of this late, great American hero. Each of us has been diminished by his passing, but as the President pointed out:

> Each of us here will have a special memory of Dwight Eisenhower.

That is true. And it is powerful.

It is true because no man who ever met him or saw him or heard him speak could forget him. Could anyone forget that smile, so full of kindliness and good humor? Could anyone forget his voice, so firm, resolute and assured, yet so rich in goodness and sincerity. There was strength in his manhood—boundless energy and enthusiasm—and such gentleness in his eyes and in his manner.

It is true and it is powerful. Powerful because it is a memory etched in the mind forever of a man who personified as no other of our era has all the noble qualities of America. Dwight Eisenhower was a man of great accomplishments who never lost his deep sense of humility. He was a man of great power whose first concern, whether as general or President, was always for the good of those he led. He was a target for thoughtless criticism who never learned to hate. He was schooled in the military, yet constantly devoted to the cause of peace and one of our most effective peacemakers. He was subjected to the greatest pressures, yet he never deserted the principles and ideals instilled in him as a youth by a devout mother, a firm but kindly father, and a community imbued with love of country. He is the kind of man every parent hopes his child will grow to be, and the challenge to emulate his example will be a powerful influence for good wherever it is taken up.

Yes, each of us will have a special memory of Dwight Eisenhower. My special memory is of playing golf with him at Burning Tree when he was President. He was a strong competitor, a great sport, a man it was tremendous fun to be with.

He was the most interesting man I have ever known; warm, friendly, and good-humored, with a deep compassion for all mankind; an American through and through. A great general, a great statesman, a great President. Yes. But more than that, he was a "great guy." That is my memory of Dwight Eisenhower. And in his passing I have lost a sincere friend. But my life has been specially blessed by having known him, and for as long as I live nothing can diminish that privilege, that honor, that great reward.

To his gallant and gracious widow, to his wonderful family, I extend my deepest sympathy and pray the blessing of God's peace upon them.

ADDRESS BY HON. THEODORE ROOSEVELT McKELDIN BEFORE CONGREGATION OF CHRIST CHURCH, RALEIGH, N.C.

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, on March 26, 1969, Maryland's distinguished former Governor and mayor of Baltimore, Hon. Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin, who now serves as a member of the Indian Claims Commission, addressed the congregation of Christ Church in the capital city of Raleigh, N.C. The occasion was the noon Lenten service in this historic church, whose rector is the Reverend Bruce Daniel Sapp; associate rector, the Reverend Edward Cook LeCarpentier, Jr.; and lay leader, a prominent citizen of Raleigh, Mr. Ben F. Park.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Governor McKeldin's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, CHRIST CHURCH LENTEN SERVICE, RALEIGH, N.C., WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1969

It has been suggested to me that this audience is particularly interested in two aspects of the problem that confronts the American who honestly strives to square his conduct with his conscience in discharging his duty as a citizen. Those two are, first, the responsibility of our governmental institutions, and, second, of government officials "for the reconciliation and maintenance of the community life in a changing world."

. Of course, I know that you do not expect me to cover that subject in detail in a single address. The theory is available to you in a whole library of books, so I assume that what you require of me is such hints as I may have picked up, not from the study of books but from practical experience as Mayor of a large city and Governor of a small state. That I can do, for I have not learned so much that I can't give you the gist of it in a speech of reasonable length.

To begin with, all our institutions of government are designed to operate within a framework of political principles so extremely simple that the rest of the world has never been able to understand them, and we ourselves have frequently misunderstood some. You may think that I am offering you a paradox calling them too simple to understand, but it is a fact that often the simplest statement is the hardest to understand. I offer you an example: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free"—twelve words, each of one syllable, all perfectly familiar, but if you can tell what they mean, not part, but *all* of what they mean, you are wise beyond the wisdom of this generation, for the whole world today is committed to the theory that only by secrecy, deception, and devious strategems can any nation hope to preserve its freedom.

So the fact that the framework is simple doesn't mean that it is easy to handle. On the contrary, we have devised the most difficult form of government the world has ever seen, and the difficulty begins with the six reasons that we have advanced as the only legitimate reasons for having any government at all. They are stated in the preamble to the Constitution, as follows:

1. To form a more perfect Union.
2. To establish justice.
3. To insure domestic tranquility.
4. To provide for the common defense.
5. To promote the general welfare.
6. To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

Consider those six statements. They are all as simple as A-B-C—and harder to grasp in all their implications than the 24 volumes of the *Corpus Juris Civilis* of the Emperor Justinian. Take Number Two, "to establish justice"—every famous writer on the law, from Tribonian, through Coke and Blackstone, down to our own Justice Holmes, has struggled in vain to explain what that means. The reason is simple—it hasn't meant exactly the same thing in any two different periods of time, or in any two different countries in the same period. It is a changing world.

Number Five, "to promote the general welfare," is even more difficult, and Number Three, "to insure domestic tranquility," is almost as obscure. Nevertheless, to these six objects the fundamental law commits the government of the United States, and to no others. There are three, in particular, to which most of the nations known to history have been committed, but to which ours is in no way pledged. They are:

1. To increase our wealth.
2. To extend our dominion over the earth.
3. To correct the manners and morals of foreign nations.

Yet there are Americans in large numbers who believe with all their hearts that the government should direct its attention first to these three, and attend to the others later, if at all. Furthermore, they would amend Number Six. Where it reads "to secure the blessings of liberty," they would make it read "to secure the blessings of prosperity."

I am no Marxist. I see nothing intrinsically evil in wealth, or in power, or in missionary zeal, but I see great wisdom in their exclusion from the list of our nation's reasons for being. Certainly the nation must acquire enough national wealth and national power to provide for the common defense, and it should proclaim to all the world its adherence to the ideals of justice and liberty. But that is the limit of its commitment under its organic law.

That, I believe, defines the full responsibility of our governmental institutions.

Now consider the responsibility of the men to whom is entrusted the operation of our institutions, which is to say, the responsibility of our government officials.

The first I shall mention is a responsibility that the official owes, not to the public, but to himself. It is the cultivation of a certain modesty as he goes about his task, a realization of its difficulty, and a firm rejection of the temptation to believe that he alone is the people and that wisdom shall die with him. I assert this without hesitation or reservation, because I have the highest possible authority for it. You know who said, "Why callest thou me good? none is good save one, that is, God." Any man who thinks he can rule this country perfectly thinks he is wiser than Jesus of Nazareth, who knew that God alone can do it perfectly. A man who forgets that—and I think I have seen some—is disqualified for public office.

But that is, I repeat, the official's responsibility to himself. What he owes to the people who elected him, or to the higher official who appointed him, is an honest effort to make the government, within his sphere of influence, serve the six objects that it was established to serve. He may be a minor official, with a small sphere of influence, but to the limit of his authority the same obligation rests upon him that rests upon the President of the United States.

I think it fair to say that the primary obligation rests upon the minor official, for it is he who has the first and most frequent contact with the public. Relatively few of us ever exchange a word with the President, and not a great many with the Governor of the States. But everybody has spoken to the letter-carrier and the policeman on the beat, while most of us have at some time had dealings with the tax-collector, all of whom in their various ways represent the government.

It may not be fair, but it is human nature for us to base our opinion of any institution on our personal contacts with its representatives. Hence it is possible for even a minor official to do something to defeat every one of the six objects for which the nation was formed. If his conduct is such as needlessly to enrage people, then by just so much he impairs the Union, aborts justice, disturbs tranquility, weakens defense, retards welfare and makes people doubt that they have any liberty.

To attribute such terrific results to one surly cop, or postman, or tax-collector you may say is nonsense, for the worst he can do is trivial. True—but multiply a triviality by a million, and it is no longer trivial. And there are more than two million government employes, not counting men in the armed forces.

At the same time, it must never be forgotten that there are times when the cop or the tax-collector, and perhaps even the postman, has to get tough if he is to do his duty. In such a case the resentment he arouses is all to his credit.

In short, the responsibility of the public official in dealing with the public is a two-way street. If he owes courtesy to the public, the public owes fairness to him. A failure in either direction results in damage to the whole political structure.

I do not believe, however, that such failures are primarily, or even largely responsible for the uneasiness that wisest men among us feel when they consider the temper of the times. It is stupid, as well as cowardly not to face the fact that there is widespread disaffection in this country. It is merely attested, it is not created by rioting in the black ghetto, rioting on the university campus, clergymen and scholars courting pains and penalties by exhibiting not merely contempt, but hatred for the law, eminent scientists giving each other the lie over the question of whether a projected defense system will defend or further imperil us. I cannot too strongly condemn the senseless violence that has not merely disturbed, but very nearly wrecked domestic tranquillity; but neither am I able to lay the flattering unction to my soul that it is all the work of a personal devil, walking to and fro in the earth, seeking whom he may devour.

I know that the situation is perilous and I think the peril rises, not from the ranting of the lunatic fringe, but from a profound exasperation among people who would scorn to take part in any rioting, or draft-card burning, or parading with idiotic signs. The silent people nevertheless begin to suspect that the government that once was theirs has somehow escaped from their hands and is now running wild. They hope that the newly-elected President is still in control, and that hope has brightened appreciably within recent weeks. Nevertheless they are considering—and they are right in considering—whether it may be that this nation for many years has been giving too much attention to wealth and power and self-righteousness, to the neglect of the six aims that it was established and ordained to seek.

I yield to none in my adherence to the principle of complete separation of Church and State, and I am adamant in my opposition to the injection of any theological concept into organic or statute law. But in this house and in this presence, I venture to remind you that every one of the six objects of government named in the preamble to the Constitution is squarely in line with the Christian ethic propounded by the Founder of our Faith.

Therefore I see nothing inconsistent with the old Americanism, in which our fathers believed, if their sons in this hour when distrust is rife, distrust of government, distrust of law, distrust of leadership and, worst of all, distrust of ourselves—in this hour of perplexity and peril, it is pure Americanism for us to resolve to act as the Psalmist did in his great defiance of the Powers of Darkness, "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh my help. My help cometh from the Lord, which made heaven and earth."

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON MEXICAN-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce legislation to establish the already-existing Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs as a permanent statutory agency of the Federal Government. The Committee is now scheduled to expire in June 1969.

I feel we must not ignore the many problems of our Mexican-American citizens. A concentrated effort must be made to provide this minority group with the advantages and protection that full American citizenship accords. It is for this reason that the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs must be established on a permanent basis.

The Interagency Committee is responsible for focusing attention on the many problems of the approximately 10,000,000 Spanish-surnamed Americans, which represents about 5 percent of our total population.

Since its creation as a Cabinet committee on June 9, 1967, the Interagency Committee has sought to identify the needs of the Mexican-Americans, provide advice on assistance and benefits available from the Federal Government, and to recommend new programs to meet the unique needs of the Spanish-speaking people in our country.

While the Committee title refers to "Mexican-Americans," its concern is with all Americans with Spanish surnames, whether from Puerto Rico, Spain, Central America, or Latin America. These persons share a common language and traditions, and they face similar problems.

The Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs is active in many areas, including education, health, welfare and poverty, housing, migrant labor, civil rights, immigration, employment, and economic development. During its brief history, the Committee has made numerous program contacts with all levels of government as well as with private industry and organizations. Progress has been made in attaining economic dependency for Mexican-Americans, but more needs to be accomplished.

The economic plight of the Mexican-American community is their most basic and serious problem, and it is largely a result of a lack of educational opportunity. From this has stemmed the chronic problems of the Mexican-Americans.

The legislation I am introducing will make available on a permanent basis the machinery necessary to improve the social and economic conditions of the Mexican-Americans. The proposed Committee will expand upon the functions of the present Interagency Committee by involving all Americans of similar ethnic and cultural backgrounds in this necessary task.

Much has already been accomplished by the Interagency Committee. The ground has been broken and the task begun on behalf of the Mexican-Americans. We must not stop in this effort until all Mexican-Americans have the advantages and protection of full citizenship and are able to participate fully in our society.

I therefore urge the Congress to give favorable consideration to establishing on a permanent basis the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs.

ABM—ADMINISTRATION'S BIGGEST MISTAKE?

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "ABM—Administration's Biggest Mistake?" by James Reston, published in the New York Times of March 12, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABM—ADMINISTRATION'S BIGGEST MISTAKE?

(By James Reston)

There are really two crises over the ABM. One is over what the initials mean: do they stand for an essential Anti-Ballistic Missile, or for the Administration's Biggest Mistake? It depends on who is talking. But the second, and maybe even more important crisis, is not so much over what to do about the ABM, but how to decide what to do.

Very few people in this country, or even in the world, have the scientific and technical competence to pass judgment on whether this missile would be effective in knocking down multiple-entry warheads with their decoys and other radar scramblers; or even whether deploying such a system, whatever its cost, would add to or subtract from the security of the Republic.

DECISION PUZZLE

In this situation, about all the rest of us can demand is not a specific decision but a sense of confidence in the *process of decision*, and this sense of confidence is precisely what is lacking.

President Nixon will make a "decision" on this five- or fifty-billion-dollar ABM question, but he won't decide it, for it is so tangled in subjective questions of politics, Government contracts, cost-effectiveness disputes and arguments on the need for spending the money elsewhere, that his "decision" will leave the controversy unresolved no matter what he says.

Accordingly, there is considerable merit in the proposal made to the Congress this week by Dr. James R. Killian Jr., the chairman of the board of M.I.T., a multiple intellectual trust located in Cambridge, Mass. The defense of the nation, Dr. Killian suggested, is too serious and complicated to be left to soldiers and politicians alone.

OUTSIDE JUDGMENTS

He was more polite than that, as usual, but he argued for the creation of an independent commission of qualified men who could make a "comprehensive study in depth of our weapons technology and of the factors which bear upon the decisions the nation must make regarding on-going strategic forces and policies."

Dr. Killian recalled that such a commission had been established during the Eisenhower Administration and proved to be useful to both the President and the Congress. He did not argue that its findings should carry more weight than studies conducted within the Government, but he noted that the competition between the services for roles and missions, and the subjective interests of military and industrial minds, often led to suspicion of narrow and selfish decisions, which an outside group of experts might avoid.

THE COMMITTED CHAIRMAN

He might have added that there are now powerful men in the armed services committees of the Congress whose disinterestedness in voting funds for missiles and other expensive explosives is not unbounded. What he did say was that even the Congress could use some special help from outside the Government from time to time in reaching decisions on the great strategic questions of the day.

The comments out of Capitol Hill on the ABM question this week illustrate the point. Chairman L. Mendel Rivers of the House Armed Services Committee said he was for deploying the ABM's. "I want protection, and like everybody else, I want the latest in technology," he said.

Representative Gerald Ford of Michigan, the House Republican leader, made an equally profound remark. "If you have to gamble and err," he said, "it is better to gamble and err on the side of strength and not weakness."

THE BIG QUESTION

This is the kind of thing that passes all too often for analysis in the Congress, and it sounds fine only until you begin to think about it. For the argument over the ABM is not whether we want "protection" but whether the ABM will provide it; not whether we want strength or weakness, but which of the two we will get from deploying these missiles.

Dr. Killian's proposal could help us out of this dilemma, or at least give us a little more time to decide how to decide. The ABM is being debated as one defensive weapons system without much relation to the other critical aspects of a strategic plan as a whole. For the moment, it has got lost in politics and opinions and past commitments, and is not likely to be accepted either at home or abroad until there is a great deal more trust in the way evidence is gathered and decisions are taken.

WASHINGTON REVISITED

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, the following is a sermon preached in the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, 212 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C., on Palm Sunday—March 30, 1969—by Dr. Arnold F. Keller, Jr., pastor:

WASHINGTON REVISITED

Today the Christian Church observes one of its significant festivals. It is the door into the observance of Holy Week. It ushers us in to those events which have forever altered the meaning of history and destiny of man. Each Palm Sunday our minds picture again that procession of Passover pilgrims winding its way along the road that leads from Bethany to Jerusalem.

Strange as the scene appears to the modern eye, how much more strange the story that it tells. For the meaning of Palm Sunday lies in a paradox, an apparent contradiction. This paradox is summed up strikingly in the poet's two lines—

"Ride on, ride on, in majesty,
In lowly pomp ride on to die . . ."[1]

On this day Jesus was greeted with the acclamation due a conquering hero. There must have been a gaiety about it all, an excitement, an enthusiasm. People waved palm branches; they laid their garments in the road to afford Him protection from the dust and grime. Was this not the prophet from Galilee who, but a few days before, had raised Lazarus from the dead? They sang and they chanted, "Hosanna! Blessed is He who comes in God's name."

Triumphal, men have called it. But not the sort of triumph that we are accustomed to expect! It did not lead to the honoring of a national hero. It did not culminate in the coronation of a king. It did not climax with the inauguration of a chief executive. Instead, in the brief span of five days the "Hosannas" had choked in their throats. In five short days the cry became the savage howl of a mob, "Crucify Him! Release Barabbas; but crucify Him!" So, in this paradox of event which wasn't at all what it seemed to be, God's purpose was unfolded, as Jesus entered the city.

I never read this story, I never come to a Palm Sunday without appreciating how completely contemporary it is. It translates so directly into the text and context of the modern world. And so, there is always the accompanying question . . . what would happen today? What would be the case were Jesus to revisit His world today? If He were, for instance, to revisit mankind in this capital city as He revisited His own in that never-to-be-forgotten Passover Week, what would be in His heart and mind? And what would be our response?

Nothing escapes His glance. Surely the eye of God is not so limited as the eye of man; the eye of God is not so easily deceived by superficial appearances, not so easily fooled by facades, as is the eye of man. Katherine Mansfield, writer of many fine short stories, is said to have cried out once, "But there isn't one of them that I would show to God." You see, it is with such thorough scrutiny, such complete perception, Jesus entered the city.

And the record of Scripture has it that as He looked at the city He wept, saying, "If only you understood on what your peace depends . . . but you didn't understand, you didn't understand, when God Himself was visiting you."

Would it be so different today? Would not our Lord weep were He to look out upon this city, or any of our great cities, today? Were He to view the tragedies of hunger (not only in the world's refugee camps, but also in the cities of America)? The richest nation in history, the most advanced in the sciences and technologies! If such a nation does not gird itself to mount a thorough attack upon the noisy, ugly, unclean environments of its cities, upon the problems of hunger and undernourishments in its midst, and to reverse its dismal failures to educate and to train its young for useful living . . . if we continue to score so low here . . . if we do not allocate our resources and direct our skills to solve these human problems, then we are faced not only with a social tragedy, but also with a sin against God. For having failed the least of these our human brothers, we have offended God Himself.

Jesus looked at the city and wept.

And would not our Lord weep at what we are doing to His world? Not to our world, but to His world! The Apollo 8 men looked out at the earth from the rare perspective of a spatial orbit. They saw the good earth as "a grand oasis in the vast desert of space." But what are we doing to the oasis? Ecologists tell us that we are making of the world a place that is increasingly unsuitable for human life. In greed and in carelessness our industry belches poison into the air we are trying to breathe and spews out waste into the water we are supposed to drink. So vile is the situation that in one of our largest cities each glass of water has been described as a mass of inert bacteria suspended in a chlorine solution.

The problem of good air, pure water, unspoiled land is so huge, the vested interests who take of the resources given us without returning are so strong, the controls upon it all are so inadequate that one feels helpless to change the relentless course. But we can and do shout out the sin of it. For it is another outrage against God; it is a religious issue as well as a matter of human survival. The wise man who stated the great concepts found in the Book of Genesis speaks of man and of the world in this fashion. "The Lord planted a garden in Eden, in the east; there he put man (2.8) . . . put him in the garden to till it and to keep it (2.15)" You see, the concern is man's stewardship of God's good earth.

Jesus looked at the city and wept.

And would our Lord not weep to see man so helpless to act creatively before the insanity of modern warfare? Ballistic missiles and anti-ballistic missiles; the potential for a man-developed and loosed plague (euphemistically spoken of as bacteriological warfare); nuclear warheads; rockets and fire; all of these make an exceedingly dubious record of human achievement. A distinguished Harvard biology professor has recently told us that "There is nothing worth having that can be obtained by nuclear war—nothing material or ideological—no tradition that it can defend. It is utterly self-defeating . . . nuclear weapons offer us nothing but a balance of terror."[2]

This is all the more lunatic when we begin to look at the total of our governmental expenditures, comparing what we spend for destructive potential with what we spend for schools, for cities, for the hungry, for children, for preserving and protecting natural resources. Some people say, give me a look at a man's checkbook and I'll tell you about that man. Well, what does a look at our nation's checkbook disclose about us? It might reveal us to be a nation of armorers and warriors, which is the very last thing that we think ourselves to be.

Jesus looked at the city, and he wept. He wept.

There is, you see, for every person, for every city and for every society the question of priorities, the choice for what really matters, the issue of the allocation of skills and resources. There is also the fact of God's judgment and of His expectation. Perhaps never before have the options been so crucial and the pressures of God's judgment as well as His hope been as clear as they are today. A break with past patterns which have not succeeded is essential. Great allocations of money and skill must be made in behalf of God's world and God's creatures.

What will we do? The record has it further that when Jesus entered the city. He was taken and crucified. Would it be any other today? Perhaps the historic response to Palm Sunday is equally a contemporary response. Or, it is more like Studdert-Kennedy's poem of how the Lord might have been received in Birmingham, England?

"When Jesus came to Golgotha, they hanged Him on a tree
They drove great nails thru hands and feet, and made a Calvary
They crowned Him with a crown of thorns, red were His wounds and deep
For those were crude and cruel days, and human flesh was cheap.

When Jesus came to Birmingham, they simply passed Him by
They never hurt a hair of Him, they only let Him die
For men had grown more tender, and they would not give Him pain
They only just passed down the Street, and left Him in the rain.

Still Jesus cried, "Forgive them, for they know not what they do"
And still it rained the winter rain that drenched Him thru and thru.
The crowds went home and left the streets without a soul to see
And Jesus crouched against a wall and cried for Calvary."[3]

---

[1] Henry Hart Milman, 1791–1868.

[2] The New Yorker; March 22, 1969; page 31, column 3.

[3] G. A. Studdert-Kennedy, *"The Crucifixion."*

Jesus looked at the city and wept. He weeps still . . . "if only you understood on what your peace depends."

JUDGE ROBERT MAXWELL WARNS AGAINST VIOLENCE OF THE FEW

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there are those among our young people who today believe that change and growth can be achieved only through disruption and destruction. The history of our Nation proves that this is not the case.

U.S. District Court Judge Robert E. Maxwell, of Elkins, W. Va., recently reminded a group of young people that there is room for dissent and constructive paths to change in our country. Judge Maxwell, a relatively young man himself, is well qualified to speak on this subject, and what he has to say is worthy of attention.

I request unanimous consent to have a report of Judge Maxwell's talk, as reported in the Clarksburg Sunday Exponent-Telegram, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE MAXWELL WARNS GROUP AGAINST "VIOLENCE OF THE FEW"

CHARLESTON.—Calling them members of the most socially conscious younger generation in history, Judge Robert E. Maxwell asked the young Saturday to develop a posture of excellence in seeking solutions to the problems they will face in the years ahead.

Addressing a luncheon meeting of the Key Clubs of West Virginia at their state convention here, the U.S. District Court judge said:

"Social change is a learning process for all who are concerned, and in today's world we have no alternative but to be concerned. Your choice is to train yourself excellently for the task which is ahead."

The Elkins jurist said society cannot achieve greatness, and new answers for old problems, unless individuals at many levels of ability accept the needs for high standards of performance and strive to achieve those standards within the limits made possible to them.

Maxwell said it is doubtful that any society on earth has been confronted with as many challenges as the present one, "or needed more desperately to draw on the deepest sources of understanding and responsibility."

He touched on the unrest welling up from college campuses all across America, saying, "All too many of those among the rebellious groups at Berkeley, Columbia, San Francisco State and elsewhere have confused the free with the free and easy. If freedom had been the happy, simple, relaxed state of ordinary humanity, as some in these groups view it, many would have been everywhere free.

"But such is not the case, and those misguided young people are giving a bad name and a disgraceful reputation to the younger generation, when in fact it should be the other way around."

Campus protest follows illegal and legal lines, he said, and went on:

"Peaceful protest is as American as the Bill of Rights . . . Peaceful protest, when linked with a righteous cause, is awesome in its appeal and overpowering in its force . . .

"There is absolutely no place in our political system for violence of the few. Violent protests of the type that has invaded the academic world forms the cutting edge of unrest, upheaval, and, ultimately, anarchy."

Maxwell urged the Key Clubbers to pursue such constructive outlets as an education "to the limits of their resources," a meaningful family life, the role of an intelligent voter, and participation in other areas of government as "alert and concerned citizens."

In conclusion he said, "Excellence, competence and good deeds of a superior quality are the only sure traits that can preserve and protect us. Even the best is not enough. We must try harder.

"With my generation already far down the road, it is in your generation that we must place our trust—to preserve and enhance our country's institutions, our system, our way of life."

REPORT ON LUMBER PRICES

HON. JOHN R. DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, recently both the executive and legislative branches were moved to begin examination of the increased prices of lumber and plywood which have affected the home-buying public as well as the wood producers.

This problem has attracted nationwide attention because suddenly those not familiar with the timber shortage—the real cause of increased prices—have realized that the Nation may not fulfill the goals of the Housing Act of 1968. Under that law 26 million housing units are to be built during the next 10 years. It is now estimated that the Nation will be short new housing for 200,000 families during this first year under the new law.

The Congress has shown its concern during the recent hearings in the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and in the House Banking and Currency Committee.

I hope this concern and the consequent discussion continue, and for this reason I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three discussions of the causes of the present crisis in lumber and plywood prices.

The Huntley-Brinkley report, on March 19, carried the following interview with the manager of a lumber yard who explained that wood prices have skyrocketed and that better management of our forests could reverse those upward trends:

REPORT OF LUMBER PRICES

DAVID BRINKLEY. The prices of lumber and plywood have risen far higher and faster than anything else affecting the cost of living. In some cases, price increases are up to a hundred percent. That, plus the highest interest rate in history on home mortgages, is raising the cost of housing.

President Nixon has asked to have it looked into, and will have the Federal Government do whatever it can to help bring lumber prices down.

From NBC News Correspondent, Jack Perkins, a report on why lumber prices have risen so high.

PERKINS. Anyone who's been to the lumber yard lately has noticed, he couldn't help but notice, prices have about doubled. It's the same with most everything in the yard, a bother for the homeowner, a major problem for the home builder.

Forty percent of the wood used in this country today, is used to build homes.

MAN. The price of lumber has gone up approximately a hundred percent on most of the items that we use in construction of our homes.

PERKINS. In the last year?

MAN. In the last year. Yes, sir.

PERKINS. Well, what does it do to you?

MAN. This raises the price of a typical house, let's say about a $22,000 home by about 13 to 14 hundred dollars.

PERKINS. The problem is, the men at the lumber companies will tell you, is that there is today a shortage of timber.

SECOND MAN. Now, when a little shortage develops, and then obviously the price goes up as, Lord knows, the prices on plywood and lumber have been way too low for at least the last ten years. That's what makes this thing look precipitous at the moment, because they have been too low, and now maybe they're a little too high.

PERKINS. The Federal Government is investigating and finding that higher lumber prices are caused by lumber shortage, and the shortage is caused by the Federal Government.

Two-thirds of the Forests of this country are owned by the Federal Government. The government sells the timber to private industry, but it doesn't sell as much as it should each year, because it doesn't run its forests very efficiently.

The Forestry Service is not given enough money properly to clear the forests, reseed them, survey them, build access roads. The government could probably get two-thirds more timber out of its forests each year if they were properly managed.

It is so the Federal Forests may be more efficiently managed that President Nixon is asking for greater appropriations for the Forestry Service.

Home builders consider this a matter of vital importance.

THIRD MAN. Wood is the basic material of the home building industry, and if we don't have if, at prices that we can live with, our industry is in trouble, and it's in trouble now.

An article in the March 28 issue of Time magazine outlines both the background of the price boosts and some of the stopgap measures designed to meet the immediate crisis. This article also covers long-range solutions such as better access to forests to facilitate harvesting ripe timber and to cut down on the waste of this valued resource, further limits on the exports of logs and a "need to revamp the Nation's timber management policies."

The article follows:

PRICES

THE COST OF NEGLECT

Anxious to escape abrasive confrontations of the kind that embroiled his two immediate predecessors, Richard Nixon had hoped to avoid direct federal intervention against price increases by private industry. Yet last week the President took strong steps to arrest soaring lumber prices—and there was little grumbling. His tactics much resembled those of the Johnson Administration, which in 1965 fought off aluminum and copper price rises by threatening to release supplies of the metals from Government stockpiles. Nixon ordered the Interior and Agriculture departments to step up the sale of lumber from publicly owned forests, which contain more than half of the nation's sawtimber supply. To reduce demand, he directed the Defense Department to limit its purchases to "essential requirements."

Wood prices have been highly volatile during the past year. The cost of plywood has risen by 77%. Douglas fir lumber, used mostly in housing, has doubled in price in many localities. Housing's surprising winter strength has only heightened the price pressure. Last week the Commerce Department reported that new housing starts reached an annual rate of 1,700,000 in February, well above last year's total of 1,500,000.

Limiting Exports: Builders blame the price problem not only on heavy domestic demand, but on rising exports to Japan, whose timber purchases in the U.S. have increased twentyfold since 1960. Last year the Japanese bought enough lumber to erect 40% of the U.S. output of one-family homes. In response to complaints that numerous small lumber mills as well as price stability have been imperiled, Congress last fall sharply limited exports of lumber harvested from federal forests. But prices have continued to rise, partly because of severe winter weather in the Pacific Northwest and the recent East Coast longshoremen's strike, which cut down the supply of timber from Canada.

At the urging of George Romney, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Nixon three weeks ago appointed a task force to recommend remedies. Last week's action is aimed at increasing timber output from federal lands by about 10%, but the Administration clearly regards that as only a stopgap. Testifying at a Senate hearing, Romney last week warned that spiraling lumber prices jeopardize the goal of raising residential construction to 2,600,000 units a year under the Housing Act of 1968. The former auto executive and Michigan Governor criticized Democrat Robert Weaver, his predecessor at HUD, for failing to develop programs to meet that objective. Complained Romney: "I have inherited a department that is essentially in the same condition as American Motors when I took over. It was losing money. Our department is losing ground."

Lack of Access: The U.S. faces no shortage of timber. National forests alone occupy an area twice the size of California. Because of federal limitations on logging operations and poor forest management techniques, the Government's holdings yield only a quarter as much timber per acre as private timberland. The Agriculture Department has long complained that Congress allows it too little money to manage better, even though the sale of timber to private lumber producers nets the Treasury substantial revenue. A lack of access roads causes as much sawtimber to be lost to storms and insect infestation as is harvested from national forests. Meanwhile, heavy opposition from conservationists makes any expansion of logging politically difficult.

For the time being, Congress will probably content itself with imposing further limitations on lumber exports to Japan. Such restrictions should help to relieve the shortage and ease prices. On the other hand, they would undercut Washington's goals of fostering free world trade and improving the U.S.'s balance of trade. In any case, Congress can scarcely overlook the need to revamp the nation's timber management policies. That is something that Washington has not done for 30 years.

Another explanation of the many facets of the timber problem is the article, "No Lid on Wood Prices," in the March 29 issue of Business Week magazine. The article points to recent action taken by the Executive to make greater quantities of lumber available to the homebuilding industry:

No Lid on Wood Prices

The rocket-like ascent of lumber and plywood prices has eased off a bit in recent weeks, but hardly anyone believes the trip is over. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development George Romney warned this week in testimony before the House Banking & Currency Committee: "We may not have seen the end of the rapid climb, even if it is interrupted."

Further, the state of the market is such that President Nixon's intervention last week—his first attempt to influence prices—offers only short-term relief to a serious long-term problem.

Acting on advice of a Cabinet-level task force, appointed only three weeks ago, the President ordered:

An increase of 1.1-billion board feet in timber to be offered from public lands by the U.S. Forest Service over the next 15 months.

Reduction in the government's own purchases of softwood lumber.

High priorities for boxcars to move wood.

Faster action on new softwood lumber standards in moisture and size specifications. The changes, proposed by the industry but subject to government approval, should bring more efficient use of the lumber supply.

ON THE FENCE

In a single proclamation, the President appeared to respond to demands of the lumber industry for more logs and to the pleas of home builders and buyers for federal action to slow soaring price increases; at the same time he avoided any real crackdown on prices. The only objections came from conservationists who decried additional cutting of federal forests.

The President's action cannot be credited with the recent softening in prices. This occurred when heavy snow and rough weather in large consuming areas of the East, Midwest, and Texas made it impossible to move building materials to job sites.

The frantic buying eased off. One leading producer in Oregon cut prices; others followed. The price of index-grade sanded plywood dropped from $144 per thousand ft. at the end of February to as low as $110.

But the slump appears temporary, Young's Forecast of Softwood Lumber & Plywood Prices last week advised readers, "The . . . market appears to have reached its low point, and we are changing our recommendation to 'buy heavily.'" A resumption of heavy buying is bound to send prices skyward once more. Also looming large is a possible strike threat when industrywide labor contracts expire June 1.

BACKGROUND

Extraordinary increases in mill prices began late last summer and have accelerated at a rate not seen in lumber in modern times. Roots of the problem trace back to the homebuilding slump of 1966–67, which clobbered the lumber industry and drove many marginal mills out of business.

The comeback in homebuilding coincided with severe shortages in log-producing regions. The extremely dry late summer of 1967 closed large areas of Western woodland at what should have been the peak season for logging. Added to raw material shortages were strong demands from military and export markets, a severe winter that prevented cutting and hauling of logs, low inventories, and a shortage of boxcars.

Underlying all these conditions, however, is one simple fact: U.S. requirements for plywood and lumber have begun to outrun the available raw material.

Almost two-thirds of the nation's total softwood sawtimber (standing timber large enough for lumber and plywood manufacture) is in public ownership. Thus, as Lowry Wyatt, vice-president of Weyerhaeuser Co. and spokesman for the National Forest Products Assn., told the Senate housing subcommittee last week, "The federal government holds the key to the log supply and to domestic wood prices in the way it chooses to manage this timber."

HINT OF PRESSURE

Romney suggests several actions for government, including a boost in imports, increasing the efficiency of harvesting public timber, encouraging use of softwood substitutes, and reconsidering the Jones Act, which prohibits shipments from one U.S. port to another in foreign ships. The latter has resulted in shipment of most Alaskan timber to Japan.

In this week's House testimony, Romney omitted a recommendation he made to the Senate last week—one that hinted strongly of government pressure on the industry itself: "The lumber industry needs to be encouraged and induced—and depending upon what happens here, more than that—to restrain price, increases beyond those levels that are reasonable in relationship to the over-all picture, their interests, their future interests, and the interests of the nation as a whole."

HOW PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO. FLOUTS THE LAW

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, illegal acts by large corporations seldom receive the attention paid to illegal acts by small individuals. The relatively tender treatment accorded corporate misbehavior has not gone unnoticed on a younger, more candid generation than ours.

A major story of corporate misbehavior involves Pacific Gas & Electric Co., the TVA-sized utility on the west coast, which has successfully defied Congress, the courts, and the city of San Francisco.

As a result of its disregard of the Raker Act, P.G. & E. received some $30 million which, as the San Francisco Bay Guardian pointed out, could otherwise have been used for a variety of other worthwhile purposes, among them "to develop job and training programs for the disadvantaged, to turn the city's resources toward the grinding problems of race and poverty and unemployment."

In 1967, after payment of all its operating expenses, including taxes, P.G. & E. had an operating income of $163,429,000. The average interest rate on its long-term debt was only 3.93 percent. Thus, after paying the interest and dividends on preferred stock, the company was able to earn 12.4 percent on its common stock, an increase of seven-tenths of 1 percent from the year before.

The outlook for P.G. & E. is the same as that for the rest of the energy industry, glowing, because it has a monopoly on an essential product.

The rosy picture was painted a few weeks ago by Robert H. Gerdes, president of P.G. & E. and also president of Edison Electric Institute, trade association of the investor-owned utilities. In a canned editorial dated March 10, 1968, and distributed for P.G. & E. to 11,000 newspaper editors by Industrial News Review, President Gerdes is quoted as saying:

> The electric power industry should properly be classified as a growth industry . . . For decades, the production of electric power has grown at more than twice the rate of

> the economy as a whole, as measured by the gross national product.

Mr. Gerdes goes on to say, according to his canned editorial service, for which he pays $2,299.92 a year, that:

> Opportunities to improve the efficiency of our operations are by no means exhausted. We are looking forward to further economies of scale, to the use of better and more sophisticated equipment, to further mechanization, to greater computerization, and to benefits flowing from modern information technology. Also, we are just beginning to realize the benefits from the great new technology of nuclear power.

Mr. President, having read P.G. & E.'s own accounts of its financial successes, as reported by the company to the Federal Power Commission, and having read the glowing account just quoted by the company president, I was taken aback to read a conflicting account of P.G. & E. finances issued last month by another one of its canned editorial services, the California Feature Service, issued weekly by the well-known public relations firm of Whitaker & Baxter, 870 Market Street, San Francisco. According to its March 31, 1969, P.G. & E. editorial, the poor utility may not be able to meet the payroll this spring. It says:

> At this tax deadline time, P. G. & E. will be about $45 million short on ready cash to make partial income tax payment of about $15 million, plus a $52.7 million due in property taxes.

So it is off to the bank for P.G. & E.'s treasurer, to see if he can wangle a loan to meet those taxes, and the State corporation tax, and more Federal income tax and interest on the bonds.

Mr. President, I submit that these two conflicting P.G. & E. editorials, both issued last month, constitute an argument for the Moss-Kennedy reliability bill, which would provide for greater coordination within the electric power industry. If the canned editorial division, public relations department, of one utility, is pushing the company forward to greater heights and backward to the brink of disaster at the same time, consider the potential for confusion in the company's and the industry's principal business, the production and distribution of energy.

Communications are in no better repair. Admittedly it is a long distance from Foggy Bottom to smoggy California. Yet 47 years have elapsed since the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, in the Galveston case, that all taxes, including income taxes, property taxes, and corporation taxes, are a part of a utility's operating expenses, collected via rates, paid for in toto by the customer. Had that message gotten to San Francisco, California Feature Service would have known how ludicrous it is to picture a utility treasurer out trying to raise some money to meet the tax bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record P.G. & E.'s Industrial News Review editorial, entitled "Confounding the Aborigines"; P.G. & E.'s California Feature Service editorial, entitled "Off to the Bank We Go"; the San Francisco Bay Guardian editorial, "A Little Law and Order, Please!" to which I have referred; and an excellent account by J. B. Neilands, in the same issue of the Guardian, of P.G. & E.'s evasion of the Raker Act, entitled "How P.G. & E. Robs San Francisco of Cheap Power."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Industrial News Review, Mar. 10, 1969]

Confounding the Aborigines

The annals of human endeavor contain few success stories to match that of the investor-owned electric industry in the United States. It is with good reason that Mr. Robert H. Gerdes, president of the Edison Electric Institute, believes, "The electric power industry should properly be classified as a growth industry. . . . For decades, the production of electric power has grown at more than twice the rate of the economy as a whole, as measured by the Gross National Product."

Since energy is the basis of our present high level of material well-being, the growth record of the electric industry is far more than a localized success story of an industry. It is an index of national growth, which goes far to explain long-term rises in living standards and the ability of the American people to move ahead without breaking stride under unprecedented burdens of inflation, wars and soaring taxes. The record of the electric industry is also a fitting answer to those who dance like aborigines around the periphery of its achievements, whooping it up for government take-over of the power business at taxpayers' expense.

What of the plans of the electric industry for the future? On this, Mr. Gerdes says, "opportunities to improve the efficiency of our operations are by no means exhausted. We are looking forward to further economies of scale, to the use of better and more sophisticated equipment, to further mechanization, to greater computerization, and to benefits flowing from modern information technology. Also, we are just beginning to realize the benefits from the great new technology of nuclear power. . . ." Measured by that surest of all barometers—energy consumption—the U.S. has a bright future. And no small measure of the credit for that future must go to the investor-owned, taxpaying electric light and power industry.

[From California Feature Service, Mar. 31, 1969]

Off to the Bank We Go

The average taxpayer who is crying all the way to the bank to borrow money to pay his April 15 income tax levy can take some comfort in the fact that he has company. Big company . . . like Pacific Gas and Electric Company, for an example.

Of course, the utility's problem isn't quite as poignant as the little fellow's, but it's a problem just the same. At this tax deadline time, PG&E will be about $45 million short on ready cash to make a partial income tax payment of about $15 million, plus a $52.7 million due in property taxes.

Because revenues totalling $80 million from a scheduled sale of bonds won't come through until April 17, the bank is the destination of Donald Bell, PG&E's treasurer. It'll be a short loan, and he won't have to carry too much identification to get it, of course, but especially at the new high interest rates it'll be expensive. And he'll have to do it again in June when such items as $3.9 million in partial payment of the state corporation tax, another $15 million on federal income tax, and some $36.5 million in interest payments to bond holders come due.

Unfortunately, this doesn't make our own little borrowings any the less painful, but it does point up the major contribution our utilities and industries and businesses are making along with us to the national, state and local treasuries.

[From the San Francisco Bay (Calif.) Guardian]

A Little Law and Order, Please!

San Francisco is the only city in the U.S. required by federal law to build a municipal power system. But it doesn't have one.

As Joe Neilands, George Norris, Harold Ickes and Sen. Lee Metcalf make clear in this Guardian, this is because the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. has defied the City of San Francisco, the federal courts, the U.S. Supreme Court and the U.S. Congress and has prevented the city from getting the millions of dollars in annual benefits (some $30 million, as computed by Neilands in his story) from the public power it produces in its own system in the Sierra.

It's a complicated story, which Neilands and the Guardian have researched for months, but the major points are simple. San Francisco was granted an unprecedented concession, the power to dam a beautiful valley in a beautiful national park, by the federal government. The condition: that the city produce cheap public power, that it build a municipal power system and that it allow absolutely no resale or transfer of power to private utilities such as PG&E.

It produces public power, but it's been PG&E—not the city—who receives the gargantuan but illegal benefits.

This is not an academic argument over public vs. private power.

It is of enormous and strategic importance for one simple reason: there's a lot of money at stake for San Francisco. Money to build swimming pools in Hunters Point, to develop McClaren Park, to save the view on Mount Olympus, to keep the Muni bus payment at 15¢ or lower it, to keep zoo admission free, to bring back the ferry boats, to build mini parks, to plant trees somewhere besides Alioto's North Beach, to develop job and training programs for the disadvantaged, to turn the city's resources toward the grinding problems of race and poverty and unemployment. Thirty million a year can go a long way.

San Francisco ought to have cheap public power for its residences and businesses, just like Palo Alto, Los Angeles, Sacramento and a dozen other California cities, but most of all it ought to get the massive tax subsidies that come from publicly owned power.

Even the most fiscally conservative among us should have few reservations. Why go to Washington for federal handouts when the money is here in San Francisco? Why not extend law and order to the City of San Francisco and to PG&E? Isn't our lack of law enforcement causing disrespect for government and alienating our youth? Why do we coddle PG&E? Let's have no more of it.

Things aren't this simple, of course, but it's time to make the City face up to its public responsibilities under the Raker Act and get about the business of establishing a municipal power system.

First: The Guardian recommends a congressional investigation to determine whether, how much and for how long SF's Hetch Hetchy power has been sold or transferred illegally to PG&E. Second: That the matter be placed squarely before the electorate in this fall's supervisorial election. In short: that every major candidate for election be forced to state unequivocally his public position on law enforcement and the Raker Act.

[From the San Francisco Bay (Calif.) Guardian, Mar. 27, 1969]

How P.G. & E. Robs San Francisco of Cheap Power

(By J. B. Neilands)

(Note.—Sen. Lee Metcalf of Montana, a nationally recognized authority on utilities, writes the Guardian: "Political manipulation by power companies is commonplace. Too few accounts of it are published. J. B. Neilands here tells well how Pacific Gas & Electric Co. defied national and local governments and denied Bay Area residents the low cost electric power to which they are entitled by law—and which they can get if they will insist on law enforcement. Metcalf is co-author with Vic Reinemer of "Overcharge," an exhaustive 1967 study of utilities. (Metcalf has invited Neilands, a professor of biochemistry at the University of California, Berkeley, to testify at current congressional hearings on public power.)

A few months before he died last year, Franck Havenner sat up in his bed in a nursing home in San Francisco and told me of how the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. swindled San Francisco out of hundreds of millions of dollars of cheap hydroelectric power.

The story was incredible: PG&E and its political allies had defeated eight successive bond issues to establish a municipal electric system in San Francisco and grant city residents and businesses the benefit of low cost power produced by the city's Hetch Hetchy water system in the Sierras.

The result: San Francisco has paid through the nose to PG&E for its power and the city loses about $30 million a year in profits it would get from a public system.

Havanner, longtime SF supervisor and later a U.S. representative, said: "In the beginning, we had the support of some newspapers, but in the end the PG&E was able to buy them all out with their newspaper ads."

The PG&E/newspaper/political combination got stronger with each bond issue. Today, you never hear about the city's sacred pledges to build a public power system.

How could this happen? How could Sacramento, Los Angeles, Palo Alto and a dozen other California cities get their own lucrative electric distribution systems when SF couldn't even get one when it had its own power? More: How could this happen when it is a specific condition of federal law for San Francisco, unlike any other American city to build its own municipal electric distribution system?

Abe Ruef's graft in 1906 was peanuts, birdseed, compared to this.

The story goes back to the turn of the century when San Francisco desperately needed an adequate water supply. Fifteen alternate sites were crossed off before Mayor Phelan filed for water rights on the Tuolumne River with money from his own pocket.

Unfortunately, however, the site lay inside Yosemite National Park and the proposed dam would flood exquisite Hetch Hetchy Valley.

Conservationists were furious and John Muir raged: "Dam Hetch Hetchy! As well dam for water tanks the people's cathedrals and churches; for no holier temple has ever been consecrated to the heart of man." Understandably, Congress was reluctant to grant the brutal intrusion into Yosemite.

The impasse was resolved by Rep. John Edward Raker, from the state's second (Mountain) district. He proposed to let San Francisco take the water from Yosemite, but in the process generate and distribute low-cost hydroelectric power.

It was the only federal grant of its kind ever made by Congress and it is certain, as Interior Secretary Harold Ickes later emphasized, that it would never have been made without crucial conditions: that both water and power go directly to consumers and that no profits whatsoever from this unprecedented public grant go to private utilities.

The act's language was explicit (see chronology, 1912) and there was no doubt, among supporters or opponents, about the public power intent of Congress. Thus, on the floor debate:

"Mr. Sumners: Is it the purpose of this bill to have San Francisco supply electric power and water to its own people?

"Mr. Raker: Yes.

"Mr. Sumners: Or to supply these corporations, which will in turn supply the people?

"Mr. Raker: Under this bill, it is to supply its own inhabitants first . . ."

Muir and other militant conservationists were bitterly disappointed by the Raker Act and the loss of Hetch Hetchy, but other conservationists, like Sen. George Norris of Nebraska, considered it a reasonable compromise.

The Raker Act was the Magna Carta for cheap public power. It was thought to be tightly drawn in the public interest and virtually impervious to subversion by private power trusts. Its basic intent was to establish a municipal power distribution system in San Francisco, but it also allowed the sale of power to public agencies and recognized the prior claims of the nearby Turlock and Modesto Irrigation Districts.

However, the Act stipulated, in strict terms especially irritating to the private power lobby, that any attempt to transfer the water or power to a "person, corporation or association" for resale could result in revocation of the federal grant.

WATER, NOT POWER

In developing water, San Francisco has observed reasonable compliance with the Raker Act on the record. It has had little trouble passing expensive water bond issues to construct the enormous Hetch Hetchy system of pipes and tunnels that delivers the water across the Central Valley, under San Francisco Bay and into the Peninsula's Crystal Springs Reservoir. There's been no reluctance to "go into the water business" in San Francisco.

In developing power, however, San Francisco has gone up against fortress PG&E and has failed miserably in complying with the Raker Act. Ickes was here on Oct. 24, 1934, for the celebration of the first flow of Hetch Hetchy water to reach Crystal Springs. He mused in his diary:

"San Francisco also develops power from this water. . . . Unfortunately, private utilities have such a grip on San Francisco that it cannot actually sell its own power to users in San Francisco. I held there was a violation of the Act . . . the newspapers and most of the politicians have seen to it, by propaganda and other devious methods, that a method of complying with the Act has been defeated."

Norris lamented in his biography that, as a supporter of the Raker Act, he had "underestimated the resourcefulness" of PG&E. "When I spoke so hopefully and so confidently (not only I but many others) it was incredible that a great utility could control the policies of city government in San Francisco . . . to defeat the original spirit and purpose of Hetch Hetchy. But it has done all this."

PG&E moved in early and has prevented the full public development of Hetch Hetchy power to this day. Hetch Hetchy's first small hydroelectric generator, Early Intake Powerhouse, went on the line in 1918. It was immediately connected to the Sierra and San Francisco Power Co. (later merged into PG&E). Interior declared the accord illegal on June 8, 1923, but nothing was pressed since only a small amount of power was involved.

With the completion of Moccasin Powerhouse in 1925, a substantial block of hydroelectric power became available; to bring the energy to San Francisco as required by the Raker Act, the city began laying a steel tower transmission circuit in the direction of San Francisco.

It was strung all the way to Newark, some 99 miles, but was stopped abruptly at Newark on the east shore of San Francisco Bay. Here, conveniently, PG&E had a substation and here, conveniently and in obvious anticipation of a new energy load, PG&E had just laid a trans-Bay, high voltage cable to span the remaining 35 miles to San Francisco.

Although the city had purchased enough copper wire to complete the Hetch Hetchy line, word suddenly rocketed from city hall that further construction funds were exhausted. San Francisco's two power companies, Great Western and PG&E, refused to sell their systems to the city, and the board instead of using eminent domain to acquire them, approved a contract on July 1, 1925 to hand over Hetch Hetchy power to PG&E at Newark. The copper wire was stored quietly in a SF warehouse and 10 years later sold for scrap.

THE BIG SELLOUT

It was a sellout worthy of chronicling by Lincoln Steffens and Frank Norris. The city produces the power, but PG&S grabs it for wholesale, then wheels it into the city at exorbitant retail rates. As the San Francisco Examiner then observed:

"It is a wrongful and shameful policy for a grant of water and power privilege in the Yosemite National Park Area to be developed at the expenditure of $50 million by the taxpayers of San Francisco, only to have its greatest financial and economic asset, the hydroelectric power, diverted to private corporation hands at the instant of completion; to the great benefit of said private corporation, and at an annual deficit to the city of San Francisco."

In the 1925 city election, every incumbent supervisor was defeated who voted for the 1925 contract and presided over the establishment of PG&E's tollgate at Newark. The people wanted public power and the new board determined the city should bond itself in whatever amount necessary to buy out PG&E and get it.

The first $2 million bond issue in 1925 fell before a powerful PG&E onslaught, but it still got 52,216 for, 50,727 against (two-thirds needed for passage). In all from 1925 to 1941, PG&E's enormous political influence defeated eight bond propositions to buy all or part of PG&E distribution properties.

To defeat the bonds, Havenner told a congressional committee in 1942, that PG&E had spent at least $200,000 in the previous 10 years; Ickes broke the amount down further: $11,876 in 1935; $25,330 in 1937; $59,755 in 1939 and much, much more in 1941. It now spends hundreds of thousands each year in political and charitable donations.

PG&E's strategy, Ickes testified, was to "spread throughout the city the word that the Raker Act could be easily amended" and to confuse the issue by saying the city "had been discriminated against" by the act (see Ickes box).

PG&E laid it on thick in an expensive series of seven ads in the daily press; the press responded by repeating and embellishing the PG&E line. The Chronicle, for example, ran nasty cartoons and editorial comments implying this was all a city hall power grab: "If the city hall were not so busy trying to aggrandize itself by clutching more business to muddle with . . ."

PG&E'S VOICE

(PG&E maintained close connections with most newspaper managements, but Chronicle/PG&E connections have for decades been intimate through family relationships, notably the Tobin and de Young dynasties. Joseph O. Tobin, who became a Chronicle owner by marrying Mike de Young's daughter, Constance, is a nephew of Joseph S. Tobin, a onetime PG&E director. The Tobins live in Hillsborough and have long been associated with the Hibernia Bank. Mike de Young and his brother founded the Chronicle.)

(Recently a Chronicle story described PG&E president Robert Gerdes as "exceedingly dignified" in the utility's whopping rate hike case before the Public Utilities Commission. His opponent, the distinguished former PUC commissioner, William Bennett, was described as "something" of a representative for consumers.)

His patiences exhausted, Ickes meanwhile filed suit in federal court to throw out the PG&E's phony 1927 contract. The case ultimately went to the U.S. Supreme Court which ruled, on April 22, 1940, that San Francisco had been illegally disposing Hetch Hetchy power to PG&E for the past 15 years.

More: that the act required a "publicly owned and operated power system" in San Francisco.

It is difficult, almost impossible I found, to determine how long this illegal sale continued, how much city users were overcharged and what is the city's current legal status. It appears to me, after months of research, that the city is still under a federal court injunction.

A significant sidelight is then Rep. Clair Engle's investigation in 1955 into another diversion of Hetch Hetchy power to PG&E. Engle's biting cross examination of public officials and his ability to disentangle complicated issues proved conclusively that San Francisco was allowing irrigation districts to serve as a conduit to transfer Hetch Hetchy power to PG&E.

Engle quoted figures compiled by the Federal Power Commission showing that 24.7 per cent of the power purchased by Modesto and Turlock "is currently and for a period from 1945 to 1953" was sold to PG&E. Forty-eight per cent of this total was Hetch Hetchy power, the FPC said.

Engle asked the American Law Division of the Library of Congress to research this point. It advised him on May 22, 1956, that SF had sold dump power to PG&E since 1945 and by letter agreement had extended the arrangement into 1962. It also said that SF had been selling power to Modesto and Turlock, which at the same time were furnishing to PG&E about the same amount they were buying from the city. M and T have plenty of power through their own generating plants at Don Pedro and La Grange.

To determine if this unlawful transfer of power continues, the following data is required: (1) hourly production by district generating plants; (2) simultaneous receipt by the districts from Hetch Hetchy; (3) simultaneous delivery from the districts to PG&E. The Interior Department has refused my repeated requests for this public information.

We are left with a significant remark in the Modesto District's 1967–68 annual report: "These once bitter enemies, the irrigation districts and San Francisco, work in close harmony toward the full economic development of the water and power resources of the Tuolumne River watershed."

And, I might ask, in supplying power to PG&E in violation of the Raker Act? Because of the power, the money and the chicanery involved, only something on the order of a congressional investigation will turn up the facts.

As a result of PG&E's influence, Hetch Hetchy's formidable power output is dribbled away in a fragmented pattern that brings relatively little revenue to the city. Besides the irrigation districts, power is sold to several low-paying San Francisco industrial consumers, which are served by PG&E lines from its Newark and Warnerville substations. The city pays for transmission charges, including losses.

City power is wheeled into San Francisco on PG&E toll lines and the company until recently levied an outrageous toll. (PG&E buys Hetch Hetchy power at Newark for $2 million, then resells it to SF consumers for $9 million, congressional testimony showed in 1941. Total overcharge: $6,600,000. Multiply these totals year by year and you begin to get the dimensions of this steal from the city treasury.)

Hetch Hetchy power goes to the airport, Muni and street light. Everything else, notably the lucrative, tightly packed retail market that forms the base of PG&E's empire, is served by PG&E.

THE BIG STEAL

What does San Francisco lose without its own system to distribute its own power? Three key points: (1) a lower use rate for business and residences, (2) a new source of city income (much, much more than PG&E taxes bring and (3) a substantially lower city tax rate because of this massive tax subsidy.

Let us compare SF with Palo Alto, a city with a municipal system since 1898, and see how these benefits accrue.

(1) Lower user rate: Palo Alto's municipal rate for KWH is $5.65, PG&E's in San Francisco is $6.20. This means that power per user is about $20 cheaper a year in Palo Alto and owners of Palo Alto's 20,000 meters would save some $400,000. (PG&E charges much higher rates around Palo Alto—in Menlo Park, for example, 250 KW costs $7.41 from PG&E.)

(2) New city income: Palo Alto put $1,327,000 in surplus power profits into the general fund in 1967. This does not include the exact in-lieu-of-tax payment PG&E would have made had it operated the utility. Palo Alto credits this as a separate item to answer PG&E charges that "public agencies do not pay taxes."

(3) Lower tax rate: income from public power is the reason, and the only reason, that Palo Alto's tax rate is just 78¢ per $100 assessed valuation. In Berkeley, a city of comparable size, the city tax rate by contrast is almost $3 because it does not have public power. Clearly Palo Alto uses power revenue as a big tax subsidy.

If we add the $400,000 in user savings to the $1,327,000 in utility revenue, the total annual benefit of public power approaches $2 million. Palo Alto also has an $8 million investment in a modern and efficient electric utility system which, at the rate of undergrounding, will be entirely subsurface by 1980.

San Francisco's profits from public power would total about $30 million a year by scaling up these figures from Palo Alto. It would more than double the city's current Hetch Hetchy power revenues.

This sum would undoubtedly rise much higher because San Francisco has an extremely high meter density, with its packed in housing, and because the city of course generates it own power. Palo Alto buys federal power wheeled over PG&E lines.

Politically, it would be difficult to establish a municipal power system in San Francisco. A ninth bond issue, even a modest one to complete the line from Newark, would surely be defeated by the PG&E/Ex/Chron combine. Sacramento is the most recent California city to buy out PG&E; even with the forthright support of the Sacramento Bee, it took a terrific battle to defeat PG&E's well-heeled campaign.

In Berkeley, where the Berkeley Coalition has made public power an issue in the April council election, PG&E agents call on the Berkeley Gazette almost daily to keep the newspaper in line.

The best course in San Francisco is to illuminate the issues as this article has done, then dramatize them in this fall's supervisorial campaign (see editorial, p. 8). There are several ways San Francisco can proceed: one is to gradually acquire its own system by putting in its own lines during redevelopment construction; another is to get acquisition capital through the non-profit corporation method of financing used with Candlestick Park and parking garages.

Since Ickes two decades ago, the Interior Department has been notoriously lax in pushing San Francisco to enforce the Raker Act. James Carr stepped out of this don't-ruffle-PG&E-atmosphere in Interior to become San Francisco's general utilities manager. He has kept PG&E's monopoly intact, untroubled and unquestioned in San Francisco.

I asked Carr, shortly after he took office in 1964, when the city would enforce the Raker Act. Carr replied in a letter, 51 years after the Raker passed as the Magna Carta of public power, that it was "premature to discuss municipal distribution of power in San Francisco." In March, 1969, it still is.

[From the San Francisco Bay (Calif.) Guardian, Mar. 27, 1969]

HOW TO "HETCH HETCHY"—A CHRONOLOGY

1902: SF City Engineer Grunsky develops a plan to pump Hetch Hetchy water in Yosemite National Park to a thirsty San Francisco.

1912: The Freeman Plan calls for a gravity-flow system with hydro electric plants on the Tuolumne River. The Board of Supervisors publishes a book, large and glossy, showing that the proposed work would beautify Hetch Hetchy and make cheap water and power available to SF.

1913: Congress passes the Raker Act (HR 7207) granting, with strict provisions, water and power rights to the City & County of San Francisco.

The two key sections: Section 6:

"That the grantee is prohibited from ever selling or letting to any corporation or individual, except a municipality or municipal water district or irrigation district, the right to sell or sublet the water or the electric energy sold or given to it or him by the said grantee: Provided, that the rights hereby granted shall not be sold, assigned, or transferred to any private person, corporation, or association, and in case of any attempt to so sell, assign, transfer, or convey, this grant shall revert to the Government of the United States."

Section 9 outlines enforcement procedures:

". . . the grantee shall at all times comply with and observe on its part all the conditions specified in this Act, and in the event that the same are not reasonably complied with and carried out by the grantee, upon written request of the Secretary of the Interior, it is made the duty of the Attorney General in the name of the United States to commence all necessary suits or proceedings in the proper court having jurisdcition thereof . . ."

1923: The City purchases enough copper transmission cable to reach from Hetchy to San Francisco.

1925: San Francisco builds a great powerhouse on Moccasin Creek in the low Sierra and the transmission line was started to the city. Suddenly, word comes from city hall that further construction funds were exhausted: just as the line conveniently reaches PG&E's substation in Newark, just after PG&E conveniently completes a high voltage line from SF to Newark. PG&E refuses to sell its SF system to the city, then inveigles SF to put up a PG&E tollgate in Newark. PG&E got the city's power cheap, then jacks up the rate for wheeling it the remaining 40 miles to SF consumers. (See 1941.) Every supervisor for this contract was defeated handily in the 1925 supervisorial election.

1927: First of eight bond issues to create an SF municipal power system as required by Raker Act. PG&E, its powerful political allies and the newspapers only manage to narrowly defeat the bonds: 52,215 for, 50,727 against on a ⅔s vote. PG&E's alliance gets stronger as the press in later years more and more shuts off the truth about San Francisco's pledges under the Raker Act. Now, you see hardly a word.

1933: Interior Secretary Ickes takes office. Begins study of 1925 contract.

1935: Ickes grumbles about PG&E and Hetch Hetchy. City sells the unused cable for scrap.

1937: Ickes files suit in Federal District Court charging San Francisco with violation of Sec. 6.

1938: Federal District Court rules in favor of the government; the city appeals.

1939: Circuit Court of Appeals reverses

the District Court; government appeals to the US Supreme Court.

1940: Supreme Court upholds the Government, remands the case to the District Court. The Supreme Court made liberal reference to the original debate on the Raker Act and said in part.

"From the Congressional debates on the passage of the Raker Act can be read a common understanding both on the part of sponsors of the Bill and its opponents that the grant was to be so conditioned as to require municipal performance of the function of supplying Hetch Hetchy water and electric power directly to the ultimate consumers . . ."

Again: "Before final passage in the Senate opposition had practically narrowed down to the power provisions of the measure, and these provisions contemplated a publicly owned and operated power system". San Francisco readied its eighth and last bond issue.

1941: Ickes comes to SF and gives a speech at the Civic Auditorium urging passage of the bond issues on Nov. 4. Chronicle runs front page editorials and nasty, misleading cartoons against the power bonds. Citizens committee is formed to fight the power bonds and amend the Raker Act. Chairman is J. W. Mailliard of the politically prominent family, a member is Walter Haas of Levi Strauss.

Committee states "We are not committed to private ownership nor to public ownership." The bonds were defeated and Rep. Tom Rolph (brother of Mayor James Rolph) introduced a bill to amend the Raker Act. Hearings were held in Washington and San Francisco. Bill died in committee.

1941: A quick glimpse of PG&E's surcharge on SF public power (unreported here) emerges in the House Public Lands Committee hearing in Washington. PG&E buys Hetch Hetchy power at Newark for $2,400,000 a year, then resells it to SF consumers for $9,000,000, testimony showed. The total overcharge: $6,600,000. It is difficult, almost impossible The Guardian found, to determine how long this illegal sale continued and how much city users were overcharged.

1944: Ickes coins the phrase "to Hetch Hetchy" in a Commonwealth Club speech. Means "to confuse and confound the public by adroit acts and deceptive word in order to turn to private corporate profit a trust set up for the people."

1949: Walter Haas elected to the board of PG&E.

1955: Rep. Engle introduces a bill to create a new irrigation district on the Tuolumne River. In the hearings, Engle proves that Hetch Hetchy power sold to Turlock & Modesto Irrigation districts was resold to PG&E in violation of a 1945 proviso by Ickes. City Atty. Dion Holm agrees Raker Act requires a municipal system and says ". . . we are minus that for the time being, which one day we will have."

1964: James Carr assumes post as manager of SF utilities. Comes from an interior department notoriously lax, since Ickes, in trying to enforce the Raker Act. His brother, Francis Carr, was until 1966 manager of PG&E's tax department. Neilands asks Carr when the city will enforce the Raker act and Carr replies, 51 years after Raker Act passes, that ". . . it is premature to discuss municipal distribution of power in San Francisco . . ."

1965: Neilands writes similarly to Frank Barry, solicitor of the Interior, Says Barry; ". . . we know of no means by which the US can require the city to acquire the municipal distribution system . . ."

1969: Oral Moore, manager of Hetch Hetchy, tells the Guardian that the city has no plans to enforce the Raker Act.

"The disgraceful history of the handling of Hetch Hetchy power should place a new ugly verb in the lexion of political chicanery. 'To Hetch Hetchy' means 'to confuse and confound the public by adroit acts and deceptive words in order to turn to private corporate profit a trust set up for the people'.

"I need not repeat the scandalous story that has given birth to this new verb, but I would remind you that the last chapter of it has not been written. The pledge that the people of San Francisco, with full knowledge, made to their government has not yet been redeemed". Interior Secretary Harold Ickes to the Commonwealth Club in 1944

LESSONS OF HISTORY FOR THE ABM VOTE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of U.S. News & World Report carries a timely reminder for those who so bitterly oppose development of an ABM system in America that they could be wrong.

There have been similar fights in our recent past and the RECORD shows that had the opponents been successful, the course of history might have been changed and America might not be the great haven of freedom it is today.

I hope those who oppose the ABM will read carefully to possible consequence of their action in the light of recent history.

It would be my hope they would reconsider their opposition and let us get on with the job of defending America at a time when our opponents are making vast gains in nuclear development to destroy us.

The article follows:

LESSONS OF HISTORY FOR THE ABM VOTE

When the chips are down on the ABM, anything can happen. Past shows that. Key defense decisions have been voted by the narrowest of margins—and sometimes with surprising results.

This nation, once again, is facing a crucial decision involving defense.

The decision this time is whether to build an anti-ballistic-missile system (ABM) proposed by President Nixon.

In the battle that is developing, many Americans are being reminded of other battles over defense proposals that proved fateful in the past. To those with long memories, some of the arguments now being heard sound familiar.

They recall the decision against fortifying the Pacific island of Guam in the face of rising Japanese belligerence in 1939.

Then came a 1941 cliff-hanger, when Congress by a single vote agreed to extend the military draft only months before Japan attacked Pearl Harbor.

In the late 1940s, the issue was whether to build the hydrogen bomb. That fateful decision, after long delay, came barely in time to win the H-bomb race against Soviet Russia.

Now the issue is how to defend the nation against the H-bomb menace.

President Nixon himself has drawn a historic parallel. He predicted that the congressional vote on his ABM proposal might be as close as the 1941 vote on extending the draft.

LOOK BACK TO '41

Americans still shudder at thoughts of what might have happened if that 1941 vote had gone the other way.

In 1940, Congress had passed a military-draft law. For the first time in history, Americans were being drafted into the armed services at a time when this nation was not at war.

But the 1940 law called for only one year of military service. This meant, in 1941, that nearly 1 million men would soon be mustered out of service—at a time when World War II was intensifying and likelihood of U.S. involvement appeared to be growing.

So Congress was asked to lengthen the draftees' period of service.

The war in Europe then had been going on for two years. But there was strong sentiment for keeping the U.S. out of that war. There were "hawks" and "doves" in those days, too. The "doves," then, were called "isolationists."

A bitter debate was stirred by the draft issue. The Roosevelt Administration was challenged to show how the nation was in peril that justified a big "peacetime" Army.

On Aug. 7, 1941, after seven days of debate, the Senate voted 45 to 30 to extend the draftees' period of service by 18 months.

On August 12 came the vote in the House of Representatives. There the extension squeaked through by the thinnest of margins. The vote was 203 to 202.

Result: When Japan attacked on December 7, the Army built up by the draft was still intact.

THE H-BOMB BATTLE

The battle over the hydrogen bomb was waged in secret councils of the Government rather than in Congress.

Ever since the U.S. exploded the world's first atom bomb over Japan in 1945, scientists had conjectured that a superbomb was theoretically possible.

However, with the world then at peace and the U.S. still holding a monopoly on the A-bomb, research on the superbomb was not pushed.

Some scientists—still feeling guilty about the destruction at Hiroshima caused by the first A-bomb—opposed the superbomb on moral grounds.

A key figure in the opposition was Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, who called the hydrogen bomb "an expensive, uncertain gamble" and "morally wrong."

Then, on Sept. 23, 1949, Russia exploded an A-bomb. The U.S. monopoly had ended. Interest in the H-bomb suddenly soared.

On Jan. 31, 1950, President Truman decided the issue in favor of the bomb.

On Nov. 1, 1952, the U.S. exploded the world's first H-bomb. Russia came up with its own in 1953. It was another close call for U.S. defense.

UNFRIENDLY GESTURE

The 1939 decision on Guam went the other way and, in the light of history, appeared costly.

Guam, strategically located between Hawaii and the Philippines, was a potentially valuable base for airplanes and submarines. Military experts viewed it as important in case of a war with Japan. In 1938, a board appointed by President Roosevelt recommended that Guam be developed and fortified.

In 1939, Congress was asked for 5 million dollars to improve Guam's harbor. Although this bill did not call for fortifying Guam, it would have been a start and would have permitted its use as an advanced scouting base.

While the bill was before the House, the U.S. was warned that Japan would regard Guam's fortification as "an unfriendly gesture."

The bill was defeated, 205 to 168—and Guam lay unfortified when Japan attacked two years later. It was the first American possession to fall to Japan and later became an important war base for the Japanese.

Now, 30 years and three wars later, this nation faces another decision involving national defense—and Americans are wondering if it will prove to be a fateful decision.

HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION

HON. MARLOW W. COOK

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, the members of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs were recently privileged to hear the testimony of a great woman from the mountains of eastern Kentucky who has been actively engaged in efforts to alleviate conditions of hunger and malnutrition in that part of our State. Mary Jane Dunn of Jackson, Ky., is as Senators were soon to learn, an intelligent and articulate person whose suggestions as to how we might alter Federal regulations to improve our food distribution programs were detailed and practical.

I highly commend Mrs. Dunn for her remarks and strongly endorse her recommendations. For these reasons, I ask unanimous consent that her statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MRS. MARY JANE DUNN BEFORE THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS, MARCH 28, 1969

There is none more generous than the American heart. He gives daily to the Red Cross, Community Chest, Salvation Army and scores of other worthy causes. And yet, in his own back yard, children are going to bed hungry. Each time I see a plea made for Care packages, I wonder how I can appeal to our people to do something about our own problems. We have arrived at a time in history when the story of a heart transplant no longer amazes us, and yet, as recent as March, 1969, I saw written on a child's record, Scurvy—malnutrition. What an indictment of a nation that speaks of conquering the moon! Each time we become inflamed about a particular problem in our society, we rush to build another program and fill it so full of red tape and regulations, that by the time it gets to the little man for whom it was intended we have to shake our heads and say to a 56 year old mother trying to put her 17 year old boy through high school with a husband not old enough to draw Social Security but too ill to work, I'm sorry lady but because you are too proud to accept welfare and want to break your back making beds and scrubbing floors you can't have food stamps. You see, by our rules, you make $5 per month too much money. When are we going to stop penalizing those people who wish to remain in the mainstream of life?

Hunger is one of the more dramatic problems facing us at this time, but you cannot zero in on one small fraction of a family's needs and hope to solve the problems that plague our people. Why do people go to bed hungry? No food! Why no food? No money! Why no money? No jobs! Why no jobs—poor health, poor education—or no jobs in the area! Why poor health? Poor nutrition—poor sanitation. It's a vicious cycle. We *must* look at the entire problem.

I would be the first to say to you malnutrition is not exclusive to the poor man. Just providing free food stamps does not assure an adequate diet. Consumer education, preparation of meals, storage, all these are a must. But you can't do it passing out printed pamphlets. General educational programs geared to the masses are good, but they do not always reach or apply to those who need them most. The media of radio and newspaper can be effective only where it is available. What good is a comparative price list to a mother who cannot read?

We voice a lot of concern about intestinal parasites in children, and yet, merely providing an adequate diet will not eradicate the problem, just as providing the basic four will not assure healthy children. We must not overlook environmental health education. Would it shock you to know there are families who for 19 years have lived in the same place and raised a family with absolutely no means of disposal for human waste?

We still have outdoor toilets over streams, or more commonly, built without a pit, garbage is still thrown into streams or out the back door where cans collect rain water and breed flies and mosquitoes which carry disease.

In spite of advances made in the fight on Tuberculosis, it will not be eradicated until conditions are improved which aid and abet the germ carriers. If you have any doubt of how intestinal parasites can wreck the health of not only children, but their parents, I call to your attention the very excellent case histories prepared by Mrs. Regina M. Roberts, which will be made available to this Committee, taken from her experiences as a Public Health nurse during the Ligon Project sponsored in Floyd County by OEO in 1965 at which time 65% of the population were found to have intestinal parasites. I myself have seen children so infested, they would vomit worms and have seen them crawl not only from the nose but the ears of children. Perhaps you are thinking there is no excuse for this type of thing. Laziness you say? Ignorance? I am sure many of you have rural backgrounds, but I wonder, if one of your children was required as of today to go to a rural area with no instructions as to how to live, would he have enough knowledge of the basic requirements of good environmental health to dig a pit and bury his garbage when all he's ever known is daily garbage pick-up. Would he know enough not to locate the water supply below the toilet, where all he's ever known is to turn on the tap. Would he dig a pit in the earth and make his outdoor toilet fly-proof? Ignorance? Yes, but only because he has not been taught better. So it is with my people. They are simply following the same pattern as your children, doing what their parents did before them. It is not a hopeless situation and it does not need to continue to exist. It can be remedied with education.

Hunger cannot be wiped out by feeding a few people a few meals. Writing a new program, appropriating new funds will not solve the problems as long as we concentrate only on a fraction of the need. It is like putting a band-aid on a wound that requires four stitches. The wound will eventually heal with a lot of good luck, but in the meantime, infection sets in, granulation takes place, and the end result is an ugly scar. If we go about this haphazardly with band-aid measures, our children after us will be looking for the solution to the same problems, only multiplied many times. Hungry people are sick people, not only in body but often in mind. Hungry people are depressed, angry, and often give up in hopeless despair. Maybe Mr. Average Taxpayer is saying "I didn't put him there. I pulled myself up by the bootstraps, let him do the same". Mr. Average Taxpayer, I wonder who provided your bootstrap! How would you go about pulling yourself up, with a third grade education, no job skills, eight children in school, the roof on the rented house leaks, there's not enough money for beans and bread for the month, much less shoes for the kids who are walking two miles out of a holler, and riding the bus 25 miles to school. The mother is ill and needs medical attention but there's no medical card, and even if they had one, there's no way to get to the doctor. It's hard to keep the kids and their clothes spic and span when the drinking water is carried a mile. You wouldn't live there you say? Where would you go? How would you pull yourself up?

If you are convinced there are resources available geared to the needs of the people, try to meet some of those basic needs. You will soon find yourself ensnarled in red tape, restricted by bureaucratic rules and regulations, and frustrated to the point of forgetting what the rules are, rather than risking impairment of the welfare of human life. It appears to those of us in the mountains that the majority of programs are written for urban areas. When we attempt to apply them to a rural area, they are just not practical or applicable. Fourteen dollar value received on food stamps can be quite a bonus if you have only to go a block or so to the Issuance office, but if you have to leave Breathitt County, go into Perry County and back into Breathitt to get to your home community and pay someone $7 to take you to town, is it any wonder the Food Stamp Office is concerned about eligible people who are not taking advantage of the programs.

Although the net income basis of coupon issuance has been revised as of February, 1969, the cost of stamps is still too high in comparison to the income of the people.

(A) A grandmother receiving $137 monthly, pays $48 for food stamps, $6 transportation fee, leaving $83 for utilities, clothing, school supplies, and other necessities. She doesn't buy food stamps because she just cannot afford $48 the first of every month.

(B) An elderly man living alone drawing $90 monthly would pay $18 and receive $24 in stamps. When I suggested the food stamp program to him, he replied it would cost him $6 for transportation. Stamps should be issued on basis of existing need.

(C) People moving back from another state to Kentucky can be certified on a no income basis but the farmer who is trying to exist on a small tobacco crop is certified on last year's income. The profits at best are small and obligated before the check is received.

Transportation is a major problem, not only in the food stamp program, but in every program. If we really intend to find a solution, let's do not leave out the basic ingredient to make it work.

Much has been said about stamps lasting only the first part of the month, and the family eating gravy and bread the rest of the month. Issuance can be arranged on a bi-monthly basis, but what about the case of the elderly man paying $18 and receiving a $6 bonus. If he gets stamps at the beginning of the month, pays $9, gets $12 and pays $6 transportation fee, then it becomes apparent merely issuing bi-monthly is not the total answer. Why not supplement with commodities? I have long wondered why commodities cannot be used in conjunction with the food stamp program, especially for emergencies such as floods and fires.

Consideration must be given to purchases allowed in order for families to receive the most benefit from their food stamps. Pop and candy can be bought while soap and detergents are forbidden. Just as important as the food served on the plate, is the care of the plates on which it is served and the pans in which it is prepared. Garden seeds and canning jars make far more sense than a carton of pop which costs $.93 for eight bottles. Although the law forbids using food stamps to pay debts it still happens. Stamps, where lost, can be used by the finder without too much difficulty. Suggestions have been made by Outreach fieldworkers that each stamp be endorsed by the recipient and the client.

Consumer education is vital to a workable food stamp program. But classes held with recipients while they wait to purchase their stamps often reach only the man of the household. Preparation and storage must be taught along with buying, but demonstration cooking classes held in gleaming white kitchens with hot and cold running water, measuring cups, saucepans, herbs and spices are not very effective for a mother cooking on a coal and wood stove, carrying water from the spring, and who has never measured anything in her life.

If the large food producers are really concerned about the plight of their customers, let them lend the resources they have available to the local people who are trying to combat the problems.

Concern has been voiced about the growing number of people who no longer garden or can. Everyone seems to be of the opinion it is due to laziness and shiftlessness on the part of the people. Perhaps in some cases. But where do you get $12 to pay for plowing one tenth of an acre of land? How do you coax food to grow in soil that has long been depleted? Fertilizer you say? Rotate crops? Wonderful! Where do I get the fertilizer? How do I plow the land? The cost-share farm programs are beautiful in theory but how can a tractor stay on our steep hillsides? Why pay for fencing the garden when there's no money to buy lime and seed?

The Emergency Food and Medical Program has been a salvation to three counties of our area, but Lee County was excluded and it has been most difficult to explain to hungry people, "I'm sorry, you're hungry in the wrong county." Even in the Food and Medical Program we were told not to supplement income by buying food stamps for people already on federal programs.

In the medical phase of the program children were taken to their family doctor for much needed hemoglobin tests. In cases where anemia and malnutrition were diagnosed, iron and vitamin therapy along with proper diet were prescribed, and after two months teachers reported weight gain, improved general appearance of hair and skin, and increased alertness in the classroom. One child, at least, was not so fortunate. Deprived of proper food since its birth, it could not sit alone at fourteen months. The child is now being hospitalized for extensive tests, but the doctors have already diagnosed mental retardation. We know the incidence of mental retardation is high and even though statistics are not readily available, we are confident that a direct correlation exists between malnutrition and mental retardation.

I am very much aware of the arguments against the food stamp program. I have heard more than one citizen expound on mothers who misuse stamps to buy pop, candy and cakes, on grocery stores who raise their prices at the beginning of the month to take full advantage of food stamps, of merchants who allow stamps to be taken in payment for debts, of fathers who use stamps to buy booze. But surely in a nation generous enough to fight every cause from Multiple Sclerosis to shelters for stray animals, and a nation wealthy enough in intelligence to produce the lunar satellite, surely, we can find solutions to these problems. There are many dedicated workers in every program who are on the firing line daily. They know the need and many of them have good down-to-earth suggestions. Why not draw from their knowledge rather than leave all the decisionmaking up to people removed from the scene.

I beg of you, don't waste time and money making more surveys on a people already surveyed to death. Don't waste more money looking at a problem that any agency worth its salt can give you barrels of statistics proving it exists. Don't allow malnutrition to continue to develop while more studies are being made. It is very difficult to explain to a mother concerned for her children that if she will just be patient, there are some very thorough studies being made, and when they are computed we'll feed you.

There is, in my opinion, too much duplication of services in federal programs. Have you stopped to consider how many people we are now sending into the homes of our low-income people? There are Outreach fieldworkers, Public Health personnel, social workers from the Department of Economic Security, nurses and social workers from Title I programs, Extension Service personnel, Pupil Personnel Directors, Emergency Food and Medical Services workers—the list is long and confusing. Is it any wonder the people cannot relate the person to the service? Some effort must be made to communicate and coordinate. In our own county we have recently formed an inter-agency commission and are in the process of publishing a looseleaf booklet listing all available resources and how to take advantage of them.

I also feel programs are tied up in too much red tape. I realize every program must have rules and regulations and I strongly urge that supervisory control be built into all programs, especially in cases of A.D.F.C. where fathers drink up the pay check and the children still remain hungry. But I also would invite for your consideration, changes where proof exists that the same rule or regulation time upon time, is detrimental to the effect of the program.

In the department of Economic Security the Division of Public Assistance, there is a great need for some provision for immediate certification for assistance. It is my firm belief that the majority of people come to the P.A. office as a last resort! Help should be given and then if it is found that a person has falsified statements, cut them off just as quickly. However, I see no large problem in verification of need since a phone call to any agency should provide information concerning the family until a home visit could be made.

Disabled persons have too much difficulty in proving their disability. The word of the local physician is rarely accepted. Central office in Frankfort nearly always requires additional information which involves transportation to other medical facilities and money for extensive tests. In one case an elderly lady trying to obtain a medical card, was told to wait three months and she would be eligible anyway under Social Security. With her bad heart, let's hope she makes it. It would be interesting to know how many people have died waiting to become eligible.

There remains a group of people I call the "forgotten ones". They have reared their families and many times have produced educators and other professional people by their sheer determination and the sweat of their brows and yet, now because they are no longer physically able for the labor market, have no job skills, are not old enough for Social Security, and unable to qualify for ADTD are just having to sit and wait until they reach 62.

I realize the government cannot care for every single individual and meet all their needs and I am a firm believer in a man working his way, but I cannot condone a society that pays a man thousands of dollars to hit a ball with a stick while people scream "kill the umpire" and at the same time allows people to go hungry and to die from lack of adequate medical care.

Although the Division of Public Assistance has a transportation clause, I am told by the social workers it just never seems to fit the situation. For instance, a woman whose husband had a chronic illness had to make three to five trips per month to the University of Kentucky Medical Center. She had a car but could not afford that much gasoline. There was no provision in the transportation clause for gasoline but there was money set aside to pay the ambulance fee of $30 per trip. I am not the best student of mathematics, but even I know the government could have saved money buying the gasoline. Again, I urge you not to build more and bigger programs. Take a good long look at what is happening with the ones already funded.

Headlines have been made recently concerning all the money being paid doctors and pharmacists and yet the doctor is handed a printed sheet telling him what drugs he can give a patient. If he is limited to the amount and kind he can prescribe what can we expect but repeated visits to both doctor and pharmacy. If Thorazine is prescribed only 50 tablets are allowed. If the patient takes 4 tablets daily, every 12 days he returns for a refill. If he cannot get someone to take him to town after walking two miles, he returns home to brood. Over a period of time this could lead to suicide, or at best reconfinement in a state hospital. Which is cheaper? This is only one example, but the result is costly in terms of doctor visits, refills, transportation and overcrowded waiting rooms filled with chronically ill patients. All this adds to our growing problem of medical care for the nation.

And finally, although rules and regulations governing P.A. all come from the same manual, each local office seems to have its own interpretation.

As a Committee concerned not only with nutrition but human needs as well, I ask you please to take a complete look at the whole picture. Transportation, substandard housing, poor health, lack of education, malnutrition, the elderly poor, inadequate water supply, and of course in capital letters, LACK OF JOBS. The list is long, but each component is part of the whole problem. And it is my most humble belief that "He who has health has hope, and he who has hope has everything", and hope must be provided first in bringing about practical solutions. Why not explore the idea of a homemaker service? It is being done on a limited basis in Day-Care Centers in the Kentucky Department of Child Welfare.

There are many women from among the low income groups who could be taught practical courses in home nursing, nutrition, consumer education and birth control. Assign them to a number of families and let them concentrate their efforts on the problems within those homes.

If we must provide assistance for household heads, let them do some of the jobs that so desperately need to be done. Clean-out streams, cutting the growth that inhibits the flow of water, dispose of unhealthy and unsightly garbage, make homes safe and attractive, in short, see what really could be done in a community to make it a safer and better place to live.

Explore the idea of adult basic education for mothers, teaching practical home management and environmental health in the home, taught by someone who speaks the language.

Consider the idea of self-help type projects such as sponsored by the Save the Children Federation. Mr. Leet who is Extension Director would have a wealth of knowledge. He has worked with the U.N. on these type things. Maybe it will become necessary to stake a small farmer to a cow, a sow, and a few chickens and some garden seed.

I think we must also look into the future and make some plans for preventive measures. History is being made almost faster than it can be recorded and yet we continue to require our children to learn every explorer that ever explored a bayou. So Ponce de Leon looked for the Fountain of Youth. He didn't find it! Of what benefit is that to a 17-year-old high school senior who has no intention of going to college but every intention of rearing a family. Would it not be more profitable to teach a good practical course in home management?

I do not assume to know all the answers, gentlemen, but I offer you for what it's worth, any assistance I can provide. The knowledge I have gained concerning the people and their needs are at your disposal. May God guide you in seeking the answers.

NEW FACILITIES FOR MONTPELIER CO-OP

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Eastern Iowa Light & Power Cooperative located at Montpelier, Iowa, does an outstanding job of serving its customers, most of whom are in my district. A recent article in the Muscatine Journal tells of the wonderful success story of this organization as it prepares to put its newest facilities into operation. I insert the article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

EASTERN IOWA LIGHT AND POWER COOPERATIVE PLANS "OPEN HOUSE" AT MONTPELIER POWER UNIT

Members of Eastern Iowa Light and Power Cooperative and the public are being invited to inspect the rural electric's "Second Miracle on the Mississippi," Unit No. 2 of Montpelier generating station, on Saturday and Sunday, March 29–30. The cooperative will hold Open House from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. both days at the generating station on Highway 22, between Davenport and Muscatine.

Eastern Iowa Light and Power serves nearly 13,000 members in 12 counties, and the cooperative is planning to host large crowds during the two-day event. Guided tours through the plant will be conducted by employees of the cooperative.

Open House guests will receive two booklets to aid in understanding the generating plant equipment and the operations of the rural electric. Several appropriate displays will be placed in the lobby and along the tour route. Refreshments will be served. All guests may register for the 14-inch portable color television door prize.

Montpelier's Unit No. 2 and the building addition that houses the new generation equipment more than doubled the cooperative's generating capacity and the physical size of the plant. In peak operation, Unit No. 2 produces 40,000 kilowatts of power. It has a rated capacity of 33,000 kilowatts.

PLAN THIRD UNIT

Generation capacity of both units at Montpelier station is 65,000 kilowatts. This production of power is more than ample at present to serve the peak demand of the cooperative's members and available surplus power is being sold to neighboring utilities. However, with power consumption of the members doubling every 10 years, planning for Montpelier Unit No. 3 is already underway.

Total cost of building and equipment for the new unit is $5 million. Cost of some of the larger contracts for Unit No. 2 were $1,501,680 for the steam generating unit, $898,302 for the turbine-generator unit, $241,211 for the substructure, and about $155,000 each for structural steel and for condensing equipment.

The boiler for Unit No. 2 is capable of generating 385,000 pounds of steam per hour, under 875 pounds of pressure, at 900 degrees Fahrenheit. It is fueled by 20 tons of pulverized coal per hour. Unit No. 2 requires 264 tons of air per hour for combustion and 30,000 gallons of river water per hour for steam condensing.

In announcing the Open House, General Manager F. E. Fair said, "Through good engineering and careful contracting, Eastern Iowa's consumer-owners have secured a 33,000 kilowatt generating unit at the normal cost of a 22,000 kilowatt unit. Availability of this dependable, low-cost electricity will stimulate agricultural, industrial, residential, and recreational growth in the large area we serve."

The Open House at Montpelier also marks the 25th year of service to the cooperative by F. E. Fair, who has been general manager of Iowa's largest rural electric cooperative since February of 1944.

J. Kermit Eland of Mediapolis, president of the cooperative's board of directors, said during a dinner at Montpelier to honor Mr. Fair, "The dream of rural America for light and power is still alive. The dedication of rural Americans to their own electric cooperatives is still vigorous. Montpelier generating station represents our pride in the past, our power for the present, and our faith for the future."

RUSTIN SPEAKS WITH REASON ON SEPARATISM

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Bayard Rustin has long been one of the most eloquent spokesmen for the Negro in America. His counsel is wise and worthy of careful attention.

I request unanimous consent to have a report of recent remarks by Mr. Rustin which appeared in the Washington Post printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSTIN DENOUNCES BLACK SEPARATISM

(By Harry Bernstein)

LOS ANGELES.—"Who the hell appointed you spokesman for the Negro people?" AFL–CIO President George Meany once shouted at A. Philip Randolph, the famed Negro civil rights leader.

Randolph, the only AFL–CIO Negro vice president and head of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, drew the Meany remark when he was challenging the labor federation to accept as fact that some unions were guilty of racial discrimination.

In those days, Randolph was among the most militant spokesmen for the Negro people. But today his approach would be in strong contrast to that of black separatists—and this difference was emphasized at one of a series of 80th-birthday celebrations for him here and in other American cities.

Bayard Rustin, Negro author, lecturer and executive director of the A. Philip Randolph Institute in Washington, led the tribute to Randolph here last weekend by the United Negro Labor Community Council.

Rustin noted that the black separatists of today defy one of the basic principles by which Randolph lived: integration.

Many young blacks at first sang out, "black is beautiful," Rustin said, but now they are changing this to "only black is beautiful."

"I can tell you this is the biggest lie ever perpetrated.

"There is nothing more beautiful about black than about white.

"I know a black family in the ghetto in New York which pays $100 a month for one rat-infested room, and they pay it to a black landlord.

"That is what a black man is doing to a black man and that ain't beautiful."

Rustin also ridiculed current pleas by some students for separate dormitories and separate classes for blacks in college.

"The Ku Klux Klan said for years that only white teachers could teach white children. Some black students must be having nervous breakdowns when they now echo the KKK and say only blacks can teach blacks.

"These people must know nothing can be learned effectively in a segregated school system, black or white," he said.

Rustin then denounced black capitalism, an idea designed to give Negroes ownership of businesses.

Black capitalism has won some favorable remarks from both President Nixon and the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), a militant civil rights group.

"When Nixon and CORE start agreeing on something, the rest of us had better start worrying about it," Rustin said.

LEWIS HILL BUILDS A NEW CHICAGO

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Chicago Tribune carried an excellent profile on Lewis Hill, Chicago's urban renewal and planning director, who is spearheading the drive to make Chicago the first city in the Nation free of slums.

Mr. Hill has brought a new activity to Mayor Daley's profound hope of making Chicago the most progressive city in the world.

The Chicago Tribune profile, by Miss Joy Darrow, captures Mr. Hill's dynamic spirit and I am pleased to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

Lew Hill exemplifies the spirit of which Chicago's administration is made.

The article follows:

THIS IS LEWIS HILL: SEE HIM PLAN

(By Joy Darrow)

At age 42, Lewis Hill, the head of Chicago's urban renewal and planning departments, has torn down and built up about as much of the city as did the combined efforts of Mrs. O'Leary's cow, Daniel Burnham, and Arthur Rubloff. And it's not too hard to see why. Or how.

Hill's attitude toward the prompt and well-organized uplift of Chicago could perhaps most accurately be likened to an army officer telling the medics who are clearing the battlefield: "Let's get on with this, men, there are 1,000 more waiting in the foxholes to get a piece of the action."

Despite his concern for action, however, "the individual" always has to be part of "the big picture," says Hill, an early transplant from Fort Worth. Chicago was the city to which his family came so that "they could search for better opportunities," which for him eventually meant degrees in both engineering and architecture and 18 years in various city departments.

The dark-haired, quietly-tailored city official now lays groundwork and prepares the preliminary "ayes" for more local projects than does any other department head. He started working for the city in the land clearance division, was appointed to head the urban renewal department in 1965, and two years later became the over-worked landlord of many of the city's most tired neighborhoods when he accumulated the additional title—and duties—of the city's planning and development department.

The dimensions of his job are delicate. He has the responsibility of a job that not only includes planning for the persons he meets daily in the line of duty, but preserving the city as well. He must keep close tabs on various neighborhoods' strengths and weaknesses, and consider everything from its number of garbage cans and rats to its unemployment and riot-potential factors.

Alternating an air of humility, ["I'm just the mayor's right arm now, remember . . ."] with that of a professional fund raiser for a worthy cause, Hill comes off as one who will have no truck with an obdurate world that does not want to better itself. His efficiency at getting this done has resulted in a win versus loss record of about 98 per cent wins, and has shown the many sides of the man.

He can be cruel: At one recent planning committee meeting he verbally lambasted the executive director of an influential business group in front of a crowd.

He can be businesslike: When a west side resident asked if she should continue remodeling her kitchen now that she lived in an urban renewal area, Hill briskly advised her that it would be in her best economic interests to stop.

But he also can be gentle. When one elderly lady, dressed in tweeds and sensible walking shoes, asked for a moment's time so that she could describe—and plug for—the renovation rather than the demolition of her lifetime Chicago neighborhood, Hill slowed the pace of an almost frenetic meeting. [Four enormous urban renewal and conservation projects were on the agenda.] City officials listened while the proud little woman fought for preserving the near north area, west of La Salle street, for residents now living there.

"There is room for all of us there, black and white, young and old," she said. And she was a much more graphic picture than could have been presented by any of Hill's charts, maps, and statistics. Hill thanked her graciously, and when he turned to the next item on the agenda, his tone was quite a bit less brisk.

Part of this gentleness comes because Hill is smart enough to know that no matter how smoothly projects hum along, the words "urban renewal" are a frightening combination to many residents. And part of it comes because he understands "that everybody wants something uniquely and exclusively his own for his neighborhood."

He speaks of a community's chauvinism these days almost solely with nostalgia because of his increasingly long distance touch, and he chafes more from irritants such as underinformed reporters or aldermen than he does from uninformed residents or bureaucratic binds.

He personally stays ahead of the game by keeping current on the contents of about 50 pounds of paperwork that each week arrives at—and departs from—his desk. A considerable portion of the work is treated to a round trip to his northwest side home in a Texas-sized briefcase he totes home each night.

His secretary spends the mornings dispatching her boss's homework to the necessary next stops and her spare time preparing memoranda to hand him when he stops in the office on his way to, or from, one of the many daily meetings he attends.

His stamina is becoming legend around city hall, but his race for time is easy to understand. The father of six children, a home owner, and a member of more than a dozen professional, civic, and social organizations, he has been known to commandeer a day full of meetings and then hurry home to cook dinner because his wife was sick that day.

If he has any fun at his largely friction-free city hall meetings, it is not noticeable. It's never amateur afternoon when he is at the conference table. His smiles are infrequent, but resilient, and his patience seemingly endless. He appears most comfortable with a pencil and some papers spread before him.

With few exceptions, Hill's hands and feet do not fidget. At one recent meeting, however, which was more verbally colorful and crowded with audience participation than usual these days, Hill's pencil tip, pressed to the breaking point, snapped.

Perhaps this is one of the few visible indications that the city's biggest planner, who says "We Will" a dozen times a day, might for once have been thinking more along the lines of "We Hope."

But, because Hill is Hill, there was no break in the meeting's continuity. He had another pencil—and 1,000 more facts—waiting in the wings to get a piece of the action.

DOVES SILENT, HAWKS SOUND FAMILIAR

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Doves Silent, Hawks Sound Familiar," written by Mary McGrory, and published in a recent edition of the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOVES SILENT, HAWKS SOUND FAMILIAR

(By Mary McGrory)

The New Democratic Coalition, an organization of McCarthy-Kennedy-McGovern veterans of 1968, making an eloquent protest against the war, included one declaration that derived more from hope than reality.

"We intend to make it clear that the voice you hear today will be the voice of the new Democratic party, speaking not from the divisions of the past but with unity against any continuation of the war in Vietnam," it said.

The fact of the matter is that Democratic dissenters, who won a glorious victory in New Hampshire a year ago tomorrow, have fallen silent, while the President ponders the "appropriate response" to the new enemy onslaught in Vietnam.

Eugene McCarthy, the hero of New Hampshire, is busy writing a book about the campaign.

BATTLING FOR TREATY

Sen. J. William Fulbright is fighting for the nuclear nonproliferation treaty in the Senate.

Sen. George S. McGovern is fighting hunger in the South.

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy is fighting against the antiballistic missile system.

Allard K. Lovenstein, firebrand of the "Dump Johnson" movement, is now a member of Congress, bemused by Biafra.

The war, which was reversed in its course a year ago March 31 by Lyndon Johnson, goes on, and with increasing fury and mounting casualties.

The rhetoric is the same.

A FAMILIAR SOUND

President Nixon sounds like President Johnson when he says (as he did in his last press conference) that "The American people will support a President if they are told by the President why we are there, what our objectives are, what the cost will be and what the alternatives would be if we took another course of action."

Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird says, as his predecessor, Robert S. McNamara said a year ago, that the Tet offensive is "a failure."

Chairman John Stennis of the Senate Armed Services Committee, says "we are chewing up the enemy in some places."

The military, who a year ago reportedly said they needed 200,000 more men to finish the job, are saying now that they can do it with the present troop level. They promise, as before, that the enemy is weaker, that the South Vietnamese are stronger, that the war is going better.

On the campuses, where dissent was born, the rumblings of disruption and all-out resistance are being heard. If the answer is escalation, the students will march. Enrollments in the radical Students for a Democratic Society are up, because, said one troubled Harvard sophomore, "We're going crazy over the war, and the SDS are the only ones who are doing anything."

The President has not scheduled his decision on the war. The ABM comes first, and there is some thought that he feels if he halts deployment, he will prove his independence of the military-industrial complex and buy more time on Vietnam.

Some dissenters, like Fulbright, feel he will, being intelligent, face the facts about the war, and proceed with whatever settlement he can get. Others, like McCarthy, wonder if he has to go through the course of previous presidents, beguiled by military optimism and repelled by the prospect of presiding over America's first defeat. Still others think the President may do nothing immediately.

The President has shown a lively response on minor matters. Encountering resistance on Willie Mae Rogers as consumer guide and Murray Chotiner as a Republican party official, he dropped them both.

But the war is the first matter of total consequence which he has faced. The only clue he gave was a laughing reference to the "domino theory," beloved of hawks, in reference to South America. He had to be forced in his Pacific press conference to warn of retaliation on the Viet Cong offensive.

The New Democratic Coalition said that the primaries seemed to them "a direct manifestation of the American conscience and will, expressing a profound distaste for the war and its consequences."

If Nixon agrees with that, his course will be clear. He will instruct the negotiators in Paris to make concessions, and instruct the field commanders to scale down the fighting. Otherwise, as he full well knows, "Johnson's war" becomes "Nixon's war" very quickly. The political opposition which turned it around once is not possible for another two years.

As he sits in the gloaming, as he likes to do when pondering grave questions, he must really make up his mind about what the people of New Hampshire were saying last March 12.

STEINER-LIFF IRON AND METAL CO. OF NASHVILLE, TENN., ENTERS AN ON-THE-JOB TRAINING PROGRAM

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a pioneer project has been underway in my home district of Nashville-Davidson County.

I have been so impressed with the ideals behind this project, and its results, that I would like to briefly outline this program, how it began, was carried, and the success it achieved, for the consideration of my fellow Members of the Congress.

For some time we have asked our business community to accept a greater responsibility and involvement in seeking solutions to our urban problems.

Steiner-Liff Iron and Metal Co., of Nashville, Tenn., has accepted its role in seeking these solutions.

The company had entered into an on-the-job training program, through a subcontract through the Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, their national trade association. The institute had a contract with the Labor Department for 1,000 jobs throughout the United States. Seventeen of these jobs were assigned to Tennessee, and Steiner-Liff obtained all 17 openings. Contracts were signed for these training openings whereby the firm was to be reimbursed by the Federal Government, through the institute, at the rate of $20 per employee for a period of from 4 to 20 weeks, depending on what the job for which the individual was to be trained.

Mr. Noah Liff, president of Steiner-Liff Industries, stated that his firm was not interested in the $20 per week, but were interested in the employee pool from which they might be able to find employees. Mr. Liff indicated that they would, in turn, take the money received and turn it over to some school or neighborhood activity program. It was then Mr. Liff learned of the complementary program, a basic education program which is done on the job.

Under this program, Steiner-Liff received $15 per student, per week, with $5 going toward paying a nonprofit organization called the Board for Fundamental Education, to set up classrooms right in the plant to teach the most basic rudiments of education, specifically, reading and writing.

In addition to the 17 on-the-job training positions, Steiner-Liff contracted directly with the Board for Fundamental Education for any and all existing employees who wanted to go to school because they had to drop out of school for some time and wanted to take a refresher course. This was done at a cost of $20 per student for the entire 25-week course.

The Board for Fundamental Education agreed to:

First. Interview all employees.

Second. Test on a Stanford Standard Achievement Test all employees who are agreeable and interested.

Third. Grade and classify, confidentially, those employees who are rated from 00 to fourth grade and those employees who are from fifth grade to eighth grade.

Fourth. Hire and assign teachers who are experienced in adult education—using the board room technique rather than the teacher-up-front, students-at-the-desk method.

Fifth. Guarantee that on graduation day at the end of the 25 weeks those students who are in the double zero to fourth-grade category will have a reading and arithmetic level of at least the fourth grade and those in the fifth to eighth grade level will have at least the eighth-grade level. When graduation comes, if there are some who have not reached this level of accomplishment, the board teachers will stay on for those few stragglers until they do reach this level of accomplishment at no additional cost.

At these prices, it was obvious that this could not be accomplished without contributions to the board by charitable foundations. Steiner-Liff Foundation, although not obligated to do so, intends to reimburse the board at the end of the sessions for any actual out-of-pocket cost they have for the program.

One hundred and one people were interviewed. Eighty-nine of them signed up to go to school. Only four of them tested out at the high school level; the balance were lower. And, of those, only about 10 or 12 were as high as fourth to eighth grade, and this included many who had actually attended high school.

The board had stated that Steiner-Liff could expect about a 50-percent-dropout rate for those who were eligible to take the course. This held true, and many of those who first enrolled dropped out of the program for a number of reasons, including transportation problems, overtime, and termination of employment with the company, among the reasons.

Yet of those who began the program, 15 graduated.

This effort on the part of a private business concern has been of benefit to the community, has helped build morale within the organization, and has improved the lives—and earning power—of those who completed the program.

Mr. Noah Liff, and his company, Tennessee Steel & Supply Co., deserve recognition, support, and encouragement for seeking immediate and meaningful solutions by those who are best capable of finding these solutions—the American businessman.

CHAMPIONS OF ALL

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, perfection is the goal of all of us, but attained by only a precious few. One who has reached that magic circle with the appropriate nickname, the "Titans," is the basketball team of Saginaw's St. Stephen's High School. This past weekend, the Titans climaxed a perfect season by winning the Michigan class C high school basketball crown. It completed a perfect season with 24 victories and not a single loss.

I extend to these young athletes my heartiest congratulations and a special commendation to their head coach, Sam Franz, and his young assistant, Hubert Lynch.

To the team, coaches, parents, and loyal followers, congratulations. I would like to insert at this time a fine editorial on the champions which appeared in the March 24, 1969, edition of the Saginaw News, Saginaw, Mich.:

OUR TITAN CHAMPIONS

> Winning it uphill against the odds, against the clock and when everything seems to say it can't be done is what it's all about. That's the mark of a champion which Saginaw St. Stephen's bears today.
>
> Champion—truly, uncontestably champion of Michigan Class C high school basketball.
>
> Coach Sam Franz' Titans answered any lingering doubts about this team's perfection late Saturday afternoon in MSU's Jenison Fieldhouse to the satisfaction of all of the experts. A 24-victory, no-defeat season now goes into the school's collection of happy memories along with that silver trophy.
>
> It may be a time before we see anything quite like this again. A 24–0 record requires more than luck. It is not an every-day achievement. If one doubts that, ask any man who has ever been associated with the coaching of the young. Saginaw High was last to turn that trick in 1962.
>
> Loyal St. Stephen's fans, justifiably bursting with pride, know very well what it took beyond "luck" to reach this pinnacle. It is a triumph, of course, that stands on much broader base even than mere athletic skill—which this team has.
>
> It is a testimony to things like desire, affection, respect, devotion and plain old-fashioned belief. For this, a coach, a team, parents and loyal followers can take a bow.
>
> We hope they'll not object if an entire All-America City reflects in some of the glory earned by its newest champion of Michigan. Somehow it seems very appropriate today.

COTTAGE GROVE, OREG., NAMED ALL AMERICA CITY

HON. JOHN R. DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, Cottage Grove, a progressive community in Oregon's Willamette Valley, has just been named an "All America City."

In selecting Cottage Grove as one of 11 cities in the Nation to receive this coveted award, the editors of Look magazine said:

> A new sense of purpose reaches down through a 40-member Metropolitan Committee to grass-roots citizen discussion groups.

The magazine, which cosponsors the contest with the National Municipal League, described the city's economic situation:

> Dependent upon a fluctuating lumber market, populated by transient loggers, a full hour's drive from the city of Eugene, Cottage Grove had a civic base as narrow as an axe handle.

The writers go on to cite the efforts of concerned and involved citizens to secure a swimming pool for the high school—thanks to a generous lumberman—housing for the elderly, and renewal of slum areas.

Said Look:

> A town of 5,700 has a hard time competing in the progress game. But in one vital area, Cottage Grove is way out in front. Across the United States, cities are spewing raw or inadequately treated sewage into lakes, streams, and rivers. Cottage Grove purifies its sewage once, twice, three times, and what goes in unmentionable comes out potable.

Last year the city dedicated the second known tertiary sewage treatment facility in the Nation.

Cottage Grove also is winning in the battle against crime. A special program has policemen talking with students about social problems that affect them and about a policeman's role in the community. The result: an 11-percent drop in juvenile crime.

Those of us who know and love Cottage Grove realize that this small city has a special feeling about it. The citizens really care about their city. They have worked hard to make Cottage Grove a better place in which to live and a nicer place to visit.

As the Congressman who represents this fine city, I join its citizens in their pride in that well-deserved title, "All America City."

A BILL TO HELP MAKE LIFE EASIER FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will extend medicare to cover those drugs which are prescribed for the treatment of diabetes and those chronic cardiovascular, respiratory, and kidney diseases that commonly afflict the aged.

Medicare, in its short existence, has done much to alleviate the financial burden of health care which is felt by so many of our older citizens. It has not only improved their quality of life, but it has brought to the aged a peace of mind which comes with the knowledge their finances will not be drained due to the heavy expenses of a serious illness.

I feel it is vital that we now extend this very successful program to include diabetic treatment for the aged among its provisions. Nearly 1 out of every 20 persons in this country today is an actual or a potential diabetic, and these figures are constantly increasing. The American Diabetes Association has found that since 1950 the prevalence of diabetes has increased nearly 95 percent.

As we all know, diabetes is a chronic condition which develops when the body is unable to make use of certain foods, especially sugars and starches. The most likely targets are: persons who are related to diabetics; women; persons who are overweight; and those who are at least 45 years of age. According to a study made by the American Diabetes Association, nearly seven out of 10 known diabetics did not discover their diabetes until they were 45 years of age or older. In one out of five cases, diabetes was discovered when the patient was 65 years or older.

Diabetes now ranks eighth among the causes of death by disease. Approximately 32,000 deaths per year are attributed directly to diabetes. Neglect of diabetes may also lead to an increased risk of coronary disease, hardening of the arteries, cerebral hemorrhage, kidney disease, failing eyesight, gangrene, and diabetic coma.

But diabetes can be controlled by diet, exercise, and insulin, or one of the oral compounds that reduce blood sugar. Without the availability of these prescribed drugs, however, a diabetic has little chance of living a normal life. This treatment must be made available to our older citizens who cannot otherwise afford it.

I feel that this legislation is necessary to help make life easier for our senior citizens. Its adoption would mean that a more comprehensive health package would be made available to millions of Americans.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF SIMPSON COUNTY, KY.

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, this year is the sesquicentennial year of Simpson County, Ky.

This is the year when a century and a half of history will be brought to light. One hundred and fifty years of earlier dreams and hopes, of honest toil and dedication, of personal and civic pride, will be recalled, retold, and relived. And in this year, as it was in 1819, the good people of Simpson County will continue to dream and hope, to toil, and to dedicate themselves toward making the future of their county ever one of growth and progress.

The stature of Simpson County and its county seat, Franklin, did not come about by chance. Its advances are by no means typical. Statistics show us that in some areas throughout our country, towns and counties have diminished in their influence and importance. This is not true in Kentucky and it has not happened in Franklin or Simpson County. Simpson Countians simply would not tolerate such a situation. I have known these people for a long time. I know them to be strong and good people—proud people who, like their forebears, love their part of Kentucky and want it to prosper. The word "decline" is not acceptable, the thought—intolerable.

Simpson County was established in February 1819 and is the nameplace of an illustrious Kentuckian, Capt. John Simpson. A distinguished lawyer and legislator, Captain Simpson, at the onset of the War of 1812 rallied his friends and neighbors to raise a company of riflemen. Together they went forth to join the first Kentucky troops to serve in that war. Captain Simpson was killed in the Battle of the River Raisin and as a tribute to his courage and bravery his name was given to the 63d county to be formed in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. One year later a town, named for Benjamin Franklin, was founded. Simpson County retains its original boundaries and Franklin remains its county seat.

Simpson County's roots were bedded in this rich and welcoming land. The soil was productive—ideal for the cultivation of wheat, corn, oats, and tobacco. Grazing lands were abundant and two great rivers, the Barren and the Red, drained the area. Though not without hardships, life was good. More and more the word of Simpson County spread and settlers came with their families to make it their home. Here they were welcomed as neighbors by friendly and hospitable folk. This same welcoming spirit exists today and perhaps could well be called the county's trademark.

The years passed and while agriculture is still vital to the county's social and economic life, civic leaders realized some years ago that if their young were to enjoy Simpson County as they themselves had been privileged to do, opportunities for their employment must be found. Industry had first to be attracted and then brought in. With intelligent planning and cooperation from all sources such projects as school improvement and recreational facilities were begun. An industrial development association was formed. Companies were invited to look over its possibilities. They came, liked what they saw, and stayed to become a part of the Franklin-Simpson community.

The community has been recognized throughout the State of Kentucky for its program of self-betterment and today is regarded as an outstanding example of what can be done when interested and concerned citizens work together. Its remarkable progress and notable history will be commemorated during the summer of 1969 with a full week of festivities. The success of Simpson County Sesquicentennial Week is assured just as the future of Simpson County is assured. Its people determined long ago—150 years ago, in fact—that Simpson County was their county and as such, in all things, it deserved their best efforts.

I know I speak for all Kentuckians in my praise of Simpson County. It has won recognition in the past and I have no doubt that more honor will come in the years ahead.

STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON CONCERNING THE DEATH OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the 28 years the Honorable Frances P. Bolton served as a Member of the Congress from the 22d Congressional District of Ohio, she was privileged to work with the administration of five Presidents of the United States. One of our Presidents with whom she worked most closely for 8 years was Dwight D. Eisenhower. Her friendship and admiration for General Eisenhower dated back many years. In 1951 Mrs. Bolton was one of a small group of prominent persons who visited General Eisenhower when he was Supreme Allied Commander in Europe to urge him to become a Republican candidate for President.

Mrs. Bolton was appointed by President Eisenhower as the first woman Member of Congress to serve as a Representative of the United States of America to the Eighth General Assembly of the United Nations. Upon learning of President Eisenhower's death, Mrs. Bolton issued the following statement:

To the many who have been privileged to work with him General Eisenhower's death is a grievous thing. Even in the last many months which he had to spend at Walter Reed Hospital, there was a courage emanating from him that gave each of us a steadiness and a strength that carried us over many stony places. For this we are deeply, deeply grateful—for we shall miss him more than words can possibly express.

To him this country was indeed "one nation under God" and he served her selflessly and well. What light there was in his eyes! What strength and calm tenderness in his voice—what force when force was needed!

One cannot grieve now that he has gone on to broader living, for has he not given us a rare legacy of patriotism? Surely it has been a wonderful experience to have known him—to have worked for and with him—to have watched his clear, open, honest ways. It will be many moons before another such as he comes into our midst.

May Heaven grant his devoted wife and family a deep and abiding comfort and peace.

CONGRESS ASSAILED

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House and a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have been distressed to note the low level at which Congress funds the Federal court system. This inadequate funding was recently the subject of some unprecedented criticism of Congress by Chief Justice Earl Warren. It is my own belief that one of the major problems with administration of criminal justice in the United States is the inordinate delay between a crime and punishment for that crime. The psychological relationship between the crime and the punishment—on which the deterrent theory of criminal punishment is largely based—is destroyed by the long wait between commission of the crime and imposition of punishment. To me a speedy trial with a decision following soon after the crime would have far more deterrent effect than the harsher sentences which have been suggested by some.

But if the long delays in criminal proceedings are detrimental of society's purposes in imposing punishment, they are even less defensible where the defendant is found innocent. Sometimes a man may have been under the cloud of an indictment for years before he is finally cleared of wrongdoing. Not only is this unfair, but it seems to me violates the sixth amendment's guarantee of a speedy trial for all citizens.

To the extent that we in Congress are responsible for the inability of the Federal courts to dispense justice expeditiously, we must bear part of the responsibility for the breakdown in administration of criminal justice in the United States. I believe that the attached editorial from the Chicago Daily Defender points out the problem which we face. The Chief Justice's words are worth pondering. So is the discrepancy between what we are willing to devote to detecting and capturing criminals, and what we devote to trying them after they are caught.

The editorial referred to follows:

CONGRESS ASSAILED

Breaking his traditional reticence about open fault-finding with the legislative branch on non-judicial matters. Chief Justice Earl Warren assailed Congress for failing to meet the needs of the nation's federal courts.

He advanced the view that part of the increasing crime problem is attributable to "the fact that we do not move along to get cases tried." To keep cases current, the Chief Justice said, "we must get a response from Congress to do our job in a proper way.

Addressing the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, Warren asked: "Do you think we can get any help from Congress? The answer has clearly been no." The Chief Justice described Congressional expenditures for the judiciary as just a drop in the bucket. And he added that the "FBI budget is infinitely higher than the whole federal court system."

LURLEEN B. WALLACE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the illness and death of the one may sometimes result in the cure and life for the many. The tragic illness and death in 1968 of Alabama's beloved late Governor, Lurleen B. Wallace, may very well be such a case. A group of dedicated Alabamians have proposed the construction of the Lurleen B. Wallace Memorial Cancer Hospital and Tumor Institute. Our present Governor, Albert P. Brewer, an author of this dream and initiator of the work which will turn it into a reality is serving as honorary chairman of a "Courage Crusade" dedicated to the task of raising $15 million to build and equip one of the Nation's finest cancer hospitals in Alabama.

The hospital is designed to become the South's most modern facility in the treatment of cancer and will engage in research for the cure of this dread disease.

In Alabama it is estimated that one out of every four persons will have some form of cancer during his lifetime. Such a fact greatly underscores the need for such a hospital.

Governor Brewer and those working with him have dedicated themselves to a meritorious but difficult task. The building of the hospital depends on the generous response of all Alabamians. The cost of the hospital must be underwritten from private and individual contributions in the amount of $5 million with another $10 million coming from other sources. The probable location of this great new facility will be adjacent to the Medical Center in Birmingham, since location elsewhere would cause the cost of the hospital to more than double. Originally planned for 200 beds, the hospital is so designed that it may be increased to a capacity of 500.

It is significant that this project has been endorsed by the Alabama Medical Association, the dean of the University of Alabama Medical School, the National Cancer Institute, and the State of Alabama Department of Health.

Supporting Governor Brewer in this significant task are two other distinguished Alabamians—Earl Mallick and Donald Comer, Jr.—campaign chairman and cochairman, respectively.

There could be no more fitting tribute to Lurleen B. Wallace, a courageous fighter against cancer in life, than to dedicate to her memory this proposed hospital, the purpose of which is cancer's cure and extinction.

PRESIDENT NIXON PREPARES FOR RETURN TO VOLUNTARY ARMY

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to learn that the new administration is taking all necessary steps to prepare for the return to a voluntary military manpower system in the historic pattern and tradition of this Nation.

An all-volunteer Army has been part of our national heritage, abandoned only in periods of major war. As a free society, we must turn away from as inherently inequitable a system as conscription and return to that heritage just as soon as circumstances permit.

President Nixon announced his intention to move in a careful and responsible way toward an all-volunteer military so that our national security is never in doubt. Accordingly, he has named a distinguished 15-member Advisory Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force to develop a comprehensive plan of action for accomplishing that goal.

The members of the Commission, under the chairmanship of former Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates, have a broad base of qualifications that should give weight to their final conclusions.

There have been previous Presidential commissions to study the military manpower requirements of the country. But there has been no rigorous study made of how to return to the voluntary system. Thus, this Commission will be breaking new ground.

The President has made it clear that the Commission will consider carefully the need to keep reformed selective service machinery available for national emergencies and also the requirements for adequate reserve forces.

The Commission's studies will dovetail with the study already ordered by the President within the Department of Defense, taking into account both the costs and the savings that would result from voluntary military manpower recruitment.

The text of the President's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ANNOUNCING A COMMISSION ON AN ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMED FORCE

To achieve the goal of an all-volunteer force we will require the best efforts of our military establishment and the best advice we can obtain from eminent citizens and experts in many related fields of national endeavor. For this purpose, I have today appointed an Advisory Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force under the Chairmanship of the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, Jr., former Secretary of Defense.

I have directed the Commission to develop a comprehensive plan for eliminating conscription and moving toward an all-volunteer armed force. The Commission will study a broad range of possibilities for increasing the supply of volunteers for service, including increased pay, benefits, recruitment incentives and other practicable measures to make military careers more attractive to young men. It will consider possible changes in selection standards and in utilization policies which may assist in eliminating the need for inductions. It will study the estimated costs and savings resulting from an all-volunteer force, as well as the broader social and economic implications of this program.

The transition to an all-volunteer armed force must, of course, be handled cautiously and responsibly so that our national security is fully maintained. The Commission will determine what standby machinery for the draft will be required in the event of a national emergency and will give serious consideration to our requirements for an adequate reserve forces program.

I have instructed the Department of Defense and other agencies of the Executive Branch to support this study and provide needed information and assistance as a matter of high priority.

The Commission will submit its report to me in early November, 1969.

MARCH WAS NATIONAL DECA MONTH

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, National DECA Month—Distributive Education Clubs of America—was observed throughout the Nation during March. The purpose is to call public attention to distributive education which identifies a program of instruction in marketing, merchandising, and management. DE is offered in all 50 States and the territories of the United States.

DECA identifies the program of youth activities related to DE and is designed to develop future leaders for marketing and distribution. It is the only youth organization operating in the Nation's schools to attract young people to the careers in commerce. Its purposes are: First, to develop a respect for education in marketing and distribution which will contribute to occupational competence; and second, to promote understanding and appreciation for the responsibilities of citizenship in our free competitive enterprise system.

These young people are not content to wait for tomorrow to learn the ways of the business world—they are learning today. By their actions, they are assuring the economy of trained, efficient business leaders in the next generation. The training they are receiving now is invaluable and I want to thank the dedicated work of DE teachers and students across the Nation for their efforts.

THE NEED FOR WATER QUALITY MONITORING

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Charles C. Johnson, Jr., Administrator of the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, presented a most significant statement at the Water Supply and Waste Water Seminar sponsored by the American Water Works Association and the Water Pollution Control Federation, March 4, 1969.

Dr. Johnson's statement warns of the critical dangers which now threaten our water resources. As a Representative from the Lake Erie water basin, I share with Dr. Johnson a desire for more meaningful Federal action and have introduced a bill to provide for the creation of a national water pollution disaster fund to meet critical problems which are either interstate or beyond the capacity of any single State to solve.

The immediate danger of ecological disaster is apparent from data I have presented in past statements. In addition, Dr. Johnson points out the need for increased monitoring of our water supplies. Although Ohioans easily know when the taste and odor of Lake Erie water have made it undrinkable, scientific monitoring of taste, color, and odor as well as bacteriological and chemical pollutants will increase the scientific understanding of our water resources. This knowledge will make it possible for us someday to offer our citizens not only the minimally acceptable water we are now seeking, but actually to provide them with quality drinking water.

Careful scientific monitoring of the water our citizens drink is an absolute necessity, and it is my hope that we will act soon to provide our water treatment plants with something more than sewer water to distribute to our citizens.

Dr. Johnson's satement follows:

THE NEED FOR WATER QUALITY MONITORING

You have asked me to direct my remarks especially to the current situation with regard to legislation affecting your area of interest. I will tell you what I can about legislative matters, but I think it would be useful first for me to review, very briefly, the principal problems which confront us today in maintaining safe, potable water and to discuss with you the direction in the new Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service believe Federal, State, and local water hygiene programs should take.

As you know, the Public Health Service's water quality program is now a part of the Environmental Control Administration, whose Commissioner is Assistant Surgeon General Chris A. Hansen.

The Environmental Control Administration is one of three agencies which comprise the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, of which I am the Administrator. The other two units are the Food and Drug Administration and the National Air Pollution Control Administration. Let me tell you just a little about the philosophy and operations of the new Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service because we feel that the present organizational structure will strengthen all of our programs including our water hygiene activities.

Most observers would agree that, at this particular time in history, we have reached, or at the very least are rapidly approaching a critical point with regard to adverse change in the physical environment. Every year, pollution gets worse, rather than better; the threat from unsafe food, drugs, water, and even consumer products is increasing; and the complex relationship of these diverse environmental threats is little understood.

Certainly, our Nation's progress in meeting human needs has been great, but it has been uneven. And our failure to come to grips with the complex problems—physical and psychological—generated by environmental change has created threats to human health—some subtle and some not so subtle—that the passage of time can only compound and complicate.

The Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service has been established to make possible a more effective and systematic approach to this complex of interrelated problems. Its primary goals are to achieve a deeper insight into the relationship of man to his environment, to assess the total impact on the human organism of many separate environmental stresses which impinge on man simultaneously, and to implement necessary action programs to help the Nation achieve needed environmental improvement.

I do not need to explain to you who are concerned with water hygiene that the human body does not always differentiate as to the method of entry or origin of chemical or bacteriological insults. The effect on the living organism may be the same whether the insult gains entry through the water man drinks, the air he breathes, the food he eats, the therapeutic drug he ingests, or some other product he consumes or uses.

You who are primarily concerned with water quality, are constantly made aware of the close interrelationship and interdependence of all parts of the environment. Significant change or deterioration in any part of the environment all too soon becomes a water problem. Soil erosion, deforestation, the use of agricultural chemicals, industrialization, urban sprawl, freeway construction, waste disposal, air pollution—each of these is the subject of grave concern in its own right, but ultimately each contributes to even more serious concern for water quality.

The Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service is initiating a vigorous new effort to try to advance our understanding of these complex, multiple threats to human health and to assure that we have a coordinated, concerted action program to maintain environmental quality. We want to consolidate all that we know today, and all the knowledge that we can develop in the future, into a sensible, revealing picture of what is happening to man in the contemporary environment. We want to assure that no important line of research is neglected. And we want to make sure that vitally needed programs are not slighted simply because they lack visibility or popular appeal.

We believe that our water quality program—and indeed the total national effort to maintain safe, wholesome drinking water—needs to be stepped up substantially. Our mission in water hygiene—and we are not alone in this responsibility—is to make certain that the quality of the Nation's water used for drinking, recreation, and other human contact is maintained at the highest possible levels. The total effort, as indicated by budget at all levels of government, seems to indicate a dangerous national complacency about the safety of our water supplies. Today, in the face of soaring populations, increasing environmental pollution, and the sometimes questioned adequacy of present treatment and distribution systems, we must not be apathetic about the safety and purity of the water we use for drinking and other human contact.

The Public Health Service, with its broad responsibility for the health of the whole population, certainly must not be guilty of such apathy. We have a clear obligation to work with State and local governments and industry, in a spirit of cooperation and mutual assistance, to achieve our national water quality goals. Working together, I am convinced we can achieve these goals, but I am equally convinced that it will require a major effort on the part of all.

In our opinion there is reason for serious concern about community water supplies in the United States. A 1967 report to the Secretary of HEW by the Task Force on Environmental Health (the Linton Report) extrapolated the statistics gathered as a result of the Public Health Service interstate carrier program and concluded that 33 percent of all public water supplies, serving some 50 million persons, do not meet the requirements of the Public Health Service Drinking Water Standards. Moreover, as I know you are all aware, the present PHS standards do not reflect the best and latest knowledge of real or potential threats to human health and fall far short of the drinking water quality goals promulgated by the AWWA last year.

Confirmation can be found simply by looking at the record. Most community water supply systems in this Nation were constructed over 30 years ago. Since then urban populations have increased from 20 to 40 percent. Many community systems are plagued by insufficient supply, inadequate transmission or pumping capacity, or other known deficiencies in their treatment and distribution systems.

Moreover, when these systems were built, there was insufficient information to design a facility for the removal of certain toxic chemical or virus contaminants. They were designed to treat a high quality of raw water for removal of bacteria. Today, both ground and surface water supplies have markedly deteriorated.

In addition, we know that water surveillance programs of State and local health agencies have deteriorated in recent years along with the treatment and distribution systems. Recurring major epidemics of water-borne disease were a primary concern of environmental health programs 40 years ago, and a major effort was sustained to curb such outbreaks. Today, however, concern has diminished, and water surveillance programs have declined in favor of other surveillance activities or pollution control programs, particularly in those fields in which Federal grants are available.

Yet today, we have problems—and they are growing every year—which point to a need for greater, not less, attention to water quality:

First of all, there is the ever increasing need for water for domestic and industrial use, caused by growth and concentration of the population and burgeoning technological development. We have already noted the obsolescence and inadequacy of many community water systems. If we have failed to keep pace with current needs, what does the future hold? It is estimated that the population of the United States will reach at least 230 million by 1980. Today, demand is running about 24 billion gallons of water each day, or 9 trillion gallons per year. By 1980, we can expect that demand to rise to 34 billion gallons per day, or more than 12 trillion gallons per year.

This means that additional water supplies must be developed, distribution facilities strengthened and extended, and more surveillance maintained in order to assure the continuous safety of water supply to the consumer's tap.

Second, there is the continued occurrence of communicable disease outbreaks resulting from contamination of water supply systems. It is true, of course, that the classical communicable water-borne diseases, such as typhoid fever, amoebic dysentery, and bacillary dysentery, have been brought under control. Nevertheless, during 1946–1960, there were 228 reported outbreaks of water-borne disease, resulting in 26,000 cases of illness. Those that are unreported are probably many times more—perhaps 100 times more than the reported cases.

In the last 5 years, reported outbreaks have averaged one per month. Two substantial outbreaks, involving 2,500 and 18,000 cases of salmonellosis respectively, and several instances of hepatitis attributed to contaminated water supplies have occurred in this period. In view of these continuing outbreaks, questions can logically be raised as to the reliability of time-honored safeguards against contamination. The adequacy of coliform organisms as a measure of water quality needs to be critically examined and better microbiological indicators of contamination sought.

Third, we know that there is a continual stream of new, and in some cases unidentifiable, contaminants originating from new industrial products. Wastes from synthetics, adhesives, surface coatings, solvents, and pesticides have reached surface waters in increasing quantities during the past 20 years. Many of these are extremely complex and are unaffected by present water and waste water treatment procedures. Some, such as pesticides and oil refinery wastes, have been shown to be toxic or carcinogenic. We know little about the identification and measurement of these compounds in drinking water, and we have little knowledge of their long-range health effects.

A fourth matter of concern is the potential needs for, and the current experimentation with, use of reclaimed waste waters for water supply purposes. During the past decade much has been learned about the treatment of waste waters for removal of some organic substances and bacteria, and processes for renovating waste waters have proceeded to the pilot plant stage. However, not enough effort has been devoted to the development of methods to remove such harmful contaminants as trace elements, pesticides, and some unidentified viruses. Little is known about the concentrations of carcinogens, antibiotics, or hormones present in waste waters, and the problem of establishing fail-safe operating and control criteria is an extremely complex one. So far as the Public Health Service Drinking Water Standards are concerned, these are based on the premise that the water source is relatively unpolluted; little work has been done to establish a basis for criteria that could be applied to the use of reclaimed municipal wastes for all purposes. Our people in the Bureau of Water Hygiene are mindful of their responsibility in this area of present and future concern.

These then are the principal problems, as we see them. It seems to me that they present to all of us, at every level of government and in industry, a serious responsibility and challenge. As I said eariler, I believe that working together we can meet the challenge, but I don't for one moment believe that it will be anything but a complicated and difficult task.

There are a host of unanswered questions which must be answered, and answered soon, if we are to maintain the safety of our water supplies. And I feel that the Bureau of Water Hygiene should mount a major research effort to find those answers. Clearly too we need to expand, far beyond the limitations of our present resources our operations, our technical services, and our training activities to strengthen State and local capabilities to deal with their water problems.

In view of the known and unknown contaminants which are increasingly present in source water, there is a critical need for more meaningful standards for drinking water, particularly with regard to chemicals. Total body burden exposure is becoming increasingly important in establishing limits for such contaminants in air, water, or food, and this is a matter of special concern in all of the CPEHS programs.

We need to determine the health of effects of trace minerals and biologicals in water supplies, both singly and in combinations in order to develop sensible standards. There is certainly a need to revise the present sampling regimen to reflect the quality of the source water, the treatment provided, and the control techniques used. We need information about what happens to various carcinogens in water treatment and we need to know more about viral contamination of water supplies. It is important that we evaluate new concentrating techniques so that we can develop studies of organics and viruses, and certain inorganics and specific bacterial pathogens.

We need to determine what happens to various carcinogens in water treatment, demonstrate the existence (or absence) of a water-borne viral gastroenteritis, and make virus challenges of the several tertiary treatment processes such as reverse osmosis membranes, electrodialysis, and carbon adsorption. We need to step up our research on infectious hepatitis. Certainly we need to initiate public health studies of waste water reuse.

We need to study quality deterioration in distribution systems and expand reservoir studies to include chemistry of destratification and the relation of hypolimnion oxidation reduction control as a means of algae control.

We need to develop a "water quality criteria for health" program that will provide updated and evaluated information to the profession.

In addition, we need a greater research effort to develop methods for rapid identification and measurement of both microbiological and chemical contaminants. New instrumentation in allied fields, and automated monitoring systems using bacteriological parameters for potable water quality should be investigated to provide more sensitive and accurate detection of harmful contaminants.

We feel that an essential preliminary to our progress in the water quality field is the development of better information on which to evaluate the status of community water supplies. So far, our only uniform information relates solely to interstate carrier supplies. If our experience with these supplies is any criteria—and we believe these supplies receive the best surveillance available—there are deficiencies in the construction, treatment, and surveillance of most community water supplies that require serious evaluation and correction.

It is the intention of the Bureau of Water Hygiene—an intention that is fully supported by its parent agency, the Environmental Control Administration, and by the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service—to move ahead as rapidly as possible to find answers to the questions I have raised about the content of our water supplies, to upgrade our water quality standards, and to intensify our technical assistance and training activities.

As one step in this direction, the Bureau of Water Hygiene is beginning this week a special community water supply study. The first surveys have begun in greater Cincinnati, Ohio; Charleston, West Virginia; and Charleston, South Carolina. During the next six months, survey teams will move on to six additional metropolitan areas, until nine cities—one in each Public Health Service region—have been surveyed. This survey was planned with the advice and guidance of a highly qualified advisory panel drawn from the American Water Works Association, the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers, universities, the consulting engineering field, and others with professional interests in water quality. The staff of our Bureau of Water Hygiene has met with the States, municipalities, utilities, and others concerned, and they are giving their full cooperation. In each of the survey areas, State and Public Health Service teams will conduct water supply inventories and collect distribution samples, measure these for various parameters, and conduct joint system surveys during the summer months. Later, in the fall, while stream flows and ground water tables are at lower levels, they will collect a second round of distribution samples and make further observations.

We feel that this nine-city survey will help to narrow the information gap which, as I indicated earlier, needs to be closed before we can make sensible, orderly progress in our Federal program.

The Safe Drinking Water Act of 1968, which the American Water Works Association supported last year, did not reach a vote in the Congress, as you know. The Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service has proposed that the Administration support a similar bill this year. In brief, the legislation would give specific authorization for the Public Health Service to broaden its standards for water quality in supplies used by interstate carriers, to include "any matter which by reason of its nature or quantity may constitute a hazard to health." In addition, it calls for a nationwide study of community water supplies.

I have no way of knowing what the fate of these proposals will be. However, I believe that passage of such legislation would give new vigor to the Federal program and make a significant contribution to State and local efforts to maintain high water quality.

As I have indicated, we are going ahead under our general authorities and with the resources available to us at the present time to begin at least a preliminary study of community water supplies because we feel this is of the utmost importance as a means of getting base line data.

This, then, is the direction I feel the Federal water program should take—a broadened program of research and development, upgrading of water quality standards, and an intensified program of operations, technical assistance, and training. Our progress may not be in "giant steps", but in this time of rapid growth and change, we in the Public Health Service cannot be content with the status quo if we are to discharge our responsibility for protecting the health of the American people.

If you who have the direct and immediate responsibility of providing safe drinking water to the American people are to discharge that responsibility, there are certain urgent and pressing needs which you must meet. These are, in my opinion, at the very least, improved surveillance of water supplies and constant vigilance against unforeseen waterborne health hazards; expanded training and licensing of water treatment plant operating staff; and a substantial, continuing program to expand, modernize, and replace deficient treatment and distribution systems.

I have mentioned several times that our program for certification of water supplies used by interstate carriers points to serious deficiencies in these systems. Let me be just a little more specific:

As of January 15, 1969, 707 of these supplies were under Public Health Service surveillance. 567, or 80 percent, of these were classified as approved for use on interstate carriers. The remaining 140 systems were classified as provisionally approved because of important defects in their supplies or their operations.

Some of these fail to meet the bacteriological standards, or do not meet the sampling frequency required.

A great many have no record of chemical analysis for trace metals such as arsenic, barium, cadmium, chromium, cyanide, lead, or selenium—elements that have limits which if exceeded, can constitute grounds for rejection of the source. A very high percentage have no records on turbidity, color, or threshold odor. A great many have no data available on radiochemical properties of their water. Others have inadequate or questionable cross-connection control programs or report major physical defects in the system or its operation.

I know that you who are working so hard to maintain safe and wholesome community water supplies are aware of these things, and I know very well the serious problems—budgetary as well as technical—that you face every year, and every day, in trying to do your jobs. Moreover, I want to say, with all sincerity, that you are doing an exceptional job under very trying circumstances. The trouble is that we are rapidly approaching a point at which you will no longer be able to assure the people of your communities of safe water unless you move, and move fast, to correct the kind of deficiencies I have cited.

I realize that the November article in *McCall's Magazine* caused consternation on the part of many conscientous professionals who are doing the most effective job they know how with the resources available to them. By its method of presentation, which certainly verged on sensationalism, it no doubt generated unjustified public alarm in some localities. However, it seems to me that, whatever the imperfections of its presentation and in spite of some errors in its factual content, it certainly pointed up the fact that the people of this country have a right to expect that the water that comes out of their taps is safe and pure, and that anything less than a "fully approved" water supply has no place in America today.

A year ago in January, the Board of Directors of the American Water Works Association approved a statement of policy supporting firmly "the position that the quality of the Nation's water resources must be upgraded and maintained at levels that are as high as are technically and economically possible." The Association recognized the engineering and fiscal difficulties involved in providing the high degree of treatment required. We all recognize the difficulties. I am confident that we all recognize, as well, that the time has come for action—whatever the difficulties—to make this goal a reality. If we don't do so we are flirting with disaster.

GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, citizens of the world mourn the loss of Dwight David Eisenhower, a dedicated leader who was beloved to friend and foe alike.

On the battlefront, in the White House, or in Gettysburg, Pa., this fine American inspired confidence and understanding in all with whom he associated. General Eisenhower was particularly devoted to the cause of better understanding among Americans, and among peoples of the world. I think it entirely fitting and proper that in his memory, each of us strive a little harder toward achieving this marvelous attribute.

His passing leaves a great void on the American scene, and the memories of his brilliant service shall long remain.

AQUANAUT CANNON IS FALLEN HERO

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, exploration of the unknown has been filled with tragedies in the loss of brave men who dared to brave new frontiers. America's eyes have been particularly turned to outer space in recent months and the names of Grissom, White, and Chaffee come to the mind each time we see an Apollo rocket burst into the heavens.

The seas have often been called inner space and America has a hero who braved the unknown as we seek to learn more about our own planet. It has been said that we know more about outer space than we do about our own environment.

It was in this quest for knowledge that a brave young man, Berry Cannon, gave his life.

His passing was keenly felt all over the Nation and particularly in my district. He was a graduate of Williston High School, in Levy County, and the University of Florida.

Two moving tributes which express what this Nation feels more eloquently than I could hope to do came from the Panama City News-Herald and the Ocala Star-Banner, which I submit as a tribute to another pioneer whose bravery and courage should serve as a lesson to us all:

[From the Ocala (Fla.) Star-Banner, Mar. 2, 1969]

A HEROIC CASUALTY

While most Americans, especially those of us in Florida, are far more familiar with space expeditions than with underwater experiments, Berry L. Cannon's death was no less a heroic casualty than any of the tragedies that have occurred in the space program.

The glamor and excitement of astronauts' adventures thus far have overshadowed aquanauts' activities in their deep sea projects. But as more underwater projects are carried out and the public becomes more aware of their value and importance, we have an idea the accomplishments of these men who work underwater will be appreciated to a greater extent.

Just as space flights are sent out into the unknown in quest of valuable information, those who probe deep under the surface of our oceans also are probing an unknown part of the universe.

Berry Cannon was a graduate of Williston High School, from there he went on to the University of Florida, before eventually becoming a member of a scientific team dedicated to learning more about the resources of vast ocean depths.

There is much to be learned and gained from underwater projects. Those who possess vast knowledge about the subject are certain there is a potential of great and incalculable value.

Just as those who are in the space program face danger, their counterparts in underwater study are engaged in a highly hazardous activity.

Berry Cannon was willing to risk his life in quest of knowledge. Despite all the skill and courage that he possessed death came to him in his pioneering effort.

The supreme sacrifices that have been paid by such men as Berry Cannon and Virgil Grissom in underwater and space activity ultimately will prove to be of immense value to all mankind.

[From the Panama City (Fla.) News-Herald, Feb. 23, 1969]

AQUANAUT CANNON A HERO—DESERVING OF HIGH AWARD

Man's pathways of progress have invariably been marked along the way by the grave stones of uncommon men.

These intrepid explorers and pioneers have shared certain identifying denominators: courage, humility, dynamic drive, and an abiding love for their God, their fellow men, their families, and the goal for which they sought.

Over the seas and across the lands, they pursued a better life and more abundance for those who remained behind; all too often to be called upon to make the supreme sacrifice attended only by the hovering Valkyrie.

The latter day quest of limitless space has already added three astronauts to the select society of Valhalla.

And now, the depths of the seas—which hold out the golden promise of wealth and plenty to a burgeoning humanity—have claimed their first heroic explorer, Aquanaut Berry L. Cannon.

He could decry this praise. In fact, Berry Cannot might shed a tear at having been taken away from the task before its completion. He might even smile quietly, and find a sad amusement at being cast as a member of the exclusive club of explorers and pioneers who have died for daring to blaze new trailways.

He was doing his job. He was doing it well. Berry Cannon was a master at his trade and profession, and he asked nothing more than this; to do his job and do it well.

But those of us who remain to benefit from his courageous work owe him something. We owe him due recognition as a hero, for that he was.

Berry L. Cannon knew hardship and heartache in his personal life. He knew the personal sacrifice of loneliness at being called away from his beloved family—Mary Louise, Patrick, Kevin and Neal—for—what must have seemed endless weeks and months in the saga of Sealab.

His dedication took him away from his beloved Florida in pursuit of education and preparation to participate in the enormous Sealab undertaking. He worked and studied and grew in proficiency and expertise, and finally achieved his berth as one of the select few to earn the title, "Aquanaut."

Then it happened. With a moment of achievement at hand, and inches away, in the black silence of a distant sea, death denied Berry L. Cannon the satisfaction of seeing the most adventurous Sealab experiment, yet, begin.

His massive contribution to the project remains. His memory is with his family and friends to be cherished and recalled for all time.

His assignment will be taken over by another, and the project will go ahead, for this is a fact of life, and the way Berry Cannon would have willed it.

He has been memorialized by his Church, by his Panama City station, the Naval Ship Research and Development Laboratory, and by the Navy at large with the final salute at the brink of the grave.

We strongly feel that certain things remain to be done:

That the citizenry of Panama City (perhaps under the auspices of the Bay County Ministerial Association) conduct a fitting memorial to this man for his achievement and sacrifice that appear to extend far beyond his brief 33 years;

That the Congress of the United States consider a fitting award or medal in posthumous recognition of his bequest to the nation and its people;

That consideration be given and action taken to rename "Princeton Circle" where he lived as "Berry L. Cannon Circle;"

That the Sealab III Experiment be permitted to continue without undue delay and pursued to the achievement of the glorious promises it holds;

And that each of us bow a moment and say a prayer of thanksgiving for having been privileged to be served by such a man, and for the family which remains, that they may find comfort at this hour of tragic loss.

Though we're certain a Benevolent Creator has already said them to Berry L. Cannon, may we too say with deep sincerity, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

FINNISH DEVALUATION

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, in October 1967, Finland made a decision to devaluate its currency and to impose a 3¼-percent tax on exports in order to reverse its balance-of-trade deficit and, generally, to improve its domestic economy. Financial authorities in this country were openly skeptical of the wisdom of this move. I am happy to report, however, that the "experts" have now admitted that they were mistaken and that the Finns, owing to their imagination and willingness to practice national austerity, have succeeded in overcoming their balance-of-trade deficit, and in turning down their long-term debt and cost-of-loving indices.

In this country, we have long been aware of the courage and initiative of the Finnish people. Indeed, one of the first national groups to migrate to this country was the Finns, who settled along the Delaware River around 1634. And it was the Finns, together with other national groups, who opened up Minnesota's timber stands and developed the iron ore deposits, forging a necessary link in the Nation's economic progress.

I would like to enter into the RECORD the following article from the Journal of Commerce, which clearly illustrates Finnish imagination, initiative, and spunk:

THE HELSINKI RECORD

Way back in October, 1967, this newspaper published an editorial dealing with the decision of Finnish authorities to devalue their currency by 31¼ per cent and to accompany this with a 14 per cent tax on exports and other measures designed, in our words, to "allow them to have their cake and eat it too."

Although not a matter of earth-shaking importance by itself (as currency devaluations go) the Finnish move gave evidence of long planning and study. The tax on exports was to be paid into an equalization fund and its proceeds made available to new industries. Friendly neighbors—chiefly in Scandinavia—got some protection in the assurance that the lowering of the price of competitive Finnish exports wouldn't come all at once. Helsinki, in the meantime, promised to go ahead with the abolition of certain duties on imports from the European Free Trade Association scheduled for the following Jan. 1, and did so.

Our comment at the time was that the Finns were trying to kill a lot of birds with one stone. Their conviction that they could help themselves without hurting their neighbors we termed "a good trick if it works."

In retrospect, it is only fair to say that Helsinki's imaginative move, combined with some rigorous austerity measures at home, did work.

Finland's balance of trade showed a surplus of about $43 million last year (the first full year since devaluation) after a decade of unbroken deficits, some of which had run as high as a quarter of a billion dollars.

Long-term debt turned down during the year. And in the fourth quarter the cost of living index turned down for the first time in the memory of most living men.

It is true that a number of factors account for these impressive results. One was the willingness of the government and of the general public to abolish a long-standing system of index-tied accounts in labor, contracts, government borrowings and the like which, if maintained, would simply have produced more inflation.

An effective wage-policy was one result, and it helped mightily.

We are not citing the Finnish experience as an argument that the United States or, for that matter, any other country ought now to set about devaluing its currency. Finland's devaluation in 1967 was not an aftermath of sterling devaluation. In fact, it preceded London's action and was ordered for reasons peculiar to Finland itself.

What the Finnish experience does teach, however, is that a good many of the economic ills besetting many governments today are not beyond solution and are, in fact, manageable, provided the government and all classes of society are not only willing but determined to make them work.

Last winter at this time many businessmen and union leaders in Finland were much concerned over economic prospects for the coming year. The former feared the export tax would rob them of the increased sales they would ordinarily expect as a result of devaluation. The unions feared unemployment and restiveness among the rank and file.

But the results speak for themselves and to those in the United States, Great Britain and other countries who are wondering how to solve their own immediate problems, they ought to make instructive reading.

GEN. DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying final respects to a great American, former President, and general of the Army, Dwight David Eisenhower.

Not only was Dwight Eisenhower the embodiment of the ancient and honorable ideal of the soldier-statesman but he was a man blessed with an abundance of personal warmth and compassion. A devoted family man, a man of religion, and a stanch patriot, he was most of all a man possessed of deep feelings for his fellow beings.

I feel greatly honored to have had the privilege of serving in the Congress during the last years of the Presidency of Dwight David Eisenhower. He served his Nation and the cause of freedom well.

I join in expressing my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and the family.

LESSONS OF HISTORY FOR THE ABM VOTE

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in the period ahead a decision will be made on the proposed Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system. This will be a momentous decision because of the significance of the Safeguard defense system to our entire national security.

Everyone, of course, wants to take what he or she believes is the right position on this vital issue. In this connection, the April 7 issue of the U.S. News & World Report contains an item which reviews various instances in recent history when far-reaching decisions had to be made involving our national defense and discusses some of the results of the decisions that were made.

I believe the article, entitled "Lessons of History for the ABM Vote," will be of interest to the Congress and under leave to extend my remarks I submit it for inclusion in the RECORD:

LESSONS OF HISTORY FOR THE ABM VOTE

This nation, once again, is facing a crucial decision involving defense.

The decision this time is whether to build an anti-ballistic-missile system (ABM) proposed by President Nixon.

In the battle that is developing, many Americans are being reminded of other battles over defense proposals that proved fateful in the past. To those with long memories, some of the arguments now being heard sound familiar.

They recall the decision against fortifying the Pacific island of Guam in the face of rising Japanese belligerence in 1939.

Then came a 1941 cliff-hanger, when Congress by a single vote agreed to extend the military draft only months before Japan attacked Pearl Harbor.

In the late 1940s, the issue was whether to build the hydrogen bomb. That fateful decision, after long delay, came barely in time to win the H-bomb race against Soviet Russia.

Now the issue is how to defend the nation against the H-bomb menace.

President Nixon himself has drawn a historic parallel. He predicted that the congressional vote on his ABM proposal might be as close as the 1941 vote on extending the draft.

LOOK BACK TO 1941

Americans still shudder at thoughts of what might have happened if that 1941 vote had gone the other way.

In 1940, Congress had passed a military-draft law. For the first time in history, Americans were being drafted into the armed services at a time when this nation was not at war.

But the 1940 law called for only one year of military service. This meant, in 1941, that nearly 1 million men would soon be mustered out of the service—at a time when World War II was intensifying and likelihood of U.S. involvement appeared to be growing.

So Congress was asked to lengthen the draftees' period of service.

The war in Europe then had been going on for two years. But there was strong sentiment for keeping the U.S. out of that war. There were "hawks" and "doves" in those days, too. The "doves," then, were called "isolationists."

A bitter debate was stirred by the draft issue. The Roosevelt Administration was challenged to show how the nation was in peril that justified a big "peacetime" Army.

On Aug. 7, 1941, after seven days of debate, the Senate voted 45 to 30 to extend the draftees' period of service by 18 months.

On August 12 came the vote in the House of Representatives. There the extension squeaked through by the thinnest of margins. The vote was 203 to 202.

Result: When Japan attacked on December 7, the Army built up by the draft was still intact.

THE H-BOMB BATTLE

The battle over the hydrogen bomb was waged in secret councils of the Government, rather than in Congress.

Ever since the U.S. exploded the world's first atom bomb over Japan in 1945, scientists had conjectured that a superbomb was theoretically possible.

However, with the world then at peace and the U.S. still holding a monopoly on the A-bomb, research on the superbomb was not pushed.

Some scientists—still feeling guilty about the destruction at Hiroshima caused by the first A-bomb—opposed the superbomb on moral grounds.

A key figure in the opposition was Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, who called the hydrogen bomb "an expensive, uncertain gamble" and "morally wrong."

Then, on Sept. 23, 1949, Russia exploded an A-bomb. The U.S. monopoly had ended. Interest in the H-bomb suddenly soared.

On Jan. 31, 1950, President Truman decided the issue in favor of the bomb.

On Nov. 1, 1952, the U.S. exploded the world's first H-bomb. Russia came up with its own in 1953. It was another close call for U. S. defense.

UNFRIENDLY GESTURE

The 1939 decision on Guam went the other way and, in the light of history, appeared costly.

Guam, strategically located between Hawaii and the Philippines, was a potentially valuable base for airplanes and submarines. Military experts viewed it as important in case of a war with Japan. In 1938, a board appointed by President Roosevelt recommended that Guam be developed and fortified.

In 1939, Congress was asked for 5 million dollars to improve Guam's harbor. Although this bill did not call for fortifying Guam, it would have been a start and would have permitted its use as an advanced scouting base.

While the bill was before the House, the U.S. was warned that Japan would regard Guam's fortification as "an unfriendly gesture"

The bill was defeated, 205 to 168—and Guam lay unfortified when Japan attacked two years later. It was the first American possession to fall to Japan and later became an important war base for the Japanese.

Now, 30 years and three wars later, this nation faces another decision involving national defense—and Americans are wondering if it will prove to be a fateful decision.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I join with our colleagues, our fellow Americans, and men of good will throughout the world in mourning the death of a great patriot, soldier, and statesman, General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower has now returned to the fertile plains of the Midwest of which he was so proud and which he loved. However, he will never be forgotten by the men and women of the world who loved him. He has left a rich legacy in which we can all take solace and encouragement. While his cheerfulness, energy, and great spirit will be deeply missed by us all, we will always remember his many contributions to his country and to the free world.

I am proud to join in paying tribute to General Eisenhower. His life, his moral courage, and his fine personal qualities serve as his best eulogy.

I wish to extend to Mrs. Eisenhower and her family my deep personal regrets and sorrow over their loss. We are all most grateful to them for having shared Ike with us.

A GREEK POET-DIPLOMAT CRIES OUT AGAINST OPPRESSION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on March 28 a Nobel Prize-winning Greek poet and former diplomat issued a short, passionate statement of protest against the dictatorial regime that took over the Greek Government in April 1967.

The author of the statement is Georgos S. Seferiades, former ambassador to Britain and, writing under the pen name George Seferis, winner of the 1963 Nobel Prize for literature.

As Mr. Seferiades explained in his statement, he has published nothing since the military takeover, as a protest against the regime. But it became imperative for him to speak out, he said, and so he issued the following eloquent words to the press:

> I long since resolved to remain out of our country's internal politics. This did not mean—and on another occasion I tried to make the point clear—that I was indifferent to our political life. For years now I have in principle abstained from such matters. But what I said in print early in 1967 and the stand that I have since taken (for since freedom was muzzled I have published nothing in Greece) showed clearly enough what my attitude was. Now for some months, however, I have felt, within me and around me, that more and more it is becoming imperative for me to speak out on our present situation. To put it as briefly as possible, this is what I would say.
>
> It is almost two years since a regime was imposed upon us utterly contrary to the ideals for which our world—and so magnificently our people—fought in the last world war. It is a state of enforced torpor in which all the intellectual values that we have succeeded, with toil and effort, in keeping alive are being submerged in a swamp, in stagnant waters. I can well imagine that for some people these losses do not matter. Unfortunately this is not the only danger that threatens.
>
> We have all learned, we all know, that in dictatorial regimes the beginning may seem easy, yet tragedy waits at the end, inescapable. It is this tragic ending that consciously

> or unconsciously sounded as in the ancient choruses of Aeschylus.
>
> The longer the abnormal situation lasts, the greater the evil.
>
> I am a man completely without political ties and I speak without fear and without passion. I see before us the precipice towards which the oppression that covers the land is leading us.
>
> This abnormality must come to an end. It is the nation's command.
>
> Now I return to silence. I pray God that never again may I find myself under such compulsion to speak.

TEMPLE'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, my hometown, Philadelphia, is one of the great basketball cities in America. One of the great universities in Philadelphia and in America is Temple. It has been long distinguished as an outstanding academic institution committed to the needs of the community it serves.

It also boasts an enviable record on the basketball court.

This year Temple University's Owls defeated Boston College 89 to 76 to win the National Invitation Tournament in New York City. In deference to our distinguished Speaker, I must add that the Boston boys were valiant in defeat.

Temple's victory adds a curious footnote to the history of the tournament founded in 1938. Temple won that inaugural tournament, defeating Colorado.

Going into this year's tourney, with a season record of 22 wins and 8 losses Temple was not the favorite. The Owls proceeded to defeat the University of Florida, 82 to 66; St. Peter's College of Jersey City, N.J., 94 to 78; University of Tennessee, 63 to 58, before going into the finals against Boston.

I would like to pay tribute to the members of this great team; Capt. John Baum, Joe Cromer, Eddie Mast, Bill Strunk, Tony Brocchi, Tom Wieczerak, Jim Snook, Pat Cassidy, Carl Brooks, Gordon Mulava and John Richardson.

I would like to pay special tribute to Temple's "Mr. Basketball," head coach Harry Litwack. He has been part of Temple and an architect of its court fortunes longer than anyone can remember.

He has been head coach at Temple since the 1952–53 season, compiling a remarkable won-loss record of 305–150. Eleven of the past 14 seasons Coach Litwack has led his Temple Owls into a postseason tournament.

From 1931–51, he was an assistant coach and head coach of the Temple freshman team. During his tenure, the freshman team never had a losing season. An undergraduate, he played for Temple from 1926 to 1929, being captain of the team in both his junior and senior years.

When you talk about Temple basketball, you are talking about Harry Litwack. Congratulations, coach.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation and the world have lost a man of unique qualities in the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower. For he was that rare military captain who genuinely renounced the very calling which put him among the historic great.

General Eisenhower first became known to the American people as Supreme Allied Commander in the European theater in World War II. What he did in those years made him a hero to all Americans and a liberator to many of the nations of the world.

He was a career soldier of a unique mold, for he embodied the best qualities of the American military even as those qualities went beyond the narrow confines of the military profession itself. In the words of the motto of the West Point Military Academy, he followed the principle of "Duty, Honor, Country." General Eisenhower carried this principle into the Presidency with him. Although a military man by background, he believed—and he made it very clear in his actions and statements as President—that the Armed Forces, just as the executive and legislative branches of the Government, are servants of the people and that their activities must stay within the confines of public policy, even if policy later turns out to be wrong. This is their duty to their country and it is what distinguishes a nation directed by its people from a people directed by their state.

As President of the United States, General Eisenhower translated this principle into action. He was the American President who negotiated an end to a war without insisting on capitulation. He made the first approaches toward a reduction of tension between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. through his atoms-for-peace proposal. He created the first program for economic aid to Latin America. But most symbolic of his personal philosophy were the actions he did not take—the wholesome restraint he exercised on our use of power on major foreign policy decisions. In reacting to the French defeat in Indochina, he stood firm against involvement in the face of strong counsel by many of his top advisers to intervene militarily. And he refused to deploy an anti-ballistic-missile system which was so vehemently urged upon him by his former colleagues in the military.

General Eisenhower revealed his unique quality as a military hero able to step back from his background in his farewell address to the American public, warning that—

> While a vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment, we must recognize the immense influence that it has in every city, every State House, and in every office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.
>
> In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.
>
> We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

General Eisenhower expressed so eloquently the principle that guided him as soldier, President, and private citizen in that farewell speech as well:

> Crises there will continue to be. In meeting them, whether foreign or domestic, great or small, there is a recurring temptation to feel that some spectacular and costly action could become the miraculous solution to all current difficulties. A huge increase in newer elements of our defense; development of unrealistic programs to cure every ill in agriculture; a dramatic expansion in basic and applied research—these and many other possibilities, each possibly promising in itself, may be suggested as the only way to the road we wish to travel.
>
> But each proposal must be weighed in the light of a broader consideration: the need to maintain balance in and among national programs—balance between the private and the public economy, balance between cost and hoped for advantage—balance between the clearly necessary and the comfortably desirable; balance between our essential requirements as a nation and the duties imposed by the nation upon the individual; balance between actions of the moment and the national welfare of the future. Good judgment seeks balance and progress; lack of it eventually finds imbalance and frustration.

With the Nation today so involved in the question of the antiballistic missile and the broader issue of how to channel our post-Vietnam economy, the greatest tribute we can pay Dwight David Eisenhower is not in our words a eulogy to his life, but by heeding the principle which governed his life and following the example he set as President by rejecting the antiballistic missile and the desire to channel our economy into bigger and better systems of mass destruction.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROGRAM WELL RECEIVED IN NUECES COUNTY, TEX.

HON. JOHN YOUNG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Dana Williams, superintendent of schools, Corpus Christi Independent School District, Corpus Christi, Tex., responding to a questionnaire of the House Committee on Education and Labor gave an overwhelming endorsement to the Neighborhood Youth Corps program based upon its high degree of effectiveness there.

Dr. Williams, a highly professional educator took the initiative to request the comments of students participating in the NYC program, and they responded with resoundingly favorable, perceptive and revealing letters chronicling the benefits of the program. These letters, as well as the questionnaire have been filed with the committee for reference in their current deliberations on this important subject, and should be of inestimable value to them in assessing the program from the viewpoint of its participants.

REAPING THE WHIRLWIND

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 the Washington Evening Star and Washington Daily News both carried articles describing the disruption of a meeting of the City Council of the District of Columbia by a group of approximately 150 people demanding that this coming Friday be set aside as a holiday to mark the anniversary of the assassination of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King. According to the Star:

> The mood of the crowd was ugly as the Negro militants delayed the start of the council meeting by about two hours.
>
> The crowd repeatedly screamed demands for the holiday while beating drums and waving a large flag.

The disruption of City Council in the Nation's Capital was ironic indeed. While one can certainly have grief and sorrow at the manner in which Dr. King lost his life, still his doctrine of civil disobedience was opposed by many citizens who viewed this doctrine as a sophisticated justification to flout all laws with which he might disagree. One cannot deny that Dr. King played a major role in bringing to public attention the necessity for change in the area of civil rights for minority groups. As long as he used legal and acceptable means to pursue his ends, he rendered a valuable service. But even Negro leaders parted company with him when policies of civil disobedience and disruption were brought into play. In Chicago, for instance, Dr. J. H. Jackson, Negro leader of the National Baptist Convention opposed this aspect of Dr. King's crusade and stated that civil disobedience and nonviolence would not carry the civil rights movement any higher and might even lead to disrespect for law and order and to possible violence.

According to the Chicago Tribune of June 30, 1967, the Chicago chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which had long been critical of the civil rights tactics of Dr. King, formally split with Dr. King's group.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer carried an article in late 1967 entitled "King Warns of Riots if Aid Meets Delay," in which Dr. King outlined a program to engage in massive nonviolence which would probably include acts of civil disobedience. To implement this program, Dr. King planned to train a cadre of 200 hard-core disrupters in the tactics of massive nonviolence, who would then return to their cities and train other units. The object of the program was to hold, according to Dr. King, "a nationwide city-paralyzing demonstration" centered in Washington but including simultaneous demonstrations in 10 other cities. The principle of the common good and the welfare of the community was conveniently forgotten by Dr. King in his attempt to gain his ends. Is it surprising then that some misguided followers of Dr. King sought to paralyze the functioning of the City Council of the Nation's Capital by disruptive tactics to gain their own ends? Should city councils in other cities be subject to disruption as they try to perform their duly authorized functions? Or should the cities themselves be vulnerable to paralyzation by massive nonviolent programs using civil disobedience tactics? Is there no defense against the nonviolent takeover of college administration offices? Or the locking in—or out—of college officials? If we have the moral obligation to disobey unjust laws as Dr. King proclaimed, and each person is left to decide which laws are just and which are unjust, how long will our Government based on law exist? Why is not lawlessness to break a law and accept willingly the penalty, as Dr. King taught?

The tragic nature of Dr. King's death was both shocking and revolting to the people of our Nation, still one should not be mesmerized into not looking objectively at the whole record. His lawful pursuit of civil rights is to be lauded; his espousal of civil disobedience in a society where lawful remedies are available must be opposed.

In addition to legal remedies available, positive efforts are being made on other fronts to help Negroes fulfill their rightful aspirations. Just a small sampling of newspaper headlines indicate that Negroes, with the help of other citizens and organizations, are making progress in a constructive, peaceful way: "Big Companies Venture Their Talent and Money in Civil Rights Effort"; "Negroes Dedicate Major Shopping Center"; "Business, Government Open Doors in Harlem"; "Cash Register Rings Harmoniously in a Biracial Store"; "Eight Banks Agree to Offer Loans in Ghetto Area"; and "Negro-Backed Building Planned."

The Federal Government, the business and labor fields, along with the participation of private individuals, are making efforts to correct inequities in this area. Admittedly, there is much remaining to be done, but most importantly, these efforts are being expended within the framework of civil obedience and mutual harmony. What a contrast between this approach and that of the disrupters of the District of Columbia Council where the order of the day was—demand, do not request; propagandize, do not reason; attack the system rather than working within it for corrective action.

I place the two articles, "King Holiday Is Demanded of Council" from the Washington Star and "Council Decrees King District of Columbia Memorial Friday," appearing in the Washington Daily News, both dated April 1, 1969, in the RECORD at this point:

KING HOLIDAY IS DEMANDED OF COUNCIL

(By William Basham)

The District City Council, under siege for two hours this morning by angry black militants demanding that Friday be set aside as a holiday to mark the anniversary of the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., finally resolved to ask Mayor Walter E. Washington to grant leave for that day to District employes.

The vice chairman of the Council, Sterling Tucker, told the angry group that the council was uncertain of its authority to specifically declare a holiday.

The mood of the crowd was ugly as the Negro militants delayed the start of the council meeting by about two hours.

The crowd repeatedly screamed demands for the holiday while beating drums and waving a large flag.

ABOUT 100 IN CROWD

Led by the Rev. Douglas Moore, the crowd of about 100 assembled quietly at 10 a.m. when the council was scheduled to begin its session.

When the council members failed to appear and one of the demonstrators refused to remove a large black and red flag (symbolizing their ideas of the District's colors as proposed 51st state), members of the audience began to shout.

Several speakers stepped forward to address the council members after they entered the chamber, all demanding the holiday.

"We are demanding it, not asking for it," one man said. Moore challenged the council's plan to issue a proclamation honoring the anniversary of Dr. King's death. He shouted, "The council acted within a matter of minutes to declare a holiday for our late president (Eisenhower)."

Another angry speaker, who was unidentified, said of Eisenhower: "While black people were being rolled and tarred and feathered, he was on the golf course."

ENTIRE WASHINGTON

The same man turned to Council Chairman Gilbert Hahn Jr. and said, "We are hip to you . . . Dr. King died for us and I want you to remember every April 4 until never."

A man who had been standing near the large flag stepped to the microphone, waved his hand back toward the seated audience, and said, "This is not one section, this isn't just Northeast or Southeast, this is entire Washington, from one end to the other. These are the people holding things in check."

The same man continued, "The word is out." He alluded to threats by some of the group who promised trouble on Friday if the holiday were not declared. "You've got people here who can stop that."

The status of possible store closings on Friday has remained in doubt.

Meanwhile, other groups also noted the assassination anniversary and called for businesses to close.

Spokesmen for the Center for Emergency Support said that letters were distributed to Connecticut Avenue stores last night requesting that the stores be closed Friday. As of this afternoon, the spokesmen said, they did not know how successful their campaign has been.

A group called Jews for Urban Justice also said that it has wired the heads of various large business concerns, asking them to close. So far, the response has been slight, a group spokesman said.

A spokesman for the Metropolitan Community Air Council, a Northeast action group which is coordinating four rallies around the city Friday afternoon, said stores along 14th Street NW and U Street from 7th to 18th Street NW were expected to be closed.

UP TO MERCHANTS

The council, whose phone number is on posters being distributed, has received calls reporting that store owners have received demands about closing Friday.

"We are telling our people to tell merchants that 'it is up to you whether you close or not.' We're not demanding, but requesting the stores be closed," the council spokesman said.

The Council of Churches of Greater Washington has requested businesses to allow employes time to participate in "memorial services and other appropriate observances."

But the Board of Trade has taken an officially neutral stand on the issue.

Council Decrees King District of Columbia Memorial Friday

(By Sidney Lippman)

The District City Council voted unanimously today to declare Friday, April 4, a holiday for most city employes in commemoration of the death of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., a year ago.

The action came after about 150 members of the D.C. Statehood Committee repeatedly disrupted the council meeting, demanding that the step be taken.

After the vote, Rev. Douglas Moore, chairman of the committee, demanded a clarification of the vote. Council Chairman Gilbert Hahn said the city government would take whatever steps it could to let employes off, although he said he wasn't certain of the extent of the City Council's powers.

The Civil Service Commission said no decision has been reached on whether to declare Friday a holiday for Federal employes here, but a meeting was scheduled for later today on the matter.

The Board of Trade said it would wait to hear if the downtown department stores will close before deciding whether to urge all its members to close. But major department stores have not yet made decisions about closing by noon.

Mr. Hahn said the council has the authority to grant administrative leave to city employes, but he didn't know if the council could influence private employers to close.

The chaotic meeting began an hour and 15 minutes late after the Statehood Committee members repeatedly interrupted with chants, bongo drum playing and rhythmic clapping.

The council finally entered its chambers at 11:15 and agreed to hear spokesmen of the group. After representatives had spoken, the council went on to other matters.

After 15 minutes of other business, the drums, applause and chants started up again.

"You're rapping (talking) on things that are going to happen in 1970, or next May. I'm telling you there isn't going to be any May after April 4. We're going to move. You're going to deal with us right now; right now," said a young man who seized the microphone.

When Chairman Hahn tried to proceed with other business, the noise started up once again.

"The only thing white people understand is violence," said a young black girl who stepped to the microphone.

"You are going to stand up and say 'that's the only way you know how to act.' But that's the only way you listen.

"You will listen after April 4," she said.

The Council had called the police Civil Disturbance Unit to tell protestors to remove their red and black flag. When they didn't, CDU members backed off and stood at the door.

"We refuse to remove the symbol of black humanity and the blood we have shed," said the Rev. Douglas Moore.

"We're going to stay here until Tarzan (Chairman Gilbert Hahn) and that City Council come out," Rev. Moore shouted at 10:30 a.m. when the City Council had failed to appear for its 10 a.m. meeting.

He said he called Mr. Hahn "Tarzan" because "all those white folks think they're going to lead us out of the jungle."

Councilman Joseph Yeldell talked briefly with the Rev. Mr. Moore but was shouted down. "Henceforth, we say nothing to Joe Yeldell," the Rev. Mr. Moore declared.

When asked if the Council would come out to meet with the people, Councilman Yeldell shrugged.

Meanwhile, the demonstrators, many of them wearing Afro haircuts, chanted "freedom" and danced in the Council chambers. Several carried signs saying: "The Man Gave You Monday. Are You Man Enough to Take Friday, April 4, in Memory of Martin?"

"This Council acted in minutes when our beloved President died and declared a holiday," Rev. Moore said. "We want a holiday April 4. We want no more and no less."

Many of the group wore red and black sashes symbolizing D.C. Statehood Committee.

The Rev. Moore said that the Council allowed Alexandria residents in its chambers last year carrying signs that said "Shoot Looters." He said the Statehood Committee flag had just as much right in the Council chambers as such signs.

However, the City Council entered the chambers at 11:15 a.m., an hour and 15 minutes late, and agreed to hear the people before taking up regular Council business.

After Councilman Rev. Jerry Moore Jr. said an opening prayer, the Rev. Douglas Moore (no relation) of the D.C. Statehood Committee said another, to the cheers of blacks in the audience. He eulogized Dr. King, who, he said, died so that garbage men might be free and blacks might "get off the plantations."

He warned the Council: "Don't misread the signs of the time."

When Chairman Hahn Jr. next said Corporation Counsel Charles Duncan had indicated the Council's powers "are unclear" over proclaiming Friday a holiday, the audience hooted in response, and an unidentified speaker read a section of the revised city ordinance, which he said gives the Council that authority.

Sammy Abbott, of the Emergency Committee on the Transportation Crisis, told Mr. Hahn and fellow whites on the council that "how white men can sit up here surrounded by 75 per cent black population and say the majority don't have the right, then you should hide your head under your arms and sneak off."

Mr. Abbott, who is white, said "when the trouble comes the black population in D.C. once again in motion is not going to distinguish between me and you, Mr. Hahn."

He warned that the council "is going to have to respond to institutional racism," and assailed three city officials—Thomas Airis, director of the Highways and Traffic Department; Lt. Col. Sam Starobin, city liaison from the Army Corps of Engineers, and Deputy Mayor Thomas Fletcher for allegedly selling out the city to the suburbs—and said the Emergency Committee was joining "in this and every other movement to get responsive action from the council and we're throwing the gauntlet down."

Rev. Walter Fauntroy, former city councilman and member of Dr. King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference, said the SCLC will recommend that individual store owners make up their minds about closing.

"The closing was not our idea and is not significant enough for us to take a stand," he said.

But Rev. Channing E. Phillips, president of Housing Development Corp. and District Democratic National Committeeman, said, "Closing would be a wise thing to do in understanding the sentiment of the community."

Asked about the importance of lost pre-Easter sales, he replied, "It depends on where your values are."

The Metropolitan Community Aid Council is organizing Friday rallies in Meridian Hill Park, Dupont Circle and a park at 48th-st and Deane-av ne. District schools will hold special events on April 3, the day before spring vacation.

Washington churches will be asked to hold services at 6:04 p.m. Friday, a SCLC spokesman said, and a morning memorial service is being planned by the D.C. Council of Churches and the Baptist Ministers' Conference.

A Jewish "freedom Seder" will be celebrated at the Rev. Mr. Phillips' Lincoln Memorial Temple on Friday evening.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the great honor of my life is to have personally known Dwight David Eisenhower.

Honesty, integrity, devotion to God and country, decency, courage—all describe our 34th President. He was the personification of all that is good and moral in America, and his countrymen responded manifold. He was a hero, a friend, a leader of the highest order.

Few men in our history have been so highly honored or so dearly loved by his people. Few in our history have so richly deserved it.

When America was provoked into war, he led the way to the swiftest victory possible, commanding the largest military machine the world has ever seen or may ever see again. But he remained a man of peace. General Eisenhower's words, spoken 14 years ago in Vermont, not only reflect his deep conviction and dedication to peace, but are particularly relevant to the world today. He said:

> We merely want to live in peace with all the world, to trade with them, to commune with them, to learn from their culture as they may learn from ours, so that our sons may stay at home, the products of our toil may be used for our schools, and our roads and our churches, and not for the guns and planes and tanks and ships of war.

A military man himself, he warned upon leaving the Presidency against "the acquisition of unwarranted influence by the military-industrial complex."

We cannot and, as he would have quickly affirmed, should not turn to the past except to learn from it. But one cannot help harboring the wistful desire for a world less fraught with tensions and turmoil, as represented by the Eisenhower years of the Presidency.

Dwight David Eisenhower will live on as an inspiration to future generations of Americans. The ideals for which he stood seem, in these days of national unrest, to reflect a simpler and more serene America. But these are the ideals that have always taken America through her most trying moments in history. They will be needed again and again in the future.

To the Eisenhower family, we express our heartfelt sympathy. To Dwight David Eisenhower, our eternal thanks and gratitude. Now committed to the ages, he can now take his rightful place in history as one of our greatest sons.

INCARNATE WORD SISTERS PLAN 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to insert into the RECORD some of the history of one of the greatest colleges in the United States, Incarnate Word College of San Antonio, Tex., on the occasion of the college's 100th anniversary: This college has contributed talent and consequently wealth and progress to our community and Nation.

The material referred to follows:

INCARNATE WORD SISTERS PLAN 100TH ANNIVERSARY

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—One hundred years ago today three determined French Roman Catholic Sisters, Srs. Madeleine, St. Pierre, and Agnes alighted from a stagecoach in frontier San Antonio, the last stop in a dusty, three-week trip from the Gulf coast town of Galveston.

San Antonio in 1869 must have been slightly overpowering to the three Frenchwomen. Not only was it remote from their idyllic French convent of the Incarnate Word in Lyons, founded in the 17th century, but they spoke little English, the building which was to have been their convent-hospital had burned to the ground three days before their arrival, and the city was suffering from the most serious cholera epidemic in years.

But Sisters Madeleine, St. Pierre, and Agnes did not leave their homeland, cross a continent for missionary nursing work because, as a poet said, 'they were made of sugar candy.' In fact, these three were selected by Claude M. Dubuis, then Catholic Bishop of Texas, to leave their hospital work in Galveston to build a similar institution in San Antonio, the city's first civilian hospital.

The Sisters were short of food, money, and a working English vocabulary—everything, that is, except the courage and stubborn determination to do, with faith, what could never have been done without it.

The challenges of that first day were to become old friends for the next two decades, and even with success challenges continued through the first century.

Those three nuns, without proper convent or hospital building, rolled up their flowing sleeves and prepared to build a hospital, and a legacy. They founded a congregation now called the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word which, in 1969, consists of over 1100 nuns in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Missouri, Illinois, Mexico, Peru, and Ireland.

By December 3, 1869 the three foundresses, thanks to the generous support of Texans drawn to their magnetic dedication "to serve, not to be served," had completed their first goal. Santa Rosa Infirmary was opened.

Today that same hospital, the Santa Rosa Medical Center, continues to grow with San Antonio, having become one of the largest in Texas and the third largest Catholic hospital complex in the United States. And that was only the beginning.

The Sisters' today have three provinces (San Antonio, St. Louis, and Mexico) and operate 82 institutions or "houses," including fifteen hospitals, fifty-four schools, five homes, and eight community and Christian doctrine centers. The Congregation also owns and operates one college, Incarnate Word College, founded in 1881 and now fully accredited by fourteen agencies to grant the bachelor's degree in 29 fields and the master's degree in five.

In San Antonio the superior general of the order, Sister Calixta Garvey, recently announced plans for the Congregation's centennial celebration, July 20 through 26. Once the major celebration is held at the San Antonio Motherhouse, institutions in other cities will follow suit.

By happy accident, the official opening of the Centennial Week coincides with the day and time the first American astronaut is scheduled to step out of the LEM and onto the surface of the moon—1:00 p.m., July 20, 1969.

The week opens with a vast, three-hour open house at the Motherhouse with tours, exhibits depicting the history of the Congregation, and progress made in the three provinces. In the late afternoon a Mass of Thanksgiving will be concelebrated at San Antonio's new Theatre of the Performing Arts in the Convention Center by Archbishop Robert E. Lucey of San Antonio and bishops from dioceses where members of the order are serving.

Sister Clare Eileen Craddock, born and raised in New Orleans and professor of French at Incarnate Word College, serves as chairwoman of the Centennial Committee.

"Much of the week," Sister Clare Eileen said, "will be devoted to the Sisters. This is their week."

In addition to the opening Mass, three other Masses will be held during the week for friends and benefactors, deceased members of the congregation, and for the order's jubilarians. There will also be cook-outs, picnics, movies, talent shows, and other entertainment for the large gathering of Sisters.

A major highlight of the week will be three evening performances by the Lutheran New World Sacred Chorus of St. Louis, directed by Professor Robert Bergt of Concordia Lutheran Seminary. Two of the concerts will be for the guests of the congregation and the third is open to the general public.

Looking back on the first century of her order, the superior general, Sister Calixta, said that she "stands in wonder at the success of our Congregation which has grown from three to over 1100."

"This could not have happened," she continued, "without Divine help . . . and the glorious faith and courage of the founding women."

Sister Calixta stressed once again that the Congregation of the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word is "here to serve, not to be served."

She also indicated that her order, like the Church and Society, was in the midst of a transitional period. It is a new challenge, not unlike the challenges of the previous century, and "we get great courage from looking back on those who went before us."

As she begins to lead her order into its second century, the superior general affirmed her belief in the permanency of the religious life, saying that the future will see an expansion of the congregation's work in education, hospital and health services, and social work in the inner city apostolate.

"We have an open attitude," Sister Calixta concluded, "(which is) to try to serve as best we can the needs of the day. We are not afraid!"

GENERAL STATISTICS OF THE SISTERS OF CHARITY OF THE INCARNATE WORD

The Congregation of the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word consists of 1,121 Roman Catholic sisters with its Motherhouse and General Administration here in San Antonio. Mother Calixta Garvey is presently the Mother General of the entire Congregation.

The Congregation is divided into three main provinces, each with a provincial house or provincialate governing that area. They are: San Antonio, St. Louis, and Mexico.

Under the San Antonio province is the Congregation's first foreign mission (October, 1964) located in Chimbote, Peru. There are six sisters working there. In 1966 another six began hospital work under the Peruvian government at a hospital for the police and their dependents. Another member of the Congregation, Sister Charles Marie Frank, is project administrator for project HOPE in Lima.

There are 82 houses in the Congregation. A "house," in our terms, is any institution operated by the sisters. It may be a school, hospital, orphanage, or community center. The following tabulation shows the diversity of work carried on by the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word:

Province	Total houses	Schools	Hospitals	Homes	Others
San Antonio (Texas and Louisiana)	34	24	4	1	4
St. Louis (part of Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and Illinois)	27	18	4	3	2
Mexico	21	11	7	1	2
Total	82	54	15	5	8

Note: These figures include the Santa Rosa Medical Center in San Antonio, the 3d largest Catholic hospital complex in the United States. The Santa Rosa was San Antonio's 1st hospital and was the prime goal of the sisters when they arrived in San Antonio in April of 1869.

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS—SISTERS OF CHARITY OF THE INCARNATE WORD CENTENNIAL WEEK, JULY 20–26, 1969

SUNDAY, JULY 20

1:00–4:00 p.m.: Open House, Reception, and Exhibit of Campus.

5:00 p.m.: Mass of Thanksgiving—Theater, Convention Center.

7:00 p.m.: Social Hour and Dinner for Special Guests—Marian Hall.

MONDAY, JULY 21—SISTERS' DAY

Special Community celebration honoring all our Sisters.

TUESDAY, JULY 22

10:00 a.m.: Mass for friends and benefactors—Motherhouse Chapel.

8:00 p.m.: New World Sacred Chorus of St. Louis—College Auditorium.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 23

10:00 a.m.: Mass for deceased members of the Congregation—Motherhouse Chapel.

6:00 p.m.: "Cook-Out" at the Pool.

8:00 p.m.: New World Sacred Chorus of St. Louis.

THURSDAY, JULY 24

10:00 a.m.: Demonstration of Liturgical Singing—College Auditorium.

12:00: Box lunch.

FRIDAY, JULY 25

4:00 p.m.: Greeting and Program for Jubilarians—Marian Hall.

7:30 p.m.: Movie—College Auditorium.

SATURDAY, JULY 26

8:30 a.m.: Mass for Jubilarians.

11:30 a.m.: Jubilee Dinner.

5:00 p.m.: Picnic Supper at the Pool

7:30 p.m.: Sisters' Program—College Auditorium.

CENTENNIAL SYMBOL: SISTERS OF CHARITY OF THE INCARNATE WORD

Important: A modern fleur-de-lis, the centennial symbol depicts the French origin of the Congregation of the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word. The three-pronged stem which cradles the flame symbolizes the three provinces of which the congregation is composed. The darting tongue of fire issuing upward bears testimony to the spiritual and intellectual illumination imparted by its educational institutions, as well as the warmth and care extended in the hospitals, the homes for children, and the social welfare centers of the congregation. The flame also symbolizes the vitality and inspiration which have guided the work of the congregation during its one hundred years of service and which hopefully will continue to distinguish its service to God and man.

Institutions Operated by Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word

TEXAS

Amarillo

St. Mary's Academy, 1112 Washington Street; Sr. Mary Wilbert Boul, Superior.

St. Anthony's Hospital, Sr. Lucy Glass, Superior.

Corpus Christi

Spohn Hospital, 1436 Third Street; Sr. Mary Digna, Superior.

Our Lady of Perpetual Help School, 5805 S. Padre Is. Dr.; Sr. Mary Joseph Smyth, Superior.

Dallas

St. Joseph Home for Girls, 901 S. Madison; Sr. Mary Achille Bugnitz, Superior.

Dunne Memorial Home for Boys, 1825 W. Davis Street; Sr. Nadine Luebbert, Superior.

Our Lady of Perpetual Help School, 7625 Cortland; Sr. Albeus Hartigan, Superior.

Del Rio

Our Lady of Guadalupe School, 603 Cuellar Street; Sr. Clara O'Driscoll, Superior.

Sacred Heart Academy, 209 East Greenwood; Sr. Honoria Keenaghan, Superior.

Eagle Pass

Our Lady of Refuge School, 577 Washington Street; Sr. Baptista Doyle, Superior.

El Paso

St. Margaret Home, 491 St. Matthew St.; Sr. Amabilis O'Byrne, Superior.

Our Lady of Mt. Carmel School, 9070 Alamede Ave.; Sr. Josette Eveler, Superior.

Our Lady of the Valley School, 8620 Winchester Place; Sr. Mary Leonard McGuire, Superior.

Fort Worth

St. Joseph's Hospital, 1401 S. Main; Sr. Mary James Whelan, Superior.

All Saints School, 2022 N. Houston; Sr. Florita Lee, Superior.

Holy Family School, 5617 Locke; Sr. Denise Smith, Superior.

Kerrville

Notre Dame School, 925 Main Street; Sr. Anna Teresa Hussey, Superior.

Lubbock

St. Elizabeth School, 2312 Broadway; Sr. Joseph Francis Geever, Superior.

Marfa

St. Mary's School, Box 1028; Sr. Bernadette Forck, Superior.

Pampa

St. Vincent de Paul School, 2320 N. Hobart St.; Sr. Alice Marie Holden, Superior.

Paris

St. Joseph's Hospital; Sr. Mary Cornelia O'Leary, Superior.

Pharr

(Parish work) Sisters Ma. Felisa Cardona and Julia Villegas, 215 North Aster Street.

San Angelo

Sacred Heart School, Box 5287; St. Frances Therese Philippus, Superior.

Holy Angels School, 2315 A&M Avenue; Sr. Mary Imelda Moriarity, Superior.

St. John's Hospital, Box 1191; Sr. Monika Schonberger, Superior.

San Antonio

St. John's Convent (Santa Rosa Medical Center); Sr. Margaret Mary Curry, Superior.

Incarnate Word Convent, 4515 Broadway; Sr. Clare Eileen Craddock, Superior.

Incarnate Word High School, 727 E. Hildebrand; Sr. Teresa Connors, Superior.

St. Joseph's Convent (senior Sisters) 847 E. Hildebrand; Sr. Clementia Carey, Superior.

Incarnate Word College, 4301 Broadway; Sr. Alacoque Power, Superior.

Our Lady of Guadalupe School, 1401 El Paso St.; Sr. Brigid Conlon, Superior.

St. Ann's School, 1334 W. Ashby; Sr. Marian Jordan, Superior.

St. Cecilia's School, 118 Lowell; Sr. Philomena Birmingham, Superior.

St. Mary Magdalen School, 1701 Alametos St., Sr. Mary Regis Byrne, Superior.

St. Patrick's School, 518 Mason St.; Sr. Ernestine Lalor, Superior.

St. Peter-St. Joseph Home, 919 Mission Rd., Sr. Margaret Mary Mannion, Superior.

St. Philip's School, 134 E. Lambert St., Sr. Timothy Muldowney, Superior.

Espada Mission, Rt. 12, Box 178; Srs. Pacifica Scallan and Mariana Gutierrez.

St. Peter's School, 112 Marcia Place; Sr. Annette Smiley, Superior.

Seguin

St. Joseph's School, 510 S. Austin St.; Sr. Bernardine Coyne, Superior.

Our Lady of Guadalupe School, 402 E. College St., Sr. Janet Marie Monsalvo, Superior.

Stockdale

St. Ann's School—Kosciusko, Box 77, Rt. 2; Sr. Edith Louise Pastore, Superior.

Windthorst

St. Mary's School; Sr. Alpheus Murphy, Superior.

LOUISIANA

Metairie

Archbishop Chapelle High School, 2651 Montana; Sr. Mary Mercy Fitzpatrick, Superior.

St. Catherine of Siena School, 400 Codifer; Sr. Brigid Marie Clarke, Superior.

OKLAHOMA

McAlester

St. Mary's Hospital, 628 East Creek Ave., Sr. Mary Alyce Odneal, Superior.

ILLINOIS

Cahokia

St. Catherine Laboure School, 1820 Jerone Lane; Sr. Mary Gerard Forck, Superior.

Cicero

St. Frances of Rome School, 1400 S. Austin Blvd.; Sr. Mary Pezold, Superior.

MISSOURI

Cadet

St. Joachim's School, Rt. 1, Box 253; Sr. Rosita Hyland, Superior.

Chesterfield

Incarnate Word Convent, 13416 Olive Blvd., Srs. Theodore Holden and Jane Frances McGrail.

Florissant

S. Dismas School, 2585 Steeplechase Lane; Sr. Rose Mary Politte, Superior.

Jefferson City

St. Francis Xavier School, Rt. 3, Box 98; Sr. Edna Marie Green, Superior.

Immaculate Conception School, 429 Clark Avenue; Sr. Joan Cecilia Moran, Superior.

Potosi

St. James School, 101 Hickory Street; Sr. Laura McGowan, Superior.

St. Louis

St. Anselm Convent, 12828 Oakstone Lane; Srs. Helen Ann Collier and Alice Marie Rothernick.

St. Sebastian School, 9920 Glen Owen Drive; Sr. Janette Fuchs, Superior.

Incarnate Word Hospital, 1640 South Grand Blvd., Sr. Juliann Murphy, Superior.

Incarnate Word Convent, 2800 Normandy Drive; Sr. Stephen Marie Glennon, Provincial Superior.

Blessed Sacrament School, 5021 Northland Avenue; Sr. Eileen Friel, Superior.

Incarnate Word Academy, 2800 Normandy Drive; Sr. Agnes Ditenhafer, Superior.

(Ireland, Peru, and Mexico not included on this list.)

WEAPONS AND ANTIWEAPONS

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is now confronted by the tragic decision of President Nixon to proceed with the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system—a project of spurious military, political, and economic value. The misguided nature of this decision to continue to proliferate weapons and antiweapons is well exposed in an article by I. F. Stone in the March 27, 1969, issue of the New York Review of Books. The article is as follows:

Nixon and the Arms Race: How Much Is "Sufficiency"?

(By I. F. Stone)

The annals of the Nixon Administration, in so far as arms are concerned, must begin, like the Gospel of John, with The Word. But Nixon has changed The Word at the very outset.

In the campaign it was "superiority." At his first press conference this was changed to "sufficiency." The two words seem to move in different directions. One implies an endless arms race. The other seems to promise that at some point we will have enough.

The real meaning of the shift is difficult to evaluate because it came, not in any formal and considered pronouncement, but in an offhand reply to an unexpected question. The correspondent, Edward P. Morgan of the Public Broadcasting Laboratory, long one of the few liberal voices on the air, is not the man the Nixon team would have chosen for a planted question. The meaning of the exchange is further obscured because it involved a double error, on Morgan's part and on Nixon's. Morgan wrongly attributed the idea of "sufficiency" to Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Nixon's chief assistant on foreign policy and national security. Nixon not only assumed that Morgan was correct but briskly and cheerfully accepted the idea. The result seemed to be a reversal of all Nixon had said in the campaign.

The question was framed, like so many reportorial questions, in such a way as to indicate the desired answer and clearly disclosed Morgan's own bias against the arms race. One would think the very wording would have put Nixon on guard. This is the full text of Morgan's question, from the official transcript:

"Q. Back to nuclear weapons, Mr. President. Both you and Secretary Laird have stressed, quite hard, the need for superiority over the Soviet Union. But what is the real meaning of that in view of the fact that both sides have more than enough already to destroy each other, and how do you distinguish the validity of that stance and the argument of Dr. Kissinger for what he calls 'sufficiency?' "

Nobody can say that was not a leading question. In a courtroom Nixon's counsel would have objected to it at once as loaded and the objection would have been sustained. But Nixon waded right in. The answer, too, merits examination in full text:

"A. Here, again, I think the semantics may offer an inappropriate approach to the problem. I would say that with regard to Dr. Kissinger's suggestion of sufficiency, that that would meet, certainly, my guideline, and I think Secretary Laird's guideline, with regard to superiority.

"Let me put it this way: when we talk about parity, I think we should recognize that wars occur, usually, when each side believes it has a chance to win. Therefore, parity does not necessarily assure that a war may not occur. By the same token, when we talk about superiority, that may have a detrimental effect on the other side in giving great impetus to its own arms race."

Nixon then went on to define what he considers sufficiency.

"Our objective in this Administration, and this is a matter which we are going to discuss at the Pentagon this afternoon, and that will be the subject of a major discussion in the National Security Council within the month—our objective is to be sure that the United States has sufficient military power to defend our interests and to maintain the commitments which this Administration determines are in the interest of the United States around the world.

"I think 'sufficiency' is a better term, actually, than either 'superiority' or 'parity.'"

This is the same Nixon who, only three months earlier, had said America's defenses were "close to peril point" and that we were in "a security gap" which by 1970 or 1971 could become a "survival gap." "I intend," Nixon said at that time[1] "to restore our objective of clear-cut military superiority."

The organ of the Air Force Association, the most powerful component of the military-industrial complex, in a pre-inaugural editorial had noted with satisfaction Nixon's commitment to superiority and to "the role of technology in maintaining such superiority." If the new Administration," it said,[2] "is willing to put its money where its mouth is in national defense, some welcome changes are in the offing." Could it be that an entirely new gap was opening—a Nixon gap, between the campaigner and the President?

II

Where did Morgan pick up the term "sufficiency" and how is it that the new President was so ready to adopt it? We know the answer to neither question. Morgan later admitted he was in error in attributing it to Dr. Kissinger. It is true that in a symposium by the Brookings Institution, Dr. Kissinger—writing before his White House appointment—rebutted the "superiority" concept on which Mr. Nixon campaigned. He wrote:[3]

"Throughout history, military power was considered the ultimate recourse. Statesmen treated the acquisition of additional power as an obvious and paramount objective. . . . The nuclear age has destroyed this traditional measure. . . . No foreseeable force-level—*not even full-scale ballistic missile defenses* [italics added]—can prevent levels of damage eclipsing those of the two world wars. . . . The paradox of contemporary military strength is that a gargantuan increase in power has eroded its relationship to policy. . . . The capacity to destroy is difficult to translate into a plausible threat even against countries with no capacity for retaliation. . . . Slogans like 'superiority,' 'parity,' 'assured destruction,' compete unencumbered by clear definition of their operational military significance, much less a consensus on their political implications.

Similar views were expressed by Nixon's new science adviser, Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, in an interview with *The New York Times*, last December 17, when he said:

"If it is a contest in which we have 1,000 hydrogen warheads and the Russians have 900, is that good or bad? Or should we have 1500 to their 900? Or are they going to get 1500 and we only have 1,000? It is an impossible race to see the end of, or to see the validity of, and it is terribly important to find a way of getting out of the rat race of nuclear build-ups *and nuclear defense build-ups* [italics added]."

Neither Dr. Kissinger nor Dr. DuBridge actually used the term "sufficiency." The President may possibly have seen it in an advance copy, perhaps even a special private draft, of a new report prepared by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. This was "cleared" before its release with a prestigious panel which included former Secretary of Defense McNamara, General Matthew B. Ridgway, USA ret., and Major General James McCormack, USAF, ret., all of whom allowed their names to appear in connection with it.[4]

This report was prepared by Dr. George W. Rathjens of MIT, formerly with the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and before that, with the Institute for Defense Analyses. In it Dr. Rathjens said, with no dissent from this panel, "The strategic forces of both sides are too large. Thus, as far as deterrence is concerned, the point has certainly been passed by now where both sides have 'sufficiency'—probably a more useful concept for describing the present strategic balance than either 'superiority' or 'parity.'"

Actually the term "sufficiency" was first used in the context of the nuclear arms race thirteen years ago. There is irony in its origin. It was first used by Eisenhower's Air Force Secretary, Donald A. Quarles, during the 1956 presidential campaign. In a speech on August 4 of that year, Mr. Quarles, though he was talking to the Air Force Association, had the courage to say, "There comes a time in the course of increasing our airpower when we must make a determination of sufficiency. . . . There is no occasion in this audience to labor the point that the buildup of atomic power in the hands of two opposed alliances of nations makes total war an unthinkable catastrophe for both sides."

What he then said of planes applies equally today to missiles and antimissiles. "Neither side," he said, "can hope by a mere margin of superiority in airplanes or other means of delivery of atomic weapons to escape catastrophe . . . even if there is a wide disparity between the offensive *or* defensive [italics added] strengths of the opposing forces." The irony is that the Quarles speech was delivered to counter the "bomber gap" campaign then being waged against the Republicans by the Air Force lobby with the enthusiastic support of the Democrats, like the "security gap" campaign waged by Nixon last year.[5]

"Sufficiency" was the Eisenhower Administration theme in fighting off the demands for higher defense spending from the military and its industrial allies. Is Nixon, faced with budgetary problems and an unstable dollar, coming back to it now? That is the question which will soon be answered by his decision on the anti-ballistic missile and by the results of the review he has ordered of the military budget, which is due the latter part of March.

The shift from "superiority" to "sufficiency" may prove to mean little or nothing. But the shift, even if only semantic, offers new leverage to the peace movement. For it raises the question of how much armaments is enough, and it raises it on the highest level and in the broadest forum. When the new President himself adopts the term "sufficiency," he invites public discussion of the military budget in the simplest and most graphic terms. How much is enough? If Secretary Laird has his way, the budget review will find present military appropriations insufficient. Perhaps the peace movement ought to set up a public hearing board of its own to take testimony from experts on this problem of "sufficiency" and publish both the testimony and the final report. In what follows we will try to give a preliminary sketch of the military monster.

III

The real word for America's nuclear arsenal is not sufficiency but lunacy. When the Rathjens report says "the strategic forces of both sides are too large," that is the understatement of the millennium. Briefly, we have 3½ times as many nuclear warheads as the Soviet Union, and ten times as many as we need—not just to "deter" but to destroy it. The first figure is from Clark Clifford's final posture statement on the fiscal 1970 budget (p. 42) last January 15, This says we can launch 4200 warheads with our ICBMs, Polaris submarines, and bombers, while the Soviet Union can launch 1200. The second figure is from a table (at p. 57) of McNamara's final posture statement for the fiscal 1969 budget dated January 22 of last year. This for the first time gave figures on the number of 1-megaton warheads (one Megaton=1,000,000 tons of TNT) needed to wreck the Soviet Union. The *maximum* is 400.

As McNamara explains, "further increments would not meaningfully change the amount of damage because we would be bringing smaller and smaller cities under attack." McNamara figures this would kill 74 million people, or more than three times the total Soviet losses in World War II, and destroy 76 percent of Soviet industry. Give or take any reasonable number for error, this is no longer war as man has ever known it before but instant cremation. Seventy-four million people will be "only" 30 percent of the Soviet population in 1972, the year to which this table is projected. But a footnote (at p. 52) of an earlier McNamara posture statement in January 1967 still applies to these estimates of lethality. The footnote explains that they cover only "prompt" deaths from blast and fallout—"they do not include deaths resulting from fire, storms, disease, and general disruption of everyday life." So add to the immediate deaths any number for the slow, and then ask yourself again how much is enough? What is sufficiency?

The assumption behind these computations is as distant from human realities as the numbers. Never has so much precision been attached to so much spurious rationality. The assumption is that war is a kind of game on which nations embark after consulting a computer to see who would come out ahead. Not the least dangerous aspect of our war machine is that it is based on so fallacious a theory as to why and how wars occur. Starting from so abstract and mechanistic an axiom, the planners have developed a series of corollaries which seem designed to confuse not only us but even our computers.

The first corollary is that if it looks to the attacker as if the damage to himself in any war would be "unacceptable," he will be "deterred." The second corollary is that the way to confront your enemy with "unacceptable" damage is to have an "assured destruction capability" which you can impose on him in a "second strike" of retaliation if he attacks first. The third is that to do this you need a nuclear arsenal which is so large and so invulnerable that the enemy cannot destroy it—or enough of it—in a first strike to save himself from destruction in return. The fourth and final corollary is that you have to keep building more and better weapons to be sure of maintaining that second-strike capacity. This is what keeps the nuclear rat race going. Those who work within the military bureaucracy are doomed to serve its purposes. The proliferation of doctrine furthers the proliferation of armaments. The finely spun concepts of deterrence and second strike give a rational appearance to an essentially irrational process, the mindless multiplication of weaponry.

The arms race is based on an optimistic view of technology and a pessimistic view of man. It assumes there is no limit to the ingenuity of science and no limit to the deviltry of human beings. Thus so-called "conservative" military planning assumes the best of the enemy's laboratories and the worst of his intentions. It seeks to ensure

Footnotes at end of article.

against all possible contingencies, like an insurance salesman selling protection against the possibility of blizzards in the tropics.

The proliferating corollaries of deterrence having conditioned us to mega-weapons and mega-deaths, the sheer numbers of nuclear weaponry no longer surprise us. They numb and comfort. When Clifford reports that we have 4200 deliverable warheads as compared with the Soviets' 1200, we are instinctively cheered to hear that we are so far "ahead." No one any longer asks where they would be "delivered" or how many times we might find ourselves killing the same peasant woman and her cow. Such talk is "old hat." It is hard to realize that less than a decade has passed since a one-time Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff like General Maxwell Taylor could argue that 200 missiles would be a sufficient minimum deterrent. It is odd to be reminded by General LeMay himself in his new book[6] that "as few as 17 large-yield Soviet ICBMs could severely damage the 17 densely populated urban complexes in the United States that contain over one-third of our population."

By the same calculation, three large-yield US ICBMs could destroy Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev while thirty much smaller ones could wreck the Soviet Union's thirty other cities with a population of 500,000 or more. Surely this should be enough deterrence. LeMay himself proceeds by a series of splendid non sequiturs to prove that this means we need more missiles! He goes on to say, "The Soviets have 40 ICBMs for each US urban complex. The US, on the other hand, to cover some 175 dispersed Soviet cities, would need 7,000 missiles to provide the same ratio of 40 per target. Yet we plan to have only 1,054 from now on." If one large-yield Soviet ICBM is enough to damage severely a whole US urban complex, why do they need 40? And why do we need 40 each for every one of 175 Soviet cities, though 175 gets us down to places like Kirovsk, half the size of Hiroshima (about 100,000) which we destroyed with a "primitive" A-bomb so small (less than 20 kilotons) we no longer consider that size a strategic weapon?

IV

Our 4200 warheads average out to adopt LeMay's standard—to twenty-four each for those 175 Soviet cities. But apparently this is insufficient. We are on the verge of expanding the number of warheads eightfold, and soon after, ten- or twelvefold. A table appended to McNamara's last posture statement (p. 214) shows that during the eight years in which he presided over the Defense Department we spent over $68 billion on our strategic forces.[7] And now we are told, in effect, by McNamara himself that it is not enough![8] Our weapons have to be MIRVed.

The acronym stands for Multiple Independently Targeted Reentry Vehicle. The subject has long been a deep secret. It was first described publicly by Secretary McNamara when he said in his final posture statement on January 22 of last year, "Now, in the late 1960s, because the Soviet Union *might* [the italics were McNamara's] deploy extensive ABM defenses, we are making some very important changes in our strategic missile forces. Instead of a single large warhead, our missiles are now being designed to carry several small warheads and penetration aids, because it is the number of warheads, or objects which appear to be warheads [i.e., the so-called "penetration aids"—IFS] to the defender's radars, that will determine the outcome in a contest with an ABM defense."

Last August, sixteen MIRVs were tested successfully for the first time in an ICBM, the Minuteman, and in an underwater ballistic missile, the Poseidon, which will replace Polaris. A vast expansion in the number of our warheads is now under way. McNamara's final budget set in motion the conversion of 31 of our present 41 Polaris-carrying submarines into carriers of Poseidon. The remaining 10 are of a type it would be too expensive to convert; it would be cheaper to replace them with new Poseidon submarines. The number of warheads the Poseidons can carry is still classified. The number generally given is 10 warheads per missile, though I have been told by one informed source that the Poseidon can carry as many as 14.

Each Polaris sub now carries 16 Polaris missiles, or a total for the fleet of 656 missiles, each with one warhead. But as Poseidons replace the Polaris on 31 ships—with a total of 496 missiles—and if each Poseidon missile can carry 10 warheads, that is a total of 4,960 wardheads. In addition, we are replacing Minuteman I and Minuteman II, our main intercontinental ballistic missiles, with Minuteman III, which will also be MIRVed. Again the figures are classified but it is generally believed that each Minuteman III will carry three warheads.

In his final posture statement McNamara projected for the period 1969–73 a nuclear missile force made up of:

Minutemen	1, 000
Poseidons	496
Polaris	160
Titans	54
Total	1, 710

This was the same size as our nuclear missile force last September when we estimated our own nuclear long-range missile force at 1,710 and the Soviet's at 945. But MIRVed up, this would become, in warheads:

	Warheads
Minutemen	3, 000
Poseidons	4, 960
Polaris	160
Titans	54
Total	8, 174

This would change the disparity in nuclear missile warheads from less than 2-to-1 in our favor (1710 to 945) to almost 9-to-1 (8,174 to 945). It would mean we could aim several of our missiles at each one of theirs, threatening a possible first strike. To see how this expansion of nuclear power must look to the other side we need only read a passage in Clark Clifford's final posture statement last January, and substitute US where he said Soviets. "It is quite evident." Clifford wrote, "that if the Soviets achieve greater accuracy with their ICBMs, together with a MIRV capability, our land-based strategic missiles will become increasingly vulnerable to a first strike."

V

The most alarming aspect of this vast expansion of American striking power, as seen from the other side, must be the fact that it is accompanied by a new propaganda campaign designed to make the US feel insecure—to sell the idea that all this still is not enough. A new numbers game is being played similar to the ones which accompanied the bomber- and missile-gap campaigns. Its principal spokesman is the man Nixon picked to be Secretary of Defense, Melvin R. Laird. Through him and its multifarious lesser mouthpieces, the military-industrial complex is trying to make it appear that new "gaps" are developing, one in strategic offensive power, the other in antiballistic missiles, and that these threaten to change the balance of power, and to create what Nixon in the campaign melodramatically called a "survival gap," a phrase he may regret if he should now seek to hold the military budget down.

This new campaign focuses first of all on the sharp increase in the number of Soviet ICBMs in recent years. The latest US intelligence estimates, as given by Clifford in January, credit the Soviet Union with a steep increase in ICBMs in the last two years: from 250 in mid-1966 to 570 in mid-1967 to 900 in September, 1968, as compared with the 1,054 ICBMs we have had since we decided to freeze their numbers at that level in November 1964.

It is possible that by next fall the Soviets will actually have more ICBMs than we do. By focusing simplistically just on these numbers, a new wave of near-hysteria may be whipped up. But ICBMs are not the only component of the strategic forces. And numbers are not the only thing that counts. The cryptic remark with which Clifford followed this revelation is a good starting point for assessing the realities. "We have been anticipating for some time," Clifford reported, "a Soviet deployment of a solid-fuel ICBM. We now believe the deployment of such a missile has started, although at a relatively slow rate." These quiet words light up an extraordinary technological missile gap in our favor. Liquid-fuel missiles are obsolete. They take about fifteen minutes to load, and they are so full of valves and controls, the chances of a misfire are high. The solid-fuel missile can be fired in less than a minute. We have only 54 liquid-fuel ICBMs left in our arsenal, the huge Titans, still useful as big city-killers though vulnerable to a first strike. We began to phase out the liquid-fuel Atlas and to deploy the solid-fuel Minuteman as far back as the autumn of 1962. It is startling to learn that we only now "believe," in Clifford's words, that the Soviets have begun to deploy a solid-fuel missile of their own, though "at a relatively slow rate." "Their new solid-fuel ICBM," Clifford added, "appears to be no better than our earliest Minuteman missiles, first deployed in fiscal 1963." Fiscal 1963 began July 1, 1962. US intelligence estimates of Soviet power are not given to understatement. If that is the best the intelligence men can say, the lag is serious indeed.

The fact is that during the past six years we have not only replaced all our liquid-fuel Atlases with solid-fuel Minutemen but introduced two new and improved models of Minuteman; the missile industry, like the automobile, believes that the way to maintain sales is to get the customer to trade in his old car every few years for a new model. Our present force consists of 600 Minuteman Is and 400 Minuteman IIs, and the Minuteman III—with MIRV, i.e., multiple warheads—is already being phased in.[9]

To go from Minteman I to Minuteman III, as we have seen, is to increase the number of warheads by at least three for the same number of missiles. Even the Senate group closest to the Pentagon in outlook, the Preparedness Subcommittee of Senate Armed Services under the chairmanship of Stennis, said in its report last September 27: [10]

"Instead of an increase in numbers of missile launches, we have planned to meet the greater and still growing Soviet threat by qualitative improvements such as *Poseidon, Minuteman III, MIRVs,* increased accuracy, penetration aids and silo hardening. *The Joint Chiefs themselves have not recommended a quantitative increase in missiles to meet the current threat* [emphasis added]."

The numbers game is discounted on this more sophisticated level of discussion. What the Joint Chiefs ask, says the Stennis report, is not more missiles but "the phasing in of an advanced ICBM, which they believe would provide for the modernization [a lovely word, in two or three years a missile model is already "ancient"—IFS] of the force while increasing our total missile throw weight. Technical improvements which the Joint Chiefs foresee include better warhead design and increased reliability, survivability, penetrability and accuracy." What the Stennis report might have added but doesn't—the Pentagon does not like to mention the subject—is that more "throw weight" would presumably make it possible for the new ICBM to carry more warheads than Minute-

---

Footnotes at end of article.

man III, further multiplying our striking power.

If we MIRV, the Soviets will eventually MIRV their missiles, too. In the letter submitting his report to the full Armed Services Committee, Senator Stennis says, "of major importance in the strategic nuclear field, are the apparently well documented press reports that the Soviets have flown a multiple re-entry vehicle. This compounds our concern. . . ." But these "press reports" apparently were not "well documented" enough to be confirmed in this year's posture statement. In any case we are several years ahead in this technological breakthrough and have already begun to deploy Poseidon and Minuteman IIIs.

Lest it stupefy the reader, we will touch only in passing on two other components of the nuclear equation in strategic offensive forces which the new numbers game omits—the intercontinental bomber (we have 646, or four times the Soviet fleet of 150) and the underwater missiles carried by nuclear submarine. We have 656 missiles (in process of being MIRVed, as we have seen, into ten times as many warheads) as against the Soviets' 45. When all these numbers and the technological factors are added in, the imbalance is so great that it makes talk of a new missile gap—even if the Soviets pass us in the number of ICBMs—a colossal deception. The gap in our favor is enormous.

Much the same holds true of the strategic defensive. It is true that the Russians have already built some elements of an anti-ballistic missile system around one city, Moscow, while we have yet to deploy our Sentinel at all. But their ABM system is already obsolete, and it would be to America's advantage if the Russians wasted scarce resources in deploying it. "Their Galosh ABM system," Clifford reported in January, "resembles in certain important respects the Nike-Zeus system which we abandoned years ago because of its limited effectiveness." It is the same system Eisenhower wisely vetoed when the Joint Chiefs recommended its deployment in 1959. Even the Stennis report (p. 10) says "the fact that it has not been deployed at other cities probably indicates that Soviet officials have reservations about its effectiveness."

Perhaps they are at last readier to learn from our experience than the present advocates of the Sentinel ABM system in this country. "Had we produced and deployed the Nike-Zeus system [which Galosh resembles] proposed by the Army at an estimated cost of $13 to $14 billion," Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance told a Senate inquiry [11] two years ago, "most of it would have had to be torn out and replaced almost before it became operational, by the new missiles and radars of the Nike–X system. *By the same token, other technological developments in offensive forces over the next* . . . [deleted by Pentagon censor] *years make obsolete or drastically degrade the Nike–X* [Sentinel] *system as presently envisioned* [italics added]."

Even here our planned ABM program is many times the size of the Soviets'. They are wasting money putting an already obsolete system around one city. We are on the verge—if we go ahead with Sentinel—of wasting many times that amount by deploying a soon-to-be-obsolete "thin" ABM system big enough to give a dubious "area defense" to the whole country and "point defense" to more than a dozen cities. Even in folly, we may insist on being "ahead."

VI

Even before the Russians finish deploying Galosh around *one* city, we are preparing a further expansion of striking power big enough to overwhelm a much more extensive and up-to-date Soviet ABM when and if they deploy one. Such is the endless see-saw of the nuclear arms race.

In any discussion of "sufficiency" it is essential to take a close look at what our military think sufficient. To see the dimensions of the expansion projected for the next four years it is necessary to go back to McNamara's final posture statement of last year and read the section entitled "Capability Against the 'Highest Expected Threat' in the NIE." The NIE stands for the National Intelligence Estimates. These are agreed upon by the US Intelligence Board (of twelve separate intelligence agencies, no less!). The Board provides a range of estimates as to Soviet power in the next few years. A McNamara footnote explains (p. 57) that the "highest expected threat" is actually higher than anyone really expects, since this "is actually composed of the upper range of NIE projections for *each* [italics in original] element of the Soviets' strategic forces." That is, strategic missiles, missile-armed submarines, and bombers. "In many cases," the footnote continues, "these represent alternatives and it is highly unlikely that all elements would ever reach the top end of the quantitative range simultaneously. Therefore, the 'highest expected threat' is really a greater threat than that projected in the NIE."

With that in mind, the reader may be prepared more fully to grasp the stupendous multiplication of our retaliatory power sketched by McNamara when he says:

"Even if the Soviet strategic forces by 1972 reach the higher end of the range of estimates [these are classified–IFS] projected in the latest NIEs and even if they were to assign their entire available missile force to attacks on our strategic forces (reserving only refire missiles and bomber-delivered weapons for urban targets), about one-half of our forces programmed for 1972 would survive and remain effective."

Then McNamara says:

"If the Soviets expand the Moscow ABM defense and deploy the same or a similar system around other cities at the highest rate projected [again the figures are classified–IFS] in the latest NIEs, about three-quarters of our surviving weapons would detonate over their targets."

Apparently—though McNamara does not say so explicitly—some 1600 1-Megaton warheads could under those circumstances reach their target. That is four times the 400 1-Megaton warheads we mentioned earlier as enough to wreck the Soviet Union. Here McNamara inserts the table to which we earlier referred. It purports to show Soviet population and industry destroyed in such an attack in 1972, assuming a total Soviet population of 247 million, of whom 116 million would be urban. This is the horrendous table: [12]

Warheads (in megatons)	Fatalities		Industrial capacity destroyed, percent
	Millions	Percent	
100	37	15	59
200	52	21	72
400	74	30	76
800	96	39	77
1,200	109	44	77
1,600	116	47	77

We see in that table that even if only 100 warheads got through it would destroy 59 percent of Soviet industry and kill 50 percent more people in one blow than the Nazis did in the four years of World War II. If the Soviet Union published a table of this kind we would accuse them of trying to terrorize us into giving up the nuclear arms race altogether.[13]

As if to pile horror on horror, McNamara added: "Even if the Soviets deploy a substantial number of [additional] ABM interceptors by 1972 our strategic missile forces alone could still destroy more than two-fifths of their total population (more than 100 million people) and over three-quarters of their industrial capacity." What an arsenal we must be building up!

McNamara goes on to explain that "these results, of course, reflect the decisions we have taken in recent years to enhance the the future capabilities of our 'Assured Destruction' forces." These, he says, include (1) the replacement of Polaris by Poseidon with MIRVs; (2) improved missile penetration aids, i.e., chaff and decoys to confuse the radars which set in motion the other side's ABMs; (3) an increase in the planned number of Minuteman III ICBMs with MIRVs; (4) development of new small re-entry vehicles "to increase substantially the number of warheads or penetration aids which can be carried by a single missile"; and (5) "The development and production of SRAMs for our strategic bombers." This last is an acronym for Short Range Attack Missiles. These would enable our intercontinental bombers to stop short of Soviet bomber defenses and fire nuclear missiles into Soviet territory.

In addition to the SRAM, the Air Force has begun a campaign for a new weapon system called SCAD (see *The New York Times*, February 5). These add a new horror to our alphabetical military nightmares. SCAD stands for Subsonic Cruise Armed Decoy. These are small pilotless but nuclear armed aircraft which could be launched from a carrier plane toward enemy targets from beyond the Soviet Union's defense perimeter. One enthusiastic planner was quoted as saying, "SCAD does for bombers what the multiple warhead does for missiles—it makes the enemy's defense problem virtually impossible." It would take a new and larger intercontinental bomber to carry SCADs, and this is what the Air Force hopes for. The cost, of course, will be in the billions.

In the meantime SCAD is one of ten "Advanced Development Projects" for which Clifford asked almost a quarter billion dollars in additional research and development funds in the new fiscal 1970 budget. One of these is a new ABM to succeed Sentinel and a new "Underseas Long-Range Missile System" in case Soviet anti-submarine capability becomes a threat to Polaris and Poseidon. Another is an Ocean Engineering project which may take us one step further toward the new idea of hiding ICBMs under the ocean floor. The armed forces also have not yet given up the idea of using the MOL (the Manned Orbital Laboratory) as a step toward weapons in space, despite an international treaty against it. This, dear reader, only skims the surface of what is on the drawing boards and in the laboratories; we have only touched the highlights of the unclassified material on strategic weapons. We have not even touched the plans in the works for counter-insurgency, which promises new Vietnams, or such goodies as new bacteriological and chemical weapons.

For the military, there will never be "sufficiency."

VII

I would like to make three grave observations in conclusion.

(1) With MIRV, we are entering a new period of darkness. What I mean is this. The U–2 and the SAMOS satellite dissipated the missile gap nonsense because we could actually see and count how many ICBMs the other side had. There is no way to see from afar, or to be sure, just how many MIRVs there are on each missile. This may bring us back to that atmosphere of panicky conjecture and exaggeration so useful to the arms lobby and the military.

(2) The deployment of an ABM will make each side fearful lest the other venture a first strike, calculating that the ABM, if improved sufficiently and buttressed by fallout and blast shelters, may cut down casualties to an "acceptable" level. Each side will become more fearful of adventurism on the other.

(3) MIRVs open a new era in the arms race, and raise the threat of a first-strike capacity. If one side can, by MIRVs, obtain, let us say, a tenfold advantage over the other, it may

---

Footnotes at end of article.

have enough to destroy the other's missiles—or think it has. This will take the balance out of the "balance of terror."

McNamara implies that the MIRV was developed as an answer-in-advance to a Soviet ABM. But there is evidence that MIRV was first developed to provide capacity for a first or preemptive strike. At last year's Senate hearings on the fiscal 1969 military budget, Senator Mansfield put a series of questions to Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., whom Laird has retained as the Pentagon's Director of Research and Engineering. These have gone almost unnoticed but deserve close attention. Question No. 10 asked, "Is it not true that the US response to the discovery that the Soviets had made an initial deployment of an ABM system around Moscow and possibly elsewhere was to develop the MIRV system for Minuteman and Polaris?" The unexpected answer was: [14]

"Not entirely. The MIRV concept was originally generated to increase our targeting capability rather than to penetrate ABM defenses. In 1961–62 planning for targeting the Minuteman force it was found that total number of aim points exceeded the number of Minuteman missiles. By splitting up the payload of a single missile [deleted] each [deleted] could be programmed [deleted] allowing us to cover these targets with [deleted] fewer missiles. [Deleted.] MIRV was originally born to implement the payload split-up [deleted]. It was found that the previously generated MIRV concept could equally well be used against ABM [deleted]."

In 1961–62 our strategic force was far greater than the Soviet Union's. If we then sought a MIRV in order to cover more aim points, this could only have been for a counterforce or preemptive strategy. That was the time when McNamara, as shown by his famous Ann Arbor speech of June 16, 1962, was moving in that direction. "For a short time," General LeMay says in his new book (p. 269), "I thought we had convinced Mr. McNamara, but I soon learned how wrong we were. To be successful, such a counterforce strategy requires a clear nuclear superiority because it takes more than one missile to destroy another." MIRV, by increasing the number of warheads manyfold (Dr. Foster admitted to Mansfield), might soon give us in the neighborhood of 10,000 warheads, in place of our present 1700 or so single-headed missiles.

At present the US has three strategic forces, each of which is big enough to strike a mortal blow at the Soviet Union even if the other two were destroyed in a first strike. If we add SCADs to our bombers and MIRVs to the Minuteman and to the nuclear submarine (Poseidon), we will have what must begin to look from the other side, with its present level of forces, like three separate strategic forces, *each with a first-strike capacity*. The MIRV is incomparably more unsettling to "the balance of terror" than the ABM. The MIRV is the Great Leap Forward of the nuclear arms race. McNamara put it very quietly in this colloquy before the House Appropriations Committee hearings last year on the 1969 military budget: [15]

"*Mr. Mahon* [D. Tex., chairman of the committee]: I am concerned lest the Soviet Union make some kind of "quantum jump" in the development of their strategic forces. . . . Is it your view that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union in the next few years will come up with an entirely new weapon which will outmode present weapons?

"*Secretary McNamara:* I think it extremely unlikely. There will be continued development in such weapons. The true significance of more recent developments are obscured somewhat by the fact that they did not involve as dramatic a *physical* [italics added] change as took place between the bomber and the missile. I, myself, do not agree with your statement that there are not changes going on today as important in terms of strategic capability as those that occurred between the bomber and the missile. *The fact is that the destruction capability between the Atlas and the Poseidon or between the Atlas and Minuteman III, in my opinion, was substantially more than between the B–52* [our last intercontinental bomber] *and the Atlas* [our first intercontinental missile]. [The emphasis is added.]"

Such are the incredible dimensions projected for our military machine. Unless some new agreement puts an end to the endless spiral and proliferation of new weapons and anti-weapons, it will devour an ever increasing share of the material and scientific resources on both sides and make war, should it come, many times more destructive. When Nixon accepted "sufficiency" instead of "superiority," suspended work on the Sentinel ABM and ordered a review of the defense budget, sent the nuclear nonproliferation treaty to the Senate and declared his intention to hold missile talks with the Russians, he began to stir hopes which run counter to everything he said in the campaign. Has he the resolution, even if he should want to, to confront the Pentagon and its formidable allies, including his own Secretary of Defense? Or will all this fizzle out into a tactical and temporary retreat to disarm the strongest wave of opposition the country has yet seen to military spending and the ABM? We should know the answer soon with Nixon's decision on the Sentinel and his review of the defense budget.

See footnotes at end of table.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Nixon's "Security Gap" speech, CBS, October 24, 1968.

[2] *Air Force and Space Digest*, February 1969, which was prepared before the Inaugural.

[3] *Agenda for the Nation*, Doubleday, 632 pp., $3.50.

[4] *The Future of the Strategic Arms Race: Options for the 1970s* by George W. Rathjens, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York, 1969, $.60. This was released two days after the Nixon press conference. The Carnegie Endowment called attention to the fact that its pamphlet had also advocated "sufficiency."

[5] Quarles, now dead, was the object of constant denigration by Joseph Alsop, the main journalistic purveyor of this nightmare and of its successor, the "missile gap." On April 24, 1959, Alsop attacked Quarles as "Mr. Missile Gap," when Alsop feared Quarles might become Secretary of Defense.

[6] *America Is in Danger*, by General Curtis E. LeMay, Funk & Wagnalls, 1968, 352 pp., $5.95, p. 88.

[7] For the morbid, it is worth adding that despite this vast nuclear arsenal we also allocated more than $190 billion to our general purpose forces during the same eight years. The total assigned in those eight years to "defense" (surely it deserves quotation marks in this context) was more than $500 billion or half a trillion dollars!

[8] At the same time McNamara warned, "'superiority' is of little significance. For even with . . . any 'superiority' realistically attainable, the blunt, inescapable fact remains that the Soviet Union could still effectively destroy the United States, even after absorbing the full weight of an American first strike . . . Under these circumstances, surely it makes sense for us both to try to halt the momentum of the arms race which is causing vast expenditures on both sides and promises no increase in security" (pp. 52–53, final posture statement, 1969 budget). In a similar vein Clifford warned in his final posture statement for fiscal 1970 (p. 49), "We stand on the eve of a new round in the armaments race with the Soviet Union, a race which will contribute nothing to the real security of either side while increasing substantially the already great defense burdens of both." No such sentiments have ever been expressed by their successor, whose book, *America's Strategy Gap: A House Divided*, Regnery, 1962, 180 pp., $4.95, is a Goldwaterite "better dead than Red" manifesto.

[9] *Status of US Strategic Power. A Report by the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee*, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, September 27, 1968, p. 11.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 11–12.

[11] *US Armament and Disarmament Problems. Hearings before the* [Gore] *Subcommittee on Disarmament of Senate Foreign Relations*, February 3 to March 3, 1967, 90th Congress, First Session, p. 58.

[12] Underline in original because, as McNamara explains, "beyond 400 . . . would not meaningfully change the amount of damage."

[13] A more than adequate substitute is provided—with majestic objectivity—by McNamara himself in a table on p. 64 showing the number of fatalities on both sides in the event of an "all-out strategic exchange" in the mid-1970s. This shows that even if the US built up offensive and defensive forces to a maximum so-called Posture B, including an anti-missile defense, which he says would probably end by costing $40 billion, the Soviets, by a maximum program of their own, adding MIRVs and penetration aids, plus 550 mobile ICBMs, could kill 90 million Americans even if we struck first! Mobile ICBMs, constantly moving around on vehicles, would be almost impossible for an enemy to target.

[14] *Senate Appropriations Committee Hearings on the Department of Defense Budget for Fiscal 1969*, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, Part 4, p. 2310. All the deletions are in the original, as made by the Pentagon's censors.

[15] *Op. cit.*, Part 1, pp. 251–2.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored, as I am saddened, to share in these farewells to a friend, for it is as a wise and deeply respected friend to his countrymen that General Eisenhower will be remembered.

He was, in the long reach of mankind's years, a unique instrument of international cooperation and a national symbol of unity. But it is not of these achievements in themselves of which I would speak. The quality to which I wish to pay tribute was his active devotion to the moral principles upon which our country was founded, through which he became great, and to which it must return if it is to survive. To the extent that we compromise or abandon those principles on whatever pretext we court destruction, both personal and national, and to the extent that we sustain them, we will achieve the order, the peace, and the liberty we pride above all else.

General Eisenhower knew this and never ceased to live by it; through all the human contacts and experiences and events of his crowded days he was guided by that honesty of purpose.

It is the living example of a richly rewarding life, a life in which the satisfactions far outweighed the disappointments and the life guided by reverence by things we cannot see, for which we shall be eternally grateful.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we allow few "great" men to walk among us. In all but rare instances, that is an adjective we reserve until the finality of death permits us to safely sum up a man's life and decide whether it will be bestowed.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was one of those rare great men permitted to wear that mantle in his lifetime. He did so with grace, humanity, and restraint.

He was a simple man in the best sense of that word who seemed to live a life filled with contradiction.

He was a great soldier, but a President who was a peacemaker. He made momentous decisions, but sometimes appeared to make none. He was a statesman who unified the Nation, but who confessed humbly his ineptitude in politics.

But the contradictions of his life were not to be found in the man. They arose naturally from the great variety of responsibilities he assumed. They were enhanced because the man did not vary with the role.

Whatever his undertaking, he applied the same principles, of duty, dedication, honesty, and humanity.

As a general he led history's most massive assemblage of men and weaponry to free the continent of Europe from tyranny.

As a President he maintained peace on a warlike globe for 8 years and presided over a world which history may credit with renouncing great wars.

He was a soldier who never permitted himself to cease cherishing human values.

He once said:

> The only thing I can bring to the White House is the values that a man thinks are important.

No man could bring more.

He left us with a restatement of those simple values in words spoken to his wife on his deathbed.

He said:

> I've always loved my wife. I've always loved my children. I've always loved my grandchildren and I've always loved my country.

In a confusing and complicated world people have not always understood the depth of those simple values and all they imply. But they have always recognized intuitively how well Mr. Eisenhower understood them.

People have always responded with affection and trust.

Even after he retired to Gettysburg every American President sought out his advice and counsel whenever a great issue required national unity and bipartisan support. For they knew that with Mr. Eisenhower's approval came the confidence and trust of millions of Americans.

Mr. Eisenhower claimed often that he did not understand politics. Yet, as commander of the Allied forces in Europe during World War II he welded brilliant military men from diverse backgrounds and with diverse ambitions to achieve the most ambitious military undertaking in history.

As President, this man who claimed not to understand politics unified for 8 years a nation weary from war and social change.

It was those same qualities of humanity and tolerance and an outstanding ability to work with others to enlist their trust and cooperation that enabled him to do so.

During those 8 years of peace and stability he worked with quiet strength to maintain the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He gave permanence to a sweeping foreign aid program and offered Americans a new, mature approach to relations with the Communist nations, an attitude whose wisdom and realism we have not yet fully grasped.

He preserved and maintained these institutions for the future often in spite of formidable and determined opposition without bombast or personal recrimination.

He did so with a quiet strength and resolve that often belied the deep inner conflicts which must have enveloped him.

It was his simplicity of motive and purpose that always came through that won him such great rapport with the American people.

And, in turn it was the trust and affection of the American people which provided him with the strength to prevail.

More than any President in modern times, he exemplified the qualities that we like to claim as truly American.

He once said:

> I came from the heart of America.

He was referring to the broad expanse of Kansas countryside in which he grew up.

I believe historians will conclude the truth of that statement rests only partially in geography.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Seventh Congressional District of Kentucky, which is generally known as the heart of Appalachia, are truly anguished by the departure from the national scene of a great military hero and a great leader in line with the tradition of great leaders of our country.

Dwight David Eisenhower will not be known in eastern Kentucky because of any bricks or mortar erected in his memory, in any bridges or roads constructed during his era of leadership, in any tangible public works or economic development, but Dwight David Eisenhower will be remembered in the hearts of every eastern Kentuckian for what to me is worth far more. Our departed general and great President will be remembered by us for the strength of spirit with which he gave Kentuckians and all Americans, for a renewed faith in our democratic principles, in our Christian heritage and in the noble task which confronts America.

Few Americans have given so unselfishly of their total lives in public service and dedication and I am pleased to rise today with my colleagues—pleased and greatly honored to have this opportunity to speak what I believe to be in the hearts of every one of my constituents.

B'NAI B'RITH HONORS SIMMS

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my constituents, Mr. B. F. Simms, received the B'nai B'rith Humanitarian Award for his work with alcoholics. Those who have been chosen for this distinguished honor have consistently been marked by their significant and selfless service to humanity, and this year's honoree is a distinguished addition to their number.

In tribute to Mr. Simms, I include the account of the award ceremony, as reported in the Birmingham News, in the RECORD and commend it to my colleagues:

SIMMS IS NAMED WINNER OF HUMANITARIAN AWARD

(By Ben Hogan)

Mankind's humanitarians, someone once said, are divided into two groups—those who make headlines and those who work.

For 25 years—until Wednesday night at Fairmont Club when he was named winner of B'nai B'rith's 10th annual Humanitarian Award—B. F. Simms was a member of the latter group.

There is little material for headlines in aiding an alcoholic at Birmingham City Jail in the early hours of the morning.

As district supervisor of Alabama Vocational Rehabilitation Service and an ordained Methodist minister, Simms, 65, has never sought headlines.

What he has sought is a reward few people seem to understand: The self-satisfaction, he says, that comes from aiding a person who's down and out.

Formerly a worker for the blind, Simms of late has devoted his seven-day-a-week efforts to alcoholics. All types of drinkers have received his advice and companionship—the 16-year-old experimenter, the ragged wino, the country club drunkard.

Aided by crutches since a misfortune took one of his legs years ago, Simms understandably is especially sympathetic with physically handicapped persons who have become alcoholics.

According to a spokesman for The Birmingham Parliamentary Law Club, which nominated him for the award, "He speaks of these outcasts . . . as 'some of the very sweetest people I've ever met'."

And Simms doesn't wait for them to meet him. He goes to them, making twice weekly—or more—trips to area courts and jails, often at times such as 3 a.m.

A native of Roanoke and holder of advanced theology degrees from Emory University and Northwestern University, Simms also is active in youth and church work, teaching Sunday School at First Methodist Church of Birmingham.

He was chosen for his award from a list of more than 20 persons active in church, welfare and charity causes.

NO QUARTER TO PRINCES OF POLLUTION

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the thought of seeing our rivers and lakes turned into open sewers is a frightening one to all Americans. Oil pollution has been turning our beaches into wildlife graveyards. There must be an end to the wretched ugliness and acid pollution caused by strip mining. A time has come for controls to prevent thermal pollution and the intolerable agony caused by noise pollution. A time is here for an end to unlimited use of pesticides, such as DDT, which are poisoning the air we breathe.

Millions of Americans are apprehensive over the mounting menace posed by a combination of these factors, which are unhinging our world's ecology. A time has arrived for plain speaking, naming of names, and an end to puerile, nonsensical excuses from those responsible. We must take advantage of these cures technologically available. The "princes of pollution," who arrogantly allow these acts to be perpetrated in their name, must be stopped.

Major segments of the American business, commercial, and industrial community are endangering the lives of scores of millions now living and hundreds of millions yet unborn. How? By pouring industrial wastes and raw sewage into streams, lakes, and ponds. By raping natural resources, then moving on, unmindful of damage they have wrought. By building and constructing without considering effects of their efforts.

We are in need of drastic action. Time grows short, for nature will turn on all of us if a balance is not restored.

When auto manufacturers say they cannot control auto pollution, or their products are not major causes of air pollution, we wonder. When metal producers claim they are not really able to control dumping of industrial wastes into major bodies of water, we wonder. When a coal company strip mines on a hillside, leaving it as a raw gash on our land, without attempts at restoration, we wonder. When a community dumps raw sewage into a river, without thought, we wonder.

The list is endless, Mr. Speaker, and we are almost out of time. We possess a finite amount of clean air, water, and usable land area. If we unhinge nature's balance, abusing these gifts, nature will take a terrible revenge on our lives and those of our children in days to come.

Do we not remember the great natural disasters which have been visited upon man whenever he has abused his environment? Is the Dust Bowl forgotten or floods resulting from poor land use and abuse of farmland?

One word of praise is in order here for the present Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Hickel. I was among those who had my doubts when he was nominated. So far, he has done a creditable job, taking several forthright stands.

In my own State of New York we see on all sides the result of this pollution. Lake Erie is, as I have said, an open sewer. So are many parts of the Hudson River. Thermal pollution is emerging in many areas as the rush for atomic power proceeds apace. Noise pollution at our airports is high now and growing intolerable, and we now face the menace of the SST. Our cities are covered by a haze of carbon monoxide, and entire populations are in danger because of this growing menace. A time has come to act, and we must not await natural disaster to make us take preventive action.

Studies have been piled on studies. Technological solutions are available. The "princes of pollution" know who they are and what their companies and municipalities are doing. If there is not civic, municipal, or corporate responsibility, there must be Federal action.

ONE NATION UNDER GOD

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I urge with all the sincerity at my command that our distinguished Secretary of Defense, Mr. Laird, reverse reported Army plans to delete mention of God in its training and guidance programs.

I was shocked and amazed that the Army was planning to buckle in to a few protestors and eliminate God from the early training of our soldiers. Should this order stand, it would only be a matter of time before our chaplains and chapels throughout all branches of our Armed Forces would be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, ours is a nation under God. In our Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, we find "One Nation under God." The House of Representatives has here above the Speaker's rostrum in gold letters, "In God We Trust." "In God We Trust" is on our currency. As a nation we grew up with a firm belief in Bible reading, prayer, and a belief in God. This has been the foundation of our strength.

The American Legion is our largest veterans' organization—a great organization of men who served all over the world in four world wars for the cause of freedom. It was chartered by Congress in 1919 and the motto of the Legion is "For God and Country." Mr. Speaker, are we to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Legion by prohibiting God from our military training and manuals? God is synonomous with liberty, individual dignity, morality, truth, purity, and "justice for all." Should we eliminate God from our Armed Forces, our culture, our education, our government, our courts, and our parliamentary system, America would crumble to dust and our great Nation perish forever from the face of the earth. Mr. Speaker, before it is too late, let us rise up and reverse this trend which would leave our Nation helpless and hopeless.

ITALIANS IN BIRMINGHAM

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Theresa Aguglia Beavers, an instructor at Hewitt-Trussville High School, is preparing a master's thesis on the history of the Italians in Birmingham. Included in the March issue of the Chamber of Commerce's magazine, Birmingham, is an excerpt from that thesis entitled, "Success Through Opportunity" in which the author observes that through three generations of hard work, enterprise, and acceptance some 25,000 Italians have a stake in the growth of Birmingham.

The article follows and I commend it to my colleagues.

SUCCESS THROUGH OPPORTUNITY

Italian settlement in Birmingham will always serve as a reminder of the early days when Italian immigrant labor helped to develop the natural resources that made Birmingham a leading industrial city in the South. As time passed, Italians contributed to the development of commerce, and brought in trades such as shoe repairing, barbering, tailoring, and stonemasonry. They have been a responsible, hard working group, property owners, with a stake in the growth of Birmingham. They have added to the spiritual facilities of Birmingham, and in their cultural activities have supplied a diversity to a city population more homogeneous than in other sections of the country. Today, there is no longer an Italian colony, separate from the American community. The descendants of pioneer Italian settlers have successfully incorporated themselves into Birmingham life.

The industrial expansion of the United States in the early years of this century brought an unprecedented number of immigrants from Europe. Over five million came from Italy between 1920 and 1967. The peak years of Italian immigration, 1900 to 1920, saw over three million arrive. Out of this number, few came South. Italian immigrants never numbered more than a few thousand in the Birmingham area at any one time.

Birmingham was a relatively young town in 1900 when Italian immigrants first came in substantial numbers. Most of them were from the sugar and cotton plantations near New Orleans, where they had originally landed. They heard of better jobs available in the coal mines and steel mills of Birmingham, spread the word to friends and relatives in home villages, and soon others arrived to join them.

The majority of Birmingham Italians came from Sicily. Italian immigration did not represent a cross-section of the Italian people, but rather groups of settlers from a particular village. In Birmingham, many settlers came originally from Bisacquino, Sutera, and Castelvetrano, farming towns within the province of Palermo.

Emigration from Sicily was heavy because of extreme conditions of poverty. Italy had only become politically united in 1870, and the problem of improving conditions in the south of Italy continues to the present day. Agriculture was the sole means of livelihood. The mass of people worked as agricultural laborers on the estates of absentee landlords. There was little hope of improving their condition, except through emigration.

Most of the immigrants were illiterate and looked upon as an undesirable type. Several characteristics of the Italian immigrants helped them win success and respect. These were a reputation for hard work, self-sacrifice, and thriftiness. The early immigrant remained in isolation from the American community. The main contacts with Americans came at places of work, and these contacts were not always friendly ones.

The primary interests of the Italian immigrants remained centered in their families and association with friends from the same village. The close relationship which characterized Sicilian family life helped the immigrants achieve stability in a time of crisis. They settled near their places of work. Thus, the original Italian settlements in Birmingham were located at Thomas, around the Republic Steel Company, in Ensley, near the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company steel mill, and later in East Lake, where a group of immigrants started a truck farming community. Other Italian settlements were in outlying coal mining areas such as Bessemer, Pratt City, and Blocton.

The Italian immigrants soon pushed ahead to better employment by saving money to get enough capital to go into business for themselves and to buy property.

This drive for independence led to fields of work more congenial to Italian talents and experience. They established small grocery stores, and went into truck farming. These eventually led to the predominance of the Italian in the wholesale produce market, and the retail and wholesale grocery business, fields in which the descendants of Italian settlers are still prominent. Many of them helped each other when obstacles were met in establishing businesses due to prejudice and fear of Italian competition.

The Italian societies formed in the early years of settlement acted as representatives of the Italian colony. They organized many parades associated with patriotic celebrations. One such was the celebration of the anniversary of the unification of Italy on September 20, 1870. This later gave way to the celebration of Columbus Day, which continues to the present time. At these occasions, which featured picnics and speeches, civic leaders of Birmingham took part as guest speakers.

Italians had a need for their own church. They could not understand English, and they wanted the celebration of feast days and the veneration of saints as practiced in their home villages. Early in the century, the Catholic Church realized it was losing many Italian immigrants. Some were converted to Protestant faiths, but a greater number were drifting away from any church membership. Priests especially trained to help the Italian immigrant were recruited to counteract this situation.

In 1904, a young Italian priest, Father Canepa, arrived in the Birmingham district to minister to the spiritual needs of the Italian population. Under his direction three Italian churches were built. The first one was St. Mark's, located in Thomas, founded in 1905. This was the first Italian church in the South outside of New Orleans. St. Joseph's was founded in 1913 in Ensley, followed by the establishment of St. John's in East Lake in 1923. In the years before World War I, Presbyterian, Baptists, and Methodists were active in attempting to convert Italians in Birmingham. They met with minor success. The majority of Italian immigrants remained within the Catholic Church.

A particular problem for the Italian immigrant in Birmingham was the presence of the Negro. Italians did not have any historical prejudice against the Negro. They worked with them in the coal mines and steel mills. In some of the company housing quarters, Italians and Negroes were housed together. In others, there was separation into three groups, the native born, Negroes, and Italians, implying the Italians were not a separate nationality, but a separate race. Italians were thus regarded as little better than Negroes in status. When Italians established small grocery stores, they were in Negro neighborhoods. This was a field which the Italians had to themselves. They were not in competition with native storekeepers. They profited from this economic opportunity, although association with the Negro lowered the Italian in the eyes of the native community.

By 1930 the Italians were the most numerous of the foreign born in Birmingham. They numbered 1,418, which together with their children, gave the Italian colony an estimated population of 15,000. Cultural activities played a larger part in their lives, once the initial struggle to make a living had been achieved. The first big cultural event of the Italians in Birmingham was an Italian art exhibit, held in the public library of Birmingham in 1931. This was carried out with the cooperation of the Italian government, which sent valuable paintings and other artistic artifacts. The money needed to stage the exhibit was raised by the Italian colony, and also donated by leading citizens of Birmingham. The exhibit was a great success. One result was the exhibit of the Kress collection, sent down in 1933. Several paintings from this collection were donated to Birmingham, forming the nucleus of a collection which boosted the eventual founding of the Birmingham Art Museum.

During the twenties and thirties, Italian clubs and associations of various kinds were numerous. The Italian immigrant was still a relatively distinct element in the Birmingham community. This separation continued well into the second generation. Social clubs were formed by the younger generation, but the members were predominantly of Italian parentage. During this period, there was an increasing number of second generation graduates in the public schools, and others going to local colleges. Education was important in the immigrants' plans for their children. They had experienced the frustrations and humiliations that went with illiteracy. Many Italians of the second generation moved to better neighborhoods as their conditions improved. There were neighborhoods where Italians were not wanted. Discrimination was practiced through refusals to sell and restrictive clauses in real estate deeds. Ironically, many of the developers of this housing had originally bought the land from Italians.

The twenties and thirties also saw a drive to Americanize the immigrant. There was increased agitation to restrict immigration, particularly from Italy. Immigration legislation, passed in 1921 and 1924, enacted discriminatory quotas against the emigrants from Italy. The continued slurs on the Italian nationality caused the immigrants to organize in self-defense. Political clubs were formed to protect Italian-American interests. The founding of the Alabama branch of the Order of Sons of Italy in 1931 served to unite Italian-Americans still more.

The Italians also suffered discrimination because of their Catholic affiliation. This was the time of the Ku Klux Klan parades through Birmingham. There is no record of overt violence against Italians, but the parades served as a display of implied hostility. To be an Italian Catholic was sufficient reason to be turned down for a job, or being offered the worst of jobs.

Relations between the Italian community and Birmingham appear to have been generally good. Italian crime was negligible. There was some conflict with the law by Italians who violated prohibition regulations, and kept their stores open after hours. The Italians regarded this as an opportunity to make money, rather than as a crime. They had different attitudes toward selling whiskey and the observance of Sunday than the American community. Italians in Birmingham never suffered the notoriety of Mafia activities. Birmingham was not then considered a big enough town for racketeers, but the Italian community also co-operated in policing themselves.

The Italian government maintained a vigilant watch over the welfare of her emigrants in the early years of settlement. It also attempted to maintain close ties with the American colonies through the thirties. Periodic visits were made by the Italian consul from New Orleans to inspect working conditions of Italians. Mussolini's rise to leadership of Italy brought visits from Italian officials, whose mission it was to explain about the improvements taking place in Italy. Mussolini was supported by most of the immigrants at first, because he was regarded as working to improve conditions in Italy. In so doing, he was raising the prestige of the Italian nation, and with it the self-esteem of Italian immigrants everywhere. The local support of Mussolini started to fall off when Ethiopia was invaded in 1935. From this time to the start of World War II, there was some boycotting of Italian businesses. The Italians became more circumspect in their community activities in order not to aggravate a strained situation. During World War II, many Americans of Italian parentage fought in the American army in the very regions their parents had emigrated from earlier.

Many immigrant leaders of the Italian colony did much to help their countrymen. Father Canepa was one of them. Another was the very able and popular vice-consul in Birmingham, G. A. Firpo. He was vice-consul from 1929 until his death in 1954. Another immigrant leader, still living in Bessemer, is Sam Raine Sr., an example of great success as a businessman and one who helped organize the local branch of the Order of Sons of Italy. Another outstanding leader was Elviro Di Laura, editor of the *Columbus Balboa Review*, a magazine devoted to news of the Italian-American community. His death in 1938 brought an editorial of praise in *The Birmingham News* for his fine work as Italian-American. Mrs. Carmela Anselmo-Antonio, who had a college degree when she came from the old country, helped prepare many Italians for naturalization and formerly taught in the Birmingham city schools.

It is probable the second and third generations of Italian stock in Birmingham have lost identity with their Italian heritage more quickly than in larger cities with crowded Italian settlements. The younger generation, educated, has been able to move up to better jobs and enter the professions Social notices in the newspapers show a number of marriages with non-Italians and even with non-Catholics. Enough time has elapsed to see three generations make a successful adjustment from Italian immigrant to American. The Italian settlement in Birmingham is an example of success in overcoming adversity, a tribute to the innate worth of the immigrants, and an affirmation of the American ideal of success through opportunity.

ROBERT D. CHEW

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Board of County Commissioners, Clark County, Ohio, has forwarded to me a resolution adopted April 1, 1969, in memory of Clark County Commissioner Robert D. Chew, who passed away on that date. Commissioner Chew was a highly respected member of the Springfield community and a devoted and hard-working public servant. His loss will be felt keenly by the citizens of Clark County, Ohio. As a further token of respect, I submit the resolution of the Clark County, Ohio, commissioners for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CLARK COUNTY, OHIO,
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Springfield, Ohio, April 1, 1969.

The following resolution was passed by the Board of Clark County Commissioners under date of April 1st, 1969, viz:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas, on April 1st, 1969, this Commission lost a most valuable member by the death of Mr. Robert D. Chew; and

"Whereas, His devotion to public service, his untiring efforts, his friendliness, his integrity and judgment in the performance of the duties of this office will long be remembered and appreciated by members of both political parties, regardless of race, creed or color;

"Whereas, The members of this Commission and his fellow county officials and associates valued his friendship and counsel, and Mr. Chew's passing is a deeply felt personal loss: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we hereby place on the permanent record of the journal of this Commission this resolution as a token of his services to us and the esteem in which he was held by the people of Clark County; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to his sorrowing family, as an expression of our sympathy in their bereavement."

L. G. RONEMUS.
CARL E. MUMMA.

TRIBUTE

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, many fine tributes have been paid to a very fine man, the late Dwight D. Eisenhower.

On March 30, 1969, Rev. Edgar Henshaw Steedle of the United Church of Christ of Glen Rock, Pa., offered a splendid tribute to General Eisenhower at his church's day service. Because this is a particularly meaningful expression on a truly great man. I submit it to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The tribute follows:

TRIBUTE

Dwight David Eisenhower, 34th President of the United States.

What does one say about a man who has served his fellow men so well for so many years?

If you list his accomplishments you must be extremely selective or you will run the risk of rambling on into the night.

If you speak of his personal attributes, and love this man as I have, you may be accused of trying to turn a man into a saint.

If you compare him with other great men of the century you will find that his unique contributions place him beyond the bounds of legitimate comparison.

I can say this, for me, Dwight David Eisenhower lived a life dedicated to the people of the nation into which he was born. He governed his life by principles founded upon eternal values, not upon selfish desires or human expediency.

He set the standard for a good life in his day and exemplified, for generations to come, those things which make a person truly human.

We thank God for the life of Dwight David Eisenhower. He answered God's call to service among his fellow men. He has now answered God's call to eternal life.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER: DUTY, HONOR, COUNTRY

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1911, a group of plebes gathered at West Point and one of them many years later said of that occasion:

> With the American flag floating majestically above us, we were sworn in as cadets of the U.S. Military Academy. It was an impressive ceremony. As I looked up at our national colors and swore my allegiance, I realized humbly that I now belonged to the flag. It is a moment I have never forgotten.

So spoke Dwight David Eisenhower, General of the Army and 34th President of these United States. We shall not forget him either.

"Duty, honor, country" is the code of the Cadet Corps at West Point and it was Dwight Eisenhower's code all his life. But this was a man who could also say on his deathbed "I have always loved my wife. I have always loved my children. I have always loved my grandchildren. And I have always loved my country." He was a man who could receive every honor that a military career could offer, lead the largest and most victorious army in the history of the world and at the same time call war a "damnable thing" and express the hope that his military colleagues would eventually find themselves unemployed. He was a man who, as 34th President of the United States, could lead the wealthiest, most technically advanced country in the world and also warn her citizens of a threat to "the very structure of our society" by a military-industrial complex and a "scientific-technological elite." He termed these two threats, very real today, "a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method."

President Eisenhower was a very human and trusting person and so at times made mistakes and was betrayed by some of those in whom he put trust. But the basic decency, honesty, and warmth of the man could never be doubted. He was without doubt one of the most popular Presidents this country ever had. Nor was his popularity limited to this country. "We like Ike" was a worldwide chant in an era when "Ami, Go Home" was much more popular.

President Eisenhower was proud to be an American and in 1953 I think he summed it up perfectly when he said:

> The things that make us proud to be Americans are of the soul and spirit. They are not the jewels we wear, or the furs we buy, the house we live in, the standard of living, even, that we have. All these things are wonderful to the esthetic and physical senses. But never let us forget that the deep things than are America are the soul and the spirit. The Statue of Liberty is not tired, and not because it is made of bronze. It is because no matter what happens, here the individual is dignified because he is created in the image of his God.

Dwight David Eisenhower, gone from us now, made us all proud to be Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a personal footnote to the foregoing. When I first became a Member of the House of Representatives on June 6, 1944, I was assigned to the House Committee on Military Affairs. As a member of that committee and in the months of November and December 1944, I had the privilege of joining 16 other members in a visit to our military installations and activities in England; France; Liege, Belgium; Maastricht, Holland and the entire western front. Subsequently, we visited such activities in Italy and the icy cold Italian front, which was then up in the Apennines, south of Bologna. It was while we were in France in 1944 that I first met General Eisenhower. Following that time, it was my pleasure and privilege to meet him on innumerable occasions. He became, as you know, president of Columbia University in New York City and subsequently the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, where I visited him a few times. He was my host in the White House on many occasions during his 8 years as President of the United States. So you see, I have lost a valued friend.

PFC. GEORGE M. GORRERA, JR., KILLED IN ACTION

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. George M. Gorrera, Jr., a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PRIVATE GORRERA DIES IN VIETNAM—MARINE VOLUNTEER ATTENDED ROLAND PARK JUNIOR HIGH

An 18-year-old Baltimorean who enlisted in the Marine Corps has been killed on patrol in Vietnam, according to a Defense Department announcement made yesterday.

Pfc. George M. Gorrera, Jr., of 412 East 27th street, died of rocket fragment wounds received March 20 at Quang Tri.

He had been in action in Vietnam since last June and was scheduled to return home soon, his family said. His recent letters indicated that the fighting and dying had begun to depress him very much.

"He'd write that it was terrible, that people were getting killed day in and day out. He'd write and say another buddy of his was killed," said his sister, Miss Patricia A. Gorrera.

Born in Baltimore, he left the Roland Park Junior High School about January, 1967, to work as a finisher for Samuel Kirk & Son, a jewelry manufacturer. He worked there until his enlistment a year later at the age of 17.

He was sent to Vietnam as a member of the 2d Battalion, 3d Marine Division.

Besides his sister Patricia, Private Gorrera is survived by his mother, Mrs. Wilbert Gover; his father, George M. Gorrera, Sr.; a brother, John W. Gorrera; a half brother, Robert L. Gover; two other sisters, Miss Anna M. Gorrera, and Miss Rosemary Gorrera; two half sisters, Miss Brenda L. Gover and Miss Helen L. Gover, and a grandmother, Mrs. Margaret Hagin, all of Baltimore.

RISKING PEACE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Michael Harrington wrote with perception and courage this week in describing President Nixon's dilemma in Vietnam: We must choose between greater military escalation, with dubious prospects for success, and a coalition arrangement with a substantial risk that a Communist government may ultimately follow:

It is interesting that other writers of quite different political views—like William S. White in a recent column—have come to the same conclusion as Harrington. The article follows:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 1, 1969]

VIETNAM: RISK THAT MUST BE TAKEN

(By Michael Harrington)

Richard Nixon must negotiate a peace in Vietnam which will risk a Viet Cong victory. That is, American power must insist that the National Liberation Front participate in the government or in organizing any new elections.

I do not suggest the possibility of a Communist takeover which such a policy entails with any enthusiasm or in the mood of those antiwar demonstrators who carry Viet Cong flags (are some of them, I wonder, government provocateurs sent in to embarrass the peace movement?). It would indeed be tragic if, after a quarter of a century of civil war, the South Vietnamese people were to be subjected to totalitarian dictatorship. But that melancholy possibility has to be faced, particularly since American policy has done so much to promote it.

Ever since 1950, when the French convinced Washington to finance its disastrous attempt to maintain the old order in Indochina the United States has been identified in that country with the colonialist past.

There was a brief period in the early days of Diem, who at least had nationalist credentials, when it seemed possible to build a genuinely democratic, socially progressive nation, particularly since Ho Chi Minh was brutally repressing the peasants in the North (they resisted forced collectivization). But Diem quickly became an unpopular minority ruler, and his police measures drove the opposition, Communist and non-Communist, into military struggle.

From that time to the present, the United States has been trying to put together a regime composed of the old friends of colonialism in Vietnam. So it is that "our" men in Saigon are generals who fought for the French against the freedom of their own homeland. That does not make it difficult to understand why they could not even win a majority in an election which they themselves organized.

It is this sad history which explains why Richard Nixon must feel that he is caught on the horns of a dilemma. The United States cannot win a war in which it has driven the nationalist forces into a united front with the Communists or to a bitter neutralism, and it has to be fearful of a peace which would accurately represent the various political tendencies in Vietnam. For the latter alternative would inevitably subvert the present Saigon regime and quite possibly open the way to a Viet Cong seizure of power.

So the issue really gets down to the question: Will the United States guarantee a peace which will recognize the Viet Cong's right to participate in the political life of South Vietnam?

This is not to say that the Viet Cong would inevitably win a popular mandate or carry out a coup after American troops are withdrawn. South Vietnam is a complex, highly political society, and outsiders—particularly four-star generals and secretaries of defense—have a woeful record in predicting what will happen in that country. Nevertheless, I believe that those who oppose this tragic war must accept the possibility that any peace which the Viet Cong will accept will run the risk of a Communist victory.

But what, then, of America's responsibility to the South Vietnamese who believed our promises? For even though I do not believe we ever should have made those promises when we wrongly supported the French and then tried to build our own client state in Saigon, they impose duties upon us. And what of the American dead?

These obligations do exist. But so do obligations to the people of Vietnam who have suffered the greatest casualties; to the people of the world who have seen the hopes of ending the cold war deferred by the conflict in Southeast Asia; and to the poor of America who have borne the greatest burden of a war which vitiated the struggle against poverty and destroyed the Great Society.

In short, there are contradictory rights and duties in Vietnam. Moreover, I can see no real honor to the American dead, or security for the Vietnamese still living, in the continuation of this horrible war. That would mean, the Joint Chiefs of Staff told Lyndon Johnson last spring, an additional 200,000 Americans. In the unlikely event that this grisly gamble won, the United States will have imposed an unpopular government upon a stricken society. And failure would mean one more excuse for further escalation.

In 1956 when the Hungarians rose up, this country rightly and tragically did not give military support to their magnificent cause because that would have threatened World War III. In Vietnam today there is no question of a democratic revolutionary movement, as in Budapest in '56, but of a minority supported by, but arrogant toward, American might.

That is why, even more so than in the Hungarian case, we must chance a Communist victory which we helped make a possibility. All the other alternatives, internationally and domestically, are intolerable.

Nixon must recognize Viet Cong participation in the future government of South Vietnam. He must risk peace.

DIGNITY OF EISENHOWER FUNERAL CAPTURED BY MEDIA

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, since March 28, 1969, the Nation, through the television and radio networks, has been able to share in and be a part of the dignified and solemn ceremonies following the death of our beloved Dwight David Eisenhower.

The general was truly a man of the people, and through the fine efforts of the broadcast media, the people were able to share throughout the days of mourning, the warmth of his personality.

Dignity and taste best describe the manner in which this last tribute was carried out. Dignity and taste also describe the way in which these days of mourning were reported to the Nation. Television did what it does best—capture a mood with fine camera work and a minimum of commentary. The restraint which the newsmen on the scene exercised was laudable, and realistic, since the participants and the observers were not listening to a flow of words describing the scene. The radio commentary I heard was also excellent—low-keyed, restrained and yet complete.

During those parts of the observances I attended, particularly the eulogy in the Rotunda and the state funeral at the Cathedral, the media were not obtrusive, and I am told the coverage was excellent.

I want to commend both television and radio executives and newsmen and technicians for their thoughtful presentation of the events of these sad days. That their excellence allowed the Nation which loved Dwight Eisenhower to participate in his funeral is to their credit. The Nation is grateful.

GEN. DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I join with the people of this Nation and the people of the world in mourning the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower. Men of peace and goodwill have lost a true champion of their cause.

First as a soldier, then as Supreme Commander of Allied Forces during World War II, and finally as the 34th President of the United States, General Eisenhower served his country in war and in peace and he served it well.

Though General Eisenhower rose to fame as the commander of the largest fighting force ever assembled, he will be remembered by the people of the world as a soldier of peace. He knew, more than any man, the havoc war wreaks on both mankind and nations. Because of this awareness of the tragedy of war, he strove diligently during his Presidency to erase this ugly menace from the world.

"Ike" represented America at its best. He was a man of great moral courage, and he possessed an overwhelming sense of duty. But more importantly he believed in the basic goodness of his country and of mankind.

At this time, when many are questioning the fundamental values of our country, we have only to look to this great man for inspiration and strength. We shall always be grateful for his many outstanding and wonderful contributions toward making this a better world in which to live.

NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO.'S EXCELLENT DOCUMENTARY ON POLLUTION

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the National Broadcasting Co. has performed an outstanding public service when it aired over its NBC radio network recently an excellent documentary on the growing problem of pollution in America.

I am pleased to place the script of this production in the Record today. It was written and produced by Harry Mantel of Chicago's WMAQ, and I am sure we can all agree Mr. Mantel did an outstanding job of research on this very important subject.

Mr. Mantel and NBC deserve the highest commendation for their timely contribution.

The script follows:

POLLUTION

Dr. Gould. I do not believe the greatest threat to our future is from bombs or guided missiles. I don't think our civilization will die that way. I think it will die when we no longer care, when the spiritual forces that make us wish to be right and noble die in the hearts of men. Arnold Toynbee has pointed out that nineteen of twenty-one civilizations have died from within and not by conquest from without. There were no bands playing and no flags waving when the old civilizations decayed. It happened slowly, in the quiet and the dark, when no one was aware. (Noise.)

Announcer. Second Sunday: "Pollution—How Dangerous?"

Bill Lindsay. Good evening. This is Bill Lindsay, NBC News. Twenty-four years ago American scientists made their first atom bomb, and they expressed their fears for the survival of mankind. Today they have again expressed similar fears, but for a different reason. This was expressed in the eloquent warning by Dr. Lawrence Gould, former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

The world is rapidly becoming overcrowded, and there are many complex, if not lethal problems created by our manner of living. The word "pollution" is an everyday word now. But there are new forms of pollutions combining with old ones that are threatening our survival. There is a world biological crisis. Nations are disturbed over the question: Pollution: how dangerous?

Sverker Astrom. Mr. President, the General Assembly is now beginning a debate on a matter which it seems to the Swedish government in rather direct and critical concern to all peoples on earth. Man has always had to struggle to force a living out of an often hostile natural environment, thereby changing it and undergoing changes himself. Every civilization has indeed been built on and conditioned by the way the natural resources are utilized. We also know that whole civilizations disappeared as a result of mismanagement and misuse of natural resources.

Lindsay. The Swedish Ambassador, Sverker Astrom, in his hour-long statement last December, carefully explained why the United Nations should adopt his country's resolutions. He had called for a world conference on the environment. It was supported by more than forty underdeveloped or developing nations who were afraid that pollution problems would be exported to their countries.

The pollution problems that face Sweden and the developing nations have faced the United States for years. But in the past, only a few of us were concerned about the long-range consequences. To most Americans, factory smoke meant dollars in their pockets. Scientists who made warnings, like that of Ambassador Astrom, were called alarmists.

Dr. Harrison Brown is a renowned geological chemist and a Professor of Science and Government at the California Institute of Technology. Harrison Brown has measured the life-support system of this planet in terms of space, food, steel, coal, sand gravel, and other resources that are needed to support every person on this earth.

Harrison Brown. We have viewed our atmosphere as being a sink into which we can throw everything without having repercussions. We now recognize that our atmosphere is limited from this point of view. We have viewed our rivers as being infinite in size, having infinite capacity to take our trash and our garbage. We now know that that is not true. We have viewed our ocean as being of infinite size. We now know that that is not true. I think we've got to recognize gradually we're learning that in a sense our planet is like a spaceship going around the sun, and that we have a life-support system, and that life-support system consists of our atmosphere, our ocean—they're interacting with each other. And we've got to learn to treat that life-support system properly.

Barry Commoner. I think the significance of the pollution problem is that it constitutes a threat to the survival of man. We sometimes think of pollution as kind of a smelly nuisance, something that makes the eyes smart and so on. But it's really much more than that. The changes that pollution represents in the environment are destroying, I think, the capability of the environment to support human beings or, for that matter, most forms of life. We live in a thin film on the surface of the earth—the soil, the water, and the air. And we have to have the air, water, and soil in order to survive. We have to breathe air that has oxygen in it, we have to drink water, we need water for our industries, we need the soil in proper condition to grow crops.

What's been happening with pollution is that the new technological developments that we've begun to use have changed the environment in such a way as to threaten the stability of the biological systems that make up the environment.

Lindsay. These were the warnings of the Swedish Ambassador to the United Nations and of leading American scientists, the latter, biologist Barry Commoner, author of "Science and Survival." To believe the seriousness of their statements, one should examine the evidence.

Professor Barry Commoner is the director of Washington University's Center for the Biology of Natural Systems. He is concerned about the death of Lake Erie, the two hundred million gallons of raw sewage dumped into the Hudson River every day, the serious pollution of the once-princely Rhine River, the oceans, too, which are becoming polluted, and a very serious water pollution problem that he says will hit this country around 1980.

Commoner. Well, now we have enough information to be able to calculate the growing amount of organic waste that is imposed on our surface water. We can also calculate from experimental data the amount of oxygen that's available to the rivers and lakes of the United States to accommodate organic wastes. And what we now know is that the amount of organic wastes being put into rivers and lakes is increasing. And that its demand for oxygen will equal the total oxygen available in our surface waters somewhere around 1980. In other words, we're heading for a kind of crunch between the wastes that we're putting into our waters and the ability, as expressed through the available oxygen, of these waters to accommodate that waste. And somewhere around 1980, we are going to be producing enough waste to break down the capability of surface waters to purify that waste and organic matter will begin to accumulate in our surface waters, which means that they're going to be pretty smelly, not very good for industrial use or domestic use, and we will have a very serious water pollution problem on the average throughout the country at that point because we will have used up the self-purifying capacity of our water system.

Now, of course, this will be worse in some places and better in others, but this is an average figure, which shows how serious the problem is throughout the country.

Lindsay. American farmers use nitrogen fertilizers extensively. The fertilizers are cheap and produce profitable returns. However, little has been said that the fertilizers have caused about fifty percent of our water pollution problem. It is industry or municipal sewage that still get most or all of the blame, but the nitrogen fertilizers get down to the ground water and wash into the rivers, where it promotes the growth of algae. The algae die, and the organic matter they contain pollutes the surface water. It was recently reported that almost every river in Illinois has reached this eutrophic condition.

This is one of the pollution problems the developing countries wish to avoid, despite the benefits of technology. From a health standpoint, it's even more serious because there might be nitrite poisoning, and blue babies can result if their food and water contains too much nitrate. Dr. Commoner says that well water in a good deal of the central valley of Southern California has reached levels of nitrate from fertilizer that exceed the limits proposed by public health officials. Nitrate is not very harmful in itself, but it can be converted into toxic nitrite by bacteria in the intestines.

Dr. Commoner explains.

Commoner. Nitrite is poisonous because it combines with the hemoglobin in the blood and it prevents the blood from carrying oxygen. This is a particular problem in infants. So, for example, an infant that has diarrhea may have bacteria moving from its intestines into the upper part of its intestinal tract and there it can come in contact with nitrate that might be in drinking water or in the baby's formula, and as a result, the bacteria convert nitrate to nitrite, so the nitrite combines with the blood and you have a blue baby, which has to be treated right away in order to save it from asphyxiation.

This problem has already arisen as a result of feeding infants on formulas made from well water that contain too much nitrate. And in some parts of California, pediatricians have recommended to mothers that they use bottled water instead of well water. Another feature of this problem is that when plants are grown on excessive levels of fertilizer, they may contain enough nitrate in them to cause trouble when fed to infants. This problem has not yet arisen medically in the United States, but in north Germany, a number of cases have been reported by pediatricians of nitrite poisoning which results from feeding children spinach, particularly, which often contains too much nitrate.

Analyses of baby foods in this country and Canada show that the levels of nitrate that occur in these baby foods sometimes get as high as those reported in Germany as causing difficulty, and again, this is a problem we need to look at very carefully because it is likely to get worse if we don't watch the way in which we use nitrogen fertilizer.

Dr. Gould. At the Thanksgiving weekend in 1966, the level had risen beyond emergency and Mayor Lindsay asked everyone to leave Manhattan Island. Fortunately, it was the Thanksgiving weekend, and most of the people had gone away. Even so, five or six hundred deaths occurred from this smog that settled down into the canyon-like streets of that city. And it's estimated that if there had been no holiday, perhaps as many as ten thousand would have died.

Lindsay. Dr. Gould points out that every day chimneys in the United States pour one hundred thousand tons of sulphur dioxide into the air. Motor vehicles add 230,000 tons of carbon monoxide. This air pollution is known too well by city-dwellers who suffer rising rates of lung diseases. But now, modern technology has added new hazards to the air people breathe. Tiny particles of asbestos from building materials. And bits of glass wool from air-conditioning systems that find their way into human lungs. And then, there is the question of how much lead is natural in the modern environment. Five years ago, American scientist Claire Patterson, who is well-known for measuring the age of the earth with lead isotope-tracers, began a series of expeditions to Greenland and Antarctica. There he tunneled hundreds of feet through layers of virginal snow, measuring the industrial lead contamination deposited there by the wind over hundreds of years—industrial lead from the world's smelters and car exhausts.

Claire Patterson. We calculate that about one hundred times more lead is in our bodies than were in our prehistoric ancestors'. I'm an avid foe of lead pollution, and in this regard I am also, therefore, on the other side of the fence from lead industries. We are opponents, and we are antagonists. For example, I feel that children living in urban areas near freeways, for example, just to take this case, are being irreparably damaged. Their nervous systems in their bodies are being irreparably damaged from fumes, from the lead in the fumes coming from automobile exhausts.

Roy Neal. What are the effects of lead concentration on the human body? What does it do?

Patterson. Well, the concentration of lead in a typical American today is about two-tenths of a part per million. That means out of a million parts of a man's blood, two-tenths of those million parts is lead. Now, the concentration as it has been observed experimentally, the concentration of lead in a person's blood changes. It increases as the input of lead increases. As you intake food that's contaminated with lead, the lead level of your blood goes up. And then while this—now the leads enters the body from the intestines, and it goes through what's called the portal blood system, it goes through the liver, and then it goes throughout the whole body.

Most of the lead is excreted in the feces, but part of the lead that gets through the intestinal wall and into the body and into the blood, part of that is stored in the bone, and part of that is excreted in the urine. Now, as I say, we today, the average person has about two-tenths of a part per million lead in our blood. I think, as a geochemist, and looking at the trace metals, the other trace metals in the biosphere, in soils and plants and animals and so on, and comparing those with lead, I believe that we should have about one percent of that amount of lead in our bodies.

Lindsay. The US Public Health Service claims that Norway, with low air pollution, has half the lung cancer of the United States. But does this mean that air pollution is a direct cause of lung cancer? This debate came up during a surgical operation in a Chicago hospital recently. The patient, a young medical student, was undergoing mediastinoscopy, a relatively new diagnostic procedure for lung cancer. The surgery is considered minor, and in no way was the patient's life endangered during debate between the lady anesthesiologist and the non-operating doctor spokesman.

Woman. In the incidence of respiratory diseases in New York City, now it's true you can make the same correlation with drinking pop, there may be the same increase—incidence. But people who are working with a disease, it seems to me that although it isn't foolproof yet, believed that one of the causes for increased incidence of bronchitis and general resistance to infectious disease. In other words, a patient has an infectious lung disease. If it weren't—if a lung were healthy, he might be up and around in a few days. Because the lungs are less healthy because of air pollution, the person may end up in the hospital with a chronic respiratory disease. Now I feel that there's a correlation indirectly this way.

Man. I can't but agree with you.

Woman. This means that air pollution is very important in lung diseases, even though there is no established connection between cause of a specific disease.

Man. Well, we'd have to say even more than lung diseases, because since the body defenses requires adequate oxygen content to the entire—all the tissues, then one might even say the same about other diseases ouside of the chest, but the resistance to this disease would be decreased by poor lungs.

Woman. I just appreciate being on this project, because I feel that air pollution is a firm subject that most people are very easy not to pay attention to. It's very easy to get up and go to work and pretend that the health of the nation is not suffering from air pollution, and I didn't want the fact that there isn't a direct cause and effect to think, well, we don't have to worry about air pollution. I think it's important that as part of this discussion, since we've discussed air pollution, that we include the fact that it's terribly important in the health mechanisms.

(Man speaks off mike, laughter).

Woman. It's very important as a health mechanism in terms of general resistance to disease.

Man. One of the things that should be mentioned here, although we're taking all the precautions of sterility, we generally do not try to talk during an operation. We try to make—because there are all sorts of questions, there are all sorts of questions of memory to the patient related to the consideration of the problem of sterility. I'd like to say that as we're getting the rest of these nodes out, it appears to be more and more like sarcoidosis (?). An early sarcoidosis. Sarcoidosis is non-cancer, is that right?

Man. That's right.

Man. Just two years ago, we found DDT in penguins and seals in Antarctica. We know that must have come from thousands and thousands of miles away because none of it has ever been used anywhere near Antarctica. We know it must have come by water, because we have been unable to find any traces of it in the snows that cover the vast continent.

Lindsay. Dr. Gould's warning on DDT was echoed by Ambassador Astrom's in his argument that the United Nations must hold a world conference on the environment. Ambassador Astrom pointed to the ecological disturbances brought about by man. These can lead to and have led to, he said, extinction of whole species of fish and other marine organisms, thereby causing severe strains on the food situation in the world. DDT, he said, poses a direct threat to the life of oceanic plankton and algae, for which global oxygen depends largely. And, he added, DDT can be detected in the body fat and nervous tissues of all living beings, including man.

The short-term benefits of the long-term problem of pesticide pollution was discussed by three young scientists associated with Professor Commoner in St. Louis.

Man. You say that the cotton that's grown in the United States is not native to here.

Man. No, it isn't.

Man. Where is it from?

Man. It is native. . . .

Man. To the Middle East.

Man. To the Middle East, yes.

Man. I see. So then the boll weevil isn't native to the United States.

Man. No, the boll weevil came in through Mexico in around 1898, I think. Something like that.

Man. I see. So if you stopped growing cotton for one year or for two years, the boll weevil would not have any other plant that it could eat, and it would die.

Man. That's right. That would probably solve the major insect problem in Southern cotton.

Man. How do you think the money spent on pesticides compares to, say, one year's crop. If you skip one year out of five, would that be more expensive than the present spraying of chemicals to control the boll weevil.

Man. That's very difficult to answer, but when you consider that the entire pesticide business in this country runs to about two billion dollars a year, I would say that it would probably be very close.

Man. And the biggest use of pesticides is on this cotton in the South.

Man. Two-thirds of all the pesticides used in North America are used on Southern cotton, yes.

Man. That's almost one and a half billion dollars, isn't it?

Man. Yes.

Man. How important is the cotton that's grown in the South?

Man. From a standpoint of manufacturing cotton fabrics, it's not important at all. Most of it is bought—purchased by the government, stored in warehouses, and then eventually shipped to overseas countries.

Man. Do you have any idea how much the value of this cotton is annually?

Man. No, I really haven't.

Man. I mean, this is just not very good cotton, then, all these chemicals.

Man. It's a very poor-quality cotton that fabric-makers in this country just refuse to use. They use it for—some of it is used for stuffing mattresses and making very, very rough kinds of fabric, but not much of it.

Man. So this huge global pollution problem stems from the spraying of poisonous chemicals on useless cotton.

Man. That's what it amounts to, yes.

Man. That is really fantastic.

Lindsay. One of the young scientists at Dr. Commoner's environmental center in St. Louis is 27-year-old Sheldon Novick. He has written a book, "Careless Atom", which was published a few days ago by the same company that put out the late Rachel Carson's book, "Silent Spring" in 1963. Like Miss Carson, when she warned of the indiscriminate use of chemical sprays, Novick also believes that the public should know what is happening in the expanding nuclear power industry. He is concerned with the problem of safety and cites examples of mishaps, problems of insurance, radiation damage, and a new pollution problem—radioactive wastes, all from nuclear power reactors in this country. It is reactors like these we intend to export to the developing nations. Novick claims that many within the Atomic Energy Commission share his concern.

Sheldon Novick. I wouldn't say that I have more information than the Atomic Energy Commission; I certainly don't. Most of the information I have, I think, probably comes from them and their publications. I am more concerned than many of them seem to be, and I can't even guess as to why they are officially not as concerned as I. I should think they would be. I know that many individuals within the commission and on its staff and in its various advisory bodies are as concerned as I, and they have expressed these views in private. It would be good if some of them would express their views in public.

Lindsay. It is doubtful that any one of the pollutants we've talked about is actually a killer at their present levels. Federal laws do guard their permissible limits. However, scientists are continually warning that we are producing a new strain upon biological life, that we must think about the total and not just the part. For no one actually knows the effects of all the pollutants combined from air, water, soils, lead, radiation, and thermal pollution. There is also noise pollution, which presents both emotional and physical problems.

If there is an experiment unlocking this question, it may be going on now in man himself. For probably he is the guinea pig himself but doesn't know it. To probe the total effects of pollutants, we turn to a distinguished Professor of Environmental Medicine at Mount Sinai School of Medicine, of New York University, Dr. Irving Selikoff.

Irving Selikoff. The question has been raised, and I think, justifiably, that there may be a very important potential problem with such things as widespread low-level radiation or the widespread contamination of air and soil with lead. It's justifiable, absolutely so, to point to these potential problems rather than wait for their description in terms of human disease which may not come about for many years. Now, some people will say that we have no knowledge that there actually will be such disease effects. That's true. But I don't think we can take the chance that therefore control of such potential hazards is unjustifiable.

I have another reason for suggesting such controls. And that is that we are beginning to understand that there may be an additive effect of many different substances. In other words, the total body burden of environmental contaminants may be important. There may not be enough lead in itself to cause difficulties. There may not be enough benz-pyrine (?) from coal soot to be a problem. There may not be enough carbon monoxide to in itself be a problem, from automobile exhaust. There may not be enough radiation exposure to in itself be a problem. But the sum of all these, the total body burden of these environmental hazards, may be significant and, indeed, we may eventually see diseases that we don't even begin to understand at this time and too, the sum total of these various low level contaminants, each in itself not very important, may be to generally shorten life. And this is something that we are beginning to study at this time.

Announcer. Second Sunday: "Pollution—How Dangerous?" continues after a ten-second pause for station identification.

Lindsay. What are we in the United States doing about the total effects of all pollutions on living things, especially humans? There is much being done, and yet there is very little being done. It depends on the way you look at the amount of money and labor that are being spent on research and legislation. Government bureaucracy has prevented one single agency from having total responsibility over water, air, land, radiation, thermal, noise, and pesticide pollution. Instead, the recent Air Quality Act, once its regional standards are approved, will be enforced by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The recently approved regional standards of the Water Quality Act are being enforced by the Department of the Interior. If there were any standards nationwide for radioactive wastes, then by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Last Thursday in the Congress Senator Frank Moss of Utah re-introduced his bill to bring the scattered agencies that guard the nation's land and water resources under a single boss, a Cabinet Secretary running a single Department of Natural Resources. Senator Moss says that unless there is a single executive department there cannot be full coordination of the presently fragmented agencies that guard the nation's health and its resources.

Senator Edmund Muskie is also holding hearings on his proposal to form a select senate committee on technology and the human environment. This would be a study committee only, not a legislative body. It would bring scientists into the Congress for the first time as consultants only, not as lawmakers. In Washington, one might say as a gag there is concern over pollution, but it is not coordinated.

The same fear of Big Brother regulating the low-cost nitrogen fertilizers on the farm is also found in the case of controversial pesticides. However, a close check is kept on the manufacture of pesticides through an effective system of guidelines as explained to NBC reporter Russ Ward by a leading Agriculture Department expert on pollution, Kenneth Walker.

Russ Ward. Mr. Walker, you say these guidelines are effective, and yet last April an Arizona dairy cooperative took out a full-page newspaper ad protesting what it called the uncontrolled use of DDT because of the losses it was suffering in terms of milk that simply didn't pass federal standards. There's been—the American Beekeeping Foundation complained to the Agriculture Department last year that it was suffering losses. There have been complaints made by salmon hatcheries in the state of Michigan complaining about pesticides being carried through the waterways and creating losses. If we have effective guidelines, how do we account for the complaints that come in to the Agriculture Department?

Kenneth Walker. The guidelines that I referred to just a moment ago are registration guidelines. They are guidelines that require certain information be furnished to prove that the material is safe and effective when used as directed. The federal government does not regulate the use of the material in the sense that they tell the farmer, the homeowner, whoever is using the material, that he must or you must not do something.

Ward. It's a user violation rather than a manufacturing violation, is that correct?

Walker. Yes. Violation may be a little strong. In the case of the dairy incident that you mentioned, some of this we believe was due to drift when the material was applied, say, by aircraft. The particle size is very small, this material is very light, and it carries quite a distance.

Man. This is what I mean when I say mankind is on a collision course with disaster. I don't see any prospect that in the next few years we are going to bring into balance the population with the food resources of the earth. We forget that we live on planet earth, which is limited. There is only a limited quantity of air, a limited quantity of water, a limited quantity of soil. The air you and I are breathing right now is air that Socrates and Darwin and all others have breathed before us. The water you drank in your coffee this morning may have been the water that flowed down the Delaware when Hudson crossed it.

You see from the beginning of time there has been a recycling. Creatures that lived before us produced wastes, including their own corpses. These were degraded or decayed biologically by nature and reused by other forms of life. This is what I mean now when I say man is the dirtiest creature ever to inhabit the earth because he is the first creature that has and continues to produce wastes which are not destroyed, which are not recycled. The glass bottle, the aluminum beer tin are practically indestructible. They'll last as long as the Parthenon or the pyramids.

Lindsay. The director of the population center at the University of Chicago, Philip Hauser says nothing indicates that population can be slowed down in its race with economic development in Asia, Latin America, and Africa, where developing nations contain two-thirds of the total population of the world. But Professor Hauser points out that present rates of world population growth could not possibly have been sustained over any long period in the past nor could they persist for very long into the future.

Philip Hauser. Since present rates of world population growth cannot possibly persist, it is clear that we will have population control. The only question is, whether control will be that imposed by nature or by man, and if by man, whether control will be rational and relatively defensible or completely irrational and indefensible. If the control is imposed by nature nature would use of course the weapons of famine and pestilence as discussed by Malthus. If the control comes through man, the irrational and indefensible methods could include war, which incidentally, with the hydrogen bomb, for the first time offers the possibility of population control. Up until the hydrogen bomb, the military were really quite inept and inefficient and ineffective in controlling population growth. But the hydrogen bomb does hold forth some prospect for control.

The second irrational and indefensible method, in my judgment, would of course be homosexuality, which studies show is never accompanied by a very high birth rate. And the third, which has much to commend it, because of its beautiful symmetry, is cannibalism, because under this method the population would go down as the food supply increased, and various points of equilibrium could be decided upon, depening on various factors involved. Now, obviously, I'm not advocating these methods. But I am serious in calling attention to the fact that they are not beyond the realm of possibility if more rational and desirable methods are not effected.

Lindsay. Ambassador Astrom warned the UN General Assembly that all efforts should be encouraged to reduce or to eliminate the harmful side effects of large-scale application of modern technology. One of the primary purposes of the world conference on the environment, he said, should be to enable the developing countries to avoid making the same ecological mistakes. One good example is the high dam at Aswan in Egypt, which was designed to produce power and to store up water in Lake Nasser to supply irrigation canals.

As the new lake fills up, it is clear to biologists that water hyacinths are evaporating much of the water that enters Lake Nasser each year. The Egyptian government is considering introducing a 300-pound sea cow, manatee, to the lake to destroy the hyacinths. But not enough progress has been made on the animal's husbandry.

Another serious problem at Lake Nasser is the disastrous spread of the disease schistosomiasis. It is reported that nearly all of the people living in the irrigated region have this debilitating disease, which is spread by snails in the irrigation water. The water is used by people for drinking and for discharging their human wastes, which contain the parasitic eggs. The only medication is toxic to humans.

Astrom. Mr. President, let me sum up. Man depends for his survival on an infinitely complex system of relationships and balances between innumerable living organisms, all existing in or on the extremely thin crust of the earth or just above it. The system has a remarkable capacity for adaptation and regeneration. But nature's patience has a limit. Indiscriminate and uncontrolled use of modern technology indispensable as such technology is for economic and social progress may set trends in motion which lead to unforeseen harmful effects in unexpected places.

Many of these effects are irreversible. Even if we avoid the risk of blowing up the planet, we may, by changing its face, unwittingly be parties to the process with the same fatal outcome. It seems, therefore, that a broad consideration of the environmental problems and our possible approaches to their solution is of equal interest to all peoples on earth. The United Nations provides a unique forum for such consideration.

Mr. President, there are many issues on which the members of the United Nations are divided and deeply divided. On the issue now before the General Assembly we are hopefully all united, if there is ultimately a question of collective self-preservation. I thank you, Mr. President.

Lindsay. The resolution for a world conference on the environment was passed by the General Assembly unanimously, after other statements were heard from Nigeria, Pakistan, Canada, and Romania. More than fifty nations had drafted the resolution. The conference will be held in 1972, the first calendar opening, permitting the nations sufficient time to assemble their scientific thinking. The conference can find solutions to the pollution problem, if the nations work out the difficult economics of coming to terms with nature. They must. As Rachel Carson has said with taste, sensitivity, and imagination, man is a part of nature, and his war against nature is inevitably a war against himself.

Last November, a group of concerned citizens met together one evening in a lecture hall at the University of Chicago campus. They were the local chapter of the American Meteorological Society, and their guest speaker was Laura Fermi, an elderly brilliant lady, distinguished author and widow of the atomic pioneer Enrico Fermi.

Laura Fermi. I am here as a member of the Cleaner Air Committee of Hyde Park and Kenwood just to give an example—oh, I see a member of our committee down there, Mrs. Ann Sykes, if I did something wrong, there will be an attack on me. To tell you a little what a group of citizens can do, the Cleaner Air Committee organized in the spring of 1959 was organized by a group of housewives who were concerned about dirt. Looking in retrospect, the main feature seems to me what our ignorance was at that time. We—our motivation was simply dirt and the frustration of having to fight a losing battle against the dirt every day. Of the health hazards of air pollution we knew only the one that got us tired. We were always tired because we had so much cleaning to do. When we went to Alderman DePres to ask what could be done, we were very surprised to find that there was a Department of Air Pollution Control, that to him dirt was not dirt but air pollution and that an ordinance had just been passed and was going to go into effect within, I think, one month of the time we were talking to him. And he said you should help the department in getting the ordinance enforced.

So, feeling so ignorant, we went around and sought information. We visited the Department of Air Pollution Control, the Armour Research that was doing the measurements of dirt—dust fall all over the city. We talked with people from coal and iron firms, with building managers, doctors, the head of the local janitors' union.

Lindsay. Chicago air probably would be a lot filthier than it is today had Mrs. Fermi's group not taken their stand ten years ago. But it still is reported to be the second dirtiest in the country. The sulphurous, noxious air, along with other reasons, made Dr. Henry Collins, a university lecturer, flee Chicago with his wife and children to Sydney, Australia just one month ago.

Maquarie University, on the outskirts of Sydney, Australia, is so new they're still building it. It's rising against a background of fields and gum trees. There's fresh air to spare. The birds sing.

Man. Doctor, why did you leave Chicago?

Collins. For one thing, you could mention the languour of air pollution that is especially bad in the fall and in the spring. I could mention the inflation which was gradually getting ever more heavily felt by me because of the expenses of my growing family. I could also mention the racial tensions which broke out in serious riots during the last several summers right near my home on the West Side of Chicago. But to tell you the truth, the thing that made me most afraid and most downcast was the unwillingness of my friends in Chicago, people whom I knew very well, the people next door in fact, who refused to recognize that there were problems.

For example, I know many people who in the same breath will say that they have never smelled or never seen the air pollution and who will also go on to say that they take pride in not seeing it or not smelling it. In plain language, there's an underlying attitude, an unwillingness to face problems which to me seem to indicate that current problems, no matter how bad, would continue to get worse.

Tom Lehrer. (Singing) Just go out for a breath of air, And you'll be ready for Medicare.

The city streets are really quite a thrill—If the hoods don't get you, the monoxide will. Pollution, pollution, You can use the latest toothpaste and then rinse your mouth with industrial waste.

Lindsay. How far have we come since this satire was recorded in an American nightclub in 1965?

If we just look at it or just talk about pollution, without doing something about it, then another civilization will probably die from within and not by conquest from without.

Announcer. This has been Second Sunday: "Pollution—How Dangerous?" Reporter, Bill Lindsay. Field reporters, Lionel Hudson, Jay Miller, Roy Neal, and Russ Ward. Technical supervisor, Harry Dinaso. Director, Bob Sprentall. Producer, Harry Mantel.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S MAGNIFICENT EULOGY TO IKE

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the comments of the distinguished, patriotic and dedicated American philanthropist H. L. Hunt concerning the beautiful eulogy to former President Eisenhower by President Nixon in the Capitol Rotunda on March 31, 1969, are particularly timely. I believe they are deserving of consideration by all readers of the Record.

The comments by H. L. Hunt follow:

President Nixon's unparalleled eulogy of the late President Eisenhower was truly magnificent. While his words were clearly spoken for no other reason than to express what he and a grieving nation felt for a good man and a good leader, the impact of his oratory, the depth of his feeling and the warmth with which he expressed what he and the nation felt, will doubtless have the effect of raising his popularity rating of 60% in March to at least 70%.

In addition to enhancing the President's popularity noticeably in the polls, his words, spoken with such feeling, are also quite likely to have the effect of setting back the cause of crime and rioting which have been at least sympathetically tolerated, if not actually encouraged, by members of the Administrations of Mr. Nixon's predecessors and a vast number now in government.

In his masterful eulogy, Mr. Nixon literally grasped the mind of America and turned it, for 16 minutes, upon itself. Through a departed soldier of the Republic, he did something that is almost never done: the President reminded us of what is good about Republic USA. Sad though the nation was at the loss of a beloved man, who declared that "I am from the heart of America," refreshed it assuredly was at the convincing words of a man at the helm, that "America is Okay!"

H. L. Hunt.

TWO STATE SOLDIERS, MARINE ARE KILLED IN VIETNAM WAR

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Thomas M. Deitz, Sp4c. Roger L. Garlick, and L. Cpl. Ronald B. Cassell, three fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the Record:

Two State Soldiers, Marine Are Killed in Vietnam War

A Marine corporal from Baltimore, an Army sergeant from Perry Hall and an Army specialist fourth class from Oakland, are the latest Marylanders to die in the Vietnam war, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Killed were:

Sgt. Thomas M. Deitz, son of Mr. and Mrs. Lewis M. Deitz of 4209 Penn Avenue, Perry Hill.

Spec. 4 Roger L. Garlick, husband of Mrs. Loula M. Garlick, of Oakland.

Lance Cpl. Ronald B. Cassell, son of Mr. and Mrs. Lee R. Cassell, of 8165 Park Haven road, Baltimore.

Corporal Cassell, who was 20, died March 21 in Da Nang from wounds he suffered three days earlier during an enemy mortar attack in Quang Nam province.

Corporal Cassell, who was attached to the 3d Battalion of the 1st Marine Division, was assigned to helicopter crews assisting in the evacuation of wounded and the ferrying in of supplies to field troops.

A graduate of Patapsco Senior High School, he was an active committee member of the Hut teen center during his high school years. He enlisted in the Marine Corps in March, 1968.

His mother said her son wrote that he felt South Vietnam "was too beautiful a country to be torn up" by the war.

Besides his parents, he is survived by an older brother, Robert L. Cassell, of Essex, and a sister, Mrs. Toni Hedge, of Plymouth, Mich.

Sergeant Deitz, 21, was accidentally killed March 18 when his own troops mistook him for the enemy.

He was graduated from Perry Hall Senior High School in June, 1966, and worked on a factory assembly line until he enlisted in the Army in July, 1967. A year later, he was sent to Vietnam.

He was a squad leader in charge of a rifle team. His mother said yesterday: "He was a good soldier, a good leader, liked by all his men."

Besides his parents, he is survived by two sisters, Margie L. Deitz, who attends the University of Maryland, and Barbara L. Deitz.

EULOGY OF DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, there is little one can add to the many magnificent tributes which have already been paid to our distinguished former President, Dwight D. Eisenhower. His leadership at a time of great danger to the free world is a matter of history and his place in it is secure.

One of the most memorable events of my career in Congress took place several years ago when I and several of my colleagues were invited to General Eisenhower's farm in Gettysburg for an afternoon visit. We conferred with the former President, viewed his beautiful farm and were taken on a guided tour of the Gettysburg battlefield. I could not help but think that here was a five-star general, former President of the United States, willingly taking the time from his heavy schedule to welcome a few freshman Congressmen to his farm, personally guiding us through the historic battlefield and giving us the benefit of his wisdom and knowledge.

I do wish to pay my respects to this great statesman. We have suffered a great loss in his passing but freedom will continue to live in the world because Dwight David Eisenhower lived and defended it.

Mr. Speaker, General Eisenhower's passing was the subject of an editorial eulogy published March 29, 1969, by the Saratogian newspaper of Saratoga Springs, N.Y. I would like to share this exceptional expression with my colleagues:

IKE WAS THERE

If the essential greatness of Dwight David Eisenhower could be summed up in one-word epitaph, it would be simply: "Ike."

Here was the professional soldier who rose from relative obscurity at the beginning of the greatest war in history to supreme command of the greatest assemblage of armies in history; who later served his country for eight years in the highest position of responsibility any man can attain.

Yet he was always "Ike."

Looking back from the turbulent present, the years of the Eisenhower administration seem calm and stable. They were not, but if they seemed so then as well as now, it was only because of the presence of this immensely popular president in the White House. There was something about this uncommonly common man that inspired confidence and unshakable faith that no matter how beset the nation was by crisis and challenges, nothing dire would happen as long as Ike was there.

Beset the nation was:

Those were the years when the cold war was really frigid; when a man named Khrushchev came to power in Russia to strut the world's stage for a time with his rhetoric of nuclear diplomacy and ballistic blackmail; when a man named Ho Chi Minh was mauling the French in Indochina; when a man Joe McCarthy was finding Communists in every State Department closet and setting neighbor suspiciously against neighbor; when a man named Faubus in Little Rock, Ark., was fomenting the gravest federal crisis since the Civil War; when a U.S. vice president was being spat upon in South America; when the world hovered on the edge of Armageddon as war broke out in the Middle East; when freedom-loving men everywhere agonized as Hungary was ground under the heel; when the nation plunged briefly into its worst recession since the 1930s; when Americans indulged in an orgy of self-doubt because Russia had launched something into space called a Sputnik; when words like "agonizing reappraisal," "brinkmanship," "U-2," "summit" and "missile gap" became part of the vocabulary of reproach against the administration.

Yet they seemed like calm years, because Ike was there.

Now the general has lost his last battle, after besting the scythe-bearer in encounter after encounter. He went down fighting, he surrendered reluctantly. More than that can be asked of no soldier.

The Eisenhower years are still too close for historians to be able to give us a balanced and dispassionate summary. The full figure of Dwight D. Eisenhower as president and elder statesman remains to be limned by a future generation.

Of one thing we can be certain, however:

If, in their study of this man, his life and his accomplishments, Americans of the future can come at all close to knowing him as his contemporaries did, they will call him "Ike."

JOSEPH B. RIDDER DAY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in these days when the press of the United States is under attack, I take great pleasure in rising to praise the press, not to attempt to bury it. In particular I would like to praise Joseph B. Ridder, publisher of the San Jose Mercury & News.

It truly has been said the press of the United States is the mirror in which we see ourselves daily. Sadly, sometimes we do not like what we see, and even more sadly, some of us when faced with ugly truths, try to blame the reporting agency, instead of facing the truth. Despite this unpleasant fact of today's life, Joseph B. Ridder, and the staffs of his newspapers often have braved the wrath of their readers in the printing of uncomfortable truths. A case in point is the campaign Mr. Ridder and the Mercury & News have waged against the use and abuse of drugs in Santa Clara County. In this area they have demonstrated their determination to fully explore and to offer answers to this unfortunate and unpleasant side of our society. The stories by Sam Hanson, education writer of the Mercury & News, and by other staff members, spelled out not only the depth and breadth of the problem, but in the finest tradition of crusading American journalism, were part of the solution, not part of the problem.

I would also like to mention other areas in which Mr. Ridder has played a constructive role, including the articles on delays in payment and overcharging of medicare recipients, the series of articles on the financial problems of Cal Expo, the continuing fight against air and water pollution, and Mr. Ridder's continuing successful effort to keep their 220,000 daily customers fully informed on international, national, and local news. It is here I would like to express my personal thanks not only to Mr. Ridder, but to the individual reporters and editors, who have so much to do with the quality of the newspapers.

Mr. Ridder's efforts to improve the Santa Clara Valley have not been restricted to his journalist efforts. He has served well the University of Santa Clara as a member of its board of regents, he has worked to improve and enlarge the Triton Museum, he is serving as chairman of the Medical Research and Equipment Fund of Santa Clara County, and he has been and remains an active leader in civic and community efforts to improve the quality of life in the Santa Clara Valley.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the City Council of Santa Clara in celebrating "Joseph B. Ridder Day" on April 11, 1969, and have introduced in the Congress the following resolution:

H.J. RES. 361

Whereas the Congress of the United States wishes officially to recognize the achievements of Joseph B. Ridder, publisher of the San Jose Mercury and News in informing the adults and youth of Santa Clara Valley of the use and abuse of drugs; and

Whereas Joseph B. Ridder and the San Jose Mercury and News through a series of articles outlined the extent and depth of drug problems not only in the Santa Clara Valley but throughout the Nation; and

Whereas he and his newspapers have continued in their information programs not only on the subject of drugs but also on many other vital and important topics; and

Whereas Joseph B. Ridder, his newspapers and reporters including Sam Hanson, education writer have been cited by the Governor of the State of California for their efforts and fight in what the Governor terms "the menace facing the younger generation through the use and abuse of drugs"; and

Whereas Joseph B. Ridder through his activities as a member of the Inter-American Press Association and the International Press Association and as a board member of the Inter-American Press Association has helped spread the American concept of freedom of the press worldwide; and

Whereas for this positive effort and for his many other important contributions to community development, the Santa Clara City Council has declared April 11, 1969 Joseph B. Ridder Day; now therefore be it

Resolved by the United States Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, That the Congress and people of the United States extend their sincere appreciation to Joseph B. Ridder, his newspaper and staff.

SEC. 2. The 11th day of April 1969 is designated as Joseph B. Ridder Day in his honor and in the honor of the efforts of his newspapers and staff.

EULOGY TO PRESIDENT DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, a time of sorrow has again blanketed our Nation. The loss of Dwight David Eisenhower touches the hearts of many individuals not only in America but throughout the free world and inspires the emotions of people everywhere who cherish freedom.

I had the pleasure and privilege of meeting President Eisenhower on many occasions. Dwight Eisenhower exemplified compassion, dedication, and integrity. His charismatic personality and distinguished character promoted respect and admiration in practically everyone he met.

Dwight Eisenhower fought for freedom for all people and made tremendous gains. His biggest battle, however, was lost to time.

Words cannot truly express our heartfelt condolences to Mrs. Eisenhower and family. I am thankful for being able to bear witness to the era of Dwight David Eisenhower for he was an inspiration to all of us.

INTRODUCTION TO A TRANSCRIPT OF A MEETING BETWEEN POOR PEOPLE OF BEAUFORT AND JASPER COUNTIES, S.C., AND REPRESENTATIVE ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, some 50 residents of Beaufort and Jasper Counties, S.C., met with representatives of the Agriculture Department. That same day they presented some 2 hours of testimony about conditions facing poor people in their home counties to several Congressmen. This testimony again underscores, among other things, the enormous deficiencies of the food stamp program as it is set up.

The broader aspects of the hunger problem in America are coming to be generally understood, thanks in large measure to the great efforts of Senator McGovern and his subcommittee. But I think this testimony is of special import and value. It gives a striking picture of what faces valiant people trying to eke out an existence while trapped in a pocket of rural poverty, and sheds valuable light on details and specifics of how best to change current practices and programs.

I think it is time the Congress gave its first priority to the consideration of the problems highlighted in these statements. It is clear that the Agriculture Department feels it cannot meet the challenge of malnutrition and hunger under existing legislation.

Among the problems are:

Eligibility levels in the free stamp program—$20 a month for a family of up to three, and $30 per month for a family of four or more—are so low as to make a high percentage of poor families inelgible.

The average poor family spends a higher percentage of its income for stamps than the average U.S. family spends for food—17 percent.

The poor have little or no control over their own programs and, particularly in the South, are frequently stymied by unresponsive administrators.

The great question emerging from testimony like this remains: how much longer will some Americans go hungry while others are paid not to grow food and still others spend many of their waking hours worrying about dieting? I can think of no problem that should more urgently commend itself to the conscience of this body.

The transcript of a meeting with Beaufort County welfare rights organization members follows:

Meeting With Beaufort County Welfare Rights Organization Members

Mrs. Hazel Frazier, (Chairman, Beaufort County Welfare Rights Organization). I was born and raised in Beaufort. Our problem is nutrition, and the food stamp program, I may add, is not effective. For families which make $3,000 or less a year, the children are eligible for the school lunch and clothing program. Why not let those same families be eligible for free food stamps? Thirty dollars a month or less for a family of four doesn't make any sense. Twenty dollars for a family of two or three doesn't make any sense. These people should be immediately put on welfare.

I think that whoever is responsible for setting those levels should set it higher, at the poverty level. Someone who is at the poverty level, or a member of the National Welfare Rights Organization, or a concerned citizen should elect the people who are to work with people on these problems. It should not be done through the welfare office because in Beaufort County, if it is done through the welfare office, it won't be effective.

Mrs. Green (Chairman of the Food Stamp Committee, Washington, D.C., Welfare Rights Organization). There are several problems that we think need attention. One is that the food stamp bonus—the difference between the amount of money you pay and the amount of food stamps you get—is out of proportion. If, for instance, whoever has formulated this plan says that a family of four needs $150 worth of food to get the proper nutritional value, then they should be able to get $150 worth of food whether they can afford it or not. What we are getting is the minimum amount of food required for a temporary period to live on for a long period of time. In order to bring up your children as healthy beings, you need the food that is going to make them healthy.

If we are to have these emergency food programs, it should be a more effective plan. The Agriculture Department pays the farmer not to produce so much food, and then they have to go back and buy it from them again to give to the poor people. This is excess money! Why pay the farmer again to get the food that is already subsidized? One of our main points is that we spend billions of dollars in other areas overseas, and yet we are not feeding the poor at home. We have to start at home and build our people up.

Clarence Singleton, Beaufort County. I've never seen how this food stamp business was helping the poor people, especially since they say they have this pilot project now. As poor people we must quit playing the role of Lazarus. We have been eating the crumbs from the rich man's table for too long, eating what the rich man don't want.

We have been wandering for over 200 years. The government cannot say they don't have the money. They do have it, and I know they have it because the money they spend on missiles and trying to put a man on the moon with so many people hungry and dying from malnutrition—it doesn't make sense.

Mrs. Green. With the war in Nigeria and Biafra, we have millions of people collecting money to feed those kids over there. They're dying of starvation, sure, but so are our kids here at home. It may not be in a centralized location, but 50,000 across the nation, perhaps, are dying and will die day by day because of starvation and malnutrition.

Joe McDermott, Beaufort County. This group came from Beaufort County with several points to make. First, we want the people in Washington to know how we feel about the new food stamp program. We don't think the new pilot program is getting at the needs of hunger and malnutrition in Beaufort and Jasper Counties. Second, we came to talk directly with people who are concerned about the new pilot program in Beaufort and Jasper Counties. Third, we came to participate in the formulation of plans that would get at the needs of hunger and malnutrition in Beaufort County. For too long, people have been making decisions about what will affect other peoples' lives. The people that these programs will affect directly have nothing at all to say about them. We want to participate in some of those decisions about how the new program can best meet the needs of the poor people. We feel strongly about this. If people who are poor cannot say how a program can best rid them of their hunger, then who can?

The group would like to see $40 per month worth of food stamps made available, per person, to each family in the poverty level. Next, we'd like to see poor people get involved in the administration of the new program, if it's going to be effective. The people at the welfare department cannot communicate with the people who need food stamps. Third, we've come to meet with the Secretary of Agriculture to let him know that the program is not working. Last, it's not right to give food stamps to me and then tell me how I can use them. There are people who have to pay bills—doctor bills, electric bills—and don't have the money for food stamps. The government should give the people the food stamps and let the people do whatever they want to with whatever money they are getting.

Mrs. Kathryn Frazier, Jasper County. I agree with him, because I went down to the welfare office about a week ago, and they told me that I have to pay $78 for $120 stamps. I have 11 children, my husband and I. Sometimes he don't make that much because he works on a farm, and when it's raining he cannot work. I don't get the stamps because I don't have the money to get them.

Mrs. Hazel Frazier. My income is $125 a month, and I pay $46 a month for my stamps. It all depends on my other bills. When I was working and making $4 a day, it went up to $70 dollars. We go to the store and get a big bag of rice, pig feet, pig tails, neck bones, beans, black-eyed peas, and go in the field and hunt greens. That's how we manage. You go buy your bread. Now, when you buy milk, eggs, butter, bacon, and orange juice you'll really get fouled up cause you're not going to have anything left. Even buying rice, grits, beans and peas, the food stamps run out before the end of the month, and it's just a struggle.

Dan Everhart, Beaufort County. In Beaufort County if you work on a farm they say you can't get food stamps. I went up there Monday, and they said if you get any stamps you have to pay $10. I asked "what am I going to pay that with?" I don't know.

Joe McDermott, Beaufort County. Under the new pilot program, there are only two categories that the program will affect. First, families of one to three persons with a total income of $20 or less are entitled to free food stamps. Second, if there are four or more persons in a family, with a total income of $30 or less, they are entitled to free food stamps. If there are five persons in a family with $31 income, they have to pay something for the food stamps. How in the name of heaven can three people live on $20 or less per month? The program is not going to affect that many people in those two categories. The welfare department says there are 200 families who this program will affect. I don't believe that. If there are people who are making that kind of money, they probably would have been dead long ago! Why aren't those people on welfare without any questions asked?

Alex Smith, Beaufort County. I have applied for the free food stamp program, and they told me that I would have to prove that my wife doesn't make over $30 a month. I said no; I'm a man, and I ain't going to do that. Then they told me that my stamps would cost over $20, and I told them that I don't make that kind of money.

I am a farmer. Sometimes the heat comes and burns up the crops; sometimes the rain comes and drowns them out. Sometimes I don't make $200 a year. That's why I wanted to get the free food stamps because I can't pay. That's why I'm here today.

Regina Hamilton, Bluffton, S.C. I have a mother who is not able to work, three kids, and no husband. I earn $50 a week. We pay $20 for $40 worth of food stamps. Forty dollars is not enough to feed a family of five for a month. My kids have to go to school. I want to clothe them and feed them a good breakfast, but I can't.

Angela Ford, Beaufort County. I am on food stamps. My husband works at a saw mill. I have to take my husband's paycheck to the welfare office and pay $78 for $128 worth of food stamps.

I have ten kids. Some weeks my husband's income is $37. If we can't get free stamps, why not cut the price down? There are a lot of things we can't buy with the stamps: soap, brooms, and clothes.

Mrs. John Cope, Frogmore, S.C. I am white, and I am on welfare. I have a master's degree, and my husband has finished one year of college. He is in alternative service and receives a salary of $130 a month. We qualify for food stamps, and have used them since August of last year. I could work, but I refuse to work. I feel it is my duty to raise my child. Even if I did work, I'd have to pay someone to keep my boy. When you pay someone to keep your children, and then you go to town to care for someone else's children, it doesn't make any sense because it's your children who need you.

Alice Williams, Frogmore, S.C. My husband died leaving me with four kids. I was getting Social Security and paying $13 a month rent. They cut my checks off after my two children were eighteen and twenty-one, and my landlady told me I have to move because I don't have the $13 a month to pay. So I don't have no place for me and my kids to live.

Lula Louise Bolden. We have eight kids in the family and get $132 a month on welfare, and we have to pay $102 for food stamps. All of us have to go to school. I'm in the twelfth grade, and I haven't paid all my senior bills yet.

Joclyn Truett, Beaufort County. I get a little check from Social Security, $40 a month. If I buy food stamps and pay my light bill, it don't leave me with nothing.

Mr. Tidmore (Administrative Assistant to the Hon. Louis Stokes). I came here today representing Congressman Stokes who wanted very much to be here himself. He is very sympathetic to your cause, and we have under study right now legislation that would create a federal minimum income.

Congressman Stokes' brother is the Mayor of the City of Cleveland, and both of them grew up on the welfare rolls in the Hough area of Cleveland. He knows and understands what it means to be hungry and without food.

Hon. John Conyers, Jr. Al Lowenstein began supporting the National Welfare Rights Organization long before he got elected, and I've been supporting it for many years in Congress.

I wish I could tell you that it is now just a simple matter of going back to your county and beginning to work as a citizen toward rectifying this process. George Wiley has been in and out of congressional hearings for several years now. I think that we may be making some sort of progress. I understand that there was a U.S. Senator who found out that there was poverty existing in his state, and he was properly shocked. And perhaps this week somebody else in the Congress will discover that poor people, black and white, are starving in the United States at a rate that is certainly not decreasing in number. But, what we do must turn on how we view our problem and how we attempt to resolve them.

I say that we are beginning a process in this country because the poor people are beginning to understand what their plight is, and further, are beginning to figure out how to react to it. I think you have shown by your coming here today, by being members of the NWRO, that you are attempting to responsibly change this system.

There is a new breath of fresh air in the Congress in the form of some of our members like Mr. Lowenstein, Mr. Mikva from Chicago, and a number of others who have added substantially to the liberal cause here. What we want to do is to have your help in continuing to exercise something a lot of people don't want to give us any credit for. That's the power to think and analyze your way out of your situation. Not that analysis alone is going to do it, but that at the beginning of redressing your grievances there was a George Wiley who figured there ought to be an organization of the poor, and there were staff people that thought there ought to be an organization, and they were selfless enough to join him in his efforts. There were the Fraziers and others who, acting as leaders, were able to bring us here today.

One of the arguments that I continue to use to persuade some of my colleagues who are less aware of the problems of poverty in the United States is that when you help the poor you are not necessarily helping the black people in America. I try to point out to them that there are more poor white people in America than there are poor black people. We are really all in this together. If they could only understand and act purely on the selfish basis of helping their own, since these national programs are distributed fairly among all segments of the country, we could take a giant step toward alleviating the problems of poverty in America.

So rather than tell you that we're going to come up with some legislation this year to eliminate the problem, I will say that I think we are going to make some progress. As long as each one of you is able to maintain the dignity that you bring here to this House, then you're able to go back and continue the struggle; I can assure you that there will be more Lowensteins, more Conyers, coming into Congress to try to make meaningful changes in the system which creates and perpetuates poverty. Congressman Lowenstein, I am honored that you invited me to join you in this discussion.

George Wiley (Executive Director, National Welfare Rights Organization). One of the things that really needs to happen is that welfare rights organizations are forming all over the country. We now have 250 of them in 100 cities. I don't think it is any accident that Senator Hollings suddenly got the message that there was poverty in his state. There is a Beaufort County Welfare Rights Organization, and there are numerous other welfare rights groups forming in other cities around the state, and he began to see that the poor were going to have some political muscle. I think that is beginning to happen in a lot of places around the country.

It's time for us to have our own legislation and our own proposals; it's time that we begin shaping some programs that the people have a voice in, programs that begin to meet their needs. We should try to form a coalition to push for (1) a food stamp program that makes sense and (2) reform of the whole welfare and income maintenance programs. I think the initiative that has come out of Beaufort County can be a beginning to building that coalition.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our country and indeed the world has lost one of its greatest leaders. We mourn him in death as we loved him in life, for Dwight David Eisenhower, General of the Army, 34th President of the United States, had a very special place in the hearts of men and women everywhere. He had lived a full life, accomplishing more than most men would dare to dream, and when the end came he was peaceful, and he was ready. I watched some of the thousands of people who filed quietly by his casket as it lay in the Rotunda of the Capitol. They came out of a deep and profound respect for one of the best loved and most humane men of our time. That is a great tribute.

But there is a greater tribute still that we can, and should, pay to a man who dedicated his life to the causes of his country and its people. That tribute is to look to the lessons of his life and to see that what he stood for, what he tried to accomplish, and what wisdom he passed to us, is not lost, but woven into the fabric of our national future.

Dwight Eisenhower was a professional soldier and he was a man of peace. Perhaps one of his great accomplishments was in showing us that the two are not incompatible. Only a man of his inner strength, patience, cheerfulness, and good humor combined with rare modesty, could have molded together the diverse elements needed to mount the great Allied offensive that landed at Normandy and culminated in the surrender of the German armies 11 months later. For that accomplishment he will forever hold a place of affection and respect in the hearts of all free men.

In 1948, General Eisenhower refused to run for the Presidency, indicating his strong belief that the subordination of the military power to the civil power, wisely structured, was best served if professional soldiers did not seek high political office. As Tom Wicker has pointed out:

> Only a general of Dwight Eisenhower's human quality, of whom there are precious few, should ever be exempt from (that) reasoning.

He was exempt, and he was elected President in 1952, in the midst of a "conflict" in Korea that frustrated the American people much as the Vietnam conflict does today. And President Eisenhower brought us peace, a peace which he sustained throughout his years in office.

In his administration the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was forged; an International Finance Corporation was created; the International Atomic Energy Agency was approved, and a U.S. Development Loan Fund was established. All these, and more, were solid contributions to building peace through international cooperation.

We sometimes tend to forget—because those were peaceful and tranquil years—that President Eisenhower presided over major contributions to domestic progress, contributions that formed the basis for much that has come since. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was created; the research and assistance program on air pollution was enacted; the National Defense Education Act and the Interstate Highway Act were passed; and the basic Civil Rights Act, the first legislation in this area in some 80 years, was brought into being.

Before leaving office General Eisenhower delivered an eloquent farewell address, and in it he gave us some advice we would do well to heed carefully now. He understood before many of us that "the potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist." And he tried to tell us that, "in the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes."

We are engaged today in a great national debate which involves, at its heart, the determination of important priorities for ourselves and for generations to come. What should be our guides to a wise decision? Dwight Eisenhower made a start on what have become some of our most pressing national problems. We have done more and there is still more to be done. If we can bring a part of the wisdom and a fraction of the generosity of heart and of mind to the task that remains as he did to his, we shall have served his memory well.

DONALD J. WALSH RETIRES

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, Mr. Donald J. Walsh, business manager of Chicago's American, retired after spending 48 years as one of Chicago's most highly respected members of the press.

The Chicago's American ran an editorial on his retirement which I believe states most succinctly the feelings of all of us who know Mr. Walsh well.

I join in wishing him many happy years in retirement.

The editorial follows:

DONALD J. WALSH RETIRES

Donald J. Walsh's retirement as business manager of Chicago's American ends a Chicago newspaper career spanning 48 years. For this newspaper and its staff, it ends 18 years of active partnership with him, but it doesn't end anything else—not friendship or esteem or the good memories of working together in an endlessly worthwhile task.

Don Walsh's talents and energy have benefited many people besides this newspaper and its readers. As state director of public safety under the late Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, he helped carry thru a massive overhaul of the state police from a political patronage grab-bag to a well-organized force operating on the merit system.

He has been a creative force in many political, civic, and educational projects—Catholic Charities, De Paul university, and Hektoen Institute among them—and knowing Don Walsh, we're sure he will go on giving them the same drive, energy, and dedication that he has given to The American. We'll miss him, and we wish him luck.

MR. NORMAN R. BROWN—OUTSTANDING POSTMASTER

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the citizens and postal patrons of my congressional district and, particularly of Arroyo Grande, are very proud and elated that Postmaster Norman R. Brown has been named the outstanding postal employee of the year for the western region of the United States for States including California, Hawaii, Nevada, and the South Pacific.

We are especially pleased because we believe the award is so well deserved.

Norman R. Brown, 59, postmaster of Arroyo Grande for the past 17 years is a paraplegic. He was selected for the regional award over 10 other nominees.

Brown and 14 others, now will be considered for the national award. The finalists will attend presentation ceremonies at the Post Office Department in Washington this spring.

Regional Director Ken W. Dyal said Brown was a "very popular choice" and had an abundance of support from fellow postmasters who knew of his outstanding record of public service despite confinement to a wheelchair.

Brown lost use of his legs during an on duty accident while a member of the Oakland Fire Department 30 years ago.

Prior to his injury, Brown was an airplane pilot and was engaged in cropdusting and in giving flying instruction. His accident occured just prior to the outbreak of World War II, preventing him for accepting a call to train British pilots.

Brown spent 5 years at Lancaster and at Terrell, Tex., teaching ground school classes while studying a new vocation. He moved to Arroyo Grande in 1945 and established a photographic studio.

He was the unanimous choice of the community for the appointment of postmaster in 1951.

Brown taught photography in high school adult education classes for 15 years. He has earned many awards in national competition and has appeared as guest lecturer before the Photographic Society of America.

He also has had many works published in Camera magazine and is one of the limited number who can legally endorse a photo with his name followed by APSA or Association, Photographic Society of America.

Brown has served as head of the civic association, president of the San Luis Obispo County Delinquency Board, president of the Arroyo Grande Rotary Club, and of the harvest festival.

He drives his own car and designed controls so that they can be hand operated. He and his wife, Gertrude, have a married daughter, Mrs. Paul Reese, and two grandsons.

Brown originally was nominated for the honor by postal service officer H. C. Anderson. He also was highly recommended by William G. Moore, Atascadero postmaster; Barbara H. Potter, Avila Beach postmaster; and Neva Hollibaough, retired Oceano postmaster.

Mr. Brown has long been an inspiration to the citizens of Arroyo Grande. To many persons he would be considered "handicapped," but Mr. Brown has overcome his handicaps and served as an example to handicapped and unhandicapped of what perseverance, effort, and self-confidence can accomplish.

I join his family and his many friends and associates in congratulating and commending him for the outstanding service and accomplishments which earned him this award.

We wish him success in his further competition.

WOUNDS FATAL TO SOUTH CAROLINA MARINE

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, Marine L/Cpl Joseph L. Freeman, Jr., a brave young man from South Carolina, was recently killed serving his country near An Hoa, Republic of Vietnam.

I wish to honor his memory and commend his courage and valor.

Lance Corporal Freeman was killed March 3, aged 20. His parents are Mr. and Mrs. J. Lloyd Freeman of 35 Pleasant Ridge Avenue, Greenville, S.C.

Lance Corporal Freeman died of head injuries inflicted by enemy rifle fire. He entered the Marines March 25, 1968, and was assigned to Vietnam August 28 of that year. He entered Greenville High School and Greenville Technical Education Center prior to enlisting in the Marines.

Full military services were conducted Wednesday, March 19, at the Mackey Mortuary in Greenville by the Reverend Lloyd Self and Chaplain T. C. Smith.

Burial was in the Westview Cemetery, Easley, S.C.

Mr. Speaker, young Corporal Freeman, was a boyhood friend of one of my sons, and his death has brought the hard reality of war home to myself and my family. Our sympathy is extended to his parents and family, who have the consolation of knowing that he died in the service of his country and in the cause of the freedom of mankind.

INDIAN OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL FOCUSES ON NEEDS OF THE URBAN INDIAN

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, of all the minority groups in this country, the urban Indian is probably the most disadvantaged—and the most ignored. Very few of us realize that there are large numbers of Indians now living in cities, with special needs that differentiate them from other groups.

It is only in the last year that a Government commission, the National Council on Indian Opportunity, has begun to focus attention on this special problem. The Commission through its Committee on the Condition of the Urban Indian, is currently investigating the condition of Indians in a number of large cities throughout the country. Recently the Committee conducted 2 days of hearings in my district, Minneapolis.

In the following article from the March 19 Minneapolis Star the Committee's Chairman, Mrs. FRED HARRIS, explains why urban Indians are faced with unique problems:

INDIANS' WOES IN CITIES CALLED WORSE THAN ON RESERVATIONS

(By Jim Jones)

Indians in the city are worse off than those still on the reservations, Mrs. Fred Harris, a spokesman for the National Council on Indian Opportunity, said Tuesday.

Mrs. Harris, a Comanche Indian and wife of an Oklahoma senator, spoke at a two-day forum on problems of the Indian Community in Minneapolis and St. Paul.

Government and welfare programs encourage Indians to move to the city, she said, this causes them to compete for employment and decent housing.

The Indians are at a disadvantage under these conditions, Mr. Harris continued, because they are from rural backgrounds and usually have poor educations.

Federal funds and programs are directed toward the reservation Indian with little or no thought given to problems facing Indians living in urban areas, she said, "although half of the U.S. Indian population lives in cities."

SHELTERED LIFE

"Indians live a sheltered life on the reservation, and the transition from rural to urban life often causes frustrations.

"Reservation life deprives an Indian of his initiative," but he receives better health care because of government assistance, she said.

Indians as a group have the lowest income, poorest housing, worst health and largest number of school dropouts, she said.

"The Indian is the low man on the totem pole," she said.

Mrs. Harris, a native of Lawton, Okla., is the mother of three chidlren, Katherine, a student at the University of Oklahoma, Byron, 12, and Laura, 8. She met her husband while attending high school in Oklahoma.

DRAMATIZE PLIGHT

The purpose of the forum is to dramatize the plight of the Indian in urban areas, Mrs. Harris said.

One-fourth of the U.S. Indian population lives in Oklahoma, she said. There are 68 tribes of Indians there.

"My husband is an authority on Indian culture. He speaks the Comanche language, and he researched Indian history after graduating from law school.

"The Comanches dominated the Southwest territory, at one time," she said. "I'm proud to be a Comanche."

Oklahoma Indians don't live on official reservations, Mrs. Harris explained, they live on "trust land."

DIFFERENT PROBLEMS

Problems there are somewhat different than the ones reservation Indians face, she explained, because reservation procedure is not used.

There are prejudices, Mrs. Harris said, but the basic problem in Oklahoma is the lack of understanding.

The youth present new social problems, and there appears to be a break down in family structure in the areas where Indian women are employed.

Mrs. Harris toured Minnesota Indian reservations for three days in 1967 with Mrs. Walter Mondale, wife of the Minnesota senator.

They inspected housing, educational and health conditions at the Prairie Island, White Earth, Leech Lake, Red Lake and Fond du Lac reservations.

A series of hearings by the Committee on the Condition of the Urban Indian, of the National Council on Indian Opportunity will be held around the country, Mrs. Harris said. The council will make recommendations to the federal government, based on the findings.

BACK 'EM UP CAMPAIGN

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, in April 1968, the members of the Veterans' Administration Central Office Employees' Association initiated Project Back 'Em Up.

As its title suggests, this project had but one purpose: to reassure our fighting men in Vietnam that their service and sacrifice are recognized and appreciated by patriotic Americans back home, and particularly by the employees of the VA Central Office whose duty it is to serve those who served.

Through December 1968, Project Back 'Em Up has given practical expression to this support and gratitude of VA Central Office employees through the contribution of 232 gift packages of personal items wanted by our fighting men but difficult to obtain in Vietnam.

It has resulted in monetary contributions that not only covered the mailing costs of these packages but enabled the VA Central Office Employees' Association to donate four small television sets to Bethesda Naval Hospital and Walter Reed Army Hospital.

And it has made available some 500 books to veterans in the Washington VA hospital.

The members and officers of the association, including Mrs. Hazel Redmon, its president, and Mr. Frank Dority, Back 'Em Up chairman, are to be commended for this exemplary project.

A JUSTICE SPEAKS OUT ON LAW ENFORCEMENT

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it has recently been my pleasure to hear timely remarks by the Honorable Cameron Bruce Littlejohn, associate justice of the South Carolina Supreme Court. The justice's comments were made at the Spartanburg Crime Prevention Council banquet.

The Spartanburg Crime Prevention Council was formed as a community involvement organization with citizens and law-enforcement officials working together to minimize crime in the community. I think the mayor of Spartanburg, the Honorable Robert L. Stoddard, and his city council are to be commended for their positive approach to this problem. By taking this matter in hand, they are taking a giant step forward in reversing the escalating crime rate. Making the community aware of ways of eliminating factors that encourage crime is one of the objectives of the council. Studying and curing the breeding places of crime is another.

Honoring outstanding law-enforcement officers for faithful service is still another, and this was actually the occasion of the banquet which Justice Littlejohn addressed. Police Lt. Rembert W. Hayes received the award for 1969 Policeman of the Year in the city of Spartanburg. It has been my observation that the police department of the city of Spartanburg is composed of dedicated officers who are seeking to improve their professional competence, and Lieutenant Hayes, along with Police Director W. T. Ivey, are leaders in the endeavor.

I find it most encouraging that citizens and law-enforcement officers are working together on this problem. It is a community project to make streets safe for every citizen. I thought the Members of Congress would be interested in Justice Littlejohn's remarks on a subject that is of great current concern to each of us:

POLICE OFFICERS, THE BACKBONE OF LAW AND ORDER

(Speech of Associate Justice Bruce Littlejohn, at Spartanburg Crime Prevention Council banquet, Feb. 13, 1969, Spartanburg, S.C.)

I want to congratulate the Mayor upon his foresight in appointing this council to assist in a problem which is always present. The prevention of crime is not the work of law enforcement officials alone, but is the problem of all good citizens, and it is well to have a representative group such as the Spartanburg Crime Prevention Council constantly studying ways that violation of the law can be minimized, and studying ways to deal with crimes that inevitably will occur.

In order to prevent a problem it is always well to determine first what is causing it. The crime and violence that flourish in America today cannot be attributed to any one cause. The causes are many and are interrelated. The causes are rooted in a number of conditions and influences in everyday life. If there were only a single cause of crime the job of preventing or minimizing the same would be considerably simplified. Since there is no one cause of crime there is certainly no single remedy. Crime and violence cannot be prevented or reduced by concentrating on any one or two phases of the problem to the exclusion of all others. A many-sided effort is required if effective results are to be achieved.

I am always amused when I hear of some individual who is thoroughly convinced that his pet peeve is the basic cause of all crime. For example, one person may say that juvenile delinquency results from the fact that mothers are working; another will be convinced that crime stems from poor housing or alcohol or drugs.

I do not pretend to be able to enumerate all of the factors which cause persons to violate the law. Some of the reasons certainly are poverty, unemployment, the breakdown of family life, absence of gun control, inadequate housing, slums, lack of training, drugs, liquor, and failure to adequately teach in our schools that crime does not pay. At the same time we can find many who have violated the law in a way that cannot be attributed to any of these reasons.

It is my conviction, if I may generalize, that crime and violence are increasing primarily because there is mass deterioration of respect for the law. In addition, the deterrents to crime have been weakened. Those who break the law get the impression that punishment isn't as sure as it used to be. This trend in their thinking must be reversed.

Too many individuals are anxious to avail themselves of all the rights, privileges and benefits which this nation affords, but shy away from the duties and responsibilities that life in a free society demands. Too many people are half boy and half man. They seek to force their own solution on everybody else's problem. The man half demands all the rights and privileges known to law. The boy half refuses to accept any of the responsibilities imposed by the law. Unfortunately there is a reluctance on the part of many of our citizens to act positively in behalf of law and order. Crimes go unreported; witnesses are unwilling to testify; citizens avoid jury duty. This is often done in a sort of "why should I get involved" attitude. The mistaken idea that law enforcement is for only those who are paid to perform it is a popular one. It is also an erroneous one.

Every individual should realize that in today's complex society he is in fact his brother's keeper. The individual must realize that as a member of society he is dependent upon other members of the same society. The individual must recognize that the more effort he contributes to law enforcement the better society will be. If each individual citizen would exert an extra measure of caution in his daily life in an effort to preclude opportunities for crime to flourish, the result in the prevention of crime and violence would be immeasurable. For example, the FBI statistics show that 42% of the cars stolen had the key left in the ignition such that it was tempting and convenient for the thief.

The demagogic exhortations of civil rights and student leaders have done much to encourage lawlessness and civil disobedience. They proceed on the theory that the answer to all social and economic problems are not to be found in legal procedures, but are to be found on the streets and solved by looting, shooting, arson and riots.

Dissent is one of the nation's priceless values. It must be protected at all times and in all areas of thought and action. But this dissent, of its very nature, requires law for both its expression and its preservation.

In our affluent society there exists a public tendency toward softness and tolerance of those who violate the law. An effort is often made to justify violations because of one's personal idea of the justness and fairness of the law. Such cannot be condoned. A person should never be permitted to take the law into their own hands by deciding which laws they like and which laws they will obey. If one is permitted to disobey the laws he dislikes, then everyone else has the same right and we are back where we started from with each man his own law.

There can be no organized society; there can be no personal security; there can be no property rights without a strong police authority. Never before have Americans been so aware of these truths.

If our system of law is to serve, then the law must be enforced. Those who break the law, acting alone or in concert, must be speedily detected and arrested, promptly prosecuted, and given proper, substantial punishment. Respect for the law is not increased by judges who are too lenient or prosecutors too timid, or by misguided writers and commentators who slant the news to their own satisfaction. I was disgusted to hear a commentator on a national newscast recently commenting upon President Johnson's statement relative to the actions of Mayor Daley during the Democratic Convention. He ended up the newscast by stating that "Mayor Daley still refuses to apologize"—the implication being that there wasn't any doubt that Mayor Daley should apologize.

People who went to Chicago to cause trouble should not be heard to complain if they weren't received and dealt with as at a pink tea. An unruly mob gathered, intent on disrupting the Democratic National Convention. If it be true that some innocent people were the victims of unnecessary roughness on the part of the police, it is also true that the Chicago police and the National Guard were faced with vicious, attacking mobs who gave to them no alternative but to use sufficient force to prevent the mob from accomplishing its destructive purpose. It is a tribute to the authorities that under these chaotic circumstances the convention was not disrupted, the city was not paralyzed, not one shot was fired by police, and no life was lost. As 1972 approaches it will be interesting to observe if any city's mayor in his right mind seeks either one of the national conventions. I think Mayor Daley would be equal to the situation. I also think that he will conclude that the convention should be rotated to some other town.

I am not unaware of the fact that police brutality can occur. In my 20 years of holding court it has been my observation that the American police officer is, with extremely rare exceptions, a good citizen dedicated to the enforcement of the law and anxious to do right as best he can conceive the right to be. A typical case of alleged police brutality involves a drunken bum who kicks a policeman on the shin or resists arrest. When the officer uses enough force to bring him under control and carries him to jail, where he ought to be, then comes the cry of police brutality.

The police officer is expected to act, and must act, in any kind of case which may arise. He must deal quickly with the purse snatcher and the petty thief, right on up to the sex maniac, the rioter, the arsonist, and the looter. Oftentimes an officer must make a split-second decision in order to prevent a crime or in order to apprehend a thug. He does not have time for extended deliberation and reasoning. Many times it is now or never. Unfortunately, sometimes it is kill or be killed. I have no sympathy for people in high authority, both in and out of government, who criticize the police officer who honestly performs his duties and does what he thinks best under difficult circumstances.

Demonstrators and commentators and editors and others can yell police brutality until their breath is gone, but they cannot escape the proposition that the fear that grips the heart of the American people today is not the fear of an officer with a badge. It is the fear of brazen criminals in the cities and communities. It is the mugger and robber, the rapist and murderer who make people afraid to walk the streets at night. It is fear of criminals anxious to create disrespect for the law by creating a belief that all policemen are brutal.

People are calling for better protection and for more policemen. They are asking for stiffer penalties for vicious criminals. They know that crime is the greatest enemy of a free society living under the rule of law.

I am a firm believer in the simple proposition that if that which one is doing is not bringing about the result which is sought, it is time to try something different. That which all of us charged with law enforcement are doing, is not bringing about the result that we desire. It is therefore time to try something new. We can deal more firmly with the criminal or we can deal less firmly with the criminal or we can continue in the same pattern. There are no other alternatives. The answer is obvious.

Law enforcement organizations in this country have been prepared to deal with individuals who occasionally violate the law. The criminal of yesteryear was the sneak thief or some other person who committed a crime and ran to seclusion. We have not until recently been required to deal with large numbers of people who conspire to violate the law en masse.

Many of the techniques of policing used for decades in dealing with crimes and criminals are no longer sufficient to deal with modern problems. Law enforcement organizations throughout the country are studying new problems in the light of the experiences of a few unfortunate cities, They are to be commended upon the progress which they are making in preparing for new difficulties.

It is important in this day of constant change that all of us keep abreast of what is new and different.

Systems of operation and skills sufficient for a police officer 25 years ago, or even 5 years ago, are no longer adequate. This should not startle us, for skills of the loom fixer or the farmer or the lawyer 25 years ago are no longer adequate either. Automation, greater production, development of the transportation and communication systems and the fact that there is more abundance of everything has changed the complexion of all governmental problems.

The law enforcement officer's equipment of yesteryear is completely outmoded. Formerly it was not necessary for a policeman to wear a helmet or carry a tear gas dispenser or gas mask. A 30 inch night stick was unknown to law enforcement.

It has been said that today an officer sometimes needs to be half a lawyer. Sometimes he needs to be a whole lawyer. The peace officer of today is selling to the people who employ him not only his time and physical effort, but is now more than ever selling his best judgment with law enforcement problems as they arise. Increasing crime, increasing social unrest, make police work more important, more complicated, and more delicate.

Law enforcement has always been a difficult task. Unfortunately many people believe in it theoretically until they themselves or their friends become involved. Oftentimes a juror abhors drunken driving, but hasn't the courage to convict. Law enforcement is a difficult task because we deal with human conflicts. Nothing will deter violation of the law more than the realization that one will be apprehended and punished.

In those cities where authorities have let it be known that lawlessness will not be tolerated there has been little trouble or none at all. In cities where the authorities were slow to act to the danger signals, things got out of hand rapidly and police officers had to be supplemented by National Guardsmen.

There are no safety zones where one can stand aloof from crime. Crime is everywhere. It can and does strike at the rich and the poor, in the slum and in the penthouse apartments. Not every community has a riot, but every community is a battleground with crime. Many citizens are fighting on the side of law and order; others are fighting with the underworld; and then there are too many who are just avoiding involvement. Actually they are lending comfort to the criminal.

The solutions are not simple but there are many things which can be done. These include better training and enlargement of police forces, reframing of court procedures, more enlightened methods of rehabilitating criminals and removing the cause of crime. More time and effort and money must be invested in law enforcement. It will be an economy in the end.

America has had many problems before. We have not always solved the problem rapidly. Fortunately, we have solved them reasonably well. I believe that the American people will arise to the emergency and will do whatever is necessary.

TERROR BOMB IN WORKS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I hope that those who have been so reckless in opposing deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system for the United States will read the following Reuters dispatch. It clearly indicates how desperately necessary it is for the United States to move ahead.

The Reuters dispatch follows:

> TERROR BOMB IN WORKS
>
> WASHINGTON.—Military sources said Saturday there was growing evidence that Russia is building a massive space bomb capable of being targeted against U.S. cities at the press of a button.
>
> The Soviet Union has been experimenting with such an orbital weapon—known as FOBS (Fractional Oribtal Bombardment System)—for at least three years.
>
> The Defense Department refused to confirm the reports, but other sources said intelligence data indicated that a decision may have been made to add the weapon to the Soviet nuclear arsenal.
>
> The orbital bomb is believed capable of carrying a nuclear payload equivalent to between one and three millions tons of conventional TNT.
>
> The bomb could be launched into outer space, ready to be dropped on a selected target by remote control, either during its first orbit or on subsequent 90-minute circuits of the earth.
>
> If deployed, it would add a dreaded new dimension to the East-West arms race.

EULOGY OF DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with millions of Americans who mourn the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower.

The affection which General Eisenhower earned from his countrymen is perhaps unique in this era. In a period of our history when many Americans have come to view the purposes and motivations of politicians with cynicism and even hostility, the nationwide respect for General Eisenhower is a reminder that honesty and openness are still essential to the formulation of public policy. For when public trust is lacking, essential programs will fail to engender the support necessary for their success.

The many accomplishments of General Eisenhower's career are well known. As Supreme Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Forces in World War II, Chief of Staff of the Army, and the first Supreme Commander of NATO, General Eisenhower achieved the highest honors which can be bestowed on a military man. In addition, he served with distinction as president of Columbia University from 1948 to 1950. And, of course, he was twice elected President of the United States.

As the victorious military Commander of Allied Forces in Europe during World War II, and the first head of the NATO forces, General Eisenhower's place in our military history is assured. It was his plan which resulted in the successful invasion of Normandy in June 1944, and it was under his direction that that invasion was carried through to the successful defeat of Nazi Germany. With the fate of the entire Allied Expeditionary Force on his shoulders, General Eisenhower made the right decisions at the right time. His leadership earned him the gratitude of all of Western Europe, as well as his own fellow countrymen.

As the head of NATO, General Eisenhower molded separate and competing military powers into a successful defense force and laid the basis for the military security of Western Europe. The unity which he helped to forge has made possible the two decades of peace which Western Europe has known, and the increasing cooperation between European powers that has characterized postwar European development.

As President, General Eisenhower's record is mixed. While he failed to attack many of the longstanding problems—including poverty and discrimination—which have had so great a significance for the future of America, he did not—as some of his supporters thought he might—dismantle the social programs and institutions which he inherited from his Democratic predecessors. His decision to send Federal troops to Little Rock in 1957 in support of the Supreme Court's order that schools must be integrated also laid the basis for future Federal action in support of desegregation.

In his farewell radio and television address on January 17, 1961, General Eisenhower issued a warning to America that in recent years has taken on greater and greater significance. Although he was himself a military man, he warned in that address of the escalating power of the military and the potential implications of the encroachment of the military-industrial complex on our democratic processes.

He said:

> In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

The rise in the military budget which has occurred since General Eisenhower issued that warning, and the initiation and perpetuation of the war in Vietnam, testify to the validity of his fears of an ever growing military influence on the conduct of public policy. As the General himself said:

> Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

The growth of the military-industrial complex since 1961 has failed to bring increased security, and today poses very real dangers to the future of our democratic processes. As a country dedicated to liberty and the democratic formulation of public policy, we can ill-afford to ignore the threat of increasing military and industrial dominance which General Eisenhower pointed out.

Americans have traditionally reserved their greatest respect and admiration for those who serve their country with honesty and dedication. General Eisenhower brought both qualities to his long and distinguished career as a public servant. His dedication and his contributions will endure as standards by which to judge the careers of those who come after him.

A NATION GRIEVES THE LOSS OF "IKE"

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, this country and the world all mourn the loss of one of our great sons.

Dwight David Eisenhower stands as one of the most outstanding figures in the American heritage. Born from the heartland of our country, he reflected the kind of spirit and enthusiasm which gives this Nation the dynamic force it has in the world today.

But at the same time, he had a deep understanding of human emotion and a sense of compassion for those ideals which truly urge man to his highest goals.

It was this combination of driving force tempered by compassion which made "Ike" the great man he was.

He was the most capable military commander in the world, and the hand of fate directed that he appear on the scene at perhaps the most critical time in world history. He was an efficient and able President who guided his country through a period of complex transition. And his success was the embodiment of the dream of the real America.

Dwight David Eisenhower, General of the Armies, President of the United States, was one of the few men in American history who only had friends, and no enemies.

MARTIN LUTHER KING

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Good Friday and the first anniversary of the tragic assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Martin Luther King had one of the most powerful personal impacts upon society this Nation has ever witnessed. Through his words, and deeds, and life, he laid bare to a society affluent in the blessings of liberty the revelation of itself using every contrived means to close its eyes to the sufferings and injustices it perpetrates upon its black and its poor despised brothers. The suffering and oppressed were Dr. King's people and he made his life and work for and among them. More than this, so compelling and stirring was his love for and message to the oppressed, oppressor, and bystander that masses of men of every color and persuasion, in this Nation and every part of the world, were influenced by him to take up the cause of justice and the brotherhood of man which he exemplified.

He was an activist—caught in historic attention from the Montgomery bus boycott of 1955 to the Memphis garbage workers strike of 1968. He changed and improved the lives of unreckoned numbers of his countrymen and brothers.

He was a revolutionary by his ideas and deeds, "turning the world upside down" as they said of the cross figure in the time in which he lived. Like that figure, Martin Luther King caused bitterness in those who could not accept his philosophy of love, or the cause of racial justice, or the power of his technique of nonviolent revolution. And so the power that inspired also brought the hate which blotted out his life in vigorous manhood and vitality, even as he knew it might.

One year later, the life of Martin Luther King has not dimmed. Rather its meaning is a daily confrontation as our Nation broods over increasing urban turmoil and the violent directions of frustration, anger, and impatience. Over all hang the questions raised by his life and his faith: Is there a peaceful means to life for all men? Is unreconciled hatred and violence the only resolution, or is this way the course to common destruction?

Dr. Martin Luther King's monumental contributions to his fellow man expose the ugliness of suffering and injustice. His life is an eloquent statement of a compelling faith. It is the repository of a dream that one day all men will know justice.

THE LUMBER PRICE CRISIS: THE KEY IS RESEARCH

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out to my colleagues yesterday, if we are to build 26 million housing units during the next 10 years and meet the demands for housing beyond that period in these United States, we must have long-range solutions to our timber supply problems in addition to the short-range solutions presently being planned.

Research is the very heart of any long-range solution. The Forest Sciences Laboratory at Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oreg., is a key installation in the long-range planning program. The School of Forestry at Oregon State is one of the outstanding schools on this important subject in this Nation. Dean of the school, Carl Stoltenberg, has shown great leadership and wisdom in his administration of the school.

Dean Stoltenberg recently wrote to me concerning the need for construction of phase II of the Forest Sciences Laboratory in Corvallis and its relation to the long-range solution to our timber supply problem. I present it here for the information of my colleagues:

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF FORESTRY,
Corvallis, Oreg., March 5, 1969.

HON. WENDELL WYATT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WENDELL: I should like to share with you some concerns for forestry research in Corvallis and the Northwest—a subject on which I know you are both interested and informed. Research is of course one of our primary objectives at Oregon State University. Our close partner in forestry research here in Corvallis is the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station of the U.S. Forest Service. I was pleased to note the several increases in their forestry research budget that was recently presented to Congress. In my opinion, each of these modest increases is in an area of high priority. Such research will contribute strongly to making Oregon's forests a more productive segment of the State's economy.

However, I was disappointed that the President's budget does not provide for strengthening any of the Station's projects at the Corvallis Forestry Sciences Laboratory. And I was even more disappointed that the expansion of their Forestry Sciences Laboratory building has again been postponed.

The Congress appropriated $170,000 in 1965 for developing plans and specifications for Phase 2 of the Forestry Sciences Laboratory. These plans for an addition to the present facility were completed in 1967, but construction funds have not yet been provided.

The Forest Service has an excellent staff of scientists here in Corvallis, but their productivity is severely handicapped by their crowded conditions and hopelessly inadequate laboratory facilities.

As the demand for building materials has expanded there has not been a corresponding supply response, resulting in a doubling of the price of lumber and of federal stumpage during the past year. But still there are huge quantities of wood which fail to reach the market because of destruction from forest insects and diseases—losses which might be prevented if this laboratory had been constructed and the Station's Corvallis entomology and pathology projects had been adequately staffed.

We need to learn how to control forest insects and diseases more efficiently and without using dangerous poisons. More progress is needed in learning how to prevent erosion and damaging siltation in Oregon streams as logging pushes into the steeper, less stable terrain. These are projects that will be accelerated as soon as the proposed portion of the Forest Service laboratory is completed. In answer to my inquiry to the Forest Service for descriptive information on the proposed construction, I recently obtained the enclosed brochure which highlights the status and the need for the laboratory addition.

Is there any opportunity of providing funds to complete this key facility promptly? If you could develop such an opportunity, I would certainly urge such action, and would appreciate any action you might take to achieve this end.

Sincerely,

CARL H. STOLTENBERG,
Dean.

MARTIN LUTHER KING

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, we begin now, on Good Friday itself, that awful season when every day will be the anniversary of another event that must remind us of how much can be lost by even the greatest of nations in the briefest of times.

We see with the perspective of a year how little we have done to move from the horrors of last spring to the fulfillment of the hopes of the two murdered Americans who had most personified those hopes that were in the fullest sense the best hopes of the largest numbers of our people. We enter this season with the memory of enough oratory to make the ear weary of words, of enough pledges of rededication to make pledges seem monuments of hypocrisy. Maybe that is in part why the wound at the heart is deeper and more painful now even than it was then, of why now more words invite cynicism and resentment in the hollowness of attitudes unchanged and things undone.

Which is not to say that it would be acceptable to abandon oratory and pledges for self-pity and despair. Rather, in the depth of our inadequacies and failure we read again the most prophetic of tributes paid in our experience by greatness to greatness, read it to join its prayers, and to determine to go on more urgently and more determinedly than before, the augmenting anguish of loss joining with the pressures of events to induce from us the best and most that can be done by those left when giants are struck from their midst at their time of greatest need.

A statement by Senator Robert F. Kennedy follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY ON THE DEATH OF THE REVEREND MARTIN LUTHER KING RALLY IN INDIANAPOLIS, IND., APRIL 4, 1968

I have bad news for you, for all of our fellow citizens, and people who love peace all over the world, and that is that Martin Luther King was shot and killed tonight.

Martin Luther King dedicated his life to love and to justice for his fellow human beings, and he died because of that effort.

In this difficult day, in this difficult time for the United States, it is perhaps well to ask what kind of a nation we are and what direction we want to move in. For those of you who are black—considering the evidence there evidently is that there were white people who were responsible—you can be filled with bitterness, with hatred, and a desire for revenge. We can move in that direction as a country, in great polarization—black people amongst black, white people amongst white, filled with hatred toward one another.

Or we can make an effort, as Martin Luther King did, to understand and to comprehend, and to replace that violence, that stain of bloodshed that has spread across our land, with an effort to understand with compassion and love.

For those of you who are black and are tempted to be filled with hatred and distrust at the injustice of such an act, against all white people, I can only say that I feel in my own heart the same kind of feeling. I had a member of my family killed, but he was killed by a white man. But we have to make an effort in the United States, we have to make an effort to understand, to go beyond these rather difficult times.

My favorite poet was Aeschylus. He wrote: "In our sleep, pain which cannot forget falls drop by drop upon the heart until, in our own despair, against our will, comes wisdom through the awful grace of God."

What we need in the United States is not division; what we need in the United States is not hatred; what we need in the United States is not violence or lawlessness, but love and wisdom, and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice towards those who still suffer within our country, whether they be white or they be black.

So I shall ask you tonight to return home to say a prayer for the family of Martin Luther King, that's true, but more importantly to say a prayer for our own country, which all of us love—a prayer for understanding and that compassion of which I spoke.

We can do well in this country. We will have difficult times. We've had difficult times in the past. We will have difficult times in the future. It is not the end of disorder.

But the vast majority of white people and the vast majority of black people in this country want to live together, want to improve the quality of our life and want justice for all human beings who abide in our land.

Let us dedicate ourselves to what the Greeks wrote so many years ago: to tame the savageness of man and to make gentle the life of this world.

Let us dedicate ourselves to that and say a prayer for our country and for our people.

BYELORUSSIA

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marked the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Byelorussia, and I think it appropriate that we take a moment to pause and pay tribute to these courageous and valiant people.

Despite a determined and hard-fought effort to maintain and preserve their independence, the young state could not withstand the onslaught of the overwhelming forces of the predatory Bolshevik army. However, through the years these gallant and freedom-loving people have sustained an unquenchable thirst for liberty, and their devotion to freedom and self-government is an inspiration to free peoples everywhere.

I am glad to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in honoring these great and noble people, and hope that through these messages of encouragement, they will know that we will never forget their hopes and aspirations to join the community of free nations.

A SENATOR OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article, "A Symbol of a Tragedy," by the outstanding newspaper columnist, William S. White, is one of the finest pieces of journalism I have ever read. In case my colleagues in the Congress may have missed reading this article in Mr. White's syndicated column, I am delighted to bring it to your attention.

I have felt for years that this country has been cheated, because Senator RUSSELL has never been objectively considered for the highest office in the land for purely sectional reasons by those who know in their hearts what this man has meant to these United States during the years.

I still pray that fate will not decree that this country will be deprived of his further service.

The article follows:

A SYMBOL OF A TRAGEDY

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The calm, patrician disclosure of Richard Brevard Russell that he is in the cold grip of a wasting lung tumor brings a sense of elegy to the Senate, and to the country the beginning of the end of an American tragedy.

For this, one of the greatest senators of his era, and the highest embodiment of a Southern tradition of aristocratic and large-minded public service, has acted for his nation with a gallantry and a generosity which that nation has, in fact, repaid with a petty discrimination against him and all his kind.

The personal disaster that has overtaken this authentic gentleman of politics, this able and devoted guardian of true national interest, is cause for general sorrow, and for more than personal sorrow.

If no man is an island to himself, true it is, too, that when the great ones pass from the scence, all are thereby left diminished all are thereby left impoverished.

So it is that if grief for a man must now run high among those who know his personal value, higher yet should run grief for all the implications of a political life so cramped and cribbed and confined by needless and surely outmoded sectional prejudice.

For here has not been simply a senator from Georgia, but rather, in the best and highest meaning of that old-fashioned term, a senator of the United States of America.

On every single ordinary and rational test of performance, of competence, and of private and public honor, no politician in his time has more clearly and more repeatedly earned consideration for the highest office of them all.

No one who understands the Senate can doubt that for many years he has towered there. But the trouble for Richard Brevard Russell has not been that he ever lacked the ability to be an outstanding president, but only that he had himself born in the wrong place at the wrong time, and thus was forever denied even a chance at that elevation which otherwise could hardly have been refused to him.

In a word, the door to the White House was locked and nailed up against him because he was "a Southerner," and thus a member of a lesser breed without the law.

More than any other qualified man, he has been absurdly the victim of a kind of reverse "discrimination" which we might all usefully examine. For the ugly coin of bias has two sides, though we usually talk as though it had only one, and in Richard Russell's case, the coin has always fallen into heads I win and tails you lose.

The bleak, the undeniable and the foolish unfairness of the facts of his career surely presents some opportunity for national second thoughts; surely elementary justice requires some reconsideration of the political criteria of this country.

Granting if one wishes a thousand sins by a South long dead and gone, how long should this nation go on and on punishing its present Southern men of talent for what went on, or is supposed to have gone on, in its long, long yesterdays?

How many times must Fort Sumter be avenged and re-avenged? How many times must "Northern liberals" in their inner awareness of their professional inferiority to such Richard Russells as still survive, reassure themselves by seeing to it that every Richard Russell is kept firmly in his place? How long can the nation afford all this?

It used to be said, and truthfully, that it was the South which would not allow the Civil War to be forgotten. But is it not now—and has it not long since been—the other way round? When the Senate says farewell to Richard Russell something much more than the Senate will have been deprived. So, too, will have been the United States of America.

Perhaps, just perhaps, it may be that his last service will not after all be that stout leadership for a strong American defense posture to which so long he has contributed so much.

Perhaps it will instead be to recall a nation to common sense, if not to a sense of ordinary justice, so that the Civil War may be ended in politics, too, and so that qualified men may be allowed to contend for the presidency, whatever the section of their birth.

SCIENTISTS PROPOSE SONIC BOOM TESTS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune recently carried an article by Louise Hutchinson, which I believe deserves the highest consideration and widest possible attention.

For a number of years I have said time and again that we cannot proceed with the development of a supersonic transport system in the United States until we know definitely just what the effects of such aircraft will have on the citizens and animal life of the United States.

To date there is little evidence that the SST would not be harmful to the well-being of this Nation, and I cannot stress too strongly my own feeling that it would be a tragedy of our time for Congress to place its approval on further development of the SST until we have more detailed information on the effects of this vehicle upon human beings.

It is my hope that our Government will choose to conduct a thorough and careful investigation into the effects of the SST before embarking on a costly venture producing chaos throughout this country.

The Tribune article by Miss Hutchinson follows:

SCIENTISTS PROPOSE SONIC BOOM TESTS

(By Louise Hutchinson)

WASHINGTON, November 22.—A scientific panel recommended yesterday that the government start a program of supersonic flights over the United States so that citizens can learn for themselves what the daily battering of sonic booms is like.

At issue is the still unbuilt and controversial supersonic transport.

Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, who called a press conference to release the study he commissioned, maintains the sonic booms that will result from the flight of the 1,800 mile-an-hour jet are an environmental problem. That puts them in his bailiwick.

The federal aviation agency, which fired back a statement, didn't say so directly, but it clearly considers the SST and its booms an FAA matter.

The squabble may amount to little more than a rattling window pane. Any major decisions will have to be made by the Nixon administration and none of the current cast may be around by then.

The panel of 12 scientists named by Udall last December to probe "noise and the sonic boom in relation to man" recommended that prompt, large-scale experiments in supersonic flight be done to see how people feel about the booms.

They also proposed that a Presidential committee be set up to hold public hearings in areas of the country potentially affected by the SST sonic booms. The committee, said the panel, then could make recommendations.

The panel also got into the economics of the SST, asserting that if the jet liner to be built by the Boeing company is not allowed to fly over this country, "its development and use would face a serious handicap."

CRASH LOCATOR BEACONS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, KABC-TV in Chicago recently commented, editorially, about the tragedy of the absence of mandatory requirements for crash locator beacons on commercial aircraft in this country today.

I am sure that there are few who would disagree with the thinking outlined in KABC-TV's forthright commentary on this subject, and I am pleased to insert in the RECORD today the editorial entitled "Crash Locator Beacons."

The editorial follows:

CRASH LOCATOR BEACONS

The recent disappearance of a DC-3 with 32 passengers aboard has been a tragic news highlight—a highlight made even more tragic because the plane might have been located if a simple safety measure were observed.

Crash Locator Beacons which automatically give off a battery-operated signal after a crash impact, have been available for some time.

Operating on specially assigned radio wavelengths, beacon signals emitted every few seconds can be detected by search planes as far as 200 miles—depending on the altitude of the searcher.

A recent aviation safety survey shows that about 20% of all downed aircraft require a search. More than 30 planes lost in the last ten years have never been found.

(Cost of the installed Crash Locator Beacon runs from about $100 up.)

KABC-TV recommends immediate legal action requiring such a device as a safety meaure in all commercially operated aircraft.

To be effective, Crash Locator Beacons must be a standard requirement.

The cost is negligible—the potential in lives saved through shortened search time, immense. We urge authorities to enact necessary regulations now.

(NOTE.—The above Editorial was telecast a total of three times—on February 25, and 26, 1969.)

THE CONSTRUCTIVE RISE OF BLACK BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT IN DETROIT

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues in Congress and the constituents of the 13th Congressional District of Michigan the history and progress of a black business development program now successfully operating in my home city of Detroit.

This growing program is being implemented by the Inner-City Business Improvement Forum, a nonprofit corporation of which, I am proud to state, I was the founder. What the Inner-City Business Improvement Forum—ICBIF—is accomplishing is doing much to counter criticism of the "black capitalism" concept of the Nixon administration.

Critics of "black capitalism" charge that encouraging this approach will do no more than provide fat incomes for a relatively few black business proprietors, while leaving unbenefited the vast numbers of black who seek economic advancement.

It is my view that "black capitalism" is indeed but one of many programs needed to produce economic quality for our Nation's 22 million black citizens, whose average income is shamefully less than that of white Americans. However, ICBIF is proving that, through imaginative planning and unselfish purpose, "black capitalism" can be employed as a means of greatly swelling black business ownership and, as a consequence, creating many additional job opportunities where they are needed the most.

The seed from which ICBIF sprouted was planted at a meeting of 65 black community leaders called by me and held in my westside Detroit congressional office on Sunday, August 6, 1967, just 1 week after the end of the fiery civil uprising in Detroit—July 23 to 29, 1967.

Among those in attendance were Mrs. Florine Hawkins, whose Hawkins Apparel Shop had been burned down during the disorder; Mr. L. M. Quinn, editor-general manager of the Michigan Chronicle; Mr. Edward Lacen, now deceased, director of Detroit's small business development center program; Mr. Nathaniel Smith, owner of the Speed-E dry cleaning chain; the Reverend Dr. Charles E. Morton, pastor of Metropolitan Baptist Church and a member of Michigan's State Board of Education; Mrs. Carmen Murphy, head of House of Beauty, Inc.; Mr. Waymon Dunn, president of the Community Association of Block Clubs, Inc.; Mr. Lawrence B. Doss, Assistant District Director of the Internal Revenue Service; Mr. Walter M. McMurtry, loan officer with the Bank of the Commonwealth and president of the financial forum; Mr. Colin Cromwell, owner of the Motor City Super Market and now operator of Detroit's first black-owned cafeteria, the Soul Buffet; Mr. Edward Davis, the only black holder of Chrysler franchise in the United States; Dr. Austin W. Curtis, Jr., the one and only laboratory assistant to the late Tuskegee Institute agricultural scientist, Dr. George Washington Carver, and president of A. W. Curtis Laboratories, Inc.; Mr. M. Stewart Thompson, a mortgage broker; Mr. Thaddeus Gaillard, president of Great Lakes Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Mrs. Esther Gordy Edwards, vice president of Detroit's internationally known Motown Record Corp.; Mr. James Garrett, president of the Cotillion Club; Dr. Karl D. Gregory, Wayne State University economics professor; and Mr. Wardell Croft, president of Wright Mutual Insurance Co.

The fruitfulness of this August 6 meeting is evidenced by the fact that unanimous agreement was reached to continue scheduling discussions on business problems contributing to and resulting from the riot and to institute mechanisms for overcoming obstacles blocking the acquirement of financing, site locations, and casualty insurance coverage by black entrepreneuers.

In order to guarantee action on these recommendations, this gathering also appointed task force committees to explore the establishment of a central office, to determine the chief concerns of inner-city Detroit's black merchants and consumers, and to search for means by which a paid staff could be hired to make these suggestions materialize.

This group, in addition, concurred in my recommendation to call itself the Inner-City Business Improvement Forum.

From this point on, meetings of the Forum were held on virtually a weekly basis, with the task force groups convening even more frequently. Since almost all of the riot damage had occurred in my 13th District and the adjoining First District, assisting in the development of ICBIF became a project of highest priority for my two congressional offices in Detroit.

On Sunday, August 20, ICBIF's task force on ways and means, headed by Mr. Lawrence Doss, outlined a program that catapulted the organization onto its present path of success.

Mr. Doss' committee proposed, first, that campaigns be launched to counsel both consumers and business owners of the inner city; second, that professional help be obtained to guide the formation of cooperatives, the restoration or relocation of riot-damaged businesses and the operations of new and existing enterprises; third, that the creation of architecturally impressive commercial structures in the inner city, such as shopping center and franchise ventures, be encouraged; and, fourth, that community-controlled agencies be set up to assist business people in solving their managerial, promotional, legal and financial problems, and to provide further training in business management and skilled crafts.

The task force budget recommendation of $14,280 needed to begin implementation of its program and covering the period of September through December 1967 was approved. A fundraising plan was devised and, within a few days, letters soliciting contributions were sent to a large number of individuals and organizations in the black community.

At this same meeting, the decision was made to incorporate ICBIF. It was decided that this corporate structure would be composed of a 30-member board of directors, representing all variances in inner-city thinking, an executive staff, and five advisory committees—an Immediate Business Opportunity Committee, a Long-Range Business Opportunity Committee, an Economic Education and Consumer Advisory Committee, a Committee on Financial Resources, and a Community Liaison and Public Information Committee.

While in the process of becoming incorporated and acquiring necessary operating funds, ICBIF used my West Side Detroit congressional office as its temporary headquarters. During this interim period, I assigned a member of my staff—Mr. Thomas Binion—to devote his full time and attention with the necessary supporting services, to matters of the Forum.

On October 13, 1967, the Inner-City Business Improvement Forum was incorporated under Michigan laws as a nonprofit organization "to enhance the general welfare of Greater Detroit through fostering and stimulating the expansion of business ownership by residents of Detroit's core communities." The organizing officers were Mr. Nathaniel Smith, president; Mr. M. Stewart Thompson, vice president; Miss Dorothy Quarker, my longtime administrative assistant, secretary, and Mr. Wardell Croft, treasurer.

At its first regular election, the following assumed offices: Dr. Charles E. Morton, chairman of the board; Dr. Karl Gregory, vice chairman of the board; Lawrence P. Doss, president; Nathaniel W. Smith, vice president; Hon. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., Secretary; Miss Dorothy Quarker, assistant secretary, and Wardell C. Croft, treasurer.

Also listed as directors were Edgar Brazelton, chairman of the Immediate Business Opportunity Committee; Russell S. Brown, Jr., chairman of the Community Liaison and Public Information Committee; Mrs. Agnes H. Bryant; Attorney Jesse H. Butler; Clyde Cleveland; Dr. Wendell Cox; Colin Cromwell; Dr. Austin W. Curtis, Jr.; Albert Dunmore; Thad B. Gaillard, chairman of the Long-Range Business Opportunity Committee; Mrs. R. Louise Groomes; Mrs. Roberta Hughes; Melvin D. Jefferson; Ernest Mackey; Walter McMurtry, Jr., chairman of the Committee on Financial Resources: Dr. Lon Polk, David Rambeau, Mrs. Esther Shapiro; Herbert Thompson; Edward Vaughn; Tony Vance, and Gabe Werba.

Studies by the ICBIF staff revealed, among other economic imbalances, that while over 65 percent of Detroit's inner-city population is black, 62 percent of the businesses in this area were white owned; and that 31 percent of the black-owned establishments were netting under $4,000 annually, and 60 percent were netting less than $8,000.

It also was confirmed that the biggest problem for black businessmen was difficulty in acquiring capital. This finding prompted my office to step up its efforts to have more attention given to this situation by the Small Business Administration and other Federal lending agencies.

In July 1968, Mr. Walter McMurtry resigned his position of loan officer with Detroit's Bank of the Commonwealth to become the salaried executive director of ICBIF. Mr. McMurtry also was retained as chairman of the organization's Committee on Financial Resources.

Appointed at about the same time to be ICBIF's deputy director was Mr. Carthan Spencer, the co-owner of an accounting firm and, prior to his appointment, a systems analyst with the mayor's Committee on Human Resources.

Grants and loans obtained to finance ICBIF's programs and staff needs now total over $1,500,000. The major portion of these funds was received from Detroit's big three automobile manufacturers and Michigan Bell Telephone Co., but there were impressive contributions from the black community.

ICBIF is now headquartered in a neatly renovated, two-story brick building at 6072 14th Street in the 13th Congressional District of Detroit, and is in the process of constructing an annex to accommodate its expanding activities. Also housed in the Forum's busy location are a district SBA office and a staff employed by the organizers of the proposed First Independence National Bank.

The bank, whose application for a Federal charter received preliminary approval from the Comptroller of the Currency in February 1969, is on the track to become the first black-controlled institution of its type in Detroit's history, the culmination of a dream I have long and activily pursued, even before I became an officer of ICBIF.

In 1968, ICBIF aided several new, black-owned enterprises in obtaining loans totaling nearly $1,000,000. Over 150 business-minded citizens were interviewed by ICBIF staff members during the last 6 months of the year and over 80 requests for loan assistance were processed.

Among the loan recipients were a plant which will manufacture plastic boat and automobile bodies, and which will employ 25 workers; a supermarket corporation which will rebuild and operate a large store that was burned out by rioters; a textbook publishing company, and a number of clothing shops, restaurants, and community-owned groceries.

At the present time, ICBIF is having a store-to-store survey made of inner-city business establishments for the purpose of accurately determining the number, types, outlooks, and needs of these operations. Soon to be opened by the organization are an Entrepreneurial Training Center and a Computer Accounting and Business Promotional Service.

In less than 2 years, the endeavors of the Inner-City Business Improvement Forum have had a measurable effect in stimulating the commercial ambitions of black Detroiters. The programs being sponsored by ICBIF are creating new business, strengthening existing ventures and producing more jobs within the suppressed community they are serving.

There is no reason to doubt that the concept of "black capitalism" can be of significant value in remedying the economic plight of black Americans, provided it is applied along the lines being laid by the Inner-City Business Improvement Forum of Detroit.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this Nation was shaken to its very foundation by the death of one of its greatest humanitarians, men of peace, and fighters for human rights, Dr. Martin Luther King.

Dr. King had a dream and he made that dream the dream of American society. His selfless dedication to the cause of equal rights, equal justice, and equal opportunity inspired people throughout the United States to seek these goals more vigorously. His profound and abiding faith in the doctrine of nonviolence dramatized the plight of the black people in our country and led to most of the major Federal and State programs now helping black citizens to rise up out of poverty.

Working with black and white alike, Dr. King did more to advance the cause of civil rights than any other Negro in the history of the United States. His achievements in this cause range all the way from the integration of lunch counters in small southern towns to the razing of slums in giant northern cities. Most important of all, however, he raised the sights of the American people.

It was, therefore, not surprising that Dr. King was held in the highest esteem by black citizens throughout the country. The surveys done by the Kerner Commission and others revealed him to enjoy greater support than all other black leaders combined.

One year later, James Earl Ray has been convicted for this dastardly murder; yet many questions remain unanswered about this tragic event. I hope the Justice Department will not close the case on Dr. King's assassination just because James Earl Ray has gone to jail. Only if all of the facts are fully exposed can the Nation ever come close to being fully reconciled to this great man's death.

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY SPONSOR CORPS

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues that the Utah State University Sponsor Corps will participate in this year's National Cherry Blossom Festival. The girls are scheduled to compete in the National Intercollegiate—ROTC—Drill Team competition on April 11 and participate in the Parade of Princesses the following day.

The ROTC Corps of Sponsors at Utah State University was founded in 1893 by 1st Lt. Henry D. Styler, the first P.M.S. & T. at the university. It was founded as an honorary society of women members with the purpose of serving as an auxiliary to and fostering interest in the then recently formed ROTC battalion. It was the first such organization formed and is therefore the oldest in the Nation.

At Utah State University, the Corps is a service organization. As such, the girls are used as official hostesses for the university. They usher for athletic contests, lyceums, guest artist presentations, commencement, and special events. They also participate in service projects for the community.

These girls, in their striking blue uniforms, have become famous throughout the campus, State, and Nation for their precision drilling. They are constantly in demand to drill at athletic events, formal occasions such as the President's review, community celebrations, and drill competitions.

Every other year, the Corps takes a 2-week trip back to the National Cherry Blossom Festival in Washington, D.C. In 1957 the USU Sponsors were the only women's drill team entered in the ROTC national drill competition. They won 10th place in competition with 38 male teams and were recognized as the first women's drill team to enter this competition and the first women's team to drill with rifles. In 1959 the Corps took first place in the coed division and 10th overall against 53 male teams. In 1961 the Sponsors took first place in the parade over 150 entries. The girls took first place in 1963 and are listed in the Hall of Fame. Fifth place was won by the Sponsors in 1965 and second place in 1967.

The USU Sponsor Corps, the only team west of the Mississippi to participate in the festival, travels to Washington, D.C., by chartered bus. After spending 4 days in Washington, the Corps travels on to New York City for a 3-day visit.

The trip costs about $5,000. The money is earned by the girls through such projects as selling pens, apples, recipe cards, and coupon books. They have collected pop bottles, stamp books, and pennies; they have sponsored four dances. The USU Student Senate also allocated $1,200 from its marginal balance to the Sponsors to help finance the bus.

Col. M. R. McCarthy is the professor of military science at Utah State University, and Capt. Kenneth S. Freeman is the Sponsor faculty adviser. Sponsor Col. Jan Seamons is commander of the Corps while Cadet Sgt. Michael Williams is drillmaster.

DIRECTOR WOODS SPEAKS OUT ON THE COMPLEXITIES OF WELFARE

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the director of the Monroe County Department of Social Services, William B. Woods, is resigning April 20 after 10½ years as director.

Mr. Woods has done an exemplary job in his capacity and has shown an intuitive understanding of the complexities of welfare.

He has a realistic appraisal of the feelings of the people on welfare and he also comprehends the feelings of taxpayers.

In a recent interview, he points out that some taxpayers feel that because a person is on welfare, "What you are supposed to do is live in a hole and be handed the groceries and a shirt once in a while and this satisfies a group of people." But Mr. Woods does not believe that a person loses his rights to dignity because he is on welfare.

This is a most conscientious and wise man. He has a clear insight, after many years of work, into the problems of welfare in Monroe County.

I feel that a two-part series in the Rochester, N.Y. Times-Union, which appeared March 25 and 26, illustrates his comprehensive understanding and points out an exemplary man. Mr. Woods was interviewed by reporters Cliff Smith, William D. Tammeus, Dolores Orman, and editorial writer Phil Currie. I would like to share these articles with my colleagues:

Few Cheats on Welfare

The county has a good system to detect welfare cheats, Welfare Director William B. Woods says.

Numbers of welfare freeloaders are negligible, he indicated in a taped interview with The Times-Union. Of 20,432 on welfare here, 200 are employable, he said. Some 12,000 welfare recipients are children, he said.

Woods also said in the first part of the interview:

The case load can be trimmed only by reducing programs, such as medical care, rather than by chipping away at single cases.

The average welfare recipient is not a shiftless bum who laughs at the public.

A strong voice is needed locally to help shape state rules.

The voluntary social service agencies, and the public, tend to hide when the Welfare Department gets in trouble.

Woods, 49, is resigning April 20 as director of Monroe County Department of Social Service (Welfare) to become chief administrator of Park Avenue Hospital.

A native of Rochester, he has been welfare director 10½ years. Previously, he was administrator of the old Rochester Municipal Hospital.

Woods was interviewed by T-U reporters Cliff Smith, William D. Tammeus, Dolores Orman and editorial writer Phil Currie. Portions of the first part follow.

Q. You're leaving the welfare administration field for the hospital field at a time when it seems that there's the biggest outcry against welfare and against welfare recipients.

Do you feel like a man who's running from a burning house? Do you think the roof is about to fall in on all the liberal legislation and the good things that have come about in past years?

A. I think your premise is wrong that this is the most difficult time for social welfare.

Public welfare has never been understood by anybody in any day in any age. . . . When Demosthenes was concerned about his Athens (he) said that public welfare was a medicine that neither cured the disease nor allowed the patient to die peacefully, to paraphrase him . . . the city fathers of London (said) we must have a residency law to keep people out of the cities and they developed one about 1673 . . .

. . . and also a series of council regulations which said that anyone who had lost his job and won't work, he would be sent to gaol. And anyone that accepts a wage more than the current wage would be imprisoned . . .

New York State took over the philosophy . . . In 1662 they passed a residency law where you couldn't move from one county to another in the State of New York. In 1823 the secretary of state of New York was concerned about all the money that was spent for public welfare and he authorized an investigation of public welfare.

In 1823 the Monroe County budget was $1,800 and about $750 was spent for public welfare.

Out of the investigation came two recommendations. One was that the county build poor houses and the county had its first poor house in 1826. And the second recommendation was that the State of New York have a residency law. A residency law was initiated and lasted until 1873. . .

Then when the federal government started to take over part of the public welfare with the Social Security Act in 1935, all residency laws went out the window in New York State.

Q. You don't feel that the criticism is any more justified today than it has been in the past?

A. Well, I dont think so . . . it's always been a very difficult question and people sometimes think, "Well, I work hard for my money—why should somebody be given their living?"

The Bible states in Proverbs that the poor shall always be despised by his neighbor . . . I don't think . . . we will ever completely sell the working man on a philosophy of providing for the poor.

Q. What's been your biggest frustration?

A. One, to do things quickly and in government you do not do things quickly . . . And secondly, living within a group of rules and regulations that are determined by somebody in Albany, when you recognize that the problems are on a local level base. To try to develop some consistency . . . is a difficult job.

Q. What do you think should be done about the problems on a local and state basis?

A. The five commissioners in Area 2 got together, the ones surrounding Monroe County, and we talked about this and we felt that there was a strong voice needed at the local level in determining rules and regulations at the state level.

And we also felt that each welfare district had its own specific problems. Rural Wayne County with its high migrant population has a different set of problems from Monroe County with a tremendous economy. And we thought that there should be a great deal more flexibility.

Q. The trend now, at least many local politicians have felt, is that one of the two governments outside the county should assume the complete role for welfare. How do you feel about that?

A. I suppose the easiest way to get rid of a headache is to give it to somebody else, if you can do it.

However, it isn't going to solve the problem and I think that this community knows more about its own problems than those on other levels.

There's a lot of pressure for state supervision and administration. Massachusetts just went into this. Pennsylvania has a state-administered system—Rhode Island, Florida. Those that I've seen, however, have developed just large bureaucracies that didn't meet the needs of the people. They cost more, these state-administered programs, and I think that . . . the community tends to slough off its responsibility. . . .

Q. What instances of this local sloughing off have there been?

A. I don't think there's been any local sloughing off, politically, anyway, under the current system where we administer the program. As I mentioned at a meeting a few weeks ago, I felt the voluntary social service agencies, and the public in general, when the Welfare Department gets in trouble, or has a problem, they have a tendency to hide rather than give us support.

The public, for example, is pounding the department about some kind of problem, rather than helping us with it or supporting us . . . As long as the taxpayer could afford to keep up a standard of living which basically meant things that were the extras, the luxury items, as long as he could purchase this, and had the purchasing power, he wasn't too concerned what his legislators did.

And we're seeing a reversal of that. He's getting pinched, and he's not getting pinched because the surpluses are going into taxes.

He's getting pinched because his credit economy is falling apart. He's generally overextending himself. He borrowed on his future and this is what's hurting.

So suddenly he's becoming interested . . . The community reacts (to) human problems by just trying to hide them in some way.

If you ask somebody—we have problems with alcoholics, what would you like to do with the alcoholics? The first thing he'll say will be, let's bury them somewhere, or let's institutionalize him so that no one sees him.

Q. Can the welfare case load in Monroe County be reduced from its present, I believe, 20,000 persons?

A. We could reduce it by abolishing the Department of Social Welfare. The reason you have a case load is the proliferation of programs.

For example, if you're not going to have any medical care program, your case load will be at X point. If you're going to have a Medicaid program, you're going to add X many thousands of people to the load. So it depends on the programming you have.

Q. Of the people who are not now on the case load, are there a significant number in the county who should be?

A. Despite what the citizen on the street thinks (sometimes they think it's easy to get welfare), I don't think it's easy and I still think it's an embarrassing kind of process for a lot of people.

And there are a lot of people who will decline no matter what, and their neighbors will help them. So I'm sure there are people who are eligible for Medicaid, and I'm sure there are people who may well be eligible for public assistance, who won't apply.

The best example of this was when medical assistance to the aged (Medicare) went into effect. When older people began to apply for this program we found that about 65 per cent of them had been eligible for public assistance since the time they were 65 years of age, but they just didn't apply.

They didn't want to. It was embarrassing. And they were living on their little Social Security checks.

Q. How many freeloaders are there on welfare in a given time? What is the range of the number of freeloaders?

A. I'd like to know what a freeloader is.

Q. A person who is receiving welfare that could be earning his keep.

A. . . . When somebody comes in and applies and they're employable, they have to by law go down to the State Employment Service and if there's a job available for them, they have to take it or they're not eligible.

We've had people who apply every month, and I get a report every month—individuals who have been offered jobs and who didn't take them and who are not given assistance. Some of them, instead of going to the employment service, end up going out and getting their own job.

Now, if there's not a job available in terms of what he can do . . . they set subsequent dates for him. We also have an employment service in the building to keep track, so that he does have to make an account of himself.

I'm sure there are some people who will go out by themselves, who may be on welfare and apply for a job.

I think people want to work, basically, and they don't want to be on welfare. The surveillance on welfare alone disturbs them. . . . Right now we have 200 people that are employable on the welfare rolls, out of 20,432.

Q. In regard to what you were saying about applying for welfare can be an embarrassing thing—do you mean simply in terms of the widely accepted Protestant ethic about work being such a wonderful purifier of man, or do you mean because there are things they have to disclose and there are things they have to go through in applying and receiving welfare that are kind of dehumanizing?

A. It has nothing to do with the work ethic. For example, a 70-year-old woman who may be applying for public assistance is not related to the work ethic. Out of 20,000 people on assistance, 12,000 are children and you're not concerned with work and children.

It's in terms of delving into their personal lives. The older person: Do you have a bank account? Where is your bank account? Do you have any relatives? Where is you son? Where is your daughter?

Her son and daughter may not pay any attention to her and she doesn't want us to get in touch with them. Or she may have a sister somewhere that we might call to ask about her.

Social information: Do you have insurance in terms of savings for your burial? What is the relationship with you and your landlord? Is he friendly towards you?

Q. Would an affidavit system remove some of that?

A. I think an affidavit system hasn't been tested enough to know whether it costs more to have a surveillance on those people you think may be defrauding you.

One advantage to an affidavit system is to probably relieve the case worker of a lot of paper work. I don't think it's been tested enough.

Q. How effective is the surveillance system the county has to uncover the defrauding of welfare?

A. I think we have a good system. There are people who thought we should have some sort of a police department of our own. However, public welfare has no police authority whatsoever.

You find that people tell on each other. Welfare clients will tell on each other. They get mad at each other or the neighbor will get mad at the next door neighbor who may be on welfare, and she'll report something. In about 90 per cent of these there is no fraudulent action.

Or the case worker may go to the home and never find the client there and will ask the special investigation unit to find out what the client is doing, and we find out the client is working. This means sending to Washington and getting all the material on Social Security and what they've paid in income taxes which has to do with their earnings and then they're arrested.

Q. Many critics of welfare would probably characterize the average recipient to be a no-good shiftless bum who refuses to work, even though he could, who fathers numerous children, who drives a big car and laughs at the public.

They probably see the women on relief as good-for-nothings who don't care for their children, who sleep with any man who comes along, adding eventually to the dependent children load. To what extent do you think this sort of thing is accurate, or inaccurate?

A. I think these are myths, generally.

You've asked a lot of questions here, and they follow the pattern of the state communities aid survey of New York State. They went out and said to people, "What do you think of public welfare?"

They came up with five items.

One was that the relief load was filled with employable people who wouldn't work and enjoyed being on welfare.

Secondly—that women had one illegitimate child after another for the purpose of increasing the allotment they got, and therefore the conclusion said that public welfare is responsible for illegitimacy, is a cause of illegitimacy.

The third myth had to do with thousands of Puerto Ricans and Negroes flooding New York State for the purpose of getting on assistance.

Four was that the relief load was full of chiselers.

And five, that the great problem with public welfare is that it's dominated by caseworkers.

These turn out to be national myths because the people in other states think the same thing . . . In speaking to groups I find that they would like to believe these myths.

So what you say to the citizen—like the citizen who shouts last night at the meeting, "All these people are driving Cadillacs—" I think they have to produce their names and their addresses.

Public welfare is provided under the law. Everything you do is under the law. The eligibility standards are within the law. And I think that I have to have names and addresses. We'll do an investigation and find out . . .

I got a call one day saying, "This woman lives across the street from me. She lives up over a bar and every day she goes down there and she gets a six-pack of beer and drinks it."

So I got the case out and it turns out to be an 86-year-old woman. Now, if Grandma

Smith wants to go down and drink a six-pack a day, I don't really care.

Maybe it's good for her. I don't care about that.

The woman that said last night, "If you're a welfare recipient how can you smoke?"

If you're a welfare recipient do you lose your citizenship? Do you lose all your chemistry so that you're sexless? The fact that you're a welfare recipient, does that mean that you have no right to sleep with anyone, or you have no right to smoke, or you have no right to drink?

What you're supposed to do is live in a hole and be handed the groceries and a shirt once in a while and this satisfies a group of people.

I don't think the general population believes that welfare should be this restrictive. And I don't think that because you're on welfare you lose your citizenship.

When you talk about being on welfare, you're talking about people that could do better than they're doing, and we have some. Then your job is to try to motivate them to do something, to do better.

But the big population we have is children, and the aged and the totally disabled and the blind and this kind of thing.

There may be some families on welfare that come from a different culture than we have.

Now the general public in Monroe County, who have lived in this culture for years, will resent that group that lives in a sub-culture, or a culture they think is not appropriate to the community.

Supposing somebody throws their garbage out the second story window. The neighbor next door is going to get pretty upset about it. But maybe to that family up there this was always the method of the disposal of the garbage.

Several studies have been done and we found out that the normal welfare family doesn't have any more children than the average family not on welfare.

There are welfare families who have 10 children. There are welfare families who have none. And the same applies for the normal population.

It's a bell-shaped curve where in the middle are the mother and father with 3.8 children.

If welfare was the cause of illegitimacy, I think we would wonder then why 85 percent of the illegitimate children never see anything of welfare. . . .

If we had thousands of Negroes and Puerto Ricans flooding this community for the purposes of getting on assistance, I think we would have seen over the last 10 years a dramatic increase in the rolls. And that hasn't occurred.

So that all of these things that you were saying . . . these become myths.

WELFARE RESIDENCY LAWS DON'T WORK

Welfare Director William B. Woods says residency laws don't work.

People don't move here to get public assistance anyway, he says.

A residency law, in which welfare assistance would be given only after a person had been in the state for a specified time (the County Legislature recommends a year) is "like a sugar pill to relieve a headache," he says.

Of more than 20,000 on home relief here, only 26 have been here less than a year, he says.

Woods' remarks are contained in the concluding half of a taped interview with Times-Union reporters. (The first half was published yesterday.)

Woods is resigning April 20 after 10½ years as director of Monroe County Department of Social Services (Welfare) to become chief administrator of Park Avenue Hospital Corp.

Portions of the interview follow:

Q. The County Legislature has just recommended that the state pass a one-year welfare residency law. I believe you've opposed such laws in the past. I wonder if you could explain to us why.

A. Residency laws don't work. They're expensive to administer.

About 1958 the state department came out with a study of residency laws. They found that those states with high residency requirements had higher migration than in those states without them.

Q. You mean eventual welfare recipients or just people in general?

A. People. The people didn't move for the purpose of getting public assistance.

Now what is a residency law supposed to do? It's supposed to keep people off assistance in the state who haven't been here a year.

They don't do it, because you usually have a clause in the law which says "but in cases of emergency the welfare director will be able to provide the family with something." You never see any one unless it's an emergency.

Right now, on the home relief load, out of 20,432 people, we have 26 people who haven't been here a year.

Now when we impose a residency law there's going to have to be some kind of an administrative detail which will cost a great deal of money.

Residency laws have been debated by the Supreme Court and they said they're unconstitutional. . . . If the state does get one, the only people it will affect are these 26 we have.

And then if they need help, we aren't going to let them starve.

. . . A residency law to the public is like a sugar pill to relieve a headache. It gives the public a feeling you're doing something to alleviate this horrible welfare problem.

The public through their legislators could drop our expenditures $5 million by doing something with Medicaid. When you look at our case load and our expenditures you go evenly to 1966 and then they both go up like this. And it's totally Medicaid.

I think that as I said before, if there were millions of people coming in here for the purpose of getting on relief and everybody says Monroe County is the mecca, why is our case load relatively the same as it was 10 years ago?

We do send people back.

In the fall we used to have a bus because migrants would get stuck here and we'd send 40 or 50 back on a bus.

Q. You were breaking regulations doing this, weren't you?

A. No, these people wanted to go back. They were basically migrants.

There are other people who come up and we say, "Well, where did you come from?" "Well, I just got here the day before yesterday from Seattle, Washington."

"Well, what are you going to do here?" "I'm going to look for a job." "What do you do?" "I make barrels."

I don't know whether there are any barrel industries here, but we tell him he should go back. And he doesn't want to go back. We'll write to Seattle and they'll give us permission to send him back. So we may take him down to a bus. And we do this to many people every year.

Q. Whenever you take the initiative in sending them back is this bending the regulations of the state?

A. We send them back without any permission of the state. The state doesn't mind as long as we pay their way back.

People don't move for public welfare.

Q. Are you saying that even though all states paid the same welfare payments, even if they were all equal, there would still be the same amount of movement?

A. There will be a movement of population.

Q. When the Medicaid program was first proposed you were one of the first to say that we weren't looking realistically at what this was really going to cost us. Do you see any way now in light of the developments that Medicaid costs can be reduced?

A. What we have in Medicaid now, probably in 1966 should have been a final goal. What happened is that the state bit off more than it could chew, overestimating the amount of money the federal government was going to supply—the standards were even above the federal standards—and then underestimating the cost.

There should have been limits to the Medicaid program. As it developed that monies were available, they could have expanded it.

For example, the state should have provided only for routine dental care. This is my own feeling. Not all the dental care, just routine dental services. Dental case, incidentally, was probably the most important part of the Medicaid program, because children who had never seen a dentist before got preventive dental treatment they needed.

But the routine dental care item in the Medicaid law would have been sufficient to do this.

(Ed. note: Eligibility for Medicaid is determined on a sliding scale which takes into account the number of persons in a family and net annual income.

(Net income is defined as total income, less income taxes, the cost of health insurance premiums, and payments made to dependents by court order.

(A single individual with a net income of $2,300 or less is eligible for Medicaid. A family of four with a net income of $5,300 or less also is eligible.)

I'm in agreement with the governor that there should be compulsory New York State Health insurance, because 80 per cent of the industry in New York State does not have any health insurance program for its employes.

What you get is the unions not wanting it because the employe is going to have to contribute a little, and the owners of industry not wanting it because they have to contribute a lot. Of course the state presumably would help subsidize it.

This would release a load on Medicare.

Probably there were certain services that should not have initially been included, such as podiatrists and chiropracters.

Certainly to be discussed is whether or not acute hospital days should be unlimited.

If the average stay in an acute hospital is 7.3 days, would it not have been sufficient for the state to say under Medicaid 10 days of hospital care is all that's provided?

They could have put in some exceptions for catastrophic illness, muscular distrophy, or multiple sclerosis. They should have started out this way.

Q. Can they go back to this point now?

A. It's a horrible problem going back.

Q. What effect do you think it had when the Medicaid law removed the restrictions on filial responsibilities as far as payments.

A. We have a great shortage in nursing home beds. I was in favor with doing away with the responsible relative law because it was more costly administering it.

I don't think we got more than $40,000 from relatives under this law, and we had to trace them all over the country, sometimes take them into court and everything else.

And not only that, there was a side effect of disrupting total families. There may be 10 children in a family. And Joe has to give $20 a month to his mother and Jim can only give $10 because he doesn't earn as much.

Pretty soon they're fighting about it.

The law itself in many respects wasn't too good. The result, however, was that many relatives, sons and daughters, who were caring for their father and mother at home saw the opportunity to move them into a nursing home and let the public pay for it.

And this they did. This alone has caused a shortage.

There is an elderly person in a local hospital that's been there for three months, under Medicare, and there are some sons and daughters. Medicare won't pay any more because the person doesn't need to be there on the "acute side."

Medicaid has picked up on it and we're trying to get the person into a nursing home, but the room in a nursing home doesn't exist.

They tried to get the relatives to do something and they said, "Just leave her there. We don't want anything to do with her. We don't care if you shut off paying for it. We aren't paying."

So this is the attitude of relatives . . .

Q. Politicians are beating the drums about equalizing welfare payments throughout the states. Do I understand correctly that this would reduce the number of poor people moving into New York State:

A. I think it probably would be good to have a federal standard through all the states.

I don't think people move for this reason. I think people will move anyway.

And on the other hand, in West Virginia, for example, if the coal mines give out and there's nothing, there are people who won't move even though you offer them an incentive saying, "In Michigan there's a job for you and a retraining program."

They may say "I'm not moving off my slag hill. I'm staying here. I was born here and raised here and I want to stay here."

Q. Will you tell us briefly how you feel about the current proposals for children's allowances for the poor and negative income tax?

A. All of these have been tried before. In 1845 there was a guaranteed income in some county in England. I guess it lasted about 40 years.

Children's allowances is not a new one. Canada, of course, has this.

The feeling is that if you have a children's allowance you'll have more children. This is not proven true in Canada. This is not a program that solves the problem. There has to be some kind of supplementation.

I think guaranteed incomes or reverse income taxes stifle initiative. I don't think we're ready for them. . . . The economy we have now does not fit itself to this kind of thing.

Q. What about a combination incentive program where a man can work at his job and still receive a certain amount of welfare payments and pull himself up a little bit?

A. We have quite a percentage of the caseload people who are working and still getting some kind of supplementary assistance but the assistance they are getting is still at a welfare standard, which is subsistence.

What I would like to see us do . . . (Let's say) someone is on welfare. The father gets a job; he goes to collect his first pay.

Now he's no longer eligible. We close the case.

This family may be a real multi-problem family, and they've been on welfare. They've got all kinds of problems and the first thing that happens to him is he starts work and his creditors garnishee his wages. And the first thing you know, he's back on welfare.

If we could just suspend the case and follow it through and do casework until the fellow gets on his feet.

We'd help him with the problems that he might come across. This might be helpful.

Q. Were you thinking of using, as case aides, people within the poorer sections of the city?

A. Could be . . . We're beginning to do a little of this with the new careers programs. This is demonstration alone.

Q. Do you have enough case workers now?

A. Yes.

Q. More than enough if you could do away with the paperwork?

A. No, I think we'd do a better job. I don't know that we're doing our complete job now because some of the bureaucracy we're mixed up in.

ORANGEBURG GROUP PROMOTES MEMORIAL FUND FOR SOLDIER

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, people throughout my congressional district are participating in programs designed to show their support for our fighting men in Vietnam.

In the city of Orangeburg, S.C., for example, patriotic and civic-minded citizens recently established a memorial to a young soldier, Sp4c. Layne Gleaton, who was killed in Vietnam. Entitled the "Layne Gleaton Vietnam Fund," this worthy project will provide much-needed personal items for our fighting men. I am very proud of the wonderful people of Orangeburg, many of whom have sons of their own serving in Vietnam, for founding such a noble program, and I feel confident that it will meet with overwhelming success.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I would like to commend the following newspaper article about this project to the attention of the Congress, as follows:

ORANGEBURG GROUP PROMOTES MEMORIAL FUND FOR SOLDIER

(By John Faust)

What began as an informal effort on the part of a few Orangeburg citizens to send Orangeburg servicemen in Vietnam packages of luxuries and necessities has turned into a determined drive to establish a memorial in memory of a fallen U.S. Army serviceman.

Under the direction of Mrs. Dorothy Passwater of Orangeburg, herself the mother of a son wounded seriously in Vietnam, a list of servicemen's names was gathered and the first package was to have been mailed with a small ceremony from the Chestnut St. Orangeburg Fire Station.

However, early Friday morning, the day the package was to be mailed, word was received by Mr. and Mrs. Yarborough M. Gleaton that their son, SP4 Homer Layne Gleaton, 20, had been killed in action Tuesday in the Republic of South Vietnam. SP4 Gleaton was to have been the recipient of the first package.

Now, instead of a loosely knit group of individuals, the Layne Gleaton Vietnam Fund has been created as a memorial to the 1967 graduate of Orangeburg High School.

Friday afternoon, with the thought of the young Orangeburger's death hanging heavily over the group, the first package from the fund was addressed to SP4 Marvin H. Thomas of Orangeburg who is serving with the 101st Airborne Division in Vietnam.

"It was a terrible shock," said Mrs. Passwater, "one that really shakes a person up."

Orangeburg Mayor E. O. Pendarvis, on hand for the occasion, noted: "There's not much you can say after something like this happens. I have a son in Vietnam . . . I know I'd be appreciative of anything done for my son to make his lot easier while he's serving his country.

"This group, created at first to show a small measure of our concern to our men in Vietnam," he said, "can perhaps show our grief and sympathy for the Gleaton family by expressing our support for those men who still carry the burden of our defense in that Asian country."

Already funds for bearing the cost of mailing have been received by the newly formed group. The employes of Fabric Services donated a check to the group and Capt. R. E. Sharpton of the Orangeburg Fire Department donated cash to enable the group to send their first packages to the men in Vietnam.

"I'd like for the families of the Orangeburg servicemen presently serving in Vietnam to send their addresses to the Layne Gleaton Vietnam Fund," said Mrs. Passwater, "so that we may help send packages to them. All they need do is mail the name and address and perhaps a list of their special favorites in foods and other items, to The Layne Gleaton Vietnam Fund, Post Office Box 856, Orangeburg."

Capt. Sharpton said that if anyone wishes to donate cash or articles for delivery to the Orangeburg servicemen in Vietnam, they could deliver them to the Chestnut St. Fire Department substation for pickup and shipment to Vietnam.

Another Orangeburg serviceman, Johnny King, sent a letter to his wife in Orangeburg listing items most desired by Vietnamese duty servicemen.

Mrs. King noted that any articles such as scented shaving lotion, cologne, soaps and such were not to be sent as the distinctive odor could leave a detectable scent on the serviceman using them, possibly causing him to be discovered by enemy Viet Cong and North Vietnamese.

Listed by King as being most-wanted articles were: ballpoint pens, pensized flashlights with batteries, small pen knives, cigarette lighters, plastic soap cases, small packages of writing paper with self-seal envelopes, small address books, plastic toothbrush holders, dark terry cloth washcloths and nail clippers.

Also, plastic cigarette cases, small combs, small tins of nuts or vacuum packed candies, small plastic snapshot holders, small kitchen size and sandwich type plastic bags, small pocket games such as cards, chess, checkers, etc., small paperback books, cans of spaghetti, fruit cocktail or other fruits, canned cookies and many other items not susceptible to a hot humid climate.

TWO MARYLAND SERVICEMEN KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, 1st Lt. Robert L. Baldwin and Marine Pfc. Joseph C. Thorne, Jr., two fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO MARYLAND SERVICEMEN ARE KILLED IN VIETNAM WAR

Two men from Maryland who enlisted in military service were killed Monday in action in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

The dead were identified as:

Army 1st Lt. Robert L. Baldwin, 21, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard G. Baldwin, of Edgewater, who was killed when the vehicle in which he was riding struck an enemy land mine.

Marine Pfc. Joseph C. Thorne, Jr., 19, the son of Mr. and Mrs. James A. Smith, of Hyattsville, who died as a result of gunshot wounds he received 5 miles north of An Hoa, in Quang Nam province.

Lieutenant Baldwin, who volunteered several weeks ago to be a platoon leader, served in Company D, 1st Battalion, 20th Infantry Regiment, 11th Light Infantry Brigade, the Americal Division.

Shortly after arriving in Vietnam last August, he took command of the landing zone at Duc Pho, and was acting company commander last winter.

A graduate of Spring Brook High School in Silver Spring, Md., where he was raised, Lieutenant Baldwin played first trumpet in both the marching and concert bands at the school. He was the photographer of his graduating class for the high school's yearbook.

At Fort Jackson, where he received his basic training, he was named the "outstanding trainee" of his class. He attended Officer Candidate School at Fort Benning.

His survivors include, in addition to his parents, two sisters, Mrs. Diane B. Greenlaw, of Laurel, Md., and Miss Carol L. Baldwin, of Edgewater, and a brother, Alan J. Baldwin, of Edgewater.

ATTAINMENT OF PEACE IS GOAL OF NEW ISRAEL GOVERNMENT

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, guns are once again being heard during this period of the Nativity and of the deliverance and I can think of no better time than to introduce into the RECORD the text of the interview with Foreign Minister Abba Eban and highlights from the address by Mrs. Golda Meir, Prime Minister. This beleaguered little nation of Israel experiences its most holy religious season during this period.

The material follows:

SAFEGUARDING NATION'S SECURITY WHILE STRIVING FOR PEACE REMAIN CENTRAL TASKS OF NEW ISRAEL GOVERNMENT

(Highlights from the address by Mrs. Golda Meir, Prime Minister, on presenting her Cabinet to the Knesset (Parliament), Jerusalem, March 17, 1969)

CENTRAL TASKS

As in the past, the central tasks facing Israel today are, above all, to safeguard the nation's security and to continue to strive for peace. . . . We are as resolutely determined as the previous government that there shall never again be a return to the borders and conditions which existed on June 4, 1967, and which not only enabled our enemies to threaten us with annihilation, but tempted them to believe in their capacity to carry out their plan. We want peace under conditions that will put an end to the temptation of a new Arab aggression.

The secret of Israel's endurance in the struggles and wars that have been forced upon us since we achieved our independence is the inexorable tie between survival and sovereignty and our consciousness of this tie. . . . For us, and perhaps not only for us, there is no alternative to a resolute confrontation of the struggle and the defeat of the designs of the aggressors. Our existence in this part of the world is no transient phenomenon. We are not a foreign growth in this region. We cannot be uprooted from our homeland.

CEASEFIRE TRANSFORMED INTO FRONT LINE

It has been our fate that while we engrossed ourselves in constructive and creative work in our homeland, we have had to defend our lives and our achievements and take up arms against attackers and aggressors. . . . It has never been our aspiration to win victory in war, but to prevent wars. It has, nevertheless, been demonstrated that when wars have been forced upon us, we have been able to fulfill our task. And there is no doubt in my heart that if a new war is forced upon us again, we shall again be victorious. . . . We will not accept any arrangement that is not true peace. We shall not agree to any "solution" which does not guarantee that this war is the last war. Unfortunately, the Arab rulers have repulsed the outstretched hand. . . . We consented to a ceasefire. The Arab States also agreed to the ceasefire. But only a few days passed before the ceasefire lines became front lines of continuous aggression waged against us by the Arab States. In truth, the war is not yet over. Day in, day out, our sons are falling at their posts. . . . The actions and utterances of the Arab rulers give no promise of approaching tranquility.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR TERRORISM

As far as violations of the ceasefire are concerned, we are not prepared to distinguish between aggression waged by regular armies and acts of murder and sabotage perpetrated by terrorist organizations. The responsibility for the saboteurs' activities must also rest squarely on the shoulders of those governments and states from whose territories the saboteurs go forth with one single purpose: to wreak murder in the midst of the civilian population of Israel . . . The Arab States must understand that the ceasefire lines can be tranquil only if quiet is maintained on both sides of the lines . . . No political factor has the moral right to deny us the authority and justification to exercise our right to self-defense against acts of murder and sabotage, irrespective of whether they are perpetrated by regular armies or by terrorist organizations . . .

"ARRANGEMENTS" CANNOT BE A SUBSTITUTE FOR PEACE

It is impossible to ignore the attempt to convene the four powers for discussions and recommendations on the problems of the Middle East . . . One cannot help wonder that one of the powers considers itself qualified to deal with Israel-Arab affairs as a neutral, although it shoulders such a heavy responsibility for the aggressive preparations which brought about the Six-Day War. Another one of the four powers is a state whose government's only constructive contribution to the aid of Israel has been the imposition of an embargo on arms for Israel. All of this government's declarations and measures since the Six-Day War are distinguished by blatant one-sidedness in matters affecting our existence and the conditions for our very physical survival. No decision can be adopted without us nor can any "recommendation" be formulated without our consent. It is a dangerous illusion to assume that any solution can be found in any arrangements whatever without real peace between the parties to the conflict . . . We cannot acquiesce in the toleration afforded to the stubborn refusal of the Arab leaders which runs counter to the United Nations charter and is opposed to all international practice to sit down with us to negotiate a solution to all problems . . . We want one simple and elementary thing, vital to us and to our neighbors: peace in the literal sense of the word, to be reached by face to face talks. This is the only way to peace . . . Israel, like every independent state or free nation, will not permit others to determine its fate . . .

STATUS-QUO SHALL REMAIN UNTIL PEACE IS ACHIEVED

We have assisted and will continue to assist Jarring in the execution of his task to bring the sides together for the purpose of establishing a permanent peace, as he was instructed to do by the Security Council resolution . . . In the absence of any readiness for peace, we have only one choice: whilst we do everything for peace, we must make every effort to be prepared to defend ourselves and to live under the present circumstances so long as there is no peace even if it should take a long time, much longer than we should desire.

ATTAINMENT OF PEACE WITHIN SECURE BOUNDARIES IS ISRAEL'S FIRM RESOLVE

(Full text of the interview with Foreign Minister Abba Eban, by Alfred Friendly, the Washington Post, March 6, 1969)

Q. The Arab states insist that Israel has never stated that it accepts the Security Council resolution of Nov. 22, 1967, or would implement it. Is this true?

A. We've made so many statements on the acceptance of the resolutions as the framework of a negotiated settlement that we can't even attach seriousness to any Arab assertions to the contrary. On Oct. 8, I myself said in the U.N. General Assembly: "Israel accepts the Security Council resolution . . . and declares its readiness to negotiate agreements on all matters mentioned therein."

That is the cabinet position. Now the Arab states have reservations about our use of the word "agreement." The word "agreement" is in the resolution. It is the very essence of our position.

That peace must grow from agreements in the Middle East, not from settlements dictated outside it. There are no Security Council resolutions calling for any action except on the basis of agreement.

Q. Have you ever declared that your implementation of the resolution would entail the withdrawal of Israeli troops to new borders? The Arabs claim you refuse to say so.

A. I was asked that by Ambassador Jarring in a memorandum presented by the United Arab Republic [Egypt]. I gave him a clear answer, namely that in a peace agreement we would replace the cease-fire lines by secure and agreed boundaries and that the disposition of troops would then be made in accordance with the new boundaries.

It is ludicrous to say that Israel and an Arab state would agree to negotiated and recognized boundaries and then would re-station their troops in places where they were not entitled to be under the agreement.

The trouble is that the Arab states ask for withdrawal without peace or the establishment of new boundaries.

Q. Why has Israel not made public in more specific terms the new territorial arrangements it envisions?

A. Here we're in a quandary. When we make our ideas public it increases the complexities. We make certain proposals and the Arab states look at them, recoil and say they cannot negotiate on them. I think it is much better to say officially that at the negotiating table the whole problem of boundaries and territories is open for agreement. The territorial question is open for free discussion, anyone can make any proposals he likes for negotiation.

When I go to my colleagues to discuss possible terms, they say "Have you got an Arab government that is willing in principle to talk peace? If not, why should we fight among ourselves about something hypothetical."

If I came one day and say, "Gentlemen, Arab government XYZ says it wants peace and would like to explore its conditions, then we would have to cross the Rubicon. We would have to give our negotiators concrete positions, determining what things are indispensable for us and on which matters they can be flexible.

The Arab states have never put us in the position of having to work out a detailed range of contingent positions.

They will not negotiate directly, they will not negotiate indirectly—as Nasser told *The New York Times* the other day—they will not negotiate orally, they will not negotiate with Jarring or without him. They will not even negotiate by correspondence course.

That's where the frustration lies. Unless they negotiate with us they will never know and we ourselves will never know the true limits of our flexibility and of theirs.

Q. You have said that details of a peace agreement are secondary to the principal objective, the sine qua non: an end to the long Arab campaign for the extinction of the State of Israel. Do you believe that the Arab states are, as they claim, sincerely renouncing that goal by accepting the Security Council resolution?

A. The policy of the UAR must be interpreted in accordance with the statements of its leaders and from communications to us by Ambassador Jarring. These are quite consistent: There isn't any distinction between them. They present the following picture:

They want us to withdraw in the first stage to the June 4, 1967, boundaries—what we call our nightmare map. They want us to reconstruct our own peril and put us back into the straitjacket. But this is only stage one.

Stage two is that the Arab armies would follow our retreat. Notice that in the Soviet Union's dialogue with the United States, the principle of demilitarization in Sinai is dropped: Arab troops move in to wherever Israeli troops move out. The June 4 powder keg is reconstructed.

Then the blockade is re-established. Freedom of passage in the Suez is made contingent on settlement of the refugee problem, which is at the very best a matter of years—I hope not decades.

The same is true about passage through the Straits of Tiran, the issue that exploded into the June war.

The UAR tells us that they would oppose any permanent arrangement not contingent on their consent. The Sword of Damocles would be put back into place. The May 23, 1967, crisis could be recreated whenever the UAR decided to do so.

Thereafter, the Palestine problem, as they call it, would have to be settled by allowing all the refugees back into what remained of Israel after its withdrawal. Enough Arabs must be introduced to convert Israel into something that is not Israel.

Then, Nasser says, he would make peace with the Israel that it then would have become namely another Arab state.

This is so clear, so repeatedly stated, that to assume that Nasser wants peace with Israel as a sovereign Jewish state in its own national personality is utterly frivolous.

In fact, in the last few days, the governments which are in closest contact with us have told us very frankly that they do not now believe that the UAR is ready for a peace with us on terms that Israel would accept or that friendly governments would advise us to accept.

At the most, Nasser would accept a Jewish community in an Arab state, or perhaps a sort of Lebanon. But the idea that Israel is an independent nation with roots in the Middle East, no less deep and much older than Arab roots is foreign to Nasser's thinking.

Our case is that Israel is part of the Middle East past and the Middle East present and the Middle East future. This is something that he has never grasped.

I think that this is the real essence of the conflict—that Arab intellectual and political leaders have never really solved the mystery of Israel's deep and authentic roots in the Middle East past and destiny.

Q. Is the same unwillingness that you assert on the part of Egypt to make peace true with respect to Jordan?

A. The situation is different, in the psychological sense. There are Palestinian and Jordanian leaders who say frankly that they would have preferred Israel not to exist but that its existence is an inexorable fact.

If Nasser can allow himself to dream, however vainly, of a military victory as a final solution, the Jordanians cannot possibly have any such illusions.

The question is whether there is in Jordan a sovereign capacity to negotiate. The question marks are whether Jordan can negotiate without a green light, or even an amber light, from Cairo; whether the green or amber light exists; whether it could explore a settlement with us under the pressure of the terrorist organizations; whether the presence of Iraqi troops in Jordan exercises an inhibiting effect.

But the issue is not dead. What I have in mind is an integral solution solving the problems of Israel, Jordan and the Palestinian Arabs by establishing an open boundary on the community model familiar in Western Europe, as for example Benelux.

We must look for a way of living together without a million Arabs being forced into an unwanted allegiance.

Q. How can there be the "real peace," the sincere willingness of Arabs to live in peace with Israel, unless the refugee problem is solved? Have you a proposal for its solution?

A. I used to think that the solution of the refugee problem would bring about peace. It is my conviction now that the exact opposite is true, that only peace can bring about a solution of the refugee problem.

So long as the Arab states do not want peace, they will not want a solution of the refugee problem.

The Security Council resolution is the first international recognition of the fact that the refugee solution can only come as a part of an integral peace solution. The problem was caused by war; it can only be solved by peace.

Nevertheless we did make a proposal, to which the press has given insufficient attention, that ahead of any question of peace or boundaries or recognition, we should have an international conference to charter a five-year plan for the solution of the refugee problem with the participation of Middle Eastern states, of governments which help to support the refugees and the U.N. specialized agencies. I should be anxious to know what is wrong with that suggestion. In proposing in New York in October to try to reach agreement on each of the eight or nine subjects in the Security Council resolution, of which the refugees is one, I said it made no matter to me which was discussed first.

I said let's begin with navigation, or the refugee problem, or boundaries, or take them up simultaneously with subcommittees to discuss each of them.

UAR Foreign Minister Riad's answer was to book passage back to Cairo because any response to this would have involved him in a dialogue with us. The peace idea was becoming too concrete for his liking. The proposal for a refugee conference was rejected rather nervously by him, because it is not easy to explain to world opinion that it should be rejected by anyone who cares anything for the refugees.

Q. But have you stated, even in principle, what Israel is prepared to do to solve that enormous problem?

A. We are on our guard against any manner of thinking that makes the refugee problem an exclusive Israeli responsibility. Israel simply cannot solve the problem; it can make a contribution to its solution. I don't believe the states of the Middle East can solve it alone. It has to be solved regionally and internationally. That is why we must create a regional and international framework for the refugee discussion. But when I say that peace could solve it, I mean that the psychology of peace would open up possibilities which we cannot envisage in a condition of war.

That's what I think the Arab governments don't understand. The key to the Israeli attitude lies in their hands. The moment they negotiate with us, they unlock in the Israeli mind all kinds of impulses which have been held back.

Q. In the absence of progress towards a settlement, will the Palestine liberation movement grow and capture the imagination of the Arab peoples, to the point that a political settlement becomes impossible?

A. These groups are a burden on our security in some places, but in my mind they are still marginal and not central.

Arab governments established these organizations. Without Arab governments they would have neither weapons nor support. The mastery still belongs to the Arab governments. If Nasser or King Hussein decided to negotiate peace, I believe these movements would dwindle at the negotiating stage and fade away at the settlement stage.

Q. They have not become Frankenstein's monster, more powerful then their creator?

A. I think the governments still retain executive control. The Fatah is simply a convenience for Arab governments which do not want to fight with their regular armies and yet do not want a period of tranquility leading to peace.

Q. Israel is accused of asking for a degree of security that no other country enjoys; that you refuse to gamble on the possible turning of your adversaries' minds towards a peaceful outcome.

A. On the contrary, I would settle for the kind of security which every other country has. I would take any sovereign country has. I would take any sovereign country in the world and ask what are its relationships with its neighbors in a state of peace. I would shut my eyes, pick one, and settle for that.

Q. How will the Israeli government changes affect the relationship between hawks and doves? Where do you stand personally in that division?

A. The ornithological definition is not useful. The hawk-dove phrase has done more to confuse public thinking on international problems than any other semantic device.

We are all hawks only in our ambition to make Israel really secure, and most of us are doves in our ardent desire for peace. My colleague (Defense Minister Moshe) Dayan is called a hawk but it was he who told your people on television that he "would give up a lot of territory for peace" with Egypt or Jordan. That sounds dovish to me.

Mrs. Meir, who I hope will lead the next cabinet, has said that she opposed the extreme slogan of "no surrender of territory" and that if our boundaries are to be agreed boundaries they cannot be the present ones, but that only a peace negotiation can make the discussion real.

So there is a national consensus which I have been expressing all these months.

HEWER OF PEACE

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, when the general who commanded history's greatest army turned to civilian life in 1948, he stated that he would not be changing the fundamental purpose of his life—"the protection and perpetuation of basic human freedom."

Dwight Eisenhower had protected the freedom of men by forging unity among the Allies and maintaining that unity until Hitler's "Fortress Europe" had been broken. After the war, he turned to perpetuating the hard-won freedom.

Although most of his life had been devoted to war and preparation for war, he was a man of peace. He believed as an article of faith that peace was the only climate in which human freedom could endure.

As President of the United States, he brought us out of war and then gave our Nation a period of growth and progress with uncommon tranquillity.

His success in maintaining the peace derived from a quality often underrated in leaders—good will. He trusted people and in turn they trusted him. He appealed to the best in people and they responded with their best. He reasoned with others and they refrained from shouting when disagreeing with his policies.

Hugh Sidey of Life magazine, a man who has covered many Presidents, commented on this quality last August after the general's last TV appearance:

> There are even those who dare suggest that his soothing spirit, the innate goodness of the man himself, did more to lift up the hearts of Americans and hold them together in a reasonable state of public happiness than many social reforms that have been propounded since.

His unending good will made him a unifier of men and allowed him to become an instrument of peace. The name Eisenhower translates to "hewer of iron." I prefer to remember him as a "hewer of peace."

NEED FOR STRONG FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY LAWS

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues facing this Congress is the necessity for enacting strong Federal coal mine safety laws.

An article appearing in the New York Times magazine of March 30, 1969, summarizes the health and safety problems of the coal industry and the history of congressional failure to adequately meet these problems.

I commend it to the attention of the Congress:

The Scandal of Death and Injury in the Mines: More Than 120,000 Miners Have Died Violently

(By Ben A. Franklin)

"Of the 54 men in the mine, only two who happened to be in some crevices near the mouth of the shaft escaped with life. Nearly all the internal works of the mine were blown to atoms. Such was the force of the explosion that a basket then descending, containing three men, was blown nearly 100 feet into the air. Two fell out and were crushed to death, and a third remained in, and, with the basket, was thrown some 70 to 80 feet from the shaft, breaking both his legs and arms."

These sentences matter-of-factly describing the pulverization of a shift of coal miners, including the three men grotesquely orbited out of the mine shaft as if launched from a missile silo, are from the first detailed record of an American mine disaster. Antiquity probably explains the nursery rhyme quality—"two fell down and broke their crowns . . ." For this earliest remembered mine catastrophe, in the Black Heath pit near Richmond, Va., occurred March 18, 1839.

A primitive time, no doubt. The nation was then so new that Martin Van Buren, warming his feet at the coal-burning grates in the White House, was the first President to have been born a United States citizen. The daguerreotype was introduced here that year by Samuel F. B. Morse, while awaiting the issuance of a patent on his telegraph. Half the coal-producing states were not yet in the Union.

The coal mines, on the threshold of fueling a manufacturing explosion that was to make this country an unmatched industrial power, produced barely one million tons in 1839, less than 1/500th of the output today. In the absence of all but the crudest technology, men relying on the death flutterings of caged canaries to warn them of imminent suffocation obviously would die in the mines. Some mines employed suicidal specialists known as "cannoneers," whose mission was to crawl along the tunnel floors under a wet canvas before a shift, igniting "puffs" of mine gas near the roof with an upraised candle. Dead miners were not even counted. Their enormous casualty rate was not archived until less than 100 years ago.

A glimpse into this dim crevice of American industrial history is necessary to put into perspective the myths and realities of the men who work in the mines today. For the real story of coal is not its multiplying inanimate statistics—tons and carloadings and days lost in strikes. It is the agony of those men—a tale as old as Black Heath and one that is so full of extravagantly evil personalities and atrocious acts that Charles Dickens would have loved to tell it. For behind and beneath the mountains of the Appalachian coalfield, miners have remained since Black Heath the most systematically exploited and expendable class of citizens (with the possible exception of the American Indian and the Negro) in this country.

The story at last may have an un-Dickensian ending. For now, coal miners can see light at the end of the tunnel. In this 1969 spring, 130 years after the Black Heath disaster, the mining industry may finally agree to pay the modest cost of keeping its work force alive, of abandoning the embedded idea that men are cheaper than coal. And—small pittance—we may all be involved in helping pay what it costs to write this long delayed postscript to the industrial revolution; the price of bringing miners into the 20th century probably will appear, as we shall see, as pennies on our electric bills.

In the context of technological advancement in nearly every other area of human enterprise, very little has changed for men who go down to the mines in shafts. Only four months ago, 78 coal miners were trapped and killed below ground in West Virginia in one of the most volcanic eruptions of explosion and fire in the memory of Federal mine inspectors. As at Black Heath, the explosion at the Consolidation Coal Company's 27-square-mile No. 9 mine at Farmington, W. Va., almost certainly was caused by an ignition of methane gas, a volatile, highly flammable, usually odorless and invisible hydrocarbon gas liberated from virgin coal.

At Consol No. 9, a modern, "safe" mine operated by one of the wealthy giants of the industry, the daily methane emission was 8 million cubic feet, enough to supply the heating and cooking needs of a small city if it were captured and sold. The explosion hazard was dealt with there as it is generally in mining today, by only modestly more sophisticated methods than those at Black Heath.

Fresh air is drawn into the mines by giant fans and circulated and directed constantly through the honeycomb of tunnels by means of doors, ducts or sometimes by curtains called brattices (miners call them "braddishes"). The intake air is supposed to dilute and, by law, "render harmless or carry away" the methane and hold the mine atmosphere to less than the legal limit of 1 percent gas. Unless coal dust is mixed with it—in which case the explosion threshold drops significantly—methane will not ignite or explode in concentrations of less than 5 percent. Miners live and die today on a margin of 4 percentage points—or less if coal dust is suspended in the air.[1]

It is known that the giant electric mining machines in use for the last 20 years—machines that chew up and claw coal from the face with rotary bits the size of railroad wheels—churn up an immense amount of dust. The machines, have water sprays to settle the dust. But the machines' rapid rate of advance through the seam also liberates much methane.

The first explosion at Consol No. 9 came at 5:25 A.M., Nov. 20, during the cateye shift. It was a day after the passage over northern West Virginia of a cold front accompanied by an abrupt drop in barometric pressure. In the primitive mythology of mine safety, these natural events—the arrival of cold, dry air and a barometric low, which increases the methane liberation in a mine—have been associated for years with disasters. The legendary great mine explosions, from Monongah and Darr in 1907, Rachel & Agnes in 1908 and on up to Orient No. 2 in 1951, have occurred in November and December and in cold dry weather. The dry air dehumidifies a mine and sets coal dust in motion.

Every fall through 1967, the United Mine workers Journal had published a fraternal warning to union brothers to observe special precautions in "the explosion season." But, no research having been done in a century of such meterological coincidences, the industry can and does take no account of what it, therefore, regards as a folklore factor—which might interfere with production. The U.M.W. Journal had not got around to running the 1968 warning when Console No. 9 blew up. "We figured afterward it would be no use," a Journal editor said later.

No one yet knows what death befell the 78 men in No. 9. Miners who survive the shock wave, heat and afterdamp (carbon monoxide) of an underground explosion are instructed to barricade themselves in good air, if any, and await rescue. But during the nine days and nights that rescue teams stood by helplessly on the surface at Farmington, there were at least 16 further explosions in the mine. The first blast had burst up 600 feet through the portals and ventilation shafts, blowing the internal works of the mine to atoms and knocking out ventilation circuits. At the top, the main shaft became the muzzle of a mammoth subterranean cannon. The massive headframe, a trestled structure of bridge-size steel I-beams that support the main hoist, was blown apart. For days, a boiling plume of poisonous black smoke alternately belched from the shaft and then unaccountably reversed its flow and inhaled, bursting forth again with renewed detonations below.

---

[1] One example of the retarded technology of mine safety is that miners testing for gas still rely today on the Glame safety lamp of Sir Humphrey Davy, perfected more than 150 years ago. The safety lamp is rugged and safe if used properly, but it requires highly skilled operators to read it accurately, and then its accuracy is no more than half a percentage point—or 10 per cent of the margin between survival and explosion.

Finally, on Nov. 29, all five shafts and portals at the mine were sealed—capped and made airtight with tons of rock, steel and concrete. Not for months, until engineers are certain that restoring ventilation will not re-ignite coked embers and trigger the millions of cubic feet of methane collecting in the primordial atmosphere below, will Farmington's dead be disinterred from their gassy grave. The same mine was sealed for more than a year following a less violent explosion in 1954 that killed 16 men (including one, Black Heath-style, topside near the mine mouth), and fires continued to burn in sealed sections of the mine even after production was resumed.

If entombing a mine fire to control it seems primitive in this day of chemical fire fighting agents and automatic deluge sprinkler systems, it is futuristic, compared with the industry's performance in disaster *prevention*. There have been profitable technological advances in the extraction of coal from the seam, and today the industry is on the brink of such a long, secure production boom that big oil companies, with some of the sharpest eyes for markets and profits in the business world, are buying up and merging with coal companies at a rapid rate. But production economies in the past have more often than not been at the expense of human economies, and Big Oil may be surprised to find itself saddled with coal's amazing insensitivity to mayhem and death. It was the fatalistic acceptance of Farmington more than the disaster itself (President Nixon has since criticized this acceptance of death as "as much a part of the job as the tools and the tunnels") that finally started the mine-safety revolution.

At first, at the daily post-explosion news conferences in Consol's cinderblock company store near Farmington (many miners are still *today* in debt to their employers' merchandising subsidiaries for nearly a full paycheck before they are paid), William Poundstone, Consol's executive vice president for mining operations, insisted that the mine was "only technically gassy." W. R. Park, a senior Federal mine inspector familiar for years with the mine, insisted it was "extremely gassy," and John Roberts, a Consol public relations man, called it "excessively gassy." Roberts, a master of malapropism who greeted the news corps before one vigil news conference by asking cheerily, "Are all the bodies here?", also described the No. 9 explosion hazard as "something that we have to live with."

Then came the parade of V.I.P.'s. U.M.W. president W. A. (Tony) Boyle came to the mine head not only to congratulate Consol on being "one of the better companies as far as cooperation and safety are concerned," but to add that if this "safe" mine blew up, "you can imagine what the rest are like." "As long as we mine coal," said Boyle, the philosophical miners' ombudsman, "there is always this inherent danger of explosion." The then assistant Secretary of the Interior, J. Cordell Moore, the department's top minerals man, flew up from Washington to add that "unfortunately—we don't understand why these things happen—but they do happen," and to venture that "the company here has done all in its power to make this a safe mine." (In fact, Moore's own Bureau of Mines had reported substandard rock dusting at Consol No. 9—the most basic of explosion-prevention measures involves rendering coal dust inert with 65 per cent crushed limestone—in all 24 of its inspections there since 1963. The bureau had cited No. 9 for 25 other safety violations since December, 1966. Moore probably saw nothing unusual in that because violations are the norm in most mines.)

Hulett C. Smith, then the Governor of West Virginia, also stood before the television cameras and observed more in sadness than in anger that "we must recognize that this is a hazardous business and what has occurred here is of the hazards of being a miner."

With that, the fuse, delayed so long, finally blew in Washington. The then Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, after eight years of more concern for California redwoods than for miners, denounced the whole system of coal mining—the technological *and* moral systems— as "unacceptable." As an astonished layman, Udall noted that Consol was mining "in an area that really is a low-grade gas field" and that "obviously it is not a solution that is completely adequate to dilute the gas by pumping in air." Within three weeks, Udall summoned a national coal-safety conference which turned out to be one of the most amazing gatherings in bureaucratic history. In a Soviet-style mood of confession, Udall publicly admitted that "we have accepted, even condoned, an attitude of fatalism that belongs to an age darker than the deepest recess of any coal mine. At every level of responsibility, from the individual miner to the highest councils of Government, we have looked with horror on the specters of death and disease that haunt our mines. Then we have shrugged our shoulders and said to ourselves, 'Well, coal mining is an inherently hazardous business' or 'It's too bad, of course, but as long as coal is mined men inevitably will die underground.' These easy rationalizations are no longer acceptable in this time in history."

The stubborn Black Heath syndrome—so costly in human life and so profitable to the industry—finally was broken. Within a week, Bureau of Mines Director John F. O'Leary, on the job one month, issued orders to his inspectors. They were to cease immediately giving prior notification of impending inspections to the operators, a practice known for years to encourage a sudden, temporary kind of mine housecleaning for the benefit of the inspector—"baking a cake," one inspector called it. They were to cease reviewing mine violation reports with owners. Where violations occurred involving imminent danger of explosion, they were no longer merely to write them down as before, they were to close the mine. The list was startling for what it said about past practices.

It is hard to tell which is more gripping—the penny-pinching, corner-cutting and profiteering waste of human life in mines still operated today—Black Heath-style—with bland abandon of what the U.S. Bureau of Mines calls "ordinary regard for safety," or the callous result, the history of human carnage in the mines. The record to date, even the most contemporary chapters of it, is appalling. In the 100 years that partial records of fatal mine accidents have been kept (the early figures are incomplete) more than 120,000 men have died violently in coal mines, an average of 100 every month for a century. The total does not include those who died of what passes for "natural causes" in work that is notoriously hazardous to health as it is to life and limb. Today, among men aged 60 to 64, the "natural" death rate of miners is eight times that of workers in any other industrial occupation.

Chronic lung diease may, in fact, turn out to be a far worse killer of miners than accidents. The U.S. Public Health Service, in unfinished research that is 25 years behind completed medical findings in British mines, has recently documented that coal dust—not the rock dust associated for decades with miners' silicosis—has become perhaps the pre-eminent threat to survival in the mines.

A prevalence study completed in 1965 found that, conservatively, 100,000 active and retired American coal miners suffered from the progressive, gasping breathlessness associated with prolonged inhalation of fine coal dust, a condition known (from autopsy observation) as "black lung" or pneumoconiosis. The U.M.W. estimates that in the 20 years that electric mining machines have been churning up greater and greater clouds of dust at least one million men have been exposed to an occupational disease whose ravages do not stop with removal to a dust-free environment.

The black-lung hazard—as the coal industry and physicians in its employ constantly point out—is as yet a qualitatively and quantitatively uncertain threat to life. It is real enough, however, to have caused more than 30,000 West Virginia miners, normally among the last in the industry to engage in wildcat strikes, to walk off their jobs for three weeks in February of this year to demand that the State Legislature include black lung in the list of injuries and diseases for which disabled miners are eligible to collect workmen's compensation benefits. Until then, only three coal-producing states—Alabama, Virginia and Pennsylvania—authorized workmen's compensation payments (generally financed by the industry) to black-lung victims, and only Pennsylvania has paid any claims. (In Pennsylvania, the benefits are paid for by the taxpayers, not the industry, which may explain how the legislation survived there. Coal has a history of very aggressive lobbying to protect its economic interest.)

In West Virginia's Statehouse last month, a doctor testifying in support of the industry's proposal of further medical studies of black lung before changing the compensation law "in haste," charged that Drs. I. E. Buff, Donald L. Rasmussen and Hawley Wells, the three crusading physicians in that state who had galvanized the miners to strike for health reform, had done more damage as "alarmists" than the disease itself. There was nothing more pathetic, the lachrymose industry witness testified, than a coal miner told to quit the only work he knows just because he is a little breathless. It was a Dickensian performance.

The coal operators, or some of them, have taken the position that pneumoconiosis does not exist. But sudden violence in the mines has been documented monotonously since Black Heath. Last year, alone, 309 miners died in accidents—"needlessly," according to O'Leary, the new and aggressively safety-conscious director of the Bureau of Mines—and the miners' death and injury rates, already the highest of any industry, are on the rise this year.

The injury *severity* rate in mines, also the highest, is two and a half times that of lumbering, nearly four times that of trucking. Since records of nonfatal accidents began to be archived in 1930, the number of men temporarily or permanently disabled digging coal has risen to 1.5 million. Today, a miner surviving a lifetime in coal (and there is one chance in 12 that he will not) can expect three or four lost-time injuries, not counting one chance in 5 or 10 of serious and eventually fatal lung disease.

Mining, like prostitution, is one of the oldest occupations in the world and is probably as impossible to stop. From the beginning, coal has been a curse on the land from whence it came, blighting the landscape with strip mines and culm banks and polluted streams, extracting for absentee owners vast fortunes from Appalachian states that are today synonymous with poverty, and plunging generations into despair.

But the scandal of gratuitous death and injury in the mines—almost all of it recognized, as the Interior Department report put it recently, as the result of the operators' "tendency to cut safety corners when profits are low and ignore good safety practices when profits are high"—has finally reached the point at which a Republican Administration in Washington is talking about limiting coal production to save lives.

In testimony this month supporting the sudden rush of mine-safety bills in Congress following the explosion at Farmington, this radical notion was put forth by none other than Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel. "It is clear that our society can no longer tolerate the cost in human life and human misery that is exacted in the mining of this essential fuel," Hickel said. "Unless we find ways to eliminate that intolerable cost, we must inevitably limit our mining of coal, which has an almost inexhaustible potential for industrial, economic and social good."

Republican coal barons must have rolled in their graves. Even from Democratic Administrations, this most destructive of industries had never received such a radical warning. In fact, Democrats in Congress have been the protectors of the industry's economic interests over the survival interests of its workers.

In 1941, at the end of three decades during which miners died at an average rate of better than 2,000 a year, a series of terrible disasters which had killed 276 men during the closing months of 1940 finally forced passage of the so-called Coal Mine Inspection and Investigation Act. It was conceded, as the Bureau of Mines timidly put it then, that "speed of operation and demand for maximum tonnage at a minimum cost resulted in a neglect of ordinary safety measures."

In 1941, when technology in the United States had advanced to the threshold of the atomic era, the gross and calculated neglect of ordinary prudence in the powder-house atmosphere of coal mines was evidenced by the fact that barely half the underground coal miners had been equipped with battery-powered electric cap lamps, approved by the Bureau of Mines for the absence of spark hazards. Incredibly, the rest still wore carbide lamps, which gave their light by generating acetylene gas and emitting an open, two-inch jet of flame.

In 1941, half the mines still used unstable black powder for blasting rather than the safer "permissible" explosives recommended for 30 years by the bureau. The carbide lamps were handy for lighting fuses. Some mines had advanced to the employment of "shot firers," solitary men whose job was to shoot down the drilled coal after everyone else had left the mine. It was a concession to modernity. If the mine blew up, only one man was lost.

Everyone knew that disasters could be stopped. "In view of the present knowledge of preventing explosions, disasters are inexcusable and discredit the mining industry," the Bureau of Mines said in 1940. Everyone knew that more improvements in the feeble state mining laws were being blocked than passed. But Congress heeded the industry's states' rights argument. The 1941 act gave the Bureau of Mines for the first time authority to enter and inspect mines and write reports containing noncompulsory safety recommendations, but no powers of enforcement. The states would take care of that.

Since 1910, when the Bureau of Mines was established, its engineers have been testing and recommending to the industry as approved or disapproved—as "permissible" or "nonpermissible" (words that convey more authority than the bureau had then or has today to require their use)—a whole range of mining equipment, including explosives and electric wiring, lights, drills, cutting machines and haulage devices. Such safety-designed machinery is obviously the key to disaster prevention in mines full of a mixture of inflammable methane gas and explosive coal dust.

Yet, nearly half the explosions—835 miners dead—between May, 1941, when the bureau got its authority to inspect and recommend, and July, 1952, when Congress next amended the mine-safety law, were caused by electric arcs from nonpermissible mine machinery. Most of the rest involved nonpermissible—but still not illegal—use of explosives.

Unbelievably, when the misnamed Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952 finally emerged from the coal lobby's permissible cutting machine, it contained a "grandfather clause" which allowed the indefinitely continued use of knowingly dangerous nonpermissible electrical machinery "if, before the effective date of this section . . . the operator of such mine owned such equipment . . . or had ordered such equipment." The law also set up two classes of mines—gassy and nongassy—and it stretched the loophole for nonpermissible equipment even further for the 85 per cent of mine owners lucky enough to meet the nongassy standard.

In effect, Congress told the mine operators that "if you were creating an avoidable explosion hazard before we passed this law, it's all right to go on doing so until the dangerous machinery wears out." Today, this means that spark-hazard machines—some of them rebuilt twice and three times over under the same serial numbers—are still in use in some mines 17 years after the law was passed. A count by the Bureau of Mines in 1967, when the law had been on the books 15 years, showed 1,117 pieces of nonpermissible electrical equipment in use in 159 mines.

The 1952 mine-safety act may have been one of the great legislative mirages of all time. It specifically exempted small mines, those with fewer than 15 employes. Although the small mines were depicted in the industry's testimony as too inefficient and limited in capital resources to bear the cost of retooling for the most basic disaster prevention, their number immediately doubled after the law was passed. Large mines were simply separated into smaller units to evade the law. (In 1966, the small mines were finally brought in—with all "grandfather clauses" still intact.)

Moreover, the law was deliberately written to apply to, and to give Federal mine inspectors jurisdiction over, only certain kinds of "major disasters"—defined by Congress as those killing five or more miners in one stroke. More than 90 per cent of mine deaths then occurred in lonely ones, twos and threes. Far more than half were caused by rock falls from the mine roof, largely at the working face. The 1952 law established roof-control standards, but only for established tunnels used as haulageways where such accidents were least common.

Having extended Federal safety jurisdiction to the kinds of "major disasters" that made the news wires and brought discrediting publicity, Congress emphasize that the new law was not to protect the miners from "the lack of, or inadequacy of, guards or protective devices." It was totally silent on hazards to health.

In signing the act into law, former President Truman obviously did not overstate the facts in observing that "I consider it my duty to point out its defects so that the public will not be misled into believing that this is a broad-gauge accident-prevention measure . . . I am advised that loopholes in the law were provided to avoid any economic impact on the coal-mining industry."

Congress has considered mine-safety legislation only three times in the last three decades. But in the years between enactments, there was activity. In 1962, after explosions in the Robena and Compass mines had killed 59 men, President Kennedy commissioned a task force to review the situation. Its report concluded that the industry's continuing disregard of the most basic hazards to life and limb deserved Congressional attention. For one thing, the task force proposed to put a deadline—one year after enactment of an implementing amendment by Congress—on the nonpermissible machinery "grandfather clause." It also noted that Britain, producing only a fraction of the coal output of the United States, was spending more than twice as much on mine health research.

But then in a series of private conferences with Bureau of Mines and Interior Department officials, the Bituminous Coal Operators Association, the union-negotiating arm of the coal industry, persuaded them to recommend to Congress a "grandfather clause" deadline of five years. Since Congress took no action on it, the B.C.O.A. had another opportunity last year to persuade the Bureau of Mines to propose an even further extension to ten years. The capitulation was so flagrant that the White House, overseeing the draftsmanship of the 1968 mine-safety bill, demanded its exclusion from the bill, which went up to Congress in September. It died without hearings.

Other capitulations to the industry have perpetuated the Bureau of Mines' reputation as the submissive captive of the industry it is supposed to police. As recently as a year ago, a long-proposed revision of the 1952 law specifically requiring diversion of a minimum flow of dust-and gas-diluting forced air ventilation to the working face of coal mines—a point beyond the last moving air current in the established workings—was dropped by the bureau upon the B.C.O.A.'s complaint that it would be too costly.

It has been known for years that progressive contamination of mine ventilation air—a pickup of dangerous amounts of methane or coal dust, or both—results from coursing air from one working section of a mine to another before routing it to the surface. The practice is known to have caused explosions and deaths. Yet a year ago the B.C.O.A. was still dickering privately with the bureau, demanding language in the bureau's proposals for tougher mine ventilation standards which would say that if it cost too much to provide a separate "split" of air to each active working place it would not be required until after "a reasonable time"—not, of course, defined.

It is not that any of these proposals were new. The industry could claim no element of surprise—except at the idea of being compelled to adopt them after so long a history of lethal *laissez-faire*. Mine technology has been equal to all of these proposed measures for at least all of this century—for 101,000 mine deaths.

The inclusive almanac of mine disasters published by the Bureau of Mines in 1960 (it is now out of print) says that the violently explosive and unpredictable characteristics of suspended coal dust in mines were known as long ago as 1886. A team of mining engineers which visited all the major coalfields in 1908, a year after the worst mine explosion in American history had killed 362 men at Monongah, W. Va., published a detailed report identifying every source of all the subsequent mine disasters (72,501 deaths—1909 through 1968) and recommending disaster-prevention standards which are *still* not observed.

While lobbying privily against safety, the industry has publicly promoted the idea that the death and mutilation of its workers was a cost of doing business. It got a depletion allowance on its taxes. Its workers got none for their depletion. The industry reaction to disaster was in the brave tradition of "what can you expect in an inherently risky business"—*and* with some of the most effective lobbying in legislative history to perpetuate the trade-off of cheap life for cheap coal. And it has not been alone.

Even on the left in this medieval atmosphere, the miners' union, the United Mine Workers of America, has been so concerned with helping the industry survive its postwar slump and with preserving coal's low-cost competitive advantage over other basic fuels—oil, natural gas and nuclear energy—that it long ago sacrificed what could have been the leadership of a mine-safety crusade for high wages, mechanized high production, and the highest accident rate of any industry.

Some of the accidents were no accident. In 1947, the U.M.W. in Illinois was found to have voluntarily signed a labor contract with coal operators in that state whose terms forbade the union from seeking improvements in Illinois' mine-safety law, upon which the industry placed such store in opposing greater Federal control. The Federal law of 1941, then in effect, was no threat to the cheapest production economies; the 1941 act had been so considerate of the industry's faith in state regulation that Federal mine inspectors were denied enforcement powers.

Since 1946, moreover, the U.M.W. had become locked in an embrace with the operators nationally. Through the 1946 coal labor contract, which set up the U.M.W. Welfare and Retirement Fund and financed it by an industry royalty—now 40 cents a ton for all coal taken out of union mines—the U.M.W. also acquired an immense interest in production. The Welfare and Retirement Fund collects income from *operating* mines, not from those harried by mine inspectors or closed down for safety violations.

The U.M.W.'s obvious conflicts of interest are a legacy of John L. Lewis, the 89-year-old former president. Lewis's postwar decision to help the coal industry survive by sacrificing 400,000 miners' jobs to mechanization in return for the company royalties was regarded then as a modernizing act of industrial statesmanship. But it established alliances that obviously are not in the best interests—on mine safety, if nothing else—of the rank-and-file membership. For example, under Lewis the U.M.W. bought control of the National Bank of Washington, a profitable sideline that has furthered the appearance, if not the fact, of shared interests by making loans to coal companies.

Since Congress was no help, in 1946 the Interior Department, which was then operating the mines under President Truman's strike-induced Federal seizure order, negotiated with the unions (as a condition in the contract) safety standards unobtainable by other means. Compliance with the contract's so-called Mine Safety Code, which incorporates many of the reforms talked about since the early nineteen-hundreds, is monitored by Federal mine inspectors. But its enforcement depends on the union, through its contractual right to withdraw men from mines in violation of the code.

Compliance, according to Bureau of Mines Director O'Leary, "leaves much to be desired." The compliance average in 20 of the largest mines is 65 per cent, O'Leary has told Congressional committees, but in some states (depending on coal operator attitudes and union militance) it is as low as 30 per cent and in one state as low as 7 per cent. The U.M.W.'s "safety division" at its headquarters in Washington consists of one man.

The Welfare and Retirement Fund is not the only loser when the men walk out of an unsafe mine. The miners lose wages. When I asked him several months ago whether the U.M.W. had considered negotiating with the companies a requirement that they pay regular wages to men who left a shift while demonstrable code violations were corrected, the U.M.W.'s Boyle, a slight, normally combative Irishman from Montana, told me that that would be impossible because even among miners there were "lazy men"; there would be abuses to get pay for no work. Later, in a safety proposal prepared by the U.M.W., the union finally supported the idea that miners should be paid for time off the job if a *Federal inspector* closed a mine.

But more than any other witnesses on this year's crop of catch-up mine-safety bills, Boyle has agreed with the industry's position. On the proposed revision that Secretary Hickel and O'Leary have called the reform of "paramount importance," Boyle's stand is significantly less reformist than the industry's. In view of the miserable record of Congressional inaction and protection of the industry, the Administration this year is asking Congress to give the Secretary of the Interior the flexibility of administrative rule-making authority. After hearings, *he* would establish the safety standards. There would be the right of appeal. It is the system in use since 1938 in nearly every other area of Federal regulatory activity, and the coal industry now says it will go along with it if the Secretary's authority is suitably circumscribed to prevent "arbitrary" decisions. Boyle, however, has said he "would rather take our chances with Congress."

Those chances this year are very good indeed, partly because Boyle himself has underlined the unequal forces working for mine safety in the private sector. The U.M.W. is clearly embarrased by the reformist zeal of what it calls "Johnny-come-lately experts" since Farmington, like Udall, Ralph Nader and Representative Ken Hechler of West Virginia. For suggesting that the union bears some responsibility and that it has compromised and "snuggled up to" management on safety issues, the U.M.W. Journal recently labeled Nader and Hechler as "finks" in a front-page editorial. And the union magazine has engaged in such a Mao Tse-tung glorification of Boyle and his record as a safety crusader—it refers to him as a "union chieftain"—that the U.M.W. has become an embarrassment to its friends in Congress. While fulminating at the charges of collaboration with the industry, The Journal has *not* reported that weeks before the Consol disaster, the U.M.W. was convicted along with the Consolidation Coal Company in a Federal court in Lexington, Ky., of conspiring to create a monopoly in the soft coal industry. With the conviction, which is being appealed, went a $7,300,000 damage award, to be paid half by the union and half by the company that Boyle has praised for "cooperation." The case involved Consol's alleged withdrawal of coal marketing services from South-East Coal Company after the company went nonunion.

Moreover the coal industry can hardly cry poor this year. Because of its secure grip on a growing share—now more than half—of the fuel market in the surging electric utility business, even the National Coal Association is calling the future "glittering." It turns out that local boosters who, through depression upon depression, have been calling the state of West Virginia "The Billion Dollar Coal Field" were not far from wrong.

As Senator Harrison A. Williams Jr. of New Jersey noted in starting mine-safety hearings, coal has become so profitable that since 1966 the three largest coal producers have been taken over by other giant mineral corporations—Peabody Coal Company by Kennecott Copper, Consolidation by Continental Oil Company, and Island Creek Coal Company by Occidental Oil. According to the National Coal Association, the list of oil corporations that have acquired coal-mining companies now includes at least 20 of the major petroleum producers—Gulf, Shell, Humble, Standard of Ohio, Atlantic-Richfield, Sun, Ashland and Kerr-McGee among them. It was a relief to know, Senator Williams noted, that the safety hearings would not be "complicated" by the usual coal claims of imminent bankruptcy. To the oil owners of coal, Williams pointedly observed that the spectacle of oil-well pollution of the Pacific Ocean off Santa Barbara, Calif., and new evidence of "lung pollution" in the mines "may be trying to tell us something." "In both cases," he said, "we find at the top of the ownership structure big oil companies."

Whether or not by corporate edict from these powerful new coal owners, the fact is that the National Coal Association, the largest industry group, is taking a remarkably calm and even welcoming view of the strenuous safety legislation before Congress this year. By enacting the Nixon Administration bill, which is among the strongest of the lot, Congress could close all the old loopholes at once and take—for coal—a daring new step into industrial human ecology. The Nixon bill would require mine operators to attack the black-lung epidemic among miners by reducing coal dust contamination in mine air to 4.5 milligrams of respirable dust per cubic meter of air, as a starter. The standard is a compromise of the U.S. Public Health Service's 1968 recommendation—3 milligrams. It would become effective six months after passage of the law and could be lowered later by decision of the Secretary of the Interior. The dust-control problem is publicly pictured as a cost nightmare by the industry. The Bureau of Mines estimates that the cost will be only pennies per ton.

The economics of mine safety are the one great unknown in this year's reform spree. No one knows what the cost of a century of neglect has been. Lee White, the chairman of the Federal Power Commission, which regulates wholesale electric power rates, opened the door a crack during Secretary Udall's post-Farmington *mea culpa* last December by observing that, as a nation, we have lost money as well as life in the mines, "and we must pay." The F.P.C. is anxious to pass on to consumers "all savings in costs that are properly made," White said. But if it takes an increase in the cost of electricity to indemnify the miners who dig the coal for steam-electric power, "I believe the American people are willing and should be willing to pay that extra cost . . . For all I know, we are not talking about increased rates but only a smaller decrease in rates."

Some but not all of coal's new 20-year and 30-year contracts to supply the huge fuel demands of electric power contain escalator clauses, which would permit certain price increases to pay for safety. But a share-the-cost program may not be as easy to work out as White made it seem; one reason that the coal industry is so mercilessly cost-conscious has been the strong downward pressure on prices exerted by the electric utilities, including the Government's own Tennessee Valley Authority, the biggest of all coal consumers. The average value per ton of coal at the mine has dropped from $4.99 in 1948 to $4.62 last year.

It may be significant that John Corcoran, the president of Consol—a moderate man to start with, by coal industry standards, and one who has been deeply affected by the Farmington disaster—also is chairman of the National Coal Association and a director of the American Mining Association and the Bituminous Coal Association. The industry does seem to be speaking with a new voice. But the coal industry is still a very loose coalition of new humanists and old buccaneers. And as one of its publicists put it recently, "We are like any association—we reflect the lowest common denominator. We have a few members who think the world is flat, so we have not publicly endorsed the use of globes."

CHARLES M. STOREY

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, we join today in greetings and tribute to Mr. Charles Moorfield Storey, one of America's most distinguished and intrepid barristers; a significant figure over the decades in education and business and in public affairs; and, above all, one of those rare public men whose contributions to the commonweal do not depend on titles or publicity. He now turns 80, still battling and twinkling, a Boston Brahmin whose concerns and vision reach far beyond the Boston Common, whose example of the upright life has uplifted countless of his countrymen with its demonstration that character and wisdom can aid in the pursuit of justice and peace, with its affirmation that a life of harmony and quality can respond to the demands of compassion and commitment.

He has served the U.S. Government and influenced scores of his family and friends, themselves elected and appointed to Government, to serve that Government more effectively and more generously than they would otherwise have done. And he has served countless groups and institutions, from Harvard and Boston to prisoners of war and children, advantaged and disadvantaged. Community and country are the better that this honorable man has been amongst us, and he will continue, engaged and invaluable, for decades yet to come.

HEMISFAIR 1968

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago April 6, HemisFair 1968 opened its run in San Antonio. Six months ago, the exposition closed. It was everything that I hoped it would be when I asked my colleagues to approve U.S. participation, and I believe that the confidence of the House was fully justified.

Never in history before last year did any world exposition ever take place in the Southwest. HemisFair was built on a 92.6-acre site in downtown San Antonio, and its cost was about $156,000,000. Most of the buildings, including the U.S. Pavilion, were designed as permanent structures, and even now some are being used, and others are awaiting conversion. HemisFair was not, and was never intended to be, an exposition on the scale of Expo '67 or other world fairs; it was a special category exposition, limited in its scope and purpose, and intending to show one special theme: the confluence of civilizations in the Americas. San Antonio is 250 years old, and in that time all the people of the Americas have passed through the city, and some have stayed. This is true of the Americas; the Western Hemisphere is the product of many civilizations, joined into a confluence that contains the strengths of many. That was the story of HemisFair.

People came to see this great show: 6,384,482 people in all. I think that most were pleased by what they found. They found the U.S. Pavilion showing a critically acclaimed film; they found the Institute of Texan Cultures telling it like it was and is; they found the Alexander Girard collection of folk art, the outstanding collection of its kind anywhere in the world; they found perhaps the greatest exhibition of Spanish art treasures ever brought to this country on loan; they saw the exhibits of virtually every country of the Americas, and learned that in our diversity there is great strength. At HemisFair one could see his work and his world in large perspective; one could see 90 miles from the Tower of the Americas, and life in miniature from a distance of less than a yard. It was all there, the old and the new, the changing and the unchangeable.

Mr. Speaker, I envisioned HemisFair as an event that could teach, and could bring new momentum into the community, and it did those things. HemisFair also created a new sense of progress in San Antonio and the Southwest, a new determination to do great things where in the past nothing was done at all, and a knowledge that indeed this is a world and ours a time and place well fit for all men to live in. I believe HemisFair was a success. I intend to offer my colleagues a full and detailed report on HemisFair at an early date. In the meanwhile, I call your attention to the 1969 "Book of Knowledge Annual," which reports as follows:

HemisFair '68

HemisFair'68 made San Antonio, Texas, the most exciting and interesting place in the United States during the six months of its run (April 6–October 6). HemisFair celebrated the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio, a city famed for the Alamo and renowned for its grace and beauty.

The theme of HemisFair was "Confluence of Civilizations in the Americas." The fair was meant to show how people from all over the world came to the United States and founded a new country and a new way of life. It also took a look into the future to see what it might hold for the United States and the world.

HemisFair occupied a site of 92.6 acres in the heart of downtown San Antonio. Over six million people attended the fair. They saw exhibits from more than thirty nations as well as industrial exhibits.

Altogether the buildings erected for HemisFair cost $156,000,000. Most world's-fair buildings are torn down at the closing of the exposition. But at HemisFair many buildings were built for permanent use. Among these are the theme structure, the 622-foot Tower of the Americas, a great Convention Center, the United States Pavilion, the Texas Pavilion and others.

U.S. PAVILION

The United States Pavilion at HemisFair consisted of two buildings: an exhibit hall and a 1,200-seat theater. In the exhibit hall were exhibits showing the people of the United States and their achievements. Across a connecting plaza, the theater showed a unique film on the largest curvilinear motion-picture screen in the world. The circular theater contained three separate sections. During the 23-minute film, the walls separating the sections were raised so that the three audiences merged into one. At the same time, the three separate motion pictures merged into one.

TOWER OF THE AMERICAS

The dominant structure at HemisFair was the Tower of the Americas. This 622-foot concrete tower has a rotating restaurant and observation decks at the top. The Tower of the Americas is the tallest observation tower in the Western Hemisphere. On a clear day visitors could see the horizon 90 miles away. Three glass-fronted elevators carried visitors to the top.

TEXAS PAVILION

The biggest exhibit building at HemisFair was the Texas Pavilion, called the Institute of Texan Cultures. The building, which cost $10,000,000, contained exhibits showing the contributions made to Texas by pioneers from many lands. Each nationality group in Texas was represented by a separate area of exhibits. These exhibits included artifacts of all kinds, as well as pictures and sound, which presented the story of the founding and development of Texas. At the center of the Texas Pavilion, visitors could sit on the carpeted floor, and see above them, projected on nearly forty different screens, slides and movies about Texas' past, present and future.

Probably the most unique of HemisFair's exhibits was the Alexander Girard Folk Art Collection, a stunning display of over ten thousand dolls and other miniatures from countries all over the Western Hemisphere.

FOREIGN EXHIBITS

Foreign exhibits at HemisFair were housed in a section called Las Plazas del Mundo—Plazas of the World. Canada, one of the large exhibitors, welcomed visitors with a display showing how Canadians live, how they are governed, and their country's place in the world. Spain displayed priceless art.

Other foreign exhibitors were Belgium, Bolivia, Colombia, France, Italy, Japan, Korea, Portugal, Panama, China, Thailand, Venezuela, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, West Germany and Switzerland.

Mexico contributed a pavilion filled with valuable paintings and artifacts. One of the most popular attractions at HemisFair were the mariachis, who performed on a floating stage in a lagoon just outside the Mexican Pavilion.

Los Voladores de Papantla, the famous Flying Indians of Papantla, Mexico, thrilled HemisFair visitors with a daily reenactment of a 400-year-old ritual. The authentically costumed Indians performed a complete ceremony, climaxed by a rain dance performed on a 12-inch disk at the top of a 114-foot-high pole. At the end of the ceremony, four of the Indians descended from the pole, flying head down on ropes secured to their waists. The flyers made 32 turns around the pole, fanning out some thirty feet in a spectacular ritual defying death itself. The ceremony is one performed by the Totonac Indians today just as it was four hundred years ago.

INDUSTRIAL PAVILIONS

The Radio Corporation of America sponsored an exhibit showing present and future use of computers as teaching aids for children. The exhibit included live demonstrations of children learning with the help of an advanced computer. A short distance away, International Business Machines showed how a computer can be connected to a loom to weave any design. Visitors drew any design they liked, and the computer commanded the loom to weave it.

The Coca-Cola Company Pavilion featured 120 puppets in a colorful and imaginative show enjoyed by children and adults alike. The Bell Telephone System sponsored a popular magic show. The Gulf Oil Corporation presented a miniature freeway where drivers could test their skills safely. General Motors, the Ford Motor Company, the Eastman Kodak Company and many other industrial exhibitors participated in HemisFair.

THE FAIRGROUNDS

HemisFair was designed for people, and the walking distances from any one point of the grounds to any other point were short "People expressways" shortened distances and made walking easier. Those who wished to ride could choose a sky-ride or a miniature monorail. A lagoon and a waterway system ran throughout the grounds, and many visitors saw HemisFair from gondolas.

HemisFair was built in an old part of San Antonio. The builders of the fair decided to restore 27 old homes and historic buildings in the grounds rather than destroy them. Old houses became restaurants, clubs and visitor centers. And an old warehouse became an exhibit hall. A carriage house became a sidewalk restaurant, while an old school served as HemisFair headquarters. The old buildings, scattered throughout the HemisFair site, offered charm and contrast to the sleek new buildings all around. The grounds were enhanced by a waterway, which included a rerouted San Antonio River, and by twenty fountains of all kinds and sizes. Sculptures, more than a hundred of them, dotted the grounds. They represented artists both recognized and new, and works in every mode from plastic to welded steel.

Food at HemisFair ranged from traditional hot dogs to exotic dishes from all corners of the world. A Mexican restaurant, two French restaurants, a Polynesian restaurant, a Philippine restaurant and many others offered food at every price and to every taste.

PROUD SAN ANTONIO

World's fairs seldom produce any profit, and HemisFair closed at a loss. The underwriters of the loan used by HemisFair had to pay for the losses, but they did so gladly, because HemisFair had brought 6,384,482 people to San Antonio, and they spent $134,000,000 in San Antonio alone. But more important than the money was the fact that HemisFair did start San Antonio moving ahead, and it did focus new attention on a proud old city, and that is exactly what the supporters of the fair hoped for.

Henry B. Gonzalez,
U.S. Representative.

ABOUT MORALITY

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am often impressed with the thinking and excellent writings of the very fine newspapers in the 20 counties of the First District of Georgia. I feel the editorial which follows from the Swainsboro Forest-Blade of March 26 shows full well the awareness and keen understanding of some of the activities of certain segments of our population today, which we read about and view so much on our television screens:

About Morality

Repeatedly, in recent months, we have been coming across the phrase, "middle class morality." Each time we see it in print it is like a wet mop in the face. The hippies head for a Haight-Ashbury in San Francisco to rid themselves of it; movie reviewers find enlightenment in movies which portray persons trying to escape it; even book reviewers are given to hailing authors who create depraved demons who deplore their middle class morality upbringing and violate whatever they fancy middle class morality to be.

It has come to be a standard phrase in the terminology of the literary license takers who defend any behavior as being simply a protest against middle class morality. At least two national magazines of recent date have devoted space and photographs to young people who represent to be busily engaged in purging themselves of this middle class morality malady, in order to be useful spokesmen for the cohorts of the unorthodox and unclean of our time.

There must be about 150 million people in this land who came out of middle class morality and that is three out of every four living and breathing Americans.

The code did not differ greatly from one part of the country to another, nor from one religion or color to another. In essence it has been: work a full day for a day's wage, save for a rainy day, fear God, defend the Flag, help the sick and poor, preserve the family, and do unto others as you'd like them to do unto you.

It was never a complicated code, and it was inbred, in every American community. It wasn't imported from any land; it wasn't carried here by any national or religious group. It was part of the beginning and the growth of America. Each incoming group had to prove itself, to be sure. And it took a little time. But the once-hated Irish did it; the Jews did it; the Chinese did it; the Negroes did it. They didn't do it as a group, or a race; they did it as individual Americans who liked the code and adopted it as a way of life and then stood proud as a peer of every other American who earnestly endeavored to pay his own way and held his God and his Country higher than himself.

Middle class morality doesn't tolerate either malingerers or maligners.

Middle class morality isn't a sickness of our society; it is the spine of it.

GOVERNMENT OPENS UP UNDER PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, once again President Nixon forged a policy favoring openness of communication between his administration and the American people.

On the troublesome question of executive privilege, where the need of Congress to obtain information must be carefully balanced against the duty of the executive branch not to disclose information incompatible with the public interest, the President has come down squarely on the side of maximum disclosure.

President Nixon has created a formal and strict procedure for cases where there might be a question of whether to disclose or not. A department head who feels information should be withheld must take his case to the Attorney General, and if there is agreement that withholding is necessary, the matter goes to the President for a final decision.

President Nixon clearly is operating on the premise that the public interest will require withholding only in rare instances.

Many newsmen already have expressed amazement at the access to high Government officials in the administration. The President's news conferences have been examples of the new level of candid communication between the people and the new administration. And the new policy on executive privilege serves as still another example that the Nixon administration is doing everything possible to assure an open administration.

The text of the President's memorandum to agency and department heads and editorials on the executive privilege policy from the April 1, 1969, Chicago Tribune and the April 3, 1969, Washington Post follow:

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, March 24, 1969

Subject: Establishing a procedure to govern compliance with congressional demands for information.

The policy of this Administration is to comply to the fullest extent possible with Congressional requests for information. While the Executive branch has the responsibility of withholding certain information the disclosure of which would be incompatible with the public interest, this Administration will invoke this authority only in the most compelling circumstances and after a rigorous inquiry into the actual need for its exercise. For those reasons Executive privilege will not be used without specific Presidential approval. The following procedural steps will govern the invocation of Executive privilege:

1. If the head of an Executive department or agency (hereafter referred to as "department head") believes that compliance with a request for information from a Congressional agency addressed to his department or agency raises a substantial question as to the need for invoking Executive privilege, he should consult the Attorney General through the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice.

2. If the department head and the Attorney General agree, in accordance with the policy set forth above, that Executive privilege shall not be invoked in the circumstances, the information shall be released to the inquiring Congressional agency.

3. If the department head and the Attorney General agree that the circumstances justify the invocation of Executive privilege, or if either of them believes that the issue should be submitted to the President, the matter shall be transmitted to the Counsel to the President, who will advise the department head of the President's decision.

4. In the event of a Presidential decision to invoke Executive privilege, the department should advise the Congressional agency that the claim of Executive privilege is being made with the specific approval of the President.

5. Pending a final determination of the matter, the department head should request the Congressional agency to hold its demand for the information in abeyance until such determination can be made. Care shall be taken to indicate that the purpose of this request is to protect the privilege pending the determination, and that the request does not constitute a claim of privilege.

Richard Nixon.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Apr. 1 1969]

Nixon Levels With the People

President Nixon has instructed his official family that the practice of withholding information from Congress on the ground of "executive privilege" is not to be exercised unless the President himself specifically approves. This step represents a welcome departure from the secrecy and "news management" which have prevailed in the executive departments for many years.

Mr. Nixon's own experience in government probably influenced his decision. He became acquainted with executive suppression of factual information in his very first term in the House as a member of the 80th Congress of 1947–49. When the 1946 election produced Republican majorities in both houses of Congress, President Truman moved to forestall the investigation he anticipated into communist infiltration of his administrator.

On March 21, 1947, he issued an executive order designed to prevent Republican investigators from obtaining documents and other information to guide their committee inquiries. Former Sen. Jenner of Indiana described this instrument as one thru which the President could "lay an absolute embargo on information demanded by Congress from the executive agencies."

Mr. Nixon, as a member of the committee on un-American activities, played a prominent part in the investigation which exposed Alger Hiss, a high functionary of the state department, as a soviet espionage agent and perjurer. Yet thruout that inquiry Nixon was keenly aware that the administration had placed every possible obstacle in the committee's path to hamper the search for truth.

While a senator and Vice President, Nixon saw the same procedures in operation on at least two other occasions. In September, 1951, President Truman issued a supplementary order authorizing non-military departments and agencies to impose a "security" censorship. Together, these two Truman orders turned out the lights on practically everything that the executive branch wanted to keep from the Congress and the people.

Nor was the Republican administration which Nixon served as Vice President without fault. On Jan. 21, 1954, when the late Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy was headed toward a public confrontation with the department of the army and its secretary, a strategy huddle was held in the White House. Sen. McCarthy had charged loose security practices at Fort Monmouth, N.J., and had protested when an honorable discharge was handed Maj. Irving Peress to hustle him out of service after he had pleaded the 5th amendment 33 times under the senator's questioning.

Plans by the White House conferees were intended to embarrass Sen. McCarthy by advancing the counter-charge that he had sought an army commission for a staff member who faced induction. When McCarthy tried to bring the White House meeting into the open, he was stopped by an executive order of May 17, 1954, that all secrets of the executive branch were to remain privy to those concerned.

During the Kennedy and Johnson administrations the doctrine was promulgated that "news management" was permissible on the ground that news was "part of the arsenal of weaponry" available to a President, and that it was "the inherent right of a government to lie to save itself."

We trust that President Nixon has acted out of revulsion to these efforts at concealment and suppression and that he has wisely decided that honesty with the people and Congress is the best policy.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 3, 1969]

THE PUBLIC RIGHT TO KNOW

The most distinctive characteristic of a democratic system is that it operates in a goldfish bowl. Except in matters of national security, where a certain amount of secrecy seems unavoidable, the public and the Congress are entitled to know what the executive branch is doing and why. Yet a constant struggle is necessary to prevent bureaucrats from hiding information about actions which may tend to place them in an unfavorable light.

It is highly significant, therefore, that President Nixon has underwritten the public right to know with specific instructions to his official family. Not only has he proclaimed a policy of complying "to the fullest extent possible" with congressional requests for information. He has also instituted a formal procedure that any executive official must follow if he wishes to withhold information from Congress on grounds of "executive privilege." The first step is to seek clearance from the Office of Legal Counsel in the Department of Justice and if that office and the Attorney General see a reason for withholding the data the request must then go to the counsel to the President for direct submission to him. Information can be withheld only if the President gives his specific approval.

Undoubtedly this strict rein upon the invocation of secrecy is intended to bolster good relations between the Republican President and the Democratic Congress. Quite a number of congressional committees are planning probes into Administration actions and policies, past and present. Apparently Mr. Nixon believes that the best way to get along with them is to permit a free flow of information in executive files, except in rare instances where the national security stands in the way. In addition to easing executive-legislative relations, this is an essential safeguard against widening the credibility gap that always exists in some measure between government and citizen.

It is well to remember also an open-information policy is easily stated but often difficult to observe with fidelity. At this point we are delighted that the President has so fully recognized the public right to know and hope that he will give a literal interpretation to his words when the going gets rough.

DAVENPORT'S MR. HISTORY

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, enclosed herewith is an article entitled, "Davenport's Mr. History." It is a story of Mr. Roy McNabney who is a great student of history and is an articulate speaker on the subject. He has properly motivated and helped us use and benefit from history. All of us need to do this more than we do and it is good that we have people in our community like Mr. McNabney with ability and desire to share his talents with other people and, thereby, make them wiser and better.

The article follows:

DAVENPORT'S MR. HISTORY

(By Hortense Finch)

Ninety years young Monday, Roy Francis (Mac) McNabney, dapper as ever, still maintains sharp interest in an amazing variety of things from sports to history.

Regardless of the weather, McNabney never misses a conversation-sparked get-together twice weekly with old and new friends at downtown Davenport Shannon's. After that, he saunters around the corner to his favorite retreat, the public library.

"In my lifetime, I've read my way through several PhD. dissertations," he claims.

Born in Hampton, Ill., he was educated in public schools there. As a senior, he won a scholarship to attend a Congregational school in Port Byron.

That was where he developed a life-long interest in history. One of his proudest accomplishments is the completion of a unique, documented history of the United States mail system. It includes such details as stage lines used, bridges crossed, and taverns used as depots.

McNabney says he spent at least 30 years researching the project, going back before the American Revolution to the present.

He also is the author of a 77-page record of the ferry boat, a work covering a time span of 120 years and including a graph listing pilots, owners and engineers by decades. Dr. William Petersen of the Iowa State Historical Society has often quoted from McNabney's writings in his own books on Mississippi River lore.

McNabney's other hobbies include playing such instruments as the saxophone, violin, mandolin and bass horn. He used to play in the Moline Plow Co. band and organized the Palmer School band of 40, which played for special school events.

He was selected a few years ago to compile a card index tabulating under various headings all significant articles that had appeared in local newspapers from their beginnings to the present. That index of more than 800 cards with amazingly complete information is now in the Davenport Public Museum.

McNabney, who formerly did varied research in the Academy of Science which preceded the present Davenport Public Museum, is generally recognized as the best informed authority on early history of the Quad-City area.

He often receives mail requests for specific information. Recently he received an inquiry about the first use of X-ray in the detection of a crime.

McNabney recalled that a man had stolen a diamond from a Davenport jewelry store and hidden it in a seam. He was taken to a doctor's office where an X-ray examination revealed the diamond's location.

His first job was with Hartz and Bahnsen, Rock Island wholesale and retail druggists. One of his first jobs was to help make rock candy. One evening McNabney forgot to shut off the burner used to heat the syrup. When he entered the room the next morning, he found rock candy syrup everywhere.

When he was 20, he took a job with a wholesale drug firm in Chicago. One of his jobs was to fill glass containers with Vaseline and then pound in the corks with a rubber mallet. One day while doing this he broke the glass bottle. Countless glass slivers were imbedded in his hands. Later he was rejected for military service for that reason.

While working for the Modern Woodsmen in Rock Island later, McNabney helped organize, about 1907, the first semi-professional football team in the area. They played a regular schedule each Saturday afternoon. McNabney has continued his strong interest in many kinds of sports.

While employed by Schmidt Brothers Gas Engines Co., I originated work sheets for piece work. This was a totally new idea, something no place else was using at the time," he recalls.

Eventually, McNabney became a timekeeper for Palmer School of Chiropractic students.

"Checking students' attendance every hour was a real challenge," he remembers. "I soon became known as the 'Czar.' Actually, I was offered every type of bribe you can imagine. But we kept meticulous records. In fact, the system I instituted was described as the best by both the medical boards of New York State and Canada."

When McNabney discovered students were cribbing answers on the lapboards the school provided, he stopped this by shellacking the boards. To keep students from erasing grades or signatures, McNabney stamped these things on with raspberry juice, which he calls "absolutely indelible."

"At any age, McNabney would be a remarkable man," says Dr. E. G. Senty, his physician, "but at 90 he's really amazing. For instance, he follows all sports events as keenly as any teenager. He knows exactly what's going on nationally and internationally, as well as locally. He's a true gentleman."

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY: MICROCOSM OF THE REVOLUTION?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, profound and rapid changes are taking place in our Nation that affect every part of our lives, from politics to technology to education to religion. We are in a revolutionary era that influences even the most traditional institutions like the Roman Catholic Church.

The Wall Street Journal has devoted a front-page article to the current tension within American Catholicism, concentrating on Catholic University of America. Simply put, the question is: How much or how little authority should there be at the official university in this country of the Vatican?

Another article in the Milwaukee Metro News approaches the same question by examining the fight of several conservatives at Catholic University, particularly Dr. William Roberts, a professor of international law and relations, for evolutionary rather than revolutionary reform at the university and within the Catholic Church.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is much food for thought in these two articles about the continuing revolution in America. I include the above-mentioned articles from the Wall Street Journal of January 9, 1969, and the Milwaukee Metro News of January 8, 1969, in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 9, 1969]

CHURCH AND CAMPUS: FREEDOM OF INQUIRY IS AT ISSUE IN CONTROVERSY AT CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY—PROFESSORS ASSERT THE RIGHT TO DIFFER WITH HIERARCHY—BIRTH CONTROL IS DEBATED—CARDINAL O'BOYLE'S REBUTTAL

(By Jonathan Spivak)

WASHINGTON.—"The University venerates the Roman pontiff as its Supreme Ruler and Teacher and submits unreservedly to his Apostolic Authority as the only safe norm of truth."

So state the statutes of the Catholic University of America here in the nation's capital. CU is the largest American university formally accredited by the Vatican (6,300 students) and one of relatively few such institutions in the world. CU is also distinctive in that it traditionally has been run by American Catholic bishops as a body rather than by a particular religious order or diocese. Yet this supposed citadel of orthodoxy has lately become something of a center of dissent.

Theologians on the university faculty have openly taken issue with the hierarchy on birth control. Their stand has stirred protests among other local priests and ordinary church-goers, and it has opened up a struggle over academic freedom and the authority of the church's presiding bishops. An inquiry into the dissent at Catholic University, starting this month or next with findings due in March, will help determine how far any change will go.

It was last summer that a handful of CU theologians mounted a rostrum at Washington's Mayflower Hotel to express total disagreement with Pope Paul's just issued encyclical, "Humanae Vitae," which opposes artificial birth control. "History shows that a number of statements of similar or even greater authoritative weight have subsequently been proven inadequate or even erroneous," the theologians declared. They then advised Catholic couples that "artificial contraception in some circumstances is permissible and indeed necessary to preserve and foster the values and sacredness of marriage."

OUTSIDE SUPPORT

Even then, the professors had supporters outside the university. And since the CU theologians' declaration, some 700 Catholics across the country have signed their manifesto, while dozens of Washington priests have joined a running birth-control wrangle with Washington's Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle. Moreover, the university has become immersed in the more subtle and probably more significant contest over church authority and academic freedom.

The CU controversy underscores some of the hard questions confronting the Catholic Church and Catholic higher education in particular. Among them: Does the authority of the Pope and bishops govern or merely guide the individual conscience? Is unorthodox theological opinion to be expressed only in the classroom and academic journals? Or can priests use modern means of communication such as the televised press conference?

"This was not a question of rebellion," declares one CU dissenter. "This was theological truth we felt a duty to convey to Catholics in the U.S. If there had been other ways of dialogue between the bishops and theologians, we could have saved a lot of trouble."

Another asserts: "The academic-freedom controversy embodies the whole problem: Can this university be a true American university and still be fostered and maintained by official church sponsorship?"

Some CU theologians say the bishops haven't seen anything yet. "The bishops think they have trouble with us; we're over 35, over the hill," exclaims one of the dissenting priests. "Wait until they deal with the young seminarians coming in."

BRIGHT AND BRASH

At this point, the university's dissidents can't speak out publicly; they've been silenced pending the outcome of the inquiry. But they're quite ready for battle with the bishops. Those facing the inquiry are 21 faculty members at the university's school of theology. Among the leaders is the Rev. Charles Curran, whom the board of trustees tried but failed to fire in a 1967 battle over birth control. Others are the Revs. Robert E. Hunt, Daniel C. Maguire and Berard Marthaler. By and large, the 21 are bright, young and brash. They like to dress informally, often appearing in wooly sweaters when not required to wear clerical garb, and they're adept at dealing with the press.

To the dissenters, 72-year-old Cardinal O'Boyle seems a symbol of the church's past and particularly of its peculiar mixture of conservative doctrine and social liberalism. The cardinal holds strict views on church, sex and family life, yet has championed the rights of minorities. "He's the last of the Renaissance princes," comments one bishop.

Cardinal O'Boyle's concept of church authority is at the heart of his conflict with the theologians. As he puts it: "When disputes arise in the church, the Pope has the last word. The Pope and the rest of us bishops are the only teachers appointed by Christ for his church. What's going on now, it seems to me, is that the theologians and other priests are appointing themselves to teach, even to teach in a way that contradicts the instructions of the local bishops and what's more the teaching of the Vicar of Christ."

THE TRUSTEES' ROLE

Cardinal O'Boyle could have summarily dismissed the 21 dissenting theologians last fall: as chancellor of the university, he is responsible for maintaining its "orthodoxy of doctrine." Most faculty members think that he wanted to fire the dissidents but feared hostile reaction and met opposition in the university's board of trustees. The 30-member board, composed equally of bishops and laymen and headed by retired Monsanto Co. executive Carroll A. Hochwalt, was split on the birth-control issue. It ducked the controversy by convening a board of inquiry, under faculty auspices, to determine whether the theologians should be punished or praised.

The inquiry is to determine whether the priest-professors violated their "responsibilities to the university" by their public dissent. "Birth control is a symbol; the question is the relationship of the theologians to the church," declares one faculty member.

The inquiry will take testimony in closed session for at least a week. The priests will be represented by the prestigious New York law firm of Cravath, Swain and Moore. (A member of the firm, John Hunt, is a brother of the Rev. Robert Hunt, one of the most outspoken of the theologians.) The American Association of University Professors, which hopes the hearings will set standards for academic freedom at church-related institutions, will have an observer on hand. "Catholic higher-educators all over the country are watching this one very intensely," says Jordan E. Kurland, associate secretary of the AAUP.

Most close observers expect the inquiry to vindicate the theologians. Four of the board's five members are themselves CU professors, and they are likely to be eager to uphold the principle of freedom of inquiry. Furthermore, the theologians' dissenting views have been echoed by many other critics within the church.

"My feeling is we'll come out okay in the inquiry; the board of trustees won't censure them (the theologians) but might give some guidelines," says one CU administrator.

"In the long run, if the inquiry is conducted correctly, it will do nothing but strengthen the university," declares John Murphy, acting dean of the graduate school of arts and sciences.

A TOUGH ASSIGNMENT

One possibility is that the board might gently reprimand the priests for issuing impetuous public statements; the specific focus of the inquiry is not the merits of their ideas but the propriety of their utterances. Setting standards for the professors' off-campus actions poses obvious problems, however. "It's like trying to write rules to define good taste; this is mighty hard to do," concedes Donald Marlowe, chairman of the inquiry and dean of CU's engineering school.

Even before the current dispute, the university had made significant strides toward establishing independence from the bishops' control. The biggest breakthrough came in 1967 when the board of trustees attempted to fire Father Curran. The board, then controlled by the bishops, offered no explanation for its action, but all sides assumed his fault was freely expressing liberal views on birth control.

The entire faculty, supported by the students, went on strike and closed the school. Within a few days, Cardinal O'Boyle relented and restored Father Curran to good standing with a promotion. "After that, no one can stomp on us," declares one participant.

The strike led to a revamping of the board of trustees giving laymen half the votes. More laymen were installed as university administrators. (Sooner or later, a nonchurchman may head the university; even now a layman is among the candidates being considered for permanent rector to replace an acting head.) Outside consultants were hired to advise on the school's long-range academic and financial course. Faculty committees were established to draw up a statement of CU's goals; their ringing affirmation of academic independence—"The only constraint upon truth is truth itself"— was endorsed by the trustees.

THE LAST STRAW

But the 1967 set-to also left hard feelings, and the bishops could find the university's course an increasing annoyance. "Curran just stiffened their (the bishops') necks," says one priest. "The faculty had better think twice about reacting that way again. It could be the last straw."

The university not only stirs up controversy but also asks the hierarchy to help pay its bills. This year the bishops agreed to increase their contribution from $2.3 million to $4.5 million, or 20% of CU's $22 million annual budget; the money is collected by local appeals in each diocese. At the least, the theologians' dissent will make fund-raising among the faithful more difficult, and it could enhance the bishops' inclination to demand orthodoxy from the institution.

Besides money, the hierarchy has another hold over the university: It controls the assignment of the priest-professors. At a moment's notice, local bishops can recall the theologians from the university faculty to their home dioceses—and without giving reason. (Father Hunt is subject to the conservative bishop of Newark.) Indeed, the dissenters' major worry is that they will be quietly consigned to obscure parish duties after the coming inquiry ends, particularly if it does not entirely exonerate them.

If the theologians were recalled, some might well balk at the transfer, rising stronger punishment for insubordination. Or the faculty and students could rally behind them and raise a ruckus on campus. "We'd have a real crisis here," worries one CU administrator.

TRAINING NUNS AND PRIESTS

Going beyond the present controversy, observers say CU's troubles reflect conflictive concepts of the role of the Catholic University of America. The bishops, particularly the more influential, such as Cardinals John Krol of Philadelphia and James Francis McIntyre of Los Angeles, regard the university as a service arm of the church. The university has traditionally been a training ground for nuns, priests, canon lawyers, social workers and parochial-school administrators.

Stressing these practical benefits is one way to persuade parishioners to contribute to a distant university when local Catholic colleges are also appealing for funds. Thus, Cardinal Krol has urged his flock to forget the theologians' "unprecedented rejection of the teaching of the Vicar of Christ" and remember CU's "80 years of service to our church and society."

The university's faculty, particularly the theologians and other young, assertive members, believe their special responsibility is to tackle the church's tough controversies. These range from the obscure and ecclesiastical, such as the standing of certain priestly orders, to the obvious and practical, such as the question of whether the church should dispose of its extensive, expensive hospital and school systems. "The bishops darn well better have the best intellectual resources they can afford when they deal with these difficult decisions," says one bishop.

When the university was founded in 1887, the American bishops envisioned it as the capstone of the church's education system in the U.S. For more than a decade, it was the only Catholic graduate school in this country and harbored lofty academic ambitions.

HAPHAZARD GROWTH

But as the years passed, CU's scant financial resources became dissipated in a widening array of assignments. Undergraduate courses and graduate departments proliferated in haphazard fashion. The university now operates separate schools of education, law, nursing, social work, theology, cannon law and philosophy. Its campus, located in a racially integrated middle-class neighborhood about three miles north of the Capitol, is crowded with a mixture of aging stone edifices and modern buildings. It is dominated by the magnificent domed National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, in which Luci Johnson Nugent was married.

On the undergraduate level, CU failed to become a national institution; most of its students come from seven nearby states. On the graduate level. It faltered in competition with other ambitious Catholic institutions, such as Fordham, Notre Dame, Georgetown and St. Louis University. However, some departments, including engineering, physics and Semitic languages, have established excellent reputations.

Now the university's officials believe they must make hard choices in order to survive and succeed. Many think some of the professional schools should be abolished or deemphasized. Some argue for a dramatic expansion of undergraduate enrollment, now one-third of the student body, to reduce per-capita costs and establish a broader fund-raising base. Everyone agrees the curriculum must be pruned and certain departments given priority; the question is which ones.

The university's church connection logically argues for an emphasis on theology, philosophy and the humanities. "CU could become, and should become, the Catholic theological center of the country," insists Acting Rector Nivard Scheel. But ironically, much of its current strength lies more in engineering and physical sciences.

There's debate, too, on how closely the university should remain tied to the church. The more radical faculty members argue that all bonds should be severed. But the bishops, who take an intense paternal pride in CU, are unlikely to endorse such a separation.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) News, Jan. 8, 1969]

REVOLUTION IN THE CHURCH: CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN TURMOIL—CENTER OF RELIGIOUS REVOLUTION

(By Stephen P. Athanasius)

WASHINGTON.—One does not have to be a Roman Catholic or even a Christian for that matter, to comprehend that the Church in America is undergoing a profound change in its very structure and foundations. Many have likened what is taking place in the Church to a "revolution" and indeed that is exactly what it is.

Even school children know that a successful revolution must have a base of operations, and it stands as a monument to irony that the launching pad for the revolution against the Church is located at The Catholic University, (CU), of America in Washington, D.C.

CU is supposed to be THE most Catholic of Catholic educational institutions in the nation. Article two of the statutes of CU says that "the University must look to the welfare not only of the students enrolled but also of all the faithful in the USA . . . thus the University should be the national centre of Catholic culture, and should be held as such by all."

In fact, Pope Leo XIII, not exactly known as a Conservative in Church circles, said in a letter to the late Cardinal Gibbons approving the establishment of CU that it ". . . promises rich and salutary results both for the spread of sound doctrine and the defense of the Catholic religion . . ."

What has been taking place at CU during the past several years amounts to exactly the opposite of what was intended, to say the least.

The New York Times of September 29, 1968 notes that Washington's Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle (who up until his enforcement of Pope Paul's ban on artificial contraception was never accused of being a Conservative by anyone) had been "stung by the fact that nearby CU had become the center of the resistance movement . . ." against orthodoxy in the Church.

Commenting on the now famous dispute in Washington between Cardinal O'Boyle and some 50 disobedient priests the Washington Post noted "that many of the priests involved in the Washington dispute caught the message of this kind of religion while studying at CU, where such notions have flourished for some time, first in the Department of Religious Education and more recently in the School of Theology."

Indeed even some of the former faculty members of CU have begun to speak out on the truly Un-Catholic developments in recent times. Msgr. Eugene Kevane, wrote in the Spring of this year that CU's purpose and objective has been increasingly interpreted "in terms of philosophical positivism." He wrote in the Catholic Education Review that "this has made it increasingly difficult for Christian philosophy to function on this campus as the Church intends and for the theology to maintain either its authentic nature or its central position within the institution."

Needless to say with such ideas it is not surprising that Msgr. Kevane was ousted as Dean of CU's School of Education in November 1967 by the then Acting Rector Rev. John Whalen.

The Avant-Garde at CU had gathered around Father Whalen since 1962. Whalen described himself in an October 1, 1967 edition of the New York Times as "an adherent of the 'radical center' in disputes over academic, doctrinal and liturgical freedom on Roman Catholic campuses."

Although Whalen himself is no longer the Acting Rector of CU, his team has remained in full charge of the University. He has been succeeded in that position by Brother Nivard Scheel, whose only apparent qualification for the post is that of having served as Whalen's "executive assistant" for a year. Previously he served as principal of a Brooklyn high school. The aim of the Whalen team is to completely capture CU for the Religious Revolution. After only six years, they have been about 90% successful. Most of their former opposition is gone, and the heirarchy of the U.S. Roman Catholic Church appears to have given up the fight.

The Whalen crowd thus far has received only one serious challenge from the side of traditional orthodoxy. That is from a little known faculty member by the name of Dr. William Roberts. Roberts is unique on two counts in his struggle against the revolution. First, he has neither given up nor been ousted from CU. Second, he has sued the University, and in fact his case is now pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia.

Roberts, who has been a full time faculty member at CU for 23 years incurred the wrath of Whalen and his group when he accepted an appointment on the staff of the New Catholic Encyclopedia (of which Whalen was the editorial operations director) at the request of the then Rector at CU. Roberts, whose philosophical and theological orthodoxy have never been in question, was a threat to the unity of the Avant-garde which Whalen had assembled around him at that time. So Whalen apparently set out to do Roberts in. Roberts responded by speaking out against those who were attacking the then traditionalist Administration at CU.

Thus the conflict between Whalen and his gang and Roberts began. In the words of the former Rector at CU, Bishop William J. McDonald, Roberts had been "harassed" and "tortured" by faculty members in charge of the University. After a couple of years the situation got so bad that the Board of Trustees, in an effort to mediate the problem, authorized the Rector at CU to enter into a contract with Roberts establishing an autonomous Institute of International

Law and Relations, with Roberts as its Director. The Institute was to have rights and obligations with those of all the other schools at the University.

The Chancellor at CU, Archbishop (now Cardinal) O'Boyle, said the establishment of the Institute was a "definite settlement of the situation." Obviously, the CU faculty leaders wanted to remove Roberts from the mainstream of the University where they felt he might damage their advancing cause of heterodoxy. Yet even as they did so with the establishment of the Institute, the Whalen crowd began to push for Roberts' complete dismissal from CU. The ink on Roberts' contract wasn't even dry when their attacks began.

In spite of pressure, villification and harassment, Roberts was able to develop the Institute so rapidly that it had 86 graduate students within the two years after its initiation.

However, under pressure of the faculty leadership, whose ire increased proportional with the Institute's success, the Administration started to restrict the Institute by cutting financial support and by excluding the Institute from participation in grants, academic consultation, etc. This forced Roberts to bring action against the University asking for a permanent injunction againt the violation of his contract and for damages.

Ten days after Whalen took office, the Academic Senate (which is completely controlled by the revolutionaries) passed a resolution recommending to the Board of Trustees the dissolution of the Institute on eleven weeks notice, or at the beginning of the Second Semester 1967/1968. The Board of Trustees approved the Senate's recommendation although 86 graduate students in the Institute were (against their will and intention) forced either to withdraw from the University or to transfer to CU's Politics Department, which is notoriously weak and which at that time had a mere nine graduate students enrolled. The Institute's faculty which Roberts had assembled, and which were as orthodox as he is, were confronted with a similar choice. In addition, Roberts' contract was breached and he was transferred back to the environment in which he had been "tortured"—all this after devoting nearly three years to the successful development of the Institute.

Roberts' two attempts to have the District court issue a preliminary injunction failed, although observers agree that testimony in court showed clearly the malicious character of the action taken. The Institute was dissolved on February 7, 1968, and the University moved on the same day to have Roberts' appeal from the denial of the injunction dismissed. The dismissal motion of the University was denied and Roberts filed his appeal on June 24, 1968. Since that time the University, through the rulings of Chief Judge David Bazelon has, in what appears to be a clear violation of procedural rules, delayed any further progress of the appeal.

As of this writing the matter stands thusly:

(1) Although the answer to Roberts' appeal would have been due 30 days after he filed it on June 24th of this year, the University did not answer until October 10, 1968. Motions made by Roberts asking the Courts to expedite the matter were ignored. (2) A number of motions made by Roberts more than three months ago have yet to be acted upon by the Court. This being the case, oral argument has not yet been ordered although the appeal was filed more than five months ago. The appeal should have been expedited in keeping with the Interlocutory Appeals Act and in keeping with Rule 2 of the Federal Rules of Appellate procedure. However, Chief Judge Bazelon,—well known for his ultraliberal positions, has seen fit to grant this unusual delay in proceedings to the CU revolutionaries and thus, to deny speedy trial and justice to Roberts. Needless to say, these revolutionaries, like all those before them, believe that passage of time will be of benefit to them.

(3) All graduate students and the entire full time faculty at the dissolved Institute have joined Roberts in his appeal as friends of the Court. All of them are vitally interested in seeing the Institute, a bastion of orthodoxy in the sea of heterodoxy at CU, reestablished.

Pending action by the Court on his appeal, Roberts continues to serve as Professor of International Law and Relations at CU's Department of Politics.

In the opinion of many observers, including this reporter, the case of Dr. William Roberts vs. Catholic University of America is a microcosm of the struggle within the Catholic Church in this nation.

There is little question that the revolutionaries at CU are pulling out all the stops to win this one. It is their last hurdle before complete victory. Roberts, for his part, is still fighting and wondering why all those who have gone before him have given up before the battle. If Roberts will just look at the present state of Catholicism in America, he will have his answer.

A FOREIGN AID MODEL

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Israel's managerial, technical, scientific, and medical personnel are assisting developing nations throughout the world. Israel's experience should serve as a useful model to other nations interested in providing useful aid to underdeveloped countries.

The following article by David Horowitz appearing in a recent issue of Israel magazine provides a reminder to us of the valuable service performed by enlightened foreign aid:

ISRAEL AND THE THIRD WORLD

(By David Horowitz)

Israel takes pride of place among the nations providing technical aid to the developing countries—this aid being measured in proportion to the contributors' population. From surveys issued by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), it emerges that one and all of its 20 members, beginning with the United States and including Britain, Canada, France and West Germany, are far outstripped by the Jewish State in the relative amount of technical assistance extended to the Third World.

The Third World? The term was coined as an afterthought in the cold war. Some years ago, the talk used to be only about the Free World *versus* the Communist World, as if nothing else existed. Then it dawned on the pundits that also present was the Third World, comprising the underprivileged, underfed, under-educated two-thirds of humanity who had not yet accomplished their Industrial Revolution.

What we are witnessing today is a global version of the 18th and 19th century drama in Europe and America, where the wealth of a small ruling elite was opposed to the shrieking poverty of the masses—the drama that stirred a Marx to revolt and a Dickens to pity. In those developed countries, the class gap is now rapidly closing, thanks to the upsurge of democratic forces striving for social justice. But another gap, a veritable abyss, at present separates the poor nations from the rich nations. And mass communications media only serve to make the "have-nots" in backward areas the more keenly aware of their plight, which contrasts so glaringly with the material comforts of the "haves" in the developed lands.

It is widely taken for granted, more often than not with a matter-of-fact shrug of the shoulders, that all-round disaster looms ahead if the "have" and "have-not" gap is perpetuated, if some countries continue to enjoy a standard of living more than 20 times higher than that of other countries, and if something does not happen quickly to give the lie to the factual finding of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) that "up to half of the world's population is still hungry or malnourished, or both."

The tragedy is not lessening but increasing. The disparities are not narrowing but widening. Both sides are drawing away. In the developed countries, the trend is towards ever-growing prosperity, overheated activity, inflation, tight capital markets. In the underdeveloped lands, the trend is towards outright famine. As modern medicine cuts the death-rate, there are more and more mouths to feed—and there is less and less food available. According to an OECD survey, during the past decade the world may have lost the ability to feed the mounting populations of the less developed nations, especially as surplus stocks of food held by the highly developed nations are depleted. With every passing day, the number of famished men, women and children increases.

The worsening of economic conditions in the developing countries is accompanied by political instability. There is an obvious correlation between the stagnation or deceleration of economic assistance to, and the escalation of domestic unrest and international tension in, the Third World. There have been no shooting wars inside the developed world in the past 20 years, while the teeming millions of Asia, Africa and Latin America seethe with disquiet, with internal and external strife which erupts into local conflicts threatening to kindle a world conflagration. Well over a dozen wars and revolutions have exploded during this period in the Third World, embroiling in some instances the Great Powers, dangerously, but so far at least not fatally.

How extinguish the conflicts? How overcome the despair and the despondency that give rise to friction and open clashes. How tackle the population outburst, the deterioration of terms of trade, the debt explosion, the specter of famine, the disease, the ignorance? What hope of rescue is there for the Third World if its real economic growth *per capita* is so low that at the present rate it will take more than a generation to double the existing average income or rather pittance per head of $100 a year—which is too much to die and too little to live on in dignity?

What is needed—there is no mystery about the remedy to the many woes—is an all-out offensive on world poverty by a massive, efficient transfer of know-how and capital from the developed to the developing lands. But the developed nations are reluctant to project onto the world arena their own domestic solutions of the Welfare Society and redistributive taxation.

As stated, Israel—herself a small country faced with epic difficulties stemming from unprecedented demographic expansion, scarcity of natural resources, and an onerous defence burden—has an outstanding record of service to the Third World. Thus, in the past 10 years, some 2,000 Israeli experts in various fields have gone out to a great many developing countries. They were active chiefly in Africa, but were also to be seen roaming the jungles of South-East Asia and the heights of the Himalayas, the plateaus of the Andes and the tropical valleys of Latin America. At the same time, some 12,000 Third World students took training in Israel, mostly in agriculture, medicine and engineering.

How explain the magnitude and, for that matter, the efficiency of Israel's help to the Third World? Many factors are at play. First there is the fact that Israel herself is at once a developing and a developed nation. Her rich fields were reclaimed from the wilderness, her factories were built on the sands. She is still fighting the desert, which covers the greater part of her territory. She can see both sides of the picture, and she has acquired invaluable do-it-yourself experience in making the transition from a backward to a progressive economy.

Next, or perhaps first and foremost, there is the moral motivation. The Jewish people came into being thousands of years ago with a humanist mission, with spiritual values which fired its creative forces down the ages. The national Jewish renascence in Israel was inspired by something bigger than the need to establish one more sovereign political entity on earth. The millennial martyrology and tenacity of the Jewish people were for a larger purpose. Narrow nationalism in resurrected Israel would have been an anticlimax to a unique history so fraught with vicissitudes and sufferings.

Then again, there is the opportunity to score politically—though Israel might well have overlooked this chance but for the initial moral impulse. Geographically, Israel is situated in the heart of the developing world. Her integration can best be effected by a constructive effort of assistance to her neighbors. Boycotted and blockaded as she is by her immediate Arab neighbors, she leapfrogs them and gives a helping hand to a wider circle of Third World countries, which repay her with friendship and sympathy. In contradistinction to the Arab States, which go to the Afro-Asian community of nations with quarrelsome slogans, with intrigues, with even armed intervention, Israel seeks to promote the economic, technological, hygienic, cultural, humane well-being of the needy peoples.

Last, and certainly least, are the economic considerations. In 1967, Israel companies carried out construction and public works in the developing countries to the tune of $55 million. Of course, such large-scale activity stimulated the export of Israel products, particularly building materials, to the countries where the work was being executed. Israel's exports to developing nations rose from $50 million in 1961 to $114 million in 1967. But these business transactions, while appreciable, were by no means a decisive element in Israel's policy.

Now, there are three facets to Israel's assistance: exemplary, executive, advisory.

To begin with, Israel sets a striking example of successful development inside her own frontiers. Most impressive and significant are her achievements in the expansion and improvement of agriculture, namely, the growing of food—and food is what the Third World is literally crying out for! According to the FAO, agricultural production in the world at large has stagnated in the last few years, while the food needs of developing countries will have doubled by 1985. In its report, *The State of Food and Agriculture* 1967, FAO notes that "*per capita* food production in the developing countries is estimated at more than four per cent less in 1966 than in the peak year of 1964 and lower than in any year since 1957."

The present standard of food production in the developing nations is too low to provide even a proper standard of nutrition. About half of the world's population is said to be still hungry or undernourished. At the same time, the countrysides of the developed nations suffer from unemployment or underemployment, and a vast pool of manpower remains under-utilized for economic growth and expansion of production.

With modern technology there is no doubt that agricultural production can be quickly, even spectacularly, multiplied. In Israel, the results in growth and production were achieved by a population predominantly inexperienced in agriculture, in an arid country with scarce natural resources, particularly water. They were obtained mainly by the application of capital, know-how and science. Israel's agricultural production went up in one decade, from 1955 to 1965, by 156 per cent in real terms, while farm employment went up only by 6.5 per cent. The value of production per employed person increased by over 140 per cent and today averages ten times more than in developing countries and is even higher than in France, Germany and Japan. In some branches of agriculture, such as milk production, Israel boasts of the highest yield in the world per cow. Within a single decade the irrigated area was enlarged by 74 per cent and net fixed assets per employed person by nearly 100 per cent. Agricultural exports increased by 96 per cent and the value of total agricultural output by 238 per cent.

In general, the economic development of Israel contradicts the superficial and widespread assumption that development and democracy are incompatible. At the last meeting of the Board of Governors of the World Bank, President Woods mentioned Israel as an example of outstanding success in economic growth. The achievement of a growth rate of 10 per cent per annum, in real terms, for 15 years under conditions of democracy certainly represents a contribution to the solution of the problem of rapid economic growth combined with a pattern of political freedom.

The second, executive method of promoting economic development is the direct one of handing out technical assistance on the spot. Here Israel is well ahead.

In irrigation and agriculture, in medical assistance and in education, her experts are engaged in the primary task of raising the standards of development, of social welfare, of technical proficiency and of education.

The third, advisory method is one of political support for increasing capital transfer to developing nations and the formulation of a plan that would greatly accelerate such transfer. The question of flow of capital to developing nations is a clear-cut case of priorities. Some $39 billion of domestic fixed-interest securities are launched each year on the capital markets of the world, as against some $3 billion of international and foreign securities. According to the United Nations Committee on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) Secretariat Report:

"During the period 1960–66, there has been a substantial increase in the volume of net issues by both the public and private sectors of these countries. Public and private borrowing on a net basis rose from approximately $16.7 billion in 1960 to $39.2 billion in 1966."

The share of developing nations in this gigantic accumulation of capital is negligible, and limited to two or three countries enjoying special conditions.

The 1967 Review of the OECD, *Development Assistance, Efforts and Policies,* puts the case in unequivocal and strikng terms: "The problem for the Members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) is essentially one of the degree of priority which is being given to aid. Governments may consider as obstacles to increases of assistance such conditions as balance of payments difficulties, fear of overheating the economy with resultant inflation, and budgetary limitations. The last item is merely a polite way of saying that domestic claims such as more roadbuilding, agricultural support, defence, space exploration, or more generous social security scales take priority. Of course, one should not set these various objectives one against the other. The choices which underlie budgetary decisions are not made in terms of absolute priority but of shifts at the margin. And a slight marginal shift in some larger budgetary areas could provide quite substantial increases in aid resources. The problem for countries wishing to provide assistance is also, like that of the recipients, essentially political."

Israel's contribution, in the form of the so-called Horowitz Proposal, is designed to overcome the difficulties faced by developing nations in gaining access to the captial markets.

A summary of the proposal is given in the Report of the UNCTAD Secretariat:

"The proposal rests on the generally accepted premise that the flow of aid to developing countries needs to be greatly increased and that the terms of assistance have to be softened considerably so as to permit an adequate net transfer of resources to developing countries and also to prevent explosive debt situations from emerging. It further assumes that because of budgetary constraints, there are limits to the growth of official aid flows but that the requisite resources for aid can be found in the capital markets of developed countries. Since funds on the capital markets can only be raised on commercial terms, there is need for subsidies to make these funds available on soft terms to developing countries. Thus the proposal envisages an international institution raising funds on national capital markets of developed countries on normal commerical terms and relending these funds through the IDA to developing countries at low rates of interest for a suggested period of 30 years. The difference between the cost of borrowing to the institution and the lower rates of interest on lending would be covered by an interest equalization fund. The resources for this fund would be obtained through budgetary allocation of the developed countries to the IDA, through the allocation of some portion of net income of the World Bank, or through some combinations of both methods."

In 1964, the first UNCTAD Conference in Geneva expressed its "strong interest" in the plan, and the study by the UNCTAD Secretariat of the Horowitz Proposal, submitted to the Second UNCTAD Conference in 1968, took a positive stand towards its possibilities and favorable effect on the transfer of capital to underdeveloped countries.

The Horowitz Proposal is intended to provide a link of collateral and of concessionary terms for the borrower, and a reasonable yield for the lender, by making it possible to borrow hard and lend soft.

With this three-prong approach—presenting a model of development, extending technical assistance, and suggesting political economic planning—Israel is striving to build a life-saving bridge to the emerging nations of the Third World, so that they may cope with their most vital problem—that of economic and social growth.

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR GENERAL EISENHOWER

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the outpouring of affection for General Eisenhower across the length and breadth of America has been an inspiration to all of us.

The simple wave of a hand as the funeral train passed through the heartland of America was refreshing in this period of history which has been so fraught with controversy.

A memorial service for General Eisenhower was held at Florida State University in Tallahassee, Fla., March 31, and I think much of what was said by Acting President Stanley Marshall; Student Government Supreme Court Justice James Tait, speaking for the students; and Dr. Robert Spivey, chairman of the department of religion, who spoke for the faculty; represents the real heart of America.

The material referred to follows:

Remarks by Acting President Stanley Marshall, Florida State University, at the Memorial Service for Dwight David Eisenhower, March 31, 1969

We assemble here briefly today to honor the memory of a good man—of a loved and respected American citizen who gave a lifetime of service to his country. We pay tribute to a soldier—a military man who commanded troops from throughout the free world—an administrator who served as president of one of this country's most distinguished universities—a politician who held this nation's highest office when he served as the 34th President of the United States—and, a statesman who enjoyed the respect and affection of peoples on every continent.

Dwight David Eisenhower was an average man who rose to challenges faced by few men in our lifetime. From a modest background in the rural heartland of America, this Texas-born, Kansas-raised boy became a leader not only of his compatriots, but of men everywhere who were dedicated to freedom. He was thought of by millions as a decent, honorable man who did his best to find decent and honorable solutions to the problems faced by mankind.

A military man who was skilled in forging together other military men from a number of nations to fight an awful war, Eisenhower also served as a soldier in the battle for peace. A military man in an establishment that sometimes wished it could throw off the yoke of civilian control, Eisenhower insisted that civil government and civil control were and should be superior to the military. A military man who had spent virtually his entire adult life in uniform, President Eisenhower warned the American people of dangers involved in a powerful military-industrial combination.

Although he was President of the United States, most people seemed always to think of Dwight Eisenhower as General rather than President. Perhaps this is true because as President he may have been less a partisan politician than many of his predecessors. President Eisenhower wanted to heal the ravages of war and strife, external as well as internal. He wanted the American people to recognize their obligations to the freedom of nations throughout the world, and to the freedom of the individual at home. This battle-tried soldier yearned for peace for all mankind and during most of his administration our nation fought only a cold war of words rather than a hot war of bombs.

Only history can truly and objectively assess the contributions of David Eisenhower but to the men and women of my generation Ike holds a unique and a very warm place in our hearts. He represented to us and for us, those age old tenets of the worth of American society and democracy. He believed in God, in country, in family, and in duty; in essence, he believed in the simple virtues that have, despite many imperfections, brought greatness to our country and our system of government. He was, as all of us are, an imperfect man in an imperfect world who gave the best of himself and urged us to give the best of ourselves. As one historian has written, President Eisenhower sought national unity and not personal power as he attempted to reconcile the differences among Americans and among nations. To what greater task can any man dedicate himself than peace and brotherhood? What greater tribute can we pay to Dwight Eisenhower than to carry forward and to implement his goals of national unity and reconciliation of our differences with other nations of the world?

Soldier, administrator, President, statesman—man of unbounding courage and good will—man of unquestioned loyalty to his beliefs—man of untiring dedication to the tasks set before him—the name of Dwight David Eisenhower will be remembered as more than a great general and a great statesman. He will be recorded in history as a man of courage and integrity and virtue who believed in the goodness of man and took account of that belief in everything he did.

Remarks by James Tait, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Student Government, Speaking for the Students of Florida State University, at the Memorial Service for Dwight David Eisenhower, March 31, 1969

In this time of strife, both domestic and international, this nation will sorely miss the wise counsel of our most outstanding "soldier for peace." General Eisenhower had that rare ability to create in all men a will, a drive for peace. He was able to turn the energies of freedom-loving, peace-loving men toward the betterment of man, rather than against one another. When necessary he would vigorously defend the democratic ideals of this nation. However, he showed a deep respect for the basic dignity of man, individually and collectively, in assisting them to determine for themselves the best approach to peace and freedom. His record speaks for itself—General of the Armies, Supreme Allied Commander, welding together men of many nations to overthrow the tyranny of one man, of one nation over the lives of many and posing a threat to others; President of the United States, bringing an end to a deadly war and also assisting in the overthrow of a man threatening the individual freedom of many Americans, presiding over a peaceful era.

Although we will sorely miss him, he has left us a legacy. I hope that all men will accept this legacy and commit themselves to the ideals for which he stood—to allow his rare ability to continue in spirit. He was such a man.

Memorial Service for Dwight David Eisenhower—Remarks by Dr. Robert A. Spivey, Chairman of the Department of Religion, Speaking for the Faculty, Florida State University, March 31, 1969

Supreme Commander of the Allied Military Forces during World War II, President of a distinguished institution of higher education, and President of these United States. Yet in all these offices, Dwight David Eisenhower towers as a person.

In his column from yesterday's New York Times, James Reston captures the spirit of this man:

"The nation mourns the death of President Eisenhower almost as if it were grieving for the loss of its own youth. For Ike was a symbol of a simpler age, and he lived long enough to become part of all the old American legends of the frontier.

"The '60s have enhanced his reputation. They have been years of solemn, clever, and calculating men, and in contrast the old soldier seems open, straight, natural, joyful, and trustworthy.

"It was not so much what President Eisenhower did in the White House but what he didn't do that seems in retrospect so much more important than it did at the time.

"He did not misuse power. He did not allow his former colleagues on the Joint Chiefs of Staff to drag him into unnecessary military adventures, and while his native caution and conservatism limited his achievements on the homefront, they also limited his risks and blunders overseas . . .

"Few men at the top of American politics in recent years have managed to make their way through the tangles and conflicts of Washington with so little personal rancor as Eisenhower. There was nothing mean or petty about him, and he never allowed political differences to loiter down into personal animosity.

"The historians so far have not rated him among the great presidents, but his contemporaries are certainly agreed that he was a remarkably warm, fair, and attractive human being. It was the personal Eisenhower rather than the political Eisenhower that triumphed, maybe because he was the living model for so many popular American myths.

"To the present young generation, he may be a magnificent square, but in his own time he proved once more that the squares usually inherit the earth. . . .

"Ike will have his place in the story of this tremendous time. He proved that simple goodness can still be a power in the world and that luck helps. He didn't "fade away" like the rest of the old soldiers but fought for life years after his obituary got dusty on the stone.

"This may be why even this cynical age has taken his death with such genuine regret and sorrow."

In a sense his death represents the reaffirmation of simplicity, goodness, trustworthiness, and normalcy. During recent years we have become accustomed to unexpected, catastrophic, tragic ends for our national heroes—Martin Luther King, Robert and John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The unexpected and seemingly unexplainable violence that has characterized our recent past causes many Americans to believe in hidden, sinister forces at work to destroy our nation and its heroes. But in President Eisenhower's death, there is a certain triumph of normalcy, a simple, dignified ending to a man's days that were spent in service and loyalty.

It is altogether fitting that his funeral and our memorial be on this day, at the beginning of holy week in which religious folk throughout this country celebrate the triumph of life through Jewish Passover and Christian Good Friday and Easter. It is altogether fitting that he be buried in the spring of the year when dogwood and azaleas declare the goodness and beauty of life. In all these manifestations of triumph, Eisenhower shared. Toward religion he was unreflective, yet broadly committed. He exemplified affirmative trust, not so much to the institutional church, but to his offices and in his presence among other human beings. Few could resist his person or resent his popularity—"we do like Ike."

Eisenhower's stature with the intellectual community was never particularly great. Probably the least distinguished part of his career was his tenure as president of Columbia University. Certainly he never considered himself an intellectual. Yet the university community does indeed respect and honor him as a leader and as a person. His finest hour, in the view of many educators, was his sharp criticism of the "military industrial complex" as he left the office of the Presidency of the United States. He was able to remain critical of that very "complex" which helped catapult him into national prominence.

His real stature was that he towered above by not elevating himself. He expended himself in service to country and others; he did not seek to expand himself. He was not an intellectual, but he did quietly serve truth.

A review of a recent movie ("The Prime of Miss Jean Brodie") about a teacher and her students points to the relevance of the example of President Eisenhower: "Those charged with the education of the young are responsible not only for the distribution of information, but for the stimulation of character. And often it takes a character to make a character. There is a desperate need for innovators who are able to stimulate unrealized potential and nourish the humanity of a student. But how risky the enterprise becomes when those who are unwhole attempt to make others whole; when the frustrated try to mold the young in their own defective image." President Eisenhower served the truth in his own quiet way, without making the mistake of imagining himself a savior. He liked to play the game of golf.

President Nixon shared the last words of President Eisenhower. "I have always loved my wife. I have always loved my children. I have always loved my grandchildren. I have always loved my country." That was Dwight David Eisenhower. That also represents his triumph, and ours if we will, of normal, simple, trusting goodness.

"RESIDENT POWER" MOVES MODEL CITIES IN MINNEAPOLIS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of our key urban development efforts, the model cities program, is moving into an important new action phase as the 63 "first round" cities submit their comprehensive plans to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for final review. My district, Minneapolis, was fortunate enough to receive one of the early planning grants and our local residents' organization is now completing work on its 5-year plan for a 500 square block area in south Minneapolis.

On paper, model cities may seem like an abstract concept in public administration but I know that in my district this program is very real and very human. Certainly the most significant aspect of the model cities in Minneapolis is the key role played by residents. I am inserting in the RECORD today an excellent five-part series from the Minneapolis Star which spotlights this role.

The articles follow:

ARRIVED WITH FANFARE: MODEL CITIES GOAL: MEET UNFILLED NEEDS—I

(By Kristin McGrath)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In November 1967 a section of south Minneapolis containing about 10 percent of the city's population was selected to be one of the first Model Cities project areas in the nation. The preliminary planning phase of the project in Minneapolis now is nearly over. Following is the first of five articles examining the present status and likely future impact of the project.)

The Model Cities program arrived in Minneapolis with a lot of fanfare a year and a half ago.

Minneapolis residents were told that the city had been chosen as one of the first cities to receive federal money to plan a program that differed in two major ways from previous federal programs for cities.

First, the program was an attempt to make an impact on specific neighborhoods by coordinating various agencies, levels of government and private organizations and by creating new services where unfilled needs emerged.

A large section of south Minneapolis—bounded roughly by downtown, Lyndale Av., Hiawatha Av. and 36th St. was chosen as the area for the program.

Second, the program called for meaningful resident participation in both planning and implementation.

FINANCIAL UNCERTAINTY

At the time of acceptance, city officials estimated that once the planning was completed Minneapolis would receive about $33 million to carry out a five-year project. Now they see they don't know how much the city is likely to receive.

Planning of the program, which was scheduled to be completed Feb. 1, is still going on, but residents and officials involved now are beginning to venture some optimism.

This week, a preliminary and locally unapproved draft of the first part of the plan was sent to federal officials for review. The current timetable calls for the rest of the plan to be submitted by May and for the "action" phase of the program to start in July.

The part of the plan submitted this week is limited to an analysis of the problems of the area, a list of goals for the program and some general proposals for achieving the goals.

Other parts of the plan—including budgets, maps, timetables and specific project proposals—will be submitted later.

Major goals, which will be the basis for future proposals, are included in the first part of the plan. These goals include improvement of the area's housing, commercial and industrial areas and transportation; improvement of police protection, schools and health, welfare and recreation services; raising the average income in the area by reducing unemployment and underemployment and by providing more meaningful employment and better welfare benefits; and working toward creating dignity and a "sense of community."

Specific proposals, all of which are in the discussion stage, range from possibilities to pipe dreams.

Some suggestions that are considered within the realm of possibility include a large-scale housing project in one neighborhood, general rehabilitation of homes through low-interest government loans, clearance of abandoned buildings, improved services to senior citizens through such programs as a hot meal home delivery service, and more extensive day-care services for children of working mothers.

The pipe dreams include a "guaranteed annual income" for all area residents, a new "Southdale" on Lake St., and creating a social services shopping center where residents could use welfare credits to shop for health, family counseling and welfare services.

Putting priorities and price tags on these proposals will be the task of planners during the next two months.

Why has it taken so long to plan?

The answer lies in one of the two major federal requirements for the program: resident participation. The residents' group that emerged from that requirement is the 107-member Policy and Planning Committee (P&PC), which was elected last spring.

Ask a resident and an official why the planning has taken so long and they will both point to the P&PC—but their explanations will differ.

City Coordinator Thomas Thompson said, "The residents have had to learn the whole field of community planning and plan at the same time." William English, P&PC chairman, said the residents simply refused to plan until officials made them a "full partner" in the project.

By most accounts, it took a full year—from November 1967, when Minneapolis received the planning funds, to November 1968, when the residents hired their own staff director—for the residents to become satisfied with their status in the program.

"The program triggered a revolution in the neighborhood," said Mike Roan, the new director. "For a long time all of the residents' energy was spent fighting for their rights and they didn't have any energy left to plan."

Most residents and officials agree that the delays have been inevitable. However, if the delays continue much longer, Minneapolis probably will lose a race for funds to carry out the project.

If Minneapolis submits its complete plan in time for federal officials to review and approve it this fiscal year, which ends June 30, competition for funds still will be limited to the first 63 cities selected for the program. Nine of these already have had their plans approved and have been given money to carry out some projects. Thompson says the complete plan should be submitted by May 1 in order to assure review this year.

If, however, the plan isn't approved until the next fiscal year, Minneapolis will probably be splitting the pie with most of a total of 150 cities that have been approved for planning.

The increased competition probably will not affect the $4.6 million in Model Cities funds that have been tentatively set aside for the Minneapolis project. However, it would be likely to affect the amount of money received for specific projects from other federal departments.

"The project is at its critical stage now," Roan said. "It could either become one of the best Model Cities projects in the country or it could fall flat on its face."

TEN THOUSAND MAN HOURS: MODEL CITIES PLAN INVOLVES RESIDENTS IN DECISION-MAKING—II

(By Kristin McGrath)

Peggy LaBore is one resident who knows what "resident participation" means.

Resident participation is the latest catch phrase in federal programs for cities. The programs began to stress resident involvement after critics complained that earlier programs, like urban renewal, ignored the people they were supposed to help.

The Model Cities program places a high priority on resident participation. Federal officials reviewing plans for the project in south Minneapolis will be asking questions like: How active have the residents been? Do the participating residents really represent the area? Are the residents contributing to the plan or are they just rubber-stamping work by their staff?

Miss LaBore, an attractive brunette in her mid-twenties whose expression and bearing sometimes make her seem older, is one member of the 107-member Policy and Planning Committee (PPC), which is the resident-participation component of the Minneapolis Model Cities program.

As an individual committee member she is no more typical than any of the others. Members range from a housewife with five children who dreams of installing moving sidewalks up and down Nicollet Av. to a man in his 80s who is still living for the future by spending 30 hours a week working on a plan to improve conditions for senior citizens in the area.

There is a Yale graduate who runs a house for male boarders, including Indians, fresh from the reservation, who have nowhere else to go; and a lawyer with a walk-up office on E. Lake St. who dreams of new and beautiful houses and shopping centers in the Model Cities area.

Peggy LaBore is an unmarried AFDC mother who has worked as a traveling, magazine saleswoman and in a potato-chip factory.

"I went on welfare because I just couldn't make enough money to live, and I just sat around feeling sorry for myself for being on welfare for the last eight months," she said.

Her depression ended when she decided to go to school and was given a student loan from the University of Minnesota. Now she nearly has completed work toward a degree in sociology and hopes to get off welfare and become a welfare case worker within a year.

She doesn't mind talking about her past because she considers it an asset. Because she has had a tough time, "people trust me. They know I can understand the problems and needs of the Model Cities area."

She has a down-to-earth understanding of the Model Cities area. She views its problems from the vantage point of a shabby, upstairs apartment in a house that has been neglected so long it defeats all attempts to make it look homey or cheerful.

Her plea for better pre-school, day-care facilities in the Model Cities area is prefaced with an account of the time her daughter was left tied to a chair at the home of a woman who runs a baby-sitting service.

When she says teen-agers in the area need a place to spend the night when they go home, she mentions the neighbor girl whose stepfather often tries to assault her when he has been drinking.

When she talks about improving tenants rights, she cites the woman with 12 children who was moved out of her rented home on one day's notice so the house could be torn down for an apartment building.

Miss LaBore is typical of the committee in that she is more aware of the area's problems and more sophisticated about federal programs than are average residents of the area.

She admits that spending three nights a week for the past several months on the program has made her into a kind of "professional resident." A few weeks ago, for example, she flew to Kansas City, Mo., to present two programs for retarded children in the Model Cities area to federal officials.

Several residents on the committee fear that the sophistication they have gained through participating in the program will result in their no longer being representative of the area. "My greatest fear is that we will become another level of the establishment," said William English, PPC chairman.

To guard against this, committee members have hesitated to speak for the area and have searched out the opinions of other residents. Last fall, for example, the committee insisted on a series of public meetings before beginning the problem-analysis section of the plan. The opinions of many nonmember residents who attended those meetings have been incorporated into the final plan.

The amount of time Miss LaBore has spent on Model Cities also is fairly typical. There have been 364 resident-committee meetings during the past year with a total estimated attendance of 6,835, according to a recent report. By January, it was estimated that members had spent 10,000 man hours—all of it free time—on the project.

None of these statistics answer the key question federal officials will be asking about resident participation in the Minneapolis Model Cities program—whether the residents have been making a meaningful contribution to planning the program. It would be possible for the residents to spend all of that time on side issues while the staff did all of the nuts-and-bolts planning of the project.

Miss LaBore objected to that suggestion. "We are not a rubber-stamp outfit," she said. Other residents and officials go even further, saying the residents' committee is less of a rubber-stamp outfit than the Minneapolis City Council.

"We usually have to trust the advice of our staff," said Alderman Richard Curtin, who represents part of the Model Cities area on the City Council. "But those residents are trying to become experts themselves. Maybe with 107 people they can do it," he said.

"We'll trust our staff as soon as we're sure they're working for us," said English.

Meanwhile, the residents' role in planning has ranged from word-by-word scrutiny of staff proposals to writing the proposals themselves.

The senior citizens, for example, have been meeting all day every day, and they're writing every word of the old-age component of the plan themselves. They occasionally will invite a staff person to one of their meetings, ask him specific questions and then invite him to leave.

One staff member emerged incredulous from that experience. "Those senior citizens are the most militant planning group in the whole Model Cities area," he said.

IN MODEL CITIES PROGRAM: "RESIDENT POWER" TAKES OVER—III

(By Kristin McGrath)

Resident participation is something that officials hoped for in the Model Cities program. "Resident power" is something they didn't bargain for; but resident power is what they got.

The residents on the 107-member Model Cities Policy and Planning Committee (P&PC) have started calling themselves the "City Council of south Minneapolis."

"It's not an inappropriate title," commented Gerard Hegstrom, alderman for much of the Model Cities area and DFL-endorsed candidate for mayor. "They have planning power and budgeting power. If that's not power I don't know what is," he added.

Two recent examples show how much power the residents have.

One item on a recent P&PC agenda was a rezoning request from the Franklin National Bank, which wanted to move to a new location. All zoning requests are handled by the City Council. But since the land in question was in the Model Cities area, the council wouldn't touch the request until the P&PC officially decided it did not object to the rezoning.

Another item was a request from Swedish and St. Barnabas Hospitals for P&PC approval of an application for federal money. The hospitals had applied to the Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) Department for money to help pay for staffing a mental health unit. HEW told the hospitals to get approval from the P&PC first.

How did the residents' committee get so much power?

The answer lies at least partly in the sparkle that comes to the eyes of William English, P&PC chairman, when he talks about Model Cities power. "In other cities that have the program residents have to beg the officials for what they want. Here we don't beg. We negotiate," he said.

English, 35, a black activist who plays down his degree in sociology and his employment with Control Data, Inc., and plays up his involvement with Sabathani Community Center and other community causes, is admired in some quarters and mistrusted in others for his ability to turn on a crowd.

He became interested in the Model Cities project through his work at Sabathani and has been active in the program since its preliminary stages. "At the beginning of the program we went into it because we thought it was about time some of the federal money started coming to south Minneapolis," he said.

"As we learned more about the program, we understood that residents were supposed to become involved. We thought then that our involvement would be advising good things and hoping someone would listen.

"Then we realized that the federal government was trying to force the cities to let the residents have real decision-making power. We saw that City Hall didn't really want us to have power, but we also knew that the politicians didn't want to lose all of that federal money. With that as a weapon we could force them to make us a full partner.

"At first just a few of us realized that, but we managed to convince the others," English continued. He said he considers part of his responsibility as P&PC chairman is "to warn the members every time they're about to give up some power and make sure they know what they're doing."

English gives the impression that he enjoys his role as keeper of the power almost as much as he likes playing the local officials against the federal officials.

He said the residents have gained their power through a series of struggles in which they used two major tactics: confrontation and the sit-down strike.

The sit-down strike was the main weapon in the first major struggle with the City Council last spring. The residents refused to plan the program until the relationship between the residents and the council was spelled out in writing, English said.

The result was a resolution passed by the council last March 29, in which the council gave the P&PC "the right and responsibility for initiating program planning and policy decisions," for the Model Cities program. It also says the P&PC can "completely change, alter and rewrite, or delete and add to, the work program" for the project at any time.

THREE MAJOR CONFRONTATIONS

Since then, there have been three major confrontations between the residents and City Hall. In the first, the residents succeeded in delaying a code enforcement project that already was underway. The residents objected to the project on the grounds that it should be delayed until the residents had completed a physical redevelopment plan for the Model Cities area.

In the second confrontation, residents demanded the authority to hire staff for the program themselves based on their own criteria. After a stalemate lasting several months, city officials managed to find ways to overlook the Civil Service nondiscrimination and veterans-preference requirements in order to meet the residents' demands.

The third confrontation concerns demands by residents to stop all new construction in the Model Cities area until the residents have approved an overall land-use plan. The fight is still going on, but English said he thinks the council eventually will comply by holding zoning densities at present or lower levels until the plan is finished.

"They know we'll have another sit-down strike if they don't," he said.

LEARNING ON BOTH SIDES

English said that as the program has progressed, "each confrontation has become less severe: People are learning on both sides." However, he said bitter confrontation probably will occur during the implementation stage of the program. He said he expects the worst fights to be between residents who want to retain low-housing densities and developers who want to build apartment buildings.

Besides strengthening their power base on the local level, the Minneapolis Model Cities residents have joined in efforts to organize Model Cities residents on a regional and national basis.

English and other residents have gone to meetings in New York, Dayton, St. Louis and other cities. English said he hopes that the result of those organization efforts will be "at least a strong national Model Cities lobby, if not a whole new level of government."

So far, city officials say they have taken the power struggle of Model Cities residents pretty much in stride. "The residents have used their power well. There was some slowness and difficulty in the beginning, but that was due to their lack of experience," Hegstrom said.

"Because of the Model Cities program, the council has a better image of citizen participation in general. It's not as much a threat to the establishment as some people thought, although the residents might furnish some individual political treats," he added.

Alderman Richard Curtin, who also represents the Model Cities area, said, "We give the residents power because we want to, not because of any threats," Curtin said some officials have "gotten fed up" with the residents' confrontation technique.

Nevertheless, the experience with the Model Cities residents has made officials more willing to listen to other resident groups, such as the Tenants' Union, Curtin said. "Our constituency is changing, and we have to learn to judge the people taken seriously at City Hall by different standards," he added.

MODEL CITY AREA PROBLEMS, GOALS FORMULATED—IV

(By Kristin McGrath)

The atmosphere in the meeting room was intense. South Minneapolis residents who were there to formulate goals for the Model Cities project thought they were onto something.

A few seconds before, someone had exclaimed, "Social power!", and everyone had fallen silent, thinking.

A staff advisor began hesitantly: "What I see as social power is that people in this area should have the same ability to shape the social goals of this whole city as the people in the other parts of the city seem to be shaping what we believe in here."

"Yeah," agreed a resident. "Culturally, man, I may not want the same social goals, but I should have the opportunity to create my own little bag."

"Okay, so let's examine what social power is, anyway," said another.

"Social power," began another resident, weighing his words, "is the ability to determine and control the social environment in which you live. The cats in Edina determine by-and-large the sociability of that community. They all do it. They have, therefore, social power—you see what I'm saying—by the sheer nature of their education and affluence and whatever. They have it.

"Whereas in my neighborhood, I do not have control of social power. I did not want a Guthrie Theater. We didn't need no Guthrie. What we wanted was . . . was, you know . . ."

"A bugaloo party," another resident broke in. "A bugaloo place where the Guthrie is," he continued, dancing.

"But we cannot create that kind of environment because we do not have social power," the first resident continued. "When we get that symphony out of Northrop Auditorium to play hillbilly music for us at Nicollet Field, that's when we have social power."

After this and several hours more of deliberation the goal was decided on: "To sensitize the broader community to the acceptance and appreciation of cultural and social values other than their own."

The goal was eventually put into its slot in a document listing dozens of the problems of the Model Cities area, goals for a five-year program to attack the problems and general proposals for carrying out the goals. The document which is more than 300 pages long, is currently under review by federal and local officials and residents.

The 300-page report is more than a laundry list of problems and proposals. It also is organized into priorities and cross-referenced to show possible areas of coordination or conflict.

For example, providing more and better employment for Model City residents is one goal, but its ranking in the plan depends on how well it fulfills a higher piority goal, which is to increase the incomes of Model Cities residents.

Proposals for employment opportunities which come from various committees working on the plan are judged according to how much income the jobs will produce. In one instance, a task force on economic development suggested new shopping centers for the area; the idea was rejected as a source of new employment because the jobs it would provide would be largely dead-end and low paying.

URBAN PLANNING THEORY

By planning for goals that are arranged on a priority basis, and by judging specific proposals according to their ability to fulfill those goals, the Model Cities plan for Minneapolis has put itself on the frontier of current urban planning theory.

Urban sociologist Herbert Gans, in a book published late last year, said the new emphasis on goal-oriented planning grew out of dissatisfaction with earlier planning approaches which concentrated on buildings rather than people, or which judged programs according to goals set by agencies rather than by the people they served.

However, Gans concludes his planning-for-goals proposal with the comment that it is easier said than done.

But if it does work, it will give the residents a yardstick for judging all of the present and future programs affecting the Model Cities area. "Instead of going to an agency and asking, 'What can you do for us?', the residents will say, 'Here is what we need; can you do it?'," explained Tom Walz, one of the consultants hired by the residents to help write the plan. "The residents might decide, for example, that they don't need a family counseling service, that they can do it better themselves," he suggested.

The goal-oriented approach might also force agencies and governmental units serving the Model Cities area to overhaul their services in the area. For example, the section of the plan that deals with recreation says that the purpose of recreation programs is not to keep people occupied but to teach them skills to make them more effective members of society. Presumably, if the Minneapolis Park Board does not come up with ways to meet that goal, the residents will find someone else who will.

REWARDS FOR AGENCIES

Mike Roan, director of the Model Cities project here, said that some of the federal "bonus" funds for the project probably will be used to reward agencies that find ways to fulfill the residents' goals.

Minneapolis has tentatively been allotted $4.6 million in federal Model Cities "bonus" funds which are intended to be used to supplement other federal and local financing for projects or start new projects.

The funds can be used to supplement the local share of projects up to 80 percent of the total cost. For example, if the Park Board received $500,000 for a recreation program on the condition that it contribute another $500,000, the Model Cities residents might decide to pay $300,000 of the local share if they thought the program was worth that much in terms of meeting major Model Cities goals.

Some of the agencies and departments Model Cities residents will be dealing with, have already started thinking about goal-oriented planning.

Several federal departments have instituted a new kind of accounting system called Program-Planning-Budgeting (PPB) which tries to relate programs and projects to overall goals as well as to existing resources and bureaucracies. However, established institutions have to deal with very complicated existing structures in making the change, and progress has been slow.

Minneapolis city government also is working on switching over to the PPB system. The change, which will affect all departments under the city coordinator's office, is expected to become effective in about two years.

How the goal-oriented Model Cities program will mesh with a new goal-oriented city government is still very much a matter of speculation—but even the speculation is like playing with fire next to old and established institutions.

"The federal government is going to encourage this kind of thinking in old-line institutions as well as new ones," said City Coordinator Thomas Thompson. "The Model Cities program just might become the impetus that leads to reorganization of other departments," he said.

IN MODEL CITIES PROGRAM: BY THE PEOPLE, FOR THE PEOPLE IS A GOAL—V

(By Kristin McGrath)

Duane Franke, a lawyer with a walk-up office on E. Lake St., is getting ready for a piece of the action in the Model Cities program. He is not alone.

One of the major conclusions that has come out of more than a year of planning a Model Cities project for south Minneapolis is that the project ought to be by the people as well as for them.

Franke is one member of the 107-member Policy and Planning Committee (P&PC) which is made up of elected residents. The P&PC is in charge of planning a five-year program to improve the social, physical and economic environment of a large section of south Minneapolis bounded roughly by downtown, Hiawatha and Lyndale Avs. and 36th St.

Federal officials are now reviewing a preliminary draft of the first part of the plan. If planning continues on schedule, specific projects could begin as soon as July.

The residents want as much control over those projects as they have had in planning them.

DOING HIS HOMEWORK

Franke has been spending several nights a week for the past year working on the plan. He is chairman of the Physical Environment Core, which is in charge of developing programs to improve housing, commercial and industrial facilities, transportation and other programs concerning land and buildings in the area. He is also chairman of the Economic Development Task Force, which is trying to find ways to bolster the area's sagging economy.

Participating in the planning, Franke, said, "has taught me more than my first 10 years of law practice."

Just getting to Franke's office from downtown is a lesson in the magnitude of the problems his committees have been trying to solve. Near downtown, many homes that were squeezed together on 30-foot lots in 1890 look as if they haven't been repaired since. Lake S. itself is a jumble of signs, obsolete businesses and abandoned buildings. Traffic crawls, and pedestrians have to shout to be heard over the noise.

Projects to attack problems like these will be among the first tangible results of the Model Cities program.

FUNDS EXPECTED IN 1969

The projects will be part of a comprehensive urban renewal plan now being prepared for the entire area. Funds to carry out at least some of the projects are expected to arrive this year under the Neighborhood Development Program (NDP of the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

NDP is a new procedure that eliminates the long waiting periods of former urban renewal projects. Minneapolis has applied for inclusion in the new program, and local officials expect the application to be granted in the next month or two. When that happens, funds are expected to be available in the Model Cities area.

City Coordinator Thomas Thompson said

he expects most of the initial financing to come through the NDP program, with lesser amounts coming from other federal departments which are giving priority to projects in Model Cities areas.

Franke said residents planning the program were opposed to urban renewal at first but eventually decided that "there has to be urban renewal to accomplish any of our programs."

DISTINCTION CITED

However, the Model Cities proposal differs from former urban renewal projects by giving the residents control over the program, Franke added. "Historically, the people affected by renewal haven't had any say in it. But we are writing a program that includes our priorities and has built-in resident control."

The residents already have set their priorities for the first year of the project, and they predictably reject the kind of renewal that makes enthusiastic use of the bulldozer for other programs which concentrate on low-income housing.

One such program already has started—and the residents are in control. It is the Used Housing program, in which the local renewal agency buys homes on the open market, rehabilitates them and rents them at a reduced rate to families eligible for public housing.

Residents on the Housing Committee control the program by approving each of the homes proposed for acquisition before allowing the renewal agency to buy it.

The residents also hope to use renewal funds within the next year to tear down about 50 abandoned homes in the Model Cities areas; to provide federal grants and low-interest loans for residents to fix up their homes, and to conduct a detailed study of the Phillips neighborhood and some commercial and industrial areas along Franklin Av., 29th St. and Lake St. to determine whether more extensive clearance and redevelopment projects are warranted.

CORPORATE PROPOSAL

Eventually, the committee hopes to start at least three resident-controlled corporations. One would build federally-subsidized housing for low- and moderate-income families. Another would provide transportation services, such as taxis, charter buses and shuttle-buses to meet such needs as getting senior citizens to doctors and shopping facilities.

The third corporation would be in charge of a historical preservation demonstration project. The project, which would cover one block, would restore and preserve historically significant buildings on the block and require new construction to blend in architecturally with the old buildings.

Franke himself hopes to participate in the corporation that will build federally-subsidized low-income housing. "Before Model Cities, I didn't know 221d–3 (one of the subsidy programs) from the man in the moon," Franke said. "Now I know that lawyers sit right in the middle of those programs. It probably will change the whole direction of my practice."

Committees working in other planning areas also have been proposing ways to retain resident control over the project. One of the more popular ideas is creating an ombudsman system, in which persons in close touch with residents would have influential positions in governmental departments and service agencies.

CONSOLIDATING SERVICES

The residents' corporation idea also is common. The senior citizens, for example, have prepared a proposal for a service center that would consolidate medical, welfare and other services for senior citizens in one place. The center would be run by a nonprofit corporation, with senior citizens making up at least half of the board membership.

Another way to give residents some of the action is to make them "para-professionals." Under this approach, residents would be hired by schools, social agencies and health facilities to help the professionals in charge by providing first-hand knowledge of the area.

Another method is to break out of the established programs completely and start new services for the Model Cities area. One new service might be a store-front academy to educate youths who are unwilling or unable to adjust to normal school surroundings. Another would be to train Indians for work and life in the city while they are still on the reservation.

The residents also hope to increase their influence by decentralizing existing departments and services into separate units for the Model Cities area. Among the proposals are a separate police precinct and court for the area, a new mini-bus transit system for the area and a health care center for Model Cities residents. The South Side School Pyramid, which was recently organized, is another example of this approach.

CONSUMER RATING SYSTEM

Finally, the residents hope to start a consumer rating system for the area. Businessmen, for example, would be inspected by a team of residents to see whether they were overcharging their customers or charging excessive interest for credit. Businesses found satisfactory would be given a sticker for display. Some social and governmental services would be similarly rated.

All of this is summarized in one of the highest priority goals of the first part of the Model Cities plan: "To improve the quality of urban life through increasing resident involvement and influence in the affairs of the community."

Local and federal officials are likely to read that statement and absent-mindedly nod agreement. They may find out once the projects get under way that the statement is anything but a vague generality in the minds of the residents.

NLRB MEMBER SPEAKS OUT

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, no public official or agency can expect to be immune from criticism. But distorted, slanted accounts of an official's performance in office are another matter. They deserve condemnation. The widespread campaign to discredit the National Labor Relations Board is clearly a case in point. NLRB member Gerald A. Brown put the lie to that propaganda during the University of Arizona's fifth annual conference on collective bargaining and law. His comments setting the record straight deserve wide circulation. I am pleased to place before the House an article from the AFL–CIO News setting forth Mr. Brown's comments.

The article follows:

Cites Distortions: NLRB Member Condemns Business Propaganda Drive

Tucson.—Slanted and biased reports of National Labor Relations Board decisions can have only a harmful effect on the nation's collective bargaining system, NLRB member Gerald A. Brown told the University of Arizona's fifth annual conference on collective bargaining and labor law.

"Distorted accounts of the board's activities have appeared recently in the Readers' Digest and other publications," Brown said.

He noted a report last year that the nation's major corporations had joined with the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and other employer groups in a $1 million campaign to help change public opinion about the labor laws.

"The labor board welcomes honest and informed criticism," Brown said. "But I have a different reaction to an organized campaign which represents a disservice to employers, employes and the general public."

The board does not seek immunity from fair comment but is concerned "about the harmful effects of the existing well-financed propaganda campaign" against the present labor law, he told the conference.

Since Big Business launched its propaganda campaign, Brown said, he has noted these propaganda techniques in critical news stories and editorials—"the use of slanted or biased news, ridicule and belittlement, color words, fear technique, guilt by association, false conclusions from fallacious reasoning, and name calling."

He cited as "distorted accounts" those in the Readers' Digest and other publications which "carefully select a few cases, gloss over or misrepresent the facts, accuse the NLRB of bias and prejudice, and conclude with emotional words predicting dire consequences for our system of free enterprise, consumers and the civil rights of all citizens."

Such accounts, Brown noted, "do not mention that almost all the cases cited have been approved by the courts" after judicial review. The "quoted authorities usually represented the losing side in the cases discussed, but this fact is nowhere mentioned."

"If a case is to be reargued before the public, both sides should be heard. It is true that the board has sometimes been reversed by the courts, but our critics ignore the fact that the reversals have been at the expense of unions as well as employers, and blame the board whatever the results."

EDITORIAL HIT

Brown quoted a Wall Street Journal editorial of Dec. 2, 1968, asserting that in requiring employers to furnish unions with employe name-and-address lists, the board was forcing employers to help unions organize their employes. The editorial said in part:

"In this instance the board didn't even find out what employers thought. The regulation was adopted without benefit of the sort of formal rule-making procedure where companies and unions could argue for or against it. The summary nature of this action led an appeals court to declare the (Excelsior) rule invalid."

The fact is, said Brown, that the board not only heard oral arguments by unions and management but invited, and received, written briefs from the CofC and the NAM more than eight months before the Excelsior rule was adopted.

Another fact, he said, is that the rule has been approved by more than a dozen other courts besides the one cited by the business paper. The Supreme Court recently agreed to hear arguments on the one adverse ruling.

Brown produced copies of three newspaper editorials in the Macomb, Mich., Daily, the Richmond, Calif., Independent and the Northern Virginia Sun, Arlington, Va. Each editorial "appeared to represent the independent view of the paper" in which it appeared but two were identical, the board member noted. All three repeated employer charges that the board has "disregarded fraud and gross misrepresentations" by unions and "rewarded strikers for flagrant misconduct by forcing employers to reinstate them with back pay."

A REPUBLICAN LOOKS AT HOUSING

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is widely recognized that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL), is not only one of the ablest and most knowledgeable people in Congress and in the Republican Party in the field of housing, but he is also one of those most committed to the humane objective of decent housing for all Americans.

At the recent National Housing Conference, held in Washington last month the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) delivered a major address of great significance in which both his knowledge and his commitment are clearly evident.

I am deeply pleased to be able to bring this important message to the attention of our colleagues by including it as a part of my remarks in the RECORD:

SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, BEFORE THE NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE, MARCH 10, 1969, WASHINGTON, D.C.

We are meeting here today, all with some expertise in the field of housing—for the purpose of discussing housing needs and how they may best be met. The situation is somewhat changed from a year ago. We now have as a part of federal law, "the largest new programs concerned exclusively with housing"—we also have a new President and a new Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

I would be the last to say that the first produced the latter two, although there may be some minor connection. You are no doubt encouraged by the reassurances you have already had from the Nixon Administration that our concern with urban problems is as great as your own. Our responsibilities today are infinitely greater.

At the same time, I do not think that you can take it for granted that this Administration is wedded to the programs of the past—committed to failures and excuses and goals that have a cloak of unreality. We intend to make this a "can do" Administration.

If we are to dig for success, you cannot require us to use time-worn shovels, if we can produce a steam-shovel that works much better.

I have participated in executive sessions and heard some of the foremost advocates of present housing tools, damn them for a lack of production. This is a part of politics and something that I can understand. But the hour is late. Some of our programs, as we all know, are in grave trouble. The panacea of increased appropriations in a time of financial crisis is proving to be not enough.

What shall we do?

We must be inventive and realize that the solutions are not just with passage of another law, but how well we handle the law that we already have on the books.

Certainly, with the creation of over 30 new programs in the last eight years in the HUD area, we should have all the tools needed to produce housing for our people, particularly those who so badly need it. We are fortunate to have in charge of those tools a man whose production record is one of the best of our times. Further, we know that his heart as well as his fine mind is behind the work he is undertaking. I am speaking, of course, of George Romney, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

I believe he is a man that deserves your support in the fullest. You cannot reach the goals you have set unless you give him the support to lead you there. And we all know that if there is a job that needs support it is the one that George Romney has undertaken. Fortunately, he has brought to his task a group of men whose records of accomplishment are second only to his own. It is not a group picked solely for its political flavor. You know that because some of your fervent supporters are among his Assistant Secretaries. He has assembled these men to make an all-out attack on the goals that were left unfinished by the previous Administration. In that Administration, there was a great deal of talk about those goals, but little progress was made towards reaching them.

Secretary Romney is 10 days short of serving his second month in his new job. He is hard at work. He has wasted no time. But already there are those political figures who are taking him to task for not meeting goals other people set. I say give him time.

The NHC strongly backed a goal of over 800,000 public housing units in 1949. It envisioned reaching that goal in six years. It is now 20 years later and we have not reached it. Do not take a man to task who has not been two months on the job.

I suggest that we drop the cliche, "Let George do it!" and all of us pitch in—not with criticism, but hard work. If we are going to make comments, let us make them be constructive. Remember—if there is any chance of realization of the goal of 6 million low and moderate income housing units within the next decade, all of us here and thousands of others besides are going to have to contribute heavily.

As I have said, there are dozens of old and new programs at HUD that can produce through government backing thousands of new housing units. But let us face it, some of HUD's highly touted programs are barely turning over and what turnover there is, is expensive.

I think we have to look at the past and the present and see what our tax dollars—and they are your tax dollars as well as mine—are producing. Then we have to make judgements. And if we have programs that for mystic reasons, HUD and the Bureau of the Budget long ago decided to phase out, be sure that the phaseout is not immediate and leaves a void unfilled by new programs that may produce and may not.

If we are going to phase out the 202 and 221 (d)(3) programs, for example, let us be sure that we have at hand the ability to go forward with the replacement programs. Let us not find out after we have stifled the operating programs through administrative decision that we have also discarded their needed production before there was anything to take its place.

There are some programs I admit that are duplicating efforts. Rent supplements, and rent certificates, now known as the section 23 leasing program, are examples. Rent Supplements approaches 8,000 units under payment. Rent Certificates now has 93,000 units in its pipeline; 17,000 awaiting approval for contract; 16,000 approved for contract; 28,000 signed for occupancy; 32,000 occupied.

Why we have these two programs competing after their respective records for the past three years I do not know. There was a great deal promised for rent supplements. In terms of the promise of the previous Administration's publicity, and its comparative unit cost which can only increase with time, the promise has not been fulfilled.

In contrast, what little was promised for rent certificates, has been far exceeded. We have housed with this adjunct of the public housing program over 100,000 people, very possible that many more than has rent supplements.

I think it is time for an evaluation. We do not need to burden HUD with the cost of running two parallel programs, particularly since the rent supplement program will, if it does grow larger, soon be faced with the fact that it does not have the bureaucratic means to check the eligibility of its tenants, a matter which should already be of concern to it. If it creates that bureaucracy or hires it as it must, the expense of rent supplements will be catastrophic.

The money being poured into the rent supplement program could be well diverted elsewhere. The 202 program, the water and sewer program, mass transit, and others could well do with its appropriations since its goal is being fulfilled much better by another program in all phases of its operation.

Let me add, however, that it is my personal opinion that FHA has done a workmanlike and the best possible job it could with rent supplements. It is the basic concept of the legislation as originally conceived by the previous administration at HUD that is flawed. This produces difficulties at once—expensive and duplicating.

For those who have misplaced their faith in rent supplements, I may sound a little harsh. If so, I think it also a little harsh on the taxpayers to have considerably less than 10,000 units produced in the three years that have passed since the enactment of the Housing Act of 1965, when the previous Administration was promising better than 300,000 units for the program when the Act was passed.

Again, it is not the FHA effort, but the legislation that is flawed.

Amongst other unfinished business we have the matter of new towns. Legislation in 1966 and 1968 has to date produced few applications. This is understandable. New towns by any definition are tremendously expensive. They require large amounts of patient capital and the careful assembly of considerable acreage. They also require a considerable amount of "know how". To get all three together is a long time job.

I am both encouraged and worried by late reports from meetings held and attended by dignitaries from this organization, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, members of Congress, Governors, Urban America, Potomac Institute, Urban Coalition, HUD and other prominent groups.

At these meetings there was a wealth of talent and, predictably, a number of individuals with varying definitions of what New Towns are and should do. One individual was reported to me as reminding the assemblage that they must use such available HUD tools as public housing and urban renewal in putting together New Towns.

Now I see no reason for inflicting urban renewal on a brand new town. That is planning ahead with a vengeance. As for public housing, it is hoped that everyone in the new town will have a decent, safe, and sanitary home. If that includes public housing, I can see no objection.

Into any new town, however, we must put the basic engineering and economics that make a town work. That means simply jobs for everyone except the retired. New Towns cannot be a dumping ground for the cities' unemployed. We cannot build for failure. We must build for success. Moving the unemployed to the countryside is simply transferring unsolved problems. If we are to entice people to New Towns it must not be just because they are attractive and well planned, but because they give whoever comes the opportunity to improve his lot, starting with the absolute necessity of employment as the rock on which to build.

Towns are born of economic necessity, generally as links in a giant transmission belt. Our American "New Towns" to date have in large part not been overly successful. I think this is because they are being proposed not because of economic, but because of social necessity. In too many cases, the driving force is not to eliminate problems, but to transfer them. If such is truly the case, we are but moving failures from one area to another less able to support them.

That is why I speak of the absolute need for providing basic economics for New Towns. The basic engineering if you will, the jobs that the head of every family must have to make lives supportable. To attempt anything else, to start with any other premise is to indulge in an exercise in futility. And let me emphasize that for every job that a new town provides a man and his family, it must also, within his needs and means, provide him with a decent, safe and sanitary home. Let us have it no other way.

As housing experts, I think we must face the demands of the present and know that the needs of the people we are so desperately trying to serve are here and now. The low income families of this country need decent, safe, and sanitary housing now. Anything that prevents that goal from being reached is self-deceiving.

I am disturbed when I am told that housing production is being inhibited by longstanding HUD regulations, however well intended. I fought last year to insure that urban renewal residential projects included at least 20 percent housing for low and moderate income families. I am now told that this hard won provision of the law is in conflict with a HUD administrative interpretation of Title VI of the 1964 Housing Act that provides that HUD programs, principally public housing, must be balanced between racially-impacted areas and non-racially impacted areas of the same community. To build in the former, you must also build in the latter.

As a long time advocate of civil rights, I am concerned that this interpretation has entrapped us. I can remember—and so can you all—of housing policies advocated for the purpose of inducing integration that produced instead segregation. And I know too that the news media today represent the black militants as desiring segregation. Yet here we have an administrative ruling, based upon an interpretation of the law as yet judicially undecided, that is prohibiting housing activity in slum areas, in urban renewal, and in non-slum areas because there the HUD cost guidelines would be breached.

I am most disturbed that administrative regulations can defy the law. I do not think that the Executive Department can dictate to the Legislative. If it can, I think we should find that out here and now and correct the matter.

What really bothers me, however, are policies that are holding down housing production, that are stopping needed replacement of slums with decent, safe, and sanitary housing, that are telling the people who have waited the longest for relief from urban pressures that they must wait longer.

What have such policies produced? They have produced angry charges from leaders of the black community of Pittsburgh that no attempt is being made by HUD to build in, and upgrade, their ghetto community. It has resulted in stoppage of public housing, urban renewal, and model cities activities in Pittsburgh, Washington, and other communities.

Now these programs are struggling with enough difficulties and handicaps, not the least of which is sufficient appropriated funds, without being hamstrung by administrative regulations, however well intentioned. We need new thinking attuned to the times of now!

Secretary Romney is being often reminded of the goals set by people whose own records of production leave a great deal to be desired. If all of us are sincere in approaching, reaching, or exceeding those selfsame goals—and we would not be here if we were not so motivated—we should get behind him—Republican, Democrat, or even Independent and give him the support that he will need to meet the goals that he inherited from the previous Administration. Whether that support be administrative, legislative, executive, or manual the Secretary of HUD must have it to fulfill the needs of our time. I pledge him my support. I suggest you give him yours.

A STRONG AMERICAN PRESIDENT

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the concern for reform of our presidential election system is widespread. In pursuing constitutional amendments toward this goal, Congress should keep in mind the nature of the American Presidency and how it might be effected by proposed electoral reforms. Milton Viorst writes on this important subject in the following article from the April Washingtonian:

The Gut Issue of Electoral Reform

(By Milton Viorst)

While Congress picks away at the mechanics of the various plans for electoral college reform, the overriding and forgotten question seems to be what kind of Presidency do we, as a people, want.

If the answer is a strong Presidency, then there is a serious flaw running through the major proposals under consideration. For what these proposal have in common, however they may differ in detail, is permanent provision for election of a minority President. If, however, there is a consensus that in these difficult times the country needs strong leadership, then a constitutional amendment that weakens the Presidential office by sanctioning a minority mandate would be a mistake.

Where these proposals go astray is in their preoccupation with procedures that will assure the continuity of constitutional rule. They aim, above all, to eliminate the possibility of governmental paralysis, currently threatened by deadlock in the electoral college or, at the next level in the process, in the House of Representatives. These, of course, are vital concerns which the Congress can no longer overlook. But, engrossed by the need to modify the methods of Presidential election, Congress seems unaware that it might very well be giving new shape to the Presidency itself.

President Nixon's proposal—to divide a state's electoral vote in ratio to the popular vote that each candidate receives—is not the worst of the plans under consideration. It is probably more democratic than the current winner-take-all system in each of the states. In its detail, it does tidy up significant constitutional lapses. In addition, it possesses the virtue of realism, the President says, in that the states might be persuaded to ratify it. But it perpetuates the possibility that a man who has come in second in the popular vote might be elected President—and, under this system, Nixon himself apparently would have become President in 1960. As long as Congress is taking the trouble to amend the Constitution, it would surely be unwise to retain this dangerous defect.

But more disturbing than the retention of old defects is the introduction of new ones. President Nixon proposes that in the event no candidate receives a majority of the electoral vote, a plurality of forty percent will suffice to elect a President, Senator Birch Bayh (D-Ind.), the principal advocate of direct election of the President, proposes that, in the absence of a clear majority, forty percent of the popular vote be established as a minimum plurality. But, again, what this attachment to the forty percent figure indicates is concern with the mechanics of continuity rather than with the quality of the Presidency.

In our system, there is no justification, save expediency, for abandonment of the majority rule principle. It is one of the democratic practices that has served us well. If we apply plurality to Presidential elections, it may spread in unforeseen and unfortunate ways. Once accepted, why not drop the minimum to thirty-five or even twenty-five percent? By building a minority Presidency into the Constitution, both the Nixon and the Bayh proposals threaten to debilitate the Presidential office.

Of course, it is not inevitable that a minority President will be a weak President. Lincoln and Wilson were very strong with mandates of some forty percent, while Harding was feeble with more than sixty percent of the vote. Presidential strength is, in part, psychological and not institutional. But the writers of a constitution cannot take the chance that the proper psychological man will somehow find his way to the White House. They must, rather, build the best possible institutions within which everyday, responsible men will function. And, unquestionably, the prospects of a strong Presidency are greatly increased if the President is the choice of a majority of the voters.

In our time, most Americans seem to agree on the need for a strong Presidency. The importance of Presidential leadership in the field of legislation seems reaffirmed by the current wallowing of Congress. Though President Johnson tended to excess in the exercise of his powers in Vietnam, it is generally recognized that a decisive hand is necessary for the conduct of foreign policy. Only the extreme right and the extreme left, these days, quarrel with the concept.

What is less widely perceived is the necessity—and difficulty—of a President's being master in his own house. On coming into office, a President faces a massive civil bureaucracy and powerful military establishment, both confident they will be around long after he is gone. They are accustomed, if not to the exercise of power, then to the pursuit of routine. A President, whatever his electoral mandate, finds it hard enough to translate his policy decisions into action, and a weak President is at a profound handicap.

From the historians of the Kennedy years, we have learned something of the magnitude of the problem. Largely because he felt insecure about his narrow electoral victory, President Kennedy allowed himself to be dragged by the military into the disastrous Bay of Pigs adventure in April 1961. During the second Cuban crisis in 1962, he was astonished to learn that his instructions to remove ballistic missiles from Turkey had simply been ignored. Other countries have had even unhappier experiences when the residual power of the bureaucrats, military or civilian, has been pitted against the transitory power of an elected leader. Certainly, any steps taken to weaken the office weigh the odds against the Presidency.

It is also probably true that the institutionalization of a minority President will encourage the proliferation of third parties. It is far easier for an outsider to shoot for forty than for fifty percent of the vote, whether popular or electoral. In times of national stress, a George Wallace or a Joseph McCarthy—working a single issue, exploiting some peculiar grievance—could conceivably gamble and win, though the combined vote of the two regular parties was overwhelmingly the greater. From the experience of other countries, one could even argue that a system which encourages minority parties tends almost inevitably to produce weak Presidents.

The answer to the problem is provision for a run-off election between the two leading candidates in the event that no candidate receives a majority vote. Many other democracies utilize this procedure without problems. France conducts its run-off exactly a week after the initial election day, obviating a second extensive campaign. With two candidates contesting head-to-head, the run-off ballot could be easily prepared and quickly counted. Certainly, the complexities are not beyond our capacity.

Interestingly, both the Nixon and the Bayh plans already include provisions for a run-off, if no candidate receives forty percent of the vote. Why not raise the ante to a clear majority? The price would be small. The result would be a President certain of his mandate from the people and, in our system, that would be an asset of incalculable importance.

SENATOR JACKSON, REPRESENTATIVE ROYBAL PROPOSE UNIQUE NEW HEALTH MEASURE TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TRANSPLANTING HUMAN ORGANS, AND TO IMPLEMENT A COMPREHENSIVE TREATMENT PROGRAM TO AID VICTIMS OF CHRONIC KIDNEY DISEASE

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, in introducing legislation in Congress to establish a National Commission on transplanting human organs, and to implement a comprehensive treatment program to aid victims of chronic kidney disease.

This unique new health measure, entitled "The Artificial Organs, Transplantation, and Technological Development Act of 1967" is designed to provide a thorough review of the full range of medical, legal, social, economic, technical, and humanitarian problems and opportunities which the Nation faces as a result of the astoundingly rapid progress of medical science toward making transplantation of human organs, and the use of artificial organs, practical alternatives in the treatment of disease.

In addition, this legislative proposal has been enthusiastically and wholeheartedly endorsed by the National Kidney Foundation as a major step forward in planning and implementing a national program for the treatment of kidney disease.

Kidney malfunctions are among the first five causes of death in the United States. The prevalence of kidney disease is 7.8 million, with an annual death rate of 100,000 or more. Ironically, only about 1 to 3 percent of the 7,000 to 10,000 cases of end-stage kidney disease receive artificial kidney care or transplantation. Both public and private sectors are making every effort to meet the challenge but, unfortunately, this is not enough.

Senator JACKSON's Senate bill, S. 88, and my own identical House bill, H.R. 8, represent a joint congressional effort to provide a national forum for considering the broad, complex problems associated with human transplantation and the use of artificial organs, while, at the same time, establishing an ongoing model kidney care program from which we can gain vital knowledge and experience.

We believe that this measure cannot only help resolve some of the most difficult and pressing medical health questions confronting the American people today, but that it also can lead to a real breakthrough by making the recent fantastic discoveries of medical research available as proven lifesaving treatments to enable thousands of our fellow citizens to continue to live productive and worthwhile lives—when today many of these people are dying for lack of money, facilities, and trained personnel to provide the essential care they require.

The Jackson-Roybal bill is a two-part measure.

One section would set up a National Commission on Transportation and Artificial Organs to deal with the often promising, sometimes disturbing, ramifications of human transplantation and the use of artificial organs.

The seven-member Commission would not stop at kidney transplantation, but would look at the whole field of potential and current organ transplants, including heart, kidney, liver, and lung, and present its findings to the President.

Another section calls for an expenditure of $20 million in the first fiscal year, and $30 million in each of the next 4 fiscal years, for the establishment and operation of a nationwide system of integrated artificial kidney and human kidney transplant centers.

This section is based on key recommendations of the report of the blue-ribbon Gottschalk Committee on Chronic Kidney Disease, submitted to the Federal Bureau of the Budget last September at the request of the President.

The Gottschalk report showed that many of the problems encountered in the transplantation of kidneys are common to the transplantation of other human organs.

We have the technical know-how to keep over 7,000 people alive today who are dying annually because of kidney disease—but the patient care cost to the individual is prohibitive.

To remedy this situation, the Jackson-Roybal bill includes an amendment to the medicare provisions of the Social Security Act, bringing hospital and medical health benefits to patients whose kidneys have failed, who require a kidney transplant, or whose infected blood needs weekly or twice-weekly dialysis or rinsing by the kidney machine.

In many cases, these patients are able to work and support families. Their survivors could be an even greater burden on our tax rolls were it not for this weekly rehabilitation of the breadwinner.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the full text of the statement issued today by the National Kidney Foundation, endorsing the Jackson-Roybal bill:

Kidney Foundation Endorses Proposed Legislation

NEW YORK, N.Y.—The National Kidney Foundation has given its enthusiastic support to two measures designed to relieve the plight of the nation's 8,000,000 sufferers of kidney disease.

The two bills, identical in content, were simultaneously introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives by Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D. Wash.) and Rep. Edward R. Roybal (D. Calif.) as numbers S. 88 and H.R. 8, respectively.

Speaking for the national health organization, Foundation president Dr. George E. Schreiner described as a "national emergency" today's delivery of life-saving medical services to the vast number of kidney disease victims.

"It is a tragedy that in these times of medical enlightenment and scientific progress, our resources permit us to bring adequate medical care to less than ten per cent of the many thousands of kidney disease sufferers who so desperately need it," he declared.

Dr. Schreiner is professor of medicine at Georgetown University and director of the Renal and Electrolyte Division of Georgetown University Hospital, Washington, D.C.

Citing the modern miracles of kidney transplantation and the artificial kidney machine—as well as new drugs available for the detection and treatment of kidney disease—Dr. Schreiner lauded the efforts of lawmakers to bridge the vast gap between the best of medical care and enormous need.

Dr. Schreiner also noted that the National Kidney Foundation's trustees and medical board long have been on record in support of similar measures.

The bills specifically provide for $20-million for the first year and $30-million per year thereafter for the establishment of training and treatment centers for transplantation, and dialysis centers and home dialysis programs from which patients can be redirected to kidney transplantation when medically indicated.

Another provision of the bills establishes a national commission to study the full range of medical, legal, social, economic, technical and humanitarian problems involving the role of the Federal government in the prevention and treatment of disease in which transplantation and/or artificial organs may be a factor.

In order to provide a somewhat more specific and detailed explanation of the Jackson-Roybal bill's major provisions, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following narrative summary of S. 88 and H.R. 8:

The "Artificial Organ, Transplantation and Technological Development Act of 1969" would amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a comprehensive review of the medical, technical, social and legal problems and opportunities which the Nation faces as a result of rapid medical progress towards making transplantation of organs, and the use of artificial organs a practical alternative in the treatment of disease.

In addition, the bill would also amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of regional and community programs for patients with kidney disease and for the conduct of training related to such programs.

Finally, the bill proposes a variety of mechanisms for financing the programs outlined, and encourages close cooperation among all the federal agencies and departments to achieve the bill's objectives.

Section 2: Following the introductory section of the Artificial Organ, Transplantation and Technological Development Act of 1968, Section 2 of the bill amends Part B of Title III of the Public Health Service Act by adding the following three new sections:

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TRANSPLANTATION AND ARTIFICIAL ORGANS

Under new Section 319 a seven-member National Commission on Transplantation and Artificial Organs would be appointed by the President, with the Chairman and members selected on the basis of their qualifications in medical, legal, social, economic and technical fields. The members of the Commission could hold no other U.S. Government position during their period of service.

Over the three-year period for which it is proposed to function, the Commission would review and report on all medical activities in the nation in the field of transplantation and the use of artificial organs for the treatment of disease, and would review legal, social and technical problems associated with this area of medicine. It would also consider various ways by which the Federal Government can participate in developing the knowledge and facilities for the appropriate use of transplantation and artificial organs in the treatment of disease, and make projections of the public need for readily available facilities for this purpose.

The Commission would consult with the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare for review and comment regarding its studies, reports and recommendations. Its reports would be submitted to the President who would in turn transmit them to the Congress together with such comments and recommendations for legislation as he deemed appropriate.

In the performance of its functions the Commission could hold hearings, procure services of expert consultants, enter into contracts, and transfer funds to Federal agencies. These agencies would be authorized to supply information and to detail personnel to the Commission upon its request.

ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF REGIONAL AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS FOR THE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF KIDNEY DISEASES

The proposed new Section 320 to the Public Health Service Act defines a series of provisions related to financial and other assistance in the establishment and operation of regional and community kidney treatment and training programs. Funds would be authorized to be appropriated in the amounts of $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and $30,000,000 for each succeeding fiscal year ending in and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973. These funds would be used for assistance in providing information, services and grants for planning, training, construction, renovation and percentage contributions towards the operation of Regional Kidney Centers and Community Dialysis Units.

Kidney Centers

A "Kidney Center" for the purpose of this section of the bill is defined to mean a "Regional Kidney Center" established within or as a part of a medical school or hospital that has demonstrated a high level of professional competence in relevant medical disciplines. The purpose of such centers would be:

(a) to train medical and supporting personnel;

(b) to provide transplantation treatment for patients with chronic uremia where this form of therapy is indicated;

(c) to provide dialysis treatment when medically indicated in connection with training, research and transplantation;

(d) to engage in research and the development of new techniques;

(e) to coordinate with and establish appropriate relations with one or more local Community Dialysis Units, and,

(f) to assure that knowledge and treatment of kidney disease will evolve in a balanced fashion;

This section of the bill also includes in the definition of "Kidney Center" a local "Community Dialysis Unit" established in conjunction with and in a continuing relationship with a Regional Kidney Center.

The purpose of such units would be:

(a) to provide a central training and treatment facility for the care of persons having chronic kidney disease;

(b) to provide training and supervision to physicians, staff members, and to patients who are candidates for home dialysis;

(c) to foster and promote the availability and wider use of the equipment and techniques of home dialysis.

Federal assistance grants to kidney centers for these purposes would include:

(1) 100 per cent of the costs directly related to the training of physicians, staff members, patients and their families;

(2) 100 per cent of the costs for construction or renovation of existing facilities and for the necessary equipment to establish a Regional Kidney Center under the provisions described above;

(3) 60 to 90 percent of the costs for construction or renovation of existing facilities and for the necessary equipment to establish a Community Dialysis Unit under the provisions described above. The percentage contribution would be determined on the basis of the economic status of the particular community involved pursuant to guidelines established by the Secretary.

(4) 90 per cent in the first year of full operation 60 per cent in the second year, and 30 per cent in the third year, and thereafter, of the operation and maintenance costs of Regional Kidney Centers and Community Dialysis Units established pursuant to the bill. *Provided*, however, that grants under this subsection could be in lesser amounts if the Secretary determines that Centers and Units are capable of meeting a larger share of the costs of operation.

(Under the Social Security—Medicare provisions of the bill, the Secretary, in many cases, would find that local centers and units were capable of meeting a larger share of their operational and maintenance costs.)

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON KIDNEY DISEASE PROGRAMS

The purpose of new Section 321 of the Public Health Service Act is to establish a National Advisory Committee on Kidney Disease Programs. This Committee would consist of 12 members, appointed by the Secretary, four of whom would be currently in Government service and eight not otherwise in the employ of the United States. The term of appointment for each member would be four years.

The Committee would advise and assist the Secretary on regulations, policy and administration of the bill as it pertains to the diagnosis, treatment and care of patients suffering from kidney disease. The Committee would also review and make recommendations on grant applications under section 320 of the bill for the establishment and operation of regional and community kidney disease treatment and training programs.

In addition, the National Advisory Committee on Kidney Disease Programs would review and make recommendations on kidney disease programs of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including, but not limited to, those in the Veterans' Administration, the Public Health Service, and the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, so that the methods, facilities, and programs of these agencies could most effectively be utilized. Particular attention would be paid to the coordination of activities of these various agencies in a given region so as to insure adequate geographical distribution of services and avoid duplication of facilities and services.

Section 3: This section of the "Artificial Organ, Transplantation and Technological Development Act of 1969" would amend the medicare provisions of the Social Security Act so that:

1. any individual who according to accepted medical authority, judgment and practice requires continuous intermittent dialysis for kidney failure would be eligible for both the hospital insurance benefits (Part A) and supplementary medical insurance portion (Part B) of the Medicare program, regardless of that individual's age or insured status. Such individuals would be allowed to enroll in the supplementary medical insurance program at any time. Coverage would begin on the first day of the month of enrollment and terminate at the end of the calendar quarter in which the individual no longer requires dialysis.

2. "medical and other health services" which are covered under the supplementary medical insurance program would include: "continuous intermittent dialysis and any other items or services required for or in connection with the treatment of kidney failure (including items or services under the supervision of a physician, furnished in a place of residence used as the patient's home, if the provision of such items or services meets such conditions relating to health and safety as the Secretary may find necessary); and

3. individuals qualifying solely because of the requirement of dialysis are limited to receiving payments under either the hospital insurance program or the supplementary medical insurance program for only those expenses incurred for items or services (including continuous intermittent dialysis and kidney transplantation) which are necessitated by such individuals' kidney failure or by conditions directly or indirectly related thereto or caused thereby.

Section 4: This section of the bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the effectiveness of the coverage extended by the amendments made by section 3 of the bill to individuals with kidney failure, giving particular attention to the need for increasing the duration of the benefits provided in the case of such individuals and for any other adjustments which may be indicated because of the unique nature of their condition and the treatment required. Within six months after the effective date of the bill the Secretary would transmit to the President and the Congress a report containing his findings of fact and any conclusions or recommendations he may have.

Section 5: Under this section, the head of each department, agency and instrumentality of the United States would be authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the maximum extent possible, in carrying out the provisions of the bill.

Section 6: This section provides that, except as otherwise specifically provided by any amendment made by the bill, there would be authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the bill.

Section 7: This section states that the foregoing provisions of the bill would become effective as of the first day of the first month which begins after the date of enactment of the bill.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART CELEBRATES 28TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 28 years ago this past month, the National Gallery of Art was first opened to the public. Housing one of the finest collections in the world, it holds more than 30,000 works of art created by more than 2,000 artists. By viewing the Gallery's collection of sculptures, paintings, drawings, prints, tapestries, and furniture, Americans from all 50 States have gained a deeper appreciation of the history of art.

Established by a joint resolution of Congress in 1937, the National Gallery is directed by a Board composed of the

Chief Justice of the United States and the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and the Smithsonian Institution, representing the Government, and five outstanding private citizens who represent the public sector. The Gallery building was constructed with funds generously donated for that purpose by Andrew W. Mellon of Pittsburgh, Pa. Mr. Mellon presented to the Gallery his own private art collection, and this is the nucleus around which the Gallery's present magnificent collection has been built. Over 200 generous Americans have donoted works of art to the Gallery.

The National Gallery has the responsibility of assembling a collection of art "representative of the best in the artistic heritage of America and of Europe." An excellent program of art education provides visitors with free tours and lectures as well as weekly concerts. The Gallery lends films, film strips, and color slides to schools, libraries, and colleges.

It is a pleasure to include in the Record the April calendar of events of the National Gallery of Art:

Calendar of Events, National Gallery of Art, April 1969

John Constable

Beginning the 30th of April, 66 painting by the English landscape artist John Constable will be shown for a period of six months on the Main Floor. This is the second in a series of intimate exhibitions devoted to individual artists in the large British art collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon.

The selection offers an opportunity to study the full range of Constable's oil paintings. It includes still lifes, landscapes, studies of sky and clouds, and one of his most successful protraits, *Miss Mary Freer*. The most important picture is *Hadleigh Castle*, a scene of melancholy grandeur "as moving as the most sublime poem by Wordsworth," in the words of John Walker, Director of the National Gallery. Constable observed the magnificent ruin while on a tour of Essex in the summer of 1814 and made several studies before completing this final version in 1829.

Mr. and Mrs. Mellon's collection is rich in landmarks of the artist's life: *Dedham Mill and Lock*, where Constable worked for his prosperous miller father; *Osmington Village, with the Church and Vicarage*, scene of his honeymoon; and *Coast at Brighton; Stormy Day*, the coastal area where he vacationed with his family.

Notes for the fully illustrated catalogue ($2.50 postpaid) are by Ross Watson, who also prepared the J. M. W. Turner catalogue for this series.

American Music Festival

The 26th festival, devoted exclusively to the music of American composers, begins April 20 under the direction of Richard Bales. Concerts by the National Gallery Orchestra, recitalists, and chamber groups are scheduled in the East Garden Court Sunday evenings at 8 p.m., through May 25.

Rembrandt Tercentenary

Continuing on the Main Floor is an exhibition commemorating the 300th anniversary of Rembrandt's death. Assembled from the National Gallery's holdings are 23 paintings, more than a dozen drawings, and a selection of 77 of the most distinguished prints in the collection. An illustrated catalogue is available at $3.00 postpaid, with an introduction by the Dutch painting and print authority Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann, Professor of the History of Art, Yale University.

J. M. W. Turner

Closing on the 20th of this month is an exhibition of 16 painting by Joseph Mallord William Turner from the British collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon. A catalogue is available with text by Ross Watson. 10" x 7½", 32 pages, 16 black-and-white illustrations. $2.75 postpaid.

Daily film program

The National Gallery of Art (52 min.): weekdays, 2 p.m.

The American Vision (35 min.): weekdays, 4 p.m., Sundays, 1:00 p.m. Auditorium.

Recorded tours

The Director's Tour. A 45-minute tour of 20 National Gallery masterpieces selected and described by John Walker, Director. Portable tape units rent for 25¢ for one person, 35¢ for two. Available in English, French, Spanish, and German.

Tour of Selected Galleries. A discussion of works of art in 28 galleries. Talks in each room, which may be taken in any order, last approximately 15 minutes. Small radio receivers rent for 25¢.

Gallery hours

Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 12 noon to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the building and to all scheduled programs.

Cafeteria hours

Weekdays, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m., luncheon service 11 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. Sundays, dinner service 2 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, MARCH 31, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 6

*Painting of the week**

Perugino. *The Crucifixion with the Virgin, Saint John, Saint Jerome, and Saint Mary Magdalen* (Andrew Mellon Collection). Gallery 8, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week

The Achievement of Camille Pissarro. Rotunda, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour

Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture

The Art of the Icon. Guest Speaker: Mary Chamot, formerly Assistant Keeper, the Tate Gallery, London. Lecture Hall, 4:00.

Sunday concert

National Gallery Orchestra. Richard Bales, *Conductor*. East Garden Court, 8:00.

MONDAY, APRIL 7, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 13

*Painting of the week**

Cézanne. *Le Château Noir* (gift of Eugene and Agnes Meyer). Gallery 76, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week

The Achievement of Claude Monet. Rotunda, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour

Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture

Artist and Patron in Western Art. Guest Speaker: Sterling A. Callisen, Professor of Art, Pace College, New York, N.Y. Lecture Hall, 4:00.

Sunday concert

David Rubinstein, *Pianist*. East Garden Court, 8:00.

MONDAY, APRIL 14, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 20

*Painting of the week**

Gentile da Fabriano. *Madonna and Child* (Samuel H. Kress Collection). Gallery 5, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week

The Achievement of Edgar Degas. Rotunda, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour

Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture

Rembrandt's Etchings. Guest Speaker: Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann, Professor of the History of Art, Yale University, New Haven. Lecture Hall, 4:00.

Sunday concert

26th American Music Festival: National Gallery Orchestra. Richard Bales, *Conductor*. East Garden Court, 8:00.

MONDAY, APRIL 21, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 27

*Painting of the week**

Jacques-Louis David. *Madam David* (Samuel H. Kress Collection). Gallery 56, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week

The Achievement of Paul Gauguin. Rotunda, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour

Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture

Rembrandt and the Italian Baroque. Guest Speaker: Joos Bruyn, Professor of Art History, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Lecture Hall, 4:00.

Sunday concert

26th American Music Festival: The Montgomery Chamber Ensemble. Assisted by Jeanne Chalifoux, *Harp*, and Eugene Dreyer, *Violin*. East Garden Court, 8:00.

We in the U.S. Congress are indeed proud of this fine national art museum, and salute John Walker, Director of the National Gallery, and his good staff for their contribution to the enrichment of our national life, through preserving the cultural heritage of this Nation and of the world.

WOMEN'S RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the elimination of discrimination in American life—whether discrimination based on race, sex, religion, national origin or any other irrelevant factor—must continue to be a central objective of the American people and their Government. For discrimination denies the fundamental moral basis of American society. And discrimination of all kinds—whatever the superficial differences between them—are basically parts of the same ugly whole.

For these reasons, I recently addressed a letter to President Nixon, recognizing that he shares my convictions in this respect, proposing alternative arrangements within the executive branch of providing more effective Federal leadership and involvement in the fight against discrimination based on sex.

At approximately the same time, the distinguished correspondent of the Women's News Service, Vera Glaser, prepared a series of five articles entitled "The Female Revolution" in which she surveyed the state of women's rights and opportunities and responsibilities today. The wide and prominent coverage given this series by major American newspapers suggests, I believe, the importance of the subject.

---

* 11" x 14" reproductions with texts for sale this week—15¢ each. (If mailed, 25¢ each.)

Mr. Speaker, I most strongly urge those of our colleagues who have not already done so to read these articles, for they comprise the most comprehensive and persuasive picture of the realities of the woman's position in American society which I have seen in recent years.

At this point in the RECORD, I include the text of my letter to the President and the series by Vera Glaser as a part of my remarks:

THE PRESIDENT
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As one who is familiar with the constructive interest you have always displayed in the general question of the expansion of women's opportunities and responsibilities, the protection of women's equal rights, and the elimination of all forms of discrimination based on sex, I feel encouraged to approach you in these first weeks of your Administration to propose concrete steps toward achieving these worthwhile objectives.

Specifically, I propose for your consideration two alternative arrangements, either of which would provide for more effective federal involvement and leadership in assuring for women and girls equal opportunity and equal protection of the laws:

First, establishment of an independent commission with a full-time chairman, appointed by the President on a bipartisan basis from among men and women with a demonstrated interest in and commitment to the strengthening of women's rights and opportunities; members would be chosen both from within and without the Government, would be served by a professionally competent staff, and would be responsible for making relevant studies, reviews and evaluations of matters affecting the status of women and for transmitting appropriate recommendations to the President and Congress.

Second, establishment within the Executive Office of the President of:

(a) an Office of Women's Rights and Responsibilities and the appointment of a Special Assistant to the President to head this office and also serve as chairman of

(b) an interdepartmental committee of the same name composed of appropriate department and agency heads; the functions and responsibilities of the special assistant and the interdepartmental committee would be analogous to those of the Special Assistant for Urban Affairs and the Urban Affairs Council, i.e. to strengthen policy direction and consistency, improve coordination, and provide for effective evaluation of Government performance in the area of women's rights and responsibilities;

(c) a Citizens Advisory * * * area of Women's rights and responsibilities would also be appointed by the President on a bipartisan basis composed of men and women with special information and concern in the subject area who would be responsible for advising the President and the interdepartmental committee on relevant matters and stimulating action in the private sphere.

Although either alternative would significantly improve the Government's ability to enlarge women's opportunities and end discrimination, my personal preference would be for the second plan which has the great advantage of more visibly and convincingly committing the Administration to effective action. Should you or your staff desire further details about either proposal, I shall be delighted at the opportunity to furnish them.

I do not believe it is necessary in this letter to detail the many areas in public and private life in which women and girls continue to be victims of discrimination, nor to document charges of discrimination with a host of ugly examples. Your own intimate knowledge of government and society has, I am sure, provided you with the necessary insight, and the work of many groups and organizations and individuals, including the recent President's Commission on the Status of Women, has furnished all too impressive a volume of evidence.

Economic, social and legal discrimination against women and girls—in employment, education, compensation, retirement and many other areas—continue to weaken our social structure and distort our system of moral principles. An Administration dedicated to the goal of moving ahead together as a united people would, I am confident, find it especially fitting and proper to continue the struggle against a form of discrimination which divides and demeans our people.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Very sincerely,
FLORENCE P. DWYER,
Member of Congress.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 17, 1969]

THE FEMALE REVOLUTION: WOMEN ARE ON WARPATH AS DOORS OF BUSINESS AND POLITICS STAY CLOSED

(By Vera Glaser)

(NOTE.—This is the first of five articles on the rising discontent among women over the inequities in American public and business life. The author, a well-known Washington correspondent, interviewed men and women in politics, business, education, and in the home for this series. Recently Mrs. Glaser caused a stir at a Presidential press conference by asking Mr. Nixon why he hadn't appointed more women to high posts. The exchange triggered considerable comment in the press.)

WASHINGTON.—A mink coat, a job, and all those shiny electrical applicances are no longer enough, it appears, for the American woman.

She wants something bigger, shinier, and far more explosive called "an even break."

Although the number of doors opening today for women seems limitless, the most important ones remain bolted up tight.

The executive secretary, for example, who makes decisions and handles her boss' job on his off days may find it unfair and infuriating, but when he quits he'll be replaced by a man, and she'll be the one to "break him in."

The female eying a "male" career area can expect ridicule and roughing up, as Barbara Jo Rubin learned when a man jockey threatened to "ride her into the rail." Or she may be turned down flat for no apparent reason, as were qualified lady scientists who applied for astronaut training.

Given the attitudes prevailing in the United States today, few were surprised when Sen. Margaret Chase Smith did not win the 1964 Republican presidential nomination after a pioneering try. It was highly revealing, however, when the second spot went to a man whose qualifications by any reasonable standard were inferior to hers.

Working women, civil rights experts, and a growing number of "contented" housewives believe sex discrimination is a serious national problem.

Some equate it with the Negro's drive for civil rights, and indeed women today stand legally about where the Negro stood in 1940.

Rep. Florence Dwyer is taking that message directly to the President of the United States. She is urging him to name a White House adviser charged with making better use of the abilities of the nation's women or to set up an independent agency to strengthen women's rights and opportunities.

The New Jersey lawmaker, who is a ranking Republican on the House government operations committee, is no professional feminist. Her initiative comes at a time, however, when the Nixon Administration is under fire for shutting women out of a top policy role.

"The economic, social and legal discriminations against women and girls," Mrs. Dwyer wrote the President, "continue to weaken our social structure and distort our system of moral principles."

To men, the yakking about feminine "equality"—some of it strident—is mystifying, irksome, and sometimes funny.

Don't women have the vote? they ask.

Aren't big corporations and government clamoring for secretaries?

Women are driving taxis, they'll tell you. They're delivering mail. They're plumbers and, yes, even wrestlers. With a skilled labor shortage developing, just look at those openings for women in mathematics, pharmacy, accounting, optometry.

Nowadays a woman can enjoy a home, husband, kids and a job, providing she keeps up with the housework.

In short, those who don't realize the American woman is emancipated are blind.

"Are you kidding? We might as well be in a ghetto!" snapped Rep. Martha W. Griffiths, (Dem.), Michigan, wife, lawyer, former judge, and eight-term Congresswoman.

In recent years, as more women have taken jobs and engaged in direct economic competition with men, a quiet revolution has been occurring.

No one denies the fair sex has made progress, but it is also difficult to deny they are cut off from the leadership role to which their education, training, and numbers appear to entitle them.

As a result, the revolution, boiling from campus to executive suite, is becoming not-so-quiet. Women are increasingly outspoken on what they see as their second-class status.

Like Negroes, they are calling for a piece of the action.

A revealing glimpse of how their aspirations are regarded at the highest level was offered recently by President Nixon himself.

Replying to a question on Negroes at a news conference he spoke eloquently and at length, leaving no doubt he is deeply concerned and working hard to improve his relations with them.

To a query on women a few minutes later, his rejoinder was brief and accompanied by indulgent male laughter. The President, it was apparent, hadn't troubled to do homework on this one.

Women represent half the population and a majority of the voters. Yet it had not occurred to the President that he might be cheating the ladies by including only three of them when some 200 top jobs were handed out.

He promised to "correct the imbalance very promptly."

To do that he would have to issue firm instructions to his cabinet and top-level aides, a step which apparently has not been taken.

The first division chief to be dropped by Nixon's Interior Secretary Walter Hickel was a woman, attorney Ruth G. Van Cleve, whose administration of the Office of Territories won her a federal award.

While a flurry of Presidential distaff appointments can now be expected in an effort to offset the negative publicity, the most important test of leadership will come on follow-through.

Unless the President exerts sustained pressure on business and government officials to equalize opportunities down through the ranks, where sex bias often occurs, there will be no steady upward flow of female executive talent. The naming of a few showcase women will be mere "tokenism."

"I have been discriminated against far more because I am a female than because I am black," said New York Rep. Shirley Chisholm, first Negro woman to be elected to the U.S. Congress.

"They said I wasn't qualified because the clients wouldn't accept a woman," said a bitter losing contender for a job as account executive in an advertising agency. "Can you imagine what would happen if they said that to a Negro?"

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 18, 1969]

Is Woman's Place at Home? She Wants a Free Choice Between Family and Chance for Success in Outside World—II

(By Vera Glaser)

(Note.—The American woman's push for a bigger role in business, the professions, and public life stirs reactions in both sexes which tend toward emotion rather than logic. It challenges deeply held religious concepts. It exposes the pervasive use of sex in America to limit the individual's life.)

Washington.—Tests of brain power, judgment and emotional stability show women to be the equals of men in everything except brute strength. Women live longer, spend less time in the hospital.

"Many women surpass in ability the average president or justice," writes Goodwin Watson, professor of social psychology at Columbia University, "but it will be many decades before a woman becomes President of the United States or Chief Justice of the Supreme Court."

Meanwhile India is led by a woman prime minister, Indira Gandhi, and Golda Meir has been chosen prime minister of Israel. A woman sits on Denmark's Supreme Court.

The rise of several new women's rights organizations in the U.S. and the tone of their offensive testifies that the ladies are increasingly resentful of what they view as outright discrimination.

Women are not working for fun, they point out, but in many cases for economic necessity. They resent being cut off from the top dollar. Of 27 million women workers, one-third of the nation's employed force, 5 million are the primary support of families and 3.5 million are supplementing their husbands' substandard wages.

Despite a law requiring equal pay for equal work, the sexual salary gap is widening. Most women are boxed into jobs that are dull or ill-paid. The most interesting and rewarding positions are tagged "men only."

Women are less welcome in graduate schools, often vetoed for professorships. Sixty percent of elementary school and ninety percent of high school principals are men.

Only six per cent of U.S. physicians are women compared to 75 per cent in the Soviet Union. Only four per cent of U.S. lawyers and judges are women, eight percent of the scientists, nine per cent of professors, one per cent of the engineers.

The number of women in the U.S. Congress is dwindling, having dropped from a peak of 18 in 1960 to 11 in 1969, less than two per cent of the membership. Sweden has 12 per cent, Norway 10, Ghana nine, and India seven.

The American male, by and large, does not give women the same break he gives men in business, the professions and public life.

Many unions and employees do not accept women for apprenticeships or managerial training, thus cutting them off from promotions.

Women are short-changed on social security and civil service retirement benefits, according to testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee.

"The most tragic and senseless waste on this century," was the way President Lyndon Johnson described the under-utilization of the American female.

He made a showcase effort to place them in top federal jobs but there was little if any follow-through.

"A Nixon Administration will not be as blind to the contribution women can make to the the leadership of this nation," the candidate promised last October.

The ladies are waiting.

That many women prefer a housewifely role, even the militants admit. But those who don't, they contend, are entitled to a free choice in the market place, including access to education and jobs based on merit, not sex.

The American woman's push for a bigger role in business, the professions, and public life stirs reactions in both sexes which tend toward emotion rather than logic. It challenges deeply held religious concepts. It exposes the pervasive use of sex in America to limit the individual's life.

Whatever logic supports the concept of "equality" for women, however, often crumbles before a single thrust:

"You can't escape biology. Women have the babies. Their first duty is to tend them. There's no way around it."

For the woman who accepts that role, there is no problem. Many indeed seem to glory in it.

For the others, the dilemma can be excruciating. Without denying the deep satisfactions of home and child, many women seek something more, are capable of more, but find themselves trapped, prevented from marketing college degrees or skills by lack of household help or disapproving attitudes.

Society dictates that rearing children is the woman's unique responsibility. Some view this as women's natural role. Others term it discrimination.

Questioning it is not popular in a society where male sexuality constantly feels threatened by so-called emasculating females, but it will have to be dealt with.

David Dietch, a financial reporter, writes that the Swedish national income could be 25 per cent higher if women's labor potential were fully utilized. The standard of living in France would rise 35 per cent if women were as professionally active as men.

Just as Negroes were for years stymied as janitors or domestics, society rules that woman's place is in the home. From the earliest glimmerings of her intelligence, a girl's motivation for a career is sabotaged. The effect of centuries of conditioning makes women, like Negroes, doubt their own capacity to achieve in a competitive society.

Although the housewife is constantly told her job is as important as anyone's, where are the professional men or women willing to trade with her? If she tends to feel inferior or sensitive to the term "housewife," who can blame her?

Twenty years after graduation a survey showed 90 percent of college women troubled by a sense of disappointment, frustration and futility.

The view that women ought to be economically supported by marriage, described by some as "the traditional prize offered in exchange for female subjugation," is coming under challenge.

Tolerance is developing for the concept that is care and support of children are joint responsibilities.

Support is growing for the repeal of legal bans on abortion, which would give women a free choice in child-bearing.

Whether it is advisable to go as far as the Soviet Union is questioned. There the rearing of the young is almost entirely trusted to professionals. Divorces are easy and abortions legal. The system has drawn charges that it is causing families as such to "wither away."

What is needed in the United States, femininists says, is acceptance of the view that the married woman cannot reasonably be expected to reach male career status if she must also be house cleaner and full-time child rearer, and that scarcity of well-run child-care facilities is the main factor imprisoning women in the home.

Nobody, neither men or women, really wants to do the bulk of what constitutes "woman's work," according to psychologist Sylvia Hartman. She categorizes much of it as boring and not valued by society.

Although men's work can be equally dull, as women learn when they undertake it, society values it, which makes a difference.

Until women are given a real choice—unpressured by men—between home and outside world, no one will really know how many prefer the hearth or how many are forced into it by social mores.

Today the average woman's life expectancy is almost 74 years. About half of today's women are married by 21 and have their last child by 30, leaving three decades of active life ahead.

As physical attractiveness fades, prevailing standards tag the mature woman as hasbeen. Facing up to this is often her first impetus toward some outside activity.

As she seeks satisfying outlets for her brains and energy, she then confronts another reality. There are limits to where her ability can carry her in the male-dominated outside world.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 19, 1969]

With Liberty and Justice for All—Law Continues To Discriminate Against Women of America Despite Orders and Decisions—III

(By Vera Glaser)

Washington.—Shocking and unfair as it may seem, the Supreme Court has never accorded women the protection of the 14th amendment.

"What we need," said Rep. Martha Griffiths, (Dem.), Michigan, "is for a Justice to look at a case involving a woman just once and say this is a human being, that the equal protection clause applies."

She urges working women to organize and finance legal prosecution of sex discrimination cases, taking them to the Supreme Court, as did the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in pursuing landmark racial decisions.

Men tend to laugh off suggestions that the ladies are not equal. They cite four recent laws and two Presidential orders, all designed to ban discrimination against women.

In 1963 Congress passed the equal pay for equal work law.

Yet the median annual salary for men ($7,200) is almost twice that for women ($4,200) and the gap is widening.

The average woman college graduate can expect to earn less than a man with a grade school education.

In 1964 the civil rights law prohibited discrimination based on sex (as well as on race, religion and nationality). It set up the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to handle complaints.

Although thousands of sex complaints poured in, EEOC's lack of enforcement powers placed the real follow-through in the lap of the Justice Department. So far it has refused to bring a class sex bias suit, although many have been initiated on behalf of Negroes.

A 1967 law permits women in the military to rise to the rank of admiral and general.

The male hierarchy has yet to name one.

A 1966 law bans bias because of age, but women in their 40's and 50's still get the brush.

The Nixon Administration itself violated the law's intent by announcing, through Assistant HEW Secretary Patricia Hitt, that high-ranking federal jobs would be filled by women between 25 and 35. Apparently realizing it had flubbed, a story was put out the following day expanding the age limit to 50, although this too violates the law.

By executive orders President John Kennedy created the Commission on the Status of Women and President Lyndon Johnson banned sex bias in federal hiring and promotions and in firms doing business with the government.

The government itself appears to be ignoring the orders.

"Widespread negative attitudes of men" were blamed in 1967 study for the fact that only two pct. of federal woman employees occupy the higher positions although the bureaucracy is one-third female.

Whether the government will cancel a contract because of sex bias remains to be seen. Racial bias by federal contractors was countenanced lòng after it was outlawed by executive order and only recently have offenders been slapped on the wrist.

In the area of equal access to education, an important case is now before the New York Supreme Court. Alice de Riviera's mathematical brilliance placed her in the 99th percentile in a city-wide competition, but the nearest coed high school with a top-caliber math department is a three-hour round trip by subway from her home.

Viewing the journey as dangerous for a 13-year-old, her parents are trying to enter Alice at Stuyvesant High, an all boy school with comparable math instruction which is more conveniently located.

Ironically, the head of the New York City Board of Education defending the exclusion of girls from Stuyvesant is John Doar, former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Justice Department's civil rights division.

Doar personally enforced the legal right, secured under the 14th amendment, of Negro James Meredith to enter the University of Mississippi.

Major roadblocks to legal equality for women are state laws, originally passed as "protective," but now serving to bar women from jobs and advancement.

Some limit the number of hours women can work, cutting them off from management training and supervisory positions.

Others set a limit on the weight (usually 35 pounds) a woman may lift on the job.

World War II proved women could hold their own in such physically taxing jobs as operating lift trucks in longshore industries and working on factory production lines. Physical limitations, feminists say, should depend on the individual's capabilities rather than sex.

Women still do not have equal property rights in many states, nor the right to custody of their children.

Last year a Connecticut woman convicted of disorderly conduct and resisting arrest was sentenced to three years imprisonment. Had she been a man, her sentence would not have exceeded one year.

When a legal aid association took the case, the federal district court ruled the statute under which she was sentenced invalid. Sixteen other women were released at the time, all having served more than maximum for a man.

Similar discriminatory sentences against women have been handed down in the courts of Pennsylvania and Maine. Although the Connecticut and Pennsylvania laws were struck down by lower courts, they have not been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court and such practices may exist in other states.

A single Supreme Court decision could nullify state laws perpetuating the inequities, but over the years it has been impossible to achieve.

In 1924 the high Court upheld a New York law prohibiting employment of women in restaurants in some cities after 10 p.m. under the guise of "protecting" them. It excepted cigarette and flower girls, ladies' rest room attendants, hotel elevator operators, and charwomen—obviously less lucrative jobs or those which men did not want.

In 1958 and 1960 the High Court upheld exclusion of women from Texas A. and M., a state college.

Another possible way to nullify discriminatory state laws is the equal rights amendment, which women's groups have tried for years to push through Congress. It would amend the U.S. Constitution to read, "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex."

The amendment was endorsed by Presidents John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, and Richard Nixon, but has had tough sledding.

It has been reintroduced in the 91st Congress. Should it pass, ratification by the states could take years. Those with discriminatory sex laws may resist.

Some legal experts prefer the alternative of carrying suits against the discrimination up to the Supreme Court, a course requiring time and money. There are enough working women to finance it if they mobilize.

A decision like Brown vs. Board of Education, by which the Supreme Court in 1954 banned school segregation in the states, would give women a solid legal foundation on which to fight sex bias.

A case which may become such a landmark is Weeks vs. Southern Bell, in which the Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans recently ruled in favor of a woman applying for the job of switchman for which she had seniority. She had been turned down because of a state weight-lifting regulation. The lower court held that was justified, but in the recent decision the Appeals Court ruled the employer has the burden of proving all or practically all women could not perform the duties of the job. If Southern Bell takes the case to the Supreme Court, the decision will have national repercussions.

Attorney Marguerite Rawalt, former head of the National Association of Women Lawyers, has been active in many such cases. Miss Rawalt helped found a fund to recruit other women lawyers to fight court battles for women's rights.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 20, 1969]

WILL WOMEN SHOW THEIR MUSCLE TO GAIN GOAL OF EQUAL RIGHTS?—IV

(By Vera Glaser)

WASHINGTON.—Some astute men are saying that the push for women's rights may contain the seeds of violence.

"When women stop cooking and start demonstrating, it will be a lot worse than Detroit and Newark," warned Norbert Rayford, a member of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders.

"It is an open secret that some women are looking for an effective and dramatic method to protest discrimination," wrote Lt. Col. Stephen Harrison in a graduate thesis on women as an untapped management resource.

His view is underscored by a professional woman who said, "All we need is an incident like the Montgomery bus boycott and a charismatic leader. We are sick and tired of watching men, some with less ability, move up ahead of us."

Should disorder occur, it seems likely it would be triggered by blue-collar women in labor unions who now number 3.5 million and who are bringing most of the court cases on sex bias under Title VII of the civil rights act. This group understands collective action, has often walked picket lines.

One reason the extent of the ferment is not more widely realized is that many men—and the mass media which is dominated by men—are unaware of it, unsympathetic to it, or refuse to admit it exists.

Five new militant women's groups have sprung up in recent years. Some older organizations have stepped up their efforts to storm new legal beachheads.

Newswise, however, they are not accorded the status of the racial push, although women involve a larger segment of the population. Most women's rights stories draw a "ho-hum" from editors and are buried in back pages.

The difference may lie in the fact that the Negro drive has been accompanied by violence and thus far the women's effort has not.

In the forefront of the fight is the National Organization for Women (NOW), a militant and vocal group headed by Betty Friedan, author of "The Feminine Mystique."

Formed three years ago, NOW has grown to 2,500 members, including 125 men. It maintains a Washington headquarters at 1424 Sixteenth st., N.W., (zip 20036). Dr. Cathryn Clarenbach, NOW's chairman of the board, keeps the ball rolling in the Middle West where she serves on the faculty of the University of Wisconsin at Madison (zip 53706).

Now is urging a vastly expanded network of child-care centers, supported partly by federal money, to let more women work outside the home or continue their education.

It wants full income-tax deduction for child-care costs for working parents, equal access of women to poverty programs, and an end to the exclusion of women from certain public restaurants.

A more select and conservative group is the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL), headed by Elizabeth Boyer, 7657 Dines rd., Novelty, Ohio (44072).

WEAL's membership includes deans of women, college professors, attorneys, judges, writers and business executives. They plan to concentrate on employment and higher education aspects of sex bias.

WEAL plans also to tabulate and distribute Congressional voting records on issues of concern to women.

Over the years the National Women's Party has lobbied actively for the equal rights amendment, as has the National Association of Women Lawyers under President Ruth Gentry Talley and the National Federation of Business and Professional Women under President Hope Roberts.

Mrs. Talley works out of the American Bar Center at 1155 East 60 st., Chicago, Ill., (60637), and Mrs. Roberts from the Federation's headquarters at 2012 Massachusetts ave., NW., Washington, D.C. (20036).

Three other radical groups, on which information is scanty, are operating in and around university campuses. They bear a resemblance to the Students for a Democratic Society which has played a key role in fomenting campus unrest.

These are the Radical Women (mostly white college women), Women's Liberation Movement (mostly white and young), the October 17 Movement (an offshoot of NOW's New York Chapter and which is roughly half white and half Negro).

Women's Liberation Movement picketed the crowning of Miss America in Atlantic City recently, protesting that it was a "degrading, mindless-boob-girlie symbol."

Despite the combined efforts of these groups, the nation as a whole has been slow to recognize that prejudice against women is as costly and demeaning as racial bias.

Should women decide to use their political clout, they could move mountains, but the women's vote has not yet become a cohesive national force.

On paper women voters could clobber the men whom they outnumber by four million. In the big "swing" states of New York, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Ohio, with a total of 119 electoral votes, the distaff majority of 1.2 million could easily sweep a national candidate to victory.

Generally, however, women have been

namby-pamby about standing up for their rights. Many are hostile to women political candidates. They are suspicious of the concept of equality, a view often rooted in religious beliefs.

Until women themselves mobilize more effectively, the climb toward "equality" will be painfully slow.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 21, 1969]

WHAT DO WOMEN REALLY WANT?

(By Vera Glaser)

WASHINGTON.—Should things be so equal between men and women that love songs and romantic poetry are rendered obsolete? Should a man no longer be able to invite a lady to dinner and expect to pick up the tab?

The answer from most realistic, red-blooded women is a resounding "No!"

Only the most militant call for an out-and-out egalitarian society. Most women recognize that a job is not life's only fulfillment, and may find their deepest satisfactions in home-oriented activities.

The majority recognize that sex prejudice, like racial and religious bias, may never be entirely wiped out.

If put to a vote, the kind of society they prefer might well be similar to the present one, but with the more obvious injustices and discriminations removed.

It is their hope that once men realize what they are doing to stifle women, they will take a more fair-minded stance. Society, they hope, will smile rather than frown on freedom of choice for all of its members, including women.

A prominent woman leader, married and the mother of two, was asked what the fair sex lacks specifically in the way of "equality."

She produced a four-page, typewritten, single-spaced roster of reforms on which she felt reasonable people could agree. Condensed, it called for action on five major fronts:

1. Equal protection under the law.
2. Equal job opportunities and pregnancy leave.
3. An expanded system of day care centers for children.
4. Legalized abortion.
5. A poverty program that does not discriminate against women.

On the legal front, current laws and practices which make distinctions against women were a special target. Any of the following, she pointed out, would be unconstitutional if race were the criterion:

Enforcing higher college admission standards for girls, discouraging or placing quotas on women seeking admission to law and medical schools, permitting publicly supported high schools and colleges to admit only one sex;

State laws banning women from certain jobs, restricting their hours or the weights they may lift on a job;

Heavier court sentences for women than men for the same offenses.

The Justice Department, she urged, should participate in cases involving sex bias in the same manner it has pursued on racial bias.

Marital property laws, she is convinced, are due for overhaul. They should be identical for both partners.

For example, husband and wife should assume joint liability for the support of the household and children in money or services, and for the personal expenses of a partner who is unable to work.

State laws which permit a husband to leave his wife a tiny fragment of his property, and in some cases nothing, or where wives lack the same legal powers as their spouses, should be revised.

On the job front, the federal government should vigorously enforce equal pay for equal work laws. It should upgrade salaries for such "women's" occupations as clerical, nursing, and teaching.

It should name women to top federal positions in recognition of their abilities and as an incentive to young girls. It should set an example in opening up promotion opportunities to women up and down the line.

Pregnancy leave should be granted in the same way as that for other temporary disabilities.

A system of efficiently-run day care centers, partly financed by the government should be established as a service to the family and the nation, not as a sop for women.

On the poverty front, the program should give as much attention to the needs of deprived girls as boys. It should recognize that a third of all poor families are headed by women.

Women should be accepted into military service under the same standards as men.

To some, her proposals may seem as far out today as space travel seemed 10 years ago.

But the pressures of a competitive world are building, and the United States may have to reassess some attitudes to properly capitalize on all of its human resources.

On an individual level, the woman who is treated with fairness and dignity by a man will have only more—not less—respect for him as a man. As in all areas of prejudice, it has been demonstrated that a feeling of equality lifts everybody up. It pulls no one down.

PEACE IN VIETNAM

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, it has now been a year since President Johnson announced the curtailment of bombing in Vietnam and the move toward negotiations of the conflict in Southeast Asia.

I know we are all deeply disappointed that, despite the diligent efforts of top officials of two national administrations, peace has so far eluded us.

But I believe that now is a most appropriate time to reemphasize and reinvigorate our search for a workable basis for achieving our goal of a just peace in Vietnam.

Certainly, the cause of peace in Southeast Asia is one in which every American has an intense, personal interest.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I share with all my colleagues in the House an urgent desire that we find equitable terms on which to build an enduring peace with freedom in that war-torn part of the world.

In recent weeks, there have been indications, both in Vietnam and at the Paris negotiations, that hopefully foreshadow a greater degree of diplomatic flexibility on both sides, as well as improved prospects for conducting meaningful discussion to end that tragic conflict through an agreed settlement which would preserve the honor of the United States, protect our vital interests, while allowing the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of their own nation in their own way.

We should be quick to seize these opportunities as a possible turning point in the movement toward a just and lasting peace in Vietnam.

Then, we can join with the other members of the world community of nations in working with the people of a Southeast Asia—no longer ravaged by the terrible scourge of war—to turn the tremendous resources and energies of the entire area, once and for all, away from conflict, and toward the creative task of building a more secure foundation for a better way of life in the future.

BIRMINGHAM FESTIVAL OF ARTS

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, each year the city of Birmingham, Ala., which it is my privilege to represent in the Congress, honors a nation during its annual festival of arts. This spring Italy was the honored nation in the planned activities from February 20 through March 30. The calendar of events included ballets, plays, concerts, Italian art exhibits, opera, and the international fair.

Congratulations are in order to this year's festival chairman, Mrs. Alan B. Drennen, and the festival of arts president, Sidney Smyer, Jr. Their tireless efforts resulted in one of Birmingham's finest festivals to date.

As the Birmingham magazine, the monthly publication of the chamber of commerce, stated in its festival issue, the true climate of a city is much more than its temperature and humidity, its sunshine and rainfall.

There is the climate of the mind, of the spirit, of the energy, and of the imagination. The truest climate of a city is measured through its people.

Because of the involvement of its people, Birmingham is celebrating this spring a festival of arts known around the world.

To it, people give their time; hundreds of hours.

To it, people give their money; thousands of dollars.

For it, they create.

For it, they labor.

In it, they participate; the fullest measure of their interest. More than 200,000 people enjoyed the 1969 Festival of Arts' Salute to Italy and The Healing Arts, browsing among the citywide art exhibitions, applauded the dozens of plays and concerts, viewed the television features, lunched at the downtown sidewalk cafes, toured the spectacular International Fair, heard noted authors.

For 18 years, Birmingham has dedicated America's oldest continuous arts festival to the conviction that through the unity of the arts, nations and men can become united.

From without, in 1968, the festival honoring Greece received a letter of endorsement from Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey. The resulting story was transmitted worldwide by the U.S. Information Agency.

This year the Vatican made Birmingham its first loan of art objects since sending The Pieta to the New York

World's Fair. The letter of notification stated:

> The Holy Father is happy to be able to contribute in this small way, hoping that this will be a practical acknowledgment of the Italian Catholic community's cultural and religious contribution to the development of Alabama.

From within, the festival has stimulated unity between Birminghamians of foreign descent and native citizens. It embraces all local arts groups, focusing their talents on a singular subject.

This year the festival was chosen one of 20 top travel events in America for March by the National Association of Travel Organizations in Washington, D.C.

Its growth has been a continuing quality, with setbacks, and some years better than others. But of one fact all Birmingham people can be certain in 1969 upon the opening the Salute to Italy and The Healing Arts.

Because of what they have wanted to do for it, because they would settle for no less, their Festival of Arts has attained true world eminence.

As for the performing arts—which is what Birmingham's Festival of Arts is all about—one could not but be impressed with what was produced, heard, and seen between March 14 and March 30 throughout the city.

The first performance of "Romeo and Juliet," by an American ballet company, opened the festival on Friday night, March 14, danced by the Alabama Ballet Company of the University of Alabama. Alexander Bennett, former principal dancer of the Royal Ballet, taught the Royal Ballet choreography of the classic love story.

At the other end of the spectrum, the foremost Italian portrait sculptor in the world, Gualberto Rocchi, completed a bust of the Honorable Lister Hill, immediate past senior Senator from Alabama. The bronze sculpture was dedicated on March 30 in Birmingham's Medical Center, completing the festival's double salute, to Italy and the healing arts.

In between were more than 50 Italian-related performances.

Three operas of the contemporary Italian composer, Gian-Carlo Menotti, were festival presentations. His three-act composition, "The Consul," which was awarded "best musical drama of the year" by the New York Drama Critics Circle, was performed by the Birmingham Civic Opera Association at Clarke Memorial Theater, March 28–29. Two one-act Menotti operas, "The Telephone" and "The Old Maid and the Thief" were productions of the Samford University Speech and Drama Department March 21–22 and 24–25 at the campus Arena Theater.

Music from the Italian opera, "La Gioconda," was played by Allegro Music Club on March 25 at the Birmingham Museum of Art. The concert was planned around the most famous music from the work, the ballet, "Dance of the Hours." Other composers honored on the program were Scarlatti, Dello Joio, and D'Agostino.

In recognition of Italian church music, Palestrina's "Mass of Pope Marcellus" was sung by the choir of Independent Presbyterian Church, directed by Joseph Schreiber, on March 30. In contrast to Palestrina's composition, written in 1562, an all-English contemporary mass, the "Festival Mass of William Marsh," was a highlight of the Pontifical Mass on March 23 at St. Paul's Co-Cathedral. Guest organist was Michael G. Baird III of the University of Alabama. Dr. Patrick Moultis directed the choir.

A "Salute to Italy" by the Birmingham Creative Dance Group featured five dances, including "The Red Dancing Slippers," a ballet for children from an Italian story, and "Homage to Italy." Both dances were choreographed by Laura Toffel, director of the creative dancers. The performance was March 23 at 3 p.m. at the new theater at Birmingham-Southern College.

The Festival's two principal stage productions were as far removed from each other in tempo and mood as Venice and Sicily. One, "The Menaechmi," is a belly-laughter. The other, "Six Characters in Search of An Author," is probing and philosophical.

Samford University Players gave four performances, March 14–15 and 17–18, in the campus Arena Theater.

A Festival of contemporary Italian film was the offering of the Junior League of Birmingham, March 24, 25, 26 at the League building, 2212 20th Avenue South. Those selected were "Casanova 70," Ponti, director; "Red Desert," Antonioni; and "Juliet of the Spirits," Fellini.

Birmingham television celebrates the Festival, too. WBRC–TV presented a half-hour special on the events and personalities as did WBIQ–TV, educational television.

Listed below is a calendar of activities during this year's Festival:

PRE-FESTIVAL EVENTS

Thursday, February 20

Cinema Unlimited presents "Tosca" starring Franco Corelli in color, Alabama Theater, Matinee and evening.

Friday, March 7

8:30 p.m. Ballet Festival, Italia, Birmingham-Southern College—Birmingham Civic Ballet Ensemble.

Saturday, March 8

3 p.m. Ballet Festival, Italia. Birmingham-Southern College.

8:30 p.m. Ballet Festival Italia. Birmingham-Southern College Theater.

Sunday, March 9

3 p.m. Ballet Festival, Italia. Birmingham-Southern College Theater.

FESTIVAL EVENTS

Friday, March 14

8 p.m. University of Alabama in Birmingham presents Alabama Ballet Company in "Romeo and Juliet." Shades Valley High School.

8 p.m. Samford University Drama Department presents "Six Characters in Search of an Author." Samford University Arena Theater.

10:30 p.m. Reception following performance of "Romeo and Juliet", Shades Valley High School, honoring "Miss America," Judith Ann Ford of Illinois.

Saturday, March 15

Noon. Books and Authors Luncheon. Tutwiler Hotel. Three national authors.

8 p.m. "Romeo and Juliet." Alabama Ballet Company. Presented by the University of Alabama in Birmingham.

8 p.m. "Six Characters in Search of an Author." Samford University Arena Theater.

8:30 p.m. "Fiddler on the Roof," starring Joe Cusanelli, Municipal Auditorium. Benefit performance sponsored by Council of Jewish Women.

Sunday, March 16

3 p.m. Ballet Festival, Italia. Birmingham-Southern College Theater.

3 p.m. Art exhibit. Birmingham University School Town Hall Gallery. (x)

3 p.m. Connoisseur Concerts, "Musical Italy Revisited," Birmingham Museum of Art. (x)

Monday, March 17

8 p.m. "Six Characters in Search of an Author," Samford University, Arena Theater.

Tuesday, March 18

8 p.m. Birmingham Symphony Orchestra. Hans Richter-Haaser, pianist. Temple Theater.

8 p.m. "Six Characters in Search of an Author." Samford University Arena Theater.

Wednesday, March 19

8 p.m. University of Alabama in Birmingham presents Town and Gown Play, "The Menaechmi" Clark Memorial Theater.

10 p.m. Town and Gown Reception honoring Festival of Arts.

Thursday, March 20

8 p.m. "The Menaechmi" repeat performance. Clark Memorial Theater.

8 p.m. ETV program. "Salute to Italy." 30 minutes. All ETV channels.

Friday, March 21

1 p.m. to 10 p.m. International Fair Opens Municipal Auditorium. Opening ceremony by Mayor George Seibels at 1 p.m.

8 p.m. Birmingham Symphony Orchestra. Temple Theater.

8 p.m. "The Old Maid and the Thief" and "The Telephone." Samford University drama department opera production at campus Arena Theater.

8 p.m. "The Menaechmi" Clark Theater.

Saturday, March 22

10 a.m.-10 p.m. International Fair.

10 a.m.-5 p.m. Studio Art Tours. (x)

6:30 p.m. Birmingham Area Chamber of Commerce and Ambassador's Reception at Art Museum. Dinner and fashion show at Birmingham Municipal Auditorium and exhibition hall honoring Italian Ambassador to U.S., His Excellency, Egidio Ortona.

6:30 a.m. "Salute to Italy." Channel 6.

8 p.m. Patrons Artists Council, east. (PACE) art exhibit. Roebuck Community Center. March 20–22. (x) "The Menaechmi." Clark Theater.

Sunday, March 23

1 p.m.-10 p.m. International Fair.

10:30 a.m. Liturgical Service of the Mass. St. Paul's Co-Cathedral, Third Avenue and 22nd Street North.

1 p.m.-5 p.m. Studio Art Tours. (x)

3 p.m. "The Red Dancing Slippers." Birmingham Creative Dance Group. Birmingham-Southern College Theater.

Monday, March 24

10 a.m.-10 p.m. International Fair. Municipal Auditorium.

8 p.m. "The Old Maid and the Thief" and "The Telephone." Samford University drama department operas. Arena Theater.

8 p.m. "Italian Film Festival." Presented by Junior League of Birmingham at Junior League Building. 2212 20th Ave. South. (x)

Tuesday, March 25

10 a.m.-10 p.m. International Fair. Municipal Auditorium.

2:30 p.m.-4:30 p.m. "Italian Music." Allegro Music Club, Birmingham Museum of Art. (x)

8 p.m. "The Old Maid and the Thief" and "The Telephone." Samford University Drama department operas. Arena Theater.

8 p.m. Italian Film Festival. Junior League Building, 2212 20th Ave. South. (x)

Wednesday, March 26

10 a.m.-6 p.m. International Fair.

8 p.m. Italian Film Festival. Junior League Building. 2212 20th Ave. South. "An Attitude and Media." (x)

Thursday, March 27

8 p.m. ETV. "Salute to Italy."

Friday, March 28

8 p.m. Birmingham Civic Opera, "The Consul," with Birmingham Symphony Orchestra. Clark Memorial Theater.

Saturday, March 29

6:30 a.m. "Salute to Italy." Channel 6

7 p.m. Italian Film Festival, "An Attitude and Media." Junior League Building, 2212 20th Ave. South. (x)

7:30 p.m. Architects Ball. Birmingham chapter, American Institute of Architects. Roma Country Club.

8 p.m. "The Consul." With Birmingham Symphony Orchestra. Clark Memorial Theater.

Sunday, March 30

4 p.m. Pope Marcellus Mass. Giovanni Palestrina. Independent Presbyterian Church. (x)

7 p.m. Italian Film Festival. "An Attitude and Media." Junior League Building, 2212 20th Ave. South.

ART EXHIBITS

Saturday, March 1

Birmingham-Southern College. From Marlborough Gallery, N.Y., and Fonino Galeria, N.Y., Paintings and Sculpture.

March 14–30

Birmingham Museum of Art. "The Pope's Tiara" and the Garibaldi relics. From Findlay Galleries.

Samford University Buchanan Gallery. Hammer Gallery, N.Y.

March 17–30

Birmingham Public Library, Rare book exhibit. The Salvadore Dali Bible.

The Festival of Art Honor exhibitor.

Children's Department, Winners of elementary city art.

March 16–30

Town Hall Gallery, Birmingham University School. Crescenzi Gallery. Paintings.

March 20–22

Patrons Artists Council, East, (PACE) art exhibit. Roebuck Community Center.

10 a.m.–5 p.m. Studio Art Tours.

March 21–26

International Fair. Municipal Auditorium.

Birmingham School Exhibit.

Italian Reproductions from Doges Palace, Venice.

March 22–29

Parochial Schools "Spring Art and Music Festival" at Eastwood Mall and Five Points West shopping center.

March 14–30

Exchange Security Bank.

Gallery 31.

Littlehous-on-Linden.

West End Baptist Hospital.

Henderson's Fine Arts Downtown and Mountain Brook.

Indurall Decorating, 2223 Seventh Ave. South.

Relay House. Exhibit of Ray Ellis, New York water colorist.

Miles College, Paintings and other art.

PACE, Patrons, Artists Council, East. Roebuck Community Center.

"The Club." Paintings.

Downtown Club. Paintings by Cornelia Rivers.

Municipal Auditorium Exhibition Hall Piranesi Prints.

Pizitz Department Store.

University of Alabama Medical Center. Bust of Lister Hill by Rocchi.

THREE MARYLANDERS DIE IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, 1st Sgt. Edward C. Cofield, Sp4c. David A. Russell, and M. Sgt. Willis F. House, three fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

THREE MARYLANDERS DEAD IN VIETNAM—ALL ARMY MEN, ONE HAD BEEN LISTED MISSING EARLIER

Two Maryland men were reported killed in action in Vietnam and a third, previously reported as missing, has been listed officially as dead, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Killed in action were:

Army 1st Sgt. Edward C. Cofield, 34, the husband of Mrs. Sylvia A. Cofield of Takoma Park, reported killed March 16.

Army Spec. 4 David A. Russell, 21, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard I. Russell, of St. Clement Shores, near Leonardtown, killed Monday by sniper fire near Can Tho.

Army M. Sgt. Willis F. House, the husband of Mrs. Elizabeth G. House, of 7509 East Furnace Branch road, in Glen Burnie, first reported missing March 13.

Sergeant Cofield, awarded the Bronze Star for valor in October, 1968, was killed in a surprise ambush by the Viet Cong outside his base, near Da Nang.

Born in North Carolina, he moved with his family to Washington when he was 13 and quit high school to join the Army.

Sergeant Cofield had been in Vietnam since June and was scheduled to return home June 7. He had been in the Army for 12 years.

According to his wife, he was a "devoted soldier and father, and died fighting for something he loved."

He had many friends who criticized the war in Vietnam as an unjust war, she said, but he always replied that he was fighting there "so you can voice your own opinions."

He had a daughter, Lynda, 14, and two sons, Victor, Charles, 5, and wanted both to follow in his footsteps, she said.

Specialist Russell, who was on a secret mission at the time of his death, was a photographer for the Army and had planned to go into commercial photography upon discharge.

He had been in Vietnam for nearly six months.

One of nine children, he graduated from Leonardtown High School and worked for the Naval Air Test Center at the Patuxent Naval Air Station.

According to his mother, he had planned to go to photographic school in San Francisco and then go into partnership with a friend.

He was stationed at Long Binh, in South Vietnam, but was on a mission taking motion pictures when fatally wounded.

Besides his parents, he is survived by five brothers, Richard I., Jr., Robert S., Donald G., Charles P., and Karl F.; and three sisters, Linda Marie, Agnus Cecilia and Carolyn Anne, all of Leonardtown.

EDITOR ASKS JOINT PROJECT BY BAR, PRESS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the very distinguished executive editor of the Chicago Tribune, Mr. Clayton Kirkpatrick, recently proposed that in an effort to improve the quality of justice, a project be undertaken jointly by the press and bar.

I believe that Mr. Kirkpatrick's proposal is deserving of the most serious consideration, and it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD today, an article which appeared recently in the Chicago Tribune outlining his suggestion, which I believe should be immediately attempted.

The Tribune article follows:

EDITOR ASKS JOINT PROJECT BY BAR, PRESS—STAND AGAINST NEWS RESTRICTION DEFENDED

A joint project by the press and bar to improve the quality of justice was proposed last night by Clayton Kirkpatrick, executive editor of The Tribune.

At the same time he proposed a moratorium on the debate which has lasted for five years between editors and lawyers over restrictions on press coverage of court proceedings in criminal cases.

Kirkpatrick, in an address before the quarter-annual dinner meeting of the Chicago Bar association, in its headquarters at 29 La Salle st. detailed his reasons for proposing both the joint project and the moratorium.

AWARDS ARE PRESENTED

At the meeting, the American Bar association's Gavel awards were presented to stations W-G-N and WGN–TV jointly and to Station WBBN–TV. These awards, previously announced, are for programs contributing to knowledge of the legal system. Receiving them were Ward L. Quaal, president of WGN Continental Broadcasting company, and Edward R. Kenefick, WBBN–TV vice president and general manager.

Kirkpatrick told the assembled lawyers that less than one per cent of those who pass thru courts on criminal charges in Cook county ever are mentioned in the news media.

Thus, he observed, the alleged prejudicial publicity involved in the "free press-fair trial" controversy "can never affect more than a tiny fraction of defendants in criminal cases."

MUST GET NEWS

Then he cited statistics to illustrate how much more important it is to the public in general that the quality of justice be improved.

Kirkpatrick referred to Chicago Crime commission reports showing 50,361 burglary, robbery, and murder offenses committed within Chicago last year, with 18,771 of these "cleared by arrest" by city police. He noted that numerous other robberies, burglaries, and murders were committed in suburban Cook county.

"Yet for the entire county of Cook only 1,825 indictments charging these offenses were returned by grand juries," Kirkpatrick continued. "The indictments named 2,690 persons as defendants. Of the 1,840 defendants to these charges tried in the Criminal courts only 728 were sentenced to the penitentiary."

MANY GET AWAY

From these figures, he noted that chances of committing burglary, robbery, and murder in Cook county and escaping jail are better than 50 to 1.

"I submit that this is a shocking indictment of our whole system of criminal investigation and prosecution," he said.

Kirkpatrick, also citing soaring national crime rates, said he thought his listeners would find in these and other available statistics "a far richer lode of defects in justice than in the few highly publicized cases which gave rise to the present tensions between the press and the bench and the bar."

He suggested that "some of the time, money, and talent" the legal profession has devoted to "restraining the press" be devoted to the proposed new project.

He added, "The need seems so compelling to me that I think the press would join you."

PRESS STAND DEFENDED

Kirkpatrick also defended at length opposition of the press to restrictions which have been imposed on news coverage of criminal proceedings with intent to assure fair trials.

He said some of these restrictions "have created ideal conditions for corruption, incompetence, and indifference among policemen, prosecutors, and judges."

"They put a muzzle on the watchdog which serves as the proxy observer for all citizens in the courts," he said. "This is a greater hazard to justice than so-called prejudicial publicity."

He said the goal of management of the nation's legal processes should be both a free press and a fair trial, rather than one or the other.

Kirkpatrick said there has been steady deemphasis by newspapers of crime news because studies have shown crime news is far down in reader preference.

"We don't cover crime for sensation and scandal but because it is a serious social problem," he said.

DON'T EXPAND NATIONAL

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, recently Senator BYRD, the senior Senator from Virginia, made some very pointed and timely comments in reference to the proposed expansion of Washington National Airport.

The remarks of Senator BYRD were commented on editorially by the Staunton (Va.) Leader. Because I think it is of considerable interest to all Members, therefore, I would like to include the editorial of Friday, March 21, of the Staunton, (Va.) Leader as follows:

DON'T EXPAND NATIONAL

Senator Harry F. Byrd Jr., D-Va., is undoubtedly right in his opposition to expansion of National Airport, which carries most of the air traffic in and out of Washington. It lies on the Virginia side of the Potomac and offers somewhat faster access to the capital than Dulles International Airport once the passenger is on the ground.

Dulles is also in Virginia. As Sen. Byrd said in a Senate speech, it "was built specifically to provide for the day when National became overcrowded, and it is clear that day has arrived."

It arrived some time ago, as many Stauntonians and others residing in the Upper Valley who fly out of Shenandoah Valley Airport to Washington have been saying.

Airline demands for expansion of National won some support last year. But as Sen. Byrd told his colleagues, architects can provide workable plans for expanding terminal facilities but "are powerless to create more air space, and that air space is alarmingly full". That it is, as any airline passenger with National as his destination, departure or transfer port could tell the government.

Why the big airlines have persisted in using National rather than Dulles has been a puzzle for some time. The Dulles facilities are thoroughly modern, the skies are not crowded, and neither are the runways or loading bays. Good highways and fast public transport have been provided. But refusal to make the shift from National has resulted in the handling there last year of 10 million passengers, although the rated capacity is four million.

Congress should not appropriate funds for expansion of National Airport, especially when huge public funds went into construction of Dulles to accommodate the increased traffic foreseen. There are grave risks to life in the crowded skies over National—a fact which, coupled with a turn-down by Congress, the expense and public dissatisfaction, should force airlines to restudy their traffic patterns and transfer a heavy volume of their business to Dulles.

SENATE—*Monday, April 14, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we thank Thee for the beauty of the world about us—for buds and blossoms, for verdant hills and lush meadows, for gentle rains, for the calm warmth of the sun and caressing breezes, for the star-lit night, for the lyric notes of the birds, and for all that combines in the symphony of nature to remind us of our origin in Thee. Create in us a character and spirit in harmony with the world about us that we may serve Thee in newness of life.

Bless this land, which Thou hast given us, with honorable industry, sound learning, pure manners, and true justice that we may be a united people who walk and work and witness to the glory of Thy higher kingdom.

For it is in Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 3, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 3, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 10, 1969, received a message in writing from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to appropriate committees.

(For nominations received on April 10, 1969, see the end of the proceedings of today, April 14, 1969.)

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on April 3, 1969, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Basil Rowland Duncan.

S. 586. An act for the relief of Ngyen Van Hue.

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to extend the time for the making of a final report by the Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

DOMESTIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-96)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the the President of the United States:

To the Congress of the United States:

As the Members of Congress know, I have had under consideration the question of whether to send to the Congress this year a message on the state of the Union. I have decided against doing so. However, to assist Congress in formulating its plans, I would like to indicate at this time some of the principal legislative proposals that I will be sending in the weeks immediately ahead, and to report on the development of Administration plans and priorities as they relate to domestic programs.

The first twelve weeks of the new Administration have been devoted intensively to the pursuit of peace abroad, and to the development of new structures and new programs for the pursuit of progress at home.

Peace has been the first priority. It concerns the future of civilization; and even in terms of our domestic needs themselves, what we are able to do will depend in large measure on the prospects for an early end to the war in Viet Nam.

At the same time, the first days of this Administration have afforded us a unique opportunity to study the nation's domestic problems in depth, and to overhaul and re-tool the complex machinery of the Executive Office.

A systematic review of domestic programs and policies has led to a series of recommendations which I will begin sending to Congress this week. Among those recommendations will be:

—An increase in Social Security benefits, to take account of the rise in living costs.

—New measures to combat organized crime, and to crack down on racketeers, narcotic traffickers and peddlers of obscenity.

—A program of tax credits, designed to provide new incentives for the enlistment of additional private resources in meeting our urgent social needs.

—A program to increase the effectiveness of our national drive for equal employment opportunity.

—A comprehensive reorganization of the Post Office Department.

—A program for the District of Columbia, including home rule and Congressional representation.

—A start on sharing the revenues of the Federal government, so that other levels of government where revenue increases lag behind will not be caught in a constant fiscal crisis.

—A far-reaching new program for development of our airways and airports, and our mass transit systems.

—A comprehensive labor and manpower program, including job training and placement, improvements in unemployment insurance and proposals to help guarantee the health and safety of workers.

—Reform of the tax structure. The burden of taxation is great enough without permitting the continuance of unfairness in the tax system. New legislation will be proposed to prevent several specific abuses this year, and plans will be set in motion for a comprehensive revision of our tax structure by 1970, the first since 1954.

The legislative proposals of the next few weeks are a beginning. They form part of a responsible approach to our goal of managing constructive change in America.

This is not law we seek in order to have it "on the books," but law that we need in action. It is designed, not to look appealing in the record, but to take effect in our lives.

It will be the goal of this Administration to propose only legislation that we know we can execute once it becomes law. We have deliberated long and hard on each of these measures, in order to be sure we could make it work. Merely making proposals takes only a typewriter; making workable proposals takes time. We have taken this time.

In other areas, where more time is needed, we will take more time. I urge the Congress to join with this Administration in this careful approach to the most fundamental issues confronting our country. Hasty action or a seeking after partisan advantage either by the Congress or Executive Branch can only be self-defeating and aggravate the very ills we seek to remedy.

For example, one area of deep concern to this Administration has to do with the most dependent constituency of all: the child under five. I have announced a commitment to the first five years of life as one of the basic pledges of this Administration. Head Start was one promising idea for bettering the environment and nutrition of young children; there also are many others. We have already begun enlarging the scope of our commitment in this vital field, including the establishment of an Office of Child Development within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We hope that this enlarging commitment will be accompanied by an enlarging of the base of knowledge on which we act. We are not beginning with "massive" programs that risk tripping over their own unreadiness. Rather, our proposals will include step-by-step plans, including careful projections of funding requirements. Equally important, though Federally supported, they will embrace a network of local programs that will enlist voluntary participation.

These legislative proposals are, of course, being prepared within the context of other Administration actions which bear on domestic program development.

On taking office, I could see that whether measured in terms of its ability to respond, to decide or to implement, the Executive Branch simply was not structured to meet the emerging needs of the 1970s. Therefore my first moves were organizational.

The National Security Council was revitalized. The Urban Affairs Council was created, so that the problems of our cities could be approached in the broader perspective they now require. A Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy was established, to bring greater coherence to the management of our nation's economic prosperity. The system of Federal regional offices was reorganized so that for the first time, related agencies will have common regional headquarters and common regional boundaries. An Office of Inter-governmental Relations was set up, to smooth the coordination of Federal, State and local efforts.

In specific operational areas, we removed postmasterships from politics, started an overhaul of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its programs, and streamlined the administration of the various manpower programs.

One purpose of this early emphasis on organizational activity was to get the decision-making process in order before moving to the major decisions.

At the same time, I sent more than 100 directives to the heads of the various departments and agencies, asking their carefully considered recommendations on a wide range of domestic policy issues. The budget was submitted to an intensive review, and throughout the Administration we addressed ourselves to the critical question of priorities.

One priority that has emerged clearly and compellingly is that we must put a halt, swiftly, to the ruinous rise of inflationary pressures. The present inflationary surge, already in its fourth year, represents a national self-indulgence we cannot afford any longer. Unless we save the dollar, we will have nothing left with which to save our cities—or anything else. I have already outlined certain steps that will be required:

—Continuation of the monetary policies the Federal Reserve authorities are now pursuing.

—A reduction of fiscal year 1970 expenditures by $4 billion below the best current estimate of the budget expenditures recommended by the last Administration.

—Continuation of the income tax surcharge for another year.

—Postponing of the scheduled reductions in telephone and passenger car excise taxes.

—Enactment of user charges equal in revenue to those now in the budget.

—An increase in postal charges.

These steps are not pleasant medicine. Medicine to combat inflation is never pleasant. But we can no longer delay taking it.

Another priority is the control of crime. On January 31, I announced a detailed plan for combatting crime in the District of Columbia, recognizing that the Federal city should be made a model of law observance and law enforcement. The crime-control package soon to be submitted to Congress will make clear the Federal Government's commitment, nationwide, to assisting local authorities in protecting the lives, rights and property of their citizens.

An equally pressing priority is the entire complex of needs that we commonly group under the heading, "the problems of the cities"—but which in fact reach beyond the cities, and include the distresses of rural America as well.

Our policy review has strengthened my conviction that in approaching these problems, America needs a new direction—not a turning away from past goals, but a clear and determined turn toward new means of achieving those goals.

One example is hunger and malnutrition. The failure of past efforts to combat these problems has been made shockingly clear. Our new programs will be both vigorous and innovative.

Another example is welfare. Our studies have demonstrated that tinkering with the present welfare system is not enough. We need a complete re-appraisal and re-direction of programs which have aggravated the troubles they were meant to cure, perpetuating a dismal cycle of dependency from one generation to the next. Therefore, I will be submitting to Congress a program providing for the reform of the welfare system.

In the field of social legislation, we now have a hodge-podge of programs piled on programs, in which too often the pressure to perpetuate ill-conceived but established ones has denied needed resources to those that are new and more promising.

We have learned that too often government's delivery systems have failed: though Congress may pass a law, or the President may issue an order, the intended services never reach the intended recipients. Last week, for example, in announcing a $200 million program for rebuilding riot-torn areas, I noted that after two, three and even four years nothing had been done, and cited this as evidence of the growing impotence of government. The crucial point here is that whereas in the past, "leave it to the states" was sometimes a signal for inaction by design, now "leave it to Washington" has become too often a signal for inaction by default. We have to design systems that go beyond "commitment," and guarantee performance.

If there is one thing we know, it is that the Federal Government cannot solve all the nation's problems by itself; yet there has been an over-shift of jurisdiction and responsibility to the Federal Government. We must kindle a new partnership between government and people, and among the various levels of government.

Too often, Federal funds have been wasted or used unwisely—for example, by pouring them into direct grants when more money could have been made available at less cost by the use of incentives to attract private funds.

The programs I will submit have been drawn with those principles in mind. Among their aims are:

- —To supplement Federal funds with private funds, through the use of "seed money" devices such as tax credits and loan guarantees.
- —To enlist the great, vital voluntary sector more fully, using the energies of those millions of Americans who are able and eager to help in combatting the nation's ills.
- —To help rebuild state and local institutions, so that they both merit and gain in a greater measure of confidence on the part of their own citizens.
- —To streamline the administration of Federal programs, not only for efficiency and economy, but to improve the certainty of delivery and to cut away the clouds of confusion that now surround not only their operations, but often their purposes.
- —To make maximum use of the new knowledge constantly being gained as, for example, in our commitment to the first five years of life.

These programs will not carry extravagant promises. The American people have seen too many promises, too many false hopes raised, too much substitution of the easy slogan for the hard performance.

Neither will they carry large price-tags for the coming fiscal year. We must recognize, however, that in the long run progress will not come cheaply; and even though the urgency of controlling inflation dictates budget cuts in the short run, we must be prepared to increase substantially our dollar investment in America's future as soon as the resources become available.

This Administration will gladly trade the false excitement of fanfare for the abiding satisfaction of achievement. Consolidation, coordination and efficiency are not ends in themselves; they are necessary means of making America's government responsive to the legitimate demands for new departures.

Quietly, thoughtfully, but urgently, the members of this Administration have moved in these first few months to redirect the course of the nation. I am confident of the direction, and convinced that the time to take it has come.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 14, 1969*.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message from the President be jointly referred to the Committees on Finance, Judiciary, Labor and Public Welfare, Post Office and Civil Service, District of Columbia, and Banking and Currency, and Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

AGREEMENTS WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY DIVERSIONS FROM THE NIAGARA RIVER FOR POWER PRODUCTION PURPOSES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive C, 91st Congress, first session, the texts of two notes constituting an agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, providing for additional temporary diversions from the Niagara River for power production purposes, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, and that the agreement, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the request, without objection, is granted.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the approval of the Senate, I transmit herewith the texts of two notes, signed and exchanged at Washington on March 21, 1969, constituting an agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, providing for additional temporary diversions from the Niagara River for power production purposes.

It is provided in the agreement that it will enter into force upon notification that the exchange of notes has been approved by the Senate of the United States. The agreement requires Senate advice and consent to approval because it would authorize a departure from the limitations prescribed in the Niagara River Treaty of February 27, 1950 in regard to minimum flows.

An agreement with Canada providing for the construction of a temporary cofferdam above the American Falls at Niagara was concluded by an exchange of notes on the same date. Copies of those notes are transmitted herewith for the information of the Senate. This cofferdam agreement is deemed to be a "special agreement" of the kind expressly authorized by the Boundary Waters Treaty of January 11, 1909 with Canada. It is stipulated in this agreement that it enters into force immediately upon the exchange of notes.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate a report by the Secretary of State explaining more fully the background and purposes of the two agreements.

I urge that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the agreement authorizing additional temporary diversions from the Niagara River for power production purposes.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 14, 1969*.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a resolution (H. Res. 358) electing the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. SCHWENGEL, to be a member of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR DOLE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, sometime shortly after the transaction of routine morning business has been concluded, the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Bioscience Program

A letter from the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of proposed action by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to conduct the bioscience program at a level in excess of that authorized in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1969 (82 Stat. 280), together with the facts and circumstances related to that action (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report on Disposal of Surplus Military Supplies, Equipment, and Materiel

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of receipts and disbursements pertaining to the disposal of surplus military supplies, equipment, and materiel, and for expenses involving the production of lumber and timber products, during the first 6 months of fiscal year 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Proposed Additional Facilities Project for the Army Reserve

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, the location, nature, and estimated cost of an additional facilities project proposed to be undertaken for the Army Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Property Acquisitions of Emergency Supplies and Equipment

A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, pursuant to law, reporting on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ending March 31, 1969; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Adequacy of Pays and Allowances of the Uniformed Services

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the adequacy of pays and allowances of the uniformed services (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Research and Development Procurement

A letter from the Deputy Chief of Naval Materiel (Procurement and Production), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over, covering the period of July 1 through December 31, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Export Expansion Facility Program

A letter from the Secretary of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Export-Import Bank of the U.S. export expansion facility program, during quarter ended March 31, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on U.S. Exports to Yugoslavia

A letter from the Secretary of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued in February 1969 in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Purchases and Sales of Gold

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a semiannual report on purchases and sales of gold and the state of the U.S. gold stock, July 1 through December 31, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Mobile Trade Fair Activities

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth annual report of activities providing for the promotion of foreign commerce through the use of mobile trade fairs (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947

A letter from the assistant to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation amending the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as heretofore amended, so as to provide that income subject to tax for District income tax purposes shall conform as closely as possible to income subject to Federal income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Proposed Legislation Authorizing Suits in the District of Columbia for Taxes Owing to States, Territories, or Possessions, or Political Subdivisions Thereof

A letter from the assistant to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize suits in the courts of the District of Columbia for taxes owing to States, territories, or possessions, or political subdivisions thereof, when the reciprocal right is accorded to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Proposed Legislation Revising the Definition of a "Child" for the Purpose of Veterans' Benefits

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft or proposed legislation to revise the definition of a "child" for the purposes of veterans' benefits provided by title 38, United States Code, to recognize an adopted child as a dependent from the date of issuance of an interlocutory decree (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

Summary of the Highlights of Federal Participation at Hemisfair, 1968

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a summary of Federal participation in Hemisfair, 1968 (with an accompanying summary); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Reports of the Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audits of Government Services, Inc., its employee retirement and benefit trust fund, and its supplemental pension plan for the year ended December 31, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration and effectiveness of work experience and training project in Kent County, Mich., under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated April 3, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of internal audit activities of the U.S. Information Agency, dated April 8, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Legislation Enacted by the Virgin Islands

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in its 1968 regular and special sessions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory of the Bureau of Mines

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory of the Bureau of Mines at Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1968; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report of the Attorney General

A letter from the Attorney General transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Attorney General, consenting to the renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, dated April 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report of the Attorney General

A letter from the Attorney General transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Attorney General on exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States, as of January 1, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

A report from the Acting Commissioner of the U.S. Department of Justice transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Revenues and Costs for Various Classes of Mail

A letter from the Postmaster General transmitting, pursuant to law, a report setting forth the cost of carrying and handling the several classes of mail matter and of performing the special services for the fiscal year 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Report on Building Project Survey

A letter from the Administrator of the General Services Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of building project survey under the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

Report of Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress

A letter from the Librarian of Congress transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Library of Congress, including the Copyright Office, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and a copy of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the house of representatives, of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"Enrolled House Resolution 1033

"A resolution memorializing Congress to amend the laws of the land regarding veterans; and directing distribution

"Whereas, those Americans who have served their country through active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States are among our most esteemed citizens; and

"Whereas, but for their steadfastness America would have fallen, a victim of the oppressor's heel; and

"Whereas, these men deserve special care and consideration by virtue of their service; and

"Whereas, in order to be admitted to a Veterans' Administration Hospital, a veteran must attest to the so-called 'Pauper's Oath'; and

"Whereas, an annual income statement must be submitted for purposes of qualification for a veteran's pension, regardless of the age a veteran attains; and

"Whereas, Social Security and other Retirement Benefits must now be considered as income for the purpose of qualification for a veteran's pension, regardless of the age of the veteran.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the first session of the thirty-second Oklahoma Legislature:

"Section 1. That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, memorialized to amend the laws of the land concerning veterans and veterans' affairs so as to eliminate the so-called 'Pauper's Oath' as a prerequisite to entrance by a veteran into a Veterans' Administration Hospital. The Congress of the United States is further requested to eliminate the annual income statement when the veteran reaches the age of seventy-two (72) years and to exempt Social Security and other Retirement Benefits from consideration as income after the veteran reaches the age of seventy-two (72) years.

"Sec. 2. That duly authenticated copies of this Resolution, after consideration and enrollment, be prepared and sent to each member of the Oklahoma Congressional Delegation and to the Chief Clerks of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States."

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1783. A bill for the relief of Roberto De Lamonica; and

S. 1784. A bill for the relief of Norad Electric Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. Fannin):

S. 1785. A bill for the relief of Irene Sadowka Sullivan; and

S. 1786. A bill for the relief of James Harry Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 1787. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Avgeropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Inouye, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Packwood, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Scott, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 1788. A bill to assist in removing the financial barriers to the acquisition of a postsecondary education by all those capable of benefiting from it; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mondale when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAKER:

S. 1789. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the deduction for each personal exemption to $1,200; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Baker when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Tower, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dole, Mr. Allott, Mr. Hruska and Mr. Dominick):

S. 1790. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1956 (70 Stat. 1115), as amended, providing for a Great Plains conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Young of North Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1791. A bill to further secure personal privacy and to protect the constitutional right of individuals to ignore unwarranted governmental requests for personal information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ervin when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1792. A bill for the relief of Lai Tung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. Mansfield):

S. 1793. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Sioux Tribe of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1794. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the deduction for each personal exemption to $1,200; to the Committee on Finance.

(See remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brooke, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Gravel, Mr. Gurney, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. McGee, Mr. Mathias, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Miller, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Packwood, Mr. Pell, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Saxbe, Mr. Scott, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Tydings):

S. 1795. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1950 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1796. A bill to amend section 510, title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the extension of time within which the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall complete its affairs in connection with the settlement of claims against the Government of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1797. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wagih Mohammed Abel Bari; and

S. 1798. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yavuz Aykent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1799. A bill to establish a National Commission on Pesticides, and to provide for a program of investigation, basic research and development to improve the effectiveness of pesticides and to eliminate their hazards to the environment, fish and wildlife and man; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Nelson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 1800. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the deduction for each personal exemption to $1,000; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Young of Ohio when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HATFIELD (for himself and Mr. Packwood):

S. 1801. A bill to establish the Federal Medical Evaluations Board to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to the regulation of biological products, medical devices, and drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hatfield when he introduced the above bill which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 1802. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to require that the public interest of the areas to be served be the sole consideration in the allocation of certain facilities pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Montoya when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1803. A bill for the relief of Edison N. Figueroa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1788—INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and Senators Bayh, Cranston, Dodd, Harris, Hart, Hartke, Hollings, Hughes, Inouye, McCarthy, Nelson, Packwood, Randolph, Scott, Williams of New Jersey, and Young of Ohio, the Student Assistance Act of 1969.

This legislation has several purposes:

First. It will remove the financial obstacles to college attendance by providing direct grants to students, based solely on need, and by greatly expanding Federal grants available to students from needy and lower-middle-income families.

Second. It will increase the flexibility of student loan resources by chartering a private, nonprofit bank to assure availability of loan funds.

Third. It will greatly expand Federal aid available for graduate and professional education by permitting graduate and professional students to obtain grants based upon need, loans from the bank chartered by this bill, and fellowships for the third and fourth years of graduate study for those who qualify on the basis of ability and need.

Fourth. It will augment existing efforts at student "outreach" to identify and encourage high school students who otherwise might not seek further education, dealing with the blended motivation and financial difficulties which impede college attendance.

Fifth. It will greatly expand Federal assistance to higher education by providing direct grants to institutions attended by students who receive assistance under this act.

Sixth. It will provide for new and expanded efforts for providing college outreach programs during the early years of high school.

None of those who join in support of this proposal are wedded to its specific and detailed language. Our purpose is to find the best possible legislation for dealing with the problems of providing assistance to college students and institutions of higher education.

Mr. President, the case for a substantial increase in Federal support of colleges and college students is a compelling one.

THE NEED FOR NEW FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Increased costs: The primary need for this bill is the vastly increased cost of attending college. Officials from the Office of Education have testified that the estimated average cost of attending a public university this school year is $1,740. For a private university the estimated average cost this year is $2,640. Allowing for the expected yearly increases during the next 3 years, the average cost of a 4-year college education for a freshman who entered a public university last fall is $7,260. If he entered a private university, the total cost is estimated at $10,990.

These costs are high. Hard-working parents with moderate incomes find that the cost of educating their children is becoming increasingly burdensome. This is especially true if they have more than one child in college, as many of them do. For the poor, these costs are completely out of reach.

College costs are rising much faster than prices for other goods and services in the American economy. The Consumer Price Index increased 44.6 percent between 1948 and 1968. During the same period the cost for attending a public college for 1 year increased 72.3 percent, and for private universities, the cost increased 91.3 percent. The percentage increase in the cost of college has been almost double that of the increase in the Consumer Price Index.

I ask that the following table be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TABLE 1.—INCREASE IN THE COST OF ATTENDING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COLLEGES FOR 1 YEAR COMPARED WITH THE INCREASE IN CONSUMER PRICE INDEX, 1948–68

	1948	1958	1968	Total, 1948–68
Consumer Price Index (1957–59=100)	83.8	100.7	121.2	
Percentage increase		20.2	20.4	44.6
Public colleges (current dollars per year)	$1,010	$1,330	$1,740	
Percentage increase		31.7	30.8	72.3
Private colleges (current dollars per year)	$1,380	$1,950	$2,640	
Percentage increase		41.3	35.4	91.3

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, these costs have increased because the cost of providing higher education has increased. There is some evidence, however, that public institutions—which now educate 70 percent of all college students—are passing these increased costs on to students faster than the cost of providing this service increases.

According to Students and Buildings, a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare publication, between 1955 and 1965 the average revenue of public colleges, exclusive of research funds, increased 34 percent. The average student charges increased 38 percent. This means that the public subsidy of higher education has been decreasing relative to the cost of providing the service. At private institutions during this 10-year period, average revenue, exclusive of research funds, increased 83 percent while average student charges increased 70 percent.

Another way to measure the increased burden posed by the cost of higher education is to look at the cost of higher education as compared with the gross national product. According to the Office of Education, in 1957 expenditures by institutions of higher education comprised 1.2 percent of the gross national product—GNP. In 1967, the most recent year for which information is available, the comparable figure was 2.4 percent.

I ask that the following table be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TABLE 2.—EXPENDITURES BY INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION RELATED TO GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT: UNITED STATES, 1959-60 TO 1975–76

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Calendar year	Gross national product[1]	School year	Expenditures by institutions of higher education	Percent of GNP
1957	$141.1	1957–58	$5.3	1.2
1958	447.3	1958–59	6.2	1.4
1959	483.7	1959–60	6.7	1.4
1960	503.7	1960–61	7.7	1.5
1961	520.1	1961–62	8.5	1.6
1962	560.3	1962–63	10.3	1.8
1963	590.5	1963–64	11.3	1.9
1964	632.4	1964–65	13.1	2.1
1965	683.9	1965–66	15.0	2.2
1966	743.3	1966–67	16.9	2.3
1967	785.1	1967–68	18.8	2.4

[1] Economic Report of the President, 1968, p. 209.

[2] Projections of Educational Statistics to 1975–76, updated by Office of Education, Jan. 3, 1969.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have already indicated that the cost to students is generally rising somewhat more rapidly than the cost of providing education in public higher education institutions. This fact, coupled with the figures above, means that students and their parents are spending an increasing proportion of their income for college education.

The geographic mobility of the educated: Higher education is a national resource. It is used nationally. It is trained nationally. We must increasingly begin to pay for it nationally.

First, many college students do not receive their education in the State of their residence. I ask inclusion of the following table in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TABLE 3.—RESIDENTS ENROLLED AS STUDENTS IN HOME STATE AND OUT OF STATE: UNDERGRADUATE, GRADUATE, AND PROFESSIONAL, 1963

	Undergraduate	Graduate
In home State	2,967,313	448,016
Out of State	668,514	182,121
Percent who live in State	81.6	71.1
Percent who live out of State	18.4	28.9

Source: U.S. Office of Education, Residence and Migration of College Students, Fall 1963.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in 1963, the last year for which geographic information is available, there were 4,265,864 students working for a bachelor's or higher degree. Of these, 850,715 were receiving their education in a State other than the one of their residence. This means that approximately 20 percent of all college students in 1963 were enrolled in institutions of higher education located outside of their State of residence.

There is no information which accurately shows how many college graduates choose to reside in the State in which they receive their degree. There is no doubt, however, that many of these graduates choose to live and work in other States. The growth of a national economy, the decreasing strength of home ties, and the general willingness of many Americans to move in search of opportunity, means that trained persons who readily qualify for positions throughout the country are likely to work in jobs either outside of their State of residence or outside the State in which they receive their college education.

The table above shows that students are more likely to go to other States for their graduate education than for their undergraduate education. Graduate education, moreover, is the most costly type of education to provide. And persons with graduate degrees are especially likely to move into a national job market that will lure them from the State in which they graduate. This means that many States provide an especially costly graduate education to many students whose families live and pay taxes in other States. These same students are then the ones most likely to move outside the State when they graduate.

For all these reasons, States are becoming more and more reluctant to pay the full costs of higher education. Rightly or wrongly, they tend to view the provision of such education as beyond their responsibility. Graduates who receive their education and then go elsewhere are viewed as a net loss to the State's economy. Students from other States are often viewed as unnecessary burdens upon State resources.

States have also traditionally relied upon taxes which respond somewhat more slowly to economic growth than the national tax structure. This, coupled with a growing reluctance to accept the responsibility for providing education to students from out-of-State, means that States are becoming increasingly hesitant to support higher education. Some States already limit out-of-State enrollments. Other States are either imposing new limits or making present limits more stringent. It is, thus, not surprising that the State and local government share of higher education cost has decreased from 33 percent in 1957–58 to 25 percent in 1967–68.

Opportunity for higher education: At least 650,000 able, college-age Americans are not in school today. The primary reason is lack of income. They cannot finance the cost of attending college. This figure is estimated by some sources to be well above 1 million at the present time.

By 1972, this number will more than double—to at least a million and a half—and this is a conservative estimate.

College attendance is very highly related to socioeconomic status—which is primarily a measure of family income. All studies show that the higher a family's socioeconomic status, the more likely that children of that family will attend college. This is true even when children have the same ability. The tables from several studies indicate this to be the case. I ask permission to include the following tables in the RECORD at this point:

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TABLE 4.—PROBABILITY OF A HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE ENTERING COLLEGE IN THE YEAR FOLLOWING GRADUATION BY FAMILY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS QUARTILE, STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT QUARTILE, AND SEX: HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 1961 (NATIONAL)

MALE

Socioeconomic quartile	Achievement quartile High	2d	3d	Low
High	0.92	0.76	0.52	0.38
2d	.81	.55	.38	.21
3d	.77	.45	.22	.17
Low	.61	.31	.19	.10
FEMALE				
High	0.87	0.72	0.43	0.37
2d	.75	.44	.26	.09
3d	.75	.32	.13	.13
Low	.42	.26	.13	.08

Source: Project Talent.

TABLE 5.—PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ENTERING COLLEGE DURING THE 1ST YEAR FOLLOWING HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS QUARTILE AND HIGH SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT QUARTILE: HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 1961

Socioeconomic status quartile	Achievement quartile High	2d Q	3d Q	Low	Total
Males:					
High	57	25	12	6	100
2d	46	32	15	7	100
3d	40	33	16	11	100
Low	26	30	23	21	100
Females:					
High	56	28	11	5	100
2d	54	27	15	4	100
3d	48	27	13	12	100
Low	28	29	22	21	100

Source: Project Talent.

TABLE 6.—PROBABILITY OF FRESHMEN WHO ENTER COLLEGE (FULL-TIME) IN THE YEAR OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION, RECEIVING A BACHELOR'S DEGREE AFTER 4 YEARS, BY ABILITY AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Ability	SES (High) 1	2	3	(Low) 4
1 (high)	78.1	63.0	66.4	65.9
2	59.1	55.9	56.8	65.3
3	47.7	51.6	47.0	54.1
4	43.9	35.3	37.0	38.3
5 (low)	30.4	44.8	23.4	28.7

Source: Project Talent.

TABLE 7.—PROBABILITY OF STUDENTS WITH BACHELORS' DEGREES ENTERING GRADUATE SCHOOL IN YEAR AFTER RECEIPT OF DEGREE, BY ABILITY AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

Ability	SES (High) 1	2	3	(Low) 4
1 (high)	54.0	50.6	41.8	30.5
2	41.7	40.8	29.4	49.2
3	43.1	39.6	33.7	17.6
4[1]	39.6	25.7	30.2	24.5
5[1] (low)	45.8	14.0	33.3	12.8

[1] The number of observations in these cells is very small.

Source: Project Talent.

TABLE 8.—PERCENTAGE WITH COLLEGE PLANS, BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND INTELLIGENCE, SEPARATELY FOR MALES AND FEMALES [1] (TOTAL COHORT)

Socioeconomic status levels	Intelligence levels (males) Low	Lower middle	Upper middle	High	Total	Intelligence levels (females) Low	Lower middle	Upper middle	High	Total
Low	4.7 (363)	12.0 (267)	23.3 (193)	33.6 (149)	14.8 (972)	2.7 (411)	4.4 (316)	11.0 (236)	26.1 (138)	7.9 (1. 101)
Lower middle	9.3 (300)	19.8 (324)	33.5 (275)	49.4 (253)	26.8 (1,152)	10.2 (335)	17.3 (342)	24.4 (291)	35.0 (226)	20.4 (1,194)
Upper middle	17.2 (273)	25.6 (277)	47.8 (316)	64.0 (289)	39.3 (1,155)	14.0 (250)	24.7 (324)	27.4 (332)	49.8 (289)	29.3 (1,195)
High	28.4 (134)	48.3 (232)	68.6 (299)	85.8 (442)	66.3 (1,107)	30.2 (126)	44.4 (223)	65.1 (324)	72.7 (458)	60.2 (1,131)
Total	12.2 (1,070)	25.4 (1,100)	45.5 (1,083)	65.2 (1,133)	37.4 (4,386)	10.5 (1,122)	20.9 (1,205)	33.7 (1,183)	53.3 (1,111)	29.5 (4,621)

[1] All χ^2's for each column and row in this table are significant beyond the 0.05 level. Effect parameters: Mzles: Socioeconomic status 0.131, intelligence: 0.144; females: socioeconomic status 0.140, intelligence: 0.105.

Source: William H. Sewell and Vimal P. Shah, "Socioeconomic Status, Intelligence, and the Attainment of Higher Education," Sociology of Education, 40, No. 1.

TABLE 9.—PERCENTAGE WHO ATTENDED COLLEGE, BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND INTELLIGENCE, SEPARATELY FOR MALES AND FEMALES [1] (TOTAL COHORT)

Socioeconomic status levels	Intelligence levels (males) Low	Lower middle	Upper middle	High	Total	Intelligence levels (females) Low	Lower middle	Upper middle	High	Tota
Low	6.3 (363)	16.5 (267)	28.0 (193)	52.4 (149)	20.5 (972)	3.7 (411)	6.3 (316)	8.9 (236)	27.5 (138)	8.5 (1,101)
Lower middle	11.7 (300)	27.2 (324)	42.6 (275)	58.9 (253)	33.8 (1,152)	9.3 (335)	20.2 (342)	24.1 (291)	36.7 (226)	21.2 (1,194)
Upper middle	18.3 (273)	34.3 (277)	51.3 (316)	72.0 (289)	44.6 (1,155)	16.0 (250)	25.6 (324)	31.0 (332)	48.1 (289)	30.5 (1,195)
High	38.8 (134)	60.8 (232)	73.2 (299)	90.7 (442)	73.4 (1,107)	33.3 (126)	44.4 (223)	67.0 (324)	76.4 (458)	62.6 (1,131)
Total	15.0	33.5	51.0	73.8	43.7	11.4	22.5	34.7	54.9	30.7
	(1,070)	(1,100)	(1,083)	(1,133)	(4,386)	(1,122)	(1,205)	(1,183)	(1,111)	(4,621)

[1] All χ^2's for each column and row in this table are significant beyond the 0.05 level. Effect parameters: Males, socioeconomic status, 0.134; intelligence, 0.166. Females, socioeconomic status, 0.146; intelligence, 0.105.

Source: William H. Sewell and Vimal P. Shah, "Socioeconomic Status, Intelligence, and the Attainment of Higher Education," Sociology of Education, 40, No. 1.

TABLE 10.—PERCENTAGE WHO GRADUATED FROM COLLEGE, BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND INTELLIGENCE SEPARATELY FOR MALES AND FEMALES [1] (TOTAL COHORT)

Socioeconomic status levels	Intelligence levels (males) Low	Lower middle	Upper middle	High	Total	Intelligence levels (females) Low	Lower middle	Upper middle	High	Total
Low	0.3 (363)	7.9 (267)	10.9 (193)	20.1 (149)	7.5 (972)	0.2 (411)	1.3 (316)	2.5 (236)	13.8 (138)	2.7 (1,101)
Lower middle	2.3 (300)	7.4 (324)	16.7 (275)	34.4 (253)	14.2 (1,152)	0.9 (335)	5.3 (342)	8.9 (291)	20.8 (226)	7.9 (1,194)
Upper middle	4.4 (273)	9.8 (277)	24.4 (316)	46.7 (289)	21.7 (1,155)	2.4 (250)	9.3 (324)	12.1 (322)	24.9 (289)	12.4 (1,195)
High	10.5 (134)	23.3 (232)	38.5 (299)	64.0 (442)	42.1 (1,107)	7.9 (126)	15.3 (223)	36.4 (324)	51.1 (458)	35.0 (1,131)
Total	3.2 (1,070)	11.5 (1,100)	23.9 (1,083)	47.2 (1,133)	21.8 (4,386)	1.8 (1,122)	7.1 (1,205)	16.1 (1,183)	33.5 (1,111)	14.5 (4,621)

[1] All χ^2's for each column and row in this table are significant beyond the 0.05 level. Effect parameters: Males, socioeconomic status, 0.081; intelligence, 0.123. Females, socioeconomic status, 0.077; intelligence, 0.083.

Source: Same as table 9.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, all of these tables except the last three are figures taken from a nationwide sample. The last three are from a large sample of Wisconsin high school graduates for a given school year.

The message is clear: Children of rich parents are much more likely than equally able children of poor parents to attend and finish college. As shown in table 4, which relates figures for a national sample of high school graduates, a male child of poor parents has only from one-quarter to two-thirds the chance of enrolling in college as a child with the same achievement level and rich parents. Clark Kerr, who recently headed the Carnegie Foundation's inquiry into the needs of higher education, has said:

> Today a young man or woman whose family's income is in the top half of the national income range has three times the chance to get a college education as one whose family is in the bottom half.

The reason that children from poor families attend college at significantly lower rates than those from rich families is in part motivational. They may not receive encouragement from their families. They often attend inferior elementary and secondary schools. Their peer-group does not lend them to think about attending college since most of their friends do not plan further education after high school.

But much of the difference in attendance rates is due solely to money. Children of low-income parents have often suffered deprival. Making future plans often seems futile. And to some students a $10 bill is a great deal of money. Raising the $1,700 necessary to attend school for a year may pose what seems to be, and usually is, an insurmountable task.

This is why there are hundreds of thousands of bright high school graduates in this country who do not continue their education. It is a tremendous waste in human resources. No nation—no matter how rich or well developed—can long afford to waste its human resources. This Nation, with its vast wealth, cannot continue this waste. This Nation, with its belief in opportunity for all, cannot continue this glaring inconsistency of bright, able, high school graduates denied the opportunity to continue their education because of lack of finances. All who can benefit from postsecondary education should have the opportunity to do so. We must end this inequality now.

The impact of low family income upon low rates of college attendance manifests itself concretely in the low rates of college attendance of some segments of our population.

Minority groups—Indians, Negroes, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans—have notably low rates of college attendance. Sometimes this is because some minorities live in isolated sections without ready access to institutions of higher education. But the most important determinant is low family income.

Significantly fewer rural children attend college than do their urban and suburban counterparts. One study of Wisconsin high school graduates found that students who lived in medium-sized and large cities were more than twice as likely to plan to attend college as were students with equal ability who lived on farms. Again, part of the reason is that children of farm families are often isolated from institutions of higher education where they can readily obtain a college education. But the overriding factor is again income. Farmers as a group tend to make less income than do city dwellers.

Finally, some States have significantly lower rates of college attendance than other States. In 1965, for example, 46.5 percent of the college age population was enrolled for degree credit. In the 12 States served by the Southern Regional Education Board the comparable figure was 34.9 percent. This was not because the States served by this board were not making a valiant effort to educate their citizens. But the South has a less developed economic base. Family income in the South is lower than family income elsewhere. Because of this, the impact of income on college attendance is likely to be especially noticeable in this region of the Nation.

Growth in higher education opportunity structure: We know that a good many of the hundreds of thousands of able students who do not go to college do not do so because of cost. As these costs become higher, more and more students, as measured in absolute numbers, will be denied the opportunity of a college education. I think that many people fail to recognize the dimensions of the opportunity structure in higher education. We are lulled into a false sense of progress. We see burgeoning enrollments—they have more than doubled in the last decade. What we fail to see is that the percentage of high school graduates who attend college has not grown appreciably during the last decade. I ask that the following table be included in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TABLE 11.—NUMBER OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES COMPARED WITH NUMBER OF 1ST-TIME COLLEGE DEGREE CREDIT ENROLLMENT, 1955, 1965

	1955	1965
Number of high school graduates	1,414,800	2,672,000
Number of 1st-time degree credit enrollment	668,064	1,411,822
Percentage of high school graduates attending college	47.3	52.8

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1968.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it is difficult to determine with certainty the percentage of high school graduates who attend college. The figures noted above compare the number enrolled in college for the first time for degree credit with the number of high school graduates in a given year. This measure gives some idea about the progress being made in providing educational opportunities to the youth of our Nation.

The rate of progress is not encouraging. The 5.5-percent increase of 10 years means that the percentage of high school graduates who attend college has increased at an average of only 0.5 percent per year.

I think that these deficiencies in our opportunity structure must be repaired. The loss of human talent and the effect on the quality of life are beyond calculation. The economic loss is almost incomprehensible.

In recent years this country has become increasingly aware of the problems of the poor. We have not always liked what we have seen. But there is now a greater awareness that problems exist. There is a greater honesty in admitting that all is not as we have sometimes pretended it to be.

We have also come to recognize that there is a large group of Americans who have not been able to participate in the opportunity structure of our society. This is not because they don't try. They are fortunate enough to find jobs. But their jobs are often low-paying ones. Their savings are eaten up by increased medical costs, increased taxes, and increased costs in providing the necessities of life. Family emergencies sometimes set them back. This large group, though, live their lives quietly. The burdens they bear are heavy. Their struggle is incessant.

Because these "working poor" live their lives in incessant struggle so quietly, they are sometimes called the "forgotten Americans." It is time that they be forgotten no longer.

Many of these parents dream of sending their children to college. Some, through fantastic sacrifice, are able to do so. Most are not. It is time this Nation do something to help them realize their dreams. It is time to relieve them of some of their struggle. After all, it is not just the individual family or child that benefits from postsecondary or higher education. The benefit to society is just as large. And it is time for this Government to assume a larger share of the cost of college educations.

The poor and the low-income working man—these are the people this bill will help. Both are caught in a vicious cycle of poverty. Their low levels of training lead to low-paying jobs—or to no job at all. There is no money to pay for education. And this is passed from one generation to another and another and another.

We must break this cycle now. We have the resources to do it. What we have never done is use them in a really massive way to attack them through higher education.

We are beginning to ask: How do we end poverty? What better first step than permitting 650,000 to 1,300,000 young people to obtain a college education? This country could make no better investment in economic development than in higher education. The increased earnings made possible by a college education would produce enough additional tax revenue to pay the entire cost of this program. And the benefits of the program are transgenerational. Once the cycle is broken, future generations will have access to more resources to pay for the education of their children.

According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare publication "Expanding Opportunities for Higher Education," the lifetime differential in earnings between a college graduate and a high school graduate is $136,187.

According to the Internal Revenue Service about 67 percent of taxpayers pay 15 percent or more of their income in Federal personal income taxes. At this rate the minimum tax return on the additional $135,000 made possible by a college education would be $20,428. In all likelihood the return would be even greater since the additional income would probably put these taxpayers into higher tax brackets. But even these conservative estimates indicate that this program will more than pay for itself through the increased tax revenues made possible by it.

Another way of predicting the likely impact of this program on tax revenue is to look at the GI bill. It is one of the most successful education programs ever undertaken by the Federal Government. The educational benefits available through this law made it possible for millions to return from war duty and complete their education; 7,800,000 World War II veterans and 2,391,000 Korean conflict veterans participated in the first two GI bills. Among these, according to the last count of the Veterans' Administration, were 11 U.S. Senators and 116 U.S. Representatives. I am one of those who was fortunate enough to qualify for this assistance. The total cost of these programs was $19 billion. The benefits of the first two GI bills ended in 1965 after approximately 20 years of operation. At that time, the Veterans' Administration concluded:

> An analysis of incomes of veterans and nonveterans in the same age groups, made with the help of the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce, shows

> that incomes of veterans who received G.I. bill help in education averaged from $1000 to $1500 a year more than of those who did not. On this basis, we estimate that the trained and educated veterans paid additional income taxes in excess of $1 billion a year. The G.I. Bill provisions for education covered a period of 20 years; the estimate of $1 billion annually in added taxes totals a $20 billion return in taxes alone on the $19 billion cost of the program.

One billion dollars in added tax revenue per year. And this is continuing. By the time the generations who participated in the first two GI bill programs complete their work life the added tax return will more than double that of each tax dollar originally spent for the program.

The benefits of the GI bill can also be measured in other ways. In human terms, the education provided by this program has permitted many to achieve their full potential who otherwise would not have been able to. Many people fail to find personal fulfillment in what they are doing. They are often capable of doing more demanding work but lack the skill to do so. They are often frustrated in their present jobs but lack the inner security and perhaps training to change to new ones. Education has permitted many to move upward and outward to higher levels of skill and salary. It has given a flexibility to millions who have been able to move out of dead-end slots and into positions which they find challenging and relevant to their interests.

Other benefits—some really incalculable—have also been generated by the GI bills.

This education provided teachers, engineers, doctors, skilled technicians, and so on. It permitted raising the skill levels of millions in this country. And it did so just at a time when the skilled manpower needs of this Nation were increasing by quantitative leaps. This permitted the technological development of this country to forge ahead unfettered. And it facilitated the growth of the economic structure of this Nation. Industry was able to develop faster than it would have otherwise. And this, too, resulted in increased revenues for the governments of this country.

When new tax revenues are generated it means that new spending power has been created. This new spending power has a multiplier effect which reverberates throughout the economy. Its impact is far reaching.

It means that millions have been able to enjoy a higher standard of living and more comfortable life than they would have otherwise.

It means that millions have spent more on homes, automobiles, appliances, and clothing than they would have otherwise.

It means that millions have been able to make larger contributions to worthy causes than they would have otherwise.

It means that millions of children are reaching high school graduation now who have the desire and motivation to attend college, because their fathers attended college. Otherwise they would not have the firsthand experience which is important in deciding whether or not to go to college.

And it means that there are millions who can afford to send their children to college today who otherwise would not have been able to.

For all of these reasons, this monetary infusion has had an almost unmeasurable effect on the economic development of this country—and its total impact on tax revenues is much greater than the simple increase in income it has provided to participants in the program.

This country still has changing manpower needs. In fact, education is more important than ever before in meeting the qualifications for skilled jobs today. This country still has millions who could absorb a new spending power and who could benefit from a more comfortable life. And we must not fail now—in sheer economic self-interest, if nothing else—to provide educational opportunities for all who can benefit from them.

Mr. President, these needs are still present. People want to engage in interesting and lively work. They want positions which challenge them. They want the flexibility to change as conditions change. They want to enjoy higher standards of living. And the skill level of our manpower needs keeps increasing. The millions who have been fortunate enough to qualify for education assistance under the provisions of the GI bill have proved—in concrete ways—for all to see, what a national commitment to education can mean. We have seen how a Federal program which provides assistance directly to students has worked. This task before us now is to extend this successful approach.

WHAT THE BILL WILL DO

Direct grants to students: This bill will provide student opportunity grants, based on need, directly to students who attend postsecondary and higher education institutions at least half time. The amount of aid will range from $200 to $1,500 for each academic year. Proportional amounts will be available for half-time and three-quarter-time study. The student will be eligible to attend the school of his choice. Specific details concerning grant eligibility, the formula which determines the amount of the grant, and the duration of the grant are discussed in a summary of the provisions included below.

The primary purpose of providing direct aid to students is to achieve equality of opportunity for higher education in this country. Making this money available on a national basis, regardless of where a student lives or where he wants to attend college, is the single most effective way to remove the financial obstacle to college attendance by needy and lower-middle-income students.

First, direct student assistance permits funneling the money directly to those students who need it most without the influence of structures which might direct this money into other channels. An equivalent amount of money spent on aiding institutions of higher education—as opposed to students—would not have the same impact of easing the financial burden of college attendance on families or reducing this obstacle to college attendance. That kind of aid would help institutions meet their mounting costs. It would ease the pressures for increases in tuition. But it would not provide specific assistance for those who would not decide to attend college without assurance of financial aid. The prospects for raising the money they need for attending college would be as hopeless as ever.

Second, making this money available on a national basis permits students to know that if they have certain income characteristics they will be eligible for college assistance. They would not have to search out a given institution which will have money available. They would not have to go through the time-consuming—and often costly—process of applying to several places in hopes that one will provide assistance. This knowledge in itself is likely to increase higher educational opportunity in this country. The recent Department of Health, Education, and Welfare report to the President entitled, "Toward a Long-Range Plan for Federal Financial Support for Higher Education" suggests that—

> There is some evidence that changes in the cost of college have a greater impact upon college attendance if these changes are made known to students early in their high school careers. If there were a fundamental improvement in the method of financing students' education, it is likely that the long range impact of this change would be to remove some of the barriers to college attendance which we identify as motivational in the short run.

The knowledge that a national program is available, for which the student can apply—regardless of where he lived or where he wanted to attend college—will give many a hope for a higher education that they do not now have.

Third, there are many who do not attend school today because of financial barriers. I spoke of this earlier. Although it is difficult to know the precise impact of present student assistance programs, the Office of Education has estimated that each $100 decrease in tuition cost—or increase in student aid—would increase the proportion of high school graduates who attend college by 5 percent.

With the number of high school graduates now approach 2.7 million per year, each $100 average increase in assistance represents higher education opportunity for 135,000 additional students. Although the intensity of the response for each increment of assistance would probably diminish, an average increase of several hundred dollars would still increase college attendance by several hundred thousand.

One of the great advantages of providing aid directly to the neediest students is to make certain that those who are neediest will benefit the most by a decrease in their educational costs. For example, if we were to provide enough aid to decrease the cost of college attendance by $100 for all of the 6 million students enrolled in college the cost would be $600 million. The impact of this would be to make college available for 135,000 additional students. But a program which would make $100 available to each of the neediest students would only cost $13.5 million and would have an impact on college attendance similar to that of a much more costly program of $600 million.

The Office of Education also estimates that—

> A $500 subsidy offered to all high school graduates in the lowest half of the income distribution would increase first-year enrollment of this group by over 25% in 2 years.

Mr. President, there is no question but that lower income groups are much more responsive to cost of attending college in making their decisions to further their education after high school graduation. This bill will help to make it possible for all to attend college, if they want to and have the ability to do so, regardless of their famiy income.

I would like to point out that making direct grants to students is not a new concept in providing Federal assistance to higher education in this country. Several present programs already do this. They include: Benefits are paid to college age dependents of deceased and disabled parents covered by programs of the Veterans' Administration, social security, and railroad retirement. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has a grant program for persons of Indian descent. The GI bill provides assistance to veterans, and the National Science Foundation makes fellowship awards to graduate students. I ask inclusion in the RECORD at this point of the following table which indicates the number of students receiving aid through these programs during the most recent month for which figures are available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TABLE 12.—FEDERAL PROGRAMS PAYING AID DIRECTLY TO POST-SECONDARY STUDENTS

	Number	Average yearly benefit
Social Security	341,000	$864
Railroad Retirement	8,000	1,140
GI bill	346,861	[1] 809
Veterans' Administration sons and daughters program	27,423	[1] 980
Bureau of Indian Affairs	2,660	863
NSF graduate fellowship program	2,255	[2] 5,128

[1] Includes part-year students.

[2] Includes cost-of-education allowance.

Note: Except for the NSF program, all of these programs pay aid to students studying in the field of the student's choice.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this bill takes the basic concept behind these programs and applies it to a larger number of students who do not meet the eligibility requirements of present direct-aid programs. What this bill does that present direct-aid programs do not do, however, is to include an institutional cost-of-education allowance to each grant. This allowance, discussed below, will be paid directly to the institution in which a student chooses to obtain his education.

Aid to postbaccalaureate degree students: Graduate and professional degree students will also be eligible for the student opportunity grant program based on need. In addition, this bill will create a Federal fellowship program which will provide fellowships to graduate students for their last 2 years of work on the Ph. D. or equivalent degree.

The rationale for extending eligibility for the student opportunity grants to graduate and professional degree students is the same for making this aid available to postsecondary vocational and undergraduate students: to remove the financial barrier to higher education. The cost of attending graduate or professional school is often higher than that of attending undergraduate school. The student, moreover, often cannot count upon family support for graduate school. Table 7 shows that students from high-income families are more likely than student of equal ability from low-income families to attend graduate school. This bill will seek to remove this inequality.

The new fellowships are provided for several reasons.

First, graduate enrollments are increasing at a faster pace than undergraduate enrollments. According to the "Digest of Educational Statistics 1968," graduate enrollments increased by 70.3 percent between the fall of 1960 and 1965. During the same period of time, undergraduate enrollments increased 54.3 percent. This is putting an increasing strain upon present sources of graduate support, many of which are supported by State governments, private endowments, and foundations. We must assure that the flow of this highly trained talent will continue.

Second, most of the present aid provided by the Federal Government for graduate education is tied to the field of study or the type of research a given graduate student undertakes. The effect of this has been to encourage graduate education in some areas while discouraging it in others. According to the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare publication entitled "Students and Buildings":

> In the natural sciences, of the 1958 bachelor degree recipients who attended graduate school, 55 percent held a stipend, and 35.6 percent obtained a graduate degree by 1963. By contrast, in social sciences and education, where the percentage of graduate students receiving stipends was only 36 and 17 percent respectively, the percentage of graduate degree recipients during the 6-year period was lower: 29 and 16 percent for the two disciplines. The availability of stipends was also closely correlated with the percentage of students engaged in full-time study. Natural sciences, with the highest proportion of students benefiting from stipends, had the highest percentage of full-time students, and education and business were in the cellar in terms of both the share of students supported and the share of students who studied full-time.

Third, many of the present federally aided graduate benefits are available only through specific universities which have received the authority to grant these aids. This means that the student must be registered in an institution which participates in a program that dispenses graduate aid.

This bill will eliminate many of these deficiencies. It will not replace present federally aided graduate assistance. Many of these programs have performed successfully and will no doubt continue to do so. But this bill will make eligibility dependent upon ability and need, rather than the field of study or the particular institution in which a student is registered.

Several points I made earlier in this statement are particularly relevant when considering the amount of Federal support which should be directed toward graduate education. It is a particularly costly item in any university's budget. Persons with graduate training are especially mobile geographically. States are becoming reluctant to undertake this responsibility and to support it at adequate levels. I think that the Federal Government will have to take much more initiative in this area, and this bill provides a good basis for a new thrust in support for graduate education.

Higher education loan bank: The bill charters a private, nonprofit bank with the power to sell securities and lend money to students. The securities and loans will be guaranteed by the Federal Government. Interest and repayment will be deferred—at Federal expense—until after the student finishes school—and for a period of up to 3 years after that for such service as the Peace Corps, VISTA, and the Armed Forces. The charter will permit students to take up to 30 years for repayment. Specific details of this bill are discussed in a summary of the provisions included below.

This bank is needed for several reasons.

First, it will make money available on a national basis to students. At the present time the guaranteed loan program makes it possible for a student to go to his local bank to borrow money, if the money is available there. Very often, it is not. And the student can usually get this credit only in the context of the credit rating of his family at local lending institutions. Some students with academic promise fail to receive these loans because of their family's credit rating.

Second, the bank will be able to tap larger pools of money than does the present guaranteed loan program. Pension funds, insurance investment funds, and other large pools of money may be available to a higher education loan bank. The managers of these funds, however, are unwilling to make this money available on a loan-by-loan basis to students at the present time. This bank will provide a structure whereby these funds may be channeled to students.

Third, loans made by this bank should be somewhat cheaper than present loans. The provisions for the bank isolate its loans from the private market to some extent. The Federal guarantee of the securities sold by the bank and the Government guarantee of the loan itself will reduce the costs of these loans. The use of the Internal Revenue Service to collect these debts will substantially reduce collection costs.

Institutional assistance: This bill provides direct, noncategorical assistance to postsecondary and higher education institutions in the following ways:

First. It provides a cost of education allowance for each student who receives a student opportunity grant. The school will receive $100 per student aided, plus an amount equal to 25 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each first-year student, 30 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each second-year student, 35 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each third-year student, and 40 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each 4 or higher year undergraduate student, and 50 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each graduate or professional degree student.

Second. It provides a cost of education allowance for each student who receives a graduate fellowship under the Federal fellowship program. The amount of this allowance will be equal to an amount of 150 percent of the basic fellowship grant.

The reasons for these cost of education allowances are as follows:

First, the effect of the other provisions of this bill will be to increase college attendance. At the present time, despite the high cost of attending college, student charges do not nearly meet the cost of providing this education. Each student, in effect, receives a subsidy from the college he attends, whether it be public or private. Increasing the number who attend college by new programs of student financial aid would raise the cost to those who would attend without student aid because these subsidies would have to be spread over a larger number of students. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare publication "Students and Buildings" explains:

> For the current college population, tuition and fees average about $500 per year, and the cost of instruction averages about $1500. Thus, one can easily speculate that if the total class hours of instruction increased by about 40 per cent—roughly what would be involved if all potential students attended full time—average tuition and fees would have to be raised to about $780 per year or about 56 percent. This assumes that the average cost of instruction would remain at roughly $1,500, and that additional instructional expenses would have to be met through increases in tuition.

We must include a cost-of-education allowance to cover the additional cost of educating the persons who receive these Federal benefits.

Second, the cost to colleges of providing education is increasing each year. They need additional funds which each college can use in its area of greatest need. This is a decision which can best be determined by the individual institution. The categorical grants which presently operate will not be replaced by this bill. But the direct cost-of-education grant provided by this bill will obviate some of the deficiencies of categorical grant programs. Categorical grant programs often unduly alter the priorities set by individual institutions. They sometimes influence the university to engage in activities which do not coincide with their greatest needs.

The aid provided by this bill will be spent where local education institutions best believe it should be spent. And they are most capable of making that decision.

Student outreach program: The present student outreach programs, Upward Bound and Talent Search, have identified and helped to motivate thousands of students during the last few years. Without the effort of these programs thousands of students who are now in postsecondary education programs would not be there.

Nevertheless, I believe that additional efforts are needed. The number of able students who are not yet in postsecondary education programs indicates a large field that has yet to be tapped. In addition, the massive Federal effort envisioned by this bill must make its full impact felt by providing new efforts to identify and motivate students to attend college. I think that this can be done by striking out in several new directions.

First, we can involve high school teachers and students in these efforts more than we do so now. We can do this by providing Federal training courses for high school teachers and counselors and for members of student councils. These courses can provide new ways that these trained persons can keep high school students up-to-date on postsecondary financial aid, study programs, and career possibilities. Many students need assistance in making their future educational plans. We must make certain that they have adequate information on which to base these plans.

Second, we must provide aid to the colleges for their recruitment efforts. Many sensitive educators have long remarked that if the colleges of this country would emphasize academic recruitment of students from low-income families as much as they emphasize the recruitment of athletes, the opportunity disparities between rich and poor students would be much less today. But I want to take advantage of the skill and know-how of universities in recruitment efforts. This bill will provide Federal assistance for this purpose to colleges which develop especially effective efforts at recruitment.

Third, when students and their parents are making postsecondary educational plans they need ready access information about financial aid, career, and college possibilities. This bill will establish higher education opportunity centers throughout the country for this purpose. Most can use existing Federal facilities. Some can use roving recruiters. All can make printed information available at all times.

Fourth, I have been appalled while working on this bill to discover how amazingly little is known about those who do not attend college. We know little about how they can be identified. We know little about what needs to be done to get them positively oriented toward postsecondary education. We know little about the mix of motivation, lack of finances, and ability in determining who does and does not go to college. As a result I think it would be well to establish a special Council on Educational Opportunities within the Office of Education which would have independent responsibility for examining and recommending improvements in this area. With the advice of this Council the Commissioner of Education would first fund research projects—either institutional or individual—designed to develop better ways to identify and motivate students who might potentially benefit from postsecondary education; and, second, develop measures designed to monitor the change in the postsecondary and higher education opportunity structure. This structure should be defined broadly, but it should include measures of the improvement we are making in assuring a college education of all who can benefit from it. We know, for example, that the percentage of high school graduates who attend college each year is increasing. But we do not know whether it is improving as fast—or improving at all—for the poor and lower income groups as it is for the upper income groups, whether it is increasing as fast for our rural youth as for our city youth, and so on.

Finally, the bill establishes an interagency coordinating committee composed of representatives from agencies administering student aid programs. I think we need a structure through which these agencies can regularly exchange information. I think they should have the opportunity to discuss their programs with each other. I believe that they should explore possible ways that they can identify individuals potentially able to benefit from further education and encourage them in this direction.

As a result of just such a meeting I had with representatives from these agencies recently I introduced S. 1638 and S. 1639. These bills respectively amend the social security and railroad retirement programs which provide benefit payments to children of deceased and disabled parents if they remain in school after their 18th birth date. One provision of these bills permits these agencies to notify potential eligibles of these benefits near their 14th birth date. The Veterans' Administration has a similar benefits program and this agency already notifies potential eligibles of their coverage early in the high school years. This is an excellent practice. Students make the decision to attend college early in the high school years. It is then that they must make financial calculations and course decisions which are crucial to the decision to attend college. I think the Railroad Retirement Board and the Social Security Administration should adopt this practice. This is but one example of how various agencies can learn from each other. I want to see it continued.

Mr. President, this is a comprehensive bill. It seeks to attack various problems of higher education in a number of different ways. I think that the need in this area is evident. We must act now to bring fuller educational opportunity to all of our people.

I ask that a summary of the provisions of the bill be included in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1788) to assist in removing the financial barriers to the acquisition of a postsecondary education by all those capable of benefiting from it, introduced by Mr. MONDALE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The summary, presented by Mr. MONDALE, follows:

SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

STUDENT OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

The bill authorizes a new program of Student Opportunity Grants. Half-time, three-quarters-time, and full-time students will be eligible for these grants for a period of up to four years (or its part-time equivalent) study for post secondary vocational or undergraduate study. If a student is enrolled in a program which normally requires longer than four academic years for the baccalaureate degree he may receive a grant for a longer period of time, although this will not exceed five academic years or its part-time equivalent.

Graduate and professional students will also be eligible for these grants for a period of time not to exceed four academic years, or its equivalent in part-time enrollment, beyond the baccalaureate degree.

These grants will be awarded solely on the basis of need according to a formula which is discussed below. The student will generally make his application to non-profit agencies authorized by the Commission of Education. These agencies, using the formula contained in this bill, will make the determination of the amount of award for which the student is eligible and notify him of that fact. The only requirement for eligibility in applying is enrollment or presumed admission to a post secondary (including vocational) or higher education institution. The student may opt to attend the institution of his choice, with his award being dispensed through the institution he finally chooses to attend.

Provision for part-time study is included to increase the flexibility of this program as it responds to the needs of students. There are some students whose family finances require that they engage in heavy part-time work loads in order to make enough money to attend school. With part-time work, plus the aid available through this program, a student may be able to attend college who otherwise could not. If he were required to attend full-time he might not have the financial resources to do so.

Students will be able to apply for these grants as early as the 11th grade of high school. Although grants made at that time will be reviewed when the student graduates from high school, it is necessary that the student have an early indication of the amount of aid which will be available to him if he chooses to undertake education beyond the high school level. All accounts suggest that the decision to attend college is made in the early high school years. Attending college requires long term course and finance planning. It is, therefore, necessary to inform the student as early as possible in his high school career as to the availability of money to finance his postsecondary education.

Under the formula, the amount of grant for each student will be a sum equal to the difference between: (a) the national average college attendance cost; and (b) the family contribution plus expected student savings. This grant will not exceed $1500 or the actual cost for an academic year for a given student at a given university—such costs to include tuition, fees, room, board, books, plus a given amount permitted for such incidental expenses as the Commissioner of Education deems to be reasonably related to the student's educational experience. The minimum grant for a full-time student will be $200 per year. The Commissioner of Education will also be permitted to provide reduced grants for half-time and three-quarter time students. The basic parts of this formula are defined as follows:

1. The *National Average College Attendance Cost* is an average of undergraduate tuition, fees, room, board, books, and such other expenses as may be reasonably assumed to be related to the student's educational experience, as determined by the Commissioner of Education. This sum would be recomputed every two years or at a shorter interval if the Commissioner of Education determines this to be appropriate.

2. The *Family Contribution* means the amount the family of a given student may be expected to contribute toward the cost of his postsecondary education for the academic year in question. The criteria used in this calculation will be determined by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Education. These criteria will inlcude: effective family income (as defined below), the number of dependents in the student's family, and the number of dependents attending or likely to attend institutions of higher education. These regulations will be reviewed, and if necessary, revised, annually. A family's effective income is the annual income minus Federal income tax paid; and minus special categories of expenses arising from unusual family circumstances as defined in the guidelines approved by the Commissioner of Education.

3. *Expected Student Savings* is the amount that students on the average may be expected to save from summer, vacation, or part-time employment which can be applied toward the cost of his postsecondary education for a given year.

The Commissioner of Education can also prescribe special rules determining family contribution in the case of students who are determined to be self-supporting. When a student is determined to be self-supporting, the student will receive, in addition to his grant, an allowance for supporting any dependents. This allowance will be $300 per dependent, not to exceed a total of $1,500. This provision will be especially useful for students, who have not received support from their families for several years, to return to school. It will also be helpful in encouraging mothers who head families to return to school.

A cost-of-education allowance will be paid to the educational institution attended by recipients of these grants. This will help to cover the difference between student charges and the actual cost of providing the services connected with the student's educational experience. Institutions attended by students receiving grants will receive for each student aided an amount of $100 plus a sum equal to: 25 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each first year student, 30 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each second year student, 35 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each third year student, 40 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each fourth year student, and 50 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each graduate or professional student. The amount the student receives for his dependents will not be included when determining the amount due the educational institution.

The increase in percent of the amount received by the educational institution as the aided student moves through the years of his educational experience recognizes that it costs more to educate students for each additional level they attain.

Educational institutions will also receive an administrative cost allowance for the grants they administer to pay for the cost they incur.

The Student Opportunity Grants will replace the present Educational Opportunity Grants program. The bill provides for a transitional coupling as the program begins and the old one is phased out.

FEDERAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

The bill also authorizes a Federal Fellowship Program which will provide awards to assist graduate students of exceptional ability, who also demonstrate financial need, to complete their final two years of study toward the Doctor of Philosophy, or equivalent degree. The number of fellowships authorized is 15,000 for fiscal year 1971, 25,000 for 1972, and 35,000 for 1973. These fellowships will be awarded directly to the student, to study in the institution of his choice.

The stipend of the fellowship will be determined by the Commissioner of Education in accordance with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs, except that the stipend will not be less than $2,800 nor more than $3,500 for each academic year of study not to exceed two years. An allowance of $300 per dependent, not to exceed $1,500, will be paid to the student if he has dependents.

A cost-of-education allowance will be paid to the institution in which the student is pursuing his study. This amount will be one and one-half times the grant to the student (not including the allowance for dependents) less any amount charged the student for tuition.

These fellowships will be based solely on ability and need. They will not be awarded on the basis of the student's field of study.

HIGHER EDUCATION LOAN PROGRAM

The bill also charters a Higher Educational Loan Bank as a private, non-profit corporation. The purpose of this bank will be to provide loans to postsecondary vocational, undergraduate, graduate, and professional students. Students will be eligible for these loans for a period of up to five years for undergraduate work and for up to five years of graduate or professional study, or for an equivalent period of part-time work. They must be enrolled in at least one-half of a normal full-time course of study in order to receive a loan. The student is eligible to borrow an amount which will not exceed the cost of attending school at the institution he attends, less any other federal aid received.

These loans will be guaranteed against default, death, and disability by the Federal Government. Interest payments and repayments of the principal will be deferred until a student has completed his schooling and for a period of time up to three years after that time for such services as the Peace Corps, VISTA, or the Armed Services. There will be no "forgiveness" features similar to those of the National Defense Student Loan program. The Bank, however, will be eligible to establish for each year a low earnings cancellation provision providing for cancelling, in whole or in part, of annual repayment in any year in which the borrower's income fails to reach a minimum level or in which the repayment exceeds a maximum percentage of income. This will encourage persons who might be reluctant to undertake these loans, because of their fear of failure in college work, or because of their hesitation to undertake the obligation of large sums, to do so. Then if their income is very low, part of their loan will be cancelled.

These loans will be collected by the Internal Revenue Service. This will reduce the cost of collecting these loans, and thereby reduce the interest charge on them.

The borrower will be permitted to take up to thirty years to repay his loan.

COLLEGE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

The bill provides for several programs which will supplement present outreach programs designed to identify and motivate individuals potentially able to do college level work, but who heretofore have not been a part of the higher education opportunity structure.

The bill authorizes new incentive grants to educational institutions which provides a program which gives unusual promise in assisting youths to initiate, resume, or complete their postsecondary education. This will provide these institutions with money to undertake imaginative recruitment efforts.

The bill authorizes new training grants for high school teachers *and* student leaders to equip them to counsel high school students about the availability of financial assistance and post-secondary educational opportunities.

The bill also establishes Higher Education Opportunity Centers throughout the country. These easily accessible centers will make information available, including appropriate application forms, and furnish guidance and counseling services with respect to all federally assisted programs designed to provide opportunities for education beyond high school, and with respect to attending vocational schools and institutions of higher education.

A Council on College Opportunities is also established by the bill. This Council shall:

a. Review and evaluate, on a regular basis, the effectiveness of programs designed to identify, motivate, and provide financial assistance to low-income youth who are potentially able to attend college but who usually do not do so.

b. Develop administrative procedures to coordinate all federal programs offering opportunities for education beyond high school, particularly with respect to coordination at the local level of informational services on these programs and to establish procedures for exchanging information among departments or agencies of the Federal Government which administer programs designed to provide educational opportunities beyond high school.

c. Report to the Congress its findings annually, including recommendations for changes in the law. With the advice of this Council, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to:

(a) Fund research projects (either institutional or individual) and pilot demonstrations designed to develop better ways to identify and motivate students who might potentially benefit from postsecondary education.

(b) Fund programs in secondary schools to identify students who are not now motivated to undertake education beyond high school and to determine the means by which such students might be encouraged to begin further educational experiences.

(c) Establish means to monitor the change in the post-secondary and higher education opportunity structure.

S. 1789—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I introduce, for reference to the proper committee, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the individual income tax personal exemption from $600 to $1,200.

There can be little question that the present $600 tax exemption for each dependent is totally unrealistic for the times. The $600 figure was established in the Revenue Act of 1948—more than 20 years ago—and has not been revised since that time. During these same two decades, however, the cost of living has risen 48.1 percent, based on the level of consumer prices indexes in 1948 and in January 1969. Obviously, the present figure is obsolete and grossly unfair.

An exemption of $600 per person provides a total exemption of only $2,400 for a family of four. However, a recent study by the Department of Labor shows that in order to maintain a moderate standard of living today, a family of four needs about $9,191. Certainly, then, the personal exemption for this family should comprise a greater percentage of their total financial need than the present $2,400.

Congress is presently considering ways of achieving equity in the tax structure in order that the burden of financing our Government may be distributed more fairly upon all our citizens. The enactment of the measure I propose would be of particular benefit to those in the low- and middle-income brackets and would relieve what many consider to be an undue burden upon these groups.

I believe it is vitally important that we act now to remove the glaring inequities from the tax system, and, in my view, the enactment of the proposal which I introduce today would be an important step in our overall effort to revise the American tax structure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1789) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the deduction for each personal exemption to $1,200, introduced by Mr. BAKER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1789

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended by striking out "$600" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,200":

(1) Section 151 (relating to allowance of deductions for personal exemptions);

(2) Section 642(b) (relating to allowance of deductions for estates);

(3) Section 6012(a) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

(4) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife). (b) The following provisions of such Code are amended by striking out "$1,200" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,400":

(1) Section 6012(a)(1) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

(2) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife).

SEC. 2 (a) Section 3 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to optional tax if adjusted gross income is less than $5,000) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1968.—In lieu of the tax imposed by section 1, there is hereby imposed for each taxable year beginning after December 31, 1968, on the taxable income of every individual whose adjusted gross income for such year is less than $5,000 and who has elected for such year to pay the tax imposed by this section a tax determined under tables prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. The tables prescribed under this subsection shall provide for amounts of tax in the various adjusted gross income brackets approximately equal to the amounts which would be determined under section 1 if the taxable income were computed by taking either the 10-percent standard deduction or the minimum standard deduction."

(b) Section 3(b) of such Code is amended by inserting after "December 31, 1964" each place it appears ", and before January 1, 1969".

(c) Section 4(a) of such Code is amended by striking out "the tables in section 3" and inserting in lieu thereof "the tables prescribed under section 3".

(d) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 4(c) of such Code are amended to read as follows:

"(2) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, in the case of a husband or wife filing a separate return the tax imposed by section 3 shall be the lesser of the tax shown in the table prescribed under such section which uses the 10-percent standard deduction or in the table which uses the minimum standard deduction.

"(3) The table prescribed under section 3 which uses the minimum standard deduction shall not apply in the case of a husband or wife filing a separate return if the tax of the other spouse is determined with regard to the 10-percent standard deduction, except that an individual described in section 141(d)(2) may elect (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to pay the tax shown in such table in lieu of the tax shown in the table which uses the 10-percent standard deduction. For purposes of this title, an election made under the preceding sentence shall be treated as an election made under section 141(d)(2)."

(e) Section 4(f)(4) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(4) For nonapplicability of the table prescribed under section 3 which uses the minimum standard deduction in the case of a married individual filing a separate return who does not compute the tax, see section 6014(a)."

(f) The last sentence of section 6014(a) of such Code is amended to read as follows: "In the case of a married individual filing a separate return and electing the benefits of this subsection, the table prescribed under section 3 which uses the minimum standard deduction shall not apply."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3402(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to percentage method of withholding income tax at source) is amended by striking out the table therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Percentage method withholding table

"Payroll period:	*Amount of one withholding exemption*
Weekly	$27.00
Biweekly	55.80
Semimonthly	58.60
Monthly	116.00
Quarterly	350.00
Semiannual	700.00
Annual	1,400,00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	3.80"

(b) So much of paragraph (1) of section 3402(c) of such Code (relating to wage bracket withholding) as precedes the first table in such paragraph is amended to read as follows:

"(1)(A) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall (subject to the provisions of paragraph (6)) deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph a tax determined in accordance with tables prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a). The tables prescribed under this subparagraph shall correspond in form to the wage bracket withholding tables in subparagraph (B) and shall provide for amounts of tax in the various wage brackets approximately equal to the amounts which would be determined if the deductions were made under subsection (a).

"(B) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall (subject to the provisions of paragraph (6)) deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee before the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph a tax determined in accordance with the following tables, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a):".

SEC. 4. The amendments made by the first two sections of this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1968. The amendments made by section 3 of this Act shall apply with respect to remuneration paid on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

S. 1790—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL PROVIDING FOR A GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the authority for the Great Plains conservation program.

The objective of the Great Plains conservation program is to assist farmers and ranchers to develop for land-use programs which will help avert many of the hazards that come with drought common to that region.

It is aimed at preserving and enhancing the great productive capacity of the Great Plains. It rests on the foundation blocks of further conservation and wise use and management of the area's soil and water resources. It recognizes that if the agriculture of the region is to be stable certain portions ought to be permanently removed from cultivation.

The original Great Plains Conservation Act authorized appropriations of up to $150,000,000 for conservation practices throughout this vast section of the Nation's midland. This authority expires on December 31, 1971.

Expenditures under this program are approaching the limitations set in the original act. The proposed legislation would extend the authority for 10 years and would authorize an additional $150,000,000 for work under this program. Several other minor improvements are also included in the bill to enable it to more adequately meet the needs of the Great Plains area today.

SEVERE CLIMATIC VARIATIONS

The Great Plains region is an area of severe climatic variations which periodically produce widespread suffering and heavy economic losses. In this region farm and ranch families have a continuous struggle to protect their best cultivated and grazing lands against soil erosion during seasons of high winds and frequent periods of extremely dry weather.

Because these problems directly concern the lives and prosperity of millions of American citizens, the Nation as a whole is directly concerned. Because all Americans are concerned with the maintenance and improvement of our soil and water resources, we all have an interest in the solution of agricultural problems in the vast Great Plains area.

BASIC POLICIES

I should like to cite 10 of the basic policies of the Great Plains conservation program:

First. The program emphasizes land use changes, wind erosion control and moisture conservation and management practices which provide, over a period of years, the most enduring conservation benefits for purposes of supporting a stable agriculture.

Second. The program is voluntary on the part of the individual producer.

Third. A plan of farming or ranching operations, including a schedule for conservation treatment, is a prerequisite to participation in the program.

Fourth. The program is in addition to other Department of Agriculture programs. Any phase of other programs that contribute to conservation objectives may be used by the producer to carry out his plan of operation.

Fifth. The producer is responsible for developing and carrying out his plan of operation. The Soil Conservation Service provides competent technical assistance to producers requesting it.

Sixth. The Department of Agriculture offers long-term contracts under which the Secretary makes commitments to share the cost of establishing conservation practices provided for in his farm or ranch plan. These cost-share contracts range from 3 to 10 years.

Seventh. The producer is encouraged to carry out his plan of operation in the shortest period consistent with conditions and his resources.

Eighth. Rental-type payments are not made under this program.

Ninth. The producer may use for grazing or other purposes the land established in vegetative cover.

Tenth. Local soil and water conservation districts are encouraged to assume leadership in facilitating the program.

PROGRAM SUCCESSFUL

The program applies only to counties designated by the Secretary of Agriculture in the 10 Great Plains States. There are 423 counties in the 10 States. I would like to insert in the Record at this point a listing of the designated counties in the 10 Great Plains States.

This is the 13th year of operation for the Great Plains conservation program. It has proved to be particularly popular and successful. It has brought more than 32,000 farm and ranch operators under contract with the Department of Agriculture to provide conservation plans on more than 57 million acres.

In my own State of North Dakota, more than 3,600 farmers are participating in the Great Plains conservation program. They have voluntarily signed up to place more than 4,800,000 acres under conservation plans. Of this total acreage, more than 315,000 acres have been removed from crop production and placed in grass. Other practices have involved installation of strip cropping programs, the planting of shelter belts, the establishment of grassed waterways, land leveling, improvement of livestock watering facilities, and the countless other practices which will conserve and stabilize our most precious resources, the soil.

As the program nears the date of expiration, the demand for the long term cost-sharing contracts continues to grow. The 1968 fiscal year ended with a backlog of more than 5,000 unserviced applications. In fiscal year 1968 3,227 new contracts were signed covering 5,176,284 acres, obligating all the funds available for cost-sharing and technical assistance for the year.

A major effect of the program is to bring about the conversion to permanent vegetation of cropland unsuitable for sustained cultivation under the conditions of the plains. Contracts signed in 1968 call for such conversion of 135,975 acres, about 18 percent, of the cropland on the farms and ranches involved. To date, more than 1,800,000 acres of cropland conversion has been accomplished under this program. This acreage has been removed from the production of other crops, many of which are in surplus, at a cost far below that of other acreage diversion and land retirement programs.

This is a good beginning, but the job is far from complete. The critical conservation needs of the area cannot be met by the 1971 expiration date. Therefore, there is need to have the authority extended for 10 years.

The minor improvements included in this bill would—

First. Confirm the role that soil and water conservation districts are playing in implementing the program under the present authority.

Second. Provide additional latitude to the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the adequacy of control of operating units to make possible, under certain conditions, contracts on land where annual leases are customary.

Third. Provide for the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a few contracts on land units not generally considered farms or ranches where serious erosion problems exist.

Fourth. Provide for the addition of practices that will help cope with agricultural pollution problems.

Fifth. Recognize the need for measures to enhance the fish, wildlife and recreation resources of the Great Plains.

I am joined in consponsoring this legislation by my colleagues Senator Mundt, Senator Tower, Senator Curtis, Senator Dole, Senator Allott, and Senator Dominick.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of designated counties be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the list will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1790) to amend the act of August 7, 1956 (70 Stat. 1115), as amended, providing for a Great Plains conservation program, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The list, presented by Mr. Young of North Dakota, follows:

Great Plains Conservation Program

[Designated counties as of December 15, 1968]

COLORADO (36)

Adams, Alamosa, Arapahoe, Baca, Bent, Boulder, Cheyenne, Conejos, Costilla, Crowley, Custer, Douglas, Elbert, El Paso, Fremont, Huerfano, Jefferson, Kiowa, Kit Carson, Larimer, Las Animas, Lincoln, Logan, Morgan, Otero, Park, Phillips, Prowers, Pueblo, Rio Grande, Saguache, Sedgwick, Teller, Washington, Weld, Yuma.

KANSAS (62)

Barber, Barton, Cheyenne, Clark, Cloud, Comanche, Decatur, Edwards, Ellis, Ellsworth, Finney, Ford, Gove, Graham, Grant, Gray, Greeley, Hamilton, Harper, Harvey, Haskell, Hodgeman, Jewell, Kearny, Kingman, Kiowa, Lane, Lincoln, Logan, McPherson.

Meade, Mitchell, Morton, Ness, Norton, Osborne, Ottawa, Pawnee, Phillips, Pratt, Rawlins, Reno, Republic, Rice, Rooks, Rush, Russell, Saline, Scott, Sedgwick, Seward, Sheridan, Sherman, Smith, Stafford, Stanton, Stevens, Sumner, Thomas, Trego, Wallace, Wichita.

MONTANA (37)

Big Horn, Blaine, Carbon, Carter, Cascade, Chouteau, Custer, Daniels, Dawson, Fallon, Fergus, Garfield, Glacier, Golden Valley, Hill, Judith Basin, Liberty, McCone, Musselshell, Petroleum, Phillips, Pondera, Powder River, Prairie, Richland, Roosevelt, Rosebud, Sheridan, Stillwater, Sweet Grass, Teton, Toole, Treasure, Valley, Wheatland, Wibaux, Yellowstone.

NEBRASKA (60)

Adams, Antelope, Arthur, Banner, Blaine, Boone, Box Butte, Boyd, Brown, Buffalo, Chase, Cherry, Cheyenne, Clay, Custer, Dawes, Dawson, Deuel, Dundy, Franklin, Frontier, Furnas, Garden, Garfield, Gosper, Grant, Greeley, Hall, Hamilton, Harlan.

Hayes, Hitchcock, Holt, Hooker, Howard, Kearney, Keith, Keya Paha, Kimball, Lincoln, Logan, Loup, McPherson, Merrick, Morrill, Nance, Nuckolls, Perkins, Phelps, Red Willow, Rock, Scotts Bluff, Sheridan, Sherman, Sioux, Thayer, Thomas, Valley, Webster, Wheeler.

NEW MEXICO (18)

Chaves, Colfax, Curry, DeBaca, Eddy, Guadalupe, Harding, Lea, Lincoln, Mora, Quay, Roosevelt, San Miguel, Santa Fe, Socorro, Taos, Torrance, Union.

NORTH DAKOTA (30)

Adams, Billings, Bottineau, Bowman, Burke, Burleigh, Divide, Dunn, Emmons, Golden Valley, Grant, Hettinger, Kidder, Logan, McHenry, McIntosh, McKenzie, McLean, Mercer, Morton, Mountrail, Oliver, Renville, Sheridan, Sioux, Slope, Stark, Stutsman, Ward, Williams.

OKLAHOMA (30)

Alfalfa, Beaver, Beckham, Blaine, Caddo, Canadian, Cimarron, Comanche, Cotton, Custer, Dewey, Ellis, Garfield, Greer, Grady, Grant, Harmon, Harper, Jackson, Jefferson, Kingfisher, Kiowa, Major, Roger Mills, Stephens, Texas, Tillman, Washita, Woods, Woodward.

SOUTH DAKOTA (39)

Aurora, Bennett, Brule, Buffalo, Butte, Campbell, Charles Mix, Corson, Custer, Dewey, Douglas, Edmunds, Fall River, Faulk, Gregory, Haakon, Hand, Harding, Hughes, Hyde, Jackson, Jerauld, Jones, Lawrence, Lyman, McPherson, Meade, Mellette, Pennington, Perkins, Potter, Shannon, Stanley, Sully, Todd, Tripp, Walworth, Washabaugh, Ziebach.

TEXAS (99)

Andrews, Archer, Armstrong, Bailey, Baylor, Borden, Brisco, Brown, Callahan, Carson, Castro, Childress, Clay, Cochran, Coke, Coleman, Collingsworth, Concho, Cottle, Crane, Crockett, Crosby, Dallam, Dawson, Deaf Smith, Dickens, Donley, Eastland, Ector, Fisher, Floyd, Foard, Gaines, Garza, Glasscock, Gray, Hale, Hall, Hansford, Hardeman, Hartley, Haskell, Hemphill, Hockley, Howard, Hutchinson, Irion, Jack, Jones, Kent.

King, Knox, Lamb, Lipscomb, Loving, Lubbock, Lynn, McCulloch, Martin, Menard, Midland, Mitchell, Montague, Moore, Motley, Nolan, Ochiltree, Oldham, Palo Pinto, Parmer, Pecos, Potter, Randall, Reagan, Reeves, Roberts, Runnels, Schleicher, Scurry, Shackelford, Sherman, Stephens, Sterling, Stonewall, Sutton, Swisher, Taylor, Terrell, Terry, Throckmorton, Tom Green, Upton, Ward, Wheeler, Wichita, Winkler, Wilbarger, Yoakum, Young.

WYOMING (12)

Albany, Campbell, Converse, Crook, Goshen, Johnson, Laramie, Natrona, Niobrara, Platt, Sheridan, Weston.

S. 1791—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO FURTHER SECURE PERSONAL PRIVACY AND TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF PEOPLE TO IGNORE CERTAIN UNWARRANTED GOVERNMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, next week the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Judiciary Committee will commence a series of hearings on privacy, Federal questionnaires, and constitutional rights.

On Thursday, April 24, the subcommittee will meet at 10:30 a.m. in room 1318 of the New Senate Office Building. We shall hear briefly from a number of citizens who, I believe, will be representative of thousands from every walk of life who have complained to Congress about unwarranted invasion of their personal privacy and about increased harrassment by Government agencies in their everlasting quests for information.

Following this, Prof. Arthur S. Miller, of the George Washington University Law Center, will discuss the constitutional issues raised by such complaints, the role of public law, and some of the questions surrounding use of Federal criminal and civil laws or administrative sanctions in order to acquire personal information from individuals.

On Friday, April 25, the subcommittee will meet at 10:30 a.m. in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building. At that time Congressman Jackson E. Betts, of Ohio, will describe for the Senate his research into the Federal laws and practices affecting individual privacy, and his proposals for limiting some coercion now used against citizens to acquire answers to Government questionnaires, especially those used in the decennial census.

Other witnesses on that day will include Prof. Arthur R. Miller, of the University of Michigan Law School, and Prof. Charles Freid, of the Harvard Law School, who will discuss some vitally important issues relating to privacy and the individual in today's society. Executive branch witnesses will testify at a later date.

Congress has received thousands of complaints from citizens about unwarranted privacy invasion through pressure and intimidation to tell all about themselves and their households. In many instances, the sanctions of the Federal criminal and civil laws are used for this purpose. I believe these complaints raise severe constitutional rights issues under the first, fourth and fifth amendments to the Constitution, but principally under the first amendment.

It is my hope that through this investigation and these hearings, Congress will be able to establish just what rights and duties a citizen has who receives a Government questionnaire.

In connection with this subject I am introducing for study a bill to further secure personal privacy and to protect the constitutional right of people to ignore certain unwarranted governmental questionnaires.

The background and scope of the problem was outlined in a letter to Seccretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans, inviting him or his representative to testify before the subcommittee. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

January 27, 1969.

Hon. Maurice H. Stans,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: In the course of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee study of privacy and individual rights, the Subcommittee has received numerous letters, telegrams and phone calls from citizens throughout the country complaining that various questionnaires distributed under the auspices of the Census Bureau of the Commerce Department constitute unwarranted invasions of the privacy of the citizens, and in some instances are burdensome devices for collecting extensive repetitive data which is irrelevant for the purposes of government. These complaints consistently reveal resentment at the governmental intrusion, apprehension over the consequences of reply or a non-reply, and chagrin that Congress has done nothing to clarify the situation or to establish guidelines and limitations for the activities of those charged with collecting Federal data.

In view of the significance of this subject for every citizen, I believe it is essential that Congress conduct a careful and comprehensive review of the public policy and the constitutional and legal issues involved.

The Constitutional Rights Subcommittee is therefore scheduling public hearings to consider these matters. Since your views as Secretary of the Department of Commerce will be invaluable in Congressional consideration of this national issue, we hereby extend to you an open invitation to appear before the Subcommittee in February or March to describe your Department's authority and purpose in collecting information from citizens. We are interested not only in the rights of citizens in surveys conducted by the Census Bureau for its own purposes, but also those undertaken for other Federal agencies. One example of this is the recent questionnaire sent to disabled veterans on behalf of the Veterans Administration requiring a full-scale revelation of the veteran's personal and family financial situation.

The new decennial Census questionnaires will be distributed shortly, and it is therefore our hope that you will be able to testify in February. It is urgent, I believe, that the American people hear from you personally what rights they have and what duties they owe with respect to the new questionnaires. The series of Subcommittee hearings will provide that forum. By affording you and other Federal agency heads the chance to testify on this subject along with constitutional law experts and ordinary citizens, the hearings will also initiate a long-delayed dialogue between citizens and government on this crucial issue. From this dialogue, we hope there will evolve a better understanding of the proper roles of both citizens and Federal officials.

With appreciation for your assistance in our study and with all kind wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

Sam J. Ervin, Jr.,
Chairman.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the members of the subcommittee are Senator John McClellan, of Arkansas; Senator Edward M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts; Senator Birch Bayh, of Indiana; Senator Robert C. Byrd, of West Virginia; Senator Roman L. Hruska, of Nebraska; Senator Hiram L. Fong, of Hawaii; and Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina.

I introduce the bill for appropriate reference, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1791) to further secure personal privacy and to protect the constitutional right of individuals to ignore unwarranted governmental requests for personal information introduced by Mr. Ervin, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1791

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of any executive branch or any executive agency of the United States Government, or for any person acting or purporting to act under his authority—

(1) to require or to attempt to require any individual to disclose for statistical purposes any information concerning his personal or financial activities or those of any member of his family or concerning his personal or real property or that of any member of his family unless the information is sought as a result of a specific provision of the Constitution and a specific Act of Congress, in which case the disclosure shall be mandatory and the individual shall be informed under which constitutional provision and which Act of Congress the disclosure is mandatory; or

(2) To request or attempt to request any person in the United States to disclose for statistical purposes any information concerning his personal or financial activities or those of any member of his family, or concerning his personal or real property or that of any member of his family, unless such request has been specifically authorized by Act of Congress, in which case the individual shall be advised that such disclosure is voluntary and that he is not compelled to comply with such request.

S. 1794—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL ON TAX REFORM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, tomorrow is the "ides of April," and millions of Americans are today dropping their Federal income tax returns into the mailbag—and burning with indignation and resentment as they do so.

They feel they are not getting fair treatment from their Government under the present tax system. They are perfectly willing to pay their share of their taxes, but they are not willing to be taxed under a system that is erratic, unjust, replete with favoritism, and unnecessarily damaging to their way of living and to their economic plans and interests. I agree with them.

I have just returned from Utah where I had an opportunity to talk with many people personally. Let me tell you that the "taxpayer's revolt" we have been reading about, and seeing reflected in our mail, is real and it is earnest. It grows in strength every day.

In my estimation, tax reform is the most urgent problem facing this Congress. It is not right to ask the average, middle-income or low-income taxpayer—the men and women who are the backbone of America—to pay such a large burden in taxes when there are millionaires who pay no taxes at all because of tax loopholes.

It makes me angry, too, to know that in 1965 and 1966 more than 150 persons with annual incomes of above $200,000 paid absolutely no taxes at all. Nor do I like it when I hear that more than half of the taxpayers whose income is over $1 million pay a tax rate at less than 30 percent. Our system is supposed to be based on ability to pay—wealthy people are supposed to pay a progressively higher rate than those in the lower brackets—yet because of special deductions and loopholes they pay what is for them little more than the cost of some new luxury.

To correct these inequities, we must move in two directions at once.

We must reduce the burden on the middle and lower income taxpayers, and we must close the tax loopholes which allow the very rich to pay very little in taxes, or in some instances, to pay no taxes at all.

I am taking the first step in this program today by introducing a bill to increase the personal income tax exemption to $1,200. This is the quickest and most equitable way to give relief to the mass of taxpayers.

The current exemption of $600 has been in effect for 20 years. It was adopted first in 1948 following World War II, and it has not been changed since that time. The consumer price index has risen almost 50 percent since 1948, but we have made absolutely no adjustment in the personal tax exemption. We have kept it at the same level because we have relied on it to meet our needs for revenue, rather than considering the needs and problems of the citizens whose country this is.

I plan to take additional steps to reform our tax structure. There are many tax loopholes which must be closed. We should make a thorough study of tax exempt foundations—more than 30,000 of them are virtually uncontrolled by the Treasury—of depletion allowances, charitable contributions, estate taxes, real estate shelters and tax free bonds, to mention only a few areas.

I question whether the time has not come to repeal the 7-percent investment tax credit which pumps $3 million a year into the overheated economy by allowing industries large discounts through the tax laws on purchases of plant and equipment.

And there are many other fields which should be carefully examined. I realize that the House Ways and Means Committee has some studies now underway, and I hope will have some recommendations soon. Legislation must be considered this session which will begin to correct some of the inequities and catch some of the tax dodgers.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the deduction for each personal exemption to $1,200.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1794) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the deduction for each personal exemption to $1,200, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1795—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, for myself and 26 other Senators, I introduce a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in an effort to encourage and accelerate the attack against air and water pollution by private industry. This bill would permit, for Federal income tax purposes, the amortization of the cost of pollution abatement equipment over a period of 3 years rather than over the period of the equipment's useful life.

Mr. President, this Nation is daily becoming more aware and worried about the growing menace of our deteriorating environment. The increasing incidents of dirty air and water in America are cause for widespread concern and shame. Time is running short when we can take effective action to clean up this pollution.

The foundation for a national effort against this problem was laid in the comprehensive air and water pollution control legislation which has passed Congress in the last 5 years. But Federal legislation is not enough by itself. To launch a truly effective assault against air and water pollution we must join private industry as a full-fledged partner in the effort. The bill which I introduce today seeks to encourage this partnership by providing a tax incentive to industry to purchase and utilize the best pollution abatement equipment available.

If we are to clean up this Nation's air and water a significant part of the task will fall to private industry. But we cannot simply point to industry as the culprit and expect the job to be done over night. Unfortunately, in today's polluted environment, clean air and water are no longer free. We cannot hide the fact that the development, purchase and installation of the most sophisticated pollution control equipment will be an expensive undertaking. Unlike capital expenditures for other equipment, pollution abatement equipment will not materially enhance a company's profits. This kind of investment is an investment in the public welfare, and we must be realistic and ask the public to bear a small share of the cost.

The benefits will far outweigh any tax loss. By encouraging industry to take immediate steps to curb pollution, we insure the greater success of Federal, State and local control programs. Today, all levels of government are establishing pollution standards. But mere standards are not sufficient. We must seek to encourage compliance with these regulations at the earliest possible date. Therefore, I believe tax incentives in this field are a justifiable expense which will return a public benefit many times over.

A major part of this country's air and water pollution can be traced directly to industrial activity. Therefore, industry must bear a great burden of the cleanup effort. But industrial pollution will be a costly matter to wipe out. Complying with Government pollution regulations will be expensive and, frankly, the more expensive it is, the longer it will take to make real progress.

According to recent statistics, factories which install efficient anti-air-pollution equipment may face a 5- to 20-percent increase in costs. At some locations pollution abatement equipment may cost more than the actual production facilities.

In turn, water pollution control devices are equally expensive. One estimate for example, puts the cost of industrial water pollution control to the year 2000 at $32 billion.

The plain fact is that the high cost of

clean air and water will simply delay the time when clean air and water become a reality unless the cost is shared.

For some marginal plants the cost of such equipment may be prohibitive; for others the expense will encourage delay. I believe the enactment of tax incentives in this area will eliminate any excuses for the failure to clean up industrial wastes.

Under present law a taxpayer who buys equipment to abate pollution may take a depreciation deduction for such equipment over the years of its useful life. However, some of this equipment may have a life of 20 years or more, and the deductions each year are relatively small. At the present time the capital expenditures for pollution control equipment are treated in the same manner as other capital expenditures—despite the fact that the money spent does not return a profit.

By allowing a taxpayer to depreciate his equipment for tax purposes in 3 years, there is a greater incentive to install such equipment.

To qualify for this special treatment the appropriate state pollution control agency must certify to the Federal Government that the equipment is in conformity with State standards and pollution control programs. For water pollution control equipment, this certification will go to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration; for air pollution it will go to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Secretary of the Interior will certify to the Secretary of the Treasury that the equipment meets minimum Federal standards and is in furtherance of the policy of tne United States to cooperate with the States in preventing pollution.

Our tax laws already provide economic incentives in several areas. Research and experimental expenditures can be deducted immediately. Capital expenditures for water and soil conservation can also be deducted currently. The same treatment is afforded exploration expenditures in search of minerals. I believe that the national interest calls for similar treatment for expenditures related to improving the condition of our water and air.

We cannot realistically expect to attain our goals without the full cooperation of private industry. This legislation will encourage such cooperation at a small cost. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has estimated that rapid amortization of abatement equipment would cost the general revenue between $50 and $150 million annually for 3 years. This loss would decline after 3 years.

Mr. President, I am pleased to have join me in sponsoring this bill the following Senators: **Bennett**, **Bible**, **Boggs**, **Brooke**, **Byrd** of West Virginia, **Dodd**, **Ervin**, **Fannin**, **Gravel**, **Gurney**, **Inouye**, **Jackson**, **Mathias**, **McGee**, **McIntyre**, **Miller**, **Moss**, **Muskie**, **Packwood**, **Pell**, **Randolph**, **Saxbe**, **Scott**, **Thurmond**, **Tower**, and **Tydings**.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1795) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months, introduced by Mr. **Ribicoff** (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1795

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 183. Amortization of works to abate water and air pollution.

"(a) Allowance of Deduction.—Every taxpayer shall, at his election, be entitled to a deduction, in lieu of the deduction provided by section 167, with respect to the amortization, on the straight line method, of the adjusted basis (for determining gain) of any certified water pollution abatement works or any certified air pollution abatement works based on a period of 36 months. The 36-month period shall begin as to any such works with the first month for which a deduction under section 167 would (without regard to this section) be allowable.

"(b) Election.—

"(1) Time.—The election provided by subsection (a) shall be made with respect to any certified abatement works not later than the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the returns for the taxable year in which the Federal certifying authority makes a certificate with respect to such works as provided in subsection (c) (1) (B).

"(2) Manner; revocation.— The election provided by subsection (a)—

"(A) shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegates shall prescribe by regulations; and

"(B) may not be revoked except with the consent of the Secretary or his delegate.

(c) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) Certified water and air pollution abatement works.—The terms 'certified water pollution abatement works' and "certified air pollution abatement works' mean so much of any property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167 which is used to abate water or atmospheric pollution or contamination, respectively, by removing or altering pollutants, contaminants, and wastes from any type of manufacturing process, as—

"(A) the State certifying authority has certified to the Federal certifying authority as having been construed, erected, installed, or acquired in conformity with the State program or requirements for abatement of water or atmospheric pollution or contamination; and

"(B) the Federal certifying authority has certified to the Secretary or his delegate as meeting the minimum performance standards described in subsection (d), and as being in furtherance of the general policy of the United States for cooperation with the States in the prevention and abatement of water pollution under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.), or in the prevention and abatement of atmospheric pollution and contamination under the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857 et seq.).

"(2) State certifying authority.—The term 'State certifying authority' means, in the case of water pollution abatement works, the State water pollution control agency as defined in section 13(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and, in the case of air pollution abatement works, the air pollution control agency as defined in section 302(b) of the Clean Air Act.

"(3) Federal certifying authority.—The term 'Federal certifying authority' means, in the case of water pollution abatement works, the Secretary of the Interior and, in the case of air pollution abatement works, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(d) Authorization of Secretaries of Interior and of Health, Education, and Welfare to Set Standards, etc.—

"(1) Performance standards.—The Federal certifying authority shall from time to time promulgate minimum performance standards for purposes of subsection (c) (1) (B), taking into account advances in technology and specifying the tolerance of such pollutants and contaminants as shall be appropriate.

"(2) Profitmaking abatement works.—The Federal certifying authority shall not certify any property under subsection (c) (1) (B) to the extent it appears that, by reason of profits derived through the recovery of wastes or otherwise in the operation of such property, its cost will be recovered over its actual useful life.

"(e) Allocation of Basis.—In the case of property a portion of which is certified water or air pollution abatement works for which an election has been made under subsection (a), the adjusted basis of such property shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be properly allocated between the portion which is a certified abatement works and the portion which is not a certified abatement works.

"(f) Cross Reference.—

"For special rule with respect to certain gain derived from the disposition of property the adjusted basis of which is determined with regard to this section, see section 1245."

(b) (1) The table of sections for part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 183. Amortization of works to abate water and air pollution."

(2) Section 46(c) of such Code (relating to qualified investment) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) Water and air pollution abatement works.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the useful life of any property shall be determined without regard to section 183."

(3) Section 642(f) of such Code (relating to special rules for credits and deductions of estates and trusts) is amended—

(A) by striking out "Amortization of Emergency or Grain Storage Facilities" in the heading of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "Amortization Deductions"; and

(B) by inserting after "169" in the first sentence of such section ", and for amortization of certified water or air pollution abatement works provided by section 183,".

(4) Section 1245(a) of Such Code (relating to gain from disposition of certain depreciable property) is amended—

(A) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (2) (A);

(B) by inserting "or" at the end of paragraph (2) (B) and by inserting after such paragraph the following new subparagraph:

"(C) with respect to any property referred to in paragraph (3) (D), its adjusted basis recomputed by adding thereto all adjustments, attributable to periods beginning with the first month for which a deduction for amortization is allowed under section 183,";

(C) by striking out "section 168" each place it appears in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 168 or 183";

(E) by striking out the period at the end paragraphs (3) (A) and (B);

"(D) so much of any real property (other of paragraph (3) (C) and inserting in lieu thereof ", or"; and

(F) by adding at the end of paragraph (3) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) so much of any real property (other than any property described in subparagraph (B) as is a certified water or air pollution abatement works which has an adjusted basis in which there are reflected adjustments for amortization under section 183."

(c) The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act but only with respect to property as to which the first month for which a deduction would be allowable under section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 ends on or after such date.

S. 1796—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 510, TITLE V OF THE INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 510, title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the extension of time within which the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall continue its affairs in connection with the settlement of claims against the Government of Cuba.

The bill has been requested by the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record at this point, together with the letters from the Chairman of the Commission dated January 14, 1969, and from the general counsel of the Commission dated March 21, 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letters will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1796) to amend section 510, title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the extension of time within which the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall complete its affairs in connection with the settlement of claims against the Government of Cuba, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1796

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 510, title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 510. The Commission shall complete its affairs in connection with the settlement of claims pursuant to the provisions of section 503(a) of this title not later than (1) five and one-half years following the final filing date with respect to claims against the Government of Cuba; and, (2) three years following the final filing date with respect to claims against the Chinese Communist regime."

The letters, presented by Mr. Fulbright, follow:

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1969.

Hon. J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission by letter dated March 18, 1969, that a reclearance had been made with respect to a draft bill, "To amend section 510, Title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the extension of time within which the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall continue its affairs in connection with the settlement of claims against the Government of Cuba", in that there would be no objection to the Commission's continued support of the draft bill from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

The draft bill was transmitted to the President of the Senate as an attachment to the Commission's letter dated January 14, 1969, and was referred to your Committee on January 16, 1969.

Sincerely yours,
Andrew T. McGuire,
General Counsel.

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1969.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Transmitted herewith in behalf of the Executive Branch for the consideration of the 91st Congress is the draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A Bill to amend section 510, Title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the extension of time within which the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall complete its affairs in connection with the settlement of claims against the Government of Cuba."

In effect the draft bill proposed to extend for an additional two and one-half years the program under which the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is authorized to administer claims of United States nationals against the Government of Cuba as authorized by Title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended.

Title V of the Act directs the Commission, among other things, to receive and determine in accordance with applicable law the amount and validity of claims of nationals of the United States against the Government of Cuba arising since January 1, 1959, for losses resulting from the nationalization, expropriation, intervention, or other taking of property owned at the time by nationals of the United States provided that such claims be filed within a certain period. The filing period as established under the Act terminated on May 1, 1967. Over 7,400 claims were received by the Commission under this program plus an additional 886 claims held open for American citizens still in Cuba.

Section 510 of Title V of the Act provides, in effect, that the Commission complete its affairs in connection with the settlement of these claims not later than 3 years following the final date for filing claims. This date was thus established as May 1, 1970.

Annual personnel requirements with respect to the program were projected over this three year settlement period in order to meet the deadline settlement period. Severe appropriations cuts, however, by the Congress with respect to the Commission's budget for operating expenses in connection with the program for fiscal year 1969, necessitated the reduction in force of approximately 60 per cent of the Commission's staff. Due to this staff reduction it is estimated that the Cuban program is currently off schedule by approximately two and one-half years.

In order to complete the work on these 7,400 claims filed and the 886 claims held open for the Americans in Cuba, the program must be extended for this period. Such extension can only be accomplished by an amendment to the statute.

Section 510 of the Act as originally enacted applied only to the settlement period of claims against Cuba. By reason of an amendment under Public Law 89–780, however, this section was amended to provide for an identical settlement period of 3 years with respect to similar claims against the Chinese Communist regime. These claims were added to Title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, under the provisions of Public Law 89–780, approved November 6, 1966.

The filing period for claims against the Chinese Communist regime ends on July 6, 1969 and in accordance with section 510 of the Act, the program is scheduled for completion 3 years after that date on July 6, 1972. No change in this schedule is anticipated at this time. Consequently, the amendment as proposed by the draft bill would not affect the present 3 year settlement period in regard to the China claims program.

The Commission respectfully urges early and favorable action on the proposed bill so that the program can be properly completed within the provisions of the statute.

The Bureau of the Budget advises by letter dated January 13, 1969, that the enactment of this proposal would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,
Leonard v. B. Sutton,
Chairman.

S. 1799—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL COMMISSION PROPOSED TO MEET MOUNTING DANGER OF PESTICIDES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, today marks the fifth anniversary of the death of the highly acclaimed environmental author, Rachel Carson. It was just prior to her death when her perceptive book, "Silent Spring," awakened the American public to the dangers of DDT and other persistent pesticides. Her book visibly shook a country that had become complacent about the indiscriminate use of these long-lived poisons.

She pointed out that most pesticides, especially the chlorinated hydrocarbons, cannot distinguish between man's friends and man's enemies. They are almost as lethal to beneficial insects and creatures as they are to destructive ones.

Although many scientists attacked her thesis on the grounds of inadequate proof, it is becoming frightfully evident that she may very well have understated the case.

Convincing evidence is accumulating rapidly from every corner of the world that dangerous environmental contamination is resulting from the use of persistent pesticides at a swift and ever increasing pace.

We are literally heading toward an environmental disaster.

It is no longer a question, Will it happen? It is happening now. The question is: Will we temporize with this issue until it is too late? Until, in fact, the land, the water and the air are irreparably polluted and all the living creatures are dangerously compromised. That is the issue we face.

I am introducing legislation in the U.S. Senate creating a permanent National Commission on Pesticides to study and investigate problems arising from the use of pesticides and to establish improved programs and regulations for their use.

Under the provisions of this bill, the President would appoint three representatives from Government agencies, three from the scientific and medical professions, two each from conservation and agricultural organizations and two from private enterprise for a term of 3 years to serve on the Commission.

The Commission would be responsible for—

First. Determining and evaluating the present usage of pesticides;

Second. Reviewing existing limitations on pesticide use and current labeling requirements;

Third. Recommending standards of safety for pesticides in water;

Fourth. Developing a continuing monitoring program for pesticides in the soil, air, water, wildlife, fish and humans;

Fifth. Fostering research in the development of less persistent, less toxic pesticides;

Sixth. Initiating basic research into the degradability of pesticides;

Seventh. Conducting research on the effects of pesticides on the environment, fish and wildlife and humans; and

Eighth. Making recommendations on the elimination or limitation of use of certain pesticides to the President and Congress.

The Commission will make annual recommendations to the President and Congress concerning improved restrictions on pesticide use and present potential hazards to wildlife and human health. It will be a permanent body to evaluate pesticides on a continuous basis and advise the President, the Congress, and the country on its findings.

We must bring pesticide use in the United States into better perspective and completely reevaluate existing regulation in light of the growing documentation of their harmful effects.

Many researchers have been concerned about the effects of persistent pesticides, especially DDT, since its initial development and use in the 1940's to control mosquitoes, flies, and other disease carriers. Even at that time, the fact was known that DDT would kill fish as well as flies, according to Dr. Barry Commoner, noted Washington University environmentalist.

The use of persistent, toxic pesticides has since spread extensively to farms and forest land. Today, more than 600 million pounds of pesticides, including insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, rodenticides, and fumigants, are used annually in the United States, about 3 pounds for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Last year, the sales of pesticides increased some 10 percent over the previous year and, by 1985, it is estimated that they will increase another sixfold.

Reports indicate that about 1 acre of every 10 in America is treated with an average of nearly 4 pounds of pesticides every year.

Through this massive, often unregulated use of highly toxic pesticides, every corner of the earth has been contaminated. Living creatures around the world have been reached by the drift of pesticide residues through the air, soil, and water. The reindeer of Alaska, the penguin of the Antarctic, the petrel of Bermuda, the bald eagle and pereguine falcon of America and the blue shell crab of the sea are each being pushed to the brink of extinction by the spreau of pesticides through our environment.

While the effects of persistent pesticides on fish and wildlife have been of growing concern to conservationists over the past few years, in comparison, sparse attention has been given to the implications of pesticide use on man.

The Food and Drug Administration has the Federal responsibility for preventing foods contaminated by pesticides and other harmful substances from reaching the general public. It has a lengthy history of detaining foods that have accumulated a dangerous level of pesticide residues. But, in almost every case, the foods have been vegetables and fruits, which receive a direct application of pesticides, or milk, meat, and poultry, which are derived from animals which consumed commodities which are treated with pesticides. For the most part, this pesticide contamination has occurred because of the overuse or misuse of certain pesticides.

However, the recent FDA seizure of 28,150 pounds of Lake Michigan Coho salmon contaminated by pesticide residues places an entirely different light on the whole topic of pesticides and human health.

This disclosure of high concentrations of residues in the Coho salmon proves the tremendously dangerous persistence of these pesticides. To ultimately reach the salmon, the DDT and Dieldrin probably traveled hundreds of miles through the air, water, and soil and was consumed through the normal food chain of up to a half dozen organisms.

According to the FDA, the concentration of DDT in the salmon was found to be up to 19 parts per million while the accumulation of Dieldrin was just short of 0.3 of a part per million, both levels considered hazardous by both the FDA and the World Health Organization.

At last year's Lake Michigan Water Pollution Conference, a spokesman for the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries testified that the concentration of pesticides in Lake Michigan could reach a level lethal to both man and aquatic life if the use of pesticides was continued at such a heavy rate in the Lake Michigan watershed.

The discovery of these pesticide-contaminated Coho salmon certainly substantiates that testimony. The future of all the Great Lakes will be imperiled unless action is taken soon to stop this poisoning of our waters by these pesticides.

Last spring pesticides were also blamed for the death of nearly 1 million Coho salmon fry. This finding has raised a serious question about the future of salmon reproduction in the waters of Lake Michigan.

There is also growing concern among scientists that the reproduction capabilities of other fish may be harmed. This is especially the case with the Lake Trout, which spend 6 or 7 years in the water before sexual maturity as compared with only about 2 years for the salmon.

Lake trout were also the subject of recent extensive research by the New York Health Commission, which reported that high concentrations of DDT are being found in Lake trout in the State's central and northern lakes.

The health commission has cited DDT concentrations in the lake trout up to 3,000 parts per million in the fatty tissues of the fish. The figure representing the concentration in the whole fish would be considerably lower since the pesticide tends to concentrate in the fat.

This concentration in both the salmon and the lake trout points to one characteristic that makes DDT and other persistent pesticides so harmful—biological magnification, which results in an increasing concentration of the pesticide progressively along the food chains until it reaches a serious and often lethal level.

A well-researched example of this dangerous phenomenon was documented in Clear Lake, Calif. In order to control a troublesome flying insect that hatches in the lake, the water was treated with the insecticide DDD—similar to DDT, yielding a concentration of .02 parts per million. Plankton, which include microscopic water-borne plants and animals, in the lake accumulated the DDD residues at five parts per million. Fish eating the plankton concentrated the pesticide in their fat to levels from several hundred to up to 2,000 parts per million. Grebes, diving birds similar to loons, fed on the fish and died. The highest concentration of DDD found in the tissues of the grebes was 1,600 parts per million.

After many years of general apathy by the public and governments alike, efforts are finally being mobilized at all levels to deal with the threat of pesticides to the environment, fish and wildlife and man.

Sweden has just banned the use of DDT for a period of at least 2 years. According to the London Observer, this is the first time any nation has instituted such a sanction on a pesticide.

During a recent conference on pesticides in Stockholm, evidence was presented that DDT, even in very small quantities, could affect human metabolism. One of the studies citied was Russian research that indicated that workers whose jobs bring them in contact with DDT and other organochlorine pesticides were found to suffer from changes in the liver which slowed down the elimination of wastes from the body.

Here in the United States, the establishment of firm sanctions on the use of persistent pesticides would be entirely consistent with the recent recommendations of two highly regarded presidential panels.

In my judgment, the most important recommendation of the Wiesner Committee in 1963 was the one urging cutbacks in the use of such persistent pesticides as DDT. The panel recommended:

> The accretion of residues in the environment (should) be controlled by orderly re-

> duction in the use of persistent pesticides. As a first step, the various agencies of the Federal government might restrict wide-scale use of persistent insecticides, except for necessary control of disease vectors. The Federal agencies should exert their leadership to induce the States to take similar actions. *Elimination* of the use of persistent toxic insecticides should be the goal. (Emphasis added.)

The report of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee in 1965 also dealt with this subject. It recommended:

> Research should be encouraged toward the development of pesticides with greater specificity, additional modes of action, and more rapid degradability than many of those in current use.
>
> Pesticide effectiveness should be increased and total environmental contamination decreased by further research leading to the more efficient application of pesticides to the target organisms.

The State of Arizona, growing concerned about increasing residues of DDT in milk and other food products, has banned the use of DDT within its borders for a year. A Pennsylvania State Senate committee has concluded a 7-month study of pesticide use with the recommendation that DDT and other persistent pesticides be banned from use in fields and forests. In addition, the committee has proposed the creation of a Pennsylvania Board of Ecological Review to advise the public and Government officials on the interrelationships of natural vegetation and animal life with their environment.

Michigan, Illinois and Wisconsin have already issued recommendations against the use of DDT for the Dutch Elm disease, which is one of the primary targets of DDT use in the United States today.

Wisconsin is also the scene of the first major confrontation between the pesticide industry and concerned citizens and scientists. The Citizens Natural Resources Association of Wisconsin and the Izaak Walton League have filed a petition with the Wisconsin State Department of Natural Resources to ban the use of DDT in the State under any circumstances where the pesticide can enter world circulation patterns and further contaminate the biosphere.

Beginning last December, the citizens groups and the Environmental Defense Fund, a Long Island, N.Y.-based alliance of concerned lawyers and scientists, have presented extensive testimony outlining the growing pollution of the environment by persistent pesticides in the chlorinated hydrocarbon family.

Distinguished scientists, ranging from biochemists and biologists to ecologists and toxicologists, have presented volumes of testimony supporting the citizens' petition.

Dr. Robert W. Risebrough, an environmental scientist at the University of California at Berkeley, stated that the effect of pesticides on man may be very serious. He said that man accumulates 12 parts per million of DDT in his fatty tissues before the body discharges it. He said that this is enough to stimulate enzyme production, which acts as catalysts for bodily processes, such as digestion. Risebrough said that the extinction of some birds has been traced to enzyme induction by DDT, impairing their ability to reproduce.

Dr. Charles F. Wurster, Jr., an organic chemist at the State University of New York, Stonybrook, testified on the range of the pesticide residues through the world. He confirmed that DDT has been found in penguins in Antarctica and is causing the extinction of the rare Bermuda petrel, a sea bird which never has direct contact with areas where DDT is used.

Other witnesses have testified that DDT goes into the atmosphere along with evaporating water, builds up to extremely high levels in predator birds and animals, and has caused new insect problems by killing predators that once held those insects in check.

Dr. Joseph Hickey, a University of Wisconsin wildlife ecologist, said that DDT has been linked to reproduction failures of certain birds, including the eagle, the osprey and the peregrine falcon. Dr. Hickey and other researchers have traced the presence of pesticide residues to a decrease in the weight and thickness of the shells of eggs produced by these birds.

In related testimony, Lucille Stickel, the pesticide research coordinator of the Interior Department's Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, stated that the presence of small quantities of DDT and its derivative DDE in the diets of mallard ducks decreased eggshell thickness, increased egg breakage and decreased overall reproductive success.

This and other testimony has represented the strongest case that has yet been presented in any public forum for new sanctions to be placed on the use of DDT, the most expendable of all the persistent pesticides.

I have advocated a nationwide ban on the use of DDT for several years and have recently reintroduced legislation to prohibit the interstate sale and shipment of this persistent pesticide.

After a recess, the hearings are reconvening on April 22 to give the pesticide industry the opportunity to present evidence in opposition to the DDT ban.

This public momentum toward more sensible pesticide regulation is mounting.

It seems clear that existing Federal agencies charged with pesticide research and regulation have failed to launch the comprehensive, coordinated effort necessary to effectively deal with the growing problem of worldwide pesticide pollution.

These agencies include the Agriculture Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

Two recent General Accounting Office reports have been very critical of the Agricultural Research Service's handling of its pesticide responsibilities. Last September, GAO stated that ARS did not have an adequate system for tracing misbranded, adulterated, or unregistered pesticides and was also failing to report violations to the Justice Department for prosecution.

In another report in February, GAO indicated that ARS was allowing the pesticide Lindane to be used in commercial and industrial establishments, including food handling businesses, without resolving certain questions of safety that the American Medical Association and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have raised.

From information available, the Food and Drug Administration has been effectively monitoring the buildup of pesticides in various foodstuffs. However, many observers were very surprised to learn during the recent Coho salmon incident that the FDA had not apparently considered it necessary to set pesticide tolerance levels for fish.

There also appears to be a lack of meaningful research on the effect of pesticide contamination on man, which has been the basic responsibility of the Public Health Service.

The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Interior Department is just launching its research and has a tremendous amount of ground to cover. From mounting scientific evidence, it is the area of fish and wildlife that is the most immediately vulnerable to pesticide contamination.

While not questioning the ability or commitment of these agencies, there seems to be an absence of coordination and direction in pesticide research and regulation.

A new impetus is needed to provide our country and its citizens with the information and policies we deserve to safeguard our environment from pesticide contamination for generations to come.

Well documented research has indicated that pesticides are a basic cause of serious disruption of the ecological balance, of permanent injury and death to fish and wildlife, and a potential threat to the health and welfare of the general public. A permanent National Commission on Pesticides would provide a significant step toward resolving those difficulties.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the Record at this time, followed by two articles from a recent issue of the Washington Post regarding the banning of DDT in Sweden and my bill to prohibit its interstate sale and shipment here in the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and articles will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1799) to establish a National Commission on Pesticides, and to provide for a program of investigation, basic research and development to improve the effectiveness of pesticides and to eliminate their hazards to the environment, fish and wildlife and man, introduced by Mr. Nelson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1799

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Pesticide Commission Act of 1969."

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Sec. 2. While the value of pesticides in controlling undesirable insects, fungi and rodents has been well established, the widespread and sometimes indiscriminate use of pesticides, especially those pesticides which do not degrade rapidly after use, has resulted in serious major problems by disrupting the ecological balance, causing permanent injury or death to fish and wildlife, and by posing potential threats to the health and welfare of the people. It is necessary, therefore, in order to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the Nation, to find a solution to such problems. It is the purpose of this Act to establish a National Commission on Pesticides to study and investigate problems arising from the use of pesticides, to monitor the build up of pesticide residues in the environment, fish and wildlife and man, and to foster and stimulate research directed at the determination of the effect of pesticides on the environment, the fish and wildlife and man and the development of pesticides that will break down in the air, soil and water more rapidly after use than those presently in use.

TITLE I—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PESTICIDES

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SEC. 101. There is hereby established a National Commission on Pesticides (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 102. (a) The Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) Three representatives from Government to be appointed by the President, including representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture.

(2) Three representatives from private life to be appointed by the President from the scientific and medical fields.

(3) Two representatives from private life to be appointed by the President representing conservation organizations.

(4) Two representatives from private life to be appointed by the President representing agricultural organizations.

(5) Two representatives from private life to be appointed by the President from among persons engaged in private enterprise.

(b) Members on the Commission appointed from private life shall be appointed for terms of three years.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission to serve as Chairman and one to serve as Vice Chairman.

(e) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

FUNCTION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 103. (a) It shall be the function of the Commission to make a continuing study and investigation of any and all matters relating to the manufacture and usage of pesticides. Such study and investigation shall include, but shall not be limited to—

(1) a determination and evaluation of the usage of pesticides, including the total amounts used and the specific uses in any year;

(2) whether or not the existing labeling requirements for pesticides should be modified and if so in what manner; and

(3) the desirability of requiring a limitation on the usage of any pesticide based on its toxicity, solubility, and persistence.

(b) It shall also be the function of the Commission to carry out, by its own staff or by contract, or encourage basic research programs directed at, but not be limited to—

(1) the determination of the manner by which pesticides degrade, decompose, or persist in the environment;

(2) the discovery of means and methods by which pesticides may be caused to degrade more rapidly after their introduction into the environment;

(3) the ascertainment of the toxic or lethal concentrations of pesticides;

(5) the ascertainment of the synergistic and accumulative effects of pesticides on man, on fish and wildlife and on the environment;

(5) the development of natural insect predators; and

(6) the development of rapidly degradable pesticides.

(c) It shall also be the function of the Commission to formulate and recommend a continuing monitoring program of the human population, fish and wildlife and the environment for the build up of pesticide residues.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 104. (a) The members of the Commission who are appointed from private life shall each receive compensation at the rate of $75 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission. All other members of the Commission shall serve without compensation.

(b) All members of the Commission shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

STAFF

SEC. 105. The Commission is authorized, without regard to the provisions of title 5 of the United States Code governing appointments in the competitive service and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 of such title, relating to classification.

(1) to appoint such personnel as it deems necessary to assist it in performing its duties, and to fix the compensation of such personnel at rates not in excess of those provided in the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title for employees performing comparable functions, and

(2) to procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of such title, but at rates not to exceed $75 a day for individuals.

POWERS OF COMMISSION

SEC. 106. (a) The Commission or any committee thereof may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such committee may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or any committee thereof.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this title; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

REPORTS

SEC. 107. The Commission shall submit a written report of the result of its study and investigation to the President and to the Congress not later than March 1 of each calendar year together with such recommendations for legislation or other action as the Commission may deem advisable.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 108. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

The material, presented by Mr. NELSON, follows:

SWEDEN BANS DDT FOLLOWING REPORTS OF HARM TO PEOPLE

(By Roland Huntford, London Observer)

STOCKHOLM.—Sweden is banning the use of DDT—the first country to do so. The ban is to last for two years and the first aim is to discover if a local prohibition will reduce the amount of DDT finding its way into plants and animals.

The decision came after an international conference on Stockholm to discuss the dangers of using the chemical.

It is recognized that since the chemical is so easily spread, a purely local ban is bound to have a limited effect. Consequently, there is a move afoot to extend the measure to the rest of Scandinavia, and demands have already been heard in Norway for a total ban on DDT all over the country.

The Swedish ban is comprehensive, covering DDT and all its derivations in every field. Agriculture and domestic uses are specifically mentioned on the regulations, and DDT will therefore disappear from all sprays and insecticides.

Although the Swedes promulgated their ban in connection with an international conference to make an impact abroad, their information had been carefully gathered for some years. Fish, birds, and many plants were found to contain rising amounts of DDT, and its presence in human beings was distinctly on the increase. The most disturbing aspect of this was the fact that no scientist was able to say for certain that DDT was harmless in the case of the higher forms of life.

On the other hand, evidence was presented at the Stockholm conference that DDT, in remarkably small quantities, could affect the human metabolism. Soviet investigations showed that certain people habitually working with DDT were found to suffer from changes in the liver which slowed down the elimination of waste products from the body.

Perhaps what clinched the matter, as far as the Swedes were concerned, was a recent report published by some Stockholm scientists. They had been investigating the presence of DDT in wild life along the Swedish coast, and made the discovery that it was present in rapidly increasing quantities as one moved up the scale of predatory creatures. Thus, gulls had more DDT than the fish upon which they fed, while certain types of sea eagles, which preyed upon both, exhibited the highest concentration of all. They were found to have 25 percent by weight of DDT in their fat tissues.

It is usually alleged that DDT affects only lower forms of life, particularly the insects it was originally designed to kill. But it has also been shown to have poisonous effects on shellfish, and to cause thickening of the shells of birds' eggs. If these become too thick the chicks are unable to hatch, and the species would therefore be threatened with extinction.

It is a curious comment on the present situation that certain dinosaurs disappeared for exactly the same reason caused, some experts presume, by a natural catastrophe, either of a chemical or radioactive kind.

There are also suspicions held by a few scientists that DDT might be capable of causing mental disease. There is a chemical closely related to DDT, which is known to produce schizophrenic symptoms.

At the Stockholm conference an English scientist, Dr. Norman Moore, who specializes on the effect of DDT on wild life, said that nobody at present could predict the effect of DDT in years to come. Faced with such ignorance, he said, the only sensible thing to do was to ban the use of insecticides, such as DDT, which were difficult to break down, and which remained after use to pollute the human environment.

At present, there is not a corner of the globe free of DDT. Eskimos in Greenland and seals in the Antarctic have it, and both are far from the nearest source. Perhaps the Swedish ban will at least eliminate an annual contribution of 700 tons but this is a small amount compared with the 11,000 tons used annually by the United States.

The strongest opposition is expected to come from countries involved in malaria control. DDT and its allied compounds are the chief chemicals used to eliminate mosquitoes. And in this field there are no frontiers: even if all Europe and North America were to ban DDT they would still receive an aid and seaborne supply from Africa, Asia and South America. But the threat of gathering bans might persuade scientists to develop a chemical without the toxic side effects and penetration of DDT.

Senator Nelson Introduces Bill Against Compound

Last Tuesday, Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.) introduced a bill which would prohibit the interstate sale or shipment of DDT in the United States.

He said the accumulation of DDT is reaching "catastrophic proportions," threatening the extinction of some forms of fish and wildlife.

"In a single generation," he told the Senate, "DDT has polluted our environment on a worldwide basis, infiltrating the atmosphere, the water and the tissues of most of the world's creatures, pushing some, like the peregrine falcon and the bald eagle to the brink of extinction."

Citing the seizure of 21,000 pounds of contaminated Lake Michigan Coho salmon by the Food and Drug Administration, the Senator warned "the future of all the Great Lakes will be imperiled unless action is taken soon to stop this poisoning of our waters by these pesticides."

He said he had urged the FDA to intensify its inspections for pesticide residues in all marine life taken from the Great Lakes.

S. 1800—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL INCREASING THE PERSONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION FROM $600 TO $1,000

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, our Federal income tax laws are an abominable mess, so riddled with tax loopholes favoring a few at the expense of the many that it is no wonder that average American taxpayers are loudly and clearly demanding genuine tax reform.

The truth is that those earning between $5,000 and $15,000 a year—the great majority of citizens—pay a higher percentage in income tax than do those whose earnings exceed $25,000. Middle and lower income Americans bear the heaviest burden of taxation. Of all Federal income taxes paid by individuals, 72 percent comes from those earning less than $15,000, 22 percent with incomes of less than $7,000, and 50 percent from those earning between $7,000 and $15,000. In 1967, 150 Americans with incomes of more than $200,000, including 21 with incomes exceeding $1,000,000, paid no income tax whatever. During the same year, 25 million citizens living below the $3,000 a year poverty level paid more than $1.5 billion in Federal income taxes.

I have received hundreds of letters from honest hard-working citizens who report of their individual problems in coping with the rising cost of living and with increased local, State, and Federal taxes. It is high time that average-income Americans receive a tax break.

A first step which would help more than 100 million average-income taxpayers should be to increase the $600 individual income tax exemption to $1,000. When the $600 personal exemption was adopted in 1948, each exemption represented 20 percent of the median family income of $3,031. The most recent census statistics place the median family income at $8,017. This means each $600 exemption now amounts to only 7.5 percent of the average family income.

Today the $600 exemption is on its way to becoming merely a token deduction. Since 1948 when the $600 was approved, basic expenses such as food, shelter, and clothing have increased by more than 50 percent. Medical expenses alone have climbed nearly 90 percent.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the personal income tax exemption from $600 to $1,000.

The revenue lost can easily be recovered by plugging atrocious tax loopholes that now exist. It is estimated that as much as $50 billion is lost to the Treasury through income tax gimmicks of one sort or another favoring various and sundry special interest groups in our society.

The most flagrant tax loophole is the 27½ percent depletion allowance for oil- and gas-producing companies which costs taxpayers from $3 to $5 billion annually. The fact is that oil companies have been paying Federal income taxes at about half the average rate of most American wage earners. While most corporations outside the petroleum industry pay 40 to 50 percent of their profits in Federal income tax, the 40 largest oil companies paid Federal income taxes at an average rate of 8.2 percent of their net income in 1967. Fourteen of them paid no Federal income tax at all. Eight others were taxed an average of less than 5 percent, and 13 were taxed from between 5 to 14 percent. The largest of the 14 non-taxpaying oil companies was the Atlantic Richfield Co. which in 1967 paid no tax whatever on a net income of $145 million. This company and its predecessor, the Atlantic Refining Co., accumulated profits of nearly $½ billion from 1962 to 1967 without owing a penny in Federal income tax. At the same time a retired Ohio couple both partially handicapped, with an income of $3,976 paid a Federal income tax of $137.

The largest company in the petroleum industry, the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, reported net income before taxes of $2 billion in 1967 and paid Federal income taxes of $166 million for a rate of 7.9 percent. From 1962 through 1967 this firm had a total net income before taxes of $10.1 billion and paid an average of 4.7 percent in Federal income taxes for the entire period. There are many other tax loopholes which may not be as costly to the Treasury but are equally unfair. The failure to tax capital gains passed on from one generation to another deprives the Treasury of $2.5 billion every year. Allowing a tax-free bonus on the first $100 of dividends loses another $200 million. Deductions permitted gentleman farmers and loopholes favoring farm corporations deprive the Treasury of additional hundreds of millions of dollars annually. One wealthy widow, her inheritance invested in municipal and State bonds, received $1.5 million in interest annually. Since the bonds are tax exempt she does not even have to file a tax return. Her gardener earns $5,000 a year and pays $350 in Federal income taxes. Can anyone blame heavily burdened taxpayers for demanding an end to such blatant and outrageous tax favoritism?

These are but a few of the unconscionable tax loopholes that exist for the benefit of the rich and powerful while the real tax burden falls on lower and middle income taxpayers. It is high time to plug them and provide relief for average taxpayers. What we in Congress should be talking about is imposing fair taxes, not more taxes, not surtaxes on top of present taxes. Genuine reform of our income tax laws is long past due.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1800) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the deduction for each personal exemption to $1,000, introduced by Mr. Young of Ohio, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1801—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE FEDERAL MEDICAL EVALUATIONS BOARD

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am pleased to offer for introduction today, for myself and the junior Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood), a bill to establish the Federal Medical Evaluations Board to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to the regulation of drugs, biological products, and medical devices.

For some time I have been concerned that the functions of judge and prosecutor relating to new drugs have been consolidated in the Food and Drug Administration. This concern has developed out of my experience as a member of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee, in its hearings over the past several years into matters relating to the drug industry, and out of my knowledge of the regulation by the FDA of the use of DMSO—dimethyl sulfoxide—a simple organic chemical developed from lignin, the cement substance of trees, and having the ability to penetrate human tissues.

DMSO's medical applications sprang from collaboration in the early 1960's between Robert Herschler, of the Crown Zellerbach Corp., in Oregon, and Dr. Stanley Jacob, who was working out of the University of Oregon Medical School.

Dr. Jacobs has said:

> Like antibiotics and cortisone, DMSO cuts across disease lines. The principle of DMSO is that it provides a relatively easy method of using the skin for an avenue for curing ills affecting the body generally. DMSO is rapidly absorbed and will influence a disease process elsewhere in the body.

Only limited formal testing in the United States has been permitted by the FDA, despite its high potentiality for the relief of human ills. In contrast, DMSO has been a prescription drug since June 1967—without any evidence of serious toxicity—in Germany and Austria.

As the areas of concern of the FDA have grown, it has become less efficient and more subject to political pressures. As in the case of DMSO, many months—even years—of delay has been caused by the FDA in allowing new drugs, having promise of safety and efficacy, to be fully tested or marketed.

A highly competent, professional handling of new drugs is essential for protection of the public health. In my view, only by legislation such as this introduced today can the needed changes in the administration of new drug applications be provided. This bill will give the function of judging new drugs to qualified, medical, and scientific experts, but leave the prosecution or enforcement function to the FDA.

The purposes of the bill are to—

Provide for a maximum of professional competence and swift, thorough review in the evaluation of medical products—that is, biological products, medical devices, and drugs—so that the highest standards of protection for the public are maintained, yet so medical products which have shown proven efficacy and safety shall be made available to the public without undue delay;

Centralize and upgrade the evaluation of all medical products, and to cut down the expense of overlapping jurisdictions and duplicative efforts in this field;

Assure all medical products of a fair, swift, and highly professional evaluation in terms relevant to protection of the public;

Provide for an independent appeals mechanism in cases where there may be an honest dispute over the safety or efficacy of a medical product or a decision of the Board;

Separate evaluation, primarily a professional scientific and clinical judgment, from enforcement powers in the regulation of medical products;

Establish standards for the evaluation of medical devices in terms of safety and efficacy—not now provided for in the law—for the increased protection of the public.

This bill provides for—

The establishment of a 15-member Federal Medical Evaluations Board, to be composed of highly qualified eminent scientists, physicians, and clinical researchers to be appointed by the President;

The jurisdiction of the Board to encompass evaluation of all medical products, including drugs, antibiotics and medical devices, and regulatory authority over the same;

The appointment by the Board of an Executive Director and a highly competent medical staff to aid the Board in its evaluations;

The use by the Board of advisory panels to be called in cases where the Board may deem more professional expertise is necessary to making evaluative judgment;

The mandatory establishment by the Board of ad hoc independent advisory appeals panels in cases where there may be a disagreement over the decision or judgment of the Board;

The review and evaluation of medical devices, both diagnostic and therapeutic, on the basis of safety and efficacy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I am introducing be set forth in full at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1801) to establish the Federal Medical Evaluations Board to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to the regulation of biological products, medical devices, and drugs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HATFIELD (for himself and Mr. PACKWOOD), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1801

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—FEDERAL MEDICAL EVALUATIONS BOARD

ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 101. There is established in the executive branch of the Federal Government the Federal Medical Evaluations Board (referred to in this title as the "Board").

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 102. (a) The Board shall be composed of fifteen members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Members of the Board shall be selected from persons in private life who because of their experience, position, or training in the fields of general medical practice, clinical research, or the relevant basic sciences are eminently qualified to carry out the functions of the Board. Members of the Board shall be appointed in such a manner as to provide a balanced representation of such fields on the Board. A vacancy in the Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), members of the Board shall be appointed for terms of three years.

(2) Of the members first appointed—

(A) five shall be appointed for terms of one year,

(B) five shall be appointed for terms of two years, and

(C) five shall be appointed for terms of three years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment.

(3) Any member of the Board appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. A member may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor has taken office.

(c) The Board shall have a Chairman and a Vice Chairman who shall be elected by the members of the Board from among their number for a term of one year. Except for the first two chairmen of the Board, the Chairman of the Board shall be selected from members of the Board who will have served for at least two years as a member of the Board before assuming the office of Chairman. Except for the first two vice chairmen of the Board, the Vice Chairman of the Board shall be selected from members of the Board who will have served at least one year as a member of the Board before assuming the office of Vice Chairman. The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board shall, during the period of their service in such positions, be full-time officers of the United States.

(d) The basic pay of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board shall be at the rate prescribed for level III of the Executive Schedule by section 5314 of title 5 of the United States Code. Each other member of the Board shall be paid at the rate of $200 for each day such member is engaged upon the work of the Board, and shall be allowed travel expenses, including a per diem allowance, in accordance with section 5703(b) of title 5 of the United States Code.

(e) The Board shall meet monthly and at such other times as the Chairman or Vice Chairman shall direct. Seven members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the carrying out of the functions, powers, and duties of the Board.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND STAFF OF THE BOARD

SEC. 103. (a)(1) The Board shall appoint an Executive Director and fix his basic pay at the rate prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule by section 5316 of title 5 of the United States Code. The Executive Director shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

(2) The Board may delegate to the Executive Director such of its functions, powers, and duties (other than those relating to the making, amending, or repealing or regulations) as it deems appropriate.

(b) With the approval of the Board, the Executive Director may appoint and fix the basic pay of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Board.

TRANSFERS TO BOARD

SEC. 104. (a) There are transferred to and vested in the Board the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—

(1) to make, amend, and repeal regulations under (A) section 351(d) of the Public Health Service Act, (B) sections 506, 507, 510, and 511 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, (C) section 701 of such Act (but only to the extent necessary to carry out the functions, power, and duties transferred to and vested in the Board by this section and the functions, powers, and duties of the Board under section 513 of such Act), and (D) subsections (l) and (n) of section 512 of such Act; and

(2) under sections 501, 502, 503, 505, 508, and 707 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under those subsections of section 512 of such Act not referred to in paragraph (1).

(b) So much of the positions, personnel, assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of authorizations, allocations, and other funds, which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines (1) were employed, held, used, or available or to be made available in connection with the functions, powers, and duties transferred by this section, or (2) arose from such functions, powers, and duties, shall be transferred to the Board.

ADVISORY EVALUATION PANELS

SEC. 105. (a) The board may, from time to time, establish advisory evaluation panels to advise it with regard to the exercise of any of its functions, powers, and duties (other than those with respect to which an advisory appeals panel is established under section 106). Members of a panel shall be drawn from persons specially qualified in the subject matter to be referred to the panel and shall be of adequately diversified professional background.

(b) The size of any panel shall be determined by the Board, except that there shall be no fewer than three members and no more than ten members. Members of a panel shall receive as compensation for their services a reasonable per diem, which the Board shall by regulation prescribe, for time actually spent in the work of the panel, and shall in addition be reimbursed for their necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence. The members shall not be subject to any other provisions of law regarding the appointment and compensation of employees of the United States. The Board shall furnish each panel with adequate clerical and other assistance, and shall by regulation prescribe the procedure to be followed by each panel.

ADVISORY APPEALS PANELS

SEC. 106. (a) The Board shall, upon request of any applicant under section 505, 512, or 514 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, establish an advisory appeals panel to review and advise the Board with respect to any order of the Board refusing, withdrawing, or suspending approval of the application of such applicant filed under such section 505, 512, or 514. An advisory appeals panel established by the Board shall in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Board review the applicable order and application and any other materials and information the panel considers relevant to its inquiry and shall report to the Board its recommendations.

(b) The Board shall make regulations prescribing the time and manner in which a request for the establishment of a panel shall be made. The Board shall also prescribe regulations requiring that an applicant for an advisory appeals panel shall pay (either in advance or by way of reimbursement) one-half of the costs to the Board for the establishment and operation of an advisory appeals panel.

(c) Members of an advisory appeals panel shall be drawn from persons specially qualified in the subject matter to be referred to the panel and shall be of adequately diversified professional background. No person who served as a member of the advisory evaluations panel which considered the application to be reviewed by an advisory appeals panel may serve on such advisory appeals panel.

(d) The size of any panel shall be determined by the Board, except that there shall be no fewer than three members and no more than ten members. Members of a panel shall receive as compensation for their services a reasonable per diem, which the Board shall by regulation prescribe, for time actually spent in the work of the panel, and shall in addition be reimbursed for their necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence. The members shall not be subject to any other provisions of law regarding the appointment and compensation of employees of the United States. The Board shall furnish each panel with adequate clerical and other assistance.

SAVINGS PROVISIONS

SEC. 107. (a) All orders, determinations, rules, regulations, permits, contracts, certificates, licenses, and privileges—

(1) which have been issued, made, granted, or allowed to become effective (A) by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the exercise of duties, powers, or functions which are transferred under this title, or (B) by any court of competent jurisdiction upon review of such action by the Secretary, and

(2) which are in effect on the date of the enactment of this title,

shall continue in effect according to their terms until modified, terminated, superseded, set aside, or repealed by the Board (but only in the exercise of any function, power, or duty transferred to and vested in it by section 104 of this title), by any court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(b) The provisions of this title shall not affect any proceedings which are pending on the date of the enactment of this title before the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and which relate to functions, powers, or duties transferred by this title; but such proceedings shall be continued before the Board.

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2)—

(A) the provisions of this title shall not affect suits commenced prior to the date of the enactment of this title, and

(B) in all such suits proceedings shall be had, appeals taken, and judgments rendered, in the same manner and effect as if this title had not been enacted.

No suit, action, or other proceeding commenced by or against any officer in his official capacity as an officer of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall abate by reason of the enactment of this title. No cause of action by or against the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or by or against any officer of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in his official capacity shall abate by reason of the enactment of this title. Causes of actions, suits; or other proceedings may be asserted by or against the United States or such official of the Board, as may be appropriate, and, in any litigation pending on the date of the enactment of this title, the court may at any time, on its own motion or that of any party, enter an order which will give effect to the provisions of this subsection.

(2) If before the date of the enactment of this title, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or any officer of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in his official capacity, is a party to a suit which relates to a function, power, or duty transferred by this title, then such suit shall be continued by the Board, but only in the exercise of any function, power, or duty transferred to and vested in it by section 104 of this title).

(d) With respect to any function, power, or duty transferred by section 104 of this title and exercised after the date of the enactment of this title, reference in any other Federal law to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in connection with a function, power, or duty transfered by this title shall be deemed to mean the Board.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 108. This Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment except that the provisions of sections 104 through 107 shall take effect ninety days after the members of the Board first appointed take office or on such prior date after the date of the enactment of this Act as the President shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register.

TITLE II—STANDARDS FOR MEDICAL DEVICES

PART A—AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH STANDARDS

SEC. 201. Chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C., ch. 9, subch. V) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"STANDARDS FOR MEDICAL DEVICES

"Authority To Set Standards

"SEC. 513. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Board such action will protect the public health and safety, it may by regulation establish for any device (including any type or class of device), a reasonable standard relating to the composition, the properties, or the performance of the device or devices involved (or relating to two or more of such factors).

"Weight Given Other Standards—Consultation With Interested Groups

"(b) In the development of consideration of proposals for the issuance of standards under this section, and in particular prior to the commencement of formal proceedings on its own initiative pursuant to subsection (c), the Board shall to the optimum extent consult with, and give appropriate weight to relevant standards published by, other Federal agencies concerned with standard setting or other nationally or internationally recognized standard-setting agencies or organizations, and invite appropriate participation, through joint or other conferences, workshops, or other means, by informed persons representative of scientific, professional, industry, and consumer organizations that in its judgment can make a significant contribution to such development.

"Procedure for Issuance, Amendment, or Repeal of Standards

"(c) The provisions of section 701 (e), (f), and (g) of this Act shall, subject to the provisions of subsection (d) of this section, apply to and in all respects govern proceedings for the issuance, amendment, or repeal of regulations under subsection (a) of this section (including judicial review of the Board's action in such proceedings). The Board may suspend the running of any applicable time limit under section 701(e) pending receipt of the report of an advisory committee under subsection (d) of this section and consideration of the committee's report by the Board.

"Referral to Independent Advisory Committee

"(d)(1) In any proceeding for the issuance, amendment, or repeal of a regulation establishing a standard under this section, whether commenced by a proposal of the Board on its own initiative or by a proposal contained in a petition, the petitioner, or any other person who will be adversely affected by such proposal or by the Board's order issued in accordance with paragraph (1) of section 701(e) if placed in effect, may request, within the time specified in this subsection, that the petition or order thereon, or the Board's proposal, be referred to an advisory committee of experts for a report and recommendations with respect to any matter involved in such proposal or order that requires the exercise of scientific judgment. Upon such request, or if the Board on its own initiative deems such a referral necessary, the Board shall appoint such an advisory committee and shall refer to it, together with all the data before the Board, the matter so involved for study thereof, and for a report and recommendations thereon, in accordance with the applicable provisions of paragraph (5)(C)(ii) of subsection (b), and subject to paragraph (2) of subsection (d), of section 706. A person who has filed a petition or who has requested the referral of a matter to an advisory committee pursuant to this subsection, as well as representatives of the Board, shall have the right to consult with such advisory committee in connection with the matter referred to it. The request for referral under this subsection, or the Board's referral on its own initiative, may be made at any time before, or within thirty days after, publication of an order of the Board acting upon the petition or proposal.

"(2) The appointment, compensation, staffing, and procedure of such committees shall be in accordance with subsection (b)(5)(D) of section 706.

"(3) Where such a matter is referred to an expert advisory committee upon request of an interested person, the Board may, pursuant to regulations, require such person to pay fees to pay the costs, to the Board, arising by reason of such referral. Such fees, including advance deposits to cover such fees, shall be available, until expended, for paying (directly or by way of reimbursement of the applicable appropriations) the expenses of advisory committees under this subsection and other expenses arising by reason of referrals to such committees and for refunds in accordance with such regulations."

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

Sec. 202. Section 501 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 351) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(e) If it is, or purports to be or is represented as, a device of a type or class with respect to which, or with respect to any components, part, or accessory of which, a standard established under section 513 is in effect, unless such device, or such component, part, or accessory, is in all respects in conformity with such standards."

Part B—Premarket Clearance of Certain Medical Devices

PREMARKET CLEARANCE OF CERTAIN MEDICAL DEVICES

Sec. 210 (a) Section 501 of such Act, as amended by section 202 of this title, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(f) If (1) it is a device, and (2) such device, or any component, part, or accessory thereof, is deemed unsafe, unreliable, or ineffective within the meaning of section 514 with respect to its use or intended use."

(b) Chapter V of such Act, as amended by section 201 of this title, is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"PREMARKET CLEARANCE FOR CERTAIN MEDICAL DEVICES

"When Premarket Clearance Is Required

"Sec. 514. (a) A device shall, with respect to any particular use or intended use thereof, be deemed unsafe, unreliable, or ineffective for the purpose of the application of section 501(f) if—

"(1) its composition, construction, or properties are such that such device is not generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of such device to be safe, reliable, and effective for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof; and

"(2) such device (A) is intended to be secured or otherwise placed, in whole or in part, within the human body or into a body cavity, or directly in contact with mucous membrane, and is intended to be left in the body or such cavity, or in such direct contact, permanently, indefinitely, or for a substantial period or periods (as determined in accordance with regulations issued after notice and opportunity to present views), or (B) is intended to be used for subjecting the human body to ionizing radiation, electromagnetic, electric, or magnetic energy (including, but not limited to, diathermy, laser, defibrillator, and electroshock instrumentation), or heat, cold, or physical or ultrasonic energy, or is intended for physical or radio or electronic or electric communication in either direction with any part of the human body or with a device placed within or connected with the human body, or (C) is a device which the Board, by special order made on the basis of a finding (for reasons stated in the order) that there is probable cause to believe that the device is not effective for use or not reliable, under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in its labeling, has declared to be subject to the requirements of this subsection with respect to such use or intended use,

unless either—

"(3) an application with respect to such device has been filed pursuant to subsection (b) and there is in effect an approval of such application by the Board under this section.

"(4) such device is exempted by or pursuant to subsection (j), (k), or (l) of this section, or

"(5) such device is intended solely (A) for use in the cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease in animals other than man or (B) to affect the structure or any function of the body of such animals. The Board shall by regulation issued or amended from time to time under the authority of this sentence, insofar as practicable promulgate and keep current a list or lists of devices, and of the particular uses (or conditions of use) thereof, which it finds are generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of such devices, to be safe, reliable, and effective for use (under the conditions, if any, referred to in such list or lists), and the inclusion, while in effect, of a device in such a list shall, in any proceeding under this Act, be conclusive evidence against the United States of the facts stated in that list with respect to such device.

"Application for Clearance

"(b) Any person may file with the Board an application for determination by the Board of the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of any device to which paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) apply. Such persons shall submit to the Board as a part of the application (1) full reports of all information, published, or otherwise available to the applicant, concerning investigations which have been made to show whether or not such device is safe, reliable, and effective for use; (2) a full statement of the composition, properties, and construction, and of the principle or principles of operation, of such device; (3) a full description of the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and, when relevant, packing and installation of such device; (4) an identifying reference to any standard, applicable to such device, which is in effect pursuant to section 513, and adequate information to show that such device fully meets such standard; (5) such samples of such device and of the articles used as components thereof as the Board may require; (6) specimens of the labeling proposed to be used for such device; and (7) such other information, relevant to the subject matter of the application, as the Board may require.

"Time for Initial Consideration of Application

"(c) Within one hundred and eighty days after the filing of an application under subsection (b), or such additional period as may be agreed upon by the Board and the applicant, the Board shall either—

"(1) approve the application if it then finds that none of the grounds for denying approval specified in subsection (d) applies, or

"(2) give the applicant notice of an opportunity for a hearing before the Board to be held under subsection (d) on the question whether such application is approvable.

The Board may suspend the running of the applicable time limit under this subsection pending receipt of the report of an advisory committee under subsection (h) and the period allowed to the Board for consideration of the report thereafter.

"Bases for Approval or Disapproval; Opportunity for Hearing

"(d)(1) If, upon the basis of the information submitted to the Board as part of the application and any other information before it with respect to such device, the Board finds, after due notice to the applicant and opportunity for a hearing to the applicant, that—

"(A) such device is not shown to be safe and reliable for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the proposed labeling thereof;

"(B) the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing and installation of such device do not conform to the requirements of section 501(g);

"(C) there is a lack of substantial evidence that the device will have the effect it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the proposed labeling thereof; or

"(D) based on a fair evaluation on all material facts, such labeling is false or misleading in any particular;

it shall issue an order denying approval of the application. If, after such notice and opportunity for hearing, the Board finds that clauses (A) through (D) of this subsection do not apply, it shall issue an order approving the application.

"(2) As used in this subsection and subsection (e), the term 'substantial evidence' means evidence consisting of adequate and well-controlled investigations, including clinical investigations, by experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the effectiveness of the device involved, on the basis of which it could fairly and responsibly be concluded by such experts that the device will have the effect it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling or proposed labeling thereof.

"(3) For the purposes of this section, when a device is intended for use by a physician, surgeon, or other person licensed or otherwise specially qualified therefor, its safety, reliability, and effectiveness shall be determined in the light of such intended use.

"Withdrawal of Approval

"(e)(1) The Board may, after due notice and opportunity for hearing to the applicant, issue an order withdrawing approval of an application with respect to a device under this section if the Board finds—

"(A)(i) that clinical or other experience, tests, or other scientific data show that such device is unsafe or unreliable for use under the conditions of use upon the basis of which the application was approved; or (ii) on the basis of evidence of clinical experience, not contained in such application or not available to the Board until after the application was approved, or of tests by new methods or by methods not reasonably applicable when the application was approved, evaluated together with the evidence available to the Board when the application was approved, that such device is not then shown to be safe or reliable for use under the conditions of use on the basis of which the application was approved;

"(B) on the basis of new information before it with respect to such device, evaluated together with the evidence available to it when the application was approved, that there is a lack of substantial evidence that the device will have the effect it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof;

"(C) that the application filed pursuant to subsection (b) contains an untrue statement of a material fact;

"(D) that the applicant has failed to establish a system for maintaining required records, or has repeatedly or deliberately failed to maintain such records, or to make required reports, in accordance with an applicable regulation or order under subsection (a) of section 515, or that the applicant has refused to permit access to, or copying or verification of, such records as required by paragraph (2) of such subsection;

"(E) on the basis of new information before it, evaluated together with the evidence before it when the application was approved, that the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing and installation of such device do not conform to the requirements of section 501(g) and were not brought into conformity with such requirements within a reasonable time after receipt of written notice from the Board specifying the matter complained of; or

"(F) that on the basis of new information before it, evaluated together with the evidence before it when the application was approved, the labeling of such device, based on a fair evaluation of all material facts, is false or misleading in any particular and was not corrected within a reasonable time after receipt of written notice from the Board specifying the matter complained of.

"(2) If the Board finds that an imminent health or safety hazard is involved, it may suspend the approval of such application immediately, and give the applicant prompt notice of its action and afford the applicant the opportunity for an expedited hearing under this subsection; but the authority conferred by this paragraph to suspend the approval of an application shall not be delegated.

"(3) Any order under this subsection shall state the findings upon which it is based.

"Authority To Revoke Adverse Orders

"(f) Whenever the Secretary finds that the facts so require, he shall revoke any previous order under subsection (d) or (e) denying, withdrawing, or suspending approval of an application and shall approve such application or reinstate such approval, as may be appropriate.

"Service of Secretary's Orders

"(g) Orders of the Secretary under this section shall be served (1) in person by any officer or employee of the Department designated by the Secretary or (2) by mailing the order by registered mail or certified mail addressed to the applicant at his last-known address in the records of the Secretary.

"Referral to Independent Advisory Committee

"h(1) In the application filed by the applicant under subsection (b), or at any time prior to the expiration of the time for action by the Secretary under clause (1) or (2) of subsection (c), or within such reasonable period after notice of opportunity for a hearing to be held under subsection (d) or (e) as may be specified by the Secretary in such notice, the applicant may request that such application or the Secretary's action thereon, or the matter or matters with respect to which notice of opportunity for hearing is given, be referred to an advisory committee of experts for a report and recommendations with respect to any question therein involved that requires the exercise of scientific judgment. Upon such request, or if the Secretary on his own initiative deems such a referral necessary, the Secretary shall appoint an advisory committee and shall refer to it, together with all the data before him, the question so involved for study thereof, and for a report and recommendations thereon, in accordance with the applicable provisions of paragraph (5) (C) (ii) of susbection (b), and subject to paragraph (2) of subsection (d) of section 706. The applicant, as well as representatives of the Board, shall have the right to consult with such advisory committee in connection with the question referred to it.

"(2) The appointment, compensation, staffing, and procedure of such advisory committee shall be in accordance with subsection (b) (5) (D) of section 706.

"(3) Paragraph (3) of section 513(d) shall also apply in the case of a referral to an advisory committee under this subsection.

"Judicial Review

"(i) The applicant may, by appeal, obtain judicial review of a final order of the Board denying, or withdrawing approval of, an application filed under subsection (b) of this section. The provisions of subsection (h) of section 505 of this Act shall govern any such appeal.

"Exemption for Investigational Use

"(j) (1) It is the purpose of this subsection to encourage, to the maximum extent consistent with the protection of the public health and safety and with professional ethics, the discovery and development of useful devices and to that end to maintain optimum freedom for individual scientific investigators in their pursuit of that objective.

"(2) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (3), there shall be exempt from the requirement of approval of an application under the foregoing provisions of this section any device which is intended solely for investigational use (in a hospital, laboratory, clinic, or other appropriate scientific environment) by an expert or experts qualified by scientific training and experience to investigate the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of such device.

"(3) (A) The Board shall promulgate regulations relating to the application of the exemption referred to in paragraph (2) to any device that is intended for use in the clinical testing thereof upon humans by separate groups of investigators under essentially the same protocol, in developing data required to support an application under subsection (b).

"(B) Such regulations may provide for conditioning the exemption in the case of investigations intended for such use, upon—

"(i) the submission to the Board, by the manufacturer of the device or the sponsor of the investigation, of an adequate plan for the investigation, together with a report of prior investigations of the device (including, where appropriate, tests on animals) adequate to justify the proposed investigation;

"(ii) the manufacturer, or the sponsor of the investigation, of a device to be distributed to investigators for such testing obtaining a signed agreement from each of such investigators that humans upon whom the device is to be used will be under his personal supervision or under the supervision of investigators responsible to him;

"(iii) the establishment and maintenance of such records, and the making of such reports to the Board, by the manufacturer of the device or the sponsor of the investigation, of data (including but not limited to analytical reports by investigators) obtained as a result of such investigational use of the device, as the Board finds will enable it to evaluate the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of the device in the event of the filing of an application pursuant to subsection (b), but nothing in this clause or in this subsection shall be construed to require any clinical investigator to submit directly to the Board reports on the investigational use of devices; and

"(iv) such other conditions relating to the protection of the public health and safety as the Board may determine to be necessary.

"(C) Such regulations shall also condition such exemption upon the manufacturer, or the sponsor of the investigation, of the device requiring that investigators using the device for the purpose described in subparagraph (A) certify to such manufacturer or sponsor that they—

"(i) will inform individuals upon whom such device or any controls in connection therewith are used, or the representatives of such individuals, that the device is being used for investigational purposes, and

"(ii) will obtain the consent of such individuals or representatives,

except where they deem it not feasible or, in their professional judgment, contrary to the best interest of such individuals.

"(D) Such regulations shall provide—

"(i) that whenever the Board determines that a device is being or has been shipped or delivered for shipment in interstate commerce for investigational testing upon humans as described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, and that such device is subject to the foregoing subsections of this section and fails to meet the conditions for exemption for investigational use of the device, the Board shall notify the sponsor of the Board's determination and the reasons therefor and that the exemption will not apply with respect to such investigational use until such failure is corrected, and

"(ii) that is determining whether subparagraph (A) of this paragraph (3) is applicable and, if so, in determining compliance with the conditions of exemption, including the adequacy of the plan of investigation submitted to the Board, or upon application for reconsideration of its determination with respect to any such matter, the Board shall, if so requested by the sponsor of the investigation, or may on its own initiative, obtain the advice of an appropriate expert or experts who are not otherwise, except as consultants, engaged in the carrying out of this Act.

"Exemptions for Devices Complying With or in Anticipation of Standards, Custom-Made Prescription Devices, and Devices Made to Specifications of Licensed Practitioners for Use in Their Practice

"(k) In addition to the devices exempted by subsection (j) the Board shall, by or pursuant to regulation, exempt the following devices, with respect to any particular use or intended use thereof, from the requirement of approval under this section:

"(1) Any device which, with respect to such use fully conforms to an applicable standard in effect pursuant to section 513, or pursuant to section 358 of the Public Health Service Act, to the extent that the Board finds that the standard provides assurance that the device will be safe, reliable, and effective for such use.

"(2) Any device of a type or class with respect to which there is in effect a notice by the Board, published in the Federal Register, that in its judgment the establishment, within a reasonable time, of a standard that would adequately meet the requirements of public health and safety with respect to such use of the device (without subjecting such device to the requirement of approval under the foregoing subsections of this section) appears to be feasible; that the Board intends to propose the establishment of such a standard; and that the non-application of the foregoing subsections of this section to such type or class of device with respect to such use pending the establishment of such standard would involve no undue risk from the standpoint of the protection of the public health and safety.

"(3) Any device made to the lawful order, and in accordance with specifications, of a practitioner licensed by law to use or prescribe the use of the device if—

"(A) a device meeting such specifications is not generally available in finished form for purchase or for dispensing upon prescription and is not stocked, or offered through a catalog or advertising or other commercial channels, by the maker or processor thereof, and either

"(B) (i) such device is intended for the use of a patient, named in such order, of such practitioner, or (ii) such device is intended solely for use by such practitioner, or by persons under his professional supervision, in the course of his professional practice.

"Other Exemptions

"(l) (1) The Board shall also by regulation exempt from the requirements imposed by or pursuant to the provisions of this section preceding subsection (j), or from one or more of such requirements, devices licensed by the Atomic Energy Commission under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to the extent the Board finds it to be appropriate to avoid duplication of regulatory controls or procedures and to be consistent with the purposes of this Act.

"(2) The Board shall further, by or pursuant to regulation, exempt from such requirements, or from one or more of such requirements, devices with respect to which in its judgment the application of such requirements is not necessary for the protection of the public health, either because of the small number of devices involved, the negligible significance of the device from the standpoint of the protection of the public health and safety, or for other reasons."

PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 211. (a) Paragraph (e) of section 301 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "or" before "507 (d) or (g)", and (2) by inserting "514(j), or 515," after "512 (j), (l), or (m),".

(b) Paragraph (j) of section 301 of such Act is amended by inserting "514," immediately after "512,".

(c) Paragraph (l) of such section 301 is amended (1) by inserting "or device" after the word "drug" each time it appears therein and (2) by striking out "505," and inserting in lieu thereof "505 or 514, as the case may be,".

PART C—REQUIREMENT OF GOOD MANUFACTURING PRACTICE

REQUIREMENT OF GOOD MANUFACTURING PRACTICE

SEC. 220. Section 501 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 351), as amended by sections 202 and 210 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph;

"(g) If it is a device and the methods used in, or the facilities or controls used for, its manufacture, processing, packing, holding, or installation do not conform to, or are not operated or administered in conformity with, current good manufacturing practice to assure that such device is safe and reliable and has the properties and performance characteristics which it purports or is represented to possess and otherwise meets the requirements of this Act."

PART D—RECORDS AND REPORTS: INSPECTION AND REGISTRATION OF ESTABLISHMENTS

SEC. 230. (a) Chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C., ch. 9, subch. V) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"RECORDS AND REPORTS ON DEVICE EFFECTS AND EXPERIENCE

"SEC. 515. (a)(1) Every person engaged in manufacturing or processing, or in distributing, a device that is subject to a standard in effect under section 513, or with respect to which there is in effect an approval of an application filed under section 514(b), shall establish and maintain such records, and make such reports to the Secretary, of data relating to clinical experience and other data or information, received or otherwise obtained by such person with respect to such device, and bearing on the safety, reliability, or effectiveness of such device, or on whether such device may be adulterated or misbranded, as the Board may by general regulation, or by special regulation or order applicable to such device, require. Regulations and orders prescribed under the authority of this subsection shall have due regard for the professional ethics of the medical profession and the interests of patients and shall provide, wherever the Board deems it appropriate, for the examination, upon request by the persons to whom such regulations or orders are applicable, of similar information received or otherwise obtained by the Secretary.

"(2) Every person required under this subsection to maintain records, and every person in charge or custody thereof, shall, upon request of an officer or employee designated by the Secretary, permit such officer or employee at all reasonable times to have access to and copy and verify such records.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

"(1) pharmacies which maintain establishments in conformance with any applicable local laws regulating the practice of pharmacy and medicine and which are regularly engaged in dispensing prescription drugs or devices, upon prescriptions of practitioners licensed to prescribe such drugs or devices, to patients under the care of such practitioners in the course of their professional practice, and which do not, either through a subsidiary or otherwise, manufacture or process drugs or devices for sale other than in the regular course of their business of dispensing or selling drugs or devices at retail;

"(2) practitioners licensed by law to prescribe or administer drugs and devices and who manufacture or process devices solely for use in the course of their professional practice;

"(3) persons who manufacture or process devices solely for use in research or teaching and not for sale;

"(4) any person, with respect to any device—

"(A) which (and the components of which) have not been in interstate commerce, and

"(B) which are not introduced or intended for introduction into interstate commerce; or

"(5) such other classes of persons as the Board may by or pursuant to regulation exempt from the application of this subsection upon a finding that such application is not necessary to accomplish the purposes of this subsection."

INSPECTION RELATING TO DEVICES

SEC. 231. (a) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 704 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 374) is amended by inserting "or prescription devices" after "prescription drugs" both times it appears.

(b) The third sentence of such subsection is amended (1) by striking out "for prescription drugs", (2) by striking out "and antibiotic drugs" and inserting in lieu thereof ", antibiotic drug, and devices", (3) by striking out "or section 507 (d) or (g)" and inserting in lieu thereof ", section 507 (d) or (g), section 514(j), or section 515", and (4) by inserting "or devices" after "other drugs", inserting "or of a device subject to section 514" after "new drug", and inserting "or section 515" after "section 505(j)".

(c)(1) Paragraph (1) of the sixth sentence of such subsection is amended by inserting "or devices" after "drugs" each time such term occurs.

(2) Paragraph (2) of that sentence is amended by inserting ", or prescribe or use devices, as the case may be," after "administer drugs"; and by inserting ", or manufacture or process devices," after "process drugs".

(3) Paragraph (3) of that sentence is amended by inserting ", or manufacture or process devices," after "process drugs".

REGISTRATION OF DEVICE MANUFACTURERS

SEC. 232. (a) Section 510 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 360) is amended as follows:

(1) The section heading is amended by inserting "OF DRUGS AND DEVICES" after "PRODUCERS".

(2) Subsection (a)(1) is amended by inserting "or device package" after "drug package"; by inserting "or device" after "the drug"; and by inserting "or user" after "consumer".

(3) The first sentence of subsection (b) is amended by inserting ", or of a device or devices," after "drug or drugs"; and the second sentence of such subsection is amended by inserting "or of any device" after "drug".

(4) The first sentence of subsection (c) is amended by inserting ", or of a device or devices," after "drug or drugs"; and the second sentence of such subsection is amended by inserting "or of any device" after "drug".

(5)(A) The first sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (d) is amended by inserting ", or of a device or devices," after "drug or drugs"; and the second sentence of such paragraph is amended by inserting "or any device" after "drug".

(B) Paragraph (2) of such subsection (d) is amended by inserting "or any device" after "drug".

(6) Subsection (g) is amended by inserting "or devices" after "drugs" each time such term occurs in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of such subsection.

(7) The first sentence of subsection (i) is amended by inserting ", or of a device or devices," after "drug or drugs"; and the second sentence of such subsection is amended by inserting "or devices" after "drugs".

(b) The second sentence of section 801(a) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 381(a)) is amended by inserting "or devices" after "drugs" both times such words appear.

(c) Section 301 of the Drug Amendments of 1962 (76 Stat. 793) is amended by inserting "and devices" after "drugs" each time such word appears, except that "or devices" is inserted after "which drugs" and after "intrastate commerce in such drugs".

PART E—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 240. Section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(y) The term 'Board' means the Federal Medical Evaluations Board."

EFFECTIVE DATES AND TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 241. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section, the foregoing provisions of this title shall take effect on the date the provisions of sections 104 through 107 of title I of this Act take effect.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, paragraph (f) of section 501 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added to such section by section 210(a) of this title, shall, with respect to any particular use of a device, take effect (1) on the first day of the thirteenth calendar month following the month in which this title is enacted, or (2) if sooner, on the effective date of an order of the Federal Medical Evaluations Board approving or denying approval of an application with respect to such use of the device under section 514 of such Act as added by section 210(b) of this title.

(c)(1) Where, on the day immediately prior to the date of enactment of this title, a device was in use in the cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease in man, or for the purpose of affecting the structure or any function of the body of man, such paragraph (f) of section 501 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act shall become effective with respect to such preexisting use or uses of such device on the closing date (as defined in this subsection) or, if sooner, on the effective date of an order of the Federal Medical Evaluations Board approving or denying approval of an application with respect to such use of the device under such section 514 of such Act.

(2) For the purposes of this subsection, the term "closing date" means the first day of the thirty-first calendar month which begins after the month in which this title is enacted, except that, if in the opinion of the Federal Medical Evaluations Board it would not involve any undue risk to the public health, it may on application or on its own initiative postpone such closing date with respect to any particular use or uses of a device until such later date (but not beyond the close of the sixtieth month after the month in which this title is enacted) as it determines is necessary to permit completion, in good faith and as soon as reasonably practicable, of the scientific investigations necessary to establish the safety and effectiveness of such use or uses. The Federal Medical Evaluations Board may terminate any such postponement at any time if its finds that such postponement should not have been granted or that, by reason of a change in circumstances, the basis for such postponement no longer exists or that there has been a failure to comply with a requirement of the Board for submission of progress reports or with other conditions attached by it to such postponement.

(d) Any person who, on the day immediately preceding the date of enactment of this title, owned or operated any establishment in any State (as defined in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act) engaged in the manufacture or processing of a device or devices, shall, if he first registers with respect to devices, or supplements his registration with respect thereto, in accordance with subsection (b) of section 510 of that Act (as amended by section 232 of this title) prior to the first day of the seventh calendar month following the month in which this title is enacted, be deemed to have complied with that subsection for the calendar year 1969. Such registration, if made within such period and effected in 1970, shall also be deemed to be in compliance with such subsection for that calendar year.

S. 1802—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I am a firm believer in the concept that the broadcasting industry has the dutybound obligation to serve the public interest, and that everything possible should be done to insure that this is possible. However, it has come to my attention that certain restrictions have been placed upon the Federal Communications Commission that prevents the Commission from helping local radio stations fulfill this obligation.

Section 307(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, now reads:

> (b) In considering applications for licenses, and modifications and renewals thereof, when and insofar as there is demand for the same, the Commission shall make such distribution of licenses, frequencies, hours of operation, and of power among the several States and communities as to provide a fair, efficient, and equitable distribution of radio service to each of the same.

I am proposing today to amend that section by adding the following proviso:

> *Provided, however,* that in such matters, sole regard shall be given to the public interest of the areas to be served and without regard to the effect on network competition.

The necessity for such an amendment arises out of a decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, wherein the court ruled that any disparate treatment of the ABC, NBC, and CBS radio outlets from New York City would have to be justified by "public interest reasons compelling different treatment"—*American Broadcasting-Paramount Theatres, Inc.*, v. *FCC*, case No. 17567, decided February 25, 1965.

The FCC has taken the position that such a "per se" rule would seriously interfere with the Commission's administration of the act. In a petition for certiorari, the FCC stated:

> In the foreseeable future, network relationships are likely to become more fluid than they have been in the past. In television, in particular, there is the possibility of the emergency of new networks, both national and regional in scope. Moreover, despite the enactment of the recent legislation (76 Stat. 150) requiring that all receivers be capable of receiving both VHF and UHF signals, the future equivalence of UHF to VHF facilities remains uncertain. The situation will be further complicated by the as yet undefined role of an expanding community antenna television service. A *per se* rule of network equality of facilities would affect all of these developments. If the rule is, as the Commission believes, of doubtful validity, the Court of Appeals' decision would create uncertainty and confusion in the critical period during which the new patterns of television service develop.
>
> The same difficulties are possible in the field of radio. For example, the Mutual Broadcasting System, the national radio network with the largest number of affiliated stations, has no network-owned station in New York City or elsewhere. A demand by it for a license on a clear channel in New York City, on the ground that it is entitled to equal treatment with the other networks, would, under a *per se* rule, raise a serious question since all of the clear channel frequencies assigned to New York City are licensed to existing stations. The Commission believes that it could not appropriately act on any such request by Mutual under a *per se* rule, but that it would need to weigh the degree of prejudice to Mutual's network service against the disruption in other service to the public which would be caused by the reallocation of existing station assignments.

The U.S. Supreme Court did not review this case. Thus, the Commission's hands are now tied by the appellate court's decision unless legislative relief is afforded. The court of appeals did not point to any provision of the Communications Act, the rules of the Commission, or any legislative history of either to support its position on equality of treatment of networks. It is without judicial precedent, and according to the FCC is contrary to other decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

My interest in this whole matter stems from the fact that an Albuquerque radio station has been involved in a year's long struggle with the ABC network-owned radio station in New York City over rights to broadcast over 770 kilocycles. The ABC station seeks to deny legitimate rights to the Albuquerque station because of slight interference with ABC's New York-originated signal in the Midwestern States. ABC brought the aforementioned suit against the FCC solely to deny the Albuquerque station its rights.

The FCC, in a September 1958 decision, had found that the Albuquerque station should be entitled to fully enjoy the facilities and coverage on 770 kilocycles, as this would best serve the public interest.

Passage of the legislation I have proposed would thus enable the Commission to bring this about if it found that such action would still serve the public interest. I believe this is fair and just, and urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1802) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to require that the public interest of the areas to be served be the sole consideration in the allocation of certain facilities pursuant to such act, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1802

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 307(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided, however,* That in such matters, sole regard shall be given to the public interest of the areas to be served and without regard to the effect on network competition".

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1782), to amend section 7(b) of the Small Business Act to provide for new interest rates on the Administration's share of disaster loans.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1076) to establish a Youth Conservation Corps in the Departments of Interior and Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1363) to provide for support by the Teacher Corps of programs in which volunteers serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7), proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) be added as a cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 168) providing a new approach to financing college educations.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 180—RESOLUTION DESIGNATING MAY 6, 1969, AS "A. PHILIP RANDOLPH DAY"

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution to declare May 6, 1969, as "A. Philip Randolph Day."

On April 15, 1969. A Philip Randolph will be 80 years of age and on May 6, 1969, his birthday will be celebrated by friends and dignitaries at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City.

The contribution A. Philip Randolph has made to his people and to this Nation deserve special recognition. He has in the past been referred to as Dean of Civil Rights, a Man for all Seasons and has been recognized by leaders of this Nation to be a truly great man.

In 1964 Mr. Randolph was presented the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest American civilian award, by President Johnson which reads in part:

> Trade unionist and citizen, through four decades of challenge and achievement, he has led his people and his nation in the great forward march of freedom.

The great accomplishments which prompted this citation are too numerous to recall, but were all attained with dignity and restraint and without a single act of violence. He has proceeded through the years to assist in the building of a Negro-labor alliance and to the integration of the Negro people into the economic, social, and political life of America, through the application of principles of nonviolent reform.

His participation in the labor movement, from the organization of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters in the 1920's to vice president of the AFL–CIO and international president emeritus of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters in the 1960's, has contributed greatly to the attainment of just and deserving rights by the poor and working man of all races.

It is therefore appropriate that we recognize this outstanding man for accomplishments past and present and for those which will surely come in the future.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. 180), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. RES. 180

Whereas A. Philip Randolph has dedicated his life to the securing of dignity, justice and equality for the Negro in America;

Whereas Mr. Randolph has worked diligently to meet the needs of the working man and has made a tremendous contribution to the American trade union movement;

Whereas Mr. Randolph has dedicated his life to the building of a Negro-Labor alliance and to the integration of Negro people into the economic, social and political life of America;

Whereas Mr. Randolph will be celebrating his 80th birthday on April 15, 1969;

Whereas a special celebration for Mr. Randolph's birthday will be held on May 6, 1969, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates May 6, 1969, as "A. Philip Randolph Day."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit to A. Philip Randolph a copy of this resolution.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON EDUCATIONAL MATTERS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is planning to start its hearings on education matters for the first session of the 91st Congress.

The initial plans call for open hearings on S. 1611, a bill to amend Public Law 85–905 to provide for a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped, on Monday, April 21; and open hearings on S. 1519, a bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, on Thursday, April 24th, both to be held in the hearing room of Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

"I AM CURIOUS—YELLOW"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a Swedish film has been shown and perhaps still is being shown in Washington, D.C. It is being shown in Sweden, Denmark, and the United States. It was banned in Norway. It was censored in France and Germany, and a New York jury found it obscene. The U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in New York overruled the finding. It was relying on guidelines in decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. There you have it. A jury, mindful of the community morals, finds the film obscene. A Federal appellate court, taking its cue from the High Court, declares otherwise.

It was precisely this situation in previous cases which impelled me to introduce S. 1077, which would restrict the jurisdiction of the Federal courts to set aside a determination made by a jury on the question of whether certain matters are, in fact, obscene. It would leave it with the jury in the community to determine what they think the moral standards and the moral atmosphere should be in which their youngsters are to be reared.

I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the March 10, 1969, issue of the Wall Street Journal, an editorial published in the March 8 issue of the San Diego, Calif., Union, and an editorial published in the Washington Post of March 31.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 10, 1969]

THE BARRIERS FALL: AS CENSORSHIP RELAXES, DEBATE GROWS ON IMPACT OF NEW PERMISSIVENESS—EFFECTS OF EROTICA ON HUMAN BEHAVIOR STUDIED—EXPERT SEES SHOCK VALUE WANING—WILL PURITANISM COME BACK?

(By Alan Adelson)

NEW YORK.—The Swedish film "I Am Curious—Yellow" was banned altogether in Norway and, for a while, Belgium. It was censored in France and Germany and will be cut for showing in England.

Only in Denmark, Sweden—and the U.S., beginning today—is it being shown uncut.

The 120 minutes of screening time depict the hero and heroine in abundant nudity, various scenes of intercourse (including one in the crook of a tree) and more exotic sexual play. It has a dream sequence in which the heroine castrates her lover. There also is a good bit of ponderous political debate.

The U.S. Customs Office sought to prevent the film's entry into this country, and a jury found it obscene in a New York Federal Court. A Court of Appeals reluctantly concluded that it couldn't be banned, however, relying on guidelines of Supreme Court decisions.

The Appeals Court voted two to one to release the film uncut, saying, "The sexual content of the film is presented with greater explicitness than has been seen in any other film produced for general viewing." Judge Henry J. Friendly was explicit too in saying that he was reluctantly concurring "with no little distaste."

FOR AND AGAINST

Some viewers may be pleased, others perplexed or angered, but the showing of "I Am Curious—Yellow" seems to qualify as a significant event. Those who tilt against all forms of censorship see it as marking the emergence of the U.S. as a leader in free speech and expression. To quite another group, the film is the final confirmation of a disaster they have long seen brewing. The growing permissiveness of American society, they maintain, has finally reached total depravity.

For or against, it is difficult to argue with one observation: The barriers are coming down. In the Off-Broadway play entitled "Dionysus in '69," five nude men and four naked girls celebrate a Greek rite by slithering over one another and romping through the audience. Last week a New York City producer announced plans for a play to include on-stage intercourse. Philip Roth's steamy novel "Portnoy's Complaint" has climbed rapidly to the top of best-seller lists (the author says the book is a deliberate effort to elevate obscenity "to the level of a subject" for serious art).

And as the barriers fall, the debate over what the relaxation means, how far it should go and why it is happening is intensifying. Father John Culkin, an ardent student of Marshall McLuhan and director of the Center for Communications at New York's respected Fordham University, sees the anticensorship explosion as rooted in American Puritanism.

SHAKEDOWN CRUISE

"We're reaping a reaction to the very repressive atmosphere we've maintained in our families, churches and schools," Father Culkin says. "Calvin and those creeps left us very uptight. We weren't allowed to have bodies. And what we're going through now is a shakedown cruise exploring a new morality."

The cause of such rapid change, says, Father Culkin, echoing Mr. McLuhan, is the growth of the electronic media. Years ago, he says, it took half a century for styles and mores to change significantly, because information spread so slowly. Now the latest vogue from the miniskirt to accounts of the off-beat lives of the "swingers" is flashed across the nation by television.

But if the media seem to reflect a new sexuality, Americans actually aren't changing their mores radically, according to Paul Gebhard, director of the Institute for Sex Research (formerly the Kinsey Institute). However, Mr. Gebhard says his interviewers have found a striking readiness to tolerate discussion and airing of the so-called revolution.

"Where there has been a revolution is in censorship," he says. "The trend toward liberalization of what's allowed in the media has been going on since World War I." Mr. Gebhard points out that court decisions have accelerated the trend in the past decade. The underground market in erotic books has nearly disappeared, he says.

The legal transformation of dirty books into "literature" was lamented ironically in an article by Jerome H. Doolittle in Esquire magazine. Mr. Doolittle watched his once-cherished collection of taboo books smuggled from France appear in book stores volume by volume. "Fanny Hill" and the Henry Miller and William Burroughs books went fairly early.

VANISHING TREASURES

"My only remaining comfort was the thought that I was still the only kid on the block to own such hard-core items as 'The Roman Orgy,' 'The Pleasure Thieves' and 'Houses of Joy,'" Mr. Doolittle wrote. But then came "The Olympia Reader," a massive collection of stories that contained his own favorites and many other erotic tales.

Mr. Doolittle was encountering what one student of censorship and the courts calls "the grapes of Roth." The Supreme Court in 1957 upheld the obscenity conviction of Samuel Roth, a New York book dealer. In doing so, the court laid down what have come to be the boundaries within which publishers and film makers can operate.

The Roth case, and later decisions that made slight clarifications, established that obscenity could be proved only if ". . . to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interest" and the work is found to be "utterly without redeeming social importance."

The Appeals judges cleared "I Am Curious—Yellow" because it included serious social and political themes. The vagueness of just what constitutes "redeeming social importance" has produced many successful legal defenses of books and films which somewhere concern themselves with matters other than sex.

"As long as children are excluded from access, we can win with almost anything now," says Richard Gallin, the New York attorney who negotiated "I Am Curious—Yellow" past the Customs Office. Ephraim London, an attorney who has won six such cases in appeals to the Supreme Court, says only a movie "with out-and-out intercourse and no pretense of having any social value" is in peril before the courts now.

Barney Rosset, president of Grove Press, which is distributing "I Am Curious—Yellow" in the U.S., believes sex has its own redeeming social importance. "After all, if it weren't for sex, we'd depopulate the entire human race," he says. Mr. Rosset, in fact, argues, "There's no such thing as pornography. Things can be erotic, and they can be good or bad (in quality), but I just don't believe in censorship."

The argument over what is pornographic, or "prurient," has been raging for decades. For D. H. Lawrence, author of "Lady Chatterley's Lover," pornography was not vivid sexual description but "the attempt to insult sex, to do dirt on it." That he said, was "unpardonable" and cause for censorship.

Mr. Rosset finds prurient interest in the TV commercial where a Scandinavian girl, pitching for Noxzema, purrs "Take it off, take it all off." Declares Mr. Rosset. "She's saying, 'Hurry up and shave with this stuff so we can go to bed.' And no one says they can't keep running that ad all the time." He groups such appeals with the dirty postcards and traveling salesmen's jokes that D. H. Lawrence found offensive. However, Mr. Rosset wouldn't censor the commercial—or anything else.

CONVINCING POINT

Lawyer London recalls his first censorship case. A state prosecutor wanted to proscribe the film "The Bicycle Thief" because it depicted a little boy urinating. "I made it very clear that the whole state would be thrown into scandal if they insisted that the sight of this lad urinating aroused their prurient interests," he says. "That was all it took."

"No girl was ever ruined by a book," said Jimmy Walker, the free-wheeling mayor of New York City during the Roaring Twenties. But the advocates of censorship don't agree. Father Morton Hill, a New York priest who went on a hunger strike several years ago in connection with his campaign to clean up magazine stands, says exotic literature "incites to violence, drug usage, promiscuity and perversion."

Rabbi Julius G. Neumann, chairman of the organization called Morality in Media (which is still fighting the showing of "I Am Curious—Yellow"), says the new era of permissiveness is breaking every barrier of decency. "It's eating away at the moral fiber of America," Rabbi Neumann says.

Actually, there has been little research into the effects of erotic material on its consumers. The Institute for Sex Research challenges the assumption that the circulation of pornography inevitably leads to an increase in sex crimes. On the contrary, interviewers found that persons classified as potential sex offenders are less responsive to erotica than a normal "control" group. The prospective rapists, voyeurists and exhibitionists didn't have the patience to plod through make-believe sexual experiences.

WOMEN AND MEN

In a 1953 study on comparative sexual behavior in men and women, Kinsey researchers found that men were more stimulated than women by "hard-core" pornography. But women were at least as responsive as men to the more artistic type of sexual material now current in films and books.

Only 32% of women studied were stimulated by "raw" pictures of sexual acts, compared with 77% of the men. But 48% of the women responded to erotic scenes in films, compared with 36% of the men, and 60% of the females found erotic passages in novels stimulating, against 59% of the men.

Mr. Gebhard, the director of the Institute for Sex Research, speculates that current liberalizing trends might be making both men and women more equal now in response to erotica. And he says that the "bombardment with sexual stimulus" that now is commonplace may be conditioning consumers to take erotica for granted. "I think a young man now is no more aroused by a pretty girl in a miniskirt than my grandfather was by the sight of a well-turned ankle," he says.

Dr. William Masters, co-author of "Human Sexual Response," says he hasn't found any great influence in pornography on people's lives. Ned Polsky, a sociologist at the Stony Brook campus of the State University of New York, goes so far as to maintain that pornography has a positive role as a "safety valve," allowing the indulgence of antisocial sex desires without damage to the family structure.

THE YOUTH WAVE

Several theoreticians find a relationship between falling censorship barriers and the widening "generation gap." John Gagnon, also a Stony Brook sociologist, says that some young people use sex as an instrument of rebellion against a wide variety of social institutions. He finds particularly relevant a scene in "I am Curious—Yellow" in which the young couple make love on a balustrade in front of the royal palace in Stockholm.

Fordham's Father Culkin says young people are exposed to all the problems of the world through their exposure to increasingly candid films, television shows and publications. Thus, he says, they find that such sins as unmarried sex, stealing and lying "just don't account for all our problems—they say, 'Well, what about war?' And then they write their own moral codes."

To be sure, not all bans have been dropped. Last week Boston authorities halted showings of the movie "The Killing of Sister George." A similar raid was made on a New York City theater showing "Muthers." A district attorney charged that this film depicted "masturbation, lesbianism, incest, sodomy and perversion."

Some observers suspect that Puritanism may reassert itself. Margaret Mead, the anthropologist, insists that Puritanism never really vanished. "All this business about clothes on and clothes off is really the same thing," she says. "It's only the older folks, the Puritans, who get excited about this sort of thing and get kicks out of it."

[From the San Diego Union, Mar. 8, 1969]

COURTS PROVIDE PEEP HOLES—ACTION IMPERATIVE TO CURB SMUT

Every person concerned about the welfare of his family and community should make it a point to take a scheduled tour of the San Diego Police Department to see the exhibit about pornography.

The courts have ruled that the material on display is legal. By judicial definition this means that the salacious pictures, clipped from magazines, do not go beyond the limits of "ordinary candor," do not appeal to "prurient interests" and do have "redeeming social value."

We believe that any person seeing the typical cross-section of salacious material on exhibit will think the courts are oblivious to the responsibility for protection of society from gutter filth and wholesale demoralization.

It is smut of the most repulsive kind. The pictures are not art—they show men and women in naked poses with close-up photography that leaves nothing to the imagination.

No decent family would have magazines with these pictures in its home. But a youth of any age with a few dollars can buy one of these publications in 20 stores in San Diego—legally.

The same youth could visit more than 20 peep shows in the downtown San Diego area where color and motion is added to the prurience. Some of the peep shows and book stores are off limits to military personnel, but nothing deters a civilian youth from being a patron.

Perhaps the most alarming aspect of the Police Department exhibit is the way it shows an increasing boldness of the smut peddlers. Just a relatively few years ago a smutty picture was naughty voyeurism. Today the photographs show all parts of the body in detail. Tomorrow they might depict sexual activity or sexual play—still fortunately forbidden by the California Supreme Court.

We believe that every concerned adult in the San Diego area should take the Police Department tour as an obligation of citizenship. It will be continued every Saturday and Sunday from 1 a.m. to 4 p.m. through March.

During the tour a visitor should pay close attention to his guides—intelligent, dedicated and concerned police officers who have been fighting our battles for us. They need our help and if they don't get it we will be the victims.

Initially, the best help we can offer is to raise our voices for the passage of Assembly Bills 62 and 63. These would prohibit persons from selling or distributing smut to any person under 18 years of age.

We should ask why the filth can be shown to the youth of California but not to the youth of neighboring states. We also should ask for laws that clearly establish definitions of pornography and support their enforcement.

Apathy will not solve the smut problem which is reaching crisis proportions in undermining our youth.

We must act. The courts have failed!

Senator Dirksen's Incuriosity

The exhibitors of the Swedish film "I Am Curious (Yellow)" which is to open here tonight doubtless have a gold mine on their hands—a gold mine the veins of which are being steadily enriched by people who denounce it as obscene, pornographic, salacious, lascivious and otherwise indecent. The film has already been on exhibition in New York, and, according to Variety, its first week of box-office receipts set "an absolute record for a firstrun N.Y. artie—without any qualifications whatsoever."

Charging that the film shows "open fornication" on the screen, Sen. Everett Dirksen announced plans the other day to make a speech about it in support of his bill to limit the Supreme Court's power to review jury decisions in obscenity cases. Had he seen the film himself? "Lord, no," the Senator thundered.

In our opinion, the Senator would be well-advised to stay away from the film. We can say with confidence that he would like it even less if he saw it than he does now without having seen it. It is simply not a film for people who dislike the depiction of "open fornication" on the screen. There are critics who say that this fornication is artistic or otherwise socially significant and who see in the film some sort of cinematographic "landmark." Nevertheless, we would defend to the death Senator Dirksen's right to avoid it.

Fortunately, attendance at the film is in no way compulsory. In point of fact, admission to it is dependent upon the payment of at least $2.50 ($3.50 on weekend and holiday evenings), prices doubled for this particular attraction. So only the curious, and the reasonably affluent, need apply. And another thing, under D.C. law, admission is restricted to persons over 18 with suitable identification.

Now, why, we wonder, if the persons who want to go to see "I Am Curious (Yellow)" are willing to let Senator Dirksen stay away from it, is he not equally willing to let them pay their money and make their own choice as to whether it is art or obscenity. The decision is obviously not an easy one. A Federal District Court jury in New York condemned the picture as obscene. But the Second Circuit Court of Appeals overturned that verdict on the ground that the film was not wholly without redeeming social value. Perhaps the Supreme Court will be asked to add its opinion to the judicial controversy. But in the end, the decision about the merits of this curiosity will lie with the public. Is that such a bad idea?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am a great believer in the jury system, and I feel the decision about the merits of this curiosity should be made by a jury.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "The Mess Found on Broadway," written by William T. Buckley, and published in one of the New York newspapers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Sentinel, Apr. 10, 1969]

The Mess Found on Broadway

(By William Buckley)

It wasn't hard to predict (I did so at the time in as many words) that when the Supreme Court ruled that the states could not suppress reading matter or by extension movies provided that they included something of social interest, that that was the end of antiobscenity legislation, notwithstanding the Supreme Court's reassurances to the contrary.

New York being a vigorous city, full of entrepeneurial verve, it is not surprising that it has emerged, in the few years since the court's decision, as the metropolitan center of pornography. It had, to be sure, a long underground apprenticeship.

A witticism of John Lindsay is recorded that when he was the congressman for Manhattan and voted on a single day against a subversive control bill and against an obscenity control bill, that he commented to an aide that Congress was trying to crack down on his constituency's two major products.

Now the social-interest bit is intellectually confusing. In the first place, anybody can insert social interest into a sex book or a sex film in about, oh, 10 minutes. In the second place, the term "social interest" is itself meaningless. Why is it not of social interest to read about the sexual affairs of Mr. Satyriasis and Madame Nymphomanial? Certainly Freud would have found it socially interesting, inasmuch as sexual relations lead to psychological insights which are of social interest.

In other words the Supreme Court acted either thoughtlessly or disingenuously; thoughtlessly if it really thought that fine lines would ensue from its decision; disingenuously if it pretended to salvage antiobscenity legislation but actually foresaw that within a few years people would be lining the streets outside theaters in New York to see couplating couples on-screen.

The interesting questions at this point are the responses of the community. It is probably fair to say that much of the community is outraged. But my notion is that the Supreme Court and the Congress have trained us well to accept rulings by the Supreme Court as irreversible.

Four years ago the Supreme Court ruled that we could not recite a common prayer in the public schools, not even one which the community's priests, ministers and rabbis approved of. On that occasion, 49 out of 50 governors of our states came out for a constitutional amendment, and see what happened. As much is likely to happen in the drive to control obscenity.

What is most discouraging is the level of analysis. The incomparable Mr. Art Buchwald was on television the other night and professed his utter unconcern with the subject. His point was that love is a perfectly wholesome thing, by contrast with, for instance, violence. Rather, he said, the sex act on-screen, than somebody sticking a knife into somebody. Now the trouble with analysis carried on at that level is that it takes us away, not towards, an understanding of the issues.

To dispose of the analogy, it does not follow from the wholesomeness of anything, that it is appropriate to conduct said anything on a public stage. The tradition of "clothing our nakedness," as the Bible puts it, is not to be confused with the Manichaean tradition of loathing one's body or despising natural bodily acts.

Such violence as we see on stage is feigned and reminds the viewer of an unenviable aspect of the human condition. If all viewers were sadomasochists, the same objections that nowadays apply to promiscuous sexual encounters on-stage might be plausibly raised. But the purpose of the kind of theater we are here referring to is not to edify, or to instruct, or to ennoble: but, at the expense of the players, to slake—or stimulate—the public lust. And it is as much a community decision whether this is desirable as it is a community decision whether there should be public brothels.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if this does not alert people and awaken them to what is going on by way of a deterioration of the moral standards and the atmosphere, then I do not know what will.

I expect to pursue the matter, Mr. President, and to pursue it with some vigor. I serve notice now that if I cannot get action on this bill in the committee on which I serve, I am going to hook it onto any measure that comes along, and make a determined attempt to cope with the terrible problem of pornography and obscenity that now besets our movies, our television, our literature, and everything else.

A SERMON ON THE FREEDOM OF MAN—PART II: COMMUNISM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on April 2, 1969, Representative L. H. Fountain, of the Second Congressional District of North Carolina, inserted in the Congressional Record a sermon preached by the Reverend Charles S. Hubbard, minister of the First Methodist Church, Wilson, N.C., entitled "A Sermon on the Freedom of Man—Introduction."

Mr. Hubbard has preached a second sermon on the general theme of the freedom of man which bears the title "A Sermon on the Freedom of Man—Communism," which merits the widest possible dissemination. This is so because such sermon deals in the most eloquent and lucid manner with the fundamental characteristics of communism, which is bent on extinguishing the lights of liberty throughout the earth.

I ask unanimous consent that this second sermon on the general theme of freedom be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Sermon on the Freedom of Man—Part II: Communism

In our next section I am going to talk about some of the dangerous causes right in our midst. A lot of these are inter-related with one major and evil cause that I shall hold before you at this time. It is Communism. I believe that to a great extent the trends that tend to strangle human freedom in the United States find their roots deep in the Communist manifesto, that is not much over a hundred odd years old. And I believe that many foolish responses that are made by people in the United States to present problems have been conditioned by this Communist manifesto. Now, I know there are many people who say, "Why, that can't be so, preacher, because free people do not like communism." Yes, but I would accuse half of you in this church that you wouldn't recognize a communist line when it appeared—not half the time, and that's the danger. Our proneness to propaganda and our brainwashing—I'll say it again, brainwashing—has led us to believe what is not true. We even try to attribute Christian principles and motives to atheistic communist leaders, and that is not true. We also try to believe that when Communists use the same precious terminology of freedom we use, they mean the same thing. And that is never true.

For instance, let me compare some Communist and American definitions of the same terms. My source for this information is the Hoover Institute, Stanford University, which has done major research in this field and has just published a report relating to wordmanship, or semantics, Communist weapon against you and me. Using the very words we like best, Communism is attacking democracy where we are at our weakest—in our own soft-headed love of wishful thinking. Let us look at some of these definitions.

What does the Communist semanticist mean by "democracy"? He means "the dictatorship of the proletariat"—and that is all he means! What does he mean by "planning"? He usually means expropriation of property. What does the Communist mean by "liberation"? He means revolution. That's all he means. He disguises the word "communism" for the consumption of Westerners by simply calling it "anti-colonialism," "anti-imperialism," "anti-Fascism." Every time he uses any of these terms, he is talking about communism. And by "peaceful co-existence"—and we heard that at the United Nations so very recently—that there will be peace and co-existence in Korea when foreign troops leave South Korea. The speaker didn't mention foreign troops in North Korea. He said nothing about foreign troops in East Germany, or foreign troops in Hungary. He did not say anything about foreign troops in Poland, or on and on and on. And what does he mean by "peaceful co-existence?" He means that we are to be persuaded to abandon our own national security program and scrap our military forces so Communism can take over. That's what he means by "peaceful co-existence!" And that is all.

Well, is that entirely impossible to tolerate? I have even heard a minister or two—and some professors who profess to teach religion—say that it might be all right for them to take over; and then we can bore from within. So right now is a good time for me to remind you, according to the great Charles Malick, an international statesman from Lebanon, that in the 44 years that communism has been an imperialist movement, not one foot of ground that they have completely taken over has ever been taken away from them. Not one foot! So what do you mean—bore from within? Anybody is free to vote for a communist; but after he votes for the communist, he is never free to vote him out. That is a funny freedom! You say it can't be that bad, that people defect from the United States of America—oh, yes they have—maybe a few hundred people have defected from the United States of America to communism since the Second World War. Add a few who were escaping communist spies. Add a thousand or so who were dodging the draft or deserting from the armed forces, who did not go to communist countries. We confess to that few! And, of our few defectors, many have returned to the United States voluntarily—at the risk of going to jail.

How about the Communist World since the Second World War? How happy have their citizens been in these countries that advertise land, bread and peace? Since the Second World War, over nineteen million persons have escaped from behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. (And untold millions more were killed trying to escape.) Why did they leave?

Why? Just to be free.

How are we going to compare a small company of Americans, half of whom are prisoners and brainwashed, with nineteen million people who have left communist countries since the Second World War? We will not try to make the comparison. But a good Communist or a stupid American might try.

And the sobbers continue to cry, "But, it's changed! They can't be *that* bad!"

Recently, four young Soviet writers were sentenced to hard labor in Siberia because their writings urged the government to grant more freedom to the Russian citizen.

"But it's changing!" you say. I wish it were so. There has been some sign of change in the satellite countries, but everything that you and I look upon hopefully as a change in Soviet foreign policy has been nothing but a temporary expedient.

Do you really know what international communism stands for? Do you know the four pillars that hold it up? Do you know the four indispensible props that can never let go? I'll tell them to you, for right here is the "battleground of America;" right here is a battleground of freedom; and right here is the battleground of your souls. Here they are.

(1) Everything in nature is the product of accumulated chance. That is communistic doctrine. There is no design; there is no law; there is no God.

(2) Human beings are simply evolved beasts—no more; no breath of God was breathed anywhere. Humans are evolved beasts; therefore, human life is no more sacred than that of a pig.

(3) There is no such thing as moral right or wrong. Now, Lenin stated, and I quote him, "The upbringing of Communist youth must not consist of all sorts of sentimental speeches and precepts. Morality is that which destroys the old, exploited society"—(which is any society other than Communist). Communist discipline demands that every subject person obey blindly. This, they say, is good, and therefore is morally right.

And—what's number four?

(4) All religion (not just the Methodist Church—the Baptist Church or the Christian faith, but all religion) must be overthrown—because it opposes the spirit of World Revolution.

Now, Marx did say that religion is "the opiate of the people," but more recently Yaroslavski wrote, "Atheism is the natural and inseparable part of Marxism." More recently the magazine, *Young Bolshevik*, which is promoted in every Russian home, had this to say, (and I quote directly from the magazine): "If a Communist youth believes in God and goes to church, he fails to fulfill his duties."

These, then, are the four major premises of Communist doctrine. They have not been changed since the beginning of the Communist revolution and there is no reason to believe that they will change in the future. The softest time we have known was under the leadership of Krushchev. Oh, how many people yearn that "old papa Krushchev" was back in charge! What did he say? He said that "the Soviet state will renounce Communism when shrimp learn to whistle!" He said it, and he believed what he said. These beliefs are necessary if communism is to take over the world: and if they can, they do intend to take over the world! And when you come to believe that they intend to do it, you can defend against it. But if you continue to think wishfully, probably they shall take it over.

Oh, we want to live too much. Oh, we want to live too much! There are many things worse than death. I would be happy to commit myself, my family, you and all your families, to death this day if, for that price, I could buy the promise of real freedom for our great grandchildren. Then that price would be cheap indeed. But if we keep swapping a little freedom today and tomorrow for a little more security and time today and tomorrow, pretty soon there won't be anything worth fighting for, and the Communists will prove to be right, because they will be in charge, and your freedom and dignity will be gone.

Now, what are the Communists trying to do? They have a three-point program for the United States of America. It is not a new program, but you can begin to see some of it. It is already working here.

First, Communists will influence all major national organizations, all trends, all movements. Mr. Hoover said they were in the forefront at the Pentagon march for peace! They've been in many civil rights demonstrations; they are disrupting college campuses; they may be right here in the streets of your city now. All we've got to do is *nothing* long enough, and pretty soon we will look at our own spilled blood. Our luck won't hold out.

Second, Communists will work to divide America into antagonistic special interest groups and then encourage each to seek its own welfare, never the welfare of America as a whole. Now, what has been happening in the last ten years? Isn't that exactly what we are beginning to see? Isn't that the great play of race against race? And the poor against the rich? And class against class? Labor against capital? Hasn't it been "Me first and the devil take the rest?" Did you know this condition has been communist policy for the last twenty years for the United States of America?

Third, Communists will manipulate mass thinking. They will find the mood of the masses and then guide this mood to their own use. Obviously, they didn't get hold of me today!

Now, using these techniques, the "Reds" are confident that they can get you to accept certain conditions, little by little; certain points of view, little by little; until you accept their "bait" today, and tomorrow sometime you will go passively "like sheep to the slaughter-house" and not whimper at all. You will then be conditioned as a socialist slave.

My friends, our problem today is not only that we do not take the Communist threat seriously; we do not even take our own blessed way of life seriously. We have grown fat; we have grown satisfied on the fruits of freedom and the Christian faith that made these fruits possible; and in turn, we have returned to God doubt and disobedience. We have made our own little gods of business and pleasure and status-seeking. We have allowed our children to become religious illiterates, and don't tell me they aren't because I know they are! And we are being suckered right now into selling our birthright of responsible Christian freedom for some "devil's pottage" of secular materialism. I say, "Wake up, America! Wake up! While you still can wake up!"

Your little respect for human freedom is not enough respect. Your little devotion for democracy is not enough devotion. Your little love for God is not enough love. Wake up from your sleep, America, while you can still wake!

Now, a brilliant man by the name of Dimitri Z. Manuilsky teaches in the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow, and he describes Communist strategy for the period of the sixties, a period just now concluding. We thought we had it easy in sixty-one, two, three, four and five, didn't we? I quote him, "The bourgeoisie"—now that's you—"will have to be put to sleep, so we will begin by launching the most spectacular 'peace movement' in history. There will be electrifying overtures, unheard of concessions; the capitalist countries, stupid, and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends, and as soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

I quoted the director of the School of Political Warfare in Moscow. *All Right; what shall we do?*

First, we had better keep America militarily strong. We had better keep America prepared. There is no other way we can neutralize their armed might. We must be a nation that loves peace, but we had better not be a nation that buys peace with slavery.

Secondly, our representatives now negoti-

ating had better negotiate with their eyes open, knowing that they are dealing with atheists, with liars and with back-stabbers.

Third, we must be as loyal to human dignity and freedom as they are loyal to degradation and slavery. This means that we shall commit ourselves totally to the God of Jesus Christ. If we are going to survive, we had better. Totally! Not part way. He is the only Author and Sustainer of dignity and human freedom. But let's be specific. We who are parents had better stay close to our children; and we who are teachers had better do that too, and make real sure that they are being trained to think like Washington, and Jefferson, and Lincoln, and *not* like Lenin and Marx. And while we provide for the physical needs of our families, we had better not forget their spiritual needs. It has been shown again and again that an agnostic mind is already three-fourths conquered by Communists. And we had better make that Holy Bible a *read* book in our homes. We had better—while there is still time. We had better *take* our children to church and church school instead of *sending* them, while there is still time. We had better be loyal to our church while there is still time. We had better come to it; we had better pray for it; we had better serve it. We had better give to it; knowing that an investment in Christ's church today is the best investment we can make to a free world tomorrow.

And we had better make our homes cells of Christian thought, just like the Communists make theirs cells of anarchy and hate. There, in the midst of our family, we will find the power of prayer and we will find the binding unity of devotion. We had better be active in the Parent-Teachers Association; we had better be active in Boy Scouts, and Girl Scouts; we had better be active in civic groups today. We had better be active in politics—all of us. We had better be active in every organization that will help our adults, youth and children grow into spiritual and social maturity. And we, each one of us here, had better witness our loyalty to Christ. And we had better quit being timid and ashamed. Christ and his Kingdom shall come before all other loyalties in our lives, or it shall not come at all. And thus, we shall repent of our sins; and thus we shall "put on God's armour," and thus we shall abide in His strength; and thus shall America grow strong in the Providence of God. Thus shall America grow beautiful; and thus shall America grow free again.

May God grant it. He'll do His part; we had better do ours. God bless you for hearing. God keep you safe.

SCOFIELD AND ALLIS CHALMERS: THE LABOR BOARD AND THE SUPREME COURT AS A JOINT COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE REVISION

Mr. **ERVIN.** Mr. President, for the past year, the Subcommittee on Separation of Powers has been investigating the independent administrative agencies with a view to determining how faithfully they interpret and apply congressional intent as expressed in the statutes which Congress has delegated to them to administer. The subcommittee's first detailed study has been directed to the National Labor Relations Board and its administration of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The National Labor Relations Board is charged by Congress with implementing the policy of the Labor Act—and that means the whole policy, not solely those parts which the Board in its independent wisdom considers well advised, workable, and worthy of its blessings. The Taft-Hartley Act declares in section 7 that all employees shall have the protection of the law in engaging in collective action and collective bargaining, and in refraining from collective action. The obligation placed by Congress on the Board with respect to the enforcement of section 7 means that it must protect the right of workers to refrain from collective action—even in the face of a contrary wish of the union—no less vigorously than it protects the rights of workers to engage in collective action free of employer interference.

Under the administrative agency system, the function of the courts is to review agency decisions applying the law, and to correct the agency when it strays from congressional will. Just as the National Labor Relations Board is not above the statute and congressional intent, so the courts, including the Supreme Court, must not substitute their own views of desirable labor policy for that of Congress. While many these days believe that the Supreme Court has a roving commission to rewrite the Constitution however it sees fit, thus far no one has suggested that the Court may disregard congressionally enacted law and substitute its own view in place of Congress' when it reviews an agency's administration of a statute.

These fundamental canons governing the administrative agency system and the role of the courts seem, from the subcommittee's investigations, to be honored more in the breach than in the observance, at least so far as labor law is concerned. Time after time the subcommittee has seen examples of the Board's aggressive enforcement of statutory language the agency agrees with, and the watering down or complete disregarding of portions with which it disagrees.

The Taft-Hartley Act is a complex system of law designed to bring the diverse interests of labor, management, the working man and the general public into harmony and balance. In writing the statute, Congress sought to find an accommodation of these many competing interests, and the compromises and adjustments that are expressed in the statute was reached only after much controversy and painstaking effort. The Board, however, is oblivious to this. It continually exhibits a tendency to favor one or more of these interests to the detriment of the others. The Board has failed in its duty to give expression to the balances which Congress sought to achieve.

Regrettably, the Supreme Court has itself failed to perform its function of insuring that the Board applies the whole of the statute and enforces all of the congressional intent. The Court, too, prefers to emphasize portions of the law it agrees with, and to leave other interests and congressional policies to decay for lack of protection. Even where the Supreme Court may disagree with the Board, too often the result is that Board distortion of the statute is replaced by Supreme Court distortion. The Supreme Court seems to be no less eager than the Board to create its own system of labor law, independent of Congress.

Nowhere can this be better seen than in the so-called union-fine cases. Even a passing familiarity with this newly devised doctrine shows that both the Supreme Court and the Board have lost or forgotten a major interest that the Taft-Hartley Act seeks to protect and have destroyed what is on its face simple statutory language.

The major Supreme Court declaration in this field, and the least defensible, is the Allis-Chalmers case, which was decided in June 1967. In that case, the Court upheld the Board's position that unions can fine members who refuse to participate in union-called strikes, and who instead prefer to continue working. And just the other day, the Supreme Court decided the case of Scofield against National Labor Relations Board, which extends the evils of the Allis-Chalmers decision by holding that unions may fine workers for working hard and too efficiently at their jobs. This decision makes even more imperative the need for congressional action to restore the original meaning of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Taft-Hartley Act prohibits restraint and coercion by either union or employer against any employee who exercises his section 7 rights. In plain words, the employee is protected against his employer when he engages in collective action, and against his union when he declines to do so. Nothing could be more fundamental than the conclusion that if a worker decides he does not wish to go on strike he may refrain from this union activity and be protected by the law from any union restraint or coercion because he continues to work. Similarly, if he wishes to increase his earnings, he may refrain from union-imposed work quotas, and be free of union retribution. The Board's function is to protect the worker in the exercise of this statutorily confirmed right. The Supreme Court's duty is to enforce Board decisions designed to protect a worker's free choice. Unfortunately, both the Board and the Supreme Court have failed to protect this right.

Unions have a right to make rules for the retention of membership. This is a right which is explicitly granted by the statute. But both the Board and the Supreme Court have inflated this limited provision which protects the union's right to manage its internal affairs into a power to deprive a man of his earnings and his livelihood. The Board and Supreme Court have ruled that union discipline in the form of fines may be imposed for violation of union rules plainly and admittedly designed to operate as coercion and restraint of section 7 rights. Thus, by that peculiar logic which seems to govern the Board and the Supreme Court in this area, it is deemed a matter of internal union business when a man exercises his right to work in the face of a strike, or when he chooses to work harder than the union would like and to collect his pay for his extra work.

The union's right to regulate its internal affairs must end when this right conflicts with a man's job rights. This is explicitly and repeatedly emphasized in the statute. Union rules which impose fines strikes at the very heart of a man's job—his right to be paid for working. When the Board and the Supreme Court affirms a union's power to deprive a man of pay for working they strike at the heart of section 7, they directly affect that worker's job right, and they give the union leadership an all-powerful weapon over the livelihood of their members.

The rule which the Supreme Court created in the Scofield case and Allis-Chalmers case is an interesting illustration of the law-revision process which the Board and the Court engage in when they mangle statutory language. The rule in these cases, the Court now says, is that the statute "leaves a union free to enforce a properly adopted rule which reflects legitimate union interests, impairs no policy Congress has imbedded in the labor laws, and is reasonably enforced against union members who are free to leave the union and escape the rule." Of course, this new Court rule appears nowhere in the Taft-Hartley Act, nor anywhere else in the statutes-at-large.

This formulation is curious for a number of reasons. First, one may look in vain for any reference to employee free choice, or for any acknowledgment that individual workers have rights or interests different from that of the unions they belong to. Nowhere is mentioned made of section 7, the "magna carta" of employee rights, and its forceful statement about the right to refrain from what the Court has entitled "legitimate union interest." The new Supreme Court rule ignores the statutory prohibition or union "restraint and coercion" by defining it out of meaning. And it completely ignores reality and facts when it refers to a member's supposed freedom to "escape the rule" by leaving the union. The key to these cases is that fines are enforced by State court suits, not by expulsion from the union. Because of the Board and the Supreme Court, there is no escape from union tyranny and confiscatory fines.

The Court makes much of the requirement of "reasonable" fines, but no Board decisions or Court cases in which a fine was evaluated in terms of its reasonableness, much less ruled invalid on that ground. In fact, the Board and Court have explicitly left it to State courts to rule under State laws governing contracts when a fine is unreasonable. And as recently as last year, the Board's General Counsel refused to issue complaints in cases alleging the unreasonableness of fines. Fines ranging from $10,000 to over $20,000 have been imposed against employees seeking to exercise their "right to refrain from collective action" under section 7. The General Counsel refused to allow these individuals an opportunity to test their fines before the Board or the Supreme Court.

The union-fine cases decided by the Board and the Supreme Court illustrate all too clearly the fact that these bodies have been revising the law in the guise of enforcing it. They have championed the right of unions to enforce unrelenting discipline on members by permitting them to impose compensatory fines and enforce them by court suits as well as by expulsion from the union. In doing so they have raised the union's right to manage its internal affairs to the level of an overriding principle of the act, higher than section 7, higher than the prohibition against coercion and restraint by unions, and higher than the policy that a man's union membership and his job rights are to be kept distinct.

The need for legislative correction of the joint Board-Supreme Court perversion of legislative intent and statutory language is apparent to every union member. So far, unfortunately, Congress has shown no great willingness to come to their defense, despite the shocking number of fines being imposed. Although many legislative alternatives have been proposed, there is a strange disinclination in Congress to come to grips with the critical distortions of the law which the Board and the Supreme Court have created.

Congress has an obligation to insure that both the courts and the independent administrative agencies operate within the confines of the legislative will. An important part of Congress responsibility is to be alert to what the agencies and the courts are doing with legislation. All too often, as the subcommittee's hearings on the Board have shown, this responsibility is not fulfilled. But the other part of Congress responsibility is to take the necessary action to redress a situation where it is clear that congressional intent has been disregarded. Nowhere is this need more evident than in the union-fine cases. Proposals to correct this state of affairs have been in Congress for years. It is high time they were considered by the appropriate committees. Legislation to remedy this crisis should be passed without further delay.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Secretary of Defense, Mr. Laird, for not appearing before the Republican National Committee today to discuss the question of the ABM.

I wish to express my concern about reports I have read in the newspapers to the effect that the Democratic National Committee has indicated that the question of the ABM might become a partisan issue.

I also want to express my concern about Republican attempts to make it a partisan issue on the basis of pressures which I understand—but cannot prove—have been in operation during the past several days.

Furthermore, I also wish to express my concern about any Democrat in this Chamber who attempts to make the ABM a partisan political issue.

I am also concerned with committees being set up either for or against the ABM and being allied with either party. I think they should go their own way, make their own case. The Senate will make up its own mind, either for or against.

I commend the President, if a report which I have heard is accurate on the statement, attributed to the White House, that he contemplates appearing before the Nation in defense of his proposal for a Safeguard missile system. That is within the area of his responsibility—make his case, so to speak. But the point I emphasize above all else is that this is not a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. It is a national issue which supersedes the interests of both parties. It is an issue which has two sides. There are meritorious arguments on both—let them be heard in the Senate.

In recent years many issues of foreign relations and military policy have come before the Senate. That these questions have been considered in an atmosphere free of partisan political consideration reflects great credit on Senators of both parties.

I have no hesitancy in this connection in acknowledging a debt to the distinguished minority leader (Mr. DIRKSEN) and to the entire Republican membership. During the Kennedy and the Johnson administrations, there was no inclination on their part to play politics with the Nation's security. Equally, there will be no inclination on the part of the majority leadership to play politics with these issues during the current administration.

That is not to say that there will not be differences. There are already differences even as there were differences during the past two administrations. The differences, however, will cut across party lines, now, even as they did then. That is to be expected when complex questions confront the Senate. That is as it should be when these questions are examined in the context of the variety of insights and attitudes which exist in the Senate.

The treatment of Vietnam during the last administration illustrates this point. The Senate will recall that policies of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations on Vietnam were disputed, in the first instance, by Democratic Senators, by members of the Democratic majority. My own views of disagreement with these policies are well known because they were expressed publicly and, in private, to both President Kennedy and President Johnson. Clearly, there was no element of politics involved in Democratic Senators assuming positions of opposition to a Democratic administration.

Distinguished Republican Senators, however, also formed a most articulate and perceptive segment of the opposition to the spread of the Vietnamese violence during the previous administration. To be sure, the opposition of these Republican Senators was directed at a Democratic administration. They acted, however, not out of partisanship but on the basis of their high constitutional responsibilities. In my judgment, those Republican Senators deserve not partisan labels but national thanks for their contribution to preventing the compounding of the tragic conflict in Vietnam.

In the same fashion, the critical examination of the ABM issue has also transcended party lines. The opposition to this immensely costly and questionable military undertaking did not begin on January 20 with a Republican administration. Rather, the opposition had already reached significant expression—perhaps over 40 percent of the Senate—in the last session of the Congress.

There were Democratic Senators, then, who voted their convictions that the Department of Defense was moving into dubious grounds with the ABM proposal. There were Democrats, then, who felt and so stated—the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), for example—that we would risk enormous tax funds for what, at the very best, would prove an unnecessary piling up of useless military hardware.

In this instance, too, as in the case of Vietnam, voices of opposition were raised on the Republican side of the aisle. Indeed, the initiative which served to marshal the opposition to the ABM came largely from the perceptive and articulate arguments of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER).

Why did this distinguished Republican speak out? Did he speak as a Republican to embarrass a Democratic administration? Or did he speak as a Senator of conscience and conviction? Did the Senator from Kentucky speak as a partisan politician or as a former diplomat with an immense knowledge of world affairs? And did the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH), the ranking member of the minority of the Armed Services Committee, in opposing this project last year, speak as a partisan politician? Or did she speak as one of the Senate's ablest experts in military matters, with a far longer experience in the problems of nuclear weaponry than most of the Defense Department officials who were urging the ABM?

I need not labor the point. I make the point only to underscore the total absence of partisanship, heretofore, in the consideration of the issue of the ABM. I make it only because of disturbing reports of outside efforts to synthesize a political partisanship where, in fact, none has existed and where none should exist.

We were, none of us, born yesterday. We are, none of us, strangers to the more devious byways of the world of politics. But the attempt to bring political considerations into this issue by the backdoor of the Senate is not trivial and it is most inexcusable.

What is at stake, here, is not the political popularity of this administration anymore than its predecessor. What is at stake here, in the end, are billions of dollars of funds—expenditures which have been proposed by the Defense Department under consecutive administrations. These are public funds which we can ill afford to waste on superfluous impractical or irrelevant defenses at a time when inflation and taxes and urgent civil demands are pressing heavily upon the people of the United States.

What is sounding in the ABM question is not the clarion call to politics in 1970 or 1972. It is, rather, the call to face clearly in the Senate the issues of peace and war—to consider deeply what may contribute to the strengthening of peace and what may intensify the prospect of war.

That is what confronts us. I do not know how the Senate will decide this issue. I am confident, however, that Senators of both parties will dismiss from the consideration of the issue this patent attempt to intrude an extraneous politics into the constitutional responsibility which devolves upon each Senator regardless of his views.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield, if I have time remaining.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I thank Senator MANSFIELD for his very generous remarks. But I must say that the effort in the Senate to bring before the Congress and the country the merits of the proposed ABM system has been led and shared by many on both sides of the aisle, and certainly the leadership and moral force of the majority leader has been in my view a most important factor.

I share his viewpoint that the ABM issue should be removed from the arena of partisan politics, as far as it is possible. I say—as far as possible—because of public interest in issues and in political personalities make it impossible that a debate such as this will be carried on wholly apart from political consideration. And beyond the partisan politics, the Executive, as well as Members of the Congress who oppose and support this system, has the right and the duty to the country to call for support.

But I would caution the national committees and political organizations, whether of the Republican or Democratic Party, not to appeal for support or opposition to the system because of party or support of individuals. As Members of the Congress deeply concerned about this issue which affects our country seek to make their decision, partisan efforts do not help and in my judgment will backfire.

This debate involves the question of national security, which no responsible person of either party would want to compromise. Beyond the question of whether deployment against some sudden or immediate danger which in my view has not been satisfied, is the larger issue of determining the elements of security in a world of nuclear weapons, and the question of deployment concerns its effect on negotiations with the Soviet Union on control of nuclear weapons, for which the President is striving. The question of whether such arrangements are possible is always a doubtful one, but the very nature of our system of government demands always that we make the effort. A sensible ground upon which we can expect an opportunity to reach such an accord is that our interests in this case are mutual. The Soviets are unpredictable, but like the United States, we cannot consider that they want to be destroyed.

We must consider the effect of the continued escalation of defensive and offensive nuclear weapons. Will their continued development cause the balance of terror to become an imbalance of terror with increased danger that one nation may try a preemptive strike? This condition would create a sense of fear, and certainly a sense of futility, particularly among the young people of our country who would like to live their lives in a peaceful world, at least relatively peaceful, and one not overhung by the threat of a nuclear race and a nuclear war. I do not suppose that any of us, young or old, want a nuclear weapons system hanging over us—and to live in mind if not in fact, like our ancient ancestors in caves. It may be there is no other way, but I am constrained to believe that reason can prevail.

When Senator HART of Michigan, and I introduced an amendment last year to postpone the deployment of the ABM system, joined by Members of the Senate, both Republicans and Democrats, we did so that the Senate, the Congress, and the country would have the chance to fully examine its merits and the necessity of its deployment. Throughout last year as Senator HART and I persisted in the submission of amendments, joined always by a bipartisan group and as others introduced amendments—Senator YOUNG of Ohio, Senator NELSON of Wisconsin, Senator CLARK of Pennsylvania—continuing debate had the effect we had desired—submission of the issue on its merits to the country.

The debate has brought forward many versions of the purpose of the system—whether against a Chinese or Soviet threat, whether to protect our missile sites, whether for a mixed population and missile site protection, or whether to strengthen the hand of our country in negotiations with the Soviet Union. Each of these purposes has been questioned at times both by proponents and opponents.

But the debate has been upon the merits and not upon partisan grounds. The elected leadership of both the majority and the minority and other Members of the Senate have taken their positions on the merits and some are opponents and some are proponents of the system.

I hope this is the way it will continue and that the decision in the Congress will be made upon the merits. I continue to hope that the President will establish a committee such as Dr. Killian recommended, which working with the executive branch will provide the best judgment of the best informed minds of our country upon the issue, and that a judgment will result which would have the support of the great majority, perhaps an overwhelming majority, of our people.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EAGLETON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as long as no Senator seems to be seeking recognition at this time, I should like to read a statement which I made on Saturday, so that it will be a part of the record of my position on the ABM:

A HOLD-FAST ON MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

After several years of relative stability, the Soviet Union and the United States are on the verge of major additional deployments of nuclear missiles. The pressure to proceed with the installation of these new systems is on in this nation and the indications are that it is on in the Soviet Union. It is on despite the fact that each nation can ill-afford the enormous expenditures of these deployments in the light of other national needs. It is on even though, for years, both nations have urged arms limitations as the better way to national security than the continuance of this appalling missile merry-go-round.

It should be noted, therefore, that during the last months of the Johnson Administration and the first months of the present Administration the Soviet Union apparently made three overtures which suggested a willingness to sit down and discuss a limitation on armaments of various types. In a similar vein, President Nixon has stated that he wants to replace the era of "confrontation" with the era of "negotiations." He has made clear that he would prefer the "open-hand" to the "closed fist" in the relationship of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Based on Secretary Rogers' press conference of April 7, I assume that Soviet probings for talks on armaments have received full consideration in the Executive Branch.

I quote from that press conference, at which time Secretary of State Rogers was asked whether there was anything standing in the way of the strategic arms limitation talks. He gave this answer: "No, there is nothing that stands in the way and they can go forward very soon. We are in the process of preparing for them now and we expect they will begin in the late spring or early summer."

It would be my hope that the President, on that basis and on the basis of the preparations which he has made since taking office, would now be ready to set a date certain to open U.S.-Soviet discussions.

I am not suggesting that armaments negotiations should be "linked" with a consideration of political differences and the host of other issues which have separated the United States and the Soviet Union for many years. Panoramic negotiations of that kind may or may not be fruitful at some point in the future. In my view, however, first things should come first.

The first thing, in my judgment, is not to be found in the political issues of many years standing. Nor is the first thing to be found in arms reduction in a general sense which has been under discussion for two decades. Rather, the most urgent need is to curb the rising pressure in both countries for another major intensification of the deadly nuclear weapons confrontation.

The time to respond to Soviet overtures for talks or to take the initiative ourselves should be before not after the deployment of new nuclear weapons systems, for which the gears are now turning, has gained irreversible momentum in both countries. What is needed before all else are U.S.-Soviet negotiations which, confined to one question, may act to halt these gears promptly. What is needed, now, in my judgment, is the negotiation of an agreement to hold-fast on the further deployment of nuclear weapons in the Soviet Union and the United States.

If agreement on that single point can be achieved there would be created a climate of calm, as in the case of the aftermath of the Test Ban Treaty, which might help to bring about solutions of mutual interest to the more complex problems of arms-reduction as well as the resolution of political differences. At the least, the immediate result of an agreement to hold-fast on further nuclear deployments would be an immense savings of resources which would otherwise be diverted into new weapons systems in both countries over the next few years. Any initiative by the President in this connection, in my judgment, would be gratefully received, not only by the peoples concerned but by the peoples of the world.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intent of the leadership to call up tomorrow Senate Resolution 167, a resolution authorizing a speech reinforcement system for the U.S. Senate Chamber.

HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTION—RESOLUTION BY CULVER CITY YOUNG DEMOCRATS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there are many times when we become impatient with some of the actions of the so-called younger generation. People point to the misdeeds of some younger people and tend to scorn the good deeds of the entire generation. Unfortunately, we are not always aware of the truly constructive actions of the younger generation.

Recently I received a resolution by the Culver City Young Democrats supporting the Human Rights Conventions—on genocide, forced labor, and the political rights of women.

This is a constructive action. An unselfish one, and one which deserves our applause. I hope that it will help to bring about Senate ratification of these conventions. I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the RECORD, in the hope that it will spur the Senate to action, and remind us all of our common humanity, young or old.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES TO RATIFY THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTIONS ON GENOCIDE, FORCED LABOR AND THE POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN

Whereas, the United Nations conventions relating to Genocide, Forced Labor, and the Political Rights of women here-in-after referred collectively as the Human Rights Conventions are in accord with the principles embodied in the Constitution; and

Whereas, ratification of the Human Rights Conventions would not commit the United States to any action that is contrary to the laws of the United States or any states or territory thereof; and

Whereas, the Human Rights Conventions assert principles essential to the operation of democratic societies; and

Whereas, the Human Rights Conventions concern the essential precepts of civilization; therefore, be it

Resolved by the Culver City Young Democrats, That, The United States Senate be memorialized to ratify the United Nations Conventions relating to Genocide, Forced Labor, and the Political Rights of Women with expedition consistent with thoughtful consideration; be it further

Resolved, That pursuant to Article III, Section 4, Clause 1 of the Club Constitution, the Chairman shall forward copies of this resolution to the appropriate agencies and individuals.

Approved: March 26, 1969.

SHELLY SHAFRON,
Chairman.
HOWARD S. WELINSKY,
Parliamentarian.

FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, over recent months there has been some controversy over where—in what office or department of Government—responsibility for execution of our foreign trade policies should be vested.

The Congress itself under article 1, section 8, of the Constitution, is responsible for setting basic foreign trade policy. Since 1934, however, the Congress has delegated the execution of that policy to the executive branch. During most of this period, the State Department enjoyed a virtual monopoly over the execution of that policy. However, in 1962, when Congress was framing the Trade Expansion Act it incorporated a section—241—which established the Office of Special Trade Representative and made it responsible for negotiating the Kennedy round and any other negotiations as determined by the President. The special trade representative reported directly to the President, and in this way it was felt that he would remain independent from the foreign policy orientation of the State Department. In short, we wanted a man who would defend American commercial interests and not sacrifice those interests for the sake of vague political objectives and grand designs, which from time to time emanate from the Department of State.

The question now is whether that office should continue to exist within the White House or whether the many responsibilities of executing the trade policy and legislation enacted by the Congress should be vested in another department, such as the Commerce Department. That decision, of course, will have to be made by the President himself, but with the advice and consent of the Senate.

According to recent press reports, the President has decided to keep the office of special trade representative within the White House, and will nominate a new special trade representative in the near future, subject to the confirmation by the Senate.

Since the Committee on Finance has a major responsibility for the formulation of foreign trade policy legislation within the Senate, and since there have been some misgivings on the part of many members of the committee with regard to certain agreements concluded by the previous special trade representative, I think it is altogether proper and fitting for me to say a few words today about the controversy as to where execution of trade policy should reside within the executive family.

Before getting into that concrete issue, however, I would like to state a few basic principles with which I think most Members of this body agree.

First, while trade policy is necessarily a part of overall foreign policy in that it involves dealings and negotiations with foreign governments, the basic goal of foreign trade policy—reciprocity—should not be sacrificed for other policy objectives. Commercial policy should never be subservient to the grand designs of our foreign policy advisers, otherwise we will be continually sacrificing commercial interests—and reciprocity—for vague political goals and ambitions—even the ambition of a person to be promoted to a political job. We all remember that the Trade Expansion Act was billed as a bridge toward a strong Atlantic alliance. We also know that the State Department recommended and the Congress accepted a provision of that act—section 211—which was aimed at encouraging the entrance of Great Britain into the Common Market. Although that intent was plain, it had the opposite effect, because within 3 months of the signing of the Trade Expansion Act, General de Gaulle vetoed the entry of Great Britain into the Common Market, and it was no coincidence that this happened. The point is that political objectives, such as the unity of Europe which are worthwhile in themselves cannot be bought by a tariff negotiation, and must never be bought at the cost of American jobs, farmers' incomes, or our critical balance of payments. In short, we can no longer play the role of "Uncle Sugar" or "Sad Sam," sacrificing economic considerations for vague political objectives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Second, the executive branch should realize that as a constitutional matter "the regulation of commerce with foreign nations," and "the imposition of import duties" are responsibilities vested in the Congress—not the executive. We have no intention of abdicating those responsibilities. From time to time, however, we may delegate authority for the executive branch to enter into trade agreements with foreign nations covering reciprocal tariff reductions, nontariff barriers or other matters. But the executive branch should realize—and there have been some shortsighted mistakes, concerning this in the past—that they cannot, and should not attempt to exceed the authority expressly delegated to them and expect Congress to sit supinely by accepting this de facto abdication of its responsibilities.

As a matter of fact, we embarrassed the previous President. President Johnson was embarrassed by a Democratic Congress which passed a bill and forced him to sign it and concede that he did not have the authority to do what he had been doing and what he was supporting.

Now, while the President must decide where the major responsibilities for carrying out day-to-day commercial policy with foreign governments should reside, Congress has a constitutional mandate to help him make that decision. Pursuant to this, I suggest here today that the Commerce Department has certain advantages which make it the best choice for handling that responsibility.

First, the Commerce Department trains commercial attachés who serve at most of our Embassies abroad who can expeditiously carry out directives with their counterparts in foreign countries. They also can gather a great deal of material with regard to the kinds of barriers which American exporters must cope with in doing business with these countries.

Second, the Department itself has a large staff of experts on foreign trade matters; it also has commodity experts and desk officers who follow trade developments in foreign countries on a day-to-day basis. That the Commerce Department has been responsible for the export expansion program for the past 7 years, it is an indication that their staff is well acquainted with foreign trade matters. In other words, it is fully equipped to handle the job of carrying out the foreign trade policy directed by the Congress. And where Congress has executed this responsibility, it has not incurred the kind of rare enmity or downright hatred for the executive branch which has from time to time been generated by the State Department arrogating unto itself the power to do things that Congress never intended.

The special trade representatives on the other hand have demonstrated in the past that the interest of the foreigner is probably a more important consideration in being "successful" in a trade negotiation than are the interests of U.S. firms and workers suffering from unfair trade practices of ruthless foreign producers who, for the most part, are immune from criminal prosecution under unfair trade laws in the United States. Thus, the Committee on Finance—and indeed the entire Congress—has disagreed, and indeed has overruled some of the agreements which were negotiated during the Kennedy round by the special trade representative and his staff. I refer specifically to the International Antidumping Code. The negotiations of that Code was a disservice to the American people and negotiated, as it was, without statutory authority, it was an affront to the Congress of the United States. Before it was negotiated, Congress, or at least the Senate, said, "If you dare to do this, we will throw it out."

There is nothing in the responsibilities of the Commerce Department which would bias it in seeking fair solutions to difficult trade problems. Nobody knows better than the Secretary of Commerce that it takes exports to finance imports. And better than anyone else he should be able to get the story to the foreign supplying countries that we cannot buy their products unless we can export our own. Better than anyone else he can convince them that fairness over there will be repaid by fairness over here, but that foreign discriminations against our trade is going to have to beget a reaction here which the foreigner may find financially distasteful.

Furthermore, the Secretary of Commerce is not going to have the same incentive, when American investments are being expropriated, to forgive and forget and make loans and gifts to foreign countries that are stealing the money of our people and destroying our people in order that we might get some favorable vote from the United Nations Security Council. That, in my view, is worth zero.

I have seen American rights given away in the belief of the State Department that it was important to do so.

That type of thing cannot be done by the Secretary of Commerce because he has no interest in that to begin with. The same thing cannot be said of the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, to illustrate that point, I recall when I was asked to be an adviser at the negotiations on the law of the seas at Geneva. The people representing the American fishing interests were present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, these parties who represent the American fishing interests said that the negotiations on the law of the seas could not do anything but fail.

I asked why that would be. The representative said:

> Because the American State Department has given away so many of our fish trying to get some agreement on the limitation of the territorial waters with various other countries that they have now given away more than 100 percent of the fish. And when the foreign countries discover that we have given away more than 100 percent of the fish, there will be controversy. They gave away all of our fish. Then they gave all of the fish away a second time. And when the Arabs and various other people find out that our fish have been given away twice, they will try to decide on who is to get the American fish. They will then fall out over that and the conference will be a failure.

And so it was. How would the Senator from Wisconsin like to be an American fisherman and have the State Department give all of the fish away, not once, but twice?

It would be ridiculous to say that

Maurice Stans, a highly regarded Secretary of Commerce is a protectionist because the Commerce Department is charged with concern for domestic jobs and employment opportunities for the disadvantaged. Under that line of reasoning, the Council of Economic Advisers would all be protectionists, and we know that that is not the case.

The Council of Economic Advisers is as capable as anybody else of agreeing with what any businessman says is true: that no deal is a good deal unless it is a good deal for both partners. Over a period of time, when you are trading with someone, if you are gaining and he is losing, eventually he is going to quit trading with you, because he cannot afford to trade with someone who is cheating him or when he is not making a profit. So it should be a good deal both ways, and everybody should be in favor of that kind of deal and trade. No one should be in favor of the other kind. We do not want to exploit the other person, and we do not want to be exploited.

In conclusion, it seems to me that the Commerce Department is the logical place where responsibility for executing our trade policy should be vested. No one wants to see our foreign trade policy become subservient to vague political objectives, and no one wants to see American jobs and American plants sacrificed in the interest of being a "nice guy" to the foreigner in trade negotiations, or for the purpose of taking a so-called vague international point of view which cannot be defined.

I am convinced that Congress will agree on the general proposition that foreign trade policy should be more consistent with our domestic goals of full employment and price stability than it has been in recent years. I am equally convinced that the Secretary of Commerce is the best man to correlate these policies and make them buttress each other rather than conflict with each other.

By my lights, Secretary Stans is a very liberal man when it comes to foreign trade. He believes in expanding it drastically. In my judgment, he is unrealistic when he speaks of the fantastic goals of foreign expansion that he has in mind. It would seem to me that to achieve such an objective, the other trading partner would have to agree to it, and I do not think anyone is going to be interested in taking as much exports as he would advocate from the United States unless they are going to ship us as much as they have in mind.

While I find myself in difference with some of Mr. Stans' views, and always have, I would insist to the end that he is the logical person to handle this office, especially that of trade representative. If at long last we are going to start having any trade relations and think of what is good for American workers, American industry, and American investments, as well as what is good for foreign policy objectives, to try to correlate these two desirable objectives, then it occurs to me that the time has come when the responsibilities and duties of the Commerce Department should be recognized in this field.

OIL INDUSTRY CONTRADICTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the contradiction of major oil companies pleading for less Government intervention in the free market, while relying on the Government to fix prices for them, was aptly pointed out in an editorial in today's U.S. Oil Week—an industry publication.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Senator HART has done a magnificent job in the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee in exposing how the big oil companies use the Federal Government to fix prices. For the first time academic economists have had a chance to comment on the system of Government controls which enables the major oil companies to guarantee profits for themselves while, at the same time, hiding their gigantic profits from taxation.

Reform of this system is long overdue. It is injurious to our economy, taking money from the majority of Americans, who consume oil, to help the immensely profitable corporations, while encouraging inflation.

Although it is clear that the administration is going to do very little about the big oil companies inflationary behavior, I was delighted to hear on the Today Show, my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, call for reexamination of the whole system of Government regulations, controls, and privileges which so benefit the big oil companies and insulate them from the competitive enterprise system. I join with him wholeheartedly.

Mr. President, I should like to read this editorial, because, as I have said, it comes from an oil industry publication. It is the editorial in today's issue of "U.S. Oil Week":

> The next time you hear a major oil company employe wax philosophically on about the horrors of government controls on business, smile.
>
> We've got to guard against the growing threat of government regulation in our business.
>
> That's the refrain frequently heard from major oil company employes.
>
> Utter humbug.
>
> Without government controls, big refiners would have to go out and hustle for a living.
>
> "Under the antitrust laws," professor Walter Adams told a Senate Subcommittee recently, "its a per se offense for private firms to fix prices or allocate markets.
>
> "Yet in the name of conservation the government does for the oil companies what they could not legally do for themselves," he noted.
>
> Incidentally, it's a criminal violation to fix prices, and some electric industry executives have been jailed for it.
>
> Sen. Philip Hart's probe of government intervention in gasoline and oil markets shows a different view of producer thinking than the usual conservative image shown in company magazines.
>
> For oil refiners have destroyed the time-honored view that supply and demand tend to balance each other.
>
> At the state level major companies have won government control over oil production.
>
> When jacked up prices were threatened by oil produced under competitive conditions abroad, a federal imports wall was erected with only a dribble allowed in.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has made a number of statements. I have been waiting to hear his support of those statements.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to the Senator that I am reading from the U.S. Oil Week editorial, published today. I am reading an editorial which is based on the findings of a publication which represents the oil industry.

Mr. LONG. I thought the Senator just starting reading about three paragraphs ago. Has the Senator been reading all the time, or has he just started reading?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I started reading about 35 seconds ago, when I said, "The next time you hear a major oil company employee wax philosophically on about the horrors of Government controls on business, smile."

That is what the oil industry says.

Mr. LONG. If I correctly understand what the Senator is now saying, it is that oil imports are just a dribble. Is that what the Senator said?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is still reading from an editorial of an oil industry publication which says that the oil imports are a dribble. They amount to 12.1 percent.

Mr. LONG. Is that what the Senator thinks?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the distinguished Senator from Louisiana indicate how big oil imports are, if they are not limited to 12.1 percent?

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator think that that is what oil imports are——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course they are.

Mr. LONG. That is what the Senator thinks?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is not what I think. It is what they are.

Mr. LONG. In terms of total requirements of oil and natural gas in this country, would the Senator like to know what it actually is?

Mr. PROXMIRE. What figure would the Senator from Louisiana like to offer?

Mr. LONG. Twenty-five percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana's figures are wrong.

Mr. LONG. Somebody has to be wrong.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana is wrong.

Mr. LONG. May I tell the Senator where he is wrong?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Wisconsin is only talking about zones 1 through 4. Did he know that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am talking about the oil imports that are allowed into this country under the Oil Import Administration's program.

Mr. LONG. When the Senator from Wisconsin made the statement that all of the oil that comes into this country is 12.5——

Mr. PROXMIRE. I said 12.1.

Mr. LONG. I thought it was 12.2. I am not going to argue about one-tenth of 1 percent.

When the Senator from Wisconsin made that statement, all he was talking about was zones 1 through 4. Did he know that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I made the statement as to what the oil——

Mr. LONG. Let me tell the Senator what the program is.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Go right ahead.

Mr. LONG. In zones 1 through 4, foreign crude imports are permitted to be 12.2 percent—I thought it was 12.2 percent—of the domestic consumption of crude oil in zones 1 through 4. Does the Senator know what zones 1 through 4 are?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. LONG. What are they?

Mr. PROXMIRE. These are the areas of the country on which the oil import program is organized.

Mr. LONG. What is zone 5? Where is zone 5?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I cannot tell the Senator where zone 5 is.

Mr. LONG. Zone 5 is California, Oregon, Washington, and I believe Nevada and Arizona. It certainly includes most of those Western States, and I assume it would include Alaska and Hawaii.

Zones 1 through 4, generally speaking, start at the Rocky Mountains and come to the Atlantic Ocean.

So the Senator is only talking about zones 1 through 4 when he uses the 12.2 percent figure. Furthermore, has the Senator heard of residual crude oil?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. LONG. That is under an entirely different program, but we produce very little residual oil; we had to use higher gravity oil. We do not find it advantageous in this country to produce much residual crude. However, it is a very cheap fuel, and a huge amount of it is used on the eastern seaboard.

As far as bringing in residual crude, either a coal miner has to lose a job or an oil producer has to produce less, or a gas producer has to produce less, or somebody has to produce less hydroelectric power, in order to consume the imports of residual fuel oil.

Therefore, if one looks at fuel requirements he must also look at residual fuel oil to see how much of our market they are taking, and it also affects our balance of payments.

The Senator should also look at zone 5. In zone 5, the percentage is a lot more than 12.2 percent. That is a heavy import area, even though Alaska is coming on strong.

All factors considered, foreign oil exporters to the United States now have 25 percent of the market for oil and liquefied gas products in the United States.

Can the Senator tell me of another instance where an American producer which traditionally produced our requirements and had to accept a situation where foreigners have 25 percent of the market while he sat there?

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, I do not accept the Senator's argument.

Mr. LONG. I heard the Senator's speech.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I just argued the zones covered called for 12.1 percent.

Mr. LONG. I thought the Senator said something about 12.2 percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator did not give the basis for his statement that 25 percent are oil imports.

Mr. LONG. I made a speech which lasted for at least an hour and a half on this subject. Did the Senator read that speech?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I heard part of it.

Mr. LONG. I appreciate that. The figures in that speech are not my calculations but calculations of the staff of the Committee on Finance which has the responsibility of handling the complete program. It is the calculation they came up with. They came up with that figure after consulting with the best consultants in and out of Government. It is about 25 percent of the market.

The Senator comes from a State which is interested in iron and steel. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. We process it; we do not mine it.

Mr. LONG. The Senator's State is interested in automobiles.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We process iron and steel. We are not a major producer of oil.

Mr. LONG. But the Senator's State does handle a lot of iron and steel, and he has done some fine work for workers in helping American Motors keep some of them employed. I applaud the Senator for the large payroll in his State. Certainly the Senator is interested in the United Automobile Workers, and the fact that they can work at high wages, and that they are able to do the fine job that they do. Is that not correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will look at steel imports, does the Senator know what percentage of the market steel imports now take?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not know the exact figure, but it is between 10 and 15 percent.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is correct, if he splits the difference. It is about 12.5 percent; that would be about right the last time I looked at it, but that does not include the steel in the automobile imports.

Is the Senator familiar with the great increase in foreign automobiles in this country?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am concerned about all of these things, but they do not have anything like the protection——

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator——

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator would permit me to finish, I believe I have the floor.

In the first place, the Government limits the domestic production; and, in the second place, the Government strictly limits foreign imports on the basis of a quota system. When oil officials say they have to stop Government control and that it is an evil thing, this is very contradictory.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator would permit me to interrupt, I wish to ask a question. The Senator is failing to understand what I am getting at. I want to get at it and then hear his reaction.

One must add on to the steel imports coming into this country the steel that is in the automobiles being imported in this country. What is an automobile? Most of it is steel.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As the Senator knows, the automobile industry does not receive the kind of limitation on domestic production or the kind of limitation on foreign imports which the oil industry enjoys.

As a matter of fact, American Motors has done a marvelous job selling its product abroad. Eighteen percent of all of this country's cars sold abroad are American Motors cars from Wisconsin.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will add the steel in foreign made automobiles coming into this country, and the other steel that is being imported in other forms and shapes, such as bars and pipe, then one has to conclude, when one looks at the steel in those automobiles and other shapes coming in, that steel imports have now taken 25 percent of our market for steel.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No, I cannot agree with that figure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I question that figure. In the first place, it is true that we import a number of automobiles. I doubt very much that it is anything like 25 percent of the market. I am sure it is less than that. When one computes the amount of steel in those automobiles, it is small because most of those cars are small. I think the figures of the Senator are subject to some question.

Mr. LONG. I did not say that 25 percent of our automobiles are foreign made. I said if one were to add the steel in the automobiles that foreigners are shipping to us, to the steel they are sending in in other forms, the foreign producer would appear to have 25 percent of the American market for steel. They may have only about 10 to 15 percent of our market for automobiles, and I could be a little off on that figure. I know what the steel figure is.

If the automobile makers are not concerned about it, the steel manufacturers will be concerned about it if the present trend continues.

I say the automobile workers will become concerned to the point they will have to do something about it one day, and so will the steel workers. I say that because it is fine for the Ford Motor Co. to build a big plant in England and it is fine for some other American motor companies to build big plants in Germany and Italy and send automobiles here, but the time is going to come when American labor is going to wake up to the fact that they are being traded out of good jobs. One day the Senator is going to become as concerned as I am if we have to decide which company to keep in business, and what work we want our people to do. One day the Senator is going to be as concerned as I am about trading away a $5 job or a $7 job for a $1 job.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course, I am concerned with the loss of any jobs by American workers, whether they are in Wisconsin or Louisiana. Certainly in my State, and in many other States throughout the country there are as many jobs, and perhaps more, based on exports, as there are on imports.

As the Senator knows, up until a few months ago we had a strongly favorable balance of payments. This means we sell more abroad than we buy abroad. We cannot possibly sell more abroad than we buy abroad unless we have more jobs depending on exports than on imports.

In Wisconsin we have benefited by a free trade policy because much of what we produce we sell abroad. In a few States there may be exceptions, but by and large we have benefited and the consumer has benefited. The price is held down. If we import more the consumer is paying less for gas and fuel so imports help combat inflation.

Mr. LONG. There would be a lot less to pay with because the worker would lose his $7 job and get a $1.50 job. He would be losing a job which paid more.

Mr. PROXMIRE. He could lose his job in the automobile plant. We do not have high tariffs or quotas on autos.

Mr. LONG. We have tariffs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We do not have flat limits like the quota limitation on oil. If we dispense with all our trade restrictions on automobiles, I am convinced that we would be able to compete. The people in the industry say they are not concerned about competition from abroad.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know why?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No. Why?

Mr. LONG. Because the American automobile companies have their plants in Canada, Europe, and elsewhere. I hope the Senator voted for that Canadian auto parts agreement bill. I helped to put it through. They have their plants in American companies in Canada, Britain, in France, in Germany, Italy, Latin America and elsewhere. Therefore, so far as they are concerned, they are not too greatly worried whether the autos are fabricated over there or over here.

Someday, the American worker will wake up to find that General Motors has decided it can make more money by making automobiles over there than over here; or they might make more money assembling them and selling them here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 minutes.

The PRESIDNG OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. When that American worker finds out that he lost his $5 job, and he can now get only $1.50 for it, the fact that he buys something for 10 percent less is not going to make him very happy, because his income has been cut by 75 percent.

When we put those factors together, the consumer may be able to buy for 10 percent less but instead of his $5 job, he may be making $1.25. So that, on balance, you have "had it," Senator. You would really have had the worst of it. When we make that kind of trade we are letting other people get taken for a ride.

In the steel industry the wages are $7 an hour. They are concerned. When a boy in a steel mill loses his job and has to go to Wisconsin to milk cows, he will not get as much money as he would by working in the steel mill. He is not going to be happy about the fact that he can buy something cheaper, when he looks at the fact that, on the one hand, what he will have gained as a consumer will be lost because his salary will be cut by more than 50 percent.

So that the fact he can buy more with the pitiful amount he has left, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, is not going to make him very happy.

All I am trying to say, Senator, is that when we look at this foreign trade program, we have to look at all the factors not just whether we can buy something cheaper.

One other thing the Senator has not mentioned in his speech—I hope that he will get around to it after a while—is that we cannot be sure that we can buy this foreign oil for $1.75 and base impressive figures on that assumption if we are not capable of producing our own requirements. That is what one can buy Arab oil for, when one is in the position of producing every barrel he needs in America. But the Arabs are better traders than to sell us that oil at that price, if we cannot produce our necessary requirement. It is one thing for us to be in the position to buy on a buyer's market and quite another when we are forced to buy it on the seller's own terms. We will find that the seller will get everything he can, and that will be a lot more if we are at his mercy either in whole or in part.

Does the Senator know what OPEC is? Does the Senator know what that is?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would the Senator from Louisiana like to say what it is?

Mr. LONG. First, I would like to know if the Senator knows. What is OPEC? Does the Senator know?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Offhand, no, I do not.

Mr. LONG. Well——

Mr. PROXMIRE. What is OPEC? I would be delighted to find out a little later, but the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) has time reserved to him, to begin speaking at 1:30. I rose merely to make an insertion in the RECORD, which I thought would take just a minute and a half, but the Senator from Louisiana was in the Chamber, so it has taken me much longer. If the Senator would permit me to finish this brief insertion in the RECORD, then the Senator from Louisiana could enlighten me as to what OPEC means, and we can go ahead.

Mr. LONG. Well, let me say, that if I knew as little about the oil industry as does the Senator from Wisconsin, I would want to get off my feet, too.

Let me tell the Senator what OPEC means. It is just the "Office of Production," "Office," no "oil." [Laughter.]

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator from Louisiana know what it means?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LONG. Before I answer the question, I would like for someone to ask the person who laughed, if he knows what OPEC means so we can know at a later date just how much that person knows about the subject himself.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator can do that after I leave. I do not want to be cut off. The time for the Senator from Kansas to speak is rapidly approaching.

Mr. LONG. Without burdening the Senate further with the full name of this organization, which frankly escapes me at the moment, would the Senator like to know who they are?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad that neither the Senator from Louisiana nor the Senator from Wisconsin knows what OPEC means. That should be clear by now.

Mr. LONG. May I tell the Senator who they are?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should be delighted to hear.

Mr. LONG. They are the Arab countries that sell us oil out of the Near East and Libya. That does not include Venezuela. But Venezuela does business with them. It works hand in hand with them. Does the Senator know what they are organized for? They are organized for the purpose of getting as much money for their oil as they can get. If one wants to negotiate with some foreign producers to get some oil in one of those countries, he will find that they will send someone down there about the same time he gets down there to be sure that no oil-producing country undercuts the price of the others. They are traders who want to get every penny for their oil that they can get.

If the Senator has any idea of what the steps are taken by oil-producing countries to assure that they get all the traffic will bear he will not be in favor of buying it——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to finish my remarks and then I will be very glad to yield again to the Senator from Louisiana. I will be, of course, very much pleased to get off the floor as soon as I have finished, up until the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) gets the floor; but, I have the floor now, and as I understand it, once a Senator has the floor only the good Lord himself can take him off.

Mr. LONG. If I did not know more about this industry than——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Chair.

May I say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that I know he is as able in this field as he is in many other areas.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will yield, I will tell him in 30 seconds——

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is clear that the oil industry in other countries could very well hold up our prices. I never made the claim that we can or should buy oil at $1.75 per barrel. I do think, however, that we can get it cheaper than we get it now. The consumer will be in a far better position if we had a somewhat more generous oil import program, so far as the consumer is concerned, than we have at the present time.

Now, Mr. President, to conclude reading from the United States Oil Week, the oil industry's own editorial, it goes on to say:

> Many big refiners recently found a windfall in marketing games of chance to captive resellers.
>
> It must be profitable.
>
> Majors, with some praiseworthy exceptions, are working to protect their new product line by calling on the Federal Trade Commission for more federal regulation.
>
> If the Bureau of Mines bought samples of gasoline to check the octanes—as some states do—refiners would cry "foul."
>
> As it is the Bureau of Mines takes samples for majors and evaluates them and puts out the findings for all to read . . . all who have the key to the table and only the refiners have the key.
>
> Saves the refiners a lot of money.
>
> The refining industry "neatly avoids the twin horrors of competition and antitrust action" in crude marketing and gets "statistical and policing services (from the Interior Department) that supports its private price fixing and that would be unlawful if provided by the API or another trade organization," Dr. Robert Engler, a New York economist testified.
>
> Despite the incentives, he noted, the domestic search for oil hasn't been stepped up.
>
> While the economic power of the larger companies has been increased.
>
> So it seems our sophisticated refining industry has learned what a good friend Uncle Sam can be.
>
> It's a good Uncle who charges small businessmen 20% of their income as federal income tax and no income tax to one refiner, Atlantic Richfield, with well over $100 million in net income.
>
> Maybe the next American Petroleum Institute meeting should set aside a Government Appreciation Day.

Mr. President, this is, as I say, an editorial from the U.S. oil industry and not from a Wisconsin dairy publication. It is a solid indictment of the overwhelming generosity of the American Government—at the expense of the American consumer and taxpayer—to the oil industry.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

MAJORS LOVE GOVERNMENT

The next time you hear a major oil company employe wax philosophically on about the horrors of government controls on business, smile.

We've got to guard against the growing threat of government regulation in our business.

That's the refrain frequently heard from major oil company employes.

Utter humbug.

Without government controls, big refiners would have to go out and hustle for a living.

"Under the antitrust laws," professor Walter Adams told a Senate Subcommittee recently, "It's a per se offense for private firms to fix prices or allocate markets.

"Yet in the name of conservation the government does for the oil companies what they could not legally do for themselves," he noted.

Incidentally, it's a criminal violation to fix prices, and some electric industry executives have been jailed for it.

Sen. Philip Hart's probe of government intervention in gasoline and oil markets shows a different view of producer thinking than the usual conservative image shown in company magazines.

For oil refiners have destroyed the time-honored view that supply and demand tend to balance each other.

At the state level major companies have won government control over oil production.

When jacked up prices were threatened by oil produced under competitive conditions abroad, a federal imports wall was erected with only a dribble allowed in.

Many big refiners recently found a windfall in marketing games of chance to captive resellers.

It must be profitable.

Majors, with some praiseworthy exceptions, are working to protect their new product line by calling on the Federal Trade Commission for more federal regulation.

If the Bureau of Mines bought samples of gasoline to check the octanes—as some states do—refiners would cry "foul."

As is the Bureau of Mines takes samples for majors and evaluates them and puts out the findings for all to read . . . all who have the key to the table and only the refiners have the key.

Saves the refiners a lot of money.

The refining industry "neatly avoids the twin horrors of competition and antitrust action" in crude marketing and gets "statistical and policing services (from the Interior Department) that supports its private price fixing and that would be unlawful if provided by the API or another trade organization," Dr. Robert Engler, a New York economist testified.

Despite the incentives, he noted, the domestic search for oil hasn't been stepped up.

While the economic power of the larger companies has been increased.

So it seems our sophisticated refining industry has learned what a good friend Uncle Sam can be..

It's a good Uncle who charges small businessmen 20% of their income as federal income tax and no income tax to one refiner, Atlantic Richfield, with well over $100 million in net income.

Maybe the next American Petroleum Institute meeting should set aside a Government Appreciation Day.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I am going to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will remain for a moment longer and perhaps learn a few things about the oil industry which he does not know at present.

In the first place, I have tried to fathom out what those initials OPEC mean, and I think I have it. OPEC means, "Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries." That fits. I think that is what OPEC means, because that is what they are. That would include all the countries in the Persian Gulf, including Libya, but would include everyone else that could get in on it. It does not include Venezuela because they have not been able to persuade Venezuela to join. But Venezuela collaborates with them. Those countries so organized have a common purpose to make every country which buys that oil pay as much as they can get for that oil.

There is no reason why they should not. They have parallel interests, and they work together to advance their intrusts. I discussed that matter in a lengthy speech I made on the Senate floor. I recommend it to the Senator. I think he would learn quite a few things that he does not know now.

Here is my second. At the urging of the Hart subcommittee certain people come in and give their opinions. Some may be college professors like Walter Adams. He is a fine man. He used to work with me. I used to be chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. I think he is a good economist. I would recommend him—not necessarily if I were to go into the oil industry. I think I could find someone who knows more about that business than does Walter Adams. He is a fine man, he is intellectually honest, so I think he is fair in what he says. But we do not necessarily get the correct answer from a man like Walter Adams, who would look at a price of $1.75 a barrel for foreign oil and say, "See, you can buy all you want at $1.75?

If the United States is in a position to produce all the oil it needs, it will be doing the foreign producers a favor to buy their oil at $1.75. If we told them that we would not buy it at $1.75, the United States could buy it at $1.50.

I ask the Senator if he knew what it would cost to produce oil in Libya. It would be about 10 cents for the lifting price. It is going to cost about 30 cents to ship it over here, or perhaps less. So if we look at the price which will be paid, we have to subtract 30 cents from it, which leaves $1.45. So 14½ times the lifting cost, which means 14½ times the cost of production, is being charged. The only reason they are not charging 25 times the cost of production is that they cannot get it.

When Libya raised the price on its oil some time ago, every member of OPEC joined in support of Libya. They knew that if Libya raised its price, they also could.

So when we take the American price of $3 a barrel at a gulf port, and subtract $1.75, and then multiply that by 6 million barrels of oil per day and contend that the nation could save $4 billion per year, the Senator is making a great, fatal miscalculation. He is assuming that the American consumer would buy the foreign oil at the same price when one is the captive as he could when the other is the supplicant. There is a substantial difference depending on who holds the whip hand.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I never made the assumption that we could buy it at that price. I said we could buy oil at a lower price than we are paying. There is another advantage—we would not use up our own limited reserves.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Wisconsin did not say that, but the Senator from Massachusetts came on the floor and said that in my presence a few days ago. I debated that. He did not hear my speech. He heard one of the committee witnesses, who, if I do say so, represented about as one-sided a parade of witnesses as I have ever heard of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. The Senator listened to the Hart subcommittee witnesses explain one side of the argument, and did not hear the other side, which I explained, but he attempted to reply to a speech he had not heard, and fell into the fallacy which I have been pointing out. I am sorry the Senator is not here. I shall be glad to debate it with the Senator any time he wants to. His reply was based on the assumption that if a country cannot produce any oil, it can buy oil at the same price it could if that country could produce every barrel of oil it needed, when the producers in that same country complain that they are not allowed to produce more because foreign imports are coming into the country.

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) is in error when he makes the calculation that we would save all that money, when the fact is that the other countries would raise their prices if this country were their captive buyer.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would the Senator concede any competence on the part of the witnesses who testified before the committee?

Mr. LONG. Some.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not possible that they may be right and the Senator from Louisiana may be wrong in some respects? Is it not also possible——

Mr. LONG. Just let me answer the first question. If the Senator asks one question at a time, I shall be delighted to answer.

I have heard what the witnesses said. They obviously have not heard what I said. They have not offered to answer my argument. I have answered theirs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If we eliminated the oil import program—which I do not propose; I say we should modify it—these witnesses testified that the oil could be bought at a price lower than the present international price, absent the oil import problem. They argue that the foreign countries would then compete vigorously for the U.S. market, and if they did so, the price would be lower.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would be lower than the price the consumer now has to pay for oil in this country.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. LONG. I am willing to yield to the Senator, but I would like him to show me the courtesy of allowing me to answer the first question before he takes me to the second question. I will answer any question he wants to ask me about the oil business. One thing I am satisfied of is that I know more about the oil business than does the Senator from Wisconsin, and I am happy to respond if he wants me to provide answers about it, because I think he needs that information.

The Senator asked me if we could get the oil cheaper.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. Let me answer that one question first. Can we get the oil cheaper? The answer to that question is "Yes." Why do we pay more? Do they know why? I will tell the Senator. Because there is no more vital thing one needs if he is going to fight a war than to have enough fuel to operate the instruments of war. I do not care how good a tank is—if we do not have any gasoline to put into the tank, we are bound to one spot on the ground with it and we cannot move it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. I do not care how good an airplane may be—without some fuel in that airplane's tank, it will not move. Nobody has learned how to boot the thing into the air and keep it up. It will not do the job unless it has fuel.

One thing which was determined by those who studied the problem under Presidents Johnson, Kennedy, and Eisenhower, was that we must be able to provide the requirements of the American national defense position even if it costs a little more. We should not be at the mercy of Nasser at the Suez Canal. Let us not be at the mercy of the Sultan of Kuwait—not that he would not help us, but the Russians can take that country any time they want to. Let us not be in a position where we cannot provide our own requirements. The policy was decided, by every President, under his advisers, that we should be able to meet our own requirements of fuel. That is why we have a domestic petroleum policy.

Even if we did not have those national defense requirements, we would still need to produce oil, because the Arabs and their associates would not stop at a $3 price. They would raise the price until we were able to get enough fuel out of coal or shale to make it unprofitable for them to further raise the price.

Now for another point.

Would the Senator be surprised to know that the oil industry pays more taxes than the average for all manufacturing? Woulld the Senator be surprised?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator want me to answer?

Mr. LONG. Yes, I want the Senator to answer. I asked him the question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that they pay about 17 percent, as far as income taxes are concerned, as compared with close to 50 percent for others. The Senator has many times argued that oil companies pay more taxes than the rest of industry. When he does this he includes all of the user taxes. The Senator included the taxes you and I pay when we drive our car into a filling station and fill the tank and then says the industry pays all those taxes. When we recognize that the corporation income tax is the only tax in which the incidence of the tax, the full burden of the tax falls on the corporate owner, the stockholder. Here is where oil gets away with murder.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, regular order.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On this basis the oil companies pay only a part of the taxes that other companies pay.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator to answer my question, not to make a complete speech on a totally irrelevant question. All I asked him was whether he would be surprised to know that the industry paid more taxes than the average for all manufacturing. He said, yes, he would be surprised, because it is not a fact.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is right.

Mr. LONG. He said it is not true. Well, it is true. The Senator again is proceeding under a fatal burden of ignorance that I am including in my assumption the gasoline tax that one pays when be buys the product at the pump. I am not including that. This is a burden on the product, a product that has a greater burden than any other except tobacco and alcohol. When a product carries a burden like that, it obviously makes it more difficult to make a profit. Oil carries a heavier burden of taxes than any other except the two that I mentioned, both of which have health or moral aspects involved.

Leaving that out, leaving out the consumer tax that they pay when the product is sold at the pump, let us just talk about the taxes they pay to government. Aside from that, would the Senator be surprised to know that those companies pay more than the average for the manufacturing industry, leaving those items out?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I say they do not.

Mr. LONG. They do not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. They do not.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the answer is that they do. And if the Senator will not shout me down, I will prove him wrong again.

You see, when I asked that question, I was not talking about just the Federal tax on the income. I was talking about the property taxes they pay to State governments. I was talking about the tax they pay on the severance, when they take oil out of the ground, which is a State tax. I was talking about the taxes they pay the State, city, and local governments, as well as the Federal Government; because, from the point of view of a businessman making an investment, he wants to know how much he made after taxes, and it does not really make too much difference whether it was a Federal tax or a State tax he paid, he wants to know how much he made by the time he got through.

If you put it on that basis, you will find that the oil industry pays more taxes than the average for all manufacturing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LONG. I ask for 3 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. I say to the Senator, I have made that statement a half dozen times around here, and I am sorry I had to challenge the Senator in order to direct his attention to it, but if he will look that up, and look at some of my speeches, he will find that I have been responding to some of his arguments, but he is not responding to mine. If the Senator will look that up, he will find that the severance tax—does the Senator know how much that is in Louisiana? Between 15 and 23 cents a barrel, depending on the gravity of the oil. It works out to 8 or 9 percent of the gross, before the producer knows whether he made a profit or not.

When you look at the severance taxes,

the property taxes—why do they tax an oil company so much more than a manufacturing company in property taxes? Let me explain that to the Senator. If you are a manufacturing company, with your plant sitting here, and they put a big tax on you, you would just pick that plant up and move it to the next State. So they cannot tax the eyeballs off of you if you are a manufacturing concern, but if you are an oil company, and they put a big tax on you, you cannot slant drill far enough to get Louisiana oil out of Wisconsin, so you have to pay the tax to Louisiana, whether you like it or not.

So this industry has paid more taxes than the average for all manufacturing; and furthermore, they have a control on production for reason of public interest. The Senator said it is just for purposes of helping maintain the price.

The fact is that the present method of conservation is about the only way you can do it.

Let me explain that, I regret that the Senator has left the floor now, but I will explain it, hoping that he will read it in the Record.

Mr. President, I did not plan to take the Senator from Wisconsin off his feet to begin with, nor did I plan to run him off the floor now, but I guess if I did not know any more about the oil industry than my friend, I would have left by now, too. So, Mr. President, let me explain that part of it.

It used to be, in the early days when people were in the oil business, the first guy discovering the oil tried to get it all. They used to dam up a hollow, run the oil out on the surface of the ground, and fill the hollow before the other fellow could drill a well. Then it was all yours, and he got none, and you would hope it would not rain until you could sell the oil.

I see the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Hansen), a Senator from an oil-producing State, is here. He can understand why they would hope it would not rain while they have that oil in the hollow; because if, while you had all the oil, your oil plus your neighbor's oil, here comes a great big rain. Oil is lighter than water, and if the rain fills the reservoir, the oil level will rise higher and higher. The oil floats on top of water. It runs over the dam, and never stops until it gets to the Gulf of Mexico; and nowadays folks would complain about your polluting the water while all your oil escaped down to the gulf and killed our fish down there.

So we passed some conservation laws, to say, "Look, you cannot dam up the oil and fill up the hollow with oil; you must leave the oil in the ground until you have a sale for it. If you try to get it all, you will lose most of it anyway, when you have lost all your gas pressure that pushes it up for free."

We said, "Look, you cannot do it that way. We are not going to let you take that oil out any faster than you can haul it away and sell it; and if you do not have any place to put it, we are not going to let you pollute the Mississippi River or the State of Wisconsin, if they had any oil up there, which they do not, all the way down to the Gulf of Mexico."

We said, "If you have no place to put it, and nobody to buy it from you, you just cannot produce it until you have a market and a buyer."

Then we run into the next problem. Here we are, over in Louisiana, looking at our friends across the Texas line. If you were from Louisiana, you would know what I mean by the SUFT program: "Save Us From Texas." Every time we have a chance to get something for Louisiana, they try to take it away from us and carry it off to Texas. We produce more oil per acre than they do; we produce more oil per capita than they do; we produce more oil any way you want to count it, except for the fact they are bigger than we are, which is the only reason that they produce more oil.

If we had our way, we would take their market away from them, and if they had their way, they would take ours away from us. They have taken quite a few things from us, and we have taken some from them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LONG. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. So we found in those early days, when they brought in that big east Texas field, all the farmers up there were drilling alongside one another, just pulling the oil out, disposing of it any way the mind could conceive with a lot of it going down the rivers to the Gulf of Mexico. The Governor of Texas had to call out the National Guard to save the State from being burned up by the oil. Everybody was trying to haul it off, sell it, give it away, bootleg it, or do anything they could with it.

So we said to them, "Let us try to work this out. We in Louisiana will only produce this stuff as fast as we have sale for it, and you in Texas only produce it as fast as you have sale for it, because if we do not do it that way, you are going to get all that oil above ground, where it will pollute the streams, or it will evaporate. It will last better and store better right down where God put it, right down there in the ground. It will not depreciate, and nothing will happen to it until somebody has need of it."

We did not have a Santa Barbara episode, or anything like that, where the oil polluted everything, but we got the thing under control. If you have no place to put it and no one to sell it to, you should not take the oil out of the ground.

That is what the oil quota system is all about. We have the interstate compact to work together, to see that Louisiana will not produce so much oil that we have no place to store it, nor will Texas do that, because we found that you have to get some agreement between Louisiana, Texas, and other States, like Wyoming, whereby the States say to each other, "Look, fellows, don't try to hog the whole market. You produce your share, and we will produce our share." You try to get some understanding among the various commissioners as to what each State's fair share ought to be, and say, "You take your share and we will take ours." It is just about that simple.

I can understand how my good friend Dr. Adams can argue that the whole thing was for the purpose of creating a monopoly. Of course, if I were as anti-trust-oriented as he, I would almost be bound by that position. But as a matter of fact, that is not what has caused us to have an interstate oil compact. That is not how it happened. It happened because we needed some good conservation practices.

It is true that if we had oil polluting all our streams, burning up all over the place, creating health and fire hazards, and polluting the atmosphere as well as the water, it might make some people happy, because they might be able to buy it a little cheaper. But looking at all the factors, is it not better that we keep the streams clean, keep the atmosphere clean, and take the oil out of the ground only as we have a sale for it? If we do not have sale for it, we keep it there in the ground until we do have sale for it. That is where the good Lord put it, and if we try to follow Him, we will not destroy this planet or pollute it.

Mr. President, I had not read the Senator's article. I did not object to it when he put it in the Record, but I would be curious to know its source.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LONG. I ask for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I would be curious to know what this man found in what is supposed to be an oil publication that would prove his point against the oil industry. I will read the article with great interest.

It may be that that industry is trying to show as a matter of fairness to the oil people why somebody else does not like the oil industry.

I wish the Hart subcommittee would be that fair and bring forth some people to tell the other side of the argument that the subcommittee has not heard. I guess that if I were to come from a State that produced practically no oil but mostly automobiles, I would make the same argument. Michigan produces very little oil.

Mr. President, the truth is that the people in the oil industry are every bit as honorable, fair, and ethical as those in any other industry. To cite one example, the oil industry does more business over the telephone than does any other single industry. People are constantly amazed at the fact that oil men will call on the telephone and say, "I will let you have that lease. I will sell you that oil." This is done over the telephone, with no written memorandum. Yet, people can trust them to deliver on their word given over the telephone. They have been doing this for many years. A man's word is good.

That frontier spirit exists in the oil industry more than in any other industry in America. A man gives his word, and it can be counted on. The man can be trusted. Those are good people.

As one who represents a State producing a good deal of oil, I do feel a sense of compassion for someone who so poorly understands Americans as to think they are corrupt and pirates when they are, in fact, good, hard-working citizens, trying to make an honest buck, the same as everybody else.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

POLLUTION IN POTOMAC REFLECTS U.S. APATHY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate an article entitled "Pollution in Potomac Reflects U.S. Apathy," written by William Steif, and published in today's Washington Daily News.

I commend the article to my colleagues for its content and to underscore the seriousness of the problem confronting the country. I also commend the Washington Daily News and Scripps-Howard for dealing with this very important subject.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLLUTION IN POTOMAC REFLECTS U.S. APATHY

(By William Steif)

(NOTE.—The following article is the first of a series in which Scripps-Howard Newspapers will report from time to time on flagging efforts to counter the ever-growing menace of pollution of our environment. This story, while focusing on the Potomac, outlines problems common to many of the nation's befouled waterways.)

The historic Potomac has become a monument to the nation's apathy toward the pollution of its dwindling water resources.

The Potomac's turbid waters slosh thru the District, carrying tons of silt from Maryland and Virginia and untreated wastes from hundreds of thousands of people and animals. The shad and herring which Capt. John Smith found "lying thicke" in the river in 1608 have all but vanished. In their place are carp, catfish and sometimes only bloodworms.

Upstream, at Harpers Ferry, the visitor can stand on a piling and watch the clean and sweet waters of the Potomac merge with those of the Shenandoah.

FOULED DOWNSTREAM

Seventy miles downstream the river has become fouled. Only a few miles below the District the Potomac meanders past Mount Vernon. There the river is clotted wih blue-green algae, oil spills and garbage.

Washingtonians have made their uses of the Potomac's water and flushed it away.

We are typical of most Americans, hustling and heedless. And the Potomac, with some regional differences, is typical of most American waterways—the Mississippi and the Ohio, Lake Erie and Biscayne Bay, the Platte, Rio Grande, Trinity and Tennessee.

Few Americans apparently care enough to save a dwindling resource. The game is to pass laws and then pay lip service to them.

SHORT RIVER

The Potomac is a short river, rising in Western Maryland.

Just above the District, its character changes. It becomes an estuary, possessed by a tide. In terms of pollution, this is ominous. The Potomac does not flow swiftly to the sea. It sloshes back and forth on the tides, and so does its filth.

The Potomac has one great advantage over most major bodies of water. Since Washington's chief industry is government, there is little industrial pollution.

But the river also is in the midst of one of the three fastest growing metropolitan areas in the nation. Sometime next year there will be three million people in the area, compared to 1.6 million in 1955. The experts say 7.7 million people will live here by the year 2000.

And people account for 90 per cent of the Potomac's pollution.

What is pollution?

Think of the waste produced by one human being in one day.

Multiply that by 673,000.

That is the equivalent of how much incompletely treated sewage is pumped into the Potomac yearly. Mixed with the silt are the pesticides drained from nearby farms and gardens.

What do raw sewage and silt do to the river?

Every month water is tested all over the Potomac basin. The scientists who do the testing say water is dangerous to swim in if a large drop has more than 1000 bacteria. They say a large drop with more than 100 fecal bacteria is dangerous.

Altho 15,000 pleasure boats operate on the Potomac in this area and some people water-ski, hardly a month passes in which the bacteria tests of the river don't exceed the safety limits. Here are typical results:

Last July at the Woodrow Wilson Bridge, the standard bacteria count was 29 times the safety limit.

Last August at Memorial Bridge the fecal bacteria count was 230 times the limit.

These counts explain why Don Lear, a biologist at the Annapolis laboratory of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA), says:

"People working on boats in the Potomac should use bacteriacide to wash their hands."

DESTROYS OXYGEN

The worst thing pollution does is destroy the oxygen in the water.

Oxygen is vital for the biological process by which tiny organisms in the water "burn up" organic wastes. When too much oxygen is demanded the wastes pile up, thereby further depleting the water of oxygen. The end product of this chain is the accumulation of enormous "dead" areas in bodies of water, where nothing lives. This already has happened in Lake Erie. It is a threat to Lake Michigan and the Potomac.

The pollution of the Potomac started years ago.

In 1894 an Army Surgeon General's report complained that the river was "unfit for bathing as well as for drinking and cooking." In 1907 an Interior Department study fretted over the river's pollution. So have many other studies.

In the 1930s agitation for a waste treatment plant began and in 1938 the District's first such plant opened.

CONGRESS ACTED

In 1956 Congress ran one of its periodic fevers over pollution. It authorized the Public Health Service to call conferences—actually a form of legal proceeding—on interstate pollution. Congress authorized PHS to go to court against polluters if the conferences failed to produce solutions.

A Potomac pollution conference was among the first five called. It convened Aug. 22, 1957, and again Feb. 13, 1958. The outcome was an order to the District, Maryland, Virginia and their subdivisions to treat their raw sewage so that 80 per cent of the sewage's demand for oxygen in the river would be eliminated. The District also was ordered to separate all storm and sanitary sewers by 1966 so that great amounts of raw sewage would not be washed directly into the river during rainstorms.

Since the District was adding a modern treatment facility to its plant, it was believed these modest goals could be attained.

They were not.

An FWPCA report issued last month said: "The Potomac river estuary remains grossly polluted due to inadequate sewage treatment, the rapid population growth and the discharge of combined sewer overflows and raw sewage."

The report noted that oxygen in the water had been reduced "to levels that would not support a sport fishery." It talked of "repulsive debris . . . fish kills . . . offensive odors" and nutrients—phosphates and nitrates—which support "excessive growths" of slimy algae.

The D.C. waste treatment plant at Blue Plains which today serves 1.8 million people in the area treats raw sewage so that just over 70 per cent of the sewage's demand for oxygen in the river is eliminated. Two of the eight much smaller plants in the area also fail to come up to the 80 per cent standard.

The separation of storm and sanitary sewers is only 78 per cent completed and at the present rate won't be finished until the year 2000.

NEW GOALS

Assistant Interior Secretary Carl L. Klein reconvened the pollution conference this month to try to learn why the goals had not been attained—and to establish new goals along lines suggested in the FWPCA report.

Why haven't the goals been reached?

The main reason, it is agreed, is local, state and federal apathy.

Says George Arnstein, a social scientist working on an ecology project for the National Academy of Sciences: "If water pollution were nuclear radiation, you can bet you life something would have been done about it."

Mr. Arnstein has a tongue-in-cheek proposal. He asks: "Why not pass a law forcing all communities to put their water intakes below their waste treatment outfalls?"

Other pressures also keep the Potomac dirty:

In 1965 then Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall sold President Johnson on a grandiose plan for the Potomac basin. Then FWPCA was transferred from the public health service to the Interior Department, where a struggle ensued for jurisdiction over Potomac planning. Some FWPCA officials think that because the pollution planners lost to the park planners, the river's filth was ignored. The park plan took three years and is now gathering dust.

A squabble over extending a waste treatment plant pipeline across National Park Service land in Maryland has kept a new treatment plant running at a quarter of capacity. Several million gallons of waste are being pumped daily into the ineffective D.C. plant as a result, for conservationists have persuaded the House Interior Committee to block the pipeline permit.

Since 1957 only $165 million has been spent for waste treatment plants and sewer separation in the Washington area. That is $15 million a year in an area where municipal budgets total more than $1 billion. It is an index of the apathy toward water pollution.

Now FWPCA wants waste treatment plants which can't achieve 80 per cent reduction in the oxygen demand of their sewage to be pushed to 96 per cent. It demands immediate storm and sanitary sewer separation, silt control and new phosphate treatment facilities.

PLAN DRAFTED

District officials have drafted a 30-year, $306 million Potomac cleanup plan. But they doubt they can get financial support from Congress for it. They aren't sure people here care about swimming in the Potomac enough to pay for it.

Congress hasn't shown it cares. Tho Mr. Klein at the recent Potomac pollution conference tongue-lashed local officials, his department is asking only a fifth of the $1 billion authorized nationally for water cleanup in fiscal 1970.

Last summer the people in Cleveland wanted to swim in Lake Erie. The city and federal government spent $2 million to chlorinate a few hundred yards of beach and lake for three months of swimming.

This kind of makeshift cleanup may be

the only kind applied to the Potomac—and the Ohio, Mississippi, Platte and Tennessee rivers—for years to come.

DECISIONS OF PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATION ON CURTAILING RAILWAY POST OFFICE OPERATIONS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it has been nearly 2 years to the day since this Senator introduced legislation in the 90th Congress aimed at preventing the Post Office Department from further curtailing their railway post office—RPO—operations.

For many years the Post Office had utilized RPO cars for significant long-distance mail routes. While RPO's took a greater length of time in traveling from place to place than did planes, the mail on the RPO's was sorted en route to its destination which meant that it was ready for home delivery when it was unloaded at the rail station.

The Post Office, over a long period of time, had been substituting other modes of transportation for RPO's here and there, as the need of the Department required it. Yet just 3 years ago, a great part of the postal operation was handled via RPO's.

At the time I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 which I mentioned before, it had become obvious that the Postal Department had adopted a policy of wholesale conversion of RPO service to other modes, especially air service.

By means of literally dozens of letters, telephone conversations, and questions to the Department when the Post Office appeared before the Treasury Post Office Subcommittee of Appropriations, I tried to learn the true reasons for the decision to abandon the RPO's.

The man who essentially made that decision was William J. Hartigan, who was Assistant Postmaster General for Transportation. He contended that the discontinuance of RPO's was an "improvement." He told the Congress that this move would save the Government money.

From the reaction I received from throughout the Nation to my campaign to save the RPO's, and the documented evidence which poured into my office, I could only conclude that mail service had substantially deteriorated as a result of this move. In addition, no figures were ever presented to the Congress which satisfactorily proved that the elimination of RPO's saved the Government money. In fact the opposite appeared to be the case.

Nevertheless, I continued to probe and question. I was determined to find out just why the discontinuance of RPO's was being pursued with almost ruthless determination by Mr. Hartigan and the Post Office.

Finally, on September 22, 1967, my patience having been exhausted, I issued a statement calling for the termination of Mr. Hartigan's employment with the Post Office.

Unbeknown to me and other legislators similarly concerned with this problem, but certainly known to Mr. Hartigan, another important event occurred in September 1967.

In that very eventful month, The Sedalia Marshall Boonville Stage Line, Inc., began air taxi mail service. This firm, with headquarters in Des Moines, Iowa, had no air taxi mail service prior to that time, but it wasted no time in acquiring prime contracts from the division of the Post Office which Mr. Hartigan administered.

Now, later on in 1967, in fact just before the year ended, I was contacted by Mr. James H. Phelps, who was at that time State legislative representative for the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen in Idaho.

Mr. Phelps speaking by phone from Pocatello, said he had heard from a reliable source that Mr. Hartigan would soon leave the Post Office Department and would take a position with an air taxi service which had just begun to obtain many important air taxi mail contracts. He asked me to check out this report.

Shortly after the first of the year, when Mr. Hartigan announced that he would soon be following the suggestion of the senior Senator from Colorado and would be finding employment elsewhere, I determined to watch closely exactly what position he would take.

However, Mr. Hartigan by his actions in February 1968, did nothing to publicly substantiate the most interesting report Mr. Phelps had mentioned and I so informed him.

Mr. Hartigan, it seems, established himself as a Washington "transportation consultant," a broad general title which, as everyone in the business knows, can cover a multitude of activities.

However, later in 1968, Mr. Hartigan apparently felt that an up and coming air taxi firm would better suit his experiences, which were acquired while he was busy at the Post Office determining which RPO's should be eliminated in favor of which air mail hauling contracts.

And so Mr. Hartigan became vice president of the Sedalia Marshall Boonville Stage Line, Inc. Undoubtedly that firm was able to make Mr. Hartigan an attractive offer since its air mail revenues had jumped from $60,030 in 1967 to $1,289,851 in 1968. The firm is now the largest air mail taxi carrier in the United States.

This whole episode reads like a fairy tale with a happy ending. Mr. Hartigan is happy in an executive position which properly utilizes his talents and I am happy because I believe that I finally have a little better understanding of why it was that Mr. Hartigan pursued the discontinuance of RPO's with such determination. Until now, I never could quite comprehend that point, given the fact that the service had not improved and Post Office costs continued to escalate.

Unfortunately for those who utilize the mails, or who have been stranded without rail passenger service because the elimination of RPO's made passenger trains so unprofitable they were discontinued—unfortunately for these people this tale has an unhappy ending.

One can be sure of one thing, however: the next time Mr. Phelps calls me with a report, I am going to pay very close attention to it.

I also hope and trust that this administration will reexamine the whole matter of mail transportation to see if the decisions which were made under Mr. Hartigan's jurisdiction were fair and just and in the national interest. If they were not, they should be rescinded immediately.

GOOD DEEDS EVERYDAY THING FOR YOUNG IOWANS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, it would be wonderful if the present dissent and discord in our Nation would disappear—or, at least, be exercised more responsibly.

It would be nice if we could somehow convince those in our country who persist in defying the law, who seek to destroy the physical and intellectual assets of our universities, who tear at the moral fiber of our society, that such actions do neither themselves nor our civilization any good.

If this rush down the path of anarchy by the destructive among the young dissidents is to be stopped, then the example must come from the 99 percent of our youth who choose not to destroy, who seek not to undermine, but who elect to build and rebuild. In that 99 percent are reflected the good in America, the strength of America, the future of America.

They are the ones who by their example demonstrate their faith in America. To them, good deeds are their thing, on a daily basis. The youth of Iowa are in that category.

The Iowa story is the story of the real America, a story repeated in every State of the Union. But their good deeds, their warmth and compassion are usually not the stuff of headlines.

However, last week the good in our youth did make the headlines across the State of Iowa. In an excellent article, Iowa Associated Press Writer John Armstrong chronicled the community service activities of Iowa youth. As Armstrong put it:

> Without fanfare, thousands and thousands of young Iowans are proving each day they're not such bad kids after all.

I believe his article, which appeared in the Cedar Rapids Gazette of April 8 and in other Iowa dailies, merits the attention of my colleagues and the other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It truly underscores that when all seems lost, you can always depend on our youth to come through. Perhaps printing of the Iowa youth story will lead to a national movement to reporting the good in our youth, not the isolated bad which makes the news so frequently and which leaves in its wake the impression that most of our youth are bad.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Good Deeds Everyday Thing for Young Iowans," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objections, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

GOOD DEEDS EVERYDAY THING FOR YOUNG IOWANS

(By John Armstrong)

They pitch in by the hundreds to help cities fight back floods. They take orphans to parks and art galleries. They raise thousands of dollars for starving Biafra children. They show juvenile delinquents that someone cares.

Without fanfare, thousands and thousands of young Iowans are proving each day they're not such bad kids after all.

Despite talk of sex orgies and pot smoking, four-letter words and unruly draft protests, the vast majority of Iowa's high school and college students never cross the law. Many of them make good deeds an everyday thing.

While state legislators were complaining recently about profanity at a University of Iowa seminar, a "nude-in" at Grinnell college, sexual promiscuity, beer drinking and marijuana use at Des Moines high schools, most students were quitely "doing their thing."

Like forming teams to help river communities erect sandbag dikes.

"These young people do a tremendous job," said Scott County Civil Defense Director Joseph Dooley in Davenport. "Some of them do it as a lark. Others like the exercise. All of them are impressed with the fact they're serving the community.

"In emergencies the kids are much more likely to volunteer than the parents."

Clinton Mayor Harold Domsalla found that out last week. He said great numbers of high school students were turning out to fill sandbags, but adults were reluctant to help with the back-breaking work.

"We are making good progress," he said of Clinton flood control efforts, "but unless we have better response from the adults, we are apt to find ourselves in a serious situation."

In Des Moines about 15 teenage boys responded to an immediate emergency Sunday when they helped firemen douse flames from a brush fire at Water Works park. The flames almost reached two stables housing about 100 horses.

"The fire could have been a catastrophe, but it wasn't," commented Lt. Harry Wray of the Des Moines fire department. "Those boys really helped us. It kind of revives your faith in youth."

Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Cassatt of Ottumwa have faith in youth. Four Ottumwa high school students raised more than $400 for brain surgery for the Cassatts' 8-year-old boy, Danny.

Elderly men at the Hamilton county home in Webster City have faith in youth. A group of male students at Iowa Central Community college goes to the home regularly to play cards and checkers or just visit with the residents.

Members of the St. Paul's Episcopal Indian Mission in Sioux City have faith in youth. Some Morningside college students purchased a 54-seat bus, which is used to transport Indian families to various events in the city.

Also at Morningside, a fraternity provides monthly support money for Huynh Lang, a 9-year-old South Vietnamese boy whose father was killed in military action.

While many college students engaged in Easter vacation hijinks in Florida and California, others made better use of the free time.

More than 40 Grinnell college students spent time in Denver, New York, St. Louis and Des Moines studying the problems of education, housing, recreation, employment and health among the poor. Nineteen Pella Central college students did the same in Cleveland.

A number of University of Northern Iowa students organized Easter egg hunts for poor children.

IOWA UNIVERSITY ROLE

Kathy Starbuck, head of the Hawkeye Area Community Action Program, said one of every 10 volunteers for the program are University of Iowa students. Most of them tutor underprivileged children.

University of Iowa coed Jane Rosborough of Iowa City spends one and a half hours a week at the Pine school, which provides special education for handicapped children. She's now decided to make special education her major field of study.

A number of Iowa State students are tutoring high school students two hours a week, while others spend six to 10 hours a week with young delinquents and children from fatherless homes.

About 20 University of Northern Iowa students meet at least two hours a week with juvenile delinquents in Black Hawk County. Juvenile Court Judge Forest E. Eastman of Cedar Falls said the meetings help raise the goals of the troubled youngsters.

FUNDRAISERS

Students also are energetic fund raisers.

Waterloo's East High has made headlines because of its racial troubles, but there's white-black harmony, too. A group of white and black students currently is trying to raise $2,500 for new playground equipment at a neighborhood center.

A Biafara Fast day at the University of Northern Iowa earlier this year raised $3,000.

The Des Moines Inter-City Student Council recently presented a $1,000 check to the Brian O'Donnell fund to help the Central college football player whose spine was severed in a game last fall.

Members of a University of Northern Iowa fraternity have raised $2,000 over the last two years by throwing a carnival for the Crippled Children's fund. Most of the money has gone to Camp Sunnyside, a facility for handicapped children near Des Moines.

Hundreds of University of Iowa students are raising money for the Martin Luther King Scholarship fund, which will provide financial aid for needy Negro students who wish to attend the university. Lora Kluever of Atlantic raised several hundred dollars in her hometown last Christmas vacation.

Dr. Ray Pugh, chairman of the men's physical education department at Drake university said too many adults condemn young people for the actions of the small number of trouble-makers while ignoring student's many worthwhile activities.

"You know," he said, "so often a pat on the back is 100 percent better than a slap in the face."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), for not to exceed 1 hour.

HANDICAPPED AMERICANS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, my remarks today concern an exceptional group which I joined on another April 14, twenty-four years ago, during World War II.

It is a minority group whose existence affects every person in our society and the very fiber of our Nation.

It is a group which no one joins by personal choice—a group whose requirements for membership are not based on age, sex, wealth, education, skin color, religious beliefs, political party, power, or prestige.

As a minority, it has always known exclusion—maybe not exclusion from the front of the bus, but perhaps from even climbing aboard it; maybe not exclusion from pursuing advanced education, but perhaps from experiencing any formal education; maybe not exclusion from day-to-day life itself, but perhaps from an adequate opportunity to develop and contribute to his or her fullest capacity.

It is a minority, yet a group to which at least one out of every five Americans belongs.

Mr. President, I speak today about 42 million citizens of our Nation who are physically, mentally, or emotionally handicapped.

WHO ARE THE HANDICAPPED?

Who are the handicapped?

They are persons—men, women, and children—who cannot achieve full physical, mental, and social potential because of disability.

Although some live in institutions, many more live in the community. Some are so severely disabled as to be homebound, or even bed-bound. Still others are able to take part in community activities when they have access and facilities.

They include amputees, paraplegics, polio victims. Causes of disability include arthritis, cardio-vascular diseases, multiple sclerosis, and muscular dystrophy.

While you may have good vision and hearing, many persons live each day with limited eyesight or hearing, or with none at all.

While you may enjoy full muscle strength and coordination in your legs, there are those who must rely on braces or crutches, or perhaps a walker or wheel chair.

While you perform daily millions of tasks with your hands and arms, there are many who live with limited or total disability in theirs.

And in contrast to most people, thousands of adults and children suffer mental or emotional disorders which hinder their abilities to learn and apply what is learned and to cope adequately with their families, jobs, and communities.

Then there are those who are afflicted with combination or multiple handicaps.

NOT JUST THE HANDICAP

For our Nation's 42 million handicapped persons and their families, yesterday, today, and tomorrow are not filled with "everyday" kinds of problems which can be solved or soothed by "everyday" kinds of answers. Their daily challenge is: accepting and working with a disability so that the handicapped person can become as active and useful, as independent, secure, and dignified as his ability will allow.

Too many handicapped persons lead lives of loneliness and despair; too many feel and too many are cut off from our work-oriented society; too many cannot fill empty hours in a satisfying, constructive manner. The leisure most of us crave can and has become a curse to many of our Nation's handicapped.

Often when a handicapped person is able to work full or part time, there are few jobs or inadequate training programs in his locale. Although progress is being made, many employers are hesitant to hire a handicapped person, ignoring statistics that show he is often a better and more dependable worker.

The result is that abilities of a person are overlooked because of disabilities which may bear little or no true relation to the job at hand. The result to the taxpayer may be to support one more person at a cost of as much as $3,500 per person a year. To the handicapped person himself, it means more dependency.

STATISTICS

Consider these statistics: Only one-third of America's blind and less than half of the paraplegics of working age are employed, while only a handful of about 200,000 persons with cerebral palsy who are of working age are employed.

Beyond this, far too many handicapped persons and their families bear serious economic problems—despite token Government pensions and income tax deductions for a few, and other financial aids. I recall a portion of a letter received recently from the mother of a cerebral palsy child in a Midwestern urban area:

> There are the never-ending surgeries, braces, orthopedic shoes, wheelchairs, walkers, standing tables, bath tables and so on . . . we parents follow up on every hopeful lead in clinics and with specialists; we go up and down paths blindly and always expensively . . . I have talked with four major insurance companies who do not insure or infrequently insure CP children . . . although our daughter is included in her father's group hospitalization plan, many families are not as fortunate. These are just a few of the problems, compounded by the fact we must try to adequately meet the needs of our other "normal" children. In many cases, some kind of financial assistance would enable us and others like us to provide for our children in our homes, avoiding overcrowding of already overcrowded facilities and further adding to the taxpayer's burden costs for complete care.

There are other problems—availability and access of health care personnel and facilities at the time and place the individual with handicaps needs them. In my own largely rural State of Kansas, many handicapped persons travel 300 miles or more to receive the basic health services they require.

Education presents difficulties for many parents of handicapped children. Although a child may be educable, there may be few, if any, opportunities in the community for him to receive an education. Private tutoring, if available, is often too expensive. Sadly, to date, the Council for Exceptional Children estimates less than one-third of the Nation's children requiring special education are receiving it.

In rehabilitation, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare said recently 25 percent of America's disabled have not received rehabilitation services and do not know where to seek such help. They estimate that at least 5 million disabled persons may be eligible for assistance.

Other problems the handicapped person faces each day include availability and access of recreation and transportation facilities, architectural barriers in residences and other buildings, and many, many more.

STILL A PROMISING OUTLOOK

We in America are still far from the half-way point of assuring that every handicapped person can become as active and useful as his capacities will allow. The outlook for the handicapped person in 1969, however, is not altogether bleak. Unparalleled achievements in medicine, science, education, technology as well as in public attitudes have cemented a framework in which the handicapped person today has more opportunities available to him than ever before. Consider first what government is doing.

THE GOVERNMENT STORY

The story of what the Federal Government, hand in hand with State governments, is doing to help meet the needs of the handicapped is not one that draws the biggest and boldest headlines. Broadly, the story is a "good" one, consisting of achievements in financial assistance, rehabilitation, research, education, and training of the handicapped—a massive effort to help many disabled Americans live as normal, as full and rich lives as possible.

It is, in part, the story of a man who, at age 21, became a paraplegic after sustaining injuries to his spinal cord and head in an accident while on the job.

In 1968, he joined over 2,300,000 other disabled men and women who have been restored to more productive, useful lives since the State-Federal vocational rehabilitation program began 48 years ago.

In 1964, the young man—a high school dropout with a wife and child—was referred to his State's division of vocational rehabilitation where a thorough program of total rehabilitation began. In addition, he was enrolled in a training school and was graduated as a fully licensed insurance agent.

Today—4 years later—he has his own successful insurance business. He and his wife have built a new home and adopted a baby.

It is a measure of America's concern for its handicapped citizens that even 50 years ago, this story could not have been told.

It takes place now because the Congress and the Federal Government initiated and guided a vital, vigorous program of vocational rehabilitation.

Mr. President, vocational rehabilitation is one of many ways the Federal Government works to aid the handicapped. But none of the Federal programs necessarily reaches or helps every handicapped person.

Nevertheless, the role of the Government has been basically successful in terms of numbers assisted, basic research performed, and the movement of increasingly large numbers of persons into more productive, satisfying channels. It demonstrates what Congress and Federal and State governments are doing to help America's handicapped better participate and achieve.

Mr. President, at this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the close of my remarks, a brief summary of Federal programs for the handicapped.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it is in the American tradition and spirit that parallel to Government effort there has developed the vital and growing effort for the handicapped by individuals, business and industry, churches and private, voluntary organizations. It is a herculean task to properly assess the many, far-reaching effects of the private sector—in health care, education, employment; in research, rehabilitation, by fundraising drives and through professional organizations and groups for the handicapped themselves. But it is here in the private sector—with its emphasis on the creativity, concern, and energies of our people—that America has become the envy of the world. Our private economy and the resources of our people have combined to improve the quality of life in America in ways and for persons the Government could not begin to match or reach.

For the handicapped, their achievements have been no less. I shall not today, detail or single out the achievements of the voluntary groups and private enterprise involved in aiding the handicapped. But let the record show that without the sincerity, scope, and success of their efforts—in public information, employment and training, in upgrading health care and education personnel and facilities, in fundraising and in supporting research to conquer or at least minimize the effects of handicapping conditions—the prospects for the handicapped individuals would not be as hopeful as they are today.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Mr. President, as new public and private programs are developed, as old ones are strengthened and some, perhaps eliminated, as we in Congress allocate comparatively limited funds to help the handicapped, the responsibilities and opportunities loom large before us.

We must insure our efforts and money are not misplaced or misdirected—that they do not just promise, but really do the job.

Are we all doing our best to see that all the knowledge, information, money, and other help is consolidated and available to the handicapped person in the form he can use and at the time and place he most needs it?

Is there sufficient coordination and planning between and among the private groups and the Government agencies to avoid multiplicity and duplication so that we best serve America's handicapped?

Are we sometimes engaged in a numbers race—attending to cases that respond more quickly in order to show results to donors, members, and taxpayers, thus sacrificing some attention which should be focused on the really tough problems?

Many handicapped persons of our Nation are no longer helpless or hopeless because of private and public efforts which have helped them to better help and be themselves.

But the fact remains that some of our Nation's handicapped and their families are attacking the very programs and projects created to help them.

Some are disillusioned and disaffected by the programs.

Too often, the information, the services, the human help and encouragement are not reaching the person for whom they were intended and at the time and place he needs them.

Some sincerely believe there may be better ways we can demonstrate our concern and thereby better achieve for the person with handicaps the independence, security, and dignity to which he is entitled.

I am reminded of a statement given recently by the 1968 president of the National Rehabilitation Association:

> It is the person, not the program that is of overwhelming importance. It is not the disability that claims our attention, *it is the person* with handicaps. It is not the main-

tenance of prestige of a particular profession that matters. It is the contribution of the profession to solving the complex problems of the individual who has handicaps.

When more of this emphasis on the individual better influences the agencies and professions dealing with the handicapped, I believe we can begin to open new, more meaningful vistas for more persons with handicaps.

We have been involved in efforts which have been creditable to date. Of this, there is no doubt.

But are we doing our best?

A highly respected official of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare summed up the problem this way:

> I do not feel we are spending our dollars—public or voluntary—as effectively as we could. We need to take a whole new look at what is going on, where the service is given. We need to try to design new methods and clearer purposes for our efforts. We need to relate our efforts more closely to the needs of a community, to the needs of its individuals. And we need to try to measure, as concretely and specifically as possible what is actually achieved by our expenditures.

Our handicapped citizens are one of our Nation's greatest unmet responsibilities and untapped resources. We must do better.

PRESIDENTIAL TASK FORCE

With this in mind, I suggest the creation of a Presidential task force or commission to review what the public and private sectors are doing and to recommend how we can do better.

Composed of representatives of the public and private sectors, this task force or commission could provide an overview of how to provide the handicapped more help and hope.

Such a task force or commission could provide valuable assistance to Congress and the administration as we develop programs and allocate comparatively limited funds for the handicapped.

It could also help private organizations and voluntary groups conduct their efforts more efficiently and effectively.

The goal of a task force or commission, to achieve maximum independence, security, and dignity for the individual with handicaps, should encompass the total needs of the handicapped, not just employment or education or any other

Rather the task force or commission should concern itself with the whole broad spectrum of needs and services, because as I have pointed out the problems of the handicapped do not begin and end with the handicap itself.

Although there are hundreds of areas a task force or commission could review, I am hopeful, if created, it would include the following subjects:

First. Expansion of employment, transportation, and recreation opportunities for the handicapped.

Second. A directory or central clearinghouse to help inform the handicapped person and his family of available public and private assistance.

There are many helpful handbooks and information sources available. But most are not comprehensive and are more accessible to professionals in the field than to the handicapped who really need the guidance and information.

Third. Removal of architectural barriers.

Many persons cannot secure employment or fill their leisure hours because their disabilities bar use of the facilities. It is just as easy to build and equip buildings so that the handicapped and unhandicapped can use them. The Federal Government is doing this now for federally financed structures.

Fourth. More development of health care on a regional or community basis.

This is a tough, but priority matter and one which cannot be accomplished quickly or inexpensively. But we must begin to move toward more adequate health care facilities and personnel which serve each person at the time and place he needs them.

Fifth. Better serving the special educational needs of the handicapped.

Both the person and the Nation suffer when any educatable child—handicapped or unhandicapped—does not receive an education.

Sixth. Income tax deductions and/or other financial assistance to extend relief to more handicapped persons and their families.

Seventh. More attention on the family of the handicapped person.

These are the people who often need a degree of encouragement, counseling, and "rehabilitation" themselves. Are there services we should provide to family members whose own lives and resources are deeply affected by the presence of a handicapped person?

Eighth. Increased dialog and coordination between private and voluntary groups and Government agencies to avoid multiplicity and duplication.

What is at stake is not the agency, group, or program. What is at stake is the future of the handicapped person with his own abilities and potentialities.

CONCLUSION

. This, then, Mr. President, is the sum and substance of my first speech in the Senate.

I know of no more important subject matter, not solely because of my personal interest, but because in our great country some 42 million Americans suffer from a physical, mental, or emotional handicap. Progress has been and will continue to be made by Federal and State governments, by private agencies, and individual Americans; but nonetheless there is still much to be done, if the handicapped American: young, old, black, white, rich, or poor is to share in the joys experienced by others. The task ahead is monumental, but I am confident that there are forces in America ready and willing to meet the challenge—including, of course, many of my distinguished colleagues who by their acts and deeds have demonstrated their great interest.

EXHIBIT 1

FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

DISABLED VETERANS

The program of services for disabled veterans as we know it today began with enactment of the Soldier Rehabilitation Act, which was passed unanimously by Congress June 27, 1918 (P.L. 178, 65th Congress). Under this law, the Federal Board for Vocational Education, created by legislation the year before, was authorized to organize and offer vocational rehabilitation programs for disabled veterans.

The program was finally closed out July 2, 1928. In the program's 10-year existence, about 675,000 veterans applied for training. About 330,000 completed their courses satisfactorily and were considered rehabilitated, and about 98 percent of them were employed at the time their training was completed or terminated.

Soon after the U.S. entered World War II, planning began for vocational rehabilitation programs for disabled servicemen returning from that war.

On March 13, 1943, after much discussion over whether the veterans program should be allied with the civilian vocational rehabilitation program, the House passed a bill authorizing a separate veterans' program. It was signed into law 11 days later as P.L. 16, 78th Congress, and covered veterans who served in the armed services between Pearl Harbor Day, December 7, 1941, and the declared end of the war. This legislation set into motion an effort which, before termination, benefitted several hundred thousand disabled veterans.

When the U.S. entered the Korean conflict, the Congress enacted legislation to insure that the men who fought there could receive the same services as World War II veterans. By 1955, about 36,000 Korean veterans had received vocational rehabilitation training for service-connected disabilities.

Later legislation made it possible for veterans disabled after the conclusion of the Korean conflict to receive rehabilitation and other services of the Veterans' Administration. This includes peace-time veterans and the veterans of the Vietnam war. In 1968 alone, 5,192 veterans participated in vocational rehabilitation training, bringing the total number since the program began to 721,000.

Disabled veterans who need prosthetic and sensory aids can obtain them from the Veterans Administration. In 1968 prosthetic appliances and services were furnished to about 465,000 disabled veterans, including 5,400 Vietnam veterans. Approximately $10.2 million was spent in 1968 for the procurement and repair of prosthetic and other related appliances.

Last year, too, requests for grants were approved to help pay for special automobiles for 2,850 veterans because of loss of hands or feet or severe eye impairment. Expenditures for this benefit in 1968 totalled almost $3.5 million, bringing the total cost to $83.6 million since this program was enacted in 1946.

Another special benefit for disabled veterans is the grant program for acquiring specially-adapted housing for those who need braces, crutches, canes, or wheelchairs. Grants totaling $4.4 million were made to 460 veterans in 1968. Since the program began in 1948, 9,705 grants at a cost of $92.7 million have been awarded.

With the creation of a new Department of Medicine and Surgery December 31, 1945, the Veterans Administration set in motion a new pattern of care and rehabilitation service for sick, injured and disabled veterans entering VA hospitals. A special rehabilitation service was developed; selected hospitals were specially staffed and equipped for certain disabilities such as spinal cord injury, blindness, epilepsy, amputation and other conditions.

PROGRAMS FOR DISABLED CIVILIANS

A rehabilitation program for disabled civilians was not enacted simultaneously with the veterans' program because of opposition that it was not practicable and also not the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Two years later—June 2, 1920—President Wilson signed into law the Civilian Vocational Rehabilitation Act (P.L. 236, 66th Congress). The bill, known as the Smith-Fess Act, is one of the oldest grant-in-aid programs for providing services for individuals. At that time, services under the act, were confined to counseling, job training, artificial limbs and other prosthetic appliances, and job placement. It provided for an appropriation of $750,000 for fiscal year 1921 and $1 million for fiscal years 1922 to 1924 and for payments to States cooperating in vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry. Federal funds were to be matched by the States and were not to be used for institutions for handicapped persons except when individuals entitled to benefits of the act, required special training.

In its first year, the vocational rehabilitation program helped rehabilitate 523 disabled persons. Authorization for the program was renewed by Congress several times until 1935, when the Social Security Act included permanent authorization. This action demonstrated the consensus of congressional thought that vocational rehabilitation should be a permanent program in the United States. Continuing to grow, the program rehabilitated 11,890 persons in 1940.

The entry of the United States into World War II caused a manpower shortage which gave disabled persons who had been rehabilitated an opportunity to show the nation that the disabled could be productive, capable workers. Many employers began calling for more rehabilitated workers than the vocational rehabilitation program, despite its success, was prepared to provide. For more than 20 years since its enactment, the program had been limited in scope and uncertainly financed. Some States had excellent programs, but many did not. Development on a national scale had been uneven.

Legislation in 1943 helped solve some of these problems, and other legislation in later years helped to shape it into the more meaningful and effective program it is today.

In 1943 after an attempt to combine the Veterans' and civilian vocational programs was defeated, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1943 (P.L. 113, 78th Congress) were signed into law. The 1943 law superseded the 1920 legislation and broadened the vocational rehabilitation program—more liberal financing, increased State services, and broadened the concept of rehabilitation.

Rehabilitation services were extended to the mentally handicapped and the mentally ill. Separate State agencies for the blind were incorporated into the Federal-State rehabilitation program. In addition, the now 50 States, and Puerto Rico were all placed on the same footing with respect to Federal grants. An improved provision of the 1943 law was coverage for specified corrective surgery or therapeutic treatment necessary to reduce or eliminate a disability. Administration of the program was transferred from the Commissioner of Education to the Federal Security Agency. In 1950, 59,597 persons were rehabilitated.

There were problems, however. Partly because the financial system was becoming inadequate and because there was no provision for research, professional training, and other features, essential progress was not being made.

Legislation in 1954, supported by President Eisenhower, was an effort to remedy these problems. While retaining the basic pattern of services, the 1954 amendments (P.L. 565, 83rd Congress) made sweeping improvements. They included provisions for research, demonstration, and training activities. The Federal share was increased on a formula basis, to give greater support to States with relatively large populations and relatively small per capita income. It initiated a new system of project grants for improvement and extension of services. For the first time, the use of Federal grants to expand, modernize and equip rehabilitation facilities and workshops was also authorized.

In 1954, Congress also amended the Hill-Burton hospital survey and construction act to provide Federal grants to help construct rehabilitation facilities.

While in 1960, 88,275 persons were rehabilitated under the vocational rehabilitation program, by 1965 it had mushroomed to over 135,000 persons.

The 1965 amendments to the vocational rehabilitation act (P.L. 89–333) were designed to bring the public and voluntary agencies into a closer working alliance. It expanded and enlarged the program by broadening its legal and financial base. Services to the severely disabled, the mentally retarded, the deaf, and other handicapped individuals were increased. A national commission on architectural barriers to rehabilitation of the handicapped was established. Federal financial support was extended to local areas for funding more vocational rehabilitation programs. In a drive to build more rehabilitation facilities and workshops, funds were authorized for a comprehensive program to improve the workshops and to construct more vocationally-oriented rehabilitation facilities. Grants to States to conduct comprehensive State-wide planning by agencies designated by the Governors were also provided.

In 1967 Congress took further steps to improve rehabilitation programs for the Nation's disabled. The 1967 amendments (P.L. 90–99) extended and expanded grant authorizations to States for rehabilitation services. Provisions were made to establish a national center for deaf-blind youth and adults and to extend services to disabled migrants, and their families. In addition, the 1967 amendments required State agencies to provide services to the handicapped without regard to their residence locations.

Finally, just this past year, Congress passed another bill amending the vocational rehabilitation program. The bill increased the Federal share for basic support of State programs from 75 to 80 percent, beginning in fiscal 1970, and established a minimum allotment of $1 million for each State to increase efficiency, expand services, and reach more clients. The 1968 amendments (P.L. 90–391) also extended programs of grants for innovation, for special projects and for rehabilitation facilities construction and staffing.

The bill established a new vocational evaluation and work adjustment program to serve those who are disadvantaged by such reasons as physical or mental disability, youth, advanced age, low educational attainment, ethnic or cultural factors, or prison or delinquency records, especially in association with poverty.

Evaluation may include preliminary diagnostic studies to determine whether the individual is disadvantaged, has or will have an employment handicap, and needs rehabilitation services. Work adjustment services include appraisal of the individual's pattern of work behavior and development of work habits, work tolerance, and social and behavior patterns suitable for successful job performance.

Establishment of the social and rehabilitation service in 1967 also brought about an expansion of the Federal Vocational Rehabilitation Agency, and its transfer to the Division of Mental Retardation, under the newly-named Rehabilitation Services Administration. In 1961, President Kennedy appointed the President's Panel on Mental Retardation and gave them a mandate to recommend a national plan to combat mental retardation.

The Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963 (P.L. 88–156) carried out several recommendations of the panel. This act provided funds to assist the States in planning comprehensive State and community programs for the mentally retarded. The Social Security Amendments of 1965 (P.L. 89–97) extended comprehensive planning grants to the States, enabling implementation of their comprehensive plans to combat mental retardation.

The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (P.L. 88–164) authorized grants to States to construct facilities to serve the mentally retarded. It also provided grants to assist in construction of university-affiliated facilities to provide an interdisciplinary approach for clinical training of specialized personnel and for demonstration of new service techniques.

The Mental Retardation Amendment of 1967 (P.L. 90–170) extended these two programs and established a new grant program to pay part of the compensation of professional and technical personnel in community facilities for the retarded, for initial operation of new facilities, or of new services in a facility. Projects have been approved for construction of 242 community facilities to serve over 63,000 retardates.

In 1963, Congress authorized the hospital improvement program to support projects to improve services in State mental retardation institutions. This program is assisting about 100 of the 169 existing facilities.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90–391) authorized projects for rehabilitation of mentally retarded persons not eligible for vocational rehabilitation due to age, severity of handicap, or other reasons. The first appropriation for this program is being requested for 1970.

Today, there are 90 rehabilitation agencies with 800 offices operating nationwide and in four territories. They serve nearly 700,000 handicapped persons each year at a State-Federal cost of over a half-billion dollars.

PROGRAMS FOR THE BLIND

One of the first pieces of legislation providing Federal aid for handicapped persons was approved March 3, 1879, under the title "An Act To Promote the Education of the Blind." This law set up a perpetual trust fund of United States Bonds, the income from which, in the amount of $10,000 a year, would go to the American Printing House For the Blind in Louisville, Kentucky, so that books and other materials could be distributed among the schools for the blind throughout the country. Subsequent amendments gradually increased the authorization for this program. In 1956, it was $410,000 a year. Then in 1961, Congress removed the ceiling from the annual appropriation and made it an amount to be determined by Congress. In fiscal year 1968, the printing house served some 19,000 blind children with books and other teaching materials at a cost of $1.5 million.

The printing house was originally designed to serve blind children. In 1931, Congress enacted the so-called Pratt-Smoot Act (P.L. 787, 71st Congress) to "Provide Books for the Use of the Adult Blind Residents of the United States." This legislation formed the basis for the Federally-supported library service to the blind vested in the division for the blind and physically handicapped in the Library of Congress.

In 1933, an amendment to the act made available for distribution talking books, or phonograph records, in addition to the Braille books already used.

As commercial firms became interested in producing talking book records, a 1939 amendment gave preference to "nonprofit-making institutions or agencies whose activities are primarily concerned with the blind." A 1942 amendment provided maintenance and replacement of talking book machines as well as the talking books.

Then in 1952 Congress enacted an amendment removing the word "adult" from the act, clearing the way for blind children to also benefit from the program. In 1966, another amendment extended the program to include other physically handicapped persons. In 1968, 140,000 handicapped readers received catalogs from which to select reading matter and circulation of the containers, and reels, and volumes, was over 5,265,000. The expenditure for the program in 1968 was $5.6 million.

One aspect of the vocational rehabilitation program is the emphasis given to adjustment, training, and placement of blind persons in competitive employment. Attention was first focused on this severely disabled group as a result of the passage of P. L. 113 in 1943.

The amendments to the vocational rehabilitation act in 1954 made a limited amount of training and research money available, so employment opportunities for blind workers have been greatly expanded. In 1968, 6,800 blind and 12,000 visually-limited persons were placed in a variety of occupations. In addition, special workshops for the blind now employ approximately 5,000.

Another phase of employment for the blind was made available through the provisions of the Randolph-Sheppard Act (P. L. 732) in 1936 which gave preference for operation of snack bars, vending stands, and other facilities of Federal properties to qualified blind persons. Installation of facilities, training, and supervision of blind operators are responsibilities of the State licensing agencies. In 1968, 3,259 blind persons earned $16.6 million, an average of $5,580 per operator.

EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

In 1864 President Abraham Lincoln signed into law a bill establishing a national college for the deaf later to be known as Gallaudet College, and in 1879, Congress enacted legislation giving federal financial aid to the American Printing House for the Blind. Unfortunately, these two programs were the extent of Federal aid for education of handicapped children for the next three quarters of a Century.

In 1954 Congress enacted the cooperative Research Act (P. L. 83–531) for research grants in education. In 1957, $675,000 of the $1 million appropriated under the Act was earmarked to be spent on research on education of the mentally retarded.

In 1958 Congress passed the captioned films for the Deaf Program (P. L. 85–905). Originally aimed at cultural enrichment and recreation, amendments in 1962 and 1965 broadened the program into a flexible, comprehensive instructional program for the deaf, including teacher training. 1967 legislation extended the program to include all handicapped children requiring special education.

Legislation in 1958 (P.L. 85–926) authorized grants to educational institutions to help train professional personnel to train teachers of mentally retarded children. In 1961, Congress enacted legislation authorizing support for training classroom teachers of the deaf (P.L. 87–276).

In 1963, these programs for training personnel to work with handicapped children were expanded to include teachers of children who are "hard of hearing, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired," as well as mentally retarded and deaf. The same legislation (P.L. 88–164) authorized grants for research and demonstration projects in education of handicapped children. A 1965 amendment to this program authorized construction, equipping, and operation of facilities for research and related purposes.

The year 1965 saw enactment of a great body of legislation to aid in the education of handicapped youngsters. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (P.L. 89–10) provided programs through local education agencies to reach handicapped children in low income areas. It also provided support for supplemental services including special instruction for the handicapped and for innovative programs. A 1965 amendment to this act (P.L. 89–313) provided grants to State agencies directly responsible for educating handicapped children. This brought assistance to State-operated or State-supported schools for the deaf, retarded, etc., not eligible under the original act.

Also in 1965 Congress enacted the National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act (P.L. 89–36) authorizing establishment and operation of a postsecondary technical training facility for young adults who are deaf. This institute, which is being established at the Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, New York, complements Gallaudet College, which provides a liberal arts program.

1966 saw more legislation for education of the handicapped. There was the Model Secondary School for the Deaf Act (P.L. 89–694) which created a model high school as part of Gallaudet College to serve deaf children of the Washington, D.C. area. Planned to offer a full curriculum and the normal extracurricular activities of high schools, this model high school for deaf children may lead to formation of other similar schools throughout the country.

Also in 1966, Congress passed further amendments (P.L. 89–750) to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which authorized funds to assist the States in improvement of programs and projects for the education of handicapped children at preschool, elementary, and secondary levels. The 1966 amendment also required establishment of a National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children to make recommendations concerning programs carried on for handicapped children by the Office of Education.

In addition, the Congress undertook a bold precedent, establishing the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped to administer all Office of Education programs for the handicapped. The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has made major strides in stimulating a local, State and Federal partnership for improvement of education for handicapped children.

The 1967 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act further broadened and extended the program of services to the handicapped. Regional resource centers were authorized to determine special education needs of handicapped children referred to them, develop educational programs to meet these needs, and assist schools in providing such programs. The 1967 legislation also authorized establishment and operation of centers for deaf-blind children, programs designed to improve recruiting of educational personnel and to improve dissemination of information on educational opportunities for the handicapped.

The 1967 Mental Retardation amendments (P.L. 90–170) provided support for training professional personnel and for research and demonstration activities in physical education and recreation for mentally retarded and other handicapped children.

The most recent piece of legislation for education of handicapped children was enacted in the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act of 1968 (P.L. 90–538). It authorizes grants to public and private agencies and organizations for establishment of experimental preschool and early education programs which show promise of developing comprehensive and innovative approaches for meeting special problems of handicapped children. This legislation recognizes that the most rapid learning period comes in the years before school traditionally begins. The programs engendered by this legislation should do much to identify handicapped children early and to help give them a better start toward full, productive lives.

EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

Once a handicapped person is rehabilitated and able to support himself, he often encounters tremendous difficulties in securing meaningful employment. A case is not considered closed, in the vocational rehabilitation program, until the disabled person is on the job, and has satisfactorily adjusted in the eyes of both the disabled person and his employer.

For many reasons, employers are reluctant to hire the handicapped. The Federal Government is trying to change this attitude among employers and the public and has met with some success.

In addition to the placement program of the vocational rehabilitation program, the Bureau of Employment Security, through State and local employment services, provides direct employment counseling and assistance to physically and mentally handicapped persons seeking work. Public information and educational activities directed toward employers and labor organizations are part of the effort made under these programs. Selective placement techniques are also used to help match the physical demands of a job to the physical capacities of a worker.

The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, a voluntary group of about 600 men and women, has made great accomplishments in the past 20 years to promote greater employment opportunity for qualified handicapped men and women. Operating within the Department of Labor and within a budget that until last year had a ceiling of only a half million dollars, the Committee maintains working relationships with the 53 cooperating governor's committees, and with the various Federal Departments, Agencies, and Commissions. The Committee works to help assure that the handicapped are considered for their abilities, and to help facilitate development of maximum employment opportunities for them. The peak of its activity, although it goes full steam throughout each year, is in the first full week of October, National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

The Department of Labor is also involved in training the handicapped. Enactment of the Manpower Development and Training Act in 1962 widened the opportunity for the Department to develop meaningful training programs for handicapped workers. It was estimated that by the summer of 1966, well over 25,000 handicapped persons had received training under MDTA and over 20,000 of those had already obtained jobs.

HOUSING FOR THE HANDICAPPED

The Federal Government is involved in several programs concerned with housing for the handicapped or disabled. The Housing Assistance Administration of the Department of Housing and Urban Development provides loans and contributions to local housing authorities which, in turn, provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for low-income families at rent they can afford. Handicapped persons of limited income are among those eligible for benefits under this program, established by the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 (P.L. 75–412).

The Housing Assistance Administration also provides low-interest, long-term loans to private nonprofit corporations, consumer cooperatives, and public agencies for new and renovated rental housing, dining facilities, community rooms, and workshops for the elderly and the handicapped whose incomes are above the levels set for admission to public housing projects, but below that needed to pay rents for available private housing. This program was enacted by the Housing Act of 1959 (P.L. 86–372).

The Housing Act of 1961 (P.L. 87–70) established a grant program for public and private groups to develop new or improved means of providing housing for low-income persons, the physically handicapped, and families. Demonstration of means to provide housing is specifically authorized by this legislation.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (P.L. 89–117) authorized rent supplement payments to help assure privately-owned housing is available to low-income individuals or families of low income. The handicapped are among those eligible for this program if their income does not exceed the maximum amount established in the area for occupancy of federally-aided, low-rent public housing.

ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS

Related to housing, Congress in 1968, passed legislation to insure that certain buildings financed with Federal funds are designed and constructed to be accessible to the physically handicapped (P.L. 90-480). This legislation applies to any public buildings constructed in whole or part with Federal funds. The only exceptions are privately-owned residences and buildings or facilities on military installations intended primarily for use by able-bodied military personnel.

This legislation was passed after recommendations were made by the National Commission of Architectural Barriers to Rehabilitation of the Handicapped, authorized by the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1965 and appointed by the President in 1966.

The legislation should spur States and local governments to enact legislation and regulations so that all public buildings, not only those built with Federal funds, will be so constructed that the disabled will be able to fully utilize them. Some 45 States have laws or resolutions already, but many of them are not strong enough to have much effect. Only a few municipalities thus far have taken similar action.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE NEEDY BLIND AND TOTALLY DISABLED

The Federal Government is involved in programs of support for needy blind persons and for permanently and totally disabled persons through social security legislation enacted in 1935 and 1950. Under these public assistance programs, the Government provides grants to States and the States, in turn, provide three forms of assistance: cash payments for food, clothing, shelter, and other basic needs; medical or remedial care recognized under State law, through payments directly to hospitals, physicians, dentists, and other providers of care; and social services, such as counseling on personal problems, help in finding better housing, referral to community resources, and homemaker services.

These programs are available to needy blind persons so that they may attain or retain their self-support or self-care capability and to people over age 18 who cannot support themselves because they have a permanent and total physical or mental impairment.

In 1967 the number of persons receiving aid to the blind in the States and territories with programs in operation totaled over 82,000. Combined, total expenditure of local, State, and Federal funds for this purpose was over $86.9 million, and the average payment for all individuals participating nationwide was $90.45 per month. Under the program for the permanently and totally disabled, there were 646,000 recipients receiving a total of $573.5 million, averaging $80.60 per monthly payment.

SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY INSURANCE

The basic social security program which provides benefits to the worker when he retires also provides cash benefits to covered disabled workers under age 65 and to their dependents for as long as the worker is unable to engage in "substantial gainful activity." In 1967, over two million disabled workers and dependents received social security cash benefits totalling over $147.8 million. Under the 1965 social security amendments, use of trust funds was authorized to pay the cost of rehabilitation services provided by the State vocational rehabilitation agencies to certain disability insurance beneficiaries.

The "Medicare" Act passed in 1965 included a little-publicized but valuable new arrangement for restoring more disabled people: It authorized the Social Security Administration to transfer from trust funds for retirement and disability benefits certain amounts for vocational rehabilitation services to disabled workers receiving social security benefits. A limit of one percent of the total benefits being received placed a control on how many funds could be transferred each year. These funds are used by the Federal-State Vocational Rehabilitation Program to pay for services to disabled beneficiaries, most of whom can be restored to activity and work, thereby resuming their payments into the trust funds. For this year, $18,077,000 was transferred for this work.

SUMMARY

The above Federal programs have been described briefly and quite possibly some programs may have been unintentionally overlooked in our research.

At any rate, the summary may be of assistance to those interested in the problems and programs concerning handicapped Americans.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I should like to express great pride in, and ask to be associated with this most excellent statement just made by my distinguished colleague. He speaks of a problem which, in his own words, affects every person in our society and every fiber of our Nation.

Here is, then, a definition coupled with a solution and, treated with sympathy and yet with reason, an approach, I am sure, that will yield to progress.

I think that one point he so clearly set forth is the challenge. That is when he asked all of us:

> Are we doing our best to see that all the knowledge, the information, and money, and other help is consolidated and available to the handicapped person in the form he can best use and in the time and place he needs it most?

I think he answered that question by saying a little later on that we must do better. He makes a proposal which is specific in its recommendations, and is an enormous contribution, I think, to a very great problem.

I look forward to the other proposal that he shall be making in the days ahead in regard to what is, really, one of the great problems facing this country in the last third of the 20th century.

I congratulate my distinguished colleague. I am very much pleased to be here today when he makes his first speech in the Senate.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I should like to join my friend, the other distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. Pearson), in commending the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. Dole) for his contribution this afternoon.

I have served in this body many years. I do not know that I have ever heard a new Senator make a greater contribution in what he characterizes as his first speech in this body.

He talked on a subject which is close to the hearts of all Americans. This country has grown so fast, with over 200 million people in it, with a huge Government requiring complicated machinery, that it is a supertask for us to try to see that some of the less fortunate people in this country are not ground under the wheels of the massive instrument that we have played our part in creating.

I predict for the junior Senator from Kansas a long and distinguished career. I venture to say that although his contributions, I am sure, will be great, he can always remember with pride the fact that his first contribution was on a subject which is so important to all Americans.

As a Member of the Senate, I join in congratulating the distinguished Senator from Kansas on the masterly speech he has just delivered.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I should like to join the senior Senator from Kansas (Mr. Pearson) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Cotton) in commenting on the speech which the junior Senator from Kansas (Mr. Dole) has just completed—a speech which addresses itself to a problem which is becoming increasingly felt as one of the serious problems in America today. The subject has a humanitarian impact because it deals with the problems of the individual, but it also has a social and economic impact because it affects the way in which we, as a nation, deal with problems that touch the lives of so many of our citizens.

The Senator has treated the subject in great depth, with thoroughness, and with understanding. I can only say that this is typical of him. He and I entered the other body on the same day. We came to the Senate on the same day. I have known him very well in the intervening years.

The remarks of the junior Senator from Kansas today are evidence of the promise of the enormously valuable service which he will render in this body as the years pass by.

I wish to express my appreciation to him for his valuable contribution.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleagues for their patience and their kind remarks.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Kansas is to be commended for his statement today on problems faced by the handicapped. This statement, in many ways, typifies the man who made it. It is well prepared, thoughtful, and above all, it is a warm and human examination of the problem.

The Senator from Kansas, during his four terms in the House of Representatives, established himself as a man who truly cares about people and does his best to aid them. His emphasis is not on statistics, but on the people involved. This is as it must be. The dollars spent, the programs generated, mean nothing unless they benefit those in need.

The problem of aiding the physically, mentally, or emotionally handicapped is not one to be solved by government alone. In the end it is people who must help. People will provide jobs, training, and dignity. A partnership of government, local and national, and the private sector of our economy is the wise way of approaching the question of assistance to the handicapped. It is the way highlighted by the able Senator from Kansas.

There is one final point I wish to make, Mr. President. In mentioning specific causes of disability, there is one the Senator from Kansas left out—service to our Nation. A great number of our citizens have made the sacrifice of health and well-being for the cause of peace. The distinguished Senator knows well the problems of which he speaks today. He knows the vitality that remains in the human soul despite injury to the body. He has demonstrated how well a man can serve his country despite a handicap.

Mr. President, I congratulate the junior Senator from Kansas on his fine remarks to the Senate.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

UTAH GIRL WINS ABILITY COUNTS CONTEST

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, for the third time in the last 5 years, a Utah high school girl has been named national winner of the Ability Counts Contest, sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Taking top honors in the 1969 contest is Miss Kathy DeAnn Saxton, 17, of Ogden. She won in competition with upper class high school students from 47 States, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands, all writing on "What Every Employer Should Know About Handicapped Workers."

In 1965, Marilyn Dautrich, of Salt Lake City's Granite High School, won first-place honors in the essay contest. The following year her sister, Ann, won the same honor. The back-to-back winning by sisters was unprecedented in the contest's history.

This year's winner, Miss Saxton, is a junior at Bonneville High School, in Ogden. Along with first-place State winners, she will come to Washington during May to meet with the President's Committee, and to receive her $1,000 national award, contributed by the Disabled American Veterans.

The Ability Counts Contest is aimed at making us aware of the problems faced by the handicapped in obtaining employment, and the many high achievements of severely disabled persons.

Miss Saxton's excellent paper, which was written after a good deal of research into the problems faced by the handicapped, what is being done to meet these problems, and personal interviews with disabled Utahans, shows what can be accomplished to tap the potential of these citizens.

As she says in her theme:

> It is our duty and our opportunity to help give the disabled a chance to prove their own worth and retain their dignity. To produce useful and lasting citizens, rehabilitation of both employer and employee must take place from the shoulders up.

I ask unanimous consent that the essay be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT EVERY EMPLOYER SHOULD KNOW ABOUT HANDICAPPED WORKERS

(By Kathy DeAnn Saxton)

There are nearly eight million disabled people in our country. We have a responsibility to assure each American a prosperous life. The hiring of the disabled can prove to be as beneficial to the employer as the employee. Our society can, and will help find employment for these Americans.

In ancient times evil spirits were thought to cause disease. The physically handicapped or mentally retarded persons were given as sacrifices to the gods. If a child were born deformed in ancient Greece or Rome, he could be killed at birth.

Americans of our generation have placed a great emphasis on a beautiful body with no physical or mental deformities. When people see an individual who is different from themselves, they look at him with sympathy. Our society treats him with special kindness, often sympathizing instead of encouraging.

The United States Constitution promises justice and equality for all. This means all God's children, including the disabled as well as the rich and healthy. We, therefore, cannot deprive any citizen of the right to a prosperous and happy life.

In recent times Americans have found that the disabled need to be an integral part of our working force. The late President John F. Kennedy has said, "The Federal Government shall lead the way in employment of the disabled." Former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey has said, "We are an affluent country, enjoying full employment and unprecedented prosperity; but we are not so rich that we can be prodigal with any human resources. Our handicapped must be enabled to participate fully in every phase of society. We simply cannot afford the economic loss of their wasted ability."

Statistics have shown that, if we could employ 700 rehabilitants a year and bring their average earning capacity to $3,000 a year over an average earning period of twenty-five years, the earnings would total $52,500,000. When one adds the earnings to those rehabilitated in the succeeding years of the twenty-five year period plus the savings in welfare, the figure is phenomenal.

If one looks at people with the capacities they have and judge them on how well they use these capacities, one will see each person as an individual. A disabled person has the capacity and is capable. Both the employers and the employee must be educated to the fact that a disabled person can compete if given a chance.

In the 1950's an employer would probably hire a non-handicapped worker over a disabled person because the insurance and workmen's compensation were such that to do otherwise just wasn't good business. Today an employer cannot use this excuse. In the American Insurance Association booklet, *The Physically Impaired—A Guidebook to Their Employment*, it states, "The formula for determining workmen's compensation insurance rates do not consider an employee's physical defects. No higher rate is charged because physically impaired workers are employed."

Sometimes workmen's compensation stands in the way of employment of the disabled. But, workmen's compensation is determined by two things: the relative hazard in a company's line of work and its accident experience.

In certain jobs, changes are made so a disabled person can be employed. Small things mean a great deal to a handicapped person. Changing the height of a workbench can be important to a workman confined to a wheelchair. Sometimes the redesigning process is small and sometimes it is large. The important idea is to allow the person to work to his full capacity.

In two communities of Utah alone, a number of excellent examples of the successful employment of the handicapped have been found. Two key punch operators who are deaf are employed at the U.S. Forest Service, Ogden, Utah. They can "run rings around the other employees." A secretary in a Salt Lake City, Utah business firm functions efficiently as a typist. She has only one arm. Paralyzed from the waist down by polio while in college, a young man is employed by the Security Employment Office, Salt Lake City, Utah as a journalist. He is well liked by everyone and is doing an excellent job. Acting as mail handlers for the U.S. Post Office, Salt Lake City, Utah, five mentally retarded individuals are reported as doing excellent work.

In summary, personal interviews have helped to formulate certain ideas concerning disabled people. First, the barriers and ideas of yesterday toward the disabled are gradually breaking down. Second, the placement of disabled persons on the job is rewarding to the employer and the employee. Third, the employment programs for the handicapped are continuing to grow and gain momentum through the nation. Fourth, the disabled can prove their worth on the job, if given a chance.

How sad it is when a society can become so hardened that it will not accept the disabled. It is our duty and our opportunity to help give the disabled a chance to prove their own worth and retain their dignity. To produce useful and lasting citizens, rehabilitation of both employer and employee must take place from the shoulders up.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR RANDOLPH OPPOSES BUDGET CUTS IN NATURAL RESOURCES PROGRAMS AND ASKS FOR $10 BILLION CUT IN DEFENSE SPENDING

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the annual submission of the budget of the U.S. Government has again become the signal for the opening of public discussion on cutting back programs in the development of our human and natural resources.

Invariably, the first things looked at are those programs which concern themselves with the improvement of the quality of our environment. Natural resource programs of every kind become suspect. The first items proposed for discontinuance or deferment are programs related to water supply, air and water pollution control, education, hospital construction, recreation, manpower training, and urban and transportation development. Programs which constitute the investment in our future are the ones which are most susceptible to curtailment, excision, or obliteration.

On Monday, March 24, 1969, the Director of the Budget, Robert P. Mayo, in an appearance before the Senate Committee on Finance, discussed the possibility of a freeze on public works. The objective of the freeze, the reduction of inflationary pressures, is indeed noteworthy. However, since this is not the first such moratorium on our national public works investment programs, it is time for us to evaluate the relationship between these programs and our national fiscal policy, and indeed the very purposes for which we have resource development programs.

For a decade the pressures of rising costs have borne down heavily upon the American people. Inflation has directly affected the cost of Government services. In a period of great prosperity, we have experienced tremendous increases in the cost of services, along with an expansion of the kinds of services needed by our expanding population. As the total budget of the Federal Government has risen, however, that portion of it devoted to the preservation, conservation, and improvement of our human and natural resources has decreased.

The total dollars spent on such things as water pollution control, air pollution control, parks, recreation, water resource development, solid waste disposal, and the like have stayed fairly constant, but the proportionate amount relative to the Federal budget has steadily decreased. We have, in the parlance of business, curtailed our investment in plant and equipment and have tried to meet important public needs with inadequate and obsolete facilities. I am deeply concerned that the Bureau of the Budget should again be considering a freeze on "all but the most urgent public works projects," in view of the fact that in the last 20 years, the Bureau of the Budget itself has exercised such strict controls over our public works programs that only the most urgent have been submitted to the Congress.

In the budget for fiscal year 1970, submitted by the Johnson administration, our total outlays were estimated to be $195 billion; more than $83 billion would be obligated for national defense; some $55 billion would be for social security, unemployment insurance and medicare payments; and almost $16 billion would be needed to service the national debt. Of the total budget, only $19 billion would be available for programs which related in greater or lesser degree to our investment in the America of the future and its people. Of this amount, the net expenditure for those primary categories traditionally considered as "public works," that is, water and land resources and power development—as my knowledgeable colleague who honors me by listening to these remarks, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), well knows—will be less than $2 billion.

We are informed that the revised budget for fiscal year 1970, submitted by President Nixon, will be transmitted to the Congress tomorrow. Reports in the press indicate that the Johnson budget will be trimmed by $4 billion, with $1.1 billion coming from the defense related budget—now in excess of $83 billion—and $2.9 billion being cut from the so-called controllable nondefense expenditures which are estimated at less than $20 billion. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that this proposed allocation of cuts fails to acknowledge the mounting criticism of independent scientific and military experts and of Members of Congress regarding the policies and practices of the Defense Establishment. And I suggest also that both the Johnson and the Nixon budgets express the continued confusion of values and priorities which has been dominated by a militaristic psychology, which has resulted in our deferring the solutions to critical social and economic problems and postponing the development of vital natural resources.

Not long ago, Under Secretary of Defense David Packard stated that the proposed budget would allow for "guns and some butter." This is the kind of polarized language that has for too long dominated our thinking, saying it is either here or it is there—in other words, that there are only two sides to a problem. I say to the Members of the Senate and the people of the United States that there are more than two sides to any public issue these days. There are as many sides as there are factors to be considered and weighed; and to say that there are just two sides to such a question is a tragic oversimplification of the very complex society in which we live. It implies that we must make a choice between providing for the sturdy sinews of defense or accepting the self-indulgences of a peaceful society. Mr. President, several Senators during the Easter recess were making studies of conditions of hunger and malnutrition within their own States and other States. They have found, as has the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, that a significant portion of the American people, including children, not only do not have the butter of which Secretary Packard speaks, but they are deficient in the basic supplies of iron, protein, and other nutritional elements which are vital to the physical, intellectual and emotional development of a normal human being. The "guns versus butter" phrasing is the kind of cliche that short circuits the critical and reflective thought which we in the Senate must bring to bear on this matter.

In point of fact, Mr. President, it is our defense expenditures—generally subjected to very little critical analysis—that have fostered a bloated, overweight, wasteful and frequently inefficient Defense Establishment. As the Joint Economic Committee stated in its report of January 1969:

> We have been impressed by the evidence of widespread waste, mismanagement, and inefficiency in defense spending brought to light in recent months. It now seems clear that the present level of national security can be maintained on a substantially smaller defense budget.

These are not my words. These are the words of the Joint Economic Committee, in its report of January 1969.

In this regard, let us recall what former President Eisenhower, to whom the Nation paid its last respects last week, wrote in 1965:

> Every addition to defense expenditures does not automatically increase military security. Because security is based upon moral and economic, as well as purely military strength, a point can be reached at which additional funds for arms, far from bolstering security, weaken it.

These are the words of that great former President of the United States.

Mr. President, I believe we have long since reached and passed that point, as my votes in support of cutting the military budget have indicated since 1963. We cannot be considered secure as a nation in the most meaningful sense of the word when too many of our cities are rotting at the core, when the air we breathe and our streams and lakes are increasingly fouled by municipal and industrial pollution, and when earnest young Americans feel—and understandably so—that they are not being given full participation in the decisions that govern their own destinies.

I have spoken with many of these young people on college campuses throughout the country in recent months, and I know of their longings for peace and for the opportunity to make creative contributions to our society in the years ahead. Last Friday, April 11, I spoke in Morgantown, W. Va., where I quoted remarks of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur when he stated:

> The great tragedy of the world today is that we have not been able to establish the mechanics to carry out the will of the common people that war shall be non-existent. Now, the masses of the world are far ahead of their leaders . . . I believe it is the massed opposition of the rank and file against war that offers the greatest possible hope that there shall be no war.

I stated at that time in Morgantown, and I assert here vigorously again this afternoon, that it is quite possible that we are beginning to see the genesis of mass opposition to war in the attitudes and protests—though I am strongly against violence and often speak out against it—of what is thus far a small segment of the young people of the United States and other countries. Although all reasonable persons wish for peace, it is our young people who most often have taken an active part in translating that desire into affirmative actions.

I talked not only with students in high school and college, but with other young people who are working at jobs in our labor forces in the West Virginia valleys and on the West Virginia hills. I talked to young men who are beginning to rear families, and to realize the responsibility of bearing the heavy costs under which they live in these troubled times.

Mr. President, I honor the patriotism, the sincerity, and the integrity of the career military officers of the armed services. And I do not imply a conspiracy within the so-called military-industrial complex. Though I do believe the military-industrial complex is a reality, and the problem of controlling it in the broader interests of society is more difficult than if it were dominated by a conspiracy; for if that were the case we could ferret out the conspirators and be done with it. The problem is much more deep seated and pervasive than that of a conspiracy; for it stems from attitudes and habits of thought generated more than 20 years ago which are no longer relevant to the world of today.

Too much of the thinking of our Defense Establishment and foreign policy planning is frozen in the ice of the cold war. And as the knowledgeable senior Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) demonstrated in his remarks to the Senate on April 1 of this year concerning his recent trips in the Soviet Union, the rigid and inflexible attitudes of the cold war are no longer relevant to the realities of today.

As the senior Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) stated at that time:

> For almost 20 years now, many of us in the Congress have more or less blindly followed our military spokesmen. Some have become captives of the military. We are on the verge of turning into a militaristic nation. Since the end of the Second World War we have been operating under a cold war psychology. The attention of the country has been turned abroad and the problems of our domestic life have been neglected. We have forgotten many of the traditions and values which made this country great, and we have

flung men, arms and materials almost heedlessly about the world.

Mr. President, I shall long remember the year 1963 in the Senate. That was the year in which I joined with the junior Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern) in offering an amendment to cut military appropriations by 10 percent. Only our two names were on the amendment. A rollcall was demanded, and the amendment received two votes—the votes of Senator McGovern and Senator Randolph. That was 6 years ago.

On that occasion, I stated:

> I share the conviction that America should have a defense force which is second to none, but the time has come to question the assumption that we are adding to defense and security by increasing more and more the nuclear stockpile when it is a well documented fact that the United States already has an accumulation of nuclear weapons in excess of any conceivable need. This excess is spoken of in military terms as "overkill capacity."

Though the details have changed with the changing weapons technology, the basic issue is the same today as it was in 1963. This point of view is shared by a growing number of Americans, in the general public and among independent military and foreign policy experts, but it seems not yet to have penetrated the Pentagon. I started to say the recesses of the Pentagon. I hope it begins to touch the fringes of the Pentagon.

As former Marine Commandant Gen. David M. Shoup, so eloquently and courageously stated in his recent article in the Atlantic Monthly, in both Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic adventure of 1965, the professional military planners propelled the United States into an excessively aggressive response. The comments of a former Commandant of the Marine Corps and member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff can hardly be dismissed as irresponsible, naive, or unwitting. These are the measured statements of one of America's great military combat leaders who is desperately concerned with the direction our country is taking. Many Americans, and many Members of this body, I believe, share the general's concern.

Mr. President, the able senior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Proxmire), who has been one of the most consistent and effective critics of defense spending, has documented the growth in the military-industrial complex against which President Eisenhower warned the Nation in his farewell address in 1961. One measure of this growth is in the increase of high-ranking retired military officers in the employment of the leading defense contractors. As the senior Senator from Wisconsin noted in the Senate on March 24 of this year, the number of retired officers of the rank of colonel or naval captain or above, employed by the top 100 defense contractors, has increased from 721 in 1959 to 2,072 in 1969, an increase of almost threefold.

During the same decade, defense expenditures have almost doubled; and in recent months we have learned—from reports of the General Accounting Office, testimony from such experts as Admiral Rickover, and from committee investigations in both the Senate and the House of Representatives—of vast overruns in defense contracts, the failure of weapons systems to function with more than a fraction of their specified capabilities, and of the decreasing use of competitive bidding among defense suppliers. These conditions were summed up in the 1969 report of the Joint Economic Committee in the following statement:

> While over $44 billion was spent on the purchase of weapons and other military goods last year, only 11 percent of the contracts were awarded through formal advertising. Sole source procurement accounts for 57.9 percent. It is the sole source procurement of major weapons systems where much of the problem of excessive costs and cost overruns have occurred. Cost increases of 200 percent and more over original estimates have been common.

The conditions prevail, Mr. President, because we have not established in the Department of Defense or in any other agency of the Government machinery to assure effective audit, control, and program management of defense expenditures. The Defense Contract Audit Agency, established by the Secretary of Defense as of July 1, 1965, has made progress in postaudit reviews of contract prices. But this is only a partial attack on the problem.

As this agency becomes more effective, it is the intention of the Comptroller General to shift the emphasis in the very competent work being performed by the General Accounting Office from individual contract audits to the broader areas of procurement and contract administration. Under the present allocation of manpower, the General Accounting Office devotes approximately 40 percent of its staff to audits of Defense Department activities. This seems to me a fair allocation of manpower, considering that the GAO also has to respond to many unprogramed requests by Members and the committees of Congress. But I believe the appropriate committees of Congress should also give consideration to increasing the funds and professional personnel of the General Accounting Office, especially in view of the savings that have accrued to the Government as a result of GAO audits of Defense Department contracts.

But the kind of control of the Defense Establishment which is now required is not the function of an arm of Congress, nor of Congress itself. Certainly, no committees in the Senate have carried a greater burden than has the Committee on Armed Services, chaired so long and so ably by the distinguished former chairman, the senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. Russell), and now led by the knowledgeable and diligent Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Stennis). A Senate committee has neither the time nor the staff adequately to control as massive an operation as the Department of Defense.

Indeed, the primary responsibility for weighing the requests for defense expenditures in relation to competing claims from the non-defense sector of the Government rests with the Bureau of the Budget. Yet, among the 500 professional staff persons in the Bureau of the Budget, only 45 are assigned to audit, control and program management of national security programs—that is, less than 10 percent of BOB personnel assigned to manage the expenditure of 50 percent or more of budgeted funds, depending on how one categorizes "national security" expenditures. Five hundred professional staff persons are employed in the Bureau of the Budget, but only 45 are assigned to audit, control, and program management in our national security efforts—less than 10 percent of the personnel assigned to manage the expenditure of 50 percent or more of budgeted funds.

I desired to make a comparison between BOB manpower allocation to national resources programs and national security programs and requested this information from the Bureau of the Budget. I ask unanimous consent to have the two tables printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Estimated fiscal year 1970]

Budget analysts (Estimated fiscal year 1970)

NATURAL RESOURCES PROGRAMS

Agriculture price support, Public Law 480, and related programs	2
Conservation programs	1
Credit programs	1
Forestry programs	1
Research programs	1
Marketing, foreign agriculture, and food programs	1
Indians	1
Territories	1
Mineral exploration, production and supply	1
Land, forage, timber	1
Recreation use and preservation; also includes fish and wildlife programs	2
Water supply and control	7
Corps of Engineers—Civil, including project report review	5
Power and energy	4
General program support	4
Total	33

NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Strategic forces	6
General purpose forces	19
Intelligence and communications	7
Research and development	3
Logistics, construction and general support	8
Support to other nations	2
Total	[1] 45

[1] All but 10 of these positions are located in the national security programs division; one is an assistant director; seven are located in the international programs division; two, in the general government division.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President (Mr. Dole in the chair), it is, of course, virtually impossible to make a refined comparison of man-per-dollar volume between the two categories of programs—the natural resources and the national security programs—because they do not follow the overall budget categories to which funds are allocated. However, one does not need a definitive analysis to see the grossly disproportionate allocation of manpower to natural resources programs compared to those associated with national security. For example, in the field of national security programs of research and development, the budget estimate for fiscal year 1970 is in excess of $9 billion, including the $829 million entered for weapons research by the Atomic Energy Commission and thus not carried in the Defense Department budget. In order to monitor this massive program—where some of the most flagrant examples of mismanagement and cost overruns have occurred—the Bureau of the Budget has assigned three, only three, budget analysts. On the other hand, for natural resources programs, which, in their entirety, do not approach fiscal 1970 obligations of $9 billion, the Bureau has assigned 33 budget analysts. For water resources and power development alone—programs administered largely by the Corps of Engineers, Civil Works Division, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, with combined budgets of less than $1.8 billion for fiscal year 1970—for these programs alone, the Bureau has assigned 16 budget analysts, or more than five times the manpower for programs which are less than one-fourth the size of our weapons research and development programs.

Given this kind of manpower allocation, it is no mystery why the unvarying reflex of the Bureau of the Budget, during times of financial constraint, is first to trim the natural resources programs—the programs of people, the programs to help people, the programs to strengthen the very vitals of this Nation. Yet, it is these programs, and those which develop our human resources, that provide the real bone and muscle of our national security, not only today but also for the years ahead; for if it were not for the great economic and industrial strength generated by these programs, we could not afford the fat and waste in parts of our defense effort today. To cite only two examples, it was the control and harnessing of the Tennessee River that helped make possible the development of the aluminum industry so vital to our air strength in World War II, and the development of the atomic bomb at Oak Ridge with which we ended that dreadful conflict. And, similarly, the navigational development and the control of floods on the Ohio River have made the Ohio Valley one of the great industrial centers of the heartland of America.

It is for these reasons, and countless other benefits which could be cited, that I oppose, vigorously and earnestly, any so-called moratorium or cutback on our programs of natural resources development, and I shall oppose with equal strength any cutback on valid programs of developing our human resources.

It may be that on a strict cost effectiveness, accounting basis, some of the Job Corps centers would be difficult to justify.

I turn at this point to say that many, many calls from West Virginia over the weekend and today have indicated the value of the Job Corps workers in Greenbrier County, Camp Anthony, where the Conservation Corps has been going forward. I visited there twice. I met with the officials and with the boys and counseled with them in connection with the diplomas they receive in carpentry. These boys, I should say to the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), are dropouts from school and perhaps do not know more than one of their parents. These are boys who need programs of this type. They are being trained in the skills of carpentry. They go there without any means of earning a livelihood and perhaps with only the capability of fomenting violence. However, now they can go out from the camp ready to earn $3 an hour and contribute to the society of which we are all a part.

The development potentials of these natural and human resources are being cut from some of the programs, as we have been reading in the last few days. If this is so—there may be some reason I do not see—and if such cuts are being made for reasons of cost effectiveness and to control inflation, then these reasons are even more applicable to much of our Defense Department expenditures. The overrun of $2 billion on the C–5A airplane alone is greater than the entire budget for the Job Corps—not to mention the ABM, which is of doubtful merit at best, and the folly of committing our Nation to another multibillion-dollar manned bomber program.

Mr. President, it was on March 10 of this year that the senior Senator from Wisconsin offered eight or nine specific recommendations in the Senate for ways in which we might control the runaway military budget. These were developed from his penetrating investigations, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee. We should address ourselves seriously to these recommendations.

Other suggestions have been offered, including the recommendation of a national commission on the defense budget, which would include experts not only on matters of foreign policy and defense but also individuals committed to solving the urgent domestic problems which face us today. Overriding all these specific suggestions is the recognition of the need to question the basic assumptions of our defense policies and to reorder our national priorities in the light of such questioning.

The current ABM controversy is a beginning—and I hope it is only that. I hope that the Congress this year will deny the funds for deploying the ABM, and will proceed from there to make an overall cut in the defense budget in the neighborhood of $8 to $10 billion. Thus we may force the Defense Department to live within the kind of realistic constraints that are imposed on other agencies of the Government, and we can then begin to establish the kind of institutional procedures needed to analyze the kind of institutional procedures needed to analyze the assumptions of the defense establishment.

Mr. President, I recognize the thief of inflation, the hidden taxes which all Americans pay as a result of rising costs. And I join with this administration in the effort to curb inflation. But I suggest to Members of this body that we concentrate on those areas of most rapidly rising costs and cost overruns in the $83 billion defense budget rather than on the less than $20 billion of so-called controllable nondefense programs which invest in the development of the human and natural resources of this Nation which we love.

I am very grateful for the attention of several of my colleagues as we counsel together on this subject. I am not an expert and I do not pose as one on this matter. But I am a student of this subject, and I have been working, as other Senators have, in relation to the many matters of concern not only to us but to our constituency and the people of the United States.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I think it is very obvious that the Senator from West Virginia has made a very outstanding contribution today in calling our attention to this important subject. There are so many things I would like to say in response to and in comment about his statement, but I shall restrict my comments very briefly because I know that those who are here today listening to the Senator from West Virginia are very knowledgeable in this subject field and have had great opportunity to listen to the speech today and, with their own backgrounds, no doubt have much they want to say about this matter.

I am especially pleased that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) is in the Chamber because over the years he has been most involved with that part of this speech of the Senator from West Virginia which deals with western reclamation.

The Senator mentioned TVA. I think this is very pertinent because the TVA in his frame of reference was a national issue and a national project. I think sometimes we are a little prone to think of these projects in reference to our own region or area alone. I would agree that while there is real and urgent need to stem inflation, there is pressing need to examine priorities in spending, especially as related to public works and natural resources.

The war in Vietnam and the fiscal crisis it has brought to the American scene is a tragedy of our time and it does not make sense to me to cut back Federal developments that create and assist our Nation's economy.

I am sure the Senator realizes that the Department of Defense budget today ranks third in reference to national budgets of other countries. In other words, only two countries in the world have a budget larger than the budget of our Department of Defense.

Public works seems to be one of the first programs whittled whenever cutbacks are made, and this is the third consecutive year of such cutbacks.

It seems incongruous to be facing cutbacks on water-resource developments, especially water-storage reservoirs for flood control, on this very day when thousands of Americans are reportedly homeless as a result of flooding rivers in the Midwest.

I think we need an increase, not a decrease, in funding for water-resource developments, pollution control, and reclamation projects, since funding for these programs has already been sliced to the bone.

Water is a fundamental resource and its conservation, preservation and cleanup cannot continue to be delayed in order to protect the funding of other programs that do not pay their way or have not been proven economically feasible by time consuming and costly benefit-to-cost-ratio studies. I refer to the military budget.

The administration has fallen heir to water resource developments and pollution control programs that are not going to be readily solvable.

This country needs a consistent and adequately financed water resources restoration and development program to be kept on an even and dependable plane.

The drought cycles in the Midwest in the past are in sharp contrast to the devastating floods there at present and point up a need for protective works before, rather than disaster relief for recovery and rehabilitation after flood damage is done.

Flood control benefits from the federally financed water storage projects in some areas of California were realized fully during the flooding that beseiged southern California early this year.

The federally financed dam and reservoir projects in my State of Oregon prevented millions of dollars of flood damage in the worst floods in the State's history in December 1964.

The West, like most regions of the Nation, has always been plagued with the problems of either too much or too little water.

A few years back a 5-year drought in the Northeastern States highlighted a water crisis in that region.

In all cases the single development that can do the most good is a facility to impound water.

In the face of these needs, the Chief of Army Engineers testified before Congress last spring that new starts in the pipeline for his agency, which had been averaging about $1 billion a year in the total cost of the projects started, dropped down for the last 2 years to somewhat under $200 million.

When this reduction of 80 percent in the pipeline reveals itself we are going to be faced with the need for massive amounts of Federal funds just to restore this one program to its $1 billion a year former level.

To compound this problem, this one agency alone has a backlog of active authorized civil works projects not yet under construction of $8½ billion.

When the backlog of reclamation and pollution control fund needs are added to the above, the total will be a monumental one.

Where can better investments of public funds be made than in the water resources projects that prevent loss of life and property while preserving the water and its quality for its many and varied uses and at the same time allowing land reclamation and recreation, all of which contribute to a permanent environmental and economic development.

In Oregon we have five major reservoir projects held up awaiting a construction start—Applegate, Cascadia, Elk Creek, Gate Creek, and Lower Grande Ronde. We have another flood control project in Oregon that is somewhat unique and it has not yet had a planning start. Willow Creek Reservoir in Heppner was authorized in 1965 after more than a half century of on-and-off-again studies. In 1908—61 years ago, a flood took 247 lives in Heppner in what was then the worst natural disaster of of its kind in the history of the United States. Sixty-one years later, we still plead for a planning start on this reservoir project.

In addition to the flood control needs, the cutback in reservoir projects will add to an upcoming power shortage. Bonneville Power Administration, marketing agent for the Federal dams in the Columbia River Basin and the Northwest Power Pool, the cooperative arrangement on the part of public systems, private utilities, and the Federal power agencies, is predicting a power deficit in 1973–74.

With this power deficit facing us, lower Granite lock and dam on the Columbia River system, a substantial power generating facility, remains as it has been for the past 3 years, with the cofferdam installed awaiting funds for a start on the main dam structure.

Beyond the direct returnable benefits lost in delaying water resource projects, the additional costs to be added due to the continuing annual increase in construction costs are staggering.

Assuming a 5-percent average increase per year, the Corps of Engineers' total backlog alone will increase costs $425 million each year of delay. This, added to the cost of past delays, makes the rationale for continuing a policy of no new starts difficult to understand.

The continuing growth in this country and the ever-increasing needs to clean up and fully utilize our water demands unprecedented development of this fundamental resource.

Mr. President, I have taken only this very small part of the outstanding presentation made by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), and that is the water resource. I could talk about all the other resources to which he referred so eloquently today, such as human resources, the need for education, for housing, for job developments, for health facilities and programs, the needs of the aged and the poor, the needs of the young—all of these things bear great comment and further discussion; but I wanted to touch briefly this one, small facet of the greatest of all our natural resources; namely, that of water, and how fundamental it is, not just to the West and to my own State, but also to the entire Nation.

Again I compliment the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for drawing our attention to this question.

I think the fundamental question is one of priorities. Are we going to put the priorities upon becoming involved in a revolution in Southeast Asia and neglect the revolution which is taking place here at home, or are we going to spend more money to destroy cities and villages in Southeast Asia than to build and reconstruct here at home?

These are some of the priorities which have certainly challenged my thinking and I know they will be read tomorrow in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by all Senators not privileged to hear the presentation of the Senator from West Virginia today.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am grateful for the comments of the able Senator from Oregon and most appreciative of his thoughts toward me. There is a compelling argument to advance the water resources development programs in this country. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) has painstakingly, day after day and month after month, looked into these projects which are so glibly called pork barrels. There is no Member of this body who knows better than the senior Senator from Louisiana the falsity of the term "pork barrel" when applied to vital flood-control projects which protect the lives and property of our citizens.

I am very appreciative of the time the Senator from Oregon has taken to listen to my remarks this afternoon and to make his very helpful comments on what I hope will be a partial building of the RECORD.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I share the apprehensions of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. The week before last, the extent of this problem came to my notice. I held hearings and heard all the Corps of Engineers witnesses in respect to our public works programs for fiscal 1970. Congress appropriated, as I recall, the figure of $906 million, for the Corps of Engineers construction program for fiscal year 1969.

Last week, I learned that based on the need to pay for past commitments substantially less than that amount would be spent during the current fiscal year. What has happened is that practically all of the contracts scheduled for award in fiscal year 1969 will be delayed, some extending into 1970. However, those awarded in fiscal year 1969 will be delayed so as to incur no expenditures until fiscal year 1970, and contracts scheduled for award in fiscal year 1970 will probably be delayed to late in that year.

If the present administration freezes this work, as they have indicated they might, we might as well close down the work of the Corps of Engineers because, as I said, this year they will spend substantially less than the amount we made available to them.

As we are discussing this problem, the Senate is acquainted with the vast damage now being caused in the States of Iowa, Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota—in fact several other States in the North. If we in the past had been provided enough money to construct the projects which were authorized in those areas, a large portion of the damage we are reading about now would not have occurred.

I do not know what the President will do, but if he further curtails the expenditures of money to take care of natural resources, there is no telling the extent of the damage our country will suffer in the future. In many divisions, the increase in cost of some of these projects because of delays and slowdowns is more than the appropriation request to continue the project in fiscal year 1970. In other words, we had at least a half dozen projects presented this year in which the additional cost to the Government because of delays was greater than the sum we are being asked to appropriate. So we are making no progress. I hope, before the President takes such an action, that he will reconsider the situation and let Congress appropriate sufficient funds to carry out these urgent and worthy projects.

I had hoped to speak with the President on this matter, but I have not had occasion to do it so far. Insofar as I am concerned, I am going to recommend that the committee put into the bill whatever is necessary.

As the Senator well knows, the late President Eisenhower vetoed a public works appropriation bill in which we had quite a few unbudgeted items for the construction of navigation, flood control, and beach erosion projects on various rivers in our country, particularly the Ohio and the Monongahela, in the area of my friend from West Virginia. Notwithstanding the fact that the President vetoed the bill, the Congress overruled him. Congress felt it was most necessary for us to continue those projects.

For quite some time now—in fact long before I came to Congress—it has been my belief that we must do what we can to protect our two most important resources—land and water. If ever we fail to do that, our country will sustain great losses.

I am very hopeful that, if, as, and when I present my report to the Congress to carry on the water resource program, I shall receive the support of the Senate. Insofar as I am personally concerned, I intend to add quite a bit more than the amount allowed by the budget, as I have in the past.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this is a well reasoned comment of caution and counsel which the Senator from Louisiana makes to the present administration and to the President of the United States. I hope the opportunity will be provided for him, informally and officially, to talk with our Chief Executive with respect to matters of overriding concern to the people of the United States.

Mr. President, we are at a great threshold. We are at a great watershed in the history of our people and in the thinking of our people. Here the Congress must be responsive to the electorate. The people are evaluating the situation. We cannot hide in a sanctuary, because it is not there to hide in. The problems are all about us. We must face them, as I hope we do, realistically and courageously as Members of the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I congratulate the Senator from West Virginia on an excellent speech. I think he has put the matter in proper balance.

It is always difficult to criticize military spending. There is not a Member of the Senate who does not want us to have a completely adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force. We know defense cannot be bought at bargain basement prices. We must pay for it. At the same time, as the Senator has so well indicated in his speech, there is waste in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and, as the Senator has suggested in the last few minutes, it has not been scrutinized the way it should be. We have not devoted the resources of the Budget Bureau to a scrutiny of defense expenditures. There are 500 people in the Bureau of the Budget, and only 50, according to the Director of the Budget, have responsibility for auditing defense operations.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Forty-five, to be exact.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Forty-five. I stand corrected.

Even more important, when the Army, Navy, or Air Force comes before the Bureau of the Budget, they come in a position of power which the other agencies do not enjoy. When the officials of other agencies go before the Bureau of the Budget, an official of the Bureau of the Budget will sit in on the request and will determine, more or less, what the budget will be. On the other hand, when the Army, Navy, or Air Force agencies come before the Bureau of the Budget, there will be presiding an official of the Bureau of the Budget and also presiding an official of the agency of defense. Because they have a technical advantage, this gives Army, Navy, and Air Force officials a special advantage. Any recommendation of the Bureau is likely to require agency approval and then, by and large, the Secretary of Defense, backed up by the power of the joint chiefs, is in a peculiarly strong position with the President. This is not criticism of President Nixon or any President; it is just a statement of the fact.

As for congressional review, we all know of the problem we have on the floor when the military budget comes before us with more than $70 billion to be debated in a few hours. In the 12 years I have been in the Senate, I have never heard an effective debate responsibly questioning and answering this massive budget, this very large proportion of all this Government spends.

I should like to make one other point in connection with military expenditures. The Bureau of the Budget has a very fine analyst in Richard Stubbings. He made a report a few weeks ago pointing out that in this decade, of 11 major weapons systems developed, six have been dismal failures; that is, they did not work even up to 25 percent of standard specifications called for in their contracts. On the other hand, their cost was 100 to 200 percent more than the Pentagon told Congress they would cost when they were authorized. They were delivered more than 2 years late on the average. This is an unfortunate situation, because these weapons become obsolete swiftly. Finally, the firms that did the worst job, that failed most miserably, made the highest profit.

So it is difficult for Congress to be able to step in and exercise judgment on each of the myriad of items in the Defense Department budget. But cut this budget we must. Let me suggest how appropriate such a cut would be.

The Congressional Quarterly made a fascinating study, some 3 or 4 months ago, in which it was argued that if we cut the defense budget by $10.8 billion, we would have a leaner, harder, tougher, better military operation, and we would not damage our combat effectiveness. The study pointed out that there were between 10 and 11 support personnel in Vietnam for every one engaged in combat, and 20 commissioned officers in Vietnam for every command post.

I think the Senator from West Virginia is on sound ground. It will be difficult for us to do it. If I have a criticism of the Nixon budget-cutting proposal—to be sure, looking at it only overall, as it has been reported to us—it seems to me that to cut only $1.1 billion, which the newspapers report is what is expected to be cut, out of the defense budget, is grossly inadequate. I say we have to do far more than that, and I think with leadership such as that of the Senator from West Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, who has made such a fine speech here this afternoon, we can do it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I am, of course, appreciative of the references made to my remarks by the knowledgeable Senator from Wisconsin. I referred to him in my speech, not merely in pleasantry, but because of the work he has been doing in this field, and doing so very effectively.

I, of course, realize that there are different opinions among Senators about such programs as the Job Corps. I referred to them, as the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) knows, earlier this afternoon, though not in the terminology I shall now use. But what do we find? We find a mistake in a defense item can run to $30, $40, or $50 million, but we gloss such mistakes over very easily. If, however, a $10, $12, or $15 million mistake is made in connection with conservation or resource development programs, or even programs of helping people to help themselves, such mistakes are disproportionately inflated before the American people.

So I think there is, as was stated earlier today by the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), a need to understand the priorities and attempt to establish them.

I believe Congress is ready to try to do that. I referred earlier to the absence of my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, at the time of the vote in 1963 when the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) and I offered an amendment to cut 10 percent from the military appropriations, across the board. I am not sure that such a figure was the correct amount at that time. I am not an expert. But it seemed to me that it was an opportunity for the Senate to express a deeper concern than just that implied in a figure.

We received two votes—that is all—out of all the membership of this body. I do not know what we should have received then, 6 years ago. Let us say the matters that concerned us then were not as relevant as they are today. I am not critical of the vote of any Senator, or the attitude or position he may take on this problem, but I do feel we must come to grips with the issue as we never have before. We can no longer push it aside. And we ourselves cannot step aside from the obligation of being responsible Senators to a responsible electorate.

KENNEDY, KHRUSHCHEV, AND CUBA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interesting article entitled "Kennedy, Khrushchev, and Cuba," written by the distinguished commentator, Drew Pearson, and published in the Saturday Review of March 29. The article is based upon several personal visits with Khrushchev.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Kennedy, Khrushchev, and Cuba

(By Drew Pearson)

(Note.—The tides of peace were at their crest when a new President took office in 1961; yet within two years a series of mistakes had brought Washington and Moscow to the edge of nuclear war. A distinguished columnist reveals these errors and specifies some lessons for the Nixon Administration.)

"I felt," said the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy, "that we were on the edge of a precipice with no way off." He was describing the "Thirteen Days" in October 1962 during which the United States almost went to war with Soviet Russia over the Cuban missile crisis. Kennedy's book is being cited by various experts as a lesson for President Nixon, and it is. David Schoenbrun, who covered the crisis for CBS, warns that Mr. Nixon should be aware of hawkish advisers. John Kenneth Galbraith, who was then Ambassador to India, points out that President Kennedy's political neck—and for that matter the United States—was saved by men of moral courage. Dean Acheson, who participated in the talks, is convinced President Kennedy was "phenomenally lucky."

While all of the above are true, I would like to make the very important point that the Cuban missile crisis didn't have to happen. And that is the chief lesson for President Nixon. It was not necessary for Kennedy to depend on the advice of either hawkish generals or men of moral courage. For it was not necessary to bring the two most powerful nuclear nations to the brink of war, and it was not necessary to risk a challenge to Soviet vessels on the high seas. For the express duty and function of diplomacy are to prevent these crises. When they happen it is because diplomacy has been neglectful, irresponsible, inefficient.

Some of the events in the early days of the Kennedy Administration which led to the Cuban missile crisis were so juvenile, so overconfident, that they amounted to a travesty of diplomacy. A case in point is the inexcusable failure of Secretary of State Dean Rusk to carry out the President's orders to remove American missiles from Turkey—one of Khrushchev's main reasons for placing Russian missiles in Cuba. Twice the President gave orders to remove American missiles from a country that is not 90 miles distant, as Cuba is from the United States, but only 100 yards from the Soviet Union. Yet these orders were never carried out.

This error is passed over very lightly in Senator Kennedy's book. But it was one of the many mistakes of American diplomacy which led to the most serious danger of major war the United States has faced since December 7, 1941.

There were other serious mistakes, and they began on the day John F. Kennedy took the oath of office, January 20, 1961. They were related to me by such men as the late Adlai Stevenson, former Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles, Senator William Fulbright of Arkansas, and Senator John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky, both members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I relate them here in the hope that President Nixon, who faces the same opportunities as John F. Kennedy, may not repeat his mistakes.

Perhaps the most intriguing of these conversations took place high in the Montenegrin mountains in August 1962, two months before the Cuban missile crisis. Adlai Stevenson and I were the guests of Mrs. Eugene Meyer on a yachting cruise along the Adriatic coast and had traveled with Chief Justice Earl Warren into the interior of Montenegro, partly to give "the chief" some fishing. Our Montenegrin hosts had taken us to a secluded mountain lake where Warren set out in a rowboat to test its potentialities. Stevenson and I, meanwhile, walked among the pine trees along the shore. Perhaps it was the isolation of the spot, but he began talking of his trials and tribulations as Ambassador to the United Nations. The State Department in Washington gave him little authority. He was a diplomatic puppet, dancing to the tune of the career men in Washington. Dean Rusk was slow, sometimes to the point of exasperation.

Stevenson's chief hope had been that he could contribute something toward peace by improving relations with Soviet Russia. To that end he urged Kennedy, in December 1960, shortly after he was elected and before his Inauguration, to take the initiative with the Soviet government. Khrushchev, he said, was ripe for friendly overtures, Averill Harriman had reported, even before the election, that Khrushchev was throwing whatever indirect influence the Soviets had against Nixon. Specifically, he had refused to release the RB–47 Naval fliers before the election for fear it would help Nixon.

After Kennedy's victory, Khrushchev suggested through Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin in Washington that the Soviets might send a special ambassador of Cabinet rank to the Inauguration. Kennedy turned this down. On Inauguration day, Khrushchev sent an effusive telegram, overflowing with friendship to the new President. Kennedy replied with a curt three-line message.

After the Inauguration, following a conference with the new President, Stevenson was asked by newsmen whether Kennedy would confer with Khrushchev if the Soviet leader came to New York for a special U.N. Assembly meeting. Stevenson had answered in the affirmative. Whereupon the White House issued a blunt denial. Later, Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson in Moscow was ordered to track down Chairman Khrushchev in Siberia where he was traveling and inform him that the new President of the United States preferred to postpone any early meeting. Khrushchev is reported to have hit the ceiling.

The American Embassy in Moscow reported early in 1961 that Khrushchev had been given six months in which to demonstrate to the Red Chinese that his policy of coexistence with the West would work. At the Communist Conference in Moscow in November 1960, the Chinese had vehemently opposed Khrushchev's so-called policy of appeasing the West. In a four-hour speech, the Chinese delegate had excoriated Khrushchev. This was followed by a Russo-Chinese compromise, which according to the American Embassy consisted of a six-month grace period during which Khrushchev would have to prove to the Red Chinese that his policy would work.

For this reason then, Kennedy's rebuff of Khrushchev's suggestion that they meet together in New York made the Soviet leader see red. Almost immediately, he turned off his policy of cooperation and began to haze Mr. Kennedy. The Kremlin delivered a brutal note regarding the Congo, undercutting the United Nations and everything the United States stood for there. Simultaneously the Soviet delegation of the Geneva nuclear testing conference stiffened its position. And there was stepped-up Communist activity in Laos.

Simultaneously, Kennedy made a saber-rattling speech threatening military intervention in Laos, appropriated more money for missiles, upped expenditures for B–52s, the long-range bombers. All Stevenson had advised was thrown overboard.

To cap it all, four months after Kennedy had taken office, Stevenson had stood up in the United Nations to defend—and lie about—the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba, only to discover that Washington had not told him the truth. Yes, Adlai Stevenson was indeed discouraged.

It began to get cold high up in those Montenegrin mountains. The Chief Justice had exhausted his patience and rowed back to shore. He had caught two bluegills, too small to keep. Stevenson had finished his discourse, a confession of failure delivered two months before the Cuban missile crisis, a confession in which he saw Russian-American relations drifting from days of hope to days of danger.

I cannot remember the chronological order in which I talked to the others who had urged John F. Kennedy to take the initiative with Khrushchev early in his Administration for fresh new starts toward peace. Senator Cooper, a moderate Republican who had served with success as American Ambassador to India, had visited Moscow shortly before Kennedy's Inauguration and conferred with Foreign Minister Gromyko, Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan, and others. He came back to dine with Kennedy and tell him this was the time for the United States to take the initiative regarding Berlin; otherwise the Russians would. They were in a friendly frame of mind toward the new Administration, but would not wait. European opinion, Cooper told Kennedy, generally agreed that sixteen years was long enough to delay signing a peace treaty with Germany.

Chester Bowles, who served as Under Secretary until he ran afoul of Robert Kennedy over the Bay of Pigs, advised likewise. So did Senator Fulbright, who had been on excellent relations with Kennedy until he heard Kennedy was about to undertake the Bay of Pigs invasion and passionately urged him, in his slow Arkansas drawl, not to do it. All told the new President, in those formative months in the winter of 1961, that he should take advantage of the Moscow thaw.

Perhaps it was Kennedy's caution. Perhaps it was the advice of old-line bureaucrats in the State Department, steeped in the Dulles policy of bowing daily before Chancellor Konrad Adenhauer. But Kennedy did not move. And in April of that fateful year, there began a series of events that some diplomats said turned the luck of the Irish. In any event, they led to the Cuban missile crisis and the brink of war between Russia and the United States.

After the United States invaded Cuba on April 18 in a poorly conceived, poorly prepared expedition masterminded by the CIA, Kennedy emerged as something of a hero to many Americans. His announcement that he was to blame aroused a sense of sympathy, even among those inclined to criticize. But it did not make him a hero abroad, especially in the Soviet Union.

Moreover, it did not make Mr. Kennedy a hero to himself. It gave him a definite inferiority complex. Here was a handsome young President, elected on the promise of giving the United States a new image in foreign affairs, yet he knew in his heart that he had failed. Prestige counts heavily with every human being, especially with men who represent nations; so the President of the United States sought to recoup his prestige and that of the United States. He invited Khrushchev to the meeting that only two months earlier he had vetoed.

Against this background, the Vienna Conference took place in May 1961, a moment when Kennedy was suffering from the Bay of Pigs fiasco and when Khrushchev was growling both privately and publicly over having had his earlier overtures of friendship rebuffed. "I told young Mr. Kennedy that if he wants war, he can have war," Khrushchev later told me that summer during a very frank interview on the shores of the Black Sea.

"Mr. Kennedy told me," Khrushchev reported, "Our forces are now equal. We can destroy each other."

"'Yes, Mr. President,' I replied, 'I agree, though in my heart I feel we are stronger. But I agree on the policy of equality. We regard the strength of the United States in a very serious light.'

"'We have to judge governments by their actions,' I told him, 'and the United States has now increased its defense budget, you have ordered the mobilization of more men, and you have ordered more bombers. These are not toys. The United States has now dispatched 1,500 additional troops to Berlin. This is a clear threat.'

"I told Mr. Kennedy," Khrushchev continued, "that if he sent 50,000 troops to Berlin, it would offer us an opportunity to send even more troops; since we had more troops than he in closer to Berlin. 'If you introduce more troops to Berlin,' I told him, 'it will be a very unwise step.'"

Kennedy's Vienna Conference with Khrushchev got nowhere, and he returned to Washington a very shaken man. On the plane flying across the Atlantic, Kennedy advisers reported that he seemed more depressed than at any time in his life. He talked about the probability that his children might live under war. The first thing he did on arriving home was to get a military appraisal of the number of lives which would be lost in an atomic war.

I dined with President Kennedy three days after he had returned from Vienna. He was still in a very depressed mood. He said he did not see how the United States could get through the summer without war. Khrushchev, he said, was under obligation to the East Germans to sign a separate peace treaty. This, he said, would bring war. The next morning the President suffered a recurrence of his back injury and was confined to his bed for the next few weeks. Officially it resulted from planting a tree at a dedication. Some doctors, however, said it was psychosomatic; the result of his talk with Khrushchev.

Toward the end of the month, I was invited on a cruise down the Potomac by then Vice President Lyndon Johnson, in honor of the Premier of South Vietnam. On the yacht was Walt Rostow, Kennedy's national security adviser, who had been with him in Vienna. Rostow was glowing with pride over the results in Vienna. "Our President looked straight down the gun barrel of atomic war," Rostow said, "and he did not flinch."

I am sure this was true. But I am also sure that there was no necessity whatsoever for this confrontation. Had John F. Kennedy taken the advice of Adlai Stevenson, Chester Bowles, Senator Cooper, and others to meet Khrushchev halfway during the early months of 1961, he would never have had to look down that gun barrel.

By this time, however, Khrushchev had the bit in his teeth. He had been embarrassed by Kennedy's refusal to see him in New York in March. The Chinese and the big missile men in the Kremlin were taunting him over the increased military budget of the United States. At Vienna Khrushchev, the son of a peasant and a shrewd trader, knew he had the upper hand with Kennedy, but back in Moscow, his hand was being called. He had argued that war with capitalism was not inevitable, that coexistence was the only substitute for atomic war and the end of civilization. But his gestures toward the United States had not been reciprocated.

I wrote at the time that Khrushchev and Kennedy were acting like "little boys with Halloween masks frightening each other into war."

A few weeks later, Khrushchev built the Berlin Wall, and there followed a hue and cry from American right-wingers that we move in and tear it down.

On August 17, while the wall was still being perfected, I was conducting the aforementioned interview with Khrushchev on the shores of the Black Sea. The formal interview extended into a series of talks lasting two days, during which time we swam, breakfasted, and dined together. Khrushchev started off on a serious, formal note, but later relaxed and came forth with amazingly frank statements about his concern for the peace of the world and his problems with American leaders. It was at this time that he told of his hopes that Kennedy might be elected President over Richard Nixon.

"In October 1960," he said, "the American Ambassador came to see me and wanted to release the American RB-47 flyers as a gesture to show that our two countries could work together. 'No,' I replied, 'this would only help Nixon, and we're voting for Kennedy.' And insomuch as Kennedy was elected by a very narrow margin, I figure that we elected him."

As Mrs. Pearson and I were saying goodby to Khrushchev two days later, he said: "Please tell Mr. Kennedy that if the United States and Russia stand together, no country in the world can start war."

I delivered this message to Kennedy four days later under very unfavorable circumstances. Twenty minutes before I saw the President in the upstairs living room of the White House, he had received word from the Atomic Energy Commission that the Soviet government had resumed nuclear testing. Khrushchev had hinted to me that this might take place. Though I did not take him seriously. He was under great pressure from the generals in the Red Army, he said, to resume testing because of their belief that American nuclear production was far ahead of that of the Soviet Union. He was also under pressure, he said, because Kennedy had called up the Reserves, to continue the class of the Red Army about to be mustered for another tour of duty. President Kennedy was so upset over the news that the Soviet Union had resumed nuclear testing that I am quite sure my report on the interview with Khrushchev made scant impression.

My talk with Kennedy took place in the last days of August 1961, and the next month he sent Rostow and Gen. Maxwell Taylor to Saigon to make recommendations on what policy the Kennedy Administration should follow in South Vietnam. John Kenneth Galbraith heard about their trip from his post in India and flew back to Washington to try to influence its final result, or at least negate it with Kennedy. He knew that Rostow, the hawk, was likely to recommend military intervention. That was exactly what he did. And it was at this crucial point that President Kennedy made the first major military commitment in South Vietnam. Hitherto, the level of troops had been kept to 1,000 so-called military advisers, sent by former President Eisenhower. But in September 1961, Kennedy sent 18,000 men and later upped this to 30,000.

George Ball, then Under Secretary of State, who opposed the escalation, is convinced that the President made it because he had suffered a series of defeats—first at the Bay of Pigs, later in Vienna, later with the Berlin Wall. By sending troops to Saigon, he was determined to recoup his prestige and that of the United States. Thus mistake built upon mistake; the early rebuff to Khrushchev, the Bay of Pigs, the failure to remove American missiles from Turkey, Khrushchev's nuclear rebuff to the United States—all pointed toward the showdown over Cuba when the United States and Soviet Russia stood eyeball-to-eyeball on the brink of war.

I do not mean to say that mistakes were not also made by the Kremlin. I am sure they were. But I was not privy to conversations inside the Kremlin, as I was to conversations with American leaders. I can only report factually on American mistakes. There were enough of these to have precipitated the Cuban missile crisis by themselves, without those made by the Soviets. Undoubtedly Khrushchev's biggest mistake was to misjudge the United States by sending the missiles to Cuba in the first place.

The lesson to be learned from these mistakes is herewith spread out for Mr. Nixon. The tides of peace are like the tides of man. They must be ridden on the crest, not on the ebb. On the very day that Mr. Nixon was delivering his inspiring Inaugural speech pledging his all-out effort for peace in the world, the Soviet government was officially offering to begin talks with the United States on limiting offensive and defensive missiles just as soon as Mr. Nixon was ready. As I read the announcement, I couldn't help thinking that this is where I came in with another President's Inauguration on January 20, 1961.

KEY ISSUES AFFECTING UNITED NATIONS—REPORT BY SENATOR SYMINGTON

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, my colleague from Missouri (Mr. Symington), who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, served as a member of the U.S. delegation to the recent session of the United Nations General Assembly.

During this period he had an opportunity to participate in debates and discussions and served on the First Committee, dealing with poltical and security matters, and the Second Committee, responsible for economic and financial issues.

In a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations concerning his experiences, he summed up his views on a series of key issues affecting the United Nations. A limited number of complete copies of the report are available on request.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the Symington report be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Symington Reports on United Nations

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The United Nations is not the ideal organization many had envisioned; but it is by far the best—actually the only—forum where nearly all the countries of the world can discuss international problems.

Some say the United States is not obtaining its "money's worth" from its participation in the United Nations. These critics should ponder the fact, however, that the total 1968 U.S. contribution to this organization including all auxiliary agencies, special programs, and peacekeeping forces, is less than the 4-day cost of the Vietnam war; in fact the total U.S. contribution to all aspects of the United Nations since its inception in 1946 is less than the cost of 5 weeks of that war.

RISING ROLE OF THE SMALL COUNTRIES

All nations, regardless of size, have an equal vote in the General Assembly. As a result the increasing number of less developed nations, approximately 90 in all, has produced a powerful voting bloc against the more developed countries, far out of proportion to either their political power as individual nations, or their financial contribution to the organization itself.

This is not to suggest every country should be required to contribute an equal share of the United Nations budget; but there are developed countries as well as less developed countries which could, and should, contribute a larger share to an organization from which they too derive substantial benefit.

The rising role of the less developed countries, expressed through the increasing voting power of their bloc, is a development which the United States and other developed nations of the world should give full recognition in assessing the future role of the United Nations. Under the existing system, programs are passed and financial assessments often made over the objections of the United States and other developed countries.

VIETNAM

The issue of U.S. involvement in Vietnam continued to have a disrupting influence on U.N. discussions. This effect on U.S. prestige is just one more reason for doing everything considered possible to extricate our Nation from this tragic and costly involvement.

CHINA QUESTION

The United States has not and will not support any proposal which would result in the expulsion of Taiwan and the admission of Communist China. I fully support that position. But, in my opinion, every effort should be made by our Government to have the United Nations state it would not object to the People's Republic of China joining the U.N.

It has long been my belief that the policy of the U.S. Government toward Communist China has been an unrealistic one. I have asked consistently, "Why should we continue to turn our back on some 700 million people whose leaders say they desire to stab you in the back?"

Now that all peoples are beginning to realize the true implications of a nuclear exchange, it would appear that a change in our China policy is long overdue.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET ARMS REDUCTION TALKS

In July 1968, at the time the Non-Proliferation Treaty was signed, the United States and the Soviet Union agreed to enter into discussions with respect to possible limitation and reduction of offensive strategic nuclear weapons delivery systems and systems of defense against such missiles.

Let us hope that both countries carry out the spirit and letter of that preliminary agreement and proceed with these discussions at an early date; because if some accord cannot be reached calling for a limitation in our respective missile system, a prolonged, costly, and dangerous escalation in the arms race is inevitable. For the United States that would mean that the costs for strategic arms would rise to at least $30 billion annually; and could rise to a great deal more.

KOREAN QUESTION

The resolutions cosponsored by the Soviet bloc and other supporters of North Korea have one common purpose: They are designed to force the United Nations to end its vital role in preserving peace and security in Korea and in seeking the establishment of a unified, independent, and democratic Korea by peaceful means.

Rather than introduce these hostile resolutions year after year, I would hope that the supporters of North Korea would become genuinely interested in the peaceful reunification of Korea and the development of peace and stability in Northeast Asia.

THE "PUEBLO"

While serving as delegates to the United Nations, my colleague, Senator John Sherman Cooper, and I made several attempts to instill life into the sterile negotiations which had been going on for months prior to the release of the crew. In this connection, we made two suggestions which we thought would be helpful in obtaining the crew's release. Both of them have been classified secret by the State Department and we are not at liberty to discuss them in this report.

PEACEKEEPING

Because of political difficulties, neither the Security Council nor the military staff committee has been able to carry out the peacekeeping functions which were assigned to them under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter; and the Secretary General, therefore, has assumed the responsibility for administering peacekeeping operations.

Under these conditions, he should be provided with a professional staff adequate to conduct these operations on at least a reasonably effective basis, and a military staff of sufficient size and capability to plan properly the organization, support and control of any approved peacekeeping operations. Obviously peacekeeping missions have political overtones; but the actual conduct of operations are military, and their tactics should be planned and carried out by people with military training.

Let us hope, therefore, that the U.S. representatives will continue to impress upon the Secretary General the importance of his maintaining an Office of Military Adviser in the Secretariat.

FINANCING THE UNITED NATIONS

The Senator said he found "disturbing" the latest report on the "continuing deterioration of the U.N. financial position."

Outstanding assessed contributions, all accounts, totaled over $178 million; and of this amount, almost $36 million is outstanding re the regular budget for 1968.

Over the years the United States has contributed over $3 billion, or 45 percent, of all United Nations programs to date. This ratio of contributions added to our growing financial problems, would appear high. With that premise we believe the U.S. Government should take a new look at continuing this percentage of support. We believe in the United Nations, without reservation. But we also believe that the unprecedented prosperity of many member countries should be expressed in practical fashion through greater percentages of contributions. Security and well-being through peace is as important to them as it is to the United States.

THE 23D GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Some have observed that this 23rd session of the General Assembly will be noted for what it did not accomplish rather than for its accomplishments. It did not deal in any formal fashion with such obvious and pressing problems as Vietnam, Czechoslovakia, the Middle East, and Biafra.

It did decide, however, to convene an international conference on the human environment to consider the problems of sea, air and earth pollution; and it established a permanent committee to advance international cooperation in the exploration and peaceful uses of the seabeds and deep ocean floor.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE

Almost everyone with whom we talked, in and out of the United Nations, were of the view that the U.S. Representative to the United Nations lacked adequate prestige and authority to carry out the job in an effective and efficient manner. The post of U.S. Ambassador is one of the highest importance. It should never be regarded as a relatively unimportant adjunct to the State Department.

THE COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACT OF 1969 SEEKS RELEVANT CURRICULUM PROGRAMS WITHIN A RESPONSIVE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Williams) recently discussed the Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969 before a governmental relations luncheon for educators in Washington. His cogent remarks clarify the role of private 2-year colleges; the definition of "comprehensive"; the nature of the State agency; and the need for local institutional responsibility outlined in this measure.

Senator Williams' comments are timely. They should answer most of the issues that have been raised about our intentions with regard to the proposed Comprehensive Community College Act. In addition to answering specific questions, the Senator from New Jersey set the tone for our consideration of this important legislation by stating:

> I consider myself one who is learning; and one who is flexible; and one who is ready to hear suggestions as to how we can meet the objectives of this bill.

Mr. President, as a sponsor of the Comprehensive Community College Act, I associate myself with these remarks. I ask unanimous consent that Senator Williams' speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Before the Governmental Relations Luncheon Group at the Jefferson Hotel, March 26, 1969

By now most of you have read or heard about the Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969. The purpose of this Act is to assist States in providing post-secondary education to everyone. We want to make sure that this education is suited to the needs, interests and potential benefit of the total community. The community college is best suited to provide this service: Its low cost to students—proximity to those it is designed to serve—flexible admissions arrangement—strong counseling and advising programs—and other varied education services are responding to the lack of relevance in traditional education.

Mayor Carl Stokes of Cleveland recently said: "I regard the junior college movement as one of the most hopeful and promising developments on the national scene today. After decades of regarding higher education as a special privilege for those who could afford it, we are now approaching the day when no student of ability will be denied the opportunity to develop his mind and talents."

He compared the need for higher education to get involved with the urban crises—similar to their response to the needs of agriculture fifty to one hundred years ago. He said:

"The Agriculture Extension Program was a recognition that universities and colleges had a responsibility that went beyond education and research. Helping farmers with new technology to increase their productivity extended the definition of the role of the university into the area of public service. Somehow it was appropriate to assist the farmers, but to aid poor people of the inner city and of the rural countryside has not become equally appropriate. . . . In some respects, the junior college is the urban counterpart of the agriculture extension school. The distinguishing feature of the community college is its clear goal of service to the community."

When Carl Stokes speaks about education and when I speak about education, we speak not as professional educators. Our concern is to encourage a relevant curriculum program for all those who attend, and find an institution which is involved in the work and aspirations of the community it serves.

Until recently, many institutions have waited too long to get involved. I am hopeful that there is a trend in this direction for all centers of learning—from the elementary schools and the day care centers through the sophisticated and elite post-doctoral training centers around the country. My approach to community colleges is based on this hope.

And I think that the third of the Senate which has joined me in sponsoring this legislation shares this same commitment.

Community colleges are in search of an identity—they are not second-class citizens—and that is what this bill is all about. The biggest service that each of us can make to the future of education is to recognize this need, solve it, and not force community colleges to conform to traditionalism.

This bill undoubtedly has raised a lot of questions—possibly more than it will settle. But I am hopeful that soon after the Senate acts on the extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, there will be an opportunity for hearings on this bill. In the meantime, I consider myself one who is learning. And one who is flexible. And one who is ready to hear your suggestion as to how we can meet the objectives of this bill.

To this end, I wish to clarify my definition of "comprehensive". By "comprehensive" I mean a two-year post-secondary education program which provides occupational-technical and adult continuing education, community services, developmental, counseling-advising, and lower division university parallel programs.

Since the bill includes private and public junior or community colleges, the question has been raised: To what extent will private and, in some cases, public institutions be required to meet every aspect of this definition? If we lived in an ideal world, I would say every institution should have these programs. But I recognize that we do not.

Practically speaking, the technical aspects of these programs will in many cases require duplication of effort within a community and will result in too much money being spent on hardware. Therefore, when the institutions which do not have this commitment or scope become involved in the planning of the master plans at the State level, they could resolve this problem through a consortia—or reflect in the master plan a combination of private and public facilities that offer the comprehensive programs to the total community.

If the private or public institution has an exclusionary admissions policy and concentrates all of its efforts on a transfer program, then it will not be included. If, on the other hand, the community requires an emphasis on transfer programs but not to the exclusion of community service, career, and remedial programs then they would be eligible. I hope this clarifies my intentions for some of you who have raised this question.

Community colleges are at a different level of development from State to State, the development and the one-year planning of the master plan will resolve these problems at a State level where they should be resolved. For example, the two-year branch campuses of the university system in Wisconsin and Kentucky will be covered by this bill. The post-secondary vocational schools will be covered also.

Another point which needs some clarification is the State agency which will carry out the provisions of this Act. Flexibility is the intention here. We do not want to disrupt organizational harmony where it exists. On the other hand, this legislation should help to resolve jurisdictional disputes where confusion and dissatisfaction prevail. Since each State is unique with respect to this problem, I am hopeful that the hearings will provide sufficient direction to meet the intention of this Act.

One of the tasks of the Advisory Committee which is established under this bill, will be to develop criteria for the Commissioner of Education to evaluate the viability of this agency and its responsiveness to community college needs.

In closing, let me make one additional comment. The final form which this bill takes will include a provision to make sure that community colleges retain and maintain local authority and responsibility for the carrying out of their services to the community. The danger of conformity is strong for community colleges as they mix with other institutions of higher learning. It could be equally strong and devastating if these same pressures require the community colleges to conform to State jurisdiction alone.

At the same time these two-year institutions must make sure that they are community colleges, not "junior" colleges. This bill is to develop community colleges.

Those of you who represent the more established and experienced areas of higher education can ensure the development of these community colleges. After all, in many ways they provide the training ground for the rigorous paces you have waiting for them in your upper division programs and graduate schools.

PROPOSALS TO SUBSIDIZE DONATIONS OF MILITARY CONTRACTORS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I was amazed to read in Saturday's Washington Post that the Pentagon has proposed that the taxpayer foot the entire bill for the donations of military contractors.

At present the Government subsidizes, through income tax deductions, a portion of the contributions to charitable and educational organizations by corporations and individuals. In effect the Government matches the corporation's or individual's contribution, thereby providing an incentive to donors. The percentage amount of the Government's contribution depends on the tax bracket of the individual or corporation. At present, of course, with corporation tax at the 48-percent tax rate. Government provides almost $1 for every dollar contributed by a corporation.

The policy now under consideration goes far beyond the present incentive system. It would include all contributions as operating expenses. In other words, they would be in the same category as hardware, labor, plant investment. The taxpayer would pay the entire amount of the contributions, for which the defense contractor would get the credit.

Mr. President, what is here proposed is putting defense contractors on a utility basis. For years, utilities in a majority of the States have been permitted to include their contributions as operating expenses, rather than merely as tax deductions. This is not true in all States. The weakness of such a lenient policy toward utilities—and the argument would apply with equal force toward defense contractors or any corporation—was well stated by Ray E. Untereiner, a former member of the California Public Utilities Commission whose background also included service as an economist for the National Association of Manufacturers. Mr. Untereiner expressed his doubts in this way:

> I do not question for a moment that utilities must participate in business organizations and contribute to civic undertakings and charities; and these things cost money. There is a real question in my mind, however, whether they should expect the rate payers to contribute toward these costs. Since it is the utility that gets the public credit for a contribution to the Community Chest, for example, it would seem reasonable that it should be the utility that makes the sacrifices; that the stockholders rather than the rate payers, should pay the bill.

Substitute "defense contractor" for "utilities" and "taxpayer" in Mr. Untereiner's comments and we have a telling argument against the Pentagon's proposed policy. The California commission, bucking the lenient national trend of State utility commissions in this respect, upheld the Untereiner argument. The commission ruled, in the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph case in 1964, which was subsequently upheld by the California Supreme Court, "henceforth to exclude from operating expenses for ratefixing purposes all amounts claimed for dues, donations, and contributions."

The telephone company, said the California commission, "should not be permitted to be generous with ratepayers' money." Nor should defense contractors be permitted to be generous with taxpayers' money.

Why cannot a defense contractor help his community on the same basis as a small businessman or an individual? Why does he need preferential treatment? Is he less civic minded, less patriotic? I think not. Rather, this proposed policy shows, I fear, that they are more profit minded and, being awesomely powerful in Government, are exercising that power to make more profit.

Mr. President, I am disturbed by another aspect of this proposed new policy. A number of the organizations which are defined as charitable and educational organizations under the tax-exemption provisions of the Internal Revenue Act are uncharitable exponents of rightwing education. They presently enjoy contributions from a number of defense contractors and utilities. How wonderful it would be for these organizations—such as the American Economic Foundation, the Foundation for Economic Education and America's Future—which write of the rigors of free enterprise and the malevolence of Government, to have a spigot from the U.S. Treasury manned by the large companies that have already given them more than their due.

On the other hand, an outstanding conservation organization, the Sierra Club, is excluded from this Internal Revenue Service list because of an arbitrary ruling by the IRS.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it is passing strange that this new policy which would cost the taxpayers tens of millions of dollars, is proposed now by an administration which is also, it says, trying to reduce unnecessary Federal expenses.

I think the taxpayer should give to the charity of his choice, not the choice of a utility or contractor who gets the public and tax credit for the donation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the April 12 Washington Post article written by Laurence Stern. It is entitled "Pentagon May Repay Firms' Charity Gifts."

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the proposed Defense Department regulations to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 12, 1969]

PENTAGON MAY REPAY FIRMS' CHARITY GIFTS

(By Laurence Stern)

The Pentagon is proposing that it repay its contractors for their contributions to charities and educational organizations.

If adopted, the new regulations would provide many millions of dollars in reimbursements for costs now disallowed under a ten-year-old Defense Department ruling.

The recommendation is also being circulated among three other big Federal Government spenders—the Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the General Services Administration.

Industrial and trade groups have already endorsed the proposed new policy. They have sought the change for some time.

"We know of many contractors who are the heart and soul of their communities," one Defense Department spokesman explained. "It's necessary that they contribute to such groups as Red Cross and United Givers or else the association dies.

"The question is whether it shouldn't be recognized that this is a valid cost of doing business."

The proposal was drafted and circularized by Capt. E. C. Chapman, chairman of the Armed Services Procurement Regulation Committee, the Pentagon's top procurement policy board.

Chapman said he could not assign a dollar amount to the effect of the change.

PENTAGON SEEKS TO AID CONTRACTORS

Under the proposal the Defense Department would repay contractor donations up to a tenth of 1 per cent of the total contract. Alternatively the contractor could get back an average for his past two years' contributions to charity. The Pentagon would pay whichever of these amounts is lower.

Currently the Pentagon is paying out $45 billion a year in procurement contracts. A tenth of 1 per cent would amount to $45 million—although this is by no means a precise indicator of how high the reimbursements would run. That figure was not available.

Final action on the proposal could come as early as a month from now after responses are in from the other agencies.

Currently repayments are allowed by the Pentagon under fixed price contracts. It would extend this practice to cost-reimbursable and fixed price incentive contracts, which make up the lion's share of Defense Department contracting activity.

Capt. Chapman said the proposal would apply for groups defined as charitable and educational organizations under the tax exemption provisions of the Internal Revenue Act.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1969.

Attached is a proposed revision to ASPR 15–205.8 Contributions and Donations.

Under present ASPR coverage contributions and donations are unallowable costs. The proposed revision would permit reimbursement to contractors for such payments made in accordance with the Internal Revenue Code, however, with limitations on the amount that can be charged in any one year.

We would appreciate receiving your comments (25 copies if convenient) within the next 45 days.

Sincerely,

E. C. CHAPMAN,
Captain, SC, U.S. Navy,
Chairman, ASPR Committee.

15–205.8 CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS

(a) (CWAS) "Charitable contributions" as defined in subsection (c), and payments for which are made in accordance with subsection (a), of Section 170, Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, are allowable as indirect costs in a cost grouping provided they do not exceed the lesser of:

(i) the average annual expenditures by the contractor for such contributions and donations for that same cost grouping during the contractor's preceding three fiscal years; or

(ii) one-tenth of one percent (0.1%) of the total costs incurred for all work of the contractor to which the cost grouping is applicable during the current year.

(b) (CWAS–NA) Contributions and donations other than those defined in subsection (c) of Section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, are unallowable.

THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL
CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1969.

Capt. E. C. CHAPMAN,
U.S. Navy, Chairman ASPR Committee, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CAPTAIN CHAPMAN: We have reviewed the proposed revision to ASPR 15–205.8 pertaining to contributions and donations. No recommendations have been received from AGC Task Units suggesting changes.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposal.

Sincerely yours,

D. A. GIAMPAOLI,
Director, Heavy-Utilities Division.

ENGINE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
February 12, 1969.

E. C. CHAPMAN,
Captain, U.S. Navy, Chairman, ASPR Committee, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CAPTAIN CHAPMAN: We have advised our members of your proposed revision to ASPR 15–205.8. Responses received are favorable. Should any other comments be received, I will advise you.

Cordially,

THOMAS C. YOUNG,
Executive Director.

COUNCIL OF DEFENSE AND SPACE
INDUSTRY ASSOCIATIONS,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1969.

Capt. EDGAR C. CHAPMAN, Jr., (SC),
U.S. Navy, Chairman, ASPR Committee, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (I. & L.), the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CAPTAIN CHAPMAN: As member associations of the Council of Defense and Space Industry Associations, we are pleased to respond to your letter of January 15, 1969 with our views concerning proposed revision of ASPR 15–205.8, Contributions and Donations. Member companies of our Associations indicated that they appreciate the recognition by DOD of the fact that Contributions and Donations are normal business expenses and are being recognized as such and therefore the member associations of CODSIA are not suggesting any changes in the proposed revision at this time.

We do wish to reflect a view expressed by some member companies of our Associations relative to the limitations to be imposed on those companies not CWAS qualified. Use of the average of the prior three (3) years expenditures for contributions and donations as a limit does not give recognition to current inflationary trends. Also, the percentage limitation of total costs incurred might prove unduly restrictive in those cases where volume is significantly changing as the result of major reprogramming. We suggest it may be desirable that you give further consideration to the specific limitations.

We note that ASPR 15–205.44(e) treats with the allowability of grants to educational or training institutions, etc. and is in conflict with the proposed revision to ASPR 15–205.8. The member associations of CODSIA are preparing comments on ASPR 15–205.44 and as an interim action to avoid confusion, we suggest modifying ASPR 15–205.44(e) to read as follows:

"(e) Grants to educational or training institutions, including the donation of facilities or other properties, scholarships or fellowships, are considered contributions and are subject to ASPR 15–205.8."

We again express our appreciation for this opportunity to comment and the recognition given to this necessary and normal business cost.

Very truly yours,

EDWIN M. HOOD,
President, Shipbuilders Council of America.

JOSEPH M. LYLE,
President, National Security Industrial Association.

KARL G. HARR, JR.,
President, Aerospace Industries Association.

ROBERT W. BARTON,
Vice President, Western Electronic Manufacturers Association.

KENNETH M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Procurement Regulation Committee, National AeroSpace Services Association.

JAMES G. ELLIS,
Manager, Defense Liaison Department, Automobile Manufacturers Association.

WILLIAM H. MOORE,
Vice President, Electronic Industries Association.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS,
New York, N.Y., February 28, 1969.

E. C. CHAPMAN,
Captain, S.C., U.S. Navy, Chairman ASPR Committee, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CAPTAIN CHAPMAN: The proposed revisions to ASPR 3–408 and 7–802.5, 15–205.8 and 15–204.34, have been circulated to all members of the Institute's Committee on National Defense for review and comment. Individual committee members have submitted comments on certain of the proposals which are attached herewith. However, the comments should not be regarded as a consensus of the entire committee but rather a compilation of individual views.

Effective January 1, 1969, Mr. Bruce N. Willis resigned his position with the American Institute of CPAs to accept a position in public accounting. Therefore, will you please direct future correspondence to my attention.

Sincerely,

THOMAS R. HANLEY,
Manager, Special Projects.

PROPOSED REVISION TO ASPR 3–408 AND 7–802.5, DEFINITIZATION OF LETTER CONTRACTS

Committee members commenting upon this proposed revision are of the opinion that approval of the proposal should be deferred. They believe that a more equitable division of responsibilities between the government and contractors with respect to the "definitization of letter contracts" should be considered. Some of the reasoning offered by committee members in arriving at this opinion follows:

The proposed change in the above regulations puts too much of the burden on the contractor for the completion of a definitized contract. Typically, the Government has as much at stake in delaying the completion of a finalized contract as does the contractor. The proposed change in the wording seems to take too much of the responsibility away from the Government and places it upon the contractor.

The contractor may have valid and good reasons for delaying the definitization of a letter contract. Quite often the "state of the art" is such that it is difficult to be committed to a price without further experience. Also, the contractor must adhere to the "truth in negotiation" regulations which could work to his detriment if he does not have sufficient time to obtain all the necessary information, particularly from subcontractors, to properly negotiate wtih the Government and definitize a contract.

If it is important to have letter contracts, then it is also important to allow adequate time to complete whatever documentation is necessary for definitizing the contract. It is obvious that the burden of proof cannot be entirely placed upon the contractor as this proposed change seems to do.

Proposed Revision to ASPR 15-205.8, Contributions and Donations

The consensus of committee members commenting on the proposed revision is a concurrence with the ASPR Committee's recommendation that contributions and donations made by defense contractors be allowed as indirect costs. Members believe, however, that the limitations placed upon the amount of contributions that can be included as allowable costs is much too restrictive. Some members believe it is acceptable to require that there be some history of what would be an acceptable base for the contribution, such as the proposed three-year average, but do not believe the lesser of the three-year average or some percentage is necessarily acceptable. Local charitable organizations, in fact, might be in the position of making an assessment against companies irrespective of the nature of their business for their annual needs. These demands are frequently based upon so much per employee and accordingly any organization that is growing is requested to recognize that growth in their contribution. While the percentage would permit the recognition of growth, some believe the percentage that we are starting out with is much too low a figure to be realistic.

The percentage does not recognize the position that a company might carry within a given community. In one community, a defense contractor may be a prime business organization and accordingly, the largest contributor to the various charitable organizations supported by the community. In another situation, a defense contractor may be a very nominal part of a community and have had very little demands made upon it. Prior experience has probably been the most meaningful restraint that can be placed upon the amount of contributions that would be allowable.

The phrase "in a cost grouping," which is used in the proposed revision, should be defined or deleted.

Proposed Revision to ASPR 15-204.34, Rental Costs

Members of the committee who have commented on the proposed revision to ASPR 15-205.34 strongly recommend that implementation of the proposed changes be deferred.

Members believe that the proposed revision to this section of ASPR XV should be considered with other related sections of ASPR so that the entire subject can be considered in total. In addition, the following specific comments on the proposed revision were offered:

1. The costs of property taxes as set forth in paragraph (d) (2) on page 3 should include property taxes.

2. The proposed changes will require more accounting justification, more judgment, and result in more arguments than the net effect will probably justify.

3. With the increased business practice of leasing property, nonrecognition of the total leasing costs is contrary to current business practices.

4. Clarification of paragraph (b) (2) is needed. Under the definition of long-term leases no provision is made for those instances where a lease originally started as a short-term lease is continued at the end of the lease on a month-to-month basis without a formal document extending the lease. Under these circumstances, the lease could change from a short-term lease to a long-term lease without any documentary evidence to suppport it.

5. The proposed revision has attempted to set forth the criteria to be used in determining whether it is more economical to lease property, continue to lease a particular property, or to own it. Because there is so much judgment involved in such matters, it is doubtful that criteria can be developed that will be uniformly used and understood.

Financial Executives Institute,
New York, N.Y., February 25, 1969.

Capt. E. C. Chapman, SC,
U.S. Navy, Chairman, ASPR Committee, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (I. & L.) The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

Dear Captain Chapman: We have for acknowledgement your request for comment on the proposed revision to ASPR Section 15-205.8, Contributions and Donations.

We are naturally pleased that Contributions and Donations are now to be brought under the CWAS formula and to be recognized as a necessary cost of doing business. We are also in agreement with the principle that the limits of allowability be made generally consistent with the provisions of Section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended.

In view of this change in policy, it appears to us that the tight limitations imposed by Paragraphs a(i) and a(ii) have the effect of building back into the regulation a substantial disallowance of this type of cost. We believe it would be more consistent with the policy to adopt the principles and the limitations of the Internal Revenue Code.

If Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) of (a) are to be retained, we think the phrases "for that same cost grouping" in Subparagraph (i) and "to which the cost grouping is applicable" in Subparagraph (ii) should be deleted. It is not clear what is meant and we do not believe it would have any material effect. Contributions are generally a G&A type expense which is distributed across an entire base rather than selectively.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed change.

Very truly yours,
W. Stewart Hotchkiss,
Chairman, Government Procurement Policies Committee, Financial Executives Institute.

THE ABM SYSTEM IS A DISASTER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the former general counsel for the Department of Defense, Mr. Roger Kent, of California, has written to the editor of the San Francisco Chronicle an extremely perceptive and concise letter about the ABM. The letter was published on April 7, 1969, and deserves wide circulation. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Monday, Apr. 7, 1969]

The ABM System Is a Disaster

Editor: I have the strongest feelings about the ABM system. I see it as contributing nothing good, and much that is disastrously bad.

Will it work? Nearly all disinterested scientists say no. Even if it would work against today's missiles, will it work against those available when it is installed in five years? Furthermore, it has either got to be activated electronically or by a man's decision. I don't want my fate in the hands of a computer, and I don't see how it would be possible to reach the President for a decision in the minutes that are required for effective defense.

It is necessary? The planned ABM will, as we know, protect only two missile bases, one in South Dakota and the other in Montana. It is probable (as we hear) that they represent no more than 10 per cent, or at the most 20 per cent, of our deterrent capacity. These and other bases, SAC and the Polaris submarines just cannot be all destroyed in open surprise attack (and who says the Russians plan one). We would have, and the Russians know it, the power to mortally wound them, and who would be around to pick up the pieces? Those "friendly" Chinese, that's who, and the Russians know it. What are the dangers internationally? The reactions of the Russians and Canadians are in.

The Russians regard it as an armaments threat, and we can be sure, based on their past internal armament policy and on their response in Vietnam, that they will meet the challenge. Here we go again with vast and wasteful expenditures which will serve only to preserve (but at a higher and more dangerous level) the standoff that exists today.

The interception of missiles aimed at the South Dakota and Montana bases by ABMs will almost certainly take place over Canada. I predict that all hell will break loose when the Canadians come to a full realization of the consequences of the President's proposal. Relations will be strained.

What is the cost and what are the consequences of the cost? It is estimated now that the thin system proposed will cost $6.6 billion. The average man can hardly gauge the immensity of that sum, but it would be enough to clean up the slums in a dozen cities and in addition buy all the beaches and parks that have been proposed. Senator Mansfield has correctly stated that at this moment in history the internal dangers to our country exceed the external. For those of us who can read and see, he's got to be right.

It is of course certain that the cost will be greater than $6.6 billion for even the proposed "thin" system, and furthermore, when that is built, there will be no stopping. It could run to the $40 billion estimate by former Secretary of the Air Force Stuart Symington. Don't forget how the modest commitment for "advisors" in Vietnam became a half-million man army, with $30 billion a year expenses and 35,000 Americans dead.

Who is for it and why? The bureaucrats in the Pentagon in and out of uniform will have vastly increased staffs, prestige, promotions, increased salaries and even medals. They will also have many richer friends to go work for when they leave the Pentagon.

Corporations that will build the system are looking down a rosy road of negotiated contracts and assured profits running into the hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars.

The President's decision is of course based on Pentagon advice. It's the military-industrial complex speaking, and the advice is bad. I don't mean to impute evil motives to these people in the Pentagon or industry, but I feel that what Woodrow Wilson said (in substance) many years ago is totally relevant: "These men are not evil, but they confuse their own interests with the interests of the public." If the President does not reverse this disastrous decision, the Senate must do it for him, and we concerned citizens must support those senators with the courage to say no.

Roger Kent.

San Francisco.

(The writer is former General Counsel for the Defense Department.—Editor.)

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST: URGENT BUSINESS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the situation in the Middle East has become exceedingly critical, and the future peace of the world may be involved.

An editorial published in the current issue of Prevent World War III discusses the relevant facts and presents four steps which are necessary for peace in this troubled part of the world. To get peace in the Middle East, we must have first, negotiated settlements based upon mutual recognition of sovereignty, and peaceful coexistence; second, an end to Soviet troublemaking in the Arab world; third, resettlement of the refugees in a way that will end their maintenance by international charity; and fourth, plans for regional development.

The magazine Prevent World War III is published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., 50 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., an organization which for the past 25 years has been engaged in studying the causes and methods of preventing international warfare.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST: URGENT BUSINESS

(NOTE.—To get peace in the Middle East, we must have: (1) Negotiated settlements based upon mutual recognition of sovereignty, and peaceful coexistence. (2) An end to Soviet trouble-making in the Arab world. (3) Resettlement of the refugees in a way that will end their maintenance by international charity. (4) Plans for regional development.)

In the year and a half since the end of the Six-Day War, the best that can be said about the Middle East is that no new general war has erupted.

On the other hand, tensions between Israel and the Arab states have not decreased and there have been uncounted border incidents. Even more ominous, Soviet penetration in the area has accelerated, with a far greater likelihood of disaster in the event that the present unstable status should explode.

It is clear that the negotiation of permanent peace treaties cannot be longer delayed. So far as American official positions are concerned, both President Johnson and President-elect Nixon—and the 1968 platforms of both the Democratic and Republican parties—have called for peace negotiations.

The Arab states, however, continue to adhere to the intransigent position adopted months ago at their Khartoum Conference: No negotiation with Israel.

DELAY PERILS PEACE

The mission of Ambassador Jarring has served a useful interim purpose by at least preserving a readiness to "talk about talking" in some Middle East capitals.

With the passage of each month, however, it becomes increasingly apparent that unless the parties to the conflict sit down and work out formally negotiated agreements, we are merely postponing the day of another explosion.

The Israelis, in Foreign Minister Eban's Nine Points enunciated before the General Assembly of the United Nations, set forth a series of discussable topics. The stumbling block, however, comes in the complete refusal of the Arab States to recognize the existence of Israel. As noted elsewhere in this issue of Prevent World War III, even the official Arab Information Center maps distributed in New York and at the United Nations continue to refer to Israel only as "Israeli occupied territory." To ignore so basically actions of the United Nations during the past 20 years constitutes a flagrant disregard for the world community.

There may be many issues between Israel and her neighbors which require adjustment, but the *existence* of Israel has not been in question in the world's major capitals at any time for more than two decades—and so long as the Arab governments (except perhaps that of Tunisia) continue to adhere to an Alice-in-Wonderland view of the world, peace remains in continual jeopardy.

U.S.S.R. STIRS TROUBLE

The preservation of this dream-world approach to international politics in the Arab capitals has been made much easier by the action of the Soviets in restoring the armaments of Egypt, Syria and other countries to the point where their military strength (especially in the air) is probably even greater than was the case a year and a half ago. The Soviet Navy has also established a continuing presence in the Eastern Mediterranean which has the unfortunate effect of leading Arab dictators to believe that they have external help ready at hand in the event of trouble.

Finally, Soviet diplomacy has constantly backed up Arab intransigence. Moscow's ideological position, set forth in official publications, continues to blame Israel for "unprovoked aggression," to insist that the Gulf of Aqaba is not an international waterway, and to claim that opening of the Suez Canal is a domestic Egyptian matter.

Any serious analysis of the Middle East as a factor in world peace must begin with recognition of the new Soviet ambitions in that area. (We say "new"—but really old, because the basic geopolitical factors are the same as in the days of the Czars.)

For the first time, Russian warships are a prominent part of the Eastern Mediterranean scene. They have established bases at such places as Alexandria. Obviously, they plan to replace the British Navy as a force East of Suez.

Given these imperialist ambitions, the rearming of Egypt is a natural corollary. Here are some partial specifics: Moscow, since the Six-Day War, has provided Cairo with 150 Sukhoi-7 attack planes, some 210 MIG–21 supersonic jets, and an entirely new naval weaponry of 18 missile crafts, 44 torpedo boats, 6 rocket assault vessels, plus minesweepers, landing craft and tugs. There are at least 3000 Russian technicians in Egypt, training Nasser's forces—and more than 300 Egyptian pilots are in the USSR, being taught the use of the MIG–21 jets.

When we read news dispatches about a Soviet readiness to negotiate an end to Middle East tensions, such declarations must be taken in the context of these hard facts.

It is clear that the Arab states, and particularly Egypt, feel themselves ready for a "fourth round." Indeed, in April of this year, President Nasser declared in a widely publicized speech at the University of Cairo, that the Soviets had "made up for the arms we lost . . . free of charge."

Obviously, the Soviets are taking every advantage of Arab belligerency, and doing all that they reasonably can to keep it alive. At no other time in history has a defeated power refused to talk with the victor in a war, or even to recognize an antagonist's sovereign existence. The Arabs can afford this intransigent position only because their backers in Moscow have made it possible.

CLASH OF INTERESTS

Meanwhile, the commitments of the United States to preserve the integrity of states in the area continue—and both strategic and economic factors, including oil reserves, make it impossible for the Western world to permit the entire Middle East to become another "sphere of influence" for the Soviets. To do so would have unbearable consequences for this country, and would so upset the fragile balance of power between the NATO powers and the Communist world as to immediately imperil the peace of the globe.

In fact, that balance in the Middle East is already imperiled, by Soviet extensions of interest in Iran and in Southern Arabia, where the British are withdrawing. The establishment of the latest Arab state, the Peoples Republic of South Yemen, is just one additional indication of this penetration.

For years, Washington has been trying to reach an understanding with Russia on limiting the rearmament of all Middle Eastern states, but Moscow has refused to negotiate on this subject—and only very recently do we begin to hear "inspired" stories of a readiness to do so. But in the meanwhile the balance has already been largely upset, so that "negotiations" now would have only the effect of making permanent a Soviet-Arab preponderance, with its built-in assurance of future trouble.

GUERRILLA WARFARE

Against this background we must look at the almost unbelievable increase in the number of border incidents, precipitated by El Fatah, the PLO and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. All of these agencies have shown an increase in financial backing, and all have ready access to official Arab radio and press facilities. The three groups have worked out an "agreement" with King Hussein's government in Amman, which makes the King a prisoner of the terrorists, so far as Israel border events are concerned. Indeed, the Jordanian Ambassador to the United Nations has expressly disclaimed any responsibility for policing the Jordanian side of the border, for the purpose of preventing commando raids.

As a result, these raids have grown into more than daily incidents—and Israel is faced with the necessity of self-defense by mounting counter attacks, as any responsible government would have to do under the same circumstances.

Thus we get a series of escalating events which can only lead, at some future date, to full-scale warfare, unless peace negotiations can be gotten under way promptly. The call for "direct negotiations" between the late belligerants becomes not merely a pious wish, but an urgent necessity, if the fragile peace is to be maintained.

The United Nations has all too often neglected Israeli complaints of illegal guerrilla actions. Peace requires a fair-handed treatment of complaints, even though a USSR veto is apt to prevent any action against Arab commando activities. A statement by 16 U.S. senators, issued just as we go to press, strongly underlines this point by referring to the "double standard" prevailing at the U.N.

To make the mixture still more inflammable, the tendency toward totalitarianism in Middle East governments continues to grow. As an added instance, the Iraqi government resulting from the July, 1968, coup has nationalized private schools, and expelled 25 New England Jesuits who had for years conducted Al-Hikma University at Baghdad. Commenting on the expulsion of the Jesuit teachers, *The Boston Pilot* (organ of the Archdiocese) noted that Al-Hikma is the only institution in Iraq which has admitted Jewish students.

In Jordan, with 21,000 Iraqi troops stationed there and with the guerrillas constantly claiming more and more power, the already weakened position of the sometimes-Western-oriented King Hussein becomes increasingly difficult. In short, the possibilities of democratic development in the area are being more and more curtailed, as the present turmoil is permitted to continue without a peace settlement.

Meanwhile, too, the need for border readjustments to ensure the security of each separate country becomes more obvious—especially as to Israel—and at the same time the difficulty of readjustments increases, as delay leads to escalated tensions.

To all this must be added another major factor—the refugee problem.

REFUGEE POLITICS DELAY PEACE

The continued presence of large numbers of displaced Palestinians, mostly isolated in settlements or "camps," and not resettled on the land, provides a source of trouble that must be eliminated if any permanent peace is to be established.

President Johnson's Five Points for Peace in the Middle East included the call for "a just policy for the refugees"—and language of about the same kind is found in any set of proposals for dealing with this area.

For nearly 20 years UNRWA (the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees) has provided assistance to a group of people whose numbers have gradually grown to nearly a million and a half—now including children and grandchildren. This is the only major group of displaced persons anywhere in the world who have not been resettled in some way, following so long a period of years.

The time has come when a good, hard look at the entire Mid-Eastern refugee question is required.

First, we must start with the understanding that there are really *two* refugee problems in the Middle East: (1) the Jews who were forced to move out of Arab countries (Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Egypt, etc.); and (2) the Arabs who left Palestine at the time of the establishment of Israel—now increased by the addition of a smaller group who fled from the West Bank during the June, 1967, hostilities.

The numbers of these two categories of refugees—the Jews and the Arabs—were in the beginning very nearly identical. The Jews, however, were promptly settled, cared for, and provided with land or jobs, in Israel. They have not to this day received any compensation or restitution from any Arab government, for the enormous amounts of illegally seized property, land and bank accounts which they were compelled to leave behind.

The Arabs have not been so fortunate in the reception they received in the several Arab countries—in spite of the great tracts of unused arable land available along the Fertile Crescent. True, many of the urban Palestinians, and those of the new generations who have received technical training at the hands of UNRWA, have found employment in places like Lebanon, Jordan and Kuwait. As UNRWA reports indicate, however, the hard problem of the agricultural workers still remains—and it is this very problem that the Arab states have taken no steps to solve (not even by facilitating the efforts of UNRWA, in most cases, to set up agricultural cooperatives). Arab lands remain empty, and displaced persons remain as quarrelsome wards of UNRWA's international charity.

Any attempts at resettlement—as distinct from repatriation—have met with insuperable obstacles from political sources contending that such resettlement would admit the sovereign existence of Israel and thus reduce the impact of the intransigent Arab position, which is that "Israel doesn't exist." An official Egyptian publication once went so far as to "accuse" the United Nations of "plotting" to solve the refugee question—thus changing the status quo vis-a-vis Israel.

The refugee problem is therefore inextricably involved with the whole question of a peace settlement based upon mutual recognition of statehood by the Arab governments and Israel.

UNRWA'S STRANGE ROLE

Meanwhile, UNRWA has left the education of the Arab children in refugee camps to local school authorities, with the result that these young people have been constantly indoctrinated from an anti-Israel point of view. A first-grade reader in Syria, for example, contains the sentences:

"The Jews are enemies of Arabs. Soon we will rescue Palestine from their hands."

A book for older children indoctrinates its readers:

"Israel exists in the heart of the Arab homeland. Its extermination is vital for the preservation of Arabism."

When refugee education in the Gaza Strip came under Israeli surveillance following the Six Day War, 70 out of 79 textbooks in use there were found to contain similar material, and the Israeli authorities rightly terminated the use of such publications. As a result, UNRWA in many areas now depends upon temporary "teaching notes" produced to serve as a transitory substitute for textbooks hitherto provided by local Arab authorities—and UNESCO, as the agency officially responsible for now authorizing all of UNRWA's education materials, is engaged in a complete reexamination of textbooks in UNRWA/UNESCO schools, with a view to their complete revision. This step is being vigorously fought by the local Arab authorities.

An even more serious problem has been the use of refugee camp facilities as staging areas for guerrilla bands intent upon upsetting the tentative peace effected by U.N. cease-fire arrangements.

Palestine Liberation Organization units, El Fatah groups and other guerrilla formations are recruited in large numbers from people inscibed upon UNRWA lists, and trained in or near the camps—which means that international relief funds are being used to create and support insurrectionists intent upon blocking the operation of United Nations peacekeeping resolutions, and destroying the possibilities of peace along cease-fire lines.

In his 1966–67 Report, the Commissioner General of UNRWA took cognizance of this complaint and noted that the Arab states concerned had agreed to make up through special contributions to UNRWA for rations diverted to the guerrillas. The fact that UNRWA submitted to such an unsavory deal casts shame upon UNRWA's leadership: it is obviously nonsense to allow any overlapping at all between a United Nations agency such as UNRWA, and schemes to destroy the peace through guerrilla action. In the end, however, nothing appears to have come even from the promise of "special contributions"—and so far as detailed published accounts show, no such funds were ever received.

Meanwhile, UNRWA facilities in such places as Ramaleh became so conspicuously centers of terrorist training activities as to lead to Israeli reprisals.

In Jordan, moreover, the operation of these commando units, helped both by Iraqi arms and UNRWA rations, has become a serious danger to the stability of King Hussein's government, as well as to the peace at the Jordan-Israel borders.

It is obvious that these two abuses—the use of UNRWA staff and teaching materials to preserve and inculcate group hatreds, and the use of UNRWA facilities to assist in organizing illegal terrorist groups—cannot be countenanced by the peace loving nations whose contributions make UNRWA possible. Such misuse of UNRWA funds perpetuates trouble in the Middle East, and does not assist any legitimate humanitarian purpose.

ELEMENTS OF A GOOD POLICY

What solutions can we propose? We believe that:

(1) Negotiated settlements between Israel and the Arab states must be entered into promptly. If these negotiations are not undertaken now, their postponement can lead only to a new war. They must, moreover, be direct talks. Third party endeavors that leave the existence of Israel an unsettled matter on Arab maps cannot mean anything, and can only undermine the prestige of the United Nations in the region, as well as the peace of the world.

(2) The Soviets must understand that America and the NATO powers will insist firmly upon an "open" Middle East. They must realize that an attempt to make this part of the world into an extension of the Warsaw Pact area will lead to prompt and resolute counteraction.

(3) The refugee matter must be settled once and for all, perhaps along the line of Foreign Minister Eban's proposal that a "five year plan" be negotiated for the resettlement of these people. This could be done at once, and separate from other aspects of the problem.

(4) Finally, the United States should again assure the peoples of the Middle East that we stand ready to help finance a regional development plan, which would make the enormous potential wealth of the region available to all of its people, eliminating the age-old injustices on which dictatorial regimes have based themselves.

Throughout all of these proposals, there is implicit the thought that it is to the advantage of freedom in the world to support free institutions everywhere. This means support for Israel, support for Iran and Turkey, and every effort to build democracy in Lebanon and Jordan, as well as in any other place where foundations for freedom can be found. Only in free institutions can we find the beginnings of peace—and we must not wait longer in seeking that purpose.

WHO OBSTRUCTS PEACE?

In conformity with the various points and aspects of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, the Israeli Government informed Dr. Jarring that it was ready to continue indirect talks through him with the Arab Governments; but that it is imperative that Egypt should reply to seven questions previously submitted to its government by Dr. Jarring:

1. Does Egypt accept the need for agreement with Israel on the substance of the Security Council resolution?
2. Is Egypt ready to replace the cease-fire line with secure and recognized boundaries?
3. Is it prepared to agree to a "just and lasting peace"?
4. Will it allow Israeli ships to use the Suez Canal?
5. Does it agree to Mr. Eban's proposal as outlined in his October 9 speech to the Assembly to start talks on a refugee settlement?
6. Is Egypt prepared to accept new arrangements which will prevent a recurrence of the dangerous situation created in May, 1967, when Nasser demanded and achieved withdrawal of the U.N. Emergency Force?
7. Is Egypt ready to acknowledge Israel's sovereignty and express the end of belligerency in a signed agreement?

According to press reports the reply to Dr. Jarring by the Egyptian Foreign Minister Mahmoud Riad was completely negative and could only be considered as a total rejection of peace. The implication of this reply was: (1) that Egypt was not prepared to sign a peace treaty with Israel, (2) nor to discuss secure and recognized borders, (3) not ready to accept Israel's right to navigation through the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran, (4) and was not prepared to discuss any practical solution of the refugee problem.

No wonder the talks are deadlocked.

THESE ARE THE SOCIETY'S CONVICTIONS

1. The United States is deeply and unavoidably concerned in the future of the Middle East, and has a major responsibility for what happens next in that area.

2. We must make up our minds whether we want to act in ways that will promote peace, or in ways that will make war more probable.

3. We must decide now whether we intend to increase Arab intransigence and belligerence by withholding from Israel the weapons she needs, knowing that such weapons would act as the only effective deterrent to the widely-proclaimed Arab purpose of waging a war of revenge. (We certainly do not want to follow the example of General DeGaulle in this regard.)

4. The Soviets did not ask permission of anyone before acting to create a war climate in the Middle East. Why should America, because she fears possible criticism, hold back from actions to promote a climate conducive to peace and security?

5. In Russian propaganda and diplomacy, the United States is painted as the worldwide aggressor, and they proclaim this line on every possible occasion. No American action or attitude will change Moscow's propaganda line, so faithfully supported by the present Egyptian government.

6. The inclusion of the Middle East on the Soviet's proposed agenda of disarmament is not a step toward establishing peace. They have already carried out their rearmament of the Arabs, and talk of arms limitation based on a one-sided status quo is therefore an indication of bellicose intentions, not of pacific purposes. *Nothing can or will change Soviet plans,* except the knowledge that Israel can withstand any probable assault by Russia's protégés.

7. The bait of peaceful co-existence and negotiations toward controlled disarmament should not lure us away from reality: the Arabs will postpone their war plans—and think of negotiations—only if they are convinced that Israel is strong enough to beat them again.

8. The more we act to keep Israel strong, the better are the chances for an era of peace to come in the Middle East. Or do we wish to continue chasing the illusion of friendship with Nasser?

9. The Arab states will come to the peace table only when they become finally convinced that the United States will re-arm Israel at the same level to which the Soviets have rearmed them.

10. Only by matching the Russian buildup weapon for weapon will the Soviets understand America's determination to deter or prevent a new war—which would bring with it the risk of engulfing the whole world. Supplying needed new arms to Israel is not a provocation for war, but the only effective guarantee of peace. *There is no time to lose.*

Such a course will best serve the interests of the United States and of peace.

A STRANGE SET OF PRIORITIES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, along with many other Senators, I am deeply concerned about the strange set of priorities which seem to govern many of our crucial decisions at the national level.

I certainly hope that in the age of rapidly developing technology we do not become so hypnotized by the hardware of war and outer space that we forget the fundamental human needs of the people who make up the real strength of America.

It is a tragic irony that we are proceeding to deploy an anti-ballistic-missile system—a system which will never be used unless the world is plunged into nuclear war and which most scientists tell us will probably not work even then—while at the same time we are cutting back on some of the limited programs we offered recently in an effort to reclaim some of the lost members of our society.

The anti-ballistic-missile system may cost about $10 billion in its present form, or $50 to $100 billion if it is expanded into a full-fledged system such as its advocates really want. Think of those figures—10,000 millions on the one hand, or 50,000 millions or 100,000 millions on the other.

Meanwhile, telegrams were sent last week ordering the closing of 57 Job Corps centers all across America, in the hope of saving an amount of money which the Labor Department estimates at $100 million.

In order to save this estimated $100 million, some 17,500 youths who would otherwise receive valuable vocational training along with basic education, medical and dental care, will be sent back to the slums and the depressed rural areas from which they came as volunteers to be converted into productive, taxpaying citizens.

At his press conference announcing the closing of these 57 Job Corps camps, the Secretary of Labor conceded that "one could not say that $100 million was a make or break item." It certainly is not, at least for the Federal Government, which finds it very difficult to estimate the cost of a new airplane within that range of dollars.

But the kind of long-overdue education and job training which a deprived youth would have received in a Job Corps camp may well be a "make or break item" in his life.

Has America lost its sense of perspective? What are we really trying to achieve?

Is the development of supersonic airplanes, the landing of a man on the moon, the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system an end in itself?

What would any of these achievements mean if it was realized at the expense of the deterioration of our society at home?

I can assure you that many, many Americans share this concern over the strange set of priorities which seems to guide our national policy.

In the last few days, a great number of telegrams have been pouring into congressional offices and the White House, protesting the closing of the Job Corps camps.

There are many aspects of the Labor Department's action which concern people, both in Congress and in the Nation as a whole.

First of all, there is real concern that the Job Corps program as a whole is being gravely weakened, at a time when every available fact seems to indicate that it should be strengthened instead. The reasons which led to the creation of the Job Corps have not changed. We still have thousands of young men and women who have not been properly educated and trained to take their place in modern society. Many of these young people never will make it unless we take them out of their environment, give them concentrated and comprehensive remedial services, and then see to it that when they go back into society, they find a place in the labor market, in school or in the armed services. So many thousands of people are saying this is no time to cut back on the Job Corps.

Second, there is understandable concern at the manner in which these cuts were carried out. They were planned by the Department of Labor, which has no legal authority over the Job Corps program as of this date. Congress was not consulted; a program which the Congress established has been greatly altered and a new program is being set up in its place—without any legislative action.

Third, those of us who are deeply concerned about the conservation crisis in America are shocked at the almost total abandonment of the conservation camp concept. When he was asked about this at his press conference, the Secretary of Labor said:

> Ours is a manpower objective, not a conservation objective.

But Congress specifically gave the Job Corps a "conservation objective." Can this directive simply be ignored? The law requires that 40 percent of the Job Corps enrollees be assigned to conservation camps. The Secretary of Labor says that no more than 32 percent will be so assigned under the changes which already have been ordered into effect. Can the Labor Department simply ignore this law—while insisting on strict obedience of the law from the citizenry?

Fourth, there is concern about the manner in which camps were selected to be shut down. On an issue of such great concern as closing 57 Job Corps camps, one would certainly think there would be a full disclosure of the standards to be applied, and an opportunity for consultation and discussion before the camps were ordered to close.

In order to discuss this great nationwide concern over the closing of the Job Corps camps, the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty will hold a special public hearing this Friday, April 18, starting at noon. We will have as our first witness Mr. Louis Harris of Louis Harris Associates, New York City, a widely known firm of public opinion, Mr. Harris recently completed the largest survey ever made of Job Corps graduates, their families and their employers, to learn the impact of Job Corps training on these young people.

In addition, we have invited the director of the Job Corps, Mr. William Kelly, to testify. We will hear from some of the conservation organizations, which are deeply concerned at what appears to be the scuttling of the conservation camp program, and from the National Congress of American Indians, which is deeply concerned at the wholesale closing of Job Corps camps which have served Indian youth.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of documents relating to the closing of the Job Corps camps.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS, AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
April 11, 1969.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR NELSON: We have been advised that a severe curtailment of the Job Corps Program is being considered.

Since May of 1968, we have had the opportunity of working very closely with the Job Corps Conservation Centers Program through the Department of Agriculture Forest Service and more recently with the Department of Interior in the operation of seven (7) Carpentry Programs, wherein we are providing related and manipulative experience to sixty (60) of the underprepared and underprivileged youth in each of the seven (7) centers.

Although none of our programs have run the full cycle, we have already placed fifty-two (52) young men that we were able to qualify into our apprenticeship programs throughout the country and we expect to place all of the young men now in our programs in the industry upon the completion of their program, some of which will be completed in June, 1969 and others in July, 1969.

Therefore, we request that serious consideration be given to the continuance of the Job Corps Conservation Centers in that we feel an excellent job is being done in the training and placement of young men in gainful employment who will take their place in their community as active citizens and workers in the industry who, otherwise, will be returned to their home community as unskilled workers and thus become a burden, as well as a problem for society.

If curtailment is essential of some of the Conservation Centers, it should be done on a selected basis after full investigation of the quality of training and job placement that has been accomplished at each center.

Sincerely yours,
M. A. HUTCHENSON,
General President.

WOMEN IN COMMUNITY SERVICE, INC.,
April 10, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: We, the 20,000 volunteers of Women in Community Service, who have given millions of hours of dedicated service for the purpose of helping young women find a useful place in society are deeply concerned about the news reports on the future of the Job Corps program.

We hope you will consider carefully this very valuable program of human rehabilitation which has helped thousands of young people to become useful citizens, and that your final decision will not in any way impair the initial concept of the program.

Job training and vocational educational opportunities were available long before there was a Job Corps, but apparently the young people who joined the Job Corps found that these programs did not meet their needs.

We have committed a great deal of our time and resources to this program because of our deep conviction that the Job Corps provides the best possible opportunity for the personal and vocational rehabilitation of young women whose home environment does not encourage effective participation in society. We, therefore, feel strongly that the Job Corps program must continue as originally conceived.

We hope you will give this matter your very serious consideration and support the concept of the program so that the Job Corps can continue to give hope to young women from the depressed groups in our country.

Respectfully,
DOROTHY I. HEIGHT,
President.

CHURCH WOMEN UNITED,
April 10, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: We are greatly concerned about the news stories of serious cut backs on the Job Corps program.

Our several years' experience in recruiting girls for Jobs Corps has convinced us of the value of a residential training program.

We have seen girls' lives dramatically changed because they were able to have the living as well as training experience that Job Corps has brought them.

We hope you will give careful consideration to a continuation of a residential program for youth from poverty areas.

Respectfully,
DOROTHY DOLBEY
Mrs. James M. Dolbey,
President.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CATHOLIC WOMEN,
April 10, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: The 12,000 member organizations of Council of Catholic Women which has a commitment through WICS to provide volunteer women power to recruit and screen young women in poverty for the human renewal provided by Job Corps, is shocked by today's press reports of curtailment and dilution of that program. Mr. President we hope and pray that you will do everything in your power to preserve the concept and coverage of the Job Corps program.

Respectfully,
MARIE FOLDA
Mrs. Norman Folda,
President.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN,
April 10, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: In my recent communication to you we emphasized that the National Council of Jewish Women was convinced of the validity of the Job Corps program particularly its inherent concept of human rehabilitation. We are disturbed by press reports which imply that you are considering a drastic change in the program. Its delegation to the Labor Department is also interpreted by some as an emphasis merely on job training.

We urge you to support the original concept of the Job Corps and to authorize a greatly expanded program so that many young people in the depressed groups of our society will continue to believe that their government is determined to offer them the opportunity to become useful and productive members of society.

Respectfully,
JOSEPHINE WEINER
Mrs. Leonard H. Weiner,
President.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN,
April 10, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: The National Council of Negro Women is greatly alarmed over the news reports of massive shutdown of Job Corps centers.

We are equally concerned and disturbed over the unrest of our youth in this country and the possible curtailment of this program to which many of our deprived and disadvantaged young women have responded for the first time in their lives. Small nonresidential centers cannot hope to lift these youth from their crippling environment in the ghettoes and provide for them real opportunity and hope for a productive adult life.

Thousands of chapter and affiliate members located in every section of the United States have given many hours of volunteer service because we believe our Government is sincere in its efforts to help our desperate young people find their rightful place in society.

We urge continuance of the women's centers of the Job Corps.

DOROTHY I. HEIGHT,
National President.

AMERICAN GI FORUM OF THE UNITED STATES,
April 10, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: We are deeply concerned of the future of the Job Corps. The program has helped poverty stricken Mexican-American girls derive an education, that otherwise because of their misfortune they could not have acquired. In their behalf, Mr. President, we pray to God that you will give your fullest consideration in keeping the Job Corps program as it is.

Respectfully,
Mrs. DOMINGA G. CORONADO,
National Auxiliary Chairman.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 11, 1969]

AXING THE JOB CORPS

Seven weeks ago when President Nixon announced his intention to reorganize the Federal war on poverty, he suggested that "we often can learn more from a program that fails to achieve its purpose than from one that succeeds." That sounded fine. However, the Administration's action in deciding to close down 57 Job Corps centers in one swoop suggests that not enough effort was invested in finding out what had succeeded and what had failed.

It appears that centers were selected for closing largely on the basis of statistical data on performance and cost. The centers themselves were not inspected, nor were the center directors and Job Corps officials consulted. It was a policy decision at a high level, clearly foreshadowed by Mr. Nixon's condemnation of the Job Corps program during the presidential campaign. Already the Administration has decided to back down on its decision to close the women's center at Cleveland, and complaints have been received about the closing of many of the other centers. The action slashes Job Corps rolls by 17,000 young men and women by July 1. Anyone still enrolled in a closed center at that time will be transferred to one of the remaining centers, we are assured. But this will only partly ease the impact on those youths whose hopes had been raised by the Job Corps program.

It appears that economy was the primary motivating force in deciding which centers should be closed down, but it is questionable how much of the projected savings will be realized when the cost of shutting down the existing centers is considered. Also, there is some doubt about how economically the Labor Department will be able to run the 30 mini-centers that will now be opened in urban areas. One thing the Job Corps has learned is that much of its overhead cost is fixed and that small centers tend to be proportionately more expensive. The decision to shift away from rural conservation centers toward urban centers where the disadvantaged youth are seems logical, but it does not explain why some existing urban centers were closed too.

The furor created by the decision to close the Cleveland center caused the Administration to take a second look. A second look is in order for many of the other centers as well in view of the way they were selected for closing.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1969]

Reorganizing the Job Corps

Of the many programs in the war on poverty, the Job Corps was the least controversial in concept but has proved one of the most controversial in practice. Theoretically, it seemed ideal to move slum youths out of their dead-end environments and give them a fresh start in remote camps. They would be away from bad companions, destructive temptations and the scene of past failures.

Practically, however, the high dropout rate of Job Corps enlistees of both sexes suggests that many of these young persons found a radical change of environment more demoralizing than helpful. There were other sources of difficulty. The Government contracted with private business to do the actual training, but some of the nation's most prestigious industrial firms proved unimpressive in imparting usable skills to slum youngsters. Some critics have also argued that, although the conservation centers are doing useful work in the care of natural resources, these centers are not preparing enlistees for jobs in a highly technical economy.

The Job Corps has had its successes. The record is not entirely bleak. The question is whether the money spent on the existing program could achieve better results if spent otherwise. It is not clear that the Nixon Administration has correctly asked or answered this question. It reportedly proposes to shut down more than half of the conservation centers, six women's centers and two large camps for young men, thereby gradually reducing the Job Corps to half its present enrollment of 735,000 and saving $100-million.

But the point is to save lives, not dollars. If hundreds of thousands of untrained ill-educated youth drift into the stagnant pool of unemployables, they will cost the nation much more in the long run in crime, drug addiction and higher welfare costs. More small training centers in the cities are envisaged but the over-all effect still is to scale down the job training program. That is not a good enough answer.

While President Nixon and his advisers ponder how to make good on his promise of last year to get the unemployed "off the welfare rolls and on the payrolls," it is imperative that a high level of employment be sustained. No job training program can produce results if a recession occurs and the students cannot see a job waiting for them at the end of the course.

GLOBE, ARIZ.,
April 12, 1969.

GAYLORD NELSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee, U.S. Senate,
Washington D.C.:

Request you review and reconsider action of closing the San Carlos Job Corp Center as we are a one industry community, our economy would suffer considerable. Letter follows.

E. ROSS BITTNER,
Mayor.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
April 11, 1969.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Having seen the magnificent work done by WICS in the Chicago area working through the Job Corps, I urge you strongly to keep the Job Corp as it is now.

Mrs. MAX BERG.

GLOBE, ARIZ.,
April 11, 1969.

GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Opposed to closing Job Corp, San Carlos, Arizona.

RICHARD A. MACIAS,
ELVIRA A. MACIAS,
ANGELA GUTIERREZ.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
April 11, 1969.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Four years close association with Job Corps program convinces us of its value to our entire Nation and to disadvantaged young men and women. Your determined efforts to maintain the services and potential of Job Corps. I'll support you all the way.

Mr. and Mrs. JOSEPH FLANAGAN.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
April 12, 1969.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge continued support of Job Corps program. Personal volunteer experience this program convincingly evidences need to rebuild and motivate lives to disadvantaged youth.

Mr. and Mrs. BRUCE WALTERS.

GREATER DALLAS SECTION, NATIONAL
COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN,
Dallas, Tex., April 12, 1969.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Employment and Manpower, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We urge that the concept of the Job Corps center as it was originally conceived be retained. Fragmentation with vocational training only and no cultural enrichment will not break the poverty cycle. As members of WICS with a national membership of many hundreds of thousands of women we urgently request that you do everything in your power to keep the Job Corps centers open.

Mrs. SANFORD FAGADAU,
President.
Mrs. MORRIS NEWBERGER,
Vice President.

GLOBE, ARIZ.,
April 12, 1969.

GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Opposed to closing Job Corps Center at San Carlos, Arizona. Benefits of this center to underprivileged youth of our country, employment of people from our community by this center and economic increase in the community far outweigh reason for closing center.

Dr. C. A. BEJARANO.

WHITEFISH BAY, WIS.,
April 11, 1969.

Hon. GAYLORD A. NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am interested in retaining the concept of the Job Corps as it is presently.

Mrs. CHARLES W. PECKARSKY.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
April 11, 1969.

GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge sustaining Job Corps program. Have personal knowledge of the vitality and need locally.

BERTH LITCHENSTEIN.

STUDENT TAKEOVER AT HARVARD IS INTOLERABLE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Students for a Democratic Society has proved again with the Harvard takeover that it is in fact Students for a Destructive Society.

The attempt by a small group of students to destroy the American system of higher education has gone beyond the bounds of tolerance when probably our Nation's most distinguished center of learning can be brought to the brink of closure. It is serious when any university is threatened by those who have nothing but disruption on their minds, but the real danger to our free academic tradition is brought home full force when the target is Harvard.

If any institution in this country has worked hard to foster the liberal academic heritage our academic community holds dear, it is at Cambridge. The unprovoked, disgusting, and totally unwarranted revolt by a small group of anarchists cannot be allowed to threaten this respected citadel of learning.

As the Washington Post commented editorially today:

> It may be that a majority of the students at Harvard would like to get what education they can from the faculty without striving to destroy the institution or to make it over in conformity with the blueprints of the New Left.

Mr. President, one of the most responsible voices being heard through the tumult at Harvard is that of Franklin L. Ford, dean of the faculty of arts and sciences at the university.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from a statement issued by Dean Ford and published in the New York Times on Saturday be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 12, 1969]

Excerpts From Dean Ford's Statement at Harvard

(From a statement today by Franklin L. Ford, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard University, to the Harvard faculty, Cambridge, Mass., April 11, 1969)

As everybody knows by now, University Hall was occupied beginning shortly after noon on Wednesday. The degree of premeditation was indicated by the fact that the intruders had chains for securing the doors, crowbars for smashing windows if necessary, and they also had a large supply of apparently miscellaneous keys.

So far as the decision to clear the building is concerned, I should make clear that everyone involved in reaching that conclusion felt sadness and dread at the thought of the use of police within Harvard Yard. However, I remain convinced that, all things considered, there was no real alternative.

Many members of the Harvard community—perhaps a majority at present—do not share that conviction. But I should like to explain the considerations which finally determined the move in the hope that they will at least be carefully considered by everyone arguing about it.

First, let it be kept in mind that a physically repugnant and intellectually indefensible seizure had occurred. It is not possible to discuss this issue without beginning with that event.

Second, University Hall is not just another building, one which could be left occupied and isolated while instruction and research continued elsewhere.

TIME HELD A FACTOR

In University Hall there are confidential, personal files of all members of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the complete financial records and current operating accounts of the faculty, the personal folders of all members of the freshman class, and a variety of other materials which are either confidential or necessary for the functioning of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, or both.

The fact that the door to the room containing the financial records was broken down by the intruders within hours of the occupation is an indication that time was a real factor to consider.

Furthermore, personal correspondence between members of the faculty and past or present deans was lifted from the files in my office and systematic reproduction of such documents has already begun. Excerpts from some of these files have today appeared in the current issue of Old Mole, Boston's self-styled "radical weekly."

The arguments against using police to clear the building are self-evident. If we could have isolated the invaders of University Hall, while continuing a decent pattern of existence in the Yard, this would have been an infinitely better outcome than the one we have now to discuss. As I try to explain, however, it is my firm conclusion that such an outcome was not a real alternative open to us.

WEEK OF SICKENING EVENTS

If there had been reality in the S.D.S. demands or the possibility of "talking the occupiers out," that too would have had to be carefully explored. But the demands as such were nonnegotiable, in the literal sense of offering no basis for discussion; and the temporary occupants of University Hall had made clear to me and others that they felt "the time for talking is over."

We are now faced with the predictable next chapters of what have become the stale script for "radicalization" of a university. Every effort is being made to focus attention on the appearance of police and to divert attention from the short-term and long-term implications of the building seizure itself. The usual vilification of individuals is under way. Where the real villians cannot be found, we may be sure, that they will be invented.

For myself, I can only say that this has been a week of sickening events and discouraging discoveries about how some minds work.

If the Harvard community, students and faculty alike do not recognize that what is now at stake is the freedom to teach, to inquire and to learn—if that community sees in the present situation only an opportunity to attack the governing boards, the president or some other part of the institution—there will be little point in pretending much longer that this is a real university.

The buildings will remain but the soul will be gone.

Some now insist that "the storm troopers entered University Hall." This is true, but they entered it at noon on Wednesday, not dawn on Thursday.

TEXAS ESCAPES SERIOUS AIR POLLUTION PROBLEM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the State of Texas has been very fortunate to have escaped any serious air pollution problem. Because we are blessed with an abundant supply of natural gas to use as a fuel source, we in Texas have not had to burn solid or liquid fuels which contribute so directly to pollution in the air.

We cannot ignore the danger of impure air, however, simply because we are fortunate enough to be able to breathe freely now. To do so would be to emulate the ostrich who hides his head in the ground in order to avoid the reality of approaching danger.

The people of Texas realize that the pollution in the air over New York City and Los Angeles will be duplicated in Houston and Dallas if they do not act now. I am encouraged to note that Texans are working to preserve the clean skies which are their heritage.

So that we can all be made aware of the present air pollution problems in Texas and the steps being taken to solve them, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The Control of Air Pollution in Texas," written by Mr. Otto Paganini, be printed in the RECORD. The article is an excellent survey of the air pollution situation in Texas, I believe we will all profit from reading it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION IN TEXAS

(By Otto Paganini, P.E.*)

What is happening to the Texas environment as a result of man's progress is a crucial matter for every person in the state. An environment is not merely a location in which an organism lives; it is the means by which an organism lives.[1] It conditions the quality of existence. Man, as an organism, must depend upon what is available in his environment for survival. Civilized man, in his desire to make his work easier and each day more pleasant than the last, has developed many means for accomplishing this end. Along with his achievements he has created a great deal of waste and, perhaps, may have destroyed more than he has created. The American Indian early complained of this propensity of white men when he observed the decimation of his people and his food supply, the buffalo, by the early American settlers.

THE PROBLEMS

Since the Industrial Revolution in the late 1800's the citizens of this country and others have been creating so much waste (presently an estimated 4.5 pounds per capita per day of solid waste alone) that we have polluted many of our streams, rivers, lakes, and—most important of all—the envelope of air that surrounds us. Although efforts were made to prevent pollution, most air-pollution control was very feeble until the late 1940's, when the County of Los Angeles, California, brought it to the attention of the citizens of this country by creating the first air-pollution control district in that state, and in the country. It had been found that not only industry, but all the activities of the community, emitted pollutants into the community atmosphere.

The citizens of this country, in their desire to go places, and do things in a hurry, have in a sense destroyed some 1.7 million acres of land[2] in the laying out and building of an Interstate Highway System; to raise more crops for food production they have laid bare many acres of land, a condition which in turn permits erosion of the soil by wind action and contributes to the overall dust loading of the atmosphere; they have polluted the air through the operation of motor vehicles and other forms of transportation, which emit upward of 85 million tons of pollutants into the atmosphere each year;[3] with other community activities they have contributed another 48 million tons.[4] These totals do not include the carbon dioxide, which mounts to million of tons.

Industry is not altogether to blame, because it exists only as the result of the demand for its products or services by the citizenry; in like manner the degree of cleanliness of the air and water depends upon the demands made by the citizens. When they demand a wholesome atmosphere, however, they must pay the cost, because it is included in the price of the commodity they purchase, whether it be a material object or a service. Again this demand for clean air must come from the citizens, because when man relinquishes any portion of his prized gains he must feel he is getting some other tangible item or service to hold in exchange—in this case reasonably clean air.

Three factors are necessary for creation of an air-pollution problem: a source of emission of a pollutant, a transporting medium, and a receptor. The source of the pollutant may be emission of dust from an industrial operation, smoke from the backyard burning of trash, noxious and innocuous dust or gaseous emissions from industrial, oil-field, and municipal operations, gases from motor-vehicle, truck, or other transportation-vehicle exhausts. The transporting medium for the air pollutant is the thin moving envelope of air that surrounds the earth. The receptors are human beings, animal and plant life, and physical objects such as painted, metallic, glass, and plastic surfaces.

Texas is blessed with an abundance of combustible gas fuels which have replaced solid and liquid fuels for heating and power generation. The consumption of fuel gases, in the amount of billions of cubic feet annually, contributes to the overall pollution loading of the atmosphere, but not in equal proportion with other fossil fuels, such as coal and fuel oil. The city of Dallas consumed more than 100 billion cubic feet of natural gas (exclusive of liquid petroleum gas) during 1965.[5]

STATUTES FOR CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION

The laws concerning air pollution are fairly explicit. The federal law—the Air Quality Act of 1967—delegates certain responsibilities and powers to the United States Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prevent and abate air pollution; perform or have done certain research on air pollution and its abatement; delineate air-pollution areas and regions; distribute funds as appropriated by the Congress to develop, establish, improve and maintain air-pollution control programs of an interstate, state, county, or local air-pollution control agency. The Act gives the Secretary jurisdiction in air-pollution matters involving more than one state and in intrastate air-pollution problems when the state governor requests federal assistance. Copies of the Act are available from the National Air Pollution Control Administration, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 101 North Randolph Street, Arlington, Virginia 22203.

The 59th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, passed the Clean Air Act of Texas, 1965 V.C.S. 4477-4; the 60th Legislature, Regular Session, made additions, deletions, and changes to the Act (V.C.S. 4477–5). The Act provides for a nine-member Air Control Board with powers to prepare and develop a general plan for the proper conservation of the air resources of the state. They may promulgate and adopt rules and regulations to prevent and reduce undesirable levels of air pollutants as permitted under the Act. The Board is further permitted to hold hearings, to subpoena witnesses and the production of papers and documents, and to take testimony in connection with the hearing. It is the sole authority in the state in the setting of air-quality criteria, and in determining levels and emission limits for air pollutants; it can enter orders or determinations as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of the Act; it may utilize the services of other state agencies in carrying out the purposes of the Act; and it may hire outside persons when necessary to assist in making such orders and determinations.

---

*Chief Engineer, Air Control Program, Division of Occupational Health and Radiation Control, Environmental Health Services, Texas State Department of Health, Austin, Texas.

[1] A Concept of Environment—A Factor of Life," *Progress Report*, New York State Air Pollution Board, Vol. III, No. 3, 1-2/64 (7/30/65).

[2] Based on the planned 41,000 miles of Interstate Highway System with 300-foot right-of-way and extra land allowed for interchanges and parks.

[3] Edmund K. Faltermayer, "We Can Afford Clean Air," *Fortune Magazine*, November 1965.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] An Appraisal of the Air Resources of Dallas and Dallas County, Texas," 11/9-12/15/65, Texas State Department of Health, Austin, Texas, 4/25/66.

The Clean Air Act of Texas further allows for an executive secretary who shall act as the administrator for the Board in carrying out its orders and in the conduct of the business of the Board. He shall be an employee of the Texas State Department of Health. The Texas State Department of Health shall provide the basic personnel and necessary laboratory and other facilities as may be required to carry out the provisions of the Act. In addition, the Department acts as an agent of the Board in obtaining the services of other state agencies in connection with air-pollution control. Control over air pollution resulting from the emission of radioactive material, however, still rests with the Texas Radiation Control Agency, and problems pertaining to the control of inplant air pollution are not covered in the Act.

The Act permits a local government as defined in the Act to enforce the rules and regulations adopted by the Board, to inspect the air and to go in and on public or private property within the city's boundaries and jurisdiction to determine whether the level of air contaminants in any area within those boundaries and that jurisdiction meets levels set by the Board. Furthermore, a local government may enforce through its own attorney the provisions of the penalty section of the Act (Section 12B).

In addition, the Act is careful not to set aside or invalidate the right of any private person to pursue all common-law remedies available to abate a condition of pollution or other nuisance or to recover damages therefor, or both. Nor does the Act diminish such rights and powers as are otherwise vested by law in any incorporated city or town to abate a nuisance or to enforce any ordinance for the control of air pollution, subject only to the provisions of Section 15 of the Act. In substance, if the ordinance is not inconsistent with the provision of this Act or rules or regulations, or orders of the Board, the local government may bring action against a violator to prevent or abate the emission of pollutants into the community atmosphere. However, where the local government institutes a suit under Section 13D of the Act, the Board is authorized to be and must be a necessary party of the local government's suit.

A local government, furthermore, shall transmit the results of its inspections to the Boards as prescribed in its rules.

Where a person (including a company, as defined in the act) is not in compliance with the Board's rules and regulations he may ask for a variance to allow time to make changes in his operations so that he may meet regulation standards. The Board has promulgated and adopted procedural rules and general provisions by which it will conduct and handle its business. Furthermore, it has adopted four regulations which cover particulate matter and smoke, outdoor burning of waste material and refuse, sulfur compounds, and motor-vehicle exhaust emissions. The Board encourages local air-pollution control programs.

A copy of the Act and the regulations are available from the Executive Secretary, Texas Air Control Board, 1100 West 49th Street, Austin, Texas 78756.

A number of cities and counties in Texas, through their health departments or districts, now have air-pollution control programs. These are Dallas, El Paso City-County, Fort Worth, Galveston County, Houston, Harris County, Laredo-Webb County, Lubbock City-County, and San Antonio-Bexar County. In addition, more than forty-two local health departments are cooperating in the maintenance and operation of two types of air-sampling stations—high-volume and effects-package types—which collect air samples on a weekly, bi-weekly, and monthly basis. These samples are used to ascertain the amount of total suspended-particulate and benzene-soluble organic matters, sulfates, nitrates, ozone, sulfation compounds, and other emitted pollutants—to determine their volume and their effects.

ORIGIN OF POLLUTION IN TEXAS

The everyday activities of a community contribute varying amounts of pollutants to the community atmosphere. Their sources, some of which have been previously cited, are industrial operations, commercial installations, motor vehicles operating over public streets and roads, and domestic and municipal activities. They vary from minor particulates and gases, such as street dust and carbon dioxide, to those of major significance, such as soots and carbon monoxide.

More than 10,500 manufacturing establishments of various types are located in Texas. These include processors and producers of petroleum, petrochemicals, natural gas, lime, cement, asphaltic and ready-mix concrete, carbon black, furniture, cotton, cottonseed and cottonseed oil, castings, vegetables and fruits, flour and cereals, other foods, grains, lumber, steel, and other metals fabrications, lead, antimony, aluminum, zinc, tin, manganese, magnesium, graphite, gypsum, lignite, mercury, oil, rock and table salt, organic chemicals, and others.

These endeavors contribute pollutants to the atmosphere, some to a greater degree than others. Although Texas does not have air-pollution problems in the same degree as is found in the solid- and liquid-fuel-burning areas of the country, some of the major population centers in the state are beginning to develop what is commonly referred to as photochemical smog or smaze.

The Houston-Harris County area is showing signs of such. A good example of this occurred on June 13, 1968, and appears quite often to a lesser degree. The City of El Paso experiences low-level temperature inversions from October through March, and pollutant build-up under the inversion layer is quite evident during this period. Fortunately, however, because of meteorological conditions in the El Paso area, these inversions normally break up and dissipate before noon and prevent build-up of the pollutants to the point where they might threaten the well-being of the area. In addition, operations at one major plant, which releases a large quantity of sulfur dioxide in this area, are terminated when meteorological conditions are unfavorable for adequate dispersion of this particular pollutant. The Fort Worth-Tarrant County and Dallas City-County areas are experiencing some pollution. All of these cited areas, however, are trying to prevent further emissions of pollutants, and to abate those that exist, through the activation of air-pollution control programs in their health departments. These local programs are also cooperating very closely with the Texas Air Control Board and the Board's right arm, the Air Control Program of the Division of Occupational Health and Radiation Control, Environmental Health Services, Texas State Department of Health.

MAJOR SOURCES OF POLLUTANTS

Cotton gins

In recent years one of the major contributors of pollutants to the community atmosphere has been operations at cotton gins. This situation has resulted from the changes made in the method of harvesting seed cotton. No longer is just the lint with its seed brought into the gin for separation by straight ginning. Now, because most of the seed cotton that is harvested is either machine-picked (by spindle pickers) or strip-picked from the stalk, the gins, in order to produce a 500-pound bale of marketable staple cotton free of trash, must remove anywhere from 50 to more than 2,000 pounds of trash and dirt from the seed cotton before and after separation of the seed from the lint. This necessity results in the emission of dust, lint fly, and parts of the stalk, leaves, and bolls, some of which may contain residues of economic pesticides. Most gins are located in rural communities and towns. Some, however, are situated in larger urban centers of population and create not only a nuisance, but a health hazard, when their emissions reach the community atmosphere. A letter to the Air Control Board, Texas State Department of Health, dated April 20, 1966, and signed by David F. Pugh, M.D., Diplomate, American Board of Pediatrics, Associate Fellow, American Academy of American College of Biology, attests this fact:

"To Whom It May Concern: This is to confirm in writing the conversation, which I had on April 18, 1966, with Mr. Wimberly of your Department concerning the extremely harmful effects produced particularly against Children with asthma by cotton gins in our area. I see patients from all over West Texas, as far north as Crosbytown and as far west as Clovis, New Mexico, and Odessa, and as far south as Pecos and Fort Stockton. It would be easy to go through the files and find literally dozens of cases that are easily controlled with minimum amounts of medication and regular hypersensitization injections for pollen dust, molds, and spores, etc., until the cotton gins begin operating in the fall. It is impossible to put into an injection everything to protect them against the extremely irritating effects of lint, dust, and smoke from cotton gins. Anything which can be done to minimize the air pollution from this source will be of real service to the asthmatic patients in this area. I would be happy to cooperate in any way in furthering this objective."

The 60th Legislature, when it revised the Clean Air Act of Texas 1965, included Section 6C, which states:

"The board shall establish its rules and regulations concerning the emission of particulate matter from plants processing agricultural products in their natural state according to a formula derived from the process weight of materials entering the process. The board may not require in its rules and regulations that such plants meet a standard which requires an emission of less than eight percent of the process weight of the materials entering the process."

Examples of industries that process agricultural products in their natural state are cotton gins, rice dryers, and grain elevators, where these grains are dried and stored. Most plants processing agricultural products in their natural state can stay within this requirement without providing any type of traps to remove the dust, lint, and chaff from the conveying air stream. Studies made around these plants have shown that emissions as permitted in Section 6C of the Act in plants of this type exceed particulate-matter limits set by the Board in Regulation I, governing emissions for other types of industry. It should be pointed out, however, that many cotton gins, some rice dryers, and many grain elevators have installed primary-type dust and/or lint-trapping devices to reduce such emissions.

Smelters

Smelters in the state include those that produce aluminum, copper, ferromanganese, ferrosilicon, lead, tin, and zinc. With the exception of several secondary aluminum and lead smelters, most Texas smelters are primary producers of these metals. Emissions which result from these smelter operations are chlorine, ferromanganese, ferrosilicon, fluorides, sulfur compounds, and some metals. In the reduction of alumina to aluminum, a process in which fluoride compounds are used as a fluxing agent, the reduction plants have incorporated recovery systems in the smelting process to prevent undue emissions of this material. As previously noted, one copper-lead smelter utilizes bag filters for recovering lead fumes to prevent their loss to the community atmosphere; the sulfur compounds, however, are emitted to the atmosphere under control by the use of tall stacks for dispersion of the sulfur oxides into the atmosphere at heights that are less liable to creation of a nuisance or a health hazard. When meteorological conditions are not favorable for good dispersion of the sulfur compounds the operations are reduced until weather conditions are favorable for such dispersion at the heights provided. In the zinc smelters tall stacks are utilized to disperse the sulfur oxides formed by the sintering and smelting of the zinc ore concentrate.

The tin smelter utilizes a roasting process to remove arsenic metal from the tin concentrate. Settling chambers and electostatic precipitators are employed to entrap the arsenic that sublimes from the ore concentrates when roasted. A tall stack is used to disperse, at a rate that is believed to be below harmful levels, any metal that may get through the collectors. Tin fumes lost from the reverberatory furnaces are passed through settling chambers and electrostatic precipitators and recovered to prevent both an economic loss and pollution of the community atmosphere.

The ferromanganese and silicon operations presently utilize scrubbers to reduce emissions, but are planning improvements in these devices for further reduction of escaped pollutants. The magnesium producers are using scrubber units to prevent loss of chlorine that results from the reduction of magnesium chloride to magnesium metal and chlorine. The chlorine is converted to an acid by the scrubbing process. Lime is used in the separation of magnesium chloride from other impurities. The manufacture of lime, a separate process, can result in some loss of lime to the atmosphere if the process is not properly controlled. Most of this lime loss in this plant, however, is prevented by recently installed electrostatic precipitators.

Secondary-lead smelters, for the most part, are those associated with the recovery of lead from lead storage batteries and scrap lead. These operations are situated in three of our major centers of population, Dallas, Fort Worth, and Houston. Emissions of lead and acid gases, such as oxides of sulfur, do occur. Recovery systems are provided to a limited degree, but they are directed primarily toward the recovery of lead metal and not the prevention of the escape of these pollutants.

Foundries

Foundry operations in the state contribute to the overall pollution loading in the community. Several large foundries of the production and captive type are situated in the larger metropolitan areas, while some, along with job-type foundries, are located in smaller communities. At present, with the exception of one or two, no provisions are made for the control of emissions from the cupola, a major source of pollutants from foundry operations. Other sources of pollutants in foundries are core making and baking, molding, shakeout and cleaning of casting, and molding-sand conditioning, or preparation. For the most part, the major foundries, and a number of the smaller ones, utilize bag filters to prevent emission of dust generated by these other pollutant-source operations. Some foundries are converting to electric furnaces to produce metal for castings. These electric furnaces, if not controlled, generate and emit considerable amounts of iron oxides in the melting process. Several foundries, however, have installed local exhaust-collection systems to serve these furnaces by directing these oxides into bag filters, thus preventing the emission of these pollutants into the community atmosphere. However, acrid smokes from core-baking and pouring operations still go uncontrolled.

Steel plants

Operating in the state are two major steel-production plants, with a third under construction, and several small producers. At present one of the major plants uses open-hearth furnaces with oxygen lancing; the other utilizes this same process plus electric furnaces of the carbon-electrode type. Both plants charge hot metal and cold scrap to these furnaces. The coke production, a by-product operation, is used at both plants. Both plants are in the process of providing facilities to prevent emissions of iron-oxide fumes, the chief pollutant discharged in this operation. In the process which produces the by-product coke, hydrocarbon-recovery units are used, but because of the coke-oven doors and other leakage points, the coke-quenching operations still emit some undesirable quantities of smoke and acrid gases.

The smaller steel plants utilize electric furnaces to produce the steel and use pig and scrap iron as the raw charge. The considerable iron oxide generated by these furnaces is exhausted into the community atmosphere. Only two of these plants presently prevent these emissions.

Petroleum refining

Petroleum refining, an important industry in the state, in years past was a major source of hydrocarbons, smoke, and the sulfur-compound type of air contaminants—sulfides and oxides of sulfur. More recently, however, much has been done by this industry to abate emissions by closer surveillance of manufacturing units, development of new products out of what was once considered unusable hydrocarbons, conversion of spent sulfuric acids to virgin acid, and others. In addition, these producers recognized the necessity for improving their product by removing the sulfur and sulfide gases. Whereas these gases were previously burned, with resulting sulfur dioxide, the sulfur is now recovered in the form of elemental sulfur or converted directly to sulfuric acid. Today many of the undesirable by-products of the industry are now caught, sold to the petrochemical plants, and converted to useful products. Smokeless flares have replaced the smoking type. New storage tanks have floating roofs to prevent loss of volatile hydrocarbons, while older models, with fixed roofs, are being remodeled to include floating roofs. In addition, those hydrocarbons which are gases at ambient temperatures and are easily liquefied are stored in tanks under pressure or are recovered by systems that reliquify these hydrocarbons to prevent their loss. Where waste hydrocarbons must be disposed of by open burning or dumped through uncontrolled flares they will generate considerable smoke. Many of these waste hydrocarbons are being controlled by burning in incinerators and flares of the smokeless type; practically all will be so handled before another year is out. These smokeless units, when properly designed and operated, completely burn the hydrocarbons to an invisible carbon-dioxide gas. The industry, becoming more aware of the importance of the conservation of energy and the prevention of waste, is taking a continuously deeper interest in the prevention of the emission of pollutants into the community atmosphere.

Petrochemicals

The petrochemical industry, an outgrowth of the union of the chemical and the petroleum-refining industries, is converting many waste gasses and liquids, formerly burned or dumped by the refineries as unusable material, into useful organic and inorganic chemicals. This industry in Texas is centered along the Gulf Coast, as are the refineries, where it may contribute pollutants to the community atmosphere. The industry is putting forth great effort, however, to abate emissions that may be attributed to the industry.

Electric powerplants

The generation of electricity in this state employs both thermal and hydroelectric power-generation units. The thermal plants contribute little in the way of pollutants to the community atmosphere, the only exceptions being a currently operating plant and a proposed unit, both adapted to the use of solid fuel, lignite, and a few plants that may be forced to fuel oil in an emergency. However, should the price of natural gas, the fuel used by most of these generating plants, increase to the point that operation with liquid and solid fuels would be more profitable, then those power plants using gas may convert to liquid, solid, or nuclear fuel, with their respective potentials for emission of pollutants.

Municipal activities

The everyday operations of all our municipalities contribute pollutants to their respective community atmospheres in many ways. The burning of refuse at public disposal sites, in citizens' backyards, or in commercial incinerators emits numerous pollutants. In addition, the operation of our motor-vehicular transportation units and the maintenance of poor general sanitation cause the emission of unburned hydrocarbons, noxious and innocuous gases, and dust into our community atmosphere. These pollutants result from poorly maintained and adjusted internal-combustion engines used in our motor vehicles, from litter in the form of dirt, carbon, rubber, soil, and other particulates that are permitted to accumulate on our streets. The movement of motor-vehicular traffic over the streets pulverizes these particulants and disperses them over the community. The proper maintenance of our cars, with adjustments of the motors and frequent cleaning of their understructure, in combination with good street sanitation, can minimize these emissions. Many of our municipalities, through the efforts and encouragement of local health and sanitation and street departments and the Environmental Development Program, Environmental Health Services Section, Texas State Department of Health, have done much to abate emission of this type. This improvement has resulted from the efforts of these agencies before city councils and mayors to encourage the institution of collection services, the conversion of burning open dumps into sanitary landfills or their replacement by the use of proper types of incineration units. These sanitary landfills prevent emissions of smoke and acrid gases and, along with regular street-cleaning services, reduce emissions of dust. In addition, a number of cities have passed ordinances which prohibit the burning of solid waste within their areas of jurisdiction.

Agriculture

Agricultural operations create air-pollution problems by cultivation of the soil in fields denuded of vegetation coverage. In such situations the soil becomes airborne by wind erosion, especially in the High Plains area and the arid regions of West Texas. The Extension Service and the Plants Sciences Departments, Texas A & M University, are working in some areas to prevent this erosion. The planting of various crops in close succession, to provide nearly continuous protection through vegetation, is one method that is being employed to counteract this wind erosion. Another is the selection of the best times and methods of cultivation to cut down losses of soil by wind action.

Carbon black

Smoke emissions result from the improper combustion of fuels and waste organic matter. The channel carbon-black manufacturing industry, because of the nature of its process, emits considerable carbon particulate, with resulting heavy smoke. Smoke is emitted also with the furnace-oil and gas and thermal-type carbon-black manufacturing methods, except that, with proper trapping devices, such as bag filters, carbon black produced by these three methods emits little or no black. In this state one must not willfully emit smoke from any operation in excess of the amount allowed by Regulation II, Texas Air Control Board. Many of the various sources of smoke emissions are gradually being eliminated through the action taken by the Texas Air Control Board and the cooperation of those persons who are responsible for their occurrence.

Natural gas

Some air pollutants in the form of hydrogen-sulfide gas result from the production of petroleum and natural gas and the mining of sulfur by the Frasch process. Some natural gases produced in West Texas contain as much as 22 percent by volume of hydrogen-sulfide gas, while some crude oil contains from 0.5 to 3.0 percent sulfur, part of which may be in the form of hydrogen sulfide in solution. When these gases are brought to the surface the hydrogen-sulfide gas must be stripped out, either by recovery or by flaring. Burning by flare results in the emission of the combustion product, sulfur dioxide, into the atmosphere.

Sulfur production

The emission of hydrogen sulfide occurs also in sulfur-mining operations when the sulfur and bleed water are brought to the surface for sale and treatment respectively.

In several areas in the state hydrogen-sulfide gas is recovered and converted to elemental sulfur or neutralized by acid or lime treatment to a sulfate. Sulfur-recovery plants are located in Ector and Andrews Counties, and at several other locations.

Papermills

Several papermills in the state manufacture paper from pine and hardwoods. In the digestion of the wood chips for removal of lignon and recovery of salt cake from the spent digestion liquors, odoriferous gases and particulates, if not controlled, are emitted to the atmosphere. These emitted particulates absorb the odorous gases, which are liberated from the particle when they reach the atmosphere. Mercaptans released from the digestors when they are blown down are odoriferous. Plants install electrostatic precipitators with 90-95-percent collection efficiency to trap the particulate. The digestor blow-down gases are sent to a recovery system for removal of the condensables and some odorous gases. A recently completed mill using a scrubber followed by an electrostatic precipitator claims over a 98-percent efficiency in the recovery of saltcake particulates through the waste-gas recovery system. Company officials plan to improve the collection efficiency by installation of additional control devices if needed.

PROGRESS TOWARD CLEAN AIR

Prior to the creation of the Texas Air Control Board, the then Air Pollution Control Program, Division of Occupational Health and Radiation Control, Environmental Health Services Section, Texas State Department of Health, by persuasion and education was successful in the abatement of a number of emissions of pollutants into the community atmosphere. These were obtained primarily where a health hazard was evident and the seriousness of it could be pointed out to the offender, where a nuisance was evident and the local citizens were ready to file suit in court to have the nuisance abated, where an economic loss was resulting from the emission of a valuable product, and in some instances, where the goodwill of the community or region was in jeopardy.

The Texas Air Control Board, whose duties are to protect the air resources of Texas, may do so by promulgation and passage of rules and regulations to protect these air resources. The Board has been quite active and has promulgated and passed regulations to control the emission of particulates, smoke, sulfur compounds, and motor-vehicle exhaust. The Board, through its executive secretary, and with the staff of the Air Control Program, Division of Occupational Health and Radiation Control, Environmental Health Services Section, Texas State Department of Health, has been most instrumental in obtaining corrections of hazardous conditions by persuasion, education, and cooperation of those who are not in compliance with the rules and regulations passed by the Board.

Several cases filed against violators of these rules and regulations when cooperative means failed have resulted in settlements out of court with payment of fines and issuance of court orders in which the offenders agreed to abate the emissions.

Some areas of the state present special problems because of their emissions of pollutants into the atmosphere. A great number of these are of the point-source, or single-source type. In Houston and El Paso, however, meteorological and topographical conditions do combine at certain times to create conditions which cause smaze or undue pollutant loadings to occur. These situations are offensive to some persons living in these areas. In addition, smaze conditions have been noted in the Dallas and Fort Worth areas. Local air-pollution control programs, as well as state programs directed by the Texas Air Control Board, are maintaining surveillance on these areas and are working together to achieve clean air in areas where emissions of pollutants are problems. At the same time these groups are working to prevent further pollution of the atmosphere and to conserve the air resources in those areas where emission of pollutants does not occur or is of little consequence at this time.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, an article published recently in the Washington Post focuses on the excellent initial achievements made by the Cooperative Extension Service program administered by America's only totally urban land-grant college, Federal City College.

Throughout the 90th Congress I urged that the benefits of the Cooperative Extension Service—USDA—long familiar in rural areas in the form of 4–H programs, be adapted to the urban environment in which better than seven of every 10 Americans now reside. I have, in fact, previously introduced proposed legislation to provide for the establishment of such a center at a District of Columbia institution of higher education. Consequently, I draw great personal satisfaction from the reported success of Federal City College's initial cooperative extension work.

Mr. President, many Senators having origins in the countryside know first-hand the helpful contribution which Cooperative Extension Service efforts make in youth development. I have contended that as our population moves from the country to the city, extension work—especially in its youth development and home economics aspects—should do the same. The early achievements of the Cooperative Extension Service program administered by the Federal City College indicate the soundness of that judgment, and I look forward to increased Cooperative Extension Service efforts in other urban centers.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, written by Elizabeth Shelton, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Country-Style Nutrition in the City

(By Elizabeth Shelton)

The Nation's only totally urban land grant college, Federal City College, is copying its country cousins and carrying homemaking and 4–H programs to District residents.

The Cooperative Extension Service program was described yesterday by the College's Associate Dean, Dr. Selma Lippeatt, who said trained nutrition aides are helping Far Northeast and Model Cities area housewives to plan balanced meals on low incomes.

In some cases, the aides, who are residents of the areas served, have become "emotionally disturbed" by conditions of malnutrition, approaching starvation, in homes they have visited, Dr. Lippeatt said.

A group of 12 of the aides, trained intensively by Federal City College before being sent out to rap on doors, is working in the Northeast area. Another 15 recently began canvassing the redevelopment area bounded by Massachusetts and Florida aves., 15th st. nw. and Bladensburg rd., ne.

Dr. Lippeatt estimates the 27 nutrition aides will be able to reach some 1800 families with five or more members by June 30.

The aides have not had "100 per cent success every time they knocked on a door," Dr. Lippeatt conceded, but, she said, there has been a great deal of interest in "better buymanship," how to stretch a dollar, how to use the food stamp program and manage family finances.

The National Capital Housing Authority granted the Extension Service the use of an apartment in the Lincoln Heights center at 51st st. ne., and with the cooperation of the tenant council and other community organizations, adult classes in homemaking are held there.

A homemaker who has been using raw milk is taught she can get twice as much for her money by using dried whole milk in her cooking and disguising it with flavorings when using it as a beverage.

In poor families where obesity, due to cheap fatty meats and a predominance of starches, is a problem, the homemaker is encouraged to substitute dried skim milk. The nutrition aides also discourage sugary fruit drinks made with powder and fattening but nonnutritious snacks for growing children.

"You can enrich snack time by adding dried milk and apple sauce to peanut butter," Dr. Lippeatt explained. When hunger in the District was last surveyed, she added, "the amount of milk in diets of young children was very high on the list" of inadequacies.

The aides visting their neighbors wear name tags and hand out brochures reading, "I am a Cooperative Extension Service Aide. I work with Federal City College. These are the kinds of things I can help you to do:" The services offered are illustrated by pictures.

Of the Service's youth development program, Dr. Lippeatt said it is expected between 1000 and 1500 young people will be working in 4-H or other youth development programs by the end of June. "This is only the beginning, the first stage," she said.

Dr. Lippeatt, whose offices are at 815 Mt. Vernon pl. nw., is a former dean of the Home Economics Department of the University of Maryland and a former deputy to the Director of the Women's Job Corps.

HUMAN EVENTS RECEIVES 25TH ANNIVERSARY COMMENDATIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, 25 years ago, in Washington, a small group of knowledgeable and patriotic Americans joined in starting a new medium of communication from our National Capital, which at that time was a weekly newsletter called Human Events. It was printed on a four-page folio. This effort to bring to serious-minded Americans some of the little-published but highly significant reports of activities and developments in our National Capital struck a responsive chord in this country, and the infant enterprise developed with unusual speed.

Some years later, the format of Human Events was changed from that of the usual newsletter to that of a magazine format published in the nature of a weekly report of tabloid newspaper size. It has continued to grow and prosper in this new format and Human Events is now firmly established as one of our country's important and widely read media, emphasizing the achievements of good government and the challenges confronting its preservation as viewed primarily, from the standpoint of those devoted to constitional conservatism.

On the occasion of its 25th anniversary, Human Events published a special birthday edition which included expressions of commendation, congratulations, and well wishes from a great many well-known and highly regarded American readers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD pages 39 through 44 of the April 12 "birthday edition" of Human Events, so that Senators and the country generally may read these expressions of high regard for one of America's most lively and factual weekly magazines.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREETINGS ON HUMAN EVENTS' 25TH ANNIVERSARY

Holmes Alexander, *Author and Syndicated Columnist*—"I want to congratulate *Human Events* on its 25th Anniversary. No other publication has been so constant in its duty to bring facts and viewpoints to the American readership. *Human Events* has been resilient in times of adversity and responsive in times that called for revaluation of news representation. It has been inflexible only on fundamental principles of truth and the republican form of government which our country was founded upon."

Tom Anderson, *President, Southern Farm Publications*—"Since its inception *Human Events* has been one of my favorites. It is newsworthy, factual and educational. The same can be said of many publications, but in addition to those attributes, *Human Events* is entertaining and highly readable. Sadly, *that* cannot be said of many so-called conservative publications. *Human Events* deserves the support of all Americans who believe in God, family, country and freedom."

Dr. Edward R. Annis, *Past President, American Medical Association*—"The national liberal communications media as a whole are determined to present a distorted, fragmentary, and often deliberately misleading interpretion of the news. Publications like *Human Events*—and they are all too few—present the other side of the story, and the whole story, for evaluation and critical appraisal from a necessarily broad perspective."

Rep. Leslie C. Arends (*R.-Ill.*)—"I should like to extend to all associated with this publication my heartiest congratulations. It is the clash of opinions that makes the wheels of democracy turn. *Human Events* has been of great value over the years in presenting a point of view that so often has gone unexpressed in other media of communication. I have been a regular reader of your publication and, to say the least, it has regularly presented the important facts that often escape notice and consideration."

Rep. John M. Ashbrook (*R.-Ohio*), *Chairman American Conservative Union*—"The resurgence of conservatism in our country during the past few years has been due, in no small part, to the faithful reporting of *Human Events* and we can never thank them enough. *Human Events* has served as a beacon light in the fog of managed news which has been foisted on the American people by the liberal press. As I travel the country, I find that *Human Events* reaches every area and is one of those ties which brings together the responsible constitutional conservatives who work for our principles and oppose socialism and communism. Certainly, achieving this significant milestone is a most commendable occasion. I offer my best wishes for 25 more good years for *Human Events* as we conservatives build a more effective political force in our country."

Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, *former Secretary of Agriculture*—"For years I have read with interest and appreciation current issues of *Human Events* and extend my sincere congratulations for its 25 years of service to the people of the United States and the cause of freedom."

Dr. Geo. S. Benson, *President, National Education Program; President Emeritus, Harding College*—"Twenty years ago we began our subscription to *Human Events*. Its intelligent journalism and the courage and patriotism of its publishers and editors have served well the cause of freedom. It has been a priceless aid to our National Education Program staff in the preparation of our own educational materials reaching an estimated 25 million people weekly. We wish to voice our heartfelt congratulations to *Human Events* on its 25th birthday and express our gratitude for its distinguished service to mankind."

Kenneth G. Bentson, *Chairman, Guaranty Trust Co., Phoenix*—"You can be justly proud of the impact and influence *Human Events* has had on thinking Americans during your 25 years in publication. The permissive men of government who have allowed socialism, crime, riots and inflation are on their way out, thanks to you people of *Human Events*, and I hope for a long, long time."

Rep. Ben B. Blackburn (*R.-Ga.*)—"At a time when most publications appear to be dominated by writers intent on promoting socialism, the demise of our federal system and the loss of local control over local matters, it is refreshing and encouraging to have a publication which speaks out in favor of protecting basic American principles which have given rise to our nation's great success. In my opinion, the American public has begun to recognize the fallacies which exist in much of the thinking which has been fed to them in recent years. Such fallacies can only be exposed through presentations by publications such as yours."

Prof. Anthony T. Bouscaren, *Political Science Department, Le Moyne College*—"I congratulate the editors of *Human Events* on the occasion of the 25th Anniversary of this fine weekly Washington report. Over the years I have found *Human Events* to be indispensable in keeping up with the key issues which confront us."

L. Brent Bozell, *Editor, Triumph Magazine*—"I have found *Human Events* a consistently valuable source of political news from that increasingly rare perspective, thoughtful American conservatism."

Hon. Spruille Braden, *former U.S. Ambassador*—"I am delighted to express my approval of *Human Events*, to which I have been a subscriber practically ever since I returned from my diplomatic service abroad in 1945. . . . I might add that each time I have resubscribed to *Human Events* it has been for the longest period possible. It was *Human Events* which in the middle of August 1957, a year and a half before the Communists took over in Cuba on Jan. 1, 1959, when Castro came down from the hills, published an article in which I said that if the United States government continued with its then policy we would get Castro, chaos and communism in Cuba. This article was ignored by the State Department. . . . it would be a godsend to the country if some of our so-called leading journals would be replaced by *Human Events*."

Wm. H. Brady, Jr., *President, W. H. Brady Co.*—"The singular accomplishment of *Human Events* is that for 25 years it has challenged the liberal illuminati, and has given great hope and greater courage to conservatives everywhere."

Walter Brennan, *Actor*—"The busy person who desires to keep informed on the rapidly changing events in this most crucial time in our history will find the facts in *Human Events*. I read every issue."

Hon. John W. Bricker, *former U.S. Senator*—"I am glad to offer my congratulations to *Human Events* on the occasion of its 25th year of publication. I read in it many things I would not otherwise read in other papers or hear on radio or television."

Rep. Bill Brock (*R.-Tenn.*)—"In the past quarter century, thanks to the efforts of responsible, resourceful reporting and analysis such as that in *Human Events*, public opinion in America has slowly but surely been influenced. Today, the results of this long campaign of educating the public and keeping it informed have paid off. In the elections of 1966 and 1968, millions of Americans showed a new awareness of the issues and a stronger support for good, sound government. *Human Events* is one of the reasons for this great popular breakthrough, and so its 25th Anniversary comes at a specially appropriate time. Best wishes for the future, and congratulations on a job well done."

Rep. Joel T. Broyhill (*R.-Va.*)—"You are to be congratulated on 25 years of consistently fair presentation of the conservative viewpoint, which is so seldom presented in other news media."

Avery Brundage, *Chairman, International Olympic Committee*—"My compliments on 25 years of effective efforts toward sanity in government. Congratulations."

David Tennant Bryan, *Chairman and Publisher, Richmond Newspapers, Inc.*—"I have discussed with my colleagues (responsible for the editorial pages of these newspapers) their own opinions of *Human Events* and find that we are all remarkably in harmony. We believe that *Human Events* has been one of the most consistently reliable, perennially readable, continuously informative publications of any stature and, in our opinion, it is the grand-daddy of contemporary conservative publications: It is our belief that conservatism can thrive in this country only so long as *Human Events*, and its companion publications, continue to expound the conservative doctrine, to provide a forum for conservative thought and to serve as a source to which conservatives may turn for facts and explanations. We are particularly pleased that *Human Events* finds occasion with some frequency to reprint editorials from the *Times-Dispatch* and the *News Leader*."

Patrick J. Buchanan, *Special Assistant to the President*—"Both as an editorial writer and an assistant to the President, I have found *Human Events* to be an indispensable source of information on the conservative movement and an invaluable symposium of some of the best of conservative writing and thinking in the United States. I would not be without a subscription."

Wm. F. Buckley, Jr., *Editor, National Review*—"I am delighted to joint in complimenting the editors of *Human Events* on the survival of their admirable journal over the years. It is a far different publication now from what it was a quarter-century ago when I first came across it. It was then the only lighthouse around—four pages of informed news commentary by Frank Hanighen, an essay of four pages, and once a month a European report. My first published piece (outside school and college stuff) was there, so that I am indebted to it not only for its public, but for its personal services. My heartiest congratulations to the able team which is now in control of it."

Rep. George Bush (*R.-Tex.*)—"I'm sure you will hear from many people on the general benefit they feel your publication has been to their communities, but I wanted to add my words of congratulations and best wishes for many more years!"

Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. (*D.-Va.*)—"Your editors and staff deserve a rating of high excellence for a helpful evaluation of vital national issues and problems. My hope is that *Human Events* will maintain its important contributions to our true national welfare far into the future. I know they are needed and believe they will be appreciated."

Taylor Caldwell, *Author*—"I rely on *Human Events* to get the truth in the current news."

Jameson G. Campaigne, *Editor, Indianapolis Star*—"We at the Indianapolis *Star* have been reading *Human Events* since the days of Felix Morley, Frank Hanighen and Jim Wick and though it has gone through many changes it still serves as an inspiration and informant for conservative writers and thinkers. In those early days it seemed like a lonely voice, but I am glad to be able to say that its influence was in large measure responsible for the rise and success of other conservative journals and magazines, and for the growing success of conservative influence among young Americans. It has always been useful to us as a source of information and a challenging expression of vigorous conservative philosophy. I can only hope for its continued success in the future."

John Chamberlain, *Author and Syndicated Columnist*—"I rely on *Human Events* absolutely. Long life to you."

William Henry Chamberlin, *Author*—"As one of the frequent early contributors to *Human Events*, launched by the late Frank Hanighen and Felix Morley during the war, I am glad to offer 25th birthday greetings to a publication that has never gone with the tide and has provided a continual voice of dissenting criticism of the many follies of United States foreign and domestic policy. I think especially of its vigorous rejection of the adulation of Stalin which was all too common in the war years and engulfed some of our best-known magazines and commentators. *Human Events* has also furnished a rallying point for critics of the unsound financial and economic policies that have led the United States down the primrose path of inflation. May its 50th and 100th birthdays be equally or more auspicious."

Fred G. Clark. *Chairman, American Economic Foundation*—"Twenty-five years ago I had occasion to congratulate Frank Hanighen on having launched a new potential means of communicating significant news generally ignored by the mass media. Today, I congratulate you for having made this potential a reality. The truth is not always popular, but it is always important."

Gen. Mark W. Clark—"As an avid reader of *Human Events*, I am deeply impressed with the value of such a publication. Since the conservative point of view has so few eloquent voices in these times, *Human Events* takes on added importance in our day. It is my hope that it will long continue and that other quality conservative publications will follow in its wake."

Prof. Roy Colby, *Colorado State College*—"It is obvious that movements, trends and significant events on both the national and international scene are subject, in general, to two diverse interpretations: (1) that of the collectivists, who misuse words to coerce men into desiring and accepting what is deemed good for them by other men; and (2) that of the liberators of the human spirit, who encourage men to develop their potentialities as individuals. For a quarter of a century, *Human Events* has been exposing the seductive but spurious values of the former position and extolling the merits of the latter."

Joe Crail, *President, Coast Federal Savings and Loan Association*—"*Human Events* is 'first reading' when it arrives every week. *Human Events* provides valuable intellectual leadership and documentation for letters, speeches and educational material in our struggle against the rise of a Socialist dictator. It is also interesting news, as it happens, and with background material of the liberal-conservative conflict in Washington and throughout the country. The dedicated publishers, editors, writers and supporters have my thanks and congratulations for 25 years of important as well as entertaining service."

Rep. William C. Cramer (*R.-Fla.*)—"*Human Events* has rendered an outstanding public service in making known to its subscribers what is going on in government and calling attention to the people the serious problems which our country is facing. Many of my constituents and friends read *Human Events* and have expressed their sincere appreciation to me for the valuable information that has been provided to them. I myself have found much of the material enlightening and interesting and I look forward to receiving continued issues."

Philip M. Crane, *Author, Academician*—"Congratulations to *Human Events* on its Silver Anniversary. Thank God for Frank Hanighen, James Wick, Milton Wick, and the entire *Human Events* family. *Human Events* is a trusted friend no conservative can afford to be without. Its journalistic integrity and reportorial accuracy are as vital in trying to to keep Republican administrations honest as in exposing the heavy-handedness of every Democratic administration since the publication's birth. May *Human Events* continue to enjoy good health for another quarter-century and may it ever adhere to its policy of independence of any individual, however exalted, and complete dependence upon principle, however degraded."

Sen. Carl T. Curtis (*R.-Neb.*)—"*Human Events* is a publication that performs a very definite and beneficial public service. I like its fearless devotion to principle and to the preservation of the political philosophy that has made the United States a great nation. Because of its uniqueness it gives to its readers needed information not found elsewhere."

Wainwright Dawson Jr., *Chairman, United Republicans of America*—"The consistently sound information and analysis on the state of our Republic has made *Human Events* the greatest political tool in publishing today. Conservatives all across the country agree that *Human Events* is the major cohesive force of our cause. I hope we may count on this effective newspaper for another 25 years at least."

Prof. Gottfried Dietze, *Department of Political Science, Johns Hopkins University*—"Congratulations on your 25th Anniversary! *Human Events* has rendered a great service by staunchly defending free government and by constantly reminding the people of the venerable ideals of the Constitution. My best wishes for your continued success!"

Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, *Department of Economics, Georgetown University*—"On its 25th Anniversary *Human Events* deserves the greatest tribute for its forthright and courageous reporting of news, events and interpretations that ordinarily cannot be found in most periodicals and newspapers. It fully represents what Jefferson meant: 'When the press is free and every man able to read, all is safe.' "

John Dos Passos, *Author*—"I have subscribed to *Human Events* since its inception 25 years ago. With the increasing deterioration of the daily press as a source of news an opposition organ becomes more and more needed. To obtain any kind of balanced picture of what is going on in the world you have to have the other side of the story. *Human Events* furnishes that other side of the story."

Rep. John Dowdy (*D.-Tex.*)—"*Human Events* has displayed courage and insight during the years I have read this publication. I have found this paper to be dependable, and I am glad to receive it from time to time."

Allen Drury, *Author*—"*Human Events* is to be congratulated on reaching its 25th birthday in such lively and effective shape. It digs into dark corners and brings into the light many interesting facts which otherwise would be carefully swept under the rug by the so-called 'liberals.' This is an invaluable service in a era when some extremely powerful broom-wielders are doing some very frantic sweeping. May the next 25 years be as constructive and worthwhile."

Hon. Charles Edison, *former Governor of New Jersey and Secretary of the Navy*—"As a subscriber to *Human Events* from its very beginning, I have found it consistently excellent and most helpful in keeping me accurately informed on important issues of the day. I look forward eagerly to reading it every week. Hearty congratulations on your 25th Anniversary."

Sen. Sam J. Ervin, Jr. (*D.-N.C.*)—"*Human Events* has rendered great service to the American people by its constant advocacy of the fundamental principles upon which the United States was founded. I commend its reading to all Americans who believe that liberty is the supreme value of civilization, and trust that it will have other anniversaries throughout the foreseeable future."

Sen. Paul Fannin (*R.-Ariz.*)—"*Human Events* has been most helpful to me in my service in the United States Senate. There I find stories and information that appear in no other weekly publication. Often this information appears in *Human Events* days and weeks before I see it printed elsewhere. Therefore I consider *Human Events* a vital part of the Washington news scene and wish many more years of publication to those in charge."

Lawrence Fertig, *Author, Economist*—"*Human Events* fills an important need in the intellectual life of Conservatives. It provides essential information to guide one's thinking and it also gives encouragement and inspiration to those who are dedicated to the preservation of a free society. In view of calculated distortion of news in the press, and by radio and television commentators, *Human Events* is all the more important these days. Nowhere else can one read the weekly comments of so many leading Conservative writers, and nowhere else can one get the kind of information which is either eliminated or submerged by general news media."

John M. Fisher, *President, American Security Council*—"I have found that *Human Events*, over the years, has been alert to matters affecting our national security and responsible and articulate in expressing its point of view with regard to these issues."

Frank Flick, *President, Flick-Reedy Corp.*—"Whether we are losing the battle and are destined by God to be the remnants, or holding the line, or reversing the tide of false teaching, *Human Events* will go down in history as one who contributed great things in a tireless and encouraging manner."

Rep. Gerald R. Ford (*R.-Mich.*)—"Conservatism needs more than routine exposition. If the true meaning of conservatism is to be understood, it needs enlightened interpretation. That is what *Human Events* has been providing for a quarter of a century—a service most beneficial in this world of sharply contending political philosophies. It therefore gives me pleasure to pay tribute to the editors and staff of *Human Events* in this 25th Anniversary Issue."

Rep. Ed Foreman (*R.-N.M.*)—"*Human Events* is one of my favorite publications. Consistently—it is objective in its reporting, correct in its analysis—it remains a most important piece of reading matter. For a nation weary of liberal rhetoric, *Human Events* offers—as it has for the last 25 years—a clear, reasonable approach to event-making news."

Patrick J. Frawley Jr., *Chairman, Schick Safety Razor Co.*—"*Human Events* is 'must reading' for getting a full and balanced viewpoint of what is happening in the nation. Its style of interesting, responsible and accurate reporting makes it easy to keep on reading every week."

Sen. Barry M. Goldwater (*R.-Ariz.*)—"I am very happy to tell you what a great contribution I feel *Human Events* has made and is making in the not-too-easy task of telling the American people about honest conservatism. It has been of great value to me in my years in the Senate, and I look forward to working with the staff in the years ahead."

Pierre F. Goodrich, *Attorney*—"My remembrance of *Human Events* goes back to the first copy I ever received which must have been in 1944. I was throwing away mail, but this particular thing happened to arrive in my wastebasket face up and it said *Human Events*. I thought that was a strange title and I pulled it out of my basket. I have been a reader of *Human Events* ever since then. . . . There are some parts of the country where we can buy the Chicago *Tribune* and the Indianapolis *Star*. There are other parts of the country where that is impossible. While *Human Events* is welcome reading even in this hopefully better-informed area, it surely must be worthwhile where there is no news coverage otherwise. . . . I think *Human Events* is an important weekly newspaper which colleges may well less justly omit than their necessity of having the New York *Times*. I am wondering if you might not test somewhat the intellectual integrity of the college by the extent to which it excludes one or the other or both."

Wm. J. Grede, *Chairman, Grede Foundries, Inc.*—"Some people are still thanking me and expressing appreciation for the fact that on that first launching of *Human Events*, I placed their names on the subscription list. Through the intervening years, *Human Events* has consistently carried on a program of objective reporting and at the same time, when the bulk of the mass media press were extolling the virtues of the trend toward socialism, *Human Events* kept the fundamental American philosophy of freedom clearly before the eyes of its readers. For this reason it has served not only as an inspiration for me, but has served well as an educational tool which I have for many years made available to staff and other employes in our company, to educators at grade, high school, and college level, and to college students. It is my hope that this 25th Anniversary is only a way station on a continuing journey dedicated to the preservation of conservatism and freedom in a free America."

Rep. H. R. Gross (*R.-Iowa*)—"I have been a regular reader of *Human Events* for many years and have always found its articles to be accurate and informative. Most importantly, it performs a vital function in espousing the conservative cause."

Rep. Charles S. Gubser (*R.-Calif*)—"In my opinion, *Human Events* presents the conservative point of view in a manner which is completely responsible and ethical. By so doing, it contributes to the national welfare by helping to balance the information on which national policy is based. I wish you many more successful years of printing the truth."

Sen. Edward J. Gurney (*R.-Fla.*)—"Ever since *Human Events* was founded it has been a valuable source of information for the Conservative community. In my own case, it has saved my staff and me from tedious research and helped to keep us informed on the thinking in this country. Many of us read *Human Events* as a guide and use it to supplement our own thinking. I can only hope the editors continue to publish this fine newspaper, and in doing so, continue their outstanding service, not only to the Conservative element in this country, but also to all concerned Americans."

Rep. Durward G. Hall (*R.-Mo.*)—"*Human Events* has served as an effective voice in combating and answering the privileged liberal dogma. It has also served as a thoughtful and constructive exponent of the conservative cause."

Sen. Clifford P. Hansen (*R.-Wyo.*).—"Let me extend my thanks to the staff of *Human Events* for articulating a valid point of view that all too often would be not adequately covered if not for your efforts. There are a number of us who appreciate the efforts that you have made in the past and look forward to your contributions in the years ahead."

Walter Harnischfeger, *Chairman Harnischfeger Corp.*—"I was well acquainted with Mr. Hanighen who founded this publication. It is one of the outstanding publications which is consistently writing articles on economic and political conditions and expressing the truth. In this day and age, when there is so much false propaganda, it is of great importance that there is a newspaper like *Human Events* still in existence."

Henry Hazzlitt, *Author and Economist*—"If *Human Events* did not exist, I for one would be a less informed man, and certainly a far more discouraged one. *Human Events* has been important to me first of all because of its background information and its news—news of political developments, plans and plots that one seldom gets in the ordinary newspapers and newsmagazines. In addition to that I find it a constant source of encouragement. It tells me that I am not alone. Whenever I am disturbed by some new leftist development, some new scheme of government spending, some new usurpation of government power or extension of the welfare state, and find nothing but praise for this development in the Establishment press, my sense of frustration is almost sure to be relieved by the next issue of *Human Events*, where I find a realistic appraisal of the new project. *Human Events* has given encouragement and a wider audience to many of the country's outstanding conservative writers, and increased their influence individually and collectively. It has been second to no other periodical in its defense of free enterprise, law, order, honorable peace, and individual freedom. America will need it even more in the next 25 years than in the last 25 years."

John A. Howard, *President, Rockford College*—"In an era when a great part of the public news media has maintained a forceful editorial policy in support of governmental answers to the great problems of society, *Human Events* has provided one of the few consistent and forthright voices in behalf of local initiative and individual responsibility for decision-making. Our country is the stronger for the courage of *Human Events* in making widely known both the philosophical and the practical reasons for maintaining a decentralized society."

Sen. Roman L. Hruska (*R.-Neb.*)—"It has become commonplace over the past quarter-century for constituents to send me clippings from *Human Events* with the observation that 'the enclosed article says it better than I can.' I can think of no higher praise for a publication which seeks to present a consistent and outspoken viewpoint on the issues which confront our nation."

William Jackman, *President, Investors League, Inc.*—"Many congratulations to you and your predecessors for keeping *Human Events* alive and active for the past 25 years. No one interested in national politics and economics should do without it. Your editorial staff is excellent. The conservative community now needs it more than ever. It deserves to receive a great deal more corporate institutional advertising."

David R. Jones, *Executive Director, Young Americans for Freedom*—"*Human Events* has been the pace-setter for those young Americans who want this nation to be a beacon light for free men everywhere. *Human Events* has provided thousands of young Americans with an up-to-date review and preview of news emanating from our Nation's Capital. Those who cherish individual liberty through constitutional government can be grateful for the efforts of those who keep the torch of liberty glowing at *Human Events*."

Jenkin Lloyd Jones, *Editor and Publisher, Tulsa Tribune*—"One of the strongest points of *Human Events* is its willingness to document in detail a case against some of the popular thinking of the moment. Good journalism in every age requires observers who have the courage to defy orthodoxy and to think unthinkable thoughts. I find a lot in *Human Events* that is worth thinking about."

Howard E. Kershner, *Editor, Christian Economics*—"*Human Events* is the best collection of news and comment on political affairs coming out of Washington. I have read it almost from the beginning and find it indispensable to one who seeks to keep abreast of the Washington scene. As a columnist, radio commentator, editor and writer on political, economic and international affairs, I would not be without this useful aid. Best wishes for the next quarter-century."

James J. Kilpatrick, *Syndicated Columnist*—"In terms of conservative values, *Human Events* performs the same vital function that once was performed by the patriarchs of ancient tribes. Their task was to preserve the tablets—to see that the laws and covenants and judgments, graven in stone, were passed from one generation to another. One of the happy aspects of *Human Events*, however, is that its editors do not perform this solemn task solemnly. They go at it lustily—even belligerently—in the combative spirit of men who love to fight for the causes they cherish. They hit hard;and they consistently come up with reports and viewpoints that I find nowhere else."

Gov. Claude R. Kirk Jr. *of Florida*—"*Human Events* has fulfilled a role in American journalism for 25 years as an articulate advocate for the conservative point of view. Best wishes on this 25th Anniversary and for at least 25 more years of outstanding service to your readers."

Russell Kirk, *Author and Syndicated Columnist*—"It is heartening to observe the steady growth of *Human Events* over the years in vigor, circulation and practical influence. The paper commenced as an endeavor to counter injustice and imprudence in American foreign policy; it now casts its net wide. It is weary work, contending against the follies of the mass-age; but the editors of *Human Events* cheerfully take arms against our sea of troubles."

Walter Knott, *President, Knott's Berry Farm*—"Congratulations to *Human Events* on its 25th Anniversary. It has been my pleasure to watch you grow. I have always found your articles interesting, enlightening and courageous; and may you continue to provide such articles for your readership."

Gen. Thomas A. Lane, *Author, Syndicated Columnist, President, Americans for Constitutional Action*—"Ours is an age when reason is overwhelmed by errors. The liberal news media are floundering in a fog of emotional irrelevance. Our people are oppressed and bewildered by bad counsel. To this scene, *Human Events* brings clear vision and sound analysis. On my lecture tours, I have been told repeatedly by concerned citizens, 'I didn't know what was happening in this country until a friend gave me a subscription to *Human Events*.' I rejoice in this 25th birthday of *Human Events* and in its growing acceptance by our people. Where *Human Events* goes, light is shed."

Reed Larson, *Executive Vice President, National Right to Work Committee*—"I look forward to receiving *Human Events* each week. It provides a breadth of coverage and insight which is available from no other publication. *Human Events* offers an important service for the entire nation by providing a measure of balance to the reporting available to the American people."

Victor Lasky, *Author and Syndicated Columnist*—"*Human Events* is not only the voice of decent conservatism—at a time when conservative voices are few and far between—but it is always readable, exciting and provocative. Long may it be published!"

Fulton Lewis III, *Radio Commentator*—"When historians write their reviews of the past quarter of a century, they will find it difficult to ignore the magnificent role which *Human Events* has played in the crusade to preserve American principles. I am proud to be among the many who salute you on the occasion of your 25th Anniversary. As a distinguished, responsible and dynamic voice of conservatism, you have earned and deserve much respect and admiration."

William Loeb, *President, Manchester* (*N.H.*) *Union Leader*—"Every U.S. citizen who wants to see our nation develop and grow in harmony with the principles set forth by the signers of the Declaration of Independence should read *Human Events* each week so as to determine how the battle is going and on what new bastion the enemy must be met. For a quarter of a century *Human Events* has been the lighthouse on freedom's shores."

Ted Loeffler, *President, Viewpoint Books*—"In an era which has seen the inauguration of more Socialist programs than the United States has ever known, *Human Events* dared to speak out; dared to have a purpose and make it known. The dedication of *Human Events* to fearless reporting from a conservative viewpoint has played no small part in the holding action against incompetence and political irresponsibility."

Philip Abbott Luce, *Author*—"*Human Events* is the ony publication that isn't afraid to report the truth every week from our Nation's Capital. If I had to depend upon the generally accepted mass media outlets for my news from Washington, then I might be tempted to 'drop-out' of the political fight. I hasten to add the fact, generally unknown and never unfortunately boasted about, that the owners and staff at *Human Events* represent the youngest political talent on any major political publication in the United States. Any college student fearful of the 'system' need only look at Tom Winter, Bob Kephart and Allan Rsykind to find the courage to buck the current ultra-liberal political trend. The staff at *Human Events* has proven that you can be young, radical and truthful while producing a weekly newspaper that causes our liberals and leftists to retreat to their philosophically dark and dank ivory towers."

Rep. Donald E. "Buz" Lukens (*R.-Ohio*)—"On occasion I have not agreed with you; however, your paper has never failed to shed a refreshing insight to the many problems facing our country. To the truly concerned American, regardless of his ideology, *Human Events* has succeeded in broadening the individual's knowledge of the issues of the day when that individual would normally have been handicapped and shortsighted because of the predominately liberal editorials presented by the majority of the news media."

Daniel Lyons, S.J., *Author, Editor, Twin Circle*—"*Human Events* is by far the finest publication in its field. It is required reading in order to keep informed on what concerns our country. I read it every week and would never be without it."

Eugene Lyons, *Author and former Senior Editor, The Reader's Digest*—"I have been a subscriber to *Human Events* from the day it was founded and an occasional contributor throughout the years. So it is almost as a member of the family that I want to congratulate not only the newspaper, but ourselves. Left-liberal propaganda in the last dozen years has succeeded, alas, in turning 'anti-Communist' into a dirty word. The need for hard, dedicated anti-communism is therefore especially urgent today, and support for *Human Events* consequently indispensable."

J. Daniel Mahoney, *State Chairman, Conservative Party of New York*—"*Human Events* has been a tremendous source of information, counsel and journalistic leadership to the entire conservative community. The growth of the conservative movement in recent years is attributable in no small part to the inspiration and guidance which *Human Events* has provided over the past 25 years. Not only has *Human Events* been in the forefront of day-to-day political developments, it has also played a key role in shaping the thinking of the conservative leaders who are now at the forefront of the American conservative movement. All of us owe a great debt of gratitude to *Human Events* for its fine work over the years."

Clarence Manion, *former Dean, Notre Dame Law School*—"I can hardly believe that I have been receiving *Human Events* for *only* 25 years. It seems to me that the solid Conservative convictions that it helped me to form are much older than that. But I am sure of this: I couldn't do without *Human Events* now. So may God bless *Human Events* and keep it coming."

Hughston M. McBain, *former Chairman, Marshall Field and Co.*—"Looking back across the years, what impresses me most about *Human Events* is that no one need ever be ashamed of what it has said, or the positions taken, on countless important issues. I know of no other publication with such a record. How did this happen? I think I know the answer. From the start, its editors' credo has been truthfulness and integrity. They have remained steadfast against the temptations ever before them to 'go along with the crowd,' 'butter-up politicians and bureaucrats,' and let 'expediency' cause them to let down their standards."

Neil McCaffrey, *President, Conservative Book Club*—"I know of no publication over the past quarter-century that has been so consistently reliable, accurate, perceptive and comprehensive in its political coverage as *Human Events*. Without *Human Events*, many conservatives would have been flying on one engine—and many others would have been grounded. My one regret is that it took most of these 25 years for this valuable weekly to reach a circulation of 100,000. I hope it reaches 200,000 much faster. That will be a sign that our country has turned the corner."

Charles A. McManus, *Executive Director, Americans for Constitutional Action*—"For 25 years *Human Events* has consistently been in the forefront of the crusade to provide accurate and worthwhile news of vital importance to the over-all workings of our political system and the success of our constitutional form of government. *Human Events* has provided an invaluable service to the public by presenting responsible conservative opinions along with a clear, concise summary of current events. For many years responsible conservative groups have been fighting for a cause that at times seemed lost, or at best unpopular. Finally, through a monumental effect, with *Human Events* among the leaders, constitutional conservatives have reached a position of strength which seemed virtually unattainable 25 years ago."

Rogers Milliken, *President, Deering Milliken, Inc.*—"Responsible citizenship requires that said citizen shall be as well informed as possible on the issues affecting his country. *Human Events* over the years has done much to bring to the attention of its readership an extremely important point of view in the analysis of the news which has done much to round out the knowledge of its readers."

Raymond Moley, *Syndicated Columnist*—"I have never known a more dedicated and unselfish man than Frank Hanighen and that applies equally to Jim Wick. If they were alive I know they would rejoice in the growth and influence, and the extension of coverage that is represented in *Human Events* today. With so many of our publications following the Liberal party line, especially the ones that emanate from New York, this torchbearer of sound principles is a blessing for a country which must return to fundamental principles or it too, like other great nations, will perish. This mission is now entrusted to new editors who are equally dedicated to the objectives which the founders established so many years ago. As a journalist I find it indispensable writing every week."

Adm. Ben Moreell, *Chairman, Americans for Constitutional Action*—"I have always been proud of the fact that I was among the first supporters of *Human Events* when it was officially launched in 1944. As I look back over the years since that date I am impressed by the almost insuperable difficulties that this struggling venture has faced and overcome. It has not been easy, I know. It took dedication to high ideals, perseverance, wisdom and lots of courage to stay with the task during many years when the going was very, very rough. There is no way to calculate one's debt to *Human Events*. Perhaps those who owe most are the starry-eyed liberals who more than once were saved from their folly by the courageous men of *Human Events* who were resisting them! But all of us are indebted to them for holding high the banner of freedom while many of us slept!"

George Morgenstern, *Editor, Editorial Page, Chicago Tribune*—"I was an admirer and friend of Frank Hanighen, who founded *Human Events* 25 years ago, and wrote with some regularity for his weekly report on the national scene. We felt a wrench at his passing, but, providentially, *Human Events* went on, and its standards of conviction and courage are no less than they were in his day. As a reflection of what is right and what is wrong in America, and especially in its political management and its courage in world affairs, *Human Events* gives heart and direction to conservatives. As long as it persists, we may hope that our day will yet come."

C. C. Moseley, *Businessman*—"I have read *Human Events* with great interest since its inception and have been so impressed by the outstanding job it does of informing our conservative community concerning the problems confronting our nation every day that I have subscribed for many of my friends."

Edgar Ansel Mowrer, *Author and Syndicated Columnist*—"During the quarter-century of its existence, *Human Events* has kept the torch of freedom burning, notably at times when other Americans, misguided or over-optimistic, have sought to replace it by a torch of peace. This is a great achievement."

Sen. Karl E. Mundt (*R.-S.D.*)—"Whether it be a background analysis of the forces at play within and without America shaping foreign policy, or an in-depth exposure of under-the-table dealings designed to siphon away tax dollars from legitimate use, or a simple barb deflating the pomposity of some power-hungry political figure, the impact of *Human Events* has been a forceful voice for national liberty and individual freedom. No one can measure the contributions of *Human Events* in helping the citizens of this free nation better understand the swift-moving events which have enveloped our world in this quarter of a century. Fortunately it is not necessary to gauge these contributions, for the fact that this is the 25th Annniversary observance of the publication speaks well of its influence and foreshadows its continuing importance in the coming years."

Sen. George Murphy (*R.-Calif.*)—"As you well know, I am a consistent and avid reader of *Human Events* and find it of special importance not only in helping to form decisions, but also in keeping well-informed on the many matters which daily concern all of us."

Frederic Nelson, *former Editor, Editorial Page, Saturday Evening Post*—"I take in, as the British put it, three newspapers every day, but still find in *Human Events* important news which eluded all of them."

Arthur C. Nielsen Sr., *Chairman, A. C. Nielsen Co.*—"According to my observations, *Human Events* has made substantial contributions to our country in many ways. By keeping its readers well informed about many operations of government—operations very unlikely to come to their notice through other channels. By equipping teachers, ministers of the gospel and other influential persons with important, interesting facts and ideas which they can and do pass on to their students and congregations. By providing political workers with information which not only results in a great increase in their effectiveness, but also inspires them to work more actively for the important causes in which they believe. In these and other ways *Human Events* is playing an important and effective role in slowing the growth of government where further growth is unjustified, increasing the efficiency of government by exposing flagrant cases of waste and improving the morality of government by exposing unethical conduct."

Peter O'Donnell, Jr., *Chairman, Republican Party of Texas*—"I find *Human Events* to be very valuable because it gives excerpts of important news from a wide range of publications."

Otto F. Otepka, *Member-Designate, Subversive Activities Control Board*—"On the occasion of the 25th Anniversary of *Human Events*, I feel greatly honored as a government employe to offer my views on the services your publication has contributed as encouragement to every federal employe who exercises his rights in the interest of principles that have always been a part of our national heritage. I have been a reader of *Human Events* since 1946 and I know from such experience that you have consistently maintained the highest standards of reportorial integrity and accuracy in presenting current news about matters that affect our national security. I can also say from my own experiences that the American people need a publication like *Human Events* to tell them the facts about national affairs which they are entitled to know that frequently are absent from the columns of many daily newspapers."

John H. Platts, *President, Whirlpool Corp.*—"It is with great interest that I look forward to receiving each issue of *Human Events*. While I frequently find my posture on a subject somewhat more liberal than that of the *Human Events* staff—nonetheless, their points of view are objectively presented and fully researched."

Stefan T. Possony, *Director, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace*—"*Human Events* is one of the most informative publications in the United States. It has provided a forum for the discussion of issues which are shunned by our mass media, and it has contributed a great deal to the clarification of public issues. *Human Events* seeks the truth, not cheap popularity."

Eugene C. Pulliam, *Publisher, Phoenix Republic and Gazette*—"I have long admired *Human Events'* ability to dig behind the news headlines and come up with significant information that is otherwise often ignored or distorted. Your enterprising writers, reporters and researchers have illuminated many dark corners of government and politics."

Max Rafferty, *Superintendent of Public Instruction and Director of Education, State of California*—"There are few publications today which carry a constant standard of human values to which the wise and the honest may repair. I have always looked on *Human Events* as a medium of communication which is unique in that it consistently stresses the all-too-often-forgotten fact that in this life, this world, this universe, there are certain eternal truths, certain lasting values, certain positive standards which the founders of our country found essential in building the American dream. To a conservative who values above all other things the preservation of eternal verities, *Human Events* comes literally as a godsend."

Gov. Ronald Reagan *of California*—"Please accept my congratulations on the 25th anniversary of *Human Events*. Your efforts during the past quarter of a century have paid tremendous dividends by keeping concerned Americans aware of the critical events and issues of our time. I know you will continue on your course of informing our citizens and making further contributions to better government in the years ahead."

Rep. John J. Rhodes (*R.-Ariz.*)—"In its 25 years of publication, *Human Events* has fulfilled a vital need. It has been a voice of enlightened conservative philosophy. So much time and space has been devoted to explaining and expounding the philosophy which advocates centralization and big government that opposing philosophies have by comparison received little in the way of exposure and explanation. In fact, without publications such as *Human Events*, this generation of Americans might not have been cognizant of the existence of a philosophy dedicated to the freedom of the individual, under law, with a concept that the government should only do for the people those things which the people cannot do for themselves."

Victor Riesel, *Syndicated Columnist*—"When in the course of *Human Events* one reads and is intrigued by, edition after edition, issues and crusades, on the foibles and mores, on the corner-cutters and political wheelers and dealers, one knows he has heard the reasonable voice of the rational right, the incontrovertible conservative, the check-and-balancer of a society seared by short-order, philosophical cooks and semi-skilled intellectuals. What is exhilarating about *Human Events* are the enemies it keeps—and keeps. Its opponents and critics, generally the voice of gloom and doom which rarely materialize, it seems to me, have been consistently wrong. During the 25 years of *Human Events'* existence, it has been consistently right. Not strident. Just right, while its louder critics later mumblingly forget how wrong they've been. It has raked the muck of politics strewn by the extremists. It has therefore been the target of those who hide behind the rhetoric of vituperation, shouted from ivory towers. So it has been an exciting 25 years. Here's to another hard-hitting quarter-century—and more and more."

W. F. Rockwell, *Honorary Chairman, North American Rockwell Corp.*—"The shocking decline in morals, the fearsome increase in crime rates, the disastrous inflation, and the increasing bureaucracy in our government have been duly recorded in *Human Events*, and will be available to the historians and philosophers of the future. If this nation retains its position as the greatest in this world, both in its peacetime pursuits and in its military powers, it will be because it has returned from its atheistic and Communistic course to its original religious and constitutional principles."

William A. Rusher, *Publisher, National Review*—"I had the privilege of knowing Frank Hanighen and Jim Wick personally, and know the ability and rock-like integrity that both of them brought to the task of reporting the Washington scene. In Bob Kephart, Tom Winter and Allan Ryskind they have three sturdy young successors capable of carrying on in the great tradition."

Rep. Henry C. Schadeberg (*R.-Wis.*)—"Your publication has been at the forefront of helping to present the Washington scene to my constituents. Because you 'tell it like it is,' thousands of people throughout the United States are getting information which they would not receive from any other source. You fill a needed vacuum in the area of communications."

Phyllis Schlafly, *Author*—"As a regular reader of *Human Events* for 24 years, I have found it indispensable for accurate news often overlooked by other publications. It is consistently reliable and interesting, and it is an inspiring example of fearless journalism at its best."

Emerson P. Schmdit, *Economic Consultant*—"The editors of *Human Events* provide a rich alloy of carefully researched information on government agencies and politics, which is largely ignored or overlooked by other news media. Its stable of hard-digging columnists furnishes a vast panorama of fact and sharp analysis. The format makes for easy and comfortable reading."

George S. Schuyler, *Author and Columnist*—"It is astonishing to note but pleasant to reflect that *Human Events* has been published for a quarter-century and will celebrate its 25th Anniversary in April. It was the spark needed to enliven and enlighten the Washington scene, and to report to the country the Conservative view of our government. I personally became aware of its courage and dedication when more than 10 years ago it carried and reprinted my controversial piece on the Dominican Republic and Trujillo; 'Where Communists Fear to Tread.' It has also been gratifying to watch its growing influence in governmental circles as shown by the congressional contributors. I am very pleased to have been able to contribute in a small way to its influence and expansion."

Paul Scott, *Syndicated Columnist*—"On its 25th Anniversary, *Human Events* has become the voice for those that believe much of the past must be kept to guide us in making the changes that will be necessary to keep this nation free and its leaders dedicated to developing the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God."

R. K. Scott, *President, America's Future*—"I have not missed a single issue of *Human Events* in the past decade and a half. Nor has there been a single issue that did not have at least one important article of information that might not have otherwise come to my attention. *Human Events* has been and will always be 'must' reading for my family."

Rep. William L. Scott (*R.-Va.*)—"Your publication keeps me abreast with the political trends and feelings of the conservative community. I wish you continued success in your efforts to serve a major segment of our political thought."

John P. Sears, *Deputy Counsel to the President*—"I have always been impressed with the content of *Human Events* and wish to compliment it upon its 25th Anniversary for a job well done. *Human Events* represents a responsible voice on the right which can never be disregarded."

Prof. Hans F. Sennholz, *Grove City College*—"*Human Events* is the conservatives' window to the political maze that is Washington. It is a clear window through which we may observe liberal intrigue and power politics, and above all, the ascendancy of Caesar."

George C. Shattuck, *M.D., Harvard Medical School*—"I regard *Human Events* as a reliable source of important news, much of which has been slighted or overlooked by the daily press."

Charles B. Shuman, *President, American Farm Bureau Federation*—"I want to congratulate *Human Events* on its 25th Anniversary of service to the conservative cause in America. It has been a valuable reference source for me, as I have sought to cause farm people to understand the dangers of centralized and socialized controls in agriculture. *Human Events* provides a concise review of the events and issues that affect the continuing batting between those who believe in the market economy and those who favor central planning."

Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, *former Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission*—"I had not realized that *Human Events* was approaching a milestone. When my late, great friend, Frank Hanighen, founded *Human Events* a quarter-century ago, I became a constant reader. I was then in government service and it was of enormous value to me to be able to read an analysis of current history, domestic and foreign, which, knowing Mr. Hanighen, I could be certain was *honest* and *penetrating*. I have been out of public life for 10 years—and three years beyond the Biblican span—and my horizons no longer extend so far as once they did, but I see that Frank's successors maintain the high standards set, and I congratulate them and wish them my warmest greetings and respect."

Sen. Strom Thurmond (*R.-S.C.*)—"*Human* Events is to be highly commended for giving the people the inside story on what's happening in Washington. It has rendered this unique and distinctive service for 25 years and I wish *Human Events* continued success in the crucial years ahead."

Sen. John G. Tower (*R.-Tex.*)—"I have always found this publication to be most helpful in keeping me informed of the trends in America. I am sure that *Human Events* will continue to live up to this standard for the next 25 years of its existence."

Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, *Assistant to the Chairman, North American Rockwell Corp.*—"As a long-time subscriber to *Human Events*, I extend my congratulations to you and all concerned as the 25th Anniversary approaches. I am sure this fine little paper, from the time of its founding, has provided invaluable information to its readers and has helped to support a strong constitutional stand against the ravages of the growing welfare and Socialist state."

Richard A. Viguerie, *President, Richard A. Viguerie Co.*—"*Human Events* was one of the first conservative publications brought to my attention as a young person while I was in the process of forming my political opinions. To a large extent I owe my commitment to free enterprise and anti-communism to *Human Events*."

Prof. Ludwig Von Mises, *New York University*—"Nothing is for all of the people more important than the preservation of the fundamental human right, the right of the individual to choose the way in which he plans to integrate himself into the system of human society. In this fight for freedom and against totalitarian enslavement of all, *Human Events* has accomplished a brilliant job. All true friends of freedom and prosperity do hope that *Human Events* and its brilliant contributors will be no less successful in these endeavors in the coming years."

George R. Wackenhut, *President, The Wackenhut Corp.*—"The role of *Human Events* on its 25th Anniversary has become more important than ever before in providing its readers with comprehensive coverage on vital events that so often develop into important national and international issues. I find it a valuable aid to judgment because it supplies information not always available elsewhere."

Rep. Albert Watson (*R.-S.C.*)—"In an age in which many of our traditional values and institutions have been toppled by the various coalitions of the Left, *Human Events* continues to stand guard over the principles which have made America great. This remarkable publication has championed constitutional government, patriotism, devotion to duty, frugality in government, and the other virtues of the American spirit. I am convinced that if *Human Events* reached every home in America, the influence of the so-called 'Liberal Establishment' would be substantially diminished and the voices of reason would be heeded by those in authority throughout our land."

John Wayne, *Actor*—"I find *Human Events* to be a publication that prints the facts concerning current issues and commonsense opinions to be gleaned from these facts. May they have another 25 years! That'll take care of me, at least."

Hon. Charles E. Whittaker, *former Associate Justice, United States Supreme Court*—"I have found *Human Events* to be very responsible, and I believe that, over the years, it has been of great value to the conservative community."

Alice Widener, *Editor, U.S.A. Magazine, Columnist*—"During the 25 years that *Human Events* has grown from a little to a big publication, the quality of its contribution to freedom and to sound, conservative thinking has been enormous. In a quarter-century of managed news in Washington, D.C., *Human Events* has remained unmanaged; that is, an independent voice, not a puppet with strings attached. In my judgment *Human Events* has played a unique role in maintaining a free press in our beloved nation."

Ernest L. Wilkinson, *President, Brigham Young University*—"Congratulations on the 25th Anniversary of *Human Events*. This spans a period of time when the trend of government has been in many ways at variance with the principles of our Founding Fathers and the principles of liberty. Never, therefore, was there a time when *Human Events* was as necessary as during this period. In such periods of change there is a tendency for all of us to lose our moorings, but *Human Events* has helped me, as I am sure it has helped thousands, to keep my feet on the ground and not lose sight of the concepts which have made our country great."

Rep. Bob Wilson (*R.-Calif.*) *Chairman, Republican Congressional Committee*—"Congratulations! Throughout the course of political events over the past quarter-century, a time of vast change in America, *Human Events* has stood as a steadfast reminder of our constitutional form of government. As the Declaration of Independence from which its name is taken gave notice that the American Colonies would 'declare their cause.' *Human Events* has never failed to take positions on the various political issues which have transpired since it began publication. After 25 years *Human Events* continues as the voice of conservative policies. Thorough reporting, astute editing and unchanging principle have gained it recognition in the publishing field. I add my congratulations to those of my colleagues in Congress and the many Americans who are among its readers."

Gen. Robert E. Wood, *former Chairman, Sears Roebuck Co.*—"I have been a reader of *Human Events* from the time it was first published and have a very high regard for it. I think its views are useful and beneficial to the nation and are of value to the conservative community."

Loyd Wright, *Attorney, former President, American Bar Association*—"*Human Events* is an indispensable instrument for alerting the people of America to what really goes on in Washington. I congratulate the people of America on the 25th Anniversary of your splendid newspaper. I find it gives me information that I cannot get out of the press which is essential to an understanding of the things that really take place in our capital. As a citizen, devoted to my country. I am most appreciative of what you have done throughout your 25 years. Congratulations."

THOMAS HART BENTON, OF MISSOURI

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, today in Kansas City, Mo., one of America's most distinguished living artists celebrates his 80th birthday. Thomas Hart Benton bears the name of his great granduncle, who, as U.S. Senator from Missouri from 1821 to 1851, made much of the legislative history of his time. At the turn of the century, Thomas Hart Benton's father, Col. M. E. Benton, served as a Representative from Missouri in the 55th, 56th, 57th, and 58th Congresses. It was while his father was serving in Congress that young Thomas Hart Benton received his first instruction in art in Saturday morning classes at the Corcoran Gallery in Washington, D.C.

So it is fitting, I believe, that we in the Senate acknowledge and salute the 80th birthday of this son of a Representative and great grandnephew of a great Senator who has made the Benton name even more distinguished in his chosen field of art.

But let me not leave the impression that this 80th birthday is more than just another milestone in the remarkable career of Thomas Hart Benton, for here we have a man who is hard at work every day in his studio, continuing to create some of the great art of our time. I invite Senators who may not be familiar with the work of Thomas Hart Benton to view his oil painting. "Country Politics," which he has generously lent me for display in my office.

I also wish to call attention to the fact that the Library of Congress begins today, in the Great Hall of the main building, a panel exhibit of lithographs and books illustrated by Thomas Hart Benton.

Last night in New York City the Associated American Artists Gallery opened an exhibit of all of the lithographs of Benton. Today the New Britain Museum of American Art in New Britain, Conn., opens an exhibit of the lithographs and some oils and murals of Thomas Hart Benton. Also, today, in Fort Worth, Tex., the Amon Carter Museum of Western Art opens an exhibit of the lithographs of Thomas Hart Benton.

Today the University of Texas Press is publishing a fine book entitled "The Lithographs of Thomas Hart Benton," written by Creekmore Fath, which brings together for the first time all of the graphic work of Benton.

Many Senators have visited the Truman Library in Independence, Mo., and have seen Benton's great mural in the entrance hall, and those who know Benton's historic murals in the State capitol building, Jefferson City, Mo., realize that these are only a part of the magnificent legacy of art which Thomas Hart Benton has created. In his drawings, lithographs, watercolors, oil paintings, and murals, Thomas Hart Benton has given us the greatest panorama of American life of any contemporary artist.

In his autobiography, entitled "An Artist in America," Benton has shown that he is a great writer as well as a great artist. I can assure Senators that he is a great talker and conversationalist. What Thomas Hart Benton is, I suppose, is the truly modern equivalent of the Renaissance man.

I shall close these remarks with a biographical summary of the life of Thomas Hart Benton to date.

Thomas Hart Benton. Born April 15, 1889, Neosho, Newton County, Mo.; son of "Colonel" Maecenus Eason Benton and Elizabeth Wise Benton. In 1897–99 Thomas Hart Benton attended grade schools in Washington, D.C., and was first introduced to formal art in the Library of Congress and in classes at the Corcoran Gallery. In 1906–07 he attended Western Military Academy at Alton, Ill., until he began the serious study of art at the Chicago Art Institute. In 1908–11 Benton went to France and enrolled at the Académie Julien in Paris. In 1912 he returned to America and settled in New York. In 1916 he had his first public exhibition with a series of paintings in the Forum Exhibition of Modern American Painting held at the Anderson Galleries in New York. In 1918 he enlisted in the U.S. Navy. In 1919 upon discharge from the Navy he returned to New York and had an exhibition of drawings and watercolors which were based on his Navy activities. In 1922 Benton participated in the Philadelphia Exhibition of Modern Americans and sold a large work to the famous Philadelphia collector, Albert C. Barnes. In 1922 Benton married Rita Piacenza. It was in the mid-1920's that Benton began a series of paintings on American historical themes. These were mural-sized works. They were controversial because, with their sculptural and three-dimensional character, they were in opposition to prevalent beliefs of architects and critics that mural paintings should not break wall surfaces but remain flat and linear. It was also during this period that Benton began exploring the "back-country" of America by foot, bus, and train. In the past 45 years Benton has traveled more widely in America than any other artist, indeed he has probably seen and drawn more of the indigenous life of America, than any other American artist ever has. In the late 1920's Benton lectured on art at Dartmouth College and at Bryn Mawr College, and debated with Frank Lloyd Wright on architecture and mural painting at Brown University, Providence, R.I.

Benton's first child, Thomas P. Benton, was born in New York City in 1926. And at about the same time Benton purchased his permanent summer home on the island of Martha's Vineyard, Mass.

In 1928–29 Benton joined with Jose Clemente Orozco in exhibitions at the Delphic Studios in New York City, and received a commission with Orozco to do murals for the New School for Social Research.

In 1932 Benton received a commission to do murals for the library of the Whitney Museum of American Art. In 1933 Benton was awarded the gold medal of the Architectural League for his mural work. It was also in 1933 that Benton received the commission and executed a mural for the State of Indiana. Covering the theme of social evolution of Indiana, this mural was shown as Indiana's exhibit at the 1933 Chicago World's Fair and is now installed in the University of Indiana auditorium at Bloomington.

In the spring of 1934 Time magazine carried a feature article on the regionalist school of American art and presented its first color cover which was a self portrait by Thomas Hart Benton.

In 1935 Benton received the commission for the murals in the Missouri State Capitol along with a request to head the painting department at Kansas City Art Institute. So this year Thomas Hart Benton moved to Kansas City, Mo.

In 1937 Benton wrote "An Artist in America." A new edition of this book was published last year by the Missouri University Press. In 1939 Benton's second child, a daughter, Jessie P. Benton was born.

In the early 1940's Benton produced drawings portraying the characters of John Steinbeck's "The Grapes of Wrath" for 20th Century Fox Film Corp. Benton also illustrated "The Adventures of Tom Sawyer," "The Grapes of Wrath," "Huckleberry Finn," and "Green Grow the Lilacs" for the Limited Editions Club.

Also, in the early 1940's Benton made an album for Decca Records, the music based on American folk songs, which was called "Saturday Night at Tom Benton's."

After Pearl Harbor Benton commenced a series of war paintings designed to help awaken the American public to dangers of the moment. Reproductions of this series of paintings ran to some 18 million copies. The exhibition of the original paintings at the Associated American Artists Gallery in New York City attracted over 75,000 visitors.

In 1945 Benton was made an honorary member of the Argentine Academia Nacional de Bellas Artes. In 1948 Benton received an honorary degree of doctor of arts from Missouri University and was made an honorary Phi Beta Kappa. In 1949 Benton returned to Europe and in Italy was made an honorary member of L'Accademia Fiorentina delle Arti del Disegno at Florence, and of the Accademia Senese degli Intronati at Sienna.

In the 1950's Benton painted the Lincoln mural for Lincoln University, at Jefferson City, Mo.; the "Old Kansas City" mural for the Kansas City River Club; the "Discovery of the St. Lawrence River" mural for the New York State Power Authority Administration Building at Massena, N.Y. He also received an honorary degree of doctor of letters from Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Mo. In 1958 he began the work on his mural "Independence and the Opening of the West" for the Truman Library. This mural was finished in the spring of 1961.

In April of 1960 the American Institute of Architects conferred their fine arts medal on Thomas Hart Benton. In May 1962, Benton was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Letters.

In his 75th year, Benton went on an expedition into the Canadian Rockies. He rode horseback from Banff to Assineboine. The following year, 1965, he went to Italy to try his hand at bronze sculpture. He went on a long exploratory expedition up the Missouri River from Omaha, Nebr., to Three Forks, Mont., and from there into the "Rendezvous" area of the Wind River Mountains, in Wyoming.

At all times Benton has been busy drawing and painting. This thumbnail sketch of some of the highlights of the life of Thomas Hart Benton simply illustrates some of his accomplishments. His life has been a full one and as he continues on his way of work and constant creation it is a great pleasure for me to bring this anniversary to the attention of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF ROYALTIES TO RECORDING ARTISTS AND RECORDING COMPANIES

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 8, 1969, the Nashville Tennessean published an editorial in support of the amendment to the proposed copyright revision bill introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Williams).

While I am not at present a cosponsor of this measure, I have previously voiced my strong support for the principle of extending royalties to recording artists and recording companies.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Just Amendment for Music City

Sen. Harrison Williams, D-N.J., has proposed an amendment to the general copyright revision bill pending in the Senate which would guarantee royalties for artists, musicians and record producers when their records are played on radio, television and juke boxes.

The amendment is of special interest in Nashville, where artists and record companies are losing large sums of money every year because these royalties have never been included in the copyright laws.

When their records are sold to the public, artists and record companies share in the proceeds, just as composers and publishers do. But under present law, when their records are played on radio, television and juke boxes for public listening, the composers and publishers get a royalty which is not shared by the artists and record companies.

Under Senator Williams' amendment, artists and record companies would get the same royalty received by composers and publishers for radio and television airings of their work. A juke box fee would be established and the artists and record companies would get 25%

of the receipts, with the composers and publishers getting 75%.

The right to this compensation has long been sought by Music City performers and others across the country. Senator Williams' amendment presents a just request. It should be adopted.

PRESENT CONDITIONS IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Occupation Increased Dominican Dependence," published in the Washington Post of March 30, 1969.

This is a very interesting analysis of the present situation in the Dominican Republic.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCCUPATION INCREASED DOMINICAN DEPENDENCE

(By Lewis H. Diuguid)

SANTO DOMINGO, March 29.—After U.S. Marines broke up the Dominican civil war, and worldwide criticism was at a peak, President Johnson passed the word that the intervention must be a success.

An army of technicians soon replaced the Marines and aid money flowed in at unprecedented rates.

Four years later, this is still a divided nation. Now it is also obsessively dependent. Democracy is only a catchword in the remarkably cynical Dominican game of politics.

The causes of this situation are found more in the country's troubled history than in recent events, but U.S. intervention was a big part of that history long before the Marines landed April 28, 1965.

Interviews with Dominican scholars, politicians and technicians, as well as their U.S. counterparts at nearly every level, belie the general assumption heard in Washington—that, as one State Department official put it, "Despite the criticism at the time, the intervention has turned out for the best."

Economically, there is some improvement and prospects for more. But politically, the always tenuous sense of national purpose has weakened. By most accounts, the probability of the civil war resuming is great. The main deterrents so far are division within the army and the belief that the U.S. Marines would surely land again.

U.S. officials challenge that latter assumption, but few Dominicans do. Many Dominicans continue to believe that all important decisions are American-made.

When a minor politician decided recently to run for the presidency next year, he made his declaration and in the next breath announced that he was departing for Washington. In virtually any other Latin American country, that sequence would have meant political suicide. Here it is considered good politics.

This attitude is reflected in the inability of AID to find Dominicans willing to undertake development projects. The attitude seem to be, "Let the Americans do it." Often they do, thus increasing the dependency. Businessmen admit that when they conceive an investment, their first thought is the need for a foreign loan.

Nationalism seldom appears, although it is growing in a negative form among the youth. They show some anti-American frustration, but surprisingly little given the virtual occupation four years ago. Perhaps more damning than a jeer is the reaction when many Santo Domingo youths see an American tourist on the street: they salute.

The scarcity of national culture, and the administrative weakness of the highly centralized and statist government make this a nation only in the broadest sense.

This is attributable mainly to the 30-year Trujillo dictatorship. Before he came to power in 1930, the republic was a set of barely connected sugar communities. The U.S. Marines ran things from 1916 to 1924, and when Rafael Trujillo took over he unified the land by centralizing all power and most property in himself.

Potential leaders learned during those years to keep their heads down. To a large extent they still do. After Trujillo's assassination in 1961, the United States intervened to prevent his family from retaining power.

The demoralization that Trujillo imposed is well-characterized by one of his latter-day public works projects. He built a massive artillery emplacement atop a mountain overlooking Puerto Plata, a city known to house some resistance to Trujillo. To this day the citizenry there debates whether the guns were fixed to defend the city or to destroy it.

A succession of provisional regimes followed the dictator, punctuated by two coups and two elections. The accompanying politics were dominated by a few familiar personages, many of whom moved left and right along the ideological spectrum when opportunity called.

The second post-Trujillo election, in 1966, was the culmination of the U.S. occupation that suspended the civil war. Joaquin Balaguer, who had served under Trujillo and who succeeded him, was elected.

Balaguer has maintained quiet while working long hours at administrative decisions. Whether he purposely surrounded himself with weak administrators, or whether no other sort was available, the result has been to defer all initiative to Balaguer.

His efforts to revive the all-important sugar industry are praised even by his politican enemies, but Balaguer is widely criticized for using his power to enhance himself politically. In 1961, Balaguer was saying that he wanted to retire from politics and devote himself to literature.

Balaguer has used government income to build scenic city overlooks, mercury-lit boulevards and apartment projects rising at the entrance to the capital.

Balaguer supporters say visible projects are a political necessity here, and AID loans to improve education or agricultural output are not very photogenic. Local funds for such efforts are not often forthcoming, while Dominican revenues go to build an extra bridge or a money-losing hotel in a critical voting area.

Lately, opposition parties have been joined by the normally reticent Catholic Church heirarchy in more basic charges against the government, that the police and army exercise arbitrary authority over the countryside with impunity and that the concentration of land in the hands of the government and large holders is crushing the peasantry.

Francisco Pena Gomez, secretary general of Juan Bosch's important Dominican Revolutionary Party, charges that Trujillo-style terrorism has revived and that the government has failed to prosecute the perpetrators.

Some of the current unrest is based on an enigmatic statement by Balaguer suggesting he might take his constitutional option to run again.

Questioned about this, most Dominicans recalled the events that brought in Trujillo—a president propped up by the Americans so that they could leave in 1924 defied broad public distaste for reelection and engineered a victory. Soon thereafter a coup brought in the dictator.

Many Dominicans say that if Balaguer is re-elected—as incumbents usually manage to be—he will not last a year. But they also add that Balaguer is no Trujillo.

The future may be decided by the effect of all this on the 2.5 million Domicans, out of the total 4 million, who are under 25. But when the youth looks to its elders for political traditions, it sees the electorate polarized by the '65 civil war. Many, including moderate politicians opposed to violence, are convinced that the two sides are waiting to resume conflict, and that the U.S. intervention merely postponed it.

Despite the postwar attempt to collect arms, civilians are said to be heavily armed and the incidence of violent crime tends to support this.

The American influence, real and imagined, is pervasive and is a contributing factor to politics so chaotic that if true stability is achieved it will be a surprise to both Dominicans and the representatives of their big brother.

Most Dominicans say that in polarizing the politics the intervention created more Communists than existed before. It also provided a graphic lesson in the politics of power.

A POSITIVE PLAN OF ACTION

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, Congress has been presented with an excellent and positive plan of action by the President. I applaud his activities of the past 12 weeks and look forward to working with him in the months and years ahead.

All of us can fully subscribe to his interest in the pursuit of peace abroad and to the development of new structures and new programs for the pursuit of progress at home.

The message that President Nixon has presented to us provides for a blueprint to progress; it is both reasonable and far reaching. It is responsible and responsive.

As to his recommendations, soon to be offered on a number of fronts, I have long contended, and have so stated on a number of occasions, that we do not need a whole new series of laws to combat crime; rather we should see to it that the Department of Justice and all branches of law enforcement are determined to prosecute violations of the law.

Another important area is the program of tax credits to be recommended by the President. The enlistment of additional private resources, in order to meet our urgent social needs, is a significant step in the right direction. We must provide better alternatives than have been available so far. We can encourage industry to train more people so that jobs will be available and waiting for them.

The Nixon administration's plan to reform our postal service, with a comprehensive reorganization of the Post Office Department, will benefit all. My bill on Postal Corporation is a starting point, and I know that Postmaster General Blount and his staff are studying it and other plans.

All in all, it is obvious that President Nixon has placed statesmanship above politics. It is a refreshing approach. It will, indeed provide for an abiding satisfaction of achievement, and I pledge my best efforts to those worthwhile ends.

MISS CAROL MUELLER, EL PASO, TEX., REPRESENTATIVE OF TEXAS TO INTERNATIONAL FARM YOUTH EXCHANGE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am pleased to welcome to Washington today

Miss Carol Mueller, of El Paso, Tex., who has recently been chosen to represent the State of Texas in Norway as the International Farm Youth Exchangee. Carol will spend 6 months in Norway living with rural families and learning of their practices and way of life. On her return to the United States, she will give lectures around the Nation on her experience during her travels and help better to acquaint the people of America with the people of Norway.

Miss Mueller has long been active in the promotion of the 4–H Clubs of the United States and has an outstanding record with that organization dating back to 1964 when she showed and won her division at a livestock exposition in the sheep category. Carol will make a fine rural ambassador to Norway; this is an honor of which she is much deserving—the State of Texas is proud of her.

ELECTRIC POWER AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on March 19, Secretary of the Interior Hickel delivered an address before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. The address concerned the future development of the power resources of the Nation.

I commend Secretary Hickel's remarks to the attention of Senators as worthy of their serious consideration as we enter an era of balancing the competing demands on the Nation's resources, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel Before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Atlantic City, N.J., March 19, 1969

I am glad to have this opportunity to explain my views of the role of the Department of the Interior as they relate to electric power.

You know, when I served as Governor of Alaska, I learned that the 49th state has the highest power costs in the nation.

The average price for 500 kilowatt hours per month in Alaska is $14.67. The national average is $10.37 for the same amount of electricity.

I also know the value of public power because—in Alaska—most of the power is public power.

When I became Secretary of the Interior, I found that I had also become chairman of the board of a very big electric utility. The Department of the Interior gets its power from a generating system of almost 17.2 million kilowatts.

It markets 85.7 billion kilowatt hours annually. And, it collects about $296.6 million per year.

That's pretty big. But, I also found out that TVA is number one.

That makes us number two, so we're just going to have to try harder to assure every American family has an ample supply of power—whether public or private—at the lowest cost, consistent with reliable service and an adequate rate of return on investment.

Americans deserve no less.

This goal isn't going to be easy. It will take a lot of cooperation—cooperation between privately-owned utilities, public power groups like yours, and the Federal Government.

It is going to have to be a three-way partnership, with no one dominating the other.

None of us will get everything we want. But, we will get a lot more than we would if we fought each other.

Public power—particularly the rural coops—have done a lot of good in this nation. I know from experience.

You brought electricity into the Kansas countryside where I was born and raised. You have lifted the burden of many hours of hard work from the backs of many farm families.

Private power, too, has done an excellent job in the more concentrated areas of America. It has provided the backbone of our industrial society. And, in the cities, more people are using more electricity than ever before.

But while we pat ourselves on the back, we must also keep our eyes focused on the road ahead.

With less than seven percent of the world's population, this country leads all others in generating electricity.

Our 1966 production represented 36 percent of the world's total. Expressed another way, this is two and one-half times the amount produced in Russia—the second ranking nation.

In 1967, 20 million new kilowatts of generating capacity were added to our electric system—the largest annual increase in history.

Starting in 1968, the addition of 154 million kilowatts is scheduled over the next few years. This will make our electric capacity 30 percent greater than in 1967. And, this increase alone is greater than our total capacity in 1958.

By 1980, this nation's power producing capacity may be well over three times that of 1960 and twice that expected by 1970.

This means all of us are going to have to try harder whether we're one, two, or last.

When we talk about the future development of the power resources of the nation, the federal government doesn't have to do the whole job. In many areas, the private sector and groups such as yours should rightly carry the load.

The federal government should set the tone in the things that it does. We should set an example and be a prime mover in encouraging others to follow.

Our responsibility in Interior should be one of balancing the competing demands on the nation's resources. It is also one of assuring that the wise use—and wise conservation—of our natural resources be shared by all.

Our engineers inform me that we are on the threshold of a new era of low-cost power in many parts of the nation. Exciting new developments in technology point the way. Larger and larger machines are being built that produce more power at lower cost.

Extra-high-voltage transmission lines move greater amounts of power over longer distances.

These trends have made it practical to connect power systems into power pools covering broad areas. In time our nation may be covered with a single network of electric systems.

The Department of the Interior can continue to interconnect its facilities with both private and public groups—wherever it makes sense to do so. We can continue to interconnect our own systems, as an example to others. We can work to assure that these interconnections are safe and free from blackouts.

Furthermore, we can work to assure that the benefits of our interconnections are shared by all.

This is one example of how the Government can set the tone.

Another is in the field of research.

My Department has 27,600 miles of transmission lines.

We are building the world's longest—and largest—extra-high-voltage direct current transmission lines. This is being done cooperatively with private utilities and non-Federal public groups. We also operate nearly 2,200 miles on conventional extra-high-voltage transmission lines.

If the full value of the economies of the large generating units are to be attained, we must continue to improve the nation's transmission system.

This will take research. And, we are moving. The Deartment is a member of the Electric Research Council, a group composed of private utilities, public utilities, and the federal government. This group sponsors and coordinates research to advance the technology of the utility industry.

The Council has started a $4 million, five-year research program. Its objectives are to reduce the cost and increase the reliability of transmission lines at all voltages.

Another is to provide engineering and design guidelines for ultra-high-voltage transmission. These will be the giant lines of the future.

In a related action, the Department is planning to install 600,000 kilowatt generators at Grand Coulee Dam. These will be world's largest hydro-generators, and Grand Coulee will be the world's largest power plant.

Work is also continuing to the Department's Transmission Study 190. This project is concerned with the broad engineering aspects which should be considered in western power system planning. It proposes a number of alternate plans for a large power transmission system for the entire Western United States.

The study is now being reviewed by the Western States Coordinating Council, a group of western utilities, public and private. It should stimulate all segments of the industry to proceed with far more effective planning and interconnections.

Last December, while Governor of Alaska, I supported the Alaska Power Administration in its efforts to have our country work out an electric study agreement with Canada. Both governments will cooperate in assessing the power marketing possibilities which could justify the power development potential of the Upper Yukon watershed.

The study envisions alternate water diversion possibilities to supply power developments in either British Columbia or Alaska. In assessing the market for the Yukon Taiya project, my engineers say in the early stages we must consider the possibilities of marketing a substantial amount of power in British Columbia or the Pacific Northwest.

This would enable us to have a very-high-voltage transmission grid between Alaska and the Pacific Northwest which would envision power flows from Anchorage to Los Angeles.

The Department is also interested in underground transmission. As our cities grow closer and closer together, there is not going to be land available for an ever-increasing number of power lines. But, the lines will be needed. As a result, one answer may be the undergrounding of all power lines in highly populated areas. However, we won't know whether costs can be sufficiently reduced until we do some research.

Speaking of research generally, the Government—because it is in the utility business—must do its fair share of new research. We haven't done this in the past. I hope that we will be able to do it in the future—especially in the fields where we possess expertise.

As some of you are producers of power and all of us are concerned with our natural resources, I know you are interested in thermal pollution.

We must think carefully about new guidelines governing the discharge of hot water from electric generating plants. It is easy to be against this. It's harder to do something constructive.

Obviously, where discharges cause thermal pollution and violate water quality standards of the states, they cannot be permitted. But we are not going to be negative. The ultimate answer, I believe, is the constructive use of the waste heat of the water wherever possible. We should seek such uses. They may not be applicable in every instance. But, where they are, they should be used.

Experiments along these lines are now in progress. Can this water be used in irrigation, thus speeding up the growing season? Can this water make certain fisheries more productive? The answers aren't in yet, but I hope the results will be constructive.

Also, there is no reason why this waste heat cannot be used to convert saline water into fresh water in some areas. It is even possible to use this heat to clean up other polluted waters before they are discharged into streams.

We know that cooling towers and ponds work. They should be used where no other solution is available. But, we must stretch our imagination to devise other, more productive methods of heat control.

I started this speech stressing the need for cooperation. I am going to end it on the same note.

Among its customers, the Department of the Interior serves over 450 rural electric cooperatives. So in one sense today, the head of that number two utility is talking to a large group of his customers.

Turning to the future, I make you certain pledges:

. . . The power marketing agencies of the Department, plus the Bureau of Reclamation, will serve you to the best of their ability. Interior has a complaint department. It's me. And, if you get poor service, I want to know about it.

. . . I am a firm believer in the sound development of the water resources of this nation, consistent with good conservation values. I will support sound, multi-purpose projects—including hydroelectric power when it is a legitimate project purpose.

. . . The Congress has legislated that nonprofit, public groups get preference in the sale of power from federal projects. That is the law, and I will support the law.

A former Secretary of the Interior, the honorable Fred A. Seaton, once said:

"Conservation is a magic word of many meanings, but the common denominator of most definitions is the concept that sound conservation demands wise and prudent use—without either waste or abuse—of our natural resources."

I agree with that definition. Through its support of many conservation measures over the years, it is a definition which the National Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives practices.

I hope that today has been the first of many meetings with you. And, as other Secretaries of the Interior have, I shall probably seek your support on a number of the conservation issues of today and tomorrow.

I am confident I will receive that support.

STATEMENT OF ASSETS, LIABILITIES, AND INCOME OF SENATOR AND MRS. CASE AT THE END OF 1968

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a combined statement of the assets and liabilities of Mrs. Case and myself at the end of 1968, and of our income for that year.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Combined financial statement of Senator and Mrs. Case

ASSETS

Cash in checking and savings accounts (after provision for Federal income tax for 1968), approximately	$25,000
Life insurance policies with the following insurers (currently providing for death benefits totaling $138,500): U.S. group life insurance, Aetna Life Insurance Co., Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co., Continental Assurance Co., Equitable Life Assurance Society, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Philadelphia, Travelers Insurance Co.—cash surrender value	43,922
Retirement contract with Federal employees retirement system (providing for single life annuity effective Jan. 3, 1973 of $26,304 per annum). Senator Case's own contributions to the fund total, without interest	31,241
Annuity contracts with Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association and college retirement equities fund. As at Jan. 31, 1967, these contracts (estimated to provide an annuity beginning at age 65 of $1,127) had an accumulation value of	12,209
Securities as listed in schedule A	377,891
Real estate: consisting of residence building lot on Elm Avenue, Rahway, N.J., and house in Washington, D.C. (original cost plus capital expenditures, $71,745, less mortgage on Washington property, $5,836)	65,909
Tangible personal property at Rahway apartment and Washington house, estimated	10,000
Undistributed share in estate of Senator Case's mother—estimated value	70,000

Contingent interest in a small trust fund of which Chase Manhattan Bank of New York is trustee. Income from from this was zero in 1968.

LIABILITIES

None except mortgage above listed.

INCOME IN 1968

Senate salary and allowances, $31,772, less estimated expenses allowable as income tax deductions of $7,538 (actual expenses considerably exceed this figure)	24,234
Dividends and interest on above securities and accounts	13,815
Lectures and speaking engagements: Washington Journalism Center, Brimberg & Co., Stanford University, Princeton University, the Brookings Institution	2,750
Net gains on sales of property	3,796

CLIFFORD P. CASE.

APRIL 14, 1969.

SCHEDULE A—SECURITIES

Bonds and debentures of the following, at cost (aggregate market value somewhat lower, $52,735):

	Principal amount
U.S. Treasury	$2,500
American Telephone & Telegraph Co	11,000
Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co	4,000
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York	5,000
Consumers Power Co	5,000
General Motors Acceptance Corp	5,000
Iowa Electric & Power Co	5,000
Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co	$5,000
South Western Bell Telephone Co	5,000
Toledo Electric Co	5,000
Stocks (common, unless otherwise noted) at market	326,156

	No. of shares
American Electric Power Co	919
American Natural Gas Co	548
American Telephone & Telegraph Co	200
Cities Service Co	104
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York	400
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York ($5 preferred)	50
Detroit Edison Co	100
General Electric Co	100
General Motors Corp	150
Household Finance Corp. ($4.40 cumulative convertible preferred)	100
International Business Machines Corp	128
Investors Mutual, Inc	2,520.19
Kenilworth State Bank	21
Madison Gas & Electric Co	275
Marine Midland Corp	563
Merck & Co., Inc	200
Tri-Continental Corp	1,286
Union County (N.J.) Trust Co	801
Warner-Lambert Pharmaceutical Co	200

PROPOSED MERGER OF YOUNGSTOWN SHEET & TUBE CORP., AND LYKES CORP.

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, for some period of time I have been concerned with a growing phenomenon in our country which can best be described as the rise of the so-called corporate conglomerate. I have recently been advised of another example of this startling trend in the State of Ohio. That example is the proposed merger of the Lykes Corp., hereinafter referred to as Lykes, and the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., hereinafter referred to as Youngstown. Under the proposed merger of Lykes and Youngstown, a new corporation was organized on February 20, 1969, under the name of Lykes-Youngstown Corp. The proposal has already been agreed upon in principle by the board of directors and this proposal needs only shareholder approval at this particular point in time.

The proposal is as follows: The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. will organize a new subsidiary and transfer all its assets to this wholly owned subsidiary, which will then assume Youngstown's liabilities. The Lykes Corp. presently is a holding company owning as wholly owned subsidiaries Lykes Brothers Steamship Co. and Lykes Financial Corp. Lykes-Youngstown Corp. will then be a holding company holding Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. and Lykes Brothers Steamship and Lykes Financial Corp.

It is my understanding that both of the merging corporations will have equal representation on the board of directors of the Lykes-Youngstown Co. However, what strikes me as strange is the relative size of the two corporations prior to the merger. Lykes, for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1968, had total revenues of approximately $132,032,000. Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. had 1968 revenues of approximately $793,190,000. It therefore appears that this is another example of the proverbial minnow swallowing the whale. What also disturbs me is the exchange of 24 percent of Youngstown common stock for "subordinated debentures" of Lykes-Youngstown Corp., and the subsequent dilution in the equity position of Youngstown's present shareholders. There are further adverse sociological effects in a merger such as the one involving Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. Local control is superseded by outside interests whose concern is primarily with profit and loss statements. Further these outside interests have little time or inclination to involve themselves with the myriad of problems which face our communities across the Nation.

A recent study by the staff of the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability shows that 78 manufacturing corporations with assets of $1 billion or more held 43 percent of the Nation's total manufacturing assets. The study further points out that 451 corporations with assets in excess of $100 million but less than $1 billion own an additional 30 percent of the Nation's manufacturing assets. Another group of 791 medium sized corporations with assets of $25 million to $100 million owned another 9 percent of the Nation's total manufacturing assets. The remaining 18 percent of the assets were held by approximately 185,000 corporations. This study by the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability shows that 185,869 corporations owned virtually all of the manufacturing assets of this country. More significant is the fact that a relatively small number of corporations, 1,320 to be exact, own approximately 82 percent of the manufacturing assets of this country. Most studies plotting the number of mergers and acquisitions show a rapid rise in this phenomena since the year of 1965 when there were approximately 1,700 mergers. In 1966 there were approximately 2,000 mergers, and in 1967 roughly 2,915 merger announcements. In 1968, studies show that there were approximately 4,462 merger announcements. When studies showing the number of merger and acquisitions are viewed in context with the number of corporations holding the manufacturing assets of this country, the conclusion is inescapable that this Nation is heading toward a situation where a relatively small number of corporations will hold the bulk of the manufacturing assets. In fact, were it not for the present antitrust legislation, in particular the Sherman Act, and the Clayton Act, we could reasonably expect that viewing the number of mergers as it relates to the number of corporations, we might end up with as few as 200 corporations. If one stretches the imagination somewhat, a veritable handful of corporations in this country could be envisioned as controlling all of the assets. One does not need a doctorate degree in economics or corporation finance to see that this would be, to say the least, an unhealthy situation.

Since this is the situation with which the Nation is faced, I for one welcome the administration's new antitrust policy. In particular, I welcome the determination of the Nixon administration to attack the acquisition of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. by the giant conglomerate, Ling-Temco-Vought. It would appear to me that section 7 of the Clayton Act—the Celler-Kefauver Amendment of 1950—is being abridged when leading corporations in one industry are acquired by conglomerates that specialize in many product lines. Clearly, the test of section 7 which asks if there is a substantial lessening of competition is met. I would now call upon Attorney General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General MacLaren, chief of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division to give serious consideration to the study of possible action being taken under section 7 of the Clayton Act to prevent the impending merger between the Lykes Corp. and the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Corp. Surely this proposed merger is analogous to the Ling-Temco-Vought-J. & L. merger.

ENDANGERED SPECIES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, for many years I have been interested in many programs designed to save various species of America's fish and wildlife. It is a pleasure to be able to report that a program at the Endangered Wildlife Research facility at the Patuxent refuge near Laurel, Md.—established as a result of my funding amendment several years ago—is moving forward. Scientists there, under the able direction of Dr. Ray Erickson, are learning many of the methods which not only should but will save some of our most endangered species from extinction.

Work is also moving forward at refuges and research stations in the various States. Recently the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader published a most interesting article on the Giant Canada goose, written by Rod C. Drewien and Lyle J. Shoonover. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Giant Canada Geese Are Making Comeback—Believed To Be Extinct

(By Rod C. Drewien and Lyle J. Schoonover [1])

The giant Canada goose once nested in suitable habitat over large portions of the Northern Great Plains.

Early settlers gathered their eggs during the spring and hunted them throughout the year.

By the early 1900's they had nearly disappeared from their original range in South Dakota, and in the 1950's most authorities believed the giant Canada to be extinct.

In 1962 Dr. Harold C. Hanson, of the Illinois Natural History Survey, examined Canada geese wintering near Rochester, Minn. These geese were much larger than other subspecies of Canadas he had examined and studied for many years in other portions of the United States and Canada.

The Rochester geese seemed to fit the early description of the giant Canada. Upon further investigation, he found a number of isolated giant Canada goose flocks, both captive and wild, existing from Michigan to Colorado and into the prairie provinces of Canada, including the geese that nest in the area around Waubay, S.D.

START PROGRAM

In 1962 a cooperative program was started between the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to restore free-flying giant Canada geese to portions of their original breeding range in South Dakota. This project was instituted by the late Ray Hart, department waterfowl biologist.

The restoration program consists of three phases, and includes maintaining a captive flock for production of young; a landowner-cooperator program whereby the department farms out breeding pairs to interested parties, and the release of free-flyers in suitable habitat.

The first phase involves maintaining a captive flock, presently consisting of about 90 pinoned breeding pairs, at the Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge in Brown County. Rearing facilities at the refuge cover about 90 acres and include a brooder house, wintering pen, breeding pens for individual pairs, and a 30-acre impoundment, all enclosed within a woven wire fence.

CARE IS TAKEN

Care is taken in the selection of brood stock for the propagation program. Specimens must be attractive and have good characteristics to qualify. Some of the older ganders weigh over 17 pounds, while some larger females exceed 15 pounds.

Most pairs do not begin nesting until three years old. Egg laying begins about April 1. From three to eight eggs are laid with an average first clutch of 5.4 eggs. At Sand Lake, eggs from first clutches are gathered daily and replaced with a dummy egg. Upon completion of the first clutch, the dummy eggs are removed. This stimulates about 60 per cent of the pairs to start a second nest.

Eggs taken from first nests are artificially incubated, whereas pairs that renest are allowed to keep and incubate their second clutch. In this manner many more goslings are hatched than would normally be produced, since in the wild Canada geese will only hatch and raise one brood annually.

PAIRS FARMED OUT

The second phase of the restoration program consists of the department farming out pinioned breeding pairs to interested parties having suitable facilities and habitat on private lands.

Goslings produced from these projects are wing-clipped and retained for future release as free-flyers in surrounding habitat. Presently, there are five cooperators involved in the program and their flocks each vary from two to seven pionioned pairs, plus the young that are produced annually.

The largest cooperator flock is maintained by rancher William Schlider, Faulkton, and contains more than 100 geese. Other cooperators include the Belvidere Rod and Gun Club; George Hauk, Cottonwood; Ivan Pray, Hill City, and Levon Shearer, Wall.

CLOSED TO HUNTING

In 1967 all or portions of five counties in the southern part of the West River area, that include three of the cooperator flocks, were closed to goose hunting. In addition, the third phase of the restoration program involving the release of free-flyers was initiated with the release of 32 on the Carr ranch near Cedar Butte, Mellette County, which is within the closed area. About half were known to return to the vicinity of the release in the spring of 1968, and two pairs nested on the stock dam which was used as the release site.

---

[1] Lyle J. Schoonover, refuge manager for the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries & Wildlife at Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge, has degrees from the University of Minnesota in wildlife management. He has been at Sand Lake 10 years.

Red Drewien, waterfowl biologist for the Department of Game, Fish and Parks, is a graduate of Humboldt State College, California, and has a degree from South Dakota State University. He has been with the department since 1966.

Also in 1967, 140 goslings raised from the captive flock at the Sand Lake Refuge were moved to the LaCreek National Wildlife Refuge in Bennett County. In 1968 an additional 275 goslings were transferred and plans call for moving 300 more to the LaCreek Refuge this year.

These goslings are wing-clipped and retained in large holding pens until they are two years old. At this time they will be released in suitable hatitat within the area closed to goose hunting in West River.

The first large release involving about 140 geese will be made this spring. Some of these geese will be placed in the Cedar Butte area to supplement the original release. Other releases are scheduled for private ranches and lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service in the Buffalo Gap National Grasslands near Kodoka and Wall.

Stock dams selected for release sites are generally larger than 10 acres and have small islands, since geese show a preference for secure island nesting sites. On water areas lacking islands, artificial nesting structures can be erected. The U.S. Forest Service plans to put out artificial nesting structures on some of their stock dams located in the National Grasslands.

WE MUST MAKE A CHOICE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, on March 11, 1969, the Petroleum Situation, a publication of the Chase Manhattan Bank, contained an article entitled "We Must Make a Choice."

This illuminating article centers on the controversy created by the proposal to create a foreign trade zone at Machiasport, Me., as a means of bypassing the quotas set by the mandatory oil import control program.

Present prices for petroleum products in the New England area are compared with the present prices for the same products in other areas of the United States as well as the U.S. average price. The conclusion is reached that petroleum product prices in New England are currently in line with those elsewhere in the Nation.

The article continues with a thorough analysis of the need for the proposed refinery at Machiasport, the immediate and long-range effects which the proposal would have on New England petroleum prices, and the impact which the loopholes created by the foreign trade zone would have on the national security and the economic well-being of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST MAKE A CHOICE

Probably more of the world's problems stem from the lack of effective communications than from any other cause. There is indeed much evidence of the difficulties that can arise from a breakdown of communications within the family, in business, in education, in religion, in government—and between nations.

In recent months, a highly unfortunate situation has developed—for the most part—because of both improper and insufficient communications. It is a development that has pitted one region of the United States against another. And from the earliest days of this nation the multiple and lasting dangers of that sort of conflict have been apparent.

The problem had its beginning last year with a proposal to build an oil refinery in Maine. Sometimes the announcement of a new refinery is met with vigorous objections from the area in which it is to be located. Recently, the residents of a community in another New England state—Rhode Island—successfully resisted the construction of a refinery in their area. But, in the case of Maine, the proposed new plant was welcomed. It would provide certain economic advantages. There would be some opportunities for employment—but not many, because modern refineries are operated mainly with automatic controls. The plant would also constitute a new tax base, of course.

But the foremost reason for wanting a refinery in Maine, reportedly, was based on the belief that it would provide lower priced petroleum products. Somehow, there has developed a widespread impression that petroleum products cost much more in New England than elsewhere in the nation because the region does not have any refineries. If this were true, the consumers of New England, or any other region for that matter, would understandably have cause for complaint. But the impression is erroneous—it is based upon misinformation.

Actually, prices in New England do not differ significantly from those in most other sections of the nation. Reflecting variations in the basic elements of cost, consumer prices naturally are not precisely the same everywhere—but the differences are usually minor. Let's look at the facts. Here is a summary table that compares the price of gasoline in Boston—the leading New England market—with prices in three other major markets and also the average for all of the United States. In each case, basic elements of cost contributing to the consumer price are shown:

REGULAR GRADE GASOLINE PRICES IN 1968

[In cents per gallon]

	Boston	Philadelphia	Norfolk	Chicago	U.S. average
Crude oil cost	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
Refinery margin	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
Transportation and terminal costs	2.0	1.9	1.4	1.2	1.6
Jobber/dealer margin	10.2	9.1	10.9	12.8	10.7
State and Federal taxes	10.5	11.0	11.0	10.0	10.8
Consumer price	33.3	32.6	33.9	34.6	33.7

For all of the markets shown, the cost of crude oil is based upon the U.S. average price. And the refinery margin is based upon the average at the Gulf Coast—the scene of the nation's largest and most competitive refinery complex. Chicago, Philadelphia and Norfolk all have refineries nearby that serve part of the local market needs—but the refinery margin is essentially the same as at the Gulf Coast.

Clearly, the price of gasoline in Boston is not out of line—it is neither the highest nor the lowest, and is below the U.S. average. A comparison for other petroleum products will indicate a similar situation. Because of variations in local distribution costs, prices in other parts of New England range slightly above or below the Boston level.

Although petroleum product prices in New England are currently in line with those elsewhere in the nation, this has not always been the case. For several years within the past decade, New England prices were substantially lower than the average for the nation as a whole. A combination of factors—slower market growth, a general business recession in 1958, and oversupply—brought about depressed petroleum prices throughout the nation. But for various economic reasons, conditions were even more severe in New England. Price warfare persisted for several years until 1964, when improved economic conditions led to gradual price recovery. In 1963, the price of regular grade gasoline in Boston was 3.4 cents per gallon below the national average. But, by 1968 it had recovered to a level of only 0.4 cent under the nationwide average. Let's see what happened to the elements of cost between those years:

CONSUMER PRICE OF REGULAR GRADE GASOLINE IN BOSTON

[In cents per gallon]

	1963	1968	Change
Crude oil cost	6.9	7.0	+0.1
Refinery margin	3.8	3.6	−0.2
Transportation and terminal costs	1.8	2.0	+0.2
Jobber/dealer margin	5.0	10.2	+5.2
State and Federal taxes	9.5	10.5	+1.0
Consumer price	27.0	33.3	+6.3

Although most of the increase occurred at the jobber/dealer level, that element of cost in 1968 was nevertheless still below the average for the nation as a whole. The jobbers and dealers—small local businessmen—are badly squeezed in periods of depressed prices. And they, like all other businessmen, have encountered sharply rising costs in recent years. Included are the costs of government, which rose between 1963 and 1968 by more than one-third at the federal level and in New England by nearly 50 percent at state and local levels. Taxes are a cost of doing business that ultimately must be passed on to consumers—to think otherwise is illogical. Under the circumstances, the petroleum industry has performed a commendable feat indeed in holding prices down. In thirteen years—between 1955 and 1968—the average consumer price of gasoline in the nation, excluding taxes, rose by only 1.5 cents per gallon. Over the same period, state and federal excise taxes increased by more than twice as much—3.1 cents per gallon. But, relatively few consumers are aware of these facts—because of insufficient effective communications. And there is a tendency to blame the petroleum industry for all of the increase.

From the figures presented in the foregoing tables, it should be apparent that a new refinery located in New England would be able to provide lower priced petroleum products only if it could obtain crude oil at a lower cost. And it could do that only if it obtained the oil from a foreign source. Generally speaking, crude oil from some foreign sources can be delivered to East Coast ports for 2.5 to 3.0 cents per gallon less than oil of domestic origin. It is cheaper because it can be found and produced at a lower cost. Various economic factors are involved. Oil in the United States is found in smaller reservoirs and the cost of materiel and labor is higher. Transportation costs are higher too. Oil transported from the Gulf Coast to New England—or any other U.S. port—must, by law, be shipped only in tankers registered in the United States. And the labor costs on these ships are much higher than on vessels of foreign registry.

If crude oil from a foreign source is available at a lower cost, why shouldn't a refinery located in New England use it rather than domestic oil? For that matter, why shouldn't refineries everywhere operate on foreign crude oil if the nation's consumers can thereby be provided with lower priced petroleum products? Why, indeed? There are reasons vital to the nation's welfare why they should not. Many good arguments can be presented for free trade between nations when the benefits derived outweigh any harmful effects. But the security of the United States is tied directly to the degree of its petroleum self-sufficiency.

It is absolutely essential to any developed nation that it have an adequate and continuous supply of primary energy. And in the United States as much as three-fourths of all the energy consumed is petroleum—oil and natural gas. It is used nearly everywhere in the home, in industry, in commerce, in agriculture, and by all the Armed Forces. For the nation's vast transportation system, oil is virtually the only form of energy used. Clearly, any prolonged shortage of oil would be devastating. And an adequate domestic supply is the only sure way of avoiding such a shortage.

Recognizing the dangers posed by rapidly rising imports of lower cost foreign crude oil, the President of the United States imposed mandatory controls in March 1959. In part, the Presidential proclamation reads as follows: "The new program is designed to insure a stable, healthy industry in the United States capable of exploring for and developing new hemisphere reserves to replace those being depleted. The basis of the new program, like that for the voluntary program, is the certified requirements of our national security which make it necessary that we preserve to the greatest extent possible a vigorous healthy petroleum industry in the United States."

To limit imports in a manner that would be entirely equitable is an impossibility. But the controls as originally established in 1959 were reasonably well conceived. They were, however, susceptible to manipulation for political reasons and were therefore difficult to administer. From the beginning there have been numerous efforts to alter or circumvent the regulations—and some have been successful. It is, of course, unrealistic to think that any change that gives an economic advantage to some individuals or companies or regions will go unchallenged. Others, understandably, will clamor for equal treatment for competitive reasons. And each change in the import regulations has to a degree undermined the original intent of the control. The extent of the erosion thus far has raised widespread concern over the future status of the control—and some doubts that it will survive.

Surely, if import controls were removed, the action would mark the beginning of the end for domestic producers. The price of domestic crude oil would doubtless fall by 35 to 40 percent. And this would remove much of the incentive to search for new reserves. Producers would continue to produce oil and natural gas from reserves already found, but they could not afford to use their capital to find more—it would instead be shifted into other fields of economic endeavor that provide a better rate of return. Within a few years the nation's dependence upon foreign oil would soar from 21 percent now to more than 50 percent. And, as a result, the nation would be placed in a highly vulnerable position. Based upon past experience, there is positively no reason for believing that petroleum imports would be continuously available—instead, there are obvious reasons for believing otherwise. And in the event of another international war, the position of the United States would be critical. A successful military effort would require fully adequate supplies of petroleum at all times. And, because the private economy is far more dependent upon petroleum now than during World War II, it would be impossible to ration supplies to the degree they were during that conflict—to do so would lead to a breakdown of activities that necessarily must go on in support of the military effort.

Unlimited imports of foreign oil would have a severely damaging effect upon the future supply of natural gas too. Most gas reserves are found incidental to the search for crude oil, and if the financial incentive to find oil is destroyed, new gas reserves would not be discovered either. The wellhead price of natural gas is much too low to warrant a separate search for gas alone. Natural gas can be imported, but only to a limited degree. For the most part, consumers would have to do without, if the supply from domestic sources was limited.

Over the past ten years, domestic producers have spent a total of 44 billion dollars in their efforts to find oil and natural gas reserves in the United States. In the next decade, they will need to spend twice that much if the nation's current level of self-sufficiency is to be maintained. These capital expenditures flow through, and favorably influence, many sectors of the nation's economy. But, under the circumstances created by unlimited imports of foreign oil, relatively little of this money would be spent in the United States. Oil and natural gas are now produced in 32 of the nation's 50 states—and all of them would feel to varying degrees the detrimental economic impact of uncontrolled imports. In addition, the nation's balance of payments would be affected adversely.

Clearly, consumers would benefit if the import controls were removed. But only to a limited degree. And only for a temporary period. If refineries operating on lower cost crude oil were able to provide petroleum products for one cent per gallon under the present level, the saving would amount to about 6 dollars per year for the average consumer of gasoline and 13 dollars annually for the average residential heating oil customer. But most if not all of the saving would disappear within a comparatively short period of time. As soon as the self-sufficiency of the United States fell by a significant amount, the price of foreign crude oil could be expected to rise. Because of their direct financial interests, it would be perfectly natural for the governments of foreign producing countries to seek the highest price possible for their oil. The United States and Western Europe together constitute nearly three-fourths of the Free World market for crude oil. And by the time the United States had to import half of its needs, the combined self-sufficiency of the two areas would be no more than 25 percent. Under such conditions it is inconceivable that the price of crude oil from abroad would not be raised repeatedly to the maximum level the traffic would bear. The price of domestic crude oil would rise again too, but by this time a great deal of damage would have been done.

The United States can have somewhat lower priced petroleum products for a brief period by using unlimited quantities of foreign crude oil. But it can do so only by paying an exceedingly high price in other terms—by seriously jeopardizing the national security and by causing widespread damage to a great many economic activities. The economic impact would be felt by numerous levels of government deprived of tax revenue, by several industries, but mostly by thousands upon thousands of small businessmen. It is noteworthy that those who would benefit most from unlimited imports of foreign oil—the large international petroleum companies—have nevertheless supported restrictions. From the time mandatory controls were first imposed these companies have consistently put the nation's best interests ahead of their own.

The nation must soon decide which route it wishes to follow. And the responsibility for making that decision rests heavily indeed upon those who will be involved. History has recorded the mistakes of the past and will continue to do so in the future. But, surely, if all the lines of communication are kept open and fully utilized, if all the pertinent facts are brought out and carefuly weighed, and if the long range effects are measured accurately, the chances for making the best decision will be much improved.

JOHN G. WINGER,
Energy Division.

MARCH 11, 1969.

U.S. PETROLEUM STATISTICS SUMMARIZED

	January		Percent change	3 months ended Jan 31		Percent change
	1969 Thousand barrels daily	1968 Thousand barrels daily		1969 Thousand barrels daily	1968 Thousand barrels daily	
Demand:						
Gasoline	5,167	4,778	+8.1	5,217	4,934	+5.7
Kerosine	1,145	1,079	+6.1	1,071	970	+10.4
Distillate	3,880	3,806	+1.9	3,226	3,186	+1.3
Residual	2,215	2,775	−20.2	2,093	2,824	−8.4
All other	2,780	2,775	+.2	2,778	2,715	+2.3
Total demand	15,187	15,213	−.2	14,385	14,089	+2.1
New supply:						
Crude oil production	9,033	9,021	+.1	8,988	8,969	+.2
Natural gas liquids production	1,550	1,461	+6.1	1,550	1,461	+6.1
Crude oil imports	1,274	985	+29.3	1,401	1,061	+32.0
Residual fuel imports	1,292	1,643	−21.4	1,128	1,304	−13.5
Other products imports	450	386	+16.6	410	358	+14.5
Total new supply	13,599	13,496	+.8	13,477	13,153	+2.5
Crude runs to stills	9,945	10,093	−1.5	10,182	10,109	+.7
	Million barrels	Million barrels		Million barrels	Million barrels	
Stock change in million barrels	−49.2	−53.6		−82.5	−86.4	
Stocks—end of period:						
Gasoline	212.0	220.0	−3.6			
Kerosine	34.0	33.0	+3.0			
Distillate	136.0	120.0	+13.3			
Residual	61.0	59.0	+3.4			
Other products	233.0	214.0	+8.9			
Total products	676.0	646.0	+4.6			
Crude oil	283.0	245.0	+15.5			
Total, all oils	959.0	891.0	+7.6			

Sources: U.S.B.M., A.P.I., and C.M.B.

WOULD YOU SIGN THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, recently the students in a class of American Government and politics at the University of Maryland, European division, conducted a most revealing survey. They decided to circulate a portion of the preamble of the Declaration of Independence among a cross section of Americans at an Air Force base in Germany. This survey was circulated to see how many of our country's citizens would actually recognize their own Declaration of Independence. Also, these students wished to know how many of the individuals interviewed would support the document and if necessary, sign it as evidence of their convictions. I am confident that the results of this survey will be a matter of keen interest and deep concern to my colleagues. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the information concerning this survey and its results be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTION OF THE PREAMBLE OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these, are life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudent, indeed, will dictate that governments long established, should not be changed for light and transient causes; and, accordingly, all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But, when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty to throw off such government and to provide new guards for their future security.

I. Direct totals:	
a. Total number interviewed	252
b. Total number who signed the document	68
c. Total number who would not sign the document	148
d. Total number of those who agreed with the document, but would not sign it	36
e. Total number of those who realized exactly what the document was	41

II. Direct percentages in relation to part I:	
a. Percentage of base population interviewed	11
b. Percentage of those who would sign the document	27
c. total percentage of those who would not sign the document	73
1. Percentage of those who agreed with the document, but would not sign it	14
2. Percentage of those who absolutely would not sign the document	59
d. Percentage of those who realized what the document really was	16

STATEMENTS MADE BY INDIVIDUALS WHO WOULD NOT SIGN THE SURVEY DOCUMENT

(These are just some of the statements that were given, but they are a good sample of many responses received.)

1. Some called it a lot of trash.

2. Many felt that the document is advocating a coup d' etat.

3. Many did not believe in the principles stated in the document.

4. Some felt that the document is very vague and left a lot to be desired.

5. Many felt that it was a direct rebuttal of the Government.

6. One teacher at a local junior high school, after reading it stated: "Do you really believe in this document?" When the man responded with a definite YES, the teacher shouted: "You believe in what you want to you communist."

7. Many would not sign the document for fear of repercussion.

8. Some would not sign the document because it failed to clarify how the government would be replaced, and had there been any mention of elections they would have signed it.

9. Four individuals accused the surveyor (a Negro) of trying to develop his own black state.

10. This document is "advocating the abolishing of our government and the possible establishing of a dictatorship."

11. One individual refused to sign the document and called it a very radical document, he also thought it was poorly written.

12. A few felt that it was an outdated document, and left too much for interpretation.

13. An individual felt it was not necessary to reaffirm the principles to which he has dedicated his life to and had sworn to uphold when he took the Oath of Allegiance.

14. One man said the document was "basically stupid and a lot of trash." Also, this same individual felt people should not have the right to abolish the government.

15. Some individuals would not sign it because they wanted to know what it would be used for.

16. Another individual stated: "Who wasted an afternoon writing this?"

17. Another man felt that the government shouldn't be changed by the "little people".

18. Too much "legal talk".

19. Doesn't give enough to the majority class.

20. One individual left the room and refused to even talk about the document again.

21. One individual did not like the word prudence in the document.

22. Many thought this document to be too radical.

23. Another individual thought the document was "pretty", but not workable.

24. One gentleman asked if the document had anything to do with the "Communist Party of America".

25. One individual said that "it sounds like that long haired kid stuff".

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Survey assistants: David S. Haynes, Joseph Kupferschmidt, Robert E. Lock, Tony Tolbert.

The survey was conducted during the period of February 13, 1969 through March 10, 1969.

Faculty advisor: Dr. Serge M. Shewchuk, University of Maryland, European Division.

For questions concerning this survey please contact David S. Haynes, Box 2299, APO New York 09130.

THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am one of a number of Senators who have been watching with interest, and with concern, the extent to which the Nixon administration intends to implement civil rights laws and regulations. In particular, I have been watching, and commenting upon, the inadequate and inconsistent way in which the Nixon administration has handled its responsibilities in the areas of school desegregation and contract compliance.

An editorial in Sunday's Washington Post entitled "The President and Civil Rights Law" was addressed to this issue. It characterized the administration's performance in implementing civil rights law as "a directionless one, marked by rude, unsettling swings back and forth between upholding the law and temporizing it." The editorial spelled out in very clear language the disastrous results the administration can expect if it continues its "policy of ambiguity" in this vital area.

This editorial deserves the attention of all Americans dedicated to the goals of equal justice and equal opportunity and I ask unanimous consent that it appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1969]

THE PRESIDENT AND CIVIL RIGHTS LAW

"The laws have caught up with our conscience," President Nixon said in his inaugural address. "What remains is to give life to what is in the law: to ensure at last that as all are born equal in dignity before God, all are born equal in dignity before man." Giving "life to what is in the law"—the formulation was an excellent one, clear and to the point. But Administration execution of the President's inaugural dictum has been something else again, an uneven performance and seemingly a directionless one, marked by rude, unsettling swings back and forth between upholding the law and temporizing about it.

To the extent that this can be called a policy, it is a policy of ambiguity, one which can only produce losers and not just among the black Americans whose rights and opportunities are at stake. For it is hard to see how the Administration can bring anything but trouble to itself—discontent and disappointment on all sides—by failing to give out a clear and unambiguous signal in this matter.

The latest in the series of troubling episodes concerns the resignation of Clifford L. Alexander Jr. as chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Mr. Alexander, a Negro and a Democratic Administration appointee, pointed out the implications that must be drawn from the fact that the White House had announced its intention to replace him the day after he had been the object of a vicious attack by Senator Dirksen for his efforts to enforce Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, Senator Dirksen having also suggested that he would talk to the right person in the Administration and see to it that the likes of Mr. Alexander would be fired. Mr. Alexander, in his resignation remarks, also charged the Administration with having omitted from its goals the vigorous enforcement of the "laws on employment discrimination."

President Nixon, it should be noted, had no obligation to retain Mr. Alexander in the chairman's post. But to have so entirely failed to support Mr. Alexander at a moment when he was under this kind of attack is another matter. Like so many other aspects of the Administration's mixed performance in this field, the best construction one can put on it is that nothing more sinister than inadvertence and insensitivity underlay it. That was the best that could have been said, for instance, of the Defense Department's cavalier approach to the letting of contracts to three Southern firms which were out of compliance with civil rights standards. That situation has now been in large measure retrieved, but it shook confidence sufficiently to have prompted a lawsuit on the part of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund which will seek to have the contracts revoked.

The one place where there has been evidence of firmness is at HEW where Secretary Finch has moved ahead on fund cut-offs from Southern school districts that disregard the provisions of the law and has made some irreproachable appointments to the offices charged with carrying out civil rights policy. But even at HEW, there has been a slow infusion of appointees (with or without the Secretary's unequivocal blessing is not clear) whose presence suggests that the Administration is trying to have it both ways and to please its unpleasable constituents in the South.

The point is that the Administration cannot afford an inadvertent or insensitive approach to these questions—much less an artfully misleading one. President Nixon still has much to do to gain the confidence of those citizens who will be most profoundly affected by any undermining of the laws and regulations on the books. Moreover, lacking as he does in present circumstances the funds to affirm his commitment to their well-being by moving ahead with the substantive domestic programs legislated in the past several years, he has a special obligation to affirm that commitment by way of uncompromised and unequivocal support of the laws that define and protect their rights.

Finally, there is the plain fact that by playing it both ways or even suggesting the possibility of a weakness of resolve, Mr. Nixon can only excite hopes he will ultimately be unable to fulfill on the part of those communities, corporations and pubic institutions that are still resisting implementation of our civil rights laws.

It will be tough politics, but good politics, when the Administration decides that its business is precisely what the President said: giving life to what is in the law.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a news analysis in this morning's Washington Post amplified and reinforced the reasoning in yesterday's editorial. It described in detail the inconsistent and uncoordinated manner in which the Nixon administration has approached the implementation of civil rights laws. This news analysis calls the central themes of the Nixon administration's civil rights activities a "lack of coordination and a tendency to react and improvise rather than initiate action." After reviewing a series of conflicting and uncoordinated administration actions, the article concludes that "beneath these appearances of confusion and lack of direction, there is a real confusion and lack of direction."

I ask unanimous consent to insert the article entitled "Nixon Civil Rights Policies Appear Mired in Confusion" at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1969]

NIXON CIVIL RIGHTS POLICIES APPEAR MIRED IN CONFUSION

(By John P. MacKenzie)

Less than three months after taking office, the Nixon Administration appears to have as many civil rights policies as there are agencies with civil rights duties.

So far, it's been a record of activism and equivocation of creative effort and indifference, of talk and conduct that both excites and worries Negro leaders. The only central themes have been lack of coordination and a tendency to react and improvise rather than initiate action.

On the same day that the Justice Department's civil rights chieftain announces a bold new move to protect Negroes from real estate "blockbusting," the Secretary of Transportation is roasted on Capitol Hill for easing up on equal employment demands for highway builders.

On the same day that the Justice Department sues a textile mill for job and company housing bias, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund is taking the Pentagon to court for letting three prime textile contractors off the hook over their hiring, promoting and company housing practices.

In one 24-hour span, President Nixon vows publicly that the executive branch shall "lead the way as an equal opportunity employer"—and his press secretary states that the Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, freshly rebuked by Senate Republican leader Everett Dirksen for "harassing" employers, will be replaced.

Beneath these appearances of confusion and lack of direction, there is real confusion and lack of direction—although the young Administration's failure to attempt high-level across-the-board civil rights enforcement may not be entirely an accident.

Assistant Attorney General Jerris Leonard for example, did not know in advance that the Defense Department was accepting verbal equal employment assurances from the textile firms rather than the written promises required by a 1965 executive order.

Such a snafu probably would not have happened under President Johnson who, besides making his stand on civil rights very clear, designated Attorney General Ramsey Clark as his man, Government-wide, to ensure enforcement of Federal law barring financial aid to areas plagued by discrimination.

Nobody has stepped forward to claim the laurels of Mr. Civil Rights for the Nixon Administration, partly perhaps because Attorney General John N. Mitchell has indicated he wants to make the line between Justice and, say, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, firmer rather than fuzzier where they have over lapping jurisdiction such as in school desegregation.

The total effect of each department going its own way, is not one of neutrality toward civil rights. The Pentagon's failure to submit its contracting policy to scrutiny elsewhere in Government amounts to a decision to avoid the kind of review that almost certainly would build pressures for a tough Defense Department policy.

Besides making it easier to temporize, such lack of necessary embarrassment. The Pentagon made its textile announcement within hours of President Nixon's promise to NAACP Executive Secretary Roy N. Wilkins to investigate complaints on the subject—a bureaucratic goof that no cynic could have stage-managed.

Leonard, 39-year-old former Wisconsin state legislator, has overcome an initial setback about his membership in a segregated Milwaukee club to earn a reputation among many civil rights workers for a sincere desire to enforce Federal law vigorously.

He stepped in quickly to argue in the Supreme Court on the side of Negroes who tried to desegregate a recreation area near Little Rock, Ark. When he filed a friend-of-the-court brief in a Chicago "blockbusting" case, lawyers for Negroes there credited him with a creative legal argument and they were grateful to have the prestige of the United States Government thrown in as well.

Leonard is regarded by some subordinates as easily educated in the intricacies of civil rights enforcement, but he is being watched to see whether he can capture the appropriations needed to unfreeze the current travel restrictions that keep many bias fighters chairborne.

At HEW, Secretary Robert H. Finch weathered an initial period of unpreparedness and uncertainty to begin a pattern of toughness over school desegregation-Federal aid guidelines.

But Finch's appointment of Robert C. Mardian, who has urged a quiet cutback in Federal fund cutoffs, as general counsel, counterbalanced his naming of Leon A. Panetta, a liberal, to do the actual enforcing, has created a new mix of emotions and expectations. So have Finch's own conflicting public statements on civil rights issues.

No civil rights legislative program has emerged, but it will be surprising if the White House backs a Johnson Administration proposal for enforcement powers for the Employment Commission, since Dirksen has upbraided former chairman Clifford A. Alexander Jr. for his use of its existing powers.

The Administration's failure to coordinate with Dirksen plus an ill-timed White House statement the next day saying Alexander would be replaced as chairman combined for the maximum Administration embarrassment. Knowing that Alexander, a Democrat, could become difficult to handle politically, the Administration nonetheless managed to let Alexander resign as chairman (while remaining on the commission) in a righteous huff rather than quietly.

The signs are scant that segregationist Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) wields great influence on civil rights matters. But signs are plentiful that the Nixon Administration will continue for some time to move in several directions at once on civil rights.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, our country cannot tolerate confusion and inconsistency in the implementation of civil rights laws and regulations. The time has come for the Nixon administration to publicly clarify its intent to enforce the law in civil rights matters, and to act unequivocally and consistently to carry out that intent.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate today, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to and (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, April 15, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, April 10, 1969, under authority of the order of April 3, 1969:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

William J. Handley, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

Kenneth B. Keating, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India.

William Leonhart, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Val Peterson of Nebraska, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

Alfred Puhan, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Hungary.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Lewis Butler, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Robert C. Mardian, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

L. J. Andolsek, of Minnesota, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for the term of 6 years expiring March 1, 1975.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Walter L. Mazan, of Vermont, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers of the U.S. Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Robert C. Herold
Arthur R. Whittum
Malcolm W. Gray
James H. Oliver
Gene A. Forest
John H. Powers, III
Lavere E. Amundson
Frank C. Lewis
John J. Castulik
Dennis W. Mahar
John F. Weseman
Karl Kaufman
Ernest R. Smith, Jr.
Michael W. Wade
Thuren M. Drown
Brian W. Mills
Donald L. Dobbs
Frank K. Cole
Brian Pickhover
Carl D. Fry
Robert L. Melville
Paul C. Monette
Michael L. Kelly
Gerald F. Arens
Michael G. Cavett
Ramond L. McFadden
Richard F. Mattingly, Jr.
Herman F. Hirsh, III
Gerald D. Johnson
Claude W. Brock
Robert J. Parsons
David W. Thiel
Edward S. Olszewski, Jr.
Thomas E. Ross, III
Douglas D. Lundberg

The following-named Reserve officer to be permanent commissioned officer of the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant commander:

Walter R. Wilkinson.

The following named Reserve officers to be permanent commissioned officers of the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant:

Stanley J. Spurgeon.
William McPherson.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Philip N. Whittaker, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Joseph Rohrich Jr. FR3310 for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force in the grade of colonel from the temporary disability retired list under the provisions of sections 1210 and 1211, title 10, United States Code.

Orley B. Caudill, FR13074, for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, from the temporary disability retired list, under provisions of sections 1210 and 1211, title 10, United States Code.

The following officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captain (medical)

Stone, James D., 3203093.

To be first lieutenants (medical)

Adams, Michael, 3038976.
Amonette, Rex A., 3201243.
Behringer, Blair R., 3041076.
Bevans, David W., Jr., 3202663.
Boatman, Dennis L., 3202580.
Bolin, Robert B., 3167477.
Bordelon, Fred C., 3202299.
Bullock, Milton L., 3202766.
Chudnow, Ivan, 3202290.
Colclasure, Joe B., 3202293.
Dahl, Vincent H., 3202577.
Ellerby, Richard A., 3201756.
Hall, John L., 320,2095.
Hamilton, Oliver F., Jr., 3202094.
Harris, Ashby T., 3203071.
Heard, John G., 3201802.
Hooper, Joseph R., 3202946.
Hughes, Thomas H., 3202401.
Jackson, James E., 3202035.
Jackson, Joseph A., III, 3202033.
Kirkpatrick, Barry V., 3202869.
Koop, Lamonte P., 3203876.
Kracke, William I., 3202062.
Lawrence, David R., 3203254.
Martin, Thomas R., 3202281.
McCord, George E., 3203359.
Milam, William F., Jr., 3203401.
Mims, William W., Jr., 3185162.
Myers, Charles M., 3201597.
Parris, Fred N., 3202614.
Pica, Donald G., 3201423.
Raines, Richard D., 3202904.
Reiman, Charles B., 3203202.
Ricks, John P., 3202315.
Righetti, Thomas R., 3202314.
Rimmer, Charles W., Jr., 3201280.
Rogers, Roy S., III, 3216222.
Rosenbaum, Thomas W., 3202705.
Rustin, Dowse D., 3201544.
Simpson, Charles L., 3203046.
Thibault, Frank G., 3202332.
Tibbels, Terrence E., 3202339.
Wexler, Nathan S., 3201249.
Wilkins, Kaye E., 3202130.
Williamson, Warren L., 3201238.
Yatteau, Ronald F., 3164613.

To be captain (Dental)

Depew, Theodore E., Jr., 3140997.

To be first lieutenant (Dental)

Almquist, Theodore C., 3142412.

To be first lieutenant (Judge Advocate)

Baur, Byron D., 3156167.
Shockley, Larry G., 3223040.
Stark, Thomas M., 322968.

The following Air Force officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be first lieutenants

Ahrens, Darrell J., 3127872.
Aldrich, Robert M., 3151977.
Alexis, Joseph Jr., 3147873.
Allen, Robert D., 3163336.
Alley, Ronald G., 3134095.
Altenhof, Bruce D., 3161524.
Anderson, Jerry A., 3160060.
Andrews, Francis J. Jr., 3151562.
Apel, Charles L., 3158341.
Bainter, Billy D., 3151299.
Balsamo, Salvatore R., 3168815.
Barker, Edward R., 3151554.
Barnett, Glenn, R., 3160469.
Barrett, Billy A., 3137834.
Basler, Edward W., 3158968.
Bayless, William D. Jr., 3147874.
Beard, Preston S., 3147684.
Beardslee, Stephen A., 3149698.
Beckham, Wilbur L. Jr., 3161343.
Beebe, David A., 3161042.
Behl, John H. III, 3161796.
Belcher, Glenn A., 3160907.
Belisle, Charles A., 3150117.
Bell, Jeffrey, 3133596.
Benedict, Rettig P. Jr., 3160521.
Berg, Lothar E. Jr., 3150572.
Bertolami, Paul R., 3158216.
Biniewski, Daniel J., 3150226.
Blackburn, Gary E., 3163636.
Blair, John D. Jr., 3147336.
Blankenship, Norman R., 3149424.
Bledsoe, Gleyn E. Jr., 3163082.
Bonfanti, Harry J., 3160253.
Bookman, Thaddeus A., 3151497.
Boulware, John H., 3159380.
Bourne, Alan M., 3161137.
Brisby, Johnny M., 3163276.
Briscoe, Jerald D., 3151415.
Britt, Wayne I., 3150224.
Brown, Richard A., 3149682.
Bruce, Robert W., 3163047.
Bruhn, Peter C., 3163162.
Bryant, William L., 3148549.
Brzostek, Chester F., 3157966.
Buchanan, Ellis G., 3151422.
Buckner, Dean T., 3162793.
Buehler, Gary F., 3147428.
Burton, Larry D., 3161247.
Buser, Lamoyne G., 3158879.
Canavan, Thomas E., 3150339.
Carl, Ronald W., 3157722.
Carpenter, Richard J., Jr., 3150195.
Cary, Thomas M., 3151767.
Cashel, William F., 3147906.
Chin, Rodney D., 3163310.
Clark, William D., Jr., 3148211.
Cook, James R., 3150431.
Cortez, Robert, 3149406.
Cote, Robert T., 3149796.
Cote, Ronald J., 3160129.
Cournoyer, Ronald C., 3151833.
Couture, Louis C., 3150501.
Cox, Juanita R., 3151019.
Crowder, James R., 3150225.
Crump, James C., Jr., 3149700.
Cundey, William R., 3160189.
Cunningham, Charles A., 3149789.
Czernik, Chester E., 3150911.
Dakan, Dennis K., 3157886.
Dansby, Jesse L., Jr., 3162159.
Derboghossian, Zaven C., 3139351.
Disz, Thomas E., 3158519.
Dixon, William E., 3151517.
Dodson, Allen E. Jr., 3152094.
Donnelly, George E., 3151630.
Douglas, William A., 3151852.
Duerholz, Robert J., 3150132.
Durkin, William C., 3160473.
Durst, Carl L., 3160978.
Eckstone, Stephen D., 3150093.
Emmons, Donald R., 3158882.
Evans, Kenneth P., 3149546.
Felderman, Harold J., 3157887.
Fierman, Paul B., 3133863.
Filbin, Paul W., 3161618.
Filiatreau, Thomas R., 3163647.
Ford, John E., III, 3095611.
Freeman, Lawrence R., 3157970.
Freewald, Robert C., 3150590.
Freisinger, John J., 3151489.
Freund, Donald W., 3161364.
Furrer, Max E., 3149453.
Garcia, Freddie, Jr., 3150297.
Gemlich, Stephen L., 3158857.

Gerber, Ronald H., 3149714.
Gess, William G., 3151451.
Gest, Alan E., 3150366.
Gibbs, Douglas L., 3168841.
Gifford, Norman L., 3133587.
Gilbert, Robert G., 3149623.
Goodwick, Kenneth A., 3148301.
Goshorn, William J., 3110091.
Green, Harlan D., 3150929.
Grouls, David R., 3160336.
Habermel, James G., 3150243.
Hacker, Brian M., 3149292.
Haley, Thomas E., Jr., 3149185.
Haller, Carl A., 3148483.
Ham, Howard C., Jr., 3149583.
Hamner, John B., 3158858.
Hanks, Alvin L., 3163277.
Harris, Richard A., 3149139.
Heagy, Charles F., Jr., 3157327.
Healy, Donald M., 3163603.
Hein, Donald H., 3151652.
Helms, John H., 3156316.
Henningsen, Richard F., 3150095.
Henry, Larry L., 3154444.
Henry, Leonard O., III, 3149944.
Henryson, John A., 3151948.
Hill, Frederick A., 3159786.
Horn, Michael S., 3151803.
Hotcaveg, Kenneth J., 3150101.
Hull, John W., Jr., 3162277.
Hunsiker, Bobbe E., 3161068.
Hussey, James H., 3151520.
Huxley, Donald L., 3151514.
Inge, Kenneth W., 3150034.
Janson, Gutthard, III, 3151896.
Jessup, Ervin L., Jr., 3163633.
Johnsey, Gary H., 3157335.
Johnson, Dale E., 3147918.
Jones, Hugh B., 3150053.
Jones, Thomas L., 3155043.
Kaehler, Robert D., 3161637.
Kaesemeyer, Roy H., 3155780.
Kang, Alden, 3158434.
Kapinos, Victor L., 3147942.
Kelley, Brian J., 3162866.
Kercher, David H., 3151344.
Kintigh, David D., 3163724.
Kohn, John A., 3158463.
Koppe, Thomas F., 3149649.
Kross, Walter, 3151906.
Krumm, John A., 3149566.
Kuzmack, Michael S. II., 3149388.
Lambert, Ronald L., 3147648.
Lang, David M., 3152070.
Lapczynski, Thomas J., 3151222.
Laroche, Robert P., 3151355.
Lasocki, Richard P., 3159682.
Lemoine, Leo J., 3160020.
Letzelter, Cyril J. II., 3151043.
Lewis, Beacher B., 3151124.
Lichacz, John, 3150306.
Lightner, Jeffrey L., 3157925.
Linn, Thomas A., 3150982.
Livingston, Ronald D., 3150537.
Lohr, William F., 3161811.
Loos, James H., 3149036.
Louk, Frederick A., 3152047.
Lynn, Fredric M., 3162293.
Lyon, William K., 3157734.
Macaluso, Salvatore J., 3150375.
MacInnis, William H., 3160435.
Madura, John T., 3157598.
Malik, John J. Jr., 3151776.
Manning, William S., 3034745.
Marshall, William H., 3151138.
Mathews, Jack S. Jr., 3161260.
Matson, Eric K., 3149186.
Matthews, James F., 3161261.
Mauldin, William T., 3157401.
Maurice, James H., 3163610.
Mazer, Ronald G., 3148668.
McCain, Harvey G., 3149165.
McCullough, Lee W., 3163659.
McGhee, Robert E., 3151783.
McIlree, Alexander Jr., 3149134.
McInerney, Michael B., 3151261.
McKee, William C., 3160087.
McRae, William C., Jr., 3147962.
McWilliams, Howard H., 3149117.
Meador, Robert C., 3152100.
Meier, Stephen L., 3147677.
Miller, Howard H., 3149886.
Mink, Richard C., 3151278.
Monsour, Lawrence F., 3149328.
Moody, Ira A., 3149997.
Mooshie, John S., 3149733.
Morell, Dennis P., 3163239.
Morey, Kent W., 3148139.
Morss, Dean A., 3159796.
Nagel, Kenneth J., 3151272.
Neal, Lawrence L., 3163662.
Nemetz, Robert A., 3150051.
Nesbitt, Edward H., 3163626.
Nester, Robert A., 3155010.
Newman, William R., 3168807.
Noel, Thomas F., 3158805.
Norton, Robert L., Jr., 3152007.
Nozynski, Raymond J., 3151578.
Nutter, Steven M., 3150630.
Oates, James A., 3149141.
Okeefe, Paul J., 3149876.
Omeara, John J., 3151459.
Ovalle, Ralph A., 3150983.
Paquette, David W., 3159529.
Parish, John I., 3026118.
Parks, Rodney G., 3148046.
Peach, Ernest B., 3133545.
Pearson, John M., 3168918.
Peck, Peter E., 3151423.
Personius, Gerald R., 3147907.
Petersen, Edward A., 3163286.
Peterson, Ralph W., 3159072.
Pogue, Richard A., 3161395.
Pontiff, Gary J., 3150651.
Price, Charles R., 3160836.
Pringle, Sammie, 3150961.
Radowski, Michael J., 3150652.
Raezer, David P., 3151442.
Rakestraw, Pat W., 3157556.
Ramsey, Thomas J., 3151008.
Rasimus, Edward J., Jr., 3158591.
Rau, Edward C., 3149256.
Rayko, John C. B., 3150027.
Reaves, Cato L., 3155626.
Reavis, Radford L., 3162321.
Reinert, Kenneth W., 3161786.
Reinhard, Ralph R., 3150445.
Reiter, Richard T., 3159099.
Rhoton, Bert V., 3021563.
Ribbentrop, Richard T., 3148890.
Rice, Ernest W., Jr., 3149921.
Rice, George B., 3147553.
Rico, Juan M., 3161398.
Ripko, John C., 3157743.
Ritchie, Adrian A., Jr., 3133692.
Robbins, Robert E., 3151094.
Robinson, David E., 3151473.
Robinson, James R., 3157859.
Robinson, Larry A., 3151373.
Rose, James W., 3149787.
Roser, Thomas M., 3151515.
Rovegno, John F., 3161583.
Royster, Jack A., Jr., 3162182.
Safris, Charles E., 3149069.
Satre, Stephen F., 3133990.
Savanick, Andrew, Jr., 3148100.
Schenck, James L., 3151499.
Schulze, Charles E., Jr., 3150290.
Schwartz, John C., 3158872.
Searcy, Jerry W., 3157116.
Seymore, Lesley L., 3162603.
Sharp, Paul R., 3149741.
Shaughnessy, Dale J., 31449909.
Sheldon, Earnest L., 3149499.
Shelton, Maurice L., 3146662.
Shiomi, Brian T., 3133462.
Smith, Gerald E., 3149891.
Smith, Herbert S., 3163292.
Smith, Robert B., 3157803.
Snyder, John G., 3150360.
Sorce, Domonic P., 161790.
Sousa, Paul E., 3150892.
Spears, Phillips D., 3150993.
Stein, Lowell L., 3159998.
Stevenson, John C., 3151986.
Stockwell, David E., 3147917.
Stolp, Durward D., 3151000.
Stoner, Tommy C., 3150301.
Standlie, Michael D., 3159817.
Swinney, David M., 3151855.
Tashner, Richard, 3151719.
Telesio, John H., 3148418.
Thomas, Luther L., 3151814.
Thomas, Terry A., 3154429.
Thompson, William H., 3149749.
Tilmon, Ronald I., 3149665.
Upton, Robert D., 3151478.
Valasek, Jon E., 3151062.
Valerian, Robert J., 3158028.
Vaneynde, James A., 3151424.
Vanpelt, John R., 3160849.
Vantilborg, Dale W., 3159144.
Veilleux, John M., 3160572.
Vinkels, Gunars, 3149188.
Walker, Lester L., 3134075.
Walker, William H., II, 3150384.
Waller, Thomas S., 3150636.
Wallerstedt, John R., 3148237.
Walsh, Edward F., 3151356.
Warren, John R., 3158781.
Welch, David N., 3130605.
West, James B., 3158412.
White, Walter E., Jr., 3161953.
Wiess, Martin P., 3160329.
Wildes, James S., 3151535.
Wimer, Glenn C., 3162106.
Wise, Anthony C., 3151177.
Wood, Phillip D., 3151279.
Wratten, Thomas F., 3158826.
Wright, Donald E., 3151973.
Wyatt, Milton R., 3151046.
Yajko, John A., 3149211.
Zaugg, David M., 3132799.
Zertuche, Leopoldo, Jr., 3150682.

The following distinguished graduates of the Air Force Officer Training School for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Barrett, Robert M., Jr., 3239432.
Bayley, John S., 3239434.
Bunker, John W., 3228178.
Cambridge, David J., 3228380.
Carroll, Robert L., 3228336.
Chenette, Rudolph L., 3228128.
Collins, Richard, 3239444.
Dare, James M., 3239447.
Davis, Ricky W., 3227985.
Emery, Patrick I., 3239450.
Ford, Gary E., 3228277.
Goodman, Jack L., Jr., 3239457.
Haslam, Donald E., 3239458.
Jackson, Clark G., 3228324.
Kinlin, Donald J., 3239464.
Lamont, Stephen S., 3228025.
Moreland, Tim E., Jr., 3228000.
Mullen, John T., 3239473.
Nelson, Renwick T. II, 3239474.
Parker, James T., 3228334.
Possemato, Paul A., 3228310.
Reynolds, William L., 3228087.
Rodriguez, Ignacio, 3228389.
Saenger, George W., 3228097.
Schroyer, Anthony J., 3239484.
Smyth, Gerard A., 3227855.
Squire, James M., 3228041.
Stephenson, Stephen J., 3227885.
Strand, Randolph L., 3228027.
Sutton, James P., Jr., 3228388.
Truitt, James F., 3239496.
Velez, Jose N., 3239499.
Wenzel, David E., 3228386.

In the Marine Corps

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

Jeffrey W. Oster.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant:

Richard G. Ericson.
James R. Hughes.
Earl M. Collins.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant:

Paul E. Brown
Wayne P. Campbell
James C. Cockerl
Thomas C. Dean
Rex W. Foster, Jr.
Charles E. Ganc
John J. Gaynor, Jr.
Robert J. Gleason
John R. Gregory
Frank H. Griffin, III
Robert P. Hansen
Norris G. Henthorne, III
Walter T. Hicock
Robert J. Hopmann
Charles W. Holmes
Edward A. Horne
William H. Hunt
Michael E. Jackson
John B. Kelly
William R. Knapp
Patrick P. Oates
John A. Janega
Michael L. Parks
Simon Poljakow
John W. Schwab, Jr.
William H. Stubblefield
Joshua D. Tallentire
Harry B. Wease
David L. Weber
Edward R. Zaptin
Gerald B. Benes
Gofdon E. Evans
Richard L. Jahne
Joseph T. Jewell, III
Frederick E. Leek, II
Craig L. Mayer
Ronald C. Skelton
James R. Benson
M. L. Buchanan, Jr.
Blake J. Cate, Jr.
Steven E. Gugas
Patrick A. Nourot
Ralph A. Orlandella
Ronald S. Rossini
James A. Ruska
William J. Sublette
Thomas M. Timberlake, Jr.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 14, 1969:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Carl J. Gilbert, of Massachusetts, to be special representative for trade negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Thomas K. Cowden, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Brantley Blue, of Tennessee, to be Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named (staff noncommissioned officers) for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Acri, Albert A.
Adams, Andrew W.
Ale, Richard L.
Angle, Donald A.
Bessette, Alfred F.
Binion, Sammy G.
Bragg, Donald R.
Burnham, Thomas R.
Cerqua, Vincent
Chepenik, Marcus P.
Dawson, William J.
Dearing, Hugh H. II
Docherty, Daniel J.
Dodd, Howard C.
Eveler, Bernard H.
Florian, Frederick J.
Gingras, Leon E.
Hodge, Tommie S.
Hutson, Clarence E.
Jacques, Timothy A.
Jenkins, Eugene
Johnson, Charles A.
Kampen, Gordqn E.
Kennedy, Michael B.
King, Carl E.
Lindsay, Jimmie A.
Lopes, Robert
Madda, Anthony V.
Madenford, Eugene C.
Martin, Darrell F.
Marx, Ronald E.
Mayo, James E.
Medrano, Gary F.
Morris, Wayne V.
Moylan, Michael J.
Napier, Freddie
Nottingham, Arthur W.
Novak, Francis P.
O'Dell, Jerry W.
Puida, Terrence T.
Pullin, Jesse P.
Rizzo, Joseph F.
Roebuck, Kenneth D.
Schuette, Walter R.
Sellers, Thomas R.
Shanklin, Michael L.
Shepherd, David H.
Stone, Robert A.
Tedrick, Robert B., II
Tracy, Terry N.
Webb, Jesse E.
Wilson, Joseph C.
Yantorn, James J.
Young, William C.

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Blevins, Earl A.
Gardner, William D.
Greene, Michael R.
Howard, John E.

The following named (Navy Enlisted Scientific Education Program) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

McConaghy, Dennis A.

The following named (commissioned warrant officers/warrant officers) for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for limited duty, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Barber, Robert, Jr.
Barrett, Odis L.
Berryhill, Thomas J.
Fernandez, Orlando
Fritz, Ray
Glidewell, Horton A.
Jones, Larry
Kennedy, Floyd M.
Mallick, Michael T.
McCartney, Charles A.
McGuire, Jerome M.
Miller, Ashby R.
Miranda, Jimmy
Moore, David D.
Newman, John N.
Panchy, Louis N.
Robinson, Wade A.
Staigle, Charles L.
Wallace, Charles L.
Woltner, Rudolph E., Jr.

The following named (commissioned warrant officers/warrant officers) for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for limited duty, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Baltezore, Allen
Boehlke, Fred W.
Chambers, Walter C.
Fischer, Frederick J., Jr.
Flowers, James J.
Ganeles, Burton F.
Gerber, Robert P.
McClay, Thomas F.
Nelson, Clarence M., Jr.
Nowark, Billie F.
Ochoa, Johnnie M.
Palumbo, Lewis H.
Reffelt, Edwin L.
Sykes, Donald B.
Tesh, David M.
Zigovsky, Martin J.

The following named (staff noncommissioned officers) for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for limited duty, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Croston, John L.
Ermish, Harold J.
Fish, George F.
Hinson, Earl M.
Houghton, Carl K.
Hulce, Jack M.
Huning, Neil V.
Jennings, Gordon D.
Lee, Harvey C.
Lee, Jewell D.
McCallum, Philip L.
Miller, Frank L.
Shoup, Allen D.
Thompson, Charles E.
Tibbetts, David L.
Williams, Herbert W.

The following named (Platoon Leaders Class) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Messerschmidt, James A.
Nogueiro, Juan C.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, April 14, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor, Frederick, Md., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, author of life and of love, let the light of Thy countenance shine brightly upon the Speaker of this House and upon all the Members of the U.S. Congress.

Grant a special blessing to the President of the United States of America as, today, before the Organization of American States, he outlines his policies for a revitalization and expansion of the programs necessary for the health, education, standard of living, and socioeconomic development of peoples in the inter-American system.

Since this session of the U.S. House of Representatives officially marks the silver jubilee, or 25th congressional celebration of Pan-American Day, we join all men, women, and children throughout the Western Hemisphere in praying that executives, lawmakers, judges, and citizens may give practical support to broad, durable measures of progress. May our leaders see fit, from motives of brotherly love and for sound reasons of national self-interest, to provide more generous rewards for the farmers, miners, managers, office, and factory workers who now, in large numbers, barely make a living.

Vouchsafe, dear Saviour, that this year of grace and this session of the Congress may transform into golden realities the glittering promises often proclaimed under such banners as the good neighbor policy and the partnership for progress.

May we, the sons and daughters of God-loving peoples, be conscious of our responsibilities to the youth of America for the future well-being of all the American Republics.

In a spirit of rededication, wisdom, fairness, love, and peace, we implore these divine favors in the name of the Christ of the Andes. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 3, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On March 28, 1969:

H.R. 8438. An act to extend the time for filing final reports under the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965 until July 31, 1969.

On April 1, 1969:

H.J. Res. 584. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

On April 7, 1969:

H.R. 8508. An act to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document studies and hearings on the Alliance for Progress.

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the eulogies on Dwight David Eisenhower.

THE LATE HONORABLE ALVIN M. BENTLEY

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest regret that I inform the House of the death of a friend and former colleague, Representative Alvin M. Bentley, of Owosso, Mich. Al died last Thursday in Tucson, Ariz., at the age of 50 after an extended illness.

Al Bentley represented the Eighth District of Michigan in this House for 8 years, leaving at the close of his fourth term after making an unsuccessful run for the U.S. Senate.

On March 1, 1954, while still a first-termer, Al Bentley was one of five House Members who were wounded when four Puerto Rican nationalists sprayed the floor of the House with pistol shots from one of the spectator galleries. All five House Members recovered and the attackers were sent to prison.

Al Bentley came to this House with a background of experience in the diplomatic service, including tours of duty in Mexico, Colombia, Hungary, and Italy. Appropriately, he was named to the House Foreign Affairs Committee. An ardent anti-Communist, he received a Distinguished Service Award from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Michigan Department. He also received a Distinguished Service Award from the Slovak League of America for distinguished service to the Nation.

Al Bentley was a 1940 graduate of the University of Michigan and was a member of the university's board of regents at the time of his death. He was a trustee of Cleary College and the Detroit Institute of Technology.

A man of wealth with a deep social conscience, Al established the Alvin M. Bentley Foundation and pledged $1 million in gifts to further "science, education, and charitable projects." He received a Knights of Charity Award for his philanthropic work from Maryglade College in 1962.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my heartfelt condolences to Mrs. Bentley and the family in this time of their bereavement.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join our distinguished minority leader in his tribute to Alvin Bentley, who was a most competent and knowledgeable Member of this House, a very great American, as the gentleman from Michigan said, with a deep sense of social consciousness.

I remember the day Al was wounded. He was the most seriously wounded of all those who were stricken that day.

Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Michigan in extending to the family of Al Bentley my deepest and heartfelt sympathy.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of our dear departed colleague, Alvin Bentley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

The was no objection.

CHAIRMAN PATMAN INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 WITH RESPECT TO INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISTRIBUTION MADE PURSUANT TO SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1968, H.R. 8696, the Savings and Loan Holding Company Amendments of 1967, was under consideration in this body. At that time question was raised on providing tax relief for the divestitures that would be required under the act—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 114, part 1, pages 705–707. During the debate, I, along with others, opposed amendments to the proposed legislation which would have postponed divestiture until appropriate tax relief was provided. At the conclusion of the debate on the second proposed amendment, I stated:

> Mr. Chairman why should their people expect a special consideration, a special dispensation in this case? Others have not been injured by it, and Congress has always performed its duty, and particularly in the Ways and Means Committee, and the gentleman has nothing to fear. So I hope the amendment is defeated.

The attached draft of a bill on this subject is patterned after the amendment to the Internal Revenue Code governing taxation of distributions pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, as amended.

Under the provisions of section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended by the Savings and Loan Holding Company Amendments of 1967, a multiple savings and loan holding company which is conducting any activities unrelated to the savings and loan business has two alternative courses of action. It may remain a multiple, in which event it must divest itself of its business activities unrelated to the savings and loan business or it may continue those unrelated business activities and dispose of all but one of its controlled institutions, so that it is no longer classified as a multiple. The draft bill provides in essence that no tax is to be imposed on the shareholders of such a multiple where the corporation makes a distribution to them of either its savings and loan assets or unrelated business assets.

In the case of the distributing multiple itself, the usual provisions of the tax laws would continue to apply. Under those provisions, gain is generally not recognized to a distributing corporation except under unusual circumstances.

If a corporation decides to remain a multiple and distribute its unrelated assets, the distribution to the shareholders would be tax free only if the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation certified that the corporation had disposed of all property necessary or appropriate to effectuate section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended.

If the corporation chose not to remain a multiple, it could distribute to its shareholders any stock of a subsidiary insured institution or other property of the kind which causes it to be a multiple holding company. In that case, for the distribution to be tax free, it would be necessary for the FSLIC to certify that the corporation had distributed sufficient property so that it had ceased to be a multiple holding company.

It is intended that the bill permit the distributing corporation to distribute to its shareholders all savings and loan assets which it holds without the recognition of gain even though under section 408 the corporation could retain stock in one insured institution and continue its unrelated business activities. That treatment parallels the tax treatment afforded distributions pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act, as amended.

The draft bill would also provide tax relief in connection with required distributions by unitary holding companies pursuant to the requirements of section 408(e)(1)(a) of the National Housing Act.

Mr. Speaker, assuming this bill will be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, it is my hope that the bill will be given immediate consideration so that the provisions of the Savings and Loan Holding Company Act of 1967 can be fully effectuated.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 10027

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of certain distributions pursuant to the Savings and Loan Holding Company Amendments of 1967

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART X—DISTRIBUTIONS PURSUANT TO SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

"Sec. 1121. Distributions Pursuant to Savings and Loan Holding Company Amendments of 1967.
"Sec. 1122. Special Rules.
"Sec. 1123. Definitions.

"SEC. 1121. DISTRIBUTIONS PURSUANT TO SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANY AMENDMENTS OF 1967.

"(a) DISTRIBUTIONS OF CERTAIN NON-SAVINGS AND LOAN PROPERTY.—

"(1) DISTRIBUTIONS OF PROHIBITED PROPERTY.—If—

"(A) a qualified holding company distributes prohibited property (other than stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c)(2) applies)—

"(i) to a shareholder (with respect to its stock held by such shareholder), without the surrender by such shareholder of stock in such company; or

"(ii) to a shareholder, in exchange for its preferred stock; or

"(iii) to a security holder, in exchange for its securities; and

"(B) the Corporation has, before the distribution (or January 1, 1970, if later), certified that the distribution of such prohibited property is necessary or appropriate to effectuate section 408 of the National Housing Act,

then no gain to the shareholder or security holder from the receipt of such property shall be recognized.

"(2) Distributions of stock and securities received in an exchange to which subsection (c)(2) applies.—If—

"(A) a qualified holding company distributes—

"(i) common stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c)(2) applies to a shareholder (with respect to its stock held by such shareholder), without the surrender by such shareholder of stock in such company; or

"(ii) common stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c)(2) applies to a shareholder, in exchange for its common stock; or

"(iii) preferred stock or common stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c)(2) applies to a shareholder, in exchange for its preferred stock; or

"(iv) securities or preferred or common stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c)(2) applies to a security holder in exchange for its securities; and

"(B) any preferred stock received has substantially the same terms as the preferred stock exchanged, and any securities received have substantially the same terms as the securities exchanged,

then, except as provided in subsection (f), no gain to the shareholder or security holder from the receipt of such stock or such securities or such stock and securities shall be recognized.

"(3) Non Pro Rata Distributions.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply to a distribution whether or not the distribution is pro rata with respect to all of the shareholders of the distributing qualified holding company.

"(4) Exception.—This subsection shall not apply to any distribution by a company which has made any distribution pursuant to subsection (b).

"(5) Distributions Involving Gift or Compensation.—In the case of a distribution to which paragraph (1) or (2) applies, but which—

"(A) results in a gift, see section 2501, and following, or

"(B) has the effect of the payment of compensation, see section 61(a)(1).

"(b) Company Ceasing To Be a Holding Company or Multiple Holding Company.—

"(1) Distributions of Property Which Cause a Company To Be a Holding Company or Multiple Holding Company.—If—

"(A) a qualified holding company distributes property (other than stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c)(3) applies)—

"(i) to a shareholder (with respect to its stock held by such shareholder), without the surrender by such shareholder of stock in such company; or

"(ii) to a shareholder, in exchange for its preferred stock; or

"(iii) to a security holder, in exchange for its securities; and

"(B) the Corporation has, before the distribution (or January 1, 1970, if later), certified—

"(i) in the case of a multiple holding company, that such property is all or part of the property by reason of which such company controls two or more insured institutions (as defined in section 408(a)(1)(A) of the National Housing Act), or such property is part of the property by reason of which such company did control two or more insured institutions before any property of the same kind was distributed under this subsection or exchanged under subsection (c)(3); or

"(ii) in the case of any other holding company, that such property is all or part of the property by reason of which such company controls an insured institution (as defined in section 408(a)(1)(A) of the National Housing Act) or holding company, or such property is part of the property by reason of which such company did control an insured institution or holding company before any property of the same kind was distributed under this subsection or exchanged under subsection (c)(3); and

"(iii) that the distribution is necessary or appropriate to effectuate section 408 of such Act,

then no gain to the shareholder or security holder from the receipt of such property shall be recognized.

"(2) Distributions of stock and securities received in an exchange to which subsection (c)(3) applies.—If—

"(A) a qualified holding company distributes—

"(i) common stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c)(3) applies to a shareholder (with respect to its stock held by such shareholder), without the surrender by such shareholder of stock in such company; or

"(ii) common stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c)(3) applies to a shareholder, in exchange for its common stock; or

"(iii) preferred stock or common stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c)(3) applies, to a shareholder in exchange for its preferred stock; or

"(iv) securities or preferred or common stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c)(3) applies to a security holder, in exchange for its securities; and

"(B) any preferred stock received has substantially the same terms as the preferred stock exchanged, and any securities received have substantially the same terms as the securities exchanged,

then, except as provided in subsection (f), no gain to the shareholder or security holder from the receipt of such stock or such securities or such stock and securities shall be recognized.

"(3) Non pro rata distributions.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply to a distribution whether or not the distribution is pro rata with respect to all of the shareholders of the distributing qualified holding company.

"(4) Exception.—This subsection shall not apply to any distribution by a company which has made any distribution pursuant to subsection (a).

"(5) Distributions involving gift or compensation.—In the case of a distribution to which paragraph (1) or (2) applies, but which—

"(A) results in a gift, see section 2501, and following, or

"(B) has the effect of the payment of compensation, see section 61(a)(1).

"(c) Property Acquired After April 14, 1967.—

"(1) In General.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), subsection (a) or (b) shall not apply to—

"(A) any property acquired by the distributing company after April 14, 1967, unless (i) gain to such company with respect to the receipt of such property was not recognized by reason of subsection (a) or (b), or (ii) such property was acquired by it in exchange for all of its stock in an exchange to which paragraph (2) or (3) applies, or (iii) such property was acquired by the distributing company in a transaction in which gain was not recognized under section 305(a) or section 332, or under section 354 with respect to a reorganization described in section 368(a)(1) (E) or (F), or

"(B) any property which was acquired by the distributing company in a distribution with respect to stock acquired by such company after April 14, 1967, unless such stock was acquired by such company (i) in a distribution (with respect to stock held by it on April 14, 1967, or with respect to stock in respect of which all previous applications of this clause are satisfied) with respect to which gain to it was not recognized by reason of subsection (a) or (b), or (ii) in exchange for all of its stock in an exchange to which paragraph (2) or (3) applies, or (iii) in a transaction in which gain was not recognized under section 305(a) or section 332, or under section 354 with respect to a reorganization described in section 368(a)(1) (E) or (F), or

"(C) any property acquired by the distributing company after April 14, 1967, in a transaction in which gain was not recognized under section 332, unless such property was acquired from a company which, if it had been a holding company or multiple holding company, could have distributed such property under subsection (a)(1)(b)(1).

"(2) Exchanges Involving Prohibited Property.—If—

"(A) any qualified holding company exchanges (i) property, which, under subsection (a)(1), such company could distribute directly to its shareholders or security holders without the recognition of gain to such shareholders or security holders, and other property (except property described in subsection (b)(1)(B) (i) or (ii)), for (ii) all of the stock of a second corporation created and availed of solely for the purpose of receiving such property;

"(B) immediately after the exchange, the qualified holding company distributes all of such stock in a manner prescribed in subsection (a)(2)(A); and

"(C) before such exchange (or January 1, 1970, if later), the Corporation has certified (with respect to the property exchanged which consists of property which, under subsection (a)(1), such company could distribute directly to its shareholders or security holders without the recognition of gain) that the exchange and distribution are necessary or appropriate to effectuate section 408 of the National Housing Act, then paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to such distribution.

"(3) Exchanges Involving Interests in Savings and Loan Property.—If—

"(A) any qualified holding company exchanges (i) property which, under subsection (b)(1), such company could distribute directly to its shareholders or security holders without the recognition of gain to such shareholders or security holders and other property (except prohibited property) for (ii) all of the stock of a second corporation created and availed of solely for the purpose of receiving such property;

"(B) immediately after the exchange, the qualified holding company distributes all of such stock in a manner prescribed in subsection (b)(2)(A); and

"(C) before such exchange (or January 1, 1970, if later), the Corporation has certified (with respect to the property exchanged which consists of property which, under subsection (b)(1), such company could distribute directly to its shareholders or security holders without recognition of gain) that the exchange and distribution are necessary or appropriate to effectuate section 408 of such Act,

then paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to such distribution.

"(d) Distributions to Avoid Federal Income Tax.—

"(1) Prohibited Property.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a distribution if, in connection with such distribution, the distributing corporation retains, or transfers after April 14, 1967, to any corporation, property (other than prohibited property) as part of a plan one of the principal purposes of which is the distribution of the earnings and profits of any corporation.

"(2) Savings and loan property.—Subsection (b) shall not apply to a distribution if, in connection with such distribution, the distributing corporation retains, or transfers after April 14, 1967, to any corporation, property (other than property described in subsection (b)(1)(B)(i) or (ii)) as part of a plan one of the principal purposes of which is the distribution of the earnings and profits of any corporation.

"(3) Certain contributions to capital.—In the case of a distribution a portion of which is attributable to a transfer which is a contribution to the capital of a corporation, made after April 14, 1967, and prior to the date of the enactment of this part, if subsection (a) or (b) would apply to such distribution but for the fact that, under paragraph (1) or (2) (as the case may be) of this subsection, such contribution to capital is part of a plan one of the principal purposes of which is to distribute the earnings and profits of any corporation, then, notwithstanding paragraph (1) or (2), subsection (a) or (b) (as the case may be) shall apply to that portion of such distribution not attributable to such contribution to capital, and shall not apply to that portion of such distribution attributable to such contribution to capital.

"(e) Final Certification.—Subsection (a) or (b) shall not apply with respect to any distribution by a company unless the Corporation certifies that, before the expiration of the periods permitted under the relevant provisions of section 408 of the National Housing Act (including any extensions thereof granted to such company under such provisions), the company has (1) disposed of all the property the disposition of which is necessary or appropriate to effectuate such section, or (2) ceased to be a holding company or multiple holding company (as the case may be).

"(f) Certain Exchanges of Securities.—In the case of an exchange described in subsection (a)(2)(A)(iv) or subsection (b)(2)(A)(iv), subsection (a) or (b) (as the case may be) shall apply only to the extent that the principal amount of the securities received does not exceed the principal amount of the securities exchanged.

"Sec. 1122. Special Rules.

"(a) Basis of Property Acquired in Distributions.—If by reason of section 1121, gain is not recognized with respect to the receipt of any property, then, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate—

"(1) if the property is received by a shareholder with respect to stock, without the surrender by such shareholder of stock, the basis of the property received and of the stock with respect to which it is distributed shall, in the distributee's hands, be determined by allocating between such property and such stock the adjusted basis of such stock; or

"(2) if the property is received by a shareholder in exchange for stock or by a security holder in exchange for securities, the basis of the property received shall, in the distributee's hands, be the same as the adjusted basis of the interest or securities exchanged, increased by—

"(A) the amount of the property received which was treated as a dividend, and

"(B) the amount of gain to the taxpayer recognized on the property received (not including any portion of such gain which was treated as a dividend).

"(b) Allocation of Earnings and Profits.—

"(1) Distribution of Stock in a Controlled Corporation.—In the case of a distribution by a qualified holding company under section 1121(a)(1) or (b)(1) of stock in a controlled corporation, proper allocation with respect to the earnings and profits of the distributing corporation and the controlled corporation shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(2) Exchanges Described in Section 1121(c)(2) or (3).—In the case of any exchange described in section 1121(c)(2) or (3), proper allocation with respect to the earnings and profits of the corporation transferring the property and the corporation receiving such property shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(3) Definition of Controlled Corporation.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "controlled corporation" means a corporation with respect to which at least 80 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote and at least 80 percent of the total number of shares of all other classes is owned by the distributing qualified holding company.

"(c) Periods of Limitation.—The periods of limitation provided in section 6501 (relating to limitations on assessment and collection) shall not expire, with respect to any deficiency (including interest and additions to the tax) resulting solely from the receipt of property by shareholders or security holders in a distribution which is certified by the Corporation under subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 1121, until five years after the distributing company notifies the Secretary or his delegate (in such manner and with such accompanying information as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe) that the period (including extensions thereof) prescribed in the relevant provision of section 408 of the National Housing Act, or section 1121(e), whichever is applicable, has expired; and such assessment may be made notwithstanding any provision of law or rule of law which would otherwise prevent such assessment.

"(d) Itemization of Property.—In any certification under this part, the Corporation shall make such specification and itemization of property as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part.

"Sec. 1123. Definitions.

"(a) Holding Company.—For purposes of this part, the term "holding company" means any corporation which is a savings and loan holding company as defined in section 408(a)(1)(D) of the National Housing Act.

"(b) Multiple Holding Company.—For purposes of this part, the term "multiple holding company" means any corporation which is a multiple savings and loan holding company as defined in section 408(a)(1)(E) of the National Housing Act.

"(c) Qualified Holding Company.—

"(1) In General.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), for purposes of this part the term "qualified holding company" means any corporation which is a holding company or multiple holding company (as the case may be) and which holds prohibited property acquired by it—

"(A) on or before April 14, 1967,

"(B) in a distribution in which gain to such company with respect to the receipt of such property was not recognized by reason of subsection (a) or (b) of section 1121, or

"(C) in exchange for all of its stock in an exchange described in section 1121 (c)(2) or (c)(3).

"(2) Limitations.—

"(A) A holding company or multiple holding company shall not be a qualified holding company, unless it would have been a holding company or multiple holding company, respectively, on April 14, 1967, if the Savings and Loan Holding Company Amendments of 1967 had been in effect on such date, or unless it is a holding company or multiple holding company, respectively, determined solely by reference to—

"(i) property acquired by it on or before April 14, 1967,

"(ii) property acquired by it in a distribution in which gain to such company with respect to the receipt of such property was not recognized by reason of subsection (a) or (b) of section 1121, and

"(iii) property acquired by it in exchange for all of its stock in an exchange described in section 1121 (c) (2) or (3).

"(B) A holding company or multiple holding company shall not be a qualified holding company by reason of property described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) or clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, unless such property was acquired in a distribution with respect to stock, which stock was acquired by such holding company or multiple holding company, respectively.—

"(i) on or before April 14, 1967,

"(ii) in a distribution (with respect to stock held by it on April 14, 1967, or with respect to stock in respect of which all previous applications of this clause are satisfied) with respect to which gain to it was not recognized by reason of subsection (a) or (b) of section 1121, or

"(iii) in exchange for all of its stock in an exchange described in section 1121 (c) (2) or (3).

"(C) A company shall be treated as a qualified holding company only if the Corporation certifies that it satisfies the foregoing requirements of this subsection.

"(d) Prohibited Property.—For purposes of this part, the term 'prohibited property' means in the case of any holding company or multiple holding company, property (other than nonexempt property) the disposition of which would be necessary or appropriate to effectuate section 408 of the National Housing Act if such company continued to be a holding company or multiple holding company (as the case may be) beyond the relevant period specified in such Act.

"(e) Nonexempt Property.—For purposes of this part, the term 'nonexempt property' means—

"(1) obligations (including notes, drafts, bills of exchange, and bankers' acceptances) having a maturity at the time of issuance of not exceeding 24 months, exclusive of days of grace;

"(2) securities issued by or guaranteed as to principal or interest by a government or subdivision thereof or by any instrumentality of a government or subdivision; or

"(3) money, and the right to receive money not evidenced by a security or obligation (other than a security or obligation described in paragraph (1)or (2)).

"(f) Corporation.—For purposes of this part, the term 'Corporation' means the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation."

(b) The table of parts for subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Part X. Distributions Pursuant to Savings and Loan Holding Company Amendments of 1967."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

HEARINGS ON ONE-BANK HOLDING COMPANIES TO OPEN TUESDAY

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Banking and Currency Committee will open hearings on legislation to control financial conglomerates—the so-called one-bank holding companies.

This is some of the most important legislation to come before the committee in recent years. The growth of these one-bank holding companies threatens to concentrate the economic power of the Nation in the hands of a few large banks. These conglomerates, with a bank as the central driving force, are the greatest danger to our free enterprise system.

Through these one-bank holding companies, the large banks have been able to move into a variety of nonbanking enterprises ranging from insurance to manufacturing. This device is destroying the traditional safeguard of separation of banking from nonbanking.

Mr. Speaker, the grave dangers of banks moving into other businesses was outlined in a speech by J. L. Robertson, Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, at a meeting in St. Louis last week. Mr. Speaker, I hope that all Members who are concerned about this problem will take the time to read Governor Robertson's remarks. I place a copy of the text of that speech in the RECORD:

BACK TO BRANDEIS

(Address of J. L. Robertson, Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, at a meeting of member banks of Metropolitan St. Louis and the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis and its Little Rock, Louisville, and Memphis branches, St Louis, Mo., April 10, 1969)

While to the best of my knowledge Chairman Martin has never undertaken to visit, much less speak in, my home town, Broken Bow, Nebraska, it is certainly my pleasure today to be once again in his, and it is a pleasure doubled by the opportunity to pay public tribute to him and to a distinguished career in the city where it began. My remarks, however, will concern another career which has St. Louis roots, namely, Mr. Justice Brandeis, who was admitted to the bar a few hundred yards from this very spot little less than a century ago.

As you know, Louis Brandeis was more than a judge and a lawyer. Both on and off the bench, he was preeminently a public philosopher to whom a legal brief, a judicial opinion, and an article for the popular press were equally available modes of safeguarding the public interest by an unflagging insistence on the highest standards of commercial and financial ethics. And it is from his most popular writing on this subject, the basic "Other People's Money and How the Bankers Use It" that I take my text for today.

It was a work which sent a shock wave through the America of the gaslight era, and in fact was one of the forces which led to the establishment of the Federal Reserve. In one sense, the book now is anachronistic and even antiquarian, for the specific abuses which moved Brandeis to write have long been corrected. In another sense, however, the overall philosophy captured in its title has a continuing, and even a timeless, validity. In fact, it has an extraordinarily apt relevance and application to two distinct but related public questions of today—on one hand, the bank holding company issue and on the other, the problem posed by the current wave of congeneric and conglomerate expansion.

If I may briefly shift my authorities and borrow a phrase from Brandeis' great colleague, Mr. Justice Holmes, these two questions are ones which could stand more emphasis on the obvious and less elaboration of the obscure. Certainly the root issues involved are neither complex nor difficult, but rather are simplicity itself and turn on the three simple points of *prudence, fairness,* and *experience.*

On the issue of prudence, I return to Justice Brandeis and an injunction which he made a chapter title in his book. The injunction was "Serve One Master Only". It is as valid to the banking of 1969 as it was to the banking of 1913, and its validity consists in this—applications for bank credit are to be granted on their merits, not on the influence nor even the possibility of influence of some other considerations.

Its most topical application is on the question of whether the salutary constraints which the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 lays on inter-organization dealings should be extended to one bank holding companies. On this point there is certainly room for debate, but I must confess my failure to comprehend the relevance of the argument that the great majority of such organizations have comported themselves with honor and integrity in such dealings. That point can be disposed of almost out of hand, for virtually every law on the statute books has resulted not from the conduct of the many but the misbehavior of the few. Hence, any invocation of a general pattern seems to me to miss the point completely.

Rather, what we are talking about here is the reasonable possibility of regrettable consequences which can come to pass when a conflict of interest is present. When this happens, when a banker tries to serve two masters, indeed, when he merely has two masters, there arise invidious implications which cut two ways. More obvious is the possible out-and-out favoritism that may be accorded to the applications of subsidiaries and affiliates or to the customers of either. More subtle, and I think really more corrosive, is the possible negative discrimination—the loans not made, or even the double standard of judgment which may be applied to the competitors of subsidiaries and affiliates. Again, to my mind it is absolutely no answer to either situation to assert that the recipients of such potentially favored treatment, whether positive or negative, are subject to examination *ex post factor* or that only a limited percentage of bank assets may be legally misapplied.

What we are dealing with here, as the very title of the Brandeis book reminds us, is a situation very close to the law of trusts. For both trusts and banking by definition involve other people's money and the analogy common to both comes down to this—a banker should not only resist temptation, but like a trustee, he should not even let himself be led into it. Or to put the matter another way, any evil inherent in allegiance to two masters is not to be punished after the fact, but the very possibility of its commission is to be forbidden at the outset. Hence, as the Board of Governors has repeatedly recommended, there is a powerful case for extending the salutary restrains of the Bank Holding Company Act against self-dealing to their logical conclusion—*i.e.,* to one bank holding companies.

Actually, there seems to be no serious dispute on this issue, and most of the public debate has proceeded on the nature and extent of the constraints rather than the necessity of constraints themselves. Yet this very general recognition is paralleled by a surprising lack of attention on a related front and this concerns my second, and even more basic, point. This is fairness.

To be sure, this issue of fairness has not gone completely undiscussed. To the extent I have been able to follow the matter, however, such public utterances as I have read seemed singularly irrelevant. So let me make a point as emphatically as I can. In addition to the obvious violation of prudence, any alliance of banking and nonbanking enterprise—other than that permitted under the most rare, rigorous, and regulated exceptions—offends the elementary principle of fairness in not one but two particulars. Both derive from a common root, the distinctiveness of banking. For banking is unusual in being a business of highly restricted entry, and it is unique in its monopoly of demand deposits. From these distinctive aspects two inequitable advantages are afforded, actually or potentially, to a bank-allied business over its independent competitors. The first, as I have mentioned, is the risk of adverse odds, or even the double standard, which the latter may meet in seeking bank credit. The second is the possibility—thanks to the indispensable business need of cheuking account facilities—of actually having to furnish a competitive adversary with the financial sinews of war by using the deposit services of his banking affiliate.

This point has another application, it seems to me, in an area where, again, much argument has a high degree of irrelevance. This concerns what is—or should be—the business of banking, and this applies whether or not the bank involved is affiliated with a bank holding company operation. Now the proper business of a bank is not an issue to be resolved by analysis of nineteenth century court decisions which were written in a day of virtually unlimited market entry and of distinctions, as yet uncomprehended, between financial and nonfinancial operations. Rather, it is to be answered in a context in which banking has become a business of restricted entry, and one possessing a monopoly of an indispensable resource. The consequence is that the most elementary fairness demands that a bank stick to the business of banking, as the latter twentieth century understands it, with such facilities and powers as are necessary to provide banking services to the public efficiently and economically, and not foray from a protected sanctuary to compete (either directly or via an affiliate) with enterprises which operate in a free-entry environment and which must use banking services.

However, the issue of fairness does not stop here. Bound up in the current debate is the whole vexed question of permitting, via grandfather clauses, the continued existence of certain alliances of banking and nonbanking business. Certainly the invidious double standard and the ongoing special privilege of grandfather clauses seem self-evident. In the holding company context, the special unfairness of a grandfather clause seems particularly manifest, for here we have witnessed the scramble—I am almost tempted to say copycat stampede—to achieve special status, under the foreknowledge of almost certain Congressional action on one hand, and on the other, the resulting consequence of the arbitrary and completely fortuitous character of any exemptions accorded.

To me, the "fairness" doctrine is perhaps the most basic in law. Its strength is its simplicity, as the child's complaint—"That's not *fair!*"—tellingly reminds us.

There are some other issues in the holding company arena which are neither simple nor self-evident and which must be mentioned. I have previously addressed myself to them. One is the ominous parallels, obvious to anyone who cares to look, between the corporate pyramiding of the twenties and that of the present time. In mentioning any parallel between the sixties and the twenties, neither I nor any of my colleagues on the Board are to be understood as asserting that the current situation is either a mirror image of what is gone before or that the past will play out its pattern once more, complete as to every minor detail. Yet the past is not without its merit as a guide to the future, and as the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*[*] has noted, we have had a long history—"predominantly unsatisfactory" of holding company pyramiding of regulated and unregulated enterprise.

We have also had a history, not so long perhaps but certainly unsatisfactory—of the effects of a fragmented jurisdiction and perverse cross-purposing of authority among the federal bank supervisory agencies. I would make only one point here—this unsatisfactory experience did not arise because the several agencies were staffed with inept or evil men. Rather it arose because the very structure of supervision was faulty, and the wonder is that we did not have more trouble. To try to put that structure to rights is a Herculean task, I can testify, and it is a task we cannot accomplish overnight. But what we certainly can do now is to avoid any step, in solving the holding company problem, which would deliberately extend the supervisory muddle to new fields, and particularly to do so at that critical juncture of banking and nonbanking activities where the possibility of divided decisions, competition in laxity, and inequitable distinctions seem so manifestly probable.

---

[*] Corporate Life among the Pyramids, February 5, 1969.

Having spoken at length on both points previously, it is unnecessary to do so here. I might, however, close by noting their similarity with a return to the wisdom of Mr. Justice Brandeis and his injunction that experience is the best teacher. This is my final point and it applies to both corporate pyramiding and bank supervision. Both are products of history, and we should learn something from that history. For while I am not saying that the past will repeat in every detail, I do ask you to remember that in those fields as elsewhere, the price of ignoring the lesson of history is to be fated, in some way or other, to repeat it.

Mr. Speaker, I also place in the Record a news release which I issued last week announcing the list of witnesses for the first week of hearings on the holding company legislation. Other witnesses will be announced later:

Washington, D.C., April 8.—Chairman Wright Patman of the House Banking and Currency Committee today released the list of witnesses for the first week of hearings on H.R. 6778, a bill to regulate financial conglomerates.

The hearings will open at 10 a.m., April 15, Room 2128, Rayburn House Office Building, before the full Banking and Currency Committee.

The witness list for the first week:

Tuesday, April 15: Professor A. A. Berle, Columbia University; Professor Louis B. Schwartz, University of Pennsylvania Law School.

Wednesday, April 16: Mr. Milton Shapp, Businessman, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; T. H. Milner, Jr., President and Trust Officer, First National Bank of Athens, Athens, Georgia; Mr. Othmar G. Grueninger, Grueninger Travel Service, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Thursday, April 17: Secretary of the Treasury David M. Kennedy; Undersecretary of the Treasury Charles Walker; Richard W. McLaren, Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust.

Friday, April 18: Chairman William McChesney Martin and Vice Chairman J. L. Robertson, representing the Federal Reserve Board.

BANKER SPEAKS OUT AGAINST HIGH INTEREST RATES

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are many conscientious bankers throughout this Nation who do not agree with the high interest policies which are forced upon them by the Federal Reserve and the large banks in the money centers.

Mr. Speaker, many small- and medium-sized banks are conscientiously attempting to serve their customers and they do not share either the profits or the greed of the larger members of the banking fraternity. It is often difficult for the officers of these smaller banks to speak out since their industry is so dominated by the financial giants.

Mr. Speaker, this week I received a letter from the president of a bank in Pennsylvania denouncing the high interest rates and the questionable practices of the big banks.

This conscientious bank officer wrote me:

> We have always felt that a national bank should try to meet all the credit needs of its community regardless of the size of either the community or bank. For me, this means serving not only the businessman, professional man and prosperous farmer, but also all wage earners and even those who might be unemployed temporarily and receiving public assistance. I feel that I can say that no one need leave this community looking for a small, personal loan and have to resort to a company charging 36% annual interest.

Mr. Speaker, if the practices of this Pennsylvania banker were emulated by the large banks we would not today be faced with this critical economic situation. I commend this banker for speaking out and, Mr. Speaker, I place a copy of his letter in the Record, but for his protection I have deleted his name and the name of his bank:

Hon. Wright Patman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Patman: I want you to know that you have a few friends in the banking fraternity who support you in your fight against the ridiculously high rates of interest on borrowed money.

We are a small, country bank which has survived the various panics and the great depression, to celebrate our 100th Anniversary this year. Although, we mark this anniversary in sound financial condition, I face the future with many misgivings for we are in direct competition with banks who are ten, one hundred, even five hundred times our size.

Some of them apparently care little what happens to interest rates, for they use a number of "gimmicks" like points on mortgage loans, compensating balances on commercial loans, and special incentives to car dealers to augment interest rates which are already too high in my estimation.

We have always felt that a national bank should try to meet all the credit needs of its community regardless of the size of either the community or bank. For me, this means serving not only the business man, professional man and prosperous farmer, but also all wage earners and even those who might be unemployed temporarily and receiving public assistance. I feel that I can say that no one need leave this community looking for a small, personal loan and have to resort to a company charging 36% annual interest.

We want to continue operating as we have in the past although, I don't know how much longer we can continue if something isn't done to bring interest rates back to reasonable levels. "Truth in Lending" may help some, but I have talked to a number of fellow bankers who have the cavalier attitude, "If you don't like our rates there are plenty of others who want a new car or home so badly they will pay without question".

We wish you well in your continued efforts to bring the cost of borrowed money back to a reasonable level.

Sincerely,

—— ——.

STATION KVII–TV DENOUNCES HIGH INTEREST RATES

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, much of the news media has begun to speak out against high interest rates and the policies of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. Speaker, one of the clearest and most forthright statements on this issue was broadcast in an editorial by Tom Martin over KVII–TV, channel 7, in Amarillo, Tex., on March 21.

Mr. Speaker, I place a copy of this excellent editorial in the Record:

The message that Representative Wright Patman of Texas had for a meeting of the Independent Bankers Association in Las Vegas this week must have gone down like castor oil.

As Patman put it, unless President Nixon forces a roll back of the new seven and one-half percent prime interest rate now being charged by the country's banks, the U.S.A. is in for a "monumental economic squeeze." And since Patman is the chairman of the House Banking Committee, his words have a particularly authoritative ring to them.

The seven and one-half percent rate that went into effect on Monday is, of course, the lowest interest rate it's possible for the biggest corporations with the best credit to get.

From that level—the big corporate level, in short—the situation deteriorates rapidly, until you get down to the level of consumer finance, where the interest rates mount sharply. To put it in another perspective, many have now concluded it's too costly to get sick because of hospital charges, and many have already concluded it's too costly to die because of the high cost of funerals. Now it may fairly be said it's too costly to borrow money, buy a TV set, build a home, get a college tuition loan, or to borrow money for any reason, in short.

William McChesney Martin, the crusty Chairman of the Federal Reserve System where the money rates are determined, sees the economy as one big set of charts and graphs which can be manipulated to cause any set of economic conditions we want. If money gets too plentiful—just hike the interest rates a pinch and things will right themselves. If unemployment gets a little high, just drop the interest rates so industry can borrow more, expand more, and create new jobs for the unemployed.

Patman, on the other hand, sees the whole picture differently. When the cost of money gets unconscionably high, it's not the big corporations who suffer—they're only inconvenienced. It's the little guy who takes it on the chin every time he tries to buy anything from a TV set to a house to put it in. And this, in Patman's words, "is little more than robbery."

Just about two weeks ago, in one of their now famous committee hearing exchanges, Patman pointed a finger at Board Chairman Martin and told him he may go down in history as the most expensive Federal official on record.

Maybe soon you'll be out shopping for a new car or a house or a household appliance that you'll be buying on credit, or maybe soon you'll be talking to your friendly neighborhood banker about a small loan for some worthwhile purpose. In that case, you'll maybe soon find out just how accurate Wright Patman's description of the Fed and its Chairman is.

TIME TO CLOSE $3 BILLION BIG BUSINESS TAX LOOPHOLE

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the unnecessary inflationary condition of the economy, largely created by the Federal Reserve Board as it swings between recessions on its' pendulum of panic, has once more imposed a cyclical credit crush on the people of our Nation—particularly the people of low and moderate income.

President Nixon's administration, which appears to have trained under Federal Reserve coaching, has responded by raising FHA and VA home mortgage interest rates to an alltime high of 7⅓ percent, thereby saving our low- and moderate-income citizens the trouble of seeking homeownership because they cannot afford it any more.

The Federal Reserve System, always ready to compete—even with its own pupils—when it comes to clubbing the economy, has raised the prime interest rate to 7½ and the discount rate to 6 percent, showing us again that it refuses to be outdone when it comes to setting sorry records.

Mr. Nixon himself, after indicating support for continuation of the surtax, seemingly has been caught up in the spirit of the situation and has called for a drastic reduction in the Job Corps program. As a result, many of the hardcore unemployed will be relieved of holding even slender hope of earning the right to share the Nation's wealth.

At the same time, Mr. Nixon, through his lieutenants, has indicated reluctance to close one of the largest loopholes in the Nation's tax structure—one through which big business and industry have skipped while planning an enormous, inflationary, 14-percent investment spending increase for this year.

Mr. Speaker, I have issued a news release which essentially states that the high interest, tight money conditions that now mark our inflationary economy, be shared more equitably by the people who can best afford to. Accordingly, I insert the release in the RECORD:

PATMAN CALLS FOR REPEAL OF INVESTMENT CREDIT

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 8.—The Chairman of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee declared today that realistic efforts to check damaging inflation "absolutely require elimination of a $3 billion a year tax windfall to big business and industry."

Representative Wright Patman (D., Texas) said, "It doesn't make any sense to continue the 7 percent investment tax credit windfall and at the same time try to fight inflation by creating a credit crunch for consumers, home buyers, and State and municipal governments struggling to finance urgently-needed public facilities."

Patman, who is also Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, said that the small businessman and industrialist can't take advantage of the 7 percent investment tax credit because they can't afford to borrow at today's record high interest rates.

On the other hand, he said, "large companies raise investment funds through their prices—in effect getting interest-free money on which the Treasury pays $7 for every $100 invested in plant expansion or improvement."

As an example, a large industry planning to invest $25 million in plant will receive a $1,750,000 gift from the Treasury which means the ordinary taxpayers have to pay more.

Patman said the investment tax credit was voted by Congress to stimulate the economy, reduce unemployment, and avoid a recession.

"A recent Commerce Department survey," Patman said, "discloses that business and industry plan to increase spending this year by 14 percent."

"This amounts to a fantastic 350 percent increase over last year's rise in spending and a 700 percent increase over the rise in investment spending the year before," Patman continued.

"Under these conditions," the Joint Economic Committee Chairman said, "the investment tax credit constitutes a strong push toward worsening inflation, even higher interest rates, and, ultimately, a recession."

"The Federal Reserve's policy of excessive borrowing costs and restricted credit have already put the nation's housing objectives in jeopardy," Patman asserted.

"By the same token," he added, "it is becoming all but impossible for States and municipal governments to finance all of the $500 billion in public facilities that the Joint Economic Committee has determined they must build in the ten-year period ending in 1975."

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE THIS WEEK

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the Committee on Banking and Currency to sit during the sessions this week provided we do not sit while the House is considering a bill under the 5-minute rule. The Committee on Banking and Currency has been delayed a couple of weeks in starting hearings on a very important bill, the one-bank holding companies. We shall start hearings tomorrow and we will have hearings on each day this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have talked to the ranking minority member on our side, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL). He is in agreement with the request of the chairman of the committee. As long as the request is limited to the committee sitting during general debate, we on our side have no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, that is the way we will proceed.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

TERMINATION OF SMOTHERS BROTHERS TELEVISION PROGRAM IS DISSERVICE TO VIEWING PUBLIC

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues in this House are familiar with the fact that CBS network has terminated the showing of the Smothers Brothers television program. Those who have watched that program would, I trust, agree with me that CBS has done a disservice to the viewing public in taking such action.

There is little enough worthy of watching on the "boob tube." To censor and remove one of the few sparkling shows because of the wit and the use of satire makes TV even more depressing.

I have sent a letter to Dr. Frank Stanton which I am setting forth in its entirety with the hope that others of my colleagues will register similar complaints with the Columbia Broadcasting System:

APRIL 8, 1969.

Dr. FRANK STANTON,
President, Columbia Broadcasting System
New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. STANTON: I was very distressed to learn that the CBS network has cancelled the Smothers Brothers Comedy Hour.

It seems that our network censors have little respect for the intelligence of the 33 million Americans who regularly enjoy these talented and irreverent entertainers. Surely, any adult audience should be allowed to decide for itself whether comedy material is in good taste or not.

In applying standards of good taste, I fail to see why CBS singles out the Smothers Brothers program from other network fare which so often is nothing more than juvenile nonsense and banality passed off as adult entertainment.

The medium of television is an important public asset that should be free to experiment, to be provocative—it should never, never be entrusted to a censorship mentality. How deplorable that a few cautious and humorless men can decide what political or religious satire can be televised on air waves that belong to the American people in the first place.

I hope the decision of the CBS network will be reviewed and reconsidered.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON MARIHUANA

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today that would establish a Presidential Commission on Marihuana. I think it is high time that our Government take a new look at marihuana use and educate itself and the American people. We need a respected blue-ribbon panel to examine the medical, social, and legal questions involved—an authoritative study that sweeps away old myths and shibboleths and establishes in their place intelligent up-to-date conclusions and recommendations.

It has been said that a society that fears its own children is a sick society. There is no doubt that marihuana use is a major issue that divides young and old in this country. If we are to condemn and punish our young people, we ought to be sure we have facts—not propaganda.

I am shocked by the legislative history that prompted the enactment of the first marihuana laws passed by Congress in 1937. The severe criminal penalties imposed on possession of marihuana were based on emotion and hearsay. Even more regrettable—30 years later—the testimony of Dr. James Goddard, then Food and Drug Administrator, was summarily dismissed by many persons unwilling to reexamine the question in light of new scientific evidence. This intemperate climate should no longer be permitted to exist.

I have been greatly impressed by the conclusions set forth in the report of the Advisory Committee on Drug Dependence as submitted to the British Home Secretary on November 1, 1968.

The committee found that an increasing number of people in all classes of British society were using marihuana regularly for social pleasure.

The most striking conclusion of the British report is:

> There is no evidence that such activity is causing violent crime or aggressive anti-social behavior, or is producing in otherwise normal people conditions of dependence or psychosis, requiring medical treatment.

And the report goes on to point out that the cannabis substance used in the United Kingdom is more potent than the leaf products—marihuana—of the cannabis plant which is widely used in the United States.

We now should have a similar study in this country. I am aware of the marihuana research efforts being made by the National Institute of Mental Health. Such efforts should be encouraged—more funds should be appropriated and coordination improved. But a Presidential commission is also needed. Its eventual conclusions and recommendations should be the basis for intelligent public discussion and legislative action of all levels—local, State, and Federal.

It would be presumptuous of me to predict what the recommendations of the Commission would be—but there is not doubt in my mind that the present criminal penalties under Federal and State law for the mere possession of marihuana are excessive and self-defeating. I am not talking about pushers who are in the business of selling marihuana.

It is an outrage and a tragedy that young men or young women should be imprisoned for the possession of marihuana. It is apparent that such penalties have not been an effective deterrent because our young people have not been persuaded they do themselves or others any harm. The dimensions of this problem are reflected by the fact that it is conservatively estimated that at least 35 percent of our college students have used marihuana and the numbers are increasing every day.

How can anyone seriously believe that imprisonment is the way to deal with this situation? The appalling conditions and practices in many of our penal institutions can do infinitely more damage to a young person than his use of marihuana. Furthermore, a criminal record can haunt that young person for the rest of his life. He may be barred from certain professions and denied employment to which he is entitled and for which he is qualified.

Regardless of whether marihuana is conclusively shown to be deleterious, we must find new remedies—criminal penalties only exacerbate the problem and reflect attitudes concerning marihuana use.

My bill does not suggest in any way that marihuana be legalized, nor does it prescribe the nature of penalties for its use; those questions should properly be left to the Commission to decide.

My bill does propose that the Commission shall conduct a study of marihuana including, but not limited to, the following areas:

First, the extent of use of marihuana in the United States to include number of users, number of arrests, number of convictions, amount of marihuana seized, type of user, nature of use;

Second, an evaluation of the efficacy of existing marihuana laws;

Third, a study of the pharmacology of marihuana and its immediate and long term effects both physiological and psychological;

Fourth, the relationship of marihuana use to aggressive behavior and crime; and

Fifth, the relationship between marihuana and the use of other drugs.

It is time we started asking the right questions about marihuana use instead of clinging to the wrong answers. I hope a Commission study will educate all of us and thus provide the basis for finding the right answers.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any idea what such a Presidential commission would cost the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. KOCH. I appreciate the gentleman's concern about money. I am more concerned about the effects of marihuana use on the young people in this country.

We spend a lot of money in this Congress, but there is one thing we ought to be concerned about—that is, the people who are now taking marihuana and what the consequences are.

I believe it is imperative that this country be informed as to whether or not there are detrimental physical or psychological consequences which result from the use of marihuana.

It is estimated that 35 percent of our college students use marihuana. That is a very conservative estimate. They use it because they think there is nothing wrong with its use and that it is no more harmful than alcohol. I do not know whether that is true, but we ought to have a Presidential study to make a definitive statement.

Mr. GROSS. The British have already studied it backward and forward. Why not look over what they have found as to the use of marihuana? Perhaps we can get something back for the billions we have spent on the British through the years.

Mr. KOCH. I agree with the gentleman that we ought to study the British report, but I believe it is necessary to have a Presidential Commission to study marihuana use in this country and evaluate the effects—social, legal, and medical—on the young people in this country. It is just not right that we are sending our young men and women to prison today and ruining their careers because of their use of marihuana. Surely it has been demonstrated that imprisonment is not the answer and that is one more reasons why we desperately need a Presidential Commission to shed some light on the whole subject.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TOBACCO MARKET ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1969

(Mr. CORMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, with the growing awareness of the danger of cigarette smoking as a health hazard, I introduced several bills earlier this year that would strengthen labeling provisions on cigarette packaging and would prohibit the advertising of cigarettes, in certain instances, on television and radio. Today, I have introduced another bill, the Tobacco Market Adjustment Act, which would phase out Federal price supports for tobacco production over a 4-year period, beginning in 1970, and would prohibit the use of Federal funds to advertise or promote the product here or abroad.

It has been 4 years since the Surgeon General's alarming statement that cigarette smoking as a health hazard is of sufficient importance to warrant remedial action. This warning precipitated the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act of 1965, a notably weak answer to the facts that were known then. Since 1965, studies have provided a mass of additional statistics to prove that cigarette smoking is beyond reasonable doubt one of the main causes of death from lung cancer, heart disease, and other smoking-related diseases.

Smoking is, of course, a matter of individual choice. But, I am convinced that the Congress has a clear obligation to inform the American people of the serious health consequences that the habit may bring in its wake. The bills I introduced earlier this year, which are now before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, support such action. One proposal, in particular, limits advertisement of cigarettes on television and radio during the hours when impressionable youngsters of elementary and secondary grades would be most likely to watch or listen to the media. Studies have revealed that as many as half the boys and girls in this country become cigarette smokers by the time they are 18 years old—a fact that certainly suggests the effectiveness of advertising.

The Washington Post Co. last week took noteworthy action in this respect when it announced that it was voluntarily banning all cigarette advertising commercials on WTOP-TV and WTOP-AM and FM radio stations after June 1, 1969. I commend the Washington Post Co. for taking such a costly step in the interest of public service and the Nation's health.

It would seem that our Government could do no less. So far, not only have we done little in this area, but Federal programs are often in conflict with one another. In fact, far too often one agency does not know what the other is doing.

On the one hand, we enacted legislation to provide a response to the health hazards posed by cigarette smoking and today we have a House committee beginning action to strengthen this legislation. On the other hand, the Department of Agriculture is spending millions of dollars annually to subsidize the production and sale of tobacco products here and abroad.

I am not unmindful of the effect of tobacco production and sales on our economy and on our balance of payments in exports. I am certain that no amount of enacted legislation or education about the cigarette-smoking health hazard will completely stop the sale of the product. Most likely, some people will always smoke, and the grower and manufacturer will doubtlessly be in business for a long time to come. But, I do strongly oppose Federal subsidies for the product. The absurdity of one agency using Federal funds to subsidize the very product that another Federal agency is discouraging is so apparent as to warrant no further comment.

What is particularly disturbing is that Federal funds are also being used to help pay for the advertising of cigarettes in foreign countries. Under Public Law 480, where counterpart funds are used, the Secretary of Agriculture recently announced that he approved a 1-year extension of a $210,000 Government subsidy to help pay for cigarette advertising in Japan, Thailand, and Austria. How can we in good conscience use public funds to promote overseas markets for tobacco products when we spend millions of Federal dollars in our own country in an attempt to educate the American people on the need to stop smoking, and when we have asked the communications media to voluntarily divest themselves of vast sums of advertising income?

Mr. Speaker, I am all in favor of keeping our overseas markets healthy and sharing our expertise with other countries, but not at the expense of the health of innocent people.

Tobacco subsidies are certainly a "nonessential item" in terms of the Federal budget and in terms of the Nation's health.

The bill I have introduced today should be enacted, both in the interest of health and in the interest of the overburdened taxpayer.

SPIRITUAL SUPPORT FOR SERVICEMEN

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extent his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have the opportunity to share with my colleagues the story of Chapel Foundation, Inc., a St. Louis-based religious organization imbued with true ecumenical spirit. A nonprofit organization, Chapel Foundation is designed to serve the spiritual needs of many by distributing through the mail religious booklets and pamphlets. I am advised that the foundation has distributed over 1 million pieces of literature through the mail in the past few years. It also sponsors a sheltered workshop for the disabled and handicapped veterans.

These uplifting efforts are designed especially for our servicemen and veterans who are hospital patients. Inspired by the Reverend Vincent D. Sievers, an Air Force chaplain retired for disability, Chapel Foundation exists and works for the spiritual benefit of those most in need. Businessmen in Missouri and Illinois support these efforts to let servicemen overseas know that people at home are behind them in every way.

Its value has been clearly recognized by a number of individuals, many of whom have given of their time and services to the foundation's cause. Indeed, Chapel Foundation's voluntary spirit of good will has been contagious. From a small group of dedicated individuals, it has grown to such an extent that it has three locations in the St. Louis area. L. J. Anderson, St. Louis civic leader, serves as president and Father Sievers is spiritual director.

Chapel Foundation is growing in other ways, too. A scholarship fund has been established through the generosity of several donors to help send children of deceased and disabled veterans to college, especially those interested in teaching.

Another example of Chapel Foundation's fine work is the spiritual pamphlet Father Sievers has compiled. Entitled "Prayers for Servicemen," the booklet contains prayers and spiritual messages for all occasions. After reading the offerings, I am certain it must be a source of comfort to all those possessing a copy, and through the generosity of the Knights of Columbus, the foundation has been able to have printed 40,000 copies of the booklet for free distribution to servicemen overseas. Father Sievers visited Vietnam to learn the needs of chaplains and servicemen.

I would like to include at this point in the Record one of the prayers contained in the booklet:

A Serviceman's Prayer

Give me clean hands, clean words, clean thoughts.
Help me to stand for the hard right against the easy wrong.
Save me from the habits that harm.
Teach me to work as hard and play as fair in Your sight alone as if all the world saw.
Forgive me when I am unkind and help me to forgive those who are unkind to me.
Keep me ready to help others at some cost to myself.
Send me chances to do a little good every day,
And so grow more like Christ, my Divine Commander in Chief.

The headquarters of this organization is Chapel Foundation, 2927 South Brentwood Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo. 63144.

UNITED MINE WORKERS WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette, in its issues of April 7 to 12, 1969, contained a series of articles by Michael Adams, entitled "16 Tons and What Do You Get?" concerning the United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund. I believe that these articles should convince Members of the need for a full-scale investigation of this fund and the manner of its operation. The articles follow:

Miner Fund Is Ghost Story for Some

(By Michael Adams)

Thousands of ex-coal miners in West Virginia and other states methodically have been denied the pension, medical and other benefits they feel were explicity promised them 23 years ago by John L. Lewis and his powerful United Mine Workers of America.

The benefits were to be paid by the UMWA's Welfare and Retirement Fund established in 1946 and financed by royalties paid by coal operators on every ton of bituminous coal mined by union labor.

During the first few years of fund operation, a wide array of benefits were paid, and residents of the soft coal fields believed that their future medical, maintenance and pension needs were absolutely safeguarded.

Beginning in 1953, however, trustees of the fund began making cutbacks and changes in the programs that had been established for the miners, frequently with little or no explanation.

This widescale destruction of the security of these ex-miners and their families, together with the buildup in recent years of a sizable unexpended balance in the fund's coffers, has served to engender suspicion and bitterness throughout the coal fields.

In instance after instance, men who once would have supported the union to their last ounce of strength now express only a fierce distaste toward the officials who led them, or lead the UMWA today.

The disenchantment and bitterness felt by the ex-miners or their widows has not escaped the attention of members of Congress.

Rep. Ken Hechler, D-W. Va., is calling for a "full-scale congressional investigation of the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund."

"Such an investigation," said Hechler, "is necessary to insure that all retired and disabled coal miners and their widows and families, as well as miners now working, are receiving now and will in the future receive the fullest benefits to which they are entitled."

Hechler charged that many inequities had apparently developed in the way the fund was being used.

"I think it is necessary to clear up a lot of questions which have been raised about this gigantic Fund," he said, "and whether or not its rules are applied fairly to all coal miners."

Informed sources on Capitol Hill say that the labor subcommittees of both the House and Senate likely will make such an investigation in the near future, not only into the mine workers fund, but into others as well.

In the meantime, no matter what the ultimate truth may be, many of the ex-miners and their families in the nation's coal fields who feel they have been arbitrarily denied their "benefits" have already made up their minds as to what has transpired through the years.

In a nutshell, they firmly believe that union and fund officials have deliberately cut off their benefits so as to rid themselves of any responsibility for an untold number of sick, disabled or aged miners no longer of service to the UMWA in this day of highly mechanized mines and vastly diminished labor force.

Spokesmen for both the union and the fund vehemently deny this, but in the coal fields the facts to disprove it are hard to come by.

Hechler agrees. He says:

"It is difficult to obtain clear and complete information about the inner workings of this fund, how its money is spent, how its rules are made, and how the rights of the coal miners themselves are being protected."

It is only evident that under current federal law, the trustees of the fund can do pretty much as they please. In the words of a fund annual report:

"No vested interest in the fund extends to any beneficiary.

"Resolutions adopted by the trustees governing fund benefits . . . specifically provide that all these benefits are subject to termination, revision, or amendment, by the trustees in their discretion at any time."

And information is scarce.

For example the fund's trustee-director, Miss Josephine Roche, adamantly refuses to discuss the operation of her organization with the press.

And those ex-miners denied pensions, among other things, say they frequently cannot find out what information was used by the Fund's directors to arrive at the decision to deny.

As a result, an atmosphere of secrecy and apparent disregard for the spurned ex-miners and widows has permeated the poverty-ridden coal regions, and those denied benefits have drawn their own conclusions.

To them, reality is composed of incidents like these:

They see hundreds, and possibly thousands of sick or physically disabled men unable to qualify for the pensions because of a rules change in 1953 which said, in effect, that vast numbers of them could not count their early years of work in the mines toward the 20 years necessary for obtaining a pension.

In 1954, they saw 30,000 disabled miners and their dependents who had been receiving small cash benefits from the fund cut off without a cent, even though nearly three-fourths of them had no other source of income, and about 70 per cent of the affected miners were totally disabled for life.

They saw, also in 1954, 24,000 widows and childen of dead miners also get cut off from any further maintenance aid cash benefits. The previous year, nearly 90 per cent of these recipients were identified as aged widows.

In 1960, thousands of UMWA members and their families were told they could no longer receive fund medical benefits because they were no longer working, were not on pension, and had not been employed in the mines during the previous year. This included sick and disabled miners, widows and children.

In 1965, the "have-nots" witnessed yet another rules change, this one perhaps the most frustrating of all. The trustees announced that the younger miners—and those older ones still lucky enough to be employed—would not have to meet the rigid pension requirements established in 1953. They were told they could stop working at a much earlier age and, in the long run, receive better benefits than ever before.

By 1965, then, opinion had solidified on the part of the denied ex-miners and widows.

They had decided true or not, that the UMWA and the trustees of the fund had formed an unholy alliance to dispose of thousands of faithful union men and their families by letting them perish on the bitter slag heaps of old age, sickness and poverty.

And the bitterness grew deeper. New facts, as well as rumors, kept finding their way into the coal fields.

It was said that each year the fund had millions of extra dollars left over that could have been used to offset the harsh poverty felt by those denied benefits.

And it is a fact that since 1951, the fund never has had less than a $92 million unexpended balance at the end of a fiscal year, even though in at least four different years it did spend more money than it received. At the end of the last fiscal year $180 million was in reserve.

In the coal fields, it is rumored that much of this "left over" money is being given to the union to do with as it pleases.

In truth, the fund—under federal law—is required to be completely separate from union control, except that one of the three fund trustees represents the union's interest.

These trustees do, however, keep the vast majority of the fund's money in the National Bank of Washington, which is 75 percent-owned by the UMWA. And a large portion of this money collects no interest.

To add to the ex-miner's confusion is the fact that this bank, since being acquired by the UMWA, invested huge sums of money in the West Kentucky Coal Co., although this relationship—according to union officials—no longer exists today.

To the average miner, the coal operator is the "enemy" to be fought by the union.

Just as surprising to some observers is the fact that a federal jury in Kentucky decided recently that the UMWA—since 1950—has been conspiring with powerful Consolidated Coal Co. to create a monopoly of the soft coal industry in direct violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act.

Consolidated Coal is particularly well-known to West Virginia miners because it owns the ill-fated Mannington No. 9 mine that exploded last fall, killing 78 men.

The court case is on appeal to a higher court, and could be overturned, as happened in a similar case several years ago.

Even if the lower court's decision is upheld, it would not be the first time in the bitter history of the UMWA that it has been found violating a federal law.

But it could surprise these miners if it is upheld that their union conspired with the "enemy" to drive smaller coal operators out of business, thus creating even fewer jobs for men who know how to do little else but mine coal.

To many of them who have watched as the range of welfare and retirement benefits have been decreased since the early 1950's a suspicion has formed that perhaps they also have been conspired against, somewhere within the complex operations of the UMWA, the larger coal companies, the National Bank of Washington, and the fund itself.

These ex-miners and widows do not believe they are being unreasonable.

They know better than most that their industry has gone through some bitter financial years since the end of World War II. But they also know that by the end of fiscal 1968, royalty payments had reached an all-time high of more than $163 million.

On Nov. 28, 1955, John L. Lewis testified before the Senate Labor Subcommittee. He said:

"The greatest testimonial to the worth of the fund is the gratitude, in the hearts of its beneficiaries, who for 150 years were neglected and left alone to stand the vicissitudes, if they could, of the most brutal and savage industry in our economy, or in the economy of any other country."

To those thousands in the coal fields who feel they have been deliberately cut out of their benefits, gratitude is hard to come by. They feel only that they are the latest victims of this "most brutal and savage industry."

Fund's Sweetness Becomes Bitterness

(By Michael Adams)

Bitterness, suspicion and distaste now characterize the attitudes of thousands of ex-coal miners and their families toward the United Mine Workers of America and its multi-million-dollar Welfare and Retirement Fund.

The former coal miners believe that union and fund officials arbitrarily cut off their pension, medical and other benefits because they no longer are useful to the UMWA in this day of highly mechanized mines and diminished labor force.

That one of the three trustees of the fund is John L. Lewis makes the depth of this bitterness remarkable.

There are many of the same men who, in the mid-1940's, worshipped no man so ardently and fanatically as they did Lewis.

Such adoration is understandable.

During World War II and the years that immediately followed, in the words of a Washington Evening Star editorial, ". . . the United Mine Workers spoke with a voice of thunder. And when they spoke the nation listened—attentively."

It universally was acknowledged that Lewis exercised an overwhelming influence upon the American economy.

The bituminous coal industry was in a perpetual state of chaos. Much of the nation lived in constant fear that the mine workers would "shut down the mines" yet another time.

Three times during the war, the federal government had to seize the mines as a result of UMWA strikes.

And the coal miners loved Lewis, almost to a man.

A 1954 study by the Industrial Relations Center of the University of Chicago published in the Quarterly Journal of Economics concludes:

"To the miners, Lewis is more than just the head of the UMWA. He has become their champion, the defender of an underprivileged group in its relations with the mine operators, a spokesman for a way of life."

It was with such a following that Lewis, in early 1945, introduced what many observers still feel was his greatest contribution to the country's long-lived labor movement.

He informed the coal operators that men—like machines—wear out and need constant upkeep.

He demanded that the operators pay a "royalty" on every ton of coal mined by union labor to be used to establish and independent trust fund to guarantee medical, pension and maintenance programs for his miners, their wives and their children.

The short strike in April, 1945, failed to win his point.

During April and May, 340,000 soft-coal miners refused to work in the pits—except for a brief period to honor a plea by President Harry S. Truman. It was short-lived.

Consequently, on May 21, 1946, Truman once again ordered seizure of the bituminous coal mines.

He directed Secretary of the Interior Julius A. Krug to negotiate a contract with the UMWA. Eight days later, the Krug-Lewis agreement was signed in the White House.

It provided for a "welfare and retirement fund to be financed by payment into the fund for operating managers of 5 cents per ton on each ton of coal produced for use or for sale."

Lewis had won. A "great dream" apparently had become reality for the soft-coal miners.

But for the next four years, chaos remained in the coal fields, and the fund was the cause of much of it. The coal operators proved uncooperative.

It was a time which saw the Taft-Hartley Act enacted over Truman's veto; and Lewis defiantly continued to use all the muscle of his mighty union to try to force the coal operators to support the fund.

The American public grew more and more disgruntled as the UMWA repeatedly shut down the mines.

Finally, on March 3, 1950, Truman sent a request to Congress for the power once again to seize and operate the coal mines.

According to the fund's 1951 annual report:

"Several hours after President Truman's

request to Congress . . . representatives of Northern, Western, and 'captive' coal operators reached an agreement with President Lewis and the UMWA on 'fundamental principles' of a new contract."

Unquestionably, Lewis had been successful in his defense of the fund. In 1947, royalty payments were raised to 10 cents a ton, in 1948 to 20 cents and in 1950 to 30 cents.

Two years later, on Oct. 1, 1952, they would go to 40 cents a ton.

By the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, nearly three-quarters of a million men, women and children in the coal fields had received millions of dollars in benefits, $82 million in fiscal 1951 alone.

Programs provided were: 1) Rehabilitation for the ill and injured; 2) Pensions for the aged; 3) Cash aid for disabled miners; 4) Hospital and medical care for miners and their families; 5) Death benefits, and 6) Maintenance aid for widows and orphans.

But a decade later, some of these basic programs had been discontinued, and participation in others sharply curtailed.

Bitterness against both fund and union slowly spread through the coal fields as those who were denied benefits began to ask: "What happened?"

The answer is elusive.

The trustees of the fund—including Lewis—are either unavailable to the press or noncommittal. Union officials say they cannot speak for the fund because it is legally separate from the UMWA.

"I haven't got any answer on why the board of trustees do certain things," said George J. Titler, international vice president of the union. "I'm not satisfied in the way they've expended their money."

Yet, a certain history can be pieced together. It is a history that runs hand-in-hand with that of the coal industry and the UMWA.

After World War II, the economics of the bituminous coal industry became very unstable. More coal was being produced than the market demanded.

This postwar decline of bituminous coal consumption reflected, in part, a progressive long-term shift from coal to alternative sources of energy, such as natural gas and petroleum.

But Lewis, the UMWA and the coal producers had also contributed to this lapse in the fortunes of coal. The public finally rebelled against the long years of bitterness and instability in the coal fields. It switched to gas or electricity.

After the war, then, consumption fell and unemployment in the coal fields rose. Full-scale mechanization further decreased the need for miners.

The U.S. Labor Department says: "Employment fell sharply. The average number of production workers . . . fell from about 411,000 in 1948 to less than 150,000 in 1959."

In short, hundreds of thousands of UMWA members who were employed miners when the fund was established, quickly became unemployed and, in many cases, unemployable—for they were no longer young and knew only the skills of coal mining.

Consequently, the fund found itself, seemingly, with a multitude of former miners and their families expecting their benefits and unaware that never again would they find work in the mines.

This truth, observers say, seems to have struck home during the 1950s then several national recessions occurred, further aggravating the situation by causing coal production and accompanying royalty payments to fall.

But the decline proved temporary. In the long run, the coal industry began to regain its health and by the end of its last fiscal year a record $163 million was paid to the fund in royalties, up $33 million from 1951.

The unexpended balance of the fund had risen from $99 million to $180 million.

Many of those denied benefits in the interim began asking angry questions.

Their feelings were put into words by Rep. Ken Hechler, D-W. Va., on Sunday when he called for a "full-scale Congressional investigation" of the fund. He said:

"I acknowledge that many benefits have reached the miners as a result of payments which have been made.

"But still the gnawing questions remain: Are the working and retired coal miners really getting a fair break out of the vast sums which are collected from the 40-cent-a-ton royalty on every ton of coal mined?

"Does an auditing and accounting of the fund reveal precisely how these millions of dollars are actually being spent and invested?

"What must be done to insure that every active and retired coal miner and his family is really protected and fairly compensated?"

Denial of Pension Embitters Hundreds

(By Michael Adams)

Hundreds, and possibly thousands, of embittered ex-coal miners have been denied pensions because trustees of the Welfare and Retirement Fund of the United Mine Workers of America will not give them credit for the early years they worked in the mines.

Many are old, sick and disabled now.

But in the 1930s, they were the youthful miners who helped organize the bituminous coal fields, under the brilliant leadership of John L. Lewis.

In 1946, they were the middle-aged miners who helped make up the backbone of the union as it defied both the coal operators and the federal government to get the first pension and welfare fund established.

They were men who then repeatedly shut down the mining industry to protect the fund and to force the operators to pay more money into the pension and welfare trust.

Today, many of these same men live in quiet desperation through-out the coal regions of America. They received no pension, and they have no way to get one.

The trustees of the fund (including their beloved John L. Lewis) refuse to let them count toward the 20 years required for pension eligibility some of their most productive years in the mines.

There are many reasons for which a miner can be denied a pension.

Some critics of the fund claim that its eligibility rules for pensions are so restrictive that only the most fortunate eventually qualify.

Proof of eligibility, they point out, is always the burden of the miner. But coal operators have been allowed to destroy the very work records he needs for proof.

Several months ago, Staff Reporter Jerry Landauer of The Wall Street Journal wrote:

"Critics say serious inequities seem apparent. The fund has rejected many hundreds of pension claims . . . and the grounds for a number of the rejections appear questionable to some observers."

To many of the men denied pensions, the most questionable eligiblity rule was passed by the trustees in 1953.

That rule says miners applying for a pension—besides meeting all other requirements—must have 20 years service in the coal industry "within the 30-year period immediately preceeding date of receipt of application by the trust fund."

Before 1953, pension applicants could count any time worked in the mines toward their 20-year total, as long as other requirements were met. And a rules change in 1965 gives the same privilege to all miners working after February 1 of that year.

Close examination reveals that many miners born from 1893 to 1926 are not allowed to count their earliest years of work toward the required 20.

In practical terms, the men in this age group dared not stop working until 10 years before they reached pension age, or they wouldn't have enough of the 30 years left to be able to qualify, no matter how many years they had worked.

For many hundreds of miners, it was impossible to meet this requirement. They had become sick or disabled, or they couldn't find employment.

Yet large numbers of them had worked the 20 years which would have been adequate had they only been born earlier or later.

Critics say, therefore, that the change in rules has created a situation for many miners which is "arbitrary and discriminatory"—though they admit the trustees had a legal right to make such changes.

Odell Sylvester Gwynn exemplifies the plight of these men.

Gwynn was born on May 5, 1906, in the small town of Goodwill.

He went to work in the mines, his records say, at age 15 as a brakeman for Gulf Smokeless Co. in Tams.

Ten years yater, the UMWA arrived in the southern coal fields. Gulf Smokeless was organized, and Gwynn was one of the first to join the union.

He remained a member for more than 20 years, actively participating in the affairs of his local.

"I was vice president of the local union there for four years." he says. "I was also on the (grievance) committee."

He was there in May, 1946, when the union struck for nearly two months to force the operators (and finally the federal government) to establish the Welfare and Retirement Fund.

And he was there in the years that followed as the union battled the operators to force them to support the fund concept and increase the amount of money they paid into it.

But in 1949, misfortune settled on the shoulders of Odell Gwynn. At age 43, he became one of the disabled.

"I came out of the mines . . . the doctors found out I had ruptured some discs in my back," he said.

In 1951 and again in 1952, fund doctors operated on Gwynn's back. They couldn't repair it.

"The doctors told me I could never do any more work," he said.

And, although he didn't realize it at the time, he would never receive the pension to which he believed he was entitled, even though he had worked 28 years in the mines. The reason?

Gwynn reached pension age in 1965.

He went to the UMWA District 29 office in Charleston.

"They wouldn't even give me an application form," he said. "They refused to let me file. They told me I'd been out of the mines too long.

"I told them I had hoped they would give me some time because I had been sick and couldn't work."

They refused.

Under the 1953 rule, the fund would credit only the years Gwynn worked after 1935. This left him with only 14 of his 28 years to show for his labor.

Today, Odell Gwynn and his ailing wife, Carvie, live in their small home on the south side of Beckley. Their income is $2,119.20 a year, all from Social Security. The pension he anticipated so long would have lifted the Gwynns to an income above the poverty level.

There are many hundreds of cases similar to Gwynn's in the nation's coal fields.

Critics say this group of men deliberately were cut out so that the fund and the UMWA could rid themselves of responsibility for the multitude of older, unemployed miners and their families who were expecting pensions and accompanying medical benefits.

The 1953 and 1965 rule changes, they say, were enacted to benefit the younger miners who are now more valuable to the UMWA.

Harold W. Ward, chief spokesman for the trustees denied this.

"I think you would make a horrible mistake if you thought a decision was made just to favor the younger guys.

"It would be a horrible mistake to think there was some kind of collusion between the fund and the . . . union."

Ward was asked to query Trustee Director Miss Josephine Roche on the subject, as she refuses to meet with the press. Her answer was, in part:

"The (1953) resolution was adopted . . . in recognition of the need to preserve the stability of the trust fund in order to meet the equities and future expectations of the men currently working in the mines under contract calling for a 40 cents royalty.

"It was felt that by 1953, the equities of the older miners, who had been active almost entirely before the fund was created . . . had been fully met."

Some critics will argue that Miss Roche's statement seems unrealistic and inhumane. The lack of recognition of the sacrifices these older men made to establish and maintain the fund is obvious, they say.

It is true that approximately 40,000 miners were pensioned under the early (1953 and before) regulations.

But the U.S. Department of Labor points out in its literature that employment in the bituminous coal mines fell from 411,000 in 1948 to less than 150,000 in 1959, leaving thousands of men out of work.

Further after World War II large numbers of these men undoubtedly were nearing retirement age. According to the Labor Department.

"Older mine workers increased markedly in importance in the industry's contracting work force. In 1938 . . . 30 per cent of all coal miners were 45 years of age and over; by 1957, the proportion had risen to 41 per cent.

"Compared with U.S. workers as a whole, the labor force of the coal industry was older and the average age was rising faster."

Since the first pension check was presented to H. M. Ainscough, of Rock Springs, Wyo., on Sept. 9, 1948, more than 130,000 miners have been found eligible for this benefit.

As of June 30, last year, 69,750 of these men were still alive and receiving their money. Lewis said.

"No pen can write no tongue can tell, no vocabulary of language is large enough to express the many benefits that through the establishment of the Welfare and Retirement Fund."

Fund critics now wonder whether those words were meant to apply to the many hundreds of other men who worked their 20 years in the mines, but were denied the pension because they were born in the wrong year, or became sick or disabled.

There is bitterness in the coal fields.

Employed Men Were Aloof to Rebellion

(By Michael Adams)

In 1960, a little-noted miners rebellion was staged in some of the nation's bituminous coal fields against the Retirement and Welfare Fund of the United Mine Workers of America.

Since the early 1950s, trustees of the fund gradually had been restricting the number of miners and ex-miners who could qualify for benefits.

Individual ex-miners or their widows sometimes would complain, but few of the employed men listened.

One who didn't is Lee Christian, 44, of Avondale. That was before Christian, himself, was disabled. He says:

"I was working, and I never gave it a thought.

"There was these people out here saying, 'I can't get this, and I can't get that.' We thought it was people trying to get something for nothing.

"If a man's working, he never gives it a thought."

On July 1, 1960, the trustees announced that most miners would be terminated from hospital, medical and death benefits after being unemployed for one year—regardless of the reason.

This struck home. Some of the working miners (in this industry of high unemployment, accident and fatality rates) did give that a thought.

Protest meetings were sparked in Kentucky and Pennsylvania. A half-dozen mines were picketed and temporarily shut down in West Virginia.

In the end, however, the small convulsion achieved little that seemed significant nine years ago.

But the suspicion, bitterness and distaste toward both fund and union found in the coal fields today have much of their roots buried in the events of 1960.

Such attitudes often are dated from "the day they took my medical card."

To many observers, it is ironic that some of the deepest resentment of the fund stems from this cutback in medical coverage.

For, it is in the field of medicine that the fund made some of its most significant contributions to the people of the coal industry.

The original 1946 agreement to establish the fund specifically stipulated that a survey be made of hospital, medical and sanitary facilities in the coal fields.

The results were released March 17, 1947, by Rear Adm. Joel T. Boone of the U.S. Navy Medical Corps.

The Boone report shocked the nation with its descriptions of squalor and inadequate health and medical facilities in the soft-coal areas.

It was the fund that took the first steps to remedy the situation.

On Dec. 1, 1948, ten regional medical offices were opened at strategic points in the bituminous coal fields.

Less than two years later, a rehabilitation program was begun that still stands today as a great accomplishment in the history of coal mining.

A backlog of more than a thousand men brutally crippled by mining accidents and explosions were moved from the desolation of the coal fields and admitted for treatment into some of the nation's finest medical centers.

By 1952, the program was well on its way toward being a brilliant success.

That year, the trustees announced still another program destined to have a lasting impact on the coal fields.

Ten hospitals would be constructed, they said, in Kentucky, West Virginia and Virginia "so that fund beneficiaries living there might receive the adequate hospitalization which is not now available to them in their home communities."

On June 2, 1956, John L. Lewis dedicated all 10 in a ceremony at Beckley. They had cost the fund nearly $30 million.

Even the harshest critics of the fund grudgingly admit that its early medical programs—and some that exist today—almost defy criticism.

While calling for a "full-scale congressional investigation" of the fund earlier this week, Rep. Ken Hechler, D-W. Va., noted:

"The building and maintenance of the miners' hospitals is a godsend to many miners."

But overshadowing the "godsends," say the critics, is the manner in which ex-miners and their families have been treated by the fund since 1954.

In August 1949, Miss Josephine Roche, then director and now trustee-director of the fund appeared before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

She described the fund programs of cash aid to disabled miners and to widows and children of deceased miners.

Miss Roche said:

"The disbursement . . . has to do with this endlessly long accumulation of broken human beings, of human denials and human want."

Disability grants, she said, had been paid to 84,625 miners (77.1 per cent of whom were permanently disabled) . . . "who have had recourse only to public-charity pittances and charity-hospital wards."

Widows assistance grants were paid to 30,583 widows and children, Miss Roche said, adding:

"And included . . . are nearly 4,000 widows whose husbands were killed in the mines.

Less than a year later, Miss Roche became one of the three trustees of the fund.

In another three and a half years, on Jan. 14, 1954, the three trustees, at their "discretion," terminated these aid programs.

The 1954 annual report announced that the programs both had been "temoprary." This wasn't mentioned in earlier reports.

Nearly 55,000 disabled miners, widows and children were cut off. Seventy per cent of the men were totally disabled. About 90 per cent of the widows were "aged." Only 25 per cent of all those affected had any other source of income, according to figures in the annual reports.

Six years later, the majority of the 55,000 still living also lost their hospital benefits.

Harold W. Ward is chief spokesman for the fund. Asked why the cash aid programs were stopped, he said:

"Social Security benefits were getting better, and relief agencies were being born all over the states. Should they be discriminated against by welfare agencies just because they were miners?"

Information from the Social Security Administration indicates, however, that programs which would benefit those denied the cash aid were not put into effect for several more years.

Miners suddenly denied the aid say:

"In that day and age, welfare wasn't so easy to get, and its payments were much lower than today."

Thomas M. Blevins, who lives near Glen Fork in Wyoming County, seems to typify their plight.

A mine worker for 25 years, and member of the union for 30, he was disabled in 1952 by a respiratory disease. When the cuts came, he was surprised and dismayed.

"I didn't know it was temporary," he says. "I didn't have no other income when I got cut out."

To live, he says, "I sold some property I owned. I was on DPA (welfare) for awhile. Then my son joined the Marines, and he helped support us."

In 1958, Blevins finally qualified for disability Social Security. Five years later, he was denied a pension, though he had worked at the same coal company for 25 years.

The same year Blevins went on Social Security, the nation entered a period of economic recession. Coal production dropped sharply.

Royalty payments into the fund fell from $155 million in 1957 to $114.5 million in 1961, as the unexpended balance dropped from $145.4 million to $99.8 million.

The 1960 medical program limitations resulted directly from this recession, according to fund literature.

Six months later, pension payments were reduced from $100 to $75 a month.

In October, 1952, the trustees announced the hospitals would have to be closed or sold.

To many observers, the actions of the trustees seem to have been based upon economic realities.

What these observers do not understand is why, at a time when their decisions were visiting misfortune upon thousands of miners, the trustees did not make a greater effort to explain the difficulties they faced.

To a man accustomed to the poverty of

the coal fields, critics say, a $99.8-million reserve seems like a lot of money.

In writing the Welfare and Pensions Plans Disclosure Act, the U.S. Congress pointed out that owing to "the lack of employee information" concerning the operation of such plans, "it is desirable in the interests of employees and their beneficiaries . . . that disclosure be made with respect to the operation and administration of such plans."

Critics say that while the fund may be meeting the legal requirements of the act, it is still being obscure from the point of view of the beneficiaries.

As an example, they cite the sale of the hospitals.

The actual amount of the money lost in the sale was never detailed. The 1964 annual report simply reads:

"Long term mortgages held by the trust fund on these hospitals were released upon their sale . . . allowances have been made by the fund to reduce the amount of the notes receivable to the remaining net worth of the debtor corporation."

Fund spokesman Ward admits that the chain was sold at a loss of about $16 million, which had to be made up from royalty payments in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

To many, $16 million is a sizable allowance.

Fund, Union Bank Ties Bring Raised Eyebrows

(By Michael Adams)

The Welfare and Retirement Fund of the United Mine Workers of America has accumulated at least a $180-million cash reserve.

The money was paid into the fund by coal operators as royalties on every ton of soft coal mined by union labor.

Three trustees rigidly control operation of the fund and its assets. One represents the union, another the industry, and the third is neutral.

These trustees deposit most of the money collected in the National Bank of Washington. This bank, for the most part, is owned and controlled by the union.

Appreciably less than half of the money deposited there by the fund has collected interest.

Since being purchased covertly by the union in 1949, the bank has experienced amazing growth. Critics say this has been possible only because huge sums of fund money have been available, through the bank, for the union to use as it sees fit.

This situation, they say, violates the Taft-Hartley Act, which says that the fund must operate entirely independent from the union.

Meanwhile, thousands of ex-coal miners and their families systematically have been excluded from pension and medical benefits they believed were promised them by John L. Lewis when the fund was established 23 years ago.

Lewis is the trustee representing the union.

Those denied benefits bitterly are asking, "What happened?"

And a great deal of interest has been generated over the relationship between the fund, the union and the National Bank of Washington.

Ultimate responsibility for operating the fund is vested in the three trustees—Lewis, Henry G. Schmidt and Miss Josephine Roche.

Lewis, now 89, reportedly has been in failing health for the past year, although fund spokesmen say he still attends board meetings. He receives a $50,000-a-year pension from the UMWA, and apparently takes no pay for serving as a trustee.

Schmidt is chairman of North American Coal Co. and serves as the industry trustee. At age 68, he receives $35,000 a year from the trust fund. In addition, North American reportedly pays him an additional $75,000 a year.

The "neutral" trustee is Miss Roche, who has been described as the "alter ego" of Lewis. Eighty-two years old, she also serves as the funds' executive director and is paid $60,000 a year .

Critics argue that the trustees, no matter what their virtues in the past, are now too elderly to have such absolute power over the destinies of the nation's thousands of soft-coal miners.

They also feel that salaries paid the trustees are much too high for an organization that, in the past, has reduced or cut off benefits, using economic necessity as the basis for their decision.

A miner's pension, they say, brings him $1,380 a year. Miss Roche's salary alone, they pointed out, would provide pensions for 43 miners a year at its present level.

In truth, the whole question of salaries paid employes and officers of the fund is being raised more and more often.

In its annual reports, the fund regularly makes it a point to state how low administrative costs are in comparison to total yearly expenditures.

In the report for the year ending June 30, 1968, administrative costs were given as 3.1 percent of total expenditures—nearly $5 million.

Salaries account for almost $4.1 million.

According to Harold W. Ward, chief spokesman for the fund, the organization employs 325 persons in its Washington, D.C., headquarters and its 10 area medical offices.

This would seem to mean that the average salary paid by the fund is $12,606.72 a year.

"We have to pay the doctors good salaries to keep them," said Ward. "That brings up the average."

While the fund, at times, seems reluctant to discuss any of its affairs with disenchanted miners or the press, this particularly seems true in matters of finance.

Miss Roche refuses to meet with reporters. Questions to her must be channeled through Ward. Lewis is unavailable. Schmidt does not comment.

Many feel that this attitude on the part of the trustees is autocratic, and that it reflects long-time practices of the UMWA—a practice no longer so palatable in this age of self-assertion.

Lewis, say the critics, ran the union with an iron hand for 40 years. Miss Roche, they say, employs the same philosophy in administering the fund.

The lack of openness inherent in such an operation, they argue, is reflected in the relationship between the fund, the union and the National Bank of Washington.

Records in the Comptroller of Currency's office show that the National Bank of Washington has one million shares outstanding, each valued at $10.

As of June 29, 1969, the UMWA owned 740,888 of those shares.

Substantial interest in the NBW was first acquired covertly by Lewis and the union in June, 1949. It would be years before Lewis would admit the bank was owned by the UMWA.

Washington's oldest bank, the NBW at the time the union purchased it was also one of the smallest, with some $25 million in assets in 1948.

Within the next few years, the bank experienced phenomenal growth.

One reason for this, say bankers near the coal fields, is that Lewis insisted they establish a financial relationship with the NBW which might not have been in their own best interests.

When they refused, Lewis took the union and fund money deposited in their banks and shifted it to Washington.

Further growth resulted from the NBW's acquisition in 1954 of Washington's Hamilton National Bank through an unknown buyer who paid about $10 million to buy 80 per cent of Hamilton's outstanding shares, at $110 a share.

According to a newspaper account at the time:

"Executives of other banks shook their heads at the price of $110 a share and said it was abnormally high."

Critics say that such lavish expenditures might not have been possible, had not millions of fund dollars been on deposit at the NBW.

And the 1954 annual report for the first time lists a fund savings account in the bank. It totalled exactly $10 million.

Critics also complain that a disproportionate amount of the money on deposit in the NBW is from the fund and that—although the trustees and union officials may be abiding by the letter of the Taft-Hartley Act—in practice, the union is able through the bank to do what it wants with the royalty income.

Accounting differences make difficult a comparison of fund deposits to total deposits in the bank (excluding U.S. Government deposits).

Roughly, however, it would seem that in 1967—the last year complete figures are available—about 25 per cent of the money in time and demand deposits in the bank came from the fund.

The percentage seems to have climbed steadily from 13 percent in 1963.

Recently, the fund has come under sharp attack for keeping nearly $70 million in checking accounts in the NBW where it does not draw interest.

Staff Reporter Jerry Landauer of The Wall Street Journal put it this way:

"This act of generosity to the union-controlled bank deprives the pension fund of more than $3 million a year in interest income."

Three million dollars would pay pensions for a year to 2,173 miners.

Fund spokesman Ward queried Miss Roche about the checking accounts. She said:

"That happened to be the balance on June 30, 1968, because of estimated potential needs at that time in keeping with our expenditures of $13.5 million to $14 million a month."

Critics say this is a strong argument against keeping $70 million in the checking accounts.

Ward said that the balance just happened to be particularly high at the end of the last fiscal year, intimating that this was not a normal condition.

The fund's annual reports since 1954 show, however, that on each June 30, the trustees have had about 50 per cent or more of the royalty money in the noninterest checking accounts.

Still another criticism concerns the $180-million unexpended balance. Critics say the amount is excessive, and that some of it should have been expended to maintain the discontinued cash and medical programs for the ex-miners and widows.

Said Miss Roche:

"This unexpended balance is not excessive for the reason that it represents approximately only one year's benefit expenditures. Many other plans have many, many times that much reserved for pensions alone."

Observers say that Miss Roche, at best, is being too conservative.

George J. Titler, international vice president of the UMWA, recalled recently that after the fund was first established, the coal operators wanted to delay benefits until interest could accumulate from investing royalties already collected.

The benefits were to be paid with interest.

"Lewis argued that it would take 20 years to start benefits under that plan," said Titler. "He insisted that the fund operate on a pay-as-you-go basis. He said that never in history has production in the American coal industry gone below 330 million tons a year."

If that is the case, say the critics, the fund can always rely on at least $132 million a year in royalties, and a $180-million reserve is excessive.

They intimate that there are other reasons for building up a huge unexpended balance, reasons involving the union and the National Bank of Washington.

But their charges even if true would be hard to prove.

As Rep. Ken Hechler, D-W.Va., said Sunday while calling for a congressional investigation of the fund:

"It is difficult to obtain clear and complete information about the inner workings of this fund (and) how its money is spent. . . . Does an auditing and accounting of the fund reveal precisely how these millions of dollars are actually being spent and invested?"

ANOTHER DAY OLDER, DEEPER IN DEBT

(By Michael Adams)

This is the history of Albert Jennings Duncan, ex-coal miner.

"I started going in the mines when I was 15 years old. I wasn't even out of school age."

That was 1922.

"I joined the union when they first started. The day they signed me up, we got run off the company's property."

The early 1930s.

"I got disabled in the mines."

That was 1957.

"I couldn't keep up my union dues. I got dropped."

In 1961. "But I paid up my back dues and borrowed the money to do so. It was 80-and-some dollars."

That was 1965.

"I got turned down on a pension. They said I lacked six months.

"I said what about a refund on my money. I said it was borrowed money. The international said they'd pay the money back if the local would. The local said they wouldn't pay anything back."

That was in 1966.

Today, Duncan is 62 years old and lives in Twin Branch. His income is $63 a month from the West Virginia Department of Welfare. He says:

"That's just starvation."

"But I'm still a union man. I believe in organized labor."

Duncan's is not an isolated case. Thousands of histories can be found in the nation's soft-coal fields that are, if not similar, just as tragic as his.

This, say critics, explains the deep bitterness of the ex-miners and their families toward the United Mine Workers of America and its multimillion-dollar Welfare and Retirement Fund.

Like Duncan, many still believe in organized labor, but not in the UMWA as it exists today.

They believe they had a vested interest in the fund, and that they were guaranteed pension, medical and other benefits in 1946 when the fund was established.

"After all," they say, "we mined the coal that the operators paid royalties on. We got an interest."

Under federal law, this does not seem to be the case.

Annual reports issued by the fund state:

"No vested interest in the fund extends to any beneficiary.

"Resolutions adopted by the trustees governing fund benefits . . . specifically provide that all these benefits are subject to termination, revision, or amendment, by the trustees in their discretion at any time."

That is the law. But what the miners were led to believe in 1946 and the years that followed is another thing.

As recently as April 1, UMWA President W. A. "Tony" Boyle reiterated the line of emotional argument that leads the miners to believe the fund is theirs and that benefits are assured.

Boyle spoke to about 2,000 coal miners at a rally in Pittsburgh.

He reminded the men that exactly 23 years before, the UMWA had started "the historic work stoppage . . . that won our union its welfare and retirement fund."

He said:

"It was a tough battle. But as a result of your action you won a contract providing for a nickel a ton royalty.

"That shutdown of the coal industry—that use by you coal miners of organized labor's one and only real weapon when words fail—convinced the federal government and eventually the coal operators that an industry-financed health and welfare fund was a proper charge against the cost of production of coal."

The miners and ex-miners firmly believe they went on strike in 1946 and the years to follow because they were promised the pension and other benefits.

"That's what it was all about," they say.

But not according to George J. Titler, described by some as Boyle's closest ally in the union, as well as its international vice president.

"That's a lot of hooey," he says. "They weren't promised anything. When a miner goes out on strike, he goes out because his union says to."

So the battle goes. The exminers insist they have benefit rights. The fund and the union say they have no rights.

Warren R. McGraw was born and raised in the coal country around Pineville, where his father was a teacher.

Now 29 years old, McGraw is a freshman member of the West Virginia House of Delegates. Earlier this year, he was an outspoken advocate for the rights of coal miners during the "black lung" debate.

Six years ago, however, McGraw was fresh out of Wake Forest Law School and trying to start a practice in Pineville.

His first client was Thomas Manuel Blevins of Glen Fork.

Blevins had worked as a coal loader for the Morrison (later Bellemeade) Coal Co. from 1927 to 1952, when he became disabled.

He was a member of the UMWA for 30 years.

He was denied a pension in 1963. The fund wouldn't credit the early years he worked at Morrison toward the 20 years required.

Blevins was shocked. He distinctly remembers the strikes that led to the creation and growth of the fund.

"We was striking for those pension benefits," he says. "All they told us was in 20 years you'll get a pension. In the beginning of it, that's what we was fighting for."

McGraw took Blevin's case to the U.S. District Court in Bluefield.

In his complaint, he argued that Blevins was a "third party beneficiary" under the contract between the union and the coal operators.

He claimed that in denying Blevins his pension, the fund had "breached the aforementioned contract."

In short, McGraw claimed that Blevins did have a vested interest in the fund.

The case was never heard. It was dismissed "without prejudice."

The trustees of the fund were in Washington and could not be brought to court in West Virginia.

Asked why he didn't appeal the case or take it to Washington, McGraw said:

"We couldn't afford it. The attorney fees alone probably would have run a couple of thousand dollars. A man has to eat."

McGraw still believes, though, that his legal argument is sound.

"Once you get them into a court," he says, "they've had it. Because some court, possibly the Supreme Court of the United States is going to have to decide whether these trustees can make such arbitrary rules. One day you're on, the next day you're off."

"They're dealing with some vested interest here," he says.

As for Blevins, he and his wife now live on social security benefits, and he still keeps hoping that someday he'll get his pension.

Says McGraw:

Everybody that knows him likes him. He's just been a decent man all his life."

To sue the fund, it takes money and a lawyer. Both seem to be hard to come by in West Virginia, at least from the point of view of an impoverished ex-miner.

To remedy these problems, an unusual organization was formed in 1966—The Association of Disabled Miners and Widows.

The association charges each member a dollar a month dues. Half of the money collected is paid a lawyer; the other half is used for expenses of local chapters throughout West Virginia and expenses of the board of directors.

The association's lawyer is P. W. Hendricks of Madison. The ex-miners say they went to Hendricks after several other lawyers turned them down.

Hendricks has long been a controversial figure in the West Virginia law profession. He once was suspended from the Bar for six months.

But most of the ex-miners swear by him.

"Among the laboring class of people," says Association Treasurer Howard Linville, "Woodrow Hendricks has got the best reputation of any lawyer in the world."

"He loves to win too well to be bought," says another member.

Linville keeps a detailed record of all money paid Hendricks. From June, 1967, to January, 1969, it amounted to $11,000—or an average of $550 a month for 20 months.

Hendricks has provided office space for the association to collect the records of its 2,000 to 3,000 members.

He also furnishes them with a part-time secretary.

Currently, the association has one case pending appeal in federal court, but the going is slow and there is no assurance Hendricks will win.

For this reason, members of the association are delighted in the request made last Sunday by Rep. Ken Hechler, D-W. Va., for a full-scale congressional investigation of the fund.

Many feel that, in the long run, only the U.S. Congress can ultimately solve their problems.

But some observers feel there is one other solution. They say that the union should insist the coal operators pay more in royalties than the present 40 cents a ton.

With the extra income, they say, the fund could reinstate benefits which have been dropped and give pensions to all the miners who have been denied.

The union rejects this idea.

"We wouldn't have any non-union mines in the country if it wasn't for the welfare fund," says Titler.

He, and other union and fund spokesmen, say that many of the union's current legal problems arose out of royalty disputes.

They say that it was small coal operators being sued for back royalty payments who banded together and brought a charge that the union and giant Consolidation Coal Co. have been conspiring since 1950 to monopolize the soft-coal industry and drive the small operators out of business.

A federal jury in Kentucky recently decided that the charge was true. The case is on appeal.

It does not seem likely to observers that the union will call for increased royalty payments.

And so stand the problems of thousands of ex-coal miners, their widows and children today.

John L. Lewis once said:

> "The UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund has done more for miners than any other institution which has had to deal with mine workers since the 10th century, when coal was discovered in the Forest of Dean."

Almost no one will deny that.

Men like Albert Jennings Duncan and Thomas Manuel Blevins do ask, however, what happened to their part of the benefits.

As Wannis Stinson of McDowell County says:

> "You take we old miners, we got these young miners what they got now. We made them now what they got. But what happened to us, though. We got kicked off to one side, and that's the end of it."

RAISING INCOME TAX EXEMPTION LEVELS ON RETIREMENT AND PERSONAL INCOME

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, two identifiable groups in our country are being increasingly penalized by an unbalanced and admittedly unjust tax system. Older retired people and lower and middle income taxpayers are bearing an unfair portion of our tax burden, while special interests are evading their legitimate taxpaying responsibilities by utilizing special tax loopholes, or as former Senator Douglas, of Illinois, termed them—truckholes. Such a situation cannot continue for much longer.

A personal exemption to an individual taxpayer of $600 is grossly unfair, ignoring today's financial realities and demands. I am now introducing a measure that would double the present $600 personal income tax exemption to $1,200. This includes exemptions for a spouse, dependent, and additional exemptions for old age or blindness. I am further aware that Treasury Department people have decried any effort to raise personal exemptions because of loss of income to our Government. That is precisely one reason for my advocacy of this reform.

Passage of a bill doubling the present personal income tax exemption would necessitate closing of existing tax loopholes, relieving millions of individual lower and middle income taxpayers on the one hand and forcing tax reform on the other.

My second measure, being introduced today, is an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code which provides a full $5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits. This is in addition to whatever other exemption is received by the older citizen. It would be a basic exemption, over and above any portion of a retirement benefit exempted in any other part of the Internal Revenue Code.

Our older citizens are caught in a vicious bind, consisting of inflation and fixed income. While other elements in American society evade taxes with ease, these older citizens find their hard earned dollars threatened and overtaxed. Such an evil ill behooves our country and should be removed. My bill would have this effect.

A differentiation must be drawn here between a loophole and an exemption. Loopholes or truckholes are based on a function or activity of a special interest group, such as the oil industry, a single major corporation or the investment industry. Over the years, because of their power, wealth, and ability to hire specialists in gaining these favors, loopholes have been opened in our tax laws through which special interests have siphoned off vast sums of money. Slack left by these activities has had to be taken up by lower and middle income taxpayers and older Americans.

An exemption such as the two I have offered in my two bills is based on an inherent condition. Retired people on limited incomes falls in this category, as do lower and middle income taxpayers. They are not a special interest group in the sense that an industry or a corporation is. The oil depletion allowance is not based on income but on special interest. Contrast this with the plight of these other groups.

Trapped in a human condition, they are bearing the lion's share of the burden of the 10-percent surcharge, in addition to what they were already contributing. Certainly the special interest groups in industry are not bearing their fair share.

Passage of larger personal and retirement income tax exemptions will redress the present imbalance in our tax system as it applies to millions of Americans. Such new leeway would counterbalance advantages presently enjoyed by special interests at expense of others.

I reject the argument that more loopholes should be opened. Why riddle an already perforated system? I seek basic legislative relief through these two bills—a meaningful approach to comprehensive as opposed to superficial reform.

These measures complement H.R. 7585, which is a comprehensive tax reform package, removing most privilege and closing most loopholes.

NEW NIXON DIRECTIONS—PENNIES FOR CLEAN WATER—CUTS FOR EDUCATION—SLASHES AT JOB CORPS—BILLIONS FOR THE CANNON KINGS

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Budget turned down Secretary of the Interior Hickel's $600 million request to help clean up our water supplies. It will hold spending levels for water pollution controls to $214 million for the coming fiscal year; same amount as last year.

President Nixon and the Bureau of the Budget next delivered a body blow to American education in the form of a 10-percent cut in the proposed Federal education budget, amounting to approximately $360 million. A quick little fiscal two-step and impact aid, library programs, and advanced educational experiments are slashed to the bone. Mr. Nixon's answer to inflation. It is like seeking to neutralize nitric acid with talcum powder.

Having been raised in a city and representing a metropolitan district, I have a nodding familiarity with urban problems and thought. Evidently, such is not the case at the White House. In the name of fiscal responsibility, the administration proposes to close down a series of Job Corps centers across the country. It is reported that at least two of the largest centers for unskilled young men will be closed. Six women's centers are also on the list, as are two-thirds of our 82 conservation centers.

It seems that Mr. Nixon has our social priorities reversed, to the growing dismay of millions of Americans. Clean water and aid to the poorest school districts seem to come very low on his list. Perhaps he might enjoy inhaling the pungent smell of the Hudson River and Lake Erie, which are open sewers. Perhaps he ought to see what happens to a poor school district when you cut off aid.

During the presidential campaign, it was obvious that President Nixon knew little about cities, where the overwhelming majority of Americans now live.

When the President was a young man, fewer young people competed for fewer jobs demanding lesser skills. America was a land of small towns rather than massive concentrations of concrete, traffic, turmoil and moving masses. There were no crises in identity, mobility, pollution, training, and housing. Yet today we face all these, and especially do our young people. Yesterday they possessed no voice and few rights. Today this is all changed.

Under the previous administration, a major effort was mounted aimed at levering these youngsters out of dead end situations and into a place where alternatives could be offered them, as well as a breathing space far away from cities. Simultaneously, they were put to work on tasks benefiting the Nation and themselves, receiving a few dollars in the process. These took the form of Job Corps centers the President now proposes to slam shut in the faces of thousands and thousands of these young people, sending them back to the streets and futility of the past. How terribly sad.

Forget about past misery which molded them and their frustrations. Ignore progress made because of Job Corps. Destroy their newly raised hopes. Close our eyes to environments they will be forced to return to, and attendant strictures America shall suffer because of the administration's decision.

Violence and upsurges of a revolutionary nature are not caused by the hopeless, but by those who have glimpsed light at the end of a tunnel and had it snatched from them.

I suppose the White House will call these acts of unprecedented fiscal shortsightedness red-hot miracles at its next carefully staged press conference. New directions, indeed.

CONGRESS MUST RECLAIM FROM THE PRESIDENCY THE POWER TO DECLARE WAR

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, when the

Constitution of this Republic was propounded, written, signed, and ratified, the power to declare war was expressly reserved to Congress. Up to our present age of world wars, this rule was scrupulously adhered to in every national crisis, no matter what the exigencies of any situation happened to be. I regret to say this is no longer the case. Congress has allowed its power to declare war to slip away, along with many of its other powers, to the ever-predatory executive branch of Government.

Any strong President acts as a magnet for power, drawing it unto him so he may adequately fill roles he is constantly reaching out for. Such has been the case at least seven times in our history. Add a military conflict to a strong President, and the flow of power, usually at the expense of the legislative branch, increases in tempo and scope.

World War II and our entry into the Korean conflict provide ample proof that there must be executive action in crisis or to honor commitments. Still, political scientists and legislators may ask what about power of Congress?

It can, perhaps, be stated that the old form of declaring war by Congress has become obsolete. Yet the war power has not changed hands in any manner whatsoever. It still remains the absolute prerogative of Congress to declare when a state of war exists between this Nation and another sovereign state. Recent history, however, would never lead us to believe this. Once troops are committed and hostilities underway, initiative no longer rests with Congress. Only calls to the colors are heard, rather than appeals to reason.

Congress must take it upon itself to draw a meaningful, definite line between congressional and Presidential authority. There have been deliberate executive efforts over the years to insure that this line of authority remains blurred, leaving significant leeway to a Chief Executive. This is one of the main reasons why we are embedded in the Vietnam quagmire. By all means, a President can and should direct foreign policy. By all means, he retains the right to ask Congress to commit military forces. He does not have a right to dispatch them in the manner they have been assigned in recent years, particularly Vietnam. It is well to bear in mind that Congress has exclusive power to raise and financially support Armed Forces. If necessary, such aid to a Chief Executive can be withheld pending the drawing of a strict line acknowledging supreme power of Congress to declare war. This is particularly true of "limited wars" that are not thermonuclear confrontations. We must insure there is never again a remotest chance of repetition of our Vietnam commitment, where by a series of Executive orders America has become enmeshed in a conflict that has already killed more young men than the Korean war. Congress must insist that the concept of divided powers remains valid, insuring that it is respected by insisting on proper governmental procedures. If a war policy is being pursued, Congress must be so informed by the Chief Executive. If that policy involves use of American military forces in defense of another country, Congress must be asked for authority to satisfy the constitutional requirement and to provide a check and balance on executive action—actions sorely lacking as we casually made massive commitments in Vietnam. Power to declare war must be adapted to contemporary conditions.

Nor has the nuclear age changed things, since Congress authorized development of our thermonuclear arsenal and appropriated funds for its deployment and maintenance.

It is likely, because of the international balance of terror, which will probably endure indefinitely, that many future war crises will arise in our times. These may take the form of many potential Vietnams. Some will arise in Asia. Early outlines of future conflicts can already be seen in Thailand. Others may emerge in Latin America, similar to Cuba. Social conditions there make it almost certain that upheavals will surely follow. Our present major involvement on that continent will thrust us into the forefront. The Dominican Republic and Cuba are classic examples of previous choices offered our country. In the Middle East and Africa, the Israel-Arab imbroglio and colonial conflicts even now raging guarantee further involvement. It therefore behooves the Congress to stake out its position of responsibility and domain swiftly, in order to make it perfectly clear that no executive commitments of American forces can or should be made without consultation of the body vested with the constitutional right to declare war. We must insure that there will be no more Tonkin Gulfs.

Just as Congress drained back power taken from it during World War I after President Wilson left office, so should Congress reclaim its power right now taken from it by the executive branch of Government. It can do so by restating its role in no uncertain terms.

May I emphasize that I do not state this position in any partisan sense. Mr. Nixon as a Republican President is not the target of my remarks. It is the office of the Presidency that has gained overmuch power at the expense of other branches of Government. What I advocate now has been a historic swing of our national pendulum of power. It is time for Congress to render unto itself what belongs to it. We shall, at the same time, render unto the Presidency what is due that mighty office.

If Congress is to remain relevant—if Government is to remain in balance—there must be reclamation by Congress of its power to commit this Nation to a policy of conflict with another nation-state in the world.

Not to do so would be an abrogation of our legislative and constitutional responsibility. Not to do so would chance another Vietnam. Power within the Government of the United States of America must be rebalanced.

My concurrent resolution follows:

H. Con. Res. 199

Resolved by the House of Representatives (*the Senate concurring*), That it is the sense of Congress that since the power to declare war is vested by the Constitution in the Congress and since that power has been encroached upon, the following procedures should be followed to provide the necessary checks and balances between the executive and legislative branches of the Government: The President shall inform Congress of any war policy that he intends to pursue, and the President may not commit the Armed Forces of the United States in any combat action in any foreign country unless he has been authorized by Congress to take such action.

TAX REFORM AROUSES AMERICAN PUBLIC

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, during my long service in Congress I have never experienced the uprising in my home district concerning Federal tax inequalities like I did during the Easter recess. Many Congressmen, no doubt, received the same criticism of our Federal tax system during the last week. Evidently, many of the millions of taxpayers throughout the country were rudely awakened when they made out their income tax forms during the last month or two to find the increase 10-percent surtax "hitting their pocket books" in addition to the high tax bracket of 1968.

The average American will support his Government during a domestic or international crisis willingly if he knows that all American taxpayers are contributing the same financial support percentagewise in comparison to their annual profits. Many people are receiving firsthand knowledge of the fabulous and fraudulent loopholes given big oil, big foundations, big real estate and big exemptions, depletions and credits in other lines of industry and business. When almost two-thirds of our Federal taxes are being paid by salaried and wage earners, it is time for a congressional investigation as to why this unequal tax assessment has been allowed to grow into a scandal that an investigation as to its origin might rival the Teapot Dome scandal of the 1920's.

Many newspapers are picking up the fight although some still are reluctant to inform their readers as to the real truth of inequalities that have taken over the Federal tax structure during the last 30 years. Real action must be taken in this session of Congress or an uprising of the American taxpayers may occur that might become as historic as the Boston Tea Party during our Colonial period.

I wish to submit with my remarks a recent editorial from the St. Paul, Minn., Dispatch on the present tax crisis throughout the country:

Tax Reform Promises

If the Nixon Administration fails to submit an extensive federal tax reform program to Congress in the near future, it appears that Democrats will seize the opportunity to push for major changes and take the political credit.

Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee announced that it will start drafting a sweeping revision bill in about two weeks even if no recommendations are received from the Treasury Department or the White House. Previously the report had been that action would await Administration proposals.

"I'm dead serious about this," said Mills.

Several other members of the committee also promise action. Apparently tax gripes from constituents back home have been having an effect. John W. Byrnes of Wisconsin, senior Republican on the Ways and Means Committee, is supporting the Mills program for more than token reforms.

Byrnes lists the oil depletion allowance, accelerated depreciation of real estate investments and stricter rules for foundations as probable targets for committee action. Mills has mentioned tax advantages involved in conglomerate mergers, foundation levies and increases in standard deductions for individuals.

Rep. Ray Madden, ranking Democrat on the House Rules Committee, threatens to support an "open rule" for tax legislation if the Mills group "doesn't come up with a good, honest sincere bill." An open rule would mean that the Ways and Means bill would be subject to amendments on the House floor, something not usually permitted. Madden also is demanding a crackdown on foundations and on depletion allowances for oil and other "extraction" industries.

For the past several weeks the Ways and Means Committee has been hearing testimony from groups which generally oppose drastic revisions and want present preferences to continue. The fact that Mills and other influential congressmen continue to promise substantial reforms regardless of this opposition may indicate that this session of Congress may yet produce meaningful and long overdue revisions.

TAX REFORMS NEEDED

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, April 15, is the deadline for most American taxpayers to file and pay the Federal income taxes on last year's income. Because of the complexities of our tax laws, there is growing discontent among our taxpayers over the time, effort, and expense which must be expended in complying with the law and completing the returns. Moreover, many feel that their tax burden is disproportionate to that which is borne by others. I have recommendations which I am bringing to the attention of the House Ways and Means Committee during its milestone hearings on tax reform. Simplification and equity are the goals to which we should address ourselves.

As chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, I have, on previous occasions, spoken and conducted studies on the need to simplify our tax forms and thus ease the burdens of compliance of millions of American taxpayers. What has become increasingly obvious is that the complexity of our tax forms results from the complexity of our tax laws. Most of our tax provisions are the end products of compromise and intensive give and take in the legislative process. Thus the controversial nature of these tax provisions gives rise to intricately drawn regulations and complex forms. In essence, form is so intertwined with substance that a simplification or reform of one cannot be achieved without simplification or reform of the other.

This is not to say that we should seek simplicity for the sake of simplicity. The interminable series of complex formulas which confront our taxpayers each year, the recent proliferation of corner "tax consulting" offices promising completion of returns from $3 and up, and the number of returns submitted to taxpayers for recomputation all prove that our tax laws, regulations, and forms are ripe for overhaul.

It has been 15 years since the last overall review of our Tax Code, and, in some cases, more than twice that long since some of the preferential provisions of the code were thoroughly scrutinized to determine if their continued existence is justified in the light of equity, fairness, and economic needs.

For this reason, in particular, I applaud the Committee on Ways and Means for initiating hearings on tax reform.

Our deliberations on tax reform, Mr. Speaker, should be based on the following premises each of which, independently, makes a strong case for a thorough restructuring of our tax system:

First. Based on available evidence, which indicates that many of our tax provisions are being used solely for tax avoidance and shelter, it can be said that the present Federal tax structure does not meet objectives of fairness, simplicity, and equity.

Second. Our State and local governments, being pressed almost to the breaking point by demands on their resources, are losing the race in competition with the Federal Government for available revenues with which to fund their expanded activities.

Third. The absence of equity in our tax laws causes detrimental misallocation of investment resources because of greater consideration of tax consequences than of overall economic well-being.

Fourth. The achievement of tax equity, in itself, will not necessarily result in tax reduction for a significant number of our taxpayers. This point should be made very clear at the outset.

Fifth. There is continually mounting evidence of growing discontent among American taxpayers generally. The plight of school districts around the country resulting from the failure of local residents to approve increases in local taxation and the recent warning by former Treasury Secretary Joseph Barr of a possible taxpayers' revolt should not be taken lightly.

These are some of the major considerations which must guide us in our tax reform deliberations during the 91st Congress.

Prior to discussing the proposals that I urge, a word needs to be said about the personal exemption allowance. Many suggestions have been made to increase the ceiling on that provision from its present level of $600. It is true that that figure bears no relationship to the amount required for the sustenance of a dependent. But it does represent a significant measure of tax relief to taxpayers at every income level.

The severe revenue loss which would result from an increase in the allowance, however, represents a severe drawback to a higher ceiling. It is estimated that the Treasury would suffer a revenue loss of more than $17 billion, or almost 10 percent of the entire Federal budget, if this allowance were increased to $1,200.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I favor a reasonable increase in the ceiling on the personal exemption but the revenue loss which would result should be offset by revenue gains to be made either from new tax sources or from alteration of other provisions.

There are other measures, Mr. Speaker, which may be adpoted now without severe impact on revenue flow. The suggestions that I strongly recommend should be a part of any reform package and their adpotion will be a meaningful step toward the achievement of equity for taxpayers at every income level. In addition, they would lighten the burdens of compliance on millions of our taxpayers and facilitate the auditing chores of the IRS.

First among these is alteration of the minimum standard deduction. It is commonly admitted that the minimum standard deduction is the most equitable and efficient method available of directing tax relief to persons in the lowest income ranges. Currently, the allowable minimum deduction is $200 plus an additional $100 for each exemption subject to a ceiling of $1,000. This allowance is out of line with today's cost of living, and persons with incomes of less than $7,500 are sometimes forced to itemize their deductions or pay taxes in higher proportions than their higher earning fellow citizens. This is because the minimum standard deduction currently fails to perform the role for which it was intended.

By increasing the minimum standard deduction to $600 plus $100 for each exemption with a ceiling of $1,000, 88 percent of the resulting benefits would accrue to persons earning under $7,500. Additionally, the increased minimum standard deduction would grant relatively more tax relief to single persons than to other taxpayers by increasing the income levels at which single persons are taxable.

By increasing the minimum standard deduction, we would not only lighten the tax burdens of those in the lowest income brackets, but also enhance their capacity to better provide for their own subsistence.

The second item that I wish to emphasize is a modernized general standard deduction. In 1944, 82 percent of all individual taxpayers used the standard deduction instead of itemizing. This year, it is estimated that only 57 percent of our taxpayers will use it. The effect of this diminution in the use of the standard deduction has been to put greater auditing pressures on the IRS and cause millions of taxpayers to undertake the task of computing their deductions—needlessly I believe. This increase in the number of itemized returns results from the higher income levels which now prevail and the higher proportion of personal deductions relating to income as compared to 1944.

The Treasury Department study on tax reform recommends that the standard deduction be adjusted upward so as to once again enable 80 percent of our individual taxpayers to utilize that provision. Many other experts in tax matters have stated that the goal should be 90 percent of all individual taxpayers.

Whatever percentage is ultimately attained, I think few will disagree that the current figure of 57 percent imposes severe administrative burdens on the IRS and imposes an otherwise unnecessary task of deduction computation on 18 million taxpayers who would forgo that chore if the standard deduction were raised to meet current living costs.

The Treasury Department has said:

> The standard deduction is one of the most helpful and desirable features of our tax system for combining simplification and equity . . . It reduces the auditing problems of the Government and makes an important contribution to the orderly and uniform operation of the tax system.

Very few, if any, of the Treasury proposals make such a strong case for adoption, and thus I urge that the general standard deduction be adjusted upward to 14 percent of adjusted gross income with a ceiling of $1,800.

The principal beneficiaries of such a provision would be the 24 million taxpayers with incomes between $5,000 and $15,000 who currently itemize their deductions. Under the proposed standard deduction ceiling, 13 million of their number would change to use of the standard deduction provision instead of itemizing. More importantly, it would effect greater equity between taxpayers in this group who are able to itemize their personal deductions and those who are not able to do so.

The third provision which I especially support is the minimum individual income tax. It was once said that our tax system "is a continuing struggle among contending interests for the privilege of pay the least."

The combined use of certain preferential tax provisions has enabled some of our taxpayers to escape most, if not all, of their responsibility to contribute a fair share toward the cost of Government, and this has given credence to that remark.

In turn, greater burdens have been put on those in lower income brackets who are not able to take advantage of the preferential provisions.

Most of these provisions were enacted for the purpose of meeting some sound social or economic objective. No doubt many could stand revision. But whatever their treatment, it should be a policy of our tax law that no one with income above a certain level should be completely exempt from taxation.

Therefore, I urge that our tax structure include a mandatory graduated minimum income tax that would assure that all individuals contribute at least a minimal share to the cost of the Government.

Public respect for our tax laws is the foundation of the tax system and its successful administration. By enacting a minimum income tax, we would take an important step toward halting erosion of that respect. This is an important indirect benefit of the minimum tax that I propose.

Next among my recommendations, Mr. Speaker, is the need to give tax relief to our senior citizens and to ease their tax computation chores. Of the more than 20 million Americans over the age of 65, approximately 25 percent of them currently pay Federal income tax. During the past three decades, many provisions have been enacted to afford tax relief to the elderly. And yet, despite our best intentions, the situation now exists where many of our senior citizens are at a severe disadvantage if they choose to work to supplement their governmental retirement benefits.

In addition, the complex rules involved in computing retirement income credit have resulted in misunderstandings on the part of the elderly and caused many of them to lose benefits to which they would otherwise be entitled.

Therefore, I propose that we supplant the various tax benefits and credits now available to the elderly with a liberal exemption in the amount of $2,500 for a single person and $4,200 for married couples. To channel the major benefits of this proposal to those senior citizens most in need of tax relief, I believe we should set a reasonable income level at which the allowable exemptions would begin to phase out. Such a level may be set at $7,000 for a single person and $12,000 for a married couple.

Adoption of this proposal would lower the tax burdens of almost 80 percent of our senior citizens and would greatly simplify the forms and procedures with which they must comply.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in order to improve income tax equity at the higher brackets, I propose that we include in our tax structure an optional maximum tax. In our deliberations, we should not only consider those who pay too little tax in relation to others, but also those who pay too much. Approximately 30 percent of all those with incomes exceeding $500,000 pay more than 50 percent of their actual income in taxes. The remaining 70 percent pay taxes at a rate which is often substantially below 50 percent.

If we are to be consistent and our goal is fairness among taxpayers with like incomes, then it should be a policy of our tax law to extract no more than half of a person's income in taxes.

These are the provisions that I especially recommend.

I have made no specific mention of corporate, estate, or gift tax matters, although I hope serious consideration will also be given to alteration of provisions which have given rise to abuses and undue complexities in those areas. Much can be said for unification of the estate and gift tax laws, and few will deny that, in the area of corporate taxes, the provisions dealing with mineral depletion allowances and multiple surtax exemptions, to name just two, could stand modification.

Nor should other provisions dealing with individual taxes, such as the unlimited charitable deduction and the farm tax rules, be exempt from posible overhaul.

In essence, Mr. Speaker, what is really needed is a fundamental, rather than a patchwork, restructuring of our tax laws, because they are so related to the traditional goals of our tax laws, the items I have just highlighted should be a part of any final package.

THE 24TH ANNIVERSARY OF AUSCHWITZ—A CONCENTRATION CAMP OF NAZI BRUTALITY WHICH SHALL LIVE IN INFAMY

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 24th anniversary commemorating the liberation of victims of Auschwitz Concentration Camp where over 6 million people perished.

I would like to take the opportunity to read in part a letter from one of the survivors of Auschwitz, which in a way reflects the spirit and substance of this occasion. It was written by Mr. Allen Kiron, who is now employed by the U.S. Patent Office.

I ask only of you to listen for a few moments to those whose suffering was eternal.

I ask only of you to share a quiet thought of mourning for those whose piercing cries of agony never reached the halls of justice.

I ask only of you to remember the words of George Santayana:

> Those who forget the past are condemned to repeat it.

My friends, a memorial by definition is "anything intended to preserve the memory of a person or an event."

We are faced with a titanic task not only because there are 6 million dead involved, but because of the "event"; the brutality and suffering; the silence of free men when the cries of agony of helpless children and adults were piercing the heavens; the blind fury and madness of a professed cultured society; man's bestiality against man.

Mr. Kiron states:

> If I had the power, I would take the human race by the hand to show it what I and others suffered in concentration camps.
>
> As a start, we could enter Auschwitz and see how an SS-man takes a child from a bewildered mother and by grabbing its feet and swinging it against the wall, crushes its head, or the crematorium where a pregnant woman burns and her belly literally pops open with the child falling to the side, or the starved prisoner killing a weaker one so as to cut him open and eat his liver, or the SS amusement center where a son is forced to keep his father's head under water until he drowns his own father, the son goes berserk and is shot; or the little boy bleeding from the head walks towards the gas chamber and cries "I want to die, it can't be worse over there".

This shows you how difficult it will be to commemorate the event. But commemorate we must. He continues:

> For myself I am a soldier in an army of six million officers whose command—"do not forget us"—I must obey. To this end I have been slowly and painfully collecting a library for a "Living Museum" which some day I hope to build and will now briefly describe.
>
> It is my intention to build a museum which will make it possible for visitors to *see, feel, smell* and vicariously suffer the horrors as they occurred. Thanks to the miracle of modern science, a great deal of simulation is feasible. It will be a challenge and duty of every adult in the world to see it once in his lifetime.
>
> One of the problems we are faced with is the fraility of human memory. The secret

of a good memory depends upon the impression a subject makes on the mind. Because man forgets easily, a monument will not do. A shocking experience will. I intend to provide nothing less.

A monument too often is lost in the abstract and contemplation of beauty. Pain and suffering are real and ugly. Most important of all, people must remember.

Just how important this is can be seen in the unfortunate emergence of a new Nazi Party in Germany and the same old cycle of organized hypocrisy and lies.

Just the other day you could see this small but vociferous group offering their newspaper propaganda on the street corner with such headlines as "6 million dead is a big lie", "gas chambers is a Jewish invention", etc.

Do you see how quickly people forget?

You ask how am I going to build the museum. I do not want any monetary donations. I want everyone interested to help build a museum with his own sweat and blood. I want everyone able bodied to carry a brick, a sack of sand or a bundle of wood on his back. The sick and the old can keep records. The honor roll will not read how many dollars were contributed, but in terms of hours of labor spent, weight carried, injuries sustained and sacrifices endured.

Remember, we are not only building a memorial but a monument to our own freedom and democracy. Surely no one will doubt that. Whatever sacrifice we must make for our freedom to endure we shall endure it freely.

You ask me how long will it take? Well, maybe a year, a lifetime or an eternity.

Remember the echo of the last whimpering cry of a child burning alive is eternal also.

Finally, can *you* hear the echoes?

Will *you* remember?

ALLAN KIRON,
Survivor of Auschwitz.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of humanity, we can do no less than remember. I hope all people with a conscience will pause today to reflect on man's brutality toward his fellow man. The 24th anniversary of Auschwitz gives us cause for such a pause.

CARDINAL O'BOYLE'S HOMILY ON THE LATE PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1969, at St. Matthew's Cathedral in Washington, D.C., a mass for peace was celebrated as a tribute to the late President Dwight David Eisenhower.

At the mass, His Eminence Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, delivered a homily as a tribute to our late, beloved President, the text of which homily I herewith include in my remarks:

CARDINAL'S HOMILY AT MASS FOR PEACE

My dearly beloved friends in Christ, we have met together many times in this beautiful old cathedral. We have met in joy and in stark tragedy. We have prayed for peace and unity among our people, and have asked the guidance of Almightly God for those to whom we have delegated the awesome responsibility of governing this great nation.

Today, although our hearts are saddened by the passing of a beloved figure from our midst, we meet with a certain sense of fulfillment. For although General Eisenhower would be the last to claim personal credit for the progress achieved in the years over which he presided, his footsteps on the beachhead of human progress are sharp and deep.

General Eisenhower served his country well in many fields—as soldier, author, educator, chief executive and world statesman. Yet although he commanded the greatest military force in history, it was his accomplishments in pursuit of world peace that gave him the greatest satisfaction. He quickly perceived that the world would never find lasting peace and tranquility as long as the nuclear bomb hung like a Sword of Damocles over the head of mankind. This led to development of the "Atoms for Peace" program which President Eisenhower presented in person to the United Nations.

General Eisenhower's outgoing temperament made it easy for him to perceive both the impossibility of isolation in an expanding world and the benefits of free intercourse between nations.

By every measurement of inclination and training General Eisenhower fitted perfectly into this mold. He was the right man in the right place at the right time, and the country showed its confidence by giving him two resounding victories at the polls.

The former President's critics have argued that he sought to stay "above politics," and that no man can do that in a democracy and govern effectively. Perhaps. But the record will show that an American general successfully put together a complex striking force manned by professionals from half a dozen countries, and led them to victory.

Dwight Eisenhower was able to accomplish this military miracle because he had learned the secret of getting people to work together. He was marked for greatness even then. And try as he might to escape his destiny, the Normandy beachhead led inexorably to the White House.

In these informal recollections of a great and popular figure, I have left to the last one facet of his character that would clearly set him apart in any age. Perhaps President Nixon said it best in a tribute to his former chief shortly after his death.

"For a quarter of a century," the President said, "he spoke with a moral authority seldom equaled in American public life. This was not only because he held the nation's highest honors . . . but because of the kind of man he was."

It was true. People sensed in Dwight Eisenhower a rock of integrity that inspired not only confidence but affection. Through his humility, his dignity and his unselfish willingness to spend himself on any task that might benefit the land he loved, General Eisenhower richly earned the love and respect of his countrymen. May God rest his brave and noble soul.

In the April 3, 1969, issue of the Catholic Standard, the official newspaper of the archdiocese of Washington, appeared an editorial entitled, "Dwight David Eisenhower," which I also include in my remarks."

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

The death of General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower marks the passing of an era in the history of this country. He served as the key military leader of our armed forces and later as a two-term President of the United States when our nation reached its highest point of world political and moral leadership.

Although he was not the prime architect of the grand strategy that led to final victory in World War II or of the policies that pledged our nation to serve the world community, it was his unique talent that molded the essential ingredients into the harmonious effort necessary for success. It was a period when this nation, although a victorious world power, neither demanded nor acquired a single foot of alien territory from either friend or foe. On the contrary, this nation both instituted and supported the national aspirations of any number of emerging new nations in direct contrast to the actions of the Soviet Union and other Communist-controlled countries.

It is a matter of historical record that Gen. Eisenhower played a profound, even though at times a somewhat intangible, role in determining the future courses of this country. His ability to persuade the brilliant and sometimes domineering men with whom he was called upon to associate to put aside their diffuse interests for common causes resulted in the achievement of many successes which otherwise would have been unattainable. He was a truly remarkable man and a dedicated patriot.

There is little that we can add to the accolades he has received from the nation and the world. We can only urge all men of good will to work toward the accomplishment of the same spirit of harmony that he so richly prized and was so effective in achieving. This could be our greatest tribute to him, and the one he would cherish above all else.

We join with our fellow Americans and men of good will throughout the world in asking God's mercy for a great American—Dwight David Eisenhower.

CLOSING OF JOB CORPS CENTERS

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Nixon administration announced its intention to close 50 Job Corps centers throughout the Nation and its plans to replace them with urban residential manpower centers.

I am greatly disturbed that the administration has decided to close these valuable educational facilities in rural areas by July 1, replacing them with smaller installations in the crowded cities. I am puzzled by the administration's decision to close all but one of the Indian Job Corps centers in the country.

It seems to me that one of the results of this decision will be to hasten the migration of rural people into the already crowded cities. One of the primary goals of the Job Corps—to train rural people in rural areas—will be frustrated. Further, I am convinced that no realistic substitute plan can be formulated before the effective date of the discontinuance.

It is significant, I believe, that only eight of the urban minitraining centers proposed by President Nixon are located in States west of the Mississippi and only one—Portland, Oreg.—is located in the entire Northwest.

Mr. Speaker, correspondence and telegrams protesting the administration's decision are beginning to pour into my office. I know from my discussions with many of our colleagues that support for these centers is widespread.

I insert a sampling of telegrams I received today in the RECORD. Here are the views of the people who have seen these centers firsthand and appreciate their value:

HELENA, MONT.,
April 11, 1969.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I have just dispatched following to the President:

"Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
"President of the United States,
"White House,
"Washington, D.C.:

"I am greatly disturbed at the announcement to close the Kicking Horse Job Corps Center and respectfully request reconsideration of the proposed action.

"The Kicking Horse facility has processed 1300 enrollees since the program was first implemented four years ago. Approximately 75 per cent of graduates have been gainfully employed. Annual operating cost is estimated at $250,000, yet appraised value of completed conservation and public works projects is $500,000. Personnel and enrollees have been awarded one of the three national citations for excellence of service. A variety of important community services have been provided, including a community center in nearby Ronan, Montana; a city park in St. Ignatius; and curbing and street layout for new homesite in Arlee.

"I am anxious to improve Federal-State relations but have been extremely disappointed that the chief executive of Montana was not consulted nor were members of Montana's congressional delegation. The impact of this proposed closure on the nearby communities and the loss to our disadvantaged young people has not been fully calculated.

"I urge you to direct a thorough re-evaluation of the Kicking Horse facility before implementing the decision to close the operation."

Hon. FORREST H. ANDERSON,
Governor of the State of Montana.

HELENA, MONT.,
April 11, 1969.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The announcement by the Nixon administration to close Job Corps centers was unfortunate, not because it affects Montana, but because it affects so many young folks who were getting a new lease on life because they were becoming productive citizens. It is shocking that the Nixon administration can endorse a weapon system named ABM that will cost billions of dollars that is of debatable use, while at the same time eliminating a necessary program that provides human dignity. Do all possible to defeat the weapon systems and maintain Job Corps.

JOE REBER,
Senator, Lewis and Clark County.

RONAN, MONT.,
April 10, 1969.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Shocked, surprised, dismayed that our Kicking Horse Job Corp Camp is under consideration for closure. The camp, its personnel, its enrollees have consistently been good, well behaved, and constructive citizens of our community. It seems a shame to stop something that is doing so good. We strongly urge continuation of this camp and ask your help.

Ronan Chamber of Commerce, Ray M. Loman, President; Mayor Norman Stedje, City of Ronan; Pat Harvin, Past President Chamber of Commerce; Don Aadson, Past President Chamber of Commerce; A. I. Schroeder, President, Ronan Ministerial Administration; K. William Harvey, Superintendent, Ronan Schools.

POPLAR, MONT.,
April 10, 1969.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We oppose closing of Kicking Horse Job Corps Camp on Flathead Reservation. We ask your assistance to continue the camp for the benefit of all concerned.

WILLIAM YOUPEE,
Chairman, Montana Intertribal Policy Board.

REPEAL OF FEDERAL PAY RAISE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, JUDGES

(Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1969, I introduced H.R. 7778, a bill "to rescind the pay increases for Members of Congress and other Federal officials pursuant to Presidential recommendation to Congress in the budget for the 1970 fiscal year, to abolish the quadrennial Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, and for other purposes." Since that time there have been other identical and similar bills proposed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my opposition to the pay increases for Cabinet members, judges, Members of Congress, and so forth, has nothing to do with the "worth" of the services of these people. As a matter of fact, my personal opinion is that the vast majority are worth the money and could earn as much or more in the private economy today.

It is the duty of Congress, as well as the executive, to set the fiscal affairs of this country in order. To do this, Congress should set the right example for all Government and for the private sector as well. The inflationary impact of the implementation of the increases of the Kappel Commission—as amended by President Johnson—is obvious. Already other Government employees who have built-in pay raises for July of this year are complaining that "it is not enough" even with the recent increases already received by them. It certainly takes no genius to anticipate labor's attitude toward the Government guidelines of a 4- to 5-percent increase when they negotiate. Any union leader worth his salt will rely on Government's own action as the answer to Government's recommendation.

Now, the Senate went on record on this pay increase and approved it. There is reason to believe that several Members of that body have had second thoughts. I do not know. I would like to find out—and there is a way. Let us pass H.R. 7778 in the House and send it over to them.

The House was not permitted to vote. The American people have a right to know where House Members stand. Whether you—as Members—are "for" or "opposed" to the increases, you must agree that your constituents have a right to know where you stand.

Today, I have placed at the Clerk's desk a discharge petition for H.R. 7778. If you are willing for your constituents to know where you stand, you are invited to sign the petition.

As a part of my remarks, I include an article by Joe Creason which appeared in the April 5 edition of the Louisville Courier-Journal:

MORE ACTION, LESS TALK WOULD SEEM IN ORDER

(By Joe Creason)

Lately I notice that the days in the month and the money in the bank seldom come out even any more. And since we haven't gone on any wild spending sprees, the reason must be the ever-increasing attrition of inflation and taxes, not necessarily in that order.

Because of this, I find suddenly that I'm very short-tempered about what Congress has done—or has not done—to correct these matters on the federal level.

This is a change within myself that disturbs me since in the past I've been generally sympathetic to Congress. I've never been a great one for deriding officials who work for me. Rather, I've felt that, what with them eventually coming back and asking for my vote, in the end I—and my ilk—have the decisive last word.

But now I'm not as patient as before. I'm getting sick to my stomach of hearing Congress talk about tax reform and the need to correct inequities, economies in government, and the urgency of all of us fighting inflation with all our might and main.

I'm ready for Congress to stop talking (for the benefit of the folks back home) and start the remedies it prescribes. I—and others I have talked to all over Kentucky of late—no longer will fall for the vague promise of future tax reforms and economies; no longer do I find any solace in jokes about how a dime today is a dollar after taxes and inflation.

Moreover, I'm becoming resentful about Congress having what seems one set of standards for itself and another for the great mass of the unwashed—the public. A case in point is the 41 per cent pay increase Congress voted itself at the same time the government was urging unions, businesses and such to show restraint and hold the line against inflation by keeping pay increases and price hikes to 5 or 6 per cent.

It isn't that I doubt Congress was underpaid. But, then, who among us feels he isn't overworked and underpaid? My beef is that every member of that august body volunteered to serve—even begged us to let them serve—in Washington for the old pay scale, and I've never heard of one who applied for assistance from the poverty program after being elected.

If Patrick Henry thought taxation without representation was rough, I wonder what he'd say about how it is today with representation.

CONCERNING A WELFARE PROPOSAL

(Mr. CONABLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, I have today introduced a bill to provide for a national system of public assistance to needy individuals and for grants to States for welfare service to such individuals and to strengthen the Federal support of the State medical assistance program. This bill has its roots in the pressures developed by the patchwork welfare system that has grown like Topsy in some States and remained stunted in others without reference to the condition of its less fortunate residents. It is appropriate that New York State should take the lead in proposing such legislation, because New York not only is the largest Federal taxpaying State, but it also bears the heaviest burden of social welfare costs in the Nation.

The Governor tells me that much research and practical experience has gone into the drafting of this bill, and it is my hope that it will receive the study that such a major provision deserves at a time when public cash benefits and medical assistance are causing the costs of local and State government to skyrocket. A rational policy of public assistance should be nationwide in its scope, and the burden of misfortune should be more equally shared than it is under random systems of welfare which this Nation has permitted to develop.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in the Record at this point a summary of the provisions of this bill, in the hope that it will receive the study and consideration not only of my colleagues from the State of New York, but also from the Nation as a whole. Time is running out, and this 91st Congress must assume some responsibility for rationalizing the system of welfare. I trust this proposal will stimulate action toward that objective.

The summary follows:

A Comprehensive Block Grant Welfare Program

A. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this proposal are to: decrease the unfair disparity between welfare benefits in different states; provide more adequate assistance and services to individuals and families; improve and expand efforts to help individuals become self-supporting; and reduce the financial burden of welfare costs on the states and localities thereby enabling the states to utilize their fiscal resources more effectively for improvement of other public services.

This proposal would provide for—

A national system of public assistance to needy individuals to become effective after a transitional period;

Increased Federal funds for state public assistance programs during the transitional period;

Federal grants to states for services to needy individuals;

Strengthened Federal support of the state medical assistance programs.

B. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

1. New Title XX of the Social Security Act: Establish a new title in the Social Security Act (Title XX) which would provide Federal funds for a block grant for *all* needy welfare cases including all *five* categories: aged, blind, disabled, dependent children, and general assistance, effective July 1, 1969, along the lines of the plan provisions in the existing categories.

2. Optional Feature: The new title would be *optional* with the states. The four existing Federal titles (aged, blind, disabled, and dependent children) would continue for any states which wished to take advantage of them. One advantage of the new block grant is that states would receive Federal funds for general assistance.

3. Federal Financial Share: In order to raise payment levels in low-payment states, and to assist states in meeting the increasing financial burden of mounting welfare costs, effective July 1, 1969, the Federal financial share under the new Title XX would be as follows:

(A) Dependent children: 100% of first $30 per month plus 50% of next $40.

(B) Aged: 100% of first $50 per month plus 50% of next $40.

(C) Blind and disabled: 100% of first $65 per month, 50% of next $40.

(D) General assistance: 50% of first $80 per month.

In the fiscal years 1971 and 1972 the Federal funds would be increased in proportion to the increases in the minimum state budgetary standards for those years as required in (B) and (C) of paragraph 4.

4. Federal Eligibility Conditions:

A. In order to raise low-payment levels to qualify for new block welfare grant, each state's minimum budgetary standard of need (that is, the amount to be paid to a person without any resources) would have to be at least as follows: Children, $40 per month; aged, $65 per month; blind and disabled, $90 per month; general assistance, $40 per month.

B. For the fiscal year 1971, the minimum state budgetary standard would have to be at least 115% of that in paragraph (A) but it could be at the poverty level (as adjusted by the 15% factor in paragraph 5) or at a state's 1969 standard whichever is higher.

C. For the fiscal year 1972, the minimum state budgetary standard would have to be at least 130% of that in paragraph (A) but it could be at the poverty level (as adjusted by the 15% factor in paragraph 5) or at the state's 1969 standard whichever is higher.

D. For the fiscal year 1973, when the Federal Government takes over 100% payment of costs, the eligibility standard would be 100% of the poverty level.

5. Definition of Poverty Level: The poverty level would be established by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare upon the recommendation of the Commissioner of Social Security based upon the poverty level for families of given size and composition and for farm and non-farm families as published in the Social Security Bulletin for April 1966, page 23, for March 1965 adjusted annually for changes in the price level.

In 1966 the Social Security Administration poverty level for a man age 65 and over, who was living in a non-farm residence, was $1580 and $1975 for a couple. For a non-farm family of four members it was $3335. The poverty level range was from $1090 for an aged woman living in a farm residence to $5430 for an urban family with seven or more members.

The standard could vary by not more than 15% upward or downward upon a showing that such variation was based upon differences in costs of living (such as heat or rent).

6. Minimum Federal Payment: Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 3, in no case would the Federal financial share in fiscal years 1971 and 1972 for each state be *less* than 75% of the State's total expenditures for these years. Any expenditures in excess of the poverty level as adjusted by the 15% factor in paragraph 5 would not be counted in determining the Federal financial payment under this paragraph, unless as of January 1, 1969 the level of payment in a state was higher than the poverty level as adjusted by the 15% factor in paragraph 5, in which case such expenditures would be counted in determining the Federal financial payment.

7. Work Incentives: As an incentive to obtain and retain employment, an individual on welfare could retain earnings up to $75 a month and one-third of any additional earnings up to a maximum of one-third more than the public assistance standard for such individual or family.

8. Administration:

A. Effective July 1, 1972, the Federal Government would accept responsibility for the administration of the money payments for welfare. The Federal Government could utilize state agencies to administer the programs in any state where the Federal Government and the state had entered into agreement to administer the program in accordance with such standards now contained in the Federal welfare legislation. States could utilize city or county agencies to administer the program in accordance with such standards. The administration of the welfare programs by the states would operate similar to the way in which, at the present time, state agencies handle the determination of disability insurance benefits under the disability insurance provisions of the Social Security Act.

B. Federal matching for administration would be 75% in the fiscal years 1971 and 1972 and 100% thereafter.

C. The Federal Government would administer the work and training programs effective July 1, 1972, but could use States as their administrative agents as provided under paragraph (A).

C. SOCIAL AND OTHER NON-MEDICAL SERVICES TO NEEDY INDIVIDUALS

This section would require that those states participating in the new transitional program would be required to provide social and other non-medical services to all needy individuals. Those services are basically those for which the Federal government now provides 50%–75% reimbursement under the cash assistance programs.

States would be required to provide day care services adequate to meet the needs of those mothers who want to work.

Effective July 1, 1969, Federal financial reimbursement would be not less than 75% of state expenditures for non-medical services to needy individuals (including administrative expenses).

When the Federal government takes over the full cost of public assistance payments, all states would be required to provide these services or forego Federal reimbursement for Medicaid.

States would have the responsibility of providing and administering services. No change would be made in Part B, Title IV of the Social Security Act relating to child welfare services or Title V relating to child health.

D. MEDICAID (TITLE XIX)

Effective June 1, 1970 Federal financial participation for Medicaid would be no less than 75% of the state's total expenditures for Medicaid (including administrative expenditures).

Federal reimbursement could be available for expenditures for all needy individuals, including those receiving general assistance.

In addition, the eligibility level would be revised to provide that the maximum level could be 150% of the public assistance standard, including the new standards set forth in B.

E. MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT

Total expenditures (Federal, state and local) by a State for all money payments, vendor payments including Medicaid, and welfare services for each of the fiscal years 1970 through 1972, inclusive, must not be less than such total expenditures by a State for all such purposes for the fiscal year 1969.

RENAMING WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT IN HONOR OF FORMER PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

(Mr. MYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to introduce today legislation which would rename Washington's National Airport in honor of former President Eisenhower. A great many of our colleagues are joining with me as cosponsors and I invite others to join us in this bipartisan tribute to the World War II hero and beloved 34th President of the United States.

The proposal would change the name of the airport to the Dwight David Eisenhower National Airport.

It is significant that National Airport began full operations in 1941 at a time when General Eisenhower began his meteoric rise to Supreme Allied Commander.

Because of his close association with the Nation's Capital, as military leader, President, and civilian, I feel it particularly appropriate that we name this facility in his memory, one which daily welcomes visitors from throughout the Nation and world.

More than 27,000 persons use National each day. In addition, millions of travelers from around the world have passed through the airport facilities. Renaming the airport in honor of General Eisenhower would serve as a constant reminder of this great leader who holds the affection and trust of a grateful Nation.

GRAINS AGREEMENT "EMPTY PROMISE" FOR FARMERS

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the International Grains Agreement is full of empty promises, actually is harmful to American farmers, and should be terminated.

The treaty was sold to Congress and the wheat farmer as a sure way to higher income and better overseas markets.

Actually, the practical effect of the treaty was to give U.S. farmers access to world markets only if they paid a heavy export tax, a fee which the Department of Agriculture tried to sugarcoat by describing it as an inverse subsidy.

In arguing for the treaty 2 years ago John A. Schnittker, then Under Secretary of Agriculture, promised farmers the inverse subsidy would yield $100 million a year in revenue, which would then be redistributed to farmers.

Actually, the export tax—let us call it like it is—will yield less than $8 million when the first full year is over June 30. In terms of total overseas markets the American wheat farmer is having his worst year in a decade. The previous year, when farmers were encumbered by no market-rigging treaty whatever, farmers had their third best export year in history.

Under the circumstances, Secretary of State Rogers should take the first steps required for the United States to withdraw from the treaty at the end of this current crop year.

Farmers are having a tough enough time making ends meet, without the added handicap of a wheat treaty that hurts us and helps our overseas competitors.

The treaty gives special advantage to French, Swedish, Greek, and Spanish wheats; and to Australian and Argentine wheats by means of incomplete quality description. Further, major exporters like the Soviet Union, Romania, and Bulgaria did not sign the treaty.

I have written as follows to Secretary of State Rogers, in regard to the treaty:

> DEAR SECRETARY ROGERS: Since we began the International Grains Arrangements last July 1, the U.S. is having its poorest wheat export year in the past decade. At the same time the U.S. Department of Agriculture is projecting increased wheat exports over last year for Australia, France, and Canada. It's understandable why these countries want the treaty preserved.
>
> In studying the testimony given both in support and opposition to the Senate ratification of this grain treaty last spring, and recently the expert analysis of the workings of the treaty printed in March 20 Congressional Record, I have come to the conclusion that the arrangement is structured and geared to the consistent disadvantage of the U.S. in world wheat trade. The minimum prices for most U.S. wheat are set so high that for the first time in our history, an export tax is levied on wheat in order to comply with the treaty. This export tax—euphemistically called an inverse subsidy—has been most heavy on Soft Red Winter wheat which is commonly produced in my state of Illinois, and the export of Soft Red Winter wheat this year is running less than one-third the level for the same eight month period last year.
>
> The basing point for applying minimum prices under the treaty was set at our U.S. gulf ports from which we export most of our wheat. This has turned out to be a particularly crippling handicap for our exports. This is so because other exporting countries enjoy all the greater competitive flexibilities that accompany the ocean freight calculations in reference to a basing point that is distant from their port of export. Also, the relationships between minimum prices on wheat from different origins, spelled out in the IGA, give additional advantage to French, Swedish, Greek, and Spanish wheats by special treatment; and to Australian and Argentine wheats by incomplete quality descriptions.
>
> Finally, the Soviet Union, Romania, and Bulgaria did not sign the treaty. There appears to be mounting evidence that the high minimum prices specified in the treaty are stimulating wheat production in these countries as well as all over the world. But, because they do not belong they are consistently undercutting us, particularly throughout Western Europe and the Mediterranean area.
>
> Because the IGA is proving itself in almost every conceivable way to be prejudicial to U.S. wheat exports, I respectfully request your department to initiate immediately those steps provided for in Article 21 of the Wheat Trade Convention of the treaty that would get us out of this agreement by the end of this current crop year. It is noteworthy that the marketing year 1967–68, during which no international agreement on wheat existed, U.S. farmers enjoyed their third best export year in history.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> PAUL FINDLEY.

REPRESENTATIVE LUJAN INTRODUCES BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS ACT TO GIVE PRIMARY CONSIDERATION TO THE NEEDS OF THE PUBLIC IN ALLOCATING RADIO AND TELEVISION FREQUENCIES

(Mr. LUJAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Federal Communications Act of 1934 to insure that the Federal Communications Commission shall give primary and paramount consideration to the needs of the public when allocating radio and television frequencies. It is important that viewer and listener needs of the people of an area take precedence over the matter of fair competition between the various networks, as is now the case.

The practice of placing primary emphasis on the competition between the networks arises from a decision, American Broadcasting-Paramount Theaters against Federal Communications Commission, handed down by the court of appeals in Washington, D.C., and is not an administrative act of the FCC. The Supreme Court did not review the case, and the court of appeals did not point to any provision of the Communications Act, the rules of the FCC, or any legislative history to support its decision. The decision appears to be without judicial precedent and according to the FCC is contrary to decisions of the Supreme Court.

The FCC is now bound by the court of appeals decision, but it is my hope that the passage of this legislation would enable the FCC to rule on allocation matters on the basis of public interest rather than network competition.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that people are more important than networks, that the public interest would take precedence over any other, and I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO PASSES MEMORIAL REQUESTING ASSISTANCE OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT IN BRINGING ABOUT LEGISLATION ELIMINATING ABUSE OF THE TAX LAWS PERTAINING TO AGRICULTURE

(Mr. LUJAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of New Mexico recently passed Senate Joint Memorial 10 which asks the assistance of the U.S. Government in bringing about "legislation which eliminates abuse of the tax laws pertaining to agriculture."

I agree that the tax advantages intended to assist farmers and ranchers should remain in effect for legitimate farmers and ranchers, but closed to those who, without accepting the hard work and risks of farming, have been avoiding the payment of taxes on nonfarm income.

At this time I would like to include Senate Joint Memorial 10 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 10

Joint memorial expressing the opposition of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico to Federal legislation which would, in trying to stop certain tax practices, destroy legitimate members of the business community

Whereas, efforts have been made by the department of the treasury to present legislation to congress, in an attempt to prevent the use of agricultural businesses as a tax-avoidance technique, to prevent members of the legitimate agricultural community from using nonagricultural income to offset agricultural losses and thereby supplement agricultural income; and

Whereas, this would have the effect of driving some of the agricultural community out of business; and

Whereas, present proposals would have the effect of drying up existing sources of risk capital now available to the agricultural community; and

Whereas, present proposals would eliminate possible purchasers of agricultural land, and change current accounting procedures so as to impose ruinous taxes on legitimate members of the agricultural community; and

Whereas, there already exist, in the tax laws of the United States, numerous ways to eliminate the use of the "agricultural tax gimmick" by the tax-avoidance expert;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico that it is opposed to inhibiting the free flow of capital into and from the agricultural industry; and

Be it further resolved that the Legislature of the State of New Mexico requests that the members of the New Mexico Congressional Delegation work with the agricultural industry to bring about legislation which eliminates abuse without destroying the economic base of the agricultural industry.

E. LEE FRANCIS,
President, New Mexico Senate.
DAVID L. NORVELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

ADMINISTRATION LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS, PLANS, AND PRIORITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-96)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As the members of Congress know, I have had under consideration the question of whether to send to the Congress this year a message on the State of the Union. I have decided against doing so. However, to assist Congress in formulating its plans, I would like to indicate at this time some of the principal legislative proposals that I will be sending in the weeks immediately ahead, and to report on the development of Administration plans and priorities as they relate to domestic programs.

The first twelve weeks of the new Administration have been devoted intensively to the pursuit of peace abroad, and to the development of new structures and new programs for the pursuit of progress at home.

Peace has been the first priority. It concerns the future of civilization; and even in terms of our domestic needs themselves, what we are able to do will depend in large measure on the prospects for an early end to the war in Viet Nam.

At the same time, the first days of this Administration have afforded us a unique opportunity to study the nation's domestic problems in depth, and to overhaul and re-tool the complex machinery of the Executive Office.

A systematic review of domestic programs and policies has led to a series of recommendations which I will begin sending to Congress this week. Among those recommendations will be:

—An increase in Social Security benefits, to take account of the rise in living costs.

—New measures to combat organized crime, and to crack down on racketeers, narcotics traffickers and peddlers of obscenity.

—A program of tax credits, designed to provide new incentives for the enlistment of additional private resources in meeting our urgent social needs.

—A program to increase the effectiveness of our national drive for equal employment opportunity.

—A comprehensive reorganization of the Post Office Department.

—A program for the District of Columbia, including home rule and Congressional representation.

—A start on sharing the revenues of the Federal government, so that other levels of government where revenue increases lag behind will not be caught in a constant fiscal crisis.

—A far-reaching new program for development of our airways and airports, and our mass transit systems.

—A comprehensive labor and manpower program, including job training and placement, improvements in unemployment insurance, and proposals to help guarantee the health and safety of workers.

—Reform of the tax structure. The burden of taxation is great enough without permitting the continuance of unfairness in the tax system. New legislation will be proposed to prevent several specific abuses this year, and plans will be set in motion for a comprehensive revision of our tax structure by 1970, the first since 1954.

The legislative proposals of the next few weeks are a beginning. They form part of a responsible approach to our goal of managing constructive change in America.

This is not law we seek in order to have it "on the books," but law that we need in action. It is designed, not to look appealing in the record, but to take effect in our lives.

It will be the goal of this Administration to propose only legislation that we know we can execute once it becomes law. We have deliberated long and hard on each of these measures, in order to be sure we could make it work. Merely making proposals takes only a typewriter; making workable proposals takes time. We have taken this time.

In other areas, where more time is needed, we will take more time. I urge the Congress to join with this Administration in this careful approach to the most fundamental issues confronting our country. Hasty action or a seeking after partisan advantage either by the Congress or Executive Branch can only be self-defeating and aggravate the very ills we seek to remedy.

For example, one area of deep concern to this Administration has to do with the most dependent constituency of all: the child under five. I have announced a commitment to the first five years of life as one of the basic pledges of this Administration. Head Start was one promising idea for bettering the environment and nutrition of young children; there also are many others. We have already begun enlarging the scope of our commitment in this vital field, including the establishment of an Office of Child Development within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We hope that this enlarging commitment will be accompanied by an enlarging of the base of knowledge on which we act. We are not beginning with "massive" programs that risk tripping over their own unreadiness. Rather, our proposals will include step-by-step plans, including careful projections of funding requirements. Equally important, though Federally supported, they will embrace a network of local programs that will enlist voluntary participation.

These legislative proposals are, of course, being prepared within the context of other Administration actions which bear on domestic program development.

On taking office, I could see that whether measured in terms of its ability to respond, to decide or to implement, the Executive Branch simply was not structured to meet the emerging needs of the 1970s. Therefore my first moves were organizational.

The National Security Council was revitalized. The Urban Affairs Council was created, so that the problems of our cities could be approached in the broader perspective they now require. A Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy was established, to bring greater coherence to the management of our Nation's economic prosperity. The system of Federal regional offices was reorganized so that for the first time, related agencies will have common regional headquarters and common regional boundaries. An Office of Inter-governmental Relations was set up, to smooth the coordination of Federal, State, and local efforts.

In specific operational areas, we removed postmasterships from politics, started an overhaul of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its programs, and streamlined the administration of the various manpower programs.

One purpose of this early emphasis on organizational activity was to get the decision-making process in order before moving to the major decisions.

At the same time, I sent more than 100 directives to the heads of the various departments and agencies, asking their carefully considered recommendations on a wide range of domestic policy issues. The budget was submitted to an intensive review, and throughout the administration we addressed ourselves to the critical question of priorities.

One priority that has emerged clearly and compellingly is that we must put a halt, swiftly, to the ruinous rise of inflationary pressures. The present inflationary surge, already in its fourth year, represents a national self-indulgence we cannot afford any longer. Unless we save the dollar, we will have nothing left with which to save our cities—or anything else. I have already outlined certain steps that will be required:

—Continuation of the monetary policies the Federal Reserve authorities are now pursuing.

—A reduction of fiscal year 1970 expenditures by $4 billion below the best current estimate of the budget expenditures recommended by the last administration.

—Continuation of the income tax surcharge for another year.

—Postponing of the scheduled reductions in telephone and passenger car excise taxes.

—Enactment of user charges equal in revenue to those now in the budget.

—An increase in postal charges.

These steps are not pleasant medicine. Medicine to combat inflation is never pleasant. But we can no longer delay taking it.

Another priority is the control of crime. On January 31, I announced a detailed plan for combatting crime in the District of Columbia, recognizing that the Federal city should be made a model of law observance and law enforcement. The crime-control package soon to be submitted to Congress will make clear the Federal Government's commitment, nationwide, to assisting local authorities in protecting the lives, rights and property of their citizens.

An equally pressing priority is the entire complex of needs that we commonly group under the heading, "the problems of the cities"—but which in fact reach beyond the cities, and include the distresses of rural America as well.

Our policy review has strengthened my conviction that in approaching these problems, America needs a new direction—not a turning away from past goals, but a clear and determined turn toward new means of achieving those goals.

One example is hunger and malnutrition. The failure of past efforts to combat these problems has been made shockingly clear. Our new programs will be both vigorous and innovative.

Another example is welfare. Our studies have demonstrated that tinkering with the present welfare system is not enough. We need a complete reappraisal and re-direction of programs which have aggravated the troubles they were meant to cure, perpetuating a dismal cycle of dependency from one generation to the next. Therefore, I will be submitting to Congress a program providing for the reform of the welfare system.

In the field of social legislation, we now have a hodge-podge of programs piled on programs, in which too often the pressure to perpetuate ill-conceived but established ones has denied needed resources to those that are new and more promising.

We have learned that too often government's delivery systems have failed: though Congress may pass a law, or the President may issue an order, the intended services never reach the intended recipients. Last week, for example, in announcing a $200 million program for rebuilding riot-torn areas, I noted that after two, three and even four years nothing had been done, and cited this as evidence of the growing impotence of government. The crucial point here is that whereas in the past, "leave it to the states" was sometimes a signal for inaction by design, now "leave it to Washington" has become too often a signal for inaction by default. We have to design systems that go beyond "commitment," and guarantee performance.

If there is one thing we know, it is that the Federal Government cannot solve all the nation's problems by itself; yet there has been an over-shift of jurisdiction and responsibility to the Federal Government. We must kindle a new partnership between government and people, and among the various levels of government.

Too often, Federal funds have been wasted or used unwisely—for example, by pouring them into direct grants, when more money could have been made available at less cost by the use of incentives to attract private funds.

The programs I will submit have been drawn with those principles in mind. Among their aims are:

—To supplement Federal funds with private funds, through the use of "seed money" devices such as tax credits and loan guarantees.

—To enlist the great, vital voluntary sector more fully, using the energies of those millions of Americans who are able and eager to help in combatting the nation's ills.

—To help rebuild state and local institutions, so that they both merit and gain a greater measure of confidence on the part of their own citizens.

—To streamline the administration of Federal programs, not only for efficiency and economy, but to improve the certainty of delivery and to cut away the clouds of confusion that now surround not only their operation, but often their purposes.

—To make maximum use of the new knowledge constantly being gained, as, for example, in our commitment to the first five years of life.

These programs will not carry extravagant promises. The American people have seen too many promises, too many false hopes raised, too much substitution of the easy slogan for the hard performance.

Neither will they carry large price-tags for the coming fiscal year. We must recognize, however, that in the long run progress will not come cheaply; and even though the urgency of controlling inflation dictates budget cuts in the short run, we must be prepared to increase substantially our dollar investment in America's future as soon as the resources become available.

This Administration will gladly trade the false excitement of fanfare for the abiding satisfaction of achievement. Consolidation, coordination and efficiency are not ends in themselves; they are necessary means of making America's government responsive to the legitimate demands for new departures.

Quietly, thoughtfully, but urgently, the members of this Administration have moved in these first few months to redirect the course of the nation. I am confident of the direction, and convinced that the time to take it has come.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 14, 1969.*

PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of every Member of this House to President Nixon's message spelling out the recommendations which now will begin flowing from the White House to the Congress.

This Presidential message is highly significant, for it points the Federal Government, and indeed the entire Nation, in new directions. It calls for new approaches to meet deep and persistent problems. It opens the door to a new national effort to improve the quality of life for all Americans—a partnership of the individual citizen, the local community, the private sector, business and industry, the States, and the Federal Government—all working together for the common good.

The new approaches will be laid out for Congress to examine and dissect, Mr. Speaker—a start on sharing Federal income tax revenue with the States and local units of government; a program of tax credits, using tax incentives to promote the achievement of social objectives.

The Nixon administration is moving, too, to meet our most challenging and difficult problems head on—through a crackdown on narcotics traffickers; through a program to promote equal employment opportunity more effectively; through a top-to-bottom reorganization of the Post Office Department; through new programs in air and mass transit travel; through expansion and improvements in job training and placement; and through reform of our tax structure.

For our senior citizens, struggling to make ends meet in the face of rising prices, we pledge a substantial increase in social security benefits. They have great need of help. We must meet that need.

Mr. Speaker, it is not important that these proposals did not begin moving from the White House to Capitol Hill until after Easter recess. The new administration, of necessity, concerned itself initially with review, reappraisal, and consolidation measures.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has outlined the initial scope of his legislative program. He has also moved to fight inflation with a new determination which I believe points toward success.

We have our work cut out for us, Mr. Speaker. It now is up to us to help move the Nation ahead.

PAN AMERICAN DAY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 295, this day has been designated as Pan American Day.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 360) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 360

Whereas April 14, 1969, marks the seventy-ninth anniversary of the Union of American Republics, now known as the Organization of American States;

Whereas the continued hemispheric solidarity is essential to the cause of progress and freedom for all citizens of this hemisphere; and

Whereas in unity there is real promise of accelerated progress in social and political reform and economic growth in the countries of our home hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in honor of the founding of the Pan American Union, the House of Representatives of the United States of America extends greetings to the other Republics of the Western Hemisphere and to all citizens of those Republics, with the fervent hope that new thresholds of good will, stability, and prosperity are being crossed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 79th anniversary of the founding of the inter-American system of solidarity and cooperation, embodied in the Organization of American States.

On this occasion, it is my great privilege, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, to offer the resolution which has just been read, extending the congratulations of the House of Representatives to our sister Republics of the Western Hemisphere.

These congratulations are also intended for the men and women who direct, administer and staff the instruments of hemispheric unity and cooperation—the Organization of American States, the Pan American Union, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Inter-American Defense Board, and other related institutions.

The vitality of those organizations, and the important contribution which they are making toward the solution of the urgent problems of this hemisphere, are due in large measure to the efforts and dedication of the people who work in them.

I also extend congratulations today, Mr. Speaker, to Rev. Joseph F. Thorning, who gave us the inspirational message in the opening prayer in the House of Representatives. Father Thorning is an outstanding religious leader who has set an American tradition, because for 25 years he has offered the opening prayer in the House of Representatives in commemoration of Pan American Day.

Father Thorning is also a renowned author. One of Dr. Thorning's books bears the title, "Miranda: World Citizen." It is the biography of Don Francisco de Miranda of Venezuela, the precursor of Latin American freedom and independence. The volume is one of the most popular and scientific ever published by the University of Florida Press. In fact, "Miranda: World Citizen" has gone through several editions and, in the words of many scholars in the field, is a perennial favorite.

Francisco de Miranda, it may be noted, did much to educate other leaders such as Simon Bolivar, "the great liberator," of Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru; Jose de San Martin, of Argentina, whose leadership helped to bring liberty to peoples in the southern regions of South America; and Bernardo O'Higgins of Chile, who is honored as the George Washington of his country.

It was Dr. Galo Plaza who, as President of Ecuador, wrote the introduction to "Miranda: World Citizen," while the Honorable Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State of the United States of America, wrote the preface.

Today I express our appreciation to Father Thorning—author, religious leader, and diplomat—for his leadership, his unflagging zeal and enthusiasm for the cause of freedom and inter-American solidarity and friendship.

I should also like, on this occasion, to extend our congratulations to Mr. Galo Plaza, the eminent and distinguished Secretary General of the Organization of American States, who is completing his first year in that important office.

He has our best wishes in the difficult and demanding tasks which confront him and the organization which he directs.

Mr. Speaker, on this historic occasion, our thoughts turn, perhaps inevitably, to the problems and challenges facing our Western Hemisphere.

Our attention should focus on Latin America's unique experiment in peaceful revolution—the Alliance for Progress—nearing the end of its first decade.

It is interesting to recall the disparate trends and developments which led to the birth of that undertaking—the falling commodity prices of the 1950's, the Soviet Union's awakening interest in the continent, the unsettling impact of the communication revolution on the expectations of the masses, the programs of change advanced by the forward-looking Latin American leaders, and the willingness of the United States to join in a cooperative effort to encourage such change and help make it possible.

This was, indeed, an unusual assortment of forces; but their convergence helped to set off a spark, an explosion, which—in its ultimate consequences—may bring about nothing short of a wholesale restructuring of the economic, social, and political organization of Latin America.

Is the Alliance moving in that direction? Although the evidence in support of this conclusion is spotty and at times contradictory, I believe that the verdict is "Yes."

The Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, which I have the honor to chair, has initiated a careful review of the goals and the performance of the Alliance for Progress.

In 2 weeks of open hearings, we began to explore where the Alliance has succeeded, and where it has thus far fallen short, in pursuing the goal of a better life for the millions of men, women, and children who inhabit the southern part of this hemisphere.

We went for our initial information to the technicians—the development specialists, aid administrators, agriculturalists, educators, trade experts, and others.

Our hearings are not yet finished and the record is still open. We will begin adding to it next week.

Nevertheless, one conclusion appears fully appropriate to this occasion:

Latin America's peaceful revolution is moving forward and gathering momentum, skill, and added capacity.

This, to me, is an encouraging development.

I would like to conclude these brief remarks by stressing again the importance of a continuing, close cooperation between the north and south continents of our hemisphere.

Such cooperation is necessary in a number of fields—in trade and aid, in economic development, even in the realms of security and political policy—if we are going to move forward together, take full advantage of the tremendous opportunities which this age affords to us, and advance the well-being of our respective nations.

I earnestly hope that the historic ties which bind us—ties of friendship, of common heritage, of similar aspirations and ambitions—will continue to grow stronger and help to advance fruitful cooperation in all lines of endeavor.

We, all of us Americans, north and south, should on this Pan American Day rededicate ourselves to these purposes.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from California, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the 79th anniversary of the Pan American Union.

This is an appropriate time to take stock of the ever-growing partnership between Latin America and the United States in this changing world.

Although events of recent months have tended to divide the people and the governments of this hemisphere, we should remind ourselves that geography dictates that each country within the Western Hemisphere must be concerned with the problems and actions of the rest.

There are serious problems which confront us which require careful and unemotional analysis and resolution. It is essential that we in the United States consider the attitudes and the interests of other governments; and in turn, we ask that our neighbors not overlook the problems that face the United States.

The United States has, over a considerable period, recognized that it was in our interest as well as that of the other American Republics to assist in efforts to develop the resources and to improve the living conditions of the people of the hemisphere. We have never regarded such assistance as charity. We have considered it to be an investment from which we would benefit in years to come as a result of the increased prosperity and stability of the hemisphere.

There are always problems arising from a lender-borrower relationship, and the interests of the one who uses the money are not always the same as the one who provides it.

I do not suggest that the recipients of U.S. assistance should accept dictation from the United States or that the United States should impose its will on other nations as the price of our aid. If there is to be cooperation, however, among friends to attain a common objective, this cooperation should not be marred by acts which are inconsistent with a spirit of cooperation.

Seizure at gun point of fishing vessels owned and operated by U.S. citizens and the expropriation of U.S.-owned property without prompt and reasonable compensation does not contribute to the maintenance of the cooperative relationship which the United States has always believed that our friends desired.

The United States believes in the importance of the development of the countries of this hemisphere. The United States also believes that private investment is the most effective single means of promoting such development. Any course of action which discourages the private investor, be he a local businessman, a U.S. citizen, a European, or anyone else, inevitably retards meaningful progress.

Although I have spoken frankly, I do not forget that this day marks the 79th year of cooperation among the nations of this hemisphere. In spite of differences, I am sure that all of us realize that our futures are very much interdependent. Moreover, I believe that there is today a widespread and deep-seated feeling of common interest and common purpose among the people of this hemisphere.

The future holds great promise if we have the wisdom to do our best to achieve a true spirit of mutual helpfulness.

I have confidence that we will find solutions to the problems which confront us; and that in finding solutions to these problems, we will find ourselves drawn closer together than ever before with new confidence in each other and in our common future.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when I first came to this House in 1945, I had the honor and privilege of being assigned to the great Committee on Foreign Affairs, and subsequently I became chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs.

At that time we went to San Francisco to see the creation of the United Nations, and there, too, we emphasized in our area as observers for the Congress the importance of the relationships that the distinguished gentleman from Florida has just so eloquently outlined and in which he has been joined by the distinguished Republican ranking member for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, subsequently, I went on the Appropriations Committee for the Department of State, and then when we created the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I developed a great interest, as Members of the House may recall, in the circumstances surrounding the Panama Canal, which I have followed assiduously, with the help of this House, ever since and until this day.

So for 25 years I have had the privilege of participating in this Pan American Day. My love and affection for my friends to the south is beyond my words to express.

Mr. Speaker, in this difficult decade all of us throughout the Western Hemisphere must continue to work together to attack our common problems and to shape our common future.

Although we represent diverse societies, speak different languages, and pledge allegiance to more than 20 different flags, we have mutual hopes, and mutual concerns.

Through cooperation, insight, and understanding we can become more than good neighbors—we can become true partners as nations and as fellow citizens of the Americas.

Our Nation has assumed vast responsibility in the leadership of the Americas. We here in the U.S. Congress and Americans everywhere should reflect the true meaning of Pan American Day and rededicate ourselves to the success of the cooperative endeavors of the future. Only in this way can the inter-American system be successful in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, in almost all programs aiming toward progress in the domain of the good neighbor policy and the Alliance for Progress, it may be important to note that our friend, Father Joseph F. Thorning, maintains that the mother countries, Spain and Portugal, can round out Western Hemisphere efforts. Indeed, it is the view of many workers in this field that programs, inspired by this "triangular friendship," can prove most fruitful. Regardless of political systems, most peoples in the other American Republics have a profound admiration and love for the art, literature, history, and religious traditions of the Iberian Peninsula. This is a theme that strikes responsive chords in many minds and hearts. Dr. Thorning, aware of the value of this approach, has been one of our North American scholars to give Iberian culture a prominent place in his presentation of the inter-American system.

This is one reason why Rev. Joseph E. O'Neill, S.J., editor of the Fordham University quarterly, Thought, has assigned books about developments in the Iberian Peninsula and in Hispanic America to Dr. Thorning to be analyzed and reviewed in this widely respected review of culture and idea.

An outline of Father Thorning's achievements is available, not only in "Who's Who in America," but also in an official U.S. Government volume, "The National Directory of Latin Americanists," published by the Hispanic Division of the Library of Congress.

Dr. Thorning's service in the field of education may be judged from the fact that he has served as dean of the Graduate School, Georgetown University; as professor of church history, ethics, and social history in Mount St. Mary's Seminary and College, Emmitsburg, Md.; as the one present honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil; as an associate editor of World Affairs, Washington, D.C.; as the first associate editor for international relations of the quarterly, Thought; and as an expert witness for several standing committees of the U.S. Congress.

Moreover, on a number of occasions, Dr. Thorning has been appointed by the White House and the State Department to serve on U.S. special diplomatic missions for presidential inaugurations in South America, Central America, and the Caribbean. And for 28 years, he has been honorary chaplain of the Inter-American Defense Board.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, although the work of our friend, Father Joseph F. Thorning, in the cause of inter-American understanding and amity, is well known, it may be added that this priest-scholar has made contributions as a pioneer in the ecumenical movement. Long before interfaith progress became popular, Father Thorning was an apostle, in word and deed, for wholehearted, intelligent cooperation among people and ministers of all religious groups. Indeed, Dr. Thorning's first book, his doctoral dissertation in the Catholic University of America, was entitled "Religious Liberty in Transition," a history of the course of religious freedom in New England. This volume continues to be a standard work of reference and has been quoted by many scholars, including John Mecklin, of Dartmouth College, and Canon Anson Phelps Stokes, of Yale University. Father Thorning also wrote and spoke extensively about "An Act Concerning Religion," a charter of religious freedom proclaimed by the early settlers of what is today known as the Free State of Maryland.

This ecumenical work was carried by Father Thorning into a number of the American Republics. It is a matter of historical interest that in 1955, at the invitation of Dr. Abraham Vereide and of several distinguished legislators of a number of governments. Father Thorning participated in the first meeting of the Council for International Christian Leadership held in San Jose de Costa Rica. This conference lasted for 1 week and attracted delegates from numerous countries south of the Rio Grande. At the opening of the gathering, "the padre of the Americas," as Father Thorning has been described in the Western Hemisphere, gave the first public prayer ever offered on the national radio of Costa Rica in the presence of the then President of the Republic and his Cabinet. The whole conference was regarded as a milestone on the road to interfaith understanding and cooperation in Latin America.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

I commend the gentleman for introducing this resolution, and I also extend my congratulations on this 79th anniversary of the Union of American Republics to the Organization of American States for the work it is doing.

Mr. Speaker, we in this hemisphere are neighbors by geography and the grace of God. It is up to us then, being neighbors, to be good neighbors and better friends. I believe that on a day like this and in a week like this, Pan American Week, we should stop to reflect that we belong to a family of nations, a family of American nations, and should strive to get a lot closer to each other than we have in the past. We should all strive to bring about better friendship, understanding, and mutual respect among all the countries of the Western Hemisphere—for the good of all and the security of all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, 1890, the hemisphere nations joined in signing an agreement establishing the International Union of American Republics, and the inter-American system came into being. Each year, we in the United States, together with our many neighbors in Latin America, pause on this day to pay tribute to the special relationship which has united our nations in common purposes for the mutual benefit of all. We reflect upon the common bonds which our peoples share. As once expressed by President John F. Kennedy:

> We meet together as firm and ancient friends, united by history and experience and by our determination to advance the values of American civilization. . . . Our continents are bound together by a common history, the endless exploration of new frontiers. Our nations are the product of a common struggle, the revolt from colonial rule. And our people share a common heritage, the quest for the dignity and the freedom of man.

On this 79th anniversary, the American peoples can feel justly proud of their regional organization. Since its founding, the inter-American system has been a pioneer in the quest for a better world. It has been an innovator in establishing procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes; it has championed the principle of self-determination among peoples; it has furthered the aim of representative democracy in the hemisphere; it has developed the modern concept of collective security; it has given the world a model for preventing the spread of nuclear weapons; and it now seeks to demonstrate to all the world, through the Alliance for Progress, that nations working together can accomplish economic and social advancement within the framework of democracy.

The two pillars of our inter-American system are the Organization of American States, the juridicial framework of our system; and the Alliance for Progress, the bold social experiment whose ambitious goal is nothing less than the achievement of modernization, peace and prosperity for all peoples of the hemisphere.

This year marks the 21st birthday of the Organization of American States. When it was established, it was hailed as the keystone of a strong community of American nations. It was conceived as a system through which Americans, North and South, working together, could keep the peace, banish poverty and sickness, develop agriculture and science, safeguard human rights and repulse subversion and aggression.

Today, under the dynamic leadership of its Secretary General, Galo Plaza, of Ecuador, the OAS is striving fervently to accomplish these challenging objectives. The OAS today is an energetic force, constantly working to meet the tremendous challenges arising out of the pressures of the 1960's. It's dominant theme is action, especially in pressing social and economic areas—in tax reform and education, in science and technology, in public health and rural development, in spurring Latin American economic integration, and in implementing the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

The Alliance for Progress, the most ambitious development program in mankind's history, is now in its 8th year. Its aim is the development of a continent and its peoples—a development that will bring all American nations and peoples into fruitful participation in the technological and scientific benefits of the 20th century. Its promise is a better, more prosperous life to millions within the framework of stable and democratic societies. Its method is cooperative action by all members of the hemisphere community to attack the tragic underdevelopment from which all the Latin American nations are suffering.

The Alliance is now in its second phase of activity. The first, which began with President Kennedy's historic announcement in March 1961, was the period of organization and mobilization. This was the period of trial and error, when the American nations came to realize the magnitude of the tasks which confronted them, when they came to accept their commitment and to grapple with the challenges at hand. In this period, the peoples of the Americas gained an essential understanding of the measures necessary and the sacrifices required to meet the challenges. The summit meeting of Presidents of the American Republics, held at Punta del Este in April 1967, initiated the second phase of the Alliance. This is a period of reevaluation, of newly focused goals and of specific action plans for modernization.

The Alliance has been severely criticized for its ineffectiveness and its failure to accomplish those goals upon which it was founded. Yet, 8 years after its inception, we can point to substantial gains in Latin American development which could never have been achieved without the Alliance. And perhaps the most significant factor on the side of the Alliance is an intangible one—the Alliance for Progress has been the generator of a development momentum and a development mystique which has pervaded the entire region of Latin America. The people and their leaders have become committed to change, and they are willing to work diligently and to endure sacrifices to bring about a better life for their nations. They have demonstrated their faith in the Alliance precepts and have devoted their resources—natural, material, and human, to the task.

This Pan American Day 1969 is a time for us in the United States to recommit ourselves to the principles and goals of the Organization of American States and the Alliance for Progress. It is our primary responsibility to formulate and execute sound policies toward Latin America. We must revitalize our policy and emphasize those constructive elements which foster close and healthy Latin American-United States relations, for the good of our own Nation as well as the nations of Latin America. We must work for a viable and dynamic Alliance for Progress. The United States is a junior partner in this enterprise—we have helped the Latin nations generate a development momentum and we must now do all we can to assist them in sustaining that momentum.

The Alliance for Progress has its roots in the yearnings of the Latin American people for economic and social justice. In the final analysis, U.S. policy will be judged by how closely and successfully we identify ourselves with those yearnings of a people seeking to live in freedom and with dignity.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, much will be said on Pan American Day about efforts of our Government and other governments in this hemisphere to advance mutual interests and the welfare of our citizens.

It seems appropriate that recognition should be given also to the nongovernment hemispheric organizations that are operating in the effort to improve relationships and advance freedom.

The Inter-American Press Association is one of the most effective, though perhaps little known, hemispheric organizations, composed of newspapermen and women from most of the nations in North and South America. IAPA is dedicated to freedom of the press, a fundamental freedom which is responsible as much as any other for the establishment and preservation of the conditions that make it possible for men to govern themselves in a democratic society.

A recent article by my good friend, Lee Hills, president of Knight Newspapers, Inc., tells the story of IAPA. It will be of interest to thousands who read the RECORD and I include it with my remarks. In addition to his position as president of Knight Newspapers, Mr. Hills is executive editor of that organization, a former president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Sigma Delta Chi and the Associated Press Managing Editors Association and immediate past president of the Inter American Press Association. The following article, reprinted from the March 1969 issue of Nieman Reports, contains much of the information that was presented also in a recent address by Mr. Hills at Ohio State University:

THE STORY OF THE IAPA

(By Lee Hills)

We journalists in the United States are often tempted, I think, to believe that the fight for freedom of the press is over and that we have won.

Consistently, these days, our courts are ruling in favor of concepts of press liberty freer than ever before of legal shackles and restrictions. More and more states are adding laws to protect newspapers and reporters against coercion, intimidation and source disclosure. Even the campaign for greater freedom of information is progressing, though much remains to be done.

So the temptation to conclude that the war is over is understandable, but it must nevertheless be resisted, Perhaps Chicago will be valuable for the memory it leaves with us: Proof that freedom of the press, like all freedoms, exists only so long as we are capable of defending it.

Despite the Chicago experience, freedom of the press exists in the United States to a greater degree than virtually anywhere else in the world. In this atmosphere, it is not surprising that few of us are familiar with the Inter American Press Association, known to its friends as IAPA or "Yapa."

Perhaps the best introduction to I-A-P-A is to acknowledge to you that there are newspapermen in the Western Hemisphere today who are indebted to IAPA for their newspapers, their freedom and, in some cases, for their very lives. If that sounds dramatic, let me assure you that it is no more than the truth.

Despite its relative anonymity, IAPA has an impressive string of accomplishments.

1. IAPA is beyond doubt the most effective international group fighting to maintain and advance freedom of the press.

2. IAPA originated the concept of an inter-American professional organization, self-sufficient, unencumbered by government, and living off its own resources. No other profession has tried this and made it work so well.

3. IAPA is largely responsible for the fact that the Western Hemisphere is the one region of the world whose people—96 percent of them—have been living under varying conditions of press freedom. When I say "varying" I have in mind that less than 45 percent of the people of the world enjoy any real vestige of freedom.

4. IAPA has openly fought for the freedom of newsmen tyrannized by dictators such as Argentina's Peron, Trujillo of Santo Domingo, Colombia's Rojas Pinilla, Haiti's notorious "Papa Doc" Duvalier, and many other enemies of liberty.

5. IAPA created a Technical Center, a Scholarship Fund and other services to help raise the newspaper standards, mechanical and editorial, of Latin America. As standards rise, so does the independence of the press.

The achievements of the Technical Center alone are worth special mention.

Created as a non-profit organization almost seven years ago, the center is the forum for the exchange of information, ideas and friendships which form the core of IAPA's efforts. Its chief task is to bring together working newspapermen from throughout the hemisphere to share equally in the development of newsgathering techniques and production technology. Seminars and round table meetings have been held in the United States and eight Latin American countries, in which more than 800 news executives have participated. The center offers a consulting service for Latin American newspapers and has published a series of books, monthly bulletins and the only complete Spanish language style manual available.

Growth of the IAPA has been slow. Could you imagine the Associated Press Managing Editors Association or the American Society of Newspaper Editors enduring, much less existing, if they had the bitter opposition of a militaristic national government?

When, however, IAPA's General Assembly met last October in Buenos Aires, I was happy to report that we had more than 1,000 publications and individuals on our membership rolls, a gain of 200 in one year and of 400 in five years. Certainly these inter-Americans cannot be intimidated.

Taken together, these publications have a circulation of 50 million copies daily. Most of them espouse freedom. This is a powerful voice.

Yet we must look at the dark side of our rediscovered moon of hemispheric liberty. So soon after the exhilaration of the Argentine meeting we find freedom under attack on new fronts. Three of every four Latin Americans now live under some kind of military rule, sometimes benign but in theory always potentially repressive. Anyone can tick off the countries. But in every one of them the IAPA presence for freedom is being felt.

Since 1930 there have been 39 military coups in Latin America. Some of them have been engineered by officers trained—supposedly in democratic ways—by the United States. A third of these coups have occurred since the Alliance for Progress got shakily off the ground in 1961, leaving behind it a doubt that now is growing because of suspicions of the Alliance's eventual failure.

We cannot judge Latin America, if indeed we should sit in any kind of judgment, by our own standards. A good example is Brazil. President Arthur da Costa e Silva, who ousted the extreme left wing Goulart in 1964, is a moderate who in December, 1968, lost control to radical, hard-line younger officers. They forced him to suspend congress, arrest political critics and some journalists, and introduce the trappings of dictatorship without, perhaps, fancying them himself.

These hard-line officers fear the press and are in awe of its power. They have confiscated newspaper editions and jailed editors and publishers. They currently enforce an enigmatic "self-censorship" that has destroyed the freedom of the press in Brazil.

Leading Brazilian editors who oppose military dictatorship are considered "subversive." They have been arrested and subjected to prolonged and repeated interrogations. In the course of the interrogations the officers conducting them have often displayed a tragically simplistic view of the press. "In the past year your newspaper has published one or more editorials generally favorable to . . . the U.S. . . . West Germany . . . Israel . . . Russia. Were you paid to publish these editorials by . . . the U.S. . . . West Germany . . . Israel . . . Russia?"

When I talked with President Costa e Silva in Rio de Janeiro in late October he assured me there would be no infringement of press liberties. Yet that has occurred as the military dictatorship lets itself be drawn into political excesses alien to Brazil.

In Argentina, a nation of such great economic potential that its lack of leadership moves one almost to tears, there is yet no real recovery from the rapacious dictatorship of Gen. Peron. To a degree, however, Lt. Gen. Juan Carlos Ongania has brought the country back from ruinous inflation and is establishing some stability. So far, he has tolerated a free press and open criticism, something relatively rare among the outcroppings of military dictatorship in the last decade.

The Argentine press is free, but cautious. And the warning flags are flying. A recent law decreed by the Ongania regime despite widespread opposition from responsible public opinion calls for prior censorship of films.

Under the guise of protecting the public from "immoral" movies, government-appointed censors can ban any film on moral, social or political grounds. The editorial comment of one Argentine magazine was typical of press opposition to the law. The magazine termed the law "a bold and dangerous advance against the freedom of expression."

In Peru, too, the press lives under the cloud of a military dictatorship born last October even as we were meeting in Buenos Aires. Criticism of the government is tolerated in Peru, but not encouraged. An example comes from the editor of a moderately left magazine who was jailed for twitting the generals and questioned by a military officer.

"I tried to talk about the importance of a free press, the press as the fourth branch of government," the editor said after his release. "He reminded me that now Peru has only one branch of government."

Last October's second coup occurred in Panama, where the National Guard overthrew an elected government on its 12th day in office. One of the Guard's first actions after taking power was to crudely, and completely, censor the press. The Panamanian press now functions under "Guidelines" published by the National Guard. One of the "guidelines" warns editors "there shall be no insinuations that there is censorship." Editors are "asked" to observe the "guidelines," and one of the "guidelines" says: "This is the last time you will be asked to cooperate."

In much of Latin America today—too much—freedom of the press is as vulnerable as democracy. Newsmen in a number of countries ruefully share the views of a Peruvian editor who observed "It's easy to militarize the civilians. It takes longer to civilize the military."

Cuba, of course, is a special and most tragic case of its own. Avowedly, a Communist nation under Castro's dictatorship, its control of the Cuban press is complete. Ten years after Castro's ascendancy, many Cuban newspapermen still languish in Cuba's jails. Against the absolute tyranny of Castro, pressure from IAPA seems to be of little help but the task of rallying and maintaining public opinion against his oppressive measures continues to have top priority in our efforts.

These are just examples of what is happening in Latin America, and particularly in South America. People seem to be willing at length to accept limitations on their democratic freedoms in return for some economic well-being.

In Latin America as elsewhere when you come right down to it, the best test of a working democracy is freedom of the press. Or, as American newsmen are more fond of calling it, freedom of information—the people's right to know.

The conservative and strongly nationalistic military regimes of Latin America believe they must maintain the status quo, protecting it against the discontent of youth who are reacting there as elsewhere in the restless search for some special identity.

The dangers to a free press in this kinetic atmosphere thus are obvious. Even in Chicago, newsmen were clubbed. It is no surprise that they are the first to be jailed in any political uprising. It was the elimination of press censorship by Alexander Dubcek in Czechoslovakia that, paradoxically, led to the Soviet occupation. Far from lying down, the Czech newspapers lambasted their Soviet neighbors and compelled the Kremlin to move against them.

We all know that the Russian game in the East is a loser. When young Czechs immolate themselves by fire, we sense the depths of the desire for freedom and the certainty that it will be achieved.

The urge for freedom is even stronger in Latin America. That is why I want to tell you the story of the Inter American Press Association which I mentioned in the beginning.

Bear in mind that IAPA was not always robust, or effective, or independent. At the outset it was pitiably weak.

One of the most inspiring stories in the book of journalistic freedom is how it became, overnight, sinewy and strong. That transformation is one reason why I believe that other Latin American countries will not go the way of Cuba, and why I think that the flourishing new military regimes south of the border are less likely to follow the totalitarian footsteps of the Perons and the Trujillos.

Mary A. Gardner in her book on IAPA tells how the "First Pan American Congress of Journalists" meeting in Washington in 1926 called for creation of a permanent inter-American organization.

Sixteen years later the Mexican government organized and financed the next meeting, in Mexico City in 1942, with Communists trying to manipulate the sessions. Few journalists attended from the U.S.

A permanent organization was established at the Second Pan American Congress in Havana in 1943, and it was given the Spanish name we still carry, Sociedad InterAmericana de Prensa.

From its very start the old SIP was infiltrated by Communists. They were particularly strong in the executive committee.

Only 12 United States publications sent delegates. These included Tom Wallace, Julio Garzon, Eugene B. Mirovitch, William P. Carney, Herbert Corn, Ralph McGill, Robert U. Brown and myself.

We were fascinated but dismayed by the proceedings. Cuba and Mexico were then the centers of Communist power in Latin America, and between them sent delegates from 130 publications. The Cuban government paid all the bills. Delegations sat and voted by countries. Many of the delegates were not journalists, but simply propagandists.

Numerous resolutions were strictly political, having nothing to do with the press. The Communist thrust was openly directed at the United States. The enthusiasm of Latin American newspapermen for an inter-American organization was obvious, however, and the dedicated work of Tom Wallace, Farris Flint, Joshua Powers and a few others made possible the new IAPA which later emerged.

The reaction began in 1945 at the Caracas congress against the way the SIP was constituted—political, non-professional, government-subsidized, Communist-infiltrated. The revolt grew at the 1946 Bogota meeting and jelled into action in Quito in 1949. With the aggressive backing of North Americans and a group of influential Latin American publishers, the Quito congress voted to reorganize the association.

This was done at an historic meeting in New York in 1950 which changed the basic character of IAPA, made it totally independent, sustained entirely by dues of its own members. For the first time it occupied itself predominantly with freedom of the press. This marked the end of government-sponsored congresses. The freedom of the press report that year denounced repressive measures against the press in 15 nations in the Americas.

Thus the Western Hemisphere learned a classic lesson in the frustration of Communist intrigue. The reorganized IAPA, its treasury empty and limited in membership, had a tough new start from scratch. The struggle against Communist infiltration had sapped its strength.

It needed the prestige and financial support of United States publications, and most of them were not interested. Clearly, IAPA needed a cause.

Suddenly, it was handed one by Juan Domingo Peron in 1951. Peron harassed, closed and finally expropriated the great newspaper La Prensa in Buenos Aires. Its widely revered publisher, Alberto Gainza Paz, escaped into exile in Uruguay.

A number of leading United States newspapers joined IAPA and helped rally public opinion in the hemisphere against Peron. As a result, IAPA gained enough strength to hand Peron his first defeat in the international field.

This came at the annual meeting of IAPA in Montevideo in October, 1951, only a few months after La Prensa's confiscation. Peron sent a delegation of 53, more than half the total attendance. Only 16 came from the United States.

The Peronistas applied for membership and tried to take over the meeting. Many of them wore guns into the meetings. The Board of Directors refused to be intimidated. It rejected all but 10 of the Argentine applications on the grounds that their newspapers were not democratic.

With that, the Peronistas stormed out en masse along with eight other Latin Americans. They announced that they would form a Latin American Press Association, but it never got off the ground.

Press freedom was at a low ebb in Latin America during this period, and dictators were riding high. The re-born IAPA took them on, in country after country. It marshalled public opinion with a vigor that caused growing alarm among the dictators. They reacted with violent attacks on the IAPA.

After their defeat in Montevideo, Peron's bully-boys wrote a 437-page book assailing IAPA. The late Demetrio Canelas, of Los Tiempos, Cochabamba, Bolivia, saw his newspaper destroyed by government-inspired mobs, and then he was thrown in prison and threatened with execution as a traitor for not bowing editorially to the government. IAPA protests saved him.

Canelas thus expressed his gratitude: "I owe not only my freedom but my life to the Inter American Press Association." And so we have our theme.

IAPA has helped extract other editors and publishers from prison. It has fought to reopen newspapers closed by tyrants. It has aided in restoring confiscated newspapers to their rightful owners. Perhaps it has saved other lives.

Besides La Prensa of Argentina and Los Tiempos of Bolivia, the successful freedom campaigns include those for Pedro Joaquin Chamorro of La Prensa of Managua, Nicaragua; the late Hernan Robleto of La Flecha, also of Managua; El Intransigente of Salta, Argentina, and its editor-publisher David Michel Torino, also dead now; El Tiempo and El Espectador of Bogota; El Comercio of Quito; La Prensa of Lima and El Imparcial of Guatemala.

The IAPA cannot take credit for Peron's fall in 1955, but it has played a major role in creating the public opinion that helped topple dictatorships, and it can take credit for the return of newspapers to their legitimate owners.

The association protests every restriction of freedom of the press. This may consist of suppression of free newspapers, their direct or indirect control by a government, the imprisonment or arrest of newspapermen, official subsidies, discrimination in the release of news, the existence of official news agencies, any interference in the management's freedom to run a newspaper, discriminatory taxes, government control of newsprint imports or sales, or any other restrictive measures.

It is difficult for a North American to have the same appreciation of these efforts as do the Latin Americans. And the courage of our Latin colleagues in fighting for the principles of freedom is something we are not called upon to match.

As one friend said, "If they are willing to go to jail for freedom of the press, the least we can do is to give them moral and financial support through the IAPA."

Pedro Beltran of La Prensa, Lima, who was thrown into Peru's equivalent of Alcatraz and was freed through the help of IAPA, put it this way:

"I wonder whether those of you who have not seen this sort of thing at close range understand the great significance of IAPA and the place it will hold in history when the story of the democratization of the Americas is told. When a government stamps out liberty, when it closes newspapers and denies freedom of expression, the voices from the outside, the voice of an authorized institution like the IAPA, open up new possibilities of hope; we have seen this clearly in Peru.

"I would even say . . . that if it had not been for the invaluable help of the IAPA there would not be a regime of freedom today in my country, nor would I be here addressing you." Sr. Beltran is former prime minister of Peru, and a former president of IAPA.

While the IAPA's front line has been in Latin America, it does not hesitate to skirmish in the United States against recurrent attempts to muzzle the domestic press.

For example, it opposes the Reardon report and other proposals which would unduly restrict crime and court reporting. It fights vigorously against secrecy in governmental operations and any move that would deny citizens the right to information.

Perhaps the most powerful, and certainly the most newsworthy, arm of IAPA is its Freedom of Press Committee. Today it is opposing the resurgent censorship in Brazil, the confiscation of newspapers—including The Miami Herald and The New York Times—in Panama, a proposal to punish legislative reporters in the Bahamas if their stories are not to the liking of parliament, the harassment of reporters by travel restrictions and deportation, and censorship in Cuba and Haiti.

IAPA's Freedom of the Press Committee is keeping an eye on recurrent proposals to tax newsprint, printing machinery and other instruments of a free press. One of the new weapons of this committee, initiated in my term as IAPA president, is what might be called the task force operation. The task force is sent into countries where there is a press freedom problem. It investigates the dimensions of this problem and consults respectfully with the authorities. Commissions have visited Guatemala, Honduras, which restored freedom of the press shortly after the visit; Panama, Brazil, and Paraguay, where long-time restrictions on the press recently were lifted.

In the meantime the committee operates through a regional vice chairman and members who immediately notify our New York headquarters at the first sign of censorship or violation of the freedom of the press. Often the Freedom of Press Committee takes over from there and the matter is quickly ended with fanfare.

For North Americans complacent in the freest society in the world, few stop to think that this takes courage. The honor roll of Latin Americans who have gone to jail and even to torture for their beliefs is long. The honest North American cannot but admit that the dedication of these brave men is almost beyond belief.

Sometimes suffering much, they have accomplished even more. Inch by desperate inch, the Western Hemisphere is yielding to the fact of life that only truth can make and keep it free.

We have far, far to go in the quest with the brave banner, "The People's Right to Know." But it is being held strongly aloft. It is the guidon of freedom. In good time it must dominate the battlefield of the human mind.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it may be interesting to note that, since we gathered here last year from our Pan American Day session, the Republic of Nicaragua awarded its highest national decoration, the Order of Ruben Dario, to our Acting Chaplain of today, the Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning. The award was made by the Government of Nicaragua, headed by one of our most loyal friends, President Anastasio Somoza, Jr., the latter a distinguished graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

Investiture ceremonies were held in the Nicaraguan Embassy, Washington, D.C., presided over by another distinguished friend of many Members of the Congress, His Excellency Ambassador Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa, who served brilliantly as dean of the diplomatic corps.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, since 1931, the Western Hemisphere has celebrated April 14 as Pan American Day. I think it most appropriate that this date has been selected to celebrate the creation and growth of the inter-American regional system as it was on this date in 1890 that the First International Conference of American States established the International Union of American Republics.

The concept of hemispheric unity was

first conceived by the great South American Liberator, Simon Bolivar. He held the conviction that through solidarity based on law and democracy the nations of the Western Hemisphere could defend their independence. In 1888 the United States adopted the idea of cooperation for the mutual benefit of all the American Republics, when the U.S. Congress authorized President Cleveland to invite the Governments of the American Republics to participate in a conference to discuss the pacific settlement of disputes and to consider ways to encourage reciprocal commercial relations.

Since then, notable strides have been made in formalizing a viable inter-American system. The two primary components of this cooperation are the Rio Treaty of 1947 and the Charter of the Organization of American States—OAS—in 1948. These agreements contain the obligation of solidarity against aggression from within or without the hemisphere. Together they have preserved peace, promoted order, and have fostered economic collaboration.

In recent years significant economic strides have been made in Latin America due to a new spirit of regional economic integration. This is due in large measure to the efforts of the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—CIAP—and the creation of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Further progress is needed to promote trade and economic cooperation between the American nations and to prevent possible Communist inroads. Perhaps the structural changes contained in the 1967 protocol of amendment to the charter of the Organization of American States will make the regional system an even more effective tool for promoting the common interests of the hemisphere.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased for this opportunity to extend our greetings to the peoples of the other Republics of the Western Hemisphere on the 79th anniversary of the Organization of American States. I share the hope of other Members of this House that all Americans will achieve new levels of good will and prosperity.

Traditionally, Pan American Day is an occasion for us in North America to renew our commitment to unity and cooperation among the American States, but this year I think we have another opportunity to call upon our Latin American partners for their advice as to how we can improve our communications and our policies. For too long, it has been U.S. policymakers who have described the framework for inter-American cooperation. It is time for us to listen, and hopefully, to learn. I am sure that this approach can do a great deal toward establishing a new level—a higher level of dialog.

I am pleased that the President of the United States has undertaken to do this, and I was especially gratified with his announcement of the special mission which Governor Rockefeller will embark upon in the weeks ahead.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that by changing our approach to Latin American affairs of years past—by listening rather than lecturing—we have a chance to find the developmental mystique which has alluded the Alliance for Progress. As we are learning from our domestic experience, pride, confidence and self-reliance have more to do with development than the nature or even the quantum of external economic assistance.

As we celebrate this Pan American Day, let us pledge ourselves to a new policy, the most positive policy, with the greatest significance for long-term development in Latin America—that is, encouraging the Latins themselves to take the lead in setting the tone for the next decade.

Mr. **ROYBAL**. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues today in saluting Pan American Day, on this the 79th anniversary of the founding of the inter-American system.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as its Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I am deeply interested in promoting closer relations and more productive cooperation between all the Republics of the Western Hemisphere.

In commemorating this occasion we in the Congress have an opportunity to renew the historic bonds of friendship and mutual respect which have served to unite the nations of North and South America down through the years.

In this way, we can make our own contribution to the fulfillment of the 150-year-old Pan American dream—of a true partnership in progress throughout the hemisphere leading to a better way of life for all the citizens of the New World.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we should use this occasion to extend our congratulations to all who have helped to build and strengthen the Organization of American States. We express our best wishes for its continued growth and prosperity. And we pledge our enthusiastic efforts to foster wider understanding and more extensive cooperation with our good neighbors to the south.

Mr. **RYAN**. Mr. Speaker, today, April 14, marks Pan American Day, the 79th anniversary of the founding of the inter-American system. The occasion will be celebrated throughout the United States and the Latin American nations with speeches and festivities commemorating the political, legal, economic, and cultural ties that unite the 23 sovereign nations of the Western Hemisphere. And well our peoples should celebrate, for we have much to be proud of in our inter-American system. The Organization of American States, the structural framework of our system, is the oldest regional organization in the world, and its accomplishments in the political, juridical, economic, cultural, and social fields have been many.

Yet I feel that on this anniversary, more is needed from us in the United States than a fraternal commemoration of our special relationship; more even than a rededication of our faith in the principles which have united our peoples in a common purpose. This anniversary is a time for us to take a long and thoughtful look at our relations with Latin America—and if we do that, and do it honestly, we can only arrive at the conclusion that much is not right in that relationship.

There is increasingly widespread sentiment expressed in the Latin American press and by leading diplomats and officials south of the border that the United States is taking her sister Republics too much for granted. Even our closest Latin American friends have expressed a feeling that their nations are treated merely as "second-rate cousins" of the colossus of the North and that U.S. actions over the past years have indicated insufficient concern for events and problems in Latin America.

In addition, the Alliance for Progress, now beginning its 8th year, is under considerable criticism, and some critics in the United States are suggesting that the best way to correct its faults is to scrap it.

I believe that problems in United States-Latin American relations must be heeded now, and that what is needed is a complete review of the entire spectrum of our relations with this hemisphere, and that includes a thoughtful analysis of the realities of that relationship. These realities include:

First, recognition of the fact that it is essential to U.S. interests that we concern ourselves intimately with the challenges of Latin American economic, political and social development;

Second, recognition of the fact that the United States has seriously neglected her southern neighbors and, by following an erratic and largely crisis-oriented policy toward Latin America, has caused our image of a concerned and responsive nation to be impaired;

Third, recognition of the fact that the Organization of American States possesses the potential for being a viable organ not only for the maintenance of peace in the hemisphere, but also for spurring regional cooperation for the economic, political, and social reform which the Latin nations must accomplish;

Fourth, recognition that the Latin American nations are not content to continue in traditional paths; that the Latin American today has a vital concern for the problems of his region, that he is restless and impatient to cure the momentous ills of his civilization, that he seeks the progress and prosperity accruing to citizens of the industrialized 20th century, and that he is committed to sacrificing whatever is necessary to achieve those ends; and

Fifth, recognition that the Alliance for Progress is basically a sound program for hemisphere development, with valid goals, and that the development, progress and momentum generated under the Alliance justify its promise for the future and merit continued and increased U.S. support.

Let us now examine more closely the Alliance for Progress, the keystone of our participation in hemisphere affairs. The precepts and goals of the Alliance have redefined our relations with the hemisphere, and our commitment to that program demands a rethinking of our role in hemisphere affairs.

The decade of the 1960's, signaled by the inception of the Alliance, propelled inter-American relations into a new era, an era in which economic, political, and social development form the basis for a unique hemisphere unity. For the United States and the Latin American nations, the Alliance ushered in an age of hemisphere-wide involvement far beyond those commitments of mutual defense which drew us together in the war years. The philosophy of the Alliance has made it necessary for the United States to be willing to make a long-range commitment to work closely and unceasingly with the Latin Americans in a common effort to assail their staggering problems. It is clear, however, that we in the United States have not made that total commitment dictated by Alliance precepts.

It is obvious to all who have dealt with the Alliance that the program has not fulfilled the goals which were set 8 years ago, nor are the Latin American nations even close to achieving the stage of development conceived in the Alliance structure. Critics, therefore, brand it a failure. However, the simple truth is that at its inception the achievement of the revolutionary goals of the Alliance were thought possible in one short decade. What was expected of the Alliance was a complete transformation of Latin American life—political, economic, and social—in 10 short years. It simply could not be done. It was not possible to erase the staggering problems of Latin America or to work the required reform in institutions so profoundly rooted in century old traditions in such a short period. Yet, the Alliance was looked upon as a panacea, a magic solution to every problem, and when it failed in its impossible task, disenchantment set in. The kind of program which the hemisphere nations are trying to implement requires long-range perspectives.

Another widely held misconception concerning the Alliance for Progress concerns one of the basic development goals set by the Alliance Charter—an annual per capita growth rate of 2.5 percent, and the failure of Latin America as a region to meet it. While it is true that in the past many of the Latin nations have consistently fallen short of the 2.5-percent goal, and that—according to available 1968 figures—the regional total for the past year was only 2.3 percent, the failure has been largely relative. The significant point is that the farmers of the Alliance Charter and the critics of the program since its inception have themselves failed to acknowledge the critical interplay between the booming rate of Latin American population growth and its resultant negative effect on per capita income growth.

Latin American regional population is growing at an average rate of 3 percent, the highest average in the world. Regional GNP, therefore, must grow by 5½ percent to meet the Alliance target of 2.5 percent. The per capita growth rate in nations well developed industrially, including the United States, averages only about 5.1 percent; and we cannot expect a largely underdeveloped Latin America to equal that. Even with the tremendous obstacles imposed by spiraling population, five nations, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Costa Rica, and Mexico, have registered an increase in 1968 per capita GNP of 3 percent or above.

The explosive population growth is also contributing to another major setback in Latin American economic growth—rising unemployment. Simply stated, the available work force in many Latin American nations is growing more rapidly than these nations are able to use it. Population pressures also contribute to the failure of food production and educational facilities, both of which have greatly increased under the Alliance, to show substantial growth gains.

The spiraling population increase is one of the chief obstacles thwarting Alliance development objectives. This fact has come to be realized not only by experts in our country, but by the Latin Americans themselves. Steps are being initiated to deal with this critical problem—in 1967, the Organization of American States took bold and unprecedented action in sponsoring the first Latin American Conference on Population Control. There is growing optimism that this primary barrier to development can be surmounted.

If it is true that the failure of the Latin nations to halt the rapid growth of population is hampering the rate of economic growth and outpacing efforts in health, education, and housing, and that Alliance political and social reforms have encountered much resistance from vested interests and entrenched oligarchies, it is also true that the United States—through its cutbacks of aid—has failed to sustain its level of commitment and its faith in the Alliance as a viable development program. Criticism has also been leveled at the United States for the increasing protectionist sentiment concerning our trade with Latin America, and the trend toward restrictions on Latin American trade with the United States—a trade which is necessary to build the economic resources of those nations.

Let us for a moment look at the plus side of the Alliance program—at what it has achieved in the way of Latin American development. OAS Secretary General Galo Plaza stated in a recent speech that during the 1960's, the Latin nations have put forth tremendous efforts to meet their many commitments under the Alliance. Their achievements included the following:

First, for the first time, national policy in most of the Latin American nations has become development-oriented;

Second, the Alliance has fostered the emergence of a new generation of Latin American statesmen, economists, and technicians who share common purposes and have a firm grasp on the realities, aspirations, and possibilities of their region;

Third, physical integration has taken great strides—this is revealed in the rapidly expanding highway networks, airways, and river and sea routes, and in modernization of telecommunications;

Fourth, school enrollment has seen spectacular progress in many nations with very low rates of enrollment; and

Fifth, finally, and most revealing, the internal effort of the Latin American nations has far exceeded initial expectations. In the first 7 years of the Alliance, Latin American domestic investment in the program has amounted to approximately $125 billion, although Alliance guidelines required an investment of $80 billion for the entire 10-year period. U.S. investment during that same period has totaled less than $4.7 billion.

President Nixon has called for reevaluation of United States relations with Latin America with special emphasis on the future of the Alliance for Progress. Both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee are preparing intensive studies of the Alliance to determine what our future course should be. A large part of the future development of Latin America rests with the precepts and goals of the Alliance for Progress. Therefore, it is essential that the program be reappraised on the basis of viable and realistic goals, not dreams. The Alliance must be strengthened and perfected as the basis for sound and stable Latin American development, and as the basis for healthy inter-American relations in the years to come.

We must commit ourselves to making the Alliance a success. This commitment requires not only our resources and our plans and policies, but also our will. We must be willing to sustain the effort and the vision that will be necessary to build upon the beginnings that have been made.

Covey T. Oliver, former Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America and Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, recently said:

> We are long past the point of being able to walk away from the Alliance as though it were a crashed aircraft. It was not just Communists who arranged Mr. Nixon's bad reception in 1958, but the pent-up fury at having been ignored by the United States since World War II. Belatedly we have begun to help. The consequences of walking away would be very serious. We cannot afford to lose Latin America.

On this 79th Pan American Day, let us pledge ourselves to a reassessment of our hemisphere relations and to a realistic, long-range commitment to our partners in Latin America, that we might together strive for the ultimate goal of world prosperity and world peace.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my colleagues in observing Pan American Day. This is the 29th anniversary of the founding of the International Union of American Republics, conceived in 1890 with the First International Conference of American States held in Washington, and continuing today as the Organization of American States, a viable force in inter-American affairs, having the potential to provide meaningful solutions to socioeconomic problems of Central and South America through economic and political cooperation.

The durability of the OAS stands as evidence of our mutual determination to seek meaningful change through peaceful economic and political cooperation. Fortunately, we are not limited to pointing to the durability alone, but can point to other more tangible results of our mutual efforts. The economic base of our partners is slowly broadening to benefit all levels of their societies, and professional and technological assistance is fostering gradual rural modernization.

When we remember that many of the people of Central and South America have not advanced materially in modern education and economic opportunity, the task of those who would help is easily defined, but the same facts that delineate so clearly the depths of the problem also serve to gage the difficulty of getting results. To carry on an effective program, we must redefine our priorities to reflect the urgency of the situation.

That the well-being of Central and South America is inextricably tied to the welfare of the North American societies was recognized as early as 1823 when we enunciated the Monroe Doctrine. At that time we made known to the world our special interest in the hemisphere, and our actions since that time in forming associations of political equals to define and solve mutual problems for the common good have further indicated our interest. We have the machinery necessary to produce meaningful solutions, but to this day we have run it at less than full speed. Today let us reexamine our programs and rededicate our efforts toward a more effective solution of our hemispheric problems.

Let us look particularly to greater utilization of the Organization of American States to meet these pressing problems.

It is fitting that on Pas American Day, when we observe our hemispheric solidarity, we also pay tribute to the clergyman who offers today's invocation, the Reverend Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., the former dean of the Georgetown University Graduate School, an innovator in ideas toward hemispheric harmony, a student of Latin America, and a sincere friend of the House.

I would like to draw attention to the fact that, for many years, our friend, Father Joseph F. Thorning, has been active in promoting interracial harmony. He has often emphasized the importance of this outlook in dealing with citizens of our own country and in handling issues which touch upon progress in the other American republics. In almost all his books, articles, and lectures, Dr. Thorning has pointed out that, throughout Latin America and Canada, the ideal of interracial fairness attracts highly favorable attention. It is a principle that if applied and practiced in the United States, can win new friends for our own country and people throughout the Western Hemisphere.

Father Thorning has delivered the invocation to the House on the observance of Pan American Day for 25 years, and the thoughtful guidance which he has offered has been of great benefit to all of us as we have endeavored to find our way through the complexities of this important area. On this silver anniversary of the time when Father Thorning first delivered the invocation on Pan American Day. I commend him for his devotion to this great cause.

It is encouraging to know that such an able man as Father Thorning retains confidence in the collective wisdom of the governments of this hemisphere to enact measures which will effectively foster the common good in the spirit of peaceful cooperation.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) in this observance of Pan American Day.

At the outset I wish to commend Congressman FASCELL for his leadership in Latin American Affairs.

As chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Latin America, the gentleman has been conducting some illuminating and important hearings on the Alliance for Progress, the United States pledge of mutual assistance to the people of Central and South America.

From these hearings may well emerge a new and more complete understanding of the progress which has been made under the Alliance and of the problems which still must be solved.

We are well aware that there are problems. Social, economic, cultural, and political differences, and controversies plague our relations with our Latin American neighbors.

But these difficulties should not blind our eyes to the long tradition of mutual assistance and cooperation which has operated in the Western Hemisphere—a tradition embodied in the Pan American Union.

Since the first International Conference on American States, held in Washington in 1890, the United States has recognized the particular importance of harmonious relations among the States of this hemisphere.

Through the years we have evolved with our Latin American friends several political instruments to encourage cooperation and mutual progress.

Perhaps the most important of these is the Orangization of American States. Through the OAS we are attempting to work out a common understanding of our common desires and goals. The United States seeks not to dictate to Latin America, but to understand and to respond to its real needs.

To accomplish this end, the Alliance for Progress was established. Propounded by the late President Kennedy as a pledge of U.S. commitment to Latin American economic and social progress, it has not always met our expectations.

This does not, however, mean that the instrument itself is defective, but more likely that our use of it may require reexamination. I am confident that, given a spirit of good will on all sides, the Alliance may yet achieve the potential contemplated by those who created it.

One area in which I believe more fruitful work might be done is in the transfer of technology developed in the United States to assist the development and welfare of the nations of Latin America.

Such a transfer is not easy, since these nations often lack the necessary economic and educational foundation on which to base the wondrous products of our technological age. At the same time, however, there are areas in which scientific knowledge might well be fruitfully shared. These we should seek out and implement in meaningful programs.

The future of United States-Latin American relations is not likely to be smooth. With confidence we can predict many political storms over the hemisphere during the next decade. But this awareness should not disillusion or discourage us, but rather serve as a spur to even more intensive efforts at cooperation.

In the spirit of mutual help which has characterized the Pan American Union, therefore, let us get on with this great work for the betterment of our Western Hemisphere.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on this resolution and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

THE BURDEN OF TAXES, THE NEED OF REFORM

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the April 4 issue of Life magazine contained an important and timely editorial on tax reform which I believe all Members should read. The editorial lays heavy stress on the 1968 recommendations of the Treasury Department as the basis for tax reforms; certainly in those 908 pages of information there is enough evidence to convince the Congress that comprehensive tax reform is long overdue. My concern however is not with who made the recommendations, rather it is with our response to the crying need for tax reform. The House Ways and Means Committee has in its 25 members more than enough expertise, intelligence, and compassion to effect the needed reforms with or without the assistance of the Treasury. And it is the responsibility of Congress—no one else—to effect reforms. The editorial states that the public has been "long aware that the U.S. taxation system is badly dated, overly burdened with complexities, and shot through with glaring inequities." Mr. Speaker, the time for tax reform is upon us. We have an obligation to the public to change its concept of our tax system. The editorial follows:

THE BURDEN OF TAXES, THE NEED OF REFORM

Just a few days before leaving office, L.B.J.'s Treasury Secretary Joseph Barr touched a highly responsive chord with the public. He disclosed that more than 150 wealthy citizens in the $200,000-plus income bracket were quite legally not paying a cent in income tax—and predicted "a taxpayer revolt" if something isn't done about the widespread tax inequities that such extreme examples represent. As an unprecedented amount of mail seconding Barr poured into the Treasury and Congress, it finally seemed the long-lost cause of tax reform was an idea whose time had come. House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills scheduled exhaustive hearings to prepare legislative proposals, and the new Nixon administration seemed ready to make tax reform one of its domestic priorities.

But now, as if to thicken the April 15 taxpayers' gloom, Treasury officials of the Nixon administration are complaining that Barr's mention of wealthy tax-avoiders was "unprofessional" and "inflammatory," and are quietly spreading word that though tax reform is still desirable, it is a highly complicated subject needing further study—say until 1971.

This line is going to be hard to sell to a public long aware that the U.S. taxation system is badly dated, overly burdened with complexities and shot through with glaring inequities. The momentum for reform is particularly high at a time when the "temporary" federal surcharge for the Vietnam war is about to be extended for another year, and many racial and urban problems await expensive solutions after the wars' end. State and local taxes—which have doubled in the past 10 years—are also continuing to soar, with 38 states already considering tax increases for 1969. Against this background, it would be highly disappointing for the Republican administration, like its predecessors, to make a desultory start on tax reform.

At a time when taxpayers are heavily burdened, it is particularly important that they not be *unfairly* burdened. The fact that they are, far from needing further elaborate "studies" by Congress or the Administration, has been exhaustively documented by tens of thousands of pages of congressional committee testimony, and most recently by the thoroughly researched 1968 U.S. Treasury Department report prepared by Assistant Secretary Stanley Surrey. The Surrey report also poposed a program of tax reforms. It would not "soak" the rich, but make them pay a minimum tax of 7% to 35% regardless of the number of deductions, exemptions and exclusions they are able to claim. The proposals also make a modest start at doing away with at least a few of the most abused tax shelters. There would be a $15,000 limit on the write-off of nonfarmers' losses on "hobby farms," and estate taxes would be tightened by taxing gifts before death at the same rate as bequests, and imposing a capital gains inheritance tax on the increased value of property held until death.

The Nixon administration Treasury does not buy all of the "Surrey package," for reasons that command a respectful hearing. However politically attractive it may seem, there are grounds, for example, for questioning the "minimum tax" of the rich. On one hand, it is a weak substitute for direct action to amend or abolish exemptions and deductions which may originally have been put into the tax code to serve some national interest, but no longer do. Introducing a substitute "minimum tax" to partially cover such inequities merely perpetuates them, and smacks too much of piling exceptions onto exceptions, instead of changing rules. This is the familiar method which created so much of our tax morass in the first place.

And other exceptions, which the rich and hundreds of thousands of not-so-rich take advantage of, exist for good reasons. These include tax-free interest on bonds issued by the hard-pressed states and municipalities (which otherwise would have a harder time raising money) and capital gains taxation rates, which provide a profitable incentive to investment and business growth. Such provisions should be treated differently from much criticized tax deductions like the 27½% "oil depletion" allowance, which is excessive and should gradually be staged down to a more reasonable figure, perhaps 15%. Politics being what it is, during the campaign Nixon declared for maintaining the 27½%.

"Tax angles"—and the higher basic tax rate needed to compensate for them—have become a way of economic life in the U.S. They distort investment and other business decision-making, often discouraging initiative and innovation and undermining public faith in the tax system as a whole. The Nixon administration is right to be skeptical of a "minimum tax" that is a mere cosmetic for tax angles. But it would be wrong to dilly-dally like its predecessors over doing something about the tax angles themselves.

Some obvious measures of tax reform—such as the sensible tightening of estate taxes proposed by Surrey—could be enacted in this Congress. There should also be an early Administration start on a more equitable and less complex tax structure, as the proper prelude for consideration of such interesting Nixon taxation proposals as ghetto tax incentives and federal-state revenue sharing. It is also the way to prepare efficiently to meet the heavy domestic revenue needs that will face us after the Vietnam war.

FORESTERS AND THE JOB CORPS

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of speaking before the Washington section of the Society of American Foresters to discuss the subject of the Job Corps. I include my oral remarks to the group in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

FORESTERS AND THE JOB CORPS

I would like to talk to you for just a few moments on a matter about which I feel very deeply. I think it concerns you not only in your occupation as foresters, or as representatives of other agencies of the Government, but as individuals and citizens of this great country of ours.

As we sit around this room, we are all too prone, I am sure, to think of others as having had the same opportunities to develop as we have. Whether you realize it or not, there are many people in this country who have never had the opportunities given to us, and some of them who have had the opportunity have never made the most of it.

Under our educational system every young man and woman has to go to school. This system, moreover, is not designed to take care of those who are not as well equipped as we. Yes, they get out of the first, second, and third grades and move on to the fourth, fifth, and higher grades because they are too big for the seats. The laws in almost every State say that you must go to school. Many of these people have high school certificates, just the same as yours and mine. I hope it will come as a shock to you to realize that many of these young men and young women cannot read or write. How do they get through high school? They don't—the system shoves them through and out. A number of years ago, it was decided that we should make an effort to attract and salvage some of these people—the so-called poverty program.

When the program was initially established, there was one thing that wasn't wanted. That was the Civilian Conservation Corps. However, there weren't enough votes up on Capitol Hill on the House side to pass the Economic Opportunity Act without the support of some of us who felt that we had to have the CCC as a real element in trying to salvage human beings. I confronted Sargent Shriver and got turned down. But after about two weeks he suddenly discovered he didn't have enough votes to pass that bill. So he asked me to prepare sections for it which became the CCC. I didn't do it alone. I had lots of help. But when the Economic Opportunity Act was passed, it contained this CCC provision.

The Civilian Conservation Centers are under several fine agencies. One is the Forest Service, and another is the Park Service. I would like to say that those men who have taken themselves away from the usual jobs of forestry and instead of salvaging timber are salvaging human beings, are dedicated men who are making just as big a contribution to society as those who are doing the regular forestry job. I sincerely believe it is a part of your job as foresters and citizens to carry the story of what you are doing to as many people as you can.

The Forest Service Chief and I went down to visit a camp, and I would like to review a few of the little things of the trip because this program is in trouble. We saw a grown young man, 21 years old, sitting in a little cubicle with two or three others, and with a teacher, trying to learn the ABC's. And that young man was trying as hard as though he was cutting down a tree in a forest. There were beads of perspiration on his face as he tried to master the simple things which we take so much for granted. I looked at him and asked him where he came from. He told me Louisiana. I said to the young man, "What's the biggest thing you would like to do?" With a smile on his face that I shall never forget he said, "Sir, I would love to be able to write a letter to my father and mother back in Louisiana." Then he said, "After I wrote the letter and mailed it, I would like to take a couple of days off and go home and read it to them."

Now, you know what you have to work with in the Camps—the dropouts, the cast-offs, the ones who have been written off by society up to now as complete failures. I am sure that you have seen the statistics that have come out. Well, I'd like to tell you something about some of these statistics that the Forest Service and the Park Service have to put up with. These boys who are the camp residents come from under-privileged families—all handicapped young men. Many of them come there with a chip on their shoulder, mad at the world; many of them never had a suit of clothes; many come with shoes on that don't match; and many have never been out of the sight of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, or Washington. They've never seen an area where there is nothing but green. They have never been privileged to know from first hand that out there in those woods are other of God's creatures—the deer, the bear, the owl. Imagine yourself never having heard an owl in your life and you're away from home for the first time with no friends at all, and outside, as you sleep under a blanket and sheets for the first time in your life, you hear WHO-OO-O WHO-OO-O. Can't you imagine what would happen? You would be scared to death! Many of them get up the next day and leave. Now those who leave are charged to you just as though they had stayed for the full period. This is one of the things that makes me perturbed.

But look at the young men who stay and finish their work. Among other things, they now know that you can eat with a knife and fork. It is hard to believe that in this great land some people don't know how to eat with a knife and fork. Some didn't even know what butter was. They put mayonnaise on bread because it was cheaper and easier to spread. They never had any idea how people cooked. One young man told me he never remembered having a warm meal in his life. These are the kind of people you are working with, people who need help.

Suddenly, these people begin to realize that maybe they haven't been passed over completely, that maybe there is an opportunity for them. You who work with these young men have discovered new educational techniques and I'll tell you how good they are. They are so good that the people in the educational field are coming now to the Forest Service and the Park Service and saying, "Give us these techniques so that we can try them in the public schools."

The young men in the camps are being given a chance now to look out and to look up. What does it mean? In the camp the Chief I and went to, the Corpsmen have suddenly realized that communities in the area have things that need to be done. You have taught them certain things to do and they now ask, "Is there any place we can put what we have learned to work in our spare time?" These young men are forming groups and going out to the communities surrounding the camps. They are actually doing for others the things they learned to do themselves.

The program has been in operation for a few years. Many of those who have been in the camps now have jobs. They are now wage earners and taxpayers. I am sure there are some people up on Capitol Hill who say it costs more to put a boy in a Job Corps camp than it does to send him to Harvard. And I agree with them. But let me tell you that they go to Harvard only if their parents can afford to send them there. They have the background and ability to handle that. But to give these disadvantaged young men, some of whom live in your community, the opportunity not to be dependent on society for the rest of their lives is something I think we owe to ourselves, to them, and to society.

So I would like to leave a challenging task with you today. I'd like you, in your contacts with those up on Capitol Hill, and those you come in contact with throughout your career, to make known that this is one part of the poverty program that must be continued.

President Johnson, just before he left Washington, said he was sorry that the poverty program hadn't accomplished the things he had intended it to, but the one shining light in the entire program was the Job Corps. And it is only because people like Ed Cliff and Director George Hartzog of the Park Service, insisted that their people be the ones to handle it. I don't know what the present Administration is going to do, but one thing that must be continued is this great work to which many of you are dedicated. We live in a Christian community.

I remember the story that the good Lord used which I think applies here. He told of the shepherd who had 100 sheep. Ninety-nine were in the fold, but one was lost. So he left his flock, and he was so happy when he found the lost one and brought it back to the other 99. That is just what you in the Forest Service, Park Service and other conservation agencies are doing to human beings in the Job Corps CCC program.

PETER F. DRUCKER ON GOVERNMENT

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of Nation's Business, Peter F. Drucker in "The Sickness of Government," excerpts some of his conclusions on the state of the governing art from his new book, "The Age of Discontinuity." His critique of our Federal Government is a stinging rebuttal to those who believe that all the Nation's real and supposed ills can be solved by the influx of more taxpayer money and more Government programs. He says:

> There is mounting evidence that government is big rather than strong; that it is fat and flabby rather than powerful; that it costs a great deal but does not achieve much.

But the sad and alarming part of Drucker's analysis of our Government is:

> There is mounting evidence also that the citizen less and less believes in government and is increasingly disenchanted with it. Indeed, government is sick—and just at the time when we need a strong, healthy, and vigorous government.

If the writer is right—and I have a large stack of mail in my office every morning that would indicate that he is—then it seems incumbent upon us to do something to restore all citizens' faith in their governmental institutions. The book and article, coming as it does prior to the income tax deadline, and just before a probable decision by the administration to extend the surtax, is particularly worthy of our examination. We must do something about the load the taxpayer is carrying; moreover, we must convince the taxpayer that we are capable of reversing the trends of government so ably and graphically pointed out by Mr. Drucker.

On March 24, a Wall Street Journal editorial commented on the Drucker book and pointed out that too many people, in too many countries, have had a sort of love affair" with government over the years. The article points out that the result of this love affair is the size of our Government.

But the most critical result of the love affair, and thus the size of the Government, is not that the Government is inherently incapable of doing all the things it promises, but that, with the acquisition of so much power over so many aspects of our citizen's lives, people feel completely enveloped and helpless against the power that is arrayed before them.

The Journal editorial concluded with this hopeful and theoretically correct statement:

> When people get sufficiently disenchanted with an institution, they are not powerless to change it.

For the sake of the future of our country and our Government, I sincerely hope the Journal's assessment is right.

But, I think it is important to point out that the most insidious manifestation of the size of the Government that we have today is not that it manages badly, nor that it cannot produce what the people believe it can produce, but that the size and complexity of the Government has become so encompassing, and frankly, so frightening, that the average citizen knows not where to begin to turn to change the institutions.

Of course the citizen has "part" of an opportunity to change the process once every 2 years, and this is the only reason why the Government of which Drucker speaks has not turned into a complete monster. But still, even after election after election, when the Government continues to grow and grow, is it any wonder that John Q Citizen begins to flag in his faith that he has any power over the institution.

The responsibility and the opportunity for making the changes necessary to the reestablishment of our citizens' faith in his governmental institutions rests solidly with the House. There simply is no place else the people can go. Unless we in this body bring about the changes in the all-encompassing nature of government, the helplessness and frustration of our citizens will explode and the institutions we cherish will topple. Our first responsibility is to the concept of a representative republic; we must not allow the institutions created to carry out this responsibility to become more than that.

I include these two articles as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

[From Nation's Business, March 1969]

THE SICKNESS OF GOVERNMENT

(By Peter F. Drucker)

(Peter F. Drucker is among America's best-known experts on management and other business problems. The author of a string of books and articles, including a number of contributions to Nation's Business, he has been professor of management at New York University's Graduate School of Business since 1950. Austrian-born, and educated in England and Austria, he has been a foreign correspondent, an economist for an international bank in London, an economist for a group of British banks and insurance companies in the United States—he came to the U.S. in 1937—and a management consultant to several large American and foreign companies. His books include "The New Society," "The Effective Executive," "The Practice of Management," "America's Next 20 Years," "Landmarks of Tomorrow" and "Managing for Results.")

Government surely has never been more prominent than today. The most despotic government of 1900 would not have dared probe into the private affairs of its citizens as income tax collectors now do routinely in the freest society. Even the Czar's secret police did not go in for the security investigations we now take for granted. Nor could any bureaucrat of 1900 have imagined the questionnaires that governments now expect businesses, universities, or citizens to fill out in ever-mounting number and ever-increasing detail.

At the same time, government has everywhere become the largest employer.

Government is certainly all-pervasive. But is it truly strong? Or is it only big?

There is mounting evidence that government is big rather than strong; that it is fat and flabby rather than powerful; that it costs a great deal but does not achieve much. There is mounting evidence also that the citizen less and less believes in government and is increasingly disenchanted with it. Indeed, government is sick—and just at the time when we need a strong, healthy, and vigorous government.

There is certainly little respect for government among the young—and even less love. But the adults, the taxpayers, are also increasingly disenchanted. They still want more services from government. But they are everywhere approaching the point where they balk at paying for a bigger government, even though they may still want what government promises to give.

In the 70 years or so from the 1890's to the 1960's, mankind, especially in the developed countries, was hypnotized by government. We were in love with it and saw no limits to its abilities, or to its good intentions.

Anything anyone felt needed doing during this period was to be turned over to government—and this, everyone seemed to believe, made sure that the job was already done.

The love affair with government became general with World War I when government, using taxation and the printing press, mobilized resources way beyond what anyone earlier would have thought possible. The German war economy, the War Production Board in the United States, and the United States propaganda machine dazzled contemporaries. It convinced them that government could do anything.

When the Great Depression hit a decade later, everybody immediately turned to government as the savior. It is pathetic to recall the naive belief that prevailed in the late 30's.

World War II reinforced this belief. Again government proved itself incredibly effective in organizing the energies of society for warfare.

A TIME OF DISENCHANTMENT

But now our attitudes are in transition. We are rapidly moving to doubt and distrust of government and, in the case of the young, even to rebellion against it. We still, if only out of habit, turn social tasks over to government. We still revise unsuccessful programs over and over again, and assert that nothing is wrong with them that a change in procedures or "competent administration" will not cure.

But we no longer believe these promises when we reform a bungled program for the third time.

Who, for instance, believes any more that administrative changes in the foreign aid program of the United States (or of the United Nations) will really produce rapid worldwide development? Who really believes that the War on Poverty will vanguish poverty in the cities?

We still repeat the slogans of yesteryear. Indeed, we still act on them. But we no longer believe in them. We no longer expect results from government.

What explains this disenchantment with government?

We expected miracles—and that always produces disillusionment. Government, it was widely believed (though only subconsciously), would produce a great many things for nothing. Cost was thought a function of who did something rather than of what was being attempted.

There is little doubt, for instance, that the British in adopting the "free health service" believed that medical care would cost nothing. All the health service is and can be is, of course, "prepaid" medical care. Nurses, doctors, hospitals, drugs, and so on have to be paid for by somebody. But everybody expected this "somebody" to be somebody else. At the least, everyone expected that under a "free" health service the taxes of the rich would pay for the health care of the poor.

This is not an argument against such services. A mass basis is the only way to finance what everyone should have. Nor are such services necessarily inefficient. But they are not "free"—and their cost is inevitably high, since they have to provide for contingencies and benefits for everyone even though only a minority may ever require a particular benefit.

All such plans are, in effect, taxation and compulsory saving that force the individual to pay for something whether he wants it or not. This is their whole rationale. But obvious though this may seem, the illusion that government could somehow make costs go away and produce a great deal for nothing was almost universal during the last half-century.

This belief was, in effect, only the facet of a much more general illusion from which the educated and the intellectuals in particular suffered: that by turning tasks over to government, conflict and decision would be made to go away.

Once the "wicked private interests" had been eliminated, the right course of action would emerge from the "facts," and decision would be rational and automatic. There would be neither selfishness nor political passion. Belief in government was thus largely a romantic escape from politics and responsibility.

REJECTION OF RESPONSIBILITY

One root of this argument was hatred of business, of profit and, above all, of wealth. Another—more dangerous—root was the rejection of responsibility and decision that played such a major role in the rise of Fascism and Nazism and in their attraction for so many otherwise sane people.

That motives other than the desire for monetary gain could underlie self-interests and that values other than financial values could underlie conflict, did not occur to the generation of the '30's. Theirs was a world in which economics seemed to be the one obstacle to the millennium.

One need not be in favor of free enterprise—let alone a friend of wealth—to see the fallacy in this argument. But reason had little to do with the belief in government ownership as the panacea. The argument was simply: "private business and profits are bad—*ergo* government ownership must be good." We may still believe in the premise; but we no longer accept the *ergo* of government ownership.

There is still a good deal of resistance to the responsibilty of politics and resentment of the burden of decision. Indeed, the young today want to drop out altogether—in a frightening revival of the hostility to responsibility that made the younger generation of 40 years ago so receptive to totalitarian promises and slogans.

But no one, least of all the young, believes any more that the conflicts, the decisions, the problems would be eliminated by turning things over to government. Government, on the contrary, has itself become one of the wicked "vested interests" for the young. And few even of the older generation expect any more than the political millennium will result in government control.

In fact, most of us today realize that to turn an area over to government creates conflict, creates vested and selfish interests, and complicates decisions. We realize that to turn something over to government makes it political instead of abolishing politics.

When the garbage collectors went on strike against the City of New York in the winter of 1968, many good liberals seriously proposed turning garbage collection over to "free enterprise" to "ease the tension."

But the greatest factor in the disenchantment with government is that government has not performed. The record over these last 30 or 40 years has been dismal. Government has proved itself capable of doing only two things with great effectiveness. It can wage war. And it can inflate the currency.

Other things it can promise but only seldom accomplish.

The greatest disappointment, the great letdown, is the fiasco of the welfare state. Not many people would want to do without the social services and welfare benefits of an affluent modern industrial society. But the welfare state promised a great deal more than to provide social services.

It promised to create a new and happy society. It promised to release creative energies. It promised to do away with ugliness and envy and strife. No matter how well it is doing its jobs—and in some areas in some countries some jobs are being done very well—the welfare state turns out at best to be just another big insurance company.

THE BEST IS MEDIOCRE

The best we get from government in the welfare state is competent mediocrity. More often we do not even get that; we get incompetence such as we would not tolerate in an insurance company.

In every country there are big areas of government administration where there is no performance whatever—only costs. This is true not only of the mess of the big cities, which no government—United States, British, Japanese, or Russian—has been able to handle. It is true in education. It is true in transportation.

And the more we expand the welfare state the less capable even of routine mediocrity does it seem to become.

I do not know whether Americans are particularly inept at public administration—though they are hardly particularly gifted for it. Perhaps we are only more sensitive than other people to incompetence and arrogance of bureaucracy because we have had, until recently, comparatively so much less of it than other people.

But no matter how bad others might be, it is hard to conceive anything more chaotic than the huge, blundering, disorganized establishment of an American embassy even in a small country—both totally unmanaged and totally overadministered.

During the past three decades, federal payments to the big cities have increased almost a hundred-fold for all kinds of programs. But results from the incredible dollar flood into the cities are singularly unimpressive.

What is impressive is the administrative incompetence. We now have 10 times as many government agencies concerned with city problems as we had in 1939. We have increased by a factor of a thousand or so the number of reports and papers that have to be filled out before anything can be done in the city.

Social workers in New York City spend some 70 or 80 per cent of their time filling out papers; for Washington, for the state government in Albany, and for New York City. No more than 20 or 30 per cent of their time, that is about an hour and a half a day, is available for their clients, the poor.

As James Reston reported in the *New York Times* Nov. 23, 1966, there were then 170 different federal aid programs on the books, financed by over 400 separate appropriations and administered by 21 federal departments and agencies aided by 150 Washington bureaus and over 400 regional offices.

One congressional session alone passed 20 new health programs, 17 new educational programs, 15 new economic development programs, 12 new programs for the cities, 17 new resources development programs, and four new manpower training programs, each with its own administrative machinery.

This is not perhaps a fair example—even of American administrative incompetence. That we speak of "urban crisis" when we face a problem of race, that is, of the conscience, explains a lot of our troubles. Even the stoutest advocate of the welfare state never expected fundamental problems of conscience to yield to social policy and effective administration (though he probably would have argued that there are no "problems of conscience" and that everything is a "social problem" and, above all, a matter of spending money).

But in other areas, the welfare state does not perform much better.

Nor is the administrative mess a peculiarly American phenomenon. The press in Great Britain, in Germany, in Japan, in France, in Scandinavia—and increasingly in the communist countries as well—reports the same confusion, the same lack of performance, the same proliferation of agencies, of programs, of forms, and the same triumph of accounting rules over results.

UNGOVERNABLE GOVERNMENT

Modern government has become ungovernable. There is no government today that can still claim control of its bureaucracy and of its various agencies. Government agencies are all becoming autonomous, ends in themselves, and directed by their own desire for power, their own rationale, their own narrow vision rather than by national policy and by their own boss, the national government.

This is a threat to the basic capacity of government to give direction and leadership. Increasingly, policy is fragmented and policy direction becomes divorced from execution.

Execution is governed by the inertia of the large bureaucratic empires, rather than by policy. Bureaucrats keep on doing what their procedures prescribe. Their tendency, as is only human, is to identify what is in the best interest of the agency with what is right, and what fits administrative convenience with effectiveness.

As a result the welfare state cannot set priorities. It cannot concentrate its tremendous resources, and therefore does not get anything done.

The great achievement of the modern state, as it emerged in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, was unified policy control. The great constitutional struggles of the last 300 years were over the control powers of the central government in a united and unified nation. But this political organ, no matter how it is selected, no longer exercises such control.

Even the President of the United States cannot direct national policy any more. The various bureaucracies do much what they want to do.

This growing disparity between apparent power and actual lack of control is perhaps the greatest crisis of government. We are very good at creating administrative agencies. But no sooner are they called into being than they become ends in themselves, acquire a "vested right" to grants from the Treasury and to continuing support by the taxpayer, and achieve immunity to political direction.

No sooner, in other words, are they born than they defy public will and public policy.

The crisis of government domestically is nothing compared to the crisis of government as an effective organ in international life. In the international arena government has all but disintegrated.

The "sovereign state" no longer functions as the effective organ for political tasks. This is not happening, as the liberals would like to believe, because a political world community has transcended the narrow, petty boundaries of national states.

On the contrary, the national state is everywhere in danger of collapsing into petty, parochial baronies—whether French Canada or an independent Flanders, Biafra in West Africa or Scots nationalism.

At the other end we have the "superpowers" whose very size and power debar them from having a national policy. They are concerned with everything, engaged everywhere, affected by every single political event no matter how remote or petty.

But policy is choice and selection. If one cannot choose not to be engaged, one cannot have a policy—and neither the United States nor Russia can, in effect, say: "We are not interested."

The "superpowers" are the international version of the welfare state, and, like the welfare state, incapable of priorities or of accomplishments.

Decisions are also no longer effective. No longer can they be expected to be carried out. In the international sphere we have the same divorce of policy from execution that characterizes domestic government.

We get more and more and more governments. But all this does is increase costs. For each of these sovereignties has to have its own foreign service, its own armed forces, and so on. With a multiplication of government agencies and costs has gone a steady decrease in effectiveness.

And no government, whether its territory spans the continents or is smaller than one city block, can any longer discharge the first duty of government: protection from, and defense against, attack from outside.

This may be regarded as gross exaggeration. It certainly is not the picture the older generation still sees. But it is, increasingly, the reality. It is the situation to which we react.

And the young people, who are not, as we older ones are, influenced by the memories of our love affair with government, see the monstrosity of government, its disorganization, its lack of performance, and its impotence rather than the illusions the older generation still cherishes and still teaches in the classroom.

NEVER NEEDED MORE

Yet never has strong, effective, truly performing government been needed more than in this dangerous world of ours. Never has it been needed more than in this pluralist society of organizations. Never has it been needed more than in the present world economy.

We need government as the central institution in the society of organizations. We need an organ that expresses the common will and the common vision and enables each organization to make its own best contribution to society and citizen and yet to express common beliefs and common values.

The answer to diversity is not uniformity. The answer is unity. We cannot hope to suppress the diversity of our society. Each of the pluralist institutions is needed. Each discharges a necessary economic task.

Their task makes them autonomous whether this is admitted by political rhetoric or not. We therefore have to create a focus of unity. This can only be provided by strong and effective government.

This is even more apparent in the developing, the poor countries than it is in the developed countries of Europe, North America, and Asia. Effective government is a prerequisite of social and economic growth.

We cannot wait until we have new political theory or until we fully understand this pluralist society of ours. We will not recreate the beautiful "prince charming" of government, but we should be able to come up with a competent, middle-aged professional who does his work from nine to five, and does it well—and who, at least, is respected as a "good provider," though the romance has long gone out of him.

In the process, government may shed the megalomania that now obsesses it, and learn how to confine itself to realistic goals and to cut its promises to its capacity to deliver.

Certain things are inherently difficult for government. Being by design a protective institution, it is not good at innovation. It cannot really abandon anything.

The moment government undertakes anything, it becomes entrenched and permanent. Better administration will not alter this. Its inability to innovate is grounded in government's legitimate and necessary function as society's protective and conserving organ.

The inability of government to abandon anything is not limited to the economic sphere. We have known for well over a decade, for instance, that the military draft that served the United States well in a total war is immoral and demoralizing in a "cold war" or "limited war" period. Yet we extend it year after year on a "temporary" basis.

Government is under far greater pressure to cling to yesterday than any other institution. Indeed the typical response of government to failure of an activity is to double its budget and staff.

Nothing in history, for instance, can compare in futility with those prize blunders of the American government, its welfare policies and its farm policies. Both policies are largely responsible for the disease they are supposed to cure. We have known this for quite some time—in the case of the farm program since before World War II, in the case of the welfare program certainly since 1950.

The problem of the urban poor is undoubtedly vast. No city in history has ever been able to absorb an influx of such magnitude as the American cities have had to absorb since the end of World War II.

But we certainly could not have done worse if we had done nothing at all. In fact, the Nineteenth Century cities that did nothing did better. And so, these last 20 years, has São Paulo in Brazil, which, inundated by similar floods of rural, illiterate Negroes fresh from serfdom, did nothing—and is in better shape than New York City.

Our welfare policies were not designed to meet this problem. They were perfectly rational—and quite effective—as measures for the temporary relief of competent people who were unemployed only because of the catastrophe of the Great Depression. Enacted in the mid-30's, the relief policies had essentially finished their job by 1940.

But being government programs they could not be abandoned. Far too massive a bureaucracy had been built. The emotional investment in these programs and in their slogan had become far too great. They had become "symbols" of the New Deal.

Small wonder, then, that we reached for them when the entirely different problem of the '50's arose; that is, when the rural Negro moved into the core city in large numbers.

And small wonder that these programs did not work, that instead they aggravated the problem and increased the helplessness, the dependence, the despair of the Negro masses. For the rural Negro was not competent to manage if only given a job; he was not trained; and he was not already settled in the city in a stable family unit.

But all we could do when relief failed to relieve was to double the budget and to double the number of people engaged in filling out forms. We could not detach ourselves from the program. We could not ask: "What is the problem, and what needs to be done?"

The farm program tells the same story. It was designed—also in the '30's—to save the family farmer and to restore his economic and social health. Instead it has subsidized his replacement by large, heavily capitalized, and highly productive "industrial farms."

This may well be a more desirable result than the one the farm program has meant—and is still meant—to produce. But it was an abysmal failure in terms of the program's announced objectives. Yet again, to everybody's pained surprise, increasing the budget has only speeded up the disappearance of the family farm.

GOVERNMENT MANAGES POORLY

This is not to say that all government programs are wrong, ineffectual or destructive—far from it. But even the best government program eventually outlives its usefulness. And then the response of government is likely to be: "Let's spend more on it and do more of it."

Government is a poor manager. It is, of necessity, concerned with procedure, for it is also, of necessity, large and cumbersome. Government is also properly conscious of the fact that it administers public funds and must account for every penny. It has no choice but to be "bureaucratic"—in the common usage of the term.

Whether government is a "government of laws" or a "government of men" is debatable. But every government is, by definition, a "government of forms." This means, inevitably, high cost. For "control" of the last 10 percent of phenomena always costs more than control of the first 90 percent. If control tries to account for everything it becomes prohibitively expensive. Yet this is what government is always expected to do.

The reason is not just "bureaucracy" and red tape; it is a much sounder one. A "little dishonesty" in government is a corrosive disease. It rapidly spreads to infect the whole body politic. Yet the temptation to dishonesty is always great. People of modest means and dependent on a salary handle very large public sums. People of modest position dispose of power and award contracts and privileges of tremendous importance to other people. To fear corruption in government is not irrational.

This means, however, that government "bureaucracy"—and its consequent high costs—cannot be eliminated. Any government that is not a "government of forms" degenerates rapidly into a mutual looting society. The generation that was in love with the state 30 and 40 years ago believed fondly that government would be economical. Eliminating the "profit motive" was thought to reduce costs. This was poor economics, to begin with. If there is competition, profit assures accomplishment of a task at the lowest cost.

This was, of course, known to the economists of 30 or 40 years ago. But the inherent wastefulness of government had yet to be demonstrated.

The politician's attention does not go to the 90 percent of money and effort that is devoted to existing programs and activities. They are left to their own devices and to the tender mercies of mediocrity.

Politics—rightly—is primarily concerned with "new programs." It is concerned with whatever is politically "hot." It is focused on crises and problems and issues. It is not focused on doing a job.

Politics, whatever the form of government, is not congenial to managerial organization and makes government slight managerial performance.

In government, loyalty is more important than performance, and has to be. Whatever the system—and in this respect there is little difference between Presidential America, Parliamentary England, and Politburo Russia—the first question is "Whose man is he?"

After that, and long before performance, come party allegiance and connections. In fact the man who does well but belongs to the wrong faction, or gives allegiance to the wrong person, is a major threat to the people in power.

WAYS TO BECOME MORE EFFICIENT

We can—and must—greatly improve the efficiency of government.

There is little reason these days to insist on "100 per cent audit," for instance. Modern sampling methods based on probability mathematics actually give us better control by inspecting a small percentage of the events.

We may even, one day, hope to get approval on the part of legislature, and understanding by the public, that no system as large as government can or should work at 100 per cent efficiency. An aim of 92 per cent performance is more realistic and can be attained at much lower cost.

We may even get acceptance by government of the principle of management by exception, in which we only audit where results deviate significantly from expectation, although experienced administrators in government may smile at such utopian naïvete.

We need something much more urgently: the clear definition of the results a policy is expected to produce, and the ruthless examination of results against these expectations.

We need to be forced to admit at an early stage that the relief policies or the farm policies of the United States government do not produce the intended benefits. This demands that we spell out in considerable detail what results are expected rather than content ourselves with promises and manifestos.

We may have to develop an independent government agency that compares the results of policies against expectations and that, independent of pressures from the Executive as well as from the Legislative branches, reports to the public any program that does not deliver.

Robert McNamara's "cost/effectiveness" for the programs and policies of the American military forces may have been the first step in the development of such a new organ. And that President Johnson introduced cost/effectiveness into all United States government agencies may be one of the most significant events in American administrative history.

We may even go further—though only a gross optimist would expect this today. We may build into government an automatic abandonment process.

Instead of starting with the assumption that any program, any agency, and any activity is likely to be eternal, we might start out with the opposite assumption: that each is short-lived and temporary. We might, from the beginning, assume that it will come to an end within five or 10 years unless specifically renewed.

And we may discipline ourselves not to renew any program unless it has the results that it promised when first started. We may, let us hope, eventually build into government the capacity to appraise results and systematically to abandon yesterday's tasks.

Yet such measures will still not convert government into a "doer." They will not alter the main lesson of the last 50 years: *government is not a "doer."*

BUSINESS: A REAL DOER

The purpose of government is to make fundamental decisions, and to make them effectively. The purpose of government is to focus the political energies of society. It is to dramatize issues. It is to present fundamental choices.

The purpose of government, in other words, is to govern.

This, as we have learned in other institutions, is incompatible with "doing." Any attempt to combine governing with "doing" on a large scale, paralyzes the decision-making capacity. Any attempt to have decision-making organs actually "do," also means very poor "doing." They are not focused on "doing." They are not equipped for it. They are not fundamentally concerned with it.

There is good reason today why soldiers, civil servants, and hospital administrators look to business management for concepts, principles, and practices.

For business, during the last 30 years, has had to face, on a much smaller scale, the problem which modern government now faces: the incompatibility between "governing" and "doing."

Business management learned that the two have to be separated, and that the top organ, the decision maker, has to be detached from "doing." Otherwise he does not make decisions, and the "doing" does not get done either.

In business this goes by the name of "decentralization." The term is misleading. It implies a weakening of the central organ, the top management of a business.

The purpose of decentralization as a principle of structure and constitutional order is, however, to make the center, the top management of a business, strong and capable of performing the central, and top-management, task.

The purpose is to make it possible for top management to concentrate on decision making and direction by sloughing off the "doing" to operating managements, each with its own mission and goals, and with its own sphere of action and autonomy.

If this lesson were applied to government, the other institutions of society would then rightly become the "doers." "Decentralization" applied to government would not be just another form of "federalism" in which local rather than central government discharges the "doing" tasks.

It would rather be a systematic policy of using the other, the nongovernmental institutions of the society of organizations, for the actual "doing," i.e., for performance, operations, execution.

REPRIVATIZATION

Such a policy might be called "reprivatization." The tasks which flowed to government in the last century because the original private institution of society, the family, could not discharge them, would be turned over to the new, nongovernmental institutions that have sprung up and grown these last 60 to 70 years.

Government would start out by asking the question: "How do these institutions work and what can they do?"

It would then ask: "How can political and social objectives be formulated and organized in such a manner as to become opportunities for performance for these institutions?"

It would also ask: "And what opportunities for accomplishment of political objectives do the abilities and capacities of these institutions offer to government?"

This would be a very different role for government from the one it plays in traditional political theory. In all our theories government is the institution. If "reprivatization" were to be applied, however, government would become *one* institution, albeit the central, the top, institution.

Reprivatization would give us a different society from any our social theories now assume. In these theories government does not exist. It is outside of society. Under reprivatization government would become the central social institution.

Political theory and social theory, for the last 250 years, have been separate. If we applied to government and to society what we have learned about organization these last 50 years, the two would again come together.

The nongovernmental institutions—university, business, and hospital, for instance—would be seen as organs for the accomplishment of results. Government would be seen as society's resource for the determination of major objectives, and as the "conductor" of social diversity.

I have deliberately used the term "conductor." It might not be too fanciful to compare the situation today with the development of music 200 years ago. The dominant musical figure of the early Eighteenth Century was the great organ virtuoso, especially in the Protestant north. In organ music, as a Buxtehude or a Bach practiced it, one instrument with one performer expressed the total range of music. But as a result, it required almost superhuman virtuosity to be a musician.

By the end of the century, the organ virtuoso had disappeared. In his place was the modern orchestra.

There each instrument played only one part, and a conductor up front pulled together all these diverse and divergent instruments into one score and one performance.

As a result, what had seemed to be absolute limits to music suddenly disappeared.

The conductor himself does not play an instrument. He need not even know how to play an instrument. His job is to know the capacity of each instrument and to evoke optimal performance from each. Instead of being the "performer," he has become the "conductor." Instead of "doing," he leads.

The next major development in politics, and the one needed to make this middle-aged failure—our tired, overextended, flabby, and impotent government—effective again, might therefore be reprivatization of the "doing," the performance of society's tasks.

Government would become increasingly the decision maker, the vision maker, the political organ. It would try to figure out how to structure a given political objective so as to make it attractive to one of the autonomous institutions. It would, in other words, be the "conductor" who tries to think through what each instrument is best designed to do.

And just as we praise a composer for his ability to write "playable" music, which best uses the specific performance characteristic of French horn, violin, or flute, we may come to praise the lawmaker who best structures a particular task so as to make it most congenial for this or that of the autonomous, self-governing private institutions of pluralist society.

Business is likely to be only one, but a very important, institution in such a structure.

CREATED TO CREATE

What makes business particularly appropriate for reprivatization is that it is predominantly an organ of innovation; of all social institutions, it is the only one created for the express purpose of making and managing changes. All other institutions were originally created to prevent, or at least to slow down, change. They become innovators only by necessity and most reluctantly.

Specifically business has two advantages where government has major weaknesses. Business can abandon an activity. Indeed, it is forced to do so if it operates in a market—and even more if it depends on a market for its supply of capital.

There is a point beyond which even the most stubborn businessman cannot argue with the market test, no matter how rich he may be himself. Even Henry Ford had to abandon the Model T when it no longer could be sold. Even his grandson had to abandon the Edsel.

What is more: of all our institutions, business is the only one that society will let disappear.

Precisely because business can make a profit, it *must* run the risk of loss.

This risk, in turn, goes back to the second strength of business: alone among all institutions it has a test of performance. No matter how inadequate profitability is, it is a test for all to see.

One can argue that this or that obsolete hospital is really needed in the community or that it will one day again be needed. One can argue that even the poorest university is better than none. The alumni or the community always has a "moral duty" to save "dear old Siwash."

The consumer, however, is unsentimental. It leaves him singularly unmoved to be told that he has a duty to buy the product of a company because it has been around a long time.

The consumer always asks: "And what will the product do for me tomorrow?" If the answer is "Nothing," he will see its manufacturer disappear without the slightest regret. And so will the investor.

This is the strength of business as an institution. It is the best reason for keeping it in private ownership. The argument that the capitalist should not be allowed to make profits is a popular one. But the real role of the capitalist is to be expendable. His role is to take risks and to take losses as a result.

This role the private investor is much better equipped to discharge than the public one. We want privately owned business precisely because we want institutions that can go bankrupt and can disappear. We want at least one institution that, from the beginning, is adapted to change, one institution that has to prove its right to survivial again and again.

This is what business is designed for, precisely because it is designed to make and to manage change.

If we want a really strong and effective government, therefore, we should want businesses that are not owned by government. We should want businesses in which private investors, motivated by their own self-interest and deciding on the basis of their own best judgment, take the risk of failure.

The strongest argument of "private enterprise" is not the function of profit. The strongest argument is the function of loss. Because of it business is the most adaptable and the most flexible of the institutions around. It is the one that has a clear, even though limited, performance test. It is the one that has a yardstick.

Therefore, it is the one best equipped to manage. For if there is a yardstick for results, one can determine the efficiency and adequacy of efforts.

One can say in a business: "Our greatest profits are at a level where we control 95 per cent of the costs rather than where we control 99 per cent. Controlling and auditing the last 4 percent or 5 percent costs us much more than the profits from these marginal activities could ever be."

One cannot say this with respect to patient care in a hospital. One cannot say this with respect to instruction in a university.

And one cannot say this in any government agency. There one has to guess, to judge, to have opinions.

In a business one can measure. Business, therefore, is the most manageable of all these institutions, the one where we are most likely to find the right balance between results and the cost of efforts. It is the only institution where control need not be an emotional or a moral issue, where in talking "control" we discuss "value" and not "values."

Reprivatization is still vertical doctrine. But it is no longer heretical practice. Reprivatization is hardly a creed of "fat cat millionaires" when black-power advocates seriously propose making education in the slums "competitive" by turning it over to private enterprise, competing for the tax dollar on the basis of proven performance in teaching ghetto children.

It may be argued that the problems of the black ghetto in the American city are very peculiar problems—and so they are. They are extreme malfunctions of modern government. But, if reprivatization works in the extreme case, it is likely to work even better in less desperate ones.

INTERNATIONAL SPHERE, TOO

One instance of reprivatization in the international sphere is the World Bank. Though founded by governments, it is autonomous. It finances itself directly through selling its own securities on the capital markets. The International Monetary Fund, too, is reprivatization.

Indeed, if we develop the money and credit system we need for the world economy, we will have effectively reprivatized creation and management of money and credit which have been considered for millennia attributes of sovereignty.

Again business is well equipped to become the "doer" in the international sphere. The multinational corporation, for instance, is our best organ for rapid social and economic development through the "contract growing" of people and of capital. In the Communications Satellite Corp. (COMSAT) we are organizing worldwide communications (another traditional prerogative of the sovereign) as a multinational corporation.

And the multinational corporation may be the only institution equipped to get performance where the fragmentation into tribal splinter units such as the "ministates" of Equatorial Africa makes performance by government impossible.

But domestically as well as internationally business is, of course, only one institution and equipped to do only one task, the economic one. Indeed it is important to confine business—and every other institution—to its own task.

Reprivatization will, therefore, entail using other nongovernmental institutions—the hospital, for instance, or the university—for other noneconomic "doing" tasks. Indeed the design of new nongovernmental, autonomous institutions as agents of social performance under reprivatization may well become a central job for tomorrow's political architects.

CHOICE WE FACE

We do not face a "withering away of the state." On the contrary, we need a vigorous, a strong, and a very active government. But we do face a choice between big but impotent government and a government that is strong because it confines itself to decision and direction and leaves the "doing" to others.

We do not face a "return of laissez faire" in which the economy is left alone. The economic sphere cannot and will not be considered to lie outside the public domain. But the choices for the economy—as well as for all other sectors—are no longer *either* complete government indifference or complete governmental control.

In all major areas we have a new choice in this pluralistic society of organizations: an organic diversity in which institutions are best used to do what they are best equipped to do. This is a society in which all sectors are "affected with the public interest," while in each sector a specific institution, under its own management and dedicated to its own job, emerges as the organ of action and performance.

This is a difficult and complex structure. Such symbiosis between institutions can work only if each disciplines itself to strict concentration on its own sphere, and to strict respect for the integrity of the other institutions.

Each, to use again the analogy of the orchestra, must be content to play its own part.

This will come hardest for government, especially after the last 50 years in which it had been encouraged in the belief of the Eighteenth Century organ virtuoso that it could—and should—play all parts simultaneously. But every institution will have to learn the same lesson.

Reprivatization will not weaken government. Indeed, its main purpose is to restore strength and performance capacity to sick and incapacitated government.

We cannot go much further along the road on which government has been traveling these last 50 years. All we can get this way is more bureaucracy but not more performance.

We can impose higher taxes but we cannot get dedication, support, and faith on the part of the public. Government can gain greater girth and more weight, but it cannot gain strength or intelligence.

All that can happen, if we keep on going the way we have been going, is a worsening sickness of government and growing disenchantment with it. And this is the prescription for tyranny, that is, for a government organized against its own society.

This can happen. It has happened often enough in history. But in a society of pluralist institutions it is not likely to be effective too long.

Ultimately we will need new political theory and probably very new constitutional law. We will need new concepts and new social theory.

Whether we will get these and what they will look like, we cannot know today. But we can know that we are disenchanted with government, primarily because it does not perform.

We can say that we need, in pluralist society, a government that can and does govern. This is not a government that "does"; it is not a government that "administers"; it is a government that governs.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 24, 1969]

THE GREAT DISENCHANTMENT

The "greatest factor in the disenchantment with Government is that Government has not performed."

So writes management expert Peter F. Drucker in his new book, "The Age of Discontinuity" (Harper & Row), and it is a type of observation that is becoming increasingly common. People of practically all political persuasions are expressing their unhappiness with Governmental performance, or nonperformance.

Reflecting that view, the Nixon Administration would like to rely more on voluntary efforts, particularly in dealing with social problems. For our own part, these columns have long argued that the trouble with massive Government is not only the threat to political liberty it could pose but the demonstrable incompetence of so many of its undertakings.

Mr. Drucker puts it harshly but justly: "The record over these last 30 or 40 years has been dismal. Government has proved itself capable of doing only two things with great effectiveness. It can wage war. And it can inflate the currency. Other things it can promise but only rarely accomplish. . . . Whether private enterprise would have done worse is not even relevant. For we expected perfection from Government as industrial manager. Instead we only rarely obtained even below-average mediocrity."

This popular expectation of perfection seems pretty naive in retrospect, but there is no doubt many people in many countries did have a love affair with Government. Some were so incensed with manifestations of private greed and the apparent failure of the private economy in the Depression that they were confident Government ownership or control of everything would usher in utopia; bureaucrats would behave with only the public interest in mind. Such innocents were thus blind to human nature and especially to the human lust for power.

But why in fact is Government extremely inept in its economic and social programs?

One explanation offered by Mr. Drucker is that modern Government has grown so big it is ungovernable. Both policy and execution are fragmented. Agencies often go their own way, out of effective control and pursing their own interests, not necessarily the public's.

Even apart from size, Governments are inherently ill-equipped for certain tasks. Mr. Drucker makes the interesting, and valid, point that since Governments are by design protective institutions, they are not good at innovation. Yet anything they do start they can hardly even abandon; a Governmental activity becomes built in to the political process. Obsessed with procedure and paperwork, Government makes a poor manager.

For a horrible example, the author mentions welfare policies intended to aid the urban poor. The taxpayer has poured untold billions into the cities, but "we certainly could not have done worse if we had done nothing at all."

A central aspect of this failure is that Government resorted to the welfare policies of the Thirties—measures for the temporary relief of competent people unemployed by the catastrophe of the Depression—to solve the quite different problem of the Fifties and Sixties, namely the unprecedented influx of millions of rural Negroes into the city cores.

Small wonder, writes Mr. Drucker, "that these programs did not work, that instead they aggravated the problem and increased the helplessness, the dependence, the despair of the Negro masses. . . . But all we could do when relief failed to relieve was to double the budget and to double the number of people engaged in filling out forms."

The answer to Governmental incompetence, in his view, is first to restore to the State its proper functions—making fundamental decisions, focusing the political energies of society, in a word governing.

The actual carrying out of the nation's tasks would be largely left to nongovernmental institutions, not only business and labor but hospitals, universities and the rest. Without altering its primary purposes and motivations, business could be especially effective because it is the most adaptable and flexible of our institutions and therefore the one best equipped to manage.

All this may not sound very precise; moreover, accustomed as we are to the huge size and constant growth of Government, it may sound somewhat unrealistic. Yet it is surely the direction in which the nation should be moving. And it is encouraging that so many already agree about it in principle.

When people get sufficiently disenchanted with an institution, they are not powerless to change it.

CONVENTIONAL POWER

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the national interest demands research to take sulfur out of coal instead of laws to take coal out of the energy market.

It is now obvious that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is advocating solutions in advance of problems by attempting to place premature and unsupportable restrictions on coal use. Although medical science has not yet been able to determine safe levels of sulfur oxides in the air, HEW is urging limits that would outlaw combustion of all but the highest type fuels—those in shortest supply.

In 1962 the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council reported to the White House that only a small fraction of total coal reserves is suitable to make metallurgical coke and that a control is needed whereby only noncoking coals are burned as fuels. The scarcity of metallurgical coal is, of course, common knowledge, yet HEW continues to persuade States to adopt laws forbidding the burning of coal below steel-making quality.

What are the alternative fuels? Natural gas resources are too limited to be wasted under electric plant boilers, and the House Committee on Government Operations has just reported that use of low sulfur distillate oil would more than double the cost of utility fuel.

The committee also observed that atomic energy is "not on tap as an instant substitute for high sulfur fuels." Actually, the shortage of uranium, high costs of atomic plants, and questions of safety and contamination of the air and water eliminates at least for the present the substitution of nuclear power for any fossil fuel. In this connection I believe that my colleagues will be interested in an article, "Conventional Power," appearing in the March issue of Science and Technology. It points up some of the problems attendant to the nuclear industry and indicates what can be done toward reducing or eliminating sulfur oxide effluents from fossil fuels. I will include the article at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, random use of high-quality coal and natural gas for the generation of electric power could lead to fuel deficits in the near future. Nor is low-surplus foreign oil the answer, for present import levels are already damaging to the balance of payments and a threat to national security. The safe and economic use of nuclear fission may be years in the future.

I have today written to the Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources urging increased funding for all coal research programs, particularly those for dealing with sulphur oxides. I am confident that greater emphasis on coal research will resolve the pollution problem long before the medical question is settled.

The Science and Technology article follows:

CONVENTIONAL POWER

(By Paul N. Garay)

(We entered the nuclear age in 1945, but fossil fuels should be producing most of our power well beyond the year 2000.)

In Brief: In relation to their formation time, fossil-fuels have been in use for but an instant. Yet there are people who look upon oil, coal, and gas for power generation as relics from a past era. Nevertheless, fossil fuels will supply us with heat and electricity for decades to come. This prediction is prompted by the abundance of fossil fuels still in reserve, and by increasingly efficient methods for converting the energy stored within them into economically feasible power—power considerably less costly than the output of nuclear-powered generators.

A lot of attention is being paid to the application of nuclear sources for the generation of power. But despite all the latent glamor in this energy source, a quiet revolution is taking place in the technology of traditional, fossil-fueled power. This renewed interest may soon lead to a reappraisal—perhaps even to a realignment—of the roles conventional fuel sources will play in the not too distant future.

An important spur to this reappraisal is a new look at economics. No longer is it simply a question of fuel cost against construction and operating prices. Today managers balance subjective factors with dollar costs. One such factor of concern is air pollution. Man's general life expectancy is even weighed in terms of atmospheric contamination! And factors that at one time were considered fixed have suddenly become variables that must be manipulated. Moreover, competition has created new ideas that may be used to heal whatever ailment is currently affecting the fossil-fueled power business.

The utilities industry has a stake of $25 billion in conventional power. In spite of this, many proponents of nuclear power predict a dominant role for themselves in the future. However, while extrapolations in support of these predictions may seem valid today, they must be measured against developing changes.

In Virginia, the cost of the two-unit Surrey Nuclear Station has increased by an estimated 7¼%, or $17 million, in about ten months, to $255 million. The cost of the Bolsa Island project in Southern California is now estimated at $750 million instead of $444 million.

One problem is the availability of uranium at various price levels. There seems to be a conflict between required and available fuel. Considering plutonium recycle, all known low-cost uranium reserves will have been committed by the mid-seventies. Even after breeders are economically feasible, it will be some time before a self-sustaining nuclear system is profitably achieved.

Whether power is fossil-fueled or of nuclear origin, *fuel* is the determinant in the profit factor. While nuclear fuel—delivered—is lower in cost (16¢ per million Btu), it must be elaborately prepared; must be handled with kid gloves; and the residue must be removed and disposed of at great cost. The outstanding characteristic of atomic fuel is its compactness, making transportation costs minimal. On the other hand, fossil fuels must be mined or pumped, and cost from 25¢ to 33¢ per million Btu delivered—although more efficient production and utilization should soon cut costs in half. A pertinent factor in eliminating high transportation costs would be the establishment of generating plants where the fuel is mined and then transmitting the electricity over EHV lines. Shipping costs are high, but the ashes can be easily disposed of and offer no hazard. The nuclear plant is less efficient than the fossil-fueled plant, so costs must also be adjusted for this and also for the more complex safety requirements.

There is an additional reason for retaining use of fossil fuels for power production. If the electrical generating plant is nuclear-powered, then for each unit of electricity as much as 50% more water will be required than for a comparable fossil-fueled station. In more graphic terms, if a nuclear plant were to produce 12,000 MWe, up to 20,000 cu ft of water per second would have to be made available to the cooling condensers, and there are few major rivers in the country having minimum flows in excess of this amount. Lakes and ocean sites are possibilities, but making use of these waters requires special water handling provisions.

FUEL AND ENERGY

Supplies, of course, are an important consideration in deciding whether a specific type of fuel should be used as an energy source. A decade ago pessimistic analysis showed that fossel fuels would be exhausted in the lifetimes of the experts making the predictions.

In spite of excessive waste, not only has the fossil-fuel supply been adequate, but new discoveries of fuel reserves have extended the day of reckoning past the year 2000. Large deposits of lignite, among other coal resources, are now being worked. New finds of vast oil and gas fields have been made. Offshore oil reserves have barely been tapped. According to the U.S. Geological Survey, our recoverable coal reserves amount to some 830 billion tons. This should cover us for some 1500 years at the present rate. And some experts double this figure.

Mechanization and strip mining have kept fuel costs down, too. Experts anticipate a drop to as low as 15¢ per million Btu within the next few years. Transportation costs, a big bugaboo, will bow to technology. Coal may soon be delivered by automated trains, cross-country conveyors, or even pumped as a slurry. Such techniques are presently undergoing extensive tests.

The petroleum industry's outlook is equally promising. Here one important consideration is shale oil. On the one hand, claims are made that the large oil interests are deliberately suppressing the development of shale oil reserves. But on the other hand, oil companies claim shale oil reserves will be tapped when the economics are propitious. Yet the fact remains that the oil entrained in the shale of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming represents another stockpile to draw upon when the need arises.

Because it produces fewer noxious effluents and is most easily used and transported, natural gas is probably the best available fossil fuel. Between 1946 and 1966, gas consumption increased by 324% as compared to 82% for other fuels. By 1970, we will be using 19.3 trillion cu ft of gas per year. This is expected to increase to 34.9 trillion cu ft by the year 2000.

Where will this gas come from? The Potential Gas Committee of the Colorado School of Mines has predicted a potential supply of 690 trillion cu ft of undiscovered natural gas. Add this to the known supplies, and the total estimate of reserves as of 1966 reached 1290 trillion cu ft. Although we have sufficient fossil fuels to burn, there are problems to overcome if their use is to be continued, much less augmented.

ABOUT POLLUTION

Government is taking a hard look at regulating pollutants. Visible emissions of effluents are usually reported to pollution control officers, and citations and fines can be levied. Unfortunately, industry cannot function unless fuel is totally burned; and the combustion effluents discharged into the atmosphere.

One big problem seems to involve the various oxides of sulfur. While some low-sulfur oils are available for fuel, their costs are high compared with lower-grade oil. All fuels contain sulfur to some degree, so the use of fossil fuels must be restricted or, alternatively, the sulfur removed from the fuel, or from the combustion gases after the fuel is burned. After much investment and research by the utility companies, a number of processes are ready to do the job—although their costs might still be excessive for the purpose. In some cases, the processes are claimed to be at the break-even point.

Another technique, no more than five years old, makes use of simple but effective stoichiometric combustion: that is, combustion taking place without excess air. Eliminating the 15 to 20% excess air commonly used minimizes many of the noxious, toxic, and corrosive effluents. Gases that are produced are more readily eliminated.

An interesting combustion technique under investigation is the fluidized-bed process. In this process, the fuel bed is supported by a perforated steel plate. Air is blown upward through this plate with sufficient force to keep the burning pulversized coal in suspension. In the course of this work on fluidized-bed burning, a consultant engineering firm found it could produce coal-burning boilers of 200,000 lb/hr and larger, to match currently available oil-fired package boilers that range to over 250,000 lb/hr. An important side benefit in fluidized combustion is that much of the sulfur and nitrates in the coal are trapped in furnace ash, reducing sulfur oxide emission.

Other experiments employing pulsed pressure instead of a steady air flow result in heat-transfer values many times higher than steady-flow processes can reach.

Efficiency, incidentally, is a two-edged sword. More efficient burning not only produces fewer noxious effluents but also allows a smaller furnace for the same Btu output and reduces furnace size—offering better control over the variables that can cause excessive sulfur and other pollutant emission.

An intriguing process involves the experiment at the Central Basic Research Laboratory of Esso Research and Engineering in Linden, New Jersey. Surrounding the flame with an electrical field changes the color of the flame from yellow to blue, indicating less carbon formation and therefore more efficient combustion.

Another alternative in lowering the effluents is modifying the combustion process so that an acceptable reduction of contamination is effected. This includes processes for converting coal into other forms such as char or liquid or gas. Sulfur can be removed during the transformation. For example, the H-coal process converts the coal to liquid hydrocarbons by hydrogenation with cobalt-molybdenum catalysts, and produces three to four barrels of oil per ton of coal with costs varying from 12.1 to 14.3¢ per gallon.

Pressure for a reduction in stack effluents has resulted in many processes that approach economic justification. The U.S. Bureau of Mines has a system that involves contact between alumina pellets and the effluents. The pellets absorb sulfur dioxide and are then treated with a mix of hydrogen and carbon dioxide. This process may remove about 90% of the sulfur compounds in the flue gases, and the sulfur removed is recovered and sold to help defray the cost of the operation.

Chromatographitic absorption has been proposed by Dr. A. J. Teller of Copper Union. While similar to the activated alumina system, the absorbing material is regenerated by heat, so the addition of chemicals is not required. However, with Dr. Teller's method, the sulfur is not reclaimable.

Another method for removing SO_2 involves catalytic oxidation, in which the sulfur dioxide gas is oxidized to sulfur trioxide (SO_3). This is then condensed and later transformed to sulfuric acid that can be used commercially. There is no discharge of sulfur oxides to the atmosphere.

A chemical scrubbing process has performed satisfactorily, removing 90% of the sulfur dioxide and all of the fly ash not stopped by a precipitator. Sulfur dioxide is removed as a pure vapor and can be liquified or converted to acid or to elemental sulfur.

IF MOHAMMED WON'T GO TO THE MOUNTAIN . . .

If technology cannot get rid of effluents, then an alternative is to relocate the source of pollution to a place well away from urban population centers. The mine-mouth plant offers this solution and also saves the high cost of of transportation. Illustrative of this is the Central Illinois Public Service Company Coffeen Station. Here the first unit of a one-million-kilowatt station is now operating. Located on a man-made lake, this plant uses steam at 2500 psi and 1005° F.

Since long-distance transmission of electrical power involves energy losses, past practice has been to locate generating plants as close as possible to the point of use. Bringing the power to urban areas from the mine-mouth plant can be done via extra-high voltage (EHV) transmission lines.

In the electric utility industry, the average run from source to load has been in the order of 125-200 miles. High-voltage AC lines have been the economic choice, using step-up transformers to obtain the transmission voltages. The usual 500 kV of a few years ago has today been increased to 700 kV, and in the next few years we may see transmission at 1000 kV—all this for the sake of improved transmission efficiency.

There are even more advantages to be gained from EHV direct current transmission. There is no need for line compensation equipment; and losses due to back emf are eliminated. A new mercury-arc excitron-rectifier can produce EHV DC, and a number of such lines are now operating.

Beyond this proven step, Edison Electric Institute and TVA are financing a study program to explore the use of cryogenics to increase the conductivity of underground transmission cable. Other possible developments include sodium conductors for power cable.

GENERATORS IMPOSE LIMITS

Generator size is an important factor to efficiency—the bigger, the better. Any increase in unit size is, however, one of the trends that seems to perplex the prophets. In 1963, the average unit size of a utility station was 200 MW. Today, the arithmetic average has jumped to 650 MW. By 1970, unit sizes will reach the 500–MW level predicted for 1980 only eight years ago; 60% of the units scheduled for operation this year are 500

MW or larger. TVA has two 1300–MW units on order for early 1970 at its Cumberland plant, and its current program shows eight new units with a total capacity of over 9000 MW.

Many engineers see a new ceiling during the next decade on single-shaft turbine generator sizes at slightly over the 1000–MWe (megawatts electrical) range. Among the limitations are the following:

Generator rotor forgings weighing much more than 175 tons are not presently available from the steel industry; 190 tons would be desirable.

Since railroad car facilities have not changed appreciably in the last 50 years, massive parts must be shipped "knocked-down" and require more time to assemble on station.

Manufacturing facilities are strained at present to handle the current 600- to 1100-MWe units. Based on historical trends—in spite of the above limitations—turbine generators in the .2000-MWe range may be available around 1985.

SOME BASIC IDEAS

As the pressure vessels of nuclear plants get bigger, so do the boilers of combustion plants. Indistrial steam generators now range in size up to 700,000 lb/hr (the average is much lower and only 25% have over 300,000 lb/hr capacity). Utility boilers, in contrast, are getting bigger and bigger; keeping with the trend toward single-unit plants, the boilers must serve turbines of a size that had not been predicted twenty years ago. Three-million-pound boilers are not at all uncommon nowadays. A new boiler being built by Combustion Engineering for Pacific Power and Light will serve a 700–MW plant, and will burn pulverized coal to produce 5,168,000 lb/hr of steam at 300 psi and 1005°F. Sulzer Brothers, a well-known Swiss firm, is offering a 6,600,000-lb/hr boiler to work at 5000 psi and 1200°F. If the rate of size increase is continued, a boiler rated at 10 million lb/hr should be ordered sometime in 1969. Although larger boilers may be built, this seems to be about the largest boiler for which component parts can be shipped under present construction practices.

Incidentally, "once-through" boilers are finding increasing favor in new plants. In the usual installations, water in the boiler is circulated in sufficient amounts to keep the boiler tubes from overheating. The steam produced (only a fraction of the total water) moves with the circulating water in the generating tubes and is separated from the water in the steam drum. In the once-through boiler, the water makes only one pass through the boiler, emerging as steam at the boiler outlet. Control dynamics, efficiency, and heat-absorption rates favor this type of design. One of the problems that prevent once-through boilers from being more generally used is their need for extremely pure water. In any boiling system, if the liquid is evaporated completely in its passage through a tube, solids in the water will remain in the tube. Thus, in time, heat transfer will be obstructed.

To understand what is involved in system design, it is fitting to first understand what comprises a thermodynamic cycle and what types of cycles are involved in generating electricity.

The first formal analysis of power cycles was made by Carnot in 1824. Oddly enough, this analysis was made when heat was still thought to be a tangible substance. This mistake did not affect the validity of the description that shows how the cycle changes heat to mechanical work. Three factors are necessary to make the Carnot cycle work: A perfect gas confined by a cylinder and a piston (or an equivalent arrangement, such as a turbine); a source of energy at temperature T_h; and a receiver of energy at temperature T_c. Four processes make up the cycle: (1) heat rejection to a receiver; (2) compression of the fluid; (3) heating of the fluid; and finally (4) expansion of the fluid to its original condition. Since the gas experiences all the processes of a cycle, and ends up in its original state, all the transient energy equations must balance to zero. That is, although the energy added was more than the energy rejected, the equation is balanced by a factor *W*, which represents useful, or "shaft," work.

The Carnot cycle is a standard that can be used to show that no cycle can achieve greater thermal efficiency when operating between minimum and maximum temperatures than

$$\text{Efficiency} = 1 - T_c/T_h,$$

where T_h is the temperature of heat acceptance and T_c is the temperature of heat rejection.

Following the basic understanding of power cycles as developed by Carnot, practical cycles were expressed by other workers. The most important and basic steam cycle is the Rankine. The various processes of the cycle are illustrated in the diagram in the margin.

The basic difference between liquid and gas cycles lies in the mode of combustion; that is, whether it is external or internal to the machine. In the external system, at least one, and sometimes two heat-transfer operations occur. In the internal combustion system, the heat is generated directly in the working fluid by combustion.

A glance at the Rankine or any other cycle diagram shows that the three most important objectives in the design of any prime mover, from the standpoint of efficiency, are:

(1) To produce a temperature difference as high as possible between the hot and cold ends of the cycle.

(2) To produce a pressure differential as high as possible between the initial and final points of the cycle, and

(3) To transmit to the working fluid the highest heat content per unit volume of working space. These objectives are attained by choosing either singly, or in combination, one of the many possible practical thermal cycles.

The limiting efficiency is that of the Carnot cycle. Assume a T_c of, say, 300°K, a figure that is set by prevailing ambient temperatures. Since we must consider containment by solid boundaries, T_h cannot greatly exceed 300° K. The limiting Carnot efficiency calculates to about 90%—about twice the present practical maximum. It should be noted, however, that although approaching the available limiting temperatures yields a steady increase in efficiency, a law of diminishing returns governs the practical approach to these limits.

BOILERS—A PRACTICAL ASPECT

Since the preponderant quantity of electricity produced today depends on the stream cycle, it's obvious that many of the limitations imposed on efficiency will reside with the boiler. More efficiency in the form of a favorable heat rate results from the use of larger units incorporating higher temperature and pressure capabilities. From a postwar figure of 10,000 to 11,000 Btu/kWh, the number of Btu's required to produce one kilowatt has been steadily declining, and heat rates of the newest units are down around 8000-Btu/kWh mark.

Beginning operations in March 1957, the 120,000-kW unit at the Philo Plant of the Ohio Power Co. marked a major advance in the trend toward higher steam pressure. This was the first time that a commercially practical unit was operated at a pressure higher than 3206 psi, the critical pressure of steam.

Other firsts for the unit include the first use of double reheat (see diagram and caption) and the first use of steam at a temperature as high as 1150° F. This is 50° F above the highest temperature previously used for power generation. Generally, the 1957 development seems to be an ultimate one, barring the possibility of a metallurgical breakthrough.

But heat rate, like other desirable accomplishments, cost money. Higher temperatures and pressures—one avenue toward better efficiency—have reached a plateau. Numerous other approaches attempt to detour around these limits.

BINARY CYCLES

In the forties, designers realized that they were rapidly approaching temperature and pressure limits which would inhibit further development. They realized that different approaches might provide means of avoiding the high temperatures and pressures which were the bane of efficient cycles. Obviously a more efficient fluid would obtain the advantages of higher temperatures and lower pressures—resulting in better overall efficiency.

Efficiency improves with operating temperatures in the Carnot cycle. Yet, in present technology, we cannot contemplate any stress-carrying component operating at a temperature remotely approaching 3000°K—the limits for such components being regarded at the moment as being about 1000°K. This seems to imply a Carnot efficiency of some 70%, but it is the maximum temperature of the working fluid that determines the cycle efficiency—and this is only approximately related to the temperature of the stressed components. Since mechanical components may be cooled, the mode of heat application is also significant. For instance, in a conventional gasoline engine, peak gas temperature may reach 2500°K even though the temperature limit of the metal is only 850°K. The short duration of the heat application permits this seemingly anomalous situation. In a steady-flow system, temperature differences of this order between the working fluid and the moving stressed components are difficult to attain. In a gas turbine—even with suitable blade cooling—it seems improbable that stressed metalic turbine blades can survive in a working fluid much in the excess of 1600°K.

Similarly, in steam plants—even though furnace gases reach 2100°K—metallurgical considerations will usually limit steam temperatures to something less than 1000°K.

At the cold end of the power cycle, stress conditions are not limiting. Rather, the limitations are economic, because of the extreme size of the equipment required to approach ambiet temperature in the working fluid. The necessary heat transfer surfaces simply become excessively large.

Considering these upper and lower limits, it is apparent that any device that widens the temperature range over which energy conversion occurs can bear a high percentage of the capital cost and still be economical.

It has been shown that a temperature range from about 2600°K to ambient temperature is potentially available for energy conversion and that all existing types of plants fail to make full use of this potential.

Since a steam generating station is limited to temperature of about 1000°K, two different systems might be combined to extend the useful temperature range: If upward, the new device is sometimes termed a "topper," and by analogy, a downward extension might be called a "bottomer." This involves encroachment of the topping or bottoming device into the range normally covered only with maximum difficulty by the conventional plant.

The mercury topping cycle has been devised as being an effective though still hazardous approach. In this cycle, vaporized mercury is utilized at high temperatures and comparatively low pressures. The vapor is expanded through a mercury turbine, and condensed by steam. The steam cycle used in conjunction with the topping cycle is comparatively conventional. A number of such plants were built, but are not currently being developed further because of toxicity problems and corrosion inherent in the mercury.

While the steam-mercury cycle was the first practical binary cycle, more recent binary cycles have utilized steam and refrigeration-type fluids: steam and ammonia, and many other combinations.

Experts believe there is a sufficient supply of conventional power sources to supply human needs for decades to come. But the experts also believe that present processes will undergo changes in technology. For example, there are a number of ways of producing electrical power without conventional boiler-turbine combinations.

One of these promising methods is magneto-hydrodynamic conversion, popularly referred to as MHD. In an MHD device, the thermal energy of heated gas is converted to kinetic energy by pumping. This energy is then directly converted into electricity. Essentially, the initial step in this process resembles the process that occurs in a rocket—the flow of hot air through a duct—except that with MHD the gas is ionized and conductive. A magnetic field is applied across the duct and an electric current is generated across the gas when the gas cuts across the lines of flux. While the MHD system is still in its experimental stages, the process has created interest because of its promise of high efficiency of operation.

One of the most interesting innovations in the field of power-experimentation is EGD, or electrogasdynamics. Here too, a hot ionized gas moves through a duct. But the ionized particles are collected by an electrode, generating the electric current.

In both the MHD and the EGD processes, the residual heat of the flowing gases that create electricity is utilized even further by producing steam in a waste heat boiler.

Scientists are also probing the possibilities of using solid-electrolyte cells to produce electrical energy from coal at high efficiency in large-scale central station power plants.

Meanwhile, the Bureau of Mines is developing a turbine driven by hot gases from burning coal. Overall objective of the Bureau is to build and to operate a machine that would effectively demonstrate the technological feasibility of an open-cycle, coal-burning gas turbine power plant.

Preoccupation by researchers, scientists, and technologists with conventional sources of fuel power has, at least to the period beyond the year 2000, entrenched the role of hydrocarbons—the conventional sources of power.

ANOTHER SUBSIDY FOR THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, according to an article written by Laurence Stern in the Saturday, April 12, edition of the Washington Post, the Department of Defense is about to reverse past policy and to lavish another subsidy on the military-industrial complex by permitting defense contractors to be reimbursed for contributions which they make in their communities to charities and educational organizations.

This proposal would permit contractors to seek reimbursement of up to one-tenth of 1 percent of cost reimbursable and fixed-price incentive contracts. It is estimated that it would cost $45 million a year since the Department of Defense now pays out some $45 billion a year in procurement contracts.

This is another example of the outrageous lengths to which the Defense Establishment will go to pour more money into its industrial partners. Thousands of American businesses each year make contributions to charities and educational institutions in their communities and are allowed a charitable tax deduction under the Internal Revenue law. What justification is there for applying favored treatment to defense contractors?

Now along comes the Department of Defense at a time when the Federal budget is being cut back drastically in domestic programs and proposes this outrageous subsidy. Are funds to be slashed from inadequate urban programs only to be reinstated as subsidies to defense contractors?

Mr. Speaker, this is entirely mistaken, and I urge the Department of Defense, NASA, the AEC, the GSA not to permit this kind of repayment to Government contractors. Congress should make clear to the administration that this proposal is unacceptable.

I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

PENTAGON MAY REPAY FIRM'S CHARITY GIFTS

(By Laurence Stern)

The Pentagon is proposing that it repay its contractors for their contributions to charities and educational organizations.

If adopted, the new regulations would provide many millions of dollars in reimbursements for costs now disallowed under a ten-year-old Defense Department ruling.

The recommendation is also being circulated among three other big Federal Government spenders—the Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the General Services Administration.

Industrial and trade groups have already endorsed the proposed new policy. They have sought the change for some time.

"We know of many contractors who are the heart and soul of their communities," one Defense Department spokesman explained. "It's necessary that they contribute to such groups as Red Cross and United Givers or else the association dies.

"The question is whether it shouldn't be recognized that this is a valid cost of doing business."

The proposal was drafted and circularized by Capt. E. C. Chapman, chairman of the Armed Services Procurement Regulation Committee, the Pentagon's top procurement policy board.

Chapman said he could not assign a dollar amount to the effect of the change.

Under the proposal the Defense Department would repay contractor donations up to a tenth of 1 per cent of the total contract. Alternatively the contractor could get back an average for his past two years' contributions to charity. The Pentagon would pay whichever of these amounts is lower.

Currently the Pentagon is paying out $45 billion a year in procurement contracts. A tenth of 1 percent would amount to $45 million—although this is by no means a precise indicator of how high the reimbursements would run. That figure was not available.

Final action on the proposal could come as early as a month from now after responses are in from the other agencies.

Currently repayments are allowed by the Pentagon under fixed price contracts. It would extend this practice to cost-reimbursable and fixed price incentive contracts, which make up the lion's share of Defense Departments contracting activity.

Capt. Chapman said the proposal would apply for groups defined as charitable and educational organizations under the tax exemption provisions of the Internal Revenue Act.

PROPOSED REVENUE SHARING—BIAFRAN RELIEF

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

PROPOSED REVENUE SHARING

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the operation of our Federal system of government has led to increased intertwining of Federal Government functions and operations with those of our State and local governments.

Not only do Federal financial policies often determine the ability of taxpayers to support local governments, but the Federal Government, itself, is increasingly adopting programs to assist State and municipal governments in carrying out their functions.

During fiscal 1968, the Federal Government poured about $17 billion in grants-in-aid to local governments through over 400 separate authorizations operating through most of the Federal Government's departments and agencies. In fact, the Federal Government is presently providing funds equivalent to about 17 percent of State and local expenditures.

But this is not sufficient. There is still a huge ever-growing gap between State and local revenue needs and sources.

I have therefore proposed a revenue-sharing concept which would provide to State and local governments a portion of Federal income tax receipts—approximately 3 to 5 percent—with minimum restrictions on the use of the funds.

Designed to strengthen the fiscal base of States and localities, the proposed legislation would create a new system of Federal general support grants, while leaving determination of the use of these grants to the individual States and localities.

Basically, it would operate according to the following distribution formula:

Ninety percent of the funds would be allocated to the various States according to their population and local tax effort; the remaining 10 percent would be distributed to the 17 poorest States.

States would be required to "pass through" a specified portion of these moneys to cities and urban counties, according to a formula recently recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Urban Problems.

Mr. Speaker, the gap between State and local revenue needs and the funds available to fulfill these needs is devastating. If we want our State and local governments to fulfill their responsibilities, we must enable them to have the funds to do so. It is my belief that the Federal revenue-sharing bill provides the most efficient means of accomplishing our goals. Therefore, I urge the Congress to take swift action.

I now turn to another subject.

BIAFRAN RELIEF

Mr. Speaker, on January 22 I joined with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) and 103 of my distinguished colleagues in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 97, expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should substantially increase its humanitarian efforts in the Biafran relief operations and solicit the cooperation of other nations in this endeavor. Today I come before this House to commend this resolution to you and to urge its prompt consideration.

Over 2 months have passed since that initial effort, and while relief operations have been accelerated, the tragedy of Biafra continues. This administration, acting out of humanitarian rather than political considerations, has increased American aid to the international organizations aiding the relief efforts. The International Committee of the Red Cross, UNICEF, and other voluntary organizations have been the recipients of over $31 million in assistance. Recent reports by the International Red Cross indicate that, at least temporarily, starvation has been virtually eliminated.

But, as our efforts have increased, so has the need. We now provide food for approximately 3 million people. The ICRC estimates that by May as many as 4.5 million people in the war zone will need food and medical supplies. Additionally, there is now a need for different types of food. Recent efforts have aimed at attempting to alleviate the protein shortage; but a shortage of carbohydrates now threatens to create an increasingly serious problem in the coming months.

While our efforts have been laudable thus far they have scarcely been adequate; and prospects for the future of the Biafrans are even less hopeful.

The bipartisan support this resolution has received and the overwhelming indication of approval from the American people have demonstrated that neither time nor geography have made us insensitive to the human suffering in Biafra. We are unwilling to stand by while the progress of our civilization is scarred by the number of Biafran dead. We are reluctant to permit a nation, right or wrong in its cause, to use starvation of innocent civilians as a weapon of war. We know that ultimately we are all members of a human family and that if, in the end, political considerations do not bow to human considerations we will all be the losers.

The death by starvation of well over 1 million noncombatants in Biafra has truly been one of the tragic chapters of human history. But it is a chapter that is still being written. Bountiful America must do all it can to lessen the horror of the death toll; and free America must do all it can to promote a peaceful solution to this tragic conflict.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT IN EUROPE: SOME BASIC REALITIES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, enriched uranium is a tremendously important but complicated subject—technically, economically, and politically. This applies not only to the United States, but to Western Europe, and now, Japan as well.

The production of enriched uranium has significant military implications, but it is to the peaceful application of this material that I am directing my interest today. About 85 percent of the U.S. capacity for enriching uranium in the fissionable isotope uranium-235 is devoted to fulfilling the free world's needs for the producing of electricity in nuclear powerplants.

International interest in this subject is focused on three areas: First, the future operation of the three U.S. plants which produce enriched uranium; second, requirements for additional U.S. capacity; and third, the possibility that some foreign countries may choose to build their own plants rather than continue to rely on the United States.

I have some advice on this latter topic which I would like to dispense for the benefit of my colleagues and any other individuals, either American or foreign, who are interested in the subject.

U.S. ENRICHMENT FACILITIES

The U.S. Atomic Energy Commission operates three large gaseous diffusion plants at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Paducah, Ky.; and Portsmouth, Ohio. They represent an investment of some $2½ billion. Only about 15 percent of this capacity is required for military programs utilizing highly enriched uranium—almost pure uranium-235. The remaining capacity is made available to industry for producing the slightly enriched uranium—3 to 4 percent uranium-235—required to fuel power reactors.

The remarkable growth of the nuclear power industry suggests that the capacity of existing plants, even if improved and upgraded at a cost of about $800 million, will be fully utilized by about 1980. To meet the increasing demands, it is estimated that a new enrichment plant, costing almost $1 billion, will have to be brought on the line by 1980. Others must be added at approximately 5-year intervals until some time in the 1990's to meet the demand for separative work.

After that, it is expected that breeder reactors will come into general use. Since breeders will burn plutonium as their principal fuel, the demands for enriched uranium can be expected to diminish.

Classification of nuclear knowledge was critical in the early days of the program, when only the United States had atomic weapons and it wanted to retain its monopoly. Since then four other countries have acquired them—the United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., France, and Red China—but the practice of classification has been retained on the theory it may inhibit further nuclear weapons proliferation.

Recently, the AEC has disclosed a great deal of data about its enrichment activities. This is because the forthcoming demand for slightly enriched uranium and the enormous investment in new capacity it will require. Inasmuch as the United States taxpayer cannot be expected to make this investment on behalf of private industry, some new structure will have to be devised through which the private sector will supply the required investment.

To afford private enterprise the necessary access to data about the business, the AEC has declassified almost everything about the diffusion plants except their innermost secret—the manufacture of the diffusion barrier. The efficiency of the barrier plays a large role in determining the final cost of enriching uranium.

TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS

The principle upon which the plants operate is akin to that of a sieve. Uranium is combined with fluorine to produce uranium hexafluoride gas—UF-6. As the gas is pumped through the sieve-like barrier, the uranium-235 atoms pass through the barrier slightly easier than the minutely heavier uranium-238 atoms. By pumping the gas through a sufficient number of barriers, it becomes "richer" in uranium-235 as the uranium-238 atoms are screened out. The more times it is pumped through, the more it is enriched.

It is probable that the AEC's three diffusion plants will soon be transferred to a Government corporation with access to the private money market. A possible second step could be their further transfer to competing private companies or a regulated private monopoly. But even if the second step is pursued, it is likely the U.S. Government will retain its security wraps on barrier improvements and manufacturing.

The United States provides enriching services at cost to the private sector and overseas customers. The price is $26 per separative unit, short for kilogram unit of separative work," a term difficult to explain. Suffice it to say, the initial fuel loading of a 1,000-megawatt power reactor will require close to $10 million worth of separative work. Additional fuel over the 30-year life of a reactor will require some $5 million worth of work annually. Cost of separative work at the other free world enriching plants—Capenhurst in the United Kingdom and Pierrelatte in France—has not been revealed. However, all evidence points to its being considerably higher than U.S. costs. The same is almost certainly true of Soviet facilities.

It should be remembered that we Americans have a tremendous capability for minimizing costs in almost any kind of large-scale production work. We have had years of leadtime over others in this specific technology. Electric power to run the enrichment plants costs less than any place else in the world. And more to the point, since what is past is prologue, it can be said with 99.9 percent certainty that in the future no other nation will ever come close to U.S. enrichment costs.

Only last January, in its report on European uranium enrichment, Europe's counterpart of the U.S. Atomic Industrial Forum, called Foratom, asserted that development of new enrichment technology in Europe of whatever kind is "inconceivable" because it would add $140 million to the cost of a plant.

Foratom further declared that even if existing know-how is applied, the venture would require $25 million for R. & D. and involve construction and power costs higher than those in the United States. It is estimated that a small 2½-million-kilogram-per-year European plant would need a $17 million annual subsidy to break even with U.S. costs.

By comparison, the capacity of the U.S. plants is 17 million kilograms per year. In addition, after the United States adds its next diffusion plant the total capacity will be about 35 million kilograms per year, with considerable economies in scale over the 2½-million-kilogram facility studied by Foratom. Foratom's economic analysis of European separative costs ranges from $28.90 per unit to $36.72, depending on a number of variables. And I believe these estimates are significantly optimistic.

The additional U.S. enrichment requirements in coming years will not necessarily be supplied by diffusion plants. There are other enrichment processes which may become economic. During World War II, a method of separating U-235 and U-238 based on the principle of the centrifuge was attempted. It failed only because sufficiently durable materials were not then available to separate the two isotopes, as cream is separated from milk.

Today, new materials and technology are available. The AEC has long been interested in centrifuge development. However, since 1967 the work has been classified and no one has been allowed to report its progress.

The Japanese have been doing centrifuge research in parallel with diffusion R. & D. since 1964. They have progressed sufficiently in the laboratory with the development of a diffusion barrier fabricated with alumina to announce a capability to build a diffusion plant, should they decide to do so. It is not believed that Japanese progress either with barrier or centrifuge technology exceeds that of the Europeans. In addition, their power costs are considerably higher.

In Europe, Euratom has decided on a policy of independent European enrichment capability. With centrifuge work there having proceeded beyond the press release stage, a joint venture has been formed by the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and West Germany, to proceed with a demonstration plant. France has been invited to join the consortium and will probably accept.

Based on experiments with individual handcrafted centrifuge—and assuming that when hundreds of them are placed in a cascade they will all work right the first time and work perfectly in unison for a long time before whirling themselves apart—this group estimates a 250,000-kilogram-per-year cascade will cost out at $45.90 per separative unit and a 2½-million-killogram cascade at $27.60.

Admittedly, electric power costs for a centrifuge plant are lower than for a diffusion plant by a factor of around 4 to 5, and the capital investment is considerably less. Where centrifuge costs run up is in the operating area—repair and replacement. Despite extravagantly optimistic estimates, it is important to note that no experimental centrifuge has ever operated for sufficient time to provide dependable figures for the critical lifetime and maintenance factors involved. Until this occurs, the consortium's showy plans should not be taken too seriously.

A third technique for enrichment, known as the nozzle process, was developed by Dr. E. W. Becker at Germany's Karlsruhe Laboratory. It is not considered a choice for baseload enrichment due to its tremendous requirements for power. I have talked with Dr. Becker about his process and visited his pilot plant. His best prediction for the nozzle process is that it might possibly supply peak demands for enriching services during a few times when regular capacity is overloaded and cost becomes a secondary consideration.

My remarks thus far have explored some of the technical and economic factors involved in uranium enrichment. These necessarily are in the minds of our friends overseas when they consider whether to develop their own capacity.

POLITICAL FACTORS

There is one further factor involved. It is political. And it is simply whether other countries, in their own interest, should continue relying on the United States for this very important service. They must evaluate the price for this independence in terms of the cost and feasibility of providing their own enriched uranium.

What they do is strictly their own business. It would be quite unrealistic for them to permit U.S. worries over nuclear proliferation to loom very large in their final determinations. For this reason, it is my hope that the new Nixon administration will cease and desist from the previous policy of badgering them about it. Rather, it is my hope that the new administration will begin emphasizing some of the basic realities involved in those determinations.

That is what I am going to do in concluding my remarks today.

I shall do so by first outlining the remarkably generous arrangements which the United States offers foreign purchasers of uranium enrichment services and which it proposes to offer for all time in the future, whether through the AEC, a Government corporation or private management that operates U.S. enrichment capability.

The foreign purchaser may obtain any amount of separative units he wants. The AEC provides it at the current $26 price and guarantees not to raise that price above $30, even if U.S. costs escalate beyond that amount. The purchaser is guaranteed the supply he needs on time, and for the full 30-year life of his reactor. The foreign customer may cancel his obligation to purchase on only 3 years' notice, leaving the United States saddled with its investment in facilities to supply the full 30-year demand. Further, the foreign purchaser is not obligated to buy his raw material in the United States. He may purchase it at the cheapest cost anywhere in the world, then ship it here for nonprofit enrichment.

If but one adjective were to be applied to this permanently guaranteed policy of the United States toward its foreign friends, I believe the most fitting word would be "incredible."

But there is not a single, solitary reason for retaining such an incredibly generous policy for a foreign customer once that customer's own country decides to establish its own enrichment facilities.

Whenever that occurs, the United States will be relieved of its obligation to make large capital investments in both enrichment facilities and the powerplants necessary to operate them, for the benefit of foreign customers.

However, the United States would not necessarily discontinue foreign sales. It would have, and should have, the option to offer enrichment services to foreign purchasers if it chooses, on the price and terms it chooses.

For instance, the United States might want to make a profit by selling at a competitive price rather than a cost-reimbursing fixed price. For competitive reasons, perhaps the offering price could be somewhat below the price obtainable from enrichment plants in a potential foreign purchaser's own country.

At times when the U.S. balance of payments is in deficit, the United States might consider a policy of price cutting on the world market to obtain enrichment revenues to help restore the balance. Or when U.S. raw material purchasers need the business, we could condition sales of enrichment services on the purchase of all or part of the raw materials from U.S. mines.

Since alternate sources of enrichment services would be available, certainly there would be no need whatever to enter any foreign contracts for supply throughout the life of a reactor.

Such are the realities under consideration in Washington and which should be weighed in other capitals whenever the proliferation of uranium enrichment facilities is up for discussion.

Recently the distinguished American scientist and scholar, Dr. Manson Benedict of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, presented a detailed paper containing much useful data on the U.S. enrichment problem. I have included it below. Where Dr. Benedict and I differ on facts, I believe his to be more trustworthy. Where we differ on judgments, the choice of the reader is open.

Mr. Benedict's paper follows:

URANIUM ENRICHMENT

(Opening remarks by Manson Benedict at panel discussion of this subject at meeting of Atomic Industrial Forum, Palm Springs, Calif., March 13, 1969)

1. INTRODUCTION

All of the nuclear power plants built or planned in the United States require enriched uranium as fuel. The sole source of this enriched uranium is the complex of gaseous diffusion plants owned by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. At the projected rate of growth of the nuclear power industry, its requirements for enriched uranium will exceed the capacity of the present gaseous diffusion plants in less than ten years. Uranium enrichment is the only operation in the nuclear power industry which has not yet been transferred from governmental to private ownership. These facts make urgent consideration of the best means for meeting future demands for enriched uranium and have brought to the fore the question whether it is feasible or desirable to transfer the diffusion plants from governmental to private hands, and, if so, under what conditions.

To set the stage for a discussion of these questions by this panel, I will first summarize the main features of the AEC's present diffusion plants, next will estimate roughly the growth in demand for enriched uranium, and will then describe briefly the technical means for meeting future demands. Finally, I will list some of the alternative proposals which have been made for ownership and operation of uranium enrichment facilities and will point out some of the advantages and disadvantages of these proposals and difficulties associated with them.

2. U.S. DIFFUSION PLANTS

Although the details of the AEC's gaseous diffusion plants are still classified, much useful information about their characteristics and production costs were described in the recent report ORO-658, title AEC Gaseous Diffusion Plant Operations.[1] As most of you know, the AEC owns and operates three gaseous diffusion plants, at Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Paducah, Kentucky; and Portsmouth, Ohio. At present the three plants are operated as an integrated complex, with Paducah producing uranium enriched to about 1% U-235 which is used as some of the feed for Oak Ridge and Portsmouth. Oak Ridge produces uranium enriched up to 4% in U-235. Portsmouth uses as feed 1% enriched material from Paducah, 4% enriched material from Oak Ridge and other material and produces uranium at a variety of enrichments between 2 and 97%. All three plants strip tails to 0.2% U-235. Because of the great flexibility of these plants, they could alternatively be operated as three separate facilities, without interconnection, with no more than a 1% loss in capacity, provided Paducah wasn't required to enrich uranium above 4%. This flexibility could be achieved by rearranging the series and parallel connections among stages within each plant and by redistributing electric power input to the different stages.

Because of the almost infinite variety of product and tails enrichments at which these plants could be operated, it would not be especially informative to express their capacity in terms of the amount of product they could make of any one enrichment. Instead, it has become conventional to express their capacity in terms of a unit called *separative work*, which is nearly constant for a given plant supplied with a given amount of power, regardless of the uranium enrichment of its feed, product and tails, provided its stage connections are maintained in a configuration of maximum efficiency. To give you a feel for what separative work means, a plant with a capacity of one ton of separative work per day could produce 0.21 tons per day of 3.2% enriched uranium from 1.23 tons of natural uranium feed while stripping tails to 0.2% U-235.

The separative capacity of the three present plants when operated at maximum electric power input is given in Table 1. Thus, the Portsmouth plant operating on natural uranium feed and stripping tails to 0.2% could make 4800×0.21=1000 tons per year of 3.2% enriched product. Alternatively, it could make 21 tons per year of 90% enriched product.

Until recently, all three diffusion plants were operated with maximum electric power input to provide highly enriched U-235 for U.S. military purposes. Since these military needs were largely satisfied in the mid-1960's, the power input has been gradually reduced and will reach a low of about 2000 megawatts in FY 1970, at which the plants' output will be about 6900 metric tons of separative work per year. By then almost all of the plant product will be for civilian uses, in power and test reactors.

The AEC is now offering to provide toll enrichment services on long term contracts at a price for separative work not to exceed $30 per kilogram, with a provision for escalation of power costs and labor rates. The AEC's current charge for separative work is $26 per kilogram.

The AEC has stated that the direct cost of operating the present plants at full capacity is about $15 per kilogram, of which over $12 is for power.

The initial cost of the three plants was 2.3 billion dollars. The net value of the three plants on the AEC's books on June 30, 1967 after allowing for depreciation was 1.36 billion dollars. At this rate of depreciation, the book value of the plants by 1972 would be around one billion dollars. If private firms were to buy the plants then for that price, the unit investment cost would be one billion dollars divided by 17 million kilograms per year, or about $60 per kilograms per year. At a fixed charge rate of 25% per year, the fixed charge for separative work would be $15 per kilogram and the total cost to a private owner would be $30 per kilogram. Thus, it appears that the AEC's present ceiling price of $30 per kilogram is not inconsistent with private ownership of the plants, a fairly good return on investment, and recovery of book value by the government on sale of the plants in 1972.

TABLE 1.—SEPARATIVE CAPACITY OF U.S. DIFFUSION PLANTS

	Maximum electric power, (megawatts)	Maximum capacity, metric tons, separative work/year
Oak Ridge	1,700	4,900
Paducah	2,550	7,300
Portsmouth	1,750	4,800
Total	6,000	17,000

3. FUTURE DEMAND FOR SEPARATIVE WORK

A rough estimate of the future demand for separative work in the United States may be readily made from the enriched uranium requirements of light water reactors and the predicted growth rate of the U.S. nuclear power industry. Let us consider as a representative reactor the pressurized water reactor whose characteristics are listed in Table 2.

In report WASH-1084[2] the AEC gave an equation representing a median estimate of the rate of growth of nuclear electric capacity in the United States. Table 3 gives the installed capacity and annual growth rate predicted by this equation and the annual separative work required to provide makeup fuel for operating reactors and to charge new reactors.

The most important point brought out by this table is that U.S. demand for separative work will exceed the 17,000 ton-per-year capacity of present U.S. plants by the late 1970's. This relatively short time is what makes so urgent consideration of how best to increase uranium enrichment capacity. Demand continues to increase so rapidly that by 1985, plant capacity more than twice the present will be needed. Predictions beyond 1985 become progressively more uncertain, both because of uncertainties in the growth rate of nuclear power and in the rate at which fast breeders will be introduced. It seems likely, however, that the annual U.S. demand will remain as high as 40,000 tons per year at least till the year 2000.

The estimates of Table 3 may be slightly high for the following reasons. Boiling water reactors consume slightly less separative work than pressurized water reactors. Recycle of plutonium to light water reactors would reduce somewhat their separative work consumption. A few fast breeder reactors, which do not use enriched uranium, may be in operation by 1985. However, the continuing small production of enriched uranium for research and military purposes would make the total U.S. requirement for separative work somewhat higher, so that the estimates in Table 3 are probably not far off, unless the growth rate of nuclear power should be appreciably lower than the AEC's median prediction, as might be caused by substantial increases in nuclear power costs.

In this connection, it should be noted that an increase in the price of separative work of $1 per kg would increase the cost of electricity from a pressurized water reactor having the characteristics given in Table 2 by 0.022 mills/kwh.

TABLE 2.—PRESSURIZED WATER REACTOR

Capacity, megawatts:	
Electric	1,000
Thermal	3,125
Initial fuel charge:	
Metric tons uranium	68.5
Average percent of uranium-235	2.7
Percent of uranium-235 in makeup fuel	3.2
Burnup, megawatt-days per ton	31,500
Percent of uranium-235 in spent fuel	0.9
Average uranium makeup rate at 80 percent capacity factor, tons per year	29
Separative work requirements:	
Initial charge, metric tons	250
Average makeup, metric tons per year	130

TABLE 3.—ESTIMATE OF SEPARATIVE WORK REQUIREMENTS FOR U.S. NUCLEAR POWERPLANTS

	1975	1980	1985
Installed capacity, megawatts electric	60,000	145,000	255,000
Growth rate, megawatts electric per year	14.5	19.5	24.5
Separative work required, tons per year:			
For makeup fuel	7,800	18,850	33,150
For initial change	3,625	4,875	1,625
Total	11,425	23,725	39,275

In addition to the U.S. market for separative work, U.S. diffusion plants are expected to sell substantial amounts abroad. The AEC has estimated that the foreign market may be as high as 60% of the domestic and in fact has already contracted to supply over 10,000 tons of separative work overseas through toll enrichment.

Nevertheless, the extent to which U.S. enriched uranium will be sold abroad is very uncertain. The U.K. Atomic Energy Agency has announced plans to increase the capacity of its Capenhurst plant to 400 tons per year in the early 1970's, increasing to 1,200 tons per year later in that decade. This will satisfy English requirements but will not go far toward supplying other countries. Costs are said to be about 15% above the U.S. ceiling. The U.S.S.R. might offer to sell enriched uranium in Europe.

The gas centrifuge process is receiving increasing attention abroad. A cooperative program to investigate a jointly owned centrifuge plant was recently announced by British, Dutch and German interests. Dr.

---

[1] AEC Gaseous Diffusion Plant Operations, USAEC Report ORO-658, Feb. 1968.

[2] Forecast of Growth of Nuclear Power, WASH-1084, 1967.

Bogaardt, a leading Dutch investigator,[3] estimated that the unit capital cost of a 2,500 ton per year centrifuge plant would be $131 per kilogram per year, with direct operating costs of $8 per kilogram. With fixed charges of 25% per year, the unit cost of separative work would be $41 per kilogram, which is appreciably higher than from existing U.S. diffusion plants or from a new, large plant built at the AEC's estimated costs. Despite this, the centrifuge process has considerable appeal for countries wishing to have their own source of enriched uranium and willing to pay a higher price to be independent. Advantages of the centrifuge process are its lower specific power consumption, and the fact that the optimum size plant is much smaller than for gaseous diffusion, so that minimum unit cost is obtainable with a capital investment of only a few hundred million dollars, instead of around a billion dollars. Thus, it seems likely that gas centrifuge plants will be built abroad and will reduce foreign sales of separative work produced in the U.S.

4. MEETING FUTURE DEMANDS

Whether or not these foreign enrichment ventures materialize, it is clear that the demand for separative work will exceed present U.S. capacity by the late 1970's. To begin to meet this increased demand the AEC is starting to preproduce slightly enriched uranium in excess of the amount currently needed. In addition, it has formulated a cascade improvement program, which could be carried out between 1972 and 1976 at a total cost of $475 million and which would increase plant capacity by 4,700 metric tons per year. A further capacity increase of 4,100 metric tons per year could be achieved in 1976 and 1977 by a power uprating program, at a cost of $130 million, and with an increase in direct operating costs of $47 million per year. These measures, taken together, would increase the capacity of the present plants to 25,800 tons of separative work per year. The unit cost of this incremental separative work would be only $23 per kilogram, at a fixed charge rate of 25% per year. The increased capacity obtained by these plant improvement programs would meet U.S. requirements until the early 1980's. If the U.S. continues to supply most to the enriched uranium used abroad, the improved plants would be fully loaded by the late 1970's.

To meet the increasing requirements for separative work beyond that time, it will be necessary to build new plant capacity. The AEC has estimated that using improved diffusion technology available by 1975, a diffusion plant with a capacity 17,500 tons per year could be built at a new site for $1.3 billion, for a unit investment cost of $74 per kg per year. If the new plant were added to the present Paducah plant, the cost would be lower, $1.0 billion, for a unit investment cost of $57 per kilogram per year. In these new plants electricity at 4 mills per kilowatt hour would add only $9 per kg to the unit cost of separative work, and other direct operating costs would be under $1 per kg. Thus, the cost of separative work to a private owner of such a new plant, making a fixed charge on capital of 25% per year, would still be well under the AEC's present ceiling price of $30 per kg.

Wherever the new diffusion plant is built, it will be important to have dependable electric power available at 4 mills or less. Sources of energy worth considering are the low-cost, uncommitted hydro sites of northern Canada, low-cost strip-mined coal in the western United States, or a nuclear power plant itself, if costs can be brought back to 4 mills.

Another possible means for increasing U.S. uranium enrichment capacity would be to build a domestic gas centrifuge plant. Although all reliable information about this process is classified, prospective entrants into the uranium enrichment business will need to have full access to information on this process and its projected economies.

5. ALTERNATIVES FOR MEETING FUTURE DEMANDS

Because of the importance of ensuring timely, adequate and economic supplies of enriched uranium, the AEC has been evaluating a number of alternative arrangements for future production of separative work, and a number of specific proposals have been made both in government and industry. Before describing and discussing the individual alternatives, it is well to note some general requirements listed as follows which should be met in any future arrangement:

General requirements for uranium enrichment alternatives

1. Dependable production.
2. High efficiency and low cost.
3. Fair pricing.
4. Fair return to Government.
5. Protection of classified information.
6. Fulfillment of Government's commitments.

Reliable operation and dependable production is obviously of paramount importance.

It is important that future owners and operators of diffusion plants have the competence and incentive to reduce costs. Despite twenty years of experience with the diffusion process, there is still room for improvement which could reduce costs substantially. For example, power consumption in present plants is about four times the theoretical minimum and unit investment costs are high.

If nuclear power is to compete on an equitable basis with other sources of power, the price charged for separative work should represent neither a subsidy nor an unreasonably high profit.

If the present plants are sold, the government should receive a fair price for them, taking into account not only their initial cost, their expected future life and the cost of equivalent new facilities, but also the great value of the U–235 already produced for military purposes. Determination of what constitutes a fair price may well be one of the most difficult features of any proposal involving sale of existing plants.

So long as diffusion technology is classified, it will be desirable to keep a small as possible the number of organizations and individuals who are given access to this information.

Through agreements for cooperation and toll enrichment contracts, the U.S. government has incurred obligations all over the world to supply enriched uranium for periods up to thirty years. In any future arrangement, the government will have to ensure that these commitments will be honored.

In addition to these general requirements, a number of specific considerations which affect certain alternatives will appear in the forthcoming discussion of individual alternatives.

The alternatives to be discussed are listed below. These cover pretty well the full range of those proposed. Adoption of one of these alternatives as an interim arrangement in advance of another is also a possibility.

Alternatives for future production of enriched uranium

1. Continued AEC ownership of all facilities.
2. Ownership by new Government corporation obtaining funds from private sources, like TVA.
3. Joint ownership by Government and private interests, like Comsat.
4. Single, privately owned, regulated monopoly, like A.T. & T.
5. Sale of all three plants to separate private owners.
6. Sale of two plants to separate private owners, with interim retention of third plant by Government.

6. CONTINUED AEC OWNERSHIP

Continued AEC ownership of existing plants has recently been advocated by Chairman Holifield of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. It is pointed out that this alternative involves least disruption of present operations, that present operations are already efficient and reliable, and that it would not be necessary to disclose classified information to additional persons. The reasoning goes: We're doing all right now; why change?

The most serious difficulty with continuing the present arrangement is the likelihood that the AEC will find it difficult or impossible to obtain approval from the Bureau of the Budget and Congress to obtain funds first for preproduction and later for expanded facilities, when the increased production is to be for purely commercial purposes. This is especially true in the present period of budgetary stringency. Annual congressional appropriation is not the most dependable process for ensuring the increased production on a tight schedule which will be needed if the growth of nuclear power is not to be held back by lack of enriched uranium.

There are other drawbacks to continued AEC ownership which are common to the next alternative, ownership by a new government corporation like TVA, and which will be discussed with that alternative.

7. GOVERNMENT CORPORATION

The alternative of government ownership by a new corporation obtaining funds by borrowing from private sources like TVA has the big advantage of removing dependence on the Federal budgetary process and legislative appropriations. Another advantage is that it could be adopted without extensive negotiations between the government and private industry. Even though many, including myself, do not think this the best ultimate arrangement, it is regarded as a desirable interim arrangement to permit orderly development of means for meeting the future large increase in demand for separative work while a better ultimate arrangement is being worked out.

Other advantages of sale to a new government corporation include little interruption of existing operating arrangements, reassurance of prospective customers that separative work will be available when required, assured provision for future U.S. government needs, assured fulfillment of existing AEC commitments to supply separative work, minimal disclosure of classified information to additional groups, and reimbursement to the U.S. Treasury for the plants at a price considered fair by the government.

There are a number of disadvantages with government ownership of facilities producing primarily for the commercial market, in competition with private industry. The government uses different economic ground rules than are adopted by private firms responding to market influences. Traditionally, the government has used lower discount rates than private firms in evaluating capital expenditures. This leads to the government allocating more economic resources to productive ventures than private firms would and is viewed by many economists as a misuse of national resources. Use by the government of one set of ground rules in setting prices for separative work and use by private firms of another set in pricing alternative services or materials leads to biased competition and off-optimum allocation of resources. For example, if separative work were priced lower on the government pricing basis than it would be on the basis of private industry, more nuclear and fewer coal-burning plants would be built, at greater real cost to the nation, and to the serious disadvantage to coal producers.

---

[3] Mr. Bogaardt and F. H. Theyse: Some Considerations Regarding the Design and the Operation of an Ultracentrifuge Facility. Paper presented at Conference on the Isotope Separation of Uranium, sponsored by the Italian Atomic Energy Commission at Turin, Oct. 1–2, 1968.

Continued government ownership would entail continued loss of tax revenue by the government, unless the government's price for separative work exceeded its costs by an amount charged in lieu of taxes.

Another objection to continued government ownership is the absence of economic competition to induce producers to advance technology, reduce costs and be more flexible in meeting the needs of domestic customers. Despite the high quality of AEC management of the diffusion plants and the dedicated and cost-conscious operation of the plants by Carbide and Goodyear, one would expect service more responsive to domestic customers' needs under competitive private ownership, and probably lower costs.

8. JOINT GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

COMSAT-like joint ownership of all uranium enrichment facilities by a single company partly owned by the government and partly by private industry has many of the advantages and many of the drawbacks of ownership by a 100% government corporation. An additional advantage is that more of the principles and skills of private industrial management would be brought into the uranium enrichment industry. Partially offsetting this is the difficulty that representatives of different ownership interests, from government and from private industry, might have in reconciling divergent views and objectives. Also negotiations for sale of the plants would be more complex and time-consuming than to a government corporation.

9. SINGLE PRIVATE CORPORATION

Of several proposals for sale of the diffusion plants to a single private corporation, I'm going to comment on only one. This proposal was made recently by Philip Sporn, who contributed so much to the U.S. uranium enrichment industry by his imaginative creation of OVEC, a power generating company jointly owned by several utilities which supplied electricity at low cost to the Portsmouth diffusion plant. To purchase the diffusion plants Mr. Sporn has suggested creation of another OVEC-like corporation whose owners would be six to twelve of the leading power companies of the United States with heavy commitments to nuclear power. The new corporation would produce all the enriched uranium made in the United States. This corporation would guarantee to supply the government's own future needs for enriched uranium and would take over the AEC's contracts to supply separative work. On the strength of its long-term contracts, the new corporation would be able to raise as much as 90% of its capital by sale of bonds, as OVEC has done. Profits on the remaining 10% of its capital in the form of stock owned by the participating power companies would be limited by some Federal agency such as the AEC or Federal Power Commission, which would be responsible for regulating profits and all other features of this monopoly.

This arrangement has most of the advantages of sale to a government corporation, except for the greater length of time that would be needed to conclude arrangement between the government and a private group. In addition, it has the advantage of bringing some of the economic ground rules of private business into the uranium enrichment industry.

Compared with sale to three different owners of individual plants, sale to a single private corporation has the advantages of simpler and shorter negotiations, less disruption of existing operating arrangements, easier transfer of existing obligations of the AEC and disclosure of less classified information to fewer additional individuals.

There are however, a number of disadvantages to this arrangement which lead me to prefer having more than one firm provide enrichment services. The most serious objection I see to single corporate ownership is lack of competition, which provides such a strong incentive to improve service, advance technology and reduce costs. In addition, the lack of involvement of technically advanced companies from the process or manufacturing industries would deprive the uranium enrichment industry of the very substantial technical and managerial contributions these companies might make. Ownership of all uranium enrichment facilities by power companies which were the principal purchasers of its services and which in turn were not subject to the pressures of competition removes still further the spur of competition to keep the price of separative work low. Again, ownership of all uranium enrichment facilities by a single corporation could lead it to sell more separative work and buy less natural uranium than would represent an economic optimum. Finally, the proposed financing scheme of 90% debt and 10% equity reduces the tax revenue to the government compared with more usual industrial financing arrangements, even though it would reduce the cost of separative work and through it the cost of nuclear electricity.

Some of these disadvantages of a utility-owned monopoly could be mitigated by including firms from the process and manufacturing industries among the part owners.

10. THREE PRIVATE CORPORATIONS

Sale of each of the three diffusion plants to a different private corporation has been advocated in the recent report of the Atomic Industrial Forum's uranium enrichment study committee.[4] One big advantage of this arrangement is provision of competition in a normal economic environment. Competition should improve service to domestic customers, advance technology and reduce costs, and with suitable precautions would keep prices within reasonable bounds. Decisions between additional capital expenditures and increased operating costs would be made on the same economic basis used elsewhere in industry. This industry would compete on the same basis with the uranium mining industry and other elements of the nuclear fuel cycle, and with the fossil fuel industry. And most important, some of this country's leading process and manufacturing firms would be encouraged to bring their talents to bear on uranium enrichment technology and thus hopefully lower costs.

Sale to several private groups is not without problems. More individuals would have to be given classified information. Full details of gaseous diffusion technology and centrifuge technology would have to be disclosed to firms interested in purchasing a diffusion plant. Assurance would be required that the new plant owners would honor the AEC's present commitments to sell separative work and to supply the government's future needs for enriched uranium. Negotiations would be complex and time-consuming, so that transfer of the plants to their new owners would take longer than to a single corporation.

The most novel element of diffusion plant technology is the separating membrane, or diffusion barrier. The AEC has only one facility for developing and manufacturing barriers, at Oak Ridge. If all three plants were sold to different groups, the disposition of the barrier facility would present a problem.

With all three plants in private hands, it would be difficult for other firms to build additional diffusion plants because of the difficulty of gaining access to privately held, classified technology.

Finally, there is a real question whether three completely unregulated firms would provide fully effective competition. Studies by Robert Frederickson, one of my graduate students, have shown that U.S. demand for separative work will be relatively inelastic, that is, the amount of separative work sold would not greatly be affected by the price. With only a few firms in competition, self interest would cause higher prices to be charged than if many firms were competing. The remedy for this situation is either to have some form of price regulation or to make it easy for additional firms to enter the field if prices were raised above the cost to a new producer.

11. INTERIM SALE OF TWO PLANTS

To gain the advantages of private ownership of the diffusion plants by more than one firm while dealing with the problems just mentioned, the following compromise course of action has been suggested.

As an initial step, all diffusion plants would be sold to a single government-owned corporation authorized to borrow from private sources, so that preproduction and plant improvement could continue in an orderly manner. After a short time specified in its charter, the new corporation would offer for sale the Paducah and Portsmouth plants to two different private groups under competitive bids. The corporation would retain the Oak Ridge plant and barrier facility until a fourth plant was in operation, at which time the government would be committed to withdraw from the industry through sale of the Oak Ridge facilities. The government would announce that until that time separative work from the Oak Ridge plant and in the form of preproduced enriched uranium would be sold at or under the ceiling price of $30 per kilogram, escalated when necessary. The Oak Ridge plant would be used to fulfill the AEC's present commitments. The Oak Ridge plant would be used to provide information on gaseous diffusion technology to additional firms who decided to build new plants when the market justified new capacity. This would reduce the bar to entry of new firms which would exist if all plants were in private hands. This arrangement would provide indirect regulation of the price of separative work until at least four firms were competing. Interim retention of the Oak Ridge plant would give interested firms time to acquire capability to manufacture and improve barrier.

By these means uranium enrichment would become a normally functioning part of privately owned, competitive U.S. business, and the last, anomalous element of government ownership would be removed from the commercial nuclear power industry.

12. CONCLUSIONS

I'm going to conclude by stating three main points that I'm personally convinced of. First, continuation of the present arrangement of AEC ownership and operation of the diffusion plants will not ensure that uranium enrichment capacity will be expanded as rapidly as needed for the growing nuclear power industry. Second, sale of the diffusion plants to one or more private owners is both feasible and desirable. Third, competition among four or more independent plant owners is preferable to ownership of all plants by a single monopoly.

It will be interesting to hear the panel's views on these and related points.

---

[4] Private Ownership and Operation of Uranium Enrichment Facilities. Report of a Study Committee of the Atomic Industrial Forum, June 1968.

COMPARISON OF PRICES AND COSTS OF SEPARATIVE WORK

	Per kilogram
Prices:	
AEC's present price	$26
AEC's ceiling price for toll enrichment	30

	Capital cost	Capacity, tons per year	Unit investment cost, per kilogram-year	Direct operating costs per kilogram	Total cost [1] per kilogram
Cost:					
From present plants	$2,000,000,000	17,000	135	15.0	$48.75
	[2] 1,360,000,000		80	15.0	35
	[3] 1,000,000,000		59	15.0	29.75
From Cascade improvement	475,000,000	4,700	101		20.20
From power uprating	130,000,000	4,100	32	11.5	19.5
From new diffusion plant:					
At Paducah	1,000,000,000	17,500	57	10.0	24.25
At new site	1,300,000,000	17,500	74	10.0	28.5
From centrifuge	330,000,000	2,500	131	8.0	40.75

[1] Fixed charge rate is 25 percent per year

[2] Depreciated value as of 1967

[3] Estimated depreciated value as of 1972

CRIME

The **SPEAKER**. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **POFF**. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all my colleagues will agree, our constituents are deeply concerned—and, indeed, alarmed—about crime and rightly so. Crime has invaded the American home. It drops in through the mail slot. It pursues our children from the schoolyard. It is delivered in the grocery bags. Crime is not always violent; it can be insidious.

I am talking about the obscenity that is being put into the hands of our families through the use of the U.S. mails.

I am talking about the sale of narcotics and dangerous drugs which have been smuggled into this country and are put into the hands of our children by the professional—and often the desperate—criminal.

I am talking about the price we pay for organized crime, even in the weekly food bill.

A lock on the door or a policeman on the corner cannot provide adequate protection from this kind of criminal influence. There must be more. There must be a nationwide attack on this nationwide problem.

In launching this attack, we must know what we can expect in the way of leadership. We do not expect that this administration will produce a quick cure for what has become a chronic condition. What we do expect is that the administration will show us new approaches for using the laws we have to better attack the problems we have. Then, if this Congress is to use legislation as the problem-solving device it should be, we must use every means at our disposal to better understand the scope of the problems and how they affect the people of this country.

We can begin by looking at two or three areas of criminal activity.

In 1968 over a hundred thousand complaints about obscene materials in the mails were reported. How many more were unreported?

The adults in our society can reject the influences of lewd materials which come, without request, into their hands, but what about the influence on the children of our society? The use of the U.S. mail service is a matter of Federal responsibility. We must respond to the need for better regulation.

A more damaging influence than the smut peddler is the pot peddler in our society. Studies have revealed that use of drugs runs as high as 50 percent in certain population groups in the country. Even more appalling is the increasing number of young people who come under the influence of narcotics and dangerous drugs. There is a pressing need to stop the illegal flow of these drugs into our country and throughout the country.

Neither the dissemination of obscene materials nor the traffic in dangerous drugs is anything new. These activities have been with us for some time. What confronts us today, however, is the proportion to which these activities have begun to affect us all—and especially our young people.

There are many other areas I could mention, but I will move on to that hydraheaded principal citizen in the world of illegal activity. He is an empire builder who funds his vast enterprises with profits from crime. He is a businessman of the first order who controls money and who controls lives that could otherwise be contributing to lawful productivity in this country. This principal citizen of the underworld is organized crime.

The Task Force on Organized Crime of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice reported:

> The price of a loaf of bread may go up one cent as the result of an organized crime conspiracy, but a housewife has no way of knowing why she is paying more. If organized criminals paid income tax on every cent of their vast earnings everybody's tax bill would go down, but no one knows how much.

Dealing in narcotics, loan sharking, gambling, and through the infiltration of legitimate business, organized criminal groups extend their operations to every corner of this country.

Profits from any illegal transactions flow into the channels of organized crime and fill its giant financial reservoirs. It is this fact which makes this area of criminal activity so awesome. We have laws to cope with this problem, but we need determination to use them more effectively.

In enumerating even a few of the problems of law enforcement, I would be remiss if I did not mention our system of corrections.

Our concern with crime does not end when we have enforced a law and convicted a lawbreaker. Our concern merely shifts from focusing on the illegal activity to focus on the individual who has offended.

Too often a prisoner is released only to repeat his pattern of behavior. In this respect we are failing in our corrections system.

Not only do we frequently fail to return a better citizen to free society, but we sometimes return a person who presents a greater danger than when he was incarcerated in the first instance. We must find a means to insure that those who first enter our prisons do not become the students of the hardened criminals they find there.

Mr. Speaker, it is a time for a new commitment to more effective Federal leadership in the fight against crime. With meaningful leadership and a sincere effort on our part to better understand the problems against which we need to legislate, we can find solutions. But we cannot find them all ourselves. No governmental unit, State or Federal, can fight this battle alone. We must have a concerted effort.

All across this country there are citizens and groups of citizens who would lend their knowledge and energies to thwart this invasion of crime. As a part of our concerted effort, we must involve these people so that we may profit from their ideas and their experiences. We must find a way. I believe this administration, with the support of Congress, can find the way.

TALKING THE NITTY GRITTY ABOUT COLLEGE DISORDERS

The **SPEAKER**. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **EDWARDS** of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the outbreak of violence at Harvard University in the past few days provides fresh evidence that disorder in American colleges and universities is with us today as much as ever.

The Harvard situation also reveals still another sign that the Students for a Democratic Society—SDS—plays a consistent role in campus disorder, a role that must be considered as significant in any realistic appraisal of this matter.

One of the student leaders of SDS at the University of Wisconsin was quoted recently on the methods SDS uses to reach students. He said they start by talking to people on the top floor of a dormitory, and work down. He says:

> We talk nitty gritty, basic radicalism, getting control of your life from the forces which are manipulating you.

He adds that they pick the issues that can be given a "nitty gritty context" like draft resistance, the rental rate of rooms, party rules, and regulations for visiting hours in dormitory rooms.

The idea is that ferment spreads to all floors of the dorm, and then to other areas of the campus. And soon you have got a riot, or a sit-in, or some form of disorder going.

This kind of activity is a very real part, though not the whole story, of the campus disorders which have taken place in recent months.

These disorders are complex in their origin and in their variations. And they are serious because they have produced interruptions in classes, hate and misunderstanding, and even violent death to some.

I believe there is a deep need for all concerned to consider these events carefully, try to get a proper perspective, and try to separate the sense from the nonsense: in short, to talk the nitty gritty.

With that in mind we should take a moment to see just who the people are who have become involved, and who are affected, by these campus disorders. And having determined who the people are, then let us talk nitty gritty.

THE ORGANIZERS

Let us consider first the people who are doing the rioting. These are of two groups, the organizers and the organized. Of these two groups the organizers are a small minority in numbers, but their organizing activity has real and decisive influence in the nature of the disorder.

The organizers themselves are of two groups. The first are the so-called white radicals who rise to whatever cause seems to have high potential for the agitation of student emotion and protest on any particular campus.

The issue may be room rental rates, black studies programs, draft resistance, authority to hire and fire faculty members, or other issues, such as the ROTC program which is the issue at Harvard today.

These people say they oppose the "establishment" in general, and their college administrators in particular. They say the education programs must be more relevant, and that students must have more say in running the campus. They claim to stand for social justice.

The second group of organizers are the so-called black militants who focus their attention on what they say is the need for better breaks for black students.

This means more black students admitted, more black faculty members hired, and more, not less, separate campus activity for blacks, including segregated living quarters in some cases, and programs of black studies.

The idea of black separatism is very alive on some of our college campuses. At the new Federal City College in Washington, D.C., for example, the concept of black studies has mushroomed in a few short months.

The idea started with courses in humanities and social sciences to convey a realistic view of the constructive role played by blacks in our country. Today it has grown in its concept to a college within a college designed to build a separate "black nation" through militancy and violence.

The new approach might include courses in black physical education with instruction in karate—though it is Japanese in origin—stick fighting, riflery, and the "African hunt." And also "black mathematics."

The proposed curriculum, according to my information, provides for the first 2 years devoted to eradicating "white values" from the minds of new students. The latter 2 years are intended for structuring attitudes of separatism.

The man heading the black studies program evidently is a man who has lectured students elsewhere on the making of firebombs and handgrenades.

While not all the faculty, and perhaps only a minority of the students at Federal City College share these militantly separatist views of what a black studies program should be, the direction of the project must be of great concern for those who have believed that integration, not segregation, is our national policy.

Federal City College depends on congressional appropriation for a substantial proportion of its support. Can Congress responsibly vote funds for a college which appears to foster such an approach to education? I do not think it can.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee I will want to know if the college provost has been correctly quoted as saying "A well-disciplined and intense cadre of white radicals and black separatists who neglect academic principles for revolutionary ends" has almost taken over the faculty of Federal City College.

These organizers, black and white, are skillful, well-trained, cynical people whose interests are not constructive, but destructive. Some, but not all, are associated with SDS. Some are not really students at all, but pretend to be.

Some remain in one place and become known as local people, while others go from campus to campus. Most concentrate their activity at college level, but some are now working vigorously at the high school level peddling drugs, hate, and obscenity as part of their organizational work.

The nitty gritty to consider here is that these people do not in any way want to make education work better. On the contrary, they are working for revolution pure and simple. They seek to destroy, not build; to kill off the democratic system, not improve it.

THE ORGANIZED

The second major category of persons involved in campus disorder are those who simply respond to the agitational techniques of the organizers.

And there is a fertile field of young people who are susceptible, receptive to the seeds of distrust, misunderstanding, hate, and violence planted among them.

The college-age population of our country today is the first generation weaned on television. These are people who have vicariously experienced an incredibly broad range of events, from orbiting the moon, to heart transplants, from monstrous science-fiction violence to deathly combat in Asian jungles, all in living color.

Problems of the world have been neatly packaged for these young people in 5- or 15-minute wrapups just before the special reports on starvation in Biafra. They have been interpreted in honeytoned voices which in some cases have become more familiar than those of mother and dad, but just on what basis this interpretation is prepared, few can be expected to inquire.

Scientific advancement has been awesomely fast in the past 15 years, far faster than anyone's moral judgment can match. Broadcast and printed advertisements have promised instant solutions for all kinds of maladies both real and imagined.

Furthermore, Government has been guilty of engaging irresponsible in promising easy solutions to immense problems. Total reliance on Government has been encouraged while individual and family reliance has been discouraged. Irresponsibility has been fostered as an ingrown element of official Government programs.

In too many cases the parents of today's college-age people have believed that maximum permissiveness was the only way to encourage self-expression, and that this was the main goal. Providing direction to a child has been considered to be an inhibiting influence.

Is it any wonder that college students are susceptible to those who claim to stand for social justice?

Most college students today are morally sensitive, impatient, sophisticated, and filled with a sense that the world is such a mess that about any course of action they devise would have to provide improvement. To this extent their attitudes should be welcomed, and encouraged in a positive, constructive direction.

But with some, their impatience exceeds and distorts their perspective. They seek instant gratification, and see no reason why they shouldn't have it.

Without goals, without a real concept of direction either for themselves or for their communities or their country, and without an understanding of comparative political and economic realities, they easily drift into attitudes of alienation. They support nothing and oppose everything.

They are easy game for the organizers who urge "socially significant" mob action as a means of establishing "justice" and "relevancy." In the nitty gritty context, the manipulators have gained control of the alienated, not in any radical or innovative way, but in the same way despots have gained control of the masses from the beginning of history right down through Hitler, Stalin, and Mao Tse-tung.

THE SERIOUS STUDENTS

But these organizable students are not the majority at all. The majority of today's students are aware, morally sensitive, intelligent people who retain their perspective. What they want is simply to pursue their education.

These serious students, white and black alike, probably do not give full approval to their college administration in most cases. But they are responsible, energetic, capable, and most important, understanding that an education will provide them with immense opportunity.

They sense, and rightly so, I think, that while nobody owes them a living, their opportunities for an education are very valuable, and that with an education their prospects for pleasant and productive lives within the system are virtually unlimited. They want change on the campus to be constructive, not destructive.

The nitty-gritty consideration here is that these serious students ought to be accorded full rights to pursue their education free of disruption engineered by the malcontents.

To say that a minority of students can rightfully close down a college or university when the majority wishes to learn, and to do this under the camouflage of social justice, is blatant hypocrisy.

THE COLLEGES

Now what about the colleges themselves? Do they need improvement? Of course they do. Many of them provide only very impersonal, computerized contact between the student and the college administration.

At one university each student's primary identification is his social security number, for example. And it may be that in social sciences, education, and humanities, there are tendencies to drift away from the kind of study material today's students would consider most useful.

There is probably a core of legitimacy to many of the major complaints heard on the campus today. The tendency for an established system of administration to perpetuate itself in its own image must be at least as strong on a college campus as in business, government, or elsewhere.

But the nitty gritty to consider here is that our system of higher education must be doing something right, or we would not see our economic, scientific, industrial, and yes, our cultural achievements be what they are today.

They must be doing something right or U.S. higher education, in terms of its overall quality, and availability, would not be the immense envy of almost every nation in the world today.

To suggest that dissent has been stifled on college campuses in this country is absolute tommyrot. In no place and at no time in the world have opportunities for student expression of opinion, whatever that opinion may be, been greater than on the American campus today.

The militants, black and white alike, are as phony as they can be when they use the shibboleth of "dissent" as a tool with which to organize student mob action. They do not want improvement of the education system, they clearly want its destruction. They do not want reform, but closing of the classrooms.

Concerned students must come to draw the distinction between constructive improvement and destructive emotionalism: between those who really want an education and those who seek to manipulate others as a weapon for bringing down the social, educational, and cultural fabric of the Nation.

THE GOVERNMENT

When disorder breaks out on a college campus there is a natural reaction among many people to have the Government, Federal or State, jump into the fray and restore order. But while there are some steps government can take, the realistic solutions must develop on the campus itself. The National Guard, the Army, and Federal dictation have no place in education. The strength of American education is in its decentralized character, not in centralized authority. Washington cannot, and should not, be in the business of standardizing admission qualifications, hiring faculty, regulating visiting hours in dormitories, or otherwise imposing its will on matters which are rightfully the responsibility of colleges and universities themselves.

College administrators should, in my view, be quick to eject from the campus those individuals who show their motives to be destructive rather than constructive. Some have done this. More should follow.

But they must be afforded every opportunity to keep their own house in order before Goverment takes it upon itself to interfere. And yet, because of the violence, the destruction of property, the take-over of school buildings, the use of the National Guard and other elements of the Government in some cases becomes essential. Of course this is regrettable.

The Government can help in other ways. What are some of the steps that the Government can properly take?

To help deal with the core agitators, Attorney General John N. Mitchell has said that the Justice Department is vigorously investigating possible violations of the antiriot provisions of the 1968 Civil Rights Act.

As one of the sponsors of the antiriot provision I am encouraged by this development. This provision makes it a Federal crime to cross State lines with intent to incite or organize or encourage or participate in a riot.

The Attorney General has said that small numbers of people are doing just that today in events leading to college disorders. This law should be enforced. It is my judgment that the intent of Congress stands in support of enforcement and that the public takes the same position.

Another way the Federal Government becomes involved is in connection with its program of assistance. Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act permits Federal agencies to withhold funds from programs in which there has been found to be discrimination on account of race, color, or national origin in the application of such funds.

The militant advocates of black studies programs are blatantly promoting programs that clearly meet this definition in cases where Federal programs are involved. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appears to be taking action in this regard. The issue appears to be drawn. I am convinced that the people of our country today in 1969 expect to see an evenhanded application of provisions of this kind. Segregation, if a wrongful phenomenon by terms of legislation, executive branch policy, and Supreme Court decision, then must be wrong wherever it occurs. And if black militants now demand segregation, consistency demands that either we act against it or else undertake a massive new look at the whole issue of segregation itself.

Still further, Congress provided in 1968, in amending the Higher Education Act, that Federal school assistance to an individual be cut off when an institution determines that he has been convicted of a crime or when he willfully refuses to obey a regulation of the institution and the refusal is of a serious nature and contributes to a disruption of the institution's activities. This is a mild measure because it leaves the primary discretion where it was at the beginning, with the college administrator. However, it does provide the college with an additional tool for handling its affairs.

A more effective action was taken by Congress in adding to the fiscal 1969 HEW appropriations bill a provision that bars Federal aid to any student who has been convicted of a crime in connection with college disorders. Federal action under this law, however, depends first on a conviction having in fact been made. It does not authorize blanket Federal action in cutting off aid. In this connection it is useful to note that legislatures of some 18 States are now considering some form of antidemonstration laws. They should be encouraged. As convictions of illegal behavior increases then the Federal Government will be enabled to at least stop helping the troublemakers.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should, in my view, and in the view of millions of Americans, use the legal tools at its disposal to maximum effectiveness. And I feel optimistic that this will be the case. According to my information the Department has sent notice to the Nation's colleges that convicted campus demonstrators are not eligible for Federal aid. I regard this as a first step in the right direction. Additional steps should be taken soon.

CLEARING THE AIR

It seems evident that what we need on the college campus today is a clearing of the air. There has been a great deal of fog—confusion that has developed, and deliberately developed, by small numbers of organizers who are using other persons for their own ends.

These organizers claim to champion the cause of free expression, nonconformity, and participatory democracy, but they really are working to produce an anarchy which would be followed by the tightest authoritarian government. I believe they understand this. The end result would be suppression of freedom, rigid conformity, and a police state.

An important key to the behavior of these people is that they indulge themselves in the easy act of negativism, entering criticism of what exists, but they stop there. When asked to suggest in a positive way what it is they set forth as an improved system they are very vague. The fact is they have either nothing at all to suggest or else they really favor a dictatorial system which they dare not mention in the knowledge that if they did so their gross hypocrisy would be exposed.

They say they need to be afforded a greater measure of responsibility in their own lives and in the administration of colleges, but one of their first demands is often to be granted assurance that they will not be held responsible for their disorderly activity.

This is absurd. They talk first about the need for open discussion of their grievances, but end by presenting demands they say are "nonnegotiable."

The nitty gritty to consider here is that these organizers are not really opposed to power and the establishment. On the contrary they simply want to be the establishment and to have the power themselves.

They are not libertarian, but authoritarian. They do not want free individuals, but individuals subservient to them. They do not want free inquiry, but rather a closing off of debate and discussion, enforced by their own decree and their own power.

These are the facts as I see them. It is my hope that persons concerned with this problem will utilize reason and commonsense in their considerations, and that our education system will continue to grow and improve and serve our Nation well.

THE EMERGENCY SMALL LOAN PROGRAM: ITS BENEFITS TO THE ROSEBUD SIOUX TRIBE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Farbstein) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks I have been calling attention to the emergency small loan program which was established in 1966 by my amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Through the provisions of this program low-income families have been able to secure small loans, not exceeding $300, to meet immediate and urgent family needs. These loans bear an interest rate of 2 percent and are subject to those other terms and conditions which a local emergency loan authority may prescribe.

At present this program is operating in at least 15 locations throughout the country. In surveying the results of this program to date, I have been in contact with most of the local units and am gratified at the success which the incoming reports detail.

It has been especially pleasing to follow the progress of the program established with the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, of Rosebud, S. Dak., located in the Second Congressional District of South Dakota. The participants in this program are well represented in Congress by the Honorable E. Y. Berry. They are participating in the type of program we should have extended to these and other Indians long ago. A loan for emergency purposes is something to which most adults have ready access; the negotiations of such a loan for various urgent family needs is no uncommon matter, even for those families which are relatively well off financially. Paradoxical as it may sound, emergency loans are easily available to those who need them least and unavailable to those who need them most. Commercial lending agencies will not make loans to families whose incomes are so meager as to constitute an unacceptable risk to the lender. The emergency small loan program amendment was enacted to fill the breach in the general coverage provided by private lending agencies. Unlike commercial lending agencies, however, the emergency small loan program services a clientele whose income, at best, provides only the necessities of life; any constriction of income, therefore, affects their vital needs immediately. Consequently, we can easily imagine how important an innovation the emergency loan program has been.

Let me turn to the pertinent specific facts of this program. The emergency loan program originally made $15,000 available to the OICIYAPI Federal Credit Union of Rosebud. This $15,000 was used to make a total of 196 loans. Of this amount $6,088.93 has been repaid along with $159.47 in interest which has been forwarded to the U.S. Treasury Department. Administrative costs credited against loan funds have been only $440.47. The program allows a certain flexibility where delinquent loans are involved and repayment will be slower in some cases than in others. The community development specialist administering the program has so many basic needs which the loan program was devised to serve that he has recommended a major increase in funds to service those needs.

In thinking about this type of legislation our field of vision is somewhat dimmed by our distance, geographically and socially, from the give-and-take with the poor which the administrator out in the field experiences. Clarity, in this respect, might therefore be increased by including a comment from the response to my letter by the administrator on the Rosebud Indian Reservation. We should take note of the hopeful and persevering tone which his remarks reflect:

> If a person would stop to realize that this money was loaned to the true poorest of the poor then you could call this true success. These poor people have not stopped paying on their loans. Granted the payments are small, but at times the payments are even more than they could afford, when they make sacrifices so they can make their loan payments it makes a person proud to be associated with them.

The participants on the Rosebud Indian Reservation offer us an insight into the potential of this program. The conclusions drawn from reflections upon poverty in America no longer point to the acceptance of a permanent welfare clientele. They point, rather, toward full participation in America's economy and full citizenship in her political processes. The emergency loan program is not a dole, not a handout, and not a giveaway; but, instead, it is the essential ingredient in the recipe of self-help and the mainspring in the dynamics of productive citizenship. The recipients are encouraged to solve their own problems with the assistance of a small loan and their own resources of wit and determination. The success of their own efforts, besides developing initiative and innovative skills, results in a sense of pride on repayment and dignifies their lives by demonstrating the value of their own abilities. We are indeed fortunate, therefore, to have a program established on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation among a people whose traditions include a strong emphasis on self-reliance. Sometimes considered the forgotten American, the Sioux Indian can now illustrate to the rest of this Nation the power of pride, dignity, and self-reliance if but given the chance; they remind us of others we have forgotten who need the same chance.

We are fortunate to have these people participating and could undertake few projects more worthy than the extension and expansion of the emergency small loan program.

THE NATION NEEDS AND DEMANDS TAX REFORM NOW

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Reuss) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on April 3 I testified before the House Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 5250, the Tax Reform Act of 1969, which would plug 13 of the leading loopholes in our Federal tax system and bring in an additional $9 billion a year in revenue. A total of 42 Congressmen have now sponsored H.R. 5250 and later identical or substantially identical bills.

The following is the text of my prepared remarks before the Ways and Means Committee:

> Public clamor for a reform of our complex, inequitable and unbalanced tax structure mounts daily. The Nation is paying and has paid very dearly for the failure of successive administrations and congresses to carry out such reforms. It has often been said that tax reform is always in order, but this is a particularly propitious time for Congress to take the lead to carry out a tax reform of our jerry-formed tax structure.
>
> I have introduced H.R. 5250, which would plug 13 of the leading loopholes in our federal tax system. Identical or substantially identical bills have been introduced by 32 other members: Mr. Meeds, of Washington; Mr. Rees, of California; Mr. William D. Ford, of Michigan; Mr. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Adams, of Washington; Mr. Bingham, of New York, Mr. Brown, of California; Mr. Zablocki, of Wisconsin, Mr. Edwards, of California; Mr. Gibbons of Florida; Mr. Conyers, of Michigan; Mr. Long, of Maryland; Mr. St. Onge, of Connecticut; Mr. Farbstein, of New York; Mr. Podell, of New York; Mr. Byrne, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Thompson, of New Jersey; Mr. Mikva, of Illinois; Mr. Eilberg, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Yatron, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Rosenthal, of New York; Mr. Vigorito, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Koch, of New York; Mr. Nedzi, of Michigan; Mr. Dingell, of Michigan; Mr. MacDonald, of Massachusetts; Mr. Blatnik, of Minnesota; Mr. Karth, of Minnesota; Mr. Roybal, of California; Mr. Brademas, of Indiana; Mr. Madden, of Indiana; and Mr. Vanik, of Ohio.
>
> H.R. 5250 would plug the following loopholes, yielding the following additions to the federal revenues:
>
> Cut the 27½ percent oil depletion allowance to 15 per cent, with comparable cuts on other minerals—savings $900 million
>
> Tax Capital gains presently untaxed at death—savings $2.5 billion
>
> Repeal the 7 per cent investment tax credit—savings $3 billion
>
> Eliminate unlimited charitable deductions—savings $60 million
>
> Eliminate special tax treatment for stock options—savings $150 million
>
> Eliminate the income tax exemption for the first $100 in dividend income—savings $225 million
>
> Eliminate tax benefits derived from or-

ganizing multiple corporations from a single firm—savings $200 million

Remove the tax exemption on municipal industrial development bonds—savings $50 million

Provide a federal interest subsidy to states and localities as a substitute for tax exempt bonds—savings $900 million

Establish the same rate for gift and estate taxes by raising the gift tax rate 25 per cent—savings $150 million

Eliminate payment of estate taxes by the redemption of government bonds at par—savings $50 million

Limit hobby farmers' use of farm losses to offset other income—savings $400 million

Eliminate accelerated depreciation on speculative real estate—savings $150 million

The $9 billion which would be yielded annually by plugging these loopholes is precisely the yield projected by the Administration in its request for extending the 10 per cent surtax for a year following June 30, 1969. Raising all the needed $9 bilion by plugging loopholes rather than by extending the surtax would be the best solution. A good second best solution would be to plug as many loopholes as possible, and reduce the rate of the extended surtax as needed to reflect these added revenues.

Detailed testimony concerning the loopholes specified in H.R. 5250 has been and will be given on other occasions. Today, I shall concentrate on some of the overall reasons why the need for tax reform is both imperative and immediate:

1. The Taxpayers Revolt: An outraged public is smarting with a sense of grave injustice from a tax code that provides special privileges, producing drastically different tax bills for different individuals and families with essentially similar economic status. When 150 taxpayers with incomes over $200 thousand per year can pay little or nothing at all, it is not surprising that the public is in a mood for revolt.

When taxpayers in the very highest brackets pay tax rates as low or lower than paid by relatively modest tax payers, when they pay anything at all, it is not surprising that the public is outraged. Nor is it surprising that the outgoing Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Joseph Barr, warned the Joint Economic Committee in January that unless there was immediate tax reform we could look forward to a tax-payers' revolt. This would be particularly serious since our major tax, the income tax, is an essentially self-enforced or self-assessed tax.

We need tax reform now, not later, because the cost to the taxpayer of dealing with the present complex and inequitable structure is mounting to unreasonable levels. When taxpayers of modest means go to substantial costs of hiring a tax counsel to fill out their annual tax returns, something is wrong. When a retiree has difficulty understanding how to file a tax return involving his pension, something is really wrong. We need to do a drastic job of simplifying the tax structure, reducing the numbers of loopholes and special privileges so as to reduce the cost to taxpayers for compliance with the law, and to eliminate incentives to spend time and resources on tax evasion rather than productive activity.

2. Tax Reform Can Fight Inflation: The time is propitious for tax reform because inflation continues to mount unabated, despite the passage last year by the Congress of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. Indeed, there is some evidence that the inflation is accelerating. Consumer prices have been rising at a rate just short of 5 percent a year. The Nation's demand for goods and services in the first quarter of this year was apparently somewhere between 8 and 9 percent above the first quarter of last year, although official figures are still lacking, and private demand is being driven upward by an investment demand completely outside the bounds of prudence. The most recent survey, the Commerce-SEC Survey of Plant and Equipment, estimates that expenditures for plant and equipment will be 14 percent higher than in 1968. This, in the face of an operating rate of less than 85 percent in manufacturing and the fact that such investment last year was already at an unsustainably high rate, according to some experts.

One cannot be complacent about the inflationary threat if one thumbs through the forecasts for this year that have been made over successive months, for they show a tendency for each successive round of appraisals to be more optimistic than the previous one. Since the inflation is decidedly unbalanced, and in the private sector largely sparked by excessive investment, it is clear that additional fiscal policy steps must take the form of tax reform that can sharpshoot, so to speak, at the precise sources of the difficulty. Loopholes that particularly produce inflation are the investment tax credit, the hobby farm loophole, and the accelerated depreciation provisions on speculative real estate. All these inflate the price of capital goods of farm land, and of urban real estate.

3. Tax Reform Can Fight Inflation Without Increasing Unemployment: We need tax reform now at this session because we cannot afford to rely wholly on a meat-axe approach, chopping away at demand in general via across-the-board expenditure cuts or across-the-board tax increases, since this would simply produce mounting unemployment and recession which we cannot afford. It is not fair to ask the less fortunate in society to bear the burdens of stopping an inflation in the form of mounting unemployment. Tax reform has the virtue that it can be aimed directly at the sources of our difficulty.

4. Tax Reform Is Needed To Raise Revenue For Crying Social Needs: As a Nation we have postponed action, or have done too little, on the whole range of pressing social problems, ranging from retraining of the chronic unemployed through reconstruction of our central cities, producing adequate housing for low income families, to education and adequate health protection. Violence and riots from coast to coast warn us that the time for further postponement is over. At the same time, an outraged public will not stand for putting the burden of these problems exclusively on middle-income recipients while the rich and the speculators go comparatively untouched. If we are to meet our obligations and to bring some semblance of peace to our distressed nation, we shall have to create a greater sense of social justice, and this means meeting our problems head-on and raising the needed revenue by a tax structure which everyone will realize is reasonably equitable.

5. Tax Reform Is Essential If We Are To Prevent The Bankruptcy Of Thousands Of State And Local Governments: Already the press carries rumors that some urban school systems may be unable to re-open next September. The difficulties of our cities is, in part, an outmoded structure of the governments of our state and local municipalities. But it is also the result of inflation. Over the last 40 years the cost of operating State and local governments has gone up 1½ to 2 times as fast as has the general price level, while at the same time it is well known that the revenue of these government units go up at best in line with the general price level, perhaps somewhat less rapidly. Thus in an inflationary situation, the cost for any given level for services by local government goes up much more rapidly than their sources of revenue. We will never be able to solve the difficulties of providing adequate State and local governments services as long as we allow inflation to continue unchecked.

6. Tax Reform Is Needed To Protect Our Competitive Free Enterprise System: I am sure that all of you are well aware of the enormous burst of mergers—particularly conglomerates—that has occurred in recent years. The tax law quite evidently favors such mergers. We need to be concerned to change tax structures in such ways as to remove the incentives which promote giant mergers of capital via conglomerates. We cannot expect a healthy competitive system marked by imaginative innovations in products, services, and techniques, if we permit the tax structure to favor the elimination of competition of that independent, innovative spirit which marks a true free enterprise system.

Now let me turn to just one specific loophole—the 7 percent investment tax credit*—because its immediate repeal has so much to be said for it.

Congress knows how to rid itself of the 7 percent investment tax credit. We did it in 1966. But then in an unguarded moment we reinstated it in 1967. We must now rid ourselves of it for good.

Here are three principal reasons why the investment tax credit should be repealed:

1. It Would Recapture $3 Billion A Year For The Revenues: This is no small amount—in fact, it is precisely one-third of the $9 billion that would be raised by continuing the 10 percent surcharge past next June 30.

2. It is A Leading Cause Of Inflation: The most overheated section of the economy is in capital equipment, which is directly stimulated by the investment tax credit. The latest Department of Commerce predictions envisage a 14 percent increase in capital equipment spending this year over last year's record-breaking total. And this is occurring at a time when capital investment has so far outrun consumption that our industrial establishment is operating at only 84 percent of capacity. The 10 percent surtax is failing to reduce inflation because of the perverse effects of that other part of our tax system—the investment tax credit.

3. It Is At Least Partially Responsible For Our Present Sky-High Interest Rates, The Highest In 100 Years: The expected $73 billion in capital investment spending this year is at its swollen size largely because of the investment tax credit. Tight money and high interest rates are by no means entirely chargeable to Federal Reserve parsimony with the money supply. The Federal Reserve last year increased the money supply at an inflationary rate, and even this year it has been increasing the money supply at an annual rate of 2 percent—the figure postulated by the Joint Economic Committee as just about right. What causes the tight money and the high interest rate is excessive borrowing by business for unnecessary capital equipment—unnecessary because we are only using 84 percent of it. The banks are devoting a large part of their lending resources to this excessive investment financing. More, they are repatriating Eurodollars by the billion for this purpose. High interest rates do not much deter business expansion, as the 7 percent investment credit in effect provides a subsidy that insulates against high inter-

---

* The salient features of the investment tax credit are: (1) a taxpayer earns the right to claim a tax credit by making an investment; (2) the credit is equal to 7 percent of the value of each installation of eligible equipment; (3) the investment credit is available only on certain types of equipment (Sec. 38 items), not on all types and not on structures; (4) the amount of credit that can be claimed in any one year is equal to $25,000, plus not more than 25 percent of the taxpayers' liabilities for the particular year; (5) unused tax credits in any particular year may be carried back 3 years and forward 5 years; and (6) the credit is earned in the year in which the equipment is installed and put in service.

est rates. But the home-building industry and state and local governments have no such subsidy, and bear the brunt of the interest burden.

The Joint Economic Committee in its 1969 report, issued April 2, 1969, said:

"First priority in tax reform should be given to repeal of the investment tax credit as a significant step toward reducing inflation."

At the recent Joint Economic Committee hearings, Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy said that he had an "open mind" on the repeal of the credit. Since then, unfortunately, he has indicated that his mind has closed and that he favors retaining the credit. I hope that the economic realities of the investment tax credit will induce the Secretary to open his mind once again.

For what the Administration is now doing is fighting inflation by causing inflation. The latest Labor Department Consumer Price Index shows that we are having the fastest month-to-month price rise since 1951. As reported in this week's U.S. News and World Report, "Interest on home mortgages continued to go up in line with the up swing in interest rates . . . The increases sparked fresh concern among Government economic planners, whose efforts to slow the boom with an income tax surcharge, tight money and high interest rates so far have had little effect."

What is happening is that a current leading ingredient of inflation—high interest rates—is being created by the Administration's espousal of the investment tax credit, which causes—high interest rates.

President Nixon has called for a war on inflation. If his administration would stop causing inflation by the investment tax credit, the war would have a better chance of success.

The "justifications" for the investment tax credit will not bear analysis.

First, it is said that the credit is needed to provide enough funds for business to make necessary capital investment.

In fact, there has never been any real evidence that under prosperous conditions the cash flows generated out of current business operations—profits after taxes, plus depreciation allowances—have been inadequate to finance a high enough level of investment. Indeed, the experience of the mid-1950's indicates that these cash flows were large enough to enable industry to create excess capacity. For example, the rate of use of capacity in the 1950's reached its peak in late 1955 and declined in the ensuing two years, during which investment remained high and gross national product continued to increase in real terms though slowly. (See "Measures of Productive Capacity," hearings before the Joint Economic Committee Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, May 1962.)

Furthermore, a staff memorandum prepared in connection with the Joint Committee's hearings in August, 1962, on the "State of the Economy and Policies for Full Employment" concluded that the corporate cash flow had been, if anything, high by historical standards, and that the ratio of corporate cash flow to gross national product would be quite high at any time the economy were growing vigorously and resources were being used about in line with optimum full employment conditions. This detailed econometric analysis indicated that when corporate cash flows seemed inadequate, it was because the economy was operating below its potential and/or was growing very slowly. The formula derived in that study showed that about 22 percent of any shortfall of actual gross national product below the full employment potential output would show up in reduced corporate cash flows.

This study was based on relationships prevailing from 1929 to 1950, excluding the war years. It therefore did not take into consideration the accelerated depreciation provisions of the 1954 revision in the Tax Code, nor the more recent revisions in depreciation provisions from 1961 on, and the enactment of the investment tax credit. These more recent provisions obviously produce a cash flow well in excess of what was historically available under preceding provisions. The study, therefore, noted that cash flows began to run above those computed from the formula from 1955 on. (See pp. 687 and 965, ff. of the hearings.)

In these same heearings in August, 1962, the Secretary of the Treasury submitted a Treasury statement which reads in part as follows:

"Treasury analyses indicate that, in general, corporate expansion and modernization of productive facilities have not been restricted by any inadequacy in the availability of funds. For most individual businesses and industries there has been a steady growth of funds available from internal sources, particularly from rising depreciation allowances." (p. 688).

A second "justification" offered for the investment credit is its incentive effect via an increase in the after-tax rate of return on new projects. But the trouble with this tax device is that it raises the after-tax rate of return on all eligible investments without regard to their quality.

What kind of project is it that business is now encouraged to invest in that it is not ready and willing to invest in the absence of the investment tax credit?

If one assumes that businessmen are reasonably rational in their business decisions, they must invest in the best paying projects first, and then proceed down the list of available items toward the least desirable. This must mean that in the absence of the investment tax credit, businessmen first take up the desirable, well-paying investment projects, continuing down the list until they arrive close to the margin. Here there are questions as to whether each added project will pay an acceptable rate of return after taxes. When the investment tax credit is introduced, it tends to encourage businessmen to lower margins of acceptability and to make desirable investments—particularly ones which displace manpower with machines uneconomically.

In brief, the incentive effect of the investment tax credit must have the result of encouraging private enterprise to invest in projects which it should not be investing in, either from the standpoint of its own long-term rate of return on its invested capital or from the social standpoint of promoting a high productivity economy and rapid economic growth. If this is the case, then clearly the law is encouraging businessmen to do something which they should not do either from the standpoint of general economic policy of the country as a whole or from their own self-interests. One may well wonder whether in this case the Government is doing business a favor, or is leading it astray.

We must also be concerned with the point raised by the Joint Economic Committee in its 1962 report that the investment credit causes the business cycle to be more violent—something the Employment Act expressly rules out as an objective of policy.

"We are concerned about the cyclical features of the proposal. It is well known that investment tends to be high in boom periods and low in recessions. The effect of an investment credit will be, therefore, to lower Government revenues in times when revenues should be rising to curb inflationary pressures, and to make Federal revenues relatively higher in recession periods, when Government receipts should be reduced. Moreover, the investment credit will tend to accentuate the instability of investment by encouraging overinvestment in boom periods. This, in turn, may actually retard growth rates. For example, there was a very substantial increase in the rate of investment immediately after the adoption in 1954 of the accelerated methods of depreciation for tax purposes. However, as the report of the Council of Economic Advisers points out, capital stock for the entire period from 1954 to 1960 acutally grew at a lower rate than it did in the pre-1954 period." (p. 43)

This pro-cyclical over-investment is precisely what's happening today.

Business, in its own self-interest, should be actively campaigning for the elimination of the investment tax credit instead of urging its retention. It is a sound principle that business profits depend on two major factors external to the individual business firm. These are the speed with which the national economy is expanding and, secondly, the rate at which the Nation is using its productive resources of labor and capital. An economy marked by sharp, large, and frequent business cycles will also have a slower average growth rate. It will, therefore, be marked by a lower average rate of return on capital than an economy that maintains a somewhat faster growth rate by suppressing business cycles.

Profits can go only so high at the peak of business cycle, since there are limits on availability of resources to produce goods and services for sale. Therefore, there are limits on how fast the economy can grow. At the cyclical peaks, costs of using marginal resources rise rapidly, and there is more or less a rough, though somewhat elastic, ceiling on profit rates at full employment. A mere look at any chart of corporate profits will show these effects in high employment years. On the other hand, profits can drop, not merely to zero, but into the zone of actual loss. In a word, there is a great deal more latitude for changes in profits on the down side than on the up side during the course of the cycle.

It must be true, therefore, that the sharper, larger, more frequent the business cycles the country experiences, the more often profits will be below their peak possibility. Hence, over the course of the cycle, the average rate of return is likely to be lower than if the cycle were smoothed out. But the investment tax credit is inherently procyclical, and it must be reckoned as lowering the rate of return on capital in the long run.

The procyclical character of the investment tax credit derives from two aspects of its practical operation. First, any such device is much more likely to encourage business to try to make additional investments in periods of high employment of labor and capital than when the rate of use of resources is low. The literature has many studies of this relationship between the rate of operations and investment. In the case of the investment tax credit, there is an additional feature, namely, that the credit earned in a given year can be claimed only to the extent of $25,000, plus 25 per cent of tax liabilities. It must be obvious that business firms can claim more of the credit at cycle peaks than at cycle troughs and, other things being equal, they have a greater incentive to use the device up to the limit provided by law in prosperity, though not in recession.

It is also true that a dominant anti-cyclical device of American policy is the great cyclical swings in corporate tax liabilities. The marginal rate of tax on corporate profits has been about 50 per cent in recent decades, and corporate profits themselves are highly volatile—rising and falling much more sharply than output or sales. For example, from calendar 1957 to calendar 1958, corporate tax liabilities declined by 10 per cent, while gross national product in current dollars rose by $6 billion, or something over 1½ per cent. Even a slowdown in the rate of expansion may stop the rise in corporate profits or cause them to decline. The net effect of high marginal tax rates and the great volatility of corporate profits is to produce very large swings in Government revenues—raising them sharply in prosperity or inflation and reducing them sharply whenever business conditions weaken.

This process tends to keep private incomes more stable than they would otherwise be and transfers the instability to the public sector, namely, the Federal Government. This functioning of the stabilizing effect of corporate profits tax is completely automatic and requires no deliberate countercyclical action by the President or the Congress. It is, therefore, one of our best, most automatic, and rapid acting stabilizers. But the investment tax credit tends to weaken this, reducing the Government's revenue relatively more at business cycle peaks than at business cycle troughs. To the extent that the automatic stabilizer is weakened, either the Government must make a more aggressive use of deliberate, discretionary policies requiring formal action by the President and the Congress, or must allow larger and more frequent fluctuations than would otherwise be the case. As was pointed out above, this would have the effect eventually of reducing the long-term rate of return on capital.

The argument for the investment tax credit also ignores the fact that the productivity of capital is rising over the long run, just as is the productivity of labor. This means that for any given level of GNP we need a capital stock which would be smaller today than would be necessary if we were working with the technology of 5, 10, or 50 years ago. It must be clear, therefore, that if the ratio of output to the capital stock is rising, then the ratio of business investment in new plant and equipment to GNP will be falling slowly over time. Indeed this is what the staff of the Joint Economic Committee found in its various attempts to analyze and project the long-term full employment trends in the economy. But the investment tax credit is founded on the belief that we need to subsidize business to get enough investment. The result is an excess of investment and an inadequate level of consumption since the taxes not paid by business via this device inevitably get assessed against consumers.

The investment tax credit seeks to encourage investment at the expense of consumption. Apparently, capital goods are such desirable things to have that it makes no difference whether there is a market for the output! We must have endless streams of machines and buildings regardless of their utility! We might as well, as a Nation, start a campaign to build yachts and take them out in the middle of the ocean and sink them, or perhaps to rebuild pyramids like the ancient Egyptians. The real stimulus for investment must come not from gadgets like the investment tax credit but from a strong growing consumer demand for the output of our farms, factories and offices.

Summing up, it seems fair to suggest that both the logic and the evidence point to the investment tax credit's promoting more investment at business cycle peaks than would otherwise be the case, while at the same time weakening the automatic response of the corporate income tax to changing business conditions. The result is likely to be a procyclical effect combined with a lower average rate of return on capital in the long run. Such a policy in the long run may well produce less economic growth than a less procyclical operation.

It may be that the only way to avoid the undesirable effects of this tax device is through secular inflation at a substantial rate—perhaps at least 4 or 5 per cent a year, as has happened in the 1965–68 period. This latter exit from the dilemma would hardly seem consistent with the objectives of the Employment Act, which the Joint Economic Committee has always regarded as calling for stable prices.

At a time when the rate of inflation exceeds 4 per cent a year—and by some measures it is approaching 5 per cent a year—why continue a device whose sole economic rationale is that it will worsen inflation in the short run, and will reduce the rate of employment and the rate of investment and capital in the long run? Essentially the 7 per cent credit attempts—and succeeds—in persuading business to create an unbalancing economic situation. We are subsidizing business to create excessive investments at a time when, to restrain inflation, we are imposing restrictions on consumers, in the housing industry, and on the social programs of Federal, State, and local governments.

Tax reform is not a magical device to solve all of our economic problems, but it will solve some of the more pressing. It will help us bring inflation to a halt without excessive unemployment. It will help us build a more balanced set of incentives to economic activity. It will take the government out of the business of making private decisions via tax gadgetry. And, most of all, it will restore the faith of Americans in government and eliminate their deep and justified outrage at the inequities of the government tax system.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Frelinghuysen (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), through April 21, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Landgrebe) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Halpern, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. Hosmer, today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. Poff, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. Edwards of Alabama, today, for 30 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Preyer of North Carolina) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Farbstein, today, for 30 mintues.

Mr. Reuss, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. McCarthy, on April 15, for 30 minutes.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Hechler of West Virginia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Madden and to include an editorial.

Mr. Wright and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Landgrebe) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Findley in six instances.

Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. Wyatt in five instances.

Mr. Biester.

Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Hogan.

Mr. Hosmer in two instances.

Mr. Ashbrook in two instances.

Mr. Wyman in three instances.

Mr. Myers.

Mr. Duncan.

Mr. Winn.

Mr. Burke of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Preyer of North Carolina and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Nix.

Mr. Bingham in three instances.

Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. Eilberg in two instances.

Mr. Hamilton in 10 instances.

Mr. Fisher in four instances.

Mr. Abbitt in two instances.

Mr. Podell in three instances.

Mr. Flood.

Mr. Rarick in six instances.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. Ryan in four instances.

Mr. Brown of California in five instances.

Mr. Murphy of New York.

Mr. Mikva in two instances.

Mr. Wolff in three instances.

Mr. Pickle.

Mr. Bolling in two instances.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document studies and hearings on the Alliance for Progress; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the eulogies on Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 15, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 91st Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948; DAVID R. OBEY, Seventh District, Wisconsin.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

651. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on U.S. financial participation in the Organization of American States, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

652. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a report of receipts and disbursements pertaining to the disposal of surplus military supplies, equipment, and materiel during the first 6 months of fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 511 of Public Law 90–580, and a report on expenses involving the production of lumber and timber products for the same period, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

653. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a report of the location, nature, and estimated cost of an additional facilities project proposed to be undertaken for the Army Reserve, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233(a)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

654. A letter from the Deputy Chief of Naval Material (Procurement and Production), Department of the Navy, transmitting the semiannual report of research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over for the period July 1–December 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

655. A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting the report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment for the quarter ending March 31, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

656. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the second semiannual report on U.S. purchases and sales of gold and the state of the U.S. gold stock, and International Monetary Fund discussions on the evolution of the international monetary system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

657. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report of the export expansion program of the Bank for the quarter ended March 31, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 90–390; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

658. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting notification that the government of the District of Columbia continues to support the enactment of proposed legislation submitted January 14, 1969, to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as heretofore amended, so as to provide that income subject to tax for District income tax purposes shall conform as closely as possible to income subject to Federal income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

659. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize suits in the courts of the District of Columbia for collection of taxes owed to States, territories, or possessions, or political subdivisions thereof, when the reciprocal right is accorded to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

660. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the administration and effectiveness of the work experience and training project in Kent County, Mich., under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

661. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting an interim report on the highlights of Federal participation at HemisFair 1968 in San Antonio, Tex., pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–685; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

662. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued in February 1969, in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia, pursuant to the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, and the applicable Presidential determination thereunder; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

663. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of audits of Government Services, Inc., its employee retirement and benefit trust fund, and its supplemental pension plan for the year ended December 31, 1968; to the Committee on Government Operations.

664. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of internal audit activities of the U.S. Information Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

665. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report on the Library of Congress, including the Copyright Office, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968, together with copies of the Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress and a copy of the annual report of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board; to the Committee on House Administration.

666. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory of the Bureau of Mines at Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1968, pursuant to the provisions of the act of March 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 85); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

667. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of all laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, in its 1968 regular and special sessions, pursuant to the provisions of section 9(g) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

668. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting his report pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 90–188, consenting to the renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

669. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for fiscal year 1968, pursuant to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 4127; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

670. A letter from the national director, Boys Clubs of America, transmitting an audited financial statement in compliance with section 14, Public Law 988, approved August 6, 1956, and a copy of their annual report; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

671. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the fifth annual report of activities under Public Law 87–839 providing for the promotion of foreign commerce through the use of mobile trade fairs, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d) of said law; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

672. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the cost ascertainment report of the Post Office Department for fiscal year 1968, pursuant to the provisions of 39 U.S.C. 2331; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

673. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting copies of a building project survey report for Baltimore, Md., pursuant to the House resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Works on February 4, 1969; to the Committee on Public Works.

674. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the definition of a "child" for purposes of veterans' benefits provided by title 38, United States Code, to recognize an adopted child as a dependent from the date of issuance of an interlocutory decree, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NEDZI: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 91–145. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5615. A bill for the relief of Maria Camilla Giuliani Niro, with amendment (Rept. No. 91–146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 9996. A bill to amend section 204(a) of the Coinage Act of 1965 in order to authorize minting of all new quarter dollar pieces with a likeness of the late President Dwight David Eisenhower on one side; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9997. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Connecticut River National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9998. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9999. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemptions for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 10000. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 10001. A bill to establish a National Armed Forces Historical Museum Park and Study Center; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 10002. A bill to revise the pay structure of the police force of the National Zoological Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 10003. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $250,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Golden Circle National Scenic Parkway complex connecting the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas in the southern part of Utah with the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas situated in northern Arizona, northwestern New Mexico, and southwestern Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 10004. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10005. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 7-percent, across-the-board benefit increase, and subsequent increases based on rises in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONABLE (by request):

H.R. 10006. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for a national system of public assistance to needy individuals and for grants to States for services to such individuals and to strengthen the Federal support of the State medical assistance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 10007. A bill to promote the orderly adjustment of tobacco production and marketing; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 10008. A bill to amend the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act with respect to the labeling of packages of cigarettes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10009. A bill to assist in combating crime by creating the U.S. Corrections Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 10010. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 10011. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to protect State and local governments against the loss of tax revenues which would otherwise result from acquisitions of property in urban renewal projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 10012. A bill to amend the National Commission on Product Safety Act in order to extend the life of the Commission so that it may complete its assigned task; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10013. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 10014. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 10015. A bill to extend until July 15, 1971, the suspension of duty on electrodes for use in producing aluminum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 10016. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1971, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 10017. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $3,000 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 10018. A bill to designate the dam commonly referred to as the Glen Canyon Dam as the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 10019. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Marihuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Br. Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 10020. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to require that the public interest of the areas to be served be the sole consideration in the allocation of certain facilities pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 10021. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 10022. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MYERS (for himself, Mr. Collins, Mr. Pollock, Mr. Wyman, Mr. Cowger, Mr. Frey, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Don H. Clausen, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Mayne, Mr. Hogan, Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Mr. Grover, Mr. Robison, Mr. Collier, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Pettis, Mr. Landgrebe, Mr. Pelly, Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Biaggi, and Mr. Mikva):

H.R. 10023. A bill to designate the Washington National Airport as the "Dwight David Eisenhower National Airport"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 10024. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 10025. A bill to amend the act, entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10026. A bill to equalize the rates of disability compensation payable to veterans of peacetime and wartime service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 10027. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of certain distributions pursuant to the Savings and Loan Holding Company Amendments of 1967; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 10028. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional $5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10029. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 10030. A bill to require contractors of departments and agencies of the United States engaged in the production of motion picture films to pay prevailing wages; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10031. A bill to amend the act, entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10032. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 753(e), to eliminate the maximum and minimum limitations upon the annual salary of reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 10033. A bill to designate the dam commonly referred to as the Glen Canyon Dam as the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 10034. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the development of a large prototype desalting plant in Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 10035. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to establish a Government Corporation to assist in the expansion of the capital market for municipal securities while decreasing the cost of such capital to municipalities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10036. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10037. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home shall be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10038. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the percentage depletion rates for oil, gas, and certain other minerals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate special treatment for gains from the disposition of depreciable realty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10040. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal provisions relating to stock options; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10041. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the gift tax rates to estate tax level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10042. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate use of U.S. bonds to pay estate tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10043. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal provisions relating to dividend exclusion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10044. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal privilege of groups to elect multiple surtax exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10045. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to tax certain gains at death which are now untaxed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 10046. A bill to amend the act incorporating the Amvets (American Veterans of World War II) so as to provide for an annual audit of its accounts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10047. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize a maximum of $15,000 coverage under servicemen's group life insurance, to enlarge the classes eligible for such insurance, and to improve the administration of the programs of life insurance provided for servicemen and veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 10048. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to amend the definition of "employee" to include certain agricultural employees, and to permit certain provisions in agreements between agricultural employers and employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10049. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the present limit on the number of days for which benefits may be paid thereunder to an individual on account of posthospital extended-care services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10050. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record where that method of computation produces a higher combined benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10051. A bill to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 10052. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities with respect to the premium pay of certain employees performing irregular and unscheduled duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 10053. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to prevent the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from requiring a particular balance or distribution of low-rent housing in private accommodations within a community where such a requirement would impede the provision of such housing for low- and moderate-income families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WYATT (for himself, Mr. Dellenback, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Mr. Ullman, Mrs. May, Mr Lukens, Mr. Waldie, Mr. Eshleman, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Myers, Mr. Pelly, Mr. Hosmer. Mr Matsunaga, Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Steiger of Arizona, Mr. Pettis, and Mr. Horton):

H.R. 10054. A bill to establish the Federal Medical Evaluations Board to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to the regulation of biological products, medical devices, and drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 10055. A bill to establish the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.J. Res. 638. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Thomas J. Watson, Jr., as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.J. Res. 639. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.J. Res. 640. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.J. Res. 641. Joint resolution, a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.J. Res. 642. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the third week of May 1969 as "Municipal Clerk's Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H. Con. Res. 199. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the encroachment on the authority of Congress under the Constitution to declare war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUDE:

H. Res. 361. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban and District of Columbia Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Res. 362. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

104. By Mr. ALBERT: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the first session of the 32d Oklahoma Legislature memorializing Congress to amend certain laws relating to the eligibility of veterans for veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

105. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the Wholesome Meat Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

106. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to Point Roberts, Wash.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

107. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to the death of former President Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on House Administration.

108. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to the death of former President Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on House Administration.

109. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to increases in grazing fees on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

110. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to increases in grazing fees on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

111. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to permitting native Indians free access to public lands for pine nut harvesting; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

112. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to construction of the Bacon siphon and block 251 in the Columbia River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

113. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to establishment of a New England Regional Drug Abuse Treatment Center and Pilot Research Center at the Essex County Hospital, Middleton, Mass.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

114. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to taxation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

115. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, relative to the eligibility of veterans for veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

116. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, relative to repeal of the proposed freeze on Federal aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 10056. A bill for the relief of Chuck Hong Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 10057. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 10058. A bill for the relief of Mr. Agustin Garcia-Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 10059. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eladio Elroy Mazon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 10060. A bill for the relief of Lance Cpl. Peter M. Nee, 2465662; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 10061. A bill for the relief of Oded Rosenwax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10062. A bill for the relief of Patricia Ann Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

88. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the 21st Saipan Legislature, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to the territorywide plebiscite on the future status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to be held in 1972; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

89. Also, petition of the City Council, Worcester, Mass., relative to declaring January 15 of each year a national holiday in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

90. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Madison, Wis., relative to proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

91. Also, petition of the Board of Commissioners, township of Elizabeth, Buena Vista, Pa., relative to rescinding the recent congressional salary increase; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

92. Also, petition of the Board of Chosen Freeholders, county of Mercer, N.J., relative to repeal of the proposed freeze on Federal aid to dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT LIVES LIFE OF THE BLIND FOR A WEEK

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have long been a stanch supporter of our country's young people. I believe the vast majority of them are serious minded, responsible individuals who have a genuine concern for their fellowman.

Occassionally, one of them does something so outstanding that it deserves special attention. Such is the case with David Doepken, a student at Triadelphia High School, in Wheeling, W. Va. This young man placed patches over his eyes and for a week lived the life of the blind. He then reported his experiences in a moving article published in his school newspaper.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a column by Don Daniels on this experiment, published in the Wheeling News-Register of April 11, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT LIVES LIFE OF THE BLIND FOR A WEEK

(By Don Daniels)

This is not an inside job.

If anyone else had done it, I would feel the same.

It just happens that the performance we are about to examine was made by David Doepken. Dave is the son of my good friend, my colleague, my compatriot and my dog's aunt, Kate J. Doepken who is known in social circles as Kitty Jefferson Doepken.

Kate deserves Dave. Anyone as nice as she is entitled to a blessing now and then.

I have a sort of fondness for Dave because even in a short time I think I and the Small Tiger watched him grow up. And that kid grew plenty up, I'll tell ya. But we watched him become transformed from a snotty kid to a man of stature and that, I say, is a rare privilege. I sort of hope Dave gets into the newspaper business and becomes one of the talented poor or into some other racket and someday owns his own golf cart.

Dave did this . . . he went blind for a week.

I wish you would get the April 9 issue of the Triadelphian, the school newspaper. In it, Dave tells how it was to be sightless. And he tells it well. And he gives old, blase gaffers like me pause. He makes me think.

Now I know Dave did this and because he is the kind of man he is he did it in total honesty. He put patches over his eyes and kept them there. Even at home. He lived in darkness and groped his way through dressing and meals and harrassed his mother and found a few whole truths that will last with him forever.

He went to school blind and was led around by classmates and some fool teacher was unhappy with it and said he should have completed his sightless project in a single day. It was the teacher who was blind.

I wish you to get the Triadelphian and read what David wrote but now, because it is important, I am going to repeat some of the things he said . . .

He went to an oil painting class and his mother said if he were really blind, painting would be the first thing he'd give up. David said, "Beethoven did his best composing when he was stone deaf . . . if I were really blind I would paint for even if I could not see I could imagine and even though I could not get pleasure from seeing what I had created, I still would have created it and that is pleasurable . . ."

What he created was a picture of a clown and it is magnificent.

Pay strict attention to this paragraph:

"When you are blind, everybody is beautiful. After thinking about it I realized that was not true. The senior boy who scared me by swatting me in the nose was not beautiful, but ugly. So, when you are blind you judge people by what they do and say, not by how they look. For this reason someone considered ugly and offensive to look at can be beautiful to a blind person. Perhaps, in this way, we should all be a little more blind . . ."

Now citizen, ponder that.

Dave made himself no hero in his experiment. He admits he got "nervous and irritable." That he had a "chip on my shoulder because others could see and I could not." Dave is a total male and the sonofagun is taller than I am and it would not be his nature to have anything less than a chip on his shoulder.

Dave doesn't quit easily. He doesn't quit at all.

And the thing I would like you to consider, my friend, in all of this, is that Dave Doepken did a wildly wonderful thing. On his own. He conducted an experiment in tragedy and boy, it makes me proud that he is around. That there are so many of him.

Young people continually astound me.

Not the ones with the beards and one string guitars. The ones like Dave who want to take an inside look at life. The ones who see through blindness. I think it was a stirring thing this young man did. And a splendid thing that his fellow students would abide by his self imposed affliction.

I believe it shows that these young people have imagination and energy and a thought process considerably beyond the wounded outcries of rock and roll singers. Dave showed me something and he made me a little ashamed. I never did a thing like that.

Once, during his blindness Dave met a tree. He wrote this:

"I wrapped my arms around the tree. Squeezed it. Hugged it. For five days I had been in darkness; for five days I had been more alone than ever in my life and for five days I had been insecure. Suddenly I had hold of something firm, strong and bigger than I. I thought it was a wonderful, kind and beautiful tree . . ."

That wasn't a tree Dave embraced, it was God and I think he knows it.

I have read David's story in the Triadelphian and I hope you will too. I'll tell you this . . .

It made me see a little.

ENGINEERING AT ARLINGTON

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the University of Texas at Arlington last month was recognized for its excellent school of engineering by the establishment there of a doctoral program in the field of engineering. This action by the board of regents of the University of Texas system is extraordinarily gratifying in view of the fact that it was only 10 years ago, in 1959, that the University of Texas at Arlington was advanced from a 2-year to a 4-year college.

The regents' chairman, Frank C. Erwin, Jr., of Austin, in urging approval of the new doctoral program, noted that Arlington already had "one of the outstanding engineering schools in the country."

Located in one of our Nation's fastest growing centers of science and technology—North Texas—the university is destined to exercise an ever more significant role in Texas and the entire United States.

The achievement of the University of Texas at Arlington is such as to make Texans and all Americans proud of such dedicated and vigorous pursuit of excellence in education.

I here insert excerpts from an article from the Texas Times describing the achievement of the University of Texas at Arlington.

ENGINEERING AT ARLINGTON

(By Ken Whitt)

Organized in 1959 when the institution was advanced from junior college to four-year status, UT Arlington's School of Engineering has received the Engineers' Council for Professional Development (ECPD) accreditation, a nationally coveted stamp of approval, for all its programs.

No one recognizes the engineering developments at UT Arlington more fully than the school's chief engineer and architect, Dr. Wendell H. Nedderman, an Iowan who served on Iowa State University and Texas A&M University faculties before coming to Arlington almost 10 years ago as the school's first dean of engineering. Today he also serves as vice president for academic affairs and associate dean of graduate studies.

Dr. Nedderman and his department heads have recruited a young, dedicated faculty totaling 49 full-time personnel teaching in degree-granting departments with 37 of them holding earned doctoral degrees. How does a young engineering school without a graduate program attract an outstanding faculty?

BUILT-IN LOCATION

"We couldn't offer the ivory-covered wall concept of an established, prestigious engineering school," Dr. Nedderman says, "so we stressed the school's built-in location and future prospects for graduate work. Now when we look at our list of faculty, we're saying we are in the graduate business because we have recruited a diversified group of individuals with Ph. D. background from graduate schools coast-to-coast."

Among the school's other impressive credentials are:

A long list of faculty publications and research accomplishments, even before the graduate program was developed.

Baccalaureate degree production equal to two-thirds of the total North Texas output, and growing rapidly.

Graduates scoring almost 200 points above the national average on the Graduate Record Examination.

A strong group of student technical societies which have won more than their share of state and regional awards.

Because of the school's outstanding faculty and facilities, and an engineering enrollment of approximately 3,000 students with a better-than-average scholastic aptitude, UT Arlington has been able to receive ECPD accreditation in almost record time.

"In the past it has taken most engineering schools 10 to 15 years to achieve accreditation," Dr. Nedderman explains. "We did it in four to six years."

FIFTY PUBLICATIONS

UT Arlington's engineering faculty, representing a coast-to-coast spectrum of 21 different engineering schools, presently holds more than 30 offices and committee positions at state and national levels in technical and professional societies. As a group they were credited with more than 50 publications last year.

The School of Engineering's total enrollment last fall was 3,306, which includes about 100 graduate students and another 600 enrolled in two-year engineering technology program and pre-architecture. UT Arlington has 2,598 engineering majors, only three less than the undergraduate enrollment at UT Austin, which ranks second in the state behind Texas A&M. UT Austin and UT Arlington rank 19th and 20th in size, respectively, in the nation.

Despite national and state trends toward declining numbers of engineering graduates. UT Arlington has increased its total student credit hours in engineering at a remarkable rate, almost doubling since 1962. Dr. Nedderman says the upward trend at Arlington should continue because of transfer students from junior colleges in Dallas and Tarrant Counties.

"A conservative estimate is that the annual number of bachelor's degrees granted here will double within the next five years," he says.

ABOVE NATIONAL AVERAGE

For the past few years, all graduates of UT Arlington have taken the Graduate Record Examination. The average total aptitude score for engineering graduates last year was 1,142. The national average was 963. Almost 80 per cent of the senior engineers scored about 1,000, the minimum required for admission to graduate school in the UT System. Ninety-six per cent of the seniors scored above the national average on the mathematics portion of the exam.

UT Arlington graduates have been accepted and completed graduate degree programs at prominent engineering institutions all over the United States. The dean of a leading out-of-state engineering school recently commented:

"In recent years we have had the good fortune to attract Arlington graduates to our program and their performance has been more than satisfactory. Their capabilities demonstrate the excellent scholastic background that is expected from graduates of a respected university; we would like to have more."

Arlington student technical groups have distinguished themselves in state and regional contests. An electrical engineering student submitted the best paper in Region V (includes 13 states) competition in 1964 and 1968. Civil engineering students have won the state student paper contest three times and placed second twice in six years of competing.

NATIONAL COMMENDATION

In addition, the Arlington chapter of the American Society of Civil Engineers has won the state attendance award four times and a national commendation once in five years of competition. The student chapter of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics won third place in national competition for the 1967 Bendix Award. An aerospace engineering student placed second in national student paper competition last year, and the chapter of the Society of Automotive Engineers was named the outstanding student branch in the nation last year.

Earlier this year UT Arlington received a chapter of Tau Beta Pi, the national engineering society. A chapter of Eta Kappa Nu, national electrical engineering honor society, was formed in 1966, and a chapter for Chi Epsilon, national civil engineering honor society, also has been granted.

Among the 13 student technical and honor societies at Arlington are the Society of Women Engineers (first in Texas) and American Helicopter Society (first in the nation).

DOUBLES EACH YEAR

UT Arlington's graduate program, which got under way in the fall of 1966 with master's degree offerings in electrical engineering and engineering mechanics, has doubled each year. This spring 29 graduate courses are being taught in fields of electrical, civil, industrial and mechanical engineering and engineering mechanics with 217 students enrolled.

Classes are taught in the school's 127,999-square-foot, four-floor Engineering Building constructed in 1960 for about $2 million. The 30 engineering laboratories, totaling about 50,000 square feet, contain more than $1 million in specialized instructional equipment. Dr. Nedderman emphasizes that, partly due to timing, the labs are equipped with the most modern equipment.

Back in 1960 a national report indicated that engineering education across the country had changed its course drastically. Emphasis was being placed on "building block courses" rather than "state of the art courses," the report said. Instead of "how to do" courses, students were given "tools to do" and labs had to have new equipment.

ENVIABLE POSITION

"We found ourselves in a very enviable position," Dr. Nedderman says. "We were not holding the bag with obsolete equipment or white elephants. We developed our labs with the new look—instrumentation, not stereotyped machinery.

"Today we have dual-purpose labs equipped for instruction purposes and research. If we had started before 1960 we would have had single-purpose labs. Dual-purpose labs allowed us to develop our research capabilities," he said.

Obviously one of the major factors in the growth and development of the engineering programs at Arlington is the location of the institution. The campus is near the center of Dallas-Fort Worth's two million population centroid.

ADDRESS BY DR. HARRY M. PHILPOTT, PRESIDENT, AUBURN UNIVERSITY

HON. JAMES B. ALLEN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, Auburn University is one of the Nation's outstanding universities. We in Alabama are extremely proud of Auburn and equally proud to have the services of Dr. Harry M. Philpott, one of the Nation's best qualified and most respected educators, in the office of president of the university.

On March 13, 1969, Dr. Philpott delivered the winter-quarter commencement address at Auburn and used the occasion to review the origin of the now famous Auburn Creed and to expound on the tenets of that creed in a truly inspiring message.

Dr. Philpott's address and the tenets of the Auburn Creed are particularly relevant today in a period characterized by tensions and turmoil on some college campuses throughout the Nation. I commend the significant address to the thoughtful consideration of all who are genuinely interested in the development of a sound commonsense philosophy of higher education.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ARE YOU FOR?

(Address by Dr. Harry M. Philpott)

It is from lines found in Oliver Goldsmith's poem, "The Deserted Village," that this community and this University received its name. I wonder how many of you, with all the many interests and activities you have had here, have read the poem and are familiar with its viewpoint. Perhaps at some future date you may turn nostalgically to the opening words and recall with affection your experiences here:

"Sweet Auburn! loveliest village of the plain;
Where health and plenty cheered the labouring swain,
Where smiling spring its earliest visit paid,
And parting summer's lingering blooms delayed:
Dear lovely bowers of innocence and ease,
Seats of my youth, when every sport could please,
How often have I loitered o'er thy green,
Where humble happiness endeared each scene!"

Goldsmith wrote the poem in 1770 as a protest against the expanding industrialization of England, its preoccupation with trade and commerce and the assumed decline of the pleasant rural life he had known. Some of his warnings are timeless in their applications, such as:

"Ill fares the land, to hasten ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay:"

On the whole, however, it was a plea to stop the flow of progress and return to a more bucollic existence. Some of the evils he described were real but many of his dire warnings were against imagined adversaries. In a time of great change he followed the futile path of trying to stop or turn back the clock. Perhaps he might have been better advised to heed the words of the immortal Satchel Paige: "Never look back—somebody may be gaining on you."

I am sure that among the members of this graduating class, facing the great opportunities of the future in an age of dynamic change, there is little tendency to look back to a former imagined golden era. You know that even "Sweet Auburn, Loveliest Village of the Plain" will not be the same when you return in the future. Rather than resisters of change, yours is a generation that both embraces it and, in many cases, avidly seeks it. Your awareness of the things that are wrong in our society today and your determination to do something about these has never been more manifest in any younger generation.

It is against this backdrop that I wish to share a final word of counsel and caution with you. Rightly or wrongly, I have the feeling that many people today know all too much about what they are *against* and all too little about what they are *for*. This has been impressed on me recently as I have traveled about the state in an effort to improve our educational system in Alabama. Individuals will begin by saying, "I am for a better program of education, but . . ." and then will proceed to talk at great length about their opposition to certain educational programs, policies, and particularly additional taxes needed to enhance the quality of our system. We have seen it also nationally in the small group of students who seem bent on destroying the university as we know it today but who have nothing positive to offer in its place. Some have been described by a keen observer as "sad young men who throw dead cats into sanctuaries and then go roistering down life's highway." My ear still aches from a recent airplane trip when I had the misfortune to be sitting by an individual who effectively opposed almost every aspect of our national policy for a solid hour without suggesting a single positive alternative. The outlook I speak of was once effectively described by one of my former professors as "trying to live on negatives."

This temptation faces each of us. It is much easier to criticize someone or some policy than it is to be positively constructive. Perhaps you have had the experience of a broken love affair. Can you recall how difficult it was to find the words to express your affection and appreciation to another person and after the breakup how easy it was to condemn and revile? Words of love come slowly while words of condemnation flow forth like a never-ending stream. One recalls the words of Jesus that it is much easier to go about taking the specks out of the eyes of other people than it is to deal with the planks that we have in our own eyes.

Your mothers and fathers who are here today will remember a song that was popular in some of their own courting days. The lines went like this: "Accentuate the positive, eliminate the negative, latch on to the affirmative, don't mess with Mr. Inbetween." The advice is still appropriate today. Confronting a world that desperately needs solutions to its problems, never be content with simply the role of a critic. Tennyson once said that in his poetry, he tried to take the hiss out of the English language. I submit to you that this is a worthy purpose for your own lives and service.

Auburn University has been built by people who were for something positive. Our American democracy rests upon statements of positive principles. Our human rights are of little value as negatives but must find positive expression. It does little good to have freedom of speech if we have nothing to say, to enjoy freedom of the press if there is nothing worth printing, and to have freedom of worship unless there is the experience of genuine worship.

My plea is that you may leave Auburn with a positive faith and some firm convictions. Throughout the existence of this institution, no purpose has had more importance than this. In 1944 a group of Auburn students expressed the desire to capture in verbal form the essence of the Auburn spirit. They enlisted the aid of Dr. George Petrie, beloved teacher and administrator for over fifty-five years, who expressed it in a series of positive statements that we know as the Auburn Creed. I have always been impressed by the fact that these positive statements find similar expression in the tenets of our religious faith. In the words of the late Professor William E. Hocking of Harvard, "There are no rights of man that are not grounded in the conception of the divine value of man. All so-called rights of man which are based only on reason are at the mercy of opportunism."

As a guide for your positive approach to the problems ahead of you, and in contrast to the carping negativism that we hear so often, let me remind you once more of the statement so loved by Auburn men and women, and with the affirmation of this Creed suggest additional undergirding from the Holy Scripture:

I believe that this is a practical world and that I can count only on what I earn. Therefore, I believe in work, hard work.

Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might.—Eccl. 9: 10.

I believe in education, which gives me the knowledge to work wisely and trains my mind and my hands to work skillfully.

Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.—2 Timothy 2:15.

I believe in honesty and truthfulness, without which I cannot win the respect and confidence of my fellow men.

Remove from me the way of lying: and grant me thy law graciously. I have chosen the way of truth: thy judgments have I laid before me.—Psalms 119: 29, 30.

I believe in a sound mind in a sound body and a spirit that is not afraid, and in clean sports that develop these qualities.

Glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.—I Corin. 6: 20.

I believe in obedience to law because it protects the rights of all.

Think not I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill.—Matt. 5:17.

I believe in the human touch, which cultivates sympathy with my fellow men and mutual helpfulness and brings happiness for all.

Therefore all things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.—Matt. 7: 12.

I believe in my Country, because it is a land of freedom and because it is my own home, and that I can best serve that country by "doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with my God."

Let the words of my mouth, and the meditations of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength, and my redeemer.—Psalms 19: 14.

And because Auburn men and women believe in these things, I believe in Auburn and love it.

With such positive affirmations, or similar ones, we are confident of your great contributions to building a better world in the future.

Today marks the beginning of enlarged responsibilities and greater challenges than you have ever known before. Take pride in what you have achieved but recognize that the greatest challenge lies ahead. In 1577 Sir Francis Drake set sail around the world in the "Golden Hind" and four other ships. Buffeted by gales and storms, only the "Golden Hind" survived the Straits of Magellan, the journey around Cape Horn and up the western coast of South and North America. Landing at what is now San Francisco and which was called New Albion by Drake, the crew faced great discouragement and fear. The unknown Pacific and its perils as well as other unknown waters lay ahead. On that occasion, Drake records that he turned to a prayer in the Book of Common Prayers, I would like to conclude with the same prayer for you today:

"O Lord God, when Thou givest to Thy servants to endeaver any great matter, grant us also to know that it is not the beginning but the continuing of the same until it be thoroughly finished which yieldeth the true glory."

GREAT SOCIETY: WHAT IT WAS, WHERE IT IS

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Government which the Nixon administration inherited from President Johnson has taken on a vastly different character since the Republicans last occupied the White House. Some of these changes were described in an article by Clayton Knowles in the New York Times on December 9, 1968. Because Mr. Knowles' article offers an especially succinct summary of the many areas of Federal involvement that have evolved since 1960, I include his article in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

GREAT SOCIETY: WHAT IT WAS, WHERE IT IS—FEDERAL DOMESTIC ROLE HAS INCREASED TENFOLD IN THE JOHNSON ERA

(By Clayton Knowles)

WASHINGTON, December 8.—"Dick Nixon is going to be taking over a government one hell of a lot different than the one he left in January, 1961."

These words, spoken by a departing White House aide, dramatize the change in the Federal domestic role in the last five years because of Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society program.

Joseph A. Califano Jr., President Johnson's man Friday in nurturing the Great Society, said in an interview that President-elect Richard M. Nixon would find that a tenfold growth had occurred in governmental activities designed to "make life better for all Americans."

THERE WERE 45 THEN, 435 NOW

"There were about 45 domestic social programs when the Eisenhower Administration ended," Mr. Califano said. "Now there are no less than 435."

As the Johnson Presidency nears an end, it is possible to look at the Great Society with some perspective and examine a few of its programs.

The larger government role described by Mr. Califano involves more than new laws, though they are counted in the hundreds. Much of the change stems from a new direction of old programs, imparted either by Congressional or administrative action, to meet broader objectives.

Topsy-like at times, the program has grown and in many directions, though authorizations and funding were often cut well below Administration requests. A drumfire of criticism frequently attended a grudging acceptance of principle.

It was said that inflation watered down the dollar value of benefits to the poor, that waste and duplication threatened achievements, that over-promises created problems bigger than those up for solution.

Conservatives urged that the Federal obligation be discharged through general area grants to the states for programs developed at the state level.

The enormous cost of the war in Vietnam limited the amount that could be spent on the social programs. The fact that the war was being accelerated while the Great Society program was being developed made what progress there was all the more remarkable.

Many of the new programs have virtually become household words—Medicare, model cities, the Job Corps, the war on poverty, truth in lending, Head Start and Upward Bound.

PROGRAMS REDIRECTED

Others, such as the insured mortgage loan program of the Federal Housing Administration that spawned the nation's suburban growth, are now being redirected to the cities.

To put a price tag on the vast, somewhat amorphous Great Society is difficult, though it is clear that it represents a national commitment entailing billions of dollars.

Excluding Social Security payments, Mr. Califano estimates that the Great Society is a $25.6-billion enterprise, compared with the $9.9-billion social budget of 1960 and $12.9-billion of 1963. If Social Security costs are included, he says, $49-billion is being spent today against $22-billion eight years ago.

This turnabout in national policy on the homefront, signaled in a speech by President Johnson at University of Michigan commencement exercises on May 22, 1964, constitutes a recognition of mushrooming urban problems as an essential matter of Federal concern.

Though a descendant in many ways of the New Deal, Fair Deal and New Frontier, the Great Society established a new approach to problems that accented working relationships with the region, the state and the city more than direct Federal aid to the individual.

In five years, something of a national consensus has developed in support of comprehensive aid to cities. The recognition is now general that the cities, lacking a broad tax base other than real estate, do not have the resources to meet the many problems in a nation 70 per cent urbanized.

Even an economic conservative such as Representative Gerald R. Ford of Michigan, House Republican leader, acknowledges that huge Federal outlays are needed to meet the urban crisis. He argues only that the money go directly to the states in "broad problem area grants."

President Johnson described the Great Society as "a challenge constantly renewed" in his University of Michigan speech.

"The Great Society rests on abundance and liberty for all," he said. "It demands an end to poverty and racial injustice, to which we are totally committed in our time. But that is just a beginning.

"The Great Society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and enlarge his talents. It is a place where leisure is a welcomed chance to build and reflect, not a feared cause of boredom and restlessness. It is a place where the city of man serves not only the needs of the body but the desire for beauty and the hunger for enrichment.

"It is a place where man can renew contact with nature. It is a place which honors creation for its own sake and for what it adds to the understanding of the race. It is a place where men are more concerned with the quality of their goals than the quality of their goods."

Threaded through the address ran the promise of a broad attack on the problems of the poor and underprivileged—housing, education, equal rights and equal opportunity—as well as a drive for environmental improvement — conservation beautification, clean air and clean water—that would benefit all.

The programs that emerged can be grouped under general headings despite constant interaction among elements in different categories, particularly in the cities.

The highlights of the Great Society, by general category:

Cities

Antipoverty Campaign: Begun in 1964 with the Economic Opportunity Act and a one-year authorization of just under $1-billion, stepped up greatly in later years with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Department of Labor and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, set up in 1965, increasingly involved.

Transportation: Urban Mass Transportation Acts of 1964 and 1966.

Model Cities: Act of 1966 proposing grants to cities, supplemental to those available from other Federal sources, to fight urban problems in the most blighted areas, including housing, health, education, jobs, welfare, transportation, and public facilities. Funded with $312-million in the fiscal year 1968. Its appropriation has been doubled for the coming year.

Rent supplements: Started in 1966 to provide better housing for low-income families, funded far below Administration requests.

Crime Control: Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1968, providing block grants to improve state and city law enforcement.

Civil rights

Segregation: Act of 1964 outlawing discrimination in hospitals, restaurants, hotels and employment; authorizing shutoff in Federal aid used in a discriminatory manner.

Voting: Act of 1965 protecting voting rights at the national, state and local level.

Housing: Act of 1968 protecting civil rights workers and initiating fair housing requirements nationally.

Community Relations: Transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Commerce to the Justice Department.

Conservation

Water Pollution: Water Quality Act of 1965 and the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 under which $5.5-billion in grants have been made for water purification and sewage treatment plants.

Air Pollution: Clean Air Act and Air Quality Acts of 1965 and 1967 seeking air cleansing through regional grants.

Waste: Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965.

Roads: Highway Beautification Act of 1965 to cover 75 per cent of the cost of removing roadside eyesores.

Recreation: Urban beautification under the Urban Renewal Act, including the creation of vest pocket parks in congested areas.

Parks: Expansion of the national park system by 2.2-million acres.

Consumer protection

Meat: Meat Inspection Act of 1967, requiring states to enforce Federal standards or yield to Federal inspection.

Poultry: Poultry Inspection Act of 1968.

Fabrics: Establishment of Product Safety Commission in 1967 to study dangerous household products and flammable fabrics amendments to a 1953 act directing the Secretary of Commerce to fix safety standards in clothing.

Farm Prices: Food Marketing Commission set up to study farm-to-consumer prices.

Truth In Lending: Act of 1968 requiring dollar-and-cents accounting of actual costs under "easy credit" and other financing plans.

Packaging: Fair Packaging and Labeling Act.

Electronics: Hazardous Radiation Act designed to reduce possible harmful effects of television and other electronic house devices.

Traffic: Traffic and Highway Safety Act setting standards to be met by manufacturers for automobile safety.

Education

Elementary Schools: Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, strengthened in 1966, providing stepped-up aid to 100 per cent in 1970 for quality education, including text books for public and private schools, with a $9.2-billion authorization for the next two years.

Higher Education: Act of 1965 providing liberal loans, scholarship and facility construction money.

Teacher Corps: Act of 1965 to train teachers.

Aid to Poor: Educational Opportunity Act of 1968 to help poor go to college.

Adult Education: Act of 1968.

Job opportunity

Training: Manpower Development and Training Act of 1964 to qualify persons for new and better jobs.

Job Corps: Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 setting up Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps and new careers programs.

Business: Job Opportunities in the Business Sector, which, under the leadership of the National Alliance of Businessmen, seeks 500,000 jobs for hard-core unemployed.

Appalachia: Program of 1965 seeking economic development and jobs in 11-state economically depressed area.

Wage: Increase in minimum wage by 35 cents to $1.60.

Health

Medicare: Set up in 1965, insurance for 20 million citizens at 65 under the Social Security system to cover hospital and doctor costs.

Medicaid: Act of 1965, providing medical care for the needy, with 7.7 million people in 43 states now getting aid.

Doctors Training: Health Professions Act of 1963–65 seeking to train 1,700 doctors.

Nurses Training: Act of 1964, which has already provided 65,000 loans for schooling.

Mental Health: Program of 1965–66, providing centers for treatment and training.

Immunization: Program for preschool children against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus and measles, under which, for example, the annual incidence of measles dropped from 450,000 in 1963 to 62,000 last year.

Health Centers: Heart, cancer and stroke regional centers.

Child Health: Improvement and Protection Act of 1968 for prenatal and postnatal care.

CLIMATE RIPE

Much of all this legislation had been sought for years, and when Mr. Johnson took office after the assassination of President Kennedy, the climate was apparently ripe for breakthroughs.

President Johnson moved quickly, and kept up the pace after the landslide election in 1964 brought him large majorities in the House and Senate.

Negro rioting in the slums in 1966, capped by a Republican gain of 47 seats in the still-Democratic House, slowed the Great Society.

The election strengthened the Southern Democrat-conservative Republican coalition that had repeatedly blocked many of these projects in the past.

The Administration sought $662-million for the fiscal year 1968 ending last June 30 to fund the model cities program. It got $312-million. It sought $1-billion for 1969 and got $625-million.

However, observers considered it significant that a modest expansion of the Great Society was nevertheless made during the 90th Congress.

While noting that the Vietnam war intensified during the developing stages of the Great Society, Wilbur J. Cohen, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, said recently that the choice was "not between guns and butter."

"There is a third factor—quality of life," he said. "It is a decision every American must face. A third of our families have two or more cars, 15 million of us own yachts. There is a lot of money for liquor and cigarettes. We've got the money but we've got to establish our priorities."

He said that "the United States can eliminate poverty in the coming decade and go on to assure adequate income for the overwhelming majority of Americans."

THE POVERTY LINE

Mr. Cohen noted that since 1960 the Government had "lifted 18 million out of poverty." He defined the poverty line as $3,300 annually for a city family of four. Still below the poverty level are 21.9 million Americans.

There are other Administration claims of progress, such as 10.5 million jobs created in seven and a half years, salaries and wages up 72 per cent in the period, corporate profits after taxes up 61 per cent, three record years with unemployment below 3.8 per cent, the Federal education budget up $12-million, $5.5-million spent for housing and community development.

Many impartial observers find it hard to disagree with most claims, which are accompanied with details on the job still to be done.

During the recent national campaign, Mr. Nixon did not reject any significant facet of the Great Society but at various times suggested that the drive for a better America could be achieved more effectively by other means.

He favored, for example, tax incentives to draw business more actively into the campaign against poverty and related programs.

But the country will probably have to wait until the new President's inaugural address Jan. 20 for a clearer idea of the course of the Great Society.

DIFFICULTIES THAT FACE PRESIDENT PUSEY, OF HARVARD

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, writing in the New York Times of Sunday, April 13, 1969, James Reston put in perspective the difficulties facing President Pusey, of Harvard.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Reston's excellent article, captioned "The Harvard Faculty: Tactics or Principles?" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HARVARD FACULTY: TACTICS OR PRINCIPLES?

(By James Reston)

Somebody should say a few plain words in support of President Nathan M. Pusey of Harvard before he too gets swept away by the moral confusions of our time.

He is a political innocent and not a popular president with the students or the faculty—never has been—but his record in defending the integrity of a free university cannot be seriously challenged. He defended it from Joe McCarthy's attacks on the right when many more "popular" men ducked the issue. And he defended it from the onslaughts of the militant wing of the Students for a Democratic Society in the recent riot in University Hall.

THE FACULTY DIVISION

In all these confrontations between the S.D.S. and the administrators of the universities, there are always hard choices about calling the police to quell the riot, but one would have thought the facts of the original aggression in the Harvard case were so clear that the faculty, at least, would have been able in four hours of debate to draw a clear distinction between the morals and the tactics of the incident.

It is true that the faculty did not actually repudiate Pusey, but they sure did hesitate. On two occasions they rejected resolutions which would have been a clear vote of "no-confidence" in his handling of the attack on the university. But they waffled and divided narrowly on the issue—about 250 to 200—first on a resolution saying his calling the police was "unwise and ill-considered," and the other resolution tabling a clear vote of confidence in him which might have been defeated.

Maybe this was their way of embarrassing the president for other reasons, but if they want to get rid of him on his stewardship in general, they have the means to face that issue squarely. His record in this particular case and in other cases involving the rights of students and the integrity of free inquiry, however, scarcely justify this kind of grudging support in a moment of crisis.

HARVARD'S FREEDOM

Nobody can complain about lack of freedom or abuse of administration authority at Harvard. It is even harder to get kicked out of the place than to get into it, which may have been what the S.D.S. had in mind. There is no secret alliance between Harvard and the Pentagon. Mr. Pusey may have been unwise in giving the impression, after denying academic credit for R.O.T.C. courses, that he was trying to perpetuate the R.O.T.C. system at Harvard anyway, but his record of freedom is not only plain but is the cause of much muttering among the alumni about his "permissiveness".

Of course, it is repulsive to have cops on any university campus, and tactically, the damage to the university might or might not have been less if he had let the S.D.S. burglar the files and print the loot in the underground's press. But what do you do when students take over buildings, steal documents, and throw deans to the photographers?

If the faculty, which is responsible for discipline, will not speak out clearly on this plain issue of the original affront and humiliation to the university and its purposes, how will they ever defend the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes?

The principle of peaceful change and of opposing the using of force of political ends has been fought out in this country for many generations. Lincoln faced the agony of a Civil War to defend it. Teddy Roosevelt challenged the "robber barons" when they sought to defy the principle early in the century. Labor defied the principle with the first sit-ins in Detroit in the thirties and now we are facing the same challenge from S.D.S. on the left.

This is not to say that force is never justified. We became an independent country by using force against the constituted authority. The blacks in this country have many grievances that are not removed by peaceful debate. And even at Columbia University there were appalling stupidities that no amount of polite discourse seemed to change.

GABBIEST PLACE—HARVARD

But Harvard? Who is muzzled there? It is the gabbiest place in Christendom, and so free that even its faculty sometimes gives the impression that it would rather talk about tactics than think about principles.

The Harvards have been telling us for generations that they were just like other people, only better. And now both points are in dispute.

THE CONSUMER CRUSADE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of the 90th Congress in consumer protection have led some observers to conclude that the consumer's problems are being adequately handled through piecemeal legislation. In fact, a number of these laws are not being properly executed or have been largely diluted as a result of weak enforcement procedures.

The following article, "The Consumer Crusade," by Nick Kotz in the April 1969 issue of the Progressive, identifies the need to provide consumers with proper representation in Federal agencies. I personally believe that a Department of Consumer Affairs is the best way to insure that the steadily increasing body of consumer laws is effectively administered.

I am happy that over 100 Members of the Congress have sponsored legislation like my bill to create such a Department.

The above-mentioned article follows:

THE CONSUMER CRUSADE

(By Nick Kotz)[1]

When Presidential candidate Richard Nixon talked about consumer issues during the 1968 campaign, he hinted he would not need a White House adviser on consumer affairs. The consumer would have to protect himself in the Republican free enterprise market place. When, as President, Mr. Nixon first ventured into the consumer arena, he confirmed the worst fears of consumer advocates by appointing as his consultant Willie Mae Rogers, keeper of the Good Housekeeping "Seal of Approval."

The appointment of Miss Rogers brought joy mainly to private-interest trade groups such as the Grocery Manufacturers of America. But this achievement of their continued alliance against truth-in-packaging and mandatory standards on product safety did not last long. Mr. Nixon heard the outcry of conflict of interest and took just four days to realize that consumer protection was no longer a mini-issue; he terminated Miss Rogers' appointment.

The "keeper of the Seal" episode is a good point from which to begin assessing the consumer movement—for it is a "movement" which must be calculated in terms of its strengths and weaknesses, its enemies and advocates, and, for the next four years, in terms of what support it may get from the Nixon Administration.

Mr. Nixon now knows from his abortive appointment of Willie Mae Rogers that consumer issues can be political dynamite and that the public can learn quickly of any subtle Government efforts to downgrade consumer activities. His second choice for his adviser on consumer affairs will be watched carefully. So will his appointments to the regulatory agencies and so will the crucial White House policy positions taken on the numerous consumer issues now before Congress and the regulatory agencies.

For example, will the Nixon Administration move to enforce effectively the mass of consumer legislation enacted during the Johnson years? This legislation itself could become "a deceptive practice" if it is not funded and enforced.

The first signs have not been promising, especially the appointment of Georgia State Agriculture Commissioner J. Phil Campbell as Undersecretary of Agriculture. A Democrat recently turned Republican, Campbell led the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture in a bitter fight against the meat and poultry inspection legislation enacted by Congress in 1967 and 1968. Moreover, Agriculture Secretary Clifford Hardin has given Campbell the job of negotiating inspection regulations "acceptable" to the latter's cronies in state agricultural agencies. These state officials fought strict regulation and still decline to accept the evidence that state-inspected plants under their jurisdiction constituted a national scandal.

---

[1] Nick Kotz is a Washington correspondent for the Des Moines Register. He won both a Pulitzer Prize and the Raymond Clapper Memorial Award in 1968 for his reporting of improper conditions in the meat packing industry which led to passage of the Wholesale Meat Act. In 1966 he won the Clapper and Sigma Delta Chi awards for his Washington correspondence. He is now completing a book on the politics of hunger.

Hardin now says he has no plans to seek change of these laws, but two consumer-oriented Democrats, Representatives Neal Smith of Iowa and Thomas Foley of Washington, authors of the legislation, are watching Campbell's guarded moves. They would be encouraged, for example, if the U.S. Department of Agriculture were to follow through on the proposal it made during the Johnson Administration to limit fat content in meat, such as hot dogs, to thirty per cent. The industry is angrily protesting even this mild proposal.

Discussing the fragile characters of recent consumer victories, Ralph Nader picked out auto safety, flammable fabrics, and pipeline safety as examples where "promises of consumer legislation can become fraudulent if the legislation cannot deliver because lobbyists successfully go to work on the appropriations and rule-making process."

Nader pointed out that the auto safety law suffered a setback because appropriations were slashed so sharply that there are no funds to develop a prototype safety car and a proving ground facility needed to upgrade safety standards.

"The flammable fabrics act still has not been implemented," said Nader, "and the petroleum industry is now opposing proposed pipeline safety standards that the industry claimed it was voluntarily following before passage of the safety bill." This is often the case with so-called voluntary industry standards when they become, or threaten to become, law.

Other new consumer laws which still await appropriations and enforcement include the truth-in-packaging and truth-in-lending laws. "Packaging" is endangered by weak Federal rule-making which permits too many package variations, and the "lending" law by a proposed "uniform consumers credit code" at the state level. This proposed code, designed to supersede the Federal law, would, among other evils, permit a thirty-six per cent interest rate. It was denounced by Representative Wright Patman as "legalized usury and an attempt to wipe out truth in lending."

The clinical laboratory improvement act, the hazardous radiation act, and the interstate sales disclosures act (against fraudulent land sale schemes) are other examples of hard-won consumer protection victories. Whether these will be implemented still remains to be seen.

Senator Edmund Muskie underscored the gulf between promise and performance when he recently warned the Consumers Assembly that new antipollution laws cannot become effective if Congress and the Executive branch continually slash appropriations needed to make the measures meaningful. He offered these 1969 examples: Water pollution, authorization $836 million, appropriation $302 million; water and sewer grants, $420 million reduced to $165 million; air pollution, $185 million cut to $88.7 million.

Consumer attorney Nader takes this realistic view of the burst of consumer legislation during the final period of the Johnson Administration: "Certain consumer values were articulated. Something was done and will be done because the laws are on the books. But you can't grow a rose on top of a garbage can. The consumer movement is going to reflect and be limited by the political environment in Washington—from the corporate law firms to the appropriations committees that give billions for defense and pennies for protection against death, injury, and swindles."

The flimsy nature of the protection given the consumer becomes clear in any recital of the dangers he faces every day. The stakes can be counted in terms of human lives in some of these issues before Congress this year:

Cigarettes—50,000 die from lung cancer every year, and millions are estimated to die from heart disease and emphysema, related to smoking.

Household appliance injuries—100,000 persons are injured annually by sliding glass doors, 125,000 by faulty heating devices, and 300,000 by poorly designed stoves, washing machines, and power lawn mowers.

The National Commission on Product Safety, whose creation was a consumer victory in 1967, is now seeking to determine whether industry's voluntary safety standards offer sufficient consumer protection. On the basis of testimony received and comments from a variety of sources ranging from *The Wall Street Journal* to Admiral Hyman Rickover, the answer is a resounding "No!"

Dr. Julian A. Waller of the University of Vermont told the Commission that each year about 60,000 persons, mostly children, are partially "barbecued" by the 350-degree-hot grilles on gas-fired floor furnaces used in homes in the South and Southwest. Dr. Waller and two safety specialists from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare testified that they had tried vainly, for ten years, to get the American Gas Association (AGA) to adopt voluntary safety standards to eliminate this ghastly hazard.

Frank E. Hogdon, AGA director of laboratories, confirmed this testimony and praised the Commission-sponsored firm which in three weeks, with an outlay of $800, developed an inexpensive fiberglass shield to protect infants from burns. An industry committee on safety standards "simply did not know of any technology and apparently couldn't think of any; and didn't perhaps have enough incentive," Hogdon said, to remove the hazard.

If the sufferings of maimed children cannot provide sufficient "incentive," then possibly widespread and damaging publicity that names hazardous products can produce the proper incentive to adhere to adequately safe voluntary or mandatory, Government-enforced standards.

On the same day that this unnerving testimony was presented, Nader told the Commission about the report of Dr. Carl Walter, Harvard Medical School, that 1,200 Americans are accidentally electrocuted annually by faulty medical equipment while receiving "routine diagnostic tests" or treatment. Again, voluntary standards have not been sufficient.

Auto and tire repairs and warranties—No one knows how many of the 53,000 annual auto fatalities and four million injuries are caused by defective, improperly designed, or improperly repaired parts. But testimony before the Federal Trade Commission and Senator Philip Hart's Anti-trust and Monetary Subcommittee indicated that the economic cost is staggering. For example, Edward Daniels, claims manager for the Inter-Insurance Exchange of the Automobile Club of Michigan, has estimated the multi-billion dollar annual auto repair bill could be reduced twenty per cent by a simple change in design to provide bumpers functional enough to withstand a crash at a mere five to ten miles per hour. His testimony was typical as safety engineers, auto dealers, labor union members, and insurance firms testified that the auto giants use their warranties more as sales devices than for customer service and do not compensate dealers to make proper repairs.

Drugs—Senator Gaylord Nelson continues his probe into drug costs, safety, and the crucial question of whether the drug firms exert an unhealthy influence on the medical profession and command exorbitant prices.

Fish—The evidence indicates that the situation in fish processing is far worse than in meat or poultry; only a fraction of the fish processing industry receives any inspection.

In addition to this partial catalogue of potential or actual threats to human life and safety, there are many deceptive practices in the market place which simply cheat consumers on value received. The sheer complexity of the threats to life, limb, and pocketbook constitutes the heart of the dilemma of the consumer movement today. Consumers simply lack enough trained, dedicated personnel committed to the primary goal of representing the "consumer" as these issues are decided in Washington. The regulatory agencies seldom hear consumer views and often demonstrate an inherent conflict between their role as safety regulator and their role as promoter of an industry's products.

Although most industry spokesmen and many conservative politicians argue derisively that "consumerism" has been produced by the combined action of power-seeking Federal bureaucrats and sensationalizing by Ralph Nader, publicity-seekers, and journalists, the facts belie this explanation.

Searching for an underlying explanation, I believe that the individual citizen feels increasingly frustrated by the lack of representation for his best interests in an increasingly complex, technical, and corporate society. A confidential nationwide survey made by Opinion Research Corporation in 1968 concluded that "seven Americans in ten think present Federal legislation is inadequate to protect their health and safety and a majority believes more Federal laws are needed to give shoppers full value for their money."

Most advocates of consumer rights have now concluded that institutional reform is necessary to provide consumers with the same power in Washington that the special interests enjoy through their army of well-paid lawyers and lobbyists.

Most of those who have been involved in consumer crusades of the last few years would agree at least partly with the assessment by Ralph Nader of consumer strength: "The attack on corporate irresponsibility which produced the recent flurry of legislation in Congress has not, it must be said, been the work of a broad movement but rather of tiny ad hoc coalitions of determined people in and out of Government armed with little more than shocking facts."

Victory on most issues in the real world of Washington power often hinges on a chance fact pounced upon and turned to one's favor. If he is to succeed, the consumer advocate, as well as the General Motors lobbyist, must know when Representative Jones has become the decisive, swing vote in the pertinent subcommittee. This is the intelligence function that industry (which knew who represented the decisive vote), and not consumers, capitalized on when Representative William S. Stuckey of Georgia held the balance of power on a mutual funds regulation bill last year.

This intelligence function—getting the facts on who holds the real power on Capitol Hill on a given issue—simply cannot be provided by the enthusiasts who gather in Washington annually for the Consumer Assembly, a meeting of delegates from cooperatives, trade unions, women's organizations, and other consumer-oriented groups. They can be experts at home, but in the minute-by-minute power struggle on issues in Washington, they are amateurs. That is what Federal Communications Commissioner Nicholas Johnson had in mind when he told the Assembly:

"You are wasting your time if you think these meetings make the voice of the consumer louder. Don't kid yourselves. Get some dollars behind you and put someone in Washington to represent you who isn't beholden to the President or Congress or the regulatory agencies. And until you do that, you can hold all the meetings you want, but you won't change anything."

The meetings are valuable because they

pull consumer issues together and provide new contacts for more ad hoc "little coalitions" on specific issues. However, Johnson was emphasizing that amateurs cannot provide the skills of intelligence-gathering, consumer advocacy, or public relations.

The still-thin ranks of skilled advocates are growing as more young Congressmen take up consumer causes either out of political motive or sincere belief. The Democrats will be free to be more effectively critical of the Executive agencies with a Republican as President, and Republican consumer advocates now can command their day of glory by persuading the Nixon Administration to back their causes.

In considering the various proposals to provide more consumer power, one can evaluate their strengths and weaknesses by understanding some of the keys to Ralph Nader's phenomenal success. Apart from his steel-trap mind and sixteen-hour work days, Nader is a virtual genius at fact-finding, advocacy, and public relations. But beyond this he is a lone operator, beholden to no one, and this gives him unusual strength. Throughout the meat inspection fight Nader argued for the strongest possible bill. When Congressional consumer advocates finally had to agree to a plan with foes who outnumbered them ten to one, they first checked with Nader. Nader is not bound by any permanent alliances, and any Congressional proponent of consumer legislation worries that Nader will criticize a compromise as a sellout of consumer interests.

Aside from these attributes one must understand Nader's fervent ethical philosophy to grasp his strength. Most people in the so-called establishment apparently do not. I am amazed that most friends of mine, including lawyers and newspapermen, seem obsessed with finding out what makes Nader tick. They are tortured to uncover his "angle"—one that squares with the median values of our society. Are his work so bizarre and his ethical values so unusual in our contemporary society that our principal concern is to search out ulterior motives? Nader is not superhuman; he has the same power drives that possess many strong, talented men, but he is the ultimate example of the idealistic younger men who now seek to reshape our institutions.

The unanswered question is how idealists can be effective, if they desire to work in the consumer movement in Washington or elsewhere. Thus, the suggestions are pouring in to institutionalize "Naderism."

Nader's own idea is a non-profit firm of lawyers, engineers, doctors, and accountants which would represent the highest ethics of their professions in behalf of the consumer in Washington power struggles. In more than two years of trying, Nader has been unable to finance this project. With his high visibility, foundations afraid of political investigations and reprisals from their financial backers have shied away from him.

Numerous Congressmen are recommending creation of a Department of Consumer Affairs which would consolidate Federal consumer protection now scattered among a number of agencies, and represent consumers in the regulatory process. Transferred into the new department would be existing agencies dealing with both truth in packaging and lending, food grading, home economics research, and cost of living statistics. In addition, a consumer counsel would represent the public interest before other regulatory agencies, Federal departments, and the courts. An office of consumer safety would study measures to protect consumers from hazardous household products.

This idea has merit in that it would place primary responsibility for consumer protection and representation in a department-level agency, would provide a central department where all consumers could address their complaints, and could prod those other Government agencies which are slow to respond to the needs of the consumer.

The proposed department would not meet Nicholas Johnson's criteria of freedom from either Congress or the President. Representative Benjamin Rosenthal, New York Democrat, who is a leading sponsor, agrees that big business pressures would still exist but believes industry is far less likely to capture an agency whose only function is consumer protection than one, such as the Department of Agriculture's food inspection unit, whose consumer function is far outweighed by the Department's obligations to the food industry. A Presidential adviser on consumer affairs, such as Esther Peterson or Betty Furness, obviously is even more tightly restricted by one man's politics.

Aside from private ventures of the Nader variety, perhaps the best hope for increased representation lies in the people's counsel idea approved by the U.S. Administrative Conference and Senator Philip Hart's proposal for a quasi-public consumer counsel. In both cases there would be some insulation from more obvious political pressures.

Arthur Bonfield, the University of Iowa law school professor who wrote the much-neglected Administrative Conference report, advocates a people's counsel operated much like the Public Broadcast Corporation. The people's counsel would be created as a completely independent Federally-chartered corporation. Its board members would be appointed by the President with consent of the Senate but otherwise the organization would be independent of Federal control. This proposed office would represent the views of the poor before the Federal agencies considering matters affecting their welfare as consumers.

Few people know that the U.S. Administrative Conference, which consists of the major administrative agencies of government, acknowledged that the consumer, particularly the poor citizen, is vastly under-represented in the regulatory process. Although the Conference approved the Bonfield report, there has been scant action from the various agencies to implement their own joint recommendations to seek out the views of the poor and to provide the poor with a role in regulations that affect them.

After questioning the agencies about their practices, Bonfield deduced that one-third make no effort to solicit the views of the poor in rule-making. He described efforts of the remainder as so haphazard, unsystematic, and sporadic as to be "totally inadequate." Incredibly, the Department of Agriculture admitted it never consulted the poor in drafting guidelines for the food stamp plan.

Gilbert Cranberg, an unsung Ralph Nader who writes editorials for the *Des Moines Register*, stated the issue clearly: "A fundamental premise of democracy is that agencies of government will be responsive to the needs and wishes of the people. But theory conflicts with reality when some groups have ready access to government and others have only limited access."

If Mr. Nixon downgrades consumer issues or is hostile to consumer protection measures, then the consumer movement will have lost a most effective and powerful ally—the White House. But the consumer movement will not be powerless. It should be remembered that the Johnson White House did not stake out its position on consumer issues until after Nader publicly blistered the President and Miss Furness for failure to take a strong position on the meat inspection issue.

If the issues are real and the public is aroused, then Mr. Nixon will be vulnerable to the same sort of backlash that swiftly followed the Willie Mae Rogers appointment.

If consumer advocates can agree on one or several approaches to increased consumer representation, then their problem will be to lobby their plans through Congress. A majority of Congress may share Mr. Nixon's concern about unwarranted meddling with the free enterprise system. But as the public keeps on learning from bitter personal experience—and from reading—how poorly private enterprise is meeting its responsibilities on product safety, durability, and honesty, there will be a rising clamor for "warranted meddling" to protect the consumer. Consumer protection will then attain a popularity with politicians that it never has achieved before. When it does, let the seller beware.

TAX REFORM—STATEMENT OF GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT, AFL–CIO, BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on April 1, George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, testified before the House Committee on Ways and Means on the subject of tax reform. Mr. Meany's statement provides an excellent analysis of the urgent need for prompt legislative action in this session of the 91st Congress.

Mr. President, so that other Senators may have the benefit of Mr. Meany's remarks, I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT, AFL–CIO, ON TAX REFORM, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 1, 1969

My name is George Meany and I am president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The 13.5 million members of the unions of the AFL–CIO are, almost without exception, taxpayers. They pay their taxes regularly, payday after payday, through the payroll withholding program. They are loyal Americans; they appreciate the value of government, the services of government, the need for paying for government.

They are willing to pay their fair share.

But they are tired, Mr. Chairman, of having to pay the share of other Americans. They are specifically tired of paying the share of those Americans whose incomes are greater and whose taxes are lower—the "loophole set" in today's society.

So it is on behalf of the largest organized group of taxpayers in America, Mr. Chairman, that we come here today with proposals we believe are based on the doctrine of fair play. There are some who call the measures before this Committee "tax reform." We think "tax justice" is a better description and that is what we are seeking here today—tax justice.

The federal income-tax structure has drifted far afield from the American standard of fair play. It is rigged against income from work and against wage and salary earners. It is rigged in favor of unearned income. Because of these facts, confidence in our tax system has eroded. This erosion must be ended. Fairness in federal taxation must be restored.

In our appendix statement we have catalogued what we believe to be the most glaring abuses—the loopholes and gimmicks which lighten the tax burdens of those who have both huge amounts of unearned income and great ability to pay and yet who unfairly rig the nation's tax structure against those whose livelihood depends on a paycheck.

The program of tax justice we urge is ambitious and far-reaching, long overdue and critically urgent. There is no longer time for pause, delay, gestures or tokens.

Our program—fully adopted—would close loopholes currently costing the federal Treasury about $15 to 17 billion. We would put back $6.7 billion of this in much-needed and long overdue tax relief to those of low, moderate and middle incomes. There would be a net gain in revenue of $8 to 10 billion—to enable full funding of essential federal programs to strengthen society—and a priceless, immeasurable gain in public confidence in the nation's tax structure and the federal government itself.

Our program would eliminate the preferential treatment the tax system gives to unearned capital-gains income, the loophole which means that a married taxpayer with $8,000 in capital gains pays a tax of $354 while an $8,000 married wage earner is taxed at $1,000.

Our program would tax the $15 billion in capital gains that is passed on annually to heirs without ever being mentioned on the individual-income tax form.

The AFL–CIO reform proposals would eliminate the special provisions which permit oil operators, real-estate investors and hobby farmers to write off nonexistent costs. Under these provisions:

The nation's 20 oil giants pay an 8.5% average tax rate.

A real-estate operator with a total income of $7.5 million pays taxes at the same rate as a $10,000-per-year married wage earner with two children.

101 individuals capable of making over $1,000,000 in other endeavors claim $7.6 million in tax write-offs for farm losses.

We would end the wasteful, back-door, tax-exempt-interest federal subsidy to state and local governments and replace it with a federal grant program that would help these financially pressed governments to meet their rapidly growing needs.

We would eliminate both the 7% investment credit and extra-fast depreciation write-offs except for those investing in the construction of housing for low- and moderate-income families.

Under our proposals, tax-exempt foundations would no longer be able to use their privileged tax status as a means of avoiding estate and gift taxes while maintaining control over wealth and the power that goes hand-in-hand with such control. It is, of course, power which has been used to affect stock prices, reward friends and relatives, and help advance the foundations donors' other business interests.

In our opinion, that's hardly "fair play" and we would eliminate it. In addition, we would see to it that those who pay little or no taxes because of the "unlimited charitable-contribution gimmick" could no longer deflate their taxable income through donations that yield far greater benefits to the donor than the receiver.

And we would curb another abuse—those large corporations which exploit a privilege geared to help small business and spin off into subsidiaries. They can take full advantage of the much-reduced tax rate on the first $25,000 of corporate income and can cut their tax bill by more than half.

We are critically concerned with the alarming growth of conglomerates. We urge a thorough reexamination of those tax provisions which serve to spur the corporate take-over movement. Furthermore, the effects of these giant economic and financial power centers upon prices, competition, collective bargaining, and the political and economic system itself must become known. We believe appropriate action must be taken—whether through legislation or administrative action by such government agencies as the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission or the anti-trust division of the Department of Justice.

In the event that it is not possible to quickly adopt all of our proposals to tax in full presently exempt income—such as half of all capital gains and interest from state and local bonds—we urge immediate enactment of a 25% minimum tax on exempt income.

Furthermore, we urge that individuals and corporations with substantial amounts of tax-exempt income be required to allocate certain deductions between taxable and non-taxable income so that all income is taken into account before deductions are allowed.

Though loophole closing is utterly essential to tax reform, justice cannot be fully achieved unless the tax load simultaneously is eased for those who for too long have borne the brunt of the inequities in the tax structure.

Our tax-relief proposals would remove from the tax rolls the majority of those taxpayers whose incomes are below government poverty-income levels, and provide relief to those of moderate and middle incomes.

We recommend a substantial increase in the present minimum standard and standard deductions and a sharp reduction in the tax rates that apply to the first two income-bracket levels.

The tax system must now provide for the interests and needs of a nation of over 200 million people who are demanding more and better public facilities. Yet many of the flaws that have existed since the federal government first began to tax incomes still exist and many new ones have been added.

The costs of government are not being shared fairly. An unwarranted limitation is placed on the effectiveness of tax policy in promoting broad goals of balanced economic growth and full employment, and public confidence is decaying.

When tax revenues are to be spent, the legislative and executive branches appropriately study and evaluate every outlay of public funds to assure that national interests will be forwarded and priorities balanced. Yet, on the revenue-raising side, tax policy is all too frequently considered only in terms of need for more dollars or fewer dollars.

The temporary surtax, adopted in 1968, is a prime example. A flat percentage tax on top of the existing tax is a fair way to divide the burden of an increase in taxes—but, only if the original burden is fair.

Since a tax on a tax cannot be collected if no taxes are paid, those who are rich enough to avoid their fair share of taxes through capital gains, depletion, accelerated depreciation, tax-exempt interest and other tax-escape routes, pay no surtax on such exempt income. Because of this, others pay more and the basic inequities are compounded.

What is more, many of the inequities cause the taxation system to run in direct opposition to the objectives sought through public tax-spending programs.

For example:

While the nation is being burdened with inflationary pressures and high interest rates, the task of easing these burdens is made more difficult by the tax system. Privileges such as the 7% investment credit and accelerated depreciation on real estate fuel the fires of the only source of inflationary demand in the national economy—business investment in plants, machines and equipment.

$935 million in federal funds are being spent on low- and moderate-income housing; yet $800 million worth of tax loopholes go to real-estate operators constructing motels, office buildings, plants and high-rise, high-rent apartment complexes.

$4.5 billion is spent to "stabilize farm incomes;" yet wealthy nonfarmers are encouraged, through the tax system, to disrupt and distort the farm economy.

The large and growing concentrations of wealth and economic power are a source of growing national concern; yet the income-tax system allows $15 billion in appreciated assets to accumulate and be transferred to heirs without ever entering the tax base. At the same time, tax-exempt status is given to certain types of family foundations set up for avoiding taxes and perpetuating control of family and industrial financial dynasties. $8 million is spent enforcing anti-trust laws; yet the tax system provides incentives for those who would merge and "conglomerate."

Oil, gas and other depletion allowances are justified largely on the basis of encouraging development of domestic productive capacity; yet similar tax benefits flow to those bolstering the productive capability of foreign nations.

Some $25 billion in federal categorical grant-in-aid funds will go to the states and localities in 1969; yet the amount of federal money available to hard-pressed state and local governments is diluted by allowing interest on state and local bonds to go tax-free, since this exemption costs the Treasury more than the states and municipalities gain.

The nation is committed to alleviating the plight of its 22 million poor; yet many of these families pay federal income taxes while many of the wealthiest legally ignore the federal tax collector.

Though the case for reform is compelling and perhaps conclusively demonstrated by these incongruities and paradoxes, there is another too frequently overlooked aspect.

Federal income taxes are not the only taxes Americans must pay. In fact, though federal income-tax revenues have grown and still loom largest among the taxes paid by most individuals, state and local taxes have grown at a far faster pace. What's more, the increases in state and local taxes have in the main resulted from levies on property and sales to consumers which take their toll from those whose ability to pay taxes is the least.

In the 1969 *Economic Report of the President*, data was presented showing that the combined federal, state and local tax systems converge in such a manner as to redistribute income "away from the poor." At the same time, those of modest and middle incomes are bearing a disproportionately high share of the tax burden while those with wealth and ability-to-pay escape their fair share.

Thoroughgoing federal income-tax loophole closing and reform would make a substantial contribution toward compensating for the unfair manner in which the burden of other taxes fall.

Furthermore, it is the federal income-tax system that most states look upon as the standard for a good and fair way to allocate the costs of public services. A number of states that do use income taxes use the federal definitions and standards as models for their own systems, and three states now "piggyback" their taxes directly upon the federal taxes that their residents must pay.

Yet, as the inequities in the federal system grow and become more and more notorious, the basic principles of taxation based on income and ability-to-pay become suspect and fair-minded state and local legislators find it increasingly difficult to convince those they represent of the advantages of fair taxation methods.

The AFL–CIO has three objectives in mind to achieve fair play in the nation's tax structure:

1. The loopholes of special tax privilege for wealthy families and businesses must be eliminated.

2. The impoverished must be removed from the tax rolls.

3. There must be a reduction in the relative burden for low- and moderate-income families.

To close the loopholes, provide relief where it is critically needed, and bring the federal individual and corporate income-tax systems into line with America's standards of fair play, the AFL–CIO urges adoption of the following proposals:

1. *Capital gains.* Elimination of preferential tax treatment of capital gains for both individuals and corporations. Such gains should be taxed at regular tax rates. At the same time, the present income-averaging provisions should be broadened to include capital gains.

Approximate revenue gain: $6–7 billion.

2. *Capital Gains on Property Transferred at Death.* All appreciation (difference between original cost and market value) should be taxed in full on transfer at death. The tax rate should apply to all appreciation occurring after date of enactment; one-half the tax rate should apply to all gains occurring between an appropriate date such as January 1, 1950, and the date of enactment.

The tax should be allowed as a deduction for estate-tax purposes. It should not apply on transfers between the decedent and spouse nor to estates valued at less than $60,000.

To prevent "forced" sales of assets, appropriate installment-payment procedures should be adopted.

Approximate revenue gain: *$3–4 billion.*

3. *Depletion.* Deductions for depletion should not be permitted to be taken after the cost of the property has been fully written off.

Approximate revenue gain: *$1.5 billion.*

4. *Interest on State and Local Bonds.* All interest on state and local debt securities, issued after the date of enactment (following an appropriate transition period) should be subject to the income tax. The federal government should guarantee the bonds and pay the issuing state or local government an amount equal to one-third of the interest cost on such taxable issues. No federal guarantee or interest-rate subsidy should be permitted for industrial development bonds regardless of the amount of the issue.

There would be a net revenue gain, after taking into account the cost of the subsidy and the guarantee, of approximately $100 million.

5. *7% Investment Tax Credit.* The 7% investment tax credit should be repealed.

Approximate revenue gain: *$3.0 billion.*

6. *Accelerated Depreciation on Real Estate.* Accelerated depreciation (depreciation in excess of straight-line) should be disallowed on all real estate except low- and moderate-housing.

Approximate revenue gain: *$700–800 million.*

7. *Limitation of Deductions Attributable to Farming Operations.* Each dollar of nonfarm income over $15,000 should reduce the amount of farm loss that can be deducted from nonfarm income by $1. This provision should not apply to farm losses resulting from taxes, interest, casualty, drought, and sale of farm property. This provision should not apply to farmers using the accrual method of accounting.

Approximate revenue gain: *$145 million.*

8. *Unlimited Charitable Contributions.* The special unlimited charitable-contribution deduction should be repealed immediately.

Approximate revenue gain: *$50 million.*

9. *Multiple Surtax Exemptions from Corporate Income Tax.* Commonly controlled business enterprises should, after an appropriate transition period, be limited to only one $25,000 surtax exemption.

Approximate revenue gain: (when fully effective): *$235 million.*

10. *Tax-Exempt Foundations:*

(1) Financial transactions between a foundation and its founders, contributors, officers, directors or trustees should be prohibited.

(2) Foundations should be required to spend their income within one year of receipt.

(3) Foundations should not be permitted to own 20% or more of any business unrelated to their charitable function—a reasonable time should be allowed for presently organized foundations to comply with this provision.

(4) If a donor maintains control of a business or property after it is contributed, no donation deduction from taxes should be allowed until the foundation disposes of the property or the donor's control over the property ends.

(5) Foundation borrowing to buy investment properties should be prohibited. Foundation lending should be limited to appropriate charitable functions.

(6) A limitation, such as 40 years, should be placed on the life of foundations.

(7) Congress should carefully examine the problems posed by the actual operations of foundations and the need for some degree of federal regulation of the use of the tax-exempt funds of foundations.

11. *Conglomerates.* The skyrocketing trend of business mergers requires detailed examination—including the anti-trust laws and the operations of the appropriate government agencies as the Justice Department, Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

A thorough investigation should also be conducted to determine the extent to which the federal tax structure contributes to this alarming trend of corporate mergers and acquisitions.

Among the tax provisions that should be examined are those which permit:

(1) Corporations to deduct interest payments on debt used to finance mergers and acquisitions.

(2) Capital-gains taxes to be paid in installments when stock is exchanged for debt securities.

(3) Tax-free exchanges on corporate stock transfers made for purposes of mergers and acquisitions.

(4) Corporations to "carryover" the operating and capital losses of an acquired firm.

In addition, the penalty tax provisions applying to excessive amounts of retained profits should be made workable in the light of recent experience.

12. *Allocation of Deductions.* Individuals and corporations should be required to allocate certain deductions between taxable and nontaxable income.

Under present law, those who receive tax-exempt income derive a double benefit. The income never appears on the tax return; hence no tax is paid. Secondly, personal or non-operating business deductions can be deducted in full from taxable income.

Before such deductions are permitted, since they are designed to define ability-to-pay, total income (taxable and exempt income) should be taken into account.

Individuals with tax-exempt income (as defined in item 13) in excess of $10,000 should be required to allocate certain personal deductions in line with the ratio their Adjusted Gross Income bears to adjusted gross income *plus* exempt income. The deductions that should be allocated are: interest and tax payments, casualty losses, charitable contributions, medical expenses, and cooperative housing expenses.

Corporations with such exempt income, in excess of $25,000, should be required to allocate non-operating expense deductions between net profit from operations and exempt income.

Approximate revenue gain from allocation of deductions: *$250 million.*

13. *Minimum Tax on Exempt Income.* A 25% tax should be levied on the amount of exempt income which exceeds $10,000 for individuals and $25,000 for corporations, plus any amount of deductions disallowed under allocation-of-deductions formula. The exempt income subject to this tax should include the following:

(1) One-half capital gains.

(2) State and local bond interest.

(3) Depletion taken after the cost of the property has been written off.

(4) The difference between the cost and the market value of property donated to charity.

(5) Depreciation on real estate taken in excess of straight-line, except for low- and moderate-housing.

Approximate revenue gain from 25% minimum tax: *$1.5 billion.*

TAX RELIEF FOR LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME GROUPS

1. *The minimum standard deduction should be increased from the present $200 plus $100 per exemption to $100 per exemption.*

This proposal would exempt from federal income tax the majority of persons below the government-defined poverty level and significantly reduce the tax payments of all persons at or near the poverty level.

The revenue cost would be approximately $1.2 billion.

2. *The standard deduction should be increased from the present 10% with a $1,000 maximum to 15% and a $2,500 maximum.* This proposal would bring standard deductions closer in line with the actual deductions claimed by most taxpayers. It would simplify reporting for the great majority of taxpayers and provide tax relief for all those whose itemized deductions amount to less than 15% of income or $2,500. Most of the relief would flow to those in the $5,000 to $20,000 income range.

The revenue cost would be approximately $2 billion.

3. *The first two individual-income-tax bracket rates should be reduced from the current 14% and 15% to 9% and 13% respectively.* This proposal would provide tax relief to all taxpayers, but the major portion of the tax deduction (approximately 95%) would go to those with annual incomes below $20,000.

The revenue cost would be approximately $3.4 billion.

4. *Moving-Expense Deductions.* Deductible moving expenses should be broadened to include certain non-reimbursed expenses such as those related to the sale of the old residence—real-estate commissions and advertising costs and costs of settling an unexpired lease; pre-move househunting trips; and temporary lodging costs (for worker and family). These additional costs should be subject to an overall limitation of $2,000. Present treatment of other deductible moving expenses—unreimbursed expenses of transporting the employee, his family and belongings, incurred in a job-connected move—should continue.

The revenue cost would be approximately $100 million.

Finally, all special tax-forgiveness proposals offered under the guise of "incentives" which would provide additional loopholes for the wealthy and further erode the fairness of the tax structure should be rejected. And all proposals to adopt a federal retail sales tax—whether called "value-added" taxes or offered clearly as a tax on consumers—should also be rejected.

There you have it, Mr. Chairman, the AFL–CIO proposals which we believe would achieve tax justice, eliminate abuses, restore public confidence and bring the American standard of fair play into the tax system.

The time for action is long overdue, Mr. Chairman. We are delighted the Committee is taking this hard look at the facts and we look forward to tax justice.

APPENDIX TO STATEMENT BY GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, ON TAX REFORM, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 1, 1969

The great and growing inequities in the federal tax structure are clear to most taxpayers and reasonably informed citizens.

In 1967, the most recent date for available information, the taxes paid by millionaires averaged only 25% of their total income. Twenty-one of these millionaires and 134 other persons whose reported incomes exceeded $200,000 paid not one cent in federal income taxes.

Yet in that same year 2¼ million taxpayers whose income fell below the government's definition of poverty paid $100 million in income taxes. And the average wage and salary earner with an income of $8,000 paid over 10% of his total income in income taxes.

The federal tax structure is rigged against wages and salaries—against income from work. It is rigged in favor of unearned income.

The federal tax on wages and salaries is the full tax rate—and the tax is usually deducted from the paycheck. However, those who receive other forms of income are provided with special privileges and exemptions.

Income gains from the sale of stock or other property are taxed at only half the regular tax rate—with a top maximum rate of 25%. Moreover, when stock or other property is passed on to heirs at death, the increased value of the property from the date of purchase is not subject even to this much-reduced capital gains tax.

Income from interest payments on state and local bonds is completely exempt from federal taxation.

*Sizable portions of the income from oil and gas properties and a large number of minerals never enter the tax stream because nonexistent "depletion" expenses are written off.

Much of the income from real estate escapes taxation since it is written off as depreciation. Such income is not only exempt from taxation but, since it is considered a write-off cost, it provides a tax shelter for the wealthy because it is deducted from other taxable income.

These special tax privileges are the domain essentially of the wealthy. But the super-rich and corporations have even further privileges:

Because of the little-known unlimited-charitable-contribution-deduction special privilege, many wealthy individuals and businesses can make contributions and save more in taxes than the contribution is worth.

Tax-exempt family foundations can be set up so wealthy families can control their fortunes in perpetuity without paying taxes.

Wealthy nonfarmers can invest in farm operations which yield imaginary losses that can be charged off against their high nonfarm incomes.

Business deducts 7% of the cost of new equipment and machinery from its tax bill—as a special tax credit. And, they can deduct it again as part of depreciation.

As a result of these and similar inequities, wealthy investors and businesses pay considerably less than their full tax burden. But moderate- and low-income taxpayers bear the full brunt of the tax system. This double standard of taxation heaps an unfairly great part of the burden of running the federal government on the shoulders of middle-income wage and salary earners.

These facts are generally known. They are eroding public confidence in the tax structure and in the fairness of the federal government as well. And since Americans expect so much from their tax structure—national defense, public facilities and services, grants-in-aid to the states and local governments—these inequities in the tax structure undermine public support for much-needed expansion of government services for a growing, urban population.

The entire federal tax structure must be overhauled. Tax loopholes for the wealthy must be ended. The relative tax burden on moderate- and low-income families must be eased.

Only twice since its inception in 1913 has the federal tax structure been revised. And these two revisions—in 1939 and 1954—were, according to a former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, only "facelifts."

The case for thorough reform of the federal tax structure is compelling and demonstrated by numerous incongruities and paradoxes. There is another too frequently overlooked aspect.

Americans must pay other taxes. In fact, though federal income-tax revenues have grown and still loom largest among the taxes paid by most individuals, state and local taxes have grown at a far faster pace. From 1963 to 1967 states and localities have almost tripled their annual tax take—from $44 billion to $115 billion. In contrast, federal income taxes (corporate and individual) grew from $69 billion to $95 billion, or by slightly over one-third. What's more, the increases in state and local taxes have in the main resulted from levies on property and sales to consumers which take their toll primarily from those whose ability to pay taxes is the least.

The importance of viewing the impact of the total tax structure was dramatically documented in the 1969 *Economic Report of the President*. Data was presented showing that the combined federal, state and local tax systems converge in such a manner as to redistribute income "away from the poor." At the same time, those of modest and middle incomes are bearing a disproportionately high share of the tax burden, while those with wealth and ability-to-pay escape their fair share.

The impact of these tax changes over the past five years is shown in Table 1. A $7,500 income family of four, as a result of the net effect of the 1964 federal tax cut and the 1968 increase, had an increase in after-tax income of 2% between 1963 and 1968. The rise in Social Security insurance rates and state and local tax increases over the period resulted in a 3.4% cut in after-tax income.

For those at the very bottom of the income scale, these tax changes over the past five years cut into after-tax income by 14.2%, while those with incomes of $35,000 and over enjoyed net increases in after-tax income.

Thoroughgoing federal income-tax loophole closing and reform would make a substantial contribution toward compensating for the unfair manner in which the burdens of other taxes fall.

Furthermore, it is the federal income-tax system that most states look upon as the standard for a good and fair way to allocate the costs of public services. A number of states that do use income taxes use the federal definitions and standards as models for their own systems, and three states now "piggyback" their taxes directly upon the federal taxes that their residents must pay.

Yet, as the inequities in the federal system grow and become more and more notorious, the basic principles of taxation based on income and ability-to-pay become suspect and fair-minded state and local legislators find it increasingly difficult to convince those they represent of the advantages of fair taxation methods.

To the extent that states and localities model their systems on the federal "base," the inequities that exist in the federal structure are multiplied. And the basic advantages are lost as other states shy away from taxing income and continue their reliance on inequitable and ineffective consumer and property taxes.

A thorough overhaul of the federal income-tax structure must be approached with three objectives in mind:

1. The loopholes of special tax privilege for wealthy families and businesses must be eliminated.

2. The impoverished must be removed from the tax rolls.

3. There must be a reduction in the relative tax burden for low- and moderate-income families.

CLOSING THE LOOPHOLES

Capital gains

When certain so-called "capital" assets are sold, the profit is taxed at only one-half the rates that apply to ordinary income. And, the tax rate cannot exceed 25% regardless of the amount of the seller's total income. Capital assets under the Internal Revenue Code consist of property such as corporate stocks, vacant land, and other assets not held for use in the taxpayer's trade or business.

In addition, profits from the sale of many other assets—although not defined by the Code as capital assets—can also receive this same privileged preferential tax treatment. Profits from the sale of livestock used for draft, dairy or breeding; real estate used in a trade or business; royalties from sales of timber, iron ore, and coal deposits can all qualify for the preferential treatment as capital gains as can gains on sales of business machinery and equipment.

The preferential tax rates which apply to these unearned forms of income represent one of the most unconscionable flaws in our tax system. It is this special treatment, according to the Treasury, that is the most important factor in reducing the tax rates of those with high incomes.

Viewed in the context of the three major criteria upon which our tax system is built—equal treatment of equals, progressive rates, and neutrality in economic impact—the capital-gains tax fails on every count.

Similarly situated individuals, whose incomes differ not in amount but only because of *source*, will pay markedly different amounts of taxes. A married man with a wage income of $8,000 will pay $1,000 (excluding surtax) in federal income taxes. If his $8,000 came from capital gains, his tax would be only $354.

Tax rates on capital gains progress only from 7% to 25%. Tax rates on wages, salaries and other "ordinary income" go from 14% to 70%. An $8,000 per year single wage earner who receives a raise of $1,000 will pay a 25% income tax on this $1,000, the same amount that would be paid by a taxpayer in the $50,000 income bracket who receives $1,000 worth of capital gains.

Many business and individual decisions to buy, sell, invest, donate, trade, pay dividends, harvest crops, will to heirs, and so forth, hinge upon the Internal Revenue definitions of capital gains and the preferential treatment accorded these gains.

If a corporation, for example, pays dividends to its stockholders, the dividends are taxed as ordinary income. If the corporation retains much of its earnings, swelling the market value of its stock, shareholders can profit from capital gains. If a farmer wanting to sell his orchard harvests his crop first, the profit from selling the crop would be taxed as ordinary income. If he sells the land with the crop unharvested, the entire proceeds will be taxed at the capital-gains rate. Hence, by not harvesting his crop, he's increased his after-tax income.

What's more, the capital-gains-tax escape route combines neatly with many other avoidance schemes, stimulating their use and compounding the tax benefits. Accelerated depreciation on real estate—a loophole which permits postponement of taxes and creates opportunities for tax-loss gimmickry—also paves the way for converting what should be ordinary rental income into capital gains. The depletion allowances for mineral industries, in themselves an unconscionable gimmick for deducting nonexistent expenses, also serve as the vehicle whereby ordinary income is unjustifiably converted to capital gains.

Reported capital gains are taxed at only half the normal rate—and never more than 25%. Thus, in 1967, some $25.6 billion in capital gains were taxed at one-half the regular tax rate and subject to a maximum of 25%.

Another major leak in the tax system, according to the Treasury Department, results from the fact that large amounts of capital gains "fall completely outside the income tax system," since capital gains on assets transferred at death or by charitable donation go tax-free. The Treasury estimates that $15 billion of capital gains, in 1967, were not taxed at all, through this escape-route. If an individual holds an appreciated asset till he dies, the appreciation is not subject to the income tax. If an individual or corporation donates appreciated property to a charitable organization, the appreciation is never taxed—and, the full appreciated value can be deducted from other income.

For example, if a taxpayer donates $1,000 worth of stock which cost him $100, he pays no tax on the $900 of appreciated value and is permitted to deduct the full value ($1,000) from his income. If he were in the 50% bracket, this gift of an asset which cost him $100 would save him $500 in taxes. If he sold the asset, included half the capital gain in his income, and then contributed the $1,000 in cash, his net tax saving would have been only $275. If the $900 appreciation were taxed at ordinary rates rather than the 25% maximum capital-gains rate, the donation of this asset that cost $100 would have only yielded a net tax saving of $50.

Moreover, under certain circumstances it is possible for an individual to actually improve his after-tax position by giving away rather than selling an asset.

All told, the capital gains tax yielded only about $5 to $6 billion in revenue in 1967, representing an effective tax rate of less than 15%.

The Treasury estimates that, if all capital gains entered the tax base and were taxed as ordinary income, the 1969 revenue increase would be $8.5 billion.

Finally, though capital-gains treatment discriminates unfairly between earned and unearned income, the effect is also to discriminate between classes of individuals. The benefits of capital gains flow almost exclusively to the wealthy.

For example, in 1967 one-third of all capital gains reported went to individuals with annual incomes of over $100,000—50,000 income-tax returns out of the total 71.7 million filed accounted for 33% of the capital gains.

Put another way, after those with incomes of over $100,000 took their capital gains, 99.94% of the population was left to share the other two-thirds.

Demonstrating this same point, the U.S. Treasury in its 1969 tax study showed that capital gains reduced the effective rates on taxable income from 55.5% to 32.7% for those in adjusted-gross-income brackets of $1 million or over. For those in the $5-$10,000 brackets, capital gains reduced effective rates by only two-tenths of one percent—from 16.4% to 16.2%. Thus the net result was to water down the progression in effective tax rates from a top of 55.5% down to only 32.7%. (See Table 2.)

Depletion

Oil, gas and other mineral-extraction industries are allowed to take deductions for depletion. In principle, depletion for extractive firms is akin to the depreciation allowance taken by other industries and is geared to permit the gradual write-off of capital costs over the life of the investment.

However, the percentage-depletion deduction formula provides a much more generous write-off of otherwise taxable income than depreciation. Moreover, unlike depreciation the annual deduction from income never stops—it continues *even after the cost of the investment has been fully written off*. The Treasury estimates that oil, gas and other depletion deductions average twelve times the deduction that would be allowed based on actual costs—in the petroleum industry, for example, 90% of the depletion deductions taken are "excessive." Hence, these firms are deducting nonexistent costs.

The percentage-depletion formula allows mineral operators to deduct amounts ranging from 5% (gravel, sand and clay) up to 27.5% (in the case of oil) of the gross income from the property—regardless of the amount of investment. Since the amount that can be deducted is limited to 50% of net income, in many cases the result is that only half the net income generated from the property is subject to tax.

Moreover, mineral producers are allowed to immediately write off certain exploration and development costs which, again, under normal accounting practices should be considered as investment costs to be written off over a period of years. And since these costs do not reduce the percentage-depletion allowance, a double deduction for the same capital investment results.

In addition, there are other gimmicks used by mineral industries to circumvent the modest limitations that do exist on the depletion deduction. The carved-out production payment, for example, is in actuality a loan. The proceeds, however, are treated as income in the year received, thereby boosting the depletion deduction that can be taken. When paid off, the loan is considered an expense. These transactions are timed to generate tax advantages which the Treasury estimates cost $200 million in lost revenues.

And again, these abuses become magnified and compounded by providing opportunities for individuals, corporations and their stockholders to defer taxes, convert ordinarily taxable income to preferentially taxed capital gains, and traffic in tax-loss gimmickry by writing off imaginary losses against other income.

According to the Treasury, the 1968 revenue loss due to excess percentage depletion and the immediate write-off of development costs was as follows:

[In millions]

Excess depletion:	
To corporations	$1,100
To individuals	200
Expensing capital costs:	
To corporations	240
To individuals	60
Total	1,600

As a result of these privileges, in 1965 the petroleum industry as a group paid taxes at an effective rate 21.1% of total net income and other mineral industries at 24.3%. At the same time, the average manufacturing corporation paid taxes at the rate of 43.3%—double the rate which applied to extractive industries. In 1966 the twenty oil giants paid taxes at a rate of only 8.5% of income.

The two most frequently offered justifications for the tax incentives granted these industries are: (1) special incentives are needed because these businesses are risky, and (2) these resources must be developed domestically for strategic considerations. Yet, risk is certainly not unique to mineral development and many other industries are as strategic or more so. What's more, the fact that percentage depletion is also allowed to companies developing the mineral capabilities of foreign nations hardly squares with the notion of developing a domestic productive base.

The most dramatic testimonial to the fallacy of these arguments, however, was contained in a study done under contract with the Treasury by the Consad Research Corporation of Pittsburgh. This study viewed the $1.6 billion tax incentive appropriately in terms of a federal subsidy, since this is the amount of tax revenue the nation loses as a result of the special privileges. The study showed that this $1.6 billion subsidy led to additional national mineral resources valued in the market at only $150 million. Every dollar in federal tax forgiveness yielded 9¢ worth of additional reserves.

And, according to the Treasury's analysis of the Consad study, the depletion allowance encourages excessive drilling and inefficient production methods and discourages research into other potential fuel sources.

Interest on State and local bonds

Federal income-tax law actually operates on a triple standard in its treatment of various forms of income. Wages, salaries and so-called "ordinary income" are fully included in the tax base and are subject to the full, progressive rate scale. A second standard applies to income from capital gains, since only half of it enters the tax base and there is a 25% limit on the tax rate. A third standard is applied to some forms of income which are completely excluded from the tax base—and, of course, subject to a zero tax rate.

The interest paid to holders of state and local bonds falls into this third category. For the year ended June 30, 1967, U.S. Census Bureau figures show that state and local governments paid out some $3 billion to their bondholders. These governments saved $1.2 billion in interest expense, since the tax-exempt privilege enabled them to sell these bonds at less than market rates of interest. However, the Treasury lost $1.8 billion in revenue. The balance—$600 million—went as tax benefits to wealthy individuals and commercial banks which hold most of the bonds.

Since the Treasury loses more than the state and local governments gain, the tax-exempt privilege is a wasteful, as well as back-door, method of providing aid to state and local governments. Moreover, this tax-free interest erodes the equity of the income-tax system since the tax advantages only go to the wealthy. The Treasury notes that tax-free income from state and local bonds is the second most important factor (capital gains is first) in reducing the taxes of those with incomes of over $100,000 per year.

For example, in 1968 the average yield on high-grade municipal bonds was 4.51% and top-rated (Aaa) corporate bonds was 6.18%. The tax-exempt status compensates for the lower rate only for those in tax brackets of 28% and higher—the rate which applies to a married person with a taxable income in excess of $16,000 per year.

To illustrate, if a married person with a taxable income of about $8,000 (22% bracket) bought a high-rated tax-exempt municipal rather than a corporate bond, he would lose $1.67 in interest on every $100 invested and save $1.36 in taxes, suffering a net loss of 31¢ for each $100 invested. On the other hand for someone in the $100,000-or-over bracket the $1.67 in interest lost saves him $3.83 in taxes—thus, a net gain of $2.16 on each $100 invested in tax-exempt bonds.

Also the benefits of the tax forgiveness to state and local governments often run counter to the needs and objectives of most subsidies. Since the amount of debt most state and local governments can issue is tied to property values, it is the richer areas of the nation that rely heaviest on debt financing. Thus, the wealthier areas get the largest subsidies. Similarly, the bonds issued by the smaller, less affluent governments generally are low "rated" or not "rated" at all by the investment analysts. Consequently, these bonds are considered riskier and, if they are to compete in the bond market, the poorer governments must bear higher interest costs.

On top of this, there has been a rapid growth in the proportion of municipal bonds held by commercial banks. In 1961 these banks purchased 56% of the state and local debt, and in 1967 roughly 90% of the net purchases were attributed to commercial banks. This has resulted in an erratic market for municipal securities, since these banks switch their investment portfolios back and forth in response to demand for business loans.

In times of tight money and rising business loans, commercial banks reduce purchases of municipals and may, in fact, sell them, thereby limiting the market and driving up the interest rates that municipalities must pay. Such developments requires states and localities to pay higher and higher interest rates, in order to market their bonds.

Hence, in many ways the interest rates a municipality must pay on its debt (and the amounts of taxes its citizens must pay as a result) are at the mercy of the commercial banks and the bond raters.

What's more, many state and local governments have abused the tax-exempt privilege by issuing so-called industrial development bonds. These tax-exempt bonds have been used to build factories for private industry—sometimes to the corporations' exact specifications. In this manner, a number of states have pirated firms from other areas, using their federal subsidy for the private benefit of wealthy corporations.

Real estate

A host of special tax-forgiveness provisions apply to real estate. Taken by themselves, these privileges are hardly justifiable but, when manipulated and combined, they result in unconscionable tax-avoidance opportunities for wealthy real-estate operators, investors, and speculators.

The major tax-escape route is the special accelerated-depreciation deduction. Under the accelerated formulas, new buildings can be written off at twice normal or "straight-line rates" and the cost of used buildings can be charged off at 1½ times normal depreciation rates. In the case of a new building with a 40-year estimated life, the result is that about 23% of its cost can be deducted from income during the first five years of the property's life. For a used building, 17% of the investment can be written off in the first five years.

The following table shows the effects of the special depreciation formulas compared to the "straight-line" method which apportions the depreciation deduction equally over the useful life of the asset.

[In percent]

	Building with a 40-year life			
	Straight line	200 percent declining balance	Sum of the years digits	150 percent declining balance
Year 1	2.5	5.0	4.8	3.7
1st 2 years, total	5.0	9.8	9.6	7.4
1st 3 years, total	7.5	14.3	14.3	10.8
1st 4 years, total	10.0	18.5	18.8	14.2
1st 5 years, total	12.5	22.6	23.2	17.4
1st 10 years, total	25.0	40.1	43.3	31.7
1st 20 years, total	50.0	64.0	74.4	53.4

Since depreciation write-offs are considered a cost, these fast write-offs and other costs are subtracted from rental income and the income tax, if any, is paid on the remainder. Often there is no income at all, or even a reported loss in the early years of ownership, as a result of accelerated depreciation.

Technically, the fast write-off provisions mean that tax liabilities are deferred—in principle, the lower taxes in the early life, due to excess deductions, will be made up later, as smaller deductions are permitted. To this extent, the excess depreciation results in an interest-free, no-strings federal loan to the real-estate operator.

But actually, the accelerated-depreciation special privilege paves the way for other tax gimmickry. First, a good part of the excessive depreciation deductions are never returned to the tax base, because the property is sold long before the depreciation deduction runs out. And a good part of that which is eventually taxed is taxed at only half the usual rate, and never more than 25% since it is considered a capital gain.

Combining these advantages with "leverage"—much debt, little equity—the infamous real-estate tax shelter is created. The excessive depreciation plus interest charges on the debt result in large bookkeeping tax losses. These phantom losses are in turn washed out against an individual's other income, sheltering it from the federal tax. To take full advantage of this, many high-income individuals join together into syndicates. These syndicates buy or develop high-depreciation property that will show a loss which can be applied to the wealthy investors' other income. What's more, when the properties approach a point when a profit might be shown (depreciation and interest become less than rental income), the property is then sold or refinanced, starting the cycle all over again.

A Treasury study of 19 investors, exploiting the real-estate shelter, showed that the group had a combined income of $2.7 million from their major economic activities. But, since they made investments in real estate, they were able to "shelter" (remove from their otherwise taxable income) $1.5 million and cut their tax bill by more than half.

The average investor in this group, according to the Treasury, had an income of $141,000 from his other interests. He sheltered $77,500 of this from the Internal Revenue Service by his real-estate investments, and his paper real-estate "losses" saved him $45,000 in taxes.

The Treasury also traced the activities of one real-estate investor over a seven-year period. This operator had a seven-year income of over $7.5 million. Yet, because of real-estate depreciation deductions, he paid the same effective tax rate on his total income as a married wage earner with two children and an annual income of $10,000.

Moreover, real-estate operators can unfairly lighten their share of taxes through reporting capital gains in installments, exchanging appreciated property tax-free, and through complicated mortgage-refinancing arrangements.

The privileged treatment real-estate investors receive through the tax structure contributes to eroding taxpayer confidence as do all loopholes, and:

1. Costs some $850 million in terms of federal revenues foregone—expenditures or subsidies granted through the tax system. Fast depreciation, alone, accounts for a revenue-loss of $750 million.

2. Runs in direct opposition to meeting one of our most serious national needs. These privileges serve to channel resources into luxury housing and away from the much-needed improvements and additions to the housing available for those with low and moderate incomes. The Treasury estimates that, of the $850 million in tax benefits flowing to real-estate operators, only $50 million went to those investing in low- and moderate-income facilities.

Tax havens for wealthy farm investors

Under the Internal Revenue Code there are special tax-accounting privileges for farmers—privileges which were developed to ease the bookkeeping chores of ordinary farmers.

However, these accounting privileges are being manipulated to provide windfall tax benefits to wealthy individuals and corporations who operate or invest in farms in order to get tax losses. These losses are not true losses: nevertheless they can be deducted from the wealthy investor's nonfarm income, sheltering it from the federal income tax.

Though most businesses use the "accrual" method of accounting, since it is the most accurate way to reflect the true income of the business, farmers are permitted to choose between use of the accrual method or the "cash" method. Using the cash method, inventories are ignored. The growth in inventories is not balanced off against other costs. Put another way, costs that reflect the building up of an asset (inventories) are deducted from otherwise taxable income, but there is no corresponding adjustments made for increase in the value of the asset (inventory). As a result, certain farm operators abuse this privilege by carefully mismatching costs and the income generated by these costs, to their tax advantage.

Losses, which under normal (accrual) accounting procedures would result in gains, are created which, in turn, are used to "shelter" the wealthy investor's nonfarm income from his taxable income.

What's more, since many of these "paper" losses actually reflect increases in investment, income taxes that should be paid annually at ordinary rates are postponed until the sale of the inventory at which time the tax is cut in half because capital-gains rates apply. Under these circumstances it is possible for the tax-deductible costs of raising an animal to *exceed* the taxable gain even though the animal is sold at a profit.

For example, a cash-basis farmer spends $200 over a three-year period in raising a cow and charges the $200 off over the period as an expense. He then sells the cow for $250. His real profit on the transaction was $50; yet, since the entire $250 is considered as capital gains, only half of the $250 ($125) must be reported as taxable income. As a result, he reports $125 in income and deducts $200 in expenses over the three-year period—his tax returns show a $75 loss on a transaction which in actuality yielded a a profit of $50.

Under normal accounting techniques, the $200 spent in raising the cow would have been treated as an increase in inventory and would not have resulted in a deductible expense. Upon the sale of the cow, the capital gain would have been $50 and one-half of it, or $25, would enter his taxable income. Hence the "accrual" farmer would have reported $25 in income (although it was really $50) and no deductions. The "cash" farmer reported income of $125 and expenses of $200.

Moreover, the definition of what are capital assets (and therefore subject to capital-gains tax rates) is stretched considerably, to the advantage of certain farmers. The Internal Revenue Code, for example, treats livestock used for draft, dairy or breeding purposes as depreciable capital assets.

Through the use of "leveraging" (much borrowing—little cash investment), the advantages of these special privileges are compounded. The combined effects of interest charges on the money borrowed for the farm investment and the operating losses, that are so easily shown through cash accounting, result in phenomental phantom tax losses, which are washed out against the other income of wealthy farm investors, sheltering it from taxation.

Some insight into how these special privileges are utilized by the wealthy can be found in the annual income-tax return data published by the Internal Revenue Service.

In 1967, for example, there were over 1 million tax returns filed showing net farm losses, and almost 2 million reporting a net gain. For those taxpayers with adjusted gross income *under* $50,000, the number of returns showing profits from farm operations exceeded the number showing losses, by rather substantial amounts. The overwhelming majority of actual, operating farmers were in this group.

However, where adjusted gross incomes were over $50,000, *more* returns showed losses than gains. In the $1,000,000-and-over income group, only 12 returns showed profits—totaling $74,000—compared to 101 returns claiming losses—totaling $7.6 million. (See Table 3.)

Obviously, "nonfarmers" are investing in farms solely for tax purposes. As a consequence, these nonfarmers compete unfairly with legitimate farmers. They distort the farm economy by bidding up the price of farmland and forcing ordinary farmers to compete in the market with those who are totally indifferent to whether they receive a fair price for the product or not.

The Treasury estimates an annual tax loss of some $800 million due to the farm loopholes. By placing a $15,000 limit, just on the amount of phantom tax loss that can be applied against other income, some $145,000,000 in revenue could be recouped.

Tax-exempt foundations

The tax-exempt status granted to certain foundations represents one of the most glaring examples of how a well-intentioned, seemingly desirable, tax privilege can become twisted.

As a nation, we recognize that philanthropy is desirable and it should be encouraged. In line with this reasoning, individuals are permitted, within certain limits, to deduct from their taxable income, contributions to organizations established for religious, charitable, scientific, educational and similar purposes. Likewise, the federal government grants tax-exempt status to the organizations receiving the contributions.

Granting special tax privileges for such contributions or to such institutions raises the same fundamental question as in all tax-forgiveness schemes. The government is relinquishing funds it would otherwise be entitled to, and therefore others must pay a higher share of the costs of government. Thus, where there is tax forgiveness, there must also be an assurance that the nation's interests are being served.

Recent investigations into certain tax-exempt foundations—non-profit organizations set up and supported by wealthy families or individuals—have raised some serious doubts as to whether appropriate purposes are in fact being fulfilled and the nation's interest is being served.

Tax-exempt foundations have grown phenomenally—new ones are cropping up at the rate of some 2,000 per year. The assets of the larger foundations are currently estimated at some $20 billion, and each of the 27 largest foundations has assets worth $100 million or more.

The philosophy underlying the private foundations, according to a foundation spokesman is "the systematic use of private funds for public purposes." Unfortunately, the studies of the activities of tax-exempt foundations done by the House Committee on Small Business have shown that in many cases the opposite situation prevails. That is, public funds are being systematically used for private purposes.

Family foundations frequently are used as a means whereby the wealthy can avoid income, gift and inheritance taxes, yet maintain control over wealth. When families donate company stock to private family-run foundations, family control over the business can be assured from generation to generation, while inheritance taxes are avoided. The donor can control the management of the foundation—appointing relatives, rewarding friends and employees. The foundation provides the conduit for donations which reduce the taxes on his business income.

Furthermore, this control can be parlayed to a point where the foundation is used to promote the foundation owner's other business interests. Practices have been uncovered which can be questioned on the basis of unfair competition, conflict of interest, self-dealing, "insider" arrangements to affect stock prices, and so forth.

Foundations, for example, can lend money to the founder, his family, or the family business at preferential interest rates, thus supplying venture capital for the donor's other interests. The Subcommittee's studies noted situations, where suppliers and buyers have made sizable contributions to foundations, controlled by customers, indicating underhanded pricing deals. What's more, these organizations can enter into deals, whereby through intricate tax maneuvering, they can buy a business, invest none of their own money, and pay the seller more than the market value of the business. On top of this, the deal can be set up as an installment purchase, permitting the seller to convert what should have been ordinary income into preferentially taxed capital gains.

A Prentice-Hall Executive Tax Report, for example, offers this advice:

"Have You Put a Price on Your Business? You may be able to double it—by selling to a Charity.

"Say you're planning to sell your business and you think a fair price would be five times earnings. If the company earns, say, $101,500 after taxes ($200,000 before), you're probably figuring on selling for about $500,000. If that's the case, stop right there—you may be shortchanging yourself:

"That business could be worth $1,000,000 to a tax-exempt organization: An ordinary buyer is only interested in earnings after taxes—that's all he gets to see. But a tax-exempt buyer keeps a hundred cents on the dollar. So a fair price to a charity would be five times $200,000, or $1,000,000—twice what you figured!"

Finally, the Report notes some "Frosting on the cake" and cites a case where the seller maintained 48% ownership of the corporation, "was active in management and drew a good salary."

Commenting on the abuses uncovered, a *New York Times* editorial added another dimension—that of the increased role of foundations in shaping national policy:

"Since almost everyone pays income taxes, the burden of exempting the income of the foundations is borne by the public at large. Yet the public is virtually powerless to influence the ways in which the foundations spend their tax-free dollars."

Generous tax treatment is appropriate for charitable organizations since private philanthropy is an important adjunct to public programs serving the goals of the nation. However, this special treatment is justifiable only if these organizations are in fact using the foundations, and their tax-exempt privilege, for the public good and not merely for the private advantage of a select well-heeled few.

Unlimited charitable-contribution deduction

The ordinary taxpayer cannot deduct charitable contributions that exceed 30% of his income. However, through use of a little-known loophole—the unlimited charitable-contribution deduction—about 100 of the nation's wealthiest families escape paying $25 million in taxes. Many of these families pay no federal income taxes at all.

Though the loophole alone yields tax benefits to some of the nation's wealthiest, the major part of the tax bonanza comes about through combining the unlimited-deduction gimmick with another loophole—that which permits the contribution deduction to be based on the appreciated value of assets (typically stocks) donated, not the cost. Hence, no tax—not even at privileged capital-gain rates—is ever paid on the appreciated value; yet the full amount is allowed as a deduction from income.

The unlimited deduction privilege seems stringent in that it's only allowed if total contributions plus income taxes paid in eight out of the ten preceding years exceeds 90% of *taxable income*. However, these criteria are easily met by many wealthy individuals whose income comes from nontaxable sources. Thus many who rely upon state and local bond interest, or capital gains, or whose taxable income is "sheltered" by means of excessive depletion or depreciation deductions can easily give away large percentages of taxable income—since so little of their income is subject to tax.

The Treasury studied the 1964 tax returns of four wealthy "non-taxpayers" and found that each had a total income of between six and ten million dollars and a taxable income of zero. Their incomes came almost entirely from dividends and/or capital gains. Each gave away property close to, or in excess of, the *reported* adjusted gross income—property which was for the most part appreciated stocks, upon which no capital-gains tax was ever paid—and in each case, taxable income and income tax were $0.

As a result, a seemingly innocent and appropriate tax-forgiveness provision geared to encouraging philanthropy serves in the main to divert public revenues to private use. The public revenue cost is far out of proportion to the philanthropic goals forwarded, and the difference flows to a privileged few individuals of extreme wealth.

What is more, studies have shown that the charities supported by the contributions of the wealthy are generally quite different from those that receive the bulk of their contributions from the majority of the nation's taxpayers. And this evidence suggests that Congressional intent and the national interest in supporting charitable organizations is thwarted.

For example, a 1965 Treasury Department report showed that in the income classes under $20,000, over 80% of the contributions went to religious organizations and charities concerned with social welfare, such as the Community Chest and the Red Cross. In contrast, those in the over-$1,000,000 income class gave over two-thirds of their contributions to so-called "other organizations"—principally foundations. Religious and social-welfare organizations like the Community Chest received less than 10% of the wealthier group's philanthropy.

The 7 percent investment credit

The investment-credit tax privilege was added to the Internal Revenue Code in 1962 and liberalized in 1964. The privilege was enacted as an effort to spur the economy by encouraging business to invest in new machinery and equipment.

Under this provision, business firms are permitted to deduct from the federal income taxes owed an amount equal to 7% of the cost of new machinery and equipment. The full 7% can be deducted for firms with tax liabilities up to $25,000. If the tax liabilities are more than $25,000, the amount of credit that can be deducted is limited to one-fourth of their taxable income. In other words, the only limit on the credit is that it cannot reduce the firm's tax bill by more than 25%.

In effect then, the nation's taxpayers are picking up the tab so that a private firm can get a discount on the costs of its equipment.

What's more, prior to 1964, businesses had to deduct the credit from the cost of the investment before they were allowed to write off depreciation. This was changed in 1964 and currently the credit can be taken, *and* the full purchase price can be written off. Thus, more than 100% of the cost can be written off and, like the oil-depletion deduction, imaginary expenses are used to reduce taxable income.

The revenue cost of the credit, according to the Treasury, amounts to $3 billion at fiscal year 1969 levels of business profits and investment. This $3 billion tax forgiveness subsidy induces increased business investment and feeds the only major source of inflationary-demand pressure in 1969—while the entire national economy is burdened with tight money, uprecedented interest rates and other generally restrictive measures.

Multiple surtax exemptions

The corporate income tax is a two-step affair. The first $25,000 of profit is taxed at a rate of 22% and the remainder is taxed at 48% (excluding the temporary 10% surtax).

The exemption of the first $25,000 from the full corporate tax rate was made part of the Internal Revenue Code in order to help small corporations.

However, the intent of this provision has been thwarted by many large corporations, which have intentionally organized themselves into chains, to shelter much of their income from the full corporate rate.

Thus, by spinning off into subsidiaries, a corporation can reduce its taxes annually by $6,500 per subsidiary. A single corporation, for example, with a net profit of $1 million would pay a tax of $473,500. If the same corporation operated through 40 subsidiaries, each showing a profit of $25,000, the tax would be cut by more than half—down to $220,000.

The Treasury estimates that the exemption results in a reduction of the tax rate on corporations generally from 48% to 45.8% and a revenue loss of approximately $1.8 billion. The combined effect of both the 7% investment credit and the $25,000 exemption brings the effective rate down to only 43.4% and the revenue loss to some $4–5 billion.

Moreover, this special privilege amounts to a tax incentive that encourages unsound corporate arrangements. It also adds an element of discrimination between those types of corporations that can easily be split up to take advantage of the special privilege and those that cannot.

As a result, a benefit intended to help small business also provides tax-windfall opportunities to large, highly profitable operations.

Conglomerates

The greatest wave of mergers in American history is now rolling through the economy. This great movement towards the concentration of economic power has been building up over the last 20 years. It obscures the peaks of the two previous merger waves in 1899 and 1929. The number of mergers of mining and manufacturing companies zoomed from 219 in 1950 to 844 in 1960 to nearly 1,000 in 1966 and over 2,400 in 1968, according to the Federal Trade Commission.

Not only are the "bigs" taking over the "smalls," but minnows are swallowing whales, and the "bigs" are merging with other "bigs." Conglomerate marriages, with increasing frequency, involve partners with assets over $10 million. In 1966, there were 101 mergers involving an acquired company with assets in excess of $10 million. The Federal Trade Commission reported 192 such mergers in 1968, with assets of the acquired companies totaling $12.6 billion. The 200 largest companies acquired 70 firms in mergers in 1968, the FTC reported.

As a result, one out of every six firms that made Fortune Magazine's 1962 top-500 list has completely disappeared.

These conglomerate corporations grow in all directions, by acquiring companies in any industry or product-line, no matter how unrelated. They operate in all kinds of different industries and markets.

The great merger movement of recent years has brought an alarming increase in the concentration of economic power in the hands of the major corporations. In 1967, the 200 largest manufacturing corporations held nearly 59% of the total assets of all manufacturing corporations—up from about 48% in 1948. The 78 giant manufacturing corporations, with assets of $1 billion or more, held 43% of the assets of manufacturing corporations in 1968 and received 49% of the profits of all manufacturing corporations.

The concern is not with large conglomerate corporations merely because they are large. It is the effects which must be examined. The immediate questions concern plant closedowns and impacts on collective bargaining and the local community. Beyond this, what does the concentration of economic power do to the political system and economic system, in terms of prices, competition, efficiency and inventiveness?

These questions go beyond those that can be answered through the tax structure. They involve the anti-trust laws and the operations of the Justice Department, as well as such other government agencies as the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission. Yet it is clear that there are tax inducements to those who would merge and the tax structure adds thrust to the corporate take-over movement.

By "swapping debt for equity" (offering bonds in exchange for stock) the acquiring firm has to pay bond interest rather than stock dividends. Interest is tax-deductible; dividends are not. Because of this tax advantage, the purchaser can offer a bond (debenture) supposedly valued at more than the stock, creating what has been labeled "funny money."

The seller also has a tax advantage since he pays no taxes on the transaction until the bond is paid off. Hence, it is the nation's taxpayers who are helping to finance the take-over.

If the seller receives stock in the acquiring firm in exchange for his old stock, the transaction, under most circumstances, is tax-free. Of the 352 major acquisitions that took place in 1967 and 1968, some 90% were tax-free. The "new" firms were valued in the stock market at $3 billion higher than the pre-merged firms; yet no taxes were paid.

The tax-loss "carry-over" provisions in the Internal Revenue Code lead to anomalous situations, where a firm showing a loss becomes a more desirable partner for a merger than a profitable one. And again the nation's taxpayers are the losers. If a firm has losses, it pays no taxes. If the firm merges with a profitable firm, its losses can be washed out against the acquiring firm's otherwise taxable income. And, of course, other tax loopholes can be called into play to create phantom losses and situations similar to the tax havens built by wealthy real-estate speculators and tax-loss farmers.

Moreover, other business tax privileges—as the 7% investment credit, for example, and accelerated depreciation—help to provide many corporations with unreasonably large amounts of cash (depreciation allowances plus retained profits) after payment of taxes and dividends to stockholders. The cash is thus available for such venture as those involved in the sharp rise of foreign investment and buying out other firms.

Other loopholes for the wealthy

There are, unfortunately, many other loopholes of special privilege for rich people and corporations, that should be closed. Stock options, for example, permit corporate executives to receive income in the form of stock deals that are not reported or taxed as salaries, but are taxed on the sale of the stock, as capital gains. And other opportunities to defer taxes on salaries and convert salary income to much lower-taxed capital gains are available to high-paid executives. Tax-deductible "business" vacations are the privilege primarily of wealthy businessmen and executives, as are the nontaxable benefits that accrue to those with lavish expense accounts.

Earnings from operating ships or aircraft registered in a foreign country, are tax-exempt. This encourages "runaways." In 1968, more American-owned tonnage was registered under foreign flags than under the U.S. flag. And, special tax gimmicks also apply to corporations operating through foreign subsidiaries.

Proposals to close the loopholes

To close these loopholes and bring the federal individual and corporate income-tax systems into line with America's standards of fair play, the AFL–CIO urges adoption of the following proposals:

1. *Capital Gains*. Elimination of preferential tax treatment of capital gains for both individuals and corporations. Such gains should be taxed at regular tax rates. At the same time, the present income-averaging provisions should be broadened to include capital gains.

Approximate revenue gain: $6–7 billion.

2. *Capital Gains on Property Transferred at Death*. All appreciation (difference between original cost and market value) should be taxed in full on transfer at death. The tax rate should apply to all appreciation occurring after date of enactment; one-half the tax rate should apply to all gains occurring between an appropriate date such as January 1, 1950, and the date of enactment.

The tax should be allowed as a deduction for estate-tax purposes. It should not apply on transfers between the decedent and spouse nor to estates valued at less than $60,000.

To prevent "forced" sales of assets, appropriate installment-payment procedures should be adopted.

Approximate revenue gain: $3–4 billion.

3. *Depletion*. Deductions for depletion should not be permitted to be taken after the cost of the property has been fully written off.

Approximate revenue gain: $1.5 billion.

4. *Interest on State and Local Bonds*. All interest on state and local debt securities, issued after the date of enactment (following an appropriate transition period), should be subject to the income tax. The federal government should guarantee the bonds and pay the issuing state or local government an amount equal to one-third of the interest-cost on such taxable issues. No federal guarantee or interest-rate subsidy should be permitted for industrial development bonds, regardless of the amount of the issue.

There would be a net revenue gain, after taking into account the cost of the subsidy and the guarantee, of approximately $100 million.

5. *7% Investment Tax Credit*. The 7% investment tax credit should be repealed. Approximate revenue gain: $3 billion.

6. *Accelerated Depreciation on Real Estate*. Accelerated depreciation (depreciation in excess of straight-line) should be disallowed on all real estate except low- and moderate-housing.

Approximate revenue gain: $700–800 million.

7. *Limitation of Deductions Attributable to Farming Operations*. Each dollar of nonfarm income over $15,000 should reduce the amount of farm loss that can be deducted from nonfarm income by $1. This provision should not apply to farm losses resulting from taxes, interest, casualty, drought, and sale of farm property. This provision should not apply to farmers using the accrual method of accounting.

Approximate revenue gain: $145 million.

8. *Unlimited Charitable Contributions.* tion deduction should be repealed imme- The special unlimited charitable-contribu- diately.

Approximate revenue gain: $50 million.

9. *Multiple Surtax Exemptions from Corporate Income Tax.* Commonly controlled business enterprises should, after an appropriate transition period, be limited to only one $25,000 surtax exemption.

Appropriate revenue gain (when fully effective): $235 million.

10. *Tax-Exempt Foundations:* (1) Financial transactions between a foundation and its founders, contributors, officers, directors or trustees should be prohibited.

(2) Foundations should be required to spend their incomes within one year of receipt.

(3) Foundations should not be permitted to own 20% or more of any business unrelated to their charitable function—a reasonable time should be allowed for presently organized foundations to comply with this provision.

(4) If a donor maintains control of a business or property after it is contributed, no donation deduction from taxes should be allowed until the foundation disposes of the property or the donor's control over the property ends.

(5) Foundation borrowing to buy investment properties should be prohibited. Foundation lending should be limited to appropriate charitable functions.

(6) A limitation, such as 40 years, should be placed on the life of foundations.

(7) Congress should carefully examine the problems posed by the actual operations of foundations and the need for some degree of federal regulation of the use of the tax-exempt funds of foundations.

11. *Conglomerates.* The skyrocketing trend of business mergers requires detailed examination—including the antitrust laws and the operations of the appropriate government agencies as the Justice Department, Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

A thorough investigation should also be conducted to determine the extent to which the federal tax structure contributes to this alarming trend of corporate mergers and acquisitions.

Among the tax provisions that should be examined are those which permit.

(1) Corporations to deduct interest payments on debt used to finance mergers and acquisitions.

(2) Capital-gains taxes to be paid in installments when stock is exchanged for debt securities.

(3) Tax-free exchanges on corporate stock transfers made for purposes of mergers and acquisitions.

(4) Corporations to "carry over" the operating and capital losses of an acquired firm.

In addition, the penalty tax provisions applying to excessive amounts of retained profits, should be made workable in the light of recent experience.

12. *Allocation of Deductions.* Individuals and corporations should be required to allocate certain deductions between taxable and nontaxable income.

Under present law, those who receive tax-exempt income derive a double benefit. The income never appears on the tax return; hence no tax is paid. Secondly, personal or non-operating business deductions can be deducted in full from taxable income.

Before such deductions are permitted, since they are designed to define ability-to-pay, total income (taxable and exempt income) should be taken into account: Thus, Individuals with excluded income, as defined below, in excess of $10,000, should be required to allocate certain personal deductions in line with the ratio their adjusted gross income bears to adjusted gross income *plus* exempt income. The deductions that should be allocated are: interest and tax payments, casualty losses, charitable contributions, medical expenses, and cooperative housing expenses. Allocation formula should be as follows:

$$\text{Deductions} \times \frac{\text{adjusted gross income}}{\text{AGI plus exempt income minus \$10,000}} = \text{allowable deductions}$$

Excluded income which would cause deduction to be allocated should include the following:

(1) One-half of capital gains.

(2) State and local bond interest.

(3) Depletion taken after the cost of the property has been written off.

(4) The difference between the cost and the market value of property donated to charity.

(5) Depreciation on real estate taken in excess of straight-line, except for low- and moderate-housing.

Corporations with excluded income, as defined above, in excess of $25,000 should be required to allocate non-operating expense deductions between net profit from operations and excluded income.

The allocation formula should be as follows:

$$\text{Nonoperating deductions} \times \frac{\text{net operating profit}}{\text{net operating profit plus exempt income minus \$25,000}} = \text{allowable nonoperating deductions}$$

13. *Minimum Tax on Exempt Income.* A 25% tax should be levied on the amount of excluded income which exceeds $10,000 for individuals and $25,000 for corporations, plus any amount of deductions disallowed under allocation-of-deductions formula. The "excluded income" subject to this tax should include the following:

(1) One-half capital gains.

(2) State and local bond interest.

(3) Depletion taken after the cost of property has been written off.

(4) The difference between the cost and the market value of property donated to charity.

(5) Depreciation on real estate taken in excess of straight-line, except for low- and moderate-housing.

The effect of the allocation of deductions and minimum tax proposals on an actual case cited by the U.S. Treasury is illustrated in Table 4. As shown in the table, a taxpayer with a total income of $1.3 million paid a nil effective tax rate (.03%). Under the proposals suggested by the AFL–CIO the effective tax rate would be 21.8%.

Approximate revenue gain from allocation of deductions: $250 million.

Approximate revenue gain from 25% minimum tax: $1.5 billion.

14. All special tax-forgiveness proposals offered under the guise of "incentives" which would provide additional loopholes for the wealthy and further erode the fairness of the tax structure should be rejected. All proposals to adopt a federal retail sales tax—whether called "value-added" taxes or offered clearly as a tax on consumers—should also be rejected.

Tax relief for low- and middle-income groups

1. *The minimum standard deduction should be increased from the present $200 plus $100 per exemption to $600 plus $100 per exemption.* This proposal would exempt from federal income tax the majority of persons below the government-defined poverty level and significantly reduce the tax payments of all persons at or near the poverty level. (See Table 5.)

The revenue cost would be approximately $1.2 billion.

2. *The standard deduction should be increased from the present 10% with a $1,000 maximum to 15% and a $2,500 maximum.* This proposal would bring standard deductions closer in line with the actual deductions claimed by most taxpayers. It would simplify reporting for the great majority of taxpayers and would provide tax relief for all those whose itemized deductions amount to less than 15% of income or $2,500. Most of the relief would flow to those in the $5–$20,000 income range. (See Table 7.)

The revenue cost would be approximately $2 billion.

3. *The first two individual-income-tax bracket rates should be reduced from the current 14% and 15% to 9% and 13% respectively.* This proposal would provide tax relief to all taxpayers, but the major portion of the tax deduction (approximately 95%) would go to those with annual incomes below $20,000. (See Tables 5, 6 and 7.)

The revenue cost would be approximately $3.4 billion.

4. *Moving-Expense Deductions.* Deductible moving expenses should be broadened to include certain non-employer-reimbursed expenses such as those related to sale of old residence—real-estate commissions and advertising costs and costs of settling an unexpired lease; premove househunting trips; and temporary lodging costs (for worker and family). These additional costs should be subject to an overall limitation of $2,000. Present treatment of other deductible moving expenses—unreimbursed expenses of transporting the employee, his family and belongings in a job-connected move—should continue.

The revenue cost would be approximately $100 million.

TABLE 1.—IMPACT OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAXES, FAMILY OF 4, 1963-68

				Change in net income after taxes (percent)		
Wage or salary income	Decrease in Federal income tax	Increase in OASDHI	Increase in State and local taxes	Federal income taxes only	Federal income and OASDHI	Federa incomel OASDHI. S. and L,
$1,000		$7.75	$89		−0.9	−14.2
$2,000		15.50	110		−.8	−7.9
$3,000	$60.00	23.25	132	+2.0	+1.3	−3.9
$5,000	130.00	46.00	168	+2.8	+1.9	−2.2
$7,500	139.50	156.00	182	+2.1	−.3	−3.4
$10,000	174.45	169.20	245	+2.0	0	−3.1
$12,500	216.50	169.20	290	+2.0	+.5	−2.6
$15,000	270.35	169.20	317	+2.1	−.8	−1.9
$20,000	403.00	169.20	368	+2.5	+1.5	−.9
$35,000	943.40	169.20	567	+3.6	+3.0	+.9

Note: State and local taxes were estimated by the AFL-CIO Research Department. These estimates were based upon Council of Economic Advisers studies for 1965 and Bureau of Census State and local tax data for 1963, 1965, and 1968. Federal income taxes based on family of 4, using the minimum standard deduction where applicable and assuming deductions equal to 10 percent of income for all other groups.

TABLE 2.—RETURNS WITH TAXABLE INCOME, 1966 EFFECTIVE TAX RATES

Adjusted gross income (thousands)	Effective tax rate on present-law taxable income (percent)	Effective tax rate on taxable income including excluded half of capital gains[1] (percent(
$0 to $5	15.3	15.0
$5 to $10	16.4	16.2
$10 to $20	18.1	17.8
$20 to $50	24.0	22.8
$50 to $100	35.8	32.6
$100 to $200	45.6	37.8
$200 to $500	52.3	37.9
$500 to $1,000	55.3	35.8
$1,000 and over	55.5	32.7

[1] These effective rates are actually overstated—particularly in the upper brackets—because other forms of exempt income, such as interest from State and local bonds, are not taken into account in this table. For example, the Treasury Department estimates that the effective tax rate on total income for nearly two-thirds of those with adjusted gross incomes of $1,000,000 and over is 30 percent or less—4 percent of this group pay an effective tax rate of 5 percent or less.

Source: U.S. Treasury Department "Tax Reform Studies and Proposals," Feb. 5, 1969, p. 81.

TABLE 3.—SELECTED DATA FROM INCOME TAX RETURNS REPORTING FARM PROFITS AND LOSSES

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Adjusted gross income	Farm returns			
	Net profit		Net loss	
	Number of returns	Amount	Number of returns	Amount
Under $5,000	415,346	$728,615	180,557	$183,588
$5,000 to $10,000	502,044	1,580,178	371,917	410,518
$10,000 to $20,000	240,493	1,386,520	161,340	254,104
$20,000 to $50,000	50,608	605,232	41,441	161,673
$50,000 to $100,000	6,059	100,476	10,023	83,326
$100,000 to $1,000,000	1,292	25,537	4,262	85,827
$1,000,000 or more	12	74	101	7,577

Source: U.S. Treasury Department, Internal Revenue Service, Preliminary Statistics of Income, Individual Income Tax Returns, 1967.

TABLE 4.—ILLUSTRATION OF AFL-CIO 25 PERCENT TAX ON EXEMPT INCOME AND ALLOCATION OF DEDUCTIONS PROPOSALS ON A TAXPAYER (ACTUAL CASE) WITH OVER $1,000,000 OF INCOME AND AN EFFECTIVE TAX RATE OF 0.03 PERCENT

[Actual case cited by Treasury Department]

	Actual	Proposed
A. APPLICATION OF ALLEGATION OF DEDUCTIONS PROPOSAL		
Reported adjusted gross income	$679,405	$679,405
Less personal exemption	−600	−600
Less itemized deductions	−$676,419	[1] −$357,352
Taxable income	2,386	321,453
Income tax	383	210,507
B. APPLICATION OF 25 PERCENT TAX ON EXEMPT INCOME		
Total excluded income:		
Excluded capital gains		605,313
Excess depreciation on real estate		11,141
Total		616,454
Less $10,000		−10,000
Less disallowed deductions ($676,419−$357,352)		−319,067
Exempt income subject to 25 percent tax		287,387
25 percent on exempt income		71,847
Add tax on taxable income after deductions allocated		210,507
Income tax	383	282,354
Income tax as percent of total income	0.03	21.8

[1] Computed as follows:

Adjusted gross income	$679,405
Add excluded capital gains	605,313
Add excess depreciation on real estate [a]	11,141
Total income	1,295,859

$$\text{Deductions} \times \frac{\$679,405}{\$1,295,859-\$10,000} = \$357,352 \text{ allowable deductions}$$

[a] Actual loss reported was $22,283—analysis assumes only ½ of this loss due to excessive depreciation.

Note: 1968 surtax excluded.

TABLE 5.—EFFECT OF AFL-CIO TAX-RELIEF PROPOSALS FOR LOW-INCOME GROUPS[1]

Family size	Poverty income line[2]	Present Federal income tax	Federal income tax under AFL-CIO proposals
1	$1,751	$123	$41
2	2,265	93	24
3	2,785	68	8
4	3,572	80	15
5	4,209	71	19
6	4,723	45	11

[1] Increase in minimum standard deduction to $600 plus $100 per dependent. Reduction in first 2 bracket tax rates to 9 and 13 percent.

[2] 1966 Department of Health, Education, and Welfare nonfarm poverty income levels adjusted for change in living costs 1966–68

TABLE 6.—EFFECT OF REDUCTION IN FIRST 2 BRACKET RATES TO 9 AND 13 PERCENT—MARRIED TAXPAYER FILING JOINT RETURN

Taxable income[1]	Present Federal income tax	Tax under AFL-CIO proposal	Tax reduction	Tax reduction as a percentage of present tax
$1,000	$140	$90	$50	35.7
$2,000	290	220	70	24.1
$3,000	450	380	70	15.5
$5,000	810	740	70	8.6
$7,500	1,285	1,215	70	5.4
$10,000	1,820	1,750	70	3.8
$12,500	2,385	2,315	70	2.9
$15,000	3,010	2,940	70	2.3
$20,000	4,380	4,310	70	1.6
$35,000	9,920	9,850	70	.7
$50,000	17,060	16,990	70	.4

[1] Wage and salary income less personal exemptions and deductions.

Note: Figures exclude 1968 surtax.

TABLE 7.—EFFECT OF AFL-CIO TAX-RELIEF PROPOSALS MARRIED TAXPAYER, 2 CHILDREN, STANDARD DEDUCTION[1]

Wage or salary income	1968 Federal income tax	Tax due under AFL-CIO proposals	Tax reduction	Tax reduction as a percentage of present tax
$1,000				
$2,000				
$3,000				
$5,000	$290	$168	$122	42.1
$7,500	686	546	140	20.4
$10,000	1,114	949	165	14.8
$12,500	1,622	1,359	263	16.2
$15,000	2,172	1,827	345	15.9
$20,000	3,428	2,965	463	13.5
$35,000	8,504	7,849	655	7.7
$50,000	15,360	14,540	820	5.3

Note: Excludes surtax.

[1] Increase in minimum standard deduction to $600 plus $100 per dependent. Increase in standard deduction to 15 percent, maximum of $2,500. Reduction in first 2 bracket tax rates to 9 and 13 percent.

TABLE 8—ESTIMATED FEDERAL REVENUE GAINS AND LOSSES RESULTING FROM AFL-CIO TAX PROPOSALS

		Approximate revenue gain (loss) (millions of dollars)
Loophole-closing proposals		
1. Elimination of preferential tax treatment of capital gains		6,000–7,000
2. Taxation of gains on property transferred at death		[1] 3,100–[2] 4,200
3. Disallowance of depletion after investment fully written off		1,500
4. Elimination of tax-exempt State and local bond interest and inclusion of Federal subsidy and loan guarantee		100
5. Elimination of 7 percent investment credit		3,000
6. Elimination of accelerated depreciation on real estate except for low- and moderate-income housing		700–800
7. Limitation of farm-loss deductions		145
8. Elimination of unlimited charitable-contribution deduction		50
9. Elimination of corporate multiple surtax exemption		[3] 235
10. Tax-exempt foundations		
11. Conglomerates		
12. Allocation of deductions	$250	
13. 25 percent minimum tax on exempt income	1,500	
Total gain	1,750	14,830–17,030
TAX-RELIEF PROPOSALS		
1. Increase in minimum standard deduction		(1,200)
2. Increase in standard deduction		(2,000)
3. Reduction in first 2 bracket rates		(3,400)
4. Broadening of allowable moving-expense deductions		(100)
Total revenue loss		(6,700)
Approximate net revenue gain from AFL-CIO proposals		8,130–10,330

[1] If taxed at current capital-gains rates.

[2] If taxed at full rates.

[3] When full effective.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMP HONORING THE LIFE AND DEATH OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, recently on an NBC news special narrated by Sander Vanocur, a tape was included on the problems of Irish Catholics in Northern

Ireland. As these poor people marched to the singing of "We shall overcome," I reflected on the love of the memory of Martin Luther King that so many of the world's people have for this great American. He is a man honored by the people of the world in the only way they know—by imitation—as he was honored by the world's most important people by the Nobel Peace Prize. Yet even though I contacted a former Postmaster General on April 8, 1968, and introduced a bill on May 1, 1968, for the purpose of bringing about the issuance of a commemorative stamp, and even though I have received assurances that something was going to be done, nothing has been done.

I will try again. I am today introducing a bill that would commemorate the life and death of Martin Luther King by a commemorative stamp, should it be enacted into law.

Martin Luther King believed that the foundation of democracy was progress in human dignity, a growing share in freedom for all men. He represented a universal hope for human dignity. He was killed, as you know, while aiding a strike by municipal employees, most of whom were Negroes, some of whom were white, who wanted a voice in their own future through their labor organization. He had nothing to gain. He gave all that he had to his country and his God.

The dream of Martin Luther King was a dream that in America and in all the world our acts would match our beliefs, would match our better selves. He brought his dream for us closer to reality.

Martin Luther King did more to revive the American dream than any man during the past 40 years, and when he died as the result of a bullet fired from a rifle held by an escaped convict, he was only 39 years of age.

His life and his work resulted in the passage of three civil rights bills.

His life brought within reach equality for all Americans.

His life resulted in the beginning of the end of our race problems.

His life began the solution of what foreigners have called "The American Dilemma."

All this in so short a time and all this in one lifetime.

Martin Luther King was a builder, not a destroyer. His advocacy brought about our civil rights legislation. The civil rights laws that have been passed by the Congress became laws among prophecies of doom. Yet, no one has been destroyed. Millions of Americans benefited by becoming full citizens. America is more of a democracy, it is a bigger country and a better nation.

Martin Luther King brought understanding with him, the understanding that was carried into every home in America, white or black, that the Negro could not wait any longer to be equal, that 100 years of disappointment after the Civil War were enough. Equality is a quality that belongs to all men, but it must be recognized. The shock of recognition was necessary for all of us, the recognition that our goals were great and our performance was so weak.

There are those who thought of Martin Luther King as a lawbreaker. They are wrong. He was the most lawful of men. He ignored unjust ordinances, but he willingly paid the penalty for their violation. He showed that where men are willing to pay the penalty, unjust laws cannot stand. An unjust law is an unworkable law because the majority of Americans are not willing to begin a campaign of massive repression to deny rights to others which they accept for themselves.

The American people are a just people. They are very often too busy with the material problems of getting and spending to give their full attention to the big questions. Martin Luther King made people listen and think, to look deeply into their own souls and the soul of their country. We all have been better for that.

When Martin Luther King thought of death he said that he would like "somebody to say, Martin Luther King tried to love somebody." He loved more than somebody, he loved this country. I believe that it is fair to say that millions of Americans white and black love him back today.

For all of these reasons, I have introduced a bill today which will direct that a commemorative stamp be struck in honor of Martin Luther King. I hope that the Post Office Department and its special Committee on Commemorative Stamps will act very soon and issue such a stamp.

Last year on May 1, 1968, I introduced a bill for the purpose of encouraging the Post Office Department to honor the memory of a great American who was known and loved by millions of Americans and millions of citizens of the world as one of our greatest citizens. Since that time many commemorative stamps have been issued. Those who are responsible for such stamps no doubt thought they were very important. Perhaps they were.

A stamp commemorating the achievements of the musician W. C. Handy, the father of the blues, will be issued May 17 with first-day ceremonies in Memphis, Tenn., since that city was immortalized by Mr. Handy's compositions. A stamp commemorating the 50-year life of the American Legion was announced on January 19 with first-day ceremonies on March 15. A stamp commemorating the flight of Apollo 8 was announced on January 29 by the Postmaster General for issuance on May 5, 1969. That was quick action commemorating an important event in space, but what was even quicker was the redesigning of the stamp and the addition of the words "In the beginning God." I am sure that Martin Luther King would have approved of that change. But when I think of our concern with space and our seeming lack of concern with earth and its people, it makes me wonder about our values.

I think that I have been patient in waiting for something to be done about honoring the life and works of a great American. I had written the then Postmaster General on April 8, 1968, 4 days after the assassination of Dr. King. Now I have waited almost a year. At that time I stated that I would consider hearings and the review of the whole commemorative stamp process. I was told at that time by postal officials that I had no need to worry, that everything possible would be done. Perhaps everything has been done that could be done. Perhaps, there are problems. I would like to know what they are. If I am not assured in a very short time that a commemorative stamp honoring Dr. King will be issued, I will take action.

Surely postal officials are aware of the significance of Dr. King's life, of the significance of civil rights legislation which he helped bring about. I want action and I intend to get it.

THE LAST ECHOES

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Ray McHugh, chief of the Washington bureau of the Copley News Service, in a recent column, reflected on the funeral ceremonies for, and tributes to, former President Dwight Eisenhower.

Mr. McHugh's column, beautifully written, has captured the essence of what I believe most of us have felt during the days of the ceremonies and those which followed.

I am pleased to bring it to the attention of the Senate because of the fine tribute it is to General Eisenhower, but more so because it gives an added sense of meaning to the events of early April in which all Americans were in one way or another participants.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE—NATIONAL—INTERPRETIVE

(By Ray McHugh, chief, Washington Bureau, Copley News Service)

WASHINGTON.—The last echoes of the cannon and the bugles have faded away; the tributes are ended; but the American people may discover that in death, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower performed one last service for them that could overshadow all his victories in war, all his achievements in peace.

The last five days have seen a "coming together" of Americans in salute to a man who has been called "the all-American president," "the 50-star general," "the most beloved American of the 20th century."

Out of the death of Gen. Eisenhower and the sad, but majestic pageantry of his final rites here and in Abilene, Kans., have come some powerful reminders about the roots of America.

As men looked back on Gen. Eisenhower's years of high military command and on his presidency, it was inevitable that they should comment on the order that marked those years—even the war years.

As they looked back even further, into the general's own origins, it was inevitable that they should comment on his simple, protestant heritage, his firm belief in the West Point creed of "duty, honor, country; his uncomplicated character that disdained political maneuvering, rejected the waste of hatred and reflected until the very end his faith in his country and the principles on which it was built.

It will be a long time before American history books forget his last words to his wife Mamie:

"I've always loved my wife.

"I've always loved my children.

"I've always loved my grandchildren.

"I've always loved my country."

The outpouring of genuine affection and respect for the old soldier must have surprised those in Washington who have delighted for almost a decade in pointing to his 1953–1961 presidency as a "do-nothing" period.

Many younger political figures dismissed the simple, open Eisenhower style as an anachronism. His principles no longer fit the changing times and mood of the nation, they said.

They must wonder today if times and moods have really changed that much, or if they have been listening only to strident minorities.

For the nation, too, Gen. Eisenhower's death brought a kind of reawakening. An increasingly secular citizenry suddenly paused, looked at its television screens, and seemed drawn back to the "God of our Fathers," the apt title of one of Gen. Eisenhower's favorite hymns.

"Onward, Christian Soldiers" had the ring of a call to duty and "Army Blue" was a reminder that old loyalties are not to be forgotten.

It has been easy for some Washington observers to disregard the relative order and quiet of the Eisenhower years as a post-war "interlude" and to blame the disorder and tension of the 1960s on the release of suppressed frustrations and the encouragement of intellectual ferment.

In the dignity of the last five days, both arguments seemed to collapse.

Gen. Eisenhower brought more to the national scene than a contagious grin. He brought a strength of purpose and a conviction in America. Perhaps even his closest friends did not grasp the full measure of that strength until this week.

In death he reminded millions not only of his achievements, but of their own achievements, their own origins and the origins of their country. Each act in the funeral drama—a program he had personally approved three years ago—seemed to emphasize these origins.

The change that came over the nation was almost visible in the lines that honored the 34th president as he lay in repose at the National Cathedral, then in state at the Capitol.

In those first hours Saturday the lines were made up largely of the middle aged and older Americans who remembered Gen. Eisenhower fondly as a great wartime commander and as a president who kept the peace. There were few young people or children. Few negroes.

But in the final hours at the Capitol Tuesday, at the railroad stations along the 1,300 mile ride home to Kansas and in the streets of Abilene Wednesday, youth and people of all races joined the tribute.

It was as if this man many could not even remember had in death awakened a pride of country, a new awareness of God, a selflessness that too many had forgotten.

For the first time in a long time, Americans had a good look at themselves and liked what they saw. Gen. Eisenhower was so typical of America that each in his own way could see a bit of himself in the soldier-president.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our Nation and our people mourn the passing of General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States.

If one word were used to describe General Eisenhower, I believe that word would be "dedication." Dedication to his country, dedication to his duty, and dedication to his family.

His military career spanned the victorious conclusion of the greatest world conflict in history.

His political career was climaxed with the ending of hostilities in Korea, the first direct armed conflict our Nation faced with Communist aggression.

He was truly a man of peace.

Personal integrity and honor marked his years as our Commander in Chief, and its impact was so profound that those years have been designated the "Eisenhower Era."

General Eisenhower, through his example as a leader, as a father, and as a man, exemplified those values we cherish most highly. He was a symbol of the best our country can produce.

From the heartland of our Nation, at his birthplace in Kansas, he acquired his basic sense of values of honesty, integrity, love of family, respect for authority, reverence for God, and dedication to country. These were his contributions to the highest office of the land, the Presidency of the United States.

As a patriot, a leader, as a father, and as a man, General Eisenhower exemplified our most cherished values. He was a symbol of the best our country can produce.

He will be missed, and he will be long remembered.

GRUENING THE CRUSADER

HON. TED STEVENS

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, Ernest Gruening has served the Nation and my State with rare devotion and ability.

The Washington Post of April 3, 1969, contained an interesting article concerning his future plans. I commend the article to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

[From the Washington Post, April 3, 1969]

GRUENING, 82, IS CRUSADING IN PRINT AGAIN

(By Harry F. Rosenthal)

Ernest Gruening started crusading in his first newspaper job in 1912 and now, at 82 a distinguished former Senator, he is once more using the printed word as his lance.

In 1923 Gruening's name appeared on the masthead as managing editor of "The Nation", an influential, intellectual weekly. That was long before he midwifed Alaska to statehood, long before he became one of the Senate's most eloquent doves on the Vietnam war, which he calls "an unmitigated tragedy and disaster."

Now, deposed from his Senate seat by a younger man and long past retirement age, his name appears again on The Nation's credits as editorial associate, and he is launching a new attack on an old target—overpopulation.

"I consider it, next to peace, the most serious problem mankind faces," Gruening said in an interview.

He said he also is deeply concerned about the USS Pueblo incident and international spying in general, but reserves his sharpest criticism for the Vietnam war.

"The country has been misled and it's now pretty apparent," he said of Vietnam. "It's surprising to me that more people don't realize the extent of the disaster, the consequences of which will be with us for the rest of the lives of the people now born. We will have spent over $100 billion on this war—a sum not recoverable—we have neglected in consequence to take care of our really burning domestic issues."

In 1964 Gruening held Senate hearings on the problem of overpopulation and he now is affiliated with the Population Crisis Committee—a voluntary group—which is trying to expand government activity in the area.

"My interest in it (population control) arose over a half century ago when I was in medical school and when going on obstetrical cases in the slums of Boston I saw these large families living in tenements, children sickly, mother sickly, unable to support this ever-increasing brood. I felt then it was imperative that parents have access to the knowledge which would enable them to decide how many children they should have and at what intervals."

Gruening went into journalism soon after Harvard Medical School and, as managing editor of the Boston Traveler, wrote an editorial opposing a state law that banned publicizing of information about contraceptives.

"This editorial was considered so perilous," Gruening recalled, "that my boss, the editor of the morning paper, had the presses stopped and the editorial extracted."

Later, as editor of the Boston journal, Gruening wrote a similar editoral. "It ran, but we lost a lot of advertising."

The problem is different now and larger because of the population explosion, Gruening said.

"It took 1850 years to bring about a population of one billion. Now, 118 years later, that population is more than tripled and it will double—unless we do something about it—every 30 years . . . We have lost the battle already, we already have more people on this little earth than we can support."

His new position on "The Nation," Gruening says, includes writing an occasional article or editorial. He also is working on an autobiography.

He worked on three Boston newspapers and then became managing editor of the New York Tribune in World War I. After a brief tour in the Army, he became managing editor of The Nation.

His first book was "Mexico and Its Heritage." The second, "The Public Pays," was an expose of private power companies.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed him to a number of posts dealing with other countries and later made him the first director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions.

In 1939 Gruening was appointed Governor of Alaska and began working immediately for Alaskan statehood, saying: "A democracy has no business having colonies." He represented Alaska as a non-voting Senator for two years before Alaska became a state in 1958. When Alaska became the 49th state, he and the late E. S. Bartlett were its first elected Senators.

BIAFRA

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Maxwell T. Cohen, one of my constituents, recently made a trip to Biafra to determine the condition of the Biafran population, which has endured tragic food shortages and disease during almost 2 years of the Nigerian-Biafran conflict.

Mr. Cohen's report on his trip appeared in the winter-spring issue of the magazine entitled "Prevent World War III," which is published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc.

I include in the RECORD the text of Mr. Cohen's article in order to give my colleagues the benefit of Mr. Cohen's views of the tragic results which may arise if the Nigerian-Biafran war is not speedily terminated:

I WAS IN BIAFRA: INCUBATOR OF WORLD WAR III

(By Maxwell T. Cohen)[1]

The drama, agony, tragedy, frustration and foreboding arising out of or associated with Biafra was epitomized in the first twenty-four hours that I spent in that beautiful but disturbed country.

I landed at night in a very dimly lit improvised airfield in a plane which carried a cargo of food and medical supplies. The plane flew over enemy territory without lights and made its miraculous landing under conditions which would have horrified any aviator.

I was then driven through the jungle by a series of back-roads to the home of one of the Government Ministers for a prolonged conference.

Around 11:00 o'clock I conferred with the Chief Justice of Biafra who had been a former member of the International Court of Justice. We discussed the application of the Genocide Convention in a thoroughly objective, professional manner with a degree of cold detachment as if we were discussing the civil problems of a client in our respective law offices, distant from Africa, from warfare, from destruction and from the devious involvements of diplomacy. This, however, was the last time that I was to discuss the Genocide Convention with cold, unemotional objectivity.

I returned to the two story hotel and watched the scene from the balcony. A man was washing a car below me; there were some groups of people talking; some boys were playing soccer in the adjacent field. I could hear the sounds of the market place nearby.

I returned to my room and soon I heard a series of sharp reports followed by a thunderous sharp sound. The building shook. There was another series of sharp reports followed by a resounding boom.

I ran out to the balcony and saw heavy black smoke spiral up from the market place. I went downstairs and two boys approached me. They were bleeding profusely. One fell at my feet screaming in a high pitched voice and pointed to his left leg. There appeared a ghastly flesh wound approximately one foot long, three inches wide. Flesh, blood, bone and tissue were visible. The other boy was also shot. A car drove both boys to a nearby hospital. About fifteen or sixteen boys passed us. Every single boy was wounded.

The attacking plane, identified as a Russian Mig flown by an Egyptian pilot dropped two bombs, three rockets and also strafed the area. Seventy-four people were killed. Hundreds were wounded.

That night I heard a broadcast on the BBC shortwave. Lord Shepherd and General Alexander of the British Commission in Nigeria were blandly reassuring the world that they had seen no evidence of atrocities or incidents of genocide.

That same night the Chief Justice visited me. I confessed to him that after having experienced the bombing and seeing the consequences of the bombing, I would no longer be able to discuss the application of the Genocide Convention with professional detachment and objectivity.

I remember stating to him: "I know that you as a distinguished Jurist will advise me as an attorney not to become emotionally involved." The Chief Justice smiled very sadly and said that he would not so advise me. He told me that he had had three nieces and nephews who had been visiting his home and they had a discussion with him regarding their school work. He told me they were brilliant students. After discussing their work they went to a book store. The book store was bombed, and the three children perished. "One child we identified by some of the clothing on those parts of the body that we could find, one body we never found at all, and one body because of its condition we could never be sure, that this was the third child. I know how you feel."

There are several observations that can be made as a result of my visit to Biafra. These observations corroborate my opinion that unless there is an immediate cease-fire in the Nigerian and Biafran War that this war could be a prelude to World War III.

Although the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Nigerian Government have maintained that this war is "an internal matter," that is not the case. British guns, munitions and finances, Russian Migs, war supplies and finances and Egyptian pilots are publicly involved on the Nigerian side. In addition there are a number of African States backing Nigeria either openly or diplomatically through the OAU and the United Nations. On the Biafran side France has been supplying arms. While I was in Biafra the People's Republic of China had issued a statement of its position on the war which was exceedingly pro-Biafran. There are a number of African States whose sympathies lie with Biafra. Throughout the world, many groups have aligned themselves with the humanitarian aspects of this war and are contributing substantial amounts of food and medicine to Biafran Relief. Obviously, this conflict is international and not an "internal matter."

DISGRACEFUL IRRESPONSIBILITY

Another fact which is an ominous foreboding of World War III is the deliberate duplicity on the part of the many nations in falsifying information which their governments and their people are entitled to know.

There have been several Commissions from Great Britain, Canada, several other nations and the United Nations which have publicized repeatedly their findings that they had seen no evidence of atrocities or genocide in this war. Half a dozen Commissions supposed to visit Biafra to ascertain whether or not atrocities were being committed have repeatedly stated with a great deal of publicity that they have seen no evidence of atrocities or genocide, *but those commissions had never visited Biafra!*

Catholic and Protestant clergymen and welfare workers, objective newspaper reporters, have seen and experienced atrocities and acts of genocide. Their observations are rarely publicized. The Irish Press is the only press which has consistently published reports of those who had actually witnessed atrocities.

Russia and the People's Republic of China are involving themselves in Africa through the medium of this war. Their participation in this war will open up to them all of Africa's incredible wealth, its oil, gold supply and its political possibilities.

Tragically much of Africa is receptive to these influences. The heritage of recollection of British, Belgian, Spanish, Dutch and Portuguese colonialism and imperialism is very much in evidence.

Unless the United States intervenes at this time to induce a cease-fire, or unless the United Nations assumes its proper responsibility and authority to impose a cease-fire, I can foresee that within this generation all of Africa could be engulfed in a world war.

The Biafrans will continue this war and they are prepared to continue guerrilla war. The Nigerian economy is shaky and in sheer desperation in order to obtain further assistance Nigeria may be obliged to commit its oil reserves to Russia.

It is in the interest of every American that the United States should use its moral, economic and political pressures to induce both sides to enter cease-fire immediately. The alternative must lead to internationally deteriorating and destructive consequences.

Finally, the unbelievable tragedy existing in Biafra is forcefully brought out by the following excerpt from an editorial in the New York Daily Column of December 17, 1968:

"It has been estimated that at least 10,000 Biafrans—thousands of them children—die each day from starvation. Ten thousand every day—and the end is not in sight.

"Meanwhile, the world stands by and allows this to happen. Britain doesn't want to antagonize Nigeria because of the valuable oil reserves. The Soviet Union has supplied the Lagos government with Mig fighters. And U.A.R. pilots are flying them—probably because they need the practice. De Gaulle for reasons of his own—is supporting the Biafran effort."

The conscience of the world must come to early grips with a solution to this tragic and calamitous question if it is not to be haunted by the specter of death, destruction and deprivation.

ABM—INCREDIBLE SAFEGUARD

HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the New Bedford Standard-Times has consistently commented in a clear and logical manner in the debate over the ABM system, whether it be called Sentinel or Safeguard.

The Charleston Gazette, of Charleston, W. Va., has also spoken out in a forthright manner on the same subject.

I ask unanimous consent that two editorials from the New Bedford Standard-Times and one from the Charleston Gazette be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette,
Apr. 18, 1969]

NIXON'S SAFEGUARD PLAN PREPOSTEROUS, A SELLOUT

President Nixon has applied a generous coating of sugar. He has done everything up in a most disarming way with fancy political wrappings. But all the sweet coating and deluding packaging fails to cover the bitterness of the gall or hide the fact he has sold out to the millitary-industrial complex in his decision to proceed with deployment of a temporarily limited version of the Sentinel antiballlistic missile system.

---

[1] Maxwell T. Cohen, a New York City lawyer, is a member of the International Law Committee of the American Bar Association.

In an obvious effort to placate critics of the ABM system, he has hit upon a compromise to place the ABM sites around Minuteman missile bases in Montana and North Dakota, rather than around heavily populated cities as contemplated by the Johnson administration. He offers a generous serving of honey by promising a saving of $1 billion in next year's budget, but the sulfur will come in increased costs in succeeding years.

Indeed, the Nixon version of the ABM system will cost $6 billion to $7 billion over the next several years, which will make it considerably more expensive than the Johnson version. But the real danger from the cost standpoint is that it places a foot in the door, and on the basis of past demonstrations the Pentagon can be counted on to apply its astronomical mathematics in a way to make initial estimates look like peanuts.

In short, at a time when this nation is confronted with the very real problems of arms control, peace in Vietnam, the agonies of the cities, hunger and poverty, racial unrest, jobs and housing, President Nixon gives the go ahead on a fantastically expensive experiment that will give even greater profits to those who will benefit—namely the military-industrial complex—and that at best will provide protection of the most doubtful nature, if any at all, against nuclear attack.

The Nixon system may be different from that proposed by the Johnson administration, but it does not answer the criticisms of most leading scientists that the system is unproven, subject to computer and human error, unlikely to add much to our security and an invitation to nuclear escalation.

The President's thinner-than-thin ABM program, which he calls "safeguard," is designed to "protect" our deterrent power to launch a retaliatory second strike.

But with the ABM system "safeguarding" only two of the Minuteman missile bases, it is highly doubtful that an enemy with the capability of knocking out our population and 90 per cent of our missiles with a saturation attack would be deterred by the possibility that 10 per cent of our missiles might survive. And survival of the 10 per cent is only problematical because any kind of an ABM system depends upon delicate radar and other electronic devices which many qualified scientists say would be rendered useless by a saturation attack.

As noted by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the United States now has more than 600 Polaris missiles ready to launch from far-ranging submarines, and the Poseidon program is in process of proliferating these missiles into 4,000 warheads, all to be fired from untargetable mobile bases under the seas. If such a second-strike capacity will not deter an attack, nothing will. And the highly questionable ability to protect a small share of our land-based missiles is not going to add credibility to our deterrent capacity.

The whole plan is preposterous, not only because of the fantastic cost but also because there is no way of knowing whether the ABM will provide any protection against nuclear attack and because it creates the danger of further escalation of the arms race. A better plan would have been to provide for a thorough study of the matter by a non-governmental panel of experts and to bring about early arms control talks with the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, we can only hope that Congress will show greater fortitude than President Nixon in withstanding the pressure of the military-industrial complex.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, Mar. 16, 1969]

ABM—INCREDIBLE SAFEGUARD

There are some crumbs of cold comfort in President Nixon's decision to deploy a "modified" anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system called Safeguard, primarily to protect American offensive missile silos.

In announcing his plan to move ABM sites away from major population areas and into the countryside, the President conceded there is no way to expand the Sentinel system into a heavy defense against a Russian attack on the nation's cities. At least that $50 billion boon-doggle has been vetoed.

Implicitly, in admitting that "It is not now within our power" to provide the American people with complete protection against a major nuclear attack, the President acknowledged—as The Standard-Times argued in its recent series—that the untested Sentinel system is unfeasible and unready for deployment, even though the Army had started to deploy it.

Further, although Mr. Nixon's Safeguard decision may make it harder to reach such goals, his references to peace talks, arms limitation and emphasis on defensive, rather than offensive missiles, revealed his earnest hope of avoiding a weapons race and escalation of world tension.

Finally, the fact that he has slowed down the ABM deployment schedule, and plans extensive testing and annual review of Safeguard, at least give hope that we will not plunge blindly into fullscale establishment of the system.

Setting up a few sites at a time, beginning with two, is less of an evil than planning for 15 to 20, as was the case with the Sentinel program. But this meager case is all that can be offered for the President's decision, for it represents at best political accommodation, a public-relations attempt to soothe ABM's critics in Congress, and in the nation.

Changing the name of the weapon and moving it from city to country; reducing the initial expenditure, and promising to test it more answer none of the fundamental arguments against an anti-ballistic missile system.

Sentinel was supposed to cost $5.5 billion, according to the Johnson administration. Safeguard, Mr. Nixon estimates, will cost $6 billion to $7 billion.

Thus, although we are supposed to "save" $1 billion initially (Safeguard is budgeted in fiscal 1970 for $800 million, and Sentinel called for $1.8 billion), we shall actually spend more in the long run.

Further, the record of military spending, complicated by miscalculated costs and inflation, teaches us that if the estimate now is $6 billion to $7 billion, it undoubtedly really will cost nearer $10 to $12 billion.

In part, Safeguard will cost more than Sentinel because many more Sprint (short-range) back-up missiles will be required for full coverage of the nation's six Minuteman "wings" (headquarters complexes) with 1,000 separate missiles than would be needed for protecting five long-range perimeter acquisition radar sites under the Sentinel plan. The Pentagon is planning acquisition of 12 sites, almost the number needed for Sentinel deployment. What "modification" is this?

Moving ABM into the countryside in no way increases its effectiveness.

On March 12, Sen. Cook, R–Ky., disclosed on the Senate floor that a Sentinel subcontractor in the Northeast had told him, the anti-missile system was "technically so unreliable that it "should not be deployed." Some of the nation's top scientists have said the same thing for months.

Even if improved, the system cannot be tested because of the nuclear test-ban treaty. We will never know whether it will work at all.

By surrounding our offensive missile sites with this defensive weapon of doubtful capability, we invite an enemy to overwhelm with his own attacking missiles the sites on which our deterrent rests, and we do not know what adverse effect firing our ABMs may have on the operation of our own offensive missiles.

The administration's insistence on ABM raises a question of credibility. For years, several secretaries of defense have informed Americans that, even allowing the Russians to strike first, we possess a second-strike capability with our Minuteman missiles in underground sites that would inflict unacceptable damage upon the Soviet Union.

This basic policy—that a strong offense is the best defense—was based on public declarations that we did not need more protection for our missiles, that hardened sites were adequate.

Were we being misled then, or now?

If this policy was sound and the sites are adequately protected by their construction, why do we need an antimissile system to protect them further?

If they are not adequately protected against an increasing number of Soviet missiles, there are ways of hardening the sites that offer added protection and are far cheaper than ABM.

The flimsy argument that we need even harder protection of our land-based Minuteman ICBMs completely ignores the fact that we have 41 Polaris submarines with 16 ICBM's each, which no nuclear power can destroy with a first strike because they are under water and moving all the time.

Although Mr. Nixon expresses reservations about the effectiveness of site-hardening, it has many proponents, including the eminent nuclear physicist, Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, who has advocated it in preference to ABM, and who says it could be accomplished for $1 billion.

Deployment of an ABM system, in whatever name or place, also means that the President will lose control over the use of atomic weapons, because a quick decision on whether to fire a defensive missile armed with a thermonuclear warhead must be left to a computer or a junior military officer.

We flatly disagree with the President that deployment of this system, whether two units or 12 will not heat up the arms race. Since the Russians traditionally have emphasized defensive weapons, and since Safeguard is a defensive system, it is reasonable to suppose that our ABM deployment would cause them to move ahead with a larger defensive missile setup, and to increase their offensive missile capability as well.

Naturally, we would then be pushed to increase our offensive missile capability.

The more offensive missiles the Russians build—as they now are doing and may be expected to do to counter our ABM—the less effective any U.S. anti-missile system becomes.

ABM or, in fact, any defensive missile system, has a built-in weakness of diminishing returns; the bigger the enemy arsenal, the higher the odds rise against effective defense.

The Standard-Times predicts that if the United States goes ahead with ABM deployment, however leisurely and by whatever name, within a decade, we shall have spent another $50 billion; that the Soviets will make proportionately the same additional effort and that, relatively, our arsenals will be precisely as they are now—except with a much less stable balance of nuclear power and less security for the whole world.

This is the "mad momentum" of which former Defense Secretary McNamara warned, when he said, "What the world requires . . . is not a new race toward armament, but a new race toward reasonableness. We had all better run that race."

Mr. Nixon's Safeguard decision is not running the race toward reasonableness. Equally important, it will probably reduce—not add to—the nation's security.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, Mar. 19, 1969]

WHY ARE WE DEPLOYING ABM?

In announcing his decision to go ahead with deployment of an anti-missile system, President Nixon said the move was designed to fulfill three objectives.

1. Protection of our land-based retaliatory forces against a direct attack by the Soviet Union.

2. Defense of the American people against the kind of nuclear attack which Communist China is likely to be able to mount within the decade.

3. Protection against the possibility of accidental attacks from any source.

According to Richard L. Garwin, member of the President's Science Advisory Committee from 1962 to 1965, and Hans A. Bethe, winner of the Nobel prize in physics, and a member of the same committee from 1956 to 1959, and Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, MIT provost and former science adviser to President Kennedy and Johnson, our land-based retaliatory forces do not now need any such further protection.

Garwin and Bethe have stressed that, "The United States has 1,000 Minuteman missiles in hardened silos, and 54 much larger Titan II missiles. In addition, we have 656 nuclear missiles in 41 Polaris submarines and nearly 700 long-range bombers. The Minuteman alone could survive a surprise attack and achieve assured destruction of the attacker."

Wiesner added, "There is no real threat at all to our deterrent at this time from the Chinese or the Russians."

During the presidential campaign, in a White House news conference after his inauguration and again on March 4, Mr. Nixon said he did not accept the Johnson administration explanation that the "thin" ABM system was designed as a defense against Communist China. In other words, he acknowledged that it was a defense against Soviet missiles and, in part, a response to a missile defense system begun by the Russians.

Now Mr. Nixon apparently has changed his mind, and accepts the China argument. What weakens this aspect of the argument, however, are the quickly changing official reasons for an ABM system.

If the growing Chinese nuclear threat makes construction necessary, why—by moving defensive rocket sites away from major cities—have we de-emphasized preserving urban lives in favor of maintaining U.S. offensive weapons "second strike" capability in event of an enemy attack? In so doing, we have eliminated the principal anti-Chinese reason offered for the construction of the ABM system by the Johnson administration.

As a matter of fact, just the other day, in ruling out future expansion to a "thick" ABM system to counter Russian missiles, Deputy Defense Secretary Packard said such a system would not work because even if it knocked down most of the incoming warheads, a "very few weapons coming into your city can inflict unacceptable damage."

We are not, then, defending "American people," but American weapons, which, many experts attest, do not need further defending.

The last argument, protection against the possibility of an accidentally fired missile, is equally interesting, but even weaker.

The chance of an accidental firing is one of the few things on which pro- and anti-ABM groups agree; both call it remote, and point to the fact that in the 24 years since Hiroshima, there has not been one instance of this. It does not seem to be much of an argument for deploying a multibillion-dollar weapon system.

Moreover, should an accidental firing occur, there is disturbing contradiction as to what would actually happen. Mr. Packard said Sunday that final authority for any use of the ABM system would lie with the President, adding, "I could not recommend any system which would rely on the decision of a computer."

Dr. Herbert York, top Defense Department research official under President Eisenhower and in the early Kennedy administration, and Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky of Harvard, former science adviser to President Eisenhower, this month testified before a Senate subcommittee that:

"The decision to fire at an incoming missile must be made so swiftly that only computers and junior officers could be involved . . . the firing of an ABM must be determined in a matter of minutes after radar picks up the incoming missile and presidential control is inevitably lacking."

Dr. Kistiakowsky added that it would be "impossible" for the president to make the decision and that it would have to be made automatically by a computer, or by a comparatively junior military officer.

"Nor does the problem stop there," he said, "because a computer is really a very stupid thing, and would have to distinguish between a warhead and thousands of pieces of 'space junk' that are constantly orbiting the earth."

Thus, we first had to build ABM as a defense against China; then, it was because the Russians were building one; later, it was because the Russians are building more missiles. Initially, ABM was to protect people; now, it is to protect weapons. If it is accident "insurance," can the President make the decision to fire, or can't he?

How flexible, how changeable is the "justification" for building an ABM system; how disturbingly controversial are the arguments for doing it at all.

So much so that the Nixon administration has created its first credibility gap, for many Americans—having been given no better official reason—are bound to think we really are deploying ABM simply for deployment's sake, for more defense industry jobs, for political reasons, or for the military-industrial generals who don't care why it is built or how high the cost.

TRENTON'S OWN HERO

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, regardless of the controversy which surrounds the war in Vietnam, all America can take pride when one of its soldiers exhibits that sort of courage upon which this Nation was founded. Such an exhibition was displayed by S1c. Fred W. Zabitosky of my home city of Trenton when he, badly injured himself, rescued the pilot and copilot from a burning helicopter. For this exploit, Sergeant Zabitosky was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for demonstrating courage far above and beyond the call of duty. I am pleased to place before the House the following editorials which appeared in the April 11 edition of the Trenton Evening Times and the April 12 edition of the Trentonian which comment upon Sergeant Zabitosky's heroism:

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Evening Times, Apr. 11, 1969]

MERITED HONORS

"I was lying on the ground with some smashed ribs and my back crushed and thinking I was going to die.

"Then I saw the helicopter in flames on the ground, and heard the men screaming, and I knew I had to get them out."

And Sgt. 1C Fred W. Zabitosky went to get them out.

The sergeant was so badly injured when the helicopter in which he and some others were escaping from North Vietnamese attackers was shot down that he was unable to walk for four weeks thereafter. But he made himself walk then. He got to that burning helicopter and pulled out the pilot. Then he pulled out the co-pilot. After he had dragged these two 80 yards to another rescue copter, he started back again for other men still in the burning ship. This time he didn't make it. He collapsed.

Sergeant Zabitosky, a Trenton native, was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. He came back to Trenton this week to receive the city's distinguished service plaque. On his arrival, he met Ben Kaufman, a World World War I hero and the city's other Medal of Honor winner.

Sergeant Zabitosky forgot himself when he might well have been calling on others to help him. He risked all in repeated acts of courage to save the lives of his comrades. He deserves the proud "well done" of all of his fellow townsmen along with his country's highest military award for heroism.

[From the Trentonian, Apr. 12, 1969]

TRENTON'S OWN HERO

There is a certain special aura about a war hero, even in a war that does not have a universally popular cause. And Trenton this week put on its best suit to pay a welcome home tribute to a war hero of its very own, SFC Fred Zabitosky.

The role of celebrity is a new one to Sergeant Zabitosky and he carries it well. There is nothing pretentious about him nor is there any needless humility. He is a professional soldier, and men like him have been needed since civilization began, and perhaps, unfortunately, always will be.

But when one talks about Fred Zabitosky, it's not really necessary to talk about the philosophical aspects of war. The medal of honor he wears so well was not awarded because he was expert at killing, but rather because he risked his own life to save two comrades from a burning helicopter though seriously hurt himself at the time.

Fred Zabitosky grew up on the streets of Trenton. What made him a hero, he found there.

EROSION OF THE WAR POWER OF CONGRESS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Washington Post of April 6, 1969, contains a thoughtful article dealing with the erosion of the war power of Congress.

For a long time I have been concerned that other branches of the Government have usurped power that rightfully belongs to Congress, and I feel that Congress itself shares a major part of the blame for not fighting to protect its rights and responsibilities.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Congress Is Losing Its War Power," written by Merlo J. Pusey, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS LOSING ITS WAR POWER

(By Merlo J. Pusey)

(NOTE.—Pusey is an editorial writer for the Washington Post. The following is excerpted from his new book, "The Way We Go to

War," to be published later this month by Houghton Mifflin.)

Can the United States be committed to war without action by Congress? In 1787, the Founding Fathers resolved that it could not be, and the country held to that principle with little deviation for a century and a half.

In recent years, however, the President has been exercising the power to make war with alarming consistency. One-man decisions involving the lives of citizens and the fate of the Nation have become the rule at a time when the President has at his command more power than any other human being has ever had.

The facts about this momentous transition in American government are scarcely open to challenge. The President sends American troops to any part of the world whenever he thinks they may be needed in the national interest. Three times in the last quarter century, one man in the White House has taken the United States into war—once in advance of congressional action, once without any congressional action and once with only a casual nod from Congress. In defense of these historic acts, the Executive Branch has laid claim to "inherent powers" broad enough to determine the fate of the Nation in any future crisis.

Several years of war in Vietnam brought the country an acute awareness of the problem. Deeply troubled by the war, people belatedly woke up to the fact that it had never really been authorized by Congress, although Congress in 1964 went through the motions of supporting the President in whatever action he might decide to take.

Later, some of the legislators who sponsored the Tonkin Gulf resolution almost tore their hair in chagrin over the fact that they had let the war power slip through their fingers. The result is an executive-legislative clash which may evolve into the most important constitutional contest of this century.

T. R.'S BIG STICK

The modern expansion of the President's power to use American troops abroad began under Theodore Roosevelt. Carrying out his determination to build a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, he used the Navy to prevent the landing of Colombian troops in the rebellious Colombian state of Panama. He also sent troops into Cuba and the Dominican Republic without any authorization from Congress.

Presidents William H. Taft and Woodrow Wilson and several of their successors made a practice of intervening in unstable Caribbean states, usually seeking to justify their actions as being essential to protect American lives and property. Without waiting for congressional approval, which was later granted, President Wilson had the Navy seize Vera Cruz to cut off a shipment of German arms to Mexico and to elicit an apology from the Mexicans for the arrest of American sailors at Tampico.

In 1916, Wilson sent an expedition under Gen. John J. Pershing into Mexico following Francisco "Pancho" Villa's raid across the border. Though the action was defended on the ground of "hot pursuit," the stay of Pershing's forces for almost two years, without any congressional authorization served further to stretch the claims to presidential power.

Wilson came into direct collision with Congress over the war power when he asked, in February, 1917, for authority to arm American merchant ships against German submarines. The House passed the requested bill but the Senate procrastinated even after the President had called a special session.

Without waiting for a final showdown, Wilson authorized the installation of weapons on the merchant vessels by executive order. Before the order could be carried out, however, Congress declared war. The mounting submarine attacks in the Atlantic had left no alternative.

World War II brought an alarming inflation of the war power in the hands of the Commander in Chief. The period which led up to Pearl Harbor was an excruciating experience because the country was still addicted to isolationism in a world aflame.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt was keenly aware of the perils facing the United States as well as the peoples of Europe and Asia. Yet he could not move openly to join the hard-pressed democratic countries of Europe or to stop Japan's aggressive sweep in the Far East without risk of division in the country and defeat in Congress.

His dilemma was magnified by the fact that he was a candidate for a third term in the election of 1940. Prof. Thomas A. Bailey sharpened this collision of objectives when he wrote: "If he (Roosevelt) let the people slumber in a fog of isolation, they might fall prey to Hitler. If he came out unequivocally for intervention, he would be defeated in 1940."

No doubt the pull from these opposite poles accounts in large part for what happened. But the decision between war and peace always involves extremely painful choices. Today we must look cooly at the course of a President who moved steadily toward war while promising fathers and mothers, as he did in his campaign speech in Boston in October, 1940, that "your boys will not be sent into foreign wars."

[President Truman's decision to enter the Korean War] was not a case in which the President was responding to an attack on the United States, its forces or its citizens. Nor can it be said that Mr. Truman moved promptly to carry out the terms of a defense treaty. At that time there was no mutual defense pack between the United States and Korea.

If there was any discussion between Mr. Truman and his advisers about asking Congress for authority to launch a military venture that would almost certainly grow into war, he has not disclosed it. Rather, the President was chiefly concerned about getting a go-ahead signal from the United Nations. When the fateful presidential decision was made that Monday night, however, the Security Council had merely charged North Korea with a breach of the peace, called for withdrawal of the North Korean forces and asked for assistance in the execution of that very limited resolution.

The appalling fact is that the President plunged the United States into the war without a shred of authority from the Constitution or the laws of treaties and without so much as a request for military help from the United Nations. At that time, the Security Council had not yet decided that any kind of sanctions would be desirable or necessary. The order to Gen. MacArthur was given even before the South Korean government had asked officially for American aid.

A GENTLEMANLY ERA

Have congressional declarations of war become obsolete? The reason most often given for reliance on executive power in a war situation is that the whole concept of a formal legislative decision to go to war belongs to the horse-and-buggy days. In the nuclear age, wars are not declared; they simply begin spontaneously. Does it not follow that the power to make war must be in the hands of the President for the sake of our national survival?

The short answer to the question of whether declarations of war are obsolete is yes. Such declarations are no longer in style. They belong to an era of wars among gentlemen. Except in rare circumstances, they have no relevance to the conduct of foreign relations in the last half of the 20th century.

But when all this is accepted, it says no more than that the form in which Congress has usually exercised its power is no longer efficacious. Where the Administration spokesmen who declare the obsolescence of declarations of war have made their egregious error is in supposing that changes in international usage in some mysterious way transfer the war power to the White House.

It was not a special license to use the words "declare war" that the Founding Fathers gave to Congress. Rather it was the full, red-blooded reality of deciding that another country is our enemy and that war—any form of war—should be levied upon it. The power is not basically changed or diminished because current circumstances call for a different method of using it when necessary.

What Congress is now groping toward is a new format for the exercise of this power in keeping with the realities of the nuclear age. Executive officials have often expressed willingness to cooperate with Congress. Ardent lip service is given to the idea that the two branches must pull together to make the influence of the country properly felt in foreign affairs. Yet the White House has consistently sought to leave the line between congressional and presidential authority vague and amorphous so as to allow a maximum of flexibility in carrying out its own policy.

The fact is that the White House has ruthlessly squandered its capital of good will in Congress. Democrats and Republicans alike are worried about the continued concentration of power in the President's hands, and many of them seem determined to do something about it. If the trend keeps running in the present direction, the distrust and alienation between the two branches could reach the proportions of the post-World War I days when a rampaging Senate, with the help of Woodrow Wilson's intransigence, scuttled the League of Nations.

A DELICATE BLEND

It is, of course, an extremely complicated undertaking to secure a proper blending of presidential control over foreign affairs and the armed forces with the power of Congress to declare war and to raise and support armies. The President, as Jefferson once said and as the Supreme Court has reiterated, is the sole voice of the Nation in foreign affairs. Only he has the diplomatic contacts, the background information and the executive maneuverability to conduct our foreign relations intelligently.

It follows that the President may lead the country into situations where war seems inevitable. Indeed, his response to an attack may be the crucial step in putting the country into war. Nevertheless, the principle of divided powers remains valid, and it can be respected if the President is so disposed or if Congress insists on the proper procedures.

JUDGE'S VIEW OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUSTICE: IT'S A GIGANTIC FUNNEL

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, our concern for the crisis in crime that is now confronting our country is amply demonstrated by numerous stories, editorials, and articles that have been inserted in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD these past months. I would not be surprised if crime were the single most discussed subject in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD this year. Its importance certainly merits this attention.

In the March 9 edition of the Washington Star there appeared an extremely interesting interview with Judge Tim Murphy of the Washington, D.C., Court of General Sessions. Judge Murphy "tells it like it really is." I think it is very important that my colleagues be made aware of what is actually happening in our criminal courts today. This article, I feel, will give them an insight into the functioning of our criminal courts.

The lesson that I learned from it is that we have to know what is really going on rather than merely how the laws read or what some ivory tower scholars are telling us. Until we know this, our efforts to deal with the crime crisis will be futile.

Therefore, I am inserting this very interesting article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 9, 1969]

JUDGE'S VIEW OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUSTICE: IT'S A GIGANTIC FUNNEL

Judge Tim Murphy of the Court of General Sessions is a blunt, unblinking critic of justice here.

"You look around the court on a given day," he said in a recent interview. "Two or three Cadillacs drive up—occupied by defendants.

"They're the holdup men. Our crime rate in many respects is the same people doing it over again. The police know it. The criminal knows it. The kids on the street know it.

"And they say: 'Mr. Big. He's out on bond. He's holding up banks. And you're telling me to get job training to run an elevator or clean out a building at 60 bucks a week when I can make $9,000 on a holdup.' "

Murphy, 39, speaks from experience. Before he was named to the bench two years ago, he was chief of the U.S. attorney's office at the Court of General Sessions for three of his seven years in the U.S. attorney's office.

A major in the Marine Corps Rserve, he is one of the new breed of judges at the court. And he makes no bones about the gravity of the problems he sees facing his court and the rest of the District's justice system.

"The whole system is just kind of madness," said Murphy.

TOP GETS BIGGER

"The toughest, meanest man in the world can be named U.S. attorney, but when you get down to it, we can't even seem to try bank robbers.

"It's a gigantic funnel. We hire a thousand more policemen, but a trial that used to take two days now takes five days. So the top of the funnel gets bigger and bigger, and the bottom gets smaller and smaller.

"One police official told me he'd rather cut the number of new policemen in half and give up those people to judges, probation officers and court staff.

"First, we have a guilty plea rate of only 45 percent, I suspect. It's about the lowest in the nation. An efficient court should have an 85 to 90 percent plea rate. The plea rate is just much, much lower because the statistics on getting reversed here are so much better than in most other jurisdictions.

"So what happens? the prosecutor reduces charges that shouldn't be reduced because we can dispose of them quicker in the Court of General Sessions.

"Once they're reduced, there's 'judge shopping' here. Judges we know give lenient sentences, outrageously light sentences, are also the ones that accept a substantial number of the pleas."

ODDS FAVOR THE CRIMINAL

"The U.S. District Court is no better. One way you can avoid reversal in the U.S. Court of Appeals there is you get a plea. So pleas are encouraged. However, multiple offenders usually always get other charges dropped. And you never see big sentences any more.

"You see, law enforcement, prosecution in the District Court, is almost purely symbolic.

"Most criminals are not caught. Seventy-five percent are not caught.

"If you are caught, most are not indicted.

"And if they are indicted, only 74 percent are convicted.

"Then your appellate rate is about 75 percent sustained.

"So a criminal goes in facing tremendous odds on getting out of the system scot-free. When you add in the likelihood of going to jail, versus getting probation in spite of his record, the odds favor the criminal.

"Now the criminal may not know the sophisticated law, but he know's there's survival."

THE PUBLIC IS HOODWINKED

"You go through all this rhetoric. They always say, 'No promises have been made' in the District Court. However, he's just been told they're going to drop four counts of the indictment.

"He immediately becomes part of this great desire to move the case on.

"The public is being hoodwinked by the administration of justice—in all major cities.

"The real problem you've got, though, is that things aren't going to change much without a massive increase in the number of judges, young, able, vigorous judges and supporting personnel, including probation and bail personnel and everything else.

"Dope addicts in Washington already steal more in one day than it would have cost to put all of the judges on the bench. The police already catch more people in the act every week than they've got courts to try them in.

"This is no criticism of the U.S. Attorney. In my day, you didn't indict any more than 100 a month. You broke them all down in General Sessions."

GUNS ARE TOO NUMEROUS

"Guns after a felony? Every day, we get men in here, convicted felons on the street with guns, they're almost always broken down. Second gun offenders? Almost always broken down.

"Why? They don't want those cases in the District Court unless he was using the gun in a hostile manner. If he's just on the street with a gun, a convicted felon with a gun, even though it would be a felony charge, he doesn't go to the District Court.

"They're faced with a priority, too.

"Which is more important? To try the hold-up robber? The homicide man? The serious narcotics pusher?

"They've got so many serious cases now they don't know what to do with them. They're selecting the worst from the worst, and sending the rest back to General Sessions.

CRIME VICTIMS IGNORED

"Well, we've got to sit down and say, 'What is best? What is best for the man in the system?'

"We can con the public by making them think we're really working for the good of the community. But we're not, really, because we're not victim-oriented.

"No one gives a damn about the victim except their family.

"We shortchange justice—the victim—by reducing all the charges with generally no notice or consultation.

"Somebody ought to stand up and say, 'It's an awful thing to knife a persons 50 stitches.' "

LET'S TELL THE PEOPLE

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the recently concluded convention of the National Association of Broadcasters, which was held in Washington, D.C., I attended several of its functions as an invited guest. One of the functions I attended was the 14th annual breakfast meeting held on Monday, March 24, at the Shoreham Hotel, and the principal speaker on that occasion was Mr. Herb Jacobs, president, TV Stations, Inc. As part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of Mr. Jacobs' remarks.

The address follows:

LET'S TELL THE PEOPLE

Good morning. I certainly hope it will be a good morning, and a good beginning to a good convention. We can sure use a good one.

I say that, because even though business is good, you don't need me to remind you what a hectic year it has been for the industry. Why it has even made a lot of hitherto unconcerned broadcasters want to be cooperative and friendly.

Apropos to the friendly I'm talking about, someone once defined friends as being two women mad at the same person.

We sure have a belly full of friend makers. Now you know who they are, so I am not going to waste time calling them by name. Besides, what names you wish to call them, is a private matter between you and your religious training.

The only one who deserves special mention is broadcasting's exceptional Excedrin headache, Thomas Hoving. His do-it-yourself book on claim jumping just missed the best seller list . . . but only because his citizen's buttinsky committee ran out of money.

What pleases me most though, is the concern everyone is beginning to show about every Tom, Dick and Nicholas, who uses us as his pet whipping boy.

Amen, brothers! It's about time we started to remove the veneer, and recognize that there ain't no Jupiter on some Mount Olympus, who is gonna pull your chestnuts outta the fire. It's jes l'il ole you who is gonna hafta do it all by hisself.

It's your bag fellows, and if you expect to continue to prosper, you're going to have to do your own thing.

Television is a very successful enterprise, and more to its credit, it has succeeded despite handicaps few other industries have had to face. We are keenly scrutinized by the most well informed public in history, whose so called intelligentsia have taken unto themselves the role of Public Defender.

Their incompetent criticisms of television strangely parallel the philosophy of today's militant students—that the individual is no longer capable of responsibility for his own welfare, or morally responsible for his own conduct. This seems to me to be more of a Big Brother attitude, than that of a Public Defender. But the records show neither of them capable of offering a substitute program that will satisfy their would be defendants.

Their most notable experiment to date, has been the Ford Foundation's recent $10,000,000 fiasco, the Public Broadcasting Laboratory, which their Friendly friend has consulted them into. It has been unable to produce a single public affairs program, with merit enough to gain notice of even the breathlessly awaiting bleeding hearts . . . to say nothing of the poor deprived souls they cry out to save from our so-called inadequacies.

To some, that might be heard as the sound of two sour grapes banging together, if it weren't so tragic a miscalculation of the comically uninformed. They have been so busy listening to the beat of their own drummer, that they are out of step with reality. Moral commitment, they have yet to learn, is no guarantee against failure, and their failure is at the elementary level.

The task is to get the people to turn on the set. If they don't, there is no beginning. If they don't, you can't use the medium to educate, inform, raise the cultural level or even entertain.

We are under attack from all sides as the corruptors of our youth. And we sit there, defending our position with polite imagination, instead of using the overwhelming amount of fact to the contrary.

A few years ago, the graduate and undergraduate classes at Fordham University were given a paper to do on "The Problems of Modern Man". Along with their other concerns, quite a few of the students named television as one of the prime causes of the other evils. When challenged to prove the connection between the two, the students gave the professor a stunned look as if to say, "Why everyone knows that!"

Well, I for one do not know that! True, Jack Gould, Vance Packard and a dozen or so other prophets of doom know it—as of course do most of the college professors, artists, PTA chairmen, and intellectuals. They all know it!

The only people who are ignorant of the causal relationship are the social scientists, and those who have had long experience with mass media. The social psychologists are particularly ignorant, for they hesitate to make any really sweeping statements about the influence of mass media on national values. The evidence available does indicate that mass media does have some influence, in some areas, in some circumstances. However, it also shows that this influence is limited, and that other social forces are far more important in determining the values and ideas of a people. But unfortunately for us, these other forces are not worthy of headlines.

If this be true, and the evidence points in that direction, then the hue and cry against us is serving to hide the true responsibility. Parents, teachers and almost everyone else in public prominence, cast their sins upon us, and spend their time shouting at the scapegoat instead of facing up to their own failure.

This, I submit, is a really dangerous situation. It is part of the general pattern of flight from responsibility, and adds up to a real challenge. If they expect intelligent planning to be done, it must be based on facts—not prejudices.

The ignorance of television and other mass media effects, has done more than obscure the responsibility of parents, educators, clergy and public officials. It has opened the way for a real attack on the freedoms we so zealously guard. Paradoxically, the attack comes from those who proclaim themselves the friends of freedom . . . the intellectual, the artist, the teacher and the public official.

You hear it everywhere, at cocktail parties, faculty lounges, PTA meetings and even the halls of Congress, and it goes something like this:

"Television is pandering to the lowest tastes of the least common denominator."

"We must protect our people and children from it."

"The medium should be in the hands of universities, mothers, and citizens committees."

"The artists should have the final say as to what is presented."

"We need a National Board to supervise all television programs."

And on, and on, and on, ad nauseam. Now some complaints may not be without justification, but the thinking contains the germs of a Big Brother Knows Best attitude, and I submit there is a dangerous similarity between the two mentalities.

These people are indirectly denying that the airwaves belong to the people as a whole, and after all, it is the people who are the major patrons of the arts in our times. At base, these attitudes hide a refusal to face the fact that we have a new type of culture, which is not the exclusive property of the elite, of the wealthy, or of the well educated. And our friends also forget that in most cases, the greatest majority of the people are just not interested in the art and thought of their would be masters.

Now I myself do not enjoy everything on television, which will be unmistakably demonstrated soon. However, I suspect if the bleeding hearts had their way, we would have boring discussions in place of boring so-called comedy and variety shows, and the high-brow violence of Tennessee Williams in place of the low-brow Wild Wild West. I'm not so sure the first state would not be worse than the last.

To focus on the violence tempest, a few years ago the wire services carried a story that happened in Alabama. Perhaps some of you will remember it. An 11 year old farm boy raised the flag on a rural mailbox outside his home. When the postman stopped, the boy killed him with a .22 caliber rifle.

The boy's father said he had given the rifle to his son for Christmas, that he was normal and did well in school. He then said, "I think the main cause is TV, he liked war pictures and westerns."

Now allowing for the father's grief and shock which would numb his thinking, his effort to find a "cause" for the tragedy is pure fantasy. The inevitable logic of his pronouncement is that such acts of insensate violence, by young boys in our society, were almost unknown before 1950, when television became widely available in the American home.

In addition, there are upward of 15,000,000 pre-adolescent boys in the United States. In the countryside or suburbia, a considerable number have small rifles, or access to one, and all of them watch television too. So what were they doing that week?

Small boys, and often girls, have an instinct for violence in defense of their rights, or of right. A visual image of violence is not necessary to evoke it. It is spontaneous and biological in the young. The civilized deplore television violence for violence's sake alone, but the young are not civilized, never were, and never will be. If the young were civilized, the race would vanish in its own insipidity.

It is the duty of all of us, as adults, to civilize the young as they pass through our homes, churches and schoolyards. However, let us not try to shift the blame for any failures, for our lack of perception and courage, to a picture in a television set. The problem is not a product of the electronic age. It is ageless, and I would like to read a short referral quotation:

"Our youth now love luxury. They have bad manners and contempt for authority. They show disrespect for their elders, and love idle chatter in place of exercise. They are now tyrants, not the servants of their households. They no longer rise when elders enter the room. They contradict their parents, chatter before company, gobble up their food and tyrannize their teachers."

Gentlemen, those words were written in the 5th Century B.C. by Socrates. It's hard to believe isn't it, that in hundreds of generations so little change has taken place in what might be termed "human fundamentals." And there could be no complaint about the insidious influences of television then. Could it be, Mr. Senator, they blamed it on the scrolls and statutes?

Our main trouble is that the world of the television viewer is divided into people who want us to make what they like. The only fault with that is there are hundreds of millions of people, but only about 16 hours of available viewing time every day, except, of course, the insomniacs who stay up to watch the late, late, late show. And even someday, when it will be possible to supply them with 20 channels of programming, if we multiply them by the 16 hours, the attrition would only be 320, which would leave us about 199,999,680 short of pleasing everyone.

The answer, of course, lies in creativity, which is not for sale, and can't be legislated, adjudicated or even regulated. It is endowed by our Creator so sparingly, that it must be one of His greatest gifts. We in America must be His chosen people, because we possess more of it than any other nation. And our television industry has its rightful share, not because as an American I say so, but because the true intellects of the world do.

England's Sir Denis Brogan, Professor Emeritus of Political Science, Cambridge University, wrote in a recent New York Times article, "Europe has now gone to school in America, instead of its being the other way around. There are some European cultural exports to America now, like the Beatles. But most of the traffic is across the Atlantic from west to east."

We find proof of that in the quotas every foreign country has set against the importation of American made television programs. Gentlemen, they do not fear economic competition, for the high cost of American labor precludes it. They fear the cultural competition, because their own citizens prefer our programs overwhelmingly, when in competition with their own.

As for moral commitment, no other industry can hold its head higher. Our networks and individually owned stations throughout this nation, commit more time and money to documentary, information and public affairs programs than all the television countries on earth collectively, and it is a well known fact, that this type of programming is produced at a loss.

Reports containing millions of words of the good we do, lay in suspended animation in the files of this or that committee or agency. But our few faults find headlines magnified to astronomical proportions.

Last season alone, the three networks spent hundreds of millions of dollars on 300 Special programs, in addition to their day in and day out fare. They transported the public to every corner of the earth, under it and off of it, to all the great opera houses, symphony and concert halls, theatres, and even to the dark side of the moon and beyond. There isn't a single international, national or local everyday problem you can think of, that wasn't covered in depth, and by experts.

I think it deserves mention that the networks and local stations have committed to do it, knowing full well they would suffer a loss, because cultural, documentary and educational programs never return their production costs . . . and, in addition, be damned for it because people hate to see truth, when it mirrors their own mistakes. The networks and local stations do it because they do have the sense of obligation no one wants to give them credit for.

We should not have to remind anyone about our comprehensive news coverage, because it's unparalleled anywhere on this planet. From the White House to castles in Spain. From the battlefields of Viet Nam to the battlegrounds of our universities. From national political conventions and elections to the rape of Czechoslovakia. From wherever, whatever is happening, they are there.

They have access to the greatest collection of cultural scientific and artistic brains and talents ever assembled in one place, at one time, on one medium. Works from the pens of playwrights Arthur Miller, Jean Cocteau and Chekov. The music of Bach, Beethoven and Brahms, by Leonard Bernstein, Pablo Casals and Segovia. The teaching of every learned educator and scholar. The art of Picasso and Dali. The explorations of Jacques Cousteau, who took them to the depths of the seas never before seen by man. Documentaries of such magnitude as the four hour special ABC did on Africa, and played it in prime time on Sunday night.

When has man ever had access to so much culture, so much art, so much science, so much history in the making, prepared by so much creative intellect and presented with so much genius. Never, that's the answer! Never!

And how does anyone think almost 200 educational stations got on the air? The broadcasters donated millions of dollars worth of equipment, trained their staffs and continually gave them cash handouts, that's how.

I have seen the pilots of every new show, and I have listened to the rationale of every series from the heads of the networks, and I can tell you that they do have the sense of obligation our detractors turn blind eyes and deaf ears to. There's not one whit of violence in any of them. The networks have all but broken their spines bending over backwards, complying with today's social demands. Not only are there no new westerns or private eye series, but quite a few of the old ones are missing.

Does anyone know of another industry with any more moral commitment? Yet all they ask us are loaded questions like, "Do you still beat your wife, or when did you stop?"

It's time our story was told in its true perspective, and I don't mean to let George do it, or at the national level. That's already being done. I mean for each and every one of you to help them do it at the local level; and it makes no difference if you're ABC, CBS, NBC or an independent station. The only competition should be who does it best.

It won't take superlatives either, because, there's so much truth on our side, that adjectives aren't necessary. Let's be proud of what we are, and let's tell it like it is.

That's about all the sweet charity I can muster up on that subject so early in the morning. Except, perhaps, to recall that I spoke my piece about it, in this very room, from this very platform on this very day, four years ago. And I mention it, only because in my business as a program analyst and forecaster, when I'm right nobody remembers . . . but when I'm wrong nobody forgets.

So let's tell everyone! Let's tell every Senator. Let's tell every Congressman. Let's tell every Commissioner. Let's tell every citizen's committee, but most important, let's tell the people in our own hometowns, and let's use their own airwaves to tell them.

The public is entitled to weigh the facts for themselves, instead of the fantasies they are being breast-fed. I for one think they are ready to be weaned.

Besides, the life you save may be your own.

ABM REBUTTAL

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I know of no issue more important to the future of our country and world peace than deployment of an antiballistic-missile system. We are told that such a system is necessary to the national defense and therefore the Nation must bear the cost. Distinguished scientists have taken issue with the rationale underlying the administration's arguments for the antiballistic missile—notably the position expressed by Dr. Ralph Lapp. I am pleased to place before my colleagues an editorial from the April 11 edition of the Trenton Evening Times which suggests that the administration meet Dr. Lapp's arguments before it determines finally to go ahead with this questionable decision to deploy the ABM. The editorial reads as follows:

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Evening Times, Apr. 11, 1969]

ABM REBUTTAL

In announcing his decision to deploy a "substantially modified" version of the Sentinel antiballistic missile (ABM) system, President Nixon said the system would protect U.S. Minutemen missile sites and assure a U.S. retaliatory capability in case of attack. If this were indisputably so, it would be wrong to oppose deployment of the ABM as many congressmen have continued to do.

The threat to our retaliatory capability was spelled out by Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird, who said that it would arise in the mid-1970's out of a growing force of Soviet offensive weapons, including the SS–9 intercontinental ballistic missile. There is "no question" the defense chief said, that the Soviet Union is "going for a first strike capability"—that is, elimination of our retaliatory capability—with its SS–9.

There has since been some indication that the administration was seeking to modify the emphatic nature of Mr. Laird's statement. Nevertheless, the administration's case for the ABM rests on the contention that steps are necessary to protect Minuteman missiles against SS–9 attack.

This contention was rebutted in an analysis prepared by Dr. Ralph Lapp, scientist-author and informal scientific consultant to Senate opponents of the ABM. Dr. Lapp's detailed study concluded that, on the basis of the most pessimistic Defense Department assumptions, the SS–9 force could not eliminate the Minuteman as a deterrent force. He presented arguments to show that the strongest conceivable SS–9 attack in the mid-1970's would leave 760 of our Minutemen intact. This would be more than enough deterrent to give any would-be attacker pause.

Dr. Lapp's contribution may be likened to that of one speaker on one side of a debate of extraordinary significance. On its outcome depends the expenditure of billions of dollars for a nuclear shield that is either needed for our protection or would represent a cruel deception and a colossal waste. Dr. Lapp has gone directly to this point of need for the ABM. Unless his arguments can be refuted, the deployment called for by Mr. Nixon would be unbearable folly.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, the world has lost a friend with the death of former President Dwight David Eisenhower. He dedicated his entire life to his Nation and mankind around the world.

General Eisenhower's devotion to man's fight against tryanny, his constant quest for peace, his sense of justice and equality place him alongside the great leaders this Nation has known.

The memory of this old soldier's devotion to God and country will never fade away so long as this Nation cherishes the ideals he championed in a lifetime of service to his fellow man.

In the brief period since his passing, tributes to his life have come from around the world. To me, President Nixon struck the most significant theme when he eulogized that General Eisenhower's life reminds us "there is a moral force in this world more powerful than the might of arms or the wealth of nations."

The citizens of the Seventh Congressional District of Indiana, who gave General Eisenhower overwhelming support in his two presidential campaigns, joined the world in paying tribute to this great man as demonstrated in this sampling of editorial comment from district newspapers:

[From the Bloomfield Evening World]

May God grant that generations will continue to produce such men who place great value on religious faith, family and country.

[From the Bloomington Courier-Tribune]

Among General Eisenhower's most important qualities was his ability to bring men of diverse views together and to infuse them with his own spirit of generosity and service in a common cause.

[From the Bloomington Herald-Telephone]

The kind of man you'd want your son to be.

[From the Brazil Times]

Not since George Washington has America seen a leader such as Dwight David Eisenhower. Had he lived forever the world could never repay her debt to him.

[From the Crawfordsville Journal & Review]

There was something about this most uncommon common man that inspired confidence and faith that no matter how beset the nation was by crises and challenges, nothing dire would happen so long as Ike was there.

[From the Greencastle Daily Banner]

General Eisenhower was so many things that most Presidents are not—a military hero and a national symbol—that it became customary to minimize his accomplishments as a political leader.

[From the Plainsfield Messenger]

A soft-spoken man, Eisenhower's image of being the nonpolitician but possessing that man you could trust look, will be greatly missed in government.

[From the Putnam County Daily Graphic]

This man has a world that will remember and never forget one of the men who did not ask or hesitate but gave of himself, all of himself, for the betterment of his world.

[From the Rockville Republican]

He was a humble man. He was a good man. And was there ever a man more human?

[From the Terre Haute Saturday Spectator]

The name of Eisenhower is deeply carved in the marble tablets of history, as a leader, a man of integrity, outstanding character and compassion.

[From the Terre Haute Star]

His openly friendly and sincere character, although at times a matter of consternation to his political associates, endeared him to both great and small.

[From the Terre Haute Tribune]

In his military role he did as much as any man to save the world from totalitarianism. His abiding concern as president was to build a more stable world order.

THE MIDDLE EAST CONFLICT: A CHRISTIAN PROSPECTIVE

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vexing problems facing America today is the seemingly insoluable situation which continues to fester in the Middle East. I was recently privileged to read an address by Rev. John T. Pawlikowski, of the Catholic Theological Union, in Chicago. Father Pawlikowski entitled his address to the Hyde Park Kenwood Council of Churches and Synagogues "The Middle East Conflict: A Christian Perspective." I believe there is much wisdom in Father Pawlikowski's words, and that his thoughtful presentation does much to dispel many of the common misconceptions about the Middle East today. It is my great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to insert Father Pawlikowski's address at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The speech referred to follows:

THE MIDDLE EAST CONFLICT: A CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVE

(By John T. Pawlikowski, OSM, Catholic Theological Union)

The Russian novelist Leo Tolstoy once remarked that "certain questions are put to mankind, not that men should answer them, but that they should go on trying." The highly complex Middle East situation in which we must deal with the rights of Jews and Arabs against the background of a power struggle between a Russia and an America with nuclear weapons may often seem to be one of the questions to which Tolstoy was referring. I do not propose to offer any final solution this evening. But I will try to clear up what I conceive to be some misconceptions blocking a possible solution.

My interest in the Middle East problem is both moral and political. In fact, I do not think you can separate the two aspects. A political solution which would not consider the question of the rights of the local peoples is not morally justified as far as I am concerned. But neither is a solution which appeals to moral principles but lacks political and historical sophistication. An example of the former is the recent interview with William Polk, head of the Adlai Stevenson Institute of Foreign Affairs at the University of Chicago, which appeared in the Chicago *Daily News*. Though I highly respect Dr. Polk's knowledge of the Middle East exhibited in such a book as *The United States and the Arab World*, his position in the *Daily News* interview seemed to dictate a settlement almost exclusively on the need to avoid a nuclear confrontation between the United States and Russia. American self-interest seemed to be primary in his mind. I do not for a moment wish to deny the seriousness of the nuclear threat inherent in the tense situation. But Dr. Polk fails, in my opinion, to adequately consider either the rights of the Israelis or the Palestinians in his projected solution. A particularly striking example of the lack of political and historical sophistication in handling the problem from a moral point of view is the recent *Commonweal* issue on Israel, especially the lead article by Arthur Southwick.

To begin to evaluate the Middle East situation from a moral point of view, I believe the following considerations are essential.

(1) As a Catholic, I am seriously disturbed by the continued lack of recognition of the State of Israel by the Vatican. This is a source of some irritation to the Israeli government, and rightly so. I am not at all convinced the Vatican should be involved in the diplomatic game of recognizing governments. But it so happens that this is the case at present and there is no immediate change in the foreseeable future. And the recent visit of President Nixon to the Pope underlines the Vatican's continued importance. I strongly suspect that the traditional theology of Christianity which relegated Jews to a life of perpetual wandering for the murder of the Messiah played an important role in the original decision not to recognize Israel. This was the reply given by Cardinal Merry de Val, then Secretary of State, to Theodor Herzl, the founder of modern political Zionism, when Herzl came to the Vatican to speak about a Jewish national homeland. There is still a residue of this theological anti-Semitism present in the Vatican according to Fr. Cornelius Rijk, head of the Vatican Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations. But the principal reason given for non-recognition today is fear for reprisal by Arab governments against their minority Catholic population. The fear may be real. Yet I feel that justice of the larger situation demands that the Vatican take a risk and abandon its narrow internal Catholic concern. Some may say, what value would papal recognition have at present given the current esteem of papal pronouncements in many quarters of Catholicism. I feel the principal value would lie in increased pressure on the thirteen or so other so-called Catholic nations (principally Latin nations) which have refused to recognize Israel because of the Vatican attitude. This lack of recognition frequently constitutes a difficult problem for Israel at the United Nations where she must sometimes deal with a security council the majority of whose members do not recognize her. Vatican recognition would also remove the lingering impression that there is something immoral about the very existence of the State of Israel, a fact that Arab propaganda has played up on occasion.

(2) Christians must become much clearer in their notion of the recent history of the Middle East and of Zionism in particular before making any moral judgments on the current situation. The American Christian majority has, on the whole, been deprived of any real knowledge of modern Middle Eastern history because of the preoccupation of our educational system with American and Western European history. This situation should be corrected. Many Americans, despite the claim of the Arab nations that their point of view receives no hearing in America, have swallowed the Arab line that Zionism is a dirty word, that it is synonymous with militarism and expansionism. Zionism is anything but a rigid univocal concept. Once it is granted that a Jewish national homeland is vital to Jewish survival, Zionism takes on different meanings for different Jews. This has been the case from the very beginning of modern Zionism. Herzl's views were not fully shared by Ahad-ha-Am, Martin Buber or Labor Zionism. And there is hardly complete agreement in Israel or in the diaspora on what Israel's policy should be today. An Israeli such as Jack J. Cohen, in a major article in the *Reconstructionist* (Arabs and Jews. From Dilemma to Problem", Vol. XXXIII, No. 11, Oct. 6, 1967) has expressed the belief that the Israeli government has not done enough for its Arab citizens. Zionism has fundamentally represented an attempt to insure Jewish survival (and what, I may ask, is wrong with wanting to survive?) through the concept of a nation-state. Now there is nothing sacred about the nation-state concept. I certainly stand with those who see the need for a movement towards a more global form of government. But realistically that day is not yet with us. How many Americans are willing at present to relinquish some of their sovereignty to a world or regional government? Until we are willing to do this, I fail to appreciate how anyone can give the impression, as some Christian writers have that the Israeli preoccupation with nationhood is somehow philosophically and politically old hat. Let us not fall into the tray of judging Israel by some form of political eschatology.

(3) Christians must begin to take a realistic attitude towards the Israel-United Nations issue. So often Christian writers have given the impression that Israel should place her fate fully in the hands of the United Nations. For Israel to act otherwise would be somehow immoral. This was the attitude conveyed by some of the writers in *The Christian Century* series on the Middle East shortly after the June '67 war. I am a strong supporter of the U.N. and firmly hope that one day it might even become more important than at present. But U.N. diplomats are hardly disinterested humanists. The dominative factor is still power and a *quid pro quo* mentality. And in terms of political clout at the U.N. the Arabs have sheer numerical power. And numbers are terribly important for a nation such as Spain seeking support over Britain on the Gibralter issue. Let us also not forget that it was capitulation by U Thant that precipitated the present crisis in May of 1967 and that continued Arab attacks on Israeli children and farmers for years from the Golan Heights and elsewhere as well as recent attacks in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv have gone officially unnoticed at the U.N. while the Beruit attack received the strongest of U.N. condemnations. Israeli cynicism about the U.N. in the present crisis is not totally unjustified.

(4) The demographic changes resulting from the U.N. settlement of the British Palestinian Mandate need to be placed in proper perspective. The impression is often given that Israelis are living on stolen land which the Western nation granted her as a guilt offering for the genocide of the Nazi period. Some demographic changes were inevitable in a rational solution of the Mandate issue, changes that affected both Jews and Arabs. It should be remembered that Jews had been occupying a considerable part of the territory that is now Israel for years before 1948, having purchased the land through special funds set up by Zionist leaders. And there has been a continual Jewish settlement in the area from biblical times. Prior to the British Mandate the area was in the hands of the Turks. The U.N. partition plan of 1948 called for the creation of an Arab and a Jewish homeland in Palestine. It was the Arabs who rejected the plan and went to war. This Arab refusal has been primarily responsible for the tremendous suffering endured by the Palestinian refugees for twenty years. Here is another vital distinction that one must make when dealing with rights in the Middle East. It is not Jordan or Egypt or Syria or Iraq that have suffered injustice in Palestine. Only the Palestinians can make such a claim. And their problems are due much more to the actions of their Arab neighbors and to Russia than to Israeli policy. If the U.N. partition had been accepted, I am sure the Palestinians who are in many ways the most creative

and educated of the Arab peoples could have a well-developed national homeland. Instead their rightful homeland is in the hands of Jordan (a fact which Palestinian commando leaders have acknowledged recently with some animosity in statements appearing in *The Christian Science Monitor*) and they have been treated at best as second class citizens in other Arab countries which have used the hate-Israel slogan to cover up internal problems. This is especially true for the U.A.R., Syria and Iraq. One has to wonder if the June '67 crisis was not a way President Nassar hoped to avoid the internal challenge to his one-party regime which surfaced in the student riots at Alexandria and elsewhere. And the internal political situation of Iraq and Syria hardly needs further comment. Jordan has been caught in the middle of a political squeeze. Left to itself, Jordan would have made peace with Israel long ago.

Let me say emphatically that I believe there cannot be a morally justified settlement of the Middle East problem without the creation of a Palestinian national homeland along the lines of the 1948 plan, joined perhaps in some sort of economic union with Israel and Jordan. I do think the states have to be politically separate. The current Palestinian proposal for a single Jewish-Palestinian state is unrealistic at present.

The major world powers ought to help the growth of the new Palestinian state in anyway they can, either directly or through an agency such as the World Bank. Even from a strictly political viewpoint the Palestinian, through the recent organizational mergers, are now strong enough to prevent any effective peace in the area if they fail to receive some form of national identity.

(5) Christian writers on occasion have criticized certain Israeli actions in such a way that it would seem Israel had no right to exist if it was guilty of any failures whatsoever. Earlier on I spoke of an erroneous application of political eschatology to Israel. Here we have a case of a false application of moral eschatology to Israel. There is legitimate room to question some Israeli policies. Israelis themselves have, and are doing, precisely this. But even if one were to judge certain actions of Israel as morally wrong, this fact does not automatically rule out the continued existence of the state. If such eschatological criteria of absolute morality were applied to our own country, I ask you what the verdict would be? Certainly my conscience troubles me when I read of Israeli use of napalm in the June '67 war. And certainly I worry about the possibility of a war mentality being forced upon Israel. But I must judge these aspects against the total picture of rights and wrongs and against the fact that the Israeli government is not dominated by militarists. In fact, the recent party merger in Israel has strengthened the doves.

On particular issues such as the status of Jerusalem there is room for discussion and disagreement. I personally wish to remain open on the subject at present. Let me insist, however, that my motive here is not any fear of Israeli control of the holy places nor a desire for U.N. control (which the Danzig and Tangiers situations show to be impractical). My reason is based on the feeling that some Palestinian control of East Jerusalem might be vital to the economic stability of the state. I would be inclined at present towards and Arab and Israeli sector, but with free access to both parts of the city by Palestinians and Israelis. A temporary U.N. presence of some sort might be necessary for stabilization. But I remain open on the issue.

(6) Christians should also be aware of the danger that American policy in the Middle East might not be determined in the future by considerations for all the peoples in the area. The Middle East desk at the state department has been traditionally pro-Arab. It took a maverick president named Harry Truman to go against the state department and recognize Israel in 1948. And what Michael Harrington has termed the social-industrial complex might begin to play a decisive role in policy formulation during the business-oriented Nixon administration. Oil is one aspect of the problem, another is the potential consumer market for American goods in Arab lands.

(7) Something should also be said about the Jewish charge of Christian silence on the Middle East and the Christian countercharge that Jews over-reacted. I believe that in this exchange there has been something less than adequate sensitivity to the other's problem by both sides. Christians were ignorant of the importance of Auschwitz and all it symbolizes in contemporary Jewish theology and literature. As the novelist Elie Wiesel has said, Auschwitz and June '67 were intimately connected. Christians were also shortsighted in not realizing the close connection that exists for many Jews between what Christian would classify as the political and the religious spheres. Jews are a people, an important aspect of which is a religious tradition. The survival of Jewish religion is linked in the eyes of Jews to the survival of the people. And for an increasing number of Jews, after Hitler this means the survival of Israel. The Christian cannot simply brush off Israel as a political issue that has absolutely no place in interreligious dialogue. Although some Jewish spokesmen may have given the impression of wanting one hundred per cent support of Israeli policy, the principal Jewish leaders have no such ideas. Apart from any dialogue considerations, they are merely asking for a moral affirmation by Christians of Israel's right to survive in the face of another genocide threat. In fact, my research shows that important for most of the major non-fundamentalist Protestant groups and a number of Catholic leaders did unequivocally affirm Israel's right to exist. Silence is perhaps better applicable to Catholics than Protestants, especially to Catholic leaders. Unfortunately, many of those who did speak out had their priorities in the wrong order. They began their statements with a criticism of particular Israeli policies before coming to their affirmation of the absolute non-negotiability of Israeli independence in any peace settlement. The National Council of Churches principal (second) statement on the crisis is a perfect example of such a confusion of priorities. This confusion has greatly added to Jewish resentment.

On the other hand, I do feel that some Jews were not entirely sensitive to the dilemma faced by Christians when the crisis broke. Christian leaders in the peace movement were simply unprepared emotionally to react so quickly to war in another part of the world. And let me add this was not only a Christian problem. Jewish groups also had to face it as a special memorandum from the UAHC central office testifies . . . Ordinary Christians overwhelmingly supported Israel, though some may have done so on the basis of an anti-Communism that would embarrass many Jews. It must also be remembered that the Catholic Church has only recently broken down its conception of church-state identification and in the eyes of many Catholics the Jews were falling back into a trap that had proven so disastrous for them. This is a highly complex issue, although it needs further re-thinking in Catholic circles.

The Jewish-Christian dialogue was really quite limited prior to the war and Israel appeared on the agenda only infrequently. So the average Christian must at least be partially pardoned for his failure to understand how deeply American Jews could feel about Israel. In fact, the June '67 crisis brought to a head a growing sense of Jewish peoplehood among diaspora Jews. This made it difficult for many Jews to understand why Christians could not appreciate their new enthusiasm for Israel and Jewish peoplehood. Some Jewish leaders whose opinions I value highly have said to me privately that they feel diaspora Jewry stills needs to do some serious thinking about the precise relationship they should have to Israel. It is interesting that black American writers such as Malcolm X and Albert Cleage have a deeper appreciation of what Israel can mean to non-Israeli Jews than do most white American Christians.

The present hour thus demands from Christians an idealistic drive for peace and justice for all peoples in the Middle East combined with a realistic understanding of the tactics needed to achieve this goal. Concretely this will involve recognition of the right of Israel to exist as an independent nation with security and to have access to the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba; creation of a Palestinian national homeland; a greater sensitivity for the meaning of Israel to diaspora Judaism; and a concern lest American foreign policy turn its attention to peace without justice in the Middle East in order to aid American business interests. Only with such an approach can we hope for some daylight in the present Middle East crisis.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon and the American people have lost in the death of former President Eisenhower, a powerful voice and good counsel at a time when we can ill afford that loss.

Few men in American history have given so much to the American people. I join with all Americans in mourning his passing.

I would like to take this opportunity to insert two editorials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding Dwight D. Eisenhower from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

The articles follow:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin, Mar. 31, 1969]

A LEGACY OF DECENCY

As long as free men cherish their freedom, Dwight Eisenhower will stand with them, as he stood during war and peace; strong, confident and courageous.—President Nixon proclaiming today as a national day of mourning.

Most men who make their mark upon the world and who die in greatness leave behind as their legacy some specific deed or thing, or some words expressing inspiring or profound thoughts.

Dwight D. Eisenhower has given more. He has left behind, for all who will accept it, a legacy of decency.

As 34th President of the United States, as most respected citizen in retirement, as General of the Army, Mr. Eisenhower held to a strong and basic faith in his country and its people.

There was, he was certain, a strength, a resolve and a basic goodness in the land and in its people. To him the qualities of honesty, tolerance, self-reliance and patriotism were not to be described as old fashioned. They were part of each day.

When Mr. Eisenhower saw these qualities held up to ridicule he became concerned. He saw the young people of today as perhaps the finest the nation has ever produced. But he expressed fear that so many of them have been taught nothing of responsibility and self-discipline or the real meaning of life.

"You accepted hard work and a concern for others as a way of life," Mr. Eisenhower once said in describing his formative years. "We would have sneered at anyone who said we were underprivileged or anything like that."

Mr. Eisenhower was indeed, as President Nixon said yesterday, a product of America's soil and America's ideals. Mr. Eisenhower was, as he said in his London Guild Hall speech in 1945, from the "heart of America."

There is a tendency today to brush aside the qualities that were so much a part of Mr. Eisenhower as something of value only in a past, unsophisticated and simplistic era. But in truth they are as relevant and more needed today than ever before in the nation's history.

And, despite the cynicism and the skepticism that is part of America today, the vast majority of the nation holds to the same beliefs that Mr. Eisenhower held—a faith in themselves and in their country and a respect for their fellow man.

The difficulty today, as it has been in other periods of this country's history, is that it is difficult to hear the voice of this majority above the shrill shouts of those who seek confrontation rather than conference and conciliation.

President Nixon, in the eulogy delivered yesterday in the Rotunda of the United States Capitol said that these days of national mourning should also be days of gratitude for the inspiration and the strength which Mr. Eisenhower has given his countrymen.

These days can be something more. They can be days of rededication to the basic beliefs and the truths that were Mr. Eisenhower's. They can be the time of acceptance of Mr. Eisenhower's legacy of decency.

Nothing, in a nation so divided and torn by dissent, could be a finer tribute to a man who believed that his nation's future rested upon its moral strength.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin, Mar. 30, 1969]

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

There is nothing wrong with America that the faith, love of freedom, intelligence and energy of her citizens cannot cure.—Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The Eisenhower presidential years now seem a time of serenity and untroubled acceptance of the virtues which make us a great people.

The era has a placid, sunlit quality to it.

This tranquility and amiable consensus derived from circumstances and General Eisenhower's demeanor, his faith in God and belief in America, and in the American people.

The circumstance, of course, was the relatively brief period of calm intervening between the end of one war, the Korean War, and the gathering storm of another, the Vietnam War.

Probably no President could have made such a respite more purposeful.

His contribution was a renewal of the spirit, a general sharing of his instinctive sense of decency, a time of weighing values and the inevitable reassertion of the virtues which went into the making of the nation.

As recently as last summer, he told the GOP National Convention by television from his hospital room that the vast portion of the people are law-abiding and proud of their country and ready to sacrifice on her behalf—that all but a tiny percentage of Americans are patriotic, optimstic and loyal.

Dwight David Eisenhower was sure about important things like that, things which perhaps he made sound more simple than they are, but which are nonetheless the basis of Americans' faith in their country and in one another.

Ike, as the American family called him with fond familiarity, trusted his countrymen and his countrymen trusted him. That relationship—the affection, confidence, and respect—may not come through in the history books. Youngsters, even today, may not feel it. But it explains a great deal about the America of the nineteen-fifties, about Mr. Eisenhower's years in the Presidency, and about the inexhaustible reservoir of goodwill on which he drew among the generation of World War II.

It was this great confidence, this respect that helped to elect him President: Americans had ample cause to remember and be grateful for the services of the commander in Europe who carried such massive responsibilities in the battle against Nazi evil that threatened this nation and mankind.

But it was more than gratitude or the remembrance of past glory that put the general in the White House. In 1952 the Korean War was the sort of agonizing issue that the Vietnam War is today. Americans trusted Mr. Eisenhower to find a solution to it. They were willing to accept what he would do as necessary, in the nation's interests, honorable.

And something else: the American political atmosphere was also befouled then by those who spread fear, hate and distrust to gain their ends. Mr. Eisenhower did much to clear the air in the fifties simply because he was the kind of man he was—towering above the demagogs in public esteem, restrained, patient, moderate in speech and trusted.

There was added to Mr. Eisenhower's world reputation as a military man a universal recognition of his qualities as a man genuinely desirous of peace. He was at once able to inspire caution in potential aggressors to extend the olive branch. His countrymen trusted him to be firm without being bellicose and peace-seeking without appeasing.

Let historians deal with the specifics of his political leadership and of his Presidency. To his nation, and to the world, he gave a strength of leadership, a new sense of resolve. And although he sat along with the great, his was an open and unassuming greatness that raised him to a place above the others.

He served his country in war in one of the highest of commands. He served his country and the free world in time of relative peace and in the most powerful office in the world. The "Eisenhower Years" may blur with the passage of time, but the quick and friendly grin of the man will never be forgotten. His was a great and rare gift, the gift of measuring problems and seeking solutions in terms of people.

The American nation mourns a great soldier, a high-minded President, a good and trusted man.

WHAT IT MEANS TO BE A GIRL SCOUT

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will agree that the Girl Scouts is one of the finest organizations in this country.

I am proud of their achievements in my district and at this point place in the RECORD a statement by Girl Scout Connie Huskey, of Philadelphia, Tenn.:

Connie Huskey, of Junior Troop 133 of Philadelphia, was recent winner in a contest in which she wrote a paper "What It Means To Be a Girl Scout." She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Carlton Huskey, Route 1, Philadelphia. Mrs. Hal McCrary is troop leader.

Following is the texture of Miss Huskey's paper:

"It means to be a friend to everybody and to be kind to animals. To know the needs around, as to what you can do to help yourself and other people. To grow up to be a better citizen. Scouting gives you an opportunity to enjoy outdoor sports, such as camping, hiking, swimming, canoeing, bicycle hiking, and other group activities. It teaches you to be thrifty and not waste your money. To be considerate and thoughtful of others. It gives you an opportunity to meet other people. To share your ideas with other people. To tell the truth so people will have faith in you. To obey your parents, leaders, and other elderly people. To be cheerful and happy. In all, it helps us to be better people, to form a better world."

PLOWSHARE, POLITICS, AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I insert the remarks I made to the symposium on the Public Health Aspects of Peaceful Nuclear Explosives, on April 8 in Las Vegas, in the RECORD at this point:

PLOWSHARE, POLITICS, AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

As a friend and strong supporter of the Plowshare Program, I am delighted at the opportunity to come here this evening to speak on its behalf. This is a very important meeting on a tremendously interesting subject. It is especially timely for a variety of reasons.

First, the Senate's recent ratification of the Non-Proliferation Treaty will have a positive, long-term impact on world-wide interest in applications of peaceful nuclear explosives. Article V of the Treaty deals specifically with this subject. The United States, as a nuclear weapons nation, promises to make the benefits of Plowshare available to the non-weapons countries on a nondiscriminatory basis.

Second, President Nixon has indicated he intends to pursue the Plowshare program vigorously. A positive indication of this was his instruction to AEC Chairman Glenn Seaborg regarding a feasibility study of blasting a harbor at Cape Keraudren in Australia. The project collapsed, but for totally nonnuclear reasons. Sentinel Mining Company withdrew its interest because it couldn't make a sale to the Japanese of the iron ore to be shipped from Keraudren. But Cape Hedland and Cape Preston are emerging as alternate sites for alternate companies. An Australian Plowshare harbor is still a real possibility. You will be hearing about it quite soon. My lips are sealed for now.

Third, The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will resume hearings shortly on the Commercial Plowshare Services Bill. As you will recall, preliminary hearings were held on it last year, and I think the committee will broaden its view and look into several related issues this year. I am confident that passage of this bill and the information developed during the hearings will have positive effect on the pace of events in this field.

In short, we are approaching a period of greatly accelerated progress in Plowshare if certain obstacles are overcome. This symposium will contribute information, particularly in the public health area, which is a prerequisite to a broad commercial program. In addition, I would hope that any new questions raised here and left unanswered can be tackled by the Joint Committee at its hearing.

PROMISE OF THE PLOWSHARE PROGRAM

It is interesting to me that the papers being presented and the topics being covered at this meeting are similar to those at another seminar about 12 years ago. That, too, was an historic meeting for Plowshare.

In 1956, one of the periodic Middle East uprisings blocked off the Suez Canal to international shipping. With the patterns of international trade disrupted, serious thought began to focus on alternatives to and substitutes for the Suez Canal. Creative minds at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory came up with one of the better ideas: namely, if you can't get through the existing canal, dig a new one! And do it with nuclear explosives.

A year later, in 1957, the year in which the first underground shot was ever fired, a "brainstorming" symposium was organized at LRL to examine the concept of peaceful nuclear explosives. The program still had no name and very little money, but the scientists were certain they were on to something important. Some time later, I don't recall when, Edward Teller succeeded in attaching the Plowshare name to it.

Unlike today's symposium, the earlier one was cloaked in a necessary shroud of secrecy and security.

The now-declassified papers of 1957 demonstrate the remarkable clarity of foresight possessed by these Plowshare pioneers. With very few exceptions, their message was economics—how to introduce peaceful nuclear explosives into the marketplace at costs competitive with conventional industrial processes and technology.

All three categories for possible use were mentioned—*excavation technology* to build canals, harbors, or knock down geologic obstacles; *underground* engineering for petroleum production, gas stimulation, and mining; and *scientific applications* for seismic studies, neutron sources and new element production. With essentially zero experience in below-surface explosions of nuclear size, the participants recognized the key technical problem areas—radioactivity, containment and ground motion.

SOME OBSTACLES TO BE CLEARED

Today, at this meeting, we are seeing where we have come and how far we still have to go. For a variety of reasons, we have not moved ahead in this field as fast as we might have. When you compare progress in reactor development with that in Plowshare since, say, 1960, I think it is clear that Plowshare has been dragging.

There are understandable historical reasons for this. In the first place, Plowshare was, and to a large degree still is, a government reserve. Industry, the potential user, was not brought in at the beginning. Only in recent years have we seen the development of private industrial interest in specific applications. Meanwhile, classification, parental jealousy and over-protectiveness—all human frailties—have played their delaying roles.

Nor for the first decade and a half of the nuclear age was industry particularly alert to Plowshare opportunties. In 1958, for example, it rejected out-of-hand a joint AEC-Bureau of Mines proposal to detonate a Plowshare explosion in the oil shale of Colorado. The oil companies found a variety of superficial flaws in the project, without examining either its underlying concepts or its potentials. Later, of course, the nuclear test moratorium slowed Plowshare to a crawl and hindered establishing a rapport between government and the private sector. But that is past history. There is a healthy interest now.

Probably the most exasperating obstacles to progress in this area have been and still are those so-called "liberals" whose conscience pangs cause them to view any peaceful application of atomic energy in terms of a mushroom cloud. It strikes me as irrational that these people are offended by attempts to develop the power of the atom for man's benefit. They are 100% for foreign aid and the Peace Corps, but 100% against foreign Plowshare applications and 200% against domestic ones. To hear them tell it, Plowshare, by itself, is the single major obstacle to total and complete world disarmament.

In addition to the assorted professors, scientists, lawyers and literati who whine over Plowshare for philosophical reasons, a hard core of Plowshare opponents seems to have developed within the Executive Branch of the government itself—particularly within the Budget Bureau, the State Department and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Behind the scenes, this group strenuously fights to obstruct every attempt at upgrading the program. These people seem to have a paranoiac distrust and abhorrence for Plowshare, which they cannot divorce in their minds from the weapons program. I am sure Article V of the NPT, which gives Plowshare international respectability, must have broken their bleeding hearts.

Despite the fact that this program generally has strong support within Congress, industry, the AEC and in most corners of the Executive Branch, this clique exercises considerable clout in opposing it, by budget constriction and otherwise. For example, in early 1967, the Cabriolet experiment was summarily cancelled by the Johnson Administration for fear of upsetting negotiations on the NPT and the Latin American Treaty on a Nuclear Free Zone. At that time, I made a speech in the House of Representatives questioning the judgment that led to this decision. It is totally beyond me how a research program aimed at developing the peaceful atom could be construed as detrimental to efforts at halting the spread of nuclear weapons.

Another more recent example concerns the late, lamented Cape Keraudren project. The AEC was directed by the President to actively and promptly study the feasibility of the project. Yet this same anonymous brotherhood seemed to do everything within its power to prevent the Commission from getting any money, even for the feasibility study.

Since the Limited Test Ban Treaty was signed in 1964, they have never ceased forwarding overly-legalistic interpretations calculated to eliminate the possibility of Plowshare excavations. The Treaty prohibits a nation from "causing to be present outside its national boundaries" radioactivity from a nuclear explosive device, warlike or peaceful. They claim one single radioactive atom beyond the three-mile limit would constitute a violation. Yet all of our standard radiation protection guides—even those adopted by the United Nations—state that radiation is "not present" when its measurable amount constitutes less than 10% of the established maximum permissible concentration. Further, these guides relate to human exposure, not merely to abstract presence.

Based on evidence which admittedly is somewhat tenuous, my own belief is that the Soviets are anxious to remove the handcuffs of the Limited Test Ban Treaty from nuclear excavations. They have plenty of geological cosmetology which is in their self interest to perform, just as we do. Since any treaty means precisely what the two most powerful signatory nations say it means, I am of the opinion that the LTB can be rapidly brought into line with the facts-of-peaceful-nuclear-explosions-life, if certain people in our own government will stop throwing up artificial hurdles.

WHAT WE HOPE TO DO THROUGH H.R. 477

It is accurate to say that without the continuing support of the Joint Committee, the Plowshare program might have been successfully sidetracked, eventually buried, and never heard of either domestically or on the international scene in the form of the NPT's Article V provisions. We may not be able to overcome all the anti-Plowshare forces in the government, but we are going to try to get Plowshare off the back burner by enacting H.R. 477, the Commercial Plowshare Services Bill. This bill is co-sponsored by all the House members of the Joint Committee, and a Senate companion with similar bi-partisan support is expected shortly.

Under present law the Commission is essentially confined to experiments involving research and development. Our objective is to give AEC authority to make Plowshare services available on a commercial basis. Since, under terms of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the United States has an obligation to provide commercial services to non-nuclear nations, the new legislation is sufficiently comprehensive to accommodate foreign as well as domestic customers.

PLOWSHARE—A BUSINESS

As AEC gears up to furnish commercial Plowshare services, there are a number of business decisions and business-like procedures which need to be concluded. There are still, of course, technical areas needing additional R&D—which is your job. But some of the procedural and policy issues before us in government also need resolving:

First, exactly what the government is to furnish under the category of "peaceful nuclear explosive services" must be defined, and the responsibilities of the customer and his engineering consultants must be fixed. Within the government, a management structure must be established to coordinate and control the various inputs which will be made by AEC, the Public Health Service, the Interior Department and other appropriate government agencies.

Second, a standard line of devices must be established, perhaps 12 to 18 in number, providing a reasonable combination of yields and other characteristics. After this initial R&D effort, it will be impossible to tailor each shot minutely to a customer's particular requirements. The government cannot be expected to involve itself in new R&D expenses every time another customer comes along. The Non-Proliferation Treaty requires that the charge for services to foreign customers exclude R&D cost and that the services be supplied on a non-discriminatory basis between all customers. Since this makes R&D expenses unrecoverable, the only way they can be minimized is by the standardization technique.

Third, a price list must be posted which the NPT requires to be "reasonable" and which, in any event, is necessary if potential customers are to know enough about their costs to make rational decisions.

Fourth, in the case of foreign customers, we must re-examine our agreements for cooperation, under which U.S. and other nations spell out the extent of their nuclear collaboration, to make sure that special requirements as to Plowshare are covered. I have in mind such things as retention of the devices under U.S. custody and control, public health and safety responsibilities, liability questions, compliance with the Limited Test Ban Treaty and the NPT and similar topics requiring orderly separation of responsibilities.

Fifth, in the case of domestic customers, we shall have to establish regulatory control measures not unlike those that apply to nuclear power reactors and resolve jurisdictional questions between federal, state and local governments.

REGULATION AND CONTROL

This area of regulation and control is as important to the formation of an industry as price, technology or any other factor. I foresee the AEC as the executive agent for the government for this purpose. In addition to developing the devices and furnishing the explosives services, AEC's role is likely to include the following:

Absolute control of nuclear explosives until their detonation.

Protection of the public from harm caused by radioactivity or seismic damage at the time of detonation.

Protection of the public from harm caused by radioactivity present in any commercial product resulting from a nuclear explosion.

Protection from physical damage to buildings or structures.

In assuming this regulatory role, the AEC should be cognizant of several characteristics of the industries most likely to be involved in commercial applications of nuclear explosives. Industries such as natural gas are already highly regulated. The FPC strictly controls the gas pipeline industry. It typically requires two years to process an application for development, of new gas fields, connections to existing pipelines, construction of new pipelines and establishment of the rate structure for gas from such a field.

Other agencies are involved in the safety aspects of pipeline construction and operation. The recent Santa Barbara Channel blowout bears witness to the government's present multi-agency involvement in environmental pollution, and points to an ever-expanding governmental role in safety and pollution aspects of industry.

The point to be made here is that the AEC should recognize that it is moving into an area already strongly controlled by government, and that only those additional controls necessary under the Atomic Energy Act need be instituted. Its function as to existing controls should be that of a coordinator in these peripheral areas.

A possible scenario of the AEC's Plowshare regulatory role could go like this: The industrial applicant would be required to submit a detailed proposal for the project including the equivalent of a reactor safety analysis report which evaluates in detail radioactive and seismic safety at the time of detonation as well as possible product radiological contamination. The AEC would then conduct a detailed review of the proposed project in the same way reactor applications are reviewed. This review would be in parallel with other government regulatory reviews so that the already excessive regulatory times are not further extended by the AEC process. Assuming AEC approval of the application, provision probably should be made for a public hearing. Our options are either to provide a mandatory hearing in all cases, or just on request from affected members of the public.

Once the project has been approved, the Commission and the licensee would negotiate a contract covering the detonation services, explosives and arrangements for adequate insurance coverage. Preceding the detonation itself, the AEC would have to perform or coordinate inspections from the public health and safety standpoint and assure that all emplacement and stemming procedures have been properly performed. Final legal permission then would be given for detonation. Following the shot, the AEC would be required to retain control of the area as necessary to protect public health and safety.

The foregoing is not intended as a comprehensive description of the probable Plowshare regulatory picture, but it does indicate the kind of considerations involved and underlines the fact that large-scale applications of Plowshare technology are going to require carefully designed and intelligently administered procedures.

DIVORCING PLOWSHARE BUSINESS FROM THE WEAPONS EFFORT

At this point I am going to start treading on some toes in the AEC in general and at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in particular. For I do not see how Plowshare can really succeed unless the responsibility for its peaceful explosives devices and their use is divorced from the weapons program, which has an entirely different underlying philosophy.

In Plowshare, the primary emphasis will have to be on economics. In this competitive field economics is crucial. A Plowshare device does not have to be the most efficient nuclear device ever built. It doesn't have to be the smallest or the lightest. It must be safe and it must be clean. But it does not have to possess the ruggedness, reliability and other characteristics of a warhead. Since it is not a weapon, it will have to be designed, handled and used with the unique requirements of its users in mind. These users are not the Army, Navy and Air Force. They are civilians pursuing their economic enterprises in a cost competitive environment.

From its inception, Plowshare has been a step-child of the weapons program, both at LRL, the Nevada Operations Office and at the Nevada Test Site. Until the recent series of Plowshare tests—Gasbuggy, Cabriolet, Buggy and Schooner—this dependence was desirable, if not absolutely necessary, even though a side-effect has been to associate the weapons and Plowshare programs together in the public mind. Now the time has come to separate the two, both in the public mind and as to technical objectives.

LRL, NEVOO and NTS from their inception have been dedicated almost exclusively to weapon devices and tests. They are geared up to satisfy one customer—DOD. They have been a very efficient operation for this purpose, and we can be thankful as a nation for that. But they are not geared up—technically or philosophically—to satisfy efficiently the El Paso Natural Gas Company, the Austral Oil Company, the Kennecott Copper Corporation, or other Plowshare customers.

These weapons organizations are so traditionally geared to conducting test programs for military weapon systems that cost is of minor importance. On something as vital to our security as weapons R&D, we can't afford to quibble over a few dollars. But this basic attitude is incompatible with the Plowshare program, where you must quibble over pennies. If they don't develop economic explosives and emplacement methods, the whole purpose of the Plowshare program will become academic because industrial interest will vanish.

The weapons scientists at LRL have an entirely different set of values than does the Plowshare group. Yet during the execution period for any Plowshare event, responsibility is transferred to the weapons people. There is even some evidence that Plowshare is little more than a nuisance to the weapons organizations, and that they conduct Plowshare tests in the same extensive and expensive manners that weapons test procedures dictate.

As an example, the LRL Plowshare engineering group formulated an operational plan for the Cape Keraudren project that involved operating from a ship anchored offshore. Maximum preparation of the explosive would be done at LRL before transportation to Australia by ship. At the site, operational personnel would be housed and fed on board the same ship. The emplacement of the explosives would be done from the ship, utilizing barge-mounted cranes. The vessel would then move to a safe distance, and the row charge of explosives fired by a radio link. This procedure could save $1.5 million over conventional land-based operations with air transportation of the explosives, amounting perhaps to 15% to 20% of the total project cost. But the entire concept was vetoed by the weapons test group for the apparent reason that they simply "don't do things that way."

I don't have any specific recommendations to make in this area tonight, but I think it is something we all can think about—particularly within AEC. And the Joint Committee should devote some careful attention to it during the hearings. We could consider whether the Plowshare program should be transferred to the oversight of another field office, such as San Francisco or Grand Junction. An independent Plowshare group could have complete responsibility for the design and fabrication of explosives, the conduct of experiments, and the conduct of the commercial service itself. It would separate weapons and Plowshare philosophically and politically, and it would assure that the program is responsive to the civilian user's technical and economic requirements.

PLOWSHARE AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

Before I leave you this evening, I would like to say a few words about the public relations aspects of this program. Despite the fact that we will be conducting these events in very remote and unpopulated areas, it still will be necessary to conduct an active PR campaign to demonstrate the benefits to be achieved. I think the unfortunate experience with Project Ketch, where opposition from the public and state officials caused the withdrawal of the application, is an example of the continuing need to emphasize the benefits to society. We found during the early days of the reactor development program that winning public support and defusing the nut-fringe must start early in the project and continue actively. For example, with an underground engineering shot, if we could show convincingly how this type of mining does not deface the surface of the earth, as does strip mining, we might even end up with the Sierra Club on our side.

I don't think it is possible to overemphasize the importance of developing public support for Plowshare. Given a clear, accurate picture of the potential benefits and the high level of scientific precautions being taken, the public will not be unduly alarmed about possible hazards. For its part, industry must do its homework well and promptly respond to public inquiry and hesitation. When this is done, this nation and the world will be able to glean the vast benefits available by applying this new engineering tool to man's advantage instead of his destruction.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of President Dwight Eisenhower leaves all Americans with a deep sense of grief and sorrow.

Yet there is also a feeling of quiet pride in the very full and very rich life which he lived.

It was my honor to serve under General Eisenhower as a navigator in the Army Air Force in Europe during World War II.

I was privileged to visit with our former President in 1967, when he greeted Republican freshmen at his home in Gettysburg.

I was struck by his modesty, by the clarity of his mind, by his intellectual articulation of basic truth, by the force of his expressions, and by his constant consideration for those of us around him.

Soldier and statesman, his life was one of distinguished and disciplined devotion to service.

Ike's life and achievements and the high principles for which he stood will continue to serve over the years as an inspiration to us all.

I join my colleagues in extending my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and family at their great loss.

CONGRESSMAN DANIEL OF DANVILLE: A TOUCH OF ALGER, AND A FOUR-POINT PROGRAM FOR SUCCESS

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the fact that one of the freshmen Members of the House, the Honorable W. C. "DAN" DANIEL, of Virginia, is a former national commander of the American Legion.

In his term as national commander, he was one of the most widely traveled and active holders of that important office. During the course of his tenure, he made more than 700 speeches and is widely recognized throughout the country for his active interest in military affairs, service to veterans, and as an eloquent exponent of patriotism.

Not all of us, however, are familiar with the totality of DAN's activities and I would, therefore, like to insert in the RECORD at this point a very fine article which appeared in the February edition of the Commonwealth magazine which is the monthly publication of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce. Our colleague, DAN DANIEL, is the current president of the Virginia State chamber and prior to his election to Congress last November, he served as a member of Virginia's General Assembly.

DAN has had a colorful and active career and has come to Congress at a time when his background and experience can be most useful to this body and to the Nation. He is a member of the House Armed Services Committee and, typical of his usual performance, he has quickly assumed an important role in that committee's activities. He is well liked among his colleagues and highly respected by all who know him. Indicative of his fine qualities of leadership is the fact that he was elected President of the group of freshman Members of Congress at the beginning of the session and has lost no time in familiarizing himself with the total operations of the Congress.

I commend the article from the Commonwealth magazine to the reading of the Members of the House and include it herein with my remarks:

CONGRESSMAN DANIEL OF DANVILLE: A TOUCH OF ALGER, AND A FOUR-POINT PROGRAM FOR SUCCESS

(By Melville Carico)

President Nixon made a speech at a breakfast for newspaper editors in Washington, D.C., in the 1950s and afterwards Marion Saunders, editor of the Danville Register, found himself in a small group chatting with the then Vice President. Saunders casually asked Nixon if he happened to know Dan Daniel, then national commander of the American Legion, from Saunders' home town.

"Oh yes," Nixon replied. He recalled having met Daniel at Legion conventions which he had addressed and then added: "He's the kind of young man we need in Congress."

"Dan Daniel is a Democrat," Saunders advised Nixon.

"That doesn't matter. He's the kind of young man we need in Congress," Nixon replied.

Voters in Virginia's 5th Congressional District, where agriculture and industry are combining harmoniously into a prosperous economy, apparently felt the same way last November as Nixon did years ago.

Daniel, then a member of the Virginia House of Delegates and assistant to the chairman of the board of Dan River Mills, won the House seat which since 1953 had been held by former Gov. William M. ("Bill") Tuck who, at 72, wanted to retire from public life.

And, in winning, Daniel got more votes than his Republican opponent and an independent combined—a remarkable political feat when projected against the political turmoil that gripped Virginia last fall.

It is even more remarkable, almost unbelievable, personal story of success in an age that scoffs at Horatio Alger for a man born 54 years ago one of eight children of a tenant farmer near Chatham.

His resignation as assistant to the chairman of the board of Dan River Mills before going to Washington symbolized this success. He started as a laborer in the dye house at 40 cents an hour, having gotten the job because of his brawn.

He plans to serve out his term as president of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, which expires in April, unless a conflict should develop with his duties in Washington.

He had to resign, too, as Danville's representative in the Virginia House of Delegates where, in eight years, he reached the "inner circle" of legislators who provide the General Assembly leadership and creative thinking.

He was on four major House committees—Privileges and Elections, Education, General Laws, and Finance. There are many members who would give their eye teeth to be on even one of these committees which, together, handle nearly all of the important legislation.

Daniel carries to Washington a business background gained from his years with Dan River Mills and as frequent spokesman for the entire southern textile industry, particularly on tariffs and world marketing; a farm background growing out of his boyhood and his years in the farm district; an enviable knowledge of world affairs gleaned through years of coming up through the ranks of the American Legion to national commander, and of travel as a member of the President's People-to-People Committee.

His experiences have led him to question the wisdom of continuing economic foreign aid but, at the same time, he feels Virginia and the South have great opportunities in developing foreign markets for their products.

John T. Connor, then Secretary of Commerce, appointed Daniel to the Regional Export Council in 1965 and in 1967, he spent three weeks in Europe with Gov. Mills E. Godwin Jr. participating in Virginia's first overseas trade mission to acquaint European markets with the State's agricultural and manufactured products and its tourist attractions.

"We cannot continue to shoulder the financial burdens of the world," Daniel said in a speech on the Marshall Plan.

He wants to see the Merchant Marine expanded and is worried over what has been the reluctance of the United States to build nuclear-powered merchant vessels. "We are losing the wet war of the sea," Daniel warned in one campaign speech.

During his campaign for a seat in Congress he talked often about the rising crime rate, the looting and burning in the cities. In the General Assembly, he was a member of the Virginia State Crime Commission.

"The time has come to be harsh with those who refuse to live with the organized rules of society," Daniel said in a recent speech. And in another, he suggested that "We are the victims of an era of permissiveness."

Daniel, like many of the Southern congressmen who are returning to Washington, will be raising questions about some of the leftover programs of the Johnson Administration involving millions of dollars in appropriations, including the "War on Poverty."

"No one wants to stop worthwhile rehabilitation programs which will help to eradicate poverty, but you and I realize that in the name of fighting poverty a multitude of sins have been committed, and I say that they must not be allowed to continue," Daniel declared in a campaign speech.

Based on his own experiences, Daniel is convinced that the key to success is fourfold: education, discipline, training, and work. They paid off for him, because there is nothing in his boyhood background, using today's widely accepted yardsticks, that would be considered encouraging.

During the depression of the 1930s, he was in the Civilian Conservation Corps and when he applied for his first job at Dan River Mills he had not finished high school. Only his size, a strapping 200 pounds, got him a job.

A longtime friend of Daniel's, a newspaper man, says he believes Daniel took the first big step when Dan River Mills put in a program to provide high school classes for its employes. Daniel was the first to sign up. Many fellow workers were not interested. He was the valedictorian of the plant's first graduating class—an event that led to a job in the company's personnel department.

Daniel had been a patient in the tuberculosis sanatorium at Blue Ridge. In fact, it was there that he met Mrs. Daniel, the former Miss Ruby McGregor of Pittsylvania County, who was working there. He has been cured.

When World War II started, Daniel tried to volunteer five times, was rejected five times because of his lung condition. He finally got into the Navy on the sixth try, but was soon discharged because of the lung condition which five times before had kept him out.

Tobacco farmers in Virginia have a Congressman who can question the government's anti-smoking campaign.

"I'm the only one in my family who didn't smoke and I'm the only one who had any lung trouble," Daniel often says.

Daniel was first appointed by President Eisenhower to membership on the President's People-to-People Committee, and in the fall of 1959, he went to Russia to assess the feasibility of this concept toward improving foreign relations. In 1956, he had been on a similar mission to the Arab countries; in 1959, to the NATO countries of Western Europe and Israel. Then, in 1960, he went to Mexico; in 1961, to Canada. He has been to Vietnam twice and he did not miss the opportunity to seek out Virginia boys on the battle lines.

"I don't believe you can buy friends over the bargin counter," Daniel says. In world affairs, he says, the United States must always be able to deal from a position of strength. As for the leadership in Russia. Daniel says, "A Communist is never more dangerous than when he smiles to shake hands."

Many honors have come Daniel's way—the Star of Italian Solidtarity (First Class), given by Italy to foreigners who have performed outstanding achievements for the Italian nation; the Croix de Merit, by the Republic of France for work on the President's People-to-People Committee; the Service to Mankind Award, by the Sertoma Clubs; the Military Cross, by the Virginia Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy; the Distinguished Virginian Award, by Virginia Exchange Clubs. Daniel is a Baptist, Legionnaire, Kiwanian, Elk, and Mason. In addition, he's an excellent golfer who, friends say, shoots in the 70s. Golf is the Daniels' recreation. They have a married son who works for the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board (ABC) in Danville.

One day during the campaign, a reporter asked Daniel what he thinks, in the light of the myriad problems facing the nation at home and abroad, is the biggest challenge the United States faces in the years ahead.

"To keep America America," he replied.

KING HUSSEIN: A STATESMAN WITH A PLAN FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, King Hussein of Jordan has long been admired in this country for his courage, vision and steadfastness. Now, in a brilliant and well-reasoned speech before the National Press Club, he has clearly shown that he is a statesman of the first rank. His eloquent and moving plea for peace and the moderate and reasonable terms offered by the Arab States are impressive evidence that many Arabs sincerely and genuinely desire peace with Israel. Because of the timeliness of his remarks, I insert excerpts from his talk, as reported in the New York Times, in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

EXCERPTS FROM HUSSEIN TALK

For 18 months—since the unanimous adoption of the Security Council Resolution of 22d November, 1967, and the appointment of Dr. Gunnar Jarring, as the United Nations Special Representative, there have been no recognizable signs of progress toward a just and peaceful solution.

This has been a surprise to me because from the very beginning Jordan's attitude had been a positive one. We have from the outset agreed to accept every single one of the principles of the resolution and so indeed has the United Arab Republic. We are still waiting for Israel to do the same.

Consider this, for example: if, before the war, on the First of June, 1967, the Arabs had agreed to terminate the state of belligerency with Israel, to provide her with guaranteed access to Sharm el Sheik and the Suez Canal, to recognize her right to live in peace and security, and to agree to provisions which would finally solve the refugee problem—if the Arabs had agreed to such terms on the First of June, 1967, such a move would have been so dramatic and such a concession on the part of the Arabs that Israel would very likely have found it impossible not to acknowledge the magnanimity of the offer; and so would everyone else in the world.

The fact of the matter is that the Arabs are making Israel that same offer today, and the Israelis are rejecting it.

STRESSES 1967 U.N. RESOLUTION

Future peace in the Middle East must stand or fall on the implementation of the November '67 United Nations resolution. We have agreed to abide by its provisions, and so far the Israelis have refused to do so.

Their contention that "negotiation directly" between the parties involved is essential to agreement is a rather curious and "arbitrary" position.

* * * * *

SEES A NEED FOR SPEED

I predict that if progress toward a solution is not made within the next very few months, not only will no one be willing or in a position to talk about peace, but no outside force, even with the best of intentions, will be able to divert the area from permanent conflict and eventual war.

Perhaps unwillingness to give up the territory Israel overran during the war is not the only reason she is unwilling to accept the United Nations resolution—and that is the provision concerning the Palestine refugees.

These were people who were driven from their homes during wartime. Their homes and their land are occupied by the enemy. And they don't want to find refuge in another country. They want to go back to their homeland.

Can anything be done about it? Not by anyone but Israel. They have traditionally taken the position that the Palestinian refugee problem is not their problem—that it is up to their fellow Arabs to look after them.

WOULD NOT STOP GUERRILLAS

The danger of the refugee problem is not a question of looking after their physical needs. The United Nations, with generous aid from the United States, has been doing this for almost a score of years. It is a question of their rights. Once these rights have been restored—by Israel's acceptance of their right to repatriation or compensation—then the final step toward peace will not be far off.

That is why when I am asked "Why don't you stop the fedayeen, the commandos, in their raids against Israel?" I reply, "I would stop them." It is their land that the Israelis are occupying and they see no way out for them except to struggle to achieve their rights."

Again about the commandos. I am frequently asked, "What good does it do you to seek a peaceful solution when members of the resistance forces say they will not accept it?" And my answer to that is simply this: "There is no difference in my aim in seeking a peaceful settlement and their aim in a settlement by conflict."

It is the intolerable situation that produces the commandos, not the commandos who provoke the situation.

ASKS PART OF JERUSALEM

There is no basis for any negotiation, since Israel has not yet accepted the [U.N.] resolution. This would require that Israel realize that she must withdraw her troops from all the territories which she occupied in June, 1967.

Moreover, any plan for withdrawal must include our greatest city—our spiritual capital, the holy city of Jerusalem. To us—Christian and Moselm Arab alike—Jerusalem is as sacred as it is to the Jews. And we cannot envision any settlement that does not include the return of the Arab part of the city of Jerusalem to us with all our holy places.

* * * * *

In conclusion, may I sum up for you just what it is that we are prepared to offer Israel? And this I am speaking for President Nasser as well as for myself.

On our part, we are prepared to offer the following as a basis for a just and lasting peace, in accordance with the Security Council resolution.

1. The end of all belligerency.
2. Respect for and acknowledgment of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all states in the area.
3. Recognition of the rights of all to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of war.
4. Guarantees for all the freedom of navigation through the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal.
5. Guaranteeing the territorial inviolability of all states in the area through whatever measures necessary including the establishment of demilitarized zones.
6. Accepting a just settlement of the refugee problem.

In return for these considerations, our sole demand upon Israel is the withdrawal of its armed forces from all territories occupied in the June, 1967, war, and the implementation of all the other provisions of the security council resolution.

The challenge that these principles present is that Israel may have either peace or territory—but she can never have both.

TAX REFORM IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, Congress must act soon to reform our current tax system. Over the past months I have studied various components of the Federal Government's fiscal programs, and today I submitted for consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means a statement outlining my positions on tax reform, surtax extension, and overall Government spending. I now present that statement for the RECORD:

STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM PRESENTED TO COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS BY REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., APRIL 14, 1969

Mr. Chairman, from all over America the uproar over our current tax system steadily grows in intensity. And a few pertinent statistics indicate why I think there's good reason for such griping. For example, since 1958: the average American pays 76% more taxes to all government units—federal, state and local; but, average per capita income has risen only 56%; and, consumer prices have climbed over 20%.

No wonder the middle income American—the man or woman who heads a family with a total income between $7,000 and $20,000—is upset.

True, over the same period, both the quantity and quality of services offered citizens by government have increased dramatically—per capita expenditures by all government units went up 85% between 1958 and 1968—but the rising cost of government has been a prime contributory factor to recent inflationary pressures. In addition, distribution of the tax burden has not been even, with middle and low income earners carrying a heavy and unequal share of the rising costs of government.

Many of the complaints I receive deal with federal tax levels—and especially with the tax surcharge—although a further look at statistics presents a somewhat different perspective.

Again, since 1958, all taxes have risen 76¢ on a per capita basis, yet it has been the federal tax take which has increased the least—67% up, compared to an 82% rise for local government taxes and well over 100% for state taxes. And for both state and local government units, the cost of government itself has grown more than have allocations to any one functional area. For instance, state and local government expenditures rose nearly 95%, their educational programs increased around 77%, highway costs were up about 55% and public welfare expenses rose approximately 50%.

Per capita state and local government expenditures went from about $259 in 1958 to around $474 in 1967—an increase of some 83%—and over half of the state and local government funds went for either education or highways.

At the federal level, since 1958, areas of greatest growth have been education and job training (approximately a five-fold increase), space and science research (two-and-one-half times as much), health-welfare-housing-urban assistance (all with an increase of some 1.7 times), and defense, which had an increase of 75% but started out at a much higher base—around half of total budget allocations. These high growth areas should also be compared with other large expenditure sectors, such as agriculture, international affairs and finance, and natural resources, which saw very little real increase over the past ten years.

What the statistics mean to me is that the push for tax reform should not be limited to the federal tax structure alone. Tax reform should be implemented to all government levels—with the federal government taking the leading role.

In addition, I believe that any meaningful tax reform package must be accompanied by some rational system of allocating government funds. Without a realistic priority scheme for the budgetmaking process, I see the dismal prospect of an ever-increasing demand for more and more taxes—no matter how sweeping a reform program can be put together.

But, even without a statistical justification for tax structure change, the fact that too many high income earners and huge corporations get away with paying proportionately so little in taxes ranks as a vital incentive for major tax reform.

Ideally, the tax system in this country should reflect the basic principles of a participatory democracy, and each taxpayer should assume an equitable share of the total tax burden. Unfortunately, this is not the situation today. Strong Congressional action is needed to reform our tax structure rates and is an imperative move towards bringing government back to the people.

During the current Congressional session, I have put great emphasis on developing what I consider to be a fair and equitable program of tax reform. I have already introduced five major bills aiming for significant tax structure change, and I shall continue to consider other proposals as they are developed.

The bills which I have sponsored and which I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to act favorably upon are:

1. H.R. 3255, which increases the personal income tax exemption from $600 (where it has been since the 1930's) to a more realistic $12,00;

2. H.R. 3256, which liberalizes deductions taxpayers can claim dealing with moving expenses related to a job change;

3. H.R. 5250, the comprehensive tax reform bill—which if fully approved would raise more than $9 billion in additional revenues—with its major provisions to eliminate the investment tax credit, substantially reduce mineral depletion allowances, tax capital gains heretofore untaxed at death, limit tax losses on "hobby" farming, and to establish a municipal bond guarantee corporation as an alternative for tax exempt state and local bonds;

4. H.R. 9896, which eliminates the application of the oil depletion allowance for foreign produced oil.

In addition, I have sponsored H.R. 9915 which would return a portion of federal tax revenues to state and local governments which undertake programs of cost-reducing administrative reform, including tax structure change. I believe that Congress must begin to give serious thought to the concept of revenue-sharing, and I favor an approach which would pass funds through state governments to municipalities, and, in addition, could include another pass-through from municipal governments directly to communities or submunicipal groups.

I also support Treasury Department recommendations to provide for a basic minimum income tax paid by all income earners, for a limit on the maximum tax that any one person could be expected to pay, and for an increase in standard deduction limits.

Passage of a tax reform program such as I have outlined here would greatly reduce the need for additional surcharges. Last year the Johnson Administration pushed passage of its 10% tax surcharge on grounds that the surtax would, by the end of the year, cool off the surging economy and ease inflationary pressures. The surtax received Congressional approval but, to date, what has happened is just about the opposite of what was predicted. The economy keeps steaming ahead, price levels continue moving upwards at an alarming rate, and credit conditions are as tight as they have ever been.

Now, President Nixon is again trying to get Congress to okay the surtax for virtually the same reasons. From all indications, the chances are good that the President will prevail and the surcharge will be extended.

All of the economic justifications for the surcharge are a subterfuge, however, for the real need for additional taxes—the demands for additional resources for the defense establishment. Last year I voted against the surtax because I know that it was nothing more than a means for financing our adventures in Vietnam. This year I will once more oppose the surcharge on the same grounds.

Nixon Administration economic advisors claim that current inflation results primarily from the economic boom of the last four years, and that inflation can be cured by limiting overall consumer expenditures via higher tax rates. In part, that is true, but I feel strongly that more of our recent inflation comes from imbalances within the economy caused by burgeoning defense expenditures.

The rapid growth in defense spending since 1965 has tended to shift resources out of many non-defense sectors and into the coffers of the military-industrial complex. The result is inflationary pressures for the relatively scarce amount of resources available. This imbalance has occurred throughout the economy, and should be blamed as a prime factor in recent inflation.

I believe that the amount of funds slated to be brought in by the surcharge could just as easily be raised by other—more equitable—means, and since Congress convened in January I have been backing two major efforts in this direction—lower defense expenditures and tax reform.

Congress inserted expenditure controls into last year's surtax bill, but the defense budget went virtually untouched. The new Administration will probably attempt the same play. Recently the Defense Department announced a $660 million budget cut; earlier this year, Secretary Laird had made a $500 million reduction. But, much as I applaud these cutbacks. I am at the same time a bit leary that these are just diversions to keep Congress from severely slashing such pet programs as the Safeguard ABM and the multiple-head MIRV missile.

Almost 60¢ of every dollar already flows into the military-industrial complex, and the waste in defense programs is huge. I shall continue to support efforts to slice away at the defense budget—from which I believe at least another $9 billion could be pared without impeding national security, and, indeed, even improving it.

Certainly Congress was aware of a possible "taxpayer's revolt" even before outgoing Treasury Secretary Barr made that prediction before the Joint Economic Committee in January. One provision of last year's surtax bill was a request for a sweeping tax reform proposal from the Johnson Administration.

But tax reform is not as simple as some persons might claim it to be. In attempting tax reform, government must balance its needs for increasing revenues against problems of fairness, and both of those factors must be attuned to allow for economic growth. It might be simpler to raise more revenue through selected boosts in tax rates, but it would come at the cost of potential lower economic growth and less equity in sharing the tax burden. On the other hand, it is possible to change tax rates to share the burden more evenly, but at a cost of lower revenues and less potential growth. Or, it is also possible to have taxes that encourage rapid economic growth, but both equity and revenue might be sacrificed.

Over the past four years, the Federal government has made its first goal that of increasing revenues to support defense operations in Southeast Asia. And, it is virtually impossible to raise revenues and achieve a better deal for the average wage earner, because the areas of major inequities are just those which aid war efforts, such as oil depletion and investment credits.

As long as the defense establishment goes unchecked, chances for a meaningful tax reform are slim. I assume that any serious drive to get at the oil depletion allowance and investment credit soon will get "wrapped in the flag." Middle and low income earners suffer dearly—from both increasing inflation and from growing tax inequity. All of these conflicts must be overcome if there is to be a successful tax reform campaign. I feel my tax program confronts these conflicts and comes out with a balanced approached leading to reform and equity.

THE PROBLEM OF LUMBER PRICE INCREASES

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1969, in regular meeting, the Home Builders Association of Greater Kansas City consisting of representatives of the construction industry of Metropolitan Kansas City, did, by unanimous vote, adopt a resolution relating to the many problems of lumber pricing.

This resolution clearly outlines six key factors directly related to the appalling increases in lumber prices the construction industry has experienced in recent years, and I commend these factors to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, The lumber price increases experienced by our industry are of a magnitude that can in no way be justified by natural market forces, and;

Whereas, These price increases are not in the national interest, the industry interest, and foremost, the consumer interest, and make it impossible to fulfill our goal to provide low and moderate income housing as enunciated in the 1968 Housing Act, and,

Whereas, Large lumber manufacturers have bought out the small saw mills, or cut off their supply by bidding up the price of the timber the federal government sells at auction, thus allowing the larger concerns to increase the value of their own holdings and results in increased prices;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the present administration and that all addressees adopt the following program:

1. That we must have an immediate ban by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture of all exports of public timber; a ban to last until our internal U.S. needs are met. Having these logs available for domestic manufacture now will ease our shortage crisis and should at least hold lumber prices where they are.

2. That the federal government increase the allowable cuts by 10 per cent and thus remedy the situation which now exists.

3. That government timber auctions be discontinued and the price of timber be fixed at the 1966 level, and that the small saw mills be allocated as much of this government timber as they are able to manufacture into lumber.

4. That a time limit be set on the manufacture of all timber purchased from the government and penalties be assessed for each day exceeding this period.

5. That the small saw mills be assisted with loans from the Small Business Administration even if this involves more than the usual risk.

6. That all local associations be asked to run advertisements in their local newspapers explaining how the lumber industry has raised their prices during the past 18 months.

WHY THE REVOLT OF MODERN YOUTH?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, letters to the editor from citizens often supply constructive thoughts concerning problems challenging the Nation. Here at home few crises are greater than that of youth in rebellion. What is so wrong with what America has to offer perplexes many citizens.

In this connection a recent letter to the Washington Evening Star from Mr. Jack Markowitz of Alexandria, Va., is interesting reading. Just how to attain that "better society" without destroying the one that we have is one of the most difficult problems of our time.

The letter follows:

REVOLT ON CAMPUS

ALEXANDRIA, VA.

SIR: I believe that too many people oversimplify the causes of the student rebellion on campuses and the methods for dealing with it. Contrasted with the civil rights movement, which had support from a broad spectrum of our society, the student rebellion touches a vital nerve. Civil rights could be viewed somewhat dispassionately by the middle class as "helping others" in consonance with our Judeo-Christian culture. However, the student rebellion, composed primarily of white, middle-class young people, is a direct threat to our stability as a society and our authority as parents. This has caused an emotional and panicky response referred to as the "generation gap" or preferably, "the forgetfulness gap." Forgetfulness is a problem of both the younger and older generations, but the older generation, because of its maturity, should be "more equal."

Most parents of today's college students were born between 1918–28. This means that many of them know first-hand the false prosperity and the resulting depression of the 1920s. Furthermore, many gave three or four years of their lives to service during World War II or Korea. Depression and war have caused insecure parents who overemphasize material factors of life to make up for earlier deprivation.

While there have always been materialistic tendencies in our society, with its inherent hypocrisies of Sabbath worship and individual undercutting the rest of the week, the civil rights movements of the early 1960s forced it out into the open and imprinted itself on the consciousness of younger generation. Established institutions of church, school and parental authority were seriously questioned and found wanting. At the same time more and more of our young people were attending college because of our increased affluence and governmental policy. Also, they were being asked to stay in school longer to learn how to cope with the rapidly increased knowledge and technology of our modern society. Therefore, the problems which many of the older generation faced while in college (i.e., meaningless rules, impersonal instruction, testing for its own sake, required courses that were narrowly occupational rather than educational, etc.), became intensified.

Parents forget that they instilled a questioning attitude in their children which causes them to react skeptically to meaningless experience. Didn't we reward the children who asked good questions? Since this is also the first generation which has fully participated in a broad range of group activities from little leagues to student government, they have learned how to get things done through group action. Add to this the natural idealism of young which has been buffeted by the civil rights movement and a confusing war, we have many of the factors which are the breeding ground of an activist student rebellion.

Both students and parents must understand these causes before both over-react, cause irreparable harm and turn a "generation gap" into a chasm of misunderstanding and conflict. Students who are open and humanistic towards one another should not find it too difficult to direct the same attitude across generations. Parents must recover their latent humanism to reach out to join the young people in improving the many imperfections in our society. Both generations must remember that it is easy to destroy but infinitely more difficult to create a better society.

JACK MARKOWITZ.

JOB CORPS TO BE INTEGRATED INTO COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz has unveiled a sound and economical plan for integrating the Job Corps into the Labor Department's comprehensive manpower program.

This action, which has received President Nixon's stamp of approval, is a major step toward vastly improving the Nation's capability of preparing seriously disadvantaged youngsters for jobs.

I am most heartened that this plan would not only retain but would strengthen those features of this activity that have helped so many young people acquire training and employment.

Significantly, the emphasis of training will be shifted from conservation to industrial employment as a result of the establishment of 30 new inner city and near-city training centers and the closing of 50 conservation centers. A net reduction of 29 centers will save the Nation approximately $100 million without hindering the job-training services available for young men and women in our major urban and rural areas.

The 30 new inner city and near-city residential centers will enable the Labor Department to recruit, train and then place needy youths in jobs relatively near their homes.

The Secretary has made clear his intention to carefully phase out those camps which will be closed, insuring equitable treatment for trainees and personnel and making the fullest possible use of the old facilities. Corpsmen will be given the opportunity to complete their training, and discussions are now under way to consider alternative uses for the centers which will be closed.

I think this logical and well-conceived plan deserves the wholehearted support of every member of this Congress. I insert into the RECORD the "Report of the Secretary of Labor on Restructuring the Job Corps." It contains an excellent analysis of the deficiencies encountered in the old Job Corps programs and provides ample justification for the Secretary's new proposals.

The report follows:

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF LABOR ON RESTRUCTURING THE JOB CORPS

This report reviews the basic premises of the Job Corps, briefly describes it present structure, appraises the validity of these assumptions in the light of operation experience and proposes changes which will reshape the program.

BASIC PREMISES

The Job Corps was established to meet the special needs of a specific *target population*—low income, disadvantaged youths "currently living in an environment so characterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife, or other disorienting conditions as to substantially impair prospects for successful participation" in other training programs. We know that over 800,000 youths live below the poverty level; the number of these who need all the services offered by Job Corps has not been precisely estimated.

Job Corps is not characterized simply. There is great variety among the centers in size, focus, and quality. There are, however, several central premises and distinctive elements which have remained relatively stable.

1. Residence

A central premise is that complete *residential service* is essential for the target population. A group living situation characterized by total life-support is provided, away from the family, on the assumption that these youths are so hampered by deprivation at home that they need a totally new environment in order to learn or acquire skills.

2. Removal from community

Residential service is generally provided *away from the home community*, the premise being that the youths need to get completely away, not only from a disruptive family situation, but from their neighborhood. A key assumption on which this belief rests is that youths, particularly those from an urban slum area, will benefit if they are moved to a wholly different area, *preferably rural*. Rural conservation work, for example, has been made a substantial part of the program, on the assumption that it can play a useful role in rehabilitation.

3. Intensive supportive services

Of equal importance is the belief that such youth ordinarily need *comprehensive and intensive supportive services*. The premise here is that effective work-training alone will not entirely remove all serious obstacles to employment. The complete service includes basic education, counseling, physical and mental health services, development of improved motivation, "life skills" preparation, physical development, and recreation.

4. Self-sufficiency

And finally, Job Corps has assumed that each residential center should be substantially *self-sufficient*, providing all essential work-training and supportive services. This operating premise is rooted in a desire for administrative simplicity as well as in a search for a distinctive image for the program. In addition, the location of centers in relatively isolated areas requires that they be largely self-supporting.

PRESENT STRUCTURE

Although there is considerable variation in detail, the Job Corps now has basically *two types of centers for men* in relatively isolated rural areas (a medium-size conservation center and a large, diversified skill-training center) and *one type of center for women* (medium-size, located in cities, with the girls assigned from other areas). More specifically:

1. *Conservation centers* stress work experience in conservation activities along with some remedial education. There are 82 such centers. Modest in size (averaging 150 boys) they are generally in rural areas requiring conservation work, including such Federal lands as national forests or parks. The centers were originally focused on the needs of those who read below the 5th grade level, improving literacy so that they could go on to occupational skill training. More recently youths with higher reading levels have been enrolled and skill training in the construction trades has been added to the conservation center program.

Almost all these centers are run by units of the Agriculture and Interior Departments. This fiscal year about 37 percent of Job Corps enrollee positions were in conservation centers. (Congress mandated that 40 percent of male Corps members be in conservation centers. Currently the ratio is over 50 percent.)

2. *Men's centers* provide a varied array of skill training courses and a comprehensive range of supportive and other manpower-related services. There are only six such centers, all rather large (averaging 1800 youths). Five are run by private companies, the sixth by a State agency set up just for this purpose. Though sometimes termed "urban," all are about 40 miles from the nearest city in areas where large installations (generally abandoned military bases) were readily available.

Both urban and rural youths are enrolled, constituting some 33 percent of enrollee positions this fiscal year.

3. *Centers for women* offer skill training, together with other needed services. The 18 such centers vary in size, averaging some 500 girls. Typically located in urban areas, they enroll all girls away from their home area as a matter of policy. Most are operated under contract to private firms, with several run by nonprofit organizations.

Women's centers account for some 28 percent of all Job Corps positions this fiscal year; the Economic Opportunity Act requires that at least 25 percent of all enrollees be women and the legislative history suggests going up to 50 percent of the Corps.

The Job Corps has a new inner-city center for men and is planning several experimental centers. These account for some two percent of all enrollee positions.

PROFILE OF ENROLLEE

The typical Job Corps enrollee is 18 years of age; has had nine years of education, but performs at only the fifth grade level. Approximately one-half of the enrollees are from small towns; the others are equally divided between rural and metropolitan areas. Less than 10 percent have been convicted for serious offenses. Almost half of the enrollees were working in such menial jobs as bus boy, car washer, or farm hand before they joined the Job Corps and were earning an average of $1.27 an hour. Eighty percent of the enrollees have not seen a doctor or dentist in the ten years preceding their enrollment, and 60 percent come from broken homes.

PROFILE OF A JOB CORPS ENROLLEE

	Male	Female	Total
Age (years)	17.4	18.0	17.5
Education (years):			
Years of school	8.8	9.8	9.0
Reading level (61 percent of Corpsmen in conservation centers read below 4th grade level)	4.8	6.2	5.2
Math level	5.1	5.9	5.3
Home residence (percent):			
Rural (less than 2,500)			25
Small town, midcity			47
Metro (over 250,000)			28
Previous behavior (percent):			
No previous record			67
Minor antisocial behavior			25
1 serious conviction			8
Employment (percent): Working full or part time before Job Corps[1]	46	30	44
Induction status of those eligible for Armed Forces (percent):			
Failed test			63
Educational reasons			28
Physical reasons			22
Other			13
Health (percent): Had not seen doctor or dentist in last 10 years			80
Family pattern (percent):			
Broken home			60
Head of household unemployed			63
Family on relief			27
Substandard housing			60
Asked to leave school			64
Both parents had less than 8th grade education			49

[1] Of those reporting, wages averaged $1.27 an hour; 44 percent of those working were in jobs such as busboy, carwasher, or farmhand; Social Security reports youth worked on the average 2.5 quarters with average yearly income of only $639.

ASSESSMENT OF JOB CORPS PREMISES

Formal evaluations and the practical lessons of operating experience suggest that several of the basic Job Corps premises are highly questionable, particularly in the context of other manpower programs. The weaknesses in the organizational design of Job Corps and the way it has gone about its business, reflects the faulty underlying assumptions and point to the need for a complete reshaping of Job Corps in terms of its purposes, size, structure and relationship to other manpower programs. Nonetheless, some of the underlying premises are sound and are necessary in a comprehensive manpower system.

1. *The premise of residential service*, for some youth, seems to have proven sound and should be retained as an essential element in manpower programming.

It is now clear that some of the highly disadvantaged who are unable to benefit from or maintain enrollment in a training program will gain special benefits by living in a special residential setting away from their customory home and family problems.

Once we have effectively identified and recruited such youth, the most appropriate types of residential settings must be selected for them, with special reference to matters of size and location. The general judgment is that small (under 100) and medium-size residences (100-300) are most desirable for supplying individualized attention. Although large centers can provide more diversified training, specialized services, and significant cost economies, these advantages are often offset by problems of camp discipline and inter-personal relationships resulting in high dropout rates.

2. The premise that *the target group needs intensive supportive services in addition to work-training* is clearly sound.

It is obvious that illiterate youth urgently require remedial education and other services, but it is at least questionable whether this need is being supplied effectively in many of the camps. In addition, it does not seem that remedial education has been adequately related to the content of training and to individual employment goals, so that the youth can see its value and be motivated to apply himself. In practice, some conservation centers have placed more emphasis on performing conservation work than on raising reading levels.

Counseling, physical fitness and recreational activities, and other supportive services are definitely necessary. Continued high early dropout rates, however, particularly among the youngest enrollees indicate that substantial improvement is needed in current techniques. In addition, the program should differentiate among the needs of heterogeneous groups of youths.

3. *The premise that rural youth have needs that require special considerations is valid.* Youths from rural areas and small communities often need to leave their home areas, not because they require a different environment, but because they cannot obtain formal training where they live. If they are to receive training, they must leave. Job Corps centers have enrolled many such youths. There is an unmet need for training services in rural areas. Use of Job Corps centers as regional residential training centers catering to rural youth is one way to help meet this need.

Weakness in Job Corps concepts and operations are many.

1. The premise that all enrollees should be assigned to centers away from their home community rather than in or near it has proven questionable. (Job Corps emphasis has nearly all been on assignment away from the home area.)

It is doubtful, therefore, that the large away-from-home area center should remain the sole model for supplying continuing residential services and skill training to the Job Corps target group.

In part, the Corps has had little real choice due to the limited resources available and the necessary location of conservation centers in sparsely populated areas.

However, with the "urban" men's skill training centers a conscious choice was made to concentrate on a few large facilities. Because of the cost-of-facility and community relations problems such large undertakings generate within major cities, and because of a desire for a rural setting free of the distractions a city offers, these centers have been located in large government-owned, rent-free installations in relatively isolated areas. Other practical considerations include the economics of scale afforded by the large centers as well as the wide range of training courses offered enrollees.

Originally, assignments to these centers were made with little regard to individual geographic factors. Available openings became the key and many cross-country assignments resulted.

In practice, the great permissiveness in geographical assignment has both increased transportation costs and widened the area of choice for enrollees in regard to the content of their program. While it also exposed them to other areas of the country, it limited home visits, created difficult logistics problems on scheduling, and complicated followup on corpsmen returning home. Although the Job Corps is now concentrating assignments within the region, enrollees are still sent out of their home city. This means continued absence from neighborhood and family, with problems of readjustment and job placement upon return. While long-distance assignment and relocation may be helpful to some enrollees, it aggravates the dropout problem and discourages other youth who need residential services from signing up. Only about 35 percent of the youths that left the Job Corps in fiscal year 1968 were graduates.

Almost 40 percent left before 90 days. Job Corps centers which are in States classified by Job Corps as "import" States had much higher 30 day drop-out rates than centers in "export" States. Import States are those where the center brings in enrollees from other States to operate at capacity. Thus, centers in import States would tend to have enrollees from further distances from their homes than centers in export States. For men's centers in import States, the 30 day dropout rate average 24.9 percent, 14 percent higher than the centers in export States. For women's centers, the import States had a dropout rate of 16.3 percent, 21 percent higher than the centers in export States.

Separation of the training site from the area in which enrollee will look for a job also limits development of on-the-job training opportunities that can lead to employment after graduation.

These are serious weaknesses that have adversely affected overall performance.

2. The premise that Job Corps centers should be self-sufficient, operating independently of other programs except for certain selection and placement assistance, has had serious shortcomings in practice. To implement this concept, all necessary services must be provided by the Job Corps itself. Though this approach may have some validity in isolated areas, elsewhere it increases administration overhead and multiplies the risk of duplication of education and training programs that are often available in the same community. The centers rarely function as preparatory or supplemental programs for other manpower development activities—yet they are often unable to provide needed long-term development without aid from other programs. Since most enrollees are retained at centers for less than six months, short-term assignments to Job Corps—as a conscious prelude to or supplement for other manpower service programs—appear most promising.

3. The conservation center concept has not been a successful manpower development device. The efficiency of the conservation concept was subject to serious question even before the Job Corps was established. Conservation work, it was argued, would add little to the employability of the youth; any work performed at the centers would not justify their cost of maintenance.

Experience with the conservation centers clearly indicates that the early fears were justified.

The relative isolation of many centers has contributed to their inability to retain enrollees for a period necessary to achieve significant improvements in educational and vocational skills.

Conservation centers have a poorer record in improving a corpsman's education than do urban centers. (Corpsmen in conservation centers only increased their verbal grade level 80 percent as much as urban corpsmen; the increase in their mathematics grade level was only 50 percent as great.)

Little attention has been devoted to the high school equivalency program at the conservation centers.

The thrust of conservation center activities has been directed toward work projects, rather than to training and skill development. In most conservation centers work projects primarily involved the use of common labor and basic hand tools, a situation not conducive to the development of marketable skills.

The gain in wages after leaving the Job Corps has been less for conservation camp corpsmen than for those in urban centers.

The isolation of the conservation centers from labor demand areas has precluded the centers from taking much responsibilty in placing corpsmen after they leave the center.

These problems raise the question as to whether the conservation centers can provide the training contemplated in the act without costly upgrading; and whether such upgrading is possible at all because of the difficulty of recruiting qualified instructors at remote and isolated center locations.

ADDITIONAL OPERATIONAL WEAKNESSES

In addition to the weaknesses that arise from faulty assumptions, there are several operational inadequacies that have limited Job Corps effectiveness.

1. *First, there are critical recruitment and selection problems.*

These are apparent in the methods used by the Job Corps to reach its target group—those who need its distinctive residential service, rather than non-residential training. Unfortunately, the key factor in recruitment and selection practices has not been whether residential service is necessary in an individual case, but whether a youth is willing to leave home for training. And frequently, the mere existence of vacant "slots" becomes the stimulus for recruitment.

Consequently, many youths have been enrolled who (a) need training and other assistance but not costly residential service, or (b) are from rural areas which are not served by other programs. At the same time, young people who may need the full range of residential services are not reached by the Job Corps if they are unwilling to leave their home area. In addition, youths with police records or other evidence of antisocial behavior are often screened out in an effort to improve community relations near the residential centers and avoid disruption in the center. Thus, only 8 percent of Job Corps enrollees have had serious criminal convictions. Similarly, unwed young mothers with children are currently excluded, although this is a sizable group which may have special needs for residential training services.

This evidence indicates that the Job Corps, as presently constituted, has not been reaching the target groups that can best be served by residential services.

2. *The early dropout rate also has been unacceptably high.* The average period of enrollment at the center has not been long enough to permit progression either to other programs or to stable employment with lasting value to the corpsmen. Development of individual plans may help motivate each youth to remain in the program and to make significant progress. A shift to smaller centers located nearer the home area can also help reduce the homesickness and personal disorientation that has contributed to a high dropout rate.

3. *Job placement performance has not been good.* This, in essence, is a reflection of all of the weaknesses of the program: the high dropout rate, inadequate training, lack of program integration with other manpower programs, training sites located away from the corps members' home areas where they will seek work. If any single element of an expensive residential training program is to be regarded as basic to the program's success it is placement. Job placement performance can be improved substantially by (a) restructuring the Job Corps so that it becomes an integral part of a manpower services continuum which includes a job placement component, (b) requiring operators of centers to take the initiative in securing placement services, (c) developing an individual placement plan for each corpsman while he is still in the center, (d) providing more "gate houses" and other readjustment aid for corpsmen returning to their home area, (e) providing relocation assistance for corpsmen recruited from a job-scarce area, and (f) establishing more specific ties to job market opportunities.

RESIDENTIAL TRAINING AND COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER SERVICES

All of the considerations noted above raise a substantial question as to whether the size and character of the Job Corps is justified. This question is underscored by the changes that have occurred in the labor market and in the availability of manpower programs since the inception of Job Corps. For example in 1964:

The number of opportunities for youth in manpower programs was 27,000; compared to over 600,000 today.

We did not have CEP, JOBS, area skill centers, and other manpower service components we have now.

The Job Corps was established, at least in part, as an experiment in reaching, teaching and training the hard-core youth—a task that the regular established programs were not then prepared to handle. Since then, however, a number of new manpower programs, specifically designed to meet the education and training needs of young, disadvantaged people have been fashioned. In addition, there have been significant changes in the statutory authority and practices of the existing institutions which should make them more responsive to the needs of the target population. These developments must be taken into account in assessing the present role of the Job Corps.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN ORGANIZATION AND EMPHASIS

If the objectives of the Job Corps, and indeed of our total manpower program, are to be realized, a major reshaping is necessary:

The identity of the Job Corps as a distinct, separate program should be minimized. Instead, it should be thought of as part of a comprehensive manpower system and identified as *Residential Manpower Centers.*

2. The number of Job Corps centers should be reduced sharply and alternative program capabilities tapped to serve the target population. Centers which have not fully performed their mandate to teach, train, retain and place enrollees, would be eliminated. The conservation camps which have been low on remedial education and meaningful skill training will be particularly affected.

3. To achieve its objective of developing innovative techniques for solving the complex teenage poverty problems, more attention must be paid to the quality of its efforts. There is little to be gained from pushing larger and larger numbers of trainees through programs of doubtful effectiveness.

4. The remaining centers would be closely integrated with the other manpower programs. The conservation centers will devote more time and resources to basic education and to training for desirable jobs in the labor market. Conservation centers that have not established effective skill training programs will be closed. "Urban" centers will be converted to regional skill centers and cater primarily to youth from rural areas.

5. In addition to the present Job Corps models, 30 new "near-city" and "inner-city" models will be developed.

In short, it is proposed that we eliminate: 50 conservation centers, 7 women's centers, 2 men's centers, and add 30 new inner-city centers.

The basic objective would be to incorporate the Job Corps into a total manpower system and to design new, smaller centers, more responsive to the manpower needs of the target youth.

INTEGRATION WITH OTHER MANPOWER PROGRAMS

The first major change is to make the Job Corps an integral part of a comprehensive manpower system—rather than continue it as another, essentially separate, program. This can benefit both Job Corps and the other manpower programs, which now generally lack intensive residential-support services.

Integration will facilitate improvement of recruitment, screening and selection practices, with material reduction of inefficient recruiting and unwarranted screening-out. The Job Corps has often received a lesser priority in overall manpower programs; that will be changed. Refinement of selection criteria can help us to identify those who have a special need for residential services as against other alternatives.

If the Job Corps used available community manpower services, such as Concentrated Employment Program, Job Opportunities in the Business Sector, Manpower Development and Training Act, Neighborhood Youth Corps, all program elements will be more relevant and more readily accessible to most of the Job Corps' target population. More attention will be given to a planned sequence of integrated services. In effect, by coupling the unique residential services of the Job Corps with each of the on-going programs we will multiply the effectiveness of all our efforts.

The other manpower programs can be strengthened through the availability of Job Corps service for some of their enrollees. For example, the Concentrated Employment Program will now have an additional option for its stream of clients, while NYC and our other training and work experience programs may be able to call on Job Corps' residential support aid to meet the special needs of some participants.

Job Corps will participate in the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS). This will permit better planned use of its services as an alternative to, or for linking with, non-residential services.

A MODIFIED RESIDENTIAL CENTER

The second major change is to direct part of the Job Corps resources to new organizational forms, particularly smaller inner-city or near-city residential centers.

Examination of the past, rather rigid, forms in which Job Corps has been structured suggests the need for greater flexibility. Assignment away from the home community is necessary or useful for some enrollees, but not all.

Use of a variety of new center models will generate a greater responsiveness to the differential needs of the target population. Smaller centers, located in or near cities, can recruit, train, and place youth entirely within their home State or urban area. They can serve young people who need residential support but are unwilling or do not need to move to a distant area.

Such centers will do a better job with delinquent youth, more difficult to handle in large camps and often unwelcome in strange communities. They can be developed as multi-purpose facilities; they could, for example, provide unwed young mothers, a group particularly needing residential support, with combined day-care and residential assistance for both mother and child. They can, in general, better draw on the full range of local community resources.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR EXPERIMENTS

The Labor Department has already conducted several experiments with both near-city and inner-city centers.

1. *Near-city centers*

These centers permit commuting home on weekends and can develop ties to other programs in the city. One, Camp Madison-Felicia, provides MDTA skill training for several dozen New York City youths in a former boys' camp near the city. A second, the small Hull House Work Camp near Chicago, enrolled NYC youths judged to have a strong need for residential support. A third project, just getting underway, is the Watts Labor Community Action Committee "training campus" near Los Angeles; here some 500 youths from that city will be trained, most of whom will already be "graduates" of in-city work experience programs.

2. *Inner-city centers*

But there are other models with great promise; one is an inner-city residential training center to train local youths locally for local jobs. The Job Corps has recently started such experimental inner-city centers for boys.

A significant new approach with which the Labor Department has been experimenting warrants extended consideration. Promising flexibility, personalized attention, and adaptability to local circumstances, it seeks to establish small inner-city residences for those who particularly need residential support—and then have them obtain their work-training in programs already available within the same community. Such residences, staffed with local nonprofessional personnel, can provide intensive support—and by reaching out to work with the youngsters' families can perhaps improve the home environment which so often hampers effective participation in training.

This approach holds special promise for high-risk delinquents most crucially in need of residential support, but as yet not broadly represented in Job Corps.

The Department is now running three of these inner-city residential support efforts (one for boys, two for girls) for NYC enrollees. Experience at the boys' center, initiated in New Haven two years ago, indicates that high-risk NYC youths living in a special residence are less likely to dropout, have fewer brushes with the law and a better subsequent employment experience than a comparable group which did not receive such residential support.

After six months, average weekly earnings of graduates from the New Haven center increased by 80 percent, while the control group's earnings had declined by 29 percent, largely because of poorer work habits. Arrests of graduates were cut in half while those of the control group rose by 22 percent. Half of the residents elected to return to school full time.

The following table compares Job Corpsmen with NYC out-of-school enrollees and residents of the New Haven E&D project.

The most significant comparison involves the prior arrest record of enrollees. Ninety percent of the New Haven enrollees had a record of arrests for serious offenses in contrast to only 8 percent of the Job Corps enrollees.

ENROLLEE PROFILES: A COMPARISON OF PROGRAMS

Characteristic	Job Corps enrollees	NYC out of school	Labor E. & D. (New Haven)
Age (years):			
Male	17.4	18.0	19.0
Female	18.0	18.0	18.0
Education (years):			
Median grade	9.0	9.0	9.5
Reading level	5.2	(1)	5.0
Home community (percent):			
Rural and small town	72	40	0
Urban	28	60	100
Arrest record (percent):			
None	67	(1)	1
Minor	25	(1)	9
Serious	8	(1)	90
Previous employment (percent):			
Male	46	(1)	31
Female	30	(1)	(1)
Draft status, male (percent):			
Failed	64	(1)	(1)
Health (percent): No doctor in 10 years	80	(1)	(1)
Family (percent):			
Broken home	60	(1)	39
Head of household unemployed	63	(1)	59
Family on relief	27	(1)	27
Substandard housing	60	(1)	(1)
Asked to leave school	64	77	(1)
Parents less than 8th grade education	49	(1)	44

[1] Not available.

The costs of an inner-city center are compared with those of the Job Corps in the following table:

COMPARISON OF MAN-YEAR COSTS, JOB CORPS AND INNER CITY CENTER

	Job Corps urban center	Labor E. & D. (New Haven)[1]
Center operating expenses	$2,429	$1,864
Enrollee expenses	1,176	[2] 124
Operations and maintenance		740
Other operative expenses (including rent)	1,253	1,000
Center staff expenses	3,114	3,320
Staff salaries and benefits		2,880
Travel		240
Contracted services		200
Enrollee direct cost	1,447	40
Allowances		[3] 0
Travel		0
Insurance		40
Total, center and enrollee direct cost	6,990	5,224
Capital investment	251	560
Rehabilitation		240
Equipment		320
Grand total, center cost	7,241	5,784

[1] Includes staff cost of services to families of the center residents and followup of graduates.

[2] Residents are required to contribute $^1/_3$ of earnings as rent for room and board. Amounts vary according to hours worked (out-of-school youngsters earn more than inschool). Rent receipts are used to pay food costs, which explains why this figure is so low.

[3] Residents are not paid allowances because they are expected to hold jobs which can be either public or private sector jobs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW CENTERS

It is proposed to establish 30 new centers with a capacity for 4,625 enrollees. They will be linked to such existing programs as CEP, NAB JOBS, MDTA skill centers, etc. (A reasonable rule of thumb is that average enrollment will be about six months, so that this number of positions will mean nearly 10,000 enrollees a year.)

Over half (54%) are to be in 10 near-city centers. Some 38 percent are in the five inner-city residential-training centers, while the 15 inner-city residential-support centers, each small, account in total for only 8 percent of the positions.

The residential nonresidential mix in the average inner-city residential-training center is estimated at 200 residents and 150 nonresidents receiving training at the center.

As to sex ratio, some 34 percent of the positions are planned for women (as compared to present Job Corps 28 percent). This is intended to take account of the special need for distinctive residential service for some young unmarried mothers; some of the women's centers will include or be linked to child care service. Also, four centers will be tried on a "coed" basis; while separate residential quarters will be provided for men and women, they will be administered as a combined center.

SUMMARY OF RESIDENTIAL TRAINING CENTERS NEEDED

Several types of residential centers are required, depending on the special needs of each selectively identified segment of the target population.

1. *Comprehensive regional residential skill training centers* will be retained for those for whom full-time residence away from home area and family is necessary. These centers will provide manpower services to youth from sparsely populated rural areas which cannot support such programs. Four men's centers and 11 women's centers are proposed.

2. *Conservation centers in rural areas* will be operated for youths needing remedial education (reading below 6th grade level), skill training in less complex occupations and/or who seek outdoor-work careers. The program should lead more directly to placement in skill training or some specific occupational employment. The centers should also be used for brief summer outdoor work-experience for some inner-city residents.

3. *Near-city residential centers* will be opened for those for whom work-week residence away from home is desirable, with work-training geared to the specific occupational needs of the area served. Ten such centers should be opened. Twenty-seven conservation centers should be retained.

4. For youths unwilling or not needing to leave their city, two types of *inner-city residential support are desirable.*

One is a training *facility with attached residential support* which provides training in one or several skills, both for residents and nonresidents, while placing some of the former in courses already available at other training facilities in the area. Five medium size centers is recommended.

The other is a small residence with no training facilities of its own, serving simply to provide residential support for those who need it and are enrolled in area training programs. Such support is designed particularly for high-risk youths who ordinarily have high dropout rates from training programs because of home and family poblems. It is suggested that 15 small centers be developed.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS

1. The private sector's involvement must be expanded in both quantity and quality. This may be provided by better relating financial returns, for private operators of centers, to their performance. More effective ties will be explored with the National Alliance of Businessmen's program. The good start made on involvement of organized labor in providing trade and preapprenticeship training to corpsmen should be expanded, with emphasis on continuing union support during the formal apprenticeship period after graduation from Job Corps.

2. The distinctive capabilities of State agencies, particularly vocational education systems, should be drawn upon more fully. These agencies should utilize the experiences of the Job Corps and adapt their system to serve effectively the clientele now handled by the Job Corps. Where feasible they should participate as sponsors of centers or provide specialized services to the centers.

3. With the Job Corps part of a single manpower system there can be better coordination with the State employment agencies which are part of the same system. Screening and selection of trainees can be handled more efficiently, transportation of trainees to the centers can be arranged easier, job development and placement work for discharged corps members can be better coordinated.

4. Increased use should be made of volunteers. The Job Corps has found that a modest investment in volunteer effort can reap valuable returns. This has been particularly true with the Women in Community Service (WICS) program. VISTA volunteers have been effective and their role will be expanded in such areas as recruiting, tutoring, "big sister" roles and other supplementary activities.

5. Continued attention must be paid to community relations. During the first few years of operation,. the Job Corps suffered from an extremely bad press. Every incident, however minor, involving a Job Corps enrollee appeared to merit national attention. Some have felt that the Job Corps and its contractors failed to prepare communities and placed centers in inappropriate locations. In time, however, the novelty of the Job Corps wore off and news events involving Job Corpsmen were relegated to the back pages of the newspapers.

However, some community relations problems persist. There are still towns where corpsmen are not welcome. And "incidents" continue to occur. Finally, there is the problem of the minority of dissatisfied former corpsmen who do not look kindly on their past experiences. Perhaps the fairest characterization is that community relations, in the main, have become stabilized.

6. Additional use should be made of Job Corps facilities. During summer months, the facilities of the centers should be made available to disadvantaged children, including Neighborhood Youth Corps summer youth. Corpsmen can be used as tutors and camp counselors. Student teachers from public schools could be used in centers. This will not only provide an additional education resource for the Job Corps, but will also give the teachers-in-training a useful exposure in working with deprived young people.

PROGRAM COST ESTIMATES

The restructuring of the Job Corps discussed in this report will involve the following budget modifications:

The previous Administration proposed a 1970 budget of $280 million to continue the 1969 level of the Job Corps program providing for 35,000 man-years with 113 centers. A preliminary review of this budget yields some tentative conclusions as to ways by which we could make a major net reduction in the program and move toward the new program emphasis proposed. Our review suggests we can achieve a net reduction of $100 million in the budget from $280 to $180 million and still provide approximately $24 million to provide the new kinds of urban centers discussed earlier in this document. We would propose to achieve the reduction by taking the following actions:

1. Reduce the conservation center program by about two-thirds. This would reduce the number of centers from 82 to 32.

2. Reduce the urban men's and urban women's center by about one-third. This would result in a closing of 7 women's and 2 men's centers.

3. Using 1969 funds which probably will not be spent by June 30. OEO has already identified $5 million of this as available. We believe that this can be increased as action is initiated now to begin closing or phasing out centers as proposed above.

4. Reducing the overall average enrollee man-year cost for the enrollees remaining in conservation and urban centers.

Of the amount saved, approximately $24 million will be used to open new centers near or in urban areas that would tie urban centers into continuing manpower programs and services.

It is our preliminary estimate that we would be able to open about 30 such centers providing for approximately 4,600 enrollee man-years. By tying these centers into existing manpower programs and services in the urban areas in which they would be located, it is our estimate that the total average cost per enrollee man-year would be approximately $5,250 in contrast with the total Johnson budget enrollee man-year of $8,000. The difference in cost essentially reflects the training and support cost which would be provided through other manpower programs such as the Concentrated Employment Program.

ABM: A BIG MISTAKE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the President's support for deployment of an ABM system is deeply disappointing. I am hopeful that a concerted effort of education and discussion throughout the country and in the Congress will prevent the go-ahead for a wasteful project that will unleash a massive arms race without providing an appropriate gain in our national security.

There have been many excellent editorials written that expose the folly of "Safeguard" ABM. One such editorial appeared in Newsday, another in Forbes. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include these in the RECORD at this point:

[From Newsday magazine, Mar. 15, 1969]

THE SENTINEL DECISION

"There are two sides to every question," the wise man said.

"Yes," replied the fool, "and there are two sides to a sheet of flypaper. It makes no difference to anyone but the fly which side he parks on."

President Nixon has parked the country on the sticky side of the Sentinel controversy. He kept open the option of an annual review of his Sentinel decision, and it may indeed be possible one day to drop the whole project, with the nation only a few billion dollars poorer. It may, but there is precious little precedent in the history of nuclear weapons systems to suggest that such an occurrence is likely.

The President found grounds for proceeding with Sentinel, the anti-ballistic missile project, even though many eminent scientists dispute whether it will work, even though the nation is far ahead of the Soviet Union in its stock of deliverable atomic warheads, and even though shaky calculations of the potential Chinese missile threat and Peking's suicidal intentions were required to justify the project.

If a case can be made for Sentinel under these tenuous circumstances, imagine the administration encountering a new set of facts which will require its abandonment.

"There is a kind of mad momentum intrinsic to the development of all new nuclear weaponry," Robert S. McNamara said in 1967, when he reluctantly announced the decision to go ahead with Sentinel. "If a weapon system works—and works well—there is strong pressure from many directions to produce and deploy the weapon out of all proportion to the prudent level required."

COST WILL GO UP

With Sentinel, McNamara is being proved out in spades. One wrong decision made for the wrong reasons is being buttressed now by another wrong decision. Even though nobody knows whether the system will prove effective, it will cost an estimated $6 to $7 billion. Further upward adjustments will unquestionably occur as the bids of the defense contractors are re-negotiated, and as McNamara's "mad momentum" expands the system. Keep in mind that almost every previous system has cost more than its original estimates.

It is, of course, good news that Sentinel, if funded by Congress, would be pulled away from the cities and deployed at missile bases on the Great Plains. But the ease with which a new justification has been found to match this forced migration suggests that the desire for Sentinel has come first, the reasons for financing and deploying it second.

Nixon asserted, for example, that the Sentinel deployment would defend "the American people against the kind of nuclear attack which Communist China is likely to be able to mount within a decade." Six months ago, this same Chinese threat was said by the Johnson administration to mandate location of the Sentinel in the suburbs.

The old Sentinel system, according to the President, could have been interpreted as a first-step toward a "thick" anti-Soviet system. Indeed it could have. But so can the new plan. It is, if anything, even more open-ended: "It will be implemented not according to some fixed, theoretical schedule, but in a manner clearly related to our periodical analysis of the threat." The language is supposed to be a concession to the possibility of arms control but it sounds more like an ABM building permit.

The greatest pessimism seems warranted in the effect the Sentinel plan will have on the possibility of arms control. "It is not provocative," Nixon said of his decision. Yet it is more provocative by far than a decision to build no new missiles at all. And coming one day after Senate ratification of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, the Sentinel decision can hardly be viewed as a consistent approach to arms control.

Through the treaty, we are asking most of the world to forego nuclear weapons entirely. With the Sentinel decision, we are saying that nuclear self-restraint is solely for lesser powers.

The battle on Sentinel funding in Congress will be hard and bitter. President Nixon probably picked up some votes with the presentation of his decision yesterday. He stated his case concisely, but we still believe arguments against Sentinel are more convincing than the arguments for it. The present U.S. nuclear arsenal is more than sufficient for the President to enter arms talks with the Russians from a position of strength. Congress, therefore, should shoot down Sentinel once and for all.

[From Forbes Magazine, Apr. 1, 1969]

FACT AND COMMENT: NIXON'S ABM STANCE

The only encouraging thing about President Nixon's Antiballistic Missile "decision" is his vow to re-examine it every 12 months.

I remember well a few years ago when all the complexions of the Biggies in The Complex grew rosy describing how wonderful the Nike X missile was going to be. It never got done, at a saving of multiple billions of dollars, and if it had, it wouldn't today be worth doodley.

Apparently we can keep up with the ABM art without turning theories into hardware that's obsolete before the concrete gets poured.

THE RAGGED NONDEBATE ON THE ABM

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, discussion and debate should clarify complex issues. Such an issue is the anti-ballistic-missile project. But the discussion and debate swirling around this project seems to be making less achievable a clear understanding. The project seems engulfed by its proponents and opponents in inconsistencies, overstatements and positions generating more heat than light. At this point in time, it seems to me, the arguments for and the arguments against each merit that old Scot verdict, "Not proved." I insert an article from the Washington Post of April 4, 1969, at this point in my remarks to illustrate my observations, and also an editorial that appeared in today's edition of the Wall Street Journal.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 4, 1969]

THE RAGGED NONDEBATE ON THE ABM

(By Meg Greenfield)

The other day when he was testifying on the ABM before Senator Gore's subcommittee, Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard read a couple of pages of prepared testimony into the record on the "terrifying defects" of the so-called doomsday machine strategy. That is the nuclear strategy which calls for an automatic response on warning of the approach of enemy missiles, so that we (or the Russians) could be counted on to launch a nuclear response to evidence sensed by radar of an attack—partial, total, calculated or accidental.

Whatever potential for deterrence such a willy-nilly strategy would have, its potential for disaster seemed so much greater that it has long since been consigned to the policy junkheap, Herman Kahn himself having helped dispatch it in his 1960 treatise, "On Thermonuclear War." Launch-on-warning (as variations of this strategy are known) has the principal defects of removing whatever control a President may exercise over the military response to an enemy threat of any proportion or any degree of certainty, and it also increases the danger that nuclear war will result from any of the nerve-wracking, confused, fast-moving crises around the world in which we seem all too often to be involved. It is, in short, a form of massive retaliation lacking even the elements of control and restraint with which John Foster Dulles hedged that earlier policy ("by means and at places of our choosing").

The reason Mr. Packard found it appropriate to restate the ancient case against the automatic nuclear response is that—incredibly—it has gained favor with some of those Senators who are leading the fight against the deployment of the ABM, having occasionally been espoused, it would seem, on the spur of the moment by reason of its surface attractions. Thus, in the course of the same hearing, Senator Fulbright himself joined up: "It would seem to me the assurance, the knowledge that these ICBMs, even part of them, would be released immediately without any fiddling around about it, even without asking the computer what to do, they would be very quick on that, it would be the greatest deterrence in the world." The Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee had publicly arrived at this position a few minutes earlier, owing—he said—in part to his discovery in the hearings that our nuclear missiles, once fired could be called off (destroyed). The hearing then went on to other things. There was no evidence that Senator Fulbright had paused to consider either the possibility of technical failure or of an immediate Soviet reaction or any of the other nightmare possibilities that sprang to mind as he transformed this bit of information into a pillar of newly adopted policy. For the moment, anyhow, that was the end of it.

The episode is of importance to the degree that it characterizes what is askew in the current debate, both in the Nation at large and—more particularly—in Congress. In the weeks that have passed since the President announced his ABM decision in careful language that required elaboration and explanation, the Administration has so far failed to make its case persuasively. Its testimony, especially the oversimple, fright-peddling argumentation of Secretary Laird. has if anything tended to undermine the position originally outlined by the President. But that is only part of it. Another reason the Administration has yet to make its case is that it has not been obliged to do so by the system's opponents, many of whom are as breathtakingly playful and irresponsible in their arguments as Secretary Laird—with the result that the case *against* the deployment has not been cogently made yet either. It has not been a particularly rewarding or illuminating time for those who had hoped for an informative and even conclusive debate.

There are a number of circumstances which necessarily contribute to the disappointing quality of our recurrent public arguments over nuclear weaponry. One is that those authorized as watchdogs of the military on the Hill have failed spectacularly to exercise the responsibility that goes with their expertise, so that the job of oversight is left—if anywhere—to those legislators whose animosity toward the military and its programs far exceeds their knowledge about either. But nuclear technology and strategy are infinitely complicated matters, requiring more than casual study if Pentagon doctrine is to be challenged seriously. Beyond that there is the simple horror of the subject matter, which quite naturally inspires a frequent desperate sense that it ought not even to be "debated" at all, but rather inveighed against and denounced.

Finally, there is the fact that what advances have been made in the past several years toward gaining at least a modicum of control over our nuclear weapons and toward creating a strategic situation less likely than those of the past to encourage either foolhardy confidence or dangerous panic on the part of either of the great nuclear powers, are easily reducible to surface absurdity and susceptible of being distorted for the sake of seeming to score a telling point. More than one critic of the President's decision in recent days has made great fun of the Administration's desire to protect its "weapons" as distinct from its "people," for example, or has deplored its apparent lack of interest in the protection of our cities—and those arguing back the whole theory of the lesser provocation of maintaining retaliatory or second-strike weapons while leaving the cities "hostage" as an earnest of our disinclination to initiate a nuclear war know exactly what kind of hearing they are likely to get. For some of the more important critics of the ABM have been unable to resist the implication that those they are opposing somehow favor nuclear holocaust (or anyway don't much mind the prospect) or to resist the temptation to convert their own unfamiliarity with the subject at hand into a seeming virtue or to forego the easy, crowd-pleasing joke. That may prove true even when the witness is also a critic, but one who doesn't think along the same lines. Consider a moment in the appearance of Wolfgang Panofsky, the Stanford physicist, who provided perhaps the most cogent testimony against the new deployment plan. Dr. Panofsky argued that neither the present technology of the system nor the amount of intelligence suggesting a new and revised danger from the Soviets justified going ahead with the ABM at the present time. But he did, at the same time, uphold the theory purportedly behind the Nixon Administration's move—namely, the relative merit of trying to create a situation in which neither side felt its capacity to strike back was endangered to the degree that would encourage it, under threat or pressure, to strike first. Senator Fulbright professed himself confused by this:

"If the assumption is a second strike, well that means you can completely control that without even having a force because if you are not going to strike them and they have only second strike there is never any occasion for a second strike, or is logic completely irrelevant to these scientific matters?" (*Laughter*)

Laughter may be the operative word: the smirk seems a favored substitute for reason in much of the attack. In the ABM debate, as in most fierce debates that take place in a congressional setting with everyone entitled to equal time, there has been a tendency not just on the part of the proponents but also on the part of the opponents to undermine their own position by an unselective and undisciplined approach to argument.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 14, 1969]

The Quality of the ABM Debate

In principle the current public debate over antiballistic missiles is an altogether healthy development; too many similar decisions have been made in the past without such an airing. In practice, however, the quality of the ABM debate so far has been more on the sick side.

Both the ABM's proponents in the Pentagon and its opponents in the Senate have been playing in different ways on the publics' natural fear of nuclear war. Both have been confusing the issues rather than elaborating a cogent strategic posture. Both, if this debate is going to get back on the track, will need to agree on a few fundamentals, and to start crediting the other with such agreement.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird contends, for example, that there's "no question" the Soviet Union is striving for "first-strike" missile capability. That is, the Soviets are calculating and building the number of missiles they need to so utterly destroy the United States it cannot even retaliate. Since it's hard to see any other reason why they would want such a system, the inevitable implication is that the Soviets are some kind of madmen lusting to push the button at their first safe opportunity.

This is far too simple-minded to be at all persuasive; it does not jibe with what has been observed about Soviet behavior since Stalin. For that matter, we doubt that the hawks in the Kremlin even think in such terms as "first strike" or "assured destruction." We suspect that their moving principle is nearer to "the more the better," which of course is plenty frightening enough, but shows a lack of sophistication, not of sanity.

The disturbing thing about Secretary Laird's comments, indeed, is that they suggest the Pentagon's view is none too sophisticated either. President Nixon did far better in his explanation of the decision for a limited ABM deployment. He stressed that this system is intended chiefly to protect our retaliatory capacity, and suggested that therefore it's possible to view it as a stabilizing factor in the arms race. In this view, it maintains and solidifies the strategic balance in which both sides can retaliate, but neither can attack the other without being destroyed in turn.

A massive ABM system with the capacity to defend cities, on the other hand, could prove destabilizing by tending to neutralize the other side's second-strike capability. If we deploy a limited system there will be inevitable pressures to expand it into a thick one. To resist this expensive and possibly dangerous development, the nation will need the clearest possible grip on the rationale for the original deployment. Secretary Laird's scare-talk is hardly reassuring in this regard.

The other side of the debate has been no better. At one point in the Senate hearings, the opponents argued that since an incoming missile gives only about 15 minutes' warning, the ABM's nuclear missiles might have to be fired at the discretion of a relatively junior military officer. After thus establishing that the ABM was dangerous, they proceeded to demonstrate it was also unnecessary. The reason: When we detected an incoming missile strike, we could immediately launch our entire retaliatory force before the enemy warheads struck.

The crux of the opponents' case so far has not been an attempt to understand strategic reality, but the denunciation of war, armaments, nuclear devastation, the military-industrial complex, the arms race and the extinction of mankind. The implication has been that anyone who favors the ABM also favors all these things. In particular, there has been an implication that those who support the ABM automatically oppose arms control agreements with the Soviets.

It has always seemed to us, though, that the Soviets' apparent interest in possible agreements arises precisely from recognition that we will counteract their deployments, and that therefore the arms race involves a lot of expense with no net gain in security. They have already deployed a limited ABM system around Moscow, and the Administration presumably reasons that a credible start on our own system would drive home the point.

One can doubt that an ABM is in any sense essential to such a lesson, or even helpful enough to be worth the expense. The Administration nonetheless does have arms control agreements very much in mind. Starting an ABM system may or may not help negotiations. But as the restrained comments in the Soviet press indicate, there's no substance to the impression that it would automatically preclude them.

With such confusion stemming from both sides, the whole debate needs to reroot itself in some fundamentals. As a start: Our objective is to reach a solid arms control agreement with the Soviet Union. There may be room for debate over what part an ABM might play, but our general strategic posture should be designed to promote the kind of balance in which both sides might find such an agreement possible.

MY AMERICA

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride in a young lady of my district that I take this opportunity to share with the readers of the RECORD an essay which she recently wrote, and for which she won first place.

Gail Kitchens entered "My America" in a contest sponsored by the Elks Lodge No. 847 of Elizabethton, Tenn.—this outstanding work deserves such recognition, and I am happy to make it available:

My America

(By Gail Kitchens)

What is my America?
It is a country that is more than land or sea.
One that means so much more to me.
One that is vast and ere so wide,
From beautiful lakes to mountain sides.
My America is yet somehow small and warm.
Protecting each of us from all harm.
It is strong with a battle cry.
It is honest and true, no need to lie.
My America with all of its sparkling streams,
Exists on everyone's hopes and dreams.

My America may not be perfect, yet to me it is the greatest country anywhere. Do you agree?

My America is many things. It is a vast land. It stretches from one ocean to another, covering about 3,628,130 square miles. It is divided into fifty separate states; each very proud of itself, yet each building and strengthening America into the greatest country ever.

This land is among the most fertile of the world. Not only is it fertile for food production, but also in industrial riches. America has more potential wealth in her land than any other nation. Her putting it to better use and using it wisely, keeps her number one.

We are a nation with economic growth. We measure up very well to the world's yardstick. America is opportunity. Still though opportunity knocks quite loud, it is not about to break any doors down. The opportunity is here, but you must be willing to seize it, and use it for all of its potential.

We are a nation with culture. Painters, writers and other artists flourish here, and gently mold America into a calmer, more sophisticated nation.

Though she still likes to work hard and get dirt under her fingernails, she knows how to step back and take her position as queen of the world.

Defense-wise, we are the strongest. No other nation has the power nor the ability we have. We help and protect not only ourselves but smaller nations in need. We give in defense and receive in kindness, for this is the American way.

America is the melting pot of the world. All colors, races, creeds, and religions are found in this huge nation. Though somehow, the color doesn't matter a lot here. We are one kind, Americans, united in like causes. We all search for answers to like problems, the answers are freely shared by all. The rich, the poor, the inbetween all are here together. The difference doesn't mean much. My America was founded because of a difference.

Through our gates pass many foreign people each year. They are given the title of immigrants, but the Americans give them the name of friend. We accept people from any and everywhere. This open arm policy makes friends and friends multiply.

A heritage is much alive in my America. One of which we are aware and proud. The thundering hoofbeats of Paul Revere's horse, and the cry of liberty can still be heard. The blood of the wounded and the smiles of the victors can still be seen. It is a heritage that we have fought hard for and gained. We don't plan on losing it for some while.

America is more. It is a flag which speaks of the wars we've fought to gain our independance. It is an anthem which tells of how we have kept fighting for it. It is a coat of arms which stands for our strong nation. And then, it is a motto which shows that though we are strong, we are still meek in the eyes of God.

More than anything else, America is a hope. A hope of those here and those that wish to be. A hope that is renewed each time we repeat the Pledge of Allegiance. A hope that maybe someday, someway these words that we are saying will be the truth. That we will truly be one nation, indivisible. That we will be a nation in which truth, honesty, and justice rank high. Yes, this is a hope of a perfect nation. A hope of the future, but with a past that makes it worth all we must pay.

My America means so much and has so much from the Statue of Liberty to the redwood forests. It is huge and strong, and still gentle and close. It is the firecrackers on the Fourth of July, Christmas bells ringing. It is children running and laughing freely. It is my America, forever beautiful. May I always live here.

WARTIME HERO, PEACETIME PRESIDENT

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a tyrant is one who demands respect. A statesman is one who commands respect, but a great man earns respect.

One such man, who earned the respect of all who knew him, was Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

He was truly one of our country's greatest Americans and the respect that he earned was worldwide, from both his friends and foes alike. He lived his life among the great people of his time and yet, prior to the time of his death when he selected his burial site, he requested that he be laid to rest in the town where he spent his boyhood, Abilene, Kans.

He loved his country, his family, and people from all walks of life, and he never forgot his beginnings as humble as they were.

Much has been written and spoken about the admiration and respect the American people had for General Eisenhower, and this is true because year after year even following his retirement from active public service he was selected in poll after poll as one of the most admired Americans and one of the most respected men throughout the world.

As for me, I feel indeed fortunate to have had the opportunity of not only seeing General Eisenhower, but meeting and talking to him on a number of occasions. I first met the general when I was a second lieutenant with the 90th Infantry Division in England, just prior to the D-day invasion where I served as a courier instructed to deliver certain information to him regarding division deployment in connection with "Overlord," the overall plan for the invasion of Normandy.

I remember him well, although I only saw him two times in May and June of 1944, because many of us who would shortly land in France were deeply concerned about our futures. Despite the great problems and worry that were on his shoulders, he remained cheerful, but most of all humble, courteous, and unusually friendly to me even though I was only a second lieutenant and he was a general charged with winning the largest war in history.

I had seen him several times after that, but my next personal meeting with him was at the White House in 1955 when I was requested to be the Republican nominee for Congress from the old Sixth Congressional District following the death of Dwight Rogers.

Here again, my meeting with President Eisenhower was unusual because he was the President and I the candidate for Congress, and despite the fact that he had the problems of the world confronting him, he spent more than an hour in conversation with me at the White House. I might add that it was one of the most pleasant hours spent in my lifetime.

The fact that he had become President had not changed him and to me he was the same, quick-smiling "Ike" that he had always been.

The final time I personally saw General Eisenhower was about a year ago and then I had been elected to the U.S. Congress and he was retired with his lovely wife, Mamie, in Gettysburg. A group of us had lunch with him and I was still impressed by his quick wit and charm, but what stood out in my mind was that Ike was still the kind, humble person he had always been.

General Eisenhower had a great influence on many people and in his quiet but firm manner, he instilled confidence in the American people. He gave us the feeling of pride in being part of this great Nation.

His record as a military leader cannot be questioned and his ability to unify our allies into one smoothly run unit during the invasion of Europe will go down as one of the most superb military maneuvers in history. But even while he was noted as commander of the greatest expeditionary forces ever to be assembled, General Eisenhower was respected as a peacemaker.

He was never one to believe in retribution, thus following World War II Europe was nurtured and rebuilt and once again joined in the brotherhood of free nations.

As a military man, he lent his efforts to ending the bloody conflict in Korea and from that time forward, no American boys were killed in battle while he served America as President.

He accepted his share of criticism while President, but I feel much of it was undeserved. A look at his record shows great accomplishment, for instance, the largest roadbuilding program in the history of any nation was inaugurated; he ended inflation; provided medical care for the aged; added two new States to the Union; created the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; advocated and built the St. Lawrence Seaway; sought to balance the budget; initiated the American space program; conceived and advocated the need for strong ballistic missiles as a preventive to war; extended social security benefits to an additional 10 million Americans; and worked to contain the spread of communism and to generate good will among our allies.

Some say the Eisenhower years in the White House were boring, but it seems that it is nice to be bored to the extent that during those years there was no civil strife and no militant threats by certain groups to destroy life and property; and disrupt our colleges. There was peace with prosperity and the threat of communism was merely talk for we were militarily strong.

Dwight D. Eisenhower is to me a great and compassionate man, and truly a great American and now we as fellow Americans can best show our respect for him by rededicating ourselves to accepting our responsibilities as Americans as he did.

To do this we must stop being afraid to fight for what is right for our country. We should be proud to get a lump in our throats when we hear the "Star-Spangled Banner" and look to our flag. We should recognize that appeasement is a step backward into the road of national destruction.

We should accept national pride in relationship to the true greatness of our Nation dedicated to the principles of the golden rule instead of the rule of gold. We should recognize that those who strive to divide us are the enemies of our Nation.

General Eisenhower was a brave American and a good soldier. He made mistakes because he was human, but no one can honestly doubt his dedication to his fellow Americans. It is men like General Eisenhower that gave our country the proud heritage and courage to become the strongest people and the greatest Nation on earth.

To dedicate ourselves to our country as General Eisenhower did will insure our greatness in history.

AIR POLLUTION AMERICA'S "CARBUNCLE"

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I. W. Abel, president of America's steelworkers, and Mayor John B. Nicosia, of East Chicago, Ind., are pioneer fighters for the cause of fresh air.

I submit excerpts from President Abel's and Mayor Nicosia's remarks on anti-air pollution before steelworker delegates from 20 States, made at the National Conference on Air Pollution held in Washington, D.C., 2 weeks ago.

Excerpts from a newspaper account of President Abel's remarks follow:

> The industries of America, President Abel told the conference, "must accept a greater responsibility for the public welfare even though it cannot be measured in terms of profits." He declared that since 1951 the steel industry spent just over $19-million a year on what it termed "non-revenue producing equipment." The public pays for much of this research and development and cost of abatement facilities in the form of tax credits and grants to industry, he added.
>
> Speaking directly to the alleged economic issue often raised by some industry spokesmen, Mr. Abel emphasized that "the enforcement of emission standards will not cause economic ruin or relocation, since they will be based upon technological feasibility." He cautioned USWA members not to be swayed by arguments that say "to have industry and jobs we must have pollution."
>
> Mr. Abel addressed to both industry and state and local government, saying "we refuse to be the buffer between positive pollution control activity by the community and resistance by industry." Quoting Sen. Edmund Muskie, he added that implementation of the Air Quality Act as "a responsibility of state and local government today must not and will not be permitted to mean what it did years ago—a way of effectively killing public action in a problem area."
>
> Underscoring his contention that a wealthy metal mining and manufacturing industry can do more and spend more in air polution control, conference participants "hit the floor" to relate experiences of emission conditions and health hazards, smelters, open pit and underground mines.

Mayor Nicosia has been devoting his professional experience as a physician to the fight against air pollution for years in the Indiana industrial Calumet region. Excerpts from a newspaper comment on his speech follow:

> A case history of concerned community response was related to a luncheon meeting of the conference by Mayor John B. Nicosia of East Chicago, Ind., who was elected to office six years ago on the "clean air" issue in a city long associated with industrial pollution. Dr. Nicosia, a physician who entered politics after witnessing the effects of dirty air in the lungs of his patients, said that Youngstown Sheet & Tube and Inland Steel facilities in East Chicago will have spent $60-million by 1973 in control devices and implementation. Their response came only after concerted citizen action in the political sector, he said.

WELFARE UNION BOSSES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as taxpayers threaten a tax revolt against the inequities of the income tax laws, welfare recipients are financing a union to lobby against the already overburdened taxpayer.

I include a General Features Corp., article from the Sun-Sentinel of Pompano Beach, Fla., for March 24, as follows:

HIGH-LIVING WELFARE UNION MEN ARE EATING YOUR TAX DOLLARS

> Welfare recipients have now formed their own union—the National Welfare Rights Organizations (NWRO). In 45 states, 30,000 families are taking part of their welfare checks to pay dues to this union so they can hire lobbyists in Washington, D.C., to lobby for more something-for-nothing.
>
> As with most such organizations, poor people pay the bills so that the leaders can live mighty comfortably.
>
> Last February, 54 members of the "national co-ordinating committee" for this outfit held a convention in Jackson, Miss. They converged by jet from all sections of the country, to wine, dine and convene at a downtown hotel.
>
> Jackson News Editor James Ward, intrigued by the way 20- and 100-dollar bills were free-flowing around this poor people's gathering, invited himself to interview some of the delegates.
>
> "Do you have any idea what that aged U.S. prime steak you're eating is costing?"
>
> "I don't know and I don't care!"
>
> Not all delegates feasted so conspicuously but hotel records show there was some high-on-the-hog room service delivered to delegates that weekend.
>
> Normally it would be none of our business, yours and mine, how these delegates comport themselves privately—except that you and I are buying those steaks.
>
> We tax ourselves mercilessly in a conscientious effort to help the deserving poor and too frequently they get beans while the undeserving get steak.
>
> NWRO delegates said they had summoned this national convention "to develop strategy for dealing with the Nixon administration."
>
> The convention adopted resolutions demanding a guaranteed annual income.
>
> We have "the right to live," Chairman Johnnie Tillmon said frequently.
>
> The NWRO also voted to boycott Sears stores nationwide "because that chain does not extend credit to welfare recipients."
>
> The NWRO also demanded other fringe benefits, including special clothing, basic household furnishings, and so forth.
>
> "Present welfare assistance is destructive of dignity." They want to make it dignified.
>
> "Instead of forcing welfare recipients to work," the NWRO resolution said, the Nixon administration should guarantee every family $7,000 a year whether it works or not.
>
> And if that isn't enough to rot your socks, Second Vice Chairman Mrs. Bruce Sanders was asked:
>
> "If all 50 million persons you say are eligible for membership in the NWRO should join, what would your organization do?"
>
> "Then," she said, "you might have to come to us for jobs."
>
> "Welfare is a human right, a social right, a right under law," say these professional parasites.
>
> They say they have a "right" to your money and they demand it.

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE: POLITICAL ALBATROSS AROUND AMERICA'S NECK

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, a nation is only as strong and viable as its institutions. This is particularly the case in a republic resting upon democratic principles, for only the will of its people and their belief in their Government and institutions maintain the stability of society. Upon such bedrock has our Nation rested.

In our Nation, the Constitution has been both shaper and preserver of these institutions. Its flexibility has allowed us to reshape those institutions in order to reflect the evolution of our Nation and needs of its people. Only in this manner have we survived and grown. Constitutional amendments have been vehicles for constructive change, and constitutional change is what is demanded today if the will of the people is to be adhered to rather than thwarted.

Our formal electoral process has a kink in it at the very end in the form of the electoral college. Long ago the need for reform of this portion of the system was proven, and a call for abolition of the electoral college was sounded. Its replacement would be direct election of the President and Vice President by the people themselves. To delay reform or dilute its pure form in this case would be denying the will of the people, abrogating our responsibility as legislators and abandoning America to vagaries of future events.

Our last national election showed that the will of our people could be thwarted because of this constitutional anachronism. In a period of national frustration the voice of hatred and bigotry appealed to many, spotlighting in the process the danger we face during every national election. For a time George Wallace was a name to conjure and reckon with in every political equation. He could have denied the majority of the American people their choice for national office, opening up the dark closet of shadowy dealings in return for his favor. We must avoid repetition of this in the future. We can avoid it by passage of a measure providing for direct election of President and Vice President by the people. I have already introduced this measure in the House.

Mr. Nixon has put forth his own electoral reform proposal, which I find wanting and an evasion of our problem. It would not provide for direct election of our national leaders. Nor would it provide a changing, growing, urban-oriented nation the political and institutional change it so overwhelmingly demands. To deny our people this right is to stand like a rock in the middle of the high road to political evolution and avoidance of electoral chaos. Our only real choice is to give power back to the people, where it belongs.

Our Federal principle enshrines the will of the people, finding its supreme expression in their choice of their own leaders. To deny them the fullest form of such a supreme right is to make a mockery of principles this Nation was founded and rests upon. It calls into question the validity and meaning of our system of government in the eyes of an increasingly aware electorate.

America has evolved to the point where the will of its people must be served by passage of simple, basic reform. The Constitution was created in less than 100 working days. Is it beyond the Congress to abolish the electoral college in one session of Congress?

Now is not a time for obfuscation, delay, and weak excuses. Nor is it a time for half measures. We are either going to act, abolish the electoral college and politically emasculate America's George Wallaces, present and future, or we shall continue to trip gaily along the brink of the abyss. A meaningful, succinct amendment has been offered. The people are with us. Delay is inexcusable. Let us act.

A NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL POLICY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee in cosponsoring a bill to set forth a congressional statement of national educational policy and to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate a comprehensive study of the appropriate implementation of this policy. This policy simply and directly puts forth that—

> The Congress reaffirms as a matter of highest priority the Nation's goal of educational opportunity for all of its citizens. That Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States of America that every citizen is entitled to an education of high quality from appropriate preschool levels through graduate school without financial barriers and limited only by the desire to learn and ability to absorb such education. Our nation's economic, political, and social security demands no less.

It is time to recognize that the education of America's people is an essential national resource which is entitled to the commitment of our national financial resources to its development, growth, and improvement.

It is an especially appropriate time to reaffirm and broaden our commitment to education. These are troubled times for education. We face both actual and threatened elementary and secondary school closings because of lack of funds all across the country. Daily we read about disturbances on our college campuses.

In the face of confusing and threatening student actions it is very tempting to turn against the processes and institutions of education itself. But that to me seems far too simple an answer for those who truly care about the future of this country.

So much emotionalism has been interjected into the education issue that I thing it is time that we isolated ourselves from the sensationalism of a few extremist groups and go back to the basics of what education really is. Webster's Dictionary defines education as "the process of training and developing the knowledge, skill, mind, character." If one accepts this definition, then by espousing our support for education we are endorsing special things.

One is the right to knowledge—the right to know. There is a vast store of human knowledge, of accumulated wisdom, that is today inaccessible to millions of American children because they lack an adequate educational system.

Education should also develop skills; yet many of our young people today challenge the relevancy of the skills they are taught, and justly so. Technology is changing so rapidly that if we teach yesterday's honored professions we will be raising a generation unprepared for tomorrow, with nothing to contribute to the future. I remember vividly the demise of the American farmer; and I remember that our educational system was not prepared to foresee that the children of a farm economy had to be trained to meet the job demands of an industrial and urbanized society of the future. Our young people today are in many ways ahead of us for they foresee that the skills they are being taught today will be outmoded tomorrow. If we are to ask of them that they develop skills to become productive workers, we must also assure them that their skills will truly be marketable when they enter the job market. This requires advance planning and most probably a recognition that with the fast pace of technological advances today education does not end once a man begins his life's work but is a continuing process throughout his lifetime.

Another aspect of the educational process should be the development and training of the mind. When teachers successfully awaken a child's mind they are training the child to ask questions. Most parents eagerly await the stage in a young child's life when he begins to ask why—why is the grass green, why do airplanes fly; why can I not fly; and on and on. Youngsters at that age question everything. Yet when the same characteristic in the young child leads the adolescent to question all the basic premises we accept, it is frightening to many; but it should not be.

Development of a child's mind is a necessary process of growth. If a child's mind is never challenged, he will never have an adult understanding of our society. None of us want that for our children. We want them to think, to apply their minds, to put together their skills and knowledge to make adult decisions in their lives. This they can do only if the educational process has succeeded in developing their character.

Yet the role of education in character development is where our national commitment to education is facing the gravest dangers. If I read the pulse of the Nation correctly, there is an ever-growing feeling that our schools are turning out a generation of young people who have no character at all or whose character is warped beyond our comprehension. We read about students who are not hesitant about the use of violence, who do not respect the right of the majority of students to attend classes even though there is a campus demonstration in progress, who totally disregard another person's right of free speech unless they agreee with what he is saying.

The reaction to news stories of campus disturbances indicates the importance we place on the role of character development in education. In response to student demonstrations, taxpayers are refusing to pass bond issues necessary to keep local schools open, State legislatures are cutting education budgets, and Federal aid to education is facing strong opposition.

If it were any aspect of education other than character development that was viewed as being inadequate we would be reacting quite differently. When we were made aware that our educational system was totally failing to open up the accumulated knowledge of the past to millions of disadvantaged children, we responded with mass Federal compensatory education programs. When we discovered that our schools were turning out young people with no skills that would enable them to enter the job market, we responded with manpower training programs and a new emphasis on vocational training. When, with the orbit of sputnik, we were shocked into realization that our educational system was failing to develop the numbers of Americans capable of providing the scientific research that modern technology demanded, we responded with massive aid to scientific education.

Our present educational crisis cuts to the very core of what education is all about. It is essential that we respond to this challenge as we have to earlier challenges. We did not close our schools when we came face to face with failure in our educational system before; we should not do so now.

If we do not let the actions of a few extremists cloud our view I think that we can respond in a constructive way. The average student is only pointing to failures in our educational system that call for correction—not a rejection of the entire educational process. If universities are becoming impersonal multiversities, then the solution lies in a more personal and individualized environment for students. If universities are failing to provide equal opportunities for learning to the poor and to minority groups, then the solution is an equalization of access to education. If universities are failing to offer courses that will be relevant once a student enters the job market, then the solution is curriculum revision.

Though we have enacted a number of Federal aid to education programs at the elementary, secondary, and college levels, it is now time for the Congress to make an honest and straightforward affirmation of our recognition of the high priority which must be given to a truly meaningful Federal effort in financing education.

FROM SILENT BLACKMAIL TO OPEN ULTIMATUM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, our diplomats and leaders seem undecided over any new policy to achieve peace in South Vietnam.

It is almost as if there is one party missing from the peace table talks in Paris—the most important party—that party being the great majority of American people. For despite repeated efforts by the propagandists to condition the minds of the American people they have rejected anesthetization and over the one route to peace that has never been explored.

Our leaders, as if defeat is an American trait, find offensive any mention of pursuing the war to victory should the North Vietnamese and their Red allies not immediately sit down at the negotiation table. The United States has lost no war—we have never yet allowed our troops to start a war.

Why should the Communists be any more willing to talk peace today than a month ago, a year ago or 5 years ago? Their precedent is experience. The longer they wait, the more concessions they achieve and the more help they receive from the Cong within our country. The Communist's goals are known as are ours—but ours never is victory. A new position on Vietnam is required. Why should not our leaders announce that we are going all out for peace by victory—ordering our military leaders to prepare a military plan for an all-out military victory?

Which plan offers the greater inducement—a no-win policy proven wrong—or a plan for victory to bring Ho to the peace table in earnest.

Our most powerful weapon for peace is an official announcement that we are out to win.

I have just received a position paper from a retired foreign diplomat whose life and liberty, like ours in the United States, depends upon our leadership in the free world. I insert the paper by Mr. Z. A. Rust entitled "From Silent Blackmail to Open Ultimatum" and a news

article from the April 2 Manchester Union Leader in the Record, and I commend them to all colleagues who seek a new policy for settling the Vietnam situation.

The material follows:

From Silent Blackmail to Open Ultimatum

(By Z. A. Rust)

"I do not believe a military victory is possible for either side in the Vietnam War", declared Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge in a recent Press conference, echoing identical statements from every responsible U.S. past and present authorities, from President Johnson, Secretaries McNamara, Rusk and Clifford to President Nixon, and Secretaries Laird and Rogers.

It would be difficult to cram more perversion of truth in less words and this in a question of such vital importance not only for the United States but also for what is still called the Free World.

The Vietnam War could have been easily won and could still be won by the United States and their allies if, following a classical blue-print, under the protection of all the naval and air forces available in the Pacific area, one would have carried out a massive landing operation just north of the Demilitarized Zone, joining force across North-Vietnam territory with embattled Laos and menaced Thailand, mobilizing also the 600,000 Chang Kai-shek's hardened troops, in case of some funny Mao's move. This military feat, if executed not with the microscope optics of some Harvard professor but with the sweeping vision of a MacArthur, could have given and could give the Civilized World also the opportunity to atone for the deadly sin committed against the Chinese people when 700 millions of them were delivered to the Nameless Beast by a U.S. Administration.

As for the victory of the North-Vietnam enemy, which will be the last battle of the Third World War and the victory of the Communist World, it is not only possible but imminent and unavoidable if a total change does not occur in the way and spirit with which civilian authorities in Washington have conducted this war until now.

It is, to our knowledge, the second time in the history of warfare—the first instance having been Korea—that armies have been sent to fight and die under strict orders not to win the war they were waging, orders given by the same authorities that affirm today that this war cannot be won. It is the second time only in the history of warfare that military activities are operated in the exact terms and in the strict limits dictated by the enemy, and that a long and cruel armed conflict was not honored with the name of war, war for the defense of the Motherland and of human liberty.

It is this well calculated omission which permits the vociferous crowds, the morons, the political noodles and the conspirators at home to give support and comfort to the enemy, leaving the fighting men on the battlefields without defense against their criminal activities. And it is those activities which permit the U.S. civilian authorities to invoke an allegedly irresistible public opposition to the continuation of the Vietnam War in order to prepare the capitulation meant to prove once for all—at the price of 34,000 young lives and 200,000 young men wounded or maimed—that even for such a powerful country as the United States "the risk of intervention against Communism is greater than the risk of nonintervention" . . . to quote the New York Times.

But even this allegation of an irresistible public opinion pressure is a flagrant distortion of truth. The number of patriots is much greater in the United States than that of defeatists, and any willing government could have found in them a giant adhesion for a victorious war. Despite the fact that every effort has been made to bring things to a point where it would not be possible to distinguish between the impatience of those who have set their heart upon a victory of Ho Chi Minh and the indignation of those who ask for an end to the betrayal of the U.S. fighting forces, the last Gallup investigation shows that 51% of the United States citizens are for victory in the Vietnam War and only 26% are prepared to accept withdrawal at any price. As for the unarticulated 27%, they would have been more vocal, to be sure, if they would have been otherwise informed and educated by their daily newspaper and the responsible authorities.

The following two episodes seem pointedly relevant.—Two years ago a delegation of mothers, wives and sisters of soldiers fighting in Vietnam presented themselves at the White House not for suggesting that their kin be brought home, but for asking that they be permitted to do the job for which it was supposed that they had been sent there. The delegation was not admitted, but detained at the gates while President Johnson was blowing off to safety from the back yard in a helicopter. Recently Mrs. Coretta King accompanied by a clergyman and a rabbi presented herself also at the gates of the White House in order to demand that the boys be brought back, that the Nonproliferation Treaty be promptly ratified, that the antimissile protecting system be not established in the United States, that the sentenced or detained draft-card burners, flag besoilers, and deserters be liberated, that Red China be recognized and, first of all, that a prompt end be put at whatever price to the Vietnam War, an agenda which could have been adopted by any ultimatum bringing Soviet Ambassador. They were received immediately by the second most important personality in the Nixon regime, by Mr. Henry Kissinger, and after a long interview they came out smiling and pleased declaring to the newspapermen who had followed them that they had been listened at "very, very respectfully".

The satisfaction of the defeatist delegation was legitimated enough. The fact is that two of their more important demands have already been satisfied: the Nonproliferation Treaty has been ratified by the United States Senate, depriving thereby the allies of the United States of any real possible defense against Soviet Russia outsized ambitions and "concentrating in the United States hands the dangerous responsibility of nuclear defense, instead of sharing it out among nations which are more directly interested in this defense than the United States themselves", nations which might have formed, if nuclearly armed, the first line of political and military defense of the threatened Free World.

As for the end of the Vietnam War, American people have been officially informed by Secretary Rogers that a program exists the nature of which the State Secretary has hinted transparently enough. The kept and well informed press, which is probably preparing the public opinion to the shock it is about to receive, mentions the following points: 1) withdrawal of 200,000 United States troops *before the elections of 1970*, 2) some more arm twisting of the Saigon Government to hurl it faster towards an understanding with the Communist enemy, an understanding which will eventually mean its death. Useless to observe that this new policy is in complete contradiction with President Nixon's statements in his opposition years and during his electoral campaign, but in perfect accord with Mr. Henry Kissinger's methods and recommendations as gathered from his books and articles.

Everything seems to have been taken into account, even the possibility of the enemy "launching a massive attack in the midst of the pulling back—intended to demonstrate that the U.S. have been licked—that could decimate Saigon's troops and inflict heavy casualties upon the remaining U.S. forces." This is a risk, we are told, that the Nixon administration is prepared to accept. "A prestige defeat would be small enough cost to pay," affirms one of the most widely spread and best informed organs of the defeatist press, adding that Mr. Henry Kissinger has been one of the concoctors of this radical program.

Several circumstances, besides Secretary Roger's intimations, give credit to this surprising announcement:

President Nixon has himself informed the press about the beginning of secret negotiations as a new feature of the Paris Conference, likely to bring favorable results. Secret negotiations have been held all along the Harriman era with far from positive results. The new feature therefore must be in some new and substantial concession which the U.S. is prepared to make besides reciprocal withdrawal, which North Vietnam has rejected with scorn, and besides even unilateral withdrawal which Hanoi is sure to get, thanks to the massively organized pressure of the liberal circles in the U.S.

Wanton and unjust attacks are launched against the Thieu-Ky Government, dismally reminiscent of those which prepared the betrayal of Chang Kai-shek.

A combined attack has been started in the Congress and the controlled press against the U.S. military, despite the obvious fact that generals, officers and soldiers have done in Vietnam their toilsome and heroic best within the unbelievable limitations imposed by the doctrinaires of the no-win war and of sacrosanct enemy sanctuaries. Attack on the military in wartime are more than often the precursory signs of an accepted defeat.

Defense Secretary Laird has informed the Senate that for motive of economy a curb will be put from June 1st on the bombing operations of the B–52, which he and General Abrams have declared was the most powerful instrument in the breaking of Communist offensives. It would be too horrible to believe that the Nixon administration would, for a few millions of dollars economy, consent to shed uselessly still more young American blood. This loudly proclaimed decision cannot be anything else, therefore, than the beginning of a deescalation which once started cannot be stopped anymore, as such a beginning will amount to a commitment towards Senate doves, liberal and peacenik groups and Harvard and Yale professors.

The probability of a somewhat camouflaged total surrender, as a result of the Paris public or secret negotiations, resides principally in the fact that those negotiations have been started, in their interminable length, and in the way they have been conducted until now by both the Harriman and Lodge delegations. Rebuffs after rebuffs, insolences after insolences, slaps after slaps have been accepted from the Ho Chi Minh gang, and after each of them the heads of the U.S. delegation or even the responsible members of the U.S. Government have expressed meekly their optimism and registered "some progress," in a way which irresistibly brings to our memory the never to be forgotten Khrushchev's utterance: "You spit in their face and they say it is dew."

Khrushchev knew what he was talking about.

What has been the end of World War II for the Western Powers has been for the Soviet Union—now that their only real enemy has been eliminated—the beginning of the struggle for universal domination heralded by Lenin a quarter of a century before. In this fateful encounter between two irreconcilable worlds, Soviet Russia had from the beginning proceeded from provocations to provocations, from outrages to outrages, from robberies to robberies, even before the silent nuclear blackmail had given her agents, planted in the Western organism, the pretext and the opportunity to prevent any reaction of the Western Governments except in the circumstances desired and provoked by the Kremlin itself, as in Korea and Vietnam.

All those insolent challenges, all those acts of brigandage have been accepted by the Western World with abject condescension—the Khrushchev dew. And even now, with a Soviet nuclear stronghold in Cuba, with a cruel war in Vietnam staged, fostered and armed by the Kremlin, with Communist adepts and stooges more active than ever in the universities, churches and courts, masters of the streets, and having wormed their way in the most influential positions, the American public, conditioned by a long preparation, is told by every official and press organs that the moment has never been more propitious for a detente and a rapproachment. He is told also that just one friendly gesture towards the Soviet Union just one more sacrifice would bring the Communist World, for good and all, on the side of collaboration, peace and justice.

The new sacrifices which are asked from the United States, after the ratification of the Nonproliferation Treaty, which has deprived their allies in Europe of the only significant modern weapon, are: 1) the abandon to Communist influence and domination of the United States friends and allies in the Far East, 2) the abandon of the idea of establishing an efficient anti-missile defense which could be interpreted by Moscow and Peking as an act of provocation.

Isolated and anesthetised, the American people will soon be ripe for the Open Ultimatum which this time will not be presented by Mrs. Coretta King and whose specifications would be still more to the point than those of her benevolent delegation. This ultimatum will not be addressed, as at the moment of the Suez affair, to two bumper states like France and Great Britain but, this time, directly to Washington.

It is a foreigner who is writing these lines, so that it belongs to others to decide if he is wrong or right in firmly believing that an awakening of the American people, the last hope of liberty lost or liberty endangered, is still possible before it discovers, like Gulliver, that although awakened it cannot move, and in believing that the choice is still open to the Nixon administration to be only the winner in the next elections or to be the leadership which saved the United States and the World from Communist slavery.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union-Leader, Apr. 2, 1969]

MARINE GENERAL TELLS HOW TO WIN VIET WAR

DONG HA, SOUTH VIETNAM.—A U.S. Marine general said yesterday allied troops could win the Vietnam war by attacking Communist bases in Laos and the southern fringes of North Vietnam.

"It makes no sense to watch 400 trucks a day moving through Laos with ammunition to kill Americans," said Maj. Gen. Raymond Davis, commander of the 3rd Marine Division.

"The quickest way to shorten this war is to destroy these sanctuaries," he said.

"I'm not trying to raise the ante. But we came here to assure the freedom of South Vietnam, and I don't think that can be accomplished with anything less than the defeat of the North Vietnamese army."

Davis, 54, leaves Vietnam April 14 to become commandant of Marine Corps schools in Quantico, Va.

In an interview with UPI Tuesday, Davis said allied forays into Laos and the southern end of North Vietnam would be more effective than a resumption of bombing against North Vietnam because the Communists had learned to live with the air raids.

"We could win the war with the same tactics the enemy uses. We could run across the Laotian border, destroy his supply depots and pull out," Davis said.

"We could grab a chunk of real estate north of the DMZ and tell him that's all we're going to take for now. Pretty soon he's going to get the picture."

Expanding on his advocacy of forays into Communist territory, Davis said: "If you were asked at the war college what tactics to use in Vietnam, and you answered that the enemy should be allowed to operate freely in Laotian and DMZ sanctuaries, you'd flunk the course."

PUBLIC SERVICE INSTITUTIONS MUST REMAIN IMMUNE FROM FISCAL STARVATION

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I note with dismay the fact that the Brooklyn Museum and Bedford-Stuyvesant branch of the Brooklyn Children's Museum are facing a proposed budget cut which will limit public access to their facilities. Again Brooklyn is the whipping boy of New York City.

The next budget of the city of New York, according to the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, contains a budget cut for these and other institutions of $450,000. The Botanical Gardens and Academy of Music are also faced with significant limitation of their public service as a result of the proposed fiscal cutback.

We are advised by the Brooklyn Museum that an adult and child admission fee is a definite possibility, and that the facility faces imposition of a limited schedule, including total closing for a 5-week summer period, when it is so useful. I am futher informed that virtually all public services performed by the Brooklyn Museum will have to be eliminated.

Once again we are faced with the spectacle of reversal of social priorities.

A museum complex is confronted with cutbacks, while other areas remain untouched by the budget paring knife. The quality of urban life is faced with further erosion because some gentlemen in the legislature and the mayor of New York City face backward socially rather than forward.

Lives of children will be culturally stunted if the threat becomes reality. Such a possibility is not to be contemplated with equanimity nor suffered in resignation.

I call upon the mayor of New York and the Governor to see to it that such appalling possibilities do not come to pass. If such actions are allowed to become public policy there will be no need to search diligently for the causes of urban decline and growth of social problems.

ELIZABETH AND TED COHEN: A DEDICATED HUMAN RELATIONS TEAM

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the friendship of Elizabeth and Ted Cohen is one of my richest possessions. They stand out as people with deep and positive concerns about their fellow men. As man and wife, they form a team that has brought rich rewards to our community and endeared them as a force for human betterment and growth. It was my great honor to be present at a recent breakfast at which this dedicated team received the coveted "Torch of Liberty Award," presented by the Cardozo Lodge and Chapter Division of the Anti-Defamation League. It was an inspirational moment; a moment to be shared with all. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by Mr. Cohen and Colonel Akst from that moving ceremony:

PRESENTATION OF HUMAN RELATIONS AWARD TO THEODORE AND ELIZABETH COHEN BY COL. PAUL AKST, SELECTIVE SERVICE DIRECTOR FOR THE CITY OF NEW YORK, MARCH 23, 1969, AT THE WALDORF ASTORIA

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mayor, Congressman Murphy, honored guests on the dais, and our most distinguished audience: I am deeply grateful and proud to have been called upon to assist in the presentation of the Human Relations Award of the Anti-Defamation League to my very dear friends, Elizabeth and Ted Cohen.

It has been my privilege to have known both of them for many long years. Additionally, it also has been my distinct pleasure to have been associated closely with Ted in the Selective Service System. It was only a few short years ago that I prevailed upon him to add to his already busy schedule and become a member of one of our local boards. It was not too long thereafter that, with his typical thorough, commanding, deliberate yet friendly and considerate manner, he was elected chairman of the local board, where he continues to serve to this day, performing in a superior and dedicated manner.

Without the generous, loyal and cheerful help of his lovely Elizabeth, I am sure his step would have slowed, his enthusiasm would have dampened, and I firmly believe his modesty and humility would have disappeared. They perfectly complement each other in a learned, accomplished and scholarly way. It is this capable and efficient team we are honoring here today.

It would be foolhardy—and well-nigh impossible—to honor one without the other. Each standing alone is fully deserving of this award.

The precociousness of Ted, was evidenced early in his native city of Nashville, Tennessee, where at the age of sixteen he served as President of the Junior Congregation of the Vine Street Temple.

Looking for greener pastures and more formidable game, Ted arrived in New York in 1938. Since then he has been actively engaged in many religious, civil, professional and charitable causes. To give you an idea of what he is presently doing would appear to me to be sufficient reason for this award. Today he is President of the Men's Club of Temple Emanu-El; President of the Manhattan-Bronx Regional Brotherhoods. He is a member of the Executive Board, Metropolitan Conference of Brotherhoods. He is a member of the Executive Committee of the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods. He is President of the Benjamin Cordozo Lodge of B'nai B'rith. He is on the Foreign Affairs and Civil Rights Committee of the Anti-Defamation League. I have already referred to his dedication and devotion to duty as Chairman of Local Board 14 of the Selective Service System. He is also a member of the Grand Jurors' Association.

In the area of his profession, Ted is President of the Agents Association of Rudow Agency of Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Association of New York. He is a member of the Million Dollar Round Table Club, a member of the Massachusetts Mutual Inner Circle Club, and many more professional clubs too numerous to mention. In addition to being so actively engaged in all the previously named associations, he also lectures on brotherhood, Chautauqua and inter-faith; and in business he lectures and is an author of publications on professional underwriting and estate planning and insurance.

It is therefore any wonder that we should honor this morning a couple with such vast background, who have given of themselves repeatedly over the last thirty years to their Nation, their family, and their God. In honoring them we honor ourselves; we also honor their children and four grandchildren: David and Nancy Hollender, and Barry and Steven Anton. It is therefore with great pleasure and also with great humility that I present the Human Relations Award to my dear and deserving friends, Elizabeth and Ted Cohen.

With your kind permission I would like to read the inscription on the plaque: "To Elizabeth and Ted Cohen in recognition and appreciation of distinguished service and inspiring leadership in preserving liberty, counteracting bigotry and advancing the cause of human rights, dignity and human opportunity."

THEODORE COHEN'S SPEECH, MARCH 23, 1969

My dear friend, Col. Paul Akst, honored guests on the dais, members of the Cardozo Lodge and Chapter and dear Friends.

I must confess that this is an overwhelming and emotional moment in the lives of both my beloved wife and I since it is very much like being privileged during your lifetime to listen to a eulogy which is not often the privilege of but few men.

If you wonder why my wife would not say a few words, I should like to tell you that we have a pact between us. When we are in public, I do the talking and she listens. When we are at home, however, she does the talking and I am forced to listen.

I am truly emotionally moved when I sit and listen to so great a man, so fine a statesman and so dear a friend as our honored Mayor John V. Lindsay refer to me as a man who cares. And I look at the magnificent compliment of the Honorable John Murphy, sitting here on the dais, no less a personage than our distinguished United States Congressman, whom I am also privileged to call "dear friend." And when a man with whom I have enjoyed such a long and close friendship as Col. Paul Akst comes to pay honor to my wife and me it is only from the depth of my heart that I can express our humble gratitude and complete humility on this occasion.

As I hear these great national figures refer to my early life in Nashville, Tenn., I sat this morning and in complete nostalgia recalled my early beginnings. When I was 12 years old my ambition was to be 6 feet tall, to have black curly hair, to be good looking and to have a magnificent athletic physique. I need not tell you that by the time I was 14 my dear mother, may she rest in peace, was taking me to the doctors to find out if I would ever outgrow the proportions of a midget. When I was 15, I need only look in a mirror and with full and complete honesty realized I would never be good looking. When I was 19 I was as bald of pate as you now see me. Shortly thereafter I endured a long and painful illness which wrecked any chance I might ever have had to develop a physique of better than average proportions. I must say that I realized very early in my life that I had to change my scale of values and recognize that while you need not suffer to have character certainly one cannot suffer and not find that it builds character.

When I sat and listened this morning to the previous speakers, my mind went back to the day some 30 years ago when I arrived in New York truly a country boy who walked from 35th Street and Fifth Avenue, up the avenue to 60th Street, in seersucker slacks and tennis sneakers, frightened, unsure and feeling like a sand-lot ballplayer coming to the major leagues. To realize now that the Mayor of our great City and a Congressman of our State and a Colonel at the Head of our Selective Service System together with our many friends have gathered with my family, children and grandchildren whom I love dearly, to honor my angel and me, I am overwhelmed.

I heard a sermon delivered by my dear and beloved Rabbi Nathan D. Perilman, Temple Emanu-El of New York, who is my friend and spiritual leader and counselor—a sermon which was entitled "The Beauty of Pain." Being a very regular attendant at our religious services, my curiosity was piqued by any subject which could indicate even by implication that pain could be construed as beautiful. Do you know that I learned one of my great lessons in life when I heard the context in which Rabbi Perilman related pain to beauty? He told how, if there was no pain and we had an itch in our eye, the constant rubbing without the reflection of discomfort could result in our completely rubbing out our eyeball. He told how if there was no sense of pain, one might place their hand over a gas stove light and completely burn a finger or a hand from the body because there would be no sense of pain.

And I now confess to you and admit, dear friends, that in effect I had learned through the early physical pain of my life that there was beauty in my suffering. There was a most definite enrichment of my life as a spiritual outgrowth of the disappointments to which I alluded earlier in my remarks.

I found that there would be no monuments built to me in concrete in Columbus Circle or elsewhere because I expected to discover nothing in my lifetime. I did not and do not expect to accumulate the wealth necessary to be memorialized by a foundation such as a Rockefeller, a Mellon or a Ford. But make no mistake about it—I do hope that my monument will live in the hearts of each and every fellow man whom I can touch and help along life's path.

And for that reason, I have dedicated much of my life to organization work and to doing things that I felt would make this a better world in which to live. Yes, I have and think we should all, respect the past, honor those who have gone before us and prepared the world for our lives and lifetime. Yes, I have tried to strengthen the present and make it a better place for us to live while we are on this earth but above everything else I have tried to resod the soil for the future. I have tried to replace for future generations all of the material gain and spiritual values that I have found and enjoyed as enriching to my life.

I might say that my philosophy through life is best expressed by a poem that only recently came my way. I do not know the author as its source was anonymous when I received it. But it reads like this:

"It matters little where I was born,
Or if my parents were rich or poor;
Whether they shrank at the cold world's scorn,
Or walked in the pride of wealth secure.
But whether I live an honest man,
And hold my integrity firm in my clutch,
I tell you, brother, as plain as I can,
That matters much.

"It matters little how long I stay
In a world of sorrow, sin and care;
Whether in youth I am called away,
Or live till my bones and pate are bare.
But whether I do the best I can
To soften the weight of adversity's touch
On the fading cheek of my fellow man
That matters much.

"It matters little where be my grave,
Or on the land or in the sea,
By purling brook or 'neath stormy wave,
It matters little or naught to me.
But whether the Angel from on High comes down
And marks my brow with his loving touch
As one that shall wear the victor's crown,
That matters much."

And as I look out and see our many friends gathered around us, I am reminded of another little poem that recently came across my desk. It describes friends and I would like to share it with you:

"Friends are people who think of others more than themselves . . .
Who uplift, encourage, praise and criticize with loving honesty . . .
Friends are people who know the worth of silence . . .
And of having a talent for listening . . .
Who accept without trying to reform and understand with their hearts . . .
Friends are living examples of the Golden Rule and are strengthened by giving . . .
Friends are life's greatest treasures, found by only the most fortunate . . ."

I feel that way about you, my friends, and may I close by giving you my favorite toast: "May the road rise to meet you. May the wind be always at your back. May the sun shine warm upon your face, the rain fall soft upon your fields and, until we meet again, may God hold you in the palm of His hand."

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM'S EXCELLENT SERIES: "WHAT ARE WE DOING TO OUR WORLD?"

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Columbia Broadcasting System has earned the highest praise of the Nation for its recent two-part series entitled, "What Are We Doing to Our World?"

Isaac Kleinerman, producer of "The 21st Century," and Walter Cronkite, who brilliantly edited and narrated the series, have not only asked some extremely pointed questions about man's impact on his environment, but have taken the trouble to answer a few of those questions with bone-chilling facts.

As they eloquently stated, man has used and abused the resources of the earth and its atmosphere with little or no thought to the intricate balance among microscopic systems that make it possible for life as we know it to exist on this planet. Despite the marvels of our technology and our headlong rush into the future, we cannot dispense with or disregard the controls which stabilize our environment. We need oxygen, clean water, food, and minerals.

Man is a thinking animal, but nonetheless dependent entirely on the ecological balance of his planet to sustain him. All the forms of life over which man has become master are similarly interrelated and dependent on one another in varying degrees.

As CBS graphically illustrates in these programs, we have already gone too far in polluting and killing substantial segments of our environment. The point is inescapable that before proceeding further, we must give equal consideration to the side effects and aftereffects resulting from any future tampering with our world.

I congratulate the Columbia Broadcasting System, Mr. Kleinerman, and Mr. Cronkite for giving both time and attention to a calamity which literally perils every living organism on this earth.

Mr. Speaker, the scripts of these remarkable, awesome, and thought-provoking programs follow:

What Are We Doing to Our World?—Part I

(An episode in "The 21st Century" as broadcast over the CBS Television Network, Sunday, March 16, 1969)

Executive producer: Burton Benjamin.
Producer: Isaac Kleinerman.
Writer: Tom Shachtman.

Cronkite. To many observers the 21st Century offers promises of a bright future, with great technological progress. But this not-so-far-off future may be as perilous as it is promising. Today, we focus on some of the problems that face our civilization, problems that could mean the eventual destruction of our natural environment. (BEAT) Our land and water are in danger. Our air is in danger. And there are other perils. In this two-part program, we will examine the question: *what are we doing to our world?* Here is what an expert in the field of environmental change has to say.

Dr. **Barry Commoner.** We're filling up the world with smog, and asbestos, and radioactivity, and pollutants. We are going to have to choose, between the benefits of technological progress, and the necessity to maintain the integrity of the environment. And I think that until we realize that that choice is there, and that we are the only ones who can make it, there is a serious danger that we will go on the way we have been, and destroy the surface of this Earth as a proper place for people to live.

Cronkite. Our earth is an island of life in the universe, a place of opulence, complexity, and grandeur beyond imagination. This is the way we wish it could stay—unspoiled, its natural wonders majestic in their beauty. But this cannot be. There are people on this earth. People who need room to live, food to eat, natural resources to build a civilization, industries to produce goods. The problem is that the consummate loveliness of the earth can be spoiled by civilization's demands. The environment itself has become a battleground. We need to make use of natural resources to feed, clothe, and shelter people. But in doing this, we may endanger our physical survival. Why? Because man depends on the delicate balances in the environment for air, food and water in order to live. And in some instances man is heedlessly altering these vital balances. One alteration that has already started is what scientists call "The Greenhouse Effect." A greenhouse lets sunlight in, producing heat. The rising heat is trapped by the glass so that the greenhouse stays warm, even in winter. Carbon dioxide, CO2, acts like a greenhouse to keep the earth warm. Air pollution gives us more CO2 and more clouds. Some scientists believe that the CO2 might trap more heat and raise the earth's temperature, melting the polar icecaps.

Others say that pollution clouds could bounce the sun's heat off and cool the earth. Then we'd get another Ice Age. No one knows for sure what the so-called "greenhouse" will do. The Apollo 8 astronauts saw the earth this way—the size of a quarter, Frank Borman said—and they realized that all mankind are riders in the sky—passengers on a great, revolving planet.

What is happening to our world is directly related to "too many passengers." Before there were too many people, it did not seem to matter if we used up the environment. The earth is rich in natural resources. We could use up a spot and move on. No longer. By the 21st Century, six billion people may inhabit the earth, twice as many as we have today—and most of them will live in cities. More people mean more cities and bigger cities . . . an expanding technology using up the environment and producing mountains of garbage. Fifteen hundred pounds of it per person each year. And from this garbage 142 million tons of solid pollutants rising into the air each year. Also, factories, furnaces, industrial plants, machines, machines, and more machines—all burn things. Since 1900, the carbon dioxide level has risen fifteen percent, and may rise another fifteen percent before the 21st Century.

This adds to the roof we are slowly but surely building on top of our world. In this country a baby is born every nine seconds and a car every five seconds. America has 200 million people and nearly 100 million cars and trucks. Jams in the cities, jams on the roads, jams at the airports, jams in the skies.

Jet aircraft today fly seven miles up, and pour some 300 million tons of carbon dioxide into the air annually. Tomorrow's planes, like the supersonic Concorde, will fly twice as high. SSTs will pour even more carbon dioxide into the air and leave more pollution particles behind. Could the contrails from supersonic transports bring disastrous weather changes? Meteorologist Dr. Vincent Schaefer.

Dr. **Vincent Schaefer.** When you have a thousand jet airplanes of the type that are being planned, and the kind that Russia has recently flown, then you have a very serious problem, because the effluence from the exhaust, and I'm not talking about just moisture, I'm talking about the combustion products, are going into a region of the atmosphere—the Stratosphere, that is extremely stable. The air is warmer up there, than at what we call the Tropopause. Now, whenever you have warm air above cold air, you have an inversion. And we all know that inversions are extremely stable. That's why we have air pollution problems down near the cities, because they're capped by inversion. So that when you put impurities into the higher atmosphere, you not only are putting them in a very stable region, but a region that we know has very slow transport of particles. So, if you have 1000 airplanes flying around the globe, most of the time which is what they'll have to do to be economically feasible, then, after a few years. I'm very much afraid that we're going to find a level of "build-up" of pollution that we can't tolerate.

Cronkite. In addition to problems in the skies, we may have serious ones on the land. Experts believe that Western Civilization always has acted as though the environment existed solely for its own benefit. They also point out that the central dogma of our technological society is the importance of continuous growth. But unrestricted growth may have serious consequences. We eat away two acres of countryside in the United States every minute, more than a million acres a year. We take undeveloped land that produces oxygen and in its place create thousands of miles of roads and highways for our machines. Scientists warn that our society has not stopped to realize a basic fact of life about our environment: that all living things—plants, animals, microbes—are linked together in what is known as the "oxygen cycle".

Green plants give off oxygen to the atmosphere. Animals—including man—must take in oxygen to live.

We use it not only for breathing, but also to burn things. Automobile engines, factories, industrial processes, all burn oxygen. And they give off carbon dioxide, just as we do when we exhale. Carbon dioxide is vital to plant life. Plants need it to carry on photosynthesis and live. Only thirty percent of the oxygen we need is produced by land plants. Seventy percent of the earth's oxygen is produced by microscopic water plants and bacteria. Dr. Lamont Cole, an ecologist at Cornell University.

Dr. **Lamont Cole.** Most people don't realize that we're absolutely dependent for survival on a number of types of bacteria, living in the soil and in the water. And yet we throw these pollutants around without ever testing them for their effects on these organisms. If we should have the bad luck to throw out some chemical that is toxic to the bacteria that are responsible for keeping nitrogen in the atmosphere, or for replenishing the oxygen in the atmosphere, then we could render the Earth uninhabitable. The frightening thing is that we don't even test for the possibility that something like this might be happening.

Cronkite. These are diatoms, microscopic plants found in the ocean. Through photosynthesis, they take in sunlight and carbon dioxide, and produce oxygen. Since we are destroying the green plants on land, we are more dependent on these ocean creatures to provide much of the air we need to breathe. Yet we are dumping half a million pollutants into the ocean each year, some of which kill diatoms. Others may only alter the diatom's ability to make oxygen. Either way, they could endanger our oxygen supply.

It might take only an accident or two. This is the Torrey Canyon, an oil tanker which broke up in the English Channel in 1968 and leaked 90,000 tons of crude oil into the sea. New tankers are three times its size.

Suppose one of them had an accident while carrying—not oil, but herbicides to Vietnam? Such an accident could kill off diatoms, scientists say, with disastrous effects. Off Santa Barbara, California, another accident. An underground oil deposit being tapped sprung a leak, and left an oil slick a hundred miles wide and a thousand miles long. There was damage to beaches, and to the off-shore fish and birds. Clean-up and claims may total more than a billion dollars. But a far greater potential danger than to birds or beaches exists here. Oil-soaked diatoms could die in large numbers and this could affect the oxygen level in frequently smoggy Los Angeles. Pollution in the ocean reaches the far corners of the world. Penguins in the Antarctic have DDT in their fat. It comes from sprayings like this, thousands of miles away. A million metric tons of DDT have been used since World War II for killing bugs and controlling disease. Sometimes DDT affects birds and fish as well. These birds are dying because of DDT from a tree-spraying program. Dr. Barry Commoner of Washington University, St. Louis.

Dr. **Barry Commoner.** If we use a chemical insecticide to protect elm trees from the bark beetle—one can preserve the shade of the elm in that way. But at the same time, since this is, after all, a killing chemical, it can get into birds, and kill birds. And so when you use an insecticide like DDT, on the one hand you may help preserve the shade of the elm tree, on the other hand, you may be diminishing the song of the robin. Now, the point I want to make is—that there is no scientific way to judge the relative value of the shade of an elm tree, or a robin's song. It's an ethical question, an aesthetic question, a moral question. This same kind of a problem faces us everywhere as the result of the intrusion of modern technology on the environment.

Cronkite. Samuel Rotrosen of the National Agricultural Chemical Association, speaking for the DDT manufacturers.

Why does DDT have a bad reputation these days?

Samuel Rotrosen. I think the chief reason is the attacks by the ornithologists who are concerned with decreasing populations among fish-eating and other birds of prey. Many of them rare birds, that very few of us see, birds like the Bermuda Petrel, the California Pelican, Peregrine Falcons.

There's no question, some robins have been killed; some fish have been killed by one of our spraying programs, Particularly these forest spraying programs. But despite the occasional accidental deaths from misuse, there are more fish today, more birds being reported. When you look at the benefits that DDT has brought. It has saved lives, it has made—it has wiped out epidemic diseases in large parts of the world. I think you've got to weigh this against the possible danger to birds, which may not in fact be disappearing.

Cronkite. The controversy continues to rage. DDT is currently on trial in the State of Wisconsin where a citizens' group, the Environmental Defense Fund, charges it is a dangerous pollutant. Pesticides like DDT which leaks steadily into our oceans also could kill diatoms and compound air pollution problems and air pollution already is a serious concern. This 1953 London inversion held pollution near the ground and killed several hundred pigeons. Thanksgiving weekend 1966, the New York City death rate rose ten percent because of pollution. Some scientists believe we are going to have more of these crises—and worse ones—in the years ahead.

Technological progress often brings technological problems. The automobile is but one example. Dr. Barry Commoner.

Dr. Barry Commoner. The automobile could be regarded as a nearly perfect technological object. Up until the point that you turn the key on, and start driving it. Then it becomes what? It becomes an agent for causing lung cancer, as a result of asbestos coming off the brake linings, it becomes an agent for producing smog, it becomes an agent which is harmful by way of its intrusion in the environment. The same thing is true of a nuclear reactor. You know an exquisite technological accomplishment. But when you turn it on, it puts radiation into the environment. We are very good with our technology, up until the point when we start running the machines.

Cronkite. A hundred nuclear power plants are being planned in the United States. Plants that will emit some radiation and can have accidents. Since 1949 there have been ten serious reactor accidents in the United States. But a more immediate problem may be atomic waste, the nuclear garbage that accumulates at these plants. the question is what to do with it. Today much of it is buried in the ground. If there were an accident, concentrated wastes could endanger human life. Not all scientists are convinced that our storage facilities are safe. British science writer Lord Ritchie Calder.

Lord Ritchie Calder. There always will be this fear, particularly in terms of fission energy, that this vast accumulation of waste, radioactive waste—we won't know what to do with it. This is of course, one of the biggest problems we've got is the disposal of waste and it is said that the Hanford Graveyard in Washington State has cost more in the last twenty years to bury the live atoms than it cost to bury all the kings of Egypt in the pyramids and it's going to go on mounting in these proportions. I shudder to think what would happen with these great boiling kilns of radioactive waste at Hanford if it was affected by an earthquake.

Dr. Glenn Seaborg. I think this is pretty unlikely of course. Hanford happens to be a site where earthquakes are almost unknown. However, I do believe that the wastes are in a situation there where they could resist an earthquake. So that I don't believe we have anything to worry about there.

Cronkite. You don't have any concern then about the waste problem?

Dr. Glenn Seaborg. No, I think that it—this is a problem that we had been planning for from the beginning. The radioactivity remains in the nuclear fuel elements, and these remain intact at the site of the nuclear power plants and are shipped off to central chemical reprocessing stations. Then after the chemical reprocessing, the radioactive by-products are stored in storage tanks and in other repositories of a type that we are developing in such a manner that they will be completely safe.

Cronkite. One new method the Atomic Energy Commission is developing to get rid of the future wastes is "hydraulic fracturing." Liquid wastes are mixed with cement and pumped down hundreds of feet into bedrock and shale to harden in layers. The AEC maintains that earthquakes will not disturb the layers. Almost permanent storage is needed for solid wastes that will be kept in underground salt caves like this one. These wastes will remain radioactive for more than a thousand years. Another problem with nuclear plants that is receiving much attention today is thermal pollution. Thermal pollution is not dumping waste in water, but dumping heat in water.

Nuclear plants use tremendous amounts of water to make electricity. This water is then returned to rivers and bays, and it is 14 to 25 degrees hotter than when it was taken in. Some new plants may heat as much as a billion gallons of water per day. This one on Biscayne Bay near Miami, now being built, is under fire as a potential culprit. What will be the outpouring of heat into the bay do? Scientists maintain that thermal pollution can kill fish and plants, and spur the growth of algae.

Algae take most of the oxygen out of the water and make it unfit to drink. By 1980, they estimate that one-sixth of the water flow in this country may be needed to cool nuclear plants. One power plant may use half the flow of the Connecticut River. A hundred nuclear power plants will be built by the turn of the century and no one really knows what effect they will have.

The Atomic Energy Commission points out that today's conventional plants which burn fossil fuel also heat up water. Nuclear plants use more water—cause more "thermal pollution." The AEC believes technology will find ways to ease the problem and make nuclear plants no worse than fossil fuel plants. One way would be to build cooling towers and let the excess heat go into the air. But this would cost more money and might create changes in the atmosphere as well. Three controversial nuclear plants are being built along the Hudson River to serve New York City's ever-increasing need for electrical power. But they will throw two million gallons of hot water into the river every minute. Thermal pollution, like the "greenhouse effect," the oxygen crisis, and nuclear wastes, is an ever-increasing problem. As civilization grows, these problems will become larger and more dangerous. Where will it all end?

There are scientists who believe that these problems could eventually lead to the destruction of many of our most precious natural resources.

This is Lake Erie, which has been described as the world's largest cesspool. Its 10,000 square miles of water are, for most purposes, dead. Thoroughly polluted. Biologically inert. Eighty percent of its beaches are unsafe for swimming. Two-thirds of the streams feeding the lake have water unfit for human use. Fishing in the lake has declined from a major industry to a handful of small boats. The fishlife has been pushed out by the uncontrolled growth of algae, which feeds on wastes. Sewage, industrial wastes, silt, hot water—the cumulative effect has aged the lake, experts say, a million years in the past fifty years. Who is responsible? Dr. Herbert Borman, Yale University.

Dr. Herbert Borman. We, as individuals, do make a very major contribution to our environment crisis. We see pollution all around us. And it's—I think it's the general tendency of many of us to look about us for victims. It's easy to castigate the industrialist, pouring smoke into the air, pollution into the river. Or, to find some bureaucrat, who's making improper decisions and adding to it. And to look outward. But my feeling is that perhaps we ought to look more inward, and that to recognize the fact that all of us have a part in this.

Cronkite. To clear up Lake Erie could cost as much as fifteen billion dollars, almost as much as the man-in-space program. To treat our wastes adequately in this country could cost us fifteen billion dollars annually, ten times more than we now spend. More than a hundred years ago, Ralph Waldo Emerson said, "The end of the human race will be that it will eventually die of civilization." Today, contemplating this vast dumping ground, this dying natural resource, Emerson's words are being echoed by many scientists. They are sounding a solemn warning. We do not know, they say, all the consequences of what we are doing to our world. But we must find out, because technology is altering our environment radically, on a grand scale. For many years into the future, man must continue to live on this earth. If he continues to act heedlessly, the future will be dangerous for our children, and they are the ones who will inherit this earth.

Next week, the 21st Century presents part two of *What are we doing to our world?* Pollution is not the only threat to life. New technologies can produce sweeping changes on our planet. Will the Everglades be wiped out? Will sea-level canals mix oceans with drastic effects on the balance of life? Next week, *"What Are We Doing To Our World, Part 2."* This is Walter Cronkite reporting.

What Are We Doing to Our World?—Part II

(An episode in "The 21st Century," as broadcast over the CBS Television Network, Sunday, March 23, 1969)

Executive producer: Burton Benjamin.
Producer: Isaac Kleinerman.
Writer: Fred Warshofsky.

Cronkite. Pollution appears to be a part of the American way of life. A growing population utilizing a technology that satisfies not only our needs but our whims, pollutes our environment. There is scarcely a major city in the world that is not affected by air pollution, water pollution, and other poisons that we spew into our environment.

What was once merely a minor problem, a question of discomfort, has become a health hazard and is now becoming a threat to life itself. What was once a question of conservation is now becoming a question of survival.

We have reached a time when man the builder threatens to become man the destroyer. Too often, in engineering the globe to suit our own demands, the effects on soil, air, and ocean are totally unforeseen. In an age where global engineering is a reality, men must ask, "What Are We Doing To Our World?"

"Water, soil, and the earth's green mantle of plants make up the world that supports the animal life of the earth." So wrote Rachel Carson.

Ecology is the study of this complex, equisitely intertwined network that makes life possible. In these New Hampshire mountains, one such network, called an ecosystem, is being studied. The Hubbard Brook Experimental Forest is a natural laboratory where ecologists seek to learn the effects of man's technology on but one strand of the delicate web that links each part of the environment to the other.

Every drop of water that enters Hubbard Brook Forest is measured. Rain that passes through the tree canopy, that reaches the soil and enters the streams is all recorded by special instruments. The ecologists now know just how much water flows over the many watersheds in this ecosvstem and into the streams.

But what happens to an ecosystem when man intervenes, when he logs a forest or cuts a road through its trees, or denudes it completely for a housing development?

To find out, this watershed at Hubbard Brook was leveled. Without trees to take up rain and ground water, and hold the top soil, the amount of water that rushed to the streams increased. That was expected, but other effects were not.

Many of the soil nutrients, such as nitrates that nourished the trees and underbrush, were swept away by the water. The final result was that the entire balance of the system was altered. One of the directors of the Hubbard Brook Experiment, Dr. Eugene Likens of Dartmouth College.

Dr. **Eugene Likens**. The drainage water from this cut over watershed, looks to be as pure as the water from any of the other water sheds in the system here at Hubbard Brook. It's clear, it's cold, it looks to be pure, but it's not. The nitrate concentrations in this water are at a dangerous level, at least for human consumption, according to published standards. The broad scale studies at the ecosystem level, must be done before we understand how these things interact, and what happens when you add a pesticide, when you add radio-activity, when you add a toxic poison of some sort. How is man going to be affected? We really don't know. Our answers are very meager at this point.

Dr. **Borman**. I think that one of our problems is that we're taught in school to think in a certain way, and it isn't a holistic way. We're not taught to think about society in a total way. Where we understand how things interact, the one with the other. And this is what leads us to many of our environmental problems. We have engineers drawing straight lines on maps, because this is the easiest and the most convenient way to build a road. The cheapest way. But they don't consider what that road may do, to sociological relationships or ecological relationships. And in sum total, although they may build a cheap and fast road, they may upset the environment and create many difficulties. You know, many of us have the view that we have to fight nature, that we have to overcome it. It's an opponent that we have to conquer. I think this is what gets us into much of our trouble. What we have to do, is to understand Nature, to find out how it works, the intimate details of how Nature proceeds. And once we have that understanding, then we have to work with it. We have to gently "nudge" it along the proper courses to achieve the ends we want. In this way, we can maintain our environment, and still maintain ourselves.

Cronkite. In some cases, the environment is not being nudged, it is being dislocated. These are the Everglades, in reality, a huge river as much as 70 miles wide in places, flowing through the flatlands of south central Florida. They are a vast marshland, filled with some of the most exotic and unique forms of animal and plant life in the world.

Here, saw grass and cypress trees, alligators, fresh water shrimp, wood storks and otters, have lived together in superb balance for thousands of years. Now they are threatened with extinction because the Everglades are threatened.

The glades have suffered four years of drought, and now face strangulation from flood control locks, such as these along the Tamiami Trail, which divert the waters so desperately needed. Water is the life blood of the Everglades. It comes, in the main, from the flood waters of Lake Okeechobee. Every summer for 10,000 years, a torrent of rain would fall on Okeechobee and the overflow would spill South, and nourish the vast stretches of the Everglades.

Now the burgeoning population in nearby Miami, industrial demands, and agricultural needs clamor for water that once only fed the Everglades. Marshes and wetlands that were once flooded nine months of the year now are covered for less than five months.

As the waters recede, the land is uncovered and dries out. The felt-like floor of the marshland composed of billions of microscopic animals and lacy filaments of algae dies, and a choking underbrush replaces it, blocking the water holes that are the habitat of the alligator.

The waters of the Everglades attract migrating birds from as far north as the Arctic Circle. Here they feed and spend the winter, waiting for spring so they can return north to lay their eggs and perpetuate their life cycle. But as the Everglades dry up, the fish and shrimp that live in the water cannot survive. Without them, the birds' chief source of food is gone. An entire cycle of life, that reaches from the far north to the southern United States, is threatened.

The character of the wildlife in the glades already has begun to change. Land predators, such as snakes, rats and raccoons are increasing. They are replacing the alligators and other aquatic animals that are unique to this region.

Because the seaward flow of fresh water has been halted, salt water from the Gulf of Mexico sweeps inland across the lower end of the Everglades with every tide. Vast fields of saw grass, that grow here and in the West Indies and nowhere else in the world, are being wiped out by the salt water.

As the fresh waters recede, they pool and puddle, trapping fish. Birds glut themselves on the easy prey and soon hunter and hunted will vanish, for the fish cannot escape to bear their young and replenish their numbers. Without fish to eat, the birds will soon disappear.

* * * * *

Cronkite. Secretary of the Interior Hickel and Governor Kirk of Florida have made arrangements which should insure an adequate water supply for the Everglades, to halt further deterioration. But another danger still remains. North of the Everglades, construction has begun on a gigantic ribbon of concrete, the largest jetport in the world. Also planned is a new city that eventually will house one million people near the airport. Neither project has yet included any plans to protect the Everglades. Planes and people will emit noise and pollutants. Pollution will seep into the water, and then into the Everglades, possibly completing the destruction of that intricate ecosystem.

As man's technical skills blossom, so do his ambitions. This is the Aswan High Dam, once a cold war prize that the United States left to the Soviet Union. Russian money and technical aid has built Aswan, the largest dam in the world. The idea of the dam is to hold back the flood waters of this river that has meant life for Egypt throughout her history.

The floods were upredictable and watered only a narrow strip of land along each bank. The new dam was designed to bring year-round irrigation to new areas of land, and also produce electricity. This it has done, but it also has produced other effects that were totally unforeseen. With an end to the natural floods, the mineral nutrients that were formerly deposited on the land, and the minute plant life that was carried into the Mediterreanean to nourish the fish, now collect in a reservoir above the dam—totally unusable.

The loss of nutrients may starve the fish population of the eastern Mediterranean, and thus destroy a great food source for the people of the area. On land, the lack of nutrients plus other effects actually may reduce the land's ability to grow food. The lessons of Aswan may prove to be among the most expensive in history, for here we can see that large-scale engineering and agricultural projects can and do have effects that may be unforeseen and dangerous in the extreme.

Much of our technology is devoted to increasing food production. One of the chief means of doing this is with chemical fertilizers. Yet these fertilizers, like drugs, can have dangerous side effects. Dr. Barry Commoner of Washington University, St. Louis:

Dr. **Barry Commoner**. In the last 20 years, we have used increasing amounts of nitrogen fertilizer in the United States in order to increase our food production. But we've been doing it in a soil situation which doesn't operate efficiently. As a result, probably a third, at least, of the fertilizer that we put on our soil—nitrogen fertilizer doesn't remain in the soil, or get into the crop. It runs off into rivers and lakes. And there, it becomes a pollutant. The reason is that it fertilizes the growth of algae, and the result is, that by using fertilizer on the land, we help asphyxiate the biological systems in the water. This is a network, a cycle, this is typical of a biological cycle, that we talk about so much. By stressing it too hard, by putting in too much fertilizer, the algae grow heavily, producing a lot of organic matter. The bacteria faced with that amount of organic matter use up all the oxygen and asphyxiate themselves. And the whole cycle breaks down.

Cronkite. Can there really be too much of a good thing where food is concerned? Is it possible to overfarm, to turn fertile soil into barren land? Hundreds of thousands of miles that once supported many different types of vegetation are now geared to but one type of harvest.

These wheat fields, that stretch for hundreds of miles in every direction across the American midwest, represent the most advanced farming methods, and the most dangerous. This is monobiotic, or one-crop farming. The problem is that a plant disease such as wheat rust could wipe out hundreds of thousands of acres in a season. And the land, overfertilized and geared to growing wheat, may become incapable of supporting other crops.

Since man first invented agriculture, he has pushed the land to extremes, until it broke down. When it could give nothing more, he moved on to another field. Now we are running out of new, fertile fields. We pour fertilizer and pesticides onto the land, forcing it to yield not what it can, but what we demand. But when our demands can no longer be met, the earth rebels and nothing grows, and the land blows away. So might we create another American Dust Bowl. Many experts feel that it is not only technology that needs to be reconsidered, but our philosophy. Dr. Emmanuel Mesthene of Harvard University.

Dr. **Emmanuel Mesthene**. One of the concerns that is being—beginning to be voiced now, is that we do not spend enough time anticipating all of the foreseeable consequences of the technology, as a result of which you introduce the technology of detergents and you wind up with polluted—polluted streams—or you introduce the technology of nuclear weapons, and you wind up with polluted atmosphere . . . The effects of scientific experiments and of technologies are now themselves so wide, so widespread and occur so quickly that you might—there is a danger at least implicitly, that you will induce a permanent change in the nature of nature before you have a chance to see it coming . . . And I think that's what makes the problem more poignant now than perhaps it has been before. But certainly it's what—one wants to do has always been the more difficult problem.

CRONKITE.—The Panama Canal is an example of technology that was used to meet a need, but fortunately—or fortuitously, because no one gave it any thought—it did not affect the ecology. Finished in 1914, the canal today can no longer meet the needs of world trade. Its narrow staircase of locks, that compensate for the difference in sea levels between the Atlantic and Pacific, impede the free flow of traffic. On any given day the canal passes 30 to 40 ships through its locks, while other vessels must stand and wait at both ends to pass from one ocean to the other.

No one questions the obsolescence of the present canal. And so, a new canal has been proposed and a cluster of sites suggested, two in Panama, one in Nicaragua, and yet another in Colombia.

The new Central American Canal would be a sea level canal, which would allow the two oceans to adjust their levels so that the slow, lock system would not be needed. It would be dug in a radically different way. Atomic bombs are proposed to blast a new ditch across Central America. This animation shows how nuclear explosives might be used.

The Atomic Energy Commission says that with nuclear explosives, there would be little if any fallout in the atmosphere. Some scientists disagree. Dr. Lamont Cole of Cornell University:

Dr. LAMONT COLE.—I think the suggestion for using Nuclear explosives to dig a new Central American canal is absolutely irresponsible. The estimate that it's going to take 170 megatons of explosives to dig it by the shortest route. Even if they use the cleanest bombs they can construct. I've made some calculations on this that shows that pollution of the oceans with Cesium-137, which is a very dangerous isotope, will be way beyond the permissible limit. It will be—would give a number of lethal doses to every person on earth. And Cesium will not be trapped in the craters, because it comes out as a gas. And will escape, will pollute the atmosphere. The winds in that region are from East to West, so that the Pacific Ocean will be polluted first, and then this will wash through into the Atlantic. And this Cesium will get into all living things.

CRONKITE. There is another question: What happens when two bodies of water mix through a sea-level canal? The Welland Ship Canal which links the Great Lakes with the Atlantic is a case history. It is a sea level canal opened in 1932. In the almost 40 years experience gained here, are lessons that cannot be ignored.

For it soon became apparent that ships were not all that passed through the canal and into the Great Lakes.

The lamprey eel passed through. It is a prehistoric killer that has survived unchanged for 200 million years. Its normal hunting grounds are the chilly waters of the Atlantic, but with no natural enemies in the lakes, the lamprey exploded like a bomb among the whitefish and lake trout. Once a great fishing industry thrived there. No longer. The lampreys with their needle sharp teeth and voracious suckers have decimated the trout and white fish populations of the Great Lakes.

In their wake have come trash fish called alewives. The trout once kept the alewife population in check. Now millions of alewives clog the Great Lakes, washing ashore to pollute the beaches with their rotting carcasses. Belatedly an effort is being made to restore some biological balance to the Great Lakes.

There are Coho Salmon, transplanted from their native Pacific Northwest. They eat the eggs of the alewives and may reduce that pest to manageable numbers. But now the Coho population maybe threatened by the tons of pesticides that wash into the lakes from the surrounding farm lands.

Man is learning that nature's biological balance, once tipped, is not easily restored.

More than thirty years ago, we began to change the character of five Great Lakes. Now, our powers are far greater. In the next thirty years we may forever alter the biological balance of the world's two mightiest oceans. Millions of years ago, the Atlantic and Pacific were one ocean. Then, there was a great upheaval and the Isthmus of Panama became a land bridge between North and South America, separating the Atlantic Ocean from the Pacific. Identical creatures also were separated. Evolving in two oceans, they have now had time to become genetically different species. Predator and prey in each ocean adapted to each other, creating a mutual dependency that ensured the survival of all species.

The locks and fresh water lake that make traffic so slow moving through the present canal also prevent the whole-sale passage of fish and other marine animals from one ocean to the other. A sea level canal would allow the waters of both oceans, and the life forms they contain, to mix freely. What might the result be?

Is this Pacific water snake a deadly parallel of the Lamprey eel? Are we about to repeat the mistake of the Welland Canal?

These are some of the questions Dr. Ira Rubinoff of the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute hopes to answer in his laboratory in the Panama Canal Zone.

What happens if fish that have evolved in different environments are suddenly thrown together and mate? They may produce a hybrid form that would thrive in both oceans. Or, they may produce a weaker species that soon would succumb to predators or the environment itself.

In this experiment Pacific females were mated with Atlantic males. The results suggest a third alternative. The offspring were sterile. In a future mingling of species on a two-ocean scale, two similar forms might mate and produce no offspring—both would then disappear. The sudden break in the food chain might have disastrous effects up and down the line, and remove forever a vital food element from the human diet.

Has man the right to intrude upon nature to such an extent? Can we continue to batter and assault the planet as if it were a feather pillow that can always be plumped back up again? Are we independent of our environment, or are we a part of it?

Many scientists feel that we can no longer afford to remake the earth without also understanding in advance, what the effects will be on our ecology. Only by looking with extreme care, before we taken any more great technological leaps, can we control what will happen to our world in the 21st Century.

DWIGHT EISENHOWER: GENERAL, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, our late beloved President Dwight David Eisenhower has left an indelible mark on our Nation. It is the mark of a proud American who provided outstanding leadership in war and in peace. President Eisenhower's mark is that of a soldier-statesman who saw his duty and then filled it in the highest standards of the United States and the free world.

There have been appropriate eulogies for President Eisenhower since his recent passing. Among those that I feel best captured the spirit, drive, and success of this great man were editorials on March 29 in Newsday and the Long Island Press.

In memory of President Eisenhower I include those editorials in the RECORD:

[From Newsday, Mar. 29, 1969]

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Commander of the mightiest armada the world has ever known, he hated war. Twice elected to the White House by landslide votes, he detested partisan politics. A national and world hero, he never lost touch with the values he learned as a Kansas farm boy.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was an American original, his life a mirror of traditional virtues: honesty, hard work, religious faith, respect for authority, love of country, honor and devotion to duty. An Horatio Alger in uniform, he fulfilled the American promise that a boy from the humblest origins can grow up to be President of the United States.

Faith in America and in its democratic institutions was the central theme to which Ike was devoted. "I am proud to say," he once declared, "that I am a fanatical devotee of the American system of democracy. I believe that the two fundamentals of the American democracy are, first, a deep and abiding religious faith, and second, a system of freedoms and rights for the individual that we generally refer to loosely and roughly as 'free enterprise.' "

Although he had devoted his life to the military, Ike wished to be known as a "soldier of peace." "You help man the fortress for which freedom still finds need," he told the West Point Class of 1947. "But this service does not imply subscription to the rule of might. War is mankind's most tragic and stupid folly; to seek or advise its deliberate provocation is a black crime against all men. Though you follow the trade of the warrior, you do so in the spirit of Washington—not Ghengis Khan."

Dwight D. Eisenhower never lost faith in America, though his concern for the future of his country increased with each passing day. As he watched turmoil and disorder sweep the nation, he pleaded with his countrymen to heed the rule of law and to fight for the concept of an orderly society—lest society be destroyed.

In time, history will write its verdict on the eight Eisenhower years in the White House. Whether Ike was a weak President who failed to inspire the nation to attack the urgent domestic tasks at hand . . . or whether he was a strong President who, by holding together the western alliance, saved the world from a new holocaust . . . will be debated endlessly.

But whatever the findings of history, Americans of his generation have already made their own judgment about Dwight D. Eisenhower.

They said it loud and clear: We Like Ike.

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Press, Mar. 29, 1969]

DWIGHT EISENHOWER, 1890–1969

In mourning Dwight David Eisenhower, the sorrow is eased by the fact that his 78 years of life mirrored a glowing picture of all that is best in American life.

His initial impact upon his countrymen was as a military leader, but his first achievement as President was as a man of peace, fulfilling his campaign promise to go to Korea to end the slaughter.

Born in Denison, Tex., he grew up in near-poverty in Abilene, his mother a pacifist who wept when her boy was appointed to West Point. Perhaps that is why he was a warrior who hated what he called "this damnable thing of war," and as a President, he wielded power sparingly.

He was also a politican who told a news conference: "I think in the general derogatory sense you can say . . . that I do not like politics."

As a soldier he commanded the greatest military machine in the history of mankind and led it to victory over the most infamous enemy in memory.

A measure of this man was his popularity with the troops. Traditionally generals are fair game for the men in the ranks, but not General Ike. One of the reasons may have been his "enlisted man response" to the ingrained "chicken" of Army life.

For example, at the end of the war soldiers on leave flocked to Berchtesgarden, Hitler's Bavarian retreat. Only one elevator was available to take visitors to the top of the mountain fortress. The alternative was a long, winding climb up a path. The elevator bore a sign: "For Field Grade Officers Only." When Gen. Eisenhower saw it, he yanked the sign off and scaled it down the hillside. After that, field officers stood in line with privates to ride the elevator.

As President, he gave America no ringing slogans and made no glowing promises, but he was elected by majorities matched previously only by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The same warmth that existed between Gen. Eisenhower and his troops carried over to civilian life. "I like Ike" was more fact than slogan, and his appeal was so magnetic that the Democrats sought him as a candidate before he identified himself as a Republican.

As he rode in an open car through Long Island—as in other parts of the nation—tens of thousands turned out to see the tanned, fit hero, and to smile back at his famous grin.

Under the Eisenhower Administration the Korean War was brought to an end, the hydrogen bomb was developed and America entered the space age.

It was President Eisenhower who appointed Earl Warren Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and later sent federal troops to enforce the court's order to integrate the schools in Little Rock, Ark. He sent Marines into Lebanon at that country's request, but he avoided massive involvement in French Indo-China when Dien Bien Phu fell.

The cocktail party psychologists talked glibly of the "father image" when he was in the White House. And there may have been some truth in the trite phrases because he came at a time when America yearned for the comfort of a fatherly leader.

Although he was of the military, his outlook was never narrowly militaristic. The generals and admirals enjoyed no special influence over policy or budget decisions while he was President.

His military leadership made him aware of the parallel interests of the makers of arms, and military careerists. When he left the Presidency, he warned the nation to beware of an alliance between these parallel forces, and to guard against the danger of inertia in the defense establishment.

History may not rank him as our most brilliant general or our most extraordinary President, but history occasionally does not measure the quality of integrity or nobility in a man.

He was as popular when he left office as when he entered it, and there is little doubt he could have won a third term had he not been barred by the Constitution from running again.

The affection the nation felt for Ike did not diminish in the years afterward. He was always the elder statesman of the nation more than of his party.

His typically American optimism was deeply rooted in his firm faith in the strength of America. In his last public address—via television to the 1968 Republican convention in Miami—he said: "Let us first remind ourselves of the greatness of this nation and of its people. Let's not waste time this year searching out someone to blame, even though some seem more disposed to concede rather than to stand firmly for America."

A gentle man and a patriot has left us.

WISE COUNSEL FOR WORLD PEACE

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) spoke before an audience in Milwaukee last Friday evening on the most critical issue which confronts us today—the choice between building new armaments or seeking to negotiate their limitation. At a time when new weapons systems are being paraded before us for approval, this cogent plea for an immediate halt to the arms race merits the careful attention of every Member of this House. In order to insure its ready availability, I am inserting the text at this point in the RECORD:

THE TIME TO STOP THE ARMS RACE IS NOW

(Remarks of Representative HENRY S. REUSS, First Unitarian Church, East Ogden Avenue, Milwaukee, Friday evening, April 11, 1969)

We are now spending upwards of $80 billion a year for national security. When I first entered public life a generation ago, the hawks in the Truman Administration were plumping for defense expenditures of $15 billion a year, and the doves were for restricting the defense budget to $10 billion. Twenty years later, the defense budget absorbs more than half of our federal expenditures—and the end is not yet in sight.

Since all of this is done in the name of national security, we have a right and duty to ask whether our national security is in fact enhanced by such an endless expansion of military expenditures. We have reached the point, I believe, where your security is being diminished, not helped.

In the first place, the aim of our security policy ought to be a union of 50 states in which tranquillity reigns, progress and opportunity are the order of the day, and we are strong and united at home. The fact is that the concentration of our financial resources and our scientific and manpower resources on the military means that we are grossly short-changing those elements of our national life which really contribute to a strong America—the reconstruction of our cities, the control over our environment with particular reference to air and water pollution, the up-building of our educational and health resources, the reconciliation of the races. Because we are over-spending on the military, we lack the resources to attend to our problems at home. Security, like charity, should begin at home.

Even more important is the fact that we are now at a crossroads where the arms race threatens to engulf us. The Administration has proposed an ABM system known as Safeguard which would protect—so it is alleged—our Minuteman missile sites, our bomber bases, and perhaps the city of Washington, against Russian missiles, and against Chinese missiles if they acquire them. The Soviet Union is similarly toying with an ABM system around Moscow. Although the exact state of this deployment is subject to dispute, the system is considerably more primitive than the one we contemplate.

Furthermore, both we and the Russians are embarking on a new generation of offensive missiles designed to circumvent the enemy's anti-ballistic missile system. Our missiles are to be equipped with multiple warheads known as MIRVs—Multiple Independently-Targetable Reentry Vehicles—as many as ten warheads on one missile, each capable of being detached during flight and independently guided toward its separate target. We appear to be well ahead of the Russians at the moment. They have tested only multiple warheads, not the independently guided ones we have tested.

Once the two antagonists have even completed successful testing of MIRVs, let alone begun deployment, the chances of an effective arms control agreement substantially disappear. Air monitoring, such as by spy satellites, can readily detect the very distinctive MIRV tests; but there are no known means to detect the number of warheads on a missile, or to determine whether they are independently targetable.

The Soviet Union will probably remain unwilling to permit us to inspect their territory on the ground. It is unlikely that the United States Government would enter into an "arms control agreement" without any effective policing powers, and which relied mainly on trust in our adversaries.

And so the genie of destruction will truly have gotten out of the bottle. We shall then be launched on an uncontrollable arms race, of which the bankruptcy of both adversaries is perhaps the kindest consequence, and the launching of the war that would make our planet lifeless as the moon an increasing possibility when madmen in power think of themselves as possessing a momentary advantage, and thus strike.

My message tonight, therefore, is that we must make a last all-out effort to negotiate an enforceable arms control agreement with our adversaries, and we must do it now—not later after ABMs and MIRVs render it impossible. Such an arms control agreement should include a comprehensive ban on all nuclear testing, including underground testing, which would add some meaning to the recent nonproliferation treaty. It should also include a stand-still on the deployment of ABMs, and a ban on the deployment and any further testing of MIRVs.

It shall discuss mainly the ABM, because that is the issue before us—the issue for public education and debate, and for a congressional vote within the next few months. But I discuss it in the context of the world arms race, with its twin dangers of national bankruptcy and World War III.

Now, what of the ABM?

Its aim is to protect two of our Minuteman missile sites—in North Dakota and Montana, by 1973. Later, similar "protection" would be afforded two other Minuteman sites, plus some bomber bases in the continental United States.

I use "protect" in quotes, because an overwhelming array of scientific witnesses has expressed real doubt that the ABM will in fact protect our Minuteman sites. Enemy decoys and multiple warheads could be devised to overwhelm ABM warheads at any site. The radar detection device, which in its nature cannot be put in a concrete silo underground, would be particularly vulnerable, perhaps 50 times more vulnerable than the missiles it is meant to protect.

Our hemisphere is cluttered with obsolete Maginot lines that no longer work. At a multi-billion dollar cost, we built the DEW line across the Artic to detect Russian bombers and activate an air defense system. Meanwhile, the Russians deployed missiles which could overfly the DEW line, or could take out the DEW line radars and clear the way for their bombers. The point is simply that each defense has promptly produced a new offense which renders the defense unworkable.

If we want to improve the invulnerability of our Minuteman missile sites, which can already withstand a direct hit one mile away by the largest Soviet missile, there is abundant testimony that the missile silos can be further hardened at a cost vastly less than that of an ABM sysem.

But one may ask: What is the point of an ABM, even supposing that it worked to protect two, or four, Minuteman missile sites? The most reliable long-run deterrent that protects us against Moscow's sending atomic warheads into the United States is the Polaris Submarine, which cruises under the seven seas and can send A-bombs over the Soviet Union from below the surface. The Soviet Union now has no effective anti-Polaris capability. To the extent that it may be trying to develop one—the probabilities of success are doubtful—our task ought to be to pursue the effective counter measures we have already begun to develop.

As for protecting our bombers—and it is doubtful that with or without an ABM they can be saved from obsolescence for many more years—it is cheaper, more feasible, and far less provocative to keep some of them off the apron and on air alert as we did until recently.

So it is hard to see how an ABM, even if successful, would increase our security.

It surely would be hideously costly. While the Administration estimates the cost of its program as $7 billion, a recent Brookings Institution study has shown that weapons systems tend when actually produced to cost 300 to 700 percent above the Pentagon's estimated figure. This lends support to the assertion that the ABM system, if deployed, could end up costing us at least $30 to $40 billion.

It would be one thing if I were here pitting my judgment against that of the scientific community. In fact, I am simply pitting my judgment against the military-industrial complex—those in the Pentagon who have so often led us astray, and the huge array of equipment manufacturers whose nest is about to be feathered once again by the lucrative ABM contracts.

On the other side, this time, are ranged the greatest brains of our scientific community. George Kistiakowsky, President Eisenhower's scientific adviser; Jerome Wiesner, President Kennedy's science adviser; Donald Hornig, President Johnson's Scientific adviser—they and thousands of other leading scientists oppose the deployment of the ABM.

The average citizen is fully justified in feeling himself the victom of a snow job on the ABM by the Pentagon and the contractors who are about to profit from the ABM. A few weeks ago there came to light a plan by Army Secretary Resor for the two elements of the complex—the military and the industrialists—to collaborate on a huge public relations campaign to sell the American people on the ABM.

The plan had to be dropped when it was publicly exposed. Meanwhile, the Pentagon's credibility in its public justification of the ABM is declining steadily. For example:

1. The Pentagon has shifted its rationale for the ABM many times. For years, the Joint Chiefs of Staff formally recommended a heavy ABM system to defend our cities against Soviet attack. Nevertheless, when Secretary of Defense McNamara gave the go-ahead for the ABM in 1967, it was proposed as a means of warding off atomic missiles from Communist China. When this appeared too thin, the anti-Soviet justification began to pick up steam again, especially when sites were chosen near cities so the system could be expanded to provide a heavy defense.

When people from the cities began to protest, the protect-our-cities rationale was virtually dropped. Instead, the present ABM rationale was adopted—that it is to protect our Minuteman missile sites, and later our bomber bases and possibly neighboring cities, mostly against the Soviet Union but with Red China as an after-thought.

The shift in "justification" from one ground to another does not inspire confidence. No one should be surprised if we are told a year hence that we need a heavy defense of our cities, and that Safeguard, after all, can be expanded to provide that defense.

2. Nor does it inspire confidence to have Secretary of State Rogers and Secretary of Defense Laird differ fundamentally in their sensing of Soviet intentions. Secretary Rogers has testified that the United States would be "delighted" to abandon our proposed ABM deployment if the Soviet Union abandoned *its* ABM deployment. Indeed, that is the mutual self-control which would be the object of arms control talks if we ever started on them.

But Secretary Laird is hooked on the idea that the Soviet Union is developing a super-destructive missile known as the SS-9, and is "definitely going for a first strike capability". Here again many defense and intelligence experts disagree with this interpretation of both Soviet intentions and capabilities. But if Mr. Laird is right, would we not be improvident to abandon ABM, in return for the Soviet Union's abandoning its ABM, if we thus expose our Minuteman missile sites to the Soviet super-weapon? The Administration is confused; the public has every right to ask searching questions.

3. Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard has also made his contribution to the Pentagon's credibility gap. When pressed before the Senate to name scientific experts he had consulted on the ABM, he could name only Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky, a leading high energy physicist. Unknown to Mr. Packard, Dr. Panofsky happened to be in the hearing room. He asked to testify, and did testify, that his only encounter with Mr. Packard was a chance one at the San Francisco Airport, and went on to say that deploying the ABM now is wasteful of resources, premature, and dangerously provocative.

4. Both Secretary Laird and Deputy Secretary Packard testified the other day before the Senate that an American inter-continental ballistic missile, once launched from the site, can be disarmed in the air and a nuclear explosion thus prevented. As Secretary Laird said, "You could have it land without a nuclear explosion". As Deputy Secretary Packard said: "The most important thing about all these weapons is that you have to provide a continuing command to keep them going, and if they don't get the command, then they won't continue. This is the safe protection that is used." When their statements were challenged, the Pentagon issued a "clarification": "While it is technically possible to provide air missiles with disarm or destruct capability, we do not now provide nor do we plan to provide that capability for our operational offensive missile force." George Orwell, here we come.

* * * * *

But even if it could be established beyond doubt that the ABM is needed; that the ABM would be effective when deployed; that it will not in fact diminish rather than enhance our security—one thing is clear.

That is that we must start arms control negotiations—on underground testing, on the ABM, and on the MIRV—right now. As I have said, efforts to develop a MIRV can be detected by the other side. Our instrumentation can show the configuration caused by the testing of a multiple independently directed warhead. But once a MIRV is successfully developed—by either side, or by both—its deployment in secret cannot be monitored. Even to the gimlet eye of our spy satellite, a MIRV needed look no different from any other missile warhead on the ground.

And when that happens, the arms race is out of control!

To delay arms talks with the Soviet Union now is thus the purest of brinkmanship. The Soviet Union has for more than a year made clear its desire to talk. But Secretary Laird says that strategic arms control discussions with the Soviet Union should wait until we have made "progress not only in Paris, but also in the Middle East." We are obviously not going to make progress in the Vietnam talks in Paris under Secretary Laird's formula: on March 27 he told the House Armed Services Committee that "the basic problem remains that of achieving permanent South Vietnamese governmental control over the country." A goal of maintaining the Saigon government in power permanently is obviously not going to lead to "progress in Paris" with Hanoi and the NLF. Neither, given the attitudes of the Israelis and the Arabs, is progress in the Middle East definitely foreseeable.

Meanwhile, we are proceeding full speed to test both ABM and MIRVs—the ABM warheads with a huge series of underground explosions planned by the Atomic Energy Commission for next fall, the MIRVs under Secretary Laird's beefed-up budget for the fiscal year starting next June 30.

President Nixon should overrule Secretary of Defense Laird, and come out squarely behind Secretary of State Rogers, who has said that arms control talks with the Soviet Union could start in the "late spring or early summer." Preparations for those talks should be accelerated. Meanwhile, the President should order a halt to plans for the further testing and deployment of MIRVs and for the testing of ABM nuclear warheads. The time to stop the arms race is now.

HIGH SCHOOL DISORDERS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider H.R. 514, Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969. During the hearings on the bill before the House Education and Labor Committee the question was raised as to whether the problem of the lack of discipline in some of the schools might not work to the disadvantage of school officials in the use of Federal funds. The problem is different from that of the college campuses where the withdrawal of Federal funds from troublemakers has been proposed. Nevertheless, the record shows that in certain areas disruptive tactics in high schools have been serious, and the point may possibly be reached where it might be even irresponsible for us to put more money into areas that cannot spend the money properly.

On January 23 of this year I inserted in the RECORD an article from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Turmoil in Schools Drives Out Teachers," citing the case of New York City which has been hit hard by school strife.

On the same day that the Monitor article appeared, January 23, the New

York Daily News ran an editorial which stated in part:

> Beatings in the hallways, assaults on teachers and students, terrorism in the classroom. These, according to a report released Tuesday by the High School Principals Association of New York City, are as common a part of school life nowadays as reading, writing and arithmetic.

Less than 2 months later, Mayor John Lindsay of New York City named a 13-member committee, including top city officials to "coordinate" efforts to stem student violence in the city schools. According to the New York Times of March 13, Lindsay was quoted as saying:

> The danger is there. It's a very real problem. I do have a sense of urgency about it.

On March 16 the New York City Superintendent of School Bernard E. Donovan ordered every high school and junior high school in the city to name a security official as part of a plan to stem increasing student disruptions and violence.

New York City is not alone regarding student disruptions in high schools. A sampling of newspaper headlines of recent dates indicates the scope of the problem:

"Disorders Erupt and Subside at High Schools Across Jersey," New York Times, March 14.

"Parents, Upset Over Attacks, Threaten to Boycott School," Baltimore Sun, February 22.

"Eleven Hurt in Fights at Bloom High School," Chicago Tribune, March 18, 1969.

"School Discipline Study Ordered in Alexandria," Washington Star, February 20.

"Student Mobs Rampage Thru Schools in New York," Chicago Tribune, December 3, 1968.

"Fists Fly and Bombs Explode as Violence Racks Some High Schools," the National Observer, March 17.

Teachers in some areas might be justified in asking for a form of combat pay if cases such as the following become more widespread:

"Teacher Beaten, Clothing Ignited," New York Times, January 21.

"Los Angeles Principal Is Injured in Rampage," Philadelphia Inquirer, March 13.

"Woman Who Struck Teacher Gets 90-Day Term in School," New York Times, March 9.

"Orders Trial for Boy in Teacher Assault," New York Daily News, March 14.

The Chicago Tribune of April 13, 1969, carried an extensive article on violence in schools in the Chicago area entitled, "Act to Halt Terror in City Schools—An Aura of Fear and Violence." The lead paragraph of the article by William Jones of the Tribune staff reads:

> Chicago public school teachers are working under a reign of terror that includes attacks with Mace and other weapons, physical beatings and threats, and gangs of intruders that roam hallways preying on teachers and students, a Tribune investigation has disclosed.

More specifically, the Tribune account outlines by month the number of assaults reported:

> Reported assaults received by the board of education's safety department show 104 attacks against public school teachers and principals for the 20 school days in October. The same records show 44 attacks in September, 63 in November, 52 in December, 71 in January, and 65 in February. These totals do not include the dozens of reported threats and obscenities hurled at educators every month.

I fully realize that the above sampling of situations and incidents does not constitute an adequate cross section of conditions nationally. However, if conditions do not improve in some areas, review of the use of Federal funds in some cases might perhaps be in order.

I also realize that this problem is primarily one for the local authorities, and I certainly appreciate the extent of the financial burden which confronts school systems throughout the country. Legislation which I, and other Members, have proposed in the past sought to both assist States financially and retain authority at the State level. This proposal, tax sharing for educational purposes, prescribed an arrangement whereby a certain percentage of income taxes collected on individual incomes under Federal statutes be deemed to be revenue for the State or territory within which all of it is collected, for use, for educational purposes only, without any Federal direction, control, or interference.

Recently, the present administration has indicated that the tax-sharing approach on a wider basis is being considered. It is to be hoped that workable plans will soon be forthcoming to assist the State financially, while at the same time supporting the communities and municipalities to cope with their problems in the educational and other fields.

I request that the above-mentioned articles from the Chicago Tribune of April 13, written by William Jones, be inserted in the Record at this point:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 13, 1969]

Act To Halt Terror in City Schools—An Aura of Fear and Violence

(By William Jones)

Chicago public school teachers are working under a reign of terror that includes attacks with Mace and other weapons, physical beatings and threats, and gangs of intruders that roam hallways preying on teachers and students, a Tribune investigation has disclosed.

Violence and threats against teachers and principals during the current school year have at times averaged more than six a day and caused educators to plead for more security in their classrooms, according to board of education records.

The incidents have reached such crisis proportions, it was learned, that School Supt. James F. Redmond and his deputy superintendent, Manford Byrd Jr., are preparing a security plan that would create the first full time security staff in the history of the public school system.

REPORTS ARE LISTED

Among the reports obtained during an investigation of teacher assaults and intimidation are:

1. A 60-year-old music teacher at Steinmetz High school, 3030 N. Mobile av., was taking attendance when an unidentified intruder sprayed Mace into her classroom. She was treated at Passavant hospital, and later reported her "nose and throat seared by noxious Mace fumes." Another woman teacher at Lawson Elementary school, 1256 S. Homan av., was the victim of a similar attack and fell down a flight of stairs attempting to escape her attacker.

2. Reported assaults received by the board of education's safety department show 104 attacks against public school teachers and principals for the 20 school days in October. The same records show 44 attacks in September, 63 in November, 52 in December, 71 in January, and 65 in February. These totals do not include the dozens of reported threats and obsenities hurled at educators every month.

TEACHERS TELL OF TERROR IN CLASSROOMS—MANY ARE INJURED BY STUDENTS

"Assaults against teachers are increasing, there's no question about it," said Lt. Vincent Burke, a veteran of 19 years with the youth division. "Some of it is racial, some of it is gang competition to see who can get the most recognition, and some of it is the examples we are setting for pupils."

MANY CLASSES TOO BIG

"A kid today who wants recognition can sit in front of a television set and see a bizarre act committed by some punk in Detroit two hours after it happens," he added. "It gives him ideas.

"I also see classrooms of 40 to 50 kids where it becomes virtually impossible for the teacher to separate trouble makers. We have to get these problem kids in the lower grades before they wind up as a security problem."

Mary A. Saxton, principal of Parker High school, 6800 S. Stewart av., said six white teachers sought protection in her office March 28, after "some of our students warned them in a friendly fashion that it would be to their benefit to leave the classroom. We promised we would protect them and called in extra security.

A teacher at the Ward school, 2701 Shields av., was the victim of an armed holdup Feb. 20. The assault report noted:

"Teacher was seated at desk. A man entered the room, pulled a gun from his coat and ordered the teacher to unlock the closet and steel cabinet while he emptied the contents of her purse. He started to lock the teacher in the closet, but decided not to go out of the room or near the windows until the children had arrived." The man later left without causing any further disturbance.

STUDENT THROWS DESKS

Some of the assault reports merely described the act of violence without going into detail.

"Student threw two desks at me over his head and hit me with both," is the teacher's explanation of an attack at Drake Educational and Vocational Guidance center, 2641 S. Calumet av.

Teachers and students also are being injured outside school buildings.

A 37-year-old Avalon Park school teacher suffered neck bruises and skin punctures when she was attacked while walking from her car to the school at 8:25 a.m. She asked in her injury report that security guards be assigned to the employe parking lot.

BOTTLES ARE HURLED

In another case, a teacher at the Yale Primary-Intermediate school was escorting a class of sixth grade pupils outside the school when three truants hurled a quantity of broken bottles from the top of a three story apartment building. The teacher was hit by glass fragments, a girl suffered a deep gash on her left leg and a boy's ankle was cut.

"This incident, unfortunately, according to other sources in the community, is not an isolated one," wrote Principal Gerald J. O'Connor in a letter attached to the assault report. "Similar assaults have been committed against other passers-by in the vicinity for a period of several weeks. Glass bottles are in my opinion an extremely deadly menace in our community.

"I recommend that the board of education thru its various departments have designated agents endeavor to secure the dispensing of all beverages on the premises of public schools in containers other than glass. This recommendation should receive urgent and immediate attention."

3. Intimidation and threats against teachers at Crane High school, 2245 W. Jackson blvd., became so blatant two weeks ago that black militant students hung wanted posters in the hallways carrying the names and physical descriptions of 15 white and Negro teachers. The posters invited acts of violence against the teachers, describing them as "hogs and racists. My teachers are afraid," said Principal James Maloney. "Some of them have made arrangements to teach elsewhere in the fall."

TEACHER BADLY CUT

4. A 28-year-old teacher at Penn Elementary school, 1616 S. Avers av., required 11 stitches to close a gash in her scalp after a 14-year-old pupil attacked her with the leg of a piano. The same pupil was accused of threatening another teacher at the same school with a knife three weeks earlier.

5. The principals of Goudy Elementary school, 5120 N. Winthrop av., and Avalon Park Elementary school, 8045 S. Kenwood av., were whipped with auto antennas in separate incidents. Thomas J. Kernan, principal of Avalon Park, reported bruises on his arms, chest, and back, and a cut lip as a result of the attack March 21, by a former student. He asked for more police protection at the school.

"Teaching in Chicago has become a hazardous profession," said John Desmond, president of the Chicago Teachers union. "It stems from a basic collapse in respect for authority and a lack of principals and other administrators with enough guts to handle these situations. Teachers today are on the firing line along with policemen and firemen."

Edward D. Brady, director of the buro of socially maladjusted children, admitted that teacher assaults are on the rise. Brady, who hires and directs the 270 Chicago policemen who work part time as school security guards, is the closest thing the board of education has to a school security chief.

PLAN STRONGER FORCE

"We are doing the best we can with what we have," said Brady. "Dr. Redmond and Dr. Byrd are now in the process of formulating an all out attack against crime in the schools. It will include a larger budget, full time security staff and stepped up prosecutions against those who attack teachers."

Brady said security funds now consist of one million dollars a year which is used to pay part time policemen. In addition to this force, the police department's youth division assigns 63 men to patrol the schools, and additional manpower is available from police districts.

EDGAR ANSEL MOWRER'S VALEDICTORY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, one of the most distinguished newspapermen in American history wrote his valedictory. This occurred when Edgar Ansel Mowrer reviewed his 55 years as reporter-commentator on world affairs in a final column for Bell-McClure Syndicate of New York City. Starting in 1914 Mowrer reported the world's trouble spots, warned of the rise of Mussolini fascism and Hitler nazism and since World War II has consistently called upon the nations of the Atlantic community to form a federal government in order to avert a new worldwide catastrophe.

In addition to distinguished reporting for the Chicago Daily News foreign service for many years, he was the author of a long series of challenging books on world affairs. The most notable of these was "Germany Turns the Clock Back," which early in the 1930's sounded a warning about Adolf Hitler and his designs.

During the past 8 years it has been my privilege to be with Mr. Mowrer on numerous occasions and to have the advantage of his vast knowledge and keen intellect. He has given generously of his time and energy to those in public office. I for one am deeply indebted to him and count his retirement from regular reporting a great personal loss. At the same time it is only fair to say that his contributions to the cause of freedom have been immense. If anyone deserved on merit an easier pace it is Edgar Ansel Mowrer. Here is the text of his valedictory:

WORLD-FAMOUS REPORTER WRITES HIS VALEDICTORY

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

After almost 55 years, this reporter-commentator on world affairs is letting up and will no longer write four columns a week. This is a final attempt to make clear my position.

During most of this time, starting September 1, 1914, as a war correspondent in France, I have recorded international trouble, sometimes amounting to catastrophe.

Almost alone, from Rome in 1922, I warned that Mussolini would really try to revive a "Roman Empire" whenever he thought he could do so safely.

From Berlin, in 1930, I irritated many Americans by predicting that Adolf Hitler meant business.

In 1943, as a political columnist in Washington, D.C., I lost popularity by criticizing FDR's notion that he could handle Stalin.

AMERICAN MISTAKES

Ever since then I have felt obliged to chronicle the worsening of the world situation, following such American mistakes as:

Truman's neutrality toward the Chinese civil war of 1945–49 and his failure to reunite Korea;

Eisenhower's refusal to help the Hungarian Freedom Fighters, his handing the Suez Canal to Egypt's little Hitler, his failure to help France produce nuclear weapons and consolidate NATO, his original support of communist Castro against Batista and his revival of the myth concerning the "maturing" of the Soviet rulers;

Kennedy's failures at the Bay of Pigs and the Berlin Wall, his unnecessary concessions to Khrushchev after scoring in the missile crisis, his acceptance of something like nuclear parity with Moscow, his compromise over Laos, and finally, his tacit agreements with our enemies to limit our efforts to defend South Vietnam.

For all these mistakes the world is still paying heavily.

AMERICAN VICTORIES

To be sure, we have also had victories like the successful defense of Europe as well as strokes of undeserved luck—Chaing Kai-shek's superb performance on Taiwan, the anti-communist revolution in Indonesia, the near collapse of Red China and above all, its worsening feud with the U.S.S.R.

Unhappily, I have felt obliged to call my readers' attention less to these than to our defeats in spite of our unequalled power. For while we were seeking peace through compromise, the other side was seeking victory.

For this reason, too, at the last election, I supported Dick Nixon in the hope of a new American foreign policy based on a revived will to win.

This policy Nixon has been slow in revealing. Nevertheless, I am heartened by the testimony of Defense Secretary Laird to the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee:

"Never have the challenges to our national security exceeded in number and gravity those which we found on taking office."

Finally the truth is out, confirming a process which, to the best of my ability, I have chronicled for a quarter of a century.

NOT PESSIMISTIC

Nonetheless, I am not a pessimist! For in my opinion, there is another and heartening truth upon which I wish to insist, in this, my last, four-a-week news column: With our allies, we Americans still have all it takes to win without major war—if we are ready to pay the price!

An Atlantic Community plus Japan with a common policy and pooled resources still possess overwhelming military, economic, scientific and political superiority over our enemies, present or potential.

To be effective we need a President who, accepting the dismal diagnosis of his Defense Secretary as correct, calls upon Americans and allies to cease from the kind of wishful thinking that brought about the loss of East Europe, China and Cuba, and instead, to concentrate on the supreme challenge of our time—whether the coming world is to be free or utterly devastated by nuclear war. For the latter—or ignominious surrender—we shall surely know if we permit those who wish to reduce the world to a pattern of common slavery to equal us in strength while surpassing us in seeking victory.

Can we Americans pull ourselves together, silence those who for whatever reason are urging us down the road to decay and defeat, and prove ourselves worthy of our Founding Fathers?

I for one believe that we can and will.

In this spirit, to all readers whether they agree with me or not, I offer my thanks and best wishes.

CRASH LOCATOR BEACONS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last month 28 Members of this House joined me in introducing legislation directing the Federal Aviation Administration to require crash locator beacons on all civil aircraft in the United States. A week later, the FAA issued a proposed rule requiring this equipment on air taxis—a small but positive step forward.

While the crash locator beacon issue is just one aspect of a very complex aviation safety problem, it deserves the attention of every Member of Congress. In this regard, I am presenting today for inclusion in the RECORD, a paper on crash locator beacons by Mr. C. G. Inskeep, of San Diego, Calif. Mr. Inskeep is an electrical engineer and physicist, as well as a private pilot. He has been actively involved in the development of crash locator beacons since 1965.

Mr. Inskeep's paper will be presented at the National Aerospace Electronics

Conference at Dayton, Ohio, next month. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR THE AIRCRAFT DOWNED POSITION INDICATOR AND IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

(National Aerospace Electronics Conference, Dayton, Ohio, May 19, 20, 21, 1969, by C. G. Inskeep, Pacific Telephone, San Diego, Calif., March 1969)

Bill and Jacqueline Clark and their two young daughters, Julie and Laurie, were returning to El Cajon from a Labor Day weekend in Big Bear, California. They took off about 5:30 p.m. Monday, September 3, 1962, to fly home in a new Piper Cherokee. There was a full complement of radio equipment on board. The aircraft carried enough fuel for a four hour flight although the trip to Gillespie Field in El Cajon would take only a little over an hour. The trip spanned some of the most rugged mountainous country in the Southwest United States.

Only minutes after takeoff, the aircraft crashed at 7,900 feet into a group of trees, coming to rest with both wings sheared off, nose crumpled, and tail section high in the air. At impact, or shortly thereafter, Bill and Jacqueline Clark succumbed to injuries and the two young sisters began their long fight for survival. They had only one-half gallon of water, a few cookies, and some extra clothes. A search directed by the Civil Air Patrol and the Air Force was started Tuesday after the Clarks failed to answer a phone call from Mrs. Scott King, Julia and Laurie's grandmother. For three sub-zero temperature nights and above 80 degrees days, the young girls stayed near the plane, once climbing up a hill to call for help—then returning to the plane—all this while scores of search aircraft flew overhead in one of the biggest search and rescue operations in years. Scott King was convinced that he knew where to find the crash. Finally on September 6, about 10:40 a.m., some 65 hours after the tragic event, he sighted the crash scene at about 100 feet altitude from a rented helicopter. Miraculously, both girls survived the ordeal and were rescued only in the "nick of time".

There were literally hundreds of hours of exposure while pilots searched for the downed aircraft. How much safer, faster, and easier would it have been if some electronic device had been activated at the time of the crash on which searching aircraft could home in? How many lives would be saved by being able to locate a crashed aircraft much sooner with search at higher altitudes, faster speeds, in all types of weather, and more efficiently with reduced numbers of searching aircraft?

The Aerospace Rescue and Recovery records for 1961–1967 show 215,404 SAR hours, 135,855 of which were flown by the CAP. In fiscal 1966, the Air Force alone flew 57,585 hours at a total cost to the taxpayers of $59,224,142. (The Air Force claims to have saved 525 persons that year as a result—at a cost of $112,808 per person saved.) In the last 10 years over 70 planes and their occupants have yet to be found. There is an over abundance of statistics to emphasize the pressing need for an immediate implementation of a plan which will minimize this tragic waste of lives, suffering, and economic resource.

There were years before life preservers were required on boats. The industry did not choose to initiate such action themselves because of the inference that boating may be unsafe. Legislation had to correct this shortsightedness.

Automobile seatbelts have been recognized for years as a real lifesaving necessity. Yet legislation was necessary to make them standard equipment. It is gratifying indeed to now see that Detroit experts are spending much time and money in developing prototypes of automobile using electronic devices and systems for furthering passenger safety.

Yet few have devoted much attention to assuring the safety of a pilot and his passengers in the event of aircraft disaster. We certainly do not plan on such an event in what is one of the safest modes of transportation—yet we can and should be prepared. Even though organizations, including the far-sighted AOPA, have encouraged the use of emergency downed position indicators, the response is almost negligible. It would appear that the air-frame manufacturers, as others have in the past, do not want to infer to any potential customer that there is anything unsafe about flying—and, perhaps, understandably so. However, one cannot as of this writing, order from the airframe manufacturer an emergency downed position indicator from the optional equipment list because it is not listed.

Once again we must call for legislation to correct this uneasy situation. The FAA has already taken the first major step in issuing an Advance Notice of Proposed Rule Making on February 26, 1968, which would make such units mandatory, if accepted. When it is accepted, we can expect a sigh of relief from the airframe manufacturers.

We must have a mandatory system to insure maximum effectiveness in locating downed aircraft. A system that requires emergency downed position indicators on all aircraft less than 12,500 pounds gross. A system which will save lives, reduce suffering, and avoid costly low level search sweeps. This system must include not only a transmitter on each aircraft, but a method of obtaining adequate listening watch over the United States to further increase the effectiveness of coverage.

Considering first the transmitter portion, Gloria Heath of the Guggenheim Aviation Safety Center at Cornell has quite clearly shown that there is no one device that satisfies every requirement and condition that may exist. However, the approach proposed here statistically and practically would have been adequate to cover all but a few isolated cases over the past several years. It is not realistic to specify a different piece of equipment for each type of geography over which a plane may be flown. The "general" approach discussed here is economical and serviceable. It does not consider aircraft that spend a considerable portion of their time over water. There have been arguments in the past that would like you to believe that accidents are sectionalized in certain types of geography. After considerable research, Senator Peter H. Dominick of Colorado said his studies ". . . indicate clearly that these aircraft were lost in all corners of the United States and were not losses limited to mountainous areas, large bodies of water, or sparsely settled areas".

Therefore, we must ask that all aircraft of less than 12,500 pounds gross be equipped with the transmitter. (Larger aircraft are not a significant part of the problem.)

In addition to meeting the FCC type acceptable minimums, the aircraft transmitter should have the following minimum performance criteria.

Frequency: 121.500 MHz. There is little doubt that this is the primary frequency. It has been recognized as the international distress VHF frequency and insures maximum effectiveness. All aircraft, generally speaking, can now receive this frequency without additional equipment. Successful search patterns can be flown without DF equipment merely by using existing radio receivers.

Power Output: 250 mw effective radiated power. In order to insure a high degree of probability of receiving a signal at 100 miles out, many studies indicate that this is a realistic power level. Making some assumptions about receiver sensitivity, antenna gain, and using free space attentuation at 121.5 MHz, a theoretical distance of 280 miles can be obtained. Considering altitude, 85+ miles at 5,000 feet and 240+ miles at 40,000 feet can theoretically be obtained. Typically, however, 70–100 miles at 10,000 feet is realistic. At this power level providing an approximate 100 mile range for search patterns, a high degree of probability exists in finding a location within a couple of hours without DF capability. (Much shorter time if DF is employed.)

Modulation: Amplitude modulation is desirable for economic reasons. The modulation factor should not exceed 3. If the carrier is not on for at least 33⅓% of the time, DF equipment may not be reliable. A single tone is not distinctive. It is not necessary to have voice modulation. The modulating signal should be the distinctive swept tone covering at least 700 Hz within a range from 100 Hz to 1600 Hz at a 2–3 Hz rate. Since some military receivers do not unsquelch unless a 300 Hz signal is detected, this frequency should be covered in the sweep.

Operating Life: The power output should be within 3db of original power at 24 hours at 0° C. It is desirable to have a usable output to 48 hours. The FAA reports that 50% of those persons who are rescued are found within the first 12 hours and 75% of the persons saved are within the first 24 hours. Thereafter, the probability diminishes sharply. With electronic search, we would expect the time intervals to decrease sharply for comparable percentages saved, as well as a further diminishing response after the 24 hour period.

It is recognized that there is a direct relationship between power output and operating life. Common household variety batteries are not sufficient, particularly at low temperatures. Most manufacturers have found that particular NiCd, Mercury or Alkaline cells are necessary in this installation.

Non-Operating Life: At least 2 years. This life is limited by the shelf life of the battery selected. Although some manufacturers may claim a longer shelf life, the 2 year battery replacement life is necessary for maximum probability of effective operation. The unit should also be checked at each annual inspection to insure proper operation. Each manufacturer should outline the test to be performed.

Antenna and Pattern: ¼ wave or less; essentially omnidirectional. The ½ wave antenna is omnidirectional independent of the location of the ground plane. However, it is high impedance which can be seriously degraded by proximity of conducting surroundings. It is also relatively long. For a hand held unit it has valid arguments, but for aircraft mounted equipment it must be ruled out. The ¼ wave antenna is low impedance and considerably shorter. The major disadvantage is the effect of the location of the ground plane in determining the spectral distribution pattern of the antenna's radiation. For a beacon antenna located on an aircraft, the ground plane is in a fixed relationship to the beacon antenna and therefore the ¼ wave antenna is satisfactory. If less than a ¼ wave antenna, it can be matched to space by means of an appropriate network within the transmitter output. In this case the shortened length has aerodynamic advantages. It also has the advantage of being in a fixed relationship to its environment with the result that the matching conditions can be optimized.

Shock and Vibration: Normal airborne environment.

Impact tolerance: 50 g's in any plane. According to Garrett Corporation, data they obtained from the Flight Test Center in Phoenix revealed that in a light plane crash, the impact in the tail section almost never exceeds 20 to 25 g's. In larger, highly stressed fuselage, high performance aircraft, it may exceed this limit. However, our minimum standard is for general aviation aircraft of 12,500 pounds or less and the 50 g value offers a nominal 100% tolerance factor as the minimum.

Activation: Manual and automatic. 5 g's

±lg for single axis sensing, 7 g's ±lg for omnidirectional sensing. In single axis switches, the response axis is directed along the longitudinal axis of the aircraft. There must be some angle of tolerance from the axis which would still trigger the switch. As a minimum variation from the axis, it is suggested that if the direction of the force lies within 30°–40° of this axis (i.e., within a cone having a 60°–80° apex angle) the variation in sensitivity of the switch should not be significant. According to A. G. Sahr of Garrett Corporation, "From our study of actual crashes, we have concluded that in the case of light, fixed wing aircraft, forces having the magnitude and direction to activate such a switch do exist at some point during the crash sequence, regardless of the attitude at which the aircraft comes to rest." This observation is consistent with the fact that with very rare exceptions the aircraft will have a significant forward component of velocity which must be absorbed upon contact with an obstable.

If omnidirectional switches are used, a higher impact tolerance is suggested in order to minimize false triggering such as might be encountered in a hard landing. In this case, the switch might respond to the gravitational component and therefore a 7 g switch has been proposed.

In addition to any automatic means of activation, a simple method of manual operation is an absolute necessity. In cases of forced landings, testing, identification when lost, or other emergency conditions, a manual switch must be easily accessible.

Mounting: Empennage. According to Gary Rose of Garrett Corporation, "In the Flight Safety Foundation files of 686 cases, 143 involved search, only 3 in water. Of the remaining 140, only 2 involved destruction of the tail by fire. In only 7 cases was there damage to the empennage. In over 90% of these cases a device mounted in the tail would have led searchers to the location. The aircraft tail showed a remarkably high percentage of survival in virtually every case. The risk of fire associated with the crash of a light aircraft is remarkably low, so low in fact that it does not justify elaborate and costly fire protection of the equipment."

In addition, we recognize definite advantages of portable or hand held units. These, however, should be in addition to the automatic, permanently mounted transmitter in the rear portion of the aircraft.

Weight: 4 Pounds nominal. It has been reported that this weight does not significantly alter the center of gravity in even the smallest aircraft.

In summary of the transmitter minimum performance criteria, you will note that it closely parallels those recommendations of the RTCA Study Committee published January 14, 1965.

As David Rush, President of ACR Electronics, has stated, "There are two areas of performance that are of major importance in order to make sure of the system's concept. The crash locator is unfortunately, one-half of the system and the receiver and/or homing device on the search aircraft represents the rest of the system". He continues, "From a technical point of view, setting up requirements for a Crash Locator Beacon without taking into account the performance requirements of the DF receivers would be just fooling the Public." As was pointed out earlier, the duty cycle of the transmitter must be 33⅓% or greater in order to be compatible with the DF-systems that are on the majority of aircraft in use today.

This certainly is not to say, however, that successful searches cannot be conducted without DF equipment. Non DF search exercises have proven quite successful in recent tests. One manufacturer has designed his unit to emit a cone of signals specifically for non DF receivers.

We must consider, however, that DF capability does enhance the effectiveness of locating a position. Low cost VHF–DF is now on the market and is certain to become more popular.

Up until now, we have discussed search and rescue after an alarm has been received or an overdue report has been filed. There is a second phase of this system that can easily provide an economical blanket listening watch over the United States, thus reducing the time interval from emergency to search initiation.

We often hear "there isn't anyone listening up there on 121.5". The second part of this system calls for (1) a reemphasis of the FAA listening watch on 121.5 MHz, and (2) the installation of a simple crystal receiver for 121.5 MHz in each of some 2500 scheduled airliners.

Each unit would merely have a light which would flash when a signal is detected. The crew then tunes in his VHF radio to 121.5 MHz to confirm the reception of a distress signal. With DME and high altitude transponders, an accurate reporting fix can be obtained quickly and easily.

One of the best publicized search and nonrescue crashes in recent years took place in the Trinity Mountains of Northern California. All 3 members of Alvin F. Olen's family survived the crash of their Cessna 195. For the next 7 weeks, Mrs. Olen, and later her 16 year old daughter, Clara, kept a diary on the borders of an Airman's Guide. Five months later a deer hunter discovered the wreckage and two bodies. Yet 59 scheduled airline flights flew over or near the crash sight every 24 hours!

We know that the range increases as the square of the altitude and loss of signal strength is minimal. An airliner at 40,000 feet has a high probability of easily picking up a good signal at 50 to 100 miles. I ask you to draw circles that size over regularly scheduled airline routes in the United States. One can easily see that only an isolated spot or two exists where a signal will not be picked up in an hour or two.

In summary, we find it is neecssary to implement a program now of installing emergency downed position indicators on all aircraft less than 12,500 pounds gross. From the National Conference on Aircraft Locator Beacon Implementation held in April 1968 we know that economical equipment is now available. There is no reason that by January 1970 all new aircraft cannot be equipped with transmitters, and by January 1971 all currently active aircraft could not be retrofitted concurrent with annual licensing.

We as the Industry ask that receivers be installed on all scheduled airliners to effectively insure a listening watch over the country.

We ask that the FAA include a designation on the flight plan which would indicate that the pilot has an emergency transmitter on board.

We encourage insurance companies to offer incentives for their clients who carry the emergency transmitter.

It is time for legislation! As a recent article in the AOPA "Pilot" said, "Let's take the search out of rescue".

Rescue yes . . . search is automatic!

A DESPERATE NEED FOR REFORM IN NEW DRUG EVALUATION

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, there exists today a desperate, crying need for the complete overhaul of our new-drug evaluation machinery, indeed, the evaluation machinery for all medical products.

Congress acted in 1962 to protect the American public's health by enacting the far-reaching Kefauver amendments to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The concept is as sound today as it was then. Premarketing clearance of drugs, on the basis of safety and efficacy, is essential to the well-being of those receiving drugs for their medical care.

The Food and Drug Administration was given the primary responsibility of seeing that the law was carried out. But in the ensuing years, since the Kefauver amendments were passed, the Food and Drug Administration has grown from a small, ineffective agency into a monster bureaucracy.

In fact, the FDA has grown so large and has assumed so much power over the last 7 years that it is no longer capable of discharging its duties in the manner intended by the Congress. The inertia, so inherent in our large Government agencies, has set in.

The growth of the FDA and the redtape that becomes part of such growth has led us to the point, today, where the public may be in as much danger from the delays in drug approval as it was in the days before drugs were even evaluated for safety and efficacy.

In addition, the FDA makes up a large segment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and is, therefore, subject to the myriad political pressures besetting that highly sensitive Department.

Because employees of the FDA are subject to Government pay scales, it has been difficult to keep men with outstanding medical credentials in that agency's employ. The rapid turnover in staff and the comparatively low pay have led to a "competence gap." This is a particularly ominous situation in an agency so crucial to the health of this Nation's people. We should have men of outstanding qualifications and with the most eminent medical standing overseeing the evaluation of drugs and medical products.

Today I, along with 16 other Representatives, have introduced a bill in the House designed to remedy the ills that have come to plague the development, evaluation and regulation of new drugs and medical products. A similar measure has been introduced in the other body by Senator MARK HATFIELD. Sponsors of this legislation come from both parties, and represent 10 of the 50 States.

With the widespread and increasing concern over the enormous problems now surrounding new drug evaluation, it has become imperative that Congress act quickly and positively to completely overhaul the present system of new-drug evaluation.

Delay in processing new-drug applications has had a profoundly deleterious effect upon drug development in this Nation already. While the safety and effectiveness of these drugs is paramount, the swift and professional evaluation of new drugs is also highly significant.

What good would it do us to develop a general cure for cancer if that cure were to be held up in bureaucratic delays for

7 to 10 years after it had been proved conclusively both safe and effective? Is it reasonable to expect the American public to suffer, even die, simply because their Government has delayed for no reason in allowing their cure to be made available for general use? The answer must be a resounding "No."

Though a cure for cancer has not yet been found, there are well-documented cases of drugs, found useful in the treatment and cure of conditions not quite so widespread, which have been held up for many years through FDA delay.

Let us look at just one case. In 1965 the FDA received a new-drug application for a medicine called desferrioxamine. This medicine was the only known treatment for acute iron poisoning, a condition primarily occurring in children. This is not a widespread condition, but when it occurs the patient's life is at stake and a remedy is needed immediately.

The drug had been a prescription item in 22 foreign countries when our FDA received the application. Testing on the drug in this country had been carried on since 1962. Despite the great reservoir of information available on this drug, the FDA required four separate extensions of time to consider the application. Desferrioxamine was finally okayed by FDA in April of 1968—2 years and 9 months after it had been submitted.

Other cases include DMSO, useful in treating arthritis and many other diseases, still not approved after 7 years of testing in humans, and with no major side effects reported. Over 800 medical research papers attest to its safety and efficacy.

Another case yet is that of Daroil, an agent for carrying antiallergents in repository therapy. This mineral-oil liquid has been used in over 100,000 documented cases, for over 20 years in human clinical testing. Yet the Food and Drug Administration still has not given it approval, despite the overwhelming evidence of safety, efficacy and need.

Some other drugs that have been delayed prior to approval or are still being held up in FDA redtape include cothyrobal for use in diabetic retinitis, lithium carbonate in the treatment of manic-depression, 5-fluoricil in skin cancer, and drugs such as Emivan, Dyrenium, and Flagyl, all of which took at least 2 years between submission of an application and final FDA approval.

On the other side of the fence there are drugs that the FDA may have okayed because of political pressures, drugs now showing signs that may eventually prove them unsafe. Birth control pills may be causing deaths through blood clotting. Sodium and calcium cyclamates, used as artificial sweeteners, may cause diarrhea and even chromosomal damage.

What is needed is an entirely new agency to oversee the evaluation and regulation of these new drugs. This agency should be headed by not one man, but by a panel of the most outstanding doctors, researchers, and scientists.

Where the health and welfare of this Nation's people is concerned so directly, there should be no long delays or incompetent decisions on new drugs. Competent evaluation by a team of highly professional men should be mandatory. The competence gap in drug evaluation must be closed.

After the great Thalidomide catastrophe, Great Britain established a Committee on the Safety of Drugs. This committee has a permanent staff of approximately 25 people. Yet, overseen by a committee of outstanding doctors and scientists, they have managed to do a truly outstanding job.

Without a record of a single medical disaster, and without compromising the safety of the British public, the Dunlop Committee on the Safety of Drugs evaluated and reached decisions on 1,041 drugs in 1965, passing 807 of these; 1,004 drugs in 1966, passing 771 of these; and 888 drugs in 1967, passing 698 of these. And this was done on a budget of less than $200,000 a year.

By comparison, let us look at similar figures for the Food and Drug Administration.

The FDA has a permanent staff of over 400 people directly involved in drug evaluation and regulation. Of these nearly 120 are involved in the medical section. The FDA budget for this is over $4,500,000.

Yet how efficient is the FDA? In 1966 they examined 147 drugs and approved 40 of these. In 1967 they examined approximately 335 drugs and passed about 100.

Although the comparison may not be completely accurate, in 1966 alone the British Dunlop Committee evaluated over seven times the number of new drugs and did that with one-sixteenth the number of staff people. That makes the British system approximately 112 times as efficient as our own.

Furthermore, the British are getting safe and effective new drugs and medicines from 1 to 4 years earlier than our American people.

This must be changed.

Our FDA bureaucracy has become unwieldy, oversized, inefficient, and unable to do its job. Within the FDA bureaucracy there are over 15 ways in which new drug applications can be classified and processed.

The average time for processing an application is approaching 2 years. And even this is slowing down. Soon it may be 3, 5, even 10 years between the time a new drug is ready for evaluation and the time it is finally approved for use by the public as safe and effective.

While medical devices are not now covered by law, the FDA has been using every means at its command to gain control over them. It has used labeling provisions in present law to try and encompass therapeutic and diagnostic machinery.

The public should be assured that new medical devices are as safe and effective as the drugs they use. But this area as well as that of new drugs should be removed from FDA jurisdiction and placed under a board of men qualified and competent to evaluate such medical products in medical terms.

The FDA should retain the enforcement powers that it was given originally. But all medical decisions, evaluations, and regulatory powers over medical products should be removed from FDA domain.

These decisions of a medical and scientific nature should be handled by men with outstanding qualifications in the relevant fields.

I would like to present at this time the provisions of my bill and some articles citing the urgent need for a major overhaul of the mechanism for evaluating drugs and medical products:

A BILL TO CREATE A FEDERAL MEDICAL EVALUATIONS BOARD

PURPOSE

To provide for a maximum of professional competence and swift, thorough review in the evaluation of medical products, so that the highest standards of protection for the public are maintained, yet so medical products which have shown proven efficacy and safety shall be made available to the public without undue delay.

To centralize and upgrade the evaluation of all medical products, and to cut down the expense of overlapping jurisdictions and duplicative efforts in this field.

To assure all medical products of a fair, swift, and highly professional evaluation in terms relevant to protection of the public.

To provide for an independent appeals mechanism in cases where there may be an honest dispute over the safety or efficacy of a medical product or a decision of the Board.

To separate evaluation, primarily a professional scientific and clinical judgment, from enforcement powers in the regulation of medical products.

To establish standards for the evaluation of medical devices in terms of safety and efficacy (not, now provided for in the law) for the increased protection of the public.

PROVIDES

For the establishment of a 15 member Federal Medical Evaluations Board, to be composed of highly qualified, eminent scientists, physicians and clinical researchers, to be appointed by the President.

For the jurisdiction of the Board to encompass evaluation of all medical products, including drugs, antibiotics and medical devices, and regulatory authority over the same.

For the appointment by the Board of an Executive Director and a highly competent medical staff to aid the Board in its evaluations.

For the use by the Board of Advisory Panels to be called in cases where the Board may deem more professional expertise is necessary to making evaluative judgment.

For the mandatory establishment by the Board of ad hoc Independent Advisory Appeals Panels in cases where there may be a disagreement over the decision or judgment of the Board.

For the review and evaluation of medical devices, both diagnostic and therapeutic, on the basis of safety and efficacy.

[From Medical World News, Feb. 17, 1967]

NEW-DRUG APPROVALS CONTINUE TO DECLINE

The number of new drugs introduced in the U.S. during 1966 was less than in any of the previous 18 years. This decline is a continuation of a trend that has been observed for the past nine years. Other trends noted during this period include the increased time required by the Food and Drug Administration to give approval to new drugs, the increasing number of new drugs being marketed overseas *before* they are available to physicians in this country, and the decline in the number of American companies that are introducing new medicines.

The latest new-product survey, made by Paul de Haen, pharmaceutical industry consultant, shows that the number of prescription drug products introduced last year dropped to 80 from 112 the year before. Since 1957, the number of new drugs approved by the FDA for marketing has declined 80%.

Categorizing new products as single new chemical agents, duplicates of existing products, combinations of existing products, or new dosage forms, the survey reveals that the sharpest decline was in the number of single new chemical agents. That figure reached a new low of 12, after a high of 63 in 1959. The 1966 figure was lower than that for any of the four major countries of western Europe. In France, 34 single new chemical agents were marketed, in Germany 42, in Great Britain 20, and in Italy 21. One third of all the foregoing drugs were developed by American scientists.

During 1968, the American drug industry marketed abroad seven single new chemical agents that were not available to physicians in the U.S. Two of the seven, however, were approved for marketing here just last month. The seven drugs include a highly potent diuretic, an antituberculosis agent, two tranquilizers, an antidepressant, an antiarthritic, and a drug for anemia.

[From the Boston Herald, Jan. 17, 1967]

System "Bogged Down," Doctor Charges—U.S. Control of Drugs Questioned

(By Martin Bander)

One of the stormy petrels of the current drug regulation controversy Monday night questioned the federal government's way of controlling the sale and use of prescription items.

In a speech taped for television next month, Dr. Louis Lasagna of Johns Hopkins University warned of possible harm from failure to develop new drugs. Conceding the need for some form of drug control, he said in the opening talk of the annual Lowell Lecture Series:

BRITISH SYSTEM

"Whether such control is optimal in the U.S. at present is doubtful. Many feel that our system is bogged down in bureaucratic inefficiency and some have suggested that we might take a page from the infinitely simpler British system.

"Whatever the best solution may be, society cannot afford impasses or obstructionism in this area, anymore than it can afford reckless, irresponsible and premature regulatory actions.

"The recent publicity over patient consent in clinical trials has triggered shrill demands for restrictions which not only ignore certain fundamental aspects of the patient-doctor relationship, but promise to prevent completely some kinds of research.

"No one wishes to trample on the rights of human beings, but it would be cruel indeed to trade theoretic civil libertarian gains for actual public harm from failure to develop new drugs or to keep useless drugs off the market."

ALWAYS A PRICE

Dr. Lasagna said man will always have to pay some price in reaping the benefits of powerful chemicals.

"Our job," he said, "is to maximize the benefits while minimizing the risks. This effort will require the talents, interests, and good will of laboratory scientists, physicians, business men, politicians, regulatory agencies and you, the consumers.

"We might begin our journey by agreeing that the goal we wish to reach is not a 'medicated society' but 'a healthy one'."

The government controls over drug use and sale has been hotly debated since Dr. Robert L. Goddard became chief of the U.S. Food and Drug Commission. Partly because of the deforming of numerous European infants born to mothers who took thalidomide during pregnancy, controls have been stringently tightened.

Dr. Lasagna also had mixed words for drug companies.

INVITED CRITICISM

He said drug firms asked for criticism by their "shoddy performance" in the past, but, in part, also the industry has probably suffered from resentment at the power and success of modern drug houses.

"Not only have drug firms made tremendous profits in the last 20 years, but by their advertising and 'educational' techniques, they have guided the practice of medicine in a way which is galling to those who would like to see such guidance in the hands of groups less likely to have a bias arising out of the need to earn money for stockholders."

Dr. Lasagna heads the division of clinical pharmacology at Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine in Baltimore and is associate professor of medicine and of pharmacology. Presented in the studio of WGBH-TV, the talk was taped for telecast in February.

All lectures in the series will be shown over Channel 2 Sundays beginning Feb. 5.

New Drugs: The Tortuous Road to Approval

It is time that a public dialogue should begin again with regard to the control of investigation into the usefulness of potential new drugs. These controls are administered by the Food and Drug Administration under a new law and under regulations which are not always interpreted so that the public interest is advanced. If these regulations are legally correct, it is clear that the law should be changed in some respects to prevent harm to the public welfare. Specifically, there should be clear recognition of the difference between giving clearance for scientific studies on a small number of subjects who voluntarily elect to participate in the study of an experimental drug, and giving sanction to the general sale and use of a new drug. The latter deserves great caution and exhaustive study of all possible ill effects because of the much wider range of subjects and conditions of use. But when excessively elaborate toxicity studies are required prior to approval of limited clinical studies of a new drug, four results follow. First, there is unfortunately an incomplete correspondence in some cases between the toxicity predicted from animal tests and that encountered under use conditions. Second, there is unjustified delay in obtaining a useful product if the drug proves to be valuable. Many more lives may be lost by such delay than might be saved by excessive caution. Third, there is a serious diversion and therefore a waste of investigative effort in making many unnecessarily complete toxicity studies if it turns out, as it most frequently does during pilot studies, that the new drugs are not actually clinically useful. Fourth, many competent medical scientists have found that their efforts to test new drugs are hampered by the FDA's elaborate restrictions.

Unfortunately, Commissioner Goddard has not been able to recruit a full complement of scientifically competent and experienced personnel. For example, two persons in immediate charge of decisions affecting the clinical testing of cardiovascular drugs are not members of the relevant scientific society dealing with pharmacological matters. The society in question is not an honor society. Any modest scientific qualifications would meet the requirements for membership. If they have not sought to join, they betray lack of interest in their science.

Dedication is not enough to satisfy the real public interest. Furthermore, the stultifying effect of subconscious preference for inaction rather than action in politically sensitive decisions frequently paralyzes public employees. Errors of omission are easily glossed over as compared with errors of commission. An example of the politically generated paralysis was described by John C. Pollard of the University of Michigan (Letters, 18 Nov., p. 844) who indicated that he found it impossible to continue scientific studies of LSD. An example of general bureaucratic preference for negative rather than positive action is the case of a colleague who was for more than 3 months refused permission to test for a new purpose a potentially life-saving drug which had already been used, without evidence of toxicity, on half a million humans in other countries for a different purpose. He had submitted a great deal of toxicity data but still more was demanded. It happens that a million or more persons a year die of ventricular fibrillation, which this drug might prevent in many instances.

My points are that: (i) The public interest demands that risks of inaction as well as of action be taken into consideration in decision-making regarding the clinical testing of drugs. (ii) The FDA should use more outside civilian consultant committees of highly qualified experts rather than its own staff to make crucial decisions concerning testing of important new drugs. These experts, while not full-time employees of regulatory agencies, would be willing to serve their turns as decision-making consultants. The responsibility should not rest entirely upon hapless civil servants whose careers could be wrecked by an unfortunate positive decision, but will never be injured by even worse negative decisions. The use of such civilian panels of experts has many precedents in this country and elsewhere. (iii) The FDA should exhaust the opportunities for conference with parties at issue to attempt to resolve gray areas of scientific interpretation before resorting to heavyhanded and precipitate legal action. It should abandon the practice of issuing administrative orders without prior offering of opportunity for constructive criticism. The order of 30 August 1966 on experimental drugs is a case in point. (iv) Congress should reinvestigate through appropriate committees the actual operation of the new drug aspects of present laws and act to correct any defects it finds which are adverse to the public welfare. Congress did not intend to write laws that would improperly inhibit research on new drugs or on new uses of old drugs. But it has written laws which, in their effect, do exactly that.

MAURICE B. VISSCHER,
Department of Physiology, University of Minnesota Medical School, Minneapolis.

[From Headache, January 1966]

Back to the Middle Ages

(By Seymour Diamond, M.D.)

No one can condone the basic dishonesty of the thalidomide fiasco. However, one wrongful act by a member of the drug industry cannot and should not set off a series of impediments to research that actually will be harmful to the health of our nation. I am not referring to drugs that do not materially influence life or death, ie., a contraceptive drug. What I am referring to is existing, life-saving drugs which are now being held from the American public.

A potent diuretic, that works in intractable pulmonary edema and irreversible heart failure, has been withheld from general use for months because of unnecessary red tape. The Federal Drug Authorities have insisted on setting the standards for the physician use of this product. Can a government agency determine and set up rules by which the individual physician should practice medicine? Can they determine by regulation the severity of illness and situation of use for each individual patient? Is not the practice of medicine in itself an art which the individual physician must develop for himself? He must be the one to determine the type of drug to use on each individual patient. Isn't government control going too far when they dictate the degree of the illness governing use of the drug? Rather the FDA should limit its jurisdiction. It should provide for descriptive literature to accompany any pharmaceutical, carefully listing its actions, side effects and contraindications.

The general public is quickly appraised of the side effects and deleterious effects of a product. They are also readily familiarized with unconventional and useless projects even though these are rare exceptions in research.

They should instead be made aware of the consequences of this present government policy.

The President of the United States stated in his message to Congress, "that the consumers interest is the American interest; and in guarding this interest, we improve the lives of the people in our nation." Is the consumer, the American public, really being served by over-policing?

The wrong perpetrated by the horror of Thalidomide has been over-corrected to the extent of setting our drug research back to the middle ages.

[From Medical Tribune, Aug. 14, 1967]

EXCLUSIVE: THE FUTURE OF FDA—1: NEED FOR REORGANIZATION FOUND IN NEW REAPPRAISAL

(By Joseph D. Cooper, Ph. D.)

On July 6, 1967, in Washington, D.C., before a packed audience of drug industry officials, Dr. Dennis Cahal, medical assessor of Britain's Committee on Safety of Drugs, explained how new drugs are approved in his country. He told a fascinating story of how some really tough decision making goes on within a framework of regulation that is entirely voluntary, without force of law. This system, he said, yields final decisions on major submissions—approvals, of course, because the others are withdrawn—usually within three months. Minor submissions or supplemental applications are disposed of within a few days. The work of his permanent secretariat is done by nine professionals and 16 auxiliaries and clericals. The committee and its three subcommittees meet once a month, serving without pay.

This report to America was most timely, because at this very moment top officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are studying what, if anything, to do about the future organization of the Food and Drug Administration in the light of plans for reorganizing the over-all department along Pentagon lines to include a subsidiary Department of Health.

Of course, Dr. Cahal had much more to say, not relevant to this discussion of FDA's future. One year ago, in England, I was privileged to ask Dr. Cahal most of the same questions put to him by his Washington audience. The essence of his most recent remarks can be found in the articles I wrote for MEDICAL TRIBUNE last year (August 22 to September 19, 1966). In the concluding article I drew inferences for the future organization of the FDA.

Now, one year later, much has occurred in the United States with implications for the FDA future. The consumer protection movement has become stronger, especially in the political sector. Both the FDA and industry have had some experience in dealing with the efficacy review panels of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, which have been examining drugs approved by the FDA prior to the passage of the Kefauver-Harris Act of 1962. Increasing attention has been given to manufacturing and quality controls in the light of the national debate on generic prescribing. The country, the medical profession, and the industry have had one more year of reacting to the dynamic leadership of FDA Commissioner Dr. James L. Goddard, who probably introduced more change in the regulation of drugs within the past year and a half than his predecessors had since passage of the 1938 Food and Drug Act.

The time is ripe for open dialogue. The future of the FDA is not a matter solely for the bureaucratic and political judgment of the elders of the HEW in consultation with key members of the Congress and the Executive Office of the President. For one thing, HEW is now a party at interest in the outcome of FDA decisions. It has an economic interest in the approval of drugs from the standpoint of efficacy, in the light of its responsibilities for Medicare and Medicaid. It has a program interest in having new drugs—and potentially devices—approved in the light of its heavy investments in medical research and development.

From the standpoint of practicing physicians, it has never been more timely to get into the debate, for upon its outcome may depend the extent to which professional medical practices are to be centrally dictated, covering availability and choice of drugs and determination of dosages.

POLICIES SHOULD AID DOCTORS

To put this discussion into perspective, I suggest that the value of anything the FDA does in the drug area, as well as how it is organized and staffed, must be measured from the standpoint of how doctors are helped or hindered in their practice of medicine. We are concerned here mainly with prescription drugs, whose availability and use are controlled for the patient through the medium of the physician. In a broad sense, the effectiveness of FDA operations should be measured in terms of effect upon public health, but practically this might be an exercise in counting angels on a pinhead.

How do we know whether tougher reviews of ethical drug advertising and insistence upon fair balance in describing the advantages and disadvantages of a drug will make any or much difference in prescribing practices and public health? How do we know whether prescribing practices will be altered or improved by imposing a generic name on a label every time the brand name is used? How do we know whether a master drug compendium, kept current through a revision service and occupying a 5-foot shelf, would help or hinder a physician in his own practice of medicine? How do we know whether FDA's Bureau of Medicine is overstaffed or understaffed or whether adding more people would help or hinder the drug review process and ultimately help or hinder the physician in his care of patients? And so on.

Such questions may have been asked in the past, but they certainly have not been answered. The fact is that no one knows the answers. From a political standpoint it may not be important to know, for the politician may be concerned only with assuring a constituency that *something* is being done. In this regard, it is fair to say that the Government must accord some value, in planning its organization, to the illusion of accomplishment. Whether or not one has proof of effective action, the public wants to know that in some sensitive area—as with drugs—its government is doing something. Thereby, if something goes wrong, someone can be held accountable.

MORE GROWTH CALLED FOR

Ever since its creation in 1906, in another form, the FDA has grown by addition of responsibilities and staff. Always the question has been: What must be done to strengthen the FDA? Present projections call for even more growth. While Congress, before 1962, occasionally cut back on FDA appropriations for purely political reasons, no one seems to have asked seriously whether we could have a more effective FDA through cutting back on its staff operations. To do so would, of course, call for major reconstructions of philosophy and technique. It is at least worth considering, and I so propose. In a crude way of putting it, one can obstruct the progress of the meal by having too many functionaries in the kitchen, all doing seemingly worth-while things.

In my articles last year I said that the FDA is an anachronism in an age of science. New concepts of organization and decision making are needed. The FDA cannot really be strengthened from within. It cannot assemble within its own walls the technical competence needed to make judgments on Today's drugs, let alone the much more complex products it will be called upon to review in the future. The fact is that the greatest competence is to be found in the laboratories of the major drug companies and leading medical schools. The FDA does occasionally attract competent people, but they do not stay. Many join for reasons of convenience in the absence of other alternatives. The FDA does not offer an atmosphere of career ladder for creative advancement and recognition in the various areas of scientific and clinical judgment in which it desperately needs expertise. Whatever else might be done to improve FDA organization, the upgrading of its scientific posture is a must.

[From Medical Tribune, Aug. 17, 1967]

EXCLUSIVE: THE FUTURE OF FDA—II: A SINGLE DRUG AGENCY URGED UTILIZING REFERENCE PANELS

(By Joseph D. Cooper, Ph. D.)

In reviewing my conclusions concerning the organization of the Food and Drug Administration published in MEDICAL TRIBUNE last year, I find little to change, other than to add and explain. The comments which follow are based on interactions after publication and on discussions held since then with scores of authoriites.

The first problem to be faced is that of scope. Should there continue to be a single agency with responsibility for regulating foods, drugs, cosmetics, and hazardous substances, with the possible addition of medical devices? Are these still a homogeneous assortment requiring common direction, or have we reached a stage of scope and sophistication in the medical area which requires that it be separated out for independent attention?

The time is perhaps ripe for change by both exclusion and inclusion. The main distinguishing feature between prescription drugs and all the other objects of current FDA control is the intermediary role of the physician, who is FDA's main client. The counting of rat droppings in grain elevators, the checking of weight fill in cereal boxes, the labeling of the potential hazards of tear-gas guns, and the control of food and color additives, among other duties, all call for different judgmental processes.

The scope of a Federal drug agency should include only drugs and biologicals now under the control of the National Institutes of Health, Division of Biologics Standards. (No such transfer should be made, however, unless other upgrading proposals are adopted to assure maintenance of a viable scientific environment for DBS.) If over-the-counter drugs are kept within the scope of the Federal drug agency—for they need not be—then it should be complete, including the transfer out of the Federal Trade Commission of responsibility for policing advertising of generally available drug products.

Nondrug responsibilities could go into an environmental health agency, with the possible exception of foods, which might also be so disposed or might be reassigned to the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Trade Commission.

The important point is that drug responsibilities alone are of sufficient magnitude to warrant the full-time attention of the over-all drug authority. I wonder if the public even thinks of food when it identifies with the FDA, whose news headlines predominate in the drug area almost exclusively and whose Congressional investigations are similarly skewed. Instead of bureaucratic growth, I propose bureaucratic devolution.

This proposal might not accord with aspirations in some circles for an expanded structure of consumer protection. Without detracting from the importance of the latter, I suggest the difficulty of housing all consumer-protection activities under one roof, for they are disseminated among many different Federal departments and agencies. Nor does it necessarily follow that all consumer-oriented activities within HEW need be under integrated direction. Again, the drug situation is different because of its involvement of the whole medical-scientific community in addition to the existence of the physician as intermediary client.

SHOULD FUNCTION INDEPENDENTLY

Ideally, the drug agency should be completely divorced from the interested influence of HEW, functioning as an independent agency. This would minimize the possibility of political interference with aspects of the professional practice of medicine, apart from influences on its organization stemming from various Public Health Service programs in addition to Medicare and Medicaid.

All agencies cannot be independent, however, so an alternative would be to accord the drug agency a semiautonomous status, as was done in Britain. When its Committee on Safety of Drugs was created, the Government decided for about the same reasons given above that it would avoid influencing drug decisions in view of the economic leverage of the Ministry of Health. The latter, therefore, merely provides secretariat support. It does not enter into decision making in any way.

Whatever the arrangement, I return to the organization format proposed in my earlier articles. The drug agency would be headed by a board of commissioners who could be full- or part-time (although its chairman should probably be full-time), whose membership would be drawn from medical scientists, medical practitioners, and social scientists. The commissioners would be appointed by the President, without Senate confirmation, from among nominees proposed by accredited professional bodies. The commissioners would establish policies and standards, issue regulations, take appeals on decisions of advisory panels, appoint an agency administrator, and evaluate staff performance generally.

Actually, decision making on professional matters, including new-drug applications, would be vested in reference panels which would operate somewhat along the same line as NIH study sections. To the extent practicable, these might be organized along therapeutic specialty lines. Membership of the reference panels would be nominated to the Board of Commissioners by professional bodies. Their qualifications would be investigated and submitted to the board by its own secretariat, which would be independent of the administrator. The decisions of the panels would be published in the Federal Register and would automatically become binding unless appealed by any aggrieved party at interest, as administratively defined, including the administrator, the latter on advice of the Bureau of Medicine. The bureau would provide work-up services for the panels. It would also dispose of minor submissions, under delegation, when these would not have to go forward to the full panels. The last is an important point. The FDA has not made any distinctions in its published statistics as to minor submissions and major new submissions—which call for, or should receive, entirely different processing.

VESTIBULE PERIOD SUGGESTED

In the work-up of cases, the Bureau of Medicine, cut loose from the legalistics which now so heavily dominate proceedings, would put them through an initial vestibule period, during which informal conferences would be held with manufacturers to assure that all needed information for prompt decision making has been submitted. Such informal reviews should be without commitment to any parties, both as a means of speeding the movement of the file and as assurance that the Government would still be free to request additional data submissions.

One of the problems with the present regulatory setup, which is not in the public interest, is the arms-length dealing of two adversaries, warily seeking to catch or evade the other, with respective legal resources in depth. The public pays for this through increased costs on both sides as well as through deprivation of the use of occasionally important drugs. The probability of correcting this is not very great under present procedural arrangements. Some big change is needed, such as the reorganization proposed here or a new regulatory philisophy, or both. I choose both.

Furthermore, the approval of new drugs must be linked more closely to the stages of clinical experience. The approval of a new-drug application is presently a formal gesture subject to revocation in the event of bad conduct reports. Approval must still be regarded as an important action, not lightly retrieved, but the emphasis should be on tentative approvals at the earliest stages of clinical trial, broadening out progressively in line with clinical experience, properly monitored and reported.

The use of reference panels will provide a buffer zone in the relationships between government and industry. Presently, drug companies avoid any open, critical expression for fear of reprisal.

[From Medical Tribune, Aug. 21, 1967]

EXCLUSIVE: THE FUTURE OF FDA—III: BEST CONTROL OF DRUGS SEEN BY LICENSED SELF-REGULATION

(By Joseph D. Cooper, Ph. D.)

One major change in regulatory philosophy for the Government's drug agency would be a real commitment to maximum self-administration by industry, with Federal monitoring at key leverage points. In fact, except for obtaining approvals every time anything at all is changed, no matter how inconsequential, the drug industry already operates on a self-administering basis. The FDA is so thinly spread on plant inspections and quality controls as to be only slightly more than symbolic. This may be one of the reasons it makes use of snoop-and-swoop tactics, reinforced with threats of criminal proceedings in the best (or worst) style of a law enforcement agency.

FDA Commissioner James L. Goddard said it would cost $90,000,000 for batch certification of ethical drug products of all kinds, while continuous plant inspection would add another $30,000,000-$50,000,000. I think his staff underestimated badly. One of the biggest problems, anyway, would be to find the inspectors, whose training, directly or indirectly, would have to come from the drug companies themselves. Even surmounting this difficulty, the task could probably be done more effectively and less expensively by putting more responsibility on drug companies through a licensing system.

Each company would have to demonstrate its ability to produce products of specific categories whose quality would be reliably assured. Plant facilities would be inspected. The adequacy of quality control procedures would be reviewed. Independence of the quality control function would be verified. A qualified producer would be licensed for his capabilities. A qualified research, development, and production facility would be given a broader certification.

Such licenses would not relieve companies of making defined types of new-drug submissions, but they could be given more latitude for making minor changes, subject to simultaneous filing and to post-audit. Licensees would be obliged to keep their own batch test records, which would accord with good industrial practice. The drug agency would continue to make independent checks, but these could be made more selectively and with greater sophistication. The power of this method of control lies in the fear of the company that part or all of its license might be revoked either for willful violation or for consistent deviation from standard.

This concept of self-regulation is not new or unique. The Division of Biologics Standards operates through a licensing system for vaccines and other biologics. I had personal acquaintance with a system I once designed as a regulatory official in another area. Commissioner Goddard has asserted he is in favor of this licensing approach but fears many or most drug companies are not yet willing or able to embrace the concept.

He told me he is willing to trade off freedom of action on minor matters which now require prior approval for licensed or certificated companies under such a contemplated system. This is not to be confused with recent statements by the Commissioner on self-regulation in which he merely advised drug companies to do voluntarily that which his inspectors would subsequently check on, without any changes in the presently oppressive prior approval system.

HOW MUCH CONTROL IS NEEDED?

Another philosophical question to be faced is: How much control is needed to assure effective control? For each additional measure of control added, does the taxpayer equivalent benefit? Some people suggest that computers can be used to facilitate control. Would this be more effective from a qualitative standpoint? If not, would it be more expensive? Do mountains of data in support of new-drug applications better enable reviewing officers to ascertain whether proper toxicity and efficacy studies have been made, or does superabundance obscure significance?

In other words, does the insistence of the FDA on more and more data lead to more rational decision making, or does it merely establish that a bureaucracy has not been remiss in covering every contingency? What we must not overlook is that control costs money for the drug company and the Government. These costs are ultimately passed on directly to drug users and indirectly to all taxpayers.

Such questions are aimed at a larger phenomenon of bureaucracy from which the FDA is singularly not exempt. Bureaucratic regulation tends to acquire an elegance of its own—a baroque elegance. It propels into the future the protective devices engineered to assure that mishaps encountered in the past are not repeated, regardless of probability. Rules, regulations, record keeping, and reporting requirements grow like barnacles on the hull of a ship, slowing its passage and adding to the cost of the journey.

Let there be no mistake: control is necessary, and with control go regulations and paper work. The question is, how much? The FDA must be called upon to demonstrate a cost/benefit relationship in its control processes. More critically, how much real difference will a measure of control make in how the doctor prescribes and administers drugs? Tangibly and practically, how is the patient to be benefited?

COMPENDIUM PROPOSED

This brings up the matter of central dictum on prescribing practice. Commissioner Goddard acknowledges that package inserts are rarely seen by physicians and that, anyway, they are finely printed on Bible paper. He proposes, instead, the publication of an all-embracing compendium that would contain what are now the package inserts for all drugs, covering indications, contraindications, side effects, pharmacologic action, etc. Officially recognized dosages would be included. Physicians could deviate from these under special procedures and at their own risk. The movement in this direction is bureaucratic, logic, which formalizes current judgment as to the handling of modalities, judgments arbitrated by bureaucratic physicians.

Conceivably, this might assure rational therapy from a statistical standpoint. As an occasional patient, however, I would prefer that my physician have maximum latitude in prescribing in the light of my own medical history, conditioned by the uniqueness of my current circumstances. More broadly, for the practice of medicine, the question is whether rulebook medicine is to supersede professional judgment. Does the FDA now believe medicine has reached a state of being more science than art? How wonderful that would be!

Besides, does anyone familiar with rulebook systems believe a massive compendium would be read and used? Here again the system's wish and assertion must be put to human engineering tests.

The proposals for reorganization and self-regulation would both require and make possible an upgrading in professional capabilities of the drug agency and in management perspectives of drug companies. The FDA successor should have its own intramural staff engaged in pharmacologic, toxicologic, and other biochemical researches. In parallel, the drug agency should be the funding source of the pharmacology-toxicology centers now under grant from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences. Together with the transferred-in Division of Biologics Standards these associated activities would constitute a critical mass of creative endeavor, attracting to it and influencing biomedical scientists of promise and stature. Rotating fellowships could also be provided as a means of extending the inputs and outputs of such a science center.

PUBLIC INSPECTION URGED

Of course, these scientists would have to be insulated from the police-oriented functions of the drug agency. These, too, should have their orientations converted more constructively. Also, the affairs of the drug agency should be open for closer public inspection, as with other regulatory agencies. The FDA tags practically everything as being secret, for reasons of protecting doctor-patient relationships, trade secrets, and privileged administrative information. Each of these has a validity factor, but the FDA does not mention its dominant concern that its own fallibilities not be held open to public view.

The drug industry has been going through its own stages of maturation and in many respects has advanced its standards and capabilities at a faster pace than has the FDA. The industry as it now exists is relatively young, dating mainly from World War II production expansion and the therapeutic explosion following immediately thereafter. It has lagged somewhat—but not uniformly so—in putting at its helm a professional management leadership. It needs to accord a heavier weight in top-management decision-making processes to medical-scientific judgments than to those of marketing and legal departments, although their inputs must necessarily also find proper place.

In many respects, forces in being in the drug industry are moving it to an ever higher level of scientific sophistication. The FDA will thereby be under challenge to keep pace if it is not to stultify industrial creative processes. Recent developments, such as establishment of the Syntex research center and the Roche Institute of Molecular Biology, will be taking drug industry scientists far out onto the creative frontiers of medicine. This trend may be accelerated by parallel trends toward oligopoly, under which a few major companies will account for most pharmaceutical activity. It is a trend not unique to the drug industry. After World War II there were some 450 luggage companies in the United States. Currently there are about 150. Of these, from five to 10 account for most of the business. And so it has been going in other industries. These trends have implications also for regulatory control processes.

Finally, although I counsel the need for pluralistic mechanisms of scientific decision making, situated mainly outside of the drug agency, where knowledge is concentrated, I do not wish to minimize the need for aggressive administrative leadership. Boards, commissions, and panels do not easily provide coherent leadership and direction. To the administrator of the drug agency would be given most of the responsibility he now has. Little would be taken from him. In fact, through his increased use of extramural advisory bodies, Commissioner Goddard has already ceded *de facto* decision making. How could he really overrule the judgments of the peers of the realm empaneled by the august National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council?

Dr. Goddard has undoubtedly been the most dynamic of Food and Drug Commissioners in history. He has drawn both praise and criticism. Considering the tasks and organization he inherited, he has made remarkable progress in restructuring FDA's processes. Without doubt, the public was in the mood for a "man of the hour" who would be active as well as expressive. Anyone who surveys the scene dispassionately must conclude that the country needed a Goddard, at least for a while, and will be better off for the experience. In the longer reach of public affairs and of trends in medical practice and organization, however, the concentration of too much power over the rules of medicine in a single person is to be avoided.

While I have presented these notions as personal observations and proposals, they stem from my own dialogues with people whose experiences are infinitely broader and deeper than mine in their respective areas. What is so urgently needed now is open, constructive dialogue on a much greater scale, to bring out differing ideas and at least some consensus.

[From the Hospital Tribune, July 29, 1968]

THE END AND THE MEANS

You can measure a wall's dimensions by shooting missiles at it. The end point is the destruction of the wall, and there is a real, if approximate, correspondence between the three dimensions of the wall and the number of projectiles it takes to raze it. But if you wind up knowing its size, you do not wind up with a wall. The end may or may not justify the means, but the means cannot usefully be chosen without evaluating the end to be achieved.

When Dr. Louis Lasagna, Associate Professor of Medicine and of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics at the Johns Hopkins University, spoke on pharmaceutical communications at a recent meeting of the American Marketing Association he in effect discussed the ends sought by the Food and Drug Administration in a number of its regulations and the means utilized to achieve them. It was Dr. Lasagna's opinion that the large amount of detailed data required by the FDA regulations for drug advertising may be defeating the purpose of the regulations. The "excessive" information required in pharmaceutical ads is harder to grasp and retain, said Dr. Lasagna, than data conveyed briefly and may serve to confuse rather than to enlighten. We take it that Dr. Lasagna was referring to the "brief summary," required by Congress, relating to side effects, contraindications, and effectiveness of a drug.

The Congressman responsible for this section of the Food and Drug Act of 1962 said that he wanted "to see to it that information in capsule form goes to doctors in connection with the advertising." He cited as an example a drug with severe side effects permitted to go on the market with the requirement that these side effects be listed. They were covered, he pointed out, "in about six lines, about six words across."

But if this is what the Congressman sought to accomplish, it was expanded far beyond his intent by the FDA. Shakespeare in a somewhat different context spoke about "wasteful and ridiculous excess." We think a comment of Samuel Taylor Coleridge is even more applicable. That poet said, "Every reform, however necessary, will by weak minds be carried to an excess, that itself will need reforming." Coleridge made this statement in 1817, but poets have a knack for putting their fingers on imperishable truths.

A HOME EMERGENCY GUIDE TO SAVE LIVES

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, often in our country a life is lost or a person crippled for life for lack of some simple, easily obtained knowledge on how to react to a medical emergency. For this reason, a home emergency guide is utterly essential. One way to fill this need is to make available to constituents such a home emergency guide. Its text should be readable and it must lay out for the person in danger how to react to basic emergencies.

I have provided such a pamphlet to the people of the 13th Congressional District, and include its text here:

EMERGENCY TELEPHONE DIRECTORY

Dear Neighbor: I believe that emergency information should be available to everyone. I have compiled this guide which includes telephone numbers, first aid instruction, and emergency behavior.

This booklet doesn't cover all possible contingencies, but I think if you keep it close at hand, near the phone, you will be ready to meet most emergencies calmly, quickly and capably.

This first aid guide in no way replaces a doctor's care. In all cases your first move should be to contact a doctor or the police.

BERTRAM L. PODELL,
Member of Congress.

Police: Emergency, 911; Headquarters, 625–4400.

Fire: On the street: Pull lever at the nearest fire alarm box. Stay by the fire alarm box to direct firemen to the fire.

Ambulance, 911.

Poison: Poison Control Center, 566–8020.

Hospitals: Brookdale Hospital, Linden Boulevard & Rockaway Parkway, 495–6800; Caledonian Hospital, 10 St. Pauls Place, 469–1000; Community Hospital of Brooklyn, 2525 Kings Highway, 252–2600; Kings Highway Hospital, 3201 Kings Highway, 252–3000; Maimonides Medical Center, 4802 10th Avenue, 853–1200; Coney Island Hospital, Ocean & Shore Parkways, 743–4100; Kings County Hospital, 451 Clarkson Avenue, 462–4000.

Dental Emergency: NE 8–0400.

All Night Pharmacy: Neergaard Pharmacy, 454 5 Avenue, Brooklyn, SO 8–0600.

Animals: ASPCA, TR 5–9580; Dog Bites, 566–7105.

This guide is no substitute for your doctor! Don't hesitate to call him.

Telephone number of your personal physician —.

Congressional office, 1507 Ave. M, 336–7575.

MOUTH-TO-MOUTH RESCUE BREATHING

The following are the Red Cross directions for Mouth to Mouth Rescue Breathing:

Turn victim on his back.

1. Wipe out victim's mouth quickly. Turn his head to the side. Use your fingers to get rid of mucus, food, sand, and other matter.

2. Straighten victim's head and tilt back so that chin points up. Push or pull his jaw up into jutting out position to keep his tongue from blocking air passage. This position is essential for keeping the air passage open throughout the procedure.

3. Place your mouth tightly over victim's mouth and pinch nostrils closed to prevent air leakage. For a child, cover both nose and mouth tightly with your mouth. (Breathing through handkerchief or cloth placed over victim's mouth or nose will not greatly affect the exchange of air.)

4. Breathe into victim's mouth or nose until you see his chest rise. (Air may be blown through victim's teeth, even though they may be clenched.)

5. Remove your mouth and listen for the sound of returning air. If there is no exchange, recheck jaw and head position. If you still do not get air exchange, turn victim on side and slap him on back between shoulder blades to dislodge matter that may be in throat. Again, wipe his mouth to remove foreign matter.

6. Repeat breathing, removing mouth each time to allow for escape of air. For an adult breathe about 12 times per minute. For a child, take relatively shallow breaths, about 20 per minute. Continue until victim breathes for himself.

TREATMENT FOR POISONING

Poisoning treatment must be administered *immediately*. Consult label on packaging for antidote. Call doctor, police or poison control center for instructions.

In treatment of poisoning there are two primary concerns (1) to expell the poison from the body through vomiting where possible. (2) to protect body passages from harm through neutralization of chemical.

Poisons

Acids, see 16.

Alcohol: Denatured, see 15; rubbing, see 10; wood, see 15.

Ammonia (Household), see 13.

Antifreeze: with ethyl alcohol or ethylene glycol, see 10; with methyl alcohol, see 15.

Bleech (Chlorine), see 17.

Camphor, see 1.

Carbon Monoxide, see 18.

Cleaning Fluids (carbon tet. types), see 9.

Disinfectant: with chlorine, see 17; with carbolic acid, see 12.

Fluorescent Tube Powder, see 1.

Food Poisoning, see 3.

Gasoline, see 19.

Insect & Rat Poisons: arsenic, see 21; DDT, see 3; phosphorus, see 8; sodium fluoride, see 20.

Iodine Tincture, see 11.

Kerosene, see 19.

Lye, see 13.

Mushrooms (Poisonous), see 3.

Oil of Wintergreen, see 10.

Paint (Lead), see 3.

Solvents, see 19.

Turpentine, see 3.

Washing Soda, see 13.

Overdoses

Alcohol (Liquors), see 10.

Aspirin, see 10.

Barbiturates, see 5.

Bromides, see 3.

Codeine, see 7.

Headache & Cold Remedies, see 10.

Laxatives (Candy or other), see 6.

Morphine, Opium, see 7.

Paregoric, see 7.

"Pep" Drugs, see 21.

Sleeping Drugs, see 5.

Antidotes to use

1. If victim is conscious, cause vomiting by giving either: Tablespoon of powdered mustard in glass of warm water, or Tablespoon salt in water, or Inserting finger in throat. For vomiting, place victim face down with head lower than hips.

2. Give a mixture consisting of: 2 tablespoons of powdered charcoal or powdered burnt toast, 1 tablespoon milk of magnesia, 4 tablespoons very strong tea.

3. Cause vomiting (#1). Give 2 tablespoons epsom salts in pint (2 glasses) of water. Finally give 2 or 3 cups of hot coffee or strong tea.

5. Cause vomiting (#1). Give same mixture as #2. Give 2 tablespoons epsom salts in pint (2 glasses) of water. Then give several cups of hot coffee or very strong tea. Keep patient walking or moving.

6. Cause vomiting (#1). Keep patient warm. Give steamed dry rice or dry toast. Replace body fluids with water or weak tea. *Never* give cathartics.

7. Give same mixture as #2. Give 2 tablespoons epsom salts in pint (2 glasses) of water. Force patient to remain awake.

8. Cause vomiting (#1). Give 1 tablespoon epsom salts in glass of warm water. Then give half cup mineral oil. *Never* vegetable or animal oil.

9. Fresh air immediately. If unconscious, give artificial respiration. Summon police emergency for oxygen. If conscious, cause vomiting (#1). Then give 2 tablespoons epsom salts in glass of water. *Never* give alcohol.

10. Cause vomiting (#1). Give same mixture as #2. Give 2 cups strong tea or coffee.

11. Give 6 tablespoons thick starch paste—made by mixing cornstarch or flour in water. Then give 6 tablespoons salt in quart of warm water. Drink until vomit liquid is no longer blue in color. Then give several glasses of milk, or egg whites in cooking oil or milk.

12. Give 4 tablespoons olive oil, or castor oil, or cooking oil. Then give glass of milk or beaten white of 2 eggs in glass of water. Then 1 or 2 cups coffee or tea. *Avoid causing vomiting.*

13. Give 2 tablespoons vinegar in pint (2 glasses) of water. Give white of 2 eggs or 6 tblsp. olive or cooking oil. Coffee. *Avoid causing vomiting.*

15. Cause vomiting (#1). Give 1 tablespoon bicarbonate of soda (baking soda) in pint (2 glasses) of water. Vomit. Repeat until alcohol odor disappears. Then 1 teaspoon baking soda in glass of milk. Protect patient's eyes from light.

16. Mix either 3 tablespoons milk of magnesia or whites of 12 eggs in several glasses of water—or give several glasses of milk. *Avoid causing vomiting.* For acids on skin, flush with water for 15 minutes.

17. Give 1 teaspoon of spirits of ammonia (not household ammonia) in glass of water. 2 cups hot coffee or very strong tea mixed with whites of 3 eggs.

18. Get victim into fresh air. If unconscious, give artificial respiration. Summon police emergency for oxygen. Several cups hot coffee or very strong tea after patient revives.

19. Give half cup of olive oil or cooking oil. Several cups coffee or strong tea. *Avoid causing vomiting.*

20. Cause vomiting (#1). Give 2 tablespoons milk or magnesia or 4 egg whites in milk. Then 2 or 3 glasses of plain milk.

21. Cause vomiting (#1). Give same mixture as #2. Get patient to a hospital.

SHOCK

Cause: Depressed condition of many of the body functions due to the failure of enough blood to circulate through the body due to injury.

Symptoms: Eyes: vacant, lackluster; Pupils: dilated; Breathing: shallow; Pulse: weak or absent; Skin: pale, moist, cold.

Treatment: Lay person down. Elevate lower portion of body except if there is head injury, if breathing difficulty is increased, or if patient complains of increased pain.

Cover patient only enough to prevent large loss of body heat. Do not attempt to add heat to body. It is better if the patient is slightly cool than toasting warm.

Do not administer stimulants.

You may give the patient small sips of water.

BLEEDING

Bleeding can almost always be controlled by direct pressure with a clean cloth over the wound.

Application of bare hand may be necessary in stemming major blood loss until cloth is available.

After bleeding is controlled apply additional layers of cloth to form a good sized covering, bandage snugly and firmly. Do not remove dressing. If blood saturates dressing apply more layers of cloth.

In case of severe wounds, compression of main supplying blood vessel against underlying bone may be helpful for quick, temporary, partial control until cloth can be applied.

Caution: Tourniquets should be used only when there is a decision to risk sacrifice of a limb in order to save a life. A tourniquet patient must be taken to a hospital promptly.

ELECTRIC SHOCK

Cut electric power—either pull fuse in your fuse box or use a dry dish towel, dry rag, or dry rubber glove to pull the cord, disconnect the appliance.

If you can't cut the electric power, use a long dry stick, or long length of dry cloth to *jerk* the person free from contact with the electric power.

If breathing stops start mouth to mouth breathing and call police—911.

CHOKING

Observe patient for 30 seconds to see if he can cough up object. After 30 seconds slap patient sharply on the back between shoulder blades or try to dislodge object from his throat with your forefinger.

BURNS

Mild Burns: Hold burn under cold running water or submerge in ice water until pain subsides.

Severe Burns: Call Police—911.

Never put butter, oil, or unguents on severe burns. Use only cold running water, or ice water on burns.

Keep air from burn. Application of a loose thick dressing relieves pain and if sterile prevents further contamination. Dressing should be dry because wet dressings stick to wound and allow germs to enter from outside.

Burned persons need fluids, but fluids often cause nausea. Judgment is therefore needed to administer fluids properly. Give only enough fluid to quench thirst.

FROST BITE

Warming hand against frost bitten part is helpful, but rubbing is harmful.

Cover frozen parts with woolen material and provide extra clothing or blankets for patient.

Give patient warm drinks.

If part of body is still cold place it in warm water at body temperature.

ETHICS IN SCHOOLS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, recently the Community Newspapers, a chain of five, vital weekly newspapers on Long Island, carried an editorial that eloquently expressed the need for teaching our young people self-discipline and the basic difference between right and wrong. The editorial, entitled "Ethics in Schools," made the interesting point that "Unprincipled children will grow up into unprincipled businessmen, lawyers, teachers, and Congressmen."

As the loss of principle and discipline grows in our schools, this is a potential consequence for us to ponder. I, therefore, commend the aforementioned editorial to my colleagues' attention and, under leave to extend my remarks, wish to include it in the RECORD at this point:

ETHICS IN SCHOOLS

A hard-leftish academic person whom we admired for his genuine enthusiasm and tolerance of the mannerless student fringe has come a bad cropper. The objects of his now unrequited crush have labeled him a phony conservative bum. In another sector, a N.Y. columnist of vastly liberal persuasion, and now a simple fascist pig like the rest of us over 30, showed his trauma and ignorance the other day as he sensed a newsy paradox in the sameness of the no-nonsense admonitions to the student crazies by Father Hesburgh of Notre Dame and Morris Abrams of Brandeis University. He missed the point. In these two great seats of Jewish and Catholic learning there still lives a little faith in God, respect for right and wrong and great traditions of ethical instruction.

Among our public teachers the most noise is created by an overly permissive minority who are themselves intolerant of any authority and steadfast only in their own lack of moral purpose. If we can't get God (not dogma) back in the public schools and universities, shouldn't we at least insist on teaching His once famous 10 guides to a better society and the ethics to apply them?

Unprincipled children will grow up into unprincipled businessmen, lawyers, teachers and Congressmen. Is there anything wrong with a good stiff course in ethics in our public schools and universities? What do you think?

THE LIFE OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY SHOULD BE EXTENDED

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which will extend the life of the National Commission on Product Safety until 1970.

I have been quite impressed by the work the Commission is doing in a variety of areas. Earlier this year I sponsored H.R. 8377 which amended the Hazardous Substances Act to include additional categories of hazards found in many currently manufactured toys so that our children will not suffer the loss of life and limb because of the propensity of some toy manufactures to make and sell toys which are fashionable but not safe. This legislation was drafted by the Commission.

I do not think any parent would want his daughter to play with a toy stove that heats up to 660 degrees, hotter than a home oven, or a soldering kit that heats up to 800 degrees and involves the use of molten lead. Most recently, members of the Commission staff were of invaluable assistance to me in helping demonstrate to television viewers in the Philadelphia area some of the most dangerous toys on the market.

The mandate of the Commission authorizes it to explore the safety aspects of products used in the home. To fulfill its mandate, the Commission has conducted four sets of public hearings, each designed to look into a special phase of products and safety standards, and important future hearings are planned. In addition, it has conducted staff evaluations of standards, codes, and laws relating to product safety. It has planned special surveys in cooperation with insurance associations and received the approval of four medical groups to send questionnaires on product-related injuries to 85,000 physicians.

I believe the Commission has certainly demonstrated its worth. It has been successful in creating a new awareness of the need for safety standards not only among consumers but also within industry. Throughout its hearings attention has been focused on laxity as well as efficiency; on irresponsibility as well as responsibility. Its successes point up the welcome fact that many industries are often ready and eager to cooperate when the facts are revealed to them in public hearings.

In January of this year, the Commission held hearings on the dangers of ordinary glass patio doors. Subsequently, the Federal Housing Administration announced its intention to make safety glass a requirement of its minimum property standards.

In December, after hearings were held on hazardous toys, a manufacturer of a toy tunnel which was found to be highly flammable issued a call for the return of those still on the shelves of retail merchants. These tunnels now will be flameproofed.

The Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers voluntarily adopted a standard to require that doors of new freezers be designed to open from the inside, as refrigerator doors have been required to operate since 1958.

The American Gas Association, as a result of the evidence given in hearings conducted by the Commission in February of this year, has agreed to consider changes in the standards for floor furnaces which are capable of inflicting serious burns, especially on children. Also, Underwriters Laboratories have upgraded a number of their standards and are exercising greater control over the use of the UL seal.

As you can all see, the Commission is engaged in important work. It is work which perhaps many of us as consumers do not appreciate because all we see are the unsafe products which are still produced because the Commission has not had the staff or the time to investigate them as yet. I believe the consumer receives a service of inestimable value from the work of the Commission. This work must be continued. To achieve this, the legislation I have introduced today will extend the life of the Commission until 1970. The Commission has proved to be a powerful weapon in the consumer protection arsenal.

The consumer needs and deserves all the protection he can get. It certainly is not inconceivable that the Commission could save one life or perhaps prevent one disabling injury from an unsafe product for each dollar we spend to keep it operating. In these days when the dollar seems to be worth less and less, I believe the Commission is the exception. It performs an invaluable service to the Nation, a service we should continue.

PROGRESS, AMERICAN STYLE: PROGRESS, RHODESIAN STYLE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier this congressional session I introduced House Resolution 244 which calls for legislative approval of the expanded United Nations sanctions of Rhodesia's Ian Smith regime.

Recently, Roy Wilkins' column in the Los Angeles Times offered a vivid comparison of participatory government concepts, taking as one example the ongoing strides made by black Americans, and looking at comparable opportunities and advancement "allowed" black Rhodesians by their government. The article reinforces my strong belief that Congress must make a positive stand in behalf of the oppressed peoples of Rhodesia.

I insert the article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 26, 1969]

U.S. NEGROES AND GOVERNMENT

(By Roy Wilkins)

While a minority of Negro college students over here seeks curriculum control in institutions where they are sometimes as few as 1/10 of 1% of the enrollment, Rhodesia has proposed a constitution which will lock more than 4 million black Rhodesians forever out of any voice in the government of their homeland.

White Rhodesians number 228,000 while the black Rhodesian population is estimated at 4,280,000.

The new constitution, "racially segregating the electorate and designed to insure that there will never be black African majority rule in Rhodesia," was hailed by Prime Minister Ian D. Smith as one placing the government "in the hands of civilized Rhodesians for all time."

The key gimmick is the racially segregated election roll. The United States stood by the principle of the free democratic election process, but we fought the practice of including Negroes as voters all the way from the Convention of 1787 down to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. We are still fighting this battle in some localities.

But the U.S.A., stubborn and cunning as it has been in denying the vote to Negro Americans, never adopted the separate racial voting lists. Perhaps it was easier and cheaper to frighten Negroes away from the ballot box. Rhodesia, however, has gone the way of the separate voting list. Blacks will be on one list and can elect only 16 of the total of 66 in Parliament. The other 50 members will be elected from the list containing the names of whites, mixed bloods and Asians. Thus, some 250,000 people will choose 50 legislators and 4 million people will choose 16. This is bad, but the white Rhodesian diehards wanted blacks excluded completely from voting.

Smith feels that his version can be argued "with a clear conscience" outside the borders of Rhodesia. He will have the aid of the apartheid government of South Africa in trying to make the world agree.

It is hard to see how such a Rhodesian government can live in perpetuity. Pressures from within and without cannot help but affect change. Black African nations will not forever be occupied with growing pains and internal rivalries. The surge for individual freedom will drive black Rhodesians to change an intolerable condition.

The chief value in this for Negro Americans is the pointing up of the steady advances—too slow, but advances, nevertheless—of the participation of the American black population in its government. It is not that they are better off than black Rhodesians who are now where they were 75 years ago. It is that they are are within striking distance of full citizenship equality, not on a separate racial voting list, but in open competition with all others on a common voting list.

This underscores the warning against black separatism, a form of apartheid which some American black students profess to prefer. In order to chain the blacks more securely, the white Rhodesians first separated them into their black (and unequal) world.

The truth is that the Negro American, despite the acknowledge hobbles, is still the one black minority in all the world that comes closest to meaningful political participation in his government. Sixteen black Rhodesians in parliament? Why Negro Americans have 11 in the Georgia legislature alone. If the men be forgotten for a moment, they have one black woman state senator in Texas and one black woman in the national Congress.

This is not good enough for 10% of the U.S. population, but it is on its way to being good enough. Moreover, it makes Ian Smith's "for all time" one with Hitler's "thousand years" and kissing kin to the "never" bloc of white Americans.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC NEEDS OF THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in our effort to encourage Arab-Israel negotiations toward a peace settlement, we must not overlook the pressing social and economic needs of the Middle East. I propose today a project aimed at supplying huge quantities of water to the people of that region, which would ultimately benefit Arab and Jew alike—and provide a solid basis for reconciliation and lasting peace. For, the shortage of water—historically a cause of great conflict between Israel and her neighbors—remains a source of continued rivalry.

My bill, which I first introduced in January 1968, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the construction of a large desalting plant in Israel. The plant would be an integral part of a dual purpose power and desalting project which will produce significant quantities of electrical power and fresh water urgently needed by Israel.

This bill would harness unequaled American financial and technical resources to the Israeli talent for developing her water resources. Throughout her 20 years of independence, Israel scientists and farmers have applied new methods and techniques to agriculture, along with two vital ingredients—hard work and determination. During this period Israel has increased the amount of land under cultivation fivefold—a clear demonstration of her ability to transform deserts into fields and orchards, and exploit and utilize sources of water to their fullest.

The dual purpose power and desalting plant would produce about 100 to 150 million gallons of fresh water per day—enough water for the intensive irrigation of approximately 50,000 acres of land. The plant would also produce about 300,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical power per day—enough power to provide electricity for the homes of some 30,000 people who will be directly involved in the farming of the land under irrigation as well as for an industrial complex attached to the plant. The output of that industrial complex will include fertilizer for over 3 million acres of land.

What will be the benefits of this project? Employment opportunities could be afforded to refugees. The desalting plant would contribute substantially to agricultural and industrial growth. It would serve as a model for power and water resources development throughout the Middle East. The project will also provide us with valuable technical information for future desalination programs throughout the world.

The most valuable effect of this venture is that it would add immeasurably to the long-range possibility of a durable Arab-Israel peace. Electricity and large quantities of low-cost water could ultimately be produced cooperatively by the Arabs and the Jews in a region that needs water, food, and power so urgently.

This is a challenging plan—but the human problems of the Middle East—finding a place for men to work and provide for their families—requires a plan of this scope.

I urge my colleagues to strengthen our commitment to the economic and social renewal of Israel—and all other nations in that area. Let us seize this chance to help shift the energies and attention of the people of the Middle East from the antagonisms of the past to the opportunities of the future.

THE VOLUNTEER ARMY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the student newspaper of Winchester, Ill., High School recently carried a comment about the volunteer army proposal written by a member of the student body, David Worrell. In my view, this young man has set forth very clearly and cogently the central arguments for a transition from compulsion to voluntarism in our armed services. Here is the text of his comments:

> THE VOLUNTEER ARMY
>
> Our country has been using the present draft system since 1948. Many people feel that now is the time for a change in our old draft laws.
>
> In almost any newspaper throughout the country you can read stories of draft card burning, riots, and demonstrations over our present system. Many feel that the volunteer army is the proper thing. I believe this is a step in the right direction.
>
> Some type of volunteer system would greatly lower training costs. As it is now, a new group of men must be taught their jobs every two years, and this is expensive. Money saved could be used to pay higher salaries, so that more able men would want to make the army their career. Also, if men stay in the service for more than two years they can learn how to do a better job.
>
> A volunteer system would affirm the principles that free men should not be forced into involuntary servitude in violation of the thirteenth amendment. If a man wants to be a soldier he can do so, and if not, he does not have to be.
>
> The new system would greatly help college boys. Many have to drop out of college to go into the army, and they frequently do not return to college.
>
> The volunteer army would be mainly composed of men with character and determination. Only the men who want to keep our country free would join. Our protection would not be in the hands of those idiots who burn their draft cards. Most of those who would volunteer would have greater intelligence and more will power. Tests have shown that those who volunteer graduate from training more quickly than those who are drafted.
>
> Our national defense would improve with a volunteer army. The only two countries who do not draft men, Canada and Britain, have high effectiveness, low turnover, and contented officers. The United States Navy, Air Force, and Marines do not draft men, and their volunteer system has worked well, making these the prestige services.
>
> Many feel that a volunteer army would help the Negroes to overthrow our government. They think the Negroes would all join the army and use it to give them power. This is far from true. The higher pay would encourage both black and white. It would actually level off the number of black and white in the army.
>
> I think everybody would benefit from the volunteer army system. Our army would be better organized with more capable men. These men would want to do their jobs without being forced. This type of army would help ease racial tensions and stop draft card burners. Above all, a volunteer army would give a man a free choice which is supposed to be guaranteed him by the Constitution.
>
> DAVID WORRELL.

NEW YORK CITY COUNCILMEN INTRODUCE RESOLUTION OPPOSING ABM DEPLOYMENT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the prospect of the deployment of President Nixon's Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system has elicited considerable response from cities and communities across the country. Contrary to the opinion expressed recently by a White House assistant that the opposition has already spent itself, opposition is increasing in intensity.

A resolution opposing deployment of the Safeguard system has recently been introduced in the City Council of New York under the primary sponsorship of Councilmen Donald R. Manes and Theodore Weiss. Since it was introduced on March 25, 1969, the resolution has attracted the cosponsorship of 17 additional councilmen, giving it the support of a majority of the council.

I am happy to provide a copy of this important resolution, and a list of its supporters, for the Record:

Resolution by the City Council of the City of New York Calling Upon the Congress of the United States To Refrain From Appropriating the Funds Necessary for the Deployment of the Safeguard Missile System and Urging That the Moneys Saved by Such Action Be Spent Toward the Promotion of Equal Opportunity and Social Harmony Within Our Nation's Cities

Whereas the cost of the recent presidential decision to deploy the Sentinel Anti-Missile system is conservatively estimated at six to seven billion dollars and

Whereas the system has provoked considerable disagreement as to both its technical feasibility and political desirability and

Whereas the Defense Department has exhibited a history of spending billions of dollars on weapon systems that become obsolete before they are completed and

Whereas it is universally accepted that millions of Americans are daily faced with a multitude of problems that severely limit their present and future well being and

Whereas an enlightened government has the responsibility to endeavor to provide equal opportunity for all its citizens and

Whereas the greatest danger facing the United States is the slow disintegration and polarization of our Nation's social framework, and

Whereas needed economic and social programs within our Cities are not properly funded or are non-existent and

Whereas this intended deployment will only further siphon off funds badly needed for our Cities and

Whereas it will be more practical as well as morally correct for our national government to make the commitment needed to eliminate social imperfections before our nation's flaws become its permanent failures and

Whereas the deployment of these systems may abrogate a portion of the newly ratified treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons; now therefore be it

Resolved, that the City Council of the City of New York does respectfully call upon the Congress of the United States to refrain from appropriating the funds necessary for the deployment of the Sentinel Missile System and be it further

Resolved, that the City Council urges that money saved on this action be spent towards the promotion of equal opportunity and social harmony within the Cities of our nation.

Sponsors and Cosponsors of a Resolution Introduced in the City Council of the City of New York Opposing Deployment of the Safeguard Anti-Ballistic-Missile System

Councilmen Manes, Weiss, Bernstein, Cohen, Friedland, Greitzer, Katzman, Knigin, Lazar, Lebran, Low, Maze, Merola, Moscowitz, Rios, Sadowski, Sharison, Skolnick, and Thompson.

PROF. JOHN E. ULLMANN'S STATEMENT ON THE ABM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, I participated in a congressional hearing sponsored by the New York Council for a Sane Nuclear Policy on the subject of the proposed anti-ballistic-missile system. This hearing was held at the Ethical Culture Society. I believe that hearing was an important contribution to the national debate now taking place on the question of the ABM. Testimony was presented by academicians and scientists concerned with the implications of the ABM, its relationship to disarmament talks and the arms race, and its effect on the economy. Concerned community citizens also testified about its impact upon our society.

Prof. John E. Ullmann, who is chairman of the department of management and business statistics at Hofstra University in Hempstead, N.Y., made a presentation at that hearing which I believe gives an exceptionally well-reasoned analysis of the economic implications of the proposed ABM programs. I am today inserting Professor Ullmann's statement in the Record, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

The ABM Systems: Bankruptcy Without Security

(By John E. Ullmann)

My name is John E. Ullmann. I am Chairman of the Department of Management, Marketing and Business Statistics of Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York. I am also a national director of SANE and co-chairman of the New Democratic Coalition of Nassau County. I am a civil, mechanical and industrial engineer by training and have specialized for many years in engineering economics and in industrial and urban planning.

My purpose today is to discuss some of the economic implications of the proposed ABM programs. I would like to make it clear at the outset, however, that in commenting on some of the cost estimates announced by the Pentagon, my views are essentially that the proposed systems are not worth $50 billion, nor $5 billion, nor five cents. To be an effective defense, an ABM system could not even permit a single nuclear armed missile to reach its target. For if just one did, all would be lost anyway, and the city together with most of its population would be destroyed. Merely to set the requirements of the system in this way indicates the utter futility of trying to develop one. It would certainly have to perform enormously better than anything we now have in the defense against aircraft.

It is perfectly clear from the American experience in Vietnam and from military operations elsewhere that today, just as in World War II, the bombers, or at least most of them, will get through. The North Vietnamese have, we are told, been equipped with some of the most sophisticated Russian ground-to-air missiles but these appear to have been largely useless against our attacking aircraft. Even against armed helicopters, defense measures have proved to be quite difficult.

Are we then to take seriously any claims by the military and by their industrial suppliers that there exists now or there is in prospect any system that can provide the kind of protection which I specified earlier? I think that the very suggestion is an utter absurdity. Clearly, the advantage lies with the attacker and with the development of multiple warheads and better penetration devices, this system would not help defend anybody against anything.

This does not mean, however, that we should therefore install more offensive weapons. What with 4200 megaton warheads ready to go at no more than 136 Russian towns with over 100,000 inhabitants, we have plenty of overkill already. The Russians, in turn, can kill us 20 times over. Enough is enough for both sides; "parity" and "superiority" are slogans that have no meaning in this contest—unless we can figure out how to kill somebody more than once.

Other speakers today have concerned themselves with further technical, strategic and political objections to the ABM. It is extremely gratifying that a growing number of members of Congress is beginning to agree with our objections. To be asked to pay vast sums for something which is worth nothing is, in a commercial situation, known as attempted fraud. And we in this city would not tolerate it for one minute if we were buying hamburger. Why then should we tolerate it if the protection of our lives is to be entrusted to such quack remedies?

What are we to make of the argument that the ABM is a useful bargaining counter in the strategic arms limitation talks with the Russians? Obviously, the Russians must respond to the same physical and technical constraints as we. Whatever so-called system they have built, therefore, they cannot defend themselves against us either. We must look for something better to come out of the talks than trading one load of expensive nothing for another. Besides, why should we still let the Russians decide for us how we should act? Is it because, as Robert M. Hutchins once said, "unless we are getting ahead of, or falling behind the Russians, how would we know where we are going?" Let it be stated categorically: To refrain from wasteful futility is not unilateral disarmament; nor is the installation of a non-functioning defense system a step toward tension reduction, as Mr. Kosygin and the Hudson Institute seem to think.

Competent military planners *first* identify a threat and then try to counter it. For the reasons stated, an effective defense against nuclear armed ballistic missiles is impossible. Faced with this fact, the ABM designers have turned this planning process upside down: They define their ABM system and then invent an attack scenario to suit which, of course, the enemy would and could avoid. It is as if a knight of old had sallied forth into battle with armor only on his left kneecap—it's a great defense system if you are sure that the enemy won't aim at any other part of your anatomy. We are told that the Sentinel, sometimes referred to as "thin," is alleged to cost $5 billion. But, fat as this number is—at least to me—, is it only a downpayment? Does that $5 billion depend on the Chinese for once really being as stupid as some of our more arrogant military planners evidently expect them to be? I believe that the $5 billion would inescapably become a starter set for a thick system alleged to cost $40 billion.

Recent weapon systems (e.g., the F–111) have overrun their costs by a factor of about 3.2 and we could expect at least that with the ABM. The reason is that such a system would monopolize our technical talent even more than military industries do now and so barrel-scraping, with corresponding loss of efficiency, is inevitable. Moreover, as the design proceeds we would have to keep going "back to the old drawing board" as the uselessness of the system becomes clear; truly we have here a technical labor of Sysyphus. And when all is done, the system still won't function properly. Congressman Ryan has drawn out attention to this decline in quality in a recent highly perceptive article (*The American Engineer*, January 1968, p. 19). The only remedy for this condition is redundancy.

And here I must once again point out that long before such a system could be put in place, its design, which must necessarily be frozen at an early stage would render it obsolete.

This kind of thing has so often happened to us in the past, and with so many weapon systems, that I find it incredible that anyone should have the slightest doubt that this would occur again in the course of producing as difficult a system as an ABM.

We have, therefore, reached a working

total of $200 billion for hardware. This is a truly enormous amount, and would far exceed the combined total of all military procurement of the past five years. It would be eight times the current total output of the military electronics industry. It exceeds by about 40 per cent the total now collected by all forms of taxation in the United States. It is in fact about the size of the total Federal expenditures from all sources at present. All of this would be disastrous enough, but there is worse to come.

An indispensable ingredient of an ABM system would undoubtedly have to be a civil defense program and shelter system if for no reason other than to protect us from misfires, malfunctions and overhead explosions. Over the years there have been many so-called estimates of blast shelter costs deriving from a multitude of so-called engineering studies prepared at taxpayer expense. This is no occasion for dealing with them in detail. Suffice it to say that they all seem to have been derived by a most irresponsible cutting of corners and by other invalid design assumptions, some of them bordering on fantasies. My own estimate prepared in 1962 and contained in Seymour Melman (ed.) *No Place to Hide* (Grove Press, 1962, p. 150–156), is that the cost would have to be no less than $1,500–$2,200 per shelter place. This implies a national cost of not less than $250 billion. To this we would have to apply at the very least an inflation factor, leading to a revised estimate of some $350 billion.

In short, what we are really talking about here is a downpayment on something that will ultimately cost $550 billion. This is an amount equal to twice the Gross National Product of the Soviet Union. It is half as big again as our national debt. It is over three years' worth of all taxes at present levels. It is already, to my mind, bad enough that our present defense budget should exceed the Gross National Product of Italy by some 25 per cent but this would be seven times as high.

With the kind of spending to which the ABM proposals would inexorably lead, however, even we would [illegible] overstraining our spending capacity. The reason is, of course, that a project of such magnitude would have to be put in hand fairly rapidly for it to have any military value and in order to provide at least an illusion of protection before it is too obviously obsolete. Such a task, of course, is physically impossible of accomplishment unless we are willing to conscript all of our labor and all of our resources in the service of this preposterous exercise in what I can only describe as "necropolitan planning." The kinds of controls that this would involve would, of course, end our freedoms very rapidly. If their care and protection is what defense is all about—and I think that it is—then a set of proposals which would inexorably lead to their willful destruction obviously brands our weapons planners as professional incompetents and blunderers.

This view may seem harsh but I suggest that the alternative would be even worse. It is that the ABM is being promoted in order to find permanent work for those in the military and their suppliers unwilling to contemplate a reduced level of activity and money-wasting after Vietnam. Recent statements by military suppliers to the effect that they do not expect to have to do much conversion lend point to this argument. Congress should make it crystal clear to these people that the nation owes them a fair chance at something else to do—something the country really needs—but not more jobs and more profits at the expense of our liberties and with the result of our bankruptcy.

Finally, Members of Congress are often impatient with the "thin-end-of-the-wedge" argument, preferring to point out that at each stage of escalating expenses, Congress could say no and would do so if things got too bad. This time, however, let there be no mistake: You have been warned by all the "building block," "pilot system," "thin screen" arguments of the military of what lies ahead and you know how difficult it is in fact to say no to a military spokesman who promises glittering results for just a few more billions of dollars—and, indeed, for a few more thousand lives.

Thus I submit that the time to say no is now: Now, when there is a chance of getting a real peace dividend for our long suffering society; now when even a respected business journal like *Fortune* can put the necessary therapeutic expenditures for our neglected country at $57 billion a year. Today I am here to suggest ways in which not to waste untold billions which we need elsewhere. I hope you will all be back soon for a discussion of constructive alternatives.

ELECTORAL REFORM

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the present system for electing the President of the United States needs to be reformed. This issue will be one of the most important to be considered by the Congress. Interest and concern about how the system should be reformed is widespread. When the Judiciary Committee held hearings on this matter, AFL–CIO President George Meany made a strong case for election of the President of the United States by direct popular vote, for universal suffrage for all persons 18 years of age or older, and other reforms. Mr. Meany's testimony should, I believe, have the widest possible circulation. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 179 AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 181, AND RELATED BILLS PERTAINING TO ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM, MARCH 6, 1969

Mr. Chairman, my name is George Meany. I am President of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, and I appear here on behalf of that organization.

I appreciate very much this opportunity to appear before this Committee, Mr. Chairman, to present our views on various proposals now before the Congress for reform of the electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States. Obviously, the measures which you are sponsoring, H.J. Res. 179 and H.J. Res. 181, are of particular importance, and I shall have more to say about these proposals later in my statement. There are, of course, other measures to which the Committee will, I feel sure, also wish to give their attention.

At the very outset I would like to indicate the kind of electoral college reform that we believe to be required at this time. In 1955 the merger convention of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations adopted a resolution, which was subsequently reiterated by our Third Constitutional Convention in 1959, that stated:

"The President and Vice President of the United States should be elected by direct popular vote. The electoral college system has outlived its usefulness, and should be abolished."

Last month, the AFL–CIO Executive Council reaffirmed that policy. So our position is very clear. We want to see the electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President abolished and a system of direct popular election of these officials substituted in its place.

We are not, of course, alone in taking this position. On November 23, 1968, the *New York Times* reported the results of a survey conducted by the Gallup Poll which showed that 81 percent of adults who had been interviewed between November 8 and November 16, 1968, favored amendment of the Constitution to "do away with the Electoral College and base the election of a President on the total vote cast throughout the nation". And a recent Harris Poll showed similar results: 78 percent of the people polled favored a constitutional amendment providing for direct election of the President and Vice President instead of the present electoral college system.

Many organizations have also indicated their support of such a system of direct popular election of the President and Vice President. Among these organizations are the American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the National Federation of Independent Business—none of which are particularly noted for their radical views.

Many members of Congress, including you, Mr. Chairman, and Congressman McCulloch and other members of this Committee, have introduced proposed constitutional amendments that would provide for a system of direct popular election of the President and Vice President in place of the electoral college system. Thirty of the approximately 60 proposals for reform of the electoral college system that have been introduced in the House of Representatives thus far in the present session of Congress call for such a system, and the sponsors of these proposals total some 75 Congressmen in all. None of the other proposals has any comparably broad support among the public or the members of Congress.

The reasons for this strong support for fundamental, rather than patchwork, reform of the present electoral college system need only be briefly summarized. First, of course, the present system permits one candidate for President to be elected with fewer popular votes than his principal opponent, and this has happened three times in our history. Presidents John Quincy Adams in 1824, Rutherford B. Hayes in 1876, and Benjamin Harrison in 1888 all actually trailed their opponents in the popular vote. It is worth recalling, too, that in 1960 President John F. Kennedy led his opponent, Richard M. Nixon, by only 49.71 percent to 49.55 percent of the vote, and that in 1968 President Richard Nixon, received only 43.16 percent of the vote while his opponent, Hubert H. Humphrey, received 42.73 percent of the vote.

Perhaps the most important objection to the present electoral college system arises from the provisions which call for election by the House when none of the candidates for President has an electoral vote majority. While it is true that this has actually happened only twice in our history, the possibility has been an every-present threat to stable transfers of power from one administration to another, as in the Hayes-Tilden contest in 1876.

In this connection, it should not be forgotten that it was the settlement of that contest, achieved through a compromise designed to avoid having the choice between those two contestants go to the House of Representatives when neither appeared to have an electoral vote majority, that paved the way for the deprivation and postponement of equal voting and civil rights for Negroes and other minorities for a period of nearly 90 years. Indeed, the spectre of that dark history was ever-present even in our latest Presidential election in 1968, when George Wallace of Alabama dreamed of the possibilities of another deal like that of 1876.

But it is not only the political consequences that flow from the provision calling for decision by the House of Representatives when neither party has an electoral vote majority that is the most objectionable feature of this procedure. When this happens, the members of the House of Representatives do not vote as individual Congressmen. Each state has a single vote and that vote is determined by the votes of Congressmen who make up the delegation from that state. If the Congressmen from a particular state, be it New York or New Mexico, divide their votes evenly among the candidates, that state gets no vote at all in the selection of the President. Yet a majority of all the states, or 26 votes, is necessary for election. It is hard to imagine how a more archaic and totally unrepresentative system could have been derived. I do not believe anything good can be said about it.

There is another objection to the present Electoral College System of electing the President and Vice President which need only be briefly summarized—the fact that there is no legal way to force an elector to vote for the candidate to whom he pledged himself. It is significant that when Congress endeavored to deal with such an elector—Dr. Lloyd W. Bailey of South Carolina—in last fall's Presidential election it found itself completely unable to require the elector to cast his vote in the manner contemplated in his party pledge.

There are arguments, of course, in support of the present Electoral College System, not the least of which is that it has survived virtually unchanged since the Constitution was written in 1787. By and large, however, the arguments in behalf of this system are negative in character and the fact remains that the hazards which it presents continue to hang like a cloud over every Presidential election. This is intolerable under present-day conditions when smooth transfers from the administration of one President to another are essential.

I should like to turn now to a discussion of the recommendations of President Nixon, the two proposed constitutional amendments which Chairman Celler has introduced, and other principal proposals for reform of the present electoral college system.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council noted that, while we are fully in agreement with President Nixon that the present Presidential selection procedures require major overhaul, "we see no point to replacing the present complicated and erratic mechanism with one even more complicated and erratic." We do agree with both President Nixon and President Johnson that, whatever else is done, the individual electors should be abolished. They serve no useful purpose and, in fact, perpetuate an "anachronism whereby occasional faithless individual electors are legally free to betray their trust."

We do not agree, however, with President Nixon's plan, which he says he is proposing because of doubt that his "personal preference" for direct popular election can be adopted. That plan would (1) allocate the electoral vote of each state on a proportional, instead of the present unit vote basis; (2) make a 40 percent electoral vote plurality sufficient to choose a President; and (3) provide for a runoff election by popular vote if no candidate receives 40 percent of the electoral vote. The AFL–CIO Executive Council observed:

"Except for the third step, this plan would not improve but would worsen the present mechanism. Proportionate allocation of electoral votes could have the same unfortunate consequences as the existing system—it could elect a President receiving a smaller popular vote than his opponent. Thus the particular proportional allocation plan which President Nixon has sometimes supported would have elected him instead of President Kennedy, in 1960. Moreover, proportional allocation, unlike the present system, would favor the development of splinter parties and undercut the two-party system. In sum, the President's proposal is worse, not better than, the present system."

We feel furthermore that if direct popular election is feasible in a runoff, as President Nixon has proposed, it is feasible in the first place.

But basically we do not agree with the President's doubts as to whether a direct election amendment can be adopted. Certainly, the President could have gone far to resolve such doubts had he announced his unequivocal support, instead of merely a "personal preference," for direct popular election of the President and Vice President. As I have already pointed out, this proposal has already received far wider support in Congress than any other proposed amendment and is, according to the polls, favored by the vast majority of the American people. It is our belief, in contrast to President Nixon's doubts, that if the proposal for direct popular election cannot be adopted, there is little reason to believe that any other plan can.

I should like to turn now to a discussion of some of the specific proposals that are presently before Congress to remedy or to replace the present electoral college system. One proposal, which may be described as the "unit vote" proposal, would write into the Constitution the present practice of awarding all of a state's electoral votes to the candidate winning the greatest number of popular votes in the state. Such a proposal is contained in H.J. Res. 181, one of the proposed constitutional amendments which you, Mr. Chairman, have introduced.

This proposal would preclude the type of situation which arose in the 1968 election in connection with the so-called "faithless elector," Dr. Bailey. The mere fact, however, that H.J. Res. 181 would remedy this type of situation is hardly sufficient justification for its passage in view of the far greater drawbacks of the present system which it would leave intact.

H.J. Res. 181 does correct one other deficiency of the present system when an election is thrown into the House. Under this proposed amendment the members of the House and Senate sitting in joint session would choose the President by ballot from among the three candidates having the highest number of electoral votes. The vote of each Congressman and Senator would be publicly announced and recorded, and the person receiving the greatest number of votes would be chosen. A quorum for the purpose of such a joint session of the House and Senate would consist of three-fourths of all the Congressmen and Senators.

This feature of H.J. Res. 181 would undoubtedly be an improvement over the present procedure which is called into operation when no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes. It would not, however, eliminate the basic objection to the electoral college system which is that it permits the election of candidates who have not received the greatest number of popular votes, such as has happened in three of our presidential elections. Nor would it prevent such compromises contrary to the public interest as have characterized at least one effort to avoid submission of the choice to Congress, as happened in the Hayes-Tilden contest in 1876.

While H.J. Res 181 has some constructive aspects, we are not able, Mr. Chairman, to give it our endorsement since it still would permit the popular will as demonstrated by the votes of the people to be disregarded. At the present time, and under present-day political, economic and social conditions, we do not believe this is any longer tolerable.

Another proposal would divide each state into electoral districts comparable to Congressional districts. In some versions existing Congressional districts would in fact be used. Under this "district vote" proposal, the winner of the popular vote within a district would receive the district's electoral vote. Most versions of this proposal would also allocate two additional electoral votes to the winner of the popular vote in the state. H.J. Res. 401, introduced by Congressman McCulloch, and resolutions introduced by twelve other Congressmen are examples of proposals along this line. Although there are variations between them in respect to use of Congressional districts or specially created electoral districts, all of them would continue to provide that electors similar to those currently provided for would cast the ultimate votes for President and Vice President.

This proposal, like the proportional proposal, would leave unresolved the problem that arises if none of the candidates receives a majority of the electoral votes. When this happens under these proposals the question of the choice of the President is thrown into the House of Representatives. Had this proposal been in effect in 1960, Mr. Nixon would have been elected over President Kennedy by an electoral vote of 278 to 245, despite the fact that his popular vote total was lower.

Finally, there is the proposal which has the overwhelming support of most members of Congress who have introduced measures to effectuate reform of the present electoral college system. This is the direct popular vote system, which you have introduced, Mr. Chairman, in H.J. Res. 179, and which Congressman McCulloch has introduced in H.J. Res. 402. We support your proposals along this line, and urge that this Committee report such an amendment.

We believe, Mr. Chairman, that any amendment which is adopted by Congress should provide for election of the President and Vice President by direct nationwide popular vote. It would be desirable, we think, to provide, as your proposed constitutional amendment does provide, that a candidate must obtain at least 40 percent of the popular vote in order to be elected, and that there should be a national run-off popular vote between the two top candidates in the event no candidate receives at least 40 percent of the popular vote. We also approve of the provisions of your proposed constitutional amendment which would require the President and Vice President to be voted for jointly.

However, we respectfully suggest that the amendment does not go far enough in providing for Federal control of eligibility to vote for president and as to the places and manner of holding presidential elections and the inclusion of names of candidates on the ballot.

We think the constitutional amendment should itself provide for universal suffrage in presidential elections, that is that all persons 18 or above shall be qualified to vote in presidential elections. Further, we think that the amendment should provide that the places and manner of holding presidential elections and the inclusions of names of the candidates on ballots shall be prescribed by the Congress.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I should like to emphasize the importance of the requirement that Congress be authorized to adopt uniform age and residency requirements for voting. These matters received extended and urgent attention by the recent meeting of the AFL–CIO Executive Council. I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, that a copy of these statements be included at this point in the record of these hearings as part of my statement.

Probably the main objection that has been raised against the direct popular vote system of electing the President and Vice President is that it would represent a basic departure from the federal principles upon which the Government of the United States is based. We have given long and careful consideration to this contention and have concluded that it is not well-founded.

The electoral college system was from the outset a compromise that proved from the first Presidential election on to be wholly unworkable and was the subject of one of the earliest amendments (Amendment No. XII) to the Constitution. Conceivably the electoral college system seemed to the drafters of the Constitution to make sense when the country was young and because of difficulties of transportation and communication it was hardly possible for people in one part of the country to be acquainted with public figures in other parts of the country so as to enable them to make an informed judgment as to their qualifications for election to the Presidency or Vice Presidency.

The Presidency is a national office, and the question of who fills it is a matter of first importance to people throughout the United States. Candidates for the office of President and Vice President today are generally well-known public figures who have the means and the ability through modern systems of transportation and communication to make their qualifications known to the people in all parts of the country.

In practical fact, the federal principle today finds its strongest institutions, not in the electoral college, but in the state governments, the Senate of the United States and, above all, the substantive provisions of the Constitution itself. We are convinced that direct election of the President and Vice President will do no violence to the federal principle but will strengthen and make far more workable our constitutional system of government.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, when I recently appeared before the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations in support of S. 860 which calls for the creation of a Department of Consumer Affairs, I stated:

> Without full, vigorous, and coordinated enforcement, consumer protection laws benefit only the printers and bookbinders of the United States Code.

For it is evident that with 33 Federal departments and agencies carrying on approximately 260 consumer activities, protection of the consumer remains haphazard and ineffective.

The editorial entitled "Consumer Protection" which appeared in the Long Island Press on March 24, 1969, calls for a Federal consumer protection apparatus which will provide an overview of consumer programs and more central control. This message will be heard and read more often in the future as we see that the consumer legislation enacted in the past is only a partial solution to the problem. The editorial follows:

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Is the consumer—too often on the short end in the marketplace—also getting shortchanged in federal protection?

No, insists President Nixon, citing consumer protection programs scattered through 33 different federal agencies.

Yes, insists Betty Furness, President Johnson's former consumer aide, who told a Senate committee last week: "Given the opportunity to protect commerce or the consumer, but not both at the same time, who do you think the Department of Commerce will protect? Given the same opportunity with the farmer or the consumer, who will the Department of Agriculture protect?"

Not since the muckraking movement before World War I has there been such a thrust toward greater protection for the consumer as we are seeing today. Those early champions of the consumer like Upton Sinclair, Ida Tarbell, Lincoln Steffens and Charles Edward Russell, among others, wrote powerful exposés of abuses in meat packing, housing, labor, insurance and other enterprises, resulting in a host of landmark reforms such as the Pure Food and Drug Act, child labor laws and others.

Congress is now taking a hard new look at this difficult three-way relationship involving consumers, business and government. The Senate committee Miss Furness addressed held hearings all last week on proposals to set up a cabinet office for a Department of Consumer Affairs as a means of better protecting consumer interests. A similar proposal has for years been vigorously pushed in the House by Rep. Benjamin Roesnthal, the Elmhurst Democrat, who testified at the Senate hearing about the inadequacy of present federal machinery. Not only is there fragmentation and inefficiency, he said, but the new administration is dragging its feet about naming a chairman of the President's Consumer Affairs Committee, the post held by Miss Furness.

This gets close to the heart of the matter. While it is the mission of Congress to fight the uphill battle to enact new laws, it is up to the Executive to see that they are adequately enforced.

There are good laws on the books, but many more will be needed as times and technology change. The auto safety fight is a good example. And President Nixon is correct in pointing to how many agencies are now responsible for consumer protection. But a pressing need—that can be met immediately—is to make these agencies, so richly endowed with power, more responsive to consumer needs than they have been. A cabinet post, as a central focus of responsibility, would, of course, facilitate this. But whether we have a cabinet post or only the existing apparatus, the real key to consumer protection ultimately lies with the President to set the properly vigorous pro-consumer pace. Moreover, cooperation, instead of opposition, from business would be in the best interest of all.

STRENGTHENING PRESCHOOL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the past week the administration has finalized its proposals for establishing an Office of Child Development in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and for transferring to the new agency the Headstart program.

The President is directing that the new Office of Child Development put great emphasis on the role of parents in the administration of the program, that the program continue to focus on the poor, and that the comprehensive nature of the program, including health, nutrition, education, social services, and parental involvement be maintained. The office will encourage additional experimentation with program content and techniques in order to find better teaching methods which will increase the effectiveness of Headstart.

The essential purpose of this move is to place emphasis on investing available resources to improve the capabilities of the educational system rather than continuing to build parallel and competing systems. The new cross-disciplinary approach to early childhood services represents a significant step toward bringing all relevant and helpful services together. The establishment of a new bureau not bound by tradition or previous commitments provides a workable mechanism for making significant improvements in preschool child development programs.

I insert the President's announcement of the establishment of the Office of Child Development, together with statements of Secretary Finch in the RECORD, as indicative of the commitment of the administration to improving preschool programs for the Nation's children.

The material follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT

In my message to the Congress of February 19th on the Economic Opportunity Act, I called for a "national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life . . ." I again pledge myself to that commitment.

No such commitment has ever before been asked in our nation: No such pledge has ever been given.

Two fundamental developments bring it about.

The first is one of the most characteristic developments of the modern age: new knowledge, new facts. We know today—and with each day our knowledge grows more detailed—that the process of human development is in certain fundamental ways different from what it has been thought to be. Or perhaps it is the case that mothers have always understood, but that only men have failed to take notice.

We have learned, first of all, that the process of learning how to learn begins very, very early in the life of the infant child. Children begin this process in the very earliest months of life, long before they are anywhere near a first grade class, or even kindergarten, or play school group. We have also learned that for the children of the poor this ability to learn can begin to deteriorate very early in life, so that the youth begins school well behind his contemporaries and seemingly rarely catches up. He is handicapped as surely as a child crippled by polio is handicapped: and he bears the burden of that handicap through all his life. It is elemental that, even as in the case of polio, the effects of prevention are far better than the effects of cure.

Increasingly we know something about how this can be done. With each passing year—almost with each passing month, such is the pace of new developments in this field of knowledge—research workers in the United States and elsewhere in the world are learning more about the way in which an impoverished environment can develop a "learned helplessness" in children. When there is little stimulus for the mind, and especially when there is little interaction between parent and child, the child suffers lasting disabilities, particularly with respect to the development of a sense of control of his environment. None of this follows from the simple fact of being poor, but it is now fully established that an environment that does not stimulate learning is closely associated in the real world with poverty in its traditional forms. As much as any one thing it is this factor that leads to the transmission of poverty from one generation to the next. It is no longer possible to deny that the process is all too evidently at work in the slums of America's cities, and that is a most ominous aspect of the urban crisis.

It is just as certain that we shall have to invent new social institutions to respond to this new knowledge.

Elementary school, kindergarten, even Head Start appear to come too late for many of those children who most need help. This is no ground for despair, but, to the contrary, a clear challenge to our creativity as a great urban, democratic society. Ways of reaching and helping the very young and their mothers—when they need such help—must be found. There must be ways that protect the privacy of that relationship, and the sacred right of parents to rear their children according to their own values and own understandings. But they also bear a solemn responsibility to insure that the full potential of those children is enabled to come forth. Finding a balance between these imperatives will test our moral wisdom as much as our scientific knowledge. But it can be done, and it must.

The delegation of Head Start to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was the first step in fulfilling my commitment to the first five years of life. In HEW, this program can be supported and supplemented by other Federal programs dealing with children in the early years.

The second step, which I announce today, is the creation of an Office of Child Development, reporting directly to Secretary Finch's office. This office must take a comprehensive approach to the development of young children, combining programs which deal with the physical, social and intellectual.

Preliminary evaluations of this program indicate that Head Start must begin earlier in life, and last longer, to achieve lasting benefits. Toward this end, Secretary Finch has decided to expand the Parent and Child Center and Follow Through programs, while reducing summer programs.

We must remember that we are only beginning to learn what works, and what does not, in this field. We are on the verge of exciting breakthroughs, but much more must be learned before we can prepare a successful nation-wide preschool program.

There are any number of urban problems that can be dealt with promptly—and should be. Others can be approached in terms that admit of clear results in two, three, and four years. But some matters take longer. Above all, the process of a child's maturing is one of slow and steady growth that will not be speeded up for all our scientific knowledge.

America must learn to approach its problems in terms of the time-span those problems require. All problems are pressing; all cry out for instant solutions; but not all can be instantly solved. We must submit to the discipline of time with respect to those issues which provide no alternative.

The process of child development is such a matter.

Our commitment to the first five years of life will not show its full results during my Administration, nor in that of my successor. But if we plant the seeds and if we respond to the knowledge we have, then a stronger and greater America will surely one day come of it.

STATEMENT OF U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Robert H. Finch said today he will operate Project Head Start through a new Office of Child Development which will be located in his immediate office and report directly to him.

Delegation of Head Start to HEW is expected to take place on or before July 1.

The Secretary said the new Office would be designed to carry out President Nixon's expressed commitment to the needs of children from birth to five years of age. He said that "the delegation of Head Start to HEW offers the occasion for a new and overdue national commitment to child and parent development."

"This new Office will have direct access to me," Secretary Finch said, "and will serve as a focal point for new initiatives in child development." In addition to Head Start, the Office will be responsible for the day care program, and over time, other early childhood programs now handled by the Children's Bureau.

Secretary Finch also announced he will form an ongoing Advisory Committee on Child Development which will be made up of experts in the field, parents of children participating in the programs, and local program officials.

As soon as it takes shape, the Office of Child Development will take action to strengthen Head Start. In this connection, the Secretary intends to:

Encourage communities to try out some of the new program models which are being developed through HEW-supported research.

Encourage replacement of many summer programs with full year programs.

Double the present number of 36 Parent and Child Centers, programs for families with children under three years of age.

Seek greater use of Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds for the Follow Through program for Head Start graduates.

Experiment with a scholarship or voucher system to put Head Start purchasing power directly in the hands of parents, and encourage greater private participation by funding joint projects with industry and unions for day care or Head Start associated with places of employment.

The Office of Child Development will coordinate its activities with existing educational, health, and social service programs. Secretary Finch said he will encourage joint projects whereby school systems using education funds can collaborate with community groups using Head Start funds to provide a more comprehensive child development program.

"I am encouraged by the increasingly greater use of ESEA funds for programs comparable to Head Start. This is only one of the signs of the changes which are taking place in the schools," he said.

Secretary Finch expressed his gratitude to an advisory committee headed by former Director of the Bureau of the Budget Charles Schultze which met at HEW March 7 and 8 to consider the placement of Head Start.

In establishing the Office of Child Development, the Secretary said he was following the recommendation of the advisory committee.

STATEMENT BY ROBERT H. FINCH, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

In his February 19 message to the Congress, President Nixon announced that he intended to delegate the operation of the Head Start program to the Department, effective on or before July 1, 1969. In the days since the President's announcement, I have been conducting an intensive review to determine where Head Start might best be placed within HEW and how new resources and strength can be brought to it.

As part of that review process, I convened an Advisory Committee which was ably chaired by Mr. Charles Schultze, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Schultze's Report to me on the Committee's recommendations has played a major role in shaping my own decision. Copies of his Report are available.

In arriving at the following decisions about Head Start, I was guided by two basic principles which emerged from our review: (*1*) *the delegation of Head Start to HEW offers the occasion for a new and overdue national commitment to child and parent development, and* (*2*) *we still do not know what child development techniques are most effective, and our future efforts must more carefully test and evaluate different approaches.*

With regard to the need for greater emphasis on child development, we know that there are four times as many young people as aged in the U.S., yet:

Federal benefits and services of all kinds in 1970, including the social insurance programs, will average about $1,750 per aged person, and only $190 per young person; and

The relative imbalance has been expanding with the increase over the last 10 years for the aged standing at nearly $22 billion, compared to $11.5 for the young.

We do not begrudge our expenditures on the aged; they are a group which needs special help. But the relative lack of emphasis on investment in children seems shortsighted in light of the high social and economic payoffs which such investment can have in terms of helping to produce fully effective members of society.

Our purpose now is to strengthen and improve Head Start through this delegation, rather than in any way to weaken it. It is my intention that the basic policies governing the program be continued, including parent participation, comprehensive services, development of career opportunities for nonprofessionals, use of volunteers, and the opportunity for a wide variety of types of organizations to operate the program.

Within these guidelines, there are a number of steps which I propose to take to improve the program:

1. The Head Start experience needs to be reinforced through greater program length and continuity. To that end, I am preparing to take the following three steps:

a. We must encourage communities to convert summer programs, which are of limited effectiveness, into experimental or regular full-year programs. Preliminary surveys indicate some $45 million would be transferred in this manner into full-year efforts.

b. I plan to double, to $12 million, the size of the Parent and Child Center program which serves children under three years of age and their families.

c. I will seek a substantial expansion of the Follow Through program which is budgeted to reach only 6 percent of Head Start graduates in Fiscal Year 1970, by encouraging greater use of existing Title I funds for this purpose.

2. Technical assistance and evaluation efforts need to be increased. Accordingly, I will implement the suggestion made in the evaluation report of a consulting company that program development and review teams be sent out to work with grantees about six months in advance of their submissions for refunding. We will also expand efforts of personnel training and dissemination of research results through a new visitation and personnel exchange effort between experimental and operating programs.

3. We need to experiment with new program models and ways of bringing the full resources of HEW to bear in support of the program. In this connection we will require the larger Head Start grantees to devote 5 percent of their approved slots for experimental curricula and programs as a means of keeping them alive to new ideas. Among the promising new approaches we plan to test are (1) lower-cost "mini" programs conducted in the child's home or neighborhood through tutors or sub-centers, (2) day care programs funded jointly with industry and labor and related to particular places of employment, (3) experimental early childhood centers linking preschool and school programs for children up to eight years, and (4) programs providing Head Start scholarships or vouchers directly to parents so that they can purchase Head Start services on a competitive basis from certified providers.

I have also decided that Head Start should be administered by a separate Office of Child Development within the Department which would report directly to my office and which would not be subordinated to any existing organizational unit. This was the central recommendation of my Advisory Committee, and I believe it will offer the best possible way of responding to the President's charge to us that we make an expanded commitment to the first five years of life.

The new Office will have direct access to me and because of its high prestige and visibility can become the focal point for a new initiative in child development.

In this connection, I plan to upgrade and transfer the day care, and over time, other early childhood programs operated by the Children's Bureau to this new Office. We are undertaking further studies as to how this can best be accomplished.

I also plan to create an ongoing Advisory Committee on Child Development to include persons skilled in the early childhood field, parents of children participating in the program, and officials responsible for operation of programs at the local level.

Over the next few weeks we will also develop a coordinating mechanism which will seek to provide an overview of early childhood programs throughout the Department, so that research experience and program models can be most widely used. In this regard, I am asking each of the senior officials of the Department to work closely with the new Office and to carefully explore the ways he can be of assistance to it. In particular, we want to make the body of research knowledge now available through the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the National Institute of Mental Health an integral part of the program effort.

The new Office of Child Development will seek to coordinate its activities with related activities at the local level in our existing education, health and social service programs. For example, we will encourage school systems using education funds and community groups using Head Start funds to collaborate in order to provide a more thorough program of child development. Similar uses may be made of funds under the Social Security Act. Such collaboration would represent, not only a "Head Start," but a sustained start for youngsters.

Today, our nation's schools and child care programs are in the process of changing toward a more comprehensive approach to the physical, social and intellectual development of children and their families. The work and the program of this new Office, with all of the added resources which it will bring to bear, will help our schools and our child care programs to make that change more rapidly.

I am encouraged by the increasingly greater use being made of Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds for local school system programs which are comparable to Head Start. Similarly, I am aware that many school systems have made use of such funds for their own Follow Through programs, and that Social Security Act funds which are administered by the Social and Rehabilitation Service can and are being used to complement education funds and Head Start funds. Therefore, it is critically important that the cooperation between the Office of Child Development, the Office of Education and the Social and Rehabilitation Service be strong and continuing. Both Dr. James Allen, Assistant Secretary for Education designate and Miss Mary E. Switzer, Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service have indicated to me their intention to substantially strengthen the commitments of their programs to focus more sharply on areas of early childhood relevent to their agencies.

ATTACK AGAINST POLICE RENEWED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, those who oppose peace of mind through law and order and are irresponsible to society continue devious plans to hamstring and thwart local law enforcement protection.

Strangely, the continued attacks on police officers are well-organized and well-financed.

Can any thinking American conceive of offering a cloak of respectability to any movement to make it impossible for our cities to have trained, experienced police officers on the beat?

I feel that many of our colleagues are well aware of the war on our streets—the damage and mayhem from the outside interference with our police—will be interested in the newest attack, reported as "Community Control of Police" by Arthur I. Waskow. I ask that the report follow:

COMMUNITY CONTROL OF THE POLICE

(By Arthur I. Waskow; report of a discussion conference cosponsored by the Institute for Policy Studies and the Center for the Study of Law and Society of the University of California (Berkeley))

Participants: John P. Spiegel, Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence; Frank Mesiah, Quaker Project on Community Conflict; Newton Garver, Quaker Project on Community Conflict; Alton T. Lemon, North City Congress, Police-Community Relations; John Vincent, Institute of Criminal Law & Procedure; Calvin Hicks, New York; Paul Jacobs, Center for the Study of Law and Society; Annette Gottfried, Institute for Policy Studies; Arthur I. Waskow, Institute for Policy Studies.

Three major models for establishing community control over the police were discussed:

1. Neighborhood political control over on-the-beat policemen through elections, etc., of neighborhood commissions with full or considerable power over the police, or the creation of new neighborhood-based police.

2. Creation of counter-police organizations (in effect, "unions" of those policed) with a political base and an ability to hear grievances and force change.

3. Transformation of the police "profession" and role so as to end isolation of the police from the rest of the community, and thus to establish *de facto* community control by informal, rather than formal, means.

1. *Neighborhood control over the police.* Two strands of history were kept in mind: the tradition of popular election of the sheriff in many rural or small-town constituencies, and the recent emergency deputizing of "white hats" in racial-violence situations like Tampa—i.e., withdrawal of white police from black communities and the semi-authorization of black youths (or clergy, or teachers, etc.) to act as police within the black communities. So long as the "white hats" remain an emergency-only resort and also remain under the control of the white authorities (for pay, legitimacy, etc.), they cannot effectively base their authority on consent from the black communities. But it is possible to imagine the institutionalization of neighborhood control: e.g., the election of a neighborhod police commission authorized to hire, fire (or force transfer of), promote, and discipline officers on the beat in a given neighborhood (up to the precinct captain). In such circumstances, some units of the police would probably stay under metropolitan control (e.g. fingerprint files); but those officers in daily, constant contact with the public in a given neighborhood would be responsive to neighborhood desires on police conduct, rigidity of enforcement of particular laws, etc. It was pointed out that essentially this is the situation already in many small middleclass suburban towns, as well as in farm areas. In the great cities, however, many neighborhoods now have no direct political control over the metropolitan police, and a system of needs and desires different enough from that of the controlling groups that even if there is no deliberate harassment on racist or similar grounds, the effect is of utter disjunction from neighborhood wishes.

Some difficulties were identified with the notion of neighborhood control:

A. Protection of property in neighborhoods where few of the residents own property. Would this traditional function of the police be carried out, if the constituency were opposed or uninterested? Possible solutions: (1) Agreement by the society to pay for property stolen or damaged (essentially, public or private insurance) and to avoid endangering the physical health of those who stole or damaged property; (2) Transformation of the property relations at about the same time as transfer of the police function, so that the neighborhood would own the property (perhaps collectively through co-ops) and would therefore have an interest in protecting it from individual marauders. (The latter might suggest putting energy into demands for social change much broader than the demand for community control of the police.) (3) Abandonment of the property function and substitution of a new function especially oriented to serving the propertyless: "advocacy of change," in which the policeman becomes something like a community organizer/attorney. E.g., the "policeman" leads challenges to illegal housing practices in tenements owned by outside slumlords. (Presumably the neighborhood policeman would keep and probably greatly strengthen his role as mediator or peacekeeper, which is now strongest where the police do live under community control and weakest where they are an occupying army.)

B. Density of population in big cities, leading to greater "boundary" difficulties than in rural America. The difficulty is that the shift from one kind of neighborhood to another comes much more quickly; the likelihood of people moving around from one kind of neighborhood to another during their daily lives is therefore much greater; therefore the possibility of major differences in the kind of law enforcement one person would encounter from geographic unit to unit is much greater, if each such unit controls its own police.

C. Arms. A series of dilemmas were suggested: If neighborhood-controlled police keep their guns, they are much more likely to play conventional police roles. But if black-controlled police in the black neighborhoods are disarmed while white policemen in white neighborhood keep their guns, there may be important strains because the arms are crucial, symbolically as well as physically. Further: white America may be unwilling to let black-controlled police carry guns if the police are angry young men and true ghetto residents, while permitting black clergy and other "respectable" types to do so. Yet on the other hand, would black "respectable" police act appreciably different from or be seen as more legitimate than the present Metropolitan Police?

D. The Courts. Would neighbohood control of at least the small-crimes and small-claims courts be necessary, in order to uphold the meaning and usefulness of neighborhood control of the police? Perhaps in part, the logic would move in this direction; but note that neighborhood control of the police is not utterly meaningless without similar control of the courts: the police are themselves the court of first resort. If they do not arrest, there is no trial; if they arrest and punish, there has been conviction and punishment without trial.

2. *Counter-police organizations*. The possibility of control of the police through counter-vailing power was based on two recent models: the emergence of the Community Action Patrols in Watts and elsewhere as checks on the police, and the Community Review Board created by the Mexican-American community in Denver. Both are vastly different from the conventional proposals for a neutral Civilian Review Board, in that they are explicitly based not on a quasi-judicial model but on the necessity of having independent political power to confront that of the police forces. Both tend to assume that the police are either an independent political force or an arm of a powerful establishment, not a neutral peacekeeping body.

Thus both approaches seek some external political support for pressing grievances against the police. In the Denver case, *chicano* organizations investigate charges of illegitimate or unjust police behavior and where they regard the charges as well-founded, demand punishment of the officers and back up their demands with political pressure (publicity, threatened loss of votes, threatened disorder, etc.). As for the CAP arrangements, they used the endemic anger of young black men against the behavior of the police in the black community to energize youth patrols, accompanying the police on their rounds to take detailed notes and photographs of their behavior. Where the patrols felt the police acted badly, they filed complaints and sometimes tried to turn on some political heat to achieve redress. The Watts CAP tried, notably, to combine the insurgent political energy of the black community with the outside political (i.e. financial support of the Federal government, and thus to box in the police force. But what the Watts CAP hoped to gain from the Federal tie in political ability to resist enormous hostility from the police, was lost in the weakening of ties with the black community itself. The CAP's legitimacy within Watts declined; and then, when the Los Angeles Police Department brought its political power to bear, the Federal government backed off.

The major lessons to be learned from previous experience with the CAPs is that they must be financially and politically responsible to the aggrieved constituency, and that some institutionalization of this responsibility is essential so that the community can remove any CAP men that have stopped being the community's representatives.

3. *Transformation of the policeman's role and career*. The formal command structure, as a result of which metropolitan police forces are ultimately responsible to the power structure of the metropolitan area, is not the only process by which the neighborhoods are denied control over the police. The isolation of the police into an angry and frequently frightened subculture is another. Enforced as it now usually is by tight political organization (based on associations of policemen or their wives), this separation is a major factor in the ability of the police to insulate themselves from the demands of the black or Spanish-speaking or campus communities. The ending of this isolation might therefore be a major element in permitting community control. The analogy mentioned in the discussion was the traditional democratic hostility to a professional military, for fear that they would slip loose of civilian control.

One proposed medicine for this disease was the radical de-careerization of the on-the-beat police force. It was argued that the role of peacekeeper was not a highly technical or specialized one, but dependent rather on a rather widespread and certainly non-professional skill in conciliatory human relations. The "false professionalization" of the role was ascribed in part to an effort by policemen to defend their jobs and careers, and in part to the attempt of middle-class liberals to "upgrade" and "retrain" working class policemen, on the theory that "the uneducated cop" was typically brutal or racist. It was agreed that some policemanship—such as detective work—required more technical and professional training, but it was argued that clear distinctions should be be made between such roles and that of the policeman on the beat.

On the basis of these arguments, it was suggested that police might be recruited for a term of not more than three years from a broad cross-section of the public—especially, and deliberately, from among women as well as men and from a wide age range, so as to emphasize the peacekeeping rather than the force-dispensing function. It was thought that the short term might prevent the rigidification of a police culture and police political power. The danger of large "veterans" organizations was mentioned, but it was agreed that the chief danger of military veterans groups comes from their origins in and ties to an officer cadre which would not be present in a de-professionalized on-the-beat police force. (If it is true, as has frequently been claimed, that those who volunteer for police duty are specially self-selected for tendencies to sadism, etc., then even a short-term volunteer process might not change the police enough, and one might have to think about selection of police by lottery from the whole population, etc. But most of the discussants felt that recruitment for the police proceeds on so many different appeals that if sadism is widespread, that is because it is learned on the job from other officers. If that is so, reducing the "career" line to three years would greatly weaken the informal social pressures from older policemen.)

* * * * *

Any of these approaches would require great energy and political support to create, almost certainly against the wishes of police departments. Two approaches to creating this support seem possible: urging decentralization and community control as valuable to all American communities for the sake of their own direct relations with the police; and urging community control in black neighborhoods, either on the ground that black communities, as a result of the emergence of a black "people," are morally and politically entitled to that control or on the ground that achieving it will be the only way to protect the peace and order of the whole city.

Some participants argued that one reason to emphasize the second approach is that much of the available energy for change in the police originates from young black men who are psychologically and physically, as well as politically, outraged by present police behavior. Moreover, starting from this standpoint of the black neighborhoods may, even before community control is achieved, affect police behavior by strengthening the concept of the existence of a black community of people. Present urban policemen lack any idea of how to treat the black community because they do not "see" it: they deal with individual blacks as if they lived in a vacuum, not a community. The very demand for black control of black police in the black neighborhoods (and of course much more strongly the achievement of that demand) would encourage or force policemen to develop and accept the concept of a complex (not homogeneous) black community in which they can legitimately deal with idiosyncratic interpersonal difficulties, as well as deal with conflicts between black and white society.

There was also some discussion of the question whether such basic reconstruction of the police forces as described above were politically feasible at all, as compared to the slow reform of police practice. Most of those present felt that attempts at reform had consistently failed: civilian review boards and similar devices had neither become meaningful to black communities nor become legitimate in the eyes of the police, thus getting the worst of both worlds, and had as a result frequently started to act as protective covers for the police rather than checks upon them; community-relations training programs had made little dent on practice encouraged by the informal police reference groups; momentary changes achieved by orders from vigorous liberal police chiefs of commissioners had quickly washed away. Some participants expressed hope that deeper forms of training (such as role-playing) might effect permanent changes, but most of those present were skeptical. On the other hand, all recognized that basic reconstructions would not be easy to achieve or make legitimate.

An important problem noted by many of the participants was the difficulty they and other scholars had encountered in getting full access to police files and records, for research purposes. This—a special case of the separation of the police into a special and rather fearful subculture—was making adequate research difficult. The police also, reported some of the participants, brought to bear political pressure upon teachers and scholars in institutions (such as police academies) who were critical of traditional police roles. The participants agreed that efforts should be made to assert the principle of open research in questions and archives pertaining to the police.

EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT WITHIN THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN COMMUNITY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to receive a quality education rates as perhaps the greatest path to success for millions of Americans who belong to minority groups. Indeed, for those minority citizens whose native tongue is not English, the importance of education within a bilingual atmosphere is paramount.

Education always has been an area of special significance for the Mexican-American community—particularly in my home district of East Los Angeles. Recently, Mr. Armando Rodriguez, chief of the Mexican-American Affairs Unit of the Office of Education, sent to my attention a series of articles on educational trends in Mexican-American affairs. I find these articles quite stimulating; certainly they should be viewed as a strong argument for increasing Federal commitments to such programs as the bilingual Education Act.

Under unanimous consent I submit the articles for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Education, November 1968]

INTRODUCTION: MEXICAN-AMERICAN EDUCATION: THE SEARCH FOR IDENTITY

About 4.7 million Mexican-Americans live in the United States today, more than 90 percent of them in the five Southwestern States and more than 80 percent in an urban environment. Most of them have an inadequate education.

A 1964 survey revealed that 39 percent of Mexican-Americans in one State had less than a fifth grade education. In a border city that same year, only five to six percent of the Mexican-American children entering first grade knew enough English to go forward with the other children. And many Mexican-American youngsters never get to the first grade.

The recent high school student demonstrations in several cities clearly show that the Mexican-American youngster is very much aware of the failure of the urban school to educate him. When acknowledged student loss rates among schools with a predominantly Mexican-American student body are in excess of 50 percent—and some high schools are graduating only 59 percent of those who started in tenth grade—the evidence of failure is very apparent. The rise in cultural militancy among young Chicanos is directly related to the school's appalling ignorance about the Mexican-American and his role in the American democracy.

We need to dig deep for the ingredient in the curriculum that will enable the Mexican-American to serve himself and his society effectively. Such a program will be committed to these principles:

(1) The Mexican-American child can learn. His Spanish language should not be an obstacle to his success in school, but an effective tool for learning. To destroy it is to destroy his identify and self-esteem.

(2) Mexican-American children and parents have the same high aspirations and expectations as Anglos and Negroes.

(3) Training programs can be established which will enable the teacher and administrator to have confidence that they can be successful with the bilingual child.

(4) The parents and the community must be involved in the decisions that direct the education of their children, and the Mexican-American wants to be a part of this process.

Without a real partnership between the school and the community no basic solutions to the educational problems of the Mexican-American can be found. This partnership must center upon the child, the parent, and the teacher. The rest of the school organization must serve them. Although the community school board concept has had some trying moments, it is a sound idea that needs only more time and patience to work out problems and make it effective.

Community action groups must be mobilized to bring a new vision into the American scene—a vision of cultural diversity in which the school serves as the instrument for the creation of a society which truly accepts each man for himself. The Mexican-American sees the urban school as the prime means to produce a fundamental change in the attitude of our society—but only if it is a school where the hopes and individuality of each child are raised and praised, not diminished and destroyed.

The one issue which unites all Mexican-American activists is education. The Mexican-American is late getting into this battle. But he realizes that unless he gets in quickly and forcefully he will spend another half-century fighting for survival from a position of linguistic and cultural isolation. I was once told: "Black militants will not look out for the Mexican-American; he has his own bag to fight for."

The struggle in urban education as well as in rural education can be narrowed to a single goal. For the Mexican-American it is taking the schools out of the hands of those who use them to shape a monolinkual, monocultural society. The Mexico-American is saying that cultural superiority must be eliminated or cultural militancy will continue to rise. Cultural diversity must be the key ingredient in this new educational environment.

The Mexican-American will not remain a poor third behind the Anglo and the Negro because his school cannot teach him. Nor will he allow society to destroy his linguistic and cultural heritage. He is moving directly into the arena where his future will be decided—the school. As he moves, he calls to all who believe in the richness of differences, in a pluralistic society, in the great strength of diversity to join him.

I invite you to join me and the millions of Chicanos who are embarked on this revolution in our schools. It will be peaceful, and it will be successful! Viva la Causa, Viva la Raza!

ARMANDO RODRIGUEZ,
Chief, Mexican-American Affairs Unit.

UPRISING IN THE BARRIOS

(By Charles A. Ericksen [1])

In California's cities the natives are restless. The ethnic kin to the Cabrillos and Serras, to Joaquin Murrieta and Jose de la Guerra are confronting the power structure with demands for educational change. They want it now. They tell you that they don't intend to be stalled or sidetracked or bought off with a job or a raise, a new title or a fingerful of *atole.*

They are activist Mexican-Americans. Their awareness of what the American educational system has done to the bilingual, bicultural Mexican-American is acute. They know that in California he lags nearly four years behind the Anglo, two behind the Negro, in scholastic achievement. They know that the worst schools in cities like Los Angeles—measured by dropout statistics—are the de facto segregated Mexican-American schools.

The day when a lazy "educator" with a glib tongue dazzles them with doubletalk about "language problems" and "responsibilities of parents" is past. They know better. They've done their homework. And while they don't claim to have all the answers, they do know that solutions don't lie with the status quo.

Instant change is the only hope, or many thousands more brown children of the United States will be destroyed by the system, California's activist Mexican-Americans tell you.

Who are these activists?

They are Sal Castro, schoolteacher; Miguel Montes, dentist; Manuel Guerra, college professor; Esther Hernandez, housewife; Moctezuma Esparza, student. The list in Los Angeles alone could fill a book and encompass every trade and profession from newspaper boy to electrical engineer.

The commitment of each varies, of course. In part it is proportionate to the time each has left over from his obligation to job and family, or in the case of some who exploited or downgraded their own race, *raza,* to "make it," proportionate to their personal guilt. Or maybe it is in direct ratio to how much they have been Americanized and made aware of their individual rights.

Some send in a dollar. Some work at it 24 hours a day and go to jail for *la causa.*

The growth of Mexican-American militancy in California has been rapid. Its focus is education. Dominated by youth, it moves in spurts.

Last March several hundred Mexican-American students participated in a series of peaceful but widely publicized walkouts from their high schools in East Los Angeles. Their orderly protests brought praise from some members of the Los Angeles board of education and called the community's attention to urgently needed educational programs after adult discussion had failed to do so.

Underground newspapers, with Mexican-American reporters in their teens and twenties, are sprouting in cities up and down the length of California. They take on the police, the alleged *Tio Tomases* of their communities, the growers, the selective service system. But the main meat they feed on is the educational system. In East Los Angeles there are two such newspapers: *La Raza* and *Inside Eastside.* They have been instrumental in exciting youth's passion for change.

In the past regular community newspapers circulating in the Eastside and other Mexican-American *barrios* throughout the Greater Los Angeles area studiously avoided social controversy. Today they have changed. They report controversial matters, column upon column, because the community demands it. It wants to know what's going on.

In Los Angeles a few years ago the first significant organization of Mexican-American teachers was founded: the statewide Association of Mexican-American Educators. It flourishes today, and its leaders speak out frequently and boldly. Most of its teacher members are in their twenties and thirties.

Soon after the teachers organized, the students did, too. Today the college and high school students from Los Angeles' Mexican-American community have several organizations to choose from. Most prominent among them: the United Mexican-American Students, Mexican-American Student Association, and the Brown Berets.

When the Los Angeles district attorney's office charged 13 Mexican-American activists with conspiring to cause the East Los Angeles high school walkouts (to walk out is a misdemeanor; to conspire to walk out is a felony), United Mexican-American Students and Brown Beret members were among those arrested, as was a member of the Association of Mexican-American Educators.

The action brought an immediate response from the Mexican-American community and its leadership. Miguel Montes, a member of the California State Board of Education, termed the arrests "an imprudent attempt to keep students and teachers in line . . . unjust and highly partial application of the law."

Francisco Bravo, prominent medical doctor and president of the Pan-American bank, reacted to the arrests with an open letter to the district attorney: "I wish to take hard issue with you in this matter. . . ," he began. Referring to "the continuing mental maiming of our children which has been in existence these many decades in our local educational system," Bravo explained, "While we wish to be responsible citizens, yet we must also ask . . . that our government be responsible and responsive to the needs and to the problems of our people. . . ."

On the issue of education, California's Mexican-Americans speak with an unfaltering, united voice. Yet five years ago only a few dared to speak out, and they, with rare exception, were quickly discredited.

Why the sudden shift to militancy?

"The success of the Negro civil rights movement in America unquestionably had a lot to do with it," explains attorney Herman Sillas, a member of the California State Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

But Sillas sees other causes: "Today's activist in the Mexican-American community is the one who is most Anglo in his attitudes. He's more aware than his neighbors of his rights as an American and more sophisticated in his knowledge of the machinery of our democracy. In other words, he knows what happens to the squeaky wheel."

---

[1] Mr. Ericksen, whose wife is a native of Mexico, has been closely involved in efforts to help California's Mexican-Americans and their children.

Sillas and other committee members spent two days in the heart of the East Los Angeles *barrio* last year, listening to the testimony of intense young Mexican-Americans about civil rights problems in their community. Typical was the commentary by Rosalinda Mendez, a graduate of an East Los Angeles high school:

"From the time we first begin attending school, we hear about how great and wonderful our United States is, about our democratic American heritage, but little about our splendid and magnificent Mexican heritage and culture. What little we do learn about Mexicans is how they mercilessly slaughtered the brave Texans at the Alamo, but we never hear about the child heroes of Mexico who courageously threw themselves from the heights of Chapultepec rather than allow themselves and their flag to be captured by the attacking Americans.

"We look for others like ourselves in these history books, for something to be proud of for being a Mexican, and all we see in books, magazines, films, and TV shows are stereotypes of a dark, dirty, smelly man with a tequila bottle in one hand, a dripping taco in the other, a sarape wrapped around him, and a big sombrero.

"But we are not the dirty, stinking winos that the Anglo world would like to point out as Mexican. We begin to think that maybe the Anglo teacher is right, that maybe we are inferior, that we do not belong in this world, that—as some teachers actually tell students to their faces—we should go back to Mexico and quit causing problems for America."

According to Armando Rodriguez, chief of the U.S. Office of Education's Mexican-American Affairs Unit, young people like Rosalinda, who organize and vocalize their bitterness, are our educational system's best friends.

"What is an activist anyway?" he asks. "Our 'conventional' activists are the ones who become involved in the PTA, who get wrapped up in community projects or walk the precincts for one political party or another. Maybe they'll form a housewives' picket line around City Hall to get a street light on a dark block, or maybe they'll bake cakes to raise money for a new church building.

"Whoever they are, whatever they do, they're working to bring about change. They possess special knowledge and have a special point of view. They introduce an idea to the community, and they campaign for it. This is a basic process of democracy.

"Mexican-American activists are no different than any other American activists. The issue of education is one that affects them most intimately. They themselves were most likely victims of our schools. They've seen the hopes and dreams of their brothers and sisters, their friend, their own children, diminished or destroyed by a system which for years has been indifferent to their needs.

"They want a light in their block too."

Rodriguez contends that these people are vital—just as a PTA is vital—if Mexican-Americans are to get their full share of the American educational system.

"Remember," he says, "the Mexican-American is not talking about destroying the system. He wants to improve it."

The Federal Government's awareness of the special needs for the bicultural student is also reflected in comments made by U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II to delegates attending last April's National Conference on Educational Opportunities for Mexican-Americans in Austin, Tex. Howe cited the need to help every youngster—whatever his home background, language, or ability—to reach his full potential; "Such a goal is a lofty one, and it is doubtful that the schools will ever achieve perfectly," he stated. "What must concern us is the degree to which many schools fail to come within a country mile of that goal.

"If Mexican-American children have a higher dropout rate than any other comparable group in the Nation—and they do—the schools cannot explain away their failure by belaboring the 'Mexican-American problem.' The problem, simply is that the schools have failed with these children."

Howe pointed out that Federal funds flow through title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act into many school districts in which Mexican-American children go to school. "You and your fellow citizens with a particular concern for Mexican-American children should bring every possible pressure to bear to ensure that title I funds provide education which allows Mexican-American children to have pride in their heritage while learning the way to take part in the opportunities this country has to offer. Title I funds are not appropriated by the Congress to promote 'business as usual' in the schools. They are appropriated, instead, to help the educationally deprived get a fair chance.

"The Office of Education," Howe promised, "will join with you to help see that this fair chance is made a reality."

The California State Board of Education requires all school districts to set up advisory committees for title I funds, which assist in assuring effective programs for the disadvantaged.

"The funds enabled us, for the first time, to focus on the needs of the disadvantaged Mexican-American child—to zero in on some of his problems," says Wilson Riles, California's State director of compensatory education. "Students in our title I programs have averaged about a year's gain for each year of instruction. Before title I, they averaged about seven-tenths of a year's progress in a year."

The problem, Riles states, is in having insufficient funds to reach all of the eligible children with a saturated program. "We require districts to concentrate their programs. We try to reach the most severely deprived areas. Spread the money too thin, and you see no results."

Federal monies for migrant education projects also flow through Riles' office. Ramiro Reyes, who coordinates California's plan for the education of migrant children, says, "We're helping 50,000 children, and 85 percent of them are Mexican-American."

Through special migrant education projects some school districts are discovering that they can structure a regular summer school program capable of attracting significant numbers of migrant children. Reyes cited the community of Mendota, in fertile Fresno County, as an example of this:

"They had never had summer schools there before. They started when our program came in, and the youngsters turned out in droves. Many children of migrants from Texas were able to be absorbed into the program."

Another federally funded title I program of importance to California's two million Mexican-Americans is English as a Second Language (ESL). Manuel Ceja, consultant in program development in the State's office of compensatory education, sees ESL as the first step which districts take in recognizing that there is a problem and that other subjects should be taught bilingually too.

"Many of todays ESL programs are steppingstones to true bilingual programs," he says.

In September, Santa Monica started using some title I funds for a 10th-grade bilingual class in reading, math, and English for recent immigrants as well as native-born Mexican-Americans.

"Were watching Santa Monica closely," says Ceja. "Were looking to the day when we have Anglos in these bilingual classes too."

Riles points out that there is a strong indirect benefit from the many federally funded innovative programs in use in California. "Through these special programs," he says, "we are continually finding new educational techniques and strategies that are useful and adaptable in the broader system."

Armando Rodriguez cites one of these: "The English as a Second Language demonstration center in San Diego has been very successful in bringing the people into a more effective role in helping determine programs for their districts. Now San Diego's ESL program is moving in the direction of bilingual education."

Rodriguez points out that the Federal Government has made a national legal and moral commitment to bilingual education.

"The commitment must be taken up by the States and implemented, regardless of how many dollars will be forthcoming through the new bilingual legislation, or when they will become available," he says. "There are sufficient monies available now through a variety of other Federal programs. It's up to local school districts to re-examine their priorities as to which are the most effective programs and to initiate bilingual teaching."

California's Miguel Montes of the California school board agrees that true bilingual programs must be given top priority. He sees them as intertwined with priorities for expanded preschool programs and projects to prepare teachers for the cultural differences of the Mexican-American child.

"The entire history of discrimination is based on the prejudice that because someone else is different, he is somehow worse," says Commissioner Howe. "If we could teach all of our children—black, white, brown, yellow, and all the American shades in between—that diversity is not to be feared or suspected, but enjoyed and valued, we would be well on our way toward achieving the equality we have always proclaimed as a national characteristic."

Armando Rodriguez sees this as the challenge. "The more completely we develop this bicultural resource—the Mexican-American—the better he will serve our Nation. That's the goal: to educate the total Mexican-American, not just parts of him."

When this happens California's Mexican-American activist will stay home and bake a cake.

[From the American Education, November 1968]

Mama Goes to Nursery School

Parents are usually welcome in school one at a time for a "conference," or all together once a year on Parents' Night. But Frank Serrano, a pre-school teacher at the Malabar Street School in East Los Angeles, shatters the pattern. "It would be nice to have one parent for every child each day," he says.

"From the first day of school to the close of the semester, Mr. Serrano had from four to 14 mothers working with him daily in his class of 18 preschool children," says Constance E. Amsden, principal investigator for Reading Project for Mexican-American Children, of which Malabar is an integral part.

Many mothers could not speak English, but Serrano would go to their homes and tell them, "You're the only one who can bring the security and affection of your home into the classroom, and this will help your child tremendously."

So, cautiously they came. Quietly they sat in the back of the classroom, like cardboard figures. But Serrano was patient and encouraging. Before long everyone was merged into the happy hum of class activity.

Serrano's preoccupation with parent involvement strikes from his deep desire tc help disadvantaged Mexican-American children break out of their cycle of educational underachievement. "Why," he asks, "with all the good things in the Mexican-American culture, are the results so poor in education?"

Statistically, it's a proper question. Children from areas like Malabar Street enter kindergarten a year or two behind those from middle-class Anglo neighborhoods. Six months of preschool alone are not enough to span the gap. The difference, Serrano believes, can be made by the parents.

But first there are walls to break down. Mexicans in the lower economic levels have a high, almost reverent regard for education. The teacher is really on a pedestal. Serrano knew he had to go to the parents to scale the wall that had been built between the home and school.

"Most parents were proud that I came to their house. One mother told me that my visit gave her the feeling that I meant business and was working beyond what I was getting paid for," says Serrano. "And this receptiveness helped the children. It gave them assurance that school was going to be a nice, warm place where they'd enjoy being."

Serrano made two visits to each home: the first to break the ice and the second, just before school opened, to erase any tension that may have built during the interim. "It was important to reach the parents on the first visit," says Serrano. "I told them everything I knew about the preschool, what we were trying to do and what benefits they could expect. They were made to understand that the child was not going to play for play's sake. I'd explain, generally, what happens to the child, and some of the problems. Then I'd switch and ask specifically, 'What problems do you think *your* child will have?' and 'How can *you* help him?' As we talked, the parents realized that they were an essential part of the program, and their reserve and timidity began to crumble."

Once the mothers overcame their own shyness, they helped the children learn where things were in the classroom and showed them how to get to the bathroom and other rooms in the building. The mothers sculpted with clay, painted, and participated in all the projects the children were working on. Some children painted their first strokes only after a parent was painting next to them. And, oddly enough, these children selected their own subjects and colors, and were not aware of the picture the parent was painting.

One mother tells of a conversation with a friend whose daughter is in a preschool in another city. The friend implied that by taking part in the program the mother was doing something she shouldn't be doing. But the Malabar mother replied, "Your child was timid when she started preschool and after six months she's still timid." Then she pointed out that at Malabar all the children had improved and the only ones who did not improve dramatically were those whose parents did not participate regularly.

That reply applies to another plus in the Malabar program. One might think that a mother would coddle and favor her own child. This is not the case, however. Parents are proud of the growth in all the children and Serrano has "never seen a bit of jealousy on the part of any of them." A mother will work just as hard and be just as attentive with someone else's child as she will with her own.

One mother was a bit miffed when her little girl came home with her shoes on the wrong feet. Serrano apologized and, sensing the trouble, asked, "Aren't you telling me that you want the other parents to give Rosita the same love and care . . ." "Yes, yes, that I give the other children," the mother interrupted.

"This emphasized what I felt everyone was looking for," says Serrano. "Actually, Rosita is very much loved by the other parents, but she is also independent. She wanted to put her own shoes on, and in the turmoil of helping the other children, we forgot to check her shoes. This can happen sometimes!"

Although the mothers are undoubtedly the mainstay of the parental effort in the preschool, some fathers manage to sandwich in a few minutes from their workday. For those who can't make it, Serrano furnishes slides showing schoolroom activities, and a projector. Several fathers, upon seeing the slides, insisted that their wives "forget the housework and take care of that job at school."

After a year with the program, which is now funded by title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act after a successful debut with support solely by the Los Angeles city school system, Serrano is convinced that parents can make the difference.

"Parent participation in the school makes education important to the child. This means that he will probably continue in school as far as he can. Knowledge is the sure way out of poverty."

[From the American Education, May 1968]

SPEAK UP, CHICANO—THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN FIGHTS FOR EDUCATIONAL EQUALITY

(By Armando M. Rodriguez[1])

I sat quietly and listened as 15 Mexican-American citizens who had gathered in a crumbling adobe community center in San Antonio's oldest slum talked about their schools. As director of the U.S. Office of Education's Mexican-American Affairs Unit, I was there to learn what the local citizens and school people felt were their most pressing educational needs.

"We ought to be consulted more about what goes on in our schools," the president of the Mexican-American Community Club said heatedly. "Our high school needs a Mexican-American on the counseling staff. But the school people say they can't find a qualified one to hire. Over 60 percent of the kids are Mexican-Americans and most of them have trouble speaking English. Yet we have only five Spanish-speaking teachers and not a single person in the school office speaks Spanish. Is it any wonder the kids drop out like flies? The hell with the requirements. Let's take care of these kids' needs, and one of the first is to get somebody who can talk to them."

"Now wait just a minute," interrupted the school district's assistant superintendent. "We have to follow State regulations, you know. You can't put just anybody in the counseling office. You tell us where to find a qualified Mexican-American teacher or counselor and we'll be delighted to hire him."

"At least you could have Mexican-Americans in the school as aides, couldn't you?" asked a neighborhood representative on the community action program board. "But you folks downtown made the requirements so high that none of our people could get a job. Why?"

"We have to have qualified people to work with the youngsters," answered the director of instruction.

"Qualified?" the president broke in. "What could be better qualifications than speaking the language and understanding the kids?"

"Well, we haven't seen much show of interest from the parents," countered a schoolman. "We can't get them out to PTA meetings, can't even get many of them to come to parents' night. We hired a Mexican-American school-community coordinator for some of our schools, but she's finding it an uphill battle getting the parents to take an interest in school matters."

And so it went at meeting after meeting that I attended with Lupe Anguiano and Dean Bistline, my coworkers in the Mexican-American Affairs Unit. We visited 17 communities on our three-week tour of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. Both Mexican-American community leaders and school people—some 1,700 altogether—poured out their frustrations, and we learned a great deal about what the people want and need and in what priority.

In those five States alone, there are more than 5.5 million people of Spanish surname. Eight out of 10 live in California or Texas. Their numbers are constantly reinforced by a stream of immigrants from Mexico. Add the 1.5 million other Spanish-speaking people—Cuban, Puerto Rican, Central and South American, and Spanish—who live in Florida and the Northeast and Midwestern industrial cities, and it becomes apparent that the United States has a substantial second minority group. They are a minority whose historical, cultural, and linguistic characteristics set them apart from the Anglo community as dramatically as the Negro's skin sets him apart. Few people outside of the Southwest realize the degree of discrimination this difference has brought about.

For me the introduction to discrimination began 37 years ago when my father brought the family to California from Durango, Mexico. I was nine years old when we settled in San Diego in an extremely poor but well integrated community of Mexican-Americans, Negroes, and poor Anglos. The trouble was in school. I knew only a dozen words of English, so I just sat around the first few weeks not understanding a thing. I was not allowed to speak Spanish in class. But after school each day I played with neighborhood kids, so I soon picked up enough English to hold my own on the playground. Then I made this smattering of English do in class.

It didn't occur to me or my family to protest. In those days people didn't talk much about ethnic differences or civil rights. The chicanos (our favorite nickname for fellow Mexican-Americans) pretty much stayed "in their place," working as domestics and laborers in the cities or as wetback stoop laborers in the fields and orchards. Only a few became professionals or businessmen.

I remember being advised by my high school counselor to forget my dreams of going to college and becoming a teacher. "They don't hire Mexican-Americans," he said. Then World War II came along, and when I got out of the Army in 1944 the G.I. Bill of Rights saw me through San Diego College. I got a teaching job and eventually became a junior high school principal in San Diego. But my experience was a rare one for the times.

Since then conditions have changed a good deal. There is spirit in the Mexican-American community now. On my recent trip I saw a pride in the young people that was not so evident when I was growing up. The chicano today is proud of his role as an American. Many parents, even those who are illiterate, as were mine, are determined that their children will not be like them. And they see education as the means. But along with their determination has come a new impatience. Gone is the meek, long-suffering separateness of the chicanos. They are beginning to stand up and make their voices heard.

"Head Start is great," said a parent-businessman at one of our meetings. "But it isn't enough. Some of the programs are only for the summer and our kids need a whole year if they are to have a chance to start out even with the Anglo kids."

"Many of our kids go to school hungry," another complained. "Why can't the schools use more of their Government money for food and health services?"

As we listened to their grievances, I realized that our most valuable role at these meetings was as a bouncing board for their ideas. With us present, both school and community leaders found themselves saying things to each other they had heretofore said only within their own group. Inevitably, though, they looked to us, the spokesmen for the Government, to "do something." Of course, that was not our role. We were there to help them establish lines of communication and to explain to them the ways in which the U.S. Office of Education can support their efforts. But we had to make clear that it is they, the State and local school people and the community, who must design the programs and carry them out.

---

[1] Mr. Rodriguez, formerly chief of the Bureau of Intergroup Relations of the California State Department of Education, is chief of the Office of Education's Mexican-American Affairs Unit.

Nationally there is a growing amount of concern about Mexican-American affairs that has generated much real help. In evidence is the recent series of conferences at Tucson, Pueblo, and El Paso sponsored by the National Education Association. Also, the Federal Government created three new agencies with specific responsibilities to the Mexican-American. The Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs assists in development of services that cover the wide range of Government activities. The United States-Mexico Commission on Border Development and Friendship is charged with creating programs to improve cooperation on both sides of the border. And the U.S. Office of Education's Mexican-American Affairs Unit seeks to bring some expertise to bear on the education of the bilingual-bicultural citizen and to develop a focus on the effort. This unit is now supported by a newly created Advisory Committee on Mexican-American Education. Still another evidence of concern and help is the passage by Congress last December of the Bilingual Education Act (title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act). It authorizes funds and support for schools to develop programs in which both English and the native language of the student can be used as teaching tools until a mastery of English has been achieved.

These are a healthy start, as is the rising involvement of the Mexican-American community itself in directing attention to educational issues. Still, some major obstacles remain in the way of the Mexican-American's progress toward educational equality. Of prime consideration is the shortage of teachers qualified to cope with the Mexican-American's particular situation. There are only 2,000 bilingual teachers in the elementary and secondary schools today. Equally distressing is the lack of teachers who are even aware of the chicano's cultural background and recognize his language as an asset. It is a striking contradiction that we spend millions of dollars to encourage schoolchildren to learn a foreign language and, at the same time, frown upon Mexican-American children speaking Spanish in school. The impression they receive is that there must be something inherently bad about their language. This, of course, leads to self-depreciation. To make the situation even more ridiculous, they are often asked to take Spanish as a foreign language later in school.

Only bilingual teachers can correct this situation—teachers who can treat the chicano's Spanish as an asset while the student is learning English. And that will require a tremendous effort in teacher education. As a starter, the Teacher Corps, cooperating with the Mexican-American Affairs Unit, has set up a high intensity language training component for a group of interns teaching in schools with a number of Spanish-speaking students. This program lasts six weeks and gives considerable attention to cross cultural values as well as to language instruction.

A second obstacle to a comprehensive education for the chicano is the lack of well-integrated curriculums. As I toured the Southwest, I saw good programs here and there for preschool youngsters, some good adult basic education going on in one place, a good program to educate the whole migrant family in another. But in no single place did I see a school district whose curriculum and instructional program correlated with the needs of the Mexican-Americans from kindergarten through high school. There were glimpses of hope, though.

In San Antonio, Tex., I was impressed with a program developed by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory of Austin that used linguistic techniques to improve the fluency of Mexican-American youngsters in oral language as a foundation for reading. Intensive instruction is given in English as a second language, and an identical program of instruction is given in Spanish. The program was started two years ago in nine schools and is in formal operation in the first two grades in San Antonio with plans for continuation in grades three and four. The first group of youngsters in the program are now equaling national norms in reading and some are even achieving the fifth-grade level. Traditionally Mexican-American boys and girls in southern Texas have lagged at least a year behind the national norms.

San Diego, Calif., has developed a demonstration center for English as a second language to help school districts create specialized educational programs for students who initially learned a language other than English. One of its bright features has been the large number of parents who worked with the professional staff in designing these programs for non-English-speaking parents and youngsters alike.

The Foreign Language Innovative Curricula Studies at Ann Arbor, Mich., used funds from title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to develop a bilingual curriculum program with materials for language arts instruction. The program has been aimed at the Spanish-speaking youngster—both migrant and permanent resident—whose linguistic handicaps severely limit his educational achievement. It is for the primary grades and stresses the development of materials which are exciting to all youngsters and are suitable for use by teachers with a minimum of specialized training.

By sharing their experiences in these innovative programs, school districts can help one another. And a wealth of good ideas are emerging from conferences such as the one sponsored by the Advisory Committee on Mexican-American Education and the Mexican-American Affairs Unit in Austin, Tex., last month. Here at the Office of Education we have a special task force that works closely with the eight bureaus in considering funding proposals for projects aimed at improving educational opportunities for the Mexican-American.

A third obstacle to the young chicano's educational success is a lack of models—"heroes," if you will. The school needs to put before him successful Mexican-Americans whom he can emulate as he sets his educational goals. A teacher, a counselor, a principal who is Mexican-American can do the trick. Discrimination in past generations has, unfortunately, limited the number of such persons. In many heavily Mexican-American schools, there is not a single Mexican-American teacher, let alone a counselor or administrator. Now, however, with the chicano's education improving and discrimination diminishing, I am hopeful that more and more of today's children will have the career models before them that they need.

If my impression of all this activity and promise is correct, the Mexican-American is about to see the dawning of a new era. He will become a far more productive member of society. His cultural and linguistic heritage will be turned to good use.

Although the chicano has suffered and lost much in the last 100 years, he now intends to do what is necessary to win his fight for educational equality. And he will do it today. Mañana is too late.

TODAY'S CHALLENGES TO YOUNG AMERICANS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. **DULSKI**. Mr. Speaker, a group of 12 young men and young women from Erie County, N.Y., were guests in the Nation's Capital over the Easter holiday, in recognition of their success in an Americanism essay contest.

Each year for the past 40 years, students in my home county have competed in the contest conducted by the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News and the Erie County American Legion and Auxiliary.

The topic for this year's contest was: "Today's Challenges to Young Americans."

Winners were selected from the thousands of student entrants in the sixth through the 12th grades in some 300 public and private schools.

Their prize was an air trip to the Nation's Capital where a special bus and veteran guide took them on a well-planned 6-day visit to places of both historic and scenic interest.

Accompanying the winners were Mr. and Mrs. Russell F. Tripi, of Williamsville—Mr. Tripi is chairman of the county Legion's Americanism committee—and Mr. David E. Peugeot, promotion editor of the Buffalo Evening News.

Following are the texts of the winning essays:

TODAY'S CHALLENGES TO YOUNG AMERICANS

FIRST WINNING ESSAY

(By Mary Lou Pankow, 12, 87 Kingston Place, Buffalo, N.Y., sixth-grade pupil at School 70, winner of the Girls Division of the Buffalo Public Elementary School Classification, Margaret A. Songin, teacher)

The challenges to young Americans are countless. However, these challenges, though many, are not very different from the ones the youth of the world faced throughout the ages. With great respect for the past, a strong faith in the future and inspiration in the present, any challenge can be met and dealt with successfully in the world of today.

Inspiration. What a challenge! We look to others for inspiration. How about ourselves?

Do we inspire others to become better students, patriotic Americans and finer human beings in the family of the world by what we say and do?

We shouldn't be ashamed of the lump in our throat when the Star Spangled Banner is sung or the gleam of pride in our eye when the flag is unfurled.

Then, our "hidden-in-the-heart" love is revealed to inspire others. The challenge of inspiration is only half completed by us. The other half is completed by those whom we inspire.

History repeats itself and young Americans should welcome the challenge of showing respect for the past. Read about it. Learn it. And profit from it. Progress is based on the ideas and deeds of the past.

Faith in the future is a challenge most young Americans forget about. Too often they become discouraged. A good American will have faith in the future and encourage this faith in others, make your faith strong, knowing the best is yet to come.

If we live up to these challenges we can bring about a Golden Age in America as the Greeks did when Pericles ruled. Show the world and the next generation that by accepting the challenges of today, we, the youth of America, will make it a better world of tomorrow.

SECOND WINNING ESSAY

(By Charles Ihrig III, 12, 1 Treehaven Road, Buffalo, N.Y., a seventh-grade pupil at School 80, winner of the Boys Division of the Buffalo Public Elementary School Classification. Mary A. Lynch, teacher)

Today, the youth of America are faced with the challenge of building tomorrow's America so it will once more regain world respect. This is our challenge and we must accept it.

Tomorrow's America will rely on people of ability and training to improve America. Therefore, youth must acquire an education to comprehend tomorrow's new ideas and to make use of them.

In education we need competent teachers to instruct tomorrow's leaders. As we begin to think about our careers, we must realize that a teaching career will greatly shape tomorrow's America.

Another challenge now confronts us. It is the widespread presence of dissenters. These young adults shout "Peace!" but do nothing to achieve peace. We, as young Americans must rebuild the United States tarnished image.

Some might say it seems an insurmountable task, but if each young person would become a builder, our country would be praised, not downgraded for its youth.

There are many ways by which we can do this. At our present age, we can set a good example to others, respect law and order, participate in community youth work, study hard in school and enjoy a compatible relationship with adults and peers.

Another challenge is to help overcome the prejudices that exist. America was built on the principle that all men are created equal. Yet today, people are discriminated against. Young Americans should move forward to stop oppression. This is the land of the free, and it must remain that way.

These challenges are but a few of those facing us. As young Americans we must carry the emblem of peace and the torch of freedom onward.

If we do, America will once more be the land of the free and the home of the brave.

THIRD WINNING ESSAY

(By Barbara J. Meyer, 17, 1027 Elmwood Avenue, Buffalo, N.Y., Lafayette High School senior, winner of Girls Division of the Buffalo Public High School Classification, Lola Marie DiPaolo, teacher)

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." This advice was given many generations ago to the entire world, but it is especially applicable to the present youth of America.

Acceptance of this simple advice poses two major challenges. The first challenge is to decide which ideals in life are good, and the second is to seek them.

As the future leaders and citizens of America, it is important that we form ideals that will guide us in maintaining this nation as a country which offers freedom and liberty to all.

We must learn not to accept blindly all the ideals that have been set before us by past generations. On the other hand, however, we must be careful not to reject, in a spirit of rebellion, everything which is suggested by those who came before us.

It is essential for us to scrutinize each situation that confronts us, to seriously mediate upon each idea which is presented to us, and to view all things objectively and without selfishness in order to prove what is good.

The second challenge is to seek those ideals which have been proven to be good and to firmly incorporate them into our lives. Often, we know what is right, but, because of social pressure and human frailty, we fail to remain steadfast in our quest of it.

The knowledge of good is useless unless that good is pursued. We must overcome any pressure placed upon us by society and support that which we know to be good. Only if we firmly uphold these worthwhile ideals can we preserve the strength of our country.

This challenge should not be taken lightly by any American, young or old. But it is more important for the young Americans to realize the significance of it because it is they who will determine the future of the United States.

Only if we "prove all things and hold fast that which is good" can we insure the strength and justice which have been characteristic of our nation from the beginning.

FOURTH WINNING ESSAY

(By Timothy Groeger, 17, 581 Highgate Ave., Buffalo, N.Y., Kensington High School senior, winner of Boys Division of the Buffalo Public High School Classification. Ruth C. Culliton, teacher)

The world has changed since our parents and grandparents were young. Its pace today is swifter, its problems more complex.

Young men die in the jungles of Vietnam, fighting for democratic ideals, while others burn their draft cards to protest the war.

Upper-class suburbanites relax in the shade by the backyard pools, while tenement poor swelter in the heat of the inner city.

Small children struggle to read and write in one-room schools in Appalachia, while student rebels riot on campus at Berkeley, Columbia, and San Francisco State.

We look around and see poverty, ignorance, hypocrisy, injustice, and inequality. As the leaders and citizens of tomorrow, today's youth will be faced with the great challenge of solving these problems which confront our nation.

Ours will be the task of keeping America great and free. But we need not wait until we are middle-aged to accept our responsibilities as Americans. There are challenges now whch are sufficient to test our strength and ability.

We must begin by bettering ourselves. We must strive to obtain a good education, develop sound values, and use our abilities to their fullest potential. We must become all that we can be, for a better world begins with better men.

In an age marked by disorder and rebellion, youth faces the challenge to respect and obey the laws. Instead of taking LSD or smoking marijuana to escape reality, we can join the Peace Corps or VISTA and work to brighten reality. Rather than fighting to resist the draft, we can accept the challenge of serving our nation with courage and honor.

Unfortunately, there is a "generation gap" which prevents many adults and young people from understanding each other's problems and viewpoints. Similarly, there is racial tension, which alienates many from their fellow Americans.

We must learn to live and work with others and through understanding, tear down the barriers which separate man from man. Together, we will be strong.

The challenges which face the youth of today are unlimited. For young Americans, no challenge is too great.

FIFTH WINNING ESSAY

(By Pamela Zammito, 12, 94 Fairview Drive, Depew, N.Y., eighth-grade pupil at Lancaster Junior High School, winner of the Girls Division of the Erie County Public Junior High School Public Junior High School Classification. Jeanette M. George, teacher)

Today's world is very complicated. Some young people feel they are facing problems that cannot be solved, such as racial inequality, poverty, pressures of higher education, and competition for better jobs, just to mention a few.

Some of today's youth have attempted to solve these problems with violence and others by "dropping out." They don't stop to think about what they may be leaving those of us who will be the next generation.

I believe this is the biggest challenge facing us today—how to keep from making the same mistakes of not the older generation, but today's. No society can exist without respect for law and order. We must learn of law and get the very best education we can, so when we become unhappy with the way life is, we can change it legally and orderly.

We have to strengthen our faith in God and uphold his commandments. No one can force a man to love his neighbor, but with common sense and common courtesy we can learn to live together in peace and harmony. Both sides must learn to listen to the other side and be fair-minded.

We can try to see life as it really is and learn to realize there will always be problems, but the way to solve them is with our heads and hearts, not force.

We young people could set an example for the older generation by love and respect for one another, regardless of race, creed, or color, and by studying and doing the best we can now so when we enter college we will be properly prepared.

So you see, our greatest challenge is the future and what we do with it when it's our turn.

SIXTH WINNING ESSAY

(By Cathleen Summers, 16, 33 Bellinger Street, Tonawanda, N.Y., Tonawanda Senior High junior, winner of the Girls Division of the Erie County Public High School Classification. Mary Elizabeth Neill, teacher)

Look around you, past those four surrounding walls, outside your secure group, around the borders of this protective, carefree society.

What do you see? If you truly wish to see, your eyes will meet the loneliness of an old woman, the hunger of a starving child, the hatred of a colored youth, and the unconcern of thousands. Many of today's Americans live in a shell, shut off from the problems of a changing world.

And yet today's youth is awakening and becoming aware of these problems. We can no longer sit back and say, "It doesn't concern me," but rather, "it could have been me."

We confront the afflictions and anguish of others in the newspaper, in magazines, on television and on movie screens; and we feel the increasing tension around us. We look to the future with hope, while others look to the future with fear. Can we turn our back on our brother? We can't unless we are willing to be untrue to ourselves. For everyone needs to love, just as everyone needs to be loved.

Not only should we be aware, but now we must become involved and entangled. We must fight for what we believe, as our forefathers did years ago, and as our men in Vietnam are doing today. For to be willing to sacrifice one's life is the greatest example of integrity and sincerity.

Therefore, let our aim be to alleviate the desperation of others, and let courage be our inspiration. If we set this goal for ourselves and struggle toward it with determination, one day we will reach it.

SEVENTH WINNING ESSAY

(By Kevin Gripple, 13, 41 Ellsworth Drive, Cheektowaga, N.Y., eighth-grade pupil at Maryvale Junior High School, Cheektowaga, winner of the Boys Division Erie County Public Junior High School Classification; Helen M. Stellrecht, teacher)

Most of today's challenges fall under one broad heading—living up to our heritage, a heritage based on the metamorphosis of thirteen struggling colonies into the most powerful country on earth. Our nation's founders fought valiantly to establish this heritage, and today's youth—tomorrow's statesmen—must fight equally hard to retain it.

As Americans, we must accept our privileges with humility, and our responsibilities with foresight. Plans for underwater cities that will solve our present population dilemma are already in the making.

Ways to desalt massive amounts of water economically must be discovered if the human race is to survive. Farming the ocean is now in its embryonic stage and must be made more commercially feasible if we are to have food for future generations.

Colonization of the moon and exploration of the solar system are within our grasp. We are on the threshhold of many accomplishments, and it is up to America's youth to turn these ideas into reality.

Such attainments cannot be perfected by a nation divided over race, color or creed. A society absorbed in violence and lawlessness cannot endure.

We must be willing to develop, through education, to our fullest potential. We must be a generation which reaffirms the basic principles of democracy—equality, justice, and the betterment of mankind.

The responsibility of protecting the rights of the entire free world will fall heavily upon the shoulders of young Americans. We must be willing to fight in any corner of the world where freedom is threatened, eternally seeking an honorable settlement and our true goal, peace.

Today's youth must continue to follow America's policy of trying to avoid war, but never fearing it.

EIGHTH WINNING ESSAY

(By Michael Krupp, 16, 193 Walter Street, Tonawanda, N.Y., Tonawanda Senior High junior, winner of the Boys Division of the Erie County Public High School Classification. Virginia L. Holcombe, teacher)

The challenges of today's life in America are so vast and numerous that they have brought a varied reaction from all. I would like to define this challenge as a call for service that we might have to offer.

With the vast technological society we have today, one might think only the intelligent person is the object of this call. This is an unfortunate misconception many of our young people have today.

The challenge is present for all; it is a call for all to develop a sincere understanding for others. Many feel life is meaningless, but this is only because they have shunned the call.

Before we can attack the problems which threaten our way of life we must understand what they are, why they have come about and the people involved in them.

Our understanding of the marvels of the universe are nothing if we can't foster understanding here on earth. The opening of the mind should be the frontier that we should concentrate on. If we can achieve this, we could solve our race problem and start solving a multitude of others.

To effectively meet this challenge we have to rearrange our personal priorities. The way of self must be abandoned and a new breed of selfless Americans must evolve. These people, young and old, will no longer find it hard to realize why the ghetto dweller hates society.

This challenge requires no campus revolution; but forces us to undergo a self-revolution. We must beat down our own foolish desires and search for a meaningful way to solve the problems of the society around us.

If our professors, college administrators and students could understand each other's goals, I am confident the disastrous disorders on campuses would abate.

The person who accepts this challenge realizes this is a fulltime job. He doesn't quit when one job is met, but continues on until all problems are vanquished. The challenge for young Americans is the same all are faced with. If we can accept it and make understanding our "thing," then we all will live in a much better place.

NINTH WINNING ESSAY

(By Mary Jo Orzech, 13, 7 Palm Street, Lackawanna, N.Y., Eighth-grade pupil of Our Lady of Victory School, Lackawanna, winner of the Girls' Division of the Private and Parochial Elementary School Classification. Sister Rita Kane, teacher)

To become instruments in the improvement of the world, searchers for enduring values in changing times and then leaders of peace and freedom, are our challenges as young Americans; in short, to become sons and daughters of whom America can be proud. Our challenge is to contribute to the good of society, realizing that like other nations, ours may need alterations and updating but not complete rebuilding; medication and even transplants but not mourning and death.

As living hopeful members of the world, we have our lives before us to fulfill our special roles. Medicine, science, space travel and racial discord, to name a few, are loaded with more than a spark of the challenges which face us. To choose the best lessons of history, to learn the solid values of what is right, is what we are challenged to learn; then, to live them so as to be visible evidence of our self determination.

When it is difficult to be strong under the pressures of today's pace, it is wise to study how yesterday's youth resolved their differences during merciless wars, depressions and troubled times. Their sacrifices and actions can give us the strength and inspiration to confront and master our challenges, for these are not insurmountable difficulties.

Our challenges are physical, mental and moral. They are self discipline, study and work to create an intelligent and orderly mosaic of life instead of an ever changing kaleidoscope of strains and stresses, uprisings and riots, crimes and disorder.

No one guaranteed America's greatness forever. History tells us empires as great as ours have fallen. My challenge is to appreciate, preserve and promote America's greatness; to enjoy my rights and privileges simultaneously respecting those of others. Finally, America should not look after us, we should look after our America.

TENTH WINNING ESSAY

(By Gloria A. Rossi, 16, 93 Clarence Street, Buffalo, N.Y., Bishop O'Hern High School, junior, winner of the Private and Parochial High School Classification. Mina Callis, teacher)

Challenges today hit youth hard. Because we are young, the mystery of existence has not yet cleared: we are still in the haze of discovery. Uncertainties about ourselves and about life surface in our minds. We want to prove ourselves as adults while we are still children. Our first challenge was to survive; now it is to survive peaceably, to make the world a better place for ourselves while tripping upon mistake after mistake.

The challenge to find ourselves and to fit into the adult world is hard; we have not quite fit into the adolescent world. Intelligent thinking replaces childhood acceptance as we begin to find God and attempt to settle questions of right and wrong for ourselves as individuals. Youth is challenged to find the pattern for its lifetime in a few short years of too little experience.

We know we must bargain and compromise with childhood thoughts a bit in youth. To meet youth's challenges a new form of thought emerges: realism and anticipation force us into the future. To meet life's challenges a bit of the extraordinary is required: clearness and sureness, uncommon to youth. A realistic outlook toward the future along with a willingness to meet challenges aid us greatly when we are thrown against life's winds and expected to survive on our courage alone.

Young Americans have claim to the best and most promising future possible. Are we worthy of it? Past and present Americans seem to be rich in the same secret of American life and happiness: belief in the people as a nation. We must claim our place in this nation and hold it if we are to grow old in dignity and in Americanism. We must prove we are as worthy as our predecessors. We must be able to match and surpass their discoveries and miracles by living our lives not repetitiously but creatively.

ELEVENTH WINNING ESSAY

(By Paul Kunkemoeller, 12, 172 Dickens Road, Town of Hamburg, N.Y., Seventh-grade pupil of Our Lady of Sacred Heart School, Town of Hamburg, winner of the Boys' Division of the Private and Parochial Elementary School Classification. Sister Catherine Mary, teacher)

Young Americans today are growing up in a rapidly changing world. Speed, action and constant change are the characters of their present environment.

Today's youth have been affected by these characteristics and feel a certain impatience with any concept hinting of moderation or complacency. This impatience, itself is not harmful. It must be channelled properly to find methods to deal with the basic problems confronting the world. Working to solve these problems is the biggest challenge to young Americans today.

The most pressing problem facing the world today is the achievement of an honorable peace throughout the world.

Once world peace is a reality, attention must be given to helping the disadvantaged people at home and in other nations.

While attacking these problems, ever-present gaps between generations, races, and nations must be corrected.

Upon the resolutions of these problems, many remaining difficulties will disappear.

The real summons to American youth is to speak out to help find avenues to peace. However, destruction and riotous behavior are not the answers. Evidence proves that draft-dodging, car burning, and other unlawful acts are not solutions. Only honorable, concrete, proposals can lead to the eventual successful establishment of peace.

Then, youth could turn its boundless energy to the unfinished task of working with, educating, and otherwise aiding the millions of disadvantaged in the world to fulfill the basic desire for self-achievement. Lobbying done by youth for needed legislation could greatly reduce the problems of the less fortunate.

The aforementioned gaps which exist are basically those of communication. A dialogue must be established with each party trying to understand the other's position. Youth must understand that the older generation listens when meaningful, workable suggestions are presented.

To meet these challenges, youth must apply the foregoing principles now.

TWELFTH WINNING ESSAY

(By David Carlson, 14, 8430 Wehrle Drive, Williamsville, N.Y., St. Joseph Collegiate Institute, Kenmore, freshman, winner of the Private and Parochial High School Classification. Mr. John M. Busch, teacher)

The late Robert Kennedy once said "our future may lie beyond our vision, but it is not completely beyond our control."[1]

---

[1] Robert Kennedy quote from "A Tribute to Senator Robert F. Kennedy" by Senator Edward Kennedy.

Listing the challenges is useless; working to meet the most important challenge is vital. This does not necessarily mean the most talked about or most extensive. Before we take large steps, we must take small steps; before we take small steps we must take the first step. This is the most important. America today is on a road leading to the realization of the goals of the Constitution and hopes of America's future. The challenge to young Americans today is to work and help America with the first steps of this journey.

The first area of challenges to young Americans is within the realms of the family. We must work to eliminate the generation-communication gap and nurture good family relationships. We then must meet the challenges of the neighborhood, school and local government.

The second area of challenges is that which young Americans present to themselves. We must work to rid our age group of the bad name society has given us. It is the result of irresponsible actions on the part of a few who are immature. We are taking on more active roles as American citizens. This entails any challenges from voting to fighting in the Armed Forces. Presently, our challenges are school and the many freedoms and responsibilities society gives us. There are also the challenges with which we are all familiar; civil rights, draft dissension, student violence, and other form of civil disobedience.

These challenges can be summed up in one basic challenge: To take the idealism, so dominant in America's youth, to work, to make it realism today and in America's future. When these challenges are met, one by one, step by step, America will be moving along that road at a fast pace. The late Martin Luther King once said "And as we walk, we must make the pledge that we shall march ahead. We cannot turn back."[2]

ENDING THE WAR STILL IS MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, behind all the fancy talk over the proposed ABM system; behind the furor over inflation and taxes; behind the Nation's attention on problems of hunger and poverty, there remains the key issue of our day—that the tragic war in Vietnam goes on and on without any real sign of peace from any front.

America's commitment to maintaining adventurism in Southeast Asia the past 5 years has resulted in perhaps the most useless, costly sacrifice of resources—human, physical, and moral—in our history.

The Nixon administration has picked up where the Johnson administration left off. We should not be fooled; substituting South Vietnamese troops for Americans is not a move toward peace.

Two recent series of newspaper articles offer some valuable perspective on the direction that we should be undertaking in our policies toward Southeast Asia. I insert the articles—from Newsday and from the Cleveland Plain Dealer—in the RECORD at this point:

[From Newsday, Mar. 25, 1969]

VIETNAM I: WHAT IS OUR CHOICE?

(NOTE.—Newsday recently published a letter from a reader raising several basic questions about the future of the Vietnam War. Because of the significance of these questions, Newsday is reprinting the letter and responding in a two-part editorial, appearing today and tomorrow.)

"SMITHTOWN.

"To the EDITOR:

"In the editorial 'How Long Must We Wait' March 3), Newsday called for the rapid termination of the Vietnam war but did not make clear how that goal could be reached.

"It may be attained by one of two means: We can either withdraw all American troops and aid from South Vietnam and surrender that country to the Communists or we can destroy the North Vietnamese capability for waging aggressive war. Looking at it another way, the choice is between subjecting 17,000,000 people to a life of atheistic totalitarianism, or giving them the chance to develop a rewarding society such as can be found in South Korea and Nationalist China.

"I argee that 'We need a policy now to end the fighting.' That policy must be either a surrender to aggression or defeat of aggression.

"GEORGE J. TREUTLEIN."

Mr. Treutlein is not alone in his opinion. The Gallup Poll reported this weekend that the views of Americans on Vietnam are rapidly polarizing between those who want to "go all-out" and those who want to "get out." Distressed by the rising toll of dead and wounded and exasperated by the stalemate which makes the suffering seem all the more pointless, people are beginning to draw the issue in the simplest of extremes: "We can either withdraw all American troops and aid from South Vietnam and surrender that country to the Communists, or we can destroy the North Vietnamese capability for waging aggressive war."

Unfortunately, the issue is not that simple. Whether or not we were right to do so, we assured several million Vietnamese who opposed the Communists that they would be safe on "our" side. Do we suddenly pull out and leave them to an adversary who is sure to be all the more vengeful because the U.S. made the price of their victory so high?

And what do we say to those other nations to whom we have repeatedly stressed that our presence in South Vietnam is proof of our belief in collective security? Is any one of them likely to place much faith in our saying now, "Well, we are out of South Vietnam, but you can count on us in——."? Critics will say this is an irrelevant question because the U.S. can no longer be the world's policeman, but they will be missing the point. If we pull out of Vietnam in a hasty and ill-contrived way, the Communists may be tempted to do what otherwise they might not have done if we had not gone into Vietnam in the first place: step up their pressure at other points in Southeast Asia.

For the supreme irony of Vietnam is that we invested the Domino Theory with a validity it may never have had until we translated a local conflict into an international confrontation. By introducing half a million men and massive amounts of materiel into South Vietnam, we made certain that the vacuum created by a precipitate withdrawal of those forces would be greater than the original vacuum we sought to fill. The consequences of a Communist victory on the heels of a quick flight by the U.S. are almost guaranteed to be more serious than they would have been if we had never intervened. Having intervened in another nation's affairs to maintain the balance of power in Southeast Asia, we would alter the balance drastically by suddenly withdrawing.

"Next to the assumption of power," Disraeli said, "was the responsibility of relinquishing it." In other words, getting out of a mess is harder than getting into it. The urge to "get out" no matter what the cost is a perfectly understandable emotion on the part of people weary of war and sickened by its costs. But our impatience and sorrow must not permit us to replace one wrong policy with another which only multiplies the costs.

THE MILITARY OPTION

What of the other choice—the "go all-out" option that would have us "destroy the North Vietnamese capability for waging aggressive war"? This presumes the war can be won in the North, a proposition hardly justified by past experience.

We have already dumped on the North Vietnamese more tons of explosives than we did on all of Europe in all of World War II, and to what end? With only marginal dislocation, they have gone on pouring enough manpower and materiel into the South to sustain the war and to mount two Tet offensives. The fact is that the primitive North Vietnamese economy does not lend itself to destruction by modern machines of war—it can be and is so widely dispersed as to be almost immune from air strikes. When American warplanes went after the large petroleum storage tanks in 1966, the North Vietnamese effectively relocated their oil supplies in thousands of smaller underground tanks scattered throughout the countryside. Leveling Hanoi and destroying the port at Haiphong would reduce their capacity only slightly, and even then not for long. The supply lines to China are short and the North Vietnamese ability to move goods on peasant backs and bicycles remains impressive.

This leaves only an invasion of North Vietnam to consider, but does anyone really believe it is either morally or militarily possible? For one thing, it would almost certainly force China and the Soviet Union to forget their own quarrels in the interest of helping a sister socialist republic under attack by a capitalist nation. For another, it would flaunt whatever measure of self-respect Americans have left to watch our forces invade a country with which we are not legally at war and which has not threatened us. Finally, it wouldn't succeed. If more than a million allied troops have been unable to defeat an outnumbered army of Viet Cong guerrillas and North Vietnamese regulars operating in South Vietnam, is it reasonable to expect there would be any greater advantage in doubling the size of the battlefield and carrying the fight to the enemy's homeland, where the terrain is even more familiar to him and the people more friendly? And who believes that the President could order such an invasion and command the resources at home to support it without splitting this country right down the middle?

NO END IN SIGHT

Is our option, then, to escalate the war in the South? Hardly. To continue to apply massive firepower to the countryside of South Vietnam is to reinforce the old dictum that some military victories make political defeat inevitable. It is quite possible that the South Vietnamese *people*, as over and against the Saigon government, are growing weary of being defended at such an excessively high cost. The longer the war continues, the higher the price they pay. And this says nothing of the grim cadence at which our own casualties continue to rise: 400 dead one week, 300 the next, more than 32,376 in all, and still no end of the violence in sight.

These, then, are three of the options: "To get out," "To go all-out," and "More of the same." None is acceptable. The first compounds the consequences of our original intervention, the second escalates the possibility of a far wider war, and the third continues the same dreary cycle of death and destruction.

---

[2] Martin Luther quote from "I Have a Dream" by Martin Luther King.

But these are not the only options. Mr. Treutlein has correctly asked that we make clear how the U.S. can reach the goal of ending the fighting. Tomorrow we will discuss more fully what is to us the most compelling choice of all: disengagement.

[From Newsday, Mar. 26, 1969]

Vietnam II: Facing the Facts

The immediate goal of the U.S. in Vietnam should be to reduce its own role in the fighting to square with these realities:

We have achieved the main purpose for which we escalated the war four years ago—to prevent a totering government in Saigon from falling to Communist armed forces.

Certain other objectives, no matter how sound in principle, cannot be achieved by U.S. military forces. Creating a sense of nationhood among the people of South Vietnam, guaranteeing their right of self-determination, and distributing power among the various groups in the country are goals which only the Vietnamese can secure for themselves through political action.

The costs of continuing the conflict have grown out of proportion to any benefit we can reasonably hope to gain beyond our original purpose. The fallout from U.S. involvement—the moral alienation of our young people, the diversion of money and talent from programs needed to solve our social ills at home, the stirring of isolationist sentiments, and the annual impact on our economy of $30 billion in war costs—cannot be tolerated much longer without the gravest consequences.

The Communists in Vietnam want to keep the finger at an intense level, and have the means to do so indefinitely, in the hope that destruction of the countryside will turn the Vietnamese people away from us and that high American casualties will undermine U.S. public support for our aims there.

No matter how long the fighting continues, neither side can win a clear military victory. We cannot kill enough Communists to force them to stop fighting and they cannot defeat half a million Americans. The result can only be a Vietnam version of the Battle of the Somme: costly but inconclusive offensives on each side leading to more conflict, death, and stalemate.

The best resolution we can hope for is a settlement in which neither side gets what it has been fighting for but which permits each side to believe it has a reasonable chance to achieve its aim by political rather than military means.

These are the realities upon which the U.S. must act. President Nixon is more free to act upon them now than he will ever be. The longer he waits, the more entwined he will become in the inherited policies of the Johnson administration and in the inexorable momentum of the machinery of war. He should begin immediately to reduce the level of violence and to make the American role less conspicuous.

Three tactical decisions are possible:

First, stop the "Search and Destroy" and "Clear and Hold" operations or turn them over to South Vietnamese forces. These have been operations of dubious value anyway, requiring too many forces to fight in exposed positions with precarious lines of supplies, and requiring indiscriminate bombing and shelling of the countryside. We cannot convince neutral villagers that they are safe on "our" side when willingly or unwillingly the allies destroy their homes and dispossess their families.

WITHDRAWING TROOPS

Second, withdraw between 50,000 and 100,000 troops in the next few months. (White House advisers are already saying privately that *most* U.S. combat forces could be withdrawn by the summer of 1970.) An immediate withdrawal of some troops would have the effect of convincing the South Vietnamese that we mean business when we insist they bear more of the load. They have often treated our demands as bluffs, believing that Washington would not dare push too hard on a Saigon government so weak that it might fall altogether. As a result, they met only those demands which they found convenient and ignored the others.

Third, concentrate U.S. troops on the mobile defense of the cities and as advisers to South Vietnamese units responsible for guarding the heavily populated rural areas of the country. South Vietnamese troops could be deployed from time to time to knock off balance Communist units poised for attack, but missions into remote terrain would be replaced by a joint allied strategy of protecting the coastal strip and the southern third of South Vietnam where most of the people live.

These steps will not end the fighting in Vietnam overnight. But they will begin to change the nature of what has become an Americanized war, one which, ironically, no American army can win. They will lower the visibility of the American war machine and demonstrate our desire to disengage from the vain and endless quest for a military triumph. Hopefully, they will accelerate the political process through which the war will ultimately be ended.

POLITICAL COMPROMISE

For this is the quintessential point. Even these steps will be useless if they are not the basis for moving toward a genuine political compromise. The keystone of such a compromise must be an election in which *all* of the people who live in South Vietnam choose a new government through universal suffrage and the secret ballot. There can be no honest settlement which avoids the fact that many of the people we have been fighting have been deeply rooted in the South Vietnamese countryside since 1954. They are determined to participate with all other groups in the political life of the country.

We and our adversaries in Hanoi and Moscow have all talked of such elections. Now let the primary purposes of the talks in Paris and any secret negotiations be to agree to move explicitly toward those elections.

Hanoi should realize that all of our troops will finally be withdrawn only in return for free elections, but Saigon must realize that only in the give-and-take of political action can the future of South Vietnam actually be decided. This may be an unpalatable risk, but it is also an unavoidable one. All of the cards are simply not in our hand. The only other practical option is to go on backing the present government ad infinitum, a decision that would drag the war far into the future.

The critical moment has arrived. If Washington chooses to press in Paris and elsewhere for an honest compromise and a true political settlement, there is hope. But if Washington believes that a decisive and ultimate victory on the battlefield still is possible and holds out for a political settlement which ignores the realities, nothing can save us from another round of death in Vietnam and division at home.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Dec. 15, 1968]

Vietnam, 1968 Is Time for Anger

(By Michael D. Roberts)

SAIGON.—It is difficult to feel sadness on leaving Vietnam. All the sadness you could muster has long been expended—uselessly you might add.

The thing you can do is lament the dead and those who are going to die in this place of confused torment.

The feeling most prevalent, though, is anger—not an anger derived from a political philosophy or a fervid moral movement, but an anger based on realism.

This anger is directed at the Vietnamese and American governments and those who represent each in their particular endeavors in the orchestrated mess called the Vietnam war.

And the others—the Vietnamese people and the American soldiers—well, they really have no control over what happens to them, and need an element of luck to duck at the right moment. You can sympathize with them, admire them and wish them luck. After they are dead you may lament them.

A new President will now confront the cursed ways of this war, and if he is not deceived perhaps he can help bring peace to the countryside and joy to the people.

But to do this he must be tough and wise and stop playing "let's pretend" with the South Vietnamese Government (GVN) and recognize what it is and what it has not done.

In many ways the GVN, masked behind its democratic drapery, is as much of a hindrance as the Viet Cong when it comes to joy and freedom for the people.

It is neither responsive to the people it represents nor viable enough to stand on its own. Directed largely by military personalities, the GVN goes its own way and in a carefully masked drama gives us the impression of being democratic. It is a hollow impression.

Most knowledgeable Vietnamese who care enough to be interested will tell you about the great election we forced the GVN to hold in the fall of 1967.

"The election was the biggest fraud," said one student. "It is common knowledge among the people that many soldiers voted twice. That many people long dead had cast ballots is quite amusing to many of us."

But since the election and the writing of a constitution Americans here have looked upon the evolution of democracy in almost a reverent manner.

"Why, I'm not worried about a coup," said an American adviser in Vung Tau. "They have a constitution now. After the election why should there be a coup? It is a practicing, living democracy now."

The fact that the GVN is a thinly disguised tyranny that closes newspapers with flimsy explanations, harasses those who would dare to speak out in public, and takes from the people in the form of corruption is usually overlooked.

Outwardly, the GVN appears to be laboring to develop a war-torn nation, but inwardly its officials, products of a system that has become part of this nation's blood, continue to grow wealthy from the ways of war, corruption and the American dollar.

Given peace tomorrow, the GVN would only have to face another armed group preparing to rid the land of oppression.

The oppression comes first, rebellion follows and the Communists fill the vacuum and provide an added spirit, eventually taking the leadership of the entire movement and making it theirs. This is a possible pattern of insurrection.

As long as the GVN continues to treat the people in the present manner communism will always have a point from which to commence.

Legions of naive, ambitious and plainly stupid Americans have unwittingly aided the GVN. Our government attempted a revolution here which was of such magnitude that it became an impossibility from the start because of the character of the people and the nature of the GVN.

Our government, under the impression that American money and men could eventually transform this land into a democratic society, gave the GVN its head. Because of the United States, the GVN had power and we really had no control over this power, which, of course, was ours from the beginning.

Never before has our government fought such a war. In response, it has sent American civilians and leaders of such naive quality that one's teeth grate in frustration.

U.S. AID employes, people who are asked to function in important jobs—jobs that require immense skill and understanding—arrive daily to collect substantial salaries and live in air-conditioned comfort. They arrive without skill or understanding.

Some go to the district and provincial capitals to serve in various advisory roles. Many who are sent to advise are recent college graduates who previously never held jobs and are avoiding military service. Others are former military men, usually retired, who were passed over on the promotion lists.

This is not to say that the civilians who serve as advisers are all inadequate, for there are some outstanding people here, but even they are stymied by the atmosphere and events that take place around them.

One adviser, a young man who is capable and knowledgeable, blames the military for many ills and refuses to mingle with the rest of the men on the advisory team who are all military.

His attitude is one of disgust toward the Army—disgust because the Army seems indifferent toward the Vietnamese people.

"I have as little as possible to do with the military," this adviser explained.

Whether he knows it or not, this adviser is dulling the effectiveness of his particular team. True enough, the military does not exhibit the same zeal as the young adviser, but he refuses to see reality and try to make the team work.

On the other hand, the military often manifests contempt for the civilians, who are sometimes viewed as "do-gooders" with an business to be cluttering up a war zone.

Since the job of fighting this type of struggle is complex, the experience and knowledge of those who have mastered a small part of it is invaluable. But by and large, many of these people give up in disgust at the leadership, which tends to give in to the Vietnamese pressures at nearly every turn.

The matter of corruption alone is of such staggering magnitude that the mind reels when it confronts only a small part of it.

And the Vietnamese people laugh—oh, how they laugh!—at the Americans who are innocent of the corruption that surrounds them. The Vietnamese people know all and see all. They are the last to be fooled by the stories of improvement and progress that we praise the GVN for making. Obviously, we are the first to be fooled.

We have done so much for the Vietnamese that they have simply stopped functioning. We advise on everything. We finance most things and we do the heaviest fighting. The Vietnamese government spends its time talking about how it is not going to talk to the National Liberation Front, a confrontation that will have to take place if there is to be peace.

While South Vietnam's large and questionable army moves about the countryside deploying in maneuvers of eluding and engaging, our military is expected to do more than fight.

The truth is that the military has been asked to do too much in Vietnam. Soldiers are expected to be politicians, good humor men, development specialists, doctors, psychologists and just about everything short of the good fairy.

If you have ever had anything to do with an infantry unit that has seen combat day in and day out, you can understand the ridiculousness of this. Men tense and tired from combat are apt to look upon any Vietnamese with suspicion and ill feeling.

However, the military in Vietnam cannot go uncriticized. Gen. William C. Westmoreland with his vocal optimism, his search-and-destroy methods and his massive use of firepower left the military effort open to the attacks of skeptics.

But in many ways the military has done its primary job in Vietnam. It has killed Viet Cong and North Vietnamese soldiers. It is even getting better at the job. What else does a military do?

The longer you are here, however, and the more closely you examine the enemy and the politics, it becomes increasingly evident that the military operations are superfluous because the "other war" is being fought like a delay-and-withdraw action. Because of the ineptness of the GVN, Viet Cong are manufactured daily.

Our participation in the "other war" has been less than brilliant.

Men were assigned to Vietnam as leaders in this program and came to build personal empires of such bureaucratic magnitude that it took elaborate charts to find out who was responsible for what.

Robert W. Komer, now U.S. ambassador to Turkey and a former Central Intelligence Agency man, came to head up our efforts in this area.

On paper, the way Komer likes things, he had great qualifications. He had good schools behind him, good experience and was generally considered a good administrator. Fine.

But Komer did not listen to his people in the field, many of whom he classified as malcontents when they complained of failures. He would urge them to "get on the team."

A cheery, ebullient sort, Komer told his people to listen to the GVN and do it their way. After all, it was their country.

Komer was fair game for the press which constantly attempted to put him on the defensive at his news briefings. These were almost always concerned with his evaluation system for pacification, a computerized system that analyzed security in the countryside.

"It is the only measurement," he would say in defense. Yes, it was the only measurement that could be worked out on the computer, but there was always the feeling that advisers' reports never quite made it to the final input. Things may not be so good out in the districts, yet by the time Saigon produced the final reports they looked good on paper.

And what about the U.S. advisory system, which has worked so long and so hard with the Vietnamese military and civilian forces?

Despite all the cheering and applause from many American advisers, who must rely upon good efficiency reports for promotion, progress among the Vietnamese armed forces is largely hope and a supply of better American arms.

Since almost all advisers, be they civilian or military, have rather limited tours of duty in specific assignments, their Vietnamese counterparts have gone through a dozen or so.

In many instances the adviser does not advise at all. He sometimes asks, sometimes begs, sometimes cons and most times functions as a line of supply or a communications clerk.

Many Vietnamese commanders, district chiefs and province chiefs have served in the environment of war for so long that it seems impossible that an American officer with no command of the language or, in many cases, no previous combat experience is really going to advise them.

Advisers do not even have the power to control American goods and materials that are sent to help the war-stricken people.

The advisory effort in name has dwindled to the static stage. Vietnamese counterparts have learned to rely too much on U.S. support as provided by an adviser who thinks that he is doing his job by making the aid available. Vietnamese leadership, as bad as it generally is, needs to regain personal initiative.

No one fools the Vietnamese people. When they are helped they know where the help comes from, and our help does not make them view their government with any more respect.

The advisory program needs re-evaluation. It would be the first step in making the Vietnamese realize that the "other war" must be fought by themselves for it is a war in which we are altogether too ineffective.

The problem of the South Vietnamese military is one that will tax the minds of our leadership for some time. The Vietnamese soldier sees how the American fights. He sees the artillery, air strikes and massive helicopter support. He is not interested in fighting without these and where, after we withdraw, is he going to get them?

Westmoreland tried to make the war as easy as possible on the GI. He always said let machines do the job to save men's lives, which was admirable enough. But the South Vietnamese are men, too. Where does their future lie?

The naive Americans are perhaps the most dangerous. They truly believe because they cannot see. The adviser in one seacoast town was oblivious of the fact that the yearly budget was being held back and lent out at a high rate of interest and then, suddenly, spent at a terrific pace at the end of the fiscal year.

"I don't know why they've spent only 20% of the budget in 10 months," he explained to a reporter. "I think it's because they have been having a difficult time getting the books straightened out."

His assistant, younger and more alert, explained later: "It is being lent out at as much as 50% interest on a loan that has to be paid back in 10 months."

"Why didn't you tell your boss?"

"I've told him a couple of times and he refuses to believe me. He says we have to listen to the Vietnamese."

A Saigon official laughed over the lending incident. "At least they are not stealing it," he said.

Americans are naive in other ways.

In a province west of Saigon, an area heavily infested with Viet Cong, the American advisers are quick to extol the virtues of the province chief, who is better than most but still is not beyond applying the con.

Several nights a month, the province chief, buttoned up in his armored car, travels with a musical band to a hamlet where the people are brought together to listen to entertainment and a speech from their leader.

The American leadership views this as quite wholesome. It is just the kind of thing Bob Komer would have in his backyard. The province chief gains prestige through this action because the Americans like it and in turn the GVN is impressed because the United States is much easier to deal with in this particular province.

So on the face of it the rice paddy variety shows are very good. The province chief displays his contempt for the VC by spending the night in the village. On paper it is a brave and bold gesture.

Since most Americans cannot speak Vietnamese, however, they do not realize one thing. The people in that particular hamlet are terrified.

Even though the province chief, who appears to be quite unconcerned about the VC, has set up night ambushes and defensive positions around the hamlet with nearly a battalion, the people fear that his foolishness is simply inviting a Viet Cong attack.

"I have talked with some people from one hamlet," a Vietnamese friend said. "The mothers fear for their babies when the musical show comes. All the people are cold with fright. They wish the colonel would stop trying to impress the Americans."

If you are sitting in Saigon reading reports and evaluating this activity, all would appear quite progressive. The province chief is attempting to pacify his province; he is out showing the flag and he is working. His counterpart seems to be doing well, too.

No one evaluates the people's feelings. Did you ever have a good time while waiting for a mortar attack? This never occurs to the Saigon officials, whose secretaries often enjoy salaries and benefits equal to those of a company commander.

The game goes on.

Most Americans in Vietnam see our effort for what it is, most recognize the GVN as despotic. To discuss this with them in Saigon is old hat; you give an example and they can give you two back.

Westmoreland could never understand the press in Vietnam. He tried to be friends, tried to use public relations to win their understanding.

Westmoreland did not lie. But what he faced in the press corps was an independent agency that could go anywhere in the country and see anything it wanted to and talk to anyone who cared to comment.

The difference between the press and the government was that the press listened to what everyone had to say. It was not that U.S. officials did not tell the truth. It was just that they did not know any differently themselves so they took the word of the GVN or of whoever could identify progress.

But when these same people who had talked to the press tried to talk with the government, people like Bob Komer did not always have time to listen. Ambassador Komer wanted to listen only to those things that told of progress. To speak otherwise meant that you were not doing your job.

Barry Zorthian, the former leader of the Joint U.S. Press Mission, another bureaucratic empire of questionable worth, returned home after a long tour in Vietnam and criticized the irresponsibility of the press.

To a degree Zorthian was right. Some poor reporting is coming out of Vietnam. But the U.S. Government accredits as a journalist just about anyone who would like to attend a war.

These persons flock in without any previous journalistic experience. They are accredited as free-lancers.

"Oh, this is my first writing effort," a young man said the other day. "I'm just here to make some money and see a little war."

A beautiful school operator came over to film a documentary, Red Cross girls return to become journalists and even a matronly woman with nothing other to do was accredited. She asked meekly:

"Please can you tell me when the tour is going out to the war?"

And strangely enough, when the free-lancers find out, as most eventually do, that a war does not necessarily make you an Ernest Hemingway and that it takes money to live even in Saigon they can get an assignment from our government that will pay them a few hundred dollars.

They are paid well to write insipid feature stories that neither will see print nor represent good propaganda. Our conception of propaganda is air-dropped leaflets that the Vietnamese use for toilet paper or peanut wrappers.

Yes, Barry Zorthian is right. There is a problem with the press, largely because the government was too timid to keep Vietnam from being a playground for would-be writers.

A lot of good is to be found in Vietnam, mostly good people. Outstanding Americans and equally outstanding Vietnamese labor daily together, endure the hardships and dangers and build binding friendships and mutual respect through their toils.

The men who extend for more duty deserve credit for they discount the odds that are made by the Viet Cong and the politicians. Not enough can ever be said about these people.

Often it is best not to mention the good Vietnamese for their government does not like to hear what they have to say. But they are the victims of politics and the times and they are the ones who suffer the most.

Both governments, reigned over by the single-mindedness of their leaderships, struggle on. The Americans look for progress during their tour so they can come home to a promotion while the GVN leaders immerse themselves in the joys of new-found power, unwilling to face reality.

That the writer has been unfair in his portrayal is acknowledged. He is unfair because he does not have the answers to these agonies, but apparently neither does any of those in power.

But first we have to acknowledge our mistakes before we can correct them. The question is whether our leadership is ready to do so.

That is why anger overcomes sadness in Vietnam.

THE ARMS RACE

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in an article published in the April 1969, issue of Scientific American, Dr. George W. Rathjens, currently a visiting professor of political science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, examines the possible effects of a decision to deploy the ABM and the MIRV systems on the spiraling arms race. Dr. Rathjens argues that none of the commonly cited purposes of the ABM system, that is, first, to defend the American population and industry against a possible Chinese attack; second, to provide at least some protection for population and industry against a possible Russian attack; third, to defend Minuteman missile sites against a possible Russian attack; and, fourth, to serve as a bargaining counter in strategic-arms-limitation talks with the U.S.S.R.—the first three being of a damage-limitation nature—would be accomplished by deployment.

Dr. Rathjens points to the inconsistency of trying to limit the damage of a possible nuclear war, while trying at the same time to lessen that possibility. If one follows a policy of damage-limitation, the advantages of a first strike are increased severalfold. In the article he concludes:

> To the extent that one accepts the action-reaction view of the arms race, one is forced to conclude that virtually anything we might attempt in order to reduce damage to ourselves in the event of war is likely to provoke an escalation in the arms race. Moreover, many of the choices we might make with damage limitation in mind are likely to make preemptive attack more attractive and war therefore more probable. The concurrent development of the MIRV's and the ABM system is a particularly good example of this.

Dr. Rathjens qualifies as an expert on the issue, having held the following positions: former member staff weapons systems evaluation team, Department of Defense, 1953–58; former Special Assistant to the President for science and technology, 1959–60; former chief scientist, Advanced Projects Agency, Department of Defense, 1961; former Deputy Assistant Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, 1962–64; and former Director of Weapons Systems Evaluation Division, Institute for Defense Analysis, 1965–68. He is also the author of a recent book entitled "The Future of the Strategic Arms Race: Options of the 1970's."

The Government should give close attention to the opinions of experts like Dr. Rathjens on crucial issues such as the ABM. I strongly urge my colleagues to read the following article:

[From the Scientific American, April 1969]

THE DYNAMICS OF THE ARMS RACE

(by George W. Rathjens)

(NOTE.—Recent decisions by the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. threaten to upset the stability of the present strategic military balance. The net result may be simply to decrease the security of both countries.)

The world stands at a critical juncture in the history of the strategic arms race. Within the past two years both the U.S. and U.S.S.R. have decided to deploy new generations of offensive and defensive nuclear weapons systems. These developments, stimulated in part by the emergence of China as a nuclear power, threaten to upset the qualitatively stable "balance of terror" that has prevailed between the two superpowers during most of the 1960's. The new weapons programs portend for the 1970's a decade of greatly increased military budgets, with all the concomitant social and political costs these entail for both countries. Moreover, it appears virtually certain that at the end of all this effort and all this spending neither nation will have significantly advanced its own security. On the contrary, it seems likely that another upward spiral in the arms race would simply make a nuclear exchange more probable, more damaging or both.

As an alternative to this prospect, the expectation of serious arms-limitation talks between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. holds forth the possibility of at least preventing an acceleration of the arms race. In the circumstances it seems worthwhile to inquire into the nature of the forces that impel an arms race. In doing so we may determine how best to damp this newest cycle of military competition, either by mutual agreement or by unilateral restraint, before it is beyond control.

There are a number of new weapons systems under development in both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., but the possibilities that are likely to be at the center of discussion not only in the forthcoming negotiations but also in the current Congressional debate are the anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) concept and the multiple - independently - targeted-reentry-vehicle (MIRV) concept. These systems, one defensive and the other offensive, can usefully be discussed together because of the way they interact. In fact, the intrinsic dynamics of the arms race can be effectively illustrated by concentrating on these two developments.

It is now 18 months since former Secretary of Defense McNamara announced the decision of the Johnson Administration to proceed with the deployment of the Sentinel system: a "thin" ABM system originally described as being intended to cope with a hypothetical Chinese missile attack during the 1970's. The technology of the Sentinel system and some of the means a determined adversary might employ to defeat it were discussed in some detail a year ago in this magazine [see "Anti-Ballistic-Missile Systems," by Richard L. Garwin and Hans A. Bethe; SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, March, 1968]. At this point I should like to review some of the background of the ABM problem.

Before the Sentinel decision most of the interest in a ballistic-missile defense for the U.S. was focused on the Nike-X program. This concept involved the use of two kinds of interceptor to protect the population and industry of the country against a hypothetical Russian missile attack. Interception would first be attempted outside the earth's atmosphere with Spartans, long-range missiles with nuclear warheads in the megaton range. The effectiveness of the defense, however, would depend primarily on the use of Sprints, short-range missiles with kiloton-yield warheads designed to intercept incoming missiles after they have reentered the atmosphere. The system also envisaged suitable radars and computers to control the engagement.

The Spartans could in principle defend large areas; indeed, about a dozen sites could defend the entire country. A defense based solely on them could be rendered ineffective, however, by fairly simple countermeasures, in particular by large numbers of lightweight decoys (which would be indistinguishable to a radar from an actual reentry vehicle containing a warhead) by measures that would make the radar ineffective, for example the use of nuclear explosions, electronic jammers or light, widely dispersed metal "chaff."

The effectiveness of a Sprint defense would be less degraded by such countermeasures. Light decoys could be distinguished from actual reentry vehicles because they would be disproportionately slowed by the atmosphere and possibly because their wake in the atmosphere would be different. Radar blackout would also be much less of a problem. Because of their short range, however, Sprints could defend only those targets in their immediate vicinity. Thus an adversary could choose to attack some cities with enough weapons to overwhelm the defense while leaving others untargeted. Heavy radioactive fallout could also be produced over large parts of the country by an adversary's delivering large-yield weapons outside the areas covered by Sprint defenses. A nationwide defense of the Sprint type would therefore require a nationwide fallout-shelter program.

Although combining Sprints and Spartans in a single system, as was proposed for the Nike-X system, would complicate an adversary's penetration problem, in a competition with a determined and resourceful adversary the advantage in an offense-defense duel would still lie with the offense. As a result, in spite of strong advocacy by the Army and support from the other branches of the military and from members of Congress, the decision to deploy the Nike-X system was never made.

At the heart of the debate about whether or not to deploy the Nike-X system was the question of what the Russian reaction to such a decision would be. It was generally conceded that the system might well save large numbers of lives in the event of war, if the U.S.S.R. were simply to employ the forces projected in the available intelligence estimates. On that basis proponents argued in favor of deployment in spite of the high costs, variously estimated as being from $13 billion to $50 billion. Such deployment was opposed, particularly by Secretary McNamara, because of the belief that the U.S.S.R. could and would improve its offensive capabilities in order to negate whatever effectiveness the system might have had. Indeed, because the deployment of a U.S. ABM system would introduce large uncertainties into the calculus of the strategic balance, there were occasional expressions of concern that the U.S.S.R. might overreact. Hence the damage inflicted on us in the event of war might even be greater than it would be if the Nike-X system were not deployed.

The Sentinel system announced in 1967 would have far less capability than the Nike–X system. It would include some Sprint missiles to defend key radars (five or six perimeter acquisition radars, or PAR's to be deployed across the northern part of the country), but the main defense would be provided by Spartan missiles located to provide a "thin" or "light" defense for the entire country (*see illustration on opposite page*). Spokesmen for the Johnson Administration argued that such a deployment would be almost completely effective in dealing with a possible Chinese missile attack during the 1970's, but that it would be so ineffective against a possible Russian attack that the U.S.S.R. would not feel obliged to improve its strategic offensive forces as a response to the decision. Both arguments were seriously questioned.

Garwin and Bethe, for example, contended that even the first-generation Chinese missiles might well be equipped with penetration aids that would defeat the Sentinel system. Other experts pointed out that the system, like the Nike–X system, could never be tested adequately short of actual war, and that in view of its complexity there would be a high probability of a catastrophic failure.

The contention that the U.S.S.R. would not react to the Sentinel decision seemed at least as questionable as the assertions of great effectiveness against the Chinese. Whatever the initial capability of the Sentinel system, it seemed clear that the Sentinel decision would at least shorten the lead time for the deployment of a system of the Nike–X type. Moreover, the fact that Sentinel was strongly and publicly supported as a first step toward an "anti-Soviet" system could hardly escape the attention of Russian decision-makers.

Since the announcement of the Sentinel decision, and particularly since the change in the Administration, the arguments in favor of the decision have become confused. It has been variously suggested by Administration spokesmen that the primary purpose would be (1) to defend the American population and industry against a possible Chinese attack, (2) to provide at least some protection for population and industry against a possible Russian attack, (3) to defend Minuteman missile sites against a possible Russian attack and (4) to serve as a bargaining counter in strategic-arms-limitation talks with the U.S.S.R. It might be noted that no one in recent months has seriously suggested that a Russian reaction to the decision is unlikely. In fact, all but the first of the arguments cited above imply the likelihood of a Russian response.

President Nixon's reaffirmation, albeit with some modification, of the Sentinel decision was presumably made on the basis of his judgment that the first and third of the aforementioned arguments justify the costs of such a system, not only the direct dollar cost but also the cost in terms of the impact on Russian decision-making and any other costs that may be imputed to the system. Whether or not his decision is correct depends strongly on how serious the possibility of a Russian reaction is. Before dealing further with that question it will be useful to bring MIRV's into the picture.

The problem of simulating an actual warhead reentry vehicle is a comparatively easy one, provided that the attacker need not be concerned with differences in the interaction of decoys and warheads with the atmosphere during reentry. If one wishes to build decoys and warheads that will be indistinguishable down to low altitudes, however, the problem is a formidable one, particularly if one demands high confidence in the indistinguishability of the two types of object. Improved radar resolution and increased traffic-handling and data-processing capability make the problem of effective decoy design increasingly difficult. The development of interceptors capable of high acceleration will also complicate the offense's problem. With such interceptors the decision to engage reentering objects can be deferred until they are well down into the atmosphere; the longer the defense can wait, the more stringent are the demands of decoy simulation on the offense.

As the problem becomes more difficult, the ratio of decoy weight to warhead weight increases. There comes a point at which, if one wants really high confidence of penetration, one might just as well use several warheads on each missile rather than a single warhead and several decoys, each of which may be as heavy, or nearly as heavy, as a warhead. Hence multiple warheads are in a sense the ultimate in high-confidence penetration aids (assuming that one relies on exhaustion or saturation of defense capabilities as the preferred tactic for defeating the defense). To be effective, however, multiple warheads must be sufficiently separated so that a single interceptor burst will not destroy more than one incoming warhead. Moreover, the utility of multiple warheads for destroying targets, particularly small ones that would not justify attack by more than one or two small warheads, will be greatly enhanced if they can be individually guided.

In principle each reentry vehicle could have its own "post-boost" guidance and propulsion system. That, however, is not the concept of the MIRV's in our Poseidon and Minuteman III missile systems, which are now under development. Rather, a single guidance and propulsion system will control the orientation and velocity of a "bus" from which reentry vehicles will be released sequentially. After each release there will be a further adjustment in the velocity and direction of the bus. Thus each reentry vehicle can be directed to a separate target. The targets can be rather widely separated, the actual separation depending on how much energy (and, therefore, weight) one is willing to expend in the post-boost maneuvers of the bus. It is an ingenious—and demanding—concept.

Two rationales have been advanced for the decision to proceed with the U.S. MIRV programs. One is that with MIRV's the U.S. can have a high confidence of being able to penetrate an adversary's ABM defenses. The apparent deployment of a limited Russian ABM system in the vicinity of Moscow and U.S. concern about a possibly more widespread Russian ABM-system deployment have been important considerations in the decision to go ahead with the U.S. MIRV programs.

The second rationale is that a MIRV system enables one to strike more targets with a given number of boosters than would be the case if one were using one warhead per missile. This rationale has been important for two reasons.

First, it enabled spokesmen for the Johnson Administration to argue against expanding the size of our strategic missile force during a period when Russian forces were growing rapidly. They were able to contend in the face of political opposition on both flanks that, whereas we did not contemplate expanding the number of our offensive missiles, the number of warheads we could deliver would increase rapidly.

Second, it raised the prospect of a missile force that could be used as a very effective "counterforce" weapon. This means that with MIRV's a limited number of missiles might be capable of destroying a larger intercontinental-ballistic-missile (ICBM) force in a preemptive attack. To achieve this performance, however, particularly against hardened offensive missile sites, would require a substantial improvement in accuracy and a high post-boost reliability—no mean feats with a device as complicated as the MIRV bus.

What bearing will the deployment of the ABM and the MIRV systems have on the future of the arms race? In attempting to answer this difficult question it is instructive to consider the extent to which the choices of each of the superpowers regarding strategic weapons have been influenced by the other's decisions.

The actual role of this action-reaction phenomenon is a matter of considerable debate in American defense circles. Indeed, the differences in views on this question account for most of the dispute of the past few years regarding the objectives to be served by strategic forces and their desired size and qualities. Thus whether the U.S. should be content with an adequate retaliatory, or "assured destruction," capability or go further and try to build a capability that would permit us to reduce damage to ourselves in the event of war must clearly depend on a judgment on whether Russian defense decisions could be influenced significantly by our decisions. Those who have felt that Russian defense planning would be responsive to our actions have held that for the most part any attempt by us to develop such "damage-limiting" capabilities with respect to the U.S.S.R. would be an effort doomed to failure. The U.S.S.R. would simply improve its offensive capabilities to offset the effects of any measures we might take. This was the basis for the rejection by the American leadership of the requests by the Army for large-scale ABM-system deployment and for the rejection of requests by the Air Force for much larger ICBM forces.

Although there is considerable evidence to support the claim that the action-reaction phenomenon does apply to defense decision-making, to explain all the major decisions of the superpowers in terms of an action-reaction hypothesis is an obvious oversimplification. The American MIRV deployment has been rationalized as a logical response to a possible Russian ABM-system deployment, but there were also other motivations that were important: the desire to keep our total missile force constant while increasing the number of warheads we could deploy, the long-term possibility of MIRV's giving us an effective counterforce capability, and finally the simple desire to bring to fruition an interesting and elegant technological concept.

Nevertheless, the action-reaction phenomenon, with the reaction often premature and/or exaggerated, has clearly been a major stimulant of the strategic arms race. Examples from the past can be cited to support this point: (1) the American reaction, indeed overeaction, to uncertainty at the time of the "missile gap," which played a central role in the 1960 Presidential election but was soon afterward shown by improved intelligence to be, if anything, in favor of the U.S.; (2) the Russian decision to deploy the "Tallinn" air-defense system, possibly made in the mistaken expectation that the U.S. would go ahead with the deployment of B–70 bombers or SR–71 strike-reconnaissance aircraft; (3) the U.S. response to the Tallinn system (which until recently was thought to be an ABM system) and to the possible extension of the Moscow ABM system into a countrywide system. It was in order to have high assurance of its ability to get through these possible Russian ABM defenses that the U.S. embarked on the development of various penetration aids and even of new missiles: Minuteman III and Poseidon.

Those examples have in common the fact that if doubt exists about the capabilities or intentions of an adversary, prudence normally requires that one respond not on the basis of what one expects but on a considerably more pessimistic projection. The U.S. generally bases its plans—and makes much of the fact—on what has become known as the "greater-than-expected threat." In so doing the Americans (and presumably the Russians) have often overreacted. The extent of the overreaction is directly dependent on the degree of uncertainty about any adversary's intentions and capabilities.

The problem is compounded by leadtime requirements for response. According to the Johnson Administration, the decisions to go ahead with Minuteman III, Poseidon and Sentinel had to be made when they were because of the possibility that in the mid-1970's the Russians might have a reasonably effective ABM system and the Chinese an ICBM capability. The Russians had to make a decision to develop the Tallinn system (if the decision was made because of the B–70 program) long before we ourselves knew whether or not we would deploy an operational B–70 force.

Once the decisions to respond to ambiguous indications of adversary activity were made it often proved impossible to modify the response, even when new intelligence became available. For example, between the time the Sentinel decision was announced and the first Congressional debate on the appropriation took place during the summer of 1968, evidence became available that the Chinese threat was not developing as rapidly as had been feared. Yet in spite of this information those in Congress who attempted at that time to defer the appropriation for Sentinel failed. Similarly, at this writing, as the Poseidon and Minuteman III programs begin to gain momentum, it seems much less likely than it did at the time of their conception that the U.S.S.R. will deploy the kind of ABM system that was the Johnson Administration's main rationale for these programs. On the Russian side, the Tallinn deployment continued long after it became clear that no operational B–70 force would ever be built.

Of the kinds of weapons development that can stimulate overresponse on the part of one's adversary, it is hard to imagine one more troublesome than ABM defenses. In addition to uncertainty about adversary intentions and the need (because of lead-time requirements) for early response to what the adversary might do, there is the added fact that the uncertainties about how well an ABM system might perform are far larger than they are for strategic offensive systems. The conservative defense planner will design his ABM system on the assumption that it may not work as well as he hopes, that is, he will overdesign it to take into account as fully as he can all imaginable modes of failure and enemy offensive threats. The offensive planner, on the other hand, will assume that the defense might perform much better than he expects and will overdesign his response. Thus there is overreaction on both sides. These uncertainties result in a divergent process: an arms race with no apparent limits other than economic ones, each round being more expensive than the last. Moreover, because of overreaction on the part of the offense there may be an increase in the ability of each side to inflict damage on the other.

All one needs to make this possibility a reality is a triggering mechanism. The Russian ABM program, by stimulating the Minuteman III and Poseidon programs, may have served that purpose. The Chinese nuclear program may also have triggered an action-reaction chain, of which the Sentinel response is the second link.

It can be assumed that there will be considerable pressure and effort to make Sentinel highly effective against a "greater than expected" Chinese threat. Such a system will undoubtedly have some capability against Russian ICBM's. Russian decision-makers, who must assume the Sentinel might perform better than they expect, will at least have to consider this possibility as they plan their offensive capabilities. More important, they will have to respond on the assumption that the Sentinel decision may foreshadow a decision to build an anti-Russian ABM system. Hence it is probably not a question of whether the U.S.S.R. will respond to Sentinel but rather of whether the U.S.S.R. will limit its response to one that does not require a U.S. counterresponse, and of whether it is too late to stop the Sentinel deployment.

It is apparent that reduction in uncertainty about adversary intentions and capabilities is a *sine qua non* to curtailing the strategic arms race. There are a number of ways to accomplish this (in addition to the gathering of intelligence, which obviously makes a great contribution).

First, there is unilateral disclosure. In the case of the U.S. there has been a conscious effort to inform both the American public and the Russian leadership of the rationale for many American decisions regarding strategic systems and, to the extent consistent with security, of U.S. capabilities. This has been done particularly through the release by the Secretary of Defense of an annual "posture" statement, a practice that, it is hoped, will be continued by the U.S. and will be emulated someday by the U.S.S.R. This would be in the interest of both countries. Because there has been no corresponding effort by the Russians the U.S. probably overreacts to Russian decisions more than the U.S.S.R. does to American decisions. (At least it is easier to trace a causal relationship between Russian decisions and U.S. reactions than it is between U.S. decisions and Russian reactions.)

Second, negotiations to curtail the arms race (even if abortive) or any other dialogue may be very useful if such efforts result in a reduction of uncertainty about the policies, capabilities or intentions of the parties.

Third, some weapons systems may be less productive of uncertainty than others that might be chosen instead. For example, it is likely to be less difficult to measure the size of a force of submarine-launched or fixed missiles than it is to measure the size of a mobile land force. Similarly, it would be easier to persuade an adversary that a small missile carried only a single warhead than would be the case with a large vehicle. Such considerations must be borne in mind in evaluating alternative weapons systems.

In short, although uncertainty about adversary capabilities and intentions may not always be bad (in some instances the existence of uncertainty has contributed to deterrence), the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. would seem well advised to make great efforts to avoid giving each other cause for overreacting to decisions because of inadequate understanding of their meaning.

The importance of somehow breaking the action-reaction chains that seem to drive the arms race is obvious when one considers the enormous resources involved that could otherwise be used to meet pressing social needs. In addition, there is particular importance in doing so at present because the concurrent deployment of MIRV's and ABM systems is likely to have drastic destabilizing consequences. It is conceivable that one of the superpowers with an ABM system might develop MIRV's to the point where it could use them to destroy the bulk of its adversary's ICBM force in a preemptive attack. Its air and ABM defenses would then have to deal with a much degraded retaliatory blow, consisting of the sea-launched forces and any ICBM's and aircraft that might have survived the preemptive attack. The problems of defense in such a contingency would remain formidable. They would be significantly less difficult, however, than if the adversary's ICBM force had not been seriously depleted. In fact, the defense problem would be relatively simple if a large fraction of the adversary's retaliatory capability were, as is true for the U.S. and to a far greater degree for the U.S.S.R., in its land-based ICBM's, most of which would presumably have been destroyed.

It may seem unlikely that either superpower would initiate such a preemptive attack, in view of the great uncertainties in effectiveness (particularly with respect to defenses) and the disastrous consequences if even a comparatively small fraction of the adversary's retaliatory force should get through. With both MIRV's and an ABM system, however, such a preemptive attack would not seem as unlikely as it does now. It might not appear irrational to some, for example, if an uncontrollable nuclear exchange seemed almost certain, and if by striking first one could limit damage to a significantly lower level than if the adversary were to strike the first blow. In short, if one or both of the two superpowers had such capabilities, the world would be a much more unstable place than it is now.

Obviously neither superpower would permit its adversary to develop such capabilities without responding, if it could, by strengthening its retaliatory forces. The response problem becomes more difficult, however, if the adversary develops both MIRV's and an ABM system than if only one is developed.

Against a MIRV threat alone there are such obvious responses as defense of ICBM sites or greater reliance on sea-launched or other mobile systems. Such responses are likely to be acceptable because, whereas the costs of highly invulnerable systems are large (perhaps several times larger than the costs of simple undefended ICBM's), only relatively small numbers of such secure retaliatory weapons would be required to provide an adequate "assured destruction" capability. Indeed, a force the size of the present Polaris submarine fleet would seem to be more than adequate. The response to an ABM system alone might also be kept within acceptable limits because the expenditures required to offset the effects of defense are likely to be small compared with the costs of the defense.

If it is necessary to acquire retaliatory capabilities that are comparatively invulnerable to MIRV attack in numbers sufficient to saturate or exhaust ABM defenses, however, the total cost could be very great. In fact, if one continued to rely heavily on exhaustion of defenses as the preferred technique for penetration, the offense might no longer have a significant cost-effectiveness advantage over the defense. Thus the concurrent development of MIRV's and ABM systems raises the specter of a more precarious balance of terror a few years hence, a rapidly escalating arms race in the attempt to prevent the instabilities from getting out of hand, or quite possibly both.

With this background about the roles of uncertainty and the action-reaction phenomenon in stimulating the arms race, one can draw some general conclusions about the functions and qualities of future strategic forces. We must first recognize that two kinds of instability must be considered: crisis instability (the possibility that when war seems imminent, one side or the other will be motivated to attack preemptively in the hope of limiting damage to itself) and arms-race instability (the possibility that the development or deployment decisions of one country, or even the possibility of such decisions, may trigger new development or deployment decisions by another country).

The first kind of instability is illustrated in the chart on the opposite page, which is based on former Secretary McNamara's posture statement for fiscal 1967. This shows that—assuming two possible expanded Russian threats, various damage-limiting efforts by the U.S. and failure of the U.S.S.R. to react to extensive U.S. damage-limiting efforts by improving its retaliatory capability—American fatalities in 1975 would be only about a third as great in the event of a U.S. first strike as they would be in the case of a Russian first strike. (In the present situation the advantage of the attacker is negligible.) Obviously if war seemed imminent, with the strategic balances assumed in this example, there would be tremendous pressure on the U.S. to strike first. There would be corresponding pressure on the U.S.S.R. to do likewise if a Russian first strike could result not only in a much higher level of damage to the U.S. but also in a diminution in damage to the U.S.S.R. The incentives would be mutually reinforcing.

To minimize the chance of a failure of deterrence in a time of crisis, it seems important for both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to develop strategic postures such that preemptive attack would have as small an effect as possible on the anticipated outcome of a thermonuclear exchange. Actually, of course, it is extremely unlikely that the Russians would passively watch the U.S. develop the extensive damage-limiting postures assumed in the foregoing example. Instead they would probably react by modifying their posture so that the advantage to the U.S. of attacking preemptively would be less than is indicated in the chart. Thus the example can also be used to illustrate the second kind of instability.

To the extent that one accepts the action-reaction view of the arms race, one is forced to conclude that virtually anything we might attempt in order to reduce damage to ourselves in the event of war is likely to provoke an escalation in the race. Moreover, many of the choices we might make with damage-limitation in mind are likely to make preemptive attack more attractive and war therefore more probable. The concurrent development of MIRV's and ABM systems is a particularly good example of this.

One is struck by the fact that there is an inherent inconsonance in the objectives spelled out in our basic military policy, namely "to deter aggression at any level and, should deterrence fail, to terminate hostilities in concert with our allies under conditions of relative advantage while limiting damage to the U.S. and allied interests." Hard choices must be made between attempting to minimize the chance of war's occurring in a time of crisis and attempting to minimize the consequences if it does occur.

The decisions made by U.S. planners in recent years with respect to new weapons development and deployment reflect a somewhat inconsistent philosophy on this point. The U.S. has generally avoided actions whose primary rationale was to limit damage that the U.S.S.R. might inflict on it, actions to which the Russians would probably respond. Accordingly the U.S. has not deployed an anti-Russian ABM system and has given air defense a low priority.

On the other hand, where there were reasons other than a desire to improve American damage-limiting capability with respect to the U.S.S.R., the U.S. has proceeded with programs in spite of their probably escalating effect on the arms race or their effect on first-strike incentives. This was true in the case of the MIRV's and Sentinel.

The U.S. will face more such decisions. For example, it may appear necessary to change the U.S. strategic offensive posture in order to make American forces less vulnerable to possible Russian MIRV attack. The nature of these decisions will depend on the importance attached to the action-reaction phenomenon and to the effect of improved counterforce capabilities on the probability of war. Emphasis on these two factors implies discounting options that would increase U.S. counterforce capability against Russian strategic forces, which in turn might provoke an expansion of Russian offensive forces. Options requiring long lead times would also be discounted, since decisions regarding them might have to be made while there was still uncertainty about whether the U.S.S.R. was developing MIRV's.

Should more weight be given in the future to developing damage-limiting capabilities? Or should more weight be given to minimizing the probability of a thermonuclear exchange and curtailing the strategic arms race? It is hard to see how one can have it both ways.

In spite of some changes in technology, there is little to indicate that the U.S. could get very far with damage-limiting efforts, considering the determination of the Russians and the options available to them for denying the attainment of such U.S. capabilities. The emergence of new nuclear powers, the rapid pace of technological advance and the other important demands on American resources suggest that a clear first priority should be assigned to moderating the action-reaction cycle. Moving toward greater emphasis on damage-limitation would seem justified only if the U.S. can persuade itself that the Russians will not react to American moves as the U.S. would to theirs, and if means can be chosen that will not increase the probability of war.

No treatment of the dynamics of the strategic arms race would be complete without some discussion of the possibility of ending it, or at least curtailing it, through negotiations. Both the urgency and the opportunity are great, but the latter may be waning. This opportunity is in part a consequence of the present military balance, as well as of somewhat changed views in both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. about strategic capabilities and objectives.

With the rapid growth in its strategic offensive forces during the past few years, the U.S.S.R. can at long last enter negotiations without conceding inferiority or (which is worse from the Russian point of view) exposing itself to the possibility of being frozen in such a position. Moreover, the U.S.S.R. may at long last be prepared to accept the prevailing American view about the action-reaction phenomenon, and about the intrinsic advantage of the offense and the futility of defense. The apparent decision of the Russians not to proceed with a nationwide ABM system at present, and their professed willingness to enter into negotiations to control both offensive and defensive systems, may be evidence of this convergence of viewpoints.

On the American side there is at long last a quite general, if not yet universal, acceptance of the concept of nuclear "sufficiency": the idea that beyond a certain point increased nuclear force cannot be translated into useful political power. Acceptance of this concept is an almost necessary condition to termination of the arms race.

In considering negotiations with the U.S.S.R. on the strategic arms problem, the first factor to be kept in mind is the objectives to be sought. It would be a mistake to expect too much or to aspire to too little. One obvious aim is to reduce strategic armaments in order to lessen significantly the damage that would be sustained by the U.S. (and the U.S.S.R.) in the event of a nuclear exchange. Regrettably this goal is not likely to be realized in the near future. In the first place, any initial understandings will probably not involve reductions in strategic forces. Even if they did, the reductions would be limited. One cannot expect potential damage levels to be lowered by more than a few percent, even with fairly substantial cuts in strategic forces, because the capabilities of the superpowers are already so great.

Other objectives have been considered: reducing the incentives to strike preemptively in time of crisis, reducing the probability of accident or miscalculation, and increasing the time available for decision-making in the hope that the increased opportunity for communication might prevent a nuclear exchange from running its full course. Last but not least, one might also hope to change the international political climate so as to lessen tension, to reduce the incentive for powers that currently do not have nuclear weapons to acquire them and to increase the possibility for agreement by the superpowers on other meaningful arms-control measures.

It is reasonable to expect that successful negotiations might to some degree achieve all these objectives except the first: the reduction of potential damage. To focus on any one objective, or combination of objectives, however, is to obscure the immediate problem. In spite of the restraint of the U.S. in its choices regarding strategic weapons development and deployment during the first two-thirds of this decade, it now appears that in the absence of some understanding between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. the action-reaction sequence that impels the arms race will not be broken. Therefore, the immediate objective of any negotiations must be simply to bring that sequence to a halt, or to moderate its pace so that there will be a better chance of ending the arms race than is offered by continuing the policies of the past two decades.

In retrospect, controlling or reversing the growth of strategic capabilities could have been accomplished more easily a few years ago, when the possibility of ABM-system deployment seemed to be the main factor that would trigger another round in the arms race. Now the prospect of ABM systems is more troublesome because of technological advances. In addition, there are the two other stimuli already discussed: the possibility of effective counterforce capabilities as a result of the development of MIRV's, and the possibility that the Chinese nuclear capability may serve as a catalyst to the Russian-American action-reaction phenomenon.

Obviously, short of destroying China by nuclear attack, there is little the U.S. can do about Chinese capabilities except to make sure that it does not give them more weight in its thinking than they deserve. This leaves the option of trying to break the ABM-MIRV chain by focusing on the control of MIRV's or ABM defenses.

Whereas one might hope to limit both, if a choice must be made the focus should clearly be on the control of ABM defenses. Verification of compliance would be relatively simple and could probably be accomplished without intrusive inspection. In addition, the incentive to acquire MIRV's for penetrating defenses would be eliminated, although the incentive to acquire them for counterforce purposes would remain.

The problems of verifying compliance with an agreement to control MIRV's would be much more difficult. Moreover, if an ABM system were deployed, there would be great pressure to abrogate or violate any agreement prohibiting MIRV deployment because MIRV's offer high assurance for penetrating defenses. Although reversing the MIRV decision would be difficult, reversing the Sentinel one would present less of a problem.

To be attractive to the U.S.S.R. any proposal to limit defenses would almost certainly have to be coupled with an agreement to limit, if not reduce, inventories of deployed strategic offensive forces. In principle this should not be difficult, since it need not involve serious verification problems.

Complicating any attempt to reach an understanding with the U.S.S.R. on the strategic balance, however, is the fact that the American and Russian positions are not symmetrical. The U.S. has allies and bases around the periphery of the U.S.S.R., whereas the latter has neither near the U.S., unless one counts Cuba. It is clear that a Pandora's box of complications could be opened by any attempt in the context of negotiations on the strategic balance to deal with the threat to America's allies posed by short-range Russian delivery systems, and with the potential threat to the U.S.S.R. of systems in Europe that could reach the U.S.S.R. even though they are primarily tactical in nature. One may hope that initial understandings will not have to include specific agreements on such thorny issues as foreign bases and dual-purpose systems.

Virtually all the above is based on the premise that for the foreseeable future each side will probably insist on maintaining substantial deterrent capabilities. For some time to come there will unfortunately be little basis for expecting negotiations with the U.S.S.R. to result in a strategic balance with each side relying on a few dozen weapons as a deterrent. The difficulties and importance of verification of compliance at such low levels, the problem of China, the existence of large numbers of tactical nuclear weapons on both sides and the general political climate all militate against this. At the other extreme, negotiations would almost necessarily fail if either party based its negotiating position on the expectation that it might achieve a significant damage-limiting capability with respect to the other.

Thus the range of possible agreement is quite narrow. There is a basis for hope, if both sides can accept the fact that for some time the most they can expect to achieve is a strategic balance at quite high, but less rapidly escalating, force levels, and if both recognize that breaking the action-reaction cycle should be given first priority in any negotiations, and also in unilateral decisions.

There will be risks in negotiating arms limitation. These must be weighed not against the risks that might characterize the peaceful world in which everyone would like to live, or even against the risks of the present. Rather, the risks implicit in any agreement must be weighed against the risks and costs that in the absence of agreement one will probably have to confront in the 1970's.

Whether the superpowers strive to curtail the strategic arms race through mutual agreement or through a combination of unilateral restraint and improved dialogue, they should not do so in the mistaken belief that the bases for the Russian-American confrontation of the past two decades will soon be eliminated. Many of the sources of tension have their origins deep in the social structures and political institutions of the two countries. Resolution of these differences will not be accomplished overnight. Restraining the arms race, however, may shorten the time required for resolution of the more basic conflicts between the two superpowers, it may increase the chances of survival during that period, and it may enable the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. to work more effectively on the other large problems that confront the two societies.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: A HARD WORKING MEMBER OF THE NIXON TEAM

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, SPIRO T. AGNEW is becoming a household word. This is so because members of the Washington press corps have learned that his attention to detail, diligence, and a quiet manner are the hallmark of Vice President AGNEW's relations with not only the executive branch, but the U.S. Senate as well.

I insert at this point in my remarks excerpts from four articles on the Vice President. These articles appeared in U.S. News & World Report, January 27, 1969, and March 17, 1969; the Washington Post, February 27, 1969, and Newsweek, March 10, 1969.

The materials follow:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 27, 1969]

AGNEW: WHAT TO EXPECT—AND WHAT HE'S REALLY LIKE

Fate, more than design, has molded the political career of Spiro T. Agnew.

Now more-precise plans are being laid for the man who rose from zoning-board member to Vice President in less than 10 years.

As he assumes the No. 2 office, some important tasks in the Nixon Administration are being set for Mr. Angew.

* * * * *

Already, Mr. Agnew has had a part in inner-circle deliberations of the new Administration. This was when the incoming Cabinet was being chosen.

Richard Nixon reportedly has said that he had to read about President Eisenhower's Cabinet choices in the newspapers when he was Vice President-elect, and that he was making sure this didn't happen to Mr. Agnew.

Nor will Mr. Agnew be left out of important discussions and decisions to come. For one thing, the new President has already said that his Vice President will participate in Cabinet meetings.

Mr. Agnew will be involved in security matters as a statutory member of the National Security Council. And problems of the cities will be a major concern for him, as a member of the Council for Urban Affairs.

On January 17, Mr. Nixon also announced that he has assigned Mr. Agnew the job of liaison with State and local-government officials in an attempt to make federal machinery "sensitive, receptive and responsive."

Nixon aides say that still other jobs are being planned for the Vice President. For instance:

Mr. Agnew will be given many foreign traveling assignments as a good-will ambassador. And he will not be restricted to Latin America, as some published reports have said.

Chairmanship of the National Aeronautics and Space Council and of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development will go to him. He will be given special assignments in the field of oceanography.

Mr. Agnew will appear on radio and television from time to time as a spokesman for the Administration.

Contrary to previous reports, Vice President Agnew's staff will be at least as big as the staff which served Hubert Humphrey, and maybe bigger. Mr. Agnew will operate from five separate offices—more than any other official in Washington. These will be in the White House, in the nearby Executive Office Building and on Capitol Hill, where he will preside over the Senate.

* * * * * *

[From U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 17, 1969]

A NEW KIND OF VICE PRESIDENT?

In choosing Spiro T. Agnew as his running mate last year, Richard Nixon said:

"My primary concern was to select a man who had the courage, the character and the intellect—not only to be Vice President—but also to be an effective President if the need arose."

The Nixon Administration has been in office now for almost two months. Yet few people seem to know very much about Mr. Agnew, or what he is doing as the No. 2 man in the U.S. Government.

The Vice President is a 50-year-old lawyer who formerly served two years as Governor of Maryland and five years as chief executive of Baltimore County. Friends call him "Ted," after his middle name—Theodore. Associates describe him as "poised and controlled"—a man of dignity, fairness and common sense.

Mr. Agnew is the first Vice President to have an office in the White House itself. His quarters have been set up in the West Wing, down a corridor from the President's Oval Room office.

In addition, Mr. Agnew has a newly refurbished suite in the Executive Office Building—the rooms occupied by Lyndon Johnson when he was Vice President; the traditional vice-presidental offices off the Senate floor at the Capitol, and staff quarters in the new Senate Office Building.

SENATE DUTY

The Vice President's only constitutional duty is to preside over the U.S. Senate. Mr. Agnew takes this duty seriously, has made a point of being in the presiding officer's chair at the opening of Senate sessions.

Often he steps down to the floor to talk to Senators. Having spent most of his prior government service as an executive, he says the legislative process "is a whole new world to me." Normally, he spends three or four hours a day on Senate business.

The Vice President cheerfully recognizes that his role is that of an "associate member," able to vote only in case of a tie. His main concern has been to win the trust and confidence of the lawmakers of both parties.

A PLEASANT SURPRISE

Veterans at the Capitol believe the new Vice President is gaining acceptance in Congress. He is the first man in 24 years to preside over the Senate without first having served as an elected member of that body—sometimes described as "the most exclusive club in the world."

A Republican Senator has observed:

"Agnew is a pleasant surprise. He is doing a whale of a job to cultivate the Senate. He has spent more time in the chair than his predecessor. He eats in the dining room at the Capitol—and I can't remember any Vice President doing that."

A Democratic Senator has commented:

"Agnew is a smooth politician. He knows how to talk to the Main Street American, and is proud of calling himself a middlebrow. He will beat the drums for Nixon all over the country. Democrats make a great mistake if they underestimate Agnew."

Recently, former President Johnson was quoted as saying he believes that Mr. Agnew is "underrated," and that "Nixon made a good choice."

By law or executive order, the Vice President is a member of the President's Cabinet and of the National Security Council, and vice chairman of the newly created Urban Affairs Council.

Moreover, Mr. Agnew is head of the National Space Council, Council on Economic Opportunity, Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, Peace Corps Advisory Council, Indian Affairs Council, Cabinet Task Force on Youth Opportunity, and Council on Physical Fitness. He also attends White House congressional-leadership meetings and is a member of the board of the Smithsonian Institution.

Recently, President Nixon assigned Mr. Agnew to work with the nation's Governors and mayors through a new Office of Intergovernmental Relations, with a 12-man staff directed by Nils A. Boe, former Governor of South Dakota.

Said a highly placed source:

"The Governors now feel they have an 'ambassador' in Washington. This new office should be helpful in bringing cooperation on domestic programs at all levels of government."

A GOOD RAPPORT

The Vice President feels that he has established a good rapport with President Nixon, whom he sees on an average of a couple of hours a day in various meetings. An official high up in the Administration describes their relationship in this manner:

"No President has ever been more considerate to his Vice President. They have the kind of mutual understanding that does not require constant consultation.

"Mr. Nixon is easy to communicate with, and precise in making his posture known. He is firm on principle, flexible on procedure. The President is always willing to listen to another approach, but he has his objectives clearly in mind, and he does not vacillate from day to day."

Mr. Agnew is becoming familiar with problems of defense and foreign affairs through frequent NSC meetings and private briefings by Government specialists. The same problems come up in meetings with congressional leaders.

The Vice President gets the same information on economic and monetary affairs that goes to the President from the Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. Agnew works closely with such key White House aides as Arthur F. Burns, Henry Kissinger and Daniel P. Moynihan. Probably his closest friend in the Cabinet is Attorney General John Mitchell.

AN INSIDER'S VIEW

A White House insider gave this insight into the Vice President's activities:

Mr. Agnew is aware that he is the Vice President, and not the President. He presides at meetings when Mr. Nixon is away, but is careful never to push his own point of view on these occasions.

When the President is on hand, Mr. Agnew never hesitates to speak out on policy matters. Hardly a meeting passes when he does not voice an opinion. He has been a prime supporter of a new national urban policy. But Mr. Agnew has impressed on his aides that only the President can make decisions.

When the Vice President chairs a meeting, he does it "superbly." He is an intelligent questioner, good at drawing people out, helping them to formulate ideas. Mr. Agnew "talks to a point," and is "very precise."

The Vice President is very correct and does not want to appear overbearing. When Mr. Nixon was on an out-of-town trip, some members of the Urban Affairs Council invited Mr. Agnew to take the President's chair. "No," the Vice President replied, "I'll preside from my own chair."

As a former State and county official, Mr. Agnew tends to look at government programs "from the bottom up," rather than "from the top down." He is interested in how federal programs affect people at the local level. Also, Mr. Nixon wants more attention paid to the impact of federal policies on State and local governments.

In the future, Mr. Agnew's role as an Administration spokesman is to increase. The Vice President will be making some trips abroad as a "good-will ambassador"—but none, probably, before autumn. Also, Mr. Agnew will be greeting foreign visitors, and doing ceremonial things for the President. "For the time being," the White House insider concluded, "he is learning the ropes, just like the rest of us."

The Vice President's schedule on an average day is described as follows:

Between 7:30 and 8:30 a.m., he arrives at the White House from his home in a nine-room apartment at the Sheraton Park Hotel.

By 11:30 a.m., Mr. Agnew goes to the Capitol, where he is briefed by aides on the legislative calendar, appointments and other activities.

At noon, the Vice President opens the Senate session, staying on through the business of the opening hours, and sometimes coming back after a late lunch.

Between 2 and 3:15 p.m., he receives callers in the Vice President's office off the Senate chamber.

By 3:30 p.m., he returns to the White House for executive duties. Usually he leaves for home around 7 p.m.

At the outset of the Administration, an aide said, the Vice President "was out almost every night, attending official social functions." Now, he added, that has tapered off to "one or two evenings a week."

The Agnews have given a few small parties for friends. They hope to do more entertaining at home in the future for Congressmen, Cabinet members and the like.

INTEREST IN URBAN AFFAIRS

The Vice President has taken a special interest in work of the Urban Affairs Council. He is reported to believe that relief, or welfare, is one of the most difficult problems in the country. Also, he sees no immediate solutions.

The Council is coming up with new data on the cause and effect of poverty in city slums. This is said to point to a need for new leadership and a complete change of social environment.

The problem is being viewed in its impact on the total economy, with a backing-up effect on the suburbs and rural areas. Solutions are to be aimed at drawing people out of the cities to populate underdeveloped areas.

The Vice President has been traveling around the country, speaking to such organizations as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Conference of Christians and Jews, American Management Association and Investment Bankers Association.

Mr. Nixon expects him to perform a variety of chores. At the recent Governors Conference, Mr. Agnew was asked to sound out State leaders on what could be done to curb student violence at colleges and universities. Later, the Vice President visited Cape Kennedy for the Apollo 9 space shot.

Mr. Agnew helped arrange the transfer of the Brooklyn Navy Yard to the City of New York, where—he said—private investment would be able to "develop an industrial park providing 3,500 jobs immediately and 20,000 jobs within three years in an area plagued by chronic unemployment."

POLITICAL CHORES

The Vice President is expected to carry the main burden of political campaigning and party building for the President—something that Mr. Nixon did during the Eisenhower Administration.

* * * * *

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 27, 1969]

AGNEW IS WORKING SERIOUSLY TO REHABILITATE HIS IMAGE

(By Don Oberdorfer)

With the President away in Europe, Vice President Spiro T. Agnew is spending his first week as the man in charge at home. Late last week, Mr. Nixon spent an hour with him in the Oval Office discussing procedures for this week and other matters, and foreign affairs experts introduced Agnew to additional mysteries during a "contingency briefing" at the White House Friday afternoon.

Displaying the self-effacement that is his current style, the new Vice President has said that nothing is different, observing that "the Presidency travels with the President." Still, he presided over the Urban Affairs Council Tuesday morning in Mr. Nixon's absence—a job he handled once before—and beginning today, he is acting as White House host to the National Governors' Conference. Friday, he plans to fly to Cape Kennedy to see the launching of Apollo 9, the first manned space spectacular under this Administration.

The notion of Spiro Agnew with even a little finger on the helm of State is horrifying to many Americans, and Agnew knows it. The ridicule and scorn heaped upon him during the fall campaign left him with a serious problem and, he acknowledges, with some bitterness. "I was hurt," he says frankly. "But I got over it. I have learned to take myself a little more lightly."

The question now is how to change the thinking patterns of his fellow citizens. Sitting in his still-bare office in the West Wing of the White House—the office Sherman Adams once occupied—Agnew senses that any conscious image-changing campaign would only be seen as self-serving. "Performance is the thing, and the job," he says, "I've done a lot of reading about political figures and the way they were looked upon, and it is amazing what was said about Thomas Jefferson at one time, even George Washington—it's all reversible. There's nothing stable about an image."

Agnew sees his role in the Administration as that of "an implementing factor, a catalyst for action," undertaking jobs assigned him by Mr. Nixon and learning at the same time the workings of the Federal Government. His Constitutional responsibility is presiding over the U.S. Senate, a task he has taken seriously to the point of almost slavish devotion. Though most Vice Presidents delegate the job of presiding to the most junior Senators, Agnew has been present each day when the Senate opens at noon, and he usually remains in the chair for at least an hour, studying the names, faces and places of the lawmakers.

The Senators seem impressed. For his part, Agnew does not expect to become a hard-sell lobbyist for the Administration in the Senate—he finds that thought unseemly—but hopes to be helpful through "off-the-record" conversations with Senators on matters of delicacy.

In his White House committee jobs—as a member and substitute chairman of the Cabinet, the National Security Council, the Urban Affairs Council and the Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy—Agnew is reported to be attentive and, at times, quite willing to speak up. At the first meeting of the Urban Affairs Council, he suggested the formulation of a written "National Urban Policy," a document that has since been completed and circulated to the members.

Agnew expects to devote the largest share of his time and effort to the thorny problems of Federal relations with states and cities, with the new Office of Inter-Governmental Relations to help him do it. One of his pet ideas—expressed at meetings on this and other topics—is urban renewal-type U.S. aid to "new towns" like Columbia, Md., as a method of easing pressure in the central cities. While interested in the idea on its economic and social merits, he has also pointed out that Republicans have been able to win twice as much allegiance in the Columbia, Md., area as in the State as a whole.

During the Lincoln Day celebration, he was dispatched as the Administration's top political speaker, liberally quoting from and extolling Mr. Nixon. He has briefed himself on space and oceanography, preparing for his job as the chairman of presidential councils in these two areas. In foreign affairs, he has been briefed by presidential assistant Henry Kissinger, CIA Director Richard Helms and others.

It is questionable how much impact all this is having or will have on those who feel Agnew unsuited to serve a heartbeat away from the Presidency. What people think of a man, he acknowledges, changes slowly. And he feels that in many aspects of his job he can be most effective if he works quietly, and ineffective if he is thought to be courting good publicity.

Mr. Nixon was faced with a similar problem of image-mending during his own tenure in the Vice Presidency. In his case, his most impressive public relations victories were scored abroad, in response to challenges in Moscow and Caracas.

Mr. Nixon may have this in mind in considering the public rehabilitation of Spiro Agnew. In a conversation at Key Biscayne, Agnew got the impression he should prepare for missions abroad starting sometime this fall. Just in case, the Vice President and key members of his staff are already receiving the necessary inoculations for foreign travel.

[From Newsweek, Mar. 10, 1969]

The Making of a Veep

* * * * *

It was really a whole week in the sun for Spiro T. Agnew, who took office barely a month ago under perhaps the blackest cloud to darken a U.S. Vice President in recent memory. All week long, he minded the shop for his traveling boss with a firm hand and a foot that never once strayed mouthward. And by the end of it, Washingtonians who paid attention were beginning to do a double take on the new Veep. What they saw bore only the faintest resemblance to the bumbling Mr. Malaprop of the 1968 campaign who stumbled toward November along a trail strewn with slights of slums and "Japs" and "Polacks." In fact, growing numbers in both political parties were cheering his performance to date. "As of today," beamed Sen. Karl Mundt, South Dakota Republican, "he is the most pleasant surprise in the whole Nixon Administration . . . All I hear in the cloakrooms, in the Senate gym, everywhere I go is: 'That Agnew has really got something.' "

What Agnew seemed to have was a disarming combination of modesty, tact, energy and quickness to learn. As presiding officer of the Senate, he capitalized on his single constitutional function to win friends and influence important people. As acting chairman of Cabinet-level committees in the President's absence, he guided discussion effectively but unobtrusively. And as the Capital's free-floating celebrity, he plunged enthusiastically into the exhausting round of receptions and dinners where political goodwill can be harvested in abundance.

No Shirking: Since the Inauguration, the Senate is where the Veep has spent most of his time—and been tossed some of his sweetest bouquets. Instead of shirking his tedious duties in the presiding officer's chair as did almost all of his predecessors (Hubert Humphrey would regularly turn over the gavel to a junior senator shortly after a session started), Agnew has made a point of staying on for an hour or two of debate. He is the first Vice President since 1945 who has not served in the Senate himself and he has turned his inexperience to advantage. He has spent hours boning up on Senate rules with the parliamentarians and he has laboriously memorized the arcane phrases in which the Senate's business is transacted ("Objection having been made, the resolution will go over under the rule"). "Humphrey and Johnson were restless and bored up there on the rostrum, and we could sense it," says one veteran legislator. "Spiro Agnew is really interested."

* * * * *

Down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue (Agnew generally starts and finishes his working day in his corner office in the White House West Wing), the Vice President has also been slowly building a new reputation for competence and modesty. At a meeting of the Urban Affairs Council when Mr. Nixon was away, Agnew was ushered toward the President's seat at the Cabinet table. "Oh, no," he said, "that's for the President," and he proceeded to chair the meeting from his own regular place across the table. "Agnew is a very good chairman," reported one member of the group "He does his homework, reads the working papers and the talking points prepared for the President, and keeps the meeting going right on the point."

* * * * *

COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, people are learning that ADA officials in high positions of leadership under the former administration have now been replaced in our Government by members of the CFR.

Many of our colleagues are following with interest the change of hats—new faces and different names—but with the pursuit of similar goals. They ask who is the CFR?

Who is dictating the policies of the United States?

I include a recent documented report on the CFR, by Mr. Gary Allen, as follows:

The CFR—Conspiracy To Rule the World

(By Gary Allen)

(Note.—Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of Communist Revolution In The Streets—a highly praised and definitive volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to American Opinion. Mr. Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.)

To every thoughtful American the foreign policy of the United States has for the past three decades been a compounding mystery and concern. Administrations have come and gone like the Ides of March, but spring never arrives—leaving America's crusade against international Bolshevism a matter of mere words frozen in the drifts of a subversive blizzard.

As better than a third of the world has fallen to the Communists, and our sons have died by the scores of thousands to fight no-win wars from Korea to Vietnam, Americans have puzzled over why taxi drivers can understand the threat of International Communist Conspiracy while the "experts" of the State Department cannot. But, with a collective shrug of shoulders already over-burdened with mounting taxes, installment payments, and Junior's tuition at Riot Tech, the average American chalks up such things as the massive credit sales of advanced computers, metals, or jet engines to the Communist bloc as mere error—or stupidity—and goes about his business with the fading hope that the *next* Administration will somehow manage to bring to government as much common sense as that found in taxi drivers.

Such hopes are doomed to disappointment, because most Americans are being kept totally ignorant of the conspiratorial organizations whose members have set the same Leftist policies for the past *ten* Administrations. Clearly, these policymakers are not fools at all, but following carefully laid plans for our convergence with the Soviet Union as the base for a dictatorial government of the world. As long as the American public remains ignorant of this organized conspiracy, there are just two chances of reversing the catastrophic momentum of America's foreign policy; slim and none.

I

Perhaps the nexus of this organized subversive effort in America is an Establishment-level organization known as the Council on Foreign Relations—the secret and incredibly powerful C.F.R. One of the extremely infrequent articles concerning this Council to appear in the national Press was published in the *Christian Science Monitor* of September 1, 1961. It began this way:

"On the west side of fashionable Park Avenue at 68th Street [in New York City] sit two handsome buildings across the way from each other. One is the Soviet Embassy to the United Nations. . . . Directly opposite on the southwest corner is the Council on Foreign Relations—probably one of the most influential semi-public organizations in the field of foreign policy."

Although the formal membership in the C.F.R. is composed of fourteen hundred of the most elite names in the worlds of government, labor, business, finance, communications, the foundations, and the academy—and despite the fact that it has staffed almost every key position of every Administration since those of F.D.R.—it is doubtful that one American in a thousand so much as recognizes the Council's name, or that one in ten thousand can describe anything at all about its structure or purpose. Indicative of the C.F.R.'s power to maintain its anonymity is the fact that despite its having been operative at the highest levels for nearly fifty years, and having from the beginning counted among its members the foremost lions of the Establishment communications media, I discovered after poring over decades of volumes of the *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature* that only one magazine article on the C.F.R. has ever appeared in a major national journal—and that in *Harper's*, hardly a mass-circulation periodical. Similarly, only a handful of articles on the Council have appeared in the nation's great newspapers. Such anonymity—at that level—can hardly be a matter of mere chance.

Had it not been for a small group of highly informed and concerned Conservatives, who have for years painstakingly combed and cross-referenced the meager materials available, the Council's power and influence would remain a total mystery to all except the *Insiders* in control of the C.F.R.[1] As a result of recent attacks by these Conservatives, the wall of secrecy this organization has built around itself has been greatly reinforced. In the past, although little appeared in the Press concerning the C.F.R., rosters of officers and members could sometimes be obtained by subterfuge directly from the organization itself. In recent years, however, the Council's membership has become as closely guarded a secret as that of the staff of the conspiracy to which the C.F.R. is ultimately responsible.

What makes this secret organization so influential? No one who knows for certain will say. The *Christian Science Monitor*, which is edited by a member of the C.F.R., did note in the article of September 1, 1961, that "Its roster . . . contains names distinguished in the field of diplomacy, government, business, finance, science, labor, journalism, law and education. What united so wide-ranging and disparate a membership is a passionate concern for the direction of American foreign policy."

The C.F.R.'s passionate concern for the direction of American foreign policy has amounted to an attempt to make certain that policy continues marching Leftward towards World Government. The C.F.R. was criticized for precisely this by the Reece Committee, a Special Committee of the House of Representatives established in 1953 to investigate abuses by tax-free foundations. In the case of the Council on Foreign Relations, the Committee found that "Its productions are not objective but are directed overwhelmingly at promoting the globalism concept."

Despite nearly incredible pressure to remain silent, the Reece Committee disclosed that the C.F.R. has in fact come to be almost an employment agency for key areas of the U.S. Government—"no doubt carrying its internationalist bias with it." The investigation also showed that the C.F.R.'s influence is so great that it has almost completely usurped the prescribed activities of the U.S. State Department. The *Christian Science Monitor* confirmed this conclusion as follows:

"Because of the Council's single-minded dedication to studying and deliberating American foreign policy, there is a constant flow of its members from private to public service. *Almost half of the Council members have been invited to assume official government positions or to act as consultants at one time or another.*" [*Emphasis added.*]

The policies promoted by the C.F.R. in the fields of defense and international relations become the official policies of the United States Government with a regularity which defies the laws of chance. As "Liberal" columnist Joseph Kraft, himself a member of the C.F.R., noted of the Council in *Harper's* of July 1958: "It has been the seat of . . . basic government decisions, has set the context for many more, and has repeatedly served as a recruiting ground for ranking officials." Kraft, incidentally, aptly titled his article on the C.F.R., "School For Statesmen"—an admission that the members of the Council are drilled with a "line" of strategy to be carried out in Washington.

It thus becomes clear that the best way to begin to understand what have seemed to be our insane defense and foreign policies is to take a long, hard look at the organization which has provided the key staff and direction for those policies. But one cannot, of course, understand the C.F.R. without first becoming aware of its background and antecedents. No group becomes so powerful by chance, and the roots go deep into conspiracy.

II

Until quite recently the origins of the C.F.R. have largely seemed, to paraphrase Winston Churchill, a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma. The man who let the skunk out of the sack is Carroll Quigley, Professor of International Relations at Georgetown University, who has been a lecturer at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces since 1951, and has lectured at the Foreign Service Institute of the State Department. Every student of the International Communist Conspiracy, and of the *Insiders* who manipulate it, will want to own a copy of the Professor's book, *Tragedy And Hope*, which provides an immense amount of new information on the subject not available from other sources.[2]

What makes Professor Quigley's volume doubly interesting is that the Professor, who was allowed access to heretofore secret materials of certain clandestine Establishment organizations, is a "Liberal" who, while presenting abundant evidence exposing the elitists seeking control of the world through a supergovernment, does not himself oppose the conspiracy. In fact, he makes it abundantly clear that he approves the aims of the *Insiders*, and scorns those foolish enough to oppose them. Lest the products of the Professor's enlightening research, which I shall subsequently review at length, cause anyone to think Professor Quigley to be some sort of an ivy-festooned avatar of Dan Smoot, let me reassure my "Liberal" readers by citing a few of his characterizations of American Conservatives:

"On the whole, the neo-isolationist discontent was a revolt of the ignorant against the informed or educated; of the Nineteenth Century against the insoluble problems of the Twentieth; of the Midwest of Tom Sawyer against the cosmopolitan East of J. P. Morgan and Company; of old Siwash against Harvard; of the Chicago Tribune against the Washington Post or the New York Times; or simple absolutes against complex relativisms; of immediate final solutions against long-range partial alleviations of frontier activism against European thought . . . ."

Carroll Quigley goes so far as to ridicule Conservatives as racist, "petty bourgeois" hysterics defending middle-class morality. He writes:

"The virulence behind the Goldwater campaign had nothing to do with default of lack of intensity. Quite the contrary. His most ardent supporters were of the extremist petty-bourgeois mentality driven to near hysteria by the disintegration of the middle classes and the steady rise in prominence of everything they considered anathema: Catholics, Negroes, immigrants, intellectuals, aristocrats (and near aristocrats), scientists (and educated men generally, people from big cities or from the East, cosmopolitans and internationalists and, above all, liberals who accept diversity as a virtue."

It is clear from his writings that Professor Quigley considers himself no Conservative but one of the elitist aristocrats (forgive me—or "near aristocrats") destined to eliminate the middle classes and rule the world. It is this colossal, smirking, gall which makes the information in his book even more illuminating and frightening. Obviously a creature of gargantuan ego, talking out of school to inform the world about how clever he is to know the way the world is really run, the Professor commits the most damning "confession against interest" to come out of the Establishment in decades.

Quigley traces the lineage of the C.F.R. back to Cecil Rhodes, the English adventurer who amassed a fortune in the gold and diamond mines of Southern Africa. While he follows the conspiracy of the Insiders back no farther than Rhodes, he does indicate that it did not begin even there. And, he notes that the man who bent Rhodes as a collegiate twig at Oxford was the notorious John Ruskin, noting of the conspiracy Ruskin called the "new imperialism":

"The chief changes were that it was justified on grounds . . . of social reform and not, as earlier, on grounds of missionary activity and material advantage."

Ruskin beguiled his students with tales of "England's downtrodden masses," did his best to fill his aristocratic charges with a sense of profound guilt, convincing them that their privileged position could not be preserved unless their power "could be extended to the lower classes in England itself and to the non-English masses throughout the world." So smitten with Ruskin's initial lecture was Rhodes that he copied it in longhand and kept it with him for thirty years.

Ruskin's ideas about using noblesse oblige as justification for the imperialism of the Insiders were used to rationalize political activities aimed at capturing the immense wealth of Southern Africa for Rhodes and the financiers and conspirators who were his backers. The indoctrination by Ruskin was thus turned into an instrument of conquest by Rhodes, on what we are asked to believe was the assumption—according to biographers Lockhart and Woodhouse—that God had chosen Cecil Rhodes to "paint the map of Africa red." Rhodes' biographer Sara Millin was a little more direct. As she put it: "The government of the world was Rhodes' simple desire." Quigley notes:

"In the middle 1890's Rhodes had a personal income of at least a millon pounds sterling a year (then about five million dollars) which he spent so freely for his mysterious purposes that he was usually overdrawn on his account. These purposes centered on his desire to federate the English-speaking peoples and to bring all the habitable portions of the world under their control."

Cecil Rhodes' commitment to a conspiracy to establish World Government was set down in a series of wills described by Frank Aydelotte, a founding member of the C.F.R. and American Secretary to the Rhodes Trustees, in his book *American Rhodes Scholarships.* Aydelotte writes:

"*The seven wills which Cecil Rhodes made between the ages of 24 and 46* [Rhodes died at age forty-eight] *constitutes a kind of spiritual autobiography. . . . Best known are the first (the Secret Society Will . . .), and the last, which established the Rhodes Scholarships. . . .*

"In his first will Rhodes states his aim still more specifically: 'The extension of British rule throughout the world, . . . the foundation of so great a power as to hereafter render wars impossible and promote the interests of humantiy.'

"The 'Confession of Faith' enlarges upon these ideas. The model for this proposed secret society *was the Society of Jesus, though he mentions also the Masons."* [Emphasis added.]

It should be noted that the originator on

Footnotes at end of article.

the profane level of this type of secret society was Adam Weishaupt, the monster who founded the Order of Illuminati on May 1, 1776, for the purpose of conspiracy to control the world. The role of Weishaupt's Illumnists in such horrors as the Reign of Terror is unquestioned, and the techniques of the Illuminati have long been recognized as models for Communist methodology. Weishaupt also used the structure of the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits) as his model, and rewrote his Code in Masonic terms. Aydelotte continues:

". . . In 1888 Rhodes made his third will . . . leaving everything to Lord Rothschild [his financier in mining enterprises], *with an accompanying letter enclosing "the written matter discussed between us." This, one surmises, consisted of the first will and the 'Confession of Faith,' since in a postscript Rhodes says 'in considering questions suggested take Constitution of the Jesuits if obtainable. . . .'"*

Apparently for strategic reasons Lord Rothschild was subsequently removed from the forefront of the scheme. Professor Quigley reveals that Lord Rosebury "replaced his father-in-law, Lord Rothschild, in Rhodes' secret group and was made a Trustee under Rhodes' (next and last) will."

The last will of Cecil Rhodes provides for bringing "Rhodes Scholars" from the Empire, Germany, and America for schooling in internationalism at Oxford. The plan, according to Rhodes' fellow conspirator, William Stead:

". . . was that after thirty years there would be 'between two and three thousand men in the prime of life scattered all over the world, each one of whom would have impressed upon his mind in the most susceptible period of his life the dream of the Founder, each one of whom, moreover, would have been specially—mathematically—selected towards the Founder's purposes [World Government] . . .'"

Biographer Sara Millin writes of the qualifications for becoming part of this cadre:

"In speaking of these attributes [desirable in Rhodes Scholars] to Stead, Rhodes defined them, with that defensive cynicism of the romantic, as: smugness, brutality, unctuous rectitude, and tact."

At the very time the Rhodes Trust began to filter its "scholars" into Oxford, the University was of course coming under the academic domination of members of the Fabian Socialist Society, providing the Rhodes Scholars not only with the intended indoctrination and preparation to become part of an international government, but part of an international *socialist* government.[3]

Quigley informs us approvingly that it was the aim of the Rhodes group to promote the economic doctrines taught in the London School of Economics. He does not mention, however, that the London School of Economics was established by the Fabians to teach the economics of international socialism. In fact, Professor Quigley is very careful to avoid so much as a mention of the Fabian movement.

At first glance it would appear that the Fabians were working at cross-purposes with the Rhodes conspiracy since Rhodes is said by his admirers to have wanted to extend "the British Empire" to encompass the entire world, while the Fabians wished to dissolve that Empire into an international socialist Utopia. Yet the strategy of using Fabian socialism clearly fits. Times were changing and a more subtle and devious approach was necessary to accomplish Rhodes' dream of World Government. The new ideology was doubtless provided by the Fabians. Those who doubt it have only to note the well-known influence of the Fabians on those organizations cited by author Frank Aydelotte when he proclaims that the carefully indoctrinated Rhodes Scholars from America:

". . . have taken a prominent part in the work of such organizations as the Council on Foreign Relations, the National Policy Committee, the League of Nations Association, Union Now, the United Nations Association, the Commission For the Study of Organization of Peace, the Universities Committee on Post-War International Problems, the Institute of Pacific Relations, the World Peace Foundations, and the research group attached to the State Department. . . ."

Note that all are both Fabian-oriented and working for World Government. More distressing, Aydelotte concludes: "The number of those going into government is constantly increasing."

What happens to Americans passing through the Rhodes indoctrination at Oxford? Frank Aydelotte assures us: "If he have [*sic*] the capacity for assimilation, if he can become a part of what he meets, he may return from Oxford to the United States a citizen of the world." And, there can be little doubt of it. Some of the Rhodes alumni to wear the old school tie in our government are Dean Rusk (C.F.R), Walt Whitman Rostow (C.F.R.), Senator J. William Fulbright ("formerly" C.F.R.), Harlen Cleveland (C.F.R.), Nicholas Katzenbach, and Senator Frank Church (C.F.R.). Rene Wormser, who served as counsel for the Reece Committee, points out in his book, *Foundations: Their Power And Influence*, that:

"At least one foreign foundation (the Rhodes Scholarship Fund) has had a strong influence on our foreign policy . . . [it] has gained great influence in the United States for British [Fabian] ideas. It has accomplished this by annually selecting a choice group of promising young men for study in England. The usually Anglophile alumni of this system are to be found in eminent positions in legislature, administration and education, and in the ranks of American foundation officials. They form a patronage network of considerable importance."

That is very nearly the understatement of the decade.

III

The scholarship scheme was not, however, the most important segment of Cecil Rhodes' commitment to World Government. His Illuminist-style "secret society" also spawned the world's most influential foreign-policy combine—including America's Council on Foreign Relations. Professor Quigley writes of the formalization of Rhodes' "secret society":

"They [Ruskin's disciples] were remarkably successful in these aims because England's most sensational journalist William T. Stead (1849–1912), an ardent social reformer and imperialist, brought them into association with Rhodes. This association was formally established on February 5, 1891, when Rhodes and Stead organized a secret society of which Rhodes had been dreaming for sixteen years. In this secret society Rhodes was to be leader; Stead, Brett (Lord Esher), and (Alfred) Milner were to form an executive committee; Arthur (Lord) Balfour, (Sir) Harry Johnston, Lord Rothschild, Albert (Lord) Grey, and others were listed as potential members of a 'Circle of Initiates'; while there was to be an outer circle known as the 'Association of Helpers' (later organized by Milner as the Round Table organization)."

Notice that the secret society as organized on the Illumunist pattern of "circles within circles," used in Baravia and France by Weishaupt; and that the Round Table group, which was later to spawn the Council on Foreign Relations, was not part of the inner circle.

Professor Carroll Quigley continues as follows:

"Thus the central part of the secret society was established by March 1891. It continued to function as a formal group, although the outer circle was, apparently, not organized until 1901–1913. This group was able to get access to Rhodes' money after his death in 1902 and also to the fund of loyal Rhodes supporters like Alfred Beit [a German financer from Frankfurt, and partner of Rhodes] (1853–1906) and Sir Abe Bailey (1864–1940)."

Later, financing was to come from the Astor family and, according to Quigley:

"Since 1925 there have been substantial contributions from wealthy individuals and from foundations and firms associated with the international banking fraternity, especially the [Andrew] Carnegie United Kingdom Trust, and other organizations associated with J. P. Morgan, the Rockefeller and Whitney families and the associates of Lazard Brothers and of Morgan, Grenfell and Company.

"The chief backbone of this organization grew up along the already existing financial cooperation running from the Morgan Bank in New York to a group of international financers in London by Lazard Brothers."

Why would international bankers and financiers be interested in promoting a socialist World Government? Clearly, socialism is only the bait to obtain the support of the political underworld and to create the structure necessary to maintain dictatorial control. What this small group of financiers and cartel-oriented businessmen are interested in is monopoly control over the world's natural resources, trade, transportation, and communications—something that despite their great wealth they could not achieve otherwise. Therefore, the super-capitalists become super-socialists, realizing that only a World Government under their control can give them the power necessary to achieve their goal. Only this could explain why these extremely wealthy men would be willing to support movements which seem to be aimed at their own destruction.[4] The financiers and cartelists do not expect to be injured by the socialists so long as they can manipulate them, using them for their own purposes. Professor Quigley confirms this:

"There does exist, and has existed for a generation, an international . . . network which operates, to some extent, in the way the radical Right believes the Communists act. In fact, this network, which we may identify as the Round Table Groups, *has no aversion to cooperating with the Communists, or any other groups, and frequently does so.*" [Emphasis added.]

This clearly suggests that the directors of the network are convinced that they have little to fear from the Communists; that, in fact, they maintain some form or degree of inside control over the Communists.

To the Insiders of the Round Table, World Government is a Messianic cause. As Lionel Curtis, a member of the Round Table, phrased it: Through world federalism "the Kingdom of God could be established on earth." According to his obituary written for his fellow members of the Round Table, Lord Lothian (who ended his career as Ambassador to the United States) "held that men should strive to build the Kingdom of Heaven here upon this earth, and that the leadership in that task must fall first and foremost upon the English-speaking peoples."

Leaders of this group of would-be gods have been, according to Quigley:

"(Alfred) Milner, until his death in 1925, followed by Curtis (1872–1955), Robert H. (Lord) Brand (brother-in-law of Lady Astor) until his death in 1963, and now Adam Massic, son of Sir William and Brand's successor as managing director of Lazard Brothers bank."

Footnotes at end of article.

Professor Quigley maintains that the power and influence of the Rhodes-Milner group since 1889, "although not widely recognized, can hardly be exaggerated." For example, the Round Table Group controlled the London Times and numerous other newspapers and periodicals on six continents, and also influenced literally hundred of university faculties. Quigley discloses:

"From 1884 to about 1915 members of this group worked valiantly to extend the empire and to organize it into a federal system. They were constantly harping on the lessons to be learned from the [British] failure of the American Revolution and the success of the Canadian federation of 1867, and hoped to federate the various parts of the empire as seemed feasible, then confederate the whole of it, with the United Kingdom, into a single organization. They also hoped to bring the United States into this organization to whatever degree was possible."

"Stead was able to get Rhodes to accept, in principle, a solution which might have made Washington the capital of the whole organization or allow parts of the empire to become states of the American Union."

A loosely organized corps of the Round Table conspirators was thus formed in the United States prior to World War I. The chief personalities were George Beer, Walter Lippmann, Frank Aydelotte, Whitney Shepardson, Thomas Lamont, Jerome Greene, and Erwin Canham. This group's activities were Coordinated with those of similar groups throughout the British Empire by frequent visits and discussions, and by a "totally anonymous quarterly magazine. The Round Table."

It was in the aftermath of World War I, however, that the Round Table conspiracy made its move for power and influence in America. According to Professor Quigley:

"At the end of the war of 1914, it became clear that the organization of this system [the Round Table Group] had to be greatly extended. Once again the task was entrusted to Lionel Curtis who established, in England and each dominion, a front organization to the existing Round Table Group. This front organization, called the Royal Institute of International Affairs, had as its nucleus in each area the existing submerged Round Table Group. In New York it was known as the Council on Foreign Relations, and was a front for J. P. Morgan and Company in association with the very small American Round Table Group.

"The American organizers were dominated by the large number of Morgan 'experts,' including Lamont and Beer, who had gone to the Paris Peace Conference and there became close friends with the similar group of English 'experts' which had been recruited by the Milner group. In fact, the original plans for the Royal Institute of International Affairs and the Council on Foreign Relations were drawn up at Paris. The Council of RIIA (which, by Curtis' energy came to be housed in Chatham House, across St. James' Square from the Astors, and was soon known by the name of this headquarters) and the board of the Council on Foreign Relations have carried over since the marks of their origin."

Although Professor Quigley's information is extremely revealing, it is amazing to note that he has very carefully omitted the name of one of the stars of the founding of the C.F.R.—the mysterious "Colonel" Edward Mandell House. This could hardly have been a mere oversight. For whatever reason, Professor Quigley thought House best left out of his discussions. Joseph Kraft (C.F.R.), however, tells us in *Harper's* that the chief agent in the formal founding of the C.F.R. was Colonel House, *supported* by such of his proteges as Walter Lippmann (C.F.R.), John Foster Dulles (C.F.R.), Allen Dulles (C.F.R.), and Christian Herter (C.F.R.). It was House who acted as host for the Round Table Group, both English and American, at the key meeting of May 19, 1919, in the Majestic Hotel, Paris, which committed the conspiracy to creation of the C.F.R.

The conspirators had hoped to establish a World Government under the League of Nations, as an outgrowth of World War I. But, while President Woodrow Wilson and House (the man he called his *"alter ego"*) were doing their best to restructure the world at Versailles, the ether of internationalist propaganda was rapidly wearing off back home. As the negotiations revealed that one side had been about as guilty as the other, and all the glitter of the "moral crusade" evaporated with Wilson's vaunted "Fourteen Points," the "rubes back on Main Street" began to stir and awaken. Reaction and disillusionment set in.

Americans hardly wanted to get into a World Government with double-dealing European crooks whose specialty was secret treaty hidden behind secret treaty. The guest of honor, so to speak, stalked out of the banquet before the poisoned meal could be served. And, without American inclusion, there could be no meaningful World Government.

Aroused public opinion made it obvious that the U.S. Senate dared not ratify a treaty saddling the country with such an internationalist commitment. The American public had to somehow be sold the idea of internationalism and World Government, and the C.F.R. was made to order for precisely that purpose. Again, the key was Colonel House.

IV

The significance of the hands of House in the construction of the Council on Foreign Relations can only be understood against his background as an agent for the *Insiders*. House, whose father was a representative in the American South for English financial interests, was Texas-born but educated in England. He was a long-time intriguer in Democrat politics and had been instrumental in electing several Governors of Texas (one of whom gave him the honorary title of "Colonel"). His move into national politics came with his early backing of Woodrow Wilson, who regarded him as his political mentor [5] and relied heavily upon him.

The "Colonel" was strictly a behind-the-scenes operator who never had any official capacity, but who gained intense satisfaction as a master of the marionettes who occupied the center stage. His personal political philosophy was detailed in a prophetic novel entitled *Philip Dru: Administrator*, published by B. W. Huebsch, a favorite of the Left and for many years a prominent Fabian. The book was so loaded with political dynamite that no author was listed; but, in private letters to friends, House admitted authorship.[6]

In *Philip Dru*, Edward House laid out a thinly fictionalized plan for conquest of America. He described a "conspiracy"—the word is his—which succeeds in electing a U.S. President by means of "deception regarding his real opinions and intentions."† Among other things, wrote the C.F.R. "founder," the conspiracy was to insinuate "itself into the primaries, in order that no candidate might be nominated whose views were not in accord with theirs." Elections were to become mere charades conducted for the dedazzlement of the booboisie. The idea was to use both the Democrat and Republican Parties as instruments to promote World Government.

House's outline for conspiracy is given excellent analysis by his fawning biographer, Professor Charles Seymour (C.F.R.). Professor Seymour states in *The Intimate Papers Of Colonel House:*

"The extent of Colonel House's influence upon the legislative plans of the [Wilson] Administration may be gathered from a remarkable document which deserves some attention. In the autumn of 1912, immediately after the presidential election, there was published a novel, or political romance entitled 'Philip Dru: Administrator.' It was the story of a young West Point graduate . . . who was caught by the spirit of revolt against the tyranny of privileged interests.

"As stupid and reactionary Government at Washington provokes armed rebellion, in which Dru joins whole-heartedly and which he ultimately leads to complete success. He himself becomes dictator and proceeds by ordinance to remake the mechanism of government, to reform the basic laws that determine the relation of the classes . . . *and to bring about an international grouping or league of powers founded upon Anglo-Saxon solidarity.* His reforms accomplished, he gives effect once more to representative institutions as formulated in a new American Constitution, better fitted than the old for the spirit and conditions of the twentieth century." [Emphasis added.]

Much that House outlined in *Philip Dru* became reality during the Wilson Administration. "All that book has said should be, comes about," wrote Wilson's Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane. "The President comes to Philip Dru [*House*] in the end."

In *Philip Dru*, Edward House wrote of establishing "Socialism as dreamed by Karl Marx." A major step towards achieving this was taken with the passage of the graduated income tax, a plank in the Communist Manifesto the realization of which House called for in *Philip Dru*. Of course, House's patrons, who helped push the graduated income tax, deftly sidestepped its effects by placing major portions of their own fortunes under the umbrella of tax-free foundations. (The idea, remember, is to destroy the middle class, not the wealthy.)

House also served the *Insiders* by acting as what Professor Seymour calls the "unseen guardian angel" of the Federal Reserve Act. In his book, "Colonel" House had Dru decree just such a new banking law providing "a flexible [paper] currency." Again, placing the control of money and all credit in the hand of the State was another plank from the Communist Manifesto. *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House* reveals that the "Colonel" was working hand in glove with certain Wall Street *Insiders* to promote the Federal Reserve Act under the guise of its being a move towards "democracy." Biographer George Viereck assures us that "The Schiffs [C.F.R.], the Warburgs [C.F.R.], the Kahns [C.F.R.], the Rockefellers [C.F.R.], and the Morgans [C.F.R.] put their faith in House . . ."

Many patriotic bankers, of course, opposed the Federal Reserve and other socialist legislation imposed on America by the Wilson-House regime, but conspirators are interested in control and, in the end, control resides in the power to expand government. He who controls the reins of government controls the people. Control the government of the world, and you control the people of the world. Much of the control over the people of America was originally engineered by Colonel House—who, by the time he acted as midwife at the birth of the C.F.R. in Paris, was an experienced and successful front man for the *Insiders*.

The C.F.R., as we have seen, was the brainchild of the Round Table conspiracy, acting with and through Colonel House. Its purpose was to promote the concepts of internationalism and World Government. This was to be

---

Footnotes at end of article.

accomplished largely by infiltration of the government and both political Parties *á la* Philip Dru. You will recall it was House's plan to manipulate this "conspiracy" in such a way that opposing candidates would only *seem* to have differences; and, you may have noticed, today national candidates argue only over providing "new leadership"—not new policies. The move toward World Government has thus never so much as slowed. Key to this conspiracy in America has been the Round Table's Council on Foreign Relations.

V

The C.F.R.'s Twenty-Fifth Annual Report tells us this of the C.F.R.'s founding at Paris:

" . . . The Institute of International Affairs founded at Paris in 1919 was comprised at the outset of two branches, one in the United Kingdom and one in the U.S. . . ."

Later the plan was changed to create an ostensible autonomy because. ". . . it seemed unwise to set up a single institute with branches." It had to be made to appear that the C.F.R. in America, and the R.I.I.A. in Britain, were really independent bodies, lest the American public become aware that the C.F.R. was in fact a subsidiary of the Round Table Group and react in patriotic fury.

Professor Quigley provides a run-down on who was who in the C.F.R. when it was finally incorporated in 1921:

"The New York branch [of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, i.e. the Council on Foreign Relations] was dominated by the associates of the Morgan Bank. For example, in 1928 the Council on Foreign Relations had John W. Davis as president, Paul Cravath as vice-president, and a council of thirteen others, which included Owen D. Young, Russell C. Leffingwell, Norman Davis, Allen Dulles, George W. Wickersham, Frank P. Polk, Whitney Shepardson, Isaiah Bowman, Stephen Duggan, and Otto Kahn [all of whom were partners, associates, or employees of Morgan interests] . . .

"The academic figures have been those linked to Morgan, such as James T. Shotwell, Charles Seymour [House's biographer], Joseph Chamberlain, Philip Jessup and, more recently, Philip Moseley, Grayson Kirk and Henry M. Wriston. . . .

"Closely allied with this Morgan influence were a small group of Wall Street law firms, whose chief figures were Elihu Root, John W. Davis, Paul D. Cravath, Russell Leffingwell, the Dulles brothers and, more recently, Arthur H. Dean, Philip D. Reed, and John J. McCloy."

According to Quigley, the most important financial dynasties in America during the Twenties were (in addition to Morgan) the Rockefeller family; Kuhn, Loeb and Company; Dillon Read and Company; and Brown Bros. Harriman. All were well represented in the C.F.R., and by such luminaries as Otto Kahn, Jacob Schiff (financier of Leon Trotsky and the Russian Revolution), Paul Warburg (Schiff's partner, architect of the Federal Reserve Act, and brother of Max Warburg who, financed the Russian Revolution from Germany), William Averell Harriman, Albert H. Wiggin, Frank Vanderlip, and Herbert H. Lehman. In addition, the charter membership of the C.F.R. was comprised of 150 members of Colonel House's select Task Force for planning the Peace Treaty, plus one of the founders of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society named Walter Lippmann.

During the "return to normalcy" of the Twenties, the C.F.R. remained relatively quiet. In 1929, it acquired its headquarters property, the Harold Pratt House at 58 East 68th Street in New York, as a gift from the Rockefellers. Through the years the Rockefeller clan has continued to support the C.F.R. with generous grants from their tax-free foundations.

Much of the Council's financing has come also from the various Carnegie foundations. There is, in fact, a great deal to indicate that Andrew Carnegie was neck-deep in the Rhodes conspiracy. The two were very close friends and Carnegie, who made millions in America yet never became an American citizen, dreamed like Rhodes of the re-uniting of England and America. The Reece Committee, in its investigation of the foundations, discovered that the Carnegie Endowment for *International Peace* began propaganda activities for U.S. involvement in a European war several years before World War I began. The conspirators of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace were convinced that the best way to establish "world peace" was through a "world war," which would lead to World Government. The various Carnegie foundations were, and still are, heavily represented in the C.F.R. membership.

As World War II approached, the Round Table Group was influential in seeing that Hitler was not stopped in Austria, the Rhineland, or Sudetenland—and thereby was largely responsible for precipitating the holocaust. A second world war would greatly enhance the opportunity for establishment of World Government.

With the Round Table doing its work in Europe, the C.F.R. carried the ball in the United States. The Council's first task was to infiltrate and develop effective control of the U.S. State Department—to make certain that after World War II there would be no slip-ups as there had been following World War I. The story of the C.F.R. takeover of the U.S. Department of State is contained in State Department Publication 2349, *Report To The President On The Results of the San Francisco Conference*. It is the report of Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius (C.F.R.) to President Harry Truman. On page twenty we find:

"With the outbreak of war in Europe it was clear that the United States would be confronted, after the war, with new and exceptional problems. . . . Accordingly, a Committee on Post-War Problems was set up before the end of 1939 [two years before the U.S. entered the war], at the suggestion of the CFR. The Committee consisted of high officials of the Department of State [all but one of whom were C.F.R. members]. It was assisted by a research staff [provided by, financed by, and directed by the C.F.R.], which in February, 1941, was organized into a Division of Special Research [and went off the C.F.R. payroll and on to that of the State Department].

"[After Pearl Harbor] the research facilities were rapidly expanded, and the Departmental Committee on Post-War Problems was reorganized into an Advisory Committee on Post-War Foreign Policies [Completely staffed by the C.F.R.]." [7]

This is the group which designed the United Nations—the first major successful step on the road to a World Superstate. Members of the C.F.R. group included Harold Stassen, John J. McCloy, Owen Lattimore ("conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet international conspiracy"), Alger Hiss (Communist spy), Philip Jessup, Harry Dexter White (Communist spy), Nelson Rockefeller, John Foster Dulles, John Carter Vincent (security risk), and Dean Acheson. Forty-seven C.F.R. members were among the American delegates to the founding of the U.N. in San Francisco in 1945.

Not only did members of the Council on Foreign Relations dominate the establishment of the U.N., but C.F.R. members were at the elbow of the American President at Teheran, Potsdam, and Yalta—where hundreds of millions of human beings were delivered into the hands of Josef Stalin, vastly extending the power of the International Communist Conspiracy. Administrative Assistant to the President of the United States during this time was a key member of the C.F.R. named Lauchlin Currie—subsequently identified by J. Edgar Hoover as a Soviet agent, and C.F.R.-I.P.R. liaison to the President.

So completely has the C.F.R. dominated the State Department over the past thirty-eight years that every Secretary of State† except Cordell Hull, James Byrnes, and William Rogers has been a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. While Rogers is not C.F.R., Professor Henry Kissinger, the President's chief foreign policy advisor, came to the job from the Staff of the Council on Foreign Relations. It will be interesting to watch as Kissinger, not Rogers, runs America's foreign policy.

Having ensured that Eastern Europe would fall into the hands of the Communists, the C.F.R. helped to arrange the sell-out of China to the Communists. The propaganda which convinced Americans that Mao Tse-tung was an innocent agrarian reformer running an Asian branch of the A.D.A. emanated from a C.F.R. front known as the Institute of Pacific Relations. Professor Quigley reveals:

"After 1925, a somewhat similar structure of organizations, known as the Institute of Pacific Relations, was set up in twelve countries . . . on an interlocking basis with the Round Table Group and the Royal Institute of International Affairs."

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which investigated the American branch, concluded:

"The Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR) has been considered by the American Communist Party and by Soviet officials as an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda, and military intelligence.

"The IPR disseminated and sought to popularize false information originating from Soviet and Communist sources.

"Members of the small core of officials and staff members who controlled IPR were either Communist or pro-Communist.

"The IPR was a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives."

Quigley, whom you will keep in mind is biased in favor of the Round Table conspiracy, states:

"The influence of the Communists in IPR is well established, but the patronage of Wall Street is less well known.

". . . The headquarters of the IPR and of the American Council of IPR were both in New York and were closely associated on an interlocking basis. Each spent about $2.5 million dollars over the quarter-century from 1925 to 1950, of which about half, in each case, came from the Carnegie Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation (which were themselves interlocking groups controlled by an alliance of Morgan and Rockefeller interests in Wall Street). Much of the rest, especially of the American Council, came from firms closely allied to these two Wall Street interests, such as Standard Oil, International Telephone and Telegraph, International General Electric, the National City Bank, and the Chase National Bank."

Since the English and American Round Table groups were financed by men who had extensive holdings in China, why would they not be doing everything in their power to make certain that China did not fall to the Communists? This is what Alfred Kohlberg, a patriotic American who had investments in China, could not understand. Kohlberg was an I.P.R. member who, when he discovered its Communist domination, tried to fight the Rockefeller and Carnegie interests and expose the I.P.R. Through his efforts the Institute of Pacific Relations *was* exposed, by the McCarran Committee of the U.S. Senate—though the role of the C.F.R. was kept out of the scandal. The fact of the matter is that the Communist I.P.R. was run by such C.F.R. stalwarts as Owen Lattimore (the "conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy"), Soviophile Philip

Jessup, Dean Rusk, Communist spies Alger Hiss and Lauchlin Currie, and other such C.F.R. notables.[8]

VI

Whenever one points to the strange affinity between a coterie of finance capitalists and Communism, one is treated as if he is a candidate for the funny farm. In spite of all the evidence in his own book, Professor Quigley, who describes the Eastern Establishment as "internationalist, astonishingly liberal," and admits the group "has no aversion to cooperating with the Communists," laughs at the idea that the two are linked. He does, however, admit:

". . . the relationship between the financial circles of London and those of the eastern United States . . . reflects one of the most powerful influences in twentieth-century American and world history. The two ends of this English-speaking axis have sometimes been called, perhaps facetiously, the English and American Establishments. There is, however, a considerable degree of truth to the joke, a truth which reflects a very real power structure which the Radical Right in the United States has been attacking for years in the belief that they are attacking the Communists. This is particularly true when these attacks are directed, as they so frequently are, at 'Harvard socialism,' or at 'Left-wing newspapers' like the New York Times and the Washington Post, or at foundations."

After describing how cosmopolitan and sophisticated these people are, the Professor actually tries to rationalize Communist activity in this Establishment conspiracy as a product of *naïveté*. Quigley writes.

"It was this group of people, whose wealth and influence so exceeded their experience and understanding [sic], who provided much of the frame-work of influence which the Communist sympathizers and fellow travelers took over in the United States in the 1930's. It must be recognized that the power that these energetic Left-wingers exercised *was never their own power or Communist power but was ultimately the power of the international financial coterie*, and, once the anger and suspicions of the American people were aroused, as they were by 1950, it was a fairly simple matter to get rid of the Red sympathizers." [Emphasis added.]

This, of course, raises the question of just who is using whom? It is always assumed that it is the Communists who dupe others into doing their work. In most cases this is undoubtedly true; however, it strains credulity to believe that men who are the world's best businessmen and bankers, on the one hand, can be perennial pigeons in dealing with Communists on the other. Clearly there are *Insiders* manipulating both ends of the show.

The Reece Committee attempted to investigate this matter. Norman Dodd, chief investigator for the Committee, was told by the then-President of the Ford Foundation that the purpose of his Foundation "was to so alter American society that it could be comfortably merged with most of the Soviet Union." Dodd was then told that this was being done on "orders from the White House." Quigley says of the Reece Committee's investigation of tax-exempt foundations:

"It soon became clear that people of immense wealth would be unhappy if the investigation went too far and that the 'most respected' newspapers in the country, closely allied with these men of wealth, would not get excited enough about any revelations to make the publicity worth while, in terms of votes or campaign contributions. An interesting report showing the Left-wing associations of the inter-locking nexus of tax-exempt foundations was issued in 1954 rather quietly."

Dodd maintains that when the investigation began probing into "the so-called legitimate world" which is the real nerve center of the Communist movement, the investigation was quashed. Rene Wormser, counsel for the Reece Committee, states in his book *Foundations: Their Power And Influence:* "Mr. [Congressman Wayne] Hays told us one day that 'the White House' had been in touch with him and asked him if he would cooperate to kill the Committee." The man in the White House at that time was Dwight Eisenhower—a member of the C.F.R. who named six members of the C.F.R. to his Cabinet, as well as naming no less than twelve members of the C.F.R. to the rank of Under Secretary.

The answer to the question of who is using whom is at least partially answered by Professor Quigley, who reveals the following amazing information about C.F.R.-Morgan manipulation of the Left:

"More than fifty years ago the Morgan firm decided to infiltrate the Left-wing political movements in the United States. This was relatively easy to do, since these groups were starved for funds and eager for a voice to reach the people. Wall Street supplied both. The purpose was not to destroy, dominate or take over but was really threefold: (1) to keep informed about the thinking of Left-wing or liberal groups; (2) to provide them with a mouthpiece so that they could 'blow off steam,' and (3) to have a final veto on their publicity, and possibly on their actions, if they ever went 'radical.'"

What is more likely is that these Wall Streeters financed the Left because it was promoting the world Superstate sought by the Round Table Group. After all, despite the erroneous publicity about "wealthy Rightwing millionaires," there has been no corresponding financing of Constitutional Conservatives by these elements.

Quigley cites the alliance between Wall Street and the Left in creating *New Republic* magazine, which was organized by a Morgan associate and financed by an heiress to the Standard Oil trust. He writes:

"The original purpose for establishing the paper was to provide an outlet for the progressive Left and to guide it quietly in an Anglophile direction. This latter task was entrusted to a young man, only four years out of Harvard [where he helped found the Intercollegiate Socialist Society], but already a member of the mysterious Round Table Group, which has played a major role in directing England's foreign policy since its formal establishment in 1901."

The young man was Walter Lippmann, described by Carroll Quigley as the authentic voice of the Eastern Establishment.

The *New Republic* was founded by Morgan agent Willard Straight. Herbert Croly, the first Editor of the magazine and a naive "Liberal" who accidentally stumbled into seventy-two officially cited Communist Fronts or activities, makes perfectly clear in his official biography of Straight that the latter "was in no sense a liberal or a progressive. but was, indeed, a typical international banker and that the *New Republic* was simply a medium for advancing certain designs of such international bankers, notably to blunt the isolationism and anti-British sentiments. . . ."[9]

Reader's Digest Senior Editor Eugene Lyons, in his book *The Red Decade,* extensively chronicles the services done for Soviet Russia by the *Insider*-controlled *New Republic*. Lyons writes:

"The American liberal aberration had its house organ, "The New Republic," which led all the rest in avid and undiscriminating acceptance of the myth of Stalin's Utopia."

What did serving as Stalin's press agent have to do with "advancing certain designs of such international bankers?" What indeed, unless it is promoting the interests of the C.F.R.'s goal of World Government?[10]

The Round Table Group, using Morgan money, has at the same time used both of our political Parties and the Communists for its own purposes. Quigley reveals:

"The associations between Wall Street and the Left . . . are really survivals of the associations between the Morgan Bank and the Left. To Morgan all political parties were simply organizations to be used, and the firm always was careful to keep a foot in all camps. Morgan himself, Dwight Morrow (C.F.R.), and other partners were allied with Republicans; Russell C. Leffingwell (C.F.R.) was allied with the Democrats . . . and Thomas W. Lamont (C.F.R.) was allied with the Left."

Accordingly to Quigley the Lamont family was the "chief link" between Wall Street and the Communists—although Thomas Lamont, Morgan's partner, was active in Republican Presidential politics. As Phyllis Schlafly noted in *A Choice Not An Echo,* "Among the most influential kingmakers who profess to be Republicans in the Morgan banking group headed by Thomas S. Lamont Jr., son of the Thomas S. Lamont who masterminded Willkie's nomination. . . ." The Lamonts were also avid supporters of Eisenhower, and helped finance *Saturday Review* and the *New York Post*.

Quigley states that the chief evidence against the Lamonts "can be found in the files of HUAC which show Tom Lamont, his wife Flora, and his son Corliss as sponsors and financial angels to almost a score of extreme Left organizations including the Communist Party itself. . . . During this whole period of over two decades, Corliss Lamont, with the full support of his parents, was one of the chief figures in 'fellow traveler' circles and one of the chief spokesmen for the Soviet point of view. . . ."

Corliss Lamont, a member of C.F.R.-related groups such as the American Association for the United Nations and the Foreign Policy Association, was named by the House Special Committee on Un-American Activities as "probably the most persistent propagandist for the Soviet Union to be found anywhere in the United States."

In *The Bolshevik Invasion Of The West,* Louis Budenz, former Editor of the Communist *Daily Worker,* turned anti-Communist, writes of the current state of this Wall Street-Moscow axis and makes the following observations:

"It is the Communists in the United States themselves who continue to attest to the progress of the Soviet line, reporting continuously improvement of relations with the Rockefeller-Morgan interests in Wall Street. Right in the midst of the war in Southeast Asia we are informed that these financial giants push forward their program of help to the Soviet dictatorship."

The *Worker* of July 11, 1965, comes forward with this touching tribute to the House of Morgan's affection for the Sino-Soviet cause:

"The ironical result is that big businessmen are generally more progressive than big labor leaders. It is Thomas Gates (C.F.R.), chairman of the board of Morgan Guaranty Trust Company, who advocates reconsideration of our China policy, not George Meany. It is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce that would explore means of expanding East-West trade, not the AFL–CIO."

The Worker of August 30, 1964, contained this statement from Comrade Victor Perlo:

"The change in the balance of world forces towards socialism and nationalism has impelled the more sensible and knowledgable of the Wall Streeters to move to-

---

Footnotes at end of article.

wards limited accommodations with the U.S.S.R."

Clearly, the *Chicago Tribune's* editorial on the C.F.R. of December 9, 1950, still applies:

"The members of the Council [on Foreign Relations] are persons of more than average influence in the community. They have used the prestige that their wealth, their social position, and their education have given them to lead their country toward bankruptcy and military debacle. They should look at their hands. There is blood on them—the dried blood of the last war and the fresh blood of the present one [the Korean War]"

It goes without saying that the C.F.R.'s hands are now bloody also with the gore of 150,000 Americans in Vietnam, as the Council has succeeded in promoting as American policy the shipment of American aid and trade to the East European arsenal of the Vietcong killing our sons in the field.

VII

Today the C.F.R. remains active in working towards its final goal of a government of all the world—a government which the *Insiders* and their allies will control. And, they don't even try to hide it. *Study No. 7*, published by the C.F.R. on November 25, 1959, openly advocates "building a new international order [*which*] must be responsive to world aspirations for peace, [*and*] for social and economic change . . . an international order . . . including states labeling themselves as 'Socialist' [*Communist*]." To accomplish this the C.F.R. says we must "gradually increase the authority of the UN." As part of this effort, the Council on Foreign Relations advocates secret negotiations with the Communists as part of "disarmament":

"The U.S. should explore Soviet proposals for complete or partial disarmament . . . Efforts to resolve political conflicts with Communist powers should occur simultaneously with, not prior to, disarmament negotiation. Negotiate on these problems perhaps directly with the U.S.S.R. in secret. . . ."

President Kennedy responded by appointing the Chairman of the Board of C.F.R., John J. McCloy—formerly of the Rockefeller Chase Manhattan Bank—to head the U.S. Disarmament Agency.

The C.F.R. in *Study No. 7* also advocates a "more ambitious, longer term," foreign-aid program which would "avoid making aid contingent upon political commitments to the West." In addition, it recommends recognition of Red China and greatly expanded trade with the Communists supplying the Vietcong.

An endless interlock is maintained by the C.F.R. with the major foundations, the Foreign Policy Association, World Affairs Council, the Committee for Economic Development, Business Advisory Council, Institute for American Strategy, Commission on National Goals, American Assembly, National Planning Association, and Americans for Democratic Action. On the international level, the C.F.R. is heavily interlocked with the Bilderbergers, the English-Speaking Union, the Pilgrims Society, and with the parent organization, the Round Table.

The Council has completely dominated the Cabinet and chief advisory posts of the Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson Administrations. President Nixon, a "former" C.F.R. member, has appointed or retained the following members of C.F.R. to high posts in his Administration: Henry A. Kissinger, Chief Foreign Policy Adviser (a paid member of the staff of C.F.R.); Henry Cabot Lodge, Chief Negotiator in Paris; Charles Yost, Ambassador to the United Nations (a paid member of the staff of C.F.R.); Arthur Burns, Counselor to the President; Harlan Cleveland, U.S. Ambassador to N.A.T.O.; George Ball, Foreign Policy Consultant to the State Department; Robert Murphy, special consultant on international affairs; Robert F Pederson, Counselor and Executive Secretary of the Department of State; Alan Pifer, consultant to the President on educational finance; Dr. Paul McCracken, chief economic aide; Ellsworth Bunker, U.S. Ambassador to Saigon; General Andrew J. Goodpaster, chief military policy advisor; Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for Middle East and South Asia; Jacob Beam, Ambassador to the Soviet Union; and, Gerald Smith, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Administrations, both Democrat and Republican, come and go—but the C.F.R. lingers on. This is why the more things seem to change, the more they remain the same. The fix is in at the top, where the same coterie of *Insiders*, bent on control of the world, runs the show.

FOOTNOTES

[1] The popular encyclopedia on the C.F.R. and its satellites remains former F.B.I. agent Dan Smoot's *Invisible Government*. Much updating material and a list of members for 1966 (obtained circuitously) can be found in Phoebe Courtney's *The C.F.R.* Both books are available for one-dollar each from American Opinion Library, Belmont, Massachusetts 02178.

[2] Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy And Hope, A History Of The World In Our Time*, The Macmillan Company, New York, Collier-Macmillan Limited, London, 1966. Though the volume is nearly 1,350 pages long, it is *must* reading for the student of political conspiracy in our time.

[3] See Rose Martin, *Fabian Freeway*, Western Islands, 1966.

[4] Let me emphasize here that the matter of the machinations of international financiers is an area in which misinformation abounds. There is much literature in the field which contains dubious or totally false data and simply idiotic economic theory. Many authors writing in this area have drawn vast conclusions on the most doubtful sort of "evidence." We recommend that readers venturing into this field maintain a healthy skepticism concerning any work which does not cite thoroughly reputable sources (and that even then care be taken against contextual fraud). This is a field from which those seeking to become students of the Communist Conspiracy can find themselves rocketed hopelessly into orbit—for all practical purposes effectively removed from the struggle against the Communists.

† Quigley's attitude toward this conspiracy and his sources of information are revealed in the following statement: "I know of the operations of this network because I have studied it for twenty years and was permitted for two years, in the early 1960's, to examine its papers and secret records. I have no aversion to it or to most of its aims and have, for much of my life, been close to it and to many of its instruments. I have objected, both in the past and recently, to a few of its policies. . . . but in general my chief difference of opinion is that it wishes to remain unknown, and I believe its role in history is significant enough to be known.

[5] House was described by a friend of twenty-five years' standing as "highly radical, more than liberal, in the political-social sense."

[6] Edited by Charles Seymour, *The Intimate Papers Of Colonel House*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1926, pp. 152–159.

† Although partially thwarted by the loss of Wilson to illness, House succeeded in 1932 with F.D.R., who went straight from the Chicago convention to huddle with the "Colonel" at the latter's Massachusetts home. In 1938, House told his biographer Charles Seymour: "During the last fifteen years I have been close to the center of things, although few people suspect it. No important foreigner has come to America without talking to me. I was close to the movement that nominated Roosevelt. . . . He has given me free hand in advising [Secretary of State Cordell] Hull. All the Ambassadors have reported to me frequently."

[7] The fact that a powerful C.F.R. contingent was moved into the State Department in 1939 is verified in the C.F.R.'s booklet, *A Record Of Twenty Years, 1921–1947*, which says of the financing for the takeover: "The program here described was largely financed by generous annual renewals of the initial grant of funds by the Rockefeller Foundation late in 1939. In addition, an annual grant of the Carnegie Corporation contributed to the success of the work."

†C.F.R. Secretaries of State include Henry Stimson, Edward Stettinius, George Marshall, Dean Acheson, John Foster Dulles, Christian Herter, and Dean Rusk.

[8] It is less than coincidence that the Council on Foreign Relations now advocates recognition of Red China "to pull China back into the family of nations." (See Richard Nixon's "Asia After Vietnam" in the October 1967 issue of the Council on Foreign Relations' official magazine, *Foreign Affairs*.)

[9] Straight subsequently launched the magazine *United Nations World*.

[10] The *New Republic* has been enormously influential among American "Liberals" who do not realize they are tools being used for ulterior purposes. William F. Buckley Jr. says he began *National Review* to serve as a Right-wing *New Republic*, but has succeeded only in producing the world's most effective cure for insomnia while attacking anti-Communist activists. In fact, the editors of *New Republic* and *National Review* have arranged a deal whereby one may now receive both magazines at the same time for a reduced package rate.

Mr. Buckley, whose TV program is carried over C.F.R.-controlled stations, and whose column appears in such C.F.R. organs as the *New York Post* (owned by Jacob Schiff's granddaughter, Dorothy), never mentions the C.F.R. In his syndicated column shortly after the election of Richard Nixon, Buckley went so far as to give his seal of approval to the appointment of Nelson Rockefeller (C.F.R.) as Secretary of State—calling the man who along with partner Cyrus Eaton controls American trade wtih the Red bloc, an "anti-Communist." Mr. Buckley pretends the enemy is simply "Liberal" philosophy and ideology. He has become the Liberal Establishment's "house conservative," a "respectable and responsible" adversary,—one who never ever whispers about conspiracy.

FRANCE REAFFIRMS TIES WITH ATLANTIC ALLIANCE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Michel Debre, the able French Foreign Minister, in a speech prepared for the National Press Club on April 9, 1969, reaffirmed France's ties with the Atlantic alliance. He took the occasion to remind his audience that his "presence in Washington for the 20th anniversary of the treaty is proof to the contrary" that the Atlantic alliance has lost its raison d'etre for France.

In extemporaneous remarks after the question and answer period, the Foreign

Minister recalled for his audience the advice given to Louis XVI during the American Revolution by one of France's greatest Foreign Ministers, Vergennes, "Support the American insurgents." Debre concluded by saying that while the Americans are no longer insurgents, the friendship between this country and his is fundamental to world peace and security.

Mr. Speaker, I insert excerpts from the text of the speech in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

STATEMENT BY MICHEL DEBRE, FRENCH FOREIGN AFFAIRS MINISTER

* * * * *

EUROPEAN CONSTITUTION

I will briefly recall before you these three fundamental ideas.

NATIONAL SENTIMENT AND SUPRANATIONALITY

* * * * *

Europe as described in geography and recorded in history is a mosaic of nations, each endowed with an affirmed personality, long ripened on the basis of its own ethnic and linguistic characteristics, of painful confrontations—whose aftereffects are still visible in the heart of our continent. It is not possible to ignore this permanence of realities. It is not possible to build Europe starting from scratch and disregarding facts and feelings.

A day will perhaps come when, in Europe, French, Germans, British, Italians, Dutch, Belgians, Spaniards and still others will envisage no longer being what they are. But such is not the case. Europe in the twentieth century is not the new and vacant America of the end of the eighteenth century. National feeling remains and it is, moreover, fortunate that this is so. One cannot build Europe while scorning this reality which is, besides, a necessity for accepting social disciplines. It is a fact of history that Europe is not one motherland but a complex of motherlands. Moreover, liberty, as it is clearly seen in Eastern Europe, is linked to national sentiment. People revolt against any form of hegemony in the name of patriotism, which is the other side of a coin whose right side is liberty and whose other side is the nation. That is why the political pretensions of the supranational authorities make one smile or suffer.

However, the European nations must unite. If there is one nation which has affirmed this truth more than any other, it is, indeed, France: immediately following World War II General de Gaulle began teaching the French that the future, if it could not be founded on forgetting the past, should, however, be oriented in function of good and solidary relations with Germany. This policy has been followed with exemplary steadfastness and, today, as yesterday, we affirm and implement it. We have established between our two countries relations that, without making them disappear, are gradually blurring memories that one would have thought ineradicable. We will continue. Beyond this our duty is to organize in a rational manner, in order to make it constant, real and effective, the cooperation between European nations without questioning the personality of each of them, that is, conserving for each one, according to the laws of liberty and in keeping with the will of its people, the control of its destiny. One day may come when, by dint of cooperation between the leaders, of exchanges among the young people of shared industrial productions, of dangers accepted and overcome with the same determination, a new common sentiment will dominate the various national sentiments. But that can only be the result of time, of the will of men and of circumstances. An evolution, which in the best hypotheses will be slow, must not be forced. In the meantime, any artificial mechanism, that is, any authority or organism which without legitimate bases seeks to impose fundamental orientation independently of national acceptance, creates a risk of rebellion, that is, it delays union.

A will to independence

One of the elements that may bring about the birth of a European sentiment is the will to independence. People readily distort independence by likening it to hostility. * * *

Look at the Common Market. It represented and still represents a great adventure for France—a real economic upheaval after generations of protectionism. * * * We are determined to complete its organization, and the French Government, moreover, has proposed various measures which aim at reinforcing the Common Market. We have even gone further, and we proposed, already a few years ago, to draw up between the Six a form of organized political cooperation which would have constituted the starting point of a European will and would have made it possible for Europe to play a constructive role in settling the conflicts that are tearing our planet apart.

We would like to go further and draw up, as regards energy, industrial investments and finances, a coordinated policy of states to set up the bases of a strong economy, capable through its research and development capacity of being one of the very great elements of international competition.

We have not been followed. However, I dare say that we were right. As we are right, it seems to me, about enlarging the Communities. As you know, we disagree with our partners on this point, for there are really two different philosophies in opposition. On one hand, there are those who want to enlarge the Community as a matter of principle, without really knowing where it will lead us, without even accepting to study concretely what would happen to the Community under the impact of those successive enlargements, and who are resigned to the spontaneous but, I repeat, the unpredictable evolution that will be born from that enlargement. Whereas we, for our part, intend to define beforehand among us Six the goals that we must safeguard, and among which we consider cohesion of thought and action and a truly European spirit of the undertaking to have priority.

The enlargement will probably come about one day, very difficult though it may be to fix a date, for it depends on many factors, some of which are outside of the six members of the Common market. But enlargement brings about so many unknown factors, notably as far as the political future is concerned, that there would be, in our view, a very serious danger in not studying beforehand, carefully and sincerely, the goals and the means.

I repeat, in wanting to preserve that independent position of Europe, we do not at all mean to set ourselves against the United States, as some simplistic interpretations have sometimes sought to imply, and the recent conversations between President Nixon and General de Gaulle showed us, moreover, that no ambiguity on this subject remained on this side of the Atlantic. The new climate of trust which has been established in French-American relations, and about which the French Government is particularly pleased, comes, it seems to me, from a more accurate evaluation of French policy's European goals, which President Nixon analyzed perfectly in his press conference of March 5.

I shall recall to you some of his statements:

"General de Gaulle believes that Europe should have an independent position in its own right, and frankly I believe that, too."

"The world will be a much safer place and, from our standpoint, a much healthier place economically, militarily and politically, if there was a strong European Community to be a balance between the United States and the Soviet Union, rather than to have this polarization of forces in one part of the world and another."

WESTERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

In the field of relations between the East and West, we hope for a radical change. * * *

The evolution that we are witnessing at the present time is going in that direction. We ourselves have been developing our contacts with the USSR for several years, and with the Central and Eastern European countries, with which we have many affinities and common memories, and which very eagerly desire an intensification of their contacts with the West, and with France in particular. Other Western European countries have done the same thing. As far as your Government is concerned, for a long time it has been engaging in significant discussions with the Soviet Government and it intends to persevere on that path. We are satisfied with the perspectives that can thus be opened for an improvement of your relations with the USSR, an improvement which would contribute, in an important way—I am convinced of it—to the general progress of détente.

* * * * *

Certainly, this road is pitted with obstacles, as we saw last summer. We witnessed at that time a violent reaction of the USSR to certain consequences of the détente, which seemed to us in the logic of an evolution desirable and realistic, but which in the present circumstances the Russians considered dangerous.

Despite this reaction, which we condemned and which we continue to deplore as long as it is manifested, we believe that the evolution which began to appear so clearly in Europe will necessarily continue. For, it responds to the action of invincible forces. And, if our faith in the détente remains, it is because we have the conviction that this evolution is in the interest of all.

Is this to say that, in our eyes, the Atlantic alliance, born out of the cold war, has lost its *raison d'être?* My presence in Washington, for the twentieth anniversary of the treaty, is proof to the contrary.

Between the two shores of the North Atlantic there exists a profound affinity, as the men and the women, for the immense majority, have the same past and share the same faith. From the two shores of the ocean springs the same ambition—that of participating in world peace by the combined weight of our influence and of progress, notably through cooperation from which we can have so many other peoples, our brothers, benefit. Finally, history teaches us that peace is never insured forever. Tragedies can occur, which will require our solidarity.

Certainly, we exclude integration, and this refusal is decisive. Integration is not the consequence of the alliance. To the contrary, among certain partners it risks weakening the alliance. France intends to keep command of her defense, as she intends to keep control of her policy. This is a fundamental requirement. It represents for a country such as ours a rule all the more essential in that, with time, the importance of the commitments of each may be subject to change. But we know so much better and more than anyone else the imperatives that, in case of extreme danger, solidarity imposes, that the Americans and the French can flatter themselves for never having been, throughout the wars of the past, in opposing camps. This is a tradition higher than the treaties. It is dear to us, to us French; we intend to hand it down to our children, as a guarantee of peace and friendship, based on a shared feeling of the price of liberty.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, April 15, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, DD., offered the following prayer:

God has not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.—II Timothy 1: 7.

Most gracious and loving God, the strength of all who put their trust in Thee and the light of those who walk in Thy way, make us truly conscious of Thy presence as we enter this new day fresh from Thy hand. Grant that in the stress and strain of these troubled times we may never lose heart or hope.

We pray that our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of this House of Representatives may be abundantly blessed with the strengthening presence of Thy spirit as they labor earnestly for good will in our Nation, for peace in our world, and for the good of all mankind.

In all our endeavors on behalf of our country may we be ever mindful that our highest resources are spiritual, and upon the foundation of justice, righteousness, and good will may we build our life as a nation, and seek to build our lives together on this planet.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE NATION'S NEWSPAPERS NEED PROTECTION

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in March, the Supreme Court upheld an antitrust judgment against two Tucson, Ariz., newspapers because they had combined their advertising and circulation departments. Involved in this case were a morning and an evening paper who in 1940 had merged their production, circulation, business, and advertising functions. Some 44 daily newspapers in 22 cities may be effected by this decision, I understand, because they are operating under similar arrangements.

Mr. Speaker, I do not quarrel with the importance of preserving independent competitive editorial viewpoints in a community. The question is, Can such competing editorial voices be preserved in some communities unless economies in printing costs, advertising solicitation, and subscription sales are effected?

Also, as a onetime operator of a printing plant, it is obvious to me the substantial savings to advertisers that can be obtained by joint publication arrangements. These newspaper presses often cost substantially in excess of a million dollars. To run a press two shifts instead of one thereby reduces depreciation by half and an advertising contract for advertising space in two newspapers could offer substantial discounts to retailers and other advertisers.

And, for the life of me, I cannot see that competition is thereby lessened. Rather, to me, the public benefits by reduced danger of business failure and lower costs. In this regard, I am hopeful Congress will speedily enact legislation to permit joint business operations under exemption from antitrust laws. Such a bill was approved by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee last year, but adjournment prevented further consideration of the full Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, a number of Members are cosponsoring similar legislation in the House. Passage of such a law is in the public interest. Congress must protect the press so that the press can protect the public.

NAME MOON LANDING SITE "POINT EISENHOWER"

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, according to present plans, a journey across 4 billion years and a quarter of a million miles will be completed on Sunday afternoon, July 20, 1969. At some spot in Mare Tranquilitatis, the Sea of Tranquility, on the right side of the moon's face, an American astronaut will become the first human being to set foot on earth's lone satellite.

It will be the most dramatic and breathtaking step in the long history of exploration. In the future still to come, when man shall reach the stars, he will look back to this spot on the moon and say "It started here."

The proper name for this site is of the utmost importance. The name should be indisputably American, in that it would reflect part, parcel, and essence of the best our Republic has produced. It must be a reflection of strength, without aggression; courage, without bluster; hope, without fear; and it must be symbolic of that faith in the unfathomable which leads man to supremacy over the unknown and the uncharted.

So, we seek a fitting name for this landing site at the same time we also seek an appropriate and truly enduring memorial to one of the finest sons of our American Republic. I am writing to the Director of NASA urging that this site be named "Point Eisenhower" and I am also introducing a sense-of-Congress resolution to that effect.

Let us by this step insure perpetuation of his memory far beyond the bounds of earth, his home. Let the name of that great American whose highest goal, and proudest attainment, was peace, be the first to mark the road through the universe.

NORTH KOREA CONTINUING DELIBERATE CAMPAIGN OF HARASSMENT

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, early today we received the distressing news that the North Koreans had shot down an American reconnaissance aircraft that was flying well beyond North Korea's territorial limits. It is my understanding that search operations are underway for survivors among the 31 persons who were reported to be aboard.

Mr. Speaker, this was no isolated incident. It is part of a deliberate campaign of harassment against the United States and its South Korean allies, which has included the Blue House raid and the infamous seizure of the *Pueblo*. We must protect our men when we send them on dangerous missions that are of vital importance to the security of our country. This criminal act by the North Koreans calls for a prompt and appropriate response. We must make it crystal clear to the North Koreans—through a response that they understand—that their provocations will not be tolerated by the United States of America.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE ON APRIL 17

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate on April 17.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

CLAIM OF JOHN T. KNIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1507) conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1507

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations pertaining to suits against the United States, or any lapse of time, or bars of laches, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim of John T. Knight, of New Orleans, Louisiana, arising out of his claim against the United States for disability retirement pay for a disability allegedly incurred or aggravated while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

SEC. 2. Suit upon that claim may be instituted at any time within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States. Except as otherwise provided in this

Act, proceedings for the determination of that claim, and review and payment of any judgment or judgments on that claim shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which that court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUTUAL BENEFIT FOUNDATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2214) for the relief of the Mutual Benefit Foundation.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

HENRY E. DOOLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2940) for the relief of Henry E. Dooley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2940

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. Henry E. Dooley, Mount View Terrace, Manchester Center, Vermont 05255, the sum of $394.49, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of transportation of the privately owned automobile of his son, Lieutenant (junior grade) James E. Dooley, United States Navy, from San Francisco, California, to Manchester Center, Vermont, the said Henry E. Dooley having transported such automobile at his own expense upon the receipt of official notification that his son was missing in action in Vietnam. No part of the amount appropriated in the Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAIM OF SOLOMON S. LEVADI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3213) conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Solomon S. Levadi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3213

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations pertaining to suits against the United States, or any lapse of time, or bars of laches or any prior judgment of the United States Court of Claims, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim of Solomon S. Levadi arising out of his service with the United States Armed Forces from the years 1942 to 1946.

Sec. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States. Except as otherwise provided herein, proceedings for the determination of such claim, and review and payment of any judgment or judgments thereon shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK KLEINERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3377) for the relief of Frank Kleinerman.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee.

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF PIERRE SAMUEL DU PONT DARDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3348) for the relief of the estate of Pierre Samuel du Pont Darden.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3348

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any period of limitations or lapse of time, claim for credit or refund of overpayment of Federal income taxes made by the late Pierre Samuel du Pont Darden for the taxable year 1959 may be filed by his administrator at any time within one year after the date of enactment of this Act. Sections 6511 and 6514 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall not apply to the credit or refund of any overpayment of tax with respect to which a claim is filed pursuant to this Act within such one-year period.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEDRO IRIZARRY GUIDO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5000) for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

REDDICK B. STILL, JR., AND RICHARD CARPENTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6400) for the relief of Reddick B. Still, Jr., and Richard Carpenter.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. A. F. ELGIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6585) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Elgin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6585

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Elgin, Post Office Box 7263, Hays Park Station, Spokane, Washington 99207, the sum of $317.40 in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of transportation of the privately owned automobile of their son, Robert G. Elgin, deceased, E–5, Regular Army, from Fayetteville, North Carolina, to Santa Clara, California, Mr. and Mrs. Elgin having transported such automobile at their own expense upon receipt of official notification that their son was killed in action in Vietnam on April 4, 1968. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shal be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOEL S. MARSTON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6378) for the relief of Noel S. Marston.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ELISABETA HORWATH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2464) for the relief of Elisabeta Horwath.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2464

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elisabeta Horwath shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant visas, and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders, and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Elisabeta Horwath. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Elisabeta Horwath shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA DEL BAGLIVO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4546) for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4546

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Del Baglivo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Anna Del Baglivo. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Anna Del Baglivo shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out all of lines 3, 4, 5, 6. 7, 8, 9, 10, and the following language on line 11: "quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ARANKA MLINKO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6366) for the relief of Mrs. Aranka Mlinko.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6366

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Aranka Mlinko shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided,* That any fee received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this Act shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Aranka Mlinko. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Mrs. Aranka Mlinko shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERESINA FARA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6670) for the relief of Teresina Fara.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 6670

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Teresina Fara shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Teresina Fara. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Teresina Fara shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, an a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GIUSEPPE DE STEFANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6931) for the relief of Giuseppe De Stefano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 6931

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe De Stefano shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Giuseppe De Stefano. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Giuseppe De Stefano shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROMEO DE LA TORRE SANANO AND HIS SISTER, JULIETA DE LA TORRE SANANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1632) for the relief of Romeo de la Torre Sanano and his sister, Julieta de la Torre Sanano.

There being no obligation, the Clerk read the bill, as folows:

H.R. 1632

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Romeo de la Torre Sanano and his sister, Julieta de la Torre Sanano, may be classified as eligible orphans within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of that Act, upon approval of a petition filed in their behalf by Captain and Mrs. Andres S. Sanano, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of that Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after the words "may be classified as", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following: "children within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of petitions filed in their behalf by Captain and Mrs. Andres S. Sanano, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided,* that the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiaries shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOURDES M. ARRANT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 20005) for the relief of Lourdes M. Arrant.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2005

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lourdes M. Arrant may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Staff Sergeant and Mrs. Robert B. Arrant, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, strike out the word "Act." and insert in lieu thereof the following "Act: *Provided,* That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM JOHN MOHER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2218) for the relief of William John Moher.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 2218

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, William John Moher may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Captain and Mrs. Thomas A. Moher, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act. Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, after the language "pursuant to section 204 of the" strike out the word "Act." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Act: *Provided,* That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADELA DURDA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2336) for the relief of Adela Durda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 2336

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Adela Durda shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien daughter of Vincent and Jane Kaczmarski, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 7, after the words "natural parents" insert the language "or brothers or sisters".

On page 1, line 8, strike out the word "parentage" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "relationship".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Adela Kaczmarski."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN VINCENT AMIRAULT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2552) for the relief of John Vincent Amirault.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

LEE, IN SOOK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3040) for the relief of Lee, In Sook.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3040

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lee, In Sook may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Jack Raymond Witt and Irene Joyce Witt, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, strike out the word "Act." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Act: *Provided,* That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act. Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YUKA AWAMURA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5067) for the relief of Yuka Awamura.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5067

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Yuka Awamura may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of that Act, and a petition may be filed in her behalf by Mrs. Edith Fukunaga, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided,* That no brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall thereafter, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5067, a private bill which would facilitate the admission into the United States of the prospective adoptive child of a citizen of the United States. Yuka Awamura, the beneficiary is a female 2-year-old native and citizen of Japan. Mrs. Edith Fukunaga, the adoptive mother, was born in Hawaii, and is now 47 years of age. She has been a widow since 1959, but for a period of 2 or 3 years prior to her husband's death the couple, being childless, had taken active steps to adopt a child from Japan.

The beneficiary was born out of wedlock. The alleged father, who was married since before the child's birth, has never admitted paternity, and the natural mother abandoned the child at birth. The natural mother reportedly married when the beneficiary was about 16 months old, and now lives at some distance from Hiroshima, Japan, where the child is temporarily living with the retired director of a social welfare organization and his wife. The adoptive mother first saw the child in an orphanage in Hiroshima and immediately took appropriate steps to adopt the child. The natural mother has released the child for emigration and adoption.

Under the laws of the State of Hawaii, where the adoption proceedings will be instituted, a widow, if otherwise qualified, is eligible to be an adoptive parent.

Mrs. Fukunaga, the adoptive mother, is financially able to give the child a good home and a good education. She earns approximately $9,000 per annum as the secretary-treasurer and office manager of a Honolulu corporation, and receives an additional $5,000 to $6,000 per annum from dividends, rentals and joint venture distributions. She and her mother-in-law live in a jointly owned five-bedroom house, valued at $90,000, in one of the better residential areas of Honolulu. The adoptive mother has other assets, consisting of real estate investments, savings deposits, stocks and bonds and other personal property, exceeding the total amount of $85,000. Her mother-in-law has an independent income of about $10,000 per year. Both ladies are very anxious to have the child admitted to the United States so she can be adopted by the younger Mrs. Fukunaga.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the beneficiary, if admitted under the provisions of this bill, will be brought into a very comfortable home by American standards and given the love and care of which she has been deprived because of the circumstances of her birth. She will be given a good education and will be brought up as a good American.

I therefore urge, very strongly, a favorable vote for this bill.

The Senate in the closing weeks of the 90th Congress, and again in the opening weeks of the 91st Congress, passed this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAGONA ANOMERIANAKI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5133) for the relief of Pagona Anomerianaki.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

MISS ELIZABETH SCHOFIELD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5134) for the relief of Miss Elizabeth Schofield.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

GEORGE TILSON WEED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5136) for the relief of George Tilson Weed.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5136

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Tilson Weed shall be held and considered to have complied with the provisions of section 316 of that Act as they relate to residence and physical presence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFER U.S. CITIZENSHIP POSTHUMOUSLY UPON SP4C KLAUS JOSEF STRAUSS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6607) to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Sp4c. Klaus Josef Strauss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6607

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Specialist Four Klaus Josef Strauss, a native of Germany, who served honorably in the United States Army from November 15, 1966, until his death on February 8, 1968, shall be held and considered to have been a citizen of the United States at the time of his death.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES RICHARD SCOTT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7160) for the relief of Charles Richard Scott.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 672) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 672

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 204(c), relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of adopted children, shall be inapplicable in the case of a petition filed in behalf of Charles Richard Scott by Mr. and Mrs. Denny F. Scott, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That no brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall thereafter, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 7160) was laid on the table.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 35]

Bates
Bell, Calif.
Betts
Brock
Carey
Chamberlain
Chisholm
Clark
Clay
Cunningham
Dawson
Dwyer
Edwards, La.
Foley
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gibbons
Green, Oreg.
Gubser
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hastings
Hathaway
Hébert
Kirwan
Landrum
Long, La.
Lukens
Mann
May
Mollohan
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Pelly
Powell
Purcell
Rostenkowski
Sandman
Schadeberg
Scheuer
Sisk
Teague, Tex.
Tunney
Watkins
Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 340 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 340

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4148) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Public Works now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when this rule was considered in the Committee on Rules there was some controversy over the jurisdiction between the committee handling the bill and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The Committee on Rules overwhelmingly decided that the bill should be sent to the floor with the rule that has just been read.

Mr. Speaker, points of order were waived on the bill as a whole because there are some transfer funds, and the establishment of a revolving fund—not transfer of funds, but payment of cash is authorized in the acquisition of land, and that is the reason for the waiver of points of order.

Insofar as I know, there is no substantial controversy over the rule. I understand there is some on the bill itself, but not too much.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, House Resolution 340 does provide for 3 hours of debate under an open rule for consideration of the bill H.R. 4148, entitled "The Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969."

Points of order are waived as against the substitute bill, and the committee amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to improve the means available to control pollution of offshore waters and rivers of the United States. Major sections of the bill seek to control such sources of pollution as, first, oil and other sea-carried pollutants; second, sewage from vessels; third, acid and other pollutants from mines; and, fourth, pollution from any federally operated source. Additionally, the bill provides for research grants and a scholarship program for students, both programs to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill applies to oil discharges on the high seas in the contiguous zone along our coastline. Such discharges are forbidden except in emergency situations. Civil penalties of up to $10,000 for an oil discharge are provided. Operators of facilities or ships are required to remove any discharge of oil or other pollutants. If the United States must do the removal work, the cost shall be borne by the polluter up to $10 million or $100 per gross registered ton—of ships—whichever is the lesser. The bill also sets up a revolving fund of $20,000,000 for use in cleanups. The effort is to place responsibility for damage done by discharges of oil or other pollutants by ships or shore-area facilities upon the owners and operators, and to require them to be primarily responsible for necessary cleanup operations.

The bill also seeks to remove pollutants discharged into the water in the form of raw sewage from vessels. The Coast Guard will oversee a program designed to insure that such raw sewage is treated before discharging it. New vessels are to have approved toilet facilities installed by December 31, 1971, or within 2 years of the time the Coast Guard promulgates standards and regulations. For existing vessels the time period is set at within 5 years after such promulgation. The States will be brought into the program with respect to their intrastate waters.

After the effective dates of the standards set by the Coast Guard, it shall be unlawful to operate a vessel which does not comply. These regulations will apply to pleasure boats as well as commercial vessels, in short, any vessel which has toilet facilities will be required to treat its raw sewage before discharging it into the water. Civil penalties are provided for violations and in proper cases injunctive relief may be sought.

The Secretary is also authorized to make grants to universities for research and for planning and developing of training for students in the field of design and operation of waste treatment works. He may also provide scholarship grants. Authorizations for educational grants are $12,000,000 for 1970 and for 1971 and 1972 the figure is $25,000,000 per annum.

Finally, the bill provides for research in a number of water quality problems. The current level of funding is extended for two additional years, through fiscal 1971. Funding levels authorized are $65,000,000 per annum. Areas in which research work is to be continued include: First, prevention, removal and control of lake pollution; second, prevention of oil pollution; third, research into prevention of pollution discharges from recreational vessels and the development of treatment facilities for such craft; and, fourth, funding for appropriate demonstration projects.

Total authorizations contained in the bill are $348,000,000 covering fiscal years 1970 through 1972. Major items include:

	Millions
General research and development of treatment facilities	$130
Demonstration projects and development	120
Training grants	62
Clean-up revolving fund	20

There are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4148) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4148, with Mr. SMITH of Iowa in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FALLON) will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER) will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FALLON).

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4148, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, has been developed after extensive hearings by the Committee on Public Works, both here in Washington and in Santa Barbara, Calif., and is the culmination of the consideration given by this body and the Public Works Committee during the 90th Congress. H.R. 4148 was reported out unanimously by the committee.

The legislation covers discharges of oil and other hazardous substances from vessels and onshore and offshore facilities, including the cleanup of these discharges and the prevention thereof, the control of untreated or inadequately treated sewage from vessels, the extension of the research, development, and training program of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the effect of Federal activities and federally licensed or permitted activities on our Nation's waters, and establishes a new training program designed to provide more efficient waste treatment works, both at the municipal and industrial level. Finally, the legislation would change the name of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to the National Water Quality Administration in order to provide a more positive emphasis to the program.

It is clear that the need for this legislation is quite urgent. The history of oil spills dating back to the one we all remember; namely, the *Torrey Canyon* off the coast of England, the *Ocean Eagle* in the San Juan Harbor, P.R., and the disastrous oil spill off the Santa Barbara coast, only serve to demonstrate that unless action is taken immediately to provide the tools necessary to cope with these spills more of our coastline beaches and marine resources could be destroyed or severely damaged. The public outcry that has developed in the past year in connection with these spills shows that there is considerable interest throughout the country in this legislation.

In addition to the more dramatic aspects of this legislation; namely, those relating to oil spills, there is also a very definite need to improve, accelerate, and expand our research and demonstration and training efforts in the water pollution control area and to control sewage that is discharged from both commercial and recreational vessels into our Nation's waterways. This legislation meets these needs.

In the area of financing of waste treatment works, we are most concerned with the fact that to date this program has not been adequately financed despite the Congress' considerable efforts in 1966 and subsequent years to establish a graduated and meaningful level of financing the Federal share of these works. We are hopeful that recommendations will be made by the executive branch to increase the financing in the forthcoming fiscal year through additional appropriations over and above the meager amounts appropriated during the last Congress. If, however, this cannot be accomplished, the Committee on Public Works will consider alternative legislative approaches during this session of the 91st Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I urge unanimous approval of this important and far-reaching Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969. It is a major conservation measure that deserves the support of every Member of Congress.

Let me conclude by paying tribute to the members of the Committee on Public Works, my colleagues who have worked so diligently, so hard and so long on this legislation which is before us today. I would particularly commend the ranking minority member of the committee, and one of the leaders in the field of water pollution control, my good friend from Minnesota, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATnik, and all the other members of the committee on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of H.R. 4148.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Blatnik), chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation, as much time as he may require.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, at the outset on behalf of the entire committee, I would like to pay our respects to our able and effective and certainly highly regarded chairman, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Fallon). He worked diligently with all of us every step of the way, and we therefore doubly appreciate the kind words he said about those of us who worked on the development of this legislation. Many of us, on both sides of the aisle, joined together to resolve the problems so that we could present a strong and workable proposal. A tremendous amount of frustrating day-in and day-out work was handled with talent and patience by both the majority and the minority staffs. In our meetings we had the benefit of experience and advice from representatives of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the Coast Guard, and the State Department, as well as constant contact with the various State agencies and conservationists.

Mr. Chairman, very thoughtful care has gone into this very complicated and involved matter, and particularly that section dealing with enormous catastrophic oil spills where the complex problems of liability and responsibility, as well as preventive aspects, are involved. We have also evolved recommendations on what can be done when these catastrophies do occur, in spite of whatever preventive measures were pursued. That remedial work, which is inevitably a laborious and extensive job, will be explained in more detail by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Wright) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Howard), both of whom have devoted long hours to this legislation.

We will also hear from good spokesmen for the minority on this program. Their unanimous work and support have continued the genuine bipartisanship that has characterized our pollution control work over the years.

The Committee on Public Works had extensive hearings on this legislation starting in the 90th Congress and continuing in the 91st Congress in February and March of this year.

During the 90th Congress, the committee considered legislation on the control of oil pollution discharges, the treatment of sewage from vessels, the extension and expansion of the vital water pollution research programs, and legislation to provide more money for the financing of needed waste treatment works. The committee reported out strong legislation in all of these areas, and that legislation unanimously passed the House of Representatives on two occasions but unfortunately the time ran out on the 90th Congress before differences in the House and Senate versions could be resolved in conference.

Since last year the need for this legislation, particularly in the area of oil pollution control, has been dramatically brought to the attention of the Congress and into the public eye by one of the worst oil pollution disasters in the Nation's history. The catastrophe in Santa Barbara, Calif., was a realistic example of the damages which can result from a major oil spill.

It was the committee's objective in our hearings and in our discussions leading up to the reporting of this legislation to recommend legislation which would adequately meet all contingencies and avoid the need for additional legislation if and when a new disaster occurs. In pursuit of this objective, we obtained meaningful data from industry and governmental witnesses on the best means and methods of preventing discharges of oil and other hazardous matter, the costs of removing these pollutants from our waters, beaches and shores when they occur, the availability of insurance and its costs, and the extent to which measures and devices have been developed to remove oil and matter.

In addition to the oil pollution problem, this legislation extends the water pollution research program authorization 2 additional years, provides new emphasis on the problems of acid mine drainage water pollution, and lake eutrophication and related lake pollution problems.

H.R. 4148 further provides for control of sewage from vessels, establishes a training program for individuals in the field of design, operation, and maintenance of modern waste treatment works, and requires applicants for a Federal license or permit to conduct an activity which may result in discharge into the navigable waters of the United States to obtain a State certification that the activity will not reduce the quality of the water below applicable water quality standards. Finally, this legislation changes the name of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to the National Water Quality Administration so as to provide a psychological lift to the program by providing a more positive approach through preventive measures to maintain adequate water quality levels.

This legislation has been endorsed by the administration. We have received a letter dated April 3, 1969, from Russell E. Train, the Undersecretary of the Interior, to the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the Honorable George H. Fallon. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of the letter at this point:

Dear Mr. Chairman: Your Committee has requested the Department's views on H.R. 4158 as reported by your Committee on March 25, 1969.

H.R. 4148, which is known as the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, covers the subjects of oil and matter discharges from vessels, onshore facilities, and offshore facilities; untreated or inadequately treated sewage from vessels; research and development in the area of acid mine pollution, lake pollution, oil pollution, and sewage from vessels; pollution from Federal installations and facilities; and waste discharges from activities constructed and operated under Federal license or permit. It also extends the research provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act an additional 2 fiscal years, and changes the name of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to the National Water Quality Administration.

In regard to the provisions on the control of pollution by oil and other matter, the legislation would—

Provide that any individual in charge of a vessel or onshore or offshore facility who has knowledge of the discharge of oil or matter from such facility or vessel must immediately notify the Secretary of the Interior or the Coast Guard of the discharge so that appropriate steps may be taken to remove the discharged oil or matter. Failure to notify could result in a criminal penalty;

Prohibit the discharge of oil or matter from a vessel into the navigable waters of the United States or into the waters of the Contiguous Zone, except under certain limited conditions such as emergencies affecting the life of individuals, or acts of war or sabotage, or unavoidable accidents, collisions, or strandings;

Provide a civil penalty of up to $10,000 in cases of willful or negligent discharges of oil or matter in substantial quantities in violation of the above prohibition. This penalty would be assessed by the Coast Guard after notice and an opportunity for a hearing. We note that the term "substantial quantities" is discussed in the Committee report. The report indicates that it will need interpretation in its application in specific situations;

Define the term "matter" to include all substances other than oil, dredged spoil, sewage, and certain materials now covered by the Atomic Energy Act. In defining this term, the bill leaves it up to the Secretary of the Interior to determine what matter would present an imminent and substantial hazard to the public health or welfare including fish, shellfish, wildlife, and public and private lands. We also note that the Committee report indicates that the Secretary of the Interior would have to issue regulations from time to time establishing what items might be considered substances that would be subject to the provisions of this Act;

Authorize the United States to clean up discharges of oil or matter when the Secretary of the Interior determines that there is an actual or threatened pollution hazard unless other adequate arrangements for removal of these discharges have taken place. We interpret the latter provision to mean that the United States would have to be satisfied that the arrangements made by the owner or operator of a vessel or a person owning or operating an onshore or offshore facility are adequate within the regulations prescribed under this section to insure that the removal will be carried out expeditiously and in a manner that would not be harmful to marine resources and other property. If they were not adequate, in the judgment of the United States, then the United States could act to remove the oil or matter and later recover its costs.

Authorize the United States to remove summarily and, where necessary, destroy any vessel that presents a substantial threat of pollution in the navigable waters of the United States because of an actual discharge or the imminence of a threatened discharge of large quantities of oil or matter. The expense of removing a vessel would be charged against the vessel, its cargo, and the owner or operator of the vessel where the negligent operation of the vessel caused or contributed to the marine disaster;

Require that the owner or operator of a vessel remove any oil or matter discharged into the navigable waters of the United States or into the waters of the Contiguous Zone where the discharge was due to some willful or negligent act. In cases where the United States removes such discharges, the owner or operator would be liable to the United States for the cost thereof up to a maximum of $10 million or $100 per gross registered ton, whichever is less;

Provide a similar requirement in the case of onshore facilities and offshore facilities located within the territorial sea of the United States, except that the limitation of liability where the United States removes the discharges of oil would be $8 million. It also provides that the Secretary of the Interior would establish by regulation classifications of onshore facilities and activities which would be subject to the $8 million limitation and possibly establish differing limitations of liability with respect to these classifications. This classification authority would not become effective, however, until the Secretary notified the Congress of the intended classifications and allowed at least 60 days before the effective date of the classifications;

Authorize the issuance of regulations by both the Secretary of the Interior and the Coast Guard relative to removal of discharged oil or matter and provide civil penalties for violations of the regulations;

Establish a revolving fund to be administered by the Coast Guard and authorize a maximum appropriation of $20 million to the fund in addition to other revenues for the clean up of discharges and provide for delegation by the President of the authority to clean up discharges of oil or matter; and

Provide for the establishment of a system of financial responsibility for vessels over 100 gross registered tons, including any barge of equivalent size, that use our navigable waters or ports. The financial responsibility provisions would be effective one year after enactment and would apply to the liability to the United States for the removal of oil or matter discharges.

The oil and matter provisions of the legislation make it clear that the legislation is not intended to affect the authority of the States to establish different requirements or limitations of liability, nor does this legislation affect the rights of third parties who might bring actions to recover damages resulting from the discharge of oil or matter or from the removal of such discharges. In addition, the bill does not cover the discharges of offshore facilities located on the Outer Continental Shelf. The Committee report indicates that this omission results from the fact that this Department advised your Committee that we believe we have adequate authority to require Federal lessees on the Outer Continental Shelf to remove discharged oil and to pay the United States for any cost it may incur in the removal of the discharge without any dollar limitations or findings of fault.

In addition to the oil provisions, the legislation would provide for the establishment of standards of performance in connection with marine sanitation devices and the establishment of regulations by the Coast Guard relative to the operation, maintenance, and installation of these devices. The devices would have to be installed on both commercial and recreational vessels with installed toilet facilities using United States waterways once the standards and regulations were effective. The bill also provides a system of certification by the Coast Guard of the device and establishes a pre-emption of State laws and regulations once the Federal standards and regulations are effective. It, however, permits the States to prohibit all discharges in intrastate waters if the States also prohibit discharges from other sources in those waters. As in the oil provisions, the bill provides for civil penalties for violations specified in the legislation.

The bill would provide that any applicant, other than a Federal agency, seeking a Federal license or permit must obtain certification from any affected State or interstate agency that the discharge from the applicant's activity for which he seeks a license or permit will be conducted in a manner that will not reduce the quality of the waters below the applicable Federal, State, or local water quality standards. In cases where a State lacks authority to give such certification or where the Secretary of the Interior has established the water quality standards under the Water Quality Act of 1965, then the Secretary would provide such certification. In cases where a license or permit has been given by a Federal agency for an activity that is under construction prior to the date of enactment of this legislation, no certification will be required, but the license or permit issued without the certification will terminate after the expiration of 2 years after enactment unless the licensee or permittee obtains the proper certification. No Federal permit or license can be issued where it is required under this legislation until the certification is obtained.

The bill would provide additional authority for training individuals in the field of design, operation, and maintenance of waste treatment works.

The bill would also extend the present research and demonstration provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act an additional 2 fiscal years at the current annual level of appropriation authorization. This appropriation authorization will expire on June 30, 1969, and an extension is urgently needed.

Lastly, the bill would change the name of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to the National Water Quality Administration. The objective of this change is to provide a more positive emphasis to the program.

On the basis of our review of the reported bill, we conclude that the legislation follows, in general, the recommendations made by the Secretary in his testimony before your Committee. In particular, it carries out the Administration's recommendation relative to the division of responsibility for enforcement, cleanup, and other matters between this Department and the Department of Transportation in the oil and sewage sections of the reported bill. While we may have some specific recommendations on the bill for the Senate Committee, once it passes the House of Representatives, we are able at this time to recommend its passage by the House of Representatives.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that they have no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

Russell E. Train,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

However, I would like to quote one paragraph of the letter:

> On the basis of our review of the reported bill, we conclude that the legislation follows, in general, the recommendations made by the Secretary in his testimony before your Committee. In particular, it carries out the Administration's recommendation relative to the division of responsibility for enforcement, cleanup, and other matters between this Department and the Department of Transportation in the oil and sewage sections of the reported bill. While we may have some specific recommendations on the bill for the Senate Committee, once it passes the House of Representatives, we are able at this time to recommend its passage by the House of Representatives.

I would be remiss in these opening comments if I did not pay proper commendation to my colleagues on the Committee on Public Works who have labored hard and long this year to bring this excellent legislation before you. In addition to the effective leadership, encouragement, and support of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Fallon), the chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, splendid contributions were made by such outstanding colleagues and workers in the field of water quality as Bob Jones of Alabama; Jim Wright of Texas; Ed Edmondson of Oklahoma; and Jim Howard of New Jersey, each of whom will explain in detail a portion of this legislation, and all my colleagues on the committee on both sides of the aisle.

At this point I submit for the Record a brief synopsis of the highlights of H.R. 4148.

Synopsis of H.R. 4148

A. In the area of oil and other hazardous pollution, the bill would:

Apply to discharges of oil and matter into the navigable waters, the contiguous zone, and the high seas from vessels and onshore and offshore facilities (see definition p. 38).

Provide for notice of all discharges by individuals in charge of a vessel or onshore or offshore facility to either the Secretary of the Interior or the Coast Guard (see Section 17 (b), p. 4).

Prohibit oil and matter discharges from vessels except in emergency situations or except where permitted by international convention (see section 17(c), p. 41).

Establish civil penalties of up to $10,000 for willful or negligent oil or matter discharges from vessels (see section 17(c)(2), p. 41).

Direct that the U.S. remove oil or matter discharged where there is a pollution hazard to private or public beaches or shorelines in the U.S. or to marine resources (see section 17(d)(1), p. 42).

Authorize the United States to remove or destroy a vessel in U.S. waters when a marine disaster creates a substantial pollution threat to the United States. The Corps of Engineers has similar authority today in cases of navigation hazards (see section 17(d)(2) p. 43).

Require the owner or operator of the vessel or onshore or offshore facility to remove the discharged oil or matter immediately (see sections 17(e) and (f) p. 44 & 46).

Provide a limitation of liability to the U.S. for costs of removal by the U.S. of vessel discharges of up to a maximum of $10 million or $100 per gross registered ton, whichever is the lesser (see section 17(e) p. 45).

Provide an $8 million limitation of liability for U.S. costs of removal in case of onshore facilities and offshore facilities located on inland waters and within the territorial sea, but suspends the limitation on onshore facilities until certain findings are made by Interior (see section 17(f)(3) p. 47).

Establish a $20 million revolving fund for cleanup to be administered by the Coast Guard (see section 17(h) p. 50).

Provide a system of financial responsibility for vessels of over 100 gross registered tons and barges of equivalent size, effective 1 year after enactment (see section 17(k) p. 53).

Repeal the antiquated Oil Pollution Act of 1924 which was developed by the House Public Works Committee (see section 7 p. 78).

B. In the area of control of sewage from vessels, the bill would:

Direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue Federal standards of performance for marine sanitation devices for all vessels (except vessels not equipped with installed toilet facilities), and it would direct the Coast Guard to issue regulations relative to the design, construction, installation, and operation of these devices on board such vessels (see p. 56).

Apply to existing vessels, the construction of which is initiated prior to issuance of the standards and regulations (see definition p. 55).

Apply to new vessels, the construction of which is initiated after issuance of the standards and regulations (see definition p. 55).

Provide that the initial standards shall be effective for new vessels two years after promulgation, but not earlier than December 31, 1971, and for existing vessels five years after promulgation (see definition p. 57).

Provide for a system of certification by the Coast Guard of marine sanitation devices (see definition p. 59).

Provide for the establishment of civil penalties after notice and opportunity for a hearing (see p. 62).

Provide that provisions of this section shall be enforced by the Coast Guard (see p. 63).

C. In the area of training of personnel, the bill would:

Authorize the Secretary to make grants or to enter into contracts with institutions of higher education to assist them in planning, developing, strengthening, improving, or carrying out programs or projects to prepare undergraduate students entering into occupations involving the design, operation, and maintenance of waste treatment works (see p. 64–72).

Provide that these grants or contracts may be used to pay the compensation of students employed in connection with the operation and maintenance of treatment works (see p. 68).

Authorize the award of scholarships for undergraduate studies for periods up to 4 academic years and the making of stipends (see p. 69).

Provide that the Secretary by regulation will require that any person awarded a scholarship must enter into an agreement in writing to enter and remain in an occupation involving the design, operation, or maintenance of treatment works for such period as the Secretary determines appropriate after the completion of the student's studies (see p. 71).

Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1970 of $12 million and for fiscal years 1971 and 1972 of $25 million annually—total $62 million (see p. 72).

D. In the area of research, the bill would:

Authorize grants and contracts for the prevention, removal, and control of lake pollution (see p. 76).

Authorize research and demonstration projects relative to acid mine pollution (see p. 64).

Authorize grants and contracts relative to research and development on the prevention and control of oil pollution (see p. 76 and 77).

Authorize the Secretary to engage in studies, research, experiments, and demonstrations relative to discharges from recreational vessels and the equipment installed thereon with the requirement of a report to Congress (see p. 77).

Authorize the Secretary to acquire lands and interests therein for field laboratories and research facilities and in connection with demonstration projects (see p. 76).

Extend the appropriation authorization provisions of sections 5 and 6 of the Act two additional years at the current level of appropriation authorizations which is $120 million for F.Y. 1969 (see p. 78).

E. In the area of controlling pollution from federal activities and federally licensed or permit activities, the bill would:

Require that all federal installations take immediate steps to insure compliance with applicable federal, state or local water quality standards, subject, of course, to the availability of appropriations, and consistent with national needs (see pages 73–75).

Require that all applicants, other than Federal agency applicants, obtain a certificate from the appropriate state or interstate water pollution control agency in connection with the granting of a federal license or permit by a federal agency for the conduct of an activity that may discharge waste into the navigable waters of the United States (see p. 73–75).

Provide that in instances where state lacks authority to certify the Secretary of the Interior will provide the certification (see p. 73–75).

Provide that any activity which is under construction under a federal license or permit upon enactment of this legislation shall have two years to obtain a certificate, and if they fail to do so within that period of time the license or permit shall be suspended.

F. The bill would also change the name of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to the National Water Quality Administration in order to provide a more protective emphasis to this very important national program (see section 8, p. 78).

Mr. Chairman, so that the amounts of funds involved will be clear, the following summary of the cost of the legislation will be helpful:

	Millions
Section 17(h)(1), which establishes a revolving fund for cleanup of oil and matter discharges by the United States	$20
Section 19(d) which provides for the research and demonstration program for the control of acid mine pollution	15
Section 23, which provides authorization for appropriations for the training of operators of waste treatment works	62
Section 5, which extends the research training and demonstration authority in Section 4 of the Water Pollution Control Act	130
Section 5, which extends the research authority of section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act	120
Section 4, which extends the authority to conduct a study on the estuaries	1
Total	348

Mr. Chairman, we have come a long way in our struggle to preserve and protect, and even to rescue, the waters of this great country of ours. We have a long way still before us. This legislation represents effective further progress in critical areas. I cannot overemphasize the importance of enacting this legislation and getting on with the job.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from our neighboring State of Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

What is the total annual cost of this proposed legislation?

Mr. BLATNIK. The total cost would be approximately $348 million over maybe 2 and up to 4 years.

Mr. GROSS. But the total annual cost is what?

Mr. BLATNIK. I cannot give the gentleman the annual cost, but the total cost. The authorizations and extensions will amount to $348 million over a period of at least 2 and in some instances perhaps up to 4 years.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for further clarification?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I think what the gentleman is saying is the total cost for the total period is $348 million. The annual cost is a revolving fund for oil pollution, $20 million for an indefinite period. That is the total cost of that program. It is a revolving fund. The amount for area acid and mine water pollution for 1 year is $15 million. The amount for training grants and contracts is $12 million. The amount for estuary research extension is $1 million. The amount for general research and for project research, two programs for 2 years, $250 million, which is the same level as in the present law. So the cost of the program is substantially less than that which we brought in last year, in that we eliminated the title of financing proposed for sewage treatment plants at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I believe section (d) is contained in section 17, Control of Pollution by Oil and Other Matter. I would refer the gentleman to page 43 of the bill, where it says:

> Whenever a marine disaster in or upon the navigable waters of the United States has created a substantial threat of a pollution hazard—

And so on. There is an authorization of $20 million set up for the financing of this provision of the bill. Does this mean that the taxpayers of the country, in the case of an oil pollution occurrence such as that off the coast of California, could expend x number of dollars and recover none of the money that was expended? I see no provision in section (d) whereby the company or corporation polluting the water would be called upon to repay.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will turn to page 44—and this will be explained in complete detail by Mr. WRIGHT—and refer for the time being to page 44, lines 20 to 23, the gentleman will see it states:

> If the United States removes oil or matter which was willfully or negligently discharged by such owner or operator, the vessel and such owner or operator shall be liable to the United States for the full amount of the costs.

The United States can, therefore, recoup or claim whatever expenses are involved; this also applies to onshore facilities on page 46 and offshore facilities on page 47.

Mr. GROSS. This then is not confined to vessels, and it will go to oil wells such as were involved and caused the pollution off the coast of California?

Mr. BLATNIK. Those would be covered by this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. So the Federal Government can recover funds it has expended?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama, who has made outstanding contributions to this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Minnesota and the other members of the subcommittee, who participated for the very deliberate way in which the hearings were held and the legislation was prepared. I am quite sure the House can take pride in the results of their work.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of H.R. 4148 as an essential continuation for development of this Nation's water resources to benefit all the people.

We cannot ever overstate the importance of water resources to the development of our Nation. Without full and proper attention to the water which we possess, we cannot hope to successfully reach the levels of attainment to which this Nation is dedicated.

Water pollution has resulted from man's misuse of his inheritance. President Lyndon B. Johnson stated well the problems which we face when he said:

> This is water that could be used and reused, if treated properly. Today it is ravaged water—a menace to the health. It flows uselessly past water-hungry communities to an indifferent sea.

Water is an invaluable commodity. However, most people simply take it for granted until the supply runs low in quantity or in quality. Unfortunately, this problem where it occurs usually stems from our mismanagement of the water quality.

The Congress has passed major legislation in this field on several occasions. In 1956 there was enacted into law the first comprehensive Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments were passed in 1961 and were followed in 1965 by the Water Quality Act, in 1966 by the Clean Water Restoration Act, and now hopefully in 1969 by the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969.

This legislation deals with the serious problems concerning the prevention and cleanup of discharges of oil and other matter from vessels and onshore and offshore facilities, the control of sewage from vessels, acid and other mine water control, the training of skilled and knowledgeable people to handle the modern sophisticated waste treatment works in our cities and industries, the effect of Federal activities and federally licensed or permitted activities on our navigable waters.

This legislation is good legislation, it is needed legislation. The committee has heard over the past 2 years representatives of all segments of our society, our governmental institutions, and our industry. It has taken testimony from Governors of large States, owners of small boats, representatives of international insurance associations, concerned citizens, and many, many others. The committee members worked long and hard to make the right decisions, and I believe they have succeeded. I commend the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, my close friend from Maryland, George H. Fallon; the gentleman from Minnesota, John A. Blatnik, and all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle of this great committee.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the overwhelming passage of H.R. 4148 by all our colleagues in this great body.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank my very dear friend, our able colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Jones).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to prolong the debate nor discuss subject matters other Members are going to discuss, in that this bill comes out of our committee unanimously, supported on both sides of the aisle, as it did last year and as it has traditionally in the past recent years.

Except for the fact that we eliminated the basic financing provisions relating to sewage treatment plants, this is a bill similar to the bill voted twice by this House unanimously last session. Unfortunately it did not become law because of the other body's unwillingness to accept the House position.

Frankly, I believe this is an instance where the passage of time is resulting in better legislation. This could be partially attributed to certain circumstances which have occurred, however, such as the oil spill off the shore of southern California, which obviously alerted the American people to the risk involved.

Some of us had been attempting to alert the American people for some time relating to the possibility and the prospect of oil spillages of major nature. I recall a few years ago I and some others tried to alert this country to the risk involved, for instance, with respect to sunken tankers, the possibility of the holds of those tankers, because of the extended period of time, rusting out, causing major spillages on the beaches in some areas of this country. I raised the necessity of trying to find out what those possibilities were, what could be done about them, and who should be responsible for the cleanup.

We have gone a long way, I will say, since that request for information. The *Torrey Canyon* incident has occurred.

We know this is an area in which there is a possibility of a major disaster in a given area. It has occurred off the coast of California. It has occurred in England. It has occurred on the shores of Puerto Rico.

So we feel it is a responsibility of the U.S. Congress to determine what is the liability of those who cause this risk. Therefore, this legislation is now before us.

I am happy to say also that this legislation is supported by the administration.

I am happy to say that the administration has been most cooperative, with our committee on both sides, in an effort to try to draft good legislation.

I want to say further that the Secretary of the Interior took immediate action. We called that to the attention of the House on October 7 and again on October 14, 1968, and, yes, to the attention of the administration, Mr. Udall, and called attention to the fact that he had authority, in entering into leases with these offshore drillers, to require that they accept absolute liability for such oil spillages off the shores of the United States and, yes, onshore, as a matter of fact, when it is Government-owned land.

The previous administration did not see fit to include this in the leases, despite the fact that on the floor of the House we called it to their attention and said this could be done.

I recall responding to a question by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Keith), in the debate in the last session. I believe he asked, "What are you going to do about the offshore oil drilling and the risks which might be involved there?" I see the gentleman is on the floor. I congratulate him for his foresight, because he asked the question before the spillage took place in California.

At that time I stated, as I believed to be the case and as now proved to be the case, that the Secretary does have authority to restrict these leases under the law, and under his present authority for these offshore drilling rigs, to require them to accept responsibility for these spillages.

Secretary Hickel has seen fit to put this into effect, and I congratulate him for it. This legislation in no way infringes upon the authority which he is now exercising and, as a matter of fact, it permits it to go forward in the future as it has in the past.

Also, of course, we had to deal with the very difficult question of what do you do with on-shore facilities. I think the approach taken here is one that is logical and reasonable. It will not put anyone out of business and yet it will protect the people of this Nation with regard to oil spillages on shore. In federally owned lands, of course, they can do it under a lease authority. On privately owned lands, with private facilities, we had to try to find a formula.

It started out as an $8 million maximum liability formula. Obviously that was not the proper approach for a filling station or a boatyard which has gasoline and oil for sale to boats, such as they do in many of the fishing camps in Florida. It is just not logical. There is no way in which they can issue that amount of liability. So we adopted a proposal which permits the Secretary to set up classifications of businesses which have risks of possible pollution where they deal with hazardous material.

There are some 200 such materials that are already defined by the Secretary under present regulations and it is contemplated that materials of that nature will be dealt with by the Secretary in those present regulations. This not only includes oil but many other materials. This legislation authorizes the Secretary to classify those businesses concerned with these materials to make certain that the public is properly protected up to a maximum limitation of $8 million. We think this is a logical and reasonable approach.

Last year, when we considered oil pollution legislation, there was insufficient time to consider the difference between offshore facilities under the complete control of the United States and offshore facilities under the control of the States. We concluded, after much study, that where the United States did not have full control of the licensing procedures, a maximum liability for cleanup of spills that would be realistic in face of available insurance would be $8 million per discharge. This figure is frankly based upon the insurance market as is a figure of $10 million or $100 per gross ton for cleanup costs of vessels.

There was considerable soul-searching as to whether or not the insurance industry should, in effect, control our oil pollution requirements. Many of us had reservations concerning this approach. Nevertheless, at the present time, it seems to be the only practical method by which we can assure reimbursement for Government expenditures in cleanup. To this end we have provided for a study to be made by various Federal agencies concerned in cooperation with business, industry and all others that might be able to contribute to the solution of the problem. This study hopefully will provide us with information upon which to base future limitations of liability or financial responsibility requirements on all types of facilities—onshore, offshore, afloat, that may be responsible for the cleaning up of discharges.

In the area of onshore facilities, we were very concerned lest we imposed a burden upon the businessman that would drive him out of business. Again, we did not have available the information we would have liked—and that we would have had if our bill had passed last year—but we felt we could not forebear from acting at this time. Consequently, we have included all onshore facilities within the purview of the act. In order to preclude hasty action and to preclude forcing the business owner to guess whether or not he was required to insure himself under the act, we have provided that no facility is included until the Secretary of Interior shall find that it is included. This is to give the businessman, and in particular the small businessman, a chance to be heard and to protect himself against crippling loss.

At this point, perhaps it is well to make absolutely clear that the committee's intention is not to force upon the businessman the closing of his business or bankruptcy because of our requirement of responsibility for discharge cleanup. Neither is it in other provisions of this bill the intention of the committee to destroy lawful activities now enjoyed by the citizen. Thus, in our vessel pollution bill, which I will discuss in a moment, it is not our intention to drive the boatowner off the water. Indeed, we wish to emphasize that the agencies that administered the provisions of this bill are zealous in the protection of all citizens, including those directly affected by the provisions of this bill.

Recognizing that our knowledge will increase with time and recognizing the need to accelerate the gathering of knowledge in certain areas pertaining to pollution, the bill directs the Secretary to study further methods of clean-up and the prevention of oil spills.

Now all this legislation in the area of oil pollution would be meaningless if we did not provide the tools by which these spills could be arrested and cleanup accomplished. Accordingly, we have called for a revolving fund to be established for the purposes of accomplishing cleanup.

If the gentleman will permit me, I will be glad to answer any questions in just a moment. Let me say now that this is the approach we took with regard to that problem.

On control of sewage emanating from vessels, we believe that the approach here is a reasonable one. This bill goes further—and I want to make sure that this is clearly understood—this bill goes further than the bill we had last year. One reason for that is that we have more experience and have gone into more areas, so we were able to do an even better job. Therefore we have provided for certain requirements relating to marine sanitation devices which are required of all vessels where such toilet facilities are built in or where they have such facilities built in in the future. Also we provided logically for the departments and for the legislatures of States to come up with a proper approach by providing ample time for them to do this.

We gave present boatowners who have sanitation facilities in present boats 5 years to conform to these requirements. As to new vessels it gives 2 years and prolongs the standards for that period of time in order to allow them to conform.

I just mentioned the control of sewage from vessels. Here again was an area of great difficulty. The testimony and evidence that we had before us was such that several members of the committee did not feel confident that small recreational craft made a substantial contribution to the pollution of our waters. Nevertheless, it appeared clear that it would be unwise to withhold legislation until such time that a convincing demonstration of pollution could be made. To a large extent, the vessel pollution provisions, which deal solely with sanitary sewage—that is human waste—will be what I would call a prophylactic prevention of future pollution.

We recognized that at the present time our technology is such that there is no effective practical solution for the treatment of sewage on small vessels. Even in large vessels the problem is difficult. Consequently, we have chosen to demonstrate our concern for this problem at the present time by requiring the Secretary of Interior to conduct such research as would be necessary to develop suitable marine sanitation devices, including perhaps chemical or biological treatment. We have required that the results of this study be furnished to the Congress prior to the effective date of standards for marine sanitation devices to be promulgated under the act.

Based upon the information available to him from all sources, including his research program, the Secretary of Interior is to issue Federal standards of performance for marine sanitation devices. In doing so, he will take into account the technology available and the economics involved. The bill takes into consideration the problems of existing vessels as opposed to vessels constructed after issuance of standards and regulations by the Secretary and by the Secretary of Transportation. The initial standards shall not be effective for new vessels until 2 years after promulgation and no earlier than December 31, 1971. In the case of existing vessels, they will have 5 years to comply. Broad authority is given to the Secretaries to classify vessels and distinguish between them so that their different characteristics, practices and use may be taken into account.

In order to assure that the interests of the vessel owner are fully considered by the Secretary, requirement that section 4 of the Administrative Procedures Act apply to the issuance of standards and regulations is included.

It was forcefully brought to our attention by many witnesses that a burden upon the passage in interstate commerce of vessels has been imposed as the result of differing States imposing differing standards for marine sanitation devices. Thus, a boatowner in compliance with the laws of his own State where his boat is registered will find himself in difficulty if he enters the waters of another State having differing requirements. We, therefore, have chosen to preempt from the States the adoption or enforcement of any statute or regulation with the respect to the design, manufacturer, or installation of a marine sanitation device on a vessel. Recognizing that there are circumstances under which a State may choose to prohibit discharge of sewage, whether treated or not, from a vessel, the right of a State to make such prohibition is protected. In order to prevent inequities, however, the bill permits prohibition by a State of such discharges only if discharges from all other sources are likewise prohibited in such waters. Thus, the very justifiable complaint of boatowners that we have all seen appearing in boating magazines and newspaper columns to the effect that the small boatowner should not be required to carry his sewage aboard while his boat is sailing through waters befouled with filth from the land is recognized and dealt with.

The enforcement of the marine sanitation device provisions seems to us to depend upon two areas. The first, to stop the manufacture of devices which do not meet the standards that will be developed and promulgated by the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Transportation. The second is to prevent unlawful discharges by the vessel. Consequently, penalties are provided to punish the selling or distributing of vessels not equipped with a necessary sanitation device and to punish unauthorized discharges. Vessels that are too small or have some reason to not spend extended periods of time on the water so that installed toilet facilities are not on board are not required to have marine sanitation devices. Nor is it our intention to leave to the State the prerogative of requiring such vessels to install toilet facilities with marine sanitation devices.

We think that this is a sound approach and will leave the administration where it belongs, in the Coast Guard. We do not want to erect a separate department of the Interior or department of the Navy in order to police these regulations, so we leave the administration and jurisdiction of them where they belong, just as it was in the bill last year, in the Coast Guard. I understand the Coast Guard is in full support of this legislation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one section that I will take up for just one moment relates to the amendment which is now a part of this legislation similar to the bill a number of us introduced here, H.R. 8516, dealing with training of personnel. We will never solve this problem if we do not have people who are qualified actually to administer the program. This has been an area of weakness for some time, but it is an admitted area of weakness.

As a matter of fact, the other body had lengthy studies relating to this, and in the 90th Congress, Senate Document 49, entitled "Manpower and Training Needs in Water Pollution Control" which was published in August 1967, this document called attention of the Congress to the very dire need for trained personnel at all levels in order to accomplish water pollution control programs and to say to the States that they have to have this and say to the States that they have to have that and that they are going to have to have standards and they will have to conform to those standards.

We will have to have money available for sewage treatment plants and faced with the finding of fact that the personnel with which to accomplish this objective do not now exist is to ignore one of the necessities in reaching a sound solution to a very serious problem.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to report that the committee adopted, again unanimously, an amendment which I think represents a sound approach and which, in effect, amends the present law to provide for funds for the training of personnel, for tooling up the university systems and encouraging them to go into this field of clean water and to become qualified from an instructional standpoint to turn out the personnel to do this job in the future.

Mr. Chairman, rather than spend the time of the Committee in discussing it in detail, I shall place the justification for that in the Record:

Memorandum on Manpower and Training for Water Pollution Control

Early in the history of water pollution control legislation, the need for training of qualified personnel was recognized and provided for by statute. After the transfer of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to the Department of Interior, an extensive study was conducted by that Administration concerning manpower needs for water pollution control. The results of this study were published as Senate Document #49 of the 90th Congress entitled "Manpower and Training Needs in Water Pollution Control." Published in August of 1967, the document called the attention of Congress to the need for trained personnel at all levels to accomplish our water pollution control program.

TABLE I.—ESTIMATES OF MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS

Employers	Fiscal year 1967			Fiscal year 1972								
				Professionals			Technicians			Sewage treatment plant operators		
	Professionals	Technicians	Sewage treatment plant operators	Estimate	Increase	Percent increase	Estimate	Increase	Percent increase	Estimate	Increase	Percent increase
State agencies	1,368	317		3,422	2,054	150	980	633	208			
Local agencies	2,250	2,250	20,000	5,550	3,250	144	5,500	3,250	144	30,000	10,000	50
Subtotal [1]	3,600	2,600	20,000	9,000	5,400	150	6,500	3,900	150	30,000	10,000	50
Industrial waste treatment	1,700	1,700	3,500	6,000	4,300	253	6,000	4,300	253	12,000	8,500	243
Consulting engineers [2]	6,000	6,000		21,000	15,000	250	21,000	15,000	250			
Total [1]	11,300	10,300	23,500	36,000	24,700	219	33,500	23,200	225	42,000	18,500	30

[1] Numbers are rounded.
[2] Estimated by Black & Veatch, consulting engineers.

On page 15 appears Table 1, "Estimates of Manpower Requirements." The increase in sewage treatment plant operators estimated to be required by fiscal year 1972 over that required in fiscal year 1967 was 10,000. Granting that the need for trained operators will be determined to a large extent by the rate by which sewage treatment plants are completed, the report notes that the demands for operating personnel lag well behind construction appropriations, while the demands for design personnel are more immediate. (P. 14). In addition, this increase is based upon an estimate by the Water Pollution Control Federation that the number of operators employed at the time of the report was 20,000. The FWPCA estimated that only 16,500 operators were employed at the time. The estimated need for 1972 is 30,000 operators. If the FWPCA estimate is correct, the increase in operators would be 13,500. The report gives no figures for replacement of personnel due to death, retirement, or transfer of employment outside the field because accurate turnover rates were not available.

Table 1 of the report indicates that an increase of 8,500 industrial waste treatment plant operators will be required. In addition, an increase of 3,900 technicians will be needed for state and local agencies and 4,300 for industrial waste treatment. The state and local agencies will need an increase of 5,400 professional personnel, and 4,300 more industrial waste treatment professional personnel would be required.

One very interesting figure deals with professionals who operate as consulting engineers. The 1967 estimate based on figures by Black and Veatch, Consulting Engineers, indicates that 6,000 consulting engineers were available for consultation in the field in 1967 and that 21,000 would be needed by 1972—an increase of 15,000. It's estimated that for technicians working with professional consulting engineers, an increase from 6,000 to 21,000—that is an increase of 15,000—is required.

During testimony before the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on Thursday, March 6, 1969, Allen R. Voss, Assistant Director of the General Accounting Office, pointed out that the Federal Water Pollution Control Act requires that no grant shall be made for any project until the applicant has provided for ensuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works after completion of construction. In other words, *under the law a grant depends upon the availability of trained personnel who can effectively carry out efficient operation and maintenance.*

The GAO investigation of various aspects of the implementation of water pollution control legislation was, at the time of Mr. Voss' statement, still in its early phases. Nevertheless, the following paragraphs quoted from Mr. Voss' statement indicate the need for activity:

"In examining into the operation and maintenance of treatment plants, we are using as criteria the minimum requirements for personnel, laboratory controls, and records established by a conference of State Sanitary Engineers in cooperation with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1963.

"We are finding, generally, that these minimum requirements are not being met. For example, on the basis of a review of 20 operation and maintenance reports in two States, we believe that 17 plants did not meet the minimum requirements. Thirteen of the 20 did not meet minimum personnel requirements; 15 of 20 did not meet minimum laboratory requirements; and seven of 20 did not meet minimum records requirements. In our opinion, 11 of the 20 plants were strongly deficient.

"During one of our on-site inspections of a treatment plant, we found that the plant was shut down and that no operator was available. State representatives accompanying our staff members stated that the plant had been shut down for about a month. In another instance, a review of FWPCA files showed that FWPCA, in its inspection of a plant in September 1968, noted a number of deficiencies among which was the fact that the plant did not have a full-time operator and daily operating records were not being maintained. We could not find evidence that these deficiencies had been brought to the attention of the State. * * *

"In February 1969, staff members of our office accompanied by a state representative found that the plant still did not have a full-time operator and that daily operators were still not being maintained. * * *"

Following is a colloquy between Congressman William H. Harsha and Mr. Voss, during the latter's testimony before the Committee:

"Mr. Harsha. Now, do you know or have you had an opportunity to make this determination, whether or not we have the engineering potential in this country to design and construct the municipal treatment plants that could be built if the whole billion dollars authorization by fiscal year 1970 were appropriated?

"Mr. Voss. No, sir, we have not done a thing in that area. I know, just recently, we talked to an official in the FWPCA and this is something that he said that possibly that agency may consider doing.

"Mr. Harsha. Apropos to the same question about available personnel and professional people, is it not a fact that one of the problems is this dearth of trained personnel, scientists, water quality men, even technicians and operators of plants, is that not so?

"Mr. Voss. Yes. At least at a number of the plants that we have visited—it does not seem that the operators have been trained as well as they could be. There is a lack of laboratory testing. There is a lack of keeping of records. And if you do not keep these records on the tests, that supposedly you are making, it is very difficult for anyone to determine whether or not that plant is operating to the design capability. You do not have on record the water and sewage going into the plant, and that going out of the plant.

"Mr. Harsha. Well, is this due to the lack of efficiency of the personnel there or due to the lack of sufficient personnel?

"Mr. Voss. I would say both.

"Mr. Harsha. And, as a matter of fact, have you not found that a number of plants are not operating at capacity?

"Mr. Voss. This, but what we are finding, offhand, I cannot say how many.

"I might mention, Mr. Congressman, we have figures which are estimates as to the number of operators you are going to need to operate these plants by 1972, and it is a tremendous increase in the next 4 or 5 years. They are just estimates, but it is the best we have available and it is jumping from about 23,000 to 43,000 or 44,000."

In order to combat this dearth of personnel, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has used three approaches. Two of these involved joint federal agency efforts with the states working through the regional office of FWPCA. The third is to secure adequate appropriations directly to FWPCA to support training contracts.

At this point, it is well to review the sections of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, applicable to training. Section 5 of the Act deals with research, investigations, training, and information. Subsection 5(a) (2) authorizes the Secretary of Interior to make grants-in-aid to public or private agencies and institutions and to individuals for research and training projects and for demonstrations, and provide for the conduct of research, training and demonstrations by contract with public or private agencies and institutions. Subsection 5(a) (4) authorizes the Secretary to establish and maintain research fellowships in the Department of Interior with stipends and allowances, including travel and subsistence expenses. Subsection (5) (a) authorizes the Secretary to provide training in technical matters relating to the causes, prevention, and control of water pollution to personnel of public agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications.

In addition, under the Secretary's authority for grants for research and development included in Section 6, the Secretary may make grants to those engaged in research, including, but not limited to, those attending recognized education institutions.

Appropriations for Section 5 purposes have been as follows:

	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970[1]
Grants for training	$3,667,000	$3,400,000	$3,980,000
Research fellowship	633,000	600,000	600,000
Federal technical training and administration	637,000	804,000	1,006,000
Graduate and special training	251,000	258,000	258,000
Total	4,888,000	5,062,000	5,844,000

[1] Requested by Johnson administration.

According to figures received from the FWPCA, the Division of Manpower and Training has training grants of $3,400,000 available for the training of approximately 500 trainees in FY 1969. $600,000 will be distributed amongst 101 research fellows. For FY 1970, the FWPCA estimates that $3,980,000 will be spent for training grants to train approximately 700 trainees. FWPCA short courses for those actually employed in water pollution control activities are scheduled to train 1,465 trainees in FY 1969 and 360 trainees in FY 1970.

The FWPCA was awarded a contract by the Department of Labor on January 21, 1969, to train waste treatment plant operators. When augmented by funds from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare a total of $1,032,000 will be available. The program will involve approximately 800 operators in 10 urban and 10 rural projects. The states of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Iowa, Texas and California are receiving initial consideration as potential project sites. All trainees will be selected by the management of waste water treatment plants from the employees engaged in this work. There is no tuition fee.

The project, established under authority of the Manpower Development and Training Act will be administered by the Division of Manpower and Training of the FWPCA as a prime contractor. Training and supervision will be handled through subcontracts with municipalities or waste treatment districts with oversight by FWPCA regional offices. The length of the course is 44 weeks or 1760 hours, and includes 20 weeks or 800 hours of full on-the-job training and 630 hours of part-time on-the-job training.

In the area of federal-state cooperation, FWPCA has joined the cooperative area manpower plan system (CAMPS). The importance of this program to water pollution control is that it provides the first opportunity for training of those who are not currently employed as operators in water pollution control and envisions training of the unemployed seeking a place in that field. It does not, apparently, consider the training of personnel already employed in other fields for transfer to water pollution control work.

As commendable as the efforts of the FWPCA are, it is clear that there are two major deficiencies. One is obviously the numbers involved.

If we add together all those who receive any training under the programs discussed above, they come to well under 2,000 for FY 1969. Practically all of these are already employed or engaged in the water pollution control field. Practically nothing is being done to eliminate the great gap between available personnel and personnel required for the operation of treatment plants. Another defect is the failure of any program to look to other fields for personnel to be transferred into the water pollution field. No inducements are set forth for the competent intelligent person to consider transferring his activities to water pollution control.

The purpose of H.R. 8516, which has been incorporated by the Committee into H.R. 4148, is to provide inducements to those not in the field of water pollution control to enter it and to induce those already within the field to achieve a greater degree of competence and to remain in this work. In order to do this, it would make available to interested students scholarships and stipends now available primarily for those in the professional level. A student who wishes to become a sewage treatment plant operator may do so while receiving a stipend, which, to some extent, would accommodate him for his loss of income during his period of study. Thus, the individual student would receive an inducement to come into the field, which he otherwise could not afford to enter.

An estimated average of $1,000 a year per student at all levels was used in calculating the total amount authorized. This figure was derived from information based upon the needs of community colleges which either have or are developing training programs for operators.

Assuming a need for 10,000 more operators within the next three years and assuming an average training program of two years, $20,000,000 would be needed for the training of operators over the next two years. Applying a loss factor used by the FWPCA of approximately 25% for students who would, for one reason or another, be unable to complete the program, the program should cost approximately $24,000,000 for the first two years. This figure is restricted strictly to training persons required by state and local agencies for municipal operations and does not provide for training industrial waste treatment plant operators. In order to compensate for an expected lag in the administration of the program, selection of students, and completion of construction of necessary facilities, $8,000,000 is suggested for the first year's appropriation for operational training and $16,000,000 for the second year's operational training. The same figure is suggested for the third year for the increased number of students anticipated to fulfill the needs of increased sewage treatment plant construction, for those students who will need to receive advanced training, and for those students who must take three years to complete their training program rather than two. Similarly, figures are derived for state and local professionals at $3,000,000 for the first year and $8,000,000 for each of the second and third years. For the training of technicians, $1,000,000 is needed for each of the three years. The number of technicians required for local and state agencies is much smaller than the number of operators required, and the cost of their instruction is estimated at somewhat less. This leads to a total of $12,000,000 for the first year and $25,000,000 for each of the second and third years.

Now, what would be the effect of cutting any of these figures? The immediate effect would be that the state and local agencies will not be able to acquire the personnel that they will need to administer their programs and to evaluate their projects. Because of the scarcity of professional personnel, salaries offered by consulting engineer firms and by industry will be more attractive than state and local employment which can lead to the absorption by those groups of the professionals who do finish their training without federal assistance. Even so, the number of people absorbed by the consulting engineer firms will still be inadequate to accomplish the design engineering necessary for project development and evaluations. Consequently, a reduction of funds for the professional training part of the program will lead to an immediate impact upon the design and administration levels. Reduction of funds for that portion of the program dealing with operators and technicians will not lead to a loss that will be felt immediately. However, upon completion of construction of treatment works, the works will be maloperated or not operated at all, as indicated by Mr. Voss' testimony.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York, since I promised to yield to him first.

Mr. McCARTHY. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER) alluded to the new Secretary of Interior.

Mr. CRAMER. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. As a Member on this side of the aisle, I would like to identify myself with the remarks that the gentleman from Florida has made about the new Secretary of the Interior. I was one, at the time that he was being considered for confirmation, who seriously questioned whether, by virtue of his background, experience, and public statements, he could actually be a good modern Secretary of the Department of Interior.

I must say in all fairness that I have been impressed with the new Secretary with reference to the American Indian, with reference to wildlife, the national parks, and certainly, on this matter of oil pollution. I think he has shown vigor and determination and, frankly, I have been pleasantly surprised to find the qualities which he has exhibited. I think Mr. Hickel's record thus far has been commendable.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman very much. The gentleman's hindsight is very excellent I will say.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding. In several places in the bill there is the language—"Secretary of the Department under which the Coast Guard is operating."

Mr. CRAMER. Where is the gentleman reading?

Mr. GROSS. Page 44, line 14, but it also appears in a number of other places—"Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating."

I am just curious to know why this language is contained in the bill.

Mr. CRAMER. To make sure that the Coast Guard itself in no matter which Department it is presently operating continues to have jurisdiction over this enforcement.

Mr. GROSS. I thought there might be some question about where the Coast Guard would be located.

Mr. CRAMER. There is no question.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOWARD. As has been true in the past, the Coast Guard has been in the Department of Transportation, but in wartime it may be under the Department of Defense.

Mr. CRAMER. That is right; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, on page 42, line 19, there is the language "—by action in rem—" What is the meaning of that?

Mr. CRAMER. Action against the vessel.

Mr. GROSS. Action against the what?

Mr. CRAMER. The vessel.

Mr. GROSS. Action against the vessel?

Mr. CRAMER. In rem is an action against the vessel itself—action against the property, a concept permitted by the law of admiralty.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENNEY. Actually, an action in rem is the phraseology which means action against the thing. It means that you get a judgment and a lien against a vessel and you foreclose on this lien.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. He sounds like a legal professor, and I thank the gentleman for his response.

Mr. GROSS. Is it proposed in this bill to go into more brick and mortar in order to provide for research laboratories and further research in this field?

Mr. CRAMER. No. It is my understanding that this is a technical type of research dealing with individuals, equipment, et cetera, and not buildings.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any other areas of government expenditures for this same purpose?

Mr. CRAMER. Not to my knowledge, I will say to the gentleman, we certainly would not try to duplicate expenditures. I might add to the gentleman that this is an ongoing research program, this is not new. This is a program that is presently in existence. This is a continuing authorization at exactly the present level.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, to the knowledge of the gentleman there are no other areas of government in which money is being expended for the same general purposes as envisaged in this bill?

Mr. CRAMER. I would not support a duplication if I were aware of it, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I appreciate the statements that the gentleman has made, and the functions performed.

I rise simply for a point of clarification in the text of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am referring now to section 11, part (b).

Mr. CRAMER. Does the gentleman have the page number in the bill?

Mr. HALL. This is on page 74.

My query is simply as to whether or not, in fact, it does not give the various States of the Union certification power for permits in the first part of subsection (b), and in a later portion gives certification authority to the Secretary?

Mr. CRAMER. Let me say to the gentleman that this does not do so. It does provide for certification by the Secretary when the State cannot certify because it has no authority or certification procedure established. Once the State established has a certification procedure. In fact, if the States cannot certify, then the Secretary comes into play, but it is contemplated that the States will do the initial certification.

Mr. HALL. I understood that, if the gentleman will yield further, from the earlier part of the bill and from reading the report, but I am not quite sure about the language. Do I understand that the gentleman agrees that it might be clarified either by an amendment, or legislative history?

Mr. CRAMER. That is a matter that is under consideration now. I will be glad to clarify it further on the record as consideration of an amendment in this area is given, if the request for it is made.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the statement made by the gentleman, and if the gentleman would refer then to page 59, has any consideration for the purpose of clarification been given to eliminating lines 8 and 9? That is where it says that "nothing in this section shall be construed to affect or modify the authority or jurisdiction of any State to prohibit discharges of sewage whether treated or not from a vessel within all or part of the intrastate waters of such State"?

It might be suggested that it stop right there, but instead the language goes ahead and says "if discharges from all other sources are likewise prohibited."

I am just thinking of State jurisdiction versus Federal jurisdiction in our offshore waters, estuaries, or navigable streams.

Mr. CRAMER. This deals with intrastate waters. I believe the language as presently in the bill accomplishes what should be done as it relates to intrastate and not interstate waters. And it is on the basis that if discharges from other sources are likewise prohibited, it would be so controlled. Of course, once the statute goes into effect the vessels could only discharge adequately treated sewage in any case.

Mr. HARSHA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. This is a position that was brought out by representatives of the boat industry where the boatowners have complied with all regulations of the State as covering discharge into State waters, and yet they found that they could be prevented from making such distribution or discharges while other users of water were entitled to discharge polluted material into the water. They felt that because of the different changes in regulations from State to State that this was imposing an undue burden upon them where other pollutants were permitted to go into the water.

Mr. CRAMER. That is what I have tried to say to the gentleman, that where there are other discharges permitted into intrastate waters by the States, it does not make sense to control this aspect of it until they control the entire pollution problem.

Mr. HARSHA. There was considerable question as to whether or not the discharge from private sources was in fact a part of this program, or to any degree, and that is why we put this provision in.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman, this will cause no problem of pollution in my opinion in those areas where they are not presently controlled by the State.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. I think this is an important legislative record, and I understand the phrase "all other sources" is not predicated upon jurisdiction——

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. But, is predicated upon the sources of discharge.

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I rise in support of the pending bill, H.R. 4148, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1967. I urge its approval.

I want to commend my colleagues on the committee for this piece of legislation. It is farsighted legislation. It breaks new ground.

Particularly I want to call attention to section 2 which adds an entirely new section to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The new section deals with the control of pollution by oil and other matter. This is a far-reaching provision—a strong provision. By any standard, it is a tough provision. If we err, I think it would have to be said that we err on the side of strength.

This provision with respect to oil pollution goes much farther than we have ever gone before. It provides stiff penalties for negligent pollution of the shores or waters or beaches of this country. Further, it establishes direct responsibilities for swift action to clean up these spills.

It makes those who pollute responsible for cleaning up the damage that they cause. It creates a machinery for the Federal Government to conduct the cleanup operation expeditiously if the polluter does not have the technical capability to do it. But in this case it places the financial burden of the cleanup on the polluter if his actions were either willful or negligent.

In addition, it provides rather stringent civil penalties to be imposed upon the willful or negligent polluter.

The recognition of oil and other hazardous matter as potentially serious water pollutants is not new. As long ago as 1886 the Congress recognized the need to control discharges in navigable waters in New York Harbor, and in 1899 the Congress enacted the Refuse Act, administered by the Corps of Engineers, to apply to both vessels and shore-based facilities with respect to almost every discharge into navigable waters except that flowing from streets and sewers. The need for control of oil was specifically recognized in the Oil Pollution Act of 1924.

However, several recent instances such as the breakup of the tanker, *Torrey Canyon*, off the coast of England and the misfortune of the SS *Ocean Eagle* off the Puerto Rican coast, and most recently the despoliation of California beaches by oil from an offshore drilling rig, have indicated to us that we need the capacity to do much more than the Oil Pollution Act of 1924 permits.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, with great pleasure I yield to my colleague.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. As the gentleman knows and as other members of the committee know, I have been very much concerned about this problem because Santa Barbara is in my congressional district.

Almost a year ago I introduced a bill very similar to the one that has now been approved by your committee and again this year I introduced a similar bill.

At this time I would like to voice my complete support for the bill now before us and commend the committee and thank all the members of that committee for their good judgment in bringing this bill before us today.

Mr. WRIGHT. I wish to express my appreciation, and I am sure that of the entire committee, not only for the comments made on the floor today by our distinguished colleague from California (Mr. TEAGUE), but for his constructive contributions and his longstanding interest in this matter evidenced by his frequent appearances before our committee when we were considering these bills. He has indeed made significant contributions to the considerations of the committee, and much that is in this bill has been influenced by the interest expressed by the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE).

The Oil Pollution Act of 1924 does not adequately meet present day needs. That Act applies only to discharges and to spills that are caused by gross negligence or willful conduct. It applies only to vessels. It does not apply to spills from fixed installations, either onshore or offshore, such as pipelines, refineries, manufacturing plants of various types and other kinds of industrial activities that use and store large quantities of oil. The Oil Pollution Act of 1924 is confined solely to oil spillage. It provides no protection whatever against other potentially hazardous substances, of which there are many, as the gentleman from Florida has pointed out, more than 200 of which have already been officially identified. In short, we believe that H.R. 4148 does effectively deal with this serious problem and plug up the gaps that were left in the Oil Pollution Act of 1924.

This legislation addresses itself not only to the prevention of such disasters but also to the methods of cleaning them up and abating them once they have occurred, as regrettably they will occur, in such a way as to prevent further ecological damage and impairment of environment.

In the area of oil and other hazardous pollutants, the bill before us applies to discharges of oil and other hazardous and harmful matter, which is very broadly defined in the bill, into the navigable waters, the contiguous zone, and the high seas from vessels, and it applies to discharges from both onshore and offshore facilities.

The bill requires that immediate notice be given of all discharges of these substances in any substantial quantity by individuals in charge of a vessel or onshore or offshore facility. It requires that such notice be given either to the Secretary of the Interior or to the Coast Guard. This, of course, permits immediate remedial action. It allows us to accomplish the appropriate steps to remove the discharged oil or matter as expeditiously as possible. The bill provides penalties up to $5,000 or 1 year in prison or both for failure to comply with this notification requirement.

The bill strictly prohibits the discharges of oil and matter from vessels except in emergency situations or except where it is permitted by international convention. It establishes civil penalties for violations of this section in an amount up to $10,000 if the discharge was willful or negligent.

It directs that the United States remove or arrange for the removal of any oil or matter that is discharged into any water or onto any shoreline or beach when, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, such discharged oil or matter presents an actual or threatened pollution hazard. The United States would exercise this authority, of course, only if it is determined that the owner or the operator of the vessel or facility has not made adequate arrangements to complete the removal of the oil or the other hazardous matter as required by the bill.

The bill authorizes the United States to remove or destroy a vessel in the navigable waters when a marine disaster creates a substantial pollution threat to the United States.

In those cases the cost of removing the vessel would be levied against the vessel, its cargo, and the owner or operator of the vessel where it can be established that the negligent operation of the vessel caused or contributed to the marine disaster.

The bill requires the owner or operator of such a vessel or of an onshore or offshore facility to remove the discharged oil or other harmful matter immediately, or to pay for the cost of removal up to the limits of liability provided in the bill if the United States takes that action.

The bill does provide for limitations of liability to the United States for the cost of removing or cleaning up. In the case of a vessel discharging oil or pollution into the water, the maximum limit of liability is $10 million or $100 per gross registered ton, whichever is the lesser. This is susbtantially more than our experience thus far has indicated that any cleanup has cost, and we believe by reason of this limitation that we have adequately protected the United States.

The committee heard in its hearings representatives of the insurance industry, some of whom came all the way from Great Britain to testify for us. Those representatives of groups insuring some 80 percent of the free world's shipping tonnage discussed with us their thoughts as to what the maximum insurable liability would be. We have tried to take their knowledgeable testimony into account.

With regard to onshore and offshore facilities—fixed installations as distinguished from moving vessels—the bill provides an $8 million maximum liability limit for costs assumed by the United States in cleaning up the spills. This was a particularly difficult and in some respects a very delicate determination. Obviously it is much too high for most situations encompassed in the scope of the bill. The committee is conscious of the fact that when we begin to apply a liability upon onshore facilities that may spill various pollutants into navigable waters of the United States, then we apply that liability against almost countless numbers of large and small enterprises that exist on the banks of the small streams that flow into the navigable waters of the United States.

I would imagine that, in almost any congressional district represented here, there would be several hundred enterprises, large or small, which would come under the liability provided in this bill. Therefore, so as not to provide an unworkable or an unnatural liability upon a relatively small business institution, we provided in the bill that the Secretary of the Interior shall establish by regulation, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the Small Business Administrator, reasonable and equitable classifications of onshore facilities and activities, and that he will then apply to such classifications differing limits of liability, which in many cases will be very considerably less than $8 million.

Everyone can understand that for many thousands of businesses it would just be absolutely impossible for them to gain any sort of indemnification through insurance or otherwise for a loss up to $8 million. Therefore, it is anticipated by the committee that classifications would take into account the type and size of the businesses involved as well as their capacity to inflict pollution damage.

The bill establishes a $20 million revolving fund which will be discussed at greater length by our colleague from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD)—who incidentally has probably visited more oil spills personally than any other Member of this

House. This $20 million revolving fund will allow the President to delegate the authorities to perform an immediate cleanup if it is necessary for the Government to act before waiting until it becomes a serious hazard to health and property.

The bill requires proof of financial responsibility for all vessels over 100 gross registered tons and for barges of equivalent size, which would become effective 1 year after the enactment of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, as one who has fought for effective pollution control legislation for years, I believe this is a long step forward.

As regards oil pollution and pollution by other hazardous substances, this is a landmark piece of legislation. There can be no doubt that it is strong legislation, very strong legislation.

As I said earlier, if we err then we err on the side of strength and on the side of protecting the United States and the people of the United States.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield with great pleasure to a distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Harsha).

Mr. HARSHA. I rise at this time to ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas a series of questions in order that we may make some legislative history.

As the gentleman knows, section 17 deals not only with the problem of oil and oil pollution, but also with the problem of hazardous matter. In that relation I should like to ask the gentleman: Is it intended that section 17 of the act will in any way permit the Secretary to list substances and concentrations in any orders defining "matter," to permit the Federal Government to bring pressure on any person to discourage him from discharging substances, where such substances, concentrations and discharges are within the limits of the water quality standards of the appropriate State?

Mr. WRIGHT. In answer to the gentleman, I would say section 17 is in no way intended to alter the State's water quality standards or its enforcement of them. If there is a situation in which a material which becomes classified as "matter" under section 17 is officially permitted to be discharged under the State's enforcement program, then obviously the State's determination in this instance would be controlling. The intent of this legislation is to provide a much needed tool to combat the effects of sudden spills which, if unreported, might cause serious damage and which must be cleaned up in order to preserve our waters.

Mr. HARSHA. I think the gentleman. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. May I ask the gentleman this question: Is it intended that any action will be taken against any person for failure to report a discharge under section 17(b) where the substance discharged has not previously been listed in an order promulgated under administrative hearing processes as presenting an imminent and substantial hazard to public health or welfare?

Mr. WRIGHT. The answer to that question is "No." Obviously, until such time as the Secretary promulgates regulations, as clearly contemplated in the bill and directed in the committee report, on page 9 of that report, no person could be expected to know what material would be included on the Secretary's list as hazardous matter, and consequently no prosecution under section 17(b) relating to "matter" as distinguished from oil could be undertaken prior to the publication of the Secretary's list.

As the gentleman is quite well aware, we have been extremely broad in our definition of what constitutes "matter." I might refer to the bill, which defines "matter" as meaning any substance of any description or origin which, when discharged into the navigable waters in substantial quantities, presents, in the judgment of the Secretary, an imminent and substantial hazard to public health or welfare.

Now, there are certain substances exempted by specific reference from this definition, but the definition of course is so very broad that the committee thought it necessary to take note in the committee report, as it does on page 9, of the expectation that the Secretary shall with care compile a specific listing of what constitutes harmful matter.

The committee report declares that the Secretary will be expected to publish a list from time to time of the types of substances included in this definition in order to inform the public in accordance with standard administrative procedures. So, until the Secretary has done that, of course, no prosecutions under that section could be undertaken.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman. One final question. Under the provisions of section 11(b) which requires State certification prior to the issuance of a Federal permit, is it not possible that a State, for reasons other than water pollution, may refuse to grant such certification or simply fail to act upon it? If so, what could the applicant do?

Mr. WRIGHT. This question was commented upon by the gentleman from Florida a bit earlier, and I think I would rest upon his answer. It is possible that this particular question may be subject to an amendment tomorrow, and pending that time I think I would not want to make any further comment on the question.

Mr. HARSHA. Would the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Edmondson) for some clarification?

Mr. WRIGHT. I do yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, who is extremely knowledgeable on this question of certification.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the committee was interested in discussing this question and the staff conceded there was a possibility that this could happen, but it felt there would be a relatively remote possibility of it happening over any extended period of time. It is assumed, I think, in connection with this bill that all of the people involved in connection with this pollution control would be acting in good faith. Particularly I think it is a sound assumption that your States and the Federal Government will act in good faith throughout.

However, if the applicant has reason to feel that his rights have been interfered with the judicial procedures available now in the State courts to require action by the State would be available to the applicant. In a case where the Secretary is the certifying authority, the Federal courts would be available to the applicant. Once this act becomes law, it is contemplated that the entire statute will be construed in pari materia.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNGATE. Would the gentleman answer this question? Could I inquire of the gentleman, in cases where the State or interstate agencies have authority to certify the conditions of discharge in navigable waters, would certification by the Secretary of the Interior also be required?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The only requirement, if the gentleman will yield, as I understand it, is the Federal certification would be in a situation in which the State did not have standards established and a certifying procedure itself.

Mr. HUNGATE. Would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNGATE. I am referring to the provision on page 74 of the bill, line 18, where it says:

> Except that (1) if any affected State or the Secretary, if his certification is involved, after notice, which shall be given by such Federal agency, makes written objection, such certification may not be so accepted . . .

That does not mean that the Secretary of the Interior then could object in a situation where the State had made its certification, does it?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would not construe it that way. I would think the alternative that is stated here would be consistent in the situation, that if the affected States had given certification, that that would be the route you would follow. And, if you had a Secretary's certification involved in it you would then be confronted with the regular procedure.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This bill does not provide for the creation of a new commission or board, does it?

I have not been able to discover such language in it.

Mr. WRIGHT. The bill provides for the creation of no new commission, no new board, no new agency. In one instance it changes the name of an existing agency.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. I should like to say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that this is strong legislation. It is broad in its application, stringent in its prohibitions. I believe that it will provide a very useful adjunct to that legislation already existing on the books in our continuing battle to clean up and purify the streams and waters of the United States, and prevent their further defilement.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA).

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4148. The importance of this legislation may be seen from the number of activities which it covers and the broadness of its scope. This legislation deals with offshore facilities, onshore facilities, acid mine drainage, lake pollution, education and training of water quality control personnel, and licensing and permit considerations. As such, it affects in some degree nearly every family in the United States. It goes to nearly every activity—government or private, State or Federal, civilian or military.

Legislation that comes to grips with so many problems in so many diverse areas is not simple. There are many difficult problems that have been dealt with in the attempt to protect the quality of our waters.

Mr. Chairman, simple solutions to difficult problems are extremely rare if they exist at all. We would be presumptuous if we claimed that the bill prepared by the committee provides a set of simple solutions, because, Mr. Chairman, we have dealt with difficult problems. The legislation before the House was arrived at after much difficulty and study over the last year and a half. I feel confident that the solutions that we have proposed are the best that we can propose at this time, and, therefore, urge the Members to support the bill, H.R. 4148, as presented by the committee.

In doing so, Mr. Chairman, I should like to invite the attention of the Members to the very fine and diligent work that has been done by the members and the staff of the committee in preparing this legislation. I think that all Members will agree, when they have had an opportunity to study the provisions of this bill, that it reflects a high degree of professional competence upon the part of the staff and of real diligence upon the part of the members.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio yielding, so that I may take just a moment or two to congratulate the Committee on Public Works, on which I had the pleasure of serving for some 7 years before beginning my present committee assignment, on bringing out this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, my particular interest in this legislation, as some of the members of the committee will recall, relates to the growing national problem with reference to thermal discharges or cooling waters being released from steam-power plants, whether fired by fossil fuels or fired by nuclear energy.

I am especially interested, Mr. Chairman, in section 11(b) of the bill now pending before us.

It seems to me that this section does exactly what ought to be done now in this area of concern in that it does reach toward a national solution to what is rapidly becoming a national problem.

As I understand section 11(b), it will require that an applicant for a Federal license or permit for a facility which may discharge cooling waters into the navigable waters of the United States must first provide the Federal agency issuing a license or permit in connection with that facility, with a certification from the affected State or States, or interstate water pollution control agency, that the activity will be conducted in a manner that will not reduce the quality of the waters below applicable water quality standards.

I would like to say to the gentleman, if he will permit me to, that this has become a matter of serious concern in my own State and in my own congressional district where a nuclear powerplant is in the preconstruction stage. And, if anyone on the committee has wondered whether or not the States would be responsible for moving into this field, I can report to the committee that the New York State Water Resources Commission has been holding public hearings around our State on its tentative criteria in this field of thermal discharge, or thermal pollution. It is important also to know that, in adopting those tentative criteria, our State water resources commission did, generally speaking, accept the recommendations as made in this area last fall by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration after making a study of the problem.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman. I certainly want to commend the gentleman on his views in this particular field. The committee listened with a great deal of interest to his testimony, and gave very serious consideration to his views. The gentleman made very significant contributions toward these matters during the past leading to the formation of this legislation, as he always did when he served on the committee several years ago.

Mr. ROBISON. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Chairman, on page 8 of the report reference is made to the question of whether or not separate certificates ought to be required, both at the time of an applicant applying for and obtaining a Federal construction permit, and then later on at the time that same applicant applies for a Federal permit to operate and maintain the plant as now constructed.

On page 8 of the committee report it is stated:

> Based on testimony by the Commission, the committee has concluded that the very different character of the two applications, the long period of time that elapses between their issuance, and the uncertainty as to the finality of plans at the construction license stage, all support the requirements for certification with respect to both applications.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I would merely like to take this moment to encourage the Committee of the Whole, and the Members of the House in their respective wisdom, to retain this requirement, if a question should arise on this, not only just for the reasons that are stated in the committee report, but, it seems to me, for one more reason, which is that as research goes forward in this field, about which we know all too little yet, we may well learn a great deal more about thermal pollution and the effects of thermal discharges than we do now. As 3 or 4 years may elapse between the time of a construction permit being granted for a nuclear powerplant, and then the operational permit being granted for that plant, it would be well for the Committee to hold intact this language as it is in the bill, and as mentioned in the report, requiring certification in both separate instances.

Mr. HARSHA. As the gentleman points out, it is precisely for these reasons that we collaborated on this, and that the committee put that provision in the bill.

However, I am not at all saying that this is a matter that is not under discussion at the present time, and I cannot advise the gentleman as to whether or not any amendments will be offered to that particular effect.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On the point that my colleague from New York raised, on two certifications, or whatever number they might be, whenever there is a license applied for, let me say first to my colleague, of which I am sure he is aware, this applies to other matters other than just steamplant power generating facilities, it applies to anything where a license is required. Nevertheless, while I share the concern of the gentleman on the adequacy of those standards, and as the gentleman has pointed out, that there is an intervening lapse of time of maybe 3 or 4 years between a construction license and an operating license in the case of a powerplant with a thermal discharge, I believe we have got to give careful consideration to what burden we are placing on all these facilities.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, our power needs, for example, are doubling every decade in this country. In our own State of New York, and in many other States, I would say to my colleagues, we are seeing steam generating plants, as the gentleman has pointed out, either fossil fueled or atomic fueled, under construction, and some coming on the line in operation.

Now, should there be a change in water quality standards in the intervening, shall we say 4 years, between the time when the construction license is granted and when the application is made for an operating license, we could place a very serious burden upon this type of generating facility. And not only that, in the case of public authorities in this field, as we have in the State of New York, we could jeopardize that authority's ability to finance these needed plants.

So I say to the gentleman, that I share his concern in this matter, and I share it concerning these two times of construction and operation, but also that we not place a burden upon these facilities that they will be unable to meet, or have an adverse influence upon the confidence of those who are investing in them.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ZWACH).

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4148. Not only does this bill provide for a method of dealing with oil pollutants, it also has a small section authorizing research on other pollutants affecting our inland lakes.

My home State happens to have about one-seventh of the entire U.S. total of inland lakes. We are and have been proud of them and until recently, have been able to cope with siltation and eutrophication problems. Now with much greater use of these lakes for recreational and residential purposes, coupled with the wash-in of surrounding soils or fertilizer, some new methods must be developed to return these lakes to beautiful, cold water bodies. This research can be done by contracts from the Secretary to public or private groups or individuals.

This condition must be prevalent in most of our Nation's 100,000 lakes. It is a problem that should no longer be delayed. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this legislation, and I wish to commend my colleagues on the Public Works Committee and the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee for the amount of time they have given to this problem of water pollution and oil pollution, and to commend them for the legislation that is before us today.

I especially wish to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) for his statement concerning this vital problem of oil pollution. Mr. WRIGHT discussed the controls that we will have in the future, the responsibilities that oil carriers do have to the public and to the beaches, the fact that installations must also concern themselves with precautions and be prepared to take responsibility for accidents that do occur.

But there is also the problem, Mr. Chairman, from the viewpoint of those who are on the beach, the ones who will have the oil on their sand, killing their shellfish and their fish, where they do not know in which direction to point the blame. The vessels are to be responsible, but what about the ship that passes in the night. All too often in recent years we have found instances where early one morning the Coast Guard or a commercial fisherman will report a huge oil slick off the coast coming toward the shore of some seaside resort. And no one knows where it came from for sure. They are not sure which vessels had passed by recently. Therefore, we must have something in addition besides the regulations that will charge certain vessels or installations that have dumped the oil with the responsibility of paying for the cleanup.

So I am very happy, Mr. Chairman, that in this legislation there is established a revolving fund of $20 million which will be used in the cleanup of these oil spillages. Of course, we know that where blame can be fixed, the expense of the cleanup will be paid back and that will keep the fund in an ongoing basis, because it is expected that the appropriation will be a one-time appropriation. It will also protect the vital beaches so the economy of an entire area will not be ruined because of an oil spillage when the Coast Guard, the Department of the Interior, or the Government does not know in which direction to point in fixing the blame. We must be prepared to take quick action against these spillages.

In 1967, when the first major oil crisis came with the crackup of the *Torrey Canyon* off the coast of England, it was seen at that time that even though work was begun immediately to try to combat the oil, much of it hit the beaches. It went into the harbors. It fouled the shoreline. About a month and a half after that occurrence I visited the area, and found that although the beaches were clean, there were several problems that this seaside area still had. First, at that time we did not have enough research to know what kind of materials to use, and there was a kerosene base used in the dispersals. That left a tremendous kerosene odor along the beachfront area.

We found also that there were detergents used in this dispersal which, in many instances, caused shellfish and other fish to be ruined and sport fishing to be stopped for many years in the area.

In one town after another, whether it were Port Land's End, or St. Ives, we found the people concerned about the economic future of their area. They were telling the people in London and around England that the beaches were cleaned up now that summer was coming. Come and visit us. And, naturally, spend your money here. But they found that because of the uncertainty, because the people in the country did not want to take a chance on those beaches being clean, many of them, in the case of the village of St. Ives, had its summer economy damaged to the tune of 90 percent of the previous year's income. The Ocean Eagle, which the gentleman from Massachusetts discussed a moment ago, pointed out the need for a program. We are very happy that a program is now being implemented which we hope will soon be approved by the President when it is presented to him so that the Coast Guard will have the responsibility and the authority to move quickly in this area and be able to clean up our beaches. There are many other areas of oil pollution where we cannot depend on saying, "We will have the person who caused it pay for it."

Many of us found to our surprise just a year or so ago that around the coastline of the United States there are 103 known oil tankers—and their position is known—that had been sunk during World War II. We are not certain whether many of these tankers still contain oil. We feel some of them probably do. Now it is approximately 20 years later, and what would we do if these tankers should burst, as has been suspected in the past couple of years, and the oil from a World War II tanker should come to the shore?

Mr. Chairman, with this section on the revolving fund, we can be certain the economy of our seashore areas will remain constant and we will have protection of the Coast Guard, and the Coast Guard will be ready and willing to move so we can keep the economy of these vital resort areas producing revenues, which will help taxpayers all over the country.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain the bill will pass. I hope it will pass unanimously. I commend all the members of the subcommittee for bringing this fine legislation before the House.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I think this committee and the House Members all are indebted to the gentleman from New Jersey for his pronounced interest in the matter of pollution of the beaches and shores of this and other countries. I am certain there is no Member of Congress who has more diligently pursued the effort to clean up the beaches of the country and to prevent insofar as possible further spillages. The gentleman from New Jersey has personally visited many places throughout the world, including Great Britain and Puerto Rico and places off the coast of New Jersey and elsewhere, in his vital interest in this matter.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary to elaborate on what has already been stated in the presentation of the bill, other than to say I believe it is very timely.

I do want to extend to the committee members as a Californian my personal appreciation for the time they have given to the very unique problem that occurred off the coast of Santa Barbara. I think what has occurred off the coast of California has, in fact, focused national attention on a major problem—that of maintaining some semblance of environmental control and man's impact in this regard.

I also compliment the gentleman from Florida in particular for advancing the idea of the necessity of developing a training program in order to implement that which is legislated here at the national level. Time and time again as we have listened to the testimony before our committee, as we would legislate the necessary authorizational funds, we would find we would not have the administrative and sanitation engineering competency, out at the grassroots level, that could carry out the program as initially intended by the Congress of the United States. So I believe this program which will give substance to an adequate training program will have a tremendous impact on the ultimate success and objectives of this legislation. I strongly support its passage.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) such time as he may consume.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4148, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969.

There is one particular portion of this act which I would especially like to call to the attention of my colleagues. That is section 5(g) which reads:

> The Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts with, or make grants to, public or private agencies and organizations and individuals for the purpose of developing and demonstrating new or improved methods for the prevention, removal and control of natural or manmade pollution in lakes, including the undesirable effects of nutrients and vegetation.

Mr. Chairman, there are over 100,000 lakes in the United States. In Wisconsin alone we have 8,676 lakes which cover a total of 1,138,374 acres. I think it is important to remember that 97.2 percent of all the water on earth is contained in the oceans. The ice caps and glaciers contain 2.15 percent. The remainder—only 0.65 percent of all the water on the surface and underground—is available to man for drinking, cooking, and such purposes necessary to sustain him and enrich his life. Put in this perspective, our inland lake resources become vitally important.

While the demand and need for water pollution control is growing money committed to cleaning the Nation's water resources does not match the priority of the job. And our lack of complete knowledge of the process of lake eutrophication and its contributing factors and in treatment of the situation, makes research and demonstration projects mandatory if our money is to be well spent and our fresh water resources enhanced.

Without the proper research and demonstration for control of pollution in lakes, we could very well spend large sums of money, and still not have the job done.

This is the importance of section 5(g) of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I first introduced this provision as a separate bill in August 1967. Review of that bill by the Department of the Interior resulted in a new bill, H.R. 13312, which was supported by the Secretary and subsequently incorporated into the 1968 Omnibus Water Pollution Control Amendments. Although differences existed between the House and Senate on portions of the omnibus bill, both bodies approved the clean lakes provision.

Once again we have an omnibus water pollution control bill before us, and once again it includes the "clean lakes" provision.

Every year that passes makes our task more difficult and more demanding. I strongly urge favorable action on this bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN).

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, we are considering legislation today which deals with the complexities of water pollution control. The Santa Barbara oil spill and other similar disasters have demonstrated the urgent need for improved laws in the control of water pollution. H.R. 4148, the Water Quality Improvement Act, is designed to respond to these particular needs in a number of ways. The bill makes the owner or operator of a vessel liable for oil discharge or spillage cleanup costs up to $10 million or $100 per gross ton. Criminal penalties would be imposed against individuals operationally responsible for vessels, who fail to promptly report a discharge of oil or other polluting matter to the Coast Guard or Secretary of the Interior. The bill also provides for civil penalties against vessel owners or operators in case of willful or negligent discharge and it authorizes the Government to clean up the damage to beaches from pollution regardless of source, providing for appropriate reimbursement by the offending business.

Mr. Chairman, the fact that oil is a serious water pollutant is clearly evident. From January 1968 through February 1969, a period of 14 months, the Great Lakes witnessed a total of 21 oil spills. In addition to its contamination of water, shoreline, and beaches, oil often has severe effects on fish and wildlife, shellfish, and recreation. The use of harmful chemicals to treat oil spills may in themselves, produce severe ecological damage.

In addition to oil, the discharge of untreated sewage from vessels and other installations is another major source of pollution. Installation of preventive devices for effective sewage treatment will be necessary if this bill is enacted. Several million dollars will also be channeled into extensive research, development, and training programs to achieve maximum effectiveness in the operation of our water quality control facilities.

Clean water should be a right of every U.S. citizen. It is the duty of the Government to maintain and protect this right. Unfortunately, the Government is not sufficiently protecting or maintaining this right. Recreational, commercial, and industrial interests have been severely impaired by the lack of adequate water pollution control throughout the Nation.

The Great Lakes area, in 1966, conducted over one-fourth of the Nation's manufacturing activity. Projected estimates for the Great Lakes area predict a doubling of the population within 50 years, with industrial activity increasing at least fourfold, if not more. Such forecasts are indicative of the immediate steps that must be taken to improve and maintain our water resources. A genuine commitment to adequate preventive laws and sufficient funding so that new technological discoveries can be applied to all our Nation's waterways, is essential if we expect to achieve proper results. The people of Cleveland have expressed their wholehearted support for antipollution efforts by recently approving a $100 million bond issue to improve the water quality of Lake Erie.

An amendment will be offered calling for the establishment of a national pollution disaster fund to respond to the specific needs of the Great Lakes and other environmental disaster areas. The amendment, to be offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK), is almost identical to legislation we introduced earlier this year along with several other Members of the House. The amendment authorizes an appropriation of $100 million for the establishment of a pollution disaster fund within the Treasury Department to provide corrective relief to those areas in the Great Lakes, the Continental Shelf, or the United States, which are in environmental crises. To determine how these moneys are to be allocated, a seven-man Commission would be set up, composed of four experts in the field of biology, ecology, and conservation, and three representatives of the general public.

It is generally acknowledged that Lake Erie is one of the most severely polluted waterways in this country. This amendment will assist in upgrading the quality of its water as well as providing careful attention to the changing environmental conditions affecting the ecology of the water. It is the duty of this Congress to revive not only Lake Erie, but also our other water resources and to make them, once again, enjoyable and usable areas for the citizens of the United States. This amendment and the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 deserve our enthusiastic support.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY), a member of the committee.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4148, a great legislative blow at dirty water and stream pollution. This legislation is a real prescription for a healthier nation and its people.

Mr. Chairman, for years our scientific and technical expertise was not sufficient to find ways of eliminating the pollution of our lakes, streams, and rivers. We did not know as much about industrial waste and sewerage disposal plants.

Thanks to our great American know-how, we have the methods but not enough money. States, local communities, and private industry can not do the job alone. They must have help.

For every Federal dollar we spend we will see many times more in non-Federal money invested in clean water. Without the Federal money being available as seed money, the other sources will not be moved to invest. This is why we must continue the great work started by the Congress.

We must find ways of attaining the funds for this program.

The bill is another step forward. It brings in to full pollution control for the first time—oil spillage and sewage from oil wells as well as thermal pollution. It continues needed and necessary research in all fields affecting polluted water. Coming from southern Illinois where we have the Ohio River on one side of my district and the Mississippi on the other, with four major river basins in between, we certainly know how difficult it is to find enough funds to stop pollution. With the help of the Federal Government we are now doing the job. I want to commend our great chairman of the full Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FALLON), the outstanding chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), all the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. I also want to thank our outstanding general counsel of the committee, Mr. Sullivan for his untiring efforts. It is a real privilege to serve on this important committee of the House and to be able to recommend to my colleagues the enactment of this most important bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4148, and I want to express my personal appreciation to the very able chairman of our full committee and several subcommittee chairmen who have joined in working on this bill, along with, I believe, one of the most able staffs in the Capitol—the staff of the Public Works Committee operation.

The bill, H.R. 4148, does a number of things which seems to me to be long overdue.

One of the things it endeavors to do is to promote a much better program of cooperation among the Federal agencies in the control of pollution. One of the strange and embarrassing things about the pollution problem which exists in many areas is that the Federal Government itself has sometimes been a culprit with considerable responsibility for the pollution problem which is present. This is something that subsections 11(a) and 11(b) endeavor to deal with.

Subsection 11(a) requires that every Federal agency having jurisdiction over any real property or facility of any kind shall, within available appropriations and consistent with the interests of the United States, insure compliance with applicable water quality standards. This section puts into law what is now contained in an executive order. It deals directly with procedures for control of pollution caused by the administration or actual operation, either directly or by contract, of federally held real property or facilities.

In attempting to insure that Federal facilities will be in compliance with the applicable water quality standards, the problems to be considered, the priorities to be assessed, and the relative values and public interests to be weighed, are very much akin to the problems, priorities, and interests which must be taken into account by a State when it is establishing water quality standards for a given area, by industries when they are making decisions on how and where they will expand capital investment, and by local governments in attempting to achieve a balance among health and welfare, economic development potential, and supportable tax structure.

The Federal Government must allocate its available tax revenues among a great many priorities. Subsection 11(a) is designed to insure that the maximum extent possible, the Federal Government will conduct its own operations in a manner to control and prevent water pollution.

To further insure that the Federal Government will cooperate to the maximum extent possible with the States in achieving compliance with water quality standards, subsection 11(b) requires that any applicant for a license or permit from a Federal agency when the activity involved will discharge into the navigable waters must first obtain from the State or States involved a certification that the operation of the activity will not reduce the quality of the water below the State's water quality standards.

There are some instances in which a State or interstate agency may at least for the present not have the authority to issue the certification and there are other instances in which water quality standards are issued by the Secretary. In both cases, the Secretary will provide the required certification. Where licenses or permits are required for more than one Federal agency for the same activity, the certification obtained for the first license involved will be sufficient for the succeeding licenses and permits. This is to insure that neither the applicant nor the State be burdened with duplicating permits for a single activity. However, if either the Secretary or a State has reason to believe the original certificate is not sufficient for succeeding purposes, it may make its objections known and require additional certification.

The ability to use an original certificate for a succeeding permit does not apply, however, to an applicant for an operating license or permit. This situation arises specifically with respect to nuclear generating plants where considerable time elapses between the issuance of the permits for the building of the plant and the operating license for its actual operation.

This time lag can be anywhere from 4 to 7 years, and construction plans upon which the construction permit is based are not always sufficiently precise to insure the kind of operation that is contemplated. Also, because of the length of time involved, external as well as engineering changes could occur, and we believe the additional safeguard of obtaining a second certification at the time the operating license is obtained is necessary.

A further safeguard has been written into this section to take care of the situation where actual physical construction of the facility itself has been started prior to enactment of this act. Actual physical construction means excavation or building. Property acquisition, construction of roads or similar preliminary activity would not satisfy the requirement for exemption from certification. In the case where the license or permit has already been issued, a 2-year period beginning with the date of enactment is granted and within that time the person having the permit is required to obtain the certification otherwise required. Two years seems an adequate time to bring the existing construction into conformance.

Renewals of licenses or premits which come within this section are considered to be new applications for the purposes of this act.

A wide variety of licenses and permits—construction, operating, and otherwise—are issued by various Federal agencies. Many of them involve activities or operations potentially affecting water quality. The purpose of subsection 11(b) is to provide reasonable assurance that no license or permit will be issued by a Federal agency for an activity that through inadequate planning or otherwise could in fact become a source of pollution.

The language of the legislation is intended to eliminate duplicating certification requirements, and to afford a safeguard against too broad a use of the single certification.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield at this time to my good friend and one of the most respected Members of the House, the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank my friend for yielding.

On page 8 of the report, the second paragraph from the bottom, starting with the words "the Atomic Energy Commission has informed the committee," there are outlined a number of individuals and facilities which are licensed by the Commission to possess and use limited quantities of nuclear materials that might, in minute quantities, be disposed of through a waste disposal system. It is said, "It is not intended that subsection 11(b) apply to these specific types of licenses or permits."

I am a little concerned that the delineation of just those few entities might preclude others in the same category, so I will ask the chairman of the committee, Mr. FALLON, at this time a question with relation to the clarification of this part of the report.

My question is this: Am I correct in believing that the committee intended to exempt from subsection 11(b) coverage activities under AEC license not involving discharges directly into navigable waters, and not just those activities specifically identified in the report on H.R. 4148, on page 8?

Mr. FALLON. I say to my distinguished colleague that he is correct. The language on page 8 of the committee report concerning the inapplicability of subsection 11(b) to certain AEC materials licenses was intended to be illustrative, not selective or exhaustive. Where the discharge from the licensed activity will be in minute amounts and will not be disposed of directly into navigable waters, the license for any such activity is not subject to the subsection's requirements.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman very much for that clarification.

I want to say, I think this is a good

bill, and I am supporting it. I am very much interested in control of water pollution, and I appreciate particularly the handling of the problem as a result of the oil spillage in the Santa Barbara channel off the coast of California.

There are one or two other little points in the bill I may want to discuss tomorrow, during the amending period. Otherwise. I think it is a very good bill and I intend to support it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman from California.

May I say, on behalf of the entire Committee on Public Works, we deeply appreciate the manner in which the gentleman from California, as the chairman of one of the major joint committees of the Congress, has brought to the committee's attention in detail questions which that committee which he heads has raised concerning this legislation.

I think that the presentation that was made to our committee on this subject by the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) has been most helpful to an understanding of the problems of the Atomic Energy Commission by our committee. I am hopeful that it will be possible to work out tomorrow, when we get to the stage of considering amendments under the 5-minute rule to this bill, language that will be acceptable to the gentleman and his committee in connection with sections 11(a) and 11(b), which I understand created most of the concern in his committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his interest and mention to the House the fact that the gentleman from Oklahoma is now the latest member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and rapidly becoming one of the valuable members of that committee. I do appreciate his assistance as well as the assistance of the staff of the Committee on Public Works as well as the chairman, the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman very much.

I might add that we have had made available to us an excellent summary legal analysis on the Federal-State jurisdiction with regard to regulating atomic energy. At the appropriate time, when we go back into the House, I intend to ask permission to have this document made a part of the RECORD. This is a very fine piece of work and something that is useful to all of the membership both as a part of the permanent RECORD and also for study for tomorrow in advance of the consideration of amendments in which the gentleman from California has expressed interest.

The material referred to follows:

SUMMARY LEGAL ANALYSIS ON FEDERAL AND STATE JURISDICTION TO REGULATE ATOMIC ENERGY

In examining the Federal-State relationships respecting the regulation of atomic energy, it is important to note the history of the various legislative enactments concerning atomic energy. Under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946,[1] the Nation's first such legislation, atomic energy was enveloped in an almost air-tight Government monopoly. The possession, use, transfer, export, import, etc., of source, byproduct and fissionable materials[2] were subject to pervasive Atomic Energy Commission regulatory controls. Moreover, except in certain enumerated and very limited circumstances, facilities for the production of fissionable material (e.g., nuclear reactors) could not be owned by anyone (including agencies and departments of the Federal Government) other than the AEC,[3] and under no circumstances could there be ownership of fissionable materials by anyone other than the AEC.[4] The Act wrought modifications of the patent system unprecedented in American history—certain inventions and discoveries pertaining to atomic energy were removed entirely from the regular patent system,[5] and certain others, while patentable, were subject to compulsory licensing if found by the Commission to be affected with the public interest and such licensing was "necessary to effectuate the policies and purposes of this Act."[6]

Certain of these rigid controls were relaxed at the time of the passage of the superseding Atomic Energy Act of 1954,[7] but even so, it can be said that, with respect to the Commission's assigned areas of responsibility, few other statutes confer upon an executive agency the broad powers with which the AEC is endowed by the Act's terms. The patent provisions of the 1954 Act, while somewhat less far-reaching than those which existed under the 1946 Act, represent marked departures from the normal patent system in terms of the controls which they vest in the AEC over atomic energy inventions and discoveries. The earlier Act's virtual prohibition against private ownership of "utilization facilities" (e.g., nuclear power reactors) was removed with passage of the 1954 Act;[8] however, it was not until a Congressional enactment as recent as 1964[9] that private ownership of the fuels for such facilities (i.e., special nuclear material)[10] became permissible. Moreover, authority for the AEC to impose a comprehensive and detailed regulatory control scheme upon the possession, use, transfer, export, import, etc. of source, by-product and special nuclear material continues to reside with the Commission under the Act.[11] Absolutely no mention was made by Congress in the 1954 Act of a role for the states in the regulation of these materials, and except for one limited provision[12] not relevant to radiological considerations, no notice was taken of a role for the states in the regulation of nuclear power reactors.

As atomic industrial activity and the number of trained personnel grew in the years following passage of the 1954 Act, and as classification restrictions on atomic information were lifted, some states began to develop an interest in applying their general health and safety powers to the atomic activities being carried on within their borders. In that context, Congress was persuaded of the advisability of legislation offering to the states a role and thereby clarifying the respective roles of the AEC and the states under the Atomic Energy Act. For that primary purpose, Congress added Section 274 to the Act in 1959.[13] Under that section the Commission may relinquish to states, on a state-by-state basis, certain of its authority to regulate the use of reactor-produced isotopes, the source materials uranium and thorium, and small quantities[14] of special nuclear materials. (These materials collectively are referred to as agreement materials.) In order to relinquish any such authority the Commission must find that the state's regulatory program is adequate to protect the public health and safety and is compatible with the AEC's regulatory program. The Act specifically reserves certain areas to the Commission, such as regulation of the construction and operation of nuclear reactors (including the discharge of radioactive effluents from the facility site[15]), the export and import of agreement materials, and the ocean disposal of radioactive wastes. To date nineteen states have entered into agreements with the AEC to assume the regulatory responsibilities transferable under Section 274.[16]

If any shadow of a doubt existed prior to 1959 that Congress intended to preempt the regulation of atomic activities insofar as radiation protection is concerned, the abovementioned amendment should have dispelled that doubt. According to the House and Senate reports on the legislation which became Public Law 86–373,[17] it was the intention of that law to clarify the responsibilities of the Federal Government, on the one hand, and state and local governments, on the other, with respect to the regulation of byproduct, source and special nuclear materials in order to protect the health and safety from radiation hazards. The report states:

"It is not intended to leave any room for the exercise of dual or concurrent jurisdiction by States to control radiation hazards by regulating byproduct, source, or special nuclear materials. The intent is to have the material regulated and licensed either by the Commission, or by the State and local governments, but not by both. The bill is intended to encourage States to increase their knowledge and capacities, and to enter into agreements to assume regulatory responsibilities over such materials."[18]

The comprehensive controls over the various nuclear materials, devices (including weapons) and facilities which the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and its 1946 precursor lodged in the AEC; the paramount national interest in this highly sensitive and important field; the significant implications of these materials, devices, and facilities to public health and safety and the common defense and security; and Congress' utter silence in 1946 and 1954 on the role, if any, of the states in regulating the potential radiological hazards of source, byproduct and special nuclear materials—all of these quite clearly evidence a legislative intent to "occupy the field" to the exclusion of state regulation. If any further evidence were required of Congress' intention to preempt this field, the legislative history of Public Law 86–373 provides it in abundance—indeed, it fairly compels this conclusion. That Congress under the supremacy clause of the U.S. Constitution has the power to preempt an entire area of regulation with consequential suspension of state enactments touching thereon is well settled.[19]

Such published authorities as have considered the preemption question in the context of atomic energy unanimously agree that Congress has preempted substantially the whole field to the exclusion of the states except only state regulation pursuant to an agreement as provided in section 274.[20] For example, the Attorney General of Michigan concluded that:

"We are convinced that under the terms of the [Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended] viewed in the legislative history of the 1959 amendment and [in] light of "all that bears upon its purpose and meaning," Congress intended to place the exclusive and primary responsibility for regulation of radiation hazards for the protection of the public health and safety in the peaceful use of atomic energy; i.e., source, byproduct and special nuclear material as defined in the Act in the Atomic Energy Commission and that it has preempted this field of regulation, with provision for limited relinquishment thereof, under the terms of authorized agreements."[21]

The Attorney General of South Dakota similarly concluded that:

"It is my opinion that the Federal Government has preempted the field of protection of public health from the radiation hazards associated with atomic energy. 42 U.S.C.A. § 2012, 2014(c)."[22]

The New York State Bar Association's Committee on Atomic Energy, in a study of the agreement between the State of New York

---

Footnotes at end of article.

and the Atomic Energy Commission, came to the same conclusion. Its report stated:

"While the United States Supreme Court has never been required to determine whether the Atomic Energy Act has pre-empted the regulation of atomic activities for radiation protection purposes, it seems clear that Congress intended so to pre-empt, if not by the provisions of the 1954 Act, then, certainly by means of the Federal-state amendment in 1959. In the latter amendment, Congress came perhaps as close as it has ever come to stating expressly that a regulatory area has been pre-empted." [23]

This conclusion is particularly significant because the study stemmed from a provision in the agreement between the State of New York and the Commission which indicated that there were apparent differences of opinion between the Commission and the State as to the jurisdiction of each.

While, as noted above, the U.S. Supreme Court has not specifically ruled on the question of preemption under the Atomic Energy Act, it is significant to note that the two state courts before which the question has been raised both agreed that such preemption had occurred.[24] In addition, it is interesting to note that the National Association of Attorneys General has reviewed the law and the proposed transfer of regulatory responsibilities from the AEC to the states and has endorsed the program. On April 25, 1962, the Association adopted a resolution favoring transfer of regulatory responsibilities, the resolution reading in part: "Be it resolved . . . that all states are urged to accelerate the adoption of such legislation and the development of such programs as will permit the states to enter into agreements with the Atomic Energy Commission pursuant to P.L. 86–373." It is doubtful that any State's Attorney General would endorse such a program unless he was confident that the responsibility rested with the Federal Government and that it could be transferred to the states.

The American Bar Association has also endorsed a program of state assumption of atomic energy regulatory responsibilities from the Federal Government, as did the Governors' Conference in a resolution adopted on July 2, 1962. It might also be noted that such other organizations as The Council of State Governments and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States have approved the practice of a transfer of AEC regulatory responsibilities to the states, without any expression of concern that a constitutional issue exists in this connection.

Of course, it is not meant by any of the foregoing to suggest that the regulation of source, byproduct or special nuclear material, or utilization or production facilities, from other than the standpoint of *radiological* health and safety is without the authority of the states; nor is it meant to suggest that the regulation, including regulation of the radiological effects, of radioactive materials other than those controlled by the Atomic Energy Act is beyond the reach of the states except pursuant to a Section 274 agreement.[25]

There remains the question whether the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPC Act)[26] has the effect of vesting in the states any authority, by their participation in the setting of water quality standards, over the release of radioactive effluents, which had been preempted to the Federal Government by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 as amended. Radioactive effluents from AEC licensed facilities are discharged to waters as "interstate" by the FWPC Act.[27]

The terms of the FWPC Act, of themselves, do not speak expressly to the preemption question.[28] The FWPC Act contains no express provision relating to state authority to adopt water quality standards applicable to radioactive affluents, or to the Act's relationship to the Atomic Energy Act.[29] The legislative history of the 1965 amendments to the FWPC Act, which added the water quality standards provisions, indicates that no consideration was given to possible effects on the jurisdiction of the AEC under the Atomic Energy Act.

It appears quite clear, however, that the FWPC Act does not affect the AEC's preempted jurisdiction over radioactive effluents. The FWPC Act provides for the establishment of standards applicable to interstate waters which become effective only when approved by the Secretary of the Interior, if established by the state, or when promulgated by the Secretary in the absence of acceptable state standards. The standards thus promulgated by the Secretary are then used in the Federal enforcement proceedings authorized by the FWPC Act.

Nowhere does the FWPC Act speak in terms of *a grant of authority* to the states to set water quality standards. Prior to the passage of the 1965 amendments, which added water quality standard provisions to the Act, the states had power, pursuant to the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, to set water quality standards and to enforce them as to interstate waters within their boundaries.[30] In actuality, while at least three-quarters of the states had state legislation directing or permitting the establishment of water quality standards and/or stream classifications, not all these states had actually adopted standards. In the States which had adopted standards, both the content of the standards and the method of application varied. [31]

While, in theory, individual states could, on the basis of such standards, abate pollution in interstate waters within their boundaries, such action was not likely to be undertaken without the cooperation of other states involved in the pollution.[32]

If Federal abatement action were undertaken, a choice among, or determination of, standards to be used in arriving at abatement measures had to be made. Thus, the statutory pattern of the Federal Water Quality Act of 1965, now embodied in the FWPC Act, was to provide for the establishment of water quality standards consistent with the expressed purposes of the Act, to be achieved through review and approval, or promulgation by, the Secretary of the Interior, for use with respect to interstate waters. While the FWPC Act was intended to encourage the states to develop water quality standards initially, it did not grant them new authority; indeed, as noted above under the discussion of the states' reserved powers under the Tenth Amendment, except for the preempted (and limited) field of regulation of the radiological effects of atomic energy materials on interstate waters—about which the Act and its legislative history are utterly silent—no grant to the states of new standard-setting authority was necessary to achieve the expressed purpose of the Act. Far from showing an indication that the states expected to add to their jurisdiction over discharges, the hearings on the Federal Water Quality Act of 1965 exhibit a concern on the part of the states and their representatives that the legislation would preempt the field to the Federal Government through the requirements for approval of state standards and/or setting of standards by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration for use in Federal enforcement proceedings.[33]

On the other hand, the Atomic Energy Act clearly reserves to the Federal Government the field of regulation of atomic energy, except as that jurisdiction has been relinquished to the states under agreements entered into pursuant to section 274. The FWPC Act, as noted *before, did not grant any new* authority to the states, but has provided a mechanism for approval of state standards as a basis for subsequent Federal action against polluters. Thus, the state role under that statute may be viewed as limited, at most, to establishment of standards which the states have authority to adopt. By reason of the preemption to the AEC of jurisdiction over regulation of byproduct, source and special nuclear materials, states have no jurisdiction to adopt standards relative to such materials, including those contained in effluents, in the absence of an agreement with the AEC. Those states which have entered into agreements are, by the terms of the agreements, obligated to use their best efforts to assure that their regulatory programs continue to be compatible with the AEC's program.[34]

One final thought deserves brief mention. If, contrary to the view expressed above, the Federal Water Quality Act of 1965 could be construed as a grant of authority to the states, this together with the fact that such authority was granted subsequent to enactment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and section 274 thereof in 1959 would in no way disturb the foregoing conclusions. It is a recognized principle of statutory construction that subseqeunt legislation is not presumed to effectuate an amendment of a law not under consideration, in the absence of an express amendment, unless the terms of the subsequent act are so inconsistent with the provisions of the prior law that they cannot stand together.[35] No such incompatibility or inconsistency would appear to exist here as to require invocation of the exception to this general rule of statutory construction.

Based on the foregoing, it seems clear that the Atomic Energy Act and the FWPC Act can and should be construed together so as not to disturb the jurisdiction of the Commission, vis-a-vis the states, under the Atomic Energy Act. This would have the effect of leaving intact the statutory scheme of section 274 which contemplated, among other things, that regulations for protection against radiation hazards should be as consistent as possible, while at the same time preserving the complementary jurisdiction of the states and the Department of the Interior in the area of water pollution.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Public Law 585, 79th Cong., 60 Stat. 755–75 (1946), hereinafter referred to as the 1946 Act.

[2] The terms source material, byproduct material, and fissionable material were the names given to the various nuclear materials controlled by the 1946 Act, and were defined respectively in Sections 5(b)(1), 5(c)(1), and 5(a)(1) thereof. The term "fissionable material" was replaced by the term "special nuclear material" under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. See footnote 10, *infra*.

[3] Sec. 4(c)(1), 1946 Act.

[4] Sec. 5(a)(2), 1946 Act.

[5] Sec. 11(a)(1), 1946 Act.

[6] Sec. 11(c)(2)(A) and (B), 1946 Act.

[7] Public Law 83–703, 68 Stat. 919 (1954), as amended, 42 USC 2011–2281, as amended, hereinafter referred to as the 1954 Act.

[8] The terms "production facility" and "utilization facility" are defined in Section 11 v. and cc. of the 1954 Act. Except for certain military activities involving the Department of Defense, no person within the United States may transfer or receive in interstate commerce, manufacture, produce, transfer, acquire, possess, use, import, or export any nuclear reactor, nuclear fuels reprocessing facility, fission product conversion and encapsulation plant, or other utilization or production facility except under and in accordance with a license issued by the Commission pursuant to section 103 or 104. Sec. 101, 1954 Act.

[9] Public Law 88–487, 78 Stat. 604 (1964), the so-called Private Ownership of Special Nuclear Materials Act.

[10] The term is defined in Sec. 11 aa., 1954 Act. Essentially it refers to plutonium, uranium 233, and uranium enriched in the 235 isotope.

[11] See Secs. 53, 62 and 81, 1954 Act.

[12] Sec. 271, 1954 Act, as amended by Public Law 89–135, 79 Stat. 551 (1965).

[13] Public Law 86–373, 73 Stat. 688 (1959).

[14] I.e., quantities not sufficient to form a critical mass.

[15] IO CFR § 150.15(a) (1) (1965).

[16] Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas and Washington.

[17] H. Rept. No. 1125, S. Rept. No. 870, 86th Cong., 1st Sess. (1959).

[18] Id. at 9.

[19] See Corwin, *Constitution of the United States of America* (1963), p. 807.

[20] See, e.g., Mich. Ops. Atty. Gen. No. 4073 (1963); Cavers, *State Responsibility in the Regulation of Atomic Reactors*, 50 Ky. L.J. 29, 29–32 (1961); Estep & Adelman, *State Control of Radiation Hazards: An Inter-Governmental Relations Problem*, 60 Mich. L. Rev. 41 (1961); Committee on Atomic Energy, N.Y. State Bar Assn., *State Jurisdiction to Regulate Atomic Activities: Some Key Questions* (July 12, 1963).

[21] Opinion No. 4073, October 31, 1962, pp. 6–7.

[22] Official Opinion, July 23, 1964, p. 2.

[23] Committee on Atomic Energy, N.Y. State Bar Assn., *State Jurisdiction to Regulate Atomic Activities: Some Key Questions* (1963), supra note 20, pp. 4–5.

[24] Boswell v. City of Long Beach, 1 CCH Atom. En. L. Rept. 4045 (Cal. Super. Ct. 1960); Northern Cal. Assn., etc. v. Public Utilities Commission, 37 Cal. Repts. 432, 39 P. 2d 200 (1962).

[25] E.g., radium, radioactive materials produced in accelerators, X-ray machines, and fluoroscopes.

[26] 33 U.S.C. 466 *et seq.*

[27] That Act defines "interstate waters" as "all rivers, lakes and other waters that flow across or form a part of State boundaries, including coastal waters" (33 U.S.C. 466 j(e)).

[28] Section 466 c. does, however, provide that nothing in the Act "shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters (including boundary waters) of such States."

[29] Section 14 of the FWPC Act (33 U.S.C. 466 k.) which provides that the Act shall not be construed as, among other things, superseding or limiting the functions, under any other law, of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to water pollution, is not dispositive of questions of preemption. Since this section has not been changed by any of the various amendments to the Act since 1948, including those subsequent to the addition of section 274 to the Atomic Energy Act which set forth, in more or less clear terms, the extent to which states could exercise jurisdiction over byproduct, source and special nuclear material, its retention is evidence of Congressional intent to preserve the exclusive jurisdiction of the AEC with respect to discharges containing such material. However, the terms of the section are not necessarily inconsistent with a withdrawal of Federal preemptions and "restoration" of some jurisdiction over atomic energy materials to the states.

[30] It may be noted that the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, in its regulation relating to procedures for adoption and promulgation of state standards (18 CFR Part 620), described them (§ 620.2(a)) as "Water quality standards adopted and promulgated by a State in accordance with applicable State law and with section 10(c) of the Federal Act" (33 F.R. 2632).

[31] See Water Pollution Control Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, Senate Committee on Public Works, on S. 649 et al., 88th Cong., 1st Sess., pp. 119–122. S. 649 was a bill to amend the FWPC Act, which passed the Senate in the 88th Congress, and contained provisions for establishing water quality standards for interstate waters somewhat similar to those in the bill passed by the 89th Congress which became P.L. 89–234, the Water Quality Act of 1965.

[32] A description of the practical difficulties in state adoption and enforcement of water quality standards is found at 111 Cong. Rec. 8287–8 (April 28, 1965).

[33] The Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Mr. Quigley, emphasized, in response to questions from Representative Harsha of Ohio, that no federal preemption was intended, and that there was nothing in the legislation to prevent the states from raising their standards above the levels set by the Federal Government. (Water Pollution Control Hearings on Water Quality Act of 1965 before the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., February 18, 19 and 23, 1965, pp. 80–81.)

[34] It should be noted that section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act also establishes the Federal Radiation Council, and provides for its functions to include guidance for Federal agencies in the formulation of radiation standards and in the establishment and execution of programs of cooperation with states.

[35] Frost v. Wenie, 157 U.S. 46 (1895); 1 Sutherland, *Statutory Construction*, pp. 365–6. Sutherland specifically discusses the question of abrogation of state law by Federal statutes and the revival of state legislation by repeal of Federal regulation (§§ 2026, 2027). The cases cited, however, all concern situations in which the Federal statute was expressly repealed or the obstacle to state action removed by express Congressional enactment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND).

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 and urge its approval by the House today. This legislation has evolved from the realization that existing laws are inadequate in meeting all situations in which pollution by oil is involved. The disaster which occurred off the coast of Santa Barbara, Calif., 3 months ago served to highlight the need for further legislation, and gave impetus to this bill.

The Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 will give the President the authority and the means to act quickly should another disaster like that at Santa Barbara, or one like the breakup of the tanker *Torrey Canyon* off the coast of England, occur within our territorial waters. It sets up a revolving fund to clean up oil pollution. It levies a civil penalty of up to $10,000 in cases involving willful or negligent discharges of oil or matter in such quantities that it presents a pollution hazard. This legislation holds the owner or operator of a vessel financially responsible for cleaning up the pollution which they caused.

The act also deals with the subject of research and development in the water pollution field, extending the research provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act another 2 years.

REAL ISSUE IS FINANCING

Mr. Chairman, this bill does a great deal, but I feel that Congress is missing the point if it does not face up to the real issue involved in the whole question of how we control water pollution. That issue is the question of financing. For until Congress comes face to face with the question of where do we get the money to pay for all the programs we have passed, and resolves it, the quality of the water in our rivers and lakes will continue.

Almost every Congress since I have been here has enacted at least one water pollution control measure. The Land and Water Conservation Act of 1964, the Water Quality Act of 1965, the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1968, these are a few that come to mind.

And yet, despite the gains we have made, and despite all this wonderful sounding legislation which we have enacted, the testimony which we heard recently in the Public Works Committee indicates that the situation is only getting worse. And so, Mr. Chairman, until we face the question of financing, we will find that the legislation we pass today, like that which we have enacted before, will be precious little help in combating the pollution hazard which this Nation faces.

I have been in contact with State officials in New Hampshire to assess the opinions on this legislation. Their words have a familiar ring. Mr. William Healy, executive director of the New Hampshire Water Supply and Pollution Control Commission, says the bill is fine, but of little use to him unless there is some money behind it. Mr. Clarence Metcalf, director of municipal services for the same commission, said that within 6 months New Hampshire will have in excess of $10 million in projects waiting to be funded.

Mr. Metcalf expresses the commission's concern over the greatly reduced funding of water pollution control programs at the Federal level, and urges increased appropriations in fiscal year 1970 for the Clean Waters Act.

Still, it is obvious from looking at the state of the Federal budget today, there is little real prospect of additional revenue from pollution control programs from this source. This is a reality, and it is best we recognize it as such immediately and begin to look at other sources.

One suggestion which holds some promise has been the use of tax credits to industries who construct sewage treatment facilities. There is no question that industry—not to mention the Government itself—is one of the most serious pollutors of our waters. Too few industries, however, do anything to reduce the amount of sewerage which they pour daily into our streams and rivers. A system of tax credits might provide the needed incentive for them to take the necessary steps in reducing their own pollution.

Another proposal, and one which I favor, would be similar to the highway trust fund, where those who use the highways pay a tax to do so. This money is placed in the trust fund, and used to construct new roads and improve old ones.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL TRUST FUND

Similarly, if Congress established a water pollution control trust fund, those who use our waters and are contributing to its pollution would pay a tax on it. This money would then be used to finance the construction of sewage treatment plants and other facilities used in the fight against pollution.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Congress will give immediate attention to the question of financing, for unless we resolve this most crucial question, I am afraid the situation will only continue to deteriorate, and will contribute to the growing belief among our constituents that the Federal Government is not able to cope with the really serious problems which are facing this country today.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER), a member of the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, clean water should be of concern to every American. Much of our recreation, industry, and natural environment is dependent on adequate supplies of good water. Water is the very foundation of life itself.

It is imperative that the Federal Government enact stringent measures to protect our water sources from the abuse of pollution. Too many of our rivers and lakes have already been turned into lifeless sewers and cesspools by man's wantonness and neglect. The tragedy of Lake Erie must not be repeated in the other Great Lakes and then in the world's oceans. Our civilization must police itself or we will be progressively poisoned by our own effluents.

H.R. 4148 is a major step in the direction of preserving the remaining purity of our natural water sources. Hopefully we may even begin to reverse the pollution processes that have desecrated so many of our waterways.

A major provision of this bill places the responsibility for cleaning up after a marine pollution disaster where it should be—on the operator or vessel that caused it. If there is ever another *Torrey Canyon* or Santa Barbara catastrophe, there must be no question of legal liability for the resulting damages.

The grants authorized under this bill for scientific and technical training and research will be a wise investment in the future cleanliness of our waterways.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I will briefly explain a couple of the important sections of this bill.

Section 19 of the act sets up a program for demonstration projects to study methods for the elimination and control of acid or other mine drainage which results in pollution. The demonstration projects will be carried out under agreements with the States or interstate agencies and they are intended to demonstrate the engineering and economic feasibility of possible abatement techniques. The State share of the cost of the project would be at least 25 percent and to encourage the States to participate in the program, that 25 percent can be in the form of land, facilities, and services. An appropriation of $15 million for this program is authorized. No more than 25 percent of the available funds can be allocated to any one State in the program.

Section 4 of the act authorizes the Secretary to enter into contracts and grants with individuals, agencies, and organizations for research and development on the problem of lake eutrophication and other lake pollution problems. It also authorizes the Secretary to acquire lands and interests therein by purchase with appropriated or donated funds, or by donation, or by exchange, in connection with development of field laboratories, research facilities, and demonstration projects.

Section 4 contains the general authorization for the Secretary to undertake research studies, demonstrations, and so on, by grant, contract, or otherwise for the prevention or control of oil pollution, including the removal of oil discharges. This section further includes general authorization for the Secretary to engage in research relative to the equipment which will be required to meet the standards for control of sewage from vessels which are covered elsewhere in the act. It should be noted that with respect to this research, the Secretary is directed to file a report of his findings prior to the effective date of any standards to be established in connection with vessel sewage.

The general research, investigation, and training program contained in the basic act is extended for 2 additional years at the present funding level of $65 million.

Section 5 of the act extends for 2 additional fiscal years the project research authority already contained in the basic law and authorizes appropriations for each of fiscal years 1970 and 1971 in the amount of $60 million.

Sections 6 and 7 are technical amendments providing for the deletion or repeal where required of the Oil Pollution Act of 1924.

Section 8 changes the name of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. This is a positive program to achieve high water quality standards, and the name of the administering agency should adequately reflect this purpose.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK).

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4148 recognizes that waste from waterborne vessels is still another cause of pollution of our Nation's waters. In view of our resolve to restore and enhance the quality of our water by controlling waste discharges from our municipal sewers and our industrial complexes, we cannot ignore the wastes emanating from waterborne vessels. It is presently most severe in bays, inlets, lakes, harbors, and marinas. These pollutants include sewage and other wastes. Many vessels are not equipped to provide even minimal treatment. With the growing popularity of recreation craft, corrective and preventive action must be set in motion now to prevent a more serious problem to our waters.

H.R. 4148 would—

Provide for the control of sewage from vessels including foreign vessels using our waterways and commercial and recreational vessels;

Direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue Federal standards of performance for marine sanitation devices for all vessels except vessels not equipped with installed toilet facilities, and it would direct the Coast Guard to issue regulations relative to the design, construction, installation, and operation of these devices on board such vessels;

Apply to existing vessels, the construction of which is initiated prior to issuance of the standards and regulations;

Apply to new vessels, the construction of which is initiated after issuance of the standards and regulations;

Provide that the initial standards shall be effective for new vessels 2 years after promulgation, but not earlier than December 31, 1971, and for existing vessels 5 years after promulgation; and

Provide that once the initial standards and regulations are effective a State or a political subdivision thereof may not adopt or enforce any law or regulation governing the design, manufacture, or installation of any marine sanitation device on board any vessel subject to the Federal standards or regulations. This would not, however, affect the State's authority to prohibit completely all sewage discharges from vessels in particular intrastate waters of the State, regardless of whether the sewage is treated or not.

In such cases, however, the State must also prohibit waste discharges from all other sources.

H.R. 4148 would also—

Provide for a system of certification by the Coast Guard of marine sanitation devices;

Provide for the establishment of civil penalties after notice and opportunity for a hearing; and

Provide that provisions of this section shall be enforced by the Coast Guard.

Watercraft are of course only one of the many sources of pollution that must be corrected, but as we previously noted this pollution is highly visible and noxious. It is our belief that H.R. 4148 takes major strides in controlling this source of pollution in a reasonable manner. It provides appropriate time where it is needed and yet takes the remedial steps which are necessary in preventing major problems in the future.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLATNIK. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. On page 59, beginning on line 4, there is this language, "except that nothing in this section shall be construed to affect or modify the authority or jurisdiction of any State to prohibit discharges of sewage whether treated or not from a vessel within all or part of the intrastate waters of such State if discharges from all other sources are likewise prohibited."

Would that not mean that the States

during this 5-year period could not prohibit the discharge of primary waste from a vessel as long as a city of village discharges waste that had primary or secondary treatment?

Mr. BLATNIK. Would the gentleman read the last part of his question again?

Mr. HUNGATE. It states in here that a State, as I read it, "except that nothing in this section shall be construed to affect or modify the authority or jurisdiction of any State to prohibit discharges of sewage whether treated or not from a vessel within all or part of the intrastate waters of such State if discharges from all other sources are likewise prohibited."

Mr. BLATNIK. It is my opinion that refers only to discharges of any and all sources that are prohibited at the present time.

For instance, you may have a bay where there is no discharge whatsoever, whether it be primary or secondary, and under that condition the State does have the right to prohibit the discharge from any vessel.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if we have a small municipality which has a secondary treatment plant, under this provision as I read it, it could not prohibit the discharge of raw sewage from a vessel for 5 years even though it prohibits the secondary discharge of sewage from the village?

Mr. BLATNIK. Not for 5 years, but after the provisions of this law go into effect it would be only 5 years for old boats, but only 2 years for new boats. But I would believe the State would have the right, and the Federal Government could not preempt the State's authority, to insist that there be compliance with definite standards which certainly could not be less than the standards that the municipality would comply with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Waldie).

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to ask the gentleman a series of questions, and to establish some legislative history.

Is it the understanding of the gentleman that the words "water pollution" would include an act that would result in salinity intrusion, if a fresh-water body, for example, was altered in quality by saline intrusion into that body, would that be an act of pollution?

Mr. WRIGHT. In reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from California, as to whether saline materials could be described as matter under the terms of the bill, would depend entirely upon their listing by the Secretary. The Secretary has been directed to compile a list of hazardous materials. Now, there is no question but that excessive salinity in certain circumstances can be a serious pollutant to water.

For that matter, the United States has recognized this responsibility under a treaty with Mexico to provide pure water to be discharged into Mexico from the Colorado River. However, I believe there must be borne in mind that discharge of a certain material might be hazardous in one case, and harmless in another.

Therefore the Secretary must take into consideration the environment into which the discharge would occur, and presumably also the establishment of certain quantitative requirements as to how much of the harmful substance would constitute a pollution hazard.

Mr. WALDIE. It would be my understanding that salinity intrusion being defined as a pollutant, would then require the respective States in the adoption of their water quality standards to set that as a criteria.

Mr. WRIGHT. There is no prohibition whatever against the State setting that, or any other stricter criteria than the Federal Government itself establishes.

Mr. WALDIE. I believe what I am attempting to establish is that the Congress went further in this act than not prohibiting the States from doing so, but that in fact the Congress instructed the States to define salinity intrusion as constituting pollution. And I call the attention of the gentleman to the concern that Congress has already expressed for the preservation of its estuarine areas, and to the damage that is done to those estuarine areas when there is diversion upstream of the fresh water flow into the estuary, and thereby resulting in an inflow of saline water intrusion damaging and destroying the ecological system of the estuary, and the economic benefits that are found in estuarian waters.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is correct, that this does constitute one precedent and recognition of excessive salinity as a harmful pollutant. I do not believe that where there exists in law a specific mandate from the States that in all cases salinity must be defined as being a pollutant, however, emphatically, there is nothing in the legislation——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

As I was saying, there emphatically is nothing in the legislation to prohibit a State from making this requirement, and it is the expectation that the Secretary will list all those susbtances which he deems to be hazardous.

For example, I call the gentleman's attention to paragraph 4 on page 48 of the bill which states very clearly:

> Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as preempting any State or political subdivision thereof from imposing any requirement or liability with respect to the discharge of oil or matter into any waters within such State.

Mr. WALDIE. If I may just pose one more question to the gentleman. In my own State, California, the responsibility under this act of setting forth water quality standards and setting forth acts that constitute pollution vest in the State itself. Yet, the State itself is really the polluter by reason of their activities in diverting the fresh waters from the upstream flow into the San Francisco estuarian system. It is unreasonable to assume, unless they are compelled to do so, that they will place themselves in the role of becoming an active polluter—which, in fact, they quite clearly are.

The only real question I am asking the gentleman is—if within the concept of this bill, if a body of water that is fresh and is utilized for irrigation, for example for agricultural purposes, subsequently becomes salty water because of the diversion of upstream water that formerly prevented salt water intrusion—if that situation exists, does the person who has diverted the fresh water and thereby has permitted the salt water intrusion and destruction of the agricultural use—does that person become the polluter?

Mr. WRIGHT. The answer would have to be that the extent of the pollution, if any, and whether or not it constituted a hazard under the meaning of the act, would be up to the determination of the Secretary under the terms of the act.

Mr. WALDIE. The Congress has not in this bill given him that specific direction and said that it would be an act of polluting?

Mr. WRIGHT. The Congress has not specifically defined the quantities of matter which constitute a hazard under the meaning of the bill. It leaves that to the determination of the Secretary since it would vary in numerous instances. Obviously, a small amount of salinity in a large body of water could be harmless while a large amount of salinity in a limited quantity of water could be extremely harmful and destructive of crops or destructive of other forms of animal or vegetable life.

Mr. WALDIE. I thank the gentleman. I hope that the present Secretary will act as his predecessor has acted and declare that salt water intrusion does in fact constitute pollution.

I also want to congratulate the committee for their excellent work in bringing this bill up for consideration and I am wholeheartedly in support of it.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Stratton).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Members will be familiar with those famous lines that run, depending upon which particular version you happen to remember:

High above Cayuga's waters
  With its waves so blue
Stands our Noble Alma Mater
  Glorious to view.

I mention these lines this afternoon not because in the circumstances of today we have any new demonstrations or student strikes going on above Cayuga's waters at Cornell University, but rather because one of the problems to which this legislation addresses itself is the problem of thermal pollution.

And this problem is being faced today, urgently and seriously, by those same blue waters above which Cornell stands. Since part of this lake is in my district, I am concerned about its future.

Another part of it is in the district of my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. Robison), and since I have mentioned his college and his lake, I would now be very happy to yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. ROBISON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rose to correct the gentleman. The first word is "Far"—"Far above Cayuga's water,"—not "High."

Mr. STRATTON. I stand corrected by the Congressman whose district includes that distinguished university.

The problem in Cayuga Lake is that a nuclear-powered electric generated powerplant is soon going to be built on this very beautiful, relatively small, very slow moving lake; and if that nuclear powerplant is constructed without regard to thermal pollution, then the cool water at the bottom of Cayuga Lake is going to be taken out of the lake and used to cool the reactor and will be put back into the lake at a higher temperature.

Now, this may not seem like much of a problem, but this is what we mean by "thermal pollution." By gradually raising the temperature of a lake, you not only encourage the growth of weeds in the lake, which in the case of Cayuga Lake are already interfering with its use for recreational purposes, but you also destroy the fish and the wildlife.

I think it is important that as we deal in this legislation with various aspects of pollution we face up immediately to this relatively new problem of thermal pollution. There has been a good deal said this afternoon about oil pollution, for example, and we have some strong language in this bill dealing with the kind of tragedy that hit the beaches at Santa Barbara.

Unfortunately, what is being done about oil pollution comes after at least a good part of the barn door has already been left open, and we are being asked to close it now after a good deal of pollution has already taken place. With regard to thermal pollution, we ought to close this door before the horse leaves the barn. And I am just afraid that the thermal pollution section of this bill, although it does recognize and deal with the problem, will not go nearly far enough, because it provides in effect that the applicable State standards shall apply.

The fact of the matter is that in New York State, as in many other States, we simply do not have any really effective applicable State standards. The State Assembly has recently passed a very strong bill, but my information is that it is likely to die in the Senate, and even if it does get through the Senate the Governor may veto it. So I do not think we can afford to rely on that kind of State protection.

If they can get away with destroying Cayuga Lake and turning it into another Lake Erie, think what may happen to the lake in your district or your district.

If we begin the process of building nuclear plants in small lakes like Cayuga Lake, instead of on the ocean or fast-moving rivers, as we have done up until now, we can destroy not only this beautiful recreational section of the Finger Lakes, but we can destroy a lot of other recreational lakes as well. I think it is just not enough for us to rely on State standards that will not be effective at the start of the threat, when they are most needed. Many of the States have not even done the research in this field, as the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has done it, and as the Secretary of the Interior has done it.

Therefore, I propose to offer on tomorrow, when we read the bill for amendment, an amendment which would merely give to the Secretary of the Interior the power with regard to thermal pollution alone, because this is a new field, and one in which, fortunately, we have not had much destruction so far, the power to set Federal standards which will apply to all facilities constructed with a Federal agency license, so that we can lock the door before the horse is stolen and thus can successfully avoid the debacle that we now face in connection with oil pollution.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am happy to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. The gentleman has mentioned the absence in New York State of criteria standards with respect to thermal discharge. However, the gentleman knows that the State water quality commission is holding public hearing on tentative criteria which would attempt to control this particular problem, and there is ample authority, in my judgment, under the existing public health laws of the State of New York for the water resources commission to adopt those standards.

The gentleman mentioned bills before the legislature. Those bills might possibly strengthen the hand of the water resources commission in this connection, but I do not think we need further legislation for the State to act as it is.

Mr. STRATTON. I hope they will. There is no question about the fact that the State has authority to act. But I have been a little disturbed about some of the things I have heard. Certainly the State health department and the conservation department, which have the authority, have been very wishy-washy so far. That is why I think we should strengthen this bill at the very start, rather than waiting for the States to act. If we wait it will be too late for Cayuga Lake, and it could be too late for other lakes as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. As I understand, the Federal Government is requiring the States to provide water quality standards, and one of those standards required is to include thermal pollution. They are in the process now of negotiating what that thermal pollution standard should be within the respective States. So I would contemplate that in the not too distant future every State will have a thermal pollution standard established, and approved by the Secretary.

But I will say to the gentleman that when he starts talking about national standards, I do not think the gentleman from New York fully appreciates that in the State of Florida a certain number of degrees of greater heat than presently exists in a body of water that would result in a deleterious effect might be completely different with different locations in the United States. This is because that number of degrees, that might cause a disruptive effect in warm water, with other different environmental factors cannot be said to have the same effect in the cooler and different waters of a northern lake or in Alaska for instance?

The point I am making is that we do not necessarily want the same number or percentage of degrees above present temperature controls in one State, where it is warmer, and environmental conditions are different to be the same as that for the waters of another State, so I do not think we can have a national standard based upon what is known of thermal problems presently that would make much sense.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will give me the time, I, too, would prefer not to have to set a national standard, but we are dealing with a shortage of time in this case. There may be approval by the Atomic Energy Commission to build a nuclear powerplant on the Finger Lakes within a few weeks. Therefore, I do not think we are likely to have any strong standards in New York State by the time this problem comes up. For that reason, I think we have to act now. If a precedent is set on Cayuga Lake, it could be carried out in the Finger Lakes or in lakes in the gentleman's State.

As the gentleman knows, the standards proposed do not involve an exact number of degrees but a certain percentage over mean temperature of the water or over the temperature of the water as it is on the surface. That kind of a standard could be applied nationally without any problem, as I see it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the gentleman there is not enough knowledge about what the ecological and other effects of thermal pollution will be, nor up to what degrees or percentages or otherwise above what exist at the present time. From lake to lake and State to State and level to level there are the different environmental circumstances that controlled and judged by the State after approval of the standards by the Secretary. I would suggest to the gentleman this is an area best left to the jurisdiction of States and particularly where States are required to act under present law anyway.

Mr. STRATTON. If there is any lack of research, I think it is in research which has been done on a State level. A good deal of research has been done by the Federal Government, and it is presently pretty clear as to what constitutes thermal pollution of our waters and what must be done to prevent it.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii 2 minutes.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MATSUNAGA was allowed to speak out of order.)

STATUES OF FATHER DAMIEN AND KING KAMEHAMEHA I TO BE UNVEILED TODAY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, at 4 o'clock this afternoon, the statues presented by the State of Hawaii of two of its most eminent personages for commemoration in the National Statuary Hall will be unveiled with appropriate ceremonies to be held in the rotunda of the Capitol. These are the statues of the Reverend Joseph Damien De Veuster, a Roman Catholic priest, and King Kamehameha I, the first monarch of all the island of Hawaii. In behalf of the people of Hawaii, I extend to the Members of this House a cordial invitation to attend the ceremonies.

Father Damien was born in Belgium in 1840 and came to Hawaii at the age of 24. He completed his studies for priesthood a few months after his arrival in Hawaii, and in May 1864, he was ordained in the Cathedral of our Lady of Peace in Honolulu. Nine years later, in 1873, after he had served in an area on the island of Hawaii where Kamehameha was born over 100 years before, Father Damien asked to be sent to the leper colony on the tiny island of Molokai. As the resident priest on Molokai, Father Damien served his unfortunate parishoners in almost every conceivable capacity. Because of the lack of doctors, he rendered medical services. He was also an administrator, undertaker, coffinmaker, gravedigger, builder of homes, and champion of the afflicted. His compassion for his flock knew no bounds, and he labored day and night for 16 years before he died of the disease himself at the age of 49. For over three-quarters of a century since the death of Father Damien, the story of his voluntary sojourn among the lepers of Molokai has been told again and again, and it continues to inspire men and women throughout the world.

King Kamehameha, the second citizen whom we honor, will be the first monarch to grace the Halls of the U.S. Congress. He was born in the late 1750's in Kohala, on the island of Hawaii, one of the four kingdoms into which Hawaii was then divided. He was said to have been born on a stormy winter night, under weather conditions indicating the nature of his future adult life. As one of the six lesser chiefs of his island district, young Kamehameha led the others in successful wars to insure an equitable distribution of land. After overcoming rival chiefs on the island of Hawaii, Kamehameha transported his large army on war canoes to Maui, Molokai, and Oahu, successively, and these islands, along with Hawaii, were unified under his rule in 1795. The two remaining islands Kauai and Niihau, were later ceded without a fight.

This unification of the islands into the Hawaiian kingdom was the foundation from which eventually emerged the Territory and still later the State of Hawaii.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Vanik).

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, during the consideration of the Water Quality Improvement Act, I expect to offer an amendment to provide a special program for the solution of pollution problems of such dimensions that they are not even touched by the present legislation. I think they should be separately considered as national water pollution disaster areas.

The legislation reported out by the committee provides no assistance whatsoever to so critical a problem as the Lake Erie problem with which the citizens of northern Ohio, northern Pennsylvania, and northern New York, and eastern Michigan are confronted. This Congress can no longer stand by while huge natural resources of this type are destroyed in our full sight and knowledge.

The legislation in its present form provides Ohio, along with all the other States, a sum of money which is based on a formula established under the law, with which I have no argument as far as it goes, except that it does nothing whatsoever to help us in northern Ohio solve what is the greatest problem with which we are confronted.

The people of my community have set aside a $100 million bond issue, in the city of Cleveland, to begin—just to begin—to solve the problem of reducing the contamination of Lake Erie. Under the law we consider today, we get no resources out of State funds, because the State programs are not oriented toward the most critical problem of Lake Erie pollution. These resources are used by the State for economic development, for the construction of facilities as an industry inducement. When industry goes into an area and needs a sewage system, then this money is used for economic development rather than to control or to provide some remedy for areas of existing pollution.

I should like, Mr. Chairman, to ask the chairman of the committee if, under the provisions of this bill, we can expect any help for a problem which is as severe as the Lake Erie problem? This problem is interstate, it is international, and it is beyond the capacity of any single State. What can we look for under the terms of this bill?

Mr. WRIGHT. In answer to the gentleman, the bill provides only for research into a means of assisting lakes such as the Great Lakes. It does not provide a broad or a meaningful assault upon existing pollution in those lakes, as the gentleman is very fully aware, he being completely cognizant of the water pollution legislation and he having appeared before our committee and having testified on this matter of the need for urgent attention to the lakes and particularly Lake Erie.

As the gentleman knows, the bill does not provide for a broad assault, such as the gentleman himself desired to be provided in the present legislation, on the existing pollution in lakes such as Lake Erie.

Mr. VANIK. Am I correct in understanding that under the formula provided under this bill the State of Ohio will receive about $9.5 million as the proportionate share of the grant program money?

Mr. WRIGHT. That sounds about right, under the present level of appropriations. I would not want to be held pinpointed as to the precise amount.

Mr. VANIK. Will the gentleman tell me about other special provisions which are set forth in the bill, such as authorizing the sum of $15 million for the mine acid problem? Is that in the bill?

Mr. WRIGHT. Is that the mine acid drainage?

Mr. VANIK. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. The bill provides $15 million.

Mr. VANIK. If the committee in its wisdom and judgment decided to authorize $15 million for this specific problem, is it unreasonable to ask the committee to come forth with some special allocation for national pollution disasters like the Lake Erie problem?

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is asking a question which lends itself to an answer by opinion rather than by fact. I am, as one member of the committee, quite sympathetic to the desires of the gentleman.

The gentleman is aware of all that has been attempted through the regular water control legislation by means of grants-in-aid to municipalities up and down the streams, which are polluting these lakes.

The gentleman is aware of the budget limitations under which we have suffered in our attempts to move that program forward more rapidly. The gentleman appeared before our committee and made a very eloquent and very moving statement as to the need for a massive assault on the pollution which created in Lake Erie a dead body of water, in effect, at the core of the lake, so lacking oxygen that plant and animal life cannot survive.

Mr. VANIK. May I ask the gentleman if there is any other problem that was presented to the committee that matches the Lake Erie problem in magnitude?

Mr. WRIGHT. The answer I think would be that pollution is a nationwide problem.

Mr. VANIK. No. I say, was there any other single problem that matched the magnitude of the Lake Erie problem?

Mr. WRIGHT. I know of no situation that is worse.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself first with the response made by one of our most productive and knowledgeable workers in water pollution, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Wright). Also I wish to emphasize not only sympathy but the very serious concern which we share with the gentleman from Ohio with respect to the plight of all the States in dealing with the problem of Lake Erie.

Some scientists have suggested as Mr. Wright said, that it may already be, in a sense, a dead lake, in that unless massive measures are undertaken immediately, the problem may be almost irreversible. It is such a complicated problem, as I see it, that no matter how well we think we understand it—and I have spent considerable time on the technical and chemical aspects of the problem—no matter how effectively we try to control lake pollution from both industrial and municipal sources, the lake has already reached such concentrations in its accumulation of solids and other materials in colloidal suspension that even the technical experts are not sure what can best be done to alleviate it.

There is, for example, matter in a liquid form, such as acids and pickling liquors, and chemicals of all types that form a fluid with a heavier density than clear, pure water. This covers most of the bottom of the lake. Some scientists believe it cannot be flushed out; that no matter how much fresh water you would pour in, it would be just like pouring cream on top of milk. The cream would just slither across the top of it. The fresh water that you would pour in might come out at the other end, at Niagara Falls or Buffalo.

So we can see that we have a problem that is monumental and complicated as all get-out. No one knows what to do about the matter. But that does not mean that we should stop trying, or that we cannot act in other ways. There is nothing to prevent municipalities or State agencies or groups of States from getting together and using rather substantial funds which are available for aid in the form of demonstration projects or for trial grants. The kind of thing that you mentioned was done at Lake Barcroft could be done.

We know that more research is necessary. I agree with you that an enormous effort has to be made. Not only $100 million but several hundreds of millions of dollars will be required in order to clean out and to reverse the situation existing in Lake Erie so as to restore it to an acceptable level of quality and maintain it in accordance with the standards in existence now. The big problems are getting the tremendous amounts of money, and the technical knowledge, and to the limit they are available we will do everything we can to see that they are used effectively.

Mr. VANIK. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress would not write off Lake Erie as a lost cause. I think it can be saved, and I am here pleading with you, my colleagues, for help. It is my opinion that we are now at the point where it belongs in this bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McCARTHY. As the gentleman from Ohio knows, I joined in cosponsoring this pollution disaster relief bill. Coming from the shores of Lake Erie, also, I share the gentleman's concern, and I am urging the committee to consider holding hearings at an early date on the gentleman's bill with the hope that we can come up with something to deal with this particular problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Of course, under the present law we are all concerned about lake pollution as we are river pollution and various other types of pollution throughout America. It is not only the Great Lakes but the entire country.

As I understand what the gentleman from Ohio is proposing is relief to the Great Lakes that is not now available to other equally polluted areas——

Mr. VANIK. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. I do not know how the gentleman could justify it as compared to other polluted areas. Where is more money coming from for sewage treatment plants? As I understand the gentleman's proposal, many other areas throughout this Nation equally want such consideration and there are more needs for sewage treatment plant construction than we can fill at the present time.

We are authorizing $1 billion. The past administration recommended $214 million for appropriation out of the $1 billion authorization. The money just is not there under the present budget squeeze so as to even tool up the existing sewage treatment plant authorization, including Lake Erie. So where does the gentleman suggest the money would come from? He is recommending a special authorization and a specific sewage treatment plant for this area. This is only a small portion of the pollutant problem of these lakes. What does one do about industrial and other types of pollution?

Mr. VANIK. I might say that my amendment is not limited to sewage treatment plant facilities because the problem of Lake Erie is going to involve some other approaches to be determined by extended research and study. There are other things that must be done to save a decaying lake. This may require an aeration process and a dredging of the lake bottom in certain areas.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman that there is a presently existing section in the present law, section 5(f) which provides as follows:

> (f) The Secretary shall conduct research and technical development work, and make studies, with respect to the quality of the waters of the Great Lakes, including an analysis of the present and projected future water quality of the Great Lakes under varying conditions of waste treatment and disposal, an evaluation of the water quality needs of those to be served by such waters, an evaluation of municipal, industrial, and vessel waste treatment and disposal practices with respect to such waters, and a study of alternate means of solving water pollution problems (including additional waste treatment measures) with respect to such waters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, in this bill, as appears at page 76 thereof, section (g) reads as follows:

> (g) The Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts with, or make grants to, public or private agencies and organizations and individuals for the purpose of developing and demonstrating new or improved methods for the prevention, removal, and control of natural or manmade pollution in lakes, including the undesirable effects of nutrients—

And so forth. The committee has not been oblivious to this problem. The gentleman is not really offering a solution to it unless you want to go into the payment of grants to all operations which contribute to the pollution of waters, including the operations of private enterprise.

Mr. VANIK. Does the gentleman agree that the Lake Erie problem is much different and its dimension is much greater than anything proposed in this bill?

Mr. CRAMER. I do, and that is why we included the Great Lakes in the last bill. That is why we are pinpointing the Great Lakes in this bill.

Mr. VANIK. What is there in the present bill to deal with a problem of such dimensions as the present problem which exists with reference to Lake Erie, a problem which is international, interstate, and beyond the capacity of any one State to cope with it?

Mr. CRAMER. There is $65 million in this bill to carry out this research.

Mr. VANIK. $65 million which is allocated to the several States just like the grant money.

Mr. CRAMER. Oh, no. No, it is not.

Mr. VANIK. It is parceled out just like the grant money. There is nothing for the Lake Erie problem.

Mr. CRAMER. This problem is nationwide. It is not allocated to the States alone.

Mr. VANIK. May I ask the gentleman——

Mr. CRAMER. It is nationwide insofar as on the lake problem.

Mr. VANIK. May I ask the gentleman specifically how under previous authorizations it was allocated among the States?

Mr. CRAMER. The Secretary has authority to allocate the money according to where the problem is.

I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly, I am not arguing with the gentleman, that Lake Erie and some of the other Great Lake areas have a serious problem, as the gentleman from Minnesota suggests, but this provides the tools to do something about it to the tune of up to $65 million. The Secretary can put any or all of this into the Great Lakes.

Mr. VANIK. Not one dime has gone into the Lake Erie problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Does the gentleman from Florida wish to use further of his time?

Mr. CRAMER. I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Florida yields back the balance of his time, I wonder if the gentleman from Florida, from his great and generous heart, would share with this side some 6 minutes of his time in order that two Members of the House, the only two Members remaining who have asked for time, might be permitted to speak on this legislation, the two gentlemen being the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

It is my understanding that we have

4 minutes remaining on our side, so I am wondering if we might borrow some time from our distinguished colleague from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, after the generous statement of the gentleman from Texas about the gentleman from Florida I am persuaded, and as a matter of fact I will not even ask for a payback of the time, and I will yield 5 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank my colleague from Florida and the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 4148. I believe this is landmark legislation. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FALLON), the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), the chairman of the subcommittee, as well as all of the members of the Public Works Committee on both sides, deserve the highest commendation of this House for bringing this very important and historic bill to the floor of the House for action.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the two scripts that I put into the RECORD yesterday. They appear on pages 8962 and 8963. These are scripts which were used in two excellent programs produced by the Columbia Broadcasting System in its "The 21st Century" presentation entitled "What Are We Doing to Our World?"

Mr. Walter Cronkite quite properly pointed out:

> Man is a thinking animal, but nonetheless dependent entirely on the ecological balance of his planet to sustain him. All the forms of life over which man has become master are similarly interrelated and dependent on one another in varying degrees.

This excellent series can be recommended here to the Members as an absolute justification for this legislation.

I should also like to call attention to a statement made by a great American, Charles A. Lindbergh, recently in New York City when he received an award from the National Institute of Social Sciences. I believe Mr. Lindbergh has placed this whole problem into proper perspective. He made the argument on behalf of this legislation for us when he stated:

> I have been forced to the conclusion that much of our scientific and technical progress is negative progress in relation to man's basic welfare: that many of the steps we take to insure our present survival lead toward a future breakdown. I have asked myself over and over again how this trend can be avoided.

Then he added:

> In trying to affect a trend, one considers its beginning. This takes us back through ages to what was, in many ways, the disastrous impact of the human mind with its lack of selective judgment—a mind so paradoxical, to date, that it has achieved life's greatest knowledge and caused life's greatest evil.

And he concludes—and I would like to especially call your attention to these words, because these are the words that I believe bear directly on this legislation:

> In the short period of evolutionary time after intellect gained domination over instinct, it has made man the most destructive creature upon earth.

Mr. Chairman, everyone talks about the crisis affecting our rivers, streams, and waterways in America.

There is no question that man is killing the very environment that nourishes him. Our much-proclaimed American know-how and can-do technology have not been applied to preserving the highly intricate balances of nature. We survive by utilizing the infinite complexities of our planet, but our resources are not inexhaustible. With all of our hardware and amazing technical proficiency, we have yet to find substitutes for either clean air or potable water.

Lake Michigan, which borders part of my own State of Illinois, is in imminent danger of total destruction due to wholescale pollution. Lake Erie is already comatose and virtually incapable of supporting life. There must be limits imposed on man's opportunity to destroy his natural resources.

Lake Michigan is approximately 300 miles long and 80 miles wide. Its area encompasses nearly 25,000 square miles. Before passage of legislation that permitted the Army Corps of Engineers to use this inland sea as a massive dumping area, the depth of the lake was 113 feet. Today it is 103 feet deep. By pouring millions of tons of junk and toxic material into this enormous lake, we have raised its depth more than 10 feet. This is unconscionable.

We cannot continue the heedless destruction of irreplaceable resources merely because it is "cheaper" to dispose of our waste products in this way. The question of "cheapness" or economy in general when discussing an end to pollution is academic. We must spend whatever it costs and we must begin now.

The bill before the House today strengthens our ability to end pollution and to set about mitigating its effects and regaining at least a measure of what we have lost.

As human beings who share this earth with its tens of millions of forms of plant and organic life, we can do no less than insure its survival as a life-supporting planet.

So, Mr. Chairman, tomorrow when we start reading the bill, it is my intention to offer an amendment to this bill which would repeal that part of the act of 1905 which set up and specified and utilized and authorized certain areas in the Great Lakes for dumping by the Corps of Engineers.

It is my hope that this amendment will be adopted.

We heard a moment ago the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) say that Lake Erie appears to be beyond the realm of salvation. Lake Erie is a national disaster area and its shame is shared by all of us. Tomorrow I am going to ask my colleagues to join me in barring any further dumping in the Great Lakes by the Corps of Engineers. You cannot have effective antidumping procedures by local municipalities and by the various States surrounding the Great Lakes when Uncle Sam through his Corps of Engineers is the largest single polluter of all.

I am not at all persuaded when the Corps of Engineers comes before us and pleads that if we do not let them dump in the Great Lakes that they are going to have to stop dredging the harbors and rivers. This is a problem that the Department of Defense will have to address itself to in order to find alternative solutions. Surely our technology is capable of supplying an answer.

Until this Congress stands up and says that the law of 1905 was a mistake and can no longer be tolerated and we refuse to permit indiscriminate mass dumping we are not going to be able to save the Great Lakes or our other great water resources.

Who in this Congress, on either side of the aisle, is competent to tell us what is the price tag on recreating a Lake Michigan or the other Great Lakes? Man can never create such a vast natural resource, but surely man can save it.

It is my hope that tomorrow when this bill comes before us, our colleagues are going to join in taking this bold but determined step. Let us here in the Congress say that there shall be no more dumping by the Corps of Engineers in Lake Michigan and then get the rest of private industry to fall in line.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues for making this time possible.

(Mr. KARTH (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4148, the Water Quality Improvement Act.

Today when this country's population is at the 200-million level we are rapidly discovering that our air and water resources are not limitless. The efforts of the Federal Government have in recent years been directed with special urgency toward meeting the air pollution problem because the need for control has been demonstrated most dramatically by so-called death fogs and eye-watering smogs. This Congress has enacted air quality control legislation which now makes it possible to reduce the noxious chemicals in automobile exhaust and smokestacks. We are happily making progress in air pollution control and can soon expect real technological breakthroughs which will eliminate the most alarming threats to our air.

But it has been recently, only through the catastrophes of *Torrey Canyon* and the Santa Barbara Channel that the public has become alarmed by the tremendous problem created by the oil pollution of our waters. True, there has been on our law books since 1924 statutes to prohibit the willful and negligent dumping of oil in our navigable waters. But the scale of today's problems are so much broader and more aggravated than they were even a decade ago that new legal tools have to be provided the executive department to cope with unanticipated threats to the water resources in our environment.

H.R. 4148 as reported by the Committee on Public Works, I believe, makes tremendous steps toward up-dating the laws dealing with water pollution by providing more stringent controls against oil and sewage pollution of our waters, research grants to combat acid and mine water pollution, and training grants and contracts to alleviate a critical shortage of skilled engineering aides, scientific technicians, and sewage treatment plant operators.

I think that it is symbolic of the new approach of this important legislation that the bill proposes the name of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration be changed to the National Water Quality Administration.

I hope this Congress will quickly enact this bill and provide the funds necessary to implement it so that our Nation can eliminate the national jeopardy which presently threatens our water resources. I urge the support of my colleagues for the enactment of this bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on our side, 4 minutes, to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) who has been a longtime advocate for clean water and who is a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, and my good friend, the gentleman from Florida, for so graciously making possible these few brief remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the distinguished members of the Committee on Public Works and the committee for the very able work they have done in presenting to this body a very fine piece of legislation, one which is well calculated to make further badly needed strides in the field of abatement of pollution of the Nation's waters and water resources.

Mr. Chairman, I have several comments on the bill.

First, with regard to the question of funding and financing. I would point out that the very best efforts, and they have been indeed tremendous, by the Committee on Public Works and the distinguished members have been largely frustrated by the inadequate funds presented by the different administrations for the handling of water pollution.

In all of the years since the original legislation was passed back in 1956, we have appropriated vastly less than the needed funds and this year we have the administration's budget request for something like $200 million, against an authorized Federal expenditure under Public Law 660 of something like a billion dollars for this coming fiscal year.

Indeed, it is probable with the rate of the population increase and the increased level of pollutants, the higher authorized figure will fall significantly behind meeting the real needs of our Nation.

I rise also to make certain comments with regard to activities now going on in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. As my good friends on the Committee on Public Works know, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been engaged in a study of legislation and holding hearings on proposals which would begin abatement of pollution of the seas and navigable waters by law.

During the existence of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee this has been a matter of particular concern by that committee. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has reported to this floor a number of pieces of legislation over the years which have dealt with this particular problem. Over the years these pieces of legislation have been enacted by this body and now constitute a portion of the permanent laws of the United States.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, today is considering similar legislation, much in keeping with and, indeed, substantially similar to that involved in the sections of H.R. 4148 dealing with the same subject. It is with pleasure I note that the Committee on Public Works has moved with great vigor. It is with some sadness I note some of the thoughts of the membership of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have not been fully and, in our opinion, adequately reflected in H.R. 4148. Nevertheless, I do point out to this body that H.R. 4148 is an admirable piece of legislation. It reflects careful consideration, and I believe it makes possible long strides forward in the abatement of water pollution. And, despite the jurisdictional problems which have existed with H.R. 4148, it does take proper, and I believe desirable and, in fact, adequate steps toward the abatement of the pollution of our navigable waters by oil, something which has been a significant problem.

It was the hope of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that this would be handled by making the Coast Guard the primary agency. It is my hope that this will still take place in connection with the cleanup of the seas of oil, because, my friends and colleagues in this body well know that the Coast Guard is the agency most immediately affected, and almost invariably the first and only agency directly on the scene when this occurs. Indeed, our cleanup endeavors during the times we have had these oil spills have largely been conducted under the leadership of the Coast Guard. That agency demonstrated a remarkable capacity for vigorous and effective action in the Santa Barbara incident and in a number of other lesser incidents.

So it is my hope that this will take place in that fashion.

I would point out a caution to my colleagues, and that is that failure to adequately and properly center responsibility for the abatement and cleanup of oil pollution in the hands of an institution like the Coast Guard may conceivably result in a problem of the kind they had when the *Torrey Canyon* went down. During that incident it is fair to point out that there was a significant period of time during which the British Government was unable to assign responsibility and to fix the duty on any of the several agencies of the British Government for the actual cleanup of the oil. Had the Government been able to move more expeditiously under those circumstances, it is not inconceivable that damage to the British coast and the coast of Europe might have been significantly reduced.

I do report to the House at this time that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries does have a number of matters it is considering which will involve other segments of the Coast Guard's responsibility in connection with the abatement of the pollution of the seas and navigable waters by oil, and that my discussions with the chairman, with the staff, and other members of that body indicate to me there is every probability that during the next few weeks the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will continue its consideration of these matters, and hopefully will ultimately complete a useful and complementary piece of legislation, one which will add to the very able drawn and well-done piece of legislation which we have before us, in terms of increasing the ability of this Nation to abate the pollution of our navigable waters by oil.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues for making this time available to me.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL).

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969.

The committee of which I am a member has worked hard on this legislation. Its leaders especially are to be commended, as well as the staff, for the work they have done.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is good legislation and goes a long way toward solving our pollution problems. It is not a perfect bill, but it will deal with some of the critical problems that are presented today and it will pave the way for even better programs in the years ahead.

One of the best features of the bill is that which provides for training of persons in the water control area. Mr. Chairman, I was a cosponsor of the bill which resulted in this section, and can speak with some authority on the point. The witnesses who appeared before our committee pointed out the dramatic urgency of this training. They noted the severe shortage of trained personnel in almost every area of the pollution control effort. Section 20 authorizes grants and contracts to train undergraduate students interested in the design, operation, and maintenance of waste treatment works and other facilities for water quality control. The urgent nature of this need is pointed out here primarily for the benefit of my good colleagues on the Appropriations Committee.

Another important provision of the act is section 19 which deals with demonstration projects for the control of acid mine pollution. This too is a step in the right direction.

The chief shortcoming of the act, in my opinion, is the lack of provision for adequate research. Like so many problems, we have rushed into pollution control without full and careful research into the exact nature of the problem. Good, solid research to identify and isolate the problem makes solution of the problem 10 times easier.

We also need much more cooperation

and coordination among the various levels of government, and private industry, in our pollution research. My suggestion for this problem is a series of satellites research stations which would serve as coordinators of research for the overall pollution problem in a given area. They would coordinate the efforts of the various levels of government, and those of private industry.

Another shortcoming of the bill is the absence of more strict regulation of pollution by Federal activities. Our Federal agencies and activities around the country should be taking the lead in establishing new concepts and methods of pollution control. Instead under the provisions of this act, we will still have some agencies dragging their feet as bad if not worse than some private industries.

While these shortcomings are serious—I do support the act and urge that it be passed. In the meantime, I will be introducing legislation to correct these shortcomings and hope that the committee will give early and serious consideration to my legislation.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

(Mr. McCARTHY (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today deals with one of the major problems of our environment. Water pollution is no longer the concern of the expert but rather is a concern of the public. Our swimming beaches have been contaminated by sewage. Our lakes are polluted or crowded with algae fed by fertilizers or human wastes. Our rivers have the stink of open sewers during the summer months. There is less pleasure in boating when owners must scrape oil and sludge from the sides and bottoms of their boats constantly. Waterways that once delighted the eye now offend; we have damaged a major natural resource.

But the time for talking about the dangers of water pollution, for calling attention to man's neglect of this natural resource is past. Opinion polls show clearly that the American public is concerned about this problem. They show clearly that the public is ready for action—not words. This demand has been recognized by Congress in the unanimous votes approving the authorization of money to construct sewage treatment facilities. The funds that have been authorized were in keeping with the size of the problem. I would have preferred to have even larger authorizations, but can appreciate the many different demands for our tax dollars.

Unfortunately, we have failed to appropriate anywhere near the amounts that have been authorized for the construction of treatment plants and sewers. For treatment plant construction we authorized $450 million in 1968; we appropriated $203 million. We authorized $700 million in 1969; we appropriated $214 million. We authorized $1 billion in 1970; the administration has budgeted $214 million. In these years alone, we have appropriated $1,519,000,000 less than the amount authorized. I think that our national priorities are sadly misinterpreted when we spend, for example, more than $350 million a year on chemical and biological warfare, weapons of questionable value, while only spending $214 million to prevent the destruction of our water resources.

What does the water pollution funding gap mean in terms of water pollution control at the State and local level? The Federal Water Pollution Control Act made it necessary for the States to develop acceptable water quality standards and to initiate programs to bring the waters within their States up to these standards. In a number of cases bond issues have been passed to assist in cleaning up their waters. My own State, New York, passed a $1.6 billion pure waters bond issue to help cities and towns build the necessary sewage treatment facilities. And New York went beyond that; it agreed to prefinance the Federal share of construction of these facilities so that there would be no delay in cleaning up our rivers and lakes.

At the local level cities and towns have passed referendums authorizing the financing of the construction of sewers and treatment facilities. The local leaders who must convince the residents of a town or village to add to their property tax to construct new sewers and treatment facilities must use a part of their political capital in building support for these referendums—the additional tax burden is not assumed lightly.

One can imagine, then, the effect of the failure of the Federal Government to provide its share of the funds required for facility construction. New York State will not receive a fraction of the Federal funds to which it is entitled under the amounts authorized. A tax burden is thrown back from Washington on the State and local government, increasing the rapidly growing demands on State and local revenues.

Towns and villages under legal order to clean up pollution find that they do not have the funds to do the job. They know that the cleanup has been ordered by Washington—why, then, does not Washington do its share and provide the promised assistance?

In fairness it must be recognized that the demands of the Vietnamese conflict have kept domestic spending at much lower levels than had been desired. Many worthwhile programs were cut back and many others failed to see the light of day as a result of the economics brought about by the war.

The shortage of funds for water pollution control while the Vietnamese conflict is going on was recognized, however, and a remedy was suggested. Last year's water pollution control bill contained a provision that placed the financing of treatment facilities on a capital basis rather than on a annual basis. This is a technique whereby the Federal Government agrees to pay the principal and interest on a 30-year bond issued by the State, town, or village to cover the cost of new facilities. Rather than giving the community one lump sum to cover the Federal share in the first year, the Federal Government would only have to pay roughly one-thirtieth of the cost each year. This would make it possible to start many more projects than could be initiated following the present lump-sum approach. As you may recall, both bodies of Congress passed that legislation last year but it failed to clear the conference committee at the last minute.

Recognizing the value of this financing approach to the task of water pollution control, I reintroduced a comprehensive water quality bill in this session of Congress. I was joined by 24 of my colleagues in that action. The companion bills—H.R. 7734 and H.R. 7767—both include a financing section identical with that passed by both bodies of Congress in the last session. It has been my impression that those concerned with water pollution control realize that this capital financing approach is a most effective way to make the limited funds available go as far as possible.

Both the House and the Senate committees dealing with water pollution control have deferred consideration of financing proposals for this activity until the new administration has had an opportunity to review their budget and make any proposals that they believed desirable. As a matter of courtesy, financing provisions are not included in the bill considered today.

I have learned, however, that the administration will propose an appropriation of $214 million for the construction of water pollution control treatment facilities. And as far as I am able to determine, this request will not include a provision for capital or long term funding. If this is the case, $214 million is totally inadequate. Apparently, Secretary of the Interior Hickel recognizes this, for I understand that he requested a total of $600 million for this purpose, only to be turned down by the Executive Office of the President.

If the Federal Government does not do its share, what can we legitimately ask the State and city to do? Can we hold enforcement conferences and demand that localities upgrade their treatment facilities? Can we ask the cities located along Lake Erie or along the Mississippi or Missouri to build secondary rather than primary treatment facilities? This sort of hypocrisy is one of the roots of dissatisfaction with Washington found at the local level.

I hope that the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee will be able to hold hearings on my bill to provide adequate financing for water pollution control in the near future. This legislation is important to our environment. Neglect now will mean destruction later. We cannot afford to wait.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I am glad I have the opportunity at this time to comment on this bill, and express my wholehearted approval of this measure designed to start the long-delayed assault on water pollution which has affected this country for so long, but which has been marked by serious inaction on the part of the Government. The problem has reached a critical stage, but I am hopeful that quick action now can stop further damage to our environment and start to roll back the damage already done.

It is incumbent upon us to pass H.R. 4148. Further delay may very well make the problem insoluble, forever relegating our lakes and rivers to open sewers infesting all surrounding areas.

In my district in California we have one of the most beautiful bodies of water in the State, Clear Lake. This lake has long been recognized as one of the leading recreational waterfronts in the area, and its existence has spurred the development of the surrounding land area. As is the case in so many of these situations however, the development of the surrounding landscape has upset the entomology of the land. In the case of Clear Lake, development of surrounding land areas has begun to fill the lake with raw sewage and waste. Engineering reports clearly indicate the damage done by the invasion of algae which has upset the natural balance of this beautiful body of water, and will soon make it unfit for human use.

It is not too late to turn the tide however. This bill is a good start toward an all encompassing fight to reverse the damage done by man to his natural assets.

I view this measure as an economy move. If we do not get the funding now, the costs will be immeasurably higher later. I think we are all agreed that action must be taken at some time. In the case of water pollution, delay will mean added expense at a later date. The studies on the Clear Lake problem point this up. As the pollution gets worse, the corrective measures will be far more expensive. I do not think anyone on the floor today disagrees with the proposition that the problem must be faced at some time. In this time of fiscal extremis however, many of my colleagues feel that all but the most urgent spending measures must be curtailed. I generally agree. But in this case I feel that the fight for control of environmental pollution is possibly the most urgent priority on the legislative agenda. Delay now will at best make corrective measures more costly in the future. At worst we will have passed the point of possible correction and will be forced to forever consign these areas of natural beauty to putrid wastelands. The problem of Clear Lake is a prime example. We must not allow this body of water to become an open sewer that will forever be lost to the citizens of California and the Nation.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to join with my colleagues in expressing my strong support for H.R. 4198, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969. This is the type of legislation that is very badly needed to clean up our polluted waters and harbors and keep them free of oil and sewage pollution.

If we are ever going to restore our environment to its natural state so that it can be enjoyed by all free of contamination, we must begin now. For too long we have allowed technology to alter the environment without attention being paid to the consequences. This legislation is a good step in the right direction.

The Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 essentially will do five things:

First, it will make shipowners liable for oil discharge or spillage up to $10 million and provide criminal penalties for failing to report such discharge or spillage as well as civil penalties in cases of willful or negligent discharge.

Second, it will set up a $20 million revolving fund for reimbursing states assisting in cleanups of pollution.

Third, it will direct the Secretary of the Interior to stop discharge of sewage from vessels by development of marine sanitation devices on ships.

Fourth, it would authorize up to $15 million for a demonstration program on acid pollution from mining.

Finally, it would appropriate funds for research into water pollution and development of water quality control facilities.

This legislation is urgently needed, particularly in light of the recent tragic oil spill off the coast of California. The incident served to focus increased attention on this important problem and helped us bring this legislation to the floor of the House today. I am hopeful the Water Quality Control Act of 1969 will pass both Houses of Congress and will be signed by the President. We just cannot afford to wait any longer. The showdown between a continued polluted environment and a return to a clean environment is at hand.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have but one complaint about the bill now being considered by this House. It does not do enough.

All of us were shocked by the oil discharge which polluted the Santa Barbara coast, and this bill speaks to such pollution in part, but I wish to speak of 100 years of pollution of an even more fabled resource, San Franscisco Bay, and the unreported results.

Let me make the facts clear: Much of San Francisco Bay is now septic. Much more of the bay will become septic unless something is done.

Some of the provisions of this bill directly attack the problems of San Francisco Bay and I support the bill. However, this bill still represents an approach which is "too little and too late."

The magnitude of the problem in San Francisco Bay was spelled out in a recent study which called for a master sewer system to cost the communities involved $2 billion between 1970 and 1990.

The crisis facing San Francisco Bay is not one that has come slowly, nor is it one that all of the people around the bay have ignored. In fact communities and industries around the San Francisco Bay have spent $283 million in their efforts to clean up the bay and to keep it clean. Within my own district, as an example, San Jose and Santa Clara have spent $35 million on a new sewage treatment plant. This last year the voters of these two cities by a two-thirds majority margin approved the expenditure of another $30 million. Most other communities around San Francisco Bay, under the leadership of the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board, have made similar sacrifices.

The condition of bay waters is better today than a few years ago because of the continuing sacrifices of many bay area taxpayers and because of the leadership of the water quality control board. Marine life is returning to the South Bay, harbor seals are once more able to survive in the bay, dead waters have returned to life.

Despite the dramatic improvement in the quality of some of the waters of the bay, red tides have started to appear, tides which may well mark the biological death of the bay, and massive reports of fish kills have become more frequent.

Health officials still warn the public not to eat the oysters of the bay, because they carry sewage-borne diseases.

The same health officials warn some of the waters of the bay are dangerous for body contact sports. These waters, because of sewage, can carry diseases in their spray.

The efforts of 90 of the 91 cities around the bay and of the water quality control board have suppressed many of the sewage odors of the past, restored the quality of waters so fish can live in them, but increasing loads of pollutants, nutrients, chemicals and toxics are undoing the good work of the past.

Obviously we have not done enough.

And the tides of growth are still pouring into the San Francisco Bay area, bringing more people to join the 4.5 million already living around the bay, and bringing more human and industrial wastes.

At the same time there are those who wish to fill the open water of the bay for profit, further limiting the circulation of waters in the bay, while at the same time increasing the loads it must absorb.

We are not too far from the point where the only use of San Francisco Bay will be that of an open sewer.

Most of us who live around the bay are committed to a clean bay, a healthy bay, a bay seeable by the public. Yet, I must point out there are two public bodies which have not fulfilled their public responsibility to insure raw sewage and industrial wastes are kept out of the bay.

They are the city and county of San Francisco and the Federal Government.

Let me first say a few words in defense of the combined city and county governments of San Francisco. San Francisco is the second oldest city, next to San Jose, in the bay area, it has a shrinking population of 740,000 out of a total bay area growing population of 4.5 million, and it is the only city with a combined storm drain and sewage system. Thus, it is the only city of the 91 around the bay which regularly dumps its sewage raw, not only into the bay, but also on the beaches where its children play.

The problem is simple: When it rains as little as two-tenths of an inch an hour, really only a heavy fog, the city's overburdened combined storm drain and sewage system overflows, resulting in the present unsightly, unhealthy, and putrid conditions. It may take up to $1 billion to correct this problem.

San Francisco, faced by other massive problems of the inner cities, needs far more help than that offered in this bill.

It also needs to face its sewage problem and to inform its people of that problem.

The second major offender is the Federal Government.

At present at least 12 Federal installations are polluting San Francisco Bay.

An estimated 500,000 gallons of industrial wastes, including, but not limited to, cyanide, flow into the bay from the Alameda Naval Air Station. These wastes are discharged at the water's edge, not even taken out to deep water where the damage they do might be diluted. Mare Island pours an additional 150,000 gallons of similar industrial wastes into the bay, the Concord Naval Weapons Station contributes 3,000 gallons a day, and the Point Molate Facility near Richmond, discharges 10,000 gallons a day of treated, but substandard, wastes.

The hard pressed San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board has no authority over these Federal installations.

The U.S. Navy has promised to hook up both the Alameda Naval Air Station and Mare Island to local sewage treatment plants during fiscal 1969–70, if the funds are available. Short as funds are this year, I pray that they will be available.

The bill we are now discussing says:

> Each Federal agency having jurisdiction over any real property or facility of any kind shall within available appropriations and consistent with the interests of the United States insure compliance with applicable water quality standards.

I for one wish this provision were stronger. Pollution is not in the interest of the United States.

Finally, ships of the U.S. Navy, including its giant aircraft carriers discharge their sewage raw into the bay, not only as they pass in and out of the bay, but also as they rest in harbor. In effect they are moveable, small cities, polluting the bay as they go.

Again this bill speaks to the point, but in a manner I wish were more effective. The bill calls for waste treatment standards for civilian shipping, but in the case of military vessels it leaves the decision up to the Secretary of Defense.

I would hope all of us would agree the U.S. Navy should stop polluting San Francisco Bay.

The waters of San Francisco Bay face one more major Federal threat—a threat not created by the people who live and work around the bay. It is called the San Luis master drain and it will dump, for it is now under construction, millions of gallons of agricultural waste waters, carrying pesticides and nutrients, into this already polluted bay. The drain will bring its pollution to the bay even as the fresh waters, which once flushed out the bay, are cut off by Federal and State of California water projects. I would refer any of my colleagues, who might wish to explore this problem further, to the statements of Congressman Jerome Waldie, whose district faces disaster because of this drain.

The story of the pollution of San Francisco Bay is a long and sad tale, told not often enough. Even today the people of the city and county of San Francisco know little about the condition of their own beaches. However, the job of education of the public about bay problems has been done well by the San Jose Mercury and News and the Oakland Tribune. The most recent and one of the best of these accounts was written by Mr. Fred Garretson of the Oakland Tribune.

Mr. Chairman, I will include Mr. Garretson's stories at the conclusion of my remarks, so every Member of Congress will have available the story of the polluted San Francisco Bay.

The problems of San Francisco Bay are not unique. Many areas of my State, and of the Nation, face similar problems. In Washington we only need go to the banks of the Potomac River to bring ourselves face to face with the ugly facts of water pollution.

I speak in favor of this bill, not because it is as much as we can do, but because it is the least we can do.

The articles referred to follow:

Our Polluted Bay: San Francisco's Flood of Sewage—Tour of Waterfront Bares Filth Problem

(By Fred Garretson)

It is one of those pleasant afternoons in San Francisco when a brisk little storm has cleared away the fog and the citizens of the most sophisticated city in the West go down to the beaches and the Bay to play among the streams of raw brown sewage draining out of fancy hilltop apartment houses.

Near Phelan State Beach Park, two teenage girls romp happily among the sewage that flows across the beach like a small river and mixes with the ocean waves.

Near Lake Merced, children from Park Merced Towers build sand castles out of the easily molded brown sludge that stains their beach.

At Lincoln Way, where Golden Gate Park meets The Great Highway, a shallow, 20-foot-wide sewage stream flows across the public beach and strolling couples make agile leaps to keep the water out of their shoes.

Near Fleishhacker Zoo, where the outflow of the Vicente Street sewer has carved a rolling valley into the shifting beach sand, a woman with a dog on a leash stops to let the thirsty animal drink out of the sewage stream.

This is a typical nice day in San Francisco.

It would be any one of at least 61 days between October and May when the city's antique "single pipe" municipal sewer system overflows. Then raw, untreated sewage drains into the Bay and ocean from 38 "sewer diversion structure outfalls" along the waterfront.

During dry weather the municipal system intercepts most of the sewage—except during what state officials describe as the "regular" once-a-week breakdown—and provides a low degree of treatment before the waste is discharged into the Bay and ocean.

But a trace of rain—only 0.02 of an inch of precipitation per hour—pours storm water runoff from the streets into the sanitary sewers, overwhelming the treatment plants and sending raw sewage onto the beaches, marinas and around the docks.

The sewage streams are plainly visible after a storm.

Near the Marina Green, boats twist against their mooring lines in the current flowing out of the Pierce Street sewer.

At Aquatic Park, one of the leaders of the city's cultural enlightenment steps out of the locker room at the Dolphin Swim Club, takes a deep breath of the salt air blowing through the Golden Gate, and then dives into the water amid the flecks of toilet tissue dancing on the waves.

At Baker Beach State Park the favorite picnic spot is a deep, somewhat smelly, lake gouged out of the beach by the sewer outfall at a spot far above the high tide line. Children say it's a popular swimming hole for those who want to avoid ocean salt water and is frequently used by sunbathers to wash sand off their skin.

The river of sewage pouring out of this lake to bisect the public beach is so wide that only an athletic teenager, who takes a running jump, could get across without getting his feet wet.

At the foot of Pierce Street children scramble over the big concrete outfall pipe and fish among the flecks of human waste and detergent foam which gushes into the Bay.

The view from the dining room picture window at St. Francis Yacht Club is dominated by the sight of the Baker Street sewer pipe, which sits on the beach like a grounded whale discharging bubbling, turbulent water just off the shore.

At Fisherman's Wharf, a honeymooning couple sit in a famous restaurant watching the fishing boats rise and fall on the oily waves where the waterfall sound of the Hyde Street sewer is lost among the sound of waves washing among the piers.

Only three years ago health officials had to order three fish packing companies in San Francisco to stop washing their floors, cleaning fish and swabbing out fish packing cases with water pumped out of the Bay a few feet from a raw sewage discharge point.

Farther east, near Pier 33, a brown upwelling in the Bay tinges the air. Within a few more hours—if it doesn't rain again—the North Point sewage treatment plant will be back under control and able to chlorinate the sewage flowing out of the homes of 409,000 San Francisco residents in the north point "sewage watershed."

Farther south and east along the waterfront, where pretty girls drink coffee in open air lunch rooms on the docks, there are flecks of sewage solids coating the pilings that support docks and office buildings on the waterfront.

At Islais Creek there is a foul smell in the air where the unchlorinated sewage of 161,000 residents, and the flow from the South-of-Market industrial complex, pours through primitive machinery at the Southeast sewer treatment plant and is discharged to fester in the oily waters of a dead-end lagoon.

Northward, at the heart of San Francisco's maritime commercial center, five full sewers of raw waste pour into the dead-end channel of China Basin.

Just south of Pier 50, where people daily wade into the water at the municipal boat launching ramp, is the outfall of the South Fourth Street sewer. The line, until recently, discharged the waste of an industrial neighborhood 365 days a year—pipes weren't connected to any treatment plant.

Prudent folk might worry about wading into San Francisco's waters where a raw sewage discharge pours into the Bay at every single marina in the city.

But boat owners can find one thing good: human sewage has special powers as a wood preservative. Boats floating in sewage—and wooden pilings in polluted water—are protected from the effects of teredo and limnoria, the Bay's destructive salt water termites.

From a helicopter, flying along the waterfront to San Franicsco International Airport, passengers can almost always see a two-mile long tongue of brown, polluted water pouring out of Islais Creek at the rate of more than 15 million gallons per day in the summer time, and much faster in the winter.

The great tongue of brown water wavers like a living thing on the Bay's tidal currents—swinging miles south along the waterfront toward Hunters Point with the incoming tide and then licking north toward Potrero Point on the ebb tide.

The ebb tide sends the brown water up into the intake pumps at Bethlehem Shipyard where workers are drenched in polluted water while washing ships. At flood tide it's the U.S. Naval Shipyard workers who get bathed in sewage.

The wavering brown tongue also engulfs the favorite swimming spot where children from the Hunters Point neighborhood dive into the Bay. It's prohibited, of course, but at any time on a good day, health inspectors see 20 children in the water at a time.

The weekends are probably the least polluted times in San Francisco because the factories are closed and the offices of hundreds of thousands of commuting workers are empty.

At such times, there are only the toilets of 740,000 residents to pollute the Bay.

In the rainy season one can be quite sure of finding the flow of raw sewage pouring out from a given neighborhood.

That stream of raw sewage that carved out the swimming hole on Baker State Beach comes from Mayor Joseph Alioto's neighborhood.

The Jackson Street sewer flow near the Ferry Building comes from the financial district. Haight-Ashbury sewage drains both toward China Basin and to the ocean beach of Golden Gate Park.

This is a waterfront tour you won't find listed in any guidebook issued by the Chamber of Commerce or the San Francisco Tourist Bureau.

It's a summary of facts—neither the best nor the worst facts—listed in a little-known book issued by the Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board.

The title is: "Staff Report on Long Range Plan and Policy with Respect to Water Pollution Control in That Portion of the City and County of San Francisco Which Drains Into San Francisco Bay."

You might find a copy of it at San Francisco City Hall.

It should be easy to find at the public library, because almost nobody ever looks at it.

"The City That Knows How" doesn't like to think about its sewage problem.

An Ominous "Red Tide" Threatens Bay's Future

(By Fred Garretson)

On a cloudy morning during the last week of April, 1966, the passengers aboard Doug Webb's party boat "Sturgeon" caught a whiff of a strange, fishy smell rising out of San Pablo Bay.

Seconds later, flecks of red foam leaped up in the wake of the motorboat and for the next few minutes Webb sailed through what looked like a great mass of burgundy wine spilled into the blue waters of San Francisco Bay.

Carl Bennett Jr., owner of the Rodeo Marina, also saw the same thing and telephoned the officers of the Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board to report that, "There's something wrong out in the Bay."

This was the first official record that the so-called "red tide" had appeared in San Francisco Bay.

To the scientists and engineers who study the Bay, the appearance of the red tide was a deadly warning sign, that man's constant dumping of sewage and poison had overwhelmed the Bay's ability to cleanse itself.

It might, they said, be a symptom the living Bay was about to become a sterile dead sea.

The mysterious red phantom continued to haunt all parts of the Bay during the spring and summer months of 1966, 1967 and 1968. It's expected to appear again in about April of this year.

Despite 20 years of effort, the Bay pollution problem is getting worse, according to Fred Dierker, executive officer of the regional water quality agency in the nine Bay Area counties.

He said the sewage smell has been suppressed and many forms of fish life have returned to the Bay, but the buildup of sewage chemicals in the water has turned the Bay into a biological time bomb.

"We don't know why the red discoloration appeared or what it represents," Dierker said, "but we think it's one more warning sign that the Bay has become overloaded with pollution, nutrient chemicals and toxics."

He said the red discoloration isn't the true "red tide"—a toxic, fish-killing algae which is limited to the Atlantic Ocean and is most commonly reported near Florida.

"What has appeared in the Bay is a red phytoplankton growth. There's no evidence that it kills fish or reduces the oxygen content of the Bay water," he said.

Perhaps it has always been present in the Bay waters, but is now spreading across the Bay in great red blankets because pollution has upset the balance of nature.

William Macke, the district's field engineer who has spent most of his time during the past 12 years taking water samples in all parts of the Bay, described it this way:

"The red discoloration is generally several thousand feet long and about 150 to 200 feet wide, but sometimes spreads out much wider.

"It's very visible from the air. It looks like a herringbone pattern on the wave crests, but in quiet water it spreads out flat like a blanket. It's usually out in the center of the Bay although it also appears in shallow water.

"It's also clearly visible from a boat. As you approach it there's a definite line of demarcation between normal Bay water and the red discoloration.

"As you pass through it you can see red waves on all sides and a churning red bow wake behind a motor boat.

"It's like sailing through a sea of burgundy wine.

"There's a distinctive fish odor—that's the only way to describe it—while you're passing through it. In fact, that's how you know you're approaching it. You smell it.

"It's kind of weird. We know its composed of billions of individual living things, but sometimes it acts like one big creature. The scientific studies have confirmed that it has swimming ability and can move around the Bay.

"Usually it's right on the surface, but once we went looking for it at night and it had dropped down under water to some depth. It apparently comes up to the surface in the daytime.

"One day it looks like a big single mass and the next day it's broken up in strips and streaks, depending on the weather conditions. It persists for a long time," Macke said.

Although it's been seen in all parts of the Bay, the greatest number of reports come from the South Bay, where pollution problems are greatest. Reports have been particularly numerous around Burlingame and Coyote Point in San Mateo County.

Macke said the worst discolorations appeared during the summer of 1967, a peculiar year when a lot of strange things happened in the Bay.

Thousands of dead and dying sting rays came to the surface.

Hundreds of sharks seemed to commit suicide by swimming up onto beaches and mudflats as if they were trying to climb out of the Bay. Scientists carried some of them back to deep water, but the sharks swam right back up onto beaches.

But 1967 was also the year that record numbers of seals appeared in isolated areas along the Eastbay shore. There was a population explosion among shrimp in San Pablo Bay and for the first time in decades commercial shrimp fishing resumed in the Bay.

A lot of people cheered that the return of seals and shrimp was a good sign indicating that Bay pollution was being cleaned up. As for the death of sharks and sting rays . . . well, it's hard to get indignant about it.

But biologists were alarmed. Sharks are like humans, predators at the end of the food chain, feeding on smaller animals which in turn eat smaller plants and animals right down to the most primitive organism that would be most sensitive to pollution.

The pessimists warned that the mass death of sharks might indicate that pollution had shattered the bottom of the food chain. Vital microorganisms and plants might be dead or poisoned, passing on poison to bigger animals, destroying their nervous systems so that sharks went mad.

A reduction in the population of some predators—because of starvation or poisoning—might also lead to a population explosion in other creatures—like shrimp.

The optimists said sharks are strange creatures and some species in other parts of the world have sometimes been observed performing the rite of mass suicide. So do lemmings.

The optimists said it might be a sign fish life was improving in the Bay and now the shark population had expanded so much that mass suicide in the Bay was more likely to be noticed.

The red tide was a disturbing fact, but there were unconfirmed reports of sightings before April, 1966, and a few people say they saw something like a red tide—which wasn't studied at the time—appear in Richardson Bay 15 years ago.

These earlier reports could be interpreted either as an early warning of potential ecological disaster or as an indication that red tide had been around for many years.

Ecology is the science which studies the total web of life, the environmental interrelationships between plants, animals, man, the landscape, the weather, etc.

And ecology will be the forum of debate in the next few years about how—and whether—to spend hundreds of millions of dollars cleaning up the Bay so the Bay Area might become a more livable place for many creatures—including man.

Ecological arguments, often involving extremely technical disputes within—and between—scientific and engineering disciplines, are hard for a layman to judge—and sometimes people miss the whole point of the discussion.

For example, on Jan. 27 the regional board proposed some controversial engineering standards and goals aimed at cleaning up the Bay to the point where the water could meet the extremely rigid standards necessary to reestablish commercial oyster farming in the Bay.

A major industry spokesman denounced the idea of spending vast sums of money to benefit some unknwn future oyster farmers because, he said, "It would probably be cheaper to import oysters from Australia."

Regional Board officials patiently explained oysters were only one facet of the proposal—a yardstick by which water quality could be measured. A Bay clean enough for commercial oyster raising would produce a host of other ecological—and economic—benefits.

But the protest was valid: Money is one part of the ecology of man, and it weighs heavily in the efforts to restore the ecological balance of the Bay.

Since 1950, when the legislature created the regional board under provisions of the Dickey Act, the board has persuaded or compelled Bay Area cities and sewer districts to spend more than $300 million on sewage treatment facilities, Dierker said.

Industries have spent an undisclosed number of millions more.

But what has been the result?

The most noticeable effect is the horrible hydrogen sulphide (rotten egg) smell is gone from most parts of the Bay.

Motorists no longer have to roll up their windows to keep out the stench when they drive along the Bay Bridge approaches at Emeryville.

At one time, local officials say, airborne chemicals wafting off the Bay were so caustic that fresh coats of paint would peel off of structures within two blocks of the Bay.

The first big sewage clean-up efforts came in the 1950s.

In the decade of the 1960s, the people of the Bay Area rediscovered the Bay.

Boat ownership has skyrocketed bringing with it an economic boom in marinas, waterfront restaurants and water-related recreation.

The property value of formerly depressed waterfront land has risen sharply. In Marin County alone the assessor estimates the value increase was one-third of one per cent per day in the mid 1960s.

There's a big and growing demand for homes beside the Bay. In Alameda's Fernside district homes inland from the Bay used to be worth more than those beside the water. Today the waterfront homes are worth thousands more.

The same thing happened at Point Richmond.

Even in the polluted South Bay, private investors are willing to pour millions into waterfront subdivisions like Foster City or recreational complexes like Marine World.

The shipping business, which has to be on the waterfront, has been hard pressed in San Francisco where business and professional men keep moving offices into converted docks or warehouse buildings because they want to be next to the water.

There is abundant evidence of the return of all kinds of Bay plant and wildlife which almost vanished when bay pollution became serious in the first decade of the 20th Century.

Today many scientists, and even some investors, talk about reviving the oyster farms which used to be an economic mainstay of the Bay Area. There are some dizzying estimates about the potential profit of establishing other types of "farming-of-the-sea" industries in the protected waters of the Bay if pollution is eliminated.

But is pollution being eliminated?

No, says Dierker.

The regional pollution control board has consistently maintained it's running on a treadmill trying to keep ahead of the growing population and industry of the Bay Area which now pours at least 667 million gallons of sewage and industrial waste into the Bay every single day.

Most of the municipalities around the Bay have built, or are building, advanced sewage treatment facilities, and some of them—such as Valley Community Services District in the Livermore Valley turn out an effluent which comes close to meeting the U.S. Public Health Service standards for drinking water.

In 1965 the legislature established the Bay-Delta Study, a state agency, to prepare a waste disposal master plan for the nine Bay Area counties, plus portions of the Sacramento-Stockton-Tracy area east of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

The Bay-Delta Study report will be issued next month.

One of the major problems, Dierker said, is that existing sewer treatment doesn't remove nutrient chemicals (nitrates, phosphates, etc.) which are continuing to accumulate in the Bay.

"The level of nutrients in the Bay already exceeds the theoretical level at which 'algae blooms' should form all over the Bay. The blooms already exist in Suisun Bay, the Napa and Petaluma Rivers and some sloughs in the South Bay," Dierker said.

The algae blooms he foresees are great "rafts" of scum floating over all parts of the Bay depriving the water of oxygen, killing fish, fouling boat propellers and washing up on the beaches and tidelands to rot in the sun.

"Apparently something is suppressing the algae blooms so far. Perhaps some minute quantity of a trace chemical is missing," Dierker said.

The missing trace chemical—if that's what it is—could appear almost any day in a casual discharge from some industrial process or perhaps the coloring material in a new brand of toilet paper or maybe as a residual from a new fertilizer used to grow the potato peelings that get thrown into a garbage disposal.

Dierker said that the Bay-Delta Study report will say that there has been a startling increase in the nutrient level of Bay waters during the past four years.

The claim of the sudden sharp increase might be challenged on statistical grounds, but there is no doubt that the existing nutrient level in the Bay already exceeds the algae bloom level, he said.

The Bay has become a biological time bomb, and every flush of the toilet or clank of the kitchen garbage disposal adds more fuel.

If and when it explodes, this great nine-county urban area could be a metropolis sitting on the shores of a dead sea.

Eastbay Cities' River of Sewage

(By Fred Garretson)

The second biggest river emptying into San Francisco Bay is a river of sewage.

It discharges about 40 feet below the surface at a spot just south of the Bay Bridge, 2,000 feet east of Yerba Buena Island.

It's the flow of sewage from the cities of Oakland, Berkeley, Alameda, Emeryville, Albany and Piedmont discharged by the East Bay Municipal Utility District Special District No. 1 sewage treatment plant in West Oakland.

It's bigger than the Napa River.

(Engineers, who regularly translate total annual flows into small increments for easy comparisons, say the mean annual discharge of the EB-MUD sewer pipe is 127 cubic feet per second while the Napa River flow into the Bay is only 114 cubic feet per second.)

That single sewer pipe discharge is bigger than the combined annual flows of ALL the rivers and streams flowing into the Bay south of San Francisco.

The EBMUD sewage flow is probably big enough to have some effect on the tidal currents of San Francisco Bay.

The only bigger flow into the Bay is the 20,255 cubic foot per second annual outflow of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, a figure which includes all the winter floods draining out of watershed that includes 40 per cent of the land in California and stretches from the Oregon Border to the Los Angeles County line.

But while EBMUD is the biggest single discharger, the combined flow from the city of San Francisco's antique sewer system is bigger—but no one knows how much bigger.

San Francisco's three sewer treatment plants keep records, but the city has 38 raw sewage overflow pipes which overflow every time it rains—and only one of them has ever been measured.

A key difference between East and West Bay is that EBMUD discharges treated and disinfected sewage in deep water whereas San Francisco's treatment plants and raw sewers discharge right at the water's edge, sending streams of raw sewage flowing across public beaches and leaving brown water lapping against the piers.

Figures compiled by the Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board three years ago showed that the total municipal and industrial waste water discharge from the nine counties around the Bay was 541 cubic feet per second.

This man-polluted flow dwarfs the 332 cubic feet per second combined flow of all the local streams and rivers flowing into the Bay (not counting the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta).

The board said that sewage and industrial waste accounted for 2.7 percent of the net total flow of all water into the Bay system.

But with cities and industries expanding rapidly, and new dams in the mountains reducing the outflow of river water into the Bay, sewage will soon be a major source—perhaps the major source—of the water flow entering the Bay.

During the summer time waste discharges are already equal to more than one-third of the carefully regulated flow of 1,500 cubic feet per second from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

If it weren't for the constant release of water from Shasta Dam in order to flush Bay salt-water out of the fresh water channels of the Delta, the flow of sewage from Bay Area cities would probably exceed the flow of the Sacramento River during many summer months.

The winter floods now flush out the Bay's accumulated pollution, but a report to be issued by the state's Bay-Delta Study next month is expected to say that dams constructed for the California Water Plan will cut off most of this flushing flow by the end of the century.

Fred Dierker, executive officer of the regional pollution control board, said the degree of sewage treatment varies widely in different parts of the Bay.

He said 90 of the 91 cities in the Bay Area now treat their sewage. San Francisco is the only municipality with a system designed so that raw sewage flows into the Bay whenever it rains causing the system to overflow.

The only other significant raw sewage in the Bay comes from ships and boats, but the state and federal governments are starting a crackdown on these polluters.

The general types of sewage treatment are:

Primary: A primitive system in which sewage stands in tanks long enough for floating material to be scooped off and heavier particles are allowed to settle out.

Intermediate: Sometimes called "advanced primary." Chemicals and bacteria are added to break up smaller particles. Sometimes disinfection is added.

Secondary: Usually involving processes called "activated sludge" or "trickling filter" treatment. Sewage passes through several treatment tanks, some of which add oxygen to help stimulate natural biological processes in the Bay which aid in sewage assimilation. This effluent often meets health standards for "swimming pool quality water."

Tertiary: Various advanced—and expensive—treatment processes which turn sewage into a liquid that might meet U.S. Public Health Service minimum standards for drinking water.

The most recent (1966–67) compilation by the regional board showed that, "398 million gallons of treated sewage and industrial wastes are discharged daily during dry weather to the tidal waters of the Bay from 77 municipal sewerage systems.

"Approximately 35 per cent of these waste flows receive secondary treatment at 23 sewage treatment plants with the remaining flow receiving primary treatment at 54 sewage treatment plants," Dierker said.

He said 47 municipal waste dischargers, who dump 245 million gallons per day, have facilities to disinfect their sewage discharge, although some of them don't always use them or vary the amount of disinfection seasonally.

Another 32 dischargers, with a total waste flow of 153 million gallons per day, don't have disinfection facilities, he said.

Three big sewage treatment plants account for half of all municipal sewage discharges into the Bay: EBMUD; The San Francisco North Point plant, and San Jose.

The EBMUD flow gets "advanced primary" treatment, according to Dierker. Because of its discharge in deep water under good tidal conditions, "EBMUD treatment is considered adequate for the present, but it might not be good enough for conditions within the next few years," Dierker said.

San Francisco's North Point plant (one of three San Francisco treatment plants) discharges 487,000 gallons per day near Fisherman's Wharf. This flow received only primary treatment but is disinfected during dry weather.

However, a slight rainstorm overwhelms the San Francisco system and causes untreated sewage to discharge through 38 bypass pipes.

San Jose's new, ultramodern sewer plant provides "secondary" treatment for its more than 1,240,000 gallons of sewage per day, yet even this very advanced process fails to meet the regional board's standards because of stagnant tidal conditions in South San Francisco Bay, Dierker said.

In addition to the Bay Area's 398 million gallons of municipal sewage, there is a total flow of 269 million gallons per day of industrial waste discharged directly into the Bay by 44 industries, Dierker said.

Approximately 94 per cent of this industrial waste total is water used to cool industrial machinery, mainly in electricity-producing steam plants, oil and chemical companies and steel refineries.

The cooling water is drawn out of the Bay, cycled through a factory in a closed pipe system and discharged back into the Bay. There is considerable dispute about whether these vast flows of warm—sometimes boiling—water are actually a form of pollution.

Fisheries experts say some big flows of industrial cooling water are capable of upsetting the balance of nature in portions of the Bay, but the regional board doesn't classify cooling water discharges as pollution.

SAN FRANCISCO SEWER SYSTEM MUNICIPAL ANTIQUE

(By Fred Garretson)

There are 91 cities in the Bay Area, but only the city of San Francisco operates an antique municipal sewer system which overflows and dumps raw sewage onto public beaches and the waterfront every time it rains.

The other 90 cities—with varying degrees of success—have taxed themselves for expensive public works projects which are at least the first effective steps toward cleaning up the pollution in San Francisco Bay.

But unless San Francisco does something about its raw sewage discharges, the rest of the Bay Area cities are going to be reluctant to invest more money in cleaning up water pollution.

This is the opinion of Sidney S. Lippow, of Martinez, the "public-at-large" representative on the Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board.

"All over the Bay Area people are saying, 'Why should we spend more and more money building bigger and more advanced sewage treatment facilities if you're going to let San Francisco get away with doing nothing'," Lippow said.

Grant Burton, of Alamo, long-time chairman who retired from the regional board last week, said, "San Francisco city officials spent 18 years trying to avoid doing anything about the problem."

Burton advocates "turning the problem over to the State Attorney General" for prosecutions. The law provides for possible jail sentences for officials and fines of up to $50,000 per day for the city—as long as the city violates pollution control laws.

Fred Dierker, executive officer of the regional board, explained that most cities have two sets of pipes buried in their streets. One pipe system handles sewage and the other pipe carries away rain water from the streets.

But San Francisco uses a "single pipe" system which receives all the liquid waste from toilets, street gutters, roof storm drains, garbage disposal machines, industrial acids, hospital refuse and even the sweepings from the elephant cage at the zoo.

During dry weather, almost all of San Francisco's liquid waste ends up in one of the city's three sewage treatment plants and is given low-grade "primary treatment" to remove floating grease and solids before its discharge into the Bay or ocean.

But in wet weather, the rush of rain water from the streets pours into the sanitary sewers and overwhelms the system. Sewage cascades through the treatment plants without time for adequate treatment.

Sewage backs us in the main pipes and—because of the San Francisco system's design—starts overflowing through 38 "sewer diversion structure outfalls" located on beaches, marinas and under the San Francisco docks.

Even in dry weather the San Francisco system is primitive by the standards of other Bay Area cities.

The North Point and Mile Rock Beach discharges are given only "primary" treatment, chlorinated and discharged at the water's edge. The Islais Creek treatment plant discharge isn't chlorinated and is discharged to fester in a dead-end lagoon.

By contrast, most Bay Area cities have built—or are actively planning—expensive "secondary" treatment facilities which cycle sewage through a series of processes which, some engineering consultants claim, turns sewage into "swimming pool quality water."

Some communities, such as Valley Community Services District near Livermore, use even more advanced "tertiary treatment," which turns sewage into an effluent which almost equals the U.S. Public Health Service standards for drinking water.

East Bay Municipal Utility District Special District No. 1, covering Oakland, Berkeley, Emeryville, Albany, Piedmont and Alameda (and soon to add El Cerrito and Kensington) uses what Dierker calls "advanced primary" treatment.

However, instead of discharging at the water's edge as is done in San Francisco, EBMUD's treated sewage passes through a long pipe and disperses in a deep channel in the middle of the Bay where there are strong tidal currents.

In addition, EBMUD is designing secondary treatment facilities and is considering a further program to treat storm water discharges which pick up pollution from city streets.

Some South Bay cities are planning to bond themselves for expensive equipment that would carry their already treated sewage through pipes 20 miles long to discharge it into better tidal currents.

Water pollution control is expensive.

Dierker said most cities and sewer districts charge the equivalent of more than 50 cents per $100 assessed valuation for sewage treatment facilities. Until recently Oro Loma Sanitary District residents in Ashland paid 97 cents, and in some parts of the Bay Area the cost is higher, Dierker said.

Dierker and Daniel Murphy, an engineer for the regional board, both stressed that a properly designed sewer system has an emergency overflow that would discharged raw sewage into a river or the Bay in case of a major disaster such as an earthquake or a big flood.

The difference between San Francisco and every other city in the Bay Area is that fundamental design in San Francisco causes its system to overflow raw sewage in every rain storm.

No one knows how much of San Francisco's sewage goes into the Bay raw, but according to Murphy, during what engineers call a "five-year storm," 99.25 per cent of the water flowing in San Francisco's sewers does not even go into a treatment plant.

What little sewage does reach the treatment plant simply cascades through the pipes without a chance to settle.

In such a storm (equal to half an inch of rainfall in any one hour period) the sewers are discharging at the rate of 20,000 cubic feet a second where the maximum hydraulic flow which could receive even minimal treatment is only 150 cubic feet per second, Murphy said.

All storm drains carry some pollution from streets and roofs, but the San Francisco problem is made worse because the rush of water from the streets loosens the accumulation of grease and slime inside the sanitary sewer pipes.

"That first few hours of flow out of the San Francisco diversion outfalls is extremely bad stuff," Murphy said.

Burton, a member of the regional pollution control board from its formation in 1950 until last week, said the agency prefers to work closely with local people rather than clubbing them with legal action to upgrade sewage treatment facilities.

"But," Burton recalls, "we spent more than 18 years trying to get the San Francisco City Administration to discuss the problem, but they kept dodging us."

"On one occasion we arranged a meeting with the San Francisco supervisors in their own board of supervisors chambers, but none of them showed up for the meeting.

"Another time some supervisors came to a meeting, but they started denouncing their own city engineering staff when they started to talk about the problem. Maybe they thought their own city employees were members of the regional board staff, or maybe they just didn't want to hear about it," Burton said.

However, Burton praises Joseph Alioto as "the first San Francisco mayor in the past 18 years who has been willing to at least talk about the problem."

But, Burton stressed, "There's a difference between talking about a problem and doing something about it."

Jerome Gilbert of Novato, present chairman of the regional board, said, "There's a well-founded lack of confidence in San Francisco's willingness to actually solve the problem."

He said pressure from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration finally produced a resolution by San Francisco supervisors last October which officially admitted, for the first time, that the city has a sewer problem and proposing a time table for partially solving it.

He said federal authorities refused to approve a minor federal grant to the city until supervisors filed a time schedule for providing secondary treatment of all sewage.

There was the implied threat that the government would start rejecting other kinds of federal grants for the city.

The San Francisco resolution promised to provide secondary treatment at two of three city treatment plants by 1975 and said the city would start treating four of its 38 wet-weather raw sewage discharges.

Regional Board member Sidney Lippow said the San Francisco resolution was "full of a lot of weasel words" which, even if carried out completely, would solve only part of the problem.

San Francisco supervisor Robert Mendelson, who presented the resolution to the regional board, said that because of other urban problems San Francisco won't budget much money for sewage treatment and said the Federal Government would have to pay most of the cost.

Under questioning by the regional board, Mendelson said the "secondary treatment" standards all other Bay Area cities are being asked—or compelled—to obey, are too expensive to apply in San Francisco.

"But I'm sure San Francisco can probably get an adjustment in the federal standards for this city," Mendelson said.

This observation stunned officials of other Bay Area cities, who have spent more than $300 million since 1950 on sewage treatment facilities and are planning to spend much more to meet federal and state standards.

Mendelson said San Francisco officials declined even to consider financing the improvements through sewer service and sewer connection charges which have financed the ambitious pollution control programs in Oakland and San Jose.

The regional board's suspicions about San Francisco worsened in December when city officials failed to show up—until after adjournment—at a regional board meeting called to consider detailed implementation of San Francisco's plans.

At that meeting William Bishop, a federal pollution control official, testified that a $921,000 federal grant had been given to San Francisco in June to finance a demonstration design project to suggest various ways to eliminate the wet-weather raw sewage discharge from the Baker street sewer at the St. Francis Yacht Club.

But, board chairman Gilbert discovered, six months after the money was given to San Francisco, the city hadn't even let a design contract.

"If you're having that kind of trouble on something as simple as this, what's going to happen in the next few years when you're scheduled to have real work under way?" Gilbert asked San Francisco officials.

San Francisco will have real problems complying with their promise to provide secondary treatment of the massive flows of sewage in wet weather.

Secondary treatment requires holding sewer water for hours at a time when flow of the San Francisco sewers is big enough to fill a good sized reservoir in a short time.

Murphy said it will require imaginative thinking, such as possible carving out huge tunnels or caverns in the San Francisco hills to hold storm flows until they can be treated. Conceivably such a system could generate hydroelectric power as sewage flows down to treatment plants, he said.

San Francisco officials reject the idea of doing what Oakland is doing in older parts of the city—digging up the old single-pipe system and installing separate pipes for sanitary sewage and storm drainage.

(Oakland spends $1 million a year from special tax funds specifically earmarked for this purpose.)

Murphy said installing two pipes would require digging up every single street in San Francisco and also reinstalling the plumbing in every building in the city because toilets and roof drains are now connected to the same pipe system.

Oakland and Berkeley used rapid transit construction as an opportunity to replace many older portions of their sewer systems, but San Francisco is reconstructing Market Street with the same old antique single-pipe sewers.

Murphy said it would be useless to put separate sanitary and storm pipes under Market Street if all the tributary sewers from surrounding streets still used the old system.

But, Murphy said, complete replacement isn't impossible.

He noted that the U.S. Defense Department rebuilt and separated storm and sanitary pipes at the Presidio and at San Francisco Naval Shipyard; both handle as much sewage as a small city.

However, the Army and Navy sewer cleanup programs didn't have much effect. The brand new systems were reconnected to San Francisco's obsolete single-pipe sewers.

And when it rains, Army and Navy toilet flushings still pour out onto the public beaches, along with the sewage of 740,000 San Franciscans.

Sewage Control Vested in Boards

(By Fred Garretson)

Control of water pollution is fundamentally a state responsibility which in the San Francisco Bay Area has been delegated to an autonomous, and powerful, local board known as the Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board.

There are nine such boards in California whose boundaries of authority are set up on watershed lines which have only a passing relationship to city or county boundaries.

The Bay Area regional board has authority to specify standards for all waste water discharges into streams, rivers or ground water flowing into San Francisco Bay as far eastward as a point about one mile west of Antioch Bridge.

The control of waste flows in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, and the Delta—which has a major effect on the quality of Bay water—is controlled by a Central Valley regional board encompassing 40 per cent of the land area in the state.

The Bay Area board's authority also extends 50 miles out into the Pacific Ocean and along part of the San Mateo and Marin County ocean coastlines.

The Bay Area board's authority covers at least parts of all nine Bay Area counties, although most of Sonoma County lies in the jurisdiction of the North Coast regional board, which had headquarters in Santa Rosa.

The seven members of the regional board are appointed by the governor for four-year terms. By law, six members represent special interest groups and one represents the public at large.

Jerome Gilbert of Novato, manager of the North Marin Water District, the chairman of the board, last week was appointed executive officer of the State Water Resources Control Board, which sets broad policies for the nine regional boards in the state.

His appointment leaves a vacancy on the regional board for a representative of a water supply agency in the nine county area.

Other members are:

Vice-chairman, Ercole Caroselli of San Francisco, a Pacific Gas & Electric Co., executive representing industrial waste dischargers.

James F. McCormick, of Moraga, manager of a Berkeley printing firm, representing conservation groups; William C. Weber, of San Mateo, a businessman and city councilman representing city governments.

Edward Teresi, a San Jose land developer, chairman of the Santa Clara County Planning Commission, representing county governments; Cecil E. Herrick, Napa Valley farmer, representing agriculture interests who depend upon irrigation.

Sidney S. Lippow, of Martinez, a businessman with diversified holdings, is the public-at-large representative.

Teresi and Weber were appointed to the board last year by Gov. Ronald Reagan.

Herrick was appointed last week to succeed Grant Burton of Walnut Creek, longtime chairman of the regional board who had served on the regional board since it was created in 1950 following passage of the Dickey Act, which set up the state pollution control program in 1949.

The regional board office is at 364 14th St., Oakland.

Since 1950 it has compelled or convinced cities and sewer districts to spend more than $300 million of sewage treatment facilities, plus other millions for private industrial waste treatment, according to Fred Dierker, the board's executive officer.

The board's top engineers are Roger James, policy formation; Dr. Teng Wu, surveillance, and Bill Gingrich, administration.

Regulatory engineers for special county areas are H. C. (Chuck) Knapp, Contra Costa, Solano and Napa; Dan Murphy, Marin, Sonoma and San Francisco; Robert Scholar, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Alameda.

The board's powers are purely regulatory, with the actual operation of sewage treatment facilities in the hands of local governments or industries.

Dierker stressed that the board can't compel a local government or industry to use a specific type of treatment process.

The board sets engineering standards either for the actual sewage discharge or for certain specified levels of water purity in the "receiving waters" (usually a specific section of the Bay or a river near the discharge site.)

Unlike most government agencies, the regional board has the power to change the rules at any time for any discharger.

Agencies who violate the board's orders are served with cease and desist orders. In severe cases the problem is certified to the county district attorney (or the state attorney general if the county official refuses to act) for possible prosecution.

City or industry officials can then be found in contempt of a court order, if pollution continues, and jailed. Fines of up to $50,000 per day—or even larger—against the offending agencies are possible.

The regional board operates under guidelines set down by the five member California State Water Resources Control Board. The chairman is Kerry Mulligan, former mayor of St. Helena.

The Federal Water Poluution Control Administration, an Interior Department agency, whose southwest regional headquarters are in San Francisco, with Bay Area offices in Alameda, has a broad influence over pollution control programs.

FWPCA has the power to give or withhold federal grants, which often amount to more than 50 per cent of a multi-million dollar local project, in effect, a life-and-death control over these local government projects.

Another major agency is the Bay-Delta Project, a special state agency drawing up a master plan for waste disposal in the Bay Area plus portions of three more ccunties east of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Much of the Bay-Delta Project planning has been done under contract by Kaiser Engineers of Oakland.

Gilbert said the regional board is seeking to persuade cities and sewer districts to consolidate their operations into larger, more efficient sewage treatment plants.

The model for such consolidation is East Bay Municipal Utility District No. 1, which treats all sewage from the cities of Oakland, Berkeley, Emeryville, Piedmont, Albany and Alameda and will soon annex the Stege Sanitary District in El Cirrito and Kensington.

Industry Lends a Hand in Bay Pollution Battle

(By Fred Garretson)

Industry has been one of the major polluters of San Francisco Bay.

For decades it befouled the water with unchecked streams of butchered hogs' blood, fruit packing sugar, sulphuric acid, copper smelting poisons and the multitudinous deadly wastes of oil refineries.

But times have changed.

A number of major industries—but by no means all of them—are now taking significant, and expensive, steps to clean up the Bay and to keep it clean.

The most recent figures compiled by the Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board show 44 industries discharging 269 million gallons of industrial waste per day directly into the Bay through industry-owned sewer pipes.

In addition, industry provides a big proportion of the flow of 398 million gallons of waste per day discharged into the Bay by municipal and sanitary district treatment plants.

This witch's brew of industrial waste poured into the cauldron of the Bay, combined with the sewage of 4.5 million people in the Bay Area metropolis, could without control turn the Bay into an algae-covered dead sea, according to regional board officials.

Control of pollution requires setting and enforcing specific engineering standards. Some industries have a big financial stake in how high the standards are set and the cost to industry of complying.

To understand industry's role in the Bay pollution problem, it's necessary to look at some specific examples.

One of the major policy decisions now facing the regional board—is a proposal to establish "thermal pollution" standards.

The board's reports say that 94 per cent of the industrial waste discharged directly into the Bay consists of "cooling water" that has been pumped out of the Bay, cycled through factories to cool off hot machinery, and then discharged back into the bay several degrees warmer—and sometimes boiling hot.

The most outspoken opponent of thermal pollution standards is Pacific Gas & Electric Co. which uses a huge flow of cooling water at its power plants at Pittsburg, Antioch and San Francisco, and is planning to build more such plants in the Bay, including an atomic power plant at Collinsville.

These flows of warmed-up water affect wildlife. PG & E argues that warming up the Bay stimulates marine life and improves fishing. Some naturalists say it's bad for wildlife.

The board is also considering stiff new regulations reducing the already minute traces of radioactivity allowed to be discharged into the Bay.

State officials say the radioactivity rules are necessary to protect delicate forms of marine life whose natural processes help clean up other forms of Bay pollution. PG&E objects that the new rules will hurt atomic power plant projects and perhaps make electricity more expensive in the future.

The regional board, consisting of seven laymen appointed by the governor, including a PG&E executive as the official representative of pollution-causing industries, will wade through a mass of conflicting expert testimony, and then set engineering standards for the nine Bay Area counties.

Under terms of the Dickey Act, which creater the regional board in 1950, these seven men have enormous power to set very high pollution standards for one city or industry, set low standards (or no standards) for a neighboring community . . . and to change the regulations at any time.

The differing treatment given to two companies—Humble Oil and Refining Co., and Johns-Manville Products Corp.—illustrates the problem.

Humble Oil has been criticized at times in national conservation circles.

Three years ago conservationists gathered almost a million proxy votes and marched into the stockholders meeting of Standard Oil Company of New Jersey (Humble's parent corporation) to demand—successfully—that a proposed Humble refinery not be built on a Monterey County beach.

Yet, Fred Dierker, executive officer of the regional pollution control board, says, "Humble is doing a good job on control of Bay pollution."

Coming from a tight-lipped engineer like Dierker, that's high praise.

When Humble set out to build its new $100 million refinery at Benicia (the one that got thrown out of Monterey), the company accepted—with a minimum of battling over specific details—the stiffest water pollution control standards ever established for a Bay Area industry.

In addition, company officials say, the new plant in Solano County will comply with regulations of the Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control District even though Solano County isn't a member of the district and the county board of supervisors is fighting to keep state and federal air pollution regulations out of the county.

Dierker said he'd like to see more companies with Humble's cooperative attitude move into the Bay Area.

In contrast, Dierker cites the problem of pollution at the Johns-Manville Products Corp. plant at Pittsburg.

Johns-Manville has an outstanding national reputation as a manufacturer of pollution control equipment and a company where top management figures are active in wildlife conservation.

For this reason it was one of a handful of Bay area industries which, under a regional board policy, was permitted to operate under "self regulation" rules for 18 years with the understanding that the company would voluntarily clean up its pollution by redesigning production facilities.

Dierker said some industries spent millions of dollars cleaning up pollution under this voluntary policy.

But in May, 1968, the board's inspectors visited Johns-Manville for the first time and found 1.04 million gallons per day of untreated waste pouring into the deadend lagoon of New York Slough on the south side of Suisun Bay.

This is a spot where tidal fluctuations during winter and spring can easily carry significant amounts of this pollution into the drinking water intake pumps of both the city of Antioch and the Contra Costa County Water District.

The board report said the Johns-Manville discharge consisted of the toilet flushings of 300 workers "mixed with industrial waste from the manufacturing of tar paper, asphaltic and asbestos roofing and asbestos-cement building products."

Company officials did not appear at a public hearing to discuss the problem. The regional board then ordered stiff regulations for the company's plant and asked the staff to draft some more.

Johns-Manville national officials were stunned by the resulting publicity and promptly flew top management officials to California to issue a public apology.

The company is still discharging raw waste into the Bay, but the plant will be hooked up to the Pittsburg city sewer system by May. This has required redesigning Pittsburg's sewage facilities.

The regional boadr's policies toward industry differ with each plant. Situations which would be considered intolerable in the stagnant waters of South San Francisco Bay might be acceptable in North Bay areas which have a strong natural tidal "flushing action."

Tidal flushing in the south Bay (generally south of Bay Farm Island and Hunters Point) is so poor that Army Engineers tests show that only one-millionth of the sewage discharged at Redwood City gets flushed out of the Golden Gate by tidal action in a measurable length of time.

The Army tests on the Bay model at Sausalito shows pollution dumped into the South Bay simply flows up into all of the tidal sloughs and sits there.

San Jose's ultra-modern new $32 million treatment plant, which serves 750,000 people, has improved the South Bay situation since 1964, but even the San Jose plant can't meet the desired South Bay water quality standards.

San Jose, and other South Bay cities, are now considering constructing a 35-mile-long sewer pipe up the Bay from Alviso to the vicinity of Treasure Island so that San Jose's already highly treated sewage can discharge where tidal currents will carry it to the ocean.

The situation in the North Bay is different. Dierker said the city of Vallejo uses only low-grade "primary" sewage treatment, but its discharge into the fast moving currents of Carquinez Strait is adequate to disperse the waste.

The last of the "self-regulating" industries brought under regional board control was the California and Hawaiian Sugar Co. at Crockett, which sends its sewage to a municipal treatment plant but also discharges 45.2 million gallons of industrial waste per day into Carquinez Strait from 21 outfalls.

The board's policy statement about C&H, drafted by Dick Russell and H. C. Knapp, of the board's staff, said 96 per cent of the discharge is cooling water.

The report said the remaining flow consists of sodium carbonate cleaning chemicals, burned sugar, raw sugar and the washings of sugar-processing machinery, battery acid, sulfamic acid, hydrochloric acid, hydrofluoric acid, etc.

This would be a bad combination in most areas of the Bay—particularly the sugar discharge, which burns up oxygen in the water, kills fish and can turn salt water black.

Sugar in cannery waste at San Jose is the major source of water pollution in the South Bay.

But, Russell explained, "The flow of water at Carquinez Strait is tremendous and the C&H discharge isn't really a problem." In engineering terms, he said, "pollution is a function of volume" and at the C&H plant the volume of good water is tremendous.

There is widespread evidence that industry is willing to spend considerable amounts of money to clean up pollution, but in most cases the actual figures aren't available as a matter of public record.

Ronald James, mayor of San Jose, recently told a pollution control meeting "A few years ago the local managers of national corporations wouldn't give us the time of day when we talked about pollution.

"We have some bad stuff flowing into San Jose's sewers, including sugar and various cannery wastes, acids and chemicals from electronics manufacturing and other things that are difficult for a treatment plant to handle.

"But recently, the local plant managers have been told by national firms that they're supposed to cooperate. In most cases we're getting good cooperation.

San Jose enacted a sewer tax surcharge under which industries with difficult-to-treat sewage are charged at a higher rate. This has resulted in considerable experimentation in "pre-treatment" to clean up waste before it goes into the sewers.

East Bay Municipal Utility District is considering the same sort of surtax for hard-to-treat sewage in Oakland, Emeryville, Alameda, Berkeley, Piedmont, Albany, El Cerrito and Kensington.

However, in San Francisco, where the worst kind of raw, untreated industrial pollution pours out from overflowing sewer lines every time it rains, the county board of supervisors is on record as opposed to any kind of sewer tax, sewer surtax or sewer connection fee.

When asked what the possibility of using such taxes to clean up the San Francisco mess, San Francisco Supervisor Robert Mendelsohn, chairman of the health committee, told the regional board, "We aren't even considering anything like that."

The Islais Creek Sewer Treatment Plants, which discharge the toilets of 161,000 persons, plus the south-of-Market industrial area, into a dead-end lagoon one block from the San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market, doesn't even chlorinate the sewage.

The regional board's report on San Francisco County found 660,000 gallons per day of untreated waste, mostly in the industrial district, discharging into the Bay because pipes hadn't been hooked up to flow into the sewer treatment plants.

Under board orders the city shut down a dozen individual company raw sewage discharges and agreed to tie the South Fourth Street industrial area sewer pipes into the municipal collection system.

At the San Francisco Port Authority docks the regional board investigators found 207,000 gallons of raw sewage per day flushing directly into the Bay from 405 toilets, 243 wash basins and 180 urinals.

The city has launched a program of connecting San Francisco Port Authority toilets to the municipal sewer system although some officials consider this a futile effort because of the flows of raw sewage pouring out under the docks from the rest of the city sewer system.

The regional board report concluded: "The city and county of San Francisco has the ambivalent role of being the greatest waste discharger while requiring the greatest protection of Bay waters along her shore for beneficial uses."

There are some kinds of pollution which are extremely visible in the Bay but are considered harmless to wildlife and are therefore at the bottom of the board's priority list.

Dierker said these include the reddish tint seen in the water near the Bay Bridge Toll Plaza, which he said is iron oxide from an Emeryville paint plant. A white tinge can be seen near a South San Francisco milk of magnesia factory.

Dierker said a "very significant" effort is being made by a committee of industries to clean up pollution in the North Richmond area in the cove east of Point San Pablo.

During the past four years the dischargers spent $5,145,000 on new pollution control equipment and worked on a major long range plan to eliminate pollution to this cove.

A report issued by the industrial committee listed spending in four years as: Allied Chemical Corp., $90,000; Chevron Chemical Co., $1,632,000; San Pablo Sanitary District, $236,000, and Standard Oil Co. of California, $3,187,000.

On Jan. 15, the regional board adopted a policy, agreed to by the dischargers, under which dischargers promised to work toward the "maximum feasible degree" of treatment in North Richmond.

Dierker said, "This means tertiary treatment (very pure) discharges. The companies and the sewer district might elect to use a lower degree of treatment and discharge it far out into the Bay through a long pipe, but in that case they'd have to come back to the board to ask for a lowering of standards."

This program might turn North Richmond into one of the most beautiful spots along the shoreline of San Francisco Bay.

SAN FRANCISCO REALLY HAS A SEWER PLAN—BUT JUST WHAT IS IT?

(By Fred Garretson)

San Francisco city officials talk boldly, but not too confidently, about Mayor Joseph Alioto's master plan to clean up the San Francisco sewer mess.

After 20 years of playing hide-and-seek with the Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco's supervisors caved in to strong pressure from the U.S. Interior Department and on Oct. 28 passed a resolution agreeing to obey state pollution control laws.

On Nov. 13 Alioto signed the official "policy of intent to adhere to a schedule for compliance with waste discharge requirements" established by the pollution control board.

At the same time Alioto let it be known that San Francisco wouldn't be able to meet the time schedule unless the state and federal governments put up most of the money to buy pollution control facilities which the other 90 cities in the Bay Area have taxed themselves to pay for.

Nonetheless, Alioto and other San Francisco officials have been able to say, "We are proceeding with a plan . . ."

But there is considerable confusion among San Francisco's top officials about just what that plan is:

Mayor Alioto says it's a $300 million plan to build a great sewer discharge pipe stretching miles out into the ocean. He tells reporters, "See Tom Mellon for the details."

Chief Administrative Officer Tom Mellon says its a $600 to $800 million plan to build huge "sewage caverns" in the San Francisco hills and to construct many small treatment plants along the shoreline. He tells reporters to "See Myron Tatarian for details."

Public Works Director S. Myron Tatarian says it's a $135 million plan to extend three city sewer treatment plant outfalls a few thousand feet out into the Bay and to "do something" about the great streams of human excrement which now cascade across the public beaches in the western part of the city after every little rainstorm.

Tatarian doesn't pass the buck to anyone, but he refers a lot of questions to City Engineer Robert C. Levy, who said the city is considering a whole galaxy of plans including sewage caverns, mini-treatment plants, shoreline sewage holding ponds, and, if worst comes to worst, maybe a big pipe out into the ocean.

San Francisco's fundamental problem is an antique design which combines sewage and storm water runoff in a single pipe system which, in dry weather, delivers sewage to three treatment plants, but which in wet weather overflows raw sewage through 41 bypass pipes along the city shoreline.

Tatarian said the plan adopted by the Board of Supervisors is:

1. By 1975 the city's average daily dry weather flow of 99 million gallons of partly treated sewage will be discharged in deep water tidal channels instead of spilling out close to shore in brown waves under the docks near Fisherman's Wharf, in a deadend creek near the San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market and directly onto the sands of Mile Rock Beach near Lands End.

2. By 1981, if all goes well, 12 of the city's 41 wet weather sewer discharge pipes along the ocean beaches and near Aquatic Park and the Marina will be fixed so that human excrement will no longer be dumped onto the public beaches.

No provisions were made to fix up the other 29 sewer outfalls along the Bay shoreline south of Pier 45 (Fisherman's Wharf). This area includes not only the largest sewers, but the heaviest population densities in San Francisco.

San Francisco is divided into three "sewer watershed" zones whose resident populations are: Richmond-Sunset, 170,000; Southeast (the industrial district), 161,000; North Point (including all of downtown) 409,000.

By 1981, if the city can meet the official timetable, all of Richmond-Sunset's wet weather discharges, plus four of the 20 North Point Sewers (Baker, Pierce, Laguna and Hyde Streets) will be fixed. No one knows for certain, but these four sewers apparently serve about 60,000 persons.

This means that the toilet flushings of the entire Southeast Zone, plus 350,000 residents of the North Point Zone will continue the pour untreated into the Bay during wet weather.

The current boom in skyscraper office and apartment houses will increase the number of toilets in this zone.

A 1965 survey by the Northern California Transit Demonstration Project showed 890,299 daily trips in and out of San Francisco Central Business District between 10 a.m. and 6 p.m. on weekdays.

This figure can be subjected to wide interpretation because visitors contribute to the sewers through toilets, restaurant dishwashing and garbage disposal machines.

City planning department officials said this particular study counted commuting workers only once, but downtown shoppers twice and also included some of the through traffic from the Bay Bridge that bypassed downtown San Francisco. The figure doesn't include evening visitors to San Francisco.

But by conservative estimates the figure could be translated into 450,000 visitors depositing into the sewer system.

This means that in the North Point and Southeast Sewer Zones the raw sewage of almost one million people will continue to get dumped into the Bay untreated every time it rains.

The timetable adopted by the Board of Supervisors and proclaimed as official policy by Mayor Alioto, makes no provision for these 29 sewers except to say that the problem will be considered "as the need arises," if and when water contact sports facilities are built along the waterfront.

Tatarian says this means that individual sewers will be diverted if the city decides to build a marina or swimming facility at a spot where a sewer now discharges.

And Tatarian stresses, the multi-million cost of fixing the sewers will be computed as part of the cost of the recreation development.

This runs exactly opposite to the policies of the regional water pollution control agency, which aims to make all parts of the Bay safe for swimming.

Levy said reconstructing the entire San Francisco sewer system to modern standards by putting in separate sanitary and storm drainage pipes would cost $1.4 billion.

He said it would require digging up every street in the city, and rebuilding the plumbing of every building to separate the sanitary pipes from the roof rain drains.

Half of the cost would be public money. The other half would be borne by private property owners, who would have to pay an estimated $2,000 per dwelling unit to make the conversion, Levy said.

"There wouldn't be any money available for other civic projects," he said.

Tatarian and Levy said various types of construction could solve a major part of the sewer overflow problem—mainly sewage retention basins—and might bring San Francisco into conformity with water quality control board standards.

They said extending dry weather outfalls into the Bay and making internal treatment plant improvements would cost $35 million.

Fixing the wet weather outfalls on ocean beaches and near the Marina District would cost $45 million. Fixing the other 29 wet weather sewer outfalls would cost $55 million.

However, Levy stressed, these are 1968 dollar figures which don't include bond interest costs, inflation or rising land and construction costs, which they said are increasing five percent per year.

Levy said these cost figures are optimistic estimates based on tentative conclusions by consultants working on an experimental design for a miniature wet-weather treatment plant that might meet water pollution standards.

This pilot plant is proposed for the Baker Street Sewer outfall next to St. Francis Yacht Club.

The success or failure of this experiment will affect all future planning to clean up the San Francisco sewer problem.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4148, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969.

This measure contains several important safeguards to preserve the remaining purity of this Nation's water resources and to insure that they will be free of the pollution that results from a number of major activities.

In particular, the bill provides strict controls on oil pollution and establishes the liability of the owner of the facility responsible for the oil leak for cleaning up the water and surrounding beaches. I believe that the civil and criminal penalties in this section of the bill for failure to comply with these requirements are fair and necessary in light of the several recent tragic oil leaks.

There is another aspect of this legislation which I would like to emphasize briefly. That is section 11(b) which requires that any applicant for a Federal license for an activity that may discharge waste into the navigable waters of the United States present the issuing agency with certification from the affected States that the activity will be conducted in such a manner that it will not reduce the quality of the water below the State's accepted standards. This provision is specifically intended to require that the Atomic Energy Commission take thermal pollution into consideration when issuing licenses for nuclear generating facilities.

This section was included in the bill over the objections of the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, who sought to weaken it in several particulars. I applaud the firm stand of the Public Works Committee in insisting on these sensible precautions so that the thermal standards for water quality adopted by 34 of the Nation's water quality jurisdictions will not be meaningless in the eyes of the AEC.

In my judgment, we must give much more study to the deleterious effects of thermal pollution. While many States have made progress in adopting thermal standards for water quality, there are indications that some of those standards are inadequate. I feel that we should effect a moratorium in the construction of nuclear powerplants until we can be sure not only that the plants present no radiological hazards, but also that they will not reduce the quality of surrounding waters or upset the ecological balance in the area. There has been some indication that the coolant towers associated with nuclear plants can be a source of enormous air pollution, and even cause weather modification in some instances. While these aspects of power production are not of immediate concern in connection with this legislation, my colleagues may wish to bear them in mind for future discussions regarding air pollution, nuclear plants, and the quality of our environment. To further befoul our air and water and retard their purification in the name of advancing technology would be folly.

It is my understanding that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) will propose an amendment to this bill, to incorporate the features of H.R. 9382, of which I am a cosponsor. Mr. VANIK's amendment would provide an emergency fund to provide permanent corrective relief for those areas of the Nation which are in environmental crises. Included among those "pollution disaster" areas are the Lake Erie basin, the great rivers, and other offshore regions. The problems in these areas are international, interstate, and of such magnitude that their solution is beyond the capacity of any single State. I urge my colleagues to support Mr. VANIK's amendment, in order that these areas may receive the urgent attention which they need.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, while I commend the committee's comprehensive approach to the problem of water pollution, I feel that the appropriations authorized by this legislation are totally inadequate. It has been estimated that, to restore this Nation's waters to their natural state and keep them that way, we would need to spend $100 billion between now and the end of the century. This bill would authorize appropriations of only $348 million during the next 3 fiscal years. I hope that my colleagues will provide full funding for this legislation, will increase the funds for water pollution control in future years, and provide funds for sewage treatment in an additional bill. There is a critical need for legislation providing for the treatment of solid wastes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join in support of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 which promises to be another major step forward in our effort to curb water pollution and protect our environment for future generations.

There is a special pleasure in supporting this bill because section 18 contains provisions I had previously introduced as separate legislation to control sewage from vessels. I am, of course, gratified to see my long-standing recommendation included as part of this omnibus legislation.

It is essential that this legislation receive our prompt affirmative action. Every day our waterways are being polluted by waste from vessels, industrial spillage, oil slicks, and other pollutants that collectively threaten to permanently destroy our environment. I have long felt this is an area, along with air pollution, deserving the highest priorities of the Federal Government. It is therefore reassuring that this legislation is among the first major bills to come before the House this year. I trust we will pass this bill without delay and declare ourselves firmly in favor of necessary controls on the menace of water pollution.

As has been noted in debate the major provisions of this legislation are designed as a greatly needed assault on the problem of pollution from offshore oil drilling and oil leaking from tankers. This problem has increased sharply in recent years and reached its unfortunate zenith in January and February when the beaches of southern California were turned into filthy, blackened sponges full of oil. A repetition of this tragedy, which killed fish and wildfowl besides ruining recreational and natural resources for human enjoyment, cannot be tolerated and I am hopeful this bill would begin to solve this problem.

I am also impressed by those provisions of the bill requiring assurances that industries and utilities discharging wastes into waterways provide necessary assurances that the waste will not violate existing guidelines on pollution. This is a constructive step in the effort to curb the still unmeasurable impact of thermal pollution.

As I noted at the outset I am pleased that the bill contains provisions I had sponsored previously to control the sewage from vessels. As pleasure boating and commercial use of the waterways are growing we must have the necessary protections to ward off still another threat to our rivers, harbors, and shoreline.

This is a good bill that takes a giant step in the effort to stem the rising tide of pollution. With constructive legislation such as this there is reason to hope that the great waterways and shorelines of the United States will be conserved in a manner befitting our heritage. I believe there is little we might do that is more important than conserving that heritage so I am pleased to be able to vote for the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I concur with the basic provisions of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, which is before us today. The Committee on Public Works is to be commended for directing early attention to the problems of water pollution, and it is hoped that these proposals receive favorable action.

I am most grateful to the committee for including the basic principles of my own lake pollution control bill, which I introduced in 1967. I urge that this section of the bill be kept intact.

We in Minnesota are particularly aware of the benefits derived from attractive and clean lakes, since we have so many of them.

The scenic surroundings and satisfying recreational and relaxing activities associated with lakes will be in ever greater demand as our population continues to grow. It is quite a sight to see the cars stream out of our cities at the end of the week, all carrying families to a favorite lakeshore spot that promises fresh, clean air and pure water for swimming, boating, fishing, and the many other activities connected with our lakes.

Unfortunately, the presence of man in ever-increasing numbers has aggravated a problem that threatens the future of these great resources. This is why many of us introduced legislation to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize a comprehensive planning program in lake pollution prevention and control. The comprehensive planning programs called for in the bill before us today will go a long way toward halting the steady erosion of our lakes.

The manmade pollution of our lakes is accelerating the normal aging process of such bodies of water. Lake Erie is a conspicuous example, but our smaller lakes, some in Minnesota, also are deteriorating at a rapid pace. Rank vegetation chokes much of the lake beginning in July, and restricts fishing, boating, swimming, and other recreational activities. Subsequently the mass of vegetation begin to rot, creating odor problems, and lowering the oxygen level so that fish frequently die.

These conditions might naturally develop, through the regular aging process, but it would take thousands of years. But man has accelerated this aging process through pollution. It comes from many sources, such as septic tanks of the shoreline cottages, sewage from cities and towns situated on the watershed, pollution from livestock on farms, and draining from fertilized farmlands. Siltation from erosion within the drainage area further complicates the problem. Unfortunately, a lake has relatively little flushing action, and has much less capacity to dilute introduced wastes than does a flowing stream.

Greatly expanded Federal, State, and local research and demonstration programs are needed to develop practical and effective methods for improving the quality of lake waters. The problem must be attacked on two fronts simultaneously. First, we must find ways to remove or dissipate the existing nutrients. And then we must reduce the nutrients entering the lake.

The clean lakes section of the bill before us is a welcome step in the right direction. It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts and grants with various individuals, agencies, and organizations, for research and development on the problems of lake eutrophication and other lake pollution problems. The Secretary would also be authorized to develop field laboratories, research facilities, and demonstration projects. We desperately need new and improved methods for the prevention, removal and control of natural or manmade pollution in our lakes. This bill will provide the means of accomplishing these methods.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge and hope that the House will approve this bill before us, H.R. 4148, as another forward step in the legislative efforts we have exerted, and which I have supported, over the last several years to strengthen the Federal Government's effectiveness in trying to prevent catastrophic pollution of our waterways.

The provisions of this current measure are designed particularly to help the various States adequately deal with the most vexing problem of oil discharge and spillage by making shipowners liable for such discharge; establishing a revolving fund for reimbursing States faced with sudden and tremendously expensive cleanups of oil and other polluted material; initiating a demonstration program for effective water pollution control; encouraging students, through grants, to undergo training in water quality control; and authorizing funds for extending water pollution control research and development.

Mr. Chairman, the reasons for and the meaning of these and other provisions in the bill have been thoroughly and expansively explained to the membership, and there is no need of enlarging upon them at this time.

The objectives of the bill are unquestionably in the national interest and the appropriations projected are reasonably moderate in consideration of the vital importance of removing and preventing the very dangerous and damaging pollution of our national waters.

Therefore, I hope that this Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 will be overwhelmingly adopted.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity of recording my unqualified support of H.R. 4148, a bill which will help solve some of the major unmet pollution abatement needs of this country.

There is no question that water pollution is one of the most aggravating and serious problems of our time. For over 10 years now the Congress has been studying the facts and enacting progressive legislation to overcome the shortcomings of public and private action. Nevertheless, our citizens continue to express deep concern over the slow pace of cleanup efforts and achievements to purify the waters of our streams, lakes, and shoreline.

The Gallup poll, in 1968, issued the results of a study in which the people questioned were asked what they considered the most urgent of environmental problems. Thirty-two percent said water pollution. When asked what they considered the best solution, they responded that new ways must be found to stop industrial pollution, existing laws should be better enforced, and new legislation passed.

Enactment of H.R. 4148 will be a significant step in these directions.

The bill provides strong penalties for discharging oil into the navigable waters of the United States and also establishes a program in which the Federal Government can clean up the oil from a spill and require that the industry or person responsible for the spill reimburse the Government for costs of the clean up. In considering this provision, the House Committee on Public Works urged that State and local groups already formed for clean-up operations be called upon for cooperation and assistance. In addition, both national and regional contingency plans are to be developed to meet all future emergency spillages such as the *Ocean Eagle* incident off the coast of Puerto Rico.

Wastes from ships and boats with inadequate marine sanitation devices are a major cause of pollution. According to estimates of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the combined waste being discharged from all watercraft operating in American waters approximates the quantity of raw sewage that could be discharged by a major city such as Buffalo or Cincinnati. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with other appropriate departments, to promulgate Federal standards of performance for marine sanitation devices. The enforcement of these standards would prevent the future discharge of untreated and inadequately treated sewage into navigable waters.

Acid mine drainage is still another major source of pollution. It has been estimated by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration that each year over 4 million tons of acid-equivalents are being discharged into streams from both active and abandoned mines. These acids can destroy fish and their habitat, thereby greatly reducing the recreational value of our Nation's streams. Experts have indicated that control methods are not yet known. The bill therefore authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements with State or interstate agencies to carry out demonstration methods and projects for acid mine water control.

There is urgent need for more skilled manpower both in research and the operation of treatment facilities. To alleviate this need, the bill authorizes an expansion of the existing training grants program established under the Water Quality Act.

Federal agencies which control property or issue licenses and permits for construction or development, have a major role to play in pollution control, since many of these facilities and operations affect water quality. For example, the dredging and disposition of spoil in navigable waters is controlled by the Corps of Engineers. The bill provides that each agency having jurisdiction over property or over the issuance of permits or licenses must insure that all operations resulting in pollution effects, must be carried out in a manner that will comply with established water quality standards. This provision simply means that the Federal Government, in all of its activities, will lead the way in preventing pollution.

There are a number of research studies that must be sustained in the years ahead if adequate solutions are to be found to outstanding and poorly understood pollution challenges. For example, although some advances have been made on the problem of lake aging or "eutrophication," much more knowledge is required. Research is needed on the control of phosphorus and on the elimination of pollution from combined storm and sewer systems. The bill provides for these and other needs by authorizing appropriations for 2 additional years at the level already provided for fiscal year 1969.

Mr. Chairman, the control of water pollution must be a dynamic effort, responsive to both old and new problems stemming from constant technological change. I have supported the passage of earlier pollution legislation. I hope and I am confident that this House will enact into law this bill before us.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 4148, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969. Adoption of this much-needed protection is long overdue.

Basically, this legislation takes the approach of making those who handle oil and other potential water contaminants responsible for any damage caused by these materials. The existing law applies only to oil damage that is willful or grossly negligent; but the increasing complexity of our civilization has produced many sources of contamination that did not meet these criteria.

The breakup of the tanker *Torrey Canyon*, with its incalculable damage to the coast of England and its nearly $8 million cleanup costs, and the devastation of California's beaches this year by oil from an offshore drilling rig are but two examples of unintentional but tragic damage to wildlife and our natural environment. Making those who handle oil and other possible pollutants responsible for the cost of any damage will provide a powerful incentive for them to take ever greater measures of protection.

One provision of the bill makes shipowners liable for oil discharge or spillage cleanup costs up to $10 million, or $100 million per gross ton. It provides criminal penalties against individuals operationally responsible for vessels who fail to prompty report a discharge of oil or other polluting matter to the Coast Guard or Secretary of Interior. It also provides civil penalties against vessel owners or operators in cases of willful or negligent discharge. The measure would authorize the Government to recover costs of clearing up discharge or spillage presenting an actual or threatened pollution hazard if those responsible are unable or unwilling to remove it.

But this legislation does not stop in these major areas of water pollution concern. It provides protection against discharge of inadequately treated sewage from vessels, and authorizes a demonstration program on acid and other mine water pollution control. Research funds on water quality control are also provided, and it is hoped that these expenditures will enable us to do a far better job of preserving and protecting our water environment in the future.

Taking all of these things into account, the legislation is strongly in the national interest. From my own area's viewpoint, it could help prevent the golden sands of Miami Beach from being despoiled by oil from offshore vessels—a tragedy which has not happened so far only because of good fortune. Internationally, this bill would help cleanse the world's waters by encouraging foreign nations to follow our example.

The increasing size and number of oil tankers, the growing exploration for offshore oil, and the presence of other pollutants make it necessary that we impose these new protections. Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to approve this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the Committee substitute amendment printed in the bill as an original bill for purposes of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4148

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969."

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4148) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 4148) and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 363) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 363

Resolved, That David R. Obey, of Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESIDENT NIXON ENUNCIATES VITAL INFORMATION POLICY

(Mr. MOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I direct to the attention of my colleagues an important policy statement by President Nixon concerning the availability of executive branch information to the Congress.

The President, in an exchange of correspondence with me, and as set forth in his implementing memorandum to administrative officials, has stated that any claims of executive privilege to withhold information from the Congress will not be asserted without specific Presidential approval in each instance.

The information policy is consistent with the pattern established in recent years. I wish to express to the President my appreciation and that of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information for taking this significant step in behalf of freer access by the Congress and the American people to information concerning the activities of the Federal Government.

The above-mentioned exchange of correspondence and the President's memorandum are included herewith:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The claim of "executive privilege" as authority to withhold government information has long been of concern to those of us who support the principle that the survival of a representative government depends on an electorate and a Congress that are well informed.

As you know, some administrations in the past made it a practice to pass along to Executive branch subordinates a discretionary authority to claim "executive privilege as a basis to refuse information to the Congress. The practice of delegating this grave Presidential responsibility was ended by John F. Kennedy when he restored a policy similar to that which existed under previous strong administrations, including those of Presidents George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and Theodore Rooosevelt. In a letter to the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, dated March 7, 1962, he enunciated the policy as follows:

". . . this Administration has gone to great lengths to achieve full cooperation with the Congress in making available to it all appropriate documents, correspondence and information. That is the basic policy of this Administration, and it will continue to be so. *Executive privilege can be invoked only by the President and will not be used without specific Presidential approval.*"

President Lyndon B. Johnson informed the Subcommittee by letter, dated April 2, 1965, he would continue the policy enunciated by President Kennedy. He stated:

"Since assuming the Presidency, I have followed the policy laid down by President Kennedy in his letter to you of March 7, 1962, dealing with this subject. Thus, the claim of 'executive privilege' will continue to be made only by the President."

In view of the urgent need to safeguard and maintain a free flow of information to the Congress, I hope you will favorably consider a reaffirmation of the policy which provides, in essence, that the claim of "executive privilege" will be invoked only by the President.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 7, 1969.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
Chairman, Foreign Operations and Government, Information Subcommittee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Knowing of your interest, I am sending you a copy of a memorandum I have issued to the heads of executive departments and agencies spelling out the procedural steps to govern the invocation of "executive privilege" under this Administration.

As you well know, the claim of executive privilege has been the subject of much debate since George Washington first declared that a Chief Executive must "exercise a discretion."

I believe, and I have stated earlier, that the scope of executive privilege must be very narrowly construed. Under this Administration, executive privilege will not be asserted without specific Presidential approval.

I want to take this opportunity to assure you and your committee that this Administration is dedicated to insuring a free flow of information to the Congress and the news media—and, thus, to the citizens. You are, I am sure, familiar with the statement I made on this subject during the campaign. Now that I have the responsibility to implement this pledge, I wish to reaffirm my intent to do so. I want open government to be a reality in every way possible.

This Administration has already given a positive emphasis to freedom of information. I am committed to insuring that both the letter and spirit of the Public Records Law will be implemented throughout the Executive Branch of the government.

With my best wishes,

Sincerely,

RICHARD M. NIXON.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

(Establishing a procedure to govern compliance with congressional demands for information)

The policy of this Administration is to comply to the fullest extent possible with

Congressional requests for information. While the Executive Branch has the responsibility of withholding certain information the disclosure of which would be incompatible with the public interest, this Administration will invoke this authority only in the most compelling circumstances and after a rigorous inquiry into the actual need for its exercise. For those reasons Executive privilege will not be used without specific Presidential approval. The following procedural steps will govern the invocation of Executive privilege:

1. If the head of an Executive department or agency (hereafter referred to as "department head") believes that compliance with a request for information from a Congressional agency addressed to his department or agency raises a substantial question as to the need for invoking Executive privilege, he should consult the Attorney General through the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice.

2. If the department head and the Attorney General agree, in accordance with the policy set forth above, that Executive privilege shall not be invoked in the circumstances, the information shall be released to the inquiring Congressional agency.

3. If the department head and the Attorney General agree that the circumstances justify the invocation of Executive privilege, or if either of them believes that the issue should be submitted to the President, the matter shall be transmitted to the Counsel to the President, who will advise the department head of the President's decision.

4. In the event of a Presidential decision to invoke Executive privilege, the department head should advise the Congressional agency that the claim of Executive privilege is being made with the specific approval of the President.

5. Pending a final determination of the matter, the department head should request the Congressional agency to hold its demand for the information in abeyance until such determination can be made. Care shall be taken to indicate that the purpose of this request is to protect the privilege pending the determination, and that the request does not constitute a claim of privilege.

RICHARD NIXON.

OIL AND TAXES—THEY DON'T MIX

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, today is the Federal income tax deadline for all people of the United States. Millions of them will fill the night air with tears and recriminations, fulminating at the injustice of it all. Let us look behind this. Let us examine some shocking facts.

Our oil industry pitifully staggers under a Federal tax burden of approximately 8.8 percent, while taxpayers average out closer to 25 percent of their income in Federal taxes.

In 1966, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey paid out 6.3 percent in Federal tax of a net income before taxes of $1,830,944,000. Gulf earned $655,727,000 in 1965, paying 8.1 percent of it in Federal tax. As you tote up what you are paying today, individual taxpayers, think of Conoco Oil, which earned $241,362,000 in 1967 in net income before tax. It paid out $30,031,000 in taxes to our Federal Government. Atlantic Oil Co. earned $61,110,000 in 1962 and didn't pay a penny in Federal taxes. In 1965, Atlantic earned more than $105 million in net income, and did not pay a penny in Federal tax that year. In 1966, Atlantic earned $127,284,000 in net income and did not pay a cent in Federal tax that year.

How much did you pay, Mr. Taxpayer? How much did your family have to do without that year? Or the year before? How about the year Atlantic got away without paying a penny again? How much did you skimp on food, clothing, and education? How much did you do without in spite of hard work and saving, while oil company barons made fortunes, enjoying them in poverty-stricken leisure?

Pure Oil Co. did not pay a penny Federal taxes in 1962, 1963, and 1964, as it earned upward of $88 million. Richfield earned more than $26 million in 1964, and did not pay a cent in Federal taxes that year. How is that for helping America's consumers? Like throwing an anchor to a drowning man.

Now we contemplate the pitiful sight of these oil companies parading before the tax-writing committee of the House, pleading poverty. Weep for them. Roll in agonized sympathy on the floor. Before they will admit they have done you wrong, you will be able to milk an elk. To slap them on the hand is like prescribing milk of magnesia for a typhoon or aspirin for an earthquake. The only thing these princes of plunder understand is tax reform delivered by an aware and responsible Congress.

Congress gave the oil-depletion allowance to this industry. Congress has the daily power to remove these privileges, or at least bring them down to manageable levels.

Congress must do its duty to America's taxpayers, who have asked for tax reform. The oil-depletion allowance could be abolished tomorrow, including that priceless little gem which allows an oil company to produce oil in a foreign country and receive a depletion allowance for U.S. tax purposes. I have introduced a bill to abolish the 27½-percent depletion allowance. Other Members have done the same. Let us act.

DEDICATION OF THE STATUES OF FATHER DAMIEN AND KAMEHAMEHA

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, symbolic of the harmony between races in Hawaii, the two men chosen by the Hawaiian people to be honored in Statuary Hall represent two different worlds which, fused, created the great State of Hawaii. Kamehameha the Great was a warrior king who believed in the gods of his ancestors, and the man who successfully united the Hawaiian Islands in 1810 under one rule. Father Damien was a Catholic priest from Belgium who spread the Christian faith throughout the islands before devoting the last 16 years of his life to the suffering lepers of Hawaii; Father Damien was an example to all mankind of the spirit of Christianity.

Kamehameha was born in 1758 in Kohala, Hawaii, to High Chieftess Kekuiapoiwa and High Chief Keoua of Kona. Legend has it that soothsayers had reported to the king that the child would be a rebel and "slay the chiefs," and the king had ordered him killed, but the baby's mother had insured his safety by hiding him in the hills. He was brought back to the Hawaiian court when he was 5 years old and named Kamehameha, which means "The Lonely One."

Even as a boy, Kamehameha was a strong young warrior. In his youth, the boy's ruler-uncle placed him in charge of a temple where Kamehameha performed his duties seriously. The death of his uncle in 1782 brought about a civil war on Kohala, and the youthful warrior Kamehameha led one of the three rival factions. With the aid of seven loyal warriors, Kamehameha led his forces to victory, and captured the large island of Hawaii. In the summer of 1794, King Kahekili, ruler of all the other islands, died, and left his lands to a younger brother and to his son. After these leaders had declared war, Kamehameha captured the islands one by one. By 1795, he had conquered all of them except the islands of Niihau and Kauai, and had made himself king. In 1810, the two remaining islands were ceded to him, and Kamehameha was ruler of all the Hawaiian Islands, united under one ruler for the first time.

Kamehameha, for having achieved the political consolidation of the islands, is universally recognized as the outstanding Hawaiian chief of the island's history. A fearless leader of powerful physique, he was skilled in the practices of war and government. The most popular tale told of Kamehameha took place during the civil war on the island of Kohala. Jumping from a canoe to battle some fishermen on shore, he caught his foot and fell, and the fishermen took that opportunity to strike him with a canoe paddle. Later, when he became king, Kamehameha's first great edict was "mamalahoa," or the "law of the splintered paddle" whereby he decreed that, "The old men and children shall sleep on the highways unmolested." The greatness of Kamehameha lay in his humanitarian qualities and in his ability to effectively organize his government, while encouraging industry and promoting agricultural endeavors by his people.

He is honored as an enlightener and reformer of his people. He was a good judge of men, and had the ability to inspire loyalty in his followers. He was the first chief to understand the advantages to be gained by friendly relations with foreign visitors to the islands, many of whom came to Hawaii during his reign. He managed the internal affairs of his kingdom in a way that minimized the danger of insurrection or revolution. His relations with other chiefs, his disposition of lands, and his administration of the government all tended to quell disruptive influences, to weld discord into union, and to create national feeling and national pride. He was true to the traditions and ancient religion of his people, and, at the same time, built a new nation and united his people. Kamehameha died at Kailua, Hawaii, on May 8, 1819, 150 years ago, but he has not been forgotten by the Hawaiians of today who celebrate Kamehameha Day each year, and perpetuate his memory in many other ways.

The second man to be honored here today was born Joseph de Veuster in the Flemish sector of Belgium on January 3, 1840. One of six children, he was expected to bring material success to the family, and, as a young man, he was sent to France to study a commercial course. The de Veuster family was one in which religion played an important part. Joseph's brother, Auguste, was studying for the priesthood; his sister, Pauline, became a nun. His parents were disappointed, but gave their approval when, at age 18, Joseph decided to enter a religious order.

He was accepted at the monastery at Louvain, where his brother Auguste soon became Father Pamphile and Joseph took the name "Damien." It was at Issy near Paris, studying for the novitiate, that Damien first heard about the need for missionaries in the Pacific islands. Both he and his brother were anxious to go. After taking his final vows, Pamphile was scheduled to go to Hawaii, but, before he could sail, he caught typhoid when an epidemic struck, and Damien went in his place.

Two months after Damien landed at Honolulu, he was ordained a priest and assigned to the island of Hawaii. For 8 years, he served the district of Kohala, preaching the Gospel and ministering to the sick. In 1869 the Government of Hawaii began to enforce rules for isolating lepers; a colony was set aside for this purpose on a peninsula on the northern coast of Molokai.

Cut off forever from healthy men and women, the 800 lepers at Molokai were given no supplies, no assistance of any kind. Their condition was tragic and deplorable. When a new group of priests arrived, and someone was found to take his place in Kohala, Father Damien went to Molokai to bring help and the word of God to the forsaken lepers. He gradually gained their trust, built a chapel, and brought them faith. In the 16 years that he lived in the leper colony, churches, schools, and orphanages were built, a pipeline was constructed to bring fresh water to the colony, and wooden houses were built. Word spread around the world of the work of Father Damien. Franciscan Sisters from the United States arrived to nurse the acutely sick housed in a makeshift hospital. In 1885, Father Damien found that he was now himself a leper, and a shocked and sorrowful world contributed the money and supplies that made it possible to build a hospital that housed over a thousand lepers.

From a hopelessly vile encampment where doomed lepers waited to die, Father Damien had built a colony with sanitary facilities, medical help, and spiritual aid. He brought love and hope to the sick and dying. After 16 years of devotion to the lepers, Father Damien died of leprosy on April 15, 1889—exactly 80 years ago today.

These men, whose lives and works continue to inspire the people of Hawaii today, are worthy indeed of this honor we accord their memories. By placing their likenesses in Statuary Hall, millions of people who visit the Capitol may learn of their greatness, and come to understand our meaning of the word "aloha."

LING-TEMCO-VOUGHT

(Mr. CABELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks one of the finest corporate entities in the Nation has been the victim of a smear campaign by individuals in Government, and by one or more agencies of the Federal Government.

Why this firm, LTV and its chairman, Mr. James J. Ling, should be so singled out is beyond comprehension.

In this morning's mail, I received an unsolicited letter from one of the Nation's great philanthropies, the National Jewish Hospital and Research Center at Denver, chronicling the many contributions that Mr. Ling and his company have made to this organization during the past years.

Anyone reading this letter will join me in decrying the slanderous misinformation, and I suspect, the demogoguery, to which these people have been subjected.

I will insert this letter in the RECORD at this point in the hope that all Members will read it:

NATIONAL JEWISH HOSPITAL
AND RESEARCH CENTER,
Denver, Colo., April 10, 1969.

Hon. EARLE CABELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has been said of the "conglomerates" that they lack social conscience and evade social responsibility.

Like most generalizations, this one is only partly factual. But where they are not true, they cast an unfair light upon those who do not fit into the generalized description.

Whatever the general feeling is about conglomerates and their social conscience, we would like to tell you about the one with which the National Jewish Hospital and Research Center at Denver is specifically acquainted.

Mr. James J. Ling, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Ling-Temco-Vought, has for many years taken an active part in behalf of the National Jewish Hospital. After serving on the Dallas area NJH Committee, he undertook the Chairmanship of the Annual Dinner in 1962, was the Guest of Honor in 1968, and serves on its Board of Trustees. Through his active interest, many, many thousands of dollars have been raised for our free treatment medical center in Denver.

For any other person, these efforts might have been enough and their "social responsibility" considered fulfilled—but not for James Ling. In September of 1968, he agreed to serve as National Chairman for the National Jewish Hospital's $4,000,000 Building Fund Campaign. Toward this effort he has not only rallied the resources of LTV but also of dozens of other business and community leaders throughout the country—in addition to making a most general personal contribution.

The cause of the National Jewish Hospital that Mr. Ling has so ably assisted is truly a philanthropic one in every fine sense of the word. The patients treated, without charge to them, could not have afforded the high cost of hospital medical care and often would not have been able to receive treatment had NJH not been available.

Without income from patients, almost the total amount of the budget must be raised every year. In 1968–69, this was 6½ million dollars and will be 7 million in 1969–70. This then, is the challenge presented to the nation's business leaders—to which they so nobly responded. This is the effort put forth by James Ling and through him by his friends and business associates. An effort for which they get nothing in return—nothing that is, in a materialistic sense but perhaps everything in the sense of fulfillment achieved as the results of a good deed done.

Very truly yours,
NORMAN DAVIS,
President.

PROPOSED CUTS IN B-52 MISSIONS IN VIETNAM—A CRUEL ECONOMY?

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned about the recent cutbacks in B-52 bombing missions in South Vietnam announced by Secretary of Defense Laird. Cutbacks, I might add, that were said to have been made solely in the interest of economy.

My very, real concern about this 10-percent cut in one of our most effective tactical weapons was heightened yesterday by the receipt of a letter from the parents of a young man who at this very moment is on his way to the front lines for combat duty.

At this time I would like to read an excerpt from that letter from Mr. and Mrs. Arnold O. Anderson of Orinda, Calif.:

> Our son Robert is leaving for Vietnam next Thursday after 1½ years of training including recently concluded Special Forces training at Fort Bragg, N.C. Both Ruth and I (the parents) feel very strongly that if America's sons are sent to fight in Vietnam, the least the rest of us can do is support them properly. We have some doubts about our involvement in that small far-away country, but if we are going to continue this war, then let us give more than adequate support to our forces there.

Mr. Speaker, the parents of Robert Anderson and the parents of all our young men in Vietnam deserve the assurances that their sons will receive the fullest support possible. To reduce that support in the name of economy is irresponsible to say the least.

I, like Mr. and Mrs. Anderson, harbor some doubts about the scale of this Nation's involvement in the Vietnam conflict. Twice in the past year I have joined my colleagues on the floor of the House of Representatives to call for a reduction in our combat commitment in the hope that the South Vietnamese military establishment would take a more active role in the conflict and that reduction of our commitment would ease the path toward a mutual deescalation by all combatants.

However, there is a great distinction between reduction of combat commitment in the interest of peace and reduction in tactical strength in the interest of economy.

There has been some speculation in the press that the administration's decision to reduce the B-52 missions by 10 percent, thus saving some $110 million, is actually a move by this country to indicate to the opposing side that we are interested in scaling down the war.

There have been no indications from the administration or the Defense Department that this is indeed the case. Rather, the White House and the Pentagon have steadfastly maintained that the B-52 cutbacks were "strictly budgetary."

Mr. Speaker, our commander in the field, General Abrams, has repeatedly said the B-52 raids are a most vital and most effective weapon in this difficult war. Our young men on the lines concur. To remove even 10 percent of this weapon from their disposal to pare down this Nation's budget is an inconceivable and cruel economy.

If, Mr. Speaker, this reduction is actually an important step to remove the present impasse in peace negotiations in Paris and elsewhere, then I call on Secretary of Defense Laird or President Nixon to announce that this is the case.

Mr. Speaker, when President Lyndon Johnson announced to the Nation, in March 1968, that he was reducing the level of bombing in North Vietnam in the real belief that this act would result in significant progress toward a lasting peace in Vietnam, he did so without regard to saving money. He did so in the interest of saving lives. Yet, he did not reduce the effectiveness of our fighting men in the field.

This, I think, is in marked contrast to the announced reduction of B-52 raids that are in close and direct support of our troops in the combat zones of South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, this so-called economy move is being taken at a grave risk to the lives of our young men on the frontlines. It is being taken despite the protestations of the commander in the field and despite the concern of parents of boys on the lines.

I urge that so long as we persist in a questionable policy of maintaining combat forces in Vietnam, that those forces be given every feasible means of support—at any cost. They, and their parents, deserve no less.

ROGERS SAYS FINCH TARDY IN APPOINTING HEALTH SECRETARY

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, to date there have been more than 100 bills introduced relating to public health referred to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Hearings have been held and will be held on these bills.

I think my colleagues will agree that the public health of the people of the United States is a matter of top priority.

Indeed, when Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Finch appeared before our committee on March 5, he said there existed a genuine crisis in terms of the confidence of the American people in the health delivery system.

Yet the Secretary has failed to name an Assistant Secretary for Health, the executive position of leadership in the executive branch. This certainly is no way to calm a crisis.

I can understand the thought which must go into the appointment of a man to this position and I appreciate this.

But it has been almost 3 months since Mr. Finch took office. And when he appeared before the committee and was asked about the immediacy of the appointment, he said he expected it to come within a few days or a week.

That was 42 days ago.

I think that period allows for ample consideration. I know that there are varying elements concerned with the problem which must be taken into account when appointing a man to this position.

Still, we must also realize that this Nation's health problems need attention now and should not be relegated as the stepchild of HEW. The organization of our entire health effort suffers in proportion to the number of days that the office of Assistant Secretary for Health remains vacant.

I think we have waited patiently past the period of reasonableness. Now I call upon the Secretary to unravel what problems he may be facing and proceed with the task of naming a man to the post of Assistant Secretary for Health and to set in motion the planning necessary to assure the field of health the attention and leadership it merits.

I would also add that I hope the Secretary gives proper attention to the appointment of a Chief Dental Officer. This position has been vacant for nearly a year and a half and has allowed our efforts in the field of dental care to splinter and proceed leaderless.

PRESIDENT SUPPORTS TAX INCENTIVE CONCEPT

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's domestic proposals announced Monday included one very important goal which I have been working on for the last two Congresses.

The recommendation for "a program of tax credits, designed to provide new incentives for the enlistment of additional private resources in meeting our urgent social needs" is one with great potential to help solve our great social problems.

This program should include an attack on our hardcore unemployment.

Government cannot create permanent employment for all Americans; and should not attempt to do so. However, I believe Government can help in solving the problem of the 2 million permanently unemployed in America.

I have introduced, H.R. 112, along with 40 cosponsors which would provide tax credits to businesses for training the hardcore unemployed. The legislation is pending in the House Ways and Means Committee, and I have urged speedy reports and hearings on this bill. In view of the President's recommendations I am hopeful for fast action.

I applaud the President for his support in essence of H.R. 112. The bill would go a long way in solving the hardcore unemployment problem—for 2 million Americans.

The cosponsors of the tax incentive legislation are:

Mr. ADDABBO of New York, Mr. BARING of Nevada, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania, Mr. COWGER of Kentucky, Mr. DERWINSKI of Illinois, Mr. DICKINSON of Alabama, Mr. DOWNING of Virginia, Mr. DULSKI of New York, Mr. EDMONDSON of Oklahoma, Mr. ESHLEMAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. FASCELL of Florida, Mr. FRIEDEL of Maryland, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. HALEY of Florida, Mr. HAYS of Ohio, Mr. HOWARD of New Jersey, Mr. HUNGATE of Missouri, Mr. LEGGETT of California, Mr. LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. LUKENS of Ohio, Mr. MATSUNAGA of Hawaii, Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan, Mr. MESKILL of Connecticut, Mr. OTTINGER of New York, Mr. PICKLE of Texas, Mr. PUCINSKI of Illinois, Mr. RIEGLE of Michigan, Mr. SANDMAN of New Jersey, Mr. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIERNAN of Rhode Island, Mr. VIGORITO of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALDIE of California, Mr. WOLFF of New York, Mr. ZION of Indiana, Mr. WHITEHURST of Virginia, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. POLLOCK of Alaska, and Mr. GROVER of New York.

ON LOWERING VOTING AGE TO 18

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable discussion today about a "generation gap."

Such a "gap" does exist, and it is my feeling that one of the major causes of such a situation has resulted from our telling our young people they must accept the responsibilities of adulthood, and yet we have denied them a voice in their own destiny.

Their voice could, and should, be heard at the polls.

We call upon our 18-year-old citizens to enter our military services and face combat.

We permit our 18-year-old citizens to marry, accept family responsibilities, to earn a living, pay taxes, operate a car, accept legal obligations which mean they can be sued, buy a home, obtain charge accounts, answer for their debts, make a will, and become eligible for employment under our civil service laws.

Yet we deny what is considered the basic right of citizenship and responsibility—the right to vote.

Today's youth of 18 is more physically fit than his parents, thanks to an improved diet and living standard.

More important, today's youth, at 18, is better educated than his parents were at the same age. Not only have our teaching techniques improved, but far more is expected of a young man or woman in high school today. Technological changes, coupled with more qualified instructors, utilizing improved techniques in teaching that were not even known in previous generations, have played major roles in not only teaching more students, but in teaching students more.

Television, not only as a tool of education but as a part of our mass communication media, has increased the scope of knowledge of today's young men and women. These young people see history happening. Through the television media they usually participate in great debates of our times at the United Nations, the horror and reality of war is brought to them by our network correspondents, and they see, firsthand the human misery spawned by a civil war in Nigeria.

Our young people are idealist and enthusiastic. They are knowledgeable of our political processes and are capable of making meaningful contributions to our social, economic, and political life.

In 1956, young people between the ages of 15 and 19 numbered 17,052,000, and those between 20 and 24 numbered 13,667,000. By 1970, it is estimated that the number of 15- to 19-year-olds will total 17,261,000. In just 8 more years, in 1975, there will be 20,807,000 young people between 15 and 19 and 19,299,999 will be between 20 and 24 years of age. By then half our population will be under 25 years of age.

Our 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old men are carrying a major share of the burden in the war in Vietnam. Well over 25 percent of our fighting men in Vietnam are between 18 and 20 years of age. The casualty rate for this age group is just under 30 percent.

Our 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds have earned their right to be heard through their ballot. They have earned this right through their service to their Nation.

A man's maturity should be judged by how he accepts and carries out his responsibilities, and today, the vast majority of our young people have shown they are not only willing, but capable of accepting the obligations and responsibilities of full citizenship, including the right to vote.

It is my pleasure to join many of my colleagues in seeking to lower the voting age from 21 to 18, by introducing a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment prohibiting denial of the vote on account of age to anyone 18 years of age or older.

KIRKLAND COLLEGE WILL INAUGURATE ITS FIRST PRESIDENT

(Mr. PIRNIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 19, 1969, Kirkland College, a new and educationally noteworthy institution of higher learning will inaugurate its first president. I am confident my colleagues will desire to join me in wishing every success to Kirkland College and its first chief executive officer Samuel F. Babbitt.

The history of Kirkland College is brief only because of the newness of the institution; but the brevity of the chronicle should in no way be allowed to detract from the college's significance and the quality of education it makes available to its students.

In 1961, as part of its 150th anniversary, Hamilton College in Clinton, N.Y., decided to take a long and intensive look at itself and at its possible future. The trustees of Hamilton, the Nation's 30th oldest college, finally decided that they could best meet those demands engendered by the ever-increasing number of young people who seek and qualify for a college education of superior quality by establishing a series of coordinate, undergraduate colleges, all of which were to be built on land adjacent to the Hamilton campus.

The first of these units is Kirkland, a residential college for women which was opened to a class of 165 freshmen last fall. It has enriched its older brother and established a pattern whereby both colleges may maintain a small size, individual traditions, and the historical respect for human values which has characterized Hamilton. Kirkland, like Hamilton, is committed to a liberal arts curriculum, and it believes in small classes and the individualized teaching which this allows.

Kirkland has been able to attract an extremely well-qualified group of men and women who are dedicated to teaching undergraduates. Its imaginative curriculum together with the opportunity to share in the development of a new college has attracted scholars from over thirty different institutions. In its first year of operation a member of this faculty was one of ninety in the country to be awarded a research grant by the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The mission of Kirkland College is best summarized in this paragraph from its catalog:

> It sets out to prepare a woman to be intellectually alert and to handle with superior capability the multiple and overlapping phases of her life—as an individual active in society, as a wife, mother, career professional. These phases are of necessity dissimilar. They require widely differing abilities and attitudes. They require a woman who can continue her role as learner into adult life beyond college—a woman able to discriminate between unchanging values and ever-changing circumstances. Kirkland would equip its students to meet these demands by developing, to the maximum, each student's potential for self-preparation and self-direction.

The person charged with seeing to it that Kirkland College meets these ideals will be inaugurated on April 19.

Samuel Fisher Babbitt became Kirkland's president in July 1966 after he had served as an assistant dean of the Yale Graduate School. A graduate of Yale, he began his academic career as an assistant to the director of admission of Yale College and assistant to the freshman dean. In 1957 he became dean of men at Vanderbilt University. Five years later he joined the Peace Corps in Washington, D.C., as Director of the Division of Colleges and Universities in the agency's Office of Public Affairs. He received his Ph. D. in American studies from Yale in 1965.

President Babbitt's undergraduate career at Yale was interrupted by 3 years of service in the infantry, during which time he was made a master sergeant. This enlistment included 11 months of combat duty in Korea during which he received the Silver Star for outstanding valor.

At the age of 40, he is a young president of a very young college. He is sensitive to and profoundly aware of the issues that now threaten so many of this Nation's colleges and universities, and, with the approval of his trustees, he has taken a number of imaginative steps in an attempt to insure that what has happened elsewhere will not occur at Kirkland.

These actions may be characterized by their involvement of students in the college's decisionmaking process. For example, both students and faculty are appointed to standing committees of the board of trustees, and a recently adopted constitution for the conduct of the affairs of Kirkland College provides for a joint assembly of students and faculty to discuss and propose a broad range of college policies. The result has been a means of expression and impact which can instill and maintain the vital sense of community which is so scarce in the educational community today.

Kirkland College is the first new, independent women's college in the East since 1926. I am proud that it is in my district, and I am proud, too, that the president of Kirkland College has had the foresight to include in his inauguration day festivities a colloquium of educators from the United States and foreign countries who will travel to Clinton to discuss the possible responses of educational institutions and of government to the changes dramatically reflected in student action throughout the world.

I know you will be watching this new institution which comes into being in such troubled times for education, and I am confident you will join me in congratulating Kirkland College and President Babbitt and extending every good wish in their new and important venture.

LET US STOP SOCKING IT TO THEM

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, we could hardly find a better day to discuss the need for tax reform than today when we are all so pointedly reminded of the existence of, and the inadequacies in our tax system. An article by Murray Seeger in the April 1969 Washingtonian does an excellent job of pointing up some of the present inequities and the need for reform. I insert Mr. Seeger's article in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S INCOME TAX TIME AGAIN OR SOCK IT TO THE MIDDLE-CLASS!

(By Murray Seeger)

You might call it the nation's most exclusive club. At the last roll call there were only twenty-one members and each had an annual income of a million dollars or more. What is most unusual, however, is that these fortunate souls make their millions without paying a penny of Federal income tax.

There is nothing illegal about their tax returns. The lucky twenty-one have simply taken full advantage of Internal Revenue Code loopholes. The club members pay high fees to the lawyers who guide them to the promised land, and together they can laugh at the innocents who believe the United States has a progressive or confiscatory tax system.

These anonymous club members, known only to a few Treasury Department experts, have one thing in common . . . they are very, very rich; for the biggest and best tax shelters are tailored for our wealthiest citizens.

For the poor, about the only defense against the tax collector is the personal exemption of $600 for each member of the family. For middle and upper-middle income groups, income-splitting between husband and wife cuts tax rates. The rich, however, have capital gains, oil-depletion allowances, rapid depreciation allowances, "hobby" farm losses, and unlimited charitable contributions.

One of the great anomalies of American life is that the poor save on their Federal taxes by having babies and the rich escape simply by having so much money. The result is that the largest group of taxpayers, the much-abused middle class, carries a disproportionate share of the Federal tax burden.

It is not just the twenty-one super tax evaders who stand out. In 1967, a total of 155 taxpayers each reported gross incomes of more than $200,000 and paid no taxes.

A landmark study of 1962 tax returns by Joseph A. Pechman, the brilliant economist at the Brookings Institution, found that those earning over a million dollars a year paid an average actual tax rate of 26.7 percent, about the same rate as taxpayers earning between $50,000 and $100,000 a year. Although the law says tax rates for individuals making $50,000 and up slide from 62 to 70 percent, only a very naive taxpayer would pay that high a rate. The highest average tax rate paid is actually about 30 percent and that falls on the $100,000 to $200,000 group.

How do these champion tax dodgers do it?

Here is an actual example—call him Mr. X:

His total income was $10,829,028 in 1967, almost all of it from stock dividends and therefore subject to the full maximum tax rate of 70 percent. But Mr. X is a great benefactor to mankind, giving $10.5 million to charity. With other deductions Mr. X was able to protect his entire income from taxation.

But did Mr. X really give away all his income? No, what he gave away was stock that had grown in value over a period of years without being taxed. Mr. X thus avoided the capital gains tax, got a full deduction against his current income, and laughed all the way to his broker's office where he started the cycle over again.

Mr. Y earned stock dividends of $2 million and in addition had capital gains of $4.4 million. The 70 percent rate should have applied against the dividend flow and the lower capital gains tax of 25 percent against the remainder.

But Mr. Y was able to juggle his capital gains and losses that year and give away $4 million worth of property to charity so that he, too, ended up with a zero on the line marked "balance due."

Mr. Z didn't have to find a convenient charity because he is in oil. As most everyone knows, the enterprise and luck of oilmen are rewarded as no other economic activity is. Mr. Z also was a farmer, but his luck on the land was not nearly so good as it was underground.

After his costs for exploring and developing new wells are taken off the top, Mr. Z still had reportable income of $2,280,962 in 1967. Then came the other deductions—$865,644 from the twenty-seven and a half percent depletion allowance and $828,571 from that lousy farm. Charity got only $32,809, because all the other deductions were big enough to wipe out Mr. Z's tax obligation.

About that farm. You would think a smart fellow like Mr. Z who did so well in oil could make his farm break even. But Mr. Z knew that the law allows him to write off his farm losses against nonfarm income. Maybe he built himself a mansion on that farm, loaded it up with the best equipment and best cattle, and charged it against the money pumped out of the ground in the form of oil.

A recent Treasury study observed: "The indication is that as people have more adjusted gross income they have a remarkable propensity to run their farm operations at a loss."

Another club member, call him Mr. A, earned his million in real estate, another area of investment favored by the tax laws.

Mr. A's total income was $1,433,000, mostly in capital gains from selling real estate. But he could deduct depreciation costs of $864,000, since real estate can be written off at rates up to twice as fast as other capital investments. He had to give away only $33,000 to end up with a zero tax bill.

Almost everyone, of course, tries to pay as little Federal income tax as possible. The ideal tax system would be neutral, that is, it would treat everyone alike and there would be equity not only among different classes of taxpayers but also among various sources of income.

Our system, however, is not neutral, so people make decisions that will be rewarded by the tax laws. One of the simplest examples is the couple who buy a house instead of renting an apartment because the mortgage interest deductions will actually give them more cash income at the end of the year.

Conspicuous among those making financial decisions in hope of avoiding the tax collector are doctors, lawyers, and small businessmen.

A few years ago, Washington real estate speculator Burton J. Dorfman started tapping the surplus income of Montgomery County doctors and businessmen. He used the money to buy central city properties on which he obtained oversized mortgages. The investors shared in the income from the properties, and also shared in the special depreciation provisions.

Together the partners put up $250,000 to help Dorfman buy four apartment buildings. "We went into a smaller one first," Dr. Arthur J. Wilets of Chevy Chase explained, "and it paid off nicely. When more came up, we decided to go into them, too. But we lost money on them."

"It is difficult for any of us to tell what happened," Dr. Wilets, who first met Dorfman at a party, recalled. "Evidently, the mortgages were very high, a very tight squeeze. The break-even point for the buildings was then very high. And apparently the cost of running them went up too high." In this case, the tax provisions had seduced a group of Washingtonians into making a reckless financial investment.

Others who have money to bury buy shares in oil development companies because of the big write-offs available even if no oil is found. A big strike, of course, allows a depletion allowance that goes on at twenty-seven and a half percent of the mineral property's income no matter if the oil keeps coming for four years or 40.

Combines are formed every day to buy new buildings or expensive items such as airplanes that can be leased to corporations who don't want to spend their own cash. The lenders share the rent and the tax credits.

The case of the central city investor, however, has serious social implications. The speculators do little to improve their slum property since such investments use up depreciation benefits.

The rapid depreciation, plus mortgage interest deductions, wipes out taxable rental income and also allows depreciation-caused tax losses which can be applied against other income. As a result, there is a payoff for rapidly turning over slum properties and spending little on maintenance. Selling prices are held artificially high because there are always buyers looking for the tax havens. Millions of tax dollars are lost because of these special provisions, yet the tax incentives have not given us the kind of housing needed in our cities.

In the same way, the tax loophole that invites the rich to buy hobby farms means that those who actually want to farm have to pay more for land.

The analysis of what the tax loopholes do to the nation has been going on since the Congress started writing the provisions into law. In many respects, one man's loophole is another man's tax reform.

The late Senator Robert F. Kennedy, for instance, was highly successful at dramatizing the inequities in the law which allow the small group of very rich taxpayers to evade their responsibility. And still he advocated other forms of tax write-offs to speed private investments in urban renewal and job training for the hard-core unemployed. To a tax purist, the Kennedy proposals were potential new loopholes.

"Tax reform is like cutting federal spending," says Rep. Wilbur D. Mills, the canny chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. "Everyone is for it until you get down to the details."

As a result, countless efforts to remove individual privileges such as the oil depletion allowance or unlimited charity donations have failed. Every recent attempt to tighten the depletion allowance resulted in more minerals being covered by the fixed write-offs.

The current drive for tax reform is gaining momentum, however, and one reason is the notoriety of the Twenty-One Club.

Joseph W. Barr, now vice chairman of American Security and Trust Co. turned the spotlight on the privileged few in testimony before the Joint Economic Committee last January shortly before he left the Treasury Department.

"We face now the possibility of a taxpayer revolt if we do not soon make major reforms in our income taxes," Barr said. "The revolt will come not from the poor but from the tens of millions of middle-class families and individuals with incomes of $7,000 to $20,000 whose tax payments now generally are based on the full ordinary rates and who pay over half of our individual income taxes.

"The middle classes are likely to revolt against income taxes not because of the level or amount of the taxes they must pay but because certain provisions of the tax laws unfairly lighten the burdens of others who can afford to pay. People are concerned and indeed angered about the high-income recipients who pay little or no Federal income taxes."

Whatever measure Barr had taken of public opinion, his conclusions were accurate. A few days after he testified, Congressmen and the White House started getting mail. President Nixon called Wilbur Mills to the White House to confess he was truly interested in tax reform. "We're getting letters from all over the country," says one congressional staff member. "They are mostly from little old ladies who are mad to find there are people who don't pay taxes." The Treasury went on overtime to prepare legislative proposals.

The revenue gained if the twenty-one biggest tax evaders were roped would be small compared to the money lost in other areas. But the notoriety gained by this little club has been the biggest stimulant to tax reform this year. It almost seems like a put-up job, having those very rich, anonymous individuals to shoot at. But if a true tax reform bill is written, the twenty-one will have performed a great public service.

TAX RELIEF AND NEED FOR SIMPLIFICATION OF FEDERAL TAX RETURN FORMS

(Mr. HUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, today, April 15, will rank high on the list of days that would preferably be forgotten. But it will not be forgotten soon, because by midnight tonight, millions of taxpayers across the Nation have already had to dip into savings or obtain personal loans, at interest rates approximating 8.5 percent, to pay taxes for which withholdings were insufficient. This situation is due largely to the retroactive effectiveness of the 10-percent surtax, but especially in the case of single persons, withholdings would have been inadequate anyway.

To make matters worse, there were additional millions of taxpayers whose State and local taxes were not withheld from their wages and salaries, and in the aggregate, it is a rather bleak day for those who come to the realization once a year that while the cost of living climbs, so do taxes.

Perhaps, the only consolation, if indeed it is one, is that the taxpayer gets only a very small taste of just how much the Government of which he is a part is costing him. To be sure, if no taxes, Federal, State, or local, were withheld, there would undoubtedly be a complete tax rebellion tomorrow let alone the mere rumblings of such an occurrence as it is.

Compounding the already dismal situation even more is the fact that taxpayers were faced with an ever-increasing maze of paperwork and instructions they were to comprehend only to find that the results were as frustrating as the paperwork. Literally millions even had to pay someone else to find out how much more they had to pay Uncle Sam.

Today, I am introducing two measures which are intended primarily to relieve those in the middle and lower income brackets. One would raise the standard and the minimum standard deductions allowable to individual taxpayers to provide direct economic relief. The other would provide for the establishment of an advisory committee to the Secretary of the Treasury to recommend improvements in and simplification of Federal tax return forms and procedures. While other major tax reforms are still being formulated, I commend both of these measures to the attention of the appropriate committee for due consideration.

CAUSE FOR CONCERN

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, less than 2 weeks ago I described to the House a new kind of race hatred that is developing in Texas. This new racism is racism practiced by a minority group; past victims of discrimination, they have adopted the same poisons, the same attitudes, the same tactics of those who have so long offended them. Mexican Americans in Texas now see racists among them; they now see self-appointed so-called leaders making facile judgments of large classes of people, using the same sort of distorted logic, deceitful tongues, and hateful words of racists. We now have the supreme irony that to these misguided souls, the answer to racism is racism in return. I had hoped when I spoke a few days ago that I might be wrong about this phenomenon, but time has proved that indeed there was cause for concern and that rather than being wrong, I was right.

A few days ago the leader of the Mexican-American Youth Organization held a press conference during which he stated that his goal was freedom and independence for Mexican Americans—in a confused kind of way—and stated that if all else failed he would resort to killing his "gringo" enemies. This young man says that he can claim that some members of the Anglo-American society are all right, but in the next breath condemns the whole group and its society. Apparently to these new racists, the key to being good or evil depends on whether they personally approve of you or not; if you are an Anglo, you are presumed guilty of racism until you prove yourself innocent; if your name happens to be Spanish surname you are presumed all right no matter what you might have done in the past—crimes being excused as the product of Anglo racism—as long as you are with them; and if you are not with them then you have "gringo" tendencies.

The thinking, unrefined as it is, connected with the words, irresponsible as they are, of groups like this, compose a potent mixture. There is held forth pride as the goal, and there is held forth an enemy of pride, and there is put forward much heat, but little information on where exactly people should go to find their new pride. All that is said is that the reason that pride does not exist lies with the Anglo racists ,and that one day the "gringos" might have to be killed. This odd mixture of hate and cant gives rise to serious concern. Neither misdirected hatred, meaningless slogans, empty rhetoric, nor dramatic gestures can alone produce real progress. Progress requires real goals and real work, something that seems beyond the ken of the new racists.

Indeed, what appears most disturbing of all is that the new racism demands an allegiance to race above all else. In this new allegiance an individual is entitled only to those views which the leaders—self-appointed and self-anointed—believe forward the cause. Anyone deviating, anyone criticizing, anyone questioning, is tainted with having "gringo" tendencies or having sold out the cause. On the other hand, anyone judged loyal can do no wrong, and regardless of his actions, regardless of how irresponsible he might be, is not to be criticized, because such criticism would destroy the unity of "la raza." Thus the new racists want it both ways—total loyalty for those within, but the right to excommunicate those who deviate.

I do not believe that the sins of the past can be forgotten, nor do I believe that present-day racists ought to be forgiven. I do believe that facts are required on the side of the right, and that these new racists lack the facts to support their claims; and I believe that honest goals require honest tactics. It saddens me to see mirrored in faces promoting idealism the same ugliness I have seen in faces promoting shameful bigotry. It is in the name of idealism that some of the most shameful episodes of history have taken place; and it is the name of idealism that is being used by these thoughtless adventurers.

What saddens me most of all is not that I am personally an issue, because that has happened before; it is that the issue, the real issue, is not being addressed at all, and that is: What is the goal, how do we defeat poverty and hopelessness and despair best, and where do we now stand? The real questions stand forgotten, and that is proved in the following report from the San Antonio Express and News:

MAYO LEADER WARNS OF VIOLENCE, RIOTING

(By Kemper Diehl)

(NOTE.—Elimination of gringos may become necessary, Gutierrez tells press conference in South America.)

A gringo-dominated society is responsible for the problems of the Mexican-American "barrios" and unless there is social change there is a possibility of violence and rioting as a result of "very serious social unrest."

If "worst comes to worst" it may be necessary to eliminate gringos by killing them.

That was the message delivered in a calm and scholarly way Thursday by a 24-year-old "Mexicano" at a press conference called to detail the aims of the Mexican-American Youth Organization—a group under fire from U.S. Rep. Henry Gonzalez as a source of the spread of racial hatred.

Presiding adroitly at the conference held by MAYO leaders at their headquarters at 1009 S. Zarzamora St. was Jose Angel Gutierrez just back from a fund-raising visit to Washington.

Gutierrez in predicting the possibility of violence was agreeing with fears expressed by Gonzalez earlier this week. But he did not agree with the congressman on much else during a question and answer session which lasted well over an hour.

In fact, he agreed that Gonzalez might turn out to be a gringo himself.

Joining Gutierrez in the conference were Mario Compean, recent candidate of the Committee for Barrio Betterment in the city election, and Norman Guerrero. Standing by to lend legal assistance, if necessary, was Juan Rocha of the Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund and taping the proceedings as a precautionary measure was the Rev. Henry Casso.

During the lengthy conference it was established that MAYO's operating budget of $8,527 is financed by Ford Foundation funds distributed through intermediary organizations.

Gutierrez, it was explained, draws no pay directly for his MAYO efforts, but is a staff investigator and "community involvement specialist" for MALD which is also funded by the Ford Foundation. Guerrero is head of the University of the Barrios which operates on a budget of some $6,000 provided by the Mexican-American Unity Council, a Ford-funded group.

Gutierrez prefaced his remarks with a demand that newspapers and broadcasters distribute the entire text of his opening statement in full as well as the entire give and take of the conference itself.

The statement actually served as an excellent take-off point for the discussion to come. It announced:

"MAYO has found that both federal and religious programs aimed at social change do not meet the needs of the Mexicanos of this state.

"Further, we find that the vicious cultural genocide being inflicted upon La Raza by gringos and their institutions not only severely damage our human dignity but also make it impossible for La Raza to develop its right of self-determination.

"For these reasons, top priority is given to identifying and exposing the gringo. We also promote the social welfare of Mexicanos through education designed to enlarge the capabilities of indigenous leaders.

"We hope to secure our human and civil rights, to eliminate bigotry and racism, to lessen the tensions in our barrios and combat the deterioration of our communities.

"Our organization, largely comprised of youth, is committed to effecting meaningful social change. Social change that will enable La Raza to become masters of their destiny, owners of their resources, both human and natural, and a culturally and spiritually separate people from the gringo.

"Only through this program, we of MAYO, see the possibility of surviving this century as a free and complete family of Mexicanos. We will not try to assimilate into this gringo society in Texas nor will we encourage anybody else to do so.

"Rather MAYO once again asks of friends here and across the nation to assist us in our efforts. We intend to become free as a people in order to enjoy the abundance of our country and share it with those less fortunate.

"MAYO will not engage in controversy with fellow Mexicanos regardless of how unfounded and vindictive their accusations may be. We realize that the effects of cultural genocide takes many forms—some Mexicanos will become psychologically castrated, others will become demagogues and gringos as well and others will come together, resist and eliminate the gringo. We will be with the latter."

Gutierrez was asked his definition of a gringo and replied:

"A person or an institution that has a certain policy or program or attitudes that reflect bigotry, racism, discord and prejudice and violence."

He was asked if Gonzalez was a gringo, and replied:

"He has demonstrated some tendencies that fit in that category."

Asked if a majority of Anglo-Americans could be designated as gringos. Gutierrez responded:

"According to the Kerner report we could say yes to that answer."

He went on to say he could not testify as to this from personal experience as MAYO had not had extensive dealings outside of Texas. He added:

"The majority of the ones (Anglo-Americans) here in this state are gringos."

Gutierrez was then asked what was meant by the phrase "eliminate the gringo" in the MAYO statement. He replied:

"You can eliminate an individual in various ways. You can certainly kill him but that is not our intent at this moment. You can remove the base of support that he operates from, be it economic, political or social. That is what we intend to do."

A newsman asked:

"If nothing else works, you're going to kill all the gringos?"

Gutierrez replied:

"We'll have to find out if nothing else will work."

The questioner persisted:

"And then you'll kill us all?"

Gutierrez replied:

"If it doesn't work . . . I'd like to add to you that if you label yourself a gringo then you're one of the enemy."

Gutierrez was asked if he might not be a gringo himself in that he appeared to show racial animosity toward Anglo-Americans. He replied that he did not accept the premise that he displayed racial animosity.

"I don't think I have," he announced, "I think I am identifying the problem and attempting to point out what the problem is."

He was asked if he could say, "Some of my best friends are Anglos," and chuckled befor replying:

"That's a racist statement. I wouldn't be that derogatory or condescending . . . I would say that a lot of people are friends of mine and some of them are Anglos."

He was asked if the MAYO group sought a separate society and replied he did not mention society.

"I said culturally and spiritually," he explained. "We are distinct and we don't wish any part of this racist society. We have something beautiful to begin with."

He emphasized that the MAYO aim was to "resist any further cultural genocide."

Asked to explain this he cited as one example "racism" in textbooks and the denial of the right to speak Spanish in elementary grades.

Gutierrez asserted that so far as he knew the San Antonio ISD was the only local school district to change its policy so as to legitimatize the use of Spanish. Of Edgewood ISD he said:

"They don't require them to speak English, but they do have punitive measures of punishment for those who do speak Spanish."

Asked if MAYO identified with the people of Mexico in its aims, he replied:

"If they share the same values, yes. We are different from the Mexicans in Mexico . . . in that we have been able to develop and adapt to the local situation here and as a consequence we have modified many of our value systems."

Gutierrez was again pressed as to intentions of killing gringos "if worst comes to worst." He replied:

"If worst comes to worst and we have to resort to that means, it would be self-defense."

Asked if he hated gringos, he replied:

"Yes I do."

He was asked if there were a time limit as to when it might be determined that "worst had come to worst."

He answered:

"Well I can only make a personal decision. If the attacks on my person and my property continue as they have been doing then it will only be a matter of a few years."

He explained:

"Last year part of my property in Crystal City was burned. Two months ago my home was burned in Crystal City. In 1963 I was kidnapped and coerced or attempted to be coerced . . . by gringo elements."

He continued that in "the whole attempt to create an organization and movement" he had been "abused and misused by a lot of people."

He added:

"If this continues, within a few years I will no longer try to work with anybody."

Asked to explain why 500,000 Mexican nationals had immigrated to the U.S. within the past 15 years despite his charges regarding the misery and degradation they face, he replied:

"Maybe they don't know any better . . . You'll find about an equal number going back."

Gutierrez said he had been born and reared in Crystal City. He is a graduate of St. Mary's University.

He said that he felt Gonzalez "has been unjust in his treatment of us because he hasn't presented any proof or any base for the charges that he makes."

He was asked if Sen. Joe Bernal and Comm. Albert Pena had helped MAYO and replied:

"They've certainly been around when we need them."

Asked who might be called the "white hats" and "black hats" in his view, he answered:

"In gringos there's nobody wearing white hats. They're all a bunch of animals."

He cited Mayor McAllister as a gringo.

Asked about the reference to the religious programs in the opening lines of the MAYO statement he said that he did not believe the church had "ever reached" the Mexicano for "social change."

He was asked what the church had reached the Mexicano for, and replied:

"To make them dependent on the church as a crutch."

Despite a "Brown Power" sticker on the window of the office, Gutierrez said he did not know anything about the background of such a slogan and commented:

"I don't know that we're advocating brown power."

On several occasions Gutierrez made it clear he had no confidence in the courts of Texas. He was asked if he was optimistic about obtaining justice in the courts and replied:

"Not at the Texas level. In fact there's been no relief by any Texas court given to any Mexicano. It's always come from federal court."

Gutierrez said that the MAYO movement might concentrate on the employment of economic force through "labor strikes," the "boycott of certain business," development of barrio-owned business firms, or even "a loan from McAllister's San Antonio Savings Assn."

He was asked if he had any opinion on the Cuban revolution and Fidel Castro and replied he knew little about them, adding:

"Only what I read in the newspapers and that leaves a lot to be desired as far as getting the other side of the story."

Near the close of the conference Gutierrez dealt with the relationship of the work of MAYO to that of VISTA which has been accused of distributing MAYO literature.

He held that MAYO was more effective in its work because VISTA youngsters must contend with "hangups."

The MAYO leader said that VISTA workers are "completely prohibited from any political activity which is a tremendous source of power."

Further, they have no "identification" with the people of the Southwest and tend to think they are doing "missionary work."

Expounding on the political activity situation, Gutierrez said that the VISTA workers are not really able to get people together to discuss issues. He added:

"We can relate the same message in Spanish without actually getting up there and advocating anything or anybody."

Though Gutierrez said he regarded some portions of the MAYO effort as a sort of nonpartisan political activity, he was confident it did not threaten the tax-exempt status of the Ford Foundation.

Rocha explained that what MAYO actually does is to bring about public dissemination of information.

Compean reported briefly on educational and leadership aims of the organization including participation in voter registration drives. He emphasized work of MAYO with former gang members.

Guerrero discussed the work of his university which has a staff of three and works with gang members and drop outs.

"We've been out on the streets until two or three in the morning," Reported Guerrero, adding that "We have a lot of fun with the policemen."

Asked to amplify on the 3 a.m. duty, he said that "we're talking to the people—to the dope addicts."

He charged that police have called his students "pachucos" and at times had booted them in "the rear end."

Asked of the police involved were Anglo-American or Mexican-American, Guerrero mused that police are "weird people." He said that, though there are "good cops," the people of the poverty area consider the police to be "perros—dogs."

Asked about the murder which occurred late one night at the university, he noted that "after the years of poverty and degradation we have encountered—this system has not produced angels."

A reporter asked if the group felt Rep. Gonzalez had done anything for the Mexican-Americans. Gutierrez replied that he had passed a tremendous amount of social legislation but "locally the record with Mexicanos is not very impressive."

Asked if Gonzalez had not helped with the food stamp program, Gutierrez assailed the food program as helping "Mexicanos become dependent on a welfare system." He called for replacement of the present welfare system with a system under which the government as a last resort would guarantee every person a job or a fixed income.

Guerrero reported he was a scholarship student at Trinity University. Pressed as to whether he considered it a gringo institution, he reported:

"The majority of my professors are—they're Anglos. There are a lot of gringos that go there."

Asked if the professors were "all right," he replied:

"Some of them . . . but my hassel is not with Trinity."

NEED FOR REDEFINITION OF FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Minshall) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, events of last year in east-central Europe clearly spelled out two facts for all the world to see: First, the resilience of the forces opposing Soviet Russian hegemony and of traditional, totalitarian communism, and, second, the brute military power of the Kremlin ready to crush any burgeoning nationalism, humanism, or market-oriented economics in the region.

In 1968 we witnessed the "spring of Prague," the challenge to bureaucratic totalitarianism, secret police terror, and alienation of the individual in a collectivist society by Czech and Slovak students and intellectuals, regardless of whether they were Communist Party members or anti-Communists. We watched the increasing search for national identity and sovereignty, renewed interest in the history of these nations in order to strengthen identification with the West. We discerned the younger generation's hunger for humanism and moral values rather than the emptiness and deceit of communism.

Yet we also witnessed the use of military force against Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union, the repression of students, intellectuals and Jews in Poland, the revival of the old divide-and-conquer tactics of the Russian occupiers in Czechoslovakia, the slowdown in economic reforms in Hungary, and the fateful proclamation of the "Brezhnev Doctrine." This unilateral pronouncement of the Soviet Government, restricting the national sovereignty of "Socialist" nations by declaring Soviet intervention legal if the "Socialist" governmental order were endangered, is a clear attempt to legalize the protectorate status of these countries.

No wonder that even some of the Communist governments and parties protested this unabashed claim to become the protecting power in contravention of the United Nations Charter.

American policy under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations was mostly that of detached waiting and ineffectual sloganeering. Our silence before, and shortlived protests after the invasion of Czechoslovakia seemed to indicate to many a tacit understanding that we consider the area a Russian preserve which can be ruled according to the whims of the Moscow regime.

The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia reawakened old fears of Russian expansion by force in Europe. It reopened the Berlin problem. More immediately, it raised the specter of a Russian invasion of those Communist countries which, in part or entirely, detached themselves from Russian military domination; that is, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and even Albania. Occupation of these countries by the Red Army would greatly aggravate the situation of our NATO allies in the Mediterranean and our position in the Middle East.

At the same time, however, Moscow's political gamble in Czechoslovakia remained a pyrrhic victory. Resistance, though in muted forms, persists in Czechoslovakia, federalization strengthened the allegiance of the people to the state, and the death of Jan Paluch focuses world attention to the undefeated spirit of the youth that seeks humanism and believes in Western values of freedom and human dignity. This determination was displayed on a historic scale by the young Hungarian freedom fighters in 1956, it burns now in the youth throughout east-central Europe.

Under these circumstances, the new administration is well-advised to seek a redefinition of our policies. A way must be found to reduce and remove Soviet military presence and pressure and to help restore national self-determination to these countries. If liberation is excluded by the existence of nuclear parity, and if "bridge-building" only leads to Soviet military intervention, a new approach must be found. Soviet actions in east-central Europe, the resilience of anti-Soviet, pro-Western nationalism there, the quest for humanism infiltrating even some party workers, the increasing intensity of the Sino-Soviet conflict—all are factors which might enable the United States and other Western countries to suggest new solutions to the Soviet Union. Solutions, which would, if not solve at least alleviate the sad fate of these proud nations so closely allied through history, culture, economic interest and sympathies with Western Europe.

One such approach would be the strengthening of unity and the coordination of efforts in Western Europe in the spirit of Atlantic partnership, with a proposal to neutralize, at least part, but preferably all of the area between Germany and Russia by international guarantee after a withdrawal of Soviet military forces. The new buffer zone also would include pro-Western Austria, national Communist Yugoslavia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and probably Rumania and Poland as well.

Such ideas were most succinctly analyzed in a recent memorandum of the American Hungarian Federation submitted to the President and Secretary of State Rogers. The International Affairs Committee of the Federation and its active, scholarly chairman and secretary are to be warmly congratulated for their incisive analysis of the situation. I am particularly impressed by the scope of their thinking, which does not limit itself to Hungary alone. For, in reality, there is no separate question. The future of Hungary hinges on development of the East European region in particular and on unity and coordination of efforts in Western Europe in general.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I will insert the memorandum in the Record:

Memorandum of the American Hungarian Federation

Self-determination of all nations has ever been the fundamental tenet of American foreign policy. In its name, and mindful of the disappointing experiences of the last 25 years, the division of the globe into spheres of influence among the superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, must be rejected as ineffectually and dangerously offensive to American national interests.

Conceived as a four power system at the Teheran and Yalta Conferences, this master plan had further deteriorated into a confrontation of the two superpowers maintaining a precarious balance through mutual intimidation. Accordingly, instead of unification, the European continent was partitioned into two halves, and that deplorable split is enforced even today by unopposed Soviet intervention.

The existing balance of terror is fragile and an unfortunate conglomeration of events resulting from cumulative minor decisions could produce a situation in which even the superpowers would lose their freedom of choice.

The basic assumption for a reassessment of our policies cannot be "bridgebuilding," an ineffectual slogan of irresolute politicians unhappy with the results of bipolarity, but unwilling to work for a gradual transformation of the European status quo. It must be rather the promotion of the *emergence of a Europe, friendly toward the United States, but sufficiently united and undependent to act as a third superpower in regard to its major regional interests. Therefore, measures promoting Atlantic partnership must be given priority over bilateral arrangements with the Soviet Union.*

Only the emergence of a politically well-coordinated Europe can overcome the frustration felt by Europeans on both sides of the Soviet-American demarcation line and their relapse into provincial isolationism.

Acceptance of Europe as an equal partner would create a power sharing Western cultural and historical heritage at the center of the power conflict. It should exert a peaceful, but almost irresistible, pull on Central European nations and serve as the natural mediator and major cultural force in reforging the ties with these countries, preventing them from moving closer to the Soviet Union as a result of the feeling of helplessness and abandonment by Western countries.

However, even a Western European superpower could not offer an automatic solution to the overriding problem of Europe's central lands, the partitioning of Germany, and the presence of Russian troops in the area between Russia and Germany. For Soviet power in the region is military and economic, rather than ideological. Nationalism, therefore, forms the counterpoise to communism and the Soviet Union. Nationalists in East Central Europe are committed to Western historical traditions of their nations and yearn for closer ties with Western European countries.

Under these circumstances, the road to change would have to lead probably through a neutralization of the Central European states, creating actually three Europes: the Western European power, the buffer area of East Central Europe and the East European superpower: the Soviet Union. Such a neutral zone would even cater to real or alleged security interests of the Soviet Union in regard to "German revanchism," and "American imperialism."

The contention of the Soviet Union, however, that the maintenance of a "Socialist" order supersedes the rights of East Central European states to sovereignty as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, can never be accepted either implicitly, or explicitly. The "Brezhnev Doctrine" contravenes the basic principle of the United Nations and international law which is the sovereign equality of nations, and endangers peace and security in all of Europe.

While a neutralization cannot be conceived without future progress on the solution of the problem of German reunification, it is not dependent upon a full solution of the same. Neutralization would have to include preferably all nations between Germany and Russia, but at the minimum Hungary, Czechoslovakia and already neutral Austria, perhaps also Yugoslavia, Rumania and Poland. International guarantees by the major powers, and a corresponding withdrawal of foreign troops to 200–250 miles from the present demarcation lines, could make such proposals attractive even to Moscow which today has less problems with Austria and Finland than with allies Rumania and Czechoslovakia. Furthermore, a European settlement would increase the freedom of action of the Soviet Union on her Chinese flank. Central European peoples would greatly benefit by the removal of Soviet military and economic pressure from the area. Premier Imre Nagy Hungarian Government asked for a neutralization of Hungary on November 1, 1956, and neutralization formed topic of serious discussions in Czechoslovakia during the summer of 1968.

Our alternative option is to maintain bipolarity and to emphasize the control of nuclear arms in order to find common grounds with the Soviet Union. In the long run, this course would result in a reheating of the German question, in frustration and possible revolts among the despairing Central European nations, and in an increasing fragmentation of Western Europe. Finally, Soviet American tensions would be reintensified with no mediating European power present.

Lured into a false sense of security by the seemingly stable bipolar balance, with the sympathy of our friends alienated by our unattractive role as the policeman of the status quo, we could easily approach the precipice facing surrender, or a nuclear Armageddon. For legitimacy, or the recognition of binding principles of international order, are not accepted in theory, or practiced in diplomacy, by the Soviet Union.

President Nixon, in his October 19, 1968 speech at Eatonville, N.J., stated that a regional pact can have a great role in peacemaking and continued:

> "Regional pact can prevent a local conflict from escalating into a world war. The regional pact thus becomes a buffer separating the distant great powers from immediate threat—and the danger of a local conflict escalating into a world war is thereby reduced. A regional pact would provide a buffer between the United States and the Soviet Union in future flareups."

It is this kind of regional pact establishing a neutral zone in Europe that our memorandum seeks while asking for the promotion of Atlantic partnership concepts for Western Europe in order to promote a stable peace on the continent of Europe that should not be bargained away for real, or alleged, concessions of the Soviet Union on the issues of the Middle East and Viet Nam.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with my colleagues, ably led by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, in discussing new approaches to our policies toward east-central Europe after the deadlock of many years under the past administrations. The occasion is provided by the memorandum of the American Hungarian Federation on the issue to the President and the Secretary of State which was recently sent to them.

Our policy toward east-central Europe was characterized by either indifference or irresolution. Despite the strong forces opposing the present status quo which condemns these nations to the satellite status toward the Soviet Union, forces which manifested themselves clearly in the 1956 Hungarian Revolution and the events in the spring and summer of 1968 in Czechoslovakia, and the efforts of even the Communist regimes of Rumania and Yugoslavia to escape Russian domination, we have not come up with a comprehensive policy that would have had a reasonable chance of ridding these nations from Russian military pressures and occupation. The liberation policy failed as it was to be restricted to propaganda. The bridgebuilding policy remained ineffective, morally compromising us in accepting the regimes and Soviet influence. Instead of successfully detaching some states from the Russian orbit, it only led to the consequential and evil Brezhnev doctrine which claims the right of military intervention by the Soviet Union in case the "Socialist" order is endangered in any one of these "Socialist" countries. This is an international law definition of protectorate and nullifies the sovereignty of these nations even under international laws.

We must find some means to counteract the increasing pressures of the Soviet Union on the area in view of the strength of those native forces which struggle valiantly against overwhelming odds for national sovereignty, human dignity and more individual initiative in these collectivist, totalitarian societies.

As it seems to be clear that even much of the Communist Party leadership of the lower- and middle-echelon levels desires the removal of Russian military occupation and a freer development of national policies, and as it is evident that the peoples are in favor of ending Russian occupation and of reforging their ties with Western Europe, it would be in our interest in proposing neutralization of the Central European area, including Austria and Yugoslavia, as well as to the Soviet Union and the governments concerned. While such neutralization might not be the best solution, it would enable these countries to resume more independent national policies, rid them from Russian occupation troops, and enable them to cooperate among one another. The "inner core" of the buffer zone would approximately be the territory of the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy where common historical traditions and economic interests already exist and have been forcibly torn apart by the Versailles-Trianon Treaties of 1919–20, the German domination of the area in the late thirties and the Russian domination of the region since 1945.

We hope that if our Government plans to have negotiations with the Soviet Union, this approach would be used instead of continuing with the Kennedy-Johnson policy of watchful waiting and idleness toward the region that helped the peoples of east-central Europe and the Western European nations, as well as believe that we have written off east-central Europe for good as a Russian reservation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining my colleagues in discussing our policy toward the region of east-central Europe on the basis of the recent memorandum of the American Hungarian Federation.

With the events in Czechoslovakia and the visit of the Russian leaders to Rumania the problems of east-central Europe are again moving into the forefront of interest of world politics. To this added the expressed desire of the new administration to concern itself increasingly with European problems and its intent to start in the near future substantial talks with the Soviet Union involving European and Middle Eastern questions. Undoubtedly, much thought must be given by our policymakers on how to activate American policy in this region without necessarily upsetting the general aim of a detente with the Soviet Union.

One such well-reasoned proposal has been recently submitted by the American Hungarian Federation which memorandum was also signed by the Federation of Free Hungarian Jurists and Hungarian Freedomfighters Association of America. The memorandum urges a rethinking of our policies in finding ways which would induce the Soviet Union to yield military control over part of the area in return for Western concessions. The way suggested is a neutralization of the Danubian countries on both sides of the Iron Curtain, including Austria and Yugoslavia and Hungary, Rumania, and perhaps Czechoslovakia.

It is in support of this concept that I am speaking today, though I believe that the proposal should be extended to Poland as well and perhaps the idea of neutralizing both the Danubian countries, Poland and the two Germanies would find a better response in the Soviet capital. However, we must realize that at the present, a more modest approach might be of better diplomatic value and, therefore, I welcome the proposal of the American Hungarian Federation and hope that our policymakers will pay the needed attention to it and will further research it.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the fortunes of the peoples of east-central Europe are always close to our hearts. Many Americans or their ancestors came from these lands of the Danubian region, Poland and the northern Balkans. They helped us to build a better and culturally more enriched America, and they remain concerned about the fate of their former conationals.

Furthermore, the strategic importance of the Danubian region and the northern Balkans has been of great significance to our NATO allies, particularly Germany, Greece, and Italy; and the deprivation of the right of the Danubian and northern Balkan nations to self-determination remained a heavy heritage of our inept policies at Teheran and Yalta and of brutal Soviet aggression toward them.

Events, however, continue to evolve even in east-central Europe. The days of Stalinist monolithic satellization are gone, but Russian military and economic hegemony over the area still deprives them of true political independence and strong internal pressures for such a state of affairs still provoke Soviet military intervention, like in Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968. Yet the forces of nationalism, which is almost completely anti-Russian, and the search of the youth and intellectuals for a more democratic life and humane methods cannot be repressed even by Russian tanks; and the economic realities of the 1960's force even the Communist regimes to expand trade with the West in order to help modernize their obsolete machinery and management methods.

Yet the central fact remains continued Soviet control and no true solution can be achieved until this central fact is successfully altered. Therefore, it is with great interest that I have read the recent memorandum of the American Hungarian Federation proposing neutralization of part of the area: The Danubian region, including now neutral Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia and either or both Rumania and Czechoslovakia. I trust that our diplomats and policy planners will further study the interesting proposal and work out a comprehensive plan which could form our counterproposal to the Soviet-backed European Security Conference which will have to be dealt with in some manner after the remarks of President Nixon to the NATO meeting last week and the NATO communique composed at the end of the same meeting.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining my colleagues in discussing various alternatives to American policies toward east-central Europe.

The two salient facts evident about the situation in that region are the anti-Russian, nationalist spirit of the peoples, and the unchallenged military superiority of the Soviet Union which finds its expression in the occupation of most countries of the region and in the newfangled "Brezhnev doctrine" claiming the legal right of intervention, a carte blanche for political and military domination.

The events of 1968 in Czechoslovakia showed with great clarity the presence of these two major forces and the absence of any coordinated policy on our part. While liberation is outmoded by the military-political realities of life in international politics, we must continue looking for an alternative policy not based on the sanctioning of the protectorate status of these proud nations in the "Socialist commonwealth."

Recently the American Hungarian Federation which for over six decades served as the spokesman of the American Hungarian community submitted a memorandum to the President, Secretary of State, and the National Security Council on the subject of future policies of the United States in east-central Europe. They discussed the issue in the all-European framework, pointing out that the emergence of a politically coordinated Europe that can speak with one voice on the major regional issues is a prerequisite for any successful Western policy toward these historically pro-Western countries of the European center. Therefore, they suggested that we give precedence toward policies directed toward Western unity, and promoting Atlantic partnership.

In addition, however, realizing that negotiations with the Soviet Union over the major international conflict issues are necessary, they also suggested the official presentation of a comprehensive neutralization program for Austria, Yugoslavia and at least Hungary, Czechoslovakia, preferably Poland and Rumania including the withdrawal of foreign forces from these countries. This neutralization would also be guaranteed by NATO and the Soviet Union thereby increasing the security of both Western Europe and the Soviet Union by the creation of a buffer zone especially as the increasing intensity of the Sino-Soviet conflict and the troubles the Soviet Union continues to have with some of her allies in east-central Europe, must render Moscow more interested in a European settlement.

I certainly hope that the memorandum will be carefully read by the policymakers in this country and further studies be made on the proposals of the American Hungarian Federation.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in discussing alternate courses to present American policies toward east-central Europe.

Recently, we are faced in east-central Europe with two forces for change. The first one is the increasing recognition of national independence and historic tradition of these nations in response to the increasingly anti-Russian feelings of the peoples. The second force is the search for some kind of humanism by the younger generation, a return to Western moral and philosophical ideals even when presented within the political framework of a socialist society. These ideals found acceptance in many countries even among the young and the intellectuals who were Communist Party members and who occupy important positions in the cultural and political life of their countries.

However, since August 1968, Russian military and economic pressure against the states of the region has increased in order to counteract these tendencies. We have seen the repression of the spring demands of the Polish university youth in 1968, the military occupation of Czechoslovakia where individual freedom was, at least in part, restored and further reforms demanded, and the pressures on Rumania and even on independent Yugoslavia.

Yet the pressures were only partially successful. Everywhere, even in Hungary, which underwent the traumatic experiences of an anti-Communist national rising in 1956, the peoples express their quest for reforms and humanism with increasing impatience despite the Czech events.

President Nixon is preparing this year for a new summit meeting with the Soviet Union, and it is to be expected that the future of east-central Europe will form one of the most important topics of such a negotiation. Together with the German question, it could cause a confrontation between the two superpowers and NATO more easily than Vietnam or the Middle East.

It is, therefore, necessary to ask ourselves what alternatives we have. Liberation can no longer be pursued in view of the present military balance between the West and the Warsaw Pact nations. Bridgebuilding via Moscow has been proven too ineffective because in the moment the policy is even half successful, Russian intervention can deprive the nations and the West of any of its accomplishments as has been proved in Czechoslovakia.

We must search for a regional arrangement which would safeguard great power interests in the area, as well as the interests of the nations involved. A compromise plan is proposed by a memorandum of the American Hungarian Federation which suggests that neutralization of central Europe, including Hungary, Czechoslovakia, possibly also Rumania and Poland on the one hand, and already neutral Austria and independent Communist Yugoslavia on the other, would remove the seeds of conflict from the Danubian Basin while safeguarding also alleged Russian fears of Western advance in Europe under the guise of neutralization. We believe that in view of increasing Russian interest in a detente with the West, a result of sharpening conflict between Russia and China, such a proposal may even be considered by the Kremlin, and we urge the President and the Secretary of State to give careful consideration to the ideas expressed in the memorandum.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my distinguished colleagues in discussing our policies toward east-central Europe.

The initiative for this round of discussion was provided by the recent memorandum of the American Hungarian Federation sent to President Nixon and Secretary of State Rogers, proposing the inclusion of a neutralization plan for part of central Europe as an official American negotiating position.

This plan appears to have much merit and follows, in many respects, earlier plans by American-Polish experts on a Central European Federation. Since we cannot liberate east-central Europe and we cannot prevent the continued rise of nationalist and anti-Russian sentiments, it is our duty to find some provisional solution that could provide security to the peoples of the area, including a large degree of national self-determination, and also which would be acceptable to NATO and the Soviet Union.

Any neutralization plan must include some progress toward a solution of the German question. Placing the complex German question into the foreground of negotiations negated, in the past, any progress toward a restoration of peace and free development to the other nations in the region. Therefore, we welcome the suggestion of the American Hungarian Federation for a neutral zone to be established on the Austrian pattern, not only including Austria, but also Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and independent Yugoslavia, and providing for the withdrawal of foreign forces from the zone. While such a proposal would have been considered Utopian a few years ago, in view of the many difficulties the Soviet Union has been experiencing with many of its "allies" in the region and the increasing Chinese pressure on the eastern frontiers of the Soviet Union, perhaps this might become a proposal of considerable interest to the Soviet Union as well as a counterproposal to the European Security Conference promoted for propaganda purposes by Moscow.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining my colleagues, led by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, in discussing the problem of American policies toward east-central Europe. The debate is occasioned by the fine paper of the International Affairs Committee of the American Hungarian Federation recently submitted to the President, the Secretary of State, and the National Security Council.

It is my belief that the Czechoslovak events of 1968, the Timisiora Conference between Tito and Ceaucescu, the recent, not too successful, attempts of the Soviet Union to gain wholehearted support of the parties of the region against the Chinese are all signs that east-central Europe is not going to remain a docile subject of the Soviet Union even in the face of our continued inaction. Internal developments, whether manifested in the quest for economic efficiency instead of the wasteful practices of Marxist-Leninist economics, for humanism among the youth and the intellectuals, or for political democracy among the masses are going to continue despite Soviet intervention. In fact, the more repressive foreign measures are used, the more nationalism and aversion against Russia will grow, rendering slowly, but inevitably, this region of the world a new powder keg just like in the decades since 1914.

The new administration wants to take a different approach to the problem from the ineffectual "bridgebuilding" attempts of the last 8 years. We must find some means to deal with the overriding problem: the presence of Russian military forces in the area. Entering an era of negotiations rather than confrontation we cannot revert to "liberation" policies, but neither can we recognize the satellite status of these countries under what is now called the Brezhnev Doctrine of legal Soviet Russian intervention in case of danger to the Socialist order in these countries by internal developments.

The ideas of the American Hungarian Federation on these matters are interesting. They stress the need for more active Atlantic partnership policies in Western Europe in order to promote the emergence of a politically well coordinated Europe, independent but friendly which could make its own decisions about major regional issues. Such a Europe would, of course, exercise a strong peaceful pull on the states of central Europe. But the memorandum goes beyond these generalities. It proposes studies on a possible neutralization of Austria, Yugoslavia, and part of the Warsaw Pact nations, particularly Hungary and Czechoslovakia, by means of negotiations with the Soviet Union and the NATO allies.

I hope that our policymakers will give the attention to this paper which it deserves by its new approach and that further studies will be made in this direction.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the recent publication by Frederick A. Praeger of "The Czech Black Book," a translation of a publication compiled by the Institute of History of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences and entitled "Seven Days in Prague."

The purpose of the book, which was first secretly circulated in Czechoslovakia, was and is to refute the so-called Soviet white book—"On Events in Czechoslovakia," Press Group of Soviet Journalists, Moscow 1969.

"The Czech Black Book" is an excellent account of the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia and seriously undermines any credibility the Russian "white book" may have had.

As just one example of the unreliability of the Soviet publication, I would cite a statement on page 18 of the translation which states:

> U.S. Congressman J. Culver who returned from a visit to Czechoslovakia was quoted by the Lebanese newspaper Al Hadaf on August 29 as describing his encounters with the former director general of the Czechoslovaki television, J. Pelikan.
>
> Here is what J. Pelikan said in short:
>
> "The advocates of liberalization are counting on purging the leading party organs not only of hostile elements but also of all those who have been taking a vacillating or wait-and-see stand.
>
> "The leadership of the country will be taken over by men who will be able to wrest Czechoslovak politics and economy from out of the influence of the red ideology and to turn them in a direction conforming to Western traditions."

Mr. Speaker, there is no truth whatsoever to the story which appeared in Al Hadef and was reprinted in the Russian "white book." At no time either during my travel abroad or after my return to the United States did I describe to a representative of the press a meeting with Mr. Pelikan, nor attribute to him in any way the comments which the Soviets have reported.

It is this type of fabrication which "The Czech Black Book" overcomes, through its report of the 7 tragic but heroic days in Czechoslovakia last August. I commend it to the Members of the House.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity today to join my distinguished colleague from the State of Ohio in discussing the direction of American foreign policy in Eastern Europe.

The general direction of American foreign policy in all areas has been toward the self-determination of all nations. It has been my feeling that this course should be more aggressively followed. In the case of the Eastern European bloc, I feel it must be our responsibility to do everything possible, in a nonmilitary manner, to encourage and support the attitude of self-determination which is being so earnestly sought by these freedom-loving people.

As we consider the possibility of bilateral discussions in the near future, I feel we should keep in mind the possibility of correcting our own course of direction in foreign policy. We have recently watched the development of more independent governmental structures in the Eastern European countries, and we cannot help but notice that this move toward independence continues to grow in strength, despite efforts by the Soviets to stop it. I feel American Government must indicate its support of these efforts, which may well lead to a more united Europe, with a healthier, more viable economy.

As I have stated many times previously on this floor, the nations of Eastern Europe have long fought for the right to govern themselves as part of a free society. In developing our Nation's policies toward those countries, we should keep their efforts well in mind, and keep our minds open for new alternatives in supporting those efforts.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it gives pleasure of joining my colleagues, ably led by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, in analyzing trends and options of American policies toward Eastern Europe.

The last years have seen a renewal of the spirit of nationalism and humanism in that part of the world. A remembrance of the historical and cultural ties which binds the countries of the Danubian region, Poland and Bulgaria to the western part of the continent and which go back in some cases more than a thousand years. There is also a spirit of questioning and defiance on the part of the youth and the workers, the so-called darlings of the Communist system against the untenable and erroneous Communist ideology, and a search for a more humane and more effective approach to politics and economics.

Simultaneously, the dislike of the Russian occupation and dictation is growing even among nominal party members, and even by some in the high echelons. The ferment in Czechoslovakia was primarily anti-Russian, the foreign policy of Rumania betrays increasingly nationalist motivations behind the veil of Communist Aesopian language, and even the presence of large occupation troop units have not done away with all the vestiges of liberalization in Czechoslovakia. The Kremlin is finding it harder and harder to keep the satellites in line who are encouraged also by the sharpening Sino-Soviet conflict.

At the same time, the Kremlin found no new recipe for dealing with the native forces of resistance. Tanks, censorship, secret police methods are still sought in order to keep Russian control, increasing the dislike which prompted the alienation in the first place.

The United States has a great stake in seeing freedom and national self-determination restored to the peoples of east-central Europe. Our past policies under the past two administrations was basically a hands-off policy, camouflaged by the ineffective slogans of "bridgebuilding," which was, however, exposed as extremely vulnerable to Russian actions in the moment of its first incomplete success.

We need a new approach which could be summarized by viewing the policy toward east-central Europe in the greater NATO and Soviet framework and in counterproposals rather than acceptance of the Russian-East European suggestion for an European Security Conference. Such counterproposal should take the form of a neutralization plan for the Danubian countries on both sides of the demarcation line, including at least Austria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Rumania and preferably also Czechoslovakia.

Such ideas were proposed by the American Hungarian Federation memorandum recently submitted to President Nixon and the State Department. I welcome them as an expression of real concern on the part of Americans of Hungarian descent in the matters not only of the country of their origin but also for the future of the entire region in general and American relations with Eastern Europe in particular. I am sure that our policymakers will listen to the new approach proposed and will further the study of the situation.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in discussing the memorandum of the American Hungarian Federation on problems of American foreign policy toward east-central Europe.

The memorandum has several positive assets. First, it recognizes the complexity of the situation and does not call for simple solutions. It perceives clearly that there are no independent Hungarian, Czechoslovak, or Polish problems in our policy toward the belt of states located between Germany and Russia. Furthermore, that our policies are greatly influenced by our conception of Europe as a whole, by our attitudes toward an evolution of NATO and by our relations with the Soviet Union, the dominant power in east-central Europe at the present time.

Moreover, the memorandum exposes the failures of our past policies, whether they be of the "liberation" or the sloganeering "bridgebuilding" type. The success of any of these two policies in part brought about a tragedy for the peoples of the region. The so-called liberation policy was unmasked as propaganda without military backing by the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, which was finally crushed by the Red army despite the heroic efforts of the Hungarian people. The bridgebuilding policy was proved worthless by the invasion of Czechoslovakia last August and the subsequent repression of liberalism in that state at direct Russian intervention.

The question remains whether we should conduct a hands-off policy of indifference toward these states, which for most of the last millennium played a major part in shaping the history of Europe, or should we look for new initiatives? The memorandum concludes that the latter must be the case and I tend to agree with its conclusions. The form in which the new initiative could be made remains to be rendered more precise by expert research, but the general direction is clearly shown in the memorandum.

In the forthcoming talks with the Soviet Union, the new administration must seek to raise the issue of a possible neutralization of the countries of the Danubian Basin, including Austria and Yugoslavia, which are outside of the Soviet orbit, Hungary and Rumania, and possibly also Czechoslovakia. I hope that our policymakers to whom this memorandum has recently been submitted will take the time to consider it carefully and will apply its contents to the subject of further policy-oriented research.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the new administration attaches great significance to European affairs, and therefore I believe that it would do well to closely study the proposals advanced by the American Hungarian Federation in a memorandum recently submitted to the President, the Secretary of State and other major policymakers.

The memorandum deals with both Western and Eastern European affairs, as the two cannot in reality be separated from one another. Our policies toward Western Europe should reflect the spirit of Atlantic partnership and aim at promoting a strong and independent Europe which, together with the United States, can deal with the regional problems of the Continent.

The European Continent has two major problems, both inherited from the Second World War. The first is the question of the division of Germany; the second the problem of continued Russian domination over large areas of east-central Europe. While we continue to hope for progress on the question of German unity, which is a concomitant requirement for progress on the situation in east-central Europe, the two problems are not identical.

The creation of a buffer zone including Austria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania would still be possible before a full solution of the German question and could pave the way toward solving it. The centrifugal forces within the Warsaw bloc are already so strong that even in the face of our very limited involvement they can only be restrained—not eradicated—by superior Russian military and economic power. The increasing difficulties of the Soviet Union in keeping these countries in line, together with the intensified tension at the eastern border of the U.S.S.R. with the People's Republic of China, are factors that may make even the Russian receptive to such an arrangement, provided their security and economic needs are respected by some international guarantee on the status of the region and the retainment of certain economic ties. The winners would be the peoples of the region who crave for national independence and for an evolution of their systems into more humanistic and democratic forms, and for the reforging of their severed ties with Western Europe. I hope that our policymakers will consider these possibilities in preparing for talks with Russia.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is pertinent in the discussion to insert at this point the remarks of Dr. Z. Michael Szaz, secretary of the International Affairs Committee of the American Hungarian Federation:

REMARKS BY MR. SZAZ

American foreign policy toward Eastern Europe has been ever since 1944 a basically defensive one. The region was recognized as not vital to American national interests and therefore political considerations have always prevailed over security considerations.

While the Yalta Agreement did not in effect establish a sphere of influence division of Europe, such a division existed in fact as soon as the American and Soviet armies met at Torgav on April 24, 1945. As the Soviet Union has never lived up to the Declaration of Liberated Europe calling for the establishment of representative governments by free elections, by 1946 the United States also reconsidered its position and stopped sending reparations from its zone in Germany to the Soviet Union and in 1947 established the Bizonal Economic Area in Germany. The cold war soon hardened the military demarcation line into a political and ideological one and non-Communist parties and politicians met either jail and execution at home in Eastern Europe or had to escape to the West.

The Communization of Eastern Europe was not accepted as final by the United States. Public opinion's disgust was paired with the general assumption of American military superiority and it was considered possible to shake the Russian rule over the countries of Eastern Europe by diplomatic, economic and propaganda means without provoking World War III.

This was basically the "liberation" program of John Foster Dulles endorsed by General Eisenhower in his speech to the American Legion in August 1952 before his election to the Presidency of the United States.

The weakness of the "liberation" theory has been that it came too late. Such an active policy might have saved at least part of the area in 1946, but starting six years thereafter was doomed to failure by Soviet and domestic Communist entrenchment in the entire socio-political apparatus superiority over the Soviet Union in the nuclear and air power fields Soviet control over Eastern Europe can be loosened by political and economic means, by psychological warfare without leading to World War III and American military intervention.

While the Truman Administration continued to protest and undertake a large-scale propaganda campaign with the help of Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America, the full use of all political, economic and psychological means in form of a "liberation" campaign with all means short of war was first promised by the Republican Presidential candidate General Eisenhower in his speech to the American Legion on August 24, 1952.

The incoming Eisenhower Administration, under the leadership of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles embarked on the above program. However, it became soon clear that psychological warfare alone would not suffice to break down the vise of Communist control which by that time has permeated all socioeconomic and political levels of the Eastern European countries and was wedded to a ruthless and terroristic, but efficient secret police apparatus. Only an appeal to open revolt or to guerilla warfare would have been powerful enough to shake loose Communist control, but such an appeal would have meant promise of active American military support, a conclusion to which the Eisenhower Administration has not subscribed.

Three months after the inauguration of the Eisenhower Administration the death of the Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin appeared to have created a completely new situation rendering the success of the liberation program more likely but also introducing new elements like an evolutionary process of "nationalization" and "liberalization" of the existing regimes in Eastern Europe and possible Russian acquiescence into neutralization of part or all of the region due to internal weaknesses.

The results were tragic for the peoples involved, especially in Hungary where as a result of inept Communist leadership the discontent assumed the form of open revolt and forced the establishment of a multi-Party Government which tried to restore democracy and leave the Warsaw Pact. The challenge to Soviet and Communist control resulted in the near-intervention in Poland only averted by Gomulka's cooling of nationalist passions and temporary liberal reforms and in the bloody intervention of Russia in Hungary crushing the fight for freedom and establishing a quisling regime.

The Hungarian Revolution represents a watershed in American policy toward Eastern Europe. It demonstrated unmistakably the insufficiency of an activist policy which is unable or unwilling to draw the necessary military conclusions of its successes. The result of the fall events of 1956 has not been a curtailing of Soviet influence over the region but an actual increase in the long-run prospects of acceptance of Russian overlordships by these peoples. After all the dream of American liberation has been shown utterly unreal by the Hungarian freedomfighters. Rightly or wrongly the peoples of Eastern Europe felt even more abandoned than in 1945 and drew their own conclusions that they have to get along with their present masters and work for improvement within the existing ideological and power political framework.

On the American side the twin crisis in the Middle East diverted attention from the magnitude of political defeat but before any new policies could have been effectively implemented, a new event had occurred destroying the basis for an activist policy in Eastern Europe, the Russian space feats with the Sputnik and their implicit ramification of nuclear stalemate with the arrival of ICBMs.

The remaining period of the Eisenhower Administration did not produce any firm policy toward the region. The argument between those who wanted to continue the old tactics and aim it now for a "nationalistic" deviation of the regimes, and those who advised a hands off policy, or even a bridgebuilding policy continued with none of the protagonists achieving clear superiority in American Administration councils. Thus, the Hungarian question was kept on the U.N. agenda, but food and credits were extended to Poland, a summit meeting was sought and the German question was still discussed but after the second Berlin crisis in November 1958 attention was focused on the new Russian offensive in the region rather than on any liberation policies.

The Democratic Kennedy Administration started on a new tack. Especially after the Cuban confrontation and the end of the Berlin crisis, a new theory underlined our policies toward Eastern Europe. It called for an activist policy but not toward undermining the governments by direct appeals to the opposing elements among the population. Rather it called for improvement of economic, cultural and even political relations with the governments in power recognizing their permanence and political claim to power and hope that the enlightened national self-interest of the governments will lead them to better relations with the West and liberalization of the totalitarian controls at home. Yet, this bridgebuilding policy explained in President Kennedy's speech at the American University and elaborated by President Johnson's October 1966 speech was not to be restricted to Eastern Europe.

It was rather to be a minor part of our bridgebuilding policy toward the Soviet Union, for the policy was based upon the permanence of Russian military and economic control of the region. We were trying to become, together with other NATO countries a sort of junior partner in Soviet-controlled Eastern Europe and receive in return the economic satisfaction of trade and the moral satisfaction of the removal of the worst features of dictatorial rule for the populations involved.

The theory was very logical and nice, but it has never completely worked. There were too many internal contradictions in it and it did not fit into the Soviet plans for the region in the long run.

II

The bridgebuilding theory via Moscow has been long advertised as the major accomplishment of the Kennedy-Johnson Administration. It has laid the basis for a durable peace and led to a limited but vital cooperation between the two superpowers, both of whom realize now that the existence of the other and the avoidance of a nuclear holocaust is in its own national interest.

It is a political misfortunate for the Democratic Presidential candidate in 1968 that the failure of the policy occurred exactly during the Presidential campaign with the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia. For facing the mess in Vietnam and its urban and racial affairs at home, the apparent accomplishments of the bridgebuilding, detente policies were the only selling points of the eight years of Democratic Administration to the American people.

A close analysis of the bridgebuilding via Moscow policy has shown in the past that it does not work in the interest in the United States. Already long before the Prague events the negative sides has outweighed the positive ones. The first corollary of the policy has been the slowing down of American involvement in NATO, and a passive acceptance of French "going it alone" policies by the Johnson Administration. Once agreements with the Soviet Union became possible on international security matters and Russian aggression did not have to be feared, the role our NATO allies played in the formulation and implementation of American policies could be relegated into the background and NATO could be deemphasized. The events of the last four years of NATO history show clearly this trend of American policy and the sorry disarray they have created. In a perverse manner, apparent success in detente also meant that American influence over Western Europe could be reenforced, but for reasons of his own, President Johnson avoided this temptation which was exploited by President Kennedy in his first year of detente policy (1963).

The second corollary of the policy was the assumption that both the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries would be slowly liberalized and thereby become more open to Western cultural and economic contacts. The Iron Curtain was to be dismantled and people-to-people contacts expanded. As all East European countries needed the hard currency of the tourists and Western businessman, the bridgebuilding policies attained some successes. However, the cultural and economic beneficiaries of the bridgebuilding were not United States citizens, but Germans and Frenchmen, Britons and Italians who could both on historical and economic grounds compete better for the favor of the local Communist regimes than their American counterparts. However, the policy was linear and was unprepared for a refreezing of the atmosphere that must occur when the bridgebuilding becomes moderately successful in Eastern Europe and present a latent danger to Russian economic and political control. Thus, in the moment of its success the policy would become a failure unless the liberalization or disintegration trends in the Soviet Union would proceed approximately at the same speed, a very unlikely occurrence.

The third corollary of the policy was the abandonment of anti-Communism as an American bargaining point in Eastern Europe. While the old liberation policy was strictly based on it, the new policy tried to hide it, ignore it, or even deny it, thus going to the other extreme. Realpolitik was to silence the opposition forces and cause them to cooperate with the new regimes and try to force the changes from the inside. The damage done to American image by this policy in Eastern Europe among the people over 35 has never been completely analyzed, but it must have been considerable. It also deprived the American informational agencies and papers of their strongest moral, ideological and political weapons. At Radio Free Europe even articles were no longer accepted for publication as early as 1964 which would prove economic exploitation of satellite countries by the Soviet Union. They were considered to be too delicate.

The final corollary of the policy was based upon its acceptance by the Soviet Union. However, the bridgebuilding policy toward the Eastern European countries has never been accepted by Moscow. Russian and local Communist writers and essayists were always warning of the ideological and political infiltration of the West and kept the people to people contact generally within well defined limits, minimizing the intellectual and economic impact of Western influences.

III

The Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia and the ensuing threats to Rumania and the Federal Republic of Germany raises anew the question of American foreign policy toward Eastern Europe.

The Soviet occupation destroyed most of the assumptions of an evolution of the region to national communism of a more permissive type. It has shown that even when facing ideological bankruptcy, the Soviet Union can and will revert to military methods to enforce her own national control over the region. Furthermore, that bridgebuilding policies do not deter the Soviet Union from assuming a psychological-diplomatic offensive in Europe as long as NATO is in disarray and our relations with France and Germany are strained.

In my opinion, reassessment of our policies must not be restricted to Eastern Europe like in the past. The question of Eastern Europe is embedded in the problem of our relationship with our NATO allies and the Soviet Union. Viewed in isolation, a return to activist "liberation" policy would reheat the cold war without great advantages to us. Yet the bridgebuilding policy is dead and no matter of rhetoric of the New York *Times* or Professor Brzezinski can resurrect it.

We must find a East European policy that takes into consideration the following factors:

1. There is no such unit as Eastern Europe. Events of the last few years created at least "two Eastern Europes," one held in subjugation by Russian military power, or by national interest complementary to the Soviet desires (Bulgaria), and one ruled by Communist regimes responsive to the local national interests, e.g., Rumania and Yugoslavia. Furthermore, no solution of the Eastern European problem may be achieved without some progress on the German question.

2. The basis for Soviet power in Eastern Europe is no longer ideological. Even in Poland, as the spring events of 1968 have evidenced, there are many Communist elements who disagree with the Soviet-type of socialism and local nationalism is on the rise in every Eastern European country. Nationalism remains the only major counterpoise to communism in Eastern Europe and its development since the death of Stalin constitutes the only effective anti-Soviet force. In reverse, there is little question that the Prague events show that the Soviet Union is also giving continuing precedence to national imperialist considerations over general, international Communist interests.

3. The basic question in Eastern Europe is the presence of foreign occupation troops. By now, every country still subject to Russian control has Russian troops at her soil. The removal of Soviet troops must be the primary aim of American diplomacy in the region. There is reasonable hope that once this objective is achieved, the countries would orient themselves toward Western Europe and liberalize their policies at home.

4. Unless we have a strong Western Europe which is further integrated, there cannot be an active policy toward Eastern Europe for any settlement leading to a diminution of Russian presence in the area can only be based at the reduction of American forces in Western Europe. While disengagement cannot provide the full answer, some disengagement and progress on the Germany question would have to precede Russian withdrawal from Eastern Europe.

IV

There are few other alternatives. To continue the present policy would be disadvantageous to the United States and would encourage the Soviets to assume an offensive stance toward the NATO countries while putting military pressure on Rumania and Yugoslavia.

A return to "liberation" policies would probably not receive public support either in the United States and Western Europe and would be ineffective in view of nuclear parity.

To abandon all interest in the region again would be interpreted in Moscow as neo-isolationism forced upon the United States by internal problems and result in Soviet initiatives against the NATO region.

The new policy must be based upon the recognition that in the long run it is in our national interest to promote increasing contacts and integration between Eastern and Western Europe and to reduce our military presence in Europe.

This is not a call for troop reduction at a time of danger to NATO countries. The prerequisite for the policy is the reestablishment of military balance by an enlargement of present NATO forces and withdrawal of the forward elements of the Red Army from Czechoslovakia. But as a medium-range consideration, the thinning out of the Central European sector from foreign troops must be the hub of any reasonable policy aiming at furthering American and European interests in Eastern Europe.

The new policy must aim at the reopening of the German question. No amount of talk about disengagement, or reduction of forces, or bridgebuilding can solve the problem unless German unity is restored in some shape or form. The basis for a solution of the security and free development of Eastern Europe is progress in restoring German unity.

The new policy must guarantee to a greater extent than before that countries which assume a nationalistic stance will not be abandoned at the alter of the detente to the Soviet Union's kind graces. This is not to call for their full guarantee by NATO, but at least for their placing into the grey area of American military interests which, under certain circumstances might be defended from armed aggression. The Johnson announcement of Rumania came close to such a position, though his abject silence on Czechoslovakia was rightly interpreted as a disclaimer of any American interest in Czechoslovakia.

Each of the three principles of a new policy would require a long study in itself. However, they must be part and parcel of an all-European policy aiming at bringing increasing coordination and unity to the continent not by American-sponsored community projects, but by helping the European powers to find the way to one another, in the spirit of John Foster Dulles, but realizing that the best encouragement we can give is the expression of our interest and the upgrading of their role in our policymaking vis-a-vis the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The creation of Europe united on foreign policy, integrated economically, and culturally independent, and friendly to the United States without forming part of an enforced Atlantic Community, is in our national interest. The fulfillment of the promises of this policy would go far in solving the problems created by Russia in Eastern Europe without direct American involvement. After all, it was the success of West German trade and cultural relations with Eastern Europe which exerted a substantial influence on the Soviet leaders to occupy Czechoslovakia lest they lose their influence in most of the region. And Soviet Russia, too, in the long run, will have less objections to ties between Eastern and Western Europe than to close ties between Eastern Europe and the United States.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today's discussion of American policies toward east-central Europe is very timely.

A solution to the complex problems of the region cannot come overnight, but unless we start thinking of new ways of trying to deal with the present crisis-filled deadlock between the nations of the area and the Soviet Union on the one hand, and between NATO and the Soviet Union on the other, central Europe might again become the powderkeg of Europe just as it had been twice during the present century.

Native forces in these countries have already worked some change during the past decade. The Soviet monolithic control has been already cracked by the Polish and Hungarian events of 1956, especially by the temporary victory of the revolutionary forces in Hungary later defeated by Soviet armored divisions. With some modifications, the Soviet Union was quickly able to restore control over the region by the end of 1957. The second upheaval came more gradually.

Yet, despite Soviet occupation, nationalist and democratic unrest continues in Czechoslovakia where passive resistance extends not only to the masses and workers, but to much of the party leadership itself. Rumania succeeded in vetoing closer economic integration within Comecon which would have been detrimental to her national interests, and even in foreign policy has recovered some leverage and independence. Hungary is experimenting with economic reforms and while it is emphasized that they could not spread to the political realm, the changes are undermining classical Marxist economics. Anti-Russian feeling is high in almost every country of the Warsaw Pact in view of the events of August 1968 and nationalism has become the major counterforce penetrating, transforming, and often outrightly opposing traditional Communist tenets.

It has been said that the Soviet Union has less trouble in her relations with neutral Austria, or Finland than with Rumania and Czechoslovakia who are formally members of the Warsaw Pact.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues, ably led by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL), in discussing the situation in east-central Europe in the light of recent proposals of the American Hungarian Federation.

With the new administration displaying signs of renewed interest in East European affairs and preparing serious negotiations with the Soviet Union on major issues, it is of great importance that we try to find new approaches to our relationships with central Europe.

The American Hungarian Federation's call for an Atlantic partnership to be the mainstay of our policy toward Western Europe appears to be a most hopeful approach to this problem. We cannot and should not play the policeman of Europe; rather, we must help the European nations to become self-sufficient in military and political matters and promote integration and coordination among them in the creation of a viable European community.

It is my belief that we can arrive at no solution of the complex east-central European question without a regional plan which would be acceptable to the peoples of that region and which would at least be tolerable to the Soviet Union. It is, therefore, with special interest that I read the proposal for the neutralization of much of central Europe by the American Hungarian Federation. Such a neutralization would establish common guarantees against intervention. Creation of a buffer zone would in fact create three Europes: Western Europe, the buffer zone, and the Soviet Union. It would be a possible solution to the security needs of the Soviet Union and the needs of the central European nations to live outside of blocs. This desire needs no proof as far as Austria and Yugoslavia are concerned, and was also manifest in Hungary and Czechoslovakia in 1956 and 1968, respectively.

Such an approach could take the form of a cautious but positive reply to the European Security Conference ideas which the Soviets and their satellites are now pushing for propaganda reasons and for effecting our withdrawal from Europe, unmasking the Soviet designs, but preserving the potentially positive elements of the plan which call for the dissolution of military blocs. A buffer zone neutralization could even be acceptable

to Soviet security needs at a time when the Soviet Union has considerable trouble with several of its Warsaw pact allies.

In this connection, may I call attention of my colleagues to a periodical published in New York: "Studies for a New Central Europe," which is pushing the idea of neutralization of the Danubian states, with possible common institutions among them once neutralization has been achieved and guaranteed by the major powers.

I insert at this point the editorial in the last issue of the "Studies for a New Central Europe" which pertains particularly to the idea of neutralization:

Toward a Third Way in a New Central Europe

Europe is an extremely sensitive area of the world where the use of bare military power will bring neither permanent peace nor a solution to its problems and needs. The Russians will soon realize that the use of a raw force in a highly developed area backfires. The military "blood and iron" method of Napoleon, the Czars, Bismarck, Mussolini and Hitler harmed in the long run more than they helped their nations and Europe. American and Western policy must also change from their predominantly military countermeasures, pacts and expenditures—as Richard Nixon recently emphasized—to "preventive diplomacy" and peace planning with "regional peace pacts" and the whole-hearted participation of the nations concerned.

THREE ALTERNATIVES IN EUROPE

The solutions commonly advocated for Europe fall into three categories:

A. A *United Europe*. This is presently politically unrealistic, at least for the foreseeable future and so long as the Soviet Union is a nuclear superpower. Moscow would never give its consent to a politically, economically and militarily unified Europe that included East Central Europe "from the Atlantic to the Urals." Such a unity exists only culturally, based on deep historical sentiments of the European nations. But politically, a *United States of Europe* is still unrealistic, a fantastic dream like that of Coudenhove-Kalergi's *Pan-europa* proposed between the two World Wars to which some statesmen like Briand, Seipel and Masaryk gave lip service but which proved to be a political illusion. Now, the European Movement invites its friends and adherents to almost yearly conferences with its program devoted to "European unification." The main speaker of the last conference held January 19–20, 1968 in Rome, was the German Professor Walter Hallstein who emphasized the idea of "Europe as a whole." Another organization, Action Europeene Federalist held its congress November 18–19, 1967 in Brussels with the participation of Jean Rey, Professor Hendrik Brugmans, Dr. Dieter Roser, Vice President of the German Europa-Union and others. The 17th congress of the latter organization met on March 4–5, 1968 in Cologne. But Jerzy Jankowski, a Polish journalist and editor of *Poland in Europe,* who attended these congresses, summarized their net results as follows: "The regimes in power in Eastern Europe are hostile to the United Europe idea. Thus, what is there left to say at the congresses beside repeating cheap formulas about an 'entire Europe' and platonic compliments to the peoples of the 'Second Europe'?"[1]

B. The Present *Two Europes* organized militarily by NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries would permanently fix the present East and West Europe side by side. This would be a hell to those nations caught unwillingly between the two superpowers, the masters of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. This present *status quo* would leave the German problem unsolved, the Berlin Wall and the Iron Curtain permanently established, the Cold War, intermittently intensified, especially now after the occupation of Czechoslovakia and as it was previously, after 1948 and 1956. The greater the increase of military power on both sides of the Iron Curtain, the more unbearable will life be for the 120–130 millions who live between Russia and Germany. Such enormous military expenses incurred by both America and the USSR are also an unnecessary burden on their economies that unbalance their budgets, foreign payments, and hinder finding solutions to their problems at home. Both America and England are willing to withdaw from Europe but as long as the Two Europes exist, a military de-escalation in Europe remains a dream. At whose expense were the 650,000 Soviet troops deployed in Czechoslovakia and now rocket bases established there? The NATO forces, America, Germany and also Yugoslavia immediately reacted by increasing their military expenditures, ordering more expensive rockets, tanks and jet bombers. Cannot lessons be learned from Hitler's military failures? The present trend only lays the base for a Third World War which could not be contained in Europe.

C. We submit, the realistic solution is a third way:

Three Europes: 1. Western Europe with its nucleus, the Common Market. 2. East Europe which is practically Soviet Russia. 3. Central Europe, a neutralized buffer zone between Russia and Germany.

The French President De Gaulle was realistic when he reminded the world in a speech at the Warsaw parliament, in the heart of Central Europe, that politically, there are Three Europes: Western, Central and East Europe. While a United Europe is an utopistic dream, the present Two Europes a hell, Three Europes would be to the advantage of all nations—and is politically realistic. It would be in the interest of the nuclear powers too, including the Soviet Union.

For Peace and Military Deescalation, a Neutral Buffer Zone is needed in Europe.

It is vain to exhort the leaders of the Kremlin to move their troops out of Hungary, Czechoslovakia and East Berlin so long as the English-American troops remain and are even strengthened on the other side of the Iron Curtain. Russia was invaded several times since Napoleon and it understandably feels the need of protection against what it calls "German revanchism" or other aggression. The present "revanchism" of West Germany serves as an admirable bogeyman to keep the Warsaw Pact group in line. Therefore a neutral buffer zone between the Russians and Germans would release the Soviet Union from this fear and enable the Kremlin to concentrate against a possible invasion from China. If a Central European neutral zone were guaranteed by the Great Powers and, as in Austria's case, by some other 60 states, the security of Russia's Western frontier would be unquestionable. Moscow's obsession must be removed by a proposal made through diplomatic channels to neutralize the zone from Finland down through the Danubian countries. Such an agreement would make the motivation written into the recent Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty obsolete. Article 1 of the treaty "ensures the security of the countries of the socialist community against the increasing revanchist strivings of the West German militarist forces." Neutralization would serve the security of the Soviet Union, Poland, and Czechoslovakia as well. It would open the way for a military de-escalation. The neutralization of Austria in the State Treaty of 1955 was one of the wisest steps taken in decades. The Kremlin now has less trouble with Austria than with the non-neutralized Hungary, Rumania or Czechoslovakia. Neutral Sweden and Finland are better neighbors than Rumania. It will of course be in the best interest of the nations in such a neutralized buffer zone to have good economic and cultural relations with Russia. With their military expenditures reduced, peoples of the zone will attain a higher level of existence.

The idea of a Neutralized Buffer Zone gains momentum.

Fifteen years ago many questioned the usefulness of such a neutralized buffer zone between the great powers. Western diplomacy was reluctant in giving consent to neutralize Austria. Only after more than 280 fruitless four-power conferences did it yield. It was the Austrian Chancellor Raab who succeeded in negotiating the matter with Molotov in Moscow. The final Memorandum[2] contained the "international obligation that Austria will maintain neutrality of the *same type as maintained by Switzerland.*" This was the key. The neutralization of Austria was a step forward. Following this, the withdrawal of troops from Hungary could have been negotiated immediately on the same platform and formula. But Western diplomacy did not see this opportunity. When the Hungarian revolution broke out in 1956, the government of Imre Nagy proclaimed neutrality. This was not backed by Western diplomacy, and the millitary intervention of the USSR followed. However, the Hungarian uprising marked the first defeat of Communism in Central Europe and its repercussions in the West undermined the prestige of Communist parties everywhere.

Recently, Western observers in Prague have reported increased interest among Czechs and Slovaks in the concept of a neutralized zone. Dan Morgan, correspondent for the *Washington Post* wrote from Prague on September 14, 1968:

"The Czechoslovak central authorities have completed a candid, confidential report in which they had to acknowledge an increase in a *detectable interest in neutrality for Czechoslovakia.* The invasion episode has also raised a significant doubt about the role of the Czechoslovak army which, although one of the best in Europe, was not ordered to resist the Warsaw Pact onslaught."

At the tenth anniversary of Imre Nagy's execution, the Prague *Literarny Listy* (June 13, 1968) published a eulogy of Nagy emphasizing his demand for Socialist neutralism. The growing interest in neutralization in Central Europe is also stated in a note sent by Czechoslovakia to the Polish government on September 13, 1968:

"An allegation made in the Polish party paper *Trybuna Ludu,* that the Czechoslovakian National Assembly's Foreign Affairs Committee had advocated neutrality of Czechoslovakia—was absolutely false."

The note, however, acknowledged that the Committee did discuss neutrality but at the insistance of the government came to the conclusion that "a proclamation of neutrality would not bring about a solution." This confidential report proves that a plebiscite in Czechoslovakia would favor neutralization by a large majority. A Hungarian journalist, Tibor Pethö, spokesman for the Government, wrote even before the Czechoslovak invasion:

"Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians have lived together close to each other for centuries. The common experiences of this long togetherness taught us many things. We gathered ample experiences concerning antagonisms and hatreds; also the advantages of friendship and cooperation . . . by eliminating the influence of friendship and cooperation . . . by eliminating the influence of foreign powers which tried to divide and confuse the people in the Danube basin either by methods of the Hapsburgs or by those of Hitler . . . We trust in a federalist reorganization." (*Magyar Hirek*, June 29, 1968)

---

[1] Jerzy Jankowski: Problems of Eastern Europe at the Three European Congresses. *The Central European Federalist,* New York, 1968. No. 1, p. 17–22.

[2] Memorandum on the results of negotiations between Austria and the Soviet Union. Moscow, April 15, 1955. See *Documents on American Foreign Relations,* Vol. 1955, p. 121.

János Péter, Hungarian Foreign Minister, gave the following report to the Parliament (July, 1968):

"Diminuation of the dangers in Europe is in the common interest of all continents. For further clarification of the situation in Europe it is necessary to increase the number of existing bi-lateral agreements, and also that of the *regional agreements*. Only from the mosaic of these can the future peace of Europe be composed. Together with our neighbors we are working for a *well organized cooperation of Central European and Danubian Basin countries* with different systems economically, culturally and politically, in the interests of the peace and security of Europe."

Western Powers and a Buffer Zone.

Franz Joseph Strauss, West German Minister of Finance, who has influence on German foreign policy matters, stated in one of his lectures:

"If the *Eastern satellites can be formed into a buffer Europe,* if the mistrust in Germany which derives from the prejudices and experiences of the past can be allayed step by step, if this policy turns the pages of history and liquidates the legacy of the Second World War, then much will have been gained." [3]

Dr. Lujo Toncic-Sorinj, Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Austria, expressed his firm conviction more than once, that close cooperation among the peoples of the Danubian region is only a matter of time owing to the natural historical elements at work which will prevail against difficulties created from outside. Even Otto Winzer, Foreign Minister for East Germany told the National Assembly on August 9, 1968 that "under European security we must understand a *regional system* based on international agreements."

It was the English Prime Minister Eden at the Geneva Conference of Heads of Government that proposed the establishment of a buffer zone on July 18, 1955:

"We would be ready to discuss and try to reach agreement as to the total of forces and armaments on each side in Germany and the countries neighboring Germany. To do this it would be necessary to join in a system of reciprocal control to supervise the agreements effectively."

A mutual withdrawal of forces 250 miles on each side was proposed. It is regrettable that other events in world politics diverted attention from following up this idea or that of George Kennan on mutual disengagement. See also the study of E. Chaszar: "*The Possibility of a Neutralized Zone in Central Europe.*" [4]

The Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, advocated a "vigorous and articulate *Third Force*" between the great powers. We agree with *Nelson Rockefeller*: "The historic choice fast rushing upon us, then, is no less than this: either the free nations of the world will take the lead in adopting the federal concept to their relations or, one by one, we may be driven into the retreat of the perilous isolationism, political, economic and intellectual, so ardently sought by the Soviet policy to divide and conquer." [5]

Richard Nixon recommended a regional buffer zone in his campaign speech at Eatonville, N.J. on October 19, 1968:

"Regional pacts that can prevent a local conflict from escalating into world war. The regional pact thus becomes a *buffer* separating the distant great powers from immediate threat—and the danger of a local conflict escalating into world war is thereby reduced. A *regional pact* would provide a *buffer* between the United States and the Soviet Union in future flareups."

Dangers to be averted by "preventive diplomacy."

Austrian Chancellor Klaus was told in Moscow during his visit of March 14–21, 1967 that Austria would be breaking the obligations of permanent neutrality if she joined the European Common Market and this would be a *casus belli*. On the other hand, Klaus was told that Austria would be supported if she strengthened her neutrality and her relations with the other Central European states. Austria was also encouraged to call a Conference on European Security to be held in Vienna.

Today many dangers exist in the Central European area beside a new Anschluss. Because of the unsolved situation the possibility of widespread protest movements e.g. in Vienna, East or West Berlin like those in Paris and France in May-June, 1968, cannot be excluded. Because of the closeness of the Soviet nuclear super-power, De Gaulle's methods would be dangerous. The Soviet forces would step in to "help restore democratic order" in Vienna, Berlin, East or West Germany. If thousands of German citizens were killed in such actions as were Hungarians in 1956, the West German army, supported by fifty-five million West Germans would certainly step in. Such action could start a Third World War.

Could anyone predict what would happen if the dictator Tito should die without having an able successor to hold the multinational and insecure Yugoslavia together? Is there secure peace or safety in the Rumanian situation? Therefore, it would be wise for the U.S. State Department to nominate a committee of experts on Central Europe to prepare a detailed plan for a neutralized buffer zone between Russia and Germany to be proposed to a European Conference on Security. Although America won two world wars militarily, they were lost diplomatically at the peace conferences because of insufficient preparation of realistic peace plans. Clémenceau, Stalin, Molotov, etc. dominated the conferences because they had plans. Should not Western "preventive diplomacy" possess as carefully elaborated peace plans as the Chiefs of Staff who have their alternative military plans for possible dangers?

THE EDITORS.

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman on the position he is taking in his special order this afternoon. I hope this may be widely supported throughout the Nation.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the distinguished gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, the United States and Russia may take a step in the next 2 or 3 months that would destroy the possibility of success at the bilateral nuclear disarmament talks. This step is the final testing of the MIRV multiple-warhead system. I understand that both nations are expected to complete their tests within that period. And completion of testing of this new warhead would introduce a new phase in the nuclear arms race. I urge that we announce that we will defer final testing of the MIRV warhead until we begin the nuclear talks and that we ask the Russians to do the same.

Nations have few opportunities to change their policies, to modify in a significant way the positions that they have taken in the past. Each opportunity is important because the choice of alternatives sets the course for years to come. The United States and Russia have an opportunity to change their policies today. A decision by both nations to slow down and possibly reverse the nuclear arms race of the past quarter century would reduce the threat of mutual destruction.

There is no guarantee that talks with the Russians will succeed. Each nation has different goals, goals that often conflict, as events in Czechoslovakia illustrated last summer. But we also may have mutual interests, in this case the limitation of strategic arms. At this stage in the nuclear arms race, it may be in the interests of both nations to negotiate a halt in the growth of our nuclear arsenals. But this stage will shortly come to a close. Every effort must be made to start these negotiations promptly and to bring them to a successful conclusion.

The arms limitation talks are threatened by the final testing of MIRV multiple warhead systems because once those tests are completed, we will speed up the nuclear arms race. This new phase involves building many highly expensive new nuclear arms systems—systems that will increase the chances of nuclear disaster. If, for example, a decision by both nations to complete testing of the MIRV warhead would encourage a fundamental change in defense strategy. Russia or the United States might believe it necessary to attempt to develop a first-strike capability—the capability to destroy the other nation before it would be able to retaliate.

This would be a major change from the present policy of assured second strike capability—the ability to inflict unacceptable losses on the other nation after a nuclear attack. The possibility of this change in our strategy takes on added reality in light of the recent charge by Secretary Laird that the Russians are already attempting to build a first strike capability. We know that today neither the Russians nor the United States has a first strike capability. Each nation does have an assured second strike capability. Commonsense urges that we strive for agreement with the Russians on a limitation and possible reduction of strategic arms before we enter this next phase.

There are several major defense decisions facing the United States today. The decision as to whether we go forward with an anti-ballistic-missile system has received the most attention. The pros and cons are being discussed by Congress and the people. A second question is whether we should begin the development of a new strategic manned bomber. A third decision, one that has not received the attention that it should, is whether we should complete testing of the MIRV multiple-warhead system before we begin the arms talks.

---

[3] Franz Joseph Strauss, *The Grand Design*. Praeger. New York. 1966.

[4] Studies for a New Central Europe, Series 2, No. 1, 1968, p. 9–15.

[5] Nelson Rockefeller: *The Future of Federalism*. (Paperback, 1968.)

Other major decisions, dependent in many ways in the first three are whether we should begin a sea-bottom-based strategic missile system, mobile land-based strategic missile system, or a surface ship strategic missile launching system. Individually and collectively our decisions on these questions will have a major effect on our defense strategy and the possibility of successful strategic arms limitation talks.

The decision as to whether we complete testing of MIRV is the most important of all. Many of the experts, such as Dr. Jeremy Stone, of Stanford University, believe that if the United States and Russia complete testing of multiple warheads, the arms limitations talks cannot succeed. Once testing is completed there is no way for either side to know whether the other is arming its missiles with MIRV's. It is possible to verify, I am told, whether the Russians complete their MIRV tests. It is much more difficult, if not impossible, after that point to know whether their missiles are being armed with MIRV's.

The final testing of a multiple-warhead system such as MIRV is critical because the system must be very accurate. Each warhead must be able to hit close to its target if it is to be effective. It must be highly accurate if the smaller warhead is to destroy its target. And the only way to know whether the warhead is that accurate is to test it in flight. It apparently is possible to determine whether a nation tests one of these warheads in flight. We cannot determine, short of actual physical inspection, whether a missile is equipped with one of these warheads once flight testing has been completed.

One of the key problems of nuclear arms limitations is that of verification. Each nation must be able to determine what the other is able to do. It is somewhat more easy for the Russians to know what we do, for ours is an open society in which most decisions are made known to the public. Russia, on the other hand, has always opposed inspection within her borders. Verification of Russia's actions must be accomplished by means that do not involve sending inspection teams to Russia. We apparently are able to accomplish this. As William Foster, former head of the Armaments Control and Disarmament Agency said, we have more capability for verification than the public is generally aware of. One can speculate that he is talking about cameras and other instruments mounted in reconnaissance satellites. Final testing of MIRV marks the last point at which it may be possible to agree not to equip missiles with them.

I might add here that the distinguished Senator from Vermont, Senator AIKEN, said that we now have a capability with our spy in the sky satellites for detecting a postage stamp at a height of 50 miles.

Once Russia and the United States start equipping their missiles with MIRV multiple warheads they enter a new phase in the nuclear arms race. Today we have approximately 2,400 targetable warheads. If we equip our missiles with multiple warheads, we would increase the number to 8,000 to 10,000. This increase would be accompanied by a Russian increase. And the jump in size would make it more likely that one of the nation's might consider a first-strike. With 8,000 or 10,000 highly accurate warheads, it might be possible to wipe out the opponents missiles before he was able to launch very many of them. The threat of a possible first-strike by the opponent would make it necessary to take measures to counter the threat.

These measures would probably consist of building a new generation of strategic missiles, such as a mobile land-based missile system, a seabed mounted missile system, or a new strategic manned bomber. Another measure, of course, would be to build an anti-ballistic-missile system. But I think that it has been clearly demonstrated that the ABM is not the answer to the nuclear missile threat. The answer, with all its horrible consequences, would probably be to build more and more missiles that would be more difficult for an opponent to destroy.

One of the ironies of the decision that we made to build MIRV multiple warheads is that we made the decision based on a belief that the Russians were building an anti-ballistic-missile system for their nation. It now turns out that the system that we thought was an ABM, is the Tallin antimanned bombed system. And it is only recently that the Russians started construction of the Galosh ABM around Moscow. But although a total of 67 sites were constructed, little work has been done on them lately and the system has not been expanded to the rest of Russia. It would be tragic if our decision to complete testing of the MIRV multiple warhead now led the Russians to build additional ABM sites.

We have delayed beginning the strategic arms limitations talks longer than they should have been. Unfortunately, shortly after the Russians indicated that they were interested in talking about this subject, they intervened in Czechoslovakia, chilling relations between East and West. The United States also has undergone a change in administrations with the accompanying problems of having the new team learn the ropes. President Nixon has indicated that one of his main objectives is to begin the talks. I welcome that commitment and urge that the talks begin as soon as possible.

But it will not increase the chances of success at the talks, if we complete testing of the MIRV multiple warhead and make decisions to build an ABM anti-ballistic-missile system and an AMSB advanced manned strategic bomber. The opportunity to freeze current levels of strategic arms and even reduce them could well be lost. If anything, we will strengthen the hand of those in the Soviet Union who do not want to slow down the arms race.

A delay in final testing of the MIRV multiple warhead until the talks begin does not prevent us from completing the tests if the Russians decide to complete their tests, or if the initial arms limitation talks do not offer any indication of success. One of the first items on the agenda might well be for both nations to agree not to complete the MIRV tests for the duration of the talks. A ban on MIRV multiple warheads could then still be included in the discussions at the conference.

Some of our goals at the strategic arms limitation talks might well be:

A freeze on the final testing of MIRV multiple warheads leading to a ban on their use;

A freeze on further Poseidons, Minuteman III's, and SS-9 and FOBS intercontinental ballistic missiles;

A ban on ABM anti-ballistic-missile system—this would involve dismantling the 67 Galosh ABM sites around Moscow;

A ban on land-based mobile strategic missile system;

A ban on sea-bottom-based strategic missiles;

A ban on new strategic manned bombers;

An extension of the partial nuclear test ban to underground tests; and

A ban on the use of chemical and biological warfare.

The experts tell us that, with the exception of chemical and biological warfare, we have the means of knowing whether these limitations are being followed without actually sending inspection teams to the other nation. Our reconnaissance satellites make it possible to exercise effective arms control. Many experts also believe that we can detect underground nuclear tests. And briefly, because I intend to discuss this at length at a later date, a Russian-United States ban on chemical and biological warfare would offer much to both nations without a significant effect on their defense capabilities.

I believe that we can negotiate some, if not all, of these limitations with the Russians. Our success may well determine the fate of mankind. And if we cannot reach agreement, we will move into the next phase of the nuclear era. The risks of nuclear holocaust will mount. The costs will be high. But the United States will maintain an effective defense because there is no alternative.

Although we are willing to bear the costs of effective defense, a new nuclear era would weigh heavily on the taxpayer. William Foster estimates that the next generation of nuclear weapons will add $100 billion more each decade to our defense budget. This would double the amount of money that we now devote to defense. And this is probably a conservative estimate.

A defense budget twice the size of today's would also place additional strains on our society. National strength is not only a matter of missiles and warheads; it is also a matter of the morale of a society. Our morale during the second half of the 1960's has not been high. The Vietnamese conflict, the decay of our cities, the difficulties of communication between youth and their parents all illustrate the troubled nature of our society. Although we have attempted to meet these problems, we have not had the resources to do as much as we should. We have used most of our Federal taxes for defense.

I might inject here that during the debate this afternoon we heard that although the Committee on Public Works had authorized an expenditure of $1 billion throughout the United States to combat water pollution next year, the administration has recommended only $214 million, about 20 percent of the amount authorized. That $214 million is considerably less than we spend on gas and germ warfare.

A limitation on strategic arms would make it possible to use some of these resources to rebuild our cities, provide a better education for all, clean up our environment, to achieve the goals toward which each American strives.

A new upward spiral in the arms race would also bring with it a further change in the nature of our society. Bigger defense budgets would mean an increase in the proportion of our industry involved in arms production. It means new defense bases located around the country. It means more defense research by experts at our universities. Each one of these steps increases the impact of the military on our society. It would further shift the balance from civilian orientation toward military orientation. This is of the utmost importance for the distinction is what made the difference between Athens and Sparta—one devoted to the enhancement of man but occasionally defending herself—the other devoted to the warlike arts alone.

The most important reason for seeking success at the arms limitation talks is survival. The main question is whether mankind can survive the nuclear age. As Henry Stimson pointed out, the nuclear weapon "constitutes merely a first step in a new control by man over the forces of nature too revolutionary and dangerous to fit into the old concepts, it really caps the climax of the race between man's growing technical power for destructiveness and his psychological power of self-control and group control—his moral power." We must strengthen our moral power, our collective moral power to control these awesome weapons of destruction.

I urge, therefore, that we delay completion of the MIRV multiple warhead tests and that we do not make decisions about other new weapons systems that will lessen our chances of successful arms limitation talks. We should not call our intentions into questions by ill-advised action now.

When I first considered making these remarks, the need to include this final thought was not evident. But events in the past week make it necessary. There is nothing more dangerous for the United States than to make honest differences on defense questions a partisan matter. It was with the deepest unrest that I have heard some administration spokesmen characterize opposition to the ABM as partisan. If defense decisions are caste in terms of Republican versus Democrat we will suffer the gravest consequences. As a matter of fact, much of the dissatisfaction with the earlier decision to proceed with the ABM anti-ballistic-missile system derives from the fact that politics appeared to play a major part in it.

The question of MIRV multiple warhead final testing is being debated today among the top experts in the executive branch. Their's is not a partisan debate. And I have not made my remarks on MIRV in a partisan spirit. Rather, I seek what I hope every thoughtful American seeks—the road to sense in a nuclear age. There is no room for politics on that road.

COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the National Broadcasting Co. radio network carried an hour-long program on April 13 devoted to the problems of coal mine health and safety. Because of the great public interest in this question, and the pending legislation on the subject in the Congress, I am pleased to provide the full text of this radio broadcast for inclusion in the Record:

[Music]

Woman (singing):

"Shut up in the mines at Cold Creek
And I know I will have to die.
So tell my wife and children
That I'm prepared to die."

Announcer. This is NBC News. Second Sunday, "The Coal Miner—A Cry From the Depths."

Woman (singing):

"Shut up in the mines at Cold Creek
And I know I will have to die.
So tell my wife and children
That I'm prepared to die."

The birds . . .

Russ Ward. But who is prepared to die? This is Russ Ward. Turn off Highway 250 in West Virginia, just outside the town of Mannington, and you pass a white, two-story, green-shuttered house where a man named Fred Rogers used to spend most of his time—his time above ground, his time when he was not working the overnight shift in the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Company's mine number nine. Five nights a week and sometimes six Fred Rogers would back his car off a slag ramp near his porch, turn on to the meager climbing road, and drive the few miles to Llewellyn Portal, to the mine shift that led him down to his work. And surely at some time in the years he drove that road, Fred Rogers must have noticed the signs stuck in the hillside by one of the valley churches. "Prepare to Meet Thy Maker." At 5:25 a.m. on November 20th, with just a few hours to go on the cateye shift, Consolidation Mine Number Nine blew up. 78 men lost their lives. Among those men, the husbands of Mary Rogers and of Nora Snyder—miners' wives, miners' widows. Once strangers, now friends, sharing the sudden inheritance of bewilderment, grief and shock.

Mary Rogers. That night, I don't know, I seemed to sleep much better than I usually did. In fact, I didn't hear anything. And the next morning, I think it was around about 7:30, I heard a knock on my front door right here. And I came down. It was my neighbor. And she said, "Mary," she said, "there's been an explosion at the mine." And she said, "How bad, I don't know." She said, "My husband went up there." I said, "He hasn't come back yet." And she said, "How bad is it? I don't know." Well, from then on, I couldn't tell you what happened. And I think it was around noon the phone rang and some man said to me, said, "Did your husband work last night?" And I said, "Yes." And that was the only word that I received from the mine. There was no one came to visit to tell me that my husband was in there, about the explosion, or nothin'. And still to this day they haven't. There's been no representative from the mine come to tell me what happened to my husband. To me he went to work and he hasn't come home. Oh, I never gave up hope, and I never gave up hope. Well, I still, really, I don't—even to this day, I still feel it. Think maybe somewhere he's still livin'.

Nora Snyder. I've heard of things like this happening, but you don't realize what it's really like until you go through with it yourself, you know. When they do bring them out, we don't know if there will be ones—he'll be in his casket or not. But the general manager, he told me—I'm talking to him, and he says "You can rest assured that I'm going to make sure that part of your husband will be in that casket," you know. How do we know what'll be unless—if it's our husbands, if it's just a check number? We never got a check, I mean, you know, it might be somebody else's body that we were burying and what—when they bring them out, we won't know. You really won't know that. I don't know. A lot of people have said, "Well, our husbands are dead too. We've lost our husbands." But yet—but their husbands are out and they're buried, you know. That's different. This is a lot different, when they have to be left like this. Did something terrible to the three of them.

Man. We won't know with precision what happened in that mine, but I think we can—we can develop several postulates, and they all arise from the combination of three factors. There was an ignition source—that is to say, there was methane in the mine. There was something to propagate the ignition once it got started. And that's possible in a mine either through coal dust or more methane, and there was a spark. So I think we can say with confidence that as yet we don't know what the cause was, but the cause was clearly some omission with regard to the safety in the mine.

Ward. The speaker, John O'Leary, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines. The subject, methane gas—odorless, invisible. Years ago, millions of years ago, this was the energy of the sun being absorbed by the floral growth, which, driven later into the earth, was to become coal. And that energy, locked in the coal, was to become methane. Methane which, freed, could join with coal dust and sparks to rip open the innards of its imprisoning earth and the men working in it. John O'Leary, then, on the question of technology and whether such an explosion could happen again.

John O'Leary. The truth of the matter is, we do not have at hand the technology to completely foresee and thereby safeguard against an unexpected liberation, massive liberation of methane. Until we get to the point where methane control is a part of the mining operation, we always have the hazard of another Mannington. I don't think there's any question about it.

Ward. December, Washington, D.C. The Mannington-Farmington mine has been sealed, its fire-spewing shaft choked with slate, and the Senate calls a hearing on mine safety. The shock of Manningtons passed and the possibility of Manningtons to come bring together Congressmen, Cabinet members, federal officials, and union leaders to discuss the death and accident rates in the nation's most hazardous occupation—coal mining—and the question, "Have we done enough in this area?" John O'Leary.

O'Leary. Among the major industries for which systematic data are maintained, this is the most hazardous industry in the United States and the striking thing about this is that the overall safety record of the industry, from the standpoint of fatalities per million man-hours of employment has not really improved in more than two decades. This is one of the very few indexes that you can look upon as being static. Most things over the last twenty years have either gotten better or they've gotten worse. And happily, in coal mining, it hasn't gotten worse, but certainly it hasn't gotten better.

Ward. Surely no occupation is completely safe. The parttime seamstress, working at home, can run through her finger with a bureau drawer needle and die of blood poisoning. But in the case of the coal mine, the death and injury rate is astonishing. Each day in the six principal coal-producing states, some 142,000 men enter the mines. Of these, last year there were 309 deaths and more than eight thousand injuries. Indeed to qualify as a disaster, a mine accident must claim at least five lives. Anything less, presumably, can be taken in stride.

There is the mud, the water, the dark, the spinning cables, the high-voltage lines, the explosions, the rattling rail cars, the danger of collapsing walls, and, in fact, the worst killer of all, the overhead, which gives way to mangle men or bury them in tons of rocks. These are the accidents that strike them. There are others that take their slow and deadly time. Among these, perhaps the worst offender is a piece of equipment known as the continuous miner, the gigantic bit that rips through the earth to pull out coal at the rate of five or six tons an hour. The dust is unimaginable. Thin as talcum powder, able to clog a miner's respirator and where it is not watered down, the cause of pneumoconiosis—black lung.

The Appalachian Regional Hospital in Beckley, West Virginia. This is a miner with black lung. A tracheotomy should help. But these are the sounds of his unending battle just to breathe. (NOISES)

Man. Been in the mines since 1919. My breathing got awful short on me about four or five years ago. It's been continuing to get worse all the time. For a time I breathe pretty good. There comes a time when your breath just completely leaves you and you can't hardly breathe at all. When my breath leaves me, it's like someone's throwing something over me, smothering me like this. It just leaves all at once. It's just the same as throwing something in your face.

Man. Black lung is due to coal dust or carbon.

Ward. Dr. I. E. Buff, Charleston, West Virginia.

Dr. I. E. **Buff.** Carbon or the black lung or the dust attacks the little arteries in the lungs. It causes a constriction in these arteries and eventually cuts the blood supply off to the lungs. Also, carbon is an irritant to the terminal part or the end of the lungs, what we call aviolar spaces. Now, what they are in plain language are air spaces, and this is where the damage is done by coal dust. It makes them choke to death because they can get the air in but they can't get it out, and because of this they get an accumulation of carbon dioxide. Carbon dioxide is a killer. It will kill the brain, it will kill the liver, it will kill the kidneys, it will kill the bone marrow—as a matter of fact, there isn't any part of your body that will not be affected by a high carbon dioxide. The black lung is just a lung that looks like carbon. It looks like a lump of coal, actually. When you open the chest in a miner, you look like you got two lumps of coal instead of two lungs. They're that black, that shiny, and that glistening.

The ordinary lung is pink. The black lung looks like a piece of coal lying in the lung, in the area. They're hard and they're brittle. This means that the lung has been dead for ten—partially for ten, fifteen years, and the patient has slowly died. I don't think it takes a pathologist very much time to tell a black lung, because he doesn't really have to make sections. He can tell it right easily.

So actually, what you are doing, besides choking these fellows to death, is giving them a picture of someone who has cancer because the blood supply is cut down on all the organs so that they eventually die. It is as if a string is tied around their neck and made tighter every day and eventually, of course, they die from asphyxia. And asphyxia, a medical term, means choking to death.

Ward. Curiously, though it's been estimated that eight out of every ten miners risk disease, West Virginia would not recognize black lung as an occupational illness and provide compensation for it. Buff lost whatever professional detachment he may have had and swung into open battle against the state legislature and the coal companies.

In this, Buff was joined by Dr. Hawey Wells of Morgantown, West Virginia, and the scholarly, bearded Donald Rasmussen of Beckley. Separately, together, the three doctors descended on coal towns, mining camps, union rallies, private gatherings, laying out the black lung problem, offering a solution, ripping into the coal companies along the way.

Buff. Now, there is a genocide of a race of people, a genocide of a group of people, an occupational genocide that miners are being actually murdered by coal dust.

Ward. Going back to black lung, then, would it not be possible, as in the case of astronauts, to supply miners with a kind of fresh air system that they could carry with them, at least an oxygen mask?

Buff. This is feasible. It would work. But the mask costs $85 approximately. And the air costs three dollars a day. I have suggested this and met with very, very, very little success. Because I also suggested to the operators that they put in chemical toilets in the mines instead of spilling their debris on sites and walking around in an area that is full of human wastes. And there's also the problem of the human wastes drying and they breathe it in their lungs and get fungi infection and other types of infections which happen.

Now, the coal miner lives like a hog in there. The hog wouldn't even take that. I don't think he'd even stay. But the human being does. And I said, well, put in chemical toilets. You know the answer I got was this. Well, doctor, don't you know how much waste a person puts out a day? And I said, yes, two, and two and a half pounds. Suppose we had three hundred miners, then. Do you realize it would cost us a quarter a day to remove this waste? You think we can afford such a thing? How do you expect an industry that refuses to spend a quarter a day for sanitation to spend $75 for a mask and three dollars a day for compressed air?

Ward. But as it turned out, the West Virginia miners cup of bitterness finally overflowed. Early this year, three to four thousand of them marched on the state legislature. For three weeks, the mines were shut, closed by a wildcat strike, and the fight to win recognition of and compensation for black lung. The miner had simply had enough. The battle was on.

Man. Gentleman, the blame belongs on the shoulders of the state legislature. (Applause.)

The body, the elected body of the people who have deliberately sat on their hands in an effort to kill this legislation of humanity for our people in the state. (Applause.)

Man. What we physicians want, basically, is to clean up the mines from dust. We don't want your children to be sacrificed for money. (Applause.)

Speaker of the House of Delegates. The question is on the passage of the bill. All those in favor of the bill will vote "Aye." Those opposed "No." (BELL) Has every member voted? Having voted in the affirmative, I declare the bill effective as of July 1, 1969. (Applause.)

Man. The legislature has adjourned. There's no more weight that we can swing in Charleston. So I propose that we return to work tomorrow morning. (Shouts.)

Ward. So, perhaps because they were feeling their oats, the miners stayed out for still another day. But whatever, the West Virginia miner who went back to his job was not the same miner who three weeks before had walked off it.

Man. The coal miner had been held down for a hundred years or more to nothing except just the barest level of recognition as human beings. And he has begun over up here to find it's somewhat like an evolution. He grows into becoming more civilized every year until he has come to a point of where he looks back over all of these atrocities that have held him down and till he has built to a position where he's in a state of revolt right now. He has listened to these politicians and the union leaders tell him that well, next year, next year, next year, next year until he's so tired of it that he's ready to actually pick up arms and fight if necessary.

Ward. But the victory over the state legislature did not leave all the battles won. Indeed, the circumstances of that victory have led some of the Charleston rebels into another battle. Curiously, with their own union.

Announcer. Second Sunday will continue after a ten-second pause for station identification. (Noise.)

Announcer. Again, "The Coal Miner—A Cry From the Depths." Here is Russ Ward.

Ward. Fairmont, West Virginia. The lift door opens. The bell rings all clear. And from three hundred feet down, the four to twelve shift is back above ground, on the way to check in their head lamps, shower off and go home. (Bell.)

There's a cameraderie here, a sense of experience shared and danger felt that has lent itself to a sly and irresponsible fiction—the fiction that come what may in the way of hardship, exploitation, pain, even death, the coal miner will somehow stay cheerful and stay cheerful because he's a fatalist. There was a time, perhaps, the miner himself contributed to this fiction but there is at least some evidence now that he is withdrawing his support. The march on Charleston occurred because the miners had passed the limit of their own considerable capacity to accept and endure. They felt their government had let them down, that their state had let them down and by some that their union had let them down, particularly in the matter of the march.

Man. Now I can read you an article here out of the Mine Workers' Journal where it says—and I quote this verbatim now out of the United Mine Workers' Journal. It says, "The fact that the black lung bill passed at all was due to the legislative team appointed by United Mine Workers' president W. A. Boyle." Well, now, that's a lie. We had no support, no backing whatsoever from our international union. They wouldn't open their mouths. In fact, they told us before we ever struck, they told us we couldn't do that—that we'd start a violation of the law and a federal lawsuit, but we were within our rights because we have a health hazard clause in our contract. Well, if our union leaders had this clause in there, why didn't they know it? If a dumb, simple coal miner knew it, why didn't those educated people who are supposed to be our leaders know it? I'm talking about our leaders in the union now. Why didn't they know it? It was proven in court.

Man. In September I said to the convention, I assured the convention, I guaranteed the convention that every coal mining district would get a copy of what we considered a model law to be introduced in each one of the respective states where they mined coal.

Ward. The head of the United Mine Workers' Union, W. A. "Tony" Boyle.

W. A. "Tony" Boyle. West Virginia, being one of the first states in session, we were there with our bill. We introduced it. And the bill was in there and, as a matter of fact, if you read the bill, the greatest proportion and preponderance of the law presently passed down there in Charleston is the Mine Workers'. Now, in Charleston, sure there's a certain group. There's always been a certain group—I said Charleston. I mean West Virginia. Certainly there's always been a certain group in West Virginia that's been opposed to the local arrangements in their respective areas or in most—in some instances opposed, we'll say, to John L. Lewis or the National Union. You find that in any organization. But the fact remains that the large majority of the coal miners in every one of these states knows that in their hearts that no one fought any harder for legislation for their protection than John L. Lewis and Tony Boyle have. I can go to sleep and that doesn't bother my conscience at night.

Ward. The question of how widespread is the opposition to Tony Boyle is a moot one, answerable only by how the West Virginia miner votes in the next UMW election. In the meantime, the so-called rebel miners have found a Congressional ally in Representative Ken Hechler, Democrat, West Virginia. In his criticism of Tony Boyle, Congressman Hechler is close to unsparing. He says the UMW is "in bed" with the industry. He wants a full-scale Congressional investigation of the UMW Welfare and Retirement Fund. And he charges that the UMW has not fought for safety in the coal mines. Congressman Hechler.

Ken Hechler. Oh, the UMW leadership will talk very loud in public, you know, about what they're doing. They'll drag out the record of what they have said in the past, but when you come right down to it, they haven't really stood up to fight for and lead the parade for health and safety legislation that they should have. That's the great missing balance wheel in this whole sordid history of the treatment of the coal miner. The UMW top leadership has not stood up for the coal miners as they should have. They have supported high wages, but forgotten about health and safety.

Ward. Again, Boyle of the United Mine Workers.

Boyle. The leadership of John Lewis, the leadership of Tony Boyle has been one recognized by the Congress of the United States in every administration, Republican and Democrat, as fighting for safety measures in coal mines ever since 1890. Those are the things that some of the membership that are distant and disgruntled because we haven't done enough on safety, know nothing about because they're out working in coal mines and no one has got the story over to them, I suppose.

Ward. Boyle on the question of safety, the coal mine operators, and whether in the mine production comes first.

Boyle. I think that the coal operators of this country are—certainly I think they're dragging their feet. They've always been dragging their feet, and they've always opposed safety legislation in the past that would cause them to put profits, whether they say to the contrary notwithstanding, that they do not put profits ahead of safety; that may be true with an individual coal company here or there, that they're vitally concerned or vitally interested in safety and that they're thinking about safety before they are profits, but they're not kidding me. Because I believe that the coal operator is in a business to make money, and I think that they're making a profit, and they should be making a profit, but not at the expense of safety of coal miners.

Ward. John O'Leary, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines.

O'Leary. The coal industry has used a good deal of ingenuity in the past twenty years to reduce the real cost of coal production in light of competition from other fuels and when you take a look at the industry the way it is today I think that experts are of the view that there are still substantial opportunities for cost reductions in the basic process. There are for example some pretty evident improvements in the machinery in a mine which would permit continuous miners to operate a higher percentage of the time. On average, on the basis of the sample that we have now, the large continuous miners operate about 28 percent of the total minutes in a shift. In other words, their capacity is substantially underutilized and if we could find low-cost techniques for connecting the continuous miner with the hauling system in a mine, there is an evident cost saving right there.

Now, those cost savings, it seems to me, are adequate to compensate or perhaps substantially more than compensate for the additional cost of safety. I don't want to mislead you on this now. Safety costs money. There's no two ways about it. On the other hand, it seems to me that the alternatives to that expenditure are simply not in the cards. The expenditure is going to have to be made and happily, we are in a circumstance here where we can actually make safety pay for itself to a degree by improvements in the overall system of extracting coal from a seam.

Ward. Pose the question of safety in the coal mine and you immediately draw the argument of who is or should be responsible for it. And even then, the argument is not confined to the upper levels of industry where government, company, and union leadership face each other across the polished conference tables of Washington. Indeed, it flourishes even in the dark and muddy passages of the mine itself. The safety issue as debated by a company foreman and a union miner.

Man. I can't understand it when you try to enforce safety. They tell me you give the men a violation there, they want to strike.

Man. No. The only way I have ever heard of a strike over safety is for it not to be corrected, is when they go to the safety committee and the company officials and ask them to correct it and if they don't, now this is something big, you know, something that's a hazard that they'll threaten a strike over. And if they go to squawkin' maybe too much, you know, applyin' too much pressure on 'em, then they put 'em doin' somethin' else. In other words, he'll put 'em doin' the dirtiest job there is.

Man. Your supervisor, your foreman, like myself or any other foreman can turn his back and that's when a man breaks one of the safety rules. Then they get caught. One way or the other, they get caught by gettin' hurt. But a lot of people think that the foreman, they give him ten or fifteen or twenty men, and he's in charge of those men. Now, they think that you ought to go around and hold a hat over these guys' heads and keep this rock from fallin' on 'em. You can't do that. But when a man's got common horse sense, if he sees it's bad, he don't have to go out there. You can't make him go out there. The law provides that. If I make you go out in a bad place, you get killed, well, they can—well, they'll hang me.

Man. I'd say that superintendent is definitely wrong, because all miners realize the hazards in going under the ground to start with. They know what their chances are of getting cripped up for life or even getting killed. They know how easy it is to get hurt in there. You can go to your safety man that the company has. Now, he has authority to fire a man if he catches him, you know, violating safety, which he won't. And you can ask him to correct it, and he still don't do nothing about it. That is, I'm not saying all of the mines are that way. But I have seen this done and I have went to the section man myself over some of it. And go back the next day, and you see the very same thing practiced.

Man. Every week, there's fifteen minutes of safety meetings on their own time now. The Eastern's paying for that. That costs them way up into thousands of dollars to have a fifteen-minute safety meeting. Every man employed has a meeting. Every Monday morning. You bring up those little things that happen. What can you do to prevent this or prevent that. That's brought up every Monday morning. Well, two or three days later, you come find they're back in the old swing, they're still doing the same thing. Safety meetings don't do no good. You're apt to see some guy over there eating a sandwich, two guys over here telling a joke, maybe the guy over here's half asleep, not paying attention. It's just time throwed away. So then they holler, well, of course, now, you can't say it's all the men and of course it's some of the supervisors just as bad. You can't have one unless you have the other.

Man. Talking about safety, now I know up on the section I work at, well, we have a lot of water up on that section now. It's running now from the old works, you know, back down to where we're working at and the splices on the cables are smoking and you can cut your light off and you can see sparks flying from it. It's very weak, you know, coming through the splice of the tape. And now that's one thing that we hop on to 'em about.

Man. He hollers about cable smoke in the mine. We do something about the cable smoke. The company provides stuff for the men to hang their cable up. They have nails for 'em to drive and to hang their cable up. Not to run over the cable. When you run over the cable, you're tearing it up. No, it takes too much time. It takes 'em about a minute. That's too much energy they waste, see. They don't want to do that. Just get off a shuttle car, walk around, hang it up. Get by the easy way.

Man. But they won't give us time. They say, listen, go on to the face. I ain't told you to do this. You go on to the face and work or you get your bucket and go outside. Everything is in a mad rush. It's just like a rat race, in other words.

Ward. Ironically, Consol Mine, in the Mannington-Farmington area, was known as a clean mine, a safe mine, managed by a company whose safety practices had won the endorsement of government and union alike. So to the coal miners' charge that the owners in general want production first and safety after, this reply from the president of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal, John Corcoran.

John Corcoran. Our safety record in 1967, and I use that year because it's the last full year for which we have national statistics, in 1967 the industry accident frequency record was 41. That's not very good. Our company record was 12. And the record for all manufacturing was 14. Now, this proves rather clearly that if a company does have a competent safety program, a coal company, it can develop a safety record that is even better than that of manufacturing generally. We spend a great deal of money in training and educating our men in safety practices. Last year alone, we spent about a million and a half dollars solely in training and educating our miners in safety methods and safety practices. Now, in addition to the programs on training and education, we spend a great deal of money in various safety procedures in the mine, thoroughly rock-dusting our mines, putting in all kinds of roof supports to try to insure against roof-fall accidents. Again, I could go through a list of, multitude of things that are done. I think the best demonstration of how thoroughly a job we try to do is the fact that we spend about fifty cents a ton on nothing more than trying to put in the kinds of equipment, the kinds of facilities, and the procedures that will hopefully insure safe mining practices.

Ward. But in all candor, it must be said that not all members of the National Coal Association hunger and thirst for reform in the mines. Assuredly, there are mines that are safety-conscious, and assuredly there are mines that are not. So is it a question, then, not only of rules and standards but also one of enforcement? Again, Congressman Hechler.

Ken Hechler. I think what you're going to have is a real will to safety on the part of both the coal operators and the United Mine Workers' top leadership, and an aggressive, cooperative effort on the part of everybody concerned. All too frequently, I think the coal operators sort of react like a person taking a high school examination when the inspectors come in. They get things all ready and cram for it, and then once the inspector has left, it's sort of like a person who has finished an examination. They say, okay, now we can forget that subject until the next exam or next inspection, you see. And as a result of this, there isn't a constant will to safety as being the most important single goal in the mines. The emphasis has been on production up to now. Production, production, production. The foreman holds his stop watch, the teams of miners are encouraged to compete to try to produce more, but nobody really comes down hard and says, are you thinking about safety today, and what have you done about it and how are you protecting the individual human beings?

Ward. Obviously, then, the coal mine has never been the consistent target of aggressive legislation, decent reform laws of the type that would have made unnecessary much of what we have heard tonight. Now, though, with Mannington-Farmington in mind and the coal fields astir, the proposed tougher legislation stands a chance—higher standards of safety, sterner enforcement, harsher penalties for the offender. John O'Leary.

O'Leary. I think the whole safety consciousness of the mining community has been aroused, as witness the events in West Virginia that have just culminated in the passage by the West Virginia legislature of some pneumoconiosis legislation. But I think that there's a major change in the attitude of the individual workers in the mine that's a very, very necessary step to coming to grips with this problem. After all, their lives are on the line every day. It's easy for the instant expert in Washington to theorize on how it should be done, but the people are in there day in and day out, they live with the problem, and to the extent that they in effect permit management to get away with bad practices or contribute to those bad practices themselves, they're living with a hazard.

When they become alert to it, when they become aroused by it and above all, when they find there is something they can do about it, and I think they're finding that now, that attitude changes. That attitude of fatalism that's been one of the negative influences on the safety record of this industry show to him one way or the other that he has some options, that he is, to a degree at least, the master of his own fate and I think that that has been amply demonstrated here recently and the West Virginia situation is a very clear example of that. He is not fatalistic with regard to the condition of his lungs. He went out statewide for two weeks on strike because he didn't like the statutory setup. He didn't like the degree of protection that was accorded him. And I think that once the miner begins to feel he can influence the situation, that he will become about like the rest of us. Remember, the first rule for all of us is survival. The miner may be fatalistic, but above all he's a human being, and he wants to survive.

Ward. But there remains the problem of the human factor. Mr. Hechler.

Ken Hechler. You've got to have a complete reorientation of the thinking on the part of both the coal operators and the top UMW leadership as well as the men themselves. There are many, many examples of this. One miner up in Morgantown who still has his arm in a sling as the result of a compound fracture, said, "I didn't mind so much being hurt, but when I was layin' there in a stretcher and the operator, company operator came along and he passed right by me, he didn't even say that he was sorry that this had happened to me." I think it's terrible what happened to some of the widows at Farmington, who said that the only way that they found out that their husbands were trapped down there in the mine was the company called later in the day, not to express any sympathy or to express hope of what they could or should do, but rather to simply ask the question, "Was your husband working last night on the cat-eye shift?" and hung up and made it a very, rather crude way to inform a potential widow of exactly what happened. The relationship here is not a very personal or human one. There doesn't seem to be a feeling of equality on the part of the coal miner and those at the company level. They're treated as cogs in a great production machine.

Ward. The president of the Bituminous Coal Operators Association, George Judy.

George Judy. Oh, I think that all the coal companies have a real concern for their employees. After all, our employees, I think, are our greatest assets. And we have to take care of these employees, we have to look after their well-being and safety and I just don't see how anyone can say that the coal companies have little or no concern for the welfare of the men.

Ward. And John Corcoran, Pittsburgh Consolidation.

Corcoran. I think one of the problems here is the fact that the coal industry is such a fragmented one. We have some 5100 companies operating 5900 coal mines. Now, I haven't any doubts that when you look at the industry as a whole, there are many of these miners who move from mine to mine and therefore are moving from company to company very quickly and very rapidly. And I can readily see that in those circumstances a man would not develop any great close feeling to the company for which he happened to be working temporarily. But I feel that in our own company and companies like ours, we do have a much better relation with our men.

I hasten to add that in this area we all have more to do, which is the same in many other areas today, and that is sometimes we just don't seem to be able to communicate as well as we'd like to. I'd like to think that we could develop a better relationship among our employees and certainly it's going to be one of my objectives to try to instill that same feeling into all of our people. They should be aware of the fact that we are trying to do everything we can in the area of safety, and we are spending a lot of money on research and we are trying to make these mines as safe as we know how to make them. And in this respect, certainly, our objectives and that of the men working in the mines are exactly the same. And therefore, we should have a feeling of closer relationship in achieving this objective.

(Music)

Woman (singing):

"The birds are gaily singing
Up on the mountain high.
So tell my dear old mother
I'll meet her up in the sky.
Shut up in the mines of Cold Creek,
And I know I'm about to die.
Go tell my mother's friends
I'll meet them up in the sky."

Ward. Significantly, this kind of music is acquiring in West Virginia today the quality of quaintness. It is no longer that close to the people, because, whatever the forces that have worked against it, the twentieth century is managing to fight its way into those distant coal fields. There is more radio, more television, more houses, and more supermarkets. There is less company housing, and even some company stores are being phased out. And although the accidents and the dangers and the deaths continue, there is a change, too, in the miner. He knows more, he wants more, and he hopes to get it by mining coal. And in this, he is right. Because coal is a growing industry. Production is up. Carloadings are up. Sales are up. And domestic and foreign markets are expanding. So we know the industry is not dying. It is only the miner who is doing that. Russ Ward, NBC News.

(Music)

Woman (singing):

"The birds are gaily singing
Up on the mountain high.
Go tell my dear old mother
I'll meet her up in the sky.
Shut up in the mines of Cold Creek
I know I'm about to die
So tell my mother's friends
I'll meet them up in the sky."

(Music)

Announcer. This has been Second Sunday, "The Coal Miner—A Cry from the Depths." Directed by Robert Sosman. Technical supervision, Raphael Weiss. Field correspondents, Peter Hackes in Washington; Merrill Pollis and George Hickey of Station WJAS in Pittsburgh. Your announcer has been Arthur Gary. This has been a production of NBC News.

THE PHONY WAR AGAINST INFLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Dorn). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Reuss) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the administration has declared war on inflation. It is a just war, what with the 5-percent increase in the consumer price index in the last year, and the 3-percent increase in the wholesale price index.

I wish the war would succeed. But unfortunately, it is not being seriously fought, and I am afraid it will not succeed. Until it is effectively fought, we are going to continue to have inflation.

The ingredients in the administration's war against inflation are three:

First. Continuing the surtax after next June 30 for another year, to yield $9 billion.

Second. Modest cuts in spending, apparently most of them on the nondefense side of the budget. This is so because Secretary of Defense Laird's budget cutting exercise has so far resulted in a cut of only $1.1 billion out of the enormous $80 billion defense budget. Significantly, virtually all of this cut is in the area of bombs and artillery shells for Vietnam, leaving the Pentagon free to come back next January for a supplemental appropriation if their optimistic projections about the level of fighting are not borne out. There has still been no cutback in the enormously expensive new weapons systems the Pentagon has waiting in the wings. From what we see portended, therefore, most of the cuts will come out of Health, Education, and

Welfare—$1.2 billion—and Social Security—$1 billion.

Third. Moderately tight money. The Fed so far this year has been creating money at approximatey the rate of 2 percent a year—just about what the Joint Economic Committee has recommended. Though it recently raised bank reserve requirements, the potential restrictiveness of this move will be at least partially vitiated by a somewhat more expansive open market purchase of securities by the Fed. At least, I hope that the Fed will negate some of the effect of its increased reserve requirements by added open market purchases. Unless it does so—at a rate consistent with a slow and steady 2-percent increase in the money supply—it could well throw us into a recession.

I see little reason for believing that this combination—a continued surtax, modest expenditure cuts mostly elsewhere than in defense, and reasonably tight money—will work. We have had the surtax since last summer. It has not markedly chilled consumer expenditures, probably because consumers saw fit to spend a percentage point or so more of their after-tax income following the surtax. And Government expenditures, fueled by Pentagon spending, have shown no appreciable decline.

As I shall demonstrate, these largely meat-ax methods are not likely by themselves to come to grips with the inflation we are actually suffering. Indeed, not only are they not likely by themselves markedly to reduce inflation; they will produce—judging by the administration's own admissions before the Joint Economic Committee earlier this year—up to 500,000 new unemployed by the end of this year who would have had jobs but for the slowdown of growth which is the aim of the administration's program. The Council of Economic Advisers conceded a probable rise in unemployment this year from 3.3 percent at the beginning of the year to 3.9 percent at the end. Administration witnesses were not able to answer the Joint Economic Committee when we asserted that, if this is what was going to happen, it would result in 400,000 or 500,000 unemployed.

I should have thought that the wise way to fight demand inflation, Mr. Speaker, was to concentrate on reducing excess demand, and to avoid throwing men out of jobs by stepping up structural ghetto-oriented manpower programs. With our manufacturing establishment currently operating at only 84 percent of its plant capacity, it seems to me shortsighted economics to contemplate throwing away half a million jobs. Yet that is precisely what the administration seems bent on doing.

Thus the administration's program has a considerable potential for doing harm by causing unemployment.

But the tragic thing is that it is not going to do much about dampening inflation, either. Let us look at where the inflationary pressures in the economy actually are. If you look at the consumer price index and the wholesale price index, you come up with about five such major pressure spots:

First. Defense spending: This is the greatest single inflationary factor—greatest not only in its enormous amount and in its unthinking disregard of bottlenecks, but in the fact that it produces no useful good which can be used to sop up the purchasing power created by the act of producing defense goods. Surely our swelling military hardware program is at the core of our inflation. To talk about penny-ante cuts in welfare programs is silly when the place where major cuts could be made without diminishing our real security lies in the military.

Second. Business equipment spending: Whereas the wholesale price index is up 9 percent in the last 10 years, the indexes which most closely reflect business capital equipment spending are up by a much greater amount. Metals are up by 13 percent, machinery and equipment by 17 percent. These two are at the top of the wholesale index list, primarily because of the Government-induced inflationary boom in capital equipment spending by business, as a result of the continued 7-percent investment tax credit. Business capital expenditures will reach a total of some $73 billion this year, up a whopping 14 percent over last year's recordbreaking total. The administration with one breath announces that it must stop excessive business equipment investment by tightening money—which is then done with a vengeance. With the next breath, it deliberately creates an incentive for excessive business equipment investment by continuing the investment tax credit. How silly can you get?

Third. Home mortgage interest rates: The consumer price index has gone up overall by 23 percent since 1959. Expenses of homeownership, however, have gone up by 34 percent. And this is largely because of soaring interest rates, now at their highest level in a hundred years. Interest rates for homeownership, in turn, are as high as they are largely because of the extraordinary siphoning off of the Nation's credit resources to business investment which, as I have pointed out, is induced by our present tax policy largely through the 7-percent investment tax credit. The Federal Reserve, if it continues to create money at a modest rate of around 2 percent a year, cannot avoid contributing to the high interest rates which now make homeownership so expensive as to all but price it out of the market. Its task becomes almost impossible because of the 7-percent investment tax credit.

Fourth. Medical care: This is now 49 percent above what it cost 10 years ago. Here we are now reaping the whirlwind of a monopolistic situation in the health profession. But prolonging the surtax is not going to reduce medical costs. People are going to have to pay for medical care even if they are taxed more. What will break the medical care logjam is a long delayed Federal program of seeing that we have adequate schools for medical and other health professionals, so as to eliminate the present severe shortage on the supply side in the health field.

Fifth. Lumber: Prices of lumber and lumber products have skyrocketed, particularly in the last year. At the same time, profits in the lumber industry have increased, by almost 100 percent. Basically, this is the result of poor national planning in recent years. Our timber resources and cuts are simply not adequate for both present domestic and foreign consumption. Short-term remedies include increasing allowable cuts without jeopardizing sound forest practices, and temporarily reducing the level of our lumber exports. HUD Secretary Romney recently appealed to the lumber industry to exercise restraint in its price increases. The appeal was well intended, but is not likely to have much effect in the absence of wage-price guideposts.

A real war on inflation would involve the following steps:

First. The administration should adopt a goal of ending inflation, instead of just about giving up and accepting another 3.5 percent increase this year. As the Joint Economic Committee said in its annual report of April 2, 1969:

> The rise in prices of 3½ percent, as projected and accepted by the Council, is both inconsistent with the Employment Act and intolerable, for it not only damages the retired and others on relatively fixed incomes but it robs millions of workers of the purchasing power of their wages, and everyone of the value of his savings.

Second. Achieve an adequate surplus. No war on inflation can succeed if the Government itself is so irresponsible as to permit the budget to go again into a substantial deficit at high employment levels. This, manifestly, would be very inflationary and would make the task of monetary and other policies virtually unmanageable. Actions on expenditure and taxes this year must be guided by the overriding necessity to achieve a significant budget surplus. As the joint Economic Committee said in its annual report:

> The momentum of inflation and evidences of economic strength, despite monetary and fiscal actions of the past year, indicate the need for fiscal restraint in the year ahead—indeed, the budgetary surplus for fiscal year 1970 should be larger than the $3.4 billion estimated in the January Budget.

Excessive demands for credit which have been driving interest to unparalleled heights, and the inflationary rate of expenditures for business investment, are evidences of an excessive tendency toward investment at the expense of savings. The Federal Government can make a distinct contribution toward quieting the speculative inflationary fever by increasing the national rate of savings via achievement of a significant budget surplus.

Third. Military expenditures should be substantially cut. But the administration's proposed budget cuts are lopsidedly in the nondefense area—almost $3 billion as opposed to $1.1 billion in defense. As the Joint Economic Committee said in its April 2, 1969, report:

> The largest segment of the Federal budget is that devoted to national defense expenditures. These outlays should especially be subject to expenditure analysis and control. So far, at least, we are not realizing substantial reductions in national defense spending, though there continues, of course, to be the

> hope that reduced outlays for Vietnam will be achieved as the year advances. To complicate the issue, costly military proposals are being made for improvements in our strategic forces, modernization of the tactical air force, other increased research and development efforts, and introduction of an ABM system. The potential adverse effect of adding to the non-Viet Nam outlays for defense is substantial. Thus the Administration and the Congress should search out and reduce defense programs and commitments of lower priority or those that have outlived their usefulness. This will not be easy but should be pursued vigorously.

Fourth. Wage-price guideposts should be restored. As the Joint Economic Committee said on April 2, 1969:

> This committee, as it has for a number of years, strongly advocates the development of an effective, realistic, and definite set of wage-price guidelines. We also advocate the establishment of a special office at a high level in the administration to assemble and analyze information on a comprehensive and fair basis in order to apply these guidelines to important industries.

Fifth. Those tax loopholes which cause inflation should be repealed forthwith. Foremost among them is the 7-percent investment tax credit, which contributes both to the inflation in the capital equipment industry and to the inflationary overdemand on scarce credit supplies. As the Joint Economic Committee said on April 2, 1969:

> First priority in tax reform should be given to repeal of the 7 percent investment tax credit as a significant step toward reducing inflation.

Other loopholes which are directly inflationary and should be promptly plugged are the hobby farms loophole, which bids up the price of farmland, and the accelerated depreciation provision, which causes speculative price rises in urban real estate. Other loopholes whose inflationary impact is less direct—the oil depletion allowance, the abuse of the capital gains provision, tax-exempt local securities, for example—should likewise be closed, if only to serve as an answer to the taxpayer's revolt.

Despite much talk of a tax reform message by the administration any day now, if press hints of what it may contain are to be believed, it will be more of a mouse than a lion. Major loopholes—the oil depletion allowance, the investment tax credit, capital gains at death, tax-exempt bonds—will be largely untouched. Instead, affluent loophole-enjoyers will be charged a small hunting or license or users fee for enjoying the loophole. New loopholes, known as tax incentives for businesses will be introduced, thus removing further areas from congressional annual budgetary control. New revenue raising for the fiscal year starting June 30 will be close to zero.

Sixth. Interest rates should be brought down. As the Joint Economic Committee said in its annual report of April 2, 1969:

> Should inflationary pressures worsen, we advocate strongly that purchasing power be siphoned off through increased taxes and the resulting surplus applied to reduction of the national debt. We oppose any further increase in our already excessive interest rates and urge their reduction to a level that is less dislocative and harmful to our economy."

This is an admonition, let me make it clear, not that the Federal Reserve System bring interest rates down by creating new money at an excessive rate, but instead that we lower interest rates generally by removing from the demand side of the credit equation the swollen demand for business equipment spending engendered by the 7 percent investment tax credit.

Lower interest rates will help three elements of the economy that need help—the homebuilding industry, State and local government, and small business. If repeal of the investment tax credit does not by itself product sufficiently lower overall interest rates, consideration should be given to direct controls over credit. The Nation used this power over consumer credit by raising the down payment and shortening the payoff period on purchases of certain consumer durable goods, in the early 1950's, during the Korean inflationary period, with considerable success. We should be ready to employ consumer credit controls again rather than see interest rates rise out of sight.

When you look at the kind of program needed to win the war against inflation, you come to the reluctant conclusion that the administration's choice of anti-inflationary weapons is just not going to do the job. Indeed, a war that begins by postulating a 3.5 percent rate of inflation this year concedes defeat before it starts.

Perhaps the saddest aspect of the phony war on inflation is that the administration committed itself before election against doing anything very meaningful about inflation. This was clearly shown in just one day of Mr. Nixon's campaign last fall. On November 1, Mr. Nixon campaigned through Texas. Under the heading "Nixon Pledges Support to Top Texas Ventures," the Los Angeles Times described the day's activities:

> Richard M. Nixon jet hopped Friday across President Johnson's home state promising to support ventures dear to Texas ears. Trying hard to win the 25 Texas electoral votes, Nixon promised in stops at Ft. Worth, Lubbock and San Antonio that he would:
>
> Retain the F-111, the controversial swing-wing fighter conceived under the Kennedy Administration, which is produced in its Air Force version at the General Dynamics Corp. plant in Ft. Worth.
>
> See to it that a "fair shake" is given U.S. farmers and textile producers in secret trade negotiations with foreign countries.
>
> Recognize that government, rather than private enterprise, is better qualified to handle great projects like the $1 billion Trinity River Project that could open Ft. Worth to oceangoing ships. The project has been authorized by Congress, but funds have not been appropriated.
>
> Stand firm by his commitment to support the 27½ percent oil depletion allowance that is built into the Internal Revenue Code as an inducement for oil production but that is a constant target for tax reformers.

Here, in one swoop, Mr. Nixon promised to continue one of the military's most expensive and wasteful aircraft ventures; to see that U.S. food and textile producers are protected against foreign competition that might lower their domestic prices; to back the $1 billion Trinity River project by the Corps of Engineers—a project that some say would be less costly if Fort Worth were made an ocean port by moving it bodily down to the sea; and to avoid tampering with the present oil depletion allowance, thus passing up a leading opportunity of increasing Federal revenues and balancing the budget.

November 1 was a day the Nation will long remember. And there were, unfortunately, many like it.

The administration has made clear that it is not meaningfully going to cut military and military-related expenditures; that it rejects wage-price guideposts; that it has no intention of repealing the system of tax loopholes, ranging from the investment tax credit to the oil depletion allowance. The administration has thus unilaterally disarmed itself before the war against inflation has begun.

My complaint is nonpartisan. But it is no answer to the absence of a real war on inflation today that it was the Democrats who allowed the wage-price guideposts to atrophy, who enacted the investment tax credit, who have let the tax loopholes go unplugged for years, who have enormously increased military spending.

Nothing could please me more than to help President Nixon turn the phony war against inflation into a real war. There are enough of us on the Democratic side who feel as I do, to give him a clear majority if he should decide that we are really going to wage a war against inflation.

MORTON ATTACKS APATHY IN CHESAPEAKE BAY DEVELOPMENT

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MORTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, before us today is another bill, which I support, aimed at controlling pollution of our water resources. The measure authorizes new weapons—in the form of funds, demonstration projects, and educational programs—to be used in our fight against this encroachment on our environment.

We can see the vital need for acts of this nature when we consider the impact of pollution on a specific body of water. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak at this time on a matter of grave economic and environmental importance to this Nation. This is the rapidly accelerating deterioration of Chesapeake Bay, the largest, possibly the most magnificent, and certainly the most productive estuarine area in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, let me hasten to say I am indebted to many people who are dedicated to the proposition of conserving our environment, and particularly to saving this magnificent bay and its system of watersheds.

We have been guilty of an almost criminal neglect in allowing urban and technological pressures to stalk virtually unchecked through the estuarine environment. Pollution is steadily, silently winning its fight against society. Its arsenal consists of ignorance, temporizing, and apathy—simple weapons which man effectively uses against himself.

If the Chesapeake Bay water resource planning and concomitant action are to be more than a frantic race to catch up with the present, immediate action must be forthcoming. A study of wide scope is urgently needed to develop a comprehensive plan to set forth an effective and rational program of management for the Chesapeake Bay. The Corps of Engineers has been authorized to make this study; the problem has been that the funds have not been appropriated.

The Chesapeake Bay, situated as it is in a rapidly expanding industrial and urban complex, is as vulnerable to the adverse effects of the works of man as any other estuarine system in the world. In order to save it, we must institute a sound program based on a firm foundation of an expanding estuarine and watershed management technology.

The problems that are emerging today forecast the magnitude and complexity of problems expected in the future. In 1960, the 64,000-square-mile drainage basin was the recipient of the waste products of an estimated 11 million people.

This population will grow to approximately 17 million by 1990 and is projected at 30 million in 2020.

The increasing nutrient and chemical loads in the bay system is a problem of great concern. One appaling source of this is the District of Columbia sewerage system. After final treatment, it discharges some 8 million pounds of phosphorus and 25 million pounds of nitrates into the Potomac River annually. Unless tertiary treatment facilities are provided, the above numbers can be expected to double within the next 25 years. An excess of chemical nutrients frequently leads to explosive blooms of algae and to increased growth of noxious aquatic weeds which triggers other problems. These noxious weeds tend to trap silt, potentially causing a shoaling problem. Small boats are inoperable in areas heavily infested by weeds. Further, weeds affect the recreational and esthetic uses of the waterways. If nutrient discharges are excluded from a flowing nontidal river, the river in time will revert to its natural state. But, the damage done to the estuary by excess nutrients is virtually irreversible because of the continuous recycling of the nutrients.

It is generally believed that the present trend toward more intensive urban development in the United States, and in nearly all other nations, will persist at least through the end of this century. Problems associated with water resources management in urban areas have become both acute and complex. As this development moves along the tributaries of the bay system, we shall see radical changes as more and more agricultural and forest lands are replaced by streets and roofs.

Urban construction skins the earth's surface and can increase sediment yield a thousandfold. These sediments enter the bay and smother bottom-dwelling organisms and create esthetically objectional conditions. Over the centuries, shore and bank erosion have removed much fine agricultural land, in fact a number of islands in the bay have completely disappeared.

Urban development tends to increase runoff, which, in turn, lowers the groundwater table. Depending on the extent of development, this can cause a measurable decrease in base flows during drought periods, which can have a significant effect on salinity values in the tributaries.

Growth in impervious areas increases both the magnitude and frequency of flooding, which can have a decided effect on water quality in the estuarine environment.

Rapidly expanding electrical power requirements and the resulting demand for larger powerplants are requiring use of large volumes of estuarine water for cooling purposes. One proposed plant on Chesapeake Bay will use about 1 million gallons of water per minute for cooling, with a rise of 10 to 12 degrees Fahrenheit in water temperatures. The exact effects of heat on many estuarine species is not well known, but this problem is being studied by a number of scientific and educational institutions.

The States of Maryland and Virginia have no technically reliable system to evaluate the effect of thermal loads on specific bay areas. On the other hand, some public utility companies have spent considerable sums on the construction of hydraulic models in an effort to estimate the effects of thermal electric plants on aquatic environments.

The protection of aquatic life from adverse water quality factors is much more complicated in the estuary because of its diversity of life and the fragile nature of its ecological interrelationships. The subtly shifting estuarine equilibrium can easily move toward ecological disaster through neglect or mismanagement. A grave example of our lack of understanding of ecological balance occurred in Virginia in 1966, when the oyster crop was virtually destroyed by *Michinia nelsoni*—MSX. A better knowledge of the basin system might have minimized the spread of this oyster-killing fungus.

Accelerated urban development, an increasing amount of leisure time, and a generally expanding level of personal income have created a great demand for water-based recreation in the bay area. Conversely, and ironically, the industrial and economic base of the prosperity that generated the demand also threatens to destroy the existing recreation potential by its deleterious effect on the water quality upon which water-based recreation depends.

There are other significant threats to the Chesapeake Bay environment. These include both inter- and intra-basin diversions of fresh water inflows. Current examples are first, the deepening of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, which will increase the net amount of water flowing from the head of Chesapeake Bay into Delaware Bay from about 900 cubic feet per second to about 3,000 cubic feet per second; and second, the Baltimore water supply tunnel, which taps the Susquehanna River above Conowingo Dam. Fresh water diversions can alter the salinity regime of the headwaters of the bay, affecting the spawning of many species of fish.

Many estuarine areas have been subject to the gradual destruction of wetlands through filling for urban development. The once productive San Francisco Bay has been reduced by approximately one-third through land reclamation operations. Wetlands, now recognized as "powerful biological engines," produce many of the organic nutrients so necessary for the maintenance of the estuarine ecological system. The extensive, well-established Chesapeake Bay wetlands must be protected, now, from shortsighted land-use patterns.

The great size of Chesapeake Bay, its little understood physical, chemical, and biological parameters, and the effect which rapidly increasing population and urban-industrial development have on the estuary make necessary for the preservation of the rare body of water, a specialized study. Realizing this, the Congress directed, in section 312 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965, that a complete study of Chesapeake Bay be made by the Corps of Engineers, and that, as a part of this study, a hydraulic model of Chesapeake Bay be constructed in the State of Maryland.

The Corps of Engineers, with the advice and support of many Federal agencies, the States concerned with Chesapeake Bay, and a number of educational institutions of outstanding competence in bay-oriented research, has prepared preliminary plans for this authorized study of Chesapeake Bay.

These plans take cognizance of the extreme complexity and reaction potential within the bay to the man-environment, and well note that no single political or social entity can have the requisite personnel, equipment, and technical know-how to accomplish the many specialized studies needed for such a comprehensive investigation.

Fortunately, the required expertise does exist among the many agencies which historically have been responsible for certain features of water resource development.

The proposed Chesapeake Bay study is a comprehensive estuarine study. It is multidisciplinary in scope, encompassing the engineering as well as the physical, biological, and social sciences. The study is being managed by the district engineer, Baltimore, Md., whose staff is experienced in managing resource development studies of a size comparable to the magnitude of the Chesapeake Bay study. Comprehensive planning experience in many disciplines has been developed and strengthened over time by intense involvement in diverse studies.

But on the whole, this effort is not moving forward to the degree it should, because of lack of funds. This indicates to me that the importance and survival of this great estuary as a biological, productive entity has not been considered in its relative urgency.

The specific objectives of this study are to:

First. Make a complete investigation and study of water utilization of the Chesapeake Bay Basin.

Second. Formulate a long term sound water-land management plan for the development and use of the bay area's resources, with special attention to improving the economic and social well-being of the people of the Chesapeake Bay area.

Third. Define an early action program, setting forth those elements which require prompt execution in order to: first, prevent deterioration of the bay's resources and environment, and second, meet present needs.

Fourth. Make recommendations for carrying out the plans and programs, including institutional arrangements, cost sharing, and management of the bay's resources.

It is intended, further, that the study develop a mechanism by which the plan recommended for optimum development of the area can be subject to review and revision as changing conditions require.

A major difficulty confronting the formulation of a rational plan of management is a serious lack of quantitive data. Never has an adequate inventory of the bay resource been attempted. Little quantitative data are available concerning the physical, chemical, and biological characteristics of the bay and the capacity of the bay to support its own natural functions as well as the diverse and often destructive activities of man. This serious lack of perspective of the bay environment in its present uneasy relationship with a rapidly expanding urbanized environment is probably the most dangerous existing threat to the bay system.

A logical plan of study directed toward development of a comprehensive plan must include many parameters because, for whatever purpose the bay is used, such use affects all other purposes. There is a need for a coordinated management approach to developing and preserving the resources of the system. Although the States of the bay area support a number of progressive agencies which have regulatory and management functions in Chesapeake Bay, there is no single agency that is actively engaged in an overall multistate planning effort directed toward the maintenance, enhancement, and rational utilization of the bay resources.

This complete study of water utilization and control, involving the largest estuary in the Nation and its spectrum of complex problems, is expected to yield significant knowledge of many important physical, chemical, biological, and social phenomena of importance not only to Chesapeake Bay, but to other estuarine areas. This study undoubtedly will improve the environmentalist's ability to estimate the effect of man's works on estuarine ecology, based on the development of a methodology to determine realistically the carrying capacity of these important resources.

As a part of the Chesapeake Bay resource study, a hydraulic model of Chesapeake Bay, together with a technical center for bay studies, is planned for construction at Matapeake, Md.

Thus far, the research activities which have been completed and those in progress, have established the Chesapeake Bay region as a world center for estuarine research. However, as work has progressed, it has become readily apparent that a jump in basic and applied engineering research capability is necessary.

Currently available investigative and analytical techniques have provided much valuable assistance in determining the gross physical operating characteristics of the bay system. However, the time is past when unilateral problem solutions based on judgment, available but inadequate technology, and reconnaissance type data are of use to the Chesapeake Bay community.

The hydraulic model of Chesapeake Bay will provide the necessary steps to the scientific and engineering problem solutions so urgently required now.

Most of the problems confronting the Chesapeake Bay are not and cannot be subject to rigorous mathematical analysis. The hydraulic model is an absolute necessity for continuing the economic, scientific and engineering study for the preservation of the bay.

Some of the important uses of the model are:

First. Determination of the salinity distribution in the bay system, and how it is affected by both natural events and the works of man.

Second. Determination of the mechanics of estuary flushing, the characteristics of waste dispersion, and the potential waste assimilation capacity of the bay.

Third. Location and evaluation of erosion and sedimentation problems.

Fourth. By analogy, the effects of certain processes, both of nature and of man, on some biological characteristics of the bay.

Fifth. Determination of least hazardous site location for underwater outfalls, thermal power station, and so forth.

At the request of the House Appropriations Committee a reanalysis of the study was completed during fiscal year 1969. The revised cost estimate for the Chesapeake Bay resource study is approximately $15 million.

A conservative estimate of the combined yearly value of both the commercial and the sport fishery of Chesapeake Bay is $100 million. If we were to capitalize the fishing industry at $100 million a year at 4⅝-percent interest for 50 years, we would arrive at the astronomical sum of $18.6 billion. The total cost of the proposed Chesapeake Bay resource study is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of $18.6 billion.

It must be remembered that the fishery resource of Chesapeake Bay represents only a small portion of the total value of the bay.

Process, procedure, and habit have been developed and applied for so long without thought to actual or potential impact on our environment, that many areas have already been reduced to an intolerable pollutional morass. This is doubly tragic as the technology to study and abate has been readily available. We cannot allow ourselves to be reduced to a state of self-pity, and possibly self-destruction. We must use our technical and scientific resources.

It is imperative that lead time on Chesapeake Bay be generated before we are forced into agreement and action by catastrophe. We simply must assume the responsibility to make this important study, develop rational management schemes, establish a viable management mechanism, and bring to a halt the steadily increasing deterioration of the bay resource.

It is impossible to overemphasize the fact that, as the quality of the environment deteriorates, so does the quality of life. We must stop fouling our nest, for at the very least, it will soon become uninhabitable, and at the very most, nonexistent.

Recognizing the problems, and lip service to them, is no longer enough. Action is the only answer.

DISPOSAL OF RIGHTS IN INDIAN TRIBAL LANDS WITHOUT TRIBAL CONSENT

(Mr. MOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to protect Indian tribes from involuntary alienations of interests in their lands by the Secretary of the Interior or other Federal officers.

This late in the 20th century, it probably surprises many Members of this House, as well as the public, that the Secretary of the Interior may still have power to grant away Indian property without the Indians' consent.

The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 empowers tribes organized under its provisions "to prevent the sale, disposition, lease, or encumbrance of tribal lands, interests in lands, or other tribal assets without the consent of the tribe." Similar provisions are contained in the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act of 1936. Hence, tribes organized under these acts have a guarantee from Congress that rights-of-way will not be granted, or other interests in their lands alienated, without their own consent. Tribes which did not organize under either of those acts have no such statutory guarantee.

The Indian Reorganization Act allowed the tribes 2 years within which to choose whether or not to come under its provisions. Because of various restrictions imposed by the act, many tribes voted to stay out. Today the tribes which did not organize under either that act or the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act, have more members than those who did, and own more land.

Whether the tribe came in or stayed out of the Reorganization Act has nothing to do with the current effectiveness of its organization or its present-day ability to manage its own property. For example, some of the Pueblos of New Mexico have highly organized village governments, maintained on traditional lines since long before the Indian Reorganization Act was even proposed. Some other tribes adopted constitutions under the act, but developed little or no organization except on paper. The largest American Indian tribe, the Navajo, with more land, more citizens, and a more elaborate government than several of the territories, operates entirely outside the Reorganization Act.

Despite the fact that only tribes under the Indian Reorganization Act or Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act have a statutory guarantee against such action, the Department of the Interior has not, in fact, granted a right-of-way over any Indian tribe's lands without its consent for many years. And since 1951 a departmental regulation has required consent from all land-owning tribes alike, whether or not they are organized under one of the acts. The Department by its long continued practice has acknowledged the obvious fact that the tribes outside the acts are just as progressive and just as well able to look after their own interests as those under them.

On April 4, 1967, the Interior Department published a proposed new regulation which would have abolished the consent requirement wherever it is not commanded by statute. That is, it would have taken away the right of the tribes not organized under the Indian Reorganization Act or the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act to veto unwanted rights-of-way across their lands.

The Secretary of the Interior admitted that this radical and retrograde proposal was drafted with the situation of the Navajo Tribe in mind, because that tribe, a few years ago, was unwilling to consent promptly to rights-of-way for a certain power project on its lands. Eventually the disagreement was settled amicably, and the consent given. Nevertheless, to prevent recurrence of similar disputes, not rare in the business world, the Department proposed to strip all non-IRA tribes of their power to keep unwanted rights-of-way off their lands. The consent requirement was to be abolished not because the Navajos had proved themselves incapable of guarding their own interests, but because they guarded them too well.

The House Committee on Government Operations recently published a report of this study of the Department's proposal, House Report 91-78, 91st Congress, March 13, 1969, entitled "Disposal of Rights in Indian Tribal Lands Without Tribal Consent." As a result of this study the Department of the Interior returned to reason and withdrew its proposal to abolish the consent requirement. The committee recommended, however, that consideration be given to amending the Indian Right-of-Way Act to require tribal consent to all right-of-way grants of tribal land, so as to afford the Indians adequate protection from possible spoliation of their property by the overbearing paternalism of Federal officers.

The bill which I am today introducing would do precisely this; namely, extend to tribes outside the Indian Reorganization Act, the same statutory protection against unconsented rights-of-way over their land as is enjoyed by the tribes organized thereunder.

Most people think of rights-of-way as long narrow strips used for communication or transportation facilities. Some of these, like limited-access highways can take in a lot of land and effectively split communities in two. But the Interior Department's interpretation of the term "right-of-way" goes even further; it includes reservoir sites among other things. In one case, the Department granted a right-of-way of Indian land for a 53,000 acre reservoir. The law places no limit on the term of years of an Indian right-of-way.

Make no mistake about this: the power to grant rights-of-way over Indian tribal land is the power to grant away permanently whole Indian reservations.

The area of Indian tribal land in the lower 48 States has shrunk to approximately 39 million acres. This seems like a lot of land, but it is not good land. The most productive areas were taken away from the Indians a century or more ago. What they have left is generally only what the white immigrants did not want. It is largely desert, suitable only for grazing one cow per 40 acres. Despite widespread belief to the contrary, only a small part of it produces oil or other minerals. Very little of it produces crops the Indians can live on, and even less crops they can sell for cash. Thirty-nine million acres of such land is an irreducible minimum Indian landholding. To this land 387,000 Indian citizens look, in part at least, for their livelihood. We already have enough "problems of the cities" caused by unskilled black and white poor people forced off the land. None of us wants to add a "city Indian" problem. Indian Tribes should be able to preserve every acre of Indian land for tribal purposes, if they so desire.

The Department of the Interior was not able to give a single valid reason why the power to prevent unwanted grants of their lands should be stripped away from a majority of our tribal Indian citizens. In fact, the Secretary of the Interior admitted to the Government Operations Committee:

> Generally, those requiring rights-of-way over tribal lands have encountered no particular problems in obtaining Indian consent.

He did not even suggest a reason why such problems might arise more frequently with tribes outside the Indian Reorganization Act, so as to be remediable by amendment of the regulation, than with tribes under the act, where only Congress could authorize grants over tribal veto. Furthermore, neither the Secretary of the Interior nor any other reasonable person can assert that an Indian tribe is always wrong when it refuses consent to a particular proposed right-of-way. The State highway department, the local power company, the natural gas pipeline company, and even the Corps of Engineers are not always right when they want to oust citizens from their land for a right-of-way.

The bill I am introducing today, which is based on the recommendation in the report of the House Government Operations Committee, would simply amend the Indian Right-of-Way Act of 1948 to plug up the loophole that made possible the Interior Department's vindictive proposal to abolish the consent requirement. That act, which requires tribal consent only in the case of tribes organized under the Indian Reorganization Act or the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act, does not repeal any previous right-of-way act, of which there are about a dozen, some adopted as long ago as the Indian wars. None of them expressly requires tribal consent to right-of-way grants. My bill would require consent of the proper tribal officials to all rights-of-way over tribal land, whether granted under the 1948 act or any other act, and whether or not the tribe involved is organized under the Reorganization Act or any act. In case of tribes not organized at all—of which there are very few—the amendment would require consent by a majority of the adult members of the tribe. This consent could be obtained in a referendum called by the Secretary of the Interior, or if the tribe was small enough to make such procedure practicable, by collecting signatures on a petition.

The principle that Indian tribes should not be deprived of their property without their consent is one of the oldest in the jurisprudence of the Western Hemisphere. It was first stated in 1532. It was adopted by the United States in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, even before adoption of the Constitution. Today, when Indian property holdings have long since been cut down to the irreducible minimum, it is more valid than ever.

In the 19th and early 20th centuries, Congress riddled the principle with loopholes. Since 1934 we have been closing them. Today's bill will plug one of the worst remaining.

In recent years many Indian tribes, like the Navajo, have begun to take care of themselves in the modern world. Occasional disagreement in business dealings with them only prove the success of our 35-year-old reversal of Indian policy from tearing down to building up the tribes' responsibility to manage their own property.

The bill I introduce today will protect the Indians' hard won self-reliance against attempts, whether ill or well-intended, of any future Secretary of the Interior to reinstate the debilitating paternalism of the period immediately following the Indian wars. I have confidence, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will commend itself to all fair minded and realistic Members of Congress. I present the bill to be printed at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 10093

A bill to require tribal consent to all grants of right-of-way over Indian tribal land.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 2 of the Act of February 5, 1948 (Chapter 45, 62 Stat. 17, 18, 25 U.S.C. 324), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"No grant of a right-of-way over and across any lands belonging to any tribe shall be made pursuant to this or any other act of Congress without the consent of the proper tribal officials or, if the Secretary of the Interior certifies that the tribe has no tribal officials, the approval of a majority of the adult members of such tribe."

WHY DON'T TAXPAYERS PURCHASE LOCKHEED CORPORATION INSTEAD OF THE C-5A TRANSPORT?

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, once again evidence mounts indicating that the Pentagon and a major military contractor have combined to allow costs on a project to mount far beyond original estimates. In this case, it is the C–5A Air Force military transport, which is supposed to be the major freight and troop carrier for the military in upcoming years.

The estimate when the contract was let in October 1965 was $2,880,400,000 for 120 of these craft. A new, unpublished Pentagon figure of this week's vintage reveals a figure of $5,202,400,000 for the same 120 planes. The increase in cost alone is almost as much as the original estimate.

In fact, this very latest price figure is an actual price increase of $77.2 million over cost estimates of just 3 months ago. A thought-provoking equation, to say the least.

Nor does any guarantee exist that we are anywhere near an end to the spiral on this particular project. Costs for the C–5A are climbing more than $25 million monthly and $300 million annually. One last straw is that the plane is behind schedule—and our people are footing the bill.

An Air Force spokesman attributed price escalation to an increase in prices of spare parts and inclusion of previously omitted costs for docks and hangar facilities. So nice of them to discover a rise in prices of spare parts. Most thoughtful of them to locate figures for facility costs they somehow previously mislaid. If this excuse is true, then so is Sancho Panza's ass Pegasus in disguise.

We are told the dollar history of this craft is "probably the best cost history we have ever had on any program." Behold a classic case of foot-in-the-mouth disease. Has there ever been a bolder, more venturesome misstatement of the opposite of truth by a military defender of a contractor? Verily, I am speechless with admiration at such intellectual calisthenics.

Weak Air Force supervision, poor corporate management, and a contract which rewards inefficiency emerge. Mr. A. Ernest Fitzgerald, Air Force Deputy for Management Systems, is to be commended as a veritable taxpayer's hero for allowing us to realize how badly this project has run amuck dollarwise.

Let us also note that Lockheed is perpetrator of the Cheyenne helicopter—a royal botch which was a gunship to end all gunships. After completing a model in May 1967, Lockheed had succeeded in completing a massive armada of nine more since then, bringing forth a warning of cancellation from the Army.

Rather than topple over the brink of apoplexy, litigation, and tears over the Pentagon and military-industrial complex, I prefer to grope for solutions, since technical salvation for the present seems out of reach. I therefore propose that the Government purchase Lockheed Corp., rather than obtain their C–5A plane. It would be cheaper for the Nation, and we would thereby come into possession of huge assets Lockheed has already realized by swallowing so much Government cash.

Mr. Speaker, there is a most meaningful comparison to be drawn between accomplishments and behavior of cave men and what our "Cannon Kings" produce after obtaining billions of dollars worth of military contracts.

Cave men were simplistic but effective thinkers. So are the "Cannon Kings." Cave men were brutishly shrewd. So are the "Cannon Kings." Cave men preyed upon their neighbors. So do the "Cannon Kings." There, however, all comparison ceases abruptly. Why?

Because the cave man constructed clubs, knives, slings, and other deadly weapons which worked.

CHEMICALS AND PESTICIDES—OUR FRIENDLY, SILENT ASSASSINS

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly obvious that chemicals, in form of insecticides and pesticides, are being used and abused in many endeavors with callous disregard for consequences. Added to food to preserve it—color it—utilized for medical and pharmaceutical purposes—defoliation and destruction of food supplies in Vietnam—they are increasingly altering our environment, wreaking silent damage we shall all have to pay for.

We are only now beginning to realize what long-range effects use of these chemicals will have on the ecology of our world. This is in addition to air, water, oil, thermal, and noise pollution, all of which create environmental imbalance. More evidence surfaces weekly, brought out of too-long unexplored corners by scientists who are not being listened to.

Now we have some evidence pointing to a connection between cancer and chemical pollution. Perhaps up to 80 percent of cancer victims are stricken because of chemical pollutants they eat, breathe or otherwise live with. As of now, this is not a proven theory. Yet it seems that only yesterday scientists drawing parallels between smoking and lung cancer were ridiculed. If Dr. Samuel Epstein's comments to an American Cancer Society seminar are fully proven out, many cancers could be prevented by control of chemical pollution.

He commented that suspect chemicals include pollutants in air and water, fuel combustion products, smoking, chemicals added to foods, some drugs, and pesticides.

Tiny amounts of extracts from solid particles taken from polluted city air produced a high incidence of tumors in livers, lymph glands, and lungs of laboratory animals. According to Dr. Epstein, such amounts would be inhaled in about 3 to 4 months by people living in cities with polluted air.

Under his test procedures, a weedkiller, maleic hydrazide, caused liver tumors. People eat enough of this from potatoes alone in 20 years to get the same dose he gave to newborn mice.

This scientist should be highly commended and encouraged in his work, which is aimed at creating a series of simple, sensitive and practical tests to answer questions about man's exposure to an increasing number of chemicals.

It must become the policy of our country, in actual practice, to limit use of chemicals we know to be deadly. Accordingly, I am introducing a bill today to establish an American Commission on Chemicals. Composed of 11 members, it would study, investigate, and finally make recommendations on use of chemicals for civilian and military purposes.

My measure gives the American Commission on Chemicals subpena powers to carry out objectives of the bill. A report would be submitted to the President and Congress by July 1, 1970.

Mr. Speaker, technology daily outdistances man's morality and capacity to understand the fruits of his mind. Even now we can look around and see what chemicals have done and are doing.

Sheep killed in Utah. Defoliation in Vietnam. DDT poisoning food fish in our Great Lakes so they are inedible and must be impounded. Above all, alteration of the ecology of the earth. We must act with responsibility now, lest we pay a horrible price tomorrow. Nature will suffer such abuse only so long. Then she will strike at all of us with terrible fury.

Insensitivity to this must end. Waters grow more polluted daily. Industry and municipalities offer feeble excuses. Our air grows worse daily. Our auto industry shrugs. Off our coasts, the oil crowd merrily pollutes away. Chemicals pour out everywhere, silently building up their residues in all of us.

I know, however, that the chemical industry will posture and loudly claim that questioning chemical pollution is almost an insult to the flag. Their reaction is as predictable as the fact that Coho salmon fingerlings cannot be introduced into Lake Michigan this spring because of the DDT level.

TWO CORRECT MOVES ON SST AND OLDER AMERICANS' BENEFITS

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I must confess my pleasure at two acts of the Nixon administration today. The first was an omission from the budget of new funds to start construction of an SST prototype. Leftover funds are to be made available for continuation of research and development, which is all well and good.

Mr. Nixon, by not now requesting any of the additional $212 million needed to begin construction of an operational prototype, has shown some understanding of the problem. He now may utilize the $212 million which would have been made available for the SST, to restore cuts made in funds to fight water pollution—cuts made in Federal aid to education and slashes in Job Corps. By all means, let the President slice this saved $212 million and divide it as he sees fit among these three categories of essential social needs. Our whole country would applaud him for it. Allow me to say that I have fought the SST not only because it is a significant contributor to noise pollution, but also because of the imbalance its support by the Government adds to our present reversal of social priorities. Progress is all important, of course. But humanity and the upgrading of human life in our troubled times must take priority.

I further note Mr. Nixon's intention to propose a 7-percent boost in cash payments for all of the Nation's 24.5 million social security beneficiaries. He also has stated his intention of requesting an increase in the amount of income social security recipients may earn without losing their benefits. Both actions are utterly essential, particularly when one examines the plight many millions of older Americans find themselves in daily.

Skimping on food, housing, clothing and drugs—all of which are essential to their well being, these older Americans have little cash and are allowed to earn meager incomes. Government holds the threat of withholding social security benefits from them if they dare earn too much money.

When we look around and see what leeway is allowed other segments of American society, we cannot help but wonder about our older citizens. I shall support any restoration of aid the President chooses to make to education, clean water, and the Job Corps. I intend to support any increase in cash benefits for social security recipients. I shall do the same for an increase in the amount of income they may earn without losing their social security benefits.

PRESIDENT OF UNITED SHOE WORKERS OF AMERICA SUBMITS REPORT ON TARIFF COMMISSION'S REPORT ON THE FOOTWEAR INDUSTRY

(Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives the report issued by Mr. George O. Fecteau, general president of the United Shoe Workers of America, on the Tariff Commission's report on the footwear industry submitted to the President on January 17, 1969. I am particularly impressed with the depth of Mr. Fecteau's analysis of the devastating effect of the import situation on the footwear industry.

Mr. Fecteau's remarks are as follows:

We have reviewed the United States Tariff Commission's report on the footwear industry requested by the President on April 29, 1968, and finally released on January 17, 1969. We find it completely unsatisfactory to workers in the footwear industry. The President had asked the Commission to report on all factors relating to the economic condition of non-rubber footwear producers including production, sales, investment, employment, prices, profits, exports, imports, tariff treatment, participation in international trade, and the effect of imports upon the industry.

COMMISSION'S REPORT SKIMS THE SURFACE

Unfortunately, the Commission's report merely skims the surface. It could have been turned out by the leather experts in the Commerce Department except for the profit study and the survey of importer price lines which added little to known facts on the industry. An intensive investigation should have been made of why imports are increasing, what the basic causes are, and what this implies for the future. The Commission could have assembled its own samples of work shoes from Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania if it was not satisfied with the exhibits and testimony provided by the shoe unions and the industry. It could have assembled dress shoes from Italy and Spain and vinyls from Japan—shoes in the various price categories. It could have set up an advisory group of experts to investigate the comparability of domestic and foreign footwear as to quality, labor cost, production, and workmanship. Worthwhile answers to the above questions might then have been given, as well as to the trend of future footwear imports.

At least 80 percent of the material in the Commission's report had already been presented several times by representatives of labor and the industry to the Executive branch, administrative agencies, and the Congress, or was readily available. What light the new material shed on the economic conditions of the industry added little to our understanding of the impact of imports on employment and output.

In certain cases, such as the discussion of industry technology, growth trends, the competitive nature of imports, and rising footwear costs, the Commission's analysis was inadequate and misleading. Finally, its careless observation that even 335 million pairs of imported footwear in 1975 would have little effect on employment opportunities and production in the industry can only be regarded as showing little interest in the continued export of jobs in the domestic footwear industry.

COMMISSION OMITTED ANY DISCUSSION OF FOREIGN WAGE RATES, THE CAUSE OF MOST IMPORTS

A glaring deficiency in the Commission's report was its failure to point out the basic cause of imports—low wages—and to compare labor costs here and abroad. This is the most vital point in any study of the footwear import situation. To omit this information was inexcusable, especially in view of the fact that ample data on wages, production, and numbers of workers was presented to the Commission by representatives of labor and industry.

The fact that imports are greatest from countries where wages are lowest is clear from figures that were available to the Commission.

Japan: Imports up from the 1954–56 base of 2,528,400 pairs to 65,146,100 pairs in 1968. The prevailing hourly wage, including fringe benefits, is approximately 57.2 cents.

Italy: Imports up from the 1954–56 base of 1,009,400 pairs to 58,996,400 pairs in 1968. The prevailing hourly wage, including fringe benefits, is approximately $1.04.

Spain: Imports up from the 1954–56 base of 23,100 pairs to 14,249,100 pairs in 1968 The prevailing hourly wage, including fringe benefits, is approximately 55 cents.

Taiwan: Imports up from the 1954–56 base of no pairs to 15,316,400 pairs in 1968. The prevailing hourly wage for men, including fringe benefits, is approximately 14.4 cents; for women, it is 7.9 cents.

United States: The prevailing hourly wage, including fringe benefits, is $2.62.

It was pointed out to the Commission that the same machinery is used in these countries to produce footwear that is used in the United States. In spite of the fact that the productivity of American workers is greater than in any of these countries, this is far from sufficient to offset the low wages abroad. Child labor, long hours, and low wages make it possible to ship footwear to the United States at prices several dollars below what American manufacturers can meet, and yet no discussion of these basic facts appeared in the Commission's report.

JOBS LOST TO IMPORTS

Both labor and management submitted testimony at the public hearings on the potential jobs absorbed by imports. The Commission gave this no consideration in its report and apparently is not disturbed by the continuing export of potential jobs in the footwear industry.

Based on current employment in footwear, the Commission has been shown that the industry would have hired another 56,000 employees to produce the footwear sold in 1968 if there were no imports. This is a fact that should have been brought to the attention of the President and Congress. And these workers would have been recruited from the labor groups that have the highest unemployment today.

Even the Emergency Council for the Advancement of Trade (ECAT), a group advocating free trade, in its study of the effect of imports on employment among certain industries found that footwear manufacturing had been the only one among nine industries that could lay claim to reduced employment due to imports.

MORE AUTOMATION IS NOT THE ANSWER

In its conclusion the Commission falls back on the typical answer to the import problem: that automation will overcome the competitive wage advantage abroad.

While the Commission recognizes that considerable progress has been made in recent years in the use of semi-automatic machines, conveyors, and the like, it fails to mention the fact that the same level of technological improvement has taken place in Italy and Japan, as well as in other countries exporting footwear to the United States, and it will take place as fast abroad in the future as here. Innovations made here will be used abroad tomorrow, and vice versa. There is no such thing as this country's catching up and moving far ahead in technology to offset the wide margin in wages paid here and abroad. And the Commission fails to recognize, too, that automation in the industry even at its slower pace means simply the displacement of labor, and that is important to workers.

DOMESTIC FOOTWEAR DIRECTLY COMPETITIVE WITH IMPORTED FOOTWEAR

The implication in several places in the report is that imports are chiefly low priced footwear that are not produced in the United States. This is misleading as most imports are directly competitive with domestic production, right down to packables, and this was shown at the hearings. For instance, the Commission was shown Japanese vinyl imports landed in the United States at a cost of $1.25 a pair which were exact replicas of shoes produced in Pennsylvania at a factory cost of $2.35 per pair. While these imports make up at least a third of total imports coming into the United States similar comparisons could have been made in dress shoes, work shoes, and packables retailing up to $15.00 per pair. Footwear in all price categories were displayed and loaned to the Commission so that it might check the comparability and see the competitive price advantage of imports.

Labor and the industry indicated at the hearing that they were not so much concerned with imports retailing above $20.00 a pair as they were with footwear in the lower-end area whether it was sandals, vinyls or medium low priced dress and work shoes. Nowhere, however, did the Commission's report point out the direct competitive nature of this type of footwear against similar domestic-produced footwear. Throughout the Commission's report it is implied that because the greatest volume of imported footwear is the medium and low price brackets U.S. shoe workers and manufacturers have not been harmed.

COMMISSION PASSES LIGHTLY OVER CRITICAL FACTOR OF RETAIL MARKUP ON IMPORTS

The Commission did recognize that the retail markup on imported footwear was higher than on comparable domestic footwear, but then it proceeded to de-emphasize this point so important in encouraging retailers to buy imports and push them on to the consumer by mentioning the practice of one large retail outfit which seemed to follow a uniform markup on imported and domestic products. Why did the Commission find it necessary to point out the practice of one of thousands of retail outlets while over and over again during the hearings it was brought out that lower priced imports provided retail groups with greater markups and therefore greater profits? Obviously this powerful incentive for greater profits to the retailer is reason enough to expect imports to grow and just as obviously this point warranted far more consideration than was given it by the Commission.

NO COMMENT ON RESTRICTIONS ON AMERICAN EXPORTS OR SUBSIDIES ABROAD

While the Commission mentioned the shrinking export market for American footwear, it failed to point out that major footwear exporting countries to the United States maintain barriers against footwear imports from other countries including the United States. Japan maintains quotas that prohibit any important quantities of footwear. Italy and Spain maintain border taxes and hidden custom restrictions. These should have been outlined in detail.

The Commission should also have investigated the subsidies given to encourage local and U.S. manufacturers to expand the shoe industry in these countries.

Both the non-tariff barriers and special government policies and practices (some in Communist countries) which in effect subsidize the manufacture and export of footwear in such a way that they avoid U.S. anti-dumping and tariff laws contribute even more to the unfair competition already suffered by the U.S. footwear industry and should have been given more attention by the Commission.

IMPORTS OF FOOTWEAR GREATER THAN STEEL OR TEXTILES

The Commission, after establishing the fact that import penetration of footwear amounted to 22% of the market (and the equivalent of 27% of domestic production which the Commission failed to mention) should have compared this with textiles and steel—other industries seeking relief. It is particularly important to show that an industry with less penetration has received help. The Tariff Commission study on textiles and apparel, submitted to the President showed the following share of consumption attributable to imports in 1965. In that year cotton apparel imports were 5.8% of U.S. consumption; wool apparel, 9.1%; and manmade fiber apparel, 2.6%. The Commission could have pointed out that in 1965 imports of footwear were 13% of consumption and had risen to 22% in 1968. While imports of textiles have certainly increased since 1965, they are still substantially lower than imports of footwear in terms of market absorption. And imports of steel are reported to be 18% of domestic market. Do we have one policy for industries with greater potential power and another for smaller industries?

FORECAST OF 468 MILLION PAIRS OF IMPORTS IN 1975 UNCHALLENGED

At the hearings the manufacturers forecast that imports in 1975 would reach over 468 million pairs or 48% of a 985-million-pair market for nonrubber footwear and 90% of domestic production of 517 million pairs. This would mean a loss of 168,000 potential jobs—jobs that would be there if there were no imports. No one in the opposition including the retailers and importers who are bringing in the footwear criticized this pairage projection as unrealistic.

Only the Commission suggests that imports might amount to only 335 million pairs in 1975 and that domestic production might be 650 million pairs. Only the Commission appears to be undisturbed at the industry losing 35% of its market with imports equal to 52% of production. And only the Commission seems unconcerned about the continuous loss of potential shoe jobs and the loss of all growth to the industry from 1968 to 1975.

The Commission's low estimate of 335 million pairs of imports by 1975 is unrealistically low because imports in 1966 increased 10% over 1965; in 1967 increased 34% over 1966; and in 1968 increased 36% over 1967. If the rate of increase were to fall by 5% a year until 1975 when there would be virtually no increase over the previous year, the total pairs imported in 1975 would be 483 million pairs instead of the 335 million pairs suggested by the Commission. Is it likely in the light of what has happened that the rate of increase will suddenly decline to these levels?

The Commission's conclusions that the "Growth rate of imports will no doubt eventually decline from recent levels but when and how much is problematic," is not very helpful or reassuring to the industry and its workers and is not of much assistance to the President and the Congress.

In conclusion, the American shoe workers for whom I speak reject any assumption that the shoe or any other American industry is expendible and should be allowed to expire rather than risk antagonizing foreign countries into boycotting goods produced in America. We believe that foreign countries buy from us because they need the goods we produce at the price and quality we produce them for, and they are not about to deviate from such sound and economic practices simply because America takes reasonable and necessary precautions to protect its industries and the jobs of its workers.

FACTS ABOUT TAXES

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on this income-tax-deadline day when millions of Americans reluctantly part with Uncle Sam's share of their earnings, the Nixon administration has sounded a ray of hope for the future.

The $4 billion budget cuts proposed by the President today and the promise of a $6 billion surplus a year hence offer the first real break in the long period of rising expenditures, rising debt, and rising taxes. If Congress and the American people will support the administration's economy program, regardless of whatever temporary sacrifice it may mean for some of our favorite programs, we can offer Americans the hope and promise of an end to inflation and a reduction in taxes in the months ahead.

As most of us know, April 15 this year has something new about it. This year Americans are not merely groaning under the heavy burden of taxation. The groan has become an outraged roar. Millions of Americans have concluded that we are being taxed too heavily, taxed unfairly, and taxed for purposes we do not approve.

This is a great awakening that can have great value. If we are sufficiently aroused about taxes to learn the facts about Government finance, we may save this country from fiscal suicide.

The basic fact is that the vast majority of Americans must pay for anything this Government does for them or to them. The poor cannot pay. The rich are too few to bear the burden. It is the great middle class that pays. I have letter after letter complaining that the heaviest burden of taxation falls on the middle- and low-income taxpayer. The complaints are correct. Moreover, there is no way to escape that fact.

In 1966 there were 68 million taxpayers with incomes under $20,000 and the sum of their adjusted gross income was $405.3 billion. There were slightly under 2 million taxpayers with incomes above $20,000 and the sum of their adjusted gross income was $63 billion. Of that amount $46 billion was the income of people in the $20,000-to-$50,000 range. It should be plain that confiscating the income of all people above that range would run this Government only a few days or weeks. The main burden falls upon the middle-class taxpayers because there are so many of them and they have most of the money.

Since this is the case, it behooves the middle-income individual to take great interest in the spending programs of this Government. He should take great interest in the spending attitudes of the people he elects to public office. He should realize that every new function, every new program, every inefficient practice is going to cost him, personally, because there really is no one else to pay.

If this can be demonstrated now to tens of millions of Americans who should be prosperous, who have good incomes, but who cannot make ends meet, we will have accomplished a great deal.

I hope that the realization will be strong enough to win overwhelming public support for President Nixon's economy cuts and additional cuts that the Congress may be able to make.

In bringing this lesson home, we have to be frank about tax reform. Tax reform is needed. Part of the fury of our fellow citizens is based upon the belief that some are escaping a fair share of the tax burden. We must make absolutely certain that this is not the case; that the tax laws are equitable and evenly enforced so that each pays his proper share. But we will be sadly mistaken if we submit to the delusion that tax reform will open great new sources of revenue and lift the general tax burden. It cannot do so.

The nature of the so-called tax loopholes and the income that escapes taxation because of them have been greatly exaggerated. For example, we are outraged that some millionaires escape taxes by investing in tax-free municipal bonds. Assume this loophole is closed and we encounter new questions. Obviously, State and local governments must sell bonds to create improvements. Should they compete with others in the market, thus increasing the local tax burden? Should the Federal Government subsidize the interest rate for them, thus adding another burden to the Federal taxpayer? Search as you may and I doubt you will find another method of financing local government improvements that is less a burden on taxpayers generally than the present system. Most alternatives would increase the general tax burden.

Similar considerations can be offered with regard to the many other special provisions of the tax law. The fact is that taxing income not presently taxed would only shift the burden slightly from one tax bill to another. Mr. Average American would continue to bear the load.

There is no question but that the load is too heavy, particularly since the State and local tax burdens have also increased dramatically in recent years.

The solution lies in determining the level of Government spending that is acceptable. We need a list of priorities. Every citizen should give thought to the Government services he requires or desires, and relate that requirement or desire to his own ability and willingness to pay.

Some of my constituents are disappointed that the tax surcharge probably will be extended. So am I, but if we wish to repeal the surcharge we have an obligation to find ways of trimming Federal spending by $9 billion.

Other constituents suggest that the personal exemption should be doubled, to $1,200. Experts tell me that action would reduce Federal revenue by $17.3 billion. If that is the kind of tax relief we wish, let us find ways to reduce spending $17.3 billion and double the exemption.

These suggested tax cuts, like tax reform, are subjects for consideration and recommendation by the experts on the Ways and Means Committee. Our colleagues on that committee are working hard on tax reform at this time, and I support their efforts. I do not claim expertise in their field.

I do claim to be an expert on appropriations and spending, however, and in this field I accept the challenge of the tax revolt. The taxpayers have challenged us to cut Federal spending so that they may have relief from the tax burden. That I propose to do.

Let me add that this obligation will extend, insofar as I am concerned, into the period following the cessation of war in Vietnam. The advocates of greatly expanded social programs already have made their plans for spending in the years ahead every dollar that will be saved when war expenses diminish. The people will demand that a major portion of such savings be applied to tax relief, and I, for one, will fight to make certain that is done.

THE UNITED STATES IS DRAGGING ITS FEET ON ELIMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, by the the Constitution of the United States this country is committed to absolute racial equality under law. And it has been stated to be the official policy of this country that in international, as well as national matters, absolute racial equality under the law is our goal. In fact, on September 28, 1966, the American Ambassador to the United Nations, former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg, cast the vote of the United States in favor of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. And in so doing, the Ambassador warmly praised the endeavor and noted that it was entirely consistent with the American Constitution.

And yet, despite the Constitution and the public policy commitment, the past and the present administrations have failed to submit this treaty to the Senate for ratification.

At the end of 1968, 28 countries had ratified this treaty and had begun on the work of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. Since the United States has not ratified the treaty, it cannot contribute to the work of this committee. And since the most powerful nation on earth has not endorsed the treaty, it seems inevitable that the work of the committee will be impaired. It seems too, considering the disapprobation which surrounds American policies in nonwhite third world countries, that wise and prudent foreign policy would require American ratification of this treaty. And if practicalities were not enough, then as a matter of morality it seems to me that the United States with its strong libertarian and egalitarian heritage should be a leader in the implementation of this international treaty to eliminate racial discrimination.

Prof. Frank C. Newman, of the faculty of Boalt School of Law at the University of California at Berkeley has recently written a concise and persuasive exposition on the convention and the failings of the United States in not ratifying this convention. This is a matter of large importance and I strongly recommend to my colleagues and to the administration that they pay heed to the urgings of Professor Newman.

I include Professor Newman's article in the RECORD at this point:

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL ON RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

(EDITORIAL NOTE.—It is particularly appropriate in this "International Year for Human Rights" to publish the results of a joint student-faculty project concerning the new International Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. A proposed draft of the Committee's procedural rules is introduced by Professor Frank Newman's discussion of the tribunal's organization and purposes, and followed by an appendix containing the text of the Convention establishing the Committee. The latter document has already been published elsewhere, but is reproduced here for the convenience of our readers.)

(By Frank C. Newman) *

Some months hence, nearly all lawyers will be surprised when they learn that an International Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination has been elected. Its election will mark a great step forward in implementing Article 1 of the United Nations Charter, which declares that "The Purposes of the United Nations are . . . [*inter alia*] to achieve international cooperation . . . in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race. . . ."[1]

Progress based on those words began 20 years ago when the U.N. General Assembly, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, proclaimed that, "[E]veryone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race. . . .".[2] That declaration, however, like the French Declaration of the Rights of Man proclaimed 160 years earlier,[3] said nothing about the enforcement of its commands.[4] Many observers believe that we will soon witness a new era of international enforcement of human rights, notably inaugurated by this Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.[5]

The Committee is the creation of a treaty (the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination) unanimously adopted by the General Assembly in December 1965.[6] In his statement commending the Assembly, Secretary-General U Thant noted:

"Not only does it [the treaty] call for an end to racial discrimination in all its forms; it goes on to the next, and very necessary, step of establishing the international machinery which is essential to achieve that aim. . . . [T]he adoption of this Convention, with its measures of implementation set out in Part II, represents a most significant step towards the realization of one of the Organization's long-term goals. . . ."[7]

The "measures of implementation" that he stressed involve primarily the work of the new Committee. Its members will be "eighteen experts of high moral standing and acknowledged impartiality . . . who shall serve in their personal capacity."[8] How are they chosen? Each nation that ratifies the treaty may nominate one of its citizens, and "at a meeting of State Parties convened by the United Nations . . . the persons elected to the Committee shall be those nominees who obtain the largest number of votes and an absolute majority of the votes of the representatives of State Parties present and voting."[9] As of this writing the nations that have ratified were:[10] Ghana, Iran, Libya, Kuwait, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, India, Sierre Leone, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Iceland, Spain, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Argentina, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Panama, Philippines, Uruguay, Venezuela.

The reader will note that the United States and most Western European nations have not ratified. Moslem, East European, and Latin American blocs seem well represented. Among the present members of the U.N. Security Council the only parties to this treaty are Hungary, Pakistan, and Spain.

A. WHAT RACIST ACTS MAY CONCERN THE COMMITTEE?

The racial discrimination treaty is similar to what the American Law Institute might have produced as a partial restatement of 14th amendment equal protection law. Article 5 provides:

"State Parties undertake to prohibit and to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and to guarantee the right of everyone, without distinction as to race, colour, or national or ethnic origin, to equality before the law, notably in the enjoyment of the following rights:

"(a) The right to equal treatment before the tribunals and all other organs administering justice;

"(b) The right to security of person and protection by the State against violence or bodily harm, whether inflicted by Government officials or by any individual, group or institution;

"(c) Political rights, in particular the rights to participate in elections, to vote and to stand for election—on the basis of universal and equal suffrage, to take part in the Government as well as in the conduct of public affairs at any level and to have equal access to public service;

Footnotes at end of article.

"(d) Other civil rights . . . [*e.g.*, the right to choice of spouse, to own property, to freedom of association, etc.];

"(e) Economic, social and cultural rights . . . [*e.g.*, to equal pay for equal work, housing, education, etc.];

"(f) The right of access to any place or service intended for use by the general public, such as transport, hotels, restaurants, cafes, theatres, parks."

The Committee proceeds when "a State Party considers that another State Party is not giving effect to the provisions of this Convention" (Art. 11), or when individuals claim they are "victims of a violation by . . . [a] State Party of any of the rights set forth in the Convention" (Art. 14). The sweep of governmental conduct proscribed and prescribed is gigantic.[11]

B. WHAT ARE THE COMMITTEE'S POWERS?

By no means will this be the first international body to concern itself with racism. Race and related problems that involve apartheid, South West Africa, Rhodesia, Angola, etc. have been on the United Nations' agenda since the first meetings of the General Assembly.[12] The new Committee will, however, have unique powers.[13] The treaty authorizes action on: (1) Nation vs. nation disputes, (2) citizen vs. nation disputes, and (3) reports to the General Assembly.

1. Nation versus nation disputes

Each party that thinks another party is violating this treaty may so advise the Committee. The nation complained against then has a duty to "submit to the Committee written explanations or statements clarifying the matter and the remedy, if any, that may have been taken."[14] Thus, a government's treatment of its racial minorities or racial majorities becomes a proper subject of international concern almost automatically. As to racial discrimination, this treaty once and for all eliminates the doubts and quarrels regarding domestic jurisdiction that have plagued so many international lawyers for so long.[15]

What happens if "the matter is not adjusted to the satisfaction of both parties?" Either nation may refer it back to the Committee which then, after obtaining "all the information it thinks necessary", may set in motion a procedure for an ad hoc conciliation commission "appointed with the unanimous consent of the parties to the dispute." If they disagree "on all or part of the composition of the Commission, the members of the Commission not agreed upon . . . shall be elected by secret ballot by a two-thirds majority vote of the Committee from its own members." The procedure thus is more than hortatory.[16]

2. Citizens versus nation disputes

The most provocative clauses of the racial discrimination treaty read as follows:

"A State Party may at any time declare that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by that State Party of any of the rights set forth in this Convention. . . .

"The Committee shall confidentially bring any communication referred to it to the attention of the State Party alleged to be violating. . . .

"Within three months, the receiving State shall submit to the Committee written explanations or statements clarifying the matter and the remedy, if any, that may have been taken by that State.

"The Committee shall consider communications in the light of all information made available to it by the State Party concerned and by the petitioner. . . . [and] shall forward its suggestions and recommendations, if any, to the State Party concerned and to the petitioner.

"The Committee shall include in its annual report a summary of such communications and, where appropriate, a summary of the explanations and statements of the States Parties concerned and of its own suggestions and recommendations."[17]

What does all that mean? It means that by accepting those clauses a nation allows an international tribunal to take action on the complaints of individuals who are within the nation's jurisdiction. In effect, this treaty creates ombudsmen for racial discrimination, ex officio experts who have the power to investigate and to criticize what governments do about racial discrimination that the people who are governed find objectionable.[18]

How important is that power? Some may argue that it amounts to not much and that we need courts, sheriffs, and armies if truly we intend to ensure equal protection of the law internationally.[19] Yet there are reasons for believing that these international ombudsmen could be potent and could, for instance, meet the tests Walter Gellhorn has prescribed for ombudsmen generally: "readily accessible, professionally qualified, wholly detached critics to inquire objectively into asserted administrative shortcomings . . . advisors, not commanders . . . [who] rely on recommendation, not on compulsion."[20] If the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination is bold and resourceful, if its 18 members insulate themselves from petty compulsions of global politics and display dedication and integrity and courage, then the impact could indeed be significant. They could mightily affect many of the struggles that reflect unlawful racial discrimination in this sadly torn world.

The most persuasive international analogies originate in the work of the European Commission on Human Rights.[21] For interstate disputes 16 nations have accepted its jurisdiction; 11 nations have authorized it to act also on individuals' complaints. Three interstate cases have been decided; four more (all involving Greece) are pending. Nearly 4,000 complaints have been filed by individuals, and the following are illustrative results: The Norwegian Constitution, the Belgian Penal Code, and Austrian criminal procedure statutes have been amended;[22] a complainant named Boeckmans was awarded 65,000 francs because of prejudicial remarks made by an appellate judge,[23] external forays into internal affairs have been allowed as follows:

"[C]ertain States have accepted the presence of the Commission or of some of its members to carry out investigations in their territory and have given full co-operation for this delicate task. In 1958, members of a Sub-Commission in the first Cyprus case carried out an investigation on the spot for three weeks and, in 1967, the whole Sub-Commission visited a prison and heard evidence in West Berlin in regard to a case (No. 2686/65) where ill-treatment was alleged. In 1966 and 1967, delegated members of two Sub-Commissions heard evidence in Austria and the Commission's Secretary, at the suggestion of the Federal German Government and with the Commission's approval, visited in prison the applicant X. . . ."[24]

3. Reporting to the General Assembly

The Committee's non-adjudicative duties are set forth as follows in Article 9 of the racial discrimination treaty:

"1. The States Parties undertake to submit to the Secretary-General for consideration by the Committee a report on the legislative, judicial, administrative, or other measures that they have adopted and that give effect to the provisions of this Convention: (a) within one year after the entry into force of the Convention for the State concerned; and (b) thereafter every two years and whenever the Committee so requests. The Committee may request further information from the States Parties.

"2. The Committee shall report annually through the Secretary-General to the General Assembly on its activities and may make suggestions and general recommendations based on the examination of the reports and information received from the States Parties. Such suggestions and general recommendations shall be reported to the General Assembly together with comments, if any, from States Parties."

Other agencies that report to the U.N. General Assembly have had great influence (comparing favorably, say, with the proved influence of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights).[25] The Article 9(2) directive is of no mean significance.

C. RULES OF THE COMMITTEE

Article 10 of the treaty provides, "The Committee shall adopt its own rules of procedure", and other clauses affect the content of the rules. Our chief aim here is (1) to present draft rules that implement those clauses, and (2) to array types of procedural issues that are likely to confront the Committee.

The draft itself is a project of the 1968 Boalt Hall Summer Seminar in International Legal Studies. The authors were participants in that Seminar and were aided greatly by Dr. Egon Schwelb[26] and Professor Thomas Buergenthal.[27] The documents used as guides included:

Rules of Procedure of the European Commission on Human Rights.[28]

Statute of the International Court of Justice, and that court's rules.[29]

U.N. Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and its Protocol.[30]

Rules of Procedure of the U.N. General Assembly and of its Economic and Social Council.[31]

Provisions of miscellaneous treaties concerning education, investment disputes, etc.[32]

Those documents and several others are pertinent. Yet we warn our readers that there is but a meager jurisprudence which aids officials who must finally promulgate rules like these. The administrative law of international, supranational, and transnational bodies is neither comprehensive nor mature. It begs for analysis and critique.[33]

D. WILL THE UNITED STATES PARTICIPATE?

This treaty was signed and highly praised by Ambassador Arthur Goldberg on September 28, 1966.[34] It has not been forwarded from the White House to the Senate for advice and consent.[35] That fact may puzzle some observers who praised the Johnson administration for its aggressive sponsorship of civil rights reform.[36] Yet a letter from the White House dated January 4, 1968[37] reads in part as follows:

"It is our intention to seek ratification of appropriate human rights conventions and to send them forward when conditions appear favorable.

"I have noted with interest your view that our inability to participate in the administration of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination would jeopardize our national interest. Until such time as the Committee to be elected under this Convention has been formed and has had sufficient time to begin work, we cannot actually determine whether or not United States abstention would significantly affect its work. Nothing presently indicates, however, that our interests would be jeopardized."

Should not American jurists carefully consider this question: Given the data that show the effect on foreign affairs of racial discrimination in the United States,[38] and given the range of powers and the procedural thrusts of this remarkable new Committee, can it really be argued that "United States abstention" will not drastically affect the

---

Footnotes at end of article.

Committee's work? Readers are urged once again to examine the list of nations that appears in the opening paragraphs of this discussion. Those nations, as ratifiers of the treaty, will nominate and then elect the new committeemen and massively influence the formative years. Can the United States possibly justify its role as abstainer?

FOOTNOTES

[*] Professor of Law, University of California, Berkeley.

[1] 18th Report of the Comm'n to Study the Organization of Peace, The United Nations and Human Rights 43 (1968).

[2] *Id.* at 194.

[3] *See* H. Lauterpacht, International Law and Human Rights 126 (1950) (discusses "Lord Acton's judgment that the single confused page of the Declaration of 1789 outweighs libraries and is stronger than all the armies of Napoleon").

[4] *Cf. Measures Taken Within the United Nations in the Field of Human Rights,* U.N. Doc. A/CONF. 32/5 (June 20, 1967), and Add. 1 thereto (Jan. 23, 1968) paras. 357 to 507; *Methods Used by the United Nations in the Field of Human Rights,* U.N. Doc. A/CONF. 32/6 (June 20, 1967), and Add. 1 thereto (Jan. 23, 1968).

[5] *See* Newman, *Ombudsmen and Human Rights: The New U.N. Treaty Proposals,* 34 U. Chi. L. Rev. 951 (1967); *cf.* Carey, *U.N. Response to Government Oppression,* 3 Int'l Law 102 (1968); MacDonald, *The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights,* 1967 Can. Y.B. Int'l L. 84.

[6] U.N. Doc. A/RES/2106 (XX) (1966), reprinted in 60 Am. J. Int'l L. 650 (1966); *see* Schwelb, *The International Convention on the Eliminatoin of All Forms of Racial Discrimination,* 15 Int'l & Comp. L.Q. 996 (1966).

[7] Quoted in 3 U.N. Monthly Chron., Jan. 1965, at 103. Part II of the treaty appears in the Appendix to this Article. For comment on the International Bill of Human Rights, which in December 1966 was approved unanimously by the General Assembly, see Schwelb, *Some Aspects of the International Covenants on Human Rights of December 1966* in International Protection of Human Rights 103 (A. Eide & A. Schou eds. 1968); *cf.* Newman, *Natural Justice, Due Process and the New International Covenants on Human Rights: Prospectus,* 1967 Public L. 274.

[8] Art. 8(1) of the treaty.

[9] Art. 8(4).

[10] U.N. Press Release HR/211, L/T/367, Dec. 5, 1968.

[11] See Art. 1 to 7 of the treaty.

[12] *See* Race, Peace, Law and Southern Africa (Carey ed. 1968); Commission on Human Rights, Report on the 22d Session, E/4184, at 83 (1966) (Measures for the Speedy Implementation of the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination); U.N. Press Release HR/190, Sept. 10, 1968 ("New Delhi Seminar on Elimination of Racial Discrimination Ends with Adoption of Report"); *cf.* comments on International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, 5 U.N. Monthly Chron., April 1968, at 52–55. Apparently that International Day was hardly recognized in the United States. See however Dash, *Police Balk Embassy March,* Wash., Post, Mar. 22, 1968, § B, at 1; Watson, *"Superior Race" Panned on "Discrimination Day," id.* Mar. 23, 1968, § A, at 13; *cf.* U.N. Press Release WS/339, Mar. 29, 1968 (U.S. pledges $25,000 on 40% matching basis to Trust Fund for South Africa) *See also* 5 U.N. Monthly Chron., Mar. 1968, at 72 (WHO amendment authorizes World Health Assembly to exclude from WHO any nation that ignores its constitution's objectives by "deliberately practising a policy of racial discrimination").

[13] *See* Schwelb. *supra* note 6, at 1058; Korey, *The Key to Human Rights—Implementation.* Int'l Concil. 50 (Nov. 1968).

[14] Art. 11(1) of the treaty.

[15] *See* Acheson. *The Arrogance of International Lawyers,* 2 Int'l Law. 591 (1968); McDougal, *Reply to Dean Acheson, id.* at 729; *cf.* McDougal & Reisman, *Rhodesia and the United Nations: The Lawfulness of International Concern,* 62 Am. J. Int'l L. 1 (1968); Race, Peace, Law and Southern Africa, *supra* note 12.

[16] See Art. 12 of the treaty.

[17] Art. 14 of the treaty, the last paragraph of which reads: "The Committee shall be competent to exercise the functions provided for in this article only when at least ten States Parties to this Convention are bound by the declarations in accordance with paragraph 1 of this article."

[18] *See* Newman, *supra* note 5, at 957: Schwelb, *supra* note 6, at 1041; *cf id.* at 1045 ("The Role of the Committee . . . in Regard to Petitions from Dependent Territories").

[19] *Cf. Panel: Implementation and Enforcement of International Decisions,* 1968 Proc. Am. Soc'y Int'l L. 1–35. Article 22 of the racial discrimination treaty reads, "Any dispute between two or more States Parties over the interpretation or application of this Convention, which is not settled by negotiation or by the procedures expressly provided for in this Convention, shall at the request of any of the parties to the dispute be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, unless the disputants agree to another mode of settlement."

[20] W. Gellhorn, Ombudsmen and Others: Citizens' Protectors in Nine Countries 422, 436 (1966).

[21] *See* Council of Europe Report to Int'l Conf. on Human Rights, 1968, 35–45 (1967); C. Morrison, The Developing European Law of Human Rights (1967); *cf.* K. Vasak, La Commisssion Interamericaine des Droits de L'Homme (1968).

[22] A. Robertson, European Institutions 49–50 (1966).

[23] A. B. McNulty, The Establishing of Procedures and Institutions for the International Protection of Human Rights: The European Approach 8 (mimeo 1968).

[24] *Id.* at 11.

[25] *See* J. Carey, International Protection of Human Rights 12 (1968); Bernhard, *Role of the United States Commission on Civil Rights,* 23 L. in Trans. 107 (1963); Parson, *The Individual Right of Petition: A Study of Methods Used by International Organizations to Utilize the Individual as a Source of Information on the Violation of Human Rights,* 13 Wayne L. Rev. 678 (1968).

[26] The excellent articles by Dr. Schwelb that are cited in notes 6 and 7 *supra* were especially helpful. See also his *Some Aspects of the Measures of Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights,* I Human Rights J. 363 (1968), and *Notes on the Early Legislative History of the Measures of Implementation of the Human Rights Covenants* in Melanges Offerts a Polys Modinos 270 (1968).

[27] Illustratively see his *The United Nations and the Development of Rules Relating to Human Rights,* 59 Proc. Am. Soc. Int'l L. 132 (1965); *The Domestic Status of the European Convention on Human Rights: A Second Look,* 7 J. Int'l Comm'n Jurists 55 (1966).

[28] Council of Europe, European Comm'n on Human Rights, Rules of Procedure of the Comm'n (January, 1965).

[29] I.C.J. Stat., annexed to U.N. Charter, June 26, 1946, entered into force October 24, 1947. Rules of Court, Adopted by the I.C.J., May 6, 1946, I.C.J. ser. D, No. 154–83 (2d ed., 1947), [1950–1951] I.C.J.Y.B. 235–62.

[30] International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by G.A. Res. 2200A, 21 U.N. GAOR, Supp. 16, at 52–58, U.N. Doc. A/6316 (1966); text is also reproduced in U.N. Doc. A/CONF. 32/4 at 8.

Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by G.A. Res. 2200A, 11 U.N. GAOR, Supp. 16 at 59–60, U.N. Doc. A/6316 (1966); text is also reproduced in U.N. Doc. A/CONF. 32/4 at 16–18.

[31] Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, U.N. Doc. A/520/Rev. 7 (1964); Rules of Procedure of the Economic and Social Council, U.N. Doc. E/3063/Rev. 1 (1967).

[32] Convention against Discrimination in Education, adopted and opened for ratification, acceptance and accession by the General Conference of the U.N.E.S.C.O., December 14, 1960, 429 U.N.T.S 93; text is reproduced in UN. Doc. A/CONF. 32/4 at 30–33.

Protocol Instituting a Conciliation and Good Offices Commission to be responsible for seeking a settlement of any disputes which may arise between States Parties to the Convention against Discrimination in Education. Adopted by the General Conference of the U.N.E.S.C.O. December 10, 1962; text is reproduced in U.N. Doc. A/CONF. 32/4 at 33–36.

Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States, opened for signature, ratification, acceptance or approval March 18, 1965, 575 U.N.T.S. 159; text is reproduced in 4 Int'l Legal Materials 532–44.

[33] See Newman, *supra* note 7, at 312 n. 18.

[34] See Dept. of State Press Release 6/49a–1066 BT, noting that the U.S. signature was accompanied by this statement: "The Constitution of the United States contains provisions for the protection of individual rights, such as the right of free speech, and nothing in the Convention shall be deemed to require or to authorize legislation or other action by the United States of America incompatible with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States of America." *Cf.* Statement by Mr. Goldberg, Committee III, December 14, 1965, 54 Dept. State Bull. 212 (1966); Statement by Miss Willis, Plenary Session, December 21, *id.* at 216.

[35] See Senator Proxmire, *President's Commission for Human Rights Again Calls for Ratification of Convention,* Congressional Record, vol. 114, pt. 20, pp. 25788–25789; cf. Congressional Record, vol. 114, pt. 23, p. 29608.

[36] "Gov. Harriman attended the September 17 meeting [of the President's Commission for the Observance of Human Rights Year] and cited President Johnson as achieving more progress in human rights than any of his predecessors." News of the Com'n, No. 2 (Oct. 1968) at 1.

[37] Letter to F. C. Newman from E. E. Goldstein, Special Assistant to the President (on file with the *California Law Review*); *cf.* Schwelb, *supra* note 6, at 1058.

[38] ". . . Secretary of State Dean Acheson . . . said, in 1952, that 'the continuance of racial discrimination in the United States remains a source of constant embarrassment to this Government in the day-to-day conduct of its foreign relations; and it jeopardizes the effective maintenance of our moral leadership of the free and democratic nations of the world.'" Quoted in Deutsch, *Views from Many Bridges on School Segregation and Integration,* 51 A.B.A.J. 233, 236 (1965); *cf. U.S. Race Problems No Longer a Domestic Affair—Wilkins,* Oakland Post, May 8, 1968, at 1.

DEFENSE SPENDING MUST BE REVIEWED

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at tnis point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have on a number of occasions cautioned the Members of this body that the defense budget can no longer be considered a sacred cow. The enormous sums we are now devoting to defense claim the lion's share of the resources of the Federal Treasury. Vietnam now costs more each year than we are spending at the Federal, State, and local level on public education. And non-Vietnam defense expenditures claim $5 out of every $8 paid by individuals in income taxes this year. In total, defense expenditures claim nearly 100 percent of all personal income taxes paid.

In my view, we can preserve the security of the United States with many billions less than we are now spending—even on the non-Vietnam defense expenditures. Several items recently in the news have disclosed substantial waste in defense spending—ABM, Spanish bases, battle tanks, are only a few of them. In the coming months the Congress will have to come to grips with this staggering misallocation of national tax revenues.

The press has begun to notice this need. In particular, the New York Times of Sunday, April 6, 1969, carrying the column of James Reston, notes the growing battle which looms over maintenance of the present enormous defense appropriations. I commend this column to the readers of the RECORD, and include it at this point:

THE $25 BILLION QUESTION

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 5.—The strategy of the Nixon Administration is now beginning to come clear. The indications are that the President has decided to reduce the level of violence at once in Vietnam, begin withdrawing substantial forces from that conflict by the end of 1969, and negotiate a cease-fire, a compromise settlement and a complete withdrawal of American troops from that country by the end of 1970.

There are, of course, many variables in this strategy. President Nixon's principal advisers, for example, are divided now over just how many men can be pulled out this year—the figures at issue are from 50,000 to 100,000—and they are also divided over continuing or reducing the present level of search and destroy missions in Vietnam, but the general direction of policy has apparently been set. It is toward de-escalation and disengagement and this has already started a quiet struggle over the post-Vietnam defense budget.

The debate over the anti-ballistic-missile system is only the beginning of it. The scope and scale of the battle over the defense budget has not yet emerged in public, but in private here it is developing into a major effort, not merely to cut the armed services back by a few billions, but to challenge many of the basic assumptions of the Pentagon and swing it back from around $80 billion a year to $50- or $55-billion.

This is the really big political confrontation that is over the horizon in America, and it dwarfs all the other confrontations over the cities and the races, and the universities, and poverty and the health services, for it is a $25-billion question that influences not only defense policy but the whole field of social and political reconstruction.

NIXON AND LAIRD

This is not the kind of fundamental question President Nixon likes. His way is to modify existing policies and to give the impression of change without changing things very much. But he is faced with radical and even dangerous problems which cautious adjustments will not remove. After all the polite talk and Sunday supplement articles about the military-industrial complex, there are now powerful men and forces in this country which are finally determined to take this issue by the throat and force a major reallocation of national resources away from military defense and toward reconstruction on the home front.

The Pentagon, the lobbyists for the aerospace industries and the powerful Congressmen whose districts benefit from the big defense contracts have recognized this coming defense budget battle quicker than the politicians, preachers, publicists and students who are writing and demonstrating for social reconstruction in this country.

They are already arguing that after the end of the Vietnam war it will be essential to develop the new weapons systems that have been postponed because of the war in Vietnam. They are not very original but they are very determined. They are warning on Capitol Hill at precisely the right points of power about a new "missile gap." They are talking about "new intelligence" that "proves" the Soviets have an intercontinental first-strike missile that can destroy our defenses and place our security in jeopardy.

Therefore, while they admit that we have to cut the defense budget some after Vietnam to make more money available for the problems at home, they are arguing with considerable skill that we must be "realistic" and keep the cuts to a very few billion.

This appeal to national pride and fear of the Soviet may not be very original, but it is directed very accurately at the key men in Congress whose power and political interests rest on a continuation of vast military budgets.

LAIRD'S POWER

Also, the new Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird of Wisconsin, is the only man in the Nixon Cabinet who has a powerful political constituency of his own. He has great influence with the political leaders of the Republican party. His personal view of how to defend the country coincides very closely to the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the views of Chairmen Russell and Stennis and the other military-oriented elders of the Congress, and this is a formidable coalition not only of political but of military, industrial, and one must now add labor union forces that would like to keep the military budget about where it is, even after Vietnam.

This is not a political conspiracy. These are not cynical men. They honestly think that the best way to defend the country from its external enemies, keep the national economy booming along, and minimize unemployment is to maintain a defense budget of from $75 to $80 billion.

The issue is really philosophical. How best to defend the nation? What threatens it most—its external enemies or its internal divisions and chaos? And specifically, whether to take $20 to $25 billion out of the military budget for the home front, or go on assuming that the external threat is greater than anything else.

These issues will come up even if the Administration's deescalation and disengagement policies in Vietnam do not work. The country has gone through these same arguments about how much money had to be voted for the Pentagon in the Truman Administration—only then the hawks were saying we would be destroyed if we didn't vote $15 billion for military defense, and the doves were saying the budget had to be kept to $10 or $12 billion.

The difference now is that the military have prevailed for over a generation, and even with over $75 billion for military defense, the external problems remain and the internal problems have become much more serious. So we are now approaching a defense budget debate of major proportions, for only by deep cuts in this budget will it be possible to pay for the reconstruction programs on the homefront.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT AND PARTISAN POLITICS

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, early in his administration, President Nixon stated that the Post Office Department would be taken out of partisan politics and the patronage system.

This decision had my enthusiastic support, and my congratulations on the decision were made to the White House.

In more recent correspondence with Mr. Nixon, I pointed out that my experience regarding the Post Office and political patronage has indicated that this practice has, unfortunately, not ended.

Not only have I learned that 15 individuals, all representatives of big business, have been named as acting regional directors, referred to in Post Office press releases as "expert consultants," but I have discovered that Post Office personnel in the regional post offices can no longer talk to a Member of Congress.

This situation came to light when I made a routine inquiry of the regional post office at Memphis. It has been my practice, on many occasions, to simply pick up the telephone and call the regional director when I had an inquiry or a problem from a constituent relating to a post office matter. But now, I am told, that an inquiry, even of a routine nature, must be made to an Assistant to the Postmaster General in Washington, who then must contact the regional office. Then a reply is given the Assistant, who passes the reply on the congressional Member. Thus, we add to the expense of Government operations, multiply the maze of Government bureaucracy, delay action on an inquiry, and suffer from a marked inability to provide prompt service to constituents.

In my correspondence with the President, I pointed out that Mr. Ted Ripa, of Chicago, an aide in Mr. Nixon's presidential campaign, had resigned his position as an executive with Martha Washington Kitchens of Chicago, and has now become the acting regional director with the regional post office at Memphis, Tenn. I have asked the President to inform me in what way Mr. Ripa's experience as an executive with Martha Washington Kitchens qualifies him to serve as a $100-a-day expert consultant as acting regional director with the Post Office Department.

Perhaps Martha Washington Kitchens is another fast food service organization and Mr. Ripa is going to incorporate the techniques of the convenience food industry into our postal system.

Actually, these "expert consultants" are receiving $98 a day for their services as acting regional directors. This fee sounds like a bargain basement special at a merchandise sale, but it appears that it will be at the expense of the taxpayer. In fact, we could expect a request for a postal rate increase to pay the consultant fees.

In my correspondence with the White House I have asked if it could be made public how many of the acting regional directors are members of the Republican Party, and what role, if any, they played in the presidential campaign. In addition, I have asked how long these individuals have been serving as "expert consultants" at the 15 regional post offices, how long they will remain in these positions, how they were selected, and what were the qualification requirements for the positions.

In addition, I would like to know, and I believe my fellow Members of Congress would like to know, if these expert consultants were, in fact, being trained to take over the posts of regional directors.

If they are being trained to become regional directors, perhaps this should come under the Department of Labor and its on-the-job training program.

For the benefit of my colleagues, the 15 acting regional directors are—

Dallas region: James Upfield, former vice president, Bayfield Industries Division, Automatic Sprinkler Corp.

Denver region: Robert Balbasin, of Denver, former vice president of development, May Department Store Co.

Minneapolis region: Joe D. Austin, of Minneapolis, senior vice president and member of the board of directors, Minnesota National Life Insurance Co.

Seattle region: Frank Cleary, former vice president, Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Co.

San Francisco region: Gere T. West, vice president of traffic, Consolidated Freightways.

St. Louis region: Albert P. Viragh, former vice president, Hussmann Refrigerator Division, Pet, Inc.

Washington, D.C., region: Herman Intemann, of Arlington, Va., former vice president Union Carbide Corp.

Atlanta region: William Haile, of Mooresville, N.C., former executive vice president, Union Carbide Corp.

Austin region: E. L. Mears, of Lexington, Mass., vice president, Industrial Chemical Group, W. P. Grace & Co.

Chicago region: John L. Fike, of Chicago, former general superintendent, Swift & Co.

Cincinnati region: Kroger Pettengill, of Cincinnati, former president, First National Bank of Cincinnati.

New York region: Harold Larson, of White Plains, N.Y., former vice president, American Can Co.

Philadelphia region: Raymond F. Winch of Swathmore, Pa., manager, marketing planning, Sun Oil Co.

Witchita region: Russ James, of Witchita, currently an administrator for the Kansas division of the Boeing Co.

Memphis region: Ted Ripa, of Chicago, former vice president in charge of marketing, Martha Washington Kitchens.

If we are, in reality, to remove the Post Office Department from political patronage, these are questions which must be answered and explained. I feel all of us want to create a truly efficient and fiscally sound postal operation, staffed with a professional corps of postal employees and executives.

PRESIDENTIAL POSITION ON EFFORTS TO EXEMPT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FROM TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the apparent inconsistencies and equivocations in the policies of the new administration in the area of civil rights have properly caused increasing concern in the press and among interested citizens. An excellent commentary by John P. MacKenzie appeared in the April 14 issue of the Washington Post entitled "Nixon Civil Rights Policy Appears Mired in Confusion," the text of which follows these remarks.

Several Members of the House have indicated their desire to see the legislation extending and improving the Elementary and Secondary Education Act contain a provision exempting programs under the act from title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VI, as many Members of this body are well aware, requires nondiscrimination in federally funded programs.

The House Members who supported such an exemption in committee are now weighing the possibility of offering it as an amendment on the House floor.

Here is an opportunity, it seems to me, for the President clearly and simply to clarify his views and policies on civil rights—by announcing immediately his opposition to any such amendment, and by using his influence to prevent this amendment from being offered on the floor and to oppose it with the full weight of his office if it is offered.

The issue here, Mr. Speaker, is quite clear. Either schools and school boards will be required to comply with title VI as interpreted in detail by the relevant executive agencies, or they will not. For the President to take action here will not require extensive effort on his part, or on the part of his already overworked staff. It would, however, put the new administration on record on the question of civil rights in the schools, and I urge the President to advise the Congress of his position on this matter.

The article referred to follows:

NIXON CIVIL RIGHTS POLICY APPEARS MIRED IN CONFUSION

(By John P. MacKenzie)

Less than three months after taking office, the Nixon Administration appears to have as many civil rights policies as there are agencies with civil rights duties.

So far, it's been a record of activism and equivocation, of creative effort and indifference, of talk and conduct that both excites and worries Negro leaders. The only central themes have been lack of coordination and a tendency to react and improvise rather than initiate action.

On the same day that the Justice Department's civil rights chieftian announces a bold new move to protect Negroes from real estate "blockbusting", the Secretary of Transportation is roasted on Capitol Hill for easing up on equal employment demands for highway builders.

On the same day that the Justice Department sues a textile mill for job and company housing bias, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund is taking the Pentagon to court for letting three prime textile contractors off the hook over their hiring, promoting and company housing practices.

In one 24-hour span, President Nixon vows publicly that the executive branch shall "lead the way as an equal opportunity employer"—and his press secretary states that the Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, freshly rebuked by Senate Republican leader Everett Dirksen for "harassing" employers, will be replaced.

Beneath these appearances of confusion and lack of direction, there is real confusion and lack of direction—although the young Administration's failure to attempt high-level, across-the-board civil rights enforcement may not be entirely an accident.

Assistant Attorney General Jerris Leonard for example, did not know in advance that the Defense Department was accepting verbal equal employment assurances from the textile firms rather than the written promises required by a 1965 executive order.

Such a snafu probably would not have happened under President Johnson who, besides making his stand on civil rights very clear, designated Attorney General Ramsey Clark as his man, Government-wide, to ensure enforcement of Federal law barring financial aid to areas plagued by discrimination

Nobody has stepped forward to claim the laurels of Mr. Civil Rights for the Nixon Administration, partly perhaps because Attorney General John N. Mitchell has indicated he wants to make the line between Justice and, say, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, firmer rather than fuzzier where they have over lapping jurisdiction such as in school desegregation.

The total effect each department going its own way, is not one of neutrality toward civil rights. The Pentagon's failure to submit its contracting policy to scrutiny elsewhere in Government amounts to a decision to avoid the kind of review that almost certainly would build pressures for a tough Defense Department policy.

Besides making it easier to temporize, such lack of necessary embarrassment. The Pentagon made its textile announcement within hours of President Nixon's promise to NAACP Executive Secretary Roy N. Wilkins to investigate complaints on the subject—a bureaucratic goof that no cynic could have stage-managed.

Leonard, 39-year-old former Wisconsin state legislator, has overcome an initial setback about his membership in a segregated Milwaukee club to earn a reputation among many civil rights workers for a sincere desire to enforce Federal law vigorously.

He stepped in quickly to argue in the Supreme Court on the side of Negroes who tried to desegregate a recreation area near Little Rock, Ark. When he filed a friend-of-the-court brief in a Chicago "blockbusting" case, lawyers for Negroes there credited him with a creative legal argument and they were grateful to have the prestige of the United States Government thrown in as well.

Leonard is regarded by some subordinates as easily educated in the intricacies of civil rights enforcement, but he is being watched to see whether he can capture the appropriations needed to unfreeze the current travel restrictions that keep many bias fighters chairborne.

At HEW, Secretary Robert H. Finch weathered an initial period of unpreparedness and uncertainty to begin a pattern of toughness over school desegregation-Federal aid guidelines.

But Finch's appointment of Robert C.

Mardian, who has urged a quiet cutback in Federal fund cutoffs, as general counsel, counterbalanced his naming of Leon A. Panetta, a liberal, to do the actual enforcing, has created a new mix of emotions and expectations. So have Finch's own conflicting public statements on civil rights issues.

No civil rights legislative program has emerged, but it will be surprising if the White House backs a Johnson Administration proposal for enforcement powers for the Employment Commission, since Dirksen has upbraided former chairman Clifford A. Alexander Jr. for his use of its existing powers.

The Administration's failure to coordinate with Dirksen plus an ill-timed White House statement the next day saying Alexander would be replaced as chairman combined for the maximum Administration embarrassment. Knowing that Alexander, a Democrat, could become difficult to handle politically, the Administration nonetheless managed to let Alexander resign as chairman (while remaining on the commission) in a righteous huff rather than quietly.

The signs are scant that segregationist Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) wields great influence on civil rights matters. But signs are plentiful that the Nixon Administration will continue for some time to move in several directions at once on civil rights.

COMMUNIST AIR AGGRESSION

(**Mr. RARICK** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the news that the Communist regime of North Korea has shot down a U.S. reconnaissance plane resulting in the apparent murder of 31 U.S. boys has shocked the conscience of the peace-seeking world.

Compare, for example, the barbaric act of the Government of North Korea toward our U.S. aircraft with the reports of Soviet bombers regularly flying along the U.S. coast. Compare also this action with the piracy at high seas in the capture of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and the subsequent imprisonment and torture of the American crew.

How can any informed American believe that we can negotiate peace from a position of weakness through supposed assistance from the Soviet Union, when it is the Soviets and their arms escalation and military equipment that underwrites these atrocities?

The American people must awaken our leaders that there can be no peace until we go after the peace—not by pacifist verbiage—but by a policy of retaliation and announced efforts that we are going to win our goals—including an announced all-out effort for peace through victory and the unequivocal backing of our boys wherever they serve.

I include several news articles following my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 15, 1969]

NORTH KOREA SAYS U.S. PLANE DOWNED—NAVY SPY CRAFT WITH 31 MISSING IN SEA OF JAPAN—COMBAT PATROL COVER PROVIDED FOR AIR SEARCH

TOKYO.—North Korea, which captured the U.S. intelligence ship Pueblo, reported today its air force shot down a large American reconnaissance plane.

In Washington, the Defense Department said a Navy reconnaissance plane with 31 aboard was missing in the Sea of Japan.

North Korea's official Central News Agency said "a large-sized modernly equipped reconnaissance plane" intruded deep into North Korean air space and was shot down. The time given for the downing of the plane was 1:50 p.m. or 11:50 p.m. EST yesterday.

The broadcast gave no information on the fate of those aboard.

It said only that the North Korean air force shot the plane down at a high altitude "by showering fire of revenge upon it."

ROUTINE RECONNAISSANCE

In Washington, the Defense Department said the Navy EC121 plane, based at Atsugi, Japan, was flying "a routine reconnaissance track" which kept it at least 50 nautical miles from the North Korean coastline.

The Pentagon did not immediately confirm that the North Koreans shot down the huge electronics-packed aircraft but said only that a broad search was launched for the plane and its crew of 30 Navy men and one Marine.

At the Capitol, however, Vice Adm. J. B. Colwell, deputy chief of naval operations, talked as though hostile action was involved.

He called the incident "a clear case of international piracy and a breach of international law." He talked briefly with newsmen before going into a closed session of the House Armed Services Committee. He declined to give further details in public.

PRESIDENT AWAKENED

At the White House, press secretary Ronald L. Ziegler said President Nixon was awakened "early this morning" to be told about the missing plane.

Ziegler declined to say just when Nixon was awakened, but said the information was relayed to the President by telephone from Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, his special assistant for national security affairs.

A Defense Department spokesman said the aircraft commander was under orders to approach no closer than 50 miles to the coast of North Korea.

The EC121 carried two 20-man life-rafts.

The Defense Department said combat patrol cover was being provided for two search planes, an HC130 Hercules and a KC135 tanker.

The destroyers Tucker and Dale, which have been based at Sashebo, Japan, were ordered to head toward the search area.

The EC121 is heavily-loaded with electronic gear, as was the U.S. intelligence ship Pueblo, which was captured off the North Korean coast on Jan. 23, 1968. The U.S. claimed at the time the ship was in international waters about 25 miles off the North Korean coast.

Search operations today apparently were centered within 200 miles of where the Pueblo and its 83 crewmen were captured. The crew was released late last year. The Pentagon said the air search today is centered about 95 miles southeast of Chongjin, North Korea.

The U.S. Embassy in Moscow today asked Soviet assistance in searching for survivors of the plane. A spokesman said the embassy had informed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the plane's disappearance and sought help from any Russian ships that might be in the area. Japanese fishing boats already have joined the search.

At the Pentagon, Daniel Z. Henkin, the Defense Department's chief spokesman, dodged all questions on what may have happened but said "the aircraft was in communication with its base during its mission."

"We have no information at this time which confirms the sighting of any survivors," Henkin said.

Pentagon records indicated this would be the first U.S.-North Korean air clash in 10 years.

In June 1959 a Navy P4 patrol plane was attacked by a MIG jet in the Sea of Japan about 85 miles east of Wonsan, North Korea. A tail gunner was seriously wounded in that incident but the damaged plane returned safely to a base in Japan.

The missing airplane is a converted Lockheed Super Constellation. It has a big hump in the top of the fuselage to carry radar and other monitoring devices.

"It is a large-crew airplane," the spokesman said, confirming that 31 men would not be an unusual number to be aboard. The monitoring equipment requires a number of operators.

The North Korean agency said the "U.S. imperialist aggressor army which has been rapidly intensifying the war provocation maneuvers against (North Korea) of late perpetrated on the morning of the 15th the grave provocation of infiltrating deep into the territorial air of the republic a large size modernly equipped reconnaissance plane to conduct reconnaissance, while perpetrating grave provocations along the military demarcation line."

It said the North Korean air force "instantly spotted" the plane and "scored the brilliant battle success" of shooting it down.

"The U.S. imperialist aggressors must bear in mind that the stern warning of the Korean People's Army is not empty talk and the Korean People's Army counters any provocation of the U.S. imperialist aggressors instantly with a hundred-fold, thousand-fold retaliatory blow," the broadcast said.

About the time of the announcement in Washington, the U.S. Navy in Saigon abruptly cancelled an awards ceremony tomorrow aboard the aircraft carrier Ranger off Vietnam.

A Navy Spokesman in Saigon said he did not know if the cancellation was directly connected with the plane incident.

South Vietnam's defense minister and other officials had been scheduled to go aboard the Ranger to present medals to about 50 U.S. Navy men.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State-Times, Apr. 8, 1969]

SOVIET BOMBERS ARE FLYING REGULARLY TO WITHIN MILES OF U.S. COAST

(By Bob Horton)

WASHINGTON.—Soviet bomber flights to the fringe of North America have become so routine in recent months that U.S. fighters aren't always sent to intercept them, according to Pentagon sources.

Over the last 15 months, these sources say, there have been about three dozen incidents of Soviet planes flying near continental North America, usually Alaska or Canada.

However, the Soviets have been careful to turn back before actually flying over U.S. or Canadian territory, the sources said.

While continental defense officials occasionally may decide not to scramble interceptors, the Soviet bombers are always monitored on radar from the time they get within a few hundred miles of the North American coastline until they leave.

Only two or three of the Soviet missions have been disclosed officially by the Pentagon, which indicates the low key attitude the U.S. government is taking.

The most recent Soviet flight, sources report, occurred April 1 when eight to 10 TU16 Badgers came within 65 miles of Northwest Alaska.

The Alaskan Air Command scrambled F102 interceptors, but no nose-to-nose confrontation was necessary.

The Badger is a twin turbo jet aircraft roughly comparable to the old American B47 and capable of speeds up to 580 mph.

Seven other Soviet flights near U.S. territory this year are recorded on a list now stamped secret in the Pentagon.

In addition, there were more than 25 other similar incidents in 1968 not only off Alaska but near Newfoundland, Labrador, Iceland, and around the Aleutian Island chain in the Pacific.

GROUP OF SEVEN

Usually the Soviet planes show up in groups of two or three, but on one mission this past January, seven TU95 Bear reconnaissance bombers came within 30 nautical miles of Northwest Alaska. The Bear is a 500 mph turbo prop capable of flying 7,800 miles without refueling.

Six to eight Bears were intercepted by U.S. fighters last summer, again off Northwestern Alaska, in another major flight which went unpublicized.

Pentagon sources say the Soviets have been careful to halt their approaches within 30 to 150 miles of North American territory during the 15-month period.

In 1963 the United States protested strongly to the Soviet Union that two reconnaissance bombers had flown 30 miles inland across the southwestern tip of Alaska. The Soviets denied any incursion.

Pentagon sources are frank to admit the United States has no real basis for complaint so long as the Soviet planes remain outside NATO territory.

Furthermore, the United States could hardly protest that the flights are provocative. Strategic Air Command training missions send nuclear-capable B52s quite regularly into Arctic regions near Soviet territory.

PROBABLE REASONS

Sources believe the Soviets have three reasons for conducting what appears to be a regular program of flights toward the United States:

They want to keep a constant check on how long it takes U.S. radar to detect incoming planes and scramble fighters to intercept them.

The flights provide Soviet air crews with training made highly realistic when U.S. fighters meet them.

The Soviets collect various intelligence information from the missions. Even without flying over U.S. territory, they can take long range photographs, test radar detection systems and maintain data on American radio frequencies.

The decision whether to send U.S. jets to meet Soviet planes entering the air defense zone usually depends on the speed and angle of approach of the incoming flight.

Interceptors are designed mainly to assure the Soviets that their presence has been detected.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 24, 1969]

New types of Soviet weapons are showing up in the Vietnam war. U.S. Marines have captured Soviet D–74 field guns that can fire 55-pound high-explosive shells more than 13 miles and penetrate 7 inches of armor plate. The Marines also have sighted the first self-propelled guns known to be used by the enemy. They are believed to be the Russian-made JSU–122 assault guns.

[From Human Events, Apr. 19, 1969]

MILITARY REPOSITIONED AROUND GLOBE—BEHIND THE SOVIETS' "FORWARD STRATEGY"

(By Paul Scott)

The dramatic movement of powerful Soviet naval units from the Arctic to the Pacific Ocean is an integral part of the Kremlin's strategy of repositioning its military forces in strategic areas of the world.

Although U.S. intelligence authorities are split over the immediate impact on the West of this Russian naval build-up in the Pacific, the majority agree the transfer of ships gives the Kremlin a powerful new military lever to influence future events on the Korean peninsula, in Asia, and other areas of the world.

Strikingly illustrative of this expanding "forward strategy" are the following Soviet military movements during the past year:

(1) the positioning of 80,000 Russian troops in Czechoslovakia near the West German border; (2) movement of 20,000 additional troops into East Germany and Poland; (3) shifting a large number of Russian ships to the Mediterranean; and (4) basing of Soviet long-range bombers in the United Arab Republic; (5) increasing of military supplies to Arab nations; (6) supplying of arms to Nigeria to internationalize the war there; (7) increasing the flow of arms to North Viet Nam; and (8) shifting of Arctic Ocean naval units to the Pacific.

Significantly, the transferring Soviet navy units have aboard an unusually large number of bilingual communication officers who speak either Korean or Japanese in addition to their native tongue.

Presence of these officers, detected before the Soviet naval units left Murmansk, greatly puzzled American naval intelligence officers until the final destination of the Red naval units was uncovered by the British.

While Russian diplomats are dropping hints all over the world that the Soviet naval movement is designed to meet "the growing Chinese Communist border threat" in the Far East, U.S. intelligence authorities believe there is much more to the Soviet strategic power build-up in the Pacific.

For instance, South Korean intelligence officials have warned the U.S. that the naval transfer is part of Moscow's preparations to support a 1970 invasion of their country by the North Koreans.

This latter threat is considered so real that Speaker John McCormack (D.-Mass.) recently arranged for a congressional delegation headed by House Majority Leader Carl Albert (D.-Okla.) to fly to South Korea to indicate U.S. backing for that government. The lawmakers agreed to work for a step-up of American military aid as a move to deter the Communists.

According to the South Koreans, Kim Il Sung, tempestuous North Korean dictator, is merely waiting to strike until American forces become so mired down in Viet Nam that they cannot defend Korea.

As of today, the priorities of the Viet Nam war have left South Korea woefully unprepared to resist another invasion. More than 50,000 of South Korea's best troops have been drawn out of the line to fight in Viet Nam.

The 50,000 Americans who hold 18 miles of the 151-mile Korean front are ill-equipped to face North Korea's modern 400,000-man army and air force without additional air and ground support from other U.S. bases.

The frantic war preparations in North Korea, plus the unpreparedness in the south, could make Korea a future Pearl Harbor for American forces there if Moscow decides the time is ripe to have Soviet-trained Kim Il Sung open a second Asian front.

It is known here that Moscow's agents in Japan have instructions to ferment a new round of strikes and protests designed to force the present Japanese government to block use of U.S. bases there in any new Korean war. These protests will be centered around opposition to proposed renewal of U.S.-Japanese defense agreements.

These are the little-aired developments in the Far East that President Nixon is being urged by his intelligence advisers to consider in his assessment of the movement of Soviet naval units to the Pacific.

The blow-up of Sino-Soviet border clashes by Moscow is considered highly significant by Nixon's intelligence advisers, but they caution that far too little is known about the incidents to determine whether they were connected with the naval movement or are being used as a cover for more sinister Russian intentions.

One of the most interesting articles on current Soviet foreign policy and strategy being studied at the highest level of the Nixon Administration was written by Joseph Schiebel, director of the Russian area studies program and professor of history of Georgetown University.

Titled "Convergence or Confrontation?", the Schiebel article gives a bleak prospect of a less militant Russia, stating:

"A whole array of military and particularly naval developments and the imminent succession by the Soviet Union to strategic bases (especially those which would permit the Soviet Union almost total domination over the Near and Middle East) . . . point to a preoccupation with techniques of empire by strategic control. . . .

"The emergence of the Soviet Union as a substantive provider of development aid (with strategic strings attached to much of it), as a marketer of major competitive goods (oil, advanced aricraft, etc.) and as a factor in the international money market indicate a growing capacity in this medium of political control. . . ."

Schiebel's forecast that the Kremlin's effort to undermine relations between West Germany and the U.S., the national liberation strategy, and the strategy of isolating the U.S. as a world power will dominate operational aspects of Soviet foreign policy in the foreseeable future.

"The Soviet leaders are not omnipotent supermen," he concludes. "They owe their successes to the fact that they were able to so organize and arrange their advances that there would be no enemies."

The article appears in the 1968–69 Winter Issue of the *Intercollegiate Review*.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 11, 1969]

AMERICAN ERA OF UNEQUALED MIGHT SEEN AT END

(By Alfred Friendly)

LONDON, April 10.—A 20-year period in which American policy alone largely shaped the pattern of international politics probably ended last year, a group of defense experts believes. The Soviet Union, they say, "must now be treated as a full equal in terms both of strategic power and of her ability to control conflict in the developing world."

The judgment is that of the annual survey of Britain's highly esteemed Institute for Strategic Studies, made public today.

The survey said that for various reasons 1968 marked "the end of the American desire and ability to be the universal and dominant power."

U.S.S.R. EQUALS UNITED STATES

At the same time, the Soviet Union, having equalled the United States in intercontinental ballistic missile strength, has increased and diversified its other military capabilities to the point where it can intervene more actively in local conflicts and wars distant from its borders—even as the United States can, and has done.

There was no clear evidence during the year, the survey declared, to indicate whether the increase in the power and diversity of Russian military capability meant that "an active intervention strategy was in the making" or whether it was merely to give the Soviet Union "the panoply of a superpower" and the same range of options the United States enjoys for prestige and bargaining.

But, the survey authors continued, support for the first interpretation came from the Soviet Union's proclamation of the so-called Brezhnev doctrine—the right of intervention in the "socialist commonwealth." That concept could mean intervention not just in an Eastern European country like Rumania or even Yugoslavia; "it could mean Syria or other left-wing Arab states; it could mean China," the survey said.

THREAT TO BLOC

Reviewing the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, the survey said there was little evidence that developments within the country before August were seen as an immediate security threat to the Soviet Union or its system, but much evidence that they were regarded as threats to the ability of other nations in the Eastern Bloc "to contain their own internal changes."

The invasion served to delay U.S.-Soviet arms control discussions—although the United States was held back more by "a sense of propriety than a reduced appetite for detente,"—but it did not affect the discussions in principle, the report said. Moreover, the invasion did not change the fact that the NATO nations had no alternative to trying to continue to reach a detente with the Soviet Union.

But the major consequence of the invasion, the survey asserted, was in Eastern Europe itself, where the Soviet action fundamentally changed the status quo.

In terms favorable to Russia, it reestablished the credibility of its military power as the prime instrument of its control in Eastern Europe; it seems to have snuffed out the Czechoslovak reformist movement; it left a larger Soviet military presence deployed on NATO's doorstep, and it served warning on West Germany of the dangers of continuing its wooing of the Eastern Bloc.

On the debit side, the survey said, the invasion shattered the image of a mellowing Soviet Union; frightened NATO into some fresh vibrations; menaced the unity of the Communist movement outside the Eastern Bloc, and "prompted the United States to begin mending her relations with her European allies."

The survey's gloomiest forecasts were focussed on the Arab-Israel conflict, where it found that "the materials from which a settlement" could be built are still inadequate.

Worse, it continued, the Palestine liberation movements have risen to such power that the largest, Al Fatah, now acts almost as a nation, but without a nation's formal structure. Thus, there is "a serious question whether any Arab regime could survive a settlement" in the face of the Fedayeen groups' opposition.

If the Arab governments delay in resolving their own relations, redefining their objectives and reasserting their own domestic authority, the survey warned, Israel's own considerations about "defense and deterrence" may lead it to invoking the nuclear option which she has almost certainly acquired."

SEXATION IN THE CLASSROOM

(Mr. **RARICK** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. **RARICK**. Mr. Speaker, as parents across the Nation become more aware of the inherent dangers of sex education in the schools, opposition to it begins to stiffen and become more organized.

The material for sex education is spread and pushed by an outfit calling itself the Sex Education and Information Council of the United States—SIECUS.

Scores of school boards in the United States have cited a lack of opposition to the teaching of this explosive material on sex as justification of its introduction into the school curriculum.

However, the answer to this is obvious—parents have previously had very limited access to the sensational material produced by SIECUS. As they do become aware—and more are becoming aware everyday—opposition to this lurid material stiffens.

The March 1969, edition of the journal of the Sarasota, Fla., County Medical Society contains two interesting and timely articles on sex in the schools and an informative and enlightening article on this subject appeared in the April 12, 1969, edition of the Prince Georges Sentinel published in neighboring Prince Georges County, Md. Also, a letter to the editor of the County News of Prince Georges from a concerned parent should be of equal interest to my colleagues.

I present these to follow my remarks:

THE JET SEX

(By William Campbell Douglass, M.D.)

When I was growing up, there were two sexes—the male sex and the female sex. My medical school anatomy course confirmed this. But recently something new has evolved from our schools—the Jet Sex. This is the generation of "sexually free" children, who are taught from *kindergarten* how to do it, how babies are made and how they are avoided. The Jet Sex is taught that the issue isn't morality, but fornication without fear. Religion is *out* of our schools, but coition is rapidly becoming the biggest thing since the new math. The children are assaulted with detailed texts, "study guides," visual aids, clay for modeling the human phallus, and everything conceivable short of copulation rooms—and even this has been suggested. In one school, for instance, the teacher, (who can only be described as sick, sick, sick), herded her little charges into a darkened room and had them feel each other.

One film now in vogue for *Kindergarten* shows dogs copulating followed by a human couple in bed under sheets. A recorded voice explains: "Mummy and Daddy are doing the same thing the dogs do." Now really, isn't that a bit much—even for the Jet Sex?

I mentioned sex education in the schools to a friend and he immediately replied, "Well, it's about time!" The implication was that finally someone was *doing* something and we would at last "understand" and "be natural" with sex—thereby bringing on the millenium and a non-neurotic world. But aren't there some things that are better off *not* understood during the formative years? Perhaps I am antedelvian in my thinking (I have been accused of such) but what happens to beauty and art when everything is reduced to a mathematical certainty? Our 20th century explorers have already taken the moon out of poetry and song by informing us that it is a "forbidding and foreboding place." Must we not deromantasize sex with clinical discussions in mixed company in the classroom? As the brilliant Alan Stang, writing in The Review of the News of February 5, 1969, put it: "—observe that what is happening . . . isn't just that sex is being given the most repulsive treatment possible—which it is—but that man's greatest, private pleasure is being made commercial; being made a public spectacle enjoyed by a crowd."

Certainly there is nothing wrong with giving anatomical courses to senior high school students (which is being done by the medical profession here). Most of the kids at this age already understand the reproductive process and perhaps these courses in the mechanism of conception clear up points of confusion. *But let's leave the little ones to their hopscotch and softball.* Psychiatrist Melvin Anchell puts its bluntly: "It catapults the child into advance sexual information; it perverts the child—if you turn into an obstetrician at eight years of age, you have developed a fixation—I think it is creating more perverts than were ever created before."

This is a delicate subject. But it deserves our serious consideration for it is being taught to our children with increasing boldness and diminishing restraint. What goes on in the depths of the mind of a 6 year old boy when he is shown pictures or models of the adult male phallus? Has it occured to the sexperts that they may be engendering a strong inferiority complex that could well carry through to adult life? Mighten the child "act out," as the psychiatrists say, this inferiority complex with promiscuity in a never ending attempt to prove his maleness, to prove his sexual equality with other males?

What of the 6 year old girl, who knows very well what *her* anatomy is, who is exposed to the adult male, or even the immature male, through pictures or models and is told that she will, in a few years, submit to having *that* put in *there*. In a class at the Carter Riverside school in Fort Worth, Texas, the girls were told, "If you don't want all this blood and pain on your wedding, you should - - - -" At this point, one little girl fainted.

How stupid can educators get? I just showed you.

Everyone seems preoccupied with sex these days. That is nothing new. And, of course, the pronoun "everyone" may be little too all embracing. But when the students on an American college campus riot because the faculty refused to let them erect statues of men and women performing perverted sexual acts, one wonders what Freud, sex education and John Dewey hath wrought.

Sex education is the "in thing" in America's schools, starting at the *kindergarten* level. Without it, the promoters of "sexology" warn us, your child will be warped, inhibited and, heaven forbid, moralistic. One wonders how ten generations of Americans managed to build a great and stable nation without formal sex training. We even managed to procreate without liberal busybodies telling us how. At the turn of the century, sex was considered a private matter. Some parents discussed it with their children and some did not. Everyone seems to agree that there was less mental illness then than now. But now the sexperts tell us, "If the parents won't teach their children about sex, then we must."

Why?

They tried it in a big way in Sweden, and now that formerly placid and stable land is ridden with neurosis, suicides and venereal disease. One hundred and forty Swedish doctors signed a petition to the government which stated that Sweden's young people are obsessed with sex and, panting from one partner to another, some have as many as two *hundred* different sex partners!

Mary Calderone, M.D., high priestess of sex education (who has no psychiatric credentials), promotes premarital intercourse among the kids, tacitly endorses abortion and speaks oh so gently and permissively about homosexuality. And, it is interesting to note, Ortho Pharmaceutical Corporation promotes Calderone with fancy brochures to the nation's physicians. The brochures tell America's doctors to stop moralizing and get *with* it! After all, Ortho has a lot of birth control pills to sell and 14 year olds know how to swallow pills, don't they? To coin a phrase: There's *gold* in them thar pills.

Dr. Rhoda L. Lorand, a highly qualified child analyst, has very cogently described the self-appointed sex experts. She said: "I have found that talking to these new sex education zealots about the findings of child analysts over the past forty years, is like talking to an audience of turkeys about Thanksgiving. In order to avoid the realization that their programs belong on the chopping block, they pretend that the evidence proving them in error does not exist and hope that by ignoring it, it will disappear—a most commendable scientific attitude. Don't worry, it won't disappear and more and more people who are unafraid to think are beginning to have doubts about these programs and the caliber of the groups they are attracting."

Dr. Max Levin, psychiatrist and neurologist, reviewed in current Medical Digest a book that was edited by two of our nation's "sex experts," Doctors Isadore Rubin and Lester Kirkendall. The following excerpt from that review strikes at the heart of their twisted logic:

Rubin says, "The core of the ethical problem is not whether a boy or girl remains or does not remain a virgin, but whether sex is used exploitatively and self-centeredly, or in a meaningful and dignified way."

Kirkendall says, "When it comes to sex in a relationship, the girl has several pressing questions: If I have intercourse, will it make my relationship with the boy stronger? What will he think of me? Will I please him or will I lose his respect?"

All this sounds so reasonable that it has a seductive appeal. Pattenkofer (in the Family and the Sexual Revolution, ed. E. M. Schur, Indiana U. Press), tells us of the satisfaction it gave to a perplexed high school teacher. Like other high school (and college) teachers, she hadn't found it easy to field the questions of her students in the area of premarital behavior.

Pettenkofer writes that he was "much concerned" when the teacher told him "that Kirkendall's ideas had been such a help to her." She said, "Now I have an answer: I just tell the girls and boys that they have to consider both sides of the question: Will sexual intercourse strengthen or weaken their relationship?"

This, mind you, was not a college teacher; it was a high school teacher. One can imagine the turmoil in the mind of a high school girl; in the afternoon, she heard from her teacher that the question has two sides, and now in the evening she is being propositioned by her boyfriend who assures her that intercourse will strengthen their relationship.

The criteria proposed by Rubin and Kirkendall are unsound, indeed naive, for they presuppose a power to foretell the future. A girl contemplating intercourse, says Kirkendall, must ask herself, "Will it make my relationship with the boy stronger?" Even if she possessed the wisdom of Solomon, she would be unable to foretell the answer. Rubin and Kirkendall don't tell us what the girl should do if her forecast of a strengthened relationship backfires. You can make a hit with youngsters if you tell them they're entirely on their own, but few are mature enough to assess the pros and cons of sex freedom.

Ortho Pharmaceutical echoes the sociological garbage from Rubin and Kirkendall in their news release to physicians dated November 13, 1968: "In counseling college students facing stresses arising from changing sexual attitudes and practices, the physician, rather than espousing a 'thou shalt not' philosophy, must help the student face the basic questions—'Will this behavior hurt you or those you love? Will it be good for you?' You see, Mary Jane, Ortho isn't like those other cold blooded corporations. Ortho has *heart!*"

The results obtained from sex education in the lower grades are exactly opposite from what the sexologists claim. We are sexually deprived and sick, they say, and the SIECUS crowd considers itself ordained to straighten us out. But Communists, you know, always claim to be doing the opposite of what they are actually trying to accomplish.

There I go blaming the Communists again. Your Editor has been accused of seeing a Communist under every bed and now I am seeing them in the beds as well.

What is the evidence?

SIECUS (Sex Information and Education Council of the United States) is the Big Id in all matters sexual (and homosexual) these days. One of the founders and the treasurer of this smut ring is one Isadore Rubin. Rubin was identified on May 3, 1955 in sworn testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a member of the Communist Party. Rubin is also Editor of a dirty little magazine called Sexology. (How do these titles grab your libido: "My desire for Both Sexes," "An Incest-haunted Marriage," "Women Who Have Many Climaxes," and "Fifteen Ways to Get More Out of Sex") *This pornographer's trash is now being revised so it can be used in our nation's schools.*

Another smutologist of some renown is Reverend William Genne' who is a founder, board member and secretary of the SIECUS perversion plant. Genne' has been associated with numerous Communist fronts. Also, not surprisingly, he is a big wheel in the National Council of Churches.

Reverend Joseph F. Fletcher, Professor of Ethics (of all things) at Cambridge Episcopal Theological School, works closely with the "feelthy pictures" crowd at SIECUS. He has been a member of 13 Communist fronts and Herbert Philbrick, former FBI undercover agent, testified: "Joe Fletcher worked with us on Communist Party projects and an enormous number of tasks."

The above is just a sampling . . . perhaps you are not convinced, so allow met to present some more evidence.

When General William F. Dean was released from a Communist prison camp, the Chinese psychologist who had been trying to brainwash him said: "General don't feel bad about leaving us . . . we will soon be with you. We are going to destroy the moral character of a generation of your young Americans, and when we have finished, you will have nothing with which to really defend yourselves against us."

Still not convinced? Consider this from reporter Jack Mabley writing in the Fort Worth Star Telegram:

"A town in Western Poland was the scene of a grotesque gathering in the late spring of 1954. Communist agents had gone through prisons throughout Russia and Poland, rounding up hundreds of sex criminals, perverts and prostitutes. All were transported to this Polish town.

Simultaneously the Communists took into the town scores of Red movie and still photographers and thousands of feet of film. The criminals were turned loose in the town, and for 10 days, there was an incredible orgy. The photographers recorded everything. These prints were taken to a port in Turkey. They were put on a ship which several weeks later put in at Mobile. There the pictures were unloaded. American intelligence agents, who later traced these pictures to their origin, were unable to follow their course from Mobile.

However, it is established that they fanned out through the United States, and were put into the hands of youngsters through pornography dealers. Today these pictures, and the literally millions of reproductions that were made from them, are poisoning the minds of countless young Americans. This was the aim of the Communist agents."

"The story sounds fantastic and yet I personally cannot question the source. *Rational people just aren't ready to believe that the pornography racket is part of a Red plot to undermine American morals . . . Yet the evidence is too solid to be shrugged off.*"

So Isadore Rubin, a Communist, is promoting "sex education" in our schools. That doesn't make sex education and all the raunchy movies and plays a Communist plot, now does it? An official publication of the Italian Communist Party, called Journal Cinema, would disagree:

"The film and theater production of today are really typical bourgeois phenomena. The bourgeoisie have now reached the final state in their advance toward decadence and show up their inherent rottenness *as they surrender all claims to standard bearers of responsibility*. We are not in the least bit interested in stopping do (sic) this. Why place any obstacles in their path? We are interested in encouraging this type of play. We want to encourage this sort-of production. As a technical policy our aim is to defend an enterprise that is pornographic and entirely free of the restrictions of ordinary moral rules. We must be resolute in pursuing this course, even more so in plays being shown that attempt to condone homosexuality."

Where does the National Education Association, the cultivators of the minds of our children, and the American Medical Association, the organized voice of American medicine, stand in regard to this obscene invasion of our schools, this rape of innocent young minds? This may stretch your credulity, but they have taken their stand bravely and firmly with the smutologists of SIECUS!

Naturally, most of these bumble heads in the NCC, the NEA and the AMA who have aligned themselves with Ellis, ("Religion seriously sabotages mental health." "Religion is neurosis," etc.); Fletcher ("For me there is no religion at all"); Kirkendall ("A tremendous feeling of natural unity . . . is immoral"), and the rest of these sick, homosexual-condoning egomaniacs, think they are doing something to combat the very things these neurotics are promoting: premarital sex, illegitimacy and venereal disease. Even Comrade Isadore Rubin, Treasurer of SIECUS admitted this was futile when he said: "For the Community to ask the sex director to take on the responsibility of cutting down on illegitimacy or on venereal disease, is to ask him to undertake a task that is foredoomed to failure."

Sex education, in one form or another, and whether we like it or not, is probably here to stay. So what is to be done? First, throw out SIECUS and SIECUS material, Sexology Magazine, and all the phonies associated with both. Second, read the well-reasoned article in this issue by Dr. James Parsons. Dr. Parsons deserves your rapt attention. His keen mind has penetrated to the core of the problem.

"Who so ever shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he was drowned in the depth of the sea."—Matthew 18, verse 6.

The Gathering Storm: Sex Education Versus the "No-No" Moralists

(By James M. Parsons, M.D.)

(Note.—Dr. Parsons is a graduate of the University of Florida and the University of Tennessee College of Medicine. He took his residency in Psychiatry at the University of Miami School of Medicine. He is Consultant Psychiarist to Patrick Air Force Base, United States Air Force, and Consultant Psychiatrist to Pan American World Airways.)

Mary Calderone, M.D., M.P.H., has a problem.

As Executive Director of the Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S., she is running into community opposition to her organization's programs around the country. Though her organization is notably well heeled, and nonprofit, Mary is finding communities so xenophobic that they will accept sex education, if at all, only at the level of the fifth grade. Of course, sex education in the U.S. has had a great many good receptions too, and except for the opposition, it could be confidently expected that 70%+ of American schools would have a comprehensive sex education program by the year 1970. Mary notes the operation with bitter reflectiveness, however, and has been quoted in complaint: "For too long we have listened to the vociferous minority." (SATEVEPOST, 6/29/68, "Sex Invades the Schoolhouse," John Kobler, P. 64.)

Yes, Mary does have the "No-No" Moralists to consider. Let us define terms. A "No-No" is something, usually behavior, expressly prohibited by a figure who has assumed authority. And a Moralist is one who prohibits, because the Moralist has (by self appointment) pre-empted all privilege of judgment in matters (self labeled) as "right" and "wrong."

We would expect this plot to thicken. The legions of those promoting sex education will certainly press on in their massive assault. Meanwhile, the "No-No" Moralists are stiffening defenses, aligning all ranks four square into a veritable vista of "Solid Antis."

And let the reader make no mistake: a great storm is quietly gathering; and it will ultimately involve just about every physician in the U.S., willing or not.

In the shadow of such controversy, the psychiatrist suddenly blinks away that vacant eyed preoccupation more suitable for the Freudian couch, and asks: "What is meant by sex education? Who is behind this movement which is everywhere in evidence in the mass media? What are their credentials and their motives?"

The search for the answers to these questions led this writer as far from the state of Florida as Idaho, via long distance telephone calls, in order to verify verbal and printed information from various sources. What follows is an analysis of what the promoters of sex education have been doing, what they intend to do in the future, and a commentary on some persons within this movement which has become so controversial. Perhaps of most significance is the inclusion of an estimate of the results to be achieved, from the psychiatric point of view, within young people receiving this new form of sex education.

One cannot discuss the subject without discussing Dr. Calderone's SIECUS (Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S.), so we may as well affirm now that SIECUS is, far and away, the foremost organization in the field of sex education. Moreover, this group has been able to create the aura around itself that SIECUS is, literally speaking, a selfless group of professionals who offer a not for profit consultation service to communities which have become sufficiently enlightened to desire expert assistance in setting up school programs for "sex education."

There are many who would hotly dispute that the preceding statement is true of SIECUS. However, regardless of one's opinion of the organization, most unemotional observers will usually admit the SIECUS does enjoy that reputation, rightly or not, at least at the present time.

Further, their choice of a name which, when abbreviated, turns into such an acronymic and phonetic triumph has undoubtedly given SIECUS a great boost:—pronounced, the acronym becomes "seek us," at once an invitation and a command, suggesting not only that local communities lack expertise in the matter of sex education, but that SIECUS stands ready to help, provided they are sought. True, it is a small point literally; but from the point of view of subliminal psychological techniques, the choice of the name Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S. seems a pure stroke of genius.

Their name is not all they have going for them either. "It is largely to Dr. Calderone's charm and dynamism that SIECUS owes its formidable influence. A sweet-faced, silvery haired grandmother, with the evangelical fervor of Joan of Arc, she is a great persuader. Frequently listeners who start by being hostile to the idea of public sex education end up as her confirmed disciples. To encourage candor, she avoids sexual euphemisms and has even been known, in all her matriarchal dignity, to use four-letter words." (SATEVEPOST, op. ct., p. 27.)

Dr. Mary Steichen Calderone has been a familiar fixture for years, as medical director of the Planned Parenthood organization. Now as SIECUS' executive director, she has an organization which, at last report, could boast of the affiliation of 52 professional types from such diverse fields as sociology, the bar, the clergy, the press, and—of course—medical doctors, including the specialty of psychiatry.

What are the mechanics of operation of the SIECUS Combine? From what can be gathered, there are 3 main steps. Step 1: SIECUS representatives set up community organizations to promote "sex education" in the schools. Step 2: After sufficient organization promises the adoption of the SIECUS program, certain textbooks, audio visual aids, pamphlets and related literature are recommended by SIECUS representatives, or designates. Step 3: The stage is now set for the possible appearance of "Joan of Arc"—sweet faced and silvery haired enough to make the sale . . . we hope . . . or else we hope not.

A wide divergence of opinion is to be expected among medical doctors, especially psychiatrists, but the rule among psychiatrists, discussing a differing approach toward a problem within the discipline, is normally that of restraint and caution. A tiny minority of psychiatrists contacted were hospitable to SIECUS; this minority was either untrained or unsympathetic to the analytic orientation; also, this minority favored the conditioning therapies. Among the analytically oriented colleagues contacted regarding "sex education" those familiar with SIECUS had little good to say for their approach.

What is the approach of SIECUS? "To establish man's sexuality as a health entity: to identify the special characteristics that distinguish it from, yet relate it to, human reproduction; to dignify it by openness of approach, study and scientific research design to lead toward its understanding and its freedom from exploitation; to give leadership to professionals and to society, to the end that human beings may be aided toward responsible use of the sexual faculty and toward assimilation of sex into their individual life patterns as a creative and recreative force."

It would be redundant to point out that the above quotation from the SIECUS charter sounds fine. Now. What does it mean? Certainly one must be struck by the fact that among all those high sounding abstractions arranged into syntactical structure, nothing emerges factual or concrete.

The answer to the "approach" of SIECUS? It is found only in the actual printed materials offered by this non profit group, and in the public statements of SIECUS officials. Interest has focused on their "approach" to the extent that:

"Classroom sex has fired a whole new industry of such vast and bluechip possibilities that the Wall Street Journal was prompted recently to issue a full report on it. Leading publishing houses and companies, such as International Business Machines (IBM), are pouring literally millions of dollars into texts and teaching aids for the sexual enlightenment of the young." (McCall's, January, 1968, "Sex Education," by Marjorie F. Iseman, p. 37.)

Critics of SIECUS assert that Somebody, Someway, Somehow, is getting "all that money." They also state that SIECUS officials usually write the books and other materials which The Board of "non profit" SIECUS subsequently endorses and recommends for use in classrooms throughout the nation.

Further, critics point out that Dr. Isadore Rubin (a Ph. D. on SIECUS' Board) has long evidenced interest in "profit" as related to exploitation of natural as well as unusual sexual curiosities, since he has for years edited the magazine Sexology, in which sample titles are "Group Sex Orgies," "My Wife Knows I'm Homosexual," "Mail Order Sex Parties," etc. Here, of course, that critic has ventured too far. He has become one of the "No-No" Moralists, unfairly criticizing an entire organization via guilt by association techniques.

To date, SIECUS has been loftily above all its critics. Perhaps it is because SIECUS, tax exempt, receives private contributions and grants from groups such as the Ford Foundation; and therefore, its officials feel that they breathe rarefied air.

On the other hand, some of SIECUS' critics are aware of the above information, plus the fact that, along with IBM, the 3-M Company, McGraw-Hill, Harcourt Brace and World Corporation, as well as others, are banking millions on the success of SIECUS and its program. It's said that money talks, but the critics of SIECUS are talking too, and getting noisier. Why?

The reason lies in the "approach" of SIECUS to sex education. Their program would start a child on "sex education" in the nursery, and follow through in every grade, with both boys and girls in the same classroom viewing everything from graphic illustrations, to plastic replicas of human sexual organs, to animals copulating in classrooms for the edification of the young.

For example, slides have been used in a Westchester County elementary school which show the copulation of dogs, this followed by a human couple under sheets, while a recorded voice explains: "Mummy and Daddy are doing the same things the dogs do." (SATEVEPOST, op. cit., p. 66.)

Dr. Rhoda L. Lorand, child analyst of New York and author of the well received Love, Sex and the Teenager, made the comment that such an approach to sexual education produces an "emotional split" in children in that it stimulates sexual excitement right in the very environment (the classroom) where it must be immediately suppressed.

However, Dr. Calderone carries forth the SEICUS banner bravely. The child of 3 must be started on the path toward illumination: "The penis of the father is made to carry the sperm into the mother through the vagina." Any 3-year-old ought to know that. And as the weeks, months and years pass, more and more sex information must be imparted.

The promised benefits of such a program of sex education are many: a more enlightened attitude toward sex by all, decrease or elimination of sexual problems thereby, with an accompanying decrease in pregnancies out of wedlock, venereal diseases, etc. Accordingly, we would expect a higher rate of successful and happy marriages.

Provided the goals of "sex education" could be reached, or even if matters could be shepherded along in that general direction by following SIECUS' program, it seems ridiculous that anyone would seriously object to buying the package. Therefore, let us leave out all consideration of possible economic motives and of the personalities of the SIECUS people, and think—instead—of the children.

While one may not subscribe to all of Sigmund Freud, it is a fact that his work stimulated tremendous interest in child development. In the last 30 odd years, child analysis has emerged as a highly respected discipline in its own right, and often able to document and reproduce its findings concerning children much better than any of the individual schools of adult psychiatry. Some say child analysts have the advantage, since adults are older and more complex. However that may be, there remain pertinent principles which have been firmly established regarding children, and we shall examine them here.

(1) Children learn via their senses, in the state of development existing at their particular age, and individually so. Their brains will mature anatomically later in life, so they learn by example, by rote, but are most impressed by their sensations. One only need be a parent, not even a psychiatrist, to be aware that children pass through a stage when they put everything into their mouths (the oral stage), followed by a stage when the process of elimination assumes their primary attention (the anal stage).

(2) It has been found that often when a parent, or another, tries to inculcate simple explanations of adult sexual function to a child, it is immediately translated into data meaningful to the child at his particular stage of development: e.g., a child in the anal stage, upon learning that his mother has given birth to a new baby which she had let him feel move within her abdomen, may say, "I know how it got out. Through her bottom." Lest any wag interpose here that that kid wasn't too far wrong, it should be added that upon questioning, one will learn that the child means anal birth.

(3) The child's undeveloped brain cannot assimilate (or "learn") information relating to bodily functions which are years in advance of his own physical development. Stated quite simply, a 3-year-old boy or girl does not possess the necessary physical or cerebral development to understand any such abstraction as, "The penis of the father is made to carry the sperm into the mother through the vagina." Probably a good percentage of children could be induced to repeat the statement by rote memory, but what they understood would be something else. Let us suppose that a child in the oral stage gets such an explanation of impregnation. It will, predictably, be fed into the undeveloped computer and come out as: swallowing the sperm.

It has long been recognized that what we call sexual perversions seems rooted in the infantile fantasies of violence, mutilation and death associated with ideas of oral impregnation and anal birth. The mature pervert is usually not the product of any lack of "sex education," or of sexual stimulation, during his formative years. Quite the contrary, the mature pervert often has a history of stimulation of sexual fantasies before his body and brain had matured sufficiently to cope with ideas that overwhelmed his reality testing faculties, turning his development back onto itself into a welter of fantasies of violence, death, mutilation, oral impregnation and anal birth. The morbidly fascinating *troika* of rape-murder-mutilation transfixes the attention of the civilized person too often; the psychological mechanisms triggering such psychopathic behavior lie precisely in disturbances of the infantile fantasies.

Two brief case reports are pertinent here, both from the author's files.

The first is a young man who, since age 17, has been continuously in trouble for exhibitionism: he masturbates in the presence of young girls as an almost obsessional, though intermittent, form of sexual outlet, even though he has been married for several years now. His obsession dates back to pre school days when he found some "dirty" pictures in the basement, where there also happened to be the laundry hampers. He recognized his mother's underthings (or reasonable facsimiles thereof) in the pictures of women in the sexual act and in various stages of undress. A powerful fantasy life developed thereafter. When puberty was reached the boy went to the laundry to hold female underclothing against himself until he was stimulated to orgasm. His mother came upon this scene, interestingly enough; but she pretended not to notice. Since that time, he has still been trying to "get her attention"—albeit vicariously.

The second case is an 18-year-old, recently married, and recently in trouble for shoplifting items of female intimate wear from department stores. He dates his problem to books on sex which were introduced into the public school curricula in his elementary school in a Northeastern state. "I wasn't thinking about sex at all until I read those books, and then it seemed like I couldn't think of anything else." He became preoccupied with feminine underthings too, and went through a similar experience to the patient mentioned above, though he managed to "control" it. His "control" method was homosexual experimentation, however. He became ashamed of himself, and bitter toward all females because they seemed to remind him of his lack of masculinity. After finally deciding to date girls in order to prove himself, he ended by marrying the second one he dated because she became pregnant. After marriage, "The Problem" suddenly emerged again in full bloom, first with use of his wife's underclothing, and next with a compelling desire to steal fresh, new items, masturbate into them and then throw the articles away. Often he would wear the items himself for varying lengths of time before doing this. The patient, incidentally, was unaware of any hostility toward females and had an elaborate rationalization regarding his behavior: "Why should society say it's wrong when they mean 'it's different?' Suppose I bought the underwear? Then I wouldn't even be stealing. But they make it out as criminal. Who's to say what's right and wrong?" However, when asked would he derive pleasure from buying the items instead of stealing them, he replied that he would not. In fact, he was secretly hoping he would be caught because, in his words, "It worried me that this type of release was becoming more exciting and more satisfying than intercourse with my wife." This patient was apprised that the files of criminologists often show that those convicted of exhibitionism and/or transvestism, if not stopped, go next to child molestation, then to rape, and to rape-murder-mutilation. Here, this patient suddenly demonstrated a flash of brilliant insight: "If I masturbate into new underwear that I've stolen, then it's like I've spoiled a young girl, who's new and clean. And if I carry it far enough, the symbol won't be enough. I'll have to enter the real world. If somebody came upon a dead girl who had been raped and mutilated, it would be like coming upon"—here the patient was practically choked with tears—*"the panties!"* He referred to his practice of leaving new female underwear he had soiled along routes to elementary schools, so that others might see the soiled articles. The last item was a pair of girl's panties, which he had carefully arranged in the middle of a sidewalk.

The tragedy of psychopathic behavior is that so often the patient desperately wants his impulses channeled into mature adjustments, while at the same time he has had to develop a system of rationalizations to explain his behavior which sound broad-minded to others, so that he fools even himself. Fortunately for this patient, he decided that his facile rationalizations, while suggesting breadth of mentation were, in fact, quite constricted as regards information.

With the preceding case histories as background, we may now consider two final points regarding normal child development, and "sex education."

(4) The infantile sexual fantasies become dormant, unless stimulated, during what is called the "latent period"—between ages 6 and 10 years, roughly. During this time, the child learns physical coordination unselfconsciously, and sublimates most of the sexual drive into learning academic subjects in a structured environment. What is called "sex education" would, if injected into school curricula during this period, predictably reawaken the infantile fantasies and cause great mischief—perhaps chaos—in the educational process. Females, as would be expected, have the most to lose. For a little girl to be told by a little boy, "I'll bet you have freckels on your vagina," may seem amusing to an adult (especially if, for unconscious reasons, there exists an irrational hostility toward females), but it may cause lasting damage to the girl who is the victim of such "good natured fun." The reader is to be assured that incidents similar to that depicted above, and worse, have already happened on the playgrounds of those schools where "sex education" has been implemented. Among thoughtful people there is an awareness that the female intimate functions must have a certain respect from the male if the girl who is more vulnerable and feels it, is to be able in later years to achieve that trust of her husband which is a prerequisite for her complete sexual responsiveness in marriage.

(5) Perhaps the most surprising of the findings of the child analysts relates to the effect upon the developing child of *indulging in masturbation*. To quote Dr. Anna Freud, in her recently published book, Normality and Pathology in Childhood, "It was equally unexpected that the disappearance of the masturbation conflict would have—besides its beneficial consequences—some unwanted side effects on character formation by eliminating struggles which, in spite of their pathogenic aspects, had served also as a moral training ground." Dr. Anna Freud is telling us that, while the Victorian attitudes toward masturbation (the work of the devil, it will drive you insane, etc.) were harmful to the child, we still have not achieved the proper attitudes to impart to children, since the child who is given the "permissive" routine about masturbation does not, later, show the strength of character seen in those children who have struggled to stop, or control, their masturbatory tendencies.

Contrast the above, however, with the March, 1969, issue of Today's Health, pp. 4–5: "There is no medical evidence that masturbation in either sex is harmful. You may wish to write for a very well written booklet on this subject published by SIECUS (Sex Information and Educational Council), 1855 Broadway (61st Street), New York, New York 10023. The price is 35 cents a copy." Perhaps the most fitting comment that could be made is that Today's Health describes the SIECUS booklet as "well written" instead of "authoritative."

It is exceedingly interesting that those who represent themselves as the *avant garde* of sex education for children are, to all intents and purposes, ignorant of the important basic principles demonstrably elucidated in many in depth studies by child analysts years ago. One could compare these SIECUS officials with "poachers" who go busily about, staking their claims, blissfully unaware that they are having to climb over the fences of families who have already cleared the land, fenced it, and cultivated it intensively—for at least a generation. These "poachers" conceivably could become civilized, provided they would read some books.

One has to assume that the SIECUS officials are simply unfamiliar with the work of the child analysts, for the following reasons. If they were familiar with the findings of the child analysts, they would not advocate their own programs. Or alternatively, they would continue to advocate their programs, while presenting proof that the child analysts's work of the preceding 30 years and more, is invalid. The SIECUS officials behave, instead, as though unaware that their expressed dogmatism is not only unsubstantiated, but directly in opposition to a great body of evidence already adduced.

Leaving aside the question of whether the SIECUS "sexperts" have ever learned anything about the development of the children whom they presume to "educate," we turn next to the question of whether or not they have displayed any awareness of the experience of other countries which have implemented similar programs of "sex education" to that which SIECUS advocates.

One thinks immediately of Sweden, where a program remarkably similar to that which SIECUS advocates for the U.S., has been tried for many years. One can find the results quite conveniently in the book Sex and Society in Sweden, by Birgitta Linner, (The Pantheon Press.) With all the sexual enlightenment in Sweden, one would expect that the rate of veneral disease would have plummeted, especially in view of the fact that automatic vendor machines for contraceptive now line the streets of Sweden. However, we learn on page 86 of Birgitta Linner's book that there has been an overall increase in venereal disease. In fact, on page 49 we find that gonorrhea now affects the 14-year-olds and 13-year-olds, and the girls more so than the boys.

So the VD picture was a little surprising, wasn't it? However, we should expect that the more intelligent girls and boys will have been able to avoid unwanted pregnancies, especially before marriage. But we find—*mirabile dictu!*—35% of all brides are pregnant on the day of their marriage. (That's on page 30.)

Well, we must keep optimistic. All those years of good "sex education" must have resulted in a higher rate of successful and happy marriages. No?. On page 29, we learn that approximately 20% of those reaching adult age never marry. And one the same page we find an especially interesting quote:

"In Sweden . . . a traditionally low marriage rate, a high average age at first marriage, a relatively high divorce rate, and a high incidence of premaritally conceived children (despite sex education in contraception) and births out of wedlock (⅓ of teenagers who have coitus do not bother to use contraceptives) are some characteristics of marriage as an institution within the larger societal context."

Does this mean that all "sex education" is bad, and that we shouldn't tell them a thing? Certainly not. If local doctors and their wives would institute informal programs in schools at about the 6th grade level concerning the meaning of puberty, that would be all that was absolutely necessary. To move downward into the 5th and particularly the 4th grade gets us into the latent period, which had best be left scrupulously alone. Further, any sessions on sexual subjects should be held with a sense of privacy, and the sexes should be instructed separately. Ideally, parents would be present, the mothers with their daughters, the fathers with their sons. Parents could sit unobtrusively at the back of the room; though it could not be expected that an immediate dialogue would ensue from this, one could be reasonably sure that the subject would be more open and could be broached more easily later. Which brings us to a major point: much of our sexual adjustment, if healthy, comes from following a good example set by parents. While "you don't learn that in school" it does not seem too much to hope for that some of the parents who became involved in their children's sexual instruction would take the initiative and begin to set better examples for their children.

We have talked about the "No-No." as behavior which is forbidden by an authority figure. And about the Moralist as one who can effectively prohibit because the Moralist has preempted all privilege of judgment in matters (self-labeled) as "right" and "wrong." There are those who are such Moralists that no sex education at all will be allowed by them. But they are no problem, since if a parent feels that strongly, then participation of his or her children in an unspectacular, but entirely adequate, program of sex education can be left at the option of the parents. But there are other Moralists calling the "No-No's" too. And in order that our young people are not abandoned to the fate of Sweden, there may have to be some people who will tell Joan of Arc, "For too long we have listened to the vociferous minority." There may come the time when we shall have to demand of SIECUS, "Will the real 'No-No' Moralists please stand up? And now will all of you please just walk out that door."

At this point, it looks as though the worst thing that could happen would be a few big publishing companies would lose money on books that they couldn't palm off on anybody, and some large corporations might get stuck with overly large inventories of audio-visual equipment for some time to come.

But the kids would be fine. And that's what is important.

[From the Prince Georges Sentinel, Apr. 12, 1969]

Doubts About Sex Education

(Note.—A minister who is concerned about the sex education courses either now in use or planned for all grades in the Montgomery and Prince George's school systems speaks out against them in the following communication.)

(By the Rev. Louie J. DiPlacido)

Since few parents have the full information on the new program, opposition has been minimized, but as details become known, and the potential dangers of the program exposed, opposition will and should increase. Already, an alert Council of Churches from Maryland, in their recent meeting in Rockville, adopted a resolution opposing the program, and plans are under way to alert county residents of its dangers.

Attempts to justify the program, on the part of school officials, by citing the absence of any parental objections, fail to mention how few parents have yet been able to examine the material to be used by teachers who will be in charge of the course.

The impression given by educators that parents are asking for this program "faster than schools have been prepared to teach sex education", ignores the content and nature of the proposed program, which most parents would not accept.

Legitimate objections to the program in Maryland schools are left unanswered (in a recent article in the Montgomery County Sentinel of March 29), by dismissing the source of the objections as a "right-wing, Washington based group".

The denial by Montgomery County School officials, that the new program has any connection with S.I.E.C.U.S. (Sex Information and Education Council of the United States), may be true organizationally; but the fact remains that the highly questionable sex standards, concepts, and attitudes promoted by S.I.E.C.U.S. are parallel with those found in many of the reference books on the official teacher's list for the Montgomery County schools. A careful study of the program, including the reference materials, has led me to the following conclusions:

1. The program is educationally unsound. The major aspect added by this program to the already existing sex-education program is that of human reproduction, according to school officials. And the emphasis is to introduce as much information as possible, and as soon as possible, beginning with kindergarten and in a casual, informal manner, that will lead children to recognize sex as "a natural condition" and discuss it openly and unreservedly. In the context of studying about physical sex impulses, love, liberty of action, etc. children will be asked "What kind of experiences have you had?" And "Can you think of others who have had experiences in these areas?" questions which can easily be used to invade the privacy of both the child and the family.

Qualified doctors and psychologists warn that too much information on intercourse and reproduction can be bewildering to a young child, and "too much intensity can be troubling." Sound educational procedure provides such information when a child asks, and is ready for it, and preferably in the setting of family life in the home. For this reason, extensive factual information on the subject for all children at a given age, is recognized as potentially frightening, and emotionally disturbing.

In a book identified by Dr. Milton I. Levine as a dependable source of information on sex education for children, parents are warned "not to encourage your child to talk out his thoughts and feelings" about sex from 5 and 6 years until puberty.

Premature sex interest can deprive a child of his "latency period, when development, without the strains and responsibilities that accompany sex knowledge, is necessary. Preoccupation with sex, and liberal sex education at early ages has led to liberal sex practice, and excessive sex play and sex experimentation, with disastrous results both physically and emotionally, in other countries where it has been tried.

It has been proven unsound educationally, and should be rejected. The wisdom of using examples from nature when answering a child's questions on human reproduction is also questioned by some educators, as an unsound procedure and more confusing than enlightening, yet it will be the approach in the new program.

The program is morally unsound. Contrary to the claim from officials who support the program, that "no teacher will be preaching morals" when discussing with students premarital sexual intercourse, birth control, and other controversial questions, there will be a "concept of responsibility" conveyed, which in effect will establish a standard of conduct, in sexual relations. The fact is, that the "philosophy" of sex education which defines it as a "natural condition in man", requiring a "positive attitude", will introduce a "humanistic" code of ethics to govern sexual behaviour, which is designed to replace traditional moral standards. The kind of sex education involved, therefore, does not "supplement" the parent's instruction in the home, but in many cases, will destroy and contradict it, as it will that of religion.

Dr. Lester A. Kirkendall, whose material forms a part of the K–6 program now in use has suggested in other material, not yet in use in the K–6 program, that in some cases premarital sex relations strengthen a couple's relationship and should not be condemned, if we value sexuality as a part of our "human endowment."

He argues that we should not condemn sexual promiscuity, or label sex outside marriage as sin, "but adopt more sensible, more realistic sexual standards than existed in the past," and "relax tensions" by permitting premarital sex as acceptable behaviour, without shame, as Denmark has done.

Since prospective teachers for the new program must be "knowledgable and comfortable" with the material, and have the necessary "positive attitude," it seems obvious that those with traditional moral convictions will be disqualified from teaching the course, leaving the captive pupils to teachers who advocate a "new morality."

Having carefully read many of the teacher's reference books to be used in connection with the course. I have found many attacks upon religious and moral ideals, along with approval for unrestrained sex freedom, homosexuality, adultery, and perversion. The subversion of American youth and public morals is underway. Whether it is the avowed purpose of a Communist conspiracy, or the unannounced purpose of liberal, humanistic public educators, seems beside the point.

The fact remains, that a program which takes either an amoral or immoral stance in sex education, deserves to be removed from the public school system.

Assurances that a "concept of responsibility" will be taught, without defining "right and wrong," is precisely the method used in sex education courses in Sweden, where moral restraints have been removed, and sexual freedom encouraged, and where the result has produced disease and disillusionment in young people. Sex education belongs in the home, and in the church, where new material can be given suitable to successive levels of development for each child individually, and with interpretation by loving and understanding parents, in the context of religious or moral principles that will inspire high ideals, and prepare each child for his future role as a responsible member of society, with a wholesome attitude toward his God-given gifts.

The program is legally unsound. While State law may require sex education, it does not require the kind of sex education, which destroys traditional moral standards. Such a program is unconstitutional, and infringes upon the rights of parents to teach their own children the moral values in which they believe. To allow children to be excused from such classes, is no solution to the problem. If State law requires the extensive educational program proposed in this field, including moral standards and ethics, the law should be changed, since it could be used to destroy the very foundations of our civilization.

But, if on the other hand, our educators are simply responding to the nationwide effort of liberal sex education, and using the State Department of Education in order to justify it, it is time parents become informed, and become vocal in their opposition.

There is a sexual revolution taking place, with inhibitions and moral restraints being removed, and a new morality taking its place, not completely unrelated to Marxist goals for America. If we love our Country, we should not allow our schools to be used to destroy it.

[From the Prince Georges County News, Apr. 10, 1969]

CONCERNED ABOUT SEICUS PROGRAM

SIR: As a parent who has been alarmed by reports on results of sex education in California, Arizona, New Jersey and Georgia elementary and secondary schools, I have been very much interested in the sex program for the elementary schools in Prince Georges County beginning this fall.

Sex education is a vital part of the education of our youth. The issue of the matter is how, when, where, what and by whom. The S.E.I.C.U.S. (Sex Education Information Council, United States) program reportedly used in the above named schools has caused a great deal of alarm in those areas. Parents have organized to oust the program in California; law suits have been brought against school boards, and yet authorities in charge of the program hold on tight. Why?

Is there any wonder why concerned parents of Prince Georges County are up in arms over the proposed SEICUS program to go into our schools this fall? If you think there is smoke here where there is no fire, then grab a copy of American Opinion for March 1969, and read Gary Allen's report on Sex Study: Problems, Propaganda, and Pornography.

In that article, he documents the board members of SEICUS and gives their views on educating your child in what they call sex. (I have another name for it.)

Our school board tells us that SEICUS has absolutely nothing to do with their sex education program. Yet they hand us a copy of their Sex Education Curricula, which subtitles itself as Definition of Sex Education. Source for this curricula is "SEICUS."

The "well publicized" law putting this into Maryland schools is under date of July 1967 and is entitled (Are you ready?), "Educational Programs for Pregnant Girls." The full title is: "Section Four of Bylaw 720:3—Educational Programs for Pregnant Girls." This eight-page document refers to the materials of SEICUS and their directors.

Conference with board members indicate that you, the parent, will have no say about formulating this program and only after 50 per cent of the parents in any school district protests, will the protest be considered. Parent protests will result in "consideration" by school authorities. "Consideration" was defined, finally, as another chance to sit down with the protesting parents and more fully explain the program.

You have absolutely no say in the preparation of a good program for your child. You will learn that you are not an educator, but a "Christian Crusader" or a "McCarthyite."

It has been suggested, by those in the school areas where the SEICUS program is being used, that Congress investigate sex education in the elementary and secondary schools.

Join the ranks of the interested, forgotten, tax-paying parent who wants to do something about the way their tax dollars are being used.

MRS. JULIE BROWN.

LANHAM.

TAX RELIEF FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am presently a cosponsor of legislation to close many of the tax loopholes through which the wealthy now escape, forcing middle- and low-income taxpayers to pay more than their fair share. But such legislation is only part of the answer.

Today, I am introducing a bill to provide direct tax relief for the middle- and low-income taxpayer. Such relief is long overdue.

My bill effects two simple but major changes for the middle income taxpayer. First, it increases the standard deduction from 10 to 14 percent and increases the maximum allowable deduction from $1,000 to $1,800.

Anyone who has filled out a tax form in the last month knows how complex it is. Indeed, few of us can, myself included, do it without the help of an accountant. Taxpayers today are compelled to use the long form, because the short form's standard deduction in lieu of itemizing is inadequate and unrealistic. By increasing the standard deduction, more taxpayers will use the standard form, saving on their tax bill, their accounting bill, and the Government's auditing bill.

Second, my bill increases each personal exemption from $600 to $1,200. The personal exemption has not been increased since 1948, yet the cost of living has increased almost 50 percent. No wonder that tax reform is on everyone's mind.

Those taxpayers who have children know the high cost of education, and it is simply not adequate to provide a bare minimum of $600 for each such dependent.

And what about the constant increases in rents, food, clothing, transportation, and, of course, taxes. My bill will not entirely cope with these problems, but at least it is a step in the right direction.

Finally, my bill provides tax relief for those living below the poverty line by increasing the minimum standard deduction from $200 plus $100 for each allowable exemption to $600 plus $100 for each exemption. Such an increase would mean that anyone with an annual gross income of $1,900 or less would not pay any taxes.

A GOOD SOLDIER, A GOOD PRESIDENT, AND A GOOD AMERICAN

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, among the millions of mourners for the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower few were able to mark this sad occasion in a more individual way than was one of my constituents, Capt. Nikolai Zubkow.

Captain Zubkow is a former czarist cavalry officer who escaped from Russian communism after World War II. At 77 he has a lively interest in his new country and in the world around him. He is also a professional artist.

It was in his capacity as an artist that he paid his last tribute to the American President and heroic general whom he so greatly admired. He placed before his home, in a drizzling rain, a prized portrait of President Eisenhower which he had painted a year before. His display of his regard for this great American was noted in a picture on the front page of the April 1, 1969, issue of the Miami Herald.

I would like to share with my colleagues and fellow mourners of General Eisenhower's passing the simple eulogy of Captain Zubkow for this beloved leader of our country in peace and war:

> He was a good soldier, a good President, and a good American.

BANKS AND SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS HAVE REASON TO PULL TOGETHER

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, all of us realize the enormous part the commercial banks and the savings and loan associations of the country play in the national economy. There have been times when these two great institutions, both so essential to the welfare of our country have not worked in harmony. One of my closest friends and associates, Arthur H. Courshon, president of the National League of Insured Savings, a member of the Advisory Board of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and an outstanding leader and authority in the savings and loan field and also a banker writer in the American Banker of February 18, emphasizes that in this critical time the commercial banks and the savings and loan associations have reason to pull together in the national interest. Mr. Courshon writes out of a great experience in the savings and loan field and in the banking field and as an outstanding business and professional man.

I commend his excellent article to my colleagues and to all who are interested in our financial institutions working together in the most effective way to meet the challenge of these times. I include Mr. Courshon's article at this point in the RECORD:

BANKS AND SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS HAVE REASON TO PULL TOGETHER

(By Arthur H. Courshon)

Today, perhaps more so than at any other time, commercial banks and savings and loan associations have a reason for pulling together. With problems of the inner cities, of inflation, of high interest rates threatening to dampen the nation's economic momentum, financial institutions are faced with the prospect of either coming up with solutions or being content with a situation that won't solve itself.

Adequate housing for the disadvantaged remains one of the nation's most urgent problems, and both thrift institutions and commercial banks have a large stake in making certain the problem is solved. Indeed, if this country is to be housed properly, it is going to take a partnership of all the financial institutions to meet the demand for dollars the consumer will seek.

As the industry that is the senior partner in the home finance field, savings and loan associations believe they must continue to exercise leadership in this effort.

Both banks and savings and loans have shown their keen interest in rebuilding the ghettos into decent places to live and work. The Small Business Administration's Project Own, for which the national league is coordinating the savings and loan phase, is helping minority construction contractors get into, and stay, in business. This will translate itself into new business both for banks and savings and loan associations—with its ultimate aim of helping the nation rid itself of slums.

In addition, many banks as well as savings and loan associations are heavily committed to Federal programs for housing low and moderate income families. In many instances, construction funds for these projects are provided by the banks, with long-term financing by savings and loan associations.

The Federal Reserve Board noted recently that banks have increased their construction lending to real estate investors to $4.1 billion during the first ten months of 1968. A similar Fed survey two years earlier showed the total lower by $200 million.

If prospects for home construction continue favorably, as anticipated, construction lending by banks should increase. And, with the enormous job that needs to be done in the inner cities, the partnership of banks and savings and loans, as well as other mortgage lenders, should become even more necessary.

The national league has proposed a new concept—the Urban Development Service Corp.—for improving housing conditions in the urban centers of the nation. The service corporations, wholly owned by savings and loans, would be used as a vehicle to rebuild slum areas, with decent housing as their prime responsibility.

As contemplated, the service corporations could buy the land, tear down the slums, work with Federal, state and local authorities to construct new housing, and own and manage the properties, where necessary.

It will take money—construction money—which could be provided by banks—and long-term mortgage financing, which could be provided by savings and loan associations. The idea, again, is to work together to do the job that everyone knows must be done if financial institutions are to continue to serve the public interest.

Of course the economy is facing turbulent times, and competition between financial institutions is becoming increasingly sharp. With interest rates in all sectors of the credit markets at or near record high levels, both bank and nonbank financial intermediaries are vying for available funds.

The recent Federal Reserve Board action to lift the discount rate was, of course, long overdue. Yet the Fed showed remarkable restraint in maintaining the level of Regulation Q—an absolute necessary if the level of home construction is to be maintained.

Despite the fact savings and loan associations won some new investment powers from the 1968 Housing Act, by and large the thrift institutions are locked into the home mortgage market. Unlike commercial banks, portfolio turnover of savings and loan associations is slow, indeed.

And, of course, if the Fed lifted Regulation Q, there would doubtless be an immediate outbreak of rate increases—and another savings rate war would surely begin. The resultant squeeze on profits would serve only to hamper efforts by savings and loans and banks to accomplish the job of rehousing inner city residents. At the same time, all other housing construction would suffer because of the inevitable disintermediation that would occur.

It is for this reason savings and loans are attempting to somewhat broaden their investment base—in areas strictly related to the home. During the 1968 Congressional Session, the national league was instrumental in helping the industry to secure authority to make loans on mobile homes and vacation homes; to invest in bank CDs; to make loans on home equipment so long as the equipment is affixed to the realty; to make and invest in loans up to $5,000 for the repair, alteration or improvement of real property, and several other home finance related activities.

What is necessary, too, is for Congress to enact authorizing legislation for S&Ls to make consumer loans related to home purchase. This has long been advocated by the thrift industry as a natural extension of its specialty—to better house all America.

Moreover, such authority serves several purposes. It would help the quality of credit, in that couples buying their home would not have to plunge deep into short-term debt to buy such necessities as carpeting, draperies, etc. By placing these items on the mortgage, experts agree, delinquencies on home mortgage would decline.

It also would allow S&Ls to increase earnings, and so better serve the homebuying public. And, at the same time, such authority would keep savings and loans right where they want to be, within the home mortgage field.

The savings and loan industry will continue its efforts along these lines, and it is hoped the 91st Congress will see fit to grant such necessary authority. At the same time, it is hoped, banks and savings and loans will be drawn closer together in a common effort to make the nation's cities better places to live and work.

MAJOR DOMESTIC ISSUES

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently was asked by the Connecticut State news manager of the United Press International, Mr. James V. Healion, to prepare a brief statement for publication of my views of the principal domestic issue facing Congress today. I chose to dwell upon two issues: first, the need for a more equitable tax structure; and, second, the need for better regulation of Government spending. These issues are, of course, closely related and they are intertwined with two other questions: How does the Democratic Congress adapt to the Nixon administration? And how does the Nixon administration plan to work with the Democratic Congress?

The statement follows:

> There are two principal domestic issues facing the 91st Congress:
>
> 1. The need for a more equitable tax structure;
>
> 2. The need for better regulation of government spending.
>
> The Congress must, as it did last year, continue to take firm steps to control spending programs. Let me cite some opportunities for cutting. In the case of the farm subsidy program, the seven percent of the U.S. population engaged in farming is receiving approximately 20% of the non-defense budget. This is analagous to the unhappy state of affairs existing in the late 1950's when the eight percent of the population engaged in farming were receiving approximately 18 percent of the non-defense budget. This program clearly needs to have its excessively high-spending priority re-evaluated; indeed the out-of-date concept of crop subsidies and farmer welfare needs re-evaluation as to its efficiency and its relevance to modern conditions.
>
> Other spending programs whose priorities need prompt re-evaluation are those directly aimed at improving the quality of life in the nation's urban and metropolitan centers. Clearly, Federal programs for more effective law enforcement in urban America require upgrading. The same holds true for major urban renewal programs and those providing for expanded and improved urban mass transit facilities. In regard to transit, we are reaching a critical turning point in the traditional relationship between the public sector and the private sector as represented by the railroad corporations.
>
> The Penn Central Railroad Company has requested State and Federal assistance for the support of its commuter services and it is clear that a viable rail passenger operation is a vital component in the State's economy.
>
> Another program with a national scope but a largely urban impact which requires re-evaluation is Federal welfare assistance. Here is a case where the degree and kind of Federal participation has changed radically in recent years. Expansion of the welfare program, however, has only made it more costly and more inefficient. Spending for welfare—in the states as in the nation—must be reviewed from top to bottom.
>
> Re-examination is particularly required in programs related to the country's security. In this area there has been dramatic expansion, brought on in large part by the Vietnam involvement. In addition, we are faced with requests for a new level of Federal spending for national defense and every program must be judged upon its merits and further inrceases must be approved only upon the clearest proof of necessity.
>
> It is clear from the foregoing that there is an overall necessity for establishing spending priorities and budgetary controls for every government agency, and in this connection, I have filed H.R. 5545 which sets up a Commission to do just this.
>
> The other side of the coin from spending is taxing, and on this issue, there can be no doubt that the time for major reform has arrived. My own tax reform package (H.R. 7744) requires a minimum twenty percent tax on the incomes of eligible individuals and corporations. I have taken care to devise this tax so that it is broad enough to neutralize some of the provisions in our tax laws which individuals and corporations utilize to avoid tax liability. The purpose of my tax program is not to soak the rich but to achieve a greater measure of equity. The program is designed to meet the justified complaints about tax avoidance which have been so frequently expressed by the nation's middle income earners. The 91st Congress, judging from the hearings of the House Ways and Means Committee, is giving serious consideration to tax reform proposals.
>
> The course of action which Congress takes with regard to spending priorities and tax reform will not be independent of the Executive. The policies advocated by the Administration during the 91st Congress will be of major consequence. It is too early to evaluate or assess the Nixon Administration, but it is not too early to point up the issues and the problems that confront the Republican Executive and the Democratic Congress. Re-evaluation of priorities and com-

prehensive tax reform are complex and interrelated issues. The ultimate shape of the Republican program and the date of its eventual submission will become critical factors within the whole legislative equation. Political climate must be considered also. The Administration and the Congressional leadership will have to cooperate fully if this fundamental spending and taxing challenge is to be met successfully. A spirit of common partnership must prevail over partisan politics.

Thus the questions become: How does the Democratic Congress adapt to the Nixon Administration? And how does the Nixon Administration plan to work with the Democratic Congress?

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Reuss, today, for 60 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Morton (at the request of Mr. Landgrebe), for 30 minutes today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Schwengel (at the request of Mr. Landgrebe), for 1 hour, on April 22; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McCarthy) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Culver, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Hawkins, for 30 minutes, on April 16.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Colmer.

Mr. Edmondson to include a summary legal analysis of the Atomic Energy Act immediately following his discussion with Mr. Holifield on the bill H.R. 4148.

Mr. Matsunaga during consideration of H.R. 5067 on the Private Calendar.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Landgrebe) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Findley.
Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Pelly in two instances.
Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Hunt.
Mr. Lipscomb in two instances.
Mr. Horton in two instances.
Mr. Conte in two instances.
Mr. Halpern in three instances.
Mr. Collier in four instances.
Mr. Frey.
Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Foreman in two instances.
Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Springer.
Mr. Bow in two instances.
Mr. Ashbrook in two instances.
Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Derwinski in three instances.
Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Broyhill of Virginia in three instances.
Mr. Blackburn in two instances.
Mr. Gross.
Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Roudebush in two instances.
Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McCarthy) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Reuss in six instances.
Mr. Corman.
Mr. Howard.
Mr. Addabbo in two instances.
Mr. Donohue in four instances.
Mr. Brademas in six instances.
Mr. Clay in three instances.
Mr. Boland in two instances.
Mr. Vanik in three instances.
Mr. Eilberg.
Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Podell in four instances.
Mr. Rarick in three instances.
Mr. Gilbert.
Mr. Burke of Massachusetts.
Mr. Bingham in three instances.
Mr. Mikva.
Mr. Edwards of California.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey.
Mr. St Germain.
Mr. Hamilton in four instanecs.
Mr. Nichols.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Gonzalez in three instances.
Mr. Marsh in two instances.
Mr. Hungate.
Mr. Moorhead in six instances.
Mr. Kastenmeier.
Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Udall in six instances.
Mr. Carey.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 16, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

675. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report on his survey of postal rates, pursuant to the provisions of 39 U.S.C. 2304 (H. Doc. No. 91–97); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

676. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration transmitting a report of proposed action to conduct the bioscience program at a level in excess of that authorized in the NASA Authorization Act, 1969, together with the facts and circumstances related to this action, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of that act; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

677. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installation and Logistics), transmitting the report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July–December 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

678. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of a review of the Saturn S–IVB–503 stage accident under the Apollo program, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

679. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of deferment of construction charges for the Eden project, Wyoming, due in 1969, 1970, and 1971 under repayment contract with Eden Valley Irrigation and Drainage District, pursuant to the provisions of the act of September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. 584); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

680. A letter from the treasurer, American Chemical Society, transmitting the 1968 annual report of the society, together with a copy of the audit of its books and records for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 8 of Public Law 358, 75th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

681. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an appropriation request for the Department of Justice to combat lawlessness (H. Doc. No. 91–98); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

682. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting requests for additional appropriations to the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 91–99); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

683. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting recommendations of net reductions in 1970 requests for appropriations, together with details of the changes (H. Doc. No. 91–100); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

684. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an appropriation request to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States (H. Doc. No. 91–101); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 366. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 514, a bill to extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–147). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 10063. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a full annuity for any individual (without regard to his age) who has completed 30 years of railroad service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 10064. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 10065. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 10066. A bill to designate the Interstate System as the "Eisenhower Interstate Highway System"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 10067. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10068. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain contracts entered into by the Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 10069. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 10070. A bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 10071. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 10072. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to designate the home of a State legislator for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 10073. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic $5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 10074. A bill to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to colleges and universities which are experiencing campus disorders and fail to take appropriate corrective measures within a reasonable time and to require the termination of Federal financial assistance to teachers, instructors, and lecturers guilty of violation of any law in connection with such disorders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 10075. A bill to amend the act, entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 10076. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of 16 years, to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10077. A bill to prohibit the investment of income derived from certain criminal activities in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10078. A bill to provide for the investigative detention and search of persons suspected of involvement in, or knowledge of, Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10079. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to establish extended terms of imprisonment for certain offenders convicted of felonies in Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10080. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize conditional pretrial release or pretrial detention of persons charged with noncapital offenses who are determined to pose a danger to the community or persons or property in the community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10081. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the penalty provision applicable to a Federal felony committed with a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10082. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to injure, intimidate, or interfere with any fireman performing his duties during the course of any riot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10083. A bill to amend chapter 207 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize conditional pretrial release or pretrial detention of certain persons who have been charged with noncapital offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10084. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for improved criminal procedure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10085. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to prohibit the investment of certain income in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10086. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Organized Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 10087. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to modify the provisions relating to taxes on wagering to insure the constitutional rights of taxpayers, to facilitate the collection of such taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 10088. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a full annuity for any individual (without regard to his age) who has completed 30 years of railroad service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 10089. A bill to change the definition of ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10090. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the standard deduction and the minimum standard deduction allowable to individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10091. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10092. A bill to provide for the appointment of an advisory committee to recommend improvements in, and simplification of, Federal tax return forms and procedures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 10093. A bill to require tribal consent to all grants of right-of-way over Indian tribal land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 10094. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to include the design of motor vehicles within such act, to authorize certain testing facilities, and to require Federal licensing for certain purposes of automobile dealers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 10095. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10096. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to exempt certain private aircraft entering or departing from the United States and Canada at night or on Sunday or a holiday from provisions requiring payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 10097. A bill to amend the act, entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10098. A bill to provide a uniform allowance for certain motor vehicle maintenance employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10099. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal revenues with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 10100. A bill to limit military appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 and to provide for the return of certain funds to county and city governments; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 10101. A bill to establish a commission to study the use of chemicals in peace and war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 10102. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to permit smaller redevelopment areas in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 10103. A bill to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 10104. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1956, to give the Muscatine Bridge Commission additional time to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAGGERS (by request):

H.R. 10105. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1970 and 1971, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 10106. A bill to revise the definition of a "child" for purposes of veterans' benefits provided by title 38, United States Code, to recognize an adopted child as a dependent from the date of issuance of an interlocutory decree; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UTT (for himself and Mr. BETTS):

H.R. 10107. A bill to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 10108. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of second- and third-class mailing permits of mail users who have used these permits systematically in the mailing of obscene, sadistic, lewd, or pandering mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 10109. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if the father or a brother or sister of such member dies, is in missing status, or is totally disabled as a result of service in the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 10110. A bill to provide increased opportunities for students in higher education for off-campus employment by establishing programs of work-study cooperative education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10111. A bill to provide employment and training opportunities for low-income and unemployed persons; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10112. A bill to guarantee productive employment opportunities for those who are unemployed or underemployed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10113. A bill to further promote equal employment opportunities of American workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10114. A bill to provide assistance for the improvement of State and Local law-enforcement agencies through acquisition of equipment for those agencies and provisions of educational opportunities to their personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10115. A bill to encourage improvements in the machinery of judicial administration by establishing within the Department of Justice the Office for Judicial Assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10116. A bill to promote the public welfare; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 10117. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, in order to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay the total cost of a member's servicemen's group life insurance during any period that such member is serving in a combat zone; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10118. A bill to provide incentives for the creation by private industry of additional employment opportunities for residents of urban poverty areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10119. A bill to encourage and assist private enterprise to provide adequate housing in urban poverty areas for low- and lower-middle-income persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10120. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to include, among the health insurance benefits covered under Part B thereof, coverage of certain drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10121. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to improve the program of aid to families with dependent children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10122. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant additional income tax personal exemptions to taxpayers supporting mentally retarded dependents under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 10123. A bill to require Federal approval of voluntary industrial standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 10124. A bill to amend section 2401 of title 28, United States Code, to extend the time for filing tort actions by persons under the age of 21, or insane or mentally ill, or imprisoned on a criminal charge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 10125. A bill to amend the act, entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD (for himself and Mr. Springer):

H.R. 10126. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for grants for the construction and modernization of public health centers and public and nonprofit private facilities for long-term care, rehabilitation facilities, and diagnostic or treatment centers, to provide for loan guarantees for nonprofit private hospitals and other medical facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 10127. A bill to provide additional protection for the rights of participants in private pension plans, to establish minimum standards for vesting and funding of private pension plans, to provide an insurance program guaranteeing plan termination protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GILBERT (for himself, Mr. Burleson of Texas, Mr. Gibbons, and Mrs. Griffiths):

H.R. 10128. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 10129. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (for himself and Mr. Hosmer) (by request):

H.R. 10130. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 10131. A bill to designate the Pentagon as "The Eisenhower Center"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10132. A bill to transfer certain functions to the Administrator of General Services; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 10133. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Lung Institute; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLEPPE (for himself, Mr. Andrews of North Dakota, Mr. Brotzman, Mr. Price of Texas, Mr. Sebelius, Mr. Winn, Mr. Berry, and Mr. Denney):

H.R. 10134. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1956 (70 Stat. 1115), as amended, providing for a Great Plains conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 10135. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to liberalize both the minimum standard deduction and the percentage standard deduction, and to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL (for himself, Mr. Broyhill of Virginia, Mr. Burleson of Texas, Mr. Cabell, Mr. Don H. Clausen, Mr. Denney, Mr. King of New York, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Watson, Mr. Burke of Florida, and Mr. Miller of Ohio):

H.R. 10136. A bill to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to colleges and universities which are experiencing campus disorders and fail to take appropriate corrective measures forthwith, and to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to teachers participating in such disorders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 10137. A bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds necessary for acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 10138. A bill to amend section 211 of the Public Health Service Act to equalize the retirement benefits for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service with retirement benefits provided for other officers in the uniformed services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 10139. A bill to enable consumers to protect themselves against arbitrary, erroneous, and malicious credit information; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10140. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal reclamation laws relating to the furnishing of water service to excess lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 10141. A bill to remove financial barriers so that all high school graduates will have equal opportunity for a postsecondary education of good quality, to strengthen institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10142. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide increased support for medical education; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 10143. A bill to improve education in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 10144. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.J. Res. 643. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

H.J. Res. 644. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to eliminate the office of presidential elector, and for other purposes, and proposing a further amendment providing for direct, popular election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.J. Res. 645. Joint resolution to provide for a study and evaluation of scientific research in medicine in the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.J. Res. 646. Joint resolution to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 647. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.J. Res. 648. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 649. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the third week in May of each year as "Municipal Clerk's Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.J. Res. 650. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period June 14 through June 21, 1969, as "National Painting and Decorating Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.J. Res. 651. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct election of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.J. Res. 652. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. Con. Res. 200. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the site where the first American astronaut lands on the moon be named Point Eisenhower; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. Res. 364. Resolution dismissing the election contest in the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 365. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation of the circumstances surrounding the recent trial, conviction, and sentencing of members of the Armed Forces on mutiny charges; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 10145. A bill for the relief of Maria and Onofrio Spadafino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 10146. A bill for the relief of Chung Chi Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 10147. A bill for the relief of Nicola Gemmiti and his wife, Michela Gemmiti, and their child, Piero Gemmiti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 10148. A bill for the relief of Seydou Diop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 10149. A bill for the relief of Jack W. Herbstreit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 10150. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Kelly Air Force Base, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 10151. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the District of Columbia to the National Firefighting Museum and Center for Fire Prevention, Inc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 10152. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the District of Columbia to the National Firefighting Museum and Center for Fire Prevention, Inc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 10153. A bill for the relief of Frances von Wedel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 10154. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Chapiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10155. A bill for the relief of Nikola Filipidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 10156. A bill for the relief of Lidia Mendola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 10157. A bill for the relief of First Trust & Savings Bank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

93. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council, Elizabeth, N.J., relative to commemorating April 17 as the anniversary of the Bay of Pigs invasion, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Tuesday, April 15, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our life, through all the circling years, we trust in Thee;
In all the past, through all our hopes and fears, Thy hand we see.
With each new day, when morning lifts the veil,
We own Thy mercies, Lord, which never fail.

God of the past, our times are in Thy hand; with us abide.
Lead us by faith to hope's true promised land; be Thou our guide.
With Thee to bless, the darkness shines as light,
And faith's fair vision changes into sight.

God of the coming years, through paths unknown we follow Thee;
When we are strong, Lord, leave us not alone; our refuge be.
Be Thou for us in life our daily bread,
Our heart's true Home when all our years have sped.

—HUGH THOMPSON KERR, 1916.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 14, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of the Senate proceedings.)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 11, 1969, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Basil Rowland Duncan;

S. 586. An act for the relief of Nguyen Van Hue; and

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to extend the time for making of a final report by the Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

John D. J. Moore, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works:

E. L. Stewart, of Oklahoma, to be Federal cochairman of the Ozarks Regional Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Defense Procurement From Small and Other Business Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July through December 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a review of the Saturn S-IVB-503 stage accident under the Apollo program, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated April 15, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Boys' Clubs of America

A letter from the national director of the Boys' Clubs of America transmitting, pursuant to law, an audited financial statement of Boys' Clubs of America for the year 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Survey of Postal Rates

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department on a review of the postal-rate structure and studies of expenses incurred and revenues received in connection with the various classes of mail, dated April 15, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States to Present to the States for Ratification a Constitutional Amendment Permitting the Recital of a Nonsectarian Prayer in the Public Schools

"Whereas in the case of Engel v. Vitale (370 U.S. 421) decided in the year 1962, the Supreme Court of the United States declared the use in the public schools of a voluntary prayer as prepared by the board of regents of the state of New York to be unconstitutional; and

"Whereas it is the will and desire of the vast majority to recognize the existence of God and our dependence on Him; and

"Whereas it is their belief that there is a great need to instill in the hearts and minds of our youth proper respect and reverence to the Supreme Being; and

"Whereas the recital of voluntary prayers in our public schools will accomplish that purpose and will help maintain traditions cherished by so many of our citizens; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to present to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment permitting the recital of a nonsectarian prayer in the public schools; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, March 27, 1969.

"Norman L. Pidgeon,
"*Clerk.*

"House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, April 1, 1969.

"Wallace C. Mills,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"John F. X. Davoren,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

A resolution of the Saipan Legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution 21-6-1969

"A resolution informing the Congress of the United States of America of the desire of the people of the Saipan Municipality that the alternatives of the upcoming Trust Territory Plebiscite provide for decisions on a district-by-district basis

"*Be it resolved by the twenty-first Saipan Legislature, that:*

"Whereas the six administrative districts of the Trust Territory vary greatly, in cultural, historical and linguistic characteristics; and

"Whereas the announced Territory-Wide Plebiscite of 1972 will record the wishes of these diverse peoples of the territory for a future political status; and

"Whereas reflecting upon the manifold differences of the territory's island group, the people of the Municipality of Saipan within the Mariana Islands District desire that in the forthcoming plebiscite they be given the alternative to choose separation from the other districts of the territory as the Marianas District future political status: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Twenty-first Saipan Legislature informs the Congress of the United States of America of the desire of the people of the Saipan Municipality that the alternative of the upcoming Trust Territory Plebiscite provide for decisions on a district-by-district basis; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Speaker certify to and the Legislature Clerk attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the United States of America, the United Nations Trusteeship Council, and the President, Mariana Islands District Legislature. Passed and Adopted this 17th day of March, 1969.

"Herman Q. Guerrero,
"*Speaker.*

"Attested:

"Daniel T. Muna,
"*Legislature Clerk.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; ordered to lie on the table:

"Resolution 19

"A concurrent resolution expressing profound regret for the recent death of Dwight David Eisenhower; expressing appreciation for his many contributions to the United States of America and the World; and directing distribution

"Whereas on Friday, March 28, 1969, the United States of America and the entire World suffered the loss of General Dwight David Eisenhower—a great statesman, a great general, a great American, and a great man—beloved and respected by all; and

"Whereas he attained the pinnacle of a sterling military career and led the greatest military machine in history to victory during World War II, thereby winning the hearts of his countrymen and their allies and earning the respect of all, including the enemies of his Country against whom he valiantly fought; and

"Whereas General Eisenhower's truly unselfish devotion to his Country and his fellowman is reflected in the willingness with which he gave of himself again to serve his Country as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces and President of the United States, during which time the world was blessed to enjoy a period of tranquility; and

"Whereas by reason of his own devotion to duty, Dwight David Eisenhower inspired many Americans to go forth and accomplish great things; and

"Wheras partisan considerations notwithstanding; America can be justly proud of the phenomenal record of achievement of this brilliant man who constantly displayed a breadth of interest, a depth of knowledge and understanding, a compassionate concern for the welfare of our Nation and its people, and an enthusiasm for hard work and unrelenting effort; and

"Whereas Dwight David Eisenhower was exhalted as few men have been in America and truly deserves to share with George Washington the noble eulogy that "he was, in his day, first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen"; and

"Whereas his death has taken from the World and from Oklahomans a true friend, and this loss is felt by all members of the Oklahoma Legislature; and

"Whereas we wish to express our deepest and sincerest sympathy in the grief that is shared by the World: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the first session of the thirty-second Oklahoma Legislature, the House of Representatives concurring therein.*

"Section 1. That this Legislature on behalf of its members and on behalf of the people of Oklahoma does hereby express to the family of General Dwight David Eisenhower profound sorrow and regret at the loss to our State, our Country and the World resulting from the death of General Eisenhower and does further express its deep appreciation for his countless contributions to his fellowman, his Country and to the entire World.

"Section 2. That duly authenticated copies of this resolution be delivered to Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, John Eisenhower, the White House, the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the Senate the 1st day of April, 1969.

"Denzil D. Garrison,
"*Acting President of the Senate.*

"Adopted by the House of Representatives the 2d day of April, 1969.

"Rex Pruett,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Certification:

"Basil R. Wilson,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Elizabeth, N.J., praying for the enactment of legislation proclaiming the date of April 17 as a date in tribute to the Cuban Freedom Fighter who fought and died in the Bay of Pigs invasion; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Culver City Young Democrats, Culver City, Calif., urging the U.S. Senate to ratify the United Nations Conventions on Genocide, Forced Labor, and the Political Rights of Women; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition adopted by the Episcopal Diocese of New York, St. Philip's Church, New York, praying for the enactment of legislation establishing January 15, Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday, as a national legal memorial holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 265. A bill for the relief of John (Giovanni) Denaro (Rept. No. 126); and

S. 1531. A bill for the relief of Chi Jen Feng (Rept. No. 128).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1625. A bill for the relief of Gong Sing Hom; (Rept. No. 127).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MATHIAS:

S. 1804. A bill for the relief of William H. Morning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself, Mr. Brooke, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Kennedy, and Mr. McIntyre):

S. 1805. A bill to preserve and promote the resources of the Connecticut River Valley, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOODELL:

S. 1806. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for a national system of public assistance to needy individuals and for grants to States for services to such individuals and to strengthen the Federal support of the State medical assistance program; to the Committee on Finance; and

S. 1807. A bill to improve education in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Goodell when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Hart, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Pell, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 1808. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1809. A bill to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, to authorize advance funding of such programs, to require notice to Congress prior to delegation of any program to another agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Nelson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina:

S. 1810. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rosemary E. DeLeon; and

S. 1811. A bill for the relief of Dr. Auturo J. DeLeon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1812. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to include chiropractor's services among the benefits provided by the insurance program established by part B of such title; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TYDINGS (by request):

S. 1813. A bill to provide public assistance to mass transit bus companies in the District of Columbia; and for other purposes; and

S. 1814. A bill to provide for public ownership of the mass transit bus system operated by D.C. Transit System, Inc.; to authorize interim financial assistance for the company pending public acquisition of its bus transit facilities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tydings when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1815. A bill to amend section 5517 of title 5, United States Code, to authorize certain agreements relating to withholding of State income taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tydings when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. Nelson):

S. 1816. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for treatment and rehabilitation centers for drug addicts and drug abusers, and to carry out drug abuse education curriculum programs, and to strengthen the coordination of drug abuse control programs by establishing the National Council on Drug Abuse Control; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. Bayh):

S. 1817. A bill to provide a uniform 24-hour voting period for polling places in Federal elections; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. Baker when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1818. A bill to provide for the inclusion of environmental quality considerations in the decision-making processes of government; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tydings when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 1819. A bill for the relief of Chung Wai Hung; and

S. 1820. A bill for the relief of Lam Kan Wo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1821. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to State policemen for amounts paid for meals while on duty; to the Committee on Finance; and

S. 1822. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purpose of computing annuities of surviving spouses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pastore when he introduced the second above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE (for himself and Mr. Kennedy):

S. 1823. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the restriction on the use of certain private institutions under the dependents' medical care program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pastore when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1824. A bill for the relief of Kwok Kwong Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGLETON:

S. 1825. A bill for the relief of Sujittra La-Ongmani Cross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. Bible, Mr. Cannon, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Stevens):

S. 1826. A bill to increase the domestic production of gold to meet the needs of national defense and preserve the gold mining industry of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mundt when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. Hart):

S. 1827. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a minimum income tax, to require the allocation of deductions allowed to individuals in certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 1828. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the minimum standard deduction; and

S. 1829. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce and extend the tax surcharge and to suspend the investment credit during the remaining period of applicability of the tax surcharge; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Harris when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. Gravel, and Mr. Stevens):

S. 1830. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska natives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKE:

S. 1831. A bill for the relief of Ezzallah Radi Abou Yazbeck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOK (for himself, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Mathias, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Packwood, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Schweiker, and Mr. Randolph:)

S.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution establishing the Federal Committee on Nuclear Development; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cook when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAKER:

S.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the conduct within each State of presidential preference elections and the election of delegates to conventions of national political parties for the nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; and

S.J. Res. 93. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States enabling citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Baker when he introduced the above joint resolutions, which apppear under separate headings.)

S. 1806 AND S. 1807—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS CREATING A NATIONAL SYSTEM OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND A PROGRAM OF FEDERAL BLOCK GRANTS FOR EDUCATION

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the "Federal Public Assistance Act" and the "Federal-State Education Act of 1969."

I am introducing these bills at the request of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York.

The Federal Public Assistance Act creates a national system of public assistance for needy individuals. It also provides Federal grants to States for nonmedical services—such as child welfare services—to these individuals. And it provides increased Federal support of State medical assistance for the needy and medically indigent.

The Federal-State Education Act of 1969 establishes a new program of Federal block grants to the States for education.

Spiraling welfare and education costs have been placing an intolerable burden on State and local taxpayers. The Federal Government must meet a greater share of these costs, in order to permit the States and localities to set their fiscal house in order, and to relieve State and local taxpayers.

I have long urged that the Federal Government bear a larger proportion of the rapidly rising welfare costs. A system of national welfare standards and increased Federal welfare financing is needed to overhaul the present obsolete and unfair system that has become such a burden to States and localities. As long as States and local governments have to meet their present share of the cost of public assistance, they will be unable to solve their fiscal problems; and the poor will suffer through inadequate benefit levels. Only a better system of Federal financing can eliminate the present glaring disparities in welfare benefits among the States, which have contributed so much to the migration of the poor into our overburdened cities.

I also have long supported a system of Federal block grants for education, to enable the States to support, assist, and strengthen educational programs at all levels—while giving each State the flexibility to develop the educational programs best suited to its needs.

These bills go to the heart of the fiscal problems of rising welfare and education costs faced by State and local governments across the country. They deserve most serious study and consideration by Congress.

In proposals as important, complex, and far-reaching as these, various changes, refinements, and clarifications may be needed. I am placing these bills before the Senate now, so that the process of study, examination, and review may begin.

The proposed Federal Public Assistance Act is a new plan for creating a national system of public welfare. Under this proposal, the Federal Government will, beginning in fiscal 1973, assume full financial responsibility for the cost of cash assistance welfare programs for all needy persons. All those below the poverty level, adjusted for variations of cost of living, would be declared eligible to receive this assistance. During the interim period before fiscal 1973, the bill would provide, on a step-by-step basis, increased Federal participation in financing cash assistance programs; and prescribe Federal standards for eligibility and benefits for public assistance. The bill would also:

Create stronger incentives for welfare recipients to obtain jobs by permitting them to retain up to $75 per month and one-third of any additional earnings they make.

Provide Federal grants to meet not less than 75 percent of State expenditures for nonmedical services to needy individuals, such as child welfare services, counseling and guidance, and family planning services.

Increase Federal support of medicaid to no less than 75 percent of State medicaid expenditures; and raise eligibility for medicaid to 150 percent of the public assistance standard under the bill.

Under the welfare bill, the Federal Government would spend in fiscal 1970 about $1.8 billion more than the approximately $4 billion it would spend on welfare—exclusive of medicaid—under existing law. By fiscal 1973, when the Federal Government assumed the full cost of welfare, it would spend roughly $10 billion more than the estimated $5 billion it would spend on welfare under present law. In that year, the States and localities would largely be relieved of the more than $5 billion they otherwise would have to pay as their share of welfare costs.

The proposed Federal-State Education Act of 1969 would create a new system of Federal block grants to the States for education. The bill would authorize $2.75 billion in block grants in fiscal 1970, the first year of its operation; and $14 billion in fiscal 1973, the fourth year. The amount of each State's block grant would be based on population, need and tax effort. The grants would be available for elementary and secondary, higher, vocational, and technical education, preschool, and adult education. It would leave each State wide discretion to develop the educational programs it needs.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bills be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the Record.

The bills (S. 1806) to amend the Social Security Act to provide for a national system of public assistance to needy individuals and for grants to States for services to such individuals and to strengthen the Federal support of the State medical assistance program; (S. 1807) to improve education in the United States, introduced by Mr. Goodell, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, respectively.

The summary, presented by Mr. Goodell, follows:

Federal Public Assistance Act

PURPOSES

The bill would create a national system of public assistance to needy individuals, to become effective after a transitional period. It would provide step-by-step increase in Federal support of state public assistance programs during this transition period.

The bill would also provide Federal grants to states for non-medical services (such as child welfare services) to needy individuals. It would provide increased Federal support of state medical assistance programs for the needy and medically indigent.

The bill would add a new Title XX to the Social Security Act, and amend existing law.

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF PUBLIC WELFARE

Part A of the proposed Title XX would establish a national system of public welfare to take effect after a transition period.

Effective in fiscal year 1973, the Federal government would finance the *full cost* of public assistance programs.

All individuals who are residents of the United States and whose income and resources (exclusive of public assistance) are less than the "minimum living requirement" would be eligible for assistance. The amount of assistance would be equal to the "minimum living requirement" less the amount of recipient's own income and resources.

The "minimum living requirement" would be based on the non-farm poverty level as determined by the Social Security Administration for the year 1966 (adjusted to take into account subsequent changes in price levels). The Social Security Administration's 1966 figures show $3355 as the poverty level for a non-farm family of four.

The "minimum living requirement" could be increased above or decreased below these poverty level figures by not more than 15% on the basis of regional differences in the cost of particular items such as heat, clothing or rent.

In determining eligibility for and the amount of public assistance, earned income to the extent of the first $75 per month plus one-third of additional earnings would be disregarded, except that any earned income in excess of one-third of the "minimum living requirement" would not be disregarded.

The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare would be authorized to enter into an agreement with each state, under which a state agency would administer the program. The cost of administration would be met by the Federal government. If a state did not wish to make such an agreement, the program would be administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

INTERIM FEDERAL STANDARDS AND FINANCING OF WELFARE ASSISTANCE

Part C of the proposed Title XX of the Social Security Act would establish an interim program of Federal standards and assistance. This program would apply to the transition fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972, before full Federal financing takes effect. Receiving the assistance would be optional to the states, conditional on their complying with the standards and submitting an approved plan.

In fiscal 1970, each state wishing to take advantage of the interim program would have to have the following minimum budgetary standard of need (that is, the amount to be paid to a person without any resources):

	Per month
Children	$40
Aged	$65
Blind and disabled	$90
General assistance	$40

These minimums are based on the present average benefit levels in the nation.

In fiscal 1971, the minimum budgetary standard of need would be increased by 115% of the 1970 standard. And in fiscal 1972, it would be raised to 130% of the 1970 standard. (As noted above, in 1973, the year of full Federal takeover, the standard of need would be raised to the poverty level.)

The Federal share of these welfare costs during the interim period would be increased as follows:

In the first year (fiscal 1970), the Federal government would pay 100% of the first $30 of welfare assistance paid to each needy child and 50% of the remainder paid to him (up to an additional $40). A similar scale would be established for the other types of welfare recipients.

In second and third years (fiscal 1971 and 1972), the Federal government would pay a minimum of 75% of welfare costs.

SOCIAL AND OTHER NON-MEDICAL SERVICES

The bill would require those states participating in the transitional program to provide social and other non-medical services to all needy individuals. These include child welfare services; counselling and guidance; and family planning services.

States would be required to provide day care services adequate to meet the needs of those mothers who want to work.

Effective July 1, 1969, Federal financial reimbursement would be not less than 75% of state expenditures for these non-medical services to needy individuals (including administrative expenses). Federal aid now ranges from 50% to 75%.

When the Federal government takes over the full cost of public assistance payments, all states would be required to provide these services or forgo Federal reimbursement for Medicaid.

MEDICAID AMENDMENTS

The bill would make the following changes in Medicaid:

Effective in fiscal year 1971, Federal financial participation for Medicaid would be no less than 75% of the state's total expenditures for Medicaid (including administrative expenditures).

Eligibility for Medicaid would be raised to 150% of the public assistance standard under the bill.

MAINTENANCE OF STATE AND LOCAL TAX EFFORT

The bill would require, effective in fiscal year 1973, that states maintain their tax efforts, or else be penalized by reduction in Federal formula aid.

Each state would be required, in fiscal year 1973 and subsequent years, to maintain a tax effort index of not less than the average tax effort index for fiscal years 1970, 1971 and 1972. The tax effort index would be defined as the aggregate of state and local tax revenues as a percent of total personal income for the state.

AUTHORIZATIONS

The bill would authorize "such sums as may be necessary" to meet the cost of the national welfare program and the interim financing program. Federal funding would, however, be subject to the annual appropriation process.

FEDERAL-STATE EDUCATION ACT OF 1969

PURPOSES

The bill would provide substantial Federal block grants to the states to enable them to support, assist and strengthen educational programs at all levels.

It would provide opportunities for education and training to all persons, particularly those in low income families. It would leave to each state optimum flexibility to develop programs best suited to its needs, and it would provide incentives to states and localities to make reasonable fiscal effort for education.

FINANCING

Section 2 of the bill provides that it is the intent of Congress that the costs of the block grants for education be financed by increasing the existing Federal income tax rate and/or improving the Federal income tax structure so that by the fiscal year 1973, an amount equal to 10% of the revenues derived from the Federal income tax be utilized for financing this program.

AMOUNT OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Section 3 authorizes the following amounts for block grants for education:

1970	$2,750,000,000
1971	5,500,000,000
1972	9,000,000,000
1973	14,000,000,000

ALLOTMENTS TO THE STATES

Section 4 provides that the amount of each State's block grant be based on population, need and tax effort.

Specifically, Federal funds would be allotted among the States on the following basis:

30% on the basis of tax effort (state and local taxes as a percent of state personal income adjusted for population);

25% on the basis of the formula in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act;

20% on the basis of the formula in the Higher Education Facilities Act;

15% on the basis of the Vocational Education Act; and

10% on the basis of the state's population aged 3 to 5 and per capita income.

USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Section 5 requires the funds to be utilized in accordance with a State plan submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who would determine that the plan provided reasonable assurances that—

At least 20% of the state's allotment will be used in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act relating to: purposes for which funds are to be used; distribution of funds within a state; conditions applicable to the use of funds (e.g. programs to be of benefit to students in non-public schools);

At least 15% will be used for education at institutions of higher education, including public community colleges and public technical institutes;

At least 10% will be used for vocational education; and

The remaining 55% will be used for the above or other educational purposes.

MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT

Section 7 provides that the fiscal effort for education by a state and its political subdivisions in any year must be equal to such effort for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. If it fell below the fiscal 1968 level, Federal funds to the state would be reduced by the amount of the difference.

FEDERAL CONTROL PROHIBITED

Section 8 provides that the bill does not authorize any Federal agency to exercise any control or supervision over personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction or administration of any educational institution or school system.

S. 1808—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL PROHIBITING HARMFUL CHILD LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and other Senators, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to prohibit harmful agricultural child labor outside of regular school hours and when school is not in session.

The harmful employment of children in agriculture is one of the most unfortunate aspects of our present farm labor situation. Existing Federal and State laws relating to the employment of children in agriculture chiefly apply only during school hours. Aside from the existing Federal exclusion of children up to age 16 from particularly hazardous occupations, a child of any age, when school is not in regular session, may be employed in farmwork. This condition has all but disappeared from industry, yet today approximately 375,000 children between the ages of 10 and 13 perform hired farm labor.

Migratory children, who comprise a significant segment of the children employed in agriculture, are the most seriously affected by the absence of meaningful child labor legislation. Unlimited arduous farmwork is undoubtedly harmful to the health of young children. As early as 1951 a subcommittee of the American Medical Association urged that a general 14-year age minimum be set for employment. Long hours of tiring work whether in factories or in beet or tomato fields is harmful to children in two ways. First, a child early in life must grow and gain weight. Farm labor such as the thinning, pulling, and topping of beets or the picking of strawberries or cotton requires constant bending, stooping, and frequent lifting. This excessive muscular activity expends the child's energy which should be used in the natural process of growth. Consequently, children who engage in arduous labor become undernourished and undersized. Second, chronic fatigue lowers a child's resistance to disease and infection and also interferes with his educational progress. Only one of every three farm wage workers has completed more than 8 years of schooling and only one in six has graduated from high school. One-fourth of our Nation's farmworkers have either never attended school or have not completed more than 4 years of schooling.

The continued exclusion of children working in agriculture, and migrant children in particular, from the protections against harmful child labor will continue to cause high incidence of poverty, unemployment, dissatisfied teenagers and extensive drain on our general economy and on community welfare programs in particular.

Under this bill, a child would be permitted to work in agriculture outside of regular school hours or during vacation only if, first, he is 14 years of age or over, or, second, he is between 12 and 14 and commutes daily not more than 25 miles from his permanent residence and either has the written consent of his parent or his parent is employed on the same farm. By express provision in the bill, however, no restrictions are imposed on the employment of children working for their parents on a home farm.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1808) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1808

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 13(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the provisions of section 12 relating to child labor shall not apply to any employee employed in agriculture outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while he is so employed, if such employee is—

"(A) employed by his parent, or by a person standing in the place of his parent, on a farm owned or operated by such parent or persons, or

"(B) is 14 years of age or over, or

"(C) is 12 years of age or over and is employed on a farm to which he commutes daily within twenty-five miles of his permanent residence, and (i) such employment is with the written consent of his parent or person standing in place of his parent, or (ii) his parent or person standing in place of his parent is also employed on the same farm.

"(2) The provisions of section 12 relating to child labor shall apply to an employee below the age of sixteen employed in agriculture in an occupation that the Secretary of Labor finds and declares to be particularly hazardous for the employment of children below the age of sixteen, except where such employee is employed by his parent or by a person standing in the place of his parent on a farm owned or operated by such parent or person.

"(3) The provisions of section 12 relating to child labor shall not apply to any child employed as an actor or performer in motion pictures or theatrical productions, or in radio or television productions."

S. 1813 AND S. 1814—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUS LEGISLATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, today I am introducing two bills relating to bus transportation in Washington. These bills have been drafted at the request of the District of Columbia Committee and will be referred to its Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs. These bills are being introduced so that the committee may have concrete proposals before it when hearings are held.

One bill, drafted by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, provides for a public subsidy to private bus companies. The WMATC is the Maryland-Virginia-District of Columbia interstate compact authority which regulates local bus service.

The other bill, drafted by the District of Columbia government, provides for a temporary subsidy followed by public purchase of the bus company by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. The WMATA is the Maryland-Virginia-District of Columbia interstate compact authority created to plan and construct Washington's rapid rail transit system.

A hearing on these bills has been scheduled for 9:30 a.m., April 29, 1969, in room 6226, New Senate Office Building.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills (S. 1813) to provide public assistance to mass transit bus companies in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes and (S. 1814) to provide for public ownership of the mass transit bus system operated by District of Columbia Transit System, Inc.; to authorize interim financial assistance for the company pending public acquisition of its bus transit facilities; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1815—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL PERMITTING VOLUNTARY WITHHOLDING OF MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA INCOME TAXES FOR CONGRESSIONAL STAFF

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill which would permit congressional employees who work in the District but reside in Maryland or Virginia to have their State income tax withheld on a voluntary basis.

Under present law, employees of the agencies of the executive branch, the Library of Congress and the Government Printing Office enjoy this privilege. Many Capitol Hill employees would welcome the convenience of having their State income tax withheld. I would like to stress again that this arrangement would be strictly voluntary; each employee would decide whether or not his taxes would be withheld.

I recognize that such legislation must originate in the House. Former Congressman Hervey Machen introduced this legislation in the last Congress and the measure was favorably reported by the Ways and Means Committee. Maryland State Senator Steny Hoyer recently suggested that this measure not be allowed to drop and I appreciate his recalling it to my attention.

I am putting this bill before this Congress in the fervent hope that it will be added as an amendment to the first tax bill that is reported out of the Ways and Means Committee this session.

There is no reason why employees of the legislative branch should not possess the same rights and prerogatives enjoyed by other Federal employees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1815) to amend section 5517 of title 5, United States Code, to authorize certain agreements relating to withholding of State income taxes, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1816—INTRODUCTION OF THE DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of man's most important discoveries was the realization that he could heal his wounds, and cure his illnesses, with chemical substances and compounds. He took this realization into the laboratories and clinics, and what came out was the harbinger of our modern medical miracles.

Man created pills.

The pioneers of the American frontier had pills, salts, and oils when they moved west. The apothecary shop was a fixture on colonial main street. American medicine matured as doctors learned to harness the power of the pill, and make it work for good health. We learned how to use pills and liquids to heal tissue, kill pain, stop unwanted bleeding, reduce pressure, and otherwise improve the body's functions.

Unfortunately, modern Americans tend to abuse the privilege of the pill. Housewives take sedatives, sleeping pills, diet pills, headache pills, cold pills, and of course, "the pill." Truckdrivers take pills to stay awake on the long overnight hauls. Students take pills to pep them up, and keep them awake, as they cram for exams. All of us turn to aspirin, vitamins, and other "beneficial" pills. Advertisers tell us that we can relieve tension, end acid indigestion, restore youth and sex appeal with pills—so we buy more pills.

The national average is an incredible 29.5 drugs per medicine cabinet.

Most—if not all—of this pill taking is legitimate, and often helpful. What is appalling, is the fact that our willingness to "pop a pill" has, in turn, prompted a national frenzy in illegal drugs, addictive substances, and possibly fatal experimentation with "the stuff." We face the prospect of a coast-to-coast catastrophe—a drugged society.

Evidence of the mounting crisis in drug abuse is all around us:

Some authorities say that 30 percent of college students have tried marihuana at least once. Dr. James L. Goddard, former Chief of the Food and Drug Administration, has said that 400,000 Americans may be using it regularly. The New York Times recently estimated that 100 million Americans use some form of mind-altering drugs, including excessive alcohol, amphetamines, barbiturates, and tranquilizers. In 1967, the National Student Association reported that 61,792 drug arrests were made in California for illegal use of drugs.

One often hears that there are more than 50,000 heroin addicts in the United States, but that only reflects the number reported to the Government. U.S. News & World Report recently mentioned that in New York City alone, estimates on the number of heroin addicts run from 30 to 100 thousand—"depending on who is keeping score."

Last year, 5 million "5-grain units" of illicit drugs were seized at borders and ports of entry in our country. The total weight of all drugs confiscated for the year—including marijuana—hit 35 tons. The costs run from a "nickel" bag of marijuana for $5 to as high as $50,000 for a point of heroin. It has been calculated that New York City's addicts must raise from $500,000 to $700,000 per day to support their habit. To do so, many turn to robbery, shoplifting, burglary, forgery, and prostitution. If you do not use the "stuff," you could be one of hundreds of top distributors selling a half-grain of LSD, enough for 1,000 capsules to middlemen for $1 a capsule. In a month's time, you could easily sell 5,000 capsules and clear over $3,700.

Although these figures are important, particularly as they relate to escalating problems of crime and health, we too often concentrate on the statistics and forget the people. The human cost is more staggering and more tragic. Drug abusers seldom live successful lives—by their own standards or those of anyone else. Over a period of time, they lose interest in schools, jobs, and family. Drug abusers have few friends who are not also on drugs. They simply have neither the time nor the energy to keep up normal social contacts. Their only purpose becomes the search for enough drugs to keep "high" and to duck the agony of being suddenly deprived of drug support.

There is no doubt that the abuser deprived of drugs suffers greatly. But the worst of it is that whether "high" or looking for his next "kick"—he has lost control of his life. He has given up the power to decide and to act—the very things that make him human.

At what point do you lose control? No one knows. But the worst mistake is to assume you can stop once you start.

There is probably not one drug abuser alive—or dead—who did not say, "I won't get 'hooked.' It can't happen to me." It can—and it does.

Although the link between marijuana, and progressive involvement with more dangerous drugs, has only recently been explored, there is enough evidence to concern us. Even the hint of a cause-effect relationship between marijuana and the harder drugs should shock us into action.

Too many young people have justified the use of marijuana by claiming that it is no worse than consuming alcohol. Surely it is not valid to justify the adoption of a new abuse by trying to show that it is no worse than a presently existing one. The result can only be added social damage from a new source. Moreover, marijuana, unlike alcohol, is nearly always consumed by its users for the express purpose of attaining a "high" and a disorientating intoxication.

This justification or rationale is further complicated because there is no consistent public policy about prohibiting the use of things that are bad for us. If marijuana and other drugs are prohibited, we should add alcohol, tobacco, and the automobile. A recent Washington Post editorial said it this way:

> The decision to put the liquor salesman in the Chamber of Commerce and the pot salesman in jail is irrationally arbitrary.

When and how this public policy will be made uniform—either way—is at best, some time in the future.

We cannot afford to wait for this policy to change through public law. Nor can we wait for the country to accept what the Georgia Law Review said may be a constitutional "right to get 'high'" as part of the "right to individual freedom in the pursuit of happiness."

There is a realistic and more important task we can begin now—understanding, education, and rehabilitation.

Mr. President, for the past 6 months I have been carefully researching the whole area of drug abuse and addiction. Everyone I have talked with about this problem—the Associate Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Other Dangerous Drugs, students, social workers—indicated a need for accurate information on drugs.

Last year, more than 33,000 school age youngsters wrote to the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Other Dangerous Drugs in the Justice Department asking for information. I am sure this represents only those who took the time to write—not all those looking for information. So there is already a clear need for curriculum on drugs similar to the already accepted curriculum on sex. In fact, some States have already taken the initiative. House bill 102 in the Pennsylvania Legislature is a bill which would make it mandatory to teach young people about all drugs. Commenting on its merits, Peter Duncan, presenting the network's views in an editorial for WCAU-TV in Philadelphia, said:

> Schools should not wait until House Bill 102 becomes law. They should be actively developing an aggressive, honest program for their students . . . Parents, instead of getting upset over the inclusion of such a course—should be forming a lobby to see to it that it's passed.

Most of us, including teachers, cannot even spell amphetamine, barbiturate, hallucinogens, or give the technical names for LSD and DMT, much less know what they mean or do to body and brain cells. When it comes to classifying dexies, A's, footballs, barbs, goofballs, cubes, acid as either stimulants, depressants, or hallucinogens, who among us can do it without guessing? I strongly believe that both vocabularies—the scientific and the street jargon—are equally important. Legislation has already been introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives to provide grants to educational agencies to develop drug information curriculum, and provide teacher-training programs to be an integral part of these curriculums.

However, no legislation dealing with drug abuse and addiction is complete without adequate treatment and rehabilitation facilities.

Mr. President, today, on behalf of Senators COOPER, HART, MCGEE, MONDALE, RANDOLPH, YOUNG of Ohio, PELL, and HATFIELD, I introduce for appropriate reference the Drug Abuse Prevention and Rehabilitation Act of 1969. This legislation will authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation centers for drug addicts and drug abusers; encourage drug abuse education curriculum programs for students of medicine, psychology, psychiatry, sociology, social work, and other related fields; and strengthen the coordination of drug abuse control programs by establishing the National Council on Drug Abuse Control.

My research on drug addiction has taken me on two informal visits to existing drug rehabilitation centers. The first center I visited was a center in Philadelphia which is operated by the National Institute of Mental Health. This is one of seven centers sponsored by the Federal Government which is demonstrating, testing, and evaluating various methods of drug rehabilitation. I gathered that most of these centers, including Philadelphia, are research-oriented with a strong "professional" orientation. A majority of their patients participate in a detoxification program or are maintained on methadone. Supportive counseling, group psychotherapy, and educational counseling are part of the program but vary in patient participation and application. One is certainly impressed with the process.

The second center I visited is Odyssey House on New York City's East Side. This program has no Federal support; it is a voluntary nonprofit agency which began as a pilot research program at Metropolitan Hospital in January 1966. It is now a comprehensive program for the prevention and treatment of drug addiction.

The rehabilitation service program is divided into three phases—induction, intensive residential treatment, and reentry. These programs are designed to motivate the street addict to enter treatment; to determine the sincerity of his motivation; to bring his first in-residence challege; and to provide total rehabilitation for reentry to the community.

Odyssey House is a total therapeutic endeavor. It is a working amalgamation of the professional-research establishment and the community. It treats the causes as well as the symptoms. And one is certainly impressed with the product as well as the process.

Rehabilitation centers must be an integral part of the "scene." Existing law makes referral to rehabilitation centers conditional on "adequate" facilities. I met a youngster, about 28 years of age, at Odyssey House who had been arrested about 40 times and spent 8 years in jail. It got him nowhere. The legislation I introduce today might help others escape this dead-end cycle, and make "positive" referral mandatory.

In addition, this bill provides that up to 30 percent of the money be used to develop the "Odyssey" concept in rehabilitation. We cannot afford to wait 10 years for NIMH to conclude its research and report a model of drug rehabilitation. The product of an Odyssey House experience cannot be measured in a test tube or plotted on a chart. In the vagueness and uncertainty of drug rehabilitation, we need both approaches.

Whatever the approach, though, we need better drug information in the community. Local police should not be the sole source of drug information in our cities and towns. Because of an attitude on the part of the community—"Cops are out to get us"—and a police attitude—"drug users are punks"—genuine communication and full information are blocked.

There is a better way, and one effective alternative is the neighborhood doctor or community social worker. Unfortunately, medical schools and other institutions of higher learning have ignored their responsibility to their students and to society by not providing curriculums on this subject. There is an obvious and clear need for this kind of program, and this legislation will provide this incentive. However, not only should medical students be exposed to a drug curriculum program in their formal training, but all those who will be primarily responsible for working in rehabilitation programs—both professional and paraprofessional—should be exposed to drug abuse curriculum programs.

Finally, my bill will establish a National Council on Drug Abuse Education to coordinate, evaluate, and disseminate the Federal activities in this area. George B. Griffenhagen, Director of the National Coordinating Council on Drug Abuse Education and Information, has convinced me that one of the biggest problems at the Federal level is one of evaluation of available drug information and research and the coordination of efforts to solve this problem. The Coordinating Council, representing more than 60 professional, educational, youth, religious, and service organizations, is making a commendable effort to begin this important task.

I am convinced that the time is now to build on their efforts. At the Federal level, everyone is trying to get a "piece of the action"—including the Defense Department. This polarization of effort is not helping the situation. My proposal would centralize all Federal programs, in whatever agencies, that deal with drug abuse.

This seems to me to be the most effective way to provide leadership and coordination of efforts of regional, State, and local organizations interested in the area of drug abuse and education.

One of the functions of this Council will be to review Federal and State laws with respect to control of narcotics and other dangerous drugs in order to determine the effectiveness of such laws in controlling drug abuse and make legislative or administrative recommendations to bring about a balanced and realistic approach to this problem.

Finally, it seems to me that recent headlines in newspapers, such as "Jersey Narcotics Sweep Nets 68 Young Suspects," have gotten us nowhere. This raid was the result of 200 officials working on the basis of a 15-month investigation. The suspects are from 14 to 28 years old. Instead of the "Aha! We got 'em" attitude, we should spend equal energy and resources on understanding these youths.

Mr. President, the Drug Abuse and Narcotic Control Education Act of 1969 is designed to deal with these problems. These proposals may not be more effective than our raids and arrests, but the depth and seriousness of drug use and abuse in our country demands that we give them an equal try. I am confident they will at least begin a much-needed nationally coordinated program of understanding and education.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the major provisions of this bill be reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1816) to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for treatment and rehabilitation centers for drug addicts and drug abusers, and to carry out drug abuse education curriculum programs, and to strengthen the coordination of drug abuse control programs by establishing the National Council on Drug Abuse Control, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The summary, presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, is as follows:

SUMMARY OF DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1969

TITLE I—FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

It is the purpose of this Act—

To provide for the establishment, development, and maintenance of prevention, treatment and rehabilitation centers for drug addicts and drug abusers;

To encourage drug abuse education curriculum programs for students of medicine, psychology, psychiatry, sociology, social work and other related fields;

To strengthen the coordination of drug abuse control programs by establishing the National Council on Drug Abuse Control.

TITLE II—GRANTS FOR TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION CENTERS FOR DRUG ADDICTS AND DRUG ABUSERS

Authorization of Appropriations: Five-year $350,000,000 graduated authorization beginning at $50,000,000 for fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969.

Use of Funds: The Secretary of HEW is directed to make grants to assist states and non-profit organizations in establishing, developing, equipping, and operating drug addict treatment and rehabilitation centers. Up to 30 per cent of the money available will be used to make grants to non-profit organizations which develop a comprehensive program for the prevention and treatment of drug addiction, and research with new techniques and methods for improving this treatment and rehabilitation.

Applications: The Secretary of HEW will, by regulation, establish and prescribe standards for obtaining grants under this title.

TITLE III—DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION CURRICULUM PROGRAMS

Authorization of Appropriations: Five-year $105,000,000 graduated authorization beginning at $10,000,000 for fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969.

Use of Funds: Grants will be made to medical schools and other institutions of higher learning for the development and carrying out of drug abuse education programs.

Applications: The Secretary of HEW will, by regulation, establish and prescribe standards for obtaining grants under this title.

TITLE IV—COORDINATION OF DRUG ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAMS

Council established

A national council on drug abuse control will be established in the Executive Office of the President. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will be Chairman of the Council. The Council will be composed of the Vice President, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of Defense, Attorney General, Secretary of Labor, Administrator of Veterans Affairs, and Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Function of the Council

1. The Council will advise and assist the President on drug abuse control education programs and law enforcement activities of federal, state and local agencies.
2. Provide effective procedures for coordinating all drug abuse programs and law enforcement activities.
3. Review federal and state laws on narcotics and other dangerous drugs to determine the effectiveness of such laws in controlling drug abuse.
4. Provide for a national program of dissemination of information on drug abuse control.
5. Encourage state and local and private organizations to participate in efforts to combat the abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Consultations with other Federal agencies

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to consult with the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health and the Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in the review of the applications made under this Act.

Advisory Committee on Drug Abuse Education

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall appoint an advisory committee on drug abuse education to advise him in the administration of this Act. The Committee will consist of 21 members, seven of whom shall be appointed by the Attorney General. Three members shall be ex-addicts and all the committee members will consist of persons familiar with educational, mental health, social, and legal problems associated with drug abuse.

Certification of adequate facilities for the commitment and treatment of drug addicts

The U.S. Code is amended to remove the qualification of "adequate facilities" in the referral of addicts.

S. 1818—ON THE INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO CREATE AN OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce today a bill designed to provide for the inclusion of considerations of environmental quality in the decision-making processes of government.

Entitled the "Environmental Quality Act of 1969," the bill establishes within the Executive Office of the President an Office of Environmental Quality. Headed by a Director appointed by the President, the Office will be relatively small and select with the authority to review, clear, coordinate and appraise policies and projects of the Federal Government which may adversely affect the quality and integrity of our environment.

It would operate in the area of conservation, broadly defined, much as the Bureau of the Budget operates in the field of finance.

It would pull together the activity of our Government relating to environmental quality and provide for the "overview" now lacking and so necessary to any rational and creative approach to the proper management of our environment.

I do not believe I need convince anyone that as a nation and a people we have permitted an intolerate abuse of our environment. It has, in fact, been raped. Our waters are polluted, running rich with sewage and industrial wastes. Our major cities have forgotten what clean air is. Roads have been built and housing "renewed" with little sensitivity and a remarkable forgetfulness that we are dealing with human beings. Harmful pesticides are sprayed with an abandon that is truly alarming. Their poisonous residue can be found in the tissues of fish and the bone structure of man. Such residue has actually been found in, of all places, the Arctic. We have moreover too few parks and insufficient wildlife ranges. The concept of America the beautiful is now at least open to question as our streets, sidewalks and countryside seem littered with trash and garbage. But of all this we are aware.

I am concerned that our structure of Government is not organized to handle the problems we face in this area. As Laurance Rockefeller has pointed out, our Government seems designed for an earlier day. The allocation of responsibility reflects a rural nation concerned with disposing of public lands and taming nautral resources. We are not programed for the environmental problems of a complex urban society.

Dr. Donald Hornig, formerly Science Adviser to President Johnson, has spoken of "two centuries of ad hoc decisions" in this area. Stephen K. Bailey in the Brookings Institute collection of essays entitled "Agenda for a Nation" says that "the Federal Government lacks machinery for the effective development, implementation, and coordination of public policy" in the management of the environment.

The Departments of Interior, Agriculture, Transportation, Commerce, HEW, and HUD all administer programs directly affecting the environment, as do the Atomic Energy Commission, Federal

Power Commission and other independent agencies. Yet at times they each seem to go their own way, concerned primarily with their own segment of environmental responsibility.

What is needed, I believe, is an agency whose purpose is to look at the total environment and the manner in which the Federal Government affects it. The present piecemeal approach is no longer sufficient. There is little coordination and no overview. The legislation I am introducing today remedies this and creates such an agency.

The establishment of the Office of Environmental Quality would guarantee that in everything the Federal Government does the impact on the environment is considered.

You cannot design a structure which makes certain that the proper decision will in fact be made. But you can design a structure which ensures that the right question will be asked.

Mr. President, the Office of Environmental Quality, or OEQ as it no doubt would be known, would be an agency of considerable influence, as is the Bureau of the Budget. It would review and clear all legislative proposals, checking them for their environmental impact. It would be the principal adviser to the President for environmental affairs. It would submit each year to the President and Congress a "Report on Environmental Quality" outlining its activity and indicating the environmental problems facing the Nation. OEQ would have the authority, moreover, to delay any Federal or federally assisted project or program for 180 days if it determines that such activity will adversely affect the environment.

It would indeed be an office of some strength. But our national Government needs such an office. The time is now to go beyond mere talk of coordination and creation of advisory bodies. We have had sufficient talk and much advice. What is needed at this time is authoritative action on behalf of a governmental agency charged with the responsibility of overseeing the Federal impact on our environment.

OEQ is not primarily an advisory body. Nor is it a research group. It is a review board, clearinghouse, and policymaker located in the one place where such an influential body should be located, the Executive Office of the President of the United States. There it would take its place with the Bureau of the Budget, the National Security Council, the Council of Economic Advisors, the Office of Emergency Planning, the CIA, the Office of Science and Technology and the other offices of the President's Executive Office.

Yet at the same time, OEQ does not set up a conservation czar. The office is subject to the direction of the President and can postpone action only temporarily.

Mr. President, the legislation I am introducing today is not a "bird, bug, and bunny" bill. It is not conservation carried to the extreme, as some propose. The uses of our resources are bound to conflict. Economic development at times must give way to environmental protection. Yet the latter cannot triumph each time. We need to build and grow. We cannot stand still. We need to balance the competing demands and decide specific issues without defining rigid, unalterable policies. OEQ will permit us to do this. It will also guarantee that the environmental side of the issue will not be ignored, as it too frequently is, in the decisionmaking processes. It will provide too that such considerations will take place at the beginning of the process, before the damage is done, not afterwards which is often too late.

The protection and enhancement of our environment is now a national responsibility. Our society is too complex, our technology too advanced, and our population too large to permit further the illusionary notion that State and local governments alone can and will maintain a quality environment. The Nation as a whole with the Federal Government as its agent must accept the role of trustee of the environment. The concept of stewardship must now be realized. The National Academy of Sciences recognized this in a June 1967 report entitled "Applied Scientific and Technological Progress" which stated that "Concern with the environment must be a growing Federal responsibility."

The Office of Environmental Quality would be the agent to implement this responsibility. Its creation would signify a renewed national commitment to restore, maintain, and enhance the quality of our environment.

There are of course other approaches than the one I have selected through OEQ to achieve this commitment. One way, and the simplest perhaps, would be for the President to appoint to his staff a Special Counsel for Environmental Affairs. This could only be an advisory position and would lack staff and authority to provide an effective overview. Another way would be to create an interdepartmental task force charged with environmental protection. But this would suffer, as all such groups do, by too much departmental competition and too little coordination and direction. A third approach, and one frequently heard, is to transfer certain bureaus to an upgraded Department of the Interior. Mere shifting of certain functions, however, is no panacea nor should any regular line administrative body be charged with the review and oversight of other agencies. A final alternative is to upgrade the Office of Science and Technology but OST would require a substantial uplift and redirection of its basic scientific orientation. On balance then, I believe that an Office of Environmental Quality as I have proposed is the best approach.

One important function of OEQ is the clearance of legislative proposals. All legislation would be reviewed by the office. Those proposals emanating from the executive branch would be cleared before being sent to Congress for consideration. Those originating in Congress itself would be referred to OEQ for comment by the committee to which the bill was assigned. These precedures parallel those of the Bureau of the Budget. They are easily possible and quite necessary. It is this function which permits OEQ to implement an overview of Federal activity regarding environmental quality.

For reasons of administration the establishment of an Office of Environmental Quality would necessitate the creation of a small office within the agencies of Government. These would perform an in-house review and maintain liaison between OEQ and the agency. Again the parallel with the Budget Bureau exists since each governmental agency has a budget division within it. The prototype for these offices, moreover, already exists in the Department of Transportation which on its own has established an Office of Environmental Impact. This is an exciting idea and the office's progress shall be followed closely by those of us concerned with a quality environment.

Mr. President, someone once said that the only thing wrong with our environment is that man is involved in it. While there is no doubt an element of truth in this, it is of course a rather self defeating proposition. I prefer to be more optimistic. I believe that man can restore the quality of his environment. Clean water, clear air, and the like can be obtained. I believe further that man can design his system of government to ensure effective coordination and forceful direction.

A quality environment is fundamental to the dignity of an individual. You destroy a river, I think, and you destroy a little bit of everyone. We as a people have permitted our environment to deteriorate considerably and have appeared willing to take only half steps toward its restoration and enhancement. I think we can do better than this. I think we must.

The legislation I am introducing today creating an Office of Environmental Quality is a means to do so.

Mr. President, I ask consent that the text of my bill now be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1818) to provide for the inclusion of environmental quality considerations in the decisionmaking processes of government, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1818

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Environmental Quality Act of 1969".

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that there is a need to incorporate the concept of environmental quality into the decision-making processes of government; that each individual has a fundamental right to a quality environment; that each individual has a responsibility to contribute to the maintenance and climate of a quality environment; that the purposeful, careful, creative, and intelligent maintenance of the environment is a responsibility of local, State, and national governments; that governments should no longer serve as referees among competing resource users but should act as trustees of the environment for all the people; that the people and their governments must make an effort to enhance the quality of the environment, to reject approaches that inflate present benefits at the cost of future satisfactions, to guard against, to the extent possible, every abuse, irreversible damage, irretrievable loss of our land, sea, and air, and the life within; that our environment should be safe, healthful, productive of life and prosperity, attractive, and provide for the variety, resilience, and complexity that is nature; that the deterioration of the environment must be arrested, its quality restored; that there is a need to find alternatives which will minimize and prevent future abuses of the environment by the newly developing technologies; that there can be no quality of the environment without bringing into balance the interrelationships between our expanding technology, growth in population, and finiteness of natural resources; and that the United States, as a member of the international community, should use its good offices to improve the quality of the human environment and in that connection to cooperate with other governments and organizations within the international community.

SEC. 3 (a) There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Environmental Quality (hereinafter referred to as the "Office"). The Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. There shall also be in the Office one Deputy Director and three Assistant Directors who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Deputy Directors shall perform such functions as the Director may from time to time prescribe.

(b) The compensation of the Director of the Office shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The compensation of the Deputy Director of the Office shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The compensation of the Assistant Directors of the Office shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Assistant Secretaries of the Executive Departments.

(c) The Director is authorized to employ such officers and employees as may be necessary to enable the Office to carry out its functions under this Act. In addition, the Director is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 4. (a) The Director is authorized to designate a Council of Advisors to the Office of Environmental Quality (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"), which shall consist of nine members serving staggered three-year terms of office, and qualified by virtue of their interest and attainments in areas of environmental quality.

(b) The Council shall consult with the Director on matters currently under consideration in the Office and shall meet at least twice annually. The Council and its members may make recommendations to the Director, and any such recommendations shall be incorporated in the Report to the President described in subsection (b) of section 5 of this Act.

(c) The Council shall serve without compensation except travel and per diem expenses associated with the performance of their duties under this Act.

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be the function of the Office—

(1) To review, in accordance with section 6 of this Act, proposed projects, facilities, programs, policies and activities of the Federal Government which may adversely affect environmental quality;

(2) To review and appraise existing projects, facilities, programs, policies and activities of the Federal Government which affect environmental quality and make recommendations with respect thereto to the President and the Congress;

(3) To develop policies and programs to protect and enhance environmental quality;

(4) To set priorities with respect to problems involving environmental quality;

(5) To advise the President on matters involving environmental quality and to make recommendations to him with respect thereto;

(6) To collect, analyze, bring together, collate, digest, interpret and dissiminate data and information, in such form as it deems appropriate, to public agencies, private organizations, and the general public;

(7) To conduct studies and research, by contract or otherwise, into problems and other matters involving or relating to environmental quality;

(8) To develop criteria and promulgate standards defining desirable levels of environmental quality;

(9) To consult with and advise other representatives of governments, and to utilize, with their consent, the services of Federal agencies and, with the consent of any State or political subdivision thereof, accept and utilize the services of the agencies of such State or subdivision;

(10) To assist the President in connection with the coordination and clearance of legislative proposals and Executive orders involving projects, facilities, programs, policies, activities, or other undertakings by the Federal government which affect environmental quality;

(11) To assist the President by clearing and coordinating departmental advice on proposed legislation which adversely affects environmental quality and by making recommendations as to Presidential action on legislative enactments affecting environmental quality;

(12) To assist the President by clearing and coordinating departmental policies and activities affecting environmental quality;

(13) To assist in the consideration and clearance and, where necessary, in the preparation of proposed Executive orders and proclamations affecting environmental quality;

(14) To keep the President informed of the progress of activities by agencies of the Federal government with respect to work proposed, work actually initiated, and work completed by any such agencies which affect environmental quality; and

(15) To assist the President in the efforts to achieve environmental quality in the community of nations.

(b) In carrying out its functions under this Act, the Office shall, from time to time, make such reports to the President and to the Congress as it determines necessary. The Office shall, on or before January 31, 1970, make a written report (to be known as the "Report on Environmental Quality") to the President and the Congress containing a detailed account of the activities of the Office since its establishment. Thereafter the Office shall make such reports on or before January 31 of each year covering any period not covered by such a report previously submitted.

SEC. 6. (a) Except as hereinafter provided in this section, no agency of the United States shall undertake the construction of any project or facility, issue any license or approve the expenditure of any Federal funds in connection with the construction of any such project or facility, or carry out any proposed program, policy, or activity, if the head of that agency has been notified in writing by the Director of the Office that the carrying out of such construction, program, policy or activity may adversely affect the environmental quality. Upon receiving any such notification, the agency head shall make a written report to the Director containing the details with respect thereto. Upon receipt of such report, the Director shall cause a review to be made of such proposed construction, program, policy, or activity. Such review shall be conducted as expeditiously as possible, and the Director shall keep the instigating agency advised of the progress of such review in order that there will be as little disruption or delay as possible in carrying out the functions of such agency. If, as a result of such review the Director determines that the carrying out of such construction, program, policy, or activity would not adversely affect the environmental quality, he shall immediately notify the head of the instigating agency of that fact and such agency may, if otherwise authorized, proceed to carry out such construction, program, policy or activity (including the issuance of such license or the expenditure of such funds). If, however, as a result of such review the Director determines that the carrying out of any such construction, program, policy, or activity would adversely affect the environmental quality, he shall report, in writing, to the President and the Congress concerning that fact. Such report shall be given on or before the expiration of ninety days following the receipt by him of the report from the agency head proposing to undertake the aforementioned action. Upon the expiration of a period of ninety calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the receipt by it of the report submitted by the Director, the head of the instigating agency may, if otherwise authorized, proceed to carry out such construction, program, policy, or activity (including the issuance of such license or the expenditure of such funds).

(b) For the purpose of subsection (a) of this section—

(1) continuity of session is broken only by an adjournment of Congress sine die; and

(2) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of the 90-day period.

SEC. 7. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

S. 1822—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PROVIDE FOR THE INCLUSION OF CERTAIN PERIODS OF REEMPLOYMENT OF ANNUITANTS FOR THE PURPOSE OF COMPUTING ANNUITIES OF SURVIVING SPOUSES

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have introduced legislation today to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate an inequity which now exists in the computation of annuities of survivors of reemployed annuitants.

We need not be shocked by an occasional inequity in a retirement system as vast and as progressive as the one which covers our Federal civil servants. But, once the inequity is called to our attention—no matter how small it may be nor how few it may injure—we should do something about it.

Four years ago the Reverend James W. Hackett, O.P., a Dominican friend of mine and a professor at Providence College in Providence, R.I., advised me of an instance of unfairness in this retirement act.

Father Hackett told me about Dr. Otto Reitlinger, a friend of his and of the college, who is employed at the Naval Propellant Plant, Indianhead, Md. Dr. Reitlinger is a 78-year-old scientist of great distinction. He is the recipient of the U.S. Navy Distinguished Civilian Service Award for his development of a safe nonexplosive monopropellant used in naval torpedoes.

This economical fuel which bears his

name—Otto Fuel II—is now in use in the fleet. Dr. Reitlinger at the present time is doing research on a new fuel to allow the operation of torpedoes at even greater depth. Obviously this is of significant interest in the area of modern underwater warfare.

Because of his preeminence in the field, the Civil Service Commission at the request of the Bureau of Naval Weapons exempted Dr. Reitlinger three times from retirement. The third exemption expired in December 1964. His work did not terminate, however. Dr. Reitlinger was retired on December 31 of that year and immediately reemployed to continue his classified experiments.

His reemployment created a unique problem. Under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act. Dr. Reitlinger's wife, in the event she survives him, will be deprived of additional survivors' benefits for the years of his reemployment.

To resolve this precise problem, I introduced legislation in the 89th Congress and again in the 90th Congress. Both bills passed the Senate and were approved by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Unfortunately, for reasons unrelated to the merits of this legislation, they were not enacted into law.

I am trying again today to provide a remedy. The bill I introduced provides that a reemployed annuitant may elect a survivor annuity which will be based on his supplemental annuity provided he meets certain conditions recommended by the Civil Service Commission.

A minimum number of reemployed civil servants would be affected by this bill, probably less than 50.

Dr. Reitlinger's fuel is saving the Federal Government and the taxpayers tens of millions of dollars.

The cost of this legislation in comparison will be infinitesimal. The Civil Service Commission has no objection to the bill.

I am certain that the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee will act as expeditiously and as compassionately on this bill as they did on the one which I introduced in the last session of the Congress. This time, in this session, this inequity to Dr. Reitlinger and a handful of his fellow civil servants who have devoted their lives and their talents to this Nation, must be corrected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1822) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purposes of computing annuities of surviving spouses, introduced by Mr. Pastore, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1823—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO BROADEN THE COVERAGE OF THE MILITARY MEDICAL BENEFITS ACT OF 1966

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have introduced, for myself and for Mr. Kennedy, a bill to amend and extend the coverage of the Military Medical Benefits Act of 1966.

In 1966 the Senate passed this act by a vote of 87 to 0. I supported the bill in the belief that it would provide essential medical care required by dependents of our servicemen.

The bill became Public Law 89–614. This new act contained a unique program of financial assistance for active duty members whose spouses or children are either mentally retarded or physically handicapped. The Federal Government was authorized to share the cost of care for these dependents with the servicemen.

Of course, it was our purpose to lighten the severe economic burden of these servicemen of modest income whose dependents require costly medical attention—care which is not available to them at military facilities.

A little over 2 years has elapsed since the law became effective. Today, approximately 100,000 dependents are eligible for care but of this 100,000 only 10 percent are actually receiving assistance.

When this inequity was called to my attention by a constituent in the service of our country, I investigated to determine why the condition exists. I found that the law now provides for dependent care only in public or private nonprofit institutions. Obviously, there are not enough of these facilities to meet the demand. They are crowded and their waiting lists are long.

The serviceman who has a physically handicapped or mentally retarded dependent is confronted with a depressing dilemma.

He must either deny his dependent spouse or child needed medical attention because he cannot afford the treatment or he must shoulder the full financial burden and pay the entire cost of this treatment in a private profitmaking institution.

This does not make any sense at all to me. I find nothing sacred about public or private nonprofit institutions.

Everybody knows that there are many profitmaking medical facilities providing quality care and charging no more for it than nonprofit institutions.

I cannot condone penalizing 90 percent of the dependents who qualify for care under this law simply because there are not a sufficient number of nonprofit institutions providing the care they need.

I have, therefore, introduced legislation to eliminate the arbitrary restriction on the use of private profitmaking institutions. The Department of Defense will continue to maintain the right to disapprove the use of any private profitmaking facility which does not offer quality care or which charges unreasonable fees. The Government as well as the dependents using these institutions will be adequately protected.

Senator Edward Kennedy has joined with me in cosponsoring this bill and it is our urgent hope that the Committee on Armed Services to which the bill has been referred will take early and favorable action in order that we may vote in the Senate to eliminate this inequity in the Military Medical Benefits Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1823) to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the restriction on the use of certain private institutions under the dependents' medical care program, introduced by Mr. Pastore (for himself and Mr. Kennedy), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1826—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL ON STOCKPILE GOLD FOR DEFENSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, today I introduce for myself and Mr. Bible, Mr. Cannon, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Stevens, legislation that would accomplish two objectives. First, it would help rehabilitate the gold-mining industry, and, secondly, and perhaps of even greater importance it would allow the United States to build up its stockpile of one of our most strategic resources to meet defense and space needs in the event of a future national emergency.

It is not the purpose of this legislation to provide for a revaluation or a higher price for gold, since action in such direction will not be initiated by the Congress of the United States, but will occur, when it does, as a result of action taken by international monetary conferees at the IMF. Rather, it is the purpose of this legislation to provide for Federal financial incentives to domestic gold producers to induce increased annual production and to show the relationship of gold to the internal affairs of the United States.

It is my belief that Congress should enact legislation to authorize the General Services Administration to purchase newly mined domestic gold for the purpose of establishing a gold stockpile for critical space and defense uses and for other national emergency requirements at a sufficiently high price to substantially increase gold production.

In this country, uses for gold by industry, including space and defense needs, jewelry, and the dental profession have been rapidly accelerating in recent years. The estimate for consumptive use in the United States for the year 1968 is placed at 7 million-plus ounces. Production in this country for the same year is estimated at 1.5 million ounces. Thus, we have a most significant gold gap of roughly 5½ million ounces between the output of mines and consumptive use.

Further, in order to meet our domestic needs, obviously it will be necessary to import in the neighborhood of 5½ million ounces of the precious metal per year, which in turn will have a most adverse effect upon the delicate balance-of-payments problem.

Likewise, significant events are occurring on world markets. It is estimated that in the past year 1968, world consumption of gold for industrial uses is somewhere between $750 and $800 million of an estimated production of $1.4 billion dollars. This consumptive rate has been increasing, but not at quite the accelerated rate as in the United States. Nevertheless, it is estimated by the middle or late 1970's consumption will catch up with production and no gold will be available for monetary uses if industrial demands throughout the world are met.

It is quite possible to substantially increase U.S. production if certain steps are taken to revitalize the industry, which would be in the nature of interim measures, one or more of which might be employed, until the occurrence of gold revaluation, which could happen. The Bureau of Mines, in a report published in 1967, estimated that our known gold ore reserves in this country are approximately 400 million ounces, only 9 million ounces of which are mineable at the $35 price. Obviously, if we are willing to pay a premium for the precious metal, production can be increased.

This legislation would authorize the Administrator of General Services to contract for newly mined domestic gold produced within the United States at not less than $45 per ounce nor more than $75 per ounce for the purpose of establishing a strategic and critical stockpile of gold in the amount of 20 million ounces to be earmarked for space and defense needs or other national emergency requirements.

The GSA would also be authorized to negotiate for short-term contracts, not to exceed 1 year from the date the contract is executed. The Administrator will have the discretion, however, to enter into long-term contracts of up to 10 years. This latter provision is necessary if we are to achieve any results in the reopening of dormant mines which can only be financed for reopening if there is a definite certainty as to established price for a long-enough period to warrant loans from private banking institutions.

Mr. President, the Department of the Treasury has consistently maintained that gold is an essential part of the world monetary system, even though at the same time they have been advocating the issuance of special drawing rights. Treasury's position, in short, is that special drawing rights are a necessary addition to the reserves for use in the international exchange system, which will supplement the pound sterling, the dollar, and gold. In the past, Treasury has shown concern over the fact that our gold reserves have fallen to a critically low level; that is, slightly in excess of $10 billion, several billion of which is earmarked and committed for uses by international agencies and for the repayment of Roosa bonds, if demand be made thereon. In view of the fact that our gold reserves are frozen for future potential monetary use and are still part of the international monetary system, it is quite apparent that industrial needs in this country must be made up from either foreign imports or a revitalized domestic industry.

I believe certain measures could and should be taken to substantially increase U.S. gold production. It should be noted, of course, that a mine cannot be developed overnight and that experience indicates it takes from 4 to 6 years to put a mine into production after original exploration has disclosed a potential ore body. We cannot have a viable domestic gold mining industry unless we are prepared to spend a few years in the process. All of which emphasizes the need for immediate relief of this industry.

The enactment of financial relief or subsidy legislation or measures designed to establish a critical stockpile for national emergency use or, removal of restrictions on ownership of gold by U.S. citizens or removal of Treasury licensing provision for consumers and producers will no longer have any disturbing impact upon our gold position, vis-a-vis the IMF and monetary price of the metal, since Treasury has now adopted a position which recognizes that gold is a commodity by establishing the two-tier gold price system. In view of the fact that Treasury now treats gold as a commodity, although supporting the concept of the two-tier price system with its limited free market, certainly objections to Federal relief legislation which were asserted over the years are no longer tenable and there is no longer any logic in Treasury continuing its opposition to the various interim relief measures set forth in the gold resolution. Adoption of any of them would not be disquieting to the international monetary authorities, since certainly the United States should be able to deal with a commodity without danger of disturbing the sensitive mind of the international monetary community.

I would hope, therefore, Mr. President, that this legislation will receive prompt and expeditious treatment so that we may begin compiling this stockpile of gold.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1826) to increase the domestic production of gold to meet the needs of national defense and preserve the gold mining industry of the United States, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. MUNDT, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1830—INTRODUCTION OF "ALASKA NATIVE LAND CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1969"

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the "Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act of 1969."

The claims of the native people of Alaska to the land and to the resources of Alaska have been a source of conflict between the State of Alaska, the native people of Alaska, and the Federal Government for a number of years. During the 90th Congress the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held field hearings in Alaska and a hearing in Washington, D.C., on a number of bills on the land claims controversy. As an outgrowth of those hearings, I requested the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska to prepare two reports on this problem.

Both of these reports were released February 18, 1969. The first report, "Alaska Natives and the Land," is a heavily documented and thorough 565-page study which brings together all relevant information on the land claims issue, the social and economic condition of the Alaska native, the resources of Alaska and the alternatives which might be followed in arriving at a settlement acceptable to all of the parties involved.

The second report was based on the first and is a proposal recommending the terms for a legislative settlement of the Alaska native land claims controversy.

Following release of these reports, I requested the Department of the Interior to draft a bill which reflected the Federal Field Committee's recommendations for a proposed legislative settlement. The bill introduced today is in large measure the product of the Department's drafting service. It has been reviewed by the staff of the Federal Field Committee and by members of the Interior Committee staff and a number of minor changes and corrections have been made.

Mr. President, my introduction of this measure does not constitute an endorsement of its provisions. The problems posed by the Alaska native land claims issue are very complex and reasonable men may differ as to how they should be resolved.

By the same token, it is quite clear that this bill as presently drafted is not a finished product. There are a number of provisions in the measure which will require further study, analysis and drafting before they can accomplish what the Field Committee intended. And there is, of course, no assurance that the Congress will adopt the Field Committee's recommendations. The references in the bill to specific acreage figures for land grants; to specific dollar figures; and to specific percentages of the mineral and other resources of Alaska, for example, provide starting places for discussion. They do not, however, constitute final judgments as to what form a final settlement should take.

I am introducing this measure today to insure that the recommendations of the Federal Field Committee on his problem will be placed before the Senate Interior Committee and the Congress for consideration together with any other measures which may be introduced. The recommendations of the Federal Field Committee are based on the most thorough study of the land claims problem that has ever been undertaken, and they require careful consideration.

Introduction of this measure will also provide the administration, the State of Alaska, the native peoples of Alaska and other interested parties a draft bill to comment upon at the forthcoming hearings on this matter.

Hearings on legislation to resolve the Alaska native land claims issue are scheduled for April 29 and 30 at 10 a.m. in room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the "Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act of 1969" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1830) to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska natives, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. JACKSON, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1830

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1969."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 1 (a) Congress finds and declares that there is an immediate need for a fair and just settlement of all claims by Natives and Native groups of Alaska and intends by this act to provide:

(1) a grant to Native individuals of the lands occupied and used by them for homes, businesses, fishing, hunting and trapping camps, and for reindeer husbandry;

(2) a grant of land to the communities in which they live for community use and expansion;

(3) where it is within the power of the Federal government, measures for the conservation of subsistence biotic resources and, where necessary, a priority for local subsistence in the utilization of these resources;

(4) a grant to a new corporation, owned by Alaska Natives, of $100 million for lands taken in the past by withdrawal for Federal purposes or by patent to the state or to other third parties; and

(5) a further grant to the new corporation of approximately ten percentum of the present value of the commercial resources on the remaining public domain in Alaska, in compensation for the extinguishment by this Act of all remaining aboriginal rights in these lands, this compensation to be derived from the income from leasing and sale of minerals and other resources from federal lands in Alaska over a period of ten years, including lands selected by the state pursuant to the Alaska Statehood Act (P.L. 85–508 of July 7, 1958; 72 Stat. 339) but not patented to the State of Alaska prior to the effective date of this Act.

(b) It is the intent of Congress to accomplish these aims rapidly, with certainty, and in conformity to the real economic and social needs of Alaska Natives (1) without establishing any permanent racially defined institutions, rights, privileges, or obligations; (2) without creating a reservation system or lengthy wardship or trusteeship; and (3) without adding to the categories of property and institutions enjoying special tax privileges or to the legislation establishing special relationships between the United States government and the State of Alaska.

(c) No provision of this Act is intended to replace or diminish any right, privilege, or obligation of Alaska Natives as citizens of the United States or of Alaska, nor to relieve, replace or diminish any obligation of the United States or of the State of Alaska to protect and promote the rights or welfare of Alaska Natives as citizens of the United States or of Alaska.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this Act, the term—

(a) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior;

(b) "Native" means any Alaska Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut of at least one-fourth degree Alaska Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut blood, or a combination thereof, and any individual recognized by a Native group as an Alaska Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut, but does not include any Tsimshian Indian of Metlakatla;

(c) "Native group" means any tribe, band, clan, village, community, or association in Alaska which is composed of twenty-five or more Natives and which is approved by the Secretary;

(d) "Commission" means the Alaska Native Commission established by this Act;

(e) "Public lands" means all Federal lands and interests therein situated in Alaska, except any lands used in connection with the administration of any Federal installation;

(f) "Corporation" means the Alaska Native Development Corporation authorized to be established pursuant to this Act and under the laws of the State of Alaska; and

(g) "Person" means any individual, firm, corporation, association, or partnership and includes the State of Alaska.

(h) "Fund" means the Alaska Native Compensation Fund established under the terms of this Act.

DECLARATION OF SETTLEMENT

Sec. 3. (a) The provisions of this Act shall be regarded as full and final settlement and extinguishment of any and all claims against the United States based upon aboriginal right, title, use, or occupancy of lands in Alaska by any Native or Native group or claims arising under the Act of May 17, 1884 (23 Stat. 24), or the Act of June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), including claims pending before the Indian Claims Commission on the effective date of this Act.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as may be necessary to pay all reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses actually incurred by any Native or Native group, as determined by the Commission, in connection with any claims pending before the Indian Claims Commission on the date of enactment of this Act which are dismissed pursuant to this Act.

ALASKA NATIVE COMMISSION

Sec. 4. (a) The Alaska Native Commission is hereby established. The Commission shall be in existence for a period of 10 years after the effective date of this Act and shall be composed of five members to be appointed by the President. The Chairman shall be appointed by and with the consent of the Senate. The Federal laws and regulations on conflicts of interest applicable to other Federal employees shall not be applicable to the members of the Commission.

(b) The terms of office of members of the Commission shall be five years, except that a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member prior to the expiration of the term for which he was appointed shall be filled only for the remainder of such unexpired term. A member of the Commission may be removed by the President only for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

(c) The Chairman of the Commission shall receive compensation at a rate equal to that provided for in level V of the Executive Schedule and section 5316 of title 5, United States Code. The other four commissioners, if not otherwise officers or employees of the United States shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate specified at the time of actual service for Grade GS–18 in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including travel time and shall be allowed travel expenses when engaged in the performance of services for the Commission.

(d) The principal office of the Commission shall be in Alaska. Whenever the Commission deems that the convenience of the public or the parties may be promoted, or delay or expense may be minimized, or at the request of any party, it shall hold hearings or conduct other proceedings at any other place mutually agreed to by the Chairman of the Commission and the person involved in the hearing or proceeding. The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed and which shall be preserved in the custody of the secretary of the Commission.

(e) The Commission shall, without regard to the Civil Service laws, appoint and prescribe the duties of a secretary of the Commission and such legal counsel as it deems necessary. Subject to the Civil Service laws, the Commission shall appoint such other employees as it deems necessary in exercising its powers and duties. The compensation of all employees appointed by the Commission shall be fixed in accordance with chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this Act, three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum and official action can be taken only on the affirmative vote of at least three members, but a special panel composed of one or more members upon order of the Commission shall conduct any hearing or other proceeding provided for in this Act and submit the transcript of such hearing or proceeding to the entire Commission for its action thereon. Such transcript shall be made available to the parties before any final action of the Commission. An opportunity to appear before the Commission shall be afforded any party prior to any final action affecting such party and the Commission may afford the party an opportunity to submit additional evidence as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. Each official action of the Commission shall be entered of record and its hearings and records thereof shall be open to the public. The Commission is authorized to make such rules and regulations as it deems necessary for the orderly transaction of its proceedings, which shall provide for adequate notice of hearings or other proceedings to all parties. Any member of the Commission may sign and issue subpoenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses and production of relevant papers, books, and documents and administer oaths. Witnesses summoned before the Commission shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States. The Commission may order testimony to be taken by deposition in any proceeding before it and in any stage of such proceeding after reasonable notice is first given in writing by the party or his attorney of record which record shall state the name of the witness and the time and place of the taking of his deposition.

(g) Each decision made by the Commission shall show the date on which it was made and shall bear the signatures of the members of the Commission who concur therein and, upon issuance of a decision under this Act, the Commission shall cause a true copy thereof to be sent by certified mail to all parties and their attorneys of record. The Commission shall cause each decision to be entered on its official record together with any written opinion prepared by any members in support of, or dissenting from, any such decision.

(h) Any decision issued by the Commission under this section shall be subject to judicial review by the United States district court in Alaska for the division in which the petitioner resides or the land in question is located upon the filing in such court within thirty days from the date of such decision of a petition by the person aggrieved by the decision praying that the action of the Commission be modified or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of the petition shall forthwith be sent by registered or certified mail to any other party to the proceeding and to the Commission, and thereupon the Commission shall certify and file in such court the record upon which such decision complained of was issued. The court shall hear such appeal on the record made before the Commission. The findings of the Commission, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive. The court may affirm, vacate, or modify any decision or may remand the proceeding to the Commission for such further action as it directs. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the petitioner is located and by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254, title 28, United States Code.

ENROLLMENT

Sec. 5. The Secretary, in accordance with such regulations as the Commission may issue, shall prepare an initial roll of Natives, which shall be used for identifying those individuals entitled to be shareholders in the Corporation, and a roster of Native groups eligible for benefits under this Act. Such roll shall include any Alaska Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut of at least one-fourth degree Alaska Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut blood, or a combination thereof, or any person recognized by a Native group as an Alaska Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut, but does not include any Tsimshian Indian of Metlakatla, who is born on, or prior to, and living on December 31, 1968. The final roll and roster shall be prepared as of December 31, 1978, and shall include all eligible Natives living on that date. Before any such roll or roster is finally approved by the Commission, it shall be published in such manner as the Commission shall find practicable and effective. Any applicant denied enrollment shall be notified in writing thereof and such applicant and any other interested person shall be given an opportunity for a hearing by the Commission and judicial review as provided in section 4 of this Act.

ALASKA NATIVE COMPENSATION FUND

SEC. 6. There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States an Alaskan Native Compensation Fund (hereinafter referred to as the "Fund") for the benefit of the Natives and Native groups of Alaska. Any monies authorized to be appropriated to the Fund under this Act and monies received by the Secretary other than appropriations under section 18 of this Act, or the Commission under this Act shall be deposited into the Fund and shall be available until expended. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make payment, with the approval of the Commission, to any Native, Native group, or the Corporation in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

ALASKA NATIVE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

SEC. 7. (a) There is authorized to be established the Alaska Native Development Corporation as an Alaskan Corporation which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government. The corporation, for a period of ten years after its incorporation, shall be subject to the provisions of this Act and, to the extent consistent with this Act, to the laws of the State of Alaska applicable to corporations.

(b) The Commission shall appoint incorporators, one of which shall be the Chairman of the Commission, who shall serve as the initial board of directors until the Native members of the board are elected. Such incorporators shall take whatever actions are necessary to establish the corporation, including the filing of articles of incorporation, as approved by the Commission. There is authorized to be paid from the Fund the sum of $1,000,000 which shall serve as consideration for shares authorized to be issued under this section.

(c) The corporation shall have a board of directors consisting of nine individuals who are citizens of the United States, of whom one shall be elected annually by the board to serve as chairman. Four members shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, effective the date on which the other members are elected, and for terms of four years or until their successors have been appointed and qualified, except that the first three members so appointed shall continue in office for terms of one, two, and three years, respectively, and any member so appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the director whom he succeeds. Four members shall be Natives and elected by enrolled Natives for four years, except that the first two members so elected shall continue in office for three years, and any member so elected to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the director whom he succeeds. At the end of the term of the two members elected for three years, the board shall be increased to eleven members and two additional Natives shall be elected for two year terms. The Chairman of the Commission shall be an ex officio member of the Board.

(d) The corporation shall have a president, and such other officers as may be named and appointed by the board, at rates of compensation fixed by the board and serving at the pleasure of the board. No officer of the corporation shall receive any salary from any source other than the corporation during the period of his employment by the corporation. The president shall be responsible for carrying out the corporation's functions in a business-like manner consistent with the provisions of this Act, the articles of incorporation, and the policies of the board, and shall appoint such other employees as the board deems appropriate. Such employees shall be subject to standards and requirements similar to those applicable to Federal civilian employees, but shall not be regarded as Federal employees for any purpose.

(e) The corporation is authorized to have one million shares of common stock, without par value, and to issue and have outstanding shares of common stock equal to ten times the number of Natives enrolled on the date of incorporation. Such stock shall carry voting rights and be eligible for dividends, except that such stock shall not be distributed to the Natives for a period of ten years after incorporation but shall be held in trust by the board for each eligible Native with the right of such Native to receive dividends during this period and to exercise voting rights. Each Native entitled to such stock shall have a life interest therein, and at his death, such stock shall vest in the corporation and may be reissued. Ten years after the date of incorporation, ten shares of common stock shall be issued and distributed to each eligible Native then alive and enrolled.

(f) The corporation shall, in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe and consistent with this Act and for the benefit of the stockholders thereof, invest its funds; make dividend payments to the common stockholders at such times as the board of directors deems appropriate; provide for the lending of funds to individuals or organizations for the construction of homes and other purposes that would promote economic development of the Natives; provide loans or grants to Native groups, or regional or governing bodies or Native corporations for the purpose of fostering the health and welfare of the people; provide loans for the education of individual Natives; provide emergency or charitable grants and loans to individuals and communities in times of distress; sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of its lands; and promote the economic development of the Native and the Native groups to the greatest possible extent. The corporation shall establish such rules and procedures as it deems appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this subsection. For a period of ten years after incorporation the corporation shall not in any one fiscal year issue dividends or make any grants or unsecured loans the total amount of which equal more than one-half the sum of the corporation's profits and additions to its capital from the fund during the previous fiscal year. For a period of ten years after incorporation, its profits shall not be subject to Federal or State tax laws.

(g) The corporation shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office for a period of ten years after the date of incorporation. After final audit by the General Accounting Office and the filing of a summary financial report with the Congress, the limitations established under this section applicable to the corporation shall terminate and the corporation shall continue in business under the appropriate laws of the State of Alaska. For the ten years from and after the date of incorporation, the corporation shall be considered a public instrumentality eligible for grants and contracts for planning and development programs which will assist the Natives and the Native groups under any Federal law.

(h) The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay annually to the corporation beginning on the date of incorporation and on July 1 of each fiscal year thereafter for a period of ten years from the Fund all the moneys therein, or $100 million, whichever is less. Such payments shall not be taxable under Federal or State laws.

WITHDRAWAL OF PUBLIC LANDS

SEC. 8. (a) Public Land Order No. 4582, 34 Federal Register 1025, is hereby revoked. For the purposes of this Act and for a period of ten years after the effective date of this Act—

(1) There is hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws, but not the mineral leasing laws, all public lands in the State of Alaska, except lands withdrawn for national defense purposes other than Petroleum Reserve No. 4, in each township as shown on current plats of survey or protraction diagrams of the Bureau of Land Management which encloses all or part of any native village listed as follows:

NAME OF PLACE AND REGION

Akhiok, Kodiak.
Akiachak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Akiak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Akutan, Aleutian.
Alakanuk, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Aleknagik, Bristol Bay.
Alatna, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Allakaket, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Ambler, Bering Strait.
Anaktuvuk, Arctic Slope.
Andreafsey, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Angoon, Southeast.
Aniak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Anvik, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Arctic Village, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Atka, Aleutian.
Atkasook, Arctic Slope.
Barrow, Arctic Slope.
Beaver, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Belkofsky, Aleutian.
Bethel, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Bill Moore's, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Biorka, Aleutian.
Birch Creek, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Brevig Mission, Bering Strait.
Buckland, Bering Strait.
Candle, Bering Strait.
Cantwell, Cook Inlet.
Canyon Village, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Chalkyitsik, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Chanilut, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Chefornak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Chevak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Chignik, Kodiak.
Chignik Lagoon, Kodiak.
Chignik Lake, Kodiak.
Chistochina, Copper River.
Chukwuktoligamute, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Circle, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Clark's Point, Bristol Bay.
Copper Center, Copper River.
Craig, Southeast.
Crook Creek, Upper Kushkokwim.
Deering, Bering Strait.
Dillingham, Bristol Bay.
Dot Lake, Tanana.
Eagle, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Eek, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Egegik, Bristol Bay.
Eklutna, Cook Inlet.
Ekuk, Bristol Bay.
Edwok, Bristol Bay.
Elim, Bering Strait.
Emmonak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
English Bay, Cook Inlet.
False Pass, Aleutian.
Fort Yukon, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Gakona, Copper River.
Galena, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Gambell, Bering Sea.
Georgetown, Upper Kuskokwim.
Golovin, Bering Strait.
Goodnews Bay, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Grayling, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Gulkana, Copper River.

Hamilton, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Holy Cross, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Hoonah, Southeast.
Hooper Bay, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Hughes, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Huslia, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Hydaburg, Southeast.
Igiugig, Bristol Bay.
Iliamna, Cook Inlet.
Inalik, Bering Strait.
Ivanof Bay, Aleutian.
Kake, Southeast.
Kaktovik, Arctic Slope.
Kalskag, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Kasaan, Southeast.
Kaltag, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Karluk, Kodiak.
Kasigluk, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Kiana, Bering Strait.
King Cove, Aleutian.
Kipnuk, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Kivalina, Bering Strait.
Klawock, Southeast.
Klukwan, Southeast.
Kobuk, Bering Strait.
Koliganek, Bristol Bay.
Kokhanok, Bristol Bay.
Kongigonak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Kotlik, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Kotzebue, Bering Strait.
Koyuk, Bering Strait.
Koyukuk, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Kwethluk, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Kwigillingok, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Larsen Bay, Kodiak.
Levelok, Bristol Bay.
Lime Village, Upper Kuskokwim.
Lower Kalskag, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
McGrath, Upper Kuskokwim.
Malok, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Manley Hot Springs, Tanana.
Manokotak, Bristol Bay.
Marshall, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Mary's Igloo, Bering Strait.
Medfra, Upper Kuskokwim.
Mekoryuk, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Mentasta Lake, Copper River.
Metlakatla, Southeast.
Minchumina Lake, Upper Kuskokwim.
Minto, Tanana.
Mountain Village, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Nabesna Village, Tanana.
Naknek, Bristol Bay.
Napaimute, Upper Kuskokwim.
Napakiak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Napaskiak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Nelson Lagoon, Aleutian.
Newhalen, Cook Inlet.
Nenana, Tanana.
New Stuyahok, Bristol Bay.
Newtok, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Nightmute, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Nikolai, Upper Kuskokwim.
Nikolski, Aleutian.
Ninilchik, Cook Inlet.
Noatak, Bering Strait.
Nome, Bering Strait.
Nondalton, Cook Inlet.
Nooiksut, Arctic Slope.
Noorvik, Bering Strait.
Northeast Cape, Bering Sea.
Northway, Tanana.
Nulato, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Nunapitchuk, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Ohogamiut, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Old Harbor, Kodiak.
Oscarville, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Ouzinkie, Kodiak.
Paradise, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Paulof Harbor, Aleutian.
Pedro Bay, Cook Inlet.
Perryville, Kodiak.
Pilot Point, Bristol Bay.
Pilot Station, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Pitkas Point, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Platinum, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Point Hope, Arctic Slope.
Point Lay, Arctic Slope.
Portage Creek (Ohgsenakale), Bristol Bay.
Port Graham, Cook Inlet.
Port Lions, Kodiak.
Port Heiden (Meshik), Aleutian.
Quinhagak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Rampart, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Red Devil, Upper Kuskokwim.
Ruby, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Runssian Mission (Kuskokwim) (or Chauthaluc), Upper Kuskokwim.
Russian Mission (Yukon), Southwest Coastal Lowland.
St. George, Aleutian.
St. Mary's, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
St. Michael, Bering Strait.
St. Paul, Aleutian.
Salamtof, Cook Inlet.
Sand Point, Aleutian.
Savonoski, Bristol Bay.
Savoonga, Bering Sea.
Saxman, Southeast.
Scammon Bay, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Selawik, Bering Strait.
Shagelluk, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Shaktoolik, Bering Strait.
Sheldon's Point, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Shishmaref, Bering Strait.
Shungnak, Bering Strait.
Slana, Copper River.
Sleetmute, Upper Kuskokwim.
South Naknek, Bristol Bay.
Squaw Harbor, Aleutians.
Stebbins, Bering Strait.
Stevens Village, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Stony River, Upper Kuskokwim.
Tanacross, Tanana.
Tanana, Koyukuk-Lower Yukon.
Tatitlek, Gulf of Alaska.
Telida, Upper Kuskokwim.
Teller, Bering Strait.
Tetlin, Tanana.
Togiak, Bristol Bay.
Toksook Bay, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Tuluksak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Tuntutuliak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Tununak, Southwest Coastal Lowland.
Twin Hills, Bristol Bay.
Tyonek, Cook Inlet.
Ugashik, Bristol Bay.
Unalakleet, Bering Strait.
Unalaska, Aleutian.
Unga, Aleutian.
Uyak, Kodiak.
Venetie, Upper Yukon-Porcupine.
Wainwright, Arctic Slope.
Wales, Bering Strait.
White Mountain, Bering Strait.
Yakutat, Southeast.

(2) The Secretary shall withdraw from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws, but not the mineral leasing laws, any public lands in any townships, except lands described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, which are adjacent to the townships described in said paragraph and which the Commission certifies to the Secretary to be needed by the Native village for reasonable expansion, or to fulfill future economic or social requirements, or to provide access, or to insure that the total area of land, including bodies of fresh water not in State ownership, withdrawn around and adjacent to the Native village is equal to at least 23,040 acres;

(3) The Secretary or, as appropriate, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Defense, is authorized and directed to withdraw from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws, but not the mineral leasing laws, any public lands in any other township necessary (A) to settlement of a Native group established as of January 1, 1969, or (B) to a historic Native village from which the population has been required to move, because of either direct or indirect actions of the Federal, State, or local government, and to which 25 or more adult Natives wish to return and reside, or (C) to a place which constitutes a new Native village location to which by virtue of natural phenomenon, or direct or indirect governmental actions, 25 or more adult Natives wish to relocate.

(b) All withdrawals authorized by paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a) of this section shall be made only after a public hearing has been held in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary shall require. Each withdrawal shall be initiated only after certification by the Commission that the appropriate conditions set forth in this section have been met relative to that withdrawal.

(c) Pending the disposal of any lands withdrawn under this section, the Secretary is authorized to take such actions as may be necessary to administer, manage, and protect the withdrawn public lands for the benefit of the corporation, and, after deducting the cost of administration thereof, to deposit into the fund all revenues derived from the lease, sale, or other disposal of the lands or interests therein and the resources therein. The Secretary is authorized to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of such lands or interests therein and the resources therein in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(d) All public lands within any withdrawals provided for in this section which have not been patented or in the process of being patented under this Act ten years after the effective date of this Act shall be returned to whatever status they had on the effective date of such withdrawals.

SURVEYS

SEC. 9. The Secretary shall carry out a program of townsite surveys and plat determinations within the areas withdrawn pursuant to the provisions of section 8 of this Act for the purpose of locating and defining the lands occupied within such withdrawn areas as homes, businesses, subsistence camp sites, and for religious, educational, community, governmental, charitable, and other purposes. Such surveys shall be completed prior to the issuance of any patent to lands in such areas pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS

SEC. 10. (a) Upon completion of the surveys required by section 9 of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to issue a patent to the surface of any public lands within areas withdrawn under this Act to the individual or organization occupying such land at the time of the survey. If application is made for the same lands by more than one individual or organization, determination of who shall receive such land shall be made by the Commission after public hearing. Such patent shall be issued on the following terms:

(1) Patents to Natives and to religious, educational, community, governmental, charitable, and other non-profit organizations shall be made without payment therefor; and

(2) Patents to persons other than the Natives shall be made only upon payment of fair market value as determined by the Secretary as of the date the patent is issued.

(b) Any Native who would otherwise be eligible to receive a grant of public land under the terms of this section and who, within a period beginning ten years prior to the effective date of this Act, was required to move to another location outside the withdrawn area because of an action by a Federal, State, or local government, or any Native who occupies or has occupied land patented by the United States to any other person, shall receive compensation from the Fund in lieu of such land in such sum the Commission determines to be appropriate.

(c) (1) The Secretary shall, upon application of any local government established under the laws of the State of Alaska, issue a patent without payment thereof to the surface of any public land within a withdrawn area for which a patent has not been issued or application therefor pending under subsection (a) of this section; *Provided*, such land is within the jurisdiction of such local government.

(2) The Secretary shall, upon application of such local government, issue, after a public hearing, a patent to the surface of any public land selected by such government within an area withdrawn under this Act but outside such government's jurisdiction, except that the total conveyances under this subsection shall not exceed 23,040 acres for any such government.

(3) All public lands selected by such local governments under this subsection shall be contiguous, except as separated by bodies of water, and shall be in units of not less than 160 acres. Where more than one local government makes application for the conveyance of the same public lands, and such applicants are of more than one class of government under the laws of the State of Alaska, preference shall be given by the Secretary to the smallest unit of local government. If application for patent to public land is made by more than one local government and such land is outside the jurisdiction of all applicant local governments seeking the land, the determination of which local government shall receive the lands shall be made by the Commission, after public hearings.

(d) The Secretary shall issue patents without payment therefor to the surface of any public land located in Alaska which has been used by a Native or Native group for a period of more than three years prior to the effective date of this Act for the harvest of fish, wildlife, berries, fuel, or other products of the land. Such patents shall be issued—

(1) for 5-acre tracts for each subsistence use campsite separated from the campsite of any other applicant;

(2) for 40-acre tracts where the campsites of several applicants are in such proximity to each other as to make it not feasible to patent individual 5-acre campsites; or

(3) for larger tracts where individuals can establish, under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, historic occupancy and use of the larger tracts.

Pending the issuance of a patent for campsites under this subsection the Secretary is authorized to permit the use of such lands by such Natives or Native groups as campsites.

(e) The Secretary is authorized to issue a patent to the surface of any public lands that on January 1, 1969, are leased, permitted, or used for reindeer management purposes, including summer and winter range facilities and intervening line camps, to each bona fide reindeer husbandryman, family, or village community reindeer association, or village community governing body practicing reindeer management. Maximum acreage permitted under this subsection under any patent is 2,560 acres. Lands patented under this subsection shall be in addition to, and not in lieu of, any other rights authorized by this Act.

(f) Upon application, the Secretary shall, for a period of ten years after the effective date of this Act, grant a patent to the surface of any tract of unreserved and unappropriated public lands in Alaska not in excess of 160 acres, without payment therefor, to any Native 19 years of age or older, whose primary place of residence is outside the limits of the withdrawn areas provided for in section 8(a) of this Act, subject to a reservation in the United States for access or rights-of-way for public roads or utilities.

(g) The Secretary shall patent to the Corporation the mineral estate of any withdrawn lands patented under this section. The Corporation may not sell or transfer such mineral estate to anyone, except the United States or the State of Alaska, but may lease any or all of said minerals in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(h) In carrying out the provisions of this section, patents shall be issued in accordance with the following priorities:

(1) Within the township withdrawals provided for in section 8(a) of this Act:

(A) Land for individual use;

(B) Subsistence camp sites; and

(C) Community lands.

(2) Outside the withdrawals as provided in section 10 of this Act:

(A) Isolated homesites;

(B) Subsistence camp sites;

(C) Lands for reindeer husbandry; and

(D) Disposal for other purposes.

(i) Public lands within the withdrawals not patented under the foregoing subsections may be opened to settlement and occupation by the Secretary upon recommendation of the Commission. Entitlement to patent to the surface of such lands shall be in accordance with regulations, procedures, and criteria established by the Commission which regulations, procedures, and criteria shall not discriminate between Natives and non-Natives. The surface of public lands occupied by Natives under this subsection shall be patented to such Natives without payment therefor, and the surface of lands occupied by non-Natives shall be patented to them after payment of the fair market value thereof, as determined by the Secretary as of the date of the patent.

(j) All withdrawals and patents of lands or interests therein under this section shall be subject to valid existing rights of any person, and the Secretary shall take such measures as he deems appropriate, in consultation with the Commission, to extinguish such rights where they conflict with the grants made in this section, except easements or rights-of-way for public purposes.

(k) Where, prior to patent of the surface of any land under this section, a contract, lease, or permit has been issued for the utilization of mineral or surface resources such patent shall contain provisions making the patent subject to the lease or contract and the right of the lessor or contractor to the complete enjoyment of all rights, privileges, and benefits granted him by such lease or contract. All income derived from any such lease or contract, after allowance for administrative costs as determined by the Secretary, shall be paid to the Corporation.

COMPENSATION FOR LANDS PREVIOUSLY TAKEN

SEC. 11. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $100 million to be paid into the Fund as compensation for Native rights in lands withdrawn by the United States and in lands selected by Alaska under the Statehood Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339) prior to the effective date of this Act.

MINERAL LEASING ACT

SEC. 12. (a) (1) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, deposits of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, or sulphur located in all public lands in Alaska shall be subject to disposition by the Secretary under the terms of this Act. After the effective date of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to dispose of such deposits upon application therefor or upon his own motion under such competitive bidding procedures, using oral or sealed bidding or a combination thereof, as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation. The provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended and supplemented (41 Stat. 437, 30 U.S.C. sec. 181 and following), shall apply to the extent that such provisions are not inconsistent with this Act.

(2) For a period of ten years after the effective date of this Act, all revenues derived from the disposition of such minerals shall be distributed as provided in the Statehood Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339), except that ten per centum of such proceeds shall be deducted and paid into the Fund, prior to calculating the shares as set forth in the Statehood Act of July 7, 1958.

(b) (1) The Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized to dispose of deposits of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, or sulphur located within Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 either upon application therefor or upon his own motion upon such competitive bidding procedures, using oral or sealed bidding or a combination thereof, as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation. The provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended and supplemented, shall apply to the extent that such provisions are not inconsistent with this Act.

(2) All revenues derived from the disposition of such minerals for a period of ten years after the effective date of this Act shall be apportioned as follows:

(A) 10 per centum to be returned to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts;

(B) 45 per centum to be returned to the Treasury of the United States until such time as the amount reaches $50 million to compensate the United States for the expenses of past exploration of the area, and thereafter such sum shall be paid into the Fund; and

(C) 45 per centum to be paid into the Fund. After the ten-year period set forth in this Act has expired, the entire revenues derived from the disposition of minerals from Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 will be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) Ten per centum of all revenues received by the United States from the disposition of minerals from the Outer Continental Shelf bordering the State of Alaska shall be deposited in the Fund for a period of 10 years after the effective date of this Act.

(d) (1) Any person who claims or may hereafter claim an interest in an unpatented mining claim in Alaska for which application for patent is not on file with the Secretary on the effective date of this Act shall record within one year after the effective date of this Act or within sixty days after location of such claim, whichever is first, with the Secretary a Declaration of Interest in Mining Claim" setting forth a description of the claim and such other information as the Secretary may require by regulation. Any mining claim in Alaska not so recorded within the time prescribed shall be null and void, except that recordation shall not be construed as rendering valid any mining claim which is invalid on the effective date of this Act or which becomes invalid thereafter under the Mining Laws.

(2) The Secretary shall collect, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, a royalty of 5 per centum of the value of locatable minerals, which value will be determined at the mine, extracted from mining claims in Alaska located and recorded after the effective date of this Act. A royalty of less than 5 per centum may be collected by the Secretary upon a satisfactory showing that the royalty should be reduced in order to operate the claim successfully. For a period of ten years after the effective date of this Act, 10 per centum of the revenues resulting from such royalty shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, and the remaining 90 per centum shall be deposited into the Fund, and thereafter the entire revenues derived from this royalty shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. As used in this section, the term "locatable minerals" includes any mineral not subject to disposal under (A) the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended or supplemented or (B) the Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681; 30 U.S.C. 601), as amended.

(e) For a period of ten years after the effective date of this Act, 10 per centum of the revenues derived from the sale or lease of surface resources located on public lands in Alaska, except those withdrawn by section 8 of this Act, will be deposited into the Fund, and shall be deducted before any distribution is made of such revenues under any other provision of law.

(f) For a period of 10 years, after the effective date of this Act, there shall be deposited into the Fund an amount equal to 10 per centum of the revenues collected by the State of Alaska or accruing to said State from public lands patented to the State of Alaska after December 31, 1966, including, but not limited to, receipts from the sale or lease of such lands or minerals therein, and in the event of default by the State of Alaska in making such payments there shall be deducted annually from such monies during such period the share of mineral revenues from public lands in Alaska paid as Federal grants-in-aid to the State of Alaska and any other funds paid to the State of Alaska by the United States.

PROTECTION OF SUBSISTENCE RESOURCES

SEC. 13. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for a period of 10 years after the effective date of this Act, the Secretary, upon petition by any individual residing in Alaska or by the Department of Fish and Game of the State of Alaska shall, after a public hearing, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, determine whether or not an emergency exists with respect to the depletion of subsistence biotic resources in any given area of the State and may thereupon delimit and declare that such area will be closed to entry for hunting, fishing, or trapping, except by residents of such area, subject to the provisions of any treaty concerning such resources. The closing authorized by this section shall not be for a period of more than 3 years, and may be extended by the Secretary after hearing, and a published finding that the emergency continues to exist. Any person knowingly hunting, fishing, or trapping in such area, except a resident thereof, may, upon conviction, be required to forfeit any gear, vehicle, boat or aircraft used in connection with such violation, and shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of $1,000, or a year in prison, or both.

THE TLINGIT-HAIDA SETTLEMENT

SEC. 14. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Tlingit-Haida Indians are hereby authorized to vote, under procedures established by their governing body under their organizational document, whether they shall be included under all the provisions of this Act and relinquish title to the 2.6 million acres of land in southeast Alaska held under "Indian Title" and confirmed in them by the Court of Claims on January 19, 1968, in "The Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska v. United States, (389F 2d. 778)", and accept as a credit against all future compensation to be paid to them under the provisions of this Act the amount of $7.5 million as full settlement of their claims against the United States which sum shall be a lien against the shares of the Corporation set aside for the Tlingit-Haida Indians. The Corporation, for a period of 10 years after its incorporation, shall withhold dividends on the shares set aside for the Tlingit-Haida Indians until the amount of such dividends equals $7.5 million. If, at the end of such period, the amount of dividends withheld by the Corporation, does not equal $7.5 million, the individual shares distributed to the Tlingit and Haida Indians by the Corporation under this Act shall be sold, transferred, or assigned only after the Corporation has been paid that portion of the outstanding lien against such share at the time of its distribution. The Secretary is authorized to patent upon certification to him of the results of the vote provided herein by the tribe's governing body the 2.6 million acres confirmed in the Tlingit and Haida Indians by the Court of Claims to the Tlingit-Haida governing body or its successor, except that the mineral estate shall not be patented to anyone other than the United States or the State of Alaska.

TANAINA INDIANS

SEC. 15. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Tanaina Indians of the Moquawkie Reservation (hereinafter referred to as the Tyonek Indians) may vote, under procedures established by the existing Tyonek Council, whether their tribe, in lieu of any benefits under this Act, (a) shall accept a grant to the Tyonek Council of 26,918 acres of such Reservation, with a reservation that the mineral estate underlying such lands may not be sold or transferred by the Tyonek Indians to anyone other than the United States or the State of Alaska; or (b) accept abolition of the Reservation and a grant of the lands within such Reservation to a local government body organized under the laws of the State of Alaska with a reservation that the mineral estate underlying such lands may not be sold or transferred to anyone other than the United States or the State of Alaska; or (c) accept abolition of the Reservation and be entitled to the benefits of this Act. Upon certification to the Secretary of the results of the vote required by this section, the Secretary is authorized to carry out either selection made by the Tyonek Indians in accordance with the provisions of this section. If the Tyonek Indians select to follow the provisions of either clause (a) or (b) of this section, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts with the grantees for the development of the mineral estate underlying such lands.

REVOCATION OF RESERVATIONS

SEC. 16. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except where inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, the various reserves set aside by legislation or by Executive or Secretarial order for Native use or for administration of Native affairs, including those created under the Act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 593), are hereby revoked, subject to any valid existing rights of any non-Natives.

REVIEW BY CONGRESS

SEC. 17. The Commission and the Secretary shall submit to the Congress annual reports on implementation of this Act. Such reports to be filed by the Commission until its termination, and by the Secretary annually for a period of 10 years beginning one year after the effective date of this Act. At the beginning of the first session of Congress preceding 10 years from the effective date of this Act, the Commission and the Secretary shall submit, through the President, a joint report of the status of the Natives and Native groups in Alaska, and a summary of actions taken under this Act, together with such recommendations as may be appropriate for continuation or modification of any provisions of this Act which will specifically expire at the end of such 10 years.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 18. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior such sums as may be necessary to carry out the functions and responsibilities that he is required to perform under the provisions of this Act. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

PUBLICATION

SEC. 19. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue and publish in the Federal Register, pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act (5 U.S.C.) such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Title.

SAVINGS CLAUSE

SEC. 20. Except as specifically provided for in this Act, nothing in this Act shall be construed as repealing any other provision of Federal law applicable to Alaska. To the extent that there is a conflict between any provision of this Act and any other Federal law applicable to Alaska, the provisions of this Act shall govern.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 50) to provide appropriations for sharing of Federal revenues with States and certain cities and urban counties.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 472) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 503) to provide for meeting the manpower needs of the Armed Forces of the United States through a completely voluntary system of enlistments, and to further improve, upgrade, and strengthen such Armed Forces and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1205) to provide for a medal to be known as the Supreme Sacrifice Medal and to provide for its presentation to the widow or next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who have lost their lives as the result of armed conflict.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1219) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take certain actions, and make an investigation and study, with respect to drilling and oil production under leases issued pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1446) to establish a Department of Natural Resources.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1478), for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) be added as cosponsor of the bill (S. 1477) to provide that individuals entitled to disability insurance benefits—or child's benefits based on disability—under title II of the Social Security Act, and individuals entitled to permanent disability annuities—or child's annuities based on disability—under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, shall be eligible for health insurance benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1506) to provide for improvements in the administration of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1519) to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the junior Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) and the junior Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1693) to establish a National Commission on Federal Tax Sharing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1716) to provide Federal financial assistance to States to enable them to pay compensation to certain disabled individuals who, as a result of their employment in the coal mining industry, suffer from pneumoconiosis and who are not entitled to compensation under any workmen's compensation law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the junior Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the junior Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the junior Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS), the senior Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), the junior Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the junior Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the senior Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the junior Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the junior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), and the junior Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG) be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 89) expressing the support of the Congress, and urging the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private for the international biological program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ASSISTANCE TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR RECONSTRUCTION OF AREAS DAMAGED BY RECENT STORMS, FLOODS, LANDSLIDES, AND HIGH WATERS—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 11

Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 993) to provide assistance to the State of California for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent storms, floods, landslides, and high waters, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS—NOMINATIONS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Daniel Bartlett, Jr., of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Missouri for the term of 4 years, vice Veryl L. Riddle.

Thomas A. Flannery, of Maryland, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia for the term of 4 years, vice David G. Bress.

Richard Van Thomas, of Wyoming, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Wyoming for the term of 4 years, vice Robert N. Chaffin.

Harold M. Grindle, of Iowa, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Iowa for the term of 4 years, vice Charles B. Bendlage, Jr.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing on or before Tuesday, April 22, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON DRUG ABUSE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, narcotic addiction, drug abuse, and addictive diseases are among the Nation's leading health problems. It is estimated that more than 100,000 persons are addicted to narcotic drugs such as heroin and morphine. Millions are experimenting with and many are using on a regular basis hallucinogenic agents such as marihuana. Narcotic addiction, primarily the use of heroin, has long been a major blight of our urban ghettos. Recent evidence would indicate that this problem is now spreading to the suburbs. For too many years it was hoped that primarily enforcement techniques would resolve this problem. They have not. Action must be taken to provide a greater role for our national health programs in this area. The problem of marihuana use is in the process of reaching epidemic proportions in the United States. Though sound data is lacking, it is estimated that between 20 and 40 percent of our college students have at least experimented with this drug. Recent information would lead us to believe that marihuana has spread to high schools, junior high schools, and, in some areas, to elementary schools. Our state of scientifically based knowledge about marihuana and its effects is inadequate. At the same time, based on our experience with LSD, we are convinced that public education programs based on proven knowledge can have a significant effect on decreasing marihuana use.

It has been stated often that we are living in what has been called a "drug-oriented society." Barbiturates, amphetamines, and other stimulants and depressant agents are being used and abused by millions of our people. Though it is clear that there are medically sound reasons for having these agents, it is likewise apparent that many persons in our population have become dependent on them. Too little is known about how and why so many Americans have fallen victim to this blight. Thus, we will have hearings beginning April 16 and 17 in Washington and continuing April 18 in Fort Worth, Tex. The Fort Worth, Tex., hearing will pay particular attention to the future of the Fort Worth Clinical Research Center. I hope the Subcommittee on Health will be able to learn what all of us can do in order to launch a massive and coordinated attack on the problems of drug abuse. More research to uncover new knowledge about causes and prevention is necessary; more facilities to treat and rehabilitate these victims are imperative.

The hearing witnesses for Wednesday, April 16, are the following:

Dr. Alfred M. Freedman, chairman, department of psychiatry, New York Medical College, Flower and Fifth Avenue Hospital, New York, N.Y. He is an expert in the area of experimental treatment of opiate education, as well as a medical expert in the area of marihuana, methedrine, LSD, barbiturates, and so forth.

Dr. Gilbert Geis, professor of sociology, California State College at Los Angeles, department of sociology, Los Angeles, Calif. He was formerly director, Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency; East Los Angeles Halfway House for Narcotics Addicts. He is a sociologist who runs a followup program for addicts on the west coast; is an expert in the area of education and the behavioral sciences; he is a sociologist of high repute.

Dr. Jerome Jaffee, assistant professor of psychiatry, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. He operates an excellent education treatment program in Chicago; is an expert in the area of experimental treatment narcotic antagonists, such as cyclazocine and naloxone, as well as substitution therapy with methadone.

The hearing witnesses for Thursday, April 17, are the following:

Dr. Joseph English, Administrator, Health Services and Mental Health Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, accompanied by Dr. Stanley Yolles, director, NIMH, and Mr. James Kelly, Assistant Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dr. Henry Brill, chairman, AMA Committee on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence, director, Pilgrim State Hospital; West Brentwood, N.Y. He is to cover the area of commitments and commitment laws in New York State and California, and to discuss the AMA's position on narcotics and drug abuse.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The Drug Generation: Growing Younger," published in Newsweek for April 21, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DRUG GENERATION: GROWING YOUNGER

San Francisco's middle-class Aptos Junior High, seventh graders trade barbiturates in homerooms—and smoke marijuana during lunch. In Detroit, anxious parents can take suspicious pills or bags of tobacco to their local police precincts for analysis without turning in their children. (So much marijuana has been invading Detroit recently that the sheriff's office has a marijuana-sniffing police dog that meets many flights from the West Coast.) And in sleepy Wakefield, Mass., parents were shocked a few weeks ago to learn that some high-school students were using heroin. "Some established families," says Mrs. Judith Katnabas, secretary of Wakefield's newly created Drug Action Committee, "have spent everything to finance their children's drug habit. Parents would rather see the habit continued than to have their child picked up and the whole thing made public in the courts."

The use of drugs—from chalky white pills that give Dexedrine highs to red, yellow and blue LSD capsules for mind-bending hallucinations—has spread through the youth population. Drug use is no longer concentrated among the liberal campuses of the East and West Coasts or the megaversities of the Midwest; it is as far away as the mess halls and field positions of Vietnam and as close as the schoolhouse around the corner.

Attempting to measure the exact size of the U.S. drug population is almost impossible. School officials knock down estimates to protect their institutions; students tend toward braggadocio. High-school and college administrators cite estimates ranging from 5 to 35 per cent. Students often claim that 85 or 90 per cent of their friends have smoked pot. But two facts appear incontrovertibly clear. First, the age of U.S. drug users is dropping rapidly, sometimes reaching down into elementary schools. Second, as drugs become widespread, the young have built a culture and a rationale of their own around their use and abuse.

Into Something: Turning on at home, listening to Country Joe and the Fish or watching "2001: A Space Odyssey" while stoned creates a unity among the young. "It's a whole cultural thing," says a Columbia freshman. "It has a different vocabulary, and once you start drugs you keep different hours. You can point at yourself and the other people in it and say 'We're into something'."

This "something" naturally sets adult nerves on edge. Last week, for example, the Massachusetts Poll conducted for The Boston Globe found that adults in the state were worried more about drug abuse among the young than any other state problem; 80 per cent rated it a "very serious problem" with a greater emotional impact than inflation or crime in the streets. The fact that adults become so upset over drugs seems to make drugs more attractive to the young.

Surveying five California campuses, Richard H. Blum, a Stanford University psychologist, found that marijuana use has almost tripled in the eighteen months ending in December 1968. In a new report, "Students and Drugs," Blum states that 57 per cent of students at the schools had smoked marijuana at least once, compared with 21 per cent a year earlier. About 14 per cent were "regular" users, against 4 per cent a year before.

"What we see now," says Blum, "is a rapidly increasing tempo. While it took approximately ten years, by our estimate, for experimentation and use to shift from the older intellectual-artistic groups to graduate students, it took only an estimated five years to catch on among undergraduates, only two or three years to move to a significant number of high-school students, and then, within no more than two years, to move to upper elementary grades."

Mind-Altering: Drugs have achieved a foothold independent of school status. New York City's private Dalton School (tuition: $2,000) recently placed four students on disciplinary probations for using marijuana. Many high-school students are more than willing to experiment with drugs. "Frankly," says Edward R. Kolevzon, president of The New York High School Principals Association, "I think the problem is more widespread than most people can imagine." Many high-school students smoke grass in the restrooms; a daring few will light up in class. "During the week," says a senior at Milton Academy in Milton, Mass., "many upperclassmen will smoke grass, but they won't trip on acid because of the homework. They leave the heavy stuff for weekends in Boston." And Dr. Joel Fort, a lecturer at Berkeley and one of Blum's associates, says that some seventh-grade pupils in Berkeley public schools have tried LSD or its equivalent. By the twelfth grade, he says, 14 per cent had tried LSD. Says Fort: "There is a massive and growing use of mind-altering drugs by all segments of American youth."

In general, two kinds of drugs are involved in the new drug culture. First, there are the serious drugs, such as LSD and methedrine (speed), which have proved to be dangerous. Second, there are the "soft drugs" such as marijuana, whose immediate physiological effects appear to be less serious than three Maritinis, but whose long-term psychological and emotional effects are being analyzed. While recent research indicates that LSD may cause brain damage, that it can change chromosomes or contribute to birth defects, some students still turn to LSD and speed for artificial highs.

Speed Kills: These drugs can lead to tragedy. Fairleigh Dickinson 3rd, a Columbia freshman, heir to a pharmaceutical fortune and son of a prominent New Jersey state senator, was found unconscious last month on the lower bunk of a friend's room on campus. He died from a combination of LSD and an overdose of opium he apparently had eaten to come down." At some other schools, the use of LSD has crested. "Students got frightened by the walking wounded," says Dr. Richard H. Moy, director of the University of Chicago's health service, "the people who have gotten hung up and strung out."

Still, students estimate that perhaps 600 Columbia students have taken speed and acid; most are under 20, the products of suburban high schools and prep schools. "I take speed," claims a sophomore engineering student, "because I can control it. It keeps me up and awake. You don't lose your mind like on acid." A Barnard freshman adds that "last year at boarding school everybody took diet pills to stay up for exams. This year they don't have that much effect on me, so twice, when I had to get my papers done, I took speed . . . It kept me awake and fresh, not jittery the way Dex does, and after I got the papers done I slept for 24 hours."

Marijuana, of course, a mild hallucinogen, is not nearly as potent. And students of all ages are increasingly willing to experiment with it. At many campuses, marijuana has passed the experimental stage and is an unremarked part of the social life. "Everyone does it," says a junior at one small New England college. "You see these complete Brooks Brothers straight arrows who turn on all the time." A survey of 100 Yale seniors found that 85 per cent had smoked marijuana at least once; half smoked about once a week; 20 per cent had taken LSD, and 10 per cent experiment with acid or other strong hallucinogens fairly frequently. A Barnard counselor notes an "incredible" change in the patterns of drug use. The freshmen arrive "sophisticated"—some have been "smoking marijuana since they were 14 or 15."

Misinformation: One constant in the drug culture has been the vast amount of misinformation. A few years ago police and school officials overreacted to the "drug menace," lecturing that once a youngster took his first puff of marijuana he was hooked for life on a trail that irremediably led to hashish, cocaine, heroin, jail, disgrace and the poorhouse. When the scientists eventually ground out their research to show that the argument was false, students were among the first to digest the news. Not that a certain percentage needed any encouragement. As Yale psychiatrist Kenneth Keniston points out, there are some students who are "less seekers after grades or professional expertise than seekers after truth." For them, drugs are an attempt to experiment with new states of experience and consciousness.

Other students simply never believed what they had been told about the harmful effects of drugs. Dr. Lawrence Halpern, a neuropharmacologist at the University of Washington medical school, tells of an 18-year-old girl he treated last summer; she was suffering from hepatitis and needle abscesses from shooting speed. "I asked her," he says, " 'Didn't anybody tell you this stuff was no good?' She replied, 'Yea, man, but they told me so much other garbage, who's going to believe it?" "Just because society tells you something is bad doesn't mean it is," says a Princeton history senior. "We disagree with a system that tells us Vietnam is good and marijuana is bad."

Benign: But even when they listen, many young drug users tend to hear only what they want to hear. They talk about marijuana as a totally benign experience when, in truth, researchers still don't really know about its effects. Researchers have just gotten around to synthesizing its active ingredient, tetrahydro-cannabinol (TIIC). The conclusion so far, says Dr. Sidney Cohen, director of the National Institute of Mental Health's Division of Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse, is that "marijuana, taken infrequently and in small doses, causes no more difficulty than getting stoned on alcohol. But the question in everyone's mind is whether the pothead, the person who uses it consistently over a period of years, may suffer ill effects." Scientists are now trying to assess what some call the "amotivational syndrome"—whether marijuana can lead to a loss of ambition and drive. "I don't think one necessarily loses motivation if he is an occasional user," says Cohen, "but I suspect people who do make it a career do stop being interested in getting ahead, become more passive, tend to live only in the present and not look to the future."

There is little doubt that far more needs to be known about most drugs. The New Physician, the journal of the Student American Medical Association, last month editorialized that physicians "have abdicated their responsibilities" about marijuana research. "If research substantiates present opinion that marijuana is not harmful or addicting," SAMA said, "then physicians should be in the forefront of efforts to remove legal penalties from its possessions and use."

Naked: Most schools are trying to strike a balance between these laws dealing with drug possession and use and student opinion. Many solve the problem simply by looking the other way, and a few adopt fairly lenient policies. Last year a committee of four faculty members, five students and one administrator drew up a five-page policy statement for George Washington University. It stated that the school has no legal duty "to divulge to any law-enforcement agency rumors or hearsay information about drug use on campus, or the names of students suspected of illegal use or possession of drugs" (at the same time the document did spell out possible health hazards). A campus cop explains that he would take away the ID cards of students caught with drugs and ask them to report to a dean. "After all," he says, "you're dealing with a man's reputation for life. We try to protect students; we don't try to get them in trouble." A disciplinary committee at the University of Chicago hears about four drug cases a year. "These," admits one dean, "involve the kind of students who pop up naked."

Elementary and secondary schools usually take a harder line. Donald Barr, headmaster of New York's Dalton, recently sent a memo to all faculty and parents of fourth to twelfth graders saying that "we consider marijuana a dangerous narcotic." He's particularly worried about young pupils taking drugs while they are just coming to grips with the adult world. "With marijuana," he says, "you're not dealing with professionals but with friendly sharers, with agonized, twisted kids trying to involve others, and they work within the context of friendship in school."

The New Trier schools in Winnetka, Ill., have taken an enlightened approach to drugs. The high-school faculty started thinking about a drug program a few years ago when some students were caught with their noses in the gluepots. After much research, New Trier just started a course in human behavior in February dealing with drug use—and held a seminar to discuss the entire spectrum of drugs with parents and students. Instead of trotting out reformed addicts and adopting scare tactics, New Trier officials simply told of a few specific examples of local teen-age drug users. "The parents learned how much of a communication gap there was between them and their children," says one history teacher. "And they also learned just how widespread the drug thing was." After the seminar, the school psychiatrist reported a large increase in the number of students coming in for help.

Laws: Most school and health officials believe laws regarding marijuana use will change soon. "It would make social sense," says Dr. Seymour Halleck, director of psychiatric services at the University of Wisconsin, "to legalize marijuana with stringent rules against giving it to minors. But if kids feel like using drugs, police are incapable of stopping them." Given today's permissive society, there's no telling where drug use is going to stop. It is certain, however, that drug abuse among the young would be easier to deal with if the laws and boundaries were laid out in terms they could respect.

One significant sign is that the National Student Association is no longer trying to educate students about drugs. Instead, it is challenging the constitutionality of the drug laws together with the American Civil Liberties Union. Says Bard Grosse, director of the NSA's drug studies: "We are trying to decriminalize marijuana." So many students smoke grass today, says the 25-year-old Grosse, it is already "unofficially legal."

IN VIETNAM: MAMA-SAN PUSHERS VERSUS PSYOPS

A battalion of the U.S. Army's First Cavalry Division trooped into division headquarters at Phuoc Vinh one day recently after a month in the field. The men showered and shaved and ate a hot meal in the mess hall. "Then when the sun went down," recalls one GI, "about 200 of us went into the nearest field and had a damn good smoke." But the scene was pure marijuana rather than Marlboro Country. In a war where so much is ambiguous, it is no secret that the use of marijuana by American soldiers in Vietnam is so extensive that it has produced a pot subculture among U.S. troops. They have a slogan—"Dope is hope"—and an apocryphal hero—"The Psychedelic Killer," a gunship pilot who goes into battle in Da-Glo helmet and a marijuana high.

The "head" count among the 500,000 GI's in Vietnam is naturally difficult to determine. A study called "Marijuana Use in Vietnam: A Preliminary Report," stated that 35 per cent of the troops turn on. The study was conducted by Army psychiatrist Capt. Wilfred Postell and appeared in the official Vietnam Medical Bulletin. The drug rate is highest in units where men hail from metropolitan centers like New York City and San Francisco, and the high rate in intelligence and mechanized units suggests that education may be a factor. Curiously, most mess cooks are said to be heads.

"Vietnam is a very concentrated experience," explains one soldier. "It's like some giant corporation where you can't quit and everybody has gone crazy." The marijuana weed (cannabis) grows over much of Vietnam and therefore is even easier to get in Vietnam than on any metropolitan U.S. campus. In almost any city, says a GI, "all you have to do is shuffle around until some mama-san offers it to you." In the field, troops receive regular visits from peddlers. On a couple of occasions a 2½-ton Army truck and a helicopter were reportedly "fragged," or detached, on special marijuana missions.

The Military Police have stepped up busts and are putting special pressure on Vietnamese police to arrest native salesmen. The Army has also undertaken a psychological operation (psyops) program that uses posters (MARIJUANA MEANS TROUBLE) and radio programs featuring cool, Peter Gunn-style music. Punishment for convicted GI's ranges from a two-week restriction to barracks to five years' imprisonment at hard labor. None of this, however, has done much to discourage the use of pot. Says an Army psychiatrist: "The lower-level unit commander is reaching an accommodation with pot smokers. If he stopped them all it would decimate his outfit. So he sees no evil and as long as they stay out of trouble he doesn't bother them."

CANADA AND NATO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on April 3 the Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honorable Pierre Elliott Trudeau, issued a statement regarding Canada's future participation in NATO. The Prime Minister announced a decision to withdraw elements of the Canadian forces which have been stationed in Europe. His statement appears to have perturbed some of the NATO nations. Notwithstanding, it was a thoughtful decision which was designed to take effect in due course and which cannot, in any sense, be construed as disruptive. Rather, it might well act, in my opinion, as a healthy stimulant to bring about general reassessments and readjustments in the organization.

In this connection, President Nixon's remarks on the 20th anniversary of NATO ought also to be noted carefully in NATO circles. The President seems to me to make clear that what made for an effective organizational structure two decades ago is not necessarily the same today. That is not to doubt the importance of the mutual security concept of the NATO nations and of the need for consultation and cooperation to that end. These considerations, as Mr. Trudeau has indicated, will continue to guide Canada's policy in its continued relationship as a member of NATO as I would hope they will guide ours.

Nevertheless, the Canadian Government has broken new ground. It has taken the first steps to bring about a review of NATO—what it stands for in 1969, and where it intends to go in the years ahead. By announcing that Canadian troops will gradually be withdrawn from assignment in Europe, after appropriate consultation with other members of NATO, the Prime Minister has brought about a much-needed change in direction. Indeed, it might well be emulated by the United States and other members before the 21st anniversary of the organization.

It is an anachronism for the United States to remain the mainspring around which NATO evolves. The time for an overwhelming American responsibility in NATO has passed; the time has arrived for sharing more equitably that responsibility. The continued stationing of 600,000 U.S. troops and dependents in Western Europe into the indefinable future is not in keeping with the needs of this Nation nor, in my judgment, with the needs of Europe. The cost is excessive to us. The deployment is unnecessary in this day and age. It derives from an era of the past and is not in accord with the realities of today.

Our military commitments in Western Europe should be revised. Our bases in Western Europe should be reduced. Our policy should be oriented to 1969 and not held captive to 1949. That apparently is what is happening in Canadian policy. It would be my hope that it will begin to happen with respect to the policy of this Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement made on April 3, 1969, in Ottawa, by the Prime Minister, the Right Honorable Pierre Elliott Trudeau, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Canadian Defence Policy Statement by the Prime Minister, Right Honorable Pierre Elliott Trudeau, April 3, 1969

A Canadian defence policy, employing in an effective fashion the highly skilled and professional Canadian armed forces, will contribute to the maintenance of world peace. It will also add to our own sense of purpose as a nation and give renewed enthusiasm and a feeling of direction to the members of the armed forces. It will provide the key to the flexible employment of Canadian forces in a way which will permit them to make their best contribution in accordance with Canada's particular needs and requirements.

The Government has rejected any suggestion that Canada assume a non-aligned or neutral role in world affairs. Such an option would have meant the withdrawal by Canada from its present alliances and the termination of all co-operative military arrangements with other countries. We have decided in this fashion because we think it necessary and wise to continue to participate in an appropriate way in collective security arrangements with other states in the interests of Canada's national security and in defence of the values we share with our friends.

Canada requires armed forces within Canada in order to carry out a wide range of activities involving the defence of the country also supplementing the civil authorities and contributing to national development.

Properly equipped and deployed, our forces will provide an effective multi-purpose maritime coastal shield and they will carry out operations necessary for the defence of North American airspace in co-operation with the U.S.A. Abroad, our forces will be capable of playing important roles in collective security and in peace-keeping activities.

The structure, equipment and training of our forces must be compatible with these roles and it is the intention of the Government that they shall be. Our eventual forces will be highly mobile and will be the best-equipped and best-trained forces of their kind in the world.

The precise military role which we shall endeavour to assume in these collective arrangements will be a matter for discussion and consultation with our allies and will depend in part on the role assigned to Canadian forces in the surveillance of our own territory and coast lines in the interests of protecting our own sovereignty. As a responsible member of the international community, it is our desire to have forces available for peace-keeping roles as well as for participation in defensive alliances.

Canada is a partner in two collective defence arrangements which, though distinct, are complementary. These are the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the North American Air Defence Command. For twenty years NATO has contributed to the maintenance of world peace through its stabilizing influence in Europe. NATO continues to contribute to peace by reducing the likelihood of a major conflict breaking out in Europe where, because of the vital interests of the two major powers are involved, any outbreak of hostilities could easily escalate into a war of world proportions. At the same time it is the declared aim of NATO to foster improvements in East-West relations.

NATO itself is continuously reassessing the role it plays in the light of changing world conditions. Perhaps the major development affecting NATO in Europe since the organization was founded is the magnificent recovery of the economic strength of Western Europe. There has been a very great change in the ability of European countries themselves to provide necessary conventional defence forces and armaments to be deployed by the alliance in Europe.

It was, therefore, in our view entirely appropriate for Canada to review and re-examine the necessity in present circumstances for maintaining Canadian forces in Western Europe. Canadian forces are now committed to NATO until the end of the preesnt year. The Canadian force commitment for deployment with NATO in Europe beyond this period will be discussed with our allies at the Defence Planning Committee Meeting in May. The Canadian Government intends, in consultation with Canada's allies, to take early steps to bring about a planned and phased reduction of the size of the Canadian forces in Europe.

We intend as well to continue to co-operate effectively with the U.S.A. in the defence of North America. We shall accordingly seek early occasions for detailed discussions with the U.S. Government of the whole range of problems involved in our mutual co-operation in defence matters in this continent. To the extent that it is feasible we shall endeavor to have those activities within Canada which are essential to North American defence performed by Canadian forces.

In summary, Canada will continue to be a member of the NATO and to co-operate closely with the U.S. within NORAD and in other ways in defensive arrangements. We shall maintain appropriate defence forces which will be designed to undertake the following roles:

(A) The surveillance of our own territory and coast lines, i.e., the protection of our sovereignty;

(B) The defence of North America in co-operation with U.S. forces;

(C) The fulfillment of such NATO commitments as may be agreed upon; and

(D) The performance of such international peace-keeping roles as we may, from time to time, assume.

The kind of forces and armaments most suitable for these roles is now being assessed in greater detail in preparation for discussion with our allies.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS SHOULD BE INCREASED BY 15 PERCENT AND THE EARNINGS LIMITATION RAISED TO $3,000

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is with a feeling of deep regret that I learned that President Nixon proposes to recommend an increase of only 7 percent in cash payments to the nearly 25 million men, women, and children who are the recipients each month of social security benefits.

Our social security system is an actuarially sound insurance system concerning which I am knowledgeable and very proud. As Ohio Congressman at Large, serving my second term in 1935, I spoke out in favor of and voted for the creation of the social security system. Many conservative colleagues in the House of Representatives and in the Senate at that time termed social security "state socialism." This great program, which will endure as long as our Nation endures and will be remembered as the greatest domestic legislative achievement of the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, was termed state socialism not only by ultra-conservative elements in the Nation at that time, but the Republican national platform of 1936 denounced the program and pledged that if its candidate for President were elected he would urge repeal of the Social Security Act. The claim those opponents made at that time was that this was cruelly regimenting the American people. Despite the fact that the Republican Party in 1936 offered the Nation a fine candidate for president of the United States in the person of Gov. Alf Landon of Kansas, he carried but two States of our 48.

Mr. President, if any political party in 1968 had pledged repeal of the Social security law or were to do that in 1972, that party would not obtain a majority in even one of our 50 States. Time and events have proved that since the enactment of the social security law, under which checks totaling more than $23 billion in social security benefits were paid last year to almost 25 million beneficiaries, there has been and is no possibility of a cruel depression such as was experienced commencing in 1930.

Where would the American people have been without that law? Think of the distressful situation of our country during those three recession periods of the Eisenhower administration. Where would they have been except for social security and the payments that came in every month to the beneficiaries of the social security system? Those recessions would have become great, deep, and sorrowful depressions. No one today seriously questions the need for our social security system or its importance in promoting economic and social stability.

Americans now know that private charities, breadlines, and soup kitchens must never again be the answer of American intelligence and sense of justice to the problems of unemployment and indigent old age.

On the third day of every month in my State of Ohio 1,200,000 men, women and children receive brown envelopes in the mail from the U.S. Treasury with social security checks totaling more than $100 million. That amount will be higher 6 months from now. More fatherless children, more elderly men and women and more widows will be receiving larger sums. The impact of the spending of such a tremendous sum is helping to make my State one of the most prosperous in the Nation.

The present social security system has a surplus of $25,714 million in its general fund and an added surplus of $3,025 million in its disability fund. Instead of increasing social security benefit payments including disability payments by a mere 7 percent, I urge that this Congress increase these payments by 15 percent. This could readily be done, and social security would remain as it is now, an actuarially sound insurance system.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives back in 1949, I helped draft the present expanded and liberalized social security law. Since then, Congress has made changes in the act in keeping with fast-changing times. We have a duty to further expand and liberalize this program to assure that Americans will enjoy a measure of security and dignity in their old age.

I would never deviate from my determination that social security must remain actuarially sound. The chief actuary of this system, Robert J. Myers, who was appointed to that position by President Eisenhower, has stated that social security is an actuarially sound insurance system, and I am certain that he will testify before the Committee on Finance that if a 15-percent increase in social security benefit payments is made all along the line, this would remain an actuarially sound insurance system.

Here is an opportunity, Mr. President, to render real and needful public service to the American people by increasing in a proper manner and to a proper extent these benefits, instead of providing an increase of less than half the amount that should be made.

In addition, Mr. President, we have a duty to increase the ceiling on earnings that recipients may earn and still keep their benefits intact. The present ceiling of only $1,680 annually is inadequate. It imposes a cruel financial burden on people still able to work after 65 and denies them a right which they have earned by their own contributions into the social security fund. It is reasonable to look forward to dramatic new breakthroughs in the search for cures for cancer and heart disease that will push higher and higher the life expectancy of Americans. Men and women of 65, and 70, and 75, will—and many now do—have the ability to participate in gainful employment after retirement.

I propose that the earnings limitation be increased to $3,000 per year at this time and that a new formula should be written and applied to earnings in excess of $3,000 per annum. This would encourage beneficiaries to continue to work and by their work add to the general prosperity of our Nation.

It is unfair to bar these men and women from receiving social security retirement payments for which they have paid premiums during their more active years. This can be remedied at no cost whatsoever to taxpayers by increasing the earnings limitation.

Let us enact into law this year a meaningful increase in social security benefits of at least 15 percent instead of a mere 7 percent which would barely cover the increased cost of living since 1967, the last year social security benefits were raised. At the same time let us further liberalize and expand the social security system, the most humane and advanced social legislation in our Nation's history.

S. 1805—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH A CONNECTICUT RIVER NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Connecticut River national recreation area. This bill is another step in the long journey to preserve in this Nation a decent, livable environment for the future.

The subject of this legislation is the Connecticut River which flows for more than 400 miles southward through the heartland of New England from its mountain source to Long Island Sound. It is a river of changing characters—a swift flowing mountain stream to the north; in the south, a broad, majestic estuary. Throughout, it is a river of varied beauty, historic interest and untapped recreation potential.

Situated in the center of historic New England, and in part surrounded by the great urban sprawl of industrial America, the Connecticut River provides an unmatched array of the natural resources which are fast disappearing in our modern society. The preservation and enhancement of these resources is of both regional and national concern.

We in New England are the fortunate inheritors of a river which remains largely unspoiled. Despite pollution and commercial development, most of the river valley still retains its unique charm. Even close to the river's mouth its banks remain nearly wild in places. In the midst of the populous northeast the Connecticut River stands as a proud showcase for nature's handiwork.

The northeastern United States crowds a quarter of our Nation's population into a tenth of the land area. This ratio—which is likely to remain constant—means that within a few decades we must be prepared to live with twice as many people on the same land area. In Connecticut alone there will be close to 6 million people by the year 2000. The small towns and green, open spaces which have nourished past generations of Americans in Connecticut and New England threaten to become only a memory. It must be of the greatest concern to all of us that we preserve the opportunity for millions of Americans to enjoy these surroundings.

The beauty and potential of the Connecticut River have long been a beacon to dedicated conservationists and a haven for those who live and work in the valley. But these values are now severely threatened. Today, the price of our carelessness is cheap. In a few years it will be prohibitive. If we are to save this river—if we are to take this most important step to insure the continued vitality of the New England environment—then we must act now, before it is too late.

We have a chance here to guide the future. And we can no longer afford to turn our backs on tomorrow. By accepting this opportunity we test ourselves and our success or failure will be measured for generations to come.

This bill will establish a 56,700-acre national recreation area divided into three units along the Connecticut River. Actual Federal land acquisition would be limited to 19,000 acres or less. Each unit will preserve and promote the unique natural resources of its location. The authorization of this national recreation area will be a landmark piece of conservation legislation for New England and the entire Nation.

In 1966, the entire senatorial delegation from Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut introduced legislation authorizing a full study of the Connecticut River Valley. Under that legislation, enacted in 1966, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior, carried out a detailed, 2-year study. The Department's report, "New England Heritage," was made public in September 1968. The report gave us, for the first time, a regional format in which we can work to restore the Connecticut River Valley to its original beauty.

The bill which I introduce today incorporates many of the major recommendations of "New England Heritage." It calls for a united and sustained effort by all levels of government and the private sector to preserve the great natural heritage which is ours in the valley.

The bill creates no Federal juggernaut to steamroller over the area. Quite the contrary, it places a high premium on the importance of preserving the beauty and tranquillity which are the valley's most precious qualities. A Connecticut River national recreation area will be designed to protect the scenic green forests and peaceful towns that are the heritage of New England—to do otherwise would contradict the purpose of the legislation.

The legislation recognizes that development of the valley will take place in the future. The purpose of the bill is to insure that future development is encouraged to take place in a manner which does not detract from the beauty of the river valley.

Throughout the study and the drafting of this legislation, the people of New England have been asked to participate in planning for the future. They have responded, and their efforts are the foundation for this legislation. Too often, in similar circumstances, the individual citizen and township have been left out of the planning process. This will not happen in the Connecticut Valley. When public hearings are held on this bill before the appropriate Senate committee, I will specifically request of the chairman that at least some of these hearings take place in New England so that the citizens can be heard.

In this legislation, I have insisted on the greatest concern for the private individual who lives and works in the valley. Similarly, this bill tries to take into account the legitimate interests of towns and municipalities in the affected area. This concern is reflected in several ways.

First, direct Federal acquisition of land is held to an absolute minimum. In every case, the land which must be acquired for the purpose of this plan has been carefully selected to avoid unnecessary disruption of the legitimate interests of property owners. The land to be taken is mainly undeveloped, and, on the whole, the Federal condemnation power has been severely circumscribed, to be used only as the last resort.

Second, the certain areas where a "conservation zone" will be established and the Secretary of the Interior will be authorized to set standards for local zoning laws the Secretary must act in concert with local efforts and with full respect for the well being of the local citizens and towns.

Third, a Recreation Area Committee made up of local and State representatives will be established for each unit. These committees will provide a direct channel of communication to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to matters concerning the establishment and development of that unit. Additionally, each committee will have the power to prohibit arbitrary changes of boundaries and zoning standards.

The Connecticut River national recreation area will be a unique venture in conserving our natural heritage. The recreation area will encompass parts of a river valley in the midst of a heavily populated and highly developed part of the country. We can no longer limit our conservation efforts to the wide open spaces in the Far West. There is a dire need for open space and protection of scenic and recreation values in the eastern United States. However, we must also recognize that mere condemnation of large parcels of valuable real estate will not suffice in New England. A new approach is needed.

This bill calls for cooperation—cooperation between the people, and all levels of government—in a joint venture to preserve the Connecticut River.

There will be established a three-unit national recreation area to be administered by the National Park Service. The three units, encompassing parts of four States would serve as the keystones for a concerted conservation and recreation program in the Connecticut River Valley.

The bill also defines a Connecticut River Valley corridor which includes the whole river and the first tier of towns on either shore. Far less than 1 percent of the corridor would come under direct Federal control. However, each Federal area would be a nucleus of cooperative efforts to protect the valley. The bill would also call for Federal financial and technical assistance for local and State efforts in the corridor. In essence, this bill establishes a common framework toward a common goal.

GATEWAY UNIT

The gateway unit in Connecticut would include 23,500 acres along the southernmost portion of the Connecticut River. Here, on its final trek toward the sea, the river flows peacefully through one of the most scenic areas in America. In conjunction with the Cockaponsett State Forest, the gateway unit would serve to protect a broad expanse of scenic beauty and recreation potential in the lower Connecticut Valley. Small sections of the proposed unit are already in public hands, and the acquisiton of surrounding lands would serve to increase the area available for the enjoyment of the tranquil surroundings.

In the gateway unit, the Federal Government would acquire direct title to not more than 5,000 acres of land. Most of this area is presently undeveloped and it includes 870 acres of valuable tidal marshland which provide sustenance and sanctuary for many of our aquatic and marine species.

The remaining 17,500 acres would remain in private hands under locally enacted zoning ordinances approved by the Secretary of the Interior. This "conservation zone" would shield the area from land uses and abuses which would detract from the beauty of the lower valley. However, it is not contemplated that such a "conservation zone" would inhibit the constructive growth of commerce and industry or interfere with the well-being of the citizens in the area.

As in the other proposed units, the gateway unit would not be developed or administered in such a way as to disrupt the presently existing environment. The emphasis will be on preserving and protecting the natural conditions which now prevail. By its very nature the area of the lower valley will not sustain a high degree of intensive recreational use. The purposes of this legislation, therefore, give primary emphasis to maintaining the natural, scenic qualities in their peaceful surroundings.

MOUNT HOLYOKE UNIT

In Massachusetts, the Federal Government would be authorized to create a national park area of 12,000 acres on the east side of the Connecticut River north of Springfield. At this point, the Connecticut has slashed through a ridge of mountains creating a scenic water gap between the Mount Holyoke Range to the northeast, and the Mount Tom Range to the southwest. The Mount Holyoke unit would embrace the bulk of the Mount Holyoke Range, and suggested complementary State action to expand existing public lands around Mount Tom could provide an unprecedented array of outdoor activities on both land and water in direct proximity to one of the heavily populated areas in the valley.

The boundaries of the proposed Mount Holyoke unit have been carefully drawn to exclude the Hampshire College campus and the majority of private residences on the periphery of the area. Except where land is presently required for public purposes, residents within the boundaries could elect to maintain a life tenancy.

Over half a million people live in the Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke area. New interstate highways bring the residents of Boston and New York City hours closer. The Mount Holyoke unit could serve as the essential catlyst for concerted efforts to protect that scenic expanse of the river from exploitation.

COOS SCENIC RIVER UNIT

Near its northern source the Connecticut River could provide superb recreational opportunities in the middle of a near wilderness scene. Some of the best trout fishing in the country is available and the camper and hiker can enjoy his sport in scenic surroundings. The Coos Scenic River unit of the Connecticut River Valley area would include an 82-mile section of the upper Connecticut River. Federal acquisition of land would be limited to 1,000 acres equally divided between New Hampshire and Vermont. The acquisition would take place along the stretch of the river from Lake Francis to Moore Reservoir, and would guarantee public access to the river and the establishment of some primitive camping sites. The bill would also authorize the acquisition of scenic and access easements from private property owners of some 20,200 acres of land immediately adjacent to the river. Approximately 12,000 of these acres would be in New Hampshire—the remainder on the Vermont shore. These easements will provide protection of the scenic beauty of the unit while maintaining the value of the privately owned land. The ridges and escarpments could also be protected by less restrictive easements without significant loss to the landowner. By these devices, the local tax rolls can be maintained while preserving for future enjoyment this most beautiful stretch of the river.

CONNECTICUT VALLEY SCENIC TRAIL

In addition to the three national parks to be established along the Connecticut River, this legislation authorizes the development of a Connecticut Valley scenic trail as a unit of the national trail system. This trail would be primarily a footpath of some 300 miles beginning near Hanover, N.H. and following the river north and east to Third Connecticut Lake, then bending southward to rejoin the Appalachian Trail at the Presidential Mountain Range. Much of the trail would be located in the Coos Scenic River unit. Where existing facilities are not already available, overnight shelters could be provided at reasonable intervals. A minimal amount of Federal acquisition would be required for the trail, and it is hoped that the States would assist in its development.

CONNECTICUT VALLEY TOURWAY

The bill also authorizes the designation of a Connecticut Valley tourway running the length of the valley. This tourway would facilitate access to the scenic and historic heritage of the valley. To every extent practicable the tourway would use existing roads and would emphasize the features of the valley without altering them. Alternate routes could be designated to allow access to special points of interest. Maps and a minimum of signs would be used to inform the public of the attractions on route. Great care would be taken to maintain the scenic and rural quality of the roadway.

The qualities we seek to preserve in the valley would be destroyed by additional construction of superhighways. Nevertheless, much of the existing road system must be maintained by local and State governments. The expense of maintenance if traffic should increase may prove onerous. Therefore, this bill calls upon the Secretary of Transportation to consult with local and State representatives in an effort to relieve these burdens before designating a tourway.

CONNECTICUT RIVER VALLEY CORRIDOR

"New England Heritage" contained a number of farsighted recommendations for enhancing the total environment of the Connecticut River Valley. However, the Federal Government cannot and should not carry the full burden or usurp control from State and local jurisdictions. In many cases, enlightened local and State officials have led the way toward preserving the Connecticut. I am confident these efforts will continue, and many of the further steps required to protect the environment in the area may be left to local and State determination and action.

To facilitate coordinated planning among the various levels of government, this bill creates the concept of a Connecticut River Valley corridor. The Secretary of the Interior is instructed to give particular emphasis to encouraging and coordinating the conservation and development of outdoor recreation resources inside the corridor but outside the three designated national recreation areas. In addition, the Secretary shall provide assistance in developing means to promote the use of privately owned lands in ways consistent with the purposes of the entire scheme.

All agencies of the U.S. Government are required to consult with the Department of the Interior when their actions or projects may have an adverse effect on the recreation resources of the corridor. The Secretary shall have ample time to study the plans and make his recommendations.

This bill will also instruct the Secretary of Agriculture to study and submit a report on, within 1 year, the means available for maintaining the rural, open space character of the Connecticut River Valley.

To facilitate the planning activities by State governments which will lead to a set of coordinated conservation efforts along the Connecticut River, there is authorized in this bill the amount of $100,000 to be divided among the four affected States. This money, in conjunction with the technical assistance which the Secretary is authorized to render upon request, will provide a meaningful beginning to the necessary comprehensive efforts required in the years ahead.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Mr. President, while drafting this legislation, I have been greatly encouraged by the dedicated efforts of citizens who live in the Connecticut Valley to make constructive and useful suggestions regarding the implementation of the recommendations of "New England Heritage." The people of the valley know, perhaps more than anyone, the beauties and potential of the river. Certainly more than anyone they have contributed to preserving these assets. Recognition of the success of these efforts is inherent in the report. For had not the private citizens and towns along the river initiated efforts to save it, there would have been no need for a study or a national recreation area. The river would have been lost years ago. That the river is worth saving today is tribute to the concern of generations of New Englanders.

The development and administration of a national recreation area can only benefit from contributions to be made by local and State representatives who are intimately familiar with the area. Therefore, this bill would establish an advisory committee for each of the three units along the river. The committee would be largely made up of local representatives to be appointed from recommendations of the towns adjacent to the unit. Other members would come from regional planning bodies and the State governments.

Each committee would have direct access to the Secretary of the Interior regarding all matters pertaining to the development and administration of the recreation area unit. Consultation would be on a regular basis, and all reasonable expenses borne by the Federal Government.

The committee for each area would be authorized to approve or disapprove any changes in boundaries of the particular units as well as any proposed alterations in zoning standards governing the conservation zone.

Mr. President, this bill lays the foundation for a concerted attack on the dangers which threaten the continued vitality of the Connecticut River Valley. Despite the encroachment of modern civilization with its smokestacks, superhighways, and bright lights, the Connecticut remains what Timothy Dwight once called "The Beautiful River." Its peaceful and tranquil setting beckon immediate action by all of us concerned with preserving a quality environment for the future. We must act now if we are to restore and protect the Connecticut River Valley.

But time is short. With this legislation, we have the opportunity—perhaps our last great opportunity—to make certain that this priceless resource is preserved.

For years we have recognized the great good fortune that has protected the Connecticut from ruin. But our luck cannot hold forever, and the future must not be left to chance.

This bill provides a blueprint for action which will insure that today's beauty will also be tomorrow's.

Mr. President, I am pleased to have join me in cosponsoring this legislation Senators BROOKE, DODD, KENNEDY and MCINTYRE.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (1805) to preserve and promote the resources of the Connecticut River Valley, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1805

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the Connecticut River and the first tier of towns bordering the river in the States of Connecticut, Vermont, and New Hampshire and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Connecticut River Valley Corridor", numbered ———, and dated ———, which is on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, possess unusual scenic, ecological, scientific, historic, recreational and other values contributing to public enjoyment, inspiration, and scientific study. The Congress further finds that it is in the best interests of the citizens of the United States for the United States to take action to preserve and promote such values for the enjoyment of present and future generations, to preserve the natural ecological environment and develop the recreational potential of the area, and to encourage maximum complementary action by State and local governments and private individuals, groups, and associations.

CONNECTICUT RIVER NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

SEC. 2. In order to provide for the public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of portions of the Connecticut River Valley Corridor, and for the conservation of the scenic, scientific, historic, ecological and other values contributing to public enjoyment, consistent with the well being of present and future residents of the area, there is hereby established the Connecticut River National Recreation Area (hereinafter referred to as the "recreation area"). The recreation area shall be composed of (1) a Gateway Unit comprising not more than 23,500 acres in the State of Connecticut, (2) a Mount Holyoke Unit comprising not more than 12,000 acres in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and (3) a Coos Scenic River Unit comprising not more than 21,200 acres in the States of Vermont and New Hampshire. The boundaries of each unit shall be as generally delineated on the map referred to in section 1 of this Act. The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") may revise the boundaries of any unit from time to time with a view to carrying out the purposes of this Act, with the approval of a majority of the Advisory Committee for such unit as referred to in section 8 of this Act, but the total acreage within the revised boundaries of any unit shall not exceed the acreage limitation for the unit specified in this section.

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY FOR RECREATION AREA GATEWAY UNIT

SEC. 3. (a) Within the boundaries of the Gateway Unit, the Secretary may acquire without the consent of the owner not to exceed five thousand acres of privately owned lands, waters, and interests therein which he determines are presently needed to carry out the purposes of this Act: *Provided,* That the Secretary may acquire a fee title only in cases where, in his judgment, the acquisition of scenic easements or other less than fee interests would not be adequate to carry out the purposes of this Act. The remaining privately owned property within such unit may not be acquired by the Secretary without the consent of the owner or owners (hereinafter referred to as "owner") for one year following the date of enactment of this Act, and thereafter so long as an appropriate local zoning agency shall have in force and applicable to such a property a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance approved by the Secretary. In order to carry out the provisions of this section, and following public hearings, the Secretary shall issue regulations, which may be amended from time to time, with the approval of a majority of the Advisory Committee of the unit, specifying standards that are consistent with the purposes of this Act.

(b) The standards specified in such regulations shall have the object of (i) regulating new commercial or industrial uses of such property consistent with the purposes of this Act, and (ii) promoting the protection and development for purposes of this Act of such property by means of acreage, frontage, setback design and subdivision controls and by prohibiting the cutting of timber, burning of undergrowth, removing soil or other landfill and dumping or storing refuse in such a manner that would detract from the natural or traditional riverway scene: *Provided,* That such standards shall not discourage the constructive development and use of land for industrial and commercial purposes which are consistent with the purposes of this Act.

(c) Following issuance of such regulations the Secretary shall approve any zoning ordinance or any amendment to any approved zoning ordinance submitted to him that conforms to the standards contained in the regulations in effect at the time of the adoption of the ordinance or amendment. Such approval shall remain effective for so long as such ordinance or amendment remains in effect as approved.

(d) No zoning ordinance or amendment thereof shall be approved by the Secretary which (i) contains any provisions that he considers adverse to the protection and development of such property in accordance with the purposes of this Act, or (ii) fails to have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under, or any exception made to, the application of such ordinance or amendment.

(e) If any property, with respect to which the Secretary's authority to acquire by condemnation has been suspended according to the provisions of this section, is made the subject of a variance under, or becomes for any reason an exception to, such zoning ordinance, or is subject to any variance, exception, or use that fails to conform to any applicable standard contained in regulations of the Secretary issued pursuant to this section and in effect at the time of passage of such ordinance, the Secretary may terminate the suspension of his authority to acquire such property by condemnation: *Provided,* That the owner of any such property shall have 90 days after written notification from the Secretary to discontinue the variance, exception, or use referred to in such notification.

(f) The Secretary shall furnish to any party in interest, upon request, a certificate indicating the property with respect to which the Secretary's authority to acquire by condemnation is suspended.

MOUNT HOLYOKE UNIT

SEC. 4. Within the boundaries of the Mount Holyoke Unit, the Secretary may acquire without the consent of the owner not to exceed twelve thousand acres of lands, waters, and interests therein: *Provided*, The Secretary may acquire a fee title only in cases where, in his judgment, the acquisition of scenic easements or other less than fee interests would not be adequate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

COOS SCENIC RIVER UNIT

SEC. 5. Within the boundaries of the Coos Scenic River Unit, the Secretary may acquire a fee title without the consent of the owner not to exceed one thousand acres of lands, waters, and interests therein. Other interests in the remaining privately owned property within such unit may not be acquired without the consent of the owner so long as the property is devoted to uses compatible with the purposes of this Act.

ADDITIONAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized to acquire the lands, waters, and interests therein (including scenic easements) within each unit of the recreation area by donation, negotiated purchase with donated or appropriated funds, transfer, exchange or condemnation except that such authority to acquire by condemnation shall be exercised only in the manner and to the extent specifically provided in sections 3, 4 and 5 of this Act. When a tract of land lies partly within and partly without the boundaries of a unit, the Secretary may acquire the entire tract in order to avoid the payment of severance costs. Any lands so acquired outside the boundaries of a unit may be exchanged by the Secretary for any non-federal land within such boundaries, and any portion of said land not utilized for exchange may be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended (40 U.S.C. § 471 et seq.). In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-federal land located within the boundaries of a unit and convey to the grantor any federally owned land under his jurisdiction which is within the same State or States as the unit and which he classified as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The values of the properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal or, if they are not approximately equal, shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances require.

(b) With the exception of any lands which the Secretary determines are presently needed for public use facilities to carry out the purposes of this Act, any owner of improved property within any unit of the recreation area on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may elect, as a condition to such acquisition, to retain a right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial residential and agricultural purpose for a period ending at the death of the owner or his spouse, whichever occurs later, or for a fixed term not to exceed twenty-five years. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of such date of any right retained by the owner. Any retained right of use and occupancy may be transferred or assigned. Whenever the Secretary finds that the property or any portion thereof has ceased to be used for non-commercial residential purposes, he may terminate the right of use and occupancy upon tendering to the holder thereof an amount equal to the fair market value of the portion of said right which remains unexpired on the date of termination.

(c) As used in this section, the term "improved property" shall mean a one-family dwelling the construction of which was begun before January 1, 1969, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling and land for noncommercial residential or agricultural purposes, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the land so designated: *Provided*, That the Secretary may exclude from the land so designated any water bodies together with so much of the adjacent land as he deems necessary for public access thereto.

(d) Any property or interests therein within a unit of the national recreation area which are owned by a State or by any political subdivision thereof or permanently preserved for conservation purposes under the ownership of a nonprofit, nonstock organization may be acquired only by donation. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any federal property located within a unit of the recreation area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary, without transfer of funds, for administration by him as part of the recreation area.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary shall administer and protect the recreation area with the primary aim of conserving the natural resources located within it and preserving the recreation area in as nearly its natural state and condition as possible. No development or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken in the recreation area which would be incompatible with accepted ecological principles, the preservation of the physiographic conditions now prevailing or with the preservation of such historic sites and structures as the Secretary may designate.

(b) The recreation area shall be administered, protected, and developed by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended, and supplemented (16 U.S.C. § 1 et seq.) except that the Secretary may utilize any other statutory authority available to him for the conservation and management of natural resources to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

(c) The Secretary shall permit hunting, fishing, and trapping on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the recreation area in accordance with the applicable laws of the States concerned and of the United States, except that the Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting, no fishing or trapping shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, fish or wildlife management, administration, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any regulations of the Secretary prescribing any such restrictions shall be issued only after consultation with the appropriate agency of the State concerned.

(d) The Federal Power Commission shall not authorize the construction, operation, or maintenance within the national recreation area of any dam, water conduit, reservoir, powerhouse, transmission line, or other project works under the Federal Power Act (41 Stat. 1063), as amended (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.): *Provided*, That the provisions of that Act shall continue to apply to any project, as defined in that Act, already licensed.

(e) Designated National Park Service employees of the recreation area may make arrests for violations of any Federal laws or regulations applicable to the area, and they may bring the accused person before the nearest magistrate judge, or court of the United States having jurisdiction in the premises.

ADVISORY COMMISSIONS

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby established an advisory commission for each unit of the recreation area.

(b) Each commission shall be composed of members appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary as follows:

(1) a member appointed to represent each State in which the unit is located and such appointments shall be made from recommendations of the Governors of such States;

(2) a member appointed to represent the appropriate regional planning commissions or agencies of each State in which the unit is located and such appointment shall be made from recommendations of the heads of such commissions;

(3) a member appointed to represent each town referred to in section 1 of this Act that is directly affected by the establishment of the unit and such appointments shall be made from recommendations of the governing body of such towns; and

(4) a member to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Chairman of each commission shall be elected by the membership thereafter for a term not to exceed two years. Any vacancy in each commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) All members of the commissions shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the commissions in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act on the presentation of vouchers signed by the Chairmen.

(e) The Secretary or his designate shall consult regularly with the appropriate commission with respect to matters relating to the development of each unit of the recreation area, and with respect to carrying out the provisions of this Act, including the acquisition of lands for the recreation area, the issuance of regulations specifying standards for zoning ordinances, and the administration of the recreation area.

(f) Each Commission shall make available to the Secretary an annual report reviewing matters relating to the development of each unit of the recreation area, including land acquisition and the zoning standards policies, and shall make recommendations thereto.

CONNECTICUT RIVER VALLEY CORRIDOR

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary, in accordance with authority contained in the Act of May 28, 1963 (77 Stat. 49) and in consultation with the New England River Basin Commission and the advisory commissions established by section 8, of this Act, shall encourage coordinated planning for the conservation and development of the outdoor recreation resources of the Connecticut River Valley Corridor, as depicted on the map referred to in section 1 of this Act. The Secretary shall give particular attention to encouraging and coordinating the conservation and development of the outdoor recreation resources of the corridor that are outside the boundaries of the recreation area, and he is authorized to provide technical assistance to State and local governments and private individuals, groups, and associations with respect to the conservation and development of such resources. The Secretary is authorized to establish a regional office of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation within the boundaries of the Connecticut River Valley in order to facilitate the planning and coordination under this section.

(b) The Secretary shall encourage State, regional, county, and municipal bodies to adopt and enforce adequate master plans and zoning ordinances which will promote the use and development of privately owned lands within the corridor in a manner consistent with the purposes of this section, and is authorized to provide technical assistance to such bodies in the development of such plans and ordinances.

(c) The Secretary shall cooperate with the appropriate State and local agencies to provide safeguards against pollution of the Connecticut River and unnecessary impairment to the scenery thereof.

(d) In order to avoid, insofar as possible, decisions or actions by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States which could have a direct and adverse effect on the outdoor recreation resources of the corridor, all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States shall consult with the Secretary concerning any plans, programs, projects, and grants under their jurisdiction within the corridor. Any Federal department, agency, or instrumentality before which there is pending an application for a license for any activity which could have such effect on the outdoor recreation resources of the corridor shall notify the Secretary, and, before taking final action on such application, shall allow the Secretary ninety days to present his views on the matter.

(e) The Secretary of Agriculture shall study means of preserving the agricultural forest and rural open space character of the corridor, and shall submit a report of his findings and recommendations to the President and Congress within one year after the date of this Act.

(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000 to be equally divided among the State governments in Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Connecticut.

NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL

Sec. 10. (a) In order to promote public access to, travel within, and enjoyment and appreciation of the Connecticut River Valley Corridor, there is hereby established the Connecticut Valley National Scenic Trail as a unit of the National system of trails established by the National Trails System Act (82 Stat. 919). Insofar as practicable, the right-of-way for such trail shall comprise the trail depicted on the map referred to in section 1 of this Act. The Connecticut Valley National Scenic Trail shall be administered primarily as a footpath.

(b) The selection of the trail right-of-way, the acquisition of property therein, and the development, operation, maintenance, and administration of the trail shall be in accordance with the provisions of this section and the provisions of section 7 of the National Trail System Act applicable to national scenic trails.

CONNECTICUT VALLEY TOURWAY

Sec. 11. (a) In order further to promote travel within an enjoyment and appreciation of the Connecticut River Valley Corridor, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the other Federal and State agencies involved, may designate a Connecticut Valley Tourway. The tourway shall comprise, to the extent practicable, existing roads within the corridor. Such designation of existing roads which are part of the Federal-Aid Highway System shall in no way modify the rules and procedures applicable to the maintenance, improvement or beautification of such roads under the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, as amended. The Secretary of Transportation, under appropriate agreements with the Federal or State agencies administering the lands involved, may provide for the erection and maintenance of interpretative devices and makers along the tourway for the benefit of the public, and he shall encourage the State agencies to utilize to the fullest extent funds available to them under the Federal-Aid Highway Act to preserve the scenic character of the tourway and control adverse or nonconforming uses on the roads so designated.

(b) Before the Secretary of Transportation shall designate a Connecticut Valley Tourway, the Secretary shall name a standing committee representing State and local interests to review means to safeguard the scenic rural character of the area and to relieve unnecessary burdens on local municipalities accruing from increased traffic.

SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL

Sec. 12. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army shall cooperate in the study and formulation of plans for shoreline erosion control of the Connecticut River; and any protective works for such control undertaken by the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, shall be carried out in accordance with a plan that is acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior and is consistent with the purposes of this Act.

APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 13. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, but not more than $46,000,000 shall be appropriated for the acquisition of lands, waters, or interests therein.

Mr. DODD. It is a pleasure to serve with my distinguished colleague from Connecticut as a principal sponsor of a bill for the creation of the Connecticut River national recreation area.

The proposed Connecticut River national recreation area has been under careful study by the Department of the Interior since October of 1966. It has been found to be both highly feasible and eminently desirable.

In this era of growing population, of ever increasing pressure and complexity in urban life and of continuing pollution and despoilation of our recreational resources, it is imperative that measures be taken to preserve areas of natural beauty and to permit their use and enjoyment by present and future generations.

By the year 2000, a single metropolis will cover the entire east coast of the United States from north of Boston to south of Washington, D.C. By that date, the population of this area is expected to grow to 72 million. Much of the rural area that still remains on the northeast and mid-Atlantic coasts will be required for residential areas to house these people, industrial parks to employ them, jetports, highways and railroad lines to transport them, and shopping centers to distribute the goods they will require.

Larger numbers of people, however, will also require larger amounts of land for recreation and relaxation. Provisions such as the one now proposed must be made to insure that these fundamental needs will be met.

The Connecticut River Valley offers tremendous potential for projects of this nature. It is both centrally located and easily accessible. At present, the area is served by seven interstate or limited access highways. In 1960, over 50 percent of the total population of New England lived within 50 miles of the river. Further, despite encroachment and increasing pollution, there remain large areas of natural wood and marshland along its banks which are highly suitable for development as outdoor recreational areas.

This bill provides for the acquisition by the Federal Government of three such areas: one in Connecticut, one in Massachusetts, and one on the northern borders of Vermont and New Hampshire. These areas have been carefully selected to provide a maximum of scenic beauty and recreational potential and to cause minimum disruption of existing residential, commercial, agricultural and transportation facilities.

In addition, the bill looks toward healthy cooperation between State, local and private organizations to protect other undeveloped areas. For example, local communities are encouraged to pass zoning restrictions to conform with State and Federal guidelines and to coordinate the development of master plans for the future use and conservation of the land within their boundaries.

Finally, the Secretary of Agriculture is called upon to study means of preserving additional agricultural and rural open space within the Connecticut River Valley area.

I fully support the bill. Its proposals are original and well-planned, and they take us a step in the right direction toward meeting one of our greatest needs

I am proud to join my colleagues from New England in urging its enactment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor legislation to create a Connecticut River national recreation area. The bill which is being introduced today provides for development of three conservation and recreation areas along the banks of the Connecticut—at the gateway where it flows into Long Island Sound, in the Mount Holyoke Range area of Massachusetts, and along the upper river in Vermont and New Hampshire. Passage of the legislation will be a major step in restoring the beauty of the Connecticut River Valley and preserving our natural heritage.

Three years ago, I joined with Senator Ribicoff and my New England colleagues on legislation to study the possible development of the Connecticut River and its surrounding towns as a national recreation area. That study, carried out by the Department of the Interior, found conditions, both natural and man-made, which temporarily limit the area's recreation use:

Water quality covering the entire pollution class scale and only 7 percent of the river's length presently suitable for primary contact recreation use.

Severely depleted fish and wildlife populations, and much of the river incapable of supporting a productive sports fishery.

Boating limited by natural and artificial obstructions. Virtually no public swimming areas on the river.

A lack of public picnic facilities along the river, especially near urban concentrations.

Foot, bicycling, and horseback trail mileage inadequate for present needs, with the greatest deficiencies near urban areas.

Public camping opportunities limited to a few, small, scattered areas.

The bill which has been introduced by Senator Ribicoff today and which I have cosponsored would carry out recommendations of the report and make the Connecticut River national recreation area a reality.

The bill defines a "Connecticut River Valley Corridor," composed of the Connecticut River and the first tier of towns bordering the river in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire. The aim of the legislation is to develop the recreation potential of this corridor and to preserve and protect it from scenic pollution.

A small area within the corridor, less than 1 percent of the total area, will come under Federal jurisdiction and be developed as a nucleus for efforts to save the valley. This 56,700-acre national recreation area, to be administered by the National Park Service, will be composed of three units encompassing all four States.

The gateway unit would cover 23,500 acres at the mouth of the Connecticut River where it flows into Long Island Sound. The Coos Scenic River unit would include 21,200 acres in Vermont and New Hampshire, up near the Canadian border. The Mount Holyoke unit would be a 12,000 acre national park area east of the Connecticut between Springfield and Northampton.

The Mount Holyoke unit, in my own State of Massachusetts, would include the riverfront area and would run for about 7 miles back along the heavily forested Mount Holyoke Range, well beyond the notch. The area would be developed for camping, hiking, picnicking, fishing, boating, swimming, sightseeing, and other recreation activities.

Of the 12,000 acres, the Federal Government would be entitled to acquire full title to lands only where lesser interests would not be adequate to carry out the aims of the recreation area. For the most part, it would obtain scenic easements, whereby the owner of property would agree to restrict the use of his land to preserve scenic and environmental qualities. Even where property is acquired outright, the Government in most cases would give the few owners affected a life estate.

It is hoped that as a complementary action the State would develop and expand Mount Tom State reservation.

Indeed, a major thrust of the bill is to encourage cooperation and commitment at all levels—Federal, State, local, and private. The bill provides for technical assistance grants to help support such efforts.

Other provisions of the bill include:

A 300-mile Connecticut Valley Trail for hiking enthusiasts;

A winding tourway for motorists along the full length of the river;

Establishment of scenic easements wherever possible along the river—restricting use of land without taking it out of private hands.

Creation of advisory commissions, to be composed of State and local officials, and representatives of regional planning commissions or agencies.

It is my understanding that full Senate hearings and consultation with local leaders and interested citizens will be held on the bill.

In the distant past, the Connecticut River was a valuable asset to Massachusetts and New England. It afforded fish, power and recreation.

In the recent past, however, the fish and birds have been killed by noxious pollutants. People seeking to use the Connecticut for recreation have been driven off by smells and filth.

We can and must act now to lay the base for restoring the Connecticut River to its place as an asset to be proud of. And our concern must be not only for the river itself, but for its surrounding areas. The Connecticut River Valley already has 1.7 million people and will have over 3 million by the year 2000. Action is long overdue to assure that this and similar regions of natural beauty do not become ravaged further by the destruction of the trees and foliage, by the laying of concrete and asphalt, and by the continued spoilage of the waters of the river and its tributaries. Ways must be found to prevent further deterioration and to recapture some of the beauty which has already been lost. Our children and their children need to have places set aside for recreation and to be able to enjoy swimming, boating, fishing, and the many other forms of relaxation.

Progress now is being made to clean up the river. In the U.S. Senate, I have supported with my colleagues far-reaching water pollution controls which are starting to have an effect. And here in the State, people are working together with a renewed sense of concern.

Indeed, while much work remains, it has been predicted that within a few years many sections of the river may again be swimmable.

But even as water pollution decreases, a broader danger to our natural environment has become more serious—the unchecked industrial and commercial development which now threatens the banks and surrounding areas which add so much to the overall charm and appeal of the Connecticut.

Already, along many portions of the river, ugly factories are violating the scenic beauty of the area and dumping pollutants into the river. And ironically, as the river itself becomes fit for swimming, boating and fishing, the expected influx of people to the area threatens to bring hot dog stands, trailer parks, billboards, unsightly construction and other eyesores which will spoil the natural environment of the river valley.

The Connecticut River national recreation area will meet these problems and enhance the natural beauty of the area. I look forward to swift action, with full consultation with citizens back home.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to commend my colleague from Connecticut, Senator Ribicoff, for his strong commitment and efforts to develop the Connecticut River national recreation area. As the primary sponsor of the original legislation calling for a study, and now of legislation to enact its recommendations, he has worked hard and is achieving results. It is a pleasure to join once again and continue to work with him in this effort.

I strongly support developing the Connecticut River national recreation area.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 91—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING THE FEDERAL COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENT

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution on behalf of myself and Senators Cooper, Mansfield, Mathias, Metcalf, Williams of New Jersey, Packwood, Stevens, Schweiker, and Randolph. The joint resolution, if passed, would establish the Federal Committee on Nuclear Development whose purpose it would be to assess and evaluate the current atomic energy program of the United States.

I claim no pride of authorship in this matter, as it was introduced in substantially the same form in the last Congress by my predecessor, Hon. Thruston Morton. At that time, February 28, 1968, he pointed out in great detail the history of peaceful development of atomic energy subsequent to World War II and described the current feeling among many in the scientific community that a review of the direction of our atomic energy program was greatly needed. My remarks today will be confined to a summation of Senator Morton's very comprehensive treatment of the subject.

Congress instructed the Atomic Energy Commission when it was established by the Atomic Energy Act in 1954 to promote and encourage the development of atomic energy. At least $2½ billion have been spent in the interim period to make nuclear plants efficient and able to compete with other power sources such as coal and oil. We appropriated these large sums for developing a new power source knowing full well that it would not be needed until 50 to 100 years hence when our supply of fossil fuels might begin to run short.

Congress adopted this atomic energy program, which resulted in a new technical development becoming, for the first time in our history, a Government monopoly. There is no question that the ability to create electrical energy through atomic fission is an amazing accomplishment but we also understand now what we did not realize in 1945—that atomic energy is no panacea.

Some might consider this resolution in some way a repudiation of the outstanding work of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I assure Senators that I have nothing but the highest regard for the Members of the Congress who serve on this committee and I think they have ably carried out the original mandate of Congress which was to promote the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Unfortunately, the act made no provision for consideration of the need for nuclear energy, the fate of competing fuels, and the effect on the economy.

There are many indications now that we have moved too quickly, without the proper safeguards, into the atomic energy field. Early enthusiasts who appear to have become somewhat disillusioned about the program and are now calling for a reappraisal include David Lilienthal, who was the first Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. These experts tell us that the potential hazards of nuclear power are threefold:

First. The emanation of radioactive substances into the air and into the water of streams used for cooling the plants themselves.

Second. The expensive and difficult problem of safely handling waste material which remains after the useful life of the nuclear fuel has terminated.

Third. And the possibility, even though remote, that an accident would result in the sudden release of radioactive material into the atmosphere.

Undoubtedly, the possibilities of unprecedented damage to human and animal life were not realized by Congress when it decided to develop the civilian nuclear power complex, but this does not absolve us of the responsibility today, in the light of new evidence, to reevaluate the direction of this program both in terms of costs and safety to the public.

Mr. President, is is my strong belief that the Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have diligently carried out the original mandate of Congress which was to promote the use of civilian nuclear energy. It is the original mandate I question today, and certainly not the efforts of my colleagues on this committee. The resolution which I am introducing calls for a comprehensive review of the whole Government participation in the atomic energy program including the original mandate. It is for this reason that I have suggested we call upon cabinet officers, scientists, laymen, and Members of Congress who are not on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to conduct this study. Since the problem is urgent and time is of the essence, this committee on nuclear development is required to make a report of its findings to the Congress within 2 years of its authorization. We owe it to ourselves and our descendents to objectively evaluate the future direction of this phenomenon of atomic energy which could mean much to the development of the Nation or to the contrary, become the vehicle for rendering our environment unfit for habitation. I urge Senators to support this effort to find the proper balance between progress and safety.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be appropriately referred and that its text be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 91) establishing the Federal Committee on Nuclear Development, introduced by Mr. COOK (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 91

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. There is hereby established the Federal Committee on Nuclear Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee").

MEMBERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 2. (a) The Committee shall be composed of a Chairman, who shall be a member of the general public having no ties to or connections with either the atomic energy industry or any competitive industry, and twenty other members as follows:

(1) Four Members of the House of Representatives, two from each political party, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, none of whom shall be members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy;

(2) Four Members of the Senate, two from each political party, appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, none of whom shall be members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy;

(3) The Secretary of the Interior;

(4) The Secretary of Commerce;

(5) The Secretary of Labor;

(6) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

(7) Eight members of the general public who are specially qualified to consider and evaluate the technical, economic, and sociological impact of the atomic energy program.

(b) The Chairman, and the members specified in paragraph (7) of subsection (a), shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(c) Each member specified in paragraphs (3) through (6) of subsection (a) may designate another officer of his department to serve on the Committee in his stead.

(d) Any vacancy in the Committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(e) The Committee may issue such rules and regulations as it deems advisable to conduct its activities.

DUTIES OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 3. (a) The Committee shall study, review, and evaluate the present provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1964 and examine the atomic energy program of the United States generally, with the specific objectives of ascertaining whether the existing civilian nuclear program is responsive to the public need, assessing the validity of the assumptions upon which the existing program is built, and determining what changes, if any, should be made in that program. In this connection the Committee shall consider and assess (1) the impact of the atomic energy industry upon competitive industries; (2) methods for effectively integrating atomic energy into the general energy complex of the United States so that reasonable priorities may be determined; and (3) the potential impact of atomic development upon the health and safety of the American public.

(b) The study and review provided for in subsection (a) shall be completed within two years and the Committee shall, at that time, submit a report of its findings to the President and the Congress, and shall make such report available to the public. Ninety days after the submission of such report, the Committee shall cease to exist.

POWERS OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 4. (a) The Committee, or, on the authorization of the Committee, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Committee or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Committee, or such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192–194, inclusive) shall apply in the case of failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Committee is authorized to secure directly from any department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the executive branch of the Federal Government information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this joint resolution; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Committee, upon request made by the Chairman.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 5. The members of the Committee specified in paragraphs (1) through (6) of section 2(a) shall serve without additional compensation. The Chairman and the members appointed under paragraph (7) of section 2(a) shall receive $100 per diem when engaged in the performance of the duties of the Committee. All members of the Committee shall receive reimbursement for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Committee.

STAFF AND FACILITIES

SEC. 6. (a) The Committee shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out its duties without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(b) The Committee may also procure (without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates), temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the executive departments by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(c) To the extent of available appropriations, the Committee may obtain, by purchase, rental, donation, or otherwise, such property, facilities, and additional services as may be needed to carry out its duties.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S DOMESTIC PROGRAM

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I rise to support the legislative priorities in the domestic program enunciated yesterday by President Nixon. The 10 proposals which the President announced he will soon send to Congress reflect a responsible approach and indicate that the goal of this administration will be a constructive, well-studied response to the domestic problem of our country.

In his message the President indicated that the early days of his administration have been devoted to the pursuit of peace abroad and to the development of new structures and new programs for the pursuit of progress at home. As it should be, peace has been the first priority. At the same time, however, the development of the first Nixon legislative program demonstrates a keen awareness of the domestic problems at home.

Of the proposals announced yesterday, I am most pleased at the suggestion of the President for a system of tax sharing by the Federal Government with State and local governments. On March 24 I introduced, along with 20 additional cosponsors, the Tax Sharing Act of 1969, a measure which would require the regular distribution of a specified portion of the Federal individual income tax to the States primarily on the basis of population with virtually no conditions attached. In my introductory remarks I indicated that while I am not wed unyieldingly to the specific terms and provisions of the bill I introduced, I am firmly committed to the concept of tax sharing. For this reason I am hopeful that the President's action will provide the needed impetus for hearings and the enactment by Congress of a tax-sharing plan.

I will not reiterate at this time the fiscal arguments in support of this concept. We are all painfully aware of the fiscal plight that confronts our State and local governments. We are also painfully aware, on this day of April 15 in particular, of the efficiency of the Federal Government in collecting revenue. The enactment of tax sharing would allow the Federal Government to relieve the intense fiscal pressure on State and local governments and would, at the same time, serve the tradition of federalism by instilling in State and local governments a new vitality and independence.

Again, I commend the President on the program which he announced yesterday.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for approximately 12 minutes, disregarding the morning hour rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, and as a member of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, I am greatly interested in the growing preoccupation of some groups and individuals these days with the so-called military-industrial complex in the United States. Indeed, if I were a psychologist, I might be tempted to the conclusion that the left wing in American politics has developed a "complex over a complex."

Judging from the view expressed by many of our public officials and commentators the so-called military-industrial complex would seem to be responsible for almost all of the world's evils.

Certainly, a determined effort is underway to place at its doorstep almost full responsibility for the unfortunate war in Vietnam and the high cost of American defense.

We further find great attention being paid to the number of former military officers who have gone to work for defense-related industry. It has been shown with considerable flourish and headshaking that some 2,000 former members of the U.S. armed services in the grades of colonel and above, now are employed by companies that do business with the Defense Department. This revelation seemed to imply some kind of an unholy but nonspecific alliance on the part of industry and onetime military officers to cheat and defraud the American taxpayer.

In presenting information on former military men employed by defense industries to the Senate on March 24, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) was careful to say that he was not charging any general wrongdoing on anybody's part, and that he had found no evidence that any conspiracy exists. I know that these retired people appreciate that conclusion.

He seemed most concerned, though, about a condition he described as "the old school tie" and the fact that many former high-ranking officers working in defense industry still retain personal friendships with some men still in the services.

He accurately observed:

> There is a continuing community of interest between the military, on one hand, and these industries on the other.

Now, Mr. President, I do not see how anyone could deny either the fact that friendships continue or that a community of interest exists between the military and the people who supply them with the tools of their trade.

Consequently, I am quite mystified to understand why this situation strikes the Senator from Wisconsin as—and I use his exact words—"Most dangerous and shocking."

I am sure that the Senator would agree that former Members of Congress now working for industries that do business with the U.S. Government still retain friendships with present Members of the House and Senate.

I am also sure that he would agree former Government officials now employed by companies doing business with the Government retain "old school tie" relationships with friends they made while in the Government and with friends still working in the Government. This situation even exists, I believe, with some officials who once worked for Government regulatory agencies and now are employed by industries which are being regulated. But apparently the critics of the military-industrial complex do not find situations like this shocking and dangerous.

Mr. President, perhaps the "old school tie" is more binding if it happens to be the khaki-colored type worn by military men. Critics of the military seem to think so.

In that connection, I should like to point out that the figure of 2,000-plus retired military officers working for defense-related industries is impressive only when it is permitted to stand by itself and without the proper explanation. These 2,000 officers are employed by 100 of the largest corporations in the world. They are employed by industries which do many billions of dollars worth of business every year. These 2,000 former military men are only a very small fraction of the tens of thousands of employees who work for these 100 industries—less than 1 percent. What is more, they represent only a small portion of the military officers who have been retired.

I am informed by the Pentagon that the number of former military officers receiving retired pay as of June 1968, totaled 232,892. I also discovered that since the end of World War II, some 36,800 officers in the highest grades, colonels and above, have been retired. A total of 21,484 were retired between the years 1961 and 1968.

Mr. President, I believe these figures make it amply clear that high ranking military officers are not rushing into retirement at the beckoning of defense contractors.

Be that as it may, I believe it is long past time when these questions relating fundamentally to the defense of this Nation should be placed in their proper perspective. Let us take the military-industrial complex and examine it closely. What it amounts to is that we have a big Military Establishment, and we have a big industrial plant which helps to supply that establishment. This apparently constitutes a complex. If so, I certainly can find nothing to criticize but much to be thankful for in its existence.

Ask yourselves, for example, why we have a large, expensive Military Establishment and why we have a large and capable defense industry. The answer is simply this: We have huge worldwide responsibilities. We face tremendous worldwide challenges. In short, we urgently require both a big defense establishment and a big industrial capacity. Both are essential to our safety and to the preservation of freedom in a world fraught with totalitarian aggression.

Merely because our huge responsibilities necessitate the existence of a military-industrial complex does not automatically make that complex something we must fear or feel ashamed of.

You might consider where we would be in any negotiations which might be entered into with the Soviet Union if we did not have a big military backed by a big industrial complex to support our arguments.

You might wonder how we could possibly pretend to be interested in the freedom of smaller nations if the only military industrial complex in the world was possessed by Communist Russia or Communist China.

Mr. President, in many respects I am reminded of the problem which confronted our Nation in the early days of World War II.

The madman Hitler was running rampant. Freedom was being trampled throughout all of Europe. Suddenly the United States found itself forced to fill the role of the "arsenal of democracy." This Nation had to start from scratch and finally outproduce the combined efforts of the Axis Powers. And we had to do it quickly. The very existence of freedom in the world as we knew it in the early 1940's depended on it. And how did we perform this miracle? Well, I will tell you that we performed it with the help of an industrial giant called an integrated steel industry. Although this industry and others like it performed miracles of production at a time when the chips were down all over the world, it still was the subject of long and harassing investigation after the war because of its "bigness." Incredible as it seems, the very size of an industry which enabled us to defeat the Fascists armies and remain free became the reason for investigation by liberals in the Congress during the immediate postwar period.

We never, Mr. President, seem to understand that size is not necessarily an evil.

When the Russian sputnik went up, this Nation was deeply concerned. And that concern had to do with our inability at that time to duplicate the Soviet feat. Now that we have the industrial capacity to equal the Russians in space or in matters related to defense, there seems to be a nationwide effort to make us feel guilty.

What would the critics of the military-industrial complex have us do? Would they have us ignore the fact that progress occurs in the field of national defense as well as in the field of social sciences? Do they want us to turn back the clock, disband our Military Establishment, and do away with our defense-related industrial capacity?

Mr. President, do these critics of what they term a military-industrial complex really want us to default on our worldwide responsibilities, turn our back on aggression and slavery, and develop a national policy of selfish isolation?

Rather than deploring the existence of a military-industrial complex, I say we should thank heavens for it. That complex gives us our protective shield. It is the bubble under which our Nation thrives and prospers. It is the armor which is unfortunately required in a world divided.

For all those who complain about the military-industrial complex, I ask this question: "What would you replace it with? Would you have the Government do it" Well, our Government has tried it in the past, and failed—dismally so.

What is more, I believe it is fair to inquire whether the name presently applied is inclusive enough. Consider the large number of scientists who contributed all of the fundamental research necessary to develop and build nuclear weapons and other products of today's defense industries. Viewing this, should not we call it the "scientific-military-industrial complex"?

By the same token, do not forget the amount of research that has gone on in our colleges and universities in support of our defense-related projects. Maybe we should call it an "educational-scientific-military-industrial complex." Then, of course, the vast financing that goes into this effort certainly makes the economic community an integral part of any such complex. Now we have a name that runs like this: "An economic-educational-scientific-military-industrial complex."

What we are talking about, Mr. President, is an undertaking which grew up from necessity. It is the product of American initiative, incentive, and genius responding to a huge global challenge. It is, perhaps, the most effective and efficient complex ever built to fill a worldwide function. Its ultimate aim is peace in our time, regardless of the aggressive, militaristic image which the left wing is attempting to give it.

Mr. President, I do not find the employment of military officers by 100 of the largest companies in this Nation alarming or menacing. Many of those officers were technically trained to provide special services, many of which are required by the companies involved. And I hasten to point out that these same companies employ other free Americans, some of them former Senators, some of them former Congressmen, some of them former civilian employees of the Government.

It is my contention that a retired military officer is a private citizen. He has a right to seek employment wherever he can. It is only natural that he should look to sources of employment which involve matters he was trained to work in. The fact that he once was an Army officer and the company he works for does business with the Army does not automatically insure an undesirable relationship from the public viewpoint. I would like to say that anyone who has evidence of wrongdoing, of deliberate and unlawful favoritism in the dealings which involve defense industries and former military officers should come forth and make the circumstances clear. I say that anyone who has evidence that a conspiracy exists between the Pentagon on one hand and former military officers on the other should say so and produce evidence to back it up. I say that anyone who charges that a "military elite" is at work trying to turn the United States into an aggressive nation should stop dealing in generalities and come forward with names, specific dates, meeting place locations, and all the rest of the kind of data it takes to back up such a charge.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for perhaps 6 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Arizona is recognized for an additional 6 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. So far, Mr. President, I have yet to hear of any specific case of wrongdoing involving former military officers working for companies that do business with the Pentagon. In fact, I believe the record will show that the largest single cloud ever to hang over the so-called military-industrial complex stemmed from decisions made by civilian officers in the Department of Defense.

I am, of course, speaking about the incredible circumstances surrounding the awarding of the largest defense contract in the history of the world to a company whose bid had been rejected by nearly all the military specialists and nonmilitary specialists and evaluation boards in the Pentagon. The contract was the multi-billion dollar TFX contract which former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, former Navy Secretary Fred Korth, and former Under Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric jammed down the throats of the Navy and Air Force.

This was undoubtedly the costliest fumble in American history. It has never been properly dealt with and I suggest to those, especially those in this body, who are sincerely interested in the dangers of a military-industrial complex becoming too powerful in this Nation that a full investigation be launched into all aspects of the TFX–F111 fiasco. I would recommend that the activities of all present and former military and civilian officials involved in the awarding of the TFX contract be examined.

I find it highly interesting, by the way, that one of those most directly involved in this questionable decision—Mr. Gilpatrick—is now part of the panel of experts being consulted by a Member of the U.S. Senate in connection with his campaign to defeat the deployment of a missile defense in this country.

Mr. President, I hope I shall be fully understood in this respect. If there is wrongdoing, whether of a conflict-of-interest nature or something else in our Defense Establishment, I want it investigated and stopped and the guilty parties punished. And this goes for wrongdoing by anyone concerned, whether he be a military man, a former military man, a defense industry executive, or a civilian officer of the Government. I feel that this is our true concern. Maybe the hugeness of the system which we are now compelled to maintain does lend itself to improprieties.

If so, let us concern ourselves with such improprieties and find means to deal with them legislatively. This is the constructive way to proceed. It does no good for us to gaze with awe on the tremendous increase in defense expenditures with which the McNamara era saddled us and then pretend that denunciation of a military-industrial complex will somehow make it all right.

In the attacks on the military also you will find repeated reference to a speech once made by former President Eisenhower.

But I would remind you that when Dwight Eisenhower mentioned the possibility of unwarranted influence being acquired by such a complex, he had some other profound things to say. I want to quote one passage in particular.

He said:

> We face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration.
>
> To meet it successfully, there is call for, not so much the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle—with liberty the stake. Only thus shall we remain, despite every provocation, on our charted course toward permanent peace and human betterment . . . .
>
> A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

As I have pointed out, many of the problems that are being encountered in the area of national defense today stem not so much from a military-industrial complex as they do from the mistakes and miscalculations of a "civilian complex" or perhaps I should say a "civilian-computer-complex." My reference here, of course, is to the Pentagon hierarchy of young civilians—often referred to as the "whiz kids"—which was erected during the McNamara era in the questionable name of "cost effectiveness." And this complex, Mr. President, was built in some measure to shut out the military voice in a large area of defense policy decisionmaking.

I suggest that the military-industrial complex is not the all-powerful structure that our liberal friends would have us believe. Certainly nobody can deny that this combination took a drubbing at the hands of Mr. McNamara and his civilian cadres during the past 8 years.

If the military-industrial complex had been as strong and as cohesive as its critics would have us believe, it is entirely possible this Nation and its taxpayers would not today be facing the need for rebuilding the defenses of freedom. I have already mentioned one example. The TFX decision which has proven to be such a costly fiasco was made by the civilian complex against the advice of experienced military men.

If the military-industrial complex had been the irresistible giant its critics describe, we would certainly today be better equipped. We would undoubtedly have a nuclear-powered Navy adequate to the challenge presented by the Soviet naval might. We would certainly have in the air—and not just on a drawing board—a manned, carry-on bomber. We would never have encountered the kind of shortages which cropped up in every area of the military as a result of the demands from Vietnam. There would have been no shortage of military helicopters. There would have been no shortage of trained helicopter pilots. There would have been no need to use outdated and faulty equipment. No concern ever would have arisen over whether our supply of bombs was sufficient to the task in Southeast Asia.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to point out that a very strong case can be made for the need for a more powerful military-industrial complex than we have had during the past 8 years. At the very least, I wish to say that the employment practices of industries doing business with the Pentagon—practices which lead them to hire the most knowledgeable men to do their work—are no cause for shock. Nor are these practices dangerous to the American people.

I have great faith in the civilian leaders of our Government and of our military services. I have no desire to see the voice of the military become all-powerful or even dominant in our national affairs. But I do believe that the military viewpoint must always be heard in the highest councils of our Government in all matters directly affecting the protection and security of our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the complete text of President Eisenhower's farewell radio and television address to the American people.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Farewell Radio and Television Address to the American People, January 17, 1961

(Delivered from the President's Office at 8:30 p.m.)

My fellow Americans: Three days from now, after half a century in the service of our country, I shall lay down the responsibilities of office as, in traditional and solemn ceremony, the authority of the Presidency is vested in my successor.

This evening I come to you with a message of leave-taking and farewell, and to share a few final thoughts with you, my countrymen.

Like every other citizen, I wish the new President, and all who will labor with him, Godspeed. I pray that the coming years will be blessed with peace and prosperity for all.

Our people expect their President and the Congress to find essential agreement on issues of great moment, the wise resolution of which will better shape the future of the Nation.

My own relations with the Congress, which began on a remote and tenuous basis when, long ago, a member of the Senate appointed me to West Point, have since ranged to the intimate during the war and immediate post-war period, and finally, to the mutually interdependent during these past eight years.

In this final relationship, the Congress and the Administration have, on most vital issues, cooperated well, to serve the national good rather than mere partisanship, and so have assured that the business of the Nation should go forward. So, my official relationship with the Congress ends in a feeling, on my part, of gratitude that we have been able to do so much together.

II

We now stand ten years past the midpoint of a century that has witnessed four major wars among great nations. Three of these involved our own country. Despite these holocausts America is today the strongest, the most influential and most productive nation in the world. Understandably proud of this preeminence, we yet realize that America's leadership and prestige depend, not merely upon our unmatched material progress, riches and military strength, but on how we use our power in the interests of world peace and human betterment.

III

Throughout America's adventure in free government, our basic purposes have been to keep the peace; to foster progress in human achievement, and to enhance liberty, dignity and integrity among people and among nations. To strive for less would be unworthy of a free and religious people. Any failure traceable to arrogance, or our lack of comprehension or readiness to sacrifice would inflict upon us grievous hurt both at home and abroad.

Progress toward these noble goals is persistently threatened by the conflict now engulfing the world. It commands our whole attention, absorbs our very beings. We face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. To meet it successfully, there is called for, not so much the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle—with liberty the stake. Only thus shall we remain, despite every provocation, on our charted course toward permanent peace and human betterment.

Crises there will continue to be. In meeting them, whether foreign or domestic, great or small, there is a recurring temptation to feel that some spectacular and costly action could become the miraculous solution to all current difficulties. A huge increase in newer elements of our defense; development of unrealistic programs to cure every ill in agriculture; a dramatic expansion in basic and applied research—these and many other possibilities, each possibly promising in itself, may be suggested as the only way to the road we wish to travel.

But each proposal must be weighed in the light of a broader consideration: the need to maintain balance in and among national programs—balance between the private and the public economy, balance between cost and hoped for advantage—balance between the clearly necessary and the comfortably desirable; balance between our essential requirements as a nation and the duties imposed by the nation upon the individual; balance between actions of the moment and the national welfare of the future. Good judgment seeks balance and progress; lack of it eventually finds imbalance and frustration.

The record of many decades stands as proof that our people and their government have, in the main, understood these truths and have responded to them well, in the face of stress and threat. But threats, new in kind or degree, constantly arise. I mention two only.

IV

A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

Our military organization today bears little relation to that known by any of my predecessors in peacetime, or indeed by the fighting men of World War II or Korea.

Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But now we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in the defense establishment. We annually spend on military security more than the net income of all United States corporations.

This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every State house, every office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the miliary-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

Akin to, and largely responsible for the sweeping changes in our industrial-military posture, has been the technological revolution during recent decades.

In this revolution, research has become central; it also becomes more formalized, complex and costly. A steadily increasing share is conducted for, by, or at the direction of, the Federal government.

Today, the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers.

The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present—and is gravely to be regarded.

Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

It is the task of statesmanship to mold, to balance, and to integrate these and other forces, new and old, within the principles of our democratic system—ever aiming toward the supreme goals of our free society.

V

Another factor in maintaining balance involves the element of time. As we peer into society's future, we—you and I, and our government—must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering, for our own ease and convenience, the precious resources of tomorrow. We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow.

VI

Down the long lane of the history yet to be written America knows that this world of ours, ever growing smaller, must avoid becoming a community of dreadful fear and hate, and be, instead, a proud confederation of mutual trust and respect.

Such a confederation must be one of equals. The weakest must come to the conference table with the same confidence as do we, protected as we are by our moral, economic, and military strength. That table, though scarred by many past frustrations, cannot be abandoned for the certain agony of the battlefield.

Disarmament, with mutual honor and confidence, is a continuing imperative. Together we must learn how to compose differences, not with arms, but with intellect and decent purpose. Because this need is so sharp and apparent I confess that I lay down my official responsibilities in this field with a definite sense of disappointment. As one who has witnessed the horror and the lingering sadness of war—as one who knows that another war could utterly destroy this civilization which has been so slowly and painfully built over thousands of years—I wish I could say tonight that a lasting peace is in sight.

Happily, I can say that war has been avoided. Steady progress toward our ultimate goal has been made. But, so much remains to be done. As a private citizen, I shall never cease to do what little I can to help the world advance along that road.

VII

So—in this my last good night to you as your President—I thank you for the many opportunities you have given me for public service in war and peace. I trust that in that service you find some things worthy; as for the rest of it, I know you will find ways to improve performance in the future.

You and I—my fellow citizens—need to be strong in our faith that all nations, under God, will reach the goal of peace with justice. May we be ever unswerving in devotion to principle, confident but humble with power, diligent in pursuit of the Nation's great goals.

To all the peoples of the world, I once more give expression to America's prayerful and continuing aspiration:

We pray that peoples of all faiths, all races, all nations, may have their great human needs satisfied; that those now denied opportunity shall come to enjoy it to the full; that all who yearn for freedom may experience its spiritual blessings; that those who have freedom will understand, also, its heavy responsibilities; that all who are insensitive to the needs of others will learn charity; that the scourges of poverty, disease and ignorance will be made to disappear from the earth, and that, in the goodness of time, all peoples will come to live together in a peace guaranteed by the binding force of mutual respect and love.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, I commend the Senator from Arizona for his characteristically fair and thoughtful speech. I think what he has said this morning may put into better balance the presentation I made the other day. I believe it is proper to recognize the great contributions our military has made, and the many excellent officers who have subsequently worked for contractors.

My point is this: In the last 10 years, the number of Army and Air Force generals, Navy admirals, full colonels, and Navy captains working for the 100 biggest contractors has tripled. The number working for the 10 biggest contractors has also increased threefold.

The difficulty is that these officers go from positions in the Pentagon where they have great authority and close relationships with others who remain, in some cases having been responsible for the promotions of many of those who may deal with them. They go to work for contractors in a context in which the zeal of the contracting officer in the Pentagon is of the greatest importance—in fact, it is now of much greater importance than it should be.

This is true because most of our military procurement is noncompetitive. It is subject to Federal control either by the Budget Bureau or the Congress. The result is waste that we have documented over and over again.

I made an earlier speech on the reforms I thought we ought to seek to achieve in military procurement and spending. This Senator has pointed out a number of things that we must do if we are to get our military spending under control. In addition, I believe that we need a far more effective budget review, that we need a system of zero-based budgeting, that we need to provide steps to review the nonnegotiated contracts and to increase the amount of truly competitive bidding. I made a number of further recommendations along this line in the earlier speech. I felt that the names of the officers working for the 100 biggest defense contractors, and the fact that so many more are doing so than have done so in the past, and the relationships which have existed, was a reinforcing reason why we should have far better control over military spending than we have at the present time. I agree enthusiastically with the Senator from Arizona that we must rely, of course, on the ability, the competence, the force, and the strength of our military forces.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, if I might reply, I am very happy that the Senator from Wisconsin has permitted this colloquy to take place. I think it is long overdue, and I hope that between the two of us and others who might like to join in subsequent remarks, we can put the matter in proper perspective.

I understand fully what the Senator is getting at, and I am happy to be able to report to him that the Armed Services Committee, under the able guidance of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), has divided itself into subcommittees this year, so that the budgets, when presented on the floor of the Senate, will be presented in a more intelligent and far better understood fashion.

I, too, am concerned about the increased number of officer retirements in the last 8 years. I could stand here for hours and recite the names of personal acquaintances of mine who left the military because of low morale at the Pentagon, and I shall make further remarks later on the superintendency of Robert McNamara at the Pentagon, which I think we will eventually find to be at the root of all the problems we are talking about.

The Senator from Wisconsin very properly mentioned, I believe, that officers do leave the military and go to work for civilian establishments doing business with the Government; but I could compile a rather lengthy list—I do not think it would be material to this discussion, though it would come very close—of former Members of this body, the House of Representatives, and the administrative agencies of our Government, including one who slept very well at night while President Johnson was in the White House, who have been elevated to very profitable positions, not necessarily because they had the background, but because they were once U.S. Senators, Representatives, or civilian employees.

I wrote and published a very interesting book once. BARRY GOLDWATER, pants salesman, could never have sold it, but against my background as a Senator, it sold well.

If there is an old school tie, I think we should be just as concerned whether those involved be former Senators and Representatives or civilian employees, or whether it be the military. I really do not think there is reason for concern, if we correct certain other little matters, budget items and things of that sort. I believe we should be just as concerned about the former Director of Transportation going to work for one of the country's biggest railroads, though I do not suggest there is any wrongdoing; I think there is none.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Arizona as to the undesirability of the situation developing where those who have served in Government, whether as Senators, Representatives, departmental officers, or members of the military, are in a position where they can exercise undue influence.

I might point out one example which the Senator gave in his speech. I thought it was an excellent example: the TFX. Here we have a classic example of what I protest.

Mr. Gilpatric was a lawyer for General Dynamics. He was closely associated with General Dynamics over the years. Then as Undersecretary of Defense, he was in a position to decide—or at least had a great deal of influence to cause the Pentagon to determine—who got the contract. I think that was most unfortunate. To broaden the debate so as to include all former Government officials who work for defense contractors and all persons who have worked for defense contractors and then have come into the Federal Government to exert their influence is a very constructive addition. It reinforces the point the Senator from Arizona makes. This kind of almost inevitable conflict of interest makes it more essential than ever that we provide the congressional reforms including a willingness to reduce military spending and the budgetary controls we need.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin. I hope that we can in the future proceed, as we always have in the past, to adopt intelligent, honest policies and positions. I have been very much concerned about the other side, just as the Senator from Wisconsin has been concerned about the military side.

I sat in some of the hearings relating to the TFX when I was previously a Member of the Senate. It was amazing to me that three men, all civilians, could upset the views of 200 men, civilians, who had unanimously voted that the TFX contract should go to the Boeing Co., and decide that it should now go to another company. Fine as the company was, I must say it did not have a fine record of producing airplanes.

If the Senator will bear with me in the coming days, we can discuss this question more fully. I merely did not want the military to be made the sole scapegoat in this situation, when there are others.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

S. 1809—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO EXTEND THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I introduce proposed legislation today to extend the war on poverty pending a comprehensive review by the Congress and the administration during this session of Congress.

This bill strikes a reasonable compromise between conflicting proposals, as to the length of the extension period, and it adds to the war on poverty two important new elements which cannot be ignored even temporarily.

First, it incorporates the most important change proposed by the Comptroller General as a result of the audit by the General Accounting Office—the need for top level coordination by a Presidential agency of all Federal programs aimed at eradicating poverty.

Second, it supplies meaningful funds to a neglected section of the Economic Opportunity Act—the emergency food and medical services program—to make possible a really meaningful war on hunger, bringing together all the relevant agencies of the Government, in a way which guarantees that food will be delivered to the hungry despite the barriers of red tape which have frustrated our efforts in the past.

This bill does the following:

First. Extends the Economic Opportunity Act for 5 years and the appropriations authorization for 3 years at approximately the current level of funding. Three years is the shortest period of time possible to extend appropriations if we are to incorporate the "forward funding" principle which is acknowledged to be necessary if the poverty program ever is to be properly planned and administered.

Second. Directs the President to set up within 90 days the top level, governmentwide coordinating agency which the GAO audit found to be the biggest single lack in the present program, and provides $800,000 to finance this effort.

Third. Authorizes $1 billion in new appropriations for the emergency food and medical services program of the existing Economic Opportunity Act, which calls upon the Director of OEO, working through the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to "counteract conditions of starvation or malnutrition among the poor."

Fourth. Gives Congress 60 days in which to consider proposed delegations or transfers of OEO programs to other agencies, with the transfer taking place unless one House passes a resolution of disapproval.

This is a carefully considered bill designed to continue a meaningful war on poverty while affording time to review past experience and consider new alternatives.

It is a workable compromise between suggestions made in the House, the Senate, the administration, the GAO, and among students of the war on poverty.

I will discuss these various features of the bill one by one.

Extension: The most important decision which the new administration has made in the area of poverty was the decision to request that the present program be extended in essentially its present form for some period of time, during which period the administration would have time to consider long-range improvements in the program and submit them to the Congress for consideration at detailed public hearings.

The soundness of this decision seems to be almost universally accepted. The only difference of opinion centers around the time of extension. The administration suggested 1 year. The previous administration suggested 2 years. In the House of Representatives, the Education and Labor Committee is conducting hearings on Congressman PERKINS' bill calling for a 5-year extension.

I have listened to arguments in behalf of all these proposals. The first thing one learns is that you cannot think of a compromise merely in terms of the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5. You have to relate those numbers to established procedures in the Congress and the executive branch in order to assess their significance for the poverty program. In reviewing these factors, I have been impressed by the argument developed by Republican members of the House Education and Labor Committee as they considered the Elementary and Secondary Education Act amendments this year. They supported an extension of the ESEA program for 3 years because "3 more years of operation is desirable in order to encourage advance program planning." The Republican members of the House committee said in their minority report that they "strongly supported" the principle of forward funding. This principle is equally if not more important in the war on poverty. If we are to have it, a 3-year extension is necessary.

The next budget proposal drafted by the President, for submission to Congress next January, will be for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1970, and ending June 30, 1971. If this budget is to have "forward funding" features, to make possible advance planning, then it must also propose certain appropriations for the year July 1, 1971, to June 30, 1972. Thus, if we are to have forward funding and sound advance program planning, we must consider a 3-year extension—from June 30, 1969, when the present Economic Opportunity Act expires, until June 30, 1972.

I will say more later about the urgent need for advance planning and forward funding.

Hunger: Frankly, after reading the President's excellent message to Congress on February 19, urging action on an extension of OEO in its present form, I was inclined to offer a bill which would do that and very little else—in the interest of reaching quick, bipartisan agreement.

But my conscience simply will not allow me to introduce what purports to be a war on poverty bill, which does next to nothing about the crisis of hunger and malnutrition which has been portrayed on front pages all across America and which has shocked the Nation.

This is not a partisan issue, or a sectional issue, or an economic issue. I do not think there is a single American who believes that hunger must simply be tolerated as an inevitable condition in our generally affluent society.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, who has taken the lead in alerting this Nation to the hunger crisis through a select Senate committee, has estimated that a meaningful attack on this problem will require an additional $1 billion to $1.5 billion a year. The administration has reportedly been urged by the President's Urban Affairs Council to wage a $1 billion war on hunger apparently spread over a 4-year period. Those who once questioned or resisted prompt, massive action against hunger now seem to agree we can delay no longer. The Department of Agriculture, Senators, Governors and local officials seem ready and anxious to act.

Therefore, any bill to extend the war on poverty must have a major section on hunger.

By making a billion dollars available to the emergency food and medical services program under the existing law, this bill would give the administration a tremendous degree of flexibility in mobilizing a coordinated attack on hunger.

Furthermore, by placing responsibility in OEO, we would guarantee that the attack on hunger would be systematically fitted into the government-wide war on poverty at the local as well as the national level.

If there is anything we have learned in our anti-poverty efforts in recent years it is that none of these problems can be attacked by itself. As urgent and vital as food is, it makes no sense merely to give food to an undernourished child without considering the circumstances which made the child undernourished.

Hungry children need food, first and foremost. But they also need education. They need decent shelter. They need a stable home life. Their parents need an income. The community in which they live may need new services. That gets us into programs such as Headstart, manpower training, comprehensive health services, legal services, the Job Corps, community organization—the full range of programs now operated by OEO—plus others operated by Federal agencies.

It is especially important that residents in local communities have a role in the administration of food distribution and other poverty programs. This is best assured by giving responsibility for the program to the Office of Economic Opportunity so that local efforts will be coordinated by local Community Action agencies. If we want to make Community Action agencies meaningful and effective, we must give them resources to manage and meaningful work to do.

Everyone I know—the President, the GAO, the present leadership of OEO, the independent students of the poverty program—supports the basic idea that OEO should be an innovative agency, to break new ground, to get action in areas neglected in the past, to prod other agencies into facing problems too long ignored.

A logical place to use this innovative power of OEO is in the quest for a solution to the scandal of hunger in the richest and most favored nation on earth.

Delegation authority: The Economic Opportunity Act presently gives the President authority to delegate OEO programs to other agencies. The President has proposed to transfer the Headstart program to a new child development office under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to transfer the Job Corps to the Labor Department. These proposed delegations have provoked considerable controversy. It is understandable, of course, because large numbers of people are involved in and deeply committed to these programs. They cannot avoid concern when proposed delegations to other agencies are accompanied by suggestions that budgets be drastically cut—as in the case of the Job Corps—or by implications that the program might be combined with other programs which might not be compatible—a situation which some believe exists in the case of Headstart.

However, the idea of "spinning off" successful poverty programs to older, established departments seems to have been implicit in the philosophy of the Economic Opportunity Act from the very outset, and friends as well as foes of the poverty program—including the Congress and the previous administration—have also proposed and carried out such "spinoffs."

The crucial question seems to be how the program is to be carried out—not who carries it out.

With the Headstart program, for instance, the essential point is that it continue to be operated through local Community Action agencies. It is only when local groups, including representatives of the poor have control of the Headstart programs that the program's administrators can be effectively persuaded to pay adequate attention to the needs of the community. If the administration provides ironclad assurance on this point, and intends that a delegation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare strengthen the Headstart program, then it would be difficult to argue that such a delegation would be harmful to the program.

After all, the administration is responsible for administering the programs which the Congress authorizes. If we are to hold the administration accountable for the efficient and effective operation of these programs, we must give the administration reasonable leeway in developing the most effective administrative structure.

One thing Congress should insist upon, however, is a clearcut description of how the administration proposes to administer the program, and the right to say "yes" or "no" on a specific proposal. That right would be guaranteed to the Congress under the 60-day rule contained in this bill. The legislative language, incidentally, is patterned after the Executive Reorganization Act.

Forward funding: Sound administration of the very complex program undertaken by the OEO depends on sound planning. But since the program's inception congressional funding has been consistently late. The fiscal year begins July 1. It is crucial to know by April how much money will be available by July 1, if the complex administrative arrangement between poverty groups, volunteers, old line school, welfare and employment agencies, local, State and Federal Governments are to be carefully and responsibly worked out. Everyone recognizes it is especially important when working with the poor that the Government meet its obligations as promised.

What has happened? Have we appropriated funds for OEO in April? In June? In July? No. The earliest date for an OEO appropriations bill was October 7, back in 1964. Since then the dates run like this: October 31, 1965; October 27, 1966; January 2, 1968; and October 11, 1968.

During fiscal year 1968—when the appropriation did not come until January, that is, 6 months into the fiscal year—71 local Community Action agencies were forced to shut down or were forced to operate entirely with volunteers or local funds. VISTA volunteers went without pay and over 6,000 Headstart children were forced from the Headstart program that had to be terminated, according to testimony from R. Sargent Shriver, then OEO Director.

The problems of the fall of 1967 are only the most dramatic examples of the difficulties of operating a program on a month-to-month basis under continuing resolution. It is irresponsible. It is wasteful.

The problem of operating an innovative new program without any assurance of funding is bad enough at the national level, but it is especially destructive at the local level. Here is a comment I received recently from George W. Hicks, acting director of the Southern Oklahoma Community Action Foundation, Inc., in Ardmore, Okla.:

> A great weakness is one that Congress could alleviate, and that is the short funding policy that OEO has had to face in the past. There have been times when OEO could not meet a payroll, and the program has been extended mainly on a year to year basis. Under these circumstances, it is difficult to fund programs and incorporate long range planning into their successful completion.

In order to break through this fiscal barrier the bill I am introducing today would provide for a 3-year extension of the poverty program and allow us to begin this year with forward funding for the poverty program.

Forward funding is that procedure, already adopted by Congress for virtually all education appropriations, whereby funds for a given program are appropriated a full year in advance so that a full year of careful planning is possible. It would allow, for the first time, adequate leadtime for careful local planning. I hope that the Senators will consider the proposal carefully.

As I said at the outset, this bill is an effort to find a solid middle ground on which the Congress and the administration can build solidly in the months to come.

The Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty will begin hearings on this bill Wednesday, April 23, 24, and 25.

In these hearings, we will deal with the war on poverty as a high level matter of the greatest national urgency. We intend to invite some of the most outstanding spokesmen this Nation has, to give their opinion on whether this effort should be continued at approximately the present level of funding, pending a long-range comprehensive review by both the Congress and the administration.

We do not see this as a partisan issue. Neither do we see it as an issue which need divide the administration and the Congress. The President has proposed that the war on poverty be renewed pending the development of long-range proposals. He has proposed certain administrative changes to take place in the meanwhile. The Congress and the executive branch have different responsibilities under our constitutional system, but this bill provides a way in which they can work together constructively in the months to come toward eliminating the scandal of poverty from this generally affluent nation of ours.

I am confident that the conscience of the Nation will express itself on this issue in the weeks ahead, and make clear that we must maintain—and steadily improve—our efforts to remove poverty from this land.

Mr. President, the nationwide protest against the Labor Department action in closing 57 Job Corps centers all across the country continues. Letters and telegrams from public officials, civic leaders, labor unions, conservation organizations, and deeply concerned individuals continue to pour into offices of Senators and Congress and into the White House.

I ask unanimous consent that another group of these urgent messages, received since I made my remarks here in the Senate yesterday, be printed in the Record. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a section-by-section analysis of the bill as well as the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, messages, and section-by-section analysis of the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1809) to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, to authorize advance funding of such programs, to require notice to Congress prior to delegation of any program to another agency, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Nelson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1809

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969".

EXTENSION OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Sec. 2. (a) Section 161 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended (1) by striking out "for which he is responsible", and (2) by striking out "three" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight".

(b) Sections 245, 321, 408, 615, and 835 of such Act are each amended by striking out "three" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight".

(c) Section 523 of such Act is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "seven".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 3. (a) For purposes of carrying out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and each of the next two fiscal years. Of the amounts appropriated pursuant to this subsection for each such fiscal year, the sum of $2,180,000,000 shall be allocated, subject to the provisions of section 616 of such Act, in such a manner that—

(1) $280,500,000 shall be for the purpose of carrying out part A of title I;

(2) $721,800,000 shall be for the purpose of carrying out part B of title I;

(3) $46,000,000 shall be for the purpose of carrying out part D of title I;

(4) $1,032,700,000 shall be for the purpose of carrying out title II, of which $338,000,000 shall be for the Project Headstart program described in section 222(a)(1), $60,000,000 shall be for the Project Headstart program described in section 222(a)(2), $50,000,000 shall be for the Legal Services program described in section 222(a)(3), $90,000,000 shall be for the Comprehensive Health Services program described in section 222(a)(4), $15,000,000 shall be for the Family Planning program described in section 222(a)(7), and $3,800,000 shall be for the Senior Opportunities and Services program described in section 222(a)(8);

(5) $12,000,000 shall be for the purpose of carrying out part A of title III;

(6) $34,000,000 shall be for the purpose of carrying out part B of title III;

(7) $16,000,000 shall be for the purpose of carrying out title VI; and

(8) $37,000,000 shall be for the purpose of carrying out part A of title III;

If the amounts appropriated pursuant to this subsection for any such fiscal year are not sufficient to allocate the full amounts specified for each of the purposes set forth in clauses (1) through (8), then the amounts specified in each such clause shall be prorated to determine the allocations required for each such purpose.

(b) In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated pursuant to subsection (a), there are further authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and each of the next two fiscal years—

(1) the sum of $1,000,000,000 to be used for the Emergency Food and Medical Services program described in section 222(a)(6) of such Act; and

(2) the sum of $100,000,000 to be used for part B of title V of such Act.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, unless expressly in limitation of the provisions of this section, funds appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to the provisions of this section shall remain available for obligation until the end of such fiscal year.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND MEDICAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Sec. 4. The President shall transmit to the Congress, within 90 days after appropriations are made available pursuant to section 3(b) of this Act, a report setting forth the actions which have been taken, and the plans to be implemented during the remainder of the fiscal year, for carrying out the Emergency Food and Medical Services program described in section 222(a)(6) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, including arrangements which the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity makes with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for using such appropriations in accordance with the purposes of such Emergency Food and Medical Services program.

ADEQUATE LEADTIME

Sec. 5. (a) Part A of title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"ADVANCE FUNDING

"Sec. 622. For the purpose of affording adequate notice of funding available under this Act, appropriations for grants, contracts, or other payments under this Act are authorized to be included in the appropriation Act for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which they are available for obligation."

(b) In order to effect a transition to the advance funding method of timing appropriation action, the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply notwithstanding that its initial application will result in the enactment in same year (whether in the same appropriation Act or otherwise) of two separate appropriations, one for the then current fiscal year and one for the succeeding fiscal year.

REQUIRED TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS OF ANY PLAN PROPOSING DELEGATION OF A PROGRAM TO ANOTHER AGENCY

Sec. 6. Section 602(d) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "but the delegation of administrative responsibility for any of the programs authorized by this Act shall not be effective prior to the end of the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous session of Congress (as defined in section 906 of title 5 of the United States Code) after the date on which a plan proposing the delegation arrangements is transmitted to the Congress by the President and shall not be effective if, between the date of transmittal and the end of the 60-day period, either House passes a resolution disapproving such plan".

CREATION OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL

Sec. 7. (a) Subsection (b) of section 631 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by deleting "and" at the end of clause (3), by deleting the period at the end of clause (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(5) evaluating the overall effectiveness of Federal programs and activities in eliminating poverty in the Nation."

(b) Subsection (e) of section 631 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Of the sums appropriated for carrying out this Act for each fiscal year, there shall be reserved from the funds available for this title the sum of $800,000 for the activities of the Council in carrying out the purposes of this section."

(c) The President shall, within ninety days after the enactment of this Act, designate the members and the Executive Secretary of the Economic Opportunity Council, as provided for in section 631 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

PARTICIPATION OF CHILDREN IN HEADSTART PROJECTS

Sec. 8. Paragraph (1) of section 222(e) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit the participation in Headstart projects of children who are not from low-income families if contributions are made from other sources sufficient to cover the added costs of including such children."

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT REGARDING TIME OF APPROPRIATIONS OBLIGATION

Sec. 9. (a) Section 242 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "Funds to cover the costs of the proposed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall be obligated from the appropriation which is current at the time the plan is submitted to the Governor."

(b) All obligations under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which have been heretofore recorded substantially as provided in the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section are hereby confirmed and ratified.

The material, presented by Mr. Nelson, follows:

Section-by-Section Analysis of "Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969"

(A bill introduced by Senator Gaylord Nelson, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty.)

Section 1. Short Title: Section 1 of the bill provides that this legislation may be cited by the short title of "Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969".

Section 2. Extension of Economic Opportunity Act: Section 2 extends the duration of the authority of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to carry out programs under the Economic Opportunity Act for five years beyond the existing law's expiration date of June 30, 1970.

Section 3. Authorization of Appropriations: Section 3(a) authorizes the appropriation of such amounts as may be necessary for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972 for carrying out the Economic Opportunity Act.

Out of the amounts appropriated for each such fiscal year, the bill provides that the sum of $2,180,000,000 must be allocated as follows:

(1) $280,500,000 for part A of title I (Job Corps).

(2) $721,800,000 for part B of title I (Work and Training for Youth and Adults).

(3) $46,000,000 for part D of title I (Special Impact Programs).

(4) $1,032,700,000 for title II (urban and rural community action programs), of which $338,000,000 shall be for the Project Headstart program, $60,000,000 for the Follow Through program, $50,000,000 for the Legal Services program, $90,000,000 for the Comprehensive Health Services program, $15,000,000 for the Family Planning program, and $3,800,000 for the Senior Opportunities and Services program.

(5) $12,000,000 for part A of title II (Rural Loan programs).

(6) $34,000,000 for part B of title III (Assistance for Migrant, and other Seasonally Employed, Farmworkers and Their Families).

(7) $16,000,000 for title VI (Administration and Coordination).

(8) $37,000,000 for title VIII (Domestic Volunteer Service Programs—VISTA).

Section 3(b) authorizes these additional appropriations for each such fiscal year (over and above other appropriations for OEO programs):

(1) $1,000,000,000 for the Emergency Food and Medical Services program (section 222(a)(6) of the Act) and

(2) $100,000,000 for part B of title V (Day Care programs).

Section 4. Emergency Food and Medical Services Program: Section 4 requires the President to send to the Congress a report concerning the actions taken and the plans made for carrying out the Emergency Food and Medical Services program (section 222 (a)(6) of the Economic Opportunity Act). The report must be transmitted within 90 days after appropriations for the program are made available under section 3(b) of this legislation. The arrangements which the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity makes for carrying out his functions through the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are to be set forth in the report.

Section 5. Adequate Leadtime: Section 5 amends the Economic Opportunity Act to provide for advance funding of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act by authorizing the inclusion of the appropriation for a particular fiscal year in the appropriation Act for the preceding fiscal year.

Section 6. Required Transmittal to Congress of Any Plan Proposing Delegation of a Program to Another Agency: Section 6 amends section 602 (d) of the Economic Opportunity Act (which now provides that, with the approval of the President, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity may enter into arrangements with the heads of other agencies to delegate his powers to such agencies) to add the requirement that the delegation of administrative responsibility for any program under the Act shall not take effect until 60 days after the President has submitted to the Congress a plan setting forth the delegation arrangements. If either House of Congress passes a resolution of disapproval within the 60-day period, the delegation plan shall not be effective.

Section 7. Creation of Economic Opportunity Council: Section 7(a) amends section 631 of the Economic Opportunity Act—which provides for the establishment of an Economic Opportunity Council in the Executive Office of the President—to include, among the Council's responsibilities, that of evaluating the overall effectivenes of Federal programs and activities in eliminating poverty in the Nation.

Section 7(b) amends section 631(e) of the Act, which now provides that the President shall reserve such amounts as may be necessary for the purposes of the Economic Opportunity Council, to set aside the specific sum of $800,000 annually to enable the Council to carry out its activities.

Section 7(c) requires the President, within 90 days after the enactment of this legislation, to designate the members and the Executive Secretary of the Economic Opportunity Council.

Section 8. Participation of Children in Headstart Projects: Section 8 adds language to section 222(a)(1) of the Act to provide that nothing in the legislation shall be construed to prohibit the participation in Headstart projects of children who are not from low-income families, provided contributions are made from other sources sufficient to cover the added costs of including such children.

Section 9. Technical Amendment Regarding Obligation of Appropriations: Section 9 contains a technical amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act to make clear that a proposed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance under the Act is obligated at the beginning of the 30-day period afforded the Governor of the State for his consideration, rather than at the end of that period.

International Union
of Operating Engineers,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1969.

The Honorable Gaylord Nelson,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Sir: Recent news stories regarding proposed cutbacks in the Job Corps program have caused serious concern among the members of our union. Our membership of 360,000 has supported the concept of a "latter-day CCC" since first proposed in Congress a number of years ago. We were very pleased to see the idea become a reality in the Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers.

Not only have we supported the Job Corps in principle, we have supported it in action. Since 1966, our International Union has provided training as heavy equipment operators for sixty-five to seventy Corpsmen annually at Jacobs Creek, Tennessee. In July of 1968, we extended this program to the Conservation Center at Anaconda, Montana where we have a trainee census of about fifty. We have placed almost all of the Jacobs Creek graduates in union jobs across the country, and anticipate placing some one hundred more graduates from Jacobs Creek and Anaconda this summer. I am attaching typewritten copies of several of the many letters received by the Center staff from young men who have gone to work and become taxpayers instead of "tax eaters."

While not all Job Corps graduates can tell as significant a story, there is one overriding reason that this program should remain intact. About sixty per cent of the Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center entrants have reading achievements below grade level 3.5, making them—for all intents and purposes—functionally illiterate. Where will they go? Our society cannot afford to carry them forever and they are not capable of caring for themselves.

I earnestly solicit your assistance in maintaining the conservation centers so that we, along with others, may continue to help these youngsters who want to help themselves.

Very truly yours,
Hunter P. Wharton,
General President.

Milwaukee, Wis.,
April 11, 1969.

Senator Gaylord Nelson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D.C.:

The announcement to be made today to close the Clam Lake Job Corps Conservation Center is being viewed with great alarm by the Milwaukee public schools and Milwaukee citizens. This is the site of a valuable job training and full-credit educational program for disadvantaged Milwaukee youths and is the only one of its kind in the country sponsored by the Forest Service, Department of Labor, OEO Job Corps, and the Milwaukee schools. This important Clam Lake project gives much needed help in solving one of the large city problems of the potential dropout. Your help to save the Clam Lake project in Wisconsin will be greatly appreciated.

Richard P. Gousha,
Superintendent of Schools.

April 11, 1969.

Senator Gaylord Nelson,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Gaylord: Strongly urge continued active support of Blackwell Job Corps. Important to take these young men from their environment long enough to help them develop respect for themselves. What better way to make useful citizens for our country. We have had them in our home and witnessed the solid results of Blackwell efforts.

Dave Fromstein.

Puxico, Mo.,
April 7, 1969.

The Honorable Gaylord Nelson,
Senator from Wisconsin,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Nelson: There is increasing concern in our community regarding reports of extensive cuts in the Job Corps Program. This program, which seems to draw much controversy in some quarter, has proven to be a great value to both the young men involved in it, and to the people of our community through the work being done at the Mingo Job Corps Center near here.

At this center, young men from ages 16–21, considered to be a most critical age period in their lives, are given training that prepares them for gainful employment. Here, they are given a sense of their own worth as individual human beings. The Center's record of achievement has been very high, showing that over 50% of the young men have been reclaimed from the role of hopeless welfare recipient, to that of productive worker and taxpayer. Their basic educational levels have been raised, and at the same time they are absorbing needed vocational training. The average length of time spent here is 7.4 months for each young man.

In addition to their education, these young men are learning to give of themselves in service to the community. Their asssistance at various times has been invaluable in helping to fight fires; in repair and painting of our City Hall and Public Library building; and in the building and improvement of area recreational facilities, which in turn provides a much needed place for city people to come and spend their weekends and vacation time. Their attendance at church has been good, and some have become members. Several of them have expressed a wish to remain in the area after their training is over, for fear that if they return to their old environment, pressures there will cause them to fall back into their old way of life. All this is achieved at a total cost of about $4,000.00 per year for each person.

There are also many benefits to this community besides the obvious economic ones. The Center has helped teach a complacent all white community to accept people of different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Some who were opposed to the Center in the beginning are now involved in volunteer efforts to help these young men.

For these and other reasons, we are sure that you can see the need for such a program as the Job Corps. We urge you to use your influence especially in behalf of the Mingo Job Corps Center. To many of us, it shines as a ray of hope in a troubled world.

Respectfully yours,

HOLLAN FANN,
Executive Vice President, Puxico State Bank, Puxico, Mo.

THE AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of The American Forestry Association and its 65,000 members, we urge continued support for the Job Corps Conservation Centers. On numerous occasions staff members of this Association have visited the Job Corps Centers and reported on the excellent work being done. Not only are conservation objectives being realized but underprivileged young men are being educated and trained to become productive members of society. How much is a boy worth? We recognize your overall budget problems but the Job Corps should be continued and even expanded if at all possible.

WILLIAM E. TOWELL,
Executive Vice President,
American Forestry Association.

WAUBENO, WIS.,
April 11, 1969.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Senatorial Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We the Waubeno Lions Club of Waubeno Wisconsin do hereby endorse the Job Corp program of the Blackwell Civilian Conservation Center we request your assistance in assuring its continuance respectfully.

WAUBENO LIONS CLUB,
Waubeno, Wis.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON
NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1969.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We were stunned at the news release as of this date indicating the closing of approximately 60 per cent of the Job Corps Conservation Centers because of a hundred million dollar reduction in funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

You will recall that at the time the original Economic Opportunity Act was passed, the amendment that required 40 per cent of the enrollees in the Job Corps to be in the Conservation Centers was offered by Congressman John P. Saylor, Republican from the 22nd District of Pennsylvania. In his supporting commentary Congressman Saylor spoke of the outstanding Republican tradition in the conservation of our natural resources.

The Job Corps Conservation Centers have served the dual role of rehabilitating young men and refurbishing our country's natural resource base. The Conservation Centers have received the most educationally, culturally, and economically deprived enrollees of the entire program. Despite this handicap, however, this phase of the program has been an outstanding success.

To discontinue the Conservation Centers now would be a tragic waste of money and natural and human resources. Such a program is not born without the agony of trial and error. The experience achieved in this most difficult of learning processes will have been lost.

We most respectfully urge the earliest possible reconsideration of this decision and sincerely hope that you will direct the continuance of this important undertaking.

Yours very truly,

SPENCER M. SMITH, Jr.,
Secretary.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARK
ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1969.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: Thank you much for alerting us to the Job Corps Conservation Centers. The enclosed is a copy of a telegram sent this day to President Richard M. Nixon.

Sincerely,

SAL J. PREZIOSO,
President.

APRIL 10, 1969.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

It is important that the Job Corps Conservation Centers be continued especially in these times. They are doing much needed work in parks, forests and other public reservations and providing wholesome environment and valuable training for thousands of young people. Our young people are in need of and want more of this work.

SAL J. PREZIOSO,
President,
National Recreation and Park Association.

CITY OF GLOBE,
Globe, Ariz., April 11, 1969.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HONORABLE NELSON: It is very disturbing news to the people of our community to learn that the San Carlos Job Corp Center, Arizona is to be closed. I would like to bring to your attention some facts, of which I am aware, concerning this Center.

Out of the 82 Conservation Centers throughout the United States, San Carlos ranks 9th LOW in cost per man year. Approximately 1,500 young men have entered this Center, with a present enrollment of 190. An estimated 60 of these are from our State of Arizona. Economic input to the communities in annual staff wages is $42,000, annual corpsmen wages, $60,000, operational supplies and services, $527,000. Appraised value of work accomplishments in progress includes, Retarded Children Home, Community Flood Control, Christmas toys for needy and cemetery cleanup, amount to $1,008,000. The Job Corps Center employ some 52 people, of which 26 are from the local community. I might also point out the Center's involvement in the various organizations such as Elks, Chamber of Commerce, Little League, Rotary, etc. and affiliated with all local churches.

Your review and reconsideration in the closing of the San Carlos Job Corp Center, Arizona, will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

E. ROSS BITTNER,
Mayor.

ASHLAND AREA
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Ashland, Wis., April 11, 1969.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: The Ashland Area Chamber of Commerce wishes to inform you that the Board of Directors have passed a resolution opposing the closing of the Clam Lake Job Corp Center, Clam Lake, Wisconsin in Ashland County, that the administration has decided to close before the planned Congressional study of the poverty program which is scheduled to begin hearings on the poverty program in May.

We believe it would be most unfortunate to close Clam Lake Job Corp Center on moral basis, and what it is doing to help school drop-outs, young people who cannot read or write, lack of any trade or skill, training in conservation and other projects and programs. Much of this training to these underprivileged cannot be measured like a product, but are learning to obtain some knowledge of reading and writing, trades and conservation.

This program at Clam Lake Job Corp Center is helping youngsters into developing our youthful human resources. These youngsters should not be put back into their former environment they left and to run at will with no opportunity for their future.

The closing of Clam Lake Corp Center would just add greater disillusionment to these youngsters. Certainly it is the feeling that careful study should be made as to the operations of the Center, but investigations carried on to come up with carefully planned produced and developed suggestions for improvement.

Your personal efforts and consideration to the Administration opposing the closing of the Clam Lake Job Corp Center would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. EGAN,
President.

GILLETT PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Gillett, Wis., April 11, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BYRNES,
Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senator GAYLORD NELSON.

GENTLEMEN: Last night on the news report it was rumored that the Blackwell Job Corps Center might be closed as an economy measure by the Nixon Administration. I hope that this decision has not been made, and if it has, that it be not irrevocable.

You see, I take my political science class to Blackwell each year to show them an example of a poverty program that does work. I made a trip beforehand to study the camp and was very much impressed first with the attitude of both the personnel and the trainees—secondly, with the educational methods being used. I talked with dozens of the boys privately and what they told me showed definitely that they were learning and above all they had regained hope. They were willing to accept the challenge of becoming working members of the community. I have never in all my 17 years of teaching seen a more dynamic learning situation. It would be a disaster to close this camp.

I think and I am sure most of my colleagues in the teaching profession would echo my opinion, that what is needed is tax reform to earn more money rather than cuts in spending on essential, worthwhile programs. Is congress again going to allow the vested interests their tax havens. If so, they run the risk of a tax payers revolt from the middle income citizens such as this country has never seen. The sentiment is that strong.

Sincerely,

CHARLES R. GRUENTZEL.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The National Wildlife Federation protests in the most vigorous manner possible the proposed budget reduction which will result in emasculation of the Job Corps conservation program.

The Job Corps conservation program parallels, to some considerable extent, the old Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's which did so much for conservation and for the men who were enrolled. Many of these persons later became national leaders. Like it, the present Job Corps conservation program is having a significant and beneficial impact upon natural resources programs while, at the same time, teaching the enrollees skills and abilities wherein they can become independent.

I am attaching a copy of a recent issue of National Wildlife magazine, which now goes to some 400,000 associated members of the Federation, that contains a feature article about this program.

We can name a host of programs less worthy than the Job Corps conservation centers, and this reduction only leads us to believe even more strongly that you are being given extremely bad advice on natural resources matters.

Sincerely,

THOMAS L. KIMBALL,
Executive Director.

WOMEN IN COMMUNITY SERVICE,
Des Moines, Iowa,
April 11, 1969.

To: Secretary of the Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.; Chairman, Labor Department Committee, House of Representatives; Chairman, Labor Department Committee, Senate of the United States; Chairman, Subcommittee on Poverty.

Subject: Closing of Job Corps Centers.

GENTLEMEN: We urgently request that you reconsider the closing of the Job Corps Centers for the following reasons:

I. Economic:

1. Job Corps Centers are already equipped to rehabilitate and train hard-core poverty young people. It seems poor stewardship of funds to equip other locations for a similar-type training when these are already in operation.

2. In view of the uncensored and unlimited spending on military and on such projects as AEM, Ultra-sonic plane exploration and others, that it would be appropriate to be a little more generous in spending for the youth of this nation.

II. Meeting the needs of hard-core poor:

1. The proposed city training program for high school dropouts will not meet the needs of young people who need to be out of their home environment in order to effect attitude changes and provide motivation to become self-sustaining.

2. Proposed dropout programs for cities will omit the rural youth of whom there are many in Iowa who need residential living training programs.

3. We feel that the prospect of closing three of the four Women's Centers in this area represents unequal treatment of women as there are already so many more men's centers in Job Corps.

We urge you to delay final decision on the closing of Job Corps to permit more time for study and exploration of the needs and investigating the results and benefits which Job Corps has produced.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Respectfully,

Mrs. W. T. JOHNSON,
Project Director.

MOST PRECIOUS BLOOD,
Glidden, Wis., April 11, 1969.

The Honorable **GAYLORD NELSON,**
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: This letter is intended to encourage you and support you in whatever efforts you may be able to make on behalf of the Job Corps program here and across the country.

Granted that economies must be made in the expenditure of public monies, and that urban blight is desperately in need of removal. But rural America merits concern too. And the reconstruction of present and future citizens which the Job Corps program is accomplishing is a boon both to urban and rural America.

I've served on Community Relations Council for Clam Lake Job Corps Center and I've conferred with people like Mrs. Lavine of Superior with the six Benedictine Nuns and the Christian Brothers who served out there during last summer in the education department. These are the people whose evaluation of the program ought to be considered before any action is taken to reduce or abandon the program. Not only these but also those who are earnestly involved in the conservation and development of our natural resources should be consulted. Last, but not least, closing down the Center at Clam Lake will mean closing out employment for several families in this area and consequently an appreciable economic blow to our struggling business community.

Please, then, do make your influence felt in high and low places in order to prevent or mitigate measures which might otherwise be taken to close out this beneficial program.

I am,

Very truly yours,

Msgr. GERALD F. MAHON.

P.S.—Enclosure might interest you, too!

WINSLOW, ARIZ.,
April 11, 1969.

Senator **GAYLORD NELSON,**
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR: I don't know whether or not it is fitting that I should be writing to you and bothering you with the busy schedule you have.

But I no longer can sit quiet and see the Office of Economic Opportunity sent down the drain. The idea of closing down such a large number of Job Corps Centers is without any foundations at all. One day an announcement comes out that the federal government is sending in millions of dollars to riot torn areas. And by gawd within the next few days the news comes out that Job Corps centers are being closed. Is there any better way to prevent more riots in our cities than to train the residents of these areas to be proud and to work for our country.

How in the world can they turn out over 30,000 youths half trained or not trained at all? There are youths all across the United States waiting to be contacted for the chances to make themselves better. These young men and women have volunteer to be trained and to learn. How can we stop this movement now.

Sir, please continue your fight for not only Job Corps but for all the OEO programs. No other agency can do the work OEO is now doing and can do in the future with more support and money.

We the poor people need the poverty program. How else can we achieve a real victory over poverty with all the money worries of the white-middle class structure? Please hear the plead of the children who need the Head Start Program, the teenagers who need the NYC Program and Job Corps, Legal Services and Foster Grandparents help the poor, community action is suppose to fight for the poor in all cases where it is needed (even though it isn't true in our county since the community action program is run by the middle class power structure), and the VISTA Volunteers who dedicated one year of their lives to help the poor. Sir all these programs need to be continue. Why lay a foundation to the house and then decide to build the house somewhere else? It just doesn't work. Thank you for taking the time to consider the programs and fight for *all* our programs.

Sincerely yours,

DAN CRONIN.

MILWAUKEE CHURCH WOMEN UNITED,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 14, 1969.

Senator **GAYLORD NELSON,**
Washington, D.C.:

Convinced of worth of Job Corps program through our involvement your commendable support appreciated.

Mrs. GEORGE C. WAYMAN.

KINGMAN, ARIZ.,
April 14, 1969.

GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

I believe that Job Corps is the only way the underprivileged minorities have of getting a better education. I hope you can keep the program as it is.

ZEKE MESA.

TOWNSHIP OF WATERSMEET,
Watersmeet, Mich., April 11, 1969.

Hon. **GAYLORD NELSON,**
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: I have just heard that not only the appropriations for the Job Corps program being drastically cut, but that many of the existing Centers are to be closed by July 1. Included in the list to be closed was the Ojibway Job Corps Center, located at Marenisco in Gogebic County, Michigan.

The Ojibway Civilian Conservation Center has done a good job in educating and providing work skills to the young men fortunate enough to have been assigned there. They have completed many worthwhile projects including a number of benefit to this community. In addition to the primary purpose, of aiding these young men, the Ojibway Center has provided employment for a number of local people and its expenditures for operation have been a help to our local economy.

I am hopeful that this worthwhile program and any cuts in it will be carefully considered. Should the closing of some Centers become necessary, we urge that the Ojibway Center remain in operation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK BASSO,
Township Supervisor.

GLOBE, ARIZ.,
April 11, 1969.

Hon. **GAYLORD NELSON,**
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SIR: I've been in Globe 34 years, ex U.S. Marine, truck driver, miner, salesman, cook, restaurant manager, railroad laborer, meat cutter and university graduate, attended Portland State, session at Stanford University at Palo Alto, and am of Mexican descent. (I've had their problem and had their feelings.)

I believe one of the greatest things to happen to Globe and this area was the establishment of the San Carlos CCC. Not only because of the boost in the economy but because of the opportunity for a boy of a disadvantaged area or family to change his total environment. We are looking for a change and chance to make better citizens and develop patriotism. This is happening at the San Carlos CCC.

The San Carlos CCC has a program geared to the needs of the non-English speaking. It's the only one like it in this region. One-third of our enrollment is from Arizona, (Phoenix, Tucson, Nogales), about 40% of enrollment is of Mex. descent. Let's not turn them away—

Respectfully,

JOE P. CANCHILA.

CHILLICOTHE, OHIO.

DEAR SENATOR: Please continue your good work in defense of the Job Corps.

JOSEPH A. CUDDY.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
April 11, 1969.

Senator **GAYLORD NELSON,**
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Local women volunteers—Jewish, Protestant, Catholic, black, and white urge Job Corps retained as is.

Mrs. LOUIS H. FINK.

Detroit Lakes, Minn.

Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
Senate Office Building.

Dear Sir: I believe the Tamarack Job Corps Center in our area has been well managed and a benefit for students and teachers involved.

As a member of the community council since its inception, I have seen how not only students—but local citizens have learned to become more tolerant towards the needs of others.

I believe it would be a good center to retain if there is a cutback in the program.

Sincerely,

Gerald Price.

West Allis, Wis.,
April 10, 1969.

Gaylord Nelson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Congratulations. I was very happy to see your stand as reported in this evening's Milwaukee Journal on the Job Corps. I know that you have been interested for a long time in the basic humanistic issues facing this country. Last year you spoke and wrote about our need to examine our priorities, today your stand again pointed out that you were sincere.

It does not seem to me that $100 million taken from the Job Corps is going to save anybody anything. Ask these jokers if they know the cost of maintaining people in institutions, jails, etc.? Private industry has been asked to start to do its share in training people, and they are falling far short. We not only need the Job Corps, we need to get twice as many as 32,000 young men into programs like this.

Of course what is a few million when we have to talk in the billions about getting to the moon or building a stupid ABM system? Please, in the name of God, and for the sake of human beings, keep up your fight.

Sincerely,

Nancy Flintrop.

April 11, 1969.

Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: I sincerely hope your sub-committee will reconsider the possibility of closing so many of the Job Corps Centers.

I have no first hand knowledge of other centers, but I do know what the Clinton Center is doing for the young women who come here.

First, as a paid OEO employee, and now as a volunteer in the poverty program, I have been closely associated with Job Corps personnel and some of the corps women.

The girls at the Clinton Center are not merely trainees—the people of Clinton have welcomed the girls as an integral part of our community life. Certainly, they are learning vocations that will enable them to be self-supporting, but more important, they are learning how to be human beings.

Yes, it is costly, and I'm sure there are many ways in which costs can be cut, but in heaven's name reconsider before closing these centers. Welfare roles will increase if these young people are turned back into the streets. Either way, we taxpayers will still pay, but let us at least give these young people something to hope for.

Sincerely,

Mrs. L. D. Orser.

Clinton, Iowa.

Cass Lake, Minn.,
April 12, 1969.

Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: Thousands of people will be bitterly disappointed if the Job Corps Centers are closed as announced this week.

We have had an opportunity to see the Lydick Lake Civilian Conservation Center in action and to see how they can turn an illiterate, unemployable person into a confident employable man with skills that will make him a life-long asset to this country. There were student teachers from St. Cloud State College here this spring who were surprised at the effectiveness of the teaching methods used.

We have also seen the mixture of negroes, Spanish speaking Americans, Chippewa Indians and Caucasians living and working in harmony at the Center and in our small communities near the Center.

As well as providing these young men with the education they need and their vocational training, the Center is important to this area. It has been depressed for at least 50 years—we have been here for the past 30 and so know the problems. Closing of the Center will create hardship in the area.

Mr. Clem Plattner, editor and publisher of 3 county newspapers, has observed and written about the Center. His opinion and the articles he has written would be of value to you in your subcommittee hearings. His address is Walker, Minn. 56484.

I strongly urge that the Civilian Conservation Centers be maintained—but that review be made of the whole OEO program to reduce expenses where it does not impair the quality of the programs.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. Carl Coombs.

Marion, Ill.,
April 11, 1969.

Honorable Congressman: We know the closing of Crab-Orchard Job Corps center would be a mistake.

We know that a lot of good is being done and we think the Job Corps Corpsmen need our help. Also we know that moving this center would effect many families in this area who would have to go else where to seek employment. As you know this is concerned a low income area.

Any influence you would have in helping to keep Crab-Orchard Job Corps Center open would be greatly appreciated. We feel like they have a lot of good projects that needs to be completed.

Thanking you in advance for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. Carl E. Turner.

Corvalis, Oreg.,
April 12, 1969.

Senator Gaylord Nelson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: We have heard with dismay of the proposed cut in the Job Corps and Headstart. We believe such programs are vitally needed and serve an important purpose. We urge you and your subcommittee to do all in your power to stop these cuts and to keep both of the programs under O.E.O.

We also urge you to vote "NO" on the A.B.M. system.

Sincerely,

Tom and Peggy Herbert.

Ashland, Wis., *April 11, 1969.*

Dear Senator Nelson: I am by no means very good at words, but I wish to strongly protest the closing of the Clam Lake Job Corps Center. As a tax paying citizen, I have helped to improve that center and black-top the roads. Now will all this just turn out to be another waste? What of the young men who desperately need the training they can only receive through an agency such as this?

I read in the paper this morning where President Nixon has found a $36,000 job for an old friend. I certainly wish he would do something for the people of Northern Wis. Mr. Nixon took office in Jan. and my husband was laid off last week—the first time in 6 years.

I don't know what one family can do by way of a protest like this, but I feel the Job Corps Center should stay in operation. It did bring a little money into this area and our poor boys need this training.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Joseph Nelson.

April 11, 1969.

Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
Congressional Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I would like to voice my extreme disfavor of Mr. Nixons closing the Job Corp Centers.

In my opinion, this is the most worthwhile project this government has undertaken in years.

Please convey my attitude to the appropriate people.

Thank you,

Eugene G. Newhouse, D.D.S.

Rhinelander, Wis.,
April 11, 1969.

Senator Gaylord Nelson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: I was upset when President Nixon announced that he planned on closing half of the Job Corp Centers. I feel that Job Corps is too important to phase out.

Would you please try and stop this? We must not cut social programs to pay the bills of the military complex.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

James D. Curtin.

April 10, 1969.

Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: The threatened closing of the Clam Lake, Wisconsin Job Corps Center would be about as tragic as the rape of the northern Wisconsin virgin pine by the timber barons.

Since northern Wisconsin has been denuded by the timber barons, it was only through the efforts of the Civilian Conservation Corps, the U.S. Forest Service and recent work by the Job Corps that has proven of inestimable value in reconstructing our long-lost timber and water resources.

Inasmuch as many of the Job Corps enrollees are the disadvantged blacks who might be a problem source in the city slums, just consider how much more value they are to their country to be in the great outdoors being constructive instead of being confined to city slums and thinking only of destruction.

Very truly yours,

Thomas M. Anich.

Lewiston, Maine,
April 12, 1969.

The Honorable Gaylord Nelson,
Senate Subcommittee on EMP, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: Many thanks for your letter expressing your views to do something constructive about the Poverty Program, especially in reference to the closing of the Job Corps Centers in many areas.

The decision to close the nearby Poland Spring Center was an irrational afterthought. This type of decision-making is irresponsible, and loaded with politics. It is based on emotional judgment and unfounded fact.

The total poverty program is sound. It is the only positive way to aid the young unfortunate youngster that has indicated his willingness to get out of his environment and do something for himself. But if the present Administration is going to make hasty decisions such as the closing of this particular Center, this alone adds to the "failure and rejection" aspect that these youngsters have been subjected to in their formative years. All they get is rejection.

As to the cost . . . I froth with anger when I see billions spent on defense; on systems that "may not work"; on the immoral war in Vietnam. As a taxpayer, and a heavy one this year, I cannot justify paying my hard earned dollars for the kinds of defense spending that could be used toward helping our unfortunate citizens get a lease on life. The costs of Poverty versus the costs of defense . . . who are we kidding?

Thank you for asking my views. I shall be happy to come to Washington and testify that these Centers should be increased, not eliminated. That the effort to make these centers more productive be tried, rather than discarded. That more "good old American ingenuity" be used to think positively about these programs rather than drop them in the junk heap.

Senator Muskie is a dear friend. My qualifications, if needed, can be confirmed by a call to his office anytime. If I can be of further assistance by writing or phoning at my own expense, please call on me.

Thank you again.

Respectively,

LAWRENCE J. WARD.

CHATHAM, MASS.,
April 13, 1969.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is regarding Job Corps.

Please know that I am one who has great respect for our fine President. It is therefore hard to understand why a decision concerning a slum problem was made so quickly and without regard for individual Job Corps centers.

The center at Wellfleet, Mass., is considered one of the best in the country. It has a large group of volunteer workers—men and women of intelligence and love for the boys in the camp.

They are giving them more than reading lessons. They are lifting their morale—lifting their thinking and outlook toward more constructive learning—and we feel that much good is being accomplished.

We hope that the Wellfleet Center may remain.

I am enclosing an editorial from the Cape Cod Standard Times.

Yours very truly,

MRS. EDITH C. DEERING.

[From the Cape Cod Standard-Times]

IN OUR OPINION: WHY IS WELLFLEET PICKED TO CLOSE?

Why is the Wellfleet Job Corps Center being closed in the Nixon crackdown for economy's sake?

Why this particular center among the 59 centers to get the ax when it has admittedly been doing an excellent job and is well accepted in the area?

What were the criteria used in making the decision? And how does the administration justify closing a good camp when, as some Congressmen have pointed out, some bad ones out of 82 rural centers are being kept open?

These are only a few of the searching questions that the administration will face when the Job Corps program comes up for scrutiny in Congress soon. The decision to close the rural centers supposedly to save $100 million is bound to touch off a controversy in Congress. The plan now seems to be to establish new mini-training-centers for untrained youths in some 30 urban areas at a cost of about $30 million.

The Job Corps program has come under increasing fire in the last few months as some Congressmen grumbled at the comparatively high cost of maintaining a youth in a Center until he completed training and obtained a job. And some of the centers found it difficult to win community acceptance for the poverty-stricken youths from the cities who came to the rural areas. In some places, such conflicts developed that the centers had to be closed.

The Wellfleet center, however, had a different story to tell. Community acceptance was good with many area citizens volunteering to help and work with the Corpsmen. In fact, the Wellfleet Center could easily have been developed into a showcase for the program.

No one can question the goals and motivation behind the Jobs Corps program. It is a takeoff on the Civilian Conservation Corps program which was so successful during the depression years in the 1930s.

The idea is to take a youth who lacks skills and training to hold a job and to teach him good work habits, upgrade his educational background, and do this in a good wholesome environment away from the filth and danger and crime-ridden streets of the big cities.

Now, however, the administration is choosing this moment to dump thousands of these youngsters back on the streets just when a long, hot summer is in the offing. It seems like slamming the door of opportunity in their faces just when it had been opening up.

Certainly the administration must seek to cut the budget wherever it can. But it must realize, too, that there are human values to be considered.

The Job Corps may need pruning and cutting. But why start with Wellfleet, one of the better examples of the effort to save youths from a bleak life at a bare level of existence.

Our representatives in the Congress must give the cutback order the most searching examination. There's no point in closing Wellfleet while keeping worse camps open.

WELLFLEET, MASS.,
April 11, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: May I add my strong protest on the closing of the Wellfleet Job Corps. I have worked there, as a volunteer in the reading program, and as a member of the Community Relations Council. This center has had an excellent record of achievement, and has been of great help in many ways to the community. I have known, on a personal level, many of the Corpsmen, and am impressed at the progress they have made, in learning, and in being motivated to help themselves.

It is a gross breach of faith on the part of our government to recruit these young people with the promise of two years of education and training—and new entrants are still arriving here—and then summarily turn its back on them. And it is not intelligent to turn over 30,000 young people loose in our cities in June, angry, frustrated, and disillusioned. How to make instant radicals! And some of them literally have no place to go.

If we can spend billions in Vietnam—and even for ABMs—surely we can spend a few million to salvage young lives, well worth saving. How can *anyone* have faith in our government when it behaves in this fashion?

Sincerely,

HELEN J. STETSON.

NORTH EASTHAM, MASS.,
June 12, 1969.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Bldg.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: This letter is to urge you to do everything in your power to see that reconsideration is given to the closing of the Wellfleet Job Corps.

This Corps has been outstandingly successful. I have been a volunteer in the reading program from the start. It would be unforgivably shortsighted to allow the money that has been spent on this set-up to go for naught, to say nothing of allowing 100 boys to go back to their environment disillusioned and discouraged in June. You want Law and Order. Is this the way to get it?

May I count on you?

Very truly yours,

EVELYN DICKIE.

CLINTON, IOWA,
April 12, 1969.

GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NELSON: I understand that you are chairman of the Senate Committee responsible for review with the Department of Labor of the decision to close approximately half the Job Corps installations including the one at Clinton, Iowa. I don't know what the arguments are for this closing, I have heard it said that the Job Corps was not needed, that it was unsuccessful and that it was too expensive. None of these arguments make sense. All fail to take the reality of life in the United States today into consideration.

I am familiar only with this one installation. It's philosophy was to renew the lives of the young women who came here so that they might be useful, self-respecting citizens. These young women had been damaged and defeated by their environments. Within those environments they were unable to use what little opportunity came their way. Have you ever seen the hovels of DeRidder, Louisiana, Greenboro, Alabama, the reservation dwellings of Pine Ridge and Cheyene-Crossing, South Dakota, or the slum ghettos of Houston, Texas, and Little Rock, Arkansas? If you have, you don't need anyone to tell you why a change in environment is necessary if rehabilitation is to take place. Trade schools which attempt to teach a skill have failed again and again for a large number of the young who are reaching out for a second chance at the Job Corps centers. To say that the Job Corps, or some modification which aims at the objective of rehabilitation of persons, is not needed is to say that this nation can afford to continue with its wide distance between the hard core unemployed and the Senator in Washington. I do not believe democracy can survive under these circumstances, indeed I do not see our present situation in this nation as an example of successful democracy.

The argument of success is a strange one. Every one seems to set up their own criterion for success so I will join the parade. Compare the attrition rate at the Women's Job Corps installations with the attrition rates for women in colleges, universities, trade schools. There is no way to measure or compare the amount of change required of the girl entering college, etc., with the change required of the girl entering the Job Corps. But I have taught girls in professional schools for many years and I never saw one who could not sit at a table with white people and eat because the experience was just too strange. I have seen this with the girls at our Job Corps.

Cost? What can't a nation afford . . . even afford of waste . . . that affords the waste in the Pentagon (know, documented waste in relation to accepted goals). Why hasn't it been dismantled because of the waste? Or that swept-wing super-sonic plane? Why is there any question in a nation that cannot afford to rehabilitate it's young as to whether such a debacle should be repeated? Compare the cost of the Job Corps with what it will cost per girl to maintain them on welfare or in prison. And there is this question about the waste of what has gone into these stations for three years.

I trust you will give much agonizing thought before you recommend such a destructive move as to turn out young people who have accepted the opportunity to start again.

Sincerely yours,

ELAINE RUTH.

American Federation of Labor
and Congress of Industrial
Organization,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1969.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The proposed drastic cutback in the Job Corps is completely unjustified in view of the achievements of this program for so many of our disadvantaged young people.

The Job Corps concept—as a national program—is basically sound. It has provided useful work experience, a chance to get a basic education and an opportunity to live in a new and healthy environment for young people who come from the bleakest cultural and physical environments.

The Job Corps has, in effect, been a human reclamation program. It has taken thousands of young people off the streets, away from meaningless lives full of frustration and anger and has returned them to society as useful, productive citizens. Whatever its shortcomings, the positive results of this program speak for themselves.

We in the AFL–CIO have ample evidence of the great value of the Job Corps through the experience of several of our affiliated unions, several of whom have sponsored and operated Job Corps camps. We know that this program is reaching and helping young men and women from the poverty group. Through the Job Corps, these young people are becoming productive citizens employed at decent jobs with decent pay.

To take away this option for a better life that is now open to these disadvantaged young people would be a cruel blow directed at a group who have already known more than their share of failure and disappointment at the hands of the larger society.

We strongly urge that you withdraw your proposed cutback in the Job Corps so that it can continue to serve the disadvantaged youth of the country.

Sincerely,

George Meany,
President.

Nicolet Sportsman Club,
Wabeno, Wis., April 11, 1969.

Senator Gaylord Nelson,
Washington, D.C.

With splendid record of Blackwell Conservation Center urge you make every effort to keep in operation.

Harold Pichotta,
Treasurer.

New Brunswick, N.J.,
April 15, 1969.

Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

As the closest neighbor of the Kilmer Job Corps Center and a former critic but now an enthusiastic supporter because of the visible results, I would consider it a privilege to be allowed to testify before your committee as to why these centers should be retained. From a selfish standpoint, we would benefit from this closing but from a humanitarian viewpoint and for the good of the nation, the centers now in operation should not be closed. A GAO report does not take into consideration the most important factor—the human one.

Mrs. Henry Fleinche.

Madison, Wis.,
April 15, 1969.

Senator Gaylord Nelson,
Senate Chamber Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This is regarding the future of the Job Corps about which we are very concerned. As people who have worked with the strengths and weathered the struggles of Job Corps women in the residence extension program at the YWCA we want to tell you how valuable this program has been in influencing the lives of many young women we have seen the growth of self confidence, pride, and the ability to function independently on a job in the 25 women we have counselled over the past year and a half. We feel that success can be measured only on an individual level and we are therefore confident that the Job Corps has been successful.

If there is anything that can yet be done to salvage the Job Corps program we urge you, as voters of Wisconsin and as citizens concerned about the lives of underprivileged youngsters, to do all that you can.

Job Corps SYWCA Staff.

Globe, Ariz.,
April 14, 1969.

Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

San Carlos Job Corp Center in Arizona was 8th in efficiency out of 82 camps. There are 19 other camps to remain open that rank below San Carlos. I would like to protest against the possible closing of San Carlos Job Corps Center.

E. R. Bittner,
Mayor of Globe.

Portland Section, National
Council of Jewish Women,
Portland, Oreg., April 15, 1969.

Senator Gaylord Nelson,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Education and Labor, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We 650 Oregon women appalled at the heartless cut in Job Corps program. Who will help them achieve now with poverty in the midst of plenty? We urge you to restore this training program to help provide minimum standard of living for young people with no opportunity of success in their own communities. Will these men and women be supported in jails or by welfare funds? The American dream is for the poor too, if we help make it come true.

Mrs. Max Forse,
State Legislative Chairman.

New York, *April 13, 1969.*

Senator Gaylord Nelson.

Dear Sir: Knowing how the Job Corps operates, let me say it is one fine program. At this moment my observation has been at Blue Joy Marionville Penna. The teachers, have been devoted to this way of helping Boys, Read, Write, also learning a way to earn a living.

Please do all you can to keep this Job Corps, in operation. It is real worthy and worth any consideration you may further.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Wm. Wurtenburg.

Clinton, Iowa,
April 11, 1969.

Senator Gaylord Nelson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: Thank you for your recent letter.

We implore you to do everything in your power to prevent the tragic cutback in the Job Corps, which includes the shutdown of the Clinton Job Corps Center for Women, in operation for less than three years.

Nine hundred women, mostly of minority groups, will be forced back into a lifetime of poverty and ignominy, and the loss in human potential will be incalculable.

What has happened to our national values if we permit this arbitrary action by Secretary of Labor George Shultz? No consideration was given to the successes, which at Clinton are considerable—no visits were made. It is a purely political decision by the Republicans designed to take away from those least able to object: the poor, black, and uneducated.

That Center was making progress, real progress, toward overcoming those problems that may yet overtake our country.

Sincerely,

Jay Tinsman,
Linda Tinsman.

Globe, Ariz.,
April 12, 1969.

My name is Medardo Gonzales, 36 years of age, father of seven, American and New Mexican, by birth Spanish-American by descent, a veteran of the Korean conflict, Arizonian by chance, and a voter by choice.

As a concerned citizen and voter, I am writing to protest the closing of the 57 Job Corps Centers in general, and the San Carlos Job Corps Center in particular.

What is to become of the thousands of disadvantaged youths whose only hope for a niche in society lies in Job Corps? Can we, and must we, as human beings deny these young men and women, on whose shoulders the future of our country depends, the chance to become better and more useful citizens? Are we going to turn them out into the streets and ghettos with no hope of obtaining employment because we have denied them the right to learn and earn? Have we as a righteous nation ever denied the underprivileged of the world? Are we going to start now? We cannot and we must not let these young people down! Therefore, I am asking for your support in helping these young people. These are the future voters and citizens of this great nation!

Because of its unique Special Education program, San Carlos is one of the few, if not the only center, to offer a program of education designed to fit the needs of non-English corpsmen of Spanish descent. At the same time they are learning a skill so they may become employable. They are also learning the meaning of being a first-class citizen, and developing a feeling of pride in being bi-lingual. They are finding out that theirs is a dignified and respected culture and that they should not feel inferior because of language and cultural barriers. What more can we ask of Job Corps? What answer do you give the corpsmen who ask: "Will I be transferred to a center where I can continue learning English?"

Can you, as an influential and respected American, in good conscience condone this act? Or do you care?

Medardo Gonzales.

Ashland, Wis.,
April 11, 1969.

Senator Gaylord Nelson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Yesterday we went on a tour of the Clam Lake Job Corps Conservation Center. The Principal explained to us the lack of formal education, background of economic poverty, and sometimes trouble with the law that is typical of these boys. Then he took us on a tour of the buildings and we had dinner there. We met several of the corpsmen and found them very courteous; and we enjoyed their company.

Last night in the Ashland Daily Press there was an article on the front page announcing the closing of the Job Corps camp by July 1st. It does not seem right that the corpsmen should be sent home to the troubled situations that they came from. Although they may be doing well in Job Corps, if they are sent home before completing their training, it may all be in vain. Moreover, thousands of other similar youth in our nation desperately need the training opportunity which at this time only Job Corps seems to be providing.

We learned that many of the graduates from this program have found good jobs with the skills they learned there. But skills are not all that is gained in Job Corps. They learn responsibility in classes and on their jobs, and they learned to get along with the other fellows there.

In conclusion, we would like to say that it is our opinion that the Clam Lake Job Corps Center and all others across the nation should not be shut down, as they are of great value to the individual Corpsman as well as to the economy and welfare of the entire nation!

Most sincerely,
(All addresses, Lancaster, Wis.:)
Nancy Hall, Pam Martin, Ken Gelhaus, Pastor, Dennis Baillie, Thomas Henry, Warren Crews, Arthur Tobias, Valerie Crews, Mrs. Martha McLean, Lee Kirschbaum, Diane Stick, Sherry Meighan, Loyce Jerrett, Kathy Graney, Cheryl Saylor, Julie Baillie, Donna Ames, Ruth Anderson, and Jan Fedderly.

CLINTON, IOWA,
April 13, 1969.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NELSON: As Chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor, please do all you can to save the Clinton Job Corps Center. We do not care if the Department of Labor takes over from OEO. We can see where changes and improvements need to be made. And just maybe many, many of the Clinton citizens could help in making or suggesting such changes. Only come see for yourself the tremendous center you got going here, the quality of work done, the equipment, space, personnel poured into this center—and judge if this should all be given up after only 3 years. How can you tell if anything better can take it's place? You will still be working with people and government money—why not work at doing this better?

I am a registered Republican, a woman who benefits in no way economically from the Job Corps. But I see human potential every day in those girls. I with many other women, give volunteer help at the Center to counsel, have the girls in our homes, shop with them, take them on trips, try to be a home-away from home for them. Most of them do care and do not drop out. Please give us a chance. What can one of us do to help you and your committee to reconsider this plan?

Sincerely

FLORENCE DEMPSEY.

KINGMAN, ARIZ.,
April 14, 1969.

GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

These children in Job Corps have a chance to learn good discipline and become good citizens where otherwise would remain as underprivileged and a burden to their communities. Give them a chance.

MARY ANN FRANK.

MELLEN, WIS.,
April 10, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: Apparently the Nixon administration, in an effort to cut government spending at any cost, is contemplating the elimination of certain projects that have provided reasonable opportunities for underpriviledged Americans, while simultaneously aiding the economic structure of numerous American communities. Among these proposed cutbacks, as reported today, April 10, 1969, on radio station WATW, Ashland, is the possible closing down of certain Job Corps sites, including the camp nearest to our community, the Clam Lake Job Corps.

If the camp at Clam Lake is closed, then several of the citizens of Mellen and other areas will be out of work, the youths from proverty-stricken homes who abide at the local Job Corps will be deprived of a chance for self-improvement, the surrounding communities will lose several hundreds of thousands of dollars of annual commercial income, and the solid buildings and modern facilities of the camp will be vacated.

Although we appreciate Mr. Nixon's concern about the gigantic proportions of the annual U.S. budget, please, Mr. Nelson, do not allow the poor people of this nation to continue to suffer unnecessarily at the expense of preserving the "good record" of the present administration.

We appreciate your time and effort spent to remedy this situation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ANNABELLE POPE.
Mrs. HELEN KOIWISTO.

KINGMAN, ARIZ.,
April 14, 1969.

GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

I have noticed the good work that Job Corps is doing in Kingman and urge that the Job Corps be continued here.

BETH THOMSON.

KINGMAN, ARIZ.,
April 14, 1969.

GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

If our young men and women are to be self-sustained, we urge that Job Corps continue.

TERRY CROCKER.

KINGMAN, ARIZ.,
April 14, 1969.

GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Job Corps is doing a wonderful job in helping the underprivileged and urge you to continue this good work in Kingman.

GIL MILLIKEN.

MARION, ILL.,
April 12, 1969.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: We think the closing of Crab Orchard Job Corps Center would be a mistake. We feel it would have a tragic effect on this area. (Already a low income area.) Families will have to leave to find employment elsewhere.

Worst of all is what it would do to the boys. We know how much they have been helped. Each of us has the right to develop to our best potential. How can these boys do this without help and training? They have the right to become useful and dependable citizens. This they cannot do without proper help. If not trained and educated they will, for the rest of their lives, be problems and dependents for our government. Where better can they receive this training than at Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge, where already planned training is available and one is close to nature which reflects the love of God.

Some of these boys have attended our church and have been guests in our home, so we write from first hand information. Boys have been and can be helped here. We do not feel training can be done nearly as successfully in the ghetto area as in this location. Many projects of great help to the community have been planned and begun. To discontinue them would be a waste of both time and money. Again we say money is not the most important issue, but the lives of the boys.

Enclosed is a clipping from our newspaper which expresses the feelings of others in our area.

Thank you for your help in keeping Crab Orchard Job Corps Center open.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN T. BROWN.

OFFICIAL SAYS: CLOSING CRAB ORCHARD CENTER WOULD BE MISTAKE

The chairman of the Citizens Advisory Committee of the Crab Orchard Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center said today he thought the federal government would "definitely be making a mistake" to close the center.

"It has done a wonderful job for the boys," said Rue Starr Sr.

Reports are that the Nixon administration plans to close 57 centers, including Crab Orchard, in 30 states as part of a $100 million economy move.

Speaking of the Job Corps program as a whole, Starr said that "of 90,000 boys run through the Job Corps, about half are gainfully employed, are in school or in the service. When you balance that against $100 million, you don't have much."

"The people should do something to help save the Job Corps," said Starr.

Carbondale Mayor David Keene said there was nothing official on the Crab Orchard Center closing but that if it happened, "it would be a tragedy not only for this area but for the boys. I am going to do everything possible to keep them from closing it."

"Some schools are graduating students who can't read and write. The Job Corps is teaching these boys to read and write and without that in this day and age, you go on the scrap heap."

The Crab Orchard Center, with 101 boys, is located in the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge.

Assistant center director Clayton Bubb said he was told by the national office in Washington and the regional office in Minneapolis that there was nothing official on the closing of the Crab Orchard center, which is administered by the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of Interior.

He said the center had enjoyed excellent relations with nearby towns and had participated in several projects.

"I would hate to see it closed," said Arch Mehrhoff, manager of the Crab Orchard refuge, who handles some of the work assignments for the corpsmen.

"They have made a major contribution to improvements in camping and picnic areas and I have work scheduled for them for the next year," said Mehrhoff.

The center opened in June 1965.

CLINTON JOB CORPS CENTER,
Clinton, Iowa, April 10, 1969.

To: GAYLORD NELSON:

I am a Corpswoman at the Clinton Job Corps Center, Clinton, Iowa. I am writing to protest the closing of the Centers. Don't let them close the door of opportunity to us. Help us fight this unpatriotic move. We want to be responsible adults, so don't let them take our chance away.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

MIGUELINA ALVAREZ.

GLOBE, ARIZ.,
April 14, 1969.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We, the corpsmen of the San Carlos Job Corps conservation center in Globe, Ariz., wish to thank and to express our gratitude for your support in the future of Job Corps and our center. We do not understand why Mr. Shultz wants to close San Carlos when, 1. Only eight centers in the Nation operate at lower cost than ours. 2. Only seven centers in the Nation have corpsmen who have made faster reading (educational gains) than us. 3. Only eight centers graduated a higher percentage of corpsmen than ours. 4. Only 13 centers have a longer length of stay than ours (we are 7.1 now and many have completed a full two years). 5. We have fifty percent Spanish speaking corpsmen and 30-

45 do not speak English at all when they first arrive. San Carlos is one of the few centers in the national able to teach English as a second language. 6. No center in the Nation has enjoyed better community relations than San Carlos, it has always been excellent. 7. We have completed over a million dollars worth of recreation, conservation, and community development and we have learned to take pride in our work and training. We know you will do everything possible to make these facts known to Mr. Shultz.

CORPSMAN COUNCIL, SAN CARLOS CORPS CENTER.

GLOBE, ARIZ.,
April 14, 1969.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate Office,
Washington, D.C.:

Washington closing national 9th ranked San Carlos with bilingual program for non English Mexican Americans. Why?

CRUZ SALAS.

OIL IMPORTS, PROFITS, AND TAXES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to reply to some of the points made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) yesterday. To do so, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 15 minutes in the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise to provide further information for the Senate on the issue that the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) raised yesterday concerning the amount of foreign oil being permitted to enter the United States and the amount of taxes paid by the oil industry. On yesterday there was sharp disagreement between the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Louisiana.

I enjoyed the debate very much. One thing about being in this kind of debate with the Senator from Louisiana is that one does not have to worry about false senatorial courtesy. I think that is most wholesome and helpful. I hope that the Senator from Louisiana will continue to be as frank and as open today as he was yesterday.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, as far as I can determine, I breached no rules with regard to my good friend the Senator from Wisconsin. I admire the Senator. I am fond of him. I love him. My sentiments do not change even when I find him in error. However, loving him as I do, I feel it my duty from time to time to correct him when I find him falling into error.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I said that one does not have to worry about any false, I repeat, false, senatorial courtesy.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure the Senator is sincere in expressing his affection. It is reciprocated.

Mr. LONG. I thought it was appreciated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It certainly is, and I think that the Senator knows it.

Yesterday, the Senator indicated that about 25 percent of the domestic demand for petroleum was being filled by foreign oil. Quite frankly, I am unable to find any documents to support this estimate.

I have analyzed the figures published by the Oil Import Administration, which is directly responsible for the oil import program and I could not find a figure for foreign oil imports which came close to 25 percent.

Imports into districts one to four are limited to 12.2 percent of estimated domestic production. District five, the west coast, is treated differently, as the Senator from Louisiana rightly pointed out. Imports into district five equal the difference between the amount that can be produced domestically and the total demand in that district.

According to the Oil Import Administration, total demand for petroleum in 1968 was 12,837,000 barrels a day. This includes districts one to four and district five. Excluding residual oil, which is imported without limitation, we had a total demand of 11,114,000 barrels a day. Imports for 1968, including residual oil totaled 2,525,000 barrels a day. Imports excluding residual oil totaled 1,502,000 barrels a day.

Based on these figures, if we include residual oil which is imported without limitation because domestic refiners did not find it profitable enough to produce sufficient amounts, we arrive at imports for 1968 of 19.7 percent of domestic demand. However, this is not a realistic appraisal of the situation.

WITHOUT RESIDUAL OIL 13.5 PERCENT IMPORTED

Residual oil imports should be excluded from the total figures because domestic refiners could not or would not produce such a low profit item and, thus, it had to be decontrolled. Imports into the entire United States, districts one to five, excluding residual oil, totaled only 13.5 percent of domestic demand in 1968.

However, even this percentage of foreign oil imports is too high, if we are to view the oil import situation realistically. Assuming for the purposes of argument that the oil import program is really designed to protect our national security and is not designed merely as another price-support mechanism for the oil industry, we ought to exclude Canadian oil from the amount of imports. Canadian oil which enters our country by pipeline is more secure than the domestic oil being pumped from the wells offshore in many States including Louisiana. As the Senator from Louisiana has already indicated, these wells are very vulnerable to submarine attack, yet, no one says that production from these wells should be curtailed in the interests of national security.

WITHOUT RESIDUAL OR CANADIAN-ONLY 9 PERCENT IMPORTED

If we exclude Canadian oil coming into the United States by pipeline and residual oil, we find that we import less than 9 percent of our total domestic demand for oil. Even if we include residual imports, foreign oil only consists of 15.8 percent of our total demands. This is almost 10 percentage points or 40 percent less than the 25 percent mentioned by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator made the statement that we did not produce residual fuel oil. The reason we do not produce residual fuel oil is, the Senator stated, that it is a low-profit item. Is the Senator sure that is the reason that we do not do it?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is the principal reason.

Mr. LONG. Let me say to the Senator that the principal reason why we do not produce the residual fuel oil is that the U.S. oil is of a relatively light nature, a relatively high gravity. We can use all of the oil produced, and we make a lot of No. 2 fuel oil. It does not pollute the atmosphere. But it is cheaper to use residual and residual is commercially competitive with coal. However, if one is a producer of oil or coal, he is still competing for the fuel market.

When one brings in residual, insofar as it is used, it is burned over a boiler. They use it to generate power. When one uses the residual and burns it under a boiler, it results in either one of two things. It results either in the loss of a job to a coal miner or a man in the oilfield. However, in either event, the fuel oil competes with the No. 2 fuel oil.

Insofar as that is done, we have eliminated employment. However, if an oil producer were to look at the market, he would have to conclude that while it is true that he must compete with the coal people for the same purpose that residual oil was produced, that is part of the market that is being lost. That is part of the relatively uncontrolled imports.

I have figures from the U.S. Tariff Commission dealing with this matter. I ask unanimous consent that the tabulation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CRUDE OIL PRODUCTION AND FOREIGN OIL IMPORTS

[In thousands of barrels daily]

TABLE 1.—DISTRICTS I TO IV

	1967	1968
U.S. Crude oil production	7,737	7,878
Imports (controlled):		
Crude oil	769	964
Unfinished oil	64	60
Other products	128	192
Total	961	1,216
Imports (uncontrolled): Residual	1,065	1,133
Total imports	2,026	2,349
Aggregate U.S. production plus total imports	9,763	10,227
Controlled imports as percent of aggregate	9.84	11.89
Uncontrolled imports as percent of aggregate	10.91	11.08
Total imports as percent of aggregate	20.75	22.97

U.S. CRUDE OIL PRODUCTION AND FOREIGN IMPORTS—Continued

[In thousands of barrels daily]

TABLE 2.—DISTRICT V

	1967	1968
U.S. crude oil production	1,073	1,217
Imports (controlled):		
Crude oil	359	326
Unfinished oil	32	20
Other products	49	55
Total	440	401
Imports (uncontrolled): Residual	13	18
Total imports	453	419
Aggregate U.S. production plus total imports	1,526	1,636
Controlled imports as percent of aggregate	28.83	24.51
Uncontrolled imports as percent of aggregate	.85	1.10
Total imports as percent of aggregate	29.68	25.61

TABLE 3.—DISTRICTS I TO V

	1967	1968
U.S. crude oil production	8,810	9,095
Imports (controlled):		
Crude oil	1,128	1,290
Unfinished oil	96	80
Other products	177	247
Total	1,401	1,617
Imports (uncontrolled): Residual	1,078	1,151
Total imports	2,479	2,768
Aggregate U.S. production plus total imports	11,289	11,863
Controlled imports as percent of aggregate	12.41	13.63
Uncontrolled imports as percent of aggregate	9.55	9.70
Total imports as percent of aggregate	21.96	23.33

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in districts 1 through 4, controlled oil imports under the 12.2 were 9.84 in 1967 and 11.89 in 1968. They are up.

Then, the uncontrolled part was 10.9 percent in 1967 and 11.08 in 1968, for a total of 20.75 in districts 1 through 4. Total imports as a percent of the aggregate U.S. crude production plus imports were 22.77 in 1968.

In district 5, in 1967, the controlled imports were 28.83, and they were 24.51 in 1968. I assume that was larger because of Alaska coming in strongly in that area. The uncontrolled was 0.85 percent in 1967, and 1.1 in 1968, for a total of 29.68 in 1967, and 25.61 in 1968.

Now take the total for the entire United States. It works out this way: Controlled in 1967, 12.41; uncontrolled, 9.55. That makes a total of 21.96.

Take the next year, 1968: Controlled, 13.63; uncontrolled, 9.70. That makes a total of 23.33, which is getting pretty close to the 25 percent I mentioned yesterday.

The members of the staff of the Committee on Finance who compiled these figures and obtained this information for me and study these matters for the committee say the projection they have made this year is that it will be 25 percent, which is partly gone already. We try to estimate these things as best we can, and our projection is that this year it will be 25 percent of the market for oil.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I strongly disagree with a number of points made by the Senator from Louisiana.

In the first place, I am relying on the agency that has responsibility for the importation of oil, that issues licenses, and that should have the facts—the Oil Import Administration. The figures I read are the figures they gave.

In the second place, as I pointed out, and as the Senator made clear in his explanation of the technology of oil, the fact is that residual oil has been decontrolled. There are technological reasons for it as well as profit reasons. I think profit reasons are important, also. What I am talking about is the importation of oil from abroad that competes and has a really significant effect on the price of gasoline and the price of home heating oil.

I am sure there is some degree of overlapping and competition between residual oil from abroad and No. 2 oil here, but not much. Residual, by and large, is used by big industry and some large apartments, but the home heating oil is the principle oil used in home heating.

Further, Mr. President, when we consider the Canadian import, the fact is that competing oil import adverse to our national defense is a modest percentage; as I have said, approximately 9 percent.

Mr. President, to proceed, I should like to clear up some other misconceptions on the part of the Senator from Louisiana.

END OF OIL IMPORT PROGRAM WOULD LOWER OIL PRICES

The Senator indicated that, once the American markets were opened to foreign crude oil, prices would rise above the $1.75 mid-Eastern price because we would become dependent upon that oil. I find it hard to accept that argument. It assumes that the OPEC—Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries—countries could control the total amount of oil produced. The OPEC has tried twice already to control the amount of oil produced by its member countries, but has failed because there is too much excess oil in the world markets. Should the market for that oil become larger by opening up the U.S. market to such oil, competition might drive the price down even more. I do not think it necessarily would, but it might; and this was the testimony of some of the witnesses before the Hart subcommittee.

The incremental cost of producing more oil from existing pools is minimal. I cannot believe that these countries of such diverse backgrounds could band together, trusting each other only to produce a certain amount of oil. More likely is that these countries might cut their prices in an attempt to gain a larger share of the market and thus the world price of oil could conceivably continue to go down.

I might add, as I have indicated, that this was the unanimous conclusion of the economists who testified before Senator HART's Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly.

As I have said, I think these witnesses could be wrong. I have taken a more moderate position. But, certainly, the end of the Oil Import Act, which I do not call for, the modification of it, would have the effect of driving down the prices to the consumer in this country, and driving them down sharply.

OIL IMPORT PROGRAM DESIGNED TO INCREASE PRICES

I think that the basis for the oil import program was very eloquently stated in two editorials in the New York Journal of Commerce. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like, however, to point out two paragraphs which summarize the oil import program's true purpose. Remember, this is the New York Journal of Commerce speaking, not the Senator from Wisconsin:

> In no instance . . . has the contradiction between the government's anti-inflation and protectionist policies been more flagrantly exposed than in the oil import quotas which continue to penalize many users for the benefit of a relatively few producers.
>
> It is high time this whole mock and dumbshow was abandoned, and if not in the interests of the national welfare, then at least in the interests of national credibility. National security is not now, never was, and never could be a valid excuse for this travesty. Not unless one is willing to accept the explanation that an armed hold-up was committed because the aggressor felt he needed more money and to exonerate him.

Now, this is not the position of the Senator from Wisconsin. I take a more moderate position. This is the position taken by the Journal of Commerce.

I think one can make a case for limiting oil imports for national defense reasons, but I think the present program leaves out of account the Canadian oil available to us, which is much more available than some oil offshore.

It leaves out of account the difference in the Venezuelan oil available to us. It is true that is not as easily available as continental oil, but it is far more accessible than mid-Eastern oil. It leaves out of account the experience we had in World War II, when we were able to greatly diminish the amount of oil consumed domestically by gas rationing, and we can do that again. It leaves out of account the fact that we now live in a nuclear age and the prospects that any war that could cut off oil from this country for any period of time would have to be a confrontation between a nuclear power, probably Russia, and this country. Such a war would not last a matter of months or weeks. It would be over in a matter of hours or days.

Furthermore, it leaves out of account that by not using as much foreign oil, we do use up our own limited resources more rapidly; and this could diminish rather than increase our ability to defend ourselves by diminishing this valuable and limited resource.

Mr. President, on the basis of this, I would not cut off the oil import program. I think that before we act on it, we should wait for the report of the Shultz committee, which is now studying the oil import program. Secretary Shultz has been appointed by President Nixon to study and report on the national defense justification of the oil import program.

I think, also, we should give real consideration to the possibilities of oil shale, which some people tell us is worth trillions of dollars and could supply enormous oil reserves, far more than we could need for many years. It is true that we need a technological breakthrough. Some people point out that by spending $1 billion or less, which is far less than the oil import program costs us in a year, we could make real progress in making this resource available. So the national defense justification for the oil import program is very vulnerable indeed.

In summary, then, the oil import program's surest purpose is to enable the oil industry to continue to fix prices.

Professor Steel undercut the economic rationale of the program when he pointed out that even if prices for domestic oil dropped to $2 a barrel—one estimate of the price of middle eastern crude oil delivered to the United States—95 percent of our domestic production would still be economical.

If I may paraphrase him, we are spending between $2 billion and $7 billion a year to keep 5 percent of our wells in production, and that depends on which source one takes. The Department of Interior reports that oil imports are costing us $2 billion. The figure from the chief economist of the Hart committee, John Blaine, is $7 billion. My estimate is that it is somewhere in between. Regardless, it is costing billions of dollars a year to keep just 5 percent of our wells in production. Many people feel that does not make sense. In fact, most people who are not connected with the oil industry do not think it makes sense.

OIL TAXES LOW—PROFITS HIGH

The Senator from Louisiana made mention of the profits of the oil companies and the taxes that they paid. He indicated that they paid a much higher rate than appears from merely quoting the Federal income tax paid.

First, let me deal with oil company profits. I ask unanimous consent that report on oil company profits for 1968 from the Oil Daily be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks as yesterday's Wall Street Journal article which indicates that Standard Oil of Indiana expects record high profits for the coming year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. As these reports show, the oil industry is a very healthy one indeed. Fourteen Senators, in a letter to the Attorney General, pointed out "that in 1968 the combined net profits of the 12 largest U.S. oil companies was just a fraction under $5 billion. Each of those 12 companies, moreover, has set new profit records in each of the last 4 years. Just 4 years ago, the profits of these 12 companies totaled $3.7 billion. During that short span of time, they have, thus, increased their profits by just under $1.3 billion—a 33.5-percent increase." I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is not a poverty-stricken industry. Now, let us move on to the claim that the oil industry pays more than its share of taxes. I ask unanimous consent that the tax table published in U.S. Oil Week of the Federal taxes of the largest refiners be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. The figures are very interesting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the usual Federal corporate income tax is 22 percent on earnings of up to $25,000 and 48 percent on earnings over $25,000. The figures published by U.S. Oil Week show that the average income tax paid by the large oil companies in 1967 was 8.8 percent, although they earned over $7.25 billion. The figures are even more enlightening when we get down to specific companies. Atlantic Richfield which earned over $410 million in the past 5 years paid not 1 red cent in Federal income tax. Texaco which led the recent price increase in order to get a larger depletion allowance and, thus, cut its taxes still further paid on 1.9 percent of its income in Federal income taxes in 1967.

Don Bartlett of the Cleveland Plain Dealer who is one of the best investigative reporters in the business has looked into the amount of taxes paid by the oil companies. I ask unanimous consent that two of his articles on this subject be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objction, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, why do the oil companies pay so little in Federal taxes? The reason is simple. They are the beneficiary of more tax loopholes than any other industry. They have the oil-depletion loophole which bears no relation at all to actual capital investment and has allowed oil companies to recover the cost of drilling their wells 19 times over. They write off against ordinary income about 90 percent of the intangible drilling and development costs. In any other business they would have to capitalize these expenses. They are entitled to carved out production payments which enables the oil companies to avoid even more taxes by shifting income from year to year as needed. There are more loopholes such as the 14-point Western Hemisphere allowance, but rather than spend time now explaining them all I commend Don Bartlett's article for a description of them.

All these tax breaks are said to be designed to encourage domestic exploration and development. Yet, the Treasury Department-commissioned study found that for every $1 of discovered reserve over $10 in tax revenue was lost because of the depletion allowance alone. This does not take into consideration the revenue loss due to expensing and other tax loopholes. And it does not include, as I pointed out in my analysis of the costs of the oil import program that the program costs the American economy about $2.1 billion more each year than the oil industry is spending on domestic exploration.

My distinguished colleague, Representative Wright Patman, of Texas, estimated that 40 percent of depletion was taken for foreign drilling. If national security is, indeed, the reason for all these gigantic tax breaks, why should we allow foreign depletion allowances? Additionally, why should we allow oil companies to write off disguised royalty payments to foreign countries, such as Saudi Arabia, dollar for dollar against U.S. taxes owed? This is the "golden gimmick." In effect, it forces the American taxpayer to bear 50 percent of the cost of foreign taxes paid to these countries. It does not make sense in either economic terms or in terms of our national security.

The Senator from Louisiana and others say that the oil companies pay a higher rate of taxes than is shown by the Federal income taxes they do or do not pay. This is true. But then, so do other industries. Even if we take into account foreign and State taxes, the oil companies do not pay as high a percentage of their revenue in total taxes as small businesses earning less than $25,000 a year pay in just Federal income taxes. And, of course, they paid much less than most other big businesses. In 1967, the oil companies paid only 21.9 percent of their income in Federal, foreign, and most State taxes—including severance taxes. And that was the highest percentage it has paid in years.

This excludes local taxes—property taxes—but all industries pay property taxes. I have never seen an instance where the oil industry had to pay higher property taxes in relation to the value of their property than other industries. Indeed such a tax would be of questionable constitutionality. It is true that I exclude the excise tax involved when we drive into a filling station and tell the operator, "Fill her up." My assumption is that those taxes are paid by the consumer. In the debate yesterday, I felt that the Senator from Louisiana realized that was a tax with a different impact than income tax, where the effect is on the stockholder, than the excise tax which is shifted to the consumer.

I must conclude, as did almost all the academic witnesses before Senator Hart's committee, that the oil companies are the beneficiaries of gigantic but undeserved Government favors. The Government enables them to fix prices through the oil import program and the market proration systems. The Government allows them to escape paying their fair share of the taxes we all must bear.

Finally, the Government provides all sorts of free services for the oil companies, such as statistical, geological work, and the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, which effectively exempt the oil industry from antitrust action.

I am delighted to yield to my good friend from Louisiana who has been very patient. There is no question that he is extremely competent in this area. He knows it thoroughly. I may say one more thing. If anybody can do a good job with a weak case, it is the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. He pointed out yesterday that he knew much more about this matter than I, and he may be right. However, allowing for his rhetorical superiority, if anyone would just look at the merits of the debate that emerged from the little discussion had

yesterday, he would have to come to the conclusion that the oil industry is getting away with murder.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial, Apr. 4, 1969]

NOT THROUGH THE NOSE, PLEASE

The morality of pricing in the United States is a subject that has never failed to intrigue us. Actually—if this land were as purely a capitalistic society as Russian school children are taught to believe it is—that phrase would be meaningless. If the demand for particular goods or services were outrunning the supply, their prices would rise. If the demand was short, they would fall. Morality would not be involved. That was what we were all taught in freshman economics.

But despite living in a country saddled with a Puritan heritage we were not taught (in the years the editors went to school) that notwithstanding whatever play the free markets were supposed to exert, some prices were "moral" and some weren't. Some price increases outraged Congress while some decreases outraged it even more. Only as we grew older did we discover that while high prices on some items were "good," on others they were definitely "bad." Only from reading the papers, or better still, the Congressional Record, did we learn that these appelations had less to do with the market than with a sense of morality ambiguously defined.

For example, high coffee or cocoa prices were "bad" because these items were produced abroad, and the cost of them upset that most sacred of all creatures, (so we thought), the American housewife. But high prices on onions, Maine potatoes, meat, grains, butter, almost all other domestically-grown foodstuffs, securities, motorcycles and the like were "good" because, the American housewife notwithstanding, they served the interests of other Americans almost as sacred as an American housewife if not more so.

So when the price of onions futures declined to a certain point, Congress banned any further such trading, apparently forgetting the American housewife altogether. The idea, which failed dismally, was to keep onion prices up. Then various administrations, faced with price increases in steel, aluminum or the like went into action to keep other prices down, gaining public approbation thereby but not much else.

All this would be relatively simple if it could all be boiled down to a formula that might be stated in these terms: If the item in question is produced here and consumed here, the nation need not be concerned about the American housewife. If, on the other hand, it is produced exclusively abroad but consumed here, the housewife must be protected no matter what the cost to what otherwise might be national policy.

All well and good. But what about items that are produced both here and abroad? Who then becomes the sacred cow? Well, in the case of crude oil it ought to be obvious. Refiners in Montreal were able to produce gasoline at $1.26 less per barrel than the price in Boston. The price of heating oil in Montreal is less by $1.68 per barrel than that in Boston.

Now considering the fact that much of the crude oil passing through the Montreal refineries comes from the Middle East, why should this be? Is the distance from the producing areas to the refineries so much shorter? Far from it. Much of the oil going to Montreal is brought there via a pipeline from Portland, Maine. In other words, it passes right through the high-price area without stopping, and cannot be distributed within this area. Canadians may get their oil at much lower prices, but not the citizens (including the semi-sacred housewives) of the Northeast. Why?

The answer must by now be drearily familiar. Every resource that oil producers in the Southwest, plus all the votes they can command in Congress, is concentrated on preventing anyone in the Northeast from using Middle Eastern oil imported via a point very close to Portland at prices even approximating those current in East Canada.

In no instance known to us has the contradiction between the government's anti-inflation and protectionist policies been more flagrantly exposed than in the oil import quotas which continue to penalize many users for the benefit of a relatively few producers.

It is high time this whole mock and dumbshow was abandoned, and if not in the interests of the national welfare, then at least in the interests of national credibility. National security is not now, never was, and never could be a valid excuse for this travesty. Not unless one is willing to accept the explanation that armed hold-up was committed because the aggressor felt he needed more money and to exonerate him.

Now some may feel we have borne down much too hard on this issue. They may feel that the oil import quota system was actually introduced as a national defense measure, not as an out-and-out protectionist device to reward the few at the expense of the many.

If this is the case, and if these people really do believe the national security is at stake: if they really believe that notwithstanding the new strikes on the North Slope of Alaska, in Canada and elsewhere nearby, this country is virtually lost without continued drilling in the Southwest, why not try to reach a sensible solution?

Why not adopt one suggestion now before Congress? Why not let Washington buy up all new domestic sources at the point discovered, which is the cheapest way of storing oil reserves? We have our doubts about this, too. Still and all, everyone would then know where the subsidy was going and who was getting it. And then everyone could judge the validity of the TVE claim for protection and decide it on its merits. If anyone had to pay, all Americans would pay—not just a selected geographical list of them and not through the nose.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Mar. 26, 1969]

OIL VIA THE ENTREPOTS

To read some of the recent denunciations of Occidental Petroleum's proposals for a refinery in a foreign trade zone which may or may not be created in Machiasport, Me., one might think that the idea is as nefarious as any that has come down the pike in many years.

If the zone is created, it is said, and if the company establishes a 300,000-barrel-per-day refinery, it can draw crude oil from Libya, refine it, then "export" half or more of the refined products into adjacent New England consuming centers, thereby foiling the government's oil import quotas, forcing reduction in the high delivered costs of New England's fuel oil and otherwise trampling on settled federal policies.

This sounds like great stuff for people who don't know what foreign trade zones are, who figure that the wealth of independent oil producers somehow transduces every other aspect of the national welfare and who are convinced that some kind of plot must be involved in any effort to protect shivering New Englanders from whatever may result from the subsidized efforts of Texas and Oklahoma wildcatters to find some more oil for the Northeasterners who neither need oil from these sources nor want it.

What is needed in the Northeast is a constant source of residual oil that is reasonably competitive in price. By "reasonably competitive" we don't mean to accept the price standards set by the oil independents in the Southwest. We mean by standards relative to the cost of oil brought in from elsewhere; and elsewhere can mean from anywhere, the editors not being among those who feel religiously that this area of the United States somehow owes a lucrative living to those who, having already the advantage of a 27½ per cent depletion allowance, somehow figure the nation owes them more.

Now, is it that to which the whole Machiasport proposal adds up? It adds up only to a practice in vogue for hundreds of years in Europe and for over 30 years in the United States.

What is officially called the "foreign trade zone" in this country is, in Europe, the free port or entrepot, which has been in usage there for six centuries. It involves a concept that does not try to get around rigid trade barriers as much as it does to minimize the impact of these barriers as between raw materials and processed (or semi-processed) goods.

Raw materials brought into a European free port or an American foreign trade zone are not subject to the usual customs levies. But when they come out again in processed form the story is different. If they are sent abroad in that form, no duty is paid here. If they are sent into the United States markets, the duty paid is the same as the duty due if the same products had been imported in that precise form from overseas.

What is the loss incurred by the United States in terms of customs revenue? The answer is indicated by the figures for fiscal 1967—the latest available for this type of operation. In that year, imports into U.S. foreign trade zones amounted to $86 million in value. Shipments into U.S. customs territory plus foreign ports totaled $89 million which, if you ask us, was pretty small potatoes.

Since the United States finally allowed foreign trade zones in 1937, some 13 zones (or sub-zones) have been authorized. Several originally established have since been abandoned, but among those remaining most in this country provide for processing, and by some reputable companies, too.

These include such firms as Dow Chemical and Union Carbide. Business activities within the zones embrace such items as machinery, pharmaceutical and soft drink production (New York), batteries (New Orleans), conversion of foreign-built trucks into campers (Seattle), the manufacture of women's clothes (San Francisco); power tools (Mayaguez, P.R.), petrochemicals (Penuelas, P.R.), and telephone cables (Honolulu), with three more petrochemicals operations slated for Bay City, Mich. and possibly another at Bayway, N.J., where Humble Oil is reported considering an installation.

So the Machiasport project is not unique—even in terms of the oil quotas. With the single exception of Union Carbide's authorization to import 40,000 barrels of crude per day into Pinelas, all petrochemicals projects, including that at Taft, La., are being held up pending the Nixon Administration's study of oil import quotas.

Privately it is being said that implementation of Occidental Petroleum's Machiasport project would blast so large a hole through the oil import quotas that it would effectively demolish the entire structure. This is being advanced as a prime argument against the project, on one hand, and in support of it on the other. We stand with the latter. The program was never anything more than a crude device for the escalation of domestic oil prices for the benefit of the few and at the expense of consumers. We would be glad to see it go. If the Machiasport or any other similar project hastens the day when it does collapse, so much the better for it.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Oil Daily, Feb. 3, 1969]

EARNINGS REPORTS

	1968 net	Percent change
American Petrofina	$16,280,600	+16.1
Atlanta Richfield	148,861,000	+14.5
Cities Service	121,000,000	+5.3
Continental Oil	150,000,000	+10.2
Creole Petroleum	239,700,000	+11.1
Diamond Shamrock	34,615,000	−18.1
Getty Oil	98,000,000	−17.1
Gulf Oil	626,000,000	+10.2
Hess Oil & Chemical	28,000,000	+40.0
Imperial Oil	100,000,000	+ 5.3
Marathon Oil	83,326,000	+12.8
Midwest Oil	$13,500,000	+5.1
Mobil Oil	428,000,000	+11.1
Murphy Oil	8,200,000	−.2
Phillips Petroleum	136,800,000	−16.6
Shell Oil	312,100,000	+9.6
Sinclair Oil	76,800,000	−19.5
Skelly Cil	40,269,000	−4.2
Standard (Calif.)	451,800,000	+10.4
Standard (Ind.)	309,400,000	+9.6
Standard (N.J.)	1,275,000,000	+10.4
Standard (Ohio)	70,000,000	+4.3
Sun Oil	164,400,000	+5.3
Texaco Inc	835,530,000	+10.8
Union (Calif.)	151,200,000	+4.3

1968 EARNINGS REPORTS; COMPARISONS

	1968 net	1967 net	Percent change	1966 net	1965 net	1964 net
American Petrofina	$16,280,600	$14,028,100	+16.1	$10,662,689	$4,614,000	$1,551,000
Atlantic Richfield	148,861,000	130,861,000	+14.5	113,484,000	90,111,000	47,076,000
Cities Service Co	121,000,000	127,800,000	+5.3	120,100,000	100,500,000	84,513,000
Continental Oil Co	150,000,000	136,100,000	+10.2	115,700,000	96,200,000	100,100,000
Creole Petroleum	239,700,000	215,800,000	+11.1	207,900,000	220,628,000	227,657,000
Diamond Shamrock Oil & Gas	34,615,000	42,245,000	−18.1	34,369,000		
Getty Oil Co	98,000,000	118,166,000	−17.1	98,038,000	11,765,000	13,729,000
Gulf Oil Corp	626,000,000	568,000,000	+10.2	505,000,000	427,000,000	395,000,000
Hess Oil & Chemical	28,000,000	20,000,000	+40.0	15,500,000	13,000,000	11,700,000
Imperial Oil, Ltd	100,000,000	95,000,000	+5.3	92,000,000	86,000,000	79,072,000
Marathon Oil	83,326,000	73,858,000	+12.8	68,826,000	60,071,000	60,376,000
Midwest Oil Corp	13,500,000	12,847,000	+5.1	11,280,000	10,901,000	10,821,101
Mobil Oil	428,000,000	385,400,000	+11.1	356,100,000	320,100,000	294,200,000
Murphy Oil Corp	8,200,000	8,218,000	−.2	8,431,000	6,373,000	4,253,824
Phillips Petroleum Co	136,800,000	164,000,000	−16.6	144,500,000	127,700,000	115,018,000
Shell Oil Co	312,100,000	284,800,000	+9.6	255,200,000	234,000,000	198,200,000
Sinclair Oil Corp	76,800,000	95,400,000	−19.5	93,800,000	76,700,000	58,700,000
Skelly Oil Co	40,269,000	42,016,000	−4.2	36,962,000	33,996,000	25,551,000
Standard (California)	451,800,000	409,400,000	+10.4	401,243,000	391,000,000	345,000,000
Standard (Indiana)	309,400,000	282,200,000	+9.6	255,900,000	219,300,000	194,851,000
Standard (New Jersey)	1,275,000,000	1,155,000,000	+10.4	1,090,000,000	1,035,675,000	1,050,000,000
Standard (Ohio)	70,000,000	67,100,000	+4.3	56,936,000	49,711,675	43,767,777
Sun Oil Co	164,400,000	156,100,000	+5.3	100,574,000	85,520,000	68,507,000
Texaco, Inc	835,530,000	754,386,000	+10.8	692,066,000	636,698,153	577,361,048
Union Oil (California)	151,200,000	145,000,000	+4.3	134,200,000	119,200,000	98,600,000

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 14, 1969]

INDIANA STANDARD EXPECTS 1969 PROFIT TO SET NEW HIGH—NATURAL GAS DISCOVERED ON ALASKA'S NORTH SLOPE BY PAN AM PETROLEUM UNIT—MIDDLE EAST OUTPUT TO RISE

NEW YORK.—Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) predicted record net income for 1969 and reported it has discovered natural gas on Alaska's North Slope.

In forecasting a new earnings high, John E. Swearingen, chairman, wasn't specific, but he told the New York Society of Security Analysts "we expect to meet our objectives" this year. He noted that Indiana Standard's earnings have risen an average of 11% annually the last five years, and said that the company has a goal of an 8% to 10% annual growth rate in net income.

In 1968, the big oil company reported a 10.2% rise in net income to $309.5 million, or $4.37 a share, on revenue of nearly $4 billion.

Pan American Petroleum Corp., wholly owned producing subsidiary of Indiana Standard, reported in Tulsa that its Kavik No. 1 well, about 60 miles southeast of Alaska's Prudhoe Bay in the Arctic, has tested natural gas at rates from 3.5 million to 12.5 million cubic feet daily, through various openings.

Atlantic Richfield Co. and Humble Oil & Refining Co., chief subsidiary of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), announced last summer two discovery wells in the Prudhoe Bay area that may prove to have found the largest oil field in North America. British Petroleum Co. also has announced discovery of oil at Prudhoe Bay. But since that time all producers had been declining to announce results or data on North Slope wells until the Pan American announcement.

Indiana Standard had admitted the Kavik No. 1 well sustained a "blow out" on March 17, but had declined to speculate on the meaning of that blowout. A blowout is generally considered to be an uncontrolled release of gas or oil pressure.

OTHER NORTH SLOPE DISCOVERIES

Atlantic Richfield holds a 50% interest in Pan American's Kavik No. 1 and in about 16,000 acres of leases surrounding the well. The well currently is at about 4,300 feet and has a projected depth of 10,000 feet, Pan American said. In New York, Mr. Swearingen declined to add any comment to the Pan American announcement.

Problems of transporting natural gas from the Arctic raise questions about the economic feasibility of a gas discovery there. However, a gas discovery can sometimes indicate oil will be found at a greater depth.

Mr. Swearingen also told analysts of plans to substantially increase Indiana Standard's Middle East oil production. And he noted, "While the foreign profit contribution was modest last year we expect considerable gains in the future from foreign sources." Entering the black for the first time in 1968, the company's earnings outside North America totaled $27.6 million. Indiana Standard began foreign operations about 10 years ago.

BOOST IN PRODUCTION

Gross oil production from the El Morgan field offshore from Egypt in the Gulf of Suez is expected to reach 300,000 barrels a day this year, Mr. Swearingen said. Last year gross production there averaged 180,000 barrels daily, of which Indiana Standard's share was 59,000 barrels daily. Egypt's government-owned oil agency holds the remaining interest in the field.

Indiana Standard plans to place in production next year its third oil field in the Persian Gulf of Iran, he said. The Fereidoon field is expected to initially have a gross production rate of 100,000 barrels daily, he said. That's nearly equal to gross output of 102,400 barrels daily last year from the company's other two Persian Gulf fields, of which Indiana Standard's share was 51,000 barrels a day.

Mr. Swearingen said that the group of which Indiana Standard is a member has completed 20 gas wells in the Leman Bank field offshore from Britain in the North Sea and is installing a production platform in the Indefatigable field. Indiana Standard will have about a 31% share of scheduled output from the two fields of 800 million cubic feet a day by the group, he added.

"With our chemical business firmly established, and with foreign (oil) operations in the profit column, we now are in position to consider moving into new areas," Mr. Swearingen stated. But he noted the company has deferred proposed merger with Cerro Corp., large copper and silver mining concern, to "permit additional evaluation of political developments in Peru." He declined to add to that statement when asked to outline what conditions would have to prevail in Peru for the merger to be completed.

EXHIBIT 3

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: We are writing to express our deep concern about the recent price increases in gasoline and crude oil. As you are perhaps aware, Texaco raised its wholesale price for gasoline 6/10 of a cent a gallon on February 24. Within 7 days, 13 other major oil companies followed, each raising their wholesale gasoline prices by either 6/10 or 7/10 cents a gallon.

Because of the stringent laws against price fixing, we think that the fact that all these oil companies raised their prices by almost the same amount at the same time merits close consideration. This is particularly true because gasoline prices were raised at a time of the year when consumption is relatively low and prices are traditionally at their lowest ebb.

We are especially concerned because gasoline price rises affect practically every consumer in the country. They have no choice; they must buy gasoline.

Such a price increase affecting a commodity so widely used in our economy has a devastating inflationary impact. Paul W. McCracken, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, in a letter to Senator Proxmire, just confirmed former Chairman Arthur M. Okun's estimate that the 1c a gallon increase in the retail price of gasoline will cost the consumers $800,000,000 a year.

This action by the oil companies comes at a time when the greatest single economic problem facing our nation is inflation, and at a time when virtually all of the major oil companies have earned record high profits.

You may be interested to know that in 1968 the combined net profits of the 12 largest U.S. oil companies was just a fraction under $5 billion. Each of those 12 companies, moreover, has set new profit records in each of the last 4 years. Just 4 years ago, the profits of these 12 companies totalled $3.7 billion. During that short span of time, they have, thus, increased their profits by just under $1.3 billion—a 33.5% increase.

These figures speak for themselves. Now, no matter what the apologists for the industry might say, this is certainly no time to try to fatten profits still more by an irresponsible price rise. It is important to note in this connection that the inflationary impact of an oil price rise is much larger than a price rise by any other industry. Almost none of the price increase comes back to the Federal Government in taxes. This is true because of the privileged tax treatment received by oil companies. In 1967, for example, Texaco, the instigator of this latest price rise, paid federal income taxes of only 1.9% of its net income.

The Senators whose names are listed above have, for some time now, been concerned with the combined effect of oil import restrictions and oil industry supply and pricing decisions on independent wholesalers, retailers, and consumers, particularly in the Northeast.

You may recall that we wrote to the Department of Justice on September 27, 1968 voicing our concern about price increases both in the cost of gasoline and home heating oil. In light of the facts outlined in that letter, and the circumstances surrounding the most recent price increases in an area of such enormous impact on consumers, small businessmen and the national economy in general, we urgently recommend that the Department of Justice immediately undertake an investigation to ascertain whether these price rises have been coincidental or collusive and whether they constitute part of any long-range pattern of collusive or predatory practices.

WILLIAM PROXMIRE, ALBERT GORE, THOMAS J. DODD, VANCE HARTKE, FRANK E. MOSS, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, STEPHEN M. YOUNG, CLAIBORNE PELL, EDWARD M. KENNEDY, THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, GAYLORD NELSON, JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, EDWARD W. BROOKE, and EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

EXHIBIT 4.—FEDERAL TAXES OF LARGEST REFINERS

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Net income after tax	Federal tax	Percent	Foreign, some States' tax	Percent	Profit after tax
Standard (New Jersey):						
1962	$1,271,903	$8,000	0.6	$423,000	33	$840,903
1963	1,584,469	69,000	4.3	496,000	31	1,019,469
1964	1,628,555	29,000	1.7	549,000	33	1,050,555
1965	1,679,675	82,000	4.9	562,000	33	1,035,675
1966	1,830,944	116,000	6.3	624,000	34	1,090,944
1967	2,098,283	166,000	7.9	700,000	33	1,232,283
Gulf:						
1962	488,351	19,389	3.9	128,871	26	340,091
1963	540,065	30,870	5.7	137,842	25	371,353
1964	607,343	52,443	8.6	159,782	26	395,118
1965	655,727	53,559	8.1	174,935	26	427,233
1966	813,868	90,008	11.0	219,098	26.9	504,762
1967	955,968	74,142	7.8	303,539	31.8	578,287
Texaco:						
1962	546,371	13,000	2.3	51,700	9	481,671
1963	615,768	10,250	1.6	58,850	12	455,668
1964	660,761	5,500	.8	77,900	11	577,361
1965	726,198	10,000	1.3	79,500	11	636,698
1966	845,466	32,500	3.8	103,100	12	709,866
1967	892,986	17,500	1.9	121,100	13.5	754,386
Mobile:						
1962	379,339	8,300	2.1	128,700	33	242,339
1963	437,352	23,000	5.2	142,500	32	271,852
1964	464,660	27,700	5.9	142,800	30	294,160
1965	508,016	33,900	6.6	154,000	30	320,116
1966	555,412	23,200	4.4	176,100	31.7	356,112
1967	594,593	26,900	4.5	182,300	30.7	385,393
Standard (California):						
1962	348,181	5,800	1.6	28,600	8	313,781
1963	356,568	2,900	.8	31,600	8	322,068
1964	393,188	8,300	2.1	39,600	10	345,288
1965	455,425	9,000	1.9	55,200	12	391,225
1966	515,118	29,800	5.7	61,300	11.9	424,018
1967	513,067	6,000	1.2	85,400	16.6	421,667
Standard (Indiana):						
1962	168,843	3,105	1.8	3,381	2	162,420
1963	208,022	22,182	10.6	2,748	1	183,092
1964	204,817	8,486	4.1	1,480	.7	194,851
1965	263,098	39,578	15.0	4,248	2	219,272
1966	300,531			49,672		255,869
1967	366,847	74,021	20.2	10,576	2.9	282,250
Shell:						
1962	173,555	7,200	4.1	8,680	5	157,675
1963	211,575	19,100	9.0	12,623	5	179,852
1964	213,575	2,800	1.3	12,585	5	198,190
1965	274,507	26,600	9.6	13,876	5	234,031
1966	313,085	46,100	14.7	11,785	3.7	255,200
1967	342,022	44,940	13.1	12,233	3.6	284,849
Phillips:						
1962	158,320	48,000	30.3	3,365	2	106,955
1963	160,954	52,000	26.2	3,491	2	105,463
1964	152,197	32,229	22.2	4,950	3	115,018
1965	165,876	31,745	19.1	6,415	4	127,716
1966	218,382	59,163	27.0	7,595	3.4	151,624
1967	227,766	52,255	22.9	11,496	5	164,015
Sinclair:						
1962	57,936			10,586	18	47,350
1963	85,731	[1]1,200	0	10,201	12	75,230
1964	66,444	[1]3,119	0	10,827	15	58,736
1965	96,072	4,100	4.4	15,299	15.9	76,673
1966	123,232	13,996	11.3	14,892	12	94,344
1967	130,017	10,585	8.1	24,060	18.5	95,372
Standard (Ohio):						
1962	37,235	9,275	25.0	3,738	10	24,222
1963	54,008	15,225	28.1	4,896	9	33,887
1964	70,252	21,150	30.2	5,334	7	43,768
1965	82,848	26,300	31.7	6,386	8.3	49,712
1966	84,481	21,200	25.0	6,345	7.5	56,936
1967	101,496	29,200	28.8	8,412	8.3	63,884
Atlantic:						
1962	61,110	0	0	14,844	24	46,266
1963	56,747	0	0	12,734	22	44,013
1964	61,081	0	0	14,005	22	47,076
1965	105,299	0	0	15,188	14	90,111
1966	127,384			13,900	12.7	113,484
1967	145,259			15,254	10.5	130,005
Marathon:						
1962	$36,064	[1]$2,200	0	$205	0.5	$37,889
1963	50,058	(2)	0	933	2	49,125
1964	63,220	(2)	0	2,844	4	60,376
1965	97,416	(2)	0	37,345	38	60,071
1966	130,927	2,400	1.8	59,700	45.9	68,826
1967	138,520	3,700	2.7	60,962	44	73,858
Getty:[3] 1967	132,762	3,687	2.8	10,909	8.2	118,166
Union:						
1962	59,421	8,000	13.5	5,500	9	45,921
1963	73,028	13,100	17.7	6,000	8	53,928
1964	87,564	13,300	15.2	7,200	8	67,064
1965	119,214	15,604	13.2	8,840	7	94,770
1966	170,782	18,398	10.7	10,144	5.9	142,240
1967	163,820	10,400	6.3	8,457	5.2	144,963
Sun:						
1962	66,395	[1]200	0	13,400	20	53,195
1963	79,976	1,300	1.9	17,460	22	61,216
1964	88,577	2,400	2.7	17,670	20	68,507
1965	113,405	10,300	9.0	18,220	16	84.835
1966	131,544	16,600	12.6	14,370	10.9	100,574
1967	146,946	24,700	16.8	13,670	9.3	108,576
Conoco:						
1962	73,477	1,065	1.4	3,335	5	69,077
1963	99,665	9,143	9.2	3,157	3	87,365
1964	112,009	8,725	7.7	3,175	2	100,109
1965	142,051	6,865	4.8	39,035	27	96,151
1966	204,632	24,670	12.0	64,330	31.4	45,632
1967	241,362	30,031	12.4	62,369	25.8	148,962
Cities Service:						
1962	84,143	20,773	24.7	3,185	3	60,185
1963	101,976	20,188	21.4	4,283	4	77,505
1964	105,299	19,819	18.9	967	.9	84,513
1965	137,068	31,973	23.3	977	.7	104,118
1966	194,456	51,760	26.7	902	.4	141,794
1967	165,289	32,347	19.6	5,105	3.1	127,837
Sunray DX:						
1962	41,203	3,850	9.3	1,152	3	36,201
1963	48,223	4,321	8.9	1,374	2.9	42,528
1964	34,716	[1]2,407	0	1,330	3.9	35,793
1965	41,445	980	2.3	1,597	3.9	38,868
1966	57,372	10,025	14.9	1,754	3	45,593
1967	74,526	17,672	23.7	2,390	3.2	54,464
Ashland:						
1962	24,324	6,201	25.8	2,799	11	15,324
1963	28,769	10,556	37.7	104	.3	18,109
1964	36,385	9,672	26.8	2,977	8	23,735
1965	50,594	15,500	30.6	2,440	5	31,594
1966	69,324	20,830	30.0	5,570	8	42,924
1967	72,212	23,718	32.8	3,952	5.5	44,542
Tidewater:						
1962	35,191	228	.6	2,387	6	32,576
1963	42,795	[1]63	0	3,384	8	39,474
1964	40,508	377	13.7	4,426	11	35,705
1965	60,397	58	.9	3,783	6	56,556
1966	80,542	3,350	4.1	5,301	6.5	71,891
Skelly:						
1962	22,674	1,260	5.7	250	1	21,164
1963	27,479	3,025	7.7	275	4	24,179
1964	26,601	785	1.2	275	2	25,551
1965	39,995	5,625	14.0	375	.9	33,995
1966	42,762	5,300	12.3	[4]500	1.1	36,962
Pure:						
1962	27,680	[1]2,546	0	1,276	4	28,950
1963	28,582	[1]1,212	0	27	.01	29,767
1964	32,282	[1]600	0	164	.5	31,518
Richfield:						
1962	36,615	6,000	16.6		0	30,615
1963	29,767	1,300	4.4	773	3	27,894
1964	26,255	[1]629	0	5,249	21	21,455
Total:						
1962	4,198,331	169,492	4.0	838,954	19.9	3,194,770
1963	4,921,577	304,985	6.2	951,255	19.3	3,663,037
1964	5,175,289	235,931	4.5	1,064,540	20.5	3,874,447
1965	5,814,326	403,687	6.9	1,199,659	20.4	4,209,420
1966	6,810,244	585,300	7.6	1,450,358	21	4,709,595
1967	7,225,880	637,875	8.8	1,581,034	21.9	5,006,971

---

[1] Credit.

[2] Marathon Oil's 10K filing with the SEC doesn't reveal how much Federal income tax Marathon paid in years prior to 1967.

[3] Getty income for 1967 includes companies previously listed as Tidewater and Skelly.

[4] State income tax.

Note: Figures for some companies have been changed from last year's table in Oil Week because of amended filings by refiners where income taxes have been changed due to altered tax status. U.S. income tax figures reported in 10K statement of income files may exclude capital gains on extraordinary items.

Exhibit 5

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Mar. 26, 1969]

Pew Tax-Free Trust Gets Oil Profits Tax Free

(By Donald L. Barlett)

Washington.—One of the nation's 10 largest tax-exempt foundations has received millions of dollars from an oil company that pays no federal income tax.

The oil company reported profits of more than $26 million from 1960 to 1967 without incurring any income tax liability.

Partners in the tax-free alliance are:

General Crude Oil Co., a Houston-based firm that once claimed a $300,000 tax refund from the government while recording multimillion dollar profits.

The Pew Memorial Trust of Philadelphia, controlled by the Pew family, founders of Sun Oil Co. The trust's assets have grown from $50 million in 1948 to more than $300 million today.

At the same time General Crude was funneling millions of untaxed profit dollars into the giant tax-free Pew trust. .

An elderly, retired Euclid couple—with an income of $3,894.39 in 1967—paid $82 in federal income tax.

The man, 79, and his wife, 75, reported a pension income of $2,882 and interest from savings bonds and a savings account of $1,012.39.

In a plea to Rep. Charles A. Vanik, D-22, for reforming the income tax system, the couple wrote:

"Because of the awareness by the general public of a need for the Congress to take action toward the inequities on taxation we beg to submit our complaint.

"Most of us oldsters, in our retirement years, cannot help but look upon the present tax structure as very, very unfair, and we are looking to those in a position to remedy the unequal system in the coming sessions."

The tax paid by the Euclid couple was owed, in part, on the $1,012 in interest income they received from their savings bonds and a bank savings account.

If they had received the $1,012 in dividends from General Crude stock, they would have paid income tax on it.

For individuals, interest from savings accounts and dividends from stock are both treated as income and are taxable.

But the Pew Memorial Trust—as a tax-exempt foundation—receives its dividends tax-free.

How is it possible for a family with a near poverty-level income to pay tax on interest from its savings when a corporation with profits in the millions owes no tax and a foundation with dividend income in the millions pays no tax?

In a report filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) for 1967, the latest year for which complete statistics are available, General Crude stated:

"Due to differences in reporting taxable and financial earnings, principally the excess of statutory depletion allowed for tax reporting purposes in excess of cost depletion for financial reporting, the company incurred no federal income tax expense for the year ended Dec. 31, 1967."

Translated from the language of accounting, this means:

Because of the long controversial 27½% oil depletion allowance, General Crude Oil Co. owed the federal government no income tax even though its profits for the year amounted to $5.5 million.

Under the depletion allowance, an oil company pays no tax on 27½% of its income from wells. The tax-free figure is limited to 50% of a company's net income.

The U.S. Treasury loses billions of dollars in taxes each year as a result of the depletion allowance and a string of other special tax privileges granted the petroleum industry.

In the case of General Crude Oil Co., the tax-free profits are poured into the tax-exempt Pew Memorial Trust.

The more than $300 million in assets of the trust are made up largely of stock in Sun Oil Co. and Minerals Development Co.

Minerals Development is an investment and holding company controlled by the Pew family.

A report filed with the SEC in May 1968 stated that Minerals Development Co. owned about 68% of the stock of General Crude.

All the capital stock of Minerals Development, in turn, is held in trust by the Glenmede Trust Co. of Philadelphia as trustee for the Pew Memorial Trust.

In 1965, the last year for which an Internal Revenue Service (IRS) return is available, the Pew tax-free trust reported $4.5 million in income. The revenue included:

$3.4 million from Sun Oil Co. stock.

Just under $1 million from Minerals Development Co. stock.

At the time, the trust valued its Sun Oil holdings at $223.8 million and its Mineral Development interests at $46.8 million.

While pouring $3.4 million in tax-free dividends into the Pew Memorial Trust in 1965, Sun Oil was taxed at a rate averaging 9.0%.

For the five-year period from 1963 through 1967, Sun Oil listed profits of $561.1 million and federal income tax liability of $55.3 million—a 9.8% tax rate.

Corporations outside the petroleum industry—including many Cleveland businesses—pay taxes at rates ranging from 40 to 50%, a Plain Dealer survey showed.

Halle Bros. Co., a major Cleveland department store, in 1967 reported a profit before taxes of $1,809,700 on income of $65,948,902. The store's federal income tax bill was $835,000—or 46.1% of its net income.

From 1963 to 1967, Halle's net income before taxes totaled $11,224,938. Its taxes were $5,013,600—and average rate of 44.6%.

The New York Times in 1967 paid $10,662,000 in taxes on net income of $20,782,138—a 51.3% rate.

Most individual taxpayers, who supply the treasury with 73% of its federal income tax revenue, are taxed an average of 10 to 20%.

General Crude has reported no tax owed in recent years and in 1960 even claimed a refund on taxes paid previously.

The company stated in a document submitted to the SEC in 1962:

"A net operating loss of approximately $934,000 for federal income tax purposes in 1960 was used to obtain a refund of approximately $300,000 in federal income taxes paid in 1957, 1958 and 1959."

The company's 1960 "operating loss" was only for tax purposes. General Crude reported a profit for the year of $2.2 million and paid out $1.9 million in dividends.

The operating loss and subsequent refund stemmed partly from the tax benefits peculiar to oil companies.

Most of General Crude's oil production is centered in Texas, but it has oil interests in Canada, Alaska, Australia and Barbados.

Kenneth E. Montague, president of General Crude, in reciting his company's accomplishments in the tax-free year of 1967, told stockholders:

"I am pleased to report that 1967 was a year of solid growth and progress for General Crude Oil Co.

"Operating and financial results rose significantly and established all-time highs in many areas. These new records include, among others, net earnings, cash flow, gross income, capital expenditures, production volume and new-well completions."

The company paid $2 million in dividends to stockholders, a major portion of which went to Minerals Development Co.

Although Minerals Development has other holdings in addition to its General Crude stock, specific financial details concerning the interest and size of the company are unknown because it is a privately owned corporation.

But public records disclose a close relationship among General Crude, Minerals Development, Sun Oil and the Pew Memorial Trust.

Item. Allyn R. Bell Jr. is president of the Glenmede Trust Co. in Philadelphia, the trustee for the Pew trust. He also is a director of General Crude and vice president of Minerals Development.

Item. Joseph Newton Pew III is president and treasurer of Minerals Development, a director of General Crude and vice president of Glenmede Trust Co.

Item. The Glenmede Trust Co. was organized in Pennsylvania in 1956.

The notice of incorporation was signed by J. Howard Pew, Joseph Newton Pew Jr., Mary Ethel Pew and Mabel Pew Myrin.

Item. J. Howard Pew, chairman of the board of Sun Oil Co., stated at the time the Glenmede trust company was founded it would primarily handle trusts of Pew family members and would not enter the general banking business.

Item. Offices of the Glenmede Trust Co. are in the Sun Oil Co. building at 1608 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

Item. Before taking over as president of General Crude in 1965, Montague was operating superintendent for Sun Oil Co.'s Gulf Coast production division.

Bell, the Glenmede president, declined to discuss Minerals Development Co.'s business activities, saying:

"We can't reveal any information about our customers' accounts. We are an agent for Minerals Development Co., but there are angles here that are not public."

Bell pointed out that most other foundations have individual officers responsible for managing foundation activities and answering public inquiries.

In case of the Pew Trust, a trust company acts as trustee and has the privilege of a secret bank-customer relationship.

Asked to describe Minerals Development Co., Bell told The Plain Dealer:

"Minerals Development Co. files a consolidated tax return as an operating company. For all practical purposes it is a holding company as far as General Crude is concerned."

Does Minerals Development pay federal income tax each year?

"There will be a tax liability for 1968," says Bell.

How much?

"I'm afraid I can't say."

A treasury official analyzing the unusual corporate-trust relationship, at the Plain Dealer's request, observed that any income tax paid by Minerals Development would be negligible and probably at a maximum rate of 7.5%.

The Pew family trust was set up in 1948 as the Pew Memorial Foundation with assets of $50 million.

The assets then consisted of 800.080 share of Sun Oil stock donated by the four children of Joseph Newton Pew, founder of Sun Oil.

In 1957, the foundation was converted to a trust and the name changed to the Pew Memorial Trust.

Congressional critics contend that foundations—presently a major target of tax reformers—are used to amass large pools of money and maintain control of family businesses.

Many foundations, they say, set aside part of their investment income each year, building up assets instead of distributing the money in charitable contributions.

The rapid growth in both numbers and assets of foundations in the past 25 years has resulted in the accumulation of more than $20 billion in untaxed and largely unregulated funds.

At a time when individuals with meager incomes are expected to pay some tax, the reformers say, foundation income also should be taxed.

It isn't only the tax-free billions that bother many congressmen. One critic, concerned about increasing irregularities, said that foundations:

Have broad opportunities for self-dealing business practices and even kickbacks.

Example: A company owned by a foundation buys goods from another company that makes yearly donations to the foundation.

Are used to perpetuate control of family businesses.

Example: A man who owns a company sets up a foundation, gives it controlling interest in his firm and then runs the company as chief executive officer of the foundation. When he dies, his children are named trustees of the foundation.

Are used to benefit friends or family members.

Example: A foundation loans millions of dollars tax free to friends of the man who set up the foundation. The money is used to buy stock in corporations and—on at least one occasion—enough stock to gain control of a company.

The Pew trust, in its 1965 IRS return, reported from its investments of $4,517,479. Grants awarded totaled $4,141,350.

Scores of contributions of $5,000, $10,000, $15,000 and $20,000 were made to charitable, religious, medical and educational groups.

There were larger grants like $200,000 to the Philadelphia United Fund, $140,000 to the United Presbyterian Foundation in New York and $100,000 to the Institute for Cancer Research in Philadelphia.

Then there were donations like the $25,000 grant to the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade at Long Beach, Calif.

The right-wing crusade is run by Dr. Fred Charles Schwarz, an Australian psychiatrist who preaches anti-communism with the fervor of an old-time revival minister, telling his congregations:

"The enemy is at the gate. Buckle on the armor of the Christian and go forth to battle."

The crusade conducts schools of anti-communism around the country, sells books and pamphlets ("How to Spot a Communist Trap") and anti-communist folk songs ("Poor Left Winger").

Allyn R. Bell Jr. preferred not to talk about the Glenmede Trust Co. and its management of the Pew family trust.

He did, though, have an observation on charity in general. Said Bell:

"Who can do this better. Do you think the government is better equipped to handle charity?"

	Totel income	Net income before taxes	Federal income tax owed	Percent of profit owed in tax	Profit after taxes
New York Times	$194,253,395	$20,782,138	$10,662,000	51.3	$10,120,138
Cincinnati Economy Drug Co	29,829,966	1,441,942	735,883	51.0	706,059
Halle Bros Co	65,948,902	1,809,700	835,000	46.1	974,700
Fisher Fazio Costa Foods	151,476,836	4,505,400	1,831,600	40.6	2,673,800
General Crude Oil Co	19,897,000	5,500,000	None	0	5,500,000

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Mar. 26, 1969]

PEWS CONTROL SUN OIL THROUGH WEB OF TRUSTS

The Sun Oil Co. of Philadelphia is one of the nation's 20 largest oil firms with assets of more than $1.5 billion.

The company's oil holdings reach round the world and in 1967 it reported a net income after taxes of $108.5 million on total revenue of $1.1 billion.

It was a record year for profits—up 8% over 1966—and cash dividends paid to stockholders set another record: $23.8 million.

Sun Oil was founded in 1886 by Joseph Newton Pew Sr.

More than three-quarters of a century later, the company is largely controlled by members of the Pew family through an assortment of trusts.

Sun Oil's growth has paralleled the Pew family's involvement in Republican party politics both in Pennsylvania and on the national level.

When Joseph Newton Pew Jr. died in 1963, leaving an estate of $34 million, the New York Times observed:

"Operating behind the scenes, Mr. Pew frequently dictated party policies that were announced by others or incorporated into national platforms at election times."

In the 1956 presidential election campaign, 12 members of the Pew family gave $216,800 to the Republican party. By contrast, 14 Rockefellers reported giving $152,000.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Mar. 26, 1969]

Top 10 foundations

[Assets in millions of dollars]

Ford Foundation	3,580
Rockefeller Foundation	804
Duke Endowment	615
Mott Foundation	424
Lilly Endowment	390
Kellogg Foundation	375
Carnegie Corporation	336
Sloan Foundation	327
Pew Memorial Trust	303
Hartford Foundation	270

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Mar. 26, 1969]

FOUNDATIONS FACE QUIZ

Tax-exempt foundations are growing so fast that no one knows exactly how many exist. Rough estimates place the figure from 20,000 to 40,000. The Internal Revenue Service—in the only study it ever made of the subject—found 30,200 last year.

A survey made in 1967 of 7,000 foundations with assets of at least $200,000 showed that 57% were established in the 1950s, 24% in the 1940s and the others in the 1960s or before 1940.

Since the exact number of foundations is unknown, so are the total assets. But they are calculated at upwards of $20 billion. The 10 largest foundations account for more than one-third of the total with $7.4 billion.

The laws governing foundations are vague. There is little federal regulation. Few government investigators are assigned to probing abuses. All these things have resulted, Congressional critics say, in numerous irregularities, including the:

Use of tax-free foundation funds by corporations and individuals to escape payment of federal income tax.

Subsidizing of corporations in which the foundation has a vested interest, giving them an unfair advantage over competing businesses.

Hoarding of cash by foundations that each year take in more money than they pay out in grants and charitable contributions.

Awarding of grants for political and philosophical purposes rather than philanthropic.

Use of foundations to maintain family control of businesses.

Manipulation of businesses—in which a foundation has a major stock interest—to benefit the foundation at the expense of other stockbrokers.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Apr. 4, 1969]

WHO PAYS THE TAXES?

Individual taxpayers will supply the U.S. Treasury with about 73% of its federal income tax revenue this year. Corporations will put up the other 27%. It used to be 50–50, but that was 40 years ago.

It also was some 40 years ago the petroleum industry began receiving its special tax allowances.

The accompanying article is one of a series, started on March 16, in which The Plain Dealer is examining the tax status of the oil industry in relation to the changing economy and shift of tax burdens.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Apr. 4, 1969]

OIL FIRMS PAY "HALF-RATE" TAXES

(By Donald L. Barlett)

WASHINGTON.—Oil companies with profits in the billions are paying federal income taxes at about half the average rate of most American families and individuals.

This is one of several major findings in a nationwide Plain Dealer survey of the petroleum industry's federal income tax status in a modern economy.

Based on an analysis of the financial reports of 40 oil companies, The Plain Dealer study shows that in 1967 these companies paid federal income tax at an average rate of 8.2% of their net income.

Family and individual wage earners, currently facing 1968 tax bills inflated by the 10% surcharge, are taxed at rates ranging from 10 to 20%, with the average about 14%.

Many corporations outside the petroleum industry pay 40 to 50% of their profits in federal income tax.

Of the 40 companies surveyed by The Plain Dealer, 14 reported owing no tax at all. Eight others were taxed an average of less than 5% and 13 from 5 to 14%.

The largest of the 14 nontaxpayers was Atlantic Richfield Co. of New York, which reported a gross income of $1.5 billion in 1967, a profit of $130 million and no federal income tax owed.

In Painesville, O., a retired couple, both partially handicapped, with an income in 1967 of $3,976 (excluding Social Security benefits), paid federal income tax of $137.

Observed the woman, now 67 years old:

"It seems a shame to squeeze these amounts out of oldsters who need this little to live on. I worked very hard in early years to lay away this principal to earn the interest for our old age.

"We own our own home and pay increasing real estate taxes. If my husband were not handy doing minor repairs, we would have this added expense."

The Painesville couple, like most families are paying income tax at rates far in excess of the country's richest oil companies.

The Plain Dealer's oil-tax findings are based on a sampling of financial reports filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) by publicly owned companies.

A cross-section of companies selected at random for the analysis included:

Large, fully integrated companies, like Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, which explore, produce, transport, refine and market petroleum products down to the retail level.

Diversified corporations such as the Signal Companies Inc. of Los Angeles, which, in addition to its oil and gas operations, has electronics, aerospace, trucking and banking interests.

Small companies, like Aztec Oil & Gas Co. of Dallas, which are concerned primarily with exploring and drilling for oil and gas.

The gross income of the 40 oil companies studied amounted to $61.1 billion in 1967.

Their total net income before taxes was $7.7 billion and their federal income tax bill was $635 million—or 8.2% of net income.

The companies reported $1.7 billion owed in state and foreign income taxes.

The foreign taxes and some royalty payments—which tax reformers say the companies call taxes—are used as credits to reduce the U.S. income tax liability of the oil firms.

After payment of all income taxes, the companies retained 69.8% of their net income—a total profit of $5.4 billion.

U.S. Treasury officials attribute the low average tax rate of the oil companies to the broad allowances and tax benefits granted to the petroleum industry.

One of the largest tax breaks, the long controversial oil depletion allowance, enables an oil company to keep 27.5% of its income from wells tax free. The figure is limited to 50% of the company's net income.

Another special tax privilege, the intangible drilling benefit, permits an oil company to write off upwards of 70% of its exploration, drilling and development costs.

An oil company deducts certain of these expenses as a cost of doing business in one year, while other corporations are required to make such writeoffs over the life of an asset.

In addition, the oil company may write off all expenses as losses in connection with dry holes—those wells that fail to produce any crude oil.

These and other tax privileges, along with some unique loopholes, provide the oil industry with the lowest federal income tax rate available to any business or industry except savings and loan institutions.

As a result, while many corporations and most families and individuals are being taxed at maximum rates, the oil industry each year is relieved of income tax payments running into the billions.

The tax benefits claimed by the oil companies were enacted into law under industry conditions and a tax system that have since undergone drastic changes.

The original allowance, adopted shortly after passage of the income tax amendment in 1913, enabled an oil company to recover only the actual costs incurred in the discovery of oil.

This meant that if a well cost $10,000, a company could write off only that amount.

A few years later, the cost allowance was changed to the 27.5% depletion allowance.

Based on the prevailing taxes and industry costs, it was believed at the time that the percentage depletion figure would average out to the original cost allowance.

But some four decades later, a Treasury study shows that oil companies—through the depletion allowance—are recovering the cost of a well 18 times or more.

Using the Treasury's estimate, for a well that now costs $100,000, the oil company recovers $1.8 million.

Congressional tax reformers point to other changes that have occurred over the years. For example:

The depletion allowance was enacted when most of the industry's oil production was centered in the United States. Oil companies now receive the depletion allowance on huge quantities of oil produced around the world.

In the early part of the century, wildcatting was widespread, the risks considerable. Today, wildcatters account for little of the nation's oil. Improved geological studies, the pooling of company interests and other technological advances have reduced the risks.

With the growth of integrated companies, the depletion allowance enables these firms to subsidize their refining and marketing operations, providing an advantage over independent competitors that produce little oil and thus have none of the large tax benefits.

With companies already writing off intangible drilling and dry hole costs, the depletion allowance actually provides a double deduction.

The special tax privileges enjoyed by the oil companies are extended to individual oil investors.

A person with several million invested in oil properties may pay no income tax while a family with a modest income is taxed at the top rate.

The year 1967, used in The Plain Dealer survey because it was the latest year for which complete statistics are available, was not an unusual tax year for oil companies.

In the case of Atlantic Richfield, the company reported owing no federal income tax in 1965, 1966 or 1967. Total profits for the three years were $333.6 million.

Prior to its merger with Richfield Oil Corp. in 1965, the Atlantic Refining Co. reported no income tax owed in 1962, 1963 and 1964.

The company's profits for the three years were $137.3 million. Its total tax-free profits from 1962 through 1967 were $470.9 million.

The giant of the petroleum industry, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, reported gross revenue of $14.7 billion in 1967.

Standard's net income before income taxes was $2 billion and its federal income tax liability was $166 million for a rate of 7.9%.

The company's profits for the one year after all taxes were $1.2 billion, enough to run the City of Cleveland for the next 10 years.

From 1962 through 1967, Standard registered a total net income before taxes of $10.1 billion and listed its federal income tax bill at $470 million.

This averaged out to a tax rate of 4.7%—or 3.5% under the Plain Dealer survey average for 1967.

During the six-year period, Standard Oil's profits after all taxes amounted to $6.3 billion.

Only two companies in the tax study were taxed at rates exceeding 25%: Standard Oil Co. of Ohio (28.8%) and Ashland Oil & Refining Co. of Ashland, Ky. (32.8%).

Unlike other major refiners, neither Sohio nor Ashland is a large oil producer and each must buy crude oil from other companies.

As a result, the two firms do not have access to the larger depletion allowances, intangible drilling benefits and other tax privileges utilized by producers like Atlantic Richfield.

While many of the nation's oil companies are spared any federal income tax liability and others are paying income tax at a rate under 10%, many Cleveland businesses are taxed an average 40 to 50% of their net income.

Richman Bros. Co., a Cleveland-based manufacturer and retailer of men's clothes, reported a gross income of $90.1 million in 1967.

The company's net income before taxes amounted to $7.4 million and its federal income tax bill was $3.5 million, a tax rate of 47.9%.

The Higbee Co., a major Cleveland department store, listed a net income before taxes of $3.8 million on revenue of $96.3 million.

The store reported a federal income tax liability of $1.6 million, a tax rate of 41.4%.

Testifying on federal income tax inequities, Dr. Arthur W. Wright, a visiting research economist at Yale University, told the House Ways and Means Committee:

"Present tax policies toward natural resources provide a major route by which wealthy individuals and corporations escape liability for federal income taxes.

"As a result, our tax system, judged by publicly accepted standards, is less fair than it should be.

"Taxpayers with similar incomes should bear similar tax burdens. The effective tax rate should not depend on the source of one's income: earnings from minerals and earnings from other sources should be taxed alike."

TABLE OF DATA ON PLAIN DEALER OIL SURVEY

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Gross income	Net income before taxes	Federal income tax owed	Percent of profit owed in tax	Profit after taxes
Atlantic Richfield Co	$1,578,668	$145,259	None	0	$130,005
Belco Petroleum Corp	18,505	8,025	None	0	7,665
General Crude Oil Co	19,897	5,500	None	0	5,500
Texas Oil & Gas Corp	13,986	3,705	None	0	3,705
Aztec Oil & Gas Co	7,961	2,516	None	0	2,510
Consolidated Oil & Gas	4,894	2,427	None	0	2,427
Livingston Oil Co	17,043	1,534	None	0	1,534
Mesa Petroleum Co	6,188	1,390	None	0	1,390
Felmont Oil Corp	5,749	779	None	0	779
Asamera Oil Corp	4,754	576	None	0	576
Wilshire Oil Co. of Texas	5,204	392	None	0	392
Basin Petroleum Corp	1,992	263	None	0	263
Westates Petroleum Co	3,932	200	None	0	200
Texas American Oil Corp	813	55	None	0	55
Reserve Oil & Gas Co	11,322	1,936	$11	0.6	1,924
Amerada Petroleum Corp	218,675	103,979	887	0.9	58,461
Standard Oil Co. (Calif.)	3,788,912	513,067	6,000	1.2	421,667
Texaco, Inc	5,398,976	892,986	17,500	2.0	754,386
Pennzoil Co	92,481	16,296	337	2.1	15,959
Marathon Oil Co	705,832	138,520	3,700	2.7	73,858
Murphy Oil Co	199,187	9,255	307	3.3	8,218
Mobil Oil Corp	6,473,083	594,593	26,900	4.5	385,393
American Petrofina Inc	185,562	14,828	800	5.4	14,028
Kerr-McGee Corp	423,834	39,351	2,395	6.1	34,350
Union Oil Co. of Calif	1,700,869	163,820	10,400	6.3	144,963
Getty Oil Co	1,160,258	140,422	10,747	7.7	118,166
Gulf Oil Corp	5,174,464	955,968	74,142	7.8	578,287
Standard Oil Co. (N.J.)	14,740,648	2,098,283	166,000	7.9	1,232,283
Sinclair Oil Corp	1,500,123	130,017	10,585	8.1	95,372
Tenneco, Inc	1,806,456	159,812	13,604	8.5	146,208
Midwest Oil Corp	39,975	14,214	1,467	10.3	12,693
Continental Oil Co	2,254,805	241,362	30,031	12.4	148,962
Aberdeen Petroleum Corp	690	151	19	12.5	130
Signal Companies, Inc	1,514,437	73,480	9,162	12.5	49,136
Shell Oil Co	3,674,174	342,022	44,940	13.1	284,849
Sun Oil Co	1,173,250	146,946	24,700	16.8	108,576
Standard Oil Co. (Ind.)	3,586,394	366,847	74,021	20.2	282,250
Phillips Petroleum Co	2,012,227	227,766	52,255	22.9	164,015
Standard Oil Co. (Ohio)	691,895	101,496	29,200	28.8	63,884
Ashland Oil & Refining Co	904,975	76,289	25,053	32.8	44,959
Total and tax average	61,123,091	7,736,327	635,163	8.2	5,399,978

This table is based on financial information obtained from reports filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission in Washington, D.C. In those cases where applicable, the figures are from the company's consolidated tax return. Where possible, the net income is shown as income before State, foreign, and Federal income taxes. Because of this difference, it is not possible to subtract the Federal income tax owed from net income to arrive at the profit after taxes in all cases.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Apr. 4, 1969]

Atlantic Made Half-Billion Profit in 6 Years With No Taxes

The Atlantic Richfield Co. and its predecessor, the Atlantic Refining Co., accumulated profits of nearly a half-billion dollars from 1962 to 1967 without owing a penny in federal income tax.

In February 1968, Atlantic Richfield in a joint venture with the Humble Oil & Refining Co., a subsidiary of Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, made a major oil discovery on Alaska's North Slope.

At Prudhoe Bay, the companies drilled two wells and struck a field estimated to contain 10-billion barrels of oil—the largest field in North America.

The find insures a steady supply of crude oil for Atlantic Richfield's refinery and marketing outlets—and, in the words of one company executive: "a big increase in cash flow and profits."

But the Prudhoe Bay field is only one of about 20 similar geological structures on the North Slope.

Estimates of the oil in all these fields run as high as 50-billion barrels. Before Prudhoe, the largest U.S. find was the five-billion-barrel East Texas field in 1930.

Atlantic Richfield and Humble's leaseholdings in the Prudhoe Bay area cover some 90,000 acres.

After its sixth consecutive year of paying no federal income tax, the Atlantic Richfield Co. told stockholders in its 1967 annual report:

"We are pleased to report that Atlantic Richfield Co. earned $130,005,000, or $8.56 per share in 1967, a gain of 15% over the $113,484,000, or $7.21 per share, reported in 1966.

"Dividends were increased for the third time in as many years. On July 17, 1967, the Board of Directors raised the annual rate from $2.80 to $3.10 per common share."

Last month, the Justice Department approved the merger of the Sinclair Oil Corp. (assets of $1.8 billion) into Atlantic Richfield (assets of $2.4 billion).

It was one of the largest oil company mergers in U.S. history.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Apr. 4, 1969]

Getty-Owned Oil Firm Paid Taxes at 7.5 Percent Rate

Jean Paul Getty, 76, married seven times, a graduate at Oxford, is sometimes described as the richest American, a genuine oil billionaire.

He lives in a 73-room manor house called Sutton Place (which has a pay phone for guests) near London.

Getty works out of his Sutton Place sitting room, supervising his worldwide oil operations and offering advice to the economy minded.

The Getty Oil Co. is among 40 firms surveyed by The Plain Dealer in connection with the accompanying article on the petroleum industry's tax status.

Back in 1967, the frugal oilman warned British motorists that:

"A single faulty spark plug can add ($36.40) to the fuel bill for an average motorist's annual mileage of 7,400.

"Similarly, an engine filter choked with dirt can cost another ($16.80) in the course of a year, defective piston rings ($14), faulty thermostat ($8.40) and incorrect ignition setting ($5.60)."

Getty, who spends most of his time now in England, made his first million in 1916, working with his father, a Minneapolis lawyer turned oil prospector.

The elder Getty died in 1930, leaving a $15-million estate and the nucleus of the Getty oil empire.

While other businessmen avoided the stock market during the depression years, Getty and his associates quietly bought up large blocs of oil securities at bargain basement rates.

His first stock purchases in the old Tide Water Associated Oil Co. were for $2.50 a share. During 1932 and 1933, he acquired more than 740,000 Tide Water shares.

In 1967, when Tide Water was merged into Getty Oil Co., the original $2.50 share was worth $307.80.

For the six years from 1962 through 1967, Getty Oil Co. listed a total net income before taxes of $556.9 million.

The company reported owing $41.9 million in federal income tax for an average tax rate of 7.5%. Its total profits after all taxes were $468.5 million.

Getty, individually and as trustee, owns some 12.5 million shares (selling at $77 a share on the New York Stock Exchange), or about 62% of the outstanding stock in Getty Oil Co.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG. I hope the Senator will remain in the Chamber because he will find he is mistaken on several points, even though he is a rapid reader and even though he did some homework last night.

Mr. President, the reason we have the oil import control program is not to try to get oil cheaper. We know we will have to pay more for it if we produce it here rather than obtain it on the world market. The reason we have the program is that we feel we should be able to provide for our requirements of an item that is absolutely essential to this Nation, and we should be able to produce it to the degree necessary to see us through whatever emergency may fall upon us.

Now a group was set up under President Eisenhower, and later another one was set up under President Kennedy. They made a study to see what the right level of imports should be to assure that the domestic production of oil would continue to be available in a time of national emergency. They came out with the level of 12.2 percent in zones 1 through 4, which would be about right. And because they cannot produce their own requirements in zone 5, they said let them have higher than 12.2 percent but try to make them rely on American production, if they could, even in that area. That accounts for the percentages.

The Senator talks about Canadian oil being available, and Mexican oil being available. The Senator does not know what he is talking about. How does the Senator know whether a war would not break out between the United States and Canada, and if so, why would Canada give us its oil to fight a war with Canada?

That could happen. Has the Senator ever heard of the War of 1812? Canada was on the other side and did pretty well when our invading army went up there to land troops in that place.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is the Senator from Louisiana really serious about that?

Mr. LONG. It is not inconceivable.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Canada and the United States would engage in a prolonged war that would hold up our ability to produce oil in this country?

Mr. LONG. It is entirely conceivable to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Well, let me tell the Senator, with the national defense argument for the oil import program hanging from this kind of a ridiculous assumption, no wonder it is so widely challenged. Such a prolonged war—Canada versus the United States—is inconceivable to me.

Mr. LONG. Let me answer the Senator's question. It is entirely conceivable to the Senator from Louisiana that a war could occur between the United States and Canada and that if a war did occur between the United States and Canada, Canada would not deliver Canadian oil to the United States so that the United States could fight Canada with it. That just makes sense to me. Maybe not to the Senator, but that does make sense to me.

The second fact—the Senator says it makes no sense to him—20 years ago if the Senator had told me there was a possibility of war between the United States and Cuba, I would have said to the Senator, "Now, do you really think that there is any possibility of our wonderful Latin American friend, Cuba, going to war against the United States?" I would have said further, "Why, Senator, you must be dreaming to think that that could happen."

Yet, I think the Senator from Wisconsin would agree that is a distinct possibility today.

The Senator said that we cannot rely upon that Mexican oil to come across through a pipeline. In order to help Mexico, in order to help Canada, we put forth the assumption——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield at that point for just one correction?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin said nothing about Mexican oil.

Mr. LONG. They are in the same arrangement as Canada. That being the case, I thought the Senator would probably want to include that, too. They are getting the same consideration as Canada, relatively speaking. They are permitted to sell oil products of Mexico in the United States even though some of the oil here is from the 12.2 percent in zones 1 through 4.

If we had to go to war with Cuba, I think the Senator would agree that there could be a question as to whether Mexico would deliver its oil to us, because the Latins tend to sympathize with one another, even though one is a Communist power and the other is a non-Communist power. It would be extremely doubtful that we could get their oil. Furthermore, if we have to go to war with a big power like the Soviet Union, we are going to have to rely upon Canadian oil to fight the Soviet Union.

The Russians might say, "Look, Canada, if you insist on providing America with the last remaining fuel they will have to fight us with, we will bomb your cities and knock them out."

What commitment do we have from Canada that will assure us that we would get any oil from them to see us through a war with Russia when it would mean that Canadian cities would be blasted?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is the Senator asking?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly, in a war between the United States and Russia, does the Senator really feel that that would drag on for years considering the enormous nuclear capacities both nations possess?

Mr. LONG. Senator, it is possible. It is. I will tell the Senator why.

It is entirely possible that one of these days the United States will say, "Look, Russia, the thought just occurred to us that if we have a thermonuclear war between us, you would kill at least 100 million of us, and we would kill about 100 million or more, maybe of your people. It would be foolish to fight a war that way. Would it not be better to let the war be fought out to a conclusion by the use of weapons other than nuclear weapons and poison gas? We already have international agreements to prevent the use of poison gas. It makes good sense to say that we are not going to use nuclear weapons only because we know that if we do, you will use them against us. We think it might be better to reach a decision where we fight conventionally until one side thinks it has lost and the other side is fatigued.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. LONG. We are fighting that way now in Vietnam where we have not used atomic weapons at all. General MacArthur would like to have used atomic weapons in Korea, but we would not let him do it. It is just that kind of logic, that we have been reluctant to resort to the use of nuclear weapons because we know that if we do, the other fellow will use them on us, if he has them. Does that not make sense to the Senator, or is the Senator upset about it?

Mr. PROXMIRE. How fantastic can we get? Now we base this oil import program that costs the American consumer billions a year on the weird assumption that we will fight a long, many-year nonnuclear war with Russia. After all, would we submit to defeat by the Soviet Union without the use of the nuclear weapons we have? Or would the Soviet Union submit to defeat by us without using their nuclear weapons? It is one thing to fight in Korea, or in North Vietnam, neither of which has nuclear weapons, and where we have limited political objectives, and something else to have a war with the Soviet Union. There is no question that such a terrible catastrophe would be a war of national survival.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is making an argument which has already been made. It has been considered. It was considered by President Eisenhower. It was considered by President Johnson, and it was also considered by President Kennedy. They all concluded that you were wrong, Senator. That is why we have the oil import control program, because we realize that it is possible we might have a war with the Soviet Union that would not be over within 24 hours, 48 hours, or 7 days. It is entirely possible that we might fight such a war with conventional weapons and let 200 million people survive.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would be delighted to be enlightened by the Senator from Louisiana if he would supply me with the time and the report made by the Defense Department of the need for the oil import control program as a matter of national security. It is my understanding that the Defense Department has never made any such recommendations. The experts in the Defense Department who would be in the proper position to analyze whether it was necessary never had a chance to consider it from the standpoint of the national defense. The decision was made by the Interior Department.

Mr. LONG. Senator, I will make that available to you. I will make available to you all I can find on the subject. Of course, some of the stuff is classified, but what I can make available to the Senator I will be glad to make available. Some of it I cannot make available. Some of the discussion between military officers and people in the petroleum industry, discussing the very type of argument the Senator has in mind, some of that conversation was related to me verbally. I am a military officer of this country. I did fight in the last war. I have handled top secret information for the Government. I did serve on the Armed Services Committee and left that to go on the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am regarded as being competent to have that kind of information. But to make it public, or give it to someone else, presents a problem. But I would be glad to help give the Senator what I can.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I also was in the last war. I also was in the Army. I am also cleared for top secret and classified information. I will be delighted for the Senator to give me as much information as he can, but let me say to him that I have not seen any and I am confident that the Defense Department never made any such recommendations.

Mr. LONG. I can satisfy the Senator that they thought it was appropriate, including people in the Pentagon. Some will agree that if we go to war and have a "blow up" the whole thing will be over with before sundown of that day.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Well, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. LONG. Just a moment—just a moment—of course, there might be some sanity over here and some sanity over there, too. In fact, let me tell the Senator, if he wants to ask me—that I have served on the Armed Services Committee, as well as on other Senate committees. I worked with the distinguished Senator on the Armed Services Committee, presently in this Chamber, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), but at that time, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL) was the chairman, a very fine man whom we all love; and I also served on the Committee on Foreign Relations for a number of years and had occasion to study some of those problems and ask the very same questions involving things like this.

If I, myself, had to advise a President, if, let us say, we were going to have to fight a war in Korea and we could not win it without resorting to thermonuclear weapons, I think I would advise him as follows: "Mr. President, if you must resort to nuclear weapons to prevent our being defeated, use them; but if you are going to use them, do not use them beyond the battlefields and do not use anything but tactical nuclear weapons. Tell the enemy you are going to limit them to that. Tell the enemy you are going to use those weapons in that fashion, and you expect the enemy to use the weapons the same way. Do not use those weapons on the big cities, because, if you do, they are sure to use them on our big cities. When you kill 100 million of his people, he will kill 100 million of our people. It is not fair to kill all those people unnecessarily. We would do better to lose Korea than to have two-thirds of the population of the United States killed, just as two-thirds of their population would be killed."

Perhaps the Senator was not present when President Kennedy said in his message that President Eisenhower had made a mistake in relying too heavily on nuclear weapons. He thought we had better be in a position to face the threat either way; to hope that we could prevail by the use of ordinary usual types of weapons, and to avoid resorting to nuclear weapons, so that we could save that alternative and save that fateful decision as long as we could and not go that far. So he said he was going to build up the capability of this Nation to fight with conventional weapons.

Whether the Senator knows it or not, we have increased our capability in that area, and so has the Soviet Union. In other words, both of us think it is quite possible that we might have to fight a major war with conventional weapons. If such a war comes—and we hope it will not come—whoever has thermonuclear weapons available to drop on the others capital will pray that it will not be necessary, because if he did, he would know what it meant.

Now, if we were fighting a war in the category of using less than thermonuclear weapons and trying to destroy another country, estimates have been made that we could not get a single tanker to this country from Venezuela.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG. I ask unanimous consent to have 10 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Wisconsin know that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I would like the Senator to reconsider the reasoning he is proceeding on. He is proceeding on the reasoning that if we had a war with Russia, she would threaten to obliterate Canadian cities with her enormous power; but, at the same time, she would have enough sanity and gentleness and restraint that she would not use nuclear weapons on this country. That gives a notion of the quality of the reasoning that relies on national defense to justify the oil import program.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator did not hear what I said, obviously he would say I was in error. I was trying to tell the Senator that we cannot rely on Canadian oil in a defensive emergency that might occur. We cannot rely upon it. I am saying that, if we were fighting the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union might tell Canada that if Canada insisted on providing the United States with the essential oil, which was the last thing left to keep us going, she would bomb Canada. I did not say with thermonuclear weapons. I said "bomb." I did not say "bomb with thermonuclear weapons." I said "bomb."

If the Senator ever saw what we did to Hamburg and Berlin in World War II merely with conventional bombs, he knows we can do a pretty good job with those weapons.

But let us assume it was a thermonuclear war and Russia had proceeded to knock out all of our major refineries the first day, and the second day she knocked out everything she had missed the first day, and then proceeded to put bombs on our offshore wells, whatever ones we might be operating that were economical—and I shall meet the Senator on that point later. With all that supply gone, about the only thing that would let Uncle Sam continue so he could hang on the ropes and not go down for a 10 count, would be Canadian oil. At that point the Soviet Union would say, "Canada, you are the only one keeping the United States going, and if you insist on providing this oil for the United States, we will regard it as an unfriendly act, and we are going to deal with you, too." At that point Canada would say, as a matter of survival, "The United States is going to be exterminated, and they are threatening to exterminate us, too."

Canada would have to make the fateful decision as to whether she would not or would provide us with the oil at the cost of being exterminated, as Russia had exterminated the population of the United States.

So I say we cannot rely on Canada for the oil, especially if we do not have an agreement with Canada that she will provide the oil under such conditions—which we do not have. If the Senator thinks Canada will make an agreement to give us that oil under any conditions, I invite him to come in with an agreement of that kind. He ought to try to get such a treaty and bring it in, because we do not have such an agreement; and I predict that when the Senator does bring in such an agreement we will be paying a high price for it.

So much for that.

The Senator said something about the oil producing companies being effective——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator yield on the question of Canadian oil exports to us?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that oil from Canada was exempted from the oil import program on the very ground I am talking about, because it was considered by this Government to be available in case of war and it is only recently that this initial decision has been modified?

Mr. LONG. That was not the real reason, Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What was the real reason? Why was it exempted? After all, the reason for it, as the Senator has emphasized over and over again, is national defense.

Mr. LONG. The real reason is that Canada would have some very severe imbalance of payments problems if we did not do that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Which is more important? National survival or balance of payments?

Mr. LONG. I am telling the Senator the real reason. It was to help Canada.

Does the Senator know how much Canadian oil Canada is using for its own purposes?

Mr. PROXMIRE. About 40 percent, I would think. That is my guess, but it could be a little less than that. It is far less than half.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator mind telling me why it is that Canada does not provide its own requirements of oil? She has plenty.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Because it is cheaper to import oil from Venezuela, into the east coast especially. That is why.

Mr. LONG. The point I am getting at is that the oil Canada is importing is for the most part world market oil which is being brought to the eastern seaboard, and she is buying that oil at the world market price. What Canada is producing in the West she is selling to us at our price. It does not make sense to let someone take advantage of us in that way and our not get anything for it.

Some people say that, in one sense, Canada is doing something for us and that we should subsidize her and help her out; otherwise she would have an unfavorable balance of payments and she would be in deep financial trouble. That is about the only advantage helping Canada has.

As far as relying on that oil is concerned, some people say we ought to have a common market on oil. Perhaps we should, but if we did, we should have an agreement that Canada would play the game by the same rules we have. We are not going to be able to play competitively with Canada if we let Canada play by her rules.

It is the same way in football. We play football with 11 men and Canada plays it with 12 men. Even if one had a better football team, the other team would kill that team if it were to play 60 minutes on the field when the other team had an extra man. That extra flanker would kill the other team, because that team would not have the defense to cover the 12th man. That is what we are talking about when we talk about having an oil agreement with Canada.

The Senator says we should not produce our requirements of oil because we ought to save all that oil and keep it in the ground, so that scarce oil would be available to us in the event this country should find itself in a war. May I suggest to the Senator that the first thing a man would do if he had an oil well that was not producing would be to take his lifting equipment and pumping equipment, and equipment of that nature, and use it elsewhere. The well would be sanded up, and it would cost a great amount of money to rework it and get it into production. He would move his equipment to the oil well that was still working a small profit over and above the cost of production. When it came to reworking that well, if he estimated that it would cost $2,000 to rework the well and he would not get more than $1,500 before he got through reworking it, he would shut it down and let it get sanded up and go out of production. He might put concrete at the bottom of it, pull the pipe up, and sell it for whatever he could get, or put it to work where he had another well.

So those wells just would not be available to us. Those wells would go out of production soon. You would cannibalize, by taking parts from them for some other well that could stay in operation, and use that one until it was in the same condition, and then it would go off the stream.

The Senator says 95 percent of our wells are still economical. Let me show the Senate how illogical that is. It is true that where you have a well in the ground, and you have already drilled it, even if you have to sell the oil for a dollar, you could still go ahead and take the oil out of the well and keep operating until you had exhausted that particular well. But you could not afford to go and look for more oil. You could not afford to send the seismograph crews out. You could not afford to drill exploratory wells. You could not afford to risk venture capital to go and find more oil, if you were trying to compete against a $1.75 world market. You could do some of that in the Gulf of Mexico, or you could do some of it off the shore of California. You could do some of it where the big find has been located in northern Alaska.

But with regard to these small upland wells, which are about the only ones we can rely upon still to be in production in the event of a real emergency, you could not afford to do that with regard to any of those, or at any rate very few of them, and those are the most essential ones.

Furthermore, these little refineries, which would be the last ones left after an enemy got through knocking out big refineries in New Jersey, the big refineries in Baton Rouge, and the big refineries in Lake Charles—they are the vital targets; they would knock those off in a hurry, in a big war. But after those big refineries are gone, we have more than 100 small refineries scattered throughout this country. An enemy would have great difficulty finding or destroying them. Those would be the first refineries to go out of business in the event we had no oil import control program.

The oil that would be available to those refineries is the same oil that is not economical to produce. That would be the last thing we would be able to hold on to, to defend our country.

The Senator says 95 percent of the wells could continue to produce. They would produce, but we could not afford to drill any more. They would gradually go out of operation, and we would only have a very few tidelands wells, which are a very poor security risk if we were counting on them to see us through the essential requirements in the event of a war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

Mr. LONG. I ask unanimous consent to have 3 more minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. How many additional minutes did the Senator request?

Mr. **LONG**. I asked for 3 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **LONG**. Mr. President, yesterday I made the statement that the oil industry pays more taxes than the average for all manufacturing. The Senator from Wisconsin indicated that the industry paid about 17 percent as far as income taxes are concerned as compared with close to 50 percent for other industries. This statement, of course, quite adroitly avoids the point I later made, that in talking about taxes, you must speak in terms of the total taxes paid by the industry, recognizing that in the oil industry there are other taxes involved, such as local severance and production taxes, pipeline taxes, and property and ad valorem taxes.

When you make these valid considerations, you can then determine the rate of return on invested capital which is the meaningful comparative figure. For the 12-year average, 1955–66, all manufacturing industries had a rate of return on invested capital of 10.9 percent while the petroleum industry had a rate of return of 9.7 percent. Between 1963 and 1966, the Federal income taxes on oil increased from $490 million to $780 million; the State taxes, which include income taxes, production taxes, ad valorem taxes, severance taxes, and franchise taxes increased from $630 million to $720 million; other local taxes—principally property taxes—went up from $480 million to $550 million. Other taxes, which include payroll taxes, Federal lubricating oil taxes, and other miscellaneous taxes rose from $400 million to $450 million. Taking a particular year, in 1964 oil's taxes were equivalent to 4.82 cents for each dollar of total revenue as compared with 4.32 cents for all businesses. In 1965, oil's taxes amounted to 5.43 cents per dollar of gross revenue while other corporations paid only 4.62 cents per dollar.

On top of all this, it must be remembered that in 1966, for example, foreign taxes paid by oil companies totaled over $1,131 million.

Mr. President, that was a trade against the taxes that would have been owed to this Government. If they had not paid it to a foreign country, they would have had to pay it over here.

So far as a businessman is concerned, it makes no difference whether he is paying it to the city of Baton Rouge, to the State of Louisiana, to the parish of East Baton Rouge, to the U.S. Government, or to Saudi Arabia. It is still taxes. What he wants to know is, "How much will I have left after taxes?" The oil producer receives the least profit, and he pays more than the other guys; it is just that simple.

Mr. President, when the Senator from Wisconsin tried to cut the depletion allowance, I had a big chart prepared. I had it placed in the RECORD. I have here a small reprint.

At one time apparently someone did not understand whose chart it was because the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) heard the Senator make his speech in favor of cutting the depletion allowance, and he said, "I agree with the Senator, as the charts well demonstrate."

Those were my charts. They proved my point. Apparently the Senator thought they proved the case against my point.

I ask unanimous consent to have the chart printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXES ON OIL

	1963	1966
Direct taxes (in millions):		
Federal income	$490.0	$780.0
State taxes	630.0	720.0
Local taxes	480.0	550.0
Other	400.0	450.0
Total (5 percent of total revenue) (in billions)	2.0	2.5
Excise taxes (in billions)	6.5	8.0
Total taxes (in billions)	8.5	10.5

Mr. **LONG**. Mr. President, the chart says taxes on oil. It lists the same items I covered with the Senator. And it shows that on direct taxes, Federal income taxes, State taxes, local taxes, and others, as of 1966, the figure was $2.5 billion. And it has a total in parentheses. It says 5 percent of total revenue.

The reason that is there is that it is about what an investor expects to make when he goes into business. He expects that he will make about 5 percent of his total revenue.

Five percent will be paid in taxes. If one goes behind the decimal point, he will find that they were not paying about the same as other people, but were paying more. He would find that the figures were even more favorable to my contention.

So this industry is paying more in terms of direct taxes than all other industries actually if these factors are taken into consideration. Then, if we add the excise taxes, the figure will be vastly bigger. That is a big burden on the product.

Gasoline minus taxes is selling at the refinery gate today for the same price that it was selling for 30 years ago. In terms of constant dollars, it is selling for one-third of what it was selling for 30 years ago. Very few other products can say that. The industry was able to accomplish this reduction because of improvements in technology.

Everybody in the industry and every good economist thinks one can sell more of a product if it does not have to carry a big burden. If an industry did not have to carry a burden as heavy as that borne by this product in some cases, naturally it could sell more. But even if we did not include the excise tax burden on the product, which is relatively heavier than on any other product except on tobacco or liquor, the oil industry is taxed more heavily than any other industry.

Some people vote against the liquor industry, and some people vote against the tobacco industry because they thought those products were injurious to health, or morally wrong. But taking those aspects out of it, oil is an essential item. It is taxed more heavily than is any other industry with the exception of the liquor and tobacco industries.

The Senator says they get away with too much. The truth is that they make less than the average because they pay more tax.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **LONG**. I yield.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, there is a very interesting discrepancy which I think I can explain. The Senator has just made a vigorous presentation in which he stated that the petroleum industry pays a much higher tax than does any other industry.

As I understand it, they pay far less than even small business. The figures I have from the U.S. Oil Week show that the oil industry paid something like 21.9 percent of its net income in virtually all its Federal, foreign, and State taxes including property taxes. Even small business pays 22 percent of its income in the revenue income tax alone.

But the Senator from Louisiana argues that oil pays a much higher percent in taxes. Why the difference? The difference is simple when one thinks about it. The reason is that the oil industry is an industry which makes a terrific net income on a relatively small revenue. As a result, if we compare their taxes with their over-all revenues, their total, gross income it seems that they pay a higher rate. However, I submit that the fair basis to use is the taxes compared with net income. This is what businessmen have available to pay taxes. That is the comparison I use. The Senator from Louisiana, uses gross.

My figures show that they are taxed far less heavily than almost any other industry. As I say, it is 21.9 percent of their net income, and this includes virtually all of their taxes, State taxes, foreign taxes, and Federal taxes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **LONG**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for an additional 5 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **LONG**. Mr. President, let me go on to show how this industry pays more taxes than any other industry. On the chart it shows $8.5 billion in 1963 and $10.5 billion in 1966. Those figures ought to include at least another $1 billion for income taxes to foreign countries. Actually, their total income and operating taxes paid to foreign countries in 1966 amounted to $3 billion.

The Senator said concerning foreign taxes that there is no basis for giving a depletion allowance for oil produced in foreign countries.

Insofar as I am concerned, I do not much care if someone is producing oil in Venezuela or Saudi Arabia whether he gets a depletion allowance. However, we do not allow him the allowance for the same reason that we allow it over here.

The reason is that the fellow is competing with other companies—German, Japanese, Italian, British. And those countries do not charge their oil companies any tax at all on what they produce over there. They charge them nothing. It is only when they bring it back and declare a dividend that they charge a tax.

As far as a corporate tax is concerned, they do not charge it there. And if our people had to pay the kind of taxes the Senator would impose upon them, it would be found that they could not compete with the British, the Japanese, the Italians, the Germans, or even the Russians. And we would not be getting any money from that source. As far as making money for the Government, we would be losing it because we would be killing the goose that lays the golden egg.

We do not collect the corporation taxes—and we collect very little corporation taxes—on what the oil companies are making in foreign countries. However, we get a lot of money out of that oil. Let me show the Senator why.

With respect to most companies, the big companies, the rule of thumb is that they will declare a dividend on a part of every dollar they make. They will put 50 cents into dividends and the other 50 cents will be put into expansion to keep the company rolling forward, to build it up bigger and better and to build new refineries. That all reflects it is not a reduction in the price of a product in the long run.

When the company makes more money in Saudi Arabia because of the price of oil, whether they sell the oil here or some place else, they bring back as much as they can and they declare half of it in dividends.

The people holding the corporate stock, relatively speaking, are high income people. They are paying as high as 40 cents on the dollar in taxes. They do not get any depletion on their dividend. The depletion allowance has already been taken. There is no depletion allowance available for the fellow receiving the dividend. It is probably safer to say that the man receiving the dividend pays a tax of 50 cents on the dollar for everything he gets. So, 25 cents out of every dollar they are making is going into Uncle Sam's Treasury.

So, if the Senator worries about this matter, bless your lucky stars, in addition to that, I submit that we are getting 25 cents out of every dollar they make in the world market. We are getting that much right here in the United States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator has not met my point that, while it is true—and I would concede to him—that the oil industry does pay high taxes in relationship to its gross overall revenue, this is not the proper comparison. One can go broke on an enormous gross, even though his tax may be very light.

The taxation authorities in this country, in all our States, years ago, felt that a net income tax was the fair way to impose taxes on a corporation rather than a gross tax. On a net basis, the oil industry is very lightly taxed. It pays less than half the taxes paid by other industries, on the basis of the figures from U.S. Oil Week's publication, which are taken from the SEC files.

My argument is that what they pay in relationship to their net income, their net profit, what they have available to pay, is a far better comparison than what the Senator is using, which is their gross. The Senator and I, I think, can get together.

Mr. LONG. I have put my figures in the RECORD, and the Senator has put his figures in the RECORD. I suggest that I study his figures overnight and he study my figures overnight, and tomorrow we will agree that I am right.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Tomorrow, I think we will agree, if the Senator will really think about this matter seriously, that they do pay a much lower tax in relation to their profits, in relation to their net income, in relation to their ability to pay. After all a company cannot pay a tax very long out of its gross if it is losing money without going bankrupt. It can pay out of its net. Here is the fair comparison.

Mr. LONG. I am going to make a big concession. I am going to agree with the Senator that the oil industry in the United States pays a smaller amount of Federal income tax than other industries or than the average for all manufacturing—much less. I will agree to that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. A much smaller percentage of all taxes in relationship to their net income.

Mr. LONG. That is where the Senator is wrong. I have not seen the Senator's pink sheet, but——

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is yellow.

Mr. LONG. But I have had these gone over by economists, and I am positive that I am right; and if I look at the Senator's sheet——

Mr. PROXMIRE. I concede that those figures are right. I do not dispute them. But I say they are irrelevant, because we should be talking about net profit. Here is the basis—not gross—on which any fair comparison of tax burden must be based.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I repeat the statement: It is true—I agree with the Senator—that if all you are looking at is the Federal income tax, this industry pays less than the average for all manufacturing, on profits.

Mr. PROXMIRE. All taxes.

Mr. LONG. But if the Senator will look at the severance tax, he will find that this is one of the very few industries that pay any severance tax, and the other industries that pay it pay very little.

In Louisiana, we hit them for 10 percent of gross before we know whether they made a profit or not.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The severance tax is included in the figures I have.

Mr. LONG. That is a tax they pay that nobody else pays.

When you take into account that they pay pipeline taxes——

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is included.

Mr. LONG. Take into account the property taxes. The Senator asks, "Why do they pay more property taxes?" The Senator is an apt listener, but he left the floor before I explained that yesterday.

The reason why this industry pays so much more property taxes is that when they go to drill a well somewhere and they want to produce from that well, they cannot do what some other industry does if they think that the tax is unreasonable. They just cannot get up and move out, because the only way they can get the oil is to be there with that well.

As I said yesterday—I do not know whether the Senator left the floor before I said it—a well cannot be drilled far enough to get Louisiana oil out of the ground up in Wisconsin. You might get some out of Minnesota, but you cannot get it out of Louisiana.

They have to be in Louisiana to get the oil. And the tax assessor is sitting on top of them. They put a higher assessment on the tanks and whatever else is there, to get more money out of these oil fellows.

I should like to conclude by making one more point, Mr. President, with regard to the organizations that are raising the price. There is not just one, but there are two organizations in business for the purpose of maintaining a higher price on oil sold on world markets. They are OAPEC and OPEC. OAPEC, which sounds almost the same, refers to the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries. It is composed of the mideastern and African countries. The other one—OPEC—refers to Organization of Petroleum Export Countries. It consists of all members of OAPEC, but it also includes Venezuela and Indonesia. The purpose of OAPEC was to be more vigorous and more forceful than OPEC and, hopefully, more effective and more militant about bringing pressure on foreign oil companies, such as those of the United States, with threats of nationalization of their properties and other measures so as to obtain a higher price and a better deal for the producing countries, more advantageous to them. In my speech of March 12 I included a memorandum showing how these organizations work to bring more and more out of U.S. oil companies. It is on page 6174 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date.

Mr. President, the Senator made the statement that he thought increase in competition would cause the price to go down if the demand for the product was greater. That does not make any sense to any economist—that when the demand for a product is greatly increased, the price goes down. It works the other way around, and any classical economist, I think, would say that when the demand for a product is increased, the price goes up.

To prove my point, check with the people administering the program. My impression is that they say if you did not have the oil import program, the world price would go up at least 39 cents a barrel. That is too conservative in the point of view of people with whom I have discussed the matter, who work for major companies. They have estimated a fairly swift rise of somewhere between 50 and 75 cents a barrel in world market prices, and they said it would creep up after that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then, would the Senator concede that the price to the American consumer would go down sharply, even though the world prices of oil went up?

Mr. LONG. Temporarily. In the long run, as these organizations became more and more effective in working together and collaborating and sharing markets, the price would go up to the price at which you could make fuel out of shale. That would be the limiting factor. I do not think they would want to take a chance on forcing America to produce its fuel from shale, because once they got into that, they would have lost a good market for a long time to come.

This is a quotation from the statement I made when I spoke about the Machiasport issue on March 12. It is a quote from the Department of the Interior document entitled "Cost of the Oil Import Program to the American Economy." They say:

> The assumption that foreign crude oil prices, taxes and royalties would not rise with increased imports is probably valid only in the short run. While unused world capacity to produce crude oil might delay an immediate rise in world crude oil costs, shipments to the United States would rise from 5 percent of free foreign supplies in 1967 to 15 percent by 1980, *and would almost certainly result in higher prices*. Moreover, the growing reliance of the United States on foreign crude oil would strengthen the bargaining position of a host of producing countries *whose past performance demonstrates intentions of continually increasing their share of producing profits*.

Mr. President, when I made that speech and referred to that quotation, I placed in the Record a memorandum discussing case after case after case where these foreign countries have repeatedly, even in violation of their pledged word, their sworn word, raised the prices up, and up, and up, and made the companies pay more and more and more, even though they promised not to do it. There is no way they can be held to their word because they cannot be sued in the Supreme Court or in any court in the United States. The only court to which we could go is the one that they appoint. Mr. President, then you are likely to be told what the Peruvian court told the company that was a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey; that although the court was on the side of Standard Oil, the court had no power to overrule the decree of a military junta, which means, in effect, that the power over there is with the military people. In effect, it means, "It is too bad you have to be confiscated." That is typical of what you run into, Mr. President, when you go into court in foreign lands.

I filled the Record on that occasion of examples where host countries kept boosting the price so the price would go up if you rely on them.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the principal author of the resolution (S. Res. 167), dealing with the speech reinforcement system.

The Senator will remember that I have been a protagonist of this idea which is incorporated, in general principle, in the resolution which provides that we should have some way of making ourselves heard. I am grateful that at long last the Committee on Rules and Administration has reported a proposal on that score. I would like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I can make the resolution the pending business?

Mr. JAVITS. Of course. I am sorry. I thought the resolution had been made the pending business.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The resolution has not been laid before the Senate yet.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

SPEECH REINFORCEMENT SYSTEM FOR THE U.S. SENATE CHAMBER

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 111, Senate Resolution 167, authorizing a speech reinforcement system for the U.S. Senate Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 167) authorizing a speech reinforcement system for the U.S. Senate Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it has been suggested, inasmuch as this matter is the pending business, that a quorum call be suggested so Senators will know the matter has been laid before the Senate. Therefore, I respectfully suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask at the same time unanimous consent that at the termination of the quorum call I may be again recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator suggest the absence of a quorum without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I think I had the floor and I yielded to the Senator from New York. Is that true?

Mr. JAVITS. I was recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York had the floor and he yielded to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Carolina wishes to be recognized, I withdraw my request. I hope that he will yield promptly to me, because I do have other problems.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I shall yield to the Senator promptly.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall be very brief. We have discussed this matter many times. The Senator will remember that I was the author of the original resolution that sought to accomplish this purpose 10 years ago. I brought it up in the Committee on Rules and Administration when the Senator from Montana (Mr. Mansfield) was presiding over that committee. My proposal did not get anywhere. Subsequently, a compromise was arrived at because we left it to the majority leader and the minority leader to come in with some ideas.

A number of us have been discussing this matter in the Republican conference luncheon. We are deeply concerned about the very questions I addressed to the Senator from North Carolina when the matter was before his committee and when I was there with the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Allott).

The question I raised is whether we are really adopting the most sophisticated and modern techniques to meet our needs, because I had a queezy feeling that what we are doing was a little bit old fashioned.

I wish to ask the chairman of the committee the following questions, and we will arrange later on to get the ranking minority member of the committee to agree if the chairman agrees.

Would it be the intention of the chairman and the committee if the resolution is agreed to—and the resolution gives the authority to the Committee on Rules and Administration—to seek also the concurrence of the majority leader and the minority leader? Many of us feel that if the committee and the majority leader and minority leader had concurred that we would really be getting the best break we could in the sense that we would have explored every conceivable avenue of modern technology and we would be coming up with the very best we could so that all of us can have pride in it in the Senate.

Does the Senator feel that is reasonable?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I readily agree to that because we would really want that kind of help. I remember vividly the part the Senator has played in this matter over a number of years, and the majority leader and the minority leader asking that something be done, going back to the Reorganization Act which the Senate passed and which the House of Representatives did not pass. That proposal was part of the Reorganization Act.

Mr. JAVITS. On my own amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The Senator is correct. It was section 335 in the Reorganization Act.

The Committee on Rules and Administration did what the Senate asked it to do, which was to instruct the Architect of the Capitol to hire what he considered to be very competent engineers, which they did. They reported to us.

We would like to have any additional information to be furnished because we do want the most modern system that can be installed.

Mr. JAVITS. Then, the Senate can feel that whatever is done would have the concurrence of the majority leader and the minority leader. Is that correct?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The Senator is correct. We would not want to have it any other way.

Mr. President, so far as I know, I will be glad, now, to answer any questions, although the information is fully included in the report which has tried to answer everything we can think of. Everything is explained as to the engineers, and so forth.

I am ready now to answer any questions but am happy at this point to yield to the Senator from Illinois for a statement.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, let me commend the distinguished Senator from North Carolina for the report and moving this project forward. It is one which I think is urgently needed and long overdue.

In the area of electronics, let me urge that quality is exceedingly important. I would hope that we would not in any way sacrifice quality, and strive to obtain the best possible sound reproduction and the best possible system in order to maintain the intimacy of the Senate and not have a system which would blare forth, as do some audio systems with which we have had experience.

May I ask the Senator one technical question, as to whether it would be possible, or whether the committee has given consideration to having individual volume controls on the speakers themselves, because hearing, like sight, varies with individuals and the comfort of listening is considerably changed and altered if we can bring up a soft voice or tone down a loud one to the individual capacity of the Senator.

If there could be an individual volume control on the speaker itself, I think it would add a great deal of flexibility and comfort to the system.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Let me answer that question by reading question 10 at the top of page 10 of the report, as follows:

> *Question No. 10.*—Can the volume of the loudspeaker be adjusted by the Senator? *Answer.*—It is not recommended by the consultants, because the system is designed to operate at low volume throughout the entire Chamber. Random adjustments or complete silencing of several loudspeakers would upset the inherently refined balance of the system.

Mr. President, I certainly am not an expert on this kind of system, or things related to it, but we did hire what was considered to be one of the best engineering consultant firms in the country, and this recommendation and the other things were gone into thoroughly. It is a low-frequency system which takes into consideration the low voice as opposed to the high voice and will be regulated accordingly. We can shut the speaker off. The microphone will not be in service unless it is picked up, because if it were live any conversation with one's seatmate could be broadcast, which we would not want, of course. There would be a console somewhere, in a proper location in this Chamber, to regulate the voices. I know what the Senator from Illinois means, that there are some voices which are pretty loud. They will be handled adequately by competent engineers.

Mr. PERCY. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to be recognized for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Nebraska for that purpose?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment now at the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 7, line 8, insert the following: "*Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, shall not enter into a contract for such system prior to thirty days after the detailed design and costs for the same have been presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, let me say that I am for an amplifying system being placed in the Chamber. So far as I know, I have no quarrel with what has been proposed and I commend those who have worked on it.

I invite attention to the fact that a fairly good summary of what is proposed here appears on page 13 of the report, in the form of a letter to the Sergeant at Arms from the Architect of the Capitol and I ask unanimous consent to have that letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
Washington, D.C., October 11, 1968.

Hon. ROBERT G. DUNPHY,
Sergeant at Arms,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DUNPHY: Pursuant to the provisions of contract No. ACbr–576 dated May 6, 1968, our acoustical consultants, Mr. Richard H. Bolt and Mr. Robert B. Newman of Cambridge, Mass., have engaged in comprehensive studies related to (1) the acoustical characteristics of the Senate Chamber as presently constructed and furnished, (2) the objectionable background noises which persist when the Chamber is totally unoccupied, (3) the unavoidable noises generated by the movement and intermittent presence of visitors, and (4) the adverse effects of echoes on the intelligibility of speech emanating from the Senate floor. All of the aforementioned circumstances, contributing in varying degrees to the present poor reception of natural speech in some areas of the Senate floor and in all galleries, are fully described in the accompanying report.

Our consultants' conclusions concerning the circumstances and adversities now prevailing in the Senate Chamber are as follows:

(1) The basic acoustical characteristics of the Chamber are typical for such spaces and will not present any significant problems when and if a speech reinforcement system is installed in the Chamber and its galleries.

(2) The background noises presently being generated by mechanical equipment operating both in the attic and basement of the Senate wing are extrinsic circumstances that can be reduced significantly by the proper application of modern sound attenuating procedures and devices in the areas where these noises are generated.

(3) The unavoidable transient noises generated by the movement and presence of visitors are intermittent in nature and their momentary sound levels in many instances are significantly higher than the continuous ambient noise levels produced by the mechanical equipment located in the attic and basement. At times, when the visitors remain quiet, the noise produced by the mechanical equipment becomes predominant. Advantages to be gained by enclosing the galleries with combined glass and solid partitions are described in the consultants' report and are reiterated hereinafter.

(4) The speech reception in all areas of the Chamber floor and in all galleries can be audible, natural, and effective if a properly designed speech reinforcement system is installed.

It is the opinion of our consultants that a speech reinforcement system consisting generally of (1) individual desk-mounted microphones and miniaturized loudspeakers for all Members, (2) a complement of microphones and loudspeakers distributed in the rostrum area for the Presiding Officer and other Senate officials, (3) a removable floor-stand microphone for use by distinguished visitors occasionally addressing the Senate, (4) a complement of loudspeakers for the Official Reporters, and (5) a wide distribution of loudspeakers in the galleries collectively will provide audible, natural, and effective speech reception throughout the entire space. An installation of this type, including extensions to the cloakrooms and Marble Room, is described and delineated in the accompanying report. The extensions to each cloakroom would provide facilities for the use of earpieces at will by Senators desiring to follow the floor proceedings, and a loudspeaker with local volume control at the page desk. The facilities in the Marble Room will be limited to the use of earpieces. An installation of this type is recommended in the accompanying report submitted by Messrs. Bolt and Newman, and they have estimated that the cost thereof, based on current price levels, will be approximately $108,500.

To avoid conflicts with the activities of the Senate and to conform with established security regulations, the physical installation of the system components should be accomplished by the qualified electronic technicians presently on my staff. The consultants' cost estimate is based on this premise.

The aforementioned cost estimate does not include expenditures for the reduction of background noises generated by mechanical equipment. Rectification of this annoyance is separate and distinct from the speech intelligibility solution and should be accomplished whether or not a speech reinforcement system is installed. Likewise, the cost of constructing enclosing partitions is not included for reasons hereinafter mentioned.

Our consultants have indicated in their report that the effectiveness of a speech reinforcement system in the Senate Chamber can be enhanced generally, and particularly in the galleries, by the construction of combined glass and solid partitions extending from the top of the railings at the perimeter of the galleries to the Chamber ceiling. The presence of such partitions would intercept the noises generated in the galleries and improve the microphones pickup at the desks. Both of these factors would be beneficial to the transmission of speech from the rostrum and floor of the Chamber. Furthermore, such partitions would permit the use of higher sound amplification levels in the galleries, a circumstance that would improve reception by the gallery audience.

The consultants agree with the Sergeant at Arms that enclosing the galleries also would make it possible to provide a significantly better accommodation for the thousands of persons that visit the Senate Chamber annually. By removing one or two rows of rear seats in one section of the gallery to form an aisle or passageway between two corridor entrance doors, a continuous procession of guided tour visitors could observe the proceedings of the Senate, while other less transient visitors are seated in the front rows of the same gallery section. In this way a significantly larger number of visitors would have an opportunity to briefly observe the activities of the Senate without being subjected to crowding and prolonged waiting in the corridors, or departing with an attitude of frustration and disappointment.

Since the architectural aspects and structural problems associated with the construction of enclosing partitions are factors beyond the scope of accoustical consultants, as well as any esthetic considerations in connection therewith, Messrs. Bolt and Newman have correctly confined their remarks to the acoustical efficacy of such partitions. The practicality of such new construction, including the determination of the cost thereof, necessarily would have to be the subject of a separate study and report developed by competent architects and structural engineers engaged by this office upon proper authorization.

You will be interested in knowing that our acoustical consultants have designed and specified speech reinforcement systems for the State Capitol, House of Representatives, Jefferson City, Mo.; the State Capitol, Concord, N.H.; the North Carolina State Reynolds Coliseum, Raleigh, N.C.; the Field House, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.; and many other successfully operating installations.

Attached are two copies of the formal report prepared and submitted by the acoustical consultants. Additional copies presently are in transit from Cambridge, Mass. The arrival of this shipment is expected momentarily.

The assistance and extraordinary courtesies extended by your staff have contributed substantially in the effective accomplishment of this endeavor.

Sincerely yours,

J. George Stewart,
Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the only estimates of the cost I can find are not too specific. On page 56, referring to the cost of the system, the grand total, including equipment cost is given as $86,818.35; installation $10,000—that is an allowance for overtime because it will be done by employees from the Architect's office; and professional services, $11,600, making a total of $108,418.35.

However, the Committee on Rules and Administration has already made some modifications of that, in that it is proposed there be a glassed-off passageway for tourists who come into the galleries and go out quickly so that they can hear what is going on but the noise they create will not filter down into the Chamber. That is discussed in the report on page 7.

It is entitled "Proposed Visitors Passageway Through Southwest Corner of Senate Gallery." I ask unanimous consent to have that excerpt of the report printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Proposed Visitors' Passageway Through Southwest Corner of Senate Gallery

A proposed visitors' passageway would eliminate a substantial amount of the ambient noises which now emanate from the galleries. At present guided tours visit the gallery very briefly in the course of the Capitol Building tour. These groups enter galleries set aside for them, move to seats, remain a few minutes, arise and leave to continue their tour. Their movement is, unavoidably, accompanied by a good deal of distracting sound. In addition, and especially during the spring and summer months, a substantial number of gallery seats must be set aside for these visiting tours.

Assuming a speech reinforcement system as proposed will be installed in the Senate Chamber, a plan has been developed which will provide an opportunity for guests on the Capitol Building tour to have a brief exposure to the Senate during its sessions, without going through the seating procedure described above.

This envisions the installation of a passageway in the southwest corner of the gallery with an entrance opposite the top of the west grand staircase and an exit to the third floor corridor immediately south of the Senate Chamber. Such a passageway can be constructed without impairing the dignity of the Chamber. It would be constructed of vertical transparent panels topped with a transparent ceiling. Obviously a passageway constructed in this manner would confine the unavoidable noises generated by the intermittent ingress and egress of large groups and, in addition, provide the opportunity for a greater number of visitors on tours to observe and hear the Senate proceedings. Moreover, it would free a substantial number of seats now reserved for tours, which could then be used by visitors who desire to observe the Senate for longer periods. This enclosure would be equipped with several loudspeakers of the type installed on the desks to provide low-level sound distribution within the passageway. The transparent walls and ceiling of the passageway would obviate the need for additional lighting.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, let me explain what I have in mind by my amendment. Its purpose is to provide the Committee on Rules and Administration with specific details as to what is proposed. By specific details, I mean as to each desk, and so forth, and what all of this will cost, and that the Committee on Rules and Administration have that information for 30 days before a contract is let. During that 30 days, if it be my expectation that the Committee on Rules and Administration would ask the majority leader and the minority leader for their opinions as to whether the system should proceed, I believe that this proviso will hurt nothing and think that it will be of considerable help to the Architect of the Capitol and the Sergeant at Arms.

The resolution as drawn is quite broad. It reads:

> The Architect of the Capitol in conjunction with the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate be authorized to install a speech reinforcement system and auxiliary appurtenances in the Chamber of the United States Senate subject to the approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration; and that there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

How much money? We do not know. The first part of the resolution authorizes these two officials to install it, and that would be the voice of the Senate. It is true it reads "subject to the approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration." Does that mean we are sidewalk foremen or that we are asked about something after it has already been done? I do not know, but I do know that very often, in contracts pertaining to the U.S. Capitol and Congress particularly, projects are started which cost much money, Members are dissatisfied, the public is dissatisfied, and we all have red faces after it is done and wonder why it was not done differently.

All the proposal provides is that, before a binding contract is entered into to spend any money—because we have already paid a consultant some money—the detailed design and cost be filed with the Committee on Rules and Administration and that 30 days go by.

That provision will give the Committee on Rules and Administration an opportunity to refer to the leadership. If the leadership or any other Senator have any doubts as to the wisdom, the propriety, or the cost of it, the floor is open. They can take such action as is necessary.

At the same time, I do not think this provision would cause an undue burden or undue delay. Whatever is installed will be used for a long time. It should be installed in a way that meets with the approval of the greatest number of Senators possible and that will be an irritation to the fewest number possible.

Therefore, I believe that, as a matter of precaution, we would not make a mistake by asking for the detailed plans and cost before a contract is let.

Now I want to say to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Jordan), that, because of illness, I could not attend the Committee on Rules and Administration. I am coming in late with my amendment. I plead guilty. I offer this amendment as no criticism of the Committee on Rules and Administration whatever. It should have been suggested before, but, under the circumstances, I could not do it. I hope the amendment can be adopted.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; surely.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I think it is a very reasonable amendment which the Senator has offered. I am glad to accept it. We would do that, anyway. We certainly would not want to let a contract unless the Senator and I and a great many other people had an opportunity to review it, because we are going to be responsible for it.

Mr. CURTIS. I appreciate that very much. I believe the provision will be of considerable help to the Sergeant at Arms and the Architect of the Capitol. As the resolution stands, they are directed to install. The amendment provides that they are not to enter into a contract until the detailed design and costs have been delivered and a period of 30 days has gone by in order to give an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. May I go a little further? Just a few minutes ago the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) posed a question. I readily accepted the idea that the majority leader and minority leader be consulted before anything was definitely decided on, so we could get their thinking on it. I told him I agreed with that idea.

Mr. CURTIS. My amendment would fit in with that thinking.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It fits in with what the Senator from Nebraska has said.

Mr. CURTIS. So something more concrete would be referred to the leadership than what we have today.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I may go a little further. On the day the Senator from Nebraska was unavoidably absent, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration, where we had a mockup desk with the full instruments, and so forth, on it. We asked each Senator to be there. A good many Senators came. We were delighted with that. The engineers were there to answer questions.

I think the Senator from Nebraska has offered a very valuable amendment, and we are glad to take it.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I would also like to support the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. I have been interested in this matter for a long time. I am interested in it because in several of the committee rooms in which we meet in the New Senate Office Building we have so-called loud speaker systems. Of those rooms in which I meet, the one which most needs a loud speaker system is the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs room. I am sure there is approximately $5,000 worth of equipment in that room, and I am sure that even a person who was relatively an amateur in sound techniques could set up a system that was better, for perhaps one-tenth of the cost of that equipment. It is completely inadequate.

I must say that I was not entirely happy with the answers of the engineer who was present at the meeting. For example, he said we would need a separate channel for each speaker if we used a wireless system. I have no basis for knowing whether that is true or not, but I have been in rooms where wireless systems were utilized, and I am positive that not more than one channel was used in those rooms.

For those reasons, I myself do not want to see the Senate commit itself unequivocally to a system that may cost us a great deal of money. I do not think what we spend is as important as is that we get something which is satisfactory and which suits the needs of the Senate, because the amount we spend is going to be less than a drop in the bucket compared to what the operation of the whole Congress costs, let alone what the Government costs.

For those reasons, I am happy to support the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. I know that the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration and the members of that committee worked hard on this matter. Yet I also realize that this is an area in which probably only two or three in the Senate could claim to have expertise, despite the fact that all of us use loudspeakers all the time.

Therefore, I hope we go slowly, and I hope a system is installed which is adequate and which satisfies the needs of the Senate.

I must say the aspects of the system which is proposed, which is not a loudspeaking system, but, rather, a voice augmentation system, composed of a great number of small speakers scattered throughout the Senate and at Senator's desks, appeals to me. However, I still feel that an individual volume control, if there is to be a speaker at each desk, should be provided Senators in order that, if a Senator is really orating with great vocal strength, we can at least turn down the volume a little so we are not blasted out of our seats. On the other hand, some Senators speak in a very, very low tone of voice. For what I would call the "whispering Johnnys" we might want to turn it up a little. Therefore, I think we should have a little flexibility in whatever system we get.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I thank the Senator from Colorado. I hope the very things he is talking about will be incorporated in the system, so we will get the best system that competent engineers can provide.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 167), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol in conjunction with the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate be authorized to install a speech reinforcement system and auxiliary appurtenances in the Chamber of the United States Senate subject to the approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration; and that there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution; *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate shall not enter into a contract for such system prior to 30 days after the detailed design and costs for the same have been presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 1817 AND SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS 92 AND 93—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS ON ELECTORAL REFORM

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I rise to introduce three proposals designed to strip away conditions to full participation in the electoral process. These measures, if adopted, would provide for a system of 50 State presidential primaries, allow transients the right to vote in national elections, and establish a uniform 24-hour voting period for all presidential and congressional elections.

I offer my proposals, in the form of a bill and two joint resolutions, for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill and joint resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1817) to provide a uniform 24-hour voting period for polling places in Federal elections, introduced by Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. BAYH), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 92) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the conduct within each State of presidential preference elections and the election of delegates to conventions of national political parties for the nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; and the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 93) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States enabling citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, introduced by Mr. BAKER, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BAKER. The first of these measures is a proposed amendment to the Constitution providing for the establishment of a presidential preference primary in each of our 50 States. Under the terms of this proposal each State would be required to conduct its own primary election in which candidates for the presidency could enter at their own discretion. Voters would cast ballots for a presidential candidate in the primary of the political party of their choice and would, at the same time, also cast ballots for two candidates for delegate to the national convention from their congressional district and for the number of at-large candidates for delegate to the national convention to which their state might be entitled. The results of the presidential primary would, of course, be ascertained and announced but would not be binding upon the delegates elected by the people to the national nominating conventions.

Such a system of State primaries—in which each candidate for the Presidency might enter and in which delegates to the national nominating conventions would be duly elected by the rank and file—would have many benefits without the attendant disadvantages that might be present under a nationwide presidential primary. Since under this proposal the national nominating conventions would be retained, many of the arguments that have been advanced against a nationwide primary would be overcome. A system of 50 State primaries followed by a national convention would not eliminate the compromise mechanism for registering and accommodating dissent within our political parties. A single sudden death national primary would achieve this undesirable result and would eliminate the national party convention as a forum for bargaining and, ultimately, reconciliation.

Further, a national primary would often necessitate a runoff, eliminate reluctant candidates and the possibility of a draft, and might create a problem in the selection of a nominee for the Vice Presidency. These problems would not be present under the proposal which I introduce.

At the same time a system of 50-State primaries would insure a more open and democratic method of selecting presidential nominees. It would reinforce rather than weaken our system of federalism, greatly strengthen party structures in each of the States, involve many more citizens in the vitally important work of partisan political activity, inhibit political manipulation, stimulate discussion of the issues by the candidates, and provide clear and unequivocal indicia of a given candidate's merit and of his ability to move the people.

Mr. President, closely connected to this question of reform of our nominating procedure is the intelligent controversy over reform of the electoral college system. I have previously made known my position in favor of direct election of our President and Vice President, and am a cosponsor of the proposed constitutional amendment to this effect introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH).

The many advantages of a direct vote have been frequently voiced. Under a system of direct election the possibility that the candidate winning the most popular votes might be deprived of the Presidency through the anachronistic vagaries of the electoral college would be eliminated. The wholesale disenfranchisement of minority voters in each State would be ended, and each vote would be registered equally. No man's vote would be eclipsed or magnified as a result of the chance factor of State residence. The office of elector would disappear, with the result that no unfaithful elector could take it in his own hands to influence the outcome of an election, and splinter parties would no longer have the ability to influence the outcome in pivotal States or to utilize their influence in a handful of States to throw the election into the House of Representatives.

It is for all of these reasons that I have given my support to the direct election of the President, and I seriously hope that the 91st Congress will take prompt and incisive action not only to reform our nominating procedure but also to provide for a direct election of our President.

Mr. President, the other two proposals that I introduce are also, in my judgment, urgently needed electoral reforms. The first is a measure that would provide that no citizen of the United States who is otherwise qualified to vote in a national election shall be denied that right to vote in a presidential election by reason of the fact that he has changed his residence from one State or political subdivision to another. This proposed amendment would require that a State allow one who has removed his residence to vote in a presidential election, by absentee ballot or otherwise, until such time as any residence requirement of the new place of residence is fulfilled.

As we all know, the citizens of our country are increasingly mobile. The Bureau of the Census has estimated that up to 20 percent of our citizenry is in a state of transition. In fact, it has been estimated that during a presidential election year as many as 5 million citizens are today denied the privilege of voting because they move into a new State too late to comply with residence qualifications.

All States have established qualifications for voting, with most including a residence requirement of 6 months to 2 years. No one seriously questions that the States should claim certain reservations concerning the right of any citizen to vote in local elections, on the ground that new citizens do not have sufficient knowledge of local issues and local candidates to draw meaningful conclusions or to cast an informed vote. But a far different situation prevails in national elections, in which a citizen, regardless of his residence, may become well informed on the programs and policies of each candidate seeking the office of President and in which the issues are national in scope. In this situation no citizen should be denied the right to vote because of a State residence requirement. This is a patently unjust impediment, and it must be removed.

Still another badly needed reform is the proposal for 24-hour voting coordinated between time zones. The bill which I introduce today with the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) provides for a 24-hour voting period for polling places in Federal elections. Under this provision polling places would remain open for a full 24 hours with voting beginning and ending at the same Greenwich mean time across the Nation.

This measure would, I believe, have two salutary effects. First, it would make voting a great deal easier for many Americans who now find polling hours inconvenient or impossible to meet. In almost every election our country is confronted with a serious nonvoting problem. In fact, in no national election in this century have more than 64 percent of the people of voting age gone to the polls, a ratio far below that in most other democratic countries. It is difficult to estimate how many of those millions of people who are sick or hospitalized or away from their homes on business or pleasure on election day would cast ballots if the voting period were extended to 24 hours, but every test of nonvoting that has been made indicates that there are a great number of people who have every intention of voting but are prevented from doing so by some unavoidable sickness, accident, or business.

Second, this measure would have the beneficial effect of eliminating the bothersome questions of whether early returns from eastern States and network computer predictions influence voting patterns in the West where polls are still open. The Baker-Bayh bill is designed to meet the growing concern over the effect on voters of electronic computers, a problem that has been aggravated in modern times by the rapid compilation, projection, and communication of election returns across the country through the media of radio and television. It is, of course, difficult to ascertain the actual effect of network computer projections based on partial returns in broadcasts of radio and television, but in my view we should not run the risk that a close presidential election could be decided by these predictions or that local candidates in these States would suffer because voters stayed away from the polls believing the presidential contest had already been decided.

Mr. President, I certainly do not favor replacing cumbersome, anachronistic electoral machinery that has served reasonably well with new machinery that might prove disruptive of our form of government or our political processes. I am confident that these measures will not have this effect, and I urge their enactment.

Mr. President, it occurs to me, as I have said in the Chamber before, and as I reiterate with enthusiasm now, that the hallmark of the greatness of the American democratic system is that the machinery of government, designed so exquisitely by our forefathers, is uniquely adapted to the job of sensing and determining the full range of desires, demands, and dissents of the people of the Nation, so as to assure that the governing policies of the country resonate fully to that range of desires, demands, and dissents expressed in terms of electoral activity by the people at the polls on election day.

I am convinced beyond the shadow of doubt that no single President, no administration, no Congress, no collection of people, no group within the academic community, or otherwise, possesses, singly or collectively, the insight, sensitivity, compassion, or intelligence to meet and cope with the problems that confront the Nation now and will confront it in the future as far as I can see; and that only one force in the world and in America is adapted to the changes of these times; namely, the collective genius of the people of America, the collective judgment of the electorate within this country.

So one of the most important jobs we can undertake, in my view, is to update the electoral machinery so as to provide maximum participation by the greatest number of citizens in the serious—in fact, the most serious—business of compiling the programs of the Government in the years just ahead, and making certain that all within the Nation, in every locality, of every race, color, and creed, of every political persuasion, can feel that they do in fact have a voice—an effective voice—in the formulating of the policies of the future.

Much as I venerate the democratic institutions which have made our country great; much as I believe the electoral process and the electoral machinery given us by our forefathers are uniquely adaptable to the present and the future, I believe they must be modernized to provide full effectiveness.

Therefore, I join the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) in introducing proposals that our two chief magistrates, the President and Vice President, be elected by popular vote, undiluted. I introduce these three measures to assure further that the machinery of government in this country will be fully responsive and will resonate accurately to the demands, desires, and dissents of all of the people of the country.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAKER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Tennessee for the introduction of these measures which are designed to make the election process of the country more meaningful. I suppose, as both of us have found in our study of the electoral college process and our efforts to refine it, that there will be in this case opponents of any meaningful change or any meaningful reform.

I second the statement which the Senator from Tennessee just made, indicating as delicately as I have heard indicated what an election process in the United States means. Those of us who have lived with it year in and year out for many years are prone to take it for granted. And those who live in some nations from which several Members of the Senate have just returned would give anything they own really to have an opportunity to exercise this franchise. I appreciate having the chance to join with the Senator on the measure, particularly the 24-hour voting procedure. I think that the limited time standards now set at polling places tend to make it more difficult for many voters to cast their ballots.

I think there is a considerable amount of inconsistency and many of us in the Senate and elsewhere yield to the temptation to beat our chests with pride about our Nation being a citadel in which people can make their own destiny. Yet we witness, as we did in 1968, the choice of a President of the United States with barely 62 percent of those eligible to vote making that choice.

I think the impact of the measure would be to make it more convenient to vote and increase the percentage of those who care to take advantage of the opportunity they have to cast their franchise.

Secondly, with reference to the matter to which the Senator from Tennessee referred, the influence that one part of the country may have on the other, I think this is amply taken care of in the measure he suggests.

I would imagine that if the committees have a chance to study the matter and hold hearings, we will have a chance to discuss some of the problems which might arise, financing problems and problems of one kind or another with the State and local officials.

As I see it, it is our responsibility in the Congress of the United States to see to it that elections are held justly if no other units will do so.

I think that the measure will go a long way toward accomplishing a more fair and equitable and growing degree of participation in the election of a President of the United States.

I salute the Senator from Tennessee for the initiative he has evidenced. I am grateful to be associated with him.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Indiana. I am especially grateful for his sponsorship of the 24-hour voting rule in view of his leadership in the field of electoral reform.

I am most pleased to have his support in this matter.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for his imaginative proposal. I think he has produced some very constructive ideas in connection with the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Indiana to provide for the direct election of the President. I think these are supplementary proposals that are worthwhile.

I indicate my approval.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the texts of the bill and joint resolutions be printed in full following my comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 1817

A bill to provide a uniform 24-hour voting period for polling places in Federal elections

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the text of section 1, title 3, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Except as otherwise provided by this chapter, the electors of President and Vice President shall be appointed, in each State, on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, in every fourth year succeeding every election of a President and Vice President.

"Whenever electors of President and Vice President are to be chosen by election in any State in any year, such election shall begin on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of that year, and the opening time of the polling places for that election shall be as follows: 11 ante meridian standard time in the eastern time zone; 10 ante meridian standard time in the central time zone; 9 ante meridian standard time in the mountain time zone; 8 ante meridian standard time in the Pacific time zone; 7 ante meridian standard time in the Yukon time zone; 6 ante meridian standard time in the Alaska-Hawaii time zone; and 5 ante meridian standard time in the Bering time zone. Such polling places in each State shall remain open until the same such meridian standard time on the Wednesday next after the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November."

SEC. 2. The text of section 25 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (2 U.S.C. 7), is amended to read as follows:

"The Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, in every even numbered year, is established as the day for the beginning of the election, in each of the States, of Representatives to the Congress commencing on the third day of January next thereafter.

"In any such election, the opening time of the polling places in the several States shall be as follows: 11 ante meridian standard time in the eastern time zone; 10 ante meridian standard time in the central time zone; 9 ante meridian standard time in the mountain time zone; 8 ante meridian standard time in the Pacific time zone; 7 ante meridian standard time in the Yukon time zone; 6 ante meridian standard time in the Alaska-Hawaii time zone; and 5 ante meridian standard time in the Bering time zone. The polling places in such election in each State shall remain open until the same such meridian standard time on the Wednesday next after the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November."

S.J. RES 92

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the conduct within each State of presidential preference elections and the election of delegates to conventions of national political parties for the nomination of candidates for President and Vice President

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE ——

"SECTION 1. During each year which immediately precedes a year in which the terms of President and Vice President expire, each State shall conduct a presidential preference election in which voters of that State may express their preference for candidates of national political parties for nomination for President. Each such candidate shall be entitled to have his name placed upon the ballot of his party in such election conducted in any State in accordance with the law of such State. No person shall be named upon any such ballot as such a candidate without his consent. The number of votes cast in such election within each State for each such candidate shall be officially ascertained and announced, but the result of such preference election shall not be binding upon delegates to any nominating convention.

"SEC. 2. Delegates of each national political party from each State to each nominating convention of that political party shall be chosen in the presidential preference election conducted in that State. Delegates of each such political party so chosen from each State shall include two delegates elected from each Congressional district of the State, and two delegates elected from the State at large for each Representative in the Congress who is elected from the State at large. Delegates of each such political party so chosen from each State shall include such additional number of delegates elected from the State at large as the national governing body of that political party shall prescribe.

"SEC. 3. Each State shall determine by law the manner in which the names of candidates for the nomination of any national political party for President, and candidates for delegate to the nominating convention of any national political party, shall be placed upon the ballot in any presidential preference election. The time at which any presidential preference election is conducted in any State shall be determined by the law of that State unless the Congress shall by law appoint a different day.

"SEC. 4. Each State shall prescribe by law the qualifications of voters in presidential preference elections conducted within that State, but each qualified voter in any such election may cast ballots for candidates of any political party of his choice without regard to his registration as a member of that political party or any other political party. No voter in any such election may cast ballots for candidates of more than one national political party. Each such voter in any State may cast his ballot for one candidate for the nomination of that political party for President, for two candidates for delegate to the nominating convention of that political party from the congressional district in which he resides, and for the number of candidates for delegate to such convention elected from that State at large equal to the number of such delegates so elected to which that State is entitled.

"Sec. 5. The candidates of each national political party for President and Vice President shall be chosen by majority vote of the delegates elected under this article from all States to a nominating convention of that party which shall be convened not later than September 15 in the year in which such delegates are chosen. Upon the final adjournment of each such convention, the presiding officer thereof shall certify the names of the candidates so chosen in such manner as the Congress shall prescribe by law.

"Sec. 6. Under this article, the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a State, and the Congress shall enact legislation necessary to carry this article into effect within the District of Columbia. For the purposes of this article, a political party shall be considered to be a national political party if in the most recent previous presidential election the candidates of that political party for elector for President in all States received in the aggregate at least ten per centum of the total number of votes cast in all States for candidates of all political parties for elector for President.

"Sec. 7. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"Sec. 8. This article shall take effect on the 30th day of January following its ratification.

"Sec. 9. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

S.J. Res. 93

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States enabling citizens of the United States who change residences to vote in presidential elections

Resolution by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states:

"Article ——

"Section 1. No citizen of the United States who, while a resident of a political subdivision of any State, has become qualified to vote in that political subdivision in an election to choose electors for President and Vice President shall be denied the right to vote in that political subdivision in that election because of the removal of his legal residence before the date of that election to another political subdivision of the same or any other State if that election occurs before the expiration of the minimum period of residence in such other political subdivision which is required of that citizen for qualification to vote in that election in such other political subdivision. For the purposes of this article, the district constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall be considered to be a State.

"Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"Sec. 3. The article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until noon on Friday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bellmon in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate until noon on Friday next, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and from the House of Representatives, and that they may be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. I also ask unanimous consent that, during the adjournment, all committee be authorized to file reports, together with individual, minority, and supplemental views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that this be done without the Senator from Maine losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bellmon in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PROPOSED FOREIGN TRADE ZONE AT MACHIASPORT, MAINE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy) and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McIntyre), I should like this afternoon to spend a few moments of the Senate's time to discuss a project which is of particular interest to my State and to New England, and which has already been the subject of some discussion on the floor of the Senate—the so-called Machiasport project.

I expect that the discussion this afternoon will be only one of many such discussions in the weeks and months ahead, so I do not expect to cover the subject exhaustively this afternoon. It is our desire to begin a discussion from the point of view of New England, from the point of view of those who support this project in New England's interests.

The people of New England know their needs for low cost fuel have been ignored for too long. The Governor of Maine has taken steps to reverse this situation by making application for a foreign trade zone in Machiasport, Maine. The trade zone would contain an oil refinery which will use foreign crude oil to produce cheap fuel for New England. The plan has had powerful opposition. There has been a great deal said and written about the impact of this proposed refinery on the U.S. economy and national security. Many of these statements have been misleading, or based on incomplete information. The New England delegation has a responsibility to set the record straight, to present the facts so that a proper judgment may be made with reference to the foreign trade zone proposal, the application for an oil import allocation, and the proposed change in the mandatory oil import regulations.

On March 12, 1969, our colleague, the junior Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Long) made a speech on the floor in which he spoke of the risks he saw in constructing an oil refinery in New England. We, the New England delegation, would like to submit for the Record a paper which briefly disputes the major points made in that speech. As the weeks go by, we will continue to speak to these points in detail. We will provide the facts to enlighten the Senate on the advantages of the Machiasport proposal. So I ask unanimous consent that this brief statement be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MUSKIE. With respect to the many points which might be raised in refutation of the speech made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I should like to touch upon one this afternoon, and I except that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire will touch upon others.

For example, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana challenged the request for an oil import quota of 100,000 barrels per day to serve the proposed refinery in New England. He described it in such terms as "fantastic oil concession," "crippling body blow to the oil import program," and "discrimination against other companies." He went into detail to explain how the allocation of 100,000 barrels a day of foreign oil would in his judgment threaten our national security.

In the same speech, however, he expressed approval of the allocation of import quotas of 240,000 barrels to three companies for the development of desulfurization plants. On January 23, 1969, Guardian Oil Co. was granted a 95,000-barrel-per-day quota; Supermarine was given 46,500, and Fuel Desulfurization Inc. was given 100,000 barrels per day.

The rationale was that these quotas of foreign oil would be used to produce low-sulfur oil to meet clean air regulations, thus eliminating air pollution problems in New England. I should explain that the three companies awarded these oil import quotas were newly organized. They have no prior marketing experience, no oil production, no transportation and distribution facilities, no markets, and no specific plant location. By the same token, a site has been selected in New England for the Machiasport refinery, a company has been selected that will refine low-sulfur oil, and New England independent marketers are ready to supply the market outlets.

We cannot understand how anyone can attack a refinery at Machiasport which would use a 100,000-barrel-a-day quota, and at the same time endorse allocations to import 241,000 barrels a day.

I support any legitimate move to produce and supply low-sulfur, nonpolluting residual fuel oil, oil not presently being produced in this country. That is one reason that I support the refinery at Machiasport which will produce such an oil because it will be refining low-sulfur crude oil from the Middle East instead of the high-sulfur Western Hemisphere crude oil.

On March 12 our colleague from Louisiana assured us that this 241,000-barrels-a-day import allocation for desulfurization refining will, "preserve the integrity of the mandatory import program." I think there is evidence to the contrary. In the April 7, 1969, issue of the Oil and Gas Journal there is an interesting article titled "Resid Sweetners Pluck Import Plum." This article states in part:

> A sleeper in oil-import regulations will allow operators of U.S. desulfurization plants to generate quotas for high-quality crude worth about $1/bbl in exchange for domestic residual actually processed in the plants.
>
> This was disclosed by Interior Department sources last week as a fourth desulfurization plant was announced. Steuart Refining Company, Washington, D.C., applied for a 100,000 barrel per day residual quota for a refinery-desulfurization plant to be built at Piney Point, Maryland. Steuart has been stymied in efforts to obtain a foreign-trade zone for that location. . . .
>
> The rules allow desulfurization plants to generate import quotas for residual fuel, or topped crude, equal to the low-sulfur residual produced for sale to meet clean-air regulations. The residual actually processed to make low-sulfur product must be high-sulfur material.
>
> But the plant operator does not have to import high-sulfur product. He can import high-quality, low sulfur topped crude which is good refinery feedstock, Interior sources confirmed last week, and exchange this for domestic high-sulfur residual to be run in the desulfurization plant. The difference in value, Interior officials say could be as much as $1/bbl.
>
> The typical desulfurization plant can generate quota equal to about 80% of its inputs.

This means that a company can import high-quality topped crude and exchange it for the domestic residual it will actually process. This exchange will earn the company as much as $1 a barrel, the difference in price between foreign and domestic crude. Equally important, a typical desulfurization plant can generate 80 percent of its input. Therefore, a plant using 300,000 of crude a day could import 240,000 barrels of foreign topped crude free of the mandatory import program. I cannot agree with our colleague from Louisiana that the desulfurization program will, "preserve the integrity of the mandatory oil import program."

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana also spoke of the massive research programs being carried out by the oil industry and the Government to solve air pollution problems at reasonable costs. He indicated that if special treatment is given to the proposed refinery in Machiasport, a refinery that will produce low-sulfur fuel, it would be difficult to justify alternative programs benefiting the entire Nation. He stated, with reference to pollution and the desulfurization plants, "Surely, cheaper ways are available and are now being intensely investigated." What we were not told was that it requires four refineries to process desulfurized oil using Venezuelan crude under the program and procedure he endorsed. And who will pay for the fuel products that require four refineries? If past experience is a guide, the consumer will pay.

Mr. President, I have discussed just one small segment of the controversy over the Machiasport proposal. Today, and in the ensuing weeks my colleagues from New England and I will continue to clarify and correct the many illusions that misinformed discussion has created.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Maine for the statements he has made this afternoon. His comments are balanced, reasonable, responsible, and pertinent to the issue at hand. They answer some of the arguments which our good friend and colleague, the Senator from Louisiana, made on the floor of the Senate a few weeks ago in attacking Machiasport. In reviewing these arguments we find several misleading distortions which are unfair to the people of New England.

The Senator from Maine, in providing leadership on the question of Machiasport, has addressed himself to some of these very important issues.

I wish to ask the Senator from Maine if he would give me his thinking and reasoning on one of the other areas which we have been very much interested in. The only justification advanced for the Mandatory Import Control Program is that for national security.

It is claimed that only by keeping inexpensive foreign oil out, and domestic prices high, would exploration in this country be sufficiently encouraged and sufficient oil reserves available in case of war or other international crises.

Now it seems to me that there is a flaw in the argument that our reserves will be conserved if we consume them first; for by keeping out foreign oil, we must, of course, use our own to satisfy our peacetime demands. Thus, while Senator LONG maintains that reserves have fallen despite the program, it seems to me that if they have fallen, it is—at least in part—because of the program. For under this program, U.S. production in 1967 was slightly greater than Middle East production, yet while our proven reserves remained about constant, Middle East proven reserves have grown to the point that they are now about 250 billion barrels, or about eight times our proven reserves. If we continue to force domestic consumers to use U.S. oil in peacetime, this trend will continue.

Does the Senator from Maine, then, not find some difficulty in following the reasoning of those who support an oil import program on the basis of national security? It would certainly appear to me we would be much better off conserving our own domestic resources, perhaps by finding a program that will maintain our productive capacity at less cost to the oil-consuming public throughout the country, and in particular to the consumers of New England.

Does the Senator find trouble in justifying an oil import program, as I do, in justifying it under the rationale of national security,

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator from Massachusetts, I think, has touched upon an important point. In response to it, there are two or three observations which are relevant.

First—and I suppose this is the least substantive of the answers that would be relevant—we do not propose to use any kind of project to eliminate the oil import program. As a matter of fact, we are not asking for any increase in the total import quotas. What we are asking for is the earmarking of some of the quotas for New England, which is a special deficit area in all kinds of fuel.

When the national security argument is raised by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and other Senators or other opponents of the project, they are not responsive to the nature of the project and its application. That is the first point I should like to make.

Second, there is a national security argument in reverse. There has been in the nature of an oil import program which is concentrated—well over one-third of our total refinery capacity—in the Texas-Louisiana gulf area. These gulf refineries, concentrated as they are, are likely to become a prime target of enemy attack. Thus, national security involves not only sources of oil but also the refining of oil.

At this point, with so much of the refinery capacity concentrated in the gulf area, there is a national security argument for building Machiasport in New England.

The third point I should like to make, with respect to the arguments made by the opponents of the project, is the inconsistency of the case they make to protect the oil industry. They are the first to fight for the oil depletion allowance. For example, the oil depletion allowance, they argue, is necessary in order to discover new sources of crude—new sources of oil, and that the oil depletion allowance is available for prospecting overseas as well as at home. So that, to the extent the American oil industry has foreign sources of crude which has been subsidized by the taxpayers of the United States by way of the oil depletion allowance, the same oil companies come to us and say that these sources of crude, which have been supported by taxpayers' dollars are not reliable sources in times of national security. It seems to me that that makes the case against the continuation of the oil depletion allowance to support foreign prospecting by American oil companies.

Mr. KENNEDY. As the Senator from Maine has well pointed out, not only do the oil companies get an oil depletion allowance for the exploration and research abroad as well as at home, but we also know, as has been revealed at the antitrust subcommittee hearings chaired by the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), that they are, in effect, able to credit foreign taxes against U.S. taxes otherwise owed on a dollar-for-dollar basis. Under any realistic kind of labeling, these payments to foreign governments are quite clearly royalties. Yet the companies are able to obtain a tax credit for these payments. If those same payments were made to landowners in this country they would be royalties and could be deducted, not credited. So not only do they get the oil depletion allowance, but also the written-in kind of special privilege which, as the Senator from Maine has pointed out, provides for an additional incentive for exploration outside the country. This is contrary to the rationale of the oil depletion allowance itself and to that of the oil import program which is meant to encourage domestic—not foreign—exploration.

Mr. MUSKIE. Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that there are a combination of ironies which confront the citizens of New England. One, they are asked to pay taxes and, by payment of those taxes, subsidize the oil depletion allowance of the American oil companies for exploration of foreign sources of oil. Then, when they seek to import that oil for use in a fuel deficit region, which pays the highest oil prices in the country, the taxpayers are told, in the interests of national security, that they must not import that oil but should rely upon local sources. They argue it both ways. We have an earthy way to describe that kind of situation in America but I guess I should not use it on the Senate floor. But, this is getting it both ways, and I think it is therefore perfectly appropriate for us to say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and others who oppose this project, "Choose one of the two, but you cannot have both."

Mr. KENNEDY. In the meantime, as all of us know in New England, where we are suffering because of the possibility of the limitation of oil, we see the free flow of cheap textiles and cheap shoes which come pouring into the country, which works to the disadvantage, in many instances, of New England, and adds to its problems.

On the first point on which the Senator talked in this area, does the Senator from Maine have the same kind of trouble I have with respect to importation of oil from Canada. This oil is more secure than our offshore or Alaskan production, yet Canadian imports are deducted from the 12.2 limitations. This means that even less than 12.2 percent of crude oil—excluding residual—can be imported into Districts I to IV from abroad.

We find, for instance, in the State of Alaska—which I have just had the good chance to visit recently——

Mr. MUSKIE. It seems to me I read something about the Senator's visit there. [Laughter.]

Mr. KENNEDY. It was a lonely trip up there.

We find Alaskan and offshore production not included in the 12.2 percent program, but Canada, whose production is more secure included.

If we are talking about the question of national security, it would certainly appear to me to be self-evident that so far as having that oil come in here by sea from Alaska, it would certainly be a lot more difficult than having it come across the border at any one of a number of places from Canada.

Thus, once more, if we are going to talk about the question of national security, it seems to me that consideration should be given to the total concept of security. Certainly, we should be willing to look at the resources in Canada as being resources which would be readily available, since our security is so intimately involved with hers.

Mr. MUSKIE. As a matter of fact, the oil supplies from domestic sources are brought to us by water. The water lines from the Gulf—where so much of the refinery capacity is located—to Portland, Maine, are as long as the water lines to Europe. I think, almost as long as the water lines to the Middle East. Water is the method of carriage of oil domestically produced, as well as overseas production.

Mr. KENNEDY. It seems to me that if our enemy—whoever it may be—sinks a coastal ship, it can sink it whether it comes from the gulf ports of this country, from Venezuela, or from the Middle East.

Mr. MUSKIE. If we could get some kind of exemption for coastwise traffic, I suppose that might be helpful.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am wondering whether the Senator believes, as I do, that we could devise a system that would not be nearly so costly to the consumers of New England, and to the taxpayers generally, to preserve the possibility of immediate production—if there were some kind of national crisis; for disinterested, expert witnesses before the antitrust subcommittee have estimated that our existing programs cost some $4 billion a year to the American consumers.

Does the Senator not agree with me that it certainly would seem possible to continue the kinds of production facilities necessary for our national security without having to burden the American consumer with up to $4 billion a year.

Mr. MUSKIE. As a matter of fact, as I recall the testimony before the Hart Subcommittee, the import program in effect subsidizes, at the expense of the American taxpayer and consumer, the least efficient units, wells producing 10 to 20 barrels a day, a producing capacity that we would really be better off without, in terms of the impact on consumer prices. If the import controls were eliminated and the price were allowed to seek its natural level, domestic production could compete with foreign producers of oil. At least, that appears to be the finding of the Hart committee.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. First of all, I congratulate the Senators from Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts for the magnificent fight they are carrying on for the establishment of a free trade zone in Maine.

Speaking of the security of the Nation and the preservation of our natural resources, I think one thing we should keep in mind is the fact that it is to the advantage of America's posterity to hold in reserve as much as we can hold in reserve the supply of oil that is underground in this continent. After all, there is only so much oil there, and in a matter of time, the supply will become exhausted.

I think if we can at this time promote and stimulate the importation of oil from abroad, to the advantage of the consumer, the ultimate result will be that we will stretch out our own reserves, so that, if the day should ever come when we needed domestic oil in greater supply, we would have it here if the foreign supply were shut off.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, one of the very impressive pieces of testimony that came before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee some 2 weeks ago—and this testimony has not been refuted—shows that even if imports were permitted without restriction most of our domestic production, if it were not encumbered by wasteful and inefficient prorationing regulations, would be competitive with foreign. This testimony reveals that we are paying a great deal of money to bring forth a rather small increment to domestic production.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator refers to production controls?

Mr. KENNEDY. Production controls. That is exactly right.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield, with the permission of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course, I believe the whole matter of quotas of oil importation has developed into a national scandal. It is a scandal. There is no earthly reason for it. Our hospitals and our manufacturing plants use residual oil. We do not manufacture sufficient residual oil because it is more profitable to produce higher octanes. However, for some reason, when the directive was issued during the Eisenhower administration, someone gave it the interpretation that it even included residual oil. So residual oil comes under the restriction. As a result, there are small oil dealers in Rhode Island who have to beg for tickets. The problem now is that once a small distributor becomes a customer of the large oil companies he becomes a captive customer because he has no choice. Thus, if a customer wanted to go somewhere else to get oil or have some competition for his business, he would not get the ticket he needs. So the whole distribution system has been tied up in a knot. The result is that the price keeps going up, and up, and up. The people of Rhode Island who have to use oil for heating homes or heating their plants or for manufacturing purposes are paying exorbitant prices unnecessarily.

This oil question has become a scandalous and sickening matter in New England, because, in the final analysis, the consumer is the one who has to pay the price, and he is paying it very dearly. I hope something will be done about it.

I again congratulate my colleagues for at least making this a public issue on the floor of the Senate of the United States.

EXHIBIT 1

NEW ENGLAND SENATORS' STATEMENT ON OIL IMPORT POLICY AND THE PROPOSED FOREIGN TRADE ZONE AT MACHIASPORT, MAINE

The debate over the proposed foreign trade zone at Machiasport has dragged on for many months. It has been embroiled in the politics of oil and conflicting pressures on two administrations.

Because the debate has raged so long, the discussion has become disjointed and confusing. Issues have been raised, ranging from the alleged disaster one oil refinery would create for the domestic oil industry to accusations of favored treatment for one oil company.

The New England Senators believe the Senate deserves more than a series of verbal broadsides. We believe the Machiasport project and other steps which could alleviate New England's petroleum supply problems should be considered on their merits.

The following statement is a brief expression of our concerns. We present it as evidence of our unity of purpose, as a brief refutation of arguments raised by opponents, and as a document to re-orient public discussion to the genuine issues involved. In the coming weeks we shall add to our case with more detailed discussions and factual presentations.

The case for Machiasport can be adequately presented under the following headings:

NEW ENGLAND'S NEED

New England's per capita consumption of heating oil is 3½ times the national average. The region has no indigenous sources of raw petroleum, no operating oil refineries, and no pipelines. It does not have indigenous supplies of coal. Because of its geographic position at the end of long oil supply lines, New England's oil supplies are restricted and unreliable. Fuel shortages in parts of the region have deprived people of heat during the coldest months of the year.

It is difficult for non-New Englanders to appreciate the seriousness of the problem. Few realize, for example, that winter temperature ranges and averages in Burlington, Vermont, are virtually identical with those of Anchorage, Alaska. Fuel supply in New England is not a matter of mere comfort. It is a matter of survival.

PRICING

New England pays higher prices for heating oil than the rest of the country. In 1968, New Englanders paid over 7 percent more for heating oil than people in the rest of the United States.

The following table documents the price disadvantage suffered by New England.

NO. 2 HEATING OIL PRICES, 1967–68

[In cents per gallon]

	New England	Middle Atlantic	South Atlantic	Midwest	West	United States without New England	United States including New England
1967	16.89	16.38	15.83	15.56	15.90	15.92	16.05
1968	17.54	17.00	16.31	15.96	15.92	16.29	16.44

Source: Fuel oil and heat (reanalyzed).

PRICE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NEW ENGLAND AND THE REST OF THE UNITED STATES

	Cents per gallon	Percentage
1967	0.97	6.3
1968	1.25	7.4

Source: Fuel oil and heat (reanalyzed).

New England's need is clear—and so is one of the remedies.

The Maine Port Authority has proposed the establishment of a free trade zone which would include the construction of a large oil refinery at Machiasport. That refinery would have the capacity to refine 300,000 barrels of oil per day, shipped directly from sources in North Africa. One of the benefits from the refinery would be a reliable and economical supply of low sulfur heating oil for New England.

ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSAL

The plan for a free trade zone and oil refinery at Machiasport would help guarantee a reliable supply of heating oil for New England homes. It would also bring industry and employment to an economically depressed area. Although Machiasport has a magnificent natural harbor, its economic potential has not been developed. The projected oil refinery would provide the impetus for economic growth.

The most striking effect of the new refinery would be its impact on prices. New England prices are higher than national levels because of extremely high costs of distribution. The only way to reduce costs to consumers is to obtain crude oil at low cost. The Machiasport project would have access to low cost foreign crude. Economists have estimated that New England could realize a cost reduction of 10 percent—enough to bring its fuel prices into line with the rest of the country.

FOREIGN TRADE ZONES

Under the Foreign Trade Zones Act, each port of entry in the United States is entitled to a foreign trade zone. Under the act, approval of the application is an administrative, rather than a policy-making process. If the proposed foreign trade zone meets the requirements of the act, approval should be given.

The Foreign Trade Zone Board of Alternates reviewed the proposal and recommended approval. Under normal circumstances, that recommendation would have been adopted by the board itself.

But opponents of the refinery have succeeded in clouding the issue for this administration, as they did for the last, by injecting oil import policy questions into a proceeding before a board which does not control oil import allocations. There is no connection between oil import allocations and the eligibility of a port for a foreign trade zone.

The purpose of a foreign trade zone is to serve the convenience of commerce. The creation of a zone does not in any way relax the protections which are given to goods or domestic industries by reason of our trade policy—whether tariffs or quotas.

The responsibility for the board to approve a zone is clear. The board must decide that:

(1) The applicant conducted an economic survey that reflects, "that the anticipated commerce, benefits and returns, both direct and indirect, will justify its construction to expedite and encourage foreign commerce."

(2) There is adequate proof of the ability of the applicant to finance a zone.

(3) There are adequate physical facilities in the form of warehouses, transportation connections, sanitation, light and power, fire protection, adequate enclosures to segregate the zone from the customs territory, and such other facilities that may be recommended by the Board.

Officials of two administrations, including Secretary of Commerce Stans, have openly stated that these are the only considerations pertinent to the foreign trade zone board's jurisdiction.

USE OF THE FOREIGN TRADE ZONE

The State of Maine's port authority would be the operator of the foreign trade zone. Occidental Petroleum Company has applied to the authority for a license to operate a refinery. If that application were approved, Occidental would operate its refinery according to standards set by the State of Maine.

Under the law, foreign trade zones are operated as public utilities. Use of Maine's foreign trade zone could not and would not be limited to one company or to one kind of manufacturing. Applicants for use of zone facilities must be treated equitably.

Companies other than Occidental have indicated interest in applying for use of the zone. Their proposals, when submitted, would be given equitable consideration. Approval would depend entirely on their ability to live within the foreign trade zone regulations.

Contrary to opposition assertions that Occidental Petroleum is guaranteed exclusive rights to the foreign trade zone. Occidental is only one out of several potential users of the zone.

OIL IMPORT REGULATIONS

Oil import restrictions, under the presidential proclamation of 1959, have a direct bearing on the refinery proposal. Under current regulations there is no provision for the withdrawal of finished products from foreign trade zones for consumption in the United States customs area.

In 1968, the Secretary of the Interior recognized this circumstance and requested staff proposals to amend the oil import regulations to permit him to judge applications for such withdrawals on their merits. Two proposals were published, each of which would have given the secretary authority to approve allocations of oil imports from foreign trade zones when such allocations would be in the best national interest. The major difference in the proposals concerned the source of crude oil to be refined in foreign trade zones. Under proposal "A" there were no restrictions on the source of crude oil. Under proposal "B" there was a requirement that 50% of the finished products withdrawn from a foreign trade zone would have to be refined from crude oil produced domestically.

If proposal "B" had been adopted it would not have been economically feasible to construct a refinery in any foreign trade zone that was not located next to a source of supply of domestic oil. The Johnson administration did not act in favor of either proposal.

President Nixon has transferred the responsibility for review of the oil import regulations from the Secretary of the Interior to himself. He has appointed a task force headed by the Secretary of Labor to study oil import policies. We anxiously await the result of this task force study.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The stated rationale of the import control program is to guarantee adequate oil reserves and refinery capacity for national defense. Proponents of our current oil policies maintain that the import control program, coupled with the oil depletion allowance, encourages domestic oil exploration, which in turn contributes significantly to our national security.

What the proponents fail to mention is that the current oil import regulations have forced the concentration of well over a third of our total refinery capacity in the Texas-

Louisiana Gulf area. These gulf refineries are likely to become the vulnerable first targets of an attacking enemy.

As concerns the impact of the oil depletion allowance program on national security, it should be noted that the depletion allowance applies to international oil operations, as well as domestic, giving equal encouragement to exploration in foreign fields.

CONSERVATION

Those of us who have supported the proposal have been concerned about its effect on the natural beauty of the Maine coast. The State of Maine has obtained technical advice in developing a set of anti-pollution standards for the off-loading facilities and refinery. The proposed standards require chemical and thermal wastes from the oil refinery to be disposed of without making the surrounding air and water offensive to humans. Biologists from the U.S. Department of the Interior have agreed that the standards are high enough to protect surrounding fish and wildlife.

Designing oil handling facilities and an oil refinery to meet such standards is expensive, but it is possible. We are aware of the need to enforce the anti-pollution standards, and intend to do all we can to ensure that the enforcement mechanisms are adequate. In addition, we believe the location and design of the facility will reduce the environmental impact to an absolute minimum.

CONCLUSION

These are the chief areas of relevant discussion. We think this short statement contains the basic arguments in favor of the proposal. We shall present, over the next few weeks, a series of speeches to provide the Senate with a detailed and straightforward set of evidence on behalf of a more rational and equitable oil import policy.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, Secretary of Commerce Stans shocked me by an announcement he made recently to newspaper reporters. He said no decisions will be made on a foreign trade subzone at Machiasport, Maine, until the White House study of the oil import program is finished.

Mr. Stans knows that this is specious reasoning and double-talk.

The question of a foreign trade zone for Maine and the study of the oil import programs are entirely unrelated; unrelated, that is, except for the part the powerful oil lobby is playing in these events. The oil industry favors, and urged the President to conduct the study, but they have used all their vast influence—with apparent success—to thwart the efforts of all New England to establish a foreign trade zone in Maine.

Oil imports are supposed to be the responsibility of the Department of the Interior.

The application for a foreign trade zone is supposed to be considered by three other Department heads, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Stans, the chairman.

Secretary Stans is giving the Rhode Island consumer and all citizens of New England the run around. He knows it and I can guess why.

Six weeks ago, when Mr. Stans was before the Commerce Committee on the question of his nomination to head the Department of Commerce, I asked him if he was ready to consider the Machiasport matter as soon as he took office and give to the people of New England the benefit of his decision as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Stans assured me and the committee that he was convinced that the Maine application had to have priority of attention as soon as he took office.

I am going to quote what the nominee said:

> I will do my best to expedite it, having in mind, of course, that there are other departments of the government that also have a voice in the subject, but I will expedite it just as quickly as I can.

"I will expedite it just as quickly as I can." What caused the Secretary to switch his signals in 6 short weeks? How can he justify this dilatory tactic in light of the unanimous decision of the subordinate board of alternates in favor of the Maine application?

There is no logic to Secretary Stans' position. It is another monument to the awesome power of the oil lobby. You could not convince a single Rhode Island consumer otherwise. This is a power play that is costing the housewife in my State a couple of cents a gallon for the fuel oil burned to keep her family warm. That amounts to $2 million more each year that Rhode Island families are paying for oil than they should.

We, in New England, perhaps naively, never really knew the depth and breadth of control that the oil industry had fastened on the Government. That is why the facts compiled by Senator McINTYRE's Banking and Currency Subcommittee appalled and shocked us so. If anyone in New England ever had any doubt about the raw political power of the oil companies, we certainly have no illusions left now.

That is one lesson we have learned from the Machiasport project. Time and again, over the past several months, the big oil companies have worked their will to delay, postpone, and destroy the good and valid application of the State of Maine to establish a foreign trade zone at Portland, with a subzone at Machiasport. Time and again, when a decision based on the merits was about to be made on one phase or another of Maine's application, an oil industry policeman signaled "stop" and the Government apparatus conveniently found a new way to grind to a halt.

To characterize what happened to Maine's application during the last administration as an administrative irregularity would be a kindness. We, in New England, soon learned that we were getting the runaround from Secretary Smith. We hoped for better things under Secretary Stans.

Decisions now, we are told, would be made on a businesslike basis—without prejudice. Judged by these recent developments, however, it appears as though "businesslike" really means business as usual, at the same old stand, with the big oil companies calling the tune.

New England, indeed the whole Northeast, has had its nose bloodied in this matter by the oil industry; but, as the going gets tough, we are going to get tougher. We in New England are not about to be frightened away from this fight, and, I think, the oil lobby will regret the day they decided to try and stop New England from getting its fair share of the benefits of the oil import program.

Now, I understand that Harold McClure, president of a domestic producers group, told a press conference recently that we New Englanders, in our "exuberance" Machiasport, were misleading our constituents by telling them that the oil industry was mulcting them with the highest prices in the Nation. I understand, too, that he specifically noted that Senators MUSKIE, KENNEDY, and McINTYRE were among the leaders of the group making such "wrong" claims. These three esteemed associates do not need me to defend them, but I strongly resent such criticism, particularly in light of the whole misleading record of oil company propaganda which we have been forced to stomach in New England, once we decided to seek a more equitable arrangement for our consumers under the oil import program.

Mr. McClure had some more industry slight-of-hand statistics to prove that on the average, over the last 11 years, our home heating oil prices were not out of line with those in the rest of the country. I suppose if one goes back far enough and mixes together a sufficient number of figures, one can prove almost anything, but not to the Rhode Island housewife and her husband who are footing the bill. You cannot fool them. They know they are being gouged.

The oil companies should know that we in New England do understand, at long last, the facts of oil industry pricing. We know from our own independent analyses that if one examines the figures for the last 5 years, on a year-to-year basis, that prices for our home heating oil on both wholesale and retail levels have risen far more sharply than in any other section of the country.

We know, too, that at this very moment our consumers are paying higher retail prices and our independent jobbers are paying higher wholesale prices than in any other representative section of the country. These are facts and they cannot be waved away with a magic wand by lumping them together in an 11-year exercise of "averaging".

It seemed that under the new administration, some progress was going to be made on Maine's application for a foreign trade zone. The three-man sub-Cabinet level committee of alternates unanimously endorsed the application. Moreover, Secretary Stans, Chairman of the full Foreign Trade Zone Board, scheduled a meeting of his Board for February 24 and, I understand, he confirmed his intention of disposing of this application promptly to several of my distinguished colleagues from New England on the other side of the aisle. But, the industry called a different tune and Secretary Stans found it convenient to ignore all these pledges. Well, I do not accept that. I believe he should honor his commitments and I am going to do everything I can to insure that he does.

During his confirmation hearings, Secretary of the Interior Hickel promised that the oil import quota application needed to make Machiasport a reality would receive priority treatment. Thus the stage was set for decisive action—action that was long overdue. But, we in New England may have sold the industry short again.

At the request of the oil industry, the President considered a new study of the oil import program. Fortunately, the President kept control of the study in the White House itself. This is good news, since a White House study can be completed far more quickly than one in which several departments have to coordinate their views. And the White House should be less responsive to industry pressures than has been the case in some agencies in the past.

In view of Senator McINTYRE's findings in connection with his subcommittee hearings on Machiasport, that hope may be naive, but I intend to give this administration the benefit of the doubt until or unless I find that trust is misplaced.

The oil industry has urged the White House to seek a complete review before further changes or exceptions are made to the oil import program. The only change they wish to prevent is a change to help consumers.

As shocking and callous as it may seem, 5 days after the White House study was requested, the second largest oil company in this country raised both crude oil prices and gasoline prices. A number of other major companies have now followed suit. The price rises, if they stick, will add between $750 million and $1 billion in extra consumer costs annually.

In rationalizing the reasons for the increase, Texaco noted that gasoline prices had been "depressed" for a decade. During that decade, the company's net profits rose from $354 million to $836 million. A staggering 135 percent. In the last year alone, Texaco profits rose $82 million. The price increase it has requested would add another $100 million or so to Texaco's profit picture. Enough is enough. Something has to be done to stop these oil companies before the whole economy perishes in a wave of inflation. They are unwilling to act responsibly. They are inviting a system under which they shall be forced to act responsibly. I know that Senator KENNEDY is preparing legislation dealing with the oil import program. Another fruitful avenue of approach, I should think, would be a basic overhauling of our whole tax structure, with particular emphasis on eliminating the depletion allowance which, in large measure, is responsible for the fat profits of such companies as Texaco.

Does anyone here have any idea how much Federal tax a company like Texaco pays? Well, I will tell you. According to a list compiled by an independent publication, Oil Week, Texaco's Federal tax payments in 1967 were $17.5 million. Can you imagine a company with a net profit of $754 million paying a Federal tax which amounted to only 1.9 percent of its before-tax income?

To my mind, the system reeks and is ripe for a change. I know the oil industry is used to fighting to retain the status quo. I know, too, that the unholy alliance I spoke of before has, in the past, reached to the very highest levels in government, but the industry should know that this is a time of consumer revolt. This is a time of taxpayer revolt. I might remind the big companies that there are more consumer States than producer States, and more taxpayers who vote than oil companies who vote.

In short, I agree there should be a full-fledged overhaul of the whole oil import tangle. I think, too, that any change in the import control system should include equal consideration of consumer-oriented aims. But studying such changes should not be an excuse for deferral of action on Machiasport. That action is needed promptly, and I add my fervent plea to those of others here that the administration will act promptly.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, all we are asking is a fair shake for the people of New England. We are only asking that we be allowed to reap the natural economic advantages which our geography and location make possible.

We are not asking that those States fortunate enough to be endowed with oil beneath their land be forced to share that bounty with the people of New England. All we ask is that the oil industry's outlets in New England be opened up to the kind of meaningful competition on which our economy and our free enterprise system is based. But the oil industries resistance to Machiasport has made our people curious about larger issues.

They want to know why large corporations can band together to prevent the entry of competitors into the market. The people want to know how it can be within the confines of equal protection and due process of law to let some oil marketers who do not need imported oil have it, while others who need it cannot get it. The people want to know why the $500 million a year in profits produced by the Federal oil import program should go to private industry at all rather than benefiting consumers and taxpayers. They want to know why the oil-depletion allowance which costs the American taxpayer well over $1 billion per year should be continued. And as new facts become known, they will want to know why the oil companies should be permitted a tax credit on what are essentially royalty payments to foreign governments. They will want to know why the producing States restrict production so that an artificially inflated price for oil can be maintained through a governmentally administered price fix. They will want to know why oil produced on lands leased from the Federal Government is wastefully restricted and discriminated against by State authorities. They will want to know why imports from Canada should not be permitted without deduction from existing quotas. They will want to know if there is a more efficient and more equitable way to protect national security than by imposing costs of over $4 billion per year on the American people. Finally they will want to know why, as one economist has said, the oil industry sings loudest the praise of free enterprise yet relies so heavily on special Government favors.

It has been said that the American oil industry has become a kind of "private government" with sufficient political power to shape the petroleum policies of State and Federal Government to its own benefit. I am afraid that there may be some truth in this observation.

Machiasport is a reasonable, limited proposal designed to comform to the present oil quota system, despite the weaknesses and irrationality of that system. If this proposal is defeated, then the specter of a "private government" cannot be taken lightly.

Mr. President, for the reasons which have been outlined very briefly here today, reasons consonant with considerations of national security, if there really is no violation of the oil importation program, even with Machiasport itself, and the fact that the oil industry itself will not really be disadvantaged to any extent because of this program, we in New England are certainly hopeful that this program will be approved.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. McINTYRE. Is the Senator from Massachusetts a member, along with Senator HART, of the subcommittee that is currently investigating the oil import control program?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes; I am a member of that committee.

Mr. McINTYRE. I am delighted that the Senator is in that position, because, while I have not had a chance to read any of the record, I have seen some of the newspaper reports. I think the Senator alluded to them earlier, when he said that one witness indicated that the amount of the subsidy that is involved in this mandatory oil import quota program is about $4 billion. I also noticed, in that same report, that even the oil industry's own representative admitted to a figure somewhere in the vicinity of $2.7 billion; is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct; and the $4 billion is generally considered a conservative figure. Some have estimated it to be a good deal higher, perhaps as high as $7 billion per year.

We have used a figure of $4 billion because I think it is a very reasonable and conservative figure. But that is correct.

Mr. McINTYRE. I thought it was significant that a witness for the oil industry would admit to such a figure.

The Senator from Massachusetts may recall, if he was present when our distinguished friend from Louisiana was speaking in opposition to the Machiasport project, that Senator LONG said it was no fault of his that we had such cold winters, I believe he said, or so much snow in New England, but that we were actually looking for something special; that there was some special privilege that New England was looking for in this application.

I believe the Senator will agree with me that even if we do not find the mandatory oil import program being put aside, if we in New England could share in this subsidy, our consumers would realize a significant and completely justified saving.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct. As has been brought out, we have only 6 percent of the population, and we consume 22 percent of the heating oil used throughout the country. Heating oil is certainly as necessary for the people of New England as food and clothing. When shortages occur we feel their effects first, and we are hit hardest. Consequently, we bear the heaviest brunt of a potpourri of costly, governmental policies which appear to serve the oil interests. And, we pay a disproportionate share of the $4 billion per year costs of the mandatory import control program. For if it were not for that program we would be able to import enough inexpensive oil from outside the United States to meet our fuel oil needs.

The opponents of Machiasport would also have us believe that Machiasport would not bring substantial economic relief to the people of New England. He argues that "for most years" the price of home heating fuel oil in New England "has been lower than the comparable prices in other areas on the east coast, and lower than the average for the country as a whole." They would have us believe that the high price to consumers is due to excessive "markups" by local New England fuel oil dealers which, he maintains, are by far the highest in the country.

The information given on prices is misleading. You can do anything with statistics according to the time space chosen. Our adversaries generally choose to take a static average over an 11-year period. From it they derive a highly distorted description. The years since 1964 give the true picture: in those 4 years there has been a steady upward curve in prices in New England.

In the last 4 years, the retail price in New England of home heating oil has increased 2.19 cents per gallon, while the average increase throughout the United States, excluding the west coast and New England, has been 1.35 cents. The gap between New England retail prices and average retail prices east of the Rockies has widened in the past 5 years by over 62 percent. The retail price of home heating oil in New England is now higher than it is in any other comparable section of the country. And it is higher than the next highest region by 57 cents per barrel.

Our opponents tell us that the increase in prices is due to wide dealer margins in New England. But dealer margins since 1964 have increased significantly less than wholesale prices have increased. In fact, 80 percent of the increase of 2.14 cents per gallon in the price of retail home heating oil since 1964 is accounted for by the wholesale price change.

These figures on wholesale prices are also misleading, this time because the sample is not weighted to take account of the quantity of oil consumed in different regions. A State-by-State breakdown reveals that 96 percent of all home heating oil is consumed in the 43 States within districts I–IV. And of this 96 percent, 93 percent is consumed in just 20 States. It is these 20 States, then, that most bear the burden of inflated heating oil prices. It is not very significant that the people of Jacksonville, Fla., pay more for home heating oil than the people of New England, for they use much less oil over a much shorter time span. The true picture of who is really hurt by high heating oil prices emerges only if we limit our study to those 20 States which consume 93 percent of this oil. We then find that the pattern of wholesale prices mirrors that of retail prices. Again New England's prices, which were second lowest in 1964, are now the highest. They are also rising faster than they are in any comparable section of the country. Over this 4-year period we have experienced a 79 cents per barrel increase which is 20 cents per barrel more than the average increase in comparable regions. The increase in price, therefore, cannot be attributed in a substantial degree to a rise in dealer margins. But, rather, it is due to increases in wholesale prices. It is correct that the dealer margin—that is, the difference between buying price and selling price—in New England is the second highest in the Nation. But this is because the costs of doing business are higher in New England—in part, of course, because heating costs are higher. What is more relevant is that the margin of profits of New England dealers appears to be in line with, or lower than, the national average.

The facts are clear. The people of New England are paying higher retail prices, even excluding taxes, than in any other part of the Nation. There has been a steady escalation of those prices since 1964. We are concerned about the present and the future, not the story of years ago, and unless relief is granted, the people of New England will continue to bear an unconscionable burden. We are not asking for special favors, but only that we be treated fairly.

Mr. McINTYRE. One last question: On this subcommittee, apparently the paramount reason behind the mandatory oil import program of 1959 was considered to be, in great measure, the national security; was it not?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. McINTYRE. Have witnesses testified on that subject pro and con before the subcommittee to date?

Mr. KENNEDY. They have. As a matter of fact, they seem to be unanimous in thinking the program should be modified and relaxed. They differ only on the questions of how far and how fast we should go.

Others seem to agree that the best way to proceed, in terms of our national security, is not by using exclusively the domestic shrinking domestic supply, but by trying to devise a kind of program that will not be nearly as costly to the consumer, and will assure the availability of domestic oil in case a national emergency requires it.

Mr. McINTYRE. I take it, then, that in the evidence the committee has heard to date, this national security argument is not holding all the water that apparently it must have held back in 1959?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is very true; it simply does not mesh. While some import controls may be necessary, we need not be as restrictive with imports as we now are. I think the Senate is becoming increasingly aware of the reasons for that.

Mr. McINTYRE. Does the Senator agree with me that the real purpose of the mandatory oil import program is to maintain the domestic oil price structure?

Mr. KENNEDY. It seems inescapable that this is its primary function. With less restrictive import controls, the price for oil and gasoline would drop dramatically.

I think this is a thing which troubles all consumers. It must trouble all Americans.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I yield.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, then the total cost of the present oil import quota or the present benefit to the oil industry would be in the order of billions of dollars.

Mr. KENNEDY. It has been estimated as over $4 billion a year.

Mr. PELL. Basically, is that $4 billion the profit that the oil industry would lose if the import quotas were removed?

Mr. KENNEDY. It is part profit, though not all of it.

Mr. PELL. It would be $4 billion out of the pockets of a small section of the country—New England?

Mr. KENNEDY. This $4 billion figure is for all consumers with relation to the imports; but most dramatically the import controls affect the people of New England who are paying a disproportionate share of these costs.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I congratulate my colleagues from New England, the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE) for the work they have done today in bringing this point home to the American people.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, before discussing a particular aspect of the Machiasport proposal to which I have given considerable attention, namely the reluctance of officials of both the previous and present administration to meet their responsibilities under the Foreign Trade Zones Act, I would like to express my thanks to Senator MUSKIE for the New England statement, which he has presented for the record. Senator MUSKIE's joint statement represents a commendable first step toward recognizing the regional interest in the Machiasport proposal throughout the New England States and, while it is clearly not intended to be a rebuttal of the arguments which have been presented by the opponents of the project, it is a clear and affirmative statement of the case to be made for lower fuel costs to New England through the device of an oil refinery located in a foreign trade zone.

I am particularly happy that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) is a member of the Antitrust Subcommittee that is studying the mandatory oil import control program at the present time under Senator HART's aegis. The study can be expected to run all year.

I personally intend, and I believe a number of my colleagues share my intentions, to continue to prepare a detailed rebuttal of the many phony arguments which have been raised by the opponents of Machiasport. For today, however, I intend to lay aside the arguments which have been raised, and concentrate on the gross mistreatment which has been received by the State of Maine in its efforts to obtain a foreign trade zone.

I would like to refocus the attention of the Senate and the public on the issue of the foreign trade zone application of the State of Maine which is still pending before the administration's Foreign Trade Zones Board. The New England Senators are unanimously agreed that the trade zone questions and the oil import questions are separate and distinct issues. The law itself is quite clear in this regard. The State of Maine has the right to have its application considered on the merits regardless of any reviews, studies, or decisions on oil import policies. Yet that has not been the course followed by this administration. Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans announced on February 27 that a decision on the application would be postponed until the President's review of oil import controls was completed. He cited no authority for this arbitrary action. He did not consult with other members of the Foreign Trade Zone Board, although his role as Chairman gives him no unilateral power to usurp the functioning of the Board.

Secretary Stans went back on the assurances given at the time of his confirmation hearing—which had been alluded to by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE)—that the Machiasport application would be expedited, that it would come to a decision as promptly and early as possible.

On March 3, I wrote to the Secretary and asked him how the study of the oil import program was relevant to any action that might be taken by the Foreign Trade Zones Board especially in light of the fact that the Committee of Alternates which unanimously approved the application clearly stated that approval would not reflect on any decisions to be made under the oil import program. I asked him to state the authority for delay. I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Secretary and his response be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE
ON SMALL BUSINESS,
March 3, 1969.

Hon. MAURICE STANS,
Secretary, Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your announment of February 27 stating that you will delay consideration of the Maine application for a Foreign Trade Zone until the White House study on oil imports is completed is both distressing and confusing in light of your previous statements and the law. As you may know, my Subcommittee on Small Business of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has been holding hearings on the processing of the Maine application in order to determine the cause of delay during the previous Administration. I intend to continue these hearings and would like, for the record, your answers to the following questions:

1. In view of the unanimous resolution of your Committee of Alternates which recommended approval of the application stating, "approval would not be, and should not be regarded as, an expression of a position by the Board with respect to any application . . . for allocations or licenses required under the Mandatory Oil Import Program in connection with use of the proposed subzone," how is the President's study of the oil import program relevant to any action that might be taken by the Foreign Trade Zones Board?

2. Under what criteria set forth in the Foreign Trade Zones Act is a study of the oil import program relevant to whether the State of Maine is entitled to a Foreign Trade Zone since the act clearly states "Each port of entry shall be entitled to at least one zone," and that "if the Board finds that the proposed plans and location are suitable for the accomplishment of the purpose of a foreign-trade zone under this act, and that the facilities and appurtenances which it proposed to provide are sufficient *it shall make the grant.*"

3. Under the Foreign Trade Zones Act and Regulations, what authority do you have to delay consideration of an application pending a study of the Oil Import Program?

4. How was the decision to delay consideration reached? Did you consult with other members of the Foreign Trade Zones Board? Did you consult with members of the White House staff or the Vice President or President?

5. In view of your statements reported in the press and your written assurances to Senator Aiken regarding action by the Foreign Trade Zones Board, what new considerations were studied by the Board leading to the decision to delay considerations?

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. MCINTYRE,
Chairman.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1969.

Hon. THOMAS J. MCINTYRE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Small Business of the Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCINTYRE: I have your letter of March 3 with regard to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board's consideration of the application of the Maine Port Authority.

The important dates are as follows:

As indicated by my letter of January 28 to Senator Aiken it was my then intention to convene the Board promptly upon receiving the recommendations of the Committee of Alternates.

The action of the Committee of Alternates was taken on February 10.

On February 13 I did call a meeting of the Board for February 26.

On February 20, the President announced that he was reassuming the full responsibility for oil import policies and that there would be a full review of these policies by the Executive Offices of the President.

The proceedings involved in considering a foreign-trade zone application are, of course, separate from those applicable to allocations under the Mandatory Oil Import Program. Nevertheless, as indicated by the President's announcement, for the first time in many years the White House is conducting a comprehensive evaluation of oil import policies. The matter of oil allocations to refineries and petrochemical plants in foreign trade zones will very likely be affected by such a review. In our judgment, all interests will best be served if the President's position on these maters is available to the Board before the Board decides. We are advised by counsel that the procedures applicable to the Board permit the exercise of such discretionary judgment.

I am confident that the importance of assuring an adequate supply of petroleum products for New England and every other section of the country will be a major consideration of the Administration's review of oil import policies.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. STANS,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, Secretary Stans' response to my questions was inadequate. He agreed that foreign trade zone applications were, "of course," separate from questions under the oil import program but then went on to state that he would like to know what the President's position on oil imports is before he goes on to fulfill his responsibilities under the Foreign Trade Zones Act. If Secretary Stans' curiosity about decisionmaking in other departments and agencies of Government were permitted to interfere with all his responsibilities as Secretary of Commerce, his Department would come to a grinding halt. For instance, would the Secretary delay all overseas expenditures of his Department pending a Treasury review of our balance-of-payments policy? Or suppose his curiosity infected others in Government. The Congress is now reviewing our military commitments around the world. Should the Departments of State and Defense announce that our present treaties and obligations are in a state of suspended animation until the review is concluded? Obviously if Mr. Stans' view of his role were followed to its logical conclusion, Government could not function.

Mr. Stans, however, has an inaccurate view of the functions of the Foreign Trade Zones Board and the administration of the Foreign Trade Zones Act. That law imposes an obligation to reach a decision on the merits of an application in accordance with the criteria of the act. Mr. Stans may wish that oil import questions could be considered. He may think it logical that they be taken into consideration, but that is not the law. An administration which has put so much emphasis on law and order might like to set an example by putting its own house in order, or does the administration believe that some laws are more worthy of observance than others?

I specifically asked the Secretary to cite authority under the Foreign Trade Zones Act and regulations which provide him with the power to delay decision for reasons relating to oil imports. He cited no legal theory or opinion but merely made the conclusionary statement that he had discretionary authority. It is my considered opinion that the reasoning behind his statement was omitted because the act itself provides no such justification.

The stalling of the decision on this trade zone application is not new to this Senator nor to the people of Maine and New England. The previous administration played the politics of oil on the Foreign Trade Zone Board and successfully escaped the responsibility for reaching a decision. The Nixon administration has arranged its own strategy for stall, but the result is the same. The law is flouted, the interests of the people of New England are shunted aside. I fully agree that a public review and reform of our oil import program is essential, but that is not the issue before the Foreign Trade Zones Board. The issue before the Board is found in the statute, and I quote from the Foreign Trade Zones Act, "If the Board finds that the proposed plans and location are suitable for the accomplishment of the purpose of a foreign trade zone under the act, and that the facilities and appurtenances which it propose to provide are sufficient, it shall make the grant."

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I endorse the statement of my New England colleagues in principal but I wish to disassociate myself from the specific endorsement of the Occidental Petroleum Co.

I disassociate myself from the specific endorsement of, or advocacy for, any specific oil company by any name because I prefer to concentrate on the principle involved in the issue.

INADEQUATE SOIL CONSERVATION BUDGET REQUESTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am concerned about the budgetary proposal for fiscal year 1970 for Soil Conservation Service programs, included in the U.S. Department of Agriculture budgetary submission currently undergoing hearings by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

I believe this matter should be brought to the attention of Members of the Senate. I believe they may wish to take a look at a proposal which states a nationwide limit of 25 new starts for watershed planning and 25 new starts for watershed works of improvement for the coming fiscal year. I believe that the Members of the Senate, who are aware of the magnitude of the water pollution crisis which faces this Nation, will not wish to ignore the threat to one of the programs basic to a full-scale attack on that problem.

Speaking for my State of West Virgina, I have received reports on a number of items of importance to the State which are seriously threatened by the present fiscal year 1970 budgetary proposal for the Soil Conservation Service. I would like to bring these to the attention of other Members of this body.

I believe that other Senators may find similar situations in their own States.

First, I am advised that the watershed program, provided under Public Law 566, and the Potomac flood prevention program are making good progress in West Virginia. Many of the floodwater retarding lakes being built are developed for multipurposes, including municipal water supply, industrial water supply, and recreation.

The watershed program in West Virginia is benefiting our local economy by furnishing flood plain protection for houses, businesses, industry, and agriculture. It is helping to create more jobs and a better way of life for our people.

However, the current proposal for an unrealistic limitation of 25 new starts for watershed planning and 25 new starts for watershed works of improvement—for all of the United States—threatens to sabotage these vital, ongoing programs.

I believe that the Senate will want to remove these limitations after a review of the facts.

Consider this: In West Virginia alone, merely one State, and that a State with a relatively light population total, we would expect to have at least six watershed projects in a category where construction could be started during fiscal year 1970. To put a limitation of 25 new starts for 50 States, many with heavy population totals, is truly unreasonable. And I hope that Congress will strike out this limitation.

Federal specialists working with the present national watershed program tell me that, while they feel the watershed program is making good progress, they already are limited in many areas due to the lack of enough funds for full program activity. Based on their inventories, these specialists advise me that what we actually need to do is to double the amount of watershed development in West Virginia. In my State, we have many watersheds on which construction could be started and where local people could meet their commitments for program advancement, if Federal funds can only be made available.

The budgetary provisions for watershed programs should, realistically, be increased for fiscal year 1970, not reduced.

As a second aspect of budgetary proposals for Soil Conservation Service activities for fiscal year 1970, the proposal for flood prevention is nearly $8 million less than the $28 million available for flood prevention in 1969. We use these funds in West Virginia for preventing floods on the Potomac River watershed. I am unable to imagine what forecast can have been made which would justify reduced flood protection in West Virginia for this coming year.

I urge the Senate to act to restore the flood prevention appropriations to the 1969 level.

As the third aspect of the Soil Conservation Service budgetary proposals for fiscal year 1970, so dismaying to those of us who fully realize what the detrimental effects will be, if these proposals are permitted to stand, cuts are proposed in the conservation operations item, through which technical assistance is provided to conservation districts throughout our Nation.

Conservation district officials inform me that they are highly disturbed by the steady reduction of Federal Government support of soil and water conservation district programs because of personnel ceilings imposed in the Federal Establishment and the increased cost of doing business. And well they may be, for I am told that there is already a shortage of more than 2,000 man-years of technical assistance to handle the current workload of districts in the 50 States.

I call to the attention of the Members of the Senate that no funds are provided in the budgetary proposal for the Soil Conservation Service for fiscal year 1970 to staff new conservation districts which are being organized in fiscal year 1969. No funds are proposed in the budget estimate to provide a technical staff to serve new conservation districts in fiscal year 1970. Thus, in staffing these new conservation districts, it will mean that $1 million worth of technical assistance must be withdrawn from existing conservation districts. I believe that the Members of the Senate can anticipate the dismay and resulting protests which such action can be expected to arouse at State levels.

Since their creation, conservation districts have been moving progressively and with substantial success toward the creation of new wealth and new opportunities in both rural and urban America. District programs have strengthened the economy, improved agriculture, retarded erosion and pollution, cut back on water waste and floods, enhanced recreation, served the public interest in many notable ways, and have more than paid their way many times over in terms of cost and benefits.

The future need for resource conservation and development are even more pressing today because of the expanding requirements of the population in our Nation.

I urge that Congress appropriate the additional conservation operations funds which are so essential to provide full technical staffing for each district to meet the current and future resource requirements of our Nation.

As a fourth item of importance to my State of West Virginia, there are two resource conservation and development projects, one near the city of Parkersburg and the second near Princeton, which are creating the chance for strong, local leadership, and the solving of many local problems by group and community action.

Yet under the level of budgetary proposals—$10 million— for resource conservation and development for fiscal year 1970, it is expected that a decline in operations would result, from an average per project of around $208,000 in fiscal year 1968 to a little over $142,000 in fiscal year 1970. This would represent an average reduction of about $66,000 per project.

I wish to urge that the Senate not merely accept this $10 million item in the budget but support a more realistic funding.

Mr. President, as a nation, we express more and more concern and worry for the quality of our environment. As Members of the Senate, we are aware that our actions here, in company with the activities taking place across our land to conserve and improve our soil and water resources, affect the quality of our environment. Our vigorous and consistent support of programs to help offset past detrimental effects is needed, and it is needed on a consistent basis. A piecemeal, off-again, on-again, approach will not serve to carry forward the work which must be done.

I think the time has come when we must face up to the fact that past budgetary actions do not permit us the luxury of relaxation of our efforts. Past funding is not adequate to maintain the programs that are increasingly demanded by the growing complexity of problems presented by our deteriorating environment. We must continue to provide adequate appropriations as the indispensable weaponry to protect the resource base of America.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 1827—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO PROVIDE MINIMUM INCOME TAX; S. 1828—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO PROVIDE INCREASED MINIMUM STANDARD; S. 1829—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO SUSPEND INVESTMENT CREDIT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, three separate but related bills amending the Internal Revenue Code:

First. Minimum income tax: This bill would provide for a minimum income tax on large incomes, and would bring in increased annual revenues of approximately $1.2 billion.

Second. Increased minimum standard deduction: This bill would increase the minimum standard deduction for smaller taxpayers, relieving over one-half of the 2.2 million poverty-level families from any tax liability and providing tax reduction for other low-income families. The reduction of annual revenue from the passage of this bill would be approximately $1.1 billion and, therefore, would be adequately covered by the minimum income tax.

Third. Suspension of investment credit: This bill is tied in with the extension of the 10-percent income tax surcharge, requested by the administration, beyond June 30, 1969, and would suspend the present 7-percent investment credit, originally enacted to spur business and industrial investment in plant and equipment, during the term of the surcharge extension, resulting in increased annual revenue of approximately $3.3 billion. This bill also provides that the 10-percent surcharge would be reduced by a percentage equivalent to the additional revenue which will be realized from suspension of the investment credit. Thus, the 10-percent surcharge would be reduced to 7 percent, thereby giving much-needed relief to the average middle-income taxpayer without any net effect on the revenues realized.

These three bills, if enacted by the Congress, would be a major beginning toward attaining a more equitable system of taxation and a more just apportionment of the tax burden among classes of taxpayers.

The voice of the American taxpayer is being heard in the office of every Congressman and Senator on Capitol Hill.

A spontaneous grassroots movement has begun. It reflects the dismay of taxpayers who are subject to Federal, State, and local demands for more and more tax dollars.

More importantly, it reflects the anger of the average taxpayer who knows there are many who carry little or none of the burden.

We cannot continue to ignore the abuses and inequities that exist in the Federal income tax system. That they have existed for many years only makes them more burdensome.

Many efforts have been made in the past to reform the system. Most have failed.

We must restore the faith of America's 110 million taxpayers in our tax system. If we do not, we certainly face, in the words of former Treasury Secretary Joseph W. Barr, "a taxpayer revolt."

But our most compelling reason for reform is simply that it is the right thing to do.

I believe we have arrived, finally, at a time when effective tax reform can be realized.

Our colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives are conducting hearings on this matter. Certainly we all agree that there is urgent need for general tax reform.

However, I believe that some of the most glaring injustices in our tax system are the most easily corrected.

What I am proposing today is that we take some necessary first steps to insure that every taxpayer shares the tax burden in as equitable a manner as possible.

While I am introducing these bills as a member of the committee on finance, I should point out that the 1968 Democratic platform states that—

> The goals of our national tax policy must be to distribute the burden of government equitably among our citizens.

Our Federal tax system does not meet this standard.

In theory, we have a progressive system of taxation based on ability to pay. In fact, we have a regressive system that places the heaviest burden on those least able to carry it.

MINIMUM INCOME TAX

Several weeks ago I announced my intention to introduce a bill to provide for a minimum income tax on large incomes. The first of the three bills I introduce today would carry out that intention. While I am introducing this bill as a member of the Committee on Finance, I should point out, as I have on other occasions, that this bill would, taken with the second bill increasing the minimum standard deduction, carry out the provision of the 1968 Democratic platform, which states as follows:

> We support a proposal for a minimum income tax for persons of high income based on an individual's total income regardless of source in order that wealthy persons will be required to make some kind of income tax contribution no matter how many tax shelters they use to protect them.

I am confident that there are perfections and improvements which may be made in this bill, both in general concept and in technical implementation. But I believe that the basic intent and purpose of the bill is sound and must be enacted into law. I am very hopeful that we can secure hearings on this bill as soon as possible, giving all those affected an opportunity to testify. From this testimony we can make whatever corrections of improvements that may be indicated.

For example, we ought to be awfully careful that the effect of this bill will not make the State or municipal bond market any more difficult or increase the interest rate. This market is already more difficult than it should be and interest rates are already too high. If there is to be any adverse effect on the market, since it is the abuse of this source of income by some taxpayers which we intend to get at, we would want to write into this bill an equalizing subsidy to the issuing authority so that the issuing authority would not be penalized by this bill. If that could not be worked out, then that portion of this bill would have to be substantially altered or deleted.

As the bill is presently written, it would provide for a minimum income tax to be paid by large taxpayers, taking into account income from regular sources as well as income from: interest from State and municipal bonds; net long-term capital gains; percentage depletion and intangible drilling and development costs; accelerated depreciation on real property; appreciation on property given to charity; and stock options granted to corporate executives.

The inequities which exist under the present tax system compel reform. In the year 1967, 155 Americans with incomes of more than $200,000 paid no Federal income tax, and of this group 21 earned more than a million dollars. At the same time 25 million citizens earning less than $3,000 annually paid $1½ billion in Federal income taxes.

Presently, many wealthy individuals can arrange their income so that it comes from one or more tax-favored sources and thereby pay taxes, if at all, on a much lower rate. In many cases the effective rate is as low as 1 or 2 percent of the real income. Quite often, the result is that a man who earns over a million dollars a year from real estate investments can avoid Federal taxes completely, while a married couple with an income of $2,200 must pay $84.

In a recent year a taxpayer whose net worth is $1.5 million paid income taxes of only $685. Another with an income of $20 million paid nothing. Still another who earned from real estate investments over $1 million every year for 14 years paid no Federal income tax. While this was happening, most of the middle- and lower-income families were paying the regular rate.

These abuses and inequities in the Federal income tax system can no longer be tolerated.

Sheldon S. Cohen, former Internal Revenue Commissioner, when testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee on March 28, 1969, concerning needed tax reform, stated:

> Whether our taxpayers will continue to be patient and understanding is really beside the point. The bulk of our citizens should no longer be required to assume significant burdens of taxation while others are preferred and undertaxed. Our system presently works so well that it is considered the model of the world. This is so because of the high level of voluntary compliance by our citizens. We, therefore, owe it to the American people to constantly strive to

> make the system more equitable—because that is the right thing to do—and because it will maintain and improve voluntary compliance which is the backbone of the system.

The minimum-income tax legislation I am proposing would eliminate the most glaring inequities in the present system. The proposal does not eliminate these preferences, but would simply require a tax where the use of the preferences is being abused. Former Commissioner Cohen in his testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee, commented on the soundness of a minimum income tax and stated:

> The minimum income tax does meet and fulfill a fundamental need—a more realistic and just apportionment of the tax burden. To that end its necessity is clear—it is unjust to create a class of tax millionaires while requiring the vast majority of Americans to make significant tax contributions to our Government.

The net effect of the minimum-income tax bill I propose will be that those taxpayers affected will be taxed at the regular rates on at least 50 percent of their total income. It applies to individuals, corporations, trusts, and estates. Thus, a taxpayer who has an actual income of $500,000 a year from totally tax exempt sources and who has paid no tax in the past will now pay $160,000. Similarly, a taxpayer with a total income of $600,000, of which only $200,000 is taxable now, pays approximately $125,000 in taxes. Under the new law, he will pay a total tax of approximately $195,000.

The minimum tax bill I have introduced also provides for the allocation of deductions between taxable and nontaxable income. At the present time, it is possible for a taxpayer to receive a double advantage from his tax-exempt income.

In this case, the personal deductions allowed every taxpayer for various expenses are subtracted only from his taxable income.

Thus, a man may earn $100,000 a year, three-fourths of which is not taxable because the income is derived from one or another tax preferred investment. His adjusted gross income is only $25,000 and from this he can deduct various personal expenses further reducing his tax liability.

Under the bill I propose, he would be required to allocate his deductions proportionately between taxable and nontaxable income. This is a far more equitable procedure since obviously his expenses were paid out of his combined income.

The above explanation is an attempt to make the legislation proposed more understandable, because I am reminded of the statement of Judge Learned Hand on complicated tax measures, when he said:

> In my own case the words of such an act as the Income Tax, for example, merely dance before my eyes in a meaningless procession, cross-reference to cross-reference, exception upon exception—couched in abstract terms that offer no handle to seize hold of—leave in my mind only a confused sense of some vitally important, but successfully concealed, purpose, which it is my duty to extract, but which is within my power, if at all, only after the most inordinate expenditure of time. I know that these monsters are the result of fabulous industry and ingenuity, plugging up this hole and casting out that net, against all possible evasion; yet at times I cannot help recalling a saying of William James about certain passages of Hegel: that they were no doubt written with a passion of rationality; but that one cannot help wondering whether to the reader they have any significance save that the words are strung together with syntactical correctness.

Mr. President, I think that quotation sums up, somewhat, the feelings that many taxpayers have about our very complicated tax system. That is why I have joined the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), and others, in trying to fine some way, in addition to reforming the tax system to simplify it so that the average taxpayer may have a better understanding of the tax system and its effect upon him and his actions.

Today, however, we are talking about reform and improvement in the tax system, and I have just discussed the minimum income tax bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1827) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a minimum income tax, to require the allocation of deductions allowed to individuals in certain circumstances, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. HART), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

INCREASE MINIMUM STANDARD DEDUCTION

Mr. HARRIS. Now, Mr. President, I want to turn my attention to the second bill which I have today introduced, one for an increase in the minimum standard deduction.

It is closely related to the minimum income tax. It provides for a corollary increase in the minimum standard deduction for smaller taxpayers. It would relieve over one-half of the 2.2 million poverty-level families from any tax liability and would provide tax reductions for other low-income families.

The bill I offer is identical to the recommendations of the Johnson administration Treasury Department and simply raises the minimum standard deduction from its present $200 plus $100 for each allowable exemption, to $600 plus $100 for each allowable exemption, subject to the existing overall limit of $1,000.

The reduced revenue from this proposal would be approximately $1.1 billion, a reduction more than fully covered by the additional revenue which would be realized from the minimum income tax, $1.2 billion.

This bill would carry out the provision in the 1968 Democratic platform, which stated:

> We also support a reduction of the tax burden of the poor by lowering the income tax rates at the bottom of the tax scale and increasing the minimum standard deduction. No person or family below the poverty level should be required to pay income taxes.

We may praise the widow in the Biblical parable who voluntarily, from her mite, gave proportionately far more than the rich man; but our Government should not require such involuntary generosity from its poorest citizens.

Our tax system should not be an extra hurdle for those who already have enough hazards in their race for economic survival.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1828) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the minimum standard deduction, introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. HART), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SUSPENSION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the third bill I am introducing is designed to dampen inflationary pressures while giving some immediate relief to middle-income taxpayers, who now pay more than their fair share of Government costs.

The bill is tied in with the extension of the 10-percent income tax surcharge, requested by the administration, beyond June 30, 1969, and would suspend the present 7-percent investment credit during the term of such surcharge extension.

The suspension of the investment credit would permit a reduction of the 10-percent surcharge to 7 percent, as is provided in this bill, without any net effect on the revenues realized, since suspension of the investment credit will bring in an additional $3.3 billion.

The investment credit, enacted in 1962 during the administration of President John F. Kennedy to spur business and industry investment in plant and equipment, was suspended by Congress upon the recommendation of President Lyndon B. Johnson when the economy became overheated in 1966. The suspension, which became effective on October 10, 1966, was to have lasted for a period of 15 months, but was restored on March 9, 1967.

Despite the relatively short period during which the investment credit was then suspended, two private studies, one by the Economics Department of McGraw-Hill Publications, Inc., and the other by Lionel D. Edie and Co., Inc., indicate that the suspension was definitely anti-inflationary in its effect.

The need to curb inflation is a matter of highest priority today. Thus, the administration has recommended the extension of the 10-percent tax surcharge. Since a flat increase in taxes at all income levels, even with some exceptions at the bottom, is inequitable and regressive, it would seem fairer to grant some relief to the overburdened middle-income taxpayer by not asking for the full 10-percent surcharge extension, and, instead, cutting down also on the inflationary pressures of plant and equipment expenditures.

This approach is especially indicated by reason of the fact that capital expenditures for this year are projected to be 14 percent higher than they were last year.

Since manufacturers which were operating at 90 percent capacity during 1966 were operating at approximately 84 percent of capacity 2 years later, during the third quarter of 1968, I believe there is no sound reason to believe that the suspension of the investment credit would add to inflationary pressures by allowing demand to outrun supply. To the contrary, by cutting down on the inflationary pressures of otherwise increasing capital expenditures, running some 14 percent higher this year over last year, the suspension of the investment credit would, in my judgment, have an important anti-inflationary effect.

The bill I propose calls for the suspension of the investment credit, effective on the date of introduction of the bill, with an exception for contracts already entered into for capital investments as of that time. The bill does not provide other exceptions, as was done in the 1966 bill, because I felt these matters ought to be the subject of hearings in the light of present circumstances.

Thus, this bill has two important objectives. First, the suspension of the investment credit will help curb inflation; second, the suspension of the investment credit will increase revenues by $3.3 billion, permitting reduction of the present surcharge tax from 10 percent to 7 percent, thereby giving much-needed relief, particularly to the middle-income taxpayer. It may be that at hearings on this bill, the facts developed may warrant an increase in individual exemptions from the present $600 figure as an alternative to the approach provided in this bill, that is, a reduction in the surcharge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1829) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce and extend the tax surcharge and to suspend the investment credit during the remaining period of applicability of the tax surcharge, introduced by Mr. Harris (for himself and Mr. Hart), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CONCLUSION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the three bills which I have introduced will by no means erase all of the inequities in the present Internal Revenue Code. Nevertheless, I believe they represent significant steps toward effective tax reform.

They will insure that the burden of taxation falls more fairly on all taxpayers. The taxpayers of America are demanding fairness in our tax system, and they are entitled to nothing less. These bills will move us much closer to that goal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record a summary of the three bills; a copy of the minimum income tax bill with a section-by-section analysis of it; a copy of the increased minimum standard deduction bill; and a copy of the investment credit suspension bill.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Summary of Bills

1. MINIMUM INCOME TAX

This bill would require every individual, corporation, trust or estate with substantial income to make a fair contribution to the cost of operating our Government and would operate as follows:

A. The taxpayer would compute his tax as he has done in the past under the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code;

B. The taxpayer would total the following: income from interest on state and local bonds; deductions for capital gains; percentage depletion in excess of cost; amount of depreciation in excess of straight-line depreciation on real property; amount of appreciation in property donated to a charitable organization; difference between fair market value and the cost of stock acquired pursuant to stock option plan; and the amount of the deduction claimed for intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells—all less certain deductions including a special $5,000 deduction;

C. If the aggregate of the items and deductions mentioned in paragraph 2 do not exceed taxable income the taxpayer computes his tax in the regular way. If that amount is greater than taxable income, the taxpayer is subject to the minimum tax; and

D. To one-half of the total income, taxable and preferential the regular rate table would be applied.

This bill also requires that individuals allocate certain personal deductions between taxable income and the income from the items described in Paragraph 2.

2. INCREASED MINIMUM STANDARD DEDUCTION

This bill simply increases the minimum standard deduction from $200 plus $100 for each allowable exemption to $600 plus $100 for each allowable exemption, subject to the existing overall limit of $1,000.

3. SUSPENSION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT AND REDUCTION OF SURCHARGE

This bill calls for the suspension of the investment tax credit during the applicability of the tax surcharge. There would be excepted from the suspension property acquired pursuant to legally binding contracts entered into not later than April 15, 1969.

This bill in addition calls for a reduction of the tax surcharge from 10% to 7% for the period beginning June 30, 1969.

S. 1827

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a minimum income tax, to require the allocation of deductions allowed to individuals in certain circumstances, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Section 1. Short title, etc.

(a) Short Title.—This Act may be cited as the "Minimum Income Tax Act of 1969".

(b) Amendment of 1954 Code.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Section 2. Minimum income tax.

(a) Imposition of Tax.—Subchapter A of Chapter 1 (relating to determination of tax liability) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"Part VI—Minimum Income Tax

"Sec. 55. Minimum income tax.

"(a) Imposition of Tax.—Except as provided in subsection (e), in the case of any individual, corporation, trust, or estate, in lieu of the tax imposed by section 1 (relating to tax imposed on individuals), section 11 (relating to tax imposed on corporations) and section 641 (relating to tax imposed on estates and trusts), there is hereby imposed for such taxable year a minimum tax equal to the amount computed under subsection (b), if such minimum tax exceeds the tax imposed on such individual, corporation, trust, or estate by this chapter (other than this section) for such taxable year.

"(b) Minimum Tax Rate.—The minimum tax shall be computed in the same manner as the tax otherwise imposed by this chapter except—

"(1) the taxpayer's taxable income for the taxable year shall be equal to his section 55 income, and

"(2) the tax applicable under section 1 (relating to tax imposed on individuals) and section 11 (relating to tax imposed on corporations) shall be applied to one-half of the amount of the section 55 income for the taxable year.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, in determining the amount of any allowable credit or deduction whose amount is limited or determined with reference to tax liability under chapter 1, the tax liability shall be equal to the amount imposed by this section.

"(c) Section 55 Income.—For purposes of this section, the term 'section 55 income' means the taxable income (as defined in section 63) for the taxable year plus

"(1) any amount excluded from gross income for the taxable year by reason of section 103(a)(1) (relating to interest on certain governmental obligations), plus

"(2) in the case of an individual, estate, or trust, the amount of the deduction allowed under section 1202 (relating to deduction for capital gains) for the taxable year, plus

"(3) an amount equal to the amount by which the allowance for depletion under section 611 (relating to allowance of deduction for depletion) for the taxable year exceeds the adjusted basis of the property at the end of the taxable year (computed without regard to the deduction for depletion for such taxable year), plus

"(4) the amount, if any, by which the deduction under section 167 (relating to depreciation) with respect to real property for the taxable year, was greater than it would have been under the straight line method of depreciation (applied to such property for such taxable year), plus

"(5) the amount by which the fair market value of any property (other than money) the subject of a charitable contribution during the taxable year for which a deduction under section 170 (relating to charitable, etc., contributions and gifts) is allowable (without regard to the percentage limitations specified in sections 170(b)(1) and 170(b)(2)) exceeds the taxpayer's adjusted basis therefore under section 1011 (relating to adjusted basis for determining gain or loss), plus

"(6) the amount equal to the difference between the fair market value of stock received by the taxpayer, pursuant to the exercise during the taxable year of a qualified stock option (as defined in section 422) and the price paid for such stock, plus

"(7) the amount of any deduction for the taxable year for intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells pursuant to the exercise by the taxpayer of the option to deduct such costs under the provisions of Treasury regulations 1.612–4, less.

"(8) any expenses and interest otherwise nondeductible under section 265 (relating to expenses and interest relating to tax-exempt income), but only to the extent such expenses and interest are allocable to an obligation described in section 103(a)(1), the interest income from which for the taxable year is included under paragraph (1), less

"(9) the amount, if any, of deductions disallowed under section 277 (relating to limitation on deductions for individuals), less

"(10) a special deduction of $5,000 ($2,500 in the case of a married taxpayer filing a separate return).

"(d) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) BASIS ADJUSTMENT FOR DEPRECIATION.—If a taxpayer is subject to the minimum tax imposed by this section for a taxable year, and his section 55 income for such year includes an amount under subsection (c)(4), the proper amount of the depreciation allowed or allowable for the taxable year for purposes of section 1016 (relating to adjustments to basis) shall be determined in accordance with regulations and rules prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(2) NET OPERATING LOSS DEDUCTION.—The allowance of net operating loss deductions under section 172 (relating to net operating loss deductions), for purposes of computing section 55 income shall be subject to such rules, limitations, and modifications as are necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act that the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe.

"(3) STOCK OPTION AND INTANGIBLE DRILLING COST ADJUSTMENT.—If a taxpayer is subject to the minimum tax imposed by this section for a taxable year, and his section 55 income for such year includes an amount under subsection (c)(6) or (c)(7), appropriate adjustment shall be made to the basis of the property involved in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(e) EXCEPTIONS.—This section shall not apply to—

"(1) the tax imposed under the provisions of section 871(a) (relating to income not connected with United States business), and

"(2) the tax imposed under the provisions of section 881 (relating to tax on income of foreign corporations not connected with United States business).

"(f) SPECIAL DEFINITIONS.—If a taxpayer is subject to the tax imposed by this section for a taxable year—

"(1) GROSS INCOME.—The term 'gross income' shall, with respect to such taxable year, have the same meaning otherwise applicable under the subtitle, except that the aggregate of the amounts specified in subsections (c)(1), (c)(5), and (c)(6) shall be added thereto.

"(2) ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—The term 'adjusted gross income' shall, with respect to such taxable year, have the same meaning otherwise applicable under this subtitle, except that the aggregate of the amounts specified in subsections (c)(1), (c)(2), (c)(5), and (c)(6) shall be added thereto.

"(3) TAXABLE INCOME.—The term 'taxable income' shall, with respect to such taxable year, have the same meaning otherwise applicable under this subtitle, except that the aggregate of the amounts specified in subsections (c)(1) through (c)(7), inclusive, shall be added thereto, and the aggregate of the amounts specified in subsections (c)(8) through (c)(10), inclusive, shall be subtracted therefrom."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts for subchapter A of Chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"PART VI—MINIMUM INCOME TAX"

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1968.

Section 3. Limitation on deductions for individuals.

(a) DEDUCTION LIMITATION.—Part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 (relating to items not deductible) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 277. Limitation on deductions for individuals.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—If an individual for a taxable year has section 277 deductions, such deductions shall be disallowed in an amount equal to the aggregate of such deductions multiplied by the section 277 percentage.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) SECTION 277 DEDUCTIONS.—The term 'section 277 deductions' means the amounts allowable as deductions (other than under the provisions of this section) under the following sections, but only if not otherwise deductible under section 162 or in determining adjusted gross income under section 62—

"(A) section 163 (relating to interest),

"(B) section 164 (relating to taxes),

"(C) section 165(c)(3) (relating to casualty losses),

"(D) section 170 (relating to charitable, etc., contributions and gifts),

"(E) section 213 (relating to medical, dental, etc., expenses),

"(F) section 216 (relating to deduction of taxes, interest, and business depreciation by cooperative housing corporation tenant-stockholder).

"(2) SECTION 277 PERCENTAGE.—The term 'section 277 percentage' means the percentage that the aggregate of the amounts described in paragraphs (1) through (7), inclusive, of section 55(c) (relating to section 55 income) bears to the taxpayer's adjusted gross income (as defined in section 62) plus the amounts described in paragraphs (1) through (7), inclusive, of section 55(c)."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such Part IX is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 277. Limitation on deductions for individuals."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1968.

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION, MINIMUM INCOME TAX BILL

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, ETC.

(a) *Short Title:* Subsection (a) of section 1 of the bill provides that the bill may be cited as the "Income Tax Reform Act of 1969."

(b) *Amendment of 1954 Code:* Subsection (b) of section 1 of the bill provides that, except as otherwise provided in the bill, whenever in the bill an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to or repeal of a section or other provision, the reference is considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

SECTION 2. MINIMUM INCOME TAX

(a) *Imposition of Tax:* Subsection (a) of section 2 of the bill amends the Internal Revenue Code by adding a new section 55. In general, section 55 imposes the minimum income tax and contains the provisions specifying the rate of the tax, the conditions under which it applies, and the items of income or deduction which are included in the computation of the tax.

Section 55. Minimum income tax

(a) *Imposition of Minimum Tax:* Subsection (a) of section 55, as added by the bill, provides that any individual, trust, estate, or corporation is subject to the minimum income tax if that tax is greater than the regular income tax to which he would otherwise be subject.

(b) *Minimum Tax Rate:* Subsection (b) of section 55 provides the rate of the minimum tax. The minimum tax is equal to the regular income tax rate otherwise applicable to the taxpayer, computed as if his taxable income for the year were one-half his "section 55 income," that is, his expanded income for minimum tax purposes. The term "section 55 income" is defined in subsection (c) of section 55. This means that if the total of the items added to taxable income (gross income less deductions and exemptions) in determining "section 55 income" is equal to or less than taxable income, he will not be subject to the minimum tax. On the other hand, if this amount exceeds taxable income, the taxpayer will know he is subject to the minimum tax and will compute his tax in the manner described.

For example, if an unmarried taxpayer had taxable income in 1969 of $60,000, his income tax (without the surcharge) would be $28,790. If the total of the items to be added to taxable income under the minimum tax provisions did not exceed $60,000, his tax would not be adjusted under this bill for that year. If, however, the aggregate of such items were $100,000, his "section 55 income" would be $160,000. He would then compute his tax for the year by applying the regular rate table to one-half of $160,000, or $80,000. The resulting tax would be $41,790, an increase over the regular tax of $13,000.

As under the regular income tax, the taxpayer is permitted to reduce his minimum income tax liability by the amount of any credits allowed under the law, such as the retirement income credit. If the computation of an allowable credit involve a limitation based on tax liability for the year, the taxpayer would utilize the minimum tax liability in making the computation of the allowable amount of the credit.

(c) *Section 55 Income*: Subsection (c) of section 55 defines the term "section 55 income." In general, "section 55 income" means taxable income plus the aggregate of the items specified in subsection (c).

"Section 55 income" is the base used for computing the minimum tax. Also, by totaling the various items specified in subsection (c) and comparing that with taxable income, the taxpayer will know whether he is subject to the minimum tax.

In practice it is assumed that the tax forms will contain a simple schedule for listing the items set forth in subsection (c). The taxpayer will complete this schedule and will compute his tax in the regular way if the resulting amount is not greater than taxable income. If it is greater, he will substitute the minimum tax computation for the regular income tax computation.

Under subsection (c), "section 55 income" means taxable income, plus

1. Interest income received on state and local bonds which is excluded under section 103 in determining the regular income tax.
2. The 50% deduction allowed to individuals, estates, and trusts for long-term capital gains.
3. The amount of percentage depletion claimed which exceeds the cost of the property with respect to which the depletion allowance is granted.
4. In the case of buildings and other depreciable real property, if the depreciation deduction is claimed on the basis of some accelerated depreciation method, the excess thereof over the amount which would have been allowed if the straightline method were used.
5. The amount of the appreciation (fair market value less cost) in property donated to a charitable organization.
6. The difference between the fair market value and the cost of stock acquired pursuant to the exercise of a qualified stock option.
7. The amount of the deduction claimed for intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells.

The resulting figure is then reduced by deducting therefrom the following three items:

1. Expenses and interest (otherwise nondeductible under section 265) attributable to carrying state and local bonds, the interest income from which is included in "section 55 income."

2. The amount of an individual's personal deductions which are disallowed under the companion proposal relating to the allocation of deductions.

3. The amount of $5,000 ($2,500 in the case of a married taxpayer filing a separate return). This is a special deduction allowed only in computing the minimum tax.

(d) *Special Rules:* Subsection (d) of section 55 provides special rules designed to insure that the effect of including certain items in the minimum income tax are properly reflected for other purposes.

This subsection authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue rules and regulations to prescribe the basis adjustments which are required when a taxpayer is subject to the minimum income tax for a taxable year, and his "section 55 income" for such year includes excess real estate depreciation, the profit realized when stock is acquired below its current market value pursuant to a qualified stock option, or the deduction of intangible drilling costs.

For example, if a taxpayer claims a depreciation deduction of $50,000 with respect to a building under an accelerated depreciation method, his basis in that building is reduced by $50,000. However, if straight-line depreciation on the building was only $30,000, the $20,000 difference is includable in "section 55 income" under the bill. If the taxpayer is subject to the minimum income tax, it would be improper to reduce his basis $50,000 since he did not receive an effective deduction of $50,000. Similarly, it would be incorrect to reduce basis only $30,000, since the $20,000 difference was not taxed under the regular income tax rate structure, but rather under the lower minimum income tax rates. Consequently, an adjustment must be made which reduces basis for the $20,000 taxed under the minimum income tax only by an amount which properly reflects the relationship between the minimum income tax and the regular income tax in this case.

The Secretary of the Treasury is also granted authority under subsection (d) to prescribe rules necessary to adjust net operating loss deductions to reflect the minimum income tax.

(e) *Exceptions:* Subsection (e) of section 55 prescribes two exceptions to the minimum income tax. The tax does not apply to income earned by nonresident aliens and foreign corporations not connected with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States. Under the regular income tax, these amounts are taxed at a flat 30% rate (unless otherwise provided by treaty) without the allowance of any deductions or exemptions.

(f) *Special Definitions:* Subsection (f) of section 55 contains special definitions of the terms "gross income," "adjusted gross income," and "taxable income" in the case where a taxpayer is subject to the minimum income tax. Under subsection (f), these terms are adjusted to reflect the proper inclusion in each case of items specified in subsection (c). This will facilitate the operation and application of procedural provisions of the Code, such as requirements to file tax and estimated tax returns, the imposition of penalties, exceptions to statute of limitations provisions, etc.

(b) *Clerical Amendment*: Subsection (b) of section 2 of the bill makes a clerical amendment to a table of parts in the Code required by the addition of section 55 to the Code.

(c) *Effective Date*: Subsection (c) of section 2 of the bill provides that the minimum income tax provisions will apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1968. For most individuals who report on a calendar year basis, this means that the minimum income tax will apply to the calendar year 1969. For other taxpayers who report on a fiscal year basis, the new provision would apply to their taxable years beginning in 1969.

SECTION 3. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTIONS FOR INDIVIDUALS

(a) *Deduction Limitation*: Subsection (a) of section 3 of the bill amends the Internal Revenue Code by adding a new section 277. In general, section 277 limits the amount of certain personal deductions allowed to individuals to reflect an allocation of such items between income subject to tax and items which are untaxed.

Section 277. Limitation on Deductions for Individuals

(a) *General Rule:* Subsection (a) of section 277, as added by the bill, provides that an individual's "section 277 deductions" for a taxable year will be disallowed in an amount equal to the aggregate of such deductions multiplied by the "section 277 percentage."

(b) *Definitions:* Subsection (b) of section 277 defines the terms "section 277 deductions" and "section 277 percentage."

Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) defines the term "section 277 deductions" to mean the following deductible items, but only if such items are not otherwise allowable as an ordinary and necessary business expense, or as a deduction from gross income in arriving at adjusted gross income: interest; state and local taxes; casualty losses; charitable contributions; medical expenses; and the deduction allowed to owners of cooperative apartments for taxes and interest.

Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) defines the term "section 277 percentage" as the percentage that the total of items added to taxable income under section 55(c) (without regard to the deductions allowed in computing "section 55 income") bears to the sum of that amount plus the taxpayer's adjusted gross income.

The operation of section 277 can be illustrated by the following example. Assume an individual taxpayer for a given year has $25,000 of salary income and $15,000 of tax-exempt interest income. He itemizes his deductions and claims $5,000 as a charitable contribution deduction and $3,000 as a deduction for state income and sales taxes. His "section 277 deductions" total $8,000. The "section 277 percentage" is 37.5% ($15,000 divided by $40,000). Consequently, $3,000 ($8,000 multiplied by 37.5%) of the charitable contribution and state tax deductions are disallowed under this provision.

(b) *Clerical Amendment:* Subsection (b) of section 3 of the bill makes a clerical amendment to a table of parts in the Code required by the addition of section 277 to the Code.

(c) *Effective Date:* Subsection (c) of section 3 of the bill provides that the allocation of deductions provisions will apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1968, the same effective date for the minimum income tax imposed by section 2 of the bill.

S. 1828

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the minimum standard deduction

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 141(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to minimum standard deduction) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Minimum Standard Deduction.—The minimum standard deduction is an amount equal to the sum of—

"(1) $100, multiplied by the number of exemptions allowed for the taxable year as a deduction under section 151, plus

"(2)(A) $600, in the case of a joint return of a husband and wife under section 6013,

"(B) $600, in the case of a return of an individual who is not married, or

"(C) $300, in the case of a separate return by a married individual."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1968.

S. 1829

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce and extend the tax surcharge and to suspend the investment credit during the remaining period of applicability of the tax surcharge

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 48 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definitions and special rules for purposes of the investment credit) is amended by redesignating subsection (k) as (l) and by inserting after subsection (j), the following new subsection:

"(k) Suspension of Investment Credit During Applicability of Tax Surcharge.—For purposes of this subpart—

"(1) General rule.—Section 38 property which is tax surcharge suspension period property shall not be treated as new or used section 38 property.

"(2) Tax surcharge suspension period property defined.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the term 'tax surcharge suspension period property' means section 38 property—

"(A) the physical construction, reconstruction, or erection of which begins either during the tax surcharge suspension period or pursuant to an order placed during such period, or

"(B) which is acquired by the taxpayer either during the tax surcharge suspension period or pursuant to an order placed during such period.

"(3) Binding contracts.—To the extent that any property is constructed, reconstructed, erected, or acquired pursuant to a contract which was, on April 15, 1969, and at all times thereafter, binding on the taxpayer, such property shall not be deemed to be tax surcharge suspension period property.

"(4) Tax surcharge suspension period.—The term 'tax surcharge suspension period' means the period beginning on April 16, 1969, and ending on the last day on which the tax required to be deducted and withheld on wages under section 3402 includes any amount attributable to the tax surcharge imposed by section 51."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after April 15, 1969.

Sec. 2. (a) Section 51(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to imposition of tax surcharge) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Imposition of Tax.—

"(1) Calendar years.—In addition to the other taxes imposed by this chapter, there is hereby imposed on the income of every person whose taxable year is the calendar year a tax equal to—

"(A) for calendar year 1969, 8.5 percent of the adjusted tax for such year, and

"(B) for calendar year 1970, 3.5 percent of the adjusted tax for such year.

"(2) Fiscal and short taxable years.—In addition to the other taxes imposed by this chapter, in the case of taxable years ending after June 30, 1969, and beginning before July 1, 1970, there is hereby imposed on the income of every person whose taxable year is other than the calendar year, a tax equal to the sum of—

"(A) 10 percent of the adjusted tax for the taxable year, multiplied by a fraction the numerator of which is the number of days in the taxable year occurring before July 1, 1969, and the denominator of which is the number of days in the taxable year; and

"(B) 7 percent of the adjusted tax for the taxable year, multiplied by a fraction the numerator of which is the number of days in the taxable year occurring after June 30, 1969, and before July 1, 1970, and the denominator of which is the number of days in the taxable year.

"(3) LIMITATION.—In the case of—

"(A) a husband and wife (or surviving spouse) who file a joint return under section 6013 and whose adjusted tax for the taxable year is less than $580,

"(B) an individual who is a head of a household to whom section 1(b) applies and whose adjusted tax for the taxable year is less than $440, and

"(C) any other individual (other than an estate or trust) whose adjusted tax for the taxable year is less than $290,

the tax imposed by paragraph (1) or (2) shall not be greater than an amount equal to twice the tax which would be imposed by paragraph (1) or (2) if the tax were imposed on the amount by which the adjusted tax exceeds $290, $220, or $145, respectively."

(b)(1) Section 3402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to income tax collected at source) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(n) WAGES PAID AFTER JUNE 30, 1969, AND BEFORE JULY 1, 1970.—In the case of wages paid after June 30, 1969, and before July 1, 1970, the amount required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a) or (c) (1) shall be determined in accordance with tables prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate which shall take into account the tax imposed by section 51."

(2) Section 963(b)(3) of such Code is amended by striking out "June 30, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1970".

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b)(2) shall apply to taxable years ending after June 30, 1969, and beginning before July 1, 1970. The amendment made by subsection (b)(1) shall apply with respect to wages paid after June 30, 1969, and before July 1, 1970.

THE ABM ISSUE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the remarks of the distinguished majority leader on yesterday dealing with the ABM issue have caused me great concern. First, I would like to state that I entirely agree with the distinguished majority leader (Mr. MANSFIELD) that debate on the ABM ought not to be a hard and fast political confrontation. It is obvious, I think, to the majority leader, as it is obvious to this very junior member of the minority, that there is substantial and well reasoned support for the Safeguard system on the Democratic side as well as on the Republican side, and there is opposition to the deployment of the Safeguard system on both the Democratic and Republican sides of the aisle. It is not a crystallized political confrontation.

I think one of the basic strengths of this body is that it has always, in my judgment, exercised its free will and important constitutional functions to the maximum, not by institutional political confrontations, but, rather, the Senate, in the scheme of Government, has taken into account the intricacies and delicacies of important issues that confront this country, and, indeed, the whole world.

So, I commend the majority leader for his admonition, yesterday, that the issue of the deployment of the Safeguard ABM system is not, and should not be, a political confrontation between the Republicans and Democrats. Once again, it is not. Nor should it be.

It has come to my attention that there has appeared in print, in a publication of the Democratic National Committee called the "Demo Memo," a little article entitled "A Look at the Issues: No. 1. ABM—Safeguard or Hazard?" which deals primarily with opposition to the ABM system. As I read the article I do not believe it represents a uniform consensus of opinion on the Democratic side.

It has also come to my attention that remarks attributed to the new Republican National Committee Chairman, Representative ROGERS MORTON appeared in the New York Times and the Baltimore Sun this morning and indicated that the resources and facilities of the Republican National Committee would be devoted to support of the deployment of the ABM Safeguard system.

Taken together, both of these matters disturb me somewhat. That is why I was especially pleased to read this morning the remarks by the distinguished majority leader urging consideration of this issue on its merits and admonishing against an institutional confrontation between the Democratic and Republican Parties and why today I call Representative ROGERS MORTON to discuss this matter with him further. I was told by Representative MORTON that it is not the intention of the Republican National Committee to try to turn this matter into an institutional political confrontation but to espouse what it feels to be the reasonable and logical reasons which go into making up the decision of the President of the United States with respect to the deployment of the Safeguard ABM system.

I do not care to criticize Senator HARRIS as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, nor do I criticize Representative MORTON as chairman of the Republican National Committee, for taking any position. Both of them are Members of Congress, one of them of this body and the other of the other body, and both are entitled, and required, I suppose, by the Constitution, to have and espouse their individual views.

Both of the governing bodies of our two great national parties are probably required, by the very nature of things, to take a position one way or the other, in general terms; but the point of these remarks is simply to join with the majority leader in hoping that we do not have a national, partisan, political confrontation on this issue, and to applaud Representative MORTON for what he said today in his conversation with me that he had no such intention and did not intend to proceed in that manner.

Mr. President, on another aspect of this matter, I would like to exercise my own constitutional prerogative as a Member of this body, not as a Republican, but, rather, as a conscientious American citizen and elected official of the United States, to say I support the Safeguard ABM system. I support the deployment of the ABM. I supported it in the last Congress during a Democratic administration. I support it now during a Republican administration.

I support it for different reasons than many of my colleagues do, and certainly I support it for reasons that my colleagues who oppose it do not find convincing.

I shall not impose on the time of the Senate to rehearse all the facts and circumstances which make up my somewhat difficult judgment of where we should go in this field. I wish to make only one point, and I hope to make it clearly, because I feel very keenly about it.

Since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, this world has lived essentially in a state of balanced terror. That term is used so often that it takes on now the coloration and character of a cliche, but it is still accurate. It is a state of balanced terror. There is American terror that the Russians can incinerate us, and there is Russian fear that we can incinerate them; fear that each might perish at the hands of the other.

We have contributed to that state of balanced terror by building, in greater and greater numbers, in an ever-spiraling increase, more and bigger and more accurate offensive intercontinental ballistic missiles, with nuclear and thermonuclear warheads, with destructive capacities ranging from kilotons to 15 or even 25 megatons, which could destroy all of mankind.

So far, with God's help, and the judicious restraint of the super powers of the world, we have avoided a nuclear holocaust; but I fear it cannot so continue; I fear that a state of balanced terror based on offensive weapons may lead us into the very incineration that we must avoid.

I really grow weary of a moral, conscientious United States of America basing its defensive strategy on the proposition that it always will build more and more and bigger and bigger offensive nuclear weapons and point them at Moscow or Peking.

I think if I were a citizen of the Soviet Union and lived in Moscow, I might be a little bit concerned by the knowledge that the United States is building greater numbers of ever-larger thermonuclear-tipped intercontinental ballistic missiles, and pointing them at me. I know I grow weary of being held hostage—one of perhaps 70 or 80 million Americans—to the nuclear threat of the Soviet Union. I am sure they would grow weary, as I grow weary, of this continuing escalation of the threat of offensive nuclear blackmail. It has worked so far, but I am not sure it will always work.

I believe that the arms spiral is fed by the continuing requirement that we equalize the offensive threat of Russia by building greater, more deadly, and more novel offensive weapons. I believe the arms spiral can be defused and decelerated by dedicating a part of our energy and effort to a defensive posture in this Nation. There is, I believe ample—certainly abundant—proof, that the Soviets do not consider the ABM system provocative. But you can bet your bottom dollar that they consider MIRV provocative, or that they consider FOBS provocative; and you can certainly bet that if we propose to put, as we could, a 50 or 100 megaton warhead on a Saturn V rocket, and point it at Russia, that this would be considered provocative. But the same amount of money spent on a defensive posture is not; and the reaction of the Soviet Union so far supports that thesis.

It seems to me that there is something vaguely immoral about the greatest and most moral nation on earth defending itself by saying, "I can kill you quicker than you can kill me." I believe the time has come when we have got to bring our intellectual and moral resources to bear on some different course. I believe that the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system is it. I believe it is distinctly superior, from a moral standpoint, to dedicate our assets and our treasure to the evolution, development, and deployment of a defensive system that is calculated to defend this country and its population, and which categorically cannot hurt or injure anybody outside the continental limits of the United States because of the limited range of defensive weapons, rather than to build 7,000-mile monsters, with 20 megaton warheads, that can kill 30 million people in one 4-mile fireball.

So, Mr. President, I am tired of an ICBM mentality that proposes to defend this country by nothing other than the threat of destroying someone else. That is not befitting the strongest and most moral nation on earth.

We are at the crossroads. We now have it in our grasp, by reason of the gifts of science and technology, to do something, I believe, effectively to defend ourselves, other than continuing to hold mutual hostages of 80 to 100 million Russian citizens versus 80 to 100 million American citizens under the threat of nuclear annihilation.

That is why I support the Safeguard system, and that is why I hope that the moral strength and the conscience of this Nation will rise up to say, "We have had enough of an ICBM mentality; we have had enough of being the bully; we have had enough of responding to the Russian threat by saying, 'We can burn you up faster than you can burn us up,'" and we will begin to think in terms of trying to defend ourselves instead of provoking a reaction from the Soviet Union.

I hope these arguments are persuasive, because I feel that the future of this Nation, therefore the future of the free world, is intertwined inextricably with the decision we make at this point in history.

So in conclusion, Mr. President, I am pleased that our new Republican Chairman has assured me that Republicans and Democrats together will be welcomed in the support of the deployment of this system, and that he is aware that Republicans and Democrats together will oppose it, and that for his part, he does not foresee and hopes to avoid a partisan political confrontation.

I have so much confidence in our two-party system and in the integrity and the promise of both of our great national parties that I feel sure that there must be a similar reaction in the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE NUCLEAR ROCKET ENGINE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the revised budget submitted today by President Nixon continues support of NERVA, the nuclear rocket engine. This project in which the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration jointly participate has my strong support. A March 29, 1969, article published in Business Week magazine reflects on the success of this program to date and tells why it has many enthusiastic supporters.

I request that this article, "NASA Puts an Atom in Its Tank," be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NASA PUTS AN ATOM IN ITS TANK

A flash of flame, a cloud of steam, and a muffled roar—from a distance of two miles across the barren Nevada desert at Jackass Flats, it looked like just another static rocket test.

But last week's successful first "burn" of the Nerva XE nuclear rocket engine was the culmination of two decades of experimentation by engineers and scientists backed by NASA and the AEC. It also was a critical first step in developing what could be the workhorse space engine for the U.S. in the next two decades.

The 50,000-lb-thrust XE isn't meant to fly. But it is put together in exactly the way a flight engine would be built. This means that if it continues to perform well, technicians can move on to the next step in the program to start to build a 75,000-lb. flight version by this summer.

Then by 1977—barring any huge technological hurdle—the first U.S. nuclear rocket could be performing in space.

CAPABILITIES

Nerva isn't designed as a booster for getting heavy payloads off earth, as are the Saturn V and the Titan IIIM. It will be used to power the upper stages of space vehicles, firing only after they are safely out in space to prevent the release of radioactive matter in earth's atmosphere.

But once out in space, Nerva's virtues are numerous. It is a light, flexible, compact energy source. It is more efficient than any liquid or solid rocket propellant, chiefly because it uses a different principle to produce its power.

All space engines today are powered by chemical rockets operating on the same principle that moves an auto—internal combustion. An oxidizer and a fuel are brought together and burned in a combustion chamber, and the resulting hot gases are forced through a nozzle to provide thrust.

The nuclear rocket engine operates by heat exchange. Liquid hydrogen passes through a hot nuclear reactor and is heated to temperatures of around 4,500F. The rapidly expanding hot gas forces its way out through an exhaust nozzle. Although shielding requirements would necessarily add weight to the Nerva-powered rocket stage, there is no need for it to carry an oxidizer. Thus, the net weight saving would be substantial.

ADAPTABLE

Milton Klein, NASA's Nuclear Propulsion Office manager, predicts that Nerva's greatest asset will be its adaptability. It should be able to respond, he thinks, to any space mission NASA manages to think up for it.

Among its first jobs will be long, unmanned, interplanetary trips. But it also should be able to perform complicated earth-orbital work, where many stops and starts and changes in orbit are needed. One of the goals of the 75,000-lb. Nerva is a total operating time of one hour, with 10 stop and start cycles. This is four times the lifetime and more than seven times the thrust of the Apollo moon-descent engine. But engineers are already talking about the next step—a nuclear engine that could operate on a stop-start basis for a total of two hours or more in space.

None of the many roles suggested for Nerva are being pushed by the AEC or NASA, nor by Nerva's prime contractors—Aerojet-General Corp. for the rocket and Westinghouse Electric Corp. for the reactor. The reason: They are fearful that Nerva could become tied to one particular space mission and would rise or fall as goes the mission.

COMPATIBLE

The whole Nerva development, they maintain, has been a unique and farsighted piece of planning. Its funding, unlike that of most space projects, has been modest and restrained. Over the past 20 years, only about $1.1-billion has been spent on developing a nuclear rocket engine. Total cost, by the time the 75,000-lb-thrust engine is tested, will be nearly $2.2-billion.

This could turn out to be the best investment the U.S. has made in a piece of space hardware, however. Nerva already is compatible with almost any large booster or second-stage engine the U.S. has built to date. And it should be simple to work into future rocket booster designs. Some time in the late 1970s, says Dr. Chandler C. Ross, senior vice-president of the Nuclear Div. of Aerojet-General, it could make "a beautiful combination with a 260-in. solid propellant booster rocket."

In performance, says Ross, nuclear rocket engine can be considered twice as powerful as chemical engines. Doubling the performance of an engine, he says, means getting twice the performance from the same weight of fuel and that means a doubling of what engineers call "Delta V," or change in velocity. It is this change in velocity that gets a rocket off the launch pad and into orbit, or out of orbit and into space.

This little trick, which Nerva will be able to deliver 10 times or more, will be valuable in making course changes on long interplanetary trips or for changing orbits near earth. Nerva should be powerful enough to switch a satellite, say, from an equatorial orbit to a polar orbit. And, though nobody talks about it, this would also enable future manned spacecraft to go up and inspect orbiting military satellites which are on patrol.

TEST PATTERN

Long before Nerva's time arrives, however, it probably will be the best understood, most perfected engine in history. Already, says Ross, "we have a higher state of knowledge about the nuclear engine than we do about the automobile engine." For one thing, the nuclear engine is amenable to precise modeling: It works the way the engineering curves say it will. And it is easier to understand than a chemical rocket, because scientists' understanding of the physical behavior of gases is greater than their understanding of chemical combustion.

One of the main objectives of the present testing program with the XE engine is to see how it operates in an environment that partially simulates the vacuum of space. This is being done on a new engine test stand (ETS–1) at the U.S. Nuclear Rocket Development Station at Jackass Flats. When shielded doors weighing 1-million-lb. are closed tightly around Nerva and its test equipment, a vacuum can be drawn on it simulating an altitude of 100,000-ft.

The ETS-1 is made out of aluminum because that metal doesn't absorb radiation as steel does. This permits test personnel to get back to work quickly after a power run in which radiation is produced. Other unusual features of the facilities are the reactor maintenance assembly and disassembly buildings, where technicians tear down an engine with large mechanical manipulators while they are safely housed behind a radiation shielding window.

OPENING UP

At the moment, Aerojet and Westinghouse seem to have a monopoly on the nuclear rocket engine business. But North American Rockwell Corp., which is studying the engine to see how it might better power the S–11 stage of the Saturn V rocket, says it hopes some day that the nuclear engine program will again be thrown open to competition.

If nuclear rocket engines become big business, North American, as well as several other large aerospace companies, will be clamoring to get into it.

WEST GERMANY'S STAKE IN AVOIDING A NEW ARMS RACE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the distinguished economic analyst Eliot Janeway recently made another contribution to rationality in an article he wrote on a particular economic consequence of the new missile race that looms so forebodingly before us.

Many of us who have the gravest reservations about President Nixon's call for deployment of an ABM system see as one of the compelling reasons against it the tremendous strain it would place on our own economy. What we sometimes tend to ignore is the fact that any sharp escalation in the United States-Soviet arms race will almost certainly have damaging consequences for our allies as well.

This is the point that Mr. Janeway makes so cogently in regard to the German Federal Republic, in the article that I now ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD STABILITY KEY IS WEST GERMANY

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, February 23.—The more of a nagging backache Viet Nam remains, the more of a powder keg the middle east becomes, the more of an outrage the Red army occupation of Czechoslovakia is, the more of an inflationary burden the missiles race imposes, and the more of a force for monetary instability the weakness of the French franc becomes, the more strategic a key to world stability Germany becomes.

The outward and visible form trouble takes in world affairs nowadays reflects underlying stresses and strains in America's relations with the soviet powers. While a new Russian-American missile race would portend a long-term international political catastrophe and would assure an immediate international financial catastrophe, nevertheless if it develops in spite of the negotiation aimed at avoiding it, it would develop as the consequence of troubles recurring between Russia and America on more familiar fronts.

For the barometer measuring the rise and fall of atmospheric pressures between Moscow and Washington is not located along the air waves missiles travel nor is it centered in Viet Nam or in the Mediterranean. West Germany is where it is. When trouble backs up from the fringe fronts to the critical front on which both sides are committed to gamble and on which neither side can afford to lose, West Germany is where the confrontation centers.

CALLED "THE HEARTLAND"

Europe is what yesterday's geopoliticians used to call the heartland, and what today's geoeconomists have no alternative but to think of as the heartland. And West Germany is more than ever the heartland of Europe—Europe's entire economy pulsates at the pace set by German industry.

Thus, it seems that the more things change, the more they remain the same. The change of intercontinental emphasis President Nixon's projected tour suggests for American strategic policy gives recognition to this abiding fact of life.

In the nick of time, too. For the condition of West Germany is not nearly as robust as it is said to be or as the raw figures of her formidable performance in the world economic competition suggest. The German economic achievement has been advertised as a miracle. This is more than an exaggeration. It is misleading. Like most misconceptions, it rests on a familiar phenomenon—in this case, the well-known willingness of the German people to work hard and to save diligently.

But the German people have always been willing and, indeed, anxious to work hard and to save diligently. Yet they have not always been able to stage an economic performance that could plausibly qualify as a miracle. The controlling factor in the German economy is not economic at all. It is political, in the sense in which confidence in peace results from the negotiations of statesmen and fear of war feeds on mistrust of the plays of power politicians.

The moment the German economy was freed to operate under the security umbrella provided and financed by America at the end of World War II, it gathered miraculous momentum despite the destruction which had supposedly gutted it. So long as the American umbrella remained intact and unchallenged in power terms, the German economy continued to break its own records—even after the Communists scored their psychological coup in erecting the Berlin wall.

NEEDS SECURITY UMBRELLA

But ever since the Red army moved into its new positions dominating Czechoslovakia and threatening Germany, the continuing momentum of the German productive mechanism has gradually come to seem less important than the ability of the west to pack enough muscle and to develop enough flexibility of maneuver to patch up the security umbrella under which the German economy needs to operate to insure prosperity for itself and security for Europe.

From here on out, the "German economic miracle" looks like it will remain as impressive as American strategic policy proves effective, no more and no less. If a new missile race is allowed to start—especially against a background dominated by an intensification of Red army crackdown operations against the former satellites—Germany will be caught up in it.

A return to the sorry past of German military budgeting will cut short the happy future open to German productivity by freedom from arms burdens. Meanwhile, the fact of uncertainty has been enough to stop the speculation on the presumed strength of the German deutschemark. The proliferation of fiscal fall-out from a new missiles race would subject Germany's currency to the same suspicion that is now plaguing markets everywhere else.

THE NIXON REORGANIZATION PLAN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, President Nixon's recent statement on the restructuring of Government service systems is a significant step in decentralizing Government and making Government more compatible with the times as we face the last one-third of the 20th century.

As a candidate, Dick Nixon pledged that he would modernize our governmental structures so that the ever-growing functions of Government could be performed with a maximization of efficiency and economy. President Nixon's recent statement proves that he is a man of his word, and that the people of this country can expect their Government to achieve its goals with increased efficiency over the past performance of the bureaucratic maze which had far too often engulfed the functions of Government and the demands of its citizens.

I am certain that the people of the United States who have long cast an eye of suspicion on the "inefficiency in Washington" will be pleased to know that our President is taking an active step which will coordinate and decentralize the roles of Government, reduce waste and inefficiency at all levels, and promote economy at this most crucial period in our Nation's history.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's statement and the press conference of Messrs. Moynihan, Hughes, and Ziegler relative to the subject of restructuring the Government be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON RESTRUCTURING OF GOVERNMENT SERVICE SYSTEMS, MARCH 27, 1969

The Reorganization Act which the Congress has passed and which I am signing today gives the President important tools in his effort to make the machinery of government work more effectively. As a part of that same effort, I am announcing today certain structural changes which I am making in the systems through which the government provides important social and economic services.

It was possible for me to take these particular actions without the authority extended under the Reorganization Act. I announce them at this time, however, because they provide specific illustrations of ways in which we can make significant improvement in the quality of government by making it operate more efficiently.

This restructuring expresses my concern that we make much greater progress in our struggle against social problems. The best way to facilitate such progress, I believe, is not by adding massively to the burdens which government already bears but rather by finding better ways to perform the work of the government.

That work is not finished when a law is passed, nor is it accomplished when an agency in Washington is assigned to administer new legislation. These are only preliminary steps; in the end the real work is done by the men who implement the law in the field.

The performance of the men in the field, however, is directly linked to the administrative structures and procedures within which they work. It is here that the government's effectiveness too often is undermined. The organization of federal services has often grown up piece-meal—creating gaps in some areas, duplications in others, and general inefficiencies across the country. Each agency, for example, has its own set of regional offices and regional boundaries; if a director of one operation is to meet with his counterpart in another branch of the government, he often must make an airplane trip to see him. Or consider two federal officials who work together on poverty problems in the same neighborhood, but who work for different Departments and, therefore, find themselves in two different administrative regions, reporting to headquarters in two widely separated cities.

Coordination cannot flourish under conditions such as that. Yet without real coordination, intelligent and efficient government is impossible; money and time are wasted and important goals are compromised.

This is why I said in the campaign last fall that "the need is not to dismantle government but to modernize it." The systematic reforms I announce today are designed to help in that modernization process. I would discuss those reforms under three headings: rationalization, coordination and decentralization. It should be recognized, of course, that the three elements are interdependent. Without one the others would be meaningless.

I. The first concern is to rationalize the way our service delivery systems are organized. I have therefore issued a directive which streamlines the field operations of five agencies by establishing—for the first time—common regional boundaries and regional office locations. This instruction affects the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Small Business Administration. The activities of these agencies—particularly in serving disadvantaged areas of our society—are closely related. Uniform boundaries and regional office locations will help assure that they are also closely coordinated.

The eight new regions and the locations of the new regional centers are as follows:

Region I (*Boston*): Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

Region II (*New York City*): New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Region III (*Philadelphia*): Delaware, District of Columbia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Region IV (*Atlanta*): Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

Region V (*Chicago*): Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

Region VI (*Dallas-Fort Worth*): Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Region VII (*Denver*): Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.

Region VIII (*San Francisco*): Alaska, Arizona, California, Guam, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington.

I am asking all other federal agencies to take note of these instructions, and I am requesting that any changes in their field organization structures be made consistent with our ultimate goal: uniform boundaries and field office locations for all social or economic programs requiring interagency or intergovernmental coordination.

My directive also asks that the five Departments and agencies involved provide high-level representation in cities where regional offices do not exist. Such physical relocations as are required will be made over the next eighteen months, with special efforts to minimize disruptions to the programs, the employees, and the communities involved.

II. The second step in this reform process emphasizes coordination. It calls for an expansion of the regional council concept from the four cities where it presently operates (Chicago, New York, Atlanta, and San Francisco) to all eight of the new regional centers. The regional council is a coordinating body on which each of the involved agencies is represented. It offers an excellent means through which the various arms of the federal government can work closely together in defining problems, devising strategies to meet them, eliminating friction and duplications, and evaluating results. Such councils can make it possible for the Federal government to speak consistently and with a single voice in its dealings with states and localities, with private organizations, and with the public.

III. The third phase of this systematic restructuring of domestic programs focuses on decentralization. I am asking the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to join with the heads of nine departments and agencies in a review of existing relationships between centralized authorities and their field operations. Participating in the review will be the Departments of Agriculture; Commerce; Health, Education and Welfare; Housing and Urban Development; Labor; Transportation; Justice; the Office of Economic Opportunity; and the Small Business Administration.

This review is designed to produce specific recommendations as to how each agency: (1) can eliminate unnecessary steps in the delegation process; (2) can develop organizational forms and administrative practices which will mesh more closely with those of all other Departments; and (3) can give more day-by-day authority to those who are at lower levels in the administrative hierarchy. Decentralized decision-making will make for better and quicker decisions—it will also increase cooperation and coordination between the Federal government on the one hand and the states and localities on the other. Those Federal employees who deal every day with state and local officials will be given greater decision-making responsibility.

Again, this action is a concrete manifestation of a concern I expressed during the campaign: "Business learned long ago that decentralization was a means to better performance. It's time government learned the same lesson."

Some of the reforms which I am announcing today have been urged for many years—but again and again they have been thwarted. This inertia must be overcome. Old procedures that are inefficient, however comfortable and familiar they may seem, must be exchanged for new systems which do the job as it must be done.

The particular reforms I have discussed here are part of a broad and continuing process of restructuring the basic service systems of government. The reorganization of the Manpower Administration in the Department of Labor—announced on March 13—is another example of this process. So are the reforms which are being made in the postal system and in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I have established both the Urban Affairs Council and the Office of Intergovernmental Relations in part so that the government could be better advised on additional improvements in service systems. Further systematic restructuring is on the way. Each reform, I believe, will have a major impact on the quality of American government—an impact which will benefit all of our citizens—in all parts of our country—well beyond the lifetime of this Administration.

The Federal government has been assigned many new responsibilities in the last several decades—many of which it carries and many of which it fumbles. Many of the disappointments and frustrations of the last several years can be blamed on the fact that administrative performance has not kept pace with legislative promise.

This situation must be changed. The actions I announce today are important steps toward achieving such changes. By rationalizing, coordinating, and decentralizing the systems through which government provides important social and economic services, we can begin at last to realize the hopes and dreams of those who created them.

Press Conference of Daniel P. Moynihan, Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs; Philip S. Hughes, Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget; and Ron Ziegler, Press Secretary to the President

March 27, 1969

Mr. Ziegler. You have the statement by the President on restructuring of Government service systems. It is relatively self-explanatory. Dr. Moynihan and Sam Hughes are here to discuss this with you and answer any questions you may have. Their comments are on the record, contrary to yesterday when it was on a background basis.

Is Frank Porter here? (Laughter.)

Dr. Moynihan.

Dr. Moynihan. One can say anything one thinks on the record on something about the public administration because it never gets printed anyway. If we had a war to announce, by golly, everyone would be here.

This is about the first major reorganization which the President has put into effect. I think it is a matter of some interest, as Sam Hughes, our distinguished Deputy Director of the Budget will attest, that it has been something Presidents have been trying to put into effect for almost 20 years now.

This is the first time in the history of the American Republic that the regional boundaries of the major domestic programs will be co-terminus.

You see how quickly you lose audiences with things like that? (Laughter.)

The pattern has built up that each department, when departments have been established and agencies have been established, their regional boundaries have responded to the sort of peculiarities of subjects or the Congressional arrangements that led to their enactment or just randomness. The result has been that there has been wide variation in the regional headquarters.

There are two subjects, if I could point this out. One is what is the city which has the regional headquarters, and secondly, which are the States that make up the region. Both the States have varied and the regional headquarters have varied. This, as we have gradually found in domestic affairs as more and more we have had to work one program in relation to another or we have developed programs such as Model Cities, which, by definition and by statute presumed the working between different departments on a common subject, that the regional arrangements simply impeded us very seriously.

It made it possible to stand in the Fish Room, now in the Roosevelt Room, and announce enormous events and nothing happened, because there was no structure out there to make it happen, because if there is a rule in political science, it is that Government follows its structure.

What the President has done in the face of not a little bit of presumed difficulty, is to draw common boundaries to establish common regional headquarter cities for this beginning group of domestic departments with the expectation that they will be expanded in the future.

It is this, I think, that begins to make not just the question of coordination of Federal programs a serious issue and a possible result, but also begins to give some structure to the subject of decentralization. It can't be decentralized government unless you have a system of arrangements in the field to which, with authority, with discretion and responsibility, it can be given.

I think we are creating such a structure. It will be a long time, perhaps, in becoming a reality, but it is an absolutely indispensible first move. As I say to you, for 20 years we have sought this arrangement and now, at length, we have it.

I suppose my final comment would be that there is still quite a bit of detailed working out of the forms in which authority is delegated from different agencies to their regional headquarters. As between different departments, there are quite different levels of regional responsibilities, initiative and so forth, and bringing some responsibility into that is the work of years to come—the year to come, in any event.

Q. Can you really put these together in a field where you do have a central office or are we going to have a half dozen or dozen offices to go to? Can one person speak with authority in the regional authority?

Dr. Moynihan. Sam, do you want to join me here at the lectern?

That is the work of the years to come. We have already begun in four cities a Regional Council, begun last August; just getting some sense in itself, not more than announced, really. But the question of how much of a coherent decision-making apparatus we will be able to develop at regional levels remains to be seen.

It becomes a question of how much you want, but it is now possible to find that out, and up until now it has simply been a hypothetical question for professors.

Q. Will these offices all be in one office building?

Dr. Moynihan. Some of these are pretty large offices. There is a Federal Office Building in each of these cities. In some cases they will all be in the same structure and in other cases they will not. Some of these are big places.

If I could just say, in the whole question of public administration, making the Government work, in delivering public services, the biggest single weakness of the American National Government has been its field structure.

Mr. Hughes. I agree.

Dr. Moynihan. And not to attend to that is just not to be serious about this subject. It is perhaps the least exciting subject in Government, and that has been the source of the problem, just not in being able to muster the attention of persons to its absolutely essential nature.

For that reason it was almost the first issue we took up in the Urban Affairs Council out of the experience that if you didn't take it up early and get it done fast, other more glamorous issues would drive it into the next Administration.

Q. Will you save money, too, or is this just for efficiency?

Mr. Hughes. I would regard it as in the interest of efficiency. In your terms it is a management action. It could produce savings. It is not designed to do that. Rather, it is designed to make it easier to manage Federal programs out in the field where services must be delivered, and also to make it easier for the States and cities to deal with the Federal agencies.

Think of the Governor of Colorado, for instance, or the Mayor of Denver, who must deal with Federal regional offices in Denver, San Francisco, Fort Worth-Dallas, or Kansas City. He has an almost impossible kind of a problem, in a physical sense, to span. He is left with correspondence and telephone calls and so on.

So the co-location is the starting point for a whole range of actions which, as Pat said, we hope to evolve over the coming months.

Q. How many Congressmen are losing offices in their cities and how mad are they about it?

Mr. Hughes. On the latter point, I am not really an authority. My impression is that the decibels, at least at this point, are not impossibly high. Part of the difficulty over the years, the major part of the difficulty has been, as Pat said, on the one hand this is not a glamorous kind of action, and on the other hand it has been a kind of controversial action and has taken courage and determination on the part of the agency heads, the Urban Affairs Council and the President to bring it off.

If you are interested, we have a map of the revised organizational structure, and a listing of the State movements that are involved, agency by agency. The picture gets fairly complicated because each agency, and in some instances even bureaus within agencies, have a different field structure, so you have to look at it in fairly fine detail.

Dr. Moynihan. Could I add one point? In those cities which have been regional headquarters for departments and will cease to be, we are leaving behind a high-level department representative responding to the fact that those are important cities and are intended to be sub-regions at the very least.

There will be very little actual movement of people here as compared to that which would take place in the normal course of events.

Q. What do you estimate, about 1,800 people?

Mr. Hughes. Probably less than that net, and we anticipate that the moves will take place, to the extent they are necessary, over a year or a year and a half, so that the personal impact could be minimized.

Dr. Moynihan. These are high-level and particularly high-level people in America tend to move around anyway.

Q. Do you mean you are not closing offices?

Mr. Hughes. I think the situation is this: With eight regions obviously there are major concentrations of population that would not have a regional office in them. On the other hand, to have as many regions as would be implicit in that kind of arrangement creates an impossible kind of administrative structure.

So as we see it, the ideal would be to have cities not included as regional headquarters, like Kansas City, St. Louis, Detroit, Pittsburgh, perhaps, as focuses within a particular region, focuses of Federal personnel also, and having significant Federal representation and some authority in their own right.

Q. Can either of you name the cities that are losing regional headquarters?

Dr. Moynihan. There are five times eight.

Mr. Hughes. We can list cities. There are lots of moves back and forth. Because of the change of structure certain agencies move one way and other agencies move another. We can, if you would like, take an agency at a time after this session, if you want to, and discuss the moves individually. We know this, but——

Q. Are there 40 different regional offices now?

Dr. Moynihan. You have eight regions and five agencies. You don't have 40, but you have a maximum of 40. The areas from which people are moving in and out are much simpler.

Mr. Hughes. I can run through the list. Charlottesville will be affected; Washington, D.C., Austin, Kansas City has been discussed; Birmingham, Baltimore, Nashville. There are a number of moves back and forth involving New York City itself, depending on whether the particular agency had headquarters there or not. New Orleans, Cleveland, Seattle——

Dr. Moynihan. I will give you an example of the kind of thing involved. New York City is no longer a regional headquarters for HUD, but it becomes a regional headquarters for other agencies. People who were in New York City in a HUD arrangement who will move to New England and HUD——

Mr. Hughes. HUD stays.

Dr. Moynihan. But the New England people go out. HUD's regional headquarters remain in New York, but there will be a transfer of persons who have been in New York working on New England which now goes to Boston. It sounds complex, but it is a simple reorganization.

Q. Will Buffalo, New York be affected by any of these moves?

Mr. Hughes. Not so far as I know.

Q. The President said the things you are doing today are not involved in the signing of the Reorganization Act. What are you planning to do with the Reorganization Act to streamline the Government, or what are the plans of using the powers of the act the President has just signed?

Dr. Moynihan. Don't you think we have enough trouble for one day? (Laughter.)

Q. You don't have that in the works?

Dr. Moynihan. Yes. Remember that the reorganization powers have existed for 20 years, and are sort of a standing concomitant of the Presidency and in a normally effective Government reorganization considerations are always going on. It is a more intensive point than in the earlier Administration and President Nixon has spoken with special interest on this. I think you can look forward to proposals, but we have nothing right now.

Mr. Hughes. Lots of things are being looked at.

Q. You pointed out that for 20 years people have been interested in this. Can you identify some of the obstacles that have come up over the years?

Dr. Moynihan. I think Sam put it best. This is the kind of subject that people who are close to Government are very passionate about and people out of Government don't even know about. It always happens. To be associated with the movement of some resources from one part of the Congressional map to another. So there have always been people who by definition will have to be against it.

This combination of a rather low level of public interest and a rather specific level of local opposition has meant by and large that no President has ever been willing to bite the bullet. Now we have done so.

Mind you, once it takes place, then the new arrangements become sacred and absolutely imbedded in the Constitutional division of the Republic.

Mr. Hughes. I think a factor, also, is the growing obviousness of the need to do this sort of thing, given the structures that the President has set up, the Urban Affairs Council, the interrelationship that this group of agencies and others who are involved in urban problems.

Q. What progress is being made in those cities picked for Regional Councils?

Mr. Hughes. The Regional Councils that have been established are four in number. They were established at the only four cities where the four agencies involved happen to have co-located regional offices.

Interestingly enough, none of those regions coincide. For instance, the New York regional office, those four agencies have only one State in common, New York State. So that they have been experimental in nature thus far. They have proved, in our judgment and I believe in the judgment of the people who have participated in the Councils, to be a very useful and productive experiment in working together in a fashion that is increasingly necessary, but still is somewhat novel in Federal activities, and this particular geographic action that we are talking about here is designed to encourage that kind of cooperation.

The Federal Government has been organized categorically over the years and agency programs, I think, have tended to construct walls around themselves. We need, by these kinds of measures, to attempt to pierce these walls and put doors in them, and so on, and by the process of co-location and the advantages that are obvious in these four cities, have people being able to meet and discuss common problems, whether it is the Model Cities program or any other of mutual interest.

Those advantages, I think, have appeared in these four locations, and we do plan, hopefully, if the experiment succeeds, to extend it in other areas and to other agencies and programs where there is this same kind of relationship and need.

Dr. Moynihan. We are going to establish Regional Councils in the four regional headquarters. Automatically that is done today.

Q. What is the make-up of these Regional Councils? Who sits on them?

Dr. Moynihan. HEW, HUD, Labor and OEO.

Mr. Hughes. We started with these as a nucleus. We don't regard it as the end of it all, but we do want to keep the Councils more or less homogeneous in terms of their interest and involve those agencies essentially that would be involved in the Urban Affairs Council structure here in Washington.

Q. The figure 1,800 was dropped, and then you seemed not sure of that. How many people are going to be moved out of the cities?

Dr. Moynihan. The problem there is that these moves will be phased over 18 months and an unknown number of those people will leave their jobs for other reasons, find other places they can stay in and so there will be an empty slot moved—join the Army.

Q. Can you give me a count at all?

Mr. Hughes. I would say 1,200 or 1,400 may be confronted with a move at some time in this period. I hate to use the numbers, because they focus attention on a problem that may not exist, given the time interval, given turnover, and given the opportunity to establish what may be called essentially sub-regional offices in some of these cities where the employees might otherwise have to move from.

Q. Are these only high-level people, or are you talking about clerical support, too?

Mr. Hughes. The numbers involve the total range of personnel. Some of them obviously will elect to stay, perhaps, in these agencies or otherwise disassociate from the regional office so they don't have to move. That is part of the problem of estimating the moves.

Q. Do you mean then that there will be 400 who might find jobs in the cities they are now working within Government. Is that your estimate?

Dr. Moynihan. Sure. It is a long-established industrial practice now when you have to make changes in personnel to do them through the normal turn-over as much as you can. These end up to be surprisingly painless affairs if they are given time and advance notice.

Q. I am still not clear on whether any of the current regional offices will completely close in Kansas City.

Dr. Moynihan. Is Kansas City a regional headquarters?

Mr. Hughes. Yes.

Dr. Moynihan. It will no longer be. That is the one that immediately comes to mind.

Q. Some will disappear but reappear as sub-regional offices?

Dr. Moynihan. Yes. They may have to go around and write "sub" on some of the windows.

Q. Is Kansas City——

Mr. Hughes. There is a map which would show the new regional structure and we have a map which shows agency by agency the impact in terms of boundaries.

Q. How about the numbers of jobs?

Mr. Hughes. The jobs we don't have, simply because we don't know what the impact will be over a period of time on these people. We don't know how the sub-regional structure will be involved.

Dr. Moynihan. If we seem to be a little vague on this, it is not that we are vague, it is because this is an immensely complex subject. If you want to know why we are doing it you ought to sit down and spend the day trying to find out what is the present state. We set up a regional council of four major departmetns in New York City—New York City being the headquarters for each of those departments or agencies—only to find that the only State those four departments had in common was New York itself. It is just not beyond anybody's comprehension, it is just a very complex business.

Q. You have not said exactly whether there will be any regional offices completely closed down. Is the answer no?

Dr. Moynihan. Yes, there will be, in terms of specific departments.

Q. Which ones?

Dr. Moynihan. All over this map. We can spend the afternoon on it and we will give you the data.

Q. Are those the ones you read?

Mr. Hughes. I read the list of cities where there are now regional offices or equivalent which would be affected by this action.

Q. Does that mean they will be closed down?

Mr. Hughes. No. It means that that will no longer be a regional office. There may be—and in my judgment probably will be—personnel remaining there, perhaps the same personnel, but that will not have the label on it, on the door "Regional Office."

Dr. Moynihan. Let's be very clear. There are not going to be any doors locked in this process. There is no major city in the country that doesn't have in it offices of almost all the major departments of Federal Government. The question is: Where we have tried to establish regional systems, we have settled on eight, and the question is: can we transfer to those areas a measure of initiative, a measure of responsibility and authority so that in fact the work of Government in those very areas can go on closer to the areas involved. Most of these regions are, in terms of population, if you broke these eight regions up and put them in the U.N. Gazetteer, they would be the 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th and 14th biggest and richest countries in the world.

Finding a structure where you can give real power and authority is difficult. It is not a question of the taking of people out of Kansas City and into St. Louis and so on. There are going to be HUD and HEW, DOT and Labor people in all those places. It is a question of where do you locate the man you call Regional Director and what kind of authority do you give him and do you give to each of your people a sufficiently convergent set of powers and responsibilities so they in fact can sit down and make decisions of their own that have consequences.

Q. Implicit in that, it seems to me, there will have to be a coordination among these agencies in the level of authority granted regional directions.

Dr. Moynihan. That is correct. That is the next phase of our operation.

Q. Is there going to be any single man representing all of those?

Dr. Moynihan. No, we have specifically rejected that idea.

Q. How about in the cities where you are leaving some people behind, is there going to be a single man there?

Dr. Moynihan. No. The curious fact of the American National Government is that there is only one "single man" and he is called the President and that is the arrangement we have.

Q. I would like to talk about Kansas City. You are going to move HEW, OEO and Labor. That is 825 people involved. That is $10 million a year in payroll. HEW said it will cost them $800,000 to go to Denver. The Missouri and Kansas delegations, Republicans and Democrats alike, are upset. They don't understand why you are moving three bigger offices to Denver instead of two smaller ones to Kansas City.

Dr. Moynihan. These are numbers that have to do with the headquarters functions. They do not in any sense reflect a necessary net loss to that city of Federal employees or Federal payroll. They just don't. It would be our hope that any actual change to this would be very minimal, indeed.

They are changes in our organizational structure, not in the economic structure of Kansas City.

Mr. Hughes. I think that is a fair statement. The reasons for Denver versus Kansas City—judgments differ on this—but there are reasons of transportation networks, regional practices, regional associations, the suitability of Denver versus Kansas City as the headquarters city for the mountain states and those sorts of things.

We have tried, also, to minimize the moves within the total structure.

Dr. Moynihan. Let's be very candid. When you ask what is the difference between Kansas City and Denver, the answer is that a good case can be made for either, but if you are going to have one regional headquarters you have to have one. It has just been the unsatisfactory nature of the decision that has been part of taking 20 years to make it.

Mr. Hughes. One of the problems here is that you can slice 50 States and some territories and so on almost an infinite number of ways and it has been extremely difficult to get any measure of consensus or agreement as to the best arrangement. In evolving an arrangement, you cannot just look at the mountain states or Kansas City or Denver. You have to look at the country and the feasibility of fanning out from Washington, how many regions there ought to be in total and those kinds of questions. That is what we tried to stress.

Q. Can we find out about our specific regions?

Dr. Moynihan. The Bureau of the Budget has it.

Q. Should we call the Bureau?

Dr. Moynihan. Yes.

Mr. Ziegler. We will pass out maps, together with that release, which spell out the area covered in each region. They will give you an indication of what area the various headquarters cover.

The Press. Thank you.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER—IN MEMORIAM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, of only one other citizen in the history of the Republic could it be said "First in war; first in peace; first in the hearts of his countrymen." This memorial to the Father of our Country applies as well to its 34th President, whose passing we now mourn.

His nation's hero in war, its leader in peace, beloved by his fellow citizens and the citizens of the world, Dwight David Eisenhower epitomized the vigor, conviction, discipline, and integrity which are the foundation stones of our country.

He was an American. He was a great American of his era. And even in retirement he enriched our national life with his summons to the fundamental values in the American heritage.

We will miss him. But his life will not be honored if we simply recall his virtue as some relic of our national past. We must, instead, live as he would have lived: tolerant of the views and failings of others, but relentlessly demanding in the energy, honesty and vigor with which we pursue our own life and work.

So let us honor our departed leader. Let us be proud to have been his countrymen.

DEDICATION OF OLIN D. JOHNSTON ROOM AT UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA—ADDRESS BY GOV. ROBERT E. McNAIR

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on April 2, 1969, I was pleased to be present for the ceremony marking the dedication of the Olin D. Johnston Room at the University of South Carolina.

The late Senator Johnston, known and beloved by most of the Members of this body, held for 20 years the seat I now occupy.

It is only fitting that the University of South Carolina chose to honor Olin Johnston, in view of his many services and years of dedication and hard work in its behalf. On this occasion, the dedication remarks were delivered by our State's distinguished Governor, Hon. Robert E. McNair. Governor McNair's remarks were eloquent in their simplicity and, indeed, caught the spirit of the life of this great man.

I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Gov. Robert E. McNair at Ceremony Marking the Dedication of the Olin D. Johnston Room at the University of South Carolina, April 2, 1969

It is a great personal honor for me to be able to participate in this dedication today, because I looked upon Olin D. Johnston as a friend and a great teacher in the art of serving our fellow man. Time permits us to look with some perspective now on the life and career of this man, and yet the vision does not dim. Again and again, we recall the image of the tall senator talking with the factory worker, or the small farmer, or the public employee. We recall him in the role of a man who championed difficult causes. Those causes were difficult because they served nobody but the people, and anyone familiar with public life knows that the little man, the common man, has no lobby in Washington or Columbia. He expresses himself with the only power he has—the vote—and he used this power to send Olin Johnston into high public office for more than four decades.

We are gathered here today with so many distinguished friends of Senator Johnston to dedicate this room to his memory. It is a fitting and proper tribute because this great university belongs to South Carolina, and so did Senator Johnston. I express my congratulations and appreciation to those who have made this memorial possible, because I hope that South Carolinians in the generations ahead will continue to benefit from this man's contributions to our state and nation. This memorial room brings together in one place so many of the papers and other important items of his life and career, and makes his memory a living one for us all.

I would hope, however, that this room will serve as more than a source of research and interest for students. Olin Johnston was a working man, and those who made his public life possible were working people. I would like for that great corps of South Carolinians who loved and depended upon him to feel that this is their room, too. I would hope that the factory worker, the farmer, and the public employee will come to this place, and will understand more fully exactly how much this man gave to all South Carolinians.

We live in days of relative prosperity today, and although we still face many deep and serious problems, our state is experiencing wave after wave of economic expansion. These are days of optimism and confidence in the future of South Carolina. But these are also days when we cannot permit ourselves to forget where we have been. Most of all, these are days in which we must understand fully why we can now say with hope and assurance that South Carolina's day of fulfillment is within reach.

We can say so because in the depths of deepest trouble, our state had a man of vision, courage and strength to lead us. We had a man who looked honestly and frankly at our problems, and met them head-on. History will record that Olin Johnston brought electricity into the homes of thousands of South Carolina farm families. It will record that many thousands of industrial workers gained better working conditions through his efforts, and learned a new sense of dignity through his example.

History chose a particularly challenging period for Olin Johnston to serve his state and his nation, and we can be thankful for it. He governed his state twice—in the depths of the nation's worst depression, and in the midst of our nation's most brutal war. They were not happy times or easy times. Perhaps more than any other time in this century, they were times which demanded a man of excellence to lead his people and Olin Johnston was that man.

He was a man of conviction who arrived at a time when hard decisions had to be made. All of us connected with the leadership of South Carolina today know just how important those decisions were. We know that the hard-fought battles he won for progressive government and fiscal responsibility have formed the very foundation of our economic progress today. We must not let South Carolina forget the lesson he taught us in those difficult days.

But we cannot stand here today as South Carolinians and not realize that Olin Johnston was first and foremost an American, and for the last 20 years of his life served his nation in the United States Senate as a leader of nationwide prominence. Here this tall man from Anderson County reached his fullest height, and became a giant among his peers. Just as he championed the cause of the little man in South Carolina, he spoke up for the working people throughout our nation, and they looked to him for leadership. His colleagues knew this and recognized it. I can think of no better way to give expression to our thoughts than to use the words of our nation's leaders in speaking of Senator Johnston. His long-time Senate companion Senator Richard Russell of Georgia called him steadfast champion of the small farmer and workingman. Senator Margaret Chase Smith said he was the best friend the federal employee ever had. Senator George Aiken of Vermont said that "During his entire career in the Senate, he worked for those who needed his help most and whom it would have been easy to ignore and neglect.

Olin Johnston never ducked a good fight or a sticky problem. When 97 per cent of South Carolina's farmers were without electricity in their homes, he went, as Governor, directly to President Roosevelt and got the first REA grant to bring light to our state's rural areas. In the later years of his career, he was not afraid to cast the only southern vote for the Medicare program as proof that he never deserted those who needed help the most.

But what we say of Senator Johnston's accomplishments are only surface reflections of the inner character of this man. What we will recall after we close the history books on our state and nation will be the image of this strong and imposing man reaching out to grasp the hands of all those thousands of laboring South Carolinians who knew they could place their faith and trust in his large hands. Olin Johnston could speak and fight for them because he was one of them. If I could characterize his life in one phrase, I would have to say that he proved to all of us exactly what America is all about. At a time when our state and nation were not so certain about their future, Olin Johnston gave them new reason to believe in our inner strength. His memory today, and the physical record of his accomplishments which we dedicate, give us that same strength today. These, too, are difficult times. They are not difficult in the same sense as the Depression or War years. These are times of moral uncertainty in our nation and in our world. These are days when we are pushing back the frontiers of space and scientific achievement at an unprecedented rate, but we sometimes do so at the expense of human values, and we leave a debt of unfulfilled individual aspirations. Some of our young people feel that we are de-humanizing our society as we become increasingly dependent upon machines and electronic equipment.

I say today that the life of Olin D. Johnston should be a living symbol to young people throughout America of just how important the individual spirit is in our society. He rose from the red clay of Anderson County and earned his education the hard way, working in our state's textile mills to send himself through Wofford College. Even before he received his law degree from the University of South Carolina, he had embarked on a career of public service in the South Carolina General Assembly.

He knew and understood personal sacrifice, even disappointment, and yet he used all his experience to make him a bigger, and a stronger man. He knew patience, and yet there was no more dynamic figure in our nation in bringing about the type of changes necessary to improve the lot of our working people. To those who would continue his struggle today to make our nation a better place for all persons to live, I suggest that they understand how this man turned ideas and concepts into action. It is easy to speak loudly in defense of a cause; it is much more difficult to deliver the actual means of improving a situation. Olin Johnston was a man who could deliver the type of positive action which meant the most to those whom he sought to represent and assist.

His close colleagues in the Senate knew perhaps best of all just the type of dedicated servant he was. Senator Eastland, a long-time friend, summed up his dedication to the common man this way: "When it came to loving, and being loved by just people, Olin Johnston had no peer. His devotion to his fellow man was deep and abiding. He served equally well the good and the bad, the poor and the rich, the ignorant and the intelligent, and all shades in between."

This was the nature of the man in whose memory we gather today. I am so pleased that Mrs. Johnston and so many members of his family could be with us today, because this is a happy occasion. In dedicating the Olin Johnston Memorial Room at the University of South Carolina, we not only express the appreciation of a grateful state, but we assure that the achievements of this man's life will be felt in the generations ahead. I am proud and honored to be a part of this dedication, because I can think of no greater legacy we can leave to South Carolinians of the future than the living influence of Senator Olin D. Johnston.

THE SS "HAWAIIAN ENTERPRISE"

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine, I am very proud of a notable event which took place this April 10. The world's largest containership, the SS *Hawaiian Enterprise*, was christened in the port of Baltimore. The $20 million vessel was dedicated by Mrs. Daniel Inouye, the charming wife of the Senator from Hawaii.

The ship was built for the Matson Navigation Co., one of the Nation's leading unsubsidized lines. The 34,700 deadweight ton vessel, with a 32,000 shaft-horsepower engine and a top speed of 23 knots, illustrates the dedication and abilities of the men who build and comprise the American merchant marine. She is positive proof that America has not priced herself out of the shipbuilding market, as some of our critics would have us believe. Sparrows Point Shipyard's $240 million worth of contracts also validates this proof.

The SS *Hawaiian Enterprise* gave us all a little scare, however. Like the typical woman, she could not make up her mind whether she really wanted to venture from the slip. It took a full 55 seconds for the ship to move into the Patapsco River. As Dan Mack-Forlist, general manager of the shipyard remarked:

> It seemed like an hour, but it was only 55 seconds—a long 55 seconds.

But it would take much more than a minute's delay to lessen, in the slightest, our pride in Maryland's great port and shipyard facilities.

THE GREATER WASHINGTON JEWISH COMMUNITY FOUNDATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, in November 1965, the Greater Washington Jewish Community Foundation was organized as a new home for three independent Jewish social service agencies.

The foundation initiated a drive for funds, and the Jewish community of the Metropolitan Washington area can be very proud of its success. For private contributions have now paid the entire cost of the new $8 million complex.

Much of the credit for this accomplishment goes to the foundation's president, Mr. Charles E. Smith, who has shown in so many ways that his foremost concern is the welfare of his fellow man.

Three events have been planned to celebrate the dedication of this magnificent community service complex in Rockville. The first of these, which will honor the Chief Justice of the United States, is described in detail in a newspaper story.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which was published in The Jewish Week be printed in the Record:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Foundation Will Honor Warren at Masada Opening

The Chief Justice of the United States Earl Warren, who is also Chancellor of the Smithsonian Institution, will be the guest of honor and receive an award from the Jewish Community Foundation on the occasion of the invitational opening of an exhibit entitled, Masada: A Struggle for Freedom. The opening at the Smithsonian Institution's Museum of Natural History will be on May 17, at 8 p.m. The Chief Justice will be the guest of the Foundation and the Regents and the secretary of the Smithsonian.

The exhibit, one of three events in the dedication of the new Jewish Community Foundation in Rockville will be followed by a Ball at the Washington Hilton Hotel June 14 and the Dedication ceremonies at the Foundation complex June 15.

Co-chairmen for the Masada are Sheldon S. Cohen and David Lloyd Kreeger. In asking the Chief Justice to be the honored guest, Cohen referred to: "The struggle against enslavement of the human body and mind is never ending. In 73 A.D. on the rock of Masada in the wilderness of Judea, a few hundred valiant Jews stood off 6,000 Roman soldiers until outnumbered by 20 to one they realized defeat was inevitable and took their own lives rather than submit to enslavement. During your term as Chief Justice the Supreme Court has continued the struggle against enslavement in its historic decisions against discrimination, segregation, denial of rights and denial of opportunities."

In reply, the Chief Justice wrote:

"It will be a great pleasure for me to be present on this occasion, and I am grateful to all of you for thinking of me in these terms."

Charles E. Smith, president of the Foundation said in speaking of the May 17 event, "Both this exhibition and the work of the Chief Justice remind us that freedom is not automatic. It must be preserved and protected by every man in every generation."

During the evening the Dedication Cabinet of the Foundation will present the Chief Justice with an appropriate bronze plaque depicting the Jewish community's appreciation of the Chief Justice on the occasion of the Masada opening.

Members of the Cabinet are: Justice Abe Fortas, Hon. Arthur J. Goldberg, Sen. Jacob K. Javits, Hon. Abraham A. Ribicoff, Hon. David L. Bazelon, Hon. Sheldon S. Cohen, Hon. Sol. M. Linowitz, the Hon. Lewis L. Strauss, Charles E. Smith, president of the Foundation; Bernard S. White, president of the Jewish Community Center; George Hurwitz, president of the Hebrew Home; Richard England, president of the Jewish Social Service Agency; Mrs. Joseph B. Gildenhorn, chairman of the Dedication Ball and David Lloyd Kreeger, chairman of the Dedication.

The Committae has also invited the Ambassador of Israel, Yitzhak Rabin to participate in the presentation ceremonies. The Israel Exploration Society in Israel and New York's Jewish Theological Seminary brought the Masada exhibit to this country.

Working on the Masada Committee are Mrs. Norman Bernstein, representing the Jewish Community Center; Mrs. Robert Smith, representing the Hebrew Home; Mrs. Lee G. Rubenstein, representing the Jewish Social Service Agency and Mrs. Williard I. Zucker.

These three agencies, all members of the United Givers Fund, make up the Jewish Community Foundation.

The exhibition tells the story of archeological work done at Masada in 1963 by Professor Yigael Yadin of the Hebrew University in Israel and over 5000 volunteer archeologists from the nations of Europe and the U.S. Over a two year period they uncovered two palaces of Herod, his enormous storehouses, priceless scrolls, mosaics, jewelry, coins, lamps, cooking utensils, fruits and clothing as well as some of the Roman catapult balls the people of Masada fought against. The exhibit includes scale reproductions of houses, actual artifacts, models and history of this famous modern "dig"' and its workers.

The Smithsonian has indicated that Masada is one of the most complete archeological exhibitions ever assembled and the story which it tells is full and accurate.

The exhibit which is free to the public, opens May 18 and will continue through July 20.

COSTLY MILITARY PROCUREMENT MISTAKES

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, on April 3, 1969, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cook) and I visited Dayton, Ohio, to view the world's most costly museum exhibit—the XB–70 bomber now in the Air Museum in Dayton. We issued a joint statement at that time, in which we were joined by two other Republican Senators, Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon, and William B. Saxbe, of Ohio. Two of our Republican colleagues, Senator Jacob K. Javits, of New York, and Senator John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, issued supporting statements.

We made our trip to Dayton to dramatize the fact that military estimates of what is necessary to protect our national security are not infallible. The Military Establishment can make mistakes. The XB–70 was a $1.4 billion mistake, obsolete before it was built. We wished to state our concern that the proposed Safeguard ABM may be another costly mistake; that after billions have been spent on it, it may be found to serve no purpose other than as a museum exhibit.

It has been pointed out that the civilian leadership in the Pentagon, especially former Secretaries of Defense Gates and McNamara, did not support the XB–70. This is true. It is also true, however, that the uniformed Military Establishment strongly supported the XB–70, and prevailed upon Congress to appropriate over a billion dollars for this useless bomber. The military was wrong then, as it was wrong about the "Snark," "Mauler," and "Navaho" missiles and the TFX fighter. Mistakes of this magnitude illustrate the importance of exercising the most searching independent scrutiny of the military's present claims in favor of the ABM and other costly items of hardware.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the joint statement made by Senators Cook, Hatfield, Saxbe, and myself, and the supporting statements made by Senator Cooper and Senator Javits.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senators Charles E. Goodell, of New York, Marlow W. Cook, of Kentucky, William B. Saxbe, of Ohio, and Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon, on the Proposed Safeguard ABM System

I

We are standing here in the Dayton Air Museum before the world's most expensive museum piece—the XB–70.

The XB–70 bomber cost American taxpayers $1.4 billion. It was obsolete by the time it was built. It added nothing to our nation's security. It was a huge, useless, billion-dollar-plus white elephant.

Now, the military establishment is proposing a new multi-billion dollar item of military hardware—the ABM. It will be still more expensive—costing anywhere from $6 to $20 billion or perhaps still more.

Will the ABM be a new Edsel of the air like the XB–70? Are we going to be standing before the ABM in this Air Museum in Dayton ten years from now? Is it going to be another dinasour, obsolete before it is built? Will it cost us billions without adding to the nation's security? We fear it will.

We must do what is truly necessary to preserve our national security. But we have come here to the Dayton Air Museum to make the point that military estimates of what is needed to protect our security are not infallible. The military establishment can make mistakes, just as we all can.

The XB–70 was one of those mistakes. So were missiles like "Snark", "Mauler" and "Navaho" that became obsolete before they were built. So was the TFX single-design fighter on which we have been throwing good money after bad and which still isn't working.

There is only one way to avoid this sort of billion-dollar mistake. Members of Congress and independent, unbiased experts must exercise the most searching scrutiny of military spending projects. This process of inquiry will guard against XB–70's of the future. It will help prevent billions from being wasted that are needed to meet domestic social needs. It will help assure that the weapons systems that pass the test of impartial, intelligent examination are the best in the world.

II

We are now being called upon to approve billions of dollars of spending on the ABM. We have not, however, been given clear and convincing reasons why this system is necessary for our national security.

Because we feel the case for ABM is still full of gaping holes, we believe it our duty to oppose its deployment at the present time.

We are Republican Senators, but we feel the ABM issue transcends partisan considerations. We simply owe it to American taxpayers not to vote gigantic sums for a project that may simply end as no more than another museum piece like the XB–70.

The arguments that have been presented in favor of the ABM have been full of inconsistencies.

Secretary of Defense Laird has argued that the Safeguard ABM is essential to protect our Minutemen missiles against first-strike attack by the Soviet Union. He points to the Soviet SS–9, an intercontinental missile with a 25-megaton warhead capability, as indicative of this Soviet drive for first-strike capacity against our Minutemen deterrent.

According to this thinking, the ABM is essential to our security whether or not the Russians proceed with their own ABM.

On the other hand, Secretary of State Rogers has stated that the United States would consider negotiating a halt in the development of the ABM if the Soviet Union were willing to do likewise. Secretary Laird has said the same thing. This position is clearly inconsistent with Secretary Laird's testimony on the SS–9. If the SS–9 and other Russian hardware could really destroy our deterrent, how could we afford to negotiate our ABM away?

The Administration position is further complicated by President Nixon's statement that arms control talks with the Soviet Union will be approached in terms of "freezing" levels, not limitation or reduction. As for abandoning the ABM, the President is not hopeful. As long as there is a Chinese threat neither the U.S. or the Soviet Union, he feels, would look upon abandoning the ABM with much favor.

A basic weakness of the case for the ABM is that it ignores the deterrent capacity of our Polaris and Poseidon force under the seas.

Even if a Russian first-strike could knock out our Minutemen missiles in their hard sites, our Polaris and Poseidon missiles launched from nuclear submarines could devastate Russian cities, kill 50 to 100 million Russians, and poison their atmosphere. This would make a Russian attack suicidal.

Moreover, we will continue to move ahead in this undersea missile deterrent. Secretary of the Navy Chafee has stated that we are planning an Undersea Long Range Missile System for introduction in the late 1970's.

President Nixon has pointed out that neither the Soviets nor the United States can protect its cities in a nuclear war. This stark potential of mass human destruction—and not any defensive missile system—is the ultimate deterrent against a world nuclear war.

It has been said that the ABM is a purely defensive system. Nevertheless, it will be a stimulus to the arms race. History has shown that there can be defensive arms races, as well as offensive ones. Now both great powers have a sword—the offensive nuclear missile. If one side gets an ABM shield as well as a missile sword it will inevitably seem more menacing to the other side. So the other side will rush to get an ABM shield too, or to strengthen its missile sword by developing penetration aids. This means a continued process of arms escalation.

III

The XB–70 certainly looks impressive, here in this museum. It weighs a half a million pounds. It is designed to fly three times the speed of sound. It is made of stainless steel and titanium. But it does us no earthly good as a museum exhibit.

The XB–70 is not the only white elephant in our arsenal.

In the past 15 years, we terminated over $8 billion in major military hardware that never became operational. Of this amount, about $3 billion was spent on aircraft, of which the XB–70 accounted for about one-third. About $4 billion more was spent on various missiles such as "Snark", "Mauler" and "Navaho" which were abandoned before they were deployed. The attached table lists these abandoned weapons systems.

Is this the same story we are going to hear about the Safeguard ABM System one, two, or ten years from now?

Obviously, there is a need for research and development into new weapons technology. Admittedly, many theoretical concepts don't get off the drawing boards. However, why do we build equipment that is obsolete before it comes off the assembly line—equipment which we neither need nor can use? How much can we afford to spend on weapon abandonment?

The F–111 plane—TFX—is a painful case in point. Ever since this system for a single-design fighter plane for the Navy and the Air Force was proposed in 1961, we have been throwing good money after bad. Congress has appropriated $6.5 billion for this system through fiscal year 1969, but the taxpayer doesn't get much for his money. The Navy version of the plane was cancelled last year because of costs and technical difficulties. The Air Force will receive fewer of its version of the plane this year than originally planned because the costs are too high and other types of aircraft can do the job.

The development of the FB–111—an "interim" strategic bomber version of the TFX—has always been open to question. Nonetheless, we forged ahead with production and deployment plans, despite rising costs and technical difficulties. On March 19, Secretary Laird told the Senate Armed Services Committee that the FB–111 program will be cut back; however, the program will be continued "to salvage what we can of the work in process." Meanwhile, we will "concentrate our efforts on the development of a new strategic bomber, AMSA." As the Secretary put it, "The FB–111 will not meet the requirements for a true intercontinental bomber and the cost per unit has reached the point where an AMSA must be considered to fill the void."

Haven't we heard this story before? Are there enough museums to house the FB–111s?

IV

How did we spend so much money in the past on these dead-end projects? Largely through exaggerated estimates of our opponents' capabilities and inaccurate surveys of our own defense needs.

How often have we been told that we must spend huge sums on a weapons system of questionable utility because we will soon become "inferior" in striking power to the Soviet Union; or because the Russians will outnumber us on the basis of given production estimates; or because Russia will be able to "destroy" us?

And how many times have these predictions been inadequate and proven wrong?

In 1956, General Le May, then chief of the Strategic Air Command, warned us that the Russians were building a huge bomber force which would outnumber our bomber force 2-to-1 by the end of the decade. To counter this supposed bomber challenge, the United States appropriated billions for bombers.

But these bombers became obsolete as a deterrent against a Soviet attack. Our obsession with the numbers game in bombers proved misplaced. Arms competition shifted to missiles.

When a weapon becomes demonstrably obsolete, we should promptly discontinue it. But the military did not do this in the case of the XB–70 bomber. Instead we spent huge sums trying to keep this dying project alive. General Le May was still urging the usefulness of the XB–70 in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee in 1964.

The Air Force tried to salvage the XB–70 by making it a reconaissance-strike plane (the RS–70). It was to follow an ICBM strike to see what targets remained. This plan also flopped.

The Air Force then tried to resuscitate the XB–70 as an experimental supersonic plane. Test flights measured the magnitude and effects of sonic booms produced by large aircraft in supersonic flights. Information obtained from the flights were to be applied to the supersonic transport program. But that program may itself be shelved. It has been reported that President Nixon's 11-member interdepartmental committee to study the SST project is expected to recommend that supersonic transport be deferred for a number of years.

So what did we end up with, in the case of the XB–70? A technological fossil in a museum. This must not be permitted to happen with the ABM.

What of the domestic impact of the ABM? Surely, our military spending must be considered in the context of the urgent needs to meet pressing social problems at home.

If it were clearly established that the ABM is essential in the interest of national security, we would have to build it notwithstanding the cost. We would have no choice but to tighten our belts on other spending.

But the ABM has not been shown to be essential. At best it is of unproven utility. At worst, it is useless or positively harmful. We simply cannot afford to let our domestic priorities be distorted by vast spending on costly military hardware of questionable usefulness. We cannot afford to add another exhibit to this museum at the expense of our deteriorating cities.

The experience of the XB–70 should be a lesson to us. We should think about what could have been accomplished had the $1.4 billion for this airplane been spent on meeting some of our domestic needs. Some comparisons might be instructive.

The world's largest housing development—Coop City—has just been built in the Bronx. This ambitious, moderate-income project will house over 60,000 persons in modern, comfortable, low-cost cooperative apartments. It cost about $340 million to build. For the $1.4 billion spent on the XB–70, four Coop Cities could have been purchased and built. They would have housed 240,000 people—which is as much as the entire population of a medium-sized city.

Alternately, the $1.4 billion for this airplane could have been spent to provide job training for nearly 1,000,000 unskilled workers. This investment in human beings would have been paid back many fold—in higher wages and better living conditions—instead of sitting uselessly in a museum.

As long as the Pentagon fails to establish a clear and convincing case for the ABM, we cannot afford to spend billions on its deployment. We should not abdicate our own reason and judgment before the power and prestige of the military establishment.

This week, we mourn the loss of our great General and great President, Dwight David Eisenhower. We would do well to remember the words of his Farewell Address delivered to the American people in 1961:

"In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

"We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together."

MAJOR PROJECTS TERMINATED BEFORE DEPLOYMENT DURING THE PAST 15 YEARS

Project	Year started	Year canceled	Funds invested (millions)
AIRCRAFT			
Army: XV-3 Convertiplane	1952	1960	$10.1
Navy:			
Seamaster	1951	1959	330.4
F-8U-3	1956	1958	100.0
HSL-1	1950	1955	94.0
F-5D-1	1954	1957	49.0
A-2D-1	1950	1954	47.0
T-40	1954	1958	33.0
A-2J-1	1948	1963	20.0
J-40 engine	1944	1953	18.0
F-10F-1	1950	1953	15.0
F-2Y-1	1949	1955	15.0
Air Force:			
ANP	1951	1961	[1] 511.6
F-108	1958	1959	141.9
XF-103	1950	1957	104.0
F-107	1954	1957	100.0
J-83 engines	1956	1959	55.0
C-132	1952	1957	54.0
T-61 engine	1957	1959	37.4
YH-16	1951	1954	23.4
X-21	1960	1966	36.0
X-19	1962	1966	16.0
XB-70	1958	1976	1,468.1
MISSILES			
Army:			
Hermes	1944	1954	93.4
Dart	1952	1958	44.0
Loki	1948	1956	21.9
Terrier (land based)	1951	1956	18.6
Plato	1951	1958	18.5
Mauler	1960	1965	200.0
Navy:			
Sparrow I	1945	1958	195.6
Regulus II	1955	1958	144.4
Petrel	1945	1957	87.2
Corvus	1954	1960	80.0
Eagle	1959	1961	53.0
Meteor	1945	1954	52.6
Sparrow II	1945	1957	52.0
Rigel	1943	1953	38.0
Dove	1949	1955	33.7
Triton	1948	1957	19.4
Oriole	1947	1953	12.5
Typhon	1958	1964	225.0
Air Force:			
Navaho	1954	1957	679.8
Snark	1947	1962	677.4
GAM-63 Rascal	1946	1958	448.0
GAM-87 Skybolt	1960	1963	440.0
Talos (land based)	1954	1957	118.1
Mobile Minuteman	1959	1962	108.4
Q-4 drone	1954	1959	84.4
SM-72 Goose	1955	1958	78.5
GAM-67 Crossbow	1957	1958	74.6
MMRBM	1962	1964	65.4
SHIPS			
Navy: Type II towed torpedo countermeasures	1945	1955	13.0
ORDNANCE, COMBAT VEHICLES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT			
Army:			
Vigilante	1952	1961	$26.6
Tank, medium and heavy, T-95	1955	1960	18.0
Truck, cargo, 2½-ton	1946	1965	5.9
Truck, cargo, 16-ton	1959	1965	[2] 4.8
Truck, tank, 5,000-gal	1959	1966	([2])
Truck, wrecker, 20-ton	1959	1966	([2])
Area scanning alarm (E-49)	1957	1966	3.9
Infantry mortar, 107-mm, XM-95	1960	1967	10.7
OTHER			
Army:			
AN/USD 5 drone	1957	1962	103.3
AN/USD 4 drone	1957	1960	40.0
Aerial tramway	1947	1957	13.5
Auto integrated switch	1958	1965	39.9
Navy:			
NRRS, Sugar Grove	1957	1962	70.0
High-energy boron (ZIP)	1952	1959	123.0
Air Force:			
AN/ALQ-27	1957	1959	142.0
High-energy boron (ZIP)	1956	1959	[1] 135.8
Dyna-Soar	1960	1963	405.0
Total			8,601.7

---

[1] Air Force costs only.

[2] The 3 trucks listed comprise the 16-ton series of the GOER program which was terminated in June 1965. Work was officially terminated on the tanker and wrecker in February 1966. The cost of the program was $4,800,000.

Source: D.D.R. & E., Jan. 5. 1968.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, APRIL 3, 1969

I support the initiative taken by Senators Goodell, Cook, Hatfield, and Saxbe. I am in agreement with their view that this country's democratic institutions will be strengthened by informed critical examination of such crucial issues as the ABM.

The purpose of those of us in the Senate who oppose deployment of the ABM at this time is to make it possible for the President, the Congress, and the people to consider fully and rationally the implications of a decision which will have such lasting effects upon the life of this country. We have the time to ponder in full security all aspects of this difficult problem. I am confident that through full and thorough inquiry and by hearing the opinions of this country's experts we will come to a sound decision.

I particularly respect the final tribute to President Eisenhower. The words of his last public statement were prophetic and will prove of lasting value to people of this country and will do much to strengthen our true security.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS, REPUBLICAN, NEW YORK, APRIL 3, 1969

I welcome the initiative of my colleagues in focusing public attention upon the vast sums of money which have been poured into weapons systems that often proved faulty or obsolete before they even became operational. The billions which have been misspent in this way over the past decade could have been spent on productive civilian projects. The needs of the poor, of our decaying inner cities and of our deprived minorities have—in a budgetary sense—been kept on a starvation diet which contrasts starkly with the sumptuous amounts which have been appropriated for military weaponry.

We are now at a crossroads of perhaps historic import with respect to this fundamental "guns or butter" question. The Johnson Administration tried to avoid a choice and sought instead to pursue a guns and butter policy. The results have been disastrous for our economy which is wracked by inflationary pressures at home and balance of payments problems abroad.

Those of us who have opposed ABM deployment from the beginning feel that the Safeguard variant of the Sentinel system is an issue of especially great moment for our national decision on this weapons system may set the pattern for the next decade. We are poised at the brink. We could try now to gain control of the nuclear arms race through a dramatic gesture of self-restraint or we can plunge ahead with a whole new generation of weapons systems—weapons which will claim many hundreds of billions of tax dollars and will leave us on a new plateau where the balance of terror is less stable and less amenable to rational command and control by duly constituted civil authority.

WILTON J. McKINNEY, GREENVILLE, S.C., HONORED

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on Friday, April 18, 1969, citizens of Greenville, S.C., will hold an appreciation banquet for an outstanding citizen of their community and State. Wilton J. McKinney will be honored by his fellow citizens for his dedicated service to the youth of his community. This year Mr. McKinney has been selected by World Tennis magazine for the Marlboro Award for May. Donald Dell, captain of the U.S. Davis Cup team, will be on hand to present the award. Although this is a distinguished honor to Mr. McKinney for his dedication and interest in tennis, the appreciation dinner is far more meaningful for it recognizes his civic pride and dedicated service to youth of his community and State. Mr. McKinney has coached the Greenville Senior High tennis team for over 20 years and never had a losing season. Many of his players have won regional and national honors. He has held offices in the Southern Lawn Tennis Association and the South Carolina Lawn Tennis Association. Although employed full time by the Burlington Cotton Co., Mr. McKinney has contributed untold hours to the youth of his community in teaching and coaching tennis as well as counseling young people of the needs for responsible citizenship. The door of his home is always open, and "his" youngsters are often present and always welcome.

I am proud to join in this honor to Wilton J. McKinney.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SECRETARY LAIRD

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to commend Secretary of Defense Laird for his decision yesterday not to permit defense contractors to include donations to "charitable and educational" organizations as part of the cost of doing military work. Some of the Nation's leading defense and aerospace contractors had sought this special treatment, which would enable them to include all donations as operating expenses, instead of simply getting a tax deduction as other businesses and individuals may receive for such donations.

As I pointed out in my remarks on this subject yesterday, beginning at page 8831, this policy would have put defense contractors in a preferential category above that of even utilities in some States, such as California, where the Public Utilities Commission decided that the consumer should not be required to foot the bill for donations credited to the utilities.

As Roland Page of the St. Petersburg Times points out, in a series of articles appearing elsewhere in today's Record, Florida is one of those States—unfortunately a majority of the State utility commissions now permit the practice—in which the power, gas, telephone, and bus companies get the credit, but the customer foots the bill, for donations ranging from Governor Kirk's private police force to lighting a school football field.

The defense and aerospace contractors and their friends in the Pentagon proposed this little scheme, which would have cost taxpayers tens of millions of dollars a year, but which Secretary Laird has squelched, during the last administration. This proposed new policy was the kind that often slips through during the closing days of an administration. I think credit is due former Secretary Clifford and his associates for their refusal to approve the proposal, to the Washington Post and its Laurence Stern for publicizing it last Saturday, and especially to Mel Laird for throwing it into file 13.

PAMELA RANDOLPH

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on Friday, March 30, my staff and I were overtaken by a personal tragedy of the most poignant nature. Miss Pamela L. Randolph, a member of my staff since her graduation from the University of Maryland in June 1968, died very suddenly of a pulmonary embolism. Her passing has been a severe shock to me and to her associates. Our loss, and that of all who knew her, is very great.

Pam was in the springtime of her years. Just 23, pretty, capable, and full of life, she was to have been married in 8 days and begin a new and exciting life on the west coast. Her last day with us would have been that Friday on which she died, and a farewell party was planned for that afternoon.

Death at such a time of life is hard to accept. It leaves us desolate and conscious of our own uncertain destiny.

Pam's life was bright with promise and potential. She was on the crest of the wave. But she was not given the time to follow it through for the full measure of experience that comes with age alone.

To her parents, Dr. and Mrs. E. Burl Randolph of Clarksburg, W. Va., and to her fiance, Mr. David Distad, I extend profound sympathy and fellowship in our sorrow. We sorely miss Pam, and yet will remember always her sparkle, her friendliness, her love of life.

CEREMONIES AT THE UNVEILING OF THE STATUES OF FATHER DAMIEN AND KING KAMEHAMEHA I

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, today Hawaii's congressional delegation will join representatives from Hawaii for the ceremonies commemorating the unveiling of the statues of two men who occupy illustrious positions in the history of Hawaii.

They are leaders who, by virtue of celebrated conquests in their respective endeavors, have achieved imperishable reverence and esteem in the hearts and minds of the people of Hawaii.

They became heroes in their implacable goals to better the lot and the future of the people they served. They are today the choices of the citizenry of Hawaii for memorialization in the National Statuary Hall.

These inspired men, one a conqueror of despair and a courageous servant of the victims of the most dread disease that man has known—leprosy—and the other, a brilliant military leader who founded the kingdom of Hawaii and what is today the 50th State of the United States of America, are the Reverend Joseph Damien DeVeuster and King Kamehameha I, first monarch of the Hawaiian Islands.

This day in April, when we gather to solemnize the memories of these gallant masters of their times and their destinies, is also a day of rejoicing in Hawaii.

The ceremonies are a further culmination of Hawaii's long drive toward the total benefits of representative government and of full-fledged membership in the Union of States.

The unveiling of the statues is commemoration, too, for the valiant and farsighted men and women of Hawaii—past and present—who strove so diligently and so persuasively for more than 50 years to shape the dream of Hawaii statehood into reality.

Hawaii is proud of this moment.

It is profoundly honored that the statues of two of its renowned leaders are being received and given places of repose and high homage among the great of the greatest democracy on earth.

I for one look upon this day with deep respect, gratitude, and humility. No one, less than a century ago, could ever have visualized that we of a small group of islands in the vast Pacific would one day gather in this magnificent Rotunda to see our own immortals share places of exaltation in the hallowed halls of the Nation's Capitol. The very thought is awe-inspiring.

The Reverend Joseph Damien DeVeuster, known more popularly as Father Damien, and Kamehameha I both meet the qualifications for our State for enshrinement in the National Statuary Hall. They are indeed "illustrious men worthy of commemoration."

It is fitting that we here cite their achievements, their humanitarian deeds, and their conquests in the face of extreme adversities and disorder.

Some of the most notable and most concise biographies written about Father Damien and King Kamehameha are contained in a House of Representatives report authorizing the acceptance for the National Statuary Hall the statues of Father Damien and King Kamehameha. They read:

The Reverend Joseph Damien DeVeuster, SS.CC.

Father Damien's voluntary sojourn among the lepers of Molokai, ministering to their physical and spiritual needs, has shown him to be one of the greathearted humanitarians of all time. His compassion for these sufferers—forcibly banished to a lonely island—is a profound example of devotion to one's fellow men. His death from leprosy at the age of 49, after 16 years in the "living graveyard that was Molokai" continues to inspire men and women throughout the world in their fight to eradicate forever the disease from which he died.

The son of well-to-do peasants, Joseph (Father Damien) was born in Tremeloo, Belgium, on January 3, 1840. He entered the Sacred Hearts Congregation at Louvain, Belgium, and in October 1863 set sail for Hawaii from Bremerhaven, in his brother's place who fell ill of typhus, abroad the *R. M. Wood* at 9 o'clock in the evening. Father Damien got his first glimpse of Honolulu on March 19, 1864. After a few months to finish his priestly studies, young Father Damien was ordained on May 21, 1864, in the Cathedral of our Lady of Peace in Honolulu. Shortly thereafter, he was sent to the Puna district of the island of Hawaii. In July 1865, because of the poor health of one of the other priests, Father Damien was transferred to the districts of Kohala and Hamakua, which extended over 2,000 square miles, marked by steep cliffs, deep ravines, and valleys accessible only by canoe.

He spent 8 years building churches and administering to his parishioners and it was here that he saw many of them being separated from their families and forcibly removed to Molokai.

At his request, Father Damien landed on Molokai on May 18, 1873. During his 16 years on Molokai, Father Damien was everything to his flock: priest, administrator, infirmarian, coffinmaker, undertaker, gravedigger, builder of homes, and defendant for the unfortunate group of people who were segregated and thus best forgotten. In recognition for his efforts in alleviating the distressed and mitigating the sorrows of her unfortunate subjects, Princess Liliuokalani bestowed the Order of Knight Commander of the Royal Order of Kalakaua to Father Damien.

On April 15, 1889, Father Damien died, a victim of his charity, no longer robust but horribly disfigured and a leper. He was buried in the shade of the same puhala tree that served as a home when he first arrived 16 years earlier.

In 1936 at the request of the King of Belgium, President Franklin D. Roosevelt permitted Father Damien's body to be exhumed and returned to Belgium. In February 1955 the case of Father Damien was formally introduced by the Roman Catholic Church and the first steps were taken toward his beatification. It is hoped and prayed by many of the faithful that he will be raised to the altar some day in the future.

Of him, Mahatma Gandhi said: "The political and journalistic world can boast of very few heroes who compare with Father Damien of Molokai * * * it is worthwhile to look for the sources of such heroism."

King Kamehameha I

Kamehameha is a hero of the Hawaiian people because it was he who first united the islands under a strong rulership—strong enough to maintain independence during the critical years when the islands were first opened to the enterprise of traders and explorers from Europe and America.

The last quarter of the 18th century is a period of Hawaiian history marked by the emergence of Kamehameha as a victor in a running series of civil wars. The period of peace that followed 1796 enabled him, by the power of his personality, to make firm the foundations of the Hawaiian Kingdom—the polity which eventually emerged as a territory and later the State of Hawaii.

Kamehameha ("The Lonely One") was born in Kohala, Hawaii, on a stormy winter night soon after the middle of the century

(1758 is a probable date). Although his father and mother were of high rank, he was not in the direct line of kingly succession. At the time, the islands were divided into four kingdoms, each ruled by a leading chief. The young warrior grew up at the court on Hawaii and first gained prominence when he was assigned guardianship of the war god. As leader of five lesser chiefs of the Kona district, Kamehameha led their forces in two civil wars to insure an equitable distribution of land. Kamehameha's success in getting foreign arms and foreign recruits gave him the upper hand over chiefs visited less often by the traders. He collected the largest army ever seen in the islands and embarked in an immense fleet of war canoes.

After Maui and Molokai were captured the army landed at Waikiki and marched to Nuuanu Valley and drove the defenders off the brow of the pali (precipice). Eventually, Kauai and Niihau were ceded to him without a fight.

During the two decades after the islands were united, Kamehameha showed his statesmanship by quickly restoring the islands to prosperity. He urged the chiefs and commoners to raise food. Disorder and crime were put down and industry flourished. His policy of fairness in dealing with the traders from foreign lands who had begun to come to the ports of the kingdom added to its wealth and prosperity.

Kamehameha died on May 8, 1819, at Kailua, Hawaii, where he had retired in 1811. The customary funeral ceremonies were carried out and the bones of the great King were taken and concealed in a secret cave. "Only the stars of the heavens know the resting place of Kamehameha."

LAVINIA ENGLE OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, almost 50 years have passed since women of the United States were guaranteed the right to vote. The XIX amendment to the Constitution was finally ratified in 1919.

We are, today, accustomed to the participation of women in political life, and seldom reflect upon the fact that they have not always had access to the ballot.

For Miss Lavinia Engle of Silver Spring, Md. the right to vote was preceded by many years of hard work. Miss Engle's mother was a crusader for women's suffrage, and Lavinia Engle was 21 when she joined the National American Woman Suffrage Association and began her work, with "justice, logic, and persuasion," for the enfranchisement of women.

She pursued this objective for 6 years after her graduation from Antioch College until women were finally allowed to vote, in 1920. At that time, the Suffrage Association became the League of Women Voters, and Miss Engle became director of the Maryland league. Subsequently, in 1930, she became the first woman delegate to represent Montgomery County in the Maryland Assembly.

Miss Engle's long career with the Social Security Board did not deter her active membership in the league throughout the intervening years. It would be impossible to calculate the extent of her achievement through half a century of active participation in league affairs. She has made an inestimable contribution to the league itself, and to the quality of government in her county, in Maryland, and in the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a profile of Miss Engle, published in the Washington Post's Potomac magazine on Sunday, March 16, 1969.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAVINIA ENGLE OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Fifty-six years ago Lavinia M. Engle of 500 Pershing drive in Silver Spring started one March afternoon to walk down Pennsylvania Avenue to dramatize the efforts then being made to obtain the vote for women. But Miss Engle and the thousands of other women who gathered at the foot of Capitol Hill for the march, never got to the other end of the avenue. Crowds, made up mostly of men, surged into the street and the police broke up the march. This was on March 3, 1913, and the next day Woodrow Wilson was inaugurated as President.

The uproar over the women's march did not end with Wilson's first inaugural, however. Two days later the Senate District Committee convened a hearing to look into the disturbances arising from the march. Among the witnesses was Alice Paul who, as a leader of the Woman's Party, organized the march. Today Miss Paul is the president of the Woman's Party and lives in the 19th century brick house across from the U.S. Supreme Court at 144 Constitution Ave. ne. which also serves as the headquarters for the Woman's Party. For 46 years the party has been pressing for a constitutional amendment guaranteeing equal rights to women.

After conducting its investigation of the march, the Senate District Committee concluded that "the line of march was not cleared and the parade was not protected as it should have been." The Committee also concluded that "some of the uniformed and more of the special police acted with apparent indifference and in this way encouraged the crowd to press in upon the parade."

Miss Engle, now 77, was in 1913 a 21-year-old graduate of Antioch College who aligned herself with the National American Woman Suffrage Association, pushing for integration of women into the existing political system, rather than with the more militant Women's Party, which advocated a completely feminine slate on all ballots: local, state and national. (One recent interviewer compared the past differences between the two groups to the present-day differences between integrationist civil-rights leaders and black militants.) Becoming an organizer for the Suffrage Association, she later advanced to field secretary and once traveled on mule back up a dry creek bed in West Virginia to argue (successfully) with a legislator for his support for a suffrage amendment to the State's Constitution.

The Suffrage Association became the League of Women Voters when the vote was won nationally in 1920, and in the 20s, Miss Engle was director of the Maryland League of Women Voters. In 1930 she became the first woman Montgomery County Delegate to the Maryland Assembly and later was appointed (but defeated for election) to the County Commission. In the mid-30s she went to work for the Social Security Board and remained with it and its successor agencies until finally retiring three years ago. Today Miss Engle is still an active member of the League of Women Voters and not only remembers the 1913 parade vividly but also has the gold-and-black banner proclaiming "Votes for Women" which she wore across her bosom as she and thousands of others vainly tried to march down Pennsylvania Avenue.

Her Quaker mother had been an early crusader for women's suffrage. And "early crusader" is exactly the term Miss Engle would use. To her, "suffragette" is an offensive word meaning the radical Women's Party members who poured ink into mailboxes and chained themselves to gates. Her weapons, she says, were "justice, logic and persuasion."

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, General Eisenhower served America as military leader, as President, as citizen. At all times, in all positions, he was a man utterly dedicated to the welfare of this Nation.

His interest in his country did not diminish when he left public office. As a private citizen he had a sustaining concern for the United States.

It was Eisenhower the citizen who came to Washington in 1964 to give his support to help in the adoption of the 25th amendment, the Presidential succession and disability amendment.

It was Eisenhower the citizen who at that time stated the creed he practiced, both as general and as President:

> We do believe that all of us, of all parties and all levels of government, have as our first thought and concern, the United States of America.
>
> And, if we do that, I think all of the other problems kind of recede in their immediacy, their urgency, and in their, you might say, crisis-type of complexion and they become resolvable by people of good will—that is, good Americans.

He believed in the American people, and they in him. To use the words of Dag Hammerskjold:

> He had been granted a faith which required no confirmation—a contact with reality, light and intense like the touch of a loved hand; a union in self-surrender without self-destruction where his heart was lucid and his mind loving.

Duty, honor, country, the code of West Point, became his personal commitment. He led America, both in war and in peace, and earned her love and respect forever.

America is greatly saddened by his loss.

A RESPONSIBLE APPROACH

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, all of us can, I believe appreciate the sincerity and honesty so implicitly experienced in the President's situation report to Congress.

Most striking to me is his emphasis on the "responsible approach to our goal of managing constructive change in America."

In view of the mass of legislation enacted during the last session of Congress—and, I understand, the two previous sessions—it is my opinion that the President should be congratulated for taking the time that certainly is essential to establish priorities for his legislative proposals to Congress—legislation that "we know we can execute once it becomes law."

The maze of overlapping and duplicating programs already enacted, the hodgepodge of programs piled on programs, is evidence enough of the need for a complete reassessment of many of our domestic programs before adding any more administrative layers, particularly to the already foundering welfare programs.

The President will surely have full support for an increase in social security benefits to help those who have suffered most from the cruel impact of inflation and who cannot bargain for themselves as the continuing rise in the cost of living hits hardest at those on fixed or retirement incomes.

He has placed the priorities where they need to be: an early end to the war in Vietnam, new measures to combat crime, tax reform, postal reorganization, development of our airways and airports, labor and manpower programs and, most importantly, a halt to inflation. Unless we can stabilize prices and restore fiscal responsibility and confidence in the Federal Government, no domestic program is likely to succeed.

The President's message is one of the great majority of hard working, self-reliant, overtaxed, and too-little-appreciated Americans have been waiting to hear. Long on patience and short on complaining, they are entitled to the tax relief the President proposes.

They deserve some honest answers followed by some honest action. Their pleas for an end to irresponsible Federal spending and wasteful, inefficient and ineffective Federal programs have gone unheeded too long. But it is not a turning back of which the President speaks.

It is a new approach to the lingering problems of poverty, welfare, crime and inflation that massive spending has not only failed to cure but, in many cases, has actually aggravated.

Certainly there must be a better way, and I believe the President's proposal to trade the "false excitement of fanfare for the abiding satisfaction of achievement" will appeal to the American people and, I hope, to Congress.

JACK MASUR, M.D.: A EULOGY

Mr. TYDINGS. I deeply regret the passing of one of the country's greatest physicians, Dr. Jack Masur, Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and director of the clinical center at Bethesda, Md.

Jack Masur dedicated his life to serving his fellow man. His contributions to the medical profession have been heralded throughout this country and in nations around the world.

During his career he served as the executive director of numerous hospitals, Chief medical officer of the Vocational Habilitation Center and as Assistant Surgeon General. Dr. Masur was a fellow of every important medical association in the country and received the Public Health Service Distinguished Service Award in 1965.

He is perhaps best remembered for his contributions to the National Institutes of Health. The original plans for the Bethesda Clinical Center were conceived by Dr. Masur and with his guidance the center has become not only the largest such medical facility in the world but also one of the most excellent institutes available, from a technological standpoint.

He is also one of the world's outstanding hospital planners and designers. Architects from nations around the world sought his counsel on the design of new hospitals and medical facilities.

No single tribute to the late Dr. Masur can adequately convey the greatness of the man. I know, however, that I speak today for the thousands of persons who have been helped by this extraordinary man.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Dr. W. Palmer Dearing's eulogy of Dr. Masur be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JACK MASUR, M.D.: A EULOGY

(By W. Palmer Dearing, M.D.)

It is with deepest humility, but also with a sense of high privilege that I undertake to speak for a few moments in behalf of all of us who have come together here to recall, to recognize, to honor, and to resolve to fulfill the life and work of Jack Masur.

I yield to no one in the enormity of my personal loss. At first contemplation it was overwhelming. When Barbara and Henry asked me to undertake this labor of love, my first thought was, "I cannot physically go through with it."

Suddenly I awakened from self-indulgent grief to realize that I was only one among a great multitude who had been healed in body and spirit, who had gained wisdom and insights, who had found light and strength for the road ahead through the knowing of this compassionate, courageous, dedicated, gifted, utterly honest, truly humble man. Each of us in this specially blessed multitude knows and cherishes the warm, flesh-and-blood portion that Jack gave of himself to each of us to guide, to cheer, to heal, to warn, to support. Yet, like the widow's cruse of oil, Jack was ever filled and ready to give, and give again.

What a waste, then—what a betrayal of Jack's life and work it would be to dwell on the depth of our bereavement! Let us rather direct our thoughts toward the objectives he set, to applying the lessons he taught (always first by his own example, may I say), and toward approaching the standards of excellence which he recognized, admired, and always practiced.

Each of us has his own choice selection from Jack's infinite list of attributes—his love and pride in family, his humor, his appreciation of beauty in nature and in people, his ecumenical religious sense and devotion, his intolerance of sham and cant, his towering rage at inhumanity, sloth, carelessness, or insincerity—the catalogue is endless.

As with Jack's attributes, even so with his accomplishments—their magnitude cannot be contemplated, much less recorded, here. He demonstrated that medical administration is a high calling, demanding the best in the highest traditions of a physician's service to humanity; he showed how to bridge the gap between strictures of Federal services and progressive leadership in the American Hospital Association; at the request of President Johnson, he filled the breach six weeks before Medicare's appointed day when the Government awoke to the need to know the real status of resources to meet its imminent obligations for health services to the elderly; his talents were sought and freely given in England, Holland, West Germany, and Israel.

On top of all this and much more, he was the best equipped frustrated fisherman I have ever known.

Among his greatest accomplishments, I have chosen three to expand on for a moment: The Clinical Center, Jack's counseling of colleagues, and his success in achieving and maintaining the pre-eminence of concern for the patient in medical care and research.

In a very real sense, the Clinical Center is Masur, and Masur is the Clinical Center. This man had served his Country brilliantly during the war and had returned to his chosen field—the voluntary hospital system—where a rewarding future was assured. Yet when a government research hospital to round out the NIH bench research effort was only a gleam in a few starry eyes, Jack Masur perceived its potential for advancing our knowledge of patient care as well as the scientific base of medicine. He turned from the comfortable, honorable future which lay before him to return to the modest prerequisites, the limitations, and frustrations of government service to create and thereafter to direct the greatest medical institution of its kind in the world.

Turning to the second accomplishment I have chosen for special comment, Jack was without parallel in counseling of colleagues. His unswerving devotion to people as people, plus his diligence and formidable insight, made him the Country's single most important recruitment and placement agency in the hospital, medical education, and medical care world. He knew every vacancy, every need, every resource. His wisdom, discretion, and judgment brought information and requests to him, and he always responded promptly, carefully, and cogently.

Jack Masur's crowning accomplishment, however, and the one which poses the greatest challenge to us who follow, is his achievement in maintaining the care and welfare of the patient at the pinnacle of objectives and performance at the Clinical Center and at every institution which he touched. This meant not only application of his standards of excellence, but also intolerance of anything less. In practical terms, it meant accommodation of patient welfare considerations with the real and legitimate research interests of the collection of institutes which the Clinical Center was created to serve, and subordination of research interest to patient welfare when there is conflict. Jack Masur knew that only by strict application of this principle can a great public institution such as the Clinical Center survive honorably, or in the long run survive at all, in today's world.

Now having said all this, my friends, this is a very human occasion. We are privileged to share the grief and the pride of Jack Masur's bereaved, yet fortunate family—fortunate in that they and all of us had the experience and have the heritage of his greatness. With Barbara, Nancy, Henry, Jenny, and Corinne; with Jack's sisters Ida and Mary and his absent brother Louis and all their families, we share gratitude as well as their grief.

I want to close with a quotation from the classics Jack loved and knew so well—a solemn pledge attributed to a Frenchman named de Grellet who died more than 100 years ago. It characterizes Jack Masur's approach to life as I knew him:

"I shall pass through this world but once. If, therefore, there be any kindness I can show, or any good thing I can do, let me do it now; let me not defer it or neglect it, for I shall not pass this way again."

THAT LAST CIGARETTE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, an article entitled "That Last Cigarette: An Investment in Life," written by Donna Logan, a staff writer for the Denver Post, was recently published in that newspaper. The article was based upon an interview with Dr. Charles D. Demong, a noted Denver chest and heart surgeon. Dr. Demong lamented that one of the saddest aspects of lung cancer is that while in most cases this disease can be prevented, it is nonetheless on the rise.

Dr. Demong pointed out a most important fact:

The risk of lung cancer is materially reduced for smokers who give up the habit.

He pointed out that atypical cells in the lungs disappear shortly after a person quits smoking, owing to the elimination of the irritating elements of cigarette smoking.

Mr. President, the article reports that lung cancer this year will kill approximately 59,000 persons in this country. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD, hoping that its message, like that of an increasing number of statements, will offer encouragement to smokers who are seeking to overcome this habit, and will help to reduce the temptation to our youth to take up smoking.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That Last Cigarette: An Investment in Life

(By Donna Logan)

Snuffing out your last cigarette can add years to your life, says a noted Denver chest and heart surgeon, Dr. Charles D. Demong.

In a relatively short time after a person quits smoking, any atypical cells in the lung disappear because the irritating factors in cigarette smoke are removed, Demong said in an interview.

April is Cancer Crusade month, sponsored nationally by the American Cancer Society.

"The risk of lung cancer is materially reduced for smokers who give up the habit," says Demong, "yet the disease is getting to be common."

CLAIMS 160 LIVES A DAY

Lung cancer, in fact, claims more lives—160 a day—than any other form of cancer in the United States, and is the leading cause of cancer death among men, according to the American Cancer Society.

But women, too, are increasingly falling victim to the disease because more of them are smoking now.

"The sad thing," says the physician, "is that in most cases lung cancer is preventable."

Demong quit smoking cigarettes a year ago and turned to pipe smoking. More doctors, in fact, have given up the habit than any other segment of the population, he said.

"There's no doubt that there's a direct relationship between smoking and lung cancer, and coronary heart disease. So why smoke?" says Demong.

"There has to be a choice by people if they want to assume the additional risk of smoking cigarettes," Demong says.

Prevention and early detection are the most important aspects of the problem.

SOME ARE CURED

"Many who have it are cured, but frequently it (lung cancer) is advanced by the time we see it," he said.

What are the symptoms of lung cancer?

The most common symptom, says Dr. Demong, is a persistent cough.

"People who smoke, however, attribute their cough to smoking when, in fact, it may indicate lung cancer."

Other symptoms are blood in the sputum, "a common occurrence," he said, and a shadow on the lung shown by X-ray which doesn't respond to the usual treatment.

YEARLY CHECKUP

The diagnosis of lung cancer can be made through a regular chest X-ray examination which should be made "at least every year," Dr. Demong said; examination of sputum cells and a bronchoscopix examination.

Despite these tests, exploratory surgery often is necessary to establish a diagnosis of lung cancer, he said.

Squamous carcinoma—the most common type of lung cancer—"all is associated with smoking," he said, while adeno carcinoma can be found in persons who don't smoke.

"Quite a few can be cured by X-ray and surgery," the Denver surgeon said, "and chemicals are also used but there is nothing really effective about chemotherapy for lung cancer."

Lung cancer this year will kill approximately 59,000 persons in the United States—49,000 men and 10,000 women.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND PEACE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in these days of war and confusion, skirmishes and anxiety, we on this whirling globe are all reaching out for the brass—perhaps I should say golden—ring of peace and stability. We search for peace in the Middle East, in Nigeria and Biafra, in Vietnam, and closer to home, in the troubled cities of our land. Our quest ranges from devoted work in the interests of peace to the quiet praying for peace. Some make the achievement of peace their life's goal—others accept peace as a virtue unattainable.

And yet, if we were to look in our own backyard, we can find a road which can help lead to peace. A road to peace is one made up of the untrammeled human rights of mankind. These inalienable rights—those of life, liberty, equality before the law and in society, are secure when peace is assurred, and are trampled when the hope of peace is ground to dust.

These rights, translated into contemporary terms, form the basis of the Human Rights Conventions which are now before the Senate. The Human Rights Conventions, on Genocide, Forced Labor, and the Political Rights of Women, are attempts, as effective as man can make them, to secure rights which have been violated and to promote rights which have been forgotten. If we are to have peace in this world, we must secure the common rights of mankind. And if we are to secure those rights, we must ratify the Human Rights Conventions.

As we in this Chamber pursue our thoughts on peace, it would be well for us to remember the relationship of human rights to peace, forcefully stated by President Kennedy in 1963 when he said:

> And is not peace, in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights?

I hope we have the courage to take the first step to peace, the ratification of the Human Rights Conventions.

THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, this morning the Washington Post published an article entitled "Nixon To Omit New Funds for SST Prototype." The article stated that the budget presented to the Congress does not contain new funds for the transport prototype. The budget apparently will make available "leftover funds from previous years."

I think this is a serious error on the part of our Government at a time when we have problems with balance of payments—at a time when we are facing a tremendous growth in the air transport market.

The international SST era began in December 1968 with the first flight of the Russian TU–144. This was followed in March of 1969 by the flight of the French Concorde, and just in the last few days the British version of the Concorde also made its first flight.

Mr. President, here are three supersonic transports already in the air, and we have yet to begin construction of the U.S. version of the supersonic transport. It has been estimated that revenue passenger miles in the free world will increase at least sixfold between 1969 and 1990. It has been estimated that $125 billion worth of new commercial aircraft will be required to carry this traffic. Of this expanding traffic the SST market will total about $25 billion by 1990. The proposed American SST design can obtain at least $20 billion of this $25 billion market through the sale of at least 500 SST's, 270 of them to foreign airlines.

We should remember that the aerospace industry is the largest single production element in the total American economy. Of about 69 million workers in the United States some 1,400,000 work in the aerospace industry. As a comparison, the automobile industry employs something over 800,000; and the steel industry, over 500,000. The prospective direct employment for producing 500 SST's will involve approximately 50,000 additional people at peak production. There will be an additional 150,000 in industries connected with the production of the aircraft. The original investment $1.2 billion will be returned by the sale of the 300th aircraft and an additional $1.2 billion will be paid by the time we sell the 500th airplane.

Mr. President, if we do not proceed with the supersonic program, we will lose both new jobs and new tax revenues, and certainly our No. 1 position in the world's aircraft industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Washington Post article and an open letter to President Nixon from Wayne Parrish, the editor-in-chief and president of the American Aviation publication.

The open letter has in it 15 points telling why the United States should proceed with this aircraft. I think it is well worth reading.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1969]

Nixon To Omit New Funds for SST Prototype

(By Spencer Rich)

The budget being sent to Congress today by President Nixon does not contain new funds to start construction of the supersonic transport prototype, it was learned yesterday.

The Nixon budget does make available—as did President Johnson's proposals—leftover funds from previous years (recently estimated at $92.7 million) for continuation of research, development and related activities.

But Mr. Nixon is not now requesting any of the additional $212 million that officials of Boeing, the company that is working on the aircraft, have said would be needed in Fiscal 1970 to begin construction of an operational prototype plane.

Officials said yesterday that Mr. Nixon's decision not to seek funds now for a prototype does not necessarily imply that the plane project is being killed.

Rather, they said, it indicates that Mr. Nixon has not yet made up his mind about whether, and at what pace, to go forward with the controversial project, which has been beset by public fears of sonic boom, by design revisions, and by the budgetary squeeze.

Officials said that if Mr. Nixon decides to begin moving to prototype construction, he could conceivably take some of the money from the President's contingency fund or ask Congress for a supplemental appropriation. Mr. Nixon still has some working time left, because the new funds need not be provided before the start of Fiscal 1970—2½ months from now.

Mr. Nixon's message to Congress yesterday outlining his new program made no mention of the SST.

In the related field of air traffic control and airport development, Mr. Nixon is revising President Johnson's package of proposed air user taxes. But his Administration reportedly has not yet made a decision on whether to set up a trust fund that would receive income from the user taxes and spend it solely on new air facilities and improvements.

The Nixon air user tax package would bring in more than $150 million a year in revenues, and would include the following taxes:

An increase in the ticket tax on domestic passenger service from the current 5 per cent level to 8 per cent. (Mr. Johnson's proposed increase was to 7 per cent.)

Imposition of a 5 per cent waybill tax on air cargo, carried mainly by the major airlines. (Mr. Johnson had asked 3 per cent.)

An increase in the gasoline tax for general aviation (private planes) to 7 cents a gallon instead of the current 2 cents for the 10 years starting in 1969. (The Johnson proposal raised the tax in steps to 10 cents by 1972.)

Imposition of a 7 cents a gallon tax on jet fuel used in general aviation for the 10 years starting in 1969. (The Johnson proposal reached 10 cents by 1972.)

As compared with the Johnson program, Mr. Nixon's air user taxes lean more heavily on the airlines and their passengers than on general aviation. The basic idea behind the user taxes and the related, undecided trust fund proposal is to help fund a vast expansion of the Nation's airports and air traffic control systems to meet future aviation needs and insure flight safety.

The SST, being built by Boeing with General Electric providing the engines, has already cost the Government nearly $500 million, and under current estimates the figure will exceed $1.2 billion by the time the plane has test-flown 100 hours.

Boeing officials said yesterday that they are now gunning to put the plane into the air on a commercial basis in 1978, but fear that any delay in building a prototype—they are actually talking of building two prototypes—would delay the plane sufficiently so that it will lose a large part of the overseas sales market to the British-French Concorde, a prototype of which flew for the first time earlier this year, or to the Russian TU-144.

"If we have to delay much beyond then, the Concorde may have reached a second-generation plane and we could be in trouble," one official said.

He estimated that if the Government were were to provide $110 million for a start on a prototype this year, his company could hold its scientific team together and not ultimately lose more than about 9 months in the 1978 target date.

[From American Aviation, Apr. 14, 1969]

An Open Letter to President Nixon: SST—What's the Question?

(By Wayne W. Parrish)

You have facing you, Mr. President, a decision as to whether to proceed with America's supersonic transport project, to slow it down drastically, or even to scrap it.

In the largest sense, your review is of your own making, because Congress has backed the program consistently since its inception in 1961. So have Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson. The only extraordinary factor about an SST review at this time is that anyone should be questioning the project at all.

There has been considerable sniping at the American SST from a few editorial writers and from a small group in Congress, and from some of your own economist advisers. None of these critics can reasonably qualify as experts in either aeronautics or in world air transportation and its competitive impact in the global economy.

Before you yield to any of the fallacious arguments against the SST, we suggest you take a sharp look at the following hard facts:

(1) If the U.S. does not go ahead with an SST, our own U.S. airlines will have no choice but to buy supersonic transports abroad. It is impossible for an international American carrier to compete against supersonics without having some themselves. This is a major concern not only in the delicate matter of balance of payments, but in the area of national prestige and the maintenance of a strong U.S. aircraft manufacturing establishment.

(2) Supersonic transport is an inevitable, logical, natural progression of aeronautical development of the jet age. Passenger traffic on long-haul intercontinental routes will go by SSTs, regardless of who builds them. Speed is and has been for four decades the dominant factor in growth and preferences in world air transportation. To determine the impact of SST, it is only necessary to hark back to the initial subsonic jets of 10 years ago. Those airlines that held back on their orders and were late starters with jets saw their traffic crippled; some barely managed to remain in business. This is a simple fact of life. Passengers will choose speed over all other factors.

(3) One of the arguments being used against an American SST is that the military has no requirement for such an airplane. Without fear of contradiction, 100% of this argument stems from the position taken some years ago by then Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. Without fear of contradiction, not a single responsible military man in or out of service would support that view. A dozen years ago the Pentagon took a similar official position against subsonic jet transports. Where would the military be today without its jet fleets? For that matter, where would the White House be without jet transportation? The military will require supersonic transports as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow; to be without them would be unthinkable. As has been proved over and over again, Mr. McNamara was not the greatest military/defense brain this country has ever had.

(4) We ask you, Mr. President, what would be the reaction around the United States about 1973 or 1974 when the first SST to land at John F. Kennedy Airport in New York would be a Soviet Tu-144 or the British/French Concorde—*and the U.S. would not be proceeding with its own SST?* Remember how we lagged in our space program until the Soviets jolted the world with Sputnik I? Remember how costly it was for the U.S. to push the panic button in a great rush to regain our lost prestige? The Soviets long ago determined their role in supersonic transport and have been working diligently toward this end ever since. The British and French have likewise been at work. Both of those SST prototypes have now flown, and both models should be operating commercially by 1973.

(5) A great deal of fuss has been made by critics about the sonic boom. Most of these critics have never heard one. Look at the facts. First of all, *no* SST will take off or land at supersonic speeds; it's impossible to do so in any case. There will be no really substantive noise or operating differential from present-day jets. Noise improvements are being made and will continue to be made.

Secondly, the American SST is designed to fly *economically* across the U.S. and other land areas at *subsonic* speeds. Supersonic speed is for long-haul, over-water routes, and if you will look at the globe you will see that the larger part of it is water and the major intercontinental air routes are over water. The sonic boom is *not* a problem. Any supersonic, airplane, military or commercial, *can* be a problem if one wants to create it. In realistic operating terms, the answer is no. And even the sonic boom itself will inevitably be controlled in time. In fact there is good reason to believe that high-level supersonic flights will be able to operate over land sometime down the road without public objection.

(6) The U.S. has maintained the number-one civil aviation position in the world for many decades. This position has made a very major contribution to our balance of payments. Are you, Mr. President, and are the SST critics, prepared to give up this number-one position? If we should scrap our SST (God forbid!) this would be the best news the French, British and Soviets would have in decades. It is a very great mistake to underestimate the Soviet Union's determined drive to sell their Tu-144 in the world market. Up to now, the airlines of the world have come to the U.S. to buy. But what if we have nothing to sell in the next round?

(7) There has been a great deal of loose talk about government subsidy for the SST. *This is not a subsidy project*. It is the financing of an investment. Under the very tight contract with The Boeing Co., the government will be repaid its investment 100%. The world market for SSTs is estimated at 500 by 1990. If we sell 300 SSTs, the American taxpayer gets his money back. If we sell more, the taxpayer bets back interest plus a share in the profits. What other government program calls for such repayment in dollars plus share of profits? And this does not take into account the contribution to the economy of having 50,000 workers employed in building the airplanes.

(8) Mr. President, please ponder this one: *If the SST project is scrapped, the U.S. would not have one single forward aeronautical program of any kind*. The thousands of talented engineers and scientists who have been involved in the supersonic art would vanish into other lines of work. These teams could never be pulled back again. What a travesty that would be for a nation that now is the number-one civil aviation power in the world!

(9) And here is a startling fact: *If the SST project is cancelled, no less than one-half billion dollars would go down the drain—gone and lost*. The critics seem to forget that SST has been under way for eight years with full backing of Congress and government.

(10) The cost of two prototype SSTs with 100 hours of test flying is estimated to be $1.3 billion, *with the manufacturers bearing a significant part*. Part of this cost has already been expended. (It is estimated that heroin addicts in the U.S. need to find, rob or steal $1.5 billion *per year* just for fixes, a total loss to the community. Isn't it time to put a sound investment in proper contrast with the costly, cancerous evils that pervade our country today?)

(11) At $40 million per airplane, 500 SSTs add up to a tangible market of $20 billion. Half of these sales would be to foreign airlines. Are you prepared to sign away this vast

market, not only losing dollar sales to this country but forcing American carriers to export their dollars for purchases of supersonic transports overseas?

(12) Are you aware, Mr. President, that airlines have deposited $59.5 million in down payments on American SST orders—without interest—and that some major foreign airlines have also put money into the U.S. as down payment even though they could not be required to do so?

(13) There has been a lot of irresponsible talk that the British/French Concorde (already in flight testing) will not be able to fly a full load of passengers between New York and London or Paris. This is nonsense. Pure misinformation. It is fully anticipated that nonstop, full-payload service with the Concorde will be inaugurated in 1973. Thus, the Concorde will have a five-to-seven-year jump on the American SST *if we proceed now*. Are you prepared to delay our entrance into the market even further?

(14) The British/French Concorde is a Stage I supersonic. So is the Tu-144. The U.S. made a decision some years ago not to compete with such a Stage I airplane, but to make an initial leap ahead to Stage II—a faster, larger and more flexible airplane that is as efficient subsonically as it is supersonically. The U.S. need not fear the Concorde *if* it is working on Stage II. In fact, the British/French project, as well as the Soviet Tu-144, is a welcome entrant into the supersonic era. American carriers have ordered and will fly the Concorde until the American Stage II SST is available. *If there is no American SST*, or if it is further delayed, this would indeed be an incredible posture for the U.S. and its air carriers.

(15) There has been some sniping that the SST would be "only for the few." Presumably this talk is based on an assumption that SST will require a premium fare. The same was said about subsonic jets a dozen years ago. There is nothing to indicate that an SST will require a higher fare, unless the initial operators of the Concorde place a premium on introductory services in light of the expected heavy demand. For the few? The jet has expanded world air travel immensely. Last year the airlines of the world carried 236-million passengers. The bulk of this travel was in jets. The same progression will come to the SST on long-haul routes. Air transportation is not for the few, it is for everyone, because there's hardly any other way to go.

Air transportation is the lifeline of the U.S. and the world. Scrapping the American SST will not hold back world air travel, it would merely take the leadership out of our hands.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS' 50TH ANNIVERSARY YEAR

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, when the 19th amendment to the Constitution was ratified 50 years ago, the National Woman Suffrage Association held a victory convention in Chicago from which evolved the League of Women Voters. Of the several groups that had worked for the enfranchisement of women, the league is now, by virtue of its subsequent growth and effectiveness, the most widely recognized.

League members throughout the country meet in small groups and large to discuss community and national issues and devise ways of affecting public policy. It is a determinedly political, but nonpartisan, organization. I think all of us here are aware of constructive efforts mounted by the league within our States and at the national level. There may be no organization doing a more effective job of educating the public on major issues. Because league members are generally knowledgeable about the issues at hand and about the political process, their opinions command the attention of their fellow citizens as well as their representatives in the Government.

To cite just one example from my own experience with the league, I will recall the decisive role it played during the national debate on the reapportionment of State legislatures. After extensive study, the members of the league elected to support the one-man, one-vote principle, and to oppose the proposed constitutional amendment that would have allowed one house of a State legislature to be apportioned according to matters other than population. The announcement of the league's position had a decisive effect on the outcome of that debate in the U.S. Senate.

In recognition of the league's 50th anniversary year, the Washington Post recently published an article written by Julius Duscha in its Potomac magazine describing the present organization of the league and a little of its history. I commend Mr. Duscha's article to Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS: THEY'VE COME A LONG, LONG WAY

(By Julius Duscha)

On a gray winter morning 15 women gathered in the comfortable family room of the Herman P. McNatt residence at 14620 Melinda Lane in Rockville to have coffee, exchange neighborhood gossip and talk about poverty in Montgomery County. Three of the women were knitting and another was turning worn-out collars on some shirts as Mrs. George McRory led a discussion, complete with hand-drawn charts, on the county's poverty problems and the inadequate community efforts to help its 1600 poor families.

A male reporter felt like an interloper as he sat in the back of the room listening to Peg McRory, who is a great-great granddaughter of Julia Ward Howe, author of the "Battle Hymn of the Republic." When you are the only man in a family roomful of women it is of course impossible to be inconspicuous. I was there because I had been told I could never understand the League until I had seen one of its unit meetings.

I became interested in the League of Women Voters when I learned earlier in the winter that the ladies were beginning a year-long celebration to mark the 50th anniversary of their organization and of the ratification of the constitutional amendment which gave women the right to vote. "Yes, we're celebrating for a whole year." Mrs. A. P. Guyol, national public relations director for the League, said rather defensively, "but the Girl Scouts spent three years celebrating their 50th anniversary."

For 50 years now women like those who gathered in Mrs. McNatt's family room out in Rockville the other day have been meeting in small groups and earnestly discussing such problems as poverty. Not only are League members earnest; they are purposeful, tenacious and often frighteningly well-informed. And they can be effective. No less a political realist than Sargent Shriver wrote the national president of the League last spring when he was still directing the war on poverty to praise the League for its support of the antipoverty program and to say that the organization "surely helped to make the difference between passage and outright rejection or dismantling of a highly controversial and effective poverty program."

Men of course are always tempted to kid women's organizations. There is the clubwoman image of the Helen Hokinson cartoons in the *New Yorker* which showed the befuddled lady chairmen entangled in Roberts' Rules of Order. And there is the further feeling among men that despite women's demands for equality the ladies are always prepared to fall back on appeals to motherhood or on their own feminine winks and wiles even to get poverty legislation through a stubborn Congress where the pervading atmosphere all too often is still that of a man's smoker.

But what about the League of Women Voters at the decidedly matronly if not grandmotherly age of 50? To find out I went not only to a League unit meeting to sample its participatory democracy; I also spent some time at its national headquarters on the fifth floor of the American Psychological Association Building up on 17th st. and Rhode Island ave. nw. as well as on Capitol Hill. There, among other things, I found the remnants of the rival Woman's Party and its proud leader Alice Paul, who organized the woman's suffrage march down Pennsylvania Avenue 56 years ago—broken up by the police on the eve of Woodrow Wilson's first Inaugural on March 4, 1913.

The League of Women Voters is the daughter of the National American Woman Suffrage Association which along with the Woman's Party and some other organizations carried on for more than 60 years their fight for women's suffrage. The battle ended in 1920 when the 19th amendment to the U.S. Constitution was ratified. The amendment was adopted by the Senate and the House just 50 years ago, in 1919. Early in 1920, before the suffrage amendment had been ratified by the necessary three-fourths of the states but when it was already obvious that the amendment would become part of the Constitution, the National American Suffrage Association held its victory convention in Chicago. It was followed by the first national Congress of the League of Women Voters.

Carrie Chapman Catt, last president of the National American Suffrage Association and first president of the League of Women Voters, explained the League's purpose to the founding congress in these words: "We are going to be a semipolitical organization. We want to do political things. We want legislation. We are going to educate for citizenship . . . Be a partisan, but be an honest and independent one. Important and compelling as is the power of the party, the power of principle is even greater. Those who have struggled in a 60 years old battle for political freedom should not voluntarily surrender to political slavery—and one kind of partisanship is little more than that. It is possible, even though unusual, to be a partisan and an independent.

"To sail between the Scylla of narrow-minded partisanship on the left and the Charybdis of ultra-conservatism on the right," declared Mrs. Catt in her peroration, "is the appointed task of the League of Women Voters; through that narrow and uncomfortable passage it must sail to wreck upon the rocks or to glorious victory."

In the nearly half a century since Mrs. Catt spread out her vision of the League of Women Voters, the organization has been on some shoals and has had some glorious victories. The tiny, gray-haired and persevering Miss Paul still directs the Woman's Party from the early 19th century Alva Belmont House at 144 Constitution ave. ne. across from the U.S. Supreme Court building, continuing its 46-year-old campaign for an amendment to the Constitution guaranteeing women equal rights in all matters of law. But the League of Women Voters, now under the direction of the fortyish, stylish Mrs. Bruce B. Benson of Amherst, Mass., is involved in all matter of issues ranging from foreign trade to the poverty program. The League now takes a neutral stand on the equal rights amendment, which it opposed for 30 years on the ground that it would take away from women protective labor regulations and other laws designed to help them.

"I'm not a feminist really," said Mrs. Benson, a blonde, attractive woman of 41 who favors gold jewelry, as we talked about the League in her modest, vaguely academic and New England office on 17th Street.

"A feminist," she continued, "is really someone who thinks women are better than men. I find myself very irritated with people who treat me as a woman rather than as an individual. If that young thing wants to be a jockey, let her be a jockey, not because she's a woman but if she's able to do it." (Mrs. Benson was referring to Diane Crump, the 20-year-old woman who has had such a difficult time trying to establish herself as a jockey in the face of opposition from male jockeys and from the men who control horse racing.)

Lucy Benson is fairly typical of the 150,000 members of the League of Women Voters. She is the wife of a physics professor at Amherst College. She joined the League in 1950 when the wife of the chairman of her husband's department asked her to. That's the kind of an invitation you don't turn down. But however reluctant Mrs. Benson may have been in the beginning she soon became a highly interested member. Like most other League members, Mrs. Benson is middle-middle to upper-middle class, well-educated (bachelor's and master's degrees in political science from Smith College and a master's thesis on the decline of the British Liberal party) and intensely concerned about the world around her.

Before becoming national president of the League last year, Mrs. Benson was head of the Massachusetts League. She led such a successful drive to end the excessive powers held by the Governor's Council that an infuriated legislator once referred to her group as the "League of Women Vultures." Commenting on Mrs. Benson's work as president of the Massachusetts League, a Boston newspaper noted: "She has dared to lead the League's 12,375 members far deeper into the thicket of politics than ever before. Today, as a result, the League of Women Voters of Massachusetts is unquestionably the most powerful political action group in the state."

In recalling her experiences in Massachusetts politics, Mrs. Benson said as she sat in her Washington office smoking a cigarette and occasionally sipping coffee from a paper cup: "Probably, most politicians do not attack the League because they are afraid it will boomerang on them as an attack on motherhood. Politicians have very mixed feelings about the League. Many wish the amount of energy we put into the League could be channeled into the political parties. Others want us to be barefoot, pregnant and in the kitchen."

Over the years the League has generally been allied with liberal causes. In the 1920's Mrs. Catt, an internationalist, got the League to sponsor a conference on ways to keep the peace and prevent war. The League has long advocated the removal of most restrictions on world trade. Domestically, the League in recent years has supported civil rights legislation and electoral college reform as well as the antipoverty program. But the League's program, which is supposed to percolate up from hundreds and even thousands of unit meetings to its biennial conventions (and does for the most part), has some curious blank spots. It has never taken a stand on the war in Vietnam and it has not become involved in the current surge of concern over consumer problems, an area that would seem to be made to order for a liberal-minded women's organization.

One reason the League often does not quickly become involved in controversial issues is its tradition of study, study and more study. Its units, for example, are supposed to have been talking about Communist China for four years now. Open housing has been on the agenda while Federal legislation has been passed and gone into effect. Another problem which confronts the League is the feeling among some of its leaders and a lot of its members that they only influence themselves.

"Are we just talking to ourselves?" Mrs. Benson asked in the course of our conversation. "Sometimes I think this is true, but it is not because League members want to talk just to themselves. It's because we lack financial resources to get our information out."

Throughout the country last year, the League spent almost $2.7 million, but only $447,000 of that made up the budget of the national office in Washington. As part of its 50th anniversary the League is seeking to raise its national budget by one-third. Funds for its national office come about equally from members' dues, which are around $10 a year and which are divided among local, state and national offices, and from contributions which members seek annually from businessmen. The League doesn't even pay all of Mrs. Benson's expenses as president. She spent three days a week in Washington and travels a great deal. "We have been and still are extremely poor," Mrs. Benson said, "and that's the honest-to-God truth. We still depend on voluntary contributions and that old sort of Lady Bountiful business."

Mrs. Benson and other League leaders think that the organization is probably more effective on the local and state levels than in national affairs. Local Leagues like to submit questions on key issues to candidates for public office, and these questionnaires often succeed in getting would-be fence-sitters to take positions on issues. Leagues have also helped to organize many successful campaigns for amendments to state constitutions and for reform of city charters.

But when it comes to influencing Congress or the executive departments in Washington, the League's role is much harder to assay. On a major issue before Congress there are so many pressures on both sides that it is difficult to know who is genuinely persuasive.

"Knowledge and tenacity are what we have," said Dorothy Sortor, a wide-eyed, attractive brunette who is congressional secretary—or chief lobbyist—for the League, when I asked her about the League's clout on Capitol Hill.

"League girls," Miss Sortor added, "like to read and they like to write. They know what's happening in the community, and congressmen are responsive to that. Members of Congress appreciate the quality of the letters that come in from the girls."

Senators and Representatives also appreciate the quality of the husbands of League members. Miss Sortor acknowledged that League members whose husbands are important men in a community are not above reminding Members of Congress of such not incidental facts. Sometimes the Senators and Representatives need no reminding because they quickly recognize the name of the League member who may be the wife of the president of the biggest bank back home.

As Miss Sortor makes the rounds of congressional offices she says that she still finds "a lot of men in government with a 19th century mentality."

"They say to you," Miss Sortor continued, "Oh, isn't it nice that you're interested in government?"

"Women," Miss Sortor added, "are still at a disadvantage intellectually, and the League is a place where a woman can shine on her own merits. There are no strictly 'woman' issues left anymore. But the League is a place for women who are committed, who have tenacity and who have ability and the time to stick with something. You can't be involved in the world and then just go home to raise babies."

The League also has served as a training ground for women who enter public life. Esther Peterson, a former Assistant Secretary of Labor, got her start by going to League unit meetings for coffee, gossip and serious discussions of issues, as did Mary Keyserling, who until recently was director of the Women's Bureau in the Labor Department. Other League members who made good in public life in the Washington area include Joy Simonson, chairman of the District of Columbia's Alcoholic Beverage Control Board; Kathryn Stone, a former member of the Virginia House of Delegates, and Margaret Schweinhaut, a Maryland State Senator.

Being serious-minded, the members of the League not only are always examining the world about them but are also always looking inward, too. Among other things, this means (in these days when it sometimes is easy to mistake a man for a woman on the street) that the League members are reexamining the need for a woman's organization a half century after women won the vote.

"The question is," League President Lucy Benson said as we talked about the League's future, "whether a women's organization *per se* continues to have any validity. Or is it anachronistic? There have been suggestions that we change our name simply to the League of Voters. Even bastions of female education like Vassar are going co-educational. There is all this student activism and interest in public affairs. Maybe we should make it possible for all young people and not just young women to get involved in the democratic process through an organization like the League."

Maybe. But it is hard to visualize men in a Rockville family room with clipboards at the ready, earnestly discussing poverty, seriously trying to understand its causes and laboriously trying to think, as one woman put it that morning in the McNatt home, "about what really we should be focussing on."

There is something about the slow, educational process of the League of Women Voters that seems to be peculiarly suited to the legendary patience of woman. Besides, man still needs a conscience, and in matters political the League of Women Voters is often as good a conscience today as the suffrage movement was 50 years ago.

FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN VIRGINIA

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, last Saturday I released a preliminary report on a tour of Virginia to view existing food assistance programs and to determine the extent of hunger and malnutrition which may exist in the State. The report covers the approach and the findings of the first 4 days of the tour.

I have announced my intention to visit additional areas, mainly urban ones, during the Memorial Day recess, and I intend to do so. Much legislation designed to rectify omissions and flaws in current programs is, however, being written at this time; as a result, I may not be able to reserve all comment on the existing programs until the completion of my tour, as I had hoped and as I had indicated in my report.

Nevertheless, the report does reflect findings which I believe will be of interest to a number of Senators. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Interim Report on Food Problems in Virginia

During the past week I visited Virginia localities to view existing food assistance programs and to determine the extent of hunger and malnutrition which may exist in the state. I visited in the Valley of Virginia, in the Southwest, in Northern Virginia and the South Central area—in one predominately white area, one predominately Negro area, and two mixed areas. I have been in twenty low-income homes, talked to nearly a hundred participants in various food programs and reviewed available aid with more than twenty-five officials. I saw in operation the food stamp program, commodity distribution centers, school lunch programs, Head Start operations, the VPI expanded nutrition program and Community Action Programs. I used the Easter Congressional Recess and plan to use the Memorial Day Recess for visits in order to avoid missing Senate sessions and possible votes.

My staff has visited with additional families and discussed relevant matters with public officials and interested private citizens. On the tour, I was accompanied by medical doctors and reporters who had access to the same information I had.

We found no cases of starvation.

We did find a number of persons living in desperate circumstances, many of them on welfare or pensions, who say they are, at times during the month, without food. We found many of these persons to be extremely dependent on food stamps or the commodity distribution program—the two principal Federal food assistance programs—and wondered how these people managed before the programs were instituted in their area.

We found anemia—especially in preschool children. While an average suburban community will have an anemia rate of about 14 percent in preschool children—due to a failure to eat properly, rather than a lack of access to a balanced diet—a Northern Virginia Head Start Program in an urban area discovered that 30 to 35 percent of its three-to-five year-olds suffered from anemia; a clinic in Appalachia learned 63 percent of its preschool patients were anemic; and a center serving central Virginia had a 55 to 60 percent anemia-rate for its preschool youngsters.

We found malnutrition in the rather subtle forms of iron deficiency and protein deficiency. There are children in Virginia who are sluggish, tired and apathetic as a result of iron deficiency. There are Virginia youngsters who do not grow well, who do not perform well physically and who may not perform well mentally as a result of protein deficiency.

I saw conditions I did not know existed. I saw youngsters in conditions which would fill middle- and upper-income parents with anguish and sadness. I saw mothers, with few assets, who were trying. But I also saw children whose physical and mental development has been and is being hampered by inadequate diet. And, I knew, that unless steps are taken, the odds are against these children ever sharing fully in the life of this nation, or contributing fully to their own upkeep or the development of their community.

When I decided to undertake this study, I knew that it would not be a popular thing to do. No Virginia representative could be unaware of the general antipathy throughout the state with regard to welfare and poverty problems. Virginia, with a tradition of economy, has often resisted federal expenditures for programs such as those I reviewed. Also, just as an individual dislikes having his faults widely known, a locality objects to having any less favorable aspects publicized. Finally, there is, in many cases, the belief that hunger and malnutrition are racial problems, and this belief is often reinforced by the activities of black militants and white extremists, which make objectivity difficult. It was clear to me in my travels that the problem of food deficiency plagues both white and black Virginians.

Despite the opposition to such a tour, the fact remains that federal food programs operate in Virginia; there have been many complaints about them; and I felt a duty to determine first-hand the situation within the state, both in regard to the programs and to the extent of hunger and malnutrition.

Throughout the visits, I had a dual purpose—to educate myself and to educate the public. The best means of doing the latter seemed to be through the news media. Throughout my travels the press was with me; reporters were permitted to question, at all times, the accompanying doctors. I believe the information we developed justified the presence of the media. And I believe the validity of our findings could be open to question had we not allowed the press to accompany us.

Except for the doctors who were present, I asked no one to accompany us. At the same time, no one was turned away. No questions were asked of any individual, and no press coverage was permitted without first obtaining the permission of the person involved.

I am profoundly disturbed by the situations we found and by the consequences some of these situations can produce. A wide range of programs operate in the state, reaching numerous persons. Virginians can be proud of these. But there are citizens in the state with inadequate diets, and there are undernourished children in the developmental stage when their physical and mental capacities are being determined. We cannot, ostrich-like, bury our heads in the sand and hope that these problems will go away—hope that somehow these children will reach their full physical and mental capacities.

There is seldom a mother who does not want her child to have the necessary items to insure a healthy life. There should not be a citizen of this nation willing to see a child restricted either physically or mentally because of diet. If we do not provide for the proper growth and development of our children, we do not provide for our own future. We must take the required action—whether it be in education for the proper utilization of available foods or in the provision of needed food and food supplements.

Although I have visited only selected areas, I am convinced that the conditions I witnessed exist, in varying degrees, in all localities—generally off the main roads and out of sight of the traveller. I intend to pursue my study further—mainly in the urban areas—over the Memorial Day Recess. We should reserve comment on the operation of the programs until after the study is completed.

In the meantime, I urge additional Virginia localities to participate in the food programs; that constructive discussion take place at the local, state and federal levels with regard to meeting the problems which have been identified; and that current information and theories on the consequences of inadequate diet be refined by detailed, scientific surveys and studies.

INADEQUATE MEDICAL CARE CANNOT BE TOLERATED

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, 4 weeks ago, I wrote to General Heaton concerning Army negligence in the medical treatment of Sgt. David Morgan, Sp5c. William Beach, and Pvt. Louis Harris. On April 4, I received an interim report from the Acting Surgeon General, Maj. Gen. Glenn J. Collins stating the Army was reviewing the three cases.

In the letter I received and in the attitude observed by some members of the press who talked with the Surgeon General's office, the Army appeared to take a rather routine approach to the problem. They seemed to regard the three cases as isolated incidents.

The time has come for the Army and the Congress to take note that these three cases are not isolated. Since I made them public, 15 new cases involving Indiana boys have been brought to my attention. In addition, information has been forwarded to our office from throughout the United States. Two men men have died from meningitis at Fort Dix, N.J., and in both incidents the families have held inadequate Army medical attention accountable. There have been 21 meningitis cases and two deaths from meningitis at Fort Ord. The recent Presidio trials have pointed out inadequate medical facilities found in Army stockades.

I realize that the Surgeon General has a very demanding and difficult job in providing adequate medical attention for so many men in the Armed Forces. And I realize sometimes men are guilty of goldbricking, of feigning illness in the service. But there is no excuse for the treatment of an increased number of very real cases, in what amounts to a rather cavalier attitude. There is no room for such an attitude and there is no room for negligence in medical treatment for too often a mistake can be fatal.

From my observation the medical problems seem to fall into two general classifications: First, negligence in actual medical diagnosis and care; and second, careless assignment of medically handicapped men to areas which are too demanding of their physical conditions.

I am asking the Surgeon General to review the entire medical structure that allows such cases to exist. I want him to find out where the fault lies, whether it is inadequate facilities, lack of funding, a shortage of personnel or whatever it is so we can get it corrected.

It is our very excellent medical system which is responsible for the outstanding medical aid being given in the combat zone in Vietnam. Never before in a war have men received such good medical attention and received it so promptly. Many lives have been saved, are being saved by professional, medical attention in Vietnam. The doctors, nurses, technicians have been doing outstanding work.

But American military men should receive the best possible care wherever they are. The area where the attitude which borders on negligence appears is here at home in the United States and in other noncombat areas. That is why I am asking the Army, now, to take immediate measures to find out what has been causing this epidemic in medical negligence.

The Army should first be given a chance to review its medical facilities and to correct the existing problems. Members of Congress are sympathetic to the large and demanding job the Army faces in providing medical care to our servicemen. We want to help the Army give the best possible service. But if the Army does not respond promptly, action should be taken by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of cases be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cases

1. Edgemont, Pa.: A young man with a cyst on his left leg who was placed on limited duty, yet recently received orders to report to Korea as an Infantryman. The cyst was found during basic training at Ft. Campbell. Since that time, he has been at Ft. Sam Houston, Ft. Leonardwood, and Edgemont. The Army keeps postponing surgery.

2. Hoosier reservist: A civilian doctor determined this man to be a diabetic in October. He reported this to his unit and was told to get proper documentation and submit it to Ft. Benning. This was done, but he received orders for active duty at Ft. Leonardwood as of April 21, 1969. The Army never responded to this diabetic case. It took a call from this office to get the man discharged.

3. Ft. Meade: A serviceman who had received shrapnel wounds in the head while in Vietnam. Walter Reed was to keep him under observation to see if the shrapnel remaining in his head moved toward his brain, but he has not been x-rayed since December. Presently, he is having great difficulty with his eyes, but there is no eye doctor at Ft. Meade where he is stationed. His duty is working around tanks where the vibrations are very great.

4. Ft. Gordon: While riding a motorcycle at Ft. Gordon, this serviceman was hit by a car and had his leg broken. His leg was set at the base hospital, but he, himself had to point out that it was crooked and had been incorrectly set. It was rebroken and reset. Complications ensued and osteomyelitis has set in. His parents visited him at Ft. Gordon Hospital and observed what they termed unsanitary conditions. The following is a direct quote from the letter which brought this case to our attention: "There were 30 boys in the ward, all with open sores of some kind, and the nurses and doctors went from one patient to another changing dressings, never washing their hands, dipping them in antiseptic solution, or wearing rubber gloves. We even observed in one instance, a sterile bandage dropped on the floor, picked up with their hands, and placed on an open wound."

5. Ft. Lewis: A young man due to report for shipment to Vietnam on April 24, 1969. He has arthritis in his right elbow so bad that his permanent Army records show this and state that he is not allowed to even carry a weapon.

6. Ft. Bragg: A serviceman who has received orders for Vietnam who has to wear a back brace and is supposed to be on limited duty.

7. Ft. Knox: This case is related about a serviceman's 15-month-old son who became quite ill and was taken to the base doctor. The doctor said he has only a sore throat and gave the child aspirins and cough syrup. The following day the child had a high temperature and again a base doctor in the pediatric clinic was called and the parents were told to give the child a cold bath to bring his temperature down. Finally the parents took their child to a civilian doctor who diagnosed it as a severe case of tonsillitis.

8. Ft. Gordon: This young man suffered a fractured leg in high school and steel plates and pins were required to repair it. At the time of induction, he presented letters stating this condition, but was drafted. He collapsed from the pain in this leg in February 1969 and was then assigned to limited duties. He was given orders to report to MP School which is very hard and strenuous. Although he has complained to his officers at Ft. Gordon and reported to the dispensary, he has been told that the pain he was having was "the kind he could live with." He was sent back to duty and was told he was just "trying to get out of the Army."

9. Ft. Holabird: He had polio as a child which left one leg shorter than the other and has experienced continued pain with it. The army has told him his condition was from *quadricips* weakness. Another time he was called a phoney and a liar for his complaints. He has been given a couple of weeks of therapy, which had no results, and pain pills.

10. Ft. Knox: He received head injuries which affected his eyes while serving in Germany. Civilian doctors say he is going blind. Army doctors claim there is nothing the matter with his eyes. At this time he is training for Vietnam.

11. Ft. Knox: Involved in a firing range accident, he has suffered a complete loss of hearing in one ear. Currently in Vietnam doing administrative work, he is still doing guard duty despite a permanent profile because of his hearing.

12. Ft. Sill: His assignments are said to be only for limited duty, but this is not the case. He has been told that he has had hepatitis and even counseled at Ft. Belvoir about having checkups regularly, but nothing appears on his medical records to this effect.

13. On duty in Vietnam: Long having suffered severe problems with his feet, and civilian doctors having advised his draft board of this problem, he was drafted anyway. Since he had such problems, he was given a permanent profile which stated he should be on his feet only short periods of time, but is now spending a great deal of his time on his feet as a cook in Vietnam.

14. Ft. Belvoir: He injured his hand on February 14, 1969, but it appeared at the time that no bones were broken. He returned to duty and reinjured his hand. Given 15 days leave with hopes that the hand would benefit from this rest, he returned to Belvoir after the 15 days and has been in the hospital since. He receives therapy twice a week, but the hand is not responding to treatment.

15. Ft. Leonard Wood: He was drafted after being withdrawn from school on doctor's orders for thyroid deficiency. He had a very bad skin rash as a reaction to medicine that he was given, also a rare lump in his neck and a fissure that needs surgery. A date had been set for this surgery when he was drafted. All of this was ignored at the time of his being drafted. It has taken letters from my office to have this young man discharged. I have not been given the word officially that he is being discharged, but I have received a letter from the young man to this effect.

THE TAXPAYERS REVOLT—AND THEY SHOULD

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I recently appeared before the quarterly meeting of United Democrats of Anne Arundel County to present my views on one of the most pressing issues facing Congress—tax reform.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

As the opinion polls revealed during the past election, the political concern foremost in the minds of the voters was neither Vietnam nor race relations—the issues that were supposed to dominate the election. It was taxes that vexed the voters most.

The increasing use of the phrase "taxpayer revolt" is no exaggeration. From my conversations with constituents across Maryland and from the mail I receive, it is clear that the taxpayers of this State are fighting mad over the swollen size of their tax bills and the glaring inequities in our Federal tax structure.

And well they should be. Last year a 10 percent surtax was imposed to combat inflation. At the same time, an estimated $50 billion a year in potential tax revenue that could be used to combat price rises is slipping through the loopholes in our jerry-built Federal tax system into the pockets of a privileged few.

State and local sales and property taxes continue their astronomical climb to pay for needed Government services. At the same time billions that could be used to finance these services are syphoned off for the private profit of the special interests.

The middle income taxpayers on whom the tax burden falls most heavily and most unfairly struggle to make ends meet in this period of rapid inflation. At the same time we are told that 155 Americans filed returns in 1967 on incomes of more than $200,000 a piece and paid *not one penny* in Federal taxes. 21 members of this group earned in excess of $1 million that year.

Is it any wonder that the average taxpayer is in a rebellious mood?

The Congress *must* enact far-reaching tax reform. We must do it this year. For the faith in our tax system as a fair way of raising the money needed to finance Government services is fading fast.

The list of loopholes that need to be closed is long. Let me simply point out some of the most blatant inequities.

First there is the oil depletion allowance. Adopted in 1902 to aid the then-struggling oil industry, it permits a person to freely pocket 27½ percent on his total take from oil or gas wells as a "depletion allowance" before even thinking about calculating his tax. In theory, it is supposed to operate like the deductions businessmen are permitted for the depreciation of their plant and equipment. Unlike deductions in other industries, however, the oil depletion allowance continues year after year as long as the well keeps producing. It does not stop when the cost of the well is recovered.

As a result of this loophole, the Treasury estimates the cost of the average oil well is recovered 19 times over. In 1966 the top 20 oil companies in the Nation showed a total profit of more than 4¾ billion. Yet they paid Federal income taxes at the rate of only 3½ percent; about the same rate a man and wife earning $3000 a year must pay.

With the oil industry booming today, the depletion allowance is nothing more than an enormous tax dodge which costs the American people $1.3 billion a year. But it is ferociously defended by a lavishly financed lobby with the help of a coterie of sympathetic Congressmen.

Another unconscionable loophole in the Internal Revenue Code is the provision that permits capital gains to go untaxed at death.

When shares of stock and other forms of property increase in value, the increase is subject to tax as a capital gain when the property is sold. However, if a man never sells his property and it passes to his heirs, neither he nor his heirs will ever have to pay income tax on the increase in value.

This loophole obviously favors the very rich who have large amounts of accumulated wealth to pass on their heirs. In addition, it costs the American people approximately $2.5 billion a year in potential tax revenues.

Under current tax law, the first $25,000 of a corporation's earnings are taxed at 22% while everything above that is taxed at 48%. To take advantage of this situation, businesses often break themselves up into a number of separate corporations, each earning $25,000 or less. In this way, they avoid paying the extra 26% tax entirely.

There is one case of one enterprise that divided itself into 764 separate corporations for a tax savings of nearly $5 million a year.

The cost of this multiple corporation dodge to us is approximately $200 million a year.

The list of loopholes runs on and on, including unlimited charitable deductions, different tax rates for gift and estate taxes, the use of hobby farms as a shelter for other income, and accelerated depreciation on speculative real estate.

Each loophole gives some special interest group unwarranted advantage over the average American taxpayer. Each one forces the rest of us to pay heavier taxes than we would with an equitable tax system.

Despite the outrageous nature of these loopholes and their obvious inequities, eliminating them will be a monumental task. Those who benefit from them are well-organized, well-financed, and determined to keep them on the books. The lobbyists for these special interests already are beginning to swarm over Capitol Hill.

However, the time has come to unite against those who would perpetuate the privileges of the few against the many. No democracy can long tolerate such blatant inequalities in its laws and retain the confidence of its citizens.

I, for one, intend to fight for real tax reform until it is won.

THE SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER PROJECT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, southern Nevada has become quite alarmed over the delay in the construction of the southern Nevada water project, designed to eventually provide much needed water to the southern Nevada area.

The administration last week canceled bidding invitations for almost $12 million worth of construction in anticipation of a budget squeeze. Meanwhile, the Colorado River Commission of Nevada had raised $10 million through a bond issue to construct a water treatment facility on Saddle Island. The operation and repayment is premised on the project being completed on schedule; and at an interest rate of $1,250 a day, the State stands to lose many thousands of dollars from inaction. In the meantime, southern Nevada water resources are depleting at a faster rate as hundreds of families a month relocate into the area. Las Vegas and Nevada water experts tell me the ground water basin is being depleted at an alarming rate.

This is a ridiculous way to run any Federal program. I call for an immediate reopening on the bidding, without the April 15 budget cut which will cause hundreds of thousands of Nevadans to face a serious water shortage.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two letters, one from the Colorado River Commission of Nevada and one by the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce, which describe the position in which southern Nevada is left due to this arbitrary move by the administration.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Colorado River Commission
of Nevada,
Las Vegas, Nev., April 9, 1969.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

The Colorado River Commission of Nevada is very concerned over any possible delay in the construction of the Southern Nevada Water Project occasioned by your budget review of Federal programs. The water needs of the Las Vegas area, which includes Nellis Air Force Base, are too critical to allow for any delay whatsoever in the present construction schedules. The current water supplies for the Las Vegas area, being obtained from the underground basin by a vastly over-drafted condition, must be augmented to supply this rapidly growing area not later than early 1971, the presently scheduled delivery date of project water. The Colorado River Commission of Nevada is concurrently constructing a $10 million water treatment plant with funds obtained through a bond issue. The operation of this water plant and the repayment of these bonds is premised on the Southern Nevada River Project being completed as scheduled. Any delay will have serious financial implications on the State of Nevada. From the outset the Southern Nevada Water Project has been considered a partnership venture between the State of Nevada and the Federal Government. It was on this premise that these bonds were sold and upon which we entered into a contract with the United States for the water project in which we will repay the Federal Government all its costs with interest. We urge that you take appropriate action to prevent any delays in the construction of the Southern Nevada Water Project.

Robert B. Griffith,
Chairman.

Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce,
Las Vegas, Nev., April 10, 1969.

Hon. Howard W. Cannon,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Howard: As you know from history, the Greater Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce headed an aggressive and successful effort to initiate the Southern Nevada Water Project through necessary legislation in the Nevada State Legislature.

Our Chamber has supported your equally determined campaign in guiding this all important water legislation through Congress and, in obtaining for the Southern Nevada Water Project bill, the signature of President Lyndon B. Johnson. We know the many hours of work involved on your part to steer this legislation to reality.

We are, therefore, greatly concerned with the recent news that bids for construction of this vital pipeline link have been cancelled, which will halt the construction schedule of the project. We urge that you exercise every means at your disposal to see to it that the construction bid cancellation by the Bureau of Reclamation is reversed in order that a continuity of this urgent project receives priority. Your continued initiative and leadership in behalf of the Southern Nevada Water Project is most appreciated by everyone in Southern Nevada who realize the necessity for obtaining this additional source of water. A copy of a telegram directed to President Nixon is enclosed.

Cordially,

Ken O'Connell,
Executive Vice President.

Copy of Telegram Directed to President Nixon

Greater Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce gravely concerned over possible slowdown of Southern Nevada Water Project. We strongly urge that no slowdown occur on the construction of this vital project. A serious water shortage will occur in this area if project not in operation early in 1971. Ground water basin is being depleted at alarming rate.

Colorado River Commission has under contract, construction of a $10 million water treatment plant as part of this vital project with completion time for delivery of water through Southern Nevada Water Project early in 1971. Las Vegas Valley Water District has completed over $15 million of facilities to receive project water and will have invested $5 million more in like facilities by end of 1970. This is a partnership project. Federal funds will be completely repaid with interest under existing water user contracts. Again, we strongly urge no cutback in funding for Federal part of Southern Nevada Water Project.

W. Bruce Beckley,
President, Greater Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce.

UNDER SECRETARY TRAIN'S REMARKS ON THE NEED FOR A STRONG COAL MINE SAFETY LAW

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, several weeks ago I introduced S. 1300, a bill to improve the health and safety conditions of coal miners in the United States. Hearings are now being held on this and other proposed legislation to emphasize the pressing need for the rapid enactment of a law to protect the health and safety of the coal miners of America.

In remarks to the National Coal Policy Conference on March 11, 1969, Under Secretary of the Interior Russell E. Train stated that the time had come to substitute action for words in obtaining adequate safeguards for coal miners; he further emphasized that effective regulations for mine health and safety must be supplemented by increased research and development of solutions to the problems created by the advancing technology of coal mining. I have every reason to expect that the bill reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will serve this purpose.

I ask unanimous consent that Under Secretary Train's remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address of Under Secretary Russell E. Train, Department of the Interior, at the National Coal Policy Conference, March 11, 1969

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moody, and members of the National Coal Policy Conference, it is a great pleasure to be here with you. Secretary Hickel has asked me to convey his greetings and to say how sorry he is that other commitments preclude his appearance today.

So, you will just have to settle for the Under Secretary. I am still getting acquainted with my duties, but I have learned a few things:

If an idea doesn't work, it was my idea.

If there is a tough and extremely unpopular decision to be made, I will be called front and center to announce it.

On the other hand, when the Department is doing something that will be applauded, the directors of the various bureaus are not going to bother me about that. I'm too busy, so they will announce it.

And, unlike Secretary Hickel, who has

shot to the top of the recognition polls, I do not expect to become a household word.

As the new Under Secretary of the Interior, I have joined a small, but distinguished group of predecessors—distinguished not because they are seldom remembered as having served as Under Secretaries—but because they often have gone on to loftier positions.

I am the 17th Under Secretary, as compared with Wally Hickel, who is the 38th Secretary. This is not because Under Secretaries have endured longer, but because the post of Under Secretary didn't come into being at Interior until the administration of Secretary Ickes.

Most of the Under Secretaries have been from the West. I do not fit the pattern there. I am a native of the District here. Most of the Under Secretaries have been trained in the legal profession. In this regard, I can qualify.

Justice Abe Fortas, the last of the five Under Secretaries during the Ickes administration, first brought to the Under Secretaryship an interest in the problems of the coal-mining industry. He served two years under Ickes as chief counsel for the Bituminous Coal Division.

I think that you have been aware of the great pressures in the Department of the Interior at the present time. We have already embarked on two major legislative programs:

First, water pollution legislation to prevent and to clean oil spills by tankers and offshore oil wells.

Secondly, legislation to improve the health and safety of our Nation's coal miners. I might have a few words to say about that later on.

We have also just completed a review of the Department's budget for fiscal 1970. Appropriation hearings have been going on in the House for some time and will probably start in the Senate before the end of this month.

While several nominations for Assistant Secretaries have been announced, no confirmation hearings have been held. One practical result of this is that I have now learned to sign my name with both hands.

It is hectic over there at Interior as we observe our 120th year this month, but probably not as much as back in 1850 when Secretary Thomas McKennan served under President Fillmore.

Secretary McKennan was in office for exactly 11 days. Then he resigned, because—and I quote from his letter of resignation—"Conditions in the Department are bad, for it has not been fully organized. . . . Such conditions put much of a strain on the nervous man . . ."

I want it to be known that Secretary Hickel and I are tougher and have lots of nerve.

When I was nominated Under Secretary, there was talk that, because of my reputation as "Mr. Conservation," I was selected to balance the appointment of Secretary Hickel, who was under fire by the Senate committee considering his confirmation.

As a matter of fact, what people didn't know—and perhaps still do not realize—is that he always has been more of a conservationist than some who wear the title.

No one saw fit to look up the record he wrote in his two years as the Governor of Alaska. No one seemed to care that he was chairman of the committee that wrote the natural resources portion of the Republican Party platform last summer.

During the Santa Barbara crisis, during the press of legislative matters, during the preparation of the legislation on coal mine health and safety, during these days of running a new Department, he has cared enough to take action to save the alligators in the Everglades from extinction, to stop the killing of the rare Musk oxen in his home State of Alaska.

He does not have to apologize to anyone for his conservation record.

The great resources this country has are divided into two parts—one, our natural resources, and the other—the most important—our *human* resources.

Congress is now considering legislation to improve both the health and safety of the coal miners of America. It is so vital that it was the subject of the *first special message* President Nixon sent to the Hill. In transmitting the legislation, the President said:

"The workers of the coal mining industry and their families have too long endured the constant threat and often sudden reality of disaster. . . . The acceptance of the possibility of death in the mines has become almost as much as part of the job as the tools and tunnels. The time has come to replace this fatalism with hope by substituting action for words."

The key to what President Nixon said is *"substituting action for words."*

We are going to work as hard, as long, as unstintingly as necessary to get this legislation passed because the Country and the President *want it.*

This Administration has inherited a lot of good *intentions* to help the miners. Now, there will be action. *We mean business.*

The bill introduced in the House and the Senate, and on which hearings already are being held, will do the following:

Apply to all underground and surface coal mines;

Require at least three times a year the inspection of every portion of every underground coal mine;

Extend the Secretary's authority over all types of accidents, not just the disaster type such as fire, explosions and floods;

Authorize the Secretary to propose mandatory health and safety standards for all coal mines;

Provide for review of the standards by an expanded Coal Mine Health and Safety Board;

Provide civil penalties for the violation of mandatory standards;

Require immediate evacuation of all persons in the case of an imminent danger;

Provide for the immediate withdrawal of persons, after notice, in cases of an unwarrantable failure to comply with mandatory health or safety standards;

Provide that all withdrawal orders remain in effect until modified or terminated by the inspector; and,

Expand our research activities and capabilities.

The need for this type of legislation is unmistakable. The present law is aimed exclusively at the type of accidents in which five or more persons might die as a result of fire, explosion, flood or other such major disaster. Statistics show that since this law was enacted, the fatality rate for major disasters has been cut by about 50 percent. However, the statistics indicate that there has been no change in the fatality or injury rates from the day-to-day type of accidents over the past 20 years.

There are major differences between the legislation recommended by President Nixon and that of the previous administration. It is a far stronger bill and it is more likely to get the job done.

Let's be clear what those differences are:

1. Inspection of every portion of every underground coal mine a minimum of three times a year, instead of only "frequently."

2. Establishment of a 4.5 dust standard, effective six months after enactment, rather than a 3.0 standard without any date when such a goal should be reached.

3. Any miner showing substantial evidence of the black lung disease must be assigned, at the miner's option, to an area of the mine having a 2.0 dust level, or he must continuously wear a respirator.

4. Framework is provided for the establishment of underground emergency shelters with adequate communication to the surface.

5. Adequate lighting underground is required.

6. Standards of electrical equipment are stricter.

7. Immediate withdrawal of persons, after notice and re-inspection, in cases of unwarrantable failure to comply with standards.

8. Research efforts will be expanded to improve the means and methods of communication from the surface to the underground portion of mines.

9. Grants to States are provided relative to improving workmen's compensation laws.

Any resource that supplies nearly one-fourth of our rapidly growing energy requirements and more than half our electric power needs is undeniably vital to industrial and economic progress. Any resource with the potential that coal has for augmenting our supplies of liquid and gaseous fuels and valuable chemicals must inevitably command the attention of a government that is dedicated to advancing the welfare of its people.

And a resource which, as an export commodity, ranks among the largest individual contributors to our balance of payments credits, is bound to become one of the first objects of study for any new Secretary of the Interior. Our responsibility to promote further expansion of our coal export markets naturally has taken a place high on our agenda of top-priority jobs.

One has only to read his daily newspaper, listen to the radio, or watch television to become quickly aware of the intense and widespread concern that exists at two of the interfaces between coal and the public.

One of these interfaces is in the coal mine, and the other is in the atmosphere surrounding our cities. In both, the character of the environment is at the core of the problem. It has become increasingly clear that the public will accept nothing less than a dramatic improvement in both environments . . . the coal mine and the atmosphere.

As the casual observer cannot avoid being impressed with the importance of coal to America's economy, so have I been impressed with the extent to which the coal industry's problems stem from a cause that is fairly common to our mineral and fuel industries.

We need coal mine health and safety laws mainly because the technology now in place does not protect the miners. In fact, it sometimes places them in even greater jeopardy.

Environmental pollution laws are likewise no more than attempts to compensate for technological failures. The sulfur and other noxious substances that foul our air, the oil and acid drainage that pollutes our waters, the subsidence and the spoil banks that mar the surface of our land . . . all of these are evidence of technology's inadequacies. I cannot avoid the conclusion that the ultimate answers to many of your industry's most pressing problems can be found in better technology.

Research and development on problems of mine health and safety and environmental pollution rank equally in our priorities with the development and enforcement of effective regulations.

The regulations might not have been needed had the necessary research already been performed, and I am convinced that effective research can ultimately make it possible for the industry to operate with substantially less legislation than it now requires. So, we must ask ourselves how much of a role the Department of the Interior should play with regard to research and development on mine health and safety, and pollution.

The answer to this question, I believe, is dictated by the nature of the problems themselves.

Our research will be aimed at technological problems that cross institutional lines, at problems which are beyond the capacity of single companies or industries, or problems on which, for various reasons, government initiative is in the public interest.

Thus, an adequate research program must be founded on a perspective that embraces every aspect of coal, from mining to final use,

I feel that the Department is fully capable of designing an even broader systems research effort, to cope with all the problems that hinder full development and utilization of the Nation's vast coal resources. We have the resources of the Bureau of Mines, which is the Department's in-house coal research facility, the Office of Coal Research, our contracting arm, and other organizations, including the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

Interior agencies, according to their capabilities, already are investigating ways in which the potential of coal can be more fully realized. Research, as you know, is already under way or planned on such processes as gasification and liquification, methane drainage to facilitate mining, and also on more efficient processes for converting coal to electricity.

However, these efforts are pitifully small. They simply are not of a scale commensurate with the opportunities and the national interest. We in the Department will be pressing for a significant step-up in our efforts in this area.

Our review of the existing coal programs of the Department suggest that they have been put together on a piece-meal basis and with little effort to develop a comprehensive and systematic attack on the problem of fuel synthesis from coal.

We must begin afresh. We must now work in full consultation with both the producing and using industries and with our universities to develop the means whereby this greatest of all of our fuel resources can reach its true potential.

THE ABM SYSTEM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, yesterday, Rogers Morton, the new chairman of the Republican National Committee, warned against "Trying to twist this ABM into a political issue." I was most pleased to hear Representative Morton say this.

The issues raised by the proposed deployment of an ABM system are too important and too vital to the Nation's future to be distorted by partisanship. We must make our decision as concerned citizens, not as Republicans or Democrats.

I am happy to say that a spirit of bipartisanship has characterized the Senate debate on the Safeguard proposal so far. It is my fervent hope that no Member of Congress or of the administration will destroy this spirit with calls to partisan solidarity or with the ascription of partisan motives to opponents.

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM IS VITAL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, yesterday it was my privilege to join with the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Young) and other Midwest Senators to cosponsor a bill, S. 1790, to extend the authority of the Great Plains conservation program for 10 years and to increase the amount of total authorized appropriations for the program from $150 to $300 million.

The Great Plains conservation program was authorized in 1956 by the 84th Congress after being proposed and actively supported by the Eisenhower administration. This program was a major step toward protecting and preserving the vast agricultural area of the Great Plains. It provided farmers and ranchers in the critically erodible areas with long-range cost-sharing and technical assistance, and contributed greatly to establishing well-planned conservation programs throughout this region. As of June 30, 1968, 31,122 cost-share contracts had been signed in the Great Plains area covering 56,601,700 acres, of which 18,732 contracts are still active on 37,449,169 acres.

Besides preserving the resources of this vital agricultural region, the Great Plains program has aided rural area development. According to the Department of Agriculture, the conservation treatments installed under cost-share contracts generally assure higher levels of income. A small improvement in available forage can mean the difference between profit and loss for some range units. Marginal farming systems can be changed to improved grasses.

Concentrated efforts are also being made under this program to help land owners and operators make needed land use changes. Much of the Great Plains area is suitable for production of cultivated crops when needed conservation measures are properly applied. There are other areas of the Great Plains, however, that are not suited for cropland. This program is helping participants convert these lands to permanent vegetative cover and to reseed denuded rangelands. It has helped the farmers and ranchers of Nebraska, and of the other nine States in the Great Plains, to reduce the hazardous conditions on their lands caused by drouth and soil blowing so common in the Great Plains.

The original act expires on December 31, 1971. Moreover, the appropriation limit provided in the original act, of $150 million, is being approached. It would be a disservice to the farmers and ranchers of the Great Plains to end this program before its objectives have been fully achieved, and before the critically erodible lands have been treated. The continuing need of this program is evidenced by the backlog of 5,000 unserviced applications as of the end of fiscal year 1968.

The bill which I joined in cosponsoring yesterday will extend the life of this vital program for a sufficient period of time to accomplish more adequately the conservation of our land resources in the Midwest. It is on this land that a substantial portion of our national grain and livestock production takes place.

The Great Plains conservation program is of substantial benefit to my home State of Nebraska. Sixty counties in Nebraska are presently designated to receive assistance; many of these counties were subject to serious drouth last year and will require extensive land treatment to prevent rapid erosion. As of January, 1969, about 4,429 individual contracts had been entered into in Nebraska for cost-share assistance since the beginning of the program. These contracts cover about 5.5 million acres of Nebraska grassland. The amount expended for cost-share by the Federal Government in Nebraska has been about $13.4 million since 1956.

In addition, there are now over 600 more applications pending from farmers and ranchers of Nebraska seeking assistance. Many thousands of acres were damaged last year in Nebraska, and other Midwest States, by wind erosion; crops or cover were destroyed by wind last year in this region on 351,280 acres where the land itself was not reported as being damaged; hundreds of thousands of acres being used for cropland at the time initial contracts were signed still need to be converted to permanent vegetative cover or to be reseeded.

For these reasons, I joined as a cosponsor of S. 1790, and I urge other Members of the Senate to give the bill their serious consideration.

NATIONAL COMMANDER'S AWARD OF AMERICAN LEGION TO EFREM ZIMBALIST, JR.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on March 14, Mr. Efrem Zimbalist, Jr., was given the National Commander's Award of the American Legion at a luncheon held in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Zimbalist's portrayal of Inspector Erskine has helped many Americans to become aware of the great job the Federal Bureau of Investigation does in protecting our security and tracking down the criminal element.

In accepting this award, Mr. Zimbalist's speech indicates that on or off the screen his words deserve the careful attention of all. Particularly significant, in these days of disturbances and disruptions, are his remarks that "too many Americans have developed a strange myopia—a form of defective vision which causes the rights and privileges that our country guaranteed its inhabitants to remain in sharp focus, while the duties and obligations of responsible citizenship are dangerously blurred."

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Efrem Zimbalist, Jr., in Accepting the National Commander's Award of the American Legion in Washington, D.C., March 14, 1969

This is truly an outstanding moment in my life. To receive this National Commander's Award is an honor which I shall cherish always. And to have received it on the eve of The American Legion's 50th Anniversary makes this plaque and this ceremony all the more meaningful to me.

I cannot help feeling that this is an Award to Inspector Erskine, the forthright and courageous law enforcement officer who epitomizes the "Fidelity, Bravery and Integrity" of the FBI. I have enjoyed tremendously my association with "The FBI" television series—and the opportunity it has given me to meet and develop friendship among the men and women of the FBI. They represent a caliber of dedicated public service which is as genuine as it is rare.

I welcome this occasion also because of the opportunity it gives me to express my pride in The American Legion—pride in the standards of patriotism, the love of country, the service to humanity, and the devotion to God which are this organization's basic fiber and source of strength.

Frankly, I wish that *all citizens* shared the honor and respect which Legionnaires have for Old Glory . . . the uniform of our Armed Forces . . . our country's solemn national holidays. I wish also that every citizen shared the Legion's dedication to the American ideal—the ideal of liberty and justice and opportunity *for all*.

I would like to dwell for a moment on that word "opportunity"—for contrary to the apparent belief of some elements in this country, it embodies a process of give, as well as take.

Too many Americans have developed a strange myopia—a form of defective vision which causes the rights and privileges that our country guarantees its inhabitants to remain in sharp focus, while the duties and obligations of responsible citizenship are dangerously blurred.

Who are these elements? *At best,* they are narrow and self-centered individuals who place personal pleasure and convenience above all other considerations—the shirkers of jury duty, the goldbricks on civic projects, and others who incessantly demand, "Let John do it. I don't want to get involved."

The torch of American freedom was not ignited nor could it long survive, at the hand of one-dimensional citizens such as these.

At the other extreme are noxious bands of defiant rabble-arrogant extremists militantly committed to causes and activities which challenge the fiber and the mettle of public and private institutions throughout the land.

I refer not merely to the communists, the Klansmen and others addicted to ideologies which are clearly alien to the United States—but I refer as well to those insolent "antipatriots" who have deliberately embarked on a collision course with our time-honored precepts of reason, responsibility and respect.

In this category, I place the self-professed Mao-ists, Che-ists, and other lice-ridden demogogues of the New Left who have attacked law and authorty on the streets and campuses of America. In this category, I place also the grossly unstable bands of hatemongers whose manifestos and harangues are heavily garnished with four-letter words.

Frankly, I have tired—and I am certain that you have, too—of watching brash young exhibitionists trample our flag, burn their draft cards, and defame the United States. I have tired also of seeing the educational process disrupted, and hallowed halls of learning desecrated, by a comparative handful of warped radicals.

And I have passed the stomach-churning point with the threats and demands of those racist fanatics who would divide our country by color lines.

Defiance of law, rejection of values, contempt for authority—these are divisive forces which would undermine and destroy our national unity and strength. The American Legion has opposed all such forces throughout the past 50 years, and it must continue to oppose them with sound programs—selfless programs—designed to inspire patriotism, to promote understanding, and to *enhance* national unity and strength.

Fellow Legionnaires, I stand with great pride within your ranks. And I am truly grateful for the honor bestowed on me today.

APRIL 16 HEARING ON A NATIONAL POLICY FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, as previously announced, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has scheduled a hearing for Wednesday, April 16, on proposed legislation to establish a national policy for the environment. Measures pending before the committee on this subject are S. 1075, S. 237, and S. 1752.

All of these measures constitute the response of members of the Senate Interior Committee to the growing list of environmental crises our country has experienced and to the rapid decay and decline in the quality of the human environment.

My bill, S. 1075, as well as the others, poses one of the most important issues faced by our Nation. That issue is: "How should the Federal Government be organized to deal with, to anticipate, and to avoid the adverse consequences of environmental problems."

As Senators are aware, this subject has been a matter of great concern to many Members of Congress. Last July, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs joined with the House Committee on Science and Astronautics to convene a joint House-Senate colloquium to discuss the need for the content of a national policy for the environment. In addition, many Members of Congress have introduced legislative proposals related to a national policy for the environment.

Some time ago, I requested Prof. Lynton K. Caldwell, professor of government, Indiana University, to prepare a paper outlining some of the major alternatives for institutional reforms designed to improve the Federal Government's capacity to manage the environment. Professor Caldwell's paper provides an excellent summary of the alternatives and raises many of the fundamental questions which need to be considered in deciding what needs to be done in the way of restructuring the Federal Government. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Professor Caldwell's paper be printed in the RECORD.

Witnesses scheduled to appear at tomorrow's hearing on a national policy for the environment are as follows:

MORNING

Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, President's science advisor.

Hon. Walter J. Hickel, Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Ned Bayley, Director of Science and Education, Department of Agriculture.

Mr. James D. Braman, Assistant Secretary for Urban Systems and the Environment, Department of Transportation.

AFTERNOON

Dr. Lynton K. Caldwell, professor of government, University of Indiana.

Mr. Mike McCloskey, Sierra Club.

Hon. Stewart Udall, former Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Louis S. Clapper, director of conservation, National Wildlife Federation.

Mrs. Donald E. Clausen, water resources chairwoman, National League of Women Voters.

Rev. John Corrado.

Tomorrow's hearing will provide the first opportunity for top officials of the Nixon administration who have responsibilities for the management of the environment to express their views and to outline their policies, programs, and priorities in this critical area of concern. The timing is especially significant in view of recent reports of pending action by President Nixon to establish an interagency environmental quality council composed of the Vice President, a number of Cabinet officers, and chaired by the President.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR ALTERNATIVES FOR INSTITUTIONAL REFORMS DESIGNED TO IMPROVE THE GOVERNMENT'S CAPACITY TO MANAGE THE ENVIRONMENT

(Statement by Lnyton K. Caldwell, professor of government, Indiana University, before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on S. 1075 and related measures, Apr. 16, 1969)

1. The question at issue is this: How should the federal government be restructured to deal more effectively with the growing stress upon our natural environment?

2. The term "environment" includes the life-support system of our nation and of all the earth—the system of interactions of people with the air, water, land, and living organisms that comprise the biosphere—the interactions of those elements in our world capable of sustaining life. And although our immediate concern is with environmental policy in America, that policy must permit our nation to play a constructive role in international efforts to safeguard the biosphere of the whole earth. For this sphere of life, as we have now perceived it from outer space, is on ecological unity. All men, together with other living things, depend upon its self-renewing capabilities for their continuing existence.

3. There is general agreement here and abroad that the issue of man's environmental relationships is growing in importance. But how important is it? (As important as military defense or foreign affairs?) What is its priority in relation to other needs of society? (To social welfare, civil rights, or economic growth?) What kind of problem does the environment present? (Scientific, technical, social, or a mixture of these and other elements?). Answers must be given to these questions before intelligent decisions can be made regarding institutional reforms. Differing proposals have been made for dealing with environmental policy at the national level. But in order to choose wisely among these alternatives, a judgment must be made regarding the purposes and priorities of government action.

4. Clarity of policy and action would be served if this judgment could be made explicit. No general statement of national responsibility for the protection of the environment has yet been adopted by the Congress. But on July 17 of 1968, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the House of Representatives Committee on Science and Astronautics sponsored an informal joint colloquium on "A National Policy for the Environment." A special report on environmental policy was prepared for the Senate Interior Committee in connection with this conference and has been appended as Exhibit I to Senate Bill 1075. [Congressional Record, February 18, 1969 p. 3701.] In its preamble the Bill itself sets forth a policy to:

> ". . . prevent or effectively reduce any adverse effects on the quality of the environment in the management and development of the Nation's natural resources, to produce an understanding of the Nation's natural resources and the environmental forces affecting them and responsible for their development and future well being, and to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans, through a comprehensive and continuing program of study, review, and research."

5. If the Congress were to adopt an explicit statement of policy, as it did in the Employment Act of 1946, choice among alternative proposals for environmental administration would be facilitated. An adequate statement of policy would provide criteria for determining what type of organization and procedure would be required to make the policy effective. Such a statement would, or should, provide a clearer indication than we now have of the importance attached by the Congress and the American people to environmental policy in relation to other issues. In the absence of a statement of policy on which majority agreement has been reached, we have no consensual basis to support a positive program of environmental administration. Meanwhile, we can only guess at the degree of priority attached to environmental policy by the sponsors of specific legislative or executive proposals.

6. Current proposals for institutional change can best be understood if grouped by the several categories into which they logically fall. These categories represent differing perceptions of the environmental issue, its importance and its relation to other issues. The categories are also, by implication, responses to the question: Is man's relationship to the environment *in itself* a major focus for policy or is it important primarily in relation to other issues? The greater number of proposals introduced into the 90th and 91st Congresses have assumed the protection of the environment to be a very major aspect of national policy, although obviously related to other policy areas as, for example, to agriculture, urban affairs, and recreation. Within this general category of environment as a distinct policy focus, there are three sub-categories of institutional reform which we will presently examine. But there are two other categorical approaches to the environmental issue in which it is included under other policy objectives.

7. The first of these includes the state of the environment under a continuing assessment of national social accounts. Within the social accounts category, environmental factors would be considered in relation to conditions of health, poverty, education, population dynamics, and human resource problems generally. There are important environmental aspects in all areas of social concern, and it would not be inappropriate to consider them under the social accounts category. Yet it may be argued that the primary focus of social accounts is upon man-to-man or group-to-group relationships, and that these constitute a large and complex field of concern quite apart from the equally large and complex field of man-environment relationships. Advocates of a separate organization for environmental policy argue that a national system of social accounts should not attempt to embrace environmental factors *per se*, but should deal with them only as inextricably related to human resource problems. The separate policy advocates fear that, in a merger of environmental and social concerns, the less understood, less generally apparent, environmental problems would be slighted in preference to the types of social issues and conflicts with which the public and its political representatives are historically more familiar. Moreover it is contended that the types of knowledge and judgment necessary for policy analysis and advice differ as between social and environmental concerns to an extent that separate organizations for each would better serve the public interest.

8. The second approach to the environment as an aspect of another area of policy is to bring it into the federal structure for science and technology. To some extent this has already been done. The Office of Science and Technology and the Federal Council for Science and Technology have studied environmental policy questions and the President's Science Advisory Committee has issued at least two major reports on environmental policy issues [the reports on *The Use of Pesticides*, 1963, and *Restoring the Quality of Our Environment*, 1965.] On the occasion of President Johnson's Message to Congress on Natural Beauty [February, 1965], he instructed the Directors of the Office of Science and Technology and the Bureau of the Budget to recommend how the federal government might best organize its efforts toward advancing scientific understanding of natural plant and animal communities and their interactions with man and his activities. On January 24, 1968, in a joint memorandum for the President, the Directors recommended that the Office of Science and Technology assume responsibility for maintaining an overview of this policy area and assure the necessary coordination among agencies with the scientific community. The recommendations comprising Part III of the memorandum deserve careful attention. They correspond generally to those incorporated in the Congressional proposals, presently to be discussed. No "independent" advisory committee was suggested in the memorandum, although a joint federal agency-academic planning group was recommended for guiding ecological research.

9. President Johnson does not appear to have acted on this recommendation during his remaining year in office. The substance of the report reappeared, however, in a new memorandum, presumably prepared by staff in the OST and BOB and submitted to President Nixon by his Science Adviser, Dr. Lee Alvin DuBridge, on February 24, 1969. On March 17 the *Washington Post* reported pp. 1, 3 that President Nixon was considering designating his Science Adviser as Executive Secretary for a cabinet-level inter-agency Environmental Quality Council, with the Office of Science and Technology providing staff support. Reaction to this proposal, outside the Executive establishment, has ranged from cautious to skeptical. Four serious questions have been raised regarding this proposition. *First*, is environmental policy, not broader than science and technology, involving questions of value—of economics, esthetics, and ethics for which scientists and engineers have no distinctive competence? *Second*, is the addition of environmental policy responsibility to the duties of officers and agencies primarily concerned with other issues adequate provision for the task? Or does it represent a convenient, non-committal disposition of a political issue that is perceived in the Executive Branch as troublesome, but of relatively low priority? *Third*, is there any real promise that a cabinet level council, chaired by the President or Vice President would ever function as proposed? To observers wise in the ways of bureaucratic behavior its interagency membership suggests a role of mutual adjustment and accommodation rather than an uncommitted review and assessment of alternative courses of action. *Fourth*, and last, would the Congress and the country have as much confidence in organizational arrangements tied closely to the politics and personality of the incumbent President as they would in an organization created by the Congress and staffed independently of any other agency affiliation?

10. Answers to these questions will differ among respondents. It is however a safe surmize that very few persons who have been deeply concerned and involved in environmental policy issues would consider this arrangement adequate to the task. It offers little that is not already available in the federal executive establishment. The President can convene his cabinet on issues of the environment or of any other area of policy. We have already noted that there is nothing new in the concern of the OST with techno-scientific aspects of environmental policy. But to undertake coordination of the ecological aspects of environmental research and policy would either disproportionately weight its emphasis in this area to the possible detriment of other areas of science or, more probably, would result in insufficient attention to its ecological responsibilities.

11. This objection might in part be obviated if the OST were to become the nucleus of a greatly enlarged cabinet level Department of Science and Technology. The departmental proposition has been under informal discussion for a number of years. [E.g., Carl F. Stover, *The Government of Science*, 1962.] It was recently broached by retiring science adviser Donald F. Hornig in an address at the 1968 Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. But the objection that environmental policy embraces more than science and technology would remain. Moreover the examiners of United States science policy for the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development cited environmental policy as an area in which American science had *not* been notably successful. "There is little sign," wrote Examiner C. D. Waddington, Professor in Edinburgh's Institute of Animal Genetics, that U.S. scientists concerned with grand strategy have been thinking about . . . how we can ever develop a really scientific approach to creating an environment and social organization in which human living will be at the best level of physical well-being. . . ." Examiner Lefèvre, former Premier of Belgium, remarked that environmental problems are harder ". . . to tackle systematically, on the scale required, than to solve technical problems." In sum, the prospect of developing an adequate administration of environmental policy as an aspect of science and technology does not seem promising. [Cf., *Reviews of National Science Policy: United States, OECD*, 1968]

12. But to return to the Office of Science and Technology as presently situated, what of the contention that environmental policy is not likely to flourish unless administered close to the seat of power in the White House? To argue that the President, personally, will give more attention to an arrangement of his own creating than to one "wished upon him by the Congress" is to conjecture beyond available evidence. The unique powers of the President extend primarily to foreign and military affairs; on domestic issues he must, in greater measure, collaborate with the Congress. For nearly a generation, the President has been preoccupied with wars, hot and cold, and with America's international involvements. Environmental issues are preponderately domestic and few of them can be resolved without Congressional cooperation on matters in which the Congress has not customarily deferred to the White House, as it often has on matters affecting the command of the armed forces and the negotiation of international agreements. In short, it is more important that a Council on the Environment, as proposed in S. 1075 and several other bills now in committee, have a closer rapport with Congressional attitudes and responsibilities than is necessary, for example, in the case of the Presidents Science Advisory Committee or the National Security Council. Presidential leadership is in no way diminished by the Congressional proposals on the environment but, consistent with the theory of the Constitution, the President shares responsibility with the Congress on matters of civil and domestic policy. Therefore, with one exception, all other proposals for environmental policy implementation assume a base of governmental responsibility that is broader than the Presidency.

13. This exception is the reported, but unpublished, recommendations of President Nixon's task force on environmental policy headed by Russell E. Train, then President of the Conservation Foundation, now Undersecretary of the Interior. The account of the task force recommendation appeared in the

New York Times of January 12, 1969, and has been reprinted in the *Congressional Record* as Exhibit 3 of Senate Bill 1075 [February 18, p. 3712]. The task force was reported to have recommended a cabinet-level interagency Council on the Environment, (comparable to that reported to be under consideration by President Nixon in connection with the proposal to treat environmental policy primarily as an aspect of science and technology). But the task force recommendation differed in a very fundamental respect from the Office of Science and Technology proposals of 1968 and 1969. Urging that ". . . improved environmental management be made a principal objective of the new administration," it recommended that the President appoint a Special Assistant on Environmental Affairs, who would also be Executive Secretary to the Council on the Environment, and who would presumably give full time to this assignment. The President's Science Adviser was indicated as one of the officers with whom the new special assistant would closely work. The task force, therefore, appears to have perceived the environment as a focus for policy in its own right, rather than as a special aspect of science and technology.

14. The Nixon task force proposal falls into one of three categories into which may be grouped those alternatives for institutional reform which are premised on the environment as a major focus for public policy, unsubordinated to social accounting or technoscientific considerations. With an important reservation, the following three categories of proposals reflect an ascending sense of importance and urgency on the part of their sponsors. The reservation is the judgment of individuals as to what at any given time is politically feasible. In general, conservative and adaptive reforms are more feasible than novel or drastic measure. Surgery may be what the patient requires, but it is usually easier to persuade him to accept medicine. It would therefore be incorrect to conclude that the sponsors of more conservative proposals, such as the reported task force recommendations, would not favor stronger measures *if* they believed them to be obtainable.

15. The categorical alternatives to institutional reform for the environment as an independent focus of public policy are these:

a. Presidential Special Assistant plus cabinet level interagency council (reported to be the recommendations of the Nixon task force).

b. High-level council, independent of the executive departments but located administratively in the Executive Office of the President, plus a far-reaching program of environmental research and surveillance in the Department of the Interior, and requiring annually or biennially a report from the President to the Congress on the state of the environment. (Senate Bill 1075 and several similar proposals in the Senate and House of Representatives.)

c. Major departmental reorganization taking one of several forms:

(1) A moderate reorganization of the Department of the Interior as a Department of Natural Resources (e.g., transferring the Forest Service and the civil function of the Corps of Engineers into the reconstituted department).

(2) A new specialized technoscientific agency for environmental research and engineering development, such as that recently recommended by the National Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources.

(3) A new super-department of the Environment and Natural Resources based roughly on the model of the Department of Defense, primarily for planning and coordinative purposes, and probably associated with a major restructuring of the entire Executive Branch.

The first of these alternatives has already been discussed; our attention will therefore be directed to the two remaining groups of categories.

16. The first of these categories calls for a high-level council on environmental policy to be situated in the Executive Office of the President. A near variant is Representative Emilio Q. Daddario's proposed Technology Assessment Board, but this would be an "independent" agency equally responsible to the Congress and the President, and would be concerned with technological impacts other than those on the environment. Senate Bill 1075 probably represents the proposal within this category of alternatives for which the widest consensus outside of the government presently exists. It overcomes objections to the subordination of environmental policy to a system of social accounts or to an exclusive emphasis on science and technology. And it avoids loss of identity for environmental policy, or prejudice to independence of viewpoint, that would probably attend the deliberations of an interagency council. Although it adds certain functions, chiefly those of surveillance, education, and research to the Department of Interior, it does not otherwise alter the structure of the federal government.

17. Some friendly critics of S. 1075 would like to see it reinforced by a more explicit statement of national policy and by such measures as might strengthen its leverage in relation to the other executive agencies. The experience of the National Resources Planning Board of the nineteen thirties is a warning of the vulnerability of a politically powerless agency in a policy area of conflicting interests and values. Environmental issues are avoided by some elective officials *because* of the risk that they entail. It is traditional political prudence to avoid being caught in the cross-fire of powerful, antagonistic interests. Compared to a Council on the Environment, the Council of Economic Advisers operates in a tower of ivory, behind a wall of statistical abstractions that few citizens profess to understand. The protection and improvement of the environment is unavoidably involved in controversy. Until the realities and limitations of Spaceship Earth are more widely understood and respected than they are today, the members of a Council on the Environment ought to be exceptionally free from political ambition. Effective service on such a Council would probably preclude subsequent election to public office.

18. A second concern regarding S. 1075 is with its designation of the Department of the Interior as a major agency "to conduct investigations, studies, surveys, research and analyses relating to ecological systems and environmental quality." The concern is not primarily that research is not a governmental function, but rather that the nature and scope of environmental and ecological research is no more uniquely appropriate to the Department of the Interior, as it is presently organized, than it is to the OST. Ecological and environmental concerns are the business not only of Interior, but also especially of the Public Health Service, Environmental Science Services Administration, and of at least six other federal agencies. There is little if any quarrel with the ecological survey and research objectives of S. 1075 or of a similar measure sponsored by Senator Gaylord Nelson. The question is whether the responsibility should be placed in any of the federal departments as presently constituted, unless buffered from political and bureaucratic importunities by a structure analogous to that provided for the National Institutes of Health.

19. There are a number of alternative arrangements for realizing the important objective of ecological and environmental research. Among them should be listed proposals for a quasi-autonomous National Institute of Ecology advocated by the Ecological Society of America; for a National Social Science Foundation, proposed by Senator Fred Harris; and a system of university related institutes of environmental studies, recommended by the Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee and the Caldwell-Sargent proposal to the Public Health Service Symposium on Human Ecology, November, 1968. It seems probable that some combination of research agencies under the overall coordination of the high-level Council on the Environment would be the most practical answer to the need. The previously cited OST memorandum of 1968 proposed such a coordinative arrangement, but under its own supervision. Funds, in addition to those now appropriated for research activities in presently existing agencies, could be administered by a Council on the Environment. This might advantageously reinforce its political viability by developing a constituency of professional societies, universities and research institutes, associated with it through its administration of research grants and contracts.

20. The third category of proposals—for departmental reorganization—currently includes at least three alternatives. The proposal for a Department of Science and Technology has already been mentioned, but its mission would not primarily be environmental policy. The most frequently discussed alternative would reconstitute the Department of Interior as a Department of Natural Resources. This proposition has been criticized, however, as presenting a one-dimensional view of the environmental issue—the economic. "Natural resources" is a commonly used, unobjectionable economic concept, but it does not include, except by an act of extraordinary semantic creativity, the full range of needs for which man seeks fulfillment in the environment. There appears to be a growing tendency to consider the Department of the Interior as a Department of the Environment, particularly as its concern was broadened under the administration of Secretary Udall to include, in the words of President Johnson, "a new conservation—not just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. Its concern . . . not with nature alone, but with the total relation between man and the world around him." [Message to the Congress, February 8, 1965]. "The Secretary of the Interior," editorialized *Time Magazine* May 10, 1968, "really ought to be the Secretary of the Environment."

21. The major difficulty with the transformation of the Department of the Interior into a Department of the Environment develops out of the effect of this action on other government agencies. If natural resources were the organizing principle around which the Department were reconstituted, the combination of agencies to be included would differ from those logically related to an environmental focus. All major areas of public policy tend to interrelate in ways that are inconvenient to the makers of conventional organization charts. For example, how should the federal government organize to deal with energy? The nation has no coherent energy policy, but eventually it is likely that one will emerge. Should energy policy be considered an environmental matter, or is it primarily an economic or technoscientific issue? If environment becomes the major focus of a single department, would all agencies having to do with the environment come under its jurisdiction? It should be obvious that they would not. For example, foreign affairs, education, health, and justice are the primary concern of specific agencies, but the exclusive concern of none. It is, however, possible that much of the difficulty in conceptualizing a better organization for the Executive Branch lies in our unwillingness or inability to rethink the role and functions of the federal government in American society. One attempt to break out of conventional assumptions regarding departmental organization is

the idea of the super-department or ministry. But before examining this alternative, it is necessary to review briefly another alternative (although only a partial one) for departmental reorganization for environmental policy.

22. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency, proposed by the National Commission on Marine Science (*Our Nation and the Sea*, January 11, 1969), is not directed so much toward ecology and the broad range man-environment relationships as it is toward physical science and engineering. It is considered here because of its obvious relationship to federal organization for environmental policy. But it would not answer the need for institutional reform that has induced the environmental quality legislation proposed in the Ninetieth and Ninety-First Congresses. The principal difficulty with the Marine Commission proposal is that it has not been made within a context of comprehensive reorganization within the Executive Branch. The continuing *ad hoc* creation of independent agencies is of dubious wisdom if responsible and coordinated public policy is desired. The establishment of a new Marine and Atmospheric Science Agency may be desirable, but such a decision cannot be responsibly undertaken unless it is an outcome of a careful examination of the full range of governmental responsibilities for the environment.

23. This same conditional proviso is equally applicable to establishment of a new super department for the environment and natural resources. Because discussion of the super-department has as yet been chiefly on an informal basis, official proposals for institutional reform cannot be cited. Nevertheless, there are certain considerations upon which most proponents of this type of agency seem agreed. They are, *first*, that reorganization for environmental policy can most effectively be undertaken as a part of a review of the total structure of the Executive Branch; *second*, that no agency, however comprehensive, can or probably should have exclusive jurisdiction over any aspect of public policy; and *third*, that the rationale for the super-department is to bring a greater degree of clarity, coordination, and responsibility to federal administration. The large scale of the super-department makes it easier to accommodate functions of environmental, natural resources, and energy policy under one coordinative structure.

24. The super-department is what in parliamentary government would be called a ministry. Its functions would be those of planning, review, coordination, and conflict resolution. It would not be an operative department in the traditional sense, and would relate to subordinate agencies somewhat in the manner that the Department of Defense relates to the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. An objective of the super-department would be to de-concentrate, to some extent, the power of decision now theoretically lodged in the person of the President, but in fact often exercised by lower echelon officials in the Bureau of the Budget and other Executive offices of whom the Congress or the electorate have no knowledge and no means of questioning or calling to account. The head of a super-department would have higher visibility than most cabinet officers have experienced since the early years of the Republic.

25. Professor Stephen K. Bailey in his essay in the 1968 Brookings Institution report entitled *Agenda for the Nation*, identifies four areas of prime concern for the nation as viewed from the Executive office. These he describes as national security, economic stability and growth, the integrity and viability of the physical environment, and the promotion of human welfare and of human resource development. These four areas could become the foci of new cabinet level super-departments as indeed the first of them—national security—already is. This form of administrative organization would not, however, obviate the need for separate advisor councils. Indeed, it would make their separate status more important as independent agencies for policy surveillance and review. Some students of public administration believe that there are advantages to responsive and responsible government in alternative sources for public decision or action on nearly all issues. They argue that a moderate degree of competition among agencies may actually increase the efficiency of government operations. It is therefore pertinent to this argument to point out that the super-department concept does not necessarily imply exclusiveness or monopoly in any sector of public policy, and is consistent with the idea of multiple avenues of recourse on any public policy issue.

SOME CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

26. At the outset of this statement, the point was made that a choice among alternative arrangements for environmental administration would logically depend upon an assessment of the importance of the issue and a judgment regarding its nature. The foregoing analysis of alternative proposals indicates that differing conclusions on these matters have been reached by differing groups and individuals. But the task of decision by the Congress and the President is not greatly assisted by a comparison of divergent views. Their need is for more basic criteria. The argument has been advanced that a national policy for the environment, adopted by the Congress as a statute or resolution, could provide this criteria. The absence of an adequate policy statement, accompanied by explicit provisions for its implementation, is the most serious omission from the current set of legislative proposals for institutional reform. Without such an operational charter, the political future of a high-level council on the environment, such as proposed by Senators Jackson, Nelson, and McGovern, among others, would be unduly handicapped. Its situation would be comparable to a Council of Economic Advisers *without* an Employment Act of 1946.

27. The scientific evidence of a mounting crisis of the environment is so pervasive and so thoroughly documented that rational disagreement can occur only with respect to the *degree* of its seriousness. But scientific truth does not automatically become political truth. Political disbelief cannot alter material reality; it cannot alter or amend scientific fact. But it can prevent government from coping effectively with reality. Dr. George H. Gallup, Jr., President of the American Institute of Public Opinion, believes that most Americans accept the proposition that there is indeed a real crisis of the environment and that government is not doing enough about it. In a recent survey [January, 1969] he found that younger adults in particular were concerned about environmental degradation. Analysis of the news media would tend to confirm Gallup's view. The country as a whole may be more ready for a vigorous attack upon environmental problems than are the rank and file of the Congress or the mission-bound Executive agencies. But if the recent multiplication of Congressional subcommittees with an explicit environmental concern written into their titles is more than an improbable coincidence, it is an indication that concern for the environment is being perceived in the Congress as good politics. But the scientific truth of an environmental crisis will not become a fully legitimized political truth until the Congress, or the people, by their votes make it so.

28. Mayor Carl Stokes of Cleveland recently expressed a feeling shared by millions of Americans everywhere when he compared the threat to American security posed by the pollution and decay of our urban environments to the military and ideological threat external to our boundaries. Mayor Stokes does not have to read the scientific journals to discover the nature of the threat to our environment. With millions of other Americans he daily experiences the threat, and finds it increasingly difficult to reconcile the enormous disproportion between the national commitment in money, men, and organization to defense against possible attack from overseas and the inadequate and defaulted commitments to defense against the forces of decay at home that could as surely destroy the national security. Four years ago in a prophetic essay, [Harpers Magazine, February, 1965], Peter Drucker predicted that quality of environment and of human relations would become the major political issues of the future. He foresaw success for political leadership that understood the coming change of values. But he also saw that the greater part of our political leaders of middle age were locked into the perceptions and values of the nineteen thirties and forties. When this perception gap is also a generation gap, and becomes also a political gap, the makings of political overturn are present. The Nixon administration and the 91st Congress may have the last opportunity for American political leadership to deal with the problems of the environment and of human relations by means of methods short of radical.

29. Any clear-minded elected official knows, and Lyndon B. Johnson perhaps knows better than any, that the public does not reward its political leaders for good intentions. If our estimate of the scientific and political significance of the environmental issue is correct, it is already long past time for a major reassessment of national priorities in relation to the environment. This reassessment is unquestionably a responsibility of the Congress. There has been articulate leadership on behalf of environmental policy in both Houses of the Congress. Few of the individuals or legislative proposals have been specifically identified in this report, which has been concerned with issues rather than with events. But it is now time for events—for adoption by the Congress of an explicit course of policy and action to bring the worsening environmental situation under control.

30. Let us begin the task where best we can. If the least promising of the organizational alternatives is the best that can be presently obtained, let us begin there as a temporary measure. But let us also persist in efforts to obtain the most effective organizational answer to the problems of environmental policy that experience and research can provide. Few of the alternatives now under consideration for implementing environmental policy are mutually incompatible. The effectiveness of measures taken will depend *first* upon an adequate, operational national policy and *second* upon an adequate definition of the place of environmental policy in the total structure of the Executive Branch. Beyond these considerations are problems of relating federal responsibilities to those of state and local government and to the non-governmental and international aspects of our society. On Sunday, March 30th, the *Chicago Tribune Magazine* printed Part I of a state-of-the-world report on the earth dweller's tendency to make his planet uninhabitable. "Is Man His Own Doomsday Machine?" asked the *Tribune*. The answer to that question may very well be given in the response of the elected representatives of the American people in Congress, who alone have the power to set the course of national policy and action for the protection and management of the environment.

RAIN AND FLOOD DAMAGE IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on February 7, 1969, I introduced S. 993, to help provide for the repair of damage from the recent rains and floods in California. While it was estimated that flood control projects and other preventative measures have saved more than $1.25 million worth of property from destruction, the damage to private and publicly owned facilities has been evaluated at $265 million.

S. 993, is designed to lend assistance in the permanent reconstruction of roads and highways not on the Federal system and in the restoration of timber roads. The loss suffered by individuals, however, has also been extensive. Homeowners have seen their life savings, in many instances, washed away by the floods. The livelihood of growers—their land—is under enough water so that it will be uncultivable for years in some cases.

Even under these circumstances, individuals have had great difficulty obtaining loans from both the Small Business Administration and the Farmers Home Administration. As of March 27, 1969, the SBA regional offices throughout the State of California had received 4,456 inquiries regarding home and business loans. Yet only 565 applications were accepted for processing, 217 applicants being declared eligible for loans totaling no more than $1,146,460. The SBA, however, has the money in its emergency revolving fund to lend, but, as of that date, only $17 million of the $50 million apportioned by the Bureau of the Budget had been loaned. The reason for this lack of asistance can be found in the SBA's regulations and guidelines. Regulations promulgated in March 1968, state, in part:

> Personal and/or business assets must be used by the applicant to the greatest extent feasible to alleviate the injury incurred.

They further state:

> Private credit to the extent obtainable on reasonable rates and terms must be used prior to obtaining disaster loan assistance from SBA.

Under the guidelines established for the implementation of these regulations, an applicant must exhaust all but $600 of his cash assets and marketable securities per family member toward rebuilding any destroyed property before a loan can be obtained. Furthermore, any applicant with an income of more than $10,000 per year plus $600 per dependent must seek financing through a private source.

S. 993, in the form in which it was referred to the Committee on Public Works, made provisions for loans whether or not obtainable through a private lending institution. It did not, however, direct itself toward the regulation requiring the utilization of private assets. Consequently, I am offering an amendment to S. 993 today to make loans more readily obtainable by all those suffering loss to their homes and businesses from the floods without first requiring the almost total exhaustion of private or business assets.

Presently, disaster loans are repayable at a 3-percent rate of interest; however, this provision was enacted in the 1930's when the cost of money to the Government was 1½ to 1¾ percent. Obviously these loans were not then providing "free money" to the recipients; however, the rate of interest has not been adjusted since. Therefore, the modification which I am offering today provides that disaster loans in California shall be made at the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States having maturities of 20 years or more. At the present time, this is 5½ to 5¾ percent—an amount substantially lower still than that at which funds could be obtained by individuals through private lending institutions or sources. The amendment, nevertheless, makes an exception for low-income persons so that day might still receive loans at the 3-percent rate of interest.

It also provides that a $2,500 "forgiveness" of loans or interest during a period not to exceed 3 years shall apply only to low-income persons. As originally drafted, S. 993, would have allowed this provision to apply to all recipients of loans.

Section 6 of this bill, as modified, will also provide "forgiveness" of a certain amount of the principal or interest to low-income persons who obtain loans under subtitle C of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended. Furthermore, it would allow only those qualifying as low-income persons, under regulations established by the FHA, to pay the 3-percent interest rate on disaster loans, while all others pay the rate of interest at which the Government receives the money. It would permit persons to be eligible for loans at this rate, however, irrespective of whether assistance is available through private sources.

Mr. President, the extent of the disaster in California has made clear the need for Federal assistance. Yet, as I have said, homeowners, businesses, and farmers have found it extremely difficult to receive help due to stringent regulations governing the availability of loans and applying to the qualifications of applicants.

I am hopeful that these modifications will serve not only the people of California, but as a workable procedure which might be employed to assist those in the Midwest suffering similar personal tragedies at this time.

MOUNT RUSHMORE, A GREAT TRIBUTE TO THE GENIUS OF BORGLUM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Warren E. Morrell, chief editorial writer for the Herald-Examiner of Los Angeles, Calif., was recently elected to the board of trustees of the Mount Rushmore Society of the Black Hills of South Dakota. At one time, Mr. Morrell was editor of the Daily Rapid City Journal of Rapid City, S. Dak., and as a long-time resident and a native of South Dakota he has devoted a great deal of time and energy to the evolution and completion of the world-famous "Shrine of Democracy" carved in the imperishable granite of one of the tall mountains of South Dakota's Black Hills.

While Mount Rushmore is not by any means the tallest mountain in this great chain of majestic mountains which range from the northern boundary of our State to its southern borders, Mount Rushmore has become the most widely known and frequently visited by millions of tourists every year as a result of the genius of Gutzon Borglum, who designed and implemented this most famous piece of mountain sculpture in the entire world.

Returning to California after a recent visit to his native State to attend the annual meeting of the Mount Rushmore Society, Warren Morrell wrote a most interesting and informative article about the background and significance of Mount Rushmore

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Herald-Examiner, Feb. 23, 1969]

Rushmore—Outstanding Tribute to Genius of Borglum

(By Warren E. Morrell)

It was September, the beginning of a new school year. The West Sovina English teacher would not ask her pupils, "What did you do this summer?"

But she had an indelible summer impression she wanted to share. So she asked, "How many of you have been to Mt. Rushmore?"

Surprisingly to her, several hands went up.

The teacher's eyes moistened as she relived one of her life's most stirring experiences. Her students shoved aside other thoughts from their minds as the teacher recalled her visit to the Shrine of Democracy where the gigantic likenesses of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Theodore Roosevelt and Abraham Lincoln are carved from solid granite on Mt. Rushmore in the Black Hills of South Dakota.

"I was over-awed," said the teacher. "I had seen pictures of Mt. Rushmore. I knew that the Presidents were scaled to men 465 feet tall. I had read that it was 60 feet from the top of Washington's head to his chin. But nothing I had read or pictures I had seen were comparable.

"As I was standing there, trying to absorb what my eyes were telling me, it started to rain—like one of our really hard California rains. A lady asked if I wouldn't like to come into a building. I moved backwards toward the shelter—my eyes still glued to those tremendous figures—while lightning exploded and thunder roared.

"In a few minutes, it was over. The sun shone and I went outdoors. Believe it or not, Washington was crying. And his nose was dripping! I couldn't stand to see Washington cry. So I cried—I just let go.

"A man near me, sensing my emotion, said, 'Lady, there isn't a Kleenex big enough to throw up there to help him.'

"That snapped me out of it," admitted the teacher, slowly removing a handkerchief from her purse and carefully pressing it to her eyes. Then she added, "I was even more impressed with Mt. Rushmore than I was with the Grand Canyon—maybe because Rushmore is man-made."

NOT UNIQUE EXPERIENCE

The teacher's experience is not unique. And she shouldn't have been surprised to see the number of raised hands. Californians rank fifth among the 1,500,000 yearly visitors to the Shrine of Democracy.

Seeing Mt. Rushmore gives most people a rebirth of Americanism. It pulls out latent patriotic feelings you either have forgotten or have tried to ignore. It makes tingles play hide and seek up and down your spine. Yet stirring patriotism somehow blends with soul-quieting reverence.

"Rushmore brings out the best in people," said Mrs. Carl Burgess, co-concessionnaire at the memorial, who has observed thousands of visitors over a period of nearly a score of years. Park rangers support her statement this way: "Our records show there is less litter-bugging here than in any National Park."

Mt. Rushmore National Memorial is the world's largest sculpture. It is by comparison with the Great Sphinx of Egypt what a Great Dane is to a Chihuahua.

I've taken many visitors to Mt. Rushmore, enjoying their reactions and seeing the shrine anew through their emotions.

One visitor was Ranbir-Singh, editor of The Milap, New Delhi, India.

En route to the mountain, I tried to explain the magnitude of the carvings. He couldn't fathom my statistics. So I said, "Imagine George Washington's nose empty. Turn it upside down, fill it with water, and you'd have a swimming pool ample for six people."

"Oh, you bloody Americans!" he laughed. "You're impossible."

Half an hour later, beneath Freedom's Shrine, Ranbir had the expression of a devout worshiper communicating with his God. His silence accentuated the soft winds whispering through the pine trees. Finally he uttered some phrases in his native Urdu. Then he turned to me and said in English, "I have the sensation as if I were seeing the Taj Mahal for the first time."

MORE THAN BIGNESS

Gutzon Borglum, the sculptor who changed a majestic mountain into this American miracle, would judge anyone who compared Washington's nose to a swimming pool as crass, uncouth and perhaps some unprintables.

Borglum didn't want viewers to be solely impressed at the monument's hugeness.

In a way, his friend, famed architect Frank Lloyd Wright, substantiated Borglum.

"The noble countenances emerge from Rushmore as though the spirit of the mountain heard a human plan and itself became a human countenance," said Wright. "Here is a memorial which has real meaning. Certainly, it is colossal, and in that sense spectacular and heroic. But it is not 'just a damn big thing.' Borglum has given us a work which has the impelling power that characterizes all great art."

Borglum, a genius, not only excelled as a sculptor but also as a painter, writer, salesman, engineer, speaker and humanitarian. About bigness, he said:

"A monument's dimensions should be determined by the importance to civilization of the events commemorated. We are not here trying to carve an epic, portray a moonlight scene, or write a sonnet; neither are we dealing with mystery or tragedy, but rather the constructive and the dramatic moments or crises in our amazing history. We are coolheadedly, clear-mindedly setting down a few crucial epochal facts regarding the accomplishments of the Old World radicals who shook the shackles of oppression from their light feet and fled despotism to people a continent; who built an empire and rewrote the philosophy of freedom and compelled the world to accept its wiser, happier forms of government.

"We believe the dimensions of national heartbeats are greater than village impulses, greater than city demands, greater than state dreams or ambitions. Therefore, we believe a nation's memorial should, like Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and Roosevelt, have a serenity, a nobility, a power that reflects the gods who inspired them and suggests the gods they have become."

METHOD OF CHOOSING

Why did he choose, in 1925, these four American leaders?

Borglum argued that Washington had contributed so much to independence, the Constitutional Convention, and the establishment of the government that he must be the leading and dominant figure. No one seriously disagreed. Jefferson represents our idealism, expansion, and love of liberty; Lincoln our altruism and sense of inseparable unity.

But why Teddy Roosevelt? Borglum's inclusion of the Rough Rider brought the greatest amount of national criticism and controversy. Many people at that time 44 years ago felt Theodore Roosevelt did not deserve permanent enshrinement because too little time had elapsed since his death to allow a mature judgment of his life based upon historical perspective. But the sculptor argued that he could "think of none more fitting." Roosevelt, he asserted, was "preeminently an all-American President" and reflected the "restless Anglo-Saxon spirit that made the ocean-to-ocean republic" inevitable.

Furthermore, Borglum had been a militant Bull Mooser and was devoted to Teddy Roosevelt's political ideals. Borglum was thinking more and more of a monument of "Empire Builders" or "Nation Builders." Through Roosevelt the United States had acquired the Panama Canal Zone, which ultimately provided a waterway connecting the two oceans washing American shores. In Borglum's eyes this achievement completed the national expansion of the United States.

I have my own idea of why Teddy Roosevelt was chosen. It is true that Borglum greatly admired the Rough Rider. But look at the picture of Borglum on this page—or any portrait of the sculptor. Put pince-nez glasses on Borglum and you have a striking resemblance to Roosevelt. So in addition to the Rough Rider, you also have Borglum up there. I don't fault him for this showing of what some might consider immodesty. I like to see Roosevelt and Borglum up there and realize I'm not seeing double.

Other Roosevelts figured prominently in Mt. Rushmore history. President Franklin D. Roosevelt dedicated the figure of Jefferson, Aug. 30, 1936. Roosevelt made an inspiring speech and after the ceremony, the President asked, "Where are you going to put Teddy?" The sculptor explained that the President's cousin would be between the head of Jefferson and that of Lincoln which was just taking form. "I have it all planned out in my studio," he said, as he invited FDR to see his models. "I will come back some day to look over this more fully," replied the President.

I'm sure FDR had a twinkle in his eye as he said that. He and Borglum knew and admired one another. As difficult as it was to carve the huge figures was the problem of getting the money to carry on the work during the depth of America's worst economic depression.

FLATTERED ROOSEVELT

When Borglum needed more money, as a last resort he would go to Washington, D.C., dine privately with FDR at the White House. During the luncheon, Borglum adroitly sketched FDR's countenance among the four other great faces. Borglum made no promises and Roosevelt did not comment on the sketches. But as the good guy saves the impoverished widow when her rent is due, funds came through from Washington to carry on the work.

The above has never been printed previously. It was told to me in confidence by an impeachable source who said I could reveal this sometime after his death. My informant and friend was nearly as responsible for Mt. Rushmore as was Borglum.

Many years later Hubert Humphrey, then U.S. Senator from Minnesota, worked valiantly for legislation to appropriate funds to add Franklin D. Roosevelt's likeness as the fifth face. It was a blow to him when geologists and engineers proved there was insufficient granite for a gigantic portrait of the World War II President.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, with logic, zeal and determination, plugged for Susan B. Anthony on Rushmore. When she discovered there was no room, she crusaded for a likeness of Miss Anthony to be carved on a nearby granite peak. Mrs. Roosevelt lost.

What was the engineering required in the project?

It astounded Ernie Pyle, the famous World War II correspondent, when he visited the monument in 1936. He was startled to see the large amount of machinery and equipment. His idea of mountaincarving had been that Borglum arose each morning, took his hammer and chisel, ascended the peak, and began to carve.

Here's how the late Mrs. Gutzon Borglum told it like it was:

"As each head was started its center was located, and at this center point on the top of the head a plate was located. This was graduated in degrees 0 to 360 degrees, and at its center a horizontal arm was located that traversed this horizontal arc. This arm was about 30 feet long, in effect a giant protractor laid on top of the head. The arm was graduated in feet and inches so that at any point we could drop a plumb bob from this arm, and by measuring the vertical distance on this plumb line determine exactly the amount of stone to be removed.

"After determining this master center point on the mountain, we set a smaller arc and arm on our model in the same relative position. With this small device we could make all our measurements on our model and then enlarge them 12 times and transfer them to the large measuring device on the mountain. Through this system every face had a measurement made every six inches both vertically and horizontally. These measurements were then painted on the stone and it was through this means that men totally unfamiliar with sculptural form were able to do this undertaking. In fact, all the men employed on the work were South Dakota men trained by the sculptor.

USED LEATHER SWINGS

"Pneumatic drills were used for drilling and the compressed air was provided by large compressors located on the ground . . . conveyed to the top of the mountain by a three-inch pipe.

"The men were let down over the face of the stone in leather swings similar to bo'n chairs used on ships. The men were lowered to their place of work by hand-operated winches, taking with them jackhammers or pneumatic tools and other necessary equipment. A call-boy with a microphone and loud speakers at each of the winches relayed the messages for raising or lowering the workmen to the winchmen.

"Steel used in the drilling was used over and over again, taken to the blacksmith shop on the ground via a cable car, heated, sharpened, re-heated and tempered and sent back to the mountain again. About 400 of these drills were dulled and re-sharpened each day."

People have made millions of dollars because of Rushmore memorial by accommodating visitors en route to and from the Shrine.

One of the earlier "prospectors" had a small telescope on lookout point on Iron Mountain several miles from Rushmore. The man rented the telescope to tourists who wanted to view the memorial from that distance.

Bob Dean, then owner of Radio Station KOTA, Rapid City, S.D., was driving Borglum to Mt. Rushmore and Borglum asked Dean to stop so he could talk to the "prospector".

"How's business?" Borglum inquired. "Good," the man said laconically. "What do the people say when they look at the mountain?" Borglum asked. The man looked at him quizzically. "You're Mr. Borglum, the sculptor, aren't you?" he asked, and when

Borglum nodded, he went on cautiously, "Well, some say one thing and some say another."

"Of course," Borglum agreed pleasantly. "But what do they say most often?"

"I guess I'd better not say any more," the man answered, and his lips closed in a firm thin line.

"You'd really do me a great favor if you'd tell me," Borglum assured him, but the man seemed suddenly unaware of Dean's and the sculptor's presence, and stood looking down the road hopefully for a car which might contain a customer.

CURIOSITY EXPLODES

"At this point Borglum's avid curiosity exploded." "Go ahead, man, damn it!"

The man looked up at Borglum with raised eyebrows. "You're sure you won't get mad?"

"No, no!" Borglum exclaimed. "I can take the worst you've got."

"Well," the man said hesitantly, "I guess since you've asked it as a favor, I owe it to you to tell you. If it wasn't for you I wouldn't be in business. Most folks want to know how much concrete it took."

Dean and the sculptor finally stopped laughing. Borglum asked, "and what do you tell them?"

"I tell them I don't rightly know," the man said earnestly. "How much did it take?"

It was 14 years from the time President Calvin Coolidge dedicated the memorial on Aug. 10, 1927 until Borglum's death in a Chicago hospital, March 6, 1941. At the time of the sculptor's death, only finishing the hands and hair of the four figures remained. Lincoln Borglum, the sculptor's pragmatic and talented son, who had been with his father from the beginning of the work, was commissioned to complete the details.

While the National Park Service says the Memorial is completed, it is far from the dreams Gutzon Borglum envisioned. There are 400,000 tons of rock beneath the faces which should be moved away. (It bothers fussy housekeepers.) The Hall of Records should be built. The history of the United States should be chiseled in letters large enough to be seen three miles away. This was part of Borglum's dream.

The supposition that Rushmore should remain as is—as an unfinished symphony to a great composer—has prevailed.

I feel this is not in the spirit of the nation or the sculptor. It should be completed, particularly because Lincoln Borglum is well qualified and willing to finish the titanic job his father started.

BORGLUM RETURNS—TO FOREST LAWN

Gutzon Borglum loved Los Angeles.

"You know I ran away from home when I was a boy, to come here—and I love everything about it, although I have been away many years," he told the Friday Morning Club at the Biltmore Hotel in 1926.

Later he said he wanted to spend his remaining years here.

Born in Idaho March 25, 1871, his full name was John Gutzon de la Mothe Borglum. His parents had come over from Denmark. His father, at first a woodcarver, became a physician and surgeon, also a breeder of horses.

Young Borglum was 17 when he persuaded his parents to move to Los Angeles so he could study art. They lived in a frame house on Temple Street. Later, after they moved to Omaha, he lived in a rooming house on Bunker Hill.

From here he studied art in San Francisco, then went to Paris. He began as both painter and sculptor and was accepted as both by the French salons. In England, critics and royalty heaped honors on him. After painting a series of murals for a big hotel at Leeds and another series for a concert hall in Manchester, he began to abandon the brushes for the chisel, and to turn out statuary in almost every field and almost every imaginable form.

From the first, his works won the highest honors. The Metropolitan Museum brought his "Mares of Diomedes" at once and the French Government promptly purchased a partial replica of it for the Luxembourg Gallery.

His Lincoln in the rotunda of the Capitol is considered among his great works.

Borglum never lived to fulfill his dream of spending his last days on earth in the City of the Angels. Next best, at his request, his body lies at rest at Forest Lawn, Glendale.

GRAZING FEES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the first installment of a proposed increase in grazing fees to be levied upon users of public lands by the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service has now been in effect for about 3 months. It is too soon, of course, to assess the economic impact of this increase, but it is not too soon to assess its impact on the opinion of Utah's sheep and cattlemen, or on the opinion of the many small businessmen in the State who are dependent upon stockmen and their families for trade. They are all concerned and apprehensive, and they well might be.

Under the 10 year schedule announced by the Bureau of the Budget, stockmen using lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management are now paying 44 cents to graze one cow or five sheep for a month, and those using the lands managed by the Forest Service are being charged fees ranging from 31 cents to $1.25 per cow-month, or sheep grazing fees ranging from 6 cents to 25 cents monthly. The end objective of the 10-year period of adjustment is a grazing fee of $1.23 per cow-month, a figure which the agencies have determined is fair market value for range forage.

An increase of this magnitude, even though spread over 10 years, is bound to have an adverse economic effect. I told Secretary of the Interior Udall at the time the increases were proposed, that their impact upon the livestock industry in Utah and the Intermountain region would be "catastrophic." I urged both the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to withhold the proposed increases until further studies of the matter could be completed.

Mr. President, numerous analyses have suggested that these increases will seriously cut back the annual income of many Utah ranchers. A study completed by Utah State University showed that the increases projected would cost Utah ranchers about $835,000 per year in income.

This statistic gains in significance when it is considered alongside measurements of the prosperity of typical Utah ranches. As I told Secretary Udall:

> Even with the present grazing fee schedule in operation, cattle ranchers realized only 2.0 percent and sheep ranchers only 2.6 percent average return on their investment a year ago. Over half obtained between 1.0 and 3.0 percent rate in return. About one-fourth of the ranchers received less than 1.0 percent or a negative return, and only one-fifth received a 4.0 percent return.

One fundamental issue in the grazing fee controversy involves the cost of the grazing fee permit—particularly, whether that expense should be considered as a part of the cost of the rancher's operation in the computation of grazing fees. My view of this matter has been that while livestock operators should pay a fair and reasonable fee for grazing rights, it is unfair to them for grazing fees to be based upon a procedure which fails to include one of their principal cost factors.

The Taylor Grazing Act, the fundamental law governing grazing on the public lands, precludes inclusion of the cost of the grazing permit in the fixing of the fees. It is generally agreed that the inclusion of the permit in the computation of the fees would result in the recognition of a proprietary interest for the rancher in the public lands, something which the Taylor Act expressly prohibits.

Mr. President, I have urged many times that these increases not be put into effect until the report of the Public Land Law Review Commission is received next year. I have joined in proposed legislation with the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE) which would amend the Taylor Act to provide that the acquisition cost of a grazing right could be considered in the determination of grazing fees as a cost of operating on the public lands. No legal, proprietary rights would be conveyed by such a provision; it would result only in a more realistic basis for the computation of user fees.

As a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I participated in hearings on the grazing fee increases which the Subcommittee on Public Lands held in Washington on February 27 and 28 of this year. These hearings revealed the enormous opposition which exists among livestock operators over the implementation of these rate increases.

I wish to make it clear that I have no quarrel with the fair market value concept in fixing grazing fees. I do not think that the livestock operators oppose that concept, either. What I do ask is that every effort be made to see to it that a basis for computing further increases reflects the major cost factors for these ranchers who use the public domain. Furthermore, I intend to press the agencies to see to it that they conduct a continuing review of the question of grazing fees, in order that the public interest is genuinely served in this matter. This review should include consideration of the information presented at the subcommittee hearings, as well as the Public Land Law Review Commission report when it becomes available. I have received assurances from the agencies that such a continuing study will be made.

DISRUPTIONS ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, rightly, our citizens are concerned with the riots and disruptions that have taken place on college campuses throughout the country.

Recently, I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Harold E. Green, director of community relations at Fresno State College. Writing last fall in "Techniques," a publication of the American College Public Relations Association, Professor Green discusses an approach taken by Fresno State to help neutralize militant activists.

Because of the interest in this subject, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Academic Freedom—Campus Seminars Help Neutralize Militant Activists," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACADEMIC FREEDOM—CAMPUS SEMINARS HELP NEUTRALIZE MILITANT ACTIVISTS

(By Harold E. Green, director of community relations Fresno State College)

The turmoil on college and university campuses today is forcing educators and non-educators alike to evaluate the current status of academic freedom and academic responsibility.

It appears that many attempts are being made to subvert the standards of freedom and ethical conduct developed so carefully over the years by the American Association of University Professors. Various organized groups—national and international—are seeking to force certain kinds of revolutionary change to obtain power by controlling higher education. Often these groups try to capture racial and ethnic organizations validly seeking educational, social and economic equality. The impact of all this on the public has been considerable. For example, at Fresno State we maintain a modest, selective newspaper and magazine clipping service as part of our monitoring operations. Its purpose is to keep us alerted daily about events and attitudes affecting higher education—and our college in particular.

Compared to the 1966–67 academic year, the volume of these news clippings has increased more than 150 percent. Almost all of the increased subject matter is concerned with student and faculty unrest, demonstrations and violence—in our state and elsewhere. Fortunately, at Fresno State we have been able to forestall violence thus far.

Obviously, these clippings are just one phase of the intelligence which we gather at Fresno State about the current problems of higher education. But they are dramatic evidence of the revolutionary atmosphere in which all of us function daily.

We have but to read the press to verify the strategy behind the organized attempts to force changes of an extreme nature. (I would like to emphasize that I am not talking about ethnic and racial groups seeking equality and cooperation in attaining their aspirations. At Fresno State we have significant, well-established, many-faceted programs on behalf of these groups, I am talking about organized militants seeking power.)

KEY MOVES

There appear to be four major power drives to change higher education and the social and economic structure of our country. These are:

First, the drive to eliminate administrative authority. From what I have observed, the techniques being used to accomplish this goal seem to follow established revolutionary patterns. An example is the use of delaying parliamentary techniques to subvert democratic action in administrator-faculty and administrator-student activities.

Second, the drive to establish student power on a national basis. We have but to read accounts about demonstrations and violence to identify certain groups and individuals. We have but to read "Towards Student Syndicalism" to learn of the goals of the Students for a Democratic Society. I refer you to the September 9, 1966 issue of New Left Notes. And look what has happened since then!

Third, the drive to replace the AAUP position on academic freedom and academic responsibility with a civil rights position. Without commenting on the merits of this effort to replace professionalism with unionism, I do wish to point out that this drive is gaining momentum.

Fourth, the drive to establish the principle of absolute freedom and absolute sanctuary. This viewpoint is being advanced by various controversial educators who hold extreme views on society and education. In one way or another, most of us today are contending with these power drives which seek to alter higher education substantially.

In California we have been experiencing strong public, legislative and gubernatorial reaction to such organized efforts. More than 200 bills affecting higher education were introduced in this year's session of the state legislature. Many were punitive, some exceedingly dangerous to the future of higher education. The aims include controlling campus disorders, art exhibits, campus theatre productions, faculty hiring, classroom teaching and disciplinary action.

As you might expect, we have been rather busy meeting these challenges—in addition to contending with extremists and activists.

FRESNO APPROACH

One strategy we have used at Fresno State is to involve all elements on our campus—faculty, staff and students—in an examination of academic freedom and academic responsibility. In other words, we are meeting the challenges head on!

After extensive student-faculty-administration consultation, we decided to sponsor this spring an all-college series of four seminars on academic freedom and academic responsibility. (Please keep in mind that we have had our share of demonstrations and organized dissent.) Despite the complications encountered in presenting such a series, we were certain that many useful purposes could be served by such an effort. From a public relations standpoint alone there were six basic values involved.

1. We could expose our own college community (faculty, students and staff) to current concepts and opinions on academic freedom and academic responsibility.
2. We would be able to evaluate more effectively the objectiveness and influence of certain militant groups and individuals.
3. We could expose the general public (and possibly legislators, and state government) to a variety of views on academic freedom and academic responsibility. This would be done through media and attendance at the seminars.
4. We could bring into better public perspective the highly controversial views of one of our young faculty members, a poet.
5. We could present an adequately balanced exposition on academic freedom and academic responsibility without taking too conservative a stand.
6. We could assume a leadership posture by demonstrating publicly, on campus and in our constituency, our concern about academic freedom and academic responsibility.

A five-man committee was appointed to organize the seminars—four members of the faculty and the student body president. Ground rules were established. We worked with the overall recognized faculty and student leadership.

Each of the seminars would have an outside main speaker and three panelists. Each would present varying points of view. Following each seminar a question-and-answer period would be held. Leaders or supporters of the organized militants were represented.

The first three outside speakers were well-known Californians, all basically liberal in their viewpoints. One was an expert on due process. One was a leading civil rights attorney. Another was a noted artist and author. The fourth outside speaker, in the wind-up position, was a nationally known educator and leader, the president of the Association of American Colleges.

The structure of the seminars permitted a head-on examination of the many issues concerning academic freedom and academic responsibility today. The topics were:

Academic Due Process (faculty protection)

The Academy and the First Amendment (civil rights)

The Artist, The Academy, and Society (free expression)

Free Inquiry in a Free Society (the right to explore)

TIMING PLANNED

The time set for the seminars was at an hour which would permit attendance by most interested faculty, student and staff members of the college community. The public was invited. Press coverage was welcomed. The time scheduled for the seminars was from 4 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.

From a media standpoint, this time was an ideal for us. We could obtain extensive visual-audio coverage first, followed the next day by detailed newspaper coverage.

Television. We have three network TV affiliates in Fresno. All have color. The day of each seminar we could set up airport interviews at noontime, insuring six o'clock news coverage at noontime, insuring six o'clock coverage of the principal speaker. This could be followed at 11 o'clock at night with news of what happened at the seminar.

Radio. We could depend on specialized coverage as well as news coverage. An example was a 90-minute question-and-answer appearance by a member of our faculty who was also president of the California Conference of AAUP. This was a listener participation show on the leading radio station of Fresno. The usual time for this show is about 40 minutes. Listener response was so great that the time was extended to 90 minutes.

Newspaper. The leading newspaper in the San Joaquin Valley has always given us extensive coverage on many events. The seminar series not only produced considerable news coverage but also extensive letters-to-the-editor and editorial treatment.

Attendance at the seminars was satisfactory. Significantly, there were no disruptions.

As background for this particular comment, I might add that we have used a low-key but firm approach in dealing with demonstrations, sit-ins and sleep-ins.

First, we attempt to maintain informal but firm dialog.

Second, after a reasonable amount of discussion, we state the rules of the game and outline what we intend to do.

Third, we state clearly the consequences of breaking campus regulations and state laws.

Fourth, we state when we will begin enforcement action and demonstrate that we mean business . . . but quietly.

We have had three significant confrontations thus far. We have not had to use force. However, we are not making any predictions about the future.

Concerning our four seminars, we have been pleased thus far with the results obtained. We attained our six public relations objectives to an adequate degree. We have had responsible and objective coverage by the press. The public is solidly behind the administration of the college. The organized militants, for the most part, have been temporarily neutralized. Two of our constituent state legislators, one a Democrat and the other a Republican, have been helpful at Sacramento.

As a follow-through we are printing and distributing the seminar proceedings in an easy-to-read form. Also, we are arranging for a nationally recognized authority on academic freedom and academic responsibility to provide us with an objective critique of the seminars. We believe the proceedings will provide us with a strategic tool which can be used in many ways.

THE ROLE OF DEFENSE IN AMERICAN LIFE

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, the current debate over the deployment of antiballistic-missile systems, while critically important in itself, is also one facet of a much larger question: the role of military defense in American life. As the world situation has changed and the problems confronting us at home have grown more urgent and critical, it has become clear that our overall priorities for governmental spending and emphasis must be rearranged.

In a perceptive and challenging column published in the Washington Post of Sunday, April 13, Joseph Kraft discussed this problem and the import of the ABM debates on these larger questions. Mr. Kraft's observations and his recommendations for an overall review of the role of defense deserve wide attention. I ask unanimous consent that his column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD GUYS GOING WRONG—BEYOND THE MISSILE DEBATE LOOMS ISSUE OF DEFENSE IN U.S. LIFE

(By Joseph Kraft)

The opponents of the antiballistic missile are good guys with a good cause. But as the fight moves toward a showdown with the return of Congress from the Easter recess, it is more and more apparent that they are in danger of getting hooked on an indiscriminate, symbolic issue.

If the anti-ABM groups are to avoid ignominious defeat, or meaningless victory, they need a general political strategy. Such a strategy needs to move beyond ABM to grapple with the more important elements of the central issue at stake.

The central issue is the role of military defense in American life. Without being very precise, it seems broadly evident that the money being spent on defense purposes and the influence accorded the military, are out of whack with both the decreasing tension abroad and the increasing difficulties at home. The problem is to channel resources away from external defense and toward the more pressing problems here at home.

Superficially, to be sure, all-out opposition to the ABM looks like a good approach to that problem. The Safeguard system, which the Administration backs, will cost an estimated $7 billion.

It is not clearly necessary, and not sure to pan out technically. It has long been opposed by a highly organized and articulate group of scientists. It has begun to draw the fire of the same coalition of popular forces that turned the popular tide against Vietnam.

But closer scrutiny shows that the case against the ABM has several drawbacks. First, there is the matter of provoking the Soviet Union into countermeasures that would set off the deadly spiral of a new arms race.

There are weapons whose development would do just that—in particular, the MIRV (multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicle) program for putting several warheads in a single missile.

The ABM, however, is not a serious danger in this respect. The Russians don't really care whether this country builds, or doesn't build, an ABM. They have indicated they will agree to arms limitation talks either way.

The major monetary savings, moreover, can be made outside the field of strategic weapons. The most promising targets, in fact, are such matters as the billions spent for antisubmarine warfare, for fighting a naval war in the Pacific, or for sophisticated fighter planes.

Finally, there is the matter of what would happen to the President in an ABM showdown. In a knock-down, drag-out fight, Mr. Nixon might become the prisoner of the military and their allies in the Congress for some time to come. But on the major issues of the defense budget, it is always much easier to work with, rather than against, the President.

In these circumstances, it makes sense to look beyond the ABM larger concerns. A one-shot defeat of an ABM appropriations bill, even if it were possible, would be small beer. Far better would be a compromise, giving the President his ABM appropriation, but on the proviso that there be, say, no further development of the MIRV program and only very limited expenditure for ABM pending negotiations with the Soviet Union.

At that stage, there would be a chance to direct public concern away from the trees, not to say twigs, and toward the forests—away from particular weapons systems and toward long-term budgetary and strategic choices. Just how to make this transition requires far more thought than seems yet to have been given to the problem.

But several possibilities come to mind. For one thing, the Congress needs to reshape itself to meet the issue. A special joint committee, with no legislative functions, might well be established to do nothing but scrutinize the role of defense in the budget. This committee should examine very carefully the annual statement of position by the Secretary of Defense. For purposes of comparison, it might demand that a matching statement be put forward by the Secretary of State.

A national commission on the defense budget—grouping not only foreign policy experts but also men committed to solving internal problems—also makes sense. So does the financing of independent academic groups to study the defense budget and possible areas of change.

In this way the anti-ABM effort could begin to move away from a partisan and highly symbolic issue. It could begin to move toward the true goal. That is the development of a process whereby resources can be shifted in a safe and discriminating way from military defense to the more pressing problems that assert themselves at home.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL DRUG ABUSE TREATMENT CENTER AND PILOT RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions memorializing Congress to establish a New England Regional Drug Abuse Treatment Center and Pilot Research Center at the Essex County, Mass., Hospital.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COURT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a New England Regional Drug Abuse Treatment Center and Pilot Research Center at the Essex County Hospital

Whereas, A serious drug abuse problem has been recognized to exist in the New England area in general and the greater Boston area in particular by the Federal Bureau of Drug Abuse Control; and

Whereas, State facilities and programs are known to be inadequate and are unable to render proper care and treatment of narcotic addicts in this area; and

Whereas, The Essex County Hospital in the town of Middleton, Masschusetts has been idle for six years and could be utilized in establishing a modern regional drug abuse treatment center and pilot research center; therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to authorize the establishment of a New England Regional Drug Abuse Treatment Center and Pilot Research Center at the Essex County Hospital in the town of Middleton, Massachusetts; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of each branch of he Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

House of Representatives, adopted, March 19, 1969.

WALLACE C. MILLS,
Clerk.

Senate, adopted in concurrence, March 24, 1969.

NORMAN L. PIDGEON,
Clerk.

Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, APRIL 18, 1969

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, April 18, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 15, 1969:

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Robert Ellsworth, of Kansas, to be the U.S. permanent representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Philip K. Crowe, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

COMMISSION ON AGING

John B. Martin, Jr., of Michigan, to be Commissioner on Aging.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ISRAEL TODAY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have been calling the attention of my colleagues to a series of articles written by Miss Carol Stevens Kovner, written in Israel and giving a vivid firsthand account of the feelings in that nation. Miss Kovner is managing editor and foreign correspondent of Kovner Publications, a newspaper chain in the East Los Angeles area. Following are four more in this series of articles.

[From the Eastside Sun, Feb. 27, 1969]

THE VIEW FROM GAZA: MOST DENSELY POPULATED AREA ON EARTH

(By Carol Kovner)

The road into Gaza town from Beersheba is through a large Moslem cemetery, where little girls play in the dust between the monuments and young men loll against them watching traffic pass.

The unrest rippling through the Gaza Strip these past weeks was not evident among the townspeople who were conducting business, what there was, as usual. The bus depot is also a market place, the most uninviting imaginable. Israeli passengers on the bus, which runs every half hour from Beersheba, were for the most part Jews originally from Arab countries who had come for produce bargains to be wrangled over in their native Arabic. Getting into a rickety cab we careened through the town to the UNRWA compound.

Gaza town is very ugly. Aside from its two refugee camps, it is poor and rundown, bulletholes unrepaired in its buildings and the majority of the population in worn clothing. The reason is because the Gaza Strip is the most densely populated area on earth, with three times more population than the Netherlands, most populated of the European countries. What money there is goes for food and medicine and education.

The Strip has 70 per cent refugees on the UNRWA registration and the rest local population. The huge labor pool has forced the wages of nearly all down to a subsistance level. The only sources of work available, as there is no industry to speak of, are in other Arab countries for the graduates of UNRWA schools and for local labor in the citrus fields, fishing, or handicrafts for the women, mainly embroidery sold through an UNRWA shop in town. Practically the sole employer of Gaza refugees on a meaningful scale remains UNRWA.

UNEF also provided some jobs, the secretary of the UNRWA Director told us at the compound, openly resentful of the moveout. Her attitude reminded us of the Poverty War organizations, many of which were also temporary in nature. When they are discontinued there is great resentment because employees have lost good jobs they may not be able to replace. The UNEF troops departure ordered by Nasser left many refugees dependent again only on the UNRWA dole, a 1600 daily calorie diet—a reducing diet in the U.S.

Israeli authorities understand this employment situation. After Dyan toured the Strip recently he told the Israeli public that the unrest is due to the difficult economic conditions there, urging that 35,000 work hours be allotted to the West Bank and Gaza to maintain a decent economic level. The Military Governor of the Strip, Tat-Aluf Mordechai Gur, has also said there would be fewer acts of terrorism if the standard of living was raised. Israel should invest more in industry and vocational training, he said.

At the Gaza UNRWA Headquarters, Mr. Geaney the Director had gone to troubleshoot at the vocational training center where the students were out of classes and "demonstrating in sympathy to the political situation," a phrase used by most Palestinians we talked to about the strikes. Mr. Filfil, a translator at UNRWA, drove us over to see the center, which was what we had come for. Mr. Geaney was trying to persuade the students to return to class. He said later they would probably return by the end of the week.

The students, who live on the premises in new dormitories were well dressed and well behaved. Most were young men in their twenties. They were sitting in groups on the lawn. The large airy well lighted rooms stood empty, the new equipment imported from Europe lying idle. The teachers waited to see what the students would do.

They were meeting in delegations with the principal, Mr. H. Hammad, a harried Palestinian who had studied in Haifa, then gone on scholarship to England. The students were striking in sympathy to the political situation, he told us. There were 513 at present, but only 1 in 6 were accepted who applied. Since 1954 when it began there have been 1496 graduates all taught by refugees who were given scholarships abroad in England, Switzerland, Sweden, and returned to teach.

What was the employment situation for graduates? There were 380 graduates not able to work in Gaza and not being accepted by the Arab countries, as before the war. Only local residents, not refugees, are taken for labor by the Israelis, untrained labor mostly.

Mr. Hammad said there was enough money and equipment for vocational training; in fact, too much attention was being paid to the vocational training school. It is understandable that he felt this way with his graduates not working and the school being expanded to 556 in September.

Back at UNRWA Headquarters, which was as poor and rundown as the rest of Gaza town, we talked with Mr. Geaney. He has been in Gaza since July, 1967 and with UNRWA since 1952 when he had also served in Gaza. The students can't do less than their colleagues he said, because there is great cohesion among them. If they act any differently, they are looked down upon.

This checked with what an Israeli official had told us in Beersheba, that the people in Gaza are afraid to cooperate remembering 1956 when Gaza was returned to Egypt and "collaborators" were killed. Now they create disturbances so that they can have a piece of paper to show they have been in prison for making trouble for the Israelis. It is not like a school demonstration in Los Angeles where the students are demanding improvements long overdue.

The Jerusalem Post said, "It is widely believed that the demonstrations are instigated by local political activists with the aim of emphasizing the Palestinian element, especially in view of the Four-Power negotiations on the Middle East. They have concentrated on school children to evade countermeasures."

Besides the economic situation and the school strikes in Gaza, the shortage of doctors caused by the Egyptians leaving worried Mr. Geaney. Most doctors come on a voluntary basis or for a very low salary. There are no mental hospitals in Gaza. Mental patients are sent to Israeli hospitals.

There is a $9 million budget for 313,152 registered refugees. (Non-refugees number 141,000.) Those not in the eight camps number 113,378. There are 39,305 registered children not on the UNRWA ration list because of lack of funds. Somehow, they get fed, though, Mr. Geaney told us. When a refugee becomes a wage earner of 1120 liras per month, his ration is cut. Were the rolls inflated, we asked. That has been greatly exaggerated, he said.

There is no vocational training for girls, but there are two six-month sewing courses a year that women can take, and embroidery is encouraged. UNRWA provides for up to the 9th grade in separate girls and boys schools.

What about the anti-semitic textbooks that were used by UNRWA schools and found by the Israelis when they took over the Gaza Strip, we asked. Many were objectionable, he said, and are not being used now. UNESCO has taken over that responsibility. In order for a student to graduate in a host country, it was necessary for UNRWA to follow that country's curriculum, it was felt. A strong position was not taken because the students would not be accepted in the Arab universities unless they studied these textbooks. Only a few students leave for Amman or Beirut at present. Higher education is at a standstill now in Gaza, he summed up.

The stumbling block may be the Arab university examinations, but we still feel that distributing hate textbooks was a peculiar thing for a humanitarian organization like UNRWA to do. An Israeli told us that Jewish children are not taught to hate the Arabs because first it is your enemy you kill with hatred, later it can be your brother. . . .

Why can't Israel annex Gaza and work with American Jews and the international community to settle the refugees, we had asked the Israeli official in Beersheba the day before. No, he said, it is a political problem and we can't. In Gaza it would not be the same as Jerusalem where there is daily contact and the reality of the united city.

In Newsweek Magazine, in answer to Nasser's interview in the same magazine, Prime Minister Eshkol has said, "any refugees returning now to Israel would be a time bomb. We cannot take them back but we are ready to pay compensation."

The only solution the Israelis feel is for the Arab countries to take them in, because for one thing, Israel hasn't the water to support them. Then almost 50 per cent of the Israelis are of Oriental background. This means they came from the Arab countries, so most Israelis feel it was an exchange of populations. An exchange, Arab politicians like Nasser, have turned into a convenient political football which is not a life or death issue to them, says Eshkol.

So the 380 graduates of the Gaza Vocational Training Center run by UNRWA, ready for careers in radio, TV, mechanics, what the Arab world needs most, vegetate. As idle as the ships in the Bitter Lakes and as caught.

[From the Eastside Sun, Mar. 6, 1969]

TWO STUDENTS KILLED IN TERRORIST BOMBING OF JERUSALEM SUPER MARKET

(By Carol Stevens Kovner)

While the Friday morning dynamite took the lives of two immigrant students and injured nine other shoppers in the terrorist explosion at the Jerusalem SuperSol market, I was interviewing a woman who calls them freedom fighters.

Wife of the former Jordanian Ambassador to England before 1967 and onetime Defense Minister, Mrs. Anwar Nusseiba is a pretty young darkhaired woman, softspoken and the mother of six children, two grown daughters with families. She has a reputation as a militant feminist and a militant nationalist.

Her husband is now legal consultant to UNRWA.

The Nusseiba home is on the former border between East and West Jerusalem, next to what is left of the Jordanian Army Headquarters, mostly rubble. To reach it from Mea Shersam or the Jewish Orthodox Quarter, you can cross the former Mandlebaum Gate area and pick your way across the old no-man's area where there is a new street but few sidewalks. The house looks battered from the outside because it was in the most furious part of the battle for Jerusalem, but it is pleasantly furnished inside.

Both the Nasseiba family and the El Ghoussein, her family from Ramla, are old wealthy landowning families. The Nusseibas have held the key to the Holy Sepulchre since the 12th Century. "We owned property in Ramla, orange groves, in Gaza, all over the area," Mrs. Nusseiba told me. "My mother grew up in wealth and I will never forget when we left, she had to beg for a blanket to cover me. We had to walk 90 kilometers to Jordan."

I responded to her painful memory, but I also remembered a girl I had met on the Greek ship coming to Israel. Her mother's wedding ring, all that was left to her after property, business and belongings had to be left behind, was taken from her before they would let her leave Egypt. It is a familiar refugee story Mrs. Nusseiba told, but I have heard countless Jewish versions the past months recent refugees from the Arab countries, not Europe. From communities that are hundreds of years old, or were. There are two sides to the coin.

"They want to live peacefully they say," she went on. "Look at what they are doing with Jerusalem. Katamon. This is all Arab property. Is this a legal thing?"

Katamon is a very poor district geographically situated on the outskirts of Jerusalem, a slum really. It is where thousands of refugee families from the Arab countries were settled in haste in jerry-built stone and stucco apartments that look as if they will tumble down any minute. Many who live there still wear Arab dress, but they are all Jewish. Old Bucharians, with rags wrapped Oriental-style around their heads and necks against the Jerusalem cold, ride every day on the bus with their grandchildren who dress well and speak Hebrew. But the old folk still speak Arabic. Katamon could be an Arab village if you did not know the origin.

The Pioneer Women nursery for working mothers I visited in Katamon is filled to overflowing with the children of the immigrants, tiny boys with little black cheek curls, little girls, all very dark skinned. Just over the back fence outside their playground is the Jerusalem-Tel Aviv railway. Before the 1967 War, the Jordanian border was on the other side of the tracks, a few hundred feet away.

Why are they there? Because before the 1967 war, Jerusalem was the dumping ground for thousands of destitute families and they had to be put into homes and quickly. Not clapped into camps for 20 years and left to rot as in Gaza, but absorbed into the only country that would accept them all, the sick and destitute and the old.

"In the long run, we are going to live together" Mrs. Nusseiba said once, "but we don't want all this conflict they are creating. We don't want their rule. In Jerusalem they are bringing their people here . . . there should be a Jewish side and an Arab side, but one city with some legal connection." This was a rare moment of logic in the stream of resentment and hatred she poured out on the Israeli occupation. "The Jews are the last people in the world to do this to another people," she cried.

"After 2000 years of being refugees, 20 years you can't go back? I have to laugh when I talk to them and they say they can't go backward."

The woman who showed me the Katamon nursery had been in tears the whole trip. A boy who had shown great promise had just been killed the morning before. His father had been a brilliant general in the 1956 war and killed in Sinai. In Tel Aviv a friends sister-in-law is slowly going mad, crying her womb is poisoned. She lost her 6-year-old daughter to the violence of Arab villagers who raped and killed her. She has just lost her son while doing his term in the army. Go backward 20 years to what, they would ask if they were alive, these sabras who were born in Israel.

"Politics is the real barbarian," Mrs. Nusseiba told me. "It is a monster to the Arab people." With their politics the world is killing the Palestine people. The Russians, the British, they are killing us. Where is the human consideration?

"Why do they feel with the Jews? Do they expect us to live under his thumb?," she asked. "It is my land, my water, my history! But it is very difficult to go back. If we could have the 1947 partition, we could have some of the Arab rights."

"The freedom fighters" she exclaimed as her face lit up, "how can they be called terrorists?" At that moment the bodies of the two students were carried away, in the market I would have been in if I hadn't been talking with Mrs. Nusseiba, for the SuperSol is where I shop every Friday morning.

"We want our name, our nationality, same as any nation in the world." What about the idea of a federation of states in the area, I asked her. It might be a good idea, she said, but I don't know politics. She was one of the most politically-minded women I have ever met.

When asked at a public meeting whether he favored an independent Palestine state General Dayan said, "Were elected representatives of the occupied territories population to approach Israeli government and negotiate for peace, I would advocate we sit down together."

He administers the areas with as light a hand as possible. In the recent school strikes, he went to Gaza and the West Bank schools and told the students and their teachers the Israelis would not interfer with their demonstrations if they were contained in the schools. The Israel government has lifted some of the restrictions on employment from Gaza to ease the situation there a little. Although the Vocational School in Gaza that I visited erupted the next week, it is quiet now.

The terrorism and unrest is to be lived with, say the Israeli leaders, if necessary, for a long time. Until there is an agreed peace and secure borders.

[From the Eastside Sun, Mar. 20, 1969]

Some Realities in the Middle East—Roots of Many Problems Scrutinized

(By Carol Stevens Kovner)

There is a small suburb outside of Jericho, on the West Bank, near the Jordan River. It was used as a winter home before the 1967 war, initiated on this front by the Jordanians, by many Jordanian and Arab diplomats and businessmen. It is abandoned, the once luxurious homes empty, plumbing torn out, light fixtures gone, windows and doors smashed. Goat droppings litter the floors of the rooms. One home was obviously used as a stable this winter. Mortar shells lie scattered around the gravel streets. Trees and shrubs are dying for lack of water and fences are pushed over at crazy angles. A Jewish star is on the wall of one house.

The Israel Defense Forces were quartered here for one year following the victory, then left, promising compensation to the owners for all damage by them. When we visited it we found a fresh cigarette box from Amman on the ground. The two Jordanian Arabs and the Israeli journalist with me were convinced that the Fatah were using the houses as a day hideout.

One of the Arabs, who was born in Jerusalem, was working as a policeman for the Israelis. We were curious why he was cooperating so openly with them. "The Fatah will get you," the Israeli joked with him, but he was very young and serious about his job. "I must work," he said simply. "I can't work in a factory."

When we entered Jericho, he removed his jacket and in the suburb where we found the Amman cigarette box he was frightened. Later he said he was coming to America to work for his uncle in New York. There are Jews in New York, too, we told him. "Are you planning to do what Sirhan Sirhan did to Kennedy?" the Israeli joked. The boy smiled, "Politics and business are separate."

We lunched at a large restaurant that had been popular with tourists before the war and now was empty, the patio pool full of scum. "Jazz music" or machine gun fire sounded in the streets while we ate. A swimming pool was filled with Israeli soldiers getting relief from the muggy heat.

We visited a former refugee family that had settled in Jericho. The Israeli who was a historian and worked on the Dead Sea Scrolls dig had known them for years. The host, dressed Kuwaiti style in a long white robe, was very hospitable. There were three brothers and four wives with 27 children living in three houses next to each other. It was a happy family, prosperous seeming. The children wandered in to be teased by the Israeli and to shake everyone's hand around the room. They were part Negro, descended from slaves.

On the way back to Jerusalem, we passed huge deserted refugee camps built of mud wattle and slowly melting back into the red earth in the salty ominous air. High above, plastered against a cliff like a bird's nest, was a Christian monastery. Below, in a fruit tree grove was a mosaic synagogue floor with the Hebrew words "Peace upon Israel." As it was getting dark, the Judean hills would soon be dotted with the flashlights of soldiers, looking for Fatah terrorists who traveled at night to get into the city. Very few did.

One hundred terrorists were rounded up in Jerusalem after the SuperSol explosion in which two students were killed. Most were residents of East Jerusalem, Gaza and Ramalah. Evidence was found proving the Fatah cells in Jerusalem were being directed by the Egyptian government.

A chain was reconstructed from professionals in Jerusalem, including a clergyman of the Anglican church in Ramalah, a prominent doctor, a lawyer, and teachers, that extended to an escaped woman terrorist now based in Amman. From evidence, said the police spokesman David Barelli, who announced the cracking of the ring, it was obvious that she received her orders from the Egyptian Embassy in Amman. Enough explosives was discovered, some in private houses, to blow up the heart of Jerusalem. While the terrorists were being rounded up, crowds of children in fanciful Purim costumes paraded the streets of Jerusalem for days and life went on normally.

The group is believed responsible for much of the student demonstrations in Gaza and the West Bank this winter. Israelis are inclined to wink at the demonstrations by school girls because they feel the youngsters are easily led at that age, by radio or by leaders such as those arrested in Jerusalem. They feel the schools are not up to standard anyway, and the additional missing out of classes hurts the students most. Not the Israelis.

Shooting along the Suez Canal, initiated by the Egyptians says General Odd Bull, Chief UN Observer, has cost them heavily. In the exchange which has gone on intermittently for days, and seems a political maneuver to many, for the purpose of attracting big power attention to the area before the talks. Suez oil refineries, and tankers were hit, and Major General Riad, Egyptian Chief of Staff was killed.

The sudden death by heart attack of Israelis' Prime Minister Levi Eshkol will put Golden Meir at the Helm until the next elections. The former foreign Minister, she is reputed to be a hardliner, unlike Eshkol who would take second best when he could not get first best. Eshkol kept the quarrelsome political parties in the National Unity Government together and it looks as if the same government will be kept until November.

There are many jokes in Israel about Mrs. Meir not listening to the "people in the street," only her Labor Party or the Old Guard. A cartoon by Dosh, showing a startled young Israeli looking at the reflection of Golda Meir in a mirror (she is 70) sums up the mood of the "street," the young Israelis.

[From the Wyvernwood Chronicle, Mar. 27, 1969]

Israel's Iron Jewish Mama—Press Conference With Prime Minister Meir

(By Carol Stevens Kovner)

At her first press conference after being sworn in as Israel's first woman Prime Minister, Golda Meir rejected categorically a Four-Power solution to the problems of the Middle East.

Referring to the idea of a new United Nations peace force composed of the United States and Russia, she was mildly surprised at Russia being one of the two, "since its contribution to peace in the area has been so outstanding." Russia was never the staunchest friend we have ever had, she added at another point in the press conference with a wry smile.

She described the "evaporation" of the UNEF troops just before the 1967 war (the Egyptians asked them to leave), and said, "we are asked to put our faith in the same force for the third time . . . So what? Will it be any different than 1949 and 1967? You all know what happened—they were asked to leave and they left."

On West Bank policy, she said, "As long as there is no peace agreement with us and our Arab neighbors, we stand where we are. We will do our duty to all the inhabitants of the West Bank. We will do everything possible for welfare, education and so on. They will find out it is not so terrible to live with us."

"I don't understand the world sympathy to the lack of will of Arabs to come to a peace settlement. The question is this, are the Arabs ready to live in peace with us? It is too simple. Maybe that is why it is so hard to explain to our friends.

"Until they are, NOTHING will happen. The Arabs have to be faced with the problem. We say yes to peace . . . they have 101 answers, but not one to open the road to a peaceful solution."

She told reporters she was ready to go to Amman to meet with Hussein for negotiation, although Golda Meir in Amman is not exactly what the little King, as he is called in Israel, needs right now. Between Nassar and the terrorists, he doesn't need the iron Jewish Mama, too. "I don't think he has any doubts. He knows Israel is ready to meet him. If he is prepared, certainly we are," she told reporters.

"Nobody has proved to us why it is so outlandish to expect a signed peace settlement. The only peculiarity is that the party that won the war is asking for the agreement. It is not something new for Arabs and Israel to sign an agreement . . . but it seems we must now convince our friends there is no alternative to a peace settlement."

On negotiating with the Fatah, "not today, not for several years from now can we consider them as partners in negotiations. Their heroism is expressed in marketplace murders. That does not make them a partner for negotiation to my mind."

"Jordan civilians may have been hurt but no one can say rightly that Israel attacked civilians. If Fatah bases are built near civilian villages, we are sorry about hitting them, but no one can compare THAT with marketplaces. A supermarket is not the military base of the Israeli Army."

Regarding the new settlements in the occupied areas, she said, "How many settlements did we put up in the first months after the war? If Israel is worried about security, it is its duty to do everything possible, if necessary to put up settlements on the other side of the 'Green Line,' so that children don't have to sleep in shelters."

It would be too good, she said with gentle humor, if there was an agreement right away with President Nixon. It is natural to have different views, not necessarily contrary ones. The talks with the President and his cabinet will go on.

But the United States and our other friends must realize we must have borders that will not tempt the Arabs to attack us, as the former borders on the Golan Heights (transformed to one long underground fortress overlooking the farms below), she explained.

Asked what Israel would do if the Four Powers try to force Israel to an imposed solution, she said. "When life depends on decisions, a little country will take them. We will not depend on the good will of Nassar or a UN force—we want secure borders. The Arab countries must have no natural advantage over us. We do not fool ourselves—war breaks out between those countries with peace agreements."

Golda Meir looked in good health, her voice clear and feminine, her manner positive and down-to-earth. Her face normally stern, lit up when someone asked her if she considered herself a "stopgap" until the October elections. "Did I call myself a stop gap," she laughed.

Mrs. Meir has been 48 years in Israel. She was born in Kiev, Russia in 1898. Her family moved to the U.S., to Milwaukee, in 1906. She still has a pronounced midwestern accent. When she married she moved to Israel with her husband. She had a son and a daughter. Some of her long government experience was gained in the Mo'etzet Hapo'alot or pioneer Women in 1928 which launched her on her public career. She came out of retirement to become Secretary-General of the Mapai and later the united Israel Labor Party. In August, 1968, she again resigned.

She was reluctant to accept the premiership because, she said "Obviously I am not an infant. It was the decision of my party to take this post—I took it."

HONOR PAID TO REPRESENTATIVE TIM LEE CARTER OF KENTUCKY

HON. MARLOW W. COOK

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, the young people of the Fifth Congressional District of Kentucky have shown down through the years that they recognize the outstanding qualities of leadership which have been exhibited by their Representative, Dr. Tim Lee Carter. To pay tribute to him, they came from all over southeastern Kentucky to a dinner in his honor which was held at Cumberland Falls State Park near London, Ky.

Representative Carter knows that a student or a young person who is interested and involved is much less likely to want to take over administrations and tear down college buildings. He has gotten the young people of his district involved and interested in government, both in Washington and at home, and I think it is in part a tribute to Dr. Carter that the campuses in his area have not experienced such unrest.

I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper account of the dinner in his honor, published in the Columbia Statesman, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Countians Among 400 at Falls To Pay Tribute to Dr. Carter

(By Phil Aaron and Ed Waggener)

On Saturday night, March 15, 1969, over 500 young men and women from the 24 counties of Kentucky's Fifth Congressional District gathered to pay their respects to and show their appreciation for their Congressman, Dr. Tim Lee Carter. It was an event unparalleled, without precedence in the Republican Party of Kentucky.

These young partisans were not protesting; they were not rebelling, striking, or seizing control of a university, nor were they honoring a retiring or past leader. They were, however, pledging an affirmative vote of confidence in a man who has earned their respect and support.

Their plea, in effect, was: Congressman Carter, we want more of the same.

Tim Lee Carter has gained the overwhelming support of those constituents of his under 30 because he understands them and has gone to bat for them. It seemed an appropriate night for this tribute; that same night Kentucky high school basketball teams were making their final eliminations for the "greatest show on earth"—the Kentucky State High School basketball tournament. Carter himself was once a high school roundball coach and he himself directed three teams to the Sweet 16. But when everyone else in Kentucky was thinking basketball, an overflow, turnaway crowd wedged into DuPont Lodge, at Cumberland Falls, Kentucky, to show their appreciation for Dr. Carter.

In Kentucky, citizens gain the right to vote when they reach the age of 18. Dr. Carter has made an effort to solicit the views of this younger, come-alive generation, and in turn he exhibits some of the zeal and exuberance they have for his campaigns. In an age where the typical American has a potbellied midriff bulge, Kentucky youth are proud to read that their 58 year old Congressman has defeated Olympic champion Bob Mathias in a game of handball in Washington.

Many of today's youth regard their parents as old fogeys who don't understand them. Carter has attempted to keep in touch with the problems and concerns of the younger set, and has help from his teenage son, Billy Star. When Congress did not renew its summer intern program for college students, he continued to provide the valuable experience of a summer in Washington, out of his own pocket.

But most important of all, Carter has built up a rapport with his younger constituents through his actions in Congress. He has had enough integrity to stand and be counted. He was one of the first Congressmen to attack our Vietman involvement on the floor of the House. He has pointed out the inequities in the selective service's draft, even though he himself volunteered as a combat medic in World War II. He voted for the unpopular income tax surcharge because he believed failure to do so would have disastrous effects upon our economy. And he opposed a salary increase without grandstanding. We hill people like for our congressman to perform this way.

On the political side, Dr. Carter has endorsed candidates in controversial campaigns on issues of conscience and principle even though it was evident that his district would vote heavily for another candidate. Perhaps his greatest contribution is his grasp of perspective. Congressman Carter not only says today's youth will be tomorrow's leaders; he believes it enough to put into practice what he preaches.

A side that rarely comes to light is his depth of knowledge as a scholar of Kentucky history and of Abraham Lincoln. Among his favorite Lincoln quotations is, "I shall be governed by the will of my constituents on all subjects upon which I have the means of knowing what their will is." Dr. Carter has led in the causes his people would have him to.

OPERATION FISHBASKET

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I recently read a column by Bob Miller in the Vero Beach Press-Journal and commend it to my colleagues of the House.

I am extremely proud of Bob Miller and constituents of mine who were worried about their fellow human beings, worried enough to bring great quantities of food to those who supposedly needed it. I think we can all agree that the problem of hunger in this country should not be ignored, but must be solved. I think we can further agree that the use of hunger as a political football is to be avoided.

The article follows:

BOB MILLER SEARCHES IN VAIN FOR IMMOKALEE'S HUNGRY MASSES

(By Bob Miller)

It all started on these pages, so it is only fitting it should be brought to a conclusion here.

"Operation Fishbasket" was actually a worthwhile project when subjected to deontological thinking. Whether the need was actually as acute as portrayed or not, the participants in its doing should be commended highly for their efforts. And this is the way it was.

Last week, this writer, after perusing several articles in journals conveying the events transpiring in our great state, concluded there was a need in an area that could be filled by an excess in another area. The excess being that of bluefish being caught in the Indian River area, as opposed to the reputed lack of good food in the farming district in Collier County, or, more exactly, Immokalee.

APPEAL

I appealed to all of the good citizens hereabouts to contribute what might otherwise be a waste to what I considered a worthwhile cause, that of transporting fish which might have been thrown away to indigent farm workers. Because many of our area's citizens have hearts as big as all outdoors, the appeal met with not only an excess of fish but many other staples of food that were purchased and donated to the cause.

So much was donated that I had to make another appeal for transportation to get it to its destination. Hobart Brothers Company met the appeal with the loan of a pick-up truck. Not only that, but Bob Dempsey, who works for Hobart, offered to drive the truck on his day off. Ed Belanger, brother-in-law to Dempsey, also gave us his day off to assist in the transporting of the fish 'n food to its southern destination.

Saturday morning found the three of us with a load of fish leaving from the Vero Beach Fish Camp. Another stop in Ft. Pierce added another 800 pounds of food which was brought about by the generosity and efforts of Henry Beuttell and his friends. That left us with one big truckload of food and we were on our way.

As the crow flies it is not too great a distance from Vero Beach to Immokalee. However, unless you have an amphibious vehicle, it is best that you skirt the edge of Lake Okeechobee, which we did. If you think there is one highway that can be traversed the whole way, forget it. You have combinations like highways 27, 29, 89 and several other lesser known access roads that lead to the highways.

NEW COUNTIES

The trip was interesting in that it went through several counties that I had heretofore not traversed. I was most impressed with the name of Hendry County. It was quite obvious that the name was derived from the fact that Joe Hendry lives there. If he doesn't own the whole county it would surprise me. He at least owns a lot of land that has to its credit many head of cattle and at least three or four oil wells.

We stopped at a place called LaBelle and had lunch. Now here's a place that poverty couldn't possibly exist. There's enough beef on the hoof in that area to start a packing house that would be the envy of Chicago. We had three hamburgers and three Cokes to the tune of $2.50.

DESTINATION

We finally arrived at our destination—Immokalee. We immediately set about looking for people with their eyes sunken into their heads and their stomachs bloated with hunger. It was apparent that they were not to be found in the downtown area, so we stopped at a gas station. It was obvious this place needed something, although it might not have been food. We prevailed upon the owner to give us some much needed information as to the whereabouts of the starving masses.

He allowed as how he didn't know of such masses so we were a little more explicit. Where is the migrant laborer's camp that houses the migrant farm laborers? Again our informant allowed as how there wasn't exactly any particular place where they all stayed, but if you looked around you could probably find them almost anywhere.

This was made quite obvious by the fact that several persons of unknown heritage gathered around the truck and became very informative. Some were from Texas and others from New Hampshire or other faraway places. When queried on the location of their starving brethren they all looked at me as though I were sort of stupid.

HUDDLE

Ed called a huddle and it was concluded that they were hiding their indigents from all outsiders and particularly members of the press. With this we called upon the gas station owner to put us in touch with the local welfare office representative. He commented that he didn't rightly know who that was, but he would call someone who would help us find him. A few minutes that seemed like hours (we had now become quite a spectacle), a gentleman arrived on the scene and introduced himself as Stan Wrisley, editor of the Immokalee Bulletin.

After a short conversation it was concluded that we needed the services of Captain Harold M. Reece, who among other things, is the local Episcopal minister, president of the Immokalee Migrant Committee and head of the chamber of commerce.

We picked up Captain Reece at his house and then set off in search of some starving migrant workers. We visited a certain section of the laborers' quarters where it was known that one worker with a total of 16 children did have quite a time making ends meet. An interview with this father of 16 revealed that he was rather disposed to working two jobs to keep his family fed, but he was also steadfast in his feeling toward all those d——— politicians that kept stirring things up.

QUOTE

He said, "We don't need that kind of folks coming down here. All they do is make it look bad for us and good for them. There ain't none of my kids go hungry no time and iffun they do I'll sure go out and get it (food) for them." He further stated, "If they would quit giving themselves raises every time they turn around, they would be more left for the poor folks."

Our next stop was at a camp where it was reported that Indians were living under the most primitive of conditions in thatched huts with mud floors. That the living conditions were such there is no doubt. However, the report failed to mention that this was a way of life for these people and they prefer it that way. Their total outlay for utilities, rent, etc. is $5 per family per month. I couldn't help but note how clean the area around the houses was, and the array of flowers that bloomed in front of almost every door. The fact that there was a good looking 1968 Ford station wagon parked in front of the door of one house, owned by the tenant, gave the subject of poor conditions its full perspective.

POLITICS

So it would seem that Senator McGovern and his erstwhile political efforts have no real foundation. They have debased a small southern community in an effort to gain recognition as a humanitarian by using a smattering of truth out of context. Conditions are poor, there is no doubt about that, but so are they in some areas of Indian River County and for that matter almost every community in the United States.

We did however succeed in putting our wagon load of food in the hands of Miss Blake Palmer, the county nurse, and its distribution will be allotted by one Marion Feather, the local social services worker and truant officer. We were assured that its distribution would meet with our intention and that only those who were in real need would benefit by our efforts.

NICE PEOPLE

There are a lot of nice people in Immokalee and I am most gratified that I was afforded the opportunity of meeting some of them. They were most cordial and invited me to visit any time and explore the existing conditions to my heart's content if I so desired.

So in the dusk of another Saturday, Bob Dempsey, Ed Belanger and Bob Miller wound their way home satisfied with the fact that our job had been done as most of the people who so generously contributed their time and efforts would want it done.

TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, on April 11, the Washington Metropolitan Area Council of Governments marked its 12th anniversary of service to the people of the Capital region. The organization had its beginning in the informal discussions of a group of local government officials who recognized the regional character of many of their problems and the need for metropolitanwide action to solve them.

Since then, the council of governments has become a focal point for a united attack on the urban problems of the area and has made an outstanding record in dealing with such problems as air and water pollution, crime, housing, and transportation. In the years ahead, we shall be depending more and more on regional cooperation in meeting the urban challenge. The council of governments has shown us the way.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech by Frederick A. Babson, chairman of the board of supervisors of Fairfax County, before the North Central Texas Council of Governments. Mr. Babson was recently elected president of the National Service to Regional Councils.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Remarks of Frederick A. Babson, Chairman, Board of Supervisors, Fairfax County, Va., to the Annual Meeting of the North Central Texas Council of Governments, January 28, 1969

Your metropolitan area and mine are similar in many important respects. We both have more than two million people, and in Metropolitan Washington this is now approaching the three million mark. We are both expected to continue population growth. The population projected for the Dallas-Fort Worth region in the Year 2000 is six million. Just two weeks ago we were told that our projected population in the Year 2000 is between seven and nine million.

We both have the same problems—crime, transportation, pollution, water supply, land use and a variety of other problems which are complex in nature and regional in scope.

We both have chosen the same political mechanism for working toward the solution of these regional problems, the council of governments. We both have similar programs through our COG, and we both have won awards from the Department of Housing and Urban Development for outstanding achievements in intergovernmental relations, so we both must be doing something right.

Throughout my political career I have been interested in and committed to the regional approach to regional problems. I have always been convinced, and defended this conviction when it became an issue in my most recent campaign, that we need a regional organization of our local governments if we are to do anything at all about our metropolitan problems. And in the campaign where my regionalism became an issue and my opponent showed a provincial attitude, I was the one elected.

Today we need no further evidence of the need for a united approach by our local governments. Now we must demonstrate in the face of these staggering issues whether we want to improve the life we lead and the world in which we live, or whether we want to mortgage our own futures and those of our children, leaving succeeding generations an urban world far worse than the one we inherited from our fathers. In this very real sense we must decide, you and I, whether, in the words of Thomas Wolfe, "the true discovery of America before us"—whether "the true fulfillment of our mighty and immortal land is yet to come."

This is the real meaning of the decisions facing us today, and we are challenged to meet these issues through a new device. Abraham Lincoln was faced with the same set of circumstances. (We Democrats in Washington are finding it advisable these days to quote a Republican once in a while.) Lincoln said of his time: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion." Then he said: "As our case is new, so we must think anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

It is heartening to me that the local elected officials of this country are embracing with enthusiasm and hope the council of governments' strategy against our problems. COGs now function in 115 metropolitan areas of the United States, in a manner and organization similar to the North Central Texas Council of Governments and our own in Washington. This clearly is the most significant development in American local government in the Twentieth Century.

In Metropolitan Washington, our local elected officials established our Council of Governments twelve years ago, and I would like to share our experiences with you and describe our current attitudes. My own County covers an area of over 400 square miles and has a population of more than 435,000, the largest city or county in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Our annual budget is about $200 million and that, like the population, is going up too.

But we long ago realized the futility of trying to wrestle with regional problems by ourselves, despite our size and our resources. We know that air pollution respects no city limits or county lines, that congested traffic for a man who lives in the suburbs and works in the city must be unclogged in both places if it is to mean anything to him. We know that reducing the crime in the city doesn't achieve much if criminals can use the freeways of our suburbs and increase their crimes there. We have learned what John Donne wrote over three hundred years ago, that, indeed, "No man is an island."

After twelve years of voluntary regional cooperation through our Council of Governments, I can assure you of the willingness of my elected colleagues to meet the spirit and the letter of intergovernmental cooperation. We have found that this demands time of ourselves, and money of our taxpayers. But we have paid these prices willingly and consistently because not to do so would require a far greater price. That would be the continued worsening of our problems. We reject this price.

Thus we in Metropolitan Washington have joined in this united attack on our urban ills, guided voluntarily, not through a metropolitan government because we don't want one, but guided voluntarily from the local level, where it should be, through the only logical means, our own Council of Governments. We have even paid the price in more local dollars and more of our own time—uncompensated time—to expand this attack through our COG. We have done this because we know it constitutes the only real hope for solving our metropolitan problems and achieving the good life which now lies within our political and technological grasps. To do less would be to betray our present and our future.

We have found in Metropolitan Washington that through this regional approach we have been able to produce specific results: such as a guide local air pollution ordinance adopted by all but one major local government in our urban area, and that one is expected to adopt an ordinance in the next few weeks; such as an area-wide police computer containing data from all police departments in the region and placing it at the split-second disposal of any policeman walking a beat or driving a cruiser anywhere in the Washington area; such as the most complete transportation survey ever conducted in the Washington area, involving interviews of more than 100,000 persons to determine their travel needs so as to aid us in developing a regional transportation plan; such as a radio and teletype network providing a communications link among the local police and fire departments. These are some samples of what we have been able to do, and what any council of governments can achieve.

In one other no less vital area COGs can accomplish what no other kind of organization today can, and that is in achieving regional economies by eliminating duplication. This can be accomplished by employing what we call the COG umbrella, by bringing under the council of governments those agencies and functions which logically belong there. On this I would like to tell you of a personal experience.

I was privileged to lead the fight in the early 1960s in our region for the establishment of a Transportation Planning Board to develop a comprehensive transportation plan for our future needs. The Board was established in 1965, and I was pleased to serve as its Chairman for the first two years of its existence.

My first priority as Chairman was to bring our Transportation Planning Board under our COG umbrella, to combine the organization conducting transportation planning for the area with the organization conducting all other planning for the area, since our COG, like yours, is our regional planning agency. It is not often that a Chairman is anxious to relieve his organization of its independent status, but I was convinced this was necessary in the interest of coordination and economy and, equally importantly, to combine all planning programs and recommendations into the only regional organization of elected local officials, the ones who make regional planning decisions.

This was accomplished, and in the process I was fortunate to be one of those elected officials who recruited the services of our extremely capable and greatly respected Executive Director, who is with me this afternoon, Mr. Walter Scheiber.

Now our region's Transportation Planning Board is a part of our Council of Governments and is our transportation policy arm. Its staff is part of our general COG staff, and Mr. Scheiber is Executive Director of both organizations.

You, I know, are experiencing the same success. You have won respect across the Nation with your Regional Police Academy and Training Institute. You have begun, as we have, a realistic regional planning approach and you are working on some of the same projects we are, such as coordinating the activities of your local governments in the 1970 census, analyzing the vital question of water supply and establishing a new regional law enforcement planning program.

And the Texas General Assembly has shown the rest of our State legislatures how to get things done by approving Governor Connolly's imaginative recommendations for State financial assistance to councils of governments.

We have experienced in Washington, too, the value of educating our fellow officials, the staff members of our local governments and the people in general—that means the voters to you and me—on what we are doing together, and this is essential to the success of any voluntary regional undertaking.

On March 2, 1836, four days before the fall of the Alamo before Santa Anna's hordes, 59 men signed the Texas Declaration of Independence in a blacksmith shop at Washington-on-the-Brazos River. Part of that declaration said: "It is an axiom in political science that unless a people are educated and enlightened, it is idle to expect the continuance of civil liberty, or the capacity for self-government."

It is idle, in our own context, to expect the continuance of this political innovation of mid-Twentieth Century urban America, and the bright promise which this strategy holds, unless we educate each other and our citizens on what we are doing, what we propose to do, and how we propose to do it. Our experience in Washington, where our local officials have long followed the practice of encouraging public support and understanding for this endeavor, is that it is necessary and it works. No cooperative venture of this kind can be truly productive without the knowledge and support of the citizens involved.

In a simpler time and a simpler place, Henry David Thoreau wrote: "If one advances confidently in the direction of his dreams, and endeavors to live the life which he has imagined, he will meet with a success unexpected in common hours."

We have an opportunity to achieve the kind of success of which Thoreau wrote. Never before in the recorded history of mankind have a people been given the ability to bend the world to their choosing, to be the beneficiaries of their technology and not its victims, to make their urban living centers come alive, rather than presiding over their ruin.

These are our bright opportunities, yours and mine, and our stark alternatives. What we do, and what we do not do, will determine whether we will live the life of our dreams and reach our own fulfillment.

If we fail, we fail ourselves, and we mortgage the futures of our children. If this be our decision, history may well write that in the last half of the Twentieth Century, in metropolitan America, mere survival constituted man's supreme achievement.

Thank you.

PAN AM TO FEATURE SOPHISTICATED EQUIPMENT WHEN IT PREMIERS BOEING 747 THIS YEAR

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in a unique and unprecedented fashion, the new inertial navigation system which will be used in Pan American World Airways' fleet of 33 giant Boeing 747's was put to the test recently. It passed with flying colors.

Because the North Pole is one of the world's most difficult navigational zones, Pan Am thought it would be an unusual and interesting experience to swing its regular nonstop London-Seattle flight 850 miles north of its usual route to allow the system to prove itself.

As flight No. 123 flew over the white polar plains, Pan Am Capt. Olaf Abrahamsen told the 47 passengers:

> You are flying over the North Pole using the very latest navigational equipment which will be used in the aircraft of the future.

He then watched the two Carousel display units register the 90° latitude and 0° longitude which confirmed that the aircraft was cruising directly over the pole.

Later the captain gave each passenger a personalized certificate showing a map of the route and a picture of Adm. Robert E. Peary who discovered the pole 60 years ago next month.

Most present aircraft rely upon celestial, long-range radio or radar systems. Developed by General Motors' A.C. Electronics Division, the Carousel IV, as the system is called, is one of the first navigational aids to tell the pilot precisely where he is at any given moment as well as his relationship in time and distance to any point on the earth's surface. The information is updated every few seconds and flashed onto the display unit in a fraction of a second. Also included are statistics on true course, winds and other factors affecting navigation.

Not only is the mechanism capable of absorbing and producing an unlimited amount of information, it takes up less aircraft space than presently used Pan Am radar systems, weighs some 30 percent less and is completely compatible with automatic approach and landing systems.

> It, in effect, drives the airplane. The pilot merely monitors it—

Explains Captain Abrahamsen.

The system is governed by three floated gyroscopes used to maintain a stable reference, unaffected by aircraft motion. It is the fourth in a generation of such aircraft systems developed by General Motors which has also produced the navigational equipment used by the Apollo and other space programs.

The Carousel IV is now being tested by Pan Am on three 165-passenger Boeing 707's. It will be widely used for the first time after Pan Am's introduction of the 362-passenger Boeing 747's this winter. The company has purchased three such systems for each Boeing 747 for double back-up purposes at a total cost of $300,000 per aircraft.

THE PRESIDENT'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

HON. JAMES B. ALLEN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, there is much that is commendable in President Nixon's message to Congress in which he outlined his legislative program. This would seem to be evidenced by some bills already under consideration by Congress which are designed to achieve the same objectives. I commend the President also on his awareness of certain problems which he expressed in the following phrases: "the growing impotence of Government"; "the overshift of jurisdiction and responsibility to Federal Government"; and his recognition of the fact that "too often Federal funds have been wasted or used unwisely."

In addition, I concur in the desire expressed by President Nixon that the objectives of his legislative program be approached on a nonpartisan basis. It is in this spirit that I express reservations to certain of President Nixon's legislative proposals.

For one thing, I oppose the President's proposal to continue the surtax. The feeling in Alabama is that greater efforts should be made to effect economies and efficiencies in Federal Government and that Federal spending programs should be cut back as an alternative to the continuation of the surtax.

Mr. President, there is merit in this contention. There can be no justification for duplication, waste, extravagance, and mishandling of public funds by agencies of Federal Government.

Yet there is an appalling amount of evidence that such things are going on in Alabama.

In the April 7, 1968, issue of Barrons Weekly, Shirley Scheibla has documented a shocking exposé of incredible waste, extravagance, and mishandling of public funds on the part of the Office of Economic Opportunity in Alabama. This article is but a small part of a tremendous amount of accumulated evidence which leads one to the inescapable conclusion that Congress should promptly put an end to OEO as a worse than useless Federal agency. Mr. President, if there is a single salvageable project in the entire wasteland of extravagance over which OEO presides surely there must be a competent Federal agency somewhere which could carry on such a project.

Mr. President, the article in Barrons should be of interest to all citizens who believe, as we do in Alabama, that good government begins with honest and efficient administration of government. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POVERTY AND PICKLES: THINGS HAVE GONE SOUR AT THE SOUTHWEST ALABAMA FARMERS CO-OP

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—Nearly two years ago, the Office of Economic Opportunity castigated this magazine for charging that an alleged advocate of overthrowing the U.S. government played an important role in an OEO-funded farm cooperative in Alabama. In a joint resolution, the Alabama legislature had said that the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative (SWAFCA) "was organized at the instigation and under the direction of . . . Shirley Mesher, a prime participant in the Black Panther movement . . . designed to overthrow the government of this country." In a letter widely circulated on Capitol Hill following publication of the Barron's editorial ("Poverty Warriors," July 31, 1967), OEO said that Shirley Mesher was not even a member of SWAFCA.

SWITCH ON SWAFCA

Now the General Accounting Office has issued a report which says that Miss Mesher not only was instrumental in organizing SWAFCA but also continues to be actively associated with it and to exert considerable influence over its affairs. According to GAO, she is one of three so-called "unsalaried advisors" who take part in management decisions, even to the extent of vetoing advice from an accountant and a horticulturist hired by OEO.

SWAFCA, reported GAO, lacks an adequate accounting system or proper controls over expenditures, has purchased inadequate equipment and has allowed crops to spoil before marketing; its members have received scant returns—and, assuredly, have not been brought out of poverty. Moreover, GAO could locate only 300 of the 2,000 members OEO claims for SWAFCA. Because of the co-op's practice of making payments in cash, GAO says it can't be sure where much of the money has gone, and interviews with employes have failed to provide satisfactory answers. In addition, OEO did not require the co-operative to file monthly financial reports as specified by its own regulations.

SWAFCA's dismal record notwithstanding, Washington officialdom has lavished both praise and largess upon it. In 1967, OEO endowed it with a mere $400,000; U.S. support today runs to some $2 million, which besides more OEO money includes a grant from the Commerce Department's Economic Development Administration and a loan from the Department of Agriculture's Farmers Home Administration (FHA).

FROM THE SOIL

Operating in 10 counties of Alabama's black belt, SWAFCA reportedly seeks Congressional repeal of Section 304(f) of the Economic Opportunity Act, which bans federal financial or other assistance to a co-op for agriculture production. If it succeeds, the way will be clear for Alabama, the birthplace of the Black Panthers also to become the homeland of the nation's latest leftist commune. Despite Section 304(f), when OEO announced its first grant to SWAFCA in May 1967, it said the purpose was "a self-help program of economic development, crop and livestock diversification and experimentation with higher profit and yield training."

Alabama's Congressional delegation, four probate judges, three mayors and two county commissioners visited OEO headquarters en masse, urging the agency to deny support to SWAFCA. After a warning from its regional representative, Joseph Bradford, that it could not "blindly afford to commit money and manpower to an endeavor which is doomed to fail," and a similar one from its community action agency in Selma, OEO went ahead anyway. It gave $400,000 directly to SWAFCA, instead of following even the usual policy of channeling grants through the local community action agency. (This exempted the co-op from Section 205 of the Economic Opportunity Act, which requires each community action agency, before handing out money, to establish an accounting system and internal controls that will assure proper spending.)

Alabama's late Governor Lurleen Wallace immediately vetoed the grant, but OEO boss Sargent Shriver overruled her decision. After that, the Alabama legislature passed a joint resolution calling on OEO to rescind its action. As the resolution declared, "In reality funds will be spent to finance the lawless Black Panther movement, designed to overthrow the government of their country and particularly the governments of Southern states."

HORN OF PLENTY

GAO describes SWAFCA's affairs as so confused that no one can be certain what has been financed. In the summer of 1967, SWAFCA hired a certified public accounting firm to establish a system of accounts and controls to conform with OEO regulations. By late summer, the CPA's dropped out of the picture without finishing their work, and OEO brought in a consultant of its own to work on SWAFCA's books. Among other things, he found that about 75% of the transactions were in the form of cash. No records were kept for payroll, sales or purchases. No pay deductions were made for social security and income taxes. What's more, SWAFCA's president signed blank checks, for use by anyone with access to the checkbook.

The consultant, as it happens, also gave up without finishing the job. He did so, GAO says, "because SWAFCA employes and advisors would take it upon themselves to do things their own way rather than to follow instructions." From September 1967 to August 1968, the co-op did not file monthly financial reports with OEO, as required by the agency's regulations. Furthermore, GAO "found no record indicating that OEO had sought to obtain the reports or had considered suspending the grant."

Even a horticulturist hired by SWAFCA (with OEO funds) had no better luck. The co-op was unwilling to accept his technical advice. According to GAO, that's because such advice was "subject to review and either approval or veto by the unsalaried advisors, directors or administrators, who had neither knowledge nor experience to guide them."

DISSENTING ADVISORS

GAO named those advisors as Shirley Mesher, Lewis Black and Albert Turner. Without naming names, however, GAO said one of them wielded considerable influence over SWAFCA's affairs on a full-time basis, "spent a considerable amount of time at the SWAFCA headquarters, used its telephone, had access to its files, participated in the operation of the office and, at one time prior to the receipt of the OEO grant, actually signed SWAFCA checks." This advisor, GAO indicated also participated in board meetings, made trips on behalf of SWAFCA and was particularly active in obtaining government financial assistance.

The unidentified "advisor" seems to have been phenomenally successful as a fund raiser. In May 1968, the Economic Development Administration announced a grant of $85,000 to SWAFCA for studies on the feasibility of establishing credit unions, insurance companies, small business investment corporations, processing and fertilizer plants, selling farm equipment and producing synthetic protein supplements. Of the total, $14,738 was to go to the co-op's personnel, $18,650 to "consultants" and $16,400 to "travel expenses."

ENTER THE G-MEN

Last June, GAO began its investigation, at the request of Rep. George W. Andrews (D., Ala.), chairman of the Legislative subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. Several months elapsed. Then, in October, these significant events took place:

In a letter to Rep. Andrews, U.S. Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats reported the "questionable handling of $85,000 in OEO grant funds by the SWAFCA manager, Mr. Calvin S. Orsborn." Mr. Staats said that SWAFCA's board had discharged Mr. Orsborn, that OEO had recovered all but $7,331 of the $85,000, and that it had turned the matter over to the Justice Department. He added that GAO's report would be delayed "because of the generally poor conditions of SWAFCA's accounts, the theft of certain of our working papers . . . and the withholding of certain records by Mr. Orsborn." (Earlier, Mr. Orsborn, a featured speaker at an OEO co-op conference in Washington, had said: "SWAFCA is paying its bill; it is trying to create a better community relationship, realizing that we must make our own records and set our own values.")

After examining the co-op's books, an independent auditor notified OEO that "due to the . . . breakdown in the system of internal controls we are unable to express any opinion whatsoever on the balance sheet of the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association at June 30, 1968, or the results of its operations for the six months then ended." He advised the agency to consider suspension of funds until the accounting system was improved and certified adequate by a CPA.

Selma's mayor obtained an order from a state court enjoining the co-op from spending public funds. SWAFCA then sought but failed to obtain a temporary restraining order from a federal court against the injunction. (In November the Justice Department began a separate action at the request of OEO, obtaining an injunction against the injunction. In its petition, Justice argued that the state injunction harms "a vitally important federal program.")

OEO Acting Director Bertram Harding overruled the veto of Alabama Governor Albert Brewer, successor to Mrs. Wallace, and approved another grant for SWAFCA, retroactive to June 30, 1968, for $596,000; it included $357,575 for personnel, $8,640 for consultants and contract services and $75,956 for travel.

Having been selected by OEO as an outstanding co-op, SWAFCA was host at an OEO regional conference in Selma, celebrating "Co-op Month." OEO's speaker at the event was its own James D. Templeton, Assistant Director for Rural Affairs. He declared that co-ops offer the poor a power base as well as an organizational springboard to other ventures.

PROTECTING INTERESTS

GAO was able to put together quite a record. Back in October 1967, SWAFCA had applied to the Farmers Home Administration for a loan of $850,000 (30 years at 4⅛%) for capital improvements and operating expenses. According to GAO, the FHA at first did not feel SWAFCA had enough members to justify the amount. (As noted, GAO could find only 300 of the 2,000 members claimed by SWAFCA.) "However," added GAO, "in March 1968 the Administrator of FHA apparently reconsidered and tentatively approved a loan of $852,000 ($2,000 more than requested) subject to SWAFCA's meeting certain loan conditions customarily prescribed by FHA to protect the government's interests."

When the co-op refused to accept such conditions, FHA revised them. The lending agency also agreed to administer the loan from Washington, rather than through its field organization, and permitted SWAFCA to distribute in cash up to 20% of its net earnings to members in any year—even though it might be delinquent in payment of the loan. Despite a plea from Rep. Bill Nichols (D., Ala.) to wait until GAO could complete its report—delayed by the theft of its papers—FHA gave final approval early last January. The GAO report finally was issued on January 27.

According to GAO: "An Assistant Administrator, FHA, informed us on January 24, 1969, that a U.S. Treasury check in the amount of $270,000 was drawn on January 9, 1969, and deposited in a local bank account on January 16, 1969. On the same date $200,000 was made payable to SWAFCA from this account." Asked the other day if this meant that $70,000 got lost between the Treasury and SWAFCA, a GAO official replied, "No comment."

FHA also lent another $273,000 to individual members of SWAFCA. Since SWAFCA would be buying produce from its members, and marketing it, FHA agreed to the withholding of half the amount due members for remittance to FHA as payments on the members' loans. GAO discovered that the co-op failed to pay in full members who did not have FHA loans and also cut its payment by more than it remitted to FHA.

MAKING PROGRESS?

Nevertheless, the Agriculture Department describes SWAFCA's gains as encouraging. "Members have found how to upgrade the quality of their produce so as to command higher prices on the market," a report contends. As Vice President, Hubert Humphrey once declared: "All of us who have watched the growth of the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association are thankful indeed for its success and progress." And OEO, for its part, says SWAFCA has demonstrated what co-ops can do to help people gain motivation, confidence and a sense of achievement which they can relate to other areas of their lives.

GAO drily supplies the contradictory record. SWAFCA could not explain the basis of prices it charged members for fertilizer and seed, the U.S. accounting agency points out. Moreover, SWAFCA failed to supply these inputs in time, with the result that crops fell far short of estimates. Even though the latter were late and incomplete, they served as the basis for marketing plans.

Indeed, OEO approved a budget of $20,000 for the purchase of 10 pickup trucks to haul members' supplies to, and produce from, the receiving stations. The manager, however, bought three large trucks for $29,000 "apparently to carry large loads of fertilizer." Lack of continuous truck service resulted in the spoilage of produce. Second-hand grading machines, delivered after harvesting had begun (and mostly inoperable), "reduced SWAFCA's ability to effectively process and market produce purchased from its members and from others. . . .

"In addition, at one field station it was discovered, after the grading machine was supposedly made operable, that no provision had been made to have electric power lines run to the station."

One New York wholesaler rejected a consignment of 750 bushels of cucumbers, because of poor quality. SWAFCA's then shipped them to a Maryland processor, who regraded them and salvaged 100 bushels. The net proceeds to the co-op amounted to less than the shipping costs. A consignment of 600 bushels of cucumbers to Chicago brought $1,200—only $500 more than the shipping costs. On a shipment of 575 bushels to a Louisiana processor, SWAFCA grossed less than it paid its farmer-members for the produce.

Toward the end of June, SWAFCA sought assistance from an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in locating cucumber markets—because it had lost all its customers. Soon thereafter, SWAFCA obtained orders from processors on condition that the cukes would be properly graded. "By the time the new markets were located," however, SWAFCA was receiving "quality cucumbers at Selma in lots too small for dispatch to processors on a truckload basis; thus cucumbers continued to pile up at Selma and spoil."

That pile of pickles—as GAO's evidence makes clear to many observers—is not all that has gone sour at SWAFCA.

INCOME TAX REVISION

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the $600 personal exemption now granted to taxpayers is far too small—so small, in fact, that it makes a mockery out of the congressional intent behind the laws establishing income tax exemptions. I have introduced legislation that would double the exemption, raising it from $600 to $1,200.

The history of tax exemptions makes clear the need for this legislation. The present $600 exemption was established in 1948—more than two decades ago. Yet, in the 21 years since the 1948 Internal Revenue Act, the cost of living has shot up 48.7 percent. The $600 exemption would have to be increased to $892 merely to equal the purchasing power of $600 in 1948.

The retention of this low level of exemption in our tax structure is not only a startling inequity but an abrogation of congressional intent. The personal exemption was first provided in the Revenue Act of 1913—the first income tax law enacted after the adoption of the 16th amendment. Under the Revenue Act of 1913, a taxpayer was allowed an exemption of $3,000 plus an additional $1,000 for all of his dependents regardless of number. When this Revenue Act was being debated in the House, Representative Palmer stated:

> We ought to leave free and untaxed as a part of the income of every American citizen a sufficient amount to rear and support his family according to the American standard and to educate his children in the best manner which the educational system of the country affords.

During the debate in the Senate, Senator Williams stated:

> The House framed its bill upon the theory that $4,000 was a reasonable amount, in its opinion, for an American family to live upon, with a proper standard of living, and that a sum below that ought not to be taxed.

From 1913 to 1948, Congress changed the exemption levels frequently, both increasing and decreasing them as the needs for revenue changed. During World War II, when the need for revenue was urgent, the personal exemption was reduced to the lowest level in its history, $500.

In 1948 when the present level of $600 was under discussion, the Secretary of the Treasury, John W. Snyder, stated:

> Under this bill, personal exemptions are increased by $100 to compensate for a calculated $100 decline in the purchasing power of the average income after taxes during the past 2 years.
>
> These calculations do not provide an adequate measure of the need for tax relief in the lower income groups. Under the stress of war needs, personal exemptions were reduced to emergency levels. It was then recognized that the $500 per capita exemption system would endanger the health and living standards of large segments of the population if retained for many years.

This last statement is as true of the $600 today, 21 years later, as it was of the $500 at that time. In fact, a study by the Social Security Administration in 1966 showed the "poverty line" for a nonfarm family of four was $3,335. Anyone who falls below the poverty line will have less than a minimum diet for health or will have to choose between necessities. Under present tax law a family of four with an adjusted gross income of $3,335 has to pay $46 in Federal income taxes—a significant sum for a poor family. A recently published study by the Treasury Department under the previous administration pointed out that 2.2 million families with incomes below the poverty level must now pay Federal income taxes. In addition to the Federal taxes many of the poverty stricken must pay, they also face the taxes imposed at the State and local levels. Sales taxes on necessities and property taxes which are included in rent charges are regressive, placing the heaviest burden on those least able to pay.

My proposal would greatly relieve these low-income families. But we must also help the middle-income families who pay the vast bulk of income taxes. Not only have living costs increased since 1948; so have our living standards—the goals we set for ourselves as consumers of goods and services and users of leisure time. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has just published a study which has translated three standards of living for an urban family of four in the spring of 1967 into representative goods and services which could be priced. The resulting three budgets share the basic assumption that maintenance of health and social well-being, the nurture of children, and participation in community activities are desirable and necessary social goals.

For the moderate budget, the U.S. urban average cost was $9,076 in the spring of 1967. The cost for the lower budget was $5,915, and the higher budget amounted to $13,050. The personal exemptions for a family of four today total $2,400—a figure that doesn't even approach the total of the lower budget. Certainly exemptions totaling $4,800, which my bill will provide would be far more equitable.

We cannot continue to ignore the plight of the low- and middle-income taxpayer. In addition to the burden of Federal income taxes and increasing cost of living that I have outlined above, he is also being subjected to rapidly increasing State and local taxes and the recently effected increase in social security taxes.

We must recognize that there is a limit to what the taxpayer can bear. We must increase the size of the personal exemption.

INADEQUACY OF JOB TRAINING AND JOB OPPORTUNITIES

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, one of the most critical areas of national concern at this time is the failure to use the talents of many of our citizens due to inadequate job training and job opportunities. Our young people must be made to feel that they can be productive members of our society and that they can break the cycle of poverty which they would surely face without adequate job preparation.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will provide such training and job opportunities this summer, when it once again participates in the summer employment programs.

Because of the vitally important nature of such programs, I ask unanimous consent that an article explaining the HEW summer employment program in New York City be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Summer Employment Program and New York City

The Department of Heath, Education, and Welfare is, for the fourth straight year, participating in the government's Summer Employment Programs. Of these programs, the two largest are the Youth Opportunity Campaign and the program for hiring summer employes through the Civil Service Commission's Summer Employment Examination.

While a common purpose they share is that of providing meaningful jobs for our young people, their underlying philosophies are different.

The Youth Opportunity Campaign is a national program aimed primarily at youths age 16–21, who have inadequate education, low income, and generally are out of the mainstream of American life. Its goal is to provide meaningful jobs. However, built into the program are supportive activities to help the youth understand and cope with the experiences and demands of new jobs.

On the other hand, the Summer Employment Examination program helps students continue their education by providing jobs, while also assuring to the public service a source of future talent.

Much of the planning for the summer's Youth Opportunity Campaign will be based on what was learned from last year's experiences.

For example, last year in the New York Regional Office of the Department, a pilot program developed new ways to help young people work better and understand their environment at work. With the full support and cooperation of the New York regional top management, the program benefited from the "know-how" of specialists from various fields, e.g., education, economics, equal employment opportunity, community involvement and others. Together these specialists designed a program which was beneficial for the HEW Regional Office, the Youth Opportunity Campaigner, and the community. From their efforts came improved teaching techniques in mock job-interviews, seminars on job opportunities, and a presentation by a fashion consultant for teenagers on good grooming and the purchase of an inexpensive, though stylish, wardrobe. The young people learned more about their community through visits to important social and political organizations such as the Ford Foundation and the United Nations. The New York program was a success. It will be improved this year, along with the programs of all the regional offices and HEW in Washington.

Last year the Department's nationwide summer employment effort employed more than 6,600 students and youths. This year's effort will be geared to involving more students, and additional efforts in a number of areas including:

(1) Improving the job content of work assignments in terms of meaningfulness, challenge and relevance to the job market in which the youth will soon compete. Toward this end, in the headquarters operations of HEW agencies, Job Development Task Forces are being formed. Each Task Force will be composed of one full-time professional employee, and a cadre of 4-5 Youth Opportunity Campaigners. Together they will develop and redesign the jobs available.

(2) Involving of youth in the planning, operation, and evaluation of their own programs, so as to understand their needs and concerns as they see them.

(3) Encouraging of more creative supporting activities such as meetings with Legislators and other Government officials to discuss with them such topics as, for example, the "mechanics" of the democratic system and how it relates to them both as individuals and members of their community.

All of us who are concerned with the employment of youth should support these programs. In New York City as well as across the Nation, the degree of effort that we put forth to get our young people involved in jobs and their community will repay us a hundredfold in the future.

A VETERAN'S TRIBUTE

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the death of General Eisenhower, though not unexpected, was a shock to a great many people, among them the millions of veterans of the Second World War who served under his command. One in my congressional district, sharing his grief with me, wrote that he sort of identified Ike as another dad. In every veterans post throughout the land there are numbers of men, now in middle age, who in their youth fought in North Africa and in Europe, always proud of their service to our country and of the general who led them to victory. And after the war was over these millions of American veterans enthusiastically voted him twice President of the United States, finding him first in peace as he had been first in war.

Indicative of the genuine sense of personal loss felt by so many veterans is the following tribute from James Drumm, a member of Hice-Shutes Post No. 170, the American Legion, at Three Rivers, Mich. The tribute was published as a letter to the editor of the Three Rivers Commercial on March 29, 1969, the day following Ike's passing, as follows:

TRIBUTE

To the EDITOR:

Yesterday at work a friend who is also a veteran said to me, "Do you know that Ike is dead?" Twice more I heard practically the same words expressed and I thought, "What a ridiculous idea, Ike losing a battle."

My thoughts drifted back to the dark days at the start of World War II when each succeeding day brought only defeat and despair.

The leaders of the Allied Nations finally decided that we needed a Supreme Allied Commander to unite all of the troops of all of the nations. They picked the right man, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Very soon things started looking a little brighter. The tide of battle turned our way. It was a long, hard road back, paved with broken bodies and shattered equipment, ending eventually in final victory. To me Ike's leadership was decisive.

His quiet confidence, grim determination and superior judgment was an inspiration to all of the Allied Nations and the more you think of it, the more ridiculous it sounds. Ike lost a battle.

Not to me he didn't, rather he gained a final promotion. Now he is as high as he can go.

JIM DRUMM,
Hice-Shutes Post No. 170, American Legion, Three Rivers, Mich.

RESOLUTION IN RECOGNITION OF SUFFERING OF THE LITHUANIAN PEOPLE

HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, on February 23, 1969, the Lithuanian Council of Brockton, Mass., passed a resolution in recognition of the suffering of the Lithuanian people, and in commendation of their continuing spirit of independence, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROCKTON LITHUANIAN COUNCIL RESOLUTION

A resolution adopted by Americans of Lithuanian descent, at a meeting held on February 23, 1969, at Brockton, Mass., to observe the 51st Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Lithuania, reads as follows:

"Whereas the ancient Lithuanian nation proclaimed the restoration of the independence of its State after World War I, and thereafter led an orderly and exemplary independent State existence, having de jure recognition of all the Great Powers and diplomatic relations with all its neighbors; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union, in violation of all its solemn treaties and agreements with the Republic of Lithuania, in 1940 invaded and occupied Lithuania by military force, through its occupation agents forced a mock parliamentary election, then claimed that Lithuania had of her own free will requested admission into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union continue this military occupation of Lithuania to this day, and is systematically carrying out a planned program of annihilation of the Lithuanian nation by various means, including deportation of Lithuanians to Siberia and elsewhere in Russia, appropriating the real and personal property of the Lithuanians, and bringing in Russians and other citizens as colonial settlers in Lithuania: *Now, therefore, be it*

Resolved, that the American Lithuanians attending this meeting unanimously decided to request the President and the Secretary of State of the United States to do everything in their power to investigate the situation in Russian-occupied Lithuania; to stop the genocide being perpetrated in Lithuania by Soviets to bring to a halt the present-day russification being carried out in Lithuania; to restore freedom and the rights to self-determination to the Lithuanian people and their territory; be it further

Resolved, that we request the President and Secretary of State of the United States of America to use all the diplomatic and other peaceful means at their command to demand an immediate end of Soviet colonialism in Lithuania and territorial integrity of the Soviet Russian occupation and administrative agencies; be it also

Resolved, That this Resolution be sent to the President of the United States, and copies thereof to the Secretary of State, Senators and Congressmen from our State, and to the Press."

Adopted at Brockton, on the 23rd day of February.

BRONIUS BURBA,
Meeting Chairman.
VLADAS JAKIMAVICIUS,
Secretary.

CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am again sending the residents of Pennsylvania's 23d Congressional District a questionnaire, seeking their views on the pressing problems facing Congress and the Nation.

The questionnaire, as sent to the people of the 23d Congressional District, contains the following explanatory statement on the front as follows:

> Again your Congressman, ALBERT W. JOHNSON, 23rd District of Pennsylvania: Cameron, Centre, Clearfield, Clinton, Elk, Forest, McKean, Potter, Venango and Warren Counties, is calling to ask you a few questions.

Also, on the front of the questionnaire is a picture of myself holding a telephone as an aid to insuring a substantial return of the questionnaire by the citizens. The message on the inside is as follows:

Dear Friends in the 23d Congressional District: The 91st Congress has assembled and we are about to commence voting on many controversial issues. A great variety of complex problems, both at home and abroad, face the new Administration and the new Congress. The continuing war in Vietnam, the debate over the anti-ballistic missile system, and proposals to change our method of electing the President, are but a few of the matters now demanding immediate attention and action.

As I have in past years, I would like to ask you to take a moment or two of your time to share with me your views on some of these issues. Never have your opinions been of greater importance.

You do not need an envelope to return this questionnaire. Just refold it and attach a 6¢ stamp.

I will be very grateful if you will take the time to let me have your views.

Thanking you in advance, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

Albert W. Johnson.

Congressional Questionnaire

In answering the multiple questions, indicate your opinion by inserting a, b, c, or d in the space provided. Other questions answer "yes" or "no." Your answers will be held to be confidential.

1. If the Paris talks drag on with no apparent indications of any chance of progress toward a peaceful settlement, would you favor:

(a) withdrawal of U.S. forces, even if this means Communist take-over; or

(b) continue the present holding operation by joint U.S.-South Vietnam forces; or

(c) a gradual withdrawal forcing South Vietnam to assume a bigger role in the war; or

(d) mounting a strategically sound effort for a military victory?

2. Should the United States extend diplomatic recognition to Red China?

3. With respect to raising an army to defend the Nation, do you favor:

(a) continuing the draft in its present form; or

(b) replacing the draft system with an all-volunteer army; or

(c) restoring the national draft lottery system established in World War II; or

(d) retaining the draft, but allowing draftees to choose their call up date, any time during the four-year period following registration?

4. Should Presidential candidates be selected by National Primaries, instead of party conventions?

5. What method of electing the President after nomination would you favor:

(a) retain the present Electoral College system; or

(b) direct popular vote; or

(c) allocate the electoral votes within each state in proportion to the popular votes cast, making a 40% electoral vote plurality sufficient to choose a President; or

(d) count one electoral vote for the winner in each Congressional District, with two additional votes for whomever carries the State?

6. Do you favor lowering the voting age to 18?

7. Do you favor President Nixon's recommendation for a limited antiballistic missile system?

8. Would you terminate all public financial help to students found guilty of participating in disruptive demonstrations?

9. Do you favor the plan to terminate political patronage in the Post Office Department?

10. Do you support the proposal to convert the Post Office Department into a government-owned corporation?

11. Should public employees, other than firemen and police, have the right to strike?

12. Would you vote to repeal Sec. 14b of the Taft-Hartley Act? (Right to work section)

13. Should Congress propose a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary nondenominational prayer in public schools?

14. Would you vote to increase the first-class mail rate from 6 cents to 7 cents with a guarantee of air mail delivery?

15. Do you favor statehood for Puerto Rico?

16. Do you feel that the President should be allowed to commit U.S. troops to conflicts on foreign soil without the consent of Congress?

17. Should Congress place a ceiling on the total amount of Federal farm subsidy payments which one person may receive in any one year?

18. Would you favor returning to the States for use as they see fit, a percentage of the money now collected in Federal Income Tax?

19. Do you favor transferring the more successful anti-poverty programs to other departments?

Comments:

Name ----------------------------------

Address --------------------------------

REGULATING THE CONSUMER IN FLORIDA

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the St. Petersburg Times has just published an excellent series of articles, written by Roland Page, on the subject of utility regulations in Florida. Following the publication of this series, the Times concluded editorially that the Florida Public Service Commission is not doing its job, that it lacks information on utility expenses charged to consumers, that the utilities have many experts—paid for by the customers—while the public is usually not even represented before the commission, and that the members of the commission are highly susceptible to political influence from the utility interests which contribute heavily to their campaigns.

The Florida situation is similar to that reported recently by enterprising and courageous newspapers in other States, including the Providence Journal, the Boston Globe, the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Des Moines Register, the New York Times, Cervi's Journal in Denver, and the Alton, Ill., Evening Telegraph.

This series is further documentation of the need for action on S. 607, the Utility Consumers' Counsel Act, on which hearings will resume on Monday before the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the St. Petersburg Times articles and editorials be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Mar. 25, 1969]

Customers Pay for Utilities' Charity

(By Roland Page)

(Note.—Roland Page, born in Melrose Park, Ill., is a graduate of Georgia Southern College and holds a master's degree in history and government from Florida State University. Before coming to The Times nearly two years ago, he was a reported on the Rock Hill (S.C.) Evening Herald, Savannah Evening Press and Fitzgerald (Ga.) Herald.)

"Dues, donations and contributions, if included as an expense for rate-making purposes, become an involuntary expense on ratepayers, who because of the monopolistic nature of utility service, are unable to obtain service from another source and thereby avoid such a levy. Ratepayers should be encouraged to contribute directly to worthy causes and not involuntarily through an allowance in utility rates. (The utility) should not be permitted to be generous with ratepayers' money but may use its own funds in any lawful manner."

California Public Utilities Commission.

Florida's three largest electric companies gave nearly $500,000 to their favorite charities, schools, churches and civic organizations and projects in 1967–68. And their customers are paying for it today.

General Telephone Co. of Florida gave more than $100,000 in charitable and civic contributions and dues in 1967—at no cost to the company or its stockholders.

In this State, the utilities take the bows for civic mindedness, but their customers put up the cash.

That's because the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC), unlike California, insists on allowing such donations as "legitimate operating expenses" that "should be passed on to the ratepayer."

When the PSC raises your electric and telephone bills, it's taking care of the Auburndale Booster Club, the Florida Fat Stock Show and Sale, the "Gator Football Boosters," the Wakulla Board of Public Instruction, the "St. Pete Armed Forces Luncheon," "Truth For Youth," and Gov. Claude Kirk's debt to a private police force waging his "War On Crime."

It is also taking care of membership dues of company employes in a host of civic clubs and, in some cases, social clubs.

A check of latest company reports filed with the PSC shows that Florida Power Corp. was allowed to charge its customers $154,450 in contributions for the year ending May 31, 1968.

Tampa Electric Co. charged $116,085, and Florida Power & Light (FP&L) has been collecting $151,416 in contributions and dues each year since 1964. FP&L now is seeking commission approval to more than double its allowance (to $367,090).

General Telephone Co. of Florida, for the year ending Dec. 31, 1967, chipped in $111,152.85 to almost 150 organizations and projects courtesy of its ratepayers.

Since these contributions are divided among thousands of utility subscribers—their impact on the average utility bill is barely discernible.

One PSC staffer estimated for instance that it amounts to only about a penny a month to the average residential electric bill. However, it illustrates a lack of tight supervisory regulation by the PSC.

Much of the money goes to agencies which the ratepayers already support as individuals—such as the various United Funds.

The St. Petersburg resident, however, who volunteers his "fair share" to the United Fund, unknowingly gives to that agency a second time in his electric bill and a third time in his telephone bill.

For his first donation, the citizen is thanked and claims a tax deduction. For his other two contributions, however, it's Florida Power Corp. and General Telephone Co. who are thanked and claim tax deductions.

If he buys natural gas and water and sewer service from PSC-regulated companies, and if he uses PSC-regulated transportation (buses), chances are the citizen is donating to the United Fund four, five or even six times.

To find out which other agencies he's helping to support, the citizen must depend on his news services or the commission records.

Sometimes, even the records won't tell him. The commission has no list for the $151,416 in contributions it allowed Florida Power & Light to put in its rates every year since 1964.

If that company's current application is any indication of past practices, however, customers of FP&L are helping to support the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Campus Crusade For Christ, the Martin County Country Club, the Tax Assessor's Association and the Syrian Lebanese Star.

Florida Power Corp.'s latest approved list included $23,379 for what it called "various contributions of less than $1,000 each."

The PSC chose not to ask the company for details, but ordered customers to pay for support of agencies known only to the utility executives and those who received the money.

Florida Power did itemize contributions of $1,115 to the Wakulla Board of Public Instruction and $1,249 to the Hamilton County School Board—but none to the school boards of 30 other counties in its service area.

A check with the two favored school districts revealed that neither of the donations were in cash. Mrs. Helen Dail, finance director of the Hamilton County School Board, said she wasn't aware Florida Power has made any contribution at all.

"They put some lights up on our new baseball field and I paid them $1,271.29 on Sept. 18, 1967," said Mrs. Dail. "We thought it was all paid for then . . . but I got another bill last September for $1,550.20 and there was a letter with it saying they donated labor costs of $1,249."

"I really didn't know they donated anything," she said, adding that "it's kind of a jumbled up affair." She said nothing had been paid on the second bill—pending clarification.

School Supt. William Payne of Wakulla County said that Florida Power contributions to his board also were in man-hours—to light the high school football field.

The biggest Florida Power contribution went to Florida Presbyteran College—$60,000.

General Telephone itemized donations to seven out-of-state colleges and universities, including $100 to Yale University. Fewer Florida institutions benefitted from the General Telephone subscriber—although those listed received larger contributions.

The companies apparently draw no distinction between private and tax-supported institutions as worthy customer support. General Telephone is collecting rates to raise $250 it gave the Pinellas County Park Department. FP&L, in its pending application, claims $12,032.83 in contributions to "City and County Governments."

Some other dues or donations now covered in the operating revenues of utilities whose reports were examined by The Times:

Florida Power Corp.: $2,500 to Florida State University, $1,900 to the University of Florida and $1000 to the Florida Citrus Open Golf Tournament.

Tampa Electric—$1,673 to "churches," $5,256 to "schools," $838 to the "Illuminating Engineering Research Institute," $1,815 to "State Welfare Activities," and $1,000 to the University of Florida Foundation.

General Telephone—$5,000 each to Florida Presbyterian College in St. Petersburg and New College Inc. in Sarasota, $1,000 to Gov. Kirk's War on Crime, $250 to the Florida Clergy Economic Education Conference, $50 to "Truth for Youth," $125 to the Tampa Police Pistol and Rifle Club, $3,665 for Kiwanis Clubs, $454.75 for Exchange Clubs $2,010.46 for Rotary Clubs and $478 for Jaycees.

Florida Power & Light—unknown because the commission didn't ask for a list in 1964. A pending application, however, includes $400 to the Thomas Alva Edison Foundation, $425 to the Edison Pageant of Light, $1,000 to Freedoms Foundation, $300 to the "Tax Assessors Association," $1,000 to Radio Free Europe, $50 to "Project Alert" and $40 to the "Syrian Lebanese Star."

Here are the dues and contributions of four of Florida's largest utility companies as listed in their latest reports to the Public Service Commission:

General Telephone Company of Florida:

Charitable Contributions:

American Cancer Society, $240; American National Red Cross, $115; Boy Scouts of America: Haines City, $25 (and) Zephyrhills, $25; Childrens' Home, $3,000; Childrens' Home Memorial Fund, $25; Childrens' Home Society, $25; Citrus Center Boys' Club—Building Fund, $400; Disabled American Veterans (Circus Tickets), $100; Easter Seal Guild of Hillsborough County, $100.

Florida Federation of the Blind, $25; Frostproof Salvation Army, $25; Girl Scouts, $1,025; Goodwill Industries (Enlarge Building), $100; Gulf Coast TB & Respiratory Disease Assn., $25; Harry-Anna Crippled Childrens' Home $25; Heart Assn.—Manatee County, $25; Heart Fund, $25; Heart of Florida Girl Scout Council, $25; Heart of Florida Hospital Assn., $1,000; Heart of Florida Scout Council, $25.

Hiker Monument Fund (Tks—Childrens' Home), $100; Hillsborough County Soc. for Crippled Children & Adults, $25; Hillsborough County TB & Health Assn., $300; Lakeland Cancer Fund Drive, $25; Lakeland YMCA, $35; Lake Wales Hospital Assn., $1,000; Lake Wales Salvation Army, $25; March of Dimes, $150; Mease Hospital & Clinic, $1,000; Meninak Charity Bowl, $30; Morton Plant Hospital Building Fund, $1,000; Polk County Future Farmers of America, $25; Polk County Heart Fund, $100; Rotary Boys Camp, $22; Salvation Army, $75; Sarasota County Medical Society, $35; Sarasota County Soc. for Crippled Children, $25.

Sarasota County TB and Health Assn., $25; Sarasota Hearing Society, $25; Sertoma Speech Clinic, $25; Sun City Center Shrine Club (Crippled Childrens' Home), $25; Suncoast Heart Assn., $25; Tampa Oral School For The Deaf, $500; Tarpon Springs Hospital Foundation, $1,000; United Appeal of Sarasota, $1,800; United Cerebal Palsy, $119.05; United Fund of: East Hillsborough, $250; Greater Bartow, $200; Greater Lakeland, $1,300; Greater Tampa, $20,000; Manatee County, $1,400; Pinellas County, $12,000; and South Sarasota County, $380; United Givers Fund, $1,450; Upper Pinellas Assn. For Retarded Children, $100; Winter Haven Hospital Building Fund, $2,500.

Education Contributions (General Telephone):

American International College, $25; Bowdoin College, $25; Citadel Development Foundation, $25; Florida College, $1,052; Florida Presbyterian College, $5,000; Florida West Coast Educational TV, $1,000; Gator Football Boosters (Scholarships to H. Off.), $100; Hillsborough County Quality Education Council, $1,000; Jesuit High School Foundation, $200; Muskingum College, $25; New College, Inc., $5,000; Science Center, Pinellas County, $200; Stetson University Law School, $1,000; Syracuse University, $25 University of Michigan, $25; University of South Florida Foundation, $360; University of Tampa, $11,081; Yale University, $100.

Civic promotion (General Telephone):

Alcalde of Ybor City, $25; Allied Arts Council of Sarasota & Manatee County, $100; American Legion-Post 252 (Childrens' Christmas Party) $100; Asolo Theater Festival, $50; Auburndale Booster Club, $50; Bartow Pilot Club (Scholarship Fund), $10; Beta Sigma Phi (Crippled Children), $13.58; Childrens' Home, Inc., $3,000; Childrens' Hospital Guild, Inc. (Charity Ball), $50; Civitan Clubs, $1,179.50.

Clearwater Symphony, Inc., $25; Commerce Club, $1,316; Committee of 100, $100; Community Concert Assn. of Tampa, $100; Cuban Civic Club, $24; Downtown Assn. of Clearwater (Betterment), $500; Egypt Temple Shrine Circus Fund, $48; Exchange Clubs, $454.75; Flash Athletic Boys Club, $25; Florida Citrus Showcase, $50; Florida Clergy Economic Education Conference, $250; Florida Club, $150; Florida Fat Stock Show and Sale, $434.97; Florida Sheriff's Assn., $40; Florida West Coast Orchid Society, $50; Hillsborough City Sheriff's Posse (Rodeo Tickets—Big Bros.), $25.

Imperial University Club Polk County, $500; Jaycees, $478; Junior Achievement of St. Pete, $500; Kiwanis Club, $3,665.49; Lake Wales Jr. C. of C. (Flag Service), $25; Latin American Fiesta, $35; Lions Club, $1,506.96; Loyal Order of Moose (Childrens' Christmas Party), $25.50; Manatee Players, Inc., $540; Manatee River Fair Assn., $182.85; Meninak Club, $260; Optimist Club, $1,133.50; Pilot Clubs, $106.

Pinellas County Park Dept., $250; Pinellas County Science Fair, $50; Police Athletic League, $100; Rotary Clubs, $2,010.46; San Carlo Opera of Florida, $100; Sarasota Concert Band, $50; Sarasota County Pageant, $35; Sertoma Club, $3,108.10; St. Pete Armed Forces Luncheon Comm. (Recognition), $100; St. Pete Boosters Club (Fla. Little and Major League), $25; St. Pete Civic Opera Assn., $250; St. Pete Museum of Fine Arts (Development Fund), $500; St. Pete Police Dept. (Ball), $25; St. Pete Progress, Inc. (Industrial Development), $750; St. Pete Symphony Society, Inc., $500; Suncoasters Inc., $215; Tampa Art Institute, $426.14; Tampa Bay Little League, $50; Tampa Civic Ballet, $50; Tampa Community Theatre, $60.

Tampa Jaycees (Tickets), $125; Tampa Lyric Theatre, $500; Tampa Philharmonic Assn., $471; Tampa Police Ladies Aux., $15; Tampa Police Pistol & Rifle Club, $125; Tarpon Springs Power Squadron Aux. (Boating Safety Class), $10; Teen Canteen, $100; The Players, Sarasota, $24; Toastmasters, $32; Truth for Youth, $50; University Club of Tampa, $655; University of Tampa Athletic Dept., $358; War On Crime, $1,000; West Tampa Sheriff Assn. (United Cerebral), $50; Women's Hospital Aux. (Medical Equip.), $100; YMCA, $1,989; Zonta Club, $56.

General Telephone total: $111,152.85.

Florida Power Corporation:

Florida State University, $2,500; University of Florida, $1,900; Florida Presbyterian College, $60,000; Hamilton County School Board, $1,249; St. Petersburg Museum of Fine Arts, $1,000; United Appeal, $3,650; St. Petersburg Science Center, $1,296; Florida Suncoast Opera Association, $1,157; St. Petersburg Symphony, $1,000; United Fund, $17,024; Rollins College, $5,200; Florida Citrus Open Golf Tournament, $1,000; Junior Achievement, $1,580.

Stetson University, $4,500; Wakulla Board of Public Instruction, $1,115; Trinity Preparatory School, $1,000; All Children's Hospital, $5,000; Morton Plant Hospital, $2,000; Salvation Army, $1,000; Heart of Florida Hospital, $3,000; Florida Gulf Coast Symphony, $1,000; Florida State Museum, $3,900.

Subtotal, $131,071.

Various contributions of less than $1,000 each (417), $23,379.

Total, $154,450.

Tampa Electric Company:

United Fund, $33,265; University of Tampa Library Fund, $15,000; Children's Home of Tampa, $5,463; Schools, $5,256; Little League

& Pony Colt Baseball Leagues, $5,222; MacDonald Training Center, $5,000; St. Leo College, $5,000; Community Welfare Activities, $4,918; Power System Institute—Gainesville, Florida, $4,500; Civic, $3,019; St. Joseph Hospital Building Fund, $2,500.

Educational and Cultural, $2,138; Florida College, $2,000; South Florida Baptist Hospital, $2,000; WEDU Educational TV, $1,939; Charitable, $1,915; Tampa Philharmonic Association, $1,875; State Welfare Activities, $1,815; Tampa Federation of Garden Clubs Building Fund, $1,673; Churches, $1,662; Tampa Oral School for Deaf, $1,620; Hillsborough County Quality Education Association, $1,500; Tampa Bay Art Center, $1,500; National Welfare Activities, $1,172; City of Tampa Community Relations Department, $1,000; University of Florida Foundation, $1,000; Illuminating Engineering Research Institute, $838; Girl Scouts of America, $795; Citrus Center Boys' Club, $500.

Total, $116,085.

Florida Power & Light Company is asking for approval of these expenditures in its current late case!

American Cancer Society Units, $835; American Legion Posts, $182.50; American Nuclear Society, $530.31; American Red Cross Units, $1,849.50; American Rescue Workers Units, $130; Amvets, $25; Animal Rescue Leagues, $30; Apprentice Conferences and Committees, $125; Art Leagues, Councils and Institutes, $1,985; Armed Forces of the Palm Beaches, $75; Associated Charities, $25; Association of Legal Secretaries, $50.

Athletic organizations, $4,225.15; Band Parents and Boosters Associations, $614.50; Big Brothers, $500; B'nai B'rith Women Chapters, $122.50; Booster Clubs, $1,727.54; Boys Clubs, $4,530; Boys Ranches, $32.50; Boy Scout Troops, $743.34; Builders and Builders & Contractors Associations, $372.50; Business Associations, $125; Business Executive Women's Club (Altrusa Club), $89.67.

Campus Crusade for Christ, $50; Cerebral Palsy Association Units, $70; Chambers of Commerce, $9,067.72; Charities, Inc., $40.25; Children's Home of South Florida, $60; Children's Service Bureau, $250; Christian Record Braille Foundation, $15; Churches and Temples, $2,644.26; Citizens Committee for Better Schools, $100; Citizen Safety Councils, $3,200; City and County Governments, $12,032.83; City of Hope, $25.

Civil Air Patrol, $12; Civitan Clubs, $45; Coast Guard, $20; Combined Jewish Appeal, $5,000; Committees of 100, $256; Community & Civic Clubs, Councils and Associations, $1,318.76; Cultural Foundations, $760; Cooperate Charities, $200; Council of North County Drainage District, $50; Council for International Visitors, $100; Council for Continuing Education for Women, $100; Martin County Country Club, $30; Dade County Community Relations Board, Equal Employment Opportunity Task Force, $2,840; Dade Foundation Inc., $200.

Daughters of American Revolution, $25; Diversified Cooperative Training Club, $25; Debbie Road Memorial Service League Foundation, $400; DeMolay, Order of, $20; DeSoto Celebration Inc. (Pageant), $150; Disabled American Veterans Posts, $135; Easter Seals, $100; Thomas Alva Edison Foundation, $400; Edison Pageant of Light, $425; B.P.O.E, $117.57; Exchange Clubs, $180; Executives Association, $9.36; 4–H Clubs, $1,230; 52 Association, $50; Fair Associations, $1,150; Fairchilds Tropical Gardens, $500; Fellowship of Christian Athletes, $85; Fire Departments and Fireman's Associations, $1,765.50; Florida Ballet, $250; Florida Cattlemen's Association, $100; Florida Cross & Sword, Inc., $525; Florida Foundation for Future Scientists, $200; Florida Engineering Society, $110.

Florida League of Municipalities, $500; Florida Letter Carriers, $25; Florida Prosecutors Association, $100; Florida Public Charities, $200; Florida Recreation Association, $15; Florida Soil Conservation Society, $300; Four Freedoms Civic Club, $50; Freedoms Foundations, $1,000; Future Farmers of America, $140; Friends of the Retarded, $25; Garden Clubs & Flower Shows, $1,851.74; Girl Scouts, $1,555; Goodwill Industries Units, $1,900; Hadassah Chapters, $45.82; Handicapped of South Broward Inc., $12; Ella Piper Harvey Memorial Committee, $30.

Heart Fund Associations, $350; Helping Hand Inc., $15; Hialeah-Managua Sister City Committee, $24; Historical Societies, $100; Home Builders Association, $20.07; Hospitals and Nursing Homes, $22,201.12; Improvement Associations, $125; Independent Order of Odd Fellows Lodges, $30; Jewish Welfare Federation, $25; Junior Achievement Units, $1,756.25; Junior Chambers of Commerce, $1,246.58; Junior Conservation Club, $10; Junior Deputies, $10; Junior Service League Orthopedic Center, $112.50; Junior Welfare League, $15.85; Justice of Peace & Constale Association of Florida, $10; Kiwanis Clubs, $1,522.90.

Knights of Columbus, $30; League of Women Voters Chapters, $75; Libraries, $219; Lions Clubs, $617.98; Little Theatres, $100; March of Dimes Chapters, $552.36; Marine Corps Leagues, $150; Mental Health Associations and Foundations, $1,037.50; Merchant Association, $75; Military Order of World Wars, $20; Loyal Order of Moose, $102.50; Moral Rearmament Program, $28; Museum of Arts, Science, Natural History, etc., $1,990; Music Clubs, $3,502.07; National Association of Postmasters, $50.

National Association of Power Engineers, $100; National Council of Crime & Delinquency, $270; National Municipal League, $100; National Social Welfare Assembly Inc., $100; Navy League, $20; Occupational Center for Handicapped, $15; Opera Guild of Florida, $200; Optimist Clubs, $121.79; Parent Teachers Associations, $67; Pageant Association & Contests, $1,692.50; Palmetto Clubs, $80.89; Police and Peace Officers Associations, $2,778.89; Project Alert, $50; Project Hope, $250; Propeller Club, $100.

Property Owners Committees, $500; Quarterback Clubs, $70; Quota Club of Florida, $12.88; Radio Free Europe, $1,000; Order of Rainbow Girls, $10; React Club of Putnam County, $10; Restaurant Association, $125; Rotary Clubs, $471.55; SS Providencia Inc., $50; Safety Organization Inc., $35; Salvation Army Chapters, $632; Scholarship Funds, $410; Schools, $140,299.79; School Safety Patrols, $320; Manatee County Service Club, $150; Sertoma Clubs, $105; Servicemen's Centers, $50; Shrine Temples, $343; Singing Clubs, $251.47.

Soap Box Derbys, $63,75; Soil & Water Conservation Districts, $10; Sororities, $65; St. Augustine Restoration Inc., $2,500; Sweetin Foundation, $25; Syrian Lebanese Star, $40; TB & Respiratory Disease Association Chapters, $320; Tax Assessors Association, $300; Theatres, $2,595; Toastmasters, $25; TV No. 2 Community Foundation, $1,156; U.S.O., $50; Labor Union Lodges, $300; United Cerebral Palsy, $50; United Funds—Various, $100,929.97; Veterans of Foreign Wars Chapters, $92.50; Volunteers of America, $15; WEDU-TV, $500; Women's Clubs, $490.25; Women's American Organization for Rehabilitation through Training, $30; Young Men's Christian Associations, $1,940; Young Activities Associations, $110.50; Youth Groups, $57.60.

Total, $371,698.33, less "adjustments made during test year ($4,608.31)." Equals $367,090.02.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Mar. 26, 1969]

PSC OKAYS GIFT IF IT'S "REASONABLE"

(By Roland Page)

"Florida Power Corporation should not be permitted to deduct contributions made to charitable, religious and civic organizations from test year earnings which amounted during the test year to $182,247, since the rate payer has no choice in the decision as to who receives the contributions and cannot deduct such contributions in computing his individual tax return."—Testimony of Robert E. Bathen before the Florida Public Service Commission, November 1964.

Florida citizens pay thousands of dollars annually in charitable, civic and other contributions and dues hidden in their utility bills because the Public Service Commission (PSC) thinks it's "reasonable."

Records and interviews also indicate that:

"Reasonable" usually is whatever the utility company says it is.

The commission frequently ignores its own policies concerning contributions and dues.

It makes little effort—and has less manpower—to determine whether contributions meet PSC policies or whether the agencies who received them even exist.

Under the PSC's procedure, companies could collect rates set high enough to finance approved contributions—and then pocket the money.

PSC Chairman William T. Mayo, in defending commission policy, said that charitable and civic expenditures are "just a part of the cost of doing business in a community. Any reputable business will be approached (for them) . . . it can't avoid it."

He said the regulated utility, which in most respects is a monopoly, needs public "good will" as much as any other business.

Mayo feels the consumers should pay for that good will to a "certain reasonable extent." If the commission decides an expenditure is not reasonable, he said, it disallows it for rate purposes and the company and stockholders shoulder the cost.

Asked to define "reasonable," Mayo said that "they (the companies) don't come in with ridiculous claims . . . they know what we'll approve."

He said the PSC once decided a particular college contribution was unreasonable, but he couldn't remember which college or how much money was involved.

PSC Accounting Director John D. McClellan could remember only one contribution which was not approved for rate purposes in his ten years with the agency.

"It involved something about a monument to Sam Houston in Texas," said McClellan.

Last year, the commission approved a $60,000 contribution from Florida Power Corp. to Florida Presbyterian College. That was nearly half of Florida Power's total contributions for the test year.

The PSC also approved $250 in contributions to seven out-of-state colleges by General Telepohne Co. of Florida.

Commission policy, as outlined by McClellan, allows for charitable and civic contributions and dues to be put in the rates only if they are itemized in a report during the rate case investigation.

Political expenses or dues or donations to social clubs are not considered legitimate costs for rate purposes by the commission, McClellan said.

He added that such expenses are charged to the stockholders "as a matter of policy and probably as a matter of fact."

He couldnt' be sure.

He couldn't be sure because expenditures described as vaguely as "various contributions" totalling $23,379 received commission approval in one case last year—and neither McClellan nor the commission asked for details.

He couldn't be sure because Florida Power & Light Co. (FP&L) has been collecting $151,416 in unspecified contributions and dues every year since its last completed rate case in 1964.

In its current rate case, FP&L is asking the commission to raise that figure to $367,090 and include such items as a $300 gift to the "tax assessors association" and a $30 payment to the Martin County Country Club.

Records indicate the PSC staff questioned General Telephone's $1,000 donation to Gov. Claude Kirk's War on Crime debt, but the commission approved it.

It also approved a payment of $655 to the University Club in Tampa and numerous Commerce Clubs and other agencies which appear to be almost entirely social in nature.

"We don't know what they are," McCellan said of many of the itemized recipients. "And we usually don't check it out because the amount is so small."

His staff, which varies in size between eight and ten accountants because of rapid turnover, has little time to identify agencies itemized—or even to demand more detail.

By the same token, McClellan couldn't be sure whether companies are making money or losing money under a procedure which makes it possible for them to pocket rate revenue supposedly earmarked for charity.

Florida Power, for instance, reported $182,247 in dues and donations for the test year ending Sept. 30, 1964.

So the commission added that figure to the company's rate structure when it reduced rates in 1965.

In a separate report, filed annually with the commission, Florida Power said its actual 1965 contributions were $125,641 and its civic club dues and expenses were $15,613. That totalled $141,254—or $40,993 less than the new rates were to provide annually.

Did the company realize a gain?

"Theoretically, yes," said McClellan. He said the PSC doesn't study company dues and contributions between rate cases.

Under the system, figures are frozen into a company's rate structure until the company, PSC, or the public files for a new rate case—during which new reports with new figures are considered.

The company, meanwhile, can contribute more each year than the last case allowed and charge it to the stockholders, or less than the allowed and keep the difference.

In the case of Florida Power & Light, stockholders apparently are absorbing $211,674 in excess contributions reported for the year ending May 31, 1968.

That is why the company seeks to increase its contribution allowance by that amount in its current rate case.

Chairman Mayo said dues and donations amount to "peanuts" when spread among all of a company's customers. McClellan agreed, estimating the total impact at about one cent on the average monthly bill.

Florida is not alone in allowing dues and donations to be charged to utility customers. U.S. Sen. Lee Metcalf, D-Mont., said in 1963 that about half the states did so.

Even the Federal Power Commission, which banned the practice for many years, reversed itself in 1964, decided that "contributions of a reasonable amount to recognized and appropriate charitable institutions constitute a proper operating expense."

The decision was not unanimous. One federal power commissioner, David S. Black, dissented. "The financial burden of donations to charities," said Black, "should not be shifted to the consumer who has no voice in their selection."

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Mar. 27, 1969]

THAT PUZZLING "OTHER" PADS OUT UTILITY RATES

(By Roland Page)

"Mr. President, the public has the right to know how public service corporations spend the funds collected from rate payers. This country has the technology to see that the information is provided." U.S. Sen. Lee Metcalf, Congressional Record, Jan. 24, 1969.

Want to buy a top-notch "miscellaneous?" Or a brand new "other?"

Unless you cook from a wood stove, order groceries by carrier pigeon, or drink from a backyard well, chances are you have been paying for both such items for years.

Chances are also that you have helped the telephone company win government approval to raise your rates, helped the electric company pay its income taxes, paid on a "Reddy Kilowatt" billboard, contributed to country club dues for total strangers or picked up the bill for liquor consumed at a party to which you weren't invited.

And the State of Florida offers little assurance that lobbying and political expenses don't also creep into some of your monthly utility bills.

The "state" in this case is the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC), which regulates rates of privately owned public utilities in Florida.

As part of the ratemaking process, the PSC must calculate legitimate costs incurred by the company in providing service—and then pass those costs on to the customer.

Such expenses usually cover salaries, vehicles, maintenance, wages, depreciation, supplies, fuel, advertising, research, legal and professional services, promotion, public relations, and all taxes.

All costs of company appearances before the commission, whether for a rate increase or a rate reduction, are also covered.

Since utilities, in most respects, have no competition—there would appear to be no compelling reason for them to be frugal with their money. Government regulation and a captive market guarantee them a profit on service regardless of expenditures.

The PSC theoretically acts as a substitute for competition in this respect. It theoretically serves as watchdog of the people, seeing that companies do not collect excessive profits from their customers—and that all operating costs charged to the customers are legitimate and reasonable.

That is the theory.

Records and interviews indicate that the Florida commission, like those of most states, could not adequately police operating costs even if it wanted to.

Indications are that the three elected Florida commissioners pass on millions of dollars in costs to the consumer every year on little more than the utility's word that all is proper.

The words "miscellaneous" and "other" invariably are key items in a privately owned utility company's exhibit before the commission.

"Miscellaneous" appeared 14 times in the operation costs of one company last year, at a total of $2.8-million.

One general category, entitled "Miscellaneous General Expenses," was itemized four ways. Of the four entries, the costliest single item was listed as "other"—$432,740.23.

Other entries which might have been—but were not—elaborated upon were: "Miscellaneous sales expenses $341,718;" "Recreational and Educational Expenses $102,016.20;" "Advertising $359,423.61;" and "Institutional advertising $279,341.79."

The public seldom knows what this money goes for because the commission, upheld by the Florida Supreme Court, consistently denies citizens permission to check company books for themselves.

Even the commissioners seldom know what they're telling the consumers to finance because they don't ask to see the supporting company books.

Nor do they ask the companies to itemize such categories as "miscellaneous general" because, as PSC Accounting Director John D. McClellan put it, "that would be cumbersome."

All of the public's theoretical protestation frequently is vested in the ability of discretion of an $8,000 PSC auditor who virtually lives with the company for several weeks prior to a hearing.

This auditor checks the actual company books, especially unitemized claims, to see that they support the company's exhibits.

Because the auditor's findings aren't made public, the consumer has little knowledge of what he has accomplished.

And because of a long-standing procedure, the commissioners aren't much better off in that respect.

"By instruction," said McClellan, "we (the auditors) don't detail things that are right—just where we find some question or a matter of exception."

Probably 99 per cent of the policy questions in a given rate case are decided by commissioners, nor even by McClellan.

The burden is on the auditor—and it might be an impossible assignment.

Item: The Times recently was allowed to view the workbook of the auditor who checked Tampa Electric Co.'s books prior to a rate increase.

The only "questionable" entry he had brought to Tallahassee was a $19,812.23 payment to N. W. Ayer & Son—an advertising firm which handles much of the "Electric Companies Advertising Program (ECAP)."

In the past, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) refused to allow utilities to deduct all bills paid to that firm because of the political nature of some of its advertising.

This time, however, the PSC auditor noted that "company officials" said N. W. Ayer had depoliticized its advertising and IRS has changed its policy.

Florida's commission accepted the full amount as a legitimate operating cost. McClellan said the policy switch reported by the company was not verified with IRS.

Item: A neighbor of Tampa Electric Co. Board Chairman William C. MacInnes complained to the commission in December 1967 that MacInnes was using company labor and equipment to improve his home.

It was a rare case of the public managing to assist the commission in spite of a system which discourages such help.

PSC Chairman William Mayo said that nothing could be done about it, that the commission has "no authority" to prohibit such use of company labor and equipment, but that the next time the company applied for a rate increase, such items would be disallowed as evidence it needs more money to operate.

More than a year later, and shortly after Tampa Electric was granted a $2.2-million rate increase, Mayo was reminded of the MacInnes incident.

"We asked Mr. MacInnes if the work was in any way paid for by the customers," said Mayo, "and he said no."

McClellan couldn't remember verifying this in company books—or even being ordered to do so.

Item: McClellan said he doubts companies can slip country club or social club membership dues into their miscellaneous expenditures, because the auditor would identify and question them.

Yet dues to the posh University Club in Tampa and other organizations were openly reported to the commission in charitable contribution reports last year, and they were approved for reimbursement by the consumer.

Item: General Telephone Co. of Florida spends an estimated $6,000 to $7,000 per year on a lavish annual "press party" in which hundreds of news, public relations, and advertising professionals are treated to a buffet and unlimited drinks.

The expenditure never appears in the public record because, as McClellan says—it's probably hidden in miscellaneous sales expenses" and "I would consider it part of operating a business."

Item: The PSC's chief accountant candidly admits he could have 20 more auditors and still miss lobbying and political expenditures hidden under "miscellaneous."

Parties for legislators, he said, might appear in company books as "entertaining business associates." Lobbying might be called "legal fees."

"Who am I to question it," says McClellan. "Were accountants . . . not detectives."

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Mar. 28, 1969]

Utilities Play the Rating Game

(By Roland Page)

U.S. Sen. Lee Metcalf, D-Mont., says four investor-owned electric utilities in Florida "overcharged" their customers $69.48-million in 1967.

The Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) has ordered only $6.5-million in rate reductions since then.

Metcalf says Tampa Electric Co. alone collected $11.77-million too much from its customers in 1967.

BUT THE PSC has raised that company's rates $2.2-million since then.

Metcalf says Florida Power Corp., Florida Power & Light Co. and Gulf Power Co. overcharged $17.74-million, $33.58-million and $6.40-million respectively in 1967.

But the PSC has reduced rates of only Florida Power Corp. since then—and then only by $6.5-million.

The Federal Power Commission says Florida Power enjoyed an 8.11-per-cent rate of return in 1967.

But the PSC said it was only 6.62 per cent in a rate case since then.

THE PSC notes that it ordered a net $43.3-million in electric rate reductions from 1957 to 1967.

But Floridians have continued to pay some of the highest utility bills in the land and companies have collected profits way above the national average since then.

The name of the game is regulatory gymnastics. It can be played with a dozen sets of rules producing opposite results.

Metcalf and the Federal Power Commission usually choose rules that would result in dollars for the consumer—if they could set the rates.

BUT IN Florida, the PSC is the rate-making body.

And it seems to prefer the utility rulebook, especially when the purse is big.

Take, for instance, taxes which utilities collect from their customers and pay to themselves, and use of the year-end rate base.

Taxes are considered part of the utility company's operating expenses when setting rates. Hence customers pay the company's debt to Uncle Sam. That is standard.

BY TAKING advantage of several favorable features in the tax laws, however, companies always pay the government less than they've collected.

The companies, and the Florida commission, say this money should not be refunded yearly via lower rates for the customers.

In hearings last year, one expert hired by the PSC said the rates of six major electric and telephone companies could have been reduced a total of $32.2-million if the tax policy were changed.

It was not.

Probably the most controversial and lucrative of the tax breaks is "liberalized depreciation." Roughly, it allows utilities and other industry to depreciate new property for tax purposes at a faster than normal rate.

THE PSC accepts company interpretation of these benefits as tax "deferrals" rather than tax "savings."

It reasons that the taxes on any single item will come due at the end of the rapid depreciation process.

Present ratepayers, says the PSC, should not get those first-year benefits through lower rates "at the expense of future customers or subscribers."

Opponents, including rate consultant Robert E. Bathen, argue that companies add new properties every year, claim new depreciations, and accumulate more and more money.

The PSC answers that if the companies stop growing taxes "deferred" are likely to come due.

So when liberalized depreciation was made available to utilities in 1955, the PSC ordered companies to place their tax "deferrals" into reserve accounts for the "future."

That was 19 years ago.

The old debt has not come due. The companies keep growing at faster and faster rates. The "reserve" overflows.

Florida Power Corp. customers of 1955 started that company's "reserve" for the "future." They've been adding to it ever since so that it now totals $26.6-million. Last year's contribution was $3.2-million.

Since companies keep this "tax" money, the Federal Power Commission enters it as part of their "net operating income." The PSC does not.

Hence one of the major differences which contribute to Metcalf's "overcharge."

The companies and the Florida PSC contend that this state is growing faster than the rest of the nation and that utilities in the past have financed "tremendous expansion programs" to provide service to a booming area.

The great need, said the PSC in an order affirming its tax treatment last year, is for capital to enable companies to provide facilities to meet the demand.

It quoted Dr. Josephus Parr, an economist, who said total reserves from liberalized depreciation for Florida utilities totalled $46-million.

"He was particularly interested in these reserves," said the commission, "because they indicate the additional financing necessary for their replacement."

The reserves are used to purchase new plants.

Commissioners cite the plight of General Telephone Co. of Florida in illustrating what can happen if a utility falls behind the growth rate of its service area.

General Telephone, they note, inherited an antique telephone system during a boom period and still is suffering from a severe service problem.

The company recently was granted a $4.2-million rate increase to help to meet financial demands put on it by growth. The PSC at the same time ordered it to put up $1-million bond and promised a refund of the higher income if the company fails to improve its service by June 30.

General Telephone doesn't use liberalized depreciation, but it does take advantage of similar tax breaks.

It also enjoys the benefits of the "year-end rate base," another PSC policy neither recognized by the Federal Power Commission—nor by the Federal Communications Commission.

It works this way:

"Company A" might have $100-million invested in plant and equipment (rate base) to provide service to its customers as of Jan. 1, 1967. During the year, however, it adds new plant, so that by Dec. 31, it has $200-million invested.

Problem: If a commission decides Company A should make a 6 per cent rate of return on its investment, should it take 6 percent of $100-million and set rates to produce $6-million in profits; or should it take 6 per cent of $200-million to produce $12-million in profits?

The Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission and 26 state commissions (as of 1967) say neither extreme would be fair.

They use an "average" investment rate base (6 per cent of $150-million for a $9-million profit) on the theory that it best represents the company's total operation for the test year.

The PSC's use of the year-end method amounts to another big part of Metcalf's overcharge.

Suppose, for example, the PSC adopted Metcalf's 6 per cent rate of return for "Company A"—giving the company a $12-million profit on a $200-million year end rate base.

The Federal Power Commission would divide the average $150-million rate base into $12-million profits and come up with an 8 per cent rate of return—which Metcalf would call "overcharge."

When it first adopted the year-end method in 1953, the PSC said it was helping utilities meet a "mounting economic boom" created by growth problems and demands for more service.

"Those problems have not abated," it said in 1966, "but on the contrary, have increased."

In an appeal contesting the use of the yearend rate base last year, the Florida Supreme Court "expressly commended" the average rate base as the "sounder and better practice" and said it should be used in future rate cases.

"In the absence of the most extraordinary or emergency conditions or situations," said the court, "average investment during the year should be the method employed by the commission."

The court declined to make that an order, and it upheld the PSC method in that particular case because "we cannot substitute our judgment for that of the commission."

Within less than a month, however, on April 9, 1968, the PSC ordered a $4-million rate reduction for Florida Power Corp., and switched to the average rate base.

The rate base policy switch alone was responsible for $734,023 of the rate reduction.

The commission said the timing of its action was "purely by coincidence."

The policy change was short-lived. In a $1.5-million rate reduction last December, Florida Power was placed back on the year-end system.

"There still is little difference in the year-end and average investment rate base," the PSC acknowledged.

But it said Florida Power's capital needs for the five-year period 1968 to 1972 will be about $400-million.

"The financing of this program, made necessary by the unparalleled growth of the company's service area . . . will require realistic earnings," the commission said. It added: "We are convinced that the use of the year-end rate base . . . will materially assist in the successful financing of this program."

Opponents of this philosophy contend:

Stockholders rather than consumers should provide capital for the company.

Growth also means more business and more income for the utilities and the year-end rate base fails to consider those benefits.

Use of the year-end rate base, deferred tax treatment, and other PSC policies hide the actual profit companies are receiving.

C. W. McKee Jr., comptroller of Florida Power Corp., concedes raising of capital is the stockholder's job—not the consumer's.

Asked why the PSC doesn't raise the rate of return whenever a company needs expansion money, McKee replied: "I guess it wouldn't be politically expedient—Metcalf would take the higher rate of return and issue a news release."

Despite $5-million in rate reductions last year, Florida Power's profits jumped $2.3-million over those of 1967.

Since 1962, the company has enjoyed a 64 per cent increase in its profits. Last year, they totalled $25.6-million.

Meanwhile, the company isn't confining its expansion to the service demands forced upon it.

Three weeks ago, the Williston City Council learned Florida Power wants to buy that city's municipal electric system.

No "Overcharge," Thanks to the PSC

(By Roland Page)

Did Florida Power Corp. collect $17.7-million too much from its customers in 1967—as charged by Sen. Lee Metcalf?

Yes—under the Federal Power Commission's method of computing company earnings, rates of return and investment in plant.

Yes—under the Montana Democrat's recommendation of 6 per cent as a "fair" rate of return—which also was the latest rate of return prescribed by the federal commission in an electric company case.

No—under the Florida Public Service Commission's (PSC) methods of communication.

No—under the Florida PSC's current "allowed" 7.12 per cent rate of return for that company.

The chart below shows how Metcalf, using Federal Power Commission figures, arrived at the "overcharge" he assigned to Florida Power Corp.

It also shows how the PSC, using its figures, would come up with different conclusions.

Both the state and federal commissions based their computations on reports filed by the company for the calendar year 1967.

The Federal Power Commission calculated Florida Power had an "average" investment in plant and facilities (rate base) of $435.5-million in 1967.

The Federal agency also calculated by its standards that the company cleared $35.5-million in net operating revenue.

Florida Power realized, therefore, an 8.11 per cent rate of return on its investment ($35.3-million is 8.11 per cent of $435.5-million). Metcalf thinks 6 per cent is a fair rate of return.

Six per cent would have produced $26.17-million in net operating revenues by federal standards—or $9.2-million less than the company actually earned. The difference, to Metcalf, is "overcharge."

In addition, Florida Power was figured by the federal commission to have collected from its customers $8.5-million in corporate federal income taxes to cover the "overcharge" (about 92 cents for each dollar of income). Total—$17.7-million.

The Florida Public Service Commission (top line), by using the so-called "year end rate base," always gives companies credit for a bigger investment than does the federal commission.

In this example, the PSC rate base is $35.7-million higher than the federal computation.

Meanwhile, the PSC figured net operating income for 1967 at only $32.2-million—or $3.2-million less than the federal figure.

This is due mainly to the PSC's tax policies. It treats deferred taxes as an operating expense and thus deducts them from net income.

The combination of higher rate base and lower income always makes for a lower rate of return—in this case, 6.85 per cent.

Since the PSC thinks 7.12 per cent, rather than 6 per cent, is a "fair" rate of return for Florida Power, the company is in no danger of a rate reduction.

A 7.12 per cent return by PSC standards would have produced $33.4-million net operating revenue—or $1.1-million less than the company was figured to have earned. Thus, to the PSC, there's no overcharge.

Florida Power Corporation: Are its rates fair? Or are they an overcharge?

It all depends whose figures you use. This table shows how the computations of two agencies can produce different answers:

Florida Power Corp. earnings as computed by the Florida Public Service Commission:	
Rate base	$471, 200, 000
Net operating income	$32, 300, 000
Actual rate of return (percent)	6. 85
Fair rate of return (percent)	7. 12
Net operating income at 7.12 percent	$33, 400, 000
Difference in income	−$1, 100, 000
Taxes collected on extra income	0
Total "overcharge"	0

Source: Florida Public Service Commission, by special request.

Florida Power Corp. earnings as computed by the Federal Power Commission:	
Rate base	$435, 500, 000
Net operating income	$35, 300, 000
Actual rate of return (percent)	8. 11
Fair rate of return (percent)	6
Net operating income at 6 percent	$26, 170, 000
Difference in income (called "Overcharge" by Metcalf)	$9, 200, 000
Taxes on extra income	$8, 500, 000
Total "overcharge"	$17, 700, 000

Sources: Congressional Record, and Statistics of Privately Owned Electric Utilities in the United States, 1967.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Mar. 29, 1969]

PSC: Little Reason To Favor Customers

(By Roland Page)

The three members of Florida's Public Service Commission (PSC) have little reason to favor utility customers in any given rate case or policy decision.

They were elected to office in campaigns nearly ignored by the customers but partially financed by utility company representatives.

They are visited or telephoned almost daily by the highly organized utilities—but seldom by the unorganized customers.

They are not trained in the vital regulatory fields of economics, law, engineering or accounting, and must depend entirely on the guidance of others.

They get much "guidance" from the companies, some neutral guidance from the PSC staff, but little guidance from the customers, who, incidentally, foot the bill both for the companies and for the staff.

They must seek reelection every four years, and hence worry about campaign money during the last two years of any given term.

Former Florida PSC chairman Alan Boyd acknowledged 10 years ago the problems created by statewide election of Public Service Commissioners.

"There is little interest in the commission political campaigns," he wrote, "and little knowledge on the part of the public of whom or for what they may be voting."

Boyd, who later became the first U.S. secretary of transportation, said a candidate's ability to raise money for his campaign is therefore "severely restricted" and utility companies "are in a position to exercise tremendous power in selecting the candidates."

He also noted that it usually takes a new commissioner at least two years of his four-year term to understand the complexities of utility regulation, and that "he then spends the rest of the time worrying about whether he can be reelected."

Boyd recommended the so-called "Missouri Plan" of selecting commissioners. Under it prospective commissioners are "nominated by the governor, supposedly to insure against election of commissioners whose only qualification is a hefty campaign treasury or the right party affiliation. One name is nominated for each vacancy.

The nominees are then placed on a ballot and voters may mark "yes" or "no" beside each name, thus retaining supreme authority in the people.

Boyd also recommended six-year terms for commissioners—the terms used by 35 of 55 regulatory commissions in other states, according to a recent U.S. Senate committee report.

His bill incorporating these features died in a legislative committee and PSC members continue to be elected statewide to four-year terms.

As a result, three career politicians (all Democrats) with no training in the technical or professional fields involved in regulation, now head the PSC.

Law requires that they conduct their hearings like a court—but none of them have law degrees. Their responsibilities require decisions involving questions of economics, accounting and * * * those fields, and none of them are required to have training in those fields, and none of them do.

Some of their own staff members complain privately that this lack of training makes it difficult to get technical points across to the commissioners.

While in office, the commissioners are subjected to what one attorney called "constant pressure and lobbying" from utility representatives.

"The people who contact them are the utilities," be said. "You don't have the consumers coming up to talk to them once or twice a week."

The attorney asked not to be identified. He represents a utility company before the commission.

Consumers, he said, have no organization with the money, the will or the know-how to match the utilities in their "informal discussions" with commissioners.

He pointed to the PSC's handling of the corporate federal income tax surcharge as an example of the results.

The PSC granted two major utilities permission to pass the surcharge on to their customers.

It was learned the commissioners ignored the recommendation of their own general counsel in approving the requests without a public hearing.

Utility representatives had convinced them such action was proper.

A furor ensued, with one state senator threatening a legislative investigation. The commission rescinded its order and told the companies to return what money they had collected.

In a public hearing the situation is usually the same.

Companies haul in mountains of prepared testimony and hire some of the nation's leading economists and other experts to advance the company point of view on a regulatory issue.

All company expenses in a hearing are paid for by the consumers through their rates.

Hundreds of customers might appear in opposition to the company view, but, as Boyd once pointed out, "the opinions of private citizens who are not experts is valueless, because they cannot be considered in reaching a decision."

"The commission," agreed Pinellas County Atty. Daniel Martin, "can't deny a rate increase just because some organizations pass resolutions saying they're against it—the commission has to have valid evidence that the rate increase isn't needed."

Valid evidence only can come through experts—and experts are expensive.

The Pinellas County Commission hired one such expert several years ago, Robert E. Bathen, a rate consultant from the engineering firm of R. W. Beck and Associates to testify on behalf of the county in seeking reductions in the rates of Florida Power Corp. and General Telephone Co. of Florida.

He was paid a total $25,000 for those services.

Bathen, among other things, maintained that the commission should not allow the utilities to earn a return on accumulated deferred taxes.

The commission agreed in issuing subsequent orders—though it did not mention Bathen—and a subsequent change in policy theoretically is saving customers throughout Florida thousands of dollars per year.

When it was time to appeal other commission decisions to the Florida Supreme Court, however, the county decided it could not afford the estimated $15,000 it would cost to put Bathen on the stand.

The county failed to win one penny of financial aid from other cities and counties whose citizens were affected by the cases—although it was sent a drawerful of encouraging resolutions.

Theoretically, the PSC staff is the "people's expert" in rate cases.

In practice, however, the staff functions more as a neutral adviser to the commissioners.

Staff members, says Martin, seldom take the witness stand and never appeal a decision of the commissioners.

Staff neutrality probably was best expressed by Lewis Petteway, the PSC's general counsel.

"The commission represents the public," said Petteway, "but the public includes investors, subscribers, utilities and utility employes. So we've got to balance all those conflicting interests to do a good job."

Petteway also explained a commission policy against releasing staff recommendations to the public.

"One of my recommendations got out once," he said, "and it so happened the commission had ruled against me. Then I had to defend the commission's stand in the Supreme Court and it got kind of embarrassing when the opposition read my own recommendation."

Insufficient funds and personnel problems raise doubts that the staff can match the utilities even as advisers to the commission.

The PSC, for instance, has no economist, no certified public accountant, and no securities analyst.

It hired the national accounting firm of Ernst & Ernst during its study of tax credits last year, and hence received the advice of an economist with that firm.

The State Budget Commission, however, has cut in half the recommended funds available to the PSC for such consultants in the next biennium.

Of 66 new staff positions the PSC is requesting in its request this year, the Budget Commission is recommending approval of 14.

PSC Trio: A Salesman, a Coach, a Car Dealer

Here are the three men who set utility rates in Florida and decide the complex legal, accounting, economic and technical problems involved in regulating one-fifth of the state's economy:

Jerry W. Carter, Democrat, 81 years old. He was, according to a 1967 U.S. Senate report, the only member of a state regulatory commission with no more than a grade school education.

He came to Florida in 1908 as a sewing machine salesman. He supported Sydney J. Catts for governor and was rewarded in 1917 with appointment as State Hotel Commissioner.

He was elected to the Florida Railroad & Public Utilities Commission (later the PSC) in 1934. Once describing himself as "just a cheap politician—because that's all Florida can afford," he won re-election eight times and says he is ready to run again in 1970.

He attends fewer and fewer public hearings because of illness. When he does participate, two full-time PSC staffers have been seen following him around to make sure he doesn't hurt himself. He has been known, in recent years, to doze off in the middle of complex testimony.

Staff members say Carter was one of the nation's best railroad regulators "in his prime," but added that he has "little interest" in electric, gas, or telephone utilities.

In his most recent election in 1966, Carter received $5,610 in campaign contributions from representatives of utilities regulated by the PSC.

Jess Yarborough, Democrat, 62, is the newest member of the commission, having defeated St. Petersburg attorney Ray Osborne, a Republican, last November. Osborne later became lieutenant governor of Florida.

Yarborough says there "ain't nothin' highfalutin about utility regulations" and adds that he ran for the post for three reasons: 1. "I like politics;" 2. "It's an important office;" and 3. "I thought I could win."

A former Miami high school football coach who boasts in his campaign literature that he "lost only one game to Florida schools during 10 years," Yarborough is the only commissioner with a college degree.

He was a state legislator before joining the commission. Before that, he was Miami's director of public welfare, a Dade County Commissioner and a Dade County school board member.

About one-fourth of the $24,307 in campaign funds accumulated by Yarborough, near the end of his race with Osborne, were linked to utilities. "They're old friends," he said of the donors.

William T. Mayo, 51, has only two years of college, but claims his business experience as a Tallahassee car dealer and his various government posts as qualifications for the PSC.

The son of the late Nathan Mayo, former Florida Commissioner of Agriculture, the PSC chairman was once mayor of Tallahassee, a member of the State Road Board, and administrator of the Interstate Highway System in Florida.

Mayo is the only incumbent who first joined the PSC by appointment (by former Gov. Farris Bryant). He fought successfully for a law enabling the PSC to consider service when setting rates and initiated studies to further strengthen the agency.

He is generally considered a strong commissioner. He thinks election is the best system of choosing commissioners because it keeps them "more responsive to the public."

When Mayo campaigned for election to his first full four-year term in 1966, he received $9,075 in contributions from utility-linked sources.

FINDINGS: DIVORCE PSC FROM UTILITIES

A study of Florida's system of utility regulation indicates the following findings:

The Public Service commissioners, elected to an office which few voters understand, often must depend on the very people they hope to regulate for campaign funds.

The regulatory agency, with too much work and too little staff and powers, can't meet its responsibilities.

Consumers, untrained in the technical aspects of regulation, unable to see utility records or detailed reports, and unable to combine the knowledge and resources they do have, are under-represented in rate cases.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Mar. 30, 1969]

Public Service Commission—Heavy Duties, Little Power

(By Roland Page)

The Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) has too many jobs and not enough powers.

For 82 years, the State Legislature has been quick to assign new duties to the regulatory agency—but slow to grant it the powers needed to carry them out.

Utility opposition, legislative inaction and, in some cases, PSC refusal or inability to use the powers available, have combined to keep regulation somewhat less than effective.

It began in 1887 with creation of the "Florida Railroad Commision."

It continued to 1947 with the "Railroad and Public Utilities Commission"; to 1963 with the "Public Utilities Commission," and finally to 1965 with the PSC.

The change in names reflected the change in workload—always heavier.

Today's PSC has jurisdiction over all telephone and telegraph companies, all privately-owned electric and natural gas companies, 218 private water and sewer companies, 15 railroad or railroad terminal companies, and 11,412 buses, trucks, taxicabs, and other motor carriers operating in this state.

Ferries, toll bridge companies and canal companies, as well as dump trucks, transportation brokers, freight forwarders, and movers also come under its jurisdiction.

The PSC is responsible for fixing fair, reasonable and compensatory rates for businesses under its jurisdiction and for setting and enforcing standards of service, efficiency and safety.

It must see that the operator answers when you dial "0," that some buses run on time, that the gas heater doesn't run out of gas or the refrigerator out of electricity, and that these and other services are available at fair prices.

As a footnote, it's also supposed to help the attorney general make sure bookies don't use the telephone for gambling purposes.

It has been a "catch-all" agency for the Legislature—a good spot to put a job that doesn't fit anywhere else.

At least one committee of the Florida Legislature apparently feels some of the jobs don't fit together anymore.

The House Committee on Government Reorganization proposes abolishing the PSC and putting public utilities under a new Department of Business Regulation—along with banking and insurance.

Regulation of common carriers, the committee feels, might better be handled by the Department of Transportation.

The Committee might have a point.

Growth of federal regulatory activity over railroads has dwarfed state responsibilities in that area.

Most motor carriers already are regulated in some respects by several state agencies (the Transportation Department, the Department of Agriculture) and it's not uncommon to find a PSC inspector, and several other state agents checking one truck for several purposes all of which could be accomplished by one man.

Growth of other utilities, meanwhile, especially the telephone, electric, and natural gas companies has been phenomenal.

The State's six biggest privately-owned telephone and power companies alone now serve 4.6-million customers and had a gross investment of $3.5 billion at the close of 1967.

Yet the PSC's largest single department is devoted entirely to transportation; it's largest single request for new staff this year is for transportation; and most of its general professional departments (accounting, rates, legal) must split their time between the giant utilities and commom carriers.

That's why comparison of the PSC staff with those of other state utility commissions is invalid—many states have separate boards for transportation, utilities, and other businesses.

The biggest problem in separating common carriers from utilities would be rate-making and the powers and technical staff it requires.

PSC Chairman William T. Mayo notes the Transportation Department, under the House plan, would have to be granted legislative powers similar to those of the PSC in order to set common carrier rates.

He expressed no opinion on the possible split—but voiced reservations over putting utilities under a large department with other duties.

"You might create a monster," he warned.

He might have added that a "powder puff" can result if the Legislature fails to grant the PSC or any new regulatory body powers vital to effective consumer protection.

The 1969 Legislature could consider other problems which weaken utility regulation and the consumer's voice.

Among them:

Availability of company records—Consumers can't get at utility records to verify certain claimed expenses in a rate case. The PSC has the power to review actual records, as well as the power to order them produced for consumer representatives, and the power to demand itemization of any expenses the company wants to include in its rates.

The commission, however, doesn't require such itemization and, critics say, it usually declines requests for it by utility opponents in hearings.

The City of Miami last year asked permission to see the records and federal income tax returns which support exhibits of Florida Power & Light Co. in its current rate case. The PSC denied the request, saying in a Nov. 11 order that Miami:

"Has attempted an 'en masse' examination or 'fishing expedition' into the company's records in the expressed hope that error may be discovered in the underlying documents constituting the basis for the exhibits presented at the direction of the Commission. We find that mere suspicion that some error in the company's records may exist does not constitute sufficient grounds to require the company to submit its books and records for unrestricted examination."

In cases before the PSC, companies generally list public relations, advertising, labor relations, legal, professional and other expenses as "miscellaneous general" or "miscellaneous sales."

A utility consumer's counsel, if created by the legislature, might be granted authority to inspect records along with the PSC auditors.

Inability of local governments to represent the public—A legal question prevents cities or counties from entering rate cases unless they are customers of the utility involved. Legislation apparently is needed to allow cities to combine resources for cases involving regulatory issues of statewide significance.

Lack of jurisdiction—The commission has no jurisdiction over municipally and cooperatively-owned utilities and no territorial jurisdiction over private companies.

It can do nothing about wasteful duplication of lines and facilities when one utility enters an area served by another.

Regulation—Or Disaster?

Florida might be standing at a crossroads between effective state regulation of utilities—and disaster.

A constitutional question challenging the very existence of the elected State Public Service Commission (PSC) is responsible.

It's forcing legislators to consider replacing the 82-year-old agency with an appointed board.

Critics of the PSC, including a former commissioner, long have maintained the elective system gives utilities "tremendous power" over its members.

They contend an appointed board would be better insulated from utility-linked campaign contributions, and better able to regulate independently.

It's far too early for them to rejoice.

The constitutional question has not been settled and odds are that when it is, the settlement will favor the existing system.

While legislators could change the PSC even under those circumstances, they wouldn't have to—and they've shown little inclination to do so.

If they are forced to switch to an appointive agency, hasty decisions as to terms, size, qualifications and the appointing authority could result in disaster.

The constitutional question has been forwarded to Gov. Claude Kirk, who is expected to ask the Florida Supreme Court for an advisory opinion.

Meanwhile, the only expressed legislative concern has been for conforming with the State Constitution—not for improving utility regulation in general.

That question seems to have been lost in the flurry of government reorganization.

Yet it's a massive, complex issue, striking at the pocketbook of virtually every voter in the state.

The PSC presently controls about one-fifth of Florida's economy.

It regulates 15 railroad companies, 20 telephone companies, one telegraph company, five of the state's largest electric utilities, 16 natural gas companies, 218 water and sewer companies, hundreds of taxicabs and thousands of common carriers.

It sets and enforces rates and safety and service standards for utilities under its jurisdiction. It serves as policeman, judge and jury in all matters concerning those companies and their customers.

In Florida, it's the Federal Power Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Communications Commission all rolled into one.

Like those agencies, it has a unique combination of legislative, judicial and executive powers—all of which are necessary in performing its complex and technical functions.

Also like those agencies, and practically, all similar state commissions, its members are kept independent of the legislative and executive branches through fixed terms.

Unlike the federal agencies, however, the PSC remains an elective office—it's not independent of politics.

PSC Chairman William Mayo is opposed to any change in the system under which he keeps his job.

Election, he says, keeps the commissioners "closer to the people."

But if the Legislature tries to abandon the system, either by constitutional demand or by choice, Mayo warns it should "look at the whole thing—separate it from government reorganization."

The PSC, as Mayo put it, is a "different breed of cat."

The House Committee on Government Reorganization, which first raised the constitutional issue, has drafted a plan which would place utilities under a Department of Business Regulation—along with banking and insurance.

A department director, appointed by the governor with consent of the Senate, would direct a professional staff which, in turn, would conduct hearings, set rates, investigate complaints and generally police the industry.

Decisions of the staff would be subject to appeal to a five-member board, also appointed by the governor and Senate and subject to removal only by the governor and Senate.

Regulation of common carriers, one of the biggest areas of PSC responsibility, would be placed under the Department of Transportation under the House plan—which would mean granting of rate-making powers to Transportation.

The House Committee has been silent as yet on the critical questions of terms for the Board members and the director of the Business Regulation Department and on how the director would be removed.

It also has refrained from endorsing any change in the current structure, stating only that its plan would meet the possible constitutional requirement and that it "could" be adopted whether change is mandatory or not.

The State senate, meanwhile, seems confident no change will be necessary and is keeping hands off the PSC. It has offered no plan.

State Planning and Budget Director Wallace Henderson has proposed a reorganization plan which, among other things, would abolish the PSC and put all business regulation under a Department of Commerce.

He made no recommendation on how the Department would be headed.

If they do reform the system, whether by constitutional mandate or choice, legislators might also look at the Federal Power Commission and the boards of California, New York and Wisconsin for ideas.

These are the commissions generally admired by consumer-oriented experts and professional regulators.

The Federal Power Commission consists of five members appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate for five-year terms, with one member's term expiring each year.

California has five commissioners appointed by the governor with consent of the Senate for six-year staggered terms.

New York has seven members, five full-time and two part-time, appointed for 10-year terms by the governor with the Senate's consent.

It also has in its jurisdiction the company which charged the highest electric bill in the nation in at least one category reported to the Federal Power Commission in 1967.

The company, Consolidated Edison of New York Inc., charged $9.94 for 250 kilowatt hours. The New York Public Service Commission, nevertheless, is included among most groupings of consumer-oriented state agencies—possibly because Consolidated Edison was held in the same year to a rate of return of 5.61 per cent.

Florida Power Corp. was fourth highest in the same utility bill ranking $9.26, but its rate of return, calculated by the same method, was 8.11 per cent.

Wisconsin, like Florida's present Commission, has only three members. Unlike the PSC, however, Wisconsin's commissioners also are appointed by the governor and Senate and they have six year, rather than four-year, staggered terms.

No two experts agree on the best structure for a regulatory commission, but they do note that:

Appointment removes commissioners from election campaigns in which they inevitably face voter apathy and are forced to accept campaign contributions from utility-linked sources.

The governor, more than any other official, is likely to represent the general "philosophy" voters want their state government and its agencies to take. The theory is that he will appoint commissioners attuned to that philosophy.

Consent of the Senate or Legislature in one safeguard against political patronage by the governor—especially when the legislative majority is with the opposite party. Proponents of this check also argue that it tends to encourage appointment of qualified commissioners.

Fixed terms insure the independence such commissions must have as quasi-judicial agencies operating in a specialized field.

Terms should be long enough to enable a commissioner to "get the hang" of his complicated work, but short enough and staggered so that the governor can appoint a majority within his own term—hence reflecting in commission decisions the "philosophy" expressed in the governor's election.

Change in the commission membership should be gradual so that utilities aren't confronted with abrupt policy turnabouts which could be economically ruinous.

Membership should be large enough to provide for experienced members sitting at all times (Two of Florida's three present Commissioners are up for re-election next year. If they are defeated the PSC would be left with one experienced member—whose experience began only this year).

Lack of a Staff Hampers Rate Watchers

The Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) can't do its job.

It doesn't have the staff, the funds or the professional experts needed to see that the 270 privately-owned utilities under its jurisdiction are charging consumers no more than "fair and reasonable rates."

As the PSC itself said in its current budget request to the Legislature, a "critical situation exists in all departments from Executive through the Administrative and into the technical and professional departments."

It said at least 66 new staff members are needed merely to maintain "the current level of services."

The State Budget Commission, which screens requests of all state agencies before they go to the legislators, apparently doesn't believe the PSC.

Of the 66 positions requested, the Budget Commission recommended only 14 be approved.

It noted that the PSC staff has doubled since 1961. So has its budget.

But the growth in budget and staff hasn't kept pace with the burgeoning regulatory workload in Florida.

The number of water and sewer systems alone under PSC jurisdiction tripled in one day last year—when the now defunct Duval County Commission voted to turn all such privately-owned utilities in its jurisdiction over to the state agency.

Under the budget commission recommendation, the PSC is destined to police the safety and service standards of those systems without an engineer.

The situation isn't new.

For years, the PSC has been deciding questions of economic theory without the services of an economist.

It has approved millions of dollars in utility security issues without a securities analyst.

It frequently hears the testimony of certified public accountants hired by utilities—but has no CPA of its own.

"Our people might be just as qualified," says Chief Accountant John D. McClellan. "And they frequently are—but it makes it rough when you don't have that CPA after your name."

McClellan himself is leaving the PSC because he can't get certified as long as he's there.

The State Board of Public Accountants doesn't recognize experience with the regulatory commission for certification purposes.

The PSC can't afford to send its accountants to school for an extra year—another method of gaining certification.

So, as McClellan put it, "they're forced to leave"—usually for a private accounting firm.

The problem discourages recruiting. "I have to tell them if they come with us they can't get certified," said the PSC chief.

He also has to tell young prospects they'll start at $6,840—while the national average starting pay for graduate accountants is $8,400.

The commission now has eight to ten accountants. The number fluctuates because of turnover. McClellan says he could use 20 more.

A request for one more accountant was slashed by the Budget Commission this year.

The Commission last year hired the consultant firm of Ernst and Ernst to give it the weight of CPA and economist services during critical rate hearings. The cost was $25,000.

The PSC has asked for another $25,000 in consultant funds for the next biennium.

The Budget Commission recommended against it because of the "increase in staff" it was approving for the PSC. It cut the figure in half.

Ernst and Ernst did a staff organization study of the PSC. It found, among other things, that customers of eight Florida utilities could have saved $11-million by the addition of one staff member.

The problem was an 18-month delay in $32.8-million worth of rate reductions. For each month the orders were delayed, the utilities were collecting $1.8-million more from customers than they should have been.

Ernst and Ernst blamed "multiple requirements" on the executive director and general counsel. One man was doing two full-time PSC jobs.

The $69.4-million "overcharge" U.S. Sen. Lee Metcalf has assigned to four Florida electric companies would support the PSC for 36 years under its current budget.

One company alone cleared profits last year equal to 10 times the commission budget.

Floridians, through rates, are providing utilities with unlimited funds and experts with which the companies can represent themselves before the PSC.

The commission, says PSC Chairman William T. Mayo, must have "additional personnel as capable and knowledgeable as the experts the regulated groups bring in."

WHAT'S BEST WAY TO REGULATE YOUR UTILITY BILLS?—A 3-WAY COMPARISON [1]

Present Florida Public Service Commission	California Public Utilities Commission	House proposal	
3 Commissioners	5 commissioners: Utilities, consumer counsel.	5 board members	Director, department of business regulation.
Elected	Appointed by Governor and senate.	Appointed by Governor and senate.	Appointed by Governor and senate.
4-year terms	6-year terms	Terms?	Terms?
Removed for cause by Governor.	Removal by 2/3 vote of legislature.	Removed by Governor and senate.	Removal?
Majority changeover in 1 election.	Takes 4 years for majority change.	Majority change?	
Staff under commission	Staff under commission	No staff	Staff regulates utilities subject to appeal to board.

[1] From the St. Petersburg Times, Mar. 30, 1969.

"There is little interest in the commission political campaigns and little knowledge on the part of the public for whom or for what they may be voting. The cost of a statewide political campaign is very expensive and the ability of candidates to raise money is severely restricted. Because of the lack of interest and knowledge in the office, the net result is that companies regulated by the commission are in a position to exercise tremendous power in selecting candidates, even though this power has apparently never been exercised."—Alan Boyd, former Chairman, Florida Public Service Commission.

Local Regulation?—Public Utilities Prefer State

Florida electric companies wrote and sponsored the laws placing them under state regulation because they preferred it to local jurisdiction, says former State Sen. Henry Baynard of St. Petersburg.

Baynard should know.

Electric companies in Florida went completely unregulated until a few counties began establishing utility commissions of their own in the late 1940s.

Pinellas was a leader. Public pressure, culminating in the election of a Pinellas representative who had vowed to change the situation, led to the creation of a three-man Pinellas County utility commission.

It was Baynard who introduced the bill.

To get it passed, however, he promised not to oppose repeal of the county bill if statewide jurisdiction later was approved.

"That was a mistake," says Baynard.

He said the County Utilities Commission proved effective—ordering $3-million in rebates and lower rates during its brief existence.

The companies, meanwhile, pushed legislation in 1951 placing them under the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission (now the Public Service Commission), said Baynard.

Baynard doesn't think a return to local regulation would improve the situation.

"It has to be statewide or it would be impossible for the companies to operate," he said. But he thinks the state agency should have "more teeth" to it.

A Counsel: Would It Aid Utility Regulation?

Does Florida need an "office of utility consumers' counsel" in addition to its regulatory commission?

Lack of competent consumer representation in utility rate cases before the Public Service Commission (PSC) is as telling now as it was 10 years ago.

At that time, the PSC itself called it a "problem which shouldn't exist."

Companies haul stacks of testimony and armies of experts into hearings to support their side for a rate increase—secure in the knowledge that it's all paid for in the customer utility bills.

Their customers, meanwhile, go unrepresented, unless a city, county or other agency within a company's service area decides to carry the ball.

And that doesn't happen very often. Few local governmental agencies are willing to risk spending taxes on other than local government affairs.

Especially when they find—as Pinellas County did in a three-year rate fight with Florida Power Corp. and General Telephone Co. of Florida—that other local governments in the utility's service area aren't willing to chip in.

Moreover, there's a question as to whether cities and counties can legally represent the public before the PSC.

Pinellas County and the City of Miami have justified past involvement in rate cases by being customers of the respective utilities serving them.

This approach precludes, however, united statewide action on behalf of tthe disorganized consumer.

Miami, served by Florida Power and Light Co. and Southern Bell Telephone Co., couldn't join the Pinellas struggle.

Nor can Pinellas aid Miami in its current contest with Florida Power and Light.

In 1965, Pinellas County's hired expert, Robert E. Bathen, testified in opposition to several PSC policies which were in effect statewide.

The PSC agreed with Bathen on one point, reversed its policy, and saved state-wide consumers an estimated $11-million since then.

An appeal was filed to the State Supreme Court on some of the other points—but the county ran out of funds. It already had spent more than $38,000 for the services of Bathen and George Spiegel, a Washington attorney who specializes in utility regulation.

Pinellas appealed without Bathen and Spiegel—and the appeal was dismissed.

U.S. Sen. Lee Metcalf, D-Montana, thinks he might have a solution to consumer weakness and disunity.

He's introduced a bill in Congress that would establish a "U.S. Office of Utility Consumers' Council."

It would:

Hire experts to represent the public in utility cases before federal or state agencies.

Provide grants to local or state governments for up to 75 per cent of the cost of establishing their own such offices.

Periodically recommend legislation which might strengthen consumer protection.

Metcalf introduced similar legislation last year. He suggested the Consumer Counsel be supported by a tax on utilities, since customers already pay all company taxes, all regulatory fees and all costs of company testimony and representation.

It didn't pass.

Metcalf says three states have established Consumer Counsel offices of their own without federal aid. He quotes the Public Service Commission Chairman of one of the states, Maryland, as describing the counsel office as "absolutely indispensable."

Metcalf said cost of the proposed U.S. office would be about $40-million. Divided 50 ways that would be $800,000 per State if each state decided to act on its own. The California Office, however, operated on a $60,000 to $100,000 budget.

A change in the PSC's tax policies alone, could have saved customers of six utilities $32.2-million in 1967, according to an expert hired by the PSC.

That possibly could have funded a Florida Utility Consumers Counsel for 400 years.

The PSC points to its staff as representative of the public in rate cases. The staff, however, is neutral at best and acts more as an adviser to the commissioners.

As Pinellas County Attorney Martin said, the PSC follows courtroom procedure, but the system seldom provides the "adversary" atmosphere of a court.

"You have the commissioners as judges and the companies on one side," said Martin, "but nobody on the other side."

Martin would have the staff separated from the commissioners and converted into what Metcalf is proposing.

"Let the staff appeal decisions of the commission," he says. "If it doesn't, who will?"

He also would like the PSC staff recommendations to be made public. "We can't disagree with them," he says, "because we never know what they (the recommendations) are or what these professional people think."

PSC Chairman William Mayo says staff recommendations are kept confidential because they're technical, diversified between PSC departments and would "confuse the public."

BETTER UTILITY REGULATION FOR A BETTER FLORIDA

Public utilities are not ordinary businesses. They are monopolies granted by the state and regulated in the public interest.

The 73-year history of monopoly regulation in Florida was well phrased to a congressional committee in 1965 by Edwin L. Mason, then chairman of the Public Service Commission: "The best regulation is little or no regulation."

In truth, the best utility regulation is careful, informed and complete regulation to guarantee investors a fair return and customers reliable service at the cheapest possible rates.

With its eye on reorganization, the 1969 Florida Legislature has an unusual opportunity to remodel the Public Service Commission into an instrument for more effective utility regulation.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE PRESENT PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION?

In a phrase, the PSC doesn't do its job.

A detailed series by Times staffer Roland Page last week documented repeated cases of lax regulation:

The PSC lacks information on utility expenses charged to customers. It does not require itemized listings of millions of dollars of expenses shown in reports as "miscellaneous."

The PSC doesn't even bother to check thousands of dollars worth of contributions, even those which obviously are questionable.

The reasons for these shortcomings also are clear:

The commission's staff is overworked, undermanned and undertrained.

The commission's hearings are distorted. In the natural struggle between the interests of investor and consumer, the PSC staff is neutral. The utilities are loaded with expert horsepower, and the consumers usually are not represented.

The commissioners themselves are highly susceptible to political influence from utility interests which contribute heavily to their campaign treasuries.

WHAT DO FLORIDIANS WANT OF THEIR PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION?

We believe they want a commission that does its job expertly. They want a commission that isn't classified as heavily oriented toward investors (as the Florida commission always has been), or even overly weighted toward consumers. They want middle-road regulation guided by professional skills instead of political backscratching.

They want a commission that plans well for growth. They want a commission that prevents deterioration of service and equipment such as occurred under the old Peninsular Telephone Co. They want a commission that requires better service more quickly, as since General Telephone purchased Peninsular in August 1957.

They want regulation that guarantees electric power every time a switch is flipped. They want regulation that attracts investors, rewards stockholders, satisfies customers and allows utilities to set standard of progress in their communities.

HOW CAN UTILITY REGULATION IN FLORIDA BE IMPROVED BY THE 1969 LEGISLATURE?

We recommend to the upcoming Legislature a five-point program for modern, balanced regulation of utility monopolies:

1. Restructure the commission into a professional five-member board appointed to staggered, six-year terms by the governor and confirmed by the Senate. The six-year terms would require a referendum on a constitutional amendment, which would be a good test of public acceptance. Terms must be long enough to assure experienced regulators, but who retain some independence.

It is an incredible fact that in 1968 400,000 more Floridians voted on who would cast one of 100 votes in the U.S. Senate than who would cast one of three PSC votes controlling their high monthly utility bills. Perhaps a yes-no Missouri Plan vote could be adapted to guide the governor's reappointments.

2. Provide the commission with an adequate, skilled staff. By all means the Legislature should restore the 50-plus staff additions requested by the PSC and chopped out by the Cabinet Budget Commission. The thousands of dollars invested in staff should be weighed against the millions spent and earned by utilities.

3. Establish an effective adversary system for commission proceedings. This means creating within the commission staff a consumer representative—a sort of public defender for utility customers—with the same powers of independent research enjoyed by commission auditors. There is a precedent for such a consumer's ombudsman in the Federal Communications Commission's Broadcast Bureau. Out of each contest between utility experts and consumer experts would come the true facts for a fair decision.

4. Require by law an annual report to the people from the commission. The report should be comparable to the Federal Power Commission's, using the same calendar year, and including rates of return and net earnings for all regulated utilities. With computerized accounting the report could be offered to the public without delay.

5. Grant the reconstituted commission territorial jurisdiction over all public utilities, including municipal and REA systems.

This program would provide a brilliant start toward greater representation for the consuming public in all branches of state government.

IMPORTANT LEGISLATION TO THE STATE OF ALASKA

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today at the request of the Alaskan commissioner of labor, Mr. Thomas J. Moore, I have introduced a bill which would amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to permit smaller redevelopment areas in the State of Alaska. The purpose of this bill is contained in a letter I received from Mr. Moore and I would like to set forth in the RECORD at this time a portion of this letter. As can be seen this legislation is of an extremely important nature to the State of Alaska:

Our Employment Security Division has the responsibility for the official workforce measurements (employment, unemployment and unemployment rates) within each labor market area of the State. We attempt to make these measurements as accurate and valid as is possible as the rates are utilized for many purposes. One somewhat questionable use of the rates is to determine what areas qualify for grant assistance under the terms of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. The rates are one of the major bases by which the Economic Development Administration must determine the amount of their participation, if any, in providing grants for economic development. This causes some problems as follows:

In the summer of 1966, it was determined that one rather large company had a substantial number of persons actively working in the east side of the Prince of Wales Labor Market Area. Thus, the workforce data for the area subsequent to July, 1966 included that company's employment. The net effect of this action was a substantial drop in the unemployment rate for the entire Prince of Wales labor market area. Due to the drop in the unemployment rate, the Economic Development Administration was forced to decrease their grant participation in the Prince of Wales area from 80 percent to 60 percent.

To further complicate the situation, we firmly believe that the change in the unemployment rates for the Prince of Wales labor market area does not reflect a true picture of the economic condition of the vicinity surrounding Klawock.

Some discussion of the labor market area concept would probably be helpful. One of the acknowledged facts in economics is that aggregate measures tend to hide problems in the subsectors. To point up these problems, each state's employment service agency determines that state's unemployment rate and the unemployment rates for "labor market areas" within the state. These labor market areas are generally, but not always, based on geopolitical divisions or are sub-sections of major geopolitical divisions. Examples of these divisions are counties, cities, towns, boroughs, standard metropolitan statistical areas, etc. In Alaska, we have used the election districts established for the 1956 state constitutional election for our labor market areas. It has been found that for most purposes, the areas so established were satisfactory.

However, in many areas of the state, economic development which occurs at one location within a labor market area has little effect upon other locations in the areas which remain depressed. Two more examples of this, besides Klawock, would be that—

The wholesale bulk copper ore storage and shipping terminal at Skagway will have little, if any, effect on Haines, and

The Amchitka project will have negligible impact anywhere else in the immediate area (although it may be "beneficial" to the Anchorage area.)

The unemployment rate for the labor market areas involved will probably decline causing the grant rates to drop and thus, as occurred in Klawock, effectively prevent economic development of a poverty pocket.

As is typical of most federal laws, regulations, standards, etc., the particular law involved here (the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965) is just not satisfactory to resolve Alaska's problems. Changes in the law would appear to be the only meaningful way to help small pockets left behind by development at other points.

We have been concerned about this matter for some time, but under the present law, we are restricted in what we can do.

THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the farewell address delivered by former President Eisenhower discussing his views on the need to work for peace and human advancement is a message of significance to all of us.

It has been a matter of concern to me however that many seem to concentrate on just one phrase from that address to the exclusion of other equally important aspects of the talk. That phrase is the "military-industrial complex," which the former President used to caution against a situation where unwarranted influence may rest in one element of our society. But concentration on just this one phrase tends to overlook the fact that President Eisenhower also declared we must have a completely adequate military establishment to help keep the peace. Because of my concern about this development I discussed it in a statement to the House of Representatives on April 2, 1969.

The Los Angeles Times on April 14 contained an editorial commenting on former President Eisenhower's farewell address and my statement. In mentioning both General Eisenhower's remarks about the need for caution and on the other hand the need for an adequate military establishment, the Times asserts:

> As Congress grapples with the task of deciding how much of our economic resources should be devoted to national security, both halves of Gen. Eisenhower's farewell address should be kept in mind.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit a copy of the editorial from the April 14 issue of the Los Angeles Times for inclusion in the RECORD. Also included is a copy of the text of former President Eisenhower's address which he delivered January 17, 1961:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 14, 1969]

THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

One of the most interesting phenomena of the 91st Congress has been the crescendo of attacks on the so-called "military-industrial complex."

The ABM debate, for example, has prominently featured charges that the defense establishment and its highly effective lobby have grown so powerful that democracy itself is endangered.

Such verbal assaults frequently observe, quite accurately, that the late President Eisenhower was among the first to sound the alarm.

They quote Gen. Eisenhower's farewell speech, just before his retirement, in which he declared:

"We must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence . . . by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

"Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together."

As Rep. Glen Lipscomb (R-Calif.) pointed out the other day, though, the rest of what Gen. Eisenhower had to say in the same speech somehow gets left out of the quotations.

Specifically, the late President said that "a vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk its own destruction."

As Congress grapples with the task of deciding how much of our economic resources should be devoted to national security, both halves of Gen. Eisenhower's farewell address should be kept in mind.

FAREWELL RADIO AND TELEVISION ADDRESS TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, JANUARY 17, 1961

(Delivered from the President's Office at 8:30 p.m.)

My fellow Americans:

Three days from now, after half a century in the service of our country, I shall lay down the responsibilities of office as, in traditional and solemn ceremony, the authority of the Presidency is vested in my successor.

This evening I come to you with a message of leave-taking and farewell, and to share a few final thoughts with you, my countrymen.

Like every other citizen, I wish the new President, and all who will labor with him, Godspeed. I pray that the coming years will be blessed with peace and prosperity for all.

Our people expect their President and the Congress to find essential agreement on issues of great moment, the wise resolution of which will better shape the future of the Nation.

My own relations with the Congress, which began on a remote and tenuous basis when, long ago, a member of the Senate appointed me to West Point, have since ranged to the intimate during the war and immediate post-war period, and, finally, to the mutually interdependent during these past eight years.

In this final relationship, the Congress and the Administration have, on most vital issues, cooperated well, to serve the national good rather than mere partisanship, and so have assured that the business of the Nation should go forward. So, my official relationship with the Congress ends in a feeling, on my part, of gratitude that we have been able to do so much together.

II

We now stand ten years past the midpoint of a century that has witnessed four major wars among great nations. Three of these involved our own country. Despite these holocausts America is today the strongest, the most influential and most productive nation in the world. Understandably proud of this pre-eminence, we yet realize that America's leadership and prestige depend, not merely upon our unmatched material progress, riches and military strength, but on how we use our power in the interests of world peace and human betterment.

III

Throughout America's adventure in free government, our basic purposes have been to keep the peace; to foster progress in human achievement; and to enhance liberty, dignity and integrity among people and among nations. To strive for less would be unworthy of a free and religious people. Any failure traceable to arrogance, or our lack of comprehension or readiness to sacrifice would inflict upon us grievous hurt both at home and abroad.

Progress toward these noble goals is persistently threatened by the conflict now engulfing the world. It commands our whole attention, absorbs our very beings. We face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. To meet it successfully, there is called for, not so much the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward readily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle—with liberty the stake. Only thus shall we remain, despite every provocation, on our chartered course toward permanent peace and human betterment.

Crises there will continue to be. In meeting them, whether foreign or domestic, great or small, there is a recurring temptation to feel that some spectacular and costly action could become the miraculous solution to all current difficulties. A huge increase in newer elements of our defense; development of unrealistic programs to cure every ill in agriculture; a dramatic expansion in basic and applied research—these and many other possibilities, each possibly promising in itself, may be suggested as the only way to the road we wish to travel.

But each proposal must be weighed in the light of a broader consideration: the need to maintain balance in and among national programs—balance between the private and the public economy, balance between cost and hoped for advantage—balance between the clearly necessary and the comfortably desirable; balance between our essential requirements as a nation and the duties imposed by the nation upon the individual; balance between actions of the moment and the national welfare of the future. Good judgment seeks balance and progress; lack of it eventually finds imbalance and frustration.

The record of many decades stands as proof that our people and their government have, in the main, understood these truths and have responded to them well, in the face of stress and threat. But threats, new in kind or degrees, constantly arise. I mention two only.

IV

A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

Our military organization today bears little relation to that known by any of my predecessors in peacetime, or indeed by the fighting men of World War II or Korea.

Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But now we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in the defense establishment. We annually spend on military security more than the net income of all United States corporations.

This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every State house, every office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

Akin to, and largely responsible for the sweeping changes in our industrial-military posture, has been the technological revolution during recent decades.

In this revolution, research has become central; it also becomes more formalized, complex, and costly. A steadily increasing share is conducted for, by, or at the direction of, the Federal Government.

Today, the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers.

The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present—and is gravely to be regarded.

Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

It is the task of statesmanship to mold, to balance, and to integrate these and other forces, new and old, within the principles of our democratic system—ever aiming toward the supreme goals of our free society.

V

Another factor in maintaining balance involves the element of time. As we peer into society's future, we—you and I, and our government—must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering, for our own ease and convenience, the precious resources of tomorrow. We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow.

VI

Down the long lane of the history yet to be written America knows that this world of ours, ever growing smaller, must avoid becoming a community of dreadful fear and hate, and be, instead, a proud confederation of mutual trust and respect.

Such a confederation must be one of equals. The weakest must come to the conference table with the same confidence as do we, protected as we are by our moral, economic, and military strength. That table, though scarred by many past frustrations, cannot be abandoned for the certain agony of the battlefield.

Disarmament, with mutual honor and confidence, is a continuing imperative. Together we must learn how to compose differences, not with arms, but with intellect and decent purpose. Because this need is so sharp and apparent I confess that I lay down my official responsibilities in this field with a definite sense of disappointment. As one who has witnessed the horror and the lingering sadness of war—as one who knows that another war could utterly destroy this civilization which has been so slowly and painfully built over thousands of years—I wish I could say tonight that a lasting peace is in sight.

Happily, I can say that war has been avoided. Steady progress toward our ultimate goal has been made. But, so much remains to be done. As a private citizen, I shall never cease to do what little I can to help the world advance along that road.

VII

So—in this my last good night to you as your President—I thank you for the many opportunities you have given me for public service in war and peace. I trust that in that service you find some things worthy; as for the rest of it, I know you will find ways to improve performance in the future.

You and I—my fellow citizens—need to be strong in our faith that all nations, under God, will reach the goal of peace with justice. May we be ever unswerving in devotion to principle, confident but humble with power, diligent in pursuit of the Nation's great goals.

To all the peoples of the world, I once more give expression to America's prayerful and continuing aspiration:

We pray that peoples of all faiths, all races, all nations, may have their great human needs satisfied; that those now denied opportunity shall come to enjoy it to the full; that all who yearn for freedom may experience its spiritual blessings; that those who have freedom will understand, also, its heavy responsibilities; that all who are insensitive to the needs of others will learn charity; that the scourges of poverty, disease and ignorance will be made to disappear from the earth, and that, in the goodness of time, all peoples will come to live together in a peace guaranteed by the binding force of mutual respect and love.

A MATTER OF PRIORITIES

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the April 1969 edition of the Illinois Bar Journal:

A MATTER OF PRIORITIES: FIRST, THE LAWYER'S DUTY TO HIS CLIENT; SECOND, THE LAWYER'S PUBLIC IMAGE

The proposed new "Code of Professional Responsibility" of the American Bar Association is the first overall revision of the Canons of Professional Ethics in 60 years; and the former 47 Canons are reduced to 9 in number, each accompanied by extensive "Ethical Considerations" and "Disciplinary Rules."

Canon 7 provides as follows:

"A lawyer has a duty to represent his client with zeal limited only by his duty to act within the bounds of the law."

The "Ethical Considerations" which follow Canon 7 make it clear that "bounds of the law" include enforceable standards of professional conduct. The "Disciplinary Rules" which follow Canon 7 cover specifically what the lawyer must do and what he cannot do in representing his client in an ethical manner.

Against that background, and with the limitations referred to above, let us nevertheless consider again the words of Canon 7:

"A lawyer has a duty to represent his client with zeal limited only by his duty to act within the bounds of the law."

This is very strong language, but I think it describes accurately the lawyer's duty to his client. It most certainly states my view of a lawyer's duty to his client.

However, there can be no doubt that the public image of the profession is directly affected by the conduct of lawyers who, most properly, represent their clients with the "zeal" required in Canon 7.

Unlike members of the other professions, lawyers regularly handle a wide variety of adversary matters, including trial work and negotiations in working out disagreements of all types among clients. The final decisions are not always made by judges, juries, arbitrators, referees, commissioners, boards or whatever. The great majority of controversies requiring lawyers eventually end up in negotiated settlements.

Nevertheless, clients in all of these situations have very strong views, and their frequent lack of appreciation for people on the other side of the controversy very naturally extends to and includes their lawyers—particularly so inasmuch as lawyers are the spokesmen.

Both during trial and in negotiations clients often say and believe uncomplimentary things about lawyers for the other side. Too frequently their own lawyers do nothing to correct these impressions, which are usually unfair and inaccurate.

The loser in a lawsuit, or one who feels he got the worst of negotiations, too often believes (again unfairly) that the lawyer on the other side was underhanded and deceitful.

Even with an ordinary real estate deal (and I hasten to acknowledge that many real estate deals are extremely complicated and not ordinary in any way) clients too frequently start out with the impression that it is going to be a match of wits between two lawyers, and seek reassurances that the lawyer on the other side will not get the best of the deal.

In numerous other legal situations, where more than one lawyer is involved, clients too frequently feel there is a contest of some kind and are suspicious of the other lawyer's motives.

In ordinary contacts with a minister or doctor, just for example, adversary aspects are seldom present, and there is little occasion for criticism.

In my view the situation I have described explains in large part the attitude toward lawyers by too many members of the public. Human nature being what it is, little can be done about it.

A lawyer recognizes all of this, but his primary duty is to serve his own client, regardless of whether others find this pleasing or displeasing, and regardless of whether they choose to cast aspersions when a lawyer represents his client "with zeal limited only by his duty to act within the bounds of the law."

Fortunately, all of the above applies only to a very small segment of the total population, but it is a vocal segment nevertheless; and the repeated utterances of this relatively small number on the subject of lawyers does, beyond any question, affect to some degree the public image of lawyers.

Likewise, persons who choose work in government and in politics as their careers, whether they are lawyers or laymen, have similar problems as far as their public image is concerned. A dedicated, honest, conscientious and hard-working legislator (and a very high percentage of legislators in all levels of government are exactly that) voting on a highly controversial bill knows in advance that, whichever way he votes, a large segment of the population will commend him for his vote and another large segment of the population will criticize him and challenge his motives and integrity for voting as he did.

The problems discussed above are easy to define, but no solutions are apparent. It is part of the price to be paid in rendering public service.

Alfred Y. Kirkland,
President, Illinois Bar Journal.

COLUMBUS STUDENT WINS NATIONAL ESSAY CONTEST

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include this prize-winning essay by 16-year-old Carol Poland, of the Columbus, Ind., community.

Miss Poland, who received the Lucille M. Wright citizenship award from the Girls Clubs of America, challenges her fellow young people who rebel against authority—who seek to change the establishment—to be ready to replace it with a better system.

Miss Poland's excellent essay, printed in the April 9 edition of the Columbus Republic, reads as follows:

The Kind of Citizen I Want To Be

(By Carol Poland)

The word "Citizenship" is hard to define. It means something different to everyone.

Being a citizen is having the privilege of voting. When you receive this privilege, you are given the responsibility of caring enough about your city and country to take the time to register and vote and the knowledge for choosing the one who would do the best job in each office he seeks.

A great many "protestors" have arrived on the scene of the present time. They protest the Vietnam war, the administration in the schools, the political leadership and protest just to be protesting. It is not enough just to protest, but the people should constructively take part in these activities.

Maybe our country was built on protest against a foreign power imposing unfair restrictions and taxes on our forefathers. But they had a plan to build a country, to give of themselves with hard work, and honesty, dreaming of a country with equal rights for everyone, for freedom of religion—not from religion.

Minorities should have equal rights in this country but they should not be permitted to rule the majority. The atheist "Medelines" shouldn't be granted the right to tell the children in the classroom or the astronauts that they have no right to pray or to read the Bible. She could have just turned off her television if she didn't want to hear it.

A good citizen is a friend to all, regardless of color or social status. A white person is not better than a colored person; a colored person should have no more privileges than a white person. The pigment of the skin is the only difference.

A good citizen also sets a good example in his community. He contributes volunteer services to community service groups, such as, being a senior leader at a Girls Club, by being a big sister to a C.A.P. child, by being a companion to a senior citizen.

He is active in the church of his choice. This builds a good moral background which gives reasons for performing services to country and fellowman. This country was founded on religious background, he will obey the laws of his community and the nation. The breakdown of law and order is the result of the lack of individual training and observance at church and Sunday School. Law officers tell us that few who are trained in the churches will get in trouble with the law.

A good citizen is well informed about the things going on around him. Newscasts may be dull but this information affects the lives of everyone. If the youths are dissatisfied with the way adults are running the country, they must be well informed on these matters, if they are going to change them for the better.

A good citizen appreciates what others have done for him. The brave men in the past gave their lives for our freedom and thousands of young men have given their lives in this war we are fighting now.

I feel these are the traits of a good citizen and the future concerned citizen I hope to be.

CONSCIENCE AND THE DRAFT

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago Federal Judge Charles E. Wyzanski ruled unconstitutional the provisions of the selective service law allowing the status of conscientious objector only to those who based the objections to military service on religious grounds. In his decision the judge held that this restriction was a violation of the first amendment in that it discriminated in favor of religion and against nonreligious beliefs.

I agree with and support this decision. Profound moral objections to war—especially the war in Vietnam—must be recognized. On purely practical grounds, I would consider it unsafe to be in the field with a soldier who had such strong objections to combat. On the theoretical ground on which this decision was based, we must recognize the strength of conviction of the concientious objector who opposes military service on moral grounds.

I include here an editorial from the April 4, 1969, edition of the Christian Science Monitor:

Conscience and the Draft

One of the thorniest but most exalting challenges a freedom-strong democracy can face is reconciling private conscience with public need. If public need is not served, freedom and democracy can be lost. But if private conscience is not honored, this can be equally fatal to all that freedom and democracy hold dear. The great, continuing, never-settled problem is to harmonize this right of the individual to do what his deepest, best, God-given conscience dictates with the right of society to protect and enforce what a democratic consensus of opinion deems the highest good.

Once again, with Federal District Judge Charles E. Wyzanski Jr.'s ruling, the United States must work out such a problem. By deeming that the draft law was unconstitutional where it said that a man could be exempted from military service only if his objection to war was religion-based, Judge Wyzanski has greatly broadened and sharpened the national debate over America's whole draft setup. He has said, and rightly, that the present law discriminates against those who may object to the draft on the grounds of "profound moral beliefs which constitute the central conviction of their beings."

We welcome this broadened and sharpened debate. We find it well that the question must now go to the Supreme Court for a final, definitive ruling. We are glad that the judge's decision is likely to spur the search for a bettered means of meeting the nation's military manpower needs.

Today, on many fronts, the question of conscience is coming more strongly to the fore. This is a healthy development; it is proof of the self-correcting and self-raising nature of the American ethos. And no nation or people ever loses by heeding the lessons which crises of conscience teach.

It will not be easy for the United States to cope with the practical questions raised by Judge Wyzanski in the John H. Sisson case. But the decision giving weight to the young man's conscientious objection to the draft, and thereby to war, was morally right. In the long run such decisions will strengthen society rather than weaken it.

Also to be welcomed was Judge Wyzanski's opinion that the present draft law violates the First Amendment stating that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." This amendment has been under serious and progressive weakening for some years, primarily through the granting of public and federal financial aid to religious schools. Judge Wyzanski's application of the amendment to the draft law should encourage the Supreme Court to honor the amendment's application in other fields.

TRAVELING CONGRESSMEN

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, Michael J. Howlett, the auditor of public accounts in Illinois, recently sent me some remarks which he made before a Knights of Columbia dinner in Evansville, Ind. I believe Mr. Howlett's remarks probably reflect the feelings of millions of Americans—especially those who are residents of our hard-pressed inner-city areas. Mr. Howlett points out that if Congressmen wish to travel, they might very well begin by traveling to some of the so-called ghetto areas in our Nation's largest cities and to areas of rural poverty throughout the country. I believe that Mr. Howlett's remarks indicate a healthy scepticism about the travels of congressional junketeers, as well as an awareness—which we must hope all citizens share—that Congress first and most important job in this session is to begin devising solutions to our pressing domestic problems.

Apparently some elements of the press share Mr. Howlett's thoughts, for his remarks were the subject of an editorial in the Quincy, Ill., Herald-Whig, on March 10, 1969. I include the Herald-Whig editorial for the perusal of my colleagues.

The item referred to follows:

TRAVELING CONGRESSMEN

Michael J. Howlett, who this year began a new and well-deserved term as Illinois auditor of public accounts, speaks often and well, at many gatherings and upon many subjects. Sunday night, addressing Knights of Columbus of Evansville, Ill., at their golden jubilee dinner, he teed off on the foreign travels of congressmen and suggested an interesting alternative.

Noting that during 1967 U.S. taxpayers paid the expenses of 206 congressmen for 30 trips abroad, Howlett suggested that the money might be better spent on tours of American city ghettos and rural poverty areas.

"I do not doubt that these visits were useful," he said of the trips abroad. "Many of them probably were a personal sacrifice by the men involved. Information gathered, especially in Vietnam, Korea and Western Europe was necessary to a correct understanding of our foreign policy.

"But the problems of poverty at home amid the greatest prosperity of all history, demand more meticulous attention than they are receiving. Some of the money we have spent to combat poverty has been wasted."

Howlett proposes that we have a year's moratorium on expense-paid trips overseas, "or at lease some diminution," and use the money thus saved to set up congressional tours of city slums and rural poverty areas.

Expanding on that theme, he said that congressmen representing slum districts could arrange to conduct visits of their colleagues from states, or districts, having no such problems. To provide a two-way street, he proposes that city congressmen, in return, "could profit by visits to Appalachia, some of our Indian reservations, and areas of backwoods poverty."

Howlett, as noted, does not propose a complete halt for foreign trips by congressmen, and that is wise. Some foreign fact-finding trips are valuable. But the taxpayers footing the bills have long had doubts about the need or value of many costly congressional junkets.

His idea, it must be suspected, won't be embraced happily by Congress. So we don't look for any drastic change. But there is no question about the need for those in Congress to understand the problems of areas other than the ones they themselves represent. It could lead to a broader representation of all Americans, not just those of specific states or districts. As Howlett said in his talk Sunday night:

"We have more people at work today than ever before, making more money than ever before. More young people are going to college than ever before and staying there longer. We are comfortable and well-informed, but too many of our comfortable, well-informed people don't know how the other fellow lives."

EDUCATION IN ALABAMA

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the Alabama Legislature is presently meeting in special session to consider one of the most pressing problems facing our State. That is the matter of education. We feel very strongly in Alabama that education is the answer to many problems, and that by strengthening our educational system, we can strengthen our whole State.

Great strides were made in education during the administrations of Gov. John Patterson and Gov. George Wallace. But like many other States, the lack of funds is again threatening our fast-growing schools.

Gov. Albert P. Brewer has called this special session, and has made a number of recommendations as to where the badly needed funds should come from. Already the house of representatives has given its approval to much of the program, and the senate has now begun debating these programs.

But just additional funds are not enough. Many other States are finding, just as we in Alabama are, that our educational system is still operating under antiquated rules and regulations. As Governor Brewer said in his opening address to the legislature, we must not only ask our taxpayers for better paychecks for our teachers, we must also promise better teachers and administrators for our paychecks. Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed by Governor Brewer's address, and I am sure our colleagues whose States are facing educational crises would enjoy reading it. Therefore, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the joint session, ladies and gentlemen:

We are assembled here tonight in extraordinary session for a most extraordinary reason—to do something more, to do something better, for the school children of our State.

After months of study, after many personal visits to schools in our State, and after long and invaluable consultation with you members of the legislature, I am convinced that a crisis does indeed exist in public education in Alabama today.

We have been here before.

We have too long had a crisis approach to education in Alabama. That is, we have moved from crisis to crisis—each time, appropriating more money for the public school system, yet not actually doing anything to improve the system itself. Our approach to education, rather than keeping pace with the times, has simply become more expensive.

At the outset I must say—and say it emphatically—that we Alabamians need not be ashamed of our efforts in public education. We can look with pride upon the fact that we rank fourth in the nation in state support for our schools. We can look with even greater pride upon the fact that Alabama ranks very high nationally in percentage of support for education based on per capita income. But despite our efforts of the past, despite our sacrifices, much yet remains to be done.

As we strive in the coming weeks to meet the challenge confronting us, it would be my fervent hope, and yes, my fervent prayer, that we keep uppermost in our minds this one thought—we are not here on behalf of the college administrators and faculty; nor are we here on behalf of the public school principals and teachers—we are here for one purpose, and one purpose alone, and that is to do something better for the school children of Alabama.

I will offer to you members of the Legislature tonight an educational program which may be viewed by some as revolutionary. It will propose changes in education administration and educational approaches which are indeed dramatically different from those employed for the past half a century. I am convinced that education can do a better job than it has been doing; more importantly, I am convinced that education wants to do a better job than it has been doing. The program I offer you tonight, which is in fact a consensus program which resulted from our legislative conferences, will, I believe, give education the opportunity to do a better job.

The pride I mentioned earlier in what has been done for education in Alabama was a sincere expression. But let us not confuse pride with satisfaction. I am not satisfied, nor are you, with what we have in public education today.

And we can't be satisfied with what we have in public education today when we find cumbersome administrative procedures—far too many schools—even far too many school systems—shamefully over-crowded classrooms—our institutions of higher learning at a competitive disadvantage in recruitment of faculty—classroom teachers teaching outside their subject field—many teachers teaching on emergency certificates without adequate background—salaries substantially less than the southeastern average—lack of sufficient textbooks for our school children—charges of waste and inefficiency in the administration of some of our school systems—failure to meet the special needs of many children, including those who will not attend college—and our teachers having to spend valuable class time filling out reports and taking up money and having too little time for their students. All of these factors, and many more, result in less than the best . . . far less than the best . . . for the children of Alabama.

I have said repeatedly in the past, and I say again that money alone is not the answer to the problems confronting us in public education.

I say this while readily conceding a vital need for additional revenue.

I am convinced that the people of Alabama are ready and willing to pay for a quality educational system. But I am not willing to ask them to shoulder this burden unless and until we can assure them that they are going to get more for their education tax dollar than they have in the past.

I cannot and will not ask the taxpayers for a substantial increase in educational funds without a corresponding increase in educational quality. To put it another way, I ask not only for more money for education, but more education for our money; I ask not only for better paychecks for our teachers, but better teachers for our paychecks.

So now we arrive at the hour when the people of Alabama demand something more from education than we have had in the past. They demand that we do more for our public schools than just give them more money.

The mandate for change is clear. It is echoed in every part of our state. Parents and citizens have voiced their concern for our present dilemma and have charged their leaders in government with charting a new course.

But now is not the time to fix blame for the past.

Now is not the time to wish we had done it differently.

Now is the time to welcome a new era in Alabama education.

Now is the time to stop talking about what we haven't done and do what needs to be done.

Our program for education provides Alabama with a fresh approach—a new direction for our efforts.

We seek now to lay the mistakes of the past behind us.

We seek to alter our educational system in a fundamental way to meet the new demands of our time.

And we seek to bring education closer to the people who support it.

I want the people of Alabama to know of the time and effort which you as members of the Legislature have already contributed to this effort. In our discussions in the Governor's Office, you have already exhibited your commitment to a new approach in education.

The program we offer represents the thinking of literally thousands of our citizens from all walks of life—the very excellent report of the Education Study Commission—the comments of many organized groups throughout the state—and yes, the letters and wires from so many concerned Alabamians which you and I have received.

So this program represents, in a very real way, an Alabama commitment to quality education.

The oft-stated goal of this administration for education is to get our educational dollars to the teacher in the classroom and the child at the desk for it is here that education takes place. To this end, bills will be introduced tonight to accomplish the following specific things:

First, we propose the creation of a permanent Education Study Commission, charged with providing us with a continuing study of the constantly-changing role and needs of education in Alabama.

We propose that the first duty of this Commission shall be to secure a professinoal, indepth study of the entire educational system in Alabama from the smallest school to the State Department.

Such a study will deal especially with such areas as business practices, management, and the possibility of more use of buildings, personnel, and resources.

The work of the Commission can give the Legislature guidance on future legislation to upgrade and improve the system as a whole. And at the same time, it will give those in education some concrete suggestions on how to make wisest use of our tax dollars.

Secondly, we propose the creation of a Commission on Higher Education which will be responsible for advising the legislature on matters concerning all aspects of higher learning from the junior college to the graduate level.

This Commission will advise the Legislature on budget requests, future programs, and additional institutions. We simply cannot afford wasteful duplication of effort in higher education when our needs are so great.

Thirdly, we propose legislation to provide for the election of the State Board of Education and all local Boards of Education and for the appointment of the state superintendent and all local superintendents.

Education is as much a part of government as any other function at the state and local level—and as such, should be answerable to the people who provide its support.

At the same time, we recognize that the top administrators of our school system at all levels must be highly-qualified, full-time professionals. Elected boards of education must be able to select the best possible people as superintendents—persons who will be directly supervised by the boards in their daily administration of our schools.

A system of elected Boards of Education and appointed Superintendents will give us an organization that answers directly to the people and also provides a competent, businesslike approach to the daily functions of our schools.

Fourth we propose to you tonight two measures which will provide for the future allocation of public funds to education and will correct such inequities as may exist in our present system.

Every child in Alabama, whether he lives on a farm or in a city is entitled to the same amount of state money for his education.

We therefore recommend the altering of the present allocation formula so that each child gets the benefit of his fair share of state funds. I am determined that this be accomplished.

The second proposal addresses itself to the desperate need for more local support for our schools. We propose that each school system in Alabama be required to provide local support in keeping with its ability.

We are aware that state government is now doing more than its share of providing for public education. Seventy-four per cent of the funds now appropriated to public schools in Alabama comes from the state—one of the highest percentages in the nation.

State government cannot continue to carry this burden without local help.

I strongly believe that local people will be more willing to take an active interest in their schools if they have an investment in them. The people of Alabama who take great pride in other institutions such as their homes, their businesses, and their churches are also willing to support their local schools.

State government should not do everything for local people any more than the federal government should do everything for the states. Local people know best what their needs and problems are—and they must have a direct voice in spending their tax dollars.

Fifth. We propose that Alabama's classroom teachers be paid in the future on the basis of their proven ability to do a good job.

As part of the appropriation bill for the next two years, we recommend an initial across-the-board pay raise for all of our school teachers. It is desperately needed to raise salaries to the level of our sister states, and to enable us to attract and keep outstanding young teachers.

Moreover, during the second year of the coming biennium, we propose a system of incentive pay to be administered by the local Boards of Education—and used to provide appropriate reward for those outstanding teachers who demonstrate their excellence.

I feel strongly that those who give of their best, no matter in what field, deserve recognition.

An incentive program will also be a strong inducement to our teachers to stay in Alabama and stay in education—because they know there is room for advancement. It is not fair for the overwhelming majority of skilled, dedicated, motivated teachers to be held to the level of the lowest performance.

Our program also contemplates attention to those areas of education which have been too long neglected—the needs of retarded children, emotionally disturbed children, crippled children, vocational rehabilitation, and vocational education. These and other worthy programs have not been in the mainstream of our educational effort. This shameful affront to thousands of deserving children can no longer be tolerated.

At the same time, we recognize a continuing responsibility to retired teachers, to administrative personnel, to school bus drivers, maintenance employees, cafeteria workers, and all those others so vital to the normal operation of our schools.

We simply cannot neglect any phase of education if we are to have a well-rounded program that serves the needs of all of our people. Our program reaches every area—from the grade school to the graduate school.

As a part of our responsibility, we are recommending revenue measures to you to provide the necessary funding. We are asking you to close some of those gaps in our tax laws which have given favored treatment to special groups. Let me make one thing clear—I am unalterably opposed to and will veto any increase in our already high sales tax which hits hardest those least able to pay.

I am aware of the great concern in our state about the effect of recent court orders, particularly those of the three-judge panel in the Middle District of Alabama involving 99 of our school systems.

These arbitrary and capricious rulings have denied us the use of some fifteen million dollars worth of badly needed classrooms and school buildings in our State.

They have been a source of discouragement to your governor in trying to build a program for quality education.

But we as a people have faced adversity before, and if we are to realize the great potential of growth and development and progress which exists, then we must not be deterred from our objective by the actions of these who seek social objectives rather than quality education.

I am more firm than ever in my determination that we in Alabama shall indeed have quality education—not a discriminatory education, but a quality education for every child in our State.

Here, tonight, we reach the hour of decision in Alabama. We have come to the time and the place when we must face the future and the promise it holds for our state.

Our educational system must respond to the great demands our people place on it.

We have reached the day when we no longer can afford the luxury of a second-rate effort in education—when we can no longer afford to give our children anything less than the finest possible preparation for the opportunities that lie before them.

Time waits for no man—and no state.

And unless we seize upon the opportunity presented to Alabama and its people here and now, it will surely slip from our fingers.

I have been described in the press as being supremely confident that this session of the Legislature will result in a responsible program for our schools. I am supremely confident—supremely confident that you members of the Legislature are prepared to do what needs to be done, what must be done, for the school children of Alabama.

I am convinced that you are convening here in a constructive spirit—not to tear down but to build up—not to argue negatively but to act positively—not to look for problems but to find solutions.

My charge to you is to repeat my opening remarks—We are assembled here tonight in extraordinary session for a most extraordinary reason—to do something more, to do something better—for our children.

They surely deserve no less.

HOW TO ESCAPE U.S. TAXES

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, if there is one issue which has come to the fore, it is that of tax reform. Even the most unsophisticated of our fellow citizens are aware that our Internal Revenue Code is riddled with loopholes which favor the very rich as against the middle- and lower-income taxpayers.

On April 10, 1969, the Christian Science Monitor published a very interesting story under an Associated Press byline which explained how it is possible for the very rich to escape paying their fair share of the tax load.

Mr. Speaker, this account is worthy of the attention of all Members of the House, and especially the distinguished chairman, Mr. Mills, and members of the Committee on Ways and Means, who have been considering this subject for several months now. I ask unanimous consent that it appear following my remarks in the Record.

It has been said that there is no force on earth that can compare with that of an idea whose time has come. It seems to me that tax reform is one idea whose time has come. I hope that we will not let another April 15 go by without providing the tax relief that Americans of moderate income need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot, in conscience vote to continue the odious 10 percent surcharge unless meaningful tax reform comes with it. I define meaningful tax reform as tax reform which can be seen and felt by the great mass of the people of the Nation. I will not settle for less.

The article follows:

Gift Deductions Popular: How To Escape U.S. Taxes

(By the Associated Press)

Washington.—There are two kinds of millionaires in the United States: those who pay federal income taxes and those who don't. In the latter group there were 21 last year.

How is it possible, you ask as you reach for your checkbook after a losing bout with Form 1040, to have an income of more than $1 million a year and yet not pay any federal income tax?

The method most favored by untaxed millionaires is to give away things that have grown in value since they were acquired. Stocks, real estate, a share of the donor's business, art objects—all are good for this treatment.

The current value of the gift is deducted from income subject to taxation. So it's quite possible to reduce taxable income to zero.

One return cited in a recent Treasury Department study showed adjusted gross income of $10.8 million, contributions totaling $10.5 million and other deductions of $400,000-plus. No taxable income and hence no tax.

Another taxpayer's adjusted gross income of $4.3 million was erased by $4.5 million deductions, including $4 million in contributions.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION

Ordinarily, a taxpayer may deduct no more than 30 percent of his income for charitable gifts. But it's not an ironclad rule.

A special exception allows the claiming of contributions without limit if in 8 of the past 10 years the taxpayer's contributions, plus his taxes, have added up to 90 percent or more of income.

One aspect of these gifts that bothers those seeking reform of the tax laws is that it is legal for Mr. Rich to make his donations to a foundation run by his family.

And perhaps the contribution to the Rich Foundation is a share of Mr. Rich's business. This kind of giving, a Treasury study says drily, "lacks the finality which characterizes a true parting with property."

Congress is thinking of throwing out the unlimited charitable contributions privilege, largely because it figures so often in stories about untaxed millionaires.

Another proposed change would make the untaxed superwealthy an extinct species by imposing a minimum tax on all high-bracket incomes, with no exceptions.

Before he left office in January, Treasury Secretary Joseph W. Barr told Congress many middle-income taxpayers are losing confidence in the fairness of the tax system. His warning of a "taxpayer revolt" is still echoing on Capitol Hill. The new Treasury team also is pledged to a reworking of the tax laws.

DEPRECIATION HELPS

If the unlimited charitable contribution rule is the favorite of untaxed millionaires, one of the runnersup would have to be the depreciation rules.

Depreciating is a great vanishing cream for taxable income. You don't have to be a millionaire to use it, but it helps.

Suppose you're a corporation executive poking along at $250,000 a year. Normally, you might figure on paying about $110,000 in income tax.

What you might do instead is borrow $15 million and buy a nice big apartment building. Figure an income from rents of $1 million, reduced by maybe $500,000 for upkeep and loan payments.

So far, you're $500,000 in the black as a landlord, but don't worry about having to pay tax on it. Depreciation will bail you out.

While allowable amounts in succeeding years will be smaller, one accelerated method of figuring depreciation would permit you to claim your $15-million investment depreciated $750,000 the first year.

PAPER LOSS RESULTS

You get to deduct depreciation from income, even though no actual cash expenditure occurred. So the $500,000 you netted from operating the building becomes instead a paper loss of $250,000 and this cancels out the $250,000 salary. Result: no taxes instead of $110,000.

What makes it even more attractive is that the amount of cash that has passed through your hands—money you could put into other short-run projects—is $750,000. That's more than triple the cash you had to play with back before you became an apartment owner on borrowed capital.

Then there is the oil-depletion allowance.

Suppose your wells are producing a before-taxes income of $1 million a year. It costs $450,000 to run the operation—deductible expense—so your net is $550,000.

But the depletion allowance, one of the most controversial tax breaks in the books, permits you to deduct 27½ percent of the gross income from the wells. So off comes $275,000.

BLACK TO RED INK

You still have another $275,000 in income. You can make it disappear this way:

You could spend $375,000 developing some other oil properties. This is deductible expense, so your black-ink $275,000 becomes a red-ink $100,000.

You now are theoretically $100,000 in the hole. Surprisingly enough, this is a position many of the superrich aim for, because paper losses are just the thing to shelter other income.

In your case, the $100,000 loss would enable you to have $100,000 in other income—stocks and bonds, for instance—and keep it all.

The net result of your year as a combination oilman and stock-market babbler is that you have paid no tax, and you come away with at least $275,000 clear. And though $1.1 million has passed through your hands, you have had, in the eyes of the law, no taxable income.

CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON REPORTS ON RESULTS OF HIS 1969 QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report that an extensive sampling of the returns on a questionnaire which I sent to the residents of the Ninth District of Indiana indicates they:

Support overwhelmingly the establishment of a postal corporation, such as I have proposed, to remove the Post Office Department from politics, and meet costs from postal revenues.

Favor, by nearly a 4-to-1 margin, international nuclear protection negotiations rather than the construction of an anti-ballistic-missile system.

Support by nearly a 5-to-1 margin, a congressional resolution requiring the President to seek Congress' approval before U.S. troops are committed to fight in foreign countries.

Also favor by nearly a 5-to-1 vote the abolishment of the electoral college and a direct, popular vote for the President and Vice President.

Support by lesser margins, the lowering of the voting age, a random chance, lottery draft system, and the continuation of the U.S. space program at its present level.

Tabulations on the 11-question survey were stopped at 15,747 when the trend of the responses was clearly established.

I am gratified at the number of responses. They show that Ninth District residents are keenly aware of the issues, both foreign and domestic, which face this Nation.

I recognize the limitations and inadequacies of a brief questionnaire, but it is nevertheless helpful to me as one indication—among several—of public opinion in the 16 counties of the Ninth District of Indiana.

The results of the questionnaire are as follows:

Results of Questionnaire

ELECTION REFORM

Electoral College

Would you approve of a Constitutional amendment which would substitute popular election of the President and Vice President for the present Electoral College?

1. Yes: 12,411 or 80.0%.
2. No: 3,087 or 19.9%.

Voting age

Would you favor lowering the voting age of Americans?

1. Yes: 8,190 or 52.2%.
2. No: 7,496 or 47.7%.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The draft

Attempts to revise the draft law come before the Congress each year. Would you favor:

1. The present system, which permits student deferments: 4,493 or 29.5%.

2. A random-chance lottery system, with no student deferments: 5,513 or 36.3%.

3. A professional, all-volunteer Army, at an estimated increase in payroll of $6 to $17 billion each year: 5,163 or 34.0%.

Space

The early Apollo series of space exploration missions has been spectacularly successful. Would you:

1. Continue to fund the space program at its present level of $3.8 billion: 8,448 or 54.1%.

2. Reduce the funds for space exploration: 5,144 or 32.9%.

3. Abandon the space program: 2,019 or 12.9%.

Anti-Ballistic-Missile System

Do you favor:

1. Construction of an anti-ballistic missile system to defend our cities from ballistic missile attack at a cost of approximately $50 billion: 4,317 or 30.1%.

2. Negotiating an international agreement with adequate inspection safeguards to limit anti-ballistic system defense expenditures: 10,007 or 69.8%.

TAXES AND ECONOMIC POLICY

Tax incentives

In attacking the problems of crime, slums, rural development, pollution, housing and other social problems, should the 91st Congress rely primarily upon:

1. Direct government spending: 1,547 or 9.9%.

2. Private enterprise, encouraged by tax incentives: 3,871 or 24.9%.

3. A combination of 1 and 2: 10,088 or 65.1%.

Tax sharing

Do you favor sharing Federal government tax revenues with State governments when the federal budget is in, or near to, balance?

1. Yes: 11,219 or 74.0%.
2. No: 3,928 or 25.9%

FOREIGN POLICY

Troop commitments

Would you favor a Congressional resolution requiring the President to ask for Congress' approval before United States troops are committed to fight in foreign countries?

1. Yes: 12,125 or 78.8%.
2. No: 3,260 or 21.1%.

Foreign aid

This country's foreign aid program was reduced this year to $1.7 billion, the lowest level in the history of the program. Would you:

1. Reduce further the foreign aid program: 10,693 or 73.1%.
2. Continue the program at approximately the present level: 4,024 or 26.4%.
3. Increase the level of the program: 491 or 0.32%.

GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

Antipoverty programs

Head Start, VISTA, Job Corps, Community Action Programs, Upward Bound, and other anti-poverty programs are administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO).

Would you favor:

1. Stopping all OEO programs: 4,402 or 31.2%.
2. Transferring all OEO programs to other government agencies: 2,652 or 18.8%.
3. Continuing all OEO programs under the present arrangement: 4,105 or 29.1%.
4. Continuing some OEO programs: 2,946 or 20.7%.

Postal service

Do you favor:

1. Retaining the present postal service, requiring support from general tax revenues to meet costs exceeding postal revenues: 1,827 or 12.2%.
2. Reorganizing the Post Office Department to provide improved service but still requiring support from general tax revenues to meet costs exceeding postal revenues: 1,847 or 12.8%.
3. Creating a government-owned postal service corporation to provide improved service, to meet costs from postal revenues and to make all appointments non-political: 11,244 or 74.7%.

AMERICANS: RESPECT AMERICA

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting and thought-provoking essay written by Danny Syhre, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Maynard Syhre of Webster, S. Dak. The essay, entitled "Americans—Respect America" was judged the winner in a local contest sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary.

Danny is a sophomore at Webster High School. He has obviously given a great deal of thought to his subject, and I think his essay merits careful reading by the Members of this body.

The winning essay by Mr. Syhre follows:

AMERICANS: RESPECT AMERICA

There are many ways in which we Americans can respect our country. I think patriotism, by far, is the best way to show our respect for America.

Patriotism is the love of one's country and much more. Patriotism is loyalty. Loyalty is being true and faithful to our country. If we live in a country whose privileges and protection we enjoy, it is our obligation to recognize the benefits we receive by being true to its government. A good American citizen is loyal.

Patriotism is being fair. We must not think we are the only country. All the world should matter to us. We should love the world, but we should love our country more. We do not have the right to do anything harmful to our own country. We need not think unkindly about all other countries in order to be patriotic toward our own.

Patriotism is being well-informed. It is our business to inform and concern ourselves about problems in our community, state, and nation. We owe to our government an understanding of its organization, its works, and its problems. We should know something of the great men of our country. The Pledge of Allegiance to our flag and our patriotic songs should not be just words but there must be some thought and spirit and feeling that makes these words and the music really mean something. A good citizen is well-informed of what's going on.

Patriotism is the courage of a free people firmly dedicated to the noblest cause. We should have courage to speak when we do not agree with something. Patriotism is not to believe blindly in your country, whether it is right or wrong. It means everyday service, it means keeping out of our minds motives and temptations to be selfish or to disregard the authority of our country. True patriotism will display itself in sacrifice when there is a call for it. It will always try to face the facts and know the truth. A good citizen will co-operate with other good citizens in accomplishing worthy ends.

Patriotism is the vision that led our founding fathers into dangers of a wilderness that was to become the proud American Republic in which we live today.

If we Americans will respect our country and be proud of it, then we should have the desire to make it the best of all nations.

AMMUNITION CONTROLS MISINTERPRETED

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable apprehension among our law-abiding citizenry concerning the implementation of the provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968. Those provisions to which I have specific reference deal with ammunition and the recordkeeping requirements which have been administratively imposed by the former Commissioner of Internal Revenue at the direction of the previous administration.

There is cause for suspicion in the fact that because the Congress overwhelmingly rejected attempts to attach provisions to the act that would have established national registration and licensing, a roundabout approach for registration of sorts was conceived in a misconstruction of the recordkeeping requirements for ammunition through administrative regulations.

Section 922(b)(5) of the act states, in part:

> It shall be unlawful for any licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, or licensed collector to sell or deliver—(5) any firearm or *ammunition* to any person unless the licensee notes in his records . . . the *name, age,* and *place of residence* of such person if the person is an individual . . . (Emphasis added.)

Ammunition, as defined in the act, "means ammunition or cartridge cases, primers, bullets, or propellant powder designed for use in a firearm".

This is only the half of it, Mr. Speaker, for in title 26 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 178, section 178.125(c), it is stated:

> The sale or other disposition of ammunition, or of an ammunition curio or relic, shall, except as provided in paragraph (d) of this section, be recorded in a bound record at the time such transaction is made. The bound record entry shall show; (1) the *date of the transaction,* (2) the *name of* the *manufacturer,* the *caliber, gauge* or *type of component,* and the *quantity of* the *ammunition transferred,* (3) the *name, address,* and *date of birth of* the *purchaser* (transferee), and (4) the *method* used by the licensee *to establish* the *identity of* the *purchaser* (transferee). (Emphasis added.)

It is very interesting to note that when the proposed Internal Revenue Service regulations were initially published in the Federal Register of November 6, 1968, the pertinent provisions of section 178.125 said:

> The sale or other disposition of a firearm, ammunition, curio or relic shall be recorded by the licensed dealer or the licensed collector at the time of such transaction . . . The record shall show the *date of* the *sale or other disposition of* each firearm, *ammunition,* curio, or relic, the *name, address,* and the license number (if any) *and* the *date of birth of* the *transferee* if such person is not a licensee. (Emphasis added.)

Thus, when the regulations were printed in their final form in the Federal Register of December 14, 1968, the additional requirements for information, pertaining to recordkeeping on the disposition of ammunition, included "the name of the manufacturer, the caliber, gage or type of component, and the quantity of the ammunition transferred."

Not only do I believe these additional regulations are in contravention of the intent and purpose of the Congress respecting the sale and disposition of ammunition, but the cumbersome recordkeeping requirements imposed by administrative regulation are an unnecessary burden on the licensed dealer, under penalty of not more than $5,000 fine, or not more than 5 years' imprisonment, or both. In addition, the information required pursuant to every single purchase of ammunition is no small inconvenience on the purchaser who is to be needlessly registered, in effect, every time he buys ammunition. It is beyond comprehension how this information can be of use to anyone, but it is certainly one further step to dissuade the law-abiding citizen from purchasing anything connected with a firearm by psychologically characterizing him as a potential lawbreaker or as one who might be implicated with a crime because of the purchase of a particular type of ammunition.

I firmly believe the majority of the American people are fed up with this type of personal disclosure for the record which represents the continuing erosion of his rights to privacy when there is no clearly defined public interest to be served. No one, I am sure, wants to see the day when his every move can be fed into a computer which, at the push of a button, will dislose his life's history to be used at the discretion of one whose motives might not always be beneficent.

One other point to be made is derived from the language of the preamble to title I of the Gun Control Act of 1968. It states, in part:

> . . . it is not the purpose of this title to place any undue or unnecessary Federal restrictions or burdens on law-abiding citizens with respect to the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms appropriate to the purpose of hunting, trapshooting, target shooting, personal protection, or any other lawful activity * * *, or to provide for the imposition by Federal regulations of any procedures or requirements other than those reasonably necessary to implement and effectuate the provisions of this title.

Significantly, these statements make no reference to "ammunition," even though the provisions of the act regulating the acquisition and disposition of ammunition are contained in title I. Are we to believe, therefore, the proponents of national registration and licensing, having been defeated in their obvious efforts, sought to achieve the objectives in principle by the more insidious regulation of ammunition which, if effectively controlled, would make the possession of a firearm less significant? I think the answer is yes, if for no other reason than the fact that the blanket coverage of all ammunition under the provisions of the act is otherwise without substance.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a companion bill to others sponsored by Members of both the House and Senate which would specifically exclude "shotgun shells, metallic ammunition suitable for use only in rifles, any .22-caliber rimfire ammunition, or any component parts thereof" from the definition of "ammunition" as it is used in the Gun Control Act. I urge other Members who feel as I do to do likewise in the hope that such support will allow Congress to work its will on this issue to assure that the administrative regulations of the Internal Revenue Service will not be permitted to subvert the intent of Congress.

A BELL AND A PRAYER

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives the following article which appeared in the Quincy Sun, Quincy, Mass., on Thursday, April 3, 1969, entitled "A Bell and a Prayer":

A Bell and a Prayer: Would That God Might Give Us Others To Take His Place

The bell tolled sadly and solemn words were spoken this week at Quincy's historic United First Parish Church in a farewell tribute to Dwight David Eisenhower.

The Rev. Stephen W. Brown, pastor of First United Presbyterian Church, Quincy, pinpointed the feelings of a mourning nation with these words:

"Dwight David Eisenhower is a symbol of that which is good, and right, and strong in our nation.

"Would that God might give us others to take his place."

His eulogy to the 34th President and General of the Army was given during an Ecumenical Memorial Service at the "Church of the Presidents" Monday noon.

And at 4 p.m., the big, 2,000-pound bell in the belfry tolled for five minutes as funeral services were being held in Washington, D.C.

The church's bell has thus been sounded in tribute at the death of every President since George Washington.

"Dwight Eisenhower," said The Rev. Brown, "was a warrior whose chief aim was peace."

"Our time is a time of extremes when some are willing to have peace at any price, even the price of chains, and others are willing to have war at any price, even the price of annihilation."

"His words are to be remembered. He said, 'I hate war as only a soldier who has lived it can, only as one who has seen its brutality, its futility, its stupidity.'

"He also said, 'Today . . . we still must be wise and courageous enough to live fully, confident in the knowledge that we have taken every reasonable step to deter aggression, and that we shall always be ready to defend liberty . . .'

"His words need to be heard in our time."

The Rev. Brown's eulogy was listened to attentively by approximately 150 persons attending the service at the church that contains the remains of Quincy-born Presidents John and John Quincy Adams and their wives.

Other Quincy clergymen participating in the service were:

Rev. Bradford E. Gale, minister United First Parish Church; Rev. Demetrics Micheal-ides, St. Catherine's (Greek Orthodox) Church; Rabbi David J. Jacobs, Temple Beth El; Rt. Rev. Richard J. Hawko, pastor Sacred Heart Church, Rev. Dean E. Benedict, Quincy Centre Methodist Church.

Dwight David Eisenhower: His Passing Is More Than the Passing of a Man

(Text of the eulogy to former President Dwight D. Eisenhower given by the Reverend Stephen W. Brown, at the Ecumenical Memorial Service Monday in Quincy's historic First Parish Church)

We are gathered here this afternoon to remember one, Dwight David Eisenhower . . . Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe during World War II and the 34th President of the United States.

His death on Friday last leaves our land a sadder place. And yet, because Dwight Eisenhower was full of years, because he was covered with honors and praise, because his efforts, perhaps more than any other man of our time, bore much fruit and because death is the inevitable precondition of life . . . the passing of Dwight Eisenhower does not have the overtones of tragedy that would be quite evident in the death of one not so successful, not so full of years and not so highly esteemed.

It is for that reason that the passing of Dwight Eisenhower should inspire in us not only sadness and hurt, but even more, a feeling of somber thoughtfulness, for his passing is more than the passing of a man . . . it is the death of an era in which giants walked the land, the passing of a period in history when men seemed taller and heroes were easier to come by, the passing of a quality of life that we have somehow lost.

Dwight Eisenhower was a warrior whose chief aim was peace. Our time is a time of extremes when some are willing to have peace at any price, even the price of chains, and others are willing to have war at any price, even the price of annihilation.

His words are to be remembered. He said, "I hate war as only a soldier who has lived it can, only as one who has seen its brutality, its futility, its stupidity . . ." He also said, "Today . . . we still must be wise and courageous enough to live fully, confident in the knowledge that we have taken every reasonable step to deter aggression, and that we shall always be ready to defend liberty." His words need to be heard in our time.

Dwight Eisenhower was a politician whose aim was statesmanship. He was a man who invested in the word "politics" its rightful qualities of honesty, integrity and service. In a time when there are those who would place self-interest above national interest, who would sell their souls for a vote, who would rather have position than honor, his life would guide us.

Called to serve his country as President, he found the business of politics distasteful and at the same time to give that business the depth and quality that a nation governed by political forces must have if it is to survive. He prayed in his first inaugural address, "Give us, we pray, the power to discern clearly right from wrong and allow all our words and actions to be governed thereby . . . May cooperation be permitted and be the mutual aim of those who under the concepts of our Constitution, hold to differing political faiths, so that all may work for the good of our beloved country and Thy glory."

Dwight Eisenhower was a citizen whose aim was to serve his country best by the life that he lived. There was in him a quiet simplicity that seems alien in an age of sophistication and cynicism. He loved his God; he loved his family; he loved his country . . . sentiments, if expressed by a lesser man, would bring on the snide, knowing smiles of a generation that has outgrown that kind of naivete.

However, those were the sentiments with which he worked as he forged together a group of nations and articulated those nations' goals. Those were the sentiments with which he worked as he led his own country in a time of crisis. Had Dwight Eisenhower been only an unknown private citizen who operated the general store in Abilene, Kansas, I doubt that the qualities that he personified as a Supreme Commander, a university president and president of the United States . . . I doubt that those qualities would have been different.

Let us once again listen to his words: "As friends of free people everywhere in the world, we can by our own example . . . our conduct in every crisis, real or counterfeit; our resistance to propaganda and passion; our readiness to seek adjustment and compromise of difference . . . we can by our own example ceaselessly expand understanding among the nations.

We must never forget that international friendship is achieved through rumors ignored, propaganda challenged and exposed; through patient loyalty to those who have proved themselves worthy of it; through help freely given where help is needed and merited. In this sense there is no great, no humble among us. In rights and in opportunity, in loyalty and in responsibility to ideals, we are and must remain equal. Peace is more the product of our day-to-day living than of a spectacular program, intermittently executed.

The best foreign policy is to live our daily lives in honesty, decency, and integrity; at home, making our own land a more fitting habitation for free men; and abroad, joining with those of like mind and heart, to make of the world a place where all men can dwell in peace. Neither palsied by fear nor duped by dreams but strong in the rightness of purpose, we can then pace our case and cause before the bar of world opinion . . . history's final arbiter between nations.

Dwight David Eisenhower is a symbol of that which is good, and right, and strong in our nation. Would that God might give us others to take his place. Amen.

HAMILTON PROTESTS INADEQUATE BUDGET FOR SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about certain items in the recommended budget for the Soil Conservation Service.

I represent the people in 16 southeast Indiana counties. In past years many of these 16 counties have been declared flood disaster areas and drought disaster areas within the same year. The conservation of soil, water, and related resources is vital to both their livelihood and well-being.

Development and management of soil and water resources under the leadership of soil and water conservation districts is moving toward a brighter future. These districts are continually broadening their horizons to meet ever increasing conservation needs. Where formerly they were concerned in only agricultural erosion activities, they now are deeply involved in total soil and water resource development. This includes assisting local people, both rural, and urban, manage water resource for flood prevention, erosion, and sedimentation control, municipal, and industrial water supplies, recreation, beautification, fish, and wildlife, and low flow for water quality control.

Each of the 16 soil and water conservation districts in the Ninth Congressional District are governed by five local district supervisors, plus a number of assistant supervisors. They work with and provide the technical assistance of the Soil Conservation Service to cooperators who either own or operate land. These supervisors are dedicated, leading citizens in their areas, and serve without pay to improve the public welfare through soil, water, and related resource conservation. These districts had 622 new cooperators apply for assistance this year, which brings their total to 8,656, 3,236 of whom applied one or more conservation practices this year. The Dearborn County District alone has assisted its 3,481 cooperators to install 432 ponds, 39 of which were done last year. These districts depend on the technical assistance furnished by Soil Conservation Service personnel to achieve the planning and application of the multiplicity of conservation measures.

Funds budgeted in 1969 furnished 600 man-years less technical assistance to districts nationally than was budgeted in 1959. This trend toward eventual emasculation of soil and water conservation districts, dedicated to planned development and wise utilization of our natural resources, must be reversed.

Included in the appropriation for assistance to districts are the Federal funds needed to carry on the National Cooperative Soil Survey. This provides a sound basis for determining good land use, and is used extensively by local planning boards, highway departments, park and recreation boards, engineers, architects, as well as builders, developers, and other landowners and operators.

In Indiana districts have an immediate need for 72 man-years of technical service in addition to the budgeted positions to meet their scheduled workload. Eleven of these needed man-years are in the Ninth Congressional District, and the shortage is adversely affecting the conservation effort therein. Ohio County formed a district a year or so ago. To date no funds have been available to staff this new district. The part-time technical assistance that has been made available comes from the adjoining Dearborn County soil and water conservation district, which further dilutes the assistance to that district.

In the light of these needs and the impact of the soil and water conservation movement on the lives of my constituents, the national budget appropriation for technical assistance to soil and water conservation districts should be $130 million.

Within the total program of the Soil Conservation Service are the Public Law 566 small watershed projects which have gained tremendous popularity. These projects are aimed at full development of the soil and water resources in an area, and serve to reduce costly flooding, reduce erosion and sedimentation, provide water for industry and rural and urban areas, create water-based recreation developments, and significantly improve the quality of the environment.

In the Ninth Congressional District there are 16 applications on file in various stages of completion. A breakdown of these projects is shown as follows:

Completed: Elk Creek.

Approved for construction: Stucker Fork, Muddy Fork of Silver Creek, Twin-Rush Creek, and Dewitt Creek.

Planning completed and awaiting authorization: Delaney Creek.

Planning completed and undergoing review: Lost River.

Planning authorized and underway: Upper Vernon Fork, Lower Vernon Fork, and East Fork of Whitewater River.

Preliminary investigation completed: Whitewater River (Fayette County), and Upper West Fork of Whitewater River.

Preliminary investigation studies underway: Silver Creek and Blue River.

Applications awaiting service: White Creek.

On most of these projects, local people have spent considerable time and money to organize conservancy districts, and secure land easements and rights-of-way. In some cases moneys were borrowed and interest is being paid to provide their portion of the costs for this watershed development. All this activity was predicated on the Federal Government providing their share of the agreed amounts of money for planning and construction on schedule. Preliminary investigations are currently being delayed in Blue River and Silver Creek due to lack of watershed planning funds. This is holding up the local organization of conservancy districts, which are necessary before the Soil Conservation Service can proceed with work plan development.

Construction plans are either ready, or will be ready, to contract in fiscal year 1970, amounting to $7,993,000 for the State of Indiana. If the present national budget appropriation is allowed to stand, only about 25 to 30 percent of this construction could be started.

Based on the State estimate, the three operational watersheds in the Ninth District—Twin-Rush, Stucker Fork, and Muddy Fork of Silver Creek—which have construction planned in the amount of $1,713,000 during fiscal year 1970, would be forced to delay approximately 65 to 75 percent of their needed improvements.

It required much initiative, enthusiasm, hard work, and local money on the part of my constituents to advance their watershed projects to where they are now. I do not believe we should so lightly regard this local effort, in which we encouraged the action, and then say:

> No, we cannot assist you now. You must live with your flood problems until some indefinite future time.

Instead, I strongly believe we should encourage this local initiative whenever and wherever they have the courage to move forward as my constituents have done.

A study completed in Indiana identified 44 additional potential watersheds in the Ninth District that have problems and needs that can be overcome by action under the Small Watershed Act. With these additional potential projects installed the Ninth District could receive annual benefits amounting to $2,300,000 from flood prevention and drainage improvements, have 3,000 man-years of additional employment, create 200 new jobs and 69 new or expanded businesses, 15 additional water supply reservoirs, sufficient to supply 91,000 people, 18 new recreation developments, and the increase in the annual payroll would be at least $1,480,000 per year. The reduced pollution from sediment would be very significant (1,600,000 tons per year) and the cost of antipollution efforts would be reduced by nearly $300,000 per year. The total need for application of soil and water conservation practices would be accelerated, and when all projects were installed, would have a value to the land in the Ninth District that would exceed $40 million.

For the benefit of these people, as well as many others in Indiana, the Soil Conservation Service national budget appropriation should be placed at no less than $8 million for watershed planning, and $80 million for watershed operations.

Last year I reported to this committee that there was not a resource conservation and development project in my district, but that careful evaluation was being made of the outstanding successes being achieved in the Indiana Lincoln Hills resource conservation and development project. The conservation action programs being achieved on the part of local people in the Lincoln Hills resource conservation and development project was too much of a temptation to overlook. Today I am happy to report that the application for the Historic Hoosier Hills resource conservation and development project has been prepared and submitted for planning approval. However, I am most unhappy about the delay in getting this application approved. I sincerely urge this committee to support the $10,252,000 in the budget for resource conservation and development and to add to this every dollar possible.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this is a time when every Federal dollar must be spent wisely. But, we must also move ahead with certain proven domestic programs for the well-being of our own people. In my opinion, the benefits attained through the work of the Soil Conservation Service is of tremendous value to our Nation. I sincerely hope the increase in budget appropriation outlined in this statement, will be favorably considered.

HOW ARAB PROPAGANDISTS AND THEIR FRIENDS WORK IN AMERICA

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the activities of several official Arab propaganda agencies operating in the United States have reached scandalous proportions.

The Arab Information Office, for example, maintains headquarters in five major American cities, through which it engages in a heavily financed program of propaganda activities. It is registered as an official spokesman for the 14 countries of the Arab League.

The general tenor of these propaganda activities is well indicated by the fact that the authorized maps of the Middle East, issued by the Arab Information Office, do not even indicate the existence of the State of Israel. As long as the Arab States do not admit the existence of Israel, the hope for peace in the Middle East, or even the possibility of opening direct negotiations there is obviously very small.

Of even greater concern, however, is the fact that another officially sponsored Arab organization, devoted to securing support for illegal guerrilla operations and schemes of terrorism against a peaceful neighbor, is actually maintaining an office in this country under the guise of providing information. I refer to the Palestine Liberation Organization, headed by a man named Yasir Arafat. It is the business of this group to organize guerrilla bands to invade Israel. It is shocking to learn that such an agency maintains an office on Second Avenue, in New York City.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the activities of this Palestine Liberation Organization exceed the limits prescribed for the operation of friendly information services in this country, as defined by the terms of the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

Moreover, I believe that the duties of the United States regarding our relations toward a country with which we are at peace, Israel, require us to put an end to the activities within our boundaries of any agency such as the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Mr. Speaker, the background of this entire matter is well discussed in an article appearing in the current issue of Prevent World War III, a magazine published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., of 50 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., which should be of great interest to my colleagues:

HOW ARAB PROPAGANDISTS AND THEIR FRIENDS WORK IN AMERICA

It is a commonly heard complaint from Arab quarters that their cause has "no voice" in America. In point of fact, the exact opposite is the case.

Each of the 14 Arab states has its own delegation—and usually its own information officer—at the United Nations. On top of that, the Arab Information Center, operating for all of the Arab League states, maintains headquarters in New York, Washington, Chicago, San Francisco and Dallas—plus a representative in Florida.

There is also the Palestine Arab Delegation—which purports to represent the indigenous Arab inhabitants of Palestine, but is actually the registered agency of the Arab Higher Committee of Palestine, headed by Haj Amin el-Husseini, better known as the former Grand Mufti of Jerusalem. (He was once Hitler's "special advisor" on the "final solution of the Jewish problem.")

Most reprehensible of all is the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)—an agency established and financed by the Arab League states for the express purpose of organizing guerrilla units to invade Israel, in order to bring an end to what it insists upon calling the "Zionist usurpation" there. This agency is openly dedicated to defiance of United Nations peacekeeping resolutions, and it publicly proclaims its goal of ending the existence of the State of Israel. Yet, it is permitted to operate with offices in the United States, although its bellicose purposes are clearly set forth in papers filed with the Foreign Agents Registration Section of the Department of Justice.

One might well ask whether the United States is not in fact acting contrary to its obligations to countries with which we are at peace in providing haven to such an agency as the PLO; and one must certainly say that in permitting it to operate within our borders, we are leaning over far backward to make things easy for Arab war-promoters.

ONE-SIDED VOICES

The mere presence of so many Arab state delegations at the United Nations provides a kind of built-in advantage for certain propaganda purposes. When Security Council debates are televised, for instance, the number of minutes given to Arab spokesmen and their supporters is invariably several times greater than that given to Israel and her usually less-verbose friends.

On these occasions, moreover, the Arabs have generally seen fit to play fast and loose with the ordinary rules of diplomatic courtesy, while objecting to any slight technical deviation from the rules by those on the other side.

For example, during the debate following the Six Day War, the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia delivered vituperative attacks against both Governor Nelson Rockefeller and the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy, on the ground that they had donned yarmulkes when attending as guests at a Jewish High Holiday service! One may well imagine the reaction in Cairo if an American spokesman had made similar personal attacks upon members of the United Arab Republic government.

Even the American press was attacked—most especially, the *New York Times*, which Arab propagandists keep insisting is "Jewish owned." Yet, it is impossible to report U.N. debates on the Middle East without giving more space to the Arab spokesmen than their opponents, because of the mere factor of number. A line by line survey of the *Times* coverage of two months, including 30 days before the Six Day War and 30 days afterward, in fact shows 59.3% of the space given the Middle East during that period to be "pro-Arab" and only 40.7% to be "pro-Israel." Yet, it continues to be a constantly repeated—though untruthful—theme of Arab spokesmen that "the American press is against us"—because it is "Zionist controlled."

It is true, of course, that the Arab-Israeli war was more fully reported on television from the Israeli side than from the Egyptian side. But the explanation here was very simple: the Israelis welcomed any reporters, including cameramen, who could find transportation to follow their forces. On the other hand, the Egyptians locked up all American correspondents in a Cairo hotel, under guard, and kept them there during the hostilities. Under these circumstances, the Arabs are hardly justified in complaining that few pictures were taken of their armies: after all, a cameraman cannot cover a war from a hotel room.

THEIR MAP OMITS ISRAEL

The well-financed Arab Information Center publishes a slick-paper monthly, a fortnightly news service and innumerable pamphlets; sends speakers to uncounted religious and civic groups; provides free films and maps to colleges; recruits participants for radio and television programs—and stands ready to supply any high school debater with a 10-pound assortment of literature. (Indeed, its supply of printed material is one of the largest available at any information agency of any government maintaining outlets in the United States.)

Unfortunately, not all of the material from this source is as accurate as might be hoped. For example, to this very hour of writing, the well-printed maps of "The Arab World" continue to show Israel only as a cross-hatched area marked "Israeli occupied territory of Palestine." Less partisan persons might be pardoned for asking whether, after 20 years of recognition by the United Nations and most of the countries of the world, an Arab map might not at least show the *existence* of the State of Israel—even if President Nasser might prefer to wish it out of being.

The expenditures of the Palestine Arab Delegation are much smaller than those of the Arab Information Center with its numerous branches), but its activities are a matter of special concern, because unlike most foreign propaganda agencies this "Delegation" concerns itself very directly with *internal* affairs of the United States.

For example, when President Johnson announced that negotiations would open for the possible sale of new aircraft to Israel, the "Delegation" sent him a scathing telegram and released it to the press. When Vice President Humphrey and President-Elect Nixon spoke in support of the same purpose, they were also favored with telegrams accusing them of courting "Zionist votes" and "harming" American interests. We know of no other purportedly official diplomatic group which conducts itself in such a manner—and it is unquestionable that an American information representative in Cairo, resorting to the same methods, would be hustled out of the country at once, or put in jail.

NEO-NAZIS AIDED

Even more reprehensible, however, is the relationship which this agency has built up with some of the more extreme hate-groups in the United States, where the obvious effort is to set American citizens of different religions against each other. At one period, indeed, the "Delegation" actually permitted a self-avowed neo-Nazi group, the National Renaissance Party, to use the Arab postage meter for the purpose of mailing out the "Party's" own vicious anti-Jewish publication. On another occasion, "literature" written by the Palestine Arab Delegation was made available for printing in *Common Sense* (described in a staff report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as "the source of some of the most vitriolic hate propaganda ever to come to this Committee's attention")—and the material actually appeared in two editions of *Common Sense* even before the Delegation got around to issuing its own pamphlet edition. Other hate-literature from the same source has been extensively used by Gerald L. K. Smith, and equally notorious American anti-Jewish agitators.

It is one thing to advocate a national cause; it is something quite different for a foreign agency to try to stir up dissention in a country with which peaceful relations presumably prevail.

We should emphasize here that the Palestine Arab Delegation is not a self-supported group of agitators. It has filed its official registration papers with the Department of Justice (Foreign Agent Registration No. 1459) as an agency of the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine, with headquarters at Almansurieh, Lebanon; and the Higher Committee's Chairman, the former Grand Mufti, is listed as residing in Egypt, near Cairo. Early publications of the "Delegation" list support from the four Arab states surrounding Israel, but more recently only the Higher Committee's sponsorship has appeared The "Delegation" is recognized at the United Nations, to the extent of appearing before various official committees, where it claims to represent the Arab Palestinians. These facts make its uninvited intervention in America's domestic affairs all the more inexcusable.

STUDENTS USED AS AGITATORS

A survey of this subject would be incomplete without mention of the Organization of Arab Students in the United States and Canada, which has units on over a hundred American college campuses. The United States welcomes students from all parts of the world, and tries to help them secure an education—but in this particular case, the students who belong to the Organization are also told to consider themselves as political spokesmen for the views of their home governments. The Organization prints an elaborate magazine, which contains some of the most violent anti-Israel propaganda that we have seen—and its national convention it entertains speakers from the Palestine Liberation Organizations. Apart from other considerations, it seems hardly appropriate for an organization of foreign students, with obvious support from outside governments, to engage in such activities while its members are guests in our own country.

At its last-year's National Convention the Organization of Arab Students honored Dr. M. T. Mehdi as its "Man of Year." Dr. Mehdi, a former employee of the Arab Information Center (at its San Francisco branch), now heads The Action Committee on American-Arab Relations, an ostensibly domestic agency which describes itself as "an organization dedicated to better American-Arab understanding.

Dr. Mehdi's principal claim to fame, however, is the authorship of a book entitled "Kennedy and Sirhan, Why?"—the outrageous theme of which is that the Jordanian assassin of the late Senator Robert Kennedy ought to be thought of as a political prisoner, instead of being tried for murder in the ordinary way in the courts of California.

"Sirhan's act is not an ordinary case of murder: it is a political act and political assassination. Hence traditional legal devices and legal remedies cannot adequately provide proper defense for the accused," we are told. Mehdi, in effect, tries to make Sirhan's terrible crime into a mere incident in the war between Arabs and Israelis (with the late senator classified as an Israeli protagonist). The idea is thus suggested that Sirhan should be treated as "a prisoner of war," with Kennedy classified as "a casualty in that war."

Must our government tolerate this? In short, Arab propaganda runs the entire gamut from slick-paper appeals intended to influence people with cultural and intellectual curiosity, to the stirring up of race hatreds, the organization of guerrillas, and even a quasi-exculpation of assassination.

Some aspects of this agitation are almost certainly contrary to American law, and are certainly in violation of good public policy. There is no excuse to permit the intentional stirring up of group hatreds in this country by people acting in the name of a foreign government, and our international obligations are clearly inconsistent with allowing the continued operation of militarist-terrorist groups like the Palestine Liberation Organization.

WARREN BLASTS REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, every law-abiding citizen agrees that "free people require a free judiciary." The communications breakdown results in the word "free."

This was a weak excuse for Chief Justice Earl Warren to berate the elected Members of the U.S. Congress, for their mandated duty to their constituents to act within the framework of the Constitution to correct power-grasping decisions of an arrogant Supreme Court, which has treated the Constitution as if it were some archaic scrap of paper. Or perhaps the Chief—quick to defend judicial revolution, dissent, and change—fears legislative process with the people having a voice in Government.

Strange and erratic behavior for an appointed official—even Warren—to openly profess his disapproval of the constitutional system by attacking reform measures proposed by the U.S. Congress.

A responsible, constitutional judiciary is essential and indispensable—the very essence of this Government—to maintain law and order. This is why governments are established among men. And it is only because of Mr. Warren's secessionist departure from his duty under the constitutional plan that many Members of the U.S. Congress have felt compelled to introduce bills and amendments to restore a constitutional judiciary, having integrity and the confidence of the people.

Few will be persuaded by Mr. Warren's plaintive plea over what he called the litigation explosion. For he and his fellow usurpers are alone responsible for any "litigation explosion." Their many, many maverick decisions against the American people—their seeming dedication to rewrite our basic legal concepts and laws were his Court's own fault—not the Congress or the American people.

Most humorous of the Chief's retaliatory pouting against Congress was his claiming the High Court decisions added a "civilizing aspect to our society."

Only an individual oblivious to what is taking place in our country—the murders and rapes, criminals running rampant, anarchists carrying the flag of the enemy, millions of dollars in property damage, homes destroyed, little children denied prayer—would have the audacity to boast that his role in unleashing the criminal element on our people has any relationship to a better society.

Mr. Speaker, I include a report by Lyle Denniston, from the Evening Star for April 10, 1969, as follows:

WARREN HITS EFFORTS TO CURB COURT'S POWER

(By Lyle Denniston)

Chief Justice Earl Warren has rebuked congressmen who tried to take away some of the Supreme Court's powers, telling them: "A free people require a free judiciary."

Warren's comments in a speech here yesterday, marked the second round of criticism he has aimed at Congress in the last month.

A few weeks ago he bluntly accused the lawmakers of depriving the high court and lower courts of the full amount of money they need to do their work.

Yesterday's speech, which was oblique and indirect compared with the earlier one, appeared to be an answer to the effort in Congress last year to deprive the justices of some of their authority to decide criminal law issues.

When Congress attempted to include these curbs in the new anticrime law, the effort was beaten but only by narrow margins.

Warren's response came indirectly as he used the historic figure of Daniel Webster to make his point. The chief justice was speaking at a ceremony marking the anniversary of an 1819 Supreme Court decision in a case in which Webster was the winning lawyer. The case upheld the royal charter of Dartmouth College and laid the basic foundation for much of American Business law.

Warren recalled that Webster, as a member of Congress, had been "stern and unswerving—in his opposition to legislative attempts at retaliation to unpopular Supreme Court decisions. The chief justice praised Webster for his "tireless effort to protect and sustain the independence and the integrity of the federal courts, and their authority to give meaning to the language of the Constitution."

After quoting Webster as saying that the judicial power was "essential and indispensable to the very being of this government," Warren said that those "underlying premises" remain valid today.

The chief justice also returned to his earlier theme that adequate facilities must be provided for the courts so they could handle what he called a "litigation explosion."

He commended lawyers who work without adequate pay in handling unpopular criminal cases and said these lawyers "can rightly insist that there be an allocation of public resources" to attain the "goal of equal justice under law."

Defending the advances the high court itself had made in the field of criminal law, Warren said the result has been to add a "civilized aspect to our society."

AN AMERICAN AFFRONT TO CHILE?

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David John Gladstone, of Falls Church, Va., has called my attention to an article which appeared in the March 28, 1969, edition of the Chilean newspaper, Politica Economia Cultura. The article details the plans of the publisher of an anti-American, pro-Communist newspaper to obtain an $800,000 loan through the AID program in Chile, to improve the facilities of his newspaper, now referred to in Chile as the "official bulletin of criminals."

Mr. Gladstone asked:

> Would you please find out why my tax dollars are being used to support Communist newspapers in Chile?

In an effort to comply with his request, I have today written to the Secretary of State to obtain full details on this proposed loan. I urge my colleagues, who, I am sure, would share Mr. Gladstone's and my concern over such misuse of taxpayers' funds, to join me in urging the Department of State and the Agency for International Development, to look into this loan, and, if the facts are as stated in the Politica Economia Cultura article, to deny it without delay.

The article reads as follows:

AN AMERICAN AFFRONT TO CHILE

The loans allocated to Chile by A.I.D. (Agency for International Development) during this year are close to 30 million dollars obtained from various sources which reach from the purchase by Chile of farm surpluses down to the fluctuations in the price of copper. These funds are intended to be used by manufacturers, farmers and businessmen working in Chile who need some of the almost 300 items classified as soft goods for consumption, or of the almost 70 items included under "capital goods." Item 84.34 corresponding to "Printing Machinery" has just fallen under the rapacious hands of Dario Sainte Marie, proprietor of "Clarin" the paper which has accumulated the greatest number of convictions in the Chilean courts of justice for violation of the laws, and which even makes the toughest of its readers blush with its headilnes, obscenities, insults and derision at the human and spiritual values of the country.

Hiding behind the apparent impersonality of international accords Volpone (Dario Sainte Marie's nom de plume) ordered printing machinery from the United States, applying for a credit close to $800,000. Using as his tool the terror developed by his paper, in the best Chicago racketeer style, he obtained the approval of his application by the Banco del Estado (the Chilean State Savings Bank.) This bank will endorse the bills drawn on and accepted by Volpone so that in turn the Banco Central de Chile will connect the operation with A.I.D.

Three years ago Dario Sainte Marie (Volpone) tried to fool the Export and Import Bank with a similar deal. But the authorities of that international credit establishment, better acquainted than A.I.D. with Volpone's moral stature and the consequences which such a credit would have on the prestige of the Eximbank refused the credit. Unworried Volpone turned then to his Communist pals and obtained in Leipzig the machinery he wanted. At present the insults and attacks of "Clarin" against the United States, its armed forces and its rulers are printed with equipment imported from Communist Germany. This has increased the love of the Communist Party towards "Volpone" and it is thus that there is a permanent relationship between the "Clarin" of Volpone and "El Siglo" the Communist newspaper in their mentions of Vietnam, Cuba, racial conflicts in the United States, and the turns of internal American politics. What "El Siglo" says with dullness of the comrades, "Clarin" repeats making fun and deprecating the role of the United States in the preservation of world democracy.

Officials of A.I.D. in Chile have blushingly disclaimed responsibility for this deal which will strengthen the anti-American repository of insults, explaining that the Agency grants the credit so the Chilean Government which in turn operates it through its own channels. According to these officials all A.I.D. does is to determine each year the total amount of the grants in aid, and to hand over the list of consumer goods or capital goods available to be used under the "A.I.D. Letters of Credit" which are granted at very low rates of interest.

The explanation, nevertheless, does not free the diplomatic agents of the U.S. from blame. Without their approval no credit operation can be materialized. And this is recognized by the very Banco Central de Chile which advises the commercial banks (by Circular letter No. 1052 of 30 Aug. 68) that it reserves the right to withdraw the dollar currency it has furnished "if, for any reason the [importation] cannot be completed."

And it could not be otherwise because if A.I.D. disclaimed all responsibility, passing it on to the officials of a government foreign to that which is granting the credits, it would be possible for "El Siglo" the property of the Communist Party of Chile to use A.I.D. credits to install a modern print shop and to attack with American machinery obtained with credits granted to underdeveloped countries "Yankee imperialism" and "Yankee murderers." And this has been the usual language of Volpone and of "Clarin" towards the United States on every occasion when its people have had to face a problem.

The politics and the national and international goings on of the United States are subjects of lively discussion and worry in Chile. The occupation of Santo Domingo, the conflict in Vietnam, the assassinations of John and Robert Kennedy, the Bay of Pigs, or the meddling of Ambassador Dungan to speed up the Agrarian Reform of Chonchol (head of the Agrarian Reform program until late 1968) have divided the opinion of Chileans into rabid pro and con groups. But it can be certain beforehand that the approval of the A.I.D. loan to Volpone to increase his anti-American and anti-Chilean artillery will be rejected by the majority of leaders and serious members of both the right and left areas, including those in power who are already alarmed by the jump in criminality, of corruption and immorality developed and stimulated by Volpone and "Clarin" deservedly considered the "Official Bulletin of Criminals' in Chile. There is no more refined pornographic or criminal press than that produced by Volpone and his cohorts.

American diplomats in Chile cannot evade public judgment if they do not alert their Government against the indignation which the granting of this credit to "Volpone" will arouse. Nor will they be able to justify themselves before the new president and the new regime which will be governing Chile after 1970. How will American diplomats face the new President of Chile when he shows them the dirt of "Clarin" luxuriously printed in American machinery delivered to Volpone through the unbelievable generosity of the American people?

And if the Senate and the House of Washington which are so jealous about the use of foreign aid question A.I.D. officials about this loan to Volpone what reasonable explanation will they give? Or do American diplomats in Chile ignore that Volpone's very wife *forbids* "Clarin" from entering her home fearful that her small daughters will be corrupted by reading the paper their father publishes? Or are there private plans by A.I.D. to impede the development of Chile by promoting crime, immorality, shamelessness, and public corruption?

This would be the only explanation for the inconceivable loan of $800,000 granted for Volpone to bite even harder the gentle hand which helps him with unbelievable blindness.

Chileans may disagree among themselves on the American policies in Chile: for some the "Copper Agreements" may be ruinous, for others Ambassador Dungan's efforts to harden Agrarian Reform were fatal; but for the immense majority of the country, for all the decent people, the affront to Chile should the A.I.D. loan to Volpone be finalized, will be uneradicable.

WITHHOLDING OF CITY INCOME TAXES FROM THE COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on March 10 of this year, I introduced H.R. 8526 which authorizes the withholding of income taxes imposed by incorporated cities with a population of 60,000 or more from the compensation received by Federal employees.

Under present law, Federal agencies are already authorized to withhold State income taxes from the pay of Federal employees and to return such collections to the States when State officials have requested such withholding.

My bill would simply enable larger incorporated cities also to enter into agreements with the Secretary of the Treasury which would provide for the withholding of city income taxes owed by Federal employees by the Federal department or agency employing such individuals. Since this measure would apply only to our larger cities, it will not impose too heavy an administrative burden upon those Federal agencies which withhold such taxes.

The Treasury Department in the past has supported similar legislation which would give larger cities the same assistance the States now receive in collecting income taxes owed by Federal employees.

Cities, caught in a financial bind as they attempt to provide the growing requirements of their citizens for additional and improved schools, housing, health and welfare facilities and services, and transportation systems, are finding it increasingly necessary to add income taxes to those which they are already levying to finance these needs.

Further, those cities which do impose an income tax are experiencing some difficulty in collecting the amounts owed by Federal employees. Just last month the Finance Administrator of New York City complained that about 20 percent of the Federal employees working in the city had escaped paying the city income tax. He indicated that "the root of the problem was that under Federal law the city could not require Washington to withhold local income taxes from the weekly or biweekly earnings of its employees."

Enactment of this measure will enable our cities to more efficiently and promptly collect the income taxes to which they are legally entitled. At the same time it will prove less painful to Federal employees if such amounts are withheld as they earn their income.

For these reasons I urge your support and early approval of this measure.

TIMELY SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE A. E. GIBSON, MARITIME ADMINISTRATOR, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, April 11, the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., an affiliate of the Litton Industries, launched the *Mormacstar* at its yards in Pascagoula, Miss. The *Mormacstar* is the third of the class designation Seabridge for the Moore-McCormack Lines. The *Mormacstar* is the last word in cargo ships.

I had the privilege of being present at the launching of this majestic ship. I also had the privilege of hearing the Honorable A. E. Gibson, the new Maritime Administrator, deliver the principal address on the occasion of this launching. Because of the quality of Mr. Gibson's speech and the further fact that it was his first public appearance in his new capacity as Maritime Administrator, I should like to include the speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of all who are interested in the necessity of maintaining an adequate merchant marine fleet. Mr. Gibson's speech was well received, and I am confident that he is going to discharge the duties of his office in an able and constructive manner. The speech follows:

I am honored to be present and to participate in the ceremonies attendant upon the launching of the *Mormacstar*. Since this is my first public appearance as Maritime Administrator, you might say that we are being launched together.

And if I may stay with that metaphor for a moment, I only hope that I penetrate the bureaucratic fogs, ride out the political storms and carry the workload tonnage with a degree of the ability and grace that I am sure will characterize the career of the *Mormacstar*.

It is a propitious time for all to join together to achieve an American Merchant Marine worthy of a great nation such as ours. I am sure there is no downgrading within this Administration or failure to recognize the importance to the nation of its merchant shipping. If I thought there were, I wouldn't be here today. On the contrary, at the highest level of this Administration—from President Nixon on down—there is full recognition of the importance of seapower as it relates to the nation's welfare.

The President has himself defined seapower as "the ability of a nation to project into the oceans, in times of peace, its economic strength; in times of emergency, its defense mobility." It is on this concept of seapower that future maritime policy will be based.

Speaking specifically to the merchant marine, the President has said that this Administration shall "adopt a policy that recognizes the role of government in the well-being of an industry so vital to our national defense and stimulate private enterprise to revitalize the industry." To which he has added: "We shall adopt a policy that will enable American-flag ships to carry much more American trade at competitive world prices . . .," setting as our goal "a sharp increase in the transport of U.S. trade aboard American-flag ships."

In commenting on the unsubsidized sectors of our merchant fleet, the President has said that they "must be given attention, so they, too, can replace their deteriorating fleets in the immediate future."

The President has appointed a team which is in full accord with these views. Secretary Stans told the Senate Commerce Committee that it was his avowed purpose and intent to implement the statements of the President for revitalizing the American Merchant Marine. To my personal knowledge, and I am sure that of many present here today, such similar purpose is shared by Undersecretary Rocco Siciliano, and soundly seconded I can assure you by the new Maritime Administrator.

But in addition to the determination of the new Administration, it is a propitious time for achievement for the American Merchant Marine within the Congress. Certainly at no time since the passage of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act has there been the degree of awareness that exists today in both the Senate and House of the vital importance to the Nation of its shipping and shipbuilding capacity.

With such evident awareness to the needs of the American Merchant Marine on the part of both branches of the government, there can be no question that every effort will be made to provide a merchant fleet of which this nation can be proud.

It is an opportunity to be grasped by the entire industry. It is a time for closing ranks in order to revitalize this industry upon which so many rely for a livelihood and a future. It is time to put aside the age-old feuds and divisions that have torn this industry asunder.

In speaking of the need for a revitalized merchant marine, the President has said: "In turn, I would expect initiative and cooperation from both industry and labor. Throughout the maritime industry, a new outlook must be encouraged to replace the current divisiveness and shortsightedness." In similar fashion, Senator Magnuson only a few months ago commented on the same need for eliminating this divisiveness.

There is probably no single union that could not or would not negotiate an equitable contract with the management of this industry at this time. It is only when the inter-union comparisons of benefits are made and inequities, real or fancied, are discovered that negotiations break down and the jungle takes over. There must be some plausible means developed to ajudicate these disputes between unions, or any new Maritime program will be frustrated from the outset.

The time, then, for uniting in a common endeavor in which the Congress, the Administration, together with management and labor can forge a new, a vital, a profitable merchant marine to serve the nation is now.

I have no delusions as to the difficulty of the undertaking—to unite a divided industry, to work out a merchant marine policy acceptable to many diverse elements, whose interests, at least in the short-term, often seem quite opposite from each other. Of one thing I am sure: we cannot succeed in such an undertaking without the good will and cooperation of everyone concerned.

What we need most at this time is the support of the industry in finding solutions in an atmosphere of peace and reason.

New labor contract negotiations have already begun. The recent expression of intent on the part of the maritime unions to continue negotiations beyond June 15th without a strike, if progress is being made, is most encouraging. Another maritime strike this year is unthinkable.

Together, we can all move forward to implement President Nixon's policy statements on the American Merchant Marine. In the Administration, we are doing so. We are hard at work to come up with implementing programs. We are not "studying" the merchant marine. It has almost been studied to death. We are not questioning its vital role as an instrument of national policy. We are not viewing our merchant ships solely from the defense aspect. On the contrary, we recognize their vast importance to our commerce and the national economy, their service in aiding our balance-of-payments deficit.

Since the Administration clearly recognizes this importance, I am confident that the resulting program will reflect it. However, no program can be truly effective unless it can attract private capital—for it will require large investments to match the shipbuilding subsidies, if a new fleet is to be built. In like manner, much of this fleet is totally dependent on the companies' ability to attract commercial cargoes to produce the necessary revenues to provide continued operation. Just as the private investor has alternate uses for his capital, the exporter or importer has alternate means for transporting his cargo—neither is forced to invest in or use American flag ships. There has to be a reasonable assurance of continued operation if they are to make the commitments so essential for the future of the U.S. merchant fleet, and no better way could be found to do this than the negotiation of a responsible maritime labor contract this year without resort to a work stoppage.

And now to the purpose for which we have gathered today, the launching of a magnificent addition to the American Merchant Marine, the Moore-McCormack ship, S.S. *Mormacstar*.

The building of a new ship is always a reassuring symbol of economic activity, progress, hope for the future. The *Mormacstar* and her sister ship awaiting delivery, the *Mormacstar*, are not just "replacement" ships. They are bigger, better, faster, more productive ships in every way than those whose place they will take in carrying on the commerce of our nation.

The choice of the class designation "Seabridge" for these ships is indeed appropriate. It complements the "land-bridge" concept which is being developed, as increasing availability of container carrying ships makes it possible to send a whole shipload of cargo in unit trains across an intervening continent.

The modern "sea-bridge" is now taking its place as an extension of the land-bridge, to provide totally new concepts in worldwide transportation systems.

And so, to Moore-McCormack Lines goes my sincere congratulations for their initiative, and my appreciation of this very concrete evidence of the company's belief in the future of the American Merchant Marine.

To the Ingalls Shipbuilding Division of Litton Industries, I offer similar congratulations on their building of this magnificent vessel. The capable and efficient management of the shipyard, and the skilled hands of Ingalls workers are evidenced in the *Mormacstar*.

To the gracious sponsor of the *Mormacstar*, allow me to wish your ship well. May the *Mormacstar* have a long, productive, profitable life in the service of our Nation's commerce—and may I wish her "God speed."

BROADENING THE TAX BASE

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better day than this one to bring to the attention of our colleagues a study dealing with the broadening of the Federal income tax base.

"Tax reform" is a subject mightily in the air this day as it has been most of this year. There is renewed hope on the part of the American taxpayer that "this" is finally the year when something will be done to right the wrongs, eliminate the inequities, close the loopholes, and reform the whole tax system. Whether or not all the changes that need to be made can be made this year is a subject of some conjecture. But I do not think there is any doubt in any Member's mind that we must strive extra hard to initiate substantial reforms this year. The taxpayer will accept no less.

The most unfortunate aspect of the present tax system is that it simply does not appear to be systematic. It is a "system" of loopholes, exemptions, dodges, and exclusions. We need to start at the base and work up if there is to be a real reform.

In this regard, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a study which I have found to be stimulating to my own studies of potential tax reform. The American Bar Foundation has kindly granted me permission to include this study in my remarks. The paper by Attiat F. and David J. Ott of the Department of Economics of Southern Methodist University is entitled "Simulation of Revenue and Tax Structure Implications of Broadening the Federal Income Tax Base." I have also learned from the foundation that it will soon publish a more comprehensive book on the subject of tax reform. That book, edited by Arthur B. Willis, will be entitled "Studies in Substantive Tax Reform" and should be available in the next few weeks.

I ask that Members examine the paper below with the view to sharpening their own approaches to the tax reform proposals before the Congress. There are many approaches, but whichever one we choose, we must expand the tax base. The study follows:

SIMULATION OF REVENUE AND TAX STRUCTURE IMPLICATIONS OF BROADENING THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX BASE

(By Attiat F. and David J. Ott, Department of Economics, Southern Methodist University)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge the efforts of J. Scott Turner and Gary A. Robbins in organizing and processing the basic data for the study as well as doing the necessary programming. George Williams and Robert W. Tinney contributed in collecting data and conceptualizing the imputation techniques for fringe benefits, interest on life insurance, and imputed rent on owner-occupied homes. The assistance of Larry Howard in converting tapes for use on the Southern Methodist University computer and the patience and perseverance of the Southern Methodist University Computer Laboratory staff are also gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, the authors appreciated the continuous support and encouragement of Dean Charles O. Galvin of the School of Law of Southern Methodist University and Project Director Arthur Willis.

We grant the usual absolution from blame for errors to all the persons named above.

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper is a preliminary report on the results of a study on substantive tax reform conducted at Southern Methodist University during 1967–68 under the sponsorship of the American Bar Foundation and the Tax Section of the American Bar Association.

The objectives of substantive tax reform broadly stated are as follows: [1]

1. Broaden the tax base
2. Reduce income tax rates
3. Simplify the technical provisions
4. Eliminate inequity in tax treatment of individuals with similar income
5. Remove taxation as a major factor in business, investment, and family estate planning

We limit our discussion here to the simulation of a substantial broadening of the Federal income tax base, applying existing (1965) tax rates to the new tax bases, and calculating the implied proportional tax rate and progressive structure needed, with the new bases, to raise 1964 individual and corporate income tax revenue.[2] The sample of tax returns used is the 1964 Brookings Tax File, and the data for making the income imputations were obtained from a number of different sources, but heavy use was made of the 1963 *Federal Reserve Board Study of the Financial Characteristics of Consumers.*

Two alternative broadened tax bases were used; the first, which we call BTB_1, essentially follows the plan set out in the project proposal, and the second, BTB_2, is an extension of the originally proposed base to incorporate a substantial portion of unrealized capital gains and imputed rent on owner-occupied homes.

Section II summarizes the major findings of the study. Sections III and IV discuss BTB_1 and BTB_2, respectively, in somewhat more detail—the effects on the tax base and revenues are considered by Adjusted Gross Income (AGI) classes, and the significance for the base and tax revenues of each component of the BTB's is also considered.

It should be emphasized that the changes in the tax laws explored in this study do not, by their inclusion or by the exclusion of other possible changes, imply any advocacy on the part of the investigators. Other possible changes should also be investigated before any major revision of the law is undertaken.

II. SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

The major findings of the study are summarized in Table 1. Broadening the base under BTB_1 would add $252 billion to the tax base; under BTB_2 some $271 billion would be added.[3] In both instances the bulk of the gain in the tax base comes from the elimination of all personal exemptions and deductions ($179.5 billion). However, considerable amounts are added to the base by the income imputations, particularly in the cases of partnership treatment of corporate profits (in BTB_2), the dividends plus total capital gains on corporate stock treatment of corporate income (in BTB_2), treating capital gains as ordinary income, and fringe benefits. Not surprisingly, the other imputations (excluding imputed rent) together account for only a small portion of the change in the base ($9.4 billion).[4]

While the treatment of personal exemptions and deductions and corporate income would be a large portion of any major base broadening, it must be remembered that only selected income items have been added to the base in this study. If we were to be truly comprehensive, for example, by integrating gift and estate taxation with the personal tax, the relative importance of these three items would diminish (though it would still be a large part of the base broadening).

Table 1 shows the dramatic effect that taxation of the much larger bases would have had on 1964 revenues:[5] the low 14.4–13.9 percent flat tax rate on all income needed to raise the same revenues as was obtained in 1964, and the effect on average tax rates in a progressive rate schedule yielding actual 1964 revenue.[6]

TABLE 1.—SUMMARY OF EFFECTS OF BASE BROADENING ON THE TAX BASE, TAX REVENUES, AND TAX RATES UNDER ALTERNATIVE BTB CONCEPTS

Item	BTB_1	BTB_2
	Billions of dollars	
1. Old tax base	230.4	230.4
2. New tax base	481.6	501.3
3. Change in tax base	251.2	[1]270.9
(a) State and local bonds interest	1.1	1.1
(b) Interest on life insurance	1.7	1.7
(c) Employer's contributions to and interest on profit sharing and pension plans	7.0	7.0
(d)(1) Partnership treatment of corporate profits	44.1	-------
(d)(2) Dividends plus capital gains (realized and unrealized) on corporate stock		58.6
(e) Deductions and exemptions	179.5	179.5
(f) Realized capital gains as ordinary income	11.2	-------
(g) OAI	3.6	3.6
(h) SI	.2	.2
(i) Imputed rent		28.7
(j) Unemployment compensation	2.2	2.2
(k) Sick pay	.6	.6
4. 1964 tax revenues [2]	69.7	69.7
5. Tax revenue from BTB at 1965 tax rates	113.3	126.4
	Percent	
6. Flat tax rate needed to raise 1965 actual revenue	14.4	13.9
7. Progressive rate schedule (0 to 40 percent) required to raise 1965 revenue, selected levels of taxable income (average tax rate): [3]		
(a) $1,000	.02	.02
(b) $3,000	.06	.04
(c) $5,000	.10	.08
(d) $10,000	.20	.17
(e) $50,000	.35	.35
(f) $100,000	.38	.38

Note: Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

[1] The change in the tax base for imputations is $283,200,000,000. But the addition to the base is only $270,900,000,000 since $12,800,000,000 were excluded from old base in making the (i) imputation.

[2] Includes personal and corporate income tax revenues. Corporate income tax revenue is on a cash basis, from Joseph A. Pechman, Federal Tax Policy (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1966), p. 276.

[3] For BTB_1 the revenue raised would actually be $71,900,000,000; the schedule for BTB_2 would raise $71,100,000,000. The computer program used to calculate these schedules yielded these totals as the closest approximation to the $69,700,000,000 of revenue needed. A description of the tax function used is appended to Studies in Substantive Tax Reform (see text note 1 supra).

III. A CLOSER LOOK AT BTB_1

We now consider BTB_1 in more detail. Each addition to the base will be presented separately to show, by AGI class:[7] (1) the amount imputed; (2) the change in tax revenue (1965 rates) from making the imputation alone; and (3) the change in tax revenues (1965 rates) from "dropping" the imputation alone from BTB_1. Steps (2) and (3) bracket the "first-order" (assuming no changes in *before-tax* incomes) revenue ef-

---

Footnotes at end of article.

fects of each imputation. Table 2 shows the effect of the imputation of each item in BTB_1 on tax revenues.

Interest on State and local bonds

As Table 2 shows, $1,116 million of state and local bond interest was imputed. As expected, most of the addition to the tax base falls in the upper AGI classes; $671 million, or 60 percent, of the $1,116 million is estimated to have been received by tax units with $50,000 or more of AGI. ΔR_1 is the "add-on" revenue; ΔR_2 denotes the "back-off" revenue change. The marginal tax rate (the change in tax revenue from the "add-on" (ΔR_1) divided by the amount imputed is 54 percent. This is slightly lower than most previous estimates.[8]

TABLE 2.—SUMMARY OF REVENUE EFFECTS OF IMPUTING ITEMS TO TAX BASE—BTB_1

[Amounts in millions of dollars]

Item	AGI class					
	$0 to $3,000	$3,000 to $10,000	$10,000 to $25,000	$25,000 to $100,000	$100,000 and over	Total
State-local bond interest:						
Amount imputed	0	127	161	458	369	1,116
ΔR_1	0	25	45	221	237	527
ΔR_2	0	31	55	262	256	606
Interest on saving element in life insurance:						
Amount imputed	127	773	505	255	28	1,687
ΔR_1	19	138	113	105	18	393
ΔR_2	23	163	140	131	19	476
Employer's contributions and interest on profit-sharing and pension plans:						
Amount imputed	209	2,095	3,536	711	93	6,984
ΔR_1	32	388	844	308	58	1,692
ΔR_2	41	455	1,040	375	64	2,044
OASI benefits received by filing units:						
Amount imputed	2,497	1,024	217	57	5	3,802
ΔR_1	362	186	57	26	3	635
ΔR_2	460	255	89	33	3	840
Uenmployment compensation:						
Amount imputed	720	1,399	117	3	0	2,240
ΔR_1	112	250	25	1	0	388
ΔR_2	128	289	30	2	0	450
Partnership treatment of corporate income:						
Amount imputed	2,315	8,220	11,271	14,002	8,326	44,134
ΔR_1	416	2,080	4,114	7,896	5,760	20,265
ΔR_2	497	2,429	4,682	8,404	5,817	21,830
Exemptions, deductions, and sick pay:						
Amount imputed	32,154	103,306	36,171	6,837	1,585	180,053
ΔR_1	4,818	18,495	8,179	2,880	1,052	35,433
ΔR_3	5,321	20,259	9,425	3,464	1,102	39,579
Treatment of realized capital gains at ordinary income:						
Amount imputed	545	1,596	1,889	2,863	4,292	11,184
ΔR_1	100	319	552	1,241	2,033	4,213
ΔR_2	122	420	725	1,458	2,039	4,765

Interest on savings element of life insurance

The result of imputing interest on the savings component of life insurance is also shown in Table 2. This form of income is apparently heavily concentrated in the $5,000–$15,000 AGI class; our estimate shows some 66 percent of the $1,687 million is received by tax units in this range. The tax yield varies from a low of $393 million to a high of $476 million—again there is a substantial difference in the revenue gain depending on where the income is "put on."

Employer's contributions to private pension plans and interest on pension plans

Table 2 shows the effect of imputing to the tax file a substantial portion of "fringe benefits"—employer contributions to private pension plans—and the interest on the vested interest of employees in such plans.[9]

This income is concentrated in middle-income classes; 74 percent ($5,199 million) fell in the $5,000–$20,000 AGI classes. Again, the high and low revenue gain estimates differed considerably, from $1,692 million to $2,044 million.

Social security—old age and survivors benefits

Separate imputations were made for benefits accruing to the aged and to survivors under OASI. It is estimated that $3,604 million of OASI benefits received by aged units was received by the aged units filing in 1964—the rest was received by non-filing aged units.

As one would expect, a very large proportion of this income was received by units in the lower-income classes. Those with AGI's of less than $5,000 received $2,787 million of the total, over three-fourths of the total received by filing units. As a result, the tax yield, taking either the high or low estimate, is not as large relative to the added income as with the previous items; the average marginal tax rate is about 17–22 percent.

Imputing survivors' benefits to filing survivors' beneficiaries has contributed very little to the base and revenues. Only $198 million of income was imputed and $30 million to $38 million of revenue gained. Our calculations indicated only about 107,000 of the 470,000 families receiving survivors' benefits in 1964 would be represented in the tax file, and thus about $800 million of survivors' benefits accrued to non-filing units.

Unemployment compensation

The imputation of unemployment compensation benefits shown in Table 2 was $2,240 million concentrated in the AGI classes below $10,000 (95 percent). The revenue gain at 1965 rates ranged from $388 million to $450 million.

Partnership treatment of corporate profits

The partnership treatment of corporate profits was approximated under the assumption that every dividend recipient received a constant proportion of total corporate profits in proportion to his holdings. That is, a dollar in dividends received represents a constant multiple of dollars in profits before taxes at the corporate level.[10] This was assumed to be true regardless of AGI class. This constant multiple was assumed to be equal to the ratio of gross corporate profits to dividends (net of intercorporate dividends), which was approximately 4.0 [11] in 1964. Due to underreporting of dividends in 1964 this number was blown up to 4.5. Thus the imputation was made by adding the dividend exclusion and 3.5 times dividends to taxable income. Because of underreporting in the tax file some bias may exist. Another bias may exist because profits/dividend ratios are likely to vary for dividend recipients directly with AGI class. Thus the revenue change from taxing profits to stockholders shown here is probably an underestimate.

Table 2 shows total profits imputed to stockholders above the amount paid out in dividends as $44,134 [12] concentrated largely in the AGI classes $25,000 and above. This addition to the base results in substantial revenue gains measured either "from the bottom" ($20,265 million) or "from the top" ($21,830 million). The average marginal rate is clearly high, that is, from 46 to 49 percent.

Exemptions, deductions and sick pay, and realized capital gains

Three elements in the base broadening did not involve any income imputations but consisted of eliminating certain "preferences" in treatment of income, namely, personal exemptions and deductions, the sick pay exclusions, and realized capital gains. The effects these changes have on closing the gap between AGI and taxable income are summarized in Table 2.

Treating realized capital gains as ordinary income adds $11,184 million to the tax base, 68 percent of which falls in the AGI classes $25,000 and above. This change would yield $4,213 million to $4,765 million in additional revenue.

Elimination of all personal exemptions would add $112,594 million to the tax base, concentrated in the $10,000–$15,000 AGI classes (84 percent falls in this range). The revenue gain at 1965 rates would, of course, be substantial, ranging from $20,788 million to $22,712 million.

Elimination of personal deductions also adds substantially to the tax base—$66,897 million. Over half of this is concentrated in the $5,000–$15,000 AGI classes (57 percent), and the revenue gain would be $14,542 million to $16,741 million. The sick pay exclusion adds only $562 million to the base and some $120 million to $143 million of revenue.

IV. A COMPARISON OF THE RESULTS OF BTB_1 AND BTB_2

Since the second version of the broad tax base (BTB_2) differs from BTB_1 only with regard to two items—imputed rent and the treatment of corporate income—we need only discuss here the impact the addition of these two items has on the tax base and tax revenue changes discussed in the previous section. We shall therefore discuss, in turn, the results of (1) adding imputed rent on owner-occupied dwellings; (2) substitution of the taxation of dividends plus total (realized and unrealized) capital gains on corporate stock for the partnership treatment of corporate income; and (3) the differences in the distribution of the tax base by AGI classes in BTB_1 and BTB_2.

Imputed rent on owner-occupied homes

Adding net rent on owner-occupied homes to BTB_2 increased the base $28,739 million, which was concentrated in the $3,000–$20,000 AGI classes. The addition to tax revenues is estimated as between $4,076 million and $6,062 million.[13]

Taxing corporate income by taxing dividends paid and total capital gains on corporate stock at ordinary rates

One alternative to taxing corporations as partnerships was suggested by Bittker,[14] namely, taxing the dividends paid plus total capital gains (or losses) which accrue to stockholders. We have attempted here to make a rough estimate of the effects of such a procedure.

In order to avoid violating our assumptions about not allowing for "second-order" effects, dividends (including the amounts excluded) are "grossed up" by 92.3 percent, on the assumption that corporate taxes previously paid on dividends are now passed on to stockholders. In short, we assume the ratio of retained earnings to profits is unchanged by the new treatment.

Footnotes at end of article.

The results are shown in Table 3. Whereas the partnership method added $44,134 million to the base, this treatment adds considerably more, $58,643 million. The result is large revenue gains of $34,418 million to $35,649 million, an increase of $14,153 million to $13,819 million on the partnership approach.

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF REVENUE EFFECTS OF ITEMS ADDED TO TAX BASE—BTB_2

[Amounts in millions of dollars]

Item	AGI class					
	$0 to $3,000	$3,000 to $10,000	$10,000 to $25,000	$25,000 to $100,000	$100, and over	Total
Imputed rent on owner-occupied home:						
Amount imputed	2,667	14,711	9,133	2,011	214	28,739
ΔR_1	391	2,639	2,047	810	136	6,024
ΔR_2	413	1,739	1,238	595	90	4,076
Taxation of dividends plus gains from changes in value of corporate stock:						
Amount imput	454	1,772	5,310	16,723	35,223	58,643
ΔR_1	112	483	1,342	8,914	23,539	34,418
ΔR_2	98	496	1,584	9,790	23,669	35,649

Distribution of BTB_1 and BTB_2 by AGI classes

Although BTB_2 is some $20 billion larger than BTB_1, it is not larger in every AGI class—BTB_1 is greater in the $1,500–$5,000 AGI classes and the $11,000–$50,000 AGI classes. BTB_2 is larger for all other AGI classes and particularly so for the $50,000–$500,000 classes and the "over $1,000,000" class.

This reflects the fact that BTB_2 does not differ from BTB_1 simply by the addition of income items. If this were the case, then BTB_2 would be larger than BTB_1 (or at least no smaller) for *every* AGI class. BTB_2 reflects the addition to BTB_1 of imputed rent and a change in the treatment of corporate income. The latter change causes the tax base to rise in some AGI classes and fall in others. *Total* capital gains in BTB_2, which account for a large portion of corporate income in this base, were distributed by AGI class on the basis of the Federal Reserve Sample Survey of corporate stock ownership. On the other hand, the distribution of corporate income by AGI class under the partnership treatment in BTB_1 was based on the distribution of dividends by AGI class (via the "gross-up" technique used). It is not surprising that more of corporate income goes to the higher AGI brackets under BTB_2, since persons in higher brackets are likely to prefer capital gains over dividend income and thus hold stocks with low dividend/price ratios. Thus in the highest brackets, BTB_2 considerably exceeds BTB_1.

The reason for the excess of BTB_1 over BTB_2 in the $1,500–$5,000 and $11,000–$50,000 AGI classes is a reflection also of the switch in the treatment of corporate income. In imputing *total* capital gains of corporate stock in BTB_2, *realized* capital gains were deleted. In these classes the amount imputed was less than the amount deleted, in part because realized capital gains on *all* assets (rather than just corporate stock) were deleted.

It is probable that, had an attempt been made to distribute corporate profits by ownership of shares rather than dividends in BTB_1, the difference in the distribution of the two tax bases by AGI classes would not have been very significant.

TABLE 4.—DISTRIBUTION OF BTB_1 AND BTB_2 BY AGI CLASSES

AGI class	BTB_1	BTB_2	Difference: BTB_2 less BTB_1
0 to $600	6,083.4	6,120.5	37.1
$600 to $1,000	4,408.2	4,497.2	89.0
$1,000 to $1,500	7,920.9	8,039.1	118.0
$1,500 to $2,000	8,265.2	8,120.5	−144.7
$2,000 to $2,500	9,088.8	8,913.3	−175.5
$2,500 to $3,000	10,184.7	10,164.3	−20.4
$3,000 to $3,500	11,291.7	11,063.7	−228.0
$3,500 to $4,000	13,146.6	12,866.2	−280.4
$4,000 to $4,500	14,237.2	13,949.9	−287.3
$4,500 to $5,000	14,638.6	14,339.9	−298.7
$5,000 to $6,000	34,523.0	34,812.2	289.2
$6,000 to $7,000	36,707.4	37,036.2	328.8
$7,000 to $8,000	38,982.2	39,438.2	456.0
$8,000 to $9,000	35,252.4	35,387.4	134.9
$9,000 to $10,000	31,426.6	31,459.4	32.8
$10,000 to $11,000	25,701.2	25,934.9	233.7
$11,000 to $12,000	20,634.0	20,560.6	−73.3
$12,000 to $13,000	17,191.1	16,787.2	−403.9
$13,000 to $14,000	13,282.0	12,947.3	−334.7
$14,000 to $15,000	10,407.6	9,921.6	−486.1
$15,000 to $20,000	30,850.7	29,257.2	−1,593.8
$20,000 to $25,000	14,996.9	13,558.4	−1,438.5
$25,000 to $50,000	33,296.7	29,628.9	−3,667.8
$50,000 to $100,000	18,574.2	23,283.0	4,708.8
$100,000 to $150,000	5,938.8	12,948.4	7,009.6
$150,000 to $200,000	2,952.6	7,379.6	4,427.0
$200,000 to $500,000	5,923.1	14,632.0	8,708.9
$500,000 to $1,000,000	2,277.5	2,345.8	68.3
$1,000,000 and over	3,411.3	5,928.6	2,517.3
Total	481,593.9	501,320.7	19,726.8

FOOTNOTES

[1] Arthur B. Willis, "Comments and Observations by the Project Director," in *Studies in Substantive Tax Reform*, ed. Arthur B. Willis (Chicago: American Bar Foundation; Dallas, Texas: Southern Methodist University [forthcoming]).

[2] The complete results of the project as well as the detailed methodology used will be presented in early 1969 in *Studies in Substantive Tax Reform* (*ibid.*). The book will contain, besides an expanded version of this paper, comments and a history of the project by Arthur B. Willis and Charles O. Galvin. Other papers included discuss the legal aspects of tax-base broadening (by Robert A. Bernstein) and special economic studies (by Gary A. Robbins, J. Scott Turner, and Robert W. Tinney).

[3] The major differences in BTB_1 and BTB_2 are indicated in Table 1. BTB_1 excludes imputed rent and taxes corporate profits as partnership income, while BTB_2 includes imputed rent and taxes corporate income by taxing dividends (grossed up to "pass through" the corporate tax, which is eliminated) and all capital gains (realized and unrealized) on corporate stock at ordinary rates.

[4] Recall, however, that no account here is taken of the non-filers. This would increase the increase in the base from adding OASI and unemployment insurance and also add virtually all of public assistance (most of the recipients being non-filers) to the base.

[5] Corporate plus personal income taxes. The increase in personal taxes is after deduction of the lost revenue from discontinuance of the corporate tax implied by both *BTB*'s.

[6] The progressive rate schedule used is explained in *Studies in Substantive Tax Reform* (see note 1 *supra*). Essentially it is a formula meeting the following constraints: (1) the tax begins with the first unit of income; (2) the *rate of increase* in the average tax is constant; and (3) the maximum marginal tax rate is 40 percent.

[7] To save space, the summary tables for this and the following section use 5 AGI classes; a more detailed breakdown by 13 and 29 AGI classes will be given in *Studies in Substantive Tax Reform* (see note 1 *supra*).

[8] Benjamin A. Okner, *Income Distribution and the Federal Income Tax* (Ann Arbor: Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan, 1966), p. 86, estimated a 59 percent average marginal rate; Ott and Meltzer and Robinson came up with similar estimates. See D. Ott and A. Meltzer, *Federal Tax Treatment of State and Local Securities* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1963), p. 60; and R. I. Robinson, *Postwar Market for State and Local Government Securities* (Princeton, N.J.: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1960), pp. 191–92.

[9] Total "fringe benefits" in 1964 were estimated at $16.6 billion by the U.S. Department of Commerce, *Survey of Current Business* (July 1967), p. 16. The amounts excluded here (because data were not available on the employer's share of contributions or on the distribution of this amount by AGI class) are largely contributions to health and accident insurance, life insurance, and fringe benefits of government (federal and state-local) employees.

[10] Alternative treatments of dividends and corporate profits are discussed by Gary A. Robbins in "Alternative Tax Treatments of Corporate Income and Capital Gains," *Studies in Substantive Tax Reform* (see note 1 *supra*).

[11] *Economic Report of the President* (February 1968), p. 290.

[12] Dividends received in 1964 were $12,477 million (from *Statistics of Income* [1964], p. 33). Thus the amount of total corporate profits implied by this computation is about $56.6 billion. This is less than actual total corporate profits in 1964 of $66.8 billion (*Economic Report of the President* [February 1968], p. 290) because of under-reporting and intercorporate and foreign dividends.

[13] A detailed explanation of the methodology will be presented in *Studies in Substantive Tax Reform* (see note 1 *supra*). Note that in this one case the "back-off" revenue gain is less than the "add-to" gain. This is because *net* rent was imputed, and where returns had mortgage interest or real estate tax deductions, this had to be added to the imputation to avoid double counting. When imputed rent was deleted from BTB_2, only the net rent was deleted, not the double-counted deductions. See Robert W. Tinney, "Taxing Imputed Rents on Owner-occupied Housing," *Studies in Substantive Tax Reform* (see note 1 *supra*) for further details and alternative estimates.

[14] B. Bittker, "A 'Comprehensive Tax Base' as a Goal of Income Tax Reform," *Harvard Law Review*, Vol. 80 (March 1967), p. 978. See also his further discussion of the ideal of "Comprehensive Income Taxation: A Response," *ibid.*, Vol. 81 (March 1968), p. 25 n., pp. 1041–42.

AMERICAN DEFENDERS OF BATAAN AND CORREGIDOR TO HOLD NATIONAL CONVENTION

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, during April 30 to May 4, the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, Inc., will convene in Miami Beach, Fla. This unique organization is composed of surviving members of the defense of these Pacific islands and the infamous Death March during World War II.

When this organization was formed, members recognized that it would be unusual among veterans organizations in that its ranks would never increase—only diminish. Yet it was necessary that they band together, for they had an experience in life that this country must never forget. We are grateful for this reminder of a part of the history of our country that required American fighting men to summon up amazing courage and endurance.

For the survivors, their very existence serves as testimony to bravery and devotion to their country's ideals far beyond the capacity of most people to even imagine. I congratulate all of the members of this outstanding organization for what they have accomplished.

One survivor of the Bataan Death March is Louis Cusano, who as a private first class survived 40 months in Japanese prison camps. On his return, he told a grisly story of the inhuman torture and slaughter of American military men during this terrible period. Now, Mr. Cusano is a resident of Miami, Fla., and is still serving his country as an employee of the U.S. Post Office.

I take this opportunity to offer congratulations to Mr. Cusano and other members of the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor. May they continue to gather for these meetings for many, many years. They deserve the high honor and tribute of a grateful nation.

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH CELEBRATES HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY TODAY

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 80th birthday of the noted A. Philip Randolph it is my privilege to offer this distinguished gentleman my best wishes for a future which yet promises further service in a life devoted to the advancement of the Negro people and to the cause of justice for all men.

Mr. Randolph retired last year as president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters of which he was the chief founder in 1925. From that time until the present Mr. Randolph has devoted himself unsparingly toward uniting all segments of the working class. He maintained:

> My philosophy was the result of our concept of effective liberation of the Negro through the liberation of the working people. We never separated the liberation of the white working man from the liberation of the black working man—rather, we believe the unity of these forces would bring about the power to really achieve basic social change.

And, indeed, A. Philip Randolph has been instrumental in the evolution of positive social change. He organized the march on Washington movement which led President Roosevelt to initiate the commission on fair employment practices in 1941 which became the predecessor of State and Federal antidiscrimination laws. He also served as a member of Mayor LaGuardia's commission on race in 1935 and later as honorary Chairman of the White House Conference on Civil Rights. Last year he retired as the AFL–CIO's only Negro vice president.

It is therefore an honor for me to join so many other Americans in paying tribute to a man who has done so much toward realizing the goal of equal opportunity for all Americans.

THE VULNERABLE RUSSIANS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in reference to our relations with the Soviet Union, the present period has been defined as "an era of negotiation rather than confrontation." Whether this definition is accurate and valid or ill-founded and misleading is a subject for much debate. Psychopolitically, we are being confronted by the Russians on every front, even within our own domestic environment. Nonetheless, if we believe this is an era of negotiation, then obviously, even in this case, we should approach it with knowledgeability, background, and insight.

The book, "The Vulnerable Russians," furnishes these necessary requisites for negotiating with the Russians. The numerous favorable reviews given this work point this out in a variety of ways. For example, as the review below shows:

> This is a much-needed book that should serve to startle Americans out of their cold war complacency.

Authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, the book enables us to understand why diplomacy and negotiations are themselves mere instruments utilized by the highly vulnerable Russians to advance their cold war objectives. Copies can be obtained at the Georgetown University Bookstore, White Gravenor Building, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. The following review, written by Geraldine Finch in the October issue of Free China Review, explains in part the significance of the work:

THE VULNERABLE RUSSIANS

(By Lev E. Dobriansky, reviewed by Geraldine Fitch)

In the dedication of his book, the author bares its essence: "To all freedom fighters, particularly the unsung heroes of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army which in World War II . . . fought both the Nazis and the Russian imperio-colonialists. Their supreme sacrifice . . . renders historically inseparable the far-flung events of our American Revolution, Ukraine's independence and the freedom of every non-Russian nation, as well as the Russian people, now held captive in the Red Empire . . ."

In the light of Russia's steady determination to reach world domination through the exploitation of captive nations, the often inconsistent, unplanned and wavering policies of the United States have resulted in Russian diplomatic victories and encroachments in the Middle East and North Vietnam. The United States has done well twice: (1) in getting the missiles out of Cuba and (2) in the annual Captive Nations' Week proclamation. Unfortunately the U.S. president's proclamation remains only that instead of a program of action. Khrushchev's bitter railing against the resolution during Richard Nixon's visit in 1959, and the harsh comments in the Russian press and in broadcasts indicates that a new nerve was struck.

Professor Dobriansky exposes the Bolshevik revolution as the incubator of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, the fraud of Lenin's promise of "land, bread and peace" and the sham of such Moscow slogans as "peaceful coexistence". Communism, he explains, is used as a technique by the Russian leaders. They are guilty of the same imperialism and colonialism, the empire-building that was started by Ivan the Terrible and characterized Russia after the 16th century.

Methods have included divide and conquer, networks of conspiracy, genocide, Russification, two steps forward and one back, broken treaties, messiahship, ideological smokescreens, political partition, the police state, distortions of history, anti-Semitic pogroms and Potemkin Village tactics. Russia's policy is one of internal totalitarian rule and external imperialism and colonialism.

There always have been Russian freedom fighters and resistance movements—Poland's Pulaski, the Ukraine's Shevchenko, White Ruthenian and Byelorussians, North Caucasians and the Muslims of the U.S.S.R. and of Central Asia. The author stresses the need to study the history of Tsarist empire-building in order to understand Soviet Russia. He reveals their tactics in promising self-determination and the right to secede from the U.S.S.R. while really dominating and exploiting. In 1920, eight countries came under Communist domination; from 1922 to 1946 eight more lost their freedom; since then eleven more have become part of the Communist bloc.

The author tells how Russia's propaganda deceives Americans, who are largely unaware of how other countries have been subverted and brought under Communist domination. Appeasement-minded groups and individuals in the United States do Moscow's propaganda work at no cost to Russia. Americans fall for campaigns supporting "peace" and "coexistence," for nuclear test bans and for more trade. All will be discarded like so many treaties whenever it suits the Party leaders.

Dobriansky makes these main points: (1) Whether Americans like it or not, they are involved in a continuing cold war, (2) the final outcome must be either victory or defeat and (3) political defeat of the enemy is possible and necessary to preclude nuclear holocaust. Some Americans talk of the cold war "moderating," of a "detente" between Moscow and Washington, of "building bridges" to Russia, of the influence of more trade and of moral and political compromises. Meanwhile, Moscow goes right on supporting the U.S. enemy in Vietnam, develops space missiles and carries out subversion in the Middle East and Latin America.

Hitler blundered in World War II by not realizing what the readiness of the Ukrainians and Byelorussians (and other people of captive nations) to help Germany against Russia could have meant. Instead, he attempted to foist his system on them and they therefore fought Germans as well as Russians. U.S. blunders have included appeasement at Yalta, failure to aid the Hungarians in 1956 and the desertion of Chiang Kai-shek when Russia was giving vast stores of Japanese arms to the Chinese Communists.

Dobriansky says that Russia's economic status and rank as the world's second industrial power are largely due to colonial exploitation of the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. The Ukraine has a population of 45 million and huge resources, especially of coal and pig iron. Georgia has manganese and Azerbaijan has oil.

The book is not without flaw. The author uses too many obscure or self-coined words. Examples include "actionism," "concretist," "entitative" (for entity), "hardwarists," "pendulumic," "potemkinize,"' "nomer," "venomia" and "guestimations." However, this is a much-needed book that should serve to startle Americans out of their cold war complacency. One may hope for issuance as a paperback together with tighter editing.

STILL RESISTING MOSCOW'S WAY

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I attach herewith an article by Tad Szulc, who is a New York Times correspondent who has just completed a visit to Rumania. This article is very revealing. It indicates that Rumania is trying to maintain herself in diplomatic relations with all nations. This has given the country some flexibility in trade negotiations and other aspects of foreign economic policy. Independence such as Rumania has shown will do more to keep us out of World War III than any other thing possible. Ability to retain one's independence and thinking about world matters in the end results in the best thing being done for the individual country concerned—and it would appear that Rumania has that in mind.

This article from the New York Times of Sunday, April 13, is herewith attached, and I believe my colleagues will be interested in reading it today:

Still Resisting Moscow's Way

The expression "unity and cohesion" as applied to the Communist movement had different meanings to Rumanian Foreign Minister Corneliu Manescu and to the top Soviet leaders when they conferred in the Kremlin last week.

To the Rumanians, unity and cohesion meant full cooperation on the clear understanding that there is no interference of any type by a Communist country in the affairs of another Communist state.

To the Soviet Union the phrase represented a complete acceptance of the leading role of Moscow within what the Soviets have taken to calling the "socialist commonwealth." This theory since last autumn has also been known as the "Brezhnev Doctrine," because the Soviet Communist party's General Secretary, Leonid I. Brezhnev, invoked it to justify the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

In a lengthy article last week marking Mr. Manescu's visit, Pravda, newspaper of the Russian Communist party, explained the doctrine. "Marxist-Leninists," said Pravda, "believe that whenever there is a threat to the revolutionary gains of the people in any country, and hence a threat to its sovereignty as a socialist country and a threat to the fraternal community, it is the internationalist duty of socialist states to do everything in their power to remove that threat and insure the progress of socialism and strengthen the sovereignty of all socialist countries."

This fundamental difference of opinion is at the root of the ideological schism between Moscow and Bucharest. In the opinion of many experts on Communism, this schism, gradually widening in the last seven or eight years, may in the long run be more embarrassing and even dangerous to the Kremlin than the Czechoslovak acts of defiance in 1968 and again this spring.

On many aspects of foreign, military and economic policy, Rumania has rejected Soviet guidance. She has successfully opposed Soviet plans for Warsaw Pact forces' maneuvers on her soil, even going so far as to protest against all war games by everybody, everywhere. This month, in a small concession, she sent staff officers to a brief exercise involving Soviet and Bulgarian units in Bulgaria.

Rumania has been as reluctant to follow the Soviet inspiration in the Comecom (Council for Mutual Economic Assistance) as she has been in the field of the Warsaw Pact, although she continues to belong to both Communist organizations as a reluctant partner.

At the Warsaw Pact "summit" in Budapest last month, the Rumanians virtually torpedoed Soviet plans for a unified stand against Communist China. Their argument was that there must be no taking of sides in the Communist disputes. At the Moscow conference this month, the Rumania Minister of Justice refused to sign resolutions against the United States' presence in Vietnam and against West Germany because, he said, he had no authority to do so.

The Rumanians not only deny Moscow the right to tell them what to do, they insist on maintaining relations ranging from warm in the case of Yugoslavia to cordial or reasonably correct in the case of China, Albania and Cuba—all countries considered hostile by the Soviets.

In the black-and-white terms of what Moscow regards as proper Communist allegiance to its authority, the Rumanians, therefore, have been acting as stubborn and confirmed heretics.

The question thus arises what, if anything, the Kremlin leaders proposed to do about the Rumanian recalcitrants.

A military invasion of the Czechoslovak type might still appear as a solution to the "hard-liners" propounding the Brezhnev theory of "limited sovereignty." But the long months of political upset in Czechoslovakia after the invasion, and the violently adverse reactions from much of the world Communist movement to the August intervention, may well have forced a rethinking of the Soviet options in Rumania.

Among the factors Moscow must consider in Rumania is that, in the first place, the Rumanians may well fight back. Carnage in a fellow Communist state may not be precisely what the Soviets need as they strive to rebuild the international movement, push for a European security conference, and seek serious negotiations with the United States.

The Rumanian Communist party—and the rest of the nation—is totally united around the party chief, Nicolae Ceausescu. Contrary to the case in Czechoslovakia, a pro-Soviet wing does not exist in the Rumanian party, because in the last four years Mr. Ceausescu saw to its extinction.

Rumania's centuries-old experience in playing Turk against Russian and Transylvanian against Austrian has taught her how to maneuver flexibly in the predatory world around her.

While hoping to maintain normal relations with Moscow, Mr. Ceausescu remains friendly with Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito, sends warm greetings to the Chinese Communists, signs new economic agreements with Cuba, visits Turkey, which is a NATO member, and deals extensively with the West in trade and technology.

Under the circumstances, it is unlikely that Mr. Manescu and the Soviet leaders have agreed on more than how to disagree with a minimum of Communist scandal. But Moscow's basic problem in Rumania is far from being solved as it ever was since Bucharest decided to follow its own private path to Socialism.

OIL COSTS NOT REAL CULPRIT

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a small increase in crude oil prices has been viewed with alarm by a few who seem to support inflationary increases as applied to other enterprises but do not like to see any such price adjustments as applied to the petroleum industry.

An excellent discussion of this overall subject is contained in an editorial which appeared in the April 6, 1969, issue of the San Angelo, Tex., Standard-Times. The editorial follows:

Oil Costs Not Real Culprit

Surely pure gall must have a limit. And surely the 14 senators who have urged the Nixon administration for a full-scale investigation of recent oil and gasoline price hikes have their share of pure gall that must approach the limit.

After voting to hike their own pay, approving increased salaries for Civil Service employes and otherwise spending money like it is going out of style while giving lip service to curbing inflation, these senators have the gall to ask for a probe of an industry where inflation trends rank among the lowest in the nation.

Granted the price of a gallon of gasoline is up 9 per cent from 1960. But even at that, gasoline prices have risen less than the general cost of living during that period.

The senators should turn their attention to a wide variety of other items that inflation has taken toll on to a far greater extent. Among those prices that have risen more than the general cost of living during the 1960s are:

Semi-private hospital rooms, up from an average of $20.95 per day in 1960 to $41.04 per day in 1968 for an increase of 96 per cent.

Adult movie tickets nationwide are up from the 1960 average of 90 cents to $1.61 in 1968 for a hike of 79 per cent.

A man's wool suit cost an average of $41 in 1960. In 1968 the average cost had risen by 51 per cent to $74.

There are numerous other prices that have risen by far greater percentages during the eight-year span—too numerous to name them all. But some include the cost of a house call by a doctor, up 46 per cent; maid service for a day is up 45 per cent; cigarettes have risen 42 per cent in cost per package; men's shoes, up 39 per cent; hair cuts are up 34 per cent; even oranges are up 30 per cent from 84 cents per dozen to $1.09.

More directly, petroleum prices have been forced up by rising costs of labor and steel, a necessary item in the form of pipe and machinery to the drilling of any oil well.

The senators made their request for a probe of rising oil prices in a letter to Atty Gen. John N. Mitchell, asking him "to ascertain whether these price rises have been coincidental or collusive and predatory practices." The letter was made public by signers Sens. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), William Proxmire (D-Wis.), and Edward W. Brooke (R-Mass.).

They noted that the price rise, costing consumers an estimated $800 million annually, "comes at a time when the greatest single economic problem facing our nation is inflation, and at a time when virtually all of the major oil companies have record high profits."

They commented that "this is certainly no time to fatten profits still more by an irresponsible price hike . . . Almost none of the price increase comes back to the federal government in taxes . . . because of the privileged tax treatment received by oil companies."

It would seem to us, after examining the inflationary trends that have stricken the economy with fever, that a 9 per cent price rise in eight years is not even sufficient to offset the rising costs of production. Certainly oil prices have risen and certainly no motorist enjoys paying more for a gallon of gasoline than he has in the past. But it seems remarkable that petroleum prices have not risen even higher than they have during the 1960s, and we feel the oil industry is to be congratulated for holding down its contribution to spiraling inflation.

After 14 senators have examined their own personal situations, including a wage hike of $12,500 per year and a vast array of other price hikes that are the real culprits in an overheated economy, then a request for scrutiny of the oil industry would not seem so apparently full of gall.

Sen. Everett Dirksen said when Congressional pay raises were being considered. "Even senators have to eat." We contend that oil industry people also have that right and to no lesser degree than congressmen afford themselves—and you can eat pretty good on $42,500 per year.

The real victims of price hikes, whether it be in salaries or congressmen, in hospital room fees or at the grocery shelf are the nation's poor—the unemployed whose assistance is not boosted in accordance with rising costs, the nation's elderly who find Social Security checks no larger when living costs continue to rise. Most other Americans have realized increases in take-home pay in excess of the 9 per cent in eight years that oil prices have risen—but still below the 30 per cent congressional pay hike and numerous other cost increases.

In the battle of rising costs, reality dictates that when wage costs rise, so does the cost of production. That increase is passed on in increased costs to the consumer, who, in turn, demands more wages. The people who are hurt by this process are those whose paychecks do not rise in proportion to living costs, but if congressmen aren't responsible enough to hold the line against the spiral we find it hard to understand why they want any industry—oil or otherwise—to absorb the blow without raising the prices of its products.

CAPABILITIES, JUDGMENTS, AND THE ABM

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense Laird has based a large part of his case for the Safeguard ABM system on his judgment that the Soviet Union, by resuming deployment of the SS–9 missile system, is seeking to achieve a first-strike capability against our offensive missile forces. As William Beecher noted in a perceptive article in yesterday's New York Times, the evidence to support Mr. Laird's contention is not nearly so clear as the Secretary would have us believe. Indeed, Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden have gone one step further, and argue in this morning's Washington Post that the evidence is better fitted to a conclusion exactly opposite to that reached by Mr. Laird.

These two articles warrant careful study by all of us in Congress, since we will soon be asked to vote funds for a system which is being justified on grounds which are tenuous indeed. In order that they may be readily available to all Members, I am inserting their texts at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 14, 1969]

SOVIET MISSILE DEPLOYMENT PUZZLES TOP U.S. ANALYSTS

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON, April 13.—The scope and nature of Soviet strategic weapons deployment has puzzled senior Government analysts to the point where it may play an important role in the Administration's fight for an antiballistic missile system.

The issue came to light recently when Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird asserted there was "no question" that Russia was seeking "a first strike capability" against the United States. He credited new intelligence information with bringing him to this view.

Qualified sources say that the new evidence gathered by high-flying satellites shows the following:

The Soviet Union has a total of about 1,200 intercontinental ballistic missiles, in place or rapidly going into place, roughly 150 more land-based ICBM's than in America's arsenal.

After deploying about 225 giant SS–9 missiles the Russians abruptly stopped the program early last year, but then, in December, surprisingly started it up again.

The Russians are believed to have deployed a fractional orbiting bombardment system, a weapon that could only be used effectively in a first strike against so-called "soft" targets, such as bomber bases.

They are also testing new multiple warheads for the SS–9.

As of last fall, the American intelligence community was convinced the Russians were merely following the American lead in building a secure "second strike" force that would enable them to ride out a surprise attack and then retaliate overwhelmingly.

The new information, centering on the SS–9, has raised a serious question in many officials' minds. However, Mr. Laird has apparently resolved that question to his own satisfaction in favor of assuming that the Russians are bent on upsetting the balance of power dramatically in their favor. Others in the Government are far from sure.

Secretary Laird's statement was made before a recent session of a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee that was strongly skeptical about the need for the $6-billion to $7-billion Safeguard antimissile system, designed in part to defend America's ICBM's against Soviet attack.

Without squarely disagreeing with Mr. Laird's assessment, Secretary of State William P. Rogers nonetheless told a news conference he doubted that the Russians had the "intention" of launching a first strike. But he said one of the first questions the United States would raise with the Russians when arms limitation talks got underway was: "Why would you have a 25-megaton missile?"

A megaton is equivalent to one million tons of TNT.

Since the Administration has apparently chosen to pitch much of its case for the missile defense system on the rising Soviet threat, the differing assessments within the Administration on the nature of that threat could well undermine its case.

PACE OF DEPLOYMENT

Back in 1965, when the Russians moved to a large-scale deployment of ICBM's, they concentrated on two second-generation liquid-fuel missiles: the SS–9, with a warhead of from 9 to 25 megatons, and the SS–11, with a warhead of slightly more than 25 megatons.

The pace of deployment was approximately 250 a year about 200 SS–11's for each 40 to 50 SS–9's. At the time, American analysts figured the Russians had simply put their development and production money on two different systems made by two separate design teams, just as the United States had done originally.

About 200 early model SS–7 and SS–8 missiles were retained in the Russian force as the new weapons went in.

Then, early last year, the Russians stopped deploying the SS–9 and slowed installation of the SS–11. At the same time it started putting in about 25 SS–13's, a new solid-fuel ICBM with a warhead of about one-megaton.

The feeling was the Russians thought they had almost as many ICBM's as they needed or wanted and would soon taper off.

But in December came evidence of a sudden resumption of SS–9 construction. Only a few missiles were involved but this raised concern because of the large payload of this system.

NONE BELIEVED ACCURATE

The question was whether the Russians had decided to resume the earlier construction pace that would result in a total of about 500 SS–9's in five years.

None of the Soviet ICBM's is considered very accurate. The one-megaton missiles, however, are considered quite adequate for destroying cities. They are five times more powerful than the atomic bombs that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

But the SS–9 makes up in warhead size what it lacks in accuracy and thus could be used to try to destroy minuteman missiles in their steel-and-concrete silos.

More chilling yet is the possibility that the Russians would put accurately guided multiple warheads on the SS–9. The experts say it has enough thrust to carry three 4-to-5-megaton multiple warheads, or six 1-to-2-megaton warheads, or conceivably 18 200-kiloton warheads.

The Russians have been actively testing a three-part multiple warhead on the SS–9, sources say. But, as yet, these are not believed capable to separate guidance against different targets. Instead it is said, they land "like a string of beads" in a straight line.

There were three main theories on what the Russians are up to:

One school holds that they have powerful internal pressures to continue construction of at least some more missiles, a sort of Soviet "military-industrial complex."

Another group believes they have decided they ought to build a first-strike force, more to exploit as an implicit threat in future confrontations than to use suddenly one morning in a surprise attack.

A third group holds that the Russians are interested in limiting damage in the Soviet Union in case deterrence fails and nuclear war breaks out. ICBM's that can destroy enemy missiles in their silos would limit damage on Russia fully as much as antimissile missiles.

MOST EXPERTS UNDECIDED

Most analysts say the evidence is not at all clear enough to choose among these alternative strategies with confidence.

Mr. Laird, some officials point out, has the responsibility to make conservative judgments where the country's survival may be at stake and thus understandably wants to move ahead now to start the slow deployment of a defense for the Minuteman force.

(The Administration argued for the Safeguard system, additionally, as a full protection against ICBM's Communist China is expected to have in the mid-1970's and as a defense against a small number of missiles launched accidently or without authorization from China, Russia or anywhere else.)

Those who lean to the Soviet first-strike school point to the Russian deployment of the fractional bomb system. It uses the same booster as the SS–9 ICBM, but carries a smaller warhead and is believed less accurate. Its main feature is its ability to come in low, under the view of long-range radar, thus being potentially capable of destroying bombers before they can be warned and get airborne.

Such a weapon would be of little use unless employed in a first strike. After war had begun, the bombers would not be sitting around on their bases waiting to be hit.

Additionally, the Russians have long expressed interest in building a large missile defense system. So far they have deployed only 67 long-range defensive missiles around Moscow but are testing a more advanced model.

If the Russians installed a heavy defensive all around the country, this too could cut two ways. On the one hand it could limit damage if someone else started nuclear war. But it also could be used to knock down retalitatory American missiles that survived a Soviet first strike on the United States.

Administration officials hope a freeze on offensive and defensive missiles can foreclose these horrors. But they question whether the United States can safely start a unilateral freeze even before those long and difficult talks get under way.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 15, 1969]

LAIRD SCARE STORY ON SOVIET MISSILE WON'T WASH

(By Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden)

Even so reasonable a man as Secretary of State William Rogers has apparently been taken in by the Pentagon's hard-working propagandists on the subject of the SS–9, or Soviet "supermissile," as it is now being called.

The belief of too many Americans that "bigger is better" is helpful to Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird and the generals in the campaign to make the SS–9 into a new and frightening reason why we should spend $6 billion to $7 billion—for openers—on an ABM system.

There is no doubt the SS–9 is big. Secretary Rogers, at his recent press conference, referred to it as a "25-megaton missile." This is a far higher estimate than that made by the CIA, which estimates it to have a warhead capacity of 5 megatons. But there is no need to argue the point of size. Probably, the SS–9 has a bigger warhead than anything the United States now deploys—and it is still far too small to knock out more than one ICBM site, of which we have 1054.

The fact is that the SS–9 is not a first-strike weapon, no matter how many grisly (and already public) details the Pentagon "declassifies." It is not designed to destroy the U.S. ICBM system and cannot do so. It is, instead, a large warhead designed to destroy large "soft" targets, such as cities. It is—in other words—a second-strike weapon, and that's all it is.

Thus, it does not change the balance of terror in any way or give the Russians some huge and mysterious advantage which should cause us to escalate the arms race.

Secretary Laird and the generals in the Pentagon have chosen to ignore this fact—for a very good reason. The reason is that the Safeguard ABM as proposed by President Nixon is not intended to protect large targets, such as cities. It is intended to protect our ICBM silos. And it is a tenable proposal only if Congress and the American people can be persuaded that the Soviets have a missile capable of destroying these silos. The SS–9, being large, meets the needs of the argument so long as the argument ignores the facts.

The facts are these: In order to threaten only the U.S. land-based second-strike capability, the Russians would have to build 2000 SS–9s, at a cost of $25 million each. Such a program would give them a minimal chance of destroying 1000 of our Minutemen, built at a cost of $5 million to $6 million each. There is no evidence that they are embarking on any such ridiculous course.

And if they did it would still threaten neither our substantial fleet of submarine-borne missiles nor those carried by U.S. strategic bombers.

Ever since mid-1968, when details of the SS–9 were first made public in the commercially published "Jane's All the World's Aircraft," it has been known to be inferior to the U.S. Minuteman in both reliability and launching time. Indeed, it is most comparable to our Titan I missile which we are now in the process of discarding as obsolete. To resurrect SS–9 now, as a reason for starting an ABM program, seems very close to down right deceit.

For far less money—say about $2 billion—the United States could "superharden" all of its Minuteman sites. Roughly speaking, a superhardened site is five times as strong as a hardened site. Thus, in order to maintain the same counterforce ability, the Russians would have to do one of the following: (1) increase the warhead size of the SS–9 by a factor of 11; or (2) double its accuracy.

Either of these is a far bigger order than penetrating the "thickest" ABM system.

In short, the much trumpeted SS–9 is not a breakthrough in the balance of terror. It is a weapon of great horror—but of no greater horror and somewhat less efficiency than many of our own. It justifies neither panic nor the ABM.

DEFINING LIMITS OF FREE SPEECH

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the 13 Democratic National Convention delegates and campaign staff workers who were arrested on August 29 of last year during the convention fracas were convicted yesterday of disorderly conduct. The case was heard by Magistrate Arthur L. Dunne whose statement on the limits of free speech and assembly put this complex issue in its proper context. Stated Magistrate Dunne:

> The right of free speech and assembly, while fundamental in our democratic society, does not mean that everyone with opinions or beliefs to express may do so at any public place at any time.

Conveniently forgotten by some of our free speech advocates these days is the principle of the common good which implies the maintenance of public order in the community. Perhaps the future will see more realistic definitions of the individual freedom versus individual responsibility issue, with the community receiving its rightful protection from deliberate violations of the law.

Here is the text of Magistrate Arthur L. Dunne's statement as it appeared in the Chicago Tribune of April 15, 1969:

> The right of free speech and assembly, while fundamental in our democratic society, does not mean that everyone with opinions or beliefs to express may do so at any public place at any time. The constitutional guarantee of liberty implies the existence of an organized society maintaining public order without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of anarchy.
>
> ### CITES DANGERS TO SOCIETY
>
> The authority of government is not so trifling as to permit anyone with a complaint to have the vast power to do anything he pleases, whenever he pleases, and wherever he pleases. If this were true, our customs and our habits of conduct—social, political, economic, ethical and religious—would all be destroyed and become no more than relics of a gone, but-not-forgotten past.
>
> I firmly believe that our cities, and the residents of these cities, can be and must be protected by their government from noisy, chanting, shouting, marching, threatening picketers who, under the guise of free speech, hurl pieces of brick, stones and fireworks, bent on filling the minds of men and women and children who reside in our city, with fear and hysteria.
>
> ### THREAT TO ORDER
>
> In the case at bar, there is ample evidence that the totality of the circumstances in the city of Chicago and particularly in the vicinity of 18th and Michigan on the night of Aug. 29, 1968, did present a clear, imminent and present threat of violence to our community. Under these circumstances the authorities have the right, as well as the duty, to take action under ordinances enacted by the municipal authorities for the welfare and protection of the citizenry.
>
> The ordinance which the defendants are charged with violating is narrowly drawn in such a way as to avoid abridging the right of speech, assembly and petition. It is in no sense a "meatax ordinance." It is also clear in this record that the Illinois national guard, as well as the Chicago police department, did make a determined and successful effort to permit the marchers to peacefully demonstrate and acted only in the interest of maintaining public order.
>
> ### ORDER NOT MAINTAINED
>
> I do not believe that this group and its leaders did all in their power to maintain order. On the contrary, it appears that such efforts that were made were nothing more than a shallow pretense—no more than an empty gesture. It is noteworthy that one of the defendants in this cause stated that he was a parade marshal with the responsibility of maintaining order, abandoning his duties, did remove his identifying armband, pressing to the forefront of the marchers, refusing to obey the lawful order given to him by a peace officer, ultimately being taken into custody.
>
> It is readily apparent that this group, bent on airing emotional grievances, either imaginary or real, on the streets of our city, acted in such a fashion that the joint efforts of the Illinois national guard and of the Chicago police department were of no avail, resulting in the issuance both by personal contact and by means of amplifying devices, of an order to disperse—which was lawful in every sense.
>
> The defendants in this cause knowingly disobeyed this order and sought arrest, rather than obey the duly constituted and lawful authority of the community.

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed saddened to learn of the passing of our former colleague, the Honorable Alvin M. Bentley, of Owosso, Mich.

Courageously denied once before, death nevertheless came unkindly long before its time on April 10, at the age of 50. Not before, however, Al Bentley had already completed two distinguished careers in service to the Nation. The misfortune of ill health, which he gallantly struggled against in recent years, recalls the fateful day of March 1, 1954, when a group of terrorists sprayed this Chamber with gunfire, inflicting upon Al wounds so serious he only narrowly escaped death.

Following graduation from the University of Michigan in 1940, Al was one of a group of 30 appointed to the U.S. Foreign Service from among 600 applicants, and for a period of some 8 years he served most ably at various posts, including Mexico City, Bogota, Budapest, and Rome.

In 1950, the year the Korean war broke out, Al resigned from the Foreign Service to speak out publicly about his concern over the growing threat of Communist aggression and subversion throughout the world.

In 1952 he ran successfully for the House of Representatives from Michigan's Eighth Congressional District, which at that time was composed of Clinton, Gratiot, Ionia, Montcalm, Saginaw, and Shiawassee Counties. He served in the 83d, 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses, always being returned by the citizens of the Eighth District with a generous vote of confidence.

To the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Al brought the wealth of his experience and knowledge of international relations.

A man devoted to the principles of his party, he was the choice of Michigan Republicans in 1960 for the office of U.S. Senator, and in 1962 for the office of Congressman-at-large.

Nor was his a narrow partisanship. Returning to the House Chamber on April 27, 1954, some 8 weeks after being wounded, among Al Bentley's first thoughts were these in speaking of the attack of March 1:

> Both sides of the aisle suffered casualties and both sides of the aisle reacted in the same way. Political campaigns are good and proper in their place but we here in Washington have national and international problems whose importance far surpass the exigencies of any political contest. When we in Congress faced a terrible problem 8 weeks ago yesterday it was met with no thought of party lines. Perhaps the good Lord wanted to see if we could still meet problems on a nonpartisan basis. Perhaps it would be well if we met some of our bigger problems in the same way.

And he concluded:

> With the help of Almighty God, let us then with remembrance of the past, look to the future and so conduct ourselves in the present that we may be worthy representatives of the American people, the greatest people the history of the world has ever known.

I cannot help but think that these thoughts would be among those he would, if given the opportunity, wish to leave with us.

Al Bentley served his country, his State, his constituency, his community untiringly in the finest tradition of representative government. To paraphrase the famous words of the great 18th-century English statesman, Edmund Burke, Al Bentley's happiness and glory was to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes had great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitted attention. But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he sacrificed to no man or any set of men living.

At this point, I insert a copy of the warm editorial tribute appearing in the Owosso Argus-Press of Friday, April 10, 1969, and the perceptive memorial by Judd Arnett in the Detroit Free Press of Monday, April 14, 1969:

[From the Owosso (Mich.) Argus-Press, Apr. 11, 1969]

I Liked That Guy

It seemed fitting that our front page of yesterday, which carried the somber news of the death of Alvin Morell Bentley also carried another story which proclaimed, "There Are Many People Who Care."

Fitting because Al Bentley did care. He cared about his family and friends, of course. But Al also had a deep concern for his fellow man.

Awareness of the depth of Alvin Morell Bentley's concern for his fellow man is denied those who would seek it in an edition of a newspaper or even between the covers of a book.

It was understood by those who loved him . . . and their ranks extended far beyond the ties of family.

It had somehow been communicated to people like the Owosso housewife who, when she learned that Al lay near death this week, remarked, "I liked that guy."

Al Bentley deserved to be liked. He wasn't flashy or pretentious. He was a hard worker. He was a rich man who considered himself a trustee of wealth put into his hands for the purpose of helping his fellow man.

As has been said, Al Bentley could have chosen to sit on a yacht off the Florida Keys for the rest of his life.

But selflessness, not selfishness, was a mark of the man. That and his capacity for hard work led him into the diplomatic corps, into Congress for four terms and so deeply into the field of education that he became a Regent of the University of Michigan.

To all appearances, Al Bentley had it "made" as a Congressman. But the same fellow wouldn't sit in that yacht off the Keys also declined to "sit it out" on the House floor. So he took aim at a seat in the U.S. Senate. It didn't come off. But Al was never one to set his sights low.

If you resented Al Bentley falling heir to many millions of dollars, this was a resentment that had nothing to do with the "real" Al Bentley. That was your own hangup, and Al would gladly have helped you with that problem if given half a chance.

One measure of the man was evidenced when he showed sympathy instead of malice toward the Puerto Ricans who shot him down on the floor of the House of Representatives. Many friendships were cemented when the Bentleys later visited Puerto Rico.

Being on one of Al Bentley's committees here in Shiawassee County or elsewhere was quite an experience. As that housewife said, you got to like the guy. And you liked the way things got done, because Al Bentley always did his homework. He was a leader and his leadership was based on doing more than his share of the work and listening with patience and interest to all sensible points of view.

While he was patient and understanding, Al Bentley was also a fighter. When your motivations and station in life reach as high a plateau as did Al's, there is nothing to do but fight for that in which you believe.

In politics, of course, infighting was one of the rules of the game. However, if you lost to Al Bentley in one of those fights, you never had the justification to claim "foul."

How many of us would have carried out our trusteeship for the public good nearly as well as did Alvin Morell Bentley? Too few, we fear.

The list of Al Bentley admirers who will come from the state and nation to Owosso to pay their last tribute to the man will be impressive and lengthy.

No one will ever know the numbers of those who are left to say, in eloquent simplicity, "I liked that guy."

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Apr. 14, 1969]

Mr. Alvin Bentley, True Midwesterner

(By Judd Arnett)

There is sadness in this corner at the news of the passing of Alvin M. Bentley of Owosso. He was a good man in the true sense of the phrase and those who had more than a surface knowledge of what he stood for and what he wanted to do for others will long regret his demise at the still-tender age of 50.

Generally speaking, Alvin Bentley was best known as a four-term Republican Congressman who survived an assassin's wounds in the 1954 attempt on the life of Harry Truman and other public figures. Later, he gave up his safe seat in the House to run for the United States Senate; and subsequently he sought to be elected Congressman-at-Large when our state was in the throes of maldistricting. On both occasions the majority said "no," quite decisively. He never complained of this rejection.

Had Alvin Bentley, with his advantage of great wealth, been Eastern-born and Eastern-indoctrinated, his political career might well have matched that of those from the area still in the limelight. But he was small-town-Midwestern to the core, and shy, sensitive and reserved to boot; no better equipped, really, to repell the slings and rebuffs of public life than you, dear reader, would have been.

There were times when his money—he never seemed to grasp the extent of it—was more of a handicap than a help. Not that he feared losing it. Rather, one seemed to sense in him the fear that it might lead him into false circumstances, into advantages, person-to-person, he had not otherwise earned. He was one of the least ostentatious of the very rich, and one of the most considerate in small and polite ways. He had good manners; he was what we once called "well raised."

Again in the general sense, here was a man few people knew or understood. Yet in many ways he contributed to the betterment of his fellow man. Michigan, which he loved, is poorer now that he is gone.

PROJECT CONCERN DEDICATION OF MEMORIAL HOSPITAL—ADDRESS BY GEN. W. C. WESTMORELAND

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I had the unique experience of attending the dedication ceremonies of a clinic and refugee center under the auspices of the major veteran organizations of Worcester County, Worcester, Mass., to be located in the central highlands of Vietnam.

Some 3 years ago, the people of Worcester, Mass., decided that what was needed most in Vietnam was a living memorial to the war dead of Worcester. They approached Dr. James W. Turpin of Project Concern. Today, as a result of the concentrated efforts of the people of Worcester, Mass., there stands a living memorial in the form of a 60-bed hospital and refugee center, serving over 200,000 citizens of the area of Da Lat, Vietnam.

Making the main address of the ceremony was Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army Gen. W. C. Westmoreland whom I had the pleasure of accompanying. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include the text of General Westmoreland's address:

REMARKS BY GEN. W. C. WESTMORELAND, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY, AT THE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL DEDICATION DINNER, WORCESTER MEMORIAL AUDITORIUM, WORCESTER, MASS., APRIL 13, 1969

As many of you know, President Nixon was also invited to be here tonight to join with us in dedicating this splendid living memorial to the gallant men of Worcester County. However, in view of the heavy commitments on his schedule during the time of the Ministerial Meetings of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the President was not able to leave Washington. President Nixon is extremely interested in the type of selfless dedication shown by your community effort, and he asked me to convey to you again his personal regrets in being unable to be present tonight.

I am grateful for the privilege of being associated with Project Concern—even in such a small way. And, I appreciate the opportunity to join you tonight . . . because I can think of no group more deserving than the men you honor . . . or of no finer tribute to their heroic deeds and unselfish acts than what you are doing here tonight in their name.

It is a refreshing experience for me—and I believe for a majority of people—to witness a community effort such as yours. Too many people waste their energies in pointing out what is needed to improve our world. All too few are willing to do more than just identify what is wrong. Yet, here you have both seen a need and done something to fill that need—and in the name of men who also have seen a need and acted to fill that need.

Both they and you have acted to share the responsibility of providing for the needs of your fellow men. The fighting men of Worcester County are helping to share the responsibility for defending the life of a young nation. You are helping to share the responsibility for caring for the sick and homeless people of that young nation.

The beloved American Poet, James Russell Lowell—a man from Massachusetts—expressed this thought far better than I when he wrote:

> "Not what we give, but what we share—
> For the gift without the giver is bare."

Yes, you and the men of Worcester County are *sharing*. Also, our Nation is *sharing;* and our youth are *sharing*.

And—not unlike Project Concern—our Nation, our youth, and each of us are deeply *concerned* with the ills and needs of our world.

For a few moments I should like to speak about how our Nation and our youth are sharing their gifts with other nations and people in the world who need them.

I believe that we Americans could do well to take time from our daily routine to think of what our Nation has done for mankind. Now, I say this in all sincerity, even though I am fully aware that it sounds boastful and that it smacks more than a little of patting ourselves on the back. I am proud both of what our Nation has done and why. I see no reason why we should not accept credit for doing good. We certainly have enough critics willing to take us to task for all of our failings. Let us be proud of ourselves.

In my opinion, we Americans can be proud of what we see. America has chosen not to flaunt her great strength among the less fortunate nations. Quite the opposite. America has shown her deep sense of responsibility. She has willingly assumed the burden of a great nation. She has shared her wealth and her energies with other nations and peoples who hope to live without fear of their neighbors' greed.

Throughout her relatively short history, our Nation has championed the concept of free society, and she has stood ready to defend that concept for herself and for others.

In 1954, South Vietnam in distress called for American help. In answer to this plea, President Eisenhower enunciated a policy of assistance to South Vietnam—a policy that was endorsed by President Kennedy, reiterated by President Johnson, and recently reconfirmed by President Nixon.

Our assistance took several forms. In an effort to stem the tide of rising communist insurgency, we began economic and military assistance. Our aim was to bolster a small and literally helpless nation until it could achieve the strength needed to resist aggression and—at the same time—take care of its own people. Our Nation sought nothing in return—only the satisfaction of helping a people to remain free.

However, North Vietnamese Army units invaded the south to finish the job the insurgent had started earlier. South Vietnam was faced with certain defeat at the hands of the aggressor from the north. America was called upon to make good her moral commitment. And America responded, as a responsible nation.

America's response was in the form of the necessary military forces to do the job. She chose not to unleash her vast power. Rather, she chose to exert only the means required to save a small nation. By design, America chose to undertake a limited war, with limited objectives and to use limited means.

As instruments of that national policy, our Armed Forces undertook their missions. And they accomplished a great deal in Vietnam:

They prevented South Vietnam from being militarily overrun by Hanoi.

The provided a shield behind which the South Vietnamese people began to build a democratic nation in accordance with their own desires.

They gained time for South Vietnam to build its armed forces to a point where, now, it gradually assumes a greater portion of the fighting burden.

Moreover, this union of military force and political policy enabled the South Vietnamese to: Mobilize their manpower . . . Galvanize their collective will . . . and, Help stabilize their economy.

In my judgment, there are many aspects of these accomplishments that were not brought fully to the attention of the world. Perhaps it is reasonable to expect that the nature of military operations and the drama associated with battle overshadow the less spectacular events of nation building. Yet, from the outset, our aim has been to build a nation capable of standing on its own. And nation building—publicized or not—has been very much in evidence. Our military operations, of course, provided the needed shield.

Project Concern is a part of that nation building. Worcester County's living memorial to its Vietnam War Heroes is nation building in its finest form.

I was struck by the deep significance of a remark made by Commander Carroll in his recent letter to me in which he discussed this dedication ceremony. He wrote, in part, that: "We believe Worcester County typifies a segment of our population who feel a humanitarian contribution to the Vietnam cause will better serve the wishes of our people."

No one can disagree with the logic of this statement—nor would anyone hope or want it to be any other way. However, I cannot help but wonder how long any humanitarian contribution could exist without the shield of our past—and present—military operations. The Viet Cong have clearly and repeatedly demonstrated their total disregard for humanitarian efforts.

However, I hasten to add that I fully agree with Commander Carroll's thought. And, I would even go one step further. I am sure that all Americans would hope to join the people of Worcester County in this wish. But we cannot forget that it is our youth who are making such a wish even a remote possibility—the same youth whom we honor tonight.

During my career as a soldier, I have served with many of the youth of our Nation. None have been finer or more representative of American ideals than those whom it was my privilege to lead in carrying out our national policies in Vietnam.

They have matched wits and skills with a determined foe, and they have shown themselves to be winners.

Yet, at the same time, these young men are demonstrating their compassion for . . . and deep understanding of . . . the Vietnamese people.

They have played important roles at the "grass roots"—or "rice roots"—level of South Vietnam, particularly as advisers. Extraordinary demands have been placed on them. Nevertheless, they have ably advised and assisted their Vietnamese counterparts in carrying out programs dealing with administration, education, sanitation, and medical aid—as well as military programs.

Our young men and women have earned the respect of the South Vietnamese people by their courage, their deeds, and their humanitarian acts. They have given voluntarily of their pay to build hospitals, churches, and orphanages. Unfortunate civilians have been cared for by the contributions of our fighting men—people who have been caught and impoverished in the path of war. They have built . . . they have repaired . . . and they have brought comfort. They—like all of us—would much rather devote their energies to building than to destroying.

Our young people in Vietnam have demonstrated by their attitude and conduct that they are *for* the Vietnamese people. By teaching the Vietnamese to help themselves and by giving them the opportunity to shoulder their own responsibilities, they have raised the dignity of the Vietnamese people. At the same time, they have helped overcome the apathy and indifference which followed in the wake of 90 years of colonial domination.

If you detect an unbounded pride in my accounting for the efforts of these splendid young people, you are correct. No one who has known them—or who has seen them perform—could hold them in other than the highest esteem.

In my judgment, every American can be proud of what these young men and women have done and are doing. They have willingly stepped forward when their country called; they have shouldered responsibility while a few others of their age have sat by idly and dreamed. Unlike these few contemporaries who have chosen to demonstrate their apparent disrespect for authority, these young people have demonstrated their great sense of responsibility under the most difficult conditions.

They have given much of themselves. In time of their country's need, they turned to—not against those lofty principles on which our Nation was founded—those same principles that have sustained our Nation throughout the years. I welcome them as our future leaders. I thank The Almighty for them.

One thing is certain. They can return to civilian life and be proud. They can stand tall; they can hold their heads high; they can look any man in the eye. They can proudly take their place with the veterans before them with the same sense of satisfaction. Like their predecessors, they have echoed the firm conviction that freedom is not free.

Yes, the youth of our Nation are sharing their gifts with others in need—gifts made up of their talents, and, if need be, their lives. Like the Nation they represent so ably, their gifts are far from being bare; their gifts are unselfishly given from the heart.

Earlier, I said that our Nation, our youth, and each of us are deeply concerned over the ills and needs of the world. This is as it should be. We are a working partner in the affairs of the world. We have demonstrated repeatedly our intense concern in the well-being of others who share our planet. Our concern is manifested everywhere a member of our Armed Forces stands prepared to thwart aggression.

Nowhere is that concern more evident than in South Vietnam today . . . and in Paris where we seek peace.

We earnestly pray that peace can come to this war torn land.

We earnestly pray for the day when your fine hospital at Lien Hiep can give your gifts of love and care without any need for a protective shield of soldiers.

We earnestly pray for the day when there will be no need for a refugee center at Lien Hiep or any other place.

But until that day comes, America, her youth, and each of us will continue to demonstrate our concern . . . will continue to share our gifts with these unfortunate people.

Like each of you, I am proud to be among the concerned. And, like each of you, I am proud of the gallant men and women of our Nation who have exercised that concern and shared their gifts with others.

Thank you for permitting me to share this occasion with you. You can be very proud of both the men whom you honor and of your humanitarian effort.

IKE TRIBUTES RENEW FLOOD OF LOYALTIES

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, many fine eulogies to President Eisenhower have appeared, but one of the best I have read appeared in the Indianapolis News, the largest afternoon daily newspaper in Indiana.

Mr. Fremont Power is the author of the eulogy which emphasizes the human qualities that President Eisenhower possessed to such a great degree.

Fremont Power has long been recognized as a writer and columnist of exceptional talent, and his column about President Eisenhower is typical of his ability to get to the heart of a situation and interpret the importance of an event.

The article from the April 7, 1969, edition of the Indianapolis News follows:

Ike Tributes Renew Flood of Loyalties

(By Fremont Power)

Dwight D. Eisenhower is dead and properly eulogized and, with simple dignity, interred in Abilene, Kan., whence he sprang.

The Eisenhower era in American history is thus closed.

But some thoughts of last week remain and they don't go away.

The man, even in death, seemed still to be speaking to America, for whom he gave so much. And the essence of the message was that the old verities remain and that more millions of Americans adhere to them than may ever be counted.

It is easy, particularly in this business that deals with the unusual rather than the ordinary, to acquire, unconsciously, an impression that this whole country is caught up in quarreling, bitterness, legal pornography, defiance of authority and a predilection for anarchy.

NOT SO SELF-SUFFICIENT AFTER ALL

It just isn't so. The way the nation responded to the old soldier's passing made this very plain once again.

Godless as we may seem to be, how many millions of breaths must have been caught as the old hymns came pouring forth from the organ of the Washington National Cathedral, played, incidentally, by Indianapolis-born John R. Fenstermaker Jr. These simple expressions of faith stir old memories, old loyalties, old ideas of rightness.

Not all feel as self-sufficient as they might pretend.

As pictures of these solemn ceremonies came flooding over the news wires and the television screens, there was one recurring, refreshing feature: The young faces, looking on in seeming awe.

NO OCCASION FOR NEW OUTBURST

When Eisenhower died, a grisly thought crossed the mind: What if the rebellious misanthropes took even this sad opportunity to insult and shock those who feel there are still some things worth saving in this country?

Considering some of the other outbursts, it didn't seem beyond possibility. But it didn't happen. Instead, there were these young faces, looking on as respects were paid one whom they could only have known as an old man long passed from the stage of public affairs.

Even they seemed to reflect some of the love that America held out to this man.

As the funeral train went west, there was this picture of a girl at Washington, Ind., holding up a penny flattened by the wheels that carried Eisenhower home. More memories came springing up, of small towns in another day where, if there was nothing else to do, there was always the putting of things on the railroad tracks to be flattened: Nails, pennies, a washer.

SOLDIERING NOT WHOLLY DAMNED

Now this girl has a proper souvenir which surely she will want to show her children some day and tell them how it was when the train went through bearing a man they could know only from their schoolbooks.

Perhaps if she conveys to those children that he meant something to her, he will mean something to them.

Eisenhower showed us in death that we are still capable of gratefulness to one who gave so much, that soldiering is not universally damned, that there are principles worthy of cruel sacrifices, that simple religious faith has not been completely computerized from the American psyche.

These old verities are still cherished by the masses of Americans.

As in any other death, we must return now to today's battles and not dwell overlong on yesterday's sorrow. But it has been good to have this pause, to see that decadence has not become a way of life for so many.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE SYSTEM IS URGENT

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, in a news interview last January, preceding the opening of Congress, I expressed the prediction and conviction that the House would and should take early action on the challenging problem of electoral college reform.

Accordingly, I have been very pleased that the esteemed chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, saw fit to initiate public hearings on February 5, 1969.

There is no question but that the problem of electoral college reform is an extremely difficult and complex one. However, it is clear that the great majority of American citizens very earnestly desire the Congress to effectively deal with the problem, and I most earnestly hope the House and Senate will complete legislative action on this issue before the end of this session.

At this point, I am including the statement I presented to the House Judiciary Committee on the first day of the committee's public hearings, last February 5, urging appropriate committee action at the earliest possible date. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, may I first be permitted to extend my own very deep gratitude, together with that of untold numbers of my constituents, to you and the esteemed members of this committee for promptly initiating in this new Congress, these hearings on the great number of bills before you, including two proposals of which I am co-author, H.R. 4867 and H.J. Res. 317, concerned with the very important subject of electoral college reform.

At the outset, let me make it very clear that I well recognize as all of you do, that the accomplishment of such reform is a far more complex and challenging problem than may appear on the surface. I would not, then, be so presumptuous as to contend that the corrections advocated and the reforms suggested in the bills in which I have joined contain the complete and errorless answer.

My primary purpose, here, is simply to urge your concentrated attention upon and your earliest recommendation for the achievement of the basic objective of all these measures pending before you, namely, to enable the people of the United States to select their President without hindrance, in the freest democratic manner that will truly reflect the popular will, and avoid any necessity to resort to any other agency including the House of Representatives.

I believe that is the desire of the great majority of American voters and I think it is the duty of this committee and the Congress to carry out that desire to the highest degree of our legislative wisdom.

It is my own conviction as set forth in the resolution I have co-authored, H.J. Res. 317, that this desired electoral college reform can best be accomplished by adoption of a constitutional amendment providing for the election of the President and Vice President by direct vote of the people.

Our proposed amendment would further require that a presidential candidate receive at least forty per cent of the total vote cast in order to be elected and that a national runoff election be held in the event that no candidate obtained forty per cent of the vote.

I believe, also, that the direct popular vote would serve to strengthen the two party system by making each State a voting prize well worth a concentrated campaign effort by both sides. It ought, also, to strengthen the democratic ideal by stimulating and spreading voter interest and participation everywhere throughout the country. In effect, it would extend the one-man, one-vote principle to presidential elections.

Beyond these fundamental advantages to the proposed direct popular vote system, there are several others that deserve mention. This proposed reform would make it impossible for the candidate with the greatest number of popular votes to be defeated by a candidate with fewer popular votes. This system would give every vote, regardless of where it was cast, equal weight. Voters other than those from the so-called "pivotal" states would receive the concentrated attention of the candidates, and the votes from the large "doubtful" states would not be as overwhelmingly important as they are now. The weight placed upon selecting a candidate from a large "key" state would be greatly diminished, since there would not be a disproportionate chance of the candidate completely carrying his home state. The possibility of a candidate coming from the smaller states would be increased. No less than eighteen major party candidates since 1900 have come from New York and Ohio. It is believed that the results of any nationwide direct election would not be so close that small scale frauds or minor accidents would have a significant effect on the outcome of the election. Also direct election would permit the establishment of equitable nationwide standards for the privilege of voting.

Surely, the time is appropriate to focus legislative attention and exert legislative action to improve the method by which we elect the president and the vice president of the United States. The present system appears rightly described as undemocratic, complex, and dangerously frustrating to the popular will. History shows that three times it has resulted in the choice of presidents who received less votes than their opponents. Some historians insist that on one occasion it unjustly deprived a candidate of the presidency to which he had been rightfully elected. But whatever these contentions, there can be no doubt that on many presidential election occasions in the past the thwarting of the popular will has scarcely been avoided.

No later than last November, the American public had to wait many anxious hours to find out whether or not the United States House of Representatives would be called upon to select a President, with all its inevitably attendant partisan temptations and disruptive potential.

Mr. Chairman, the evidence clearly shows there is an urgent need for congressional legislative action to reform our current presidential election procedure for the simple reason that the electoral college system as now projected can and has defeated the majority will.

Of course, many people may be rightfully hesitant about proposals to amend our most cherished document, the Constitution. This is a justifiable attitude and it is one of the reasons our founders very properly made the process of amending the Constitution both difficult and time consuming.

Nevertheless, the fact is that the Constitution has been amended twenty-five times and when such amendment is clearly designed to eliminate an anachronism in our modern democracy, as it obviously does in this instance, I believe, the Constitution should be amended again. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge you and your distinguished committee members to carefully and thoroughly examine, as I know you will, all the various legislative proposals before you and assemble from them a legislative recommendation that will enable, as fully as is humanly possible, the true popular will of the American electorate to be a reality in all future elections of the President and the Vice President of the United States.

May I thank you for your kind attention and courtesy.

RETAIN PORTSMOUTH NAVY YARD

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to note following my most recent intercessions to retain the indispensable naval shipyard at Portsmouth, N.H., that the Navy and the Department of Defense propose to take another careful look at the decision of the former Defense Secretary to close this invaluable yard by phasing out procedures over a period of time.

Naturally, I am very anxious to cooperate with my colleagues of the Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and New England delegations in urging our former, esteemed colleague and present able and distinguished Secretary of Defense Laird, not only to take a close look, but to cancel out, the incredible decision to close this invaluable, naval facility with its unique nuclear potential.

The defense of the United States must have our top priority attention at all times. The fantastic plans to dispense with this historic Portsmouth yard that is rendering such vital services to the Navy and our defense, one of the few installations in the Nation, and the only one on the northeast coast with nuclear potential, is something that demands immediate consideration and action of the Defense Department, our Armed Services Committees and the Congress in order to reverse as soon as possible, the previous, unwise decision to close this yard, and order it retention on a permanent basis until world peace is assured.

I propose to continue my efforts and join with those of my interested colleagues in pressing this matter in the Armed Services Committee and the House, and in every other possible way, with the hope and expectation that we will secure favorable results before long, guaranteeing the retention of this great, naval installation.

I urge our great President, and our esteemed former colleague, the Secretary of Defense, to scrap the plan to close this great, inexpendable yard, and establish it as a permanent installation. It would be merely compounding a very serious error of judgment not to cancel out this proposed closing as soon as it can be done.

I earnestly solicit the help and support of the House to retain the Portsmouth Navy Yard on a permanent basis and move ahead toward early implementation of this great facility as a modern base.

THE TIME FOR CORRECTING TAX INEQUITIES HAS COME

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 I testified before the House Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 3655, the Tax Equity Act which I have sponsored, and other tax reform legislation. This legislation if enacted, would close a number of the most glaring loopholes in our Federal tax system, bringing in additional revenue without adding to the burdens on moderate-income taxpayers, and hopefully permitting some reductions in taxes on moderate-income families.

This legislation would also bring to the tax structure a measure of equity which is currently lacking, and which the American people need and deserve, but do not now enjoy.

In order to make my statement to the committee more readily available, I am including it in the RECORD at this time.

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE JONATHAN B. BINGHAM BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 1, 1969

I want first to compliment you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of your Committee, for scheduling these very crucial hearings. I am grateful to be accorded this opportunity to appear before you and to register my strong support, and the support of my constituents, for prompt and sweeping changes in the tax system.

I am the sponsor of H.R. 3655, and a cosponsor of the Congressman Reuss' bill, H.R. 5250, both omnibus bills containing a number of suggested tax reforms. I have been urging for some time that legislation of the kind I have sponsored be considered actively by this Committee and the members of the House, and I was gratified earlier this year when the Committee announced its intention to convene these hearings and when the new Administration announced its intention to support tax reform legislation. The hearings that this Committee has been conducting for several weeks now have contributed immensely to a better understanding of the inequities in our tax system, and the need for remedial action by the Congress. I am quite disappointed, however, by the recent announcement by Treasury Secretary Kennedy that the Nixon Administration does not intend to submit a major tax reform proposal to the Congress in the near future.

Before discussing the specific tax reforms which I feel are most needed, Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk briefly about some aspects of the general need for this kind of legislation which I feel have not been adequately emphasized to date.

This nation is currently experiencing a crisis of confidence not only with regard to some of its policies, but with regard to its basic political structure. We cannot afford to underestimate the importance of taxation and tax equity as a factor in the despair and disenchantment which increasing numbers of citizens are feeling and expressing toward our system of government.

The income tax system of this nation touches more citizens, more directly, more consistently than perhaps any other single aspect of government. More than 74 million Americans file an income tax statement every year. For many of them—perhaps too many—it is the most intimate contact they have with the Federal government. As a result, it plays a major role in determining their attitudes about the American political system. The extent to which the Federal tax system appears to the average taxpayer to "live up" to the ideals of this society—particularly our national dedication to fairness and equality—must be regarded as a crucial factor in determining the confidence, the satisfaction, and the commitment with which the average citizen regards the Federal government.

Former Treasury Secretary Joseph W. Barr, writing in the March 22, 1969 issue of the *Saturday Review*, expresses amazement at the public response to his remark before the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress on January 17 that "we face now the possibility of a taxpayer revolt if we do not soon make major reforms in our income tax system." He describes the response to that statement as follows:

"The idea of a middle-class taxpayers' revolt caught the attention of the press, and the story was played up heavily around the country for a few days. Then the letters began to pour into the Treasury and Congress. Clearly this was an idea 'whose time had come.' "

Secretary Barr need not have been surprised. His statement elicited such an overwhelming response simply because it accurately described the full extent and intensity of public frustration with the operation of the tax system.

Briefly, what are the reasons for this frustration? I believe they can be summarized under three general headings. First, many individual taxpayers feel that the tax burden they have to bear is simply too great in relation to the tax burdens borne by non-individual taxpayers, such as corporations and other group enterprises. They cite, for example, facts like the following:

During the past year (1968), according to a recent Internal Revenue Service report, taxes on corporate profits dropped $5 billion. But the tax burden on individual citizens through personal income taxes increased by 13 percent during the same period.

"Real" net per capita income over the past eight years is up by 31 percent. But corporate profits after taxes have gone from $26.7 billion to $51 billion—a gain of 91 percent—in the same period.

The 1969 financial report of the First National City Bank of New York reports that "Corporations in the United States managed to improve their net earnings by 10 percent during 1968" and the rate of return on investment has remained steady. But "real" per capita income increased by only about 3 percent in 1968 over 1967, according to the Economic Report of the President transmitted to the Congress last January.

The question whether individual taxpayers as a group have come to shoulder an undue proportion of the growing tax burden—more than they need to bear and more than they should be required to bear—is being overlooked and ignored.

On this point, I am disappointed to notice, for example, that the extensive study of tax reform measures undertaken by the Treasury Department and printed jointly by this Committee and the Senate Committee on Finance, contains an extensive analysis and evaluation of tax reforms and inequities within the individual income tax structure, and within the corporate tax structure. But it does not get at the question of what many regard as an inequitable sharing of the tax burden by individual taxpayers in relation to corporate taxpayers.

In my view, we cannot afford to concentrate solely on inequities within the individual and corporate tax sectors, and fail to examine whether equity and rationality prevail with regard to comparative taxation levels between these two major taxpaying sectors. I realize this is a very complex question—one that is not nearly as easily answered as asked. To even begin to answer it and draw the proper policy implications from it will require much sophisticated analysis. But it is a critical question, and given the basic trends and figures I have cited, I feel there is more than adequate cause to begin immediately to elicit the views and data of our very best economic brains to determine whether it would be feasible to readjust the tax burden borne by individual taxpayers in relation to corporate taxpayers without frustrating efforts to achieve our basic economic and social goals.

When that question has been answered—and I emphasize that I do not feel it has yet even been adequately posed—then it will be appropriate to decide, as a matter of policy, whether it would be desirable to establish alteration of the ratio between total corporate and total individual taxation as a major goal of tax reform. Any tax reforms instituted before a careful decision is made one way or the other on this question of purpose will be putting the cart before the horse, and will risk achieving little in the way of increased public satisfaction. If, after careful consideration, it can be demonstrated that the total burden of individual taxation cannot be shifted, the public deserves to know why not. If that burden can be lightened, then tax reforms must be instituted with that goal in mind. This Committee certainly possesses the authority and facilities to take the lead role in such a determination, and I hope it will not fail to do so as part of its current tax reform deliberations.

I do not intend to suggest by all this that inequities in taxes paid by some individuals as compared to those paid by other individuals are insignificant, or do not constitute a significant and legitimate area of concern. In fact, there is much evidence that such inequities exist and must be alleviated, and I believe these inequities constitute a second major source of frustration for taxpayers.

The fact is that individuals similarly situated often pay strikingly dissimilar rates of tax, and equal rates of tax are often paid by taxpayers with marked differences in income. This picture has been imprinted in the public mind by recent revelations that, on the one hand, some 2.2 million families with incomes below the "poverty line" pay taxes each year, while, on the other hand, there are numerous examples of individuals with annual incomes above half-a-million dollars who have paid little or no taxes. But the inequities are not confined to these extremes. The fact is, for example, that the comparabilty of effective tax rates in income classes erodes noticeably for income groups above twenty thousand dollars a year. Particularly at these higher income levels, the range of effective tax rates paid by individuals is broad, indicating that a substantial number of individuals are paying less tax than others with roughly equal ability to pay.

Furthermore, a large majority of individuals with adjusted gross incomes in the 3–5 thousand dollar range are taxed at an effective rate of 15–20 percent—the same rate at which an almost equal majority of individuals in the 10–20 thousand dollar range are taxed. Considering the substantial difference in buying power between $5,000 of amended gross income and $20,000 of amended gross income, is there really any wonder at the disenchantment of the "moderate income" taxpayer?

Third and finally, I feel that taxpayer discontent is a product of the increasing complexity of the tax structure. As the Treasury study to which I referred earlier clearly points out, the standard deduction, which is a device intended to simplify the tax form for most taxpayers, was once used by over 80 percent of those who filed returns. Due to failures to increase the standard deduction to keep pace with increased earning levels and living costs, only an estimated 57 percent of the taxpayers who file returns in 1969 will employ the standard deduction option. Another example of unnecessary and frustrating complexity in the tax system is the extra 15% tax credit accorded senior citizens on incomes from private and government pensions other than Social Security and Railroad Retirement benefits. The computation required is so complex that many elderly people do not understand it, and thereby lose badly needed benefits to which they are entitled.

Even sweeping tax reform will not, of course, provide a total solution to the economic problems of the nation. But that is not to say that tax reform would not provide a significant increase in tax revenues. Although estimates vary on exactly how much increased revenue could be realized with a major tax reform program, a number of tax experts believe the amount would be enough, for example, to replace the "tax surcharge" now in effect.

Similarly, sweeping tax reform cannot be expected to solve the problems of social unrest and the apparent crisis of confidence toward government that appears to exist and to be growing in this country. But neither would it be appropriate to underestimate the importance of tax inequities as a contributing factor in the erosion of respect and confidence in government. The contention of those in our society who are, in Secretary's Barr's terms, on the verge of revolt is that the institutions of government are unresponsive to changing conditions—that these institutions and their policies are hopelessly frozen, insulated from legitimate pressures for revision and change. That, it seems to me, is a reasonably accurate description of what has happened in the case of our tax system.

To a great extent, what constitutes the best combination of tax reforms hinges on the particular goals the Congress wishes to achieve. Those goals, in turn, depend upon the answers obtained to some of the kinds of questions I have tried to raise in this testimony.

But regardless of the answers that eventually emerge to these overriding policy questions, I believe it is possible to designate some areas of reform which are likely to require highest priority in any tax reform program. Without going into great detail on the provisions in my own bill, or even necessarily confining myself to them, I would like to suggest some of the areas of reform that I feel should receive top priority in the process of developing the best possible program of tax reforms.

In general, Mr. Chairman, I feel top priority must be given to tax treatment of the fabulously large fortunes that are continuing to be made each year in this country, both by individuals and corporations. Many of these huge fortunes are made possible by the fact that gaping loopholes in the tax laws abound particularly at the highest income levels.

These loopholes are well known. Unrealized capital gains are not taxed at the time of an individual's death, except as part of his estate. Accelerated tax depreciation is permitted on speculative investments. Large percentages of corporate gross incomes in the oil and mineral industries are deducted as depletion allowances. Corporations can treat all kinds of questionable expenses as deductible "business expenses"—a category which too often includes the costs of lobbying, lavish entertainment and travel, and even airing of political views. Seven percent of the amount corporations and individuals invest in capital expansion is written off as a tax credit.

Unfortunately, the undesirable effects of these loopholes do not end with the tax avoidance they permit. Many economic experts feel capital investment credits and methods of accelerated depreciation accentuate cycles of deflation and inflation, acting particularly as stimuli to added investment and production in periods of inflation when the economy is already overheated.

Through misuses of the "business expense" deduction, the public and the government are put in a position of encouraging and helping to finance excessive advertising and consumption, particularly of products like cigarettes which can be harmful to health. The lobbying efforts of corporations, and the political propaganda of individuals like Mr. H. L. Hunt and corporations such as Eversharp-Shick which make a practice of mixing political views with product advertising are also subsidized by the public through the "business expense" deduction. While the Congress in 1962 wisely attempted to cut down the list of travel and entertainment activities that can be included in the "business expense" deduction, the government and the public still subsidize too much high living by businessmen, and more needs to be done to close the door on this situation.

In addition to these lines of approach, I would like to urge the Committee to give serious consideration to establishing progressive tax rates for capital gains. The effective flat rate of 25% on long term capital gains is probably the most useful tool of all for those who are intent on building fortunes without paying commensurate income taxes. While there may be considerable technical difficulties involved in applying a higher rate to net capital gains as the amount of such gains increases, I believe the effort ought to be made. If it is done, however, it would be more than ever important to change the present provision which permits capital gains to go untaxed as such at death, so that there will no longer be the incentive for people of advancing years to avoid selling holdings which show substantial long term profit.

Finally, I strongly support proposals to institute a minimum income tax, and such a proposal is contained in the tax reform legislation I have sponsored. But it would be a mistake to fall back solely on this approach as a solution to tax problems. The tax loopholes I have cited, as well as others, are the ultimate cause of inadequate taxation on many large incomes, especially when several tax loopholes are claimed in tandem by a single taxpayer. A minimum income tax should be looked upon only as a final safeguard to insure that if all other tax provisions fail, every taxpayer will pay some taxes. This should, however, be a supplement to action to close the tax loopholes that are the source of the problem, not a substitute for such action.

Neither should a minimum income tax be looked upon as major source of added revenues. Its major positive effect is likely to be psychological, not financial. Nevertheless, as I have pointed out, we face a national crisis of confidence to which tax inequities contribute substantially, and changes which alone promise to strengthen public confidence deserve no less serious and prompt consideration than those which promise added revenues.

Tax reform is indeed an idea whose time has come. Moderate income families particularly are chafing under the real economic hardships the current tax system is imposing upon them, and the psychological hardships they also bear as a product of the blatant inequities in the system. If we fail now to meet their needs and expectations, and if we fail to live up to their ideals of rationality and equality, let us not marvel in the future at the wave of repudiation, already gathering in the land, that will assuredly crash with determination not only against the policies of the Federal government but against the very system itself.

STOP THE FLOOD OF MAIL SMUT

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Alhambra, Calif., Post-Advocate, which serves an area of the congressional district it is my privilege to represent, recently carried a forceful and timely editorial entitled "Stop the Flood of Mail Smut."

The Post-Advocate is to be commended for speaking out vigorously against the flood of pornographic literature that is flowing through the mails. This problem has reached a point where it is a national disgrace.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

[From the Post-Advocate (Calif.), Mar. 20, 1969]

STOP THE FLOOD OF MAIL SMUT

> Ugh! We are terrified!
>
> Let's stop smut and fast!
>
> In recent weeks panderers have literally solicited thousands of decent families around the United States of America right in their homes in a new high level of permissive immorality.
>
> The families have received in the mails a plainly-addressed envelope that contains nauseating, repulsive filth illustrating all kinds of sexual activity and depravity. Purpose of the mailing is to sell pornographic material that is even worse.
>
> The pornography is mailed from California and East Coast cities. It seeks legitimacy by comparing its "literature" to the volumes in the Vatican Library and the British Museum. It could be opened by the youngest, most innocent child in the house.
>
> The new floodtide of obscenity that is mailed, whether requested or not, is the last straw in the boldness of the pornographic seducers. The permissiveness that has made it possible rests squarely with the Supreme Court, which opened the gates to filth with a landmark 1957 decision.
>
> Some blame also rests on the shoulders of the Congress, which has failed to define standards of obscenity or regulate the flow of filth in interstate commerce. If necessary, Congress could even limit the ability of the Supreme Court to review state pornography decisions.
>
> A bill introduced by Rep. Bob Wilson, Republican of California, which would control the mailing of smut across state lines, is an essential minimum in the fight against interstate smut. Mr. Wilson should be applauded for his leadership and supported by the people his measure would help. The post office also should crack down harder on interstate smut peddling, just as it does against lotteries and racing results.
>
> Some of the blame for the new boldness of the smut merchants rests with the state legislatures. To this day police departments in many areas do not have definitive legal guidelines to evaluate smut, particularly its sale to minors.
>
> And not the least of the blame for the smut pollution lies at doorsteps of decent persons who fail to speak up. Apathy and silence in the fight against obscenity is tantamount to support for the seducers.
>
> The breakdown of morality that undermines our nation is a major crisis. Youths can buy the filthiest of publications with ease, or see smutty movies at will in most states. Now entire families are exposed to the immoral filth through the mails.
>
> The floodtide of pornography could reach legitimate motion picture places next. A swedish film depicting a sexual act already has reached New York City. It was rejected just two years ago.
>
> It is not a coincidence that forcible rape increased 14 percent in the United States last year—and much of this crime is unreported because of embarrassment.
>
> The time has come to act decisively in stamping out the menace of filth in our nation. If the three branches of government will not assume the responsibility, the people must.
>
> The danger of this is that the public reaction could be so violent that censorship will be the result instead of the smut control that is possible without it.

EEOC SUCCESSFUL IN EMPLOYMENT CONCILIATION WITH LOCKHEED

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about recent charges that Chairman Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission as been "harassing" the business community.

EEOC's efforts to persuade the business community to comply with the law of the land which prohibits employment discrimination can hardly be considered harassment.

EEOC has no enforcement powers but must rely on persuasion through the conciliation process after charges of discrimination have been filed. Or, it can hold public hearings to discuss discriminatory job patterns in industry and unions as it did in Los Angeles in March, and urge their respective leadership to develop and implement an effective affirmative action program.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle a recent and notable example of business-government cooperation where the company involved worked with EEOC to increase and upgrade its minority work force.

Only recently, the industrial relations director of the Lockheed-Georgia Co., Mr. C. A. Jenkins, had this to say following a conciliation agreement negotiated by EEOC with his company:

> Lockheed is pleased but not content with its equal employment opportunity accomplishments. We are excited about our most recent developments in the field of human relations—

Mr. Jenkins said—

> particularly those developed in 1968 with the assistance of EEOC.

The innovations developed through the assistance of EEOC to the Marietta, Georgia division of Lockheed, include:

A new individual development program was designed to provide formal, individually tailored programs for specific development of an employee's potential for advancement. Revisions in testing procedures brought about more effective selection of employees for training and promotion.

Important advancements were made in the company's established management selection procedures.

A financial planning and counseling service was designed to deal with the "root causes" of financial difficulties, and to ameliorate garnishment action against employees—the first known service of its kind in private industry.

New promotional profiles and career paths posters opened communications for all segments of the work force.

Other unique accomplishments included formal career counseling for hourly and salaried employees and the prehiring training and employment of more than 500 persons previously considered underemployed or unemployable.

A Federal contract was negotiated to establish an industrial plant—the Ventura Manufacturing Co. in San Antonio, Tex.—for employment of disadvantaged and hard-core unemployed. Lockheed supplied key staff members for guidance and assistance. By the end of 1968, a total of 113 Mexican Americans and Negroes were trained and employed.

Progress was reflected in specific advancement of job opportunities for Negroes within the Lockheed-Georgia work force.

During the 12-month period ending December 31, 1968, 1,614 Negroes were hired, raising the total Negro work force to 2,636. The number of Negroes holding exempt salaried jobs increased from 95 to 163. Negro supervisors increased from 31 to 54.

More than 1,450 Negroes were promoted to higher rated jobs, substantially aided by the new career counseling services.

As part of the internal promotion programs, minority employees completed more than 2,200 prehire, skills, technical, and career development training programs.

In announcing the successful agreement, Chairman Alexander stated:

> By working closely together Lockheed and EEOC made significant steps forward. This was the result of mutual respect on the part of industry and Government.

Chairman Alexander is to be commended for the progress the Commission made under his chairmanship in assisting the business and labor community to carry forward our national purpose as defined in title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

It will indeed be regrettable if vacillation and confusion replace solid accomplishment in the elimination of racial discrimination in employment.

DECADE OF ARMS BLUNDERS NOW AN ISSUE IN ABM DEBATE

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the following article in the April 13, 1969, issue of the Des Moines Register, by Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, one of the best informed journalists in Washington on matters dealing with the Department of Defense, is well worth reading by all Members of Congress in view of the debate involving the anti-ballistic-missile system.

In order to make it available I am inserting it in the Record at this point:

Now There Is an Issue in ABM Debate—Foes Emphasize Past Failures

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

Washington, D.C.—A decade of documented cases of waste, mismanagement and corruption at the Pentagon is plaguing the Nixon administration as it faces the first major political test on the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile (ABM) program.

While the United States has constructed and maintained what many call "the most formidable military machine in history," the reports of Congress have documented a decade of multi-billion-dollar blunders that have suddenly become the targets of dozens of major political figures.

The new focus of attention on the "military-industrial complex" is creating alarm in the highest circles in the Nixon administration.

At the White House, at the Pentagon, and in Congress there is real concern that a flaming reaction against instances of Pentagon blunderings and mismanagement under the last two administrations could create serious problems in obtaining public and congressional support for funds the administration feels are necessary to meet American military commitments.

That concern became alarm in the last week, with the highest level White House and Pentagon personnel giving much of their time to the job of smothering the blaze of concern that could seriously harm President Nixon's political future.

Republicans fear that the new President could be the political fall guy for past Pentagon blunders.

Reaction against the military-industrial complex has included speeches by such political figures as Senator Edward M. Kennedy (Dem., Mass.), Senator Edmund S. Muskie (Dem., Maine), Senator George McGovern (Dem., S.D.) and former Vice President Hubert Humphrey.

The reaction is growing in an inflammable atmosphere of frustration resulting from the high costs and casualties of the long and inconclusive Vietnam war and from new instances of scandalous military buying practices.

A $1 BILLION BOO-BOO

Within the last few months there have been new hearings and reports that have revealed that the Army made what Representative Samuel Stratton (Dem., N.Y.) called a "billion-dollar boo-boo" in construction of the Sheridan tank and its Shillelagh missile and 152-mm. gun-launcher.

The blunder continued for nearly ten years, with high ranking army officers using a secrecy stamp to hide their fumbling from Congress. Correspondence established that even when the lack of reliability of the tank and missile system were obvious to a command using them, the officers put the tank into a production schedule to avoid the possibility of having the budget cut.

The waste in this case has been estimated at $1.5 billion as a minimum, with some saying it could reach $5 billion. The blame in this case is almost all with high Army officers who continued to pour funds into a pet project in the face of plentiful evidence that it was a failure.

Likewise, there were high ranking Army officers at fault along with political appointees in the waste of more than $40 million on contracts for the M-16 rifle.

Under former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, the Pentagon awarded a contract for 240,000 M-16 high-velocity rifles to the Hydra-Matic Division of General Motors for $56 million—a full $20 million more than the $36 million bid of the Maremont Corp. of Saco, Maine.

Other bungling on the M-16 contract included the initial single-source award to the Colt Manufacturing Co. that permitted that firm to make profits of from 13.4 per cent to 19.6 per cent on a negotiated contract.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

A Senate armed services subcommittee saw a "conflict of interest" problem for former Navy Secretary Fred Korth in the purchase of the X-22 vertical take-off and landing plane from the Bell Corp. Korth, a former director of Bell, couldn't get his own subordinates to award the contract so he turned it over to his superior, Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell Gilpatric.

Gilpatric then consulted with Korth, and made the decision to overrule recommendations for Douglas Aircraft, according to the committee report.

The result was that Bell got the contract despite the views of highest ranking Navy officers that Douglas had the best plane, and at a price that was at least $350,000 to $1 million lower than Bell's.

It took a threat of public hearings by Senator John McClellan's (Dem., Ark.) permanent investigating subcommittee to stop Air Force Secretary Harold Brown, one of the so-called McNamara Whiz Kids, from awarding a $60 million computer contract to the high bidder, IBM. All three other competing firms, RCA, Honeywell and Burroughs—were well qualified and had bid about half of IBM's bid on this $120 million contract.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in several unanimous reports criticized McNamara for pouring more than $200 million into a conventional aircraft carrier, the John F. Kennedy, rather than into a nuclear-powered carrier. The committee charged that the John F. Kennedy was obsolete in a nuclear age.

TFX CONTROVERSY

Senator McClellan has dubbed the TFX warplane "a multi-billion-dollar disaster." After waste of $1 billion or more, the Navy version, the F-111B, was canceled as too heavy, too costly and inadequate to meet Navy mission requirements.

The bomber version is reported nearly as inadequate for its mission, and it has been sharply cut back. The plane has only 70 per cent of the range of present B-52s and B-58s, and failed to meet the bomb-load performance and speed criteria.

The Air Force is going ahead with purchase of F-111A planes because there is no alternative, despite the fact that the cost of the plane has jumped from $2.8 million to about $10 million each and does not meet original performance specifications.

Also, it was noted by such critics as Senator John J. Williams (Rep., Del.) and Representative H. R. Gross (Rept., Ia.) that there were serious "conflicts of interests" by two of McNamara's top subordinates—Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric and Navy Secretary Korth.

Gilpatric, a former lawyer for General Dynamics, took a full role in making the TFX decision for General Dynamics.

LOAN TO FIRM

Korth, former president of Continental National Bank of Fort Worth, Tex., counted General Dynamics among his bank's best customers. Only a few months before he became Navy secretary, Korth personally had approved a $400,000 loan to General Dynamics.

Senator Stuart Symington (Dem., Mo.), originally a defender of the TFX contract, now calls it a blunder and declares that all versions of the contract should be canceled to let the Air Force move into a long-sought Advanced Manned Weapons System—a long-range, high-speed, manned bomber.

Symington, a former secretary of the Air Force, has become a strong critic of a whole range of past decisions. He told the Senate that the U.S. has spent over $23 billion on missile systems deployed and then abandoned.

Senator William Proxmire (Dem., Wis.) has been critical of the cost overruns of about $2 billion on the C–5A, the world's largest aircraft. That contract was a McNamara decision.

It has been pointed out by Senator Edward Kennedy that there have been studies of 13 major aircraft and missile programs that show "only four programs, totaling $5 billion, could be relied upon to perform at more than 75 per cent of their specifications."

"Five, costing $13 billion, failed 25 per cent more often than promised." Kennedy told the Detroit Economic Club last week. "Two, costing $10 billion, were dropped within three years because of low reliability; and two, after an outlay of $2 billion, were dropped outright because they performed so ineffectively.

"This same study revealed that complex electronic systems generally cost 200 to 300 per cent more than the Pentagon predicts, and are generally delivered to the military two years later than promised," Kennedy said.

CITIES NEED AID

Kennedy contrasted the waste at the Pentagon with the need for more billions for the poverty areas in American cities, and he pictured the "Safeguard" ABM as likely to be more of the same waste.

President Nixon and Defense Secretary Melvin Laird are concerned that they may appear to be defenders of the military-industrial complex with all of its worst implications of favoritism and impropriety.

The critics of Mr. Nixon's ABM decision lean heavily upon quotations from the late General Dwight D. Eisenhower warning that "We must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex."

White House officials say that those pushing for sharp cuts in the military budget seldom note that, in the same speech, General Eisenhower also said: "Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction."

One high ranking military officer said last week that "The critics from the scientific and academic field seldom note that the Eisenhower warning on the military-industrial complex was coupled with a warning against becoming 'the captive of a scientific-technological elite.' "

These will be points that President Nixon and Defense Secretary Laird will stress as they campaign actively in the next few weeks for the $800 million in ABM funds they will need for next fiscal year as a part of the $7-billion ABM program planned.

NO SCHEDULE

White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler would give no schedule on President Nixon's campaign for the ABM nor for the $77 billion defense budget.

Laird also plans a major presentation before the American Society of Newspaper Editors (A.S.N.E.) late this week.

From the administration as well as from the Republicans in Congress there is expected to be a strong effort to point up that the series of scandals involving waste and corruption flow from the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

Also, some special attention is expected to be given to Gilpatric, whose activities for General Dynamics and whose role in the TFX contract represent one of the documented problems of the "military-industrial complex."

He has turned up as a member of Kennedy's Ad Hoc Committee of New Yorkers Against ABM. This is regarded by the Nixon administration as a fortunate occurrence since it presents the possibility for dramatically planting the "military-industrial complex" label on one of those closest to a man they regard as the most likely Democratic candidate in 1972.

In the fight over the ABM and the defense budget, the Nixon administration will be supported by such influential Senate Democrats as Richard Russell (Dem., Ga.), chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, McClellan, and Henry M. Jackson (Dem., Wash.), a high-ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee as well as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Nixon administration is seeking to keep the ABM and defense appropriations fights away from the past problems of waste, mismanagement and corruption in the last decade, and place the blame for those scandals on McNamara or the military or civilian subordinates who made the decisions.

"If the ABM fight is settled on its merits, I am sure the President can convince the people that this is only an advanced research and development project and it is the minimum we can do in the light of the Soviet's SS–9," a White House aide said last week.

MILLER'S VIEW

Senator Jack Miller (Rep., Ia.) said he is hopeful that the discussions of defense spending and the military-industrial complex "will be kept in perspective."

Miller declared that we need a great industrial complex to build today's weapons, and we need a well trained military corps to use them.

"The real point of concern is that this power be managed in such a way as to meet our security requirements without allowing it to lead to excesses and abuses—well-intentioned or otherwise—which jeopardize our society," he said.

He declared that much of the problem arises because "those with little or no experience with the military are often so overwhelmed by the immensity of our requirements as to feel helpless."

Miller said the U.S. cannot expect all right decisions by the military or civilian leaders in the Pentagon in dealing with highly sophisticated weapons systems. But he noted that Congress has provided a continuing review, has focused attention on the major blunders of the past, and has forced the Defense Department to correct some wrong decisions.

Representative Gross declared that "there are dangers inherent in having high ranking military officers being recruited for defense industry, and in having executives of defense industries working at the Pentagon.

"Congressional committees and the General Accounting Office must be constantly alert to the possible conflicts of interest. A few prosecutions by the Justice Department would straighten out much of the outright dishonesty in this area," Gross said.

CONGRESSMAN GILBERT ANNOUNCES RESULT OF 1969 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent to my constituents in New York's 22d Congressional District, Bronx, my annual congressional questionnaire. The response was immediate and enthusiastic, and I want to thank the many thousands who were sufficiently concerned to take the time and trouble to complete and return this poll. Particularly gratifying was the high degree of respondents who further elaborated their views with notes and letters. I regret that space limitations make it impossible for me to share these comments with my colleagues, but I can testify to their worthwhile nature.

My questionnaire was written to reflect issues of particular concern to my district, as well as the current major national and international issues. In the multiple-choice questions, many respondents chose several alternatives. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include here in the RECORD, the tabulated results of this poll:

RESULTS OF CONGRESSMAN GILBERT'S 1969 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

[In percent]

FOREIGN POLICY

1. What kind of settlement would you favor for ending the war in Vietnam?

a. A coalition government in Saigon, to include the National Liberation Front	25
b. An agreement between our government and Hanoi to withdraw all outside troops, so the South Vietnamese can fight it out among themselves	25
c. Withdrawal on our part, whether or not we reach agreement with the other interested parties	15
d. No negotiation until we have won military victory	15
Undecided	20

2. What policy should the United States adopt for assuring stability in the Middle East?

a. A formal alliance with Israel, possibly including its admission to NATO, that would assure our intervention in the event of an Arab attack	14
b. A public declaration that we would intervene on Israel's side in the event that the Soviet Union openly intervened for the Arabs	13
c. Press for a negotiated settlement through the United Nations	29
d. Join with the Soviet Union to guarantee formally the terms of a peace settlement	17
Undecided	27

DOMESTIC POLICY

3. What should the Federal Government do about inflation?

a. Legally control prices and wages	35
b. Maintain high interest rates and taxes, including the Surtax, in an effort to reduce consumption and slow business expansion	8
c. Tie Federal salaries, Social Security benefits, welfare payments, Medicare and other outlays to the cost-of-living index	26
d. Nothing, on the grounds that inflation is better than unemployment and business recession	7
Undecided	24

4. What should the Federal Government do about crime?

a. Increase anti-poverty expenditures	9
b. Increase assistance to local police forces, for higher salaries, improved training and better equipment	25

[In percent]

c. Revoke the constitutional guarantees recently affirmed by the Supreme Court to assure representation by counsel, avoid coercion in the extraction of confessions and end illegal wiretaps, searches and seizures	8
d. Enact more stringent laws to reduce the careless trafficking in firearms	19
Undecided	39

SPECIAL ISSUE

Would you approve of a Constitutional amendment which would substitute Popular Election of the Presidency for the present Electoral College?

Yes	77
No	11
Undecided	12

NATIONAL PRIORITIES

[In percent]

What is the order of importance that you ascribe to the following budgetary items? Replies in Priority Order:

1. Aid to public schools and higher education.
2. The elimination of slums and low-income housing.
3. Health care and health programs.
4. Anti-poverty program, including job training.
5. The Vietnam war.
6. Increased Social Security benefits.
7. National defense (apart from Vietnam).
8. Mass transit, including inter-city rail transit.
9. Space exploration.
10. Highway construction.

Mr. Speaker, if I were to make some observations on these results, they would be the following:

First. Three-fourths of those answering the question indicate clearly their opposition to continuing the war in Vietnam to win a military victory. They share my view that we should act with dispatch to get out of Vietnam.

Second. A plurality of respondents favors our pursuing an effort to achieve peace in the Middle East through the auspices of the United Nations. A clear majority, however, appears to accept the view that the United States has a responsibility to assure Israel's integrity and safety. That is also my position.

Third. A substantial plurality of respondents is sufficiently concerned about inflation to favor price and wage controls. Combined with the number which favors tying various Federal benefits to a cost-of-living index, I think there is ample indication that inflation is on people's minds. In my opinion, the most sensible approach to check inflation is to cut back in military expenditures and to channel more Federal funds into domestic programs.

Fourth. More than three-fourths of respondents answering questions on crime took the sensible view that we should improve our police forces and reduce careless trafficking in firearms. An overwhelming majority of respondents left no doubt in my mind that we urgently need more foot patrolmen on our streets and in our apartment buildings to protect lives and property. We must provide more adequate salaries for policemen. While police protection is primarily a matter for local authorities; nevertheless; as U.S. Congressman, I have supported Federal funds, training and equipment to local police departments, and I shall continue these efforts.

Fifth. In a question on national priorities, the overwhelming number of respondents conveyed their preference for domestic rather than military expenditures. They ranked aid to education first, followed by the elimination of slums, health care and research, and anti-poverty programs. I heartily endorse their sense of national priorities.

Finally, I think it is important to note that 85 percent of those answering the question favor the popular election of the Presidency over the present electoral college system. I have often spoken out in support of such a change and I commend this expression of opinion not only to my colleagues, but to the President, who I hope will see fit to recommend this kind of amendment to the Constitution.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO SILVER DOLLARS?

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the toughest kid in my neighborhood when I was a boy has taken time to inform me of a program which he is vitally interested in. I would like to share these thoughts with you:

KENOSHA, WIS.,
March 24, 1969.

Congressman SCHADEBERG,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HENRY: I don't recall ever writing to you, but today is a must. I was very happy to see you at the State convention for the Disabled American Veterans last June. We were all happy that you took time out of your busy schedule to spend a few moments with us. During the campaign I had the privlege of telling my friends that I knew you when you were a kid with a running nose. Also that you were born in the house on the next street back of ours. I also told them that if they returned you to Congress, they could rest assured that there was one honest politician in Congress. Yes when I think of the good old days back home in Manitowoc it pulls on the heart strings a little. Just to give you some of the old food for thought. Barney the horse, riding down the hill next door on the sled you kids had that we called rooster. The old Garfield School, the Soo Line swiming hole, and the wreck of the Midnight Limited. Oh yes the day that Tuffy Zinkel had a new sling shot and tried it out on the weather vain on your barn. Remember I missed and the stone went through your window, hit your Dad while he was shaving and he cut himself. Well the Blacksmith put his kid over his knee heated up his butt and took out the window and repaired it. This is what parents should do today. The days of the nickel for the show and a nickel for popcorn are gone but not forgotten. Today Hank I am writing about Three Million Dollars. Enclosed is clipping from local paper. As you know, I am blind and travel about like our friend Ed Broxmeier used to only not as well. All the rehabilitation I received for my new life I received at Hines V.A. Hospital. I learned how to type, such as it is, but I never typed before in my life. I learned Braille, and how to travel with a cane alone. In general we were taught to be as normal as other people. On my last visit to Hines Hospital they were training 30 blind Veterans from Viet Nam and they had a waiting list. While I was there there was a young man there, blind and minus both hands, he had to be fed, and helped in the bathroom. Yet at this school he was in high spirits thank God. All the teachers, instructors, and personnel were just wonderful to all of us and they never tired of helping anybody, regardless of the problem. Along with training us they had a bountiful program of recreation lined up to keep all the patients in the best of spirits. I suggest that the Three Million Dollars be put on sale by the Mint at a Premium, and the proceeds be used to create more Blind Centers in the Veteran Administration Hospitals throughout this great country. I was at Wood Hospital last week for my annual examination, and they were just wonderful to me. I am sure they could use a few dollars there to further their program. Hank, not for my sake but for the sake of the young Boys that gave their eyes so others can see and read what is going on. Please, Hank with all the power that God has vested in you think about it and then act.

Sincerely, Your Old Neighbor,
ROLAND TUFFY ZINKEL.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO SILVER DOLLARS?

United States government vaults hold approximately 3,000,000 silver dollars, a majority of which were struck in Carson City, Nev. Coins from this mint are desirable to collectors, and some of them sell at fairly high prices.

Government officials have not decided what method will be used to dispose of them. Among the thousands of suggestions, the most sensible are those which would enable the country's leading national health agencies, such as mental health, heart, cancer, and others, to profit from the sale of these dollars.

Spokesmen for these groups and representatives of the coin-collecting fraternity have testified at Senate hearings on the disposition of these coins.

The government is fearful that abuses might take place in the disposition, but there must be a way it can be done under supervision and still help these groups.

Another suggestion is that the coins be sold as collector items to numismatists and curiosity seekers at three or four times their face value. This would easily give the government an approximate profit of $10,000,000.

Your suggestions should be sent to your congressman and senators so that they will know your feelings regarding the silver dollars.

OUR MODERN DUTCH BOYS

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, those inclined to take a pessimistic view about the goodness of young people today just have not met our kids. The people of the Second District will be everlastingly grateful for the tremendous help being provided by our young people in fighting devastating floods. As a case in point, I include for the RECORD an editorial by Bill Macklin, which appeared in the April 9 issue of the New Ulm Journal, New Ulm, Minn.:

OUR MODERN DUTCH BOYS

Everyone knows the story of the Dutch Boy who put his finger in a hole in the dike and saved Holland, or part of it. This week Southern Minnesota has a lot of Dutch boys, who are winning praises for their work in preventing greater damage than the flood is doing.

Delby Ames, the Springfield postmaster, sang the praises of the students who have responded to pleas for help in manning the dikes in the town, which has stood up to the relentless pounding of the Cottonwood River since the week end.

"We asked for 50 from Southwest State College at Marshall and 60 came," said Ames. "They had to cut off the volunteers."

One young man came in a wheel chair, yet filled 300 sandbags with soil Monday night. A former Springfield boy, Douglas Bloemke, who is still crippled by polio, came back to help his hometown in its hours of peril.

"That lad walked the dikes on his aluminum arm crutcher from 9 p.m. until 7 a.m. right up there with the rest of them," said Ames.

Dr. Don Tostenrud, in charge of filling sandbags, said he had never seen boys work

> so hard. It wasn't just college students, either. The Springfield schools took a day off Tuesday to let students work, and they did.
>
> One student worked 36 hours without going home to sleep. Twenty-four hours of steady duty was not uncommon.
>
> It's a well-known story that people are at their best in a crisis. It certainly is true in the flood.—WEM

NAVAJO PATRIOTISM PRAISED

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, today when college campuses across the Nation are being subjected to demonstrations on various subjects and especially against the action of our boys in Vietnam, I am proud to note that a group of Navajo Indians ejected a group from their campus seeking to promote their anti-Vietnam theme.

As it is pointed out in an editorial of the Farmington, N. Mex., Daily Times on April 10, the Navajo students did not fall for the line a group of San Francisco students, calling themselves entertainers, attempted to voice and disrupt the college. This group of Navajo students displayed their belief and support in America by opposing the demonstrators.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the editorial of the Farmington Daily Times, April 10, 1969, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> HURRAH FOR NAVAJO STUDENTS
>
> Patriotism on American college campuses is not dead!
>
> Students at Navajo Community College in Many Farms, Ariz., provided a reassuring and refreshing news story Monday night when they evicted the San Francisco Mime Troupe from the campus after two skits of a scheduled performance.
>
> The Navajo Indians didn't fall for the anti-Vietnam war theme of the so-called performers who one college official said used "obscene gestures and language" and "ridiculed the government and the national anthem."
>
> Individual Americans have a right to be opposed to the Vietnam war. Most Americans are opposed to war in any place. But a governmental system which gives individuals a right to protest certainly deserves a degree of respect not generally associated with campus protest groups.
>
> It might be pointed out to the more demonstrative anti-war protestors that the Indians of this country perhaps have the most to gain by the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam.
>
> When it comes to who should be first in anti-poverty programs which might result at the conclusion of the Vietnam war, few will deny that the Indian population of this country in all fairness should be given top priority.
>
> We can think of no element of our population which has undergone the degradations and poverty to which the Indian has been subjected.
>
> And yet in times of crisis when the nation calls for the support of its citizens, the Indian has been among the first to answer that call. All of us should be proud of the heroism shown by the Navajos and other Indians who have served in the armed forces of this country.
>
> Despite their generally stoic mannerisms, the students of Navajo Community College have displayed a brand of citizenship which should put many of their fellow-Americans to shame.

PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER: A TRIBUTE

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to pay tribute to the memory of our 34th President.

Dwight David Eisenhower was a great public servant who had the respect and admiration of the American people perhaps more consistently than any other American Chief Executive.

He first captured these feelings as the planner and leader of the invasion of Europe and held them for the rest of his life.

His personal popularity was immense after D-day and, once established, never really declined. It remained strong enough for him to run for President successfully some 8 years later.

Ike was an honest and uncomplicated man. And these qualities enabled him to achieve his many successes both in war and in peace.

His direction of the European invasion is cited as the best example of his uncanny ability to influence people to follow his leadership. That war effort involved men of many nationalities, including some with major reputations.

They were placed under the command of a junior American general who was not even well known in his own Army.

Despite this, the enormously dangerous and complicated operation of retaking Europe from the Nazis came off and exceedingly well.

As President, Ike did not accomplish everything he advocated. No President ever does.

But his 8 years in office were a reflection of the man himself. His tenure was characterized by a general tranquillity, a period of consolidation.

The 1950's, it turns out, really represented a period of transition. We were still recovering from the aftereffects of World War II when we were plunged into the Korean war. Thus, the stability we desired right after the Second World War was delayed until the Korean conflict could be resolved.

Ike presided over that transition. Toward the end of his term of office, the first signs of the turbulence that was to mark the sixties appeared.

Although a general and a war hero, Ike was a man devoted to peace. It was he who issued the warning about the military-industrial complex just before leaving office, words that have equal validity today.

It also was Ike who cut back military expenditures to the bone after ending the Korean war.

As many were moved to comment during the 5 days of mourning for this great man, his death may mark the passing of another era in our history.

Ike was the storybook hero come true. The product of small-town America, he became part and parcel of the international America. And he did it all on his own, the very model of the traditional American virtues of hard work and self-reliance.

So now he is gone after a hard year-long fight against a weakening heart. He confounded the medical profession by surviving as long as he did. Of course, he had excellent medical care. But it would have meant little without Ike's tremendous will to live.

He was a great American who spent virtually his entire adult life in the service of the Nation.

> It is a monument—

The Cincinnati Enquirer editorialized—

> that when death came to him, it found his stature undiminished in the eyes of his countrymen.

NATIONAL STUDENTS COMMITTEE ON COLD WAR EDUCATION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago several national organizations proposed and supported responsible courses dealing with education about communism in the schools. Contrasting the oppressive nature of communism with our democratic way of life, organizations such as the American Bar Association, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the National Education Association, among others, sought to alert the young people of the danger to the free world of this alien and totalitarian philosophy.

To further increase knowledge in this all-important area, the Young Americans for Freedom, an alert and active organization of young Americans who seek to protect and preserve our constitutional form of government, established its national students committee on cold war education. The goal of the committee is to help initiate activities in State legislatures to enact a statute requiring the successful completion of a secondary level course on freedom versus communism as requirement for graduation. As an aid toward this end the committee compiled and composed an action kit complete with the texts of several State statutes, the text of a suggested bill, sample news releases, suggested texts of resolutions for organizations of various types, a selected bibliography of materials of communism, and other pertinent information.

Also included in the kit is a copy of the report of the Committee on Cold War Education of the National Governors' Conference of 1963. This report was presented to the National Governors' Conference and adopted as presented by the unanimous vote of the 51 State and territorial Governors participating. The report was the product of an interim study committee which surveyed the views and activities of more than 200 individuals, institutions and organizations active in cold war education. Included in the survey were major educational institutions of the Nation engaged in some facet of cold war education; those engaged in official stimulation of cold war education, including Governors, Members of Congress, officials of the executive branch agencies having concern in this area, and local-level educational and governmental leaders, along with other individuals and organizations from the educational, labor, and business fields.

The report of the National Governors' Conference in 1963 by its committee on cold war education was but another responsible effort to emphasize the urgent importance of learning the foundations of American freedom while at the same time studying the philosophy, strategy and tactics of the international Communist movement.

The effort by the Young Americans for Freedom to encourage education in this area is certainly to be commended. They should be aided by all those who would approach the grave danger of international communism by first of all learning the very nature, strategy, and tactics of the enemy we face.

SWEDISH HAVEN FOR DESERTERS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Sweden, by admitted count, has volunteered "privileged sanctuary" to several hundred U.S. military deserters and draft dodgers from service to their country.

An inquiry directed to the State Department as to the existence of an extradition treaty with Sweden brought a guarded reply from State, professing the existence of a treaty but that military absenteeism was not grounds for extradition.

Interestingly enough, a report from the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee indicates that the Swedish Government, following World War II, disregarded all humanitarian consideration to the military absentees from Germany, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and in the infamous "Baltic Affair" extradited 3,000 military refugees from these European countries to Russia where they were executed.

If our State Department really wanted the return of these deserters, I am sure the Swedes could oblige by following the earlier precedent with the Soviets.

I include State's correspondence, Paul Scott's column of April 5 from Human Events, a clipping from the Miami Herald, and the Convention on Extradition Between the United States and Sweden:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., January 24, 1969.

Hon. JOHN R. RARICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: Secretary Rusk asked that I reply to your letter of January 13 asking whether there is a reciprocal extradition treaty with Sweden and, if there is, what steps have been taken to extradite the military deserters and draft-dodgers who have gone to Sweden.

There is a treaty on extradition with Sweden. This convention entered into force on December 3, 1963. As is usually the case with such treaties, military offenses are excluded. There are thus no grounds for requesting the extradition from Sweden of military absentees from the United States armed forces.

According to our information, Sweden does not grant permanent residence to Americans who are in violation of the United States Selective Service Act. In any event, this offense also is not covered by the extradition treaty.

Our Embassy in Stockholm has had considerable success in convincing military absentees they should return to United States military control and face the consequences of their acts. The absentees return voluntarily and must take the initiative in contacting an Embassy officer for advice and assistance, if needed. American deserters in Sweden know that they can arrange to return to military control with the help of the Embassy and about 40 have done so to date.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

[From Human Events, Apr. 5, 1969]

ON MILITARY DESERTERS: SWEDEN'S DOUBLE STANDARD

(By Paul Scott)

In handling military deserters and refugees from foreign countries, Sweden has operated under a double standard.

While asylum is granted American military deserters, the Swedish government has gone out of its way to turn over to Russia military refugees that it requests.

A study made by the Senate Armed Services subcommittee on Sweden's handling of military refugees and deserters highlights this double standard, stating:

"Not only is the policy of accepting and helping support U.S. military deserters one of choice on the part of the Swedish government, but it is a policy which has not been consistently followed in the past.

"The subcommittee has noted that the Swedish government disregarded humanitarian consideration regarding military refugees in the immediate post-World War II period. This involved the famous 'Baltic affair.'

"According to accounts available to the subcommittee, approximately 3,000 German, Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian soldiers risked their lives in crossing the Baltic in rowboats. They went to Sweden seeking asylum from the almost certain fate of Siberia or slaughter which awaited them if captured by the Russians.

"In callous disregard of the fate of these military refugees, Sweden, in compliance with Russian demands, turned over these refugee soldiers to the Russian government.

"In other words, the Swedish government chose, in the Baltic affair, not to give sanctuary to the German, Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian troops who were actually in Sweden at the time and chose, instead, to consign them to Russian authorities.

"In contrast, the Swedish government today chooses to grant sanctuary to deserters and defectors from the Armed Forces of the U.S."

In discussing the motives of the Swedish government in establishing this double standard, the subcommittee report concludes:

"One can only speculate as to the motives of the Swedish government in sending thousands of World War II refugee soldiers to Russia and the fate awaiting them, while today the Swedish government gives aid and comfort to deserters and defectors who have fled to Sweden to escape U.S. military jurisdiction and punishment for their crime."

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Apr. 13, 1969]

DESERTERS ASK DEAD GI'S DAD FOR AID

NEW PORT RICHEY.—Before dying in Vietnam, Arthur Moody's son told him the war was just. But the American Deserters' Committee in Sweden is asking Moody to help end "the senselessness and the futility."

And, according to a letter Moody received from the deserters, he may be one of hundreds of grieving parents who will be asked to put pressure on the President and Congress to end the war.

Arthur "Butch" Moody III, 22, died in Vietnam in 1965. This week his father got a letter addressed to "the Gold Star Mothers of America, surviving widows, as well as other relatives."

The deserters said they were appealing to this group "since you have directly suffered a tragic loss, a loss which is made even more tragic since it resulted from a futile and senseless war."

The letter—signed by the American Deserters' Committee, Stockholm, Sweden—asks the survivors "to force our government to cease and desist in the blood war in Vietnam, an aggression against the Vietnamese people."

The letter urges: "Write your representatives and senators in Congress and demand that they decisively act to put an end to the Vietnamese conflict. Similarly, turn to President Nixon with the request that he stop the war in Vietnam, thereby showing the same resoluteness of decision as did President Eisenhower during the Korean conflict."

The committee asks relatives of dead soldiers to "convince your friends and acquaintances of the senselessness and the futility of the war in Vietnam." It suggests this is the way to "fulfill the legacy of your dear departed ones, and also that of other young Americans who have perished on the battlefields of far off Vietnam.

"It is your moral responsibility," the committee says, "to preclude additional thousands of American families from suffering the tragic loss of fathers, husbands, sons and brothers similarly as you have. Only your decisiveness and civic courage can help put an end to the unjust war" which is robbing America of "the cream of her manhood."

The deserters say they "found in ourselves sufficient courage and determination to refuse to obey the commands of our government." They add: "Although compelled to seek asylum, support and work here in Sweden, we would prefer to live in our homeland provided we could live and work there peacefully, as here."

They can stay in exile, says Moody, and they need not have wasted the postage.

"Anybody who can't serve their country to the best of their ability belongs in Sweden or Russia or some place like that," Moody said.

"Butch was a professional soldier. I know how he felt. In his letters he said this was a just war and if we didn't fight it there we would some day be fighting in our own backyard."

Moody—himself a disabled veteran—said: "I'm sick and tired of protesters. I protest the protesters."

SWEDEN EXTRADITION

Convention and protocol signed at Washington October 24, 1961;

Ratification advised by the Senate of the United States of America October 22, 1963;

Ratified by the President of the United States of America October 29, 1963;

Ratified by Sweden April 27, 1969;

Ratifications exchanged at Stockholm December 3, 1963;

Proclaimed by the President of the United States of America December 20, 1963;

Entered into force December 3, 1963.

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas a convention on extradition between the United States of America and Sweden, together with a related protocol, was signed at Washington on October 24, 1961, the originals of which convention and protocol, being in the English and Swedish languages, are word for word as follows:

"CONVENTION ON EXTRADITION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND SWEDEN

"The United States of America and the Kingdom of Sweden desiring to make more effective the cooperation of the two countries in the repression of crime, have resolved to conclude a Convention on Extradition and for this purpose have appointed the following Plenipotentiaries:

"The President of the United States of America: Dean Rusk, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

"His Majesty the King of Sweden: Gunnar Jarring, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Sweden to the United States of America,

who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in good and due form, agree as follows:

"*Article I*

"Each Contracting State undertakes to surrender to the other, subject to the provisions and conditions laid down in this Convention, those persons found in its territory who have been charged with or convicted of any of the offenses specified in Article II of this Convention committed within the territorial jurisdiction of the other, or outside thereof under the conditions specified in Article IV of this Convention; provided that such surrender shall take place only upon such evidence of criminality as, according to the laws of the place where the person sought shall be found, would justify his commitment for trial if the offense had been there committed.

"*Article II*

"Extradition shall be granted, subject to the provisions of this Convention, for the following offenses:

"1. Murder, including infanticide; the killing of a human being, when such act is punishable in the United States as voluntary manslaughter, and in Sweden as manslaughter.

"2. Malicious wounding; mayhem; willful assault resulting in grievous bodily harm.

"3. Kidnapping; abduction.

"4. Rape; abortion, carnal knowledge of a girl under the age specified by law in such cases in both the requesting and requested State.

"5. Procuration, defined as the procuring or transporting of a woman or girl under age, even with her consent, for immoral purposes, or of a woman or girl over age, by fraud, threats, or compulsion, for such purposes with a view in either case to gratifying the passions of another person; profiting from the prostitution of another.

"6. Bigamy.

"7. Robbery; burglary, defined to be the breaking into or entering either in day or night time, a house, office, or other building of a government, corporation, or private person, with intent to commit a felony therein.

"8. Arson.

"9. The malicious and unlawful damaging of railways, trains, vessels, aircraft, bridges, vehicles, and other means of travel or of public or private buildings, or other structures, when the act committed shall endanger human life.

"10. Piracy; mutiny on board a vessel or an aircraft for the purpose of rebelling against the authority of the Captain or Commander of such vessel or aircraft; or by fraud or violence taking possession of such vessel or aircraft.

"11. Blackmail or extortion.

"12. Forgery, or the utterance of forged papers; the forgery or falsification of official acts of government, of public authorities, or of courts of justice, or the utterance of the thing forged or falsified.

"13. The counterfeiting, falsifying or altering of money, whether coin or paper, or of instruments of debt created by national, state, provincial, or municipal governments, or of coupons thereof, or of bank-notes, or the utterance or circulation of the same; or the counterfeiting, falsifying or altering of seals of state.

"14. Embezzlement by public officers; embezzlement by persons hired or salaried, to the detriment of their employers; larceny; obtaining money, valuable securities or other property by false pretenses, or by threats of injury; receiving money, valuable securities or other property knowing the same to have been embezzled, stolen or fraudulently obtained.

"15. Making use of the mails or other means of communication in connection with schemes devised or intended to deceive or defraud the public or for the purpose of obtaining money under false pretenses.

"16. Fraud or breach of trust by a bailee, banker, agent, factor, trustee or other person acting in a fiduciary capacity, or director or member or officer of any company.

"17. Soliciting, receiving, or offering bribes.

"18. Perjury; subordination of perjury.

"19. Offenses against the laws for the suppression of slavery and slave trading.

"20. Offenses against the bankruptcy laws.

"21. Smuggling, defined to be the act of willfully and knowingly violating the customs laws with intent to defraud the revenue by international traffic in merchandise subject to duty.

"22. Offenses against the laws relating to the traffic in, use of, or production or manufacture of, narcotic drugs or cannabis.

"23. Offenses against the laws relating to the illicit manufacture of or traffic in poisonous chemicals or substances injurious to health.

"24. The attempt to commit any of the above offenses when such attempt is made a separate offense by the laws of the Contracting States.

"25. Participation in any of the above offenses.

"*Article III*

"1. The requested State shall, subject to the provisions of this Convention, extradite a person charged with or convicted of any offense enumerated in Article II only when both of the following conditions exist:

"(a) The law of the requesting State, in force when the offense was committed, provides a possible penalty of deprivation of liberty for a period of more than one year; and

"(b) The law in force in the requested State generally provides a possible penalty of deprivation of liberty for a period of more than one year which would be applicable if the offense were committed in the territory of the requested State.

"2. When the person sought has been sentenced in the requesting State, the punishment awarded must have been for a period of at least four months.

"*Article IV*

"1. Extradition need not be granted for an offense which has been committed within the territorial jurisdiction of the requested State, but if the offense has been committed in the requested State by an officer or employee of the requesting State, who is a national of the requesting State, the executive authority of the requested State shall, subject to its laws, have the power to surrender the person sought if, in its discretion, it be deemed proper to do so.

"2. When the offense has been committed outside the territorial jurisdiction of the requesting State, the request for extradition need not be honored unless the laws of the requesting State and those of the requested State authorize prosecution of such offense under corresponding circumstances.

"3. The words "territorial jurisdiction" as used in this Article and in Article I of this Convention mean: territory, including territorial waters, and the airspace thereover, belonging to or under the control of one of the Contracting States; and vessels and aircraft belonging to one of the Contracting States or to a citizen or corporation thereof when such vessel is on the high seas or such aircraft is over the high seas.

"*Article V*

"Extradition shall not be granted in any of the following circumstances:

"1. When the person sought has already been or is at the time of the request being proceeded against in the requested State in accordance with the criminal laws of that State for the offense for which his extradition is requested.

"2. When the legal proceedings or the enforcement of the penalty for the offense has become barred by limitation according to the laws of either the requesting State or the requested State.

"3. When the person sought has been or will be tried in the requesting State by an extraordinary tribunal or court.

"4. When the offense is purely military.

"5. If the offense is regarded by the requested State as a political offense or as an offense connected with a political offense.

"6. If in the specific case it is found to be obviously incompatible with the requirements of humane treatment, because of, for example, the youth or health of the person sought, taking into account also the nature of the offense and the interests of the requesting State.

"*Article VI*

"When the person sought is being proceeded against in accordance with the criminal laws of the requested State or is serving a sentence in that State for an offense other than that for which extradition has been requested, his surrender may be deferred until such proceedings have been terminated or he is entitled to be set at liberty.

"*Article VII*

"There is no obligation upon the requested State to grant the extradition of a person who is a national of the requested State, but the executive authority of the requested State shall, subject to the appropriate laws of that State, have the power to surrender a national of that State if, in its discretion, it be deemed proper to do so.

"*Article VIII*

"If the offense for which extradition is requested is punishable by death under the law of the requesting State and the law of the requested State does not permit this punishment, extradition may be refused unless the requesting State gives such assurance as the requested State considers sufficient that the death penalty will not be carried out.

"*Article IX*

"A person extradited by virtue of this Convention may not be tried or punished by the requesting State for any offense committed prior to his extradition, other than that which gave rise to the request, nor may he be re-extradited by the requesting State to a third country which claims him, unless the surrendering State so agrees or unless the person extradited, having been set at liberty within the requesting State, remains voluntarily in the requesting State for more than 45 days from the date on which he was released. Upon such release, he shall be informed of the consequences to which his stay in the territory of the requesting State might subject him.

"*Article X*

"To the extent permitted under the law of the requested State and subject to the rights of third parties, which shall be duly respected, all articles acquired as a result of the offense or which may be required as evidence shall be surrendered.

"Article XI

"1. The request for extradition shall be made through the diplomatic channel and shall be supported by the following documents:

"(a) In the case of a person who has been convicted of the offense: a duly certified or authenticated copy of the final sentence of the competent court. However, in exceptional cases, the requested State may request additional documentation.

"(b) In the case of a person who is merely charged with the offense: a duly certified or authenticated copy of the warrant of arrest or other order of detention issued by the competent authorities of the requesting State, together with the depositions, record of investigation or other evidence upon which such warrant or order may have been issued and such other evidence or proof as may be deemed competent in the case.

"2. The documents specified in this Article must include a precise statement of the criminal act with which the person sought is charged or of which he has been convicted, and the place and date of the commission of the criminal act. The said documents must be accompanied by an authenticated copy of the texts of the applicable laws of the requesting State including the laws relating to the limitation of the legal proceedings or the enforcement of the penalty for the offense for which the extradition of the person is sought, and data or records which will prove the identity of the person sought as well as information as to his nationality and residence.

"3. The documents in support of the request for extradition shall be accompanied by a duly certified translation thereof into the language of the requested State.

"Article XII

"1. The Contracting States may request, through the diplomatic channel, the provisional arrest of a person, provided that the offense for which he is sought is one for which extradition shall be granted under this Convention. The request shall contain:

"(a) A statement of the offense with which the person sought is charged or of which he has been convicted;

"(b) A description of the person sought for the purpose of identification;

"(c) A statement of his whereabouts, if known; and

"(d) A declaration that there exist and will be forthcoming the relevant documents required by Article XI of this Convention.

"2. If, within a maximum period of 40 days from the date of the provisional arrest of the person in accordance with this Article, the requesting State does not present the formal request for his extradition, duly supported, the person detained will be set at liberty and a new request for his extradition will be accepted only when accompanied by the relevant documents required by Article XI of this Convention.

"Article XIII

"1. Expenses related to the transportation of the person extradited shall be paid by the requesting State. The appropriate legal officers of the country in which the extradition proceedings take place shall, by all legal means within their power, assist the officers of the requesting State before the respective judges and magistrates. No pecuniary claim, arising out of the arrest, detention, examination and surrender of fugitives under the terms of this Convention, shall be made by the requested State against the requesting State other than as specified in the second paragraph of this Article and other than for the lodging, maintenance, and board of the person being extradited prior to his surrender.

"2. The legal officers, other officers of the requested State, and court stenographers in the requested State who shall, in the usual course of their duty, give assistance and who receive no salary or compensation other than specific fees for services performed, shall be entitled to receive from the requesting State the usual payment for such acts or services performed by them in the same manner and to the same amount as though such acts or services had been performed in ordinary criminal proceedings under the laws of the country of which they are officers.

"Article XIV

"1. Transit through the territory of one of the Contracting States of a person in the custody of an agent of the other Contracting States, and surrendered to the latter by a third State, and who is not of the nationality of the country of transit, shall, subject to the provisions of the second paragraph of this Article, be permitted, independently of any judicial formalities, when requested through diplomatic channels and accompanied by the presentation in original or in authenticated copy of the document by which the State of refuge has granted the extradition. In the United States of America, the authority of the Secretary of State of the United States of America shall be first obtained.

"2. The permission provided for in this Article may nevertheless be refused if the criminal act which has given rise to the extradition does not constitute an offense enumerated in Article II of this Convention, or when grave reasons of public order are opposed to the transit.

"Article XV

"To the extent consistent with the stipulations of this Convention and with respect to matters not covered herein, extradition shall be governed by the laws and regulations of the requested State.

"Article XVI

"1. This Convention shall be ratified and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Stockholm as soon as possible.

"2. This Convention shall enter into force upon the exchange of ratifications. It may be terminated by either Contracting State giving notice of termination to the other Contracting State at any time, the termination to be effective six months after the date of such notice."

FATHER JOSEPH F. THORNING OBSERVES PAN AMERICAN DAY IN THE HOUSE

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, for 25 consecutive years, our mutual friend, Father Joseph F. Thorning, has offered the prayer in the U.S. House of Representatives on Pan American Day. It is a tribute to the foresight of you and Father Thorning that together you took the initiative in inaugurating an official Capitol Hill celebration of the cause of inter-American understanding, friendship, and cooperation in April 1944. The annual observance is now a tradition, and has been productive of many benefits to all concerned.

It is a matter of special pride to me that Father Thorning was born in Milwaukee. He studied at St. Louis University and at Catholic University in Washington. He now finds time among his many duties to be associate editor of World Affairs, and Latin American editor of the Diplomat.

On more than one occasion in Washington, the world-renowned priest who gave the invocation yesterday on the 25th anniversary of our observance has been described as "the Padre of the Americas." The title was awarded to Father Thorning in this House by the distinguished gentleman from Montana who is now the majority leader in the other body, Senator Mike Mansfield. Now, more than ever, inter-American programs need such leadership.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, April 16, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

By grace you have been saved through faith, and this is not your own doing, it is the gift of God.—Ephesians 2: 8.

Our Father God, in whom we live and move and have our being, we humbly pray Thee so to guide and govern us by Thy spirit that in all the procedures of these hours we may never forget that Thou art with us. Send us out into this new day sustained by—

A faith that shines more bright and clear
When tempests rage without;
That when in danger knows no fear,
In darkness feels no doubt.

Into Thy keeping we commit our country and all who live and fight and die for her that freedom may continue to be gloriously alive in our world. Strengthen them in danger; comfort them in sorrow; keep them steadfast in the performance of duty and ever loyal to this Nation we love with all our hearts.

Lead us, our Father, in the paths of right; blindly we stumble when we walk alone, only with Thee do we journey safely on.

In the name of Him who is the way, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S REVIEW OF THE 1970 BUDGET

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, for general information and reference purposes of Members who may be interested, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the extension section of today's Record the report summarizing the results of the review of the 1970 budget, released yesterday by the Executive Office of the President.

The document supplies a capsule synopsis of the proposed and projected changes in the budgets for fiscal years 1969 and 1970 submitted by President Johnson in January of this year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MAIL SERVICE FOR MAMIE DOUD EISENHOWER, WIDOW OF FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10158) to provide mail service for Mamie Doud Eisenhower, widow of former President Dwight David Eisenhower.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10158

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all mail matter sent by post by Mamie Doud Eisenhower, the widow of former President Dwight David Eisenhower, under her written autograph signature or facsimile thereof, shall be conveyed within the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico free of postage during her natural life. All of her mail marked "Postage and Fees Paid" in the manner prescribed by the Postmaster General shall be accepted by the Post Office Department for transmission in the international mails. The postal revenues shall be reimbursed each fiscal year, out of the general funds of the Treasury, in an amount equivalent to the postage which otherwise would be payable on matter mailed pursuant to this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ECONOMIC SANCTIONS TO CURB NORTH KOREAN AGGRESSION

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the brazen and wanton murder of 31 American airmen over the Sea of Japan is another example of North Korean aggression against the United States.

I think we all ought to be reminded today that when Mr. Nixon accepted the nomination in Miami, in his acceptance speech, he said it was time for an administration that would react promptly and effectively against incidents like the *Pueblo*.

I hope Mr. Nixon will make good in that pledge.

I suggest there are several things that can be done short of military intervention. I am not sure that we want to engage in military intervention in North Korea at this time any more than we wanted to when the *Pueblo* incident occurred.

Of course, when we see today in retrospect the tortures committed upon the American sailors of the *Pueblo*, and then this wanton shooting down of an aircraft yesterday, the least this country can do right now is to demand economic sanctions and an economic quarantine of North Korea.

Several of our allies are today doing business with North Korea. They include Japan, Hong Kong, England, and others. The least these allies can do is stand behind the United States in quarantining this aggressor before this whole situation gets out of hand.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when Secretary Rogers ought to demand that America's allies join us in an economic quarantine of North Korea. If they are not willing to join us, we should come to the realization that they are only fair weather friends and cannot be counted on when we need their help.

ACTION DEMANDED ON NORTH KOREAN INCIDENTS

(Mr. DICKINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, last fall in his quest for the Presidency, Mr. Nixon said, in referring to the *Pueblo*:

> When respect for the United States of America falls so low that a fourth-rate military power like North Korea will seize an American naval vessel on the high seas, it is time for new leadership. I pledge to you the American flag is not going to be a doormat for anybody at home or abroad.

I applauded his statement then because I believed it came from the man, not just a candidate for public office.

Now once again we are the innocent victims of armed piracy and aggression from North Korea. They have shot down an unarmed American plane 100 miles at sea, thus murdering 31 Americans on board.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak on behalf of millions of Americans who voted for a change last November—not 4 more years of indecision, frustration, and fear—when I say we are waiting, Mr. President, for you to make your promise good.

YESTERDAY THE "PUEBLO"—TODAY THE "WILLY VICTOR"—WHAT TOMORROW?

(Mr. FREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I spent most of my active naval service flying in the same type of reconnaissance aircraft which, according to the latest Defense Department statement at 11 a.m. this morning, was apparently shot down by North Korean aircraft far outside the claimed territorial air space of this nation. We called the aircraft BT's—big targets. They are unarmed, cruise at only 175 knots, and provide an easy target for an enemy.

Our wing was engaged in part to fly a barrier from Midway to the Aleutians and back. Although we only had 19 men aboard, we never felt unprotected or alone. We knew that 180 million fellow Americans were behind us. We knew that in fulfilling our obligation to our country, America would in turn fulfill its obligation to us.

The Defense Department statement points out that this flight was one of 190 similar flights made to date, all considered lawful use of international air space. Whereas all of the flights operated at least 40 nautical miles from the North Korean coast, this plane was operating at least 50 nautical miles from the North Korean coast. Despite a huge search and rescue mission, there are no reports of survivors.

I do not presume to know what course we should now follow. It is obvious we cannot afford to become engaged in another Asian land war. But it is equally obvious that we have not fulfilled our obligations to 30 Navy men and one marine who were aboard this vessel, and all the others in the service of their country. In some way and by some method North Korea must pay the price. Yesterday the *Pueblo*—today the *Willy Victor*—what tomorrow?

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) makes the point of order that a quorum is not present, and evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

[Roll No. 36]

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Abbitt
Ashbrook
Ashley
Barrett
Bates
Bell, Calif.
Boland
Brock
Carey
Celler
Chappell
Clark
Clay
Cunningham
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Dwyer
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gray
Griffiths
Gross
Halpern
Hansen, Wash.
Hébert
Jacobs
Jones, Tenn.
Kee
Lukens
Madden
May
Morton
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Patman
Pepper
Pike
Powell
Purcell
Rosenthal
Scheuer
Symington
Teague, Tex.
Yatron

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1969

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4148) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 4148, with Mr. SMITH of Iowa in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through section 1, ending on page 38, line 17, of the committee substitute amendment.

If there are no amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Existing sections 17 and 18 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, are hereby repealed. Section 19 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is redesignated as section 24. After section 16 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, there is hereby inserted the following new sections:

"CONTROL OF POLLUTION BY OIL AND OTHER MATTER

"SEC. 17. (a) For the purpose of this section, the term—

"(1) 'oil' means oil of any kind or in any form, including, but not limited to, petroleum, fuel oil, sludge, and oil refuse, but does not include oil mixed with dredged spoil;

"(2) 'matter' means any substance of any description or origin, other than oil, dredged spoil, and human body wastes and the wastes from toilets and other receptacles intended to receive or retain human body waters, which, when discharged into the navigable waters of the United States or the waters of the contiguous zone in substantial quantities, presents, in the judgment of the Secretary, an imminent and substantial hazard to public health or welfare, including fish, shellfish, and wildlife, and shorelines and beaches, but such term does not include byproduct material, source material, and special nuclear material as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2013).

"(3) 'discharge' means any spilling, leaking, pumping, pouring, emitting, emptying, or dumping;

"(4) 'remove or removal' refers to the taking of reasonable and appropriate measures to mitigate the potential damage of the discharge of oil or matter to the public health or welfare, including, but not limited to, fish, shellfish, wildlife, shorelines, and beaches.

"(5) 'vessel' means every description of watercraft or other artificial contrivance used, or capable of being used, as a means of transportation on water;

"(6) 'public vessel' means a vessel owned or bareboat chartered and operated by the United States, or by a State or political subdivision thereof, or by a foreign nation or political subdivision thereof, except where such vessel is engaged in commercial activities;

"(7) 'United States' means the States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

"(8) 'owner or operator' means any person owning, operating, or chartering by demise, a vessel;

"(9) 'person' includes an individual, firm, corporation, association, or a partnership, except individuals on board public vessels; and

"(10) 'contiguous zone' means the entire zone established or to be established by the United States under article 24 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone.

"(b) Any individual in charge of a vessel (other than a public vessel) or of an onshore or offshore facility of any kind (other than one owned or operated by the United States, a State, or any political subdivision of a State) at the time of any discharge of oil or matter from such vessel or facility in substantial quantities into or upon the navigable waters of the United States or adjoining shorelines or beaches, or into or upon the waters of the contiguous zone, shall, as soon as he has knowledge of such discharge, immediately notify either the Secretary, or the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating of such discharge. Any such individual who fails to notify immediately such delegate of any such discharge of oil or matter into or upon such waters, shorelines, or beaches, shall upon conviction, be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

"(c)(1) Except in case of an emergency imperiling life, or an act of war or sabotage, or an unavoidable accident, collision, or stranding, or an act of God, or except as otherwise permitted by regulations issued by the Secretary under this section, or except where otherwise not prohibited in the contiguous zone under the provisions of article IV of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, as amended, any owner or operator who, either directly or through any person concerned in the operation, navigation, or management of the vessel, discharges or permits the discharge of oil or matter from a vessel in substantial quantities into or upon the navigable waters of the United States or adjoining shorelines and beaches of the United States, or into or upon the waters of the contiguous zone if such oil or matter threatens to pollute or contribute to the pollution of the territory or the territorial sea of the United States, shall be subject to the penalties provided in this subsection.

"(2) Any owner or operator who, or any vessel (other than a public vessel) which, willfully or negligently, discharges oil or matter in substantial quantities in violation of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be assessed a civil penalty by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating of not more than $10,000 for each offense. No penalty shall be assessed unless the owner, operator, or vessel charged shall have been given notice and opportunity for a hearing on such charge. Each violation is a separate offense. Any such civil penalty may be compromised by such Secretary. In determining the amount of the penalty, or the amount agreed upon in compromise, the appropriateness of such penalty to the size of the business of the owner or operator of the vessel charged, the effect on the owner or operator's ability to continue in business, and the gravity of the violation, shall be considered by such Secretary. The district director of customs at the port or place of departure from the United States shall withhold at the request of such Secretary the clearance required by section 4197 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (46 U.S.C. 91), of any vessel subject to the foregoing penalty. Clearance may be granted in such cases upon the filing of a bond or other surety satisfactory to such Secretary. Such penalty shall constitute a maritime lien on such vessel which may be recovered by action in rem in the district court of the United States for any district within which such vessel may be found.

"(d)(1) Whenever any oil or matter is discharged into or upon any waters, shorelines, or beaches, the United States shall remove or arrange for the removal thereof, in accordance with the regulations prescribed under subsection (g) of this section, when, in the judgment of the Secretary, such oil or matter presents an actual or threatened pollution hazard to the public health or welfare of the United States, including, but not limited to, fish, shellfish, and wildlife, or to public or private shorelines and beaches in the United States, unless other adequate arrangements for removal of such oil or matter have been made as required by subsections (e)(1), (f)(1), or (f)(2) of this section.

"(2) Whenever a marine disaster in or upon the navigable waters of the United States has created a substantial threat of a pollution hazard to the public health or welfare of the United States, including, but not limited to, fish, shellfish, and wildlife and the public and private shorelines and beaches of the United States, because of a discharge, or an imminent discharge, of large quantities of oil or matter from a vessel the United States may (A) coordinate and direct all public and private efforts directed at the removal or elimination of such threat; and (B) summarily remove, and, if necessary, destroy such vessel by whatever means are available without regard to any provision of law governing the employment of personnel or the expenditure of appropriated funds. The expense of removing any such vessel, the negligent operation of which caused or contributed to the marine disaster, shall be a charge against such vessel and its cargo and the owner or operator of such vessel. If the owner or operator thereof fails to reimburse the United States for such expense within thirty days after notification thereof, the United States may sell the vessel or cargo or any part that may not have been destroyed in removal, and the proceeds of such sale shall be deposited in the fund established in subsection (h) of this section.

"(e)(1) The owner or operator of any vessel who, either directly or through any person concerned in the operation, navigation, or management of the vessel, willfully or negligently discharges or permits or causes or contributes to the discharge of oil or matter into or upon the navigable waters of the United States or adjoining shorelines or beaches, or into or upon the waters of the contiguous zone if the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating finds that such oil or matter threatens to pollute or contribute to the pollution of the territory or the territorial sea of the United States, shall immediately remove such oil or matter from such waters, shorelines, and beaches in accordance with regulations prescribed under subsection (g) of this section. If the United States removes oil or matter which was willfully or negligently discharged by such owner or operator, the vessel and such owner or operator shall be liable to the United States for the full amount of the costs reasonably incurred under this subsection for the removal of the oil or matter, except that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, with respect to each offending vessel and the owner or operator thereof the aggregate liability for the cost of removal shall not exceed $10,000,000 or $100 per gross registered ton of such offending vessel, whichever is the lesser amount, in the case of such a willful or negligent discharge. The district director of customs at the port or place of departure from the United States shall withhold at the request of the Secretary the clearance required by section 4197 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended

(46 U.S.C. 91), of a vessel, other than a public vessel, liable for such costs until such costs are paid or until a bond or other surety satisfactory to the Secretary is posted. Such costs shall constitute a maritime lein on such vessel which may be recovered in an action in rem in the district court of the United States for any district within which such vessel may be found. The United States may bring action against the owner or operator in any court of competent jurisdiction to recover such costs. The United States shall also have a cause of action under this paragraph against any owner or operator of a vessel whose willful act or negligence is found to have caused or contributed to the discharge of oil or matter from a vessel involved in a collision or other casualty.

"(2) In any action instituted by the United States under this subsection, subsection (c), or subsection (f) of this section, evidence of a discharge of oil or matter shall constitute a prima facie case of liability to the United States on the part of the owner or operator of the vessel or the person owning or operating the facility, as the case may be, and the burden of rebutting such prima facie case shall be upon such owner or operator or person, as the case may be. The burden of rebutting the prima facie case of liability which the United States shall have against a vessel or the owner or operator thereof, or against a person who owns or operates an onshore or offshore facility, from which the oil or matter is discharged shall in no way affect any rights which such owner or operator or person may have against any other vessel or facility or owner or operator or other persons whose willful act or negligence may in any way have caused or contributed to such discharge.

"(f) (1) Any person who owns or operates an onshore facility of any kind (other than a facility owned or operated by the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State) who, either directly or through any other person concerned in the operation or management of such facility, willfully or negligently discharges or permits the discharge of oil or matter into or upon the navigable waters of the United States or adjoining shorelines or beaches, or into or upon the waters of the contiguous zone, or into or upon the waters beyond such zone, shall immediately remove such oil or matter from such waters, shorelines, and beaches in accordance with regulations prescribed under subsection (g) of this section.

"(2) Any person who owns or operates any offshore facility of any kind (other than a facility owned or operated by the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State) which facility is located offshore but within the seaward boundary (within the meaning of the Submerged Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.)) of a State, who either directly or through any other person concerned in the operation or management of such facility, willfully or negligently discharges or permits the discharge of oil or matter into or upon the navigable waters of the United States or adjoining shorelines or beaches, or into or upon the waters of the contiguous zone, or into or upon the waters beyond such zone, shall immediately remove such oil or matter from such waters, shorelines, and beaches in accordance with regulations prescribed under subsection (g) of this section.

"(3) If the United States removes any oil or matter required by paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection to be removed by any other persons, such person shall be liable to the United States for the full amount of the costs reasonably incurred for the removal of such oil or matter except (A) that the aggregate liability for the costs of a removal shall not exceed $8,000,000, and (B) that the Secretary shall, by regulation, after consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the Small Business Administration, establish reasonable and equitable classifications of onshore facilities and activities and apply with respect to such classifications differing limits of liability which may be less than the amount contained in this paragraph. This paragraph shall not apply to any onshore facility until it shall come within a classification established by the Secretary under the preceding sentence, but no such classification shall be established without at least sixty days notification to Congress of such intended classification. The United States may bring action against any such person in any court of competent jurisdiction to recover such costs.

"(4) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as preempting any State or political subdivision thereof from imposing any requirement or liability with respect to the discharge of oil or matter into any waters within such State.

"(g) (1) Within sixty days after the effective date of this section and from time to time thereafter—

"(A) the Secretary shall issue regulations, in consultation with the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating and consistent with maritime safety and with marine and navigation laws, establishing environmental quality criteria relating to the methods and procedures for removal of discharged oil and matter;

"(B) the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall issue regulations, in consultation with the Secretary, establishing procedures, methods, and equipment (i) to prevent discharges of oil from vessels, and (ii) consistent with regulations of the Secretary, to remove discharged oil or matter.

"(2) Any owner or operator required under subsection (e), and any person required under subsection (f), to remove any oil or matter from any waters, shorelines, or beaches in accordance with regulations prescribed under this subsection who violates any such regulation shall be liable to a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for each such violation. Each violation shall be a separate offense. The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may assess and compromise such penalty. No penalty shall be assessed until the owner, operator, or person charged shall have been given notice and an opportunity for a hearing on such charge. In determining the amount of the penalty, or the amount agreed upon in compromise, the gravity of the violation, and the demonstrated good faith of the owner, operator, or person charged in attempting to achieve rapid compliance, after notification of a violation, shall be considered by such Secretary.

"(h) (1) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to a revolving fund to be established in the Treasury not to exceed $20,000,000 to carry out the provisions of subsection (d) of this section. Any other funds received by the United States under this section shall also be deposited in said fund for such purposes, except that such funds shall be available to reimburse a State or political subdivision thereof that assists in the removal of any discharged oil or matter. All sums appropriated to, or deposited in, said fund shall remain available until expended.

"(2) For the purpose of insuring the efficient and economic removal of oil or matter under subsection (d) of this section, the President shall, within ninety days after the effective date of this subsection, delegate to the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, to the Secretary, to the Secretary of Defense, and to other appropriate Federal agencies, all or part of the responsibility under subsection (d) of this section for removing discharged oil or other matter, in accordance with a national contingency plan or revision thereof, approved by the President. The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating is authorized to make available to such Federal agencies from the fund established by paragraph (1) of this subsection such sums as may be necessary to effectuate such removal. Each such agency, in order to avoid duplication of effort, shall, whenever practicable, utilize the personnel, services, and facilities of other Federal and State agencies.

"(3) The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating and consistent with maritime safety and with marine and navigation laws and regulations, may issue regulations authorizing the discharge of oil or matter from a vessel in quantities, under conditions, and at times and locations deemed appropriate by him, after taking into consideration various factors such as the effect of such discharge on applicable water quality standards, recreation, and fish and wildlife.

"(4) The provisions of subsection (c) of this section and the regulations issued under subsection (g) of this section shall be enforced by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating. The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may utilize by agreement, with or without reimbursement, the personnel, services, and facilities of any other Federal agency or State agency in carrying out these provisions and regulations.

"(5) Anyone authorized by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to enforce the provisions of this section may, except as to public vessels, (A) board and inspect any vessel upon the navigable waters of the United States or the waters of the contiguous zone, (B) with or without a warrant arrest any person who violates the provisions of this section or any regulation issued thereunder in his presence or view, and (C) execute any warrant or other process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction.

"(6) In the case of Guam, actions arising under this section may be brought in the district court of Guam, and in the case of the Virgin Islands such actions may be brought in the district court of the Virgin Islands. In the case of American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, such actions may be brought in the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii and such court shall have jurisdiction of such actions.

"(i) Nothing in this section shall affect or modify in any way the obligations of any owner or operator of any vessel or onshore facility or offshore facility under any provision of law for damages to any publicly or privately owned property from a discharge of oil or matter or from the removal of any oil or matter.

"(j) Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary or the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to regulate the operations or construction of any onshore or offshore facility, or as affecting or modifying any other existing authority of either Secretary relative to such facilities under this Act or any other provision of law.

"(k) (1) Any vessel over one hundred gross registered tons, including any barge of equivalent size, using any port or place in the United States or the navigable waters of the United States for any purpose shall establish and maintain under regulations to be prescribed from time to time by the appropriate delegate of the President, evidence of financial resopnsibility to meet the maximum potential liability to the United States which such vessel could be subjected under this section for willful or negligent discharges of oil or matter. In cases where an owner or operator owns, operates, or charters more than one such vessel, financial responsibility need only be established to meet the maximum liability to which the largest of such vessels could be subjected. Financial responsibility may be established by any one of, or a combination of, the following methods acceptable to the delegate of the President: (A) policies of insurance, (B) surety bonds, (C) qualification as a self-insurer, or (D) other evidence of financial responsibility. Any bond filed shall be issued by a bonding company authorized to do business in the United States.

"(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be effective one year after the effective date of this section. The President shall delegate the responsibility to carry out the provisions of this subsection to the appropriate agency head within sixty days after the effective date of this section. Regulations necessary to implement this subsection shall be issued within six months after the effective date of this section.

"(3) The Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretaries of Interior, State, Commerce, and other interested Federal agencies, representatives of the merchant marine, oil companies, insurance companies, and other interested individuals and organizations, and taking into account the results of the application of paragraph (1) of this subsection, shall conduct a study of the need for and, to the extent determined necessary—

"(A) other measures to provide financial responsibility and limitations of liability with respect to vessels using the navigable waters of the United States;

"(B) measures to provide financial responsibility for all onshore and offshore facilities; and

"(C) other measures for limitations of liability of such facilities;

for the cost of removing discharged oil or matter and paying all damages resulting from the discharge of such oil or matter. The Secretary of Transportation shall submit a report, together with any legislative recommendations, to Congress and the President by January 1, 1971.

"CONTROL OF SEWAGE FROM VESSELS

"SEC. 18. (a) For the purpose of this section, the term—

"(1) 'new vessel' includes every description of watercraft or other artificial contrivance used, or capable of being used, as a means of transportation on the navigable waters of the United States, the construction of which is initiated after promulgation of standards and regulations under this section;

"(2) 'existing vessel' includes every description of watercraft or other artificial contrivance used, or capable of being used, as a means of transportation on the navigable waters of the United States, the construction of which is initiated before promulgation of standards and regulations under this section;

"(3) 'public vessel' means a vessel owned or bareboat chartered and operated by the United States, by a State or political subdivision thereof, or by a foreign nation or by a political subdivision thereof, except where such vessel is engaged in commercial activities;

"(4) 'United States' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

"(5) 'marine sanitation device' means any equipment for installation on board a vessel which is designed to receive, retain, treat, or discharge sewage;

"(6) 'sewage' means human body wastes and the wastes from toilets and other receptacles intended to receive or retain body wastes;

"(7) 'manufacturer' means any person engaged in the manufacturing, assembling, or importation of marine sanitation devices or of vessels subject to standards and regulations promulgated under this section;

"(8) 'person' means an individual, partnership, firm, corporation, or association, but does not include an individual on board a public vessel;

"(9) 'discharge' means any spilling, leaking, pumping, pouring, emitting, emptying, or dumping.

"(b) As soon as possible after the enactment of this section, the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, and after giving appropriate consideration to the economic costs involved, and within the limits of available technology, shall promulgate Federal standards of performance for marine sanitation devices (hereinafter in this section referred to as 'standards') which shall be designed to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage into or upon the navigable waters of the United States from new vessels and existing vessels, except vessels not equipped with installed toilet facilities. Such standards shall be consistent with maritime safety and the marine and navigation laws and regulations and shall be coordinated with the regulations issued under this subsection by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating. The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall promulgate regulations, which are consistent with standards promulgated under this subsection and with maritime safety and the marine and navigation laws and regulations, governing the design, construction, installation, and operation of any marine sanitation device on board such vessels.

"(c)(1) Initial standards and regulations under this section shall become effective for new vessels two years after promulgation; but not earlier than December 31, 1971, and for existing vessels five years after promulgation. Revisions of standards and regulations shall be effective upon promulgation, unless another effective date is specified, except that no revision shall take effect before the effective date of the standard or regulation being revised.

"(2) The Secretary and the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating with regard to their respective regulatory authority established by this section may distinguish among classes, types, and sizes of vessels as well as between new and existing vessels, and may waive applicability of standards and regulations as necessary or appropriate for such classes, types, and sizes of vessels, and, upon application, for individual vessels.

"(d) The provisions of this section and the standards and regulations promulgated thereunder apply to vessels owned and operated by the United States unless the Secretary of Defense finds that compliance would not be in the interest of national security. With respect to vessels owned and operated by the Department of Defense, regulations under subsection (b) and certifications under subsection (g)(2) of this section shall be promulgated and issued by the Secretary of Defense and not by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

"(e) Before the standards and regulations under this section are promulgated, the Secretary and the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall consult with the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Secretary of Defense; the Secretary of the Treasury; the Secretary of Commerce; other interested Federal agencies; and the States and industries interested; and otherwise comply with the requirements of section 553 of title 5 of the United States Code.

"(f) After the effective date of the initial standards and regulations promulgated under this section, no State or political subdivision thereof shall adopt or enforce any statute or regulation of such State or political subdivision with respect to the design, manufacture, or installation of any marine sanitation device on any vessel subject to the provisions of this section, except that nothing in this section shall be construed to affect or modify the authority or jurisdiction of any State to prohibit discharges of sewage whether treated or not from a vessel within all or part of the intrastate waters of such State if discharges from all other sources are likewise prohibited.

"(g)(1) No manufacturer of a marine sanitation device shall sell, offer for sale, or introduce or deliver for introduction in interstate commerce, or import into the United States for sale or resale any marine sanitation device manufactured after the effective date of the standards and regulations promulgated under this section unless such device is in all material respects substantially the same as a test device certified under this subsection.

"(2) Upon application of the manufacturer, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall so certify a marine sanitation device if he determines, in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, that it meets the appropriate standards and regulations promulgated under this section. The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall test or require such testing of the device in accordance with procedures set forth by the Secretary as to standards of performance and for such other purposes as may be appropriate. If such results are in accordance with the appropriate performance standards promulgated under this section, and if the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating determines that the device is satisfactory from the standpoint of safety and any other requirements of maritime law or regulation, and after consideration of the design, installation, operation, material, [illegible] other appropriate factors, he shall certify the device. Any device manufactured by such manufacturer which is in all material respects substantially the same as the certified test device shall be deemed to be in conformity with the appropriate standards and regulations established under this section.

"(3) Every manufacturer shall establish and maintain such records, make such reports, and provide such information as the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may reasonably require to enable him to determine whether such manufacturer has acted or is acting in compliance with this section and regulations issued thereunder and shall, upon request of an officer or employee duly designated by the Secretary or the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, permit such officer or employee at reasonable times to have access to and copy such records. All information reported to, or otherwise obtained by, the Secretary or the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating or their representatives pursuant to this subsection which contains or relates to a trade secret or other matter referred to in section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code shall be considered confidential for the purpose of that section, except that such information may be disclosed to other officers or employees concerned with carrying out this section. This paragraph shall not apply in the case of the construction of a vessel by an individual for his own use.

"(h) After the effective date of standards and regulations promulgated under this section, it shall be unlawful—

"(1) for the manufacturer of any vessel subject to such standards and regulations to manufacture for sale, to sell or offer for sale, or to distribute for sale or resale any such vessel unless it is equipped with a marine sanitation device which is in all material respects substantially the same as the appropriate test device certified pursuant to this section:

"(2) for any person, prior to the sale or delivery of a vessel subject to such standards and regulations to the ultimate purchaser, wrongfully to remove or render inoperative any certified marine sanitation device or element of design of such device installed in such vessel:

"(3) for any person to fail or refuse to permit access to or copying of records or to fail to make reports or provide information required under this section; and

"(4) for a vessel subject to such standards and regulations to operate on the navigable waters of the United States, if such vessel is not equipped with an operable marine sanitation device certified pursuant to this section.

"(i) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdictions to restrain violations of subsections (h) (1) through (3) of this section. Actions to restrain such violations shall be brought by, and in, the name of the United States. In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena served upon any person under this subsection, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the United States and after notice to such person, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce documents, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"(j) Any person who violates clause (1) or (2) of subsection (h) of this section shall be liable to a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for each violation. Any person who violates clause (4) of subsection (h) of this section shall be liable to a civil penalty of not more than $2,000 for each violation. Each violation shall be a separate offense. The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may assess and compromise any such penalty. No penalty shall be assessed until the person charged shall have been given notice and an opportunity for a hearing on such charge. In determining the amount of the penalty, or the amount agreed upon in compromise the gravity of the violation, and the demonstrated good faith of the person charged in attempting to achieve rapid compliance, after notification of a violation, shall be considered by said Secretary.

"(k) The provisions of this section shall be enforced by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating and he may utilize by agreement with or without reimbursement law enforcement officers or other personnel and facilities of the Secretary, other Federal agencies, or the State to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(l) Anyone authorized by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to enforce the provisions of this section may, except as to public vessels, (1) board and inspect any vessel upon the navigable waters of the United States and (2) execute any warrant or other process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction.

"(m) In the case of Guam, actions arising under this section may be brought in the district court of Guam, and in the case of the Virgin Islands such actions may be brought in the district court of the Virgin Islands. In the case of American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, such actions may be brought in the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii and such court shall have jurisdiction of such actions.

"AREA ACID AND OTHER MINE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL DEMONSTRATIONS

"SEC. 19. (a) The Secretary, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, is authorized to enter into agreements with any State or interstate agency to carry out one or more projects to demonstrate methods for the elimination or control, within all or part of a watershed, of acid or other mine water pollution resulting from active or abandoned mines. Such projects shall demonstrate the engineering and economic feasibility and practicality of various abatement techniques which will contribute substantially to effective and practical methods of acid or other mine water pollution elimination or control.

"(b) The Secretary, in selecting watersheds for the purposes of this section, shall (1) require such feasibility studies as he deems appropriate, (2) give preference to areas which have the greatest present or potential value for public use for recreation, fish and wildlife, water supply, and other public uses, and (3) be satisfied that the project area will not be affected adversely by the influx of acid or other mine water pollution from nearby sources.

"(c) Federal participation in such projects shall be subject to the conditions—

"(1) that the State or interstate agency shall pay not less than 25 per centum of the actual project costs which payment may be in any form, including, but not limited to, land or interests therein that is needed for the project, personal property, or services, the value of which shall be determined by the Secretary; and

"(2) that the State or interstate agency shall provide legal and practical protection to the project area to insure against any activities which will cause future acid or other mine water pollution.

"(d) There is authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this section, which sum shall be available until expended. No more than 25 per centum of the total funds appropriated under this section in any one year shall be granted to any one State.

"TRAINING GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

"SEC. 20. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, to assist them in planning, developing, strengthening, improving, or carrying out programs or projects for the preparation of undergraduate students to enter an occupation which involves the design, operation, and maintenance of treatment works, and other facilities whose purpose is water quality control. Such grants or contracts may include payment of all or part of the cost of programs or projects such as—

"(A) planning for the development or expansion of programs or projects for training persons in the operation and maintenance of treatment works;

"(B) training and retraining of faculty members;

"(C) conduct of short-term or regular session institutes for study by persons engaged in, or preparing to engage in, the preparation of students preparing to enter an occupation involving the operation and maintenance of treatment works;

"(D) carrying out innovative and experimental programs of cooperative education involving alternate periods of full-time or part-time academic study at the institution and periods of full-time or part-time employment involving the operation and maintenance of treatment works; and

"(E) research into, and development of, methods of training students or faculty, including the preparation of teaching materials and the planning of curriculum.

"APPLICATION FOR TRAINING GRANT OR CONTRACT; ALLOCATION OF GRANTS OR CONTRACTS

"SEC. 21 (1) A grant or contract authorized by section 20 may be made only upon application to the Secretary at such time or times and containing such information as he may prescribe, except that no such application shall be approved unless it—

"(A) sets forth programs, activities, research, or development for which a grant is authorized under section 20, and describes the relation to any program set forth by the applicant in an application, if any, submitted pursuant to section 22;

"(B) provides such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

"(C) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(2) The Secretary shall allocate grants or contracts under section 20 in such manner as will most nearly provide an equitable distribution of the grants or contracts throughout the United States among institutions of higher education which show promise of being able to use funds effectively for the purposes of this section.

"(3) (A) Payment under this section may be used in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, and subject to the terms and conditions set forth in an application approved under subsection (a), to pay part of the compensation of students employed in connection with the operation and maintenance of treatment works, other than as an employee in connection with the operation and maintenance of treatment works, other than as an employee in any branch of the Government of the United States, as part of a program for which a grant has been approved pursuant to this section.

"(B) Departments and agencies of the United States are encouraged, to the extent consistent with efficient administration, to enter into arrangements with institutions of higher education for the full-time, part-time, or temporary employment, whether in the competitive or excepted service, of students enrolled in programs set forth in applications approved under subsection (a).

"AWARD OF SCHOLARSHIPS

"SEC. 22. (1) The Secretary is authorized to award scholarships in accordance with the provisions of this section for undergraduate study by persons who plan to enter an occupation involving the operation and maintenance of treatment works. Such scholarships shall be awarded for such periods as the Secretary may determine but not to exceed four academic years.

"(2) The Secretary shall allocate scholarships under this section among institutions of higher education with programs approved under the provisions of this section for the use of individuals accepted into such programs, in such manner and according to such plan as will insofar as practicable—

"(A) provide an equitable distribution of such scholarships throughout the United States; and

"(B) attract recent graduates of secondary schools to enter an occupation involving the operation and maintenance of treatment works.

"(3) The Secretary shall approve a program of an institution of higher education for the purposes of this section only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding—

"(A) that such program has as a principal objective the education and training of persons in the operation and maintenance of treatment works;

"(B) that such program is in effect and of high quality, or can be readily put into effect and may reasonably be expected to be of high quality;

"(C) that the application describes the relation of such program to any program, activity, research, or development set forth by the applicant in an application, if any, submitted pursuant to section 20 of this Act; and

"(D) that the application contains satisfactory assurances that (i) the institution will recommend to the Secretary for the award of scholarships under this section, for study in such program, only persons who have demonstrated to the satisfaction of the institution a serious intent, upon completing the program, to enter an occupation involving the operation and maintenance of treatment works, and (ii) the institution will make reasonable continuing efforts to encourage recipients of scholarships under this section, enrolled in such program, to enter occupations involving the operation and maintenance of treatment works upon completing the program.

"(4) (A) The Secretary shall pay to persons awarded scholarships under this section such stipends (including such allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such persons and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

"(B) The Secretary shall (in addition to the stipends paid to persons under subsection (a)) pay to the institution of higher education at which such person is pursuing his course of study such amount as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

"(5) A person awarded a scholarship under the provisions of this section shall continue to receive the payments provided in this section only during such periods as the Secretary finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency and devoting full time to study or research in the field in which such scholarship was awarded in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than employment approved by the Secretary by or pursuant to regulation.

"(6) The Secretary shall by regulation provide that any person awarded a scholarship under this section shall agree in writing to enter and remain in an occupation involving the design, operation, or maintenance of treatment works for such period after completion of his course of studies as the Secretary determines appropriate.

"DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 23. (1) As used in sections 20 through 23 of this Act—

"(A) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(B) The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution described in the first sentence of section 1201 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (other than an institution of any agency of the United States) which is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Secretary for this purpose. For purpose of this subsection, the Secretary shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

"(C) The term 'academic year' means an academic year or its equivalent, as determined by the Secretary.

"(2) The Secretary shall annually report his activities under sections 20 through 23 of this Act, including recommendations for needed revisions in the provisions thereof.

"(3) There are authorized to be appropriated $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, to carry out sections 20 through 23 of this Act (and planning and related activities in the initial fiscal year for such purpose). Funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, under authority of this subsection shall be available for obligation pursuant to the provisions of sections 20 through 23 of this Act during that year and the succeeding fiscal year."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 11 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"COOPERATION BY ALL FEDERAL AGENCIES IN THE CONTROL OF POLLUTION

"Sec. 11. (a) Each Federal agency having jurisdiction over any real property or facility of any kind shall, within available appropriations and consistent with the interests of the United States, insure compliance with applicable water quality standards and the purposes of this Act in the administration of such property or facility. In his summary of any conference pursuant to section 10(d) (4) of this Act, the Secretary shall include references to any discharges allegedly contributing to pollution from any such Federal property or facility, and shall transmit a copy of such summary to the head of the Federal agency having jurisdiction of such property or facility. Notice of any hearing pursuant to section 10(f) of this Act involving any pollution alleged to be effected by any such discharges shall also be given to the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the property or facility involved, and the findings and recommendations of the hearing board conducting such hearing shall include references to any such discharges which are contributing to the pollution found by such board.

"(b) Any applicant for a Federal license or permit to conduct any activity which may result in discharges into the navigable waters of the United States shall provide the licensing or permitting agency with certification from each affected State or interstate water pollution control agency that there is reasonable assurance, as determined by the State or interstate agency, that such activity will be conducted in a manner which will not reduce the quality of such waters below applicable water quality standards. In any case where such standards have been promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to section 10(c) of this Act, or where a State or interstate agency has no authority to give such a certification, such certification shall be from the Secretary. If an applicant for a Federal license or permit receives a certification under this subsection in connection with such application, then the Federal agency to whom such application is made, and any other Federal agency may accept such certification for the purposes of this subsection in connection with any other application made to it by such applicant for a license or permit, except that (1) if any affected State or the Secretary, if his certification is involved, after notice, which shall be given by such Federal agency, makes written objection, such certification may not be so accepted, and (2) this sentence shall not apply to any application for an operating license or permit. No license or permit shall be granted until such certification has been obtained. In any case where actual construction of a facility for the conduct of any activity has been lawfully commenced prior to the date of enactment of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, no certification shall be required under this subsection for a license or permit issued after the date of enactment of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 to conduct such activity, except that any such license or permit issued without certification shall terminate at the end of the two-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 unless prior to such termination date the person having such license or permit submits to the Federal agency which issued such license or permit a certification which otherwise meets the requirements of this subsection. Such license or permit may be suspended if a court of competent jurisdiction finds that such licensee or permittee is not in compliance with applicable water quality standards. Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit any other authority pursuant to this Act or any other provision of State or Federal law to require compliance with applicable water quality standards. No Federal agency shall be deemed to be an applicant for the purposes of this subsection. The Secretary shall, upon the request of any State or Federal department or agency, provide any technical assistance to such department or agency for the purpose of carrying out this section."

Sec. 4. Section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as (k) and (l), including all references thereto;

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsections:

"(g) The Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts with, or make grants to public or private agencies and organizations and individuals for the purpose of developing and demonstrating new or improved methods for the prevention, removal, and control of natural or manmade pollution in lakes, including the undesirable effects of nutrients and vegetation.

"(h) In carrying out the provisions of this section relating to the conduct by the Secretary of demonstration projects and the development of field laboratories and research facilities, the Secretary may acquire land and interests therein by purchase, with appropriated or donated funds, by donation, or by exchange for acquired or public lands under his jurisdiction which he classifies as suitable for disposition. The values of the properties so exchanged either shall be approximately equal, or if they are not approximately equal, the values shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances require.

"(i) The Secretary shall engage in such research, studies, experiments, and demonstrations as he deems appropriate relative to the removal of oil from any waters and to the prevention and control of oil pollution, and shall publish from time to time the results of such activities. In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may enter into contracts with, or make grants to, public or private organizations and individuals.

"(j) The Secretary shall engage in such research, studies, experiments, and demonstrations as he deems appropriate relative to equipment which is to be installed on board a vessel and is designed to receive, retain, treat, or discharge human body wastes and the wastes from toilets and other receptacles intended to receive or retain body wastes with particular emphasis on equipment to be installed on small recreational vessels. The Secretary shall report to Congress the results of such research, studies, experiments, and demonstrations prior to the effective date of any standards established under section 18 of this Act. In carrying out this subsection the Secretary may enter into contracts with, or make grants to, public or private organizations and individuals.";

(3) in redesignated subsection (k)(4) by striking out the words "and June 30, 1969," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970,"; and

(4) by amending the first sentence of redesignated subsection (l) by striking out "and $65,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969." and inserting in lieu thereof "and $65,000,000 per fiscal year for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, June 30, 1970, and June 30, 1971."

Sec. 5. Section 6(e) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466c–1) is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (1) is amended by striking out "three succeeding fiscal years," and inserting in lieu thereof "five succeeding fiscal years,".

(2) Paragraph (2) is amended by striking out "two succeeding fiscal years," and insert-

ing in lieu thereof "four succeeding fiscal years,".

(3) Paragraph (3) is amended by striking out "two succeeding fiscal years," and inserting in lieu thereof "four succeeding fiscal years,".

SEC. 6. Section 14 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is amended by deleting the following: "the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, or".

SEC. 7. The Oil Pollution Act, 1924 (43 Stat. 604), as amended (80 Stat. 1246–1252), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. (a) The first sentence of section 2 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466–1) is amended by striking out "Federal Water Pollution Control Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "National Water Quality Administration".

(b) Any other law, reorganization plan, regulation, map, document, record or, other paper of the United States in which the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration is referred to shall be held to refer to the National Water Quality Administration.

Mr. FALLON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the committee substitute amendment be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. EDMONDSON

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer several amendments, and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON)?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may we hear the amendments read first.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. EDMONDSON: On page 74, strike out line 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "adversely affected State or interstate water pollution control agency as determined by the licensing or permitting agency".

On page 74, line 11, after the period insert the following: "If an affected State or interstate water pollution control agency or the Secretary, as the case may be, fails to act to certify or refuse to certify within a reasonable period of time as determined by the licensing or permitting agency after notification of such application, the certification requirements of this subsection shall be waived with respect to such State, agency, or Secretary, as the case may be, with respect to such application."

On page 74, line 18, strike out "(1)".

On page 74, line 21, strike out the second comma and insert in lieu thereof a period.

On page 74, strike out line 22 and all that follows down through and including the period on line 23.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON)?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, yesterday's general debate on this bill developed some possible grounds for misunderstanding between the Committee on Public Works and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with regard to procedural matters arising from the technical language of section 11(b).

These amendments were worked out last night with a considerable amount of discussion, and I think very careful consideration by members of our committee sitting with the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and with staff people from both committees.

There has been discussion today by members on our side of the aisle with the ranking minority member and with staff of the minority to resolve these problems.

The words "affected State or interstate water pollution control agency," as used in the bill originally, left both the applicant for a license or permit and probably the States in doubt as to what "affected" means.

The amendment makes it clear that it is the responsibility of the licensing or permitting agency of the Federal Government to determine, at least initially, which are the States involved, and it is from the States included in that determination that the applicant must obtain his certification.

The Federal agency must also set a reasonable time within which the State must act, either to grant or to deny, the certification.

Now it does not have any particular pressure to compel certification but it is put in the position with this amendment to do away with dalliance or unreasonable delay and to require a "yes" or "no" and certification by States that are considered to be adversely affected.

The failure by the State to act in one way or the other within the prescribed time would constitute a waiver of the certification required as to that State.

With respect to the deletion of the mandatory requirement for a second certificate prior to issuance of an operating license the committee recognizes the possible undue and severe burden that might arise from potential time delays. The committee also believes that the language of the subsection, as it stands and without that second mandatory requirement, still adequately protects the State, in that any affected State which believes its best interest requires that it take a second look at the contemplated operation of the facility involved can exercise its right to do so simply by notifying the licensing agency that it objects to the use of the original certification in the granting of the operating license. That would then, without further requirement afford the State the opportunity to review the matter and provide recertification or not as it saw fit. It is, of course, inherent in all of this that full and complete information will be made available to all the States involved by both the applicant and the licensing or permitting agency.

I would like to make it clear that in giving the Federal licensing agency the initial responsibility for determining which are the affected States or the adversely affected States, as this term is used in the amendment, we in no way intend to lessen or transgress upon the right of any State to seek judicial relief if it feels its best interests warrant such a move. There is no intent in this amendment to cut off any judicial remedy or any judicial right that would be available to the States.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California. I want to thank him at this time for the long period of time after hours yesterday which he gave to consideration of this problem, and I recognize the very serious nature of it in terms of the development of our nuclear power potential in this country.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I, too, wish to support the amendment offered by the gentleman. I also want to thank the gentleman and the other members of the committee and the staff for spending several hours with us yesterday working over some of these troublesome details which I believe the amendments will cure in the main and that we will be able to proceed. It is my hope that in the development of the energy which is needed in this country that we all realize that every 9 years we have to double the electrical capacity of this country, and it is from that electrical energy that we will depend for the development of our industry, our homes, and our whole society.

Section 3 of H.R. 4148, as proposed to be amended by the Public Works Committee, would amend section 11 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to require, among other things, that any applicant for a Federal license or permit to conduct an activity which may result in discharges into the navigable waters of the United States to provide the licensing agency with a certification from each State which may be adversely affected by such discharge, or from the applicable interstate water pollution control agency, that there is reasonable assurance that the activity will be conducted in a manner that will not reduce the quality of the water below applicable water quality standards. In the event of a dispute over the question, the Federal licensing or permitting agency would determine which states might be "adversely affected" by the discharge. Further, if an affected State or interstate water pollution control agency or the Secretary, as the case may be, fails to act to certify or refuses to certify within a reasonable period of time as determined by the licensing or permitting agency after notification of such application, the certification requirements of the bill would be waived with respect to such State, agency, or Secretary, as the case may be, with respect to such application.

One result of this requirement will be that nuclear powerplants, which of course are federally licensed and which obviously must discharge waste heat into condenser cooling waters for return to adjoining waterways, will be reviewed by appropriate State water pollution control authorities prior to Atomic Energy Commission licensing to see that the heated liquid effluents discharged from the facility will not reduce the quality of adjoining waters below approved water quality standards.

I believe this preventive aspect of H.R. 4148 complements the existing thermal pollution control measures that have been taken under the Water Quality Act of 1965, and should contribute significantly to avoiding situations wherein after-the-fact abatement actions have to be instituted to remedy existing pollution violations.

I believe the committee amendment to H.R. 4148 is a considerable improvement over the bill's present language in several respects. First, it is now clear who shall determine, in the event of a question in this regard, which State or States are "affected." Also, there must be a potential for "adverse affect," as opposed to a mere "affect," which as I interpret the word could mean something as insignificant as 1 B.t.u. Third, this amendment guards against a situation where the water pollution control authority in the State in which the activity is to be located, or possibly in some other State, simply sits on its hands and does nothing. Any such dalliance could kill a proposed project just as effectively as an outright determination on the merits not to issue the required certificate. Thus while this bill would still permit one State to make a decision that would have extraterritorial effect upon another, at least now it cannot do so passively—it has to take affirmative action to consider the matter and to decide to withhold the certificate if it wants to defeat a proposed project.

I therefore thoroughly support the amendment, and urge my colleagues with all the powers of persuasion I can marshal to vote its enactment.

The committee has also proposed an amendment to H.R. 4148 that would help to alleviate a problem under the bill caused by the fact that, under the Atomic Energy Act, nuclear powerplants are licensed in two stages: First, a construction permit must be obtained from the AEC to build the facility, and then an operating license must be obtained to operate the finished facility. As originally reported the proposed amendment to section 11 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act would have required an applicant for an AEC license to submit the requisite certification at both stages in the licensing process. It seemed to me that satisfaction of section 11's requirements at the construction permit stage should suffice unless subsequent thereto the license applicant proposed a material change which would affect the environment adversely.

The committee amendment to H.R. 4148 proposed today would eliminate the requirement for dual certification, but does so in a way that fully protects the affected State or States. Under the amendment as I understand it, the certification obtained at the construction permit stage would also suffice at the operating license stage unless, after notice given by the Federal agency concerned, an affected State, or the Secretary if his certification is involved, makes written objection to the agency. In that event the certification given earlier at the construction permit stage would require reconsideration.

This amendment is not everything I would like it to be, since there are not any real safeguards in the bill to protect an applicant against arbitrary action by a State agency after the applicant has invested vast sums in his facility, but at least the large potential for delay built into the reported bill's dual-certification requirement has been somewhat mitigated. I trust, moreover, that, quite apart from the bill, the normal appeals procedures to the courts will protect a license applicant who, in a rare case, might be prevented from obtaining his operating license by actions of the State which are arbitrary or capricious, and based other than on the technical facts involved. I, therefore, support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have a number of comments related to the bill itself, but not to any particular amendments now under consideration. They relate primarily to section 3 of the bill, and I would like to include them in the RECORD.

Section 3 primary concerns thermal, or heat, pollution of our waterways, a matter of considerable interest to me. I sponsored legislation in the last session addressed to the thermal pollution problem, at least as it relates to nuclear power plants, and planned to re-introduce the measure in this session. However, as I pointed out in a floor statement on March 11, I refrained from doing so in deference to more comprehensive legislation like H.R. 4148, which would be applicable to all Federal departments and agencies and, in substantial part, to all forms of steam powerplants—fossil fired as well as nuclear.

One result of this bill's new requirements will be that nuclear powerplants, which of course are federally licensed and which obviously must discharge waste heat into condenser cooling waters for return to adjoining waterways, will be reviewed by appropriate State water pollution control authorities prior to Atomic Energy Commission licensing to see that the heated liquid effluents discharged from the facility will not reduce the quality of adjoining waters below approved water quality standards.

Because of my interest in the thermal pollution aspects of this legislation, I suggested several technical amendments for the Public Works Committee's consideration during its consideration of this matter. I am gratified that a number of these recommendations were accepted by the committee, and that explanatory comments in the committee report have further served to clarify the intent of H.R. 4148.

For example, proposed new section 11(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act has been amended by the committee to require only that the certifying State agency find that there is reasonable assurance of compliance with applicable water quality standards. The earlier version would have required a virtual guarantee by the State agency concerned that under no conceivable circumstances could the facility's discharges violate any of the applicable water quality standards. The requirement imposed by H.R. 4148 would appear to be considerably more workable and in keeping with the tests laid down in other legislative grants of regulatory authority.

Also, under the earlier version of this bill any affected license or permit would have been automatically suspended if a court of competent jurisdiction found that such licensee or permittee was not in compliance with applicable water quality standards. In view of the possible adverse effect upon the reliability of a region's electric power supply which the forced shutdown of a large electrical generating facility could have, it seemed to me considerably more advisable to accord the court discretionary power to permit continuation of the activity pending necessary modification of the facility or its appurtenances, if that is feasible, or of the operating practices followed there. This recommendation also has been accepted.

Another of the concerns which I brought to the committee's attention related to an apparent potential conflict under proposed new section 11(b) with the responsibility of the Atomic Energy Commission to regulate the radiological effects of source, byproduct, and special nuclear materials, as these terms are defined in the Atomic Energy Act. I was gratified to note the statement in the committee's report to the effect that nothing in section 11(b) should be construed to conflict with the AEC's preemptive authority under the Atomic Energy Act. Additional clarifying language of a somewhat similar nature appears elsewhere in the report and in subsections (a)(2) and (j) of proposed new section 17 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The committee's solution to another question gives me some cause for concern. Because it would often appear impractical to require significant changes in the design of a nuclear facility after substantial progress had been made in its construction, and because the imposition of any such requirement could seriously delay operation of a facility whose on-line availability was planned years in advance and probably heavily counted on by the affected systems, I recommended to the committee that it exempt from section 11's coverage those nuclear facilities for which construction permits had been issued at the time of the bill's enactment. The committee bill has afforded some, but not complete, relief in such cases.

As I understand the committee bill, if a construction permit has been issued for a facility and construction of that facility is actually underway at the time of enactment of H.R. 4148, the certification called for by the bill would be postponed for 2 years from date of enactment as to such facility if during that period the permittee applies for his operating license. If at the end of this 2-year grace period the requisite certification has not been obtained the operating license previously issued without certification would automatically terminate. Thus, as I understand it, anyone applying for an AEC operating license after enactment of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 who had received his construction permit and actually commenced construction prior to enactment could receive such operating authorization without the certification required by the act, but his operating license would be subject to automatic termination 2 years from the date of the act if within that time he does not provide the required certification.

To my way of thinking this requirement has a certain retroactive tone to it that normally is repugnant to Congress. However, the requirement is one that affected license applicants probably can accommodate themselves to without undue hardship, and hopefully without unnecessary delays in their operations, if the law is implemented with reason and fairness by the State water pollution control authorities and, where he is involved, the Secretary of the Interior. Therefore, rather than offering an amendment to modify the bill in this respect I shall simply express the deep hope and expectation that the States, or the Secretary of the Interior if he is involved, will implement this part of the legislation sensibly. If they do not, I rather suspect that they may find themselves carrying on their work by the light of a flickering candle.

I shudder to think of the adverse effect upon the reliability of a region's electric power supply which would be had if one or more operating nuclear powerplants in the area were forced to shut down because it was unable to obtain the required certification. Most of the newer nuclear plants are in the 800 to 1,000 electrical megawatt range; each, therefore, will be providing a significant share of the affected system's total power output. In view of this, I think it hardly necessary to elaborate further on the consequences of the forced shutdown of one of these plants after it has been fully constructed and is in operation. Nor need I elaborate, I suppose, on the economic impact of such action on the Nation's utilities and their rate-payers, who after all are the people who actually pay the tremendous sums—in the vicinity of $150 million—represented by each of these large nuclear facilities.

As you can see, Mr. Chairman, I have followed the progress of this bill and substantially similar legislation in the other body quite closely. I believe, that for the most part, the Committee on Public Works has recommended a very fine piece of legislation. I want to commend the committee for the outstanding job that it and its staff have done, and urge my colleagues to vote for the amended bill's passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. EDMONDSON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Any unnecessary or bureaucratic obstruction that we place in the development of electrical energy and the development of the capacity to produce energy will be working, in my opinion, against the general welfare of our society. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman. I do not know of any Member of this House who has done more through the years to try to develop the full potential of our country in terms of electrical power and energy. I think he has been a stouthearted champion of measures to develop our hydroelectric power, our steampower through fossil fuels, and in the atomic energy field, and, of course, he is without peer in his efforts in this direction. This committee respects the merits of his argument on the subject and is offering these amendments in an effort to meet those objections to the best of our ability.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. The amendment offered by the gentleman would strike the language appearing on page 74, line 22, which would do away with the need of second certification at the time an operating license is required; is that correct?

Mr. EDMONDSON. It would relieve the mandatory requirements in the bill. It would eliminate the mandatory requirement for a second operating certificate.

Mr. HARSHA. Does this apply only to nuclear generating institutions?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the language of the bill applies to all facilities. I do not think it is intended to be restricted to any particular facility, but it is a particularly sensitive thing for the nuclear facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. EDMONDSON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. From the time of the initial construction permit, in the case of a nuclear facility, there may be 7 years in construction. They may invest $100 to $150 million in the facility, and the requirement that we have, a mandatory requirement to come back for an operating permit, even when a State was not seeking it, and even when a State was not insisting upon it, seems to us to be an unreasonable requirement in the law.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, is it or is it not a fact that when we first have a certification for a construction permit, that deals with water quality at that time, and subsequent construction of the institution or enterprise and placing it into operation does not change the water quality standards or the effect upon the water quality standards?

Mr. EDMONDSON. It is my impression the obligations assumed in these permits not to affect the water quality standards adversely would be continuing obligations, and then as there is upgrading of water quality standards, there would be a continuing obligation on the facility to comply with the water standards to the limit of its ability.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman does not understand my question. My question is, When they obtain this first construction permit and certification, at that time, that subsequent construction of the institution and placing it in operation does not change what effect the operation of that institution will have on water quality standards from what was certified to at the initial application.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think certification would be given only as to the standards that were known, and they would have to be standards that were established at that time. But I still have the opinion that there would be carried some obligation in the operation to try to upgrade the pollution prevention to the limit of the institution's ability.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the 5 minutes, but I do want to rise and ask the gentleman a question. I rise in support of the objective which the gentleman wishes to preserve. The gentleman has advised us of the nature of the amendments and the specific verbiage. I am in support of what the gentleman intends to accomplish.

There have been many discussions about dual certification and I want to make sure what the gentleman is doing will accomplish the objective—as I am sure he does—of making certain that these certifications result in the operation of the facility in conformance to the water quality standards. I ask the gentleman: Is that not the basic objective which we all seek?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Certainly there is no particluar value in just getting reasonable assurance they are going to do something. Our real objective is to get an operating facility that does not adversely affect water standards.

In this regard all we are seeking to do with these requirements about certification is to get attention early in the construction process to the problem of not affecting water standards adversely. The facility should be designed and engineered from the first to take care of that problem as the facility is constructed.

Mr. CRAMER. So the construction, as it relates to new construction and as it relates to requiring a Federal license or certification, is that in a continuing activity it would require a certification be granted—and this is the key, as I understand it—what do they have to certify? As I read it on page 74, line 5, they have to certify "that such activity will be conducted in a manner which will not reduce the quality of such waters below applicable water quality standards."

So I ask the gentleman: Is it not correct that the thrust of the initial certification, for the certification itself under the gentleman's amendment, is that when in operation that facility has to conform to the applicable water standards? So really if it does not conform, that condition of the certification itself will continue to control, making certain that those standards are conformed to.

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is my understanding. I would hope that the licensing and permitting agencies will have the same feeling about it, that the certification is a safeguard that assures early attention to the problems when they design and build the plant, but that it is also a continuing safeguard to the State and that it is a safeguard that is meaningful to the State. I hope the licensing and certifying agency would construe it in that way and undertake to correct any violations.

Mr. CRAMER. With that assurance and as I read the language of the gentleman's amendment, and the basic legislation before us, I support the gentleman's amendments offered en bloc.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. As I understand the objective and thrust of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON), there is to be no sacrifice as far as water quality standards are concerned; it is principally designed to facilitate the procedures; is this true?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I believe the major problem disturbing the gentlemen on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was the new statutory requirement for a second certification, involving other States as well as the State in which the facility is located.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. This will in fact eliminate the dual certification requirement?

Mr. EDMONDSON. One of the amendments will have that effect.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I believe I support the principle of eliminating water pollution as much as any Member of the committee. I am very much concerned.

It is my understanding also, I might say, that we are referring to thermal plants, which include nuclear energy but also include conventional energy or any other kind of thermal pollution that goes into these streams. It is my understanding that all of these facilities—whether they be conventional, papermill, or nuclear—will comply and will be forced to comply to the applicable water quality standards of the specific State which may be involved.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is correct. It is contemplated before too long every State will have such standards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I do not believe the full impact of the amendment is really understood by the members of the committee. It is in fact a very dangerous and damaging amendment for those who are seriously concerned about pollution.

I intend to offer, as soon as I can be recognized, an amendment dealing with this problem of thermal pollution, because I do not believe that the legislation as reported from the committee, as I mentioned on yesterday during the general debate, is really strong enough.

The gentleman from Florida says eventually we are going to have adequate State standards, but the fact of the matter is that we do not have them now in most States, and not even in the State of New York.

The problem of thermal pollution is a relatively new problem, and certainly it is not one that has created the kind of damage we have seen in oil pollution, about which we are doing something now. After the horse is stolen we are closing the barn door.

Thermal pollution occurs when one pumps heated water into the small lakes and streams, which is taken out of the stream at a cooled temperature and is used to cool the nuclear reactors, and then is put back into the lake or stream.

This is now being proposed on Cayuga Lake, one of the distinguished and beautiful Finger Lakes of New York State. I quoted yesterday inexactly from the distinguished alma mater of Cornell University, in introducing my remarks, but the fact is that far above Cayuga's waters we do have this problem at the present time.

Unless we move quickly now to prevent this kind of thermal pollution, which can destroy wildlife, which can destroy fish, and which can increase the growth of weeds, we are going to ruin a great many of the Finger Lakes, and ruin other small recreational lakes in the districts of every one of the Members.

Members have not heard about this, probably, if they have not begun building nuclear power plants in their districts, but as the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Oklahoma have said, there will be a lot of new plants built in the next few years.

What this amendment proposes is that if any of the plants get constructed without cooling towers or cooling basins, being required, if they can get the construction grant before these State standards have come in, they can continue to operate in this way without any necessity for getting an additional operating certificate 2 years later.

It will be a long time before we get the appropriate State standards, and the plant on Cayuga Lake is proposed for construction now. The Atomic Energy Commission may be meeting even later this spring to act on their application. Unless we get tough standards in this bill the damage may already have been started when that permit is granted.

It would be a sad tragedy if we told these nuclear powerplants this. Surely, the gentleman from California wants to encourage construction of nuclear generating plants.

I do not object to that. Nuclear power is here to stay. But let us insist that we have proper protection against thermal pollution in these plants. If you do not do it now, you will be hearing from the conservationists in your area. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) and I can guarantee you that, because we have heard.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I regret personally that I had not seen the gentleman's amendment or had an opportunity to look at it until this minute, and I regret that I do not have a carefully formed judgment about it. There may be considerable merit to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. STRATTON. What the gentleman's amendment would do would even compound the situation even if my amendment were not to pass. That is what disturbs me.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I fail to understand how the gentleman concludes that it will compound a situation in view of the fact that the certification that is originally given on these facilities is a continuing requirement upon the facilities and it is not something that is terminated with the construction. Furthermore, the amendments recommended do not affect in any way the provision on lines 6 to 13 of page 75 requiring certification by States for facilities on which construction began prior to passage of this act.

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman will permit me to say it, if this bill will pass, there is not going to be any requirement for certification. If the bill is passed in the form in which it exists now, with the gentleman from Oklahoma's amendment added, there are not going to be any real binding New York State requirements to deal with thermal pollution. That means a nuclear powerplant will be built far above Cayuga's waters and will be damaging Cayuga Lake and we will have no opportunity, as the bill is now written, to come back in 2 years with a requirement that it cannot continue to operate under those loose and ineffective State standards on thermal pollution.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Of course, if there are no State standards, then the Federal Government is at liberty under this bill to impose standards itself and require certification by the secretary. The bill assures against any escape from certification.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I fully appreciate the gentleman from New York's concern over what he terms thermal pollution. Almost all economic activities that we carry on, including the making of ice, involve some amount of disposition of heat into the environment. In some cases you can logically term this thermal pollution. In other cases you might term it thermal enrichment because the warmer waters will enable you to produce better crops on irrigated land and to produce larger harvests of fish for human food consumption in ponds and so on. So you cannot take this business of what happens to heat in the abstract and pin the label "b-a-d" on it and get up here and legislate against it. Particularly—and this is what I want to call to the attention of the gentleman from New York—you cannot consider the matter of thermal effects in the abstract in another sense. What these nuclear electric generating plants and conventional electric generating plants are being built for is to supply a very critical need by the American people and the American economy for an increasing amount of electric power. We double over every period of 10 years in this society of ours our requirements for electric power. Now, that means if we are going to support and sustain the type of economic advancement this country has become accustomed to, we are going to have to find some place to put the generating stations.

And let me say that the conventional generating stations dissipate heat only at a fractionally lower amount into the environment than do the nuclear generating stations.

We here in Washington cannot be the arbiter of whether in the State of New York the need is greater for this added electrical capacity, or whether the need is greater to keep Lake Cayuga's waters on an average annual basis as to temperature—from going 1 or 2 degrees higher in temperature than it is today. The people of New York are going to have to make up their minds as to which is the most valuable to them. They are going to have to decide as between the temperature of Lake Cayuga or possibly some other lake, and whether they want to have blackouts in the last half of the 1970's due to the lack of electrical generating capacity to meet the new load growth for electricity developing over that period of time.

I do not believe that we would be asked by the gentleman from New York to make that decision here in Washington despite the fact that the allegation is made that all the wisdom of the country resides along the banks of the Potomac. Actually, the gentleman's people in New York and in other parts of the country are going to have to live with or without electricity, they are going to have to live with or without a slight amount of thermal enrichment in some of the waters of their areas if they are going to have their electricity requirements fulfilled. Therefore, since this is something that is personal to them and to their environment, and despite the fact that the gentleman from New York is not happy about the status of the law on thermal pollution in the State of New York, I do not believe the burden is upon us here in Washington to attempt at the present time to make that decision for them. To do what he suggests would erect an almost unscalable barrier to installation of electric generating capacity, not only against the people of New York, but against all the people of this country.

I think if the gentleman from New York is dissatisfied with the standards that have been established by the State of New York, as a citizen of the State of New York he should appeal to his duly-elected State representatives. They write him letters as a Member of Congress on Federal issues, so, perhaps the gentleman can write letters to them with reference to this matter which is a State issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me in order that I may respond to the statements which have been made by the gentleman from California?

Mr. ROBISON. Yes, I yield briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to comment upon what the gentleman from California has said. The gentleman from California does not understand that the question of a construction permit for a plant on Cayuga Lake could well be settled prior to this legislation being enacted. The Atomic Energy Commission has no authority to consider thermal pollution.

I have no opposition to the development of nuclear power-generating facilities. All I am suggesting is that when we build them let us build them in such a manner as not to have thermal pollution. That can be done, but it will not be done unless we have some kind of protective legislation enacted before this bill becomes law.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I think the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) is wrong. I say this for three reasons: First, he wants Federal standards, and I do not know of anyone else with the exception of a few, who does. I certainly do not want Federal standards. That is what we would have to have in order to accomplish the objective which is sought by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Second, he is saying that, perhaps, this bill will become law before they get a construction permit. It seems to me that the gentleman is assuming that is the case, and I am not willing to assume it. He is a pretty good long way away from getting a permit for construction of that plant. But, assuming that is true, you still have the requirement of conforming to the standards of that State relating to thermal pollution, and all other pollution which is required under the present law and now in the future. So long as that plant operates it will be subject to the thermal pollution standards of the State of New York, and subject to the court's enforcement powers under the basic law. If they were to get a permit, the controlling factor still would be what that State's standards are with regard to pollution, and not what the Federal Government says.

Mr. STRATTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROBISON. I would like to take part of my own time now, if I might for a moment.

Getting back to the issue as I see it, this is not the time to discuss now whether we should have Federal standards or State standards here, but to discuss this particular amendment, instead.

Let me say, in whatever time I have left, that I am sorry the committee has seen fit to change its position with respect to dual certifications. It seems to me it has changed its position for one reason, at least, that lies at the heart of this debate over dual certification, in that it does seem to place an unfair disadvantage on those who wish to build nuclear powerplants while those who build instead fossil-fueled powerplants are not required to obtain two Federal licenses or permits, but at best only one, and that from the Corps of Engineers, not the Atomic Energy Commission.

Now, I can see why the committee does not want—or anyone wants—to put any unfair barrier in the path of nuclear powerplants that is not going to be faced by those who might build fossil-fueled powerplants. But let me ask this question—and I would like to direct it to the attention of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

We know all too little yet about thermal effects or thermal discharge, and we do not know yet even how to define "thermal pollution." We are doing a lot of Federal research into this particular problem as well as into other aspects of the water pollution field. If we learn, as a result of this additional research, that some of the safeguards that are contemplated as necessary now in order to prevent thermal effects from becoming thermal pollution are not adequate, are we not by this amendment in effect freezing a State's ability to review and update its water quality standards in this respect?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I tried to make it as clear as I could in my own remarks that I did not personally have the view that the gentleman has about freezing the water standards of a State. It was my view that a State should be endeavoring constantly to upgrade its water standards, so that there would be in any of these certificates and in any of these permits the continuing obligation upon the operator to try to meet the new water standards of the State.

Now, if the gentleman just wants to say that we are not going to build anything that has a remote possibility the potential of having some adverse effect, we can stop the construction of every powerplant in the country. I believe that could be the effect of what the gentleman from New York—not the gentleman in the well—is suggesting here as a procedural amendment at this point.

But I believe there is a duty on the part of the committee to enable the country to go ahead with some construction permits under the understanding that we would have a continuing review authority in the issuing agency, and in fact a requirement for that continuing review.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. EDMONDSON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROBISON was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman answer another question I put to him then, in this way: Supposing the Atomic Energy Commission grants a construction permit for such a plant, and then in the intervening 3- or 4-year period between the granting of the construction permit and the time when the plant gets ready to go "on the line," as they say, and the utility comes back to the AEC for its operating permit, supposing the condition of the stream that is to receive this thermal discharge has changed substantially; supposing the State now wants to update and review the certification that it sent down to the AEC 3 or 4 years ago and now says, "Additional safeguards are needed beyond those that we thought were needed at the time of beginning construction," this is a theoretical question that I am presenting to you—but what happens then?

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is one of several possibilities that were discussed well into the night last night, and changing conditions could develop in a number of ways when one of these permits is issued.

When you have changing conditions and when you have a different situation prevailing, I think it would be incumbent upon the Atomic Energy Commission to take a second look at the permit that has been issued.

I think the State also would have the absolute right, as I read this legislation, at any time it reaches the conclusion that there is going to be an adverse effect from the operation of this facility—anytime it reaches that conclusion that its actual conduct of the operation is not going to measure up to the assurances that were given, I think the State would have the right to withdraw its certification.

Mr. ROBISON. Then the State would have to go to court or the Federal Government would go into court to obtain a restraining order with respect to this plant at that point in time, as not being in conformity with the water quality standards of the State as then in effect?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the right to go to court would be present at all times and is not affected by the statute.

If we are talking solely about nuclear facilities and the withdrawal of the certification that the State granted the operator, I believe on withdrawal; the Atomic Energy Commission would be obligated to call in the operator and to advise him the situation should be corrected or he would be required to shut down the operation.

Mr. ROBISON. I appreciate the gentleman's clarification for the record. I must say I still regret the change in the committee's position, and I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. Would the gentleman from Oklahoma agree that the amendment makes it purely optional with the Atomic Energy Commission and puts no mandate on it. As a matter of fact, knowing the record of the Atomic Energy Commission with regard to thermopollution, I would not be as optimistic as the gentleman is.

Mr. EDMONSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may respond to our colleague?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have reached the conclusion in the period of time that I have been here that it is almost impossible to mandate any agency to do anything. We are trying within the limits of our legislative ability to mandate them to do what is right in this situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATSUNAGA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATSUNAGA: On page 55, line 23, immediately after "includes" insert the following: "the States, the District of Columbia,".

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered is purely a technical amendment intended to provide consistency and uniformity of language.

The definition of "United States" on page 39, line 22, of the bill includes the District of Columbia. However, the District of Columbia is not included in the same definition which appears on page 55, line 23, purely through inadvertence according to testimony before the Rules Committee, of which I am a member. My amendment would include the District of Columbia in the second definition to negate any inference that its omission in the second instance was with a specific legislative intent.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, the committee on this side accepts the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEVELAND

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVELAND: On page 78, after line 22, insert the following: "SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the feasibility of any and all methods of financing the cost of preventing, controlling, and abating water pollution. The results of such investigation and study shall be reported to Congress no later than January 1, 1970, together with the recommendations of the Secretary for financing the programs for preventing, controlling, and abating water pollution, including any necessary legislation."

Renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is fairly clear.

We are directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study as to the feasibility of any and all methods of financing federally supported water pollution programs.

I think most of us realize that over the years our Committee on Public Works in connection with various water quality acts have authorized very substantial sums, but when it has gotten down to the actual appropriating process the state of the budget and the state of the Nation has not permitted the full appropriation of the authorizations.

We find again and again as we study the various States and the various communities that are concerned about this matter an overwhelming backlog of projects that have been approved and cannot be financed. It is causing a great deal of difficulty in the States and local communities. I discussed this subject during general debate yesterday at some length, and I am not going to repeat all of that now.

I might say, and I want to make this particularly clear in the record, that my own personal recommendation would be that we establish some sort of trust fund financed by user fees, taxes, or excises similar in nature to the highway trust fund, which has been so notably successful in financing the interstate and the primary and secondary road networks in this country. However, my amendment does not spell out that the study will be directed only in that direction. It is much more general. The purpose of this is to give the Secretary complete latitude in connection with the studies that we ask him to make under this amendment.

I think that almost every Member will find, as he goes back to his State or district, that there are a tremendous number of sewage treatment facilities that are on the books, that have been approved, but are awaiting financing. I think it is fair to say that financing is still the No. 1 issue involved here.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that I believe his amendment has considerable merit. I intend to support it. As the gentleman knows, we had financing provisions in the bill last year. For reasons known to all of us, that type of financing was not included in this bill. So the point is that until we get at this problem of financing sewage treatment plants, we are really not going down the road of solving water pollution problems. There is no use kidding ourselves. It takes adequate financing on the local level, or a partnership on the local, State, and Federal level; does it not? Your study would hopefully give us some guidance.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Exactly. It does just that. I might also add that—the gentleman from Florida has been something of a leader in this regard—tax incentives to improve or make it more attractive for industry to build pollution-abatement facilities is something that the gentleman from Florida has long urged and, of course, I think that might be included in this type of study, or I hope it would be.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I believe the gentleman has a meritorious amendment, but there are some questions I would like to ask. It may be that there are some things in there that my good friend from New Hampshire has not seen. The amendment states:

> The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the feasibility of any and all methods of financing the cost of preventing, controlling and abating water pollution. The results of such investigation and study shall be reported to Congress no later than January 1, 1970.

One of the critical problems we have had in this business of water pollution abatement and water pollution control is that we have not been able to make adequate funds available to the States under Public Law 660, with the result that many of the State programs are lagging in cleanup. They are being held up because of inadequate Federal financing. What I want to know is whether the amendment would preclude the Congress from proceeding independently. Will we be compelled to wait until the detailed study is completed by the Secretary of the Interior? I think the Congress has some responsibility to move in this area. I would be loathe—and I am sure my friend would be equally loathe—to have Congress precluded from moving if and when the Congress might conceive of an adequate device to finance these programs. I think the gentleman is well aware of the fact that the Secretary now has authority under Public Law 660 as amended to do precisely what the provisions of the amendment would do.

Though I applaud the amendment, are we not getting ourselves into a box here?

Mr. CLEVELAND. While we have authorizations appropriation through the next fiscal years, I cannot see how we could be doing that.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman knows that the Public Works Committee in the past 3 fiscal years has discussed this subject with everyone—members of the Department, members of the executive agency, and individual Members of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

(On request of Mr. DINGELL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CLEVELAND was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. DINGELL. It is well known and everybody is agreed these were sums that were not feasible but were desperately needed. But to get back to the point we are talking about, how are we going to be sure, if this amendment goes through, that Congress is not going to be precluded from the possibility of financing, or will it have to wait to get the recommendation from the Secretary?

Mr. CLEVELAND. There is nothing in my amendment that is going to prevent our going right ahead. But our authorization of $700 million is matched by a much smaller appropriation request.

Mr. DINGELL. In excess of $214 million?

Mr. CLEVELAND. $214 million. I do not contemplate the Nixon administration is going to increase that. I think they are going to keep it at that figure. There is nothing in this amendment that will interfere with that whatsoever.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman does not respond to my question. What is on my mind is this. Does the gentleman's amendment say Congress is going to have to wait until some secretary or some bureaucrat downtown comes up with a suggestion as to how we are going to finance it?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Will the gentleman confine his question to one point?

Mr. DINGELL. I tried to.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Then the answer to the gentleman's question is no.

Mr. DINGELL. The amendment reads a little differently. It says:

> The results of such investigation and study shall be reported to Congress no later than January 1, 1970, together with the recommendations—

Are we going to have to wait, as a result of this amendment until we have a recommendation from downtown, or until there is consideration of it by the Public Works Committee at some future time, or will some bureaucrat say, "On this we have a study going on." Will we have to wait until that study is completed? It is well known it is the practice, when the agencies do not want to take some action, for them to say, "We have a study. You wait 2 or 3 years until our study is completed, and we will give you some information."

I think, with my friend, this is important. In Public Law 660, as amended, we do have authority for the Secretary to do what is in this amendment. I think we are doing something here that will have results far beyond what the gentleman anticipates. That is, we would be delayed in consideration of alternative methods of financing. These are the questions I am directing to my friend.

Mr. CLEVELAND. There are a great many questions there.

Mr. DINGELL. No. It is very simple. They all revolve around one point.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Then my answer is "No." There is nothing that would preclude us from going ahead. If the gentleman has some ideas, perhaps he would offer them and I'd be delighted to support them if they get at this problem of financing the fight against water pollution.

Mr. DINGELL. I have considerable affection for my friend, but I do not agree with him on this point. I do not think he is correct.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire. This approach would mean a great deal to my State of Maryland.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his excellent amendment to this bill in which he recognizes and points to the necessity of adequate financing for the legislative proposals directed toward controlling water pollution. He specifically urges a plan whereby the Secretary of the Interior would conduct investigations and studies to determine the most efficacious financing arrangements in support of pollution control enactments.

I have experienced a similar need as a Representative of the Eighth Congressional District of Maryland. Maryland streams including the Potomac and Patuxent will deteriorate miserably if the funds are not found to finance our antipollution measures. While Congress has been quite generous in passing legislation which authorizes substantial amounts of money to combat pollution, it has been remiss in making the actual appropriations of funds when the time came for coming across with the money to institute the programs devised. Over the past 10 years the State Legislature of Maryland has authorized a $176 million debt for water pollution expenses, $150 million of which has been in the past 2 years. One reason for the enormity of these debt amounts is because the Federal Government has not come through with a proportionately great enough share. In fact it was reported only 2 weeks ago that Congress has come up more than $50 million short on its promises to share the cost of building sewage treatment plants in Maryland under provisions of the Water Pollution Control Act. The Federal Government has pledged to contribute $54 million this year to go along with the $49.9 million put up by the State; but only $3.9 million will come from the Federal Government when the fiscal year ends on June 30.

Therefore, I urge adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire as a strengthening feature to the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969.

I also would like to take this opportunity to express my support for this bill in its entirety as it speaks to the need for standards of pollution control on the navigable waters of the United States and to the need for sound, efficient enforcement procedures to cope with any deviance from those standards. Furthermore, the stance which it permits the Federal Government with respect to insuring future progress in pollution control is most encouraging: research and vocational incentives will be significantly advanced by the scholarship grants provided for in this Act.

Therefore, I urge adoption of the amendment and the entire bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STRATTON

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STRATTON: On page 74, line 24, strike out "In" and all that follows down through and including the period on line 13 of page 75.

On page 75, line 21, after the period insert the following: "Nothing in this subsection shall apply in the case of any applicant for a Federal license or permit to conduct any activity which may result in any thermal pollution to which subsection (c) of this section applies."

On page 75, line 24, strike out the quotation marks and after such line insert the following:

"(c)(1) As soon as possible after the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary, after consultation with each Federal agency issuing licenses or permits to which this subsection applies, shall promulgate Federal water quality standards which shall be expressly designed to prevent thermal pollution of any waters located in the United States, by any activity licensed by any Federal agency or operated under a permit issued by any Federal agency.

"(2) After the date of the enactment of this subsection, no Federal agency shall issue any license or permit to an individual, firm, corporation, partnership, association, State, political subdivision of a State, or any other public body or agency with respect to any activity which may result in any discharge into any of the waters of the United States which may result in the thermal pollution of such waters, unless the Secretary, after consulting with the appropriate State water pollution control agency, and, when appropriate, after public hearings, certifies, under such reasonable terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to such Federal agency that such activity will not reduce the quality of such waters below the Federal standards promulgated under paragraph (1). Each such Federal agency shall include in any such license or permit the terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary as he deems appropriate to control the discharges or other activity in a manner that will not reduce the quality of the water below such standards. The Secretary shall establish such procedures as may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this subsection, including, where appropriate, an opportunity for public hearings conducted by him or the Federal agency issuing such license or permit. Each such Federal agency is hereby authorized to include in any such license or permit such terms and conditions as such agency determines, after obtaining the advice and recommendations of the Secretary to be appropriate to protect water supplies, fish, wildlife, recreation, and aesthetic values affected by such activity.

"(d) In any case where actual construction of a facility for the conduct of any activity has been lawfully commenced prior to the date of enactment of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, no certification shall be required under subsection (b) or subsection (c) of this section for a license or permit issued after the date of enactment of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 to conduct such activity, except that any such license or permit issued without certification shall terminate at the end of the two-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 unless prior to such termination date the person having such license or permit submits to the Federal agency which issued such license or permit a certification which otherwise meets the requirements of subsection (b) or subsection (c), as the case may be.

"SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 1 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'including thermal pollution.'

"SEC. 5. Section 13 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" '(b) The term "thermal pollution" means the addition of heat or some heated substance to any waters, which addition will result in a reduction in the quality of those waters for use for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, for recreational purposes, or which may endanger the health or welfare of any person.' "

And redesignate existing sections 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 accordingly.

Mr. STRATTON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I have already raised in connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma this question of thermal pollution. This is the thermal pollution amendment which I have referred to and which I explained very briefly in a letter which should have been in everybody's office at least by this morning.

Thermal pollution is a problem created when heated water otherwise perfectly pure is discharged into a body of water, particularly a small lake; and when the temperature is raised by even a few degrees, so the scientists tell us and the conservationists and sportsmen are well aware, this can not only encourage growth of weeds, which are a problem already in many recreational lakes, but eventually it can kill all the game fish, so we have nothing but carp and a few other such fish left in the lake.

This is the problem we face with the proposed construction of a nuclear powerplant in Cayuga Lake. The scientists at Cornell University pinpointed this problem, and they created public recognition of it, and this led eventually to deferral of construction plans by the New York Electric & Gas Co.

The demand for nuclear powerplants is going to increase. They are running out of oceans and fast-running rivers. If they can construct a plant on Cayuga Lake they can construct one on Seneca Lake, and they can go to any one of the 1,000 lakes in Minnesota or to any other State; and we can have a very serious problem.

I am concerned that we should act to prevent this problem before the damage is done rather than moving to act after a good deal of damage has been done, as we are doing in this bill with regard to oil pollution. We are closing the door after the horse has been stolen from the barn. I believe we ought to close the door while the horse still is in there.

What the committee's proposed legislation would do is require certification depending on the applicable State standards. The fact of the matter is that at this particular time there are not any really binding State standards.

We usually like to think of New York as the most progressive of the States; certainly it is, at least in terms of raising taxes. But when it comes to thermal pollution, we have very wishy-washy standards. They have a strong bill which passed the Assembly, but my information is that it will not get out of the Senate, and if it does the Governor will veto it.

If we are to rely on the State standards, we may find that the pressures of the utilities are greater than those of the people who want to save the lakes.

Although I join the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER) in a general abhorrence for substituting Federal standards for State standards, if we are really to act quickly and to prevent this problem before it gets started, we ought to institute the standards. The Department of Interior has studied this. They know the problem. They know the kinds of standards to set. We ought to insist that those standards be applied whenever there is a problem of thermal pollution.

That is all my amendment will do. It repeats some of the language there. with a few changes to put in separate standards for thermal pollution as against the other kinds of pollution.

If we wait for the States to be reminded that they have to tighten up their laws, by the Federal Government, we may find we have waited too long.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am happy to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. I should like to congratulate the gentleman on a very important amendment. It makes a very significant contribution in this vitally important field.

We see the danger of thermal pollution all over the country now. In my own congressional district the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York has plans to put five nuclear plants on one very narrow stretch of the Hudson River. We may find that this will create a heat block and result in the killing of all of the fish life in the Hudson. This would mean destroying the sport fisheries business and the recreation business for not only the entire Hudson area, but as far as Long Island Sound.

I, along with other Congressmen and Senator KENNEDY, have sponsored legislation to provide for siting nuclear plants for the future to assure placement of plants so as to minimize both nuclear and thermal dangers.

I believe the contribution the gentleman is making here, requiring Federal standards until such time as the States can catch up with this problem, is a very significant supplementary contribution to resolution of this problem and I wholeheartedly support the amendment.

Mr. STRATTON. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's support. I know he has done a magnificent job in fighting the threat of pollution in his area.

Actually, I was not aware of the problem of thermal pollution until about a year ago, when the implications of the construction at Cayuga Lake brought it to my attention. A lot of the other Members may not be aware of it. If they ever start building one of these plants at a small lake in any district, the Member will hear about it, and hear loudly from the conservationists in his district.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. I read over a year ago about thermal pollution on the Hudson River, I believe. I know of nuclear and other powerplants on salt water.

Does the amendment in any way affect the plants using fossil fuel instead of thermonuclear fuel, or running fresh water for a seacoast plant?

Mr. STRATTON. Yes. It would apply to any powerplant constructed with a Federal license anywhere. I am not enough of an expert, but I assume there is not so much of a problem with regard to the ocean, because there is so much water that the temperature would not rise appreciably.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment because it would do violence to the whole concept of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. That act vested the primary responsibility to fix water quality standards in the individual States. The Congress, when it unanimously adopted this act, recognized the principle that the States were in a peculiar position to pass judgment on this issue. The Congress determined that they were much better qualified to determine their own environment, to determine their own economic needs, and to determine their own industrial demands to determine the appropriate uses of the State waters, and to determine the needs for water quality standards in each individual State. The act provided that each State should establish water quality standards subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. If these standards are not sufficient in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, then he can reject those standards and inform the States that they should upgrade them. In many cases this has been done.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government does, in effect, have some control over the individual States and the standards which they adopt. But if we were to adopt this amendment, we would be doing complete violence to the theory and philosophy of the present Federal Water Pollution Control Act that is that primary responsibility rests with the States. We would be taking away from the individual States their right to govern their own affairs. For that reason, I oppose this amendment and hope it is defeated.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. I know that the gentleman is very much against any type of pollution, including thermal pollution. We must strive to eliminate all pollution—none must escape our attention. I am wondering whether or not, in view of the importance of this amendment, it was discussed and considered in your committee.

Mr. HARSHA. This particular amendment, as I recall it, I do not believe was discussed, but the issue of thermal discharge into the waters of the United States was very thoroughly discussed. We had a member of the Atomic Energy Commission before the committee to testify on this subject. There is general disagreement as to whether or not this thermal discharge is thermal enhancement or thermal pollution. We are not far enough advanced in our research and studies to recognize it unequivocally as thermal pollution.

Mr. LATTA. As I understand it, the Atomic Energy Commission requires these plants to meet the water quality standards of the States before permits are issued? Is this not correct?

Mr. HARSHA. They are required to meet the water quality standards established by the individual States.

Mr. LATTA. Is this not being done in New York State?

Mr. HARSHA. The objection here was that in the opinion of the author of the amendment he did not think the State standards were stringent enough and he wanted Federal standards superimposed upon them.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take the time of the Committee to further discuss this troubling problem of thermal pollution, but I think we could stand to consider it for a few minutes longer.

It would be accurate to say that we stand on the threshold of a new era in the production of electric power in our Nation. As our Nation grows and its people's standard of living improves, we can expect, as someone said a moment ago, to see the demand for electricity go on doubling as it has every 10 years and, as potential hydropower sites are used up, more and more of this demand for electricity will have to be met by steam generating plants, some of which will be fossil fueled while others will be nuclear fueled. These plants will require enormous quantities of cooling waters. The waste heat, called thermal discharges, from such plants now affects something over 7 percent of all of the available fresh water runoff in the 48 contiguous States, a figure which has been projected to rise to more than 16 percent by 1980, and on to about 50 percent by the year 2000, if conventional "once-through" cooling procedures were still in use at that time.

Mr. Chairman, even if the waters of our lakes and streams were now as clean as they ought to be, it is obvious that this situation would pose an environmental and ecological challenge of massive proportions.

Mr. Chairman, with 44 nuclear powerplants moving now toward construction here and there around the Nation, and some 42 more in the planning stage, it also would be obvious that action may be fast outrunning our ability to apply reasonable environmental controls and safeguards, especially since such powerplants use far more cooling water than conventional fossil-fueled powerplants. It has been estimated, for instance, that the proposed nuclear powerplants on Cayuga Lake in New York to which the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) has made repeated reference, will circulate through its cooling system about one-quarter of Cayuga's volume of water each year. When one relates that fact to the further fact that Cayuga, one of the so-called Finger Lakes, is a deep but relatively small lake—the smallest for which such a powerplant has been proposed—and is also what is called a "stratified" lake in the summer months, with "slow-flushing" characteristics, it becomes clear why concern has been expressed over what effect such huge discharges of hot water into it may have.

Now, certainly, the States should be permitted and encouraged to establish reasonable safeguards against such plants adversely affecting the quality of the waters receiving their thermal discharges—safeguards against those discharges becoming what some people call thermal pollution.

Mr. Chairman, this bill addresses itself to this problem, and it does encourage the States to act.

Mr. Chairman, New York State has moved in the proper direction. Our Water Resources Commission has completed public hearings around the State on definitive new criteria in this respect, having done so under existing authority derived from article XII of the New York State Public Health law. As might be expected, the utility company involved suggests that those criteria are too restrictive in some respects, while others say they are not strong enough.

There is no point here in going into the details of that debate, for it will be settled by those technically competent to judge its pros and cons. But what this situation does illustrate is the fact that the States will move into this picture, are moving into it now, and, I submit, can be trusted to deal as effectively and wisely with this new newly recognized problem of thermal pollution as they have in other water pollution areas.

Now, my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) urges Federal standards, instead. He is, of course, entitled to his opinion as to the necessity for that as I am to mine that it would be best to maintain, here, that same careful balance between State and Federal interests in this area of concern as was achieved on passage of the Water Quality Act of 1965.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but remember that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON), appeared in the well of the House here in July of last year, inveighing and protesting against certain Federal standards as promulgated by the Department of Transportation relative to billboard controls under authority of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. Perhaps, there is an adequate reason for his change of attitude; I do not know. I am sure there is in the mind of my colleague. But I do not believe that Federal standards in just one water quality area, would be wise or workable or necessary.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated and the position of the committee sustained.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the gentleman in the well for pointing out these facts, lest there be a misunderstanding that our States are not moving ahead. Certainly the State of New York, in the matter of dealing with thermal discharge, has, as the gentleman just pointed out. The New York State Water Resources Commission has just concluded hearings during this past month, and it is my opinion that we can anticipate in a very short time standards to be established in that State, and I am sure other States will follow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to direct some questions, if I may, to the author of the section beginning on page 67 of the bill. This has to do with training grants and contracts. It is my understanding—and I would like to ask the chairman of the committee or any other member of the committee who wants to answer this question—Is it the Secretary of the Department of the Interior who will be the one who determines the grants to institutions, the scholarships and stipends that are going to be given to undergraduate students; is that correct?

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentlewoman will yield, there is a present provision in the legislation and under the present law that provides for precisely the same procedure for a similar purpose, but not so broad as this, and in my opinion it would not acomplish the objective, so it amends present section 5(d) which provides presently that the Secretary can provide training in technical matters relating to the causes, prevention and control of water pollution to personnel of such agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications. This is being done presently under the present water pollution control act, and this is an extension of that authority.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. It extends it to the tune of $62 million for the next 3 years.

Mr. CRAMER. For the next 3 years. This is as a result of the report of the Senate relating to the subject matter of personnel in order to accomplish adequate water pollution control. This is based upon their findings as to the necessity for, the number and the estimated costs.

If the gentlewoman would consult the Record of yesterday she will see where I placed in the Record a synopsis of that report.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Would the gentleman further advise me if there were any hearings on this particular section where people from higher education were called in? I would also like to know specifically: Is it not true that the students who might go into this kind of training are presently eligible for all of the other programs that are now available for our college and university students? And specifically would not students now being included in this program be eligible for the work-study program? Are they not now eligible for economic oportunity grants? NDEA student loans, guaranteed student loans?

Is it not true that they are now eligible for all these present forms of student financial aid financed by the Federal Government?

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentlewoman that the report I referred to is Senate Document No. 49 of the 90th Congress, first session, at which time it was found that there are not adequate laws available to accomplish this, and there are not adequate trainees in training or programs available to train them for the purpose of this particular subject.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I believe that in almost every area where professionally trained people are needed there is a shortage, but I have serious question about setting up another program in terms of scholarships, in terms of financial aid programs, in terms of work-study for a particular purpose. On page 68 I notice there is a provision to pay part of the compensation of students employed in connection with the operation and maintenance of treatment works. It is not true that any students who are in colleges or universities today would be eligible for the work-study programs and that such students who are working could be paid by the college or the university under federally financed programs?

Mr. CRAMER. May I say to the gentlewoman that I do not believe there is an adequate program under existence, moneywise or otherwise, to accomplish the purposes of this section, or I would not have introduced it in order to accomplish that objective, pursuant to the Senate report and printed document that I have referred to.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Would the gentleman advise me if he called for hearings of any people in the field of higher education to find out the question of eligibility, for programs and for student financial assistance?

I would say to the gentleman that the students who are in the colleges and universities are eligible for work and study programs, which is exactly what this outlines on page 68.

I also have serious question about the scholarships. There is no reference in the bill that I can find as to the amount of scholarships that any student would receive. The bill provides 4-year scholarships with no ceiling and no requirement based on "need." Also it occurs to me that the students of those institutions of higher education who would be eligible for the program outlined here would not come under the provisions which were adopted last year by this Congress in regard to disruption of colleges and universities. At the present time the Committee on Education and Labor is looking into this whole matter of student assistance, financial aid to the students at the undergraduate level, and at the graduate level. At a time Congress is reviewing all of the student financial aid, it seems questionable to approve of a further proliferation under another agency of Government.

I also notice that there is a provision that you are going to try to attract secondary students with a promise of financial aid. Is this going to be another upward bound program as talent search program duplicating again—programs that are already in existence?

I just do not understand the reason for this proliferation of financial aid programs. I see this happening more and more often on bills coming from the various committees.

We put in so many financial aid programs that nobody in Congress can keep track of them.

I hope the committee will reconsider and reject this part of the bill. The money could be better spent on other parts of the program so necessary in water pollution control.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, it is painful to me, in one very important sense, to oppose the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Stratton).

Were I knowledgeable of the specific local situation about which he is concerned, I might quite well sympathize with his position concerning the establishment of a powerplant on Lake Cayuga.

In another sense I feel almost like an example of those fools who rush in where angels fear to tread—into the middle of this obvious New York fight.

But I think it is necessary to state the committee's position in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Stratton).

Basically, the reason we oppose the amendment is that we do not believe it would be wise to change the well-established rules simply to achieve a desired result in one specific case.

The gentleman from New York would create an entirely different procedure with respect to thermal pollution, which after all is only one, although admittedly one important phase of pollution, from these procedures we have uniformly applied with respect to all sorts and types of pollution since the beginning of the program.

I think it would be unwise for us to change this delicate balance that we have carefully and purposely created and preserved between the States and the Federal Government. The States promulgate their own standards, but the Federal authority must review and approve those standards. There were specific reasons for this arrangement, and it appears to be working well.

I think that this balance has done some very good things by encouraging the States and indeed requiring them individually to come up with State standards on all phases and facets of pollution. We have stimulated a very great deal of activity on the part of the States to help us to fight this great menace.

If the gentleman were simply to offer an amendment to require the Secretary in evaluating State's standards to take specific account of the adequacy of those State standards with respect to thermal pollution, I think there would be no objection on the part of the committee. Such an amendment would not be necessary in my opinion, as the Secretary already takes this into account. But, you see, the States fix the water quality standards initially. The gentleman's amendment would set up Federal standards for this one type of pollution and place it in a completely different category from all other forms of pollution.

We feel that the State should draw the standards. But the gentleman's amendment would direct that the Secretary shall promulgate "Federal water quality standards, expressly designed to prevent thermal pollution." It seems to me consistent with the entire philosophy of our efforts heretofore to abate water pollution that we should require with regard to thermal pollution exactly the same situation that we have required with regard to other types of pollution.

The gentleman's State should be required to set standards in that regard.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman earlier in his remarks suggested that this situation applied to New York and would not apply anywhere else. As a matter of fact I feel there is nothing unusual here that could not occur in many other States. The only point is that New York has apparently been selected as the best bet when it comes to large companies establishing a plant on a small lake, a very small one.

There are a lot of other lakes and there is no question there are lakes in the gentleman's home State. So it is not a unique situation and we are not dealing with a new problem.

While I recognize the need in general, if we are going to set standards, they should be set by the agencies that have done the research on thermal pollution and the States have just not done this research. Would it not be best in dealing with this problem if we write in protective legislation that we need in the situation, now before it takes place, rather than after the pollution damage is done and require the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to set the standards, since they have done the research and are expert in the field.

Mr. WRIGHT. I appreciate the gentleman's concern, but in response to the gentleman's question I think it is necessary to point out that thermal pollution is not a new problem. Thermal pollution has existed, for example, here in the nearby estuaries in Maryland. It has occurred in Chesapeake Bay. Thermal pollution has probably been responsible there for the destruction of a number of former oyster beds and other shellfish habitations. I do not think that it is a new problem. I do not believe that the gentleman is quite accurate when he declares that the States are not conversant with this problem. I would be very much surprised were I to discover that the great State of New York, as progressive as it is in so many, many ways, and as interested as the people in New York and the leadership in New York have been with respect to water pollution, would not have had some standards developed, and would not be interested actively in preventing excessive thermal intrusion into its waters.

Mr. STRATTON. We have standards, but in New York State hearings are going on to decrease these standards now so as to permit those plants to be built.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

As I indicated before, I support the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. STRATTON) and I congratulate him for his work in this area. He has performed a very valuable service.

Thermal pollution, which can be caused by both nuclear and fossil fuel powerplants, presents us with a peculiar problem. Although the Federal Government licenses atomic plants that cause the problem, no agency accepts responsibility for it. The Atomic Energy Commission has specifically stated that it has no jurisdiction over thermal pollution and does not want it. The AEC's sole concern is for safety.

The AEC relies on the State conservation agencies to pass upon the effects that a plant has on natural resources and experience doesn't indicate that that is a very effective method.

The Federal Power Commission, which does get involved in the environmental problems caused by projects under its jurisdiction, is restricted to hydroelectric projects and has no authority over either nuclear or fossil fuel plants. We propose to change this in the Electric Reliability Act, which is now before the Communications and Power Subcommittee of which I am a member. We want to retain AEC jurisdiction over safety and give the FPC authority to pass on other problems. But this is going to take time.

At the present time, the Federal Government is licensing and, in fact, promoting the development of atomic power plants and not doing anything about the serious problem of thermal pollution which these plants and fossil fuel plants cause.

Now this is not a case where the Federal Government is being asked to create standards which will supersede State standards. It is a case where Federal agencies are being asked to set standards to protect from adverse effects Federally licensed projects. The States cannot be relied on to carry the ball.

Much to my sorrow, I have to report that the State of New York does not have a very good record in this regard. In reply to my good friends and colleagues from New York (Mr. MCEWEN and Mr. ROBISON) I must point out that while New York established good thermal pollution standards at the beginning, the State has recently moved to change those standards. The hearings to which they referred are not to strengthen those standards nor to see that they are more effective, but, at the behest of the utility companies, to change the definitions so that in at least one area, tidal estuaries, the standards are substantially lowered. I don't know what the motivation behind this change was, but the effect has been to make it easier for Consolidated Edison Co. to build a number of nuclear plants in the lower portion of the Hudson River, a tidal estuary. I am afraid there will be many situations with respect to federally licensed facilities where the pressure on the States from the utilities is just too great.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTTINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think it should be pointed out here that while New York State has set those standards, they really do not become operative until the Secretary of the Interior approves them. So that this is an additional protection here.

I think it should also be pointed out to our other distinguished friends from New York that if the State failed to establish standards—and I am thinking of other cases beyond Cayuga Lake—that the Secretary of the Interior could, indeed, intervene at that point and establish standards so that in terms of the gentleman's amendment, you already have a dual Federal involvement here. They can set standards, the Federals, if the State does not act within 2 years, and the Secretary of the Interior, in Washington, has to approve those standards or they do not become established.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, what I would like to point out to the gentleman is that we held hearings with respect to massive fish kills caused by thermal effects of the Consolidated Edison plant at Indian Point, N.Y. These hearings were before the Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Interior officials came to that committee and said that no agency of the Federal Government has jurisdiction with respect to thermal pollution from nuclear plants. They conceded that the problem is serious, that thermal pollution is destructive of natural resources and should be stopped, but, they said there was not anything they could do. They do not have the authority. The AEC does not have or want the authority. The Federal Power Commission does not have authority. There is a void with respect to Federal licensing of facilities that cause thermal pollution and it should be taken care of.

This is particularly important, because so many thermal nuclear powerplants are being presented as alternative sources of power to reduce air pollution.

This is a big problem and it's going to get bigger. The Office of Science and Technology warned President Johnson that the bulk of the new generating facilities in this country over the two or three decades will be nuclear. They estimated that at least 250 new plants will be built and the plants will be a lot bigger, too. Each will have a capacity between 2,000 and 3,000 megawatts as against 700 to 800 megawatts of today's plants.

Experts have estimated that within 10 years nuclear generating facilities will be using one-fifth of the total water runoff in this country. They will be using it for cooling and the effect of dumping the very, very hot water back into the lake, river or stream from which it came could be devastating. With the cooling devices now advocated, I am told that the water may still be as much as 25 degrees hotter than the stream. Furthermore, it will be dead water, deficient in oxygen and rich in the nutrients that foster the rampant growth of noxious algae that can "kill" a river or lake.

Nuclear plants have a lot to offer as new sources of energy. But we ought to be careful, before these huge investments are made, that we do have the necessary authority to regulate their operation so as to prevent destruction of our fish and wildlife.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we might get some agreement on a limitation of time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further discussion on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment conclude in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. MCEWEN) is recognized.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON).

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from New York yielding.

I would like to respond to what my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER), said a moment ago with respect to the opinion he has that the New York State Water Resources Commission is moving to decrease or to erode or to weaken whatever water quality standards we have covering thermal pollution.

Here is a copy of the statement by Mr. Alfred W. Eipper, who is an associate professor of fishery biology and leader of the New York Cooperative Fishery Unit at Cornell University, and chairman of the Save Cayuga Lake Committee, as presented to the Water Resources Commission public hearing in Syracuse in March. Among other things Professor Eipper says:

> My compliments to the Water Resources Commission on both its timely recognition of the need for such criteria—

And the "criteria" referred to is the commission's proposed thermal pollution criteria—

> and its solicitation of public opinion on them. These criteria seem to provide a good framework for regulating thermal discharges in ways that will avoid serious damage to aquatic environments, without excessively restricting the producers of heated effluents in most situations.

Then the professor goes on to make a couple of recommendations for changes in those criteria, and then he says:

> In combination with the presently proposed 3-degree, 300-foot criterion, these should effectively safeguard New York's deep stratified lakes from thermal damage.

This clearly indicates New York is moving to strengthen, not weaken, its control standards against thermal pollution, even though the ultimate decisions have yet to be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) is recognized.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER) is recognized.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) is recognized.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, let me just indicate that this amendment is a very simple test of whether we are really interested in doing something about thermal pollution. We could talk about the philosophy of Federal versus State standards, but the fact of the matter is the only effective work that has been done, has been done by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. The only real concern has been expressed by the Department of the Interior.

If we give the job of certifying to these agencies, we can prevent this menace of thermal pollution before it gets under way. If we do not, it clearly is going to be eroded in New York, in spite of what the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) says. The word around Albany is that the tough bill that went through the assembly is not going to get through the senate, and if it does, the Governor is going to veto it, because they are more interested in building nuclear powerplants than they are in protecting our small recreational lakes.

If this happens to Cayuga Lake, and if Cayuga Lake goes the way of Lake Erie—I am surprised the gentleman who fought so hard to end pollution on Lake Erie is not on my side on this question—then many other lakes are going the way of Lake Erie and we are doing permanent damage to the recreational environment of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA).

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, the important fact of this total argument is being completely overlooked; that is, the States must establish water quality standards and they must be approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

After all the scientists and engineers and qualified experts in the Department of the Interior review these standards, if they find they are not acceptable or do not meet the water quality standards that should be established in that area, then they make recommendations to the States to upgrade these water quality standards. Certainly, with all the knowhow in the Department of the Interior, they are not going to permit the State of New York to permit thermal pollution if it can be avoided.

The argument that the State is going to turn its back on the people of New York and allow a company to pollute Cayuga Lake, I believe, is a fallacious one. Certainly the Department of the Interior will not do it should the State decide to do it.

Assuming that the gentlemen are correct, that there is a hearing going on now—I am not aware of this, but assuming there is a hearing going on—to modify the State standards, already acceptable, these modifications must in turn be approved by the Department of the Interior, by the Secretary of the Interior. He is not going to permit any thermal pollution of this lake. But to the contrary assure that they meet acceptable water quality requirements.

As an added fact let me point out to the committee that the company constructing the utility in that area has voluntarily stopped construction until this whole question of thermal pollution can be more adequately studied. I believe there is adequate time here to make this determination before we would see any pollution of Lake Cayuga. I urge the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I take this time in order to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT), so as to get a clarification of the meaning of language in one of the definitions.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask this question of a knowledgeable member of the committee.

First I should like to recognize the committee's excellent work on this bill, which seems to me a broad and intelligent approach to the questions involved.

There is one area in this bill which touches my area closely, and I believe also may affect other portions of the country.

The report, on page 2, under the heading "Oil Pollution," deals with oil and matter, and refers to some 200 substances which conceivably the Secretary of the Interior might define as substances in which prevention of pollution could apply.

The point I wanted to be clear about is that these substances, under the definition of "matter" on page 38 of the bill, would include such things as very fine washings, for instance, from a dredge producing shell as an industrial product. I wanted to be sure that the term "dredged spoil" which is exempted from the term "matter" did not exempt this type of substance.

Subsection 2 says:

> "Matter" means any substance of any description or origin, other than oil—

And then the words "dredged spoil" are used.

So "dredged spoil" would be excluded from the definition of matter. However, Webster's Third International Dictionary defines "to dredge" as "to deepen with a dredging machine; excavate with a dredge." It defines "spoil" as "a material (as refuse, earth, or rock) excavated usually in mining, dredging, or excavating," and gives the example of an artificial island built with spoil from dredging operations. I assume that the term "dredged spoil" would mean that spoil which is removed from a dredge cut, as where a channel is being deepened, and then the spoil is moved to a spoil island or dump in whole, as a waste product, rather than something which might be washed overboard from what really amounts to a floating manufacturing plant.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I think if the gentleman would accept my response, that the gentleman from Texas and the author of the Webster's dictionary and the committee are all in agreement. I think we intend to include in our use of the term "dredged spoil" precisely what the gentleman assumes we intend to include; that is, material moved from one place to another for the purpose of creating a navigation channel or for other such purposes that may require the removal of earth from one place to another. I would not believe, and I do not think the committee would believe, that the type of operation which the gentleman describes as a floating factory and the refuse that is spewed out from that kind of an operation would be exempted under the term "dredged spoil." I do not believe that that type of activity would be summarily exempted as dredged spoil. The extent that the refuse from such an operation would be prohibited as "matter" defined by the Secretary would be, of course, up to the Secretary to determine. However, I think it is clear that such refuse from such a manufacturing operation could be included by the Secretary in his listing of hazardous and harmful matter and would not be summarily exempted from such a listing under the guise of its being dredged spoil.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HORTON

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORTON: On page 75, after line 24, insert the following:

"SEC. 4. Section 12 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" '(f) It is the purpose of this subsection to authorize a program which will provide official recognition by the United States Government to industrial firms and to political subdivisions of States which demonstrate excellence in their waste treatment and pollution abatement programs. The Secretary shall, in consultation with the appropriate State water pollution control agency, establish regulations under which such recognition may be granted.

" '(A) The Secretary shall award a certificate or certificates and a flag or flags of suitable design to each industrial organization or political subdivision which qualifies for such recognition under regulations established by this subsection.

" '(B) The President of the United States, the Governor of the appropriate State, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall be notified of the award by the Secretary, and the awarding of such recognition shall be published in the Federal Register.

" '(C) Beginning on the day following the awarding of such recognition, the recipient industry or political subdivision is authorized to display publicly the flag and certificate, including the display of the flag insignia and the receipt of recognition as part of advertising and other material which is publicly distributed or broadcast.' "

And renumber succeeding sections and references thereto accordingly.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to H.R. 4148 provides for a program of Federal recognition awards to private industry and local government which demonstrate excellence in the fight against pollution of our waterways.

Every once in a while it is refreshing for the Federal Government to help solve a pressing national problem with a program which does not cost millions of dollars to launch, and which is relatively free of bureaucratic redtape.

In the summer of 1966, the National Resources and Power Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, chaired by our able colleague, Congressman ROBERT JONES of Alabama, held hearings on pollution problems in Monroe and Wayne Counties in the State of New York. It was during these hearings in Wayne County that a constituent of mine, County Clerk Leonard Schlee, called me aside and made the suggestion that an effective way to encourage private initiative in improving waste treatment and eliminating pollution would be to institute a nationally publicized "clean water" award, similar to the "E" awards given to defense plants during World War II. This award would be given by the Federal Government to industries which took exemplary initiative in solving pollution problems, through improvement of waste treatment methods, or through installation of modern waste treatment facilities meeting the stringent standards of the award.

Upon returning from those hearings almost 3 years ago, I submitted legislation which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to grant such awards to private companies and local governments.

Since that time, the problems of pollution in this Nation have, despite great effort on many fronts, grown worse. The Federal Government, because of huge budget commitments to the war and to other domestic needs, has not been able to supply enough antipollution dollars, nor even all of the funds Congress has authorized to help State and local governments attack pollution. We have not yet been able to act on a plan of tax incentives for industries which invest in antipollution facilities.

I believe that a nationally publicized and carefully administered program of Federal "Clean Water" awards could provide some of the needed incentive to get industry and local government to respond positively to the sorry state of too many of our lakes, rivers, and streams. My amendment springs from the idea that one of the foundations of private initiative is the desire for public recognition and community approval. Business recognizes the importance of public good will as a necessity for building markets and for obtaining and retaining competent management and employees. Eastman Kodak Co., in Rochester, has demonstrated its awareness of the importance of this factor. This firm, which is in the process of building a modern secondary treatment plant for its chemical and industrial wastes, has publicly contracted with a little goldfish, to test the purity of its treated effluent—using the health of this lively creature as testimony to the company's efforts to eliminate water pollution.

A program of "clean water" awards would provide a double incentive, at very little cost to the Government. It would serve to encourage companies and localities which have taken very little initiative in cleaning up their wastes to get on the stick and do their part to attack this problem. It would also serve to publicly recognize those cities and towns and industrial firms which have already expended millions of dollars to provide truly exemplary waste treatment facilities, or to develop needed improvements in waste treatment techniques.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment would sharply focus on the high priority that our Government gives to correcting the pollution of our environment. Even at a time when the truly massive appropriations necessary to lick the pollution problem are beyond our reach, a well-administered and well-publicized program of awards for excellence in pollution control would stimulate the conscience of America, and I believe, would help to stimulate action on the part of both public and private organizations to do their part in this fight.

I urge each of my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I know of no one who has served with more diligence and who has gained more knowledge in water resource development than the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON), who has just offered this amendment.

It is my opinion that the amendment is one that is of great value. It could be utilized by industries which are making a great effort to meet the problem of water pollution and to increase the quality of water from which withdrawals are made. Therefore I believe the gentleman's amendment would grant recognition to these vast industrial efforts, and for that reason they would play a much greater role in seeking an answer to the solution of a major public endeavor, and that is to clean up the waters of our country. Consequently, I hope that the Committee will accept the amendment, because I feel it has great value.

Mr. HORTON. I certainly thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES). It was a real pleasure to work with the gentleman on the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works. I am sure that through the efforts of that subcommittee and the hearings which we held throughout the country, we did much to bring to the attention of the American people the work that is being done by private industry, and by many local governments, to abate pollution. We found little public recognition for vast expenditures by private industries and for great courage by local elected officials to institute expensive local programs to solve pollution problems.

A program such as proposed here would give some Federal recognition which would not be in terms of any monetary value, but an award which would represent recognition on the part of the Federal Government for outstanding antipollution programs which in my opinion would certainly be warranted and advisable.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I believe the gentleman has a good idea here. Because this amendment was not read in full, we have no understanding of the limitation that would be imposed upon this award. I am more than satisfied that the gentleman from New York contends that the award would be made only to persons who are deserving, industries, municipalities, and others who have done something in terms of cleaning up our streams, and would not be something that would be handed out merely at the whim or caprice on the part of someone, or without due consideration to the efforts which have been made by the parties involved.

Mr. HORTON. I did terminate the reading of the amendment. However, I have sent a copy of this amendment around to all Members. There would be no caprice or whim in the selection of industries, businesses, or governments to receive these awards. The essential part of the amendment reads as follows:

> (f) It is the purpose of this subsection to authorize a program which will provide official recognition by the United States Government to industrial firms and to political subdivisions of States which demonstrate excellence in their waste treatment and pollution abatement programs. The Secretary shall in consultation with the appropriate State water pollution control agency establish regulations under which such recognition may be granted.

Thus, regulations would be required on which to base recognition and granting of awards.

Then it goes on to point out that certificates shall be awarded and that the people, the industry or the municipality——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Horton was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, in order to conserve further discussion on the point raised by the gentleman from Michigan, and on the amendment itself, the committee does accept the amendment.

I would like to have the Record show that the author of the amendment made a very impressive and persuasive presentation before the committee. He had an amendment that showed a great deal of consideration had been given to it. It was reviewed by the staff, both the majority and the minority participating, and suggestions and modifications were made to it.

We do accept the amendment submitted by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Horton).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VANIK

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Vanik: On page 78, after line 17, insert the following:

"Sec. 6. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares—

"(1) that because certain waters of the Nation which have been subject to increasing pollution over the years may become environmental disaster areas in which the water of the region is in immediate danger of becoming unsuitable or possibly harmful to the population of the area, Therefore, Congress resolves by this section to provide an emergency fund to provide permanent corrective relief for those areas of the Nation which are in environmental crises.

"(b) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'Commission' means the Pollution Disaster Commission authorized by subsection (c) of this section.

"(2) The term 'pollution disaster area' means any area of the United States, the Continental Shelf, or the Great Lakes, in which the water has become or is in danger of becoming unsuitable or harmful for the uses to which it has been traditionally used in that area because of the accumulation of pollutants or other induced changes in the environment and ecology.

"(3) The term 'fund' means the Pollution Disaster Fund authorized by subsection (d) of this section.

"(4) The term 'waste treatment works' means the various devices used in the treatment of sewage or industrial wastes of a liquid nature, including the necessary interceptor, outfall, storm, lateral, collector, sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances, and includes any extensions, improvements, remodeling, additions, and alterations thereof.

"(5) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.

"(6) The term 'person' means any individual, corporation, company, association, firm, partnership, society, and joint stock company.

"(c) (1) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Pollution Disaster Commission.

"(2) It shall be the duty of the Commission to establish those areas in the United States, the Continental Shelf, and the Great Lakes which are pollution disaster areas for the purposes of this section.

"(3) The Commission shall be composed of seven members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, four of whom shall be recognized experts in the fields of biology, ecology, and conservation and the remainder of whom shall be representatives of the general public. No member of the Commission shall be a full-time officer or employee of the United States.

"(4) Members shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

"(5) Members of the Commission shall each be entitled to receive $100 for each day (including traveltime) during which they are engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission.

"(6) While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as the expenses authorized by section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(7) Four members of the Commisison shall constitute a quorum.

"(8) The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission shall be elected by the members of the Commission.

"(9) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable. Such personnel shall be appointed subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

"(10) The Commission may for the purposes of carrying out its duties under this section hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission may deem advisable.

"(d) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the "Pollution Disaster Fund". There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to initially establish the fund at $100,000,000 and to replenish it thereafter to maintain it at such amount. The Secretary, acting through the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, is authorized to expend moneys from the fund in accordance with subsection (e) of this section.

"(e)(1) Whenever, in carrying out its duties under subsection (c), the Commission determines that an area of the United States, the Continental Shelf, or the Great Lakes, is a pollution disaster area, and of such dimension that solutions are beyond the capability of any single individual state, the Commission shall notify the Secretary of such determination and the Secretary is authorized to take such action as may be necessary in the case of a pollution disaster area, to provide permanent corrective relief for the pollution disaster area as authorized in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(2) In the case of an area declared to be be a pollution disaster area, the Secretary is authorized to make grants from the fund to any State and to any political subdivision of such State, and to any interstate agency created by such State and one or more other States, for any activity designed to provide permanent corrective relief to such area, including, but not limited to, the construction of waste treatment works within the pollution disaster area. A grant for construction of waste treatment works shall not exceed 90 percent of the reasonable cost of such construction. The Secretary is also authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans (including participations in loans), and to guarantee loans, from the fund to aid in financing any projects by private persons for the construction of any waste treatment facility or any other related facility. Financial assistance authorized by this paragraph shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines are necessary to protect the interests of the United States and carry out the purposes of this section. Loans and guarantees under this paragraph shall be at low rates of interest as determined by the Secretary.

"(3) The Secretary shall, in any case where there is more than one pollution disaster area requesting assistance under this section, give priority to those areas containing the highest concentrations of population and having economies dependent upon the threatened natural resources, and to those areas where the polluted waters are interstate waters or waters along the boundary between this country and Canada, and between this country and Mexico."

Mr. VANIK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as having been read.

I have sent copies of the amendment to both sides of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment before the committee at the present time provides for the establishment of national pollution disaster areas, and for this purpose I have requested an appropriation of $100 million which will be directed toward the really massive pollution problems of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I have always supported pollution proposals which were authorized or which were brought to the Congress by this committee. In my period of time as a Member of the Congress I have joined in authorizing and sponsoring and in supporting over three billion dollars in water pollution control legislation, of which $1.5 billion has been appropriated.

Today, after the expenditure of this kind of money, we along the shores of Lake Erie find ourselves in a situation which is worse than it was when we first started these programs. It is said that Lake Erie is a dead body of water. And we do have a body of water which is deteriorating so rapidly that it has indeed become the Nation's greatest pollution disaster area.

We are likely to become the Nation's first manmade depressed area, because of the pollution problem. There are other parts of America that have a comparable problem. There is a problem in northern New Jersey, and southern New York, along the Hudson River. We have the problem that occurs along southern Lake Michigan, along stretches of the Mississippi River, and along the coast of California.

I believe that it is time that we should consider approaching the problem of pollution on a regional basis, in a massive way, to meet these problems.

For example, in Lake Michigan we find that out of $51 million that was allocated to Illinois from Federal funds, only $12.7 million has gone to Cook County.

Detroit, which pours its waste into the Detroit River, which runs into Lake Erie—probably the largest single source of our pollution—out of $47 million allocated to the State of Michigan in the last 16 years only $8 million has been spent in Wayne County.

We have the same problem in Ohio. Although we have had almost $49 million provided in Federal funds, we find that these moneys have been scattered throughout the State in small but necessary projects, which help, but the great source of pollution, the great polluted area of Lake Erie, receives no consideration at all related to its need.

A great many other grants have been made which are really in the form of economic development. We find a lot of these resources being allocated by the several States, not to clear up existing pollution, but to provide for sanitary systems and sewage disposal systems, which make it possible for new industries to locate in these areas.

In testimony before the Committee on Public Works, the Assistant Director of the General Accounting Office indicated the use of U.S.-financed waste treatment works for the sole treatment of private industrial wastes might become common.

So what we need is a task force approach—something that will be directed regionally to the area of need.

My legislation is directed toward that end. I think about Lake Erie. Some of my colleagues may think about disasters of those proportions that affect their communities. But I say that our Lake Erie problem is international. It is interstate. It is completely beyond the capacity of any single State to solve. Therefore, it is a national problem. It requires a special approach which is not available under existing law.

I cannot just stand by and see Lake Erie and the Lake Erie problem overlooked. I cannot give up on Lake Erie. I feel that we ought to perform a transplant to bring back life to the lake instead of trying to perform an autopsy on something that is dead and gone.

I have not given up hope on Lake Erie and I plead with my colleagues in the House of Representatives and on this Committee to provide the help that is needed on this most critical problem.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman on his amendment and I certainly would like to support him.

I think the gentleman is giving the House an opportunity in this bill to deal with the specific isolated problems of greatest need. The whole approach of specifying disaster areas and moving in with assistance is not new. We do it under the Economic Development Act and we do it with various other procedures.

The gentleman is proposing the machinery that would permit the Federal Government to move in with substantial resources when a problem starts to develop which could become an ultimate disaster.

The bill we have before us provides aid across the board to all communities and deals with a broad stroke in dealing with the problem.

What the gentleman is proposing here makes a great deal of sense and there are certain potentials for great disaster in this country affected by pollution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. There is no greater problem right now than Lake Erie. So it seems to me that we should recall the wise words of perhaps one of the most expert Members of this Congress in this field, the gentleman from Minnesota, who yesterday said:

> Some scientists have suggested as Mr. WRIGHT said, that it may already be, in a sense, a dead lake, in that unless massive measures are undertaken immediately, the problem may be almost irreversible.

Then he said:

> Not only $100 million but several hundreds of millions of dollars will be required in order to clean out and to reverse the situation existing in Lake Erie so as to restore it to an acceptable level of quality and maintain it in accordance with the standards in existence now.

Certainly, we have here a situation where it will take millions upon millions of dollars to restore Lake Erie. If there had been available an apparatus such as the gentleman is now proposing in this amendment 5 years ago or 10 years ago, Lake Erie would not be the disaster area that it is today.

So for that reason, I will support the amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLATNIK. I want it to be clear that if it were not for the negligence of the States bordering on the lake in the first place at anytime in the last 50 years, they could have stopped the pollution and we would not have that problem on the floor of the House here today before us. I want the record to show that. It was not because of any neglect or delay on the part of this body.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would not quarrel with the gentleman's statement in that regard. He is an expert in this field and I respect his good judgment. But the fact remains that what the gentleman is proposing is the creation of an agency or an apparatus that would be able to deal effectively with these problems, these huge problems that often go beyond the scope of the legislation now before us.

I think it makes a great deal of sense. This is the way to approach the problem. The gentleman has said, "Let us set up a fund of $100 million so we can move in and deal effectively before it spreads and affects the whole community." For that reason, I think it is an imaginative amendment. It would be my hope that the Committee would accept it.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I wish to commend my colleague for his foresight in bringing forth this amendment. It is my hope it will be adopted. I think it is patently clear to everyone that Lake Erie is just one of many unfortunate situations that exist in the Nation with reference to the pollution of rivers, lakes, and recreational areas. As an example, Cleveland, Ohio, voted a $100 million bond issue for air- and water-pollution control. It seems to me absolutely necessary that this Congress cooperate with the citizens of our country, not only those bordering on Lake Erie, or other great lakes, and offer them an opportunity to match funds in some manner or other to clear up this pollution which, in the case of Lake Erie, is creating almost a dead lake.

I certainly urge adoption of the amendment. I understand there have been considerations of other methods by which this serious condition may be met and eliminated. I would rather have this amendment accepted than to try to wait for other crash programs later.

Mr. Chairman, the creation of a national pollution disaster fund, will provide a much-needed stimulus to the water quality of the Great Lakes and other national waterways.

This amendment will authorize an appropriation of $100 million for the establishment of a pollution disaster fund within the Treasury Department. To channel these moneys into needy areas, a seven-man Pollution Disaster Commission will be created. Four of its members shall be acknowledged experts in the fields of biology, ecology, and conservation and the remaining three persons will be representatives of the general public. All members will be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate and will have as their task, the allocating of Federal funds to areas of the United States, Great Lakes and the Continental Shelf which have been subject to increasing pollution and whose waters are in imminent danger of becoming unsuitable or harmful to the population.

These areas will be designated as environmental disaster areas and as such will be eligible for Federal aid through the pollution disaster fund, to take whatever action necessary to correct the inadequate and substandard condition of their waters.

Ninety percent matching grants will

be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in coordination with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to any State or political subdivision for any activity designed to provide permanent corrective relief to the disaster area, including the construction of appropriate waste treatment works.

The amendment also authorizes the Secretary to make and guarantee loans to any individual, association, or company for the construction of any waste treatment facility.

This amendment is offered in direct response to the rapidly deteriorating conditions of our Nation's waterways. Waters such as Lake Erie, where people at one time could freely enjoy the pleasures it offered, but now the water is contaminated to such an extent that it is no longer a center for recreational activity. People have been forced to consider the harmful effects the impure waters have on their health and well-being. Plant and animal life have suffered untold damage because of the inferior quality of such waters.

In Cleveland, where the voters recently approved a $100 million antipollution bond issue, this amendment will demonstrate that the Federal Government shares their commitment to clean water and is anxious to provide them with the much-needed assistance in getting the job done. Similar areas throughout the country will benefit from this amendment and I urge my colleagues who share our commitment to clean water, to join in support of this amendment.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I thank the gentleman. I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio for bringing this amendment to the floor of the House.

I note that yesterday the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK), asked if any other water pollution problem in the Nation matches that of Lake Erie. I for one hate to brag—at least in the area of claiming the most polluted body of water in the Nation—but I must confess I believe San Francisco Bay matches, if not exceeds Lake Erie in the complexities of the pollution. We have sewage and industrial wastes of all types pouring into the bay at a rate now exceeding that of the fresh water flow in major portions of the bay. At the same time the Federal Government and the State of California are further cutting the fresh water flows into the bay while building additional pollution pipelines to the bay.

If San Francisco Bay is not now an environmental disaster area, it soon will be. We too need far more help than is offered in this bill, and we need it now. In the future I would hope to brag about the beauties of San Francisco Bay, not its problems, and my contests with the gentleman from Ohio will be in comparing the delights of Lake Erie with those of my bay. I believe I will win hands down.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleagues in supporting the amendment to H.R. 4148 which would establish a special $100 million fund to be used to combat pollution in areas which have become, in every sense of the word, natural disaster areas. I have joined with 28 other Members of this Chamber in sponsoring, as separate legislation, a bill to provide relief for pollution disaster areas. It is my hope that that bill will be accepted as an amendment to the legislation before the House today.

The congressional district which I represent touches on the waters of Lake Erie—the lake which has, as members of the distinguished House Public Works Committee have said, a pollution problem unmatched in the Nation. The Cuyahoga River, one of the major tributaries of Lake Erie, flows through my congressional district in the city of Cleveland. This river is so polluted and so covered with chemicals and oils that it periodically catches fire. It has been called "the only body of water ever classified as a fire hazard." Because of unavoidable age and overloading, the city of Cleveland's sewer system has suffered several recent breaks. For half a year in 1967 and during the last half of 1968, 30 million gallons of raw sewage a day flowed into the Cuyahoga River while sewer lines were under repair. Is it any surprise that the coliform count at the point where the river enters Lake Erie is 1,200 times the bacteria level allowed for safe swimming? Not only is the river totally unsafe for humans, but it is unable to support any form of marine or aquatic life.

The voters of the Cleveland area have just approved a massive $100 million bond issue to be used in Cleveland's antipollution crusade.

Yet the problem of Lake Erie, and even of the Cuyahoga River, is too big for a single community to solve. The major source of Lake Erie pollution is, as a matter of fact, the Detroit River. Obviously, help from the Federal Government is needed in problems as large as that of the interstate and international waters of Lake Erie.

But the legislation before us, H.R. 4148, does nothing to help solve the critical pollution problems of areas like Lake Erie, the Hudson River, San Francisco Bay, and lower Lake Michigan. During yesterday's debate on this bill, it was pointed out by members of the committee that the bill does not provide for a broad assault on the existing pollution in lakes such as Lake Erie.

The amendment offered by my colleague from Ohio (Mr. VANIK), and which I am supporting, does offer hope to areas like Lake Erie which have become pollution disaster areas. The amendment will provide that once a water area has been determined by a commission composed of conservationists and ecologists to be in severe ecological danger, to be so polluted that it is unusable and a danger to health, grants and loans from a $100 million fund will be available to communities and residents of the area for assistance in constructing pollution control devices.

Only a concentrated attack, such as this amendment provides, can save for ourselves and our children these bodies of water, our most precious natural resources.

I urge support for this amendment.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Surely every member of the Committee is fully sympathetic with what the gentleman from Ohio desires to do. He appeared before our committee and discussed his proposal in eloquent detail. Certainly Lake Erie is the most advanced case, among the other great lakes, of the debilitation of a great body of water. Certainly a massive assault should be made upon the pollution of this great natural resource.

I refer the gentleman to some lines I wrote back in 1965. I wrote a book that was published in which I pointed out:

> Lake Erie is not only blighted by municipal and industrial waste from those communities which border its shrinking shore lines, but it is also defiled by more than 20 grossly polluted streams. One of them, the Cuyahoga River, was recently found to contain 4 times the bacteria count expected in a stream of raw sewage.

So, as the gentleman can see, I have been actively concerned about this problem for years.

I simply raise this question: Sympathetic as all of us are, desirous as all of us on the committee and hopefully in the entire Congress are to make the assault necessary to clean up this great body of water and the other great lakes, I wonder if the gentleman has any thought that the Congress in the present budgetary situation is going to be able to appropriate $100 million more, as he asks?

Four years ago we approved a massive program to assault pollution on all streams and all bodies of water in the United States. It was the boldest, bravest, most forward-looking program that ever had been offered in this field. It passed this House and the other body unanimously. There was not one single vote against it.

That bill authorized this kind of escalation in expenditures: $450 million for 1968, $700 million for 1969, $1 billion for fiscal year 1970. That is already authorized. We passed that authorization without a dissenting vote in either House.

But what have we done? Have we made that money available? No, we have not. In 1968 we made less than half the $450 million authorized available. We made $203 million available by appropriation. In 1969 we made less than one-third the $700 million available. We appropriated $214 million. For 1970 the administration recommends that we again appropriate $214 million. This is less than one-fourth the amount this Congress authorized, unanimously, for fiscal 1970.

If the gentleman from Ohio wants to put on the books a suggestion that we will authorize for the Great Lakes another $100 million in addition to this $1 billion we already have authorized for the whole Nation including those streams that flow into the Great Lakes, then, fine, we could do that. But, my friends, would it not be meaningless when we cannot get Congress to appropriate more than $214 million for the whole Nation, for every community beset by pollution, for every stream that is defiled?

What good is an authorization without an appropriation? A total of $214 million for the whole program—that is all we appropriated last year and that is all we are being asked to appropriate this year. That much for the whole Nation. I think it would be a cruel deception to pass a bill that would say we are going to put up $100 million for this additional purpose and then not do it.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the testimony before the committee was that it would take us 92 years to bring water quality up to the established standards that we expected in all the bills we have passed. So we are putting a disproportionate amount on a single project. The total aim of all this legislation is to make geographical distribution of the money so that all the streams may have some proportionate share.

I will say to the gentleman from Texas nobody has done more than I and the subcommittee with which I have been associated as chairman to bring about improvement in and to draw public attention to the state of deterioration in Lake Erie and the other lakes, but I do not think it is necessary for us to take a disproportionate amount of the money and apply it to one single body of water and to the exclusion of the others. We all know, as we have pointed out, we will not be able to have sufficient money to do all the urgent tasks and studies that confront us to eliminate and arrest pollution throughout the country.

(Mr. MINSHALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened for 2 days to the debate over amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. I shall, of course, vote for it, just as I have supported antipollution measures time after time in the past. I will dedicate every effort in my House Committee on Appropriations to see that every cent we authorize today is appropriated.

But, I am discouraged after all these years that the pollution of Lake Erie and funds to save the lake should still be a subject for debate. When all the sound and fury dies down, we who come from States bordering this most polluted body of water in the world still are given only a trickle of money to fight pollution in Erie.

In order to adequately express the emergency nature of the Lake Erie crisis, therefore, I have today written Governor Rhodes asking that he, in accordance with title 42, section 1855, of the United States Code, ask the President to declare Lake Erie a national disaster area. I also am advising the White House of my action and I would urge those of my colleagues from other States bordering Lake Erie to take similar action.

For the situation in Lake Erie is just that: a national disaster, as defined by law, just as real as if the area had been stricken by flood, tornado, or blizzard. Federal funds and forces are immediately mobilized when calamities such as these strike. The disaster of Lake Erie, the decay which is inexorably leading to its death, has been gradual. Perhaps because its destruction has not been as quick or dramatic as a flash flood or forest fire that it has not captured the imagination or inspired the sympathetic indignation of a broad spectrum of Americans. But it is a disaster of the first magnitude jeopardizing the health and the jobs of millions of citizens who live and work on its borders. The lake is literally rotting away and taking with it priceless fishing and recreational areas. Erie's commercial fishermen are suffering severe financial losses, with their total catch down by more than 50 percent. Not a Clevelander who pours a glass of tap water but is reminded by its sickening discoloration of the contamination of the lake.

In 1967 I extended an invitation to then President Johnson to fly over Lake Erie to see for himself the tragic condition of that once beautiful body of water, where more than 4,000 square miles of Erie are absolutely dead, all life strangled by algae. I wanted him to see, too, the miles of beaches closed because the water is unsafe for swimmers.

I extend that invitation again to President Nixon or to those officials who he may designate to make the same flight over the lake, the same visit to the shoreline. I do not think they could fail but agree that this is, indeed, an exceptional pollution case, a national disaster.

My concern and sympathies are extended to my colleagues who argue that Lake Erie is but one of many polluted bodies of water in our Nation. I agree that pollution is a national problem, one of the greatest domestic issues confronting us. But I would suggest that they, too, might see for themselves the incredible conditions of Erie. I believe they, too, would be convinced that this is a special, a unique, case requiring national emergency action.

As regards the bill before us today, I would like to point out that I have both in this Congress and in the 90th Congress introduced legislation to curb dumping of dredging into Erie and other navigable waters by the Corps of Engineers. It is ironic that we hand out millions of dollars to combat water pollution on the one hand, the corps and other Federal agencies are among the major offenders in contributing to the pollution. I also would like to mention that in this and in the last Congress I also sponsored legislation of the type incorporated in today's bill to eliminate the type disaster witnessed in the *Torrey Canyon* incident in England. I am pleased that both pieces of legislation are incorporated and enlarged upon in H.R. 4148.

At this point in the RECORD I wish to include my letters to Governor Rhodes and to the President requesting that Lake Erie be declared a national disaster area:

APRIL 16, 1969.

Hon. JAMES A. RHODES,
Governor, State of Ohio,
Statehouse, Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR GOVERNOR RHODES: Inasmuch as the pollution of Lake Erie continues unabated, constituting a continued serious threat to the health, recreation and economy of the State of Ohio, and, inasmuch as the impact of the deterioration of the lake failed to impress the last Administration and now appears unlikely to receive sufficient support from the present Congress, I strongly urge you to ask President Nixon to declare Lake Erie a disaster area. In making this request, I cite the following Federal statute:

"Title 42, Section 1855. Declaration of Congressional Intent.

"It is the intent of Congress to provide an orderly and continuing means of assistance by the Federal Government to States and local governments in carrying out their responsibilities to alleviate suffering and damage resulting from major disasters, to repair essential public facilities in major disasters, and to foster the development of such State and local organizations and plans to cope with major disasters as may be necessary."

"Title 42, Section 1855a. Definitions.

"(a) 'Major disaster' means any flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe in any part of the United States which, in the determination of the President is, or threatens to be, of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant disaster assistance by the Federal Government to supplement the efforts and available resources of States and local governments in alleviating the damage, hardship, or suffering caused thereby, and respecting which the Governor of any State (or the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia) in which such a catastrophe may occur or threaten certifies the need for disaster assistance under this chapter, and shall give assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, local governments therein, or other agencies, for the same purposes with respect to such catastrophe."

I do not need to elaborate to you, who are so mindful and concerned regarding the crisis situation of Lake Erie, the paucity of funds granted under the last Administration for the fight against pollution to the State of Ohio. I am urging colleagues from other States bordering the lakes to call on their State Governors to take similar action, but I would of course be proud to see you in the lead.

I am certain you agree that conditions in Erie constitute a "national disaster" which has not been brought fully or dramatically to the attention of the Nation as a whole. Perhaps this will be the vehicle by which we can bring its plight to the public and enlist the aid of conservation and economy-minded citizens in saving Lake Erie.

A copy of this letter is being sent to President Nixon, along with an invitation to the President or any official he designates to join me in flying over the lake to survey the dead portions, to tour the beaches closed because of health hazards, and to discuss the problem in specific terms. This invitation is, of course, also extended to you.

With warm personal regards,
Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
Member of Congress.

APRIL 16, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The *White House,*
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Conditions in Lake Erie have reached such a critical point, and past Federal assistance to alleviate the pollution so sparse, that I have written to Governor James A. Rhodes urging him to ask you to declare Lake Erie a national disaster area.

As stated in my attached letter to the Governor, I feel that Lake Erie qualifies as a disaster area as defined under Title 42, Section 1885a(a).

Not only the economy of the states bordering the lake, but the health and recreational facilities of its millions of residents, are in the gravest jeopardy. I do not believe full realization of this threat has been brought home to most American citizens, despite the shocking fact that Lake Erie is conceded to be the most polluted body of water in the world. Its death would have an economic impact reaching much farther than the states sharing its shoreline.

It would be my pleasure to personally show you, from the air, the thousands of square miles of Erie which are absolutely dead, all life strangled by algae, and the thousands more miles under immediate threat. I invite you to inspect the deplorable condition of lake beaches, many closed because they are unsafe for swimming. And I call your attention to the severe financial losses suffered by the fishing industry, where the catch is down by 50 percent. It is not necessary to point out that the death of Lake Erie would be a virtual death-blow to lake transport as well as to local industry.

If it is not possible for you to make such an inspection trip, I respectfully request that you designate appropriate officials from the Departments of Health, Education and Welfare, Commerce, Interior and the Army to join me.

With highest regards,
Respectfully,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
Member of Congress.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as was made abundantly clear, factually, and realistically by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), and by our respected friend and colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES), we are not only aware of, but quite knowledgeable about, and truly and earnestly sympathetic—and I mean sympathetic—with the plight and the problems existing particularly but not only with respect to Lake Erie, which problems are certainly enormous—monumental and complicated. We agree we should begin to work on this large and complex problem, but we cannot approach it on a scale as large as that proposed by the gentleman's amendment.

In fact, I urge this body to vote down the amendment, in a friendly and understanding manner, with the understanding that a subsequent modified version will be worked out by the gentleman and his colleagues from Ohio and members of the committee and staff, and which will then be submitted to the House for consideration. I am confident that a proposal applicable to all the Great Lakes, and in line with the general provisions of the mine-acid pollution section is worked out, that we can agree to such an amendment and work on the Lake Erie problem can be gotten underway, as well as work on remedying pollution problems elsewhere on the Great Lakes.

I do urge that this amendment be defeated and that the gentleman from Ohio be recognized next to submit the modified amended version.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Public Works Committee from a district on the shore of Lake Erie I feel compelled to speak on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

I have cosponsored the bill which the gentleman from Ohio offered. And I am very hopeful that the committee, after this valuable debate, will seriously consider the gentleman's bill and hopefully will hold hearings, possibly on the shores of Lake Erie. I believe we need the bill.

In response to the gentleman from Alabama, while we certainly want to clean up all the streams in the country there are some pollution disaster areas. Just as in the Appalachian approach we recognize there are depressed areas in the United States, so also there are acute disaster areas in terms of pollution.

We have a crisis here, a national crisis which really affects our viability and our future as a society, in terms of pollution.

I do not see how we are ever going to really deal with this program until we reorder our national priorities.

This committee has done a tremendous job, I believe, under the leadership of our distinguished chairman and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota. We have brought excellent legislation to the floor and seen it passed. Today's bill is another major step forward.

As the gentleman from Texas said, a billion dollars has been authorized for next year for a nationwide attack on pollution, yet the Bureau of the Budget comes in with a recommendation for $214 million. That is about 20 percent.

We should contrast that by just taking one item from the budget for the Department of Defense, for germ and gas warfare, $350 million. Many items in the chemical and biological category we never even voted on knowingly. They are effectively buried in the Defense budget. Now contrast that $350 million with bills passed by the other body and by the House unanimously, to attack this crisis of water pollution, and we see how inverted are our priorities.

We do not have the money. Where is the money going to come from? One way is somehow to come to grips with the gargantuan defense budget in an effort to realistically and prudently trim it back so that we have some resources to utilize in an attack on these grave domestic problems.

I can assure the Members, coming from Buffalo, that this is a crisis. This is a major crisis. It affects the future of our area. The same is true for Detroit and Cleveland and all around the lakes. This is of major national importance. And we are putting "peanuts" into this program.

I do not believe, in fairness to the gentleman from Ohio, we can kid anybody and suggest we are going to pass any authorization, because the crunch comes in the Appropriations Committee.

Until we can muster the determination to reorder our national priorities we are not going to attack the problem of water pollution or any of the other urgent domestic problems.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I agree, certainly, with some reorientation of our priorities, but I believe we have overlooked one thing.

When the distinguished gentleman from Ohio was before our committee he testified that the city of Cleveland had passed a $100 million bond issue to help clear up its own sewage problem, but that there were 25,800 able-bodied men on welfare. So let us reorient it and do a public works project, where we can let those people work for the city of Cleveland or somewhere else on a public works project, instead of passing out these grants.

I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK). It is identical to the bill that I and a number of others are cosponsoring with him. Our growing concern about the Nation's pollution crisis is the basis for this action, and it is our hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Ample evidence has been presented to show the need for the disaster pollution fund. The California oil leak disaster, still fresh in everyone's mind, and the increasing pollution of the Great Lakes, and the Mississippi River are prime examples of the need for emergency action. It should be noted, too, as the gentleman from Ohio has pointed out, that the pending amendment does not waive the polluter's liability; it merely makes available the needed funds to get the job done.

Some may argue that $100 million is too much money, that the budget cannot stand it. Well, I think it is time to reflect on what we want this country to be. If we can spend $80 billion a year on defense, we can certainly afford to authorize an additional $100 million to protect our air and water—the two essential ingredients for sustaining human life. It is an investment that will reap dividends far beyond the original cost. The quality of human life is at stake here, and it is ridiculous to put a ceiling or price tag on it.

One other point should be discussed. Last month in testimony before the House Public Works Committee the gentlemen from Ohio brought out some very interesting statistics, indicating that an inordinate number of water pollution control grants were going to less populated areas. I have no argument with those areas receiving equitable amounts of Federal assistance, but I do object to the fact that our populated areas are shortchanged in the process. Gentlemen, we live in an urban society; over 70 percent of our people live in urban areas. It would stand to reason that our populated areas must be served adequately and effectively.

The basic purpose of the amendment is just that. To protect and to reclaim our air and water so that our growing urban population can enjoy these vital resources.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment, but on discussing this with the members of the committee I have refrained from doing so.

However, I wish to call the attention of the Committee to a problem that I think has not been sufficiently dealt with in this particular measure under consideration. This is the problem of controlling the influx of salt water into fresh water bodies and particularly into estuarine systems.

The existing act already indicates the national intention to designate these waters as deserving and worthy of considerable protection, but there is nothing in the act which deals with the threat to an estuarine area jeopardized by the intrusion of salt water—an intrusion of salt water into an estuary means there is a major decrease of inflow of lifegiving fresh water into the estuary—there is nothing in this act which determines that that decrease of fresh water flow into the estauary constitutes a pollution of the estuary and a lessening of the water quality in the estuarine system.

I can suggest to you that in San Francisco Bay, for example, where the proposal is to divert 80 percent of the only fresh water flow into San Francisco Bay and to divert it to other uses before it gets into the estuarine system, the problem will be not only a remarkable diminution in the beneficial aspects of the estuary, but the very great area of that estuary will be reduced to a minimal size because of the reduction of 80 percent of the fresh water inflow and the increase in the intrusion of salt water from San Francisco Bay into that system. This intrusion of salt water and reduction of fresh water, will practically destroy the existing estuary. In addition, the ability of the San Francisco Bay water system to dispose of the pollutants placed into that system will be remarkably diminished because of the decrease in the oxygen content in San Francisco Bay, which is a necessary factor in the reduction of wastes transported into water systems. The oxygen in San Francisco Bay is only found in the fresh water that flows into the bay, and if the oxygen is diminished further by a reduction of 80 percent of the present fresh water flow in the bay, then this means that you will diminish the ability of the water in the system to oxygenize the wastes transported into that system by a considerable amount. So you will add to the pollution by permitting salt water intrusions by reason of the diminution of the fresh water flows and their oxygen contents.

Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting considerable attention should be given to the possibility of requiring the respective States and not permitting them to, as is the case in the present act, but requiring them to adopt as a water quality standard a criteria that affects all of the estuarine systems within their particular borders as it involves salt water intrusion. This would not be a remarkably difficult thing for the State to do and would be consistent with the indication of Congress that the estuaries are deserving of protection in order to preserve the water quality of these bodies of water. It would also be consistent with our desire to preserve existing water quality and with our belief that pollution of existing water quality simply means a deterioration of existing water quality by active dumping into that water of pollutants or by an indirect action of depriving that water body of a fresh water flow into the system itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF WISCONSIN

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin: On page 65, strike all from line 21 through line 25 on page 72.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) raised with the committee some questions regarding this section of this legislation. The provision now before us which my amendment would strike is a provision which was incorporated in separate legislation and which the Committee on Public Works decided to make a part of this bill. Its major sponsor is my distinguished colleague and friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER), and therefore, I have some hesitation about entering into this field at this time to raise some questions about what I recognize is a very critical need—how we train personnel, how we bring them into the antipollution treatment field, and how we bring in the quality and numbers of those who are to operate and man the sewage treatment plants which this country so desperately needs.

But, Mr. Chairman, this provision of this bill would propose that over the next 3 years we authorize $62 million, and we are going to authorize it in such a way that, in my judgment at least, we are opening up serious questions as to the efficacy and the viability of a program of this kind without adequate safeguards which have been made applicable to other kinds of training programs which are available.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida inserted in the RECORD yesterday at pages 9022–9023 a detailed analysis of the manpower requirements which would be involved in this program.

Let me suggest to the Members that in part that answers some of the questions which are raised by this amendment. There are two major problems with our present effort. One of them is the fact that we are not training enough people. The other is that we are not adequately inducing those in other fields to enter the water pollution field. Well, let me run through this.

First of all, FWPCA, according to this information, has already been awarded a grant of something like $1,032,000, a grant under the Manpower Development and Training Act for the training of waste treatment operators; that is, those in the waste treatment field who are now employed in waste treatment plants.

Second, it has entered the camps system which will for the first time, according to this information, make it possible to offer the opening for the training of those who are not currently employed as operators.

Third, there is no limitation that you have to train only those presently employed in this field.

Fourth, there is a rather significant program, one which represents several millions of dollars, called the new careers program which makes available the training of people for upgrading their skill in areas of public service. Clearly waste treatment operators would be, in my judgment at least, one of those fields that would be eligible for new careers funding. Therefore, I question whether or not the committee has determined whether that would be available to them.

Last, let me say—before I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, as I see him on his feet and shall be glad to yield to him shortly—I have some serious questions simply with reference to the language itself.

We are here making awards for scholarships. Are we to award them for waste treatment operators only but not to sanitation engineers?

Second, there is the question of the definition of "institution of higher education." Yet the report in the RECORD of yesterday clearly indicates that the major thrust will be in 2-year colleges for this type of training.

Third, we are making the grants available on a consistent basis with those for other comparable programs.

I am not quite sure what that is except that I am guessing, based on information available, that it is going to cost $1,000 per year for students at all levels, which is the amount used in calculating the total amount to be authorized.

In all of this I want to make it clear to all of the Members that I am concerned and recognize the need for the training of personnel for treatment plant operators. I doubt seriously that this is the method that ought to be used. It is for that reason that this amendment is offered, in order to perhaps get some clarification or find out if there are some facts which are not now available.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which is exactly the same as that offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. We are rapidly approaching a point at which our student-aid program in institutions of higher learning is categorized subject matter. It has been too much proliferated.

Mr. Chairman, the general education funds available to our college students will be cut this year far below the point that I would like to have them cut.

In evidence of good faith, insofar as education generally is concerned, I would say that if this amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is adopted, I will then, when the general college aid program comes before us for debate, seek to add as much to that program as we take out of this one.

I doubt that this bill provides the way we should approach the problem of finding personnel. I rather believe that when the salaries for the positions about which we are talking here reach the point where they should be, commensurate with their importance, that we will have a sufficient number of undergraduate and graduate students in training for those jobs.

Mr. Chairman, there is one further point. Categorical subject matter grants to college students in the past have not proved that they fulfill the purpose for which they were established.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa yielding to me. I certainly would join the gentleman from Iowa in urging that when we have the higher education programs before us, that we make provision for this. I believe it would make sense.

I would join with the gentleman from Iowa in that approach.

Would the gentleman from Iowa be willing to perhaps join with me in suggesting that our problem is that the salary level may be less than a college-trained person may be interested in, so that the inducements in this bill are not guarantees that they are going to go into the field and stay there? Also that those who could go into this field are eligible now for work-study programs, for scholarship, and loan provisions, which are applicable to all college students, even those who are training in this field?

Mr. KYL. I would further state, Mr. Chairman, that in the State of Iowa, where we have more complete sewage treatment plants in our municipalities than in any other State of the Union, we have not had exceptional difficulty in finding qualified people to run those plants.

There is nothing magical about the operation of these plants any more than any other kind of industrial facility. It certainly does not take a specialized college education. That is not where this training ought to be placed. We do need more science students in the field of eutrophication, and other allied fields connected with the business of antipollution, but when we get the salaries for those positions to the point they should be we are not going to have any trouble finding students to go into that field of education.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 7, noes 29.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VANIK

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VANIK

On page 65, after line 20, insert the following:

"GREAT LAKES WATER POLLUTION CONTROL DEMONSTRATIONS

"SEC. 20. (a) The Secretary, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, is authorized to enter into agreements with any State, political subdivision, interstate agency, or other public agency to carry out one or more projects to demonstrate new methods and techniques and to develop preliminary plans for the elimination or control of pollution, within all or any part of the watersheds of the Great Lakes. Such projects shall demonstrate the engineering and economic feasibility and practicality of removal of pollutants and prevention of any polluting matter from entering into the Great Lakes in the future and other abatement and remedial techniques which will contribute substantially to effective and practical methods of water pollution elimination or control.

"(b) Federal participation in such projects shall be subject to the conditions—

"(1) that the State, political subdivision, interstate agency, or other public agency shall pay not less than 25 per centum of the actual project costs which payment may be in any form, including, but not limited to, land or interests therein that is needed for the project, personal property, or services, the value of which shall be determined by the Secretary.

"(c) There is authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this section, which sum shall be available until expended."

And renumber succeeding sections and references thereto accordingly, including any other necessary technical amendments.

Mr. VANIK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, as I stated earlier after consultation with the author and several of his colleagues from Ohio and our own committee, we now have a modified version of his initial amendment which provides for a 20-year program of all Great Lakes water pollution control demonstration. This is consistent with other provisions in water pollution control legislation which treats the Great Lakes as an entity and it is very similar to the acid mine drainage proposition.

So we do accept the amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the amendment I have submitted provides a $20 million authorization for Great Lakes demonstration projects to develop techniques and preliminary plans to remove polluted matters and abate new pollution. It is cosponsored by my distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA) who is a member of this distinguished committee and Mr. FEIGHAN. I now yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to join the distinguished gentleman from Ohio in offering this amendment and in support of this effort.

Certainly the Great Lakes situation is one of dire need and demands special attention.

We do have in this bill provision for some demonstration projects in the lake area. But this is of such a severe nature and the need is so great, I think it merits pinpointing and placing additional emphasis on the dire situation in the Great Lakes area.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio appeared before our committee and gave very persuasive testimony of the needs of Lake Erie and other Great Lakes. He pointed out in succinct terms the unfortunate condition that exists there. He has discussed this grave problem on several occasions with me and other members of the committee, imploring the committee to take positive action to help alleviate this tragic situation that exists in Lake Erie. And it was through his leadership that we have devised this amendment.

I might add that Mr. FEIGHAN has likewise discussed this problem with me a number of times and has arranged meetings with interested industry in an effort to help resolve this pressing problem.

Mr. Chairman, I also would like to call to the attention of the Congress that Mr. MINSHALL from Ohio has likewise expressed deep concern over Lake Erie and requested the committee and me to assist him in finding solutions to the situation.

Lake Erie is a great natural resource and an avenue for extended commerce, as are all of our Great Lakes, and unless we take positive immediate action to preserve them we may lose them. I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) on his leadership and am happy to join him in cosponsoring this amendment. I urge the committee to adopt it.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman, my distinguished colleague from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly rise in support of the amendment which I cosponsored with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK). The situation involving the Great Lakes, and particularly Lake Erie, has been one which has given me a great deal of concern over the last several years. I have consistently urged this distinguished committee which has reported this bill, the Committee on Public Works, do whatever is humanly possible to expedite action for the resolution of the problem affecting the Great Lakes. I appreciate all of their efforts to date and I also appreciate the fact that the amendment which is being proposed here which would authorize a sum of $20 million to be used to direct the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with other Federal agencies and all State and local agencies to carry out meaningful demonstration projects for the elimination or control of pollution within the Great Lakes and the watersheds adjoining thereto will be accepted by the committee.

I would hope that all those interested in resolving the problem involving five of the great natural wonders of the world will cooperate in this effort and that as these demonstration projects are worked out and point the way toward a final resolution in cleaning up the waters of the Great Lakes that this Congress will and it must, I believe, find the funds sufficient to fully accomplish that purpose in the immediate future.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to direct the attention of my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) to several points that I would like to discuss with him with regard to language appearing on page 74.

If I may have the attention of my good friend, I would like to raise some questions with regard to the points raised by our good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) in his recent colloquy.

I would not like the record of the debate on this particular proposal to indicate that there is no power here in the Federal Government and the State government under this legislation and under Public Law 660, as amended, for there to be adequate action where there is a proposed construction of a thermal releasing generating plant which will release thermal pollution into our waterways. I note particularly lines 7 through 11 on page 74, which deal with the question, and I note here that it states as follows:

> In any case where such standards have been promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to section 10(c) of this Act, or where a State or interstate agency has no authority to give such a certification, such certification shall be from the Secretary.

My question to my good friend is as follows: Am I not fair in inferring that where a State has not acted to establish standards regarding thermal pollution, or where its water quality standards have not been submitted to the Secretary, or where they have not been approved by the Secretary because of failure to adequately cover the problem of thermal pollution, then the Secretary becomes the licensing agency, and in effect requires compliance with water quality standards not only by the person who would be constructing the plant but also by the other Federal agencies which would be authorizing some kind of license for construction of either a thermal or a thermal-nuclear plant? Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We do agree with his interpretation of that language.

Mr. DINGELL. The point raised by my good friend from New York (Mr. STRATTON) has troubled me for some time. One of the things I have been interested in is the generating plant to which he alluded. I wonder if it will be possible for the Committee on Public Works to request the staff of that very fine committee, the very able staff, to go into this matter to ascertain whether the provisions of Public Law 660 regarding the establishment of water quality standards appropriate to preserve the quality of water are being adequately handled by the State of New York.

Mr. BLATNIK. We certainly shall. We assure the gentleman that we are well aware that thermal pollution is not only a serious problem, but it is growing in seriousness and magnitude year by year because the heavy demands for power are outpacing our control. I assure the gentleman and the gentleman from New York who presented the amendment that the staff will give us a full, detailed report on the status of thermal pollution abatement control in the State of New York and elsewhere, because this is an area that we want to get into and can get into.

Mr. DINGELL. The reason I have taken this time is that I have been particularly concerned with the situation to which my friend from New York alluded. I am satisfied that if the staff of the committee goes into this matter, we will have an adequate and proper report to assure that the situation to which our friend from New York alluded is being properly handled by all agencies concerned, both State and Federal. I thank my good friend from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) with the explanation for the record that we have unintentionally made things extremely difficult for him. He has had a commitment for the past 2 hours, so I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that consideration very much.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask questions to establish some legislative history as to the purpose and meaning of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. KEITH. I note that in the bill the Secretary is given authority to establish ways and means of overcoming the problem of oil pollution. I notice further that $65 million is authorized, among other things, for research to determine how pollution may be avoided. I am concerned particularly with oil spills such as that which occurred off Santa Barbara. In July 1967, I filed a bill which would have established a marine sanctuaries concept. It would have authorized the Secretary of the Interior to study certain ocean areas and determine whether or not their best possible use might be fishing or perhaps even recreation rather than for oil exploration and exploitation.

Officials of the Department of Interior testified then that they did not have sufficient funds to study this so-called marine sanctuaries concept. So I ask, is the legislation before us sufficiently broad to permit the Secretary of Interior to study the relative merits of the alternative uses of marine areas which fall under Federal jurisdiction? Can the Secretary of Interior study specifically whether or not the ocean off Cape Cod would be more advantageously used for recreation rather than for oil exploration and exploitation? I might point out that Cape Cod and the Santa Barbara channel have very much in common. My hope is that we can study the offshore area of Cape Cod and present the problem that exists now off the shore of Santa Barbara from ever occurring there. If I could, I would like to have the chairman comment on that.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, we have discussed this problem with the gentleman. It is a very pertinent problem. It is pertinent to the legislation we have here.

While the language may not on the surface appear at first glance to cover the problem, on page 77, beginning with line 3, we deal not only with research work and studies and experiments and demonstrations as the Secretary may deem appropriate relative to the removal of oil, but also with the prevention—and we use that word. It certainly was the intent of the committee to give perhaps more latitude than the language itself may imply. Speaking for myself, after consulting with our general counsel, chief counsel of our committee, the answer would be "Yes." The intent is certainly there and we believe the language can be interpreted to cover the problem the gentleman raises.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I have one additional question. Can the Secretary similarly study whether or not the Georges Bank area is more valuable for fishery purposes rather than oil exploration? In this case we have fishery resources versus oil rather than recreational purposes versus oil.

I would like the Secretary to study whether or not it is better for that purpose rather than oil exploration and exploitation.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the ranking minority member on that.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry it took so long to get to these questions, because they are important.

I think an important additional answer to the first question of the gentleman is that the Secretary of Interior does have jurisdiction to issue licenses for exploration. It is my opinion certainly he has the authority, prior to doing that, to determine whether in a given area it should be used for fishing or oil, and make whatever studies are necessary, such as the gentleman suggests, off the coast of his district, to determine whether that present fishing ground should be maintained as a fishing ground and therefore oil exploration licenses should not be granted. That is a necessary condition precedent to granting any permit to exploit for oil purposes.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much. Yesterday, he, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER), very kindly commented on my foresight in regard to the Santa Barbara incident.

As I said earlier, I have been very much concerned about the whole question of oil pollution, particularly as it pertains to our coastal waters.

We first became concerned in my district some time ago after fishermen returning from their grounds reported that acres of dead fish had surfaced as a result of the seismic tests being used by oil exploration teams. Now, after the alarming tragedy off Santa Barbara, we are more concerned than ever as the prospect of oil rigs some day rising from the waters off Cape Cod continues to grow.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of the legislative history we have written here today, I will write to Secretary Hickel asking him to begin at once to study and protect the esthetic values of the Cape

Cod shoreline and the fisheries resources of Georges Bank.

May I mention in passing that fish conservation as related to this bill is also a problem. At this moment in the waters off Cape Cod, the problem is not only pollution, although the threat of it, of course, hangs over us constantly. There is another perhaps even more serious: Fishermen's nets no longer bring up haddock as they did in the past.

Time magazine has made the crisis clear in its issue this week:

> In New England fishing states, the total share of the catch to local fishermen dropped from 93% to 35% in the last recorded five-year period. Much of the reversal was due to those well-equipped, hungry Soviet fishermen, who, in 1964–65 virtually depleted the Georges Bank area of haddock in just one expedition.

And so, Mr. Chairman, clean water is not enough; we must also begin to manage our fisheries resources better.

Getting back to this legislation, there are some other aspects of the bill before us today on which I would like to comment.

I am glad to find that under H.R. 4148 the Coast Guard has been given the authority to deal with the whole pollution problem.

I know when I went to look at the *Ocean Eagle* disaster in Puerto Rico and I asked who was in charge of the cleanup operations, the port captain, a Coast Guard officer, looked around the room in which several interested parties were gathered and said, "Well, I suppose I am." This illustrates the lack of organization, the fuzzy areas of command which have existed until now and which this bill seeks to eliminate.

May I say further that section 18 is a good answer to the question of pollution from small boats. But I would like to emphasize that regulations and standards should not be written without lengthy consultation with the boating industry. The economic costs involved and the limits of available technology cannot be determined without consultation with those who know most about them—the boat manufacturers and owners.

And, too, these are people who are vitally interested in preserving marine ecology. After all, they are also fishermen who want clean water to fish in, sailors who want clean water to sail in, and occasion swimmers who want clean water to swim in.

Also, Mr. Chairman, section 20, calling for assistance to institutions of higher education in their efforts to study water quality, goes to the heart of what has been missing for some time—and ongoing supply of the most up-to-date information about pollution and its cleanup. I commend the committee for making certain that this provision was included.

There are some weaknesses in this legislation, of course, and I am sure that we can all name one or two of them. But on balance it is an excellent step toward a solution to what we all know is an extremely complicated problem—how to control the pollution of our natural environment.

In the future, let us hope that we can also consider farseeing conservation legislation. We cannot only react to crisis. We must also plan well ahead if we are to keep the possibility of a bright future before us. And so, Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my other colleagues in congratulating the committee for facing up to the serious matter of water quality control. It is something which has been crying for attention for years.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNGATE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HUNGATE: In section 18(f), page 59, line 8, after the words "waters of such State", insert a period and strike the remainder of line 8, and line 9.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished committee and my colleagues for the consideration they have given this very important question.

I have an amendment offered on page 59. If the chairman and members of the committee will check this, it seems to me it reads a State may prohibit discharge of untreated sewage from a vessel in intrastate waters in a State only if discharges from all other sources are prohibited. This would mean, as I read this bill, and going back to page 57 and commencing on line 13, section (c)(1), that within 2 years or not earlier than December 31, 1971, new vessels will have to be equipped with machinery to treat sewage that they discharge into the water. Existing vessels would have 5 years in which to perfect some sewage treatment program.

This means that for a period of 2 years on new vessels or 5 years on existing vessels raw sewage could be discharged from the vessels into intrastate waters.

As I understand it, sewage can be discharged raw; can be discharged after primary treatment, which is a little better; or can be discharged after secondary treatment, which is better still.

According to the way this bill now reads, as I read it, if there is a village or a hamlet or a city or a factory located along an intrastate stream or an intrastate lake which has the highest form of treatment, secondary treatment, one could not regulate vessels discharging untreated sewage into that intrastate lake or stream for a period of at least 2 years in the case of new vessels or 5 years in the case of existing vessels.

To me, to put a "period" there, to permit a State to prohibit this discharge of untreated sewage from a vessel within all or a part of the intrastate waters of the State would mean they could regulate that, whereas now they cannot do so unless they also eliminate any factories along the bank which have a high level of treatment, like secondary, or any small cities or villages that might have secondary treatment.

My amendment would permit a State to regulate the discharge of untreated sewage from a boat within this 2- or 5-year period to which I have alluded. Otherwise they would not be able to do so unless they excluded the discharge of all sewage into that stream even though it had secondary treatment.

This would raise the water quality standards, and I urge support for my amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Again, I am sympathetic to and understanding of the intention of the gentleman, but the amendment would cause problems I know he does not want to cause. Frankly, it is not satisfactory.

Until the standards are set on the abatement of discharges and the discharge from vessels the States will have authority in this field. They will continue to have authority for 5 years for old vessels and 2 years for new vessels, even after the standards are established. But once the standards are established it is essential that the Federal Government preempt the field. We would reserve some rights to municipalities, but it is necessary to preempt the field, first, to have effective enforcement of discharges or pollution control in these instances and, second, to have uniformity.

There are vessels which go from harbor to harbor, whether they are recreational or commercial vessels. If they have different circumstances and different rules in each harbor there will be a real hodgepodge and an unworkable situation. Frankly, it would be an unreasonable situation

I do urge that the gentleman's amendment be defeated.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I might say I agree with the gentleman's explanation, and I, too, oppose the amendment.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McEWEN. I also agree with the gentleman's views.

I can say to my good friend from Missouri, the committee gave extremely careful attention to this subject. We heard from many representatives of the small boaters concerned about regulations among the States.

As I believe the gentleman from Minnesota pointed out, this will not take effect until after the regulations are established, so this is some time away. Then, a body of water that is protected from all other sources of pollution could be protected by the State.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McEWEN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUNGATE. At that point, if there is a plant which has been there, let us say, 20 years, or a village which has been there 20 years, which has secondary treatment, the highest form of treatment, could they regulate the boats on the intrastate waters on the discharge of sewage they make without prohibiting that plant or that village from making any discharge into that intrastate water?

Mr. McEWEN. No. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HUNGATE. To me the boatowner

is getting a better break. There will be plants and villages which have put in secondary treatment which will have to stop when this takes effect, also.

Mr. McEWEN. I would say to the gentleman that I think what the committee carefully considered was the amount and the seriousness of the pollution contributed by shoreside facilities and a relatively small amount of vessels, recognizing that if a State wanted to shut off all sources of pollution in a body of water, they would have to do the same with all vessels.

Mr. HUNGATE. Once again let me ask, they could not require everyone to have secondary treatment and treat the boatowner and the village to the same degree. If they will require any treatment of the boatowner, then they must prohibit the discharge of sewage from any other source as well.

Mr. McEWEN. I would say that the gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the able gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee (Mr. WRIGHT), let me say first of all that I wish to commend the distinguished committee for bringing this measure to the floor of the House.

It so happens that I have at least 20 miles of beaches in my congressional district, most of which are occupied by hotels and motels. If the operator of a vessel were either willfully or negligently to drop oil from that vessel into the water and this oil would be pushed ashore by waves and winds, this could do a great deal of damage not only to the beaches but to the private institutions that operate along them. I wish it were possible for the bill to have covered damage to private property as well as to the beaches and the shorelines, but I do realize that you would have had problems in including such a provision in this bill.

I wish to direct the attention of the able gentleman to page 52, beginning on line 16, where it says:

> (i) Nothing in this section shall affect or modify in any way the obligations of any owner or operator of any vessel or onshore facility or offshore facility under any provision of law for damages to any publicly or privately owned property from a discharge of oil or matter or from the removal of any oil or matter.

Am I correct in assuming that your able committee did not intend by that provision of this bill to impair, diminish, or enlarge in any way any private right that the public owner of a facility or the private owner of a property might have in order to recover damages under the general law other than by the provisions of this bill?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is entirely correct. The purpose of this section cited by the gentleman from Florida is to protect the private right to recover damages exactly as it exists today. This bill—while it creates maximum liabilities and requires proof of financial responsibility on the part of vessels, of onshore and offshore facilities, in amounts adequate to reimburse the Government for any claim that the Government may be required to undertake as a result of negligent or willful discharge—this bill does not seek to alter, modify, or change or diminish or enlarge in any respect the responsibilities that one individual or one firm may have under the law to some private individual damaged by his negligence.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the very able gentleman from Texas.

If he will allow me one other inquiry under another subject he mentioned, referring you to page 53, where it says that the owner of a vessel is required to maintain assets and—

> Shall establish and maintain under regulations to be prescribed from time to time by the appropriate delegate of the President, evidence of financial responsibility to meet the maximum potential liability to the United States which such vessel could be subjected under this section for willful or negligent discharges of oil or matter.

Now may I ask the able gentleman from Texas this question: It is not, as I understand it, the intention of this distinguished committee to provide that these assets that you require to be made available and maintained by the owners of the vessels shall be subject only to a claim of the United States? They are general assets, if I understand the situation correctly, of the company that operates the vessel, and they would be liable to satisfy a judgment of a private owner claimed in private litigation as well as to satisfy a claim by the U.S. Government for the removal of oil or the matter to which I have previously referred?

Mr. WRIGHT. In response to the gentleman from Florida, if I understand the gentleman's question, it presupposes a condition in which the owner of a vessel might spill oil or other matter and be required by the Government to reimburse the Government for the cost of that spillage. It also raises the further proposition that perhaps such spillage may have caused damage to a third party, a private party, and a third party might bring suit in a court to recover those damages.

I would say that the purpose of the bill is simply to require evidence of financial responsibility in an amount adequate to compensate the Government for the maximum amount to which the individual might be liable for reimbursement of a claimant. However, it would be my assumption that these assets, as any other assets owned by the firm or the individual involved after the satisfaction of any claim to the Government would be liable to a judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction in a suit by a person damaged other than the Government.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able gentleman for his response to my questions.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PUCINSKI

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. PUCINSKI: On page 79, after Line Seven (7), the following:
>
> "SEC. 9. Section 4 of the Act entitled 'An Act to make appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1905 (33 U.S.C. 419), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Nothing in this section, or any other provision of law, shall authorize the Secretary of the Army or any official or any agency of the Government to dump or permit the dumping of the spoil from any dredging operation, or any other earth, garbage, or refuse material, into the Great Lakes. Any authorized dumping areas in the Great Lakes established under the provisions of the Act of March 3, 1905, or any other Act are hereby abolished.' "

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment, yet it is broad and far-reaching. It repeals the act of 1905 when the Congress of the United States designated about 120 dumping areas in the Great Lakes for use by the Corps of Engineers.

In 1905 that was a perfectly logical and good move. They were dredging from the rivers and harbors and canals relatively clean silt mostly involving sand, and it did not affect anyone and did not create any problems. But in 1969 we have an entirely different matter.

We have heard here today and heard yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) tell us that it would perhaps take hundreds of millions of dollars to save Lake Erie. I do not intend to let that happen to Lake Michigan or any other of the Great Lakes if I can prevent it.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if adopted, would not bar the Corps of Engineers from dredging. I realize that they have to dredge. Of course, they have to keep these rivers and harbors and canals free for navigation, and I do not propose anything to interfere with or stop that. What we are saying is that the Corps of Engineers will have to find other ways of disposing of the dredging and there are other ways of doing it.

Last year when I asked the Commanding General of the Corps of Engineers whether or not he would be for this amendment to bar the dumping of dredged materials into Lake Michigan and other Great Lakes, he said "Yes, we would be for this amendment if you would find us funds for alternate methods."

They have alternate methods.

So what we are really talking about here now is money. We are not stopping anybody from doing anything. And as the Members of the House have said on many occasions since President Nixon has been in the White House, there is going to be a revision of priorities. I agree—and one of those revisions of priorities happens to be in the Corps of Engineers.

If the Members of the Congress will go along with this amendment and bar the dumping in the Great Lakes by the Corps of Engineers of dredged materials and other materials, then the Corps of Engineers will find other methods to handle this material. They have those methods now. They are using other methods.

Just the other day they stopped dumping off the shores of Chicago, and they plan to dump this dredged material on land. In many other cities they are building dikes and filling them with such material.

I want to emphasize here, because the opponents of this amendment are going to try to confuse you and say that if this amendment is agreed to, all dredging is going to stop tomorrow. Nothing is going to stop tomorrow except the polluting of Lake Michigan, because the Corps of Engineers has a whole series of alternate methods available to them.

And I suggest to the Members, and I submit to the Members, that whatever the additional costs will be—and it has been estimated that it would cost some $100 million if they would have to cease the dumping of dredged materials into the lakes and go to a land fill process operation—I am sure that is a fair price to pay.

The only people who are objecting to my amendment are the barge owners who today are hauling this stuff out into the Great Lakes and dumping this material, and polluting the lakes.

Mr. Chairman, I have some reason to believe that these barge owners are not even going all the way out to the designated areas, because the authorized areas are not marked off, there are no buoys around them, or anything else, to designate these areas. I have reason to believe that some of these barge owners are not even going to these designated areas, as I say, but are going just halfway, and dumping the stuff helter skelter in the Great Lakes.

Further, Mr. Chairman, since 1905, when this legislation was adopted, the floor of Lake Michigan alone has risen 10 feet. Lake Michigan formerly was 113 feet deep, and today it is 103 feet deep.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to join me in taking the first determined, deliberate move. I call upon the courage of the Members to support this amendment, and to say to the Corps of Engineers that we cannot get everybody else to enforce antipollution laws if Uncle Sam is going to be the No. 1 polluter.

We have evidence, and ample evidence, in the reports on that desk, to show the degree of pollution that the Corps of Engineers is dumping into Lake Michigan. The amendment offers us a means to try to save the Great Lakes, and not go the route of Lake Erie.

We heard the eloquent plea of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) telling us about what has happened to Lake Erie. We have heard from the gentleman from Minnesota, who has told us why it happened.

I do not want to challenge the statement of the gentleman. I think I have to agree with him. It was purely neglect on the part of a lot of people that killed that lake.

So I say to my colleagues who are on the floor of the House at this moment, if you really want to give meaning to this act—if you want to save one of the greatest natural resources of mid-America—then you will support this amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, again I must use the same phrase, and I hope it does not sound trite, because it is said as absolutely sincerely as it is humanly possible for one individual to say it, and that is that we are completely in sympathy with the problem presented by the gentleman from Chicago, but all of us who come from the Great Lakes, or all of those in whose districts are the mouths of rivers, where this type of pollution occurs, where there is a discharge into a bay, or into an ocean, or into a gulf, are faced with this problem.

But this has been one heck of a problem. There is not going to be an easy answer. We could appropriate $200 million right now and the Corps of Engineers would still have difficulty in dealing with this problem.

Probably the one subject that came up the most often during our hearings was the question of the disposition of dredged spoil in the Great Lakes, and more specifically, in Lake Erie and Lake Michigan, and, I might add, no subject gave us more concern during our discussions in drafting this legislation which we have brought to the floor.

Disposition of dredged spoil is currently the most highly publicized of the possible sources of pollution from a Federal activity. Research is underway seeking to determine whether dredged spoil is in actuality an active pollutant and, if it is, to what extent its introduction into any given body of water does in fact lower the quality of that water. In addition, the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration are conducting a pilot study to determine alternatives to open lake disposal. A draft of the tentative report on this study was sent to the Governors of the Great Lakes States and to other appropriate Federal agencies earlier this month. As evidence of our very real concern in this matter the Committee obtained a briefing on this subject from the reporting agencies several weeks ago. We would hope to receive the report and the administration's recommendations based on the report at an early date.

Whatever the answers are, the continuing viability of the rivers and harbors that produce the spoil are essential to the economics of the region they serve and hence to the total national interest.

For over 100 years the Congress of the United States through River and Harbor Acts has authorized the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to build and maintain the harbors and waterways of the Great Lakes through which flow the commerce of the Great Lakes, so vital to the strength and prosperity of this Nation.

The vast water area of the Great Lakes, joined by improved connecting channels, provides a low cost transport artery that permits movement of material and products in huge quantities to advantageously located industrial areas. In the calendar year 1967, waterborne commerce at Great Lakes harbors and channels totaled 217.2 million tons of traffic. Controlling depths in both upbound and downbound connecting channels are 27 feet or more.

The Great Lakes are connected with the Gulf of Mexico by means of 9- to 12-foot barge navigation on the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi River. Connections with the Atlantic Ocean are provided by the New York State barge canal system and Hudson River and by the 27-foot St. Lawrence Seaway.

In order to maintain this great economic area with its marvelous waterway system, it is necessary to dredge about 10.8 million cubic yards of material each year from Great Lakes harbors; 6.7 million cubic yards from Lake Erie harbors alone. In all, 115 harbors on the Lakes must be dredged, although not all in any one year.

The need for maintenance dredging results primarily because harbors of the Great Lakes are located predominately at the mouth of rivers flowing into the lakes. As a result of waste discharges and soil erosion, heavy sediment loads are carried into the harbors by rivers. Also, littoral drift of bottom material and storm-generated currents redistribute the deposited sediments into previously dredged areas in the form of shoals. This requires periodic maintenance dredging to remove sediments to maintain established navigation depths.

For more than a century most of the dredged material has been placed in disposal areas in the deep water areas of the lakes. In 1966 the Corps of Engineers investigated the possibility of a 4-year program to construct diked disposal areas for the 15 most critically polluted harbors on the Great Lakes. The program was estimated at that time to cost $95,000,000 and the annual dredging costs would have been increased $3,000,000. The magnitude of this cost led to the pilot study to study alternatives to open lake disposal and to evaluate the public benefits to be derived from using the alternate disposal practices.

If open water disposal operations were to be prohibited, restricted, or controlled, as I understand the gentleman's amendment would do, prior to the planned and orderly process now being pursued, the economic consequences will be catastrophic. Trade, commerce, and industry in the United States dependent on our waterways will be severely affected. Railroads, steamship lines, oil companies, steel firms, and other large industrial concerns would be unable to get to or to utilize their dock facilities for loading and unloading cargo at about one-quarter of all ports.

Allow me to include a list of examples of the harbors that would be affected and eventually closed down:

Cleveland Harbor, Ohio.
Toledo Harbor, Ohio.
Detroit River, Mich.
Buffalo Harbor & B.R.C., N.Y.
Saginaw Harbor, Mich.
Sandusky Harbor, Ohio.
Fairport Harbor, Ohio.
Rochester Harbor, N.Y.
Erie Harbor, Penn.
Lorain Harbor, Ohio.
Rouge River, Mich.
Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio.
Calumet R. & H., Ill. & Ind.
Huron Harbor, Ohio.
Monroe Harbor, Mich.
Indiana Harbor, Ind.
Green Bay Harbor, Wisc.
Chicago River & Harbor, Ill.

Conneaut Harbor, Ohio.
Harbor Beach Harbor, Mich.
Oswego Harbor, N.Y.
Milwaukee Harbor, Wisc.
Two Rivers, Wisc.
Grand Haven Harbor, Wisc.
Michigan City, Ind.
Manitowoc Harbor, Wisc.
Holland Harbor, Mich.
Waukegan Harbor, Ill.
St. Joseph Harbor, Mich.
Racine Harbor, Wisc.
Kenosha Harbor, Wisc.
Sheboygan Harbor, Wisc.
South Haven Harbor, Mich.
Frankfort Harbor, Mich.
Menominee Harbor, Mich.

Transporting the spoil to available land disposition sites is extremely expensive; the land is costly and the transportation is costly. In many cases, the States and localities have indicated their preference to preserve their land for more economically productive use. The Federal Government must allocate its available tax revenues among a great many equally vocal public demands. The dilemma is clear; the attainable solutions are dimly seen at this point. This is not the case of one Federal agency trying to circumvent the water pollution control program. This is an out-and-out case of financing appropriately our wants and needs.

Most people would probably agree that the best solution would be the construction of diked disposal areas, which would require a determination that the benefits to be gained would equal or exceed the additional expense. The pilot study should determine this once and for all time. In my judgment, the benefits are there but they must be quantified and a determination must be made as to who shall bear the burden of the considerable additional costs.

I have been advised that additional authorizing legislation is not needed at this time. The basic authority for construction of the diked areas exist. However, money to undertake this expensive proposition at more than a few locations is not available.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FALLON).

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Illinois may have given the membership this afternoon the impression that the Army Engineers are the people who are polluting the lakes or the Great Lakes. The impression that you might have been given, that the Army Engineers are getting some polluted material someplace and dumping it into Lake Michigan is just not the case. When the Army Engineers pick up polluted material, it is polluted already and in the lake when they get there, and they are moving it out someplace else in order to keep the channels open for commerce. In other words, the pollution was already there before the Army Engineers got there.

You talk about Lake Erie being a dead lake. If that is so, then it has not happened in the last 5 years. It has happened over the last 100 years. Certainly, if you want to put the blame where the blame should be, then it is on the people who polluted the lakes—the people who live around the lakes and on the lakes. It is certainly not the Engineers because they are trying to keep the channels of commerce open in this country on our waterways.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman in the well and the very distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for whom I have time and again expressed my deep respect are the great experts of this Congress in this field. He told about the problems that the Corps of Engineers will have if my amendment were to prevail. But yesterday he described the problems that we are having in trying to save Lake Michigan. He said, on page 9038 of the RECORD:

> Not only $100 million but several hundreds of millions of dollars will be required in order to clean out and to reverse the situation existing in Lake Erie so as to restore it to an acceptable level of quality and maintain it in accordance with the standards in existence now.

If you think the Corps of Engineers is going to be faced with problems now, you have not seen anything that will compare with the problems we will face when huge Lake Michigan, with 25,000 square miles, becomes the kind of cesspool that Lake Erie is today.

I am not suggesting that this amendment is going to save Lake Michigan, but it is the first step, and you can then put some meaningful law into all your other efforts once you have proven to the communities on the Great Lakes that the Government itself is not going to be permitted by law to pollute that lake.

The chairman of this distinguished committee says that the lake had already been polluted. I think that is a misstatement. We are not transferring polluted soil from one spot to another. We are taking pollution dredgings from harbors and rivers and transferring them into the clean waters of Lake Michigan. And let there be no mistake about this. I say this to my colleagues, and I would like to hear my colleague's reaction. The only thing we are talking about here is money.

Mr. BLATNIK. That is not correct.

Mr. PUCINSKI. There is no other issue. The Corps of Engineers has a whole series of alternatives they can use right now in disposing of these dredgings, either on land, in mine quarries, in dikes. They are doing so in Cleveland. So what we are talking about here is money. It means the Corps of Engineers will have to come before Congress and say, "You have barred us from this way of disposing of dredgings. We now need additional funds to do it in a different way." I say to you that I will support that kind of appropriation if it means saving the greatest national resource in America, and I say to you you cannot underestimate the contribution that the Corps of Engineers, through their dredging and their dumping, are doing toward polluting that lake. Is that not a fact? Is it not a fact that we are talking only about money?

Mr. BLATNIK. No, we are not. I made that clear. And it is neither our committee nor Congress but the Bureau of the Budget that originally asked for a review, a reappraisal of this whole program, and a study of alternatives. It is not only a question of money; it is also a matter of engineering feasibility. You can build a bridge or any other structure perhaps in a hundred different ways. But the question is, what is the best way to build it to make it most effective for the dollar value?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

What the gentleman is suggesting, in my opinion, would kill the public works projects of the Corps of Engineers in that area of this country, because to be feasible a project must have a 1-to-1 cost-to-benefit ratio. You say the problem is only money. If this means a substantial additional cost on the cost side as compared to the benefit side, and it is suggested that it will cost 10 times as much to do these projects with an onshore method as compared to an offshore dumping, then I am saying to the gentleman that in my opinion you will be killing—and if the gentleman wants to take the responsibility for doing that, that is his privilege—but he will be killing all public works projects under the Corps of Engineers dealing with this subject of dredging in that area of the United States of America.

The second point is that in addition to the fact that it is being studied as to how it can be done, we just adopted an amendment which had as its purpose the spending of $20 million in the Great Lakes area for the purpose of finding out how pollution of all types can be prevented, including the type of thing the gentleman is complaining about. So how far do we have to go?

We have millions of dollars of studies under the present law for the lakes. I just do not understand. I understand the gentleman and my objectives of cleaning up the lakes, but I do not think the gentleman understands the outflow of what the gentleman is proposing.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Yesterday the trustees of the sanitary district had a big meeting. They were discussing the fact that where there is a huge disaster, such as an oil spill or a ship breaking up in the Great Lakes or somewhere else, under the present system there is no way of coordinating immediately.

I would like to ask who is going to move with such emergency measures? There are many agencies, but there is no single agency in charge? Is there anything in this act that would help deal with this problem of trying to set up more meaningful and more coordinated activities in the event of a major disaster such as an oil tanker breaking up in the

Great Lakes or some other place? Is there anything in the bill that would bring some relief in this area?

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman talking about pollution in the lakes?

Mr. PUCINSKI. About oil spills or oil slicks or anything else.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, there is a contingency plan in the act that provides for immediate action in such cases. This is under the direction of the President.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Just for the record and and so Members and I will know, who would activate such emergency action?

Mr. FALLON. The President or his delegate. The bill provides a method by which the President would delegate to the responsible agencies involved such as the Coast Guard authority to take charge of any removal action under the other provisions of the bill. This delegation takes place 90 days after enactment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The moving party then would be the Secretary and the Coast Guard and all other agencies could go in and cooperate with them?

Mr. FALLON. That is right, That is on page 50.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is it not true that every agency involved could simultaneously move in the emergency that exists, so it is not necessary for anyone to take the lead. If one recognizes the need, it could move in without having necessarily any agency coordinate.

Mr. PUCINSKI. And they do. But the question is, Who initiates the coordination? I think the chairman has answered that. As I understand it, in this bill there is a fund and the Secretary could go to the Coast Guard to start bringing quick and immediate relief. That is as I understand the chairman's explanation.

Mr. COLLIER. But they could start moving in without waiting for coordination.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The question is, Is there some apparatus for immediately coordinating movement, and I believe the chairman has answered the question.

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4148, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969. As a member of the Committee on Public Works I have been particularly gratified during my service with that committee to participate in legislation which has continuously moved forward a vitally needed program of cleaning up the Nation's waters.

H.R. 4148 is another step in that direction. It faces head-on, and properly so, the question of what is important at the present time— oil spillage, sewage from vessels and thermal pollution.

For the first time this legislation will place on the books a meaningful approach to the question of averting such disasters as the *Torrey Canyon* and the *Ocean Eagle*. For the first time it recognizes that the many vessels, large and small, which ply our waters can, if not properly supervised, contribute to the pollution of our rivers, lakes, and streams, and coastal waters, and for the first time it faces the fact that a new and vital industry, nuclear plants development industry, which is much-needed to provide power also must be properly supervised so that by its operations through the heat of the waters it may not have an adverse effect on the waters which are needed to cool its processes.

I regret exceedingly that the question of necessary funding for this program is not contained in this legislation. However, it seems to me that by the passage of this program, and by the prior acts of 1965 and 1966, we have placed on the books the tools that are needed to combat the pollution of our waters. We must now, before too much time is lost, find ways to provide proper financial help for the implementation of the laws we have enacted and also provide the necessary properly trained personnel to carry out the operations of our water pollution control programs.

I have merely touched the highlights of H.R. 4148. There is also contained therein a study of acid mine drainage pollution, continuance of the many necessary and needed research programs now underway or to be initiated by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened today as several of our colleagues have expressed their views that this legislation does not go far enough. I agree. I believe we should have stronger water pollution standards. The fact of the matter is that we were limited in how far we could go and still retain the support necessary to pass the bill out of the committee.

In Montana we have the highest water pollution standards in the Nation. We would like to see the rest of the Nation enjoy equally high standards, and I hope we can take action in the future to assure this.

Nevertheless, this is good legislation. It is meaningful legislation. I urge its adoption.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, recent events off the coast of Santa Barbara have called attention to what may be the single greatest potential for pollution of the Nation's water resources.

Oil may be discharged from vessels, refineries, terminals, storage facilities, barges, and offshore drilling operations.

The breakup of the *Torrey Canyon* off the coast of England in 1967 was the first of a series of spectacular events which brought home to the American public the possibility that such an event can happen anywhere at any time.

The *Torrey Canyon's* oil cargo despoiled the coastlines of two nations for miles and wreaked havoc with the aquatic life of the entire area. The ensuing attempts to control and eliminate the oil were more noted for activity than effectiveness. The cost of the cleanup operation of the Governments, private interests, and citizens of France and England has been estimated at around $8 million.

It also served to point up the fact that under current law such a catastrophe would be beyond the capability of the United States to cope.

Unexpectedly such a catastrophe has occurred in U.S. waters. In the Santa Barbara Channel off the California coast an offshore drilling rig blew out in late January pouring many thousands of gallons of oil to form an 800-mile oil slick and blackening 25 miles of southern California's recreational beaches.

It will be some time before there is a full accounting of the damage, despite the best efforts of Federal, State, and local agencies.

Possible sources of oil pollution are many. There were on January 31, 1969, 7,837 drilled wells on the Continental Shelf under Federal lease. Thousands of other wells and drilling operations are to be found in offshore areas under State jurisdiction.

Hundreds of tankers travel the waterways and territorial waters of the United States. An alarming development is their increase in size to 200,000 tons, with 300,000 tons on the horizon. Together with smaller tankers and barges engaged in transporting billions of gallons of oil and petroleum products they are potential victims of accident, of collision, leakage, spillage or running up on reefs or ashore.

Under present law it has been almost impossible to fix responsibility for damage due to oil discharge. Gross or willful negligence must be proved. This, the Department of Justice reports, is extremely difficult and few prosecutions have been undertaken.

H.R. 4148, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, now before the House, will repeal the Oil Pollution Act of 1924, as amended. Instead it provides a well-balanced law which will fix responsibility for oil discharge, provide penalties for offenders and make violators responsible for the cost of cleanup up to $10 million, or $100 for each gross ton for vessels and up to $8 million for onshore installations and those within the 3-mile limit.

As the bill makes the Federal Government responsible for the cleanup, it establishes a revolving fund of $20 million with costs to be recovered from offenders and if necessary a lien may be placed on the vessels and their further use inhibited until their liability is provided for.

The Secretary of the Interior is to establish regulations for environmental criteria relative to methods and procedures for removing oil and the Coast Guard will specify the actual procedures and equipment which may be used to prevent discharges as well as those to be used for removal of oil.

Any vessel of 100 gross registered tons will be required to establish financial responsibility to meet the maximum liability in instances of willful or negligent discharge.

A study of other measures to provide financial responsibilities and liabilities with regard to vessels and onshore and offshore facilities by the Secretary of Transportation in consultation with other Federal agencies and industry, is to be completed by 1971.

The total effect of the discharge of wastes from watercraft into the Nation's waterways, estuaries, ports and harbors is enormous. There are over 8 million recreational vessels, 110,000 commercial vessels, 1,500 Federal vessels as well as 40,000 foreign vessels. These are all highly mobile and constitute a serious source of pollution, and one which is growing rapidly.

Most vessels are not equipped to provide even minimal treatment of sanitary waste and there is little control of the disposal of other waste matter from vessels.

H.R. 4148 is designed to correct this by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue standards of performance for marine sanitation devices, and the Coast Guard to issue regulations relative to the design, construction, installation, and operation of the devices. This would apply to new vessels within 2 years and to existing vessels within 5 years. Standards and regulations for Department of Defense vessels are to be issued by the Secretary of Defense.

Certification of acceptable devices is to be by the Coast Guard, and without such certified devices no vessel may be operated on U.S. waters after the lapse of the applicable time established by the act. Penalties are provided for violation.

The Secretary of the Interior may cooperate with State or interstate agencies in a research and demonstration program aimed at eliminating or controlling acid or other mine water pollution. Appropriation of $15 million is authorized for Federal participation in costs not to exceed 25 percent for each project.

This is a problem which has been increasing of late as previous measures to control have proved inadequate and the volume of such drainage is increasing at an accelerating rate.

Twelve million dollars for fiscal 1970 and $25 million for fiscal 1971 and 1972 is authorized for the purpose of grants or contracts with institutions of higher education to assist them in carrying out programs to train undergraduates for careers in design, operation, and maintenance of waste treatment works.

The shortage has been a serious problem and such a program is badly needed.

All Federal officers with jurisdiction over real property or facilities, which may discharge matter into navigable waters, are directed to insure compliance with applicable water quality standards in the administration of the property or facility within budget limitations.

Federal agencies issuing licenses or permits to conduct an activity which may discharge into navigable waters are directed to require certification that operations will not reduce the quality of water below applicable standards before issuance of license or permit. This is particularly important.

I feel that there now exists sufficient technical and administrative expertise to eliminate the problem and hazards of oil and other hazardous substance pollution. This legislation will serve to integrate and effectuate this expertise in a comprehensive manner.

Passage of H.R. 4148 will insure advances in several phases of the vital battle against the deterioration of the Nation's natural environment. I strongly urge its approval.

The pivotal question for the future, however, is whether the hazards to conservation outweigh the benefits resulting from oil and other resource development on the Continental Shelf and other areas? I believe more research on this question is needed before areas are indiscriminately opened up for resource development.

America has abundant natural resources. However, pollution is rapidly eroding these resources. The preservation of our natural resources cannot await tomorrow—for if we fail to act quickly to preserve our environment there will be no tomorrow.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise today in support of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969.

This bill has been the subject of extensive hearings before the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, and I have participated in and followed them with great interest. The testimony presented has substantiated the serious need for this legislation, particularly in view of the recent harbor and shoreline incidents involving oil pollution. As a cosponsor of water quality improvement legislation, I am satisfied that H.R. 4148 is a comprehensive measure incorporating the basic requirements for meeting our water pollution difficulties.

Water pollution is one of the most important problems facing us today. In spite of efforts at all levels, from that of the Federal Government right down to that of the private citizen, our waterways, streams, rivers, lakes, seas, and oceans have not been cleaned out. In my own State of Wisconsin we have been plagued year after year by fish carcasses being washed up on our lake shores. Our citizens have been offended by the stench and the sight of this debris, our beaches have been abandoned, our fishermen, sportsmen, and boating enthusiasts have been impeded in their activities. The provisions of the legislation before us will assist directly and indirectly in combating this unhealthy and bothersome nuisance.

Another problem whose solution will be attempted through provisions of this bill is sewage discharge from vessels. Ships and boats of all sizes which release waste pollutants into our waters will be required to meet marine sanitation standards to be established by the Secretary of the Interior.

The Water Quality Improvement Act will make a significant difference in our approach to the pollution difficulties we face.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4148, the Water Quality Control Act of 1969.

Oil and waste pollution of our coastlines and waterways presents a very real threat, not only to our personal physical well-being, but also the ecological balance of our environment.

The advent of the combustion engine signaled more than an era of mass transportation, the attendant vast utilization of oil also started a slow but steady deleterious encroachment upon the ecological constitution of our environment.

What victory will we have if we succeed in mastering the forces of nature if the leisure time we gain must be spent in a wasteland?

To date we have experienced only the immediate and obvious effects of oil and waste spillage—the dead fish, crustaceans, and plant life. The long-range damage remains to be seen. I think the actual and potential damage is sufficient justification for this legislation.

We have had experience with oil pollution in Connecticut, and I have introduced remedial legislation in this area. From my experience gained from serving on the Government Operations Subcommittee on Natural Resources, which in 1963 inspected the Connecticut shoreline and held hearings in Hartford, I have maintained a keen awareness of the problem presented by water pollution. I am gratified to note that this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior and the Coast Guard to carry out a program controlling sewage discharge.

The focus which this bill places upon oil pollution is responsive to the seriousness of the threat. The provisions of the bill which fix responsibility and limit liability in the event of negligent or willful oil waste discharges indicate that a realistic appraisal has been made of the problems created by oil transport in vessels. Also, the civil and criminal penalties provided in this bill force higher protective standards upon oil carriers and oil drilling facilities so as to avoid environmental tragedies similar to the *Torrey Canyon* and the Santa Barbara Channel.

Another prudent section is 11(b) which requires applicants for Federal offshore drilling licenses to conform to State water quality standards. This provision will encompass not only oil and waste discharges, but also thermal pollution, a more subtle but no less dangerous form of water pollution.

I am particularly pleased with the provisions of the bill establishing a revolving fund in the Treasury for the reimbursement of a State or locality that assists in oil waste removal. This provision serves to guarantee swift and effective remedial efforts since the affected States can undertake costly cleanup operations with the assurance that their expenditures will be reimbursed.

I look upon a vote for this bill not only as a vote to enact a necessary remedial measure to meet a growing menace, but also as a vote for long range conservation, for if we do not act now the problem will worsen and the funds necessary to meet the necessities will continually increase.

I regret that because of the present world situation and pressing domestic problems we cannot provide more funds for antipollution measures. I look forward to the day when this will be possible, but meanwhile this bill constitutes a good start on this problem.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the stresses on our physical environment imposed by human societies are reaching critical proportions. Many elements of the environment upon which man is dependent are becoming polluted with dangerous chemicals and other substances which threaten to make our air, water, and soil not only less usable to living things, but potentially quite dangerous to life. Perhaps no element of the environment has been more misused than our water, and it is of utmost importance that we devote as much effort as is necessary to insure that our water resources are made pure again and kept that way for both recreational and drinking purposes.

The Water Quality Improvement Act, H.R. 4148, presently before us provides for several badly needed improvements in our capacity to prevent and deal with pollution of our water resources.

The amendment offered by my colleague from Ohio (Mr. VANIK), which is substantially the same in effect as his bill, H.R. 9382, of which I am a cosponsor, points up one major approach to water pollution control and prevention that has not been included in this legislation—Federal assistance for waste treatment and pollution cleanup facilities.

I am greatly disturbed by the fact that crucial time is slipping by without any major effort being undertaken by the Federal Government to begin to help clean up certain specific bodies of water already heavily polluted and growing more polluted every day. Many scientists feel that some of these bodies of water are nearing the point of no return—that they are becoming so polluted that they may never be adequately purified or that their purification may have to be measured in centuries rather than years or decades. I, along, with Mr. VANIK and other Members of this body, am particularly concerned about such bodies of water as Lake Erie, so important to the citizens of western New York.

Mr. VANIK's amendment would allow bodies of water like these, which are terribly polluted, to be declared "pollution disaster areas", which indeed they are. Federal funds would be authorized to be provided to State, local, and interstate agencies in jurisdictions bordering on such "pollution disaster areas" to help them provide "permanent corrective relief" facilities, such as more adequate waste treatment works and sewer systems.

Inadequacy of State, local, and private waste facilities, and the inability of local governments to improve these facilities and to enforce regulations due to lack of funds, are major causes of continued pollution of many bodies of water.

A broad program of Federal assistance for improvement of such facilities is badly needed, but has been omitted from this legislation awaiting further study by the Nixon administration and the relevant congressional committees. But conditions in some bodies of water, like Lake Erie, are so critical now, and these bodies of water are so near total destruction, that I do not feel we can wait any longer. The provisions of the Vanik amendment would permit us to launch a concerted effort to stop further pollution and begin the clean-up work on at least the worst and most seriously threatened cases of pollution among our many polluted water sources, and would pave the way for a more detailed and comprehensive program. In short, the Vanik amendment provides for the emergency steps that must be taken immediately in the absence of a full-scale Federal program of financial assistance for pollution control. And I strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, it is indeed encouraging that Congress has again recognized the need for new horizons and new innovations to meet this Nation's water needs.

By passage of H.R. 4148, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, we have a logical extension in the area of water pollution control. Congress enacted the first water pollution general legislation in 1948, and the Water Quality Act of 1965, together with the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, signaled a new era for water pollution control in the United States.

Of all our natural resources, undoubtedly the most abused is water. So long as our streams, rivers, and lakes could cope with the ever-increasing loads of pollution and waste, we were content to let them struggle along. But, suddenly and dramatically, as in the oil pollution disaster in Santa Barbara, Calif., and the *Torrey Canyon* catastrophe, we find the load is too much.

H.R. 4148, the landmark legislation we consider today, provides for the extension of research, development, and training program of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration; covers rules and regulations concerning the effect of Federal activities and Federal licenses or permitted activities on our Nation's waters; establishes a new training program designed to provide more efficient waste treatment works both at the municipal and industrial level and provides for proper control of pollution from the various types of water craft that move through our Nation's lakes, streams, and waters. A major provision of this bill is the placing of responsibility for cleaning up after a pollution disaster wherever it occurs in our Nation's waters. In order to provide a more positive emphasis to the program, the legislation would change the name of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to the National Water Quality Administration.

Hopefully, this legislation will help to curb the ever-growing contamination of our precious natural water resources, and I urge the passage of H.R. 4148 by the House.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us—the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969—would correct some of the errors of the past as well as lay the foundation for more fruitful results in the continuing fight against water pollution.

We are in an ungainly financial posture at present that inhibits real progress in this battle—unless, of course, the Congress as well as those in responsible positions throughout the Nation utilize all of the authority and technical knowledge available. This, quite plainly, still hinges on the availability of adequate funding.

This bill before us corrects one grievous error in existing law. The Oil Pollution Act of 1924, recently amended, makes it unlawful to discharge oil from any vessel in the navigable waters of the United States and requires any who do to remove it. However, gross or willful negligence on the part of the owner or operator of the vessel or of the installation must be proven before punitive action may be taken, or responsibility fixed.

This has proved so difficult to do that the Department of Justice has prosecuted only a handful of cases. The result is that oil spills, leakage, and accidental discharge have occurred in many and widely dispersed areas almost with impunity.

One resort has been to resuscitate the so-called Trash Act of 1899—that is, to treat the discharge of oil as any waste material. The Corps of Engineers has striven to enforce this act but with wholly unsatisfactory results.

H.R. 4148 would remove this obstacle by repealing the entire Oil Pollution Act of 1924, as amended, and by substituting a comprehensive and orderly program.

It fixes responsibility for spillage—whether willful or not—and enumerates every known source of oil pollution and every possible means. It extends application to vessels, onshore and offshore installations, and includes inland waters, lakes, harbors, estuaries, and all territorial waters of the United States.

Penalties are specific and procedures are outlined in explicit detail.

In the interest of speed and assurance that the cleanup will be immediate a revolving fund of $20 million would be established.

A study of other measures and possible changes or improvements in the act would be undertaken by the Secretary of Transportation in consultation with all concerned interests.

A growing menace to the Nation's waterways is the burgeoning fleet of recreational boats, very few of which have means of disposing of sanitary waste. Commercial and Government vessels, moreover, have inadequate facilities for this purpose. H.R. 4148 would require every boat and ship to be equipped with such facilities within 2 years for existing vessels, and 5 years for new vessels. In cooperation with the Coast Guard their character and capability would be established under this act. And certification of the efficacy of the equipment would be required of all vessels operating in U.S. waters.

Still another growing menace to water resources exists in the rapidly swelling drainage from mining activities, present and past. The act would authorize $15 million for Federal participation—up to 25 percent of the cost of a cooperative program of research and demonstration aimed at controlling or abating this problem.

There is an acute shortage of trained personnel to operate and maintain the many new and enlarged water treatment plants. This Act would authorize $12 million for 1970, and $25 million over the next 2 fiscal years for grants or contracts with educational institutions to establish programs for training undergraduate students interested in a career in this field. Scholarships would be available for these students.

The lakes of the Nation, notably several of the Great Lakes and many smaller ones, are recipients of nutrient waste matter which is prematurely aging them. Some are being referred to as "dying." In any event, their continued existence is threatened by pollution. A program of contracts and grants would be authorized for the Secretary of the Interior to undertake research and development on the lake eutrophication and other problems of the lakes.

Other research and demonstration programs contained in this bill are for the purpose of developing field laboratories, research facilities, experiments and research in the prevention and control of oil pollution, and removal of oil discharges.

It has been demonstrated that Federal installations are among the worst offenders and that many deleterious activities are undertaken under license or permits granted by Federal agencies. Many of these installations discharge pollutants into rivers and streams. H.R. 4148 would make it imperative that in the administration of their activities that they, within budget limitations, insure compliance with applicable water quality standards. Federal agencies, before issuing licenses or permits, must obtain assurance that any activities pursued in accordance with the license or permit have been certified by the appropriate State or interstate water pollution control agency, and that any resultant discharges into water courses will not reduce the quality of the water below the applicable standards.

This act is not a panacea, of course, but it would correct some of the major blunders of the past and would authorize several new programs that hold great potential for future progress in the control of water pollution.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, on October 19, 1967, I introduced a bill entitled "The Clean Lakes Act," whose purpose was the prevention and control of lake pollution. This bill provided for comprehensive pilot programs in lake pollution prevention and control. I am greatly pleased that this proposal has been incorporated into H.R. 4148, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 passed by the House on April 16, 1969.

Section 4 of this bill grants to the Secretary of the Interior the authority to enter into contracts with, or make grants to, public or private agencies and organizations and individuals for the purpose of developing and demonstrating new or improved methods for the prevention, removal, and control of natural or manmade pollution in our lakes. In adopting this provision, the House has authorized the expenditure of $65 million for the 1970–71 fiscal years.

Pollution of our inland lakes has accelerated with the tremendous increase in lake usage during the last few years. What we are witnessing in many lakes is a greatly accelerated rate of maturation caused by man's activities. Without man, it might have taken thousands of years for some lakes to reach extinction.

This problem is, of course, of particular concern to my State of Minnesota, which contains within its boundaries over 15,000 lakes larger than 10 acres. While Minnesota has been a leader in seeking answers to these problems, what America has needed is the kind of comprehensive research program contained in the Water Quality Improvement Act. Minnesotans are anxious to preserve priceless natural inland water resources not only for themselves, but for the enjoyment of the ever-growing number of tourists coming from all parts of the country for Minnesota vacations.

Indicative of my State's concern in this regard, the Minnesota Legislature in 1967 created a Minnesota Pollution Control Agency to help coordinate Federal-State programs pertaining to all facets of the pollution problem.

With the additional assistance that this legislation will provide, the lake pollution problem can be fully researched and brought under control. This is an important victory for conservationists throughout the Nation, and a hopeful step for those of us who love Minnesota's beautiful lakes.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, this is a particularly important piece of water pollution control legislation for several reasons, one of which is that it sets up preventive measures as well as remedial ones. The oil pollution control section establishes the machinery for reducing or eliminating the pollution of our rivers, harbors, and lakes by oil and other dangerous substances; but it also establishes the procedures for preventing pollution from major spills of oil and matter through a rapid cleanup process.

The vessel sewage provisions are in most respects a preventive measure. In many of our waters this is not yet a major problem, but with the rapidly increasing boat population it is certain to become a real problem, and the requirements in the bill for research to find ways to control it as well as the regulatory controls themselves afford a real opportunity to prevent a serious buildup in this area.

The expanded training program holds promise of increasing the number of competent people to operate the vast numbers of treatment disposal plants that are and will be required if we are to successfully clean up the waters of the States.

The bill contains other essential provisions, including the extension of existing grant programs. But perhaps the most significant to my own area are the provisions of the Federal cooperation section and the special section devoted to cleanup in the Great Lakes. This has been a matter of primary concern to me for several years and I have worked diligently to find new methods by which Federal agencies could eliminate the pollution in their own activities. In this bill we give the force of law to a previous Executive order requiring Federal agencies to reduce or eliminate pollution to the maximum extent possible within existing appropriations. The requirement that Federal agencies have assurance that activities they license will not lower water quality standards is also an important move forward.

The pollution of the Great Lakes from all sources will have to be brought to a halt in as short a time as possible. We are making progress in this direction, but we are obviously not making it fast enough. I have recently served as chairman at a meeting with the Corps of Engineers and the Interior Department officials to review the results of a study to find alternative methods of disposing of dredging materials, as I have served as organizer and chairman of several meetings in the past. There are alternative methods. They are expensive and they will require maximum cooperation on the part of the Government at all levels, but we must strive to put them into operation as promptly as possible.

I wholeheartedly support this legislation, as I have supported every water pollution control bill that has been considered by our committee since I came to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee substitute amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4148) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 340, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 392, nays 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—392

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Beall, Md.
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Caffery
Cahill
Camp
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.

Griffin
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hogan
Hollfield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Landgrebe
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard

Mann
Marsh
Mathias
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Podell
Poff
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ruth

Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wold
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—1

Martin

NOT VOTING—39

Abbitt
Ashbrook
Bates
Bell, Calif.
Blackburn
Brock
Carey
Chappell
Chisholm
Clark
Clay
Collins
Coughlin
Cunningham

Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Dwyer
Edwards, La.
Esch
Evins, Tenn.
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Garmatz
Griffiths
Gross
Hansen, Wash.

Hébert
Jones, Tenn.
Madden
May
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Powell
Purcell
Scheuer
Stratton

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mrs. May.
Mr. Madden with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Gross.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Esch.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Coughlin.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Chisholm.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Chappell.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Purcell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 4148, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

YUKA AWAMURA

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings of the House whereby the bill (H.R. 5067) for the relief of Yuka Awamura was passed by the House on April 15, and consider in lieu therof an identical Senate bill (S. 458) which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary on February 18, 1969.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 458

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Yuka Awamura may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of that Act, and a petition may be filed in her behalf by Mrs. Edith Fukunaga, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided,* That no brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall thereafter, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 5067) was laid on the table.

ABOLISH THE DRAFT

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to abolish the draft. I wholeheartedly join this bipartisan effort led by the senior Senator from Oregon.

Some prefer to speak of this bill as the establishment of a volunteer army. I think the emphasis is misplaced. We already have a volunteer army—only 15 percent of that force are draftees.

I think the emphasis should be on abolishing the draft. Conscription is involuntary servitude. We have tolerated this system too long. We should put an end to it.

The bill provides that the draft could only be reinstated by an act of Congress upon the recommendation of the President. The President would have to look to Congress rather than General Hershey for the necessary military manpower needed to commit this country to a long-term conflict. Only Congress has the constitutional power to declare war. Such authority should not be subverted by the continued use of the draft.

My bill would increase the monthly pay of each enlisted grade by $100. It is estimated that the cost of such a pay raise would be substantially offset by savings resulting from the increased efficiency of maintaining a career army.

But more important, any increase in military pay costs will make clear to the American taxpayer that our force levels are already very high and will dramatically illustrate the true cost of our present military commitments. We should no longer use the draft as a cheap way to continue such commitments. The price paid in human terms is too great and unfortunately some of the military commitments are already suspect.

I reject the arguments that a volunteer army would lead to a mercenary army dominated by blacks. It has been pointed out that blacks represent 12 percent of the age group between 18 and 26, and they voluntarily enter the service at about the same percentage. Canada and Britain have volunteer armies, and I do not see any signs of militarism in those countries—in fact, their military commitments seem to be declining. On the other hand, Greece imposed conscription yet was not spared a military coup.

Some would say we must postpone abolishing the draft until after the termination of our involvement in Vietnam. I disagree. That unconscionable war and the draft that has helped sustain it has already exacted a terrible and tragic price in human life and liberty.

My bill would abolish the draft within 6 months, following the date of enactment.

SERVICEMEN EXPERIENCING HAZARDOUS DUTY IN KOREA

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the loss of

31 Americans aboard the EC-121 missing over the Sea of Japan is another tragic reminder of the dangers to which servicemen stationed in and around Korea are subject.

Despite the rising incidence of American casualties in contact with North Korea and the *Pueblo* incident that is so indelibly engraved on our hearts and minds, nothing has been done to provide appropriate compensation for servicemen experiencing hazardous duty in Korea.

I am sponsoring legislation to provide Americans, assigned to Korea and its surrounding area, tax benefits identical to those enjoyed by servicemen assigned to Vietnam. This is the very least we can do in tribute to these men who are risking, and in too many cases giving, their lives for their country.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, H.R. 9636, in tribute to our fine members of the Armed Forces in and around Korea. There is no question that the American people would heartily support such an effort to recognize, in this small way, our great American servicemen.

My bill follows:

H.R. 9636

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exclusion from gross income of certain combat pay of members of the Armed Forces) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) SERVICE IN AND AROUND KOREA.—For purposes of this section, service performed in the Republic of Korea shall be considered as service performed in a combat zone in which combatant activities are being carried on."

(b) Section 112(c)(3) of such Code is amended by striking out "; except that" and inserting in lieu thereof ", except as provided in subsection (d); and except that".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

FLYING "PUEBLO"

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it has become grimly apparent that 31 Americans have lost their lives in the Sea of Japan because of an illegal and unwarranted attack upon their plane by planes of the Government of North Korea.

Every report to date has stated that the American plane was at least 60 miles from the airspace of North Korea and some say it was as far as 100 miles.

If the facts develop as we are now told, the loss of an American plane over the high seas off North Korea is an unbelievable repeat of the *Pueblo* affair, with the added loss of 31 American lives.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation has followed months of testimony centering on the every detail of what happened to the *Pueblo*. It was understood that a lesson was to be learned from that international misadventure.

But it now appears that nothing has been learned at all.

The White House and the Defense Department have no comment on why there was no military escort for the plane although it was flying in international airspace.

There is no explanation as to why no supporting force was on ready to protect that plane.

There is no explanation on why we allowed an American plane to be shot down, in short.

And there can be no excuse.

We cannot continue to let North Korea attack American ships and planes at will. The administration has a "flying Pueblo" on its hands and the American people are watching to see what action will be taken.

Time is fast running out. If anything, there is evidence of a developing policy of permitting anyone, anywhere, to do anything to Americans without fear of retaliation. If so, that is a policy which must be reversed, and the "flying Pueblo" incident is the place to start.

Whether it is an American naval vessel off Korea, an American Air Force plane over the Sea of Japan, or civilian fishing boats off South America, our flag and the lives of our people must be protected.

The Congress and the people of this Nation are waiting for action by its President. And I do not think they should be kept waiting.

The American flag has once again been subject to violation without provocation.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I commend the gentleman from Florida for his remarks.

Would the gentleman not agree with me that under these circumstances, with such an obviously illegal action, and with the loss of 31 American lives, there can be no alternative but some kind of military response and promptly?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I see no advantage in the course of action we have been following. We must be prepared before such incidents occur. What I am particularly concerned with is that we learned nothing from the *Pueblo*.

Mr. STRATTON. Must not we do the same kind of thing in retaliation for attacks on our people and our servicemen that the Israelis have taken against their enemies?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think we have to come to some policy of that nature; otherwise this would just continue, I presume.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman.

NIXON URGES SPENDING REDUCTIONS

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing and encouraging to receive official word from the President of the United States that he is proposing reductions in Federal spending. This is unique, at least during the sixties, and I am hopeful President Nixon will have the wholehearted cooperation of the Members of this body, on both sides of the political aisle. I am sure of one thing: the American people will be overjoyed.

Yesterday, April 15, was a mighty gloomy experience for the overburdened taxpayer. And congressional mail these past few months express sincere and deep concern about inflationary pressures, Government spending, and taxes on a local, city, county, State, and Federal level. Rather than being frightened about a possible "taxpayers revolt," I think it is a healthy sign to have the American people become concerned about spending and burdensome taxes and the need for tax reform. Some of us have been talking about this for a long time.

President Nixon issued a statement last Saturday, April 12, announcing completion of his administration's first full review of the Federal budget. He plans to send the Congress a series of budget amendments shortly. He is proposing new reductions in Federal spending of $4.0 billion, and recommending cuts to Congress totaling $5.5 billion in appropriations requests.

These proposals will mean a substantial cutback in spending of tax dollars in the coming year, as well as a substantial reduction in claims against future tax dollars. This can well mark the end of an era—the era of chronic budget deficit.

The President obviously is determined to bring a halt to the inflationary spiral. It would probably be more descriptive to call it a "spending binge". Inflation has eroded the value of every paycheck, pension check, pay raise, and has worked a severe hardship to the poor as well as the folks on a fixed or retirement income.

In order for the President to be successful in lifting this burden off the backs of our overtaxed people, it will be necessary for the Congress to be realistic, "bite the bullet," and select priorities. Mr. Nixon suggests this can be achieved if this Government is willing to impose the same disciplines upon itself as inflation and taxes have imposed on the American wage earner and his family.

Decreases in the budget will, of course, require legislation, smaller appropriation requests and executive actions in order to bring Federal spending under control.

In taking this course, the President recognized the growing needs of the American people, yet, suggests that there are better ways than old ways to solve problems, old and new. He has directed a substantial reduction in the level of Federal employment—45,000 below that recommended in the January L.B.J. budget. Further, Defense Secretary Laird has already identified defense budget reductions of $1.1 billion.

So, rather than carping, or engaging in demagogy for home consumption, responsible Members of this body will listen to the voice of the people back home, and translate it into affirmative legislative action in an effort to give the President's plan and program the life necessary to move forward together.

THE REPREHENSIBLE ATTACK BY THE NORTH KOREAN COMMUNISTS ON OUR UNARMED NAVAL RECONNAISSANCE AIRCRAFT

(Mr. WHITEHURST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the reprehensible attack by the North Korean Communists on our unarmed naval reconnaissance aircraft in international airspace far outside the limits of coastal waters raises an urgent question of Communist double standards that we must face.

The Soviet Union has been playing fast and loose in American coastal waters, off the coast of Virginia near the Norfolk Naval Base area, and only today we have reports that the Russians are operating in the Gulf of Alaska.

In the affair of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, Moscow showed contempt for our rights to operate in international waters off the Korean coast. Today we are receiving compelling evidence that the naval aircraft attacked was much farther away from the coast of Korea than the *Pueblo*—even though the *Pueblo* was in international waters.

Some reports cite radar information that our aircraft was attacked as far as 100 miles off the coast.

We find ourselves in the rather ironical position of asking the Russians to search for survivors and recover debris of our aircraft, which includes supersecret electronic equipment and codes. This is a peculiar position to be in because the Russians arrogate to themselves the right to operate in our coastal waters while so militantly defending the North Korean extension of coastal waters to suit their piratical convenience.

But I am certain that our administration was motivated in its request to the Russians by the life-or-death question of possible rescue of our personnel.

An issue that must be defined at once is the two-faced Soviet policy of probing and poking around in American coastal waters while supplying North Korea with the ships and jets, and training the Red Korean forces to attack American aircraft well outside the coastal limits.

This question of territorial waters and the Russian double standard is not peripheral in the present crisis. It is a basic issue that must be faced squarely in our dealings with the Soviet Union.

Moscow must be told that they cannot get away with the duplicity of seeming to maintain one policy in the Far East pertaining to North Korea, a state they arm, equip, and support despite its piracy, but another policy in the Middle East where they allege that they want to impose peace, and still another policy in the brutal subjugation of Czechoslovakia. They cannot defend the arrogant North Korean claims to endless territorial waters while pushing the limits off the coasts of the continental United States.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLOCK INTRODUCES ALASKA NATIVE LAND CLAIMS BILL

(Mr. POLLOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing an Alaska native land claims bill. This bill reflects the conflicts, the efforts and the hopes of Alaska for more than 100 years.

Similar legislation is being introduced in the Senate by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON of Washington State and is being cosponsored by Alaskan Senators TED STEVENS and MIKE GRAVEL.

I feel it desirable that the House bill be introduced in conjunction with the introduction of the similar legislation in the Senate so that it may be used as a vehicle to which amendments may be made and so that the necessary reports from the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget may be generated.

I am aware that this bill is not acceptable in all aspects to the diverse interests of Alaska and all of her people. But it does place into the hands of the Congress a framework upon which an acceptable bill may be constructed.

I will be offering amendments to the bill in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, some of which will be at the request of Alaska's native leaders after discussing these amendments with them. The native leaders are now preparing their recommendations for changes and for proposed additions to the bill. Hopefully, we all may come to terms on a bill that is acceptable to the Congress, Alaska's Indians, Eskimos and Aleuts, the State of Alaska and the Department of the Interior, and which will carry the blessings of the President and the administration.

It will be easier and more productive, I feel, to direct our attention to this single bill rather than to a series of bills on the land claims issue.

Congress has historically reserved to itself the right to make determination of the land ownership rights of the Alaskan natives.

Today there is a sense of urgency in resolving this issue.

Because of the native claims, Alaska lies under a super freeze, imposed by the former and the present Secretaries of the Interior. The native people are uncertain of their future. The economy of the State is slowly being paralyzed. The land claims issue must be resolved justly and fairly so that all of Alaska can move ahead.

There appears to be an acceptance by both Houses of the Congress of the need to enact land claims legislation for Alaska before this Congress adjourns. As Members of the 91st Congress, we have the opportunity to arrive at a fair and equitable solution to this most complex problem which has plagued us for more than a century.

Gentlemen, I consider the resolution of Alaska's land claims as one of the most important issues that will confront me during my tenure in Congress. It is with utmost pride that I introduce today the bill that hopefully will bring to the native people and all citizens of Alaska that fair treatment which they so justly deserve. The U.S. Congress is in the unique position of now solving this historic and longstanding problem.

THE SHOOTING DOWN OF AN AMERICAN PLANE BY THE NORTH KOREANS

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday an unprovoked attack on a U.S. military aircraft in international waters destroyed one of our planes, its technical equipment, and probably 31 American lives. This was a flag aircraft and its deliberate destruction by a foreign nation in a shootdown was an act of war by North Korea. Unless the United States reacts positively and firmly to retaliate and hence deter any similar future aggression upon our personnel even our military forces will be sitting ducks for trigger-happy Communists anywhere in the world.

This hostile attack has taken place when a new administration is in control of the U.S. Government. It occurs in an area in which by bitter experience gained in a prior administration we know what can happen if patrol craft—air or naval—are put in positions lacking powerful, effective, and immediately available protection. There was much justifiable criticism that those responsible for the assignment of the *Pueblo* off Wonsan Harbor ought to have anticipated and protected against a possible attack. Yet there was no standby fighter-bomber protection at Seoul or even at sea. Now, only months later and in the same general area, we apparently have military aircraft on surveillance but where is the protection?

The Migs that shot down our plane are reported to have taken off from a North Korean airfield nearby. Is that airfield and are those Migs to be left unpunished? How can there be either self-respect within the United States, or respect for the United States in the international community, or morale within our Armed Forces if we fail now to respond to this unprovoked aggression and murder of our men in uniform?

Mr. Speaker, at the time of the *Pueblo* seizure I said on the floor of this House that U.S. policy should be that—

> No Nation anywhere in the world should be allowed to capture an American ship, or shoot down an American airplane, or kill an American citizen without all hell breaking loose for them—not just a protest from the U.S. State Department to fall on deaf ears in an enemy land.

That was January 25, 1968. I repeat that statement here today, April 16, 1969.

Let us for once act positively and courageously to respond to this aggression. Let us establish as the policy of the new administration that we will protect and defend our citizens engaged in lawful activity wherever they may be in the world, in or out of uniform. Above all let us not again leave this incident to languish in ignominy in the wailing halls of ineffective diplomatic protest.

Mr. Speaker, America is no longer a

world leader if we tolerate the unprovoked aggression and murder of our men, whatever may be the risks involved. Sometimes risks must be taken to earn the right to survive in freedom in a cruel world. This is one of those times.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not agree that we are dealing with barbarians, and that perhaps the axiom that an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth might well apply in dealing with barbarians?

Mr. WYMAN. Moshe Dayan would certainly agree. Here we are dealing with Communists, and Communists today hate us as they always have. They are our enemies today as they have been over the years past. The record proves it.

It may be highly inadvisable to risk becoming involved in a military and strategic sense in another area of conflict at this time—God knows we all wish to avoid that—but we must not fail to respond immediately to deter this sort of deliberate murder of our men, even if the response must of necessity be a military one. The world is watching.

AMENDING UNIFORM TIME ACT

(Mr. FLYNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing for myself, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. HAGAN, and Mr. STUCKEY, a bill to amend the Uniform Time Act to terminate the observance of daylight savings time on the first Monday of September of each year—Labor Day.

The citizens of my State of Georgia have experienced 2 years of daylight savings time and are generally satisfied with its observance from May through Labor Day. An overwhelming number of Georgians, however, have expressed great dissatisfaction with the present practice of extending daylight savings time beyond Labor Day.

The principal reason for this objection is the apparent safety hazard to small schoolchildren in rural areas, many of whom must walk from their homes to the nearest schoolbus stop. Others ride bicycles to school. Under the present termination date of daylight savings time this walking and bicycle riding has to be done before the sun comes up.

The school year for these children begins in the last week of August. From about the second week in September, when the daylight hours are reduced in number, until the end of October, these children must leave their homes in the early morning hours before first light and make their way to school during the period of time when visibility is restricted and when traffic is heaviest.

We know of no compelling or controversial reason why daylight savings time should not end on Labor Day of each year, and we feel that if such action were taken, most of the objections to the observance of daylight savings time would be removed.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that Congress will take immediate steps to amend the Uniform Time Act to terminate the observance of daylight savings time on Labor Day of each year.

HOGAN CALLS FOR HOBSON'S FIRING

(Mr. HOGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a shocking article which appeared in the Washington Post today. The article was headlined "Hobson: Black Community Must Take Over Schools."

The article concerns a speech made last night at Georgetown University by Mr. Julius Hobson, an employee of the Social Security Administration and a member of the District of Columbia School Board. Mr. Hobson is reported as telling the students that he is a Marxist Socialist and that he believes that the American free enterprise system "must be overthrown by force and violence." He told the students that he "believes in force and violence" because "it is not possible to solve the social problems under the present social and economic system."

He said:

> I am personally a socialist and believe in the social-economic theories of Karl Marx.

He said further that he feels that—

> the struggle is international, worldwide, and we should make use of resources outside the United States—including Cuba and China—in the fight against capitalism.

Mr. Speaker, these statements are treasonous. They are reprehensible from any American; they are totally intolerable from an employee of the Federal Government.

Recently, a delegation of teachers from the District of Columbia visited me in my office and informed me that Mr. Julius Hobson is "running the District of Columbia public school system." They also advised me that Marxism is being taught in at least one school in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Hobson has now removed any doubt as to where his true allegiance lies. If the statements attributed to him are true, Mr. Hobson has violated the oath he took as a Federal employee.

I am asking the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to fire Mr. Hobson. I am asking the FBI to conduct a thorough investigation of him to determine the extent of his subversive activities. I am asking the Civil Service Commission to determine whether or not an employee who is engaged in this type of activity should be continued in the Federal service. I am also asking the chairman of the House District of Columbia Committee to study the District of Columbia school system to determine the extent of Marxist socialism doctrine in the curriculum and to determine what action might be taken to minimize the influence of Mr. Hobson regarding the District of Columbia public schools.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, statements such as those attributed to Mr. Hobson cannot be ignored. We would be derelict in our duty to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States if we permitted such treasonous remarks to go unchallenged.

I include the article which I referred to, which appeared in the Washington Post on April 16, 1969, in the RECORD at this point:

HOBSON: BLACK COMMUNITY MUST TAKE OVER SCHOOLS

(By Paul Hodge)

Washington School Board member Julius Hobson told Georgetown University students last night the city's "black community is going to have to get angry and take over the schools, physically" in order to improve them.

He also told the students that he was a Marxist socialist and believes that the American free-enterprise system "must be overthrown by force and violence" before the gap can be bridged between the Nation's haves and havenots.

Washington's students "have nothing to lose by raising hell . . . (even if) they take over, control, occupy the schools. Nothing more can happen to them . . . They have nothing to lose but their ignorance," the 46-year-old economist with the Social Security Administration said.

Hobson claimed credit for recent school Board approval of a black studies program in the schools, introduction of a course in Swahili and for blocking construction of the new Takoma Elementary School.

"I got Swahili because I got 50 students to come down and raise hell and disrupt the meeting until the Board agreed to Swahili," he said.

To opponents of the proposed design for the Tacoma School "I told them to get a couple hundred people, come down and bust up the meeting. They did, and we put off construction of the building."

He criticized his fellow School Board members and Negroes who attempted to improve the political and educational systems from within, and said that he would not be surprised if violence flared.

Speaking during Georgetown's Black Awareness Week, Hobson said he "believes in force and violence" because "it is not possible to solve the social problems under the present economic and social system."

He said "I'm personally a socialist and believe in the social-economic theories of Karl Marx." And he said twice, for some disbelieving students, that he felt "the struggle is international, worldwide and we should make use of resources outside the United States . . . including Cuba and China," in the fight against capitalism.

"The destruction of capitalism is essential to ending poverty. You can't have political democracy without economic democracy," Hobson asserted.

To some of the 100 students present who questioned his advocating violence, he answered that violence is in the American tradition. "We are the most violent nation in the history of mankind . . . it's our way of life."

Hobson said Washington's school system is violating Judge J. Skelly Wright's 1967 decision by continuing to spend school money unequally among city schools. "Wilson High School students are getting 21 books per child, while at Dunbar High School they get six per child," he said, and "Wilson spends $820 on each pupil compared to $425 at Dunbar."

He said he was going back to court with these and other "maldistribution" figures and force a more equal distribution.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE JULIUS HOBSON A SELF-DECLARED SOCIALIST AND SUPPORTER OF THE MARXIST THEORY OF ECONOMICS

(Mr. WAGGONNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. **WAGGONNER**. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, this morning's Washington Post carried a news item reporting on a meeting last night at Georgetown University and the appearance there of one Julius Hobson as a participant in a Black Awareness Week seminar at Georgetown, wherein Julius Hobson, who this news item describes as an economist in the employ of the Social Security Administration and an elected member of the Washington School Board, is reported as having said that he is a Socialist, and believes in the social-economic theories of Karl Marx.

He said that he supported the principle of physical takeover of schools; the violent overthrow of the American system; that he thought raising a little hell would be good for this country, and that assistance in the "struggle" should be sought in Communist China and Communist Cuba.

Now, to my knowledge this is the first time that an elected official in the United States and, as reported by this news item, an employee of the U.S. Government, has spoken out and said that he was a Socialist, and that he advocated the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government. I have, today, demanded that the Social Security Administration fire this man for sedition and/or treason.

If the Social Security Administrator has any backbone at all he will fire this man, and if the Department of Justice pursues its task it will prosecute him for having advocated the violent overthrow of this Government. This breed of scum does not deserve to be paid by the taxpayers of this country, and he is un-American if his beliefs are what he says they are.

It is time to send that man somewhere else.

The Washington Post story follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 16, 1969]

SCHOOL SEIZURES SEEN WAY TO IMPROVE THEM

(By Paul Hodge)

Washington School Board member Julius Hobson told Georgetown University students last night that the city's "black community is going to have to get angry and take over the schools, physically" in order to improve them.

He also told the students that he was a Marxist socialist and believes that the American free-enterprise system "must be overthrown by force and violence" before the gap can be bridged between the Nation's haves and have-nots.

Washington's students "have nothing to lose by raising hell . . . (even if) they take over, control, occupy the schools. Nothing more can happen to them . . . They have nothing to lose but their ignorance," the 46-year-old economist with the Social Security Administration said.

Hobson claimed credit for recent School Board approval of a black studies program in the schools, introduction of a course in Swahili and for blocking construction of the new Takoma Elementary School.

"I got Swahili because I got 50 students to come down and raise hell and disrupt the meeting until the Board agreed to Swahili," he said.

To opponents of the proposed design for the Takoma School "I told them to get a couple hundred people, come down and bust up the meeting. They did, and we put off construction of the building."

He criticized his fellow School Board members and Negroes who attempted to improve the political and educational systems from within, and said that he would not be surprised if violence flared.

Speaking during Georgetown's Black Awareness Week, Hobson said he "believes in force and violence" because "it is not possible to solve the social problems under the present economic and social system."

He said "I'm personally a socialist and believe in the social-economic theories of Karl Marx." And he said twice, for some disbelieving students, that he felt "the struggle is international, worldwide and we should make use of resources outside the United States . . . including Cuba and China," in the fight against capitalism.

"The destruction of capitalism is essential to ending poverty. You can't have political democracy without economic democracy," Hobson asserted.

To some of the 100 students present who questioned his advocating violence, he answered that violence is in the American tradition. "We are the most violent nation in the history of mankind . . . it's our way of life."

Hobson said Washington's school system is violating Judge J. Skelly Wright's 1967 decision by continuing to spend school money unequally among city schools. "Wilson High School students are getting 21 books per child, while at Dunbar High School they get six per child," he said, and "Wilson spends $820 on each pupil compared to $425 at Dunbar."

He said he was going back to court with these and other "maldistribution" figures and force a more equal distribution.

THE PRESIDENT'S DOMESTIC PROPOSALS AND CUTBACK IN PROPOSED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

(Mr. **BURTON** of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. **BURTON** of California. Mr. Speaker, I noted in reading the press this morning that President Nixon has revealed a portion of his program including a cutback in the proposed social security benefit increases recommended earlier this year by President Johnson.

By way of background, President Johnson, just prior to leaving office, proposed to increase revenues to the Social Security trust fund for fiscal year 1970 by increasing the current taxable wage rate of $7,800 per year to $9,000 per year, effective January 1, 1970.

President Johnson further recommended moving ahead the current provision of the Social Security Act wherein the 9.6 percent contribution rate—4.8 percent from employee and 4.8 percent from employer—is increased to 10.4 percent—5.2 percent from employee and 5.2 percent from employer—from the scheduled January 1, 1971, effective date to January 1, 1970.

President Johnson recommended that social security benefit payments be increased to 10 percent. These payments were to become effective starting January 1970—the first check being mailed out February 3, 1970.

President Nixon, although silent on the matter on increasing the Social Security trust fund revenues, has not suggested any changes in President Johnson's proposal on the revenues. However, President Nixon proposed to reduce the proposed 10 percent benefit increase to 7 percent. Putting it another way, the outgoing Democratic administration proposed to increase benefits during fiscal year 1970 by $1.6 billion has been slashed under the Nixon proposal to a benefit increase of only $600 million—six-tenths of a billion—a slash of $1 billion.

Simply stated, the Nixon proposal adds a "surplus" to the trust fund of $1 billion by taking it out of the "hides" of the poorest people in the country. Nixon is suggesting that the 25.5 million social security beneficiaries, about 75 percent of whom are aged, will, in effect, be "soaked" to the tune of $1 billion of reduced benefits.

Nixon further compounds his outrageous suggestion by "chiseling" the social security beneficiaries out of 1 month's increase by proposing a delay of a month—from January 1970 to February 1970—with the first checks being mailed out March 3, 1970.

I dare say that before the course of this year has run, the senior citizens, the totally disabled, and the children in the families where the wage earner has died are going to let the Congress know that they will have no part of this unwarranted, unjustified, and hardhearted cutback from President Johnson's proposals.

Those on fixed incomes will let their voices be heard. Continuing inflation, anticipated to increase the cost of living another 5 percent this year alone, will wipe out the Nixon-proposed benefit increase which will not even be adequate to keep pace with the rapidly rising cost of living.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION HEARINGS IN LOS ANGELES

The **SPEAKER**. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS), is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **HAWKINS**. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of attending, a month ago, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission hearings in Los Angeles.

The purpose of public hearings is to get at the truth about an issue, and in this case the issue was whether minorities are getting equal job opportunity in some of the Nation's most important industries—aerospace, motion picture production, radio-TV, and banking/insurance—in the Los Angeles area.

The Commission and its able Chairman Clifford Alexander have come under attack for "harassing" business at these hearings. Well, having sat in at these hearings I simply want to say that when getting at the truth about equal job opportunity is called "harassment" it is a sad day for this Nation and more specifically for its minority citizens.

The closest thing I saw to any harassment or badgering of witnesses by the Commission was what might better be called a little impatience. That impatience is shared by all of the Negroes and Mexican-Americans who have long been denied equal opportunity, and been exposed instead to a lot of paper promises and hollow policy statements and press releases by companies who act as though equal opportunity stops at the level of laborer or service worker—if it exists even there.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission had data showing that out of nearly 20,000 officials and managers in the Los Angeles aerospace industry in 1968 only 177—less than 1 percent—were black. And when one of the big five aerospace companies testified, it was easy to see why things were not changing the way all the glossy brochures said they were. This company had added 95 officials and managers to its rolls in 1968—and none of them were blacks, Mexican-Americans, or any other minority groups. But the company was convinced it was doing its job as an equal opportunity employer.

This kind of thing makes me impatient too, Mr. Speaker. And if the worst that employers like this are shown is a little courteous impatience, that is an indignity that does not compare to the indignity that our Nation's minorities are shown every day by such employers, who think that when the door to the mailroom is open, all the barriers are down. The EEOC made sure that its hearings were held with proper decorum. But it also made sure it got the truth and apparently it is the truth which hurts.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us here are concerned that truth be exposed and justice be done, and that these are the reasons for the outcry against the temper of the inquiring Commission and the tone of the hearings. In order, then, that we might arrive at a just appraisal of the proceedings, I believe we must consider the kind of testimony, on the part of the company officials, that elicited the questioning that has been so strenuously objected to.

One of the leading motion picture studios stated to the Commission that—

> From the inception of the Company in 1928, the policy of merit employment was established. . . . This policy has been so indoctrinated into all management personnel that there has been no question of its acceptance by all levels of supervision.

But under further questioning, this company reported that in 1969 they employ all of 26 Mexican-Americans and nine black people out of some 900 white collar employees. This, in a city where blacks and Mexican-Americans constitute 20 percent of the population, hardly attests to the effectiveness of the "indoctrination."

This example and many others like it which arose during the 3 days of the hearings would seem to make it obvious that the only way to expose reality to the light of day is to probe beneath the surface of perfunctory policy statements. This is exactly what happened at the EEOC hearings and this is what has made some people uncomfortable. It made them uncomfortable in Los Angeles and it made them uncomfortable a year earlier in New York City, when the Commission found that among that city's 100 leading corporate headquarters, the 46 companies who were members of Plans for Progress—a group publicly pledged to affirmative action in minority employment—trailed the 54 nonmember firms in four of six white collar job categories with respect to Negro employment, and in five out of six with respect to Puerto Rican employment. In the key professional and managerial areas, where much of Plans for Progress effort is ostensibly concentrated, nonmember companies employed black people at rates 1½ and four times higher respectively than PFP members.

Clearly, then, a statement of support—public or private—for the general principle of equal opportunity does not produce equal opportunity or a result, "voluntary efforts" all too often go little further than the press release announcing them. Some type of enforcement to assure equal opportunity is imperative, and some exposure of the extent to which voluntarism fails is in the best interest of all concerned.

It is about time we placed ourselves firmly on the side of the truth by supporting, rather than condemning, efforts such as EEOC's hearings.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of California. I should like to commend the gentleman in the well, my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. HAWKINS), for his dedication and leadership in this field. I likewise commend our distinguished colleagues from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), and Missouri (Mr. CLAY), and I wish to further make note of the leadership and effective interest that has been given to this most important area by our distinguished colleague from California (Mr. ROYBAL).

Again I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS), for his leadership, and I associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. HAWKINS. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYBAL).

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS) and to compliment those who attended the meetings in Los Angeles, and most particularly, the work being done by the Chairman and members of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission toward the objective that all our citizens, regardless of race, creed, color, national origin, or sex, have an equal chance to obtain meaningful and worthwhile employment—and live a life of genuine fulfillment without the crippling handicap of job discrimination to prevent them from achieving the full potential of which they are capable.

Recently, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission held a 3-day series of hearings in Los Angeles to survey the actual situation regarding job discrimination in four major industries of southern California: Aerospace, motion picture, radio/TV, and so-called white-collar areas such as banks, insurance companies, and savings and loan institutions.

The Commission uncovered what it described as a documented record of widespread discrimination in employment in these major industries of the Los Angeles metropolitan area, including "blatant violations" of title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act—the Federal Government's antidiscrimination employment law.

In fact, in the motion picture industry, where the Commission found "clear evidence" of a pattern or practice of discrimination, the EEOC has recommended the first industrywide legal suit by the U.S. Department of Justice against virtually the entire movie and TV film industry and its craft unions.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that EEOC Chairman Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., deserves high praise for the energetic and effective manner in which he has conducted the Commission's activities.

His pioneering efforts in this vital, but often difficult and controversial area have already accomplished much in promoting the worthy goal of equal job opportunities for all Americans.

In addition, I would like to express a personal note of appreciation for the work of EEOC Commissioner Vicente T. Ximenes, who was also on the panel during its Los Angeles hearings and contributed in an outstanding way by providing imaginative leadership in the fight to assure each citizen of his full rights to share in the great benefits our Nation offers.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, because I believe they would be of interest to my colleagues, as well as of vital importance to a true understanding of the meaning of equal employment opportunity, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point four items which I have obtained from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The items are: First, the EEOC's press release summarizing its findings at the Los Angeles hearings; second, a letter I have received from Commissioner Ximenes providing some shocking statistics on what he characterized as the "intolerable minority employment record" discovered in the Los Angeles area; third, the opening statement of Chairman Alexander at the Los Angeles hearings; and, fourth, background data on the four major industries surveyed.

The items follow:

NEWS RELEASE OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

When the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission wound up its recent three-day public hearings in Los Angeles the record was clear: Blacks, Spanish Surnamed Americans and women are barred from employment or held to the lower paying jobs in the area's major industries. Also made clear was EEOC's determination to change this picture as the Commissioners exposed blatant violations of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Federal Government's anti-discrimination employment law.

In the movie production industry where the Commission found "clear evidence" of a pattern or practice of discrimination, EEOC agreed on the spot to recommend the first industry-wide suit by the U.S. Department of Justice against virtually the entire motion picture and TV film industry and its craft unions.

EEOC Chairman Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., pointed out that the motion picture industry plays a critical role in influencing public opinion. "Any company that takes equal employment seriously is able to hire qualified blacks and Spanish Surnamed Americans from this area's rich resources," he stated. Unless movie producers have a workforce representative of the nation, they are "not in a position to project what our country is", Alexander told Arthur Schaefer, of Warner Brothers/7 Arts. When this witness told of meetings held with minority organizations, Alexander said EEOC "gives no points for dinners, awards, meetings attended, etc.".

Chairman Alexander presided at the March 12–14 hearings with the full Commission and General Counsel questioning the witnesses. They are: Vice Chairman Luther Holcomb; Commissioners Vicente T. Ximenes, Elizabeth J. Kuck, William H. Brown III and General Counsel Daniel Steiner.

EEOC revealed that the 4.2 percent employment rate for blacks and Spanish Surnamed Americans in the area's movie industry is well below the average 7.4 percent rate for all industries in the Los Angeles metropolitan area in almost every occupational category.

An attractive young Mexican American actor, Ray Martell with no trace of an accent, was asked by the Commission to report his experience in seeking a job. He charged the movie industry with "outright racism" along with the craft unions involved, and said that Mexican Americans "are not salable" to the movie industry "because of racism." On the one hand he was told by casting directors that he looked too Mexican for conventional roles but not Mexican enough for the industry's stereotyped portrayals of Mexicans.

Joseph Bernay, international representative of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees claimed "no practices of discrimination" in the *union* but could not explain to the Commission why the membership application included the question "are you foreign born?". Questioned by Mr. Steiner, he revealed that one local union had 4,000 members, of whom eight are Negroes and 51 Mexican Americans. Another had a total membership of 1,000 in which there was only one black and 50 Mexican Americans.

Commissioner Ximenes repeatedly challenged the industry to change the "sombrero and barefooted" image of Mexican Americans as portrayed by the industry.

Commissioner Brown exposed the unrealistic 2,100 hour apprenticeship required for lamp operator in the industry when he reported that a U.S. Navy pilot earns his wings in 1,500 hours of which 280 are spent flying.

Commissioner Kuck wanted to know why the TV industry does not do more shows examining the depth and nature of employment discrimination. The industry had no answer.

Throughout the hearings, EEOC stressed the underemployment of minorities and women which was graphically illustrated in employers' answers to Commission questioning. The spokesman for Walt Disney productions, for example, after reporting that Walt Disney had established a non-discriminatory employment policy in 1928, admitted under direct questioning by Mr. Alexander, that most of his company's black employees are in service and janitorial jobs. Under further questioning from Commissioner Brown he said that out of 238 officials and managers in the company none is black; out of almost 900 white collar employees, only nine are black; 26 are Mexican Americans.

The three major radio-TV networks, ABC, CBS and NBC, Mr. Alexander said, bear the responsibility for bringing to the American people what goes on in this country. He found their attitude "callous" when it comes to the law concerning equal employment. "I would remind the networks", he said following their testimony, "that you are potential lawbreakers," respecting violations of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

"I don't know of any other reason for the exclusion of minorities," he concluded. The Commission, he said, would focus on action to be taken against the networks.

Almost 90 percent of the employees reported by the networks were in white collar occupations. Yet one network had no Mexican American officials, managers, professionals or salesmen and there were only 2 Mexican Americans and 1 black among the 499 officials and managers at the three networks combined. One network reported that 3.6% of its technicians were black while another could only show 0.9%.

While blacks held 7.4% of reported jobs in the Los Angeles metropolitan area in 1967, the networks reported only 2.9% black employees and this figure declined slightly in 1968. Mexican Americans represented only 0.9% of the networks' total employment in 1967 and increased to only 1.6% in 1968.

The American Broadcasting Company's claim of "aggressive recruitment" of minorities was demolished by Commissioner William H. Brown III in his questioning of James G. Riddell, Vice-President, Western Division which brought forth these statistics: out of 146 officials and managers there is 1 black and no Spanish Surnamed American; of the 140 professionals, there is one black and 1 Spanish Surnamed American; of the 307 technicians, there are two blacks and three Spanish Surnamed; of the 14 sales workers, there are no blacks and two Spanish Surnamed Americans. When ABC claimed pride in its figures, Commissioner Brown warned: "If you think you've done a good job then not only ABC but the country is in bad shape."

A similar pattern was established in the questioning of Perry Lafferty, CBS Vice-President of Programs; Herbert Schlosser, NBC Vice-President of Programs, Oscar C. Turner, NBC West Coast personnel director and H. R. Guillotte, NBC labor relations executive.

A pattern of underemployment of minorities was again revealed by three major white collar employers—Occidental Insurance, Bank of America, and Security Pacific National Bank; the five leading aerospace companies in the Los Angeles area—McDonnell Douglas Astronautics Corporation, Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, North American Rockwell Corporation, Hughes Aircraft Company, and TRW Systems, and one of the major unions in aerospace—the International Association of Machinists (IAM).

One aerospace company with 2,068 officials and managers had only 17 blacks, 18 Spanish Surnamed Americans, 35 Orientals and one Indian in these positions.

When an official of North American Rockwell Corporation testified that since December 1966 his company had increased black officials and managers from 46 to 58 and Mexican Americans in this category from 46 to 66, Mr. Alexander dramatized the slow progress by pointing out that at this rate "it would take 15 years for blacks to obtain even 3 percent of the management jobs."

IAM revealed that out of 31 or 32 international representatives, there was only 1 black and one Spanish Surnamed American which the union spokesman admitted was "inadequate."

Occidental Insurance, one of the area's major white collar employers, reported that it set targets for minorities in all job classifications and was able to report that out of its 1300 employees 19.1 percent are Spanish Surnamed, 13.2 percent black and 6.2 percent Oriental. Bank of America and Security Pacific fell far below these rates and all three showed few if any blacks and Spanish Surnamed Americans in the higher level management positions.

Ximenes observed that policies aimed at upgrading Mexican Americans and blacks "have been a failure," according to the industry's own figures. "Maybe," he suggested, "what you need is a training program for hard-core management rather than hard-core unemployment. Management has a fine statement of policy but a series of gate keepers close the doors to minority people."

Chairman Alexander emphasized again that Title VII is the law of the land warning that "it is about time these corportions—many of whom are screaming for law and order—obey the law themselves."

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION,
Washington, March 27, 1969.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYBAL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROYBAL: I thought you should know the minority employment record of the three major networks of our nation. Both Blacks and Mexican Americans must get relief from this intolerable situation. The networks are ABC, CBS and NBC.

A. Out of 3,500 employees, the three networks employ 76 Spanish Surnamed and 121 Blacks.

B. Out of 504 managers, the three networks had 3 Spanish Surnamed and 6 Blacks.

C. Out of the 76 Spanish Surnamed employees of the three networks, 36 were clerical and 17 were blue collar workers.

D. Of the 121 Blacks employed by the three networks, 67 were clerical and 12 were blue collar workers.

E. There were only 3 Spanish Surnamed professionals in the three networks.

F. There were only 15 Spanish Surnamed technicians in the three network labor force.

Sincerely,

VICENTE T. XIMENES,
Commissioner.

STATEMENT BY CLIFFORD L. ALEXANDER, JR., CHAIRMAN, U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION, AT OPENING OF COMMISSION HEARINGS, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., MARCH 12, 1969

Our hearings today, tomorrow and Friday will explore utilization of minority and women workers in several industries of national significance. Today we will be concerned with the aerospace industry, the nation's largest manufacturing employer and the largest single employer in Los Angeles. Tomorrow we will be concerned with the motion picture production industry. On Friday we will be covering the radio/TV networks. These latter two industries together exert a staggering influence on the country's image of itself and also have a great deal to do with the worldwide image of our country. On Friday, too, we will hear from a number of major white collar employers in Los Angeles, because here as nationally it is in the white collar job sector that future economic growth will come.

Let me talk a little about some of the other hearings the Commission has held, and what they have meant, in order that these Los Angeles hearings can fall into perspective. Two years ago we held a public forum on employment practices in the textile industries of North and South Carolina. A concerted follow-up effort by the Commission, other government agencies and state and local groups took place after the hearings had pointed up areas where action was needed. A year ago in New York City we had hearings involving some of that city's and the nation's largest white collar employers, and their utilization of minorities and women. Again, a concerted follow-up program took place. We are presently evaluating results of action or inaction during the intervening year by the employers involved, to determine whether necessary change has occurred; and we may return to New York for another set of hearings in the event it has not. Similarly, we are analyzing data on changes since our program with the textile industry. I plan to consult with the Commission shortly about returning for full scale hearings on utilization of blacks by the dominant employers of that industry in North and South Carolina.

This is to say, then, that our Commission believes that hearings, or "dialogues" if you wish, while often productive, are not an end in themselves. The areas for improvement that these hearings identify will be the subject of substantial follow-up activity by the Commission. We will enlist if necessary the support of other government agencies whose responsibilities relate to assurance of equal job opportunity in the industries concerned. In about a year we will evaluate the extent of improvement, or its absence, to determine whether renewed hearings or other activities are indicated. What, then, do we plan to accomplish in the three days this week? Let me quote from the letter of invitation sent to employers in the industries with which we are concerned.

"A primary objective in holding these hearings is to explore the particular advances made by some firms in providing equal employment opportunity and the techniques which produced such advances. Of equal importance is to explore with the many firms whose success in this area has been limited, the reasons why results have fallen short of intentions. Because any discussion of equal employment opportunity programs is meaningful only when it includes consideration of their results—or lack of results—in terms of actual numbers of jobs for minorities and women within the company, Commission questioning at the hearings will seek to elicit such information in the event that employers' prepared statements omit presentation of [EEO-1] figures."

A similar letter was sent to the unions invited to give testimony at these hearings.

Most of the witnesses who will be testifying today and in the next two days have supplied us in advance with copies of the oral statements they will be making, together with longer written statements and exhibits for the record. These statements were prepared to execute the objective of the hearings detailed in my invitation letter. To facilitate production of the record for the hearings, I am directing at this time that such written statements and accompanying exhibits be entered into the formal record.

Before we begin today's session on the aerospace industry, I believe each of you has obtained from the table outside—or can get from Commission staff who are seeing to seating arrangements—a copy of some background data on the aerospace industry in Los Angeles. It spells out in graphic terms the reason we are here to explore existing utilization of Mexican Americans and blacks in that industry, and why it is action to change that utilization that we are here to stimulate.

In the dialogue we will be having with companies and unions we will undoubtedly hear declarations of future intent. This dialogue must be a prologue to action and this Commission plans to do everything in its power to assure that action.

Finally, to explain the procedures that will govern the hearings, let me turn to Mr. Daniel Steiner, General Counsel and Acting Staff Director for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

BACKGROUND DATA ON THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY IN LOS ANGELES

Employment statistics for the aerospace industry in Los Angeles are particularly significant because the industry is the largest manufacturing employer in the nation and the largest single employer in Los Angeles, with over a quarter of a million employees in the SMSA (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area). The area accounts for about one-fifth of the total national aerospace employment.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's analysis of employment among seventeen (17) major employers, who account for 85% of the total aerospace jobs in Los Angeles, shows extremely low participation by minority groups at all but the lowest levels of aerospace employment in all but a few of the major aerospace companies.

In both overall white and blue collar classifications, the percentage of Mexican Americans employed by the aerospace industry is about half the figure for all industries in the Los Angeles area.

In 1967, for example, Mexican Americans constituted nearly 10% of the total foremen, craftsmen and kindred workers throughout all Los Angeles industries, but only 6.5% of craftsmen in the aerospace industry; they made up 6.5% of the total clerical workforce, but only 2.9% in aerospace. And there was not substantial improvement during 1968—participation increased for craftsmen to 7.2% and for clerical workers to 3.2%.

The white collar statistics for blacks are equally discouraging—of nearly 20,000 Officials and Managers in the Los Angeles aerospace industry in 1968, only 177 were black (0.9%); of nearly 53,000 professionals, only 625 (1.2%); and even in the clerical category, out of nearly 41,000 employees, only 1600 were black (3.9%). Only in blue collar jobs are black people employed in aerospace at rates above all-industry averages.

VARIATIONS IN MINORITY EMPLOYMENT

Sharp differences among companies' minority utilization demonstrate that qualified and qualifiable Mexican Americans and blacks are available at all occupational levels. The following chart indicates the most and the least successful major employers of minorities and divides the employment into white and blue collar categories:

RANGE OF 1968 MINORITY EMPLOYMENT AMONG 17 AEROSPACE COMPANIES

	Percent Mexican American		Percent black	
	Low	High	Low	High
Total employment	2.2	32.9	1.2	15.0
White collar	1.1	13.3	0	4.1
Blue collar	4.3	49.1	2.8	32.0

BACKGROUND DATA ON THE MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY IN LOS ANGELES

The motion picture industry reports approximately 19,000 employees, 13,000 of whom are white collar workers. But it is not the raw numbers of people employed that is significant, it is the fact that the industry plays a critical role in influencing public opinion and creating this country's image of itself. In order to portray accurately the nation's minority groups, the industry must employ minority personnel at all levels.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's analysis indicates that this is not happening.

MINORITY EMPLOYMENT RATES WELL BELOW AVERAGE

Based on analysis of 1967 data, the industry is a very poor employer of minorities. For both blacks and Mexican Americans, it falls below the average rates for all industries in the Los Angeles metropolitan area (SMSA) in almost every occupational category.

If one company is excluded from the total, reported utilization of blacks by motion picture producers is even more dramatically below other industries in the area. For example:

PERCENT BLACK EMPLOYMENT REPORTED IN 1967

	SMSA	Motion picture producers	Motion picture producers (excluding one company)
Total	7.4	4.2	2.1
White collar	3.4	3.5	.8
Officials and managers	1.1	.6	.5
Professional	2.1	7.1	.5
Technical	4.3	.4	.3
Blue collar	10.3	2.3	1.0
Craftsmen	4.9	1.5	.4
Operatives	12.5	2.3	.9

In most key occupational categories, the employment of Mexican Americans in the industry trails the metropolitan average:

PERCENT MEXICAN-AMERICAN EMPLOYMENT, 1967

	SMSA	Motion picture producers
Total	10.1	4.2
White collar	4.4	3.5
Office and clerical	6.5	3.8
Blue collar	17.5	4.7
Craftsmen	9.9	5.4
Operatives	19.0	3.9

VARIATIONS IN MINORITY EMPLOYMENT

There are enormous differences among major movie companies in reported minority participation. One company employs large numbers of Mexican Americans in every job category; another, large numbers of blacks in every category above laborer. At the same time, in several job categories, about half of the companies employ no blacks or Mexican Americans at all. The following chart indicates the most and least successful employers of minorities and divides the employment into white and blue collar categories:

RANGE OF MINORITY EMPLOYMENT, 1967, AMONG 7 MAJOR MOVIE COMPANIES

	Percent Mexican American		Percent Black	
	Low	High	Low	High
Total employment	1.5	16.2	0.6	10.4
White collar	.8	13.5	.4	13.7
Professionals	0	14.3	0	26.9
Technicians	0	17.1	0	.9
Blue collar	1.6	18.5	.2	5.5
Craftsmen	1.5	23.1	0	4.6
Operatives	1.0	11.8	0	6.0

BACKGROUND DATA ON THREE MAJOR NETWORKS IN LOS ANGELES

The minority employment picture for the 3 major radio and TV networks in the Los Angeles area is discouraging. But it is not raw numbers of people employed that is significant, it is the fact that the networks play a critical role in influencing public opinion and creating this country's image of itself. In order to portray accurately the nation's minority groups, the industry must employ minority personnel at all levels.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's data indicates that this is not happening.

While blacks held 7.4% of reported jobs in the Los Angeles metropolitan area in 1967, the networks reported only 2.9% Negro employment, and this figure decreased slightly in 1968. Mexican Americans, who comprised 10.1% of the Los Angeles employment, were 0.9% of the networks' total employment in 1967 and increased to only 1.6% in 1968.

Almost 90% of the employees reported by the networks were in white collar occupations, and here the picture is bleak. For instance, in 1967 Mexican Americans filled 4.4% of all white collar jobs reported by Los Angeles industries, but only 0.9% among the networks—and between 1967 and 1968 the Negro participation rate in white collar jobs actually decreased. By occupational category within the overall white collar category, the 1968 numbers speak for themselves:

Occupation	Mexican American (percent)	Negro (percent)
Total white collar	1.2	2.8
Officials and managers	.4	1.4
Professionals	.4	1.6
Technicians	.9	2.4
Sales persons	1.7	0
Office and clerical	2.3	4.8

While all the networks show gross underutilization of minorities—one network had no Mexican American officials, managers, professionals or salesmen; and there were only 2 Mexican Americans and 1 black among the 499 officials and managers at the three networks combined—there is variation among the networks which shows that qualified minorities are available if the effort is made to find them. One network reported that 3.6% of its technicians were Negro while another could only show 0.9%. In 1968, the first reported blacks in 6.1% of its clerical jobs, while the second reported 3.6%.

Background Data on White Collar Employment in Banks, Insurance Companies, and Savings and Loan Institutions in Los Angeles

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission analysed employment statistics for 30 large banks, non-bank credit agencies and insurance companies operating in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. Together, they employ 50,000 people, accounting for 65% of all white collar employment in this industry group.

In overall white collar employment of minorities, the thirty companies compare favorably with the average for all industries in the Los Angeles Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) particularly in the employment of Mexican Americans. For the most part, however, this overall figure reflects minority employment in clerical jobs and relatively high utilization by a few larger companies.

In the employment of Mexican Americans, the 30 companies exceed the area average in clerical employment by a substantial margin, and at the managerial level by a small margin. However, at the professional and technical levels, they lag behind the area average:

PERCENT MEXICAN-AMERICAN EMPLOYMENT, 1967

	SMSA	30 companies
Professionals	2.0	1.7
Technicians	5.2	4.9

The 30 companies exceed the average in employment of blacks only in clerical jobs. In fact, they are less than half the SMSA average in every other white collar category except managers.

PERCENT, BLACK EMPLOYMENT, 1967

	SMSA	30 companies
Officials and managers	1.1	0.6
Professionals	2.1	.9
Technicians	4.3	1.6
Salesworkers	3.5	1.5

WIDE VARIATION IN MINORITY EMPLOYMENT

The large white collar employers vary significantly in minority employment. Nine of the 30 companies have no Mexican Americans at the managerial level, while one company employs them in almost 30% of these jobs. The range of black participation is much narrower, the best utilized employing blacks in 2.9% of the managerial jobs. *Twenty-two of the 30 companies have no black officials or managers.* The performance of top utilizers suggests that qualified minority workers can be found—by those companies willing to look.

Mr. HAWKINS. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Stokes).

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some comment in the other body to the effect that the hearings held in Los Angeles last month by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission were carried out in a "carnival atmosphere."

I sat in at those hearings, and would like to point out for the record that they were conducted with all the propriety any public hearings ought to have.

I believe that much of the objection to them may have come from people who wanted to see a whitewash of minority employment patterns and practices by the companies and unions that testified. These people think that anything other than such a whitewash means a vendetta by EEOC against industry.

Well, there was no whitewash, to be sure. There was fact finding about minority employment and if the facts were embarrassing to the companies or unions who testified to them, so be it. In many cases they should have been embarrassing.

When a major movie company reported that it had an equal employment policy in force since 1928 and that equal employment was "a matter of continual discussion among top executives of the studio," perhaps the critics of the hearings would have liked to see the Commission applaud this company.

But this same company revealed under questioning that out of some nine hundred white collar workers, there were only 26 Mexican Americans and nine blacks, in a metropolitan area where these two groups make up almost 20 percent of the work force; that out of 238 officials and managers, one was black, and he headed up the janitorial department.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Commission should be commended, not denounced, for bringing to the public hypocrisy like this. The time is past when industry and labor should be able to discharge their responsibility for equal job opportunity with pious platitudes. The Commission made this clear at its Los Angeles hearings and in doing so it performed a service that was needed and still needs to be done, all of which was in keeping with the authority reposed in that commission by this Congress.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my two colleagues regarding the recent Los Angeles hearings by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

I too had the pleasure of attending those hearings, and I just want to add one thing that stuck in my mind about them. And that is that the information EEOC elicited from witnesses was properly embarrassing to them—not the way it was elicited. When the head of the joint apprenticeship training program for lamp operators in the motion picture industry was asked how long it took to train a lamp operator, he said the requirement was 2,100 hours. He was asked, very courteously and matter-of-factly whether he was aware that it only takes the Navy 1,500 hours to train a man from scratch to be a pilot—to land a jet plane on a moving aircraft carrier.

Now this is a pretty trenchant way of saying that apprenticeship programs in that industry are set up with unrealistic standards. Such standards discourage youngsters—particularly minority youngsters who for years were overtly excluded from the industry and are rightly dubious about pronouncements that now the doors are open—from ever getting work in the craft. But it was not the industry representative who was harassed by such questioning. It is the thousands of blacks and Mexican-Americans and native Americans who are daily harassed by this, and similar practices, on the part of companies and unions that keep minorities confined to the lowest level jobs—and sometimes even exclude them from those.

Mr. Speaker, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission acted responsibly and did this Nation a service at its Los Angeles hearings and I personally consider any attacks on those hearings as irresponsible.

Mr. HAWKINS. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Ryan).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. Hawkins) for yielding to me and commend him for having taken this time to bring to the attention of the House the matter of the Los Angeles hearings. His leadership in this area is well known.

I also commend the previous speaker, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Stokes), as well as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Clay), and our colleagues from California (Mr. Roybal and Mr. Burton).

Mr. Speaker, I was distressed, as I am sure the gentleman in the well was, by the attack which was leveled upon the chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission by a very well-known Member of the other body, the minority leader no less, with the result that the very next day the administration indicated that the chairman of the Commission would be replaced. I think that Clifford Alexander, Jr., deserves great commendation and credit for the work he has carried on as chairman of the Commission. It is dismaying that he has not been permitted to continue. It is perfectly clear, as indicated by the statistics cited only a moment ago by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Stokes), regarding the pattern of employment in that one company in California, that discrimination in employment persists and that the mandate of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is not being carried out. There must be vigorous enforcement of the provisions which outlaw discrimination in employment-enforcement by all elements of the Federal Government. The Commission itself has rendered a major public service by conducting hearings throughout the country.

This brings to mind the necessity for strengthening legislation, with which I know the distinguished gentleman from California has been very much concerned, to give the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission the power to issue cease and desist orders.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to strengthen the powers of the Commission so that it can more effectively discharge the responsibilities which have been entrusted to it.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I again remind the House that title VII of the Civil Rights Act is the law of the land. It seems to me it behooves those who wish to implement the law of the land to observe it, rather than to attack those who in the executive branch of the Government are attempting to implement it.

I believe the unwarranted and political attacks upon this commission in particular are not deserving of the right to the claim of the type of jurisprudence to which we should adhere in this country, and that such attacks certainly do not come out of a sense of equal justice under the law for all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. **HAWKINS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter in connection with the subject of my special order.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

A MILE FROM TIMES SQUARE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **SAYLOR**. Mr. Speaker, public alarm over whether there is an unsafety factor in atomic powerplants may require Congress to expedite action on the joint resolution which I introduced for the purpose of making a complete study of the Nation's civilian reactor program.

The proposal to build a supersized reactor on Welfare Island in New York City is reopening the safety question and exposing the Atomic Energy Commission's uncertainty about preventing radioactivity from contaminating air and water. The idea of putting a lethal facility in the midst of one of the most densely populated areas in the world is producing a public fear that should finally bring an in-depth, across-the-board investigation of all nonmilitary activities of the AEC, for the mere presumption that a grave incident will "probably or hopefully" not occur is no longer acceptable.

In dealing with a substance as deadly as the atom, assurance against an accident must be absolute.

A terrifying picture of possible consequences of an atomic generating station on Welfare Island is presented in the current issue of Environment, whose science advisory board and committee for environmental information includes many distinguished names from such disciplines as medicine, biology, physics, and sociology. I ask unanimous consent that the article, "A Mile From Times Square," be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Another item which I should like to insert in the RECORD is by Don E. Weaver, Scripps-Howard conservation editor, from the March 15 issue of the Pittsburgh Press. It is entitled "Scientists Outline Huge Danger of Atomic Powerplant Spills."

While I am confident that experience and experimentation will eventually remove hazards attendant to the transportation, use, and disposal of nuclear materials, I am alarmed at AEC's purposeless pursuit of a policy to construct atom plants throughout the Nation without regard to protection of life and property. It is for this reason that I appeal to my colleagues for immediate approval of House Joint Resolution 83. Only by making such a study of AEC's civilian operations can Congress establish to the satisfaction of all America whether we can continue to risk the rush down the perilous path over which the Commission has been leading us.

The articles follow:

[From Environment, January–February 1969]

A MILE FROM TIMES SQUARE

(By Sheldon Novick)

(NOTE.—Ordinary power plants make electricity from the heat of burning coal, oil or gas, or from the power of falling water. In nuclear power plants, spitting atoms create heat from which electricity is made.

(Nuclear plants are now usually called reactors, simply because they are little more than containers in which atomic reactions go on. The typical nuclear power reactor holds many tons of uranium in a cylindrical steel container. Splitting of the uranium atoms in a controlled chain reaction provides the heat that in ordinary plants comes from burning coal. The fragments of the split atoms are intensely radioactive and provide some added heat and considerable hazard. The problem in an ordinary power plant is to keep the fire going; in an atomic power plant the problem is to keep it from getting out of hand. The steel vessel filled with uranium would simply go on getting hotter and hotter until it exploded, unless control devices were inserted.

(The reactor at its simplest is therefore a steel vessel containing uranium; the uranium fuel is ordinarily packed into long narrow tubes which are collected in bundles called "fuel assemblies." Long control rods among the fuel tubes regulate the rate of reaction—and hence the heat produced. Water is pumped into the vessel and comes in contact with the hot fuel tubes. Steam is produced and drawn off, and from there an atomic power plant is just like any other. The steam turns the blades of turbines, which drive generators which make electricity.

(This seems a simple and cheap way to make electric power, for uranium releases huge amounts of energy when its atoms split. One pound of uranium 235 contains the energy of millions of pounds of coal. In the late 1940's, when atomic power plants were first being discussed publicly, highly respected individuals predicted that the atom would make electricity too cheap to meter. And although this has not turned out to be quite the case, atomic power plants are becoming cheaper and are appearing on the outskirts of our largest cities—New York, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, Detroit, and San Francisco. By the early 1970's there will be more than a hundred of these plants operating, most of them enormous, capable of producing a million kilowatts of power, more than enough power for a city of a million inhabitants. By the end of the century, half of all America's electricity is expected to come from the atom.)

Since the earliest days of the civilian nuclear power program there has been controversy and concern over the possibility of a disastrous accident in a nuclear power plant. Even the relatively small electric power plants first built to run on nuclear fuel contained many times the radioactivity released in a nuclear bomb explosion, and much effort was devoted to seeing that this radioactivity never reached the public.

Despite widespread concern and occasional litigation, a number of nuclear power plants were planned for fairly populous areas. The most controversial of these, the Enrico Fermi plant near Detroit, Michigan, was announced in 1956, and was strongly opposed on the ground of public safety by the United Auto Workers (UAW) and other unions; Leo Goodman, UAW atomic energy consultant for many years, led the battle, which eventually ended in a divided Supreme Court decision in favor of the plant's planners. Many serious safety problems were aired for the first time in this controversy.

In 1961, Pacific Gas and Electric Company announced plans for a nuclear plant north of San Francisco, in an active earthquake zone. This proposal met strenuous local opposition and, unlike the Fermi plant, was eventually cancelled. On December 10, 1962, the Consolidated Edison Company of New York announced *its* plans for a new nuclear power plant—this time, in the very heart of New York City. The plant was to be built in 1965 in the Ravenswood district of Queens, just opposite Manhattan's 72nd Street on the East River.

This announcement met with even more public opposition than previous plans, and the project was eventually abandoned, at least in part because of the public pressure. Yet on November 7, 1968, the *New York Times* carried a front-page announcement that Consolidated Edison had not given up its hopes for a nuclear power plant within the heart of the City. According to the *Times*, "Charles F. Luce, Con Edison's board chairman, said that while nothing was 'definite,' he hoped that in 'planning for the use of Welfare Island, the City will leave a portion of that island or plan to use a portion of that island in such a way that we can put a nuclear reactor beneath it.' "

Welfare Island is in the East River between Manhattan and Queens, in one of the most densely inhabited parts of the earth's surface. It is in an even more densely populated district than the originally proposed site in Ravenswood, a few blocks to the north on the east shore of the river. The reason for choosing this location was given by the *Times* as follows: "Mr. Luce emphasized that if Con Ed was to cut out pollution—'if we're to get our smokestacks out of Manhattan completely'—it had to have nuclear plants here.

"He said a major reason was that Con Ed plants here produced steam for large apartment and office buildings, as well as electricity.

"These plants could not be situated out in the country he said, 'because steam becomes water if you send it too far,' " Mr. Luce added that his engineers had informed him that the best place on the island would be its southern end, now covered by abandoned and crumbling city hospitals. The remainder of the long island is largely unused, although it houses two other hospitals and a Fire Department training school.

A few months before making this announcement, Consolidated Edison had made public plans for another complex of nuclear power plants just outside the city limits on another island, the site of former Fort Slocum on David's Island in Long Island Sound, just north and east of the City and within the town of New Rochelle. The Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) has never approved a reactor for a site as populous as this, but Con Ed hopes that before the planned construction date of 1972, the AEC will be convinced of the safety of the plants.

These plans for building reactors in the heart of New York are a cause for considerable concern, even more than in the early days of the nuclear power program. In recent months, a whole new class of safety problems have come to the attention of nuclear engineers, problems created by the enormous increase in size of planned reactors. The plants planned by Con Ed are from five to ten times the size of the reactors first constructed for electric power just ten years ago, and this rapid escalation of size has brought new safety problems with it.

A serious reactor accident might happen in the following way. After operating for a time, the nuclear fuel of a reactor accumulates radioactive wastes or fission products which generate heat through their decay. The fuel of a one million kilowatt (electrical power) nuclear plant, the size now being ordered by utilities, after a year's operation would contain waste products amounting to about thirteen billion curies of radioactivity. This is as much radioactivity as is contained in more than fourteen thousand tons of radium. It is more radioactivity than has been released in all nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere by all nations.

During plant operation heat is generated by the splitting of uranium atoms in a nuclear chain reaction. In the simplest design, the so-called boiling water reactor, cooling water flows through the reactor's core and carries off this heat as steam. However, large volumes of cooling water will be needed to keep the fuel below its melting point, even when the plant is not operating, because of the heat of radioactive wastes. The billions of curies of radioactive waste in the fuel will generate a great deal of heat through their decay. In power plants now planned, the heat generated by these wastes within the fuel will be sufficient to bring the whole mass of uranium and metal fuel tubes—several hundred tons—past their melting point. A reactor operating at full power, therefore, may not easily be shut down: Even after the nuclear chain reaction has been smothered by control rods, the cooling water must continue to flow for some time to forestall melting of the fuel.

The melting of a reactor's fuel—several hundred tons of uranium oxide packed into long slender rods—is a serious mishap, not only because of the high cost of fuel (a reactor's initial fuel loading is about twenty percent of the total cost of the plant). The fuel is extremely dense, and a great deal of heat is generated in a small volume. The fuel itself, divided into thousands of half-inch thick tubes, occupies only a few cubic feet. The large number of rods ensures a large surface for cooling despite the small volume. If melting or a mechanical disturbance reduces the surface area available to the coolant, water and steam are no longer adequate to cool the compact mass below its melting point.

The uranium fuel is packed into tubes of a zirconium alloy, Zircaloy, developed in the Navy's nuclear submarine program. During normal operation the centers of the fuel pins actually reach temperatures higher than the melting point of the metal jackets and close to the melting point of the ceramic fuel itself. Large volumes of cooling water flow among the rods during normal operation. The water boils, and steam is drawn off to drive electric generators. If the flow of cooling water is halted, as by a break in a pipe, the fuel will quickly approach its melting point. Before melting, the Zircaloy tubes will undergo significant chemical reaction with the water and steam remaining, and these chemical reactions will heat the reactor's core further. Once the temperature of the reactor's core has passed a given point, further cooling becomes impossible, and it will simply melt down into a mixture of uranium oxide and Zircaloy, a molten mass weighing perhaps two hundred tons at a temperature of more than 5,000° F.

A number of recent publications of the AEC discuss this conclusion and its implications. A recent summary in the AEC journal *Nuclear Safety* describes the sequence of events which it is believed would follow the interruption of all cooling-water flow in a one million kilowatt nuclear plant:

> Local core regions would reach temperatures greater than 2,000° F. within 30 to 50 seconds, and the Zircaloy-steam reaction would begin to become a significant energy source. . . . The time to reach the melting point of the cladding, 3,360° F., at the hottest portion of the reactor in the absence of effective cooling, would be on the order of one minute.
>
> The time from the [coolant] pipe rupture to the collection of the core as a heap in the reactor vessel would be dependent on the model chosen.
>
> A time range from 10 to 60 minutes . . . appears to cover the uncertainties.
>
> It is estimated that 50 to 80 percent of the fuel might fall into the pressure-vessel head. At the end of 40 to 60 minutes, the decay heat rate of the possible core material in the head would be . . . about 30 to 40 megawatts [30,000–40,000 kilowatts].

In other words, the molten portion of the reactor fuel which had dropped as a compact mass into the bottom of the reactor vessel would be generating nearly as much heat through radioactive decay as do some present civilian reactors at full power operation.

Once the core began to melt, cooling would be impossible, but melting of the fuel would begin within one minute of the interruption of normal cooling. Unless emergency cooling were available in this brief time, the melting of the core would be a definite possibility.

Once a molten core had collected in a compact mass, it is difficult to see how it would be contained. The study just quoted found that for the molten fuel to be cooled at a practicable rate, the 180 tons assumed to be collected at the bottom of the pressure vessel would have to be spread out in a slab 40 feet in diameter and 9 inches thick. It is hard to see how this could be achieved within the reactor structure.

Following the initial melting, therefore, the molten fuel would melt its way through the reactor vessel and eventually through the concrete containment structure, if it were not first dispersed by a steam explosion or violent boiling of the fuel itself. One recent study estimates that, "The time required in a large-rupture, loss-of-coolant accident for fuel that is unquenched to melt through the reactor vessel and possibly breach the outer containment vessel has been estimated at one-half to one hour."

We should emphasize that this discussion pertains only to the large reactors on order—one million kilowatts and more. For these, molten fuel would breach not only the reactor containment structures in present designs, but would melt through even the concrete and steel casing that would line the cavity of an underground installation. Therefore, the fuel would eventually melt through them and into the earth. This would be a serious occurrence, for many radioactive wastes ordinarily trapped within the fuel are gases. At this point, at least the gaseous portion of the radioactive wastes would be released to the outside air, for earth and rock will not contain them. Swedish studies have shown that even dozens of feet of high-quality granite will not contain gas under pressure. None of this would apply to smaller reactors, including the few now in operation, for which containment of molten fuel in an underground installation would be possible, and which therefore might be constructed underground with something approaching absolute safety. How large a plant must be before safe containment becomes impossible for practical purposes is still open to question, but it is apparently true that most of the large reactors now on order or under construction are too large for this approach. Deep underground caverns in granite or similar rock might be made gas-tight by injection of cement under high pressure into the cracks and fissures, but this would be expensive and suitable for only a few locations.

In other words, in a one million kilowatt plant, once the steel or concrete containment of the reactor core had been breached, even an underground site in a granite cavern would not prevent the loss of much radioactive gas to the outside air. In the Swedish study, a testing chamber was bored into Rävfjäll Mountain. "The rock . . . consisted of good granite, which was very homogeneous and had fewer cracks and fissures than normal." The chamber was pressurized, and boreholes at the surface 27 meters (88.6 feet) above the chamber were used to detect leakage. Leaks were easily detected at the surface at low pressures, and the rock chamber proved to be incapable of maintaining any significant pressure at all, dropping to atmospheric pressure within an hour or less for all initial pressurizations.

A substantial portion of the reactor's radioactive wastes are gases. Radioactivity equivalent to that released by several Hiroshima-type atomic bomb explosions would be present in a one million kilowatt nuclear plant, after extended operation, in the form of radioactive iodine alone. The release of only this gaseous radioactivity would therefore be a considerable catastrophe.

In other words, the safety of a reactor depends critically on its cooling system. Should this fail, there is now no way of assuring that the public will be protected from sizable radiation exposures. This was a conclusion first officially pronounced by the AEC's Advisory Task Force on Emergency Core Cooling. In the Report of this Task Force, which bears no date but was released late in 1967, the conclusion is put in the equivocal language customary in such documents:

"If emergency core-cooling systems do not function and meltdown of a substantial part of any irradiated core occurs, the current state of knowledge regarding the sequence of events and the consequences of the meltdown is insufficient to conclude with certainty that integrity of containments of present designs, with their cooling systems, will be maintained."

This is a new situation which arises only in the very large power plants which have become popular in the last two years. No reactors of this size are yet in civilian operation; the first will go into operation this year. It is plants of this size which would presumably be constructed on Welfare Island in New York City by Consolidated Edison.

Certainly, reactor manufacturers and the Atomic Energy Commission are doing everything possible to assure that cooling systems will not fail. Elaborate emergency cooling systems, redundancy in normal cooling systems, and other devices are being designed into commercial power plants to absorb heat from the fuel in an accident. These are all systems which depend to some extent on proper operation by human beings, and on the availability of electric power, both of which are factors which lead one to believe that failures cannot be ruled out.

In California, where reactors are being built and planned near the active San Andreas earthquake zone, violent disruptions of the mechanical parts of a reactor are not hard to imagine. (See "Earthquakes and Nuclear Power," *Environment*, November, 1968.) Hurricanes and tornadoes can be listed with earthquakes in other parts of the country. Tornadoes which may topple a power plant's towering smokestack onto the reactor are a particular hazard. Other mechanisms have been suggested. The massive rotors of a plant's turbine-generators might conceivably break free and tear through the reactor building. In Florida the possibility of intentional sabotage has been brought before the AEC.

A variety of small accidents could lead to equally drastic effects if they occurred together. This last is probably the most likely of all. The San Onofre power station in Southern California, one of the largest and newest in operation, was recently discovered to be operating improperly, with control rods inserted when they should not have been. A reactor operator faced with a small accident in such a situation might easily take inappropriate corrective measures. The Elk River (Minnesota) reactor apparently operated for some time with both its emergency cooling system and its cooling water make-up system out of operation. In the Pathfinder reactor in South Dakota, the critical isolation valve which would close off steam lines leading out of the reactor core in case of an accident was found to have rusted open, and was allowed to remain so for a month and a half before it was reported.

The reactor's cooling pumps are driven by its own electrical power output. In the event that anything causes the reactor to shut down, emergency power must be available to drive these pumps. A loss of power to the pumps, combined with some mechanical interference with coolant flow, would otherwise result in fuel melting. The changeover must be effected literally within seconds if the loss of coolant flow occurs when the reactor is itself operating at full power (at lower power levels natural circulation may be sufficient to cool the fuel).

Because of considerations like these, the reactor designers have been forced to show that nothing conceivable could completely interrupt cooling water flow. This is being done by adding a series of cooling systems to function in emergencies—when the normal primary system for some reason ceases to function. These include emergency core sprays and emergency core flooding, as well as backup pumps and redundant cooling capacity in the primary system itself, designed to offset any conceivable loss.

Unfortunately, it seems likely that any accident severe enough to disrupt the primary cooling system will also affect the emergency cooling systems. Natural disasters such as earthquakes and tornadoes are clearly in this category, as are accidents which interrupt the flow of electric power to cooling and emergency cooling systems.

Finally, emergency cooling systems powered by auxiliary diesel power seem to be the least reliable component of the safety system. The tens of thousands of kilowatts of needed emergency power must be available within 30 seconds or less following loss of coolant flow. * * *

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Mar. 15, 1969]

SCIENTISTS OUTLINE HUGE DANGER OF ATOMIC POWERPLANT SPILLS

(By Don E. Weaver)

Construction of atomic power plants, especially near large population centers, poses grave danger to human life and environment, according to Richard Curtis and Elizabeth Hogan, authors of a forthcoming book on peaceful uses of the atom.

Atomic reactors produce intense heat, which is transferred to make steam and run electric generators. But reactors give off radioactivity as well as heat. There are wastes and byproducts, all atomically hot and dirty.

Accidents, sabotage or earthquakes could spill lethal poisons over vast areas, Mr. Curtis and Mrs. Hogan contend.

In a preview article, "The Myth of the Peaceful Atom," in Natural History, journal of the American Museum of Natural History, New York, they ask:

"How heavily can we rely on human wisdom, care and engineering to hold this peril under absolute control? Abundant evidence points to the conclusion that we cannot rely on it at all."

Hazards are of two kinds, they say: Threat of violent, massive releases of radioactivity, and slow but deadly seepage of harmful fission products into the environment.

They cite the 1912 sinking of the "unsinkable" Titanic, the 1965 power blackout of New York and the Northeast, the 1947 Texas City disaster when explosion of a ship loaded with ammonium nitrate killed 561 people, as examples of technology that failed.

In 1957 an atomic power plant in England malfunctioned. Fission products spewed out into the atmosphere. Authorities had to seize all milk and growing food crops in a 400-square-mile area.

The plant had many fail-safe devices, but they all failed, just as the New York power blackout happened despite numerous technical safeguards.

Some 15 commercial atomic power plants are now operating in the U.S. The Atomic Energy Commission is supervising plans under which 25 per cent of out power will be atomically produced by 1980, and 50 per cent by the year 2000. Eighty-seven atomic plants are planned or under construction, many near large cities.

Two are built and three more planned along the great geologic fault that causes California earthquakes.

Atomic waste and byproduct disposal requires transporting, always subject to accident. Some of the fission material remains dangerous for 500 years. This has to be "permanently" sealed in "perpetual" containers for safety.

Mr. Curtis and Mrs. Hogan say this is a large and risky order, beyond the present state of the technical art. And a big atomic spill can't be reversed. It would have wide, lethal and permanent effect.

FREE-WORLD FLAG SHIPS CONTINUE TRADE WITH NORTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense has advised me that last month seven more ships flying free-world flags arrived in North Vietnam. Of these, six flew the British flag and one the flag of the Somali Republic. This brings the total for the first quarter of 1969 to some 28 free-world flag ship arrivals.

This report is, however, encouraging in one respect since the March traffic constitutes a drop from the 10 arrivals in February. I would certainly hope that a general downward trend is in the making.

I was particularly gratified to be informed by the State Department as well that an agreement has apparently been reached which should remove all Somali-flag vessels from this traffic in the very near future.

In the last 6 months there has been a steady procession of Somali flag ships in North Vietnamese waters. Through last month in fact there have been in that period 10 such arrivals. This is not only disturbing in and of itself, but because the Somali Republic is a recipient of U.S. foreign aid. I am advised that during fiscal 1968 the Somali Republic received some $5.7 million worth of foreign aid, including technical cooperation, food for peace, and Peace Corps assistance. As one who has authorized and supported amendments passed by Congress denying aid to countries which failed to take appropriate steps to prevent ships under their registry from trading with North Vietnam, I consider this a matter of utmost concern.

Mr. Speaker, the cooperation of the Somali Republic is most welcome and I commend the new administration for persevering and urge that it continue to do everything possible to dry up this, as well as other, sources of supply.

At this point, I insert a chart and Report No. 25, "List of Foreign-Flag Vessels Arriving in North Vietnam on or After January 25, 1966," issued by the U.S. Maritime Administration on March 5, 1969. As I have pointed out before, this so-called blacklist does not contain the names of all free-world or Communist flag ships trading with North Vietnam, but only those which are considered potential visitors to U.S. ports. In addition, there is no information provided about the number of trips that each vessel has made to North Vietnam.

The material follows:

1969 FREE WORLD FLAG SHIP ARRIVALS IN NORTH VIETNAM

	United Kingdom	Cyprus	Singapore	Japan	Somali Republic	Total
January	8	1			2	11
February	6	1	2	1		10
March	6				1	7
Total	20	2	2	1	3	28

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, MARITIME ADMINISTRATION REPORT NO. 25: LIST OF FOREIGN FLAG VESSELS ARRIVING IN NORTH VIETNAM ON OR AFTER JANUARY 25, 1966

Section 1. The President has approved a policy of denying the carriage of United States Government-financed cargoes shipped from the United States on foreign flag vessels which called at North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966.

The Maritime Administration is making available to the appropriate United States Government Departments the following list of such vessels which arrived in North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966, based on information received through March 4, 1969. This list does not include vessels under the registration of countries, including the Soviet Union and Communist China, which normally do not have vessels calling at United States ports:

Flag of registry and name of ship

	Gross tonnage
Polish (32 ships):	
Andrzej Strug	6, 919
Beniowski	10, 443
Djakarta	6, 915
Emilia Plater	6, 718
Energetyk	10, 876
Florian Ceynowa	6, 784
General Sikorski	6, 785
Hanka Sawicka	6, 944
Hanoi	6, 914
Hugo Kollataj	3, 755
Jan Matejko	6, 748
Janek Krasicki	6, 904
Jozef Conrad	8, 730
Kapitan Kosko	6, 629
Kochanowski	8, 231
Konopnicka	9, 690
Kraszewski	10, 363
Lelewel	7, 817
Ludwik Solski	6, 904
Marceli Nowotko	6, 660
Mickiewicz	4, 344
Moniuszko	9, 247
Norwid	5, 512
Nowowiejski	9, 186
Pawel Finder	4, 911
Phenian	6, 923
Przyjazn Narodow	8, 876
Stefan Okrzeja	6, 620
Szymanowski	9, 203

Flag of registry and name of ship—Continued	*Gross tonnage*
Polish (32 ships)—Continued	
Transportowiec	10, 854
Wieniawski	9, 190
Wladyslaw Broniewski	6, 919
Total	243, 514
British (16 ships):	
Court Harwell	7, 133
Dartford	2, 739
Fortune Glory	5, 832
Golden Ocean [1]	3, 827
Greenford	2, 964
Isabel Erica	7, 105
Kingford Meadow Court [2] (trip to North Vietnam under ex-name *Ardrossmore*, British)	5, 820
Rochford	3, 324
Rosetta Maud [2] (trip to North Vietnam under ex-name *Ardtara*, British)	5, 795
Ruthy Ann	7, 361
Shun On [2] (trip to North Vietnam under ex-name *Pundua*, British)	7, 295
Shun Wah (previous trip to North Vietnam under ex-name *Vercharmian*, British)	7, 265
Shun Wing [1]	6, 987
Taipieng (tanker)	5, 676
Tetrarch (previous trips to North Vietnam under ex-name *Ardrowan*, British)	7, 300
Total	89, 334
Cypriot (4 ships):	
Acme	7, 173
Amfithea	5, 171
Antonia II	7, 303
Marianthi	2, 137
Total	21, 784
Somali (2 ships):	
Shun Tai [2] (trip to North Vietnam, British)	7, 085
Yvonne	8, 997
Total	16, 082
Greek: (1 ship):	
Leonis [2] (trip to North Vietnam under ex-name *Shirley Christine*, British)	6, 724
Panamanian (1 ship):	
Salamanca [2] (trips to North Vietnam under ex-name *Milford*, British)	1, 889
Singapore (1 ship):	
Lucky Dragon	4, 225
Total, all flags (57 ships)	383, 552

[1] Added to Report No. 24 appearing in the Federal Register issue of February 4, 1969.

[2] Ships appearing on the list which have made no trips to North Vietnam under the present registry.

Section 2. In accordance with approved procedures, the vessels listed below which called at North Vietnam on or after January 25, 1966, have reacquired eligibility to carry United States Government-financed cargoes from the United States by virtue of the persons who control the vessels having given satisfactory certification and assurance:

(a) that such vessels will not, thenceforth, be employed in the North Vietnam trade so long as it remains the policy of the United States Government to discourage such trade and;

(b) that no other vessels under their control will thenceforth be employed in the North Vietnam trade, except as provided in paragraph (c) and;

(c) that vessels under their control which are covered by contractual obligations, including charters, entered into prior to January 25, 1966, requiring their employment in the North Vietnam trade shall be withdrawn from such trade at the earliest opportunity consistent with such contractual obligations.

Flag of registry—name of ship

a. Since last report: None.

b. Previous reports:

Flag of registry:	
British	1
Italian	1

Section 3. The following number of vessels have been removed from this list since they have been broken up, sunk or wrecked.

a. Since last report.

	Gross tonnage
Agenor (Cypriot)	7, 139
Laurel (Cypriot)	7, 297
Shienfoon (British)	7, 127

b. Previous reports (broken up, sunk or wrecked):

Flag of registry:	
British	3
Cypriot	3
Greek	1
Lebanese	2
Maltese	1
Polish	1

By order of Acting Maritime Administrator.

Date: March 5, 1969.

James S. Dawson, Jr.,
Secretary.

PHILIP STERN SHOWS HOW THE SUPER-RICH AVOID TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Reuss), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Philip Stern has written an excellent article entitled "How 381 Super-Rich American Managed Not to Pay a Cent in Taxes Last Year" which appeared in the New York Times Magazine on April 13.

The article discusses many of the tax loopholes that would be closed off by H.R. 5250, the Tax Reform Act of 1969, which I introduced earlier this year. To date, 44 Members have sponsored this bill and later identical or substantially identical bills. They are: myself; Mr. Meeds of Washington, Mr. Rees of California, Mr. William D. Ford of Michigan, Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania, Mr. Adams of Washington, Mr. Bingham of New York, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Zablocki of Wisconsin, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Gibbons of Florida, Mr. Conyers of Michigan, Mr. Long of Maryland, Mr. St. Onge of Connecticut, Mr. Farbstein of New York, Mr. Podell of New York, Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Mikva of Illinois, Mr. Eilberg of Pennsylvania, Mr. Yatron of Pennsylvania, Mr. Rosenthal of New York, Mr. Vigorito of Pennsylvania, Mr. Koch of New York, Mr. Nedzi of Michigan, Mr. Dingell of Michigan, Mr. Helstoski of New Jersey, Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts, Mr. Blatnik of Minnesota, Mr. Karth of Minnesota, Mr. Roybal of California, Mr. Brademas of Indiana, Mr. Madden of Indiana, Mr. Vanik of Ohio, Mr. Lowenstein of New York, Mr. Obey of Wisconsin, Mr. Howard of New Jersey, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. Gallagher of New Jersey, Mr. Halpern of New York, Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania, Mr. McCarthy of New York, Mr. Fraser of Minnesota, and Mr. Schwengel of Iowa.

I commend the Stern article to my colleagues and include it at this point in the Record:

How 381 Super-Rich Americans Managed Not To Pay a Cent in Taxes Last Year

(By Philip M. Stern)

(Note.—Philip M. Stern, author of "The Great Treasury Raid," wrote the book, he says, with the object of making tax loopholes intelligible to his wife.)

Washington.—There are, in this land, some 381 rich or super-rich Americans who can look back upon April 15, 1968, with satisfaction, if not smugness—and who are probably facing this Tuesday's midnight tax deadline with near or total equanimity. The reason: even though each had an income in excess of $100,000, not one of the 381 paid a penny of Federal income tax last April. Indeed, 21 of them had incomes of more than $1-million in 1967 but contrived to pass the 1968 deadline wholly unscathed. And they are likely to have equal success this year.

In 1966, four lucky Americans, each of whom drew an income in excess of $5-million, clearly escaped taxation. Even that achievement was dwarfed by the gentleman who a few years ago enjoyed an income of more than $20-million and shared not a penny of it with Internal Revenue.

Such tax avoidance exploits are dramatically on the rise. In just 12 years' time, taxlessness among those with incomes of more than $1-million has increased five-fold; for those with incomes greater than $200,000, there has been a seven-fold increase—far outstripping the growth in the number of people in each category.

Some of these facts were disclosed to Congress last January by outgoing Treasury Secretary Joseph Barr, when he issued his now-famous warning of a "taxpayers' revolt" if such tax avoidance is permitted to continue. Barr's revelation has not been kindly received by the incoming Administration, one of whose tax officials has denounced it as inflammatory" and "unprofessional." The existence of tax-free millionaires and multimillionaires, this official observed, is "not necessarily meaningful."

Judging from the public response evoked by Barr's statement (20 times as many pro-tax-reform letters received by the Treasury Department this February as compared with last), the issue of taxlessness among the hyperaffluent is of considerable interest to Americans of far more modest means. That includes 2.2 million who live below the official "poverty line" ($2,200 for a married couple), and yet pay some taxes, and those in the $7,000 to $20,000 income range. As Barr noted, these 35 million taxpayers pay half of all the individual income taxes the Treasury receives, and their taxes are generally based on the "fully ordinary rates" found on page 11 of the Form 1040 instructions.

That rate schedule, which calls for paying increasingly stiff rates as income rises, leaves the inescapable impression that the richer a person is, the greater the share of his income goes to the U.S. Treasury. But in the economic stratosphere, the actuality is strikingly different. According to Government figures for recent years, the facts are that—

More than a thousand taxpayers with incomes over $200,000 paid the same proportion of their total income in taxes as did the typical person in the $15,000–$20,000 group.

The bulk of taxpayers in the $500,000 to $1-million income group paid as small a proportion of their incomes in taxes as did most taxpayers with average incomes only one-twentieth as great (i.e., those in the $20,000 to $50,000 category).

The topmost income group—those with incomes of more than $5-million a year—

paid only half as much tax, proportionately, as those with one-tenth as much income.

As such figures indicate, the supposedly "inflammatory" Mr. Barr was actually telling only part of the story of the tax avoidance success of the very rich. The official statistics he used make no mention, for example, of the huge amounts of income which the wealthy are permitted, in computing their taxes, to treat as if nonexistent. Most conspicuously, half of all "capital gains" (profits from the sale of property—stocks, real estate, etc.) may be entirely ignored for tax purposes.[1] For the superrich, this brings immense comfort. Among those listed as having incomes over $5-million, average income was $9-million, and two-thirds of that sum was in capital gains. Thus, on the average, $3-million per taxpayer was entirely outside the reach of the tax collector. All told, about $13-billion is excluded from taxable income annually in this manner, at a yearly cost of $4.5-billion. As if this were not a sufficiently generous tax treatment of capital gains, the law permits total escape from the gains tax on stocks held until death and passed on to one's heirs. (At least $15-billion escapes the gains tax in this manner each year, depriving the Treasury of about $2.5-billion in revenue.)

In addition to the capital-gains exclusion, interest from state and local bonds doesn't even have to be reported on tax returns—a fact that put the late Mrs. Horace Dodge, owner of $56-million worth of such bonds, in a position to enjoy more than $1.5-million of this income without even filing a return.

Moreover, Secretary Barr spoke only of the wholly untaxed multi-millionaires, omitting the many others who, while paying some taxes, manage to pay far less than is called for under the regular rate schedule. For example, that schedule seems to call for those with incomes of $1-million and more to pay about 65 per cent of that income in taxes, yet more than two-thirds of the multimillionaires in that group contrive to pay less than 30 per cent, for a tax saving of $350,000 on each million dollars of income.

Chairman Wilbur Mills of the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee has said he intends to have his group look into the tax returns of those agile persons with wholly untaxed incomes of more than $200,000, to see how they manage their escape. But actually the get-away routes are far from secret, having been written into the public tax laws by the predecessors of the Mills group. Moreover, the specific tax avoidance maneuvers employed by actual taxpayers (as taken from their returns) have recently been published in a Treasury Department study, from which the following cases of Messrs. A through K have been taken.

For a man not gainfully employed (no wages or salaries reported), Mr. A fared handsomely, with an income of just under $11 million, almost all of it from dividends (indicating stock holdings of about $300 million). Not a penny of this impressive income went to the U.S. Treasury because of the "unlimited charitable deduction." Mr. A. is one of about 70 Americans who have earned an exemption from the usual 30 per cent ceiling on charitable deductions. He did so by giving to charity for eight years the equivalent of 90 per cent of his taxable income.[2] Having won the right to an unlimited charitable deduction, Mr. A was able to cancel out nearly all of his taxable income in one strike: the gift to charity (quite likely the A Family Foundation) of stock valued at $10.5-million. So great was Mr. A's wealth, however, that this act of prodigious generosity was barely noticeable; it represented only 3 per cent of his total holdings; in an average year, stock market rises would more than make up the gift, so that Mr. A would end the year richer than ever.

Had Mr. A been subject to the ordinary charitable deduction ceiling of 30 per cent, he would have had to pay a tax of about $5 million. But the unlimited charitable deduction, plus a few hundred thousand of other deductions (for state and local taxes, investment management fees, etc.) reduced his taxable income to zero and spared him that annoyance.

Actually, Mr. A's total tax saving was even greater, for the stock he donated had risen greatly in value since he had inherited it from father or grandfather. If he had sold the stock and given cash to charity, he would have had to pay a $2-million capital gains tax on the $8-million increase in the stock's value. But the tax laws are generous: they give him credit for the increase, but forgive him the tax on it.

At the end of the whole transaction, Mr. A's net outlay is only $3.5-million (the $10.5-million gift minus the two-part tax saving of $7 million). And he has the full enjoyment of the $5-million in cold, here-and-now cash spending money that otherwise would have gone to the United States Treasury.

The untaxed increase in the value of gifts to charity sometimes reaches impressive proportion. One donor got a $201,000 deduction for stock worth just $181 when he received it; another received a deduction of $21.6-million, up from $247,000. His total tax saving (or added "take-home pay," if one can put it that way): $16-million—$11-million in the income tax he wholly avoided plus an added $5-million in the forgiven capital gains tax, which he would have had to pay if he had sold the stock. The same benefits would have been available if Mr. A's donation had been in the form of a presciently purchased painting that had skyrocketed in value. And if the gift had consisted of nonvoting stock in the family-held company (as is sometimes the case), Mr. A's generosity would not even have diluted his control of the firm.

While Mr. A. cleanly avoided all taxes, Mr. G was less tidy about canceling out his $1,284,718 of income and suffered the indignity of paying $383 in taxes—about three-hundredths of 1 per cent of his total income. (By contrast, the typical unmarried individual earning $1,700 would pay 7 per cent of his income in taxes.)

Almost all of Mr. G's income was in those familiar capital gains, half of which can legally be ignored for tax purposes. Thus his reduction-finding task was reduced to some $600,000. Evidently the charitable deduction had little appeal to Mr. G: of his $1,284,000 income, only $463 went to charity. Instead, this credit-worthy individual found no difficulty in offsetting most of that $600,000 by borrowing about $10-million, on which the interest payments (all deductible) came to $588,000. But for this deduction, Mr. G would have had to pay a tax on his $600,000 taxable income of about 65 cents on the dollar. Thus, in a sense, the Treasury was underwriting 65 per cent of his borrowing costs, his net out-of-pocket outlay (taking this tax saving into account) was therefore only 35 cents on the dollar. Moreover, Congress, often so parsimonious with Government funds, has sanctioned a profligate use of the Treasury in cases such as this, for there is nothing in the tax laws to prevent Mr. G from taking his $10-million of borrowings, the interest on which is partially financed by the Government, and investing them in such a way as to generate even more tax-favored income causing further incursions on the Treasury.

He might, for example, secure a 100 per cent loan of a new $10-million building and turn it into what is aptly called a tax "shelter." Ignoring the fact that he does not have a penny of this own in the building, and according him all the benefits of a full cash owner, the law permits Mr. G to assume, for tax purposes, that the building is wearing out (depreciating) much faster in the early years of its life than in its later years. This friction, sometimes called a fast tax write-off, produces huge depreciation deductions ($800,000 in the first year, in this case), far exceeding the building's rental income and leaving generous excess deductions to "shelter," or offset, income Mr. G. derives from other sources.

The use of that very escape route brought great tax joy to Mr. J who, despite a total income of $1,433,000, was able with a straight face to tell the Treasury that his income for tax purposes was a *minus* $3,000. His real estate "losses" of $864,000 exceeded his taxable income, and he was allowed to apply that $3,000 "loss" to the reduction of his taxable income in other years. Nor is the tax-free Mr. J unique. The Treasury Department, on studying 13 wealthy real estate operators, found that nine of them had succeeded in reducing their taxes to zero and two others to less than $25.

The tax returns of these multimillionaire tycoons would suggest they are atrocious businessmen, since their mammoth investments in motels and shopping centers appear consistently to produce devastating "losses." The same impression may be derived from the returns of the so-called "gentleman farmers" whose business sense seems only to fail them when they turn to farming. Those in the $100,000-to-$1-million income group who invested in nonfarm ventures showed profits outweighing losses by a 5-to-1 ratio. But those in that same, supposedly sophisticated income group who went into farm ventures reported "losses" outweighing profits by a 3-to-1 margin.

These "losses" are incurred by top-bracket city folk (stock brokers are replacing show business luminaries as the most avid "gentleman farmers") who invest in, say, herds of breeding cattle or in citrus groves. While the herd or grove is maturing, there is no income, but lots of fully deductible expenses, creating a protective "shelter" for the nonfarm income earned in Hollywood or on Wall Street. And here again, the bulk of these expenses are in "tax dollars" which would otherwise have gone to the Treasury. In the case of Mr. K, whose seemingly egregious business sense led him to incur a farm "loss" on the year of $450,000, the shelter was sufficient to keep the tax collector from laying a finger on his $738,203 of income. (As usual, the exclusion of a quarter of a million dollars of capital gains greatly facilitated the tax-avoidance feat.)

Co-beneficiaries of the special farm tax provision are the promoters and farm "managers" who take care of the herd or grove for a fee (tax deductible, of course, to the investor) and who unabashedly encourage high-bracket Wall Street cowboys to take full advantage of the U.S. Treasury for their own enrichment. "Citrus Tax Angles," a publication emanating from a promotion group in Redlands, Calif., tells the prospective investor that, after two years of tax saving, he "more than recaptures" his original outlay, "and he still has title to appreciating real estate [the citrus grove]. Think of it—tax dollars were used to purchase the property and are the only dollars invested."

Partly out of concern that such tax blandishments are artificially boosting farm land prices, the Treasury Department and some rural Congressmen have proposed a $15,000 limit on farm "loss" deductions by city folk, a suggestion branded by retired Brig. Gen. H. L. Oppenheimer, the most celebrated promoter of tax-loss cattle breeding, as "principally motivated by a 'soak-the-rich' philosophy and the socialistic desire to bring all take-home incomes down to the same level."

---

[1] The other half is taxed at rates no higher than 50 per cent. Thus, no matter how great a person's other income, or how stupendous his capital gains, the tax on those gains is never more than 25 per cent (50 per cent of half the gain)—about the same top rate as a family with a taxable income of around $12,000. This is in acute disharmony with the "ability to pay" principle that supposedly underlies the American graduated income tax.

[2] This seemingly difficult feat can be accomplished with a puny gift to charity in the case of an oil tycoon, for example, who uses some special deductions to reduce his taxable income to negligible proportions.

Sometimes, beneath the land where tax-saving cattle graze, there lies oil. Such, apparently, was the case with Mr. I, who combined a spectacular lack of success in farming (incurring a "loss" of some $828,000) with an $865,000 special oil deduction ("percentage depletion") and was thus able to protect every penny of his $1,313,000 net income from the hands of the tax collector. Under the depletion law, 27½ percent of the income from an oil well is not taxable.

In addition to his depletion allowance, Mr. I enjoyed a $125,000 deduction for "intangible drilling expenses," a tax prerequisite less well known than percentage depletion but, to many oil investors, far more useful. Unlike the ordinary capital investment—say, in a machine—which is deducted gradually over the useful life of the machine, most of the cost of drilling an oil well can be deducted immediately. This privilege accounts for the recent dramatic growth of what Barron's Magazine has termed "a tax-sheltered venture . . . enjoying mounting popularity on Wall Street: the oil-drilling participation fund." Such funds are apparently tailored to investors more interested in tax savings than oil discovery, since they usually involve drilling in unproven, "wild-cat" areas where the odds against finding oil are something like 14 to 1.

The intangible drilling deduction is considered especially handy by those oil tycoons with an apparent aversion (or phobia) to paying any Federal income taxes—ever. One oil man has given standing instructions to his tax attorney to "drill up" any potentially taxable income that may loom on his financial horizon. Others are said to guide their drilling decisions with monthly warnings from computers as to income needing "shelter" from Internal Revenue. One oil magnate managed to avoid paying any taxes over an entire 12-year period, during which he sold at least $50-million worth of oil.

Such consistent avoiders of taxation must be the object of special envy and resentment from those of modest incomes who are deeply opposed to the Vietnam war, and who long to withhold part or all of their taxes as a protest of conscience. But while they are barred from doing so by the danger of heavy fine or imprisonment, 381 of the super-rich were able to achieve the same result last year, wholly within the law.

One proposal for ending total tax avoidance, favored by the late Robert Kennedy and espoused by officials of the outgoing Johnson Administration, would impose a minimum tax on the well-to-do, applicable to their total income, that total to include the now-excluded half of capital gains, state and local bond interest, the special oil-depletion deductions and the presently untaxed increase in the value of gifts to charity.

The suggestion has been criticized from all sides. It is strongly opposed by the new Nixon team in the Treasury Department on the ground that it would not accomplish the objective of taxing all wealthy persons. The Nixon tax experts are said to be looking for better ways of ending inequities in the tax system.

The minimum-tax idea as proposed by the Treasury also draws criticism from tax reformers. Former Internal Revenue Commissioner Mortimer Caplin points out that it leaves two escape routes unaffected—the "intangible" oil deduction and the "fast write-off" on buildings. Unless these routes are closed, Caplin says, there might still be 21 untaxed multimillionaires.

More generally, tax reform purists do not like the blanket approach embodied in the proposal; they are critical of the Treasury's failure to tackle head-on the specific loopholes. Those who had high hopes in 1961, when the leading exponent of tax reform, Harvard Law Professor Stanley Surrey, took over the Treasury's tax affairs, are puzzled as to why, after eight years of Surrey's administration, the Treasury remains silent on, or is still "studying" these longstanding, costly, well-known favors.

Surrey did bequeath his successors a study highlighting one often-overlooked aspect of tax preferences. Because the loopholes permit the leakage of revenue that would otherwise come into the Treasury, they are just as expensive, and contribute just as much to budget deficits, as do conventional spending programs for which Congress votes the funds each year. For example, were it not for the special tax provisions for oil and gas, the Treasury would net an added $1.6-billion in revenues annually. In this sense, says Surrey, each tax loophole is really a "tax expenditure," but it is hidden (it doesn't show up in the President's budget), and neither the President nor the Congress makes any annual judgment as to its benefits or how it fits into current national priorities.

This has great importance now, when President Nixon is pressing his resistant Cabinet departments to reduce rather than increase the spending levels proposed by their Democratic predecessors. If the oil and gas exploration "subsidy" were an appropriated item, as are the farm subsidies that are part of the Agriculture Department budget, the $1.6-billion would presumably be charged to the budget of the Government department concerned with natural resource development, the Interior Department, and Interior Secretary Hickel would be examining it critically against other natural resource programs as he tries to comply with the President's budget-cutting edict. But because the oil subsidy is a hidden "tax expenditure," it is immune from such scrutiny—even though it has remained unchanged for over 40 years (during which circumstances and technology have altered greatly) and even though a recently released study states that the $1.6-billion "expenditure" is netting the nation only about $150-million in added oil reserves.

The same is true of the "fast tax write-offs" for real estate, which now represent an annual "tax expenditure" of $750-million—only $50-million of which is spent on the most urgent building need, low-cost housing.

All told, the Surrey study states, such hidden "tax expenditures" now total a minimum of $60-billion a year—one-third the size of the conventional budget. Yet they remain seemingly immune from both Presidential and Congressional budget-cutting impulses while Congressionally appropriated programs such as the Job Corps (reportedly destined for a $120-million cut) remain exposed and vulnerable.

Mr. Nixon and his advisers seem intent on even greater use of "tax expenditures," via tax incentives to stimulate private participation in job training and low-cost housing. These, rather than any major reform program, will receive the Administration's attention this year.

Loophole-closing has never been a favored political pastime in America. Congress has behaved as though it had a phobia against it and to date has proved adept only at opening the loopholes wider and for more and more groups. Even Presidents, who have a national constituency and a national responsibility, have shown little feel for curbing tax avoidance. Modest efforts were made by F.D.R. in the thirties (after the disclosure that many owners of large yachts were paying no taxes), Harry Truman in 1950 and John F. Kennedy in 1961 and 1963. But in all cases, these Presidents marched up Capitol Hill and then marched down again, having failed to close any basic loophole.

Presidential skittishness about facing the tax-reform issue reached a notable height in the closing days of President Johnson's term. Under Congressional mandate to propose a loophole-closing program and with nothing political but his name in history to worry about, Mr. Johnson not only refused to endorse the Treasury Department's reform proposals, but even declined to allow them to be made public before he had left office—even though those proposals, as noted, sidestepped virtually every tax favor of any consequence. When the Treasury "package" was reluctantly made public by Congress, it was quickly disavowed by the new Treasury officials of the Nixon Administration, who have indicated they will look for their own ways to foster tax equity and are said to be floundering for a course of action as they begin to sense the muscle of the various pressure groups involved.

Why has tax reform fared so abysmally? The answer boils down to this simple fact: those who benefit from a given tax favor are generally cohesive, well organized, superbly financed and endowed with all the energy and zeal that the threat of losing tens, if not hundreds, of millions of dollars can provide. By contrast, those who favor closing a given loophole are usually diffuse, unorganized, largely inarticulate—and perhaps fearful of pressing too hard for reforms lest Congress begin to frown on their own particular tax preferences. The loophole-closing efforts of most labor unions (whose members enjoy tax-free treatment of billions in medical, pension and other fringe benefits) have been less than zealous, although logically the unions should be the leading opponents of tax favors to the rich. A few days ago, the A.F.L.-C.I.O. did call on Congress to impose higher taxes on "the loophole set"; yet a few weeks earlier, the huge union rebuffed a group of reform-minded Congressmen and refused to put up a penny to organize a citizens' tax-protest movement.

As indicated earlier, Secretary Barr's revelation of the untaxed wealthy has inspired an outpouring of mail to Congressmen, but it is only a trickle compared with the torrents stimulated in just a few weeks' time in 1962 by the savings and loan associations, when a tax provision inimical to the associations seemed likely to pass. (It was defeated, thanks to the outpouring of mail.) And when a single industry, such as oil and gas, enjoys an annual tax subsidy as huge as $1.6-billion, the expenditure of even a minute fraction of that amount to insure continued congressional (and even Presidential) sympathy for the depletion allowance must be reckoned as an extremely lucrative "investment." (In the closing days of a hard-fought off-year campaign some years ago, several Western-state senatorial candidates were offered campaign contributions provided they would pledge themselves in favor of the depletion allowance.)

As the corpses of past reform efforts attest, the battle against the loopholes is an acutely uneven contest. In my own view, the balance will not shift materially unless there comes to pass (a) some form of publicly financed support for political campaigns, so that candidates are not so heavily dependent on contributions from special-interest groups (as even the most public-spirited are today), and (b) a broad public protest against the tax favors enjoyed by the wealthy and by large corporations.

But the latter will not come to pass, I believe, as long as the loophole closers continue to address the basic tax preferences obliquely rather than head-on. A case in point is a 13-point reform bill favored by a group of Congressmen headed by Wisconsin's Democratic

Representative Henry Reuss. By far the most venturesome plan put forward this year, it has the enticement of offering an alternative to the 10 per cent surtax extension (it plugs enough loopholes to raise the same amount of revenue as the surtax—which wholly bypasses the untaxed multimillionaires). Yet the Reuss package merely favors reducing the oil-depletion allowance, rather than repealing it outright (in favor, perhaps, of a Congressionally appropriated oil exploration subsidy, should that prove necessary). By failing to question the principle of the depletion allowance, they are inhibited from asking why oil investors are so special as to require what amounts to a double deduction on their investment (the intangible deductions plus the depletion allowance) or why a multibillion-dollar exploration incentive is needed in a nation so oil rich that it permits some oil states to limit artificially the amount of oil produced.

Similarly, the Reuss group favors closing certain escape routes (the real estate and farm "losses," for example) that depend on the special capital gains tax. But the Congressmen have avoided any head-on confrontation with the preferential capital gains tax itself—that is, with the principle of according favored treatment to one kind of income. They have thus denied themselves the chance to pose such basic and popularly understandable questions as:

Why should the work of money be so vastly favored over the work of men? Why should a lawyer or doctor or engineer pay more taxes on dollars he works to earn than an investor pays on dollars that others may earn for him? Why is a dollar of capital-gains income different from a dollar of earned income when it comes to buying food or shoes—or yachts—or, for that matter, paying taxes?[3]

Many tax reformers argue that frontal assaults on such sacred cows as the depletion allowance and the capital-gains tax are "politically unrealistic." Yet the dismal fate of most reform efforts suggests that, on the contrary, it is the indirect and cautious approach that has proved politically impractical, by its failure to pose questions and issues simple enough to spark widespread public protest against the loopholes.

Tax reform is not necessarily a partisan matter. In the opinion of Republican members of the House Ways and Means Committee (which handles tax legislation for the House), "The need for a thorough overhauling of our tax system . . . is one of our most pressing national problems." And according to the chairman of that committee, Arkansas Democrat Wilbur Mills, "We can no longer afford to defer serious, large-scale efforts to revise our Federal tax system."

Each of those statements has a contemporary ring. The first was made in 1943; the second in 1958. But the sweeping tax reform of which they spoke in such urgent terms is still a thing of the future. In fact, as noted earlier, the extent of total tax avoidance among the very rich has risen greatly since Congressman Mills spoke the words quoted above.

Reformers and the general public have sometimes tended to be intimidated by the immense complexity of the tax laws. But the tax question really boils down, ultimately, to a simple question: Who pays how much? Twenty-one multimillionaires pay nothing, while two million persons below the poverty line pay something. The public response to that plain fact may encourage the would-be reformers to confront head-on both the tax "experts" and their largely unquestioned Conventional Wisdoms.

CLOSING THE JOB CORPS CENTERS THREATENS NEW YORK CITY YOUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable that the Nixon administration plans to scuttle the Job Corps and close 59 of the 113 Job Corps centers for training youth from our urban ghettos and deprived areas of rural America.

Over 1 year ago the lack of substantial employment opportunities for the thousands of youth trapped in urban ghettos was cited by the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders as one of the principal causes of riots in our urban areas and of the despair and hopelessness that characterize the lives of millions of inner city Americans. The report of that Commission recommended greatly expanded training and employment opportunities for ghetto youth as an important component of a comprehensive attack on the causes of urban poverty.

Now the President has embarked upon a course which is bound to further aggravate existing tensions. The plan to cut back the number of Job Corps training centers will produce disillusionment among present Job Corps recruits and increase the skepticism and bitterness with which millions of deprived Americans increasingly view their Government.

The effect of the closings on Job Corps trainees from New York City illustrates the disastrous consequences unless the implementation of the plan is blocked by Congress.

New York City ghetto youth constitute 800 of the 1,500 trainees at the Kilmer, N.J., Job Corps Center; 45 of the 90 trainees at Wellfleet, Mass.; 60 of the 120 trainees at Acadia, Maine; and 400 of the 1,200 trainees at Poland Spring, Maine. If the administration's plan to close these centers is carried out, between 1,500 and 1,600 New York City youths will be forced out of Job Corps training in which they are already enrolled.

Many of these youngsters are halfway through programs of training, the duration of which ranges from 6 months to 2 years. In addition, numerous trainees are well on their way toward completing high school equivalency education programs. This educational training, which is invaluable in today's job market, will also be thwarted by the administration's planned cutbacks.

The popularity of Job Corps training programs is attested to by the number of youngsters on the waiting list for enrollment. In New York City 350 young people are on the waiting lists for Job Corps centers which are already operating at capacity, and 100 youngsters apply for Job Corps training each week.

Camp Kilmer in New Jersey is to be completely closed by July 1. This means the uprooting of the 1,500 trainees now enrolled at Camp Kilmer. Although the Labor Department said, "Youth who are still at centers at the time of closing will be given other training opportunities," it is unlikely that the trainees would actually be able to continue with their programs. Many undoubtedly would leave out of discouragement and disillusionment. For others, available space at other locations simply would not exist. Furthermore, the Department of Labor stated that there would be a shift of training emphasis to 30 inner city and near city training centers. However, there are no such centers.

Not only New York City but communities across the Nation will suffer as a result of the administration's unwise decision to reduce the number of Job Corps enrollees by one-third—from the present enrollment of 35,000 to 24,000.

If economy is needed in the Federal budget, badly undernourished domestic programs surely ought not to be the first victims. Let the brunt of budget reductions fall on those Federal programs most responsible for inflation in the first place; namely, the inflated military budget. The kind of "economizing" proposed by the administration, in the short run, will produce justifiable bitterness and hostility toward the Federal Government by those millions of poor Americans who urgently require job training and increased employment opportunities. In the long run, the effect will also be counterproductive, for the contribution these young people could make to the economies of their communities and the Nation would far exceed the cost of their training.

While the administration is ready to "economize" on the budget of the Job Corps by $100 million, it proposes a $6 billion increase in non-Vietnam defense spending. We cannot allow this kind of topsy-turvey budgeting to continue.

As the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorder made clear, and as was affirmed by last month's report of the National Urban Coalition on the lack of progress made since the Kerner Commission's summons to action, we need increased support for programs like the Job Corps—not less. If the administration will not recognize that fact and arrange its budgetary priorities accordingly, then it is up to Congress to exercise its responsibility.

FOUNDATION RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, tax-free foundations control very large resources in this country. These resources are used in almost every conceivable fashion for the public good. There can be no doubt that for the most part foundations have used their powers wisely and well; they have produced new knowledge in many fields of endeavor; they have blazed new paths in arts, in sciences, and in humanities. Yet the fact remains that foundations have very great burdens of responsibility, and when they fail to exercise that responsibility the foundations lose their usefulness and worse, may actually do more harm than good.

The president of the Ford Foundation candidly admits this danger in his current annual review. Mr. McGeorge Bundy writes that as the largest of all foundations, the Ford Foundation has the greatest responsibility of all, and must take every action to insure that it does not fall into complacency, or become irrelevant. After all, he notes, if a business makes a mistake, or if a union becomes irrelevant, it fails; but a foundation can make an error and emerge with its assets completely intact. Lacking either a constituency or a market against which to test itself, a foundation must be especially wary lest it become irresponsible and defeat the good it intends to accomplish.

---

[3] It is true that capital gains often reflect several years' build-up in value, and it would be unfair to tax them as if they had been entirely earned in the year they are realized. But this is a problem the tax laws have faced in other areas and solved through so-called "income averaging."

Despite Mr. Bundy's commendable concern it is possible that the Ford Foundation can make serious errors, and I believe that in at least one case it has. I believe that the foundation has a heavy responsibility to correct the failings in a series of large grants that he made last year.

A few years ago the Ford Foundation became interested in what it conceived to be the problems of Americans of Spanish surname, or Mexican-Americans. This group is the second largest of American minorities, and its approximately 5 million persons live principally in the five Southwestern States. Most Mexican-Americans—about 80 percent—live in urban areas. Substantial numbers are poor, undereducated, and unemployed. The Ford Foundation, commendably enough, decided that it had a responsibility to alleviate the problems of this mass of people. Toward that end it designed several new programs for action.

One thing that surprised the Ford analysts was that the Mexican-American population had no effective national organization; there was no equivalent of the NAACP or the Urban League. Such groups as existed tended to exist only in a region or at most in a State, perhaps in parts of two States. But no Mexican-American organization had a paid staff, and there was no coordination between the groups that existed. The foundation concluded that one prime requisite for progress was national organization and national leadership; such an organization could define goals toward which the whole group could aspire, and could coordinate the efforts of all groups toward those national goals.

Thus the Ford Foundation made a grant of $630,000 to create what is now known as the Southwest Council for La Raza—the race. This would be the new national leadership organization. However, the council thus far seems to have restricted its concepts to creating new groups rather than coordinating existing groups, and creating further divisions in an already balkanized political structure. The council's activity in my own district has been simply to create new militant organizations, some of which have questionable leadership. Indeed, the proliferation of new organizations over the past year has made it all but impossible to determine which is and is not funded with foundation money, let alone to know even if the foundation is aware of how its money is being used.

For example, the Southwest Council of La Raza made a grant of about $110,000 to an instant organization—by that I mean a brandnew creation—known as the Mexican-American Unity Council. This council is headed by a very young and peculiar man whose attitudes appear to be more or less racist. The Mexican-American Unity Council has in turn created other new organizations such as an institution called La Universidad de los Barrios, meaning the "University of the Neighborhoods." This "university" has as its dean a young college junior, and its purpose—lacking a curriculum or classes—is said to be working with delinquents and others to create construction action.

The problem with this "university" is that its headquarters have served as a sort of hangout for tough characters, and it has been the scene of drinking bouts and wild activity. Neighbors have been terrorized; one person who called in the police reported to me that her home had been stoned and her son's life threatened. She asked me, "What am I to do? I am poor, but I am decent."

I confess that there was nothing that I could do, because this "university" like the foundation that created it, is accountable only to itself. If its "dean" knows nothing of university activity, let alone dealing with tough characters, then that is his affair, and there is nothing I can do with it. Some time ago the "university" was the scene of a killing, and since that time its life has quieted down somewhat. Still, there is no evidence that this institution has any real role to play, outside of serving as a place of employment for a confused young man and a couple of his friends who happen to know people with foundation money to dispense as they see fit. I confess to my colleagues that it is hard to answer when constituents ask me why police characters can go into banks and cash checks drawn on this "university" to be used for purposes known only to themselves.

The Mexican-American Unity Council has also lent its support to a new, young militant group known as the Mexican-American Youth Organization; its sole paid officer is paid from foundation money. This organization is out-and-out racist in its outlook and is pledged to locate, identify, and "eliminate" what it calls gringos which happens to include the majority of the people of Texas if I can judge the true meaning of their rhetoric.

But the relationships between the Southwest Council of La Raza and these strange characters become even more complex than I have described; in addition to using intermediaries to fund organizations that push the political aspirations of council board members, the Ford Foundation has another operation that also has ties with groups like MAYO.

The Ford Foundation wanted to create new leadership, and in fact the new leaders it has created daily proclaim that existing leadership is no good, having made commendable efforts but produced little progress—and my colleagues will pardon me if I disagree with that canard. The foundation also wanted to create a very large legal defense effort, similar to the NAACP legal defense fund; to accomplish this a grant of $2,200,000 was made to establish the Mexican-American legal defense and educational fund; this organization is headquartered in San Antonio and has a substantial staff of lawyers, plus about 230 cooperating attorneys.

The legal defense fund does commendable work. But it also has on its staff people whose activities seem to have little or nothing to do with legal work. For instance, the president of MAYO, who likes to threaten to "kill" what he terms "gringos" if all else fails, and who says that it is expecting too much of him if he should not hate, happens to be an investigator for the legal defense fund. He spends vast amounts of his time promoting MAYO activities, and of course the nature of his job allows him to do this. He travels widely to "investigate" but also makes a great many speeches. Not long ago he was in Washington to raise funds to replace VISTA volunteers who had been asked to leave Del Rio, Tex. I do not think that he was exactly on vacation from his job that day. The office walls of the M.A.L.D.F. legal staff are graced with Che Guevara posters.

I do not think that the Ford Foundation really intended that its funds should be used to create organizations or pay leadership that is clearly irresponsible. The actions of some of these groups and individuals is plainly and simply dangerous. I do not believe that it is wise to hand a child gasoline and matches, but this is what has been done all too often through grants made from the Southwest Council of La Raza and its subsidiaries.

I think that the Ford Foundation wants to see progress in the southwest. But I must come to the sad conclusion that rather than fostering brotherhood, the foundation has supported the spewings of hate, and rather than creating a new political unity, it has destroyed what little there was, and rather than creating new leadership it is simply financing the ambitions of some men who are greedy and some who are ruthless, and a few who are plainly irresponsible.

I hope that the foundation accepts its responsibility and will see that its funds are used in the future for the real purposes intended. It saddens me that a foundation dedicated to constructive action has let its resources be used for action that is destructive and counterproductive. I hope that racists are not the new leaders that the foundation wants to see created; I hope that little men are not permitted the luxury of using money intended for very large purposes. I hope that the House will join me in my concern, and call upon the Ford Foundation to exercise the responsibility its president is so keenly aware of.

THE HELPLESS BLIND? SAYS WHO?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Members of the House if any one of them ever believed so firmly in a bill that they visited the office of every other Member to obtain support for the bill?

I must admit I have never done this myself, nor have I ever heard of any other Member doing it.

But this phenomenal feat has just been performed.

It has been performed by John Nagle, and John Nagle is totally blind!

Traveling entirely alone, swinging his long cane from side to side before him, Nagle went from office to office in the three House Office Buildings, somehow managing to find his way through the labyrinthian corridors that are such a confusing maze to us who are sighted.

Says Nagle:

> When I first started operating on the Hill, I often got lost. When someone came along, I would hesitantly and apologetically ask for help—
>
> But—

Laughed this blind man—

> everybody would reply that they had worked in the building 6 months or 6 years, and still got lost!

So "getting lost" to Nagle proves he is just like everyone else.

John Nagle's recent journey through all of the House was undertaken to explain a bill I had introduced at the request of the National Federation of the Blind, the organization for which John Nagle speaks.

This bill, H.R. 3782, would make certain most necessary changes in the Federal disability insurance law for blind people.

But Nagle did more than just explain H.R. 3782 and answer questions about its provisions.

He also asked that each Member introduce a bill identical to my disability insurance for the blind measure.

Nagle's goal was to demonstrate that H.R. 3782 has substantial House support, and he certainly achieved this goal.

For as of yesterday, 90 bills identical to H.R. 3782 have been introduced in the House—the greatest number of like-bills, I believe, introduced so far in the first session of the 91st Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and many of our colleagues are already well acquainted with this amazing person, John Nagle, but since there are those present who have not had the inspiring experience of knowing this man, I would like to briefly describe a few facts about him.

John was born in Springfield, Mass. He lost his sight at the age of 13 and grew up into adulthood as a totally blind person.

John attended the Perkins School for the Blind in Waterstown, Mass., where he learned the skills of blindness, and, in 1934, obtained a high school diploma.

John says he understood early in life that if a blind person was to get anywhere in life, he would only be able to do so through an adequate education. So he was determined to get one.

John recalls:

> Besides, I really didn't have any other choice. The accepted employments for the blind were not open to me. Work with my hands was not for me, for I'm clumsy and inept with my hands.

After studying journalism at Boston University for 2 years and discovering that newspaper editors were not at all interested in hiring a self-confident but blind journalist, Nagle decided to become a lawyer.

The 9 years, from 1937 to 1946, were busy ones for this ambitious blind man.

For 5 years he attended law classes at night and worked days on a WPA project.

During World War II, Nagle was a subassembler at the Springfield Armory, and he was in his newly opened law office when not in the factory, or not attending classes nights at a local college—"to earn the rest of my A.B. degree," reports Nagle.

For 15 years, John was engaged in the general practice of law in his home city of Springfield, and was a most active member of the community, with memberships in many organizations, a staunch and vocal supporter of many causes.

But the one cause that increasingly absorbed Nagle's time and concern was that of his fellow blind.

He held various offices in the Greater Springfield Association of the Blind, the Associated Blind of Massachusetts, and, in December 1958 he was invited to work in the Washington office of the National Federation of the Blind.

For the past 10 years, John Nagle has become a familiar sight on Capitol Hill.

He has presented testimony in nearly 100 congressional hearings, always reading well-thought-out and forcefully presented arguments from a braille text.

John Nagle has become a Capitol Hill legend—always moving surely and swiftly to a congressional office or hearing room, always purposeful, well informed, and sober—yet with a sobriety that quickly brightens into a beaming smile.

When Nagle speaks of the organization for which he works, he speaks with a fervor of a zealot:

> The National Federation of the Blind is a nation-wide organization of blind men and women joined together and working together to improve conditions and equalize opportunities for all blind people everywhere—everywhere in the United States, everywhere in the world!

John is convinced he has the best of all possible jobs.

Nagle states:

> I'm always arguing and working on the side of the angels.
>
> As the Washington spokesman of the organized blind, I work for equality of opportunity, not protective and preferential consideration, for blind people.
>
> I work to abate injustice and discrimination, prejudice and bigotry.
>
> I ask, we of the National Federation of the Blind only ask, that blind people be judged for themselves, on their individual merits and demonstrated record of capabilities and accomplishments.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I expect all here will agree that John Nagle is truly a most distinguished and exemplary person.

But Nagle, himself, dissents from this offer of a hero's laurels.

> I'm just an ordinary guy working for a living, supporting myself and my family, paying taxes, functioning as millions of other Americans are functioning.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree that when this blind man deprecates his achievements, he speaks as a minority of one.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I have told this story of John Nagle, for I believe it is a story that needs to be told.

For John Nagle is but one of more than 400,000 blind Americans who are striving to live without a sight-structured society, who are trying to compete successfully for jobs in a sight-geared economy.

Surely no one could remain indifferent and unmoved as they listen to John Nagle, chief of the Washington office of the National Federation of the Blind, as he proclaims the magnificent philosophy of the blind people that he so ably represents:

> We reject sterile security and static shelter.
>
> We assert the right, we demand the right, to live as others live, to work as others work, to share equally with our sighted fellows in all of the hazards and responsibilities, as well as all of the rights, privileges and opportunities available to all others.

My bill, H.R. 3782, would help blind people in their determined and courageous struggle to live normal lives, to engage successfully in competitive livelihoods.

For H.R. 3782 would make disability insurance payments available more readily to more people who are blind.

It would make possible the continued receipt of disability insurance payments by blind people to meet the costs of sight, for whatever a blind person does he needs the help of sight to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House who have not yet introduced a bill identical to H.R. 3782 to do so promptly.

It is my belief that this measure has the overwhelming support of the House.

Let that support be expressed by an avalanche of disability insurance for the blind bills pouring into the House "hopper."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would ask this question: Are the blind helpless?

The life of John Nagle gives an emphatic "No" to this question.

The lives of many thousands of other blind men and women give an emphatic "No" to this question.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert a fact sheet which describes the provisions of H.R. 3782, its history, and the reasons for its need of enactment:

IMPROVED DISABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE BLIND

H.R. 3782, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder. (James A. Burke, Mass.)

HISTORY

Offered in 88th Congress by Senator Humphrey as floor amendment to H.R. 11865 (Social Security bill); adopted by voice vote without a dissent; lost when Social Security Conference ended in deadlock.

Offered in 89th Congress by Senator Hartke, as S. 1787; 41 cosponsors; adopted as floor amendment to H.R. 6675 by 78 to 11 roll call vote.

Offered in 90th Congress by Senator Hartke, as S. 1681; 57 cosponsors, including nine of the 17-member Committee on Finance; adopted by Committee on Finance as amendment to H.R. 1280; one provision approved in House-Senate Conference, making the generally accepted definition of blindness (20/200, etc.) the standard for visual loss under the Disability Insurance Program.

PROVISIONS

Allows qualification for disability benefits under the above definition if the blind person has worked six quarters in Social Security-covered work, rather than twenty of the last forty quarters as presently required to be eligible, as in all other disabilities; continuation of benefits irrespective of earnings so long as blindness lasts, rather than cutting off benefits if the blind person earns as little as $140 a month as provided in existing law.

WHAT CHANGES WOULD DO

H.R. 3782, the Disability Insurance for the Blind bill, would transform the Disability Insurance Program providing only subsistence income to long-time employed but presently unemployable blind persons into a system providing short-term employed blind persons with insurance income to off-set the economic consequences of blindness—diminished earning power, greatly diminished employment opportunities, greatly increased costs of living and working, blind, in a sight-directed economy and society.

WHY CHANGES NEEDED

To many blind persons, able to work, although blind, but unable to secure work because they are blind—or unable to secure work of long and steady duration, because they are blind—to these people the requirement in H.R. 3782 of employment for a year and a half in Social Security-covered work, instead of the five of the last ten year requirement in existing law, is much more realistic and reasonable under the special and adverse circumstances facing blind persons.

It is much more realistic, when considering the misinformed or uninformed attitudes, the adverse and prejudicial practices which confront blind people when they seek work, when they are qualified by talent and training for work, when they are skilled and able to operate successfully with blindness, yet, are not hired because they are believed to be incompetent and incapable.

Making disability insurance payments available when a blind person has worked six quarters in Social Security-covered work is much more reasonable than the five years' requirement, for it would make such payments more readily available to more persons when the disaster of blindness occurs, when the need for the security provided by regularly received disability insurance payments is greatest in a workingman's life.

H.R. 3782 recognizes that a person who tries to function, sightless, in our sight-structured world, functions at a financial disadvantage.

For whatever a blind man would do, whatever employment or activity he would pursue, he has the need for sight to assist him.

Sighted family members and friends may be helpful, when the inclination moves them to be helpful, but the blind vending stand operator, the lawyer or teacher, piano tuner, even the blind housewife soon discovers that sight which is hired is more reliably available than sight which is given from kindness.

So the blind person who would function self-dependently, the blind person who would earn a living, who would live self-responsibly, must not only pay the usual daily living costs which his sighted fellows pay, but he must also pay the extra, the burdening expenses of blindness—the expenses incurred in hiring sight.

By allowing a blind person to draw disability insurance payments so long as he continues blind and irrespective of his earnings, H.R. 3782, would provide to such blind person, a regular source of funds to pay for sight, and it would thus help to reduce the economic disadvantages and inequalities of blindness in his life.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE), is certainly correct. I have been acquainted with John Nagle for more than 10 years. And as I have become more familiar with this blind man's spirit, his determination, and his accomplishments, my admiration for him has grown.

I am not at all surprised to learn of Nagle's latest accomplishment, of visiting, alone, all offices in the House.

Knowing this astonishing blind man, I have come to expect such phenomenal efforts by him.

In my years in the House, I believe I have never encountered a person who better represents the group for whom he speaks, as John Nagle represents and speaks for the blind.

As for Mr. BURKE's bill to liberalize disability insurance for blind people—I understand a major ground swell of support for this most necessary and most worthwhile measure is building in the House.

I sincerely believe that no body of our citizens has tried to do more—and has done more—to help themselves than have our blind people.

H.R. 3782 would give these courageous people, faced by overwhelming disadvantages because of lack of sight, a more equal chance to live and work as self-dependent members of the community and of the Nation.

Self-dependence is the goal of our blind fellow Americans, and since H.R. 3782 would greatly aid them to reach this most worthy goal, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) in speaking in support of H.R. 3782, the disability insurance for the blind bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT INVASION OF PERSONAL PRIVACY ERODES INDIVIDUAL CIVIL LIBERTIES

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, a crisis in civil liberties looms on our national horizon, its shadow an ever-lengthening menace to all of us. It comes in several forms. A growing list of Federal agencies is collecting significant quantities of data on millions of American citizens. Among these are the Defense Department, Social Security Administration, Civil Service Commission and House Internal Security Committee. Much of this information is collected on citizens unaware of such activities that so intimately concern them.

A second phase of this steady erosion of personal privacy on the part of Government concerns the increasingly delicate questions the Bureau of the Census is preparing to ask every American citizen. Criminal penalties are provided for refusal to answer a wide range of questions, including why marriages terminated and how many babies a woman has ever had.

Privacy is invaded when the Census approaches America with a long list of intimate questions in one hand and the club of jail and fines in the other. We have a question of public need for statistics and individual right of privacy. It is my position that personal privacy must carry more weight in any democracy, where the rights of the individual are supposed to be preeminent.

A third phase of Government invasion of personal privacy concerns the increasing and unwarranted invasion of personal privacy by the executive branch of Government of its millions of employees. The specter of the lie detector test, personality profile, political coercion and probes of personal lives is already diminishing governmental effectiveness and inhibiting the behavior of millions of Federal employees. Numerous examples of these and other acts have amply illustrated the need for swift action.

In the first instance, I have joined my colleague from New York (Mr. KOCH), in sponsoring the Federal Privacy Act, which is designed to protect the individual citizen from unauthorized disclosure or use of personal information collected by various Federal agencies.

In the second instance, emulating the excellent initiative taken by Representative BETTS of Ohio, I am introducing a measure on questions to be asked by the Census Bureau. Its essence is elimination of criminal penalties for failure to answer questions on all but seven subjects: name, address, age, sex, race, head of household, and number of persons in the household on the day the census is taken. Failure to respond to these questions would carry penalties. All other inquiries would have no penalty.

In the third area, Senator ERVIN of North Carolina has stood alone for several years in defense of personal liberties of Government employees. My colleague, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS of North Carolina, has likewise taken up the fight in this body. I am proud to join with him in sponsorship of the Government Employees Privacy Protection Act.

It is intended to prohibit indiscriminate requirements that employees and applicants for Government employment disclose their race, religion, or national origin; that they attend Government-sponsored meetings or lectures or participate in outside activities unrelated to their employment; that they report on outside activities; submit to questioning on their religion, personal relationships, or sexual attitudes through interviews, psychological tests, or polygraphs; or that they support political candidates or attend political meetings. Coercion of employees in regard to bond purchases, charitable contributions, and disclosures of financial assets and activities are also covered. Right to counsel is provided in disciplinary cases, as well.

Mr. Speaker, these bills are a beginning, showing us how significant these intrusions are. Exorcism of these evils is essential if we are to remain a free society. People have a right to be let alone, free from unwarranted invasions of privacy. Congress has the power to act, and should. Liberty we allow to slip between our fingers today is liberty denied our posterity tomorrow.

YES, VIRGINIA, THERE IS A FOREIGN OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, by now most Americans know about the oil depletion allowance—the method used by our oil industry to evade the major share of its tax responsibilities. Since this is merely the topmost portion of the oil iceberg, I feel it is proper to discuss overseas aspects of this depletion allowance. Yes, Virginia, there is a foreign oil depletion allowance, enabling our oil and gas industry to derive vast tax-free revenues from its foreign production at American taxpayer expense.

The percentage depletion allowance does not cease at water's edge. Its 27½ percent is applicable to production of American oil companies abroad. In 1960, $633 million was deducted, and figures have skyrocketed since, with major oil production overseas.

Its justification? The same as for domestic production—because of unusual risks and high costs of exploration and development. Again truth shifts like mercury when used as an excuse by the oil industry.

Dry holes are hard to come by in Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. Drilling costs are minimal because oil is so close to the surface. Still, the depletion allowance is the same in these countries as here. In addition to the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance, oil companies possess other significant tax privileges for foreign operations. Royalty payments to foreign governments, especially to Middle Eastern despots, may be offset against taxes the company owes in the United States. Under our sievelike tax laws, royalties are recognized deductions from taxable income. However, if the American company pays income taxes to a foreign government because of its foreign operations, amount of such taxes may be deducted from tax that would otherwise be due the United States. In other words, a fat tax credit.

Naturally, the credit is preferable to a deduction. If the foreign government cooperates, and they almost always do, our struggling little oil company obtains a major tax break at expense of the American Government and taxpayers.

Most of these foreign countries are not overly concerned as to how they obtain revenue. Perhaps that is why "taxes" are far higher than "royalties" paid them. Even the most ardent supporter of a domestic percentage depletion allowance is hard put to justify a tax credit for such royalty payments. No wonder it is dubbed the "golden gimmick."

There is also a special deduction against taxable income for U.S. companies operating in the Western Hemisphere, which of course includes oil-rich Venezuela.

Many U.S. companies operating abroad pay little or no Federal tax on foreign operations even though, after paying all foreign royalties and taxes, their income exceeds hundreds of millions of dollars—primarily because of the depletion allowance. It was not an intent of Congress to extend percentage depletion allowance to foreign operations. No one then realized it was to be used as a hose for theft from our tax system.

Concept of an oil depletion allowance for exhaustion of oil and gas properties was originated in 1913 as a domestic measure aimed at obtaining greater domestic production during periods of world crisis. In 1926, when percentage depletion was adopted, there was no substantial foreign petroleum production by American companies. Under present tax law, percentage depletion for numerous minerals is restricted to domestic production only.

Supposedly, percentage depletion allowance and other tax benefits for overseas operations are aimed at encouraging oil companies to locate new oil sources in the Middle East and other areas in case of emergency. With the Middle East in constant crisis, it is the height of folly to encourage American efforts there with a massive, subsidized giveaway program. The recent enormous Alaskan strike makes such an argument even more specious. Oil industry arguments for retention of such privilege at expense of our people are as meaningful as a whale farm in the Sahara or an orange grove in Greenland.

America's citizenry spends billions to subsidize overseas oil operations while we restrict domestic production and American consumers are unable to obtain the foreign product at a lower price because of oil import quotas. Is this sense? Then so should we add witch hazel to martinis.

The trauma of April 15 is over. We are all shuddering over aftereffects upon our solvency. All except bloated oil barons, who, bursting with profit gained at expense of all of us, gaze benignly down at millions of us, writhing in financial agony because of their privileges. They dare us to challenge their power and privilege, contemptuously brushing aside pleas for elementary fairness.

Congress gave the oil depletion allowance. What Congress gave, Congress may take away. I have introduced a bill to remove the oil depletion allowance entirely. Another bill has been introduced to remove it from overseas operations, in which I have joined. We have the opportunity to remove several tax shackles now binding America's lower and middle income taxpayers. Let us act.

THE FALLACY OF THE ARAB REFUGEES

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, more and more these days we are forced to listen to anguished howls by Arab propagandists and apologists over the fate of Arab refugees. Last month, when I visited Israel, I had the opportunity of personally visiting several refugee camps in Gaza, where I observed at close hand what the true situation is.

UNRWA is doing significant work, and has aided in the successful effort to adequately feed and clothe these people. Make no mistake about it; they are quite adequately fed and clothed.

The festering sore is unemployment, as these people spend their time in mounting frustration. Jobs are what they require. Jobs are what their fellow Arabs can provide them with. Jobs are what their fellow Arabs deny them. It is a fact that every Arab country but Jordan denies these people access, so they can work gainfully.

Arab terrorists use them as pawns in their deadly game of international murder. Has anyone ever given a thought to the fact that during the last 20 years, 4,500,000 Europeans were forced out of Arab countries? More often than not, they were driven out at the point of a gun, or at least with a shadow of violence hanging over their heads.

The 2,200,000 Italian settlers were forced out of Libya and Egypt; 1,700,000 French left Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco. Over 700,000 Jews fled Iraq, Yemen, Egypt, Libya, and other Arab countries. Four and a half million Jews who lived in these countries for countless generations left everything behind. The Arabs took everything, as these people left with only clothes on their backs. The piteous plight of the few brethren who remained behind is ample testimony to the fate they narrowly escaped. Even now the Jewish community of Iraq and those few Jews left in Egypt live existences of persecution and terror.

Now we hear anguished caterwauling over the Arab refugees. Arab States had an opportunity to place 700,000 Arab refugees from Palestine into homes of European people who fled Arab countries. Instead refugees were placed and are being kept in camps that have cost millions of dollars—contributed by people of the world, especially Americans. There are many, including the Arab countries, who have a vested interest in maintaining these refugees in the same squalid misery they are in now. It is the most brutal thing Arabs have done to their own people. Palestine was never an Arab country. It never had an Arab Government. Palestine has been occupied since the time of Caesar by Greeks, Romans, English, and other nations. Its only legal government was the Jewish one of over 2,000 years ago.

Now we are confronted with the spectacle of Arab States, possessing populations which are more than 80 percent illiterate in some cases, spending billions on Russian arms in hope of obliterating Israel, while ignoring awesome social needs of all their citizens, natives as well as refugees.

THE SLUMBERING BEAST OF GERMAN MILITARISM STIRS UNEASILY

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. Hellmut Grashey, deputy army inspector of the West German Army has criticized parliamentary control over the military. He spoke sharply of the parliamentary control agency dealing with military affairs—terming it an instrument spreading mistrust in the ranks. He indicates that the attempt to build a West

German Army along democratic lines is a sop to the Social Democrats in return for their support of disarmament. This general has been called in by Defense Minister Schroeder. The Nazi-lining political party in West Germany has issued a statement supporting Grashey.

Mr. Speaker, again the ghosts of the past rise like specters to stalk the hearts and minds of millions in the Atlantic community. Again Prussian memories awaken, stretch, shake the shades of slumber from their eyes and roar defiance of democracy through the mouth of a German officer—one of the highest ranking officers in his nation's armed forces.

Again is heard a distant rumble of the goose step and that ghastly cannonade of Krupp guns sounds distantly down the corridors of history. Again we hear drums roll and trumpets blare the "Horst Wessel Leid," as brown-shirted legions take to the streets. If we cock an ear carefully, is there not a last echo of the Austrian corporal to be heard?

Do not the pronouncements of this man sound as if they echo the sentiments of Von Roon, Moltke, Seeckt, and Mackensen? Do we not hear the collective click of a thousand pairs of heels and a Prussian "jawohl" to orders to exterminate millions? Only the concept of democracy can guarantee an end to blind obedience that brought destruction upon Germany and made her an outcast among nations for so long. How dare this general seek to resurrect the basic concept of Prussian militarism that commands obedience and stifling of all disagreement.

Now we live in a thermonuclear age, where there is no room for concepts such as "alte cameraden," "Weltanschaung," or a "Drang Nach Osten."

Days of strident nationalism spearheading a military state armed by the Krupps are over. Times of the Prussian grenadiers are finished. Eras of the brushcut, monocle, jackboot, and iron discipline are gone forever. Any German general who dares stand up for them, calling into question a moderate, democratically inclined West German regime has no place in the military forces of a free world.

We have seen enough Sedans, Verduns, Normandys, and Buchenwalds. We have seen enough coal-scuttle helmets and Mauser rifles in the hands of blindly obedient automatons. I praise the Social Democrats of West Germany for their courage. It is my fervent hope that General Hellmut Grashey will be dealt with accordingly by the Government of West Germany. Let him go to a well-deserved retirement so he may attend the neo-Nazi veterans reunions instead of commanding troops.

THE AMSA BOMBER MUST NEVER GET AIRBORNE

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I was astonished to note that Mr. Laird has it in his mind and plans to commit the United States to a new multibillion-dollar bomber program that could cost more than the proposed ABM. While we struggle desperately against an obsolete ABM, we are to be saddled with a new harpie in the form of this bomber.

The Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft, or AMSA, would be supersonic at high and low speeds and carry more bombs than craft it would replace. Mr. McNamara resisted attempts to build this useless monster, but allowed research money for it. Now Mr. Laird demands $100.2 million—$23 million more than the previous administration requested—to complete AMSA research. This is why he cut two squadrons of the FB–111. We have been ridded of one useless piece of expensive flying rubbish, only to have it replaced by an even worse, more expensive one. Instead of enriching one military contractor, we see another lined up for an indefinite turn at the public feeding trough.

If the contract is drawn up, we shall be locked into the AMSA program, committed to its development and forced into guaranteeing it untold billions. Most of this information is confirmed by the Pentagon. Should Congress approve this fund request, the Air Force would be authorized to design, test, and flight test experimental craft. Approval of the extra $23 million would authorize flying prototypes. Remember the XB–70? It cost us more than $1 billion, and all we obtained were prototypes.

Purchase of some 240 of these flying dinosaurs would cost anywhere from $12 billion to almost $20 billion. What would we receive? A manned bomber in an age of missiles. A last hurrah for the "wild blue yonder." We would be reincarnating at stupendous public expense the romantic dreams of aging generals who remember "good old days" of thousand bomber raids and cities in flames. "Off we go" is their cry, carrying the U.S. Treasury with them as they fly off into the last sunset.

Mr. Speaker, this is the ultimate outrage. An Air Force spokesman concedes each AMSA would cost at least $40 million. Are we to accept this? Has Congress' power to control appropriations assumed the status of an appendix? Is not the ABM a useless, expensive enough boondoggle? Do we not all know what will happen?

Appropriations will be shuttled or rammed through the Congress, complete with a closed rule. Debate or honest questioning will be stifled. Years will pass as more and still more billions are appropriated. Questions will be answered by mere patriotic slogans and invocation of spirits of George Washington, Valley Forge, John Paul Jones, Robert E. Lee, Chateau-Thierry, and Pearl Harbor. Teddy Roosevelt will charge and Mount Suribachi will be stormed. Finally, when we have squandered billions of desperately needed dollars, we shall have another flying relic and museum piece on our hands. Generals will mutter a series of feeble excuses, then wrap the flag round themselves like a bathrobe and question our devotion to America. Hearings will be shut behind closed doors and another stillborn monster will be locked tightly in a closet marked: "Not to be opened by the American people until the heat dies down."

Mr. Speaker, our society groans under the weight of unmet responsibility. It bleeds from a hundred social wounds. It staggers under blows delivered by old enemies we should have dealt with years ago. A major reason for the existing state of affairs is reversal of social priorities. We have given our military every glittering toy they demanded so they can play war. It has reached a point where they can strut sitting down. Congress is guilty of acquiescence, and America is beginning to realize it.

We cannot, must not, dare not, allow such a military abortion to be foisted upon us. It will escalate the arms race. It will be a despicable waste of money. This plane is a national disgrace. If we allow it to pass, then it shall be a congressional disgrace and the people will know it.

PRESIDENT PUSEY SUPPORTED IN ACTION AGAINST DISORDERS AT HARVARD

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include an editorial from the Auburn Citizen-Advertiser.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as one who received an M.A. degree from Harvard University in 1940, the same year that John F. Kennedy received his A.B. degree, I have been more than a little concerned over recent developments at Harvard.

Fortunately, a very great many of Harvard's alumni support the prompt and decisive action taken by Harvard's President Nathan M. Pusey in protecting the files of the university in University Hall.

One such alumnus who expressed this support was the very distinguished managing editor of the Auburn, N.Y., Citizen-Advertiser, Mr. Frederic R–L. Osborne, a graduate of the class of 1950 at Harvard College. His expression of support, written as an editorial in the Citizen-Advertiser of April 4, 1969, is one that deserves to be read by all Members of the Congress, and I am glad to include it at this point in the Record:

A Letter to Dr. Pusey, President of Harvard

Dear Dr. Pusey: As an alumnus of Harvard I have been upset by recent events at the university. I had hoped that Harvard students would know better and that the university would escape the lawlessness which has plagued other colleges.

However, this was not to be. I believe the university took the only course open to it in ousting the invading students from University Hall.

Too many other colleges have given in to vocal minorities which had broken the law in order to get their way. I hope that Harvard will not give in and that it will expel those students who violated the rules of the university and the laws of Massachusetts.

Not all lessons at a college are learned in the class room or lecture hall. Harvard has an opportunity here to teach both its own students and other colleges.

First it can teach its own students that unlawful violence is not an acceptable means of achieving change in a democracy. The use of violence to force change infringes on the civil rights of others and cannot be tolerated.

While I regret that it was necessary to bruise the heads of a few students in evicting them, I can hardly feel much sympathy for them. The students came seeking trouble. It was they who first resorted to violence and they could hardly expect the university to do less than defend its own. The students sowed the seeds of violence and reaped a harvest of violence from the police in return. Perhaps Harvard can teach this unruly minority that violence from outside the law brings the legalized violence of the law; that force is not the way to bring change in a democracy; that the end does not justify the means.

Second, Harvard can also set an example for other colleges. Harvard was once described by an English publication as "bestriding the American educational scene like a well bred Colossus." I believe that this flattering description has a considerable basis in fact. Other colleges do follow when Harvard leads. Consequently I think that Harvard has an obligation to set an example of fairness and firmness which will stiffen the backbone of other college administrators. After all, what kind of a future generation are we creating if our young people are taught now by indulgent elders that they can break the laws of society and escape without punishment?

Harvard's rules are perfectly clear, and they do not include taking over University Hall and evicting the dean. I hope that Harvard will enforce its rules. The students agreed to abide by them when they entered the college. They should abide by these rules or suffer accordingly.

I am disturbed by the lack of understanding of the rights of others which these young people have demonstrated. To achieve their goal they have not hesitated to resort to physical violence, to break the law and to upset the orderly processing of the affairs of their fellow students. And yet, these law breakers, when the Harvard Yard is once more at peace, will be clamoring for amnesty and will feel that they have been sorely misused if they don't receive it. I hope that there will be no amnesty and that Harvard will insist that those who break its rules are punished.

F. R–L. OSBORNE,
Class of 1950.

BIG 10 UNIVERSITY STUDENT LEADERS APPEAL FOR STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to be able to welcome to Washington this week a delegation of outstanding young Americans—leaders of student government from the Big 10 universities: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Michigan State, Minnesota, Northwestern, Ohio State, Purdue, and Wisconsin.

These students came to Washington for the purpose of meeting with Senators, Congressmen, and other Federal officials to express their deep concern about the inadequacy of Federal appropriations for the major Federal student assistance programs: the educational opportunity grants, national defense student loan, and the college work-study programs.

The students presented their case positively, constructively an based on a carefully prepared marshaling of factual information.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is significant that the majority of the students visiting Washington on this mission are not themselves recipients of loans or grants under these several programs. They came to the Nation's Capitol rather to voice their support for student aid programs that would enable their fellow students who do need such financial assistance either to begin their college education or to remain there.

I want to take this opportunity to express my warm praise of these students of the Big 10 for their initiative and energy in seeking adequate appropriations for these important student aid programs. Their visit was particularly timely in view of President Nixon's budget announcement yesterday. President Nixon's budget request for higher education funds will mean a grave disappointment to a large number of low-income students, many of whom have been encouraged to seek a college education and will now be denied, as a result of the inadequate moneys made available, that opportunity.

I may here add that I have a large number of letters from colleges and universities all over the country expressing their deep concern about this matter.

Mr. Speaker, let me here cite just one example of the serious problem facing thousands of American university students today as a result of the underfunding of Federal student aid programs. Colleges and universities have requested $318 million for the national defense student loan program for 1970, basing their request on the need for loans for students. But only $155 million will actually be available in the Nixon administration's budget—and this is also all that was requested by President Johnson in his January budget message, it should be noted, in all fairness. The $161,900,000 listed in the budget for this item includes moneys to institutions and for teacher cancellation.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the joint student government appeal from the Big 10 university student leaders, and a summary of facts describing what the shortage of Federal aid will mean to low-income students at the Big 10 universities, and in particular, at Purdue and Indiana Universities:

JOINT STUDENT GOVERNMENT APPEAL FOR STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 15.—Student delegations from several mid-western universities are in Washington this week to seek the restoration of more than $200 million in student financial aid funds that have been cut from the federal budget. Among those schools represented are Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Northwestern, Purdue, Michigan University and Michigan State who are participating in a joint appeal to officials of the Federal Government.

The purpose of the trip is two-fold. Student delegates are seeking the restoration of funds for National Defense Student Loans, Work-Study Programs, and Educational Opportunity Grants. Inadequate funding of these three college-based programs will directly affect the educational future of some 250,000 students.

The student representatives, including four Big–10 student body presidents are also encouraging greater federal support in general for culturally disadvantaged and financially needy students.

In a statement issued today the student delegations said that:

"The federal financial aid picture for 1969–70 does not look promising. Severe cuts in Student aid appear in the proposed federal budget, and we view the prospects for the coming year with considerable alarm.

"The student financial aid pinch is becoming more acute every year. Not only are basic costs increasing, but there is an increasing demand for higher education among lower income students.

"We believe that this is a time when government at both the state and national level should be doing everything possible to encourage college attendance by those students from all groups, but especially from those groups which have not hitherto sought a higher education. The fact remains, however, that a limitation of federal student aid will have an opposite effect: the opportunity for a college education will diminish rather than increase for the students in these low-income groups.

"We are not unaware of the serious demands on our nation's financial resources from many quarters, but we believe that there is no area where the demand is more critical than in student financial aid. We support the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education which call for a massive federal commitment to higher education. We believe that such a commitment is necessary if our nation is to meet its needs and provide for both quality and equality of educational opportunity."

The student delegates are meeting with Senators and Congressmen from their respected states and also plan to meet with administration officials.

A POSITION PAPER BY LEADERS OF PURDUE UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT, APRIL 15, 1969

The following position paper has been presented to Congressmen and Senators from Indiana by a delegation of student leaders from Purdue University Student Government who have met in Washington this week as part of a collective effort by Big Ten Student Governments to restore serious cuts in budgeting for Educational Opportunity Grants, National Defense Student Loans, and the College Work-Study Program. Other Delegations have spoken with their State Legislators, and our opinions have been expressed to other legislators and governmental officials whose responsibilities are related to Federal Aid appropriations.

MICHAEL T. REAGAN,
Director, Student Government Academic, Purdue University.
RICHARD E. PARKER,
President, Purdue Student Senate.
JAMES G. GEORGE,
President Pro Tempore, Purdue Student Senate.

POSITION PAPER

A great number of students are disturbed by recent actions of the Congress on the subject of Federal aid for financial assistance. Those of us who are concerned are not necessarily directly receiving Federal assistance. The subject affects the entire academic community.

It appears that there has been and will be a general curtailment of student aid programs, such as the National Defense Student Loan Program, the College Work-Study Program, and the Educational Opportunity Grant Program. While some states will be unable to obtain adequate funding under the College Work-Study Program, it appears that the needs of Indiana in this area will be met. We, as students of Indiana, are primarily disturbed by the cuts in the Educational Opportunity Grant Program and the pending cut in the National Defense Student Loan Program. This action is coming at a time when renewed efforts are called for, rather than a retrenchment.

The National Defense Student Loan Program (NDSL) received $191 million in 1968–69. Authorization exists for $275 million in 1969–70. The *proposed* funding is for only $155 million, a *reduction* of $84 million from the previous year. Furthermore, it is a reduction of $115 million from the review panel recommendation of $270 million.

The Educational Opportunity Grant program needs to be considered in two distinct sections; initial year grants and renewal of existing grants. The renewal grants will, as ordained by law, have a sufficient funding level. This level has been set at $90.2 million. The initial year grants of the EOG program have encountered serious problems. The 1968–69 allocation provided for $67 million. The 69–70 authorization provides for $70 million. The proposed 1969–70 allocation is only $40–$50 million. This is not only a great reduction from the review panel request of $98 million, it is even a serious reduction from the previous year's level.

INDIANA STATE LEGISLATIVE ACTION

In addition to the common problems of inflation and the increase in the price rate, Purdue faces somewhat distinct problems. The Indiana Legislature did not fulfill the budget requests of the state Universities. Purdue's appropriation for 1969–70 is *$900,000 less than the current year's appropriation!* So that Purdue could maintain her record of academic excellence, fees were increased by $300 per year for Indiana Students and by $400 per year for non-resident students.

In addition, the state legislature curtailed the funds of the State Scholarship Commission. Funds will be available only to renew existing scholarships. No scholarships will be available from this source for incoming freshmen.

Even when operating under the unreasonable assumption that no additional students will require aid as a result of the fee increase, Purdue's financial aid office foresees a shortage of $1.2 million. This even accounts for automatic internal growth of their funds, and the granting of $0.5 million in additional fee remissions. Purdue's EOG request of approximately $1 million appears to have been posed to $454,000, significantly lower than the present level of $753,000. Purdue had planned to add 512 new students under the EOG, but now will only be able to handle 250.

We are deeply concerned about the people that these curtailments will effect, and the possible accruing social and political repercussions. All of these programs, and in particular EOG effect the disadvantaged students and families of our country. To quote a recent letter from the Indiana Student Financial Aid Association:

"Federal support to student aid resources has shown an obvious intent on the part of the Congress. With the exception of the guaranteed loan program, every federal venture has been designed and directed toward the student who would not be able to attend college with his own funds alone. The Higher Education Act of 1965 was even more specific in its expectation that colleges actively seek students without sufficient resources and "recruit" them into college. It was recognized that such expansion of educational opportunity could not be done overnight, for there were many attitudes of hopelessness and despair to counteract. The last three years have produced results, however, and a college education has become a realistic goal of many young people who would have previously not even considered the possibility. Indiana colleges and universities have been doing their homework during this intervening period of time, and in cooperation with TUTEOR (Talent Utilization Through Educational Opportunity Resources, a coordinated recruitment effort operated by the State Scholarship Commission of Indiana and funded by a federal grant) have been encouraging high school students to further their education beyond high school. In other words, our recruitment efforts as called for in the Higher Education Act of 1965 are about to bear fruit. For three years, students from disadvantaged backgrounds have been hearing from the colleges, the TUTEOR program, and the high school guidance counselor that higher education is accessible regardless of personal financial resources, and that they should plan accordingly. As a result, these students are seniors in high school, they have submitted their applications for admission and financial aid to the college of their choice, and are anxiously awaiting word as to the disposition of their applications."

PROBLEMS IN AMERICA

It is fairly obvious that many of the problems in America's recent past have stemmed not only from the individual's impoverished environment, but from the unfulfilled promises of those who would lead him to better circumstances. Imagine the frustration and despair of a student who has done well in high school, has hoped to obtain a college education, and then discovers that the long-awaited funds exist no more. In a recent interview in a national magazine, Robert Finch said: "I hope to put an end to over-promising and tokenism."

The unrest in the land has been widely attributed to the "credibility" gap. We desire the peaceful existence of our government, and we know of no better way to ensure this than to enable youth to *believe* in the government.

There has been some intimation that the curtailment of funds has been a result of the disorders on the campuses. We have no way of ascertaining the truth of this. We hope it is false. The number of those causing actual disruption is extremely small, and in general, they are not on Federal aid. Fund cutoff provisions have been written into the existing laws. We assume that Congress intended them to be enforced. Under such assumptions, what reason would there be for a further punitive or corrective curtailment? A general measure can lead to only more unrest.

We are aware, even if only from a distance, of the fiscal problems that face the Committees. The problem is further complicated at this time by the change in administrations. However, we feel that the quality of education in the United States cannot be compromised.

Political decisions are the successful solutions of immediate problems while moving toward long-term goals. We ask our legislators to obtain the overview of this question. The immediate problem is that of the need to decrease Federal expenditures. The long-range goal is the successful uplifting of those who would require such expenditures. What better way than through education?

We can afford to carry the student as a tax burden now if we can be assured that he will yield returns as a taxpayer in later life. Education now will surely lead to a decrease in the welfare roles in the future. To quote Mr. Finch again: "What we have to do is concentrate not on bigger and better welfare programs but on programs that work toward eliminating the need for welfare."

A SUMMARY

We ask our legislators to seriously review the problems and alternatives of the EOG and NDSL programs. We concur with Purdue's Financial Aid Director Richard Tombaugh in requesting the following action:

1. A supplemental appropriation for the Educational Opportunity Grant program that is sufficiently large to meet the requests of the colleges. A total of about $98 million would be required.

2. A National Defense Student Loan appropriation that provides at least the $191 million that was available in 1968–69. The regional review panels have seen the need for $270 million in this program.

We are asking not for "handouts," but rather for the establishment of a semblance of equal opportunity.

Big 10 Student Government Appeal for Federal Student Financial Aid, Washington, D.C., April 12 to 15, 1969

INDIANA UNIVERSITY DELEGATION STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The federal student financial aid picture for 1969–70 does not look promising. Severe cuts in student aid appear in the proposed federal budget, and we view the prospects for the coming year with considerable alarm. Our delegation is joining student representatives from other Big 10 universities who are also currently in Washington in a joint appeal to officials of the federal government.

Our purpose is two-fold: we seek the restoration of funds cut from existing programs including National Defense Student Loans, Work-Study, and Educational Opportunity Grants, and we encourage greater federal support in general for culturally disadvantaged and financially needy students.

We believe that this is a time when government at both the state and national level should be doing everything possible to encourage college attendance by those students from all groups, but especially from those groups which have not hitherto sought a higher education. The fact remains, however, that a limitation of federal student aid will have an opposite effect: the opportunity for a college education will diminish rather than increase for the students in these low-income groups.

We are not unaware of the serious demands on our nation's financial resources from many quarters, but we believe that there is no area where the demand is more critical than in student financial aid. We support the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education which call for a massive federal commitment to higher education. We believe that such a commitment is necessary if our nation is to meet its needs and provide for both quality and equality of educational opportunity.

Ted Najam,
Student Body President, Indiana University.
John Galles,
Secretary of External Affairs, Student Government.
Terry Straub,
State President, Indiana Collegiate, Young Democrats.
Sharon Hargan,
Secretary, Class of 1970.

Cuts in Federal Aid to Low-Income Students: Summary of Facts

1. Who are affected? Between 45,000 and 100,000 entering college freshmen. Last year 144,000 initial year Educational Opportunity Grants were made to entering students; this year the College Entrance Examination Board estimates that available funds will cover fewer than 100,000 needy students while those needing help total 200,000.

At least 100,000 students for whom adequate National Defense Student Loans will be unavailable, in a year with record high interest rates and limited private loan sources.

At least 60,000 needy students who will seek term-time work under the College Work-Study program and will not find it, due to lack of federal funds.

2. What happened? These three programs were approved by Congress for funding at levels which would have been adequate. But the federal budget greatly reduced these levels and the final appropriations fall far short of that authorized and are wholly inadequate. Colleges requested a total of $797 million under these programs; regional panels approved $669 million, but only between $435 and $466 million has been made available. (Source: CEEB memorandum to college presidents and officers of administration, Feb. '69.

3. What is needed? Immediate restoration

of the funds for these programs up to the authorized limits. A request for these additional funds could come from the Nixon administration (but has not so far). Or action could be taken from within Congress. First body which needs to act is the House Appropriations Committee.

No new legislation is needed; the problem is the level of appropriation.

4. How do these cuts affect Big Ten Universities? A number of Big Ten universities have implemented or are about to implement concentrated efforts to admit fully able but economically disadvantaged students, often from educationally deficient backgrounds as well. Pilot programs around the country in recent years have shown that such students can with very high rates of success be assisted in overcoming previous educational deficiencies. The successes offer some hope that the dismal under-representation of low-income and minority group students (as reported recently by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and others) on our nation's campuses can be countered effectively. Cuts now in federal aids to such students threaten seriously to curtail such critical efforts.

In addition to the special programs for extending access to higher education to youth handicapped by a the circumstances of birth, all Big Ten campuses have groups—already too small—of students from low-income families who are regularly admitted. They, too, require base grants and access to low-interest loans if they are to build viable programs of self-help adequate to put themselves through college. Summer jobs and term-time work are simply inadequate without these other vital funds.

THREE COLLEGE-BASED PROGRAMS

(1) National Defense Student Loan—$115 million short: 1968–69, $190 million; 1969–70, $318 million (College requested), $270 million (Panel approved), $155 million allocation in HEW budget.

(2) College Work-Study Program—$65 million short: 1968–69, $140 million; 1969–70, $266 million (College requested), $211 million (Panel approved), $146 million allocation in HEW budget.

(3) Educational Opportunity Grant (Initial year)—$48 million short ($70 million limit as prescribed by law): 1969–70, $116 million (College requested), $98 million (Panel approved), $50 million allocation in HEW budget.

$228 million dollars below the total panel request.

(NOTE.—Taken from the College Entrance Examination Board memorandum, February, 1969.)

INDIANA UNIVERSITY: A MANY SIDED PROBLEM

(1) Limited appropriation by the Indiana General Assembly for the 1969–71 biennium.

(2) Radical increase in student fees: In state: from $195/semester to $325/semester. Out-of-State: from $525/semester to $745/semester.

(3) Indiana State Scholarship Commission: Request: $15 million; Allocation: $6.5 million.

(NOTE.—Five of the twelve members of this Commission have since resigned due to lack of working funds.)

(4) Need support for compensatory education programs such as the Indiana University Program for Disadvantaged Students.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY BUDGET

[In millions of dollars]

Campus	Request		Actual		
	1969–70	1970–71	1968–69	1960–70	1970–71
Bloomington	$51.0	$59.2	$40.9	[1] $39.5	$43.08
Indiana University Indianapolis	14.9	18.9	11.9	13.8	16.1
Regional	10.1	13.7	5.9	7.6	9.6

				1967–69	1969–71
Bonding authority			$8.6	[2] $2.9	$2.3

[1] Actual request $11,500,000 below request. Bloomington operating budget for 1969–70 cut $1,400,000 below the current fiscal year. For the biennium of 1969–71 the budget shows a net increase of only $2,800,000.

[2] Cash.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY FALL ENROLLMENTS

Campus	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
Bloomington	29,006	31,021	33,565	35,072	36,973
Indiana University, Indianapolis	9,169	9,913	10,774	11,861	12,887
Regional	13,986	15,221	16,996	18,998	21,436
Total	42,161	56,155	61,335	65,931	71,296

[From the Indiana Daily Student, Apr. 8, 1969]

TRUSTEES APPROVE TUITION FEE INCREASE

(By Tom Romito)

I.U.'s Board of Trustees approved comprehensive fee increases for all I.U. students at the March 28 board meeting.

The fee increases included a two-thirds hike in costs for in-state undergraduate students at Bloomington, and a rise in costs of $220 for out-state undergraduates here.

The new fee schedule, which will be effective on all the I.U. campuses this fall, is as follows:

Bloomington campus, in-state:

Undergraduate: present, $195 a semester; new, $325.

Graduate: present, $15 a credit hour; new, $27.

Bloomington campus, out-of-state:

Undergraduate: present, $525 a semester; new, $745.

Graduate: present, $37 a credit hour; new, $62.

Regional campuses, in-state:

Undergraduate: present, $15 a credit hour; new, $20.

Graduate: present, $18; new, $25.

Regional campuses, out-of-state:

Undergraduate: present, $23 a credit hour; new, $40.

Graduate: present, $26; new, $50.

Indianapolis, in-state:

Undergraduate: present, $15 a credit hour; new, $20.

Graduate: present, $15; new, $25.

Indianapolis, out-of-state:

Undergraduate: present, $35 a credit hour; new, $40.

Graduate: present, $37; new, $50.

Joseph R. Hartley, I.U. vice president and dean of faculties, presented the new fee schedule to the board. Hartley headed a task force of I.U. administrators which had consulted to draft the schedule since the state legislature ended early last month.

Hartley said the fee increases will generate $11.6 million additional gross revenue for 1970.

The revenue will cover $1.4 million that was cut from the Bloomington campus operating budget by the legislature, and $.9 million that must be taken from the University budget for debt retirements for buildings, said Hartley.

He said the revenue will also supply $2.8 million to the campus for salaries, books, and supplies; $2.6 million for scholarships; $1.6 million to cover cost of enrollment; $.6 million for moderate salary increases for faculty and non-academic staff; $.4 million for the cost of opening the new library; and $1.3 million for the second year of the 1969–70 biennium.

Hartley said he does not think it will be necessary to raise fees in 1970.

The vice president said the cost for enrollment covers a projected increase of 800 students at Bloomington next fall, cut back from an original projected increase of 2000.

[From the Bloomington (Ind.) Herald-Telegram, Mar. 29, 1969]

WHO HEARS THEIR CRIES?: "CATCHUP" PLAN SUFFERS SETBACK

Failing to get a $3 million appropriation from the General Assembly for "Operation Catch-Up," Indiana University is actively seeking federal and foundation funding of the innovative program for disadvantaged students.

"Operation Catch-Up" will bring disadvantaged students to the university early for summer orientation and remedial programs, then provide constant counseling, tutorial help and waivers of the usual grading procedures as well as financial assistance as the students spend two years on their normal "freshman year" to reach the achievement level of non-disadvantaged students.

Dr. John W. Snyder, acting Bloomington campus chancellor, told IU trustees Friday that the four Indiana state universities are considering presenting the proposal jointly to the federal government to seek support for a statewide program.

IU Student Body President Ted Najam also said that the student body presidents of the Big Ten universities are planning a joint "lobbying session" in Washington next month, hoping to meet with President Richard Nixon to urge greater federal funding of disadvantaged students programs. The excursion is tentatively set for April 14.

Assistant Dean Rozelle Boyd of the Junior Division is in charge of "Operation CatchUp" planning, and faculty and staff to work in the program are being specially screened, Snyder said.

The original goal was 200 students, but funding problems have quashed such hopes and the number may be nearer 50 now, he said.

Trustee Mrs. Harriet Inskeep urged that the number be kept low enough that each student could receive all the help he needed, rather than attacking the problem on a halfway basis and causing greater frustration for the individual.

Commenting on the Legislature's failure to even bring the $3 million appropriation bill (introduced by Bloomington Senator David Rogers) out of committee, Trustee Carl Gray said:

"The legislators saw fit to spend considerable time delving into trivia such as visitation, but did not hear the cry of those needing help more than any other segment of our society. Now the program may be delayed another two years. How can we expect them (disadvantaged young people) to be calm and collected when they face frustration after frustration and their cries are ignored?"

Indiana University's 15-year proposed program for disadvantaged students

Need:	
Financial Aid	$14,278,400
Supporting Services	772,050
Total	15,050,450

LIBERTY AMENDMENT: HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 23

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, an interesting statement was made by Mr. Willis E. Stone, national chairman of the Liberty Amendment Committee, of Los Angeles, before the House Ways and Means Committee on Monday, April 14, 1969, on behalf of the Liberty amendment, which I have introduced as House Joint Resolution 23.

Since Mr. Stone was speaking for a nationwide organization with committees in more than 700 counties in the United States, I include his testimony as part of my remarks in the belief that my colleagues will find it timely as well as informative.

Mr. Speaker, I also include House Joint Resolution 23 with these remarks.

The material follows:

STATEMENT OF WILLIS E. STONE, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN, LIBERTY AMENDMENT COMMITTEE OF THE U.S.A., BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, APRIL 14, 1969

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the House Ways and Means Committee, for affording this opportunity of presenting the viewpoint of hundreds of thousands of your fellow Americans whose voice has apparently fallen on deaf ears for many years.

As a matter of identification, I am Willis E. Stone, National Chairman of the Liberty Amendment Committee with headquarters at 6413 Franklin Avenue, Los Angeles, California with subordinate committees organized in every state and more than 700 counties. I speak for all the members, supporters and friends of the Liberty Amendment, pending before you as House Joint Resolution #23. Additionally, more than 6,000 organizations have adopted resolutions of support for the Liberty Amendment and seven states have formally petitioned the Congress to submit this question of public policy to the American people for decision.

It has been eleven long years since a vast segment of the American people last had an opportunity to express their views that true tax reform and constitutional liberty are the same things, and can only be had through the literal enforcement of the Constitution of the United States. These truths proposed to you in 1958 went unheeded, and the cumulative disasters of the intervening years are largely traceable to the fact that violations of Constitutional principles continue to accelerate at ever increasing cost to the taxpayers.

SPEND PHILOSOPHY STEPPED UP

The Statistical Abstract of the United States shows that individual tax collections in 1950 had arisen to the staggering figure of $18.4 billion—almost twice the cost of government for the first hundred years of this nation. The 1958 "tax reform hearings" apparently stepped up, rather than diminished, the tax and spend philosophy, as individual income tax collections in 1960 reached $39.5 billion, more than double the 1950 levy. This is indeed tax reform in reverse.

By 1963 individual income tax collections skyrocketed another 25 percent to $48.2 billion that year and reached the fantastic figure of $68.7 billion in 1968, with a projected individual income tax collection of $90.4 billion for 1970! No wonder the spirit of rebellion is loose in the land.

Despite this accelerating tax take from a reluctant people, the national debt is also skyrocketing steadily toward the point of national bankruptcy. Referring again to the Statistical Abstract, the recorded federal debt in 1950 was $257.4 billion. It climbed to $276.3 billion in 1958, and on up to $290.8 billion in 1960—and on up to $310.8 billion in 1965—and on up to $369.7 billion in 1968, as Congress was spending $25.4 billion more than was taken in that year of 1968, and you have just approved the first of the 1969 increases in the "tax ceiling" by $12 billion at the highest interest rate in modern history, reflecting a lack of public confidence in government's fiscal integrity.

Your Committee can re-establish public confidence in your fiscal and Constitutional integrity if you honestly propose taxation solely to finance constitutionally authorized functions of government—finance them adequately—while withdrawing funds from those activities carried on by bureaucratic agencies without the slightest pretense of constitutional authority.

NO MYSTERY

The agencies involved in these unauthorized functions are numerous, and they consume a great volume of plunder to sustain their interest free, rent free and tax free empires in direct and ruthless competition with tax paying enterprises. Neither is there any mystery about the corruption and waste of these specially privileged enterprises which are immune from law—local, state and federal.

The Hoover Commission's Report of 1955 revealed countless ways of instituting real tax reform. A continuing study under the title of Fact Sheet revealed more than 700 federal agencies were involved in constitutionally unauthorized activities. A copy of the Fact Sheet list has been handed to you. An agency named on that list means that agency in some way invaded the private areas of activity which were, by the design of the Constitution, prohibited to government. The fact of that intended prohibition is clearly established by the 9th Amendment which provides that: The enumeration of the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

The Founding Fathers went further, stipulating in the 10th Amendment that: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Despite these safeguards, we now have this vast array of federal agencies' operating powers never delegated, and exercising rights not enumerated.

Your great dilemma arises from your quest for revenue to finance these illicit empires which have taken over forty percent of the land area and an estimated twenty percent of the industrial capacity of this nation without constitutional authority.

EXCESSIVE FUNDS APPROPRIATED

The people yearn for tax reform—true tax reform—and pray you will take steps to stop the financing of facilities and enterprises which exist without constitutional authority. Adequate evidence exists to indicate that an amount greater than the total amount of federal individual income taxes collected each year is appropriated by you to the maintenance and growth of these unauthorized activities!

At the 1958 Tax Reform Hearings of this Committee, I presented a summation of the projected budget spending under the 1959 budget then before you. It was ignored, but the subsequent developments have confirmed every factor therein. I again present that summation on the back page of the brochure titled "Two Towns." Along with it is a comparable summation of the potential savings under the 1967 budget estimating the tax supported costs of the amazing and unauthorized methods devised for dissipating the productive energies of the American people—your people.

They want it stopped. It is the first necessity for producing true tax reform on the heroic scale that will glorify you, our nation and our people for centuries to come. It can be done by just living according to our Constitution. Vast numbers of people are gathering in support of the Liberty Amendment as the best possible instrument for restoring the Constitution to full force and effect, and compelling government to live within the organic law, and within our means.

It is a tragic commentary that the people believe it necessary to forcibly apply the principles of the Liberty Amendment in order to reapply the rule of law upon those who represent us in government. It would be infinitely more desirable if you, our leaders in government, would approach the great problem of tax reform from this traditional and truly basic viewpoint, and stop the insane spiral of spending by our bureaucratic empire builders.

FUTURE OUTLOOK

What does the future hold? By the arbitrary imposition of the tax and spend philosophy which has destroyed countless nations, we can go deeper into the morass of tumulet, conflict, rioting, burning, right into the agony of revolution in the eternal struggle for power and plunder. I am sure all of us want to prevent that.

Our people prayerfully hope that your Committee will find the way to restore the equity of just and equal law under the Constitution. We pray you will finance only constitutionally authorized functions of government, leaving all else to the sovereign states and the free people of this great land.

How can you be induced to hear this message from your people? Can we guide you by the historic device of putting a light in the window as a beacon of a sure harbor—and lead you to a safe haven?

That may be a good way to instruct you, our leaders, regarding the will of the American people, and to regain the sanctuary of the Constitution as the only safeguard to our lives, liberties and property. Surely, the stark, silent but immutable message of the public will be free of oppressive governmental taxing and spending has long been evident to those who will listen. Perhaps that light in the window idea might be just the thing needed to bring America safely home again—to freedom.

H.J. RES. 23

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to abolishing personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the United States Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution.

"SEC. 2. The constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of the United States, shall not be subject to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreements which would abrogate this amendment.

"SEC. 3. The activities of the United States Government which violate the intent and purposes of this amendment shall, within a period of three years from the date of the ratification of this amendment, be liquidated and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold.

"SEC. 4. Three years after the ratification of this amendment the sixteenth article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal incomes, estates, and/or gifts."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE PREVIEWED

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are aware of a request for home rule for the occupants of Washington, D.C., nerve center of the United States. Many are sympathetic because they have been conditioned to so believe by emotional propaganda movements.

What people are closely following is the manner in which Washingtonians are exercising the self-government institutions already given them by the Congress.

Channing Phillips, Democratic national committeeman for the District of Columbia and the token candidate for the Presidency of the United States last fall, speaking at Georgetown University, has declared violence for ghetto-based Negroes is inevitable in Washington, but feels that it can be constructive if directed to the areas of the city such as Georgetown where the "decisionmakers" live.

Phillips further stated that when the anger of frustrated Negroes is touched off "my question as a responsible citizen is how can I best channel that anger to make it effective." No other inference can be derived but that he meant to terrify the remaining governmental officials and to cause them to flee the District.

Julius Hobson, member of the newly elected Washington School Board and an economist for the Social Security Administration, speaking at Georgetown University, declared that he was a Marxist Socialist and believed that the American free enterprise system "must be overthrown by force and violence."

Hobson further stated that he felt "the struggle is international, worldwide and we should make use of resources outside the United States, including Cuba and China" in the fight against capitalism.

These isolated expressions of local government leaders should be a warning to all Americans of what to expect in the future at our Nation's Capital if home rule were granted.

The message is clear that Washington, D.C., could expect a future reminescent of Leopoldville in the Congo—a haven where every international extremist in the world would be more welcome than our Government officials.

Unfortunately, Congress in its wisdom never saw fit to proclaim the District a reservation granting residency as a privilege limited solely to people in Government and those having legitimate business with the agencies of the Government or its facilities.

The question is not one of merely surrendering physical control of the District over to the occupants, but rather to attend to their stated desire to grant an opportunity for a vote.

If it is solely the vote that is desired—rather than physical control over the home of our Government—then the only logical conclusion is that the right to vote can be granted by retroceding that part of the District which was obtained from Maryland back to Maryland similar to that portion which has already been returned to Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, so that our colleagues may have ready access to the trends developing from the irresponsible behavior of the community leadership in Washington, I include news clippings from the local papers and a copy of my bill, H.R. 6786:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 15, 1969]

DIRECT VIOLENCE, PHILLIPS ADVISES

The Rev. Channing Phillips said last night that violence from ghetto-based Negroes is inevitable in Washington but that it can be constructive if directed to areas of the city such as Georgetown "where the decisionmakers live."

Phillips said he does not condone violence but that when the anger of frustrated Negroes is touched off, "my question as a responsible citizen is how can I best channel that anger to make it effective?"

About 150 Georgetown University students, assembled at the school's Hall of Nations for the first in a series of five lectures in connection with the university's Black Awareness Week, heard Phillips talk on "black dissent."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 16, 1969]

SCHOOL SEIZURES SEEN WAY TO IMPROVE THEM

(By Paul Hodge)

Washington School Board member Julius Hobson told Georgetown University students last night that the city's "black community is going to have to get angry and take over the schools, physically" in order to improve them.

He also told the students that he was a Marxist socialist and believes that the American free-enterprise system "must be overthrown by force and violence" before the gap can be bridged between the Nation's haves and have-nots.

Washington's students "have nothing to lose by raising hell . . . (even if) they take over, control, occupy the schools. Nothing more can happen to them . . . They have nothing to lose but their ignorance," the 46-year-old economist with the Social Security Administration said.

Hobson claimed credit for recent school Board approval of a black studies program in the schools, introduction of a course in Swahili and for blocking construction of the new Takoma Elementary School.

"I got Swahili because I got 50 students to come down and raise hell and disrupt the meeting until the Board agreed to Swahili," he said.

To opponents of the proposed design for the Takoma School "I told them to get a couple hundred people, come down and bust up the meeting. They did, and we put off construction of the building."

He criticized his fellow School Board members and Negroes who attempted to improve the political and educational systems from within, and said that he would not be surprised if violence flared.

Speaking during Georgetown's Black Awareness Week, Hobson said he "believes in force and violence" because "it is not possible to solve the social problems under the present economic and social system."

He said "I'm personally a socialist and believe in the social-economic theories of Karl Marx." And he said twice, for some disbelieving students, that he felt "the struggle is international, worldwide, and we should make use of resources outside the United States . . . including Cuba and China," in the fight against capitalism.

"The destruction of capitalism is essential to ending poverty. You can't have political democracy without economic democracy," Hobson asserted.

To some of the 100 students present who questioned his advocating violence, he answered that violence is in the American tradition. "We are the most violent nation in the history of mankind . . . it's our way of life."

Hobson said Washington's school system is violating Judge J. Skelly Wright's 1967 decision by continuing to spend school money unequally among city schools. "Wilson High School students are getting 21 books per child, while at Dunbar High School they get six per child," he said, and "Wilson spends $820 on each pupil compared to $425 at Dunbar."

He said he was going back to court with these and other "maldistribution" figures and force a more equal distribution.

H.R. 6786

A bill to retrocede a portion of the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all of that portion of the District of Columbia ceded to the United States by the State of Maryland and not included within the Federal area described in section 3 of this Act, and all the rights and jurisdiction ceded to the United States by the State of Maryland in connection therewith, are hereby retroceded and relinquished to the State of Maryland effective as of the date of the acceptance thereof by the State of Maryland.

SEC. 2. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to vest in the State of Maryland any property right in any real or personal property situated in that portion of the District of Columbia retroceded to the State of Maryland under the first section of this Act and held by the United States or by any person, except as such property may be transferred to the State of Maryland by the United States or by such person, as the case may be.

(b) The jurisdiction of the United States and of the government of the District of Columbia, and the laws in effect in the District of Columbia as of the date of acceptance by the State of Maryland of the retrocession provided for by the first section of this Act, shall remain in full force and effect until the State of Maryland shall provide by law for the extension of its jurisdiction and judicial system over that portion of the District of Columbia retroceded to the State of Maryland under the first section of this Act.

(c) The United States shall retain jurisdiction over the real and personal property held by it, and situated within that portion of the District of Columbia retroceded to the State of Maryland under the first section of this Act, in the same manner and to the same extent as the United States exercises jurisdiction over property held by its situated within the various States.

SEC. 3. (a) The Federal area referred to in the first section of this Act is more particularly described as that portion of the District of Columbia situated within the boundary line described as follows:

Beginning on the east side of Rock Creek where it meets the Potomac River and running generally north and east to a point where P Street Northwest intersects Rock Creek;

thence east on P Street Northwest to Floride Avenue;

thence following Florida Avenue to Fifteenth Street Northeast;

thence south on Fifteenth Street Northeast to C Street Northeast;

thence east on C Street Northeast to the East Capitol Street Bridge;

thence east on the East Capitol Street Bridge to the point where it intersects the middle of the Anacostia River channel;

thence generally south and west down the midchannel of the Anacostia River to that point in the channel that is due south of Hains Point;

thence due west to the present Virginia-District of Columbia boundary at the shoreline of Washington National Airport;

thence generally north and east up the Potomac River along the Virginia-District of Columbia boundary to a point parallel to the northernmost projection of Theodore Roosevelt Island;

thence east to the confluence of Rock Creek and the Potomac River.

(b) Where the Federal area described in subsection (a) is bounded by streets such streets shall be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal City and the Federal jurisdiction shall extend to the sidewalks of the distant side of the street.

Sec. 4. Effective as of the date of the acceptance by the State of Maryland of the Federal area retroceded to it under this Act, the State of Maryland shall be entitled to one Representative in addition to the number of Representatives to which it is otherwise entitled, until the taking effect of the next reapportionment, and such Representative shall be in addition to the membership of the House of Representatives, as now prescribed by law. Until otherwise provided by the State of Maryland, such additional Representative shall be elected from the Federal area retroceded under this Act. Such temporary increase in the membership shall not operate to either increase or decrease the permanent membership of the House of Representatives as prescribed in the Act of August 8, 1911 (37 Stat. 13) nor shall such temporary increase affect the basis of apportionment established by the Act of November 15, 1941 (55 Stat. 761; 2 U.S.C. 2a), for the Eighty-third Congress and each Congress thereafter.

GAS AND GERM WARFARE

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the country have given time and consideration to our Nation's capabilities with respect to missile strength, the ABM and our defense posture against nuclear attack. But, the public debate rarely has included another form of warfare: chemical and biological.

This exclusion is due for the most part to the shroud of secrecy with which our Government has cloaked all its actions in the field of germ warfare. How little even we of the Congress know about our Nation's ability and policies for responding to a massive gas or germ attack or the contemplated use of such awful substance by our national forces.

There is a Member of this body, however, who has persisted in exploring this matter. This is our good colleague, the gentleman from New York, Richard McCarthy.

Mr. McCarthy recently sponsored a congressional briefing with the Defense Department on our defenses in this field and most recently he directed a letter to Secretary Melvin Laird asking some of those questions with which this Congress must concern itself and whose answers are needed for an informed public discussion on how we might best guard against a poisonous biological onslaught.

Just last week the New York Times wrote an editorial on "War With Gas and Germ" and commended Mr. McCarthy for his responsible initiative in pressing for public information. I would like to submit for printing in the Congressional Record this editorial of April 7 and compliment our colleague for the extraordinary service he is performing for all of us.

The editorial follows:

War With Gas and Germ

In his recent message to the Geneva arms control conference, President Nixon listed control of chemical and biological weapons as one of six possible objectives for international agreement. The President's brief mention is one of the rare departures from the official policy of deep silence which the United States Government has maintained for many years with regard to these weapons.

Since 1964 it has not even been possible to determine how much money the Government is spending on these weapons. Funds for research and development have been scattered through the Defense Department budget under uninformative descriptions.

On the initiative of Representative Richard D. McCarthy of upstate New York, the Army recently held a briefing on chemical and biological warfare for members of Congress, but it was closed to the press and the public. Pentagon spokesmen regularly refuse to answer more than the most elementary questions concerning these weapons. When an experiment with lethal nerve gas went awry a year ago and killed over 6,000 sheep in Utah, the Army for several weeks concealed its responsibility for this disaster.

This policy of silence and deliberate mystification is inexcusable in a free nation. As Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin has observed, there is no reason why the public cannot know the facts and debate the issues of biological and chemical warfare just as it has come to know and debate those of nuclear warfare. In both cases the survival of mankind and the future of this planet are at stake.

In letters to Secretary of State Rogers and Secretary of Defense Laird, Representative McCarthy has raised major questions of public policy which deserve answer. Is it national policy to respond in kind to a gas attack or a biological weapon attack? Is it sound public policy to contemplate using weapons with which no country has had any operational experience? If gas and biological warfare efforts are purely defensive in nature, why have the American people never been told what to do in case of a nerve gas attack or a hallucinatory gas attack? What precautions are used in the testing and the transport of these weapons and why did these precautions fail in the Utah sheep kill?

These are only a few of the questions which have never been properly discussed because of the official policy of silence and secrecy. Yet several hundred million dollars are spent each year by the United States on these weapons. The pressure to use them is rising. Already this country has employed chemical warfare to defoliate jungles and destroy crops in Vietnam and has used various kinds of incapacitating gases against Communist troops there. These actions violate the spirit if not the letter of the Geneva convention of 1925.

Last August, the British Government moved at the United Nations for a new international agreement to clarify and update the Geneva convention with regard to chemical and biological warfare. A U.N. staff study on this proposal is due by July 1. But it is not necessary for the United States to wait before discharging its own responsibilities. The Nixon Administration can offer a straightforward exposition of its policies in this field. Congress can take down the "Please Do Not Disturb" sign from this program and begin to discharge its normal functions of review and debate.

MODERNIZATION OF POST OFFICE

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, within the next few weeks, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee will be considering H.R. 4, a bill which calls for the modernization of the Post Office Department. Among the provisions of this measure is title VII which concerns employee-management relations.

Mr. Fred W. Elarbee, Jr., an attorney in Atlanta who has had a great deal of experience in the area of labor-management relations, has performed an analysis of title VII of H.R. 4. I believe that after my colleagues review Mr. Elarbee's analysis, they will agree that serious revisions are needed in this section of the bill.

For the information of my fellow Members, I hereby insert Mr. Elarbee's analysis into the Record:

Constangy & Powell,
Atlanta, Ga.

In re H.R. 4, title VII.
Hon. Ben B. Blackburn,
House of Representative,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ben: I have looked over the proposed chapter on employee-labor management relations contained in H.R. 4 and have the following comments:

First of all, there does not appear anywhere in the Bill a provision against strikes. It seems to me that an absolutely necessary part of a bill which recognizes labor unions with respect to governmental employees is a no-strike clause. This is particularly true where, as in this Bill, a provision is made for arbitration of disputes.

Frankly, I do not like the declaration of policy because it implies that rank-and-file employees should participate in decisions which are basically management in nature and which involve the management of the Post Office Department. Moreover, the declaration of policy amounts to an endorsement of and encouragement almost to the point of requiring membership in labor organizations. While I think it would be all right to recognize the principle of free collective bargaining, it should clearly be a matter of choice with employees either to participate in labor union activities or to refrain from joining, forming, or engaging in union activities. To this extent, a policy along the following lines, I think, would be much more desirable:

"(a) The principle of free collective bargaining through labor organizations chosen by postal employees is recognized. The right of postal employees to present grievances and engage in collective bargaining, or refrain from such activity, with respect to matters that affect their employment will tend to stabilize the Post Office Department and contribute to the effective conduct of its business. Therefore, postal employees shall have the right to form, join, or assist labor organizations of their own choosing, or to refrain from any and all such activities."

Frankly, I think that the word "encouraged" should be deleted from Paragraph (b) of Section 3701. Here again, I think employees should have a right to choose freely and independently without so-called encouragement, which could very easily amount to pressure or coercion.

Section 3702 (Definitions) limits labor organizations that may be recognized to national unions and its affiliates. Prior to the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, independent unions were not recognized by the National Labor Relations Board. Only nationally affiliated unions could be certified. This was changed in 1948, with the passage of Taft-Hartley, to recognize the validity of independent unions and not require that they be affiliated with some national or international union. The requirement that the labor organization be a national union, or one of its affiliates, puts national unions in the driver's seat, so to speak, and gives them, in effect, a monopoly on the right to represent postal employees. I think this is wrong.

The definition of "consultation" contained in Section 3702 literally gives rank-and-file employees the right to participate in practically every decision of the Post Office Department up to and including "going to the john." I do not believe any management should turn over to rank-and-file employees the right to formulate, change, or implement policies, which is specifically included in the definition of consultation.

Fair representation, a fair grievance procedure, and contract provisions regulating wages and conditions of employment, is one thing—but the management of the Department should be left with management and executive employees and not shared with the union rank-and-file.

Section 3702 defines the bargaining unit as a "craft of postal employees" and then lists postal clerks, letter carriers, mail handlers, etc. This would literally mean that you would have a nationwide bargaining unit of all postal clerks, letter carriers, and other classifications shown. I do not think that an all-encompassing unit is good from the standpoint of the Government. For instance, it is conceivable that literally thousands of employees would prefer not to belong to a labor organization and, yet be required because of substantial vote making up a majority coming from large northern cities.

This is given as an example, and certainly not indicative of what might actually happen. I know for a fact, however, that there would be some large Post Offices in the country where practically one hundred percent of the employees involved at a location would not want to belong to a labor union. To require employees in Alexandria, Virginia, or Macon, Georgia, to belong to a union or to be represented by a union (simply because employees in Memphis, Tennessee, or Columbus, Ohio, have voted for such a union) seems to me to be inequitable and unjust. What I am saying is, bargaining units should be on a much smaller basis or a location-by-location set-up.

Section 3703 provides for recognition simply on the basis of a certified membership list. I do not think this should be allowed under any circumstances. The union should not have the right to represent any employees in any bargaining unit of the Postal Department unless and until the employees have chosen the union by secret ballot election. The free, democratic process of secret ballot election is, and always has been, the best method of selecting our representatives for any purpose—no matter what they are.

The provisions for run-off elections are inadequate and contrary to the present system followed by the National Labor Relations Board. Section 3703 provides that if two labor organizations are involved in an election and a majority of the votes cast are for representation by some union, then the run-off election will be a choice between the two unions. At that point, the employee is not then allowed to vote "no union." This is an unfair method of handling a run-off election. For instance, if 35% of the employees vote for Union A; 30% for Union B; and 35% no union, under the present provisions the run-off election would simply be a matter of choice between the two unions, without a right to vote "no union." This should be amended so that the run-off would be between the two highest voting groups.

In the example above, it would be between "no union" and the union which received 35% of the vote. In this way, the other employees would still have the right to vote for the remaining labor organization or to vote "no union." I don't think the Government can assume, simply because employees cast 30% votes for Union B, that they will then vote for Union A instead of voting "no union." This certainly has not proved to be the case with respect to run-off elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board.

Paragraph (d) of Section 3703 provides that the Department must recognize a union for a 24 month period after giving it recognition status. This is too long. The National Labor Relations Board recognizes a one-year period.

Paragraph (f) of Section 3703 gives the union the right to "participate with management in the formulation, implementation, and modification of personnel policies and practices, and all other matters affecting the conditions of employment of employees in the unit . . ." Who is going to run the store? The union . . . or the Government? Under this provision, Post Office officials would literally have over-the-shoulder guidance with respect to all management decisions concerning the operation of the Post Office Department. There is very little with respect to such operations that do not affect personnel policies conditions of employment, and their formulation, implementation, and modification.

A no-strike clause should be included in Section 3707 Paragraph (b), along the following lines:

"The labor organization and its members are prohibited from engaging in, calling, encouraging, condoning, or ratifying any strike, work stoppage, slow down, or other interference with work at any time during any employee's employment with the Post Office Department."

Section 3708, Paragraph (a)(2), is a wide-open provision with respect to the matters to be subject to grievance and arbitration before the Labor-Management Relations Panel created in Section 3709. It makes subject to grievance and arbitration, terms yet to be negotiated in collective bargaining agreements. I think this is dangerous and practically unlimited in scope. It is like buying the proverbial "pig in a poke."

The Panel created by Section 3709 is given which should be made by Post Office officials who are appointed and designated to run the Post Office Department for the Government. These duties should not be delegated to any Labor-Management Relations Panel.

Section 3711 (Settlement of Grievances) puts the postal employees at the mercy of the labor union insofar as processing their individual grievances are concerned. Thus, employees are required to "receive the written consent of said labor organization in order to have the grievance submitted to arbitration." In my view, this is an arrogant conferring of control over employees' rights to the labor union and would be in violation of the National Labor Relations Act if such a provision were incorporated in a labor agreement in industry today.

Section 3711, Paragraph (e), provides, on an open-end basis, for employees to participate in unlimited grievance and arbitration procedures with pay. We have found, from hard experience, that where employees are paid for handling or processing grievances, far more valuable management time is consumed, far more loss of production time of employees occurs, with the inevitable loss of efficiency and production. While employees should be given a fair method for presenting their disputes, it seems to me that you should not encourage dispute handling during work time or at the expense of the Department on an unlimited basis.

The Bill is unfair to the American people, who are entitled to democratic freedom within their governmental agencies, bureaus, and departments and who are entitled to management efficiency, with fairness, in all governmental activities.

Ben, the above represents some of the objectionable features I find in the Bill. I hope it will at least help you in some manner.

Sincerely,

Fred W. Elarbee, Jr.,
Attorney at Law.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORMS

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it has been my experience that when the Reader's Digest prints a story, a large number of people read it. And when an article in the Digest suggests that readers contact their Congressman, we can literally expect a veritable flood of mail.

The April issue of the Digest contained a most provocative article by Eugene H. Methvin entitled, "Is Congress Destroying Itself?" After a glittering array of facts to support his contention that our old House could stand some updating, Mr. Methvin suggested that his readers contact us to find out just what we are doing about it.

As you know, over a hundred of my Republican colleagues and I have cosponsored bills in this session to start some of the reforms we urgently need. I am hopeful that many of the suggestions we have made will eventually become law. Congress should not have to be told that we are badly out of date in some of our procedures.

I think most of us realize the tremendous task ahead to up-date and modernize our processes, but I wonder if many Members feel as I do that such modernization should be a priority task rather than one relegated to oratory. In fact, if I was pinned down on the depth of my feeling about congressional reforms, I would have to admit that there is only one subject which should bear a greater priority in this session of Congress, and that is a comprehensive tax reform.

We appear to be caught in a dilemma of our own making. Our responsibilities require us to act on the thousands upon thousands of bills that deal with the proper operation of the Government, yet we could do this task much more expeditiously if we would devote just "some" of our time to the proper organization of our House. If we could find the time to improve our internal operations, I am positive we would serve the Nation better.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in these hallowed Halls for almost 20 years and I cherish its institutions as greatly as any colleague, but length of service should not blind us to the fact that we can do a better job of serving our country if we would only modernize our institutions. I do not propose that we tear the House down; I simply feel that we should take advantage of some of the experiences of our technological society to benefit our everyday work and activities.

Any Member of this House must be saddened by the examples given in Mr. Methvin's article that show that some of the State legislatures are forging ahead of this House in terms of meeting the demands of their constituencies. It is a truth we should face.

The quality of our Nation's health and well-being lies in direct proportion to the quality of the work we do in her behalf. Can we afford not to have the very highest quality in the Congress of the United States?

The Reader's Digest article follows:

[From the Reader's Digest, April 1969]

IS CONGRESS DESTROYING ITSELF?

(By Eugene H. Methvin)

The legislative branch is in danger of becoming little more than a rubber-stamp appendage of the executive. The fault lies not so much in its membership as in its machinery, which desperately needs overhauling.

"Obsolete"—"inefficient"—"slitting its own throat." Every day these and harsher words descend upon one of the most important institutions in the free world, the U.S. Congress. The attacks come from worried citizens—journalists, political scientists, students of government, state and local officials, disillusioned voters. Most significantly, concern is now growing within the halls of Congress itself. Scores of Republicans and Democrats alike who cherish the historic values of our legislative branch realize that it is in serious trouble.

"Congress has bogged down in trivia and inaction," declares Sen. Hugh Scott (R.-Pa.). Sen. Sam J. Ervin (D.-N.C.), chairman of the Subcommittee on Separation of Powers, after lengthy hearings and study is convinced that Congress "increasingly abdicates its responsibility to determine policy and to set standards." Adds Rep. Jack Marsh (D.-Va.), "Congress is in danger of becoming merely a rubber stamp for programs proposed by the executive branch."

What these and countless other thoughtful citizens fear is this: *Unless Congress modernizes its procedures and organization, it will destroy itself as a crucial force in our constitutional system.*

No one questions that Congress has passed landmark legislation, uncovered and helped remedy grievous national ills, and produced a legion of statesmen and leaders. But certain entrenched weaknesses are crippling Congress. Only by a close, frank examination of shortcomings can the public understand the need for the sensible reforms now being pressed by Congressional members of both parties.

Since 1961 Congress increased federal dollars for manpower training ninefold, spawning 15 programs administered by eight agencies pumping out $2.25 billion this year. But the situation is "little short of chaotic," says Garth Mangum of the George Washington University Center for Manpower Policy Studies. "Individual acts were written, considered and amended in rapid succession to meet current crises with little attention to their interrelation."

After 18 months of wrangling, the House approved the income-tax increase President Johnson recommended in January 1967. As a price for this tax hike, the House demanded a $6-billion-dollar budget cut. Challenged by the President to specify where the cuts should be made, Congress would not. Instead, it left the details to be decided by the President's Budget Bureau. Thus, the people's elected representatives bucked to non-elected bureaucrats their constitutional duty to set priorities for spending our tax dollars.

Not until almost two years after Congress authorized hundreds of new anti-poverty programs and "community action agencies" did the executive branch try to determine how existing government efforts were affecting the poor. I asked the systems analyst who supervised the research, "How could Congress legislate sensibly without having such facts?" "It couldn't," he told me. "Without this information it was like throwing money out the window hoping some would blow to the poor." Concludes Daniel Moynihan, President Nixon's top urban adviser and a veteran of the 1964 White House task force which designed the $7.7-billion War on Poverty: "Many men in the Executive Office and in Congress, men of whom the nation had a right to expect better, did inexcusably sloppy work. *The government did not know what it was doing.*"

Why can't Congress respond more effectively to the challenges of our day? "It is impossible for us as now organized to discharge our constitutional duties of making policy for and overseeing the executive branch," declares Rep. Bill Brock (R.-Tenn.). Here's why:

1. INADEQUATE STAFFS

No Congressman has adequate help for his incredible array of duties. Democrat John Tunney represents 567,000 Californians. Offices in each of his two counties require full-time secretaries. In Washington he receives 200 letters daily, half of them requiring contacts with federal agencies on constituents' problems and occupying three staffers full time. Two more secretaries plus two part-time girls answer correspondence and send out a newsletter to Tunney's constituents. His "legislative assistant" must write press releases and handle other chores. Result: not one person on his staff of ten can devote full time to legislation, research and program evaluation.

Committee staffs present an even more dismal picture. The House Appropriations Committee has a catch-all Subcommittee on Independent Offices that must decide on money bills totaling $17 billion for 23 agencies ranging from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. For their gargantuan job these six Democrats and four Republicans have only three staffers! "Even if we conscientiously try to decide whether a program is useful and operating within legal limits, we have to trust to dumb luck to ask the right questions," one member told me.

For all their work our legislators vote themselves $135 million out of the $184-*billion* federal budget. They appropriate three times as much annually to support an executive-branch army of 6800 publicity agents. Prof. Samuel Patterson of Iowa State University found that Congress has only 588 committee staffers. Yet the "executive lobby" wooing legislators on behalf of federal agencies numbers well over a thousand. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has more bill drafters than the entire House legislative counsel. Senate and House Armed Services committees have only 40 staffers to oversee our vast $81-billion defense operations, while the Pentagon maintains 272 "legislative liaison" officers.

2. INFORMATION EXPLOSION

The average Congressman puts in a 60-hour week during legislative sessions, an American Political Science Association study found: 15 hours on the House floor, 11 in committee, 24 on constituent requests, postmasters, military-academy appointments and such. He has ten hours left for studying legislative issues.

Yet ponder the maelstrom he faces! Members dropped 29,133 bills into the last Congress' hoppers and voted 1002 of them into law. Their 1967 debates filled 36,420 pages of the *Congressional Record*, triple the number when Congress last renovated itself by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The Government Printing Office last year alone ground out 248,152 pages of printed committee testimony, the equivalent of 287 *Gone With the Wind*-length novels, plus 27,000 pages of committee reports and recommendations, more than the 23-volume *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

Finding out *anything* in this flood is ridiculously difficult. Is it any wonder that, in one survey, 78 percent of the legislators queried rated "lack of information" as the No. 1 problem preventing them from executing their duties satisfactorily?

3. POOR EVALUATION

One of the great reforms supposedly attained by Congressional reorganization 23 years ago was specific provision for overseeing and evaluating programs already legislated. Indeed, the General Accounting Office (GAO) was specifically commissioned to perform expenditure analyses. But Congress never voted the money to give GAO the manpower to do the job. Worse, a survey shows that the 20 House committees do not themselves systematically evaluate programs under their jurisdiction. "We vote all these programs and money and do not follow through carefully to see what the impact of our actions is," Rep. John Brademas (D.-Ind.) complained to the Joint Committee on Organization.

4. CRAZY-QUILT COMMITTEES

The 535 members of the House and Senate divide themselves into 36 committees, 376 subcommittees, plus uncounted boards, commissions and caucuses. Senators average 20 assignments each, Representatives seven. This tangled maze of jurisdictions defines rational, comprehensive policy-making. In the House 18 committees oversee one or more educational programs scattered over 42 agencies, dispensing upwards of $10 billion. One committee considers new highways to bring more cars downtown, and another works on mass transit to keep cars out. Funds are appropriated for the reclamation of Southwestern desert so that bumper cotton crops may be grown—at the same time Southeastern farmers are paid to retire their acreage to prevent surpluses. Says Rep. Fred Schwengel. (R.-Iowa): "No single unit of Congress is looking across the board at the sum of the nation's goals and resources."

5. CLOSED DOORS AND DEALS

Committee chairmen guard their domains like Oriental satraps, arrogating crucial decisions the House should make after thorough debate. The 1946 Legislative Reorganization Act requires open hearings unless a majority specifically votes otherwise, but chairmen frequently disregard it. Foreign and military affairs may require secrecy. But does the House Agriculture Committee require secrecy in 53 percent of its meetings? Protests former Rep. Tom Curtis (R.-Mo.), "Legislative hearings should be open so people can see just how badly some of these programs have been mismanaged. Congressional secrecy is a scandal."

Indeed it is. By monopolizing crucial data behind closed doors, chairmen and senior committee members are able to monopolize crucial policy decisions, leaving rank-and-file members in the dark on many complex issues. This kind of power pays off in a cozy spoils-system alliance that often soaks the taxpayer and ignores the country's real needs. Thus, it is not strange that the Department of Housing and Urban Development should shower rural DeKalb County, Tenn. (population 12,000), with "Model City" grants to the tune of $4.7 million, ahead of 147 real cities. DeKalb's foremost native just happens to be Chairman Joe L. Evins of the House subcommittee that oversees HUD's appropriations.

What can be done? Plenty.

Save Time on Votes. Today, ringing bells in legislators' offices announce a roll-call vote. As clerks on the House floor laboriously call the 435 names, members scurry through the tunnel connecting the three House office buildings to the Capitol. Frequently they have to ask a colleague for a quickie description of the pending issue. In this antique ritual, requiring half an hour, the House cast its 478 record votes during the 90th Congress. Electronic voting, already used in 33 state legislatures, could slash this time-consuming procedure to a fraction, freeing harassed legislators of the equivalent of *two calendar months* of floor sessions!

Make Information Swiftly Available. Today's legislator cannot even get a daily list of all Capitol Hill hearings, and must wait weeks for the impossibly verbose printed transcripts, relying meanwhile on sketchy press accounts.

The 310-man Library of Congress staff now serving our legislators could, if augmented and armed with modern information technology, bring order to this Capitol Hill confusion. Every legislator could have on his desk each morning, through a remote computer terminal in his office, a complete list of all meetings scheduled for the coming day, plus summaries of the previous day's testimony and even digests of every article in the many periodicals coming into the Library that matches his computerized personal "interest profile." On any roll call, he could have via television an instant summary of the issue, the bill's sponsors and legislative history, voting positions recommended by the President and majority and minority party leaders—research requiring hours now.

Florida's legislators, computerized for four years, can have daily an "instant electronic scoreboard" on the status of 5100 pending bills. A Pennsylvania legislator can tap out a question on an IBM typewriter keyboard and instantly obtain on a small television screen results of a computer search of every state law, or specified clauses in all 50 state constitutions. New York State Sen. Jeremiah Bloom asked his legislature's computer: "Give me all the laws affecting banking that are not in the banking law." The machine spewed forth 1604 laws, a task that would take trained staff lawyers weeks with pastepot and shears.

Improve Evaluation. Impatient with Congressional failure to oversee programs already passed and with the House blockade on modernization, Sen. Winston L. Prouty (R.-Vt.) and others amended the poverty legislation in 1967 to require the GAO to make a special evaluation. (The more than 150 investigators will report this spring.) But GAO itself opposed a similar Congressional attempt on the fragmented manpower training efforts because its staff, already strained by the antipoverty study, would have to neglect regular auditing duties.

One proposal is to create a separate "Office of Legislative Evaluation," possibly in GAO, staffed by social scientists armed with the best computer systems and statistical sampling techniques to do "evaluative research" on how people are affected by government programs. "A new source of knowledge is coming into being," testified urbanologist Moynihan, "and this should not remain an executive monopoly. The executive is exposed to the temptation to release only findings that suit its purposes." Such an office might well have spotted trends in the welfare, farm and educational programs in the 1950s that foreshadowed the crime wave and urban riots of the 1960s. Congress could thus have been alerted to the need to change directions.

Press for Modernization. Congress in 1965 created a Joint Committee on Organization, co-chaired by Rep. Ray J. Madden (D.-Ind.) and Sen. Mike Monroney (D.-Okla.), who pushed through the 1946 reorganization. Six Democrats and six Republicans from the House and Senate spent more than a year examining legislative procedures and organization. They unanimously recommended a reform package including a modern information system, restrained powers of committee chairmen, more adequate staffing and improved legislative evaluation.

In 1967 the Senate, after six weeks of debate, approved modernization by a vote of 75 to 9. But the entrenched powers of the House, led by Speaker John McCormack, 77, last year would not even permit the bill to come to the floor for consideration. This year, dozens of Democrats and Republicans, led by Rep. Donald Rumsfeld (R.-Ill.), are pushing modernization. Though Representative Rumsfeld's bill, H.R. 6278, would be only a modest beginning, it would at least create a permanent committee to institute continuous improvements in legislative machinery and procedures.

Congressional modernization is no substitute for tough-minded legislators who do their homework, ask the hard questions and demand no-nonsense answers. But it can help them by reducing diversions and confusion, and arming them with expert help in marshaling the facts that can illuminate complex decisions. What happens to H.R. 6278 involves nothing less than the issue of whether we shall be ruled by elected representatives or a bureaucratic elite. Find out how your Congressman and Senators stand on H.R. 6278 today—and let them know how you feel about it.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a statement by the President of the United States.)

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the body of the RECORD the following statement by President Nixon which concerns his domestic program.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The Administration's first full review of the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1970 is now complete. As a result, beginning next week I shall send a series of budget amendments to the Congress.

Amendments for most agencies will go forward within a few days. The overall totals are now being made available.

The budget that we inherited from the previous Administration in January stated the estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1970 at $195.3 billion. Our examination of that budget reveals that some of these estimates—notably those for interest on the Federal debt and farm price support payments—are turning out to be too low. After making the necessary adjustments to cover these underestimated items, we find that the actual expenditures budget submitted by the previous Administration is $196.9 billion.

I am proposing new reductions in Federal spending of $4.0 billion, reducing the overall spending figures for the coming fiscal year to $192.9 billion. I am also recommending to the Congress cuts totalling $5.5 billion in appropriations requests and other budget authority—thereby reducing significantly the future spending obligations of the Federal government.

Our proposals mean not only a substantial cutback in the spending of tax dollars in the coming year, but a substantial reduction in claims against future tax dollars and future budgets. With this approach, we believe we have made a necessary and significant beginning toward bringing the Federal budget under closer Presidential control; we have taken the reins firmly in hand.

We recognize, however, the responsibility for budget control is a continuing one. For the past eight years—the sole exception being the current year—our government has run an uninterrupted string of budget deficits. Our actions now, we believe, have brought an end to the era of the chronic budget deficit.

As a result of this review and these cutbacks, we are proposing the largest budget surplus in eighteen years—and the fourth largest in our history—a surplus of $5.8 billion dollars for fiscal year 1970.

We believe that a surplus of this magnitude will speak louder than any words to the business and labor communities in this country and to the world that the United States is determined to bring a halt to the inflationary spiral which has seriously affected our economy these last four years.

In the last thirty-six months, inflation has seriously eroded the value of every pay raise won by the average wage earner; it has done unquestionable harm to the economic welfare of the very poor in our society and those millions of Americans living on pensions and Social Security; it has weakened our international payments position; it has sapped foreign and domestic confidence in the American dollar.

Inflation is the most disguised and least just of all the taxes that can be imposed; and we intend to lift that hidden tax off the backs of an over-taxed people.

These reductions in spending cannot be achieved effortlessly, or without making some very difficult decisions as to our priorities. But they can be achieved by an Administration and a Congress dedicated to eliminating the crushing burden of inflation and committed to the responsible control of the Federal budget. They can be achieved if this government is willing to impose upon itself the same new discipline that inflation and rising taxes have imposed upon the American wage earner and his family.

Some of the decreases in the budget will require legislation; others will result from smaller appropriation requests; still others will come from executive actions that I have directed be taken. In sum, these reductions constitute my best judgment as to where to reduce this budget to bring the acceleration of Federal spending under control.

But even in the wake of these cuts—which we believe to be in the best interest of all Americans—great resources remain at our disposal to do the work that needs to be done in our society.

For example, I am proposing for fiscal year 1970 a level of spending for our domestic problems $6½ billion higher than the figure for the fiscal year 1969.

This Administration will never turn its back upon the growing needs of the American people. That is why domestic spending in the coming year—even after these cuts—will far exceed that for any other year in American history.

We have come into office convinced that there are better ways than the old ways to solve new problems; and we intend to explore these more hopeful approaches.

With regard to specific cuts, the Secretary of Defense has already identified reductions in defense budget outlays of $1.1 billion. We believe these cuts will enhance our economic security without risk to our national security. Information with regard to other specific cuts will be released by the Bureau of the Budget on Tuesday.

As part of the budget review, I have directed that a substantial reduction be made in the level of Federal employment recommended by the preceding Administration. As a result, full-time employment in the executive branch, by the close of the coming fiscal year, will be more than 45,000 below that recommended in the January budget.

These reductions will not be made "across the board," but selectively, since manpower for vital needs such as crime control will have to be increased.

Consistent with these objectives, I will ask Congress for repeal of Section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act, which imposes restrictions on hiring in the executive branch. I am in full accord with the objective of that legislation. However, that objective is best achieved, not through some arbitrary limitation, but through leadership determined to reduce personnel and willing to make the difficult decisions as to where the cuts should come.

Just as we have made the judgments as to where the Federal budget should be cut, so we ask for the authority to determine those areas where the reduction of personnel can most beneficially be made.

Although the officials of this Administration have worked long and hard conducting this review of Federal expenditures and employment, the 1970 budget is not yet a finished effort. Conditions affecting the budget change constantly.

What will remain constant, however, is our determination to rein in this rising cost of living and to spend the tax dollars of the American people with a full awareness of the personal effort and labor they represent.

JOB CORPS CLOSURES

(Mr. TUNNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision by the President to close 57 Job Corps centers has caused great concern in the Congress and throughout the Nation.

The House Education and Labor Committee is now conducting hearings on the matter and the Senate has similar plans.

I believe that the President should postpone any final decision on the closure of Job Corps centers until the Congress has concluded its hearings. Preliminary estimates by the House Education and Labor Committee indicate that precipitous closures would actually cost more than it would save—both in economic and human resources.

The Job Corps was designed to provide education and job skills for young people who are considered unemployable. What is to be done with these young people if their last hope is erased? I do not believe this question was answered when the decision to shut down 57 Job Corps centers was made. It needs to be considered.

The abrupt closure of these camps was a severe blow to thousands of young people who are in Job Corps because it was for them a final hope for permanent employment. In California, Camp Parks Center is slated for closure. This is an urban Job Corps center with 2,000 enrollees who are being provided with intensive and specialized job training and educational programs. When Camp Parks is shut down, most of the 2,000 enrollees will be returning to Watts in Los Angeles—unskilled and further alienated from the community.

The closure of many conservation Job Corps camps in California will also result in returning alienated young people back into urban communities unskilled, disillusioned, and without a stake in the future. Among the conservation centers slated for closure in California are Oak Glen, Alder Springs, Fenner Canyon, Five Mile, Sly Park, and Toyon. There are about 200 young people enrolled in each of these conservation campus. While being provided with job skills and vocational education these young people are performing much needed resource conservation work.

This Nation has called for creation of jobs rather than the expansion of welfare. By the end of 1968, over 200,000 young people had taken part in the Job Corps program. In 1968 the rate of unemployment for those between the ages of 16 and 21 was 12 percent. Most of these young people are unemployables in their communities. The Job Corps centers were giving the unemployable the motivation and skill with which to find jobs—subsequently a stake in their community. A decision to shut this door to opportunity in the face of young people who are already alienated from society should not be made without careful consideration. The only answer up to now has been the Job Corps center. It distresses me to see thousands of disillusioned young people turned back to the streets of urban ghettos. This is not in the best interest of economy or humanity.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE AND SELF-DESCRIBED MARXIST SOCIALIST, ADVOCATES PHYSICAL TAKEOVER OF SCHOOLS

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last night an employee of the Social Security Administration, who also serves as a member of the School Board in Washington, D.C., called upon this city's black community to "get angry and take over the schools, physically," in order to improve them.

This was not an idle call, Mr. Speaker. This same militant Federal employee-school board member, who describes himself as a Marxist Socialist who advocates the overthrow of the American free-enterprise system by force and violence, bragged that "I got Swahili because I got 50 students to come down and raise hell and disrupt the meeting until the Board agreed to Swahili," and that when certain citizens objected to the design of a proposed school, "I told them to get a couple hundred people come down and bust up the meeting. They did, and we put off construction of the building."

This man Julius Hobson is dangerous, Mr. Speaker. He must be stopped from destroying the last vestage of sanity in the administration of the school system in this city.

More than a year ago, when Mr. Hobson referred to himself in a speech to a suburban high school group as a Marxist Socialist who believes that the American free-enterprise system must be overthrown by force and violence, I asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who paid his salary, to insist that Mr. Hobson complete a new form application for Federal employment, and specifically that he answer question No. 27 on a "Form 57," which read as follows:

> Have you ever been a member of any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group or combination of persons which is totalitarian, Facist, Communist, or subversive, or which has adopted, or shows, a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

After 2 months of "consultation," former Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Wilbur Cohen advised me in January of last year:

> We have consulted with the Office of General Counsel, U.S. Civil Service Commission, as suggested in your letter. We are informed that the statements attributed to Mr. Hobson in the Washington Evening Star of November 13, 1967, are not in violation of Civil Service rules or regulations and do not provide a basis for asking Mr. Hobson to complete a new Form 57, "Application for Federal Employment."

Mr. Speaker, this House has repeatedly included language in appropriations measures, the first of which was a direct result of Julius Hobson's call in May of 1967 for Negroes to arm themselves against the police, to deny Federal funds to anyone convicted of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or any group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons. Yet, Mr. Hobson, who has led marches on school grounds, police stations, distributed inflammatory handbills, who has made speeches entitled "Uncle Sam Is a Bigot" in front of his own office and elsewhere, and who now is calling on the black community to take over the schools physically, continues to be paid by both the Federal and the District governments.

Mr. Speaker, I have today asked the Attorney General of the United States to enlist his Internal Security Division and Criminal Division in determining whether Mr. Hobson cannot be prosecuted for violation of Federal statutes. I have asked him, as well as the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, to rule on his eligibility for continued employment, and I have alerted the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia of these actions with a request that they, too, determine what disciplinary action can be taken against him.

Again I say, Julius Hobson must be stopped, Mr. Speaker. Now is the time to do it. Not tomorrow, when he has completed his long campaign to destroy the District schools and moves on to the destruction of the Nation's Capital and the Government of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD the newspaper article from the Washington Post which gives an account of the speech made at Georgetown University by Julius Hobson last night:

SCHOOL SEIZURES SEEN WAY TO IMPROVE THEM

(By Paul Hodge)

Washington School Board member Julius Hobson told Georgetown University students last night the city's "black community is going to have to get angry and take over the schools, physically" in order to improve them.

He also told the students that he was a Marxist socialist and believes that the American free-enterprise system "must be overthrown by force and violence" before the gap can be bridged between the Nation's haves and havenots.

Washington's students "have nothing to lose by raising hell . . . (even if) they take over, control, occupy the schools. Nothing more can happen to them . . . They have nothing to lose but their ignorance," the 46-year-old economist with the Social Security Administration said.

Hobson claimed credit for recent school Board approval of a black studies program in the schools, introduction of a course in Swahili and for blocking construction of the new Takoma Elementary School.

"I got Swahili because I got 50 students to come down and raise hell and disrupt the meeting until the Board agreed to Swahili," he said.

To opponents of the proposed design for the Takoma School "I told them to get a couple hundred people, come down and bust up the meeting. They did, and we put off construction of the building."

He criticized his fellow School Board members and Negroes who attempted to improve the political and educational systems from within, and said that he would not be surprised if violence flared.

Speaking during Georgetown's Black Awareness Week, Hobson said he "believes in force and violence" because "it is not possible to solve the social problems under the present economic and social system."

He said "I'm personally a socialist and believe in the social-economic theories of Karl Marx," And he said twice, for some disbelieveing students, that he felt "the struggle is international, worldwide and we should make use of resources outside the United States . . . including Cuba and China," in the fight against capitalism.

"The destruction of capitalism is essential to ending poverty. You can't have political democracy without economic democracy," Hobson asserted.

To some of the 100 students present who questioned his advocating violence, he answered that violence is in the American tradition. "We are the most violent nation in the history of mankind . . . it's our way of life."

Hobson said Washington's school system is violating Judge J. Skelly Wright's 1967 decision by continuing to spend school money unequally among city schools. "Wilson High School students are getting 21 books per child, while at Dunbar High School they get six per child," he said, and "Wilson spends $820 on each pupil compared to $425 at Dunbar."

He said he was going back to court with these and other "maldistribution" figures and force a more equal distribution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Cunningham (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Saylor, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Michel, for 30 minutes, tomorrow, April 17; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Findley (at the request of Mr. Landgrebe), for 30 minutes, on April 17; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Conable (at the request of Mr. Landgrebe), for 30 minutes, on April 17; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Chamberlain (at the request of Mr. Landgrebe), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Pucinski, for 30 minutes, on April 17, 1969; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Stokes) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Reuss, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Ryan, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Gonzalez, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Burke of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Mahon and to include President Nixon's review of 1970 budget.

Mr. Saylor and to include extraneous material.

Mr. Zablocki and to include extraneous material.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Landgrebe) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McClory in two instances.

Mr. Watson in two instances.

Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. McKneally.

Mr. Stafford.

Mrs. Reid of Illinois.

Mr. Miller of Ohio.

Mr. Schwengel in three instances.

Mr. Horton in two instances.

Mr. Vander Jagt.

Mr. Eshleman.

Mr. Reid of New York.

Mr. Fish.

Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Esch.

Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Bray in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Stokes) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. William D. Ford in two instances.

Mr. Rarick in four instances.

Mr. Feighan in four instances.

Mr. Hungate.

Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Kastenmeier.

Mr. Moorhead in six instances.

Mr. Anderson of California in three instances.

Mr. Yatron in two instances.

Mr. Brademas in six instances.

Mr. Biaggi in two instances.

Mr. Ryan in three instances.

Mr. Gaydos in three instances.

Mr. Burke of Massachusetts.

Mr. Montgomery.

Mr. Patten.

Mr. Fascell in two instances.

Mr. Ottinger in six instances.

Mr. Johnson of California in three instances.

Mr. Rogers of Florida in five instances.

Mr. Bingham in three instances.

Mr. Conyers in three instances.

Mr. Van Deerlin.

Mr. Fraser in three instances.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. Gibbons in two instances.

Mr. Gonzalez in three instances.

Mr. Hagan in five instances.

Mr. St. Onge in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 17, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

685. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third- and sixth-preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

686. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide mail service for Mamie Doud Eisenhower, widow of former President Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

687. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the administration and management of the biology and medicine research program of the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

688. A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H.R. 10158. A bill to provide mail service for Mamie Doud Eisenhower, widow of former President Dwight David Eisenhower.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 10159. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to compensate certain permittees where permits for summer or recreation-type residences on national forest lands are terminated and not renewed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 10160. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 10161. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 10162. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery adjacent to the Manassas Battlefield Park, Va.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 10163. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 753(e), to eliminate the maximum and minimum limitations upon the annual salary of reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 10164. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 10165. A bill to establish the Lindenwald Historic Site at Kinderhook, N.Y., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10166. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 10167. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide work clothing for postal field service employees engaged in vehicle repair or maintenance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 10168. A bill to assist the States in raising revenues by making more uniform the incidence and rate of tax imposed by States on the severance of minerals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 10169. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 10170. A bill to prohibit the sale or shipment for use in the United States of the chemical compound known as DDT; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 10171. A bill to amend the act, entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10172. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10173. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 10174. A bill, Voluntary Military Service Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 10175. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to improve the roads and certain other facilities in Kisatchie National Forest in Louisiana; to the Commttee on Agriculture.

H.R. 10176. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include as creditable service for civil service retirement purposes service as an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10177. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish the age of 16 years as the minimum age for employment on national forest lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10178. A bill to authorize the release of 100,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 10179. A bill to provide that the likeness of the late Dwight David Eisenhower shall appear on Federal Reserve notes in the denomination of $1 printed during the remainder of 1969; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 10180. A bill relating to the tax treatment of certain indebtedness incurred by corporations in acquiring stock of other corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 10181. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the limitation (added by the Social Security Amendments of 1967) on the number of children who may receive aid to families with dependent children under title IV shall not apply before the third calendar quarter of 1970; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKNEALLY:

H.R. 10182. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a full annuity for any individual who has completed 30 years of railroad service, without regard to such individual's age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10183. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to provide that the limit on the amount of compensation which may be taken into account in computing annuities and tax liability shall be determined on an annual basis (rather than on a monthly basis as at present); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 10184. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Sioux Tribe of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 10185. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code, to extend to mentally retarded or physically handicapped dependents of certain members and former members of the uniformed services the special care now provided to similarly afflicted dependents of members on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10186. A bill to establish an emergency program of direct Federal assistance in the form of direct grants and loans to certain hospitals in crtical need of new facilities in order to meet increasing demands for service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10187. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10188. A bill to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 to require repayment of amounts paid for the training of merchant marine officers who do not serve in the merchant marine or Armed Forces; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 10189. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 10190. A bill to provide additional Federal assistance in connection with the construction, alteration, or improvement or air carrier and general purpose airports, airport terminals, and related facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10191. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10192. A bill to provide for the sharing with the State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenues received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 10193. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska natives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 10194. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to increase the amount of the annual contributions which may be paid thereunder with respect to low-rent housing projects by establishing a more realistic subsidy formula, and to permit increases in the statutory per room cost limits applicable to such projects to the extent necessary to reflect rises in construction costs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 10195. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the town of Glocester, R.I.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 10196. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 10197. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of a widow's, widower's, or parent's benefit from 82½ to 100 percent of the insured individual's primary insurance amount; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 10198. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 10199. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 10200. A bill to designate the stadium constructed in the District of Columbia under the authority of the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 as the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Stadium"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 10201. A bill authorizing the construction of certain improvements on the Blue River, vicinity of Kansas City, Mo. and Kans., in the interest of flood control, water quality control, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 10202. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt ammunition from Federal regulation under the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 10203. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the date on which income tax returns shall be filed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 10204. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if any of certain relatives of such member dies, is captured, is missing in action, or is totally disabled as a result of service in the Armed Forces in a combat area; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10205. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that percentage depletion shall not be allowed in the case of mines, wells, and other natural deposits located in foreign territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10206. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10207. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H.R. 10208. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 10209. A bill to incorporate College Benefit System of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 10210. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 10211. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 10212. A bill to provide for special programs for children with learning disabilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FLYNT (for himself, Mr. Stuckey, Mr. Stephens, and Mr. Hagan):

H.R. 10213. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 10214. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10215. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to States to enable them to pay compensation to certain disabled individuals who, as a result of their employment in the coal mining industry, suffer from pneumoconiosis and who are not entitled to compensation under any workmen's compensation law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 10216. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide career status by appointment of certain qualified substitute rural carriers of record to fill vacancies on rural routes on the basis of noncompetitive examinations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 10217. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to change the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (by request):

H.R. 10218. A bill to provide chiropractic treatment when requested for veterans eligible for outpatient medical care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina, Mr. Broyhill of Virginia, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Murphy of New York, Mr. Howard, Mr. Eilberg, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Corman, Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Mr. Kee, Mr. Ruppe, and Mr. Fascell):

H.R. 10219. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 10220. A bill to promote the peaceful resolution of international conflict, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 10221. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Dinosaur Trail National Monument in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10222. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.J. Res. 653. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.J. Res. 654. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.J. Res. 655. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Federal Trade Commission to conduct a comprehensive investigation of unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in the home improvement industry, to expand its enforcement activities in this area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (by request):

H.J. Res. 656. Joint resolution proclaiming the week of May 24 through May 30 as "National Memorial Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.J. Res. 657. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (for himself, Mr. Adams, Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Boland, Mr. Brademas, Mr. Corman, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Farbstein, Mr. Feighan, Mr. Galifianakis, Mr. Gray, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Hungate, Mr. Howard, Mr. Leggett, Mr. McCarthy, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Moorhead, and Mr. Murphy of New York):

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of the memorial tributes delivered in Congress on the late Senator Robert Francis Kennedy; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (for himself, Mr. Olsen, Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Patten, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Podell, Mr. Ryan, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Tiernan):

H. Con. Res. 202. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of the memorial tributes delivered in Congress on the late Senator Robert Francis Kennedy; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 203. Concurrent resolution, Biafra, the need for an immediate cease-fire; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

117. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the financing of various facilities in the North Cascades National Forests; to the Committee on Appropriations.

118. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to studying the effects of cannibis, or marihuana, on man; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

119. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, relative to making certain medical information available to the Indiana Department of Public Welfare in the cases of applicants for, or recipients of, old-age, survivors, and disability benefits and assistance to disabled persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 10223. A bill for the relief of Charles J. Hiler, Robert F. Cheatwood, Walter R. Cotton, Ernest Levy, Kenneth Greene, and Kenneth L. March; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 10224. A bill for the relief of Mazen As'ad Sa'id; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 10225. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Miguel Herranz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10226. A bill for the relief of Edna Leers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 10227. A bill for the relief of Sgt. John E. Bourgeois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 10228. A bill for the relief of Pietro Minna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida (by request):

H.R. 10229. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Athanasakes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 10230. A bill for the relief of Karen Hanna Dethlefsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10231. A bill for the relief of Yum Foo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 10232. A bill for the relief of Lloyd T. Eastburn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 10233. A bill for the relief of Cmdr. Albert G. Berry, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10234. A bill for the relief of Aristeo Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 10235. A bill to authorize the use of the vessel *Mouette* in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

94. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Madison, Wis., relative to the Great Seal of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

95. Also, petition of Andrew W. Schroeffel, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to the judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO AIR-CONDITIONING AND REFRIGERATION INDUSTRY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today, when the Federal Government is seeking to assume an ever-increasing role in the control and policing of the Nation's industries, it is a pleasure to comment on one industry that needs no policing. The air-conditioning and refrigeration industry polices itself.

Ten years ago, leaders of the then young industry foresaw the potential growth of central residential air conditioning and took positive action to establish standards that have insured continued high quality and dependability. This action, embodied in the Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute's unitary certification program assures the consumer that any central air-conditioning system bearing the ARI seal of certification has been subjected to rigid testing and that the model meets minimum criteria for dependability and performance.

The term "unitary" is the industry word for a central air-conditioning system. Today, 70 percent of the unitary market consists of central residential equipment.

When the unitary certification program was established in January 1959, under the administration of the Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute, 530 models produced by 30 manufacturers were found to conform to ARI standards. Today, the ARI Directory of Certified Unitary Air-Conditioners contains more than 5,000 models produced by 61 participating manufacturers.

A similar program covering unitary heat pumps was initiated in 1964; in 1965, ARI consolidated the Certified Unitary Air-Conditioner Directory and the Certified Heat Pump Directory.

Models listed in the combined directory today represent more than 90 percent of the total U.S. production of the two types of equipment and a similar percentage of companies manufacturing them.

As a result of manufacturers voluntarily subjecting their products to the rigid testing requisite to certification prior to placing them on the market, the American consumer is assured that any certified unit he buys is accurately rated from a capacity standpoint and is dependable.

The tremendous growth of the air-conditioning market, particularly in the residential systems area, over the past 10 years attests to the overall effectiveness of the self-policing action of forward thinking industry leaders.

This program assumes even greater importance when it is considered in light of 10 years of continuous growth; 10 years that saw shipments of unitary air conditioners increase from 306,814 units in 1959 to 1,225,000 units by 1968, an increase of approximately 400 percent. The current annual growth rate of this multibillion-dollar industry is 10 to 20 percent.

Ten years ago, prior to the initiation of the certification program, the consumer buying a central air-conditioning system was faced with a bewildering number of performance ratings and claims. Some units were rated according to the horsepower of their compressor motors; others were rated in tons; and, still others in electrical watts input. As a result, an individual not having an engineering degree found it practically impossible to compare the capacity of one unit against another.

Today, all certified units are rated in accordance with their outputs in British thermal units per hour—B.t.u.—and the consumer knows what he is getting for his dollar.

To qualify for that all-important ARI seal of certification, each new model, before it is put into production, is submitted to an independent laboratory where it undergoes stringent testing. It must meet minimum performance criteria to make sure it has the capacity claimed by the manufacturer. Capacity and dependability are the watchwords of the program. Once qualified for the ARI seal of certification, the unit is not forgotten. Approximately one-third of each participating manufacturer's basic models are tested at random each year. A smaller number of units are called in after having been shipped to distributors and tested for capacity and performance.

The program has paid off, not only for the consumer and the industry, but also for the Government. An indication of the acceptance of air conditioning generally and certification as well, is to be found in the fact that the Federal Housing Administration requires that air conditioning installed in FHA-guaranteed homes at the time of construction shall meet the requirements of the ARI standards upon which the certification program is based. More recently, Housing and Urban Development as well as the Department of Defense have come to rely upon ARI's certification programs.

The air-conditioning and refrigeration industry did not stop with the unitary certification program. There are now certification programs for central system humidifiers, room fan-coil units, room air-induction units, air-cooling and air-heating coils, central station air-handlers, transport refrigeration equipment—used in cooling refrigerated trucks and trailers—and drinking water coolers. Several additional programs are currently under development by the institute.

I am happy to know that the air-conditioning and refrigeration industry has succeeded so thoroughly, proving that industries can regulate themselves through voluntarily establishing and conforming to sensible standards for its products.

That the industry recognized the need for regulation and certification and acted to bring programs into being that protect consumers without some Government agency having to step in is particularly commendable.

I would like to congratulate the industry and the Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute which represents it for their success. It is another example of free enterprise at work under the American system.

LT. DON C. LEWIS GIVEN OUTSTANDING AWARD

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, Marine 1st Lt. Don C. Lewis, of Texas, on April 8 received the Outstanding Naval Aviation Student of the Year Award, presented annually by the Daughters of the American Colonists.

Lieutenant Lewis was chosen because of his record of outstanding academic achievement and flying ability as demonstrated through the Navy-Marine Corps aviation training program.

This young officer, at the age of 25, is presently flying the Navy-Marine Corps F-4 Phantom, a high-performance fighter-attack jet. He is serving as a section leader for Fighter-Attack Squadron 451 at the Beaufort Marine Corps Air Station in South Carolina.

A graduate of Junction, Tex., High School and of Abilene Christian College, Lewis became interested in aviation through his father who owned a Piper Cub. An older brother, Ted, is presently a commercial pilot for Braniff, while his younger brother flies for Allegheny.

Lieutenant Lewis entered the Marine Corps in January of 1967 when he reported to the officer's candidate course at Quantico. Commissioned in March, he then was assigned to the Naval Air Station at Pensacola for flight training. While there he was chosen student of the week, student of the month, and also made the captain's list for academic achievement in November of that year.

Married to the former Miss Sandra Miller of Junction, Tex., Lewis resides with his wife and young daughter, Carla Renee, in Laural Bay, S.C.

At the recent award ceremony the lieutenant was given a gold wristwatch engraved with this inscription: "Presented by the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, to 1st Lt. Don C. Lewis, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, honor cadet, 1968."

Mr. Speaker, I salute this outstanding young American. It is reassuring to observe the progress of such energetic, intelligent, and dedicated young men. In just such young men rests much of the hope for the future of our country. They deserve to be recognized and encouraged at every opportunity.

PEACE, COMMERCE, AND HONEST FRIENDSHIP

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, recently, I had the privilege of introducing H.R. 7432, a bill which would deny favored tax treatment to any tax-exempt organization which engages in political activity. The main thrust of my bill is to prevent labor unions from using tax-exempt compulsory dues for the support of particular political candidates.

One of my distinguished colleagues in the other body, Senator PAUL FANNIN, recently presented a speech to the Labor Relations Institute, Federal Bar Association, relative to the growth of union power. For the information of my colleagues, I hereby insert this speech into the RECORD:

PEACE, COMMERCE, AND HONEST FRIENDSHIP

(Speech by Senator PAUL FANNIN, Republican of Arizona, before the Labor Relations Institute, Federal Bar Association, Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., March 6, 1969)

"We strongly believe that the protection of individual liberty is the cornerstone of sound labor policy."

That is a quotation from the Republican platform of 1968, and I think that contrary to the general idea that platforms are written in controversy, supported with vigorous rhetoric or trepidation and then promptly forgotten—we shall see a Republican Administration living up to its platform and campaign promises and striving toward an attainable goal of peace, commerce and honest friendship.

The first priority in labor policy for this Administration will, I believe, be the enforcement of labor laws we have in a fair and impartial manner and in the way they are written.

Under the previous Administration the rights of individual workers have too often been subordinated to the interests of labor unions, a result which is contrary to the intent of the Federal labor policy as adopted by Congress in the National Labor Relations Act.

Quoting again from the Republican Platform to which President Nixon pledged his support upon accepting the Party's nomination last summer in Miami:

"Today the basic rights of some workers, guaranteed by law, are inadequately guarded against abuse. We will assure these rights through vigorous enforcement of present laws, including the Taft-Hartley Act and the Landrum-Griffin Act, and the addition of new protections where needed. We will be vigilant to prevent any administrative agency entrusted with labor-law enforcement from defying the letter and the spirit of these laws."

I was in Miami when Mr. Nixon accepted the nomination and the platform. I know of nothing he said during the campaign which contradicted the platform stand. It seems apparent to me that he will continue to do what he is pledged to do—enforce the laws—in the letter and the spirit in which they were enacted by Congress. I believe he will do this—not *if* he can, but *when* he can.

When the platform language spelled out "an administrative agency entrusted with labor-law enforcement . . . defying the spirit and letter of the law," I am reasonably sure the National Labor Relations Board was uppermost in the minds of those drafting the platform language.

The reason for this is clear. The "Kennedy-Johnson" board has not only repealed the Landrum-Griffin Act, but through one-sided administration and persistent—if not consistent—distortion and disregard of Congressional intent in enacting the Taft-Hartley Act, has rendered most of the safeguards provided by the Act for the individual, ineffective.

May I pause a moment here to say that there are many other points at which the intent of the people, as expressed through their elected representatives, has been ignored by Executive fiat. Possibly the most flagrant in the news recently is the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, which has undertaken to set itself up as a complete "czar" in the field of government contracts. If the OFCC is allowed to continue unchecked it will be impossible for the Defense Department to buy a box of thumbtacks without checking first with the Secretary of Labor. This is a dangerous situation—dangerous to the security of the Nation. I have introduced legislation to clear up this overlap and contraction. This is a digression from my main theme and I cite it merely to point out the general problem and areas of difficulty encountered in the quasi-judicial status of our regulatory agencies. This is an extremely thorny area and I trust that in the foreseeable future some of you will come forward with better solutions than we now have in the area of technical regulations and independent agencies.

To return to my point—demonstrating the NLRB's disregard of the rights of the individual, and riding roughshod over the intent of Congress—if you examine the legislative history and the language of the National Labor Relations Act you find that it was created with practically the sole aim of protecting the individual employee—union member. There are simply no "protections" as such, awarded to unions.

Yet, administration of labor law by the very entity designed to protect the rights of individuals, has been twisted in such a way as to "protect" unions and leave the individual open to exploitation.

Let me cite a few examples. I know there are many, and possibly you are familiar with them, but some of these cases are so obvious in their pro-union bias that I find it difficult to believe them.

For example, in 1963 when a young, married steelworker on the West Coast grew dissatisfied with the representation he received at the hands of his local Steelworkers Union, he drove 50 miles to an NLRB regional office to inquire if he had any rights under the law.

He was assured by a government lawyer at the NLRB that he had every right to seek to replace the Steelworkers local with another union. He returned to work and proceeded to circulate a decertification petition.

As you might imagine there was an immediate explosion in the local union's headquarters. Immediately the leaders scheduled a meeting to put the young man on trial for "undermining the union." His request for a secret ballot was denied. With less than a third of the local's members present the President called for a show of hands. The steelworker was "convicted" by a vote of 20 to 15. Thereupon the young breadwinner was fined $500, suspended from the union and charged with the "costs" of his trial.

He filed charges with the NLRB and while awaiting their decision was the target of continued union harassment. Finally the Board handed down its decision. It gave the young man no help and no protection.

The NLRB noted our young man indeed had the "right" to file the petition as he did. But nonetheless, the Board held that the union's "disciplinary action" against him was permissable. (Richard Price vs. NLRB and United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO No. 154 NLRB 690).

This case demonstrates that when the rights of the individual and the rights of a union clash there is little question as to the winner. The employee invariably bears the brunt of these decisions. Is it fair to require that a man belong to a union—give the man no choice—and then let that union choose to discipline him when he does what it is lawfully his right to do?

I have introduced a bill to remedy this situation. It is S. 424 and it would prohibit unions from engaging in this sort of thing.

You have heard of the famous Allis-Chalmers case in which 100 union members were fined for refusing to engage in a strike when the union had already called a strike before taking a vote. The legislative history so clearly runs in the opposite direction to that taken by the NLRB in this case that it again defies belief. The NLRB held that a union has the right to fine members for refusing to engage in a strike. Senator Taft, in responding to critics debating the Taft-Hartley Law on the Senate Floor who feared that Sec. 8(b) (1) (A) would impair the effectiveness of strikes said . . . "All it would do would be outlaw such restraints and coercion as would prevent people *from going to work if they wished to go to work.*"

Mr. Justice Black cited this very language in his dissent in the Allis-Chalmers case (338 U.S. 175 (1967)). Obviously the Board has so twisted the law that it now operates in a manner exactly opposite that intended by Senator Taft.

The Board holds that a union may penalize or fine any employee who produces more than the union thinks he should produce. (*Wisconsin Motors Corp*, 145 NLRB 1097 (1964)).

The Board rules that the employer must turn over to the union the names and addresses of all employees so that the union may contact them in their homes, no matter how much the employees may object to disclosure of their home addresses and to being harassed by the union at home. (*Excelsior Underwear Co.* 156 NLRB 1236 (1966)).

As an alleged "corrective" of employer misdeeds, the Board frequently fastens a union upon employees without a vote, and indeed even though they may have voted decisively against the union. (*Bernel Foam Products Co.* 146 NLRB 1277 (1964)

Many other examples could be given to show that the entire thrust of the Labor Board under the Kennedy-Johnson Administration has been to strengthen the power of labor unions at the expense of the rights of the rank and file employees.

There are those who point to statistics showing Board decisions for and against unions are about evenly divided. They shy away from a close examination of the precedent setting cases, however; for there the bias in favor of the unions as opposed to the rights of the individual is so rank as to be nauseous.

If you have a penchant for statistics, try these on for credibility:

In the recent well publicized campaign of the Textile Workers Union of America, to "get"—that is to organize—the J. P. Stevens company, one of America's largest textile manufacturers, there are some interesting facts. I am reliably informed that the NLRB hearing examiner totally discredited over 300 management witnesses while totally crediting the testimony of over 100 union witnesses.

Now does it not seem at least a little strange that out of at least 300 persons called by the Stevens management to support its position, the trial examiner could not find a *single* witness whose testimony was credible to him; and does it not seem equally strange—at least very extraordinary—that out of more than 100 witnesses which the TWUA called to present its side of the case, that *every single one* was such a paragon of truth, purity and light that their testimony was totally credited by the trial examiner? It seems strange to me.

So now you know that I have some question, at least as to the impartiality of the National Labor Relations Board. What is to be done about it?

Of the present five Board members, three are Democrats, two are Republicans, appointed to five year staggered terms. The first vacancy does not come up until December of this year when Republican Sam Zagoria's term expires. He was appointed by President Johnson and is the only member who has not been reappointed to a second term.

Mr. Nixon may designate a new chairman if he wishes. It apparently will be August of 1970 before the term of the present chairman Frank McCulloch expires.

Even if the Board should be reorganized, and if a new majority, favorable to a return to interpretations of the law in accordance with Congressional intent were obtained, there would still remain the problem of the courts. The present board has fairly frequently been reversed in the Circuit Courts, but has gone on to be sustained often in the Supreme Court; whose bias in favor of union labor is a matter of public record.

That leaves action in the Legislative and Executive fields. Looking first at the Executive:

Considerable attention is being given to President Nixon's attitude toward strikes in major industries affecting the National interest. In the Atlantic and Gulf Coast dock strike of longshoremen he exhibited a firm refusal to allow the Federal government to be drawn into the strike settlement, other than as a mediator, coupled with an equally firm indication that when the limit of public tolerance of inconvenience was passed, drastic action would be taken. A settlement was reached.

I do not think you will see a return to the Johnsonian practice of "knocking and locking." That is knocking management and labor's heads together and locking them up until a settlement is reached. I am glad to see it go. In my opinion the missing partner in that kind of deal is the poor guy at home who is going to have to pay more for whatever labor and management produce.

Those who say they were surprised by President Nixon's refusal to be drawn into such an argument should not be. Quoting again from our 1968 Platform:

"Healthy private enterprise demands responsibility—by government, management and labor—to avoid the imposition of excessive costs or prices and to share with the consumer the benefit of increased productivity. It also demands responsibility in free collective bargaining, not only by labor and management, but also by those in government concerned with these sensitive relationships."

And may I just read this from the Platform also:

"We will bar government-coerced strike settlements that cynically disregard the public interest and accelerate inflation. We will again reduce government intervention in labor-management disputes to a minimum, keep government participation in channels defined by the Congress, and prevent backdoor intervention in the administration of labor-laws."

From Mr. Nixon's previously expressed intention to follow the ideas set forth in the platform, I think we can reasonably expect to see him continue to follow a similar course as circumstances dictate. I think you can agree with me that there is nothing the President has done up to this time that is inconsistent with his platform pledge.

Last, we can turn to my own area—the Legislative—and see what prospects lie there.

First, I do not believe that the chances for specific legislation to reform real abuses in areas where labor law has been found in need of amendment are diminished in the 91st Congress. While I am no longer a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it is my intention to introduce a series of bills which will serve to extend and strengthen individual employee rights.

Some of these proposals are already in the hopper, some are yet to come.

S. 817 is a bill which would provide an opportunity for workers, on strike for over 30 days, to indicate by a secret ballot their desire to continue the strike or return to work. Such a ballot, if it supported the strike, would indicate to management the determination of workers to continue to accept economic hardship in order to win the demands presented by the union. Such an indication of a determined spirit would, I believe, help bring a strike to an earlier settlement by putting pressure on the losing side to come closer to agreement in their bargaining.

I have already mentioned S. 424—prohibiting a union from levying fines upon their membership in exercise of their legal rights.

S. 425 amends the emergency dispute provision of the National Labor Relations Act, letting injuctions obtained to end emergency disputes stand until the dispute is resolved.

S. 426 would end the card-check fraud, which is still another example of how the Board has dodged around the clear language of the law which states that a secret ballot shall be held.

A very serious problem that demands the attention of the new Administration is the widespread use by unions of their members' dues money for political activities and for making cash contributions to political candidates. This has reached enormous proportions in recent years, and it has been estimated that well over $100 million was spent by Labor in the national elections in 1968.

What makes this practice so iniquitous is that much of this money is collected by the unions under compulsory union ship arrangements, with large numbers of workers having to pay dues to the unions against their will and with knowledge that their money will be used to support candidates which they, the workers, oppose. Moreover, the rank and file members never have any voice in the decisions as to which candidates are to be supported or opposed by the union. Even the elected union officials at the local level have no say-so in these matters, their function is to see to it that the dues money is transmitted to COPE organizations.

Here is a prime example of infringing on the rights of individual workers. Forcing a worker to support candidates and causes he opposes, the union denies him his constitutionally protected freedom of association, freedom of speech and freedom of political action. In my opinion, he is also deprived of property without due process of law. Here is what Justice Hugo Black had to say on the subject in his dissenting opinion in *Machinists Union* v. *Street*, 367 U.S. 740. The Court refused to look into the constitutional aspects of compulsory union membership. Mr. Justice Black dissented and said:

"There can be no doubt that the federally sanctioned union-shop contract here, as it actually works, takes a part of the earnings of some men and turns it over to others, who spend a substantial part of the funds so received in efforts to thwart the political, economic and ideological hopes of those whose money has been forced from them under authority of law. This injects federal compulsion into the political and ideological processes, a result which I have supposed everyone would agree the First Amendment was particularly intended to prevent."

Continuing to quote Justice Black:

"Doubtless employers could make the same arguments in favor of compulsory contributions to an association of employers for use in political and economic programs calculated to help collective bargaining on their side. But the argument is equally unappealing whoever makes it. The stark fact is that this Act of Congress is being used as a means to exact money from these employees to help get votes to win elections for parties and candidates and to support doctrine they are against. If this is constitutional the First Amendment is not the charter of political and religious liberty its sponsors believed it to be . . ."

There is the further fact that in spending their members' money in this manner the unions are engaging in unlawful activity in direct violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, an act which makes it a crime for any union to make any contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to federal office including president, vice president, senator or representative, and provides for punishment by fine and imprisonment for any union officer responsible for making, or any candidate who receives, any such contribution.

This criminal statute has been on the books since 1947, but no serious effort has been made to enforce it, and as a result the unions make believe it doesn't exist. Vigorous enforcement of this law by the new Administration would go a long way toward curbing this serious abuse of union power and provide more effective protection to rank and file employees.

Unions enjoy a tax exempt status under the Internal Revenue Code, and this alone should disqualify them from engaging in political activities. Section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code lists various categories of exempt organizations among which are labor unions, fraternal clubs, religious, charitable and educational organizations, chambers of commerce, civic associations and so on. Of the more than two dozen groups listed there is only one group that can engage in political action without being disqualified for tax exemption, and that group is labor. A chamber of commerce group that spends any part of its funds for political purposes would quickly lose its exemption status, and the same would happen to a religious or educational organization, a public welfare organization, a social club or any of the others. Only one group has the privilege of engaging in political action and still retain the exemption status.

Now, the interesting point is that there is nothing in the statutory language which would authorize this special treatment for unions, nor is there any legislative history to support it. It is purely and simply a position that has been followed by the Internal Revenue Service, and officially articulated for the first time under the Johnson Administration. In other words, the Treasury says, we will recognize a union as tax exempt no matter how much of its money it spends for political purposes, and notwithstanding the fact that the Federal Corrupt Practices Act makes such expenditures a Federal crime. This is incredible! It points up more than anything else the tremendous political influence of organized labor under the previous administration.

Here again is an area in which the new administration can take action to correct an abuse of power. Tax exemption is a privilege, and if unions are to continue to enjoy that privilege they should be expected to abide by the same rules as other exempt organizations. There is no logical justification for carving out a special rule for them, particularly when this special rule, in effect, condones flagrant and persistent violations of a Federal criminal law. I expect to introduce legislation that will help correct this problem.

It is my hope that President Nixon will ignore advice he is reportedly getting from some pro-union quarters asking him to support what is called "common situs" picketing legislation. In my view, this type of legislation that permits one small union to shut down an entire defense installation, would be extremely harmful to the national security, not to mention trampling upon the rights of those employees who may not be involved at all, but are nonetheless affected by such an action. In my talks with many other Senators, both Republicans and Democrats—the Administration would find itself embarrassed by the lack of support for such legislation.

Finally, I would just like to say a word about the larger interests in these matters. All of us—lawyers, legislators, employers and employees—tend to get bound up in our own narrow perspective. There are 202 million Americans in our national total. 202 million individuals. We cannot deal with the lives and fortunes of these individuals lightly.

The 1968 Republican Platform plank on labor concludes with this pledge:

"Effective methods for dealing with labor disputes involving the national interest must be developed. Permanent, long-range solutions of the problems of national emergency disputes, public employee strikes and crippling work stoppages are imperatives. These solutions cannot be wisely formulated in the heat of emergency. We pledge an intensive effort to develop practical, acceptable solutions that conform fully to the public interest."

To me these words set forth the goals I put as a title to this speech, "Peace, Commerce and Honest Friendship."

There is little detail that I can add to those goals at this time. The President has asked Secretary Shultz to develop new approaches to deal with national emergency strikes providing more options to the government. My own bill, S. 425, will protect the public interest, but will not settle the dispute.

We must work, and work together to find means of settling these disputes involving the national interest keeping in mind all the facets of the Nation.

I am sure with your thoughts, your work and your cooperation, the job can be done. Thank you.

THE NAZI HOLOCAUST

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, 1969, the world observed a solemn commemoration of an era from our darkest past, an era so extraordinarily shocking to humanity that we can only call it "The Holocaust." April 14 was a day of mourning for the 6 million who died at the hands of a deranged and barbarous madman, who saw among the Jewish people an excuse for his own momentous failings and an alibi for the shortcomings of a senseless program of hate and domination. It was not enough to point the lying finger of false guilt at the Jews for imagined wrongs; he, Adolph Hitler, chose instead to annihilate the entire innocent Jewish community of Europe.

The brutality of the Nazi holocaust can never be exaggerated. Its effects can never be dismissed, or even fully recognized. Six million people were systematically and wantonly tortured, maimed, starved, beaten, exhausted, defiled, and degraded until they were dead. The few survivors who limped from the death camps after the war were scarred physically and spiritually by the ordeal to which they had been subjected. The world of reasonable men was also scarred by the realization that they had been witness to the greatest mass-murder in the long history of mankind. The genocide of the Jews of Europe is so overwhelming that it is almost beyond the comprehension of sane men.

As if the crime of murder of a people were not enough, men of good will also realize that the manufactured reasons for the holocaust were equally based; there were no reasons, only the folly of a demented mind. The Jews were killed because they were Jews. There were no Jewish crimes to punish, no Jewish insurrections to put down, no Jewish conspiracies to foil, no Jewish subversions to stop, no Jewish acts of treason against the Nazi regime or against any government or any people. Jews who had lived in peace with their fellow men were killed because they were Jews.

It is to remember and to reflect upon this ultimate surrender to blind rage and unbridled hate that the Knesset of the State of Israel proclaimed April 14 to be a day of mourning for the 6 million. I am disappointed that I am unable to attend the sixth annual Queens Memorial Service being held on that date, but I shall be with them in spirit, just as I shall be with the 6 million in spirit. Those who gathered at "Young Israel," under the chairmanship of Eli Zborowski, for the memorial service sponsored by 50 synagogues and lay organizations in the Borough of Queens dedicated themselves anew to an enlightened search for an end of prejudice. They offered a prayer for the 6 million martyred on the altar of inhumanity. I ask my collegues in the House and the Senate to pause in rememberance of those who surrendered the cherished possession of life and to vow that we, as free men, will make every endeavor that this final act of madness shall not be repeated.

BASES IN SPAIN

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a number of us spoke out in this House last month in opposition to any renewal of the Defense Agreement between the United States and Spain. If any further arguments against this pact were needed, they have now been supplied by Messrs. Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond. In a column which has been read by millions of Americans, the Drummonds outline the humiliating conditions under which we operate in Spain in order to avoid giving offense to the Franco Government. The Washington Post called further attention to the Drummonds' column in an editorial last Sunday. In order that both these documents, and the shocking situation they outline, may be still more widely known, I insert the editorial and the column in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1969]

THE SPANISH BASES (II)

What follows here is a secondary matter, not at all concerned with wnether or not the four bases the United States leases from Spain are necessary to the deterrence of Communist aggression. The leases on these bases are now up for renewal, and the Administration has given its agreement in principle. The price tag is something on the order of $175 million in military hardware for the Franco government for a five year renewal; it is the money which is being worked out now, in negotiations between Madrid and Washington.

But there is another price that is being exacted, and it is a price—in our judgment—no self-respecting government should be obliged to pay. It seems that American servicemen stationed in Spain, and visitors to the bases who intend to make any public pronouncements, are given two documents by American authorities: a "policy directive" dated April 4, 1966, and a "sensitivity briefing guide" dated Feb. 19, 1969. This has all come to light through the diligence of Mr. Roscoe Drummond, who printed much of it in a column last month. Here are quotations from the "briefing guide."

"Do not discuss Hitler or Nazi Germany. Since Hitler and Mussolini provided military aid to General Franco during the civil war, (Franco) is against derogatory references (about them). As you may never have a favorable reference, it approaches a universal prohibition.

"Anticommunism in general is good and usable. Favorable references to communism and pro or con discussions of communism should be avoided.

"Dictatorship and references to it should be avoided. Be especially wary of comparisons between dictatorships and freedom.

"Do not emphasize the existence, activities, etc., of the Common Market. Spain is interested in joining it but do not mention this.

"Do not talk about religion in Spain or Spanish regional policies. However, if someone has visited a church recently and wants to describe the visit, this is permitted. Talking about Spanish restrictions on Protestant religious activities is NOT permitted."

These are directives which were recently handed to an America lady who was about to be interviewed over the Armed Forces Radio Station in Spain. It is sleazy. It is cheapjack. It demeans the United States, and it demeans Spain, and one can only wonder at the mentality of the official who wrote the documents, and the ethics of the government which put them into effect. They are only one more reason, albeit a secondary one, why the leases on these obsolete and obsolescent bases should not be renewed, not for $175 million or for ten cents.

[Prepared for Sunday, Mar. 30, 1969]

THE REIGN IN SPAIN

(By Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond)

Millions of dollars in hard cash is not the only price the U.S. is paying to Franco to maintain military bases in Spain.

There is a more subtle, more suffocating, more galling price.

We also submit to oppressive and undignified censorship, doing violence to the very principles by which a free people live.

Would you believe that the United States has bowed to the Spanish demand that it not fly the American flag over any U.S. military base in Spain? It's true—and no such restriction applies at other U.S. military posts in Europe.

Would you believe that the U.S. has agreed not to play the American national anthem over the United States Armed Forces radio stations anywhere in Spain unless it happens to come at the beginning of a baseball game or some other such event? It's true—and this restriction applies to no other U.S. base in Europe.

Would you believe that nothing but favorable references to Hitler, Mussolini and dictatorship are permitted? It's true.

And this is not all. There are other wide-ranging restrictions and inhibitions and "areas of sensitivity."

They are not secret. They are not classified. But they are not generally known except among the American military in Spain; certainly not in the United States. But when an American visitor to a U.S. base in Spain accepts an invitation to be interviewed on the Armed Forces radio stations, he is presented with a "policy directive" dated April 4, 1966 and a "sensitivity briefing guide" dated Feb. 19 last year and told to read them carefully, very carefully.

When he does, he likely finds it easier to be silent than to speak. We quote from the "briefing guide":

"Do not discuss Hitler or Nazi Germany. Since Hitler and Mussolini provided military aid to General Franco during the civil war, prohibition is against derogatory references. As you may never have a favorable reference, it approaches a universal prohibition.

"(Caps) NATO (end caps) should not be discussed. Casual references are permitted in canned programs, but should be avoided in locally produced programs.

"Anti-communism in general is good and usable. Favorable references to communism and pro and con discussions of communism should be avoided.

"Dictatorship and references to it should be avoided. Be especially wary of comparisons between dictatorships and freedom.

"Do not emphasize the existence, activities, etc., of the common market. Spain is interested in joining it, but do not mention this.

"Do not talk about religion in Spain or Spanish regional religious policies. However, if someone has visited a church recently and wants to describe the visit, this is permitted. Talking about Spanish restrictions on Protestant religious activities is (caps) NOT (end caps) permitted.

"Do not play the U.S. National Anthem or any other national anthem."

These are not pro-forma, theoretical restrictions. They are in constant use and this report is based on the first-hand experience of one who has been subjected to them.

He asked a high-ranking officer if it would be improper for him to air these facts in the U.S. and to protest against our continued acceptance of these restrictions. He was told that such action would be greatly appreciated by those on the post since the military are deeply irked by having to comply with these restrictive rulings imposed on them as a result of the political negotiations.

If these rented bases in Spain were a matter of national survival, such ignominious restrictions would be more tolerable. But now that the bases are of declining military value, shouldn't more weight be given to whether the U.S. should subject itself to such indignities?

POST-DISPATCH WARNINGS ON VIETNAM

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during 1954 and 1955, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published a series of four editorials warning against U.S. involvement in the war in Indochina, which later became the Vietnam war.

These editorials were written by Irving Dilliard, after consultation with the late Joseph Pulitzer, then editor and publisher. Mr. Dilliard is now professor of journalism at Princeton University.

In these editorials Mr. Dilliard appealed to President Eisenhower, in somewhat the same vein as I have recently appealed to President Nixon. Because they have a message for today, helpful in our examination of what to do about the war, I have placed the full texts below:

A WAR TO STAY OUT OF

The time has come for each citizen of the United States to decide what he thinks his Government in Washington should do or not do about the war in Indochina.

If the citizen has not yet made up his mind on this question, he actually may not have very long to do it in. Military authorities have expected the fall of Dien Bien Phu momentarily for several weeks. It may collapse at any minute. If it does surrender, the Communist-supported rebels will win the biggest prize of the war—a bag of some 12,000 French and Viet Namese troops.

Quickly in the train of that loss to the West may come a series of fast-moving events including perhaps: fall of the Laniel Government followed by a political crisis in France; suspension of the Geneva conference; demand in France that the war be ended if the United States does not take it over; decision in Washington as to whether our troops are to be sent to Indochina to prop up the French.

It then would be too late for the American people to make up their minds about the Indochinese war. Any decision to stay out should be made now, in advance, while there is indisputably time for that decision to make itself heard and effective.

As of now there is uncertainty and confusion with respect to policy in Washington on Indochina. At last week's press conference, President Eisenhower said that this country has gone as far as it can go under the mutual assistance pact. As he said, we have sent technical assistance. We have provided money. We have moved in equipment. But he also said that it would not be acceptable to us to see the anti-Communist defense of the Indochinese area crumble and disappear.

How would our non-acceptance be established? The President did not say that we would demonstrate our non-acceptance by putting troops in Indochina. But significantly he has not repudiated Vice President Nixon's off-the-record statement to the American Society of Newspaper Editors that Indochina must be held for the West even if it required this country to send troops there to hold it.

That troop statement still stands as Eisenhower Administration policy insofar as Mr. Nixon, who often presides at meetings of the National Security Council, speaks for the White House.

Whether Indochina is the first of a row of upended dominoes, to use the President's figure of speech, the French colony, as the map shows, occupies a key relationship to Southeast Asia. If Indochina falls to the Communist then Red China will in effect have a common boundary with Thailand—and beyond Thailand and Burma lies India. The desirability of keeping the manpower and the resources of that vast area out of the Communist orbit does not need to be argued. It will be a blow to the West if Communist infiltration becomes easy. It will be a bulwark to the free world if Southeast Asia remains outside the control of Communism.

To the end that Indochina may not fall before the Communist sickle, the United States has been for many months largely keeping up the French-Viet Namese cause. We are said to be bearing now about 80 per cent of the cost of the war. Our world-traveling emissaries—Vice President Nixon, Secretary Dulles and former Gov. Adlai Stevenson—have put their efforts into the struggle.

The United States Information Service, including the Voice of America, has sought to convince the Asian natives that they will be better off on the side of the Western nations than under Communist tyranny. Notwithstanding the shortcomings in our practice of what we preach, let this appeal be greatly increased and let the French do their proper part belatedly by granting freedom to the peoples of Indochina.

But if Southeast Asia is important to the free world, why not go into Indochina with troops, as Vice President Nixon has said may be necessary.

Indochina must be judged on its own set of facts. What we are called on to do at this time is to decide about Indochina. We are not called on at this moment to decide about the whole of Southeast Asia.

The one most fundamental fact about the war in Indochina is that it is a war which started nearly eight years ago as a revolt against French colonial misrule. The natives rose up against white governors whom they regarded as oppressors. They did this before the Communists had defeated Chiang Kai-shek on the Chinese mainland. Thus the outside Communist support that the Vietminh rebels now enjoy was insinuated into a war that was wholly native in its origin. The French still regard the war as a civil rebellion and it is for that reason that this war has never been taken up at the U.N.

To be sure the war in Indochina has changed a very great deal since its inception as a native revolt. The Chinese Communists saw in Indochina an opportunity to identify themselves with a popular uprising. They shrewdly attached themselves to the Indochinese struggle to throw off white colonial rulers.

The consequence is that more and more support for the Vietminh has come from Peiping and that more and more the war has developed into a contest between Communism on the one hand and the French, as representatives of the free world, on the other.

The United States is compelled, therefore, to take into account both the native origin of the Indochinese war and the substantial extent to which the Vietminh side has been taken over by the Chinese Communists.

The differences between the Indochinese war and the war in Korea, which was a United Nations war, are so clear that they need only be mentioned. The United States and the other free world nations in the U.N. took their stand in Korea because the North Korean Communists were guilty of a naked military aggression. By force of arms the Communist invaders crossed a boundary set by the U.N. between North Korea and the Republic of Korea.

Had the U.N. not stood by the Korea Republic, which it had created, the U.N. would have rendered itself utterly meaningless. The U.N. would have gone the way of the League of Nations which failed to guarantee the principle of popular self-determination after its proclamation by Woodrow Wilson in his famous 14 points.

Wilson's great principle was tersely restated by President Eisenhower in a historic address on American foreign policy in April, 1953, when Mr. Eisenhower said: "Any nation's right to a form of government and an economic system of its own choosing is inalienable." So saying the President reiterated one of the basic tenets in the U.N. Charter, signed at San Francisco nearly a decade ago.

This acknowledged and respected right of nations to governments and leaders of their own choosing caused the United States to enter the Korean war. Now that same right stands between us and entry into the Indochinese war. We could not take over this colonial war, of which the people of France long ago grew sick and tired, without placing ourselves not only against the Vietminh rebels but also all the Indochinese natives who are so determined to govern themselves.

Entry into the Indochinese war would not only take the United States into a conflict where basic principle would be against us. It would also in effect revive our recent war in Asia—for which a peace has not yet been concluded—in an area that would be far more difficult for our armed forces. We were able to use nearby Japan as a base for the war in Korea.

The map shows that the nearest bases to Indochina would be Formosa, the Philippines and Singapore—all much farther from Indochina than Japan is from Korea. The supply lines to Korea were long and wearing, but those to Indochina would be much longer and much harder to maintain.

Entry of the United States in Indochina with troops would, in our judgment, almost certainly bring Communist China into the fighting with full force of arms. Americans then would be fighting Chinese in direct conflict with President Eisenhower's 1952 pledge to get American forces out of the war in the Orient so that Asians themselves might settle Asian disputes.

The Kremlin then could watch with grim satisfaction while the life and treasure and substance of the United States were poured into a stooge war. For whether or not the Soviets could stay out of such a war, a long, exhausting struggle between the United States and China in the jungles of Southeast Asia would put our economic system under heaviest strain. Moscow could hope for the internal collapse, which it so confidently predicts, of capitalism in the United States.

Gen. Omar Bradley, one of the great military leaders of World War II and chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff until replaced by Adm. Radford, said two years ago that a general war in Asia, involving the United States, would be "the wrong war, in the wrong place, at the wrong time."

The present thinking of our top military planners was stated in last Sunday's Post-Dispatch by our military analyst, Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, retired. He wrote that the Defense Department's planners "believe that war with China, direct or second-hand through Indochina, should be avoided at all costs. Once involved in China, with Russian resources and manpower untouched, the really vital area of Western Europe could be lost while the United States was trying to extricate itself from the mud and jungles of the Far East."

Assume, however, that the United States were to disregard the basic right of self-determination in Indochina. Assume that we went to war on the side of French colonialism. Assume that Russia did not join the fighting and that eventually we were able somehow to subdue the Chinese Communists. What then?

Would we maintain a long military occupation in China as we have in Germany? Would we keep thousands of troops in China for years as we have kept troops in Europe, in Japan and in Korea? Would we appropriate the billions of dollars that would be required to feed and clothe and house the masses of Chinese war victims? Would we, after fighting the Asians, thus seek to win their good will? And if we would do it, could we do it?

There are risks in the seemingly inevitable collapse in Indochina, grave risks. We should do all we can to persuade the French to grant full freedom to the native peoples and thus prepare the way for the most satisfactory settlement possible.

We can and should use this as an opportunity to proclaim the fundamental philosophy of the free world—the dignity of individual man, the right to choose and the sanctity of democratic elections—in contrast with the iron rule of Communism.

We can and should make clear that our decision not to go to war in Indochina is a decision for Indochina alone.

We can and should make clear that we stand firm in our determination to resist Communist aggression aimed at conquest of the free world.

The risks that go with entering this war are limitless. At their worst they include atomic warfare and the destruction of the civilized world. Those are risks to be run if the United States is attacked or if we are required to go to war to defend allied forces in Europe. But they are not risks to be indulged in to support a discredited colonial regime in the jungles of Indochina.

Already our Government has taken steps that could lead down the road toward all out involvement. These steps include the dispatch of plane maintenance crews, the delivery of fighting aircraft and the establishment of an airlift to ferry French troop replacements. Each of these steps has been taken, so we believe, with the best of intentions. But each in its way has been a warlike act. Each might well have been countered by the Chinese Communists with more warlike acts by them on the other side.

The Post Dispatch does not question President Eisenhower's ability as a military leader or his experience in world affairs. On the contrary, we readily recognize these as primary among the qualities for which he was so overwhelmingly elected the nation's Chief Executive. But Dwight D. Eisenhower, like every President before him, needs the benefit of public opinion to help him in the wise conduct of his heavily burdened office.

To that constructive end, we state it as our profound conviction that the Indochinese war is a war to stay out of.

Let Washington take no more steps that may have the effect of edging us closer to military engagement in Indochina.

Let our Government end the warlike acts that can now be charged against us by the Indochinese rebels.

Let there be no more hasty, irresponsible statements about Indochina by our public officials.

Instead, let us, with our allies, in the President's own words, do what we can to "work out a practical way of getting along" in the world.

A War To Stay Out of (II)

On May 5—nearly four weeks ago—the Post-Dispatch printed an editorial on the international situation, with particular reference to Indochina. The plight of the French in their jungle colony was already critical, although Dien Bien Phu had not then fallen. We called the editorial "A War To Stay Out Of."

The passage of time has only reinforced our opinion. The war in Indochina is still largely a colonial civil war although it has been heavily infiltrated by the Communists. The war continues to be a war to stay out of.

Yet the danger of involvement not only continues. In one sense at least it grows the greater as the military situation deteriorates and white civilians in Hanoi are threatened with possible brutalities. What the next several weeks may bring cannot be anticipated. The American people need to prepare themselves for almost any possible development.

The first clue appears likely at Geneva. At any rate that is where the possibilities of a cease-fire are now being reviewed. The Communists have their ideas and the French have theirs. Whether a meeting of the minds can be arranged only time will tell.

* * *

Meanwhile Communist Vietminh military forces are proceeding with their troop movements designed to crush the French-Viet Nam defense of the vital Red river delta—the immediate rebel objective after the fall of Dien Bien Phu. From Paris comes the news that France has ordered 80,000 draftees called to the tricolor five months early in order to replace at home regular troops which are to be sent to Indochina.

If there is a meeting of the East and West minds at Geneva and an "honorable" agreement is reached—one which provides for a cease-fire on terms that represent a give and take—then that will be all to the good. The hostilities can be ended and the truce can be internationally supervised much as the peace in Korea is being supervised.

If a fair peace can be arranged then the following best step is to establish a means for keeping the peace in Southeast Asia. Any alliance for that purpose ought to be primarily Asian, but it will need to include the United States. Emphatically it should have U.N. indorsement. The participation of India will be essential if the alliance is to have fullest respect in Asia.

Such an alliance would have as its chief purpose the guaranteeing of the peace. It would function in the Southeast Pacific much as NATO functions in the North Atlantic section of the world. It would serve as notice to the Communists that any naked aggression would be resisted by united action with force of arms, just as the attack across the thirty-eighth parallel was resisted in Korea by the U.N. members, including the United States and, let us not forget, with the approval of India and the Philippines.

If a fair peace cannot be worked out at Geneva then presumably the Indochinese war will go on to its military termination. So long as it continues where it is and on its present basis, there is no question, in our opinion, that it remains a war to stay out of. The United States must be eternally vigilant that it is not drawn into an Asiatic war which would drain off our resources and thus most seriously endanger our capacity to fulfill our tremendous obligations to freedom in Europe.

To say this is not to say that this country can do nothing about helping Southeast Asia resist Communist infiltrations. There is much that we can do and much that we should do. Economic aid and technical assistance should be employed in every effective way possible.

Instead of cutting back this help to Asiatic countries, we should be extending it. We should remember that high-sounding statements of political ideals are well and good in their place, but that they get scant attention when men, women and children are hungry.

Our overseas aid programs have not been perfect but they have their creditable achievement. That the Marshall plan helped stop the spread of Communism in Europe is not open to question. Technical assistance has made us friends here and there among the great masses of population from the Pacific ocean, across Southern Asia, to the Mediterranean. It has its values that no amount of arms, necessary as arms may be, can in themselves provide.

A diplomatic move that would tend to bring East and West closer together would be for the U.N. to grant the Chinese Communist government's desire for admission to the U.N. This is a move the United States could support without in any way blessing the Peiping regime and for which this country might get in return concessions from China of much value to us.

All the while the United States should work to create a truly Asian defensive alliance of U.N. members—all the while that it redoubles its economic and technical help—this country should be increasing the effectiveness of its defense forces. Our Government in Washington must be careful to avoid dangerous tax cuts and equally dangerous curtailments in the defense program.

The military establishment should not be allowed to grow topheavy, yet it must be strong enough in this uncertain world to meet an emergency should one arise. The means must be found to encourage re-enlistments, now seriously in decline. The reserve and guard units also must be improved through the development of better training programs. For in the event of an outbreak, the reserve forces would be urgently needed in the armed services.

Finally every encouragement must be given to scientific research which leads to the development and production of new weapons. Here, in the vast and intricate electronic field, it would be only rankest folly to fall behind.

In short, then, the war in Indochina is a war to stay out of.

The United States should do all it can to help work out a structure for peace in Southeast Asia, but we must recognize that the Southeast Asians have their destiny largely in their own hands.

We can help in many ways and one way that is primary is to keep our defense strong enough that it will in itself be a deterrent to war.

A War To Stay Out of (III)

Readers of Monday's Post-Dispatch, were served fare of ominous news about the danger of United States involvement in the Indochinese war. Here are the high spots in summary form:

1. On excellent authority, Marquis W. Childs, Post-Dispatch Washington correspondent, reported the French as saying that American policy makers have promised the United States will intervene with sea and air power if the Communist forces press on at Hanoi for a full measure of victory. The prospect is that this showdown will come quickly—within the next two weeks.

2. Prime Minister Nehru warned in India that it will not take long for the world to learn whether it is headed for peace or war. He said: "Issues of vital importance to the future of the world are being debated at Geneva. Probably the present crisis is a more dangerous one than any we have had before. The next two or three weeks or even less may indicate whether we will go toward some peaceful settlement or toward the great disaster that all have feared."

3. The Washington Post, in an article by its diplomatic correspondent, Chalmers Roberts, said that President Eisenhower was prepared to go before Congress last April 26 and ask for authority to enter the Indochinese war with an air strike at Dien Bien Phu. The President was dissuaded, so The Washington Post reports, because the British would not agree.

Without casting any reflection on Mr. Childs' reporting, can it actually be that United States leaders have made a promise to go to the relief of the French in Indochina if Hanoi begins to turn into another Dien Bien Phu? Can it be that without any consultation with the American people, the President, some two months ago, actually was preparing himself to ask for authority to enter a jungle conflict that started as a civil war against French colonial misrule?

Assuming that these questions are to be answered in the affirmative, as Mr. Childs and Mr. Roberts have already answered them with their news reports, then the American people do not know nearly enough about what is going on in Washington with respect to the issue of peace or war.

If the White House has made a pledge to the French that this country will intervene in Indochina, surely the people who would be called on to bear the arms and to gear themselves to a war economy should be told about it.

If President Eisenhower was so strongly persuaded last April this country should enter the Indochinese fighting that only British non-cooperation kept us out, that should be known.

Mr. Eisenhower has said that he would never take the nation to war without explicit approval from Congress. We believe that he means what he says. Just the same these forebodings keep coming up. The wrong situation might quickly develop and out of it could come hostilities, World War III and hydrogen bomb warfare.

What would that gain us? As no less an Eisenhower Administration spokesman than Defense Secretary Wilson said Monday at the University of South Carolina, "a third world war is not the answer" to the problem of stopping Communism. An all-out war involving the United States and China over Indochina might even advance the cause of Communism. Certainly it would set the peoples of Asia against those whom many Asians regard as white exploiters.

The Indochinese war is a war to stay out of. Our mission is to join in protecting our allies in Europe and by doing so to protect ourselves as essential to the maintenance of a free world.

As Commander-in-Chief, Dwight D. Eisenhower occupies a position of leadership for all the people. He owes it to both his office and the nation to take us all into his confidence. He must remember that candid discussion of issues was one of his chief promises in 1952.

Another War To Stay Out of

Eight months ago, when some military leaders in the United States were all for getting this country involved in the Indochina war, the Post-Dispatch described that tragic, draining conflict as "a war to stay out of." We think the time has now come to describe the Chinese civil war in the same plain terms. The Chinese war also is a war to stay out of.

The danger of becoming involved in the Chinese civil war is all the greater now that Chiang Kai-shek has decided that he wants to evacuate the Tachen Islands and needs the help of the United States in doing so. The President has ordered the Seventh Fleet to fulfill Chiang's request and this means that our vessels are going into Chinese coastal waters in which the civil war is being waged.

If the Chinese Communists allow the evacuation to proceed peaceably there should be no harm to our ships or aircraft or the personnel on them. But if fighting breaks out in the redeployment, this country could easily be the victim of an inflammatory incident and thus drawn into the long struggle between the two Chinas.

This hazardous development follows in the train of the President's special message and overwhelming passage in Congress of the resolution of authority for which he asked. In his message Mr. Eisenhower said that while he did not suggest enlargement of our "defensive obligations beyond Formosa and the Pescadores," he believed "the danger of armed attack directed against that area compels us to take into account closely related localities."

This special message and the act of Congress in passing the Richards George resolution implementing it have had two contradictory results.

One result is to further the cause of peace. Peace is furthered to the extent that the message served as a clear warning that the United States will defend Formosa as part of a Far Eastern protective chain, including Japan, Okinawa and the Philippines, against Communism's spread.

HOW FAR ARE WE TO GO?

But there is also the opposite result. The message and the resolution added to the uncertainties that already existed about the Far East. Thus they increased the risk of war. This increased risk arises from the fact that the message and the resolution went beyond the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores and, in a vague way, referred to closely "related" areas. These last three words were widely interpreted to include not only the Nationalist-held Tachen islands and the Quemoy and Matsu island groups, but also areas of concentration of Communist troops, war planes and ships on the mainland.

Some members of Congress read this as an indication that the Eisenhower Administration might be considering "preventive war" against the Chinese Communists. These Senators and Representatives wondered whether the request for the resolution was in part designed to obtain the approval of Congress in advance for a possible strike that the military might consider necessary against the Chinese mainland.

President Eisenhower was quick to recognize the gravity of these concerns. While the resolution was under debate in the Senate, he sought to reassure Congress and the country by saying that he alone would make any decision to use our forces beyond the defense of Formosa.

These pledges were reassuring in so far as the President's course was concerned, but they did not remove all the areas of doubt. In fact Mr. Eisenhower himself confirmed the existence of this uncertainty at his latest press conference on Wednesday. He said in effect that the United States would use its forces to protect Formosa and the Pescadores. He then declined to answer as to Quemoy and Matsu.

UNCERTAIN POLICY AS TO QUEMOY

The President and his staff have access to military intelligence that properly is denied to the rest of us. It may be that he has good reason for keeping silent at this time on the United States intentions concerning these small coastal islands that are both geographically and historically part of mainland China.

The appearance at least is different. The appearance is that this silence with respect to Quemoy and Matsu is a continuation of what Secretary Dulles described some months ago as a policy of keeping the other side "guessing."

If this is all the policy there is on Quemoy and Matsu, then it happens that the people of the United States and their friends in the free world are kept guessing no less than our possible enemies. From this confusion and doubt arises the continuing fear of an unnecessary involvement of the United States in the Far East.

Let us assume that the situation in the Chinese civil war is as it appears to be. Then Chiang's Nationalist soldiers on Formosa cannot by themselves ever hope to invade the Chinese mainland. Neither can Mao Tse-tung's Communist forces, however much the Peiping propagandists bluster, now or in the immediate future, attack and capture Formosa. If this is the situation, and there are sound reasons to believe it is, then a United States policy of non-involvement in the Chinese civil war takes form.

The first element in this policy of non-involvement is not to be maneuvered into losing one or more vessels of the Seventh Fleet, or supporting aircraft, and the personnel, while Chiang's evacuation of the Tachens proceeds.

DANGER IN THE DEFENSE TREATY

Chiang Kai-shek was our ally in World War II and that is reason enough to sympathize with him in his concern for his men on islands that lie so close to the Communist mainland. We may hope that he will get his personnel and equipment off the Tachens, but not at the price of involving this country in war.

The second element in this policy of non-involvement is to be careful not to become caught up in the still more dangerous zones of Quemoy and Matsu just off the mainland.

The speculation that the United States might help redeploy Chiang's troops from the Tachens in order to strengthen his forces on Quemoy and Matsu envisions a maneuver that is doubly dangerous. In such a ferrying operation, a United States naval vessel would run the risk of being destroyed at the

Tachens, at Quemoy or Matsu or anywhere en route between them.

The third major element in a policy of noninvolvement, so the Post-Dispatch believes, is rejection by the Senate of the mutual defense treaty between the United States and Chiang.

This proposed treaty, which Secretary of State Dulles signed last Dec. 2, was ratified unanimously by Chiang's refugee assembly Jan. 14. It is pending in the Senate committee, where it carries strong indorsement by the President.

We are fully aware of the arguments for ratifying this treaty. Approval by the Senate would bolster the morale of Chiang and his troops. Conversely disapproval would seriously embarrass them in the eyes of their Communist enemies.

These considerations of morale are important. However, they are not the only considerations. If the United States becomes a treaty partner with Chiang, he is our colleague for better or worse. In view of his regime's record of corruption on the mainland and brutality on Formosa, he might deliberately provoke a military aggression that would involve our forces.

There is some protection for us in the provision that either party can, on a year's notice, abrogate the treaty. But long before abrogation could take effect, an act of war might occur.

A letter exchange, filed with the treaty, states that neither side is obligated to give military assistance if military action is taken without prior consultation between the parties. We might be reassurred by this were the other signatory not Chiang. But we do not trust him and we do not think that the President or the American people should trust him. Chiang's opposition at this moment to a cease-fire is warning not to join with him in a mutual defense treaty.

BETWEEN IMPERFECT ALTERNATIVES

The choice is between imperfect alternatives and we think it is the wiser, sounder course to take the alternative that is more likely to turn out better for the United States and the free world.

Therefore we propose:

First, that while the United States should not in any way weaken its warning to Communist China to keep hands off Formosa and the Pescadores, this country make it a strict policy not to run risks, in the waters of the coastal islands, likely to involve the United States in war.

Second, that the possibility of achieving a cease-fire be explored to the fullest notwithstanding the denunciation of a truce by Chiang and the rejection by Chou En-lai, Chinese Communist diplomat, of a U.N. cease-fire conference, except on extreme terms that Chiang could not accept. Inside the U.N. or on the outside, through some such grouping as the British commonwealth states which met at Colombo, Ceylon, the search for a fair cease-fire formula must go on.

Third, that plans be undertaken for an eventual solution of the problem of Formosa as an international responsibility. This might take the form of a U.N. trusteeship. It might evolve as an international protectorate under the watchful eyes of the nations of Southeast Asia which recently concluded a defense pact for their part of the world similar to NATO for the Atlantic area.

This might well mean that the United States would be forced to send troops to Formosa to participate in an international army. But by some means Formosa's integrity must be secured for the Formosan people either through the U.N. or other international agency. If the prospect does not look too bright, we must not forget that the U.N. stopped military aggression in Korea.

PROBLEM OF CHIANG'S TROOPS

Fourth, that the difficult question of the disposition of Chiang's troops (in the event of a cease-fire and the securing of Formosa) be approached as a matter similar to the problem of the prisoner exchange following the Korean war. Some of Chiang's troops doubtless would be glad to return to the mainland and their homes and families if they had the opportunity. Others could not return without being killed.

Fifth, that a climate be developed which would enable the free world to place trust in pledges from the Communist side—something not now possible. This would require the observance by the Communists of the truce in Korea. It would require the freeing of American and other U.N. personnel now held in prison. It would require full respect by the Communists for the integrity of the remaining free areas of Indochina and observance of a cease-fire in the Chinese civil war if a truce should be worked out.

Conceivably these steps, if taken in fully demonstrated good faith, could lead to the eventual admission of the Peiping Government to the U.N. as the government-in-fact of China. The very thought of Communist China at the U.N. is repugnant to Americans who have been outraged repeatedly by Red Chinese inhumanity.

Yet admission of the Chinese Communist Government to the U.N. would be no more than recognition of a geographical reality that can be seen from looking at the map. It would not mean approval of the inhumane acts of Red China any more than the presence of the Soviet Union at the U.N. means our indorsement of the Kremlin and its totalitarian rule.

UPSETTING TO SENATOR KNOWLAND

Admission of the Peiping Government to the U.N. would come, if it ever came, only after a demonstration that Red China had learned the meaning of peaceful co-existence. No less a person than John Foster Dulles himself made a statement last March of the terms under which Red China might conceivably enter the U.N.

Some of these proposals will be anathema to Chiang. Some of them will bring outcries from Senator Knowland of California, who has been Chiang's chief apologist in the Senate for nearly 10 years. Admittedly they run the risk of sharpening the foreign policy division within the President's party in Congress. This is regrettable, but it is a political fact that the Eisenhower Administration must face sooner or later.

No American citizen who cares for the future of his country wants the Communist areas of the world to spread further. He does not want appeasement. He does not want a Munich in the Far East. And he is ready if necessary to fight to keep Communist aggressors from taking over vital areas that could be used as stepping stones.

Neither does the citizen want a hydrogen bomb in his backyard as the result of some wholly unnecessary incident. And the unguarded trigger that might put that bomb in his backyard is thousands of miles away in the Far East.

PRESSURES ON THE PRESIDENT

The pressures on President Eisenhower for deeper involvement are tremendous. They come from his highest military leader, Adm. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other officers of high rank. To his great credit, the President has resisted these pressures up to now.

A year ago the President said the free nations should do what they can do "work out a practical way of getting along" in the world. In this new crisis that still must be our goal.

The President needs the benefit of public opinion to enable him to resist the continuing pressures for involvement. He needs more than ever the country's help in working out that practical way of "getting along."

What this country may be required to do in connection with an eventual defense of Formosa, no one can foretell. But the Chinese civil war, as it swirls about the small coastal islands—the Tachens, Quemoy and Matsu—is another war to stay out of.

HITLER'S CHILDREN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Headstart program's experience has proven it to be but an expensive experiment in controlled environment. All of the Headstart money taken from the taxpayers has but furnished free Federal baby-sitters to a selected few.

Yet, despite the admitted record of solving nothing the political environmentalists would slide off the disillusioned defeat by announcing the program must be shifted from young children to infants and toddlers, 3 years and under in age.

Some folks just cannot accept the facts of life or acknowledge heredity as a factor. So now, we are to have Federal nursemaids until the cradle robbers again prove themselves wrong or until that group once known as parents complain, the social experimenters will continue exploiting little babies as sacrificial statistics.

When Hitler experimented in genetics and environment his programs were called Fascist, inhuman, against the laws of nature and God, and the operation labeled "Hitler's Children."

How quickly we forget. Even Hitler was highly exuberant over his plans to upgrade the poor and unfortunate of the Aryan race.

One expects next to hear of a plan for euthanasia to legalize the murder of children, 5 and under, because of birth defects and mental deficiencies to mend the social scientists ego and upgrade their statistics.

Under unanimous consent I submit a news article from the Evening Star for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 10, 1969]

HEADSTART CHANGING AGENCIES, AGE FOCUS

(By Richard Critchfield)

President Nixon is creating an Office of Child Development to seek new ways to rescue very young Americans—especially infants—from the mental and physical handicaps of being born poor. The new office will take over Head Start, the popular preschool education program. It will be operated directly under Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Robert H. Finch, rather than by its current "parent," the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The President said yesterday HEW will be given the task of adapting Head Start to new scientific findings which show that the "process of learning how to learn begins very, very early in the life of the infant child."

He said this would involve "finding a balance" between the right to privacy and "the sacred right of parents to rear their children" and the national need to insure the "full potential" of poor children through better early environment.

Nixon reiterated his administration's commitment to the needs of the country's poorest children from birth to 5 years of age, first announced Feb. 19, along with his plans to move Head Start and the Job Corps from the Office of Economic Opportunity on July 1.

But he went further yesterday, saying modern science has confirmed that the child of impoverished parents can suffer "lasting disabilities" and that this can lead "to the transmission of poverty from one generation to the next."

"It is no longer possible to deny that this process is all too evidently at work in the slums of America's cities and that it is a most ominous aspect of the urban crisis," Nixon said.

"It is just as certain that we shall have to invent new social institutions to respond to this new knowledge."

Aside from indicating Head Start should redirect its efforts from the preschool playground to the crib, Nixon also struck a second theme by stressing that many urban problems, such as the process of child development, defy quick remedies.

"America must learn to approach its problems in terms of the time span those problems require," he said. "All problems are pressing; all cry out for instant solutions; but not all can be instantly solved.

"We must submit to the discipline of time with respect to those issues which provide no alternative."

Among a number of child experts and OEO officials canvassed today, there seems to be a consensus that the President is responding to a growing view that what a poor child really requires is the kind of environment a financially secure home and community offer other children from birth.

Head Start has been regarded as only a small step in an effort to furnish constructive educational experiences for all poor children from birth.

Currently, 55 percent of the 218,000 children enrolled in Head Start's full-year program are 5 years of age or older. The average age of 471,000 children in the summer program is 5 years and 10 months.

Although Nixon did not specify a new target age yesterday, there has been some talk of 3 years.

Yesterday at the White House, Secretary Finch outlined steps he intends to follow to reorient Head Start next fall:

The number of parent-child centers for infants and toddlers 3 years and under will be doubled from the present 36, increasing the number of children involved in this pilot program from around 3,000 to 6,000.

Communities will be asked to try out some new test programs in infant education.

HEW will encourage communities to use funds now spent on summer programs for 225,000 children—about half the total spending—for enrolling 50,000 to 60,000 children in full-year programs.

Finch said many communities have requested bigger full-year programs but that Head Start's fiscal 1969 budget of $320,000 and a requested fiscal '70 budget of $338,000 would remain unchanged.

HEW will seek greater use of poverty funds for elementary and secondary education for Follow Through programs so children can keep their head start.

The guidelines set by OEO for Head Start will remain unchanged. These include insistence on parent participation, comprehensive services, the use of volunteers and the opportunity for local churches, schools or community action agencies to sponsor their own programs.

Fears that Finch might rewrite the guidelines have been voiced by congressmen as one objection to Head Start's spinoff.

One of the first things Dr. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Nixon's chief urban adviser, did in the White House was to telephone Joseph Froomkin, a psychologist in HEW, to ask him to jot down a summary of his well-known criticisms of Head Start.

Froomkin wrote Moynihan a memorandum saying Head Start's programs were too short, placed too little emphasis on educational content and needed to be targeted toward much younger children.

Moynihan, an assistant secretary of labor under President John F. Kennedy, is an expert on jobs, but not on child education.

At his first meeting with OEO officials Feb. 9, he pulled a sheet of paper out of his pocket and read what has since become known as the Froomkin evaluation.

Now, two months later, refined and buttressed by massive research, the outlines of the Froomkin evaluation approach to Head Start seem unchanged. The Nixon administration's budget for jobs in the private sector may go up three or four times this year, while that for Head Start will remain the same.

THE SCOTT REPORT

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward J. Sloane, of Springfield, Va., has called my attention to "The Scott Report," by Columnist Paul Scott, for April 4, 1969, describing a campaign allegedly being mounted by certain members of the press against the confirmation of former Deputy Chief of Security at the Department of State, Mr. Otto Otepka, for appointment to the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. Sloane feels, and I agree, that Mr. Scott's discoveries and comments concerning this anti-Otepka campaign, deserve the widest possible attention. I therefore welcome this opportunity to insert the column in full at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington News-Intelligence Syndicate]

THE SCOTT REPORT

(By Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON, April 4.—A dramatic new chapter, with far-reaching implications for the future security of the U.S., is developing in the Otto Otepka case.

Opponents of the former Deputy Chief of Security at the State Department are preparing an all out campaign to block a Senate vote on his nomination to the Subversive Activities Control Board (SACB), an independent government security agency.

Otepka, after five years of persecution and vilification by the State Department, was nominated last month to the SACB by President Nixon.

The nomination, now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee, was a partial victory of Otepka who had been stripped of security duties and demoted by Dean Rusk, former Secretary of State, for cooperating with a Senate Committee exposing security lapses in the State Department.

The nerve center for the new onslaught against Otepka, scheduled to begin after the Easter congressional recess, is the prestigious New York Time's Washington Bureau.

Neil Sheehan, the newspaper's controversial Defense Department correspondent, has been given the assignment to write a series of articles designed to indirectly link the veteran security officer with right-wing groups—none of which Otepka had ever been a member or actively supported.

Significantly, Sheehan is the former bureau chief for the United Press International in Saigon who openly worked during the early 60s for the downfall of South Vietnam's anti-communist President Diem.

Pierre Salinger, press secretary for both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, assailed Sheehan as one of a trio of American newsmen that "announced to one and all in Saigon that one of the aims of their stories . . . was to bring down the Diem government."

More recently in a panel discussion in New York on "The Peace in Asia", Sheehan presented the following view on communism:

"We might abandon the idea that communism is our enemy in Asia. We must be willing to tolerate their enmity. I am suggesting that in some countries a communist government may be the best government."

CASTING THE SHADOW

Insiders at the New York Times say Sheehan's anti-Otepka series was scheduled to begin earlier this week but the death of President Eisenhower and his state funeral temporarily delayed their appearance.

Several of the persons involved in the volunteer raising of funds for Otepka's costly and long-drawn-out legal battle for vindication report that they have already been badgered by Sheehan about their political affiliations.

In one case, Sheehan spent more than 45 minutes on long distance phone grilling James Stewart, of Palatine, Ill., Director of American Defense Fund which raised money for Otepka's legal defense, on whether he was ever a member of the John Birch Society.

When Stewart argued the question was irrelevant and offered to discuss the issues of the Otepka case with Sheehan, the correspondent changed the subject, asking for the names of all the contributors to Otepka's defense fund.

On being told that more than 4,000 persons had contributed, Sheehan said he wanted "only the names of the big contributors". This Stewart refused on the grounds he needed approval of the individuals to give out their names.

THE BOSTON RALLY

Sheehan also quizzed Stewart at length about his group's fund-raising stand for Otepka at the New England Rally for God, Family, and Country, held in Boston in July, 1968 and attended by more than 1,000 persons.

"I have reports that Otepka manned a fund-raising booth at the Boston rally and solicited funds for his case," stated Sheehan. "Is not this true?"

"No, and you know it," replied Stewart, "Otepka had nothing to do with that stand."

What Sheehan didn't mention to Stewart was that another New York Times reporter had turned in the same negative report earlier. After spotting Otepka and his wife among the spectators at the Boston meeting, the reporter kept a watch on Otepka only to learn that he had nothing to do with the fund raising stand.

Other persons involved in the fund raising for Otepka's legal defense which cost the veteran security officer nearly $30,000, have also been intensely questioned by Sheehan.

Sheehan has been in contact with aides of several Senators, including William Proxmire (D. Wis.) and Jacob Javits (R. N.Y.), who plan to use his forthcoming stories to try to block Otepka's nomination.

Several State Department officials, who helped influence Secretary of State William Rogers to bar Otepka's return to that Agency, also have been in contact with Sheehan.

THE BIGGER ISSUE

While Otepka will be the central target of the coming attack, many congressional security experts see the campaign as having a much broader objective.

One memorandum being circulated among these experts, warns:

"The coming campaign against Otepka is designed to prevent, by smear and attack, efforts to strengthen the Subversive Activities Control Board, through the appointment to it of strong, conscientious securities specialists, and so bring about its destruction.

"The campaign will follow the pattern of the highly successful one by which the Eisenhower-Nixon program to train Americans in red tactics through civilian-military seminars was destroyed, through using General Walker as the target.

"Now, Otto Otepka is the target, and the objective is the nipping in the bud of the restoration of a strong security staff and operation within the government."

Thus, the battle lines are being drawn for a historic security showdown that could rattle a lot of windows in the national capital.

CONVOY TO MURMANSK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, foreign affairs debates constantly revolve around the question of a "detente" with the Soviet Union. A realistic appraisal reveals the fact that the constant belligerence, deceitfulness, and continued efforts toward global control by the rulers of the Kremlin make a "detente" under present circumstances a difficult and dangerous situation.

An interesting insight into Soviet attitudes and manipulations of history is dramatized in an editorial carried by the Chicago Tribune, Wednesday, April 9. This commentary dwelling on a major World War II effort speaks for itself:

CONVOY TO MURMANSK

Anyone around during World War II knew the meaning of the words "Murmansk run." They conjured up the chilling spectacle of allied convoys running the gauntlet of German planes and warships to Murmansk, 170 miles above the Arctic circle, the main center of western aid to the Soviet Union during the war.

From August, 1942, when the British navy escorted the first convoys for Russia, the "Murmansk run" became the Kremlin's lifeline for survival. Thru icy waters and storms, battling continuous attack by enemy submarines and planes based in Norway, the convoys struggled north with their precious cargo of tanks, trucks, guns, and other supplies—at fearful cost. Thousands of British, American, and Canadian sailors lost their lives in this desperate effort to save their Soviet ally.

A westerner might think that, in the normal course of events, "Murmansk run" might have some meaning to the Russians—at least to those who live in northern Russia's only ice-free port. But they don't. A reporter visiting Murmansk found that no one there had ever heard of the war time convoys which saved Russia.

There is no memorial, no plaque, to commemorate the almost incredible efforts of the convoys and their naval escorts which fought their way around Norway's dreaded North cape. The section of the city museum in Murmansk dealing with the war ignores completely the effort of the western allies. It is as if Russia had fought the war in a vacuum.

Today the Russian port on the Barents sea is busier than ever, with almost double its pre-war population. All the old men who unloaded the war time convoys have died or moved away. No one is left to remember what the words "Murmansk run" meant to a nation fighting for its life. Today that nation's masters would rather look to its missiles pointed at the nations that once made the run to Murmansk to save Russia.

TAX LOOPHOLES

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is particularly appropriate today, April 15, to underscore the almost desperate need for tax reform. The blatant inequities of our present tax system and the all too ready availability of means of avoiding income taxation by the rich, have created indignation throughout our Nation. The "Page of Opinion" of the Wisconsin State Journal on April 7 posed the question whether tax reform would come this year, as it highlighted the need to eliminate the numerous loopholes in our tax laws.

This editorial also cited the excellent piece on taxes done by my esteemed colleague and good friend, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, BILL PROXMIRE. Senator PROXMIRE has consistently been at the forefront of the battle for meaningful tax reform. I commend highly his excellent article "The Tax Loophole Scandal," which appeared in the April 1969 edition of the Progressive magazine and which was reprinted in the Journal.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the editorial and Senator PROXMIRE's article in the RECORD:

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, Apr. 7, 1969]

WILL REFORM COME THIS YEAR? REMEMBER LOOPHOLES ON T-DAY

As Apr. 15 draws near, the agonies of the income tax become intensified.

It's little comfort to realize that while the average citizen pays hundreds of dollars in federal taxes, some Americans with fantastic incomes are liable for no tax at all.

For instance, extreme cases are 155 tax returns from 1967 with adjusted gross incomes above $200,000 on which no federal taxes were paid; 21 of those had incomes over $1 million.

And from the tens of millions of middle-class families and individuals with incomes from $7,000 to $20,000—who pay taxes on full ordinary rates—come more than one half of the individual taxes in the United States.

The evidence is massive that tax loopholes not only cost the federal government billions in revenue, but are grossly unfair to the average American taxpayer.

Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.) outlines the shocking inequities in a story reprinted on today's Page of Opinion. Just as shocking as the loopholes is the lethargy of the Congress in correcting the problems.

In this 91st session of Congress is the first real sign that maybe something will be done, maybe. The House Ways and Means Committee began hearings on Feb. 27 which are still going on.

The spotlight is focused on the tax reform recommendations issued early this year by the Treasury Department which deal with most of the cumbersome jumble of personal income tax laws.

Unfortunately, the treasury's recommendation is minus a proposal to correct one of the biggest loop-holes going: the mineral depletion allowance which permits the oil industry to pay only a fraction of what most corporations must fork out.

It is this type of loophole, so carefully protected by industry lobbyists, which stands in the way of congressional action—the lawmakers in control of tax committees have close ties to these special interests.

Surely high on the list of reforms should be a realistic deduction for dependents—the present $600 deduction bears no relationship to the actual cost per dependent. Doubling that figure would be a start.

The fact that some wealthy individuals pay no tax is another must area; there should be a minimum even for those with the ability to sink all their funds in "low-interest," tax-free municipal bonds.

There are hundreds of other loop-holes that need attention and many of them are described on this page, but the problem is winning change and not recognizing the faults.

The Apr. 15 deadline also should be a deadline for all taxpayers to notify immediately their representatives and senators of their desire for tax reform now.

[From the Progressive magazine]

HARD-TO-CHANGE REVENUE LAWS—THE TAX LOOPHOLE SCANDAL

(By Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE)

As the average taxpayer fills in line 12a of his Federal Income Tax Form 1040, he must wonder why he pays so much while others, more favored economically than he, pays so little.

If he is a middle income taxpayer with a wife and two children and $12,000 of taxable income after taking his ordinary deductions, he pays almost 20 percent of it directly to the federal government. This year, as recorded on line 12b, he must pay, in addition, 7.5 per cent of his regular income tax payment, which is the equivalent of 10 per cent of the tax liability he has incurred since the surtax went into effect last April.

Piled on top of the federal income tax bill of our middle income family are the federal excise taxes, such as on gasoline; Social Security payments, and state and local income, real estate, sales, personal property, and gasoline taxes. As he signs his name to the tax form this year, more likely than not the taxpayer will also have to dip into his savings and write out a check for an amount beyond that withheld.

These are heavy burdens. In the past they have been borne out of a deep sense of responsibility and loyalty to the country. But this year, if our taxpayer is reasonably well informed, he also knows that many far wealthier than he bear a much lighter burden. In 1967 some 155 individuals with incomes of more than $200,000 each paid no federal income tax at all. Twenty-one of these had incomes of more than $1 million but paid nothing.

HOW COME?

If our taxpayer's indignation continues to grow it could lead to a breakdown of the present tax system.

The first question our irate taxpayer may ask is "How is it done? How can a man with a million dollars in income pay no federal income taxes when I pay 20 per cent?"

The loopholes are legion. Among them are the depletion allowances for virtually every mineral, especially oil, the tax shelters for real estate investment, the capital gains treatment for stock options, the dividend exclusion, the special tax breaks for conglomerates, the no-tax status of foundations, the exemption accorded municipal bonds and especially municipal industrial bonds, farm losses used by hobby farmers to offset other income, and the gimmick by which depletion allowances can be used to offset taxes owed on other income.

But the key items by which the wealthiest citizens avoid paying any taxes at all are through the unlimited charitable deduction, the array of special privileges for oil and gas producers and investors, and the exclusion for capital gains.

For a person to qualify for the unlimited charitable deduction, the taxes he pays plus the charitable contributions he makes must equal ninety per cent of his "taxable" income in eight out of ten consecutive years. He can then qualify for future unlimited deductions for charitable contributions instead of the 30 per cent limit in the law.

CONTRIBUTION

But the gimmick is the word "taxable" income. The allowance for depletion of an oil well, the intangible drilling and development cost deduction, capital gains, and various depreciation items are all deductions taken before arriving at "taxable" income. Thus, the "taxable" income of high income groups can be quite low. By contributing only small amounts to charity, millionaires often can qualify for unlimited charitable deductions.

The alleged "charitable contribution" itself may also be of dubious value. The Treasury Department has provided an example: One taxpayer took an unlimited charitable deduction of 21.6 million dollars for property he gave to a charity, but the original cost of the property was only $467,000. Thus, by donating an asset for which he paid a relatively small amount, he took a deduction worth forty-six times the amount.

Another method used by wealthy families to achieve the unlimited charitable status is to have minor children make contributions in 8 of 10 consecutive years which, when combined with the taxes they owe, make up 90 per cent of their "taxable" income. This is done in years when both the incomes and contributions of the children are low. When, upon maturity, they inherit huge fortunes, they are able to avoid taxes on their large incomes throughout the remainder of their lives.

Perhaps the most notorious examples of slipping through loopholes occur among taxpayers whose incomes are derived from gas and oil. Both individuals and companies benefit from a panoply of credits and deductions. Dry holes are written off, deducted as business losses. Depletion allowances equal to 27.5 per cent of gross income ranging up to one half of net income can be taken.

LOW TAXES

About 90 per cent of capital costs, which non-oil companies would have to depreciate over twenty years, may be "expensed" or charged off in the first year by oil companies through the intangible drilling and development cost deduction. This includes many of the construction costs at the site, drilling costs, mud, roads, and the like. Finally, the oil companies have the "golden gimmick" by which American firms can credit the royalties they pay to Middle Eastern sheiks and potentates dollar for dollar against the taxes they would otherwise owe in the United States.

As a result, numerous major oil refining companies paid little or no federal corporate income taxes in 1967, the last year for which data are available. Standard Oil of New Jersey paid only $166,000,000 in federal income taxes on net income of more than $2 billion, or 8 per cent. Texaco paid 2 per cent on earnings or net income of just under $900 million. Gulf, Mobil, Union, Marathon, Getty, and Atlantic all paid less than 8 per cent on net incomes exceeding $100 million each. Atlantic-Richfield paid nothing at all on net income of $145 million. But our hard-slogging middle income taxpayer paid twenty per cent of the $12,000 of taxable income he had left after his routine deductions.

The worst and most widespread loophole of all is that for capital gains. If a man buys property for $10,000 which on his death is worth $110,000, his heirs pay no federal capital gains tax on the $100,000 gain although they may pay a small inheritance tax.

If a bank loses money on the sale of bonds, it can be deducted as an ordinary loss against the present corporate income tax which runs as high as 48 per cent. But if the bank sells the same asset and makes an overall profit, it is treated as a capital gain and the tax is never more than 25 per cent.

THE PRIVILEGED

When a corporate executive sells a stock for $50 which he was allowed to purchase for only $10 a share under a company stock option, he does not pay the ordinary income tax rates on the $40-a-share profit. If he has held the stock for six months or longer, he pays an amount only half as much as his ordinary tax rates, up to a maximum of 25 per cent. Why should he pay no more than half of his ordinary tax rate when our hard-working, wage-earning, middle-income taxpayer must pay his full rate?

These privileges are not available to the average family. Almost all the dollar amounts of capital gains go to the top 10 per cent income group. Tax advantages, virtually denied to the poor, violate the concept that taxation should be based on the ability to pay. They favor unearned income over earned income, and they violate the fundamental principles of fairness on which our tax system should be based. More often than not, funds which are essentially ordinary income and are not real capital gains at all, are taxed at the capital gains rate rather than the higher income tax rate.

There are numerous reasons why the tax laws are in their present scandalous shape and why so little has been done about it. Every major branch of the government is at fault. Even the general public must take at least a small part of the blame. Those with specially privileged interests to protect often arouse large numbers of the public to fight the repeal of a loophole which only nominally affects them. The "widows and orphans" are often used to front for gigantic selfish interests.

The Treasury, like almost all the other major departments of the government, basically represents the interests of what they call their "clientele." The Treasury represents bankers and the financial community, as other agencies represent business, defense contractors, organized farm groups, and trade unions. The public interest is generally overlooked.

Neither Presidents nor the Treasury have been particularly zealous in their pursuit of tax reform.

LOOPHOLE GUARDS

All tax legislation must originate in the House. In the past, the Ways and Means Committee has tenaciously guarded loopholes and special tax privileges. Appointments from the Democratic side were made for so long by Speaker Sam Rayburn that on crucial issues the Rayburn appointees and allies still exercised control of the Committee. His litmus test was, how did the prospective appointee stand on oil? Only rarely, because of the workings of seniority, did an anti-oil depletion member slip through to a seat on the Ways and Means Committee.

The Democrats on Ways and Means make up the Committee on Committees that assigns House Democrats to committee posts. A newly elected representative dedicated to fighting special tax privileges and other inequities seldom finds himself in an effective committee post.

But the leadership's control extends well beyond this. There has been no vote in the House to eliminate or reduce the oil depletion allowance in the memory of almost any member. Tax bills are brought to the floor only under rules which prohibit such amendments. This is part of the protection afforded the industry.

If the Senate is so irreverent as to add a loophole-closing amendment, the House Conference Committee stands adamantly on its "Constitutional rights" to initiate tax legislation and kills the poor waif in one of the Capitol hideaways where conference committees meet in secret.

DOCILE YEARS

In the past all of this was glued together by campaign contributions funneled through the House and Senate campaign committees where interest groups made major contributions to those who stayed in line.

Appointment to the Senate Finance Committee, as in the House Ways and Means Committee, was reserved largely for those whose position on depletion was safe. Those opposed were locked out for years. Former Sen. Paul Douglas waited for seven years to get a place on the committee while those who had equal or less seniority moved toward the head of the table. In my own case, I tried in vain for five years for appointment to the Finance Committee only to see junior men, who held more orthodox views, selected. Finally, I took a seat on the powerful Appropriations Committee when a vacancy was created there on the death of Sen. Estes Kefauver.

After years of docility, the public is demanding tax reform. The Ways and Means Committee is holding hearings. Members of both House and Senate, who in the past have been lukewarm about closing loopholes, have suddenly found it an important subject.

But to win this battle the public must offset the skill of the special interests. They must keep up the pressure and continue to fight. They must do this because their interests are diffuse while those of particular interest groups are concentrated. While the public is outraged, its indignation is expressed in a general way. But those who benefit from the loopholes will send their highly paid, highly placed lawyers and lobbyists to argue against closing or shrinking any particular loophole. These advocates of privilege are skilled in reaching back into a Senator's state or community to enlist individual constituents in their cause. For example, when attempts were made in the early 1960's to repeal the lucrative, unlimited charitable contribution deduction, the presidents of the nation's major private universities, the recipients of much bounty bestowed upon them by millionaires who pay no federal income taxes, were enlisted in the fight against repeal by the legal counselors of the non federal income tax paying millionaires.

In another instance, when legislation was sought to collect at the source from corporations and banks the tax which was already owed on dividends and interest by the recipients, the affected institutions poured in tens of thousands of letters a week to key senators whose positions were pivotal. Most of the mail from irate constituents indicated they had been misled by the propaganda from the Washington-based trade associations which were fighting the bill. The measure died.

NEW INEQUITIES

One of the chief tactics of the special interests will be delay.

All of this need not be so. With determined presidential leadership to focus public indignation, reform could come and come quickly.

The public must also guard against new inequities that would result from the substitution of a program of "tax incentives" for tax reform. Most loopholes started as incentives.

The oil depletion allowance started as an incentive for "conservation." It now has little relationship to its original purpose. It promotes the misallocation of capital into marginal drillings. This, according to many economists, may well raise, rather than lower, the price of gas and oil because it is such an inefficient use of resources.

The depletion allowance illustrates why tax incentives are a poor way to promote economic or social purposes. It has grown until it now amounts to a tax drain of $3 billion a year. It is irrelevant to its original purpose. There is no annual budget review and it has proved almost impossible to reduce or terminate it. If the oil industry had to get the $3 billion by way of a direct subsidy—if that amount had to be included in the President's budget and appropriated by Congress—it would never be done. But the industry gets its largesse indirectly, through the back door method of an old tax "incentive."

In 1968, according to former Treasury Secretary Barr, more than $35 billion in tax revenues which the government did not collect were lost to the treasury because of such special credits and deductions.

Camouflaged as "incentives," a host of exceptions, credits, and deductions have riddled and eroded our tax system. That is why the outlook for reform depends upon the continued indignation and action of the taxpayers. The cause is not hopeless. These should be among our goals:

We should reduce the depletion allowance to, at most, 15 per cent for the big oil companies.

We should remove the "golden gimmick" as a loophole for the oil firms in the Middle East.

American movie stars living in Switzerland should pay their share of taxes to their own country.

After offsetting deductions are made for inheritance taxes paid, the heirs to huge fortunes should pay at least the capital gains rate on their new riches.

Most tax-exempt foundations should be required to pay taxes on the income they receive from investments in profit-making businesses.

The unlimited charitable deduction should be revised or removed.

Those with large incomes should not escape federal taxation. A minimum tax of at least 20 per cent should be required of all of those whose real incomes are large enough so that they would ordinarily pay that rate or many times that rate.

LEADERSHIP NEED

These reforms may appear to be "lost causes." But we should remind ourselves that in the recent past we have seen many lost causes won. Truth in lending, one man-one vote, open housing legislation, Medicare, repeal of the poll tax, to name only a few, were the lost causes of the decade of the 1950's the victories—even if not always fully won—of the 1960's.

If there is determined leadership by President Nixon, sustained by an aroused public, and focused on closing loopholes rather than promoting new ones, meaningful tax reform could be achieved.

We now join in a classic battle between the tax-paying, responsible public, on one hand, and powerful economic forces with lucrative special interests at stake, on the other. The battle is a test to determine whether we can make democracy work.

DOES U.S. FOREIGN POLICY ENTAIL FREQUENT WARS?

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Honorable PAUL FINDLEY of Illinois, has done some clear thinking about current U.S. policies toward the Soviet Union and China. He made a provocative presentation of his thoughts in a speech delivered Saturday, April 12, 1969, to the annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science in Philadelphia.

He suggests in his speech that U.S. policies toward each country are based more on mythology than reality, and that the basic myth we depend upon is that the Russians are more rational and more moderate than the Chinese. He states that these policies, which include continuing contact with Moscow and continued isolation of Peking have resulted in a weakening of the security of Western Europe and the polarization of the world into two spheres, that of the United States and that of the Soviet Union.

He does not suggest that Red China is our friend, but he does state that the interests of the United States would be better served if we revised our policies to reflect reality. We should deal with Moscow as it still is—secretive, hostile, unstable, and capable at any time of events akin to the Czechoslovakian invasion. We should, on the other hand, base our policies toward China on our national interests and not those of the Russians. In short, we should treat China on the same basis as we treat the Soviet Union.

It is my pleasure to insert the speech into the RECORD at this point:

DOES UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY ENTAIL FREQUENT WARS?

(By PAUL FINDLEY, Republican of Illinois, member, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives)

Writing in his book, "1940, The Fall of France," the former Chief of the French General Staff, Andre Beaufre said, "The collapse of the French Army is the most important event of the twentieth century." This was so, he said because "our downfall upset the balance which had been built up and maintained through the ages. Europe . . . found itself deprived of its western counter balance. The destruction of Germany which was to come, left in place of the traditional Europe, only a zone of weakness, while the USA and the USSR disputed between themselves the dominance of the world which Europe had lost."

One does not have to agree with General Beaufre that the collapse of the French Army is the most important event of the 20th Century. One must, however, be gripped—as I was—by his description of a proud nation in panic as it fled before the German armies: . . . "individual dramas lived out within the incomprehensible drama of France." He related how his fellow countrymen in order to protect their homes at Vierzon killed a French tank officer who wanted to defend the outskirts of the town. He described the chaos, confusion, disorganization, despair and resignation of a great nation, a great people who in the flight South first to Bordeaux and then to the shame of Vichy realized that their foreign policy and their military doctrines had failed them. Then, and only then, did they learn that the preservation of peace is not as easily established as the desire for it.

"In 1940," Beaufre continued, "we were really the victims of a series of events brought about by factors which had been apparent long before and of which the ineluctable consequences were not understood in time to grapple with them before it was too late. The great lesson of 1940 is that such maladies can only be coped with at birth, and only in the early stages is it possible to act effectively."

Maladies can be coped with effectively only in their early stages. This lesson from France of 1940 is an appropriate introduction to today's theme, "Does United States Foreign Policy Entail Frequent Wars?"

Clearly the greatest malady a nation can suffer is reliance on mythology in policymaking. To the extent that myths are rejected in favor of reality, the risk of fatal illness is reduced and the probability of national health and vigor enhanced.

To be useful as a counselor to policymakers, an historian or political scientist must "tell it like it is." He must distinguish between fact, what is a reasonable hypothesis and what must remain conjecture. If he fails to meet that test, he is a moralist or publicist, not an historian or political scientist.

Unfortunately, some members of the academic community do indeed fail the test and thereby contribute to the mythology which has excessively influenced policymakers. An overkill of words perpetuates myths and lays the foundation for one false assumption after another.

Vietnam comes first to mind. From the beginning our combat involvement there was based on assumptions which were either questionable or totally false. The leading faulty assumptions were:

1. That we responded to the invitation of a sovereign government seeking help to repel an invasion by forces of another nation.
2. That we were committed to send troops by treaty obligations and agreement of past administrations.
3. That our policy of containing communism required our intervention against Ho Chi Minh.
4. That with a little more effort and national unity the war would soon be over.

This mythology indeed entailed war for the United States—and a massive one at that.

Consider also the mythology of our policies toward Russia and China and the risk of war it entails.

Recent conduct by the Russians and the Chinese challenge several of the most important assumptions on which U.S. policy has been based. These assumptions concern the evolution of communist rule in Russia and its dependencies: the status quo and spheres of influence; and the conflict between Russia and China.

This mythology arises partly from a natural desire to believe that the Russian leaders are reasonable, moderate men, more closely associated with Western civilization than Oriental. Believing that they fear war, we have transmuted that negative fear of war into the assumption of a positive desire for detente and Great Power cooperation. Our view of China is directly opposite.

We employ a double standard. While we seem to pay more attention to Russia's words than her deeds, curiously in evaluating China we do the opposite. We pay more attention to the rhetoric of Chinese foreign policy than her actions, which, for the most part, are temperate.

Consider our contradictory policy towards these two seemingly hostile powers.

For twenty years U.S. policy towards Russia has been predicated on the assumption that the greater the contact with the West, the more moderate and responsible Moscow will be. Toward Peking, the policy has been the opposite: Isolate Peking politically, economically, and culturally. While the United States worked aggressively, even when the Russians showed no interest, in enlarging contacts and relations with the Soviet Union, we steadfastly refused for many years to consider seriously communicating with Peking.

Mythology has predominated in other strange ways. Despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary the United States continued to believe that ideology was not a guiding force in the Soviet Union, that the newly emerging managerial and technical classes would be the "gravediggers" of Communism, and that China, not the Soviet Union was the greatest threat to our security.

Prominent voices dismissed almost every instance of hostile Soviet conduct as meaningless and hailed every superficial gesture of peaceful co-existence as a solid new breakthrough. The harrassment of allied rights in Berlin, Brezhnev's extremely hostile and violent speech attacking American society and reaffirming fundamental ideological hostility, Soviet arms shipments to the Middle East, the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the sending of volunteers to Yemen were all overlooked or downgraded. The relatively enlightened plea for greater intellectual freedom in Russia and accommodation with the West by the Soviet physicist Andrei D. Sakharov was given far greater attention in the West than the immediate condemnation of his thesis by the Soviet leadership, and the imposition of even stricter censorship upon intellectuals, including domestic exile and long prison terms.

Nevertheless, accepting rhetoric for actions, appearance for reality, and hope for policy the U.S. made a fundamental shift in foreign policy priority.

It was a fundamental mistake. Under it, the United States placed Geneva ahead of NATO, detente ahead of Western European security. For eight years the path of U.S. foreign policy favored detente or bilateral cooperation with the Soviet Union at the expense of closer ties with our NATO allies. Washington appeared to accept the Soviet argument that our efforts to salvage or improve relations with Western Europe worked against detente with the Russians.

The critical point was reached when the Administration chose to override Western European objection to the draft of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty in order to achieve agreement with the Soviet Union. Basically, the United States chose bi-polar cooperation, in effect carving the world into U.S. and Soviet spheres of influence. The decision was based on the assumption that coinciding hopefully with the emergence of younger—more pragmatic—leaders and the growing demand in Russia for more personal freedoms and consumer goods, the treaty would lead to a reduction of mutual hostilities and suspicion and bring forth a genuine detente. Actually it resulted in proliferation of U.S. agreements with the Russians none of which dealt with the substance of Cold War issues.

The natural consequence of this policy of bilateral—often secret—discussions with the Soviets on matters affecting the very security of Western Europe was to weaken the alliance.

This, in turn, led to two ominous—though not necessarily contradictory trends in Europe. These trends threaten the peace in Europe, and the peace of Europe is the peace of the world. These trends resulted not only from the bilateral secret talks but also the tendency of the U.S. unilaterally to change its posture regarding Western defenses without consultation with those who would bear the results of any change should war break out.

The first trend was the development of national European nuclear defenses outside the framework and control of the Alliance. This is most clearly evident in France, although there are growing elements in West Germany and Italy that advocate this position. Britain has had national nuclear forces for years. The French believe that the U.S. commitment to defend Europe cannot be taken seriously. Consequently, French strategy was to develop its own defenses and be independent of any integrated command structure.

Although some observers brush aside as inconsequential the French nuclear force, others contend that:

1. The German refusal to abandon Paris for London and British entry into the Common Market is based largely on a desire for the advantage of two deterrent forces, French as well as United States.

2. The Soviet Union was serious in 1961 when it explained resumption of atmospheric testing because of French nuclear explosions.

3. The Soviet ABM system around Moscow is designed partly to counter French nuclear power.

It is a curious fact—but nevertheless true—that American arms negotiations with the Soviet Union and other secret negotiations have contributed to the proliferation of nuclear weapons by encouraging the French to develop their own program and pull out of NATO's command structure.

The second trend in Europe is distinct from the first and is most noticeable among the smaller European countries, although there is some sign of it in Germany. This trend is towards political accommodation with the Soviet Union. It is entirely possible to envision a series of Rappallo-like treaties which will effectively destroy the Western Alliance and render Western Europe a continent of Finlands.

Both of these trends should be alarming for the United States. I believe that if one more NATO nation acquires nuclear weapons most of the others who can do so will follow because of an atmosphere of mutual fear and distrust will have been generated.

The more the European states perceive that we are subordinating their national interests to the goal of bi-polar cooperation with the Soviet Union, the more inclined they will be to develop national deterrents, or, in the alternative, seek a political arrangement with the Soviet Union. Either course has obvious disadvantage and danger to the United States.

For some time, however, American policy makers have resolved this dilemma by picturing the Soviet Union as less hostile, and increasingly more comfortable as a status quo power. In that spirit all too often we have greeted even a temporary easing of Soviet harshness as a historic milestone to peace. This has created the illusion in Moscow that the risks of any course—such as invading Czechoslovakia—no matter how intransigent, can always be limited by superficial gestures. We have yet to convince the Soviet leaders—as well as ourselves—that their policy of aggravating all instabilities is inconsistent with a relaxation of tensions and detente.

Nor has the United States fully appreciated the political significance of the events of last August 20. If the Soviet Union considered itself threatened by even the liberalization of a Communist government—a reform movement, incidentally, led by lifelong Communists, many of whom spent their formative years in Moscow—what weight can one give to its avowal that it desires peaceful coexistence between different social systems? After all, to quote Professor Leo Mates of Belgrade, "If it is possible for unprovoked military intervention to follow negotiations and agreement, then the danger to peace is transferred to the domain of the unpredictable, which can but leave deep traces on the general behavior of states."

The traditional American reliance on the rationality and predictability of Soviet international conduct has been one of the pillars of international relations in the nuclear age. It took the candor of a longtime Moscow observer, Anatole Shub, to remind us how shaky that pillar really is. He wrote recently, "It need hardly be added that a system capable of such surprise as the invasion of August 20 is inherently capable of other surprises no less unpleasant."

I, for one, would have greater confidence in the sincerity of Soviet talk about detente if it were implemented consistently and not voiced just in moments of panic when Russia is threatened by a hostile neighbor or by internal economic or political distress.

Our Chinese mythology is equally distressing and dangerous.

The United States knows too little about China to predict or interpret accurately all the ramifications of certain events and personalities. Yet, a few general conclusions can be drawn.

One, Chinese foreign policy has been no more aggressive, provocative or irrational than that of Moscow. In fact, an impressive argument can be made that it has been less so.

Two, where the U.S. and China have only one serious political disagreement and that regards the status of Formosa; U.S. and Soviet interests conflict in a number of places—Berlin, Germany, the Mediterranean, and the Middle East.

Three, China and the Soviet Union are rapidly becoming each other's principal political and military adversary.

Four, while China may one day have the military means to extend substantially her territorial claims, she does not have it now. Militarily the Chinese are no threat to the territorial security of the United States and because of geography and other factors not a substantial threat to any of our allies, except possibly Formosa. The same cannot be said for the Soviet Union.

Compare for a moment the curious double standard the United States employs in judging Soviet adventures compared with those of China.

Although the United States succeeded in getting China labeled an "aggressor" in the Korean War, it is generally conceded by historians that the Korean War was in fact both started and stopped by the Soviet Union. Chinese troops intervened only after UN forces reached the Yalu River, and only in sufficient numbers to restore the pre-war partition. Chinese forces were long ago withdrawn from Korea, in striking contrast to the "temporary" Soviet Army still present in Poland, Hungary, and East Germany. About 400,000 Soviet troops are now stationed in Czechoslovakia. Although China has clashed with India in border disputes, the provocations no doubt originated from both sides. In any event, the Chinese forces extended only to the historic border as viewed by Peking. China did not, after all, claim or take any territory historically and indisputably Indian. All of this is not to say that China is our friend. There are some serious differences existing between the U.S. and China, but no more so than our differences with the Soviet Union.

My principal purpose in stating and contrasting the two countries is to remind Americans that in the field of international politics it is just not true that the Russians, like the Dodge Boys, always wear white hats. The United States would do well to remember the admonition of Clauswitz, "Support the weaker of your two adversaries. Accept the risk of abetting a potential future menace in order to check the present one." Bismarck was blunter: "The enemy of my enemy is my friend."

When the disparity between reality as it actually exists and reality as it is perceived by U.S. policy makers is as great as it is today regarding China and Russia, the chances for miscalculation are enormous.

What policies should the United States adopt regarding these two powers which will reduce the chances of miscalculation?

Here are my suggestions:

The United States should concentrate less on bringing about the evolution of the Soviet Union into a relatively democratic state and more on reducing its political hostility and threat.

We should deal with Moscow as it still is: secretive, hostile, unstable, insecure, suspicious, pushed in one direction by China and in the other by her European allies—at the same time pursuing economic priorities which dictate a foreign policy and military posture inconsistent with world revolutionary leadership.

We should recognize that while our ability to influence domestic trends in the Soviet Union is almost nonexistent, we nevertheless have opportunities to influence Soviet external conduct.

We should reject forcefully any effort to contain China's ambitions by "ganging up" with Russia through even an informal alliance.

We should make it clear that the security of our Western European partners is paramount in our policy priorities, and acknowledge that peaceful trade and cultural contacts with the Soviet Union, while desirable, cannot be a substitute for settling the outstanding differences of the Cold War.

In moving to normalize relations with Eastern Europe, we must realize there are severe limits on the extent to which a U.S. carrot-and-stick economic program can reduce Soviet influence in that area.

Even the Czech invasion has not stamped out a strong trend toward external independence and internal democracy in Eastern Europe. In the longterm Russia can no more prevent this than Pope Leo X could prevent the Reformation. Yet the United States by giving unwarranted encouragement to such trends may in fact weaken them as the Soviets panic and precipitously move across borders trying to put out the flames of internal revolution much as the Armies of Austria-Hungary tried to extinguish the fires of revolution in 19th century Europe.

The Soviets are more sophisticated in dealing with Western Europe than we are in dealing with Eastern Europe. We can also learn from the French, and, like them, enter into normal political and economic relations with Eastern Europe. Trade and good political relations benefit both parties and ultimately the effect of improved trade with the West will be a gradual lessening of economic dependence on the Soviet Union which will in turn weaken Soviet political influence.

The United States should make it clear that its policies with China are based on our own national interests, and not those of the Russians, and that we are not interested in supporting directly or indirectly any military action against China.

The United States should place trade with the Chinese mainland on the same basis as trade with the Soviet Union. United States should seek to open a trading mission in Canton where the trade fair is held twice a year. The United States should no longer require a special endorsement on passports for travel to China.

Our willingness to have serious, direct negotiations on the problem of Formosa through the appointment of a special ambassador to the Warsaw talks should be stressed. The United States should work for a satisfactory solution to the question of Chinese membership in the U.N. whereby both Peking and Formosa could participate.

In short, the United States should attempt to treat China on the same basis as the Soviet Union.

Attempts to normalize relations with China and with Eastern Europe, the reestablishment of proper priority for Western European interests, and the rejection of our Soviet and Chinese mythology will go far towards reducing the possibility of frequent wars.

Admittedly, even if we sweep all the cobwebs from our policy-making process risk will persist. This is primarily because of the very nature of the political systems in Russia and China. Changes in power, and hence direction, come about through internal secret intrigue, not through public election campaigns. Our Central Intelligence Agency was taken by complete surprise when Khrushchev was deposed by Kosygin. But realism, logic and clarity on our part can reduce the possibility of miscalculation on the part of these insecure power centers.

Not all the danger of frequent wars emanates from Peking and Moscow, of course. In dispelling mythology a logical starting point is in Vietnam, where our involvement originated and developed on the basis of false assumptions. But even if the basic asusmptions had validity the investment and attention Vietnam has received is grossly out of balance, in light of its essentially peripheral interest to the United States.

Avoidance of future wars like Vietnam requires, in addition to the same realism, logic and clarity in dealings with the major hostile power centers, some practical restraints on the free-wheeling war-making authority of the American presidency. A proposal I made last year would require the President to report to the Congress promptly the details of military intervention anywhere in the world, together with full, detailed justification. This would help to re-establish the proper role of the Congress in war-making, discourage military adventurism, and at the same time permit the President the military flexibility circumstances may require.

From all this I must conclude that the frequency of wars for the United States is related directly to the ability of policymakers to reject mythology in favor of reality.

PIONEER PAN AM IN VIETNAM ROLE WITH OTHER LINES

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed by the U.S. Agency for International Development—AID—that Pan American World Airways will provide technical assistance to Air Vietnam in a program designed to expand and develop civil aviation in South Vietnam.

We are all aware, Mr. Speaker, of Pan Am's innumerable, remarkable accomplishments during World War II when, as the only U.S.-flag carrier then operating to Europe, the Orient, and around South America its fleet, vast by 1942 standards, became the nucleus for our Air Transport Command.

When the first Berlin crisis developed in 1948, Pan Am became one of the first air carriers to respond to its Government's plea to keep open the air corridors to West Berlin. Likewise, during the Korean conflict, Pan American carried out the great obligations and responsibilities placed in its hands by the Government of the United States.

More recently, Mr. Speaker, Pan Am, along with many other American air carriers, both scheduled and supplemental, has been doing a continuing job, under supervision of the U.S. Department of Defense, of getting supplies and hardware to our beleaguered troops in South Vietnam.

American know-how and experience are the prime ingredients of the program under which personnel of Air Vietnam, the national airline of South Vietnam headquartered in Saigon, will receive training, guidance, and advisory assistance from Pan Am.

The overall objective of the Air Vietnam-TAP project is to assist Air Vietnam in its development as a modern, self-sustaining air transport system operated by Vietnamese citizens. This will be done through advisory assistance and training for all departments of Air Vietnam. Pan Am's assistance will be limited to functions concerned with the operation and management of Air Vietnam, as distinguished from the construction, maintenance, and operation of airports, airways navigational facilities, and air traffic control systems of the country of South Vietnam.

Air Vietnam currently operates an extensive domestic service, including some 40 flights a day out of Saigon. The carrier's international service includes flights to Hong Kong, Manila, Taipei, Bangkok, Phnom Penh, Kuala Lumpur, Singapore, Osaka, and Tokyo.

Pan Am has been active in providing technical and management assistance to foreign airlines for 35 years. Other TAP projects are currently underway with Iran National Airlines in Iran, and Ariana Afghan Airlines in Afghanistan.

I am pleased to note and to commend the continuing great contributions of Pan American, one of the world's great airlines, of which we may well be very proud as Americans devoted to the modernization and development of our famous air arms.

A RESOLUTION FROM THE RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONCERNING THE INSTITUTION OF A TAX-SHARING PROGRAM WITH STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to request permission to extend my remarks to include the attached resolution which was passed by the Rhode Island General Assembly and approved by the Governor on April 1, 1969, entitled "Resolution Memorializing Congress to Institute a Tax-Sharing Program with State and Local Governments."

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION H1418

Resolution memorializing Congress to institute a tax-sharing program with State and local governments

Resolved, That the general assembly of the state of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to institute a tax-sharing program with state and local governments; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is authorized to transmit a duly certified copy of this resolution to each senator and representative from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States in the hope that they will use every effort to institute and expedite such a program.

Attest.

AUGUST V. LA FRANCE,
Secretary of State.

TRIBUTE TO A GREAT MAN

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, Sarah McClendon, Washington News correspondent for the El Paso Times and other leading newspapers, has written a column about a great American, the late Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower. I especially appreciated this review by Sarah McClendon of the Eisenhower years.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include this article from the April 5, 1969, edition of the El Paso Times in the RECORD:

A WEST TEXAN IN WASHINGTON

(By Sarah McClendon)

WASHINGTON.—If any man ever could, Dwight D. Eisenhower probably could have become dictator of the U.S. The people were at times that close to adoration of the man. But he did not seize or use power in that manner. He was never a dictator at heart.

He wanted to be doing the right thing for his country and his government at all times, so much so, that when a mistake was made, he just could not understand it. And when there was any implied criticism, he just blew his top. It was not that he thought no one should criticize him. It was just that he was trying so hard to do his best, he could not see why others did not acknowledge at all times that his motives were high.

President Eisenhower actually did not forget the grass roots. It was probably this reason why he gave to the American people a great gift, a new institution in this country—the presidential press conference as it is today. Now the questions and answers of the President of the U.S., on the record is probably the most watched show on earth. Even the poorest minority groups and the most backward nations are now watching it. The nation had never had a presidential press conference like this before. President Truman for the first time let reporters sit down in a special room and thus make it possible for them to write. But once reporters were slow with their questions, Truman cut off a press conference in six minutes. Ike gave reporters a full 30 minutes of writing on their laps and let the conference be televised.

Early in the game, he was advised by some high-level officials not to accept questions from a certain busy-body woman reporter who might ask sharp questions. She was from the smaller papers and thus was not important anyway. A member of the President's staff spoke up and said, "She will always ask questions from the grass roots and it is important that a President know what the grass roots are thinking." Ike thought that was good advice apparently. James Haggerty, his press secretary, said "Therefore, we will always take your questions." The President did so.

Other people, however, adored Mr. Eisenhower so much that they had no brief for any persons who might imply criticism of his administration. Feeling was so high on his side that most newspapers in the country were strong for him and many people wanted to ostracize any one who criticized him. One woman wanted to drop any member of a club who raised any question of his actions publicly.

The President wanted so hard to give the best type of reorganization to the military machine that he was particularly sensitive to any doubts about his action in that regard. He felt hurt to the core when someone asked if he were building a one-man military rule. Being a perfectionist, he was put out when someone suggested a slip in getting copies of his speeches and messages to the members of Congress.

But one thing about him, when this was called to his attention, he immediately saw to it that the situation was corrected. Even today, members of Congress get copies of messages to read by the time they are presented to Congress.

President Eisenhower did not seize the opportunity which reporters gave him to use White House leadership to avert trouble between races in the civil rights field. He was strong about desegregation of schools at Little Rock. But when reporters made suggestions that he later try to avoid schism in the country by appealing to the citizens through ideological or educational methods, he stood apart.

Ike was a man who was ever trying not only to do his best, but to do better. He studied. He made numerous contributions. He was able to smooth over issues of division between sections, like on tidelands, natural gas rate structure, civil rights to some extent. He was once asked if he favored large dams downstream or small dams upstream where rain fell. At the time this was a big issue before the country, internally, but a new one for the less background White House press corps. A year later, Ike recommended to the press a book he said he had been reading, called "Big Dam Foolishness." He had learned.

He understood that reporters were trying to get news for their papers when they asked him questions. On two occasions, he demonstrated this. Once this writer asked him a question about public works, an urgent matter at the moment to many communities, and implied that perhaps too much time was being taken up with his golf to give to public works considerations. Feeling deeply later in the day that this implied he should not be playing golf for his health, she sent him a letter of apology, pointing out she was glad he played golf for relaxation and had slipped, in her zeal for getting out information to readers, on the issue. He replied immediately with a beautiful personal letter (which this writer keeps in her lock box at the bank for grandchildren to cherish) thanking her for the apology and acknowledging he knew of her interest in development of waterways resources.

The thing I like best about Ike was the time he responded so quickly and willingly to a question about why could not the nation match up hungry people in Appalachia who had had nothing but carbohydrates and fats in their diet, from surplus commodities for months with a surplus of green vegetables, in this instance, cabbages which could not be marketed, in South Texas. The growers were going to plow them under. The people in Kentucky needed green in their diet. The President rose to the occasion at once and said he would do everything he could. He did, too, and although several government agencies wrestled with bureaucracy to overcome barriers and the railroads were stopped in their efforts by their own red tape. Ike's responsive leadership enabled national volunteer organizations to accomplish the mission.

This simple man was truly a leader because he never forgot simple people.

EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker. Earlier today my able colleague from Ohio, Congressman WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, led a discussion of our policies toward east-central Europe and recent proposals by the American Hungarian Federation on this subject.

The Hungarian revolution of 1956 and the recent uprisings in Czechoslovakia attest to the fact that there is uneasiness in that part of the world. Fortunately the forces of nationalism are again on the rise. In addition, the youth of these nations are providing a powerful impetus for change.

It is impossible to solve all the problems of east-central Europe. However, an easing of tensions would serve all parties concerned. In this regard, an interesting proposal was recently submitted by the American Hungarian Federation to the President and to the Secretary of State. It proposes a neutralization of Austria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Rumania, and possibly Czechoslovakia.

I hope that this, and similarly constructive ideas, of the American Hungarian Federation receives serious consideration by our policymakers.

JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the fate of the Jews in the Soviet Union has been a serious concern of all peoples in the free world. Among the tens of millions of racial and religious minorities in that polyglot state the lot of some 3 million Jews has become particularly unenviable. They are deprived of elemental privileges and freedoms enjoyed by other non-Russian groups. They are denied the use of their own language; they are not allowed to have their own schools and their own publications devoted to Hebrew religious matters. They do not have any of these privileges even in communities where they constitute clear majorities. Moreover, the Jews in the Soviet Union suffer other discriminations and inequities.

The Soviet Government's attitude toward such injustices against the Jews is one of indifference and inaction. Petitions on the part of suffering Jews in the U.S.S.R., and protests on their behalf from abroad, have not altered the official Soviet attitude. The governments of the free world, including the Government of this great Republic, should make serious attempts to exert pressure on the men in the Kremlin in the hope of rousing them from their indifference toward the unenviable lot of the Jews. Under the existing international situation the least, if unfortunately the most, the peoples and governments of the free world can do is to publicize discriminatory practices prevalent in the Soviet Union, and ask the Soviet Government at least to allow the emigration of Jews to countries where they would be welcomed as enterprising and industrious builders of a better world.

An excellent example of the kind of publicity I have in mind appeared in the

New York Times of January 31, 1969. Headed: "We Appeal for the Jews of Silence," it is a full-page advertisment sponsored by the Academic Committee on Soviet Jewry and contains an appeal signed by hundreds of distinguished academicians, both Jews and non-Jews, at universities all over the United States. Because, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this appeal is worthy of attention of every Member of this Congress, as well as other readers of the RECORD, I include it therein in its entirety:

WE APPEAL FOR THE JEWS OF SILENCE

Soviet Jewry, three million strong, constitutes the last great remnant of the vital, creative East European community destroyed by the Nazis. It is the inheritor of no less noble and illustrious a cultural tradition, and an even more ancient one, than that of any other people residing on Soviet territory—a tradition of learning and idealism, of cultural vitality and moral grandeur.

And yet, fifty years after the October Revolution, Soviet Jews, alone among the multitude of Soviet nationality groups, remain deprived of virtually every institutional opportunity to perpetuate their cultural, religious and communal life, despite legal and constitutional guarantees of such rights, which all other groups in fact enjoy.

Hence, gravely concerned with the current situation of Soviet Jewry, the undersigned call upon the Soviet government to demonstrate its wholehearted adherence to the humanitarian ideals incorporated in the Soviet constitution, and:

1. To embark upon a systematic educational campaign to combat anti-semitism. The resurgence of "anti-Zionist," i.e., anti-Jewish, propaganda in the wake of the Six-Day War represents a clear violation of the principles laid down by Lenin in the early 1920's.

2. To enable Soviet Jews who so desire to lead culturally fulfilled lives as Jewish Soviet citizens by restoring to them the necessary educational and publication facilities in Yiddish and Hebrew, as well as Russian. There is a manifest need not only for printed works in such fields as Russian Jewish historiography and textbooks, as well as belles lettres and the arts, but for advanced scholarly research.

3. To support newspapers and periodicals of Jewish interest in Yiddish, Hebrew and Russian.

4. To sponsor professional repertory theatres in Moscow and the other great centers of traditional Jewish culture and population.

5. To facilitate the formation of clubs and centers where Jewish youth and students may come together for cultural, educational and social purposes.

6. To provide channels comparable to those assured other Soviet nationalities through which Soviet Jews may maintain close cultural, intellectual and communal ties with Jewish communities in other countries.

7. To secure for the large Soviet Jewish religious community the same kinds of institutions and prerogatives accorded all other religions—for contact and communication among congregations at home and with religious bodies abroad, for the education of rabbis and other religious functionaries, for the production and distribution of religious publications and materials.

8. To open the door to the emigration of those many thousands of Soviet Jews who wish to be reunited with families living in the United States, Israel and elsewhere, families that were shattered in the ghettoes and extermination camps of the Nazi era, and for those who would choose Israel as their national homeland.

This appeal goes beyond mere institutions, beyond even the values of language, literature, culture, religion and history. It goes to the very heart of human dignity, to the right of the Jews to live as Jews.

We hope that our appeal will not go unanswered.

ACADEMIC COMMITTEE ON SOVIET JEWRY

Harris Schoenberg, Sec.

Nathan Glazer, Chairman.

Sponsors

Daniel Aaron, Smith College.
Daniel Bell, Columbia University.
Saul Bellow, University of Chicago.
Max Black, Cornell University.
Justus Buchler, Columbia University.
Arthur F. Burns, Stanford University.
Lewis A. Coser, Brandeis University.
Herbert S. Dinerstein, Johns Hopkins University.
Richard Ellmann, Northwestern University.
Victor Erlich, Yale University.
Herbert Feis, Historian.
Lewis S. Feuer, University of Toronto.
Herman Finer, University of Chicago.
Milton Friedman, University of Chicago.
Walter Galenson, Cornell University.
Eli Ginzberg, Columbia University.
Louis Gottschalk, University of Chicago.
Henry F. Graff, Columbia University.
Louis M. Hacker, Columbia University.
Oscar Handlin, Harvard University.
Philip M. Hauser, University of Chicago.
Carl G. Hempel, Princeton University.
Abraham J. Heschel, Jewish Theological Seminary.
Richard Hofstadter, Columbia University.
Bert F. Hoselitz, University of Chicago.
Irving Howe, Hunter College.
Irving L. Horowitz, Washington University and Stanford University.
Abraham Kaplan, The University of Michigan.
Alfred Kazin, SUNY, Stony Brook.
Peter B. Kenen, Columbia University.
Milton R. Konvitz, Cornell University.
Robert Lekachman, SUNY, Stony Brook.
Abba Lerner, University of Cal., Berkeley.
Daniel Lerner, M.I.T.
Max Lerner, Brandeis University.
Seymour M. Lipset, Harvard University.
Seymour Melman, Columbia University.
Robert Merton, Columbia University.
Sidney Morgenbesser, Columbia University and Rockefeller University.
Ernest Nagel, Columbia University.
Albert B. Sabin, Children's Hospital Research Fdn.
Ithiel De Sola Pool, M.I.T.
Meyer Schapiro, Columbia University.
Benjamin I. Schwartz, Harvard University.
Melford E. Spiro, University of Chicago.
Lionel Trilling, Columbia University.
Melvin Tumin, Princeton University.
George Wald, Harvard University.
Jacob Wolfowitz, Cornell University.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

Joseph Andriola, Leon Blitzer, Jack R. Cole, Lewis Hertz, Sol Resnick, R. M. Schectman, Berthold Schweitzer, Peter A. Toma, Sid Yakowitz.

BALTIMORE HEBREW COLLEGE

Moshe Aberbach, Joseph M. Baumgarten, Herbert Birnbaum, Raymond Bloom, Isaac M. Fein, Samuel Glasner, Sonish Kaplan, Samuel Litov.

BERNARD BARUCH COLLEGE

Herbert Arkin, Maurice C. Benewitz, Jerome B. Cohen, Henry Eibirt, Charlotte Katzoff, Aaron Levenstein, Louis Levy, Michael Wyschogrod.

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY

Fred Abrahams, Alexander Altman, Albert S. Axelrad, Carl Belz, Gerald S. Bernstein, Egon Bittner, Naftali Chaim Brandwein, Samuel Cherniak, Saul G. Cohen, Edward Eugelberg, Gordon Fellman, Neil Friedman, Lawrence H. Fuchs, Stephen J. Gendzier, Creighton Gilbert, Emanuel S. Goldsmith, Jack S. Goldstein, Robert Golub, Ben Halpern, Martin Halpern, Milton Hindus, Leon A. Jick.

Rosabeth M. Kanter, Jay S. Keycer, Raphael Kutscher, Dena Lida, Henry Linschitz, Elaine Loeffler, Joseph Lukinsky, Abraham H. Maslow, Baruch H. S. Mazor, Michael Mazur, Mordeca Jane Pollock, Janice Reisman, John P. Roche, Myron Rosenblum, Joshua Rothenberg, Judith Rice Rothschild, Murray Sachs, Morris S. Schwartz, S. Schweber, Mitchell Siporin, Zvi Sobel, Fred Sommers, John P. Spiegel, Betty F. Starr, Maurice R. Stein, Robert Szulkin, Alex Weingrod, Kurt H. Wolff, Harry Zohn.

BROOKLYN COLLEGE

Harry G. Albaum, Howard Allen, Mary Anastasio, Abraham Bargman, Carl Beaver, Ruth S. Becker, Melvin M. Belsky, Benjamin H. Blottner, Irwin Bloom, S. Bowfsky, Benjamin Brickman, May D'Amato, Netta K. Dershowitz, Jack G. Deutsch, Julius Ducher, Norma H. Eisen, Bernard Eisenberg, Abraham S. Eisenstadt, George H. Fried, Vojtech Fried, Seymour Fogel, William Forman, Mordecai L. Gabriel, Allen Gerwirtz, Harry M. Goldberg, Abraham I. Goldstein, Solomon Goldstein, Sidney Goodman.

Paul Haberfield, Alvin Halpern, Betty Hershenov, Marion Himes, Murray Hochberg, Isidore Hudes, Irene H. Impellizzeri, Ruth Jolson, Meyer Jordan, Jacob M. Kagan, Paul Kahn, Samuel Katz, Hannah King, Beta K. Kirsky, Samuel L. Kleinberg, Jacob M. Lebowitz, Morris E. Levenson, Herbert Leventer, Norman J. Levin, Melvin E. Levison, J. Nina Lieberman, Paul F. A. Maderson, Ezra Mendelsohn, Charlotte Mergentime, William E. Miller, George Moriber, Anne M. Newman.

Murray Pincus, Walter Prenowitz, Joshua Proschau, David Raab, Shirley Rausher, Madeline R. Roberta, Ronald Roman, Milton J. Rosen, Louis E. Rosenzweig, Benjamin Roth, H. Rottenberg, Florence A. Ruderman, Ezra Saltzer, Alden Sayres, Bernard Seidenberg, Rose Z. Sellers, Melvyn I. Selsky, Belle D. Sharefkin, David S. Shaw, Joseph L. Shulim, Fanny K. Singer, James Singer, David T. Slominsky, Robert S. Slotnick, Wolfe Snow, Michael I. Sobel, Frances M. Sonnenschein, Ian N. Spatz, H. Sussman, Harvey Wachtel, Ida Weiner, Solomon Weinstock, Norman C. Weissberg, David Westreich, Jack M. Wolfe.

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Stuart H. Altman, Edward N. Beiser, G. Borts, John P. Brown, King Chen, Benjamin Chinitz, Elliot R. Goodman, Herschel I. Grossman, Yinmaw Kan, Mark B. Schupack, Jerome L. Stein.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY

George E. Aherlof, Kinsey A. Anderson, Edward W. Barankin, Babette Barton, Sara A. Behman, Reinhard Bendix, Arthur R. Bergen, Stanley A. Berger, Ariel A. Bloch, Woodrow Borah, Scott Briar, William M. Brinner, Alma Burlingame, Jesse H. Chaper, Florence I. Faerstein, Gerald D. Feldman, David E. Feller, Walter Fischel, Werner Goldsmith, Frank Goodman, Robert A. Gordon, Ralph Greif, Charlotte Grossman, Gregory Grossman.

Linda Israeli, Eliahu I. Jury, Sanford H. Kadish, Herma H. Kay, Anne D. Kilmer, Ralph M. Kramer, Frank Kushin, Joseph Kuypers, Abba P. Lerner, Joseph R. Levenson, Alfred A. Lucco, Herbert Maccoby, Ora Mayrose, Jacob Milgrom, Henry Miller, Ralph E. Miller, Forrest Mozer, Ray Radner, Gordon C. Roadanel, Earl R. Rolph, Sheldon Rothblatt, David J. Sakrison, David J. Salensie, Gerard G. Salinger, Samuel Silver, Lawrence M. Stone, Lloyd Ullman, Benjamin Ward, Aaron Wildavsky, Kermit T. Wilke, David S. Winston, Seth L. Wolitz, Michael J. Zweitler.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT DAVIS

Myron Bun, Alexander L. Groth, Ann Hertzendorf, Theodore Karp, Sol Perel, Jerome Rosen, Alvin D. Sokolow.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES

Joseph M. Burns, Barry R. Chiswick, Henry Goodman, Werner Z. Hirsch, Jack Hirshleifer, Walter Kingson, Frank LaTourette, Josef

May, Benjamin Klein, William L. Melintz, Yale Mintz, Daniel Rosenthal, David L. Shapiro, Steven L. Spiegel.

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE AT LONG BEACH

Charles W. Austin, Ira S. Cohen, Robert L. Delorme, T. H. Erb, Raphael Hanson, Marsha S. Harman, Thomas N. Hubble, Lloyd Invi, William M. Johnson, George V. Kacevicz, William M. Leiter, Christian Loe, Robert S. Lorch, Jerry E. Mandel, George Mazarakis, Robert D. Miewald, James G. Powell, William F. Sater, John V. Shor, Barry H. Steiner, A. Jay Stevens, Donald Urquhart, Jerry L. Weaver, Donald Whirten.

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

Gerald L. Baum, Daniel K. Bloomfield, Victor H. Frankel, Simon Horenstein, J. Horowitz, Roland W. Moskowitz, Howard J. Schwartz.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

I. D. Abella, J. Alperin, R. W. Antvers, Howard I. Aronson, David Atlas, Saul Bellow, Ross S. Benham, James E. Bowman, Terry N. Clark, Louis Cohen, Joseph Cropsey, Milton Ehre, Milton Friedman, Marc Galanter, N. Gelfand, G. Glauberman, Julian R. Goldsmith, Zvi Griliches, I. N. Herstein, Bert Hoselitz, I. M. Isaacs, D. Gale Johnson, Arcadius Kahan, I. Kaplansky, Sol H. Krasner, N. Lebovitz, Richard S. Lindzen, Sam Peltzman, Robin D. Powell, Howard Schachter, C. Schochet, Edward Siankiewicz, Lester G. Telser, Tymon Terlecki, Doreen Triber.

CHICAGO CITY COLLEGE

Otto Benca, Sidney M. Bernstein, David Erikson, Seymour Friedman, Herman Novar, Leon Novar, Irving B. Slutsky, Albert Soglin, Meyer Weinberg.

CITY COLLEGE OF THE CITY, UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

A. Abramowitz, Howard L. Adelson, James Arrowsmith, R. D. Auster, Morton Bard, Bernard Bellush, Ruth Blizer, Randolph L. Braham, Saul Brody, Alice Chandler, Morton H. Cohen, Madeline P. Cosman, John W. Cox, Allan Danzig, Gabriella De Beer, Howard Deixler, Tony De Melas, Sidney Ditzion, Miriam Drapkin, Harry Dym, Morris Ettenberg, Marnin Feinstein, Paul Fenster, John M. Firestone, Myer Fishman, Gerald Freilich, Stanley L. Friedlander.

Malcolm Galatin, Lloyd P. Gartner, Joyce Gelb, Robert V. Ghiradella, Jerome Gold, Richard Goldstone, James J. Greene, Abraham S. Halkin, Leo Hamalian, Mitch Haskel, Suzanne Hecht, Samuel Hendel, Eva Herzfeld, Edward J. Hoffmann, Lee Kaminetzky, Irving Kaufman, Benjamin J. Klebaner, F. Kool, Florian G. Kraner, Jack Landis, Jacob Landy, Harry Lazer, I. E. Levine, Harry Levtov, Phillip Liss, W. B. Long, Karl Malkoff, Jonah Mann, A. Marty, I. Mei, Stephen Meltsner, A. Melzer, Samuel M. Middlebrook, Stanley Milgram.

Samuel I. Mintz, Robert Naimaik, Peter W. Nesschalt, Sidney Neuman, Sven Eric Norton, Paul Oppenheimer, J. R. Renert, Edwin P. Reubens, Jacob Rothenberg, Charlotte S. Russell, Louis F. Sas, David Shelupsky, M. Silver, Richard Skolnick, Louis L. Snyder, Bernard Sohmer, Irvin Stark, Zvi H. Szubin, Abram Taffel, J. Taffet, Stuyvesant Van Veen, Edmond L. Volpe, Renée Waldinger, Barry Wallenstein, Sheldon Waxenberg, Michael Weiner, William Wernick, Joel H. Wiener, Henry Willard, Jess Witchell, Robert I. Wolff, Stanley Wyatt, Oscar Zeichner, Arthur Zeiger, Arthur J. Zuckerman, Martin Zuckerman, Elliot Zupnick.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Roger E. Alcaly, James Barros, Ivan Berg, Dan W. Brock, Gerson D. Cohen, Thomas S. Colahan, Henry S. Coleman, Samuel Coleman, Arthur Danto, Cyrus Derman, Fred W. Dupee, John E. England, John E. Englund, Amitai Etzioni, Horace L. Friess, Eli Ginzberg, Irwin A. Glikes, James Gutmann, Dale L. Hiestand, Peter H. Juviler, Irving Kalet, Jerome D. Kaplan, Morton Klass, Morton Klein, Richard Kuhns.

Nathaniel Leff, Sebastian Littauer, Steve Marcus, Howard Mc P. Davis, Dwight C. Miner, Ivan Morris, Charles Nadler, Ernest Nagel, Alfred R. Oxenfeldt, H. N. Porter, John Herman Randall, Jr., Orest Ranum, Sidney Robbins, Abraham Rosman, Joseph Rothschild, Leonard Sayles, Howard H. Schless, Robert P. Shay, James P. Shenton, David Sidorsky, Allan Silver, Michael Slate, James J. Walsh, Ellen Weinstock, Robert P. Woolf.

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

Alfred Brandstein, Felix Freudmann, Louis Gerson, Herbert Goldstone, David Ivry, Lewis Katz, Marcia R. Lieberman, Jerome H. Neuwirth, Helene Reschovsky, William Rosen, Mark Ross, Eugene Spiegel, Solomon Tilles, Murray Wachman, Sam Witryol, Elliot S. Wolk.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

M. H. Abrams, Moshe Anisfeld, Joel Aronoff, Vahan D. Barooshian, Toby Berger, Israel Berstein, Harry Bitner, Harley Bernbach, Max Black, Bert R. Brown, Kenneth Myron Brown, Lawrence D. Brown, Mark Brown, Sanford Budick, Harry Caplan, Patricia Carden, Herbert J. Carlin, M. G. Clark, Marshall Cohen, David Connor, Alice H. Cook, Stanislaw Czamanski, Joseph B. Dallett, Werner J. Dannhauser, David Dropkin.

Terrence Fine, Jerry Fink, Walter Galenson, Alexander Galley, Morris Goldfarb, Gerald Gordon, Leopold Gruenfeld, David L. Grunes, Baxter Hathaway, Judith Herz, Martin Horwitz, Andre T. Jagendorf, Alfred E. Kahn, Harry Kesten, Jack Kiefer, Gordon M. Kirkwood, Helmut B. Koenigsberger, Milton R. Konvitz, Richard L. Leed, Sidney Leibovich, Jay H. Levin, Simon Levin, Richard L. Lichoff, Simpson Linke, James McConkey, George Miller.

Maurice F. Neufeld, Paul Olum, David Patterson, Isaac Rabinowitz, Efraim Racker, Robert L. Raimon, Alex Rosenberg, Edgar Rosenberg, Anne J. Rosokoff, O. S. Rothaus, Arthur W. Rovine, Myron Rush, S. L. Sass, Abel Schejter, Harold A. Scheraga, Rudolf B. Schlesinger, D. N. Seidman, A. N. Shulsky, Benjamin M. Siegel, Allan P. Sindler, Walter Slatoff, Fred Slavick, George Staller, Peter Stein, M. Tenenbaum, Marvin Waldman, Lionel Weiss, John Windmuller, J. Wolfowitz, Donald B. Zilversmit.

ALBERT EINSTEIN MEDICAL CENTER (PHILADELPHIA)

Samuel J. Ajl, Marshall S. Greenberg, Samuel B. Horowitz, Stuart Licht, Harold Persky, Marvin A. Rich, Anna Steinberger, Emil Steinberger.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

S. Ben-Yehoshua, Herbert T. Berger, Meyer Bieber, Daniel Billen, R. D. Dresdner, Richard E. French, Charles W. Fristol, David Glithman, Irving J. Goffman, Norman G. Keig, Jacob H. Kress, Ted Landsman, David F. Pawliger, Joseph W. Perry, Samuel Proctor, Murray W. Shields, Martin L. Schulkind, Dale Truett.

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Morton L. Burdick, G. R. Choppin, J. R. Fisher, Earl Frieden, Robert L. Fulton, R. E. Glick, Michael J. Greenberg, Werner Herz, Seymour L. Hess, Myles Hollander, M. L. Incardona, R. H. Johnsen, Michael Kasha, J. S. Leffler, Robert Leif, Mark Levin, Bruno Linder, Harry Lipner, Leo Mandelkern, Charles K. Mann, R. S. McEwen, Duane Meeter, Joe L. Mott, J. V. Quagliano, W. Rhoades, Martin Roeder, James C. Simmons, Irwin Sobel, I. J. Vickers, H. M. Walborsky, Stephen Winters.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Frederick H. Abernathy, N. Bloembergen, Howard R. Baum, Bernard Budiansky, Milton Budoff, G. F. Carrier, Jeanne Chall, Henry Ehrenreich, Myron Fiering, Rose Frisch, Nathan Glazer, Merle Goldman, Sydney Goldstein, John W. Hutchinson, R. Victor Jones, Harvey Leibenstein, J. Carrell Morris, William Paul, Peter S. Pershan, Eliahu Romanoff, George Rybicki, J. Lyell Sanders, Jr., Israel Scheffler, Lloyd Spielman, M. Tinkham, George Wald.

HUNTER COLLEGE

Marlies K. Danziger, Robert Fried, Milton J. Gold, Marvin J. Goldfine, Lawrence Goldstein, Lillian Loewe Gottlieb, Mildred Mendelson, Harry L. Miller, Nathan Reich, William Reiner, Benjamin B. Ringer, Pauline Roth, Anna M. Schlesinger, Gertrude K. Schlesinger, Bernard Schneider, Charlotte A. Seley, Nathan Stoller, Myrtle Vogelson, Ruth G. Weintraub, Walter Weiss, Gloria F. Wolinsky.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO CIRCLE

Bernard H. Baum, Louis A. Berman, Seymour Bernstein, Sarah B. Cohen, Frieda H. Engel, I. E. Farber, Irwin K. Feinstein, B. Greenberg, C. Gutlinger, David S. Hacker, Allen H. Howard, Samuel Kantorovitz, William Kaplan, Robert Kauf, Harold Klehr, Bernard R. Kogan, Eliezer Krumbein, Nathan Lerner, Julius Menacker, Oscar Miller, Sonia Miller, Yecheskel Rasiel, Yoram Sagher, Lawrence Solomon, Reuben Sandler, Arthur O. Seltzer, S. Shalit, Gary Siegel, Roger Skoenick, Alvin B. Star, Herman B. Weissman, Lester Winsberg.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA

Larry Belman, Eleanor Blum, D. James Brademas, Rosa Lee Brill, David S. Lieberman, Ira H. Carmen, Morris Davis, Nathaniel H. Eisen, Bob Eisenstein, R. A. Eubanks, A. Belden Fields, Maxwell R. Garrett, William I. Goodman, Fred M. Gotthel, Albert Z. Guttenberg, Paul Handler, Joseph M. Heikoff, Theodore Hymowitz, Marvin E. Krasnow, Anne Martel, Stuart Nagel, Stuart S. Nagel, Alexander L. Ringer, Arthur R. Robinson, Nesbit Siems, Julian L. Simon, Marvin P. Steinberg, William H. Walker, Stanley S. Wallack, Marvin G. Weinbaum.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

David Baker, Joseph M. Beith, H. Bern, Robert F. Byrnes, Domonique De Lerma, James S. Diamond, Oded Feinberg, Henry A. Fischel, Maurice Friedberg, David H. Frisch, George Gaber, Murray Grodner, Harry Houdeshel, Albert Lazan, John R. Levene, Mitchell S. Novit, Bernard Portnoy, Menahem Pressier, Horace Reisberg, Marko Rothmuller, Lawrence Schulman, Michael Schwartz, Robert J. Seltzer, Leonard Sharrow, Gavriel Solomon, M. W. Taylor, Leopold Teraspulsky, Lawrence Walcoff, Eugene Weinberg, Eugene D. Weinberg, Irving Zeitlin.

JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

David Arzt, Joseph A. Brodie, Sylvia Ettenberg, Israel Francus, Shamma Friedman, Edward M. Gershfield, Neil Gillman, Henry Glazer, Simon Greenberg, Abraham, J. Herschel, Abraham Holtz, Aaron Kirschenbaum, David C. Kogen, David Leiber, Samuel Leiter, Bernard Mandelbaum, Shalom Paul, Zebulun Ravid, Fritz A. Rothschild, Menahem Schmelzer, Eugene Weiner, Moses Zucker.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

Arthur Davidson, Jacob Enoch, Herbert Friedson, Mark Mandelker, Theodore Palmer, David Paretsky, Allan H. Perlman, Howard Rosenfeld, R. Sokal, Lawrence R. Velvel.

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

Martin R. Baron, Seymour H. Baron, Ronald A. Brown, Bruce D. Downing, Raleigh M. Drake, Edward H. Friedman, Edward Gelerinter, Sherman Golub, Clyde Hendrick, Michel Hirt, Kenneth L. Hoving, Lawrence S. Kaplan, Marvin R. Koller, Roy S. Lilly, Lawrence E. Melamed, Horace A. Page, David C. Riccio, Stuart Taylor, F. Robert Treichler, Charles N. Winslow, Wesley C. Zaynor.

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY

J. Richard Aronson, William A. Barrett, Alvin Cohen, Frank T. Colon, A. Roy Eckardt, Samuel L. Gulden, Theodore Hallperin, Arthur Larky, Daniel Leenov, Sutton Monro, Murray Schecter, Eli Schwartz, Andrew Weintraub, Albert Wilansky.

HERBERT LEHMAN COLLEGE

Marc Aronson, Stanley Bank, Theodore Benjamin, Arthur Blatt, Louis Chary, Joan Dyer, Edgar Feldman, Bernard Flicker, Edward Frankel, Phillip I. Freedman, Martin Hannes, Seymour Hayden, Jack Herz, G. Isaacs, Perry Kalick, Stanley Kaplan, Linda Keen, Bonnie M. Kind, Connor Lazarov, Aaron Lebowitz, Joseph Lewittes, S. Markstein, Richard Sacksteder, Jack Shapiro, Irving R. Stuart, Samuel I. Squires.

LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY

Marc Ames, Ephraim D. Dworetsky, Leonard Feigenbaum, Helen Ginsburg, Wally Glickman, Seymour Goldberg, Naomi Gramer, Paul Isaacs, Chemia J. Kleinman, Max Landau, Hyman S. Laub, Michael Lester, Benjamin Litt, Florence Miller, Ronald Mirman, Harry S. Pack, Howard K. Rice, Robert E. Rochlin, Roy Rubin, Adrian M. Salee, Leo Schloss, Martin Teiger, Israel Teitlebaum, Samuel Tenenbaum, Emanuel Tsantes, Walter Vasilaky, Herbert J. Weiser, Stephen J. Weiss, Jerry Witt, Philip Wolitzer, Kenneth Yee, Hyman L. Zuckerberg, Israel Zuckerman.

LOS ANGELES VALLEY COLLEGE

Marvin Abrahams, Milton Auerbach, Pat Blakeslie, Bernard Friedman, Jay H. Glassman, Edward J. Kunzer, Allan M. Levine, Samuel H. Mayo, Bernarr Mazo, Anatol Mazor, Milton Miller, Solomon Modell, Eugene Raften, Thoryamber S. Villa.

MARQUETTE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

H. Ankel, James J. Brush, Deane N. Calvert, H. Friedman, Albert W. Girotti, David M. Glick, Donald Greiff, Sidney E. Grossberg, Michael J. Hosko, John P. Kampine, B. Kassell, Robert S. Kemp, Alan H. Mehler, Samuel A. Morell, P. Roel, Sidney Shindell, F. Taketa.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, BALTIMORE

George Beschner, Janet Brown, Shirley Buttrick, Harris Chaiklin, Paul Ephross, Hans S. Falk, Godfrey Frankel, Herman A. Gewisgold, Lily Gold, Ernest M. Kahn, Evelyn S. Kostick, Stanley Levin, Marvyn Novick, Max Siporin, Richard Sterne, Daniel Thursz.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK

W. W. Bergoffen, J. R. Dorfman, Aaron Douglis, Morris Freedman, David A. Goldberg, Louis M. Greenberg, Meyer Greenberg, Sigmund Grollman, Inda Lepson, Esther Liberman, Leonard S. Rodberg, Phillip Steinberg, Saul Ragalsky, Leonora C. Rosenfield, James Walt, Leonard Woolff.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Ernst S. Abers, Martin Abkowitz, Richard B. Adler, Stamford Anderson, Naftali Auerbach, Stanley Backer, Michael Baram, William H. Bassichis, Sylvain Bromberger, E. Cary Brown, Stanley G. Brown, Noam Chomsky, Gerald Dworkin, Murray Eden, J. Edozien, Leonard J. Fein, Albert Feingold, Herman Fishbach, Franklin M. Fisher, Aaron Fleisher, Leo Friedman, David Frisch, Ernst Frankel, Sergio Fribini, Abraham Gal, O. Glaser, Leon R. Glicksman, Samuel A. Goldblith, Robert Goodman, Leon B. Groisser, Paul Gross, Bernard Gould.

Kenneth Hale, Morris Halle, John E. Harris, aDniel M. Holland, Hans Horms, Marcus Karel, M. M. Kessler, Zvi Kohavi, Nissan Leviatan, Kurt S. Lion, Earl Lomon, S. E. Luria, Philip Mandel, G. Hubert Mathews, Henry Millar, Paolo Nunberg, Herman Pollack, Ronald F. Probstein, Edward B. Roberts, Robert M. Rose, John Robert Ross, Jerome Rothenberg, Ethel Rubenstein, Gerald L. Schroeder, Marcel Semo, Ascher H. Shapiro, Huston Smith, Barry Spacks, Steven R. Tannenbaum, Peter Temin, V. L. Teplitz, Judith Thomson, Lester C. Thurow, George Wolf, Richard J. Wurtman, J. E. Young, Lawrence R. Young, Jerrold R. Zacharias.

M'GILL UNIVERSITY

W. G. Brown, Adi Eisenberg, Arthur Grosser, Michael Herschorn, Hyman Kaufman, M. P. Langleben, Samuel Melamed, William Moser, Edward Rosenthal, Charles Roth, David J. Simkin, D. Sussmen, Robert Vomly.

MIAMI UNIVERSITY (OHIO)

Robert Bernstein, Pat Capretta, Reo M. Christenson, W. Cunningham, R. A. DeLapp, Oran B. Dent, John S. Jahnke, Arthur G. Miller, Henry L. Minton, Donald W. Ormiston, Joseph S. Vannoy, Herbert Waltzer, Raymond White, Jr.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Gerald B. Abrams, Carl Cohen, Bertram D. Dinman, Alexander Eckstein, Philip J. Elving, Albert Feuerwerker, Sidney Fine, Selma Fraiberg, Ronald Freedman, Zvi Gitelman, Leonard E. Gottesman, William Gerler, Robert A. Green, Alexander Z. Guiora, David L. Gutmann, William Haber, Paul Ilie, Abraham Kaplan, Raoul Kopelman, Eugene Litvak, Jacob M. Price, Joseph A. Reif, Melvin J. Reinhart, Melvin Selzer, A. Sussman, Ronald S. Tikofsky, Martin R. Warshaw, Gerhard L. Weinberg.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Sheldon Cherney, Jerome O. Herniter, Stanley C. Hollander, William Lazer, Joseph Meites, Harold Wein, Abraham Zemach.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Naomi Arond, Carl A. Auerbach, Melvyn S. Berger, Hyman Berman, Isaac Chavel, Edward Coen, Harold P. Cohen, Angelo Cohn, Miriam Cohn, David Cooperman, Martin Dworkin, Arnold Enker, Herbert Feigl, Edwin Fogelman, Bruno H. Greene, Velvi Greene, Donald Kahn, Gisela Konopka, David Kopf, Samuel Krislow, Joseph J. Kwiat, Robert J. Levy, Walter Littman, Manfred J. Meier, C. Robert Morris, Meir Pilch, Samuel H. Popper, Ida Rapaport, Mordecai Roshwald, Samuel Schwartz, E. M. Sparrow, Emanuel Stadlam, Marvin L. Stein, Ruth M. Stein.

MONTEFIORE MEDICAL CENTER

S. J. Estrin, Morton Finkle, Garet M. Gordon, Joseph Halperin, William Horowitz, Abraham Jezer, David M. Morson, Thelma Jones Sack, Howard S. Schwartz, Arthur G. Ship, Marcus Widneran, Felix Wimpheimer, Jack Zeller.

NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Louis Berenson, Jay Diamond, Morris Grossman, Elliot Kleinman, Richard Lenter, Mel Morgenstein, Don Nagourney, Gerald Pintel, Bernard Sklar, Harriet Strongin, Adam Wiener.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

S. R. Blum, Gerald J. Bole, Pham Chung, Ralph C. D'Arge, Ronald W. Dolkort, Richard A. Ellis, Bernard Epstein, Julian Geristy, Micha Gisser, David Hamilton, R. Hersh, Emar Hille, Paul Jonas, Robert W. Kern, Jack Kolbert, J. Laustman, James V. Lewis, R. C. Metzler, Alfred T. Parker, Noel Pugach, Clifford Qualls, Guntrer E. Rothenberg, Patricia Sanborn, Ellen Spolsky, M. Szosz, Bernard Spolsky, Donald G. Teully, Henry J. Tobias, Howard Tuttle, Beverly C. White, Robert H. White, Nathaniel Wollman, Hanna Zacks, Shelemyahu Zacks.

NEW YORK MEDICAL COLLEGE

Edward J. Brownstein, Myron S. Denhotz, Marvin G. Drellich, Francine Gelfand, Vilmos Major, Y. Moadel, Moses Naftalin, Jack L. Rubins, David D. C. Savile, Edith T. Shapiro.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Sidney H. Aronson, Phyllis Bober, Roger Even Bone, Burton Budick, Howard L. Greenberger, Bernard Hallote, Brooke Hindle, Benjamin J. Katz, Diana Klebanow, Israel Knox, Dan H. Laurence, Harold Lazarus, Edward W. Lehman, Alexander Melamed, Norman Miller, Jonas Prager, Alex Rosen, David Rudansky, Leah C. Schoengood, Frederick C. Schult, Jr., Frieda Shaviro, Dennis H. Wrong.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

Donald Cohen, Leon Cohen, Martin Edelman, Robert Fairbanks, Walter Goldstein, John Gunnell, James Heaphey, Richard Kalish, Alvin Magid, Michael Moss, Richard Nunez, James Riedel, Roy Speckhard, Ronald Stout.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO

Nate Back, Ulrich Bauer, Charlotte Catz, Maimon M. Cohen, R. G. Davidson, R. I. Davidson, Leslie Fielder, Paul Kurtz, Sol Messinger, Albert Somit, Philipp E. Veit, David Weintraub, Summer J. Yaffee, Marvin Zimmerman.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

D. Austin, Martin H. Bailyn, Adi Ben-Israel, Jochim Beug, Laurie M. Brown, Meyer Dwass, Arthur J. Freeman, C. R. Goedsche, Lillian Croag, Erich Heller, Hans E. Holthusen, D. Kahn, David J. Klein, Michael S. Koppisch, Gilbert K. Krulle, Peter L. Lehmann, Marvin B. Lewis, Eben Mathis, Stuart L. Meyer, Benjamin Mittman, Herman J. Munczek, Tilde Sankovitch, David Shemin, Arnold J. F. Siegert, Arthur B. Simon, Meno H. Spann, Norman B. Spector, Geza Von Molnar, Jacqueline L. Willrich, Art Wouk.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Benjamin W. Abramson, Manuel Barkan, J. D. Brilliant, Robert S. Brodkey, Arno Cronheim, Richard M. Goodman, Kurt Lessy, Leo E. Lipetz, Louis Nemzer, Melvin S. Newman, Samuel Rosen, Jerome Rothstein, Saul M. Siegel, James Tennenbaum, Marshall C. Yovits.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Joseph M. Allman, John Fred Beebe, Judy Bertelson, Herbert Bisno, James C. Davies, Steven Deutsch, David J. Finlay, Joseph R. Fiszman, Stanley B. Greenfield, Thomas Hovet, Jr., James P. Levine, Hal R. Lorwin, Guy F. Medler, William C. Mitchell, William Orbell, Stan Pierson, Stephen C. Reynolds, James L. Rice, Charles P. Schleicher, Lester G. Seligman, Clarence E. Shurber, Barry N. Siegel, Donald R. Van Houten, John E. Woodham, M. George Zaninovich, Harmon Zeigler.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Morton Benson, Daniel Cohen, Herbert S. Denenley, Aaron J. Gellman, Stephen R. Goldstein, A. Leo Levin, Louis D. Levine, Israel Live, Noah Prywes, Joseph R. Rose, Edward B. Shils, E. T. Siegel, Sheldon A. Steinberg, Stephen R. Sylk, Benjamin Wolf.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Gilbert Aberg, Keith Baker, Oded Bar-Or, Simar Belasco, Asa J. Berlin, Irwin Bernhart, Norman Davids, Harris P. Deverle, Samuel S. Dubin, Irwin Feller, Thomas Feuchtwang, Norman Freed, Robert S. Friedman, Maxwell Goldberg, Maxwell H. Goldberg, Norman Goldberg, Stella R. Goldberg, David Gottlieb, Richard Gordon, Howard Grotch, Henry L. Guttenplan, Melvin Gutterman, George Haspiel, Sabih I. Hayek, Julian Heicklen, Emil Kazaz, Edward Keynes, Michael King, Phillip Klass, Edward Klevans, Robert J. Laporte, Lawrence H. Lattman, Stanford Lembeck, Samuel H. Levine, Claude Lyon, Martin Marder, William R. Millman, Michael D. Morris, Richard T. Newcomb, Gerald Phillips, Ernest Rawitz, David M. Ricci, John D. Ridge, Theodore Slovin, Daniel Walden.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

Abraham I. Braude, Bernard L. Cohen, Joseph W. Eaton, Lawrence M. Epstein, Walter I. Goldberg, Adolf Grunbaum, Jonathan Harris, Lois Jaffe, Allen I. Janis, Lewis Lehrman, Irving J. Lowe, Donald Magel, Arden Melzer, Rodney Pelton, Jerome L. Rosenberg, Barbara Shore, Edward Sites, Anatole A. Solow.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Paul Benacerraf, Donald Davidson, R. E. Grandy, Gilbert H. Harman, Carl G. Hempel, Walter Kaufmann, J. M. Notterman, Terry Penner, George Pitcher, Richard Rorty, Mark Sagoff, T. M. Scanlon, Jr., James Ward Smith, Gregory Vlastos, John Wallace, Ledger Wood.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY

Arthur Aronson, J. P. Aubin, Fritz G. Cohen, H. Dan. Corbin, William A. Cramer, Chester E. Eisenger, Leslie A. Field, Harley Flanders, Solomon Gartenhaus, W. H. Gass, Sanford M. Goldstein, Edward Golub, Daniel H. Gottlieb, Jonathan Gressel, David I. Haas, M. E. Harr, Mark Harris, Samuel Harris, J. F. Hayes, Allen Hayman, David Hertzig.

Jules Janick, Albert Kahn, A. E. Kalson, Jerry Kaplan, Barnett Kottler, Martin Light, Michael E. Lipshutz, M. M. Miller, V. L. Newhouse, Sanford E. Ostroy, Norbert T. Porile, Earl Prohofsky, Henri Rothschild, Joseph Rubenstein, Marvin M. Schreiber, Stephen Robb, Jerrold Siegel, Edward Simon, Ralph C. Simon, Ethel Tessman, J. F. Treves, Arnold Tubis, I. Walterstein, S. Weingram, E. C. Zachmanoglou.

QUEENSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Abraham Bertisch, Milton Cohen, Joseph Levi, Naphtaly Levy, Gerald Meyer, Pedro Meza, Ronald C. Monticone, Sheila Polishook, Katherine Stabile, Frank White.

REED COLLEGE (OREGON)

Pearl Atkinson, William W. Bernhardt, Dean Cora Bamford, David Chaitkin, Marshall W. Cronyn, Roger B. Oake, John C. Pock, Victor G. Rosenblum, Laurens N. Ruben.

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

Melvin Granatstein, Ira Gross, Jerome R. Kutliroff, Albert Silverstein, Ephraim P. Smith, Arthur Stein, Robert G. Weisbord, Norman L. Zucker.

UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

Wilhelm Braun, Stanley Engerman, Ralph N. Haber, Richard M. Harris, Joseph H. Levine, Sidney Monas, Nathan Rosen, Stanley M. Sapon, Arthur H. Stone, Dorothy Stone.

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY (CHICAGO)

Robert I. Cohen, Gregory J. Grieco, Janice Jacobson, Burton S. Kendle, Ben Lebovitz, Crag Orear, Seymour Patinkin, Elsa G. Richmond, S. W. Specthrie, Morris Springer, Otto Wirth.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

Sanford Aranoff, Joseph Badi, Philip W. Bennett, Norman M. Bronznick, Fred Einstein, Seymour Feldman, Joseph Johnson, Martin M. Hyman, Mark Keller, Nathan Kranowski, Robert M. Krauss, Hal G. Lewis, Simon Marcson, Stanley Messer, Seymour Rosenberg, Gordon Schochet, Martin Sherman, Silvan S. Tomkins, Luba Uveeler, Renee Weber.

SMITH COLLEGE

Alice Ambrose, Louis Auld, Ron K. Banerjee, David Batchelder, Marie-Rose Carré, Louis Cohn-Haft, Charles M. Cutler, Bruce T. Dahlberg, Rosalind De Mille, Herman Edelberg, Stanley Elkins, Laurence A. Fink, Theodora Foster, Grace Ganter, Edwin E. Fehen, Jr., Myron Glazer, Arnold Gussin, Jeffrey Horn, Randall Huntsberry, Seymour W. Itzkoff, Mervin Jules, Yechiael Lander, William MacDonald, Howard Nenner, Howard I. Parad, Helen W. Randell, Donald L. Robinson, Peter Rose, Lawrence Rosen, William Shepard, Harold Skulsky, J. Diedrick Snoek, Milton D. Soffer, Melvin Steinberg, Richard P. Unsworth, Irvin Wall, Allan Weinstein, Harvard Wescott, Jochanan Wignhoven, Margaret Yeakel.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Robert McAbee Brown, Herman Chernoff, Brad Efron, P. Herbert Leiderman, Robert Hofstadter, Arthur Kornberg, Ingram Olkin, Richard Olshen, Emanuel Parzen, Martin L. Perl, David O. Siegmund, Herbert Solomon, George W. Woodworth.

SUFFOLK COMMUNITY COLLEGE

David Bonfeld, Gregory E. Bush, Dorothea Echard, George E. Frost, Jr., John Gallagher, Caroline H. Gould, Ronald J. P. Lesko, Louise B. Perkal, Murray Polner, William Zukor.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

J. Brezner, Milt Elfant, Morris Katz, Ephraim Levin, L. Naum, E. Schoenfeld, Michael Szwarc, Gunter Zweig.

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Carl Alper, Victor H. Auerbach, Danile Berger, Gerald J. Blidstein, George Blumtein, M. Eisen, Paul H. Elovitz, Stephen Fein, Daniel S. Fleisher, Walter J. Gershenfeld, Isadore W. Ginsburg, Michael Goldblatt, Leonard I. Goldman, Marvin W. Grossman, Emil Grosswald, Haym Jaffe, Alfred Katz, Norman Kendall.

Emil P. Liebman, Joseph J. Loewenberg, Maxwell S. Luria, Victor Marder, Phyllis Meisner, Bernard Meth, Eva D. K. Orlow, Louis Raymon, Bernard J. Ronis, Max Lee Ronis, Albert Schild, L. Schoenfeld, Stanley S. Schor, Samuel Seltzer, Sol Sherry, Eugene Shuster, Murray H. Shusterman, Sidney B. Simon, Herman Siplet, Adrian L. Steinberg, Edward C. Steinberg, Howard C. Wasserman, Philip P. Wiener.

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

J. M. Albert, Joseph Aschheim, Gilbert Ginsberg, Solomon Kullback, Benjamin Nimer, Bernard Reich, Howard M. Sachar, George Steiner, Rafael Supervia.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Arnold Arons, John D. Bagdade, L. Bierman, J. G. Dash, Milton B. Gordon, Neal B. Groman, Howard Kaminsky, Mark N. McDermott, Eugene Natkin, Robert Puff, Edward A. Stern.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN (CENTER SYSTEM)

Marion Bowe, Jane Burgess, Dorothy Delle, Edwin J. Dommisse, John Forde, Alan A. Grimm, Glenn Jacobs, James Knox Phillips, Rolf W. Roth, Ralph A. Russell, Donald Weast, Robert Wright.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN (MADISON)

Edwin A. Azen, Harry C. Coppel, Alan D. Corré, Patricia Cosgrove, Joseph W. Elder, Edwin H. Epstein, Henry C. Finnery, Burton R. Fisher, Sterling Fishman, Leonard B. Glick, Herman Goldstein, Simon Hellerstein, Herbert Jacob, Herbert M. Kliebard, Lawrence W. Landweber, Herbert S. Lewis, Nancy M. Matthisen, David Mechanic, H. Andrew Michener, Robert J. Miller, Robert L. Rabin, Elaine Reuben, John W. Robby, Edward Rothstein, Irving S. Saposnick, Charles E. Sherman, Shalom Schwartz, A. Aaron Snyder, Seymour Spilerman, Richard L. Venezky, Grace G. Wahba, Julius R. Weinberg, Victor Wrigley.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN (MILWAUKEE)

Len Levine, David Litchman, Jakob R. Loewenberg, Elihu Lubkin, W. K. Percival, Eric Schenker, David B. Shapiro, Michael M. Shurman, Raymond Weiss, Jack B. Zeldis.

YALE UNIVERSITY

David C. Duncombe, David Egger, Barry L. Eichler, Victor Erlich, Jack Farman, Louis B. Fierman, Dorothea Finkelstein, J. J. Finkelstein, Jacob Finkelstein, Joel Lawrence Fleishman, Tikva Frymer, Grace Goldin, Judah Goldin, Joseph M. Goldsen, Abraham S. Goldstein, Richard Greenberg, W. W. Hallo, John Harte, Richard Israel, Herbert Kaufman, Stanley R. Lavietes, Sid Leiman, Herbert D. Lewis, Joseph Lowin.

Leonard Marcus, Uri Navon, Ralph Roskies, Arthur M. Ross, Seymour Sarason, Gaston L. Schmir, Marc Schwartz, Erich Segal, Bernard G. Slavin, Samuel Slie, Elizabeth Socolow, Robert Socolow, Stanley Stern, Thomas O. Teatherwood, Joseph Tulchin, David L. Weisbrod, Caroline Whitbeck, Robert J. Wyman, Leonard Zegans, Israel Zelitch.

YESHIVA UNIVERSITY

Esther Appelberg, Bernard Beer, Menachem Brayer, Moshe Carasky, Irving H. Cohen, Hebert C. Dobrinsky, Joseph Dunner, Morris N. Eagle, M. H. Finer, Beatrice Fleisher, David Fleisher, Daniel Gasman, Nathan Goldberg, Allan C. Goldstein, Sam Goldstein, Solomon H. Green, Irving Greenberg, Joseph Greenblum, Hyman B. Grinstein, Jos. Jausner.

Mayer Herskovics, Sidney B. Hoenig, Saul Hofstein, Arthur Hyman, Shelly P. Koenigsberg, Pauline Kra, Seymour Lainoff, H. Leaf, Eli M. Levine, Boris M. Levinson, Joseph Levinson, Edward Levy, Justin Lewis, Charles S. Liebman, Norman Linzer, S. Menkowis, Macy Nulman, Emanuel Rackman, Murray Raim, Esther Reich, Rae Rosenberg, Joseph Safran, Lloyd Sepleis, Alvin I. Schiff, Sherman Siff, Dorothy Sievers, Morris Silverman, Ernest Simon, Solomon Simonson, Marshall Sklare, Leon D. Stitskin, Abraham Tauber, Norman B. Tokayer, David Vitrogen, Bluma B. Weiner, Walter J. Wurzburger, Daniel Ziff, Eric Zimmer.

ADDITIONAL SIGNATURES

Jaime Alazraki, California at San Diego.
Harvey Babkoff, Biometrics Research.
Perry B. Bach, Cincinnati.
Jack Behar, California at San Diego.
Allan J. Berman, Queens.
Sidney Bernstein, Quinnipiac (Conn.)
E. Birnbaum, Toronto.
Irwin R. Blacker, Southern California.
Abraham Blum, Scientist.
Robert Boguslaw, Washington (St. Louis).
Yvonne Broadcorens, Simmons (Boston).
Eugene A. Counihan, Scientist.
Dennis Cutler, Scientist.
Herbert S. Dinerstein, Johns Hopkins.
Donald L. Edelstein, Cincinnati.
Emil L. Fackenheim, Toronto.
Rudolph Federman, Scientist.
Joseph A. Feldman, Duquesne.
Philip Feldmesser, Fairleigh Dickinson.
Robert A. Feldmesser, Dartmouth.
Henry Fenichel, Cincinnati.
Joshua A. Fishman, Hawaii.
Donald K. Frank, C. W. Post (L.I.U.)
Kathryn B. Feuer, Toronto.
Lewis S. Feuer, Toronto.
Melvyn P. Galin, Northeastern.
Lydia Gasman, Vassar.
Walter J. Gensler, Boston.
Boris Gertz, Lesley.
Martin Godofsky, Scientist.
Marshall I. Goldman, Wellesley.
Sheldon Goodman, Massachusetts.
David Gordon, Southeastern Mass. Tech. Inst.
Gershon Greenberg, Dartmouth.
Ann B. Grieco, Educator.
Michael Grossman, Amer. Ass'n. of Univ. Profs.
Irving Halperin, San Francisco State College.
Robert L. Hambkin, Washington (St. Louis).
Theodore E. Harris, Southern California.
Ron Heiferman, Quinnipiac (Conn.)
Edward Herman, Cincinnati.
Robert Hexter, Carnegie-Mellon.
Irving Louis Horowitz, Washington (St. Louis).
Andrew I. Kaplan, Scientist.
Julian Kaplow, Monroe Community (Rochester).
Helen Kassoff, Educator.
Sam Katz, West Virginia Medical.
Robert Kingson, Foothill College (Los Angeles).
Roy L. Kisliuk, Tufts.
Sheila Klass, Manhattan Community.
Allan Kornberg, Duke.
Sanford A. Lakoff, Toronto.
Joseph C. Landis, Queens.
Berel Lang, Colorado.
Norma Lang, Quinnipiac (Conn.).
Robert W. Langbaum, Virginia.
Irvin Larner, Washington (St. Louis).
Bernard Lazerwitz, Missouri.

Allan M. Lefer, Virginia.
Sara Lehrman, Chanton College (Pa.).
Harvey R. Levine, Quinnipiac (Conn.).
Joseph H. Levine, Rochester.
Mortimer Levine, West Virginia.
Lawrence M. Lewin, Georgetown.
Sidney Lieberman, Colorado.
Martin S. Lindauer, S.U.N.Y. at Brockport.
John Luna, C. W. Post (L.I.U.).
Zella Luria, Tufts.
Hershel Markovitz, Carnegie-Mellon.
Arthur F. Menton, Polytechnic Institute, B'klyn.
Michael A. Meyer, Hebrew Union.
William R. Meyer, Dartmouth.
Hyman P. Minsky, Washington (St. Louis).
Howard Needler, Colorado.
Marc M. Nezer, Northeastern.
Roy Harvey Pearce, California at San Diego.
Philip Plant, Manhattan Community.
Richard H. Popkin, California at San Diego.
Daniel D. Raylesberg, Fairleigh Dickinson.
Harold Resnick, West Virginia Medical.
H. Alan Robinson, Hofstra.
David C. Ronsenfried, Quinnipiac (Conn.).
Robert Rosenstein, Dartmouth.
Ronald I. Rubin, Manhattan Community.
Michael D. Schmidman, Manhattan Community.
Bernard E. Segal, Dartmouth.
Harvey Senter, Fairleigh Dickinson.
Jack Silberg, Lockhaven State College (Pa.).
Gordon I. Silverman, Dartmouth.
Sidney M. Stabl, Missouri.
Isidore Starr, Queens.
Joseph Sungolowsky, Queens.
Louis Tenenbaum, Colorado.
Philip R. Tromer, Women's Medical College (Phila.).
Carol Shaffer Twersky, Manhattan Community.
Robert C. Vernon, Simmons (Boston).
Chaim I. Waxman, Central Conn. State.
David B. Weisberg, College of Jewish Studies (Chicago).
David Weinstein, S. Alexander Weinstock Manhattanville Hebrew Union.
Martin Wierschin, California at San Diego.
Mary Glenn Wiley, Washington (St. Louis).
William S. Wilson, Queens.
Naomi Woronov, Manhattan Community.
Edith Wyschogrod, Queens.

Join our appeal

As a faculty member I support your appeal for the Jews of Silence and wish to add my name.

Name ________________________________
Dept. ________________________________
Univ. ________________________________
Contribution __________________________

Academic Committee on Soviet Jewry, 315 Lexington Ave., N.Y.C. 10016, 689-7400.

(This ad was paid for by the signatories.)

A MAN WHO BELIEVED IN AMERICA

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, in a very stirring tribute to the late Dwight D. Eisenhower, Mr. Thurman Sensing, of the Southern States Industrial Council, has written an article which should be read by all Americans. For that reason, I commend it to the attention of the Congress and the Nation as follows:

A Man Who Believed in America

For millions of Americans the passing of Dwight D. Eisenhower, 34th President of the United States and commander of the allied armies in Europe, provided a solemn occasion for recalling the vital qualities of leadership in this Republic.

Gen. Eisenhower was a product of the American experience and embodied patriotic virtues which are essential to this country if it is to endure. At a time when there is disorder in the land and not inconsiderable disloyalty to its values, as evidenced among the militants of the New Left, it is timely to bear in mind what is basic to greatness and to the survival of the American system.

Nowadays, militants angrily denounce "The System," and call for its overthrow or radical alteration. The militants have their camp followers in politics who try to sell the idea that the United States is riddled with imperfections and in need of radical reconstruction. Some officeholders, sad to say, believe that it is smart to adopt the New Left's slogans about this being a land of hunger and hardship.

Dwight Eisenhower was a product of the American System, and his success in life demonstrates how effective and worthwhile that system is. He was born into a family of modest means. His father was a worker in a creamery in Abilene. Today, "liberals" no doubt would describe his family as "deprived" or "disadvantaged." But the Eisenhower family didn't see itself that way. Members of the family worked hard; they had faith in America. Not only the future President but his brothers did well in careers, achieving substantial success. The story of the Eisenhower family is the story of countless other American families of modest means who believed in the virtues of work, thrift, and loyalty to God and country.

The man who later in life was to command the largest force of free men ever committed to battle was a man brought up to believe in self-reliance. He didn't have the comforts and pleasures of other young men from more affluent circumstances, but he didn't complain. He relied on his own abilities and energies. He didn't expect an OEO or any other agency to provide him with instant prosperity.

For the young Eisenhower, service to country was a wonderful opportunity, not something to be avoided by taking refuge in graduate school. Throughout his life, he adhered to West Point's injunction to follow the path of duty, honor and courage. These concepts are a million light years away from what the New Left intelligentsia teaches today. Instead of stressing duty, the "liberal" intellectuals urge young men to avoid national service. Honor is scorned by the Left intelligentsia as an outmoded concept. Instead, they urge the young to seek peace at any price, to believe that it's better to be "Red than dead." Finally, courage in defense of one's country is dismissed by radicals as a shopworn concept. They speak of the virtue of anarchy.

In the eight years that Dwight D. Eisenhower was President, he displayed none of the arrogance of power characteristic of some of his predecessors and successors. Though his administration disappointed some conservatives who hoped for a thorough house-cleaning of entrenched radical elements in the federal government, President Eisenhower was not afraid to show his belief in free enterprise. He brought businessmen into the Cabinet. As a result, America's affluence gained greatly in the 1950's. Home ownership grew enormously during the Eisenhower years. American society was strengthened and stabilized.

Like other outstanding men, Gen. Eisenhower made mistakes in his appointments and his policies, but he acknowledged mistakes. He was extremely reluctant to give moral approval to court-ordered experiments with public education. It has been written that he felt he erred greatly in using troops at Little Rock in 1956.

In the main, however, Gen. Eisenhower was in the central current of American thinking. He understood the strength of the American "system," and upheld it as a model of opportunity and enlightenment. He had no use for the strident doctrines of social revolution. He rejected the demagoguery and truth-twisting that is involved in describing America as a land of hunger and poverty. His confidence in the United States and its essential goodness and greatness should be remembered for years to come.

DAVID J. STEINBERG DISCUSSES FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, David J. Steinberg, secretary and chief economist of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, has written an excellent paper entitled "Our Foreign-Trade Policy Is Bankrupt" which urges a commitment to free trade that advances beyond mere rhetoric. I commend this paper to my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD:

Our Foreign-Trade Policy Is Bankrupt

(By David J. Steinberg)

There is a serious infirmity in our national trade policy. It demands careful attention and an honest diagnosis. Consider the symptoms:

The government knows the general, long-range direction the country must go in an important area of economic policy—we have been going in that direction for 3½ decades. However—

It has not figured out a coherent way of proceeding steadily and confidently toward its ultimate objective in this field;

It is not even ready to articulate clearly and resolutely what the objective is and how quickly it should be sought;

It decides to take a breather (for a year or two or maybe more) to assess its past achievements and the policy terrain ahead, hoping to make some progress in alleviating problems here and there (obviously a patchwork approach);

It shows little if any appreciation of the importance of a definitive U.S. policy in this area to sound decision-making by business, labor, and government; and it appears unaware, or at least not too much concerned, that the loss of policy momentum will give heart and opportunity to interests that have opposed past policy in this field and seem bent on going back to what we thought and hoped were points of no return.

This seems to be a case of policy bankruptcy. And this seems to be where we are in our foreign-trade policy.

It seems strange, almost unbelievable, to say so. The United States for over three decades has advocated and done much to achieve freer world trade—negotiating with other countries the reduction of tariffs and other obstructions to the movement of goods across national borders. In June 1967, after four years of negotiations and a succession of agonizing crunches, it successfully concluded a highly publicized trade agreement (the Kennedy Round) with 52 other governments. It called this agreement "the most comprehensive assault on barriers to international trade that has ever taken place."

But where did we go from there? Where should we have gone from there?

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962, perhaps the greatest legislative achievement of the Kennedy Administration, had expired only days after President Johnson signed the epochal trade agreement which this legislation had made possible. Without an extension of the Act, the President lacked meaningful negotiating authority to make tariff adjustments which from time to time become necessary. New legislation was also needed to ease the apparently too rigid criteria in the 1962 statute for justifying "adjustment assistance" to firms and workers claiming injury from import competition. Our ability to follow the path of genuinely freer world trade would be greatly affected by whether or not this adjustment assistance program could be made workable. Legislation was also needed to implement certain Kennedy Round concessions the United States had made without Congressional authority. In addition, there was the question of what to do about the host of trade barriers the Kennedy Round did not touch, many of which could seriously offset the liberalizing concessions on which agreement had been reached. And beyond all this was the need for the United States to continue to play its unique role in pointing the way to new horizons of world trade expansion, an objective demanding sustained attention for a host of economic and foreign-policy reasons. In a word, all this added up to the need for *momentum*.

To repeated warnings that if we lost momentum we would also lose ground, the Administration made repeated genuflections to "freer trade", which it correctly regarded as essential to our highest priority goals at home and abroad. As to when and how major new efforts to liberalize world trade would be made, at what pace, and with what attempts to secure indispensable Congressional cooperation, it said only that we need a breathing spell, time to digest the results of the Kennedy Round, study our international trade position, and assess new alternatives, before embarking on new initiatives along this rocky road. The subject would be explored with American industry, agriculture, and labor, with members of Congress, and with foreign governments.

A formal study would first be prepared by the Executive agencies following extensive public hearings and close consultation with an advisory committee broadly representative of American industry, agriculture, and labor. Then would come discussions with Congress and foreign governments, to be followed supposedly by a bill delegating negotiating authority to the President to take the next major step in international trade policy.

While this study was under way, President Johnson sent a Trade Expansion Act extension bill to Congress. The bill's main provisions consisted of (a) extending for two years the unused portion of the negotiating authority enacted in 1962, thus providing the "housekeeping" authority needed for occasional tariff adjustments that might become necessary, (b) implementing the concession the Administration had made in the Kennedy Round without specific Congressional authorization, and (c) easing the injury test for adjustment assistance. In addition to these concrete objectives, there were two important dimensions of our overall trade-policy posture that would be affected significantly by the fate of this bill: the general credibility of U.S. commitments in international trade negotiations, and the durability of America's avowed interest in seeking genuinely freer world trade. Once more that ubiquitous question of "image."

Hearings were held last summer on this bill and on future U.S. trade policy in general, but only in the House of Representatives. Since no action was taken by the House Ways and Means Committee, the bill died in the House; and since the House must constitutionally be the originator of such measures in Congress, there was no opportunity for action by the Senate, which had little interest in the proposal anyway. The major hang-up was the very controversial request for Congressional implementation of the major concession the U.S. negotiators had made on benzenoid chemicals. A more politically astute handling of this issue in the presentation to Congress might have moved the bill further toward enactment.

At any rate, the bill is now no bill at all since the 90th Congress has expired. The Johnson Administration should have sent it up again as soon as the 91st Congress convened. But for some reason this was not done. Whether and how the Nixon Administration will attempt to achieve these legislative objectives will be the first major test of President Nixon's intentions in this policy area. Whatever he decides to do regarding these issues, there is still the crucial and highly controversial question of long-range trade policy. The extent to which we have clear and dependable plans for the long term—and the nature of these plans—will affect substantially the effectiveness of whatever ad hoc maneuvering the new Administration may attempt in the next year or two with respect to this or that trade barrier. It will also affect materially the Administration's effectiveness in dealing with a host of other policy goals from fighting inflation to fostering international cooperation. Without a *free-trade* strategy, raising the sights of the major trading nations to the highest objectives, our efforts to cope with the nitty gritty of particularly troublesome trade barriers, possibly with a few exceptions, will founder in fruitless bickering. And efforts to cope with the other policy issues that may now seem to far outrank trade policy in priority will lack the steam they need for the kind of success that is already nothing short of urgent.

Despite the many policy imperatives that underscore the need for immediate action with respect to long-range trade policy, and despite also the considerable understanding and expertness the Government already has in this policy area, long-range strategy will apparently have to wait the outcome of a new study of the whole issue by the Nixon Administration, to be followed by exploratory talks with Congressional leaders at home and foreign governments abroad. The Administration's vision and vigor in this policy area will set the sights and the tone of these political consultations. The course it will follow is very much in doubt.

The Johnson Administration's appraisal of future trade-policy needs was completed in January 1969. The report assesses a wide array of U.S. trade probelms and emphasizes the need to cope with them as quickly as possible. "Freer trade" is the theme and the goal, as it has been in all trade-policy studies sponsored by the Executive Branch for the past three decades. However, a clear, definitive, comprehensive initiative is not advocated, one that can deal adequately with the multitude of trade issues confronting the United States and the world economy. In any event, the Nixon Administration is not likely to accept this lame-duck report as a basis for its own planning in this field, just as the Eisenhower Administration shelved the so-called Bell Report on trade policy prepared in the closing months of the Truman Administration and undertook its own study via the Randall Commission (its chairman was Clarence Randall, retired steel executive and Eisenhower's special assistant for international economic affairs). The new Administration may be expected to do something not very different.

President Nixon may think he has enough prbolems on his hands at home and abroad without proposing a major new trade-policy initiative. Trade policy is always very controversial. He will probably reason that to propose a new major step toward freer trade would compound his already monumental problems in other policy areas. Trade policy could certainly not be neglected. Nor would it be. Since we have much to complain about in the barriers other countries impose against U.S. exports and in the subsidization of foreign exports to the U.S. market, the Administration could make a show of concern with trade policy by concentrating on these issues. It could be expected to cloak this activity in the garb of U.S. insistence on something called "fair competition." "Getting tough" with foreign governments, and doing some patchwork negotiating on this or that trade barrier, will probably be the emphasis of Nixon's trade policy at least for the first two years of his Administration, a period in which his own "Randall Commission" study might be prepared on what to do next. It might be just the kind of approach he thinks he needs to establish himself as a supporter of "freer trade" and at the same time cultivate the support of legislators, business executives, and union leaders who not only oppose new freer-trade initiatives but are advocating import controls. He is supposed to be a political pragmatist, and all this sounds quite pragmatic—politically, that is. What it could do to our other policy goals, and to the President's political stake in furthering them, is something else.

Freer-trade momentum was lost in the last two years of the Johnson Administration. The Administration wasn't even ready with a contingency plan if the always teetering Kennedy Round failed. The Nixon Administration seems at least equally unprepared to cope with the trade issues it found upon assuming office and that will grow more serious unless tackled vigorously and quickly. The Republican Party platform on this subject provides poor guidance. It would move the nation backward not forward, advocating import controls in the interest of something called "fair competition."

Studies and discussions are certainly vital ingredients of sound policy-making. Insistence that other governments carry out their commitments and stick to the international rules of the road in their commercial policies is essential. But these steps do not add up to a meaningful policy, even when punctuated by ad hoc negotiations on one or another trade barrier, and all to the accompaniment of pious declarations about abstract national goals and intentions. Such declarations may be expected in abundance from the White House and the various Executive agencies, just as much in the future as in the past. But the substance and intent of U.S. trade policy will be very much in doubt.

To be worthy of the name, trade policy must be more than posture, much more. It should have motion, dynamism, and determination, reflecting confidence in the merits of the end that is sought and the means of achieving it. It should involve domestic as well as foreign economic policy. It should define the national interest, not only in terms of the needs of the nation as a whole, but also in terms of the welfare of each State and the contribution each can make to maximizing the collective benefits for all fifty. To gain the indispensable cooperation of Congress, the Administration must show by deed as well as intent that it *cares* about the local economic problems that inspire protectionist opposition to freer foreign access to the U.S. market. It must show a sincere interest in seeking the cooperation of legislators, governors, and mayors, as well as business and labor, in the search for constructive, enduring solutions to problems that may be caused or seriously aggravated by rising imports.

Until the Executive Branch articulates trade policy in these terms, freer trade on a sustained, consistent basis—and this means seeking the ultimate dismantling of all barriers to legitimate international commerce by the economically advanced countries—will be an idle dream.

Such a trade policy in the national interest not only does not now exist. It is not on the drawing board, and probably will not be attempted until a crisis situation impels us to raise our sights to this level, much as the freer-trade policy of the past 3½ decades was created in the crucible of one world crisis (the economic depression of the early 1930's) and strengthened in the crucible of another (the postwar reconstruction crisis of the late 1940's). The void will be costly to the nation and hence politically costly to the Administration presiding over the resulting national slippage in economic strength, political credibility, and policy leverage.

Without sustained progress toward freer trade, and consistant domestic economic policies effectively facilitating adjustment to rising foreign competition and to the many other challenges of change, protectionism (meaning pressures for one form or another of import control) will rise at home and abroad, leading to antagonisms bearing many of the earmarks of trade warfare. While the U.S. economy digests the Kennedy Round and the Government decides what to do next, this highly touted Geneva pact may get tattered and torn by trade restrictions sought by many businessmen and labor unions in most if not all the countries that negotiated the agreement. By the time the United States recognizes the need for a new comprehensive initiative in trade liberalization and a new request for Congressional authority to negotiate it, trade barriers and popular sentiment behind such restrictions—in the United States and abroad—may have increased to the extent of opening a huge gap in the credibility of U.S. trade policy declarations, and a huge moat for the next round of trade negotiations to cross.

A trade policy of wait-and-see—a breathing spell, or call it a state of suspended animation—is tantamount to a vacuum. Protectionist pressures may be natural, but, unlike nature, protectionists do not abhor a vacuum. They adore a vacuum, the better to deploy their formidable forces and direct their political firepower against the introspective and indecisive phalanxes of the so-called "free traders." The protectionists have been doing their homework, not on economic adjustment and the imperatives of the national interest, but on the rudiments of American politics. They have been pumping up the pressure on their representatives in Congress, demanding support and getting it for bills to restrict imports and for demands on the President to get foreign governments "voluntarily" to reduce their exports to us. Any success they can achieve in these demands—even a little success would be as incapable of extension to a wider range of products as being a little bit pregnant—would tarnish the reliability of U.S. trade-policy declarations and damage our leverage at every international conference table. Our economic objectives at home and abroad—including the need to control inflation, stimulate competition, expand exports, and strengthen world confidence in the dollar—would be impaired.

In this field as in many others, you either move ahead or you fall back. "It takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place," the Queen said to Alice, "If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast." At this stage in the development of America's substantial stake (economic, diplomatic, and security) in expanding world trade, we cannot afford to sit back to contemplate our policy achievements and objectives. As Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote over 100 years ago:

> "I find the great thing in this world is not so much where we stand,
> As in what direction we are moving . . .
> We must sail sometimes with the wind and sometimes against it,
> But we must sail, and not drift, nor lie at anchor."

At this late date, we ought to know where we want to go and how best to get there. If momentum is lost, uncertainty grows at home and abroad about the purposefulness and pace of U.S. trade policy and, in turn, about the wisdom and dependability of our other policies.

Protestations about being for "freer trade" will not do any longer. The term has increasingly lost meaning. Thirty-four years ago when Cordell Hull launched his imaginative trade agreements program "freer trade" marked a new departure in U.S. trade policy. Great strides have been made under this banner since World War II. Today, however, it has become an abstraction subject to a wide range of interpretations, some of them 180 degrees apart. There is probably not a member of the 91st Congress who will not identify himself with it—naturally his own definition. He will have no difficulty reconciling "freer trade" with his special pleas for restricting imports that some of his constituents may be complaining about.

The Executive Branch itself has not been without blemishes in its pledge to "freer trade." It has yielded too many times to pressure for trade restrictions of one kind or another, regarding these, sometimes pridefully, as tactical political ploys, expedient compromises to keep the ship of state on the general, long-term course of trade liberalization. Abhorring legislated import quotas, it has at times urged foreign countries to "voluntarily" restrict their exports to our market as a device to neutralize domestic pressures for import-quota legislation. The Eisenhower Administration successfully urged the Japanese to restrict shipments of cotton textiles to the United States. The Kennedy Administration negotiated a multilateral international agreement on cotton textiles. The Johnson Administration persuaded foreign suppliers to restrict shipments of meat and steel to the U.S. market, and negotiated a three-year extension of the cotton-textiles arrangement. The Nixon Administration is seeking a similar agreement on other textiles, something its predecessors could not achieve. Whatever the domestic political success of these tactics in the short run (in terms of temporarily holding off pressures for import quotas), their longer-run implications are harmful. The Administration that follows this route (a) seems in effect to agree that the industry demanding such controls needs government help, even without an objective government finding justifying such assistance, (b) may too often find itself in the trap of political inability to phase out such restrictive arrangements and reject domestic pressures for new ones, and (c) shows itself before the world to be unable to stick to the trade-policy principles it extols so eloquently as standards for other countries to follow. More than that, it has no control over the price policies of U.S. companies that benefit from such protection against foreign competition.

Backing and filling may in some cases be necessary on the always choppy waters of trade relations with the rest of the world. But these tactics always involve a cost, and usually a net loss, to our overall national goals. This is so, particularly when import controls (direct or indirect) are not (and they never are) the short-term measures they should be—measures to buy time for a balanced package of adjustment remedies to deal constructively with the causes of the problem. Major examples of how trade restrictions persist without end are those on petroleum, cotton textiles, and agricultural products.

This is not to say that America's continuing advocacy of freer world trade is just rhetoric. There is some noticeable and useful motion. We are urging other governments to abstain from additional import barriers and from unfair methods of export promotion. We are interested in tackling the whole sticky problem of non-tariff barriers, which loom larger as tariffs are reduced. We are exploring ways of giving the less-developed countries freer access to the markets of the industrialized countries, hence a better opportunity to earn their own way in the world, less dependent on outside financial aid. But the Johnson Administration did not design a comprehensive, coherent way to relate these and the other dimensions of our trade policy goals, nor the kind of international negotiation in which these issues might most effectively be resolved. The Nixon Administration seems unready to do any better.

The reason for this lack of preparedness is refusal, for philosophical and political reasons, to urge *free trade* as the trade-policy goal of the economically advanced countries, and a new and early initiative to achieve it. The United States shies away from such a policy, even though it is essential to significant progress in our efforts (i) to expand world trade, (ii) to help the developing countries, (iii) to stimulate European unity on terms not harmful to our need for expanding access to these markets, (iv) to combat inflation, (v) to strengthen our international payments position, and (vi) to encourage our free enterprise system to go all out to innovate, generate jobs, and increase our overall productivity and rate of economic growth.

A free-trade arrangement would have to be more than a timetable for dismantling trade barriers. It would have to be a charter. Codes of fair international competition would be necessary to defend against predatory dumping and other unfair business practices, and to prohibit or at least limit government policies that give locally produced goods an unfair advantage over foreign competition at home and in foreign markets. The timetable would involve different phasing for countries on significantly different rungs on the ladder of economic development—generally more rapid for the United States than for, say, Australia. Trade barriers would be removed more rapidly for some products than others—more rapidly for items like machinery and chemicals and least rapidly for items like textiles and certain agricultural products. The "developing countries" would be allowed to benefit indiscriminately from the removal of trade barriers by the "free trade" contracting parties without having to provide equivalent reciprocity. They should, however, be asked to make broad, even if unenforceable, policy commitments regarding the gradual lowering of their own trade barriers.

There is no better, more effective way to get rid of the heavy thicket of nontariff barriers (NTB's)—those we know of and those that may sprout unless an effective anti-NTB toxin is applied—than to negotiate their removal through a free-trade commitment with the Free World's other industrialized countries. There is no better way to negotiate on some or all of these trade restrictions than to deal with all tariff and nontariff barriers in a single negotiation. There is no better way to make certain the achievement of full reciprocity for all the participating countries. Such a negotiating objective adds up to free trade. Why not recognize it? Why not "say it like it is?"

However, the United States shows a readiness and a capability to do little more about the NTB thicket in the next few years than identify the various species and tackle them in patch-quilt fashion. And with what authority to commit the United States? None where any change in U.S. statutory law is concerned. Nor, in general, is it feasible politically or sound conceptually to request negotiating authority from Congress regarding specific nontariff barriers. (What about the others?, Congress might and ought to ask, and don't our negotiators need flexibility to maneuver effectively in this NTB thicket?) Without delegated authority from Congress, the Administration (in cases where U.S. statutory law is involved) would have to ask Congress to pass special legislation implementing the U.S. commitments agreed to. Uncertainty as to how Congress would respond to such requests would seriously impair the negotiations themselves.

Some experts in this field propose a "sense of Congress" resolution urging U.S. initiative in negotiating the diminution or removal of nontariff barriers. Aside from the possible protectionist qualifications Congress might append to such a resolution, it is certain that the Administration would use the resolution as the basis for negotiating agreements on nontariff barriers, then confront Congress with *baits accomplis* and requests for their implementation. Congressional resistance would be attacked as damaging to the U.S. image and future negotiating leverage. The "sense of Congress" resolution would turn out to be a kind of Gulf of Tonkin resolution in the field of trade policy. Congress might ex post facto authorize U.S. participation in one or two such agreements, but it is likely to balk at automatically approving more of these patch-quilt pacts. Sooner or later we shall have to insist upon a more coherent approach to trade-barrier negotiations, one that ensures full reciprocity across the board of all tariff and nontariff restrictions. The patch-quilt approach ensures adequate reciprocity in neither the individual agreements negotiated nor those to be concluded in the future. It involves the risk of being left with insufficient leverage for future negotiations.

A comprehensive negotiation embracing all trade barriers is by far the most productive alternative, and free trade is the only meaningful objective of such a negotiation—particularly since the only way to deal with most nontariff barriers is to negotiate their complete removal (for the others, standards to govern their administration), and the logic of tariff cutting surely leads to zero duties.

If the Administration showed it was ready for an early and determined effort to negotiate such a free-trade charter, it conceivably could get support from quarters now either neutral or urging import restrictions. It might get the support (at least neutralize the opposition) of many of the industries that opposed the recent trade negotiations because of the tariff disparities and the host of NTB's that would remain. Many of these industries have since been urging Congress to legislate import controls. It might get the support of organized labor if there were a credible adjustment-assistance backstop to the free-trade initiative, and if the free-trade arrangement included an international code of objectives on labor standards. Indeed, the best chance for negotiating codes on labor standards, business practices, government procurement policies and other controversial aspects of contemporary international economic life is a free-trade charter that makes all these other agreements not just *desirable* as adjuncts of free trade but *indispensable* to making free trade a meaningful, practical goal.

There is no better, more effective way to open up and expand stable world markets for the whole range of goods the less-developed countries (LDC's) can produce than for the economically advanced countries to move to completely free trade. But the chief and only new proposal on the U.S. agenda to improve the trade position of the LDC's is a declared readiness to explore preferential tariff treatment for the goods of developing countries. This is not all that it seems, for there is no determination to phase out existing quota restrictions on textiles and other shipments from these areas and to avoid new restraints of this kind. Nor is it clear how this trade policy toward the LDC's meshes with our trade-policy goals vis-a-vis the rest of the world. Or how a proposal to grant preferential treatment to imports from the world's lowest-wage countries can be made politically palatable in Congress when there are no major plans for achieving freer access to the higher-wage, economically advanced countries, the best foreign markets for the goods in which we excel, produced on the whole by our highest-paid workers. Nor is any reference made to the policy commitments on trade and development we should seek from the LDC's.

When our Government says it will consider tariff preferences for the economically backward nations—a rather recent departure from previously firm resistance to such an idea—it is only resorting to a gimmick which the less-developed countries have been urging on us with mounting vigor. In the absence of dependable determination to really open our market to the goods of countries at all levels of economic development, we have no other alternative to saying "no" and thus risking serious damage to our overall policy objectives in the world's southern hemisphere. Yet we are running this very risk in our current trade-policy offerings to the developing countries. At best, we are unwittingly fooling them and fooling ourselves, too.

There is no better, more effective way to stimulate the American free-enterprise system to go the limit in enterprise and innovation than to set free trade by the industrialized countries as a definitive goal of U.S. policy. "Freer trade" would itself achieve a degree of credibility and dependability it has not possessed for a long time. Businessmen with an important stake in accurately assessing the prospects for freer foreign access to our market and freer U.S. access to markets abroad would have a precise premise to plug into their decisions on investment, prices, designs, and sales promotion. The nation is counting heavily on U.S. producers to expand job opportunities at home and U.S. export earnings abroad at a greatly accelerated pace. But their government is not providing them with the most productive of trade-policy guidelines. In fact, the delay in doing so tends to retard the productivity of our economy; it also contributes to decisions that may not be able to withstand the growing impact of international competition.

A wait-and-see trade policy, one that has lost its momentum toward genuinely freer trade, reflects a failure to grasp the realities of today's world. Business at home and abroad will not stand still waiting for the United States Government to make up its mind. Judgments will continually have to be made, come what may, on how and when money will be invested, how products will be designed and priced, and so forth. The best possible reading on the prospects for import competition and export opportunity is an important prerequisite for sound business decisions across the board. Visibility, however, becomes murky if uncertainty clouds our trade policy. The road ahead is made particularly perilous by the fact that the Administration's uncertain trumpet in effect sounds "charge" to those forces at home and abroad bent on raising, not razing, trade restrictions.

Business decisions made in this kind of policy atmosphere may turn out to have been poor calculations when confronted with growing world competition and the more definitive trade policy that will eventually have to be adopted. This policy will most probably be toward freer trade, but when, how fast, and after how much back-sliding in the intervening years is anyone's guess and hardly anything to bank on. Many producers at home and abroad will in the meantime have developed a vested interest in past decisions. They will strongly oppose significantly freer foreign access to the U.S. market, for it might, they would fear, place in jeopardy the products and investments stemming from the whole array of earlier commitments.

Distortions would also creep into the economic development programs of Federal, state, and local governments. There would be no urgency to insist upon industrial and agricultural projects (and labor retraining programs) able to cope effectively with unrestricted foreign competition. Too many uneconomic ventures could result, involving not only the unwise spending of taxpayers' money, but the fostering of a vested business, labor, and community interest in preserving types of production no longer fully consonant with our country's position in a rapidly changing world economy. Distortions, and corresponding vested interests in the consequences, would also occur abroad as businessmen make investments, and governments make trade and development decisions, that cannot be held in abeyance waiting for genuinely and consistently freer world trade to become a reality.

The old and new Administrations have been greatly and rightly concerned over the balance of payments and the sharp decline in our gold reserves. At the very heart of our balance-of-payments position is the state of world confidence in the U.S. dollar. That's the name of the game. If there is uncertainty about the dependability of America's avowed commitment to freer trade, there will be rising uncertainty, indeed apprehension, over U.S. policies in general and over the future strength of the dollar, adding up to the best way to weaken our balance-of-payments position. Yet the Government seems to be saying that these risks are outweighed by the need for a "breather" and by fear of how Congress would react if the Administration expressed clearly and forthrightly a determination to achieve truly freer trade, meaning ultimate free trade.

If properly orchestrated, with appropriate emphasis on the domestic as well as the foreign-policy aspects of the program, a free-trade policy would strengthen the dollar immeasurably. Taking careful account of the implications of free trade for import competition and export opportunity, business decisions will tend to promote a much more efficient use of human, technological, and financial resources than could conceivably evolve under any other kind of trade policy. The purchasing power of the dollar would be strengthened. The decision to seek free trade would itself dramatize the vitality of the American economy and the health of the American dollar. Movement toward free trade in accordance with a negotiated timetable would test the fixed exchange rate of the dollar. Is it overvalued, as some economists contend? Maybe it will turn out to be undervalued. The overall consequences of a free-trade initiative—the changes stimulated and the disciplines imposed—could set the stage for replacing the fixed-exchange-rate system with a "floating rate" system at least as far as the world's major currencies are concerned.

Our bankrupt trade policy also handicaps our effort to help the United Kingdom, our closest ally, and the pound sterling, in which perhaps a third of the world's business is transacted. If a U.S. free-trade initiative could help open the way for Britain to acquire free access to a large international market (in a way that protects U.S. interests), then the trade policy best calculated to strengthen the dollar would go a long way to strengthen the pound, the other "key currency" in the world's money system.

We are not prepared to offer Britain an alternative if the European Common Market persists in rejecting London's application to join the European Community. All members of the European Free Trade Association, as well as Canada and other industrialized countries, need free access to a much larger market than their own national or regional borders provide. The only sound solution, economic and political, would be a free-trade arrangement embracing all the industrialized countries. This would ipso facto heal the breach in Western Europe. The West European countries would still require regional economic and political institutions to strengthen both their ability to accelerate economic progress and their cohesiveness at international conference tables.

U.S. policy should not divert the attention of Britain and the other members of the European Free Trade Association from the need to establish a very close association with the Continent. A U.S. free-trade initiative soundly conceived and articulated would not make that mistake. Exploration of free-trade possibilities with any industrialized countries interested in the idea suggests the possibility that a free-trade arrangement with some but not all of these areas might be attempted. This could happen. It would have many drawbacks, economic and political. It should not be sought except as an alternative of last resort. What is much more likely is that an astutely expressed U.S. interest in free trade will dramatically raise the sights of all these countries and lead to a free-trade charter embracing them all.[1]

It is conceivable that the countries now comprising the European Economic Community and the European Free Trade Association might get together without a new U.S. trade initiative. There are centripetal as well as centrifugal forces at work in Western Europe. The United States would then be confronted with a new and more formidable economic force across the Atlantic, one that could pose new protectionist obstacles to U.S. exports and those of other outside suppliers. On the other hand, this united Western Europe might seek U.S. cooperation in achieving free trade on the part of all economically advanced countries. The United States must be ready with a very flexible negotiating position to respond to either contingency, and hopefully to influence the choice of options. There is today nothing in our trade policy that raises the sights and strengthens the hand and the resolve of those in Western Europe and elsewhere who seek the end of economic nationalism in the world's economically advanced countries—regional "nationalism" as well as that of the nation-state variety.

It looks as if the United States will flounder in these policy inconsistencies at least until 1970, and most likely beyond that. The major reasons for this delay may be summarized as follows:

The new Administration's assessment of trade policy should not be expected to be completed before the end of 1969. As explained earlier, the only initiative it can propose that would be meaningful in terms of all the policy goals significantly affected by what is decided in trade policy is negotiation of a free-trade time-table in cooperation with the other economically advanced countries of the Free World. To negotiate such an agreement, the White House will need the broadest, most flexible delegation of Congressional authority. This would essentially be authority "to negotiate trade agreements in the national interest", within the framework of policy goals such as the need to accelerate U.S. economic growth, promote international cooperation, help the less-developed countries, protect our national security, and facilitate adequate adjustment to the challenges of increasingly freer international competition.

The political battle to get this legislation enacted will make previous trade-policy engagements on Capitol Hill seem like a Sunday picnic. Supporters of this new initiative—a logical extension of the policy of the past 3½ decades—will have to mount the most extensive effort yet undertaken to develop a national consensus behind a "liberal trade policy." The issue will be so controversial, and the political effort so gigantic, that at least a full year of public education will be necessary before Congressional majorities can muster sufficient courage to pass such legislation. Doubts about its political practicality in an election year could keep it from a vote until 1971. A President looking ahead to a re-election drive in 1972 might shy away from such an explosive issue, particularly one that many millions of Americans are not likely to regard as urgent. This might rule out 1972. By 1973, so much ground may have been lost to the protectionists around the world that patch-quilt repairs may be the only practical course of action, rather than the far-sighted new initiatives that are already so necessary.

On the other hand, the problem of U.S. trade relations with the rest of the world may have become so serious by that time as to provide the stimulus for a dramatic new initiative to dismantle the trade barriers of the economically advanced countries. Better late than never, but the price the American economy and the world economy may in the interim have to pay for the delay could be considerable. The huge price we are paying for government neglect going back many decades in so many policy areas should be a most sobering lesson. The bills for policy neglect fall due with much greater speed these days than ever before.

The nation is caught in this mire of policy immobility—to a large extent the result of protectionist pressures and the fear of more—despite the fact that protectionism has been discredited time and again. The costly consequences of record-high tariffs enacted in 1922, and the still higher tariffs imposed by the Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930, aroused almost universal determination to reject such options outright and always. The economic expansion recorded at home and abroad over the past third of a century—in step with and assisted by progress toward freer trade—strengthened this resolve. Yet protectionism persists in rising from the ashes.

The businessmen, workers, legislators and community leaders who keep it alive seem as fearful of a changing world as once the Luddites of early 19th century England feared the Industrial Revolution. They prefer seriously out-dated road maps that would divert the nation's attention from the higher and more efficient production, improved and more attractively priced products—toward which it should be resolutely headed. These so-called protectionists, and this means anyone who does not believe in consistent, sustained progress toward free trade, take a myopic view of their own enlightened self-interest and that of their country. What is bad for the nation cannot turn out to be good for them.

They see industrial development abroad as a threat, not as the market opportunity it really is in addition to stimulating better performance from our own producers. Our exports go mainly to countries that are the most advanced industrially and the most resourceful in their ability to compete. The protectionists keep harping on the gap between U.S. labor standards and the lower wages abroad. Even using improved machinery, much of it as good as ours and sometimes better, foreign producers generally are still at the lower end of a productivity gap that shows the American economy producing much more per man per hour than any other country. American producers complaining about foreign producers having the most modern equipment in addition to lower wage standards usually fail to recognize, at least publicly, that the American economy has not reached the limit of its ability to develop and install new equipment unsurpassed anywhere in the world. There is no limit to the new production frontiers inviting the ingenuity of the American type of free enterprise system. The day the United States decides that such a limit has been reached is the day it should decide to fold its tent and cease to exist as a nation.

The protectionists zero-in on imports, but do little if anything to help find constructive, lasting answers to the real problems that beset the complaining companies and workers—their difficulty in keeping in step with the pressures of a rapidly changing and highly competitive economy here at home.

As if the confrontation with protectionism didn't pose enough problems, the very few Americans who actively seek free trade cannot even count on the energies of the so-called "free traders." The "free traders" also have fears. Nearly all of them are afraid to urge "free trade." Not that they don't believe in it. They fear the political flack such proposals are certain to attract; they haven't figured out how to make such an initiative politically palatable. Only a handful of brave souls with a fistful of courage and a head of steam—all of them not only idealists but veterans in the politics of this issue—today carry the "free trade" standard. Thus the bankruptcy in foreign-trade policy isn't just a government malaise. It is practically nationwide.

A free-trade timetable? For an initiative in dire need of drama, what more dramatic target for completing the dismantling of trade barriers by the world's most advanced nations—far enough away to be practical—than the year 2000? Only 31 years to go. The next third of a century, starting from today's high economic and technological plateau, ought to be a much easier course of trade liberalization than the last, which began in the trough of the Great Depression and on the way up had to endure hot wars and cold wars and crises at the brink of nuclear holocaust. Among the things making it easier are the confidence bred of past achievement, a growing impatience with unachieved ideals, a "revolution of rising expectations" not only in distant lands but right here at home, and improved economic, political and social techniques for solving whatever problems we face. The free-trade objective would probably be reached well before the end of the century.

President Kennedy spoke of new frontiers, and in one of the major achievements of his short tenure persuaded Congress to enact trade legislation that included a substantial amount of authority to negotiate free trade. Most of this authority was not used in the Kennedy Round because of circumstances beyond our control. Britain's failure to join the European Economic Community made virtually inoperative the major component of the free-trade authorization, which hinged on the condition that the U.S.-plus-EEC share of world trade in the particular product had to be at least 80 percent. But success in getting this much free-trade authority enacted was a major accomplishment. It should be a source of encouragement to those who seek newer frontiers.

President Johnson envisioned a Great Society. A commitment to free trade, with backstop domestic policies to make sure we stay the course, would go a long way to make a truly great society a reality. At one time or another, Johnson spoke rhetorically of such a trade objective and, in a different context, of the kind of spirit and determination necessary to achieve it:

In 1964: "Somehow, we must ignite a fire in the breast of this land, a flaming spirit of adventure that soars beyond the ordinary and the contented, and really demands greatness from our society, and demands achievement in our Government."

In 1966: Our goal is to free the trade of the world—to free it from arbitrary and artificial constraints."

This is the goal, and the spirit needed to achieve it. President Nixon's "Forward Together" will probably point in the same direction, and in words that match Johnson's rhetoric. How much substance will be given to this lofty prose, and when, are steeped in considerable doubt.

---

[1] Those who currently advocate a free trade area consisting of the United States and as many other industrialized countries as want to join at this time (Britain and Canada are usually mentioned as part of the nucleus) have moved directly to advocacy of a precise arrangement. This is politically unrealistic, domestically and internationally. Much to be preferred is a carefully composed orchestration of the free-trade theme, beginning with an overture.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S REVIEW OF THE 1970 BUDGET

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, for general information and reference purposes of Members and others who may be interested, I am inserting herewith the report summarizing the results of the review of the 1970 budget, released yesterday by the Executive Office of the President.

It is only a summary, but supplies in capsule form the proposed and projected changes in the budgets for fiscal years 1969 and 1970 submitted by President Johnson in January of this year. In summary, President Nixon proposes or projects:

For the current fiscal year 1969, budget receipts of $186.1 billion; budget outlays, expenditures, and net lending—of $184.9 billion, an updating of $1.2 billion from the January projection; and a projected budget surplus of $1.2 billion as against the $2.4 billion surplus projection for 1969 in the January budget.

It should be noted that while the review—and this is true for both fiscal years 1969 and 1970—reflects the new administration's recommendations for changes in proposals and projections as to new appropriations and budget outlays, it does not reflect any change in the revenue assumptions used in President Johnson's budget. Thus the revised projected surplus figure for 1969 of $1.2 billion and the currently projected surplus of $5.8 billion for fiscal 1970 are subject to qualification on that count. And it is pertinent to recall that about $12 billion of the 1970 revenue projection assumes legislative extension of the 10 percent surtax and certain excise taxes, enactment of social security taxes effective in fiscal 1970, and adoption of certain user charges. A postal rate increase is also proposed.

For the forthcoming fiscal year 1970 which begins on July 1 next, unrevised budget receipts are shown at the Johnson budget figure of $198.7 billion; revised budget outlays are projected at $192.9 billion, a net reduction of $2.4 billion from the January budget figure; and a currently projected surplus for 1970 of $5.8 billion, a net increase of $2.4 billion over the $3.4 billion projected in the January budget of President Johnson.

Requests for new budget authority—mostly appropriations—for 1970 are stated at $205.9 billion on the unified budget basis, a net reduction of $4.2 billion from the January budget of President Johnson.

GROSS AND NET CUTBACKS

The review supplies some detail on the point, but in respect to the reductions proposed as a result of the new administration's review, on the projected expenditure—outlay—side for 1970, the gross cutback is listed at $4 billion. But this is partially offset by net "corrections'" of $1.6 billion updating certain projections in the January budget, thus resulting in a net cutback of $2.4 billion in projected budget outlays for 1970.

Similarly, on the requests for new budget authority—mostly appropriations—the gross cutbacks from the January requests are listed at $5.5 billion, partially offset by net "corrections" of $1.3 billion updating certain estimates in the January budget, thus resulting in net cutbacks of $4.2 billion in proposed new budget authority.

RELATION TO FISCAL 1969

In total, President Nixon's review now projects total budget outlays for 1970 to be $8 billion above the corresponding fiscal 1969 total. It proposes, for 1970, total new budget authority $10.2 billion above the corresponding fiscal 1969 figure.

Mr. Speaker, some of the details of the proposed appropriation cutbacks and changes were submitted by the President yesterday. They are in House Documents Nos. 91–98, 99, and 100. Others, involving further appropriation changes and new legislation, are scheduled to follow later.

The complete text of the new administration's review of the 1970 budget follows:

REVIEW OF THE 1970 BUDGET

The Nixon Administration has completed its current review of the fiscal year 1970 budget submitted to the Congress last January by the prior administration. This report summarizes the results of the review.

THE SETTING

Persistent inflation, which has serious consequences for the American people today and if continued would have serious consequences later, makes restraint our only responsible fiscal policy now. As part of this policy of restraint, President Nixon recently requested extension for another year of the temporary income tax surcharge. In addition, he urged postponement of scheduled reductions in the telephone and passenger car excise taxes, and enactment of user charges equal in revenue to those proposed in the January budget. These tax policies were recommended because of the need to maintain Federal revenues and to restrain the growth of private consumption and investment in an already overheated economy.

At the same time, the President recognized—as he had earlier—that Federal spending has been a major cause of the inflation and that expenditure control is an essential part of both sound fiscal policy and responsible management of the Government's affairs. When recommending the revenue measures, therefore, he pledged budget revisions that would reduce Federal spending in 1970 significantly below the amount recommended in the January budget. This pledge was possible because, immediately after taking office in January, the President directed his department and agency heads to undertake a thorough review of the fiscal years 1969 and 1970 budget requests sent to the Congress in January by the outgoing administration.

The President's objectives were threefold:

To make the expenditure cuts that are a necessary part of efforts to combat inflation,

To bring Federal outlays under control, and

To begin redirecting ongoing Federal programs toward his Administration's goals.

BUDGET TOTALS

As shown in Table 1, fiscal year 1969 outlays were estimated at $183.7 billion in the January budget of the outgoing administration. Correction to take into account the effect on estimated outlays of factors beyond the control of the present Administration raise the total by $1.2 billion, to $184.9 billion.

Fiscal year 1970 outlays were estimated at $195.3 billion in the budget of the outgoing administration. Corrections for such uncontrollable changes as interest on the debt and farm price supports raise them by $1.6 billion, to $196.9 billion. Reductions of $4.0 billion were made during the recent review, lowering the total to $192.9 billion.

The Treasury Department has not yet revised its estimate of receipts for either year. These estimates will be revised and made available after the tax returns filed through April 15 have been analyzed.

TABLE 1.—BUDGET TOTALS, FISCAL YEARS 1969 AND 1970

[In billions of dollars]

	Receipts	Outlays	Surplus
Fiscal year 1969:			
January 1969 budget	186.1	183.7	2.4
Corrections in January estimates		+1.2	−1.2
Corrected budget	186.1	184.9	1.2
Fiscal year 1970:			
January 1969 budget	198.7	195.3	3.4
Corrections in January estimates		+1.6	−1.6
Corrected budget	198.7	196.9	1.8
Changes resulting from budget review		−4.0	+4.0
Revised budget	198.7	192.9	5.8

Because the receipts estimates are the same as those shown in the January budget, all of the changes in budget surplus shown in Table 1 result from revisions in estimated outlays. The 1969 surplus is halved, from $2.4 billion to $1.2 billion, while the 1970 surplus is increased from $3.4 billion to $5.8 billion.

Table 2 summarizes the estimates of budget authority (mainly appropriations), for fiscal years 1969 and 1970.

TABLE 2.—BUDGET AUTHORITY TOTALS FISCAL YEARS 1969 AND 1970

[In billions of dollars]

Description	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970
January 1969 budget	194.6	210.1
Corrections in January estimate	1.1	1.3
Corrected budget	195.7	211.4
Changes resulting from budget review		−5.5
Revised budget	195.7	205.9

Corrections in the fiscal year 1969 estimate of budget authority published in the January budget raise the total by $1.1 billion, from $194.6 billion to $195.7 billion.

Corrections in the original fiscal year 1970 budget authority estimate raise it by $1.3 billion, to $211.4 billion. Decreases proposed by this Administration total $5.5 billion, over $3.0 billion of which is in military programs.

FISCAL YEAR 1969

The revised budget published by the prior administration in January underestimated the cost of some programs and has since been affected by increases in uncontrollable items. As a result, the present Administration inherited a budget which realistically implied $184.9 billion of outlays, rather than the $183.7 billion published in January. The factors accounting for the $1.2 billion adjustment in the January budget estimates are summarized in Table 3. As can be seen from the listing, the adjustments were caused by factors beyond the control of this Administration.

TABLE 3.—*Adjustments in fiscal year 1969 budget outlay estimates*

[In billions]

Effect on higher interest rates on interest on public debt	$0.3
Farm price supports:	
Higher crop yields and/or less consumption (including effect of dock strike)	.6
Retention of advance feed grain payments because of lack of adequate notice to farmers of proposed deferral	.2
Decline in offshore oil lease receipts	.4
Effect on outlays of prior commitments for highway grants	.2
Lower unemployment insurance benefits	−.2
Revised estimates of credits for farm credit agencies	−.1
Other, smaller items, net	−.2
Total	1.2

As Table 4 indicates, the corrections in both budget outlays and budget authority were in nonmilitary programs.

Seven months had passed in fiscal year 1969 before this Administration assumed office and could begin its review. The shortness of time remaining in the fiscal year and the strong momentum of ongoing Federal programs left no opportunity to cut significantly the disbursements to be made before June 30. Nonetheless, every effort is still being made to pare the corrected budget estimates. In order to do so, department and agency heads have been instructed to keep a very tight rein on spending during the remaining weeks of the fiscal year.

TABLE 4.—BUDGET OUTLAYS AND BUDGET AUTHORITY FISCAL YEAR 1969

[In billions of dollars]

	January budget	January budget corrected	Change
Outlays:			
Military [1]	78.4	78.4	
Other	105.3	106.5	+1.2
Total	183.7	184.9	+1.2
Budget authority:			
Military [1]	77.0	77.0	
Other	117.6	118.7	+1.1
Total	194.6	195.7	+1.1

[1] Department of Defense military functions and military assistance.

SUMMARY OF EFFECT OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE CONTROL ACT OF 1968

The Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (hereafter referred to as P.L. 90–364) established limitations on 1969 budget authority and outlays that reduced by $10 billion and $6 billion, respectively, the amounts in the 1969 budget sent to the Congress in January 1968. However, in setting the limitations on budget authority and outlays, the Congress excepted certain programs from the required reductions and subsequently added other exceptions. These exceptions amount in total to more than one-half of the revised budget estimate.

The Congress last year made reductions in budget authority significantly greater than required by Section 203 of Public Law 90–364. Total budget authority for 1969 is now estimated at $195.7 billion, which is $1.1 billion more than in the January budget document. Most of this increase is in programs excepted from the statutory limitation, and the total is still well within the legal ceiling.

The current situation with respect to budget outlays is shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5.—BUDGET OUTLAYS FOR 1969—SUMMARY OF EFFECT OF PUBLIC LAW 90-364

[In billions of dollars]

	January 1968 estimate	Current estimate	Change
Programs excepted from Public Law 90–364 limitation:			
Special support of Vietnam:			
Defense	25.8	28.8	+3.0
Economic assistance	.5	.4	−.1
Subtotal	26.3	29.2	+2.9
Interest	14.4	15.5	+1.1
Veterans benefits and services	7.3	7.7	+.4
Social Security Act trust funds	36.0	36.2	+.2
OASI	(24.6)	(24.6)	(+.1)
Disability insurance	(2.6)	(2.6)	([1])
Health insurance	(5.8)	(6.2)	(+.5)
Unemployment insurance	(3.1)	(2.7)	(−.3)
TVA—power proceeds and borrowing	.1	.1	([1])
CCC—price support and related programs	2.8	[2] 3.7	[3] +.9
Public assistance	5.7	[2] 6.2	[3] +.6
Impacted areas (special 1968 supplemental)		.1	+.1
Subtotal	92.6	98.7	+6.1
Remainder—covered by Public Law 90–364 limitation	93.5	86.2	−7.3
Total	186.1	184.9	−1.2

[1] Less than $50,000,000.

[2] Excludes amounts not excepted from Public Law 90–364 outlay limitation.

[3] The exception for farm price supports is limited to $907,000,000 and that for public assistance to $560,000,000 above the January 1968 estimates.

For that portion of the budget covered by the limitation in P.L. 90–364, the current estimate of outlays indicates a reduction of almost $7.3 billion below the January 1968 budget estimate. This compares with $8.5 billion in the printed budget of January 1969; it is nearly $1.3 billion more than the reduction required by P.L. 90–364.

Section 201 of P.L. 90–364 limits—with certain exceptions—the hiring of full-time permanent civilian employees by agencies of the executive branch to 75% of separations, and the hiring of temporary and part-time employees during any month to the number of such employees during the corresponding month of 1967. These limitations are being enforced. A further discussion of Federal employment follows later in this statement.

FISCAL YEAR 1970

As was true of the revised budget for 1969, estimates published in January have since been affected by increases in many of the same uncontrollable items that cause the 1969 budget outlays to be higher. Correction of the January budget to reflect these factors raises estimated outlays from the printed total of $195.3 billion to $196.9 billion and budget authority from $210.1 billion to $211.4 billion. Table 6 identifies the factors accounting for the increase in outlays. The higher estimates for fiscal year 1970 reflect realistically the budget the present Administration faced when it came into office, and are therefore the proper amounts against which to measure the results of this budget review.

TABLE 6.—*Adjustments in fiscal year 1970 budget outlay estimates*

[In billions]

Effect of higher interest rates on interest on public debt	$0.5
Effect of higher interest rates on housing programs, including planned asset sales	.2
Farm price support:	
Higher crop yields and/or less consumption	.2
Retention of advance feed grain payments in fiscal 1969 because of lack of adequate notice to farmers	−.2
Change in accounting for CCC certificates of interest	.5
Decline in offshore oil lease receipts	.4
Unbudgeted claims and judgments	.2
Lower unemployment insurance benefits	−.2
Other, smaller items, net	.1
Total	1.6

NOTE.—Detail does not add to total because of rounding.

Table 7 summarizes the changes resulting from the current budget review; Tables 8 and 9 (attached) show changes in budget outlays and budget authority, respectively, by major agency.

TABLE 7.—BUDGET OUTLAYS AND BUDGET AUTHORITY, FISCAL YEAR 1970

[In billions of dollars]

	January budget	January budget corrected	Revised budget	Changes from— January budget	Changes from— January budget corrected
Outlays:					
Military [1]	79.0	79.0	77.9	−1.1	−1.1
Other	116.3	117.9	115.0	−1.3	−2.9
Total	195.3	196.9	192.9	−2.4	−4.0
Budget authority:					
Military [1]	80.6	80.6	77.6	−3.0	−3.0
Other	129.5	130.8	128.3	−1.2	−2.5
Total	210.1	211.4	205.9	−4.2	−5.5

[1] Department of Defense, military functions, and military assistance.

As these tables indicate:

Outlays were reduced $4.0 billion from the corrected January budget.

Budget authority was cut $5.5 billion, thereby shaving the carryover of unspent budget authority which leads to higher future outlays.

Military and military assistance programs account for $1.1 billion (27%) of the $4.0 billion 1970 outlay reduction and $3.0 billion (55%) of the cut in 1970 budget authority, largely—as the Secretary of Defense explained—because of—

Lower consumption of ammunition in Vietnam.

Reorientation of the Sentinel anti-ballistic missile program to the new Safeguard system, and

Modification in plans for procuring short range attack missiles.

Another $1 billion (26%) of the outlay reduction is attributable to modifications in the proposed legislation to increase social security benefits. The legislative proposal included in the January budget was not transmitted to the Congress by the outgoing administration.

The remaining cuts in budget outlays from the recommendations of the preceding administration affect a wide range of Federal programs.

About $185 million are in international programs, mainly lending activities of the Export-Import Bank and slower disbursement of foreign economic assistance.

Atomic Energy Commission and space program outlays are $140 million lower.

Various agricultural and natural resource programs are reduced by a total of $345 million.

Post Office and transportation program outlay reductions account for most of a $420 million cut in commerce and transportation activities.

Reductions in human resources programs other than the proposed social security legislation (referred to above) amount to $390 million, less than 10% of the total cut although about 30% of Federal outlays are made through these programs.

Veterans program outlays are down $245 million, mostly as a result of sales of assets, comprising 6% of the total reduction.

Outlays for all other programs are $150 million lower.

These reductions are a vital part of the effort to bring inflation and Federal spending under control. But the revised 1970 budget also provides large additional resources for the work that needs to be done in our society. Proposed outlays of $192.9 in fiscal year 1970 will be $8 billion higher than those for fiscal year 1969. The priority given by this Administration to meeting the Nation's urgent domestic civilian needs is evident in the following comparisons of the outlays proposed for fiscal year 1970 with estimated outlays in fiscal year 1969:

Programs to improve our human resources will increase by $5.8 billion, or 10%.

Federal aid to State and local governments will be $3.5 billion—nearly 17%—higher.

The urban share of Federal aid to State and local governments will increase $2.8 billion—or by one-fifth.

Priority has been placed on rebuilding the riot-scarred neighborhoods of our major cities. This $.2 billion effort will be financed from funds already available.

Federal aid to the poor will increase from $24.4 billion to $26.9 billion—over 10%.

About $38 million, including $11 million of District of Columbia funds, has been added to the budget to intensify efforts to combat crime, increasing these funds by about 36%.

Outlays for commerce and transportation and agricultural and natural resource programs will rise by about 6% each.

Spending for space exploration will decline by 8%.

Moreover, this Administration is determined to produce a better return for taxpayers' dollars through a more efficient use of available resources and by redirecting resources into more effective uses. For example—

Reorganization of the Manpower Administration has resulted in the creation of a Federal training and employment service which combines for the first time in one organization responsibility for work, training and placement programs.

A new program for experimental schools is proposed to try out a broad range of alternative methods of teaching children under experimental conditions.

New legislation has been proposed to establish a program of guaranteed loans for construction of hospitals and other health facilities and grants for needed new facilities to help restrain fast-rising medical care costs.

An increase in social security benefits which recognizes the increased cost of living is included in the Administration's proposed 1970 budget.

Postponement of the freeze on welfare aid to families with dependent children will be proposed, and $307 million has been included in the revised budget outlays for this purpose.

A new grant program will be initiated to permit States to participate in directing, coordinating, and improving the effectiveness of manpower training programs.

An office of Minority Business Enterprise has been established in the Department of Commerce to—

assist the establishment of new minority enterprises in the expansion of existing ones, and

concentrate Federal Government resources and involve the business community and others in providing assistance to minority business.

The adjustments needed to finance these and other new programs will not be painless—no reductions could be—and real dedication to expenditure control by both the Congress and the executive branch will be essential to achieving them. In fact, almost 85% of the recommended decreases require congressional concurrence, either as new legislation or in the form of approval of reduced appropriations requests. The other decreases will result from administrative actions taken in accordance with the President's directions.

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

As part of the budget review, President Nixon directed that a substantial reduction be made in the level of Federal employment recommended by the preceding administration. As a result, full-time civilian employment in the executive branch on June 30, 1970 will be 47,800 below that recommended in the January budget. The extent to which these reductions will affect specific agencies is shown in Table 10 (attached).

The reductions are being made selectively, in accordance with the priorities of this Administration. Manpower for such vital needs as crime control must and will be increased.

Consistent with the employment limitation objectives, the President is asking the Congress to repeal Section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, which imposes restrictions on hiring in the executive branch. This Administration is in full agreement with the objective of Section 201, but experience administering the arbitrary formula it imposes provides ample evidence that it is an inappropriate tool for achieving its objective. The Section 201 limitation imposes especially harsh penalties on agencies with high turnover rates. And it takes insufficient account of the urgency or priorities of public services or of the manpower requirements of programs the Congress has approved since 1966.

CONCLUSION

The current review of the budget is a necessary prerequisite to accomplishing three of this Administration's major objectives.

It is a crucial part of the fiscal restraint made imperative by continuing inflation.

It is the first step in establishing control over Federal spending.

It marks the beginning of a major effort to redirect the course of Federal programs in domestic affairs.

In the last of these areas, the principal objectives of the review were to establish and enforce firm priorities, to move toward basic program reform, and to develop needed new initiatives in solving the social problems of the Nation. These are difficult tasks which cannot be completed in the course of one review. But a solid beginning has been made.

Our work is far from finished. Conditions affecting the Federal budget change constantly. We will, as we must, be alert to potential changes and exert every bit of ingenuity at our command to avoid increases and to take advantages of opportunities for further reductions.

TABLE 8.—BUDGET OUTLAYS, 1969 AND 1970

[In millions of dollars]

Agency	1969 current estimate	1970		
		January budget corrected	Revised budget	Difference
Agriculture	8,409	7,460	7,197	−263
CCC	(5,492)	(4,620)	(4,482)	(−138)
Commerce	872	1,123	1,079	−44
Defense-military and military assistance	78,400	79,000	77,903	−1,097
Corps of Engineers	1,192	1,200	1,159	−41
Health, Education, and Welfare	46,259	51,779	50,551	−1,228
Trust funds	(32,981)	(36,373)	(35,324)	(−1,049)
Housing and Urban Development	2,017	2,897	2,823	−74
Interior	889	898	830	−68
Justice	517	714	730	+16
Labor	3,503	3,707	3,690	−16
Unemployment trust funds	(2,749)	(2,877)	(2,866)	(−10)
Post Office	929	553	412	−140
State	434	434	428	−5
Transportation	6,211	5,991	6,753	−238
Treasury	16,603	17,566	17,559	−7
Interest on the public debt	(16,300)	(17,300)	(17,300)	(----)
Atomic Energy Commission	2,451	2,594	2,504	−90
General Services Administration	413	415	407	−8
NASA	4,247	3,947	3,897	−50
Veterans' Administration	7,719	7,799	7,554	−245
All other:				
Foreign economic assistance	1,925	1,839	1,760	−79
Office of Economic Opportunity	1,880	1,989	1,870	−119
Other agencies	5,136	6,612	6,538	−74
Allowances for:				
Civilian and military pay increases		2,800	2,800	----------
Contingencies		350	200	−150
Undistributed intragovernmental transactions	−5,105	−5,745	−5,745	----------
Total	184,901	196,921	192,899	−4,020

Note: Detail may not add due to rounding.

TABLE 9.—BUDGET AUTHORITY, 1969 AND 1970

[In millions of dollars]

Agency	1969 current estimate	1970 January budget corrected	1970 Revised budget	1970 Difference
Agriculture	8, 818	7, 797	7, 558	−239
CCC	(5, 789)	(4, 811)	(4, 708)	(−103)
Commerce	978	1, 061	999	−62
Defense-military and military assistance	76, 998	80, 646	77, 598	−3, 048
Corps of Engineers	1, 215	1, 155	1, 012	−143
Health, Education, and Welfare	51, 837	59, 024	58, 415	−609
Trust funds	(38, 393)	(43, 557)	(43, 557)	(..........)
Housing and Urban Development	3, 243	2, 978	2, 811	−166
Interior	844	834	764	−70
Justice	541	825	841	+17
Labor	4, 536	5, 103	4, 872	−231
Unemployment trust fund	(3, 770)	(4, 092)	(3, 874)	(−218)
Post Office	1, 036	750	610	−140
State	422	431	426	−5
Transportation	7, 431	7, 953	7, 765	−188
Treasury	16, 588	17, 569	17, 563	−7
Interest on the public debt	(16, 300)	(17, 300)	(17, 300)	(..........)
Atomic Energy Commission	2, 571	2, 468	2, 359	−109
General Services Administration	318	300	302	+2
NASA	3, 992	3, 757	3, 712	−45
Veterans' Administration	7, 489	8, 011	7, 881	−130
All other:				
Foreign economic assistance	1, 217	2, 211	2, 175	−36
Office of Economic Opportunity	1, 949	2, 179	2, 048	−131
Other agencies	8, 791	8, 805	8, 786	−19
Allowances for:				
Civilian and military pay increases		2, 800	2, 800	....
Contingencies		500	350	−150
Undistributed intragovernmental transactions	−5, 105	−5, 745	−5, 745	....
Total	195, 707	211, 412	205, 901	−5, 509

Note: Detail may not add due to rounding.

TABLE 10. FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH AS OF END OF JUNE

[In thousands]

Agency	1968 actual	1969 estimate	Fiscal year 1970 January budget	Fiscal year 1970 Revised budget	Fiscal year 1970 Difference
Department of Defense, military and military assistance	1, 256. 1	1, 235. 6	1, 235. 0	1, 215. 0	−20. 0
Post Office	549. 6	564. 5	575. 7	569. 0	−6. 7
Subtotal	1, 805. 7	1, 800. 1	1, 810. 7	1, 784. 0	−26. 7
Agriculture	85. 4	83. 0	86. 4	82. 7	−3. 7
Commerce	26. 2	25. 4	26. 0	25. 5	−. 5
Department of Defense, civil	32. 1	31. 3	31. 4	31. 3	−. 1
HEW	106. 8	102. 6	106. 7	102. 6	−4. 1
HUD	15. 0	14. 8	16. 8	15. 3	−1. 5
Interior	61. 2	59. 6	60. 9	59. 7	−1. 2
Justice	34. 4	35. 6	36. 6	38. 2	+1. 6
Labor	9. 8	9. 6	9. 7	9. 6	−. 1
State	25. 8	25. 1	24. 6	24. 2	−. 4
Transportation	58. 0	60. 4	65. 4	63. 7	−. 7
Treasury	82. 1	80. 2	85. 1	83. 4	−1. 7
AEC	7. 2	7. 0	7. 3	7. 0	−. 3
GSA	37. 5	36. 9	38. 1	36. 3	−1. 8
NASA	32. 5	31. 7	31. 5	31. 5	....
Veterans	151. 0	147. 6	152. 3	147. 6	−4. 7
Other agencies:					
AID	17. 6	16. 6	15. 9	15. 7	−. 2
OEO	3. 1	2. 9	2. 9	2. 9	....
Selective Service	7. 0	6. 7	7. 0	6. 9	−. 1
SBA	4. 4	4. 3	4. 2	4. 2	....
TVA	12. 0	12. 4	12. 6	12. 5	−. 1
Panama Canal	14. 9	14. 8	15. 2	15. 1	−. 1
USIA	11. 3	11. 0	11. 0	10. 8	−. 2
Miscellaneous agencies	32. 2	31. 2	32. 8	32. 6	−. 2
Subtotal	867. 4	850. 6	880. 3	859. 2	−21. 1
Allowance for contingencies			2. 5	2. 5	....
Total	2, 673. 1	2, 650. 7	2, 693. 5	2, 645. 7	−47. 8

Note.—Detail may not add due to rounding.

FORMER CABINET MEMBER SPEAKS OF "IKE"

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, tributes to the late Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower will continue to be paid for a long time—as the impact of his passing penetrates our consciousness. Each day brings to our attention a new and expressive acknowledgment of the integrity of this great leader. Only today I noted a guest editorial in the Lake Forester-Lake Bluff Review, a weekly publication circulated widely in the 12th Illinois Congressional District. This editorial is from the pen of the Honorable James H. Douglas, a resident of Lake Forest, who served as Secretary of the Air Force and Deputy Secretary of Defense under President Eisenhower. I offer it to my colleagues for their respectful consideration:

A TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

(By James H. Douglas, Secretary of the Air Force and Deputy Secretary of Defense under President Eisenhower)

It is an honor to join with you in expressing our respect and affection for President Eisenhower, our gratitude for his leadership, and our sense of loss in his death. He was a warm and friendly man, whose life was simple in its complete dedication to the service of his country. He had a quality of straightforward integrity which gave confidence to all those who served under him and knew him. GIs knew he was interested in them as individuals, and commanders and staff officers had unflagging trust in his judgment. Difficult problems of disagreement at high levels of authority were sometimes solved—as I have seen—by his asking a single question and quietly stating his decision.

Sometimes in a press conference President Eisenhower would produce a perplexing non sentence, which seemed to please his critics, but his sincerity and persistence in expressing his purpose left no doubt as to his position.

As a nation we were fortunate when General George Marshall selected the Chief of the War Plans Division of the War Department, Major General Eisenhower, to command United States forces in the European theatre. The war had gone badly for England, France and Russia, and few soldiers ever faced and mastered more complicated problems of command. I remember a tribute to Marshall of the Royal Air Force Lord Tedder, Deputy Supreme Commander, who wrote "There was little cheerful about the last stages of the war except the wonderful spirit which existed throughout the allied team, and for which we should be eternally grateful to General Eisenhower."

When he became President in 1953 his first concern was to bring the Korean War to a close. This goal was achieved six months after his inauguration.

His command of great military forces, his understanding of war, and what nuclear war could be, led him to declare that there is no alternative to peace.

I think he would like to have us remember that when he made his "Atoms for Peace" proposal to the United Nations General Assembly, he was seeking the cooperation of the Soviet Union in peaceful uses of atomic energy, and to begin to turn nuclear science from destructive to peaceful purposes.

In his account of the White House years he says that underlying his atoms for peace effort was "the clear conviction that the world was courting disaster in the armaments race, and that something must be done to put on a brake."

Then at Geneva in 1955 President Eisenhower proposed the plan which was called "Open Skies"—for international arms control—under which nations would deliver to each other maps and descriptions of all military installations and permit inspection by air reconnaissance by crews including representatives of the country inspected.

And he would want us also to keep in mind problems inherent in what he called "the conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry"—something new in American experience. He expressed concern "that our scholars not be dominated by federal employment, project allocations and the power of money," and also that "public policy should not become the captive of a scientific-technological elite."

General Eisenhower was always concerned with protecting and building the dignity of the individual, regardless of race or creed, in the armed services and in all of American

> life. He left us a great example. He greatly loved his country, and there is undying mutual respect and trust between him and his countrymen. We shall miss him.

WASTE DISPOSAL

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have advised my colleagues of the progress made by Government and industry in the many attempts to solve various phases of the waste disposal problem.

I was pleased when the Secretary of the Interior announced in October 1965 that the Bureau of Mines was undertaking a study of how to deal with auto graveyards and to conserve the valuable metals that are a part of every car. To me, the report on that study, which was published in March 1967, was an excellent publication and valuable enough to be given the widest distribution.

To what extent that report was circulated I am not aware, but it occurs to me that somewhere we are falling down in the vital area of communications with respect to what is being done toward resolving the problem of solid waste disposal. In consequence, some municipalities may be putting money into machines and methods that are already obsolete. They are absorbing costs that could be avoided if updated technical information were at hand, for they may be investing in equipment and systems that are as outdated as the model T.

Perhaps the Office of Solid Waste Disposal has in its few years of life accumulated enough information to ascertain whether there is in fact a knowledge gap that can be narrowed through a clearinghouse for the collection and dissemination of progress reports throughout the field of waste disposal. It is for this reason that I am asking that Office for recommendations to broaden exchange of information among Federal, State, and local governments as well as with affected industries.

I am also interested in knowing whether it would be possible to determine if a part of the effort aimed at solving the disposal problem may actually be moving counter to the Nation's long-range interest. I have always opposed proposals to get rid of used cars by dumping them in the ocean deep or burying them in stripped-out areas or anywhere else, for I am convinced that the day will come when we will need the steel scrap and other salvageable items that represent utilization of natural resources. In this connection I was pleased to note this remark by Mr. William S. Story, executive vice president of the Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, as quoted in the New York Times of last January 26:

> Something is going to have to be done about the failure of the nation to keep up with the rate of discard of metallic products. It is a profligate waste of our natural resources to permit old automobiles, refrigerators, stoves and the like to molder in our fields and clutter our streets while we mine increasing amounts of natural resource, iron ore, and rely heavily on imported iron ore to help meet our needs.

I have had correspondence in the past from Mr. Story, whose theory is that no economy can profit from waste nor can a nation in our position rely heavily on foreign sources of raw materials. Yet America has been guilty of these practices for a long, long time.

On March 7 of last year the Johnstown Pa., Tribune-Democrat published an Associated Press account of a refuse disposal demonstration at the University of Pennsylvania in which the trash collector would be dispensed with through the use of equipment that would grind up cans, garbage, newspapers, and other materials into minute particles that could be washed away into pipelines and dumped into land-fill projects. While there is no question but that the idea would have multiple benefits, the day may not be far away when we will discover that we cannot afford to dispose of all trash in this manner.

How long, for instance, can we tolerate the burning of newspapers? Or grinding them up? A Pennsylvania waste paper executive has said that if it were not for his industry—whose product goes back into the manufacture of paper and paper products—the forest resources of this country would have been depleted long ago.

Furthermore, the Bureau of Mines is engaged in research to find ways of recovering iron, aluminum, zinc, copper, lead, and tin from the burnt waste residues of municipal incinerators. In Japan, a large press reduces garbage to 5-ton blocks which are then encased in concrete and dipped in asphalt baths. The blocks are used as building materials or as land fill. The Bureau of Mines has also reported on a project through which lightweight concrete building blocks moulded around compacted automobile scrap show promise as desirable material for use in light commercial buildings, bridge abutments and piers, foundations, and retaining walls.

In view of such developments, everyone engaged in any phase of waste disposal technology and application should certainly be apprised of whatever is taking place in government or elsewhere. Otherwise, there are certain to be costly projects at cross-purpose with the national view.

The disagreement over the plan to dump Philadelphia garbage in abandoned anthracite surface mines has become as ugly as the strip pits themselves. In Pennsylvania and whatever other States use or contemplate this method of waste disposal, all available technology must be applied to determine where landfills would create air, water, or soil contamination.

For the RECORD, I should like to quote the following paragraph from Outdoor Recreation Action published by the Department of the Interior in January 1968:

> In a cooperative venture, the city of Chicago, the American Public Works Association, the U.S. Public Health Service, and the New York Central Railroad have started a three-year, $468,800 experiment of removing trash and garbage from urban areas to rural areas for disposal. Trash is compressed into 40-foot containers, then delivered by flatcars to land reclamation areas where bulldozers cover the trash with dirt from mining operations.

Since like methods are presumably in use or under consideration elsewhere, some of us may wonder whether an Intratrash Commerce Commission will eventually be required to regulate the transfer of waste materials.

What concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is whether there is proper communication among those searching for facts to make this plan workable. I trust that the Office of Solid Waste Disposal is keeping up with all such developments and making the information available to all interested parties.

We are certainly not going too fast in our attack on the problem, but we may be overlooking important, vital steps that have already been put to use along the road to scientific progress. Unless we keep abreast of what is happening nationally, and internationally too, there is certain to be duplication and waste of funds as well as waste of natural assets. I am hoping that the Office of Solid Waste Disposal can get us on the right road if indeed there has been, as I suspect, a tendency to go off in all directions.

VIETNAM WAR SPURS INFLATION

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in his message to the Congress on April 14 President Nixon stressed two issues among the many currently competing for the attention of the Federal Government. Those issues are the war in Vietnam and inflation.

The costs of the war in Vietnam—in both men and resources—have been pointed out on numerous occasions by many Members of Congress, including myself. Last week American combat dead moved past 33,000, a total greater than the aggregate number of American servicemen lost in the entire Korean war. These grim figures are not the end, however, for the fighting continues to claim dozens of American lives each day, and countless numbers of Vietnamese, and the Paris negotiations continue to flounder on procedural issues. The Vietnam war is now the fourth costliest war in the history of the United States, exceeded only by the cost of American involvement in the two World Wars and the Civil War. How much greater will the cost have to be before Congress will exercise its power to end this war by refusing to vote funds to support it?

The economic consequences of the Vietnamese war—although they are less clearly understood—are nevertheless also extremely serious. Perhaps the most significant aspect of those economic consequences is the relationship between the escalation of the war and the increasing inflation in our economy that has accompanied that escalation.

An article by John O'Riley in the April 14 Wall Street Journal dramatically points out the way in which the Vietnam war has stimulated the inflationary spiral that is now of such concern to economic thinkers and strategists. By requiring massive military expenditures, and by diverting badly needed manpower into the military effort in both the factory and the field, the article argues that the war will continue to frustrate efforts to reduce inflation through either reduced Federal expenditures or increased taxes. As Mr. O'Riley additionally points out:

> What happens with regard to (the war's) continuance or termination will have a far greater impact on the domestic economy than any moves by the monetary authorities.

I hope President Nixon will heed Mr. O'Riley's advice; for if he is truly committed to securing peace in Vietnam and curbing inflation in our economy, he must realize that the most expeditious way of both saving lives and reversing inflationary pressures is to speedily end the war in Vietnam. Congress must also realize that it can end the war by refusing to vote further appropriations for its prosecution. I insert the following article in the RECORD and urge that my colleagues give the arguments advanced by John O'Riley their closest consideration:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 14, 1969]

THE OUTLOOK: APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By John O'Riley)

American combat deaths in the Vietnam war have moved well above the 33,000 level. The total is greater than for all the Korean War. It is more than 60% as many men as were lost by the U.S. in World War I. The grim figures underscore a point often forgotten in homefront talk of controlling inflation. And that point is this: The conflict is well out of the "little war" stage, and what happens with regard to its continuance or termination will have a far greater impact on the domestic economy than any moves by the monetary authorities.

This country's involvement in Vietnam goes back a long way. A refresher reference to the record shows President Truman sent a 35-man military advisory team to the new state as far back as 1950. But things moved slowly for a long time. As late as 1960, President Eisenhower was increasing the number of military advisers from 327 to 685. And even as recently as the end of 1964, the U.S. force in Vietnam was only about 23,000.

But what's happened since then is a different story. In mid-1965 President Johnson authorized an increase in the U.S. force from 75,000 men to 125,000. And the total has since jumped to about 540,000.

The nation's longest economic upswing, beginning early in 1961, spans the 1960s. The big military escalation, starting at mid-decade, thus cuts the boom in half. The first half was a period of relative stability. The second has not been. The beginning of today's spotlighted economic problems—the brisk inflation, the manpower squeeze, the soaring interest rates—coincided very neatly with the war's rather sudden enlargement. And there is little real reason to expect an abatement of these problems as long as the war continues at its present or a hotter pace.

The difference between the first half of the current "boom" and the latter half is often overlooked or forgotten. The period is viewed as a single stretch of humming economic activity, but it should be looked upon as two pretty distinct periods—the first ending in 1965 and the second covering the years since then.

It isn't hard to document the difference. Without going into heavy detail, a glance at a few key figures tells the story. The table below sketches what happened between 1961 and 1965 and also the trend pattern between 1965 and the present. Defense figures represent annual spending rates. The wholesale price index and unemployment rates are those prepared by the Labor Department. And the bond yield figures are averages on high grade corporate bonds computed by Barron's magazine.

	1961	1965	1969
Defense (billion dollars)	47.4	49.6	81.0
Prices (wholesale)	100	103	111
Bond (yields percent)	4.36	4.44	6.88
Unemployment (percent)	6.7	4.5	3.4

Note the defense spending figures. Americans are accustomed to big defense outlays, of course. Such spending has been on a vast scale since the start of World War II. Its magnitude didn't change too much, however, between 1961 and 1965. Since then has come the great leap of more than $30 billion to the $81 billion stratosphere.

How much money is $81 billion? One way to measure it would be to compare it to a year's expenditure on all types of construction ($84 billion last year) in this country. Add up the money spent in a full year on building all the new homes, all the apartment buildings, all the factories, the warehouses, the shopping centers, the motels, the schools, the bridges, the highways—the whole works from Maine to California—and you have only slightly more than is spent on defense in a year.

This kind of gigantic spending, even in the huge American economy, carries an inflationary punch of tremendous force. As long as it continues, price restraint is not going to be easy.

Both prices and interest rates, as reflected in bond yields, it will be noted, also held relatively steady in the first half of the decade. The big upturn has come since 1965.

The unemployment rate, a barometer of the manpower pinch, has declined steadily all through the decade—but a drop from 6.7% to 4.5% is not the same as a decline from 4.5% down to 3.4%. Today's unemployment rate is extremely low by historical standards. In fact it is a rate peculiar to war periods. We have it now, we had it in the Korean War, we had it in World War II—and these are the only times we have had it in the past forty years.

It is hard to measure precisely the direct impact of the war effort on the country's manpower. But it is possible to get a pretty clear idea by noting the growth since 1964 in (1) the number of defense industry workers, (2) the number of men in the military service, and (3) the number of Defense Department civilian employes. In the table below, figures represent millions.

	1964	*1969*
Defense manpower	1.2	1.6
Military manpower	2.6	3.4
Department of Defense civilians	1.0	1.3

The defense workers are those employed by defense product industries as compiled by the Government, and, while the workers and their employers also make some civilian products, their number is considered a good measure of defense work employment.

Thus a rough tabulation indicates that something like 1.5 million men have been taken out of the civilian labor force for military-related effort since 1964. This may not seem like many people in a big country like this one. But it is far more than are employed making all the automobiles and auto equipment (about 910,000) in the United States. It is more than the 1.3 million employed by all the primary metal industries—steel, copper, aluminum, etc.—combined.

The Far Eastern conflict, then, fuels the inflationary fire in two ways. It demands massive military spending. It also, in a time when manpower is already short, adds to the pinch by diverting men to military effort both in the factory and in the field—thus stimulating labor cost increases that are outrunning productivity.

SP4C. GEORGE J. GOTTWALD, JR.

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the membership of the House the following material concerning Sp4c. George J. Gottwald, Jr., who gave his life for his country in Vietnam. Four veterans posts and the Boston Fire Department Band participated in an inspirational ceremony honoring George J. Gottwald, Jr. Over 1,200 people in the Boston area attended the public dedication and some 300 guests and participants attended a buffet honoring the Gottwald family by the Cecil W. Fogg Legion Post of Hyde Park, Mass.

WBZ-TV did a 6-minute news special pictorial review of the dedication ceremonies, also attended by Specialist Four Gottwald's younger brother, Frederick Gottwald, who performed the unveiling of the sign portion of the affair. A scholarship fund in the name of George J. Gottwald, Jr., has been started by the Roslindale High School student body.

I did not want this occasion to pass without national recognition of the supreme sacrifice made by this fine young man who exemplified all that is good in American youth:

SP4C. GEORGE J. GOTTWALD, JR.

Born: Boston, Mass.

Educated: Boston Public Schools.

Parish: St. John Chrysostom.

Enlisted: U.S. Army, October 1966.

Parents: George J. and Caroline Gottwald, 6 Metropolitan Avenue, Roslindale.

Specialist Fourth Class George J. Gottwald, Jr., volunteered to lead his Platoon on a hazardous mission in Viet Nam and was intercepted, intermittenly, by enemy machine gun fire, while crawling to the aid of a wounded Medic.

Wounded three times by enemy machine gun fire, he remained undaunted—and fell mortally wounded under heavy concentrated enemy fire in his fourth attempt to reach the side of his Comrade.

Posthumously awarded the Silver Star by direction of the President of the United States, March 8, 1968.

This Memoriam Tribute published by his Brothers and Sisters: Frederick, William, Richard, Thomas, Edward, Caroline, Jean and Denise Gottwald and distributed in commemoration of the: George J. Gottwald, Jr., Square.

Dedication: Sunday, March 23, 1969, 2 p.m. at the intersection of Washington Street and Metropolitan Avenue, by the Cecil W. Fogg American Legion Post and Affiliates.

George J. Gottwald, Jr., 1948–1968, "Who Died in the Service of His Country"

A Soldier who falls in the line of duty, deserves our humble respect and profound gratitude.

George J. Gottwald, Junior, was such a soldier.

His Spirit and Courage, His Dedication to duty, place him among the hallowed ranks of Patriotic Americans whose unfailing Love of Country and Loyalty to their Comrades in Arms; have since the birth of our Country, secured the blessings of Liberty for all Americans.

Specialist Fourth Class George Gottwald never planned great battles nor did he lead an Army in the field. He did more than that: He gave his life for his Country.

There is no greater Sacrifice.

There can be no honor paid to his Memory that can fully express how much we revere it. Yet, the Cecil W. Fogg Post of the American Legion, of Hyde Park, Massachusetts, and their Affiliates; is doing what it can by Dedicating the George J. Gottwald, Jr., Square, to the memory of this brave boy.

The Legion's National Commander William C. Doyle has said of the Patriotism exemplified by George J. Gottwald, Jr:

"It is a Respect for the Rights of our Fellow Man. It is a Concern for Freedom of Man, as our God given Rights; but a recognition also that every Right carries with it an accompanying Responsibility."

George Gottwald did not shirk that Responsibility.

By his heroic act he has upheld the Honor and Tradition of the Military Services of the United States of America.

May every Bostonian, as he passes through the George J. Gottwald, Jr., Square, remember the Man for whom it is named and Soldiers like him who have Sacrificed in order that others can enjoy the blessings of Democracy and Freedom.

My heart goes out to Family and Friends assembled at this Dedication.

I salute the Cecil W. Fogg Post and their Affiliates the V.F.W. All Boston Post of Roslindale, the William Doyle and Irving K. Adams Post of the Legion and the Boston Fire Department Band for their participation at this worthy, patriotic ceremony.

It is my prayer that this fine American will not have died in vain—that through his heroism we have been brought a little closer to a just and lasting peace.

John W. McCormack,
Speaker, U. S. House of Representatives.

(Read by Master of Ceremonies Peter L. Caparell at the opening of the Dedication Ceremonies at the George J. Gottwald, Jr., Square., Sunday, March 23rd at 2:15 p.m.)

A Piece of America

(By Peter L. Caparell)

George J. Gottwald, Junior, was reared and educated in Roslindale.

Roslindale was his corner of America.

It was here—knitted within the social fabric of this ethnic community—that he developed the moral and the spiritual values that was to be put to the *supreme test* in a primitive jungle—some 8,000 miles from this intersection.

I said that Roslindale is an ethnic community. By that, I mean, George Gottwald grew up with, sat in classrooms with, mingled with and worked elbow to elbow with decent Americans of Irish, German, Italian, Greek and Lebanese extraction.

Right here on this little dead end strip of Metropolitan Avenue, where he lived and romped as a youngster: where there are no less than eleven homes—do we find the ethnic composition of families of which I just spoke. More than that, we find represented in those eleven houses, Veterans of World War I, II, Korea and now Vietnam.

His next door neighbor was a World War II Combat Medic. A neighbor who depended on George as a youngster to do many chores for him—and who sat for hours on the porch telling George stories of World War II.

Is it ironic then, that George Gottwald, Junior, died in the service of his country by crawling to the rescue of a wounded Medic?

This is the typical American story of a large or small community, whether it be Roslindale—or Sweetwater, Texas, and George Gottwald, Junior, was the typical American boy, who hung out at the corner drug store, lounged in the coffee shop, raised cain in the playground and pumped gas for his neighbors at the filling station just up the street.

Only, what he did in Vietnam—was not typical.

No one—who forfeits his life—in an effort to save the life of a wounded comrade—can be classified anything—but *extraordinary.*

And so, we are assembled here today, on a holy sabbath, to pay tribute to the memory of an outstanding, religious and dedicated young American, who left his home on this dead end strip as a boy and died as a hero on a remote jungle strip.

It is this greatness of young Americans like the George Gottwalds, that *keep* America Great.

As his neighbor and adult friend, I salute his memory with this sentiment:

The drum beats have rolled. The rifles have barked. The bugle has sounded, and in George Gottwald, Junior, a *Piece of America* has left us.

A Piece of America—a chip—of the fibre of Plymouth Rock; has drifted like a twinkling star into the vastness of Eternity.

George J. Gottwald, Junior, has returned to his maker—Maker of all men.

(Recited by City Councilor Patrick F. McDonough, Father of the George J. Gottwald, Jr., Square at the Dedication Ceremonies at the intersection of Metropolitan Avenue and Washington Street, Roslindale, on March 23rd at 2:30 p.m. as the Principal Speaker.)

By Direction of the President the Silver Star Is Awarded for Gallantry in Action Against a Hostile Force to Sp4c. George J. Gottwald, Jr.

On this date (2 February 1968), Specialist Gottwald was leading a five man reconnaissance patrol west of the village of An-Wy. He had volunteered to lead the patrol into an area where large Viet Cong forces were known to be operating. As the small patrol was moving through the thick underbrush, they were suddenly engaged by a large, well concealed Viet Cong force. The initial burst of fire wounded the medic and the patrol was forced to move back. Specialist Gottwald quickly positioned the other men and advanced under their cover power to his wounded medic. With complete disregard for his personal safety, Specialist Gottwald crawled across 35 meters of open rice paddy. Ignoring the heavy enemy fire, his only concern was the welfare of his wounded comrade. His advance was met by a hail of Viet Cong small arm fire and he was wounded twice but continued to crawl on. Finally, he fell mortally wounded to the concentrated enemy fire. Specialist Gottwald gave his life in an effort to save a fellow soldier. Specialist Four Gottwald's unquestionable valor in close combat against numerically superior hostile forces is in keeping with the finest traditions of the military service and reflects great credit upon himself, the 1st Infantry Division, and the United States Army.

Authority: By direction of the President, as established by an Act of Congress, 9 July 1918 and USARV Message 16695, dated 1 July 1966.

Department of the Army,
Headquarters 1st Infantry Division,
APO San Francisco.

RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I joined my colleagues in the House to commemorate the 51st anniversary of independence for Byelorussia, a nation which has been subjugated to Soviet occupation almost since its birth.

On March 23, 1969, the friends of Byelorussia met at the Biltmore Hotel in New York City in a commemorative assembly to observe this anniversary and to pledge their continued support to free Byelorussia from its oppressors. A resolution was adopted by the assembly outlining the plight of the Byelorussians and urging the help of all free nations to see that the injustice suffered by these fine people is brought to an end.

At this time I would like to place the resolution in the Record, so that all may know what conditions exist in Byelorussia. To my Byelorussian friends and neighbors, I once again state my unceasing and enthusiastic support in the struggle to see their homeland once more independent.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolution Adopted by the Commemorative Assembly, Celebrating the 51st Anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic in Minsk, Capital of Byelorussia, on March 25, 1918

Whereas within the territorial limits of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian people are being deprived of their natural rights and liberties to which they are entitled as free men, and which rights had been granted and guaranteed to them by the Byelorussian Democratic Republic in 1918—namely, those freedoms of conscience, worship, speech, press, assembly, petition, and the right to democratic government and elections;

Whereas the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, administered as a colony from the Kremlin, persists in its barbarous policies of exploiting workers, demoralizing intellectuals, and subjecting the rural population to the dehumanizing feudal system of the collective farms;

Whereas Soviet Russia, with the aid and collaboration of her puppet regime in the BSSR, relentlessly continues to plunder the national resources of Byelorussia, to exploit the labor of her people by forced production quotas, and to retard and undermine the economic development of the nation;

Whereas Soviet Russia continues to implement a genocidal policy of mass deportations of the Byelorussian population, especially its youth, to forced settlement and russification in the arid and frozen wastes of Siberia and other uninhabitable areas of the Soviet Empire;

Whereas Soviet Russia continues to follow a calculated policy of national genocide against the Byelorussian people within the frontiers of the BSSR by the conscious russification of its schools, literature, press, radio, institutions of higher learning, and the complete cultural milieu of the people;

Whereas the commuist party of the BSSR, under the tutelage of Moscow, attempts to conceal from the peoples of the world the political oppression, social exploitation, moral terror, colonial pillage, and the genocidal russification of the Byelorussian people behind an elaborate screen of falacious propaganda which expounds the "prosperity" that the Byelorussian people supposedly attained under the communist system. This dissemination of propaganda is especially intense this year which marks the fiftieth anniversary of the Bolshevik proclamation of the Byelorussian Socialist Republic on January 1, 1919 in Smolensk, as a prelude to the Red aggression against the new Byelorussian Democratic Republic to quench the spark of freedom before it engulfed the yet unstable communist empire.

Whereas the Byelorussian people have valiantly persisted in their fifty-year struggle against an alien form of despotism imposed upon them by Soviet Russia at a sacrifice of millions of lives felled before innumerable firing squads and lost to starvation and disease in the concentration camps of Siberia;

Now therefore, we, the participants of this Commemorative Assembly observing today, on the 23rd of March 1969 in the City of New York, at the Hotel Biltmore, the Fifty-First Anniversary of the Proclamation of Byelorussian Independence on March 25, 1918, do hereby unanimously indict before the peoples and nations of the world, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its colonial puppets in the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic of perpetrating the universally condemned crime of genocide against the Byelorussian people by consciously pursuing policies which are calculated ultimately to result in the total ethnic annihilation of the Byelorussian people; furthermore—

We appeal to the Byelorussian people not to lose hope and to continue their arduous opposition to Soviet attempts to destroy Byelorussia as a nation; and we hereby pledge our support of their struggle for self-preservation by all possible means within our power;

We appeal to all peoples who value the principles of freedom, justice and democratic government to utilize all possible means to aid the Byelorussian people in their difficult and unequal struggle with the tenacious communist despotism emanating from the Kremlin;

We appeal to all the free nations of the world to speak in the United Nations in behalf of the Byelorussian people and to protest against Moscow's genocidal policies directed at the ethnic annihilation of Byelorussia, and to demand from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to return to all the captive nations of the Soviet Empire, among them Byelorussia, their freedom which was wrenched from the young nations half a century ago by the "liberating" Bolshevik armies. We appeal to the free nations of the world because, although the BSSR has a seat in the United Nations, the Byelorussian people are not represented by a delegate who speaks out in their defense, but by a servile traitor whose only function at the international assembly is to parrot the Kremlin's destructive directives.

We earnestly hope and pray that, with God's help and the help of people of good will in the United States of America and around the globe, it will be possible in the near future for the Byelorussian people to rise up from their servile condition imposed upon them by Soviet Russia, and for Byelorussia to regain her rightful place within a community of independent and sovereign states.

VLAD KURYLO,
Chairman.

HI-SHEAR CORP. CHOSEN SUPPLIER OF THE YEAR

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Hi-Shear Corp. of Torrance, Calif., which has just been chosen "Supplier of the Year" by the Martin Marietta Corp. This is the highest award the Martin Co. has for superior supplier performance.

Hi-Shear Corp. was chosen for its outstanding performance in supplying Martin Marietta with explosively actuated separation nuts on the Titan III space launch vehicle which was built in Denver for the U.S. Air Force.

The Torrance company was selected for this top award from thousands of firms supplying goods and services to Martin Marietta. The award is part of the firm's continuing zero defects program encouraging defect-free craftsmanship and performances.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Hi-Shear Corp. for this outstanding award and for its continued exemplary contribution to our Nation's aerospace effort.

Since the beginning of our space program, Hi-Shear has provided fastening systems and separation devices for nearly every space probe, including the Mariner fly-by of Mars and the Surveyor series of moon landings.

This dynamic company has moved forward for 25 years of continued progress and contribution to the aero-space program under the able leadership of its President, Mr. George S. Wing.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to salute this outstanding company on the occasion of its selection as "Supplier of the Year." I would like to include in the RECORD a review of Hi-Shear's operations over the past year:

REVIEW OF OPERATIONS

MARKETING

The expanding market for Hi-Shear products gained momentum in fiscal 1967–1968. The increased acceptance of Hi-Shear fastener systems throughout the aerospace industry, particularly in large jet transport design, both military and commercial, resulted in net sales of $23,326,260. At fiscal year-end the company's backlog stood at an all time high of approximately $15 million.

Hi-Shear Corporation's products are marketed by its own technical sales organization throughout the United States and in Europe, Australia and the Far East. Our customers include all of the major aerospace companies and many of their subcontractors. Hi-Shear products are also used by jet engine manufacturers, the shipbuilding industry, and the electronic industry.

Throughout the company's 25 years of service to the designers and builders of aerospace machines, Hi-Shear Corporation has been able to offer a distinguished and growing line of proprietary products. These products are protected by approximately seventy-five United States patents and a greater number of foreign patents.

Today's total aerospace fastener market is estimated to be two hundred million dollars annually. Hi-Shear's fiscal 1967–1968 sales represent approximately 12 per cent of this market. Our increased marketing efforts lead us to believe that our products will become a greater part of this growing market.

Significant representative domestic aerospace programs using Hi-Shear products are the commercial jet airliners, i.e., Boeing series 707, 727, 737, and the Jumbo 747 SST; Douglas DC–8, standard and stretched versions, DC–9 plus the newly-designed DC–10 and Lockheed L1011 which is in the design stage. Also, Lockheed's huge military logistic transport, the C5A, is a large user of Hi-Shear fastening systems. Smaller commercial aircraft are also assembled with Hi-Shear products. For instance, the Grumman Gulf Stream II is literally held together with "Hi-Lok" fasteners.

The company is directing a concerted sales effort toward penetration of the precision bolt market through its Six-Wing bolt line. The sale of engine bolts is increasing.

All military aircraft produced today use Hi-Shear products. Helicopters as well as certain military land vehicles are now taking advantage of the improved assembly techniques realized by using Hi-Shear fasteners.

The increased activity in the design and construction of more sophisticated Navy vessels, such as the DE, by Todd Shipyards, is creating an increased demand for our products in that industry. Hi-Shear's explosively actuated devices and other ordnance products continue to be important to the space achievements of this country.

Hi-Shear Corporation's marketing activity includes extensive domestic and foreign advertising, as well as participation in major trade shows in the United States and foreign markets.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Sales of Hi-Shear products continue to expand in foreign markets. As U.S. jet airliners continue to be purchased by foreign carriers and U.S. airlines extend their overseas routes, the need for our company's products at service points throughout the world increases also. Hi-Shear products are used extensively in the Concorde Supersonic Transport and are being designed into aircraft in England, Europe and Japan. Wherever foreign aircraft are being designed among the friendly nations, Hi-Shear products are marketed by our company.

ENGINEERING

For the past twenty-five years, Hi-Shear has emphasized the engineering aspect of its operations. Our reputation for technical competence stems from our ability to anticipate our customers' needs in the improvement of existing products and the development of new ones.

The exacting demands of the aerospace industry have been met by a corresponding specialization in the organization of Hi-Shear's Engineering department. The past year witnessed the emergence of two separate and distinct departments—Production Engineering and Development Engineering.

Production Engineering expanded its manpower last year and successfully maintained the company's existing product lines to satisfy customers' requirements. Development of specialized installation tools is a prime function of Production Engineering and it is in this area that Hi-Shear continues to lead the entire fastener industry.

Again reflecting the company's emphasis on product development, Development Engineering manpower was increased substantially. The shop attached to this department was moved into new, expanded quarters and new machinery was assigned to exclusively serve this area. The significance of these changes during the past year is that the development of new products can now be accomplished entirely within the Engineering Department, thus eliminating costly interruptions in Manufacturing schedules and reducing the time necessary to prove a product before it goes into production. The ultimate beneficiaries of all this are the company's customers who gain a better product in less time at reduced cost.

Hi-Shear's constant search for better ways to serve its customers has earned its valued reputation for technical competence and engineering know how.

ORDNANCE DIVISION

During the past fiscal year, Ordnance completed its first full year as a separate operating division of the company and made notable strides in the development of Electro Explosive devices. In the chronicle of the company's history "from Mustang to the Moon," this division contributed significantly to the success of the Surveyor series of moon landings.

Additionally, in NASA's Mariner III space project, the Hi-Shear Ordnance Division's power cartridges were commanded to function after nearly three years in deep space. The cartridges performed perfectly to re-actuate the course correction system.

Other achievements of the Ordnance Division during the year are highlighted as follows: Development of a highly efficient compact Laser Initiated Ordnance System which uses a laser beam to ignite explosives; selection by NASA from a large field of competitors to develop the Standard Exploding Bridgewire Initiator; development of an incendiary destruct package for protecting classified information and equipment in aircraft from capture; advances in techniques for the metalizing and bonding capability of ceramics; development of a complete line of underwater release systems urgently needed in underseas exploration programs; plus numerous other projects of a highly-classified nature.

MANUFACTURING

The flexibility of this important area of operations in meeting sharply increased production volume during fiscal 1967–68 is evidence of management's ability to plan ahead.

During the past year, the company's facilities were again expanded with the acquisition of 64,000 square feet of space which is a substantial increase when added to the 50,000 square feet of new plant space constructed during the previous year. Plant expansions of this magnitude have stepped up Manufacturing's capacity to produce and deliver Hi-Shear products in the tradition of excellence which has prevailed for the past quarter of a century.

High-lighting Manufacturing's greatly expanded capabilities are other important factors such as the following:

Capital equipment—For the third consecutive year, expenditures in excess of one million dollars were authorized by management for new production machinery. Furthermore, a capital investment of a like amount is scheduled for the current fiscal year.

Personnel—While investments in plant and machinery are obviously vital to the success of any manufacturing operation, an equally important factor involves the human element. From the very beginning back in 1943, Hi-Shear's management has placed top priority on programs concerned with the welfare and training of company personnel. This investment in people has enabled the company to draw from its own ranks to fill the sharply increased demand for skilled manpower. Thus a substantial expansion in production personnel during the past year was accomplished with a minimum of outside recruiting for skilled workers.

Automation and cost reduction—For many years, the company has conducted extensive effort in this area. The evaluation of manpower efficiency and machine utilization is a never-ending process. The results more than justify the effort. The gains in efficiency and improved production methods are largely responsible for the company's ability to maintain its competitive edge in the industry.

QUALITY ASSURANCE RELIABILITY

With the step up in operations, Quality Assurance moved into expanded and thoroughly modernized quarters during the past year. The personnel complement increased and the finest equipment available was place at their disposal.

All this is vital to the success of the company's effort to maintain and improve product quality and integrity. Consequently, Hi-Shear's product rejection rate is among the lowest in the industry and has resulted in awards for quality by many distinguished customers.

Space age complexities continue to impose more exacting and stringent requirements on the company's existing products as well as on new products under development. Such requirements include greatly expanded performance parameters for spacecraft which is our training ground for modern commercial aircraft.

In the vitally important area of materials development, a new titanium alloy was introduced last year which is now in quantity production for the Lockheed Company's C–5A airplane. Also, a high-strength stainless steel introduced recently is now rapidly replacing non-stainless steels. Such items serve to expand Hi-Shear's product line and, of course, its sales volume.

The essential function of assuring the quality and integrity of its products has been well recognized by Hi-Shear's management. Such recognition has contributed in no small measure to the company's long-standing reputation for the technical excellence of its entire product line.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Employment—From a mere handful of people back in 1943, Hi-Shear now provides jobs for over 1200 people.

Personnel turnover during the past year continued to reflect a lower than average rate compared with the surrounding Southern California Labor Market. Contributing to the successful recruiting and retention of highly-skilled production employees is the fact that earnings of Hi-Shear employees are substantially higher than those reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for U.S. manufacturing in general.

Continuing progress has been made under the company's Equal Employment Opportunity program in the hiring and promotion of minority group members in all job categories.

Employee benefits.—Hi-Shear employees enjoy an outstanding company-sponsored benefit program which compares very favorably with programs offered by other major industrial employers in the Southern California area. During fiscal 1967–68 company contributions to employee benefit programs amounted to over one million dollars. The major share of this expenditure was directed to the Hi-Shear Profit Sharing Plan to which the company contributed a total of $472,500, of which amount, $447,500 went to employees other than company officers. Employee benefit programs are continually reviewed to assure their adequacy in fulfilling company objectives and to assure alignment with contemporary industry trends.

Employee activities—Hi-Shear-sponsored employee activity programs are designed to include a full range of individual and family events. These include the Annual Summer Picnic and Children's Christmas Party plus team competition in golf, bowling and darts.

Safety—During the year, the company continued to implement extensive employee-oriented safety programs. These programs have been very successful in maintaining high industrial safety standards and in minimizing the number of job-related accidents. Last year the company again received awards from the Los Angeles Chapter of the National Safety Council for its outstanding employee safety record.

Training—During the past fiscal year, the company continued to expand its employee training programs. Both on-the-job and supervisory training programs have been conducted which have helped to increase the skill level of production employees and first line supervision.

Future employee training plans contemplate additional programs that will enable Hi-Shear to continue its growth in a fast-moving and highly-competitive technical industry.

PLAYING IT BOTH WAYS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Washington Post carried an important editorial on the performance of the Nixon administration in the area of civil rights. Those of us in and out of Congress who have followed the activities of the administration in this area are well aware that the record is spotty at best and in many respects very discouraging.

I have been deeply concerned about the action—or in some cases, inaction—of this administration in the contract compliance and school desegregation programs. The cavalier treatment accorded the very able Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Mr. Clifford Alexander, was most unfortunate. One would hope that the civil rights record of the Nixon administration in the less than 3 months it has been in office—as discouraging as it has been—can be attributed to insensitivity and not design. If it is insensitive to the needs of minority citizens, then perhaps editorials such as that in yesterday's Washington Post will help to show the administration the error of its ways.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Post editorial of Sunday, April 13, to any of our colleagues who may have missed it and include it as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD. The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1969]

THE PRESIDENT AND CIVIL RIGHTS LAW

"The laws have caught up with our conscience," President Nixon said in his inaugural address. "What remains is to give life to what is in the law: to ensure at last that as all are born equal in dignity before God, all are born equal in dignity before man." Giving "life to what is in the law"—the formulation was an excellent one, clear and to the point. But Administration execution of the President's inaugural dictum has been something else again, an uneven performance and seemingly a directionless one, marked by rude, unsettling swings back and forth between upholding the law and temporizing about it.

To the extent that this can be called a policy, it is a policy of ambiguity, one which can only produce losers and not just among the black Americans whose rights and opportunities are at stake. For it is hard to see how the Administration can bring anything but trouble to itself—discontent and disappointment on all sides—by failing to give out a clear and unambiguous signal in this matter.

The latest in the series of troubling episodes concerns the resignation of Clifford L. Alexander Jr. as chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Mr. Alexander, a Negro and a Democratic Administration appointee, pointed out the implications that must be drawn from the fact that the White House had announced its intention to replace him the day after he had been the object of a vicious attack by Senator Dirksen for his efforts to enforce Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, Senator Dirksen having also suggested that he would talk to the right person in the Administration and see to it that the likes of Mr. Alexander would be fired. Mr. Alexander, in his resignation remarks, also charged the Administration with having omitted from its goals the vigorous enforcement of the "laws on employment discrimination."

President Nixon, it should be noted, had no obligation to retain Mr. Alexander in the chairman's post. But to have so entirely failed to support Mr. Alexander at a moment when he was under this kind of attack is another matter. Like so many other aspects of the Administration's mixed performance in this field, the best construction one can put on it is that nothing more sinister than inadvertence and insensitivity underlay it. That was the best that could have been said, for instance, of the Defense Department's cavalier approach to the letting of contracts to three Southern firms which were out of compliance with civil rights standards. That situation has now been in large measure retrieved, but it shook confidence sufficiently to have prompted a lawsuit on the part of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund which will seek to have the contracts revoked.

The one place where there has been evidence of firmness is at HEW where Secretary Finch has moved ahead on fund cut-offs from Southern school districts that disregard the provisions of the law and has made some irreproachable appointments to the offices charged with carrying out civil rights policy. But even at HEW, there has been a slow infusion of appointees (with or without the Secretary's unequivocal blessing is not clear) whose presence suggests that the Administration is trying to have it both ways and to please its unpleasable constituents in the South.

The point is that the Administration cannot afford an inadvertent or insensitive approach to these questions—much less an artfully misleading one. President Nixon still has much to do to gain the confidence of those citizens who will be most profoundly affected by any undermining of the laws and regulations on the books. Moreover, lacking as he does in present circumstances the funds to affirm his commitment to their well-being by moving ahead with the substantive domestic programs legislated in the past several years, he has a special obligation to affirm that commitment by way of uncompromised and unequivocal support of the laws that define and protect their rights.

Finally, there is the plain fact that by playing it both ways or even suggesting the possibility of a weakness of resolve, Mr. Nixon can only excite hopes he will ultimately be unable to fulfill on the part of those communities, corporations and public institutions that are still resisting implementation of our civil rights laws.

It will be tough politics, but good politics, when the Administration decides that its business is precisely what the President said: giving life to what is in the law.

PLAN TO CLOSE JOB CENTER DIMS SELF-BETTERMENT HOPE

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days an order has been issued to close 57 Job Corps centers throughout the Nation. Bearing the brunt of these closings are the conservation centers, three of which are located in the Second Congressional District which I represent.

When I first learned of the proposal to close these centers I immediately appealed to President Nixon commenting:

> It is tragic that this program should be crippled now that it has proven itself by combining education with good hard work to provide young men with an opportunity to become self-respecting, self-supporting, contributing members of society.

Bearing with my concern are the feelings of the communities, the center personnel, and the Job Corpsmen themselves. This feeling has been captured extremely well by Mr. Julian Fein of the McClatchy Newspapers Service in Sonora, Calif., which is located close to one of the centers, Five Mile Camp, operated by the Forest Service with a training program instituted by the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD this fine article which appeared in the Modesto Bee of April 11, 1969:

SONORA.—Part of the American dream is the hope for self-betterment and such a concept yesterday was badly shaken for young men of the Five Mile Job Corps Conservation Center upon learning their facility will be closed down.

For the hope of getting ahead recently had come to the corpsmen who a few months ago were deep in the misery of bleak city slums or half-starving in rural pockets of poverty.

With the help of counselors and teachers who have been charting brave new horizons in instructing the supposedly unteachable, corpsmen had started to believe they could become part of the "establishment," instead of living outside of it.

Both staff and corpsmen alike were stunned at news media reports saying the Five Mile Center was included in the facilities across the nation that would be closed as part of President Richard Nixon's economy drive.

EXPLAINS NEWS

Dick Broderick, a corpsmen supervisor and on first name terms with most of his men, gently told the corpsmen gathered under the tall pine trees what the news media were saying.

"The United States government usually does not conduct its business like this," Broderick said by way of explaining that no official word had come on the closedown.

And Robert Royer, center director, also was saying much the same thing to the center staff of 46 employes.

Corpsmen who have been at the center for several months came up with almost a standard reaction. They said "there are going to be a lot of kids roaming around in the streets, getting into trouble. These kids are going to end up in prison or on welfare and it's going to cost money to keep them there. The money should be spent here to keep them out of trouble and teach them how to live."

But for the newcomers, there was almost no reaction at all, almost a passive resignation that still another good thing in life was going to slip by them.

HARD TO BELIEVE

Staff members found it hard to believe that authorities could turn a deaf ear to the needs of the children of the poor.

They feel the job corps has done an excellent job for the young men of providing the specialized help, starting with developing a positive attitude and ending with vocational instruction leading to jobs.

Counselors and teachers repeatedly pointed out that by using new techniques, there is not much point in starting vocational training. Standard teaching methods used in public schools have failed with the corpsmen who are all school dropouts.

Robert Royer who has been center director since the facility started three and one half years ago says the Job Corps program has been "successful in making productive citizens out of what otherwise would be liabilities."

"These kids," Royer adds, "are deprived socially as well as economically. They come from families so deprived socially they don't know how to get out of the rut.

"Unless they can get some advantages, these youngsters will be carried on welfare or end up in prison."

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Royer lists the accomplishments of the center. More than 1,000 youngsters have completed the program, 800 of these have jobs.

A new carpentry program under union supervision has graduated to jobs 11 youngsters before they completed the one year program and 25 more are expected to finish.

The center, located in the Stanislaus National Forest, has put in $400,000 worth of improvements in the forest. With forest budget limitations, the work would not have been possible without the Job Corps, Forest Supervisor Harry Grace says.

The Five Mile Center spends $700,000 a year, mostly in Tuolumne County and the corpsmen unload a good part of their $4,500 monthly spending money in the county.

Typical of corpsmen reaction after finding out the center was slated to close was this from an 18-year old Los Angeles lad: "I've got it made now, have just finished the carpenter course and will be going home to work. I feel like a new man. But the others, they still need help."

DON'T CLOSE DOWN

A 17-year old Richmond boy who dropped out of school at 10th grade said: "I need a new start, I want to get into something so I can make a living. Don't close us down."

An 18-year old Red Bluff boy who quit school at the 11th grade. "I'm learning how to be a cook here. Other kids need a break too. If you don't help them, they are going to steal and rob to live."

From a 16-year old South Carolina boy who quit school at the ninth grade: "I was walking the streets and getting into trouble until I came here. I hope to get in with the forestry fire fighters after finishing training. Many kids need this center. Keep it open."

The corpsmen agreed that they did not get along at public school. "Teachers tried to cram it down our throats, couldn't get along with the teachers, the teachers did not care, never could get on to reading fast enough," are typical comments.

Royer says the Job Corps is taking over the rejects of the public school system—a system that does not have the time, the money and even sometimes lacks the desire to create the special programs needed.

PRAISE CORPS

The youngsters praised the Job Corps system of teaching which is based on the ability of each student to progress at his own rate of speed.

Richard Jeffs, principal of the school at the center, says a good part of developing these youngsters is to show them society cares. "And we do care," says Jeffs.

Many of our students, Jeffs explains, "have felt unwanted since they were 6 or 7 years old. Unwanted at home, unwanted at school, they find companionship and trouble roaming the streets.

"Looking at this just from an economic point of view—and there is a lot more to life than economics—consider the cost of supporting these kids on welfare the rest of their life or the cost of keeping them in prison. The Job Corps is a bargain when you compare it to the alternatives.

"But let's look at this from the moral point of view. Do we have the right to bypass the 25 per cent of our nation who are deprived? Do we have the right not to make assets out of these people."

CITES SUCCESS

Cornell Harvell, who left a teaching job in a slum to instruct at the Five Mile Center, summed it up this way:

"The Job Corps has been a success. If the centers are closed down with nothing to replace them, it will be the most disgusting thing that has ever happened."

Maurice Marsolais, a counselor and former correctional officer and former probation officer, says it is more difficult to work with men in prison. "Reaching a person already confined is so much harder because society has slapped him down, there are just more obstacles to be overcome."

Royer, a former assistant superintendent at a facility of the California Youth Authority, says corpsmen are far more responsive than the wards of CYA.

Howard Comstock, who has nothing to do with the Job Corps, is in full agreement with Royer and Marsolais.

Comstock is superintendent of the Sierra Conservation Center near Jamestown operated by the State Department of Corrections.

Comstock says, "I believe in the Job Corps. Get those kids off the streets, get them out of their environment, give them the training and education to give them a better chance in life.

"They will have less chance of being correctly oriented if you wait until they are in a corrective institution to begin their training."

As a 17-year-old corpsman from Kentucky said, "Why do they spend billions of dollars on airplanes and guns. We need it more here at home. I can't figure it out."

VERMONT REPUBLICANS HONOR JEFFERSON'S BIRTHDAY

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, April 13, marked the 226th anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest of all Americans, Thomas Jefferson. While most Americans pay annual respects to the memory of Washington and Lincoln, only rarely does Mr. Jefferson get the commemoration he so deserves.

Thus, it was a special pleasure for me to be present last Wednesday night at an extraordinary dinner honoring Mr. Jefferson's birth. It was extraordinary for two reasons: it was held in my State of Vermont, far from Jefferson's Virginia, and it was sponsored by the Vermont Republican State Committee.

The Governor of Vermont and other distinguished speakers there observed how the spirit of Jefferson formed so fundamental a part of the belief and platform of the Republican Party of the 1850's whose first Presidential platform pledged the restoration of the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson.

Perhaps the commemoration of Jefferson's birthday once again by Republicans in my small State of Vermont will herald a rebirth of interest in his principles among Republicans everywhere.

Congratulatory telegrams were received from Republican National Chairman Ray C. Bliss and from President Nixon. Speakers included Gov. Dean Davis and State representative John McLaughry of Kirby.

YOU HAVE A CHOICE

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1969, was Senior Government Day for Newaygo County, Mich. Chris Johnson, a senior at Freemont High School, spoke briefly to his fellow schoolmates. His main interests are political science, forensics, and military history. Chris plans to study law and engage in governmental work. Chris has received several awards for outstanding achievement in his school work and activities.

Because of the vitally important nature of Senior Government Day, I ask unanimous consent that remarks by Chris be printed in the RECORD.

YOU HAVE A CHOICE

I think it is obvious to almost everyone these days that the fate of America truly rests in our hands—the youth of America. Her destiny is our destiny; the challenges that will be disclosed here today are those we will have to contend with. And we can solve this fate, this destiny, this challenge in one of three ways: apathy, totalitarianism, or democracy.

If we become apathetic we are going to wind up with a corrupt, inefficient, tyrannical government—with a populace which just does not care. If we take totalitarianism we are going to wind up with a corrupt, inefficient tyrannical government—with people condoning, yea, supporting it! But if we choose democracy, then the doctrines and truths of ancient Greece will again be the rules by which all men live.

There are many today who dislike government, decrying it as being all politics. These people, apparently, are unaware of the fact that government touches all life today; if one takes no part in government one takes no part in life. So, what are your interests? The armed forces? There is a discussion group on that here today. Politics? So, too, a group on that. Health? Education? Welfare? You name it; today, too, you may discuss it.

In fact, for better or worse, government, today controls our destiny—we no longer do so directly. If you want to control your destiny then you had better control your government. But just as government determines our fate, we control that of the government, and we can control it apathetically, totalitarianistically, or democratically. To borrow a phrase coined by Gerald Ford on behalf of our generation: "Give us the tools we will build tomorrow."

Today, February 19, 1969, Senior Government Day for Newaygo County, is a day when we find out just how much of a tomorrow we are capable of building.

I thank you!

EMPLOYMENT DISRUPTION INSURANCE

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation which would authorize Federal credit unions to provide employment disruption insurance to their member-borrowers.

Purchase of this insurance would be entirely voluntary on the part of a credit union borrower and would provide for the payment of the borrower's obligations to the credit union in the event of the disruption of his employment due to personal disability. The cost of such insurance, at the option of the member, could be paid in cash, by share withdrawal, or could be included in the borrower's loan repayment schedule.

State-chartered credit unions in Michigan and many other States are authorized to facilitate their members' purchases of such insurance, but the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions has ruled that Federal credit unions do not have this authority and has opposed, or failed to recognize the benefit of, this type of insurance. Yet the desirability of this insurance which will permit a borrower to protect in advance against a hardship of unemployment caused by personal disability seems obvious to me. At a time when Government is considering extending its disability plans through social security, it is no time for Government to prohibit or impede the workingman from anticipating a "rainy day" and protecting himself through a private insurance plan against a loss of earnings due to disability. Government should not discourage but should encourage individuals to help themselves and should engage the private sector whenever and wherever possible.

The fact, too, that some Federal credit unions have already, or may decide to, become State-chartered credit unions in order to avail themselves of this insurance, is proof of its benefits and of the desires of many credit union members. The Federal bureaucracy should not stand in the way of the workingman who is thoughtful enough to protect himself against personal financial hardship.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of my bill successfully passed the House of Representatives as an amendment to the complex Federal credit union legislation we considered at the end of the 90th Congress. The Senate bill, however, contained no comparable provision, and the amendment was deleted in conference. The merits of this proposal deserve to be considered as separate legislation, and I am hopeful that the majority of my colleagues will join me and support this voluntary, but most desirable, insurance plan.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this year 1969 marks the 50th anniversary of the American Legion. I am proud to be a member of this fine organization that exemplifies the best values in America, patriotism and service to the community and their fellowman. I am equally proud to be the son of one of the founding members of the American Legion and the author of the Preamble to the Constitution of the American Legion.

The Lafayette Post of the American Legion held a celebration of the 50th anniversary on Tuesday evening, March 11, 1969. The speaker that evening was my father, the Honorable Hamilton Fish, Sr., who many of my colleagues will remember from their service with him during his long service in this body.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great amount of pleasure to insert his speech at this point in the Record:

Speech of Hon. Hamilton Fish at the Lafayette Post Celebration of the 50th Anniversary of the American Legion in Poughkeepsie, N.Y., March 11, 1969

I am greatly honored in being invited to join the Lafayette Post of Poughkeepsie in celebrating the golden anniversary of the American Legion. As one of its founders, I have seen it grow from a small acorn into a mighty oak of power, influence and as a steadfast bulwark of our Constitutional and representative government and for the principles of freedom, justice, democracy, patriotism and Americanism. It is, with its 1,700 Posts and 3 million members, the greatest organization in the United States, if not in the world, composed of war veterans who have returned to civilian life.

It might interest members of the Legion in Dutchess County and the public, to know something about the origin of the Legion and the formation of its time-tested and time-honored Preamble.

The Legion birth took place in Paris on March 15, 1919 when representatives of the various military units met to consider the formation of a veteran organization. The meeting, consisting of several hundred, decided on the name of The American Legion, and wrote a temporary Declaration of Principles and formed temporary committees to organize a meeting of World I veterans on a large scale in the United States within the next few months. Like all organizations, it was in the beginning small, but showed great wisdom not only in the choice of a name, but in its appointment of temporary committees which successfully organized the great meeting held in St. Louis on May 8, 9, and 10th in 1919.

Those who are interested in the details of the Paris Conference, should read the March edition of the American Legion Magazine. The origin and formation of the Preamble which is the very foundation and life-blood of every American Legion Post took place at St. Louis and not in Paris or elsewhere.

I was a delegate to the St. Louis Caucus from the Putnam-Dutchess District and was appointed to the Committee on the Constitution. The Chairman of that committee, Mr. Haines of Maine, for some reason I never knew, appointed me Chairman of the Subcommittee to write the Preamble and authorized me to appoint the two other members. I appointed Col. John Greenway of Arizona, who served in the Roosevelt Rough Riders and was a Colonel in World War I. He was a Yale athlete and one of the foremost mining engineers in Arizona. His statue today stands in World War I uniform in Statuary Hall in the Capital at Washington as one of the two representatives of the State of Arizona. The other was Judge Davis of Oregon who was then living in Delaware. The three of us wrote the Preamble that is known to every Legionnaire. I was a very great admirer of Theodore Roosevelt, one of our most courageous and greatest American Presidents. I knew that Greenway and Davis were also admirers of President Theodore Roosevelt and would help write a dynamic, forward-looking American Preamble.

It has been customary to give most of the credit to the Chairman of a committee, but I have always tried to give credit to both Jack Greenway and George Davis for their contribution in writing the Preamble. It was the brainchild of all three of us and all contributed important parts of it.

When it was finally perfected, I gave it to the Chairman of the Committee on the Constitution, Mr. Haines and his committee suggested a minor amendment which was acceptable to me, and then Mr. Haine presented it to the delegates of the convention for their approval, which was given unanimously. There never has been any change since that day in the Preamble, except to add an "s" to war. An effort was made by Eric Fisher Wood who was Secretary of the Paris Conference to substitute a new Preamble written by Elihu Root, former Secretary of State and a very eminent lawyer. This substitute was presented to the Resolutions Committee. I told the entire story about the creation of the Legion Preamble and the meaning of its various paragraphs and when the vote was taken, the only vote cast for the substitute Preamble by Mr. Root was by Eric Fisher Wood. President Truman and General Pershing have both publicly stated that the American Legion Preamble was one of our greatest American charters, and others have referred to it as one of the finest examples of American literature.

Many Legionnaires have claimed directly and indirectly to having something to do with the writing of the Preamble, but as Chairman of the Committee of three, I want to make it clear that no one else participated in any way in writing the Preamble.

The Preamble today represents the views, sentiments and the policies of all Legionnaires, no matter what party they belong to and regardless of race, color or creed. The Preamble has become almost immortal and is today part and parcel of the Legion, and as long as freedom prevails, the Preamble and the Legion will survive. But if freedom falls, then the Legion and the Preamble will cease to exist. The Legion is dedicated to the preservation of freedom and democracy and I mean by freedom, free speech, free press, freedom of religion, freedom to travel, freedom from fear of concentration and slave labor camps and tyrannical totalitarian Communist Governments. The only thing that Communism fears besides armed force is the spread of freedom. That is the reason that Moscow sent the Communist armies into Czechoslovakia. They knew that if freedom succeeded there, that Communism was doomed in all the satellite nations and eventually in Soviet Russia.

I am opposed to any nuclear war except in defense, but firmly urge that we support a massive freedom barrage not only in the United States, but throughout the satellite nations, Soviet Russia and China. If Soviet Russia and the satellite nations removed their iron curtains, a large part of their population would leave to live in free nations, which support civil rights and freedom.

Sirhan Sirhan, the murderer of Senator Robert F. Kennedy wrote in his notebook, "I firmly support the Communist cause and its people whether Russian, Chinese, Albanian, Hungarian or whoever." Workers of the world unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains." This is an absolute falsehood under Communist tyranny. The wage earners and workers everywhere have everything to lose under Soviet Communism. All their freedoms would be liquidated. American labor does not want to be Communized or enslaved. The preservation of freedom is the greatest issue in the world; greater than the Republican or Democratic Parties, or both combined. Freedom is the one thing that Soviet Russia fears as Communism cannot exist wherever freedom prevails.

I take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the Legion pioneers in the Lafayette Post with whom I was closely associated 50 years ago: Honorable Fred Close, Honorable John Schwartz, Harold Joseph, Rubin Von Vlack, Bill Duggan, Philip Mylord, Ely Gellert, Joseph Conte, Stephen Stec, Lewis Katz, and Frederick A. Smith of Wappingers, Honorable Griswell Webb of Hyde Park, Honorable Gordon Flannery, Roy Gillano and Thomas MacFarland of Beacon, Honorable Leonard Supple of Fishkill, Thomas J. Boyce and Stanley Vincent of Dover Plains, and John Broderick of Amenia. They were the real founders of the American Legion.

In honoring the Legion on its 50th anniversary I also want to pay tribute to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of which I have been a member for 50 years who also have fought for the same principles of patriotism, Americanism and for the preservation of freedom.

If there is any country worth living in, any country worth defending, fighting for, or dying for, it is the United States of America. This, together with the Preamble, is the credo of the American Legion. God bless freedom, the American Legion and the United States.

ALVIN M. BENTLEY

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the death of my longtime friend, Alvin Bentley, who served with distinction as a Member of the House during the Eisenhower years. I first met Al Bentley when he was a freshman Congressman and I was a senator in the Michigan Legislature. It was my privilege to campaign with him for statewide office in 1960, and to serve with him in the Michigan Constitutional Convention during 1961–62. In 1962 Michigan elected a Congressman-at-large, and Al was the Republican nominee. At that time, when the people of my State could vote for two Members of this body, one at-large and one by district, I was proud to campaign with him in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan.

Alvin Bentley distinguished himself as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. In Michigan he served with outstanding ability as the chairman of the education committee of our State constitutional convention. Always interested in education, he established the Bentley Foundation which is aiding many deserving youngsters in furthering their education. At his untimely passing, he was serving as a member of the board of regents of the University of Michigan.

Mrs. Hutchinson joins me in extending our sympathy to Mrs. Bentley and the members of the family.

THE FEDERAL-STATE EDUCATION ACT OF 1969

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today the Federal-State Education Act of 1969. This measure has been developed by the distinguished Governor of the State of New York, Nelson A. Rockefeller, and I am introducing it at his request. Similar legislation has already been submitted in the other body by Senator GOODELL.

The major intent of this measure is to share a portion of the growth dividend of the national economy with the States for the purpose of improving education within the States. A certain portion of the funds available would be distributed to the States on the basis of percentages of the total maximum grants made under title I of ESEA, the Higher Education Act and the Vocational Education Act. The remainder of the funds would be apportioned on the basis of State and local tax effort, preschool age population, and need expressed in terms of per capita income.

States would submit a plan of proposed expenditures of these moneys to the Secretary of HEW for approval, subject to the basic conditions that 20 percent be spent to the purposes of title I of ESEA, 15 percent for higher education, and 10 percent for vocational education, and consistent with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The remaining 55 percent could be used for these or other educational purposes.

I am pleased that the Governor has taken the initiative in developing the basic elements of a plan for the sharing of Federal revenues with the States, and I am particularly glad that he is focusing the initial thrust of such a plan on helping the States meet the rapidly rising cost of education. In a word, we need a program that reflects the magnitude of the problem.

This proposal, it seems to me, is one element in an overall national approach to the problems of educational financing. Clearly, the first priorities must be full funding of existing programs and implementation of the relevant recommendations on the year-old Riot Commission Report. ESEA title I, for example, is funded in the 1970 budget request at $1.6 billion less than the authorization—a shortfall of 59 percent. The President's newly revised budget cuts moneys for title III of the same act by $56 million and reduces funds for library books and equipment by $71 million. These reductions in education appropriations are serious and should not stand.

When these cuts have been restored and there is full funding of existing authorizations, we can move on to consider new approaches, such as the one that Governor Rockefeller is putting forth to encourage greater State efforts with Federal seed money. With property taxes becoming increasingly inadequate as the financial basis for public school systems and with ordinary operating expenses becoming so high that some systems cannot afford to remain open for the regular school year, it is quite clear that we need a new departure in the financing of education in this country. But I cannot overemphasize the fact that new approaches are not a substitute for the full funding of existing programs.

I would caution, however, in the development of legislation to share Federal revenues with the States for education, that there are a number of potentially troublesome areas that must be dealt with very carefully if we are to establish a genuinely sound program. For example, the proposed allotment formula must be examined with the utmost care, because formulas once enacted have the tendency to perpetuate forever undisturbed. Further, I have added certain language to the Governor's legislation to make crystal clear our commitment to upholding the school desegregation guidelines which call for an end to all dual school systems by September 1969, and to guard against reopening the church-state controversy.

While any legislation in the area of education or any other form of Federal assistance, is, of course, subject to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which requires nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs, I think that this matter is so vitally important that an explicit statement of compliance with this provision should be a part of any program under which funds go to the States for general education purposes. The subterfuges to avoid compliance with the school desegregation guidelines and to subvert the intention of the Supreme Court in invalidating freedom of choice plans are legion, and I believe that from the very beginning a new departure in educational financing must make it crystal clear that its funds are not to be used in the pursuit of any activities which are not in strict compliance with the law of the land.

The church-state language would provide equitable access to funds under this legislation for children in nonpublic schools, provide a bypass mechanism where a State legally cannot provide such aid, and require that title to all property acquired with these funds remain in a public agency and that the public agency will administer the funds. Opportunity for judicial review is also included. As the Congress considers this kind of proposal, I think it would be well to bear in mind the warning of the Task Force on Education appointed by President Nixon prior to his inauguration and headed by Alan Pifer of the Carnegie Corp. The task force states that the church-state issue could become "once again a lively area of controversy" if there is "an unsophisticated effort to rearrange the methods through which Federal aid is channeled to the support of education, either through some general aid plan, a badly designed bloc grant or a clumsy scheme for the consolidation of legislation. Such an effort could easily upset the present delicate church-state accommodation: Politically, by granting the public school such broad benefits that the competitive position of the private schools would be simultaneously undermined; legally, by permitting private schools to obtain a range of services—that is, payment of general teachers' salaries or ownership of real property—which would result in litigation testing the legislation's constitutionality."

Finally, the legislation provides that 55 percent of a State's allotment may be used for virtually any educational purpose. I believe that some limits, still broadly defined, are necessary to insure that a State is spending its money on the most urgent educational problems of its communities, particularly aid to the disadvantaged. For example, while the training of museum aides or National Guardsmen is technically "education," I do not conceive—nor do I believe that the Governor conceives—of these as appropriate activities for the expenditure of funds from this act. The intention of this legislation is to help States and localities close the gap between rising educational costs and their own revenues; generally these will involve expenditures for traditional education costs, such as construction and equipment, and for innovative purposes, such as enrichment and remedial programs for the disadvantaged and large-scale attacks on the special problems of urban education.

No doubt there will be other refinements that the Congress will want to include as it considers this legislation. These may include provision for advance funding, which is so important to meaningful educational planning, and for recovery and reallocation of unused funds.

I hope that the Congress will take a hard look not only at the salutary financial effects of a program of revenue sharing but as well at the delicate problem areas involved in an approach of this sort. A block grant is not a simple matter of handing money to a State with few strings attached; as representatives of the American people we are also charged with insuring that this money, as much as any other public funds, is used for its intended purpose.

HITTING THE "PUSHERS" OF DRUGS

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, the narcotics problem in the United States certainly deserves close scrutiny by the 91st Congress, and, I think, demands some reevaluation of the tactics used to combat drug abuse. An all-out war must be declared against the trafficking of dope to prevent further spread of dangerous drug usage by thousands of citizens, particularly young people.

Before the narcotics problem became so widespread in our Nation, a philosophy developed within law-enforcement agencies to concentrate primarily on getting to the ultimate source of drug traffic. In other words, police efforts were not aimed so much at the common "pusher," but at the "big wheels" behind the massive dope distribution network. This philosophy continues to transcend our present policies regarding enforcement of antidrug statutes. Even in the face of mounting statistics showing ever-increasing usage of addictive narcotics, we have continued to play down the crime committed by the person who actually puts the drugs in the hands of the user in hopes of tracing the product sold back to its wholesale marketer. Obviously, this policy has not curtailed narcotics traffic and may have even encouraged people to believe that it is relatively safe to engage in pushing drugs at the local level.

Congress should evaluate our drug attack with an eye toward reversing the priorities. We should encourage and support policies and programs which seek to dry up all manifestations of the trafficking of drugs. In particular, we must begin to apprehend and prosecute the "pushers" who daily make their living by leading others toward addiction and thus dependency. In effect, we must toughen our attitudes and actions toward the lower echelons of the dope distribution network.

I have talked to law-enforcement officials who admit that they know who some of the "pushers" are in various localities, but who say that they have tended to ignore these arrest possibilities in hopes of being led to a bigger prize. In cases where exact identification of "pushers" is not known to the officials, the information could be readily obtained since a vast range of drug users and nonusers among our youth know where to go and whom to contact if dope is desired. Yet, the "pushers" often go on with their activity relatively untouched by our legal system because they are considered to be mere lackeys in the narcotics problem. In addition, the rather astounding argument has been advanced that we should not curtail the sale of drugs by the "amateurs" because this will encourage more participation in distribution by the "professionals," usually defined as the criminal underworld, who prefer the sale of hard drugs with the resultant bigger profits, to the sale of so-called mild drugs.

If I may be permitted to draw an analogy, our battle against dope distribution is somewhat akin to a rather grotesque military strategy. It would be unimaginable for a battlefield commander to instruct his troops not to fire upon the soldiers on the other side but take aim only when an enemy general came into view. However, the drug attack has been waged utilizing almost precisely that kind of reasoning. It is high time that we recognize that the generals in drug traffic are only as effective as their troops in the field.

I do not mean to imply that we should reduce our efforts to weed out for prosecution the persons back of the national trafficking of dope. This would seem to be a matter of concentration by Federal narcotics agents since organized crime enters the picture substantially and control of the activities of professional crime syndicates is certainly beyond the scope of most local police departments. However, it seems to me that we must also deal forcefully with those who represent the immediate source of narcotics for the growing numbers of dope users. Programs have to be developed that will provide the law-enforcement agencies in States, cities, and rural areas the direction they need to eliminate the pushers that plague many areas throughout the Nation.

It is fine to talk of solving problems by eliminating their root causes, but responsible action often must be directed toward meeting immediate needs. The drug abuse problem now gripping the country demands dealing with some very fundamental and obvious factors. Foremost, the problem cries out for strict enforcement of the laws relating to the selling of narcotics and stiff sentences for persons convicted of supplying those goods that lead toward drug addiction. My argument finds backing in an editorial published in the Lancaster New Era of Lancaster, Pa., on April 1, 1969. I include that editorial in the RECORD at this point:

HITTING THE "PUSHERS" OF DRUGS

Dr. James Z. Appel, of Lancaster, a past president of the American Medical Association, put his finger on elemental factors in the campus drug symposium made up mainly of educators Monday at Hershey.

Dr. Appel called for strengthening the laws against the sellers of the drugs—the "pushers" who make a living by encouraging others to take drugs.

The "pushers," whom Dr. Appel called the "dregs of society," do best financially with those to whom drug use becomes habitual.

The "pusher" commits crime himself, and leads to commission of crimes by the habitual users, who will steal or rob to get the cash to buy the drugs.

A start can be made on Dr. Appel's proposal in the Legislature of our own Commonwealth. Lawmakers and police can review the present laws to see how they can be made tougher.

A national review is also highly timely, since organized crime operates across state borders and "pushers" are often merely at the end of a long syndicate line.

Dr. Appel made a number of pertinent points in his speech. To educators, he entrusted the mission of finding out why students use drugs, and what the schools can do to get at the roots of the problem.

No sector of society can stay aloof from seeking solutions. If there is to be any improvement, everyone interested in youth, and in the future of the nation, should become involved in the battle.

STANFORD SCIENTISTS AGAINST ABM DEPLOYMENT

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 4 at a convention on science in society in the Stanford Memorial Church, 342 Stanford area scientists and engineers signed a statement expressing deep concern over the pending deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system.

The petition was signed primarily by scientists and engineers as indicated by the following breakdown of signatures:

Physics	88
Biology	62
Chemistry	23
Engineering	48
Mathematics and computer sciences	18
Medical science	17

These figures include 104 faculty members and postdoctoral fellows, 109 graduate students, and 54 industrial engineers and scientists. It is my opinion that this expression of public and professional concern should be taken into careful consideration and it is for this reason I include the following petition in the RECORD:

We, the undersigned members of the Palo Alto-Stanford scientific community, are extremely concerned about the use of limited resources in unproductive and unnecessary military expenditures.

In particular, we stand strongly against the deployment of the Sentinel Antiballistic system.

Deployment of Sentinel will most certainly lead to a drastic acceleration of the arms race.

Deployment of Sentinel will waste billions of dollars which are sorely needed elsewhere.

Deployment of Sentinel is questionable on purely technical grounds.

The problems of society—over-population, pollution, education, hunger and urban redevelopment—should be given greater priority at this time than the construction of the Sentinel system.

We urge you to direct your energies against the deployment of the Sentinel Antiballistic Missile System.

INVOCATION OFFERED BY THE AMERICAN LEGION NATIONAL CHAPLAIN C. J. OLANDER, AT THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, ON MARCH 15, 1969, AT THE SHERATON-PARK HOTEL

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to attend the 50th anniversary celebration of the American Legion on March 15, 1969, at which time I heard the national chaplain, Rev. C. J. Olander, of Tchula, Miss., deliver the invocation. I would like to share this timely and eloquent prayer with my colleagues at this time:

INVOCATION OFFERED BY THE NATIONAL CHAPLAIN, REVEREND C. J. OLANDER, OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Almighty God, Our Heavenly Father we are grateful to Thee for the men and women whose love for Freedom and Justice, whose vision of a nation of free men, and whose willingness to sacrifice themselves and all they possessed to bring into existence "a nation of the people, for the people and by the people." Their faith in Thee and in the principles of Truth and Righteousness has made the United States of America the greatest nation in the history of the world.

We thank Thee for those of each succeeding generation who have paid the installment due to preserve for posterity the freedom they inherited. We would not forget our sons and daughters who are now on foreign soil in defense of Freedom's Cause.

We pray, this evening, for all who are entrusted with the responsibility of leading this nation. Give a double portion of Thy wisdom and understanding and power to President Nixon, to Vice-President Agnew, and to all who work with them in administering the affairs of state, to the members of the Congress of the United States who make our laws; to the Judges of the Supreme Court who interpret the Constitution of the United States and the laws enacted; and to all who serve in offices of lesser importance.

Today, Our Father, there is uneasiness at home and abroad. The war in South Vietnam is of great concern to our people. In our homeland there is misunderstanding, confusion, prejudice, and hatred which multiply our problems. Some of our people are afraid and are ready to succumb to the enemies of Freedom.

Help us to know that our nation has always had problems. Help us also, to know that those who preceded us on the scene of action accepted their problems as challenges calling for their best thought and effort in making the United States of America a better and greater nation. Give courage and strength to the last one of us in this hour of testing.

We give thanks to Thee for the American Legion, the largest and most effective Veterans organization on earth. For her fifty years of 100% Americanism we are humbly proud. Forgive her if she has failed Thee. Help her this evening to begin the next fifty years in Thy name and for Thy glory in "Service to God and Country."

Throughout our history the United States has given consideration to her veterans. For twenty-five years, now, our nation has endeavored as never before to show her appreciation to the veterans, their widows and orphans. This could not have been done but for the Congress of the United States. For this great service we are truly grateful.

We are here to honor this the greatest legislative body in the world's history with this banquet given by our aggressive and effective National Commander Doyle.

Long live the United States of America and the American Legion.

In the name of Him who loves us and inspires us to greater "service to God and country we pray, Amen.

LABOR COURTS: A RECIPE FOR DELAY AND DENIAL OF JUSTICE

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House knows of the concerted drive to replace the National Labor Relations Board with so-called labor courts. I think that everyone should know that this campaign is being conducted and financed by some of the Nation's biggest corporations, the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. I seriously doubt that a combine like that can really hope to be believable as the protector and defender of worker's rights. Their basic aim, I believe, is to weaken and restrict the right of workers to join unions—and to bargain collectively on wages, hours, and working conditions with their employers. Anyone who thinks otherwise should read "Labor Courts: A Recipe for Delay and Denial of Justice," an article appearing recently in the Advance, the official newspaper of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO. The article is as follows:

LABOR COURTS: A RECIPE FOR DELAY AND DENIAL OF JUSTICE

(NOTE.—The idea sounds reasonable, but it's filled with booby traps—so unions oppose it.)

The nation's labor laws spell out the policy of acceptable conduct in labor-management relations. The National Labor Relations Board interprets these rules and decides whether unions and employers are complying with them.

If they are not, the board seeks to remedy the situation either through an agreement between the parties or through its decisions which are enforceable in the federal courts.

The board is now under a concerted attack by groups of employers who want to abolish it. These employers are unhappy with some of the decisions the board has been making—and propose that the five-member board be replaced by a permanent United States Labor Court.

On the surface, this seems to have the tinge of reasonableness. Our judiciary is highly respected and such a legal tribunal could be expected to apply fair and reasoned judgments in the settlement of conflicts in the labor-management arena.

But if you pursue the matter further, the real purpose of the management effort and the effect it would have on labor relations show through clearly. The imposition of a labor court over the conduct of unions and employers would only lead to a delay and even denial of justice—particularly for workers and unions.

These employer organizations staging the attack on the board make no secret that this is the broadest combined effort they have ever made.

A BIG BUSINESS DRIVE

It is a joint campaign conducted by the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce and actively supported by many of the nation's biggest corporations. The strategy is being devised by the big public relations firm of Hill & Knowlton, which is seeking to win public support for the labor court proposal.

The campaign is built around the theme that the NLRB has a "pro-union" bias. Under the past two Democratic administrations, the charges claim, the five-member agency has moved to deny management rights" to resist union organizing, bargaining demands, picketing and other areas of potential conflict. It is being deliberately directed at the public to win support for a package of so-called "labor law reform" proposals.

In attacking the board and its decisions, the businessmen and their public relations advisers failed to point out that a great majority (80 percent) of the board's rulings have been upheld by the courts. In those highly controversial cases that have gone all the way to the Supreme Court, the NLRB has been sustained in its judgment in all nine decisions that have been reviewed in the last two terms.

Why, then, do these management groups seek a new legal tribunal to interpret the labor laws?

Presumably, a reasoning judicial body would reach similar conclusions, since its decisions would be made from the same trilogy of labor laws—the 1935 Wagner Act and the two subsequent laws that amended it in some respects, the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act and the Landrum-Griffin Act passed in 1959.

The provisions in these laws guiding the behavior of unions and employers are, indeed, highly complex. While they provide guidelines for the board, each specific case that reaches the NLRB has special conditions that require individual examination and interpretation.

The board does not claim its decisions are incontestible, or that its judgments are not sometimes in error.

THE NLRB IS FAIR

But the record of the current NLRB supports its claim of impartial administration of a major federal statute. Indeed, it is an astounding record of accomplishment.

Each year, the NLRB processes over 30,000 unfair labor practice and representation cases. Each one represents a potential labor dispute, but an overwhelming majority of cases are quickly and peacefully resolved by agreement between the parties. Of the 17,000 unfair labor practice cases received by the board each year, over 90 percent are settled without extended controversy.

The rights of employers, unions and workers alike are protected by the board through its procedures.

The board is responsible for administering the canons of labor law which, essentially, protect employees in the right to join unions and bargain collectively—or to refrain from such activities if they choose. The law specifies "unprotected activities" dealing with illegal strikes and other subjects that may become unfair labor practice complaints by an employer.

An employer, in turn, commits an unfair labor practice if he attempts to interfere with or restrain employees in the exercise of their rights, refuses to bargain collectively or attempts to encourage or discourage membership in unions.

In addition to handling complaints of unfair labor practices, the NLRB also conducts approximately 8,200 secret ballot elections each year among employees to determine whether they want to be represented by a union for collective bargaining.

This is an enormous work-load for the labor agency, but it is structured to process the cases as quickly as possible. An independent General Counsel's office determines whether an unfair labor practice charge has sufficient grounds to take it to the board. NLRB trial examiners then process these complaints for ajudication by the five-member board.

In recent years, the agency has made determined efforts to speed up its case handling, with some success. But it still may take two years or more for a decision to be handed down. Court appeals may further delay legal redress.

"Justice delayed is justice denied" is an adage that takes on special pertinence when you consider the years of litigation carried on by employers seeking to frustrate the judgments against their conduct. Some corporations have earned unenviable reputations for such conduct—Rutter-Rex, Kohler Corp., Deering-Milliken and J. P. Stevens are examples.

NEW BURDENS FOR UNIONS

But management's ability to side-step remedies for violations of the labor laws would be greatly enhanced if the NLRB were to be replaced by a labor court.

Under board procedures, when a complainant files an unfair labor practice charge, the case is taken over by the Regional Director, who is part of the General Counsel's office. His office not only investigates the situation, but also carries on the legal case before the board if it is determined that a possible violation has occurred.

But if such a complaint is made before a labor court, the burden of processing the charge would fall on the employee, the employer or the union. In the case of the individual worker or small local unions, this would inevitably discourage him from pursuing remedies from the court because he would lack the financial resources to hire the legal talent to prosecute the case.

Union, too, would be heavily burdened by such a procedure, lacking both the resources and staff that an employer could provide for the courtroom test. In addition, such an investment in funds and manpower would clearly divert unions from their principal goals of organizing and collective bargaining.

There are other telling arguments that refute the effectiveness of a labor court as an administrator of our labor laws. While the delays in case-handling before the board are too long, these delays would be of short duration compared with the time that case-processing would take before a labor ocurt.

Experience in processing the labor laws through the years would also be lost. Through the extensive handling of unfair labor practice cases at the NLRB, the staff of the General Counsel's office has developed an expertise on the intricacies of the statutes—as well as on the practices of those whose cases appear before the labor agency.

Such experience is invaluable in the processing of cases and could not be matched within any reasonable period by those who would be required to argue their cases before a labor court.

BIG DRIVE THIS YEAR

Despite the judgments of many disinterested experts on the harmful effects that a labor court would have in the labor relations field, supporters of the management campaign are pushing legislation in the 91st Congress to create such a court.

A measure introduced by Sen. Robert P. Griffin (R–Mich.) would establish a United States Labor Court of 15 judges, appointed for a 20-year period. Griffin's 27-page bill sets up procedures to terminate the full range of activities of the NLRB and the General Counsel's office; they would be replaced by the court and an administrator. Labor court decisions could also be appealed through the judicial structure.

Under this legislation, the death-knell of the NLRB would be sounded 180 days after it was approved. As the measure says, "on the effective date of this act, proceedings pending before the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board or before the National Labor Relations Board itself shall be suspended and thereafter transferred as expeditiously as possible to the Administrator of the Labor Court . . ."

The National Labor Relations Board has been a notably fair administrator of the labor statutes—for employees, employers and labor unions alike. To abolish the agency in favor of a labor court would be to create a great imbalance against workers and labor unions.

The wheels of justice would grind to a halt.

STOP CENSUS PRIVACY INVASION

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, there are many occasions when the responsible elements of the American press are able to comment with great objectivity on controversial issues facing the U.S. Congress.

The issue of compulsory responses to a detailed questionnaire proposed to be circulated by the Census Bureau next year has provided press objectivity in the case of an editorial of the Waukegan News-Sun, of which F. Ward Just is the editor and publisher.

This reputable daily newspaper has produced a logical and meaningful editorial, in which the individual's right of privacy is given priority over the Census Bureau's effort to require a mandatory response to the 120 questions which the Census Bureau proposes to present to more than 200 million Americans next year.

I commend this significant editorial to my colleagues in the Congress:

[From the Waukegan (Ill.) News-Sun, Apr. 12, 1969]

STOP CENSUS PRIVACY INVASION

In the past few sessions of Congress, numerous bills have been introduced to prevent the U.S. Census Bureau from requiring answers to questions considered to be an invasion of privacy.

The Betts bill (H.R. 3779) has emerged as the best of the lot, and we hope it is speedily approved.

The bill is sponsored by Rep. Jackson Betts, R-Ohio, along with Illinois Republican Robert McClory and others, and would limit required answers to only six of the 120 census questions.

Federal censuses are provided for in the U.S. Constitution, and their main purpose is to guide House reapportionment to reflect the growth of the nation and population movement.

However, they have been slowly expanded over the years, largely at the request of marketing research firms, to include questions ranging far beyond the basic concept of population count.

If the Betts bill is defeated, the 1970 census will require statements of personal income from all sources, property value and rent paid, and marital status, including number of marriages, their dates and divorce information.

It will also require information on household appliances, number of cars, place of parents' birth, and whether you share your bathroom with someone else.

Persons who refuse to answer these questions will expose themselves to a fine of $100 and 60-day imprisonment. The penalty for willfully giving false information is $500 and imprisonment for one year.

Congressmen Betts and McClory have been joined by more than 100 representatives in sponsoring a bill which would allow the Census Bureau to ask anything it wants, but would limit required answers to questions in only six categories:

"1, Name and address. 2, relationship to head of household. 3, sex. 4, date of birth. 5, marital status. 6, visitors in home at the time of census.".

The bill would also eliminate the threat of imprisonment, but would leave the fines at $100 and $500.

According to Rep. McClory, marketing research firms which make use of the Bureau's statistical information are opposing the Betts bill. They claim that only 1 per cent of the population would refuse to answer the questions if it were mandatory, whereas 20 per cent would refuse if it were voluntary, thus reducing statistical validity.

As McClory has said, "These arguments are persuasive, but they do little to justify the census taker's invasion of the individual's right of privacy.

"Even assurances that the census information will be kept confidential are not too convincing when it is realized that leaks of confidential information from other governmental agencies have occurred in the past."

We agree, and we add that the government is not, and should not be in the marketing research business. Those who are should not be allowed to get a free ride on the Census Bureau's back.

REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my policy of sending newsletters to my constituents, the following is my newsletter of April 1969 I intend to send to my constituents tomorrow. I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

APRIL 1969.

DEAR FRIEND: New committee assignment—Ways and Means: Shortly after the 91st Congress convened, I was elected by the Democratic members of the House to the one vacant seat on the important Ways and Means Committee. Since all tax legislation must originate in the House of Representatives, this committee, through its jurisdiction over tax matters, is considered to be one of the most responsible committees in the Congress.

Ways and Means is also responsible for a broad range of legislation affecting most citizens including social security, medicare, tariffs, international trade agreements, welfare, and the national debt ceiling. The Democratic members of the committee have an especially important role in the organization of Congress as they select all other Democrats for their committee assignments.

The Ways and Means Committee is a good assignment and I look forward to working on tax reform and other vital matters before the committee.

Ways and Means Committee working on tax reform: The inequities and unfair preferences in our Federal Income Tax laws become more noticeable each day. Congress has delayed tax reform too long. Glaring tax loopholes enable many high income people and organizations to avoid paying any income tax. In 1967, 155 people filed tax returns on adjusted gross incomes of more than $200,000 and did not pay one penny of income tax. Included in this group were 21 people with annual incomes in excess of 1 million dollars. One very wealthy widow with annual interest income from tax free bonds of $1,500,000 did not even have to file a tax return while her gardener had to pay $350 income tax on his $5000 wage.

Under existing law, the rate of taxation is supposed to be based primarily on the ability to pay. An individual taxpayer in the lowest tax bracket pays 14 percent of his income in taxes; however, the 22 largest oil refiners with a combined net profit after taxes of $5.179 billion in 1964 paid only 4 percent in taxes. The Atlantic Oil Company had income of over one-half billion dollars from 1962 through 1967, but did not pay one cent of federal income tax.

Tax reform is essential this year.

Fairness and simplicity key to successful tax reform: While there is agreement on the general need for tax reform, there is wide disagreement on precisely what needs to be done. I think the first priority should be given to legislation to more fairly distribute the tax burden. People in approximately the same economic circumstances should pay equal amounts of tax.

There should be a *minimum* tax for all persons with income above a specified amount such as $10,000. Certainly, high income persons should not be allowed a total exemption from taxation through the use of tax loopholes as we have at the present. in establishing a minimum tax rate, it should be graduated on the principle of ability to pay.

As part of a program to achieve tax fairness, we must consider not only those who pay too little in relation to others, but also those who pay too much. A *maximum* tax rate should be established in order that no individual is required to pay more than perhaps 50 percent of his total income in taxes to the federal government.

I also support raising the *allowable standard deduction* from 10 to 14 percent and increasing the dollar limitation from $1000 to $18000. This change would greatly simplify the preparation of many individual returns, eliminate the mass of records that most people have to keep, and reduce the government's cost of processing tax returns. Making the standard deduction more realistic is certainly in the best interest of both the individual taxpayer and the government. If this recommendation is adopted, upward of 80 percent of all taxpayers would use the standard deduction.

I am working on other tax reforms to increase the $600 individual exemption, provide better tax treatment for the elderly, tighten controls over tax-exempt foundations, correct abuses of tax rules by "nonfarmers" claiming farm losses, and several other important changes in our tax laws. Your comments and suggestions will be most welcome.

Congressional questionnaire planned: I have not sent you a questionnaire for the first portion of this Congress because the new Administration has not yet made major legislative recommendations to the Congress. As soon as the Administration's legislative program is disclosed, I will ask for your views on these proposals and other issues of special importance.

The response to all of my previous Congressional Questionnaires has been excellent. I think they serve as a very important communication link that should be kept open.

New congressional office opened in Plant City: I have opened a Congressional Office in Plant City to serve the growing needs of the residents of East Hillsborough County and the nine western precincts of Polk County. The new office is located on the third floor of the Hillsboro Bank Building at 202 West Reynolds Street in Plant City. The telephone number is 754–1266. The office will be open from 9:30 a.m. until 5:30 p.m. each Thursday and other days if needed. I plan to be in the office in Plant City as much as possible when I am not required to be in Washington.

Sincerely,

Sam.

TOWN OF EISENHOWER WOULD HAVE CHALLENGE

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, many excellent newspaper stories have been written about Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and more will be written.

I would like to share one of these stories with my colleagues. This was written by the fine Washington correspondent for the Indianapolis Star, Ben Cole.

Cole recommends that a town be named for Eisenhower but he warns that this town will have to live up to its name.

The article follows:

Town Of Eisenhower Would Have Challenge

(By Ben Cole)

Washington.—It would be a nice thing if somewhere in America there could be a town called Eisenhower.

It would be a far better tribute to the late soldier-President than any other.

Eisenhower, USA, shouldn't be a big, crowded city but a homey town with church spires sticking up through the hardwood trees and a good basketball team the whole town roots for.

Of course, most of the towns in America already have names—and they're proud of them and want to keep them.

When the country was expanding westward and new towns were springing up like mushrooms, finding names for them all was a challenge if not a chore.

Many took their names from some strong men who founded them—hence places like Logansport, Sullivan, Crawfordsville, etc. Some got made-up names like Indianapolis or Minneapolis. A few looked to a classical age—Athens, Ithaca, Syracuse, Cairo, Rome, Carthage.

Others took their names from geographical features—South Bend, Crown Point, Riverside. And the music of foreign language remained to described the features of many—Terre Haute, Buena Vista, Monticello, Champagne.

Many new towns took the names of Presidents out of pride in the new country and the infant government—Washington (every state has one), Adams, Jeffersonville, Madison, Monroe, Van Buren, Jackson, Harrisonburg, Tyler, Polk, Fillmore, Lincoln . . ."

In recent years there have not been many new towns—only a few real estate developments that get named after motivational psychology—Pine Manor, Heather Hills, Cloistered Woods, Colonial Shores, etc.

But if somewhere in America there is a neat and pretty town with an ordinary name that would like to make of itself a living memorial to a beloved soldier and statesman—then it ought to change its name and become Eisenhower. And then live up to it.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER: SOLDIER AND STATESMAN

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Record at this point the text of an article which I wrote for the local newspapers of the Third Congressional District of Indiana:

Congressional Corner: John Brademas Reports From Washington

Few Americans have been so genuinely respected and loved not only by their fellow countrymen, but by people all over the world as Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Destiny chose Dwight Eisenhower to play a leading role in the drama of Twentieth Century history both as Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in World War II and as President of the United States for eight years. He was always equal to the challenge.

Dwight Eisenhower was a warm and generous human being. To millions of Americans he was also a symbol of the basic strengths and virtues of the American character.

President Eisenhower once said, "I come from the heart of America."

He did, and America took him to its heart.

As we mourn General Eisenhower's passing, let our tribute to his memory be a heightened resolve to continue the quest for peace which dominated his extraordinary career.

As one of the greatest military leaders in history, General Eisenhower was all too familiar with the horrors of war. His experiences made him a passionate advocate of peace. Yet at his final news conference, when asked to indicate what he regarded as the greatest disappointment of his eight years in office, he answered in this way: "The big disappointment I felt is one not of mere incident, it was the fact that we could not in these eight years get to the place where we could say it now looks as if permanent peace with justice is really in sight."

The Eisenhower years were years of cold war, of armed peace. And no one was better situated than the President who was also a general to measure the effects upon the institutions of American democracy of a development which was totally new to American life—the growth of an enormous standing military establishment in a time of peace.

In his famous Farewell Address to the American people on January 17, 1961, President Eisenhower spoke at some length about what he termed the "conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry."

He solemnly warned that "we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications." Here is President Eisenhower's parting advice to the American people:

"In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

"We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together."

President Eisenhower's statement seems today, eight years later, to have been truly prophetic. For we are only beginning to realize the truth of his words. For example, the American people are now being asked to shoulder the burden of an expensive antiballistic missile system which an extraordinary number of scientists and other experts have criticized as useless or even dangerous; which they warn would increase our security only minimally, if at all; and which nearly everyone agrees will divert funds from vital programs in our own country.

Moreover, this controversy arises at a time when we are learning that the Army has spent $1 billion on developing a tank for which there is no ammunition; that the costs of developing a new Air Force transport have exceeded original estimates by $2 billion; and that contracts awarded by the Department of Defense are effectively exempted from the normal auditing processes of the government.

Could such developments as these be examples of the "disastrous rise of misplaced power" of which President Eisenhower warned us?

Surely all of us want a military defense powerful enough to assure the security of the United States against potential enemies—and so did President Eisenhower.

But surely we must also all take to heart President Eisenhower's admonition to be concerned lest what he described as "the military industrial complex" acquire such "unwarranted influence" as to "endanger our liberties or democratic processes."

President Eisenhower's plea for "an alert and knowledgeable citizenry" that will "take nothing for granted" may come to be regarded in decades ahead as the most significant legacy of wisdom this great man has left us.

THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN GOVERNMENT

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there could be nothing more eloquently said about women in Government than the presence of the gracious and capable gentlewomen I see in this Chamber. Their contributions to the deliberations of Government have been exceptional. They accomplish the work of the hardest-working men and add something more than even the most astute of my male colleagues can. Perhaps it is their roles as wives and mothers that gives this added dimension to their work or perhaps it is just that thing known as the "woman's viewpoint." However, I know that I speak for all my colleagues when I say that their contribution is immeasurable and beneficial to the Nation.

The Democratic Women on Wheels of Massachusetts sponsored a competition for a scholarship award. The contest was open to all senior girls in the State Public High Schools. Each girl who entered wrote an essay on the status of women in Government. Miss Barbara Higgins, of the Algonquin Regional High School, Northboro, Mass., was the winner of this year's award. My good friend, Miss Margaret M. Breen, scholarship chairman, brought Miss Higgins' essay to my attention. I have received permission to have it included in the RECORD.

Miss Higgins understands the great need for dedicated women in Government and with great discernment sees how much more they can contribute when they are active in the political arena. It gives me great pleasure to share this essay with my colleagues, and particularly with the gentle ladies of the House who epitomize the best attributes of those women who have taken valuable time in order to serve the Nation.

The essay follows:

THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN GOVERNMENT

(By Barbara J. Higgins)

There she sits in a high-backed executive chair; her body is dwarfed by the seat's dimensions. She is arrayed in an ill-fitting tailored shirt with a conservative tie; her shoulders float in a jacket of gray-green tweed. The anomaly is completed by a fluff of smoke floating up from a cigar which is poised in her delicate hand.

She is a ridiculous figure! This is not the role of a woman in government!

As woman at long last escapes the bondage of her own apron-strings to blossom in the world of politics, she must not lose the charm and identity of her sex. She has no need to imitate the man who has dominated politics for so long. Woman herself is endowed with an abundance of vigor, eloquence, and stability. Her amazing vitality has been a mother to generations of men. She is fully capable and prepared to accept a significant role in governing the nation.

In the past man has been jealously reluctant to permit feminine ability to challenge his traditional monopoly on politics. The era of colonial America has passed; women are no longer chained to their doorsteps. They have acquired mobility, education, and employment opportunities comparable to those enjoyed by the male. Women are now educated with men, together made aware of governmental facilities. Men and women are absorbed together into the fascinating surge of political events.

The "emancipated" woman has taken her place in the political world. Now she is a town or county official, a representative, a senator. Now she has passed through the processes of politics. She has campaigned, run, been elected, all in the democratic way.—This woman will still be insecure. She has earned the status of an office holder; the voters have shown their respect. Yet where is the confidence that should go with it? Where is the trust and backing which an office holder deserves? This woman has accepted a status in government so novel to her sex that she has been put on display. Her venture into politics is still so impeded by tradition that she becomes an example. The "woman in government" is placed like a specimen under microscopic view. Her movements may be prodded and analyzed in any political circle. Observers are still curious about the feminine presence in politics. The woman is set up as in a glass case, scrutinized not because she holds an office, but because she is a woman. She exemplifies all women in government. If she fails, all women fail; if she achieves, all women gain an essential bit of respect. This woman must be strong and brave with an enormous love of mankind.

The woman does not have to hold a government office in order to satisfy her political enthusiasm. Her presence is essential in other areas of influence. Her energy might stimulate a campaign or activate a political party. By voting she exercises the most sacred right of a democracy. She is able to study a candidate's qualifications and inform other voters in that regard. As an interested, irate, or satisfied citizen, she may petition and correspond with public officials; senators and congressmen are all too often neglected. Perhaps the greatest role of the woman is that which she comes by most naturally, that is, the role of a wife and mother. From this particular vantage point, she can instill in her family a deep pride in country, a trust in government, and a vibrant belief that every man possesses a unique, sacred personality.

Today the world is trembling, frightened by the shadow of bitterness, prejudice, violence. Devices of destruction now terrify their creators. War destroys the respect of man; lives are shattered, dreams destroyed. Young men lose faith in a country which teaches them to kill. Love is an unknown quantity; peace, an intangible vision. Natural disasters ravage the earth leaving thousands homeless and starving. Beauty and natural resources are squandered and destroyed. Campuses erupt in protest; violence is repaid with violence. Prophets of love and prophets of doom are equally ignored. Nations cry; there is no one to hear the agony of their suffering.

If government is a faltering child, floundering in a sea of turmoil, then swirling amid the turmoil is an abundance of kindness and sincere concern.—Perhaps a woman's outstretched hand would not correct the world, but it may provide sufficient faith to stir new life and hope.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION JOURNAL TAKES STAND ON NATIONAL PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in their April issue, the American Bar Association Journal cites a number of reasons why Congress and the State legislatures should be cautious in considering the idea of a nationwide Presidential primary.

To call attention to the "serious major objections" which they cite, I insert below the lead editorial from the current issue of the American Bar Association Journal:

A NATIONWIDE PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY?

With Congress and the state legislatures in session, we shall be hearing more about state and national Presidential primaries. At present, many states have Presidential primaries, some no more than popularity contests, some with varied effects on nominating convention delegates. These primaries are widely scattered as to dates, entered by candidates only on a limited or selective basis, sometimes avoided altogether, inconclusive, inordinately expensive and available seriously only to those who can command vast campaign funds. Imagine such a primary in each of the fifty states!

Hence there is a revival of discussion about a national Presidential primary for the nomination of the President and Vice President. There is nothing new about the idea. Constitutional amendments to bring about a national primary in varying forms have been before the Congress during all its recent sessions, including the present one. But the idea seems to gain more public attention during and immediately after Presidential election years.

A national Presidential primary is subject to serious major objections. First, there is the virtually prohibitive cost of conducting a coast-to-coast primary campaign. Injecting a nationwide Presidential primary ahead of the general election itself would require candidates to get financial backing of such large proportions that the public might fear, and rightly so, that the candidates would be unduly beholden to their moneyed benefactors. Edward S. Corwin, long-time professor of government at Princeton and considered by many to be the dean of modern political scientists, wrote in *The Presidency Today*: "Indeed, the national primary, instead of being a democratic device, would be anti-democratic, because it would limit candidates to those few who could command the big money required in the campaign."

Second, there is the threat to the health of the candidates. During the 1968 campaign we saw headlines such as: "Humphrey Ordered To Rest" and "Nixon Tired and Resting". Add to these strains the pressures of a national Presidential primary just ahead of the general election campaign, for there could hardly be a let-up between the two events, and there would be a system that might shorten the lives of the candidates. The use of television would not eliminate the burden of innumerable personal appearances throughout the country. The 1968 campaign certainly proved this point.

Third, as stated by Professor Corwin, "equally serious is the prospect that a national primary would have a devastating effect on party cohesion". A national Presidential primary might virtually destroy responsible party government and put an end to our effective two-party system. If one believes that party government, and especially our two-party government, is essential to the preservation of free institutions, then anything that weakens two-party government, as a nationwide Presidential primary might, should be avoided.

If one believes that good government rests on sound principles and policies as espoused broadly by organized political parties, then it becomes plain that "voting for the man" instead of the party's choice of a man tends to weaken party government and ultimately leads to government by individuals, which in the wrong hands could lead to dictatorship.

Good government does rest on sound principles and policies as espoused broadly by organized political parties. Might it not be said that every qualified voter should have some political convictions and a party affiliation? To be an adherent of a political party, one need not agree with everything that a party espouses at any particular juncture if it generally and preponderantly expresses one's political stance. The least effective producer of good government is the person who ignores political discussions during a campaign and forms his views by the image he prefers on the last day or two before the election by watching television.

Party strength begins at the grassroots—the precinct level. That point of beginning involves thousands of persons in the democratic processes of government. Everyone is free to participate at that level either as a candidate or a voter. One who ignores or shuns this process is hardly in a position to criticize the end results of the process. And one who does participate, but is disappointed with the results, should be willing to accept defeat and resolve to work for victory another day. The two-party system has its faults, but it is the best we have devised so far, and we should resolve to keep it healthy and strong.

The divisive effect of a party's Presidential primary was foreshadowed in the last election. Even though the primaries were mere state affairs, it was hard, after the convention, to enlist for the winner of the nomination the strength of those who had worked hard in the primaries for the loser.

NATIONAL TEACHERS-IN-POLITICS WEEKEND

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the city of Hawthorne for proclaiming the weekend of April 11 to 13 as National Teachers-in-Politics Weekend. This is part of a program urging teachers to become more interested and involved in our political process. It is sponsored by the Association for Better Citizenship, which is a part of the California Teachers Association. I would like to include the proclamation as a part of the RECORD:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the teachers of Hawthorne, California, members of the California Teachers Association and the National Education Association, to lift the understanding of teachers about the need for teacher involvement in politics, and to inspire them to be involved, have urged adoption of a proclamation for National Teachers-In-Politics Weekend; and

Whereas, it is their wish to attract the attention of the public to the new programs and political awareness on the part of the teachers; and communities will benefit when all educators accept the rights and responsibilities of political citizenship, because in so doing, educators will be contributing that which every citizen owes to self-government; and

Whereas, it is their plan to make organized teacher power visible where it really counts, where the results really get tabulated in the halls of congress, in the state capitols, in city and town council chambers;

Now, therefore, I, Gregory Page, Mayor of the City of Hawthorne, California, do hereby proclaim April 11–13, 1969, "National Teachers-In-Politics Weekend," and do call attention to the new programs of political awareness on the part of teachers and members which lead to individual participation and possible membership in political parties of their choice; and that teachers fulfill one of the best functions of free citizens by supporting, serving, and advocating, and becoming candidates for the political party of their choice.

GREGORY PAGE,
Mayor, City of Hawthorne, Calif.

CALIFORNIA FRUIT EXCHANGE'S CHIEF RETIRES

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for more than a half century an old friend of mine has been active in the fruit packing and shipping industry in the State of California. During the past years, the California Fruit Exchange has become the world's largest deciduous tree fruit and grape marketing organization. Its recent growth and expansion, marked by outstanding service to the agricultural industry of the State of California and to the housewives throughout the Nation, can be attributed directly to the inspiration and dedicated leadership of F. M. "Bud" Small, its general manager for many years.

Bud has now retired. As he leaves an active business career, I feel that recognition should be given to the contributions which this man has made to the industry. No better statement of these contributions can be made than that of Mr. Hamilton L. Hintz, agricultural editor of the McClatchy Newspapers. I would like leave to insert at this point in the RECORD Mr. Hintz' report from the March 23, 1969, issue of the Sacramento Bee.

FRUIT EXCHANGE'S CHIEF WILL RETIRE

(By Hamilton L. Hintz)

F. M. "Bud" Small, general manager of the California Fruit Exchange, has revealed he will retire at the end of March after a varied career of 53 years in the fruit business.

His successor in the top spot of what is claimed to be the world's largest deciduous tree fruit and grape marketing organization will be named at the 68th annual meeting of the exchange in the El Dorado Hotel in Sacramento on April 22.

Last fall, due to expanded administrative duties and in anticipation of Small's retirement in 1969, the board of directors named Walter M. Tindell, field department manager, as assistant general manager to work with Small.

STARTED IN 1917

Small, now 69, got his start in the fruit packing and shipping business back in 1917 because of a crop failure on his father's peach and plum ranch at Loomis, Placer County, where he was born.

He was in his second year in the James Lick High School in San Francisco at the time and had to leave school to help his father and support himself. He took a laboring job with the Pioneer Fruit Company at Loomis and after three years became manager of the packing shed.

In the next 38 years Small spent about one-half the time as manager at various times of the Loomis Fruit Growers Association, the Colfax Fruit Growers Association and the Auburn Fruit Exchange, and as an executive for three years of Bercut-Richards Packing Company in Sacramento.

BUSINESS VENTURES

The other one-half of that period was spent in various business ventures—fruit ranching and fruit shipping and brokering, some of which were successes and some of which was not.

Although he had been associated several times with California Fruit Exchange affiliated organizations, he joined the exchange staff in 1958 as manager of the field department.

He was named general manager on April 1, 1963, after the death of Fred W. Read.

"I really have had a varied career in this business but each move was a new challenge," says Small. He lists three things as representing his greatest satisfactions during the six years he has been general manager.

One is the exchange reaching a record volume of $26 million annually. Another is the conversion to computerization of accounting, sales trends and crop projections.

The third is the construction of the new Blue Anchor Building on Howe Avenue and winning the award for "The Finest Commercial Office Building Built in America in 1967" from the American Institute of Building Designers. The building is of Early California design with offices surrounding a landscaped courtyard and with the natural tree and scrub growth maintained on the entire property.

"Times have really changed in the fruit business in my lifetime," says Small. "When I started out the farmer packed his own fruit on the ranch and brought it to the shipping shed by horse and wagon. He was the arbiter of grade, size and quality.

"In 1925 I had charge of the first central packing shed in Loomis where attention was given to grade, size and quality. Now there are federal and state laws and industry regulations governing all these things, and the packing plants operate on a mechanized assembly line basis with skilled equipment operators, graders and packers."

PERIOD OF CHANGE

Small has observed great changes in the marketing of fruit. Up until a few years ago the auction markets in the large eastern cities took 70 per cent of the nation's fruit. Now 87 per cent is sold on an f.o.b. shipping basis to direct buyers. Fifty big buyers, taking about one-half the output, represent the chain stores.

Transportation of fruit has changed from nearly all rail to piggy-back refrigerated units, refrigerated trucks and air cargo.

Exports fairly constantly account for 10 per cent of the crops but shift around the world depending on local economic, political and trouble situations. Right now less is going to Europe and more to the Orient and South America.

VIEW OF FUTURE

How does he view the future?

"I see a continuing expanding situation for the California Fruit Exchange and for California agriculture in general. California has the climate and the soil and the know-how to produce competitively with any other section.

"There is much new land that is being, and can be brought into production to meet increased demands and to offset urban sprawl onto farm lands. Agricultural leaders are working together better to meet common problems of the industry.

"Small farmers are going to have a tough time competing with large corporate or family farms unless they join together to achieve economies and bargaining strength. Labor bargaining, unemployment insurance and other laws favorable to farm labor are sure to come and I am sure the industry will adjust to the new situations."

The exchange has members throughout

California and Arizona and obtains about half of its volume from the San Joaquin Valley where the growth has been such as to justify the establishment of a branch office in Fresno.

GRADE GROUPS

Small has been active in a long list of agricultural trade organizations, including the United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, California Grape & Tree Fruit League, Sacramento Valley Employers Council, California Perishable Agricultural Commodities Corporation, California Tree Fruit Agreement and California Host Committee.

In retirement he plans to travel, look after his ranch property in Sierra County and participate in the People-To-People Program. He and his wife will observe their 49th anniversary in May.

BRAY REPORTS TO CONSTITUENTS: NEWSLETTERS NO. 7 THROUGH NO. 12

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, following are my weekly newsletter reports No. 7 through No. 12:

REPORT NO. 7

Reaction by the Russian Bear to anything the lumbering animal doesn't like ranges, figuratively speaking, from sullen growls (verbose newspaper or magazine broadsides) to a swipe of the claws (moving troops to the frontier of the offending country) to the ultimate and final embrace of the Bear's hairy arms (moving troops across the frontier and taking over the country). Sir Winston Churchill's brief and devastatingly apt description of Russia—"A riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma"—means it is usually impossible to predict with any certainty what the reaction to any given thing will be.

I was somewhat surprised lately to be, personally and by name, on the receiving end of sullen growls. A recent newsletter in which I criticized Sweden for extending diplomatic recognition to Hanoi, the latest move in a series of openly anti-American actions, had the effect (as far as I know to date) of getting more response from Moscow than from Stockholm.

Not in a minor key, either: *Izvestia* ("News") which is the official Soviet Government newspaper, and *Krasnaya Svezda* ("Red Star") the authoritative voice of the Red Army, both attacked me and, in passing, defended Sweden.

In some fashion unknown to me, my newsletter or a comment about it got to Sweden. It was then picked up by a correspondent of *Izvestia* in Stockholm, who in turn sent a story to his paper in Moscow. *Izvestia* printed it on January 28 under the byline of one G. Deynichenko (presumably, the Stockholm correspondent) and *Krasnays Svezda* then followed with an article on January 29, written by V. Berezin. English versions of the articles were made available to me by a Washington source soon after they had appeared.

English to Swedish to Russian and back to English again—something got lost in the various translations along the way, since some statements given by the Soviets as direct quotes from my newsletter only have distant resemblance to what I actually wrote. For instance, the two concluding sentences of my newsletter had read:

"If you try to make friends with a dog, yet he continually snaps and snarls at you, there's probably no reason to kick him for it. But there's no reason to throw him any more bones, either."

In *Krasnaya Evezda*, this came out as:

"The American Legislator compared the object of his dissatisfaction with a dog 'who snaps and growls at those who want to befriend it.' 'Even if it is not worth driving such a dog from the house,' Bray concludes, 'one certainly should not throw it any more bones.' . . .

Soviet propaganda (for that matter, practically all Communist propaganda) is almost invariably incredibly dull, dreary, shapeless and humorless. It plods and lurches its way across the printed page with about as much style and elegance as a drunken elephant hip-deep in a mudhole. I have often thought that more people have probably been driven to defection from Communist countries on account of the dust-dry propaganda than by any other factor. Perhaps, as I said earlier, something is lost in the translation, but such an excuse says very little for the abilities of the translators.

But why could my newsletter have provoked such a response? What, in the vernacular of today, "turned them on"? All I said in my newsletter, as far as suggesting what the U.S. might do, was this:

"There is very little the United States can do about any of this. The new Administration could refrain from appointing a new Ambassador to Stockholm, and leave our embassy there under a chargé d'affaires. . . . We owe such a country absolutely no favors of any sort. And the country in question should not expect—nor have the gall to ask for—anything beyond the most stiffly formal and correct treatment that is required in normal diplomatic interchange. . . ."

I believe the Soviets saw in my newsletter a "trial balloon." To the Kremlin, everything done outside the Communist bloc is a major conspiracy of one sort or another, aimed at thwarting Russian designs. I have no way of knowing, but it well could be that Soviet analysts saw my remarks as originally inspired by the White House itself (which they certainly were not!) to test world reaction in preparation for just such a move. Then, later, go ahead if no one raised too much objection.

The next Soviet assumption, then, might have been that the Swedes would think the same thing and possibly postpone indefinitely or outright cancel, their planned recognition of North Vietnam. Net result: a propaganda defeat of sizeable proportions for both Hanoi and Moscow, which is something to be avoided at all costs.

On balance, this incident has probably been the result of a silly Soviet miscalculation and misreading of one event. I would suggest the Kremlin improve the quality of its U.S. analysts. And while they're at it, they might sharpen up their translators, too. I don't mind in the least being quoted—even by *Izvestia* and *Krasnaya Svezda*—but I do wish it would be quoted as it was written!

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT NO. 7

(NOTE.—English translation of the two articles appearing in Izvestia and Krasnaya Svezda which are referred to in Report No. 7.)

[From Moscow Izvestia, Jan. 28, 1969]

BRAY HAS BEEN ANGRY

(Article by G. Deynichenko)

STOCKHOLM, January 27.—The Kingdom of Sweden has seriously insulted the Republican, so seriously that he does not even want to know this state. The stern Republican is called William G. Bray. He lives across the ocean and enjoys considerable renown there, because he represents the State of Indiana in the U.S. Congress. William Bray also made his statement about relations with Sweden in this capacity. He proposed that Washington not send an ambassador there any more but that it limit itself to a temporary charge d'affaires.

The Congressman stated: "We are not obliged to do any service whatever for such a country."

Bray timed his statement for the moment when the United States in fact had no ambassador in Sweden. The ambassador finished his term of service and left Stockholm a few days afterwards.

What was it that disturbed Bray? The reader can easily guess—the establishment of diplomatic relations between Sweden and the DRV. The press had already reported that the Swedish decision to establish such relations had caused irritation in American official circles. However, so far nobody had gone as far as Bray. He allowed himself to use diplomatic descriptions and images that were in no way diplomatic.

The Congressman said: If you try to make friends with a dog and it continues to bite you, perhaps it is not worth driving it out but it is also not worth throwing it an extra bone.

Bray is resolutely against the "extra bone," that is, against appointing a new U.S. ambassador to Sweden.

It is not the first time that Sweden has served as the object of crude attack by the American press and even American officials. Washington has tried to exert diplomatic pressure on Sweden, and all this is in connection with the Swedish position over the Vietnam question. It is not yet clear whether Bray's statement is to be interpreted as a flash of temperament or as a sign of new pressure.

[From Moscow Red Star, Jan. 29, 1969]

THERE IS DISSATISFACTION ACROSS THE OCEAN

(Article by V. Berezin)

American Congressman William Bray was extremely incensed and no more than three days ago he gave vent to his wrath in a letter to the electorate. The American Legislator compared the object of his dissatisfaction with a dog who "snaps and growls at those who want to befriend it." "Even if it is not worth driving such a dog from the house," Bray concludes, "one certainly should not throw it any more bones."

The object of this particular irritation and these insulting attacks by the transoceanic Congressman turned out to be Sweden, which a little over two weeks ago recognized the DRV and decided to establish diplomatic relations with it. This realistic step by the Swedish Government was greeted with approval by the world public, since it is clear that such a decision will only contribute to the strengthening of peace in Southeast Asia and to a settlement of the Vietnam problem and, of course, will have a beneficial influence on the Paris talks on Vietnam. And unquestionably, Stockholm's judicious act is still another acknowledgment of the great successes of the heroic Vietnamese people, in a prolonged and just struggle.

In Washington, such a realistic step by a Scandinavian Government elicited evident disapproval. Even earlier Washington had not concealed its displeasure at the fact that Sweden maintains political, economic, and cultural contacts with the DRV. Last year Washington went to the lengths of slamming the door and recalling—allegedly for "consultations"—its Ambassador William Heath.

Sweden's latest action has been used by Swedish ill-wishers to whip up an anti-Swedish campaign in the United States. Strange as it may seem, the U.S. State Department appears to think that "Sweden's decision will not assist the cause of peace in Southeast Asia." Such a step by Stockholm "Vexes Washington," the newspaper "The Washington Post" admits. "The Swedish Government's decision will lead to another crisis in Swedish-U.S. relations," American political observers gloomily predict.

Attempts are being made to exert pressure on Sweden from across the ocean. Unambiguous threats are being resorted to, and we found out that there was no standing on ceremony in the choice of expressions used. In the meantime, sixty-one-year-old Arne Berndt Bjonberg, formerly newspaper commentator, and subsequently Sweden's Ambassador to Guatemala, is preparing to take up his new duties—this time as Swedish Ambassador to the DRV. The capitals of various other western states are now seriously considering the possibility of following Sweden's judicious example.

REPORT No. 8

"Here dead lie we because we did not choose
To live and shame the land from which we sprung;
Life, to be sure, is nothing much to lose,
But young men think it is, and we were young."

There have been over 30,000 to date—most young, but some not; privates and generals, draftees and Regulars; all creeds, all races; wearing every uniform and holding every rank; from every corner of the American Republic—our Vietnam dead. The last journey of their life was to that far-off country, and their last journey on this earth was to return home—home, for the last time—to the land and the community they had known and loved.

And so loved that they chose to face—and meet—death, rather than live and shame this same land and country.

There have been, to date, other thousands more who made a different choice. All young, all walks of life, all races, all creeds, all social and economic levels and, like their fellow Americans in Vietnam, from every corner of the American Republic. Some put on the uniform of their country and took the oath, but then broke it. Others did not, but fled, to Canada, to Sweden, no one knows how many or where. They live today, beyond reach of the laws of their homeland. Their existence in exile is a collective living sneer at, and defilement of, their country, their people, and, most of all, their 30,000 fellow Americans who have died in Vietnam.

Not to be counted are the approximately 800 young men who openly defied the laws of their country, yet had the stamina to stand and face their fate at the bar of civil justice or of a military court-martial. I think they were wrong—the draft-card burners, the draft resisters, the deserters—who are now serving prison terms—and I cannot join the ranks of maudlin sympathizers who snivel over the fate of "fine young men in prison." Their lives have been interrupted, it is true, but only temporarily. There are more than 30,000 whose lives were ended. But, for those who did choose to face the penalties they knew their behavior would invoke, I must say they did have true courage of their convictions. They did not run away.

For the rest of them, in their self-imposed exile, pressure and propaganda has already begun to seek for them a general amnesty. This amnesty would, it seems, be delivered at some future date, and the suggestion is made that it be in the form of an Executive Order by the President. It would be issued at an appropriate time, and then clear the way for them to return home. To return, no doubt, in what would be an attitude of smirking triumph, to be lauded for their "moral courage" by every slack-jawed, loose principled, meddling busybody whose energies in behalf of these exiles have been constantly geared to the adulation, encouragement, propaganda for and assistance to deeds which were nothing less than treasonous.

I cannot conceive of any action such as this proposed "amnesty" which would more enrage the American people. I know it would not stand the slightest chance of approval by the U.S. Congress if presented as proposed legislation, and I cannot imagine such a step being taken by the Administration.

"If we break faith with us who die
We do not sleep, but still we lie
In Flanders Fields . . ."

McCrae wrote his poem for the dead of World War I but the words apply today. If one chooses to break faith with his country and his fellow-citizens, and flee to alien shores, then let him make, when the time comes, one of the two choices he has left open to himself: exist out his days in exile, or return and face the judgment of those to whom the words "Duty—Honor—Country" have a meaning, and for whom the word "Loyalty" has a connotation going far beyond just taking an oath.

Pericles' famous and moving Funeral Oration, delivered over the Athenian dead in the winter of 431–430 B.C., at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, contained these stirring lines about bravery, and what it means:

". . . the man who can most truly be accounted brave is he who best knows the meaning of what is sweet in life and of what is terrible, and then goes out undeterred to meet what is to come."

The 30,000 dead knew this sweetness of life, the blessings of their homeland, the glory of its heritage and the promise of its future. They also knew what was terrible, but they met it as it came. How could any nation grant amnesty to those whose arrogant posturing and cynical, twisted moralizing blasphemes the memory of brave men? We must not allow the courage of the fallen to be defiled by those who not only reject and mock what their country stands for, but also implicitly reject and mock those who died to preserve it.

REPORT No. 9

"C'est magnifique, mais ce n'est pas la guerre"—("It is magnificent, but it is not war!")

1854—Balaclava, the Crimea: The French General Bosquet watched as Lord Cardigan's 700-man Light Brigade of cavalry thundered at the gallop down North Valley, straight into the flaming Russian cannon. Tears streaming down his cheeks as he stood on the Fedioukine Hills overlooking the valley, General Bosquet uttered that memorable phrase that has been repeated all through history ever since, when voices have been raised in protest against what has seemed to be useless expenditure of brave men and their raw courage in the face of impossible odds.

Bosquet's words have been used in different form ever since the return of the Pueblo and its crew. As their painful story unfolds, public reaction makes it clear that the American people are saying, in effect, "The crew was magnificent, but what brought this about was not war!"

I have been assigned to what I consider one of the most important duties ever given me since coming to the House of Representatives over 18 years ago: ranking Republican member of a Special Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee to investigate all circumstances surrounding the capture of the Pueblo and its crew. My Subcommittee will consider the national security aspects as well as what changes, if any, should be made in existing prisoner of war codes of conduct.

By nature of its assignment, the Subcommittee will be going far beyond the scope of the Navy's Board of Inquiry. Our report, which is due before January 1970, must contain specific recommendations for whatever corrective administrative or legislative action we feel should be taken to prevent this from happening again.

There is, I think, another area of equal importance. The Pueblo affair has raised extremely grave questions in the minds of the citizens of our Republic. It is no exaggeration to say that, coming on top of the "credibility gap" brought about by the Viet Nam War, the Pueblo case has seriously damaged the faith and confidence of our people in the country's top-level military and civilian leaders.

A change of Administration, by itself, is not sufficient to erase this doubt. A public opinion survey indicates that two out of three Americans believe the whole truth will never be known. Such voluntary cessation of trust in their Government by such a large segment of the population is highly disturbing to me. To be sure, due to national security requirements, the whole story about any intelligence operation can never be revealed. But I believe what concerns our citizens goes much deeper than mere curiosity about "James Bond" angles.

I wonder if it may be a sympton of this strange, much-debated and much-discussed abstraction called "alienation of the individual"? Have we reached a point in our country where doubt and mistrust are going to be the main governing factors in the people's relationship to their Government? Do our people really feel the Federal Government is nothing more than a vast, impersonal monstrosity, whose word is worthless, whose deeds are vain, whose promises are hollow, whose judgment is too questionable to be reliable, and whose future, indeed, may be in doubt?

Let me make it clear that I do not ask for blind belief from any one on any thing. And let me also make it clear that I feel the Federal Government has brought much of this upon itself. Protestations by the bureaucracy to the contrary, the Federal Government has all too often let itself seem to be downright callous and ignorant of the human factor in people, and more inclined to view the population as numbers, fit for coding on punch cards or computer tapes, and to be manipulated like does on a graph or symbols in some equation.

In essence, I believe what our people are trying to say about the Pueblo might come to this: "Don't gamble needlessly with human lives. If the risk has to be taken, at least make sure, by all possible steps, that the odds are in our favor as much as possible."

Much has come out of the Pueblo inquiry to date to make people think this was not observed. It makes no difference why—ignorance, carelessness or blind stupidity—but the feeling in the country is fear it may happen again.

Standing beside General Bosquet, watching the Light Brigade in its hour of agony and wondering "the reason why" was Bosquet's fellow country-man, General Brite. Brite's remarks are less well-known but apply as well as do Bosquet's:

"JE SUIS VIEUX, J'AI VU DES BATAILLES, MAIS CECI EST TROP."—("I AM OLD, I HAVE SEEN BATTLES, BUT THIS IS TOO MUCH!")

Our American Republic is not an old country, as countries go, but we have seen many battles and, sadly enough, we may well see more in the course of our national existence. But let the Pueblo be to us as was the Charge of the Light Brigade to Generals Bosquet and Brite: magnificent, for the courage of the men, but caused by nothing to be found in the common-sense rules of warfare or conflict between nations.

And, it *is* too much. It must never happen again.

REPORT No. 10

The following sentence which appeared in a Washington, D.C., newspaper last week gave me certain wry amusement:

"With all the unspent momentum of the Cold War, Berlin is once again being propelled inexorably into an East-West crisis this week, *but nobody quite knows why.*" (Italics mine.)

The underscored part of the sentence is completely wrong. It is easy and sometimes, for the sake of the reputations of statesmen living and dead, convenient, to forget. There are those who would very much like to forget Teheran, in 1944, and Yalta, in 1945. But it was at those two wartime conferences where the United States sowed the wind of carelessness that means we now reap the whirlwind of crisis, with regard to Berlin and, for that matter, the rest of the world.

Teheran produced very few firm commitments for anything except *Overlord*, the cross-Channel invasion of Europe, and *Anvil*, the invasion of Southern France. The first gave Stalin his "second front" and the second, meaning the U.S. and Britain would bypass the Balkans, gave Stalin eventual control in that area. Conference records (I have the documents and have carefully studied them) are not clear on exactly what Stalin was promised regarding post-war occupancy of Central and Eastern Europe.

British General Lord Ismay, Chief of Staff to the Minister of Defense from 1940 to 1946, and present at the conferences, has noted that ". . . the Anglo-American forces were committed to withdrawing to their respective zones of occupation as soon as Germany surrendered." General Eisenhower, altho not at Teheran, was filled in on what went on by Roosevelt. Eisenhower wrote in 1962, in an article entitled "My Views on Berlin," that " . . . by prior political agreement any territory captured by us within the planned Soviet zone would necessarily be surrendered to the Soviets."

In November 1944 the European Advisory Committee, created at Teheran, agreed to a three-way division of Germany between the U.S., Britain and Russia. Later amended to include France, the agreement had no plan for guaranteed access to Berlin. This was noted at Yalta, in February 1945, where arrangements were made for Berlin to be governed jointly by commandants appointed by respective zone Commanders-in-Chief. But still, no iron-class access to the city was provided.

However, at Yalta, the U.S. Joint Planners did recommend a memo to the British and Soviet General Staffs, pointing out this isolation, and citing the need for regular transit by road, air and rail, and proposing (here I quote from the memo) " . . . that the general principle be accepted of freedom of transit by each nation concerned between the main occupied area and the forces occupying Berlin and similar isolated areas." The British concurred; the Soviets did not. The matter was dropped.

General Lucius Clay, who served for four years first as Deputy Military Governor, then as Military Governor of Germany, said afterwards on the Berlin access question that the U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain, one of the members of the EAC, felt ". . . the right to be in Berlin carried with it the right of access and that it would only confuse the issue to raise it in connection with the agreement. . . . He [the Ambassador] believed it possible to develop a mutual friendly understanding [with the Soviets] in which differences would disappear. . . ." Now, this was the Ambassador's opinion in 1945, but in 1950 the Ambassador's Executive Assistant denied this, saying the blame lay with the military and in Washington. But with whom? He never said.

So Berlin is once again tossed into the East-West crisis barrel because the Soviets control access to the city and can close it off whenever they wish. So much for the "why" as to constant crisis, but *why* was this situation allowed to develop?

I am at a loss to understand it and there will very likely never be a complete answer to this question, telling who and for what reasons held off from pressing the Soviets for this access. As I wrote in my book Russian Frontiers: From Muscovy to Khrushchev: "No farm boy, even without formal education, would consider purchasing land without having a guaranteed route of access, even though he trusted the owner of the surrounding land."

Treason? I doubt it; why should Stalin have taken the great risk of using traitors when he had what for him was the no doubt pleasant and amusing task of dealing with those whom he considered fools?

Naivete? More like it; in those days we tragically relied on that incredibly wrong-headed cliche that "you make a man trustworthy by trusting him." But the naive, if they pursue that course long enough, soon slide over into being stupid. We struggled so hard to win a war and it seems that we also struggled so hard to lose the peace that followed. The result has been to jeopardize the stability of an entire continent, and the whole world, for no one knows how many years to come.

Whether the ultimate reason is ever found or not, we must never repeat the mistake. Because being taken advantage of once too often may just mean that the one time too often will be the last. And it won't be because we determine not to allow it again; it will be because we will no longer have any say in the matter.

We will, by that one time too often, have placed ourselves in a position where alternatives no longer exist, and acquiescence to our enemies is the only possible road we will be able to follow.

REPORT No. 11

"MURDER WILL OUT"

First used by Chaucer in Canterbury Tales and later by Cervantés in Don Quixote, this phrase implies that killers will always be known, caught, brought to justice and the case settled to everyone's satisfaction. Well, it just isn't so, as any Prosecutor, Judge, Sheriff, Chief of Police or law enforcement official will tell you.

Even if it seems all the facts are known, sudden and violent deaths of famous men have, all through history, been surrounded by speculation and theories generated by persons who do not believe the "official" reasons. Admittedly, there have been times when the theories were well-founded.

But some certainly have not. For instance, it is claimed even today by some that John Wilkes Booth was really in league with Lincoln's Secretary of War, Stanton, and that Stanton had masterminded a plot to kill Lincoln which involved high officials up to and including General Grant. This of course is totally ridiculous.

Some maintain that Tsar Nicholas II of Russia, last of the Romanov dynasty, was not really murdered with his family but was seen in Paris in 1930. Or, even if the Tsar and most of the family died, his daughter Anastasia survived and is alive to this day.

Since President Kennedy's assassination there has been a virtual flood of accounts telling the "truth" and the end is not yet in sight. Senator Robert Kennedy's killer seems, on the basis of available evidence, to have worked alone, but already there are dark rumblings of a "terrorist plot" and not-too-subtle hints that Sirhan had help from some quarter.

The conclusion last week to the trial of James Earl Ray for the murder of Martin Luther King may have ended a trial but certainly did not write finis to anything else. Five books are coming out on the killing; a Congressional Committee plans an investigation and we may be sure we will hear much more about it for some time.

Just two days after the end of the trial, where Ray pleaded guilty and was sentenced to 99 years in prison, conflicting accounts began to show up. Ray supposedly regrets his guilty plea; he did say in court that he did not agree with the statement that there was no conspiracy. Second, the statement that Mrs. King and officials of the Southern Christian Leadership Council had been consulted in advance, and had approved, of having Ray plead guilty (a questionable move in itself) has now been denied by SCLC.

One point has been made about the King murder that I think is well taken: Ray, supposedly operating alone, managed to be in the right room, in the right city, at the right distance from his intended victim, at the right time and moment when he could frame King in the cross-hairs of a telescopic sight. The mathematical odds against this happening "by chance" are truly incalculable.

Now, it goes without saying that it is impossible to satisfy everyone in such cases. Cranks and crackpots will continue to spin fairy tales that have not the slightest basis in truth. This isn't restricted to murders, either; a prominent English historian recently quite casually (and carelessly, I think) tossed out his own version of George Washington's last and fatal illness. The "explanation" is incredible and had never been alluded to, even remotely, privately or in print, by any of Washington's biographers or any historians of that period. It is also quite defamatory and I do not care to mention it here.

The Department of Justice is being pressed to open its own investigation of the King murder. But Ray is no longer a fugitive and the case against him has been settled in the courts. Justice could become involved only under the authority of a Reconstruction-era civil rights law that outlaws a conspiracy of "two or more persons" to harm or threaten any citizen in exercise of his constitutional rights.

This law was invoked in the case last year, as soon as the FBI had a definite lead on Ray, under his alias of Galt. The fugitive warrant filed at that time stated that the suspect and "an individual . . . alleged to be his brother entered into a conspiracy." Soon after this, Galt was identified by the FBI as Ray, but the earlier conspiracy allegation was never formally dropped.

So this is the only remaining basis for a Federal investigation, and a very tenuous basis at that, for there is no Federal murder statute that would apply. It is understandable why Justice does not want to get involved, because due to the wording of the statute itself this would give the impression that the Federal Government had material on hand that would prove a conspiracy existed.

So what should the American citizen believe? He is quite rightly concerned with seeing justice done and he has every right to know the facts. But the citizen's attempts to decide for himself are going to be confused and made quite difficult by the follow-up to come, some of which will be substantive and serious, but most of which will be frivolous and undertaken by those who have nothing but the basest of motives.

I can only suggest a somewhat negative answer: we should not let any second-guessing on King's murder—or on any other murder, for that matter—by any one, shake our faith in our American Republic and its laws. There very well may be imperfections in our system of government, but our duties as citizens are to help solve them, and not become weakened and divided internally by fighting over them.

REPORT No. 12

"Only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain that they will never be employed." "Today the expenditure of billions of dollars every year on weapons, acquired for the purpose of making sure we never need to use them, is essential to keeping the peace."

There is no simple answer to any question but these two statements are as good as any and better than most I have seen on the need for arms for our Republic's defense. President

Nixon no doubt had sentiments like these in mind when he decided to go ahead with a limited deployment of the Sentinel antiballistic missile system.

The President's decision, subject to Congressional approval, means placing long-range Spartan missiles, short-range Sprint missiles and radar at 12 sites around the country. Cost is an estimated $6–$7 billion; the entire plan is subject to constant review. For defense of key segments of our second-strike ability (our power to retaliate against an enemy nuclear attack) Sentinel will be at remote missile bases except for one site close to Washington, D.C.

Much heat and little light has been generated by the controversy and the loudest shouting has come from Sentinel's opponents, running from outright unilateral disarmament advocates to those whose reservations are based on less extreme grounds. In many instances, those favoring Sentinel have been placed in a bad light by biased and prejudiced reporting. One such story in a major East Coast newspaper, for example, referred to Sentinel's supporters as "braided dignitaries of the Joint Chiefs of Staff" and "a sprinkling of prominent scientists." The more favorable adjectives were reserved for Sentinel's opponents, who were described as "a politically glamorous clutch of Democrats," "an impressive array of scientists," and "a glittering group of moderate-to-liberal members of Mr. Nixon's own party." Nothing like being objective, is there?

I'd like to discuss briefly the major arguments *against* deployment of Sentinel. I know this is a highly emotional issue to many but some statements I have seen opposing the system have absolutely no factual basis whatsoever.

First, there is the charge that "Sentinel means surrender to 'the military-industrial complex.'" "The military-industrial complex" was first mentioned in Eisenhower's Farewell address in January 1961 and made up a tiny fraction of the topics covered in that speech. However, it was eagerly seized upon and since that time it has been fervently quoted at every turn by those very persons who have absolutely no use for nor good words to say about anything else Eisenhower ever said, thought or did.

I will grant that an uncontrolled, unsupervised "military-industrial complex" could indeed be an evil influence and there are historical examples to bear this out. Krupp, in Germany, and Mitsui-Mitsubishi, in Japan; historians still quarrel over to what extent alliance of these industrial giants with the military in their respective nations ultimately led to war. But in the United States there is an alert, inquisitive Congress, plus public opinion, that acts as a very strong check on such a combination. "Military-industrial complex" has been turned into a vague cliche, faintly suggestive of dark plots in high places. I am getting tired of hearing it, as these inferences have little if any basis in fact.

"Sentinel won't work." It is true that Sentinel has never been tested, because the same test ban treaty so avidly sought by Sentinel's opponents prohibit nuclear warhead testing in the atmosphere. But it certainly won't work if it isn't built; I believe it is preferable to take the chance that it will, if needed. Incidentally, the "won't work" argument was used against the H-bomb by nuclear physicist J. Robert Oppenheimer. Years later he admitted he didn't know if it would or not, but argued it would not *because he did not want it to work!*

"Sentinel antagonizes the Russians." The Russians are antagonized by the very fact of our standing in their path to world domination. Besides, why should we reach for a handkerchief every time the Russian Bear sneezes?

"Sentinel hinders arms-control talks." The Soviets agreed to arms-control talks *after* President Johnson announced Sentinel development plans. The Soviets themselves have an ABM defense system (the Tallinn complex) an estimated 1020 ICBM's and appear to be developing a new multiple-warhead missile that could deliver 10 one-megaton bombs at a time.

"Billions spent for Sentinel should be spent on social problems instead." To answer this, I offer the following from Sir John Slessor's book *Strategy for the West:*

"It is customary in democratic countries to deplore expenditures on armaments as conflicting with the requirements of the social services. There is a tendency to forget that the most important social service that a government can do for its people is to keep them alive and free."

"The Sentinel decision should be made by expert scientists, not politicians." In the last analysis, politicians must decide on everything because that is what they alone were elected by the people to do. They must hear all sides, but upon them lies the final, heavy burden of decision. This is basic to our form of government. Some persons who ought to know better than to be periodically reminded of this.

"The President's Sentinel decision means his 'honeymoon' with Congress is over." Those using this argument were just aching for a chance to go for the Presidential jugular vein, anyway, and if it hadn't been on Sentinel, it would have been on something else.

The U.S. now lead in overall missile delivery but the Soviets are working hard to close the gap and are actually ahead in deployment, if not in technology. As President Nixon said, Sentinel is "in the interests of peace throughout the world."

The two statements quoted at the beginning of this newsletter neatly and precisely sum up the very unpleasant but still vitally-essential "why" of it all. The first was made in January 1961 the second in June 1963. The author of both was President John F. Kennedy.

CENSUS REFORM

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of Trial magazine contained an article which indirectly makes a very strong argument for H.R. 3778, and companion bills relative to census reform. The article deals with the increasing threat to privacy and individualism in our modern world. The article presents an excellent case for enactment of legislation to limit the census questionnaires for the 1970 census. I insert at this point in the RECORD an excellent article by Justice Stanley Mosk in the February–March 1969 issue of Trial magazine:

THE INDIVIDUAL IN A CROWDING WORLD

(By Associate Justice Stanley Mosk, supreme court of California)

Justice William O. Douglas spoke last year at a conference called at San Francisco State College to discuss "Privacy in a Crowding World." It is a problem with which we must be increasingly concerned, as all of us become enveloped by a world population explosion, and by the development of pervasive bigness here in America: big government, big business, big labor.

Man, the unique individual, is being packed into the mold of man, an indistinguishable mass. We are being inexorably reduced as a person to a mere cipher, a telephone number, a social security number, a bank number, an employment number, a credit card number; in general, to a number in a punch-card machine which knows more about each of us than we ourselves know, and certainly more than we want our neighbors or our government to know.

Justice Douglas expressed his fears of the proposed national data center:

"The computer has taken its place alongside the A-bomb to mark the second phenomenal revolution of this generation. An idea can now be transmitted around the world in one-seventh of a second. And so the recurring question is, what ideas will be disseminated? If they concern people, what data will go into the machine, how will people be evaluated, whose names will come out if the subversive button is pressed, the lazy button is pressed, the unreliable button is pressed, and the like? If a centralized data center is established, as proposed, and all the contents of personnel files are poured into it, the privacy in this nation will be drastically diluted."

What is Douglas' objection and mine basically, to computerized data? It is the tendency to seek and to obtain utter conformity and uniformity. The iconoclast will automatically offend even the most tolerant Univac.

Is there basis for fear that liberty is threatened today? There are those, generally on the extremes of the political spectrum, who say it is. If the origin of this frightful prospect is: (a) we have too many laws today; (b) morality has broken down so more restraints are inevitable; (c) all public officials today are crooks or morons or worse; (d) courts are coddling criminals and communists; (e) let's return to the good old days of laissez-faire—meaning freedom for trusts, no labor unions, child labor, no minimum wage or maximum hours—if those elements are believed to indicate we are losing our liberty, then I must vehemently dissent. Under those enumerated theses liberty was never more secure. I reject the atavistic doctrine that modern government is unnecessary, that its services, including education, are a plot against the liberties of the citizens.

THREAT OF BUREAUCRACY

I do believe, however, liberty is endangered from another, less obvious, direction—the evils of conformity, which I prefer to call bureaucracy. By "bureaucracy" I mean the rigid and formal attitude which pervades the levels of both government and business—the bureaucracies of the public and the private sectors.

Let us look at a few facts. Government, in some form, now employs one of every ten active workers. The job classifications vary from those provided for in the Constitution of the United States to the thousands being drawn up every day in the personnel departments of federal, state, and local governments. One million Californians work for government—codified, classified, stratified, and in some instances, stultified.

In the private sector, well over 80 percent of the nonfarm workers are in corporate employment. And some 500 corporations today control two-thirds of the nonfarm economy.

It is not the power situation which concerns me, however. It is the tendency toward the same rigid organizational concept in which the individual is secondary to procedures. Indeed, I have heard speculation that the personnel departments of large corporations and large governments could be switched in toto without any interruption in the process of interviews and personality tests. It goes without saying that the IBM forms would be interchangeable.

A corporation is generally, for its employees, a riskless and seemingly eternal organization which dominates the public and personal lives of thousands of people and institutions. With the best intentions in the world, many managers are still struggling with the anonymity of corporate life. The problem is facelessness. For the first time in our history self-development has taken a back seat to security, and security has come to be synonymous with the existence of the corporation or the government agency. The corporate organization stresses the individual as a cipher over the individual in his most noble role as a creator.

AFFLUENT AMERICA

This vast machine may be functioning quite well at the moment. We have more electric can openers, color TV's, and garbage disposals than any nation in history. In affluent Beverly Hills there are 13,000 households and 70,000 telephones, and one psychiatrist for every 195 citizens. But the overall trend is bad for America. The democratic liberties, the free enterprise opportunities, and the social conscience of this nation emerged not from stratified entities but rather from the wellspring of individual thought and action. Only after our most cherished concepts were molded by individuals, who originally were neither afraid to try nor afraid to fail, did bureaucracy take over.

And, lest you think bureaucracy threatens only the Great Idea, look around you at current public and private architecture. With a few noteworthy exceptions, our metropolitan office buildings appear to be stark structures the architecture of which can only be described as Early 1984.

The stress today in bureaucracies, both public and private, is to function in a manner that is most often labeled smooth. It is a state of being hard to describe. It bears no apparent relationship to creativity, candidness, articulateness, quickness, or individuality. Obviously, the condition is foreign to controversy. It would appear to be directly related to conformity. "Conformity to what?" you ask. That, too, is hard to define. Techniques and procedures are certainly more evident than an ideology or philosophy. In fact, bureaucracy, both public and private, is characterized by a lack of ideological fervor. The method is the thing. Bureaucracy was taking away men's minds before automation was threatening their jobs.

The bureaucratic attitude invades any area:

in law, it litigates and legislates with more regard for techniques than ultimate accomplishments;

in government, it revels in rule books fashioned by anonymous bureaucrats dedicated to the destruction of the English language;

in labor, it places organizational security over concern for labor's needs;

in business, it regards expansion as preferable to innovation;

in education, it stresses rigidity of program over adaptation to the needs of individual pupils.

CREATIVITY STIFLED

A system can only function well when it is nourished with ideas and strength of spirit. Bureaucracy is being intellectually and spiritually starved today because there is timidity and blind conformity on the part of those who comprise its ranks, both in government and in business. Bureaucracy does not enroll persons for a period of challenging employment; it inters them for the period necessary to qualify for a pension.

And those who comprise its ranks submit to interment all too readily. They happily avoid any opportunity to constructively criticize, to daringly dissent, to courageously experiment.

This suggests that we have failed to inculcate the spirit of the challenging opportunities designed by our magnificent form of government. Oh, yes, we sing the Star Spangled Banner, and we recite the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. But do we really mean what we say, or do we revere conformity over individualism? Certainly each person has constitutional rights, but a dirty long-haired hippie—?

Many of us have cherished the notion that civil liberties have been under attack by only a few fanatics—that the general public regards our edifice of laws and institutions, designed to safeguard individual liberties, with respect and reverence. While this may be true in the abstract sense, I wonder how many specific elements of freedom the people would fight to retain. Chief Justice Warren said in a speech before the American Bar Association a few years ago that if the Bill of Rights were to be voted on today, he doubted that it would pass. This is a sobering thought, and yet can you believe a majority would vote for the Fifth Amendment?

Or, suppose a nationwide referendum were held asking the American people to vote on the following question: "Should our government permit the publication of newspapers that advocate the recognition of Red China?" Or perhaps this question: "Should the Constitution be amended to prevent an atheist from becoming President of the United States?" Or, "Should an avowed nudist be permitted to serve in Congress?"

I regret to say that I would be afraid of the results of such a poll. The people are often quick to react against what they conceive to be a tangible evil, even at the price of sacrificing such abstractions as law and liberty; Red China is bad, atheism and nudism are also bad—and while the Constitution is good, we may not see the connection between crushing an evil, and crippling with the same blow our fundamental concept of democracy.

CALL FOR INDIVIDUALISM

Our emphasis in this age of bigness must be on individual thought, individual initiative, and on individual courage. I reject the argument that only intellectuals can understand the philosophy of our system of government. The people can understand it, and they must understand it, if our society is to endure.

Does this encourage controversy? Does protecting individual initiative and free speech rock the boat? Of course it does. But in the words of Justice Douglas in the *Terminiello* case:

> "[A] function of free speech under our system of government is to invite dispute. It may indeed best serve its high purpose when it induces a condition of unrest, creates dissatisfaction with conditions as they are, or even stirs people to anger. Speech is often provocative and challenging. It may strike at prejudices and preconceptions and have profound unsettling effects as it presses for acceptance of an idea. That is why freedom of speech . . . is . . . protected against censorship or punishment, unless shown likely to produce a clear and present danger of a serious substantive evil that rises far above public inconvenience, annoyance or unrest. . . . There is no room under our Constitution for a more restrictive view. For the alternative would lead to standardization of ideas either by legislatures, courts, or dominant political or community groups."

COMMEMORATION OF NATIONAL COIN WEEK

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Brian E. Foss, of Westborough, Mass., has brought to my attention, on behalf of the American Numismatic Association and the Mail Order Coin Club that the week of April 19 through April 26, next, has been designated as National Coin Week.

As you know, the field of numismatology has become a very vast and interesting field with many millions of collectors. It is estimated that one in every 40 people collect coins or save them.

This year, the theme of National Coin Week is "Coins—Links in a Chain of Peace," which is being promoted by the American Numismatic Association and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Certainly this theme and every other activity that tends to promote the thought and the cause of peace in this turbulent world is most worthy of the widest public interest, and I, therefore, respectfully urge my colleagues and RECORD readers to take due note of this significant event.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE DOMINICK V. DANIELS ON AMERICAN POLICIES TOWARD EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable renewed interest in the affairs of East-Central Europe since the spring events of Czechoslovakia a year ago, which led to the Russian occupation of that proud nation and threats toward two other countries, Rumania and Yugoslavia. Yet, despite military occupation, the passive resistance of the Czech and Slovak peoples continues and Rumania has, despite token gestures of friendships toward the Soviet Union, preserved its semi-independent line in international politics, and Yugoslavia failed to be intimidated by the menace of a Soviet Russian occupation.

The spirit of reform, at least in the economic sphere, is very much alive in Hungary and unrest extends to Bulgaria where the party leadership has recently undertaken repressive measures against the intellectuals and to Poland where police had to be used to repress university unrest last spring. The forces of nationalism and humanism cannot be destroyed in the region despite the military and economic power of the protecting power, the Soviet Union.

At the same time, the Soviet Union has increasing difficulties with the Red Chinese and the conflict will only increase and not decrease, as Communist China is acquiring the wherewithal of world power: nuclear armaments and soon, also missiles to deliver nuclear warheads. There is therefore, an increasing willingness on the Soviet part for a detente in Europe. Of course, the detente to them would mean that we officially recognize the status quo in East-Central Europe, the satellite status of these countries.

Perhaps some of us would say what are we losing by such an arrangement, we do not control those countries anyway? However, the centrifugal forces in the region have been operating for the last 11 years despite our tacit recognition of the status quo by nonintervention in the Hungarian-Soviet conflict upon the victory of the Hungarian revolution in Hungary.

The forces work despite our silence at the military occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union last August. The seeds of conflicts will not be extinguished by our discreet silence not to mention our moral debasement if we were to become guarantors of the present status quo which means deprivation of these nations of the right of national self-determination. Russian power in the region is, however, manifest and no solution can be attained without Soviet consent and some consideration of the security needs of the Soviet Union.

The need for a new policy therefore, cannot be either a return to liberation policies, nor the continuation of some slightly modified form of bridgebuilding which was a soporific for inaction, the problem complex must be confronted and alternative solutions found and negotiated in the coming talks between the new administration with the Soviet Union.

Such a possible solution has been advanced by the American Hungarian Federation in its memorandum to the President, the National Security Council, and the Departments of State and Defense. It calls for a possible neutralization of already neutral Austria, independent Yugoslavia, and two to four Warsaw Pact nations, particularly Hungary and Czechoslovakia, re-creating a neutral zone roughly corresponding to the old Danubian monarchy as a buffer between NATO and the Soviet Union. I hope that our policymaker will give the important attention to this document which it deserves in view of the originality of its ideas and depth of its analysis.

KILLED IN VIETNAM, 1ST LT. WILLIAM J. TORPIE, U.S. ARMY

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report that another one of my constituents, 1st Lt. William J. Torpie, U.S. Army, of Hawthorne, N.Y., died in Vietnam last month.

I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by inserting herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, the following article:

LIEUTENANT TORPIE IS KILLED IN VIETNAM

HAWTHORNE.—First Lieutenant William J. Torpie, 25, son of Mr. and Mrs. William J. Torpie of 141 Pythian Ave. was killed, March 25 while on patrol with the 9th Infantry Division in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam, his parents learned yesterday afternoon.

A 1961 graduate of Archbishop Stepinac High School, Lt. Torpie was graduated from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in 1965 with a Bachelor of Science degree. He was a member of Pi Kappa Phi Fraternity at college.

He enlisted in the U.S. Army in January, 1967, and took his basic training at Fort Dix, N.J. He then attended Officers Training School at Fort Benning, Ga. and arrived in Vietnam on Oct. 20, 1968.

Besides his parents, the lieutenant is survived by seven sisters: Mrs. Jacqueline Hubertus of 110 Columbus Ave., Pleasantville; Mrs. Patricia Packowkski of 175 Martling Ave., Tarrytown; and Rosemary, Bernadette, Janice, Claire and Theresa, all of the home address. He also leaves his grandmother, Mrs. Fred Novey of the home address.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this year the American Legion and the Nation celebrate the Legion's 50th anniversary.

Often overlooked in discussions of the Legion's role in veterans' affairs and its concern with national issues and programs is the even more outstanding contribution it has made in exposing several generations of young people to the fundamentals of American democracy. Thousands of young men and women, myself included, have gained their first contact with, and understanding of, our form of government through the American Legion's Boys State and Girls State and Boys Nation and Girls Nation programs.

Each year some 30,000 young men gather in every State in the Union to participate in the Boys State programs, gaining an acquaintance with the fundamentals of government and an interest in participating in government at all levels. They are given the opportunity to learn about government by operating mock courts, legislatures, and city and county governments. They establish their own political parties, conduct elections, hold office, and participate in the daily functioning of representative institutions.

The Boys Nation program has brought thousands of young men to Washington to spend a week meeting with Government figures and acquainting themselves with our Nation's Capital. Together with the auxiliary's companion programs for girls, the Legion programs have given the Nation a generation of young Americans aware of their civic responsibilities and dedicated to careers of public service.

Through its broad education programs, the American Legion has worked effectively to instill in American young people a respect for democratic principles and a desire to pass them on to future generations. Since its inception in 1921, the Legion has been one of the prime sponsors of American Education Week, which gives all citizens the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the achievements, goals, and needs of our schools.

Through its concern with higher education, the Legion has helped deserving students obtain training beyond what would otherwise be available. The Legion has sponsored scholarships, directed deserving students to scholarship sources for which they are eligible, worked with organizations to recruit students for careers where personnel shortages exist, and sought out new scholarship opportunities.

Through the National High School Oratorical Contest, the American Legion has worked effectively to cultivate essential qualities of leadership and citizenship. Over a third of a million students now participate annually. The American Legion School Medal Awards honor students who have shown outstanding scholarship abilities.

Throughout its history the American Legion and the auxiliary have repeatedly demonstrated their dedication to instilling in our young men and women a sense of purpose and responsibility; to the creation of a new generation of Americans whose concern is with the preservation of our Republic and in the dignity and responsibilities of the individual.

I am proud of the work of the Legion in these and other programs and join my colleagues in saluting this organization for its half century of service to God and man.

FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF CONGRESS

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial "For the Improvement of Congress" in the April 3 issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

I am pleased to see words of praise here for our former colleague, Senator Monroney. He worked long and effectively for improvement of the Congress as a vital, on-going, and integral force in the shaping of our democracy. All of us owe both him and our former colleague in the House, Congressman Tom Curtis, a debt of gratitude on the issue of congressional reform.

I want to make a further comment on this editorial. I do not know where the Post-Dispatch acquired its measurement of opposition to certain parts of the bill and support for other parts. I have been a careful reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and in more than 2 years since the bill passed the Senate, I do not recall seeing one word of opposition to the bill or to any part of the bill. If such opposition exists, I think we ought to be told about it, and that information should be made available to the American people.

We have taken care to acquaint the public with the contents of the bill and the rationale for each of the bill's provisions, along with the history of the legislation and the work of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, and I am heartened by the growing number of writers who are assisting the effort to get information to the people. If there is opposition within

Congress to this bill, it seems to me the people have a right to know what that opposition consists of and who the opponents are.

For myself, I will strongly resist any attempt to pass portions of this bill while deleting others. I realize, as do my colleagues, that amendments will be offered when the bill comes to the floor.

But in an omnibus measure of this kind, one man's spoonful of sugar is another man's paregoric. A considerable number of us feel that we would endanger the enactment of meaningful reform the moment we start to dismantle the bill and pass only those pieces that engender the least opposition.

Notwithstanding the difficulty of generalizing about various sections of the bill, I think it would be a reasonable theory to suggest—if we could measure it—that those parts of the bill to which there is strongest resistance probably are those parts that most need to be enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks today, I include below the text of the editorial:

FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF CONGRESS

Prospects for improvement of the organization of Congress have brightened noticeably with the reported withdrawal of House Speaker McCormack's objections and the emergence of a group of reform-minded Republicans headed by Representative Rumsfeld of Illinois and Senator Mundt of South Dakota.

Speaker McCormack's about-face is reported due to the shaking-up he took when Representative Morris Udall of Arizona challenged him for the House speakership in January—and to his consequent desire to better his standing with his Republican colleagues.

If reorganization is becoming that popular in the House, another major roadblock besides Mr. McCormack may be giving at least a little. For it was in the House that the proposal languished last year after being approved by the Senate—though not in the best shape.

The recommendations laid before Congress year before last were no idle dreams of quixotic and misty-eyed reformers. They were the studied pragmatism of a special joint committee of Congress with Representative Madden of Indiana and Senator Monroney of Oklahoma as co-chairmen.

Senator Monroney in particular has as sharp an eye for the politically possible as he has for the practicably necessary. As coauthor of the LaFollette-Monroney reforms in 1946 he is Congress's most knowledgeable member in these matters.

How much can prudently be expected of the Ninety-first Congress in its first session the leaders of the present drive for reform will of course have to decide for themselves. It would be regrettable if some measures on which there is a substantial amount of agreement should be stymied on account of other measures on which there is an even more substantial amount of opposition.

At the very minimum, it seems to us, Congress should be willing to approve these three proposals: (1) Enable Congress to move closer toward equality with the Executive branch in fiscal and budgetary analysis and control; (2) remove the stranglehold of chairmen on committees by enactment of a "committees' bill of rights;" (3) establish a permanent joint committee on the organization of Congress to keep hammering away at improvement of structure and method.

Though both would correct Congress' diminution of stature vis-a-vis the Executive, the first of these proposals has very good support in the House while the second is probably the most hysterically opposed in the whole kit of proposed reforms.

A fight ought to be made for democratizing committees, but if it cannot be carried it should not be allowed to take down with it the means of informing Congress more fully in the facts about what it is doing.

Representatives and Senators will be obliged in the final analysis to give up their moated castles of preferment and power to preserve the equality of their branch in our tripartite form of government. What is good for a committee chairman is not necessarily good for Congress, to say nothing of the country; and House and Senate will be called upon to readjust their organization continuously if they are not to resign themselves to sinking to secondary status in the three branches of government.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON SALUTES TELEPHONE PIONEERS OF AMERICA

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, volunteers working in hospitals, collecting eyeglasses for the eyebank, sending books and material to servicemen in Vietnam—this is just a part of the work of the Telephone Pioneers of America.

April 25 has been set aside in New York State as "Telephone Pioneers' Day." It is a day when we can recognize the great spirit and dedication of the men and women in the telephone industry.

Founded in 1911, the association is the largest social-industrial organization of its kind in the world. It is comprised of over 300,000 men and women who have served a minimum of 21 years in the communications industry.

I am pleased that there is a chapter of this organization in my district—the Genesee chapter which consists of 1,210 active and retired employees from Rochester Telephone Corp., Stromberg Carlson, New York Telephone, Western Electric, and American Telephone & Telegraph.

The Genesee chapter is an outstanding example of a Pioneer chapter serving its community. It has the highest membership enrollment among all 75 chapters—99.7 percent. William O'Hagan, chapter president, and John Robertson, chapter vice president, have worked hard on the concept of community service.

The work of the members is diverse and meaningful. Members of the Genesee chapter have collected eyeglasses for the Rochester Eye Bank and Research Center. They have shipped 7,400 books and $2,600 worth of ditty bags to servicemen in Vietnam. They have a volunteer staffing of the poison control center at Strong Memorial Hospital. They have repaired 400 talking book machines for the blind. They have collected and distributed over 550 pounds of used clothing to inner city agencies.

Pioneers on a State and national level perform countless service activities. They volunteer for hospital work, organize libraries for shut-ins, and convert old switchboards for use in training handicapped children.

In conjunction with the "services for the blind" program, Pioneers collect used eyeglasses for "New Eyes for the Needy," and record textbooks which are later transcribed into braille for blind students.

The repair of talking book machines was recognized by the Library of Congress in 1966, when it presented an award to the Pioneers, "in grateful appreciation for support of national library service to blind people."

In all of these activities, Pioneers apply a personal interest and an earnest desire to help those less fortunate. The common bond of fellowship, dedication to community service, and the spirit and vitality of the telephone Pioneers is worthy of the respect and admiration of all Americans. "United to serve others," is most certainly, the true purpose of this organization.

EXTRACT FROM ADDRESS BY HON. HAMILTON FISH

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am pleased to include the following extract from an address by Hon. Hamilton Fish at the 50th anniversary celebration of the American Legion post at Newburgh, N.Y., on Saturday evening, March 29, 1969.

Mr. Fish is a former distinguished Member of the House and an outstanding patriot. His remarks deserve the careful consideration of every American.

The extract follows:

EXTRACT FROM SPEECH OF HON. HAMILTON FISH AT THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION POST AT NEWBURGH, N.Y., ON MARCH 29, 1969

I have spoken to you on the origin and formation of the Preamble of the American Legion as the Chairman of the Committee of Three that wrote the Preamble on May 10 at the St. Louis meeting in 1919. I would be derelict as Chairman of the First Congressional Committee to investigate Communism and as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives for a quarter of a century, if I did not warn the American people of their potential destruction by the World Communist Conspiracy that seeks to destroy Freedom everywhere.

The paramount reason for the existence of all governments is to provide for the safety of its people and the security of the nation. Some misguided Senators apparently do not realize this and are opposing President Nixon's constructive but limited proposal to safeguard and protect the sites of our transcontinental nuclear missiles. Without such protection within the next few years, Soviet Russia could destroy by a surprise attack, most of our nuclear missiles in a few hours and leave us naked and defenseless against Soviet Russia's newest and powerful nuclear weapons. Thank God the National Executive Committee of the American Legion realizing this awesome menace to all our people, recently adopted a strong resolution in favor of an adequate defensive system to safeguard our missiles sites. As General MacArthur said a number of years ago, "I do not believe there will be a nuclear war between Soviet Russia and the United States as each will always offset any advance by the other resulting in a stalemate and such a war both know, would be suicidal." Moscow and Leningrad have already established a defensive system against nuclear attacks. We have delayed too long and further delay to protect our missile sites might well be suicidal for the American people and our nation.

The United States is the strongest bastion of Freedom in the world and therefore the greatest enemy to the extension of Communism which is a negation of all freedom. If our missile sites are destroyed through lack of a defensive system, the United States would be forced to surrender and Communism would prevail not only in our own country, but throughout the world. No one is more opposed to a suicidal nuclear war with Soviet Russia, which would destroy both nations. But even the Communist leaders admit that the protection of nuclear weapons is solely for defensive purposes.

The American people are entitled to know the truth that their lives are being placed in jeopardy by those who oppose President Nixon's limited defense of our atomic sites and should notify their Congressman and their Senator that their security and that of the nation has a priority over everything else.

Communists, fellow travelers, radicals, extremists and left wing liberals have already begun to throw red hot political bricks at President Nixon before he has time to clean up the terrible mess that he inherited from the previous Administration. These extreme liberals even among the United States Senators want to bring bloody fisted chaotic Red China into the United Nations and to extend the hand of friendship to Mao for helping to kill tens of thousands of American boys in Vietnam. This is incomprehensibe at the present time. Those Democrats or Republicans in the Senate should join a combat regiment in Vietnam to test the killing power of Chinese produced machine guns. Communist China at the present time is not a peace loving nation and is not willing to comply with decisions made by the United Nations. The United Nations in New York City is already infested by Communist spies, provocateurs and revolutionists and if Red China is voted into the United Nations, then it is time that either we should withdraw from it, or its headquarters should be moved to Switzerland or to some other smaller nation.

COLLECTING TAXES ON ELECTION DAY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which I believe will eventually cause a major decrease in the burden of American taxpayers. More and more across this Nation, the quiet majority of Americans are in revolt; they are steadily mounting a verbal assault on oppressively high taxes.

The people of this Nation have a long tradition of supporting their Federal Government without complaint, but recently the massive burden of taxes has pushed the quiet American too far. Now, he is starting to speak out and the Congress will have to listen.

For years I have counseled that overspending, and not undertaxation is the problem facing the Federal Government. It has progressed to the stage where the people not only agree but are shaking off the complacency and mounting a verbal, frontal assault on the antiquated, unfair tax system and on the yearly Federal piracy which culminates in the April raid. Members of Congress who are preoccupied with spending all they can get, getting all they can, and leaving little for the man who does the earning will begin to feel the heat of this revolt, and I believe the sooner the better.

The only corrective is through selecting Representatives concerned, sincerely concerned, with lightening the taxpayers' burdens. I am today introducing legislation which I believe will aid in bringing to office such Representatives.

I have proposed a simple change in the tax regulations. It asks that the notorious tax collection day, April 15, be abolished and replaced by the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November. Election day would also become tax collection day.

I believe that shifting the concern that builds up yearly on April 15 to election day will cause many voters to think twice about the representatives they hope to elect. This is the politics of good Government, of sound Federal financing, of fiscal responsibility in contrast to the politics of Federal excesses, Government by deficit and overspending.

Many measures have been proposed over the years. Some have suggested that tax withholding be abolished, thus indicating to the taxpayer, in one lump sum, the cost to him of his Government. This is, of course, not practical and would increase the financial management burden on the taxpayer.

Another interesting proposal would establish a Tax Freedom Day. Based on the average wage and the average annual tax cost, 1 day each year would be declared a national holiday indicating that from the first of each year to that date the average American has been working for the Federal Government. All the money he had earned to that date had gone to pay his taxes. The rest of the year, what was left of it, he would be earning for himself and his family. Tax Freedom Day this year is estimated to be April 27. This includes the cost of all taxes: State, Federal, and local. I am sure such a day would demonstrate the problem, but it is imprecise. There are few average Americans, and some would have to work longer, some not as long, and the day would lose meaning for most.

I believe that a simple shift of the final tax collection day to the day of national elections will provide sufficient indirect impact to generate a lower tax burden and thorough tax reforms.

Until this proposal is adopted, I suggest that each taxpayer simply jot down the total dollar amount paid in Federal taxes on his calendar in the block designating the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

MRS. CYNTHIA LITTELL WRITES OF THE REALITY OF THE VIETNAM WAR

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that to many of our citizens the war in Vietnam is not real, that it means little, or nothing, and that they have managed to escape its impact. This is certainly not so when the son, brother, father, or husband is among our fighting men in Southeast Asia, as the following letter so beautifully points out.

It was written by Mrs. Cynthia Littell, who is employed on the staff of one of our colleagues, Hon. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, of the Ohio 23d Congressional District, about her husband, a career man with the Air Force. This touching and moving account of just how real the war is to Mrs. Littell and her daughter is the finest I have ever read. It points up the truth in the line written by the great English poet John Milton, that, "They also serve who only stand and wait." Let us all hope that the day will soon arrive when the waiting for Mrs. Littell, and thousands who share her experiences, will be over.

The letter follows:

WIFE OF MAYWOOD AIRMAN IN COMBAT ASKS AND ANSWERS: IS WAR REAL?—THE ANSWER IS YES

DEAR LEN: Yes, Vietnam and the war is a definite reality.

Eight years ago my husband joined the Air Force and has since chosen it as his career. He's been in that ominous sounding place called "APO San Francisco" nine months this time and was home for only about a month after having been there for four months.

The war is a reality each time I look at my dresser and see the picture of Bob and me, each time my little girl and I sit down for a meal and there is an empty chair at the table, the war becomes a reality. Each time my little girl asks "When is Daddy coming home from work?" the war becomes real. Each day when I come home from work and check the mail box, the war is real. Each time I look at the calendar and see my little notations about how many days left until Bob returns, the war is real. When my daughter's wagon was broken I spent two hours trying to fix it and then she turned and said, "That's okay, Mommy, Daddy will fix it when he comes home," the war is real. Figuring out income tax and then deducting pay received while in a combat zone, that makes the war real. Thanksgiving and Christmas without Daddy made the war real. A piece of jewelry Bob has bought overseas, a doll he has gotten Tami from Okinawa, a koala bear he got in Hawaii, having a broken stereo and knowing that if your handy-man husband were home he'd fix it—these things shatter the protective shield which I've tried to build up, the drone of radio and television reports becomes a violent sound, there is a tremble of my body—and the war is real.

Last year when I was hospitalized I had the experience of truly knowing what the WAR was. I spent some time in Fitzsimmons Army Hospital in Denver enroute to the Air Force Medical Center. The harsh reality of the war was all over. On the flight to San Antonio the other passengers were mostly men on their way to the nearest hospital, to their homes and families. They were coming from the war, they know it's a reality and one look at them will definitely tell you it's so.

Sometimes I feel I'm the only one that thinks the war is real. Then the Our Town comes bringing news of the people back home, that little town I grew up in that has sometimes been as far away as 2200 miles because of my husband's chosen profession. The Our Town tells me that the boy next door that I can only remember as being in about 9th grade, or the boy I had a crush on when in 4th grade, or a boy I knew only slightly from College English class, has gone to war. Suddenly you realize, that the town may be small but it feels the effects of the war and knows it's real. I'm glad to be from Maywood, Maywood cares. When the February 20 and 27 issues of Our Town hit the homes, I know Maywood felt a great loss, and I know now that Maywood feels as I do.

Pretty soon Maywood will be 2900 miles away in actual miles, but Maywood will be a lot closer since it's a place I love.

Sincerely,

CYNTHIA.

REEXAMINE U.S. FOREST POLICY

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer recently printed a very sound editorial examining the U.S. Forest Service policy and its effect on the American lumber industry.

It is common knowledge that the recent large increases in lumber prices have raised the cost of housing by hundreds or even thousands of dollars per home.

In my district and in many other parts of the country the housing shortage is becoming increasingly acute. The situation is deteriorating partly, because a deficiency of wood at a reasonable price exists.

The U.S. Forest Service owns much of the usable timberland in the country. Therefore, any easing of the problem would require some examination of Forest Service policy and administration.

Extensive forest land is one of America's prime natural resources. If forests continue to be mismanaged, and their products wasted, an important industry and a large segment of the populace will be adversely affected.

Following is the editorial:

REEXAMINE U.S. FOREST POLICY

There are so many individual problems wrapped up in the current lumber and plywood shortage-price increase crisis that an observer has a hard time making out the forest because of the trees.

But there it is—a sprawling, timber-cutting industry in which western hardwoods compete with southern softwoods; in which 60% of the nation's total softwood timber is federally owned, but where production has been cut back and trees allowed to decay instead of forests being made more valuable and productive.

The U.S. Forest Service is one of the few government agencies that turns a profit but the receipts go into the general fund and the Forest Service must depend upon appropriations from Congress to operate. Appropriations are not as large as needed for a proper job of forest management and this is critically reflected in the lumber shortage affecting the housing industry and buyers' pocketbooks.

Contributing to the shortage also is a law restricting Alaskan shipping to the U.S. mainland to U.S. vessels. This prices lumber cargoes out of reach. Consequently much lumber and plywood that could ease housing shortages in Cleveland is sold to Japan, being shipped there in Japanese ships. The American and Japanese national housing programs are competing for wood head-on. Current American production is 1.6 million housing units this year. Japan is planning 1.9 million.

U.S. Sen. John Sparkman, D-Ala., chairman of the Senate housing subcommittee and known for 20 years as "Mr. Housing," recently called for means to increase timber outputs in national forests (which are not wilderness areas or national parks), coupled with a wiser policy of cutting on private lands.

The Sierra Club, a conservation group with 72,000 members, says overcutting contributed to closing three-fourths of the Douglas fir mills in the northwest in the last 20 years and to closing 26 western plywood mills in the last two years.

Sierra warns of a "raid on the national forests," while the industry emphasizes that federal commercial forests are designed to supply needs of U.S. citizens.

A reappraisal is needed. The nation, through Congress, needs to strike a proper balance between managing forest resources, production and requirements.

Whether private mismanagement and waste are responsible for the price-supply squeeze should be established or refuted before Congress considers making drastic changes. A national study by an independent commission, as Sierra suggests, seems in order.

LET US ANALYZE OUR SYSTEM

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have long been a champion of reform for the Congress. My legislation and writings on the subject make my position quite clear. If the Congress is to have any hope whatsoever of keeping pace in our rapidly moving modern world, we must adopt the modern methods utilized by industry. A good example is the valuable tool of systems analysis. Mr. Bob J. Hansen recently discussed this subject in an article in the April 1969 issue of Government Executive magazine. I insert the article in the RECORD, and commend it to all Members:

THERE IS A ROLE FOR SYSTEMS ANALYSIS IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Bob J. Hansen, president, Decision Research Corp.)

HIGHLIGHTS

1. The workload of Congress has increased over the years and the trend is accelerating;
2. Systems analysis, considering politics and constituency factors, can help weave the entire fabric of legislative decisions;
3. Congress, for the most part, is still leery of systems analysis and must be sold on its potentials;
4. Systems analysis can be a valuable tool for the decision-making legislator, aiding necessary human judgment.

A note on history: This country's first Congress had 65 members in the House of Representatives with constituencies averaging 33,000 persons. During its Sessions, 118 public and private Acts and Resolutions were enacted. At the start of this decade, each Congressman represented an average of 450,000 constituents—and the number is increasing.

The workload has increased proportionately. In a recent Congress, 26,566 measures were introduced and, of these, 4,016 were passed. This suggests that the unlogged, unnumbered hours each legislator spent at Committee Hearings, in preparation for those Hearings, in Committee and Subcommittee attendance must be very great. A clue: During the First Session of last Congress, there were 182 quorum calls, 201 "yea and nay" calls and hundreds of teller (not individually recorded), division or standing (not recorded) and voice votes in the House.

Congressional decision-making is a continuing process between and among each Congress. Decisions must be synthesized to produce a reasonable harmony, with the more important decisions given priority attention. To do this in an effective manner demands that the Congressmen have dependable information as indicated in the chart below.

More and more, systems (or more familiarly, systems analysis) will gain the attention of Congress as a viable, dependable way of reaching decisions. The contrast between a systems trend and traditional bodies in Congress is extreme. However, systems may help Congress provide a framework to consider its role in tying together all of its parts. Explicit in this concept is the effect of decisions between all the parts of Congress and to its whole in the national legislative problem.

Most definitions of a system are similar in content. One definition describes a system as "an array of components designed to accomplish a particular objective according to a plan." There must be an objective, a design or organization and input according to a plan.

There seems to be no single answer for coping with the democratic process. If systems are used in Congress, they must be used with discretion. After all, the systems analyst technician is an advisor, not an elected Congressional decision-maker. He collects all the facts of a problem and presents alternative choices for decision.

It has been suggested that one central organization for systems analysis could be a supporting tool for Congress. However, the individual Congressman might rely too much on this systems analysis group and by-pass his own staff or, conversely, set up a duplicate manual record system to double-check the systems analyst. An alternative might be to contract for pilot applications of systems in Congress.

Congressman Robert McClory (R-Ill.), in an interview in the House Judiciary Committee chambers, stated: "Systems analysis will eventually come to the aid of the Congressman. However, the management science community must make systems analysis fashionable and sell Congress on the great potentials of management science and systems analysis—such as planning, programing, budgeting systems."

Development of new ideas has been encouraged by outside groups studying the Congressman's activities and methods for their improvement. Such an effort was undertaken three years ago by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. Here, a group of scholars was commissioned to examine various aspects of Congressional operations and prepare separate studies on how Congress "might be aided in its work to achieve a good society, counting as part of that good society the legislative way of life itself." These studies were combined in the book *Congress: The*

First Branch of Government, published in Washington by the Institute.

Congress now has begun to consider the possibility of acting through legislation to provide technological support for its own activities. In the Second Session of the 89th Congress, Representative McClory introduced H.R. 18428 as a bill to establish an automatic data processing facility to support the Congress. He told the House that Congress "must use every possible mechanism to insure that Congress executes its traditional responsibilities."

A bipartisan group of supporters of the bill has stressed the importance of using ADP and modern program evaluation techniques in support of Congressional budgetary review. The idea is to provide members a logical way to comprehend and respond to the new performance budget mode of operation within the Executive branch. Other priority applications include the preparation of legislative histories of bills and the establishment and maintenance of selected Federal data.

SCOTT'S OBSERVATION

In this regard, Sen. Hugh Scott (D-Pa.) prepared amendment number 63 to the legislative Reorganization Act of 1967. It was approved by the Senate, proposing a new capability to assist Congress. Said Scott: "The requirements of this age—reflected in the broad spectrum of issues facing the Congress—can be coped with only by the utilization of all available human and technological resources. . . .

"The electronic computer and the systems techniques connected with its use are simply tools for use by the decision-maker. They are designed to help provide that information which is necessary to make balanced, accurate decisions."

Many areas of Congressional activity appear to lend themselves to systems. In a report prepared for general distribution to the Congress, entitled "Automatic Data Processing for Congress," a number of possible applications were identified and discussed. The report suggests that areas of focus might include Congress as a whole, the functioning committee and an individual Congressman.

LEGISLATIVE BILLS

Other possible applications included: (1) data showing the status of pending legislation; (2) an automated index-catalog of Congressional documents; (3) current information on issues up for vote; (4) an automated schedule of committee meetings and hearings; (5) histories of committee action in ADP form; (6) appropriations statistics information; and (7) an automated Selective Dissemination of Information (SDI) system to retrieve key items of research value for individual Congressmen.

There has been evidence before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress showing that application of systems analysis, operations research and ADP techniques to the problems of the Congressman in his legislative role merits consideration. Constituent-oriented activities of the Congressman also can be made less time-consuming.

Within the House of Representatives in the 89th Congress, a group of 44 Republicans led by Rep. F. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts strongly supported the concept of establishing a National Commission on Public Management, by introducing H.R. 17310 and other bills. Similar legislation was introduced in the Senate by Scott and nine other Senators (S. 3762).

Morse and his associates concentrated on the need for further study of the applicability of the systems management approach to nondefense and nonspace public programs. Said he: "Appropriating money and shuffling papers in bureaucracy should not be confused with problem-solving. The traditional Government approach to a complex problem is to divide it into manageable parts and to treat each of them separately. A comprehensive solution is thus impossible. The bureaucracy simply does not have the capacity to solve today's or tomorrow's problems—but private industry with the new approach is rapidly developing that capacity."

Insight into the role of systems analysis in the public domain is also found in the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Science Research and Development, of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics chaired by Rep. Emilio Q. Daddario (D-Conn.). The subcommittee's recommendation dealing with environmental pollution stated: "To place pollution abatement on a comparable basis with our national technology programs, systems analysis and management capability should be established within the Federal Government. This approach should be used along with planning, programming, budgeting techniques to organize both near and long-term Federal research and operational efforts in pollution abatement."

THE JOINT RESOLUTION

Congressional attention to the significance of systems was also manifest in Joint Resolution 110 sponsored by Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) in the 90th Congress. This resolution would authorize the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations to "study the feasibility of a computer system to help state and local governments to participate more effectively in Federally assisted programs." Kennedy pointed out that Public Law 86–388 already gives authority to employ the type of technical consultants required to perform such a study.

The future need for a joint attack on these problems by business and Government has been identified and is being examined across the Nation. Some states are taking the initiative in supporting systems engineering studies. California, for instance, has funded studies of state needs, being conducted by four aerospace companies.

Congressional decision-making and the decision-maker must be better understood; they must be studied and examined. If a "yea" or "nay" decision is made in Congress, a human decision-maker must rate competing systems, if not qualitatively, at least quantitatively.

The Congressional decision-making process raises such questions as: Would he make the same decision as another Congressional decision-maker with identical information and alternatives? Would he make the same decision in this Congress as he would have in a previous Congress?

According to Kenneth Janda in *Congress: The First Branch of Government*, "Information systems are *not* . . . devices for grinding out policy decision and they are not designed to replace human judgment. Rather, they are intended to provide the human decision-maker—here, the Congressman—with knowledge for making informed choices."

Early last month, this author interviewed Reps. Bill Brock (R-Tenn.) and Donald Rumsfeld (R-Ill.) for *Government Executive* and was told that more thorough legislative modernization is being sought. The application of modern business management techniques was referred to by the two Congressmen in context with the need to enact H.R. 6278, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969. The act has since been cosponsored by more than 70 members of Congress.

Brock feels "There should be better ways to sift, screen and extract significant information from the accelerated volume of data Congressmen receive. Systems should show the way to achieve some of these better ways. There are various systems tools available that conceivably could be employed to help Congressmen. Some of these are information retrieval and decision-making systems that solve the problem of obtaining timely, accurate and complete and relevant information for decisionmaking."

Some private and public research is going on in the area of how decisions are made and the information necessary to make them. The Decision Research Corp. of Washington has embarked on a study of the systems approach in Congress and has published an independent report.

Rumsfeld pointed to the need to provide Congress with new organizational techniques, more modern procedures and improvements in the Lobbying Act. He said, "The last time Congress modernized was with the Reorganization Act of 1946. There have been enormous changes in our society, the nature of the problems confronting the Nation and in the tools available to help the Congress find solutions for these problems. It is important that the methods of modern management be utilized to help reach more rational decisions that reflect more thoughtfully ordered priorities. The problems of the Seventies are not going to be effectively handled with the rules devices and procedures of 1946."

Title II of the Reorganization Act of 1969 would authorize the Comptroller General of the U.S. to develop, establish and maintain a standardized information and data processing system for budgetary and fiscal data. This would be done in cooperation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget so that the Congress could more efficiently perform its overseeing functions and also have available the types of data upon which rational decision-making must rest.

Dr. James A. Robinson, professor of Political Science at Ohio State University, emphasizes the importance attached to this key area by commenting that "as problems proliferate, the amount of information required as a basis for making policy decisions also radically increases. In consequence, no legislator can be an expert on more than a few policy issues."

The unique function of the legislative decision-maker continues to be required. If a measure of effectiveness were to be used in systems methods, it must be predefined subjectively or objectively by the legislative decision-maker alone. The benefits to constituents to be derived from a system are basically the responsibility of a Senator or Representative and should be based on their criteria.

In general, the criteria for a decision originates from the decision-maker's definition of the functional relationships benefits, resources and objectives. The decision-maker approves and thus decides because of his (or his group's) incumbent responsibility for a decision. He also may establish weighting factors known only to him in his mind to be employed in evaluating the cost-effectiveness of alternatives.

The decision-maker solely is responsible to account for the limitations in the quantified analysis. These limitations are data inadequacies, modeling assumptions and uncertainty which often causes doubts about the use of systems analysis data. The final selection of the best alternative, therefore, is primarily the decision-maker's judgment. The point is, that if there were systems in Congress, the information in the array of standard and specialized reports presented to Congress would simply augment but not replace the individual judgment of each member.

The now classic method of weapons systems analysis, for decision-making is collection, analysis, recording and selection of alternatives before a decision. This systems approach can be listed as five steps: (1) establish the objective and mission; (2) specify assumptions and constraints; (3) identify alternatives; (4) model the system; and (5) select from among the alternatives.

The first four tasks are acts that the technician or systems analyst performs. The fifth is the act of deciding based on the experienced judgment of the Congressional decision-maker.

Old prejudices and outworn traditions tend to encourage fragmentation of systems efforts in Congress. Yesterday's piecemeal pattern cannot be applied in dealing with today's complex and integrated problems. This is especially true in the intergovernmental establishment.

Congress needs to know how to increase the efficiency of its software and brainware for better decisions by using better systems. Modern systems in Congressional decision-making have a potentially powerful role to play.

THE SPREADING IMPACT OF AIR TRAFFIC CONGESTION

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Miami and other Florida cities are among the few in the country planning and building airports for the future. Congestion at northern airports, however, has forced flights to wait on the ground at Miami International even though no traffic was backed up at the airport there.

Don Bedwell, aviation writer for the Miami Herald, pointed this out recently as a striking example of the spreading nationwide impact of airport congestion at such hubs as New York, Washington, and Chicago. Demand for scheduled airline service continues to grow at a phenomenal rate. Airline passenger traffic will more than double by 1975. Air cargo will double within the next 5 years. Such growth heightens the need for a truly adequate national airports system.

I believe the penetrating analysis contained in Mr. Bedwell's article is so timely as to be of interest to my colleagues, and insert it in the Record at this point:

Clampdowns Can Hurt Airport, Official Says

(By Don Bedwell)

Miami, Tampa and other cities that have instigated foresighted jetport planning could find their investment frustrated by artificial restraints, a spokesman for the nation's airline industry told a Jacksonville meeting.

Stuart Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association, listed Miami, Tampa and Jacksonville among a "select group of U.S. cities building airports adequate to meet traffic demands of the 1970s."

He told the Florida State Transportation Conference last week that Houston, Kansas City and Dallas-Fort Worth are other cities that have done the necessary planning to cope with the forthcoming age of superjets.

Tipton warned that congestion already clogging major Northeastern terminals threatens such airports as Miami, Atlanta, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Boston as well.

The three cities selected by the Federal Aviation Administration for limitation of flights—New York, Washington and Chicago—together with Atlanta and Boston constitute 46 per cent of the traffic to Miami last year, and 34 per cent of the traffic to Jacksonville.

"Even that select group of U.S. cities building airports adequate to meet traffic demands of the 1970s will see their investment partly wasted if artificial schedule restraints at major air hubs are permitted to take the place of new runways and radar really needed nationwide," Tipton cautioned.

Restraints proposed by the FAA are designed to reduce congestion at the three critically congested cities. Because of congestion at Northern terminals, flights have been forced to wait on the ground at Miami International even though no traffic was backed up at the airport here.

Sixty scheduled and supplemental airlines, domestic and foreign, have adjusted their planned flights to bring them within the limits imposed by the FAA at New York, Chicago and Washington.

While the airlines worked out a voluntary schedule-cutting for those airports—under the threat that the FAA would do it for them—Tipton said the carriers consider the restrictions "shortsighted and inherently harmful.

"In a very real sense," he said, "we have been closing the door on potential business in an era when rising costs of capital, wages and material for every profit-conscious industry to reach out for new market-expansion opportunities."

Restrictions at the three cities take effect in June.

Within the aviation industry, the restrictions have found little support, despite the critical problems that prompted the action.

The nation's airlines—represented by the ATA—have opposed the restrictions, since they involve thousands of schedule adjustments and reduce flight frequencies. Private and commercial aviation interests have attacked the restrictions in court, contending they are loaded in favor of the airlines.

The FAA rule calls for a maximum of 70 air carrier flights an hour at New York Kennedy, 115 at Chicago O'Hare, 40 at Newark and an equal number at Washington National.

"Studies at ATA show beyond any doubt that all of the major air hubs will need present airports expanded or new airports built by 1975," Tipton said. He cited an FAA airports plan which concluded that 800 new airline and general aviation fields must be built in the next five years to relieve present congestion and accommodate future growth.

"But even if we include airline-served cities of all sizes, only about a dozen have tackled the job," he said, citing Miami and its proposed port in the Everglades.

Even the advanced cities will find their skies clogged "if we don't get moving soon on a meaningful national program to provide adequate airports and airways throughout the country."

"Take each of the 500 or so airports in this country served by airlines," Tipton said, "and add up the dismal impact of artificial schedule restraints on people who want to get to and from major air hubs at their convenience and you have the public price of inadequate airport-airways development."

He urged public support for an airline industry proposal of an airport development trust fund.

He also asked the conference to support modernization of the airways system for air navigation and air traffic control "under a formula through which all users of the system contribute their fair share to its support."

User charges have been staunchly opposed by private aviation interests which argue that they would be billed for costly programs of benefit primarily to the airlines.

ALL HAVE A PART IN THE STRUGGLE FOR LIBERTY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a monument to the Hungarian revolutionists of 1956 has been dedicated in Denver, Colo. The laying of wreaths on the statue of a fleeing young man trying to break through a symbolic curtain was a sad, and noble occasion.

A man who fought in the revolution, who went through the hope and then the agony of the Hungarian freedom fighters, gave a speech that marked this a memorable event.

Istvan B. Gereben, of Washington, D.C., copresident of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation, who has adopted America as his home after struggling to gain freedom and justice for his own beloved country, told the audience:

> The Hungarian Revolution of 1956 was fought for the same ideals for which this Republic stands.

This man, who fought for what he believed, knowing it could mean death as it did to so many of his countrymen, said:

> Each of us has a part in this mighty struggle for liberty and justice.

Mr. Gereben pointed out the worth of each man's individual effort. He quoted the words of Edward Everett Hale:

"I am only one, but I am one.
I can't do everything, but I can do something.
What I can do, that I ought to do.
And what I ought to do,
By the Grace of God, I shall do."

Today, I would like to share Mr. Gereben's fine speech with my colleagues in the House:

Address by Mr. Istvan B. Gereben, Copresident of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation, U.S.A., at the Unveiling of the Hungarian Freedom Fighter's Memorial in Denver, Colo., October 26, 1968

Ladies and gentlemen: In 1956, with the victory of National Communism in Poland, a new chapter began in this History of Communism and of the subjugated countries of Eastern Europe. With the Hungarian Revolution, a new chapter began in the History of Humanity.

These two events, each in its own way, sharply express the internal conditions of the east European countries. If the events in Poland encouraged the aspirations of Communist Parties, * * * Particularly those of Eastern Europe—for equality with Moscow, the Hungarian Revolution made a gigantic leap and placed on the agenda the problem of freedom in Communism, that is to say, the replacement of the Communist System itself by a new social system. If the former event had encouraged both the people and certain Communist Circles, the latter encouraged the popular masses and democratic tendencies.

Between the two events, although they happened almost simultaneously, there lies a whole epoch. The changes in Poland mean the triumph of National Communism, which in a different form we have seen in Yugoslavia. The Hungarian uprising is something more, a new Phenomenon, perhaps no less meaningful than the French Revolution.

In short, these events have brought to the fore the following new questions:

1. The further possibilities of National Communism.

2. The replacement of Communism by a new system, and along with this, the right of people heretofore under Communist rule to choose its own—Non-Communist—path of development.

3. The problem of the future foreign—and in my opinion, internal policy of the Soviet Regime.

Had the Hungarian Revolution been saved from Soviet Intervention, it would have been difficult indeed for Moscow to obscure its internal conflicts by means of foreign conquest and the so called "World Mission." The Soviet system would soon have been confined to its own national boundaries and there, too, the citizens would be forced to reflect on their position and their destiny. And not only the citizens, but the leaders. They would have to break up into different groups which could no longer carry out mutual purges within their own closed circle, but would be forced to bid for popular support. This, new processes would begin in the Soviet Union too.

Moscow could no longer preserve Hungarian Communism: it faced the choice of either leaving Hungary or occupying it. Thus, the Russian Imperialism dropped its last Socialist mask.

The events in one Communist Country necessarily affect all other Communist countries, as in one and the same living organism. And just as Yugoslav Communism, separating itself from Moscow, initiated the Crisis of Soviet Imperialism, that is, the inevitable birth of National Communism, in the same way the revolution in Hungary means the beginning of the end of Communism generally.

As in all other great and decisive historic events, the Hungarian Fighters for Freedom, struggling for their existence and country, may not have foreseen what an epochal deed they had initiated. The world has rarely witnessed such unprecedented unity of the popular masses and such heroism. The unity of the popular masses was so strong that it appeared as though there had been no civil strife, as though a ruling class had not been wiped out overnight as if it never existed. And the heroic intoxication was so high that bare handed boys and girls were stopping the tanks of the interventionists, who like the Cossacks of Nicholas the First in 1849, tried to suppress their liberty and enslave their country.

Until now, the words spoken by me were not mine. They have been written by an expert on Russia and Communism: Professor Milovan Djilas of Princeton University, the Former Vice-President of Yugoslavia. I could not find better, clearer and more truthful evaluation of the Hungarian Revolution, in which I had the privilege to participate.

The Hungarian people on the basis of independence and equality and accordance with the spirit of the UN Charter wished to live in true friendship with their neighbors, the Soviet Union and all peoples of the world.

The Hungarian people desired the consolidations and further development of their National Revolution without joining any power blocks . . . We appealed to our neighbors and to countries far and near to respect the unalterable decision of our people for a free, independent, democratic and neutral Hungary.

The citizens of Denver today pay tribute to the spirit of the Hungarian nation and to the overwhelming sacrifice of her people by dedicating this square and monument to freedom especially freedom for Hungary and her people which values liberty more than life or love.

The history of recent times undoubtedly shows that the trend throughout the world is toward the recognition of individual liberty as essential necessity for social and political progress. America has been a forerunner in this progress, and accordingly, America's conceptions of liberty, as described in the constitution of the United States are unique.

Americans have devised the best government on earth: three branches, equal, with appropriate checks and balances between each branch. A bill of rights enumerating those essentials that make the difference between freedom and slavery.

And Edmund Burke expressed it so properly: Our liberties are tied to "Tangible objects":—Tax Consciousness, a device to control reckless government, the Habeas corpus and the right to trial by jury all part of this concept.

There can be no doubt that Americans are privileged, at least in this respect; But this special place in history commits America to certain things; we must not only protect our liberties, we must share our spiritual wealth with others. Americans must be convinced that their course is the right course. They must take their historic mission seriously, and if they do so, they will act accordingly.

Nowadays, it seems this American Mission frequently is misinterpreted and misrepresented. This mission is what the citizens of Denver fulfill today by showing understanding, respect and admiration of a small nation which tried and tried hard to achieve the privileges that we inherited from our forefathers.

Let there be no question about it: America is a nation nurtured in the Age of Reason. We have rooted in our thought an abiding faith in the rationality of man, we sincerely believe in the capacity of men to reason together and iron out differences according to the interests of all concerned. We believe, that differences, however acute, can be reconciled. We take an optimistic view of humaniity, we have faith in man's power of regeneration; we have in a word—faith in the idea of progress. And overall we have a deep and abiding faith in man's individual capacity to achieve genuine freedom.

This background, however admirable, must not be interpreted as a *carte blanche* for Americans to arbitrarily set the standards of freedom in the various areas of the World, especially not in the Communist-dominated countries. America, merely by having become the most powerful nation on this earth, has committed herself to propagate those ideals that made her great, rather than to accept tokens of material improvement in the captive nations as indicators of liberty. America, having won the second World War, has committed herself, expressly and officially, to promote the liberty in those historically sovereign nations, that had the misfortune to fall under the aegis of Soviet Communist influence.

Hungary and the rest of the Eastern European countries have over a thousand years history of constitutional government. It has been pointed out many times, that two nations in History were able to maintain constitutional governments without written constitutions: the British and the Hungarians. It is known that the Hungarian Golden Bull, a historic document guaranteeing the rights of the individual and restraining the powers of the Monarch, the Golden Bull was issued only six years after the Magna Carta.

Yet, many Westerner is talking about Hungary just as he talks about some newly formed, underdeveloped nation. Hungary and Poland have little to learn about Western ideals; some of them originated there.

Recent history in Central Europe confirms our belief that Communists will never voluntarily establish the criterions of what we, and what the Hungarians for one thousand years knew as liberty . . . They do not have to. The peoples of the West are satisfied with much less.

As members of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation, and as proud citizens of the United States we have learned to understand one basic fact:

The Hungarian revolution of 1956 was fought for the same ideals for which this Republic stands.

This identity of objectives of the American people and the Hungarian people gives us hope that with the support of the American people so impressively displayed here today, we can bring an end to the Communist ordeal in Eastern Europe. The American people are coming to realize that their dedication to the American principles must reach far beyond the borders of the United States, if they want to protect their spiritual heritage.

You might be second or third generation Americans—I am an immigrant. What you must understand, however, that as participants of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, we have no exclusive rights to be Freedom Fighters. Each of us must take our share in fighting for freedom, you too must become Freedom Fighters.

In this mighty struggle for liberty and justice each of us have a part. Stand up and be counted. If you get discouraged, as you certainly will, do what we do, remember the words of Edward Ewerett Hale, when he said:

"I am only one, but I am one.
I can't do everything, but I can do something.
What I can do, that I ought to do.
And what I ought to do,
By the grace of God, I shall do!"

With these thoughts in mind on behalf of the Hungarian People and all participants of that glorious, memorable Revolution I say to the citizens of Denver:

Thank you!

INTELLECTUAL INCONSISTENCY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, highly vocal opponents of the anti-ballistic-missile system offer as one of their objections the position that the cost of the ABM to defend our country would run in the neighborhood of $6.6 billion.

They make an emotional pitch that this money should go to help the impoverished—whatever that means.

Comparison of figures proves interesting. Interest alone on the national debt for the current year will exceed $15 billion—$16 billion for the coming fiscal year.

Further, Americans are now spending 40 billion of dollars through Federal, State, and municipal agencies to help poverty. Would these anti-ABM proponents feel that the $6.6 billion for providing defense would be a sufficient additional sum to cure poverty woes?

Would not the $15 billion contribute more? Yet the anti-ABMers would be strange hats at any movement to retire the interest on the national debt—which, if paid, would make available moneys for poverty uses.

Seems as if these errant intellectuals are more interested in defending the recipients of interest on the national debt than to defend our country—all citizens, be they rich, poor, or of moderate means.

Mr. Speaker, several news articles follow:

[From the Miami Herald, Apr. 13, 1969]

After the Tax Pain, Relief?

Sacrifices being made by Americans now should bring early rewards. We say so because the best chance for lower federal taxes is not merely to balance the budget but to get a surplus.

Consider, please, that the interest alone on the national debt has nearly doubled in the last 10 years. It was $7.07 billion in 1959.

The estimate for the current year is more than $15 billion and for the coming fiscal year nearly $16 billion.

This is an inescapable charge—a budget item which cannot be cut.

Interest on the federal debt is directly controllable. Balancing the budget would mean no further increase in this item. Yet merely equalizing income and outgo would bring no relief from that $15-billion-a-year interest on the debt already incurred.

Any decline in the interest due on the public debt is the surest and soundest hope for tax reduction. And tax cuts, as experience has shown, leave more money in the hands of individuals and corporations to spend as they please, thus boosting business.

[From the Morning Advocate, Mar. 29, 1969]

Now Hear This

(By Victor Riesel)

Washington, D.C.—It will surprise those who have been watching the search and destroy tactics of the war on poverty strategists—who've been in the big city jungles for almost five years—that this nation actually is spending some $40 billion this year to help the poor.

Positively now, these jungles need swift defoliating. The coordination is amateurish. The supervision is unskilled. The responsibility is diffuse. And the Office of Economic Opportunity, partially to blame for the chaos, has been drawing too much of the lightning criticism. It has been spending $2 billion annually. This is but five percent of the $40 billion disbursed by federal, state and municipal agencies, which is supposed to help the 11 million children and 15 million adults who are the poor and the hungry of the land.

They are the poor by Social Security Administration standards, which say that a rural family of four which has a weekly income of $46 is impoverished, as is its counterpart in the city, where the line rests on $61 weekly.

Bluntly, much of the responsibility for the discombobulation, the discoordination, the chaos, the failure to get directly to these poor, rests squarely on the White House of Lyndon Johnson.

The Congress set up a watchdog committee, the Economic Opportunity Council, in 1964. It was directed to coordinate and counsel. It was to supervise and direct. It was to mesh all government agencies which pour billions into rural and urban slums. Some of these agencies are rarely though of as anti-poverty fighters—which is why the Office of Economic Opportunity is being blamed for it all.

The other agencies include the Veterans Administration, the Labor Dept., the Health, Education and Welfare Dept. and the Department of Agriculture.

But the watchdog commitee did not watch. Its chairman, Sargent Shriver, OEO chief, just could not coordinate its members—the President's department heads—much less the fantastically intricate and innovative official "war on poverty."

So in December 1967, the Congress recast this Section 604 of the original Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It wrote Section 631. And it said that "there is established in the Executive Office of the President the Economic Opportunity Council, which shall be composed of the director and heads of such federal departments and agencies, such presidential assistants and such other officials of the federal government as the President may from time to time designate . . ."

This new council was given the responsibility to assist the President in coordinating the federal war on poverty.

This new council was never appointed.

And the General Accounting Office, after a 15-month, $500,000 probe of the poverty war, reported "the council has never functioned effectively and as recast by the 1967 amendments has not been established."

Thus there never has been a specially trained, specially aimed, watchdog over the government's spending of some $40 billion in search of the poor during 1969. This sum will rocket in the next few years, just as it has since 1961, when it was an unescalated $9 billion.

The federal government alone, which spent $24.4 billion in fiscal 1969, projects the spending of $27.2 billion in 1970. The other poverty prevention funds come from the state and cities. In addition, the public, through its churches and voluntary organizations, spends about $2.4 billion a year.

There's no doubt that much of this flood of cash is on target—and that some of it just swirled around the poor.

Without a nationally prestigious watchdog council centrally directed, how could this have been otherwise? The OEO is new and itself is a jungle within jungles. In a few years, it launches a thousand Community Action Agencies—each wtih scores of mini-agencies and "cooperations" dangling in hundreds of neighborhoods, counties, precincts and "blocks."

At the same time, it had to be innovative amidst ghettos burdened with the disbelief of the displaced, disadvantaged, unskilled and "hardcore." It has never happened before:

So the best of the projects—Head Start—reached 29 per cent of the people it should have aided. Upward Bound got to four per cent of those needing a lift. The Neighborhood Youth Corps, heavily looted, got to six per cent of its target population. The Community Action Program (CAP) Parent and Child Centers got to one per cent of the needy. CAP Migrant Day Care operations helped two per cent.

This is but a sample. The 26 million poor, still hungry, still needy, still are there despite the outpouring of $40 billion a year.

Now let's get directly to them. Jungles are out of style.

INCOME TAX RETURN FORMS

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, only too well I am afraid, yesterday marked the deadline date for completion of personal income tax returns.

The trauma perpetrated by that deadline are widespread and devastating. The annual ritual of wrestling with tax forms can reduce grown men to mere children. Without the assistance of a competent tax lawyer, that too few can afford, successful completion of a tax return form can truly be a formidable endeavor.

I am inserting a newspaper article today which pleads for relief from these yearly struggles. The relief sought is in the form of more simplified tax return forms. It appeared in the Reading Times and was written by my good friend, Martz Schoffstall. The article follows:

Help, Gus

(By Martz Schoffstall)

Good morning! And this morning may I address myself to Rep. Gus Yatron, my man in Washington—and yours, if you live in the 6th Congressional District?

Dear Gus: Along about this time of year, after wrestling for weeks—yes, Gus, weeks—with that confounded nuisance, the annual federal income tax return—I am invariably ready for the psychiatrist's couch. I need help and as I know you're always ready to help, I appeal to you for succor. You're in the big time now and are in a position, as the saying goes, to "do something." Now, I'm not a tax-yawper. I always have held the view that if we expect our government, from township to Washington, to give use services, we must expect to pay for them with our taxes. I'm not even, here and at this time, yammering about the amount of taxes I pay Uncle Sam. What I'm talking about is the fantastically complicated forms we have to fill out to pay our taxes. Can't something be done about this, Gus? Would it be possible—and I'm in dead earnest about this—for you to introduce a resolution directing the Internal Revenue Service to make a study-in-depth of the income tax form so that mathematical dolts and dullards like me can work with a greatly simplified form, do it more quickly, and not be expected to have a Ph. D. in mathematics or statistics in order to do it without going half daft?

Before I left the full-time staff of this newspaper nearly six years ago, my IRS task was nothing too onerous. I got my W2 form from the front office. I had my 1040 form through the mails. I had instructions with it. I filed Form 1040, attached the W2 and that was it. But since retiring, I now fill in Form 1040 plus Form B, Form C, and Form C3. There is also that cute little addition of the 10 per cent surtax. Have you done your form yet, Gus? Have you seen that little gimmick under "12b, tax surcharge. If line 12 is less than $734, find surcharge from tables on Page 10 of instructions. If Line 12a is $734 or more, multiply amount on Line 12a by .075 and enter result (If you claim retirement income credit, use Schedule B (Form 1040) to figure surcharge." Now isn't that a real jim-dandy, Gus? A little gem in the crown of our sovereign government? And a heck of a brick to throw at taxpayers (or most of us) who were never too bright at arithmetic in the first place?

I have a pretty fair education, Mr. Congressman. But do you think that helps me through the IRS gobbledygook? Not one little bit. I'm just as confused as the fellow who just made it through sixth grade. Moreover, I suspect that many a college professor with an A.B. an M.A., and a Ph. D. has just as much trouble translating these IRS documents out of the original Sanskirt as I do. Help us, Gus. Help, please! Get that resolution in instanter!

THE CASE AGAINST DOPE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent series of articles and editorials which recently appeared in the San Pedro News-Pilot in San Pedro, Calif., entitled "The Case Against Dope."

I wholeheartedly commend these articles on the problems of drug use and abuse to parents and teenagers alike. I particularly wish to thank Mr. Bob Beck, publisher of the San Pedro News-Pilot, for the fine job he did in putting this series together. I am sure the Members will find the articles a most interesting and enlightening commentary on this troublesome problem facing our country today. The articles follow:

[Articles and editorials from the San Pedro (Calif.) News-Pilot, Feb. 20, 1969]

THE CASE AGAINST DOPE

(NOTE.—The accelerated use and abuse of drugs in Harbor Area schools has become a major problem of the community, educators and authorities.

(The News-Pilot feels that awareness of the problem may be a deciding factor in controlling and perhaps curtailing the narcotics situation.

(The News-Pilot, with the cooperation of the Community Relations Committee of the Chamber, presents to its readers this special section of comprehensive stories and editorials on the drug problems in city, county and state.

(We hope in bringing the sometimes shocking statistics to light that an aroused public will demand—and receive—an end to a sordid situation.)

(By Arthur Ribbel)

Since 1959 in California, the proportion of boys and girls committed to Youth Authority institutions for narcotic and drug offenses has doubled.

Joblessness, discrimination, despair and destructive family situations have combined to spawn more crime and delinquency in ghettos.

These are the highlights of a recent YA report showing that some changes in characteristics of boys and girls committed to California institutions.

In 1959, boys committed for drug offenses made up only 6 per cent of the institution inmates, but by 1968 that proportion had increased to 12 per cent. The girls also doubled in drug offenses.

Atty. Gen. Thomas Lynch of California also recently focused startling statistics on the drug problem in youths.

Allen F. Breed, YA director, said the narcotics figures "are simply another confirmation that involvement with drugs among young people in California is a growing problem."

He reported that in the last eight years there has been a 2000 per cent increase in juvenile drug arrests.

Drug arrests in some of the larger counties, like Los Angeles, San Diego and Orange, have doubled.

Breed said the YA is stepping up its juvenile delinquency prevention efforts in ghetto areas of California. He said new community treatment programs for YA wards on parole are being developed, plus expansion of efforts to cooperate with organizations which already have launched ghetto programs.

The report also showed:

1. In the 10 years, girls in institutions increased from 387 in 1959 to 562 in 1968; boys from 3140 to 4922.

2. The percentage institutionalized from Southern California increased substantially, while the percentage from other areas declined.

3. In 1959, 66 per cent of the boys in institutions were there on there first commitment. In 1968, only 54 per cent were in institutions on their first commitment. Among girls, the percentage on first commitments declined from 78 per cent to 56 per cent. Those figures, said YA, reflect an increasing number of parole violators in institutions.

SAN PEDRO HIGH SCHOOL CONFRONTED WITH A 400-PERCENT DRUG USE HIKE

(By Dan Scanlan)

San Pedro High School is confronted this year with a 400 per cent increase in the incidence of students using dope in the first part of this semester over all of last year.

Narcotics is our biggest problem this year, school administrators are saying.

More than 70 students have been arrested during school hours on school grounds and booked on narcotic charges so far this year.

Last year, only 16 boys were arrested for dope usage. No girls were arrested last year, although there were a couple of incidents in which girls would carry pills or marijuana for their boy friends.

The story is different today, however. More than five girls so far have been arrested and more than 63 boys.

Two of those incidents resulted in the near deaths of two boys who had taken an overdose.

"That had a pretty deadening effect on the kids," Principal Arthur Farnham said. "No announcement was made, but they knew."

The sight of ambulance crews rushing dying classmates to emergency centers and the sight of policemen taking students into custody does seem to have lessened the onslaught of dope usage experienced at the school in the earlier days of the semester.

Four days of one week were incident-free, according to Boys' Vice Principal Robert Mills, who pointed to recent "busts" and the two near-deaths as possible causes.

Dope usage at the high school is tending to emerge in five patterns.

First, students who use illegal drugs and narcotics, are switching from marijuana to pills.

"They (pills) are easier," Mills said. A kid can pop a pill unseen during school but it's pretty difficult to smoke a marijuana cigarette and get away with it."

According to figures released by Atty. Gen. Thomas Lynch, this phenomenon is statewide.

Juvenile usage of marijuana in the first half of 1968 increased over the same period in 1967 by 126 per cent. Dangerous drugs, however, were being used by juveniles by a 323 per cent margin over last year.

Other offenses, which includes prescription violations and possession of narcotic paraphenalia, increased in the same period by 356 per cent among juveniles.

A second pattern that seems to be emerging is that pills are constantly being used by younger and younger students.

Only last year, for example, the median age of the student pill-popper was around 17. Today, however, the predominance of narcotic users seem to be in the B–10 class.

Which means they're 14 years old, and just barely out of junior high.

Police, too, are recording a greater number of pre- and early-teen arrests for narcotic usage.

Police reported the incident of an 11-year-old boy who staggered home and became belligerent with his family. That same day a 14-year-old boy was also arrested on a Wilmington sidewalk, drunk from pill usage.

Marilyn R. Duncan girls' vice principal at San Pedro High School, said that the five girls who had been arrested on narcotic charges, were incoming freshmen.

"It just seems like they want to be popular," Mrs. Duncan said.

A third pattern emerging on the high school level is the growing universality of narcotic usage. Marijuana and dangerous drugs were once thought to be solely the habits of the poor and oppressed. Today, however, the habit cuts across all strata of society.

Affluent families as well as the underprivileged are being called by police to be told their son or daughter is being held in a drunken stupor.

A fourth pattern is the shift from almost a solely male endeavor to one afflicting both sexes. In times past, teenage girls did little more than stash the dope for their boyfriends. More and more of them, however, are beginning to take up the practice.

No longer can a parent feel immune from the horrors of her child being taken in by pushers, simply because her child is a girl.

The last pattern is the most terrifying of all—a conspiracy of silence and acceptance.

All three San Pedro High School administrators shared the fear that today's youths are accepting drug abuse by their classmates.

"What would you do if you found out your best friend was popping pills?" asked Mrs. Duncan. "Would you accept her or him anyway?"

Today's youths seem to be answering that it wouldn't make any difference.

The problem is the problem of the "so-called good person who knows what is going on but who won't say or do anything," said Farnham.

This conspiracy hampers both school and police officials who are trying to probe the narcotic usage centers.

"When a kid is sitting in my office under the influence of a drug," Mills said, "all he will tell you is 'everybody takes it'."

The feeling among the administrators is that many more students know what activities are taking place than are coming forward. In fact, rarely does a student come forward at all.

This squelching of the rumors that used to float freely and voluminously cross high school campuses leads to the inevitable grimace of disbelief on the parts of both parents and teachers who come across a student under the influence.

The silence has been attributed to some as a sidekick of the anti-establishment attitude prevalent among youth.

"Somebody's got to get to the kids somehow," Farnham said. "This growing feeling on the part of some—a considerable segment—who don't believe what teachers, parents or their minister tell them, has got to stop.

"Someone who can give them a feeling of assurance and integrity has got to get to them.

"Someone has got to get to these kids."

EIGHT STUDENTS A DAY NABBED FOR DRUGS

(By Jay Berman)

LOS ANGELES.—Illnesses caused by drugs send as many as eight high school students each day to the Health Office, the Los Angeles City Schools' medical administrator told an Assembly committee Thursday.

Dr. Harriet B. Randall spoke before the Assembly Committee on Public Health, which was meeting in Los Angeles to hear testimony on the state's growing drug problem.

Dr. Randall told the committee that on any given day at any high school in the Greater Los Angeles Area, "Between one and eight" students will report to the health office, suffering from a drug-related problem.

Dr. Randall estimated the district's drug problem has doubled in the last few years.

"District procedure specifies that the nurse will contact the child's parents," she said. "If the symptoms are more than superficial, the school physician is called immediately."

Discipline is handled by the vice principal's office, Dr. Randall said, and it is the vice principal who decides whether to notify police.

"Most of these youngsters are obviously under the influence of various types of drugs," Dr. Randall said, "but they'll often tell the nurse they have a cold and want to lie down."

Testifying at the same time as Dr. Randall was Joseph Langan, director of drug abuse information for the district.

Langan said the increasing problem "can only be solved with a program employing qualified health education teachers—not English teachers teaching health education.

"They need the proper audio-visual and teaching aids along with planned curriculum structures, and the whole program should be in context with other health programs."

Earlier in the day, the committee heard from David and Winifred Kershaw, former drug users, who now represent the Berkeley-based committee for psychedelic drug information.

The husband and wife—both 25 years old—said they began experimenting with LSD and marijuana while undergraduates at Harvard University, in an attempt to "find some personal answers about ourselves."

After studying the teachings of Meher Baba, an Indian philosopher, they turned to eastern spiritualism and abandoned all use of drugs.

Kershaw told the committee, headed by Gordon Duffy, R-Hanford, he and his wife have been speaking against the use of narcotics and drugs for two years.

He said law enforcement agencies are "doing the best they can" in opposing drugs but said "the police can't put a man in every home."

"At any given time on a weekend night in Berkeley, there are probably as many as 2000 pot parties going on. The Berkeley police department just doesn't have 2000 men."

After the hearing recessed for lunch, Kershaw told Copley News Service that buying narcotics—especially marijuana—in Berkeley is "as easy as buying a loaf of bread."

"They (drug sellers) assume that most people on Telegraph Avenue are interested in buying drugs," he said. "I was walking down University Avenue near the campus a week ago and was offered 'some really good stuff'."

In response to a question by Assemblywoman Yvonne Brathwaite, D-63rd District, Kershaw told the committee many young people have stopped using opiates, amphetamines, LSD and others but have continued using marijuana.

"They (the users) aren't convinced that marijuana is harmful," Mrs. Kershaw said. "They have started to worry about chromosome damage caused by LSD, but they think marijuana is perfectly acceptable."

Mrs. Kershaw said the use of marijuana is so vast that fear of being arrested is not an effective deterrent.

"Young people think the laws against marijuana are too severe," she said. "They think marijuana should be legalized, and they rationalize their case by claiming it is less harmful than alcohol.

"We think marijuana is more harmful, but the kids don't. We hear the same thing all the time. We need more information to give them to let them know it can be dangerous."

Her husband told the hearing one of the main dangers of marijuana is not in the plant itself but in impurities. He said:

"Dealers, in an attempt to sell as much as they can, aren't always selling pure marijuana. If there is belladonna in the mixture, it could even cause blindness.'

Another speaker, Dr. Joel Fort, a professor at the University of California at Berkeley and San Francisco State College, told committee members present programs of drug information "are markedly ineffective."

He said young people are taking drugs "because society encourages it."

"If the advertising of alcohol and tobacco were stopped," he said, "along with ads for sleeping pills and capsules for everything else, maybe we wouldn't have this problem."

DOPE ONE OF WORST OF WORDS

(By Tom Coulter)

Dope—a four-letter word which has awakened today's society and its conscience—is as easily obtained by teenagers in the Harbor Area as walking to the nearest supermarket.

"In today's generation, the pusher concept no longer exists," the Rev. Vincent Coletta said.

"Instead there seems to be a sharing concept among the youth of today in drug traffic. Asking authorities to completely wipe out the problem overnight would be like trying to sweep the bottom of the ocean with a broom."

Coletta, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Palos Verdes, is one of four ministers who are on 24-hour call on the highly-acclaimed Peninsula "Hot Line."

As chairman of the Community Resource Committee of the Palos Verdes Peninsula Council of Churches, he helped initiate the program nearly two years ago as an effort to provide instant counseling by telephone for distressed parents and youths involved in drug abuse in the Harbor Area.

Today the "Hot Line" is averaging more than 60 calls a month.

"We don't have all the answers to the problem of drug abuse, but we have made some discoveries during the short time that we have been counseling youth and parents," Coletta said.

His committee, which consists of a psychiatrist, psychologist, physician, school administrator (from another school district to avoid conflict) and a parent, meets once a month to study the moral and sociological phenomena of drug abuse amongst youth.

Among the committee's findings in the Peninsula area were:

Widespread publicity across the nation seems to have brought more youth into contact with drugs than would normally have been.

Most of the involvement with drugs by youth in the Peninsula area seems to be experimental—but this doesn't lower the risk.

How affluent a background a youth comes from has a lot to do with his involvement in drugs.

Youths tend to utilize drugs as a means of coping with pressure.

Some become involved in drug abuse because of their relationship with their peers.

For others, it becomes a way of life.

Expanding on the findings, Coletta told the ministers that drug abuse by youth has shifted from the poverty ghetto to the affluent ghetto.

"We had to wake up to the fact that drug abuse is not a respector of families and students. The affluence of a family has a lot to do with the kicks in life for kids today. The wealthier the family, it seems the greater degree what will provide a kick for the youths."

The pastor said that many youths abuse drugs as a method of coping with the problems of today.

"We had one kid tell us that when he was using drugs was the only time "I feel my parents are off my back," he related.

"We are living in a psycho-chemical age of 'instant copability,' instant authenticity,' 'instant well being' through the use of chemicals. Parents are non-verbally influencing their children by reaching for an aspirin to quiet the nerves, reaching for a glass of liquor when things aren't going right, or reaching for a cigarette. Our society today has told youth through our actions that it is alright to soothe the internal problems with external help. Thus, the youth turns to narcotics and drugs as a pressure release."

Coletta said that parents and youth should keep the use of chemicals within the beneficial realm.

"We have suggested that education in drug abuse should begin in the primary grades of school—not in crash programs in high school. Schools should offer youth creative ways of escape other than through chemical means."

The ministers on the Hot Line feel that there are five aids for parents:

(1) There is a need for a third point of reference. Youths don't want to tell their parents about their drug problem and parents are afraid to talk to their kids. A third point of reference offers an area of release and guidance. In the urban society of the Harbor Area, families don't have the close relationships with aunts and uncles that they can confide in without telling dad or mom, Coletta said. And they can't confide in their peers. Parents don't want to talk to their friends about such a personal family problem. The "Hot Line" serves this purpose.

(2) It is very healthy, Coletta said, if one can succeed through personal counseling or group discussion to discover what they have found out about life on the trail to independence and self reliance. "Once you can convince a youth that he can not find a place in life unless he can say yes or no based on his own convictions and findings, then you have made progress."

(3) Since most teenagers and youth can not be swayed by medical or legal complications of drug abuse, attempt to reason with them. "If the only way they can have a good time at a party or get along with their fellow peers and withstand the problems of life is through the use of chemicals, then he's a phony."

(4) Parents do not have to feel guilty about over-reacting to the realization that their teenager is involved with drugs. "That is a perfectly healthy feeling for parents to have. But before they talk with the youth, they should curb that tendency to overreact."

(5) The parents must have authority in their home.

If he doesn't have authority over his children by the time they are in their teens, he will never have, Coletta said.

Parents should be pseudo-parents. Their relationship with their children should not be with a capital M for Mom and a capital F for Father. Children don't have a normal upbringing in that manner. There is such a thing as earned authority by parents. This is gained by having a meaningful relationship as parents, living and laughing and talking with their children as they grow up.

Coletta added that too often parents set themselves up as perfect. "We, as parents know, we goof occasionally and it doesn't do any harm to let your children know you do goof. But let him know that you are doing something about it. You are coping with the problem. This way he will learn to tackle his problems and not give up and resort to chemicals later in life.

"Drug use is a growing phenomenon, but it is no worse in the Peninsula high schools than anywhere else. It has just been more widely publicized," Coletta noted.

"We have attempted to keep only members of the clergy on the "Hot Line" for the reason that information they receive is privileged and can not be used against them in court. We attempt to establish a good rapport with the caller. In 80 per cent of the cases, we are successful in having them come in for personal consultations."

The committee then attempts to refer the caller to every possible community resource, including church related or religious oriented counseling with a priest, minister or rabbi, psychologists, psychiatrists, and a new program of a 4-week study-therapy group for parents and youth.

"Our youth today is faced with great dilemmas—Vietnam, academic excellence, concerns about the 'established order'—and our psycho-chemical age can make it easy for both adults and youth to 'get away from it all.' "

But it can also lead to false notions of mind expansion through chemicals, Coletta said.

The "Hot Line" number is 320–2020.

BIG PROFITS KEEP SOURCES MUM ABOUT TEEN DOPE PUSHERS

(By Dan Scanlan)

A 16-year-old boy drops his school books in a hallway at San Pedro High School.

He stoops in an effort to recover the books. One book is two feet away from him. He reaches out from his stooped position and falls on his chest.

A second student sees his classmate's plight and kicks the book further away from the youth, laughing.

A teacher, attracted by the laughter, watches as the boy tries to get to his feet and half stumbles in the direction of the book. The boy rests a moment, and leans against the wall.

Before he can move from the wall, the teacher has approached him and assists him to the nursing office.

"Where did you get the reds?" the police will ask when they arrive.

"From a guy. I don't remember his name," is the inevitable answer.

The question is always unanswered—where do they get the pills? Who's picking up the profit on pills that normally sell for $6 per thousand when they are sold to high school students for 25 cents each?

The teenager who lives in an electronic world that blares the news of wars and talks of deaths and drafts and kidnapings and mud slides is a sorry enough creature already without introducing him to the stupifying and distorted world of dangerous drugs.

Somebody is making more than 400 per cent profit on the illegal sale of legally manufactured drugs to teenagers.

According to Walter Gates, acting U.S. customs agent in charge at the San Ysidro, Calif., point of entry from Mexico into the United States, all the pharmaceutical companies in the United States export to Mexico dangerous drugs which wholesale at $6 to $9 per thousand.

These same pills, Gates says, then are smuggled back across the border to sell on the street at more than $60 per thousand. (The current rate for a seconal capsule is 25 cents at San Pedro High School.)

It wasn't until a little less than two years ago that dangerous drugs actually made in Mexico began to appear in smuggling cases. Before that, all drugs were American-made. At the moment, officials are unable—or unwilling—to say how much or what percentage of the seizures are Mexican or American-made.

One unidenified federal narcotics agent in Los Angeles told a county probation officer that most of the pills are manufactured by legitimate and well-respected pharmaceutical companies, however.

Gates said also that no single American company is responsible—there is no particular manufacturer whose product is conspicuous on the border. The pills are of all brands.

The average monthly seizure by San Diego police is 10,000. When the smuggling case involves 2000 or less tablets or capsules of a dangerous drug, the customs people turn the suspect and evidence over to the San Diego Police Department for state prosecution.

In the last fiscal year, the number of capsules and pills of dangerous drugs seized at the border was more than 2.6 million. In one case alone last September, 100,000 pills were seized.

The average age of the carriers of contraband drugs is 20 to 30 years. Sixty to 70 percent of those arrested fall in that age bracket.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department lists the two major sources of dangerous drugs as "illegal diversion of legal domestic drug production and drugs that are legally exported to Mexico and then illegally returned to the United States."

Other sources includes illicit production in the United States—limited at the moment to "backyard chemists"—and thefts from pharmaceutical plants, warehouses, drug stores and doctors' offices. Drug users sometimes will forge prescriptions and feign symptoms which require the use of the particular drug they are seeking.

But the largest single source remains the legal drug manufacturers themselves. Once the pills have been packaged and placed on a truck, their responsibility is over, one county official said.

The pill companies manufacture more pills than needed legally. They are then transported to Mexico for "charitable" or other purposes. Somehow—and no one is saying how—they get back into the country.

The pills the San Pedro High School student popped the day he was "busted" probably had been manufactured under strict government controls in a large and respected American company.

Whether the pill came from a hijacked truck that was to carry drugs legally to a warehouse or from a backyard chemist with a homemade machine cannot be known.

But whether the governments—state, federal and local—should move quickly to halt the chances of legal drugs arriving illegally into the hands of an emotional high school student is certain.

A county probation officer, who wished to remain anonymous cited a large part of the problem besetting any beneficial actions when he said:

"There's a lack of coordination among the pros. Each one of us (involved in the drug problem) has a bit of knowledge. Law enforcement is developing its techniques. We're working with what to do about a kid who has the habit and wants to kick it. The schools are working on another angle. Parents are worried about something else.

"We don't draw on one another's knowledge. The feds don't know what the local police do and the local police don't know what the feds are doing.

"If we want to lick the problems—and we have to—we must get together. We've got to get together.

LET US TAKE A LOOK AT THE YOUTHFUL USER OF DANGEROUS DRUGS

It's late on a Saturday night. Your 15-year-old son calls. You can't understand what he is saying. He sounds like a drunk man. You drive to pick him up. He stumbles, has a difficult time trying to walk. Just like a drunk.

But there is no alcohol on his breath . . .

Or: You wake up one night to find your boy literally trying to climb the walls. You try to put him to bed. He can't lie still. He thrashes about. Soon it's so bad you have to rush him to the hospital . . .

This is how those newspaper stories, those PTA programs, those TV documentaries suddenly become real. This is how the nasty facts of teen-agers and dope quit being statistics and start being part of your life, part of your child's life.

The number of juveniles arrested in Los Angeles County on drug charges in 1967 was 164 per cent higher than the number arrested in 1966. The number of arrests continues to increase. The problem grows despite the efforts of the police, the schools and many concerned groups.

But those arrests represent not hardened criminals, but children, boys and girls like yours. And this is what is so shocking. They are like your children and could well be your children. There is no stereotype of the individual who is most likely to start taking pills, smoking marijuana.

The drug abusers come from homes of the wealthy as well as the poor, from the homes of educated as well as the uneducated. They also come from the homes of parents who are concerned about this problem as well as from the homes of parents who are not concerned.

"He was in advance classes of school. He kept his room neat. He was never a discipline problem." This is the way one mother described her son. We won't use his name. The police have it. The boy indulged in what is probably the most dangerous teen-age fad of all times—the taking of drugs.

"We had discussed drugs with our children," the mother said. She knew there was a problem. She tried to warn her boy.

But when temptation came, his reaction was, "Well, one time won't hurt me."

The onetime came when he was offered pills by a boy he had known most of his life.

This is the story repeated in case after case with few variations—a "friend" provided the pills.

"Friends are the problem," one mother conceded. Then added bitterly, "I wish those older boys would be put away. They go around giving them away. Later they try to sell them."

It's like an epidemic. It spreads from one child to another. Older brothers and sisters involve younger children and the friends of the younger children.

Another mother recounted the experience her son had with pills.

"This older boy came up to my son. This older boy was the brother of a boy my son knows. He told my boy of all the wonderful feelings you get from the pills. First he wanted money and when my boy said he didn't have any money, this boy gave my boy the pills.

"He had heard all the other guys talking about pills so he decided to try them. He wanted to find out."

Finding out almost cost the boy his life. The normal dosage for the type of drug he took is one pill in a 12-hour period. He took four. "He took four because the boy he got them from said you have to take six to get any reaction," the mother said. "My boy thought he would be cautious and he took only four.

"These kids don't know anything about what they are taking, what they are giving others to take."

Her son almost died. In two days he lost 10 pounds. When he was finally discharged from the hospital he was still pale and weak.

So the stories go. Drug abuse among teenagers is a national problem. It's a Los Angeles problem. It may well be your problem someday—or today.

You are interested in protecting your child. You are concerned. But can the same be said of all parents? Tomorrow we will look at the parents as we continue to explore the problem of drug abuse.

PARENTS NEED INFO ON TEEN DOPE USE

The ever increasing use of dope by teenagers has many parents alarmed, many frightened.

These parents attend meetings of the Parent-Teacher Association to hear discussions of the problem. They listen to lectures by police officers. They attend seminars on drugs at their church.

These parents are the ones who need such information least.

True, they do need it. Information, facts and methods of combating the problem are essential for every parent. But those who go to the meetings, who take time to find out the details, are demonstrating the most important ingredient for the parent—concern.

They know there is a problem. They know their child is vulnerable. And they are worried.

It's the parents who do not go to the meetings, who refuse to recognize there is a problem—they are the ones who need the meetings, the information, the lectures most.

Some parents adopt the attitude "not me, not my children." Some will cling to this delusion all the way to the police department as they make the trip to town to get their child out of police custody.

Sgt. Heber King heads the Juvenile Narcotics Bureau and he can tell you stories that will touch your heart. And he can tell you stories of parents that will make your blood boil.

Some parents, according to incidents related by King will ignore every bit of evidence that their children are involved with drugs.

What's this going to do to me?" is the first thing some parents say when they hear their child has been arrested for using dope.

Still worse are those who get over protective of their children. These parents get a lawyer immediately then forbid their children to talk with police.

The police say they want the children to have every legal protection they are entitled to, but they are also concerned about the teen-ager's reaction. "Aren't these parents really telling their child that he can do anything and they'll shield him?" King asked.

This type of reaction is not just reserved for the police.

One couple tried to warn another couple that their children were deeply involved in the use of pills, even to the extent of passing them out to other children.

The father being warned reacted "I'll take you to court for saying such a thing about my boy."

Of course, he didn't take anybody to court, but such shortsightedness may well mean his son will eventually wind up in court.

These parents can't see that they are harming their own children by such a reaction. The primary goal of everyone working on this problem is to eliminate the problem, not see how many people they can lock up.

If the problem is ignored or hushed up within a family, the child will get the idea he can do anything he wants and get away with it.

People have to realize they can't shut their eyes to the problem when it crops up within their own family. The sooner it is dealt with, the less trouble there will be.

But there is still a worse parent than those who refuse to help guide and correct their own children.

"Another mother bought the glue," one heartsick parent recounted after her son got in trouble with drugs.

"She went to a store and told them she was a den mother and needed several tubes of glue. She then gave it to her own son and his friends."

The woman who told of the incident said the glue sniffing led to pills and later to detention for her son. There are other cases where parents know their children are using pills, passing them around and yet they do nothing.

Evidence for a court case against such parents is all but impossible to gather. The tragedy is it is the young people whose lives become ruined.

While the parents may ignore the problem, the law cannot. There are strict penalties on use, possession and sale of the various drugs, and narcotics.

DOPE LINGO AN ESCAPE FROM LIFE

Teenagers talking about football may not be discussing the popular autumn sport, but a deadly game involving pills.

If the talk is of yellowjackets, those doing the talking most likely are not worried about insects, but something which can pack a much worse sting, a capsule.

Almost every American knows some of the terms being used by the drug cult. Acid head, pot, grass, busted, weed, hooked, these terms are becoming part of the language.

The general knowledge of such terms is an indication of just how much drug abuse has crept into the life of this country.

The language of pills and dope is colorful, clever, frequently witty. This type of talk disguises the dangerous nature of the subject, makes it "smart." It also keeps the unwary from realizing just what he is doing and what the results will be when he swallows a brightly colored tablet or capsule.

The language is as much an escape from the reality of drug abuse as the use of the drug is an attempt to escape from the realities of life.

There are five categories of substances which have the potential of abuse. These are narcotics, sedative tranquilizers, stimulants and hallucinogens.

In these terms they lose a lot of their glamour. They also lose a lot of their glamour after a few days in the hospital for the treatment of an overdose, or after many months in jail for the sale or possession of illegal drugs.

Hallucinogens are used in medical research. The others are essential to the practice of modern medicine.

To the abuser, though, these same medically useful drugs have a compelling attribute: they affect the nervous system, producing a change in the individual's emotional responses or reactions. The abuser may feel intoxicated, relaxed, happy or detached from a world that is painful and unacceptable to him.

With repeated use many drugs cause physical dependence. This means the abuser has the habit, or in the language of the cult, he's hooked. He's an addict. His body must have the drug and if it does not get it he will suffer severe physical reactions. Some teenagers feel they are safe from physical addiction if they stay away from hard narcotics such as heroin. This isn't true.

Barbiturates including those yellowjackets, create a physical dependence with excessive use.

There is also the psychic or psychological dependence present in many cases where there is not a physical dependence. Psychic dependence is an emotional or mental adaptation to the effects of the drug. The user not only likes the drug experience, he feels he does not want to live without it.

Life can get pretty difficult for a teenager at times and he'd like to escape to another world.

One mother whose son has taken pills said, "He's shy with girls. Someone told him if he would take the pills he wouldn't be shy."

Another boy's mother reported, "He (her son) was making low grades and having to work hard to get those. He couldn't keep up with the class. He had nothing else to fall back on so he started taking pills."

Teenagers fail to realize that in grappling with the problems of school and of getting along with the opposite sex, they are learning methods of adjustment to life which they must know. If they don't learn to make these adjustments as teenagers, they never will. They may wake up from the drug-inspired dream world one day and realize they can never face reality.

A reality they may well have to face someday, if they continually use drugs, is the law.

Anyone who produces or sells dangerous drugs illegally may receive from one to three years in prison or a fine of from $1000 to $10,000 or both.

Anyone over 18 years old who sells or gives any of the controlled drugs to persons under the age of 21 faces anywhere from two to six years in prison, a fine of from $5000 to $15,000 or both.

Adults who aid and abet teenagers in getting drugs had better ponder these legal penalties, too.

There are many kinds of pills and they can produce a variety of results. Pills are popular with teenagers because they are easy to take and because many teenagers are not aware of the dangers involved. Not many teenagers have graduated to hard narcotics, but many are involved with marijuana and LSD.

LSD, MARIHUANA LEAST UNDERSTOOD DRUG SUBSTANCES

The popular phrase of the day among the drug abusers is "take a trip" and the most popular vehicles for these flight from reality are LSD and marijuana.

Of all the substances the drug cult is taking these days, LSD and marijuana are the most discussed and the most misunderstood—or least understood.

There is a great lack of understanding and knowledge of LSD (lysergic acid diethylamide). It is the most potent of the hallucinogens and no one, scientist or teenybopper, knows everything LSD can do to the mind and body.

LSD is a tasteless, colorless and odorless liquid which affects the central nervous system.

The LSD experience consists of changes in perception, thought, mood and activity.

It can sound very thrilling and if all it was were weird lights, colors and sounds, it might be thrilling. But this is only part of the LSD story.

Many individuals have had LSD experiences without apparent ill effect, but there is growing medical evidence which shows the drug can cause serious and often damaging reactions in many.

One of the primary dangers of LSD is that the reactions cannot be predicted. They are different for each individual.

LSD heightens or reveals emotional problems, problems which the individual may not have been aware of. Some users of LSD have wound up in the hospital, or killing themselves.

Then there is a delayed psychotic reaction in some people.

Another danger is that when LSD is manufactured illegally, impurities occasionally occur and the effects of these can be more dangerous than the acid itself.

James L. Goddard, commissioner of Food and Drugs, said medically unsupervised use of LSD is analogous to playing "chemical Russian roulette."

While little is known of the full LSD story, much is known of marijuana. Adults must realize that when talking about marijuana, the teen-ager may know more than the adult.

Scare tactics built upon misinformation are no good in dealing with teen-agers today.

First of all marijuana is not a narcotic, although the federal government treats it like one and punishes users with the same stiff penalties it reserves for the user of heroin and opium.

Marijuana is not physically addictive. It has no known detrimental effect on a person's physical health, though it is possible to become psychologically dependent on it.

Teen-agers are not convinced by the argument that marijuana leads automatically to heroin. While most heroin addicts started with marijuana, not all marijuana users become heroin addicts. All alcoholics start with one drink, but not all drinkers become alcoholics, they argue.

The effects of marijuana are very much like alcohol and the marijuana users say that it should be as legal as alcohol.

But alcohol is not legal for teen-agers and there is no one advocating that 15-year-olds be allowed to drink. They are not prepared to deal with alcohol nor are they prepared to deal with anything which can produce similar reactions.

Some people want the same legal controls put on marijuana as exist on alcohol. Lawrence Kolb, M.D., assistant surgeon general (ret.) of the U.S. Public Health Service, answers this argument with:

"Alcohol, during the past 2500 years, has apparently become an irreplaceable part of our social structure. We know that it does much harm, but the fact that we tolerate this harm is no reason for permitting the indiscriminate use of another intoxicant."

While people debate the effects of marijuana, there is no arguing with the fact that it is illegal and the penalties for even the possession of it are stiff.

Under the federal law, possession can bring two to 10 years in jail and a maximum fine of $20,000 for the first offense. Penalties for the sale of marijuana are even stiffer.

There are tough laws governing LSD, too. All other arguments aside, the surest trip you can get from LSD or marijuana is to jail.

DRUG USE CALLED A CANCER

(By Robert Betts)

"Drug abuse has become a social cancer," said John Finlator, associate director of regulatory and scientific programs at the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

He was referring not just to the "junkies" with their hypodermic needles and their desperate craving for dope.

The bureau is also concerned about the growing misuse of a vast variety of drugs generally.

They include the busy executives, hard-pressed salesmen, long-distance truck drivers, nervous housewives and others of all classes and professions who take pep-pills to keep them going, or tranquilizers to help them relax—plus the frightening numbers of young people who'll try any kind of drug just for "kicks."

An ever-expanding array of drugs is available to the public, most of them unknown 30 years ago. Most are legally obtainable, from a doctor or a pharmacist.

In addition to some 10 million patients taking drugs on medical prescription, untold numbers are self-medicators.

Many find themselves so drug-dependent that they resort to illegal means to obtain something stronger.

If they cannot get it by forging prescriptions, going the rounds of different doctors or making an arrangement with some unscrupulous pharmacist, there are plenty of pill-pushers and dope-peddlers eager to serve them.

"There is widespread abuse and illegal trafficking in depressant, stimulant and hallucinogenic drugs," reports the bureau.

It estimates that the illegal sale of additive drugs in the United States—one of the most profitable businesses in the world—now grosses around $400 million yearly. The figure is increasing at the rate of 15 per cent a year.

"Dangerous drugs get into illegal retail trade through larceny from reputable manufacturers, wholesalers or pharmacies," said a narcotics agent. "Clandestine manufacturers operating illegally in garages, basements and warehouses produce substantial quantities. The illegal peddler is an important link in the traffic. He deals in hundreds of thousands of capsules and tablets."

About half the 12 billion amphetamines and barbiturate tablets and the 50 million tranquilizers manufactured in this country are diverted into the illegal market.

The growing danger of drug abuse gave rise to the establishment three years ago of the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control within the Food and Drug Administration. Some 300 undercover agents were assigned the task of suppressing illegal drugs and keeping all legal drugs within legitimate channels.

In April this year the bureau was merged with the Department of the Treasury's Bureau of Narcotics and transferred to the Departments of Justice under a new name—Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

In addition to the federal laws controlling the movement of narcotics, laws have been passed to prohibit the sale of other dangerous drugs not covered by legal prescriptions. Illegal possession for resale, failure to register as a manufacturer or wholesalers of controlled drugs and failure to keep records of receipt and distribution are all punishable offenses. State laws vary greatly, but have become increasingly stringent.

Anyone producing or selling dangerous drugs illegally is subject to a maximum penalty of three years imprisonment and/or a $10,000 fine.

"The growing abuse of drugs by teenagers is a particularly tragic and disturbing aspect of the entire drug abuse problem," said the Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Bureau's director, John E. Ingersoll.

There are special penalties for peddlers and pushers over 18 years of age who sell or give drugs to anyone under 21. A first offense can incur two years imprisonment and/or a $5,000 fine. Second violations can carry a penalty of six years imprisonment and/or a $15,000 fine.

Although marijuana is not classed as a narcotic drug under federal law it is considered a narcotic under state laws. In some states, anyone who sells marijuana to a minor risks the death penalty.

EXPERTS HAZY ON DANGERS

(By Robert Betts)

Is a pot-head a drug addict? Can a pill-popper become hooked? Does LSD lead to heaven or to hell?

The nation's drug addiction problem is enshrouded in an ever-thickening fog of misconception, controversy and confusion.

Experts themselves are hazy about relative dangers of dozens of different drugs, especially the newer synthetic ones like LSD.

"No really cold explanation for the exact method of action of drugs now exists," admitted Dr. Samuel Eiduson, chief research biochemist in the Brain Research Institute at the University of California, Los Angeles.

"It has become impossible in practice, and is scientifically unsound to maintain a single definition for all forms of drug addiction and/or habituation," said another medical expert at the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

"Thousands of drugs and chemicals are capable of altering perception and behavior. Some in proper dosage may increase or decrease psychological or physical functions without distortion and find a useful place in modern medical practice. The same substances in greater dosage, and in certain susceptible individuals in almost any dosage, incite to violence or incapacitate mentally and physically."

Much of the confusion arises from differences in the legal, scientific and lay meanings of such terms, as "narcotics," "addiction," habituation," "tolerance."

The World Health Organization recently decided to substitute for "addiction" and "habituation" the single term "dependence."

Some 1600 drugs deemed dangerous are on the official controlled list. They have three general classifications.

Depressants include morphine, heroin, codeine and other opium derivatives, and the barbiturates—tranquilizers, pain-killers and sleeping pills, commonly called "goof balls," "candy," "barbs," "peanuts" and various other names.

All can produce physical dependence and withdrawal symptoms ranging from tremors, sickness and sleeplessness to vicious physical and mental torture.

Stimulants include cocaine and the amphetamines—pep-pills, weight-reducers and inhalants ("eye-openers," "truck-drivers," "co-pilots," "bennies," "peaches," "speed," etc.). Though not physically addictive they are mentally habit-forming.

Hallucinogens form the third category. They include peyote and other cactus, mushroom, fungus and seed derivatives, and several synthetics, such as LSD (lysergic acid diethylamide) and DMT (dimethyltriptamine) which have not yet been proved medically valuable.

Hard narcotics as defined under federal law include mainly the opium derivatives. But cocaine, classified in the pharmacological register as a stimulant rather than a narcotic (which means stupifying), is also included.

Marijuana, although legally classified with the narcotics for purposes of control, is chemically different from the hard narcotics. Like cocaine, it is not physically addictive, most experts say.

Whether it is "habituating" is a matter of wide debate. Many individuals and groups, insisting that it is no more harmful than alcohol or tobacco, have constantly attacked the marijuana control laws. The official view, however, based on formidable scientific evidence and wide experience with its victims, is that marijuana is indeed harmful. It produces a form of intoxication that can result in unpredictable and occasionally violent behavior.

"It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the smoking of a marijuana cigarette is a dangerous first step on the road which usually leads to enslavement by heroin," warns Henry L. Giordano, associate director of the Narcotics Bureau.

The bureau listed 62,045 "active narcotics" addicts in 1967. These were the ones who came to the attention of the authorities—usually "junkies" and "hopheads" hooked on hard stuff.

How many more persons are active addicts or on the dangerous "high" road to addiction through growing dependence on a wide variety of other drugs—drugs to sleep, to stay awake, to calm down, pep them up or ease their aches and pains—is anybody's guess.

"We live in a drug-oriented culture," said Dr. Stanley F. Yolles, director of the National Institute of Mental Health. "From aspirin to sleeping pills, from tranquilizers to 'the pill,' Americans of all ages are ingesting drugs in greater variety and greater numbers than ever before."

All drugs are potentially dangerous. They upset the body's chemistry and can damage the central nervous system. A doctor prescribing a particular drug for a certain case weighs the risk against ultimate benefits he thinks can result.

The danger lies in the unsupervised use of drugs. This, the experts agree, is where the drug addiction problem really starts.

ADDICTION SHOWS IN EYES, PULSE

(By Robert Betts)

First the breathing and pulse rate are slowed down. Blood pressure and body temperature drop. Eyes become reddened, pupils pinpointed, lids drooped.

Dizziness and drowsiness alternate with bouts of wakefulness, lapsing back into sleep. Dreams become more fantastic, more frightening.

These can be the first stages of acute drug addiction.

Desire for the drug grows. Inability to get it gives rise to restlessness and irritability. Eyes water, mucus runs from the nose, muscles start to twitch.

Seized with violent stomach pains, vomiting and diarrhea, the addict kicks, jerks, curls up in bed or on the floor with as many blankets as he can find, even in the hottest weather. But sleep is impossible. Unable to retain anything in the stomach, he loses weight rapidly—as much as 10 pounds in 24 hours.

About the third day he is in deep torment—an unkempt, disheveled wretch, neglecting all thought of personal hygiene or decency.

The description, culled from studies and testimonies of hundreds of addicts, was given by Henry L. Giordano, associate director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

"It is not a pretty picture," he said "There are many angles to drug addiction and every one of them is bad."

Not all authorities on hard narcotics and drug abuse agree with Giordano when he paints such a distressing picture.

They say many people become addicted to narcotics after sampling them and finding withdrawal is not as bad as it has been pictured. So they continue to use narcotics until they are hooked and develop a dependency that leads to theft, prostitution or some other crime to pay for drugs. The odds are against their being able to kick the habit for good even if they want to.

These authorities, among them some officials of the California Rehabilitation Center, contend it would be far better in the long run to explain the risks of drug abuse in realistic terms rather than using scare techniques. The "tell it like it is" technique might discourage thousands of teenagers from sampling marijuana, they reason.

Studies show that although fewer than 2 per cent of known addicts are under 18, most of the 72 per cent who are under 30 began the habit as adolescents.

It can start in many ways—from glue-sniffing at the age of 8 or 9 to a game of "fruit salad" played with different colored pep pills (one of each color swallowed all at once).

Some start out for a dare. Some are led by others who dabble in pills, "hash" and "stuff." A sniff of heroin on a handkerchief ("Just smelling it can't hurt you," says the pusher), can be the first temptation into the trap. Heroin is the No. 1 destroyer in the underworld of dope.

Many college students start out on an "acid" trip.

LSD, a white or tan-colored powder soluble in water or alcohol, is tasteless and odorless, and often deadly. LSD precursors can be obtained from morning glory seeds or ergot, the parasitic fungus found on wheat, rye or other grasses.

It can be synthesized by any college chemistry major. Only 25 micrograms are needed to "turn on" the average person. Two aspirin-sized tablets is enough to send 3000 people on a trip, federal drug reports say.

Whatever the claims made by LSD users—of indescribable delight, of terrible torment, or both—it can damage brain and bone marrow cells or chromosomes, trigger psychosis or suicides, clinical studies show. Its use has frequently ended in tragedy.

Sucking it on a sugar cube used to be the popular method. Since possession of sugar cubes became synonymous with possession of LSD, smugglers and users have become more imaginative. LSD has been found in animal crackers, candy, chewing gum, vitamins, vodka, mouthwash, perfume, shaving lotions and many other articles.

Most adolescents get their first high from smoking marijuana—Mary Jane, also called "pot," "grass," "tea" or "weed." Cigarettes are known as "reefers," "sticks" or "joints."

An ounce costs $10 to $15. depending on the grade and supply, and is good for 50–60 "sticks." It is rolled in cigarette paper twisted at the ends, and passed around at teen-age pot parties, the pot-heads taking turns at drawing the smoke deep into their lungs. Three or four drags are all that is usually necessary to start feeling high.

NARCOTICS KNOWN TO CAVEMEN

(By Robert Betts)

While they cannot say for sure that there were cavemen drug addicts, archaeologists believe opium, cocaine and marijuana were known to Stone Age people.

The Chinese, Egyptians, Persians and Greeks used them thousands of years ago, to heal and to hallucinate.

Ancient battles in the Orient and Asia Minor were fought by warriors high on the homicidal drug hashish, which is concentrated form of marijuana.

From hashish came the word assassin—originally a member of the secret Muslim sect which during the Crusade terrorized Christians by murders committed under the drug's influence.

Drugs have been used more recently to subvert, corrupt or demoralize the enemy—by the Japanese in World War II, by the Communists in Korea.

Red China is believed to earn around $500 million a year in hard currencies from the illicit sale of drugs.

Addiction started becoming a U.S. problem in the late 19th century. Wounded Civil War soldiers, injected with pain-killing morphine by way of the newly invented hypodermic needle, became addicted. There also was increasing self-medication with preparations—such as cough syrup—containing opium, from which morphine and heroin are derived. More opium was brought into the country by Chinese immigrant laborers.

First U.S. efforts to control addiction was an 1890 tax imposed on the importation of opium and on the domestic manufacture of its derivatives except for medicinal purposes. At the 1912 Hague Conference, 13 nations agreed to regulate domestic sale and use of opiates. Dope smuggling had become big business.

Despite various treaties and United Nations protocols to control the worldwide movement of drugs, and increasingly stiffer penalties for drug trafficking, prohibited drugs have continued to find their way into this country in increasing quantities.

The opium poppy grows profusely in many parts of the world, especially in China, India, Turkey and the Near East. The harvest is far more than needed for medical purposes. Under international agreement, some governments buy up the surplus at a nominal price. Many farmers, however, withhold a sizable portion of their over-production and sell it on the black market at a much higher price.

Price climbs with distance. A kilo (2.2 pounds) of heroin can fetch up to $15,000 wholesale in this country, where its use for any purpose is illegal. After passing through back-street "cutting laboratories," where it is diluted with lactose (milk sugar) and broken down into white grains, it is passed out in capsule form to peddlers and pushers. The strength varies from city to city, California narcotics officials say.

Last in line is the desperate "junkie" who will eagerly pay $5 for one capsule. One kilo can produce up to 300,000 capsules; thus the original kilo has a retail worth of more than $1 million.

Traffic in cocaine—which comes from the cocoa leaf—is largely restricted to the American continent, originally mainly in Peru and Bolivia.

Most marijuana, which comes from the female hemp plant, Cannabis sativa, enters the country across the Mexican border in California.

It is impossible to say how much dope gets through the customs net, but the amount being seized is increasing yearly. Total weight of all narcotics and marijuana taken by customs and narcotics officials last year was 35 tons. Commissioner of Customs Lester D. Johnson reported that seizures in fiscal 1968 broke all records. The amount of heroin seized was up by 215 per cent, cocaine by 143 per cent and marijuana by 166 per cent over last year. More drugs destined for this country were seized by U.S. undercover agents overseas working in cooperation with the authorities of the host countries.

Johnson also said that violence is more prevalent in the apprehension of smugglers. "It has been noted throughout the year that an unusually large number of pistols and other weapons have been found in the possession of smugglers," he said.

PARENTS MUST REALIZE THAT DRUG ABUSE CANNOT BE SWEPT AWAY—IT IS PART OF THE SCENE

It's obvious now that the problem of drug abuse among the teen-agers cannot be wished away any more than it can be ignored. Drug abuse has become as much a part of the scene for the school as a spring prom.

Parents must realize this and proceed from there to prepare their child for this new hazard in growing up.

No family is immune. Drug abuse is not a problem for just one group of citizens of one area of the city.

The success or failure of the marriage of the parents offers no clue as to the likelihood of a child taking drugs.

We cannot offer a foolproof answer for the problem. There is none. There are things a parent can do and the first is to examine his relationship with the child.

The parent must determine whether or not he can communicate with his children. This does not mean talk at them, but talk with them. Have you listened lately to what your child has to say?

If you want your child to listen to you, you should pay him the respect of listening to him.

As for the drug problem, the parents should become informed. One mother found a package of marijuana in her home and did not know at the time what it was. Would you recognize marijuana or some of the pills which can be dangerous?

Become informed, then make sure your child is informed. The school has programs, but these alone cannot do the job.

The police have been most cooperative in helping groups and individual families with this problem.

One mother who found her son had been smoking marijuana called the police.

"Officers from the Juvenile Narcotics Bureau came out and talked to us. They were most understanding, most helpful," the mother said. "If the parent is even suspicious, I recommend they call the police for help in talking about this to their child."

There is a new program, the Peninsula "Hot Line," which has been set up in the Palos Verdes Peninsula to help parents deal with the drug abuse problem and youngsters in trouble.

In all programs, though, parents must not remain isolated in groups, still not communicating with the child.

Parents need to know what their child does, where he goes, who his friends are.

It's not some mysterious stranger who is giving and selling the children drugs, but a fellow student or the older brother or sister of a friend.

"Parents should watch their children," one mother said after her son had an experience with pills. "Stay up until the child comes home. Then check him. Talk to him a minute, find out what he did, where he went."

This does not have to be an interrogation, but can be a friendly conversation when you are interested in your child and what he does.

While there was no single factor involved in the cases the News-Pilot checked, in the majority the child was making poor grades or having a difficult time making average grades. Also, the child participated in few if any extracurricular activities.

Several of the children were in classes for slower students. This seemed to make them feel they had already been relegated to an inferior position in life.

"My boy made average grades until the fifth grade," one mother said. "Then in the sixth grade his grades fell down and they placed him in junior high according to his sixth grade marks. This put him in with a bad group, I believe. Smoking marijuana seems quite prevalent in this group."

But there are cases of students with high grades getting mixed up in drug abuses so there is no absolute guideline. Girls are just as involved as boys.

Parents in dealing with their child had better have the faith of that child. If the child knows the parent is hypocritical on one issue, the child will tend to disbelieve his parent on other matters.

Some parents will write an excuse for their child when he misses school to go to the beach. The child knows he was not sick and when his parents write an excuse that says so, he knows his parent will lie to help him flaunt the rules. The parent may think he is being a good sport, but he has actually destroyed some of the child's faith.

Parents must remember that children look to them for guidance and leadership, not just permission, money and the car.

"SCARE" CAMPAIGN DOESN'T DO THE JOB

(By Paul Corcoran)

Parents, alarmed by lurid stories of hippies and "pot" parties, admonished their 12-year-old son he should not use marijuana because it is a dangerous drug.

But, while mother and dad say marijuana is bad, their older, college-age daughter triumphantly produces statements from public health officials that marijuana is not addictive. The same health officials cannot agree, even, if marijuana is more dangerous than alcohol.

Who is the 12-year-old boy supposed to believe?

"It creates a credibility gap," says Peter Frank, who heads the narcotics education program for San Diego County schools. He is trying out a plan to educate kindergarten-age children—and their parents—on narcotics.

Frank is one of those who believes an intensive research program to evaluate just how hazardous marijuana is should be conducted. The same type of crash program awakened law officers and health officials to the extreme hazards of LSD, one of the hallucinogenic drugs, which found favor a couple of years back with the hippies.

Yet possession of marijuana is a felony, while possession of LSD is a misdemeanor.

This does not mean, Frank is quick to say, that marijuana should be legalized now. Its use and that of other drugs can bring on a "brave new world" in which modern man is dependent upon a variety of drugs and narcotics from the cradle to the grave, he said.

Whatever the disagreements about marijuana may be, some points seem pretty well established.

1. Marijuana is harmful, whether addictive or not. "Marijuana is undoubtedly a . . . harmful drug," says Dr. Lawrence Kolb, retired assistant surgeon general of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Alcohol, taken to excess, also is harmful and is increasing as a problem among young people. But Kolb says:

"Alcohol, during the last 2500 years, has apparently become an irreplaceable part of our social structure. We know that it does much harm, but the fact that we tolerate this harm is no reason for permitting the indiscriminate use of another intoxicant."

2. The use of marijuana among high school and junior high school students far exceeds that of LSD or any other drug. "It must now . . . be recognized that drug abuse has become a serious public health problem and that it should be dealt with as such," Dr. Lester Breslow, California director of public health, recently told a legislative committee.

3. The use of marijuana cuts across socio-economic barriers. It is found among the middle class as well as the poorer minority groups. A shortage of money to pay the ever-present pusher can increase crime incidence among even the younger marijuana users.

4. Despite the absence of statistics on a national level there is every reason to believe more and more boys and girls of junior high school age are using marijuana.

5. The majority of hard narcotics—heroin, cocaine and others—users first used marijuana before becoming addicted to stronger drugs.

On all levels—federal, state and local—there is the feeling that "education" should not mean only indoctrinating the chid to drug abuses in school, but should be emphasized even more in the home.

Kolb, Breslow and many others feel that preventing narcotics use is one of the best ways to attack the drug problem, which has so many aspects, including the use of drugs by Communists and criminals to gain control over the addict.

Capt. L. L. DeVore, chief of the San Diego Police Department juvenile division, says, "The problem is the breakdown with the parent. The problem goes right back to the parent."

Frank and Clifford J. Lawrence, associate superintendent of instruction for the Clark County School District at Las Vegas, Nev., are attempting to promise programs that inform pupils at an early age.

"There must be close cooperation between parents and teachers," said Frank, a graduate of the University of Edinburgh who has been exposed to the narcotics problems in England as well as San Francisco and San Diego schools.

The sheriff's office at Las Vegas assigns members of the narcotics division to talk to school groups and civic clubs. Also, they hold demonstrations for teachers to train them to identify narcotics users. The officers burn marijuana so teachers know how "pot" smells.

Frank believes many teachers and parents are completely inadequate in background and information on drugs, and that many teenagers know more than their elders. That makes it all the more important to present the proper information to the youngsters, explaining that excessive use of all drugs—as well as alcohol—can destroy a life, he said.

Authorities on all levels agree that a "scare" campaign will do little good. The actual danger of drug abuse is so acute that it doesn't need exaggeration.

WHEN DO YOU START TEACHING A CHILD NOT TO USE DRUGS?

(By Paul Corcoran)

When do you start teaching a child not to use dangerous drugs?

How can you instill an awareness of the dangers of abusing any drugs or alcohol when a son or daughter sees parents drink too much liquor, and use pills to slow down, speed up, go to sleep or stay awake?

What can be done about drug pushers, some of them in their teens, who lurk near high schools and junior high schools when students protect them as their only source of illegal narcotics?

The accelerated use of marijuana, LSD and other drugs—particularly of an hallucinogenic nature—worries parents, and causes both schools and law enforcement officers one of their biggest headaches of the 1960s.

Some school officials believe education must start early, even at the kindergarten level. Peter R. Frank, who heads the narcotics education program for San Diego County schools, says a pilot program is beginning in selected schools in kindergarten, 4th and 6th grade classes. It is also an attempt to educate parents, many of whom provide more misinformation than fact, Frank says.

In Las Vegas, best known as an entertainment and gambling spa, mothers and fathers are just as worried as those in California, Illinois, New York, and other U.S. communities. The sheriff's office has developed a community education program starting with the 6th grade pupils.

William Beckett, a teacher-coach at San Gabriel High School in Southern California, noted that children in the 12–14 age bracket are being taken into custody for use of everything from glue to marijuana.

The Chicago Police Department was one of several agencies reporting concern existed for children sniffing glue. However, merchants there are trying to avoid dispensing glue to youngsters.

Some California police report children as young as 7 and 8 are using glue to get high instead of making airplanes. Some sniff the fumes of gasoline.

The Narcotics Bureau of the U.S. Department of Commerce sees marijuana usage at the age of 16 or over is already regarded as a problem by federal officials.

Police and school officials decry glamorizing hallucinogenic drugs or hard narcotics by the hippie movement, films and news media. They may differ on the hazards of marijuana, for example, but all are concerned about misinformation that leads youngsters to sample different drugs. The parents, many believe, deserve much of the blame for the startling increase in drug usage.

"I think I can look back to 1966 as the time it really became a problem among the young people," said Capt. L. L. DeVore of the San Diego Police Department. He said there was a "progressively lower age group," with one child having a record as a drug user at the age of 12.

The Department of Youth Authority for the state of California has drug therapy programs at several institutions, but none for those of 15 or under. One official said it was "possible" some of the younger inmates, at 8 or 9, had taken marijuana before confinement, although there were no specific records.

The most frustrating problem for those confronting the narcotics problem is just that: There is so little information and so few statistics—such a limited, short history of drug education and rehabilitation exists—that they must work from scratch.

John M. Heslep, chief of the division of environment sanitation for the California Department of Health, said his agency feels very strongly that there is a "critical need for investigations and research in several areas."

For one thing, "what is the incidence of drug abuse in the population by areas, and by special population groups . . .?"

Second, what segments of the population are most apt to become drug abusers and what techniques of education and persuasion would be most effective in reaching each?

"How may we ignore early case findings so as to reach individuals before they become physiologically or psychologically addicted?" asked Heslep.

The records that are available from law enforcement agencies do "indicate a substantial increase in illegal use of drugs, particularly among the young."

It is evident that the drug problem in general is more acute in port cities such as New York, San Francisco and Los Angeles, and near the Mexican border, where it is virtually impossible to stop marijuana from being brought into California, Arizona or Texas.

But this does not mean other areas of the nation are not affected.

The nature of modern society, Frank stresses, is a major factor in drug abuse.

"Let's face it, we're living in a drug-taking age," he said.

NAR-ANON CHAPTER MAKES DRUG PROBLEM A GROUP AFFAIR IN THE HARBOR AREA

(By Tom Coulter)

"Let me turn you on to a bennie. It will really pep you up and make you feel good," or, "Let's drop a red and get high. It's real crazy, man."

Too often these or similar statements are being made by teenagers and young adults, Los Angeles County Sheriff Peter J. Pitchess warned today. "They make it sound so innocent and harmless when the abuse of dangerous, harmful drugs is involved."

"The use of drugs is spreading throughout the community. It is spread by users themselves to relatives, close friends and associates. It is not a stereotyped peddler who is lurking in the shadows waiting to turn on innocent victims. The dangerous drugs are inexpensive and readily available. The teenagers are quick to say, 'They are cheaper than booze'."

"When prescribed by a doctor, some drugs do have therapeutic value and we in law enforcement are not concerned with this legal use of the drug," Pitchess noted. "We are concerned with the abuse or indiscriminate use, and primarily with the traffickers."

"Dangerous drug abuses are difficult to detect because symptoms are similar to those of alcohol. Drug sale profit is not the cause of drug abuse; however, it does have its place in the picture."

Pitchess said that recently the county has experienced a tremendous increase in dangerous drug use, particularly in schools and colleges. "This increase can be attributed to the changing attitudes of society and the sensational publicity by all media."

Pitchess noted that the acceptance of drug use by educated and affluent persons also is a major factor.

"Many persons," the sheriff said, "who are now being arrested for drug use have no history of any prior delinquent or criminal behavior. Thus the message that we are attempting to deliver to the citizens of Los Angeles County is that it could happen in your family."

A Palos Verdes Peninsula group has realized that drug abuse is very much a family affair.

For every user of a dangerous drug or narcotic, there is a family in the shadows—waiting and waiting—sometimes with no place to turn for advice or counsel.

For more than a year now, a chapter of Nar-Anon has been meeting at 8:15 p.m. each Tuesday at St. Peter's by the Sea Presbyterian Church in Portuguese Bend.

Patterned after Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous, the chapter helps the families of narcotics addicts through group therapy. So far it has proved successful, with as many as 50 people turning out for the weekly sessions.

"Everyone receives calls asking help with the dope situation—but no one has an answer," said the pretty housewife who founded the chapter out of concern for the families of addicts.

"The probation department gets calls—so do the police—they don't know what to do. Churches and ministers all get calls—but what is the answer?

"Any home where there is dissension, illness or alcoholism, there is more likelihood for narcotics addiction," she believes.

"Our little group goes into this, trying to help the family understand the problem and learn to adjust to the situation so it becomes more bearable. The families, too, must make a life for themselves—rid themselves of the terrible emotional distress involved, and by doing so encourage the addict to change too."

"Today many Nar-Anon members are finding serenity through our program—one of five chapters in the greater Los Angeles area."

She said that through discussion of common problems, the group members lose the compulsion to criticize, judge, condemn and retaliate. "We learn that hostility can damage us far more than those against whom we use such weapons. We have found that a change of attitude in the addict's home helps the addict to find help."

"We try very hard at our group discussions to point out the problems and what we think are solutions," she said. "When families come to Nar-Anon they realize that they are not alone, but among friends who understand the problem as few others could. By discussing their problems with others—with similar situations—and hearing 'professionals' discuss it, they can reach a solution for themselves."

The Tuesday night meetings are open to anyone with a problem.

Drug abuse is not only a family affair—it also has become a group affair in the Harbor Area.

PARENTS NEED TO KNOW SYMPTOMS OF DRUG USE

(By Dan Scanlan)

"Parents ought to be more aware of the symptoms of drug use," a Harbor Division narcotics agent told the News-Pilot. "Too many parents think the actions of their sons or daughters are simply a process of growing up."

Detective Sgt. Kaye Palmquist has worked with both adult and juvenile narcotics users for the past two years. She spent one of those years working primarily with juveniles. Since that time the police department has created a department that is responsible for working with narcotics suspects regardless of the violator's age.

One of the major problems encountered by Miss Palmquist in her work is the lack of parental knowledge concerning the problem of drug usage among teenagers and, in some cases, pre-teenagers.

"Parents have to pay more attention to what their kids are doing," she said.

There are so many changes in personality between the ages of 12 and 16 that it is difficult to perceive abnormal behavior."

Worse yet, she says, many parents know fully well what is happening to their child and yet attempt to hide it.

Miss Palmquist pointed out that it is much better for a child to have a relatively minor drug infraction on a record that can be completely cleared in a matter of a few years than to allow a child to "mess up his life" by fighting the problem with incompetence and fear.

Many pushers have begun to give away seconal and benzedrine tablets in order to increase their prospective clientele, although the going rate on the streets remain at 25 cents per pill.

A great hindrance, as was encountered among high school administrators, is the growing acceptance among teenagers themselves to condone or at least not react negatively toward those who use drugs.

"These kids don't want to fink on each other," Miss Palmquist said. "If they saw a man on the street waving a gun they would tell someone. But if they see a man with a bag full of pills they don't—even though the man with the pills can, and usually does a great deal more harm than the armed man to a lot more people."

The police department, as well as a number of agencies, is attempting to provide instructional materials for both parents and teenagers on drug abuse.

In order to combat its growing usage, it is necessary to educate parents as to the symptoms of drug use and the proper steps to take when the symptoms become visible.

Pamphlets can be obtained from the Harbor Division police station and by writing to the Office of the District Attorney, Hall of Justice, 211 Temple St., Room 618, Los Angeles 90012.

THE LINGO OF USERS—A NUMBER OF WAYS TO SAY TEENAGE TROUBLE

Here is a glossary of narcotic and dangerous drug slang:

Acapulco Gold—A supposedly superior grade of marijuana, somewhat gold in color and grown near Acapulco, Mexico.

Acid—Lysergic Acid Diethylamide Tartrate (LSD).

Acidhead—LSD user.

Bag—About one ounce of marijuana or a "lid." Also pertains to use of small plastic bags that are purchased in coin shops and used to contain either marijuana or powdered drugs.

Balloon—Rubber toy balloon used for storing or delivering heroin.

Beans—Benzedrine.

Bennies—Benzedrine.

Bindle—A small paper packet of heroin, morphine or cocaine.

Blow—To smoke marijuana.

Blow a vein—Use too much pressure when injecting a drug into a vein, causing it to rupture.

Blue heaven—Amytal, sodium petrothal or numorphin.

Blues—Sodium Pentothal.

Blues & Reds—Tuinol, 50 per cent sodium amytal, 50 per cent seco-barbitol.

Brick—Kilo of marijuana in compressed brick form.

Bummer—A bad or nightmarish LSD experience; also, colloquially, a stroke of bad luck.

Burn—To accept money and give no narcotic in return, or to substitute a phony substance instead of the expected narcotic.

Can—One ounce of marijuana.

Cap—A capsule of heroin, commonly a No. 5 gelatin capsule.

Chippy—An occasional user of heroin.

Crystals—Methedrine.

Clean—An addict who is free from narcotic injection marks, or is not in possession of narcotics; also, non-user.

Coke—Cocaine.

Connect—To buy drugs.

Cottons—Bits of cotton saturated with narcotic solution used to strain foreign matter when drawing solution up into a hypodermic syringe or eyedropper. These cottons are often saved by addicts for an emergency, as they contain a residual amount of the drug.

Crutch—A device used to hold marijuana cigarette when it has burned to the point where it will burn the fingers.

Cut—To dilute narcotics; in heroin use, the narcotic is mixed with milk-sugar, dried and cut with a razor blade.

Dexies—Dexedrine, Dexamyl.

Ditch—The inside of the elbow which has two large veins.

Doper—Someone who takes dope.

Fit—Short for "outfit" needed for injection.

Fix—A drug which is about to be injected; the act of injecting.

Flash—The feeling immediately following fixing; to throw up because of fixing.

Flip out—Go crazy.

Freak—Become afraid; wild sex; a crazy person; a fantastic "trip."

Frantic—Nervous, jittery drug user.

Fuzz—The law.

Goof ball—Any barbiturate tablet or capsule, combined with an amphetamine.

Goofer—One who drops pills.

Goofed up—Under the influence of barbiturates.

Gram—Approximately 10 capsules of heroin.

Grass—Marijuana.

Guide—A person who does not use LSD while sitting with a user during a session.

H—Heroin.

Hand-to-hand—Delivery of narcotics person-to-person.

Head—Marijuana user.

Heat—The law.

High—Under the effect of narcotics or drugs; euphoric feeling induced by them.

Hog—An addict who uses all he can get his hands on.

Holding—In possession of narcotics.

Horning—Sniffing narcotics up the nose.

Hype—An addict.

Joint—A marijuana cigarette.

Jolt—An injection of narcotics.

Joy pop—An occasional injection of narcotics; one who is "joy popping" only takes an injection now and then.

Junk—Heroin.

Kee—Kilo of marijuana.

Kilo—2.2 pounds of marijuana.

Lid—One ounce of marijuana; can.

Main-line—Veins of body, usually in arms; also intravenous injection.

Main-liner—One who injects narcotics directly into veins.

The man—The law; narcotics detectives. Also, peddler.

Manicure—To prepare marijuana for use in cigarettes.

Meth—Methedrine.

Narc, narco—Narcotics detectives; police.

O.D.—Overdose of narcotics—usually heroin.

Outfit—Equipment for injection by the hypodermic route: eyedropper, needle, spoon, small piece of cotton and handkerchief.

Panic—A scarcity of drugs, usually caused by the arrest of a big peddler.

Piece—One ounce of heroin.

Pill head—Amphetamine or barbiturate user.

Pot—Marijuana.

Pure—Pure heroin, prior to cutting.

Rainbow—Tuinal.

Red devil, redbird, or reds—Seconal, secobarbitol.

Reefer—Marijuana cigarette.

Roach—A partially smoked marijuana cigarette.

Scoring—Making a purchase of narcotics.

Script—A prescription, usually forged.

Shooting gallery—A place where addicts congregate to inject their narcotics.

Smack—Heroin.

Snow—Cocaine.

Speed—Methedrine.

Speedball—A powerful shot of drug, usually heroin and cocaine combined.

Spike—A hypodermic needle.

Spoon—A quantity of heroin theoretically measured in a teaspoon (usually between one and two grams).

Stick—Marijuana cigarette.

Stoned—Under the influence of narcotics or drugs.

Straight—Under the influence of narcotics.

Strung out—Addicted.

Stuff—Heroin.

Tea—Marijuana.

Toke up—To light a marijuana cigarette.

Tracks—A series of puncture wounds in the veins caused by continuous narcotic injections.

Trip—A drug experience, often euphoric.

Turn on—To use narcotics or to introduce another person to the use of narcotics. To alter awareness.

Weed—Marijuana.

Weed head—Marijuana users.

Whites—Amphetamine; benzedrine. Double-scored tablets.

Yellows, yellow jackets—Nenobutal.

IS THE UNITED STATES IMPERIALISTIC?—INDIANAPOLIS STAR SAYS "NO"

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been far too much careless and irresponsible talk about how the United States has become "imperialistic" and, by implication is seeking world domination in one form or the other. There has been nothing to back up these charges except impassioned, fevered and totally wrong logic. The following editorial from the April 4, 1969, Indianapolis Star sets the matter straight:

IMPERIALISM: THE RECORD

At the height of United States' military victory in World War II, our nation held more of this planet's surface and population by force of arms than any conquering power held in history.

American forces held most of Western Europe, much of North Africa, the strategic islands of the South Pacific, the Philippines, Japan.

Not only did our armed forces hold vast realms of sea, land and peoples, but our nation had a monopoly of the world's most powerful weapon, the atomic bomb. Our government had used it twice to give the death-blow to Japan and speed the war's end.

If ever the opportunity was ripe for imperialistic conquest, that was it. If ever one nation had the throat of mankind in its grip, that was the time.

The armies of the Soviet Union, then the world's only Communist power, also held large territories in their power. They held the Balkans except for Greece and Turkey, and they held Hungary, East Germany, the Baltic states and Czechoslovakia.

In countries from which the Soviet troops moved out, they left behind the one-party ruling machinery of Communist power.

The strength and significance of the Soviet grip upon those lands may be measured by the fact that when Hungary sought to overthrow it and when Czechoslovakia attempted to loosen it they were invaded by Soviet and Soviet-bloc armored divisions and occupied by Soviet troops.

What the United States did with its occupied territories was unique in the annals of war and politics.

Once our military force had destroyed and dismantled the enemy war machine and the power of its masters, the United States returned the territories it had conquered to the peoples—Italy, North Africa, West Germany and Japan, all won at tremendous cost of American life and treasure. The Philippines had been recaptured, also at high cost, and a pre-war promise of independence was fulfilled. Most of the Pacific islands were submitted to United Nations mandate.

Then America poured billions of dollars in food, equipment and money into rebuilding the societies, cities and economies of the nations it had defeated in war. Today those nations are independent and thriving. They are ruled by their own people. They have many parties—even including Communist parties—constantly competing for rule.

America's nuclear monopoly held for several years. But this nation never used its ultimate weapon for aggressive purposes. We have fought defensive wars and actions to honor alliances and protect allies from armed conspiracies and aggression.

The costliest of these of course have been Korea and Vietnam. We refrained from using nuclear force in Korea although it could have ended the war within a few days. We have used neither nuclear force nor the logical strategy of conventional warfare in Vietnam.

Whatever else our conduct of the Vietnam war merits being called, it cannot be called the act of an imperialist power. When Communist propagandists smear it with that tar of falsehood, it is time to haul out the record.

The record shows who the imperialists are.

REPORTS ON THE TROUBLED GREEK DICTATORS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the April 5 Washington Post contained two articles, datelined Athens, by its Pulitzer Prize winning correspondent, Alfred Friendly.

The first, a news dispatch, documented some of the incompetence and heavy-handedness that have characterized the military regime that has ruled Greece since April 1967.

The second, an editorial column, discussed the tight censorship that has deprived the Greek people of the right to know what is really happening in their country. In Friendly's words:

> It is corrosive to a responsible political and national life; moreover, it is probably doing the dictatorship more harm than good.

Both articles follow:

GREECE'S JUNTA UNABLE TO IMPROVE ITS IMAGE AT HOME OR ABROAD

(By Alfred Friendly)

ATHENS.—The high hopes of the Greek military regime to win "legitimacy" through last September's referendum have been bitterly disappointed.

The referendum, nominally for approval of a new constitution, gave the junta a "yes" vote of 92 percent. Presumably, that should have demonstrated great popular support and solved two of the regime's main and overwhelming difficulties: The refusal by Greeks of prestige, technical competence and executive skill to reign themselves to the permanence of the colonels' government and to go to work for it, and the refusal of Western governments to become friends.

No such hoped for changes took place. As almost everyone but the junta members themselves foresaw at the outset, the referendum was discounted as a phony, not because it was rigged, which it was not in the technical sense, but because it was held in an atmosphere of intimidation and under martial law, the antithesis of a democratic electoral environment.

The comment of one canny Greek is apt, if bitter: "Everyone knows that throughout 3000 years of history, 92 per cent of Greeks have never agreed on anything."

INCOMPETENCY REMAINS

Failure of the regime to recruit able people at the top or near-top levels means that the national administration still wallows in incompetency. It turns out—if the point still needs demonstrating—that a dictatorship is not necessarily more efficient than a democracy.

"The colonels promised to end anarchy in the streets, and they did," one opponent of the regime remarked recently, "but what they substituted was anarchy in Government.

Now, almost two years after the bloodless coup, that brought it to power, the junta presides over a country stagnant in internal development and deteriorating in its foreign relations.

From an average annual growth rate of 7 to 8 per cent in recent years, Greece dropped to about 3.5 per cent last year. It may, with luck, work up to 5 per cent in 1969. Its foreign exchange losses continue although they are masked by short-term loans at high interest rates, a phenomenon that cannot continue indefiitely.

At best, in the judgment of a neutral diplomat whose information is to be credited, "The economy is going sidewise, growing neither much worse nor much better."

The failure of the referendum to do what it was supposed to is even more evident in foreign affairs. The vote was dismissed abroad, and for the same reasons as in Greece itself.

Thus the nation finds itself on the verge of being expelled from the Council of Europe, boycotted by Scandinavian tourists, denounced by the Scandinavian countries and Holland, and regarded with great dubiety by Germany in a way that hurts—German lines of credit have yet to open up in a volume vital to the Greek economic future.

Finally, in a totally unnecessary and unbelievably badly handled row, it is making an enemy of Italy, the neighbor whose good relations are most important to it.

NENNI AND PAPANDREOU

The hurlyburly began on March 6 when Italian Foreign Minister Pietro Nenni, acting in his non-governmental capacity as leader of the Italian Socialist Party, received Andreas Papandreou, son of the late Greek Prime Minister and now an agitator-in-exile against the junta.

For domestic political reasons Nenni, who had been under fire for allegedly trending to the right, issued a statement expressing his support of Papandreou's cause and, in vague terms, promising material as well as moral support to him.

The intelligent response of the Greek government, to keep the damage to a minimum and avoid building up Papandreou in Greece itself to a stature he does not deserve, would have been to pay no attention. Its censorship would have prevented any publication of Nenni's statement and that could have been the end of it.

Instead, the junta blew its collective top, issued a denunciation of Nenni, gave it maximum publicity and demanded a denial. Privately, Nenni gave assurance that no real "material" support was intended, but reaffirmed, as an exile himself for 15 years under Mussolini, his sympathy with Papandreou and the dictatorship-ridden Greek people.

Once again, the Greek government could have let the matter drop. Instead, its demands for a public explanation grew more frenetic and it began to talk of an economic boycott. The fury of the attack gave Nenni no option but to make matters worse. On March 26 he replied that there was nothing to deny and that, in effect, Italy viewed the junta as an abomination.

In the last week or so, the junta spokesmen have soft-pedalled talk of a boycott. Greek imports from Italy cost much less than any substitutions from other suppliers would and Italy is virtually the only possible market for Greece's tobacco and olive oil.

But Greek Prime Minister George Papadopoulos, currently stumping northern Greece, grows more strident day by day, talking of Greek blood shed by Italian invaders throughout history, and more recently, in World War II.

Foreign diplomats here, as well as many thoughtful Greeks, find the whole affair a classic example of how to conduct foreign affairs disastrously.

With such profound troubles abroad and at home, some Greeks assert that the days of the colonels' government are numbered. Athens is full of highly imprecise rumors that "something is stirring."

If there is—and the proposition seems dubious—it would almost certainly have to be from within the military establishment itself. The exile organizations carry little weight inside Greece (although the junta seems to be doing its best to build up Papandreou from a much disliked figure into something better). And the former political leaders, who early had dreamed of some sort of consolidated drive to topple the junta, remain as divided as ever and are getting exactly nowhere.

But, according to most Greek political observers, the junta also remains deeply split within itself, torn by rival personal ambitions as well as by deep doubts about the regime's effectiveness and future prospects.

TWO TRENDS SEEN

These sources say there are two completely diverse trends within the military establishment. One is supposed to hold that the junta must become more autocratic and dictatorial and abandon even thinking about an ultimate restoration of democracy. The other is said to be convinced that the military dictatorship will fail and a more traditionally democratic regime must be substituted.

In a situation so precarious, these sources insist that the stimulus of some as yet unforeseen crisis could collapse the junta structure into a heap.

Possibly so, for Greek political affairs are notoriously unpredictable.

But the majority of observers, informed as best they can be about what is a closed and secret government, believe that not only is nothing much happening inside the country and the administration, but also that for some time to come nothing much will.

There is not the slightest indication of any intent of the junta to move toward democratic institutions, to hold elections or, in fact, to do anything but cement its regime more firmly and more permanently in power.

CENSORSHIP BY GREEK RULERS FEEDS RUMORS AND MISTRUST

(By Alfred Friendly)

ATHENS.—As a newspaperman with something more than passing interest in the issue of censorship, I find myself spellbound on each visit here with the workings of the Greek version.

Some of its aspects can be dismissed as merely ridiculous or sad. A couple of examples:

The writings of historian Arnold Toynbee, and even his name, may not be published in Greece. The reason: he once wrote—not too solemnly, one assumes—that the Greeks made a mistake in winning their war of independence from Turkey in 1829 because they were already well on their way to taking over the entire Ottoman Empire because of their superior abilities. The Athens censor deems the remarks denigrating of Greece's "holy war."

The governor of Northern Greece recently had a falling out with Stylianos Patakos, Minister of Interior and No. 2 man in the junta. On the governor's orders, the Salonika censor, independent of the one in Athens, accordingly forbade papers in his area to mention Patakos by name. For a week, until the row blew over, Patakos was a nonperson in northern Greece.

But for the rest, censorship is no laughing matter. It is corrosive to a responsible political and national life; moreover, it is probably doing the dictatorship more harm than good.

Where there is a news vacuum, rumor fills it. Yet rumor is surely the most dangerous threat to the goal the junta most desires: public confidence in it and governmental stability. The more insecure the colonels' regime senses itself to be, the tighter and more frantic its censorship. A vicious circle comes into being. Some serious examples of its operation:

The battle of the Greek tycoons, the former brothers-in-law Aristotle Onassis and Stavros Niarchos, over which one will operate the proposed new $400 to $500 million investment program for a new oil refinery, aluminum plants and several tourist projects raised for the first time the suspicion of corruption with the junta.

The government's off-a-gain, on-again handling of the intricate affair may have been merely clumsy or shabby, testifying only to its administrative incompetence. But on its face, the Niarchos proposal, which was ultimately rejected, seemed so much more advantageous to the country than that of Onassis as to suggest bad faith by the regime.

One would have supposed that, once the suspicion arose, the government would have taken elaborate pains to demonstrate clean hands. After all, one of the junta's most loudly proclaimed justifications for its coup two years ago was the premise that it would end the notorious corruption of previous governments. If it is subject to the same failing, it loses a principal excuse for its existence.

Suspected of sticky fingers, the regime's logical response would have been to lay out the proposals in detail, argue them and supply a complete explanation for its final choice. Instead, after a few weeks of pulling and hauling, the junta clamped complete censorship over the whole matter. Nothing more may be printed about it in the Greek press. The consequence was obvious: what was once a smoldering rumor is now a wildfire scandal.

Publication of any criticism of the regime is, of course, taboo. But the junta, seemingly driven by a compulsion to make the worst of every situation, cannot risk the temptation to make public answers to each unpublished attack.

Thus, last week when Greece's only Nobel laureate, the poet George Seferis, broke a long silence to denounce the junta, his attack remained unpublished in the Greek press. But the government at once made it obligatory on the newspapers to give major play to its response, thereby giving infinitely more prominence to what Seferis and—or to what a readership, imagining the worst, assumed Seferis said.

The reply, incidentally, achieved the nadir of nastiness. It implied that Seferis was senile—he is anything but—and said he never deserved the Nobel Prize in the first place. Its tone can be appreciated from one passage saying Seferis had spit on Greece with the saliva of Italian Foreign Minister Pietro Nenni.

The reference to Nenni recalls still another instance of the wondrous workings of the censorship. On March 6, the leader of the Italian Socialist Party received Andreas Papandreou, bete noir of the junta and its most strident critic in exile. Speaking as a private politician rather than in his government role. Nenni expressed his support of Papandreou's campaign to restore democracy in Greece.

Publication of his statement was prohibited in Greece. But ever since, the junta has flooded the country with its replies. As in the previous instance, the Greek citizenry has only a presumption of what Nenni said and is left to imagine the worst.

The consequence of the affair is twofold: confidence in the regime's handling of foreign relations, already justifiably low, is further reduced, and the one man whom the junta most despises gets a publicity build-up in Greece that makes him look like a hero.

To use the overworked term of the New Frontier, the junta's censorship is counterproductive. To a regime that wants nothing so much as the people's trust, its censorship breeds only doubts.

A prominent Athenian puts it this way: "We Greeks simply cannot know what the government is doing. How can we possibly trust it?"

DISTINGUISHED ACHIEVEMENT AWARD GOES TO UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the University of Connecticut, located in my congressional district, has received considerable publicity concerning expressions of campus dissent. Unfortunately, the press accounts have tended to overstress these events which in reality involved only a small fraction of the student body and faculty. In all fairness, at least equal notice should be given to the very significant accomplishments being made by the university.

I am therefore extremely pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the distinguished achievement award for excellence in teacher education, given annually by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, has been presented this year to the University of Connecticut for the development and implementation of the program, "educating teachers for the city."

I am at this point inserting into the Record an article from the Meriden, Conn., Record; one from the Torrington, Conn., Register, which describes the program that brought this outstanding honor to the University of Connecticut, and the text of the citation. The articles follow:

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Record, Mar. 27, 1969]

"On-Site" And Insight

"On-Site" involvement can lead to insight, especially when the site involved is the inner city ghetto itself.

Such "on-sight" involvement in one of Connecticut's inner cities has won for the School of Education at the University of Connecticut the Distinguished Achievement Award for Excellence in Teacher Education for 1969.

More than 100 American colleges and universities where teacher preparation is a major function submitted their programs for evaluation to a committee of distinguished judges enlisted by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The University of Connecticut won the award; ten other institutions were recognized for distinguished achievement.

"Educating Teachers for the City" was the program which won top national recognition for UConn. The program embraced an experimental project developed at the Hamden-New Haven Center for Educational Development. Face-to-face confrontation with the ghetto, its people and problems, with school and governmental officials and with neighborhood and community organizations provided "on-site" opportunities for unusual insights.

Such innovative and imaginative approaches to teaching teachers are a credit to the School of Education at UConn. Connecticut citizens can take pride in the recognition accorded its achievement.

[From the Torrington (Conn.) Register, Feb. 28, 1969]

University of Connecticut Wins Achievement Award

Chicago, Ill.—A teacher-training project developed by the University of Connecticut has won for it the 1969 Distinguished Achievement Award of the American Assoc. of Colleges of Teacher Education.

On hand here last night to accept the first place plaque for his institution was Pres. Homer D. Babbidge Jr. The university had been cited on the basis of its "CONN-ED" project launched last fall at the Hamden-New Haven Cooperative Education Center.

About 120 institutions across the nation entered the annual AACTE competition. The association lists, as members, some 830 colleges and universities which train about 92 per cent of the nation's teachers.

The CONN-ED program is an experimental project of the U. of C. School of Education. Housed on the Old Quinnipiac College campus in suburban Hamden, the project involves a number of future teachers in the life of the inner city as well as its classrooms. It represents a radical departure from the traditional observation and practice teaching courses.

Support for the project came from the State Board of Education and the Hamden-New Haven Center.

Initially, 12 senior U of C coeds left the rural campus in September to take up residence in an old three-story, grey stone house at the center. Each of them was henceforth immersed in an experience unlike any she had ever known—at college or at home.

Their new "dorm" was furnished—beds, desks, the usual essentials—and a house mother from the Inner City was their guide. At first, instead of visiting the city schools, they contacted the pupils at the center. The children had been bussed from the ghettos of New Haven and Hamden.

In addition to the house mother, the university and center supplied two other resident staff members—black lecturers from New Haven's inner city whose credentials were heavy on the practical side and lighter on the theoretical. The trio had been chosen in large part for their ability to translate the language and behavior of inner city youngsters into terms a middle class white student could grasp.

"Without them the program would have been impossible," insists Dr. A. J. Pappanikou, U of C project director and one of the principal architects of the innovative venture in teacher-training.

"The reality of life in the Inner City could not have been communicated to our students without their help," he declared.

Although the project was designed as a teacher-training exercise, the formal practice in techniques was but the top of the iceberg. Underneath was an intensive exposure to lives of the ghetto children.

On Mondays and Tuesdays—during the six-week observation period—the coeds visited the inner city. Community Progress Inc.'s Community Action Institute assigned workers to each pair of students. They took them on visits to inner city homes, businesses, redevelopment centers, and the neighborhoods.

"What are you doing here whitey? Are you another do-gooder?" the students were asked brusquely. But the black CAI worker helped bridge the gap and misunderstandings were averted. Meantime, the U of C students began to learn something about the black culture and acquired some insight into need for adapting teaching techniques to the life experience of the city.

On Wednesdays the students worked in the pre-school kindergarden and grade one at the center. Here they observed the youngsters in a real learning situation. Their role was similar to teacher aides. By introducing them to the inner city children at the center, the coeds were only gradually exposed to the learning problems. Later they were to be more responsive to the situation in the city. After observing the youngsters, the students attended seminars to discuss what occurred in the classroom.

On Thursdays the students spent the entire day—9 a.m. to 9 p.m.—with a member of the faculty from Storrs. These elementary education professors taught the methods courses in language arts, science and social studies. They also "entered actively into dialogue" with the students and a new give-and-taking kind of teaching occurred.

Fridays were turned over to visiting lecturers and meetings with parent groups from the inner city. Among the guest lecturers were Dr. Alexander Plante, one of the CONN-ED's foster parents and an official in the State Department of Education. Mrs. Trudi Johnson, a Department of Community Affairs' official and William Brown, former head of the Hartford Urban League.

John Rogers, a University of Hartford professor, lectured on black history; Henry Parker, a redevelopment official and one-time president of the black coalition, attempted to bridge the gap between the moderate and militant views; and CPI staff discussed training for inner city work.

Parents told the U of C students in plain talk what they wanted for their children, "We want our kids to learn to read, write and do arithmetic. I don't care if you love my kid. All I want you to do is teach him," they declared.

But Professor Pappanikou observed, "Our main goal is to get our students to look at these youngsters as exciting children not black kids."

Asked if he had any feedback with which to measure the success of the project—which later involved eight weeks of practice teaching in the inner city—Dr. Pappanikou produced some interesting statistics.

"When we started out, only three of the girls had any idea of teaching in the city. Already three, who completed their degree requirements last month, have taken jobs in the ghetto. Seven more, who will graduate in June, said they plan to take jobs in the city in September—four of them in New Haven.

"When the second semester began this month, 23 girls were at the center with two more living at home. In September we didn't think we would enroll our minimum, now we're turning them away," he smiled.

Text of Citation

The Distinguished Achievement Award for Excellence in Teacher Education of The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education for 1969 is presented to the University of Connecticut for the development and implementation of the program, Educating Teachers for the City.

This program features face-to-face confrontation with and immersion in the realities of a metropolitan area. The ghetto area provides ninety percent of the educational environment, while ten percent is provided by the formal seminar. The former involves observation, dialogue, interview, and teaching; the latter revolves around formal instruction.

Unique features of this program include (a) full-time, qualified lecturers representative of the ghetto's informal power structure, who introduce and translate to students the sociological and psychological realities of the ghetto and who serve to articulate and interpret the styles, perceptions, and reactions of the families and people to the students; (b) cooperative investments of time and money by local school districts, the State Department of Education, and the university without outside funding precipitated by ultimate benefits to inner-city education; (c) contact with the inner-city way of thinking, achieved by on-site residence during the entire program under the general supervision of a housemother-counselor who is a ghetto resident, and a program characterized by discussion and analysis of in-the-street education with inner-city leaders and representatives of community organizations, homes, and neighborhood establishments; and (d) replacement of the traditional lecture-text-examples approach to methods instruction in the campus classroom by on-site methods instruction dealing with real people, problems, materials, and situations.

Evaluation indicates that this program is successful in providing an opportunity to participate in the social problems of the city and to appreciate the complexity of metropolitan educational problems.

A NEW REPORT FOR EXECUTIVES WHO CANNOT AFFORD THE TAX CONSEQUENCES OF A BIG SALARY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, at a time when this Congress and this Nation are very much concerned with the matter of tax reform, I received an advertisement in the mail this week that highlights one very important aspect of the problem.

This advertisement, which was probably received by every Member of Congress, and thousands of business and professional men throughout the United

States, is for a report entitled, "10 Ways To Draw Tax-Sheltered Money From the Company."

The report is nothing more than detailed advice to businessmen, professional men and corporation executives on how to take advantage of loopholes in our existing tax laws; in other words, how to avoid paying a fair share of the tax load, and shift more of this load to the "little guy," for whom these loopholes do not exist.

There is nothing illegal or wrong about this publication. It merely demonstrates how the tax-loophole situation has reached such a point that people have gone into the business of making money from it.

The blatant, arrogant message in this advertisement is that these loopholes do exist for the benefit of high-income individuals and corporations, but the low- and middle-income working man must still continue to stagger under the increasing tax burden.

I think this advertisement, and the message it bears, show us clearly that action is not only needed, it is imperative! For the benefit of my colleagues who may have overlooked this advertisement, I include it in the RECORD:

A NEW REPORT FOR EXECUTIVES WHO CANNOT AFFORD THE TAX CONSEQUENCE OF A BIG SALARY

DEAR SIR: Today, few people judge their business success by salary alone.

They know that under our present tax setup it isn't tax-wise to draw all the money you can in the form of salary.

Instead, most successful businessmen have found the Tax Law allows them other ways to get money from their companies—with little or no tax. This shelters their incomes from the high tax brackets.

This strategy gives them far more after-tax money with no loss in deductions for the company.

There are many ways to do this. But 10 of them are extraordinary—they stand out as the best. They are 100% legal . . . amount to big money . . . and are readily available to most every company owner and executive.

They are fully explained in the Research Institute's new Report—10 Ways To Draw Tax-Sheltered Money From the Company:

1. It tells you how your company can deposit money to your credit tax-free (100% deductible by the company). You pay no tax on this money (including the interest) until you withdraw it—and then it can be long-term Capital Gains, about ½ the usual tax.

2. It tells how to determine your best tax-wise salary—and when the company can supplement it with business meals, lodging, club membership, recreation, other expenses that add up to a tidy sum.

3. It explains when you can get tax-free cash from the company, without running the risk of having it considered a taxable dividened. This method can be a life-saver for the man who has substantial cash "locked in" the company.

4. It reveals how executives can make "private arrangements" with their companies to guarantee them a good sum of money when they retire—or slow down. Since this money comes when the executive is in a lower tax bracket, he keeps a great deal more of it.

5. It tells you how the Tax Law enables executives, for the first time, to remain in a lower tax bracket even when their incomes jump dramatically from bonuses, dividends, or other sources.

6. It explains how accident and health insurance (even a large life insurance policy) can be tax-free to you, deductible by the company.

7. It tells you the one kind of life insurance the company can buy for you, so as to by-pass the Tax Law's new $50,000 ceiling on tax-free life insurance. This kind of policy is tax-free to the executive, regardless of size, and deductible by the company.

8. It tells how the latest Tax Law treats stock options—and explains how you can still get Capital Gains breaks on old options—how to handle new options for maximum tax breaks—and why closely-held corporations need no longer fear tax trouble when they issue options.

9. It reveals what other executives in your own and related fields draw in the form of salaries—and the other forms of compensation they benefit from.

10. It shows how to combine a vacation with business and get travel expenses paid by the company, tax-free to you.

These methods are fully explained in the new Report—10 Ways To Draw Tax-Sheltered Money From the Company.

This Report can help put any executive or company owner thousands of dollars ahead, each year, while saving money for his company.

A special section in the Report shows executives and owners of non-incorporated firms how they, too, may enjoy these benefits —without paying any corporate tax, whatever. The ways to qualify for this tax break are spelled out in the Report.

The Report is offered without charge to introduce you to the regular weekly Research Institute recommendations on business and taxes—the leading source of business and tax advice in this country.

These are the weekly recommendations which help over 30,000 executives lift part of the tax load off their backs.

Frankly, we felt that by offering you this new Report—letting you see for yourself how it switches dollars over from taxes into net income, you'll then see the type of tax-saving help you get with a year of the regular weekly recommendations.

Though the recommendations are weekly, they cost but $2 a month, payable annually. But it's only fair to tell you . . . the last time we made a comparable offer, the demand outstripped our supply.

If you want a copy of 10 Ways to Draw Tax-Sheltered Money From the Company the enclosed card should be returned at once.

THAILAND: ANOTHER VIETNAM IN THE MAKING?

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as the consequences of our military involvement in Vietnam have become more manifest, increasing attention has been focused upon the implications of U.S. military involvement in other countries. Despite the fact that the initial commitment to South Vietnam involved only a few hundred military "advisers," that lead to greater and greater involvement to the point that today more than some 540,000 U.S. military men are serving in Vietnam, and over 33,000 combat troops have been killed since the initial stages of American involvement nearly 8 years ago.

The United States today maintains 50,000 troops in Thailand. In a Washington Post column of April 14, Stanley Karnow has outlined the dimensions of our involvement in Thailand. As Mr. Karnow points out, the question of our military presence in Thailand is one of the questions which post-Vietnam appraisal of U.S. military commitments must answer.

As Mr. Karnow notes, much of our unfortunate involvement in Southeast Asia has resulted from the "cold-war tendance to tailor foreign policy to suit military expedients." I urge my colleagues to heed his call for a reexamination of this issue and to end the domination of the military in the formulation of national policy.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1969]

HEAVY U.S. HAND IN THAILAND REFLECTS INFLUENCE OF MILITARY

(By Stanley Karnow)

HONG KONG.—Any reappraisal of the military's influence on United States foreign policy should logically focus on Thailand, where Washington's commitments have grown to extraordinary proportions for debatable security reasons never fully explained to the American public.

These commitments, which have escalated steadily over the past two decades, are reflected in the current presence of 50,000 American troops in Thailand and U.S. "defense support" expenditures there of roughly a billion dollars since 1965.

In several ways, the basic military orientation of the U.S. approach to Thailand has inhibited development of modern political institutions in the country while indirectly bolstering the authority of its ruling generals, whose power remains undiluted despite a recent constitution and elections.

Perhaps more significantly, the United States has been drawn in the course of this strategy into a pledge to protect Thailand through an agreement that amounts to a treaty—even though it was never ratified by the American Senate.

With the Vietnam war gradually drawing to a close, the U.S. position in Southeast Asia is bound to undergo a new assessment. Thus a key question at present is whether Washington aims to continue bulwarking Thailand as an anti-Communist "bastion," or whether less ambitious and more realistic plans are in the offing.

Seen in retrospect U.S. involvement in Thailand resulted not from any Pentagon plot but from the Cold-War tendency to tailor foreign policy to suit military expedients. As so often happens, these expedients eventually become immutable policy dogmas.

After 1950, alarmed by the Communist takeover of China and the outbreak of the Korean war, the United States poured military aid and advisers into Thailand, matching that move with propaganda portraying the Thai leaders as beleaguered lovers of democracy threatened by subversion or invasion or both.

Since then, the Thai leaders have repeatedly evoked the Communist menace in appeals for American aid. Similarly, U.S. officials have frequently pointed with pride to Thailand's requests for aid as evidence of its firm anti-Communist posture.

A major milestone in U.S. relations with Thailand was 1954, when the French defeat in Indochina prompted Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to promote the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, with Bangkok as its headquarters. American military aid to Thailand again increased, again justified by warnings of Communist threats.

In March, 1962, following the establishment of a neutral government in Laos, Secretary of State Dean Rusk sought to reassure the Thais by promising that the United States would defend Thailand without the "prior agreement" of the other SEATO members.

This accord, in substance, modified the SEATO treaty, which called for unanimous decisions by its eight signatories. But the accord was not submitted to the U.S. Senate for approval, as the original treaty had been and hence its legality seems cloudy.

Meanwhile, U.S. involvement in Thailand took a quantum jump after 1964, when the United States built six airfields there as bases to bomb North Vietnam. Secure from enemy attack, these bases have effectively been the equivalent of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong sanctuaries in Laos and Cambodia.

That the bases were built in secrecy is a tribute to the skill of the U.S. mission in Bangkok at news management. Had plans to build the fields been publicized prematurely, their construction might well have been vetoed by the Thais, who were anxious to avoid appearing too committed to U.S. policy.

Indeed, one of the ironies over the years is that so many high-ranking Americans have believed in Thailand's total devotion to anti-communism while the Thais, with the shrewd diplomatic talent that has kept them independent for a millenium, have consistently retained their traditional flexibility.

Even as they joined SEATO and proclaimed their determination to fight communism, for example, Thai officials were quietly in contact with Peking. Though hard evidence is lacking, it is plausible that such contacts still continue.

Plainly aware of the Thai penchant for accommodation, Mao Tse-tung told visitors to Peking some years ago that "it is worth dealing tactfully with them."

All this suggests, therefore, that the Thais have been quite competent in handling themselves and that the Great American effort to save them was, like some other crusades in Southeast Asia, a vastly misguided venture.

ARMY ENGINEERS AND FLOODS

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to see President Nixon activate the Army Engineers in Operation Foresight to prepare for flood emergencies that may possibly plague some areas in the New England area and elsewhere if spring thaws come too fast.

Let us hope that the runoff can happen without any serious damage.

Some time ago in anticipation of developing flood dangers because of the large amount of snow on the drainage grounds, I communicated with the Engineers as a measure of flood forewarning, even though I knew that this great organization, so experienced in coping with floods and disasters, would be prepared for any eventuality.

I am informed that about $2 million had been obligated by the Army Engineers for emergency work to date. This permits local flood emergency work, stockpiling of supplies and equipment of many kinds, including heavy construction equipment and sandbags, polyethylene sheeting, radio equipment and lumber and so forth, and this materiel is being deployed throughout the areas of communities threatened with floods.

I am also advised that the Engineers, as a precaution, have visited literally hundreds of communities.

According to the Engineers there are potential trouble spots in 22 communities or valley reaches that have been carefully checked out by the Engineers as to adequacy of local protection systems, debris, snags, and other channel blocks that might block or reduce the discharge of flood flows.

Various communities have been contacted tnd technical advice rendered and made available to them.

Coordination has been established and will be maintained with State, Federal, and local agencies.

Dams have been inspected and the owners of three whose outlet works are in questionable condition are being assisted.

Reservoir pools are being drawn down when possible and necessary.

Flood-related equipment of many kinds—dam gates, pumps, emergency generators and the like—is being tested and made ready for emergency use.

I am told that 125,000 sandbags are being pre-positioned, and more are being readied for distribution.

Fortunately, for New England and Massachusetts, and my own district in particular, where in the past floods have been very destructive, the absence of quick thaws accompanied by heavy rain, and the generally slow melting rate in our area have been very favorable factors, and in a real sense have reduced the threat and the fears.

However, we are not out of the woods yet, and we cannot rest on our oars. Constant vigilance must be exercised by all local, State, and Federal agencies. But I think, generally, the situation is in good shape, and unless we have some sudden, rapid melting and heavy rains coming without much notice, the prospects should be good for keeping down the damage and bearing up under any floods that do occur.

Certainly the Army Engineers are invaluable in protecting afflicted areas against floods and providing suitable relief when they happen, and the American people in many communities may well be grateful for their readiness and outstanding work.

THE IDEOLOGICAL POWER STRUGGLES OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Stephen Pan, director of the East Asian Research Institute in New York, has prepared an interesting paper on the factional disputes and personality cults which have developed within the Chinese Communist Party since its inception.

Dr. Pan traces the history of the party to the present day and includes material on the cultural revolution, the Wuhan rebellion and the recent clash between the Soviets and Chinese along the Ussari River.

The material presented, I believe, can assist the Members of Congress achieve perspective in following the important Ninth National Congress of the Chinese Community Party which has just been convened in Peking.

For that reason I insert Dr. Pan's article at this point and urge the attention of my colleagues to it:

THE IDEOLOGICAL-POWER STRUGGLES OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY (CCP)

(By Stephen Pan)

Shortly after the creation of the Chinese Communist Party under the inspiration and encouragement of the Comintern in the 1920s, splits and purges took place within it. Sharp differences of opinion concerning strategy and tactics of revolution were held by its leaders. Evidences of anarchism, liberalism, conservatism, pluralism, leftism and rightism can be found in Chinese Communist documents and publications. Factionism and personality cults have long played a part in the history of the Party.

FROM 1922 TO 1949

Chen Tu-hsiu, founder and first secretary of the Party, was purged at an emergency conference on August 7, 1927, held after the August First Nanchang Revolution, which was led by Chu Teh and Ho Lung. Chen was replaced by Chu Chiu-pai, a faithful disciple of Moscow. Shortly afterwards, Li Li-san, another Soviet trained cadre, suceeded Chu as Party leader, but he was subsequently attacked for his extreme leftist tendencies, which were known as "Li Li-san Line." Chen Shao-yu (Wang Ming) and Chin Pan-hsien (Po Ku) succeeded Li to lead the Party, but they too were quickly purged.

From 1922 to 1949, there were five serious struggles, two against right opportunism and three against left opportunism. The ascendancy of one faction did not necessarily render the complete defeat of another, and at times, the superseded faction would recoup its strength to fight again.

FROM 1949 TO 1966

Since October 1949, after the seizure of power in Peking by the Chinese Communist Party, there have been several great power struggles and purges, political as well as cultural, among the Party leaders and between the authorities of the Party and Government and those belonging to the opposition.

(A) In 1951, a campaign called the "Three Anti's," i.e., "Anti-Corruption, Anti-Waste, and Anti-Bureaucracy," was launched, primarily aimed at the Party-Leaders who were actually running the Government by other Party leaders exclusively engaged in Party-Affairs. It was said that this movement was also meant to clean up those elements left over from the *Kuomintang* and professional government employees. Other Communist sources said that the "Three Anti's" movement was an attempt to convert professional government employees and intellectuals to Communist ideology.

(B) In 1952, a new campaign known as the "Five Anti's Movement," took place. This time, the "Five Anti's" were: "Anti-Bribery, Anti-Tax-Evasion, Anti-Fraud, Anti-Theft of Government property, and Anti-Theft of State Economic Secrets by Government employees, merchants and intellectuals." This movement was essentially against the people outside the Government, but the purge included everybody, except those having high authority in the Party. This campaign was intended to brainwash intellectuals and bourgeois leaders.

(C) In 1953, Kao Kang and Yao Hsiu-shih were purged for their Anti-Party Alliance in

Manchuria. This was principally a political and military purge. Chairman Mao accused Kao and Yao of creating an "Independent Kingdom" in Manchuria, which might overthrow the Mao rule. The "crime" of Kao and Yao was their alleged attempt to seize Party and Government power by forming an "Anti-Party Alliance." Mao utilized the 4th Plenary Session of the 7th Central Committee in 1954 and the National Party Congress of 1955, to purge Kao and Yao and their followers.

(D) The Hundred Flowers Bloom Together Campaign in 1957 was outwardly a relaxation of Mao's policy against the intellectuals, who in 1956 had asked for some freedom of expression. It is difficult to ascertain whether or not the Hungarian Revolt exerted an influence on the demands of the Chinese intelligentsia. The intellectuals and students in Hungary formed the *Petofi Circle* in Budapest in 1955 to seek for freedom of speech just as Czechoslovakians are asking for degree of freedom. However, as a matter of fact, shortly after the Hungarian Revolt, Nikita Krushchev, fearful that the Chinese Communists might be drawn away from the Soviet Union, paid a visit to Peking. Almost immediately afterwards, Peking announced a softer policy towards intellectuals. Chairman Mao declared that each intellectual could "say what he knows, say it all." He further assured the intellectuals: "Those who utter the truth cannot be criminally held responsible." His famous and poetic words were: "Let one hundred flowers bloom, and one hundred schools of thought contend."

Unfortunately, those scholars and intellectuals who accepted Chairman Mao's words in good faith and expressed critical opinions on many subjects found themselves later accused of being "rightist opportunists." They were forced to admit their errors or crimes, and some were sent to labor camps for correction.

(E) *The Purge of Right Opportunism (Revisionism) and The Anti-Party Group in 1958.* When Mao proposed to the Party the launching of the "General Line," to expedite the realization of Socialism by establishing the "Great Leap Forward Movement" and the "Commune System" in 1958, Mao was criticized by Peng Teh-huai, Minister of Defense and Huang Keh-cheng, Chief of Staff. In August 1959, at a Plenary Session of the 8th Central Committee of the Party in Lu Shan, Kiangsi Province, Peng and Huang were dismissed from their official position. Chang Wen-tien, Deputy Member of the Politburo and Peking's Ambassador to Moscow, was also dismissed. This purge involved many other high Party members. Its effect was still being felt when the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" began in 1966.

At the 8th National Congress of the CCP in 1956, the rift between Mao Tse-tung and Liu Shao-chi was apparent. In 1957, Chairman Mao was openly criticized in Central Committee sessions for his policy towards intellectuals and favoritism to the proletarians and peasants. In November 1958, the Central Committee dropped Mao as a candidate for Chief of State. In August 1959, Mao yielded this highest government post to Liu Shao-chi, who was then elected "President" by the National People's Congress, while Mao remained Chairman of the Party. From then until August 1966, most of the full and alternate or deputy members of the Central Committee of the Party were dominated by Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping, secretary of the Party and member of the Politburo, who sometimes issued orders in the name of the Party without consulting Chairman Mao.

On October 25, 1966, Chairman Mao admitted that since 1962, he had "retreated to the second line," and did not conduct Party affairs, and that his instructions were unenforceable, even within Peking. He related that several times his opinions were ignored by Peng Chen, then Mayor of Peking. Mao concluded that he must leave Peking for Shanghai in order to find some new means to counteract his adversaries. He decided that the Proletarian Cultural Revolution, using the young revolutionaries—the Red Guards—as a means, was the only practical and proper solution to his problems.

(F) *The Present Purge inherent in the Cultural Revolution since 1966.* An editorial entitled "Never forget the Class struggle," in the *Liberation Army Daily* on May 4, 1966, gave the initial order to launch an unprecedented campaign against any and all opposition elements to Mao's thought. It is a struggle to purge Anti-Party, Anti-Socialism and Anti-Mao elements.

It is evident that this purge is far greater in scope and intensity than any of the previous purges. Its importance has been admitted in Mao-Lin writings saying that if this struggle is not successful, they "may lose their Party, Government and even their heads."

MISCONCEPTION OF THE "CULTURAL REVOLUTION"

Some China experts in the United States say that the Cultural Revolution simply aims at the restoration of the Confucian Age, of the "Ta Tung," the Great Community of the Universe. Dr. John K. Fairbank in "the People's Middle Kingdom" in *Foreign Affairs* (New York, July 1966, p. 574), wrote: "Communist China, how far Communist, how far Chinese, and what is the difference anyway?" When Fairbank asserted that there is not much difference between Communist and Chinese, he overlooked the simple fact that Communism under Mao and Lin is totally opposed to all the Chinese traditional cultural heritages. Confucionism has been one of the first traditions to be discredited by Communists in Mainland Chinas. Fairbank also stated that "we should not get too excited over Peking's cultural revolution." (U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, *Hearings, etc.* Washington, 1966, pp. 100–1).

The great significance of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution has not been fully realized by Occidental observers. Perhaps the Red Guards, who became the principal means to carry out the cultural revolution from August 1966 to 1968, in their own literature and Big Character Posters, have properly described the nature of this revolution. They said that "the cultural revolution has threatened the Heavens and shaken the Earth." The Red Guards in their revolutionary zeal have caused much bloodshed, destroyed many Chinese cultural heritages and upset the social, economic, political and cultural traditional in Mainland China. Their impact has been felt outside of Mainland China, especially in Maco, Hong-Kong, London, Paris, Moscow and some Japanese and Italian seaports.

WHAT IS THE PROLETARIAN CULTURAL REVOLUTION?

The 11th Plenary Session of the 8th Central Committee of the CCP held in Peking, August 1 to 12, 1966, was dominated by the Mao-Lin faction. Many members of the Liu-Teng group were prevented from attending the meeting. Besides the participation of members of the Central Committee and the cadres of some regions, provinces and cities, it was also attended by hundreds of "Revolutionary Teachers and Students." The latter shouted and booed at speakers who were against Mao-Lin faction.

A communique issued at the conclusion of this session declared that Chairman Mao was the greatest genius of modern times and the greatest Marxist and Leninist of all times, and asked all the "Revolutionary Forces" to help Mao defeat the "Anti-Revolutionary Revisionists and the Leftists and Rightist Opportunists."

The aim of the Cultural Revolution was outlined by a Big Charcater Poster displayed at Tien An Men on August 18, 1966, at the inauguration of the Red Guards. The most significant phrases on the poster were:

"Raise high the great Red Banner of the thought of Mao Tse-Tung."

"Carry out the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution to the end."

"Oppose old thought, old Culture, old Customs and old habits."

"Etablish new thought, new culture, new customs and new habits."

"Down with Imperialism and Revisionism."

The Peking press media describe the rapid development of the Cultural Revolution as a single spark growing into a prairie fire. *The People's Daily* and the *Red Flag* on August 18, 1966 declared:

"The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is a great revolution; a rebellion requires a series of struggles; . . . its purpose is to overturn the old order. Thus, the greater the disorder, the better it will be for the revolution. The world must be turned upside down."

SPORADIC RESISTANCE (SEPT. TO DEC. 1966)

The Proletarian Cultural Revolution was resented and resisted by the Chinese people in many cities and in the countrysides. However, most of the resistance from August to December 1966 was sporadic and not well organized. Communist newspapers, including the *People's Daily* from October 1 to December 15, 1966, on several occasions accused the "reactionaries" and "black elements" of "carrying the Red Flag to oppose the Red Flag," and "engaging in counter-revolution by shouting revolutionary slogans." So great was the confusion that Pro-Maoists fought other Pro-Maoists, as well as Anti-Maoists. There were violent clashes among students, between students and workers, between peasants and students, and occasionary army units joined opposing sides.

NATIONAL RESISTANCE (DEC. 1966 TO JULY 1967)

The Red Guards increased the tempo of their activities from November to December 1966 and spread the revolution from Peking to various cities. Shortly after mid-December 1966, Red Guard activities began in factories, mines, communes and on the countryside. Workers' strikes and peasants helping themselves to rice and grain from store-houses occurred everywhere. Delegations of workers and peasants went to Peking to petition Chairman Mao for higher wages and better living conditions.

Riots, strikes, violent and bloody clashes between the Maoists and Anti-Maoists took place in Nanking and Shanghai, between Nanking and Peking were suspended for a week. Two thousand people on both sides were killed in Nanking in early January 1967 during the clashes. On January 6, 1967, the Associated Press quoted *Yomiuri Shimbun* as saying that when Chairman Mao was asked to explain at a meeting why all these troubles occurred, he conceded that he was partly responsible for elevating those current antagonists to high positions. This was an unusual admission from a man considered "infallible and almighty." Violence also occurred in Chengtu, Chengchow, Tsientao and several cities in Manchuria, Sinkiang and Inner Mongolia. Actually resistance to the Cultural Revolution occurred almost everywhere in the Nation.

THE WUHAN REBELLION, JULY 1967

Unlike previous resistance to the Cultural Revolution in the Mainland, the Wuhan Rebellion constituted a large-scale, direct and open challenge to the Mao-Lin rule in Peking. This rebellion involved about one million people including students, workers, peasants, armed forces and Party cadres in the Triple Cities of China's Heart-land, known as "Wuhan." Wuchang and Hankow are known to Westerners as the "Twin Cities of China," comparable to Saint Paul and Minneapolis of the United States. Hanyang, the third city of the Triple Cities is not so well known. In Chinese history, Wuhan has been of great political and military importance and it still is today.

Opponents in Wuhan to the Mao-Lin faction recruited workers, anti-Mao Red Guards, security officers, policemen and organized them into the "One Million Strong Forces." They were secretly supported by the commander of the Wuhan Military Region.

In order to cope with the Anti-Mao activities in Wuhan, Hsieh Fu-chih, Vice Premier and Minister of Public Security, and Wang Li. Member of the Cultural Revolutionary Committee of the Party and first Deputy-Editor in Chief of the *Red Flag*, were sent to Hankow on July 14, 1967. Wang Li at a military conference in Hankow on July 19 recommended that the "One Million Strong Forces" be considered conservative and reprimanded. The local officers immediately rejected Wang's recommendation and accused him of falsifying Premier Chou En-Lai's intentions and instructions. At midnight of the same day, Wang was arrested by the local forces. Hsieh Fu-chih vainly intervened. On the following day, Wang was dragged into the streets. Hsieh was insulted and placed under house arrest. When Peking learned of the assault and abduction of Wang and Hsieh, airborne troops were sent to surround the Triple cities of Wuhan from July 20 to 22, 1967. Then Chairman Mao unexpectedly adopted a conciliatory policy towards the Wuhan rebels, and Wang and Hsieh, together with their secretaries and suites, were allowed to return to Peking. Mao issued these instructions to the Wuhan authorities:

"(a) To pardon those persons who were involved in the rebellion, as long as they would not continue their erroneous acts.

"(b) The 'One Million Strong Forces' thereafter should follow Chairman Mao's line of thinking and action.

"(c) All were to be aware of the 'bad elements' who try to destroy or upset the social order."

The Wuhan Rebellion was temporarily suppressed by power and persuasion, but the basic causes of dissatisfaction with the policies and actions of the Mao-Lin faction were not removed. Mao's policy in solving the Wuhan Rebellion was an adroit piece of diplomacy. It avoided open armed large-scale conflict in Mainland China, which might have led to the overthrow of the Mao-Lin rule. The Mao-Lin group which had preached the theory of "Rebellion is justified against the authorities," began to get just a bit of their own medicine.

THE THREE-WAY ALLIANCE WITH THE CADRES, THE ARMY AND THE MASSES SINCE JULY 1967

After the Wuhan Rebellion, Peking adopted a policy known as the "Revolutionary Three-Way Alliance," hoping for cooperation among the revolutionary cadres, the army and the masses. The main purpose of this policy was to calm down the violent actions of the extreme left, to isolate the revisionists of the right, and to join the armed forces with the Party cadres in order to continue the Proletarian Cultural Revolution. This policy is intended to preserve the production of agricultural and industrial products and to enable the schools and colleges to be reopened, at least for the study of Chairman Mao's thought.

As a supplement to the Three Way or Triple Alliance, Peking has tried everything possible to form more revolutionary committees, which have temporarily substituted for the leadership at the various levels of the Party.

FORMATION OF 29 PROVINCIAL AND REGIONAL REVOLUTIONARY COMMITTEES

In a statement made in April 1967, Chairman Mao said:

"In every place or unit where power must be seized, it is necessary to carry out the policy of the revolutionary 'three-in-one combination' in establishing a provincial organ of power, which is revolutionary and representative and enjoys proletarian authority."

Since the formation of these revolutionary committees, most of their leaders are military. Of the 29 Committees, 21 are now dominated by military leaders. This shows that the situation in Mainland China is still far from stable. Also the Committees are composed of men who are not altogether faithful to the Mao-Lin faction. In eight of the Committees which are administered by non-military men, three of their chairmen are compromise choices.

Another serious problem confronting the Revolutionary Committees is the conflict between the old and new cadres. Their hostility toward each other is unveiled and growing.

The establishment of the 29 Provincial and Regional Revolutionary Committees does not mean total victory for the Mao-Lin group or for the Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Mainland China is still in a state of turmoil with no sign of an early return to normalcy.

WORKERS AND PEASANTS VERSUS RED GUARDS

It is traditional for Communists to liquidate the group with which they have cooperated. From 1946 to the autumn of 1968, the Mao-Lin faction made use of the youthful Red Guards to liquidate its opposition elements. In so doing, the Red Guards became an object of attack by the workers and peasants. This may be because some Red Guards were too zealous carrying out their purges. Also others were carrying Mao's banner against Mao's thought. The Red Guards were divided among themselves and no one could really distinguish who was for what. Mao and Lin finally decided to deal with the Red Guards by organizing the "Worker-Peasant Mao Tse-tung Thought Propaganda Teams" and using their members to cope with the student Red Guards. Such teams were first organized in Peking, Shanghai, Tientsin, Wuha, Changsha and Canton to suppress and calm down student Red Guards. With the support of some of the local armed forces, these worker-peasant teams moved into schools and colleges to "publicize" Mao Tse-tung's thought. The actions of these teams have not been confined to their mission of distributing propaganda or publicizing Chairman Mao's thought; they attempt to control student activities, supervise student meetings, publications and other activities. These teams also have substituted for some of the defunct school Party Committees, which are now to ensure the students would not deviate from Mao's thought.

Now students in Mainland China are ordered by the Party through these teams to follow the leadership of the workers and peasants and to learn and apply Mao's thought. A drastic change of policies has been clearly evidenced since the end of last year. The new Mao Tse-tung propaganda teams are replacing the Red Guards as the real rulers of the schools and colleges. This theory and practice is based on Mao's latest advocacy, which has been quoted by Yao Wen-yuan, a newly risen writer on Communist theories, quoted Mao as follows:

"The worker-peasant propaganda teams should stay permanently in the schools and take part in fulfilling all the tasks of struggle-criticism-transformation in the schools, and they will always lead the schools. In the countryside, the schools should be managed by the poor and lower-middle peasants—the most reliable ally of the working class."

These propaganda teams are outwardly administered by the workers and peasants but actually they are controlled by the Army cadres. The Mao-Lin faction needs the strong backing of the armed forces to suppress and mop up all the Anti-Maoist activities in the schools and colleges. However, these teams are encountering wide-spread and violent resistance, and they are also weakened by their own contradictions and conflicts. Their chance of success as a permanent organization is problematical.

Since Chiang Ching, Mao's wife, has been a strong advocate of the Red Guards, she certainly must feel very uncomfortable when she witnesses the current tough methods of dealing with these young revolutionaries. On September 7, 1968, at the rally held in Tien An Men in Peking, celebrating the formation of the 29 Provincial and Regional Revolutionary Committees, she made these unusual remarks: "It was this morning that I learned of the plan to call such a great rally . . . I was told at short notice to say a few words." This was very strange indeed, because since August 1966, nobody could call a rally in Peking without first notifying Mao's wife. In addressing the rally, Chiang Ching then said that "we must not forget that the revolutionary youth and the young Red Guard fighters have made tremendous contributions at the initial and middle stages of the revolution." However, she admitted that "now a small number of young fighters have committed mistakes of this kind or that, and it is quite ridiculous for them to clash with each other in a few units." She urged "the working class," backed by the Army to "help them correct these mistakes." In fact, her plea for the Red Guards indicates that there is a great difference in policy between Chiang Ching and Chou En-lai and possible between Chiang Ching and Lin Piao.

LIU SHAO-CHI EXPELLED FROM THE PARTY

Liu Shao-chi from 1958 to 1966 was Number 2 man in the Chinese Community Party, Chief of State, and logical successor to Chairman Mao. His fall from favor was apparent when he became the principal target of Mao's Cultural Revolution, and was called "China's Khrushchev."

The formal dismissal of Liu occurred at the Enlarged 12th Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Party in October 1968. This session hailed the Proletarian Cultural Revolution led by Mao and Lin Piao, the designated successor to Mao. It further decided to call the 9th Congress of the Party as soon as possible. Previously, the denunciation of the Chief of State did not mention him by name, but at this Plenary Session Liu was called a "traitor, scab, and lackey of Imperialism, Modern Revisionism and the *Kuomintang*." It also announced its intention to "dismiss him from all posts both inside and outside the Party and to continue to settle accounts with him and his accomplices for their crimes in betraying the Party and the Country."

Theoretically and legally speaking, it is doubtful whether or not the Party Central Committee has the authority to remove Liu as Chief of State, as he was elected by the National People's Congress, and there has been no meeting of that Congress since his election. The Communists, however, are not particularly concerned with legality, and procedures. They can say that they are revolutionaries and they follow revolutionary strategy and tactics and do not care about bourgeois legality.

PEKING'S IMPACT ON THE UNITED NATIONS

As a result of the violent nature of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which has affected much of the foreign rights and interests in Mainland China, many Communist and Non-Communist nations have openly criticized Peking's policies and agitations. Peking owed Moscow very much of its success in conquering Mainland China, yet the Soviet Union is more critical of Communist China and the Cultural Revolution than any other country.

Peking's blundering use of the Red Guards, its revolutionary activities and plots in Indonesia, Burma, Vietnam, Cambodia and other Asian and African nations, have alienated the friendship and good will of many countries. Peking's defiant attitude towards both Moscow and Washington and its vilification of the United Nations, slammed the door of the world organization in 1966, 1967 and 1968.

The Assembly of the U.N. in the past three years repeatedly rejected the admission of Communist China into the world organization. In pursuance of the U.N. Charter Article 18, section 2, the question of China representation was decided in 1968 with two-thirds of members of the Assembly present and voting. Thus, the American-Australian Resolution, adhering to this Charter provision, was upheld by 73 in favor (4 more than 1967, and 7 more than 1966), 47 opposed, 5 abstentions and one absentee, on the other hand, the Albanian-Cambodian Resolution suggested the admission of Communist China into the U.N. This resolution only obtained 44 votes, compared with 45 votes in 1967 and 46 in 1966, while 58 votes opposed to it, with 23 abstentions and one absentee. These voting records clearly indicate that Peking has further alientated itself from the majority of the Members of the United Nations.

In short, the Proletarian Cultural Revolution has created great great disorder, unrest and turmoil at home and distrust abroad.

PEKING'S XENOPHOBIC AGITATIONS

Peking's xenophobic agitations were well publicized since 1966, yet xenophobia is not traditionally Chinese or Confucian, as some China experts such as Dr. John K. Fairbank claim. Confucius and all his disciples believed in "universal brotherhood and harmony among nations." Some anti-foreign activities, such as the Boxer Rebellion and the Taiping Rebellion of the 19th century, were results or reactions to foreign encroachments and aggressions in China, rather than xenophobia *per se.*

Since the inauguration of the Cultural Revolution, the Chinese Communists of the Mao-Lin faction have launched campaigns against the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, Portugal and some other nations. Some of these agitations are well known to the western world. But Peking's agitations against Bulgaria, East Germany, Outer Mongolia and Yuogslavia are less known facts. Their diplomats have been publicly insulted and their property damaged in Peking. Although President Charles de Gaulle tendered recognition to Peking in 1964, yet the French Ambassador in Peking was insulted by the Red Guards in 1967 and all Chinese personnel attached to the French Embassy in Peking were arrested by them.

The United Kingdom in 1950 was the first Western Power to recognize the Peking regime. But the British diplomats and consuls suffered tremendously on Peking and Shanghai. British newspapermen were arrested and a Reuter correspondent, Anthony Grey, is still detained in Peking. British property in Peking and Shanghai was damaged. The notorious Hong Kong riots in 1967, full of violence and terror, including the demonstrations against the Hong Kong Governor's House, must be still fresh in the minds of many people.

India was one of the first Asian nations to be friendly with Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai; yet India was twice attacked by Peking's armed forces in recent years. In spite of India's advocating the admission of Peking into the U.N., fighting again erupted between the Indian and Chinese Communist forces on the borders of Sikkim in 1967.

Peking also had an important hand in the Indonesian *coup d'etat* in October 1965 to overthrow the Jakarta government and to create a Communist rule there. This caused the Indonesian Government on September 13, 1967, to announce the withdrawal of Indonesian diplomats from Peking. Jakarta's unfriendly attitude towards Peking resulted from the anti-Indonesian campaigns in Peking at that time.

Burma also had maintained very cordial relations with Peking since 1950. But because of Peking's subversive activities in Burma, the Burmese Government denounced Peking's policies and activities in Burma in 1967 and the relations between Peking and Rangoon have deteriorated.

Even Cambodia's Prince Norodom Sihanouk on September 13, 1967, at a rally publicly announced the closing of two pro-Peking newspapers in his country. He also denounced Peking's subversive activities for interfering with the internal affairs of Cambodia and accused the Chinese Communists of helping Cambodia Communists to overthrow his Government.

The recent Sino-Soviet clashes on the island of Chen Pao or Damansku on the banks of the Ussuri River have been actually used by the Peking regime as a pretext for propaganda against the Soviet Union. Similarly, perhaps Moscow also is happy to utilize the border clashes as a means to charge Peking for its aggressiveness in order to get more support from the Communist Nations at the meeting of Warsaw Pact nations recently held in Hungary and also for the forthcoming World Congress of Communist Nations, which was scheduled to be held in May but now postponed to June this year.

All the anti-foreign agitations and movements in Mainland China from 1966 until today are probably outgrowths of Chinese Communist internal disorder, confusion and power struggles. The leaders in Peking today would utilize the anti-foreign sentiments and movements to liquidate and unify their opposition elements and their counter-revolutionary efforts. The Mao-Lin faction hopes that such anti-foreign movements will be able to divert national attention from the internal troubles.

THE DELAYED NINTH NATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE CCP

The Proletarian Cultural Revolution has practically paralyzed the machinery of the Chinese Communist Party since 1966. Most of the veteran Communist leaders have been either purged or disgraced. The regional bureaus and the provincial and municipal committees of the Party cannot carry on their normal functions. It is the "Revolutionary Committees," which are performing the necessary functions at the different levels of the Party. These Revolutionary Committees are dominated by the military leaders whose loyalty to Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao is questionable. According to Communist theories, the Party is supreme and the armed forces and other organs are subservient to the Party. The existing Party Constitution, adopted in 1956, stresses the importance of "collective leadership" exhorts members of the Party not "to place the individual above the collective body of the Party." This certainly constitutes a great obstacle to the use of Mao Tse-tung and his thought as guidelines for the Party. Thus, it is natural for Mao Tse-tung himself, and Lin Piao who wants to be Mao's successor, to reorganize or rebuild the Party to suit their needs.

Furthermore, the 9th National Congress of the Party is long overdue . . . According to Article 31 of the existing Constitution, as adopted in 1956, "the National Party Congress is elected for a term of five years." It also stipulated that "a session of the National Congress shall be convened once a year by the Central Committee." However, the same article states that "under extraordinary conditions, it may be postponed or convened before its due date, as the Central Committee may decide." The last Congress, the 8th was convened in September 1956. The present members of the Central Committee have perpetuated their own terms and powers by not calling a conference. This was probably because of the Ideological-Power struggles during all these years. The 9th Party Congress has repeatedly been delayed, although it was officially announced that it was to be held in May, in October, and then at the end of 1968. But temporarily at least, the Mao-Lin faction seems to have control of most of the "Revolutionary Committees," which are substituting for the different levels of the Party machinery, and that Congress is either being held secretly or about to begin in Peking soon. This is borne out by Peking's intensification of Anti-Soviet agitations and movements throughout the Nation, based on the Sino-Soviet border clashes in order to calm down and to unify the opposition elements and embody an anti-foreign policy clause in the new Constitution.

As a matter of fact, since the delegates of the Congress are hand-picked by the Mao-Lin faction, they will certainly approve *in toto* the draft Constitution made by the same faction. This Constitution will be thoroughly "proletarian" in nature and adopt the thought of Mao Tse-tung as a guide line for action. One of the provisions of this Constitution clearly declares:

"The Communist Party of China firmly . . . fights to overthrow imperialism headed by the United States, modern revisionism headed by Soviet revisionist renegade clique, and reactionaries of all countries, in order to build a new world free from imperialism, capitalism and system of exploitation."

However, it is questionable whether the Mao-Lin faction can continue to suppress opposition from within the Party and from the masses of the Chinese people. It is also too early to predict what will be the outcome of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which is still going on in Mainland China. It depends on how the Chinese people continue to react to it at home and abroad. The policies of the Republic of China could also play an important role in the outcome. The policies of Moscow and Washington can certainly exert considerable influence in the present ideological-power struggles in Mainland China today, even though the Americans and Russians may be reluctant to admit this truth. Furthermore, the peoples in adjacent territories to Mainland China could and should also be able to exert a considerable influence in the outcome of the confusing and disorderly situation in Mainland China. There are strong indications that the ideological-power struggles of the Chinese Communist Party will continue in one way or another or even they may be aggravated and enlarged.

SP4C. MICHAEL POGGI, U.S. ARMY, KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report that another one of my constituents, Sp4c. Michael Poggi, U.S. Army, of Peekskill, N.Y., died in Vietnam last month.

I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by inserting herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, the following article:

CORTLANDT GI VIET CASUALTY—SP4C. MICHAEL POGGI VICTIM OF CONG AMBUSH

Spec./4 Michael Poggi, 21-year old son of Mr. and Mrs. Peter L. Poggi, of Birch Brook Road in Van Cortlandtville's Westchester Acres, was killed in Vietnam last Friday, his family has been informed.

Spec. Poggi, a telegram from the Army said, lost his life while riding in a motor vehicle on combat operation, ambushed by the enemy.

The young soldier, a member of the 25th Division, was promoted to Spec./4 in January and was due for advancement to sergeant soon. He had been expected to return to the U.S. in August.

Spec. Poggi, who played football at Lakeland High School from which he was graduated in 1966, was a sophomore at Orange Community College, Middletown, N.Y., when he enlisted in March 1966. He had been majoring in engineering.

Born on August 30, 1948, in the Bronx, the son of Peter and Jean Mangiatordi Poggi, the youth had resided in Westchester Acres with his family for the past 10 years. He had trained at Fort Jackson, S.C.

Funeral services have not been arranged, awaiting the arrival of the body within 7 to 10 days.

In addition to this parents, Spec. Poggi is survived by an sister, Karen Jean, a senior at Lakeland High, and a brother, Peter, 9th grade student at Lakeland Middle School.

THE HARVARD CRIMSON GOES RED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, if Lance Buhl, the "intellectual" history instructor at Harvard, were as dedicated to the understanding and teaching of history as he is to revolution and SDS, Harvard would remain the Crimson, instead of now having an image as the Red of the East.

The assorted news accounts of the death of Harvard as an academic institution are quite liberal in the estimation of participation. While the involved anarchists are unidentified as to what percentage are from Harvard, it is perhaps noteworthy that the 1969 World Almanac shows Harvard with a student population of 15,215 and a teacher population of 7,330.

Most loving parents know that the way to correct a disobedient child of insolence is to cut off his allowance.

The responsible taxpayers of America abhor this mobocracy on our campuses and look to us in Congress for responsible leadership. One of the first things we can do is to cut off Federal funds for grants and subsidies to all professors and students involved in this insolent strike. We can also demand the full cooperation of the Harvard board and if they do not comply then cut off all Federal funds going to Harvard for the duration of hostilities.

Education must remain education and riots, strikes, and revolution are not acceptable standard college curriculum.

How regrettable that the reputation of Harvard as one of the leading educational institutions in the world has been shattered by a public display of irresponsible mob force.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that reports of the Harvard fiasco and the collegiate press follow my remarks:

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 15, 1969]

Major Victory for the SDS—Harvard Turns to the Left—Politely, of Course

(By Mary McGrory)

Cambridge, Mass.—The Students for a Democratic Society have won their greatest victory. They have taken over the oldest, proudest university in the country, Harvard, which was founded 333 years ago to train young men of the Massachusetts Bay Colony for the ministry.

Five days ago, they were a grubby and despised minority whose language, tactics and goals set Harvard's teeth on edge. Now they are the biggest men on campus and they celebrated last night with a rock band and a psychedelic light show that kept the yard thumping half the night.

Their triumph was ratified at a mass meeting in Soldiers Field which a townswoman sympathetic to their opposition to university expansionism called a "demonstration of the greatness of Harvard."

All but the details of their demands were voted closely at a gathering of 10,000 or more people. It was a model of tolerance, decorum and restrained rhetoric, with crimson-clad monitors and an imperturbable chairman, Lance Buhl, 29.

At one point, a small band of black students, one of them dressed in a World War I Army uniform, stormed the long tables set in the middle of the field for moderators, clerks and counters. They shook their fists and demanded action, with obscenities. But they were taken in hand by each other. The only creature clearly out of control was a lost black poodle who raced madly across the turf, barking at the applause.

The vote to continue the student strike for three days was a surprise to almost everyone. After it was taken, a young radical leaned out of the stands to shake the hand of SDS co-chairman Mike Kazin, son of literary critic Alfred Kazin.

"All our demands are legitimized, Mike," crowed the boy, "Wasn't it beautiful?"

The revolutionaries did not do it alone. They had an assist from a remote and, they said, intransigent president, Nathan M. Pusey. They had the innocently fatuous statement of the Harvard Corporation, which after a secret meeting, declared that it faced the "spectre of closing down the university with distaste."

The meeting rose as one when Alexander Korn of Washington, a graduate student in economics, stood up and suggested a motion to "repudiate the right of seven men (the Corporation) to close down our university."

The moderates decided to create a popular front with the radicals partly because they knew that the SDS—its numbers vastly augmented after the police assault on occupied University Hall last Thursday morning—was going to continue the strike anyway.

As they chose the SDS over the cops, they chose SDS over the Corporation.

The endless talks—"colloquia" they are called here—have brought the original issue of ROTC to the surface.

Harvard students, like students everywhere else, are anti-militarist, and during the five days since the SDS seized the building and got thrown out, the call of abolishing ROTC has become a frenzy.

During their occupation, the radical raided the university files and discovered a letter from Dean Franklin Ford of the faculty of arts and science, suggesting to President Pusey how a previous faculty resolution to cut down ROTC status could be circumvented.

The publication of the letter in the Harvard Crimson has somehow justified SDS violence, for it has been recalled that SDS tried for nine months by nonviolent means—meetings, petitions, dinner speakers at the houses—to change the university's mind.

"The administration sent in the police finally," said one young moderate. "That's what comes of protest in this country. It's the same thing as Chicago."

A young SDS member said proudly over supper in Adams House, "There has been more political discussion here in the last five days than in the last 333 years."

The moderates are hoping that by making a popular front with the SDS, they can have control over the strike. Their chances seem dim. They are leaderless. The SDS is tightly organized, and while their spokesman say they do not intend to get tough, the youngbloods among them are making plans to invade classrooms and say they do not object to "militance."

The V-signs which were visible when the moderate group of students voted their first strike last Thursday, are now clenched fists. The SDS interrupted their music and their sound and light show last night to appeal for runners for their literature, their posters and their collection boxes.

One young SDS member said, "people think we want to wreck Harvard for the hell of it. We're just trying to change the system whereby they train students to accept imperialism represented by the Corporation."

Some bewildered old grads who had come back to celebrate their 25th anniversary found themselves in the Yard pleading with the inexorable young men to save the school.

Milton Binder, a dress manufacturer from the Class of '44, stood in the sunlight arguing with Emmanuel Krasner, Class of '69.

"Why are you more moral than your mothers and fathers! Are your parents so crass! Why am I so devoid of sympathy for the poor?"

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 15, 1969]

Harvard Strike Widens Gap

(By Lance Gay)

Cambridge, Mass.—Students and faculty groups appeared farther apart today as dissident students began a new three-day strike against Harvard University.

Despite faculty efforts to forge a middle ground of agreement with striking students, most moderates lined up with militants in response to what they called administrative recalcitrance.

At a mass meeting—unprecedented in Harvard's 333-year history—students voted to continue their strike for another three days and demand a public reply from the administration on the use of police to quell militant students' occupation of the administration building last Thursday.

STADIUM MEETING

The meeting was held at Soldiers Field, Harvard's stadium, under bright blue skies. An estimated 10,000 to 12,000 students and faculty members turned out.

The session was tumultuous and by the time agreement was finally reached, some of the students had left.

The students heard six proposals ranging from conservative to liberal views on the splintered campus. They chose to support a liberal motion.

A faculty-student rapport seemed in the offing when Prof. Stanley Hoffman read a letter signed by 50 faculty members.

A generous concession to student demands, it announced the inclusion of five students on a 15-member faculty board which will study and recommend action on key issues—ROTC, expansion of the university, Afro demands for an independent department, the student takeover of University Hall and the subsequent police action, and scholarships on campus.

GREETED BY OVATION

Hoffman's statement was followed by an almost unanimous standing ovation.

"We as teachers demand that we work together in a rational atmosphere and compassionate spirit," Hoffman said.

Hoffman called for time to work out a rapport and respect for one another's views. "We need a sense of perspective. Enormous things have been changed. We must not turn into a carnival of masochism—if we do this, then we are wrecked."

Norm Danieis, chairman of Students for a Democratic Society, told the assemblage that on Sunday night, 1,200 students had backed the SDS demands. "We're on strike for these demands and we'll stay on strike until they're met," he said.

The demands include abolition of all ROTC training at Harvard, amnesty for 200 arrested after 400 police stormed University Hall Thursday, a halt to university expansion until local housing issues are clarified and substitution of Harvard scholarships for ROTC students.

Despite the enthusiasm over the faculty action, sentiment at the meeting began to turn away from the faculty concessions.

The precipitant was a revolution proposed by Alexander Korns of Washington, D.C., aimed at the seven-man university Corporation. It stated: "We repudiate the right of seven men to close our university."

The speech was followed by unanimous applause and cries with clinched fists of "Strike—Strike—Strike."

The moderates' sympathy for the faculty, at its height during Prof. Hoffman's speech, ebbed further.

"STATEMENT WAS RHETORIC"

"Hoffman's statement was rhetoric," Tom Saltonstall, a moderate commented just before the final vote. "A lot of people can say 'let us reason together.'

"This is the first time we have gotten together as a community. That community has now raised serious issues. We got the response of the Corporation, that showed us the only way we get a response is to strike.

"For me, I will strike, I choose to strike, I will do so," the former McCarthy press aide said.

Following the tabling of a motion to call an unconditional strike a motion to call a three-day strike passed by a voice vote.

Mike Kazin, a chairman of SDS, called the meeting "great—the administration has to publically state its position on our demands."

SDS WINS BACKING

General student response to the gathering was that SDS had won a concensus of support of the students.

The faculty appeared to be the loser.

Late yesterday, in reaction to growing fears of polarization, the faculty remained distant from the students.

Prof. Michael Waltzer said he would continue to give classes. A member of the liberal clique, Waltzer stated that there was no strike. "Students can't strike, students can only boycott classes: they can only boycott classes when classes are held."

Prof. George Wald said that before the meeting yesterday many of the faculty felt ROTC should be deprived of credit, but saw no great objection to its continuance. "We see it differently now," he said, fighting a faculty move to rid the campus of ROTC entirely.

Late last night, students taped a bed sheet to the spacious gothic arch of Sever Hall, upon which they played slithering psychedelic lights.

Afterward, students gathered on the steps of Sever Hall, then marched through Harvard Yard singing "We Shall Overcome."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 15, 1969]

COLLEGIATE PRESS HITS AT ROTC

(By Robert Walters)

Twenty-nine of the nation's leading college newspapers today published a joint editorial calling for the abolishing of Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) courses at all of the country's college and university campuses.

Publication of the editorial came after a week of disturbances on the Harvard University campus, touched off by a demand from Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) that all ROTC programs be immediately and permanently halted at that school.

The appearance of the editorial also marked what was believed to be the first time such a substantial number of college newspapers simultaneously took the same position on a controversial issue.

The coordinated effort was initiated by Jim Heck, an editor of the University of Michigan Daily. The cooperating newspapers have a combined readership of more than 500,000 students.

PUBLICATIONS CITED

Among the papers carrying the editorial were the Cavalier Daily at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville and the Diamondback at the University of Maryland in College Park, as well as those serving the following schools:

University of California campuses in Berkeley, Los Angeles and Santa Barbara; the Universities of Colorado, Illinois, Kentucky, Minnesota, New Mexico, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Washington and Wisconsin; Rutgers, Boston, Duke, Tulane, Ohio and Michigan State Universities; and Antioch, Amherst and Harpur colleges.

"One of the unintended domestic consequences of the war in Vietnam has been the growing awareness of the dangers of the intimate connections between the military and academia," the editorial said.

"Perhaps the most blatant example of colleges and universities willingly performing functions that are rightly the exclusive concern of the military is the ROTC," it added. "It is difficult to avoid the blunt assertion that training soldiers whose ultimate aim is to kill is totally hostile to the principles of academia."

CREDIT REVOCATION

The editorial noted that in recent months such universities as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Dartmouth and Stanford "have all taken steps toward revoking academic credit from their ROTC program," then added:

"Academia's traditional function is to inspire critical thinking about man and his society aloof from partisan or superficial considerations. But it is impossible for colleges and universities to even pretend to perform this unique role if they are also subsidizing the brutal militarism of the outside world . . .

"At a time when the military is an integral element in an expansionist foreign policy opposed by a sizable segment of the population both inside and outside academia, it is clear that the ROTC program is as partisan in its own way as SDS."

The editorial said "the bulk of the ROTC program consists of technical courses . . . the teaching methods employed tend to emphasize rote learning and deference to authority . . . (and) the intellectual vacuity of many ROTC courses is directly related to the rather limited educational backgrounds of the preponderance of ROTC faculty."

Nevertheless, the editorial added, "ROTC instructors are accorded a status comparable to professors in more rigorous disciplines. And due to the high degee of autonomy of the ROTC program, colleges and universities have little direct control over the hiring, firing or promotion of these ROTC instructors."

The editorial concluded:

"It was the simplistic 'my country right or wrong' patriotism of the first World War which spawned the original ROTC program. But one of the clearest lessons of the Vietnam tragedy is that such unquestioning support of government policy is not only morally bankrupt, but counter to the long-range interests of the nation as well as the campus . . .

"It is necessary to end the universities' role as the unquestioning servant of government and military. The abolition of ROTC as a sanctioned course offering would be a major step in this direction."

[From the Evening Star, April 16, 1969]

HARVARD CALM AS DIRECTION OF STRIKE REMAINS UNCLEAR

(By Lance Gay)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—An atmosphere of calm expectation pervaded Harvard University today as the strength and direction of the student strike remained unclear.

Most classes were being held as scheduled, but there were no accurate figures on attendance. Best estimates of the number of students participating in the strike were around 3,000, but some student leaders said there were as many as 5,000. There are 15,000 students at Harvard.

A second three-day strike was called Monday at a meeting of about 10,000 students in the stadium at Soldiers Field.

Support appeared to be rising in the student body today for a newly formed Committee For Radical Structural Reform, representing the views of some moderates on the campus.

Students for a Democratic Society called a general meeting for tonight reportedly to consider a proposal calling on students to occupy business and administrative offices of the university tomorrow.

A three-hour special meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences ended in an uproar yesterday after a list of resolutions was adopted, among them the inclusion of five students on a 15-member committee to investigate the causes of the occupation of University Hall last week, the subsequent police action and the discipline of students.

The meeting, presided over by president Nathan N. Pusey, was business-like until a dispute opened on a motion to clarify faculty intentions on student demands, including those for abolition of ROTC training. Opponents jumped up to argue that it would be "disgraceful" to "rebuke" the military.

Dean of Arts and Sciences Franklin L. Ford, attempting to calm the meeting, said there was "grave danger of destruction" of the university, and called on the assemblage not to forget that the faculty held the final responsibility to keep the university going. He received a standing ovation.

But boos and hisses greeted his statement that a "part of a university building is still occupied." He was referring to the philosophy building, Emerson Hall, the third floor of which has become the headquarters of Students for a Democratic Society.

"That's not true—it's not occupied in the same sense as University Hall," Prof. Morton H. White said. White's office is in the building, and faculty members, students and reporters have not been denied access to the floor since it became SDS headquarters.

The meeting adjourned after adoption of a resolution by Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith postponing action on the ROTC proposal until a meeting tomorrow.

The meeting was broadcast live for the first time over the campus radio station.

Afterward Pusey issued a mimeographed statement saying that student demands "will, of course, be kept under consideration, but there can be no hasty decisionmaking regarding substantive issues under duress."

Pusey also called for the speedy restoration of the educational and scholarly activities of the community.

DAY FOR DECISION

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, not long ago Allen N. Peltier wrote a composition, entitled "Day for Decision." With a musical background it was narrated on a recording by Johnny Sea, of which more than a million were sold.

The essence of this recording is old-fashioned patriotism, an appeal to reason and realism in this troubled time in which we live. Having received permission, I include a copy of the recording. It follows:

DAY FOR DECISION

(By Allen N. Peltier)

The other day I heard someone say: "You know, America is in real trouble!"

It's true. Old Glory has never fallen so close to earth. Our embassies are being stoned; our diplomats are often in fear of their lives; and we're involved in a half dozen nameless, winless conflicts, spilling American blood on foreign soil. Our young men are dying for ideals which don't seem to mean too much to Americans any more.

The truth is, America's real trouble doesn't lie in the rice paddies of Viet Nam, in the masses of Red China, or in the diabolical intrigues to the south of us. The real trouble lies in the playgrounds of St. Louis, the hillside mansions of San Francisco, and in the slums of Chicago. The disease which is slowly eating away at the heart of America lives in the small southern towns, the fishing villages of New England, and in the hot, dusty streets of the Midwest.

This is the age of the American cynic, the year of the unbeliever, the day of doubt. We've killed all the sacred cows and destroyed all the images, and there's nothing left to respect. Old-fashioned love of God, country and family is passé.

We stare at our shoe laces when they play The National Anthem. We wouldn't want to be seen at a political rally or a Town Hall meeting, and we don't want to be caught with our eyes closed during public prayers. We've decided that the only way you can get in public office is to buy it. Our heroes are the fast-guys who get away with things. Patriotism, the old hand-over-the-heart, flag-waving marching singing patriotism has been condemned.

Think about this: Patriotism, when you tear away the fancy phrases and crepe paper, is plain and simple pride; a new car, prettier girl, bigger house, sort of pride in your country. Somewhere along the way we've lost that pride. Our form of government is the same; we still say America stands for the same things; But next time you're at a party, ask someone to sing America with you and see what happens. The basic ideals and structure of America hasn't changed; we have, you and me!

Our enemies know it. They've seen the news-reels of the discontented marching around the capitol. They've distorted and blown up our mistakes; they've been putting wedges in the cracks in our wall of solidarity. The new idea is: "Don't attack America, wear it down gradually; it'll eventually fall under the weight of its own corruption". And did you know: It's working! !

This sneering complacency, once stamped out by the bloody feet of a tattered Continental Army in 1776, once drowned beneath the keel of the U.S.S. Arizona in Pearl Harbor Bay, has risen again. This deadly "Let-George-Do-It". attitude lights the way for the Viet Cong in the swampy jungles of Viet Nam. This "Better-Red-Than-Dead" cancer is more feared by the American soldier than all the Communist mortar shells; it kills the vitality and spirit of America. Democracy is a frail and fragile instrument made of hope, prayer and Yankee ingenuity. It is held together by flag-waving patriotism, and we've almost exhausted our supply of it.

Try this test. Lift your eyes to a flag, then sing out as loud as you can that old, outworn, antiquated freedom hymn you learned so many years ago:

"For purple mountain majesties above the fruited plain! America! America! God shed His grace on thee!" Now, if you feel a little pride welling up inside you, if you feel a little mist in your eye; Then, Thank God for you, mister You're *still* an *American!*

"WHITE IMPERIALISM" AND "BENEVOLENT RACISM" IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, although race relations is a dominant theme in any discussion of domestic problems in the United States today, the role of race in our foreign policy is seldom mentioned. Yet race has played and does play an important part in American relations with the rest of the world, as is dramatically pointed out in the following paper by Franklin H. Williams, director of the Urban Center at Columbia University.

RACE AND AMERICAN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Despite the paramount importance of race in our domestic life very little has been written of its role in American foreign affairs. But every now and then something appears that gives some insight into this important subject.

A small news story in the center pages of the February 23rd issue of the *New York Times* graphically demonstrates *Africa's* place as a continent of concern in shaping American foreign policy. The article reads:

"Chelsea House Publishers announced last week that Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., the historian, will be general editor of a five-volume "Documentary History of American Foreign Affairs, 1945–1970."

Few events have more influenced the form and character of international relations during this period than the emergence into independence of more than 30 African states. Yet note the titles of the volumes to be included in the history: "East Europe and Soviet Union . . . Asia . . . Western Europe . . . United Nations . . . and Latin America."

Africa? Apparently, as far as American foreign affairs is concerned, the second largest continent in the world, with millions of people, has not existed from 1945 to the present. This to me is especially upsetting since for almost three years I represented our nation as Ambassador to a Black African country. It seems that in the view of Chelsea House and Professor Schlesinger, it either wasn't there or somehow did not count.

Ralph Ellison has characterized the plight of the Black man in America as that of the "invisible man." He is simply ignored as a living, breathing, sentient person. This tendency to treat Black people as if they weren't there also seems to apply to Africa, and to the problems of race in international affairs generally. If you look at practically any textbook on international relations published in recent years, there is virtually no discussion of racial factors. In eleven texts published in America since 1960, the entry "race," or its equivalent, can be found in only five of their indexes, and in three of the five the index refers the reader to less than three paragraphs of text. Yet with the possible exception of the Western European colonial empires, no nation's foreign affairs have been more influenced by racial considerations—positive and negative—than America's.

Domestically, race is a matter of deep national concern and divisiveness, and inevitably, our resolution of this national problem will directly effect our role in world affairs and our influence as a world power. Though we often refer to our country as an ethnic melting pot, America is invariably seen and sees itself as a white Anglo-Saxon Christian nation. As a result, our policies towards non-white peoples have been marked by what can fairly be called "white imperialism," on a political level, and "benevolent racism," on an ethnic level.

Domestically, our immigration laws, from the early Oriental Exclusion Acts to our present statutes, have established national immigration quotas in direct proportion to the whiteness of the country of origin. Further, the internment of the Nisei—but not citizens of German descent—during World War II reflected a national uneasiness with citizens of darker hue.

It should be noted that these are matters of contemporary history: Asians were barred from naturalized citizenship until 1946. Finally, the long-continued, almost total absence of Black, brown or yellow Americans from our foreign policy-making councils not only supports this uneasiness but invariably influences our policy-making decisions relative to the world's majority.

Externally, the Boxer rebellion; our economic support or racist South Africa; our military alliance with colonial Portugal, and our apparent readiness to resist colored in contrast to white communist aggression suggest the existence of a double standard in our international relations. It appears, indeed, that we have a bi-partisan ethnic foreign policy: one operating favorably for countries most similar to our own—predominantly white—and the other taking a more negative posture toward those countries whose inhabitants are predominantly non-white.

Over a hundred years ago, in 1854, Martin R. Delaney, a physician, author and Negro leader, spoke these prophetic words:

"The white races are but one-third of the population of the globe—or one of them to two of us—and it cannot much longer continue that two-thirds will passively submit to the universal domination of this one-third."

By 1900, Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, a distinguished Black scholar and intellectual, was no longer predicting. He stated unequivocally that "the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line."

Contemporary history validates this prediction. The two great white nuclear powers, locked in a battle for world supremacy, are attempting to win the allegiance of the uncommitted nations. But the uncommitted—with few exceptions—are colored—and China's entry into the nuclear fraternity, with its unabashed effort to speak for the non-white peoples of the world, has complicated the struggle. Russia's advantage flows from its revolutionary and supposedly non-colonial history. Ours comes also from our revolutionary history, as reflected in the language of our basic documents and the rhetoric of our founding fathers. But this advantage has been eroded if not totally offset by past practices of slavery and segregation and the fact that America is still dominated by essentially racist institutional structures.

Black Americans, who suffered and still suffer from these conditions, have always known that American life was permeated with racism; but it took the Kerner Report to drive this point home. At one point the report states: ". . . White racism is essentially responsible for the explosive mixture which has been accumulating in our cities since the end of World War II . . . What white Americans have never fully understood—but what the Negro can never forget—is that white society is deeply implicated in the ghetto. White institutions created it, white institutions maintain it, and white society condones it."

Today we run the risk that our immersion in day-to-day crises may blur our memory of the past, and that the press emphasis on Black demands may gloss over the systematic and cruel exclusion of the non-white American from the mainstream of national political and economic life throughout our history.

Let me refresh your recollection just a little.

In 1901 [sic], President Wilson, the man who was to make the "world safe for democracy," described the colored American as a "homeless class, unpracticed in liberty, unschooled in self-control; never established in any habits of prudence, bewildered and without leaders, and yet insolent and aggressive: sick of work, covetous of pleasure—a host of dusky children untimely put out of school."

The treatment of Black Americans—including 360,000 soldiers—during and after the war to make the world safe for democracy, proved that Wilson did not have them in mind when he talked of defending freedom. The last six months of 1919 saw 25 bloody race riots, and in that year more than 70 Black people were lynched, including ten soldiers in uniform.

The despair that gripped the Black ghettos following the war spawned the Garvey Back to Africa Movement, which attracted over 2 million dues-paying members. His goal was similar to that of some advocates of Black power today: economic and political control by Black people over their own Black communities. But in 1933 it was estimated that two-thirds of the Harlem labor force was unemployed. World War II created jobs, of course, but institutional racism insured, as usual, that they were on the bottom of the ladder of opportunity. The President of the North American Aviation Company, for example, stated in 1941 that "while we are in complete sympathy with Negroes, it is against company policy to employ them as aircraft workers or mechanics, *regardless of their training*. There will be some jobs as janitors for Negroes."

After the war, returning Black veterans were expected to fall back into their traditional inferior places. The same old conviction, rooted in slavery, was still in general currency: "Black people are inferior, and we're going to keep it that way." In the armed services itself, Black volunteers and draftees had to fight for the right to fight. For example, Black soldiers overseas were assigned to unskilled non-combat duties until the Battle of the Bulge, when they were organized into platoons and assigned to the front, one platoon to a white company. It was not until 1948 [sic], when our segregated army landed in South Korea to defend a colored nation, that harsh military necessity forced President Truman to order the elimination of this embarassing contradiction.

It cannot be denied that there have been major modifications of our domestic racial policies since that time. Some have been fundamental; for example, the judicial rejection of the constitutionality of enforced racial segregation. In the main however, such changes have affected more the form of our behavior than the content of our racial ideologies. From the day our founding fathers—some of them slave holders—committed the nation to the achievement of a domestic society within which all men shall be free and equal, to the present where Black Americans still live in substantial insulation and isolation, it would be fair to say that racism based on color differences has been an incipient, if not indigenous characteristic of our country. As James Conant phrased it, slavery has the "congenital defect" in the making of the country, for it built self-deception into the very matrix of the American image.

The ancestors of the more than 500,000 Black Americans who survived the voyages from Africa still seek the "promised land" of freedom and unrestricted opportunity. Mutiny aboard ship, unremitting slave rebellions, the underground railroad, experiments with resettlement in Africa, sit-ins, riots, and alternative present-day schemes for Black status and Black communities with Black capitalism all mark unrelenting efforts on the part of Black Americans to find some solution to their American condition.

Unless we bring the Black American fully into the main-stream of life in our nation, this important body of nationals—12.5% of the population—will be able to contribute little to our international relations. Unfortunately, we seem to be making little progress in this direction. A new administration has recently assumed leadership without a single Black person in a key State Department post. On the international scene, we have dropped from seven Black Ambassadors, including two in Europe, one in the Middle East, three in Africa and one at the United Nations to a total of four: one in Malta and three in Africa. Though there has been a small increase in the number of non-whites in the Foreign Service at the junior level, the number of senior grade Black officers is at a standstill, with less than a dozen based in Washington or abroad.

The mounting domestic racial crisis has emerged, next to Vietnam, as the major inhibiting factor in achieving respect, communication and support for America and its policies not only throughout the non-white world, but in Scandinavia and elsewhere as well. The gravity of race as a United States domestic problem and as an international crisis is summarized in a recent statement of the Institute of Race Relations in London:

"It is no longer necessary to emphasize the importance of race as a domestic issue in the United States. In Britain, too, this has become a national issue; we may still be in time to learn from American experience and prevent the problem reaching the gravity it has in the United States, but only if exchange of ideas is urgently sought and quickly translated into action.

"It is less generally recognized that ideas about race play a part in every major confrontation of the world today. World poverty, world hunger, world population, and the operation of aid programmes, are all affected; efforts for peace, the activities of the United Nations, the working of international agencies are frustrated by the suspicions and resentments which arise from race. Failures to solve the domestic problem in the United States and Britain; failure to enforce the views of the United Nations in South West Africa and in Rhodesia, failure to achieve peace in Vietnam—all increase the sense of frustration among the developing nations. The line between rich nations and poor and the line between white and non-white are dangerously near coinciding and the polarization of the world into camps divided by these lines becomes increasingly serious. In the power struggle between the United States, Russia and China, political use is made of this polarization and it is a major contribution to instability. There are influential people who speak of a 'race war' on a world scale as inevitable if not already in progress. But surely more reasonable courses are open if men apply their minds to the possibilities".

Dr. James Moss of the University of the State of New York has found that in spite of the long tradition of African students studying in the United States most African students experience some form of racial discrimination during their stay in the United States. Indeed, he reported that one group of African students studying in the midwest became more disaffected the longer they stayed in the United States. When we consider the history of discrimination towards African diplomats and other distinguished visitors during their stay in this country, coupled with the documented evidence that some of the most damaging effects upon our American-African relations derive from experiences with racially and culturally unsophisticated white Americans on varying assignments in Africa, is it any wonder that we are so disliked in that continent? Dr. Joseph Kennedy's research findings and conclusions five years ago are just as relevant today as then:

"Today, the entire world is caught up in a great twopronged struggle—a struggle for material and human equality. The American Negro quest for civil rights, the independence of nations, world revolutions, are a part of this larger struggle. For most countries the dissolution of old alliances and the formation of new friendships and relations will be determined by the outcome of this great struggle.

"Where this struggle takes on racial overtones, as it must in Africa, (for the African, like the American Negro, has lived with minority status within the concept of white superiority and Black inferiority) the United States finds itself in an extremely sensitive, tenuous position—much more so than the Soviet Union or England, or any other country in the world. The United States is the major force in the 'free world' standing for democracy, individual expression, and human rights. The United States has the largest Black population any place in the world outside Africa itself. Yet, the United States has an extremely negative racial image in Africa and around the world."

If our country therefore is to alter its image as one of the most hated nations in the world by non-white peoples, nothing short of a major transformation in our racial posture and priorities domestically and internationally will suffice.

The United States and our Western allies must begin to deal with the reality of an international community of non-white peoples, bound together in a common struggle against white racism and imperialism, in which our country is one of the major protagonists. I must here confess my own doubts on this score. Far too many of our policy-makers seem to consider that, in the context of world wide priorities, non-white peoples are of too little consequence to merit the kinds of activities on the massive scale that I believe are essential if racial polarization is to be reversed.

From our founding this nation and the Black man have been inextricably committed to each other. America's commitment rose out of the contradictions of slavery and democracy—a contradiction which had to be resolved if the republic was to endure. "Indeed, I tremble for my country," Thomas Jefferson told the Virginia House, "when I remember that God is just." Recognizing the contradiction inherent in his plight, and using the Christian ethic and democratic rhetoric as his tools, the Black man hewed his way out of first slavery then enforced segregation. He looked upon his activity as self-liberation; the deeper truth is that the Black man's struggle is the struggle of America itself seeking its *true* identity.

It was not by accident that as America came into its own as a world power during and after World War II, the Black man came to represent the conscience of the nation and he advanced in direct proportion to his ability to embarass America in times of international crises. My point is clear, I hope;—The fate of America and the fate of the Black man are one and the same. The challenge to the one is mirrored in the increasing freedom of the other. I submit that with the advent of national independence abroad and increasing racial opportunity at home the question of color will steadily dissolve into a question of economics. The residual issue then that will have to be faced during the remainder of the 20th century is the struggle between the haves and the have-nots.

The danger lies in the fact that the historical events of the past 350 years have doomed the majority of the non-white peoples of the world to the category of the have-nots. Our domestic danger is that we may lack sufficient national concern or commitment to make of our Black minority an asset rather than a liability. It would be a pity if the United States, which held such hope for the world's needy and oppressed, found itself isolated and alone because of its own inability to root racism out of its national body at a critical point in its own survival. Where then would we turn? How impregnable would our white defense be?

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the problem of race in U.S. foreign affairs has been recognized by the Ford Foundation, which recently announced the funding of a center on international race relations at the University of Denver. The center will be the first of its kind in this country. The university's announcement of the Ford grant follows:

A $150,000 Ford Foundation grant awarded to the University of Denver today (March 19) will establish a Center on International Race Relations, first of its kind in the United States, at the University of Denver's Graduate School of International Studies.

The three-year award for the unique center will provide programs of advanced research and training in comparative race and international relations.

"Race conflicts are becoming increasingly important in world affairs," Dr. Josef Korbel, dean of the DU Graduate School of International Studies, declared. Until recently, he noted, race has been considered "only a national problem that stopped at a country's borders." Examples of race conflicts with international implications cited by Korbel include South Africa's apartheid government, Chinese minorities in Southeast Asian countries, and domestic race problems as they affect American foreign policy.

"If we cannot understand the role racial factors play in international affairs, we cannot hope to find solutions to the problems facing us," Dean Korbel said. "We are left at the mercy of one of the key issues of the 20th century."

Dr. George W. Shepherd, Jr., professor of international relations at the Graduate School of International Studies, will be director of the new center. International race specialists to be associated with the center include Profs. Rupert Emerson, a prominent expert on African affairs of the government department at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; James Rosenau, chairman of the political science department at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.; Paul Seabury, of the political science department at the University of California, Berkeley; and Franklin Williams, director of the Urban Center at Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Associate fellows of the center from Colorado include Profs. W. A. E. Skurnik and James Scarritt, political science department, and Ragaei El Mallakh, economics, all from the University of Colorado, and Leo Cefkin, political science department, Colorado State University at Fort Collins, Colo.

Prof. Ali Mazrui, a leading African expert from Makerere College in Uganda, will join the center staff spring quarter as a visiting fellow. Author of *Pax Africana* and other books, Prof. Mazrui will deliver three lectures on race and the changing British Commonwealth.

Initially, the center will support and publish research on race factors in American foreign policy and on the relationship between Africa and black Americans in the United States, according to Shepherd. Expansion into other world areas is planned. Programs to train college teachers and government personnel will begin next fall.

Publications underway include "Race Factors in American Foreign Policy," edited by Prof. Shepherd, with a chapter by C. Eric Lincoln, sociology professor at Vassar College and Union Theological Seminary in New York, who wrote the first study of Black Muslims in America. "Aspects of Race Relations in Africa and the Middle East," another book, will include articles primarily by Colorado area faculty.

A monograph series on race will be published. "Africa Today," a periodical published at GSIS since 1967, will include articles on race.

As a preliminary to establishing the Center, the DU Graduate School invited 20 leading scholars to a three-day symposium Feb. 6–8 on the theoretical approaches to international race studies. Nationally known experts attending included Prog. Karl Deutsch, president of the American Political Science Association; Wayne Fredericks, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, now director of the Africa and Middle East Division of the Ford Foundation; Prof. John Letiche, professor of international economics, University of California at Berkeley; Prof. James A. Moss, Associate Dean of International Studies at State University of New York at Buffalo; Prof. Peter Rose, chairman of the sociology department, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

The small group of international race specialists discussed research methods in the critical but seldom studied field, recommending a set of priorities. Among crucial topics they listed for immediate attention are:

(1) The economics of racism—what groups benefit from it and in what ways. Prof. Deutsch suggested that the theories of international trade might well apply to the economic relationships between races within a single country.

(2) Academic supports of racism, a comparative study of the national biases of civil service and university entrance exams that reinforce the dominance of privileged groups, was proposed.

(3) Elimination of ethnocentrism from race studies. American race specialists have a "myopic concern with race and ethnic problems in the U.S., and with little else," according to Prof. Rose.

(4) Conditions under which racism operates in the international system. Prof. Rosenau proposed a series of hypotheses to test this.

(5) Elimination of the double standard in American foreign policy, which Prof. Moss charged was racist in its application. He cited World War II internment of American citizens of Japanese descent but not those of German origin, as one example.

(6) Research on the role of the non-white ethnic groups on American foreign policy. Work in this area has been devoted almost entirely to groups of European origin.

(7) Research on the increasingly critical black-white confrontation in Southern Africa and its implications for American and European foreign policies.

"The conference has helped us see more clearly the tremendous gaps in our knowledge of how race factors operate in world politics," Prof. Shepherd said. "The center has a big job ahead, trying to focus on just a few of these problems."

The DU center is contracting the Institute of Race Relations in London, and a few similar centers throughout the world, to develop and coordinate research projects at the international level.

A MAN OF VISION, FAITH, ENERGY AND DETERMINATION

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the year 1969 marks the 100th anniversary of Claflin College, an outstanding institution of higher learning located in Orangeburg, S.C., which is in my congressional district.

Under the able direction of its president, Dr. H. V. Manning, this predominantly Negro college has made remarkable progress in the past few years. Dr. Manning has received well-deserved acclaim for his dedication to young people, and in my State of South Carolina, he is numbered among our most respected educators.

In an article appropriately titled "A Man of Vision, Faith, Energy and Determination," which appeared in the April 6, 1969, issue of the Orangeburg, S.C., Times and Democrat, we can readily see why Dr. Manning is so successful as a college president. I commend this article to the Congress and the Nation and include it as a part of my remarks as follows:

A MAN OF VISION, FAITH, ENERGY, AND DETERMINATION

Dr. Hubert Vernon Manning, president of Claflin College in Orangeburg, is determined to make Claflin a school that places the greatest emphasis possible on the development of "the complete man."

Dr. Manning, a native of Cheraw, has been in the educational field for 29 years and has definite ideas as to what course Claflin should follow in the next quarter century.

"If we chart our course carefully," he said recently in an exclusive interview, "and continue with our basic philosophy, I think Claflin College will expand and provide a quality education—but, it has to be a controlled growth and not one that will suddenly put us in a position where we are overburdened with students to whom we cannot provide the necessary services of instruction, living quarters and referral facilities."

As the president of an independent predominately Negro college, Dr. Manning is acutely aware of the task cut out for him and his staff. At the same time, he is conversant with the advantages of being a small, independent school.

"When you speak of an independent school," he pointed out, "you're speaking of a struggle, in most cases, to acquire sufficient funds to fully exploit the responsibility of education. But, at the same time, you've got to recognize the more flexible course an independent school can follow as opposed to a college or university that is supported by the state."

Dr. Manning acknowledged that the role of the independent school is gaining in importance but pulling no punches, he also pointed out that the predominately Negro independent college has the same problems of other like schools. "Those problems and plus," he said.

A 1940 graduate of Claflin College, Dr. Manning gained his Bachelor of Divinity Degree in 1945 from Gammon Theological Seminary in Atlanta, Ga.

Not being satisfied to rest on his achievements, he went on to earn his MA from Boston University in 1947; his Doctor of Divinity degree from Gammon in 1956 and took an intensive course of study in college administration at the University of Michigan in 1958.

In 1947 Dr. Manning joined Claflin College as the school chaplain but was appointed in 1951 to serve as head of Wesley Methodist Church in Charleston, a position he held until 1956 when he was elected president of Claflin College.

Dr. Manning had acquired a positive philosophy concerning higher education during his years of study and travel—a philosophy he brought wholly to Claflin when he assumed the presidency.

"I haven't changed that philosophy," he

said, but, perhaps I've had to forgo it at times in the face of realities of the instant."

That philosophy is, "Education should have the purpose of developing the whole man for total service——and not luxury."

Dr. Manning continued, "The predominately Negro college should not be exempted from maximum demands of academic excellence, nor should students not be expected to perform at their highest capacity irrespective of their, quote, 'poor background,' unquote, that is often referred to."

Dr. Manning went on to say he was a firm believer in a solid general educational base, especially in freshman and sophomore years, to expose students to the entire gamut of educational possibilities and then urge them to pick their specialities during their junior year.

However—and there is always a "however" according to Dr. Manning—the practicalities of educational realities have interfered with his philosophy to a degree.

"Simply put," said Dr. Manning emphasizing his point with a pencil tapped lightly on his desk, "want-to and can-do are two different things.

"An independent college wants to do the best job possible and sets goals to that effect. But funds, primarily, dictate what a school can do.

"For example," he said, "I reduced the number of majors from 13 to 7 because I felt that with the resources we had it was better to do a creditable job in a few select areas than a poor job in a variety of areas."

According to Dr. Manning, the reduction of majors was a simple exercise in supply and demand. "We couldn't supply the funds necessary to hire the instructors to meet the demand of the number of majors," he said.

However, he hasn't forgotten those dropped majors. "I fully intend to restore those majors especially in the areas of science. The science fields are wide open and I think that in time this college could fully exploit the tremendous possibilities open to us."

Funds, the bugaboo of the independent school, also dictate the student body level.

"We cannot meet our needs in full," said Dr. Manning, "due to this lack. We operate on an anticipated budget whereas state supported institutions operate on regularly approved budgets. We have to have cash in hand."

But, being an eternal optimist, Dr. Manning looks at the bright side of things. "We have, since 1956, increased the student enrollment from 330 to 818 . . . it was deliberately held to 818 due to limited space facilities.

"But our student-faculty ratio is almost ideal. In 1956 it was one professor to every 35 students. Now the ratio is one to 18. That's an excellent ratio and allows a closer participation by the students in the conduct of the course," said Dr. Manning, referring briefly to the large universities of the nation where, in some instances, there is one instructor for some 200 students in each class.

Asked what was one of the major differences between the independent college, such as Claflin, and state supported schools, Dr. Manning chuckled.

"Besides the question of funds, there is what we call our Ace—ability to choose courses."

He explained Claflin College had the freedom to choose its curriculum on the basis of what their studies indicate would best benefit the student in the future years.

"Of course, there are certain required courses set by the State Board of Education, but from that base we can go where we choose."

Dr. Manning is almost between the horns of a dilemma. He has a virtual flood of applications for admittance but has chosen to keep Claflin College with a relatively small enrollment.

"You hate to turn down an applicant who is qualified for entrance," he said, "but, at the same time, as an independent school with limited funds, we have to pick and select those persons we feel have the potential to develop further than the degree they earn from us."

Claflin College, according to Dr. Manning, spends a great deal of time investigating prospective students beyond the black and white facts on their academic records.

"We talk to people who know them, and hopefully, try to come to an accurate assessment of the student's potential ability.

"Tests are fine, but they don't really show the individual—his hungers, hopes and dreams. We try to find those qualities and hone them to a sharp edge of intelligence by adding the drive to be curious about all things and to seek answers to that curiosity."

Being an educator, besides a minister, Dr. Manning is a practical and realistic man. "We hope never to become a large institution. Claflin will move into the next 25 year period retaining what it has and slowly adding on to the physical property.

"The college," he said, "has estimated a student ceiling of 1,500 to 1,600 and will not go beyond that level.

"I can foresee dangers in too rapid a growth, and would rather have a growth that is considered too slow by some and controlled, rather than jump greatly in numbers and end up with uncontrolled factors," he said.

The most pressing need of Claflin College at this time, 100 years after its founding?

"Exactly what it was in 1869," said Dr. Manning, "a larger endowment."

THE ROAD TO RENEWAL

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to call to the attention of all Members of Congress an article in the Word, official publication of the National Council of Catholic Women, written by Miss Joanne M. Moran. The article is called "The Road to Renewal" and it tells the story of cooperative efforts of Federal, State and private agencies to assist in the rehabilitation of men and women with mental and physical disabilities. As a new member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, I am vitally concerned with our present efforts to provide the best rehabilitation opportunities for men and women who wish to return to the mainstream of society. I commend this article to all Members:

THE ROAD TO RENEWAL

(By Joanne M. Moran)

"And that one talent which is death to hide,
Lodged with me useless, though my soul more bent
To serve therewith my Maker . . ."

These despairing lines from Milton's "Sonnet on His Blindness," written in the 17th century, seldom pass by the scrutinizing eyes of scholars of English literature. Equally poignant thoughts, not as richly poetic perhaps, sear the soul of any individual confronted with a handicap.

And yet how many of the rest of us pass through life reflecting little on the mysterious marvels of our own humanity. Stop and think for a moment what it would be like . . . never to view again a setting sun, the face of a friend, a work of art . . . never to hear again the roar of the sea, a burst of laughter, the sound of a symphony . . . never to move freely again, to "hop" a bus, take a stroll, or to very literally "move a finger." Unfortunately these marvels take on sudden relevance only after someone has been actually deprived of one of them. Even more striking is the fact that some of us have to go so far as to surmount a narrow brush with death before we can experience more fully the profundity of life.

Having reflected on the "what ifs," let's transcend ourselves and focus on the problems, the programs underway, and yes, the tremendous accomplishments of those individuals who are handicapped. According to a National Health Survey more than 22 million men, women and children in the U.S. (12 percent of the population) have some chronic illness or impairment that is severe enough to limit what they can do. Of these, 18 million (12 million of employable age) are limited in the amount or kind of major activity they are able to perform, whether it is working, keeping house or going to school. Add to this some 19 million Americans (one in every ten) suffering from some form of mental or emotional illness and six million more who are mentally retarded and you come up with a startling 47 million.

You might ask, who are the people most likely to suffer from mental or physical handicaps? According to a federally-funded study recently completed by Roper Research Association, "the poorer you are, the greater your chance of being handicapped physically or mentally," and ironically, "if you are both poor and handicapped, the greater your chances of not knowing where to go for rehabilitation or other help." One could speculate that the reverse is equally true: the greater the handicap, the poorer you are apt to be. Why? Because the road to renewal is usually a long and rugged one. It requires a courageous decision on the part of the traveler to shift the focus from what has been lost to what remains. It requires a determination on the part of rehabilitation personnel to see to it that not only every avenue of opportunity is open to the handicapped person, but to strive toward the creation of new occupational areas where the handicapped individual can engage in productive activity.

From both a psychological and economic point of view, improving the disabled person's living conditions via welfare assistance won't help for long unless he can eventually find a job. A job won't help unless he is both suited and trained to perform it, and he cannot be trained without the basic conviction that he has a chance to succeed. Understandably, the quality and quantity of therapy, of training programs and of job placement—the three main spokes on the rehabilitation wheel—cannot be overlooked.

WHAT'S BEING DONE

One cannot discuss the main features of rehabilitation programs without describing the agencies responsible for them. The federal agency primarily involved in the funding, planning and coordination of rehabilitative activities across the country is the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA). RSA is one of four formerly separate components of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) which were united as the "Social and Rehabilitation Service" in 1967. (The other three units are: the Administration on Aging, the Welfare Administration and the Division of Mental Retardation of the Public Health Service.)

The major role of RSA is to support the state-federal program of rehabilitation services. It does so by alloting funds to each state, based on a formula involving the state population and fiscal capacity, measured by its per capita income. RSA's budget for fiscal

1968 was $388 million, a substantial increase over previous years. As a result of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (from which RSA derives its authority), federal allotments to state agencies were increased from seventy-five to eighty percent, and a minimum rate of $1 million to each state was established in order to assure the smaller states an equitable share. "We don't believe in playing a big daddy role concerning the utilization of funds," says Norman Subotnik, RSA information officer. We believe that each state can best handle its own unique rehabilitation problems in an atmosphere which promotes freedom and responsibility rather than in a rigidly structured one." However, each state, of course, is obliged to provide RSA with detailed reports on the nature, extent and progress of its programs. In addition to this, the Associate Regional Commissioner for Rehabilitation Services in each of the nine HEW geographic regions is responsible for improving coordination with state and local governments and with volunteer agencies.

Among the services provided by the federal-state program are: comprehensive evaluation, including medical study and diagnosis; medical, surgical, hospital care, and related therapy; braces and limbs; counseling, guidance and training services; construction and maintenance of facilities; services to families (when such services will contribute substantially to the rehabilitation of the handicapped client); job placement and follow-up services.

Any individual with a handicap serious enough to impede his chances of gainful employment is eligible for assistance from a local agency. This includes handicapped youth as well as the aged, the mentally retarded, the mentally ill and restored, alcoholics, special disability groups (the blind, the deaf and speech-impaired), those with heart disease, cancer, stroke, spinal injuries, and even juvenile delinquents and convicted criminals.

RSA also provides special "Project Grants" to state agencies for research and demonstration, for expansion of services and construction of new facilities, for research and training the mentally retarded, grants to better serve disabled migratory agricultural workers, contracts or cooperative projects with business and private industry to provide training in a realistic work setting, and special grants for recruiting and training handicapped and other individuals who wish to embark on careers in vocational rehabilitation.

The rehabilitation of convicted criminals is a relatively new area of activity for RSA. Realizing the importance of raising the quality of personnel who staff prisons, in 1966 the agency awarded a $2.1 million grant for a three-year period to the nonprofit Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training to study problems of training and expanding personnel for prison programs, probational services and parole systems. In 1967 it awarded more than $500,000 to the New York State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation for an intensive four-year rehabilitation project involving approximately 200 maximum-security prisoners. The state put up almost $900,000 for the project.

In 1961, the agency embarked on a program of developing rehabilitation research and training centers in medical schools around the country; there are now 19 centers in 18 schools.

The pulse of progress in rehabilitation has been a rapid one. Over 200,000 cases were successfully closed in fiscal year 1968; placement of the handicapped by local public employment offices reached 303,000, the highest number since World War II; a record 174,000 were rehabilitated under the already mentioned state-federal program, 16 percent above the previous year; more than 8,000 disabled veterans were in training under Veterans' Administration rehabilitation programs, and the Civil Service Commission reported that 14,500 handicapped men and women were employed by the federal government.

BARRIERS TO GROWTH

Nevertheless, there are still many disabled not reached by rehabilitation programs. RSA estimates that there are some two and one-half million disabled persons in need of vocational rehabilitation services or job opportunities. To this add 270,000 persons who become disabled each year. That means, according to RSA calculations, 300,000 a year must be rehabilitated if we are to make an inroad on the problem. However, it seems that if we are to open the road of renewal to more handicapped Americans, certain weaknesses—certain cracks in an otherwise sturdy pavement must be obliterated.

One distressing factor which struck this writer in reading RSA's statistical reports is the marked discrepancy of total numbers rehabilitated among states. This was true even among states showing both similar percentages of handicapped in their populations and similar amounts of federal and state matching funds. The answer seems to lie somewhere on the turbulent battlegrounds of quality and quantity.

The National Citizens Advisory Committee on Vocational Rehabilitation notes (June 26, 1968 Report to HEW) that "a disabled person in the more populous and wealthy states sometimes has less chance for rehabilitation service than the disabled person in the less populous and poorer states." For example, "on a population basis, West Virginia rehabilitates five times as many of its citizens as New York and seven times as many as California." However, not forgetting the importance of quality, the Committee notes that such factors as pressure for case closures, the problems of the increasingly overburdened counselor, and the amount of monies available can often lead to a preference for "relatively quick, cheap service over the more expensive, long-term service that would lead to greater personal and economic independence." The effect is "to dispose the counselor to seek out the 'easy' case, the person who can be made employable with a minimum expenditure of agency time and money. As a result the difficult case—the severely disabled, multiple handicapped person who most desperately needs help—is shunted aside as 'not feasible.' Quality of service is thus sacrificed for expediency."

Yes, as previously mentioned, the converse of the Roper Report may be equally true: the greater the handicap, the poorer you are apt to be.

Other barriers to growth stem partially from a lack of knowledge of rehabilitation services on the part of the handicapped and their families, and partially from adverse misconceptions of society concerning the handicapped.

To reach the former, Warwick and Legler, a part of the Advertising Council, a volunteer group of representatives from nationally known advertising agencies, is working closely with HEW. TV commercials, bumper stickers, newspaper ads and other media will be utilized to urge the afflicted or their families to write for help. One arresting headline reads: "This man has a disability and he's giving it the best years of his life."

Public opinion surveys cast a gloomy shadow on the sunny performance record of the handicapped. In the previously mentioned Roper Study persons interviewed were shown three hypothetical case histories—a retarded person, a blind man and a young man crippled by a birth defect. "Half favored institutionalizing the retardate; over one-third favored institutionalizing the blind man; over one-fifth the crippled young man." Concerning competitive employment, "only 16 percent believed the retardate should work side-by-side with others at a regular job, 44 percent the blind man, and 36 percent the crippled youth. A deplorable percentage favored sheltered workshops instead.

What can be done to break through the heavy current of public opinion that has been impeding the flow of rehabilitated handicapped into the mainstream of society? To answer this question and to put the answers to work is the task of the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped, a non-political committee founded in 1947 at the suggestion of President Truman. The Committee does not duplicate the activities of RSA and other agencies (i.e. it does not train, employ, rehabilitate or counsel people). It supplements and complements them. It does so by operating in a strictly "missionary" capacity—using its public relations talents to spread the true story of the handicapped across the nation. Mass media is widely and effectively used, handbooks and guides for the use of state and community committees are prepared, and there is continual communication with federal agencies as well as the Governor's Committee on the Handicapped in each state to assure maximum coordination of activities.

Because the majority of persons serve on the committee as volunteers—some 750 appointed members and alternates, including the chairman and vice chairman—the committee has been able to operate on an annual budget of less than half a million dollars.

HIRING THE HANDICAPPED: MYTHS AND REALITIES

Various studies covering a twenty-year span consistently reflect the favorability of hiring the handicapped. A survey of 111 major corporations, conducted by the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped, revealed that 93.5 percent of the companies polled rated the impaired worker average or better in job performance than the unimpaired worker. A survey of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics comparing large samples of impaired and unimpaired workers gave the handicapped a slight 1 percent edge in work performance.

Attendance records of the handicapped are equally impressive. Of the companies surveyed by the President's Committee, 91.5 percent rated the impaired worker average or better in attendance. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that the handicapped worker missed less than a half-a-day more per year than the unimpaired worker.

In the realm of safety performance, the President's Committee report revealed 90.4 percent of the companies rated the impaired average or better in his accident record. In the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics survey the handicapped worker had an 8.9 injury rate as compared to a 9.5 percent for the unimpaired.

Despite these factors, many drawbacks persist. One of the major ones, according to the National Citizens Advisory Committee on Vocational Rehabilitation (June 20, 1968), is "the employer's fear of incurring economic loss by hiring the disabled." The Committee notes that "there is the opinion that, in some states, workmen's compensation commissions and courts may be going beyond the original intent of workmen's compensation (to assure an adequate livelihood after injury) and awarding exorhitant cash grants to individuals. The case of an individual in California was cited in which the family alleged that the worker's increased smoking and subsequent lung cancer were the direct result of mounting emotional tensions on the job. The court agreed and awarded $150,000. The Committee heard evidence that the courts were increasingly inclined to find for the plaintiff, even in cases where the causal relationship between work and the disability was speculative at best." While the Committee notes that it is in no position to determine whether this is "fact or fancy," it strongly recommends studies in this area. The President's Committee is currently studying the workmen's compensation problem and is trying to convince employers that properly placed handicapped workers have fewer injuries, that the states should have strong second-injury laws, and that the states should establish machinery for the early rehabilitation of injured workers.

Related to this (workmen's compensation), the Citizen's Committee says, is the problem of unrealistic screening criteria adopted by certain firms. Some companies set physical and mental requirements for employment so high as to virtually exclude all handicapped persons. This is frequently done without reference to job tasks within the company. "Ironically," the Committee points out, "such companies often arbitrarily screen out disabled persons whose skills the company badly needs. We are of the opinion that these rigid standards may have evolved as a reaction to company losses in cases such as those just cited." One anxiety that has no basis in reality stems from the employer's belief that workmen's compensation insurance rates rise as a result of hiring the disabled. The Committee notes that "this myth persists despite many pronouncements by the insurance companies indicating that insurance rates are not affected in the least by hiring the handicapped."

In the category of mental aberrations, the outlook is gradually improving. With good treatment at least seven out of ten patients can leave mental hospitals well enough to hold down jobs. To assist the mentally restored, the President's Committee has been encouraging the nation's mental hospitals and community mental health centers to take steps to involve employers in their daily activities. Several hundred hospitals have formed employer committees in which employers provide advice and guidance on employment to newly discharged patients. "We have discovered," says Bernard Posner, deputy executive secretary of the Committee, "that once employers are given an opportunity to become really involved, they become so committed that they usually volunteer to hire the mentally handicapped without having to be asked."

Concerning the retarded, 25 out of every 30 can achieve at least marginal independence through proper employment placement. IQ isn't the only way to measure ability. For example, The Pennsylvania Department of Employment Security gave a battery of aptitude tests to retarded men and women and found that of 109 cases, 90 scored high on all job aptitudes except general intelligence. Mr. Posner notes that, contrary to popular opinion, "a survey of 2,000 retarded employed by the government revealed that in most cases no job restructuring was required." Furthermore, once properly trained, retardates are better able to cope with repetitive work than are employees of average intelligence.

If you've read this far, it may be safe to say that your sensitivity quotient is more than satisfactory. It's people like you this country needs. It's people like you who, through total acceptance of the handicapped and through community action, can help the handicapped to more fully accept themselves and to become the confident, independent and productive people that they wish to be. The road to renewal will never be a smooth one. However, as Nietzsche once said, "He who has the WHY to live can bear with almost any HOW."

WHAT YOU CAN DO

1. Contact your Governor's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped or local Rehabilitation Agency to find out where volunteer help is most needed in your state. Further information may be obtained by writing to: The President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped, 14th and Constitution Avenues, Washington, D.C. 20210 and The Rehabilitation Services Administration, HEW, 330 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20201.

2. Make your community aware of the problems of the handicapped; seek out the handicapped in your community to inform them of assistance available to them.

3. Consider the following as possible community projects:

a. Elimination of architectural barriers in your community inaccessible to the handicapped.

b. Enlisting the services of professional people (retired teachers, counselors, therapists, artists) in creating and participating in workshops for the handicapped.

c. Improvement of public transportation facilities in your community which, in most cases, are painfully inadequate. Many disabled persons are unable to participate in rehabilitation programs because they cannot get to the source of the service. You might offer to chauffeur a handicapped person in your area.

d. In addition to your community get your immediate family interested. Some college youngsters have started committees to assist their fellow handicapped students on campus. (Reading for the blind, helping paraplegics, etc.)

e. Your doctor could and should be an important source of information concerning assistance available to the handicapped. However, a recent study revealed that a large percentage of doctors had no idea of publicly-supported rehabilitation facilities in their area. Most of them believe their role extends to seeing to it that patients get physical rehabilitation; only two-thirds say their role extends to vocational training. You might talk to your doctor about the possibility of having free brochures in his office, all of which can be obtained from the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped.

f. If you are interested in resuming your education and going into the field of rehabilitative services, you may write to the Rehabilitation Services Administration or local agency to see what grants might be available in your field of interest. There is an acute shortage of occupational therapists, speech therapists, social workers, counselors, persons trained in therapeutic recreation.

PUBLIC CONCERN FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Gallup organization recently completed a nationwide poll on behalf of the National Wildlife Federation, designed to determine what the attitude of the public really is toward protection of our environment.

It came as no surprise to me to learn that the public—the voting public, I might add—is deeply concerned about the problem. I was interested to learn that the public feels that the issue is so important that it is willing to pay for more adequate environmental protection. Most heartening of all is the fact that the greatest degree of concern was expressed by the youngest members of the group sampled—those in the 21 to 34 age group. These are the decisionmakers for the future and the prime movers in the effort to improve the quality of our life.

The National Wildlife Federation is to be commended for having sponsored this important study—its value is clear and will become even more apparent as time goes on. Our duty is equally clear—to listen, and to respond, adequately and in time.

The above mentioned follows:

INTRODUCTION

Objective of the study

The overall objective of the study was to provide information about the public's attitudes toward our natural surroundings. Specific objectives included:

1. Finding out to what extent the public is concerned about the degradation of our environment;

2. Investigating preferences for urban versus suburban or rural living;

3. Learning what is considered the most pressing problem with regard to our natural surroundings and what the public thinks should be done about the problems;

4. Determining whether or not the public favors setting aside more public land for conservation purposes.

Design of the research

The objectives of the study were carried out by means of a personal interview survey conducted with a national sample of 1503 adults, 21 years of age and older. The interviewing took place during the last ten days in January, 1969. The following questions were asked:

1. You may have heard or read claims that our natural surroundings are being spoiled by air pollution, water pollution, soil erosion, destruction of wildlife and so forth. How concerned are you about this—deeply concerned, somewhat concerned, or not very concerned?

2. How much would you be willing to pay each year in additional taxes earmarked to improve our natural surroundings—a small amount such as $10.00 or less, a moderate amount such as $50.00, or a large amount such as $100.00 or more?

3. It has been said that it will, at some time, be necessary to limit the human population (number of people) if our present living standards are to be maintained. Do you think this will be necessary or not?

4. Which of these kinds of places would you find most pleasant as a place to live?

Respondents were shown a card which read as follows: "Mountains, Seashore, Rural area, Small city, Suburbs, Large city, Somewhere else?"

5. In this country, which one of these do you think is the most pressing problem connected with our natural surroundings?

Respondents were shown a card which read as follows: *"Air pollution, Water pollution, Soil erosion, Wildlife preservation (birds and animals), Preservation of open green spaces, Pesticides (chemicals used to kill insects)."*

6. In your opinion what can be done to correct this problem? (Problem chosen in the above question)

7. Are you in favor of setting aside more public land for conservation purposes such as national parks, wildlife refuges, bird sanctuaries, and so forth, or not?

Information about the composition and design of the sample and tables of sampling tolerances to have in mind when reading the report will be found at the end of the report.

SOME HIGHLIGHTS OF THE STUDY

Concern About Our Natural Surroundings.—About half (51%) of all persons interviewed stated that they are "Deeply concerned" about the effect of air pollution, water pollution, soil erosion, and destruction of wildlife on our natural surroundings. About one-third (35%) said they are "Somewhat concerned" about the problem and twelve per cent said they are "Not very concerned." A greater proportion (62%) of those who have attended college than of those with less formal education are deeply concerned about these environmental problems. More of the men (56%) than of the women (46%) said they were deeply concerned. Also more of the people living in the western and midwestern states than of those in the East or South are deeply concerned.

Willingness To Pay Taxes To Improve Our Natural Surroundings.—When those interviewed were asked about their willingness to pay additional taxes to improve our natural surroundings, almost three of every four people interviewed said they would be willing to pay something. It was found that those who had said they were "Deeply concerned" about our environmental problems were willing to pay more in taxes to help solve the problems than those who did not express as much concern.

The Most Pressing Environmental Problem.—When those interviewed were shown a list of problems affecting the environment and asked which one they consider most pressing, replies divided as follows:

	Percent
Air pollution	36
Water pollution	32
Pesticides (chemicals used to kill insects)	7
Preservation of open green spaces	6
Wildlife preservation (birds and animals)	5
Soil erosion	4

In cities of over 1,000,000 in population 55 per cent said air pollution was the most pressing problem while only twenty-three per cent of those in small communities and rural areas gave this answer. Preservation of wildlife was of greater concern to people in rural areas than to those in the urban areas.

Those interviewed were also asked what they think can be done to correct the problem chosen as most pressing. Results were as follows:

Problem and most frequently mentioned corrective action

Air pollution: Find way to control auto exhaust. Control of chemical and industrial wastes. Provide filters, smoke control devices.

Water pollution: Stop industrial pollution. Enforce present laws, pass new legislation.

Soil erosion: Plant or maintain vegetation. Use proper agriculture methods.

Wildlife preservation: Enforce game laws. Reduce hunting. Establish wildlife reserves, parks.

Preservation of open green spaces: Set aside land for parks, forests. Better zoning.

Pesticides: Use different, improved pesticides. Government controls, laws.

Will It Be Necessary To Limit Human Population?—The U.S. public is evenly divided as to whether or not it will, at some time, be necessary to limit human population if our present living standards are to be maintained. Younger adults, those who have attended college, and those in the upper income brackets are more inclined to consider limitation of human population necessary than other groups.

Areas Thought Most Pleasant As A Place To Live—If a pleasant place to live were the principal consideration influencing the public there would be a marked reversal of the trend away from rural areas. Those interviewed were shown the following list of areas and asked which of them they think would be most pleasant as places to live. Results divided as follows:

	Percent
Rural area	30
Small city	25
Suburbs	18
Mountains	15
Seashore	9
Large city	6
Other	1

Analyses by size of community show that many big city dwellers have a yearning for smaller places and those in rural areas have no yen for the big city.

Should More Land Be Set Aside For Conservation Purposes?—Three of every four people interviewed favor setting aside more public land for conservation purposes such as national parks, wildlife refuges, bird sanctuaries, etc. Young people, those who have states are more inclined to this view than attended college, and those in the eastern other segments of the population.

THE FINDINGS

CONCERN ABOUT OUR NATURAL SURROUNDINGS

The question: You may have heard or read claims that our natural surroundings are being spoiled by air pollution, water pollution, soil erosion, destruction of wildlife and so forth. How concerned are you about this—deeply concerned, somewhat concerned, or not very concerned?

	Percent					Number of interviews
	Deeply concerned	Somewhat concerned	Not very concerned	No opinion	Total	
National results	51	35	12	2	100	1,503
By sex:						
Men	56	31	10	3	100	744
Women	46	38	14	2	100	759
By age:						
21 to 34 years	51	41	7	1	100	403
35 to 49 years	50	38	10	2	100	476
50 years and older	52	28	16	4	100	605
(Undesignated, 19.)						
By education:						
College	62	32	6	([1])	100	395
High school	52	37	10	1	100	748
Grade school	39	34	20	7	100	352
(Undesignated, 8.)						
By annual family income:						
$10,000 and over	58	34	8	0	100	449
$7,000 to $9,999	53	38	8	1	100	336
By annual family income—Continued						
$5,000 to $6,999	55	35	8	2	100	237
Under $5,000	41	34	20	5	100	463
(Undesignated, 18.)						
By size of community:						
1,000,000 and over	51	36	8	5	100	277
250,000 to 999,999	52	35	11	2	100	296
50,000 to 249,999	55	35	9	1	100	235
2,500 to 49,999	52	31	16	1	100	233
Under 2,500	46	37	14	3	100	462
By region of country:						
East	46	38	12	4	100	425
Midwest	56	34	9	1	100	400
South	44	36	16	4	100	428
West	59	31	10	([1])	100	250

[1] Less than half of 1 percent.

WILLINGNESS TO PAY TAXES TO IMPROVE NATURAL SURROUNDINGS

The question: How much would you be willing to pay each year in additional taxes earmarked to improve our natural surroundings—a small amount such as $10 or less, a moderate amount such as $50, or a large amount such as $100 or more?

	In percent						Number of interviews
	Small amount	Moderate amount	Large amount	None	Don't know	Total	
National results	51	18	4	9	18	100	1,503
By sex:							
Men	49	21	6	9	15	100	744
Women	53	16	2	9	20	100	759
By age:							
21 to 34 years	53	25	5	5	12	100	403
35 to 49 years	52	20	3	8	17	100	476
50 years and older	49	13	4	12	22	100	605
Undesignated—19							
By education:							
College	45	30	12	5	8	100	395
High school	52	20	2	9	17	100	748
Grade school	54	6	1	12	27	100	352
Undesignated—8							
By annual family income:							
$10,000 and over	45	28	10	6	11	100	449
$7,000 to $9,999	52	20	3	10	15	100	336
$5,000 to $6,999	59	15	2	8	16	100	237
Under $5,000	52	10	1	11	26	100	463
Undesignated—18							
By size of community:							
1,000,000 and over	52	19	5	4	20	100	277
250,000 to 999,999	43	28	6	8	15	100	296
50,000 to 249,999	53	16	2	12	17	100	235
2,500 to 49,999	49	18	4	12	17	100	233
Under 2,500	56	13	2	9	20	100	462
By region of country:							
East	49	17	6	9	19	100	425
Midwest	56	19	3	11	11	100	400
South	51	15	3	6	25	100	428
West	47	24	3	9	17	100	250

THE MOST PRESSING ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEM

The question: In this country, which one of these (Respondent shown card) do you think is the most pressing problem connected with our natural surroundings?

[In percent]

	National results	By sex		By age		
		Men	Women	21 to 34 years	35 to 49 years	50 years and older
Air pollution	36	33	40	42	39	31
Water pollution	32	36	27	32	32	31
Pesticides (chemicals used to kill insects)	7	6	8	3	6	11
Preservation of open green spaces	6	4	7	7	7	4
Wildlife preservation (birds and animals)	5	6	4	6	4	5
Soil erosion	4	6	3	2	3	6
Don't know	10	9	11	8	9	12
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of interviews	1,503	744	759	403	476	605

Note: Undesignated, 19.

The question: In this country, which one of these (Respondent shown card) do you think is the most pressing problem connected with our natural surroundings?

[In percent]

	By education			By annual family income			
	College	High school	Grade school	$10,000 and over	$7,000 to $9,999	$5,000 to $6,999	Under $5,000
Air pollution	40	39	29	42	42	36	28
Water pollution	34	31	31	32	32	33	30
Pesticides (chemicals used to kill insects)	5	8	7	6	7	6	8
Preservation of open green spaces	8	5	4	9	5	5	3
Wildlife preservation (birds and animals)	4	5	7	3	5	7	7
Soil erosion	3	4	5	3	1	5	7
Don't know	6	8	17	5	8	8	17
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of interviews	(395)	(748)	(352)	(449)	(336)	(237)	(463)
Undesignated	8			18			

The question: In this country, which one of these (Respondent shown card) do you think is the most pressing problem connected with our natural surroundings?

	By size of community					By region of country			
	1,000,000 and over	250,000 to 999,999	50,000 to 249,999	2,500 to 49,999	Under 2,500	East	Midwest	South	West
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Air pollution	55	41	41	29	23	43	34	26	47
Water pollution	22	33	32	34	34	31	38	30	24
Pesticides (chemicals used to kill insects)	6	5	5	8	10	5	6	10	6
Preservation of open green spaces	6	5	5	8	6	6	5	6	6
Wildlife preservation (birds and animals)	1	3	3	6	10	3	5	7	6
Soil erosion	2	4	4	4	5	2	4	6	5
Don't know	8	9	10	11	12	10	8	15	6
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of interviews	277	296	235	233	462	425	400	428	250

What public would do to correct environmental problems

Following the question reported on the immediately preceding pages under the heading: "The Most Pressing Environmental Problem," those interviewed were asked the following question with respect to the problem chosen as most pressing:

In your opinion what can be done to correct this problem?

The following tables summarize replies:

Air pollution

	Percent
Find way to control auto exhaust	24
Control of chemical and industrial wastes	17
Provide filters, smoke control devices	16
Enforce present laws or pass new legislation	10
Careful study, research	7
Do away with gasoline engine	6
Control burning of rubbish or garbage	3
Move industry to the suburbs	2
Educate the public	1
Other answers	3
Don't know	31
Total [1]	120

Number of interviews: 538.

Verbatim examples of answers concerning what might be done to prevent air pollution include:

"More federal money put into this problem."

"Get in a specialist and see what he could do to get it corrected."

"Move some of the industry to the suburbs instead of in the city."

"Maybe if they would take some of these chemical places way out."

"If there was some way they could control filtering and doing away with gases if possible."

"Education of the general public. Tax according to displacement of the engine instead of weight of cars. Industry tax rebate to encourage new equipment."

"Stricter control and very heavy fines on offenders—especially large corporations."

"Industry's the guiltiest. Open burning should be stopped by individuals. Perhaps a control center could tell us proper air currents to burn in."

"Quit burning old cars—put things on cars to stop the gas pollution."

"I wonder if they couldn't have an airplane go over and fumigate everyplace."

"Get after those technical facilities that cause this in cities primarily."

"Leave it up to some government official with that knowledge."

"Apply the same sort of policy here as has been applied to problems of national defense—sponsored research, an educational element."

"Let the government get more involved in finding the solutions."

"Through the federal government—by spending money. Make a study of it."

"The present laws regarding air pollution should be enforced."

"I think it's pretty much up to the state to make and enforce legislation to take care of it. Make whoever is causing this to pay out of the pocket for whatever they're contributing. Each one should take care of whatever he's causing."

"Electric cars for less pollution."

"Hurry up and put on the market new cars that go gasless; no pollution from cars would help."

"They talk about these new cars which wouldn't have much exhaust. That would be one thing. I've also heard that industry could do something different if they wanted to."

"Really I think the auto manufacturers must do something about it. We'll have to pay dearly for it. It's up to the auto makers."

"Find means of eliminating the poisons going up in the air, like burning garbage, gasoline fumes."

"Get rid of cars and do something about airplane fumes."

"Take care of the earth first and the moon second."

---

[1] Total exceeds 100% due to multiple responses.

"We'll probably have to start putting factories way out into the suburban areas. Not allow new buildings that would pollute air to build in cities."

"New highways to eliminate truck traffic in communities."

"Start new cities where there is land."

"Close down places which do not make an honest effort to correct air pollution."

"Educate people not to pollute and respect all forms of anti-pollution requests."

"Cut out all the automobiles and go back to horses and buggies."

"More chemical research to eliminate byproducts of the combustion process."

"Stopping or doing away with carbon monoxide gas in cars."

"Be more careful the way they use chemicals and gases and what you have that creates all this."

"They should find out something about it. The automobiles and the sewage is terrible."

The question: *In your opinion what can be done to correct this problem?*

Water pollution

	Percent
Stop industrial pollution	26
Enforce present laws, pass new legislation	23
Keep sewage out of water	12
Individuals should be more careful	8
Careful study, research	5
Sewage conversion plants	5
Educate the public	3
Chemically purify the water	3
Use filters	2
Other answers	2
Don't know	27
Total[1]	116

[1] Total exceeds 100 percent due to multiple responses.

Number of interviews: 475.

Verbatim examples of answers concerning what might be done to prevent water pollution include:

"Every city and town should have sewage conversion plants; also laws for factories to quit dumping in rivers."

"Find another way to get rid of the scraps from the factories."

"Correct industrial waste being dumped into rivers and lakes. Also educate the farmers to take care of streams—insecticides and so forth are allowed to enter them."

"A lot taken out of sea water so that it can be used for drinking—a substitute."

"Watch fertilizer and application of herbicides and pesticides getting into our water supply."

"The only thing I know is to spend a lot of money to try to clean up the rivers and the streams and then restrict the use of them."

"Putting responsibility to the ones who are polluting it."

"Well all they do is spend money! The factories should clean up their mess and use different soap—no detergent."

"They should do something to keep people from throwing things in the water, and companies dumping junk in it."

"Quit dumping all these sewers in the streams."

"Give industry tax incentive to reduce the amount of pollution dumped into streams and force cities and towns to cease dumping raw sewage into streams."

"We need to get on to all our big local plants as they are polluting our streams."

"Stop throwing garbage in water—especially factory wastes. Should be treated. Government should induce, not force, responsible parties."

"Stricter law enforcement as to things put into the water by factories, including the packing houses."

"Big plants should not dump waste in water we have to use."

"Start on largest amount—industrial pollution—and reduce it 50%. That's what's killing all the fish."

"Put medicine in the water—chemicals."

"Clean up areas that drain into main river. Stricter enforcement of litter laws."

"All government involved should bear down on those polluting our waters."

"Just have better laws."

"Quite a bit. Complicated, takes a lot of money. Government control. Federal industry could help."

"That would have to be attacked on many fronts. Stricter policing. Well, those persons that are responsible for water pollution will have to be pulled up on a shorter leash."

"Get after the industries and have more control on the state level. Have the state control it."

"To use more of our tax money for this purpose rather than war. Clamp down on large corporations who pollute waters."

"Put teeth in the law; increase fines to be stiff enough so that people won't throw waste and garbage in the water."

"Do like Sioux City has done—build the sewage disposal plant. These small towns in Iowa are the big offenders."

"More educational programs to direct the people."

"Experts are paid to do this."

"Curb industry's use of it or make them clean it up. Sewer facilities—improve the private facilities; some of them are inadequate."

"Have a committee and deeply look into the situation and correct it."

The question: *In your opinion what can be done to correct this problem?*

Soil erosion

	Percent
Plant or maintain vegetation	27
Proper agriculture methods	14
Have government sponsored program	11
Research, new methods to retain soil	7
Other answers	8
Don't know	37
Total[1]	104

[1] Total exceeds 100% due to multiple responses.

Number of interviews: 74.

Verbatim examples of answers concerning what might be done to prevent soil erosion include:

"Let the soil conservation people and the county take care of the job."

"Plant grass, trees, shrubs to hold soil."

"Starting with the soil—keep it in good condition and other things will be helped."

"Work on this more than they have before."

"Keep the land planted. Sow or plant trees."

"Leave more of our hilly land covered with grass or trees."

"Plant more pastures."

"Not give raises to public officials and use it for conservation."

"Sponsor a program to help make the land richer and more fertile."

"Build levees or such every so often to keep soil from washing away."

"You would have to control all streams that overflow and do damage. Proper planting of vegetation to control the runoff."

"I think problems such as these are best taken care of by following recommendations of a good agriculture college."

"People have to learn to take care of property."

"I work with soil conservation, erosion control—dam the creeks, contour plowing, cover crops."

"Sowing grass and legumes."

The question: *In your opinion what can be done to correct this problem?*

Wildlife preservation

	Percent
Enforce game laws	40
Reduce hunting	25
Establish wildlife reserves, parks	20
Control air and water pollution	7
Other answers	9
Don't know	16
Total[1]	117

[1] Total exceeds 100% due to multiple responses.

Number of interviews: 76.

Verbatim examples of answers concerning what might be done to preserve wildlife include:

"Doing a pretty good job. Growing population causes loss of birds and animals. Better hunting controls and better park control—danger of unbalancing nature at present time."

"Stricter enforcement of game laws. Control over snowmobiles."

"Enforce the laws such as hunting and fishing."

"Make sure game wardens enforce the law like they should."

"More enforcement of present laws."

"Keep areas for this purpose. Have wildlife reserves wherever possible."

"Development of areas, such as game preserves."

"Cut down on hunting and amount of tags issued. Control fishing and have more reserves, more national parks."

"Set aside more places for preservation of wildlife which is becoming scarce."

"Shorter hunting season."

"Be more careful—not to kill too many."

"We can prevent forest fires."

"The big industry leased all the land, so we have no wildlife to enjoy. Stop this."

The question: *In your opinion what can be done to correct this problem?*

Preservation of open green spaces

	Percent
Set aside land for parks, forests	31
Better zoning	31
Limit the spread of commercialization	11
Other answers	4
Don't know	30
Total[1]	107

[1] Total exceeds 100% due to multiple responses.

Number of interviews: 83.

Verbatim examples of answers concerning what might be done to preserve open green spaces include:

"They should set aside more government property for national parks for people to enjoy the outdoors."

"More land for parks, etc."

"More state and federal parks and reservations maintained."

"More sewage treatment, better treatment plants, more national forests."

"Could give us more parks for more outdoors."

"Create more parks and plant more trees. I miss the forest we had in Germany."

"Don't ruin the countryside by building large throughways. Better government control of scenic areas. Don't allow commercialization of them and keep them open for all citizens to enjoy."

"Should be some type of control for these junk heaps, billboards, and the ruination in areas by industry and by waste."

"Better planning, better zoning."

"Limit housing developments and construction and better maintenance of it."

"Limit population."

"Laws are restricted. Pass legislation for parks and for wildlife reserves. Air and water pollution are also very important. Limit expansion of cities and making parks and so forth."

"Zoning."

The question: *In your opinion what can be done to correct this problem?*

Pesticides	*Percent*
Use different, improved pesticides	26
Government controls, laws	18
Use with discretion	14
Stop using pesticides	7
Other answers	6
Don't know	31
Total[1]	102

[1] Total exceeds 100% due to multiple responses.

Number of interviews: 112.

Verbatim examples of answers concerning what might be done to prevent the harmful effects of pesticides include:

"Stronger government controls over pesticides. I don't use it on this piece of property. I'm a bird feeder."

"They should put a restriction on home owners using pesticides. Government controlled."

"Laws to control use of sprays and content of chemicals such as DDT."

"Programs for eradication by the Department of Agriculture."

"They are not labeled right. They are deadly if not used right. They are improperly advertised and used excessively. The government should regulate usage."

"The person who uses pesticides should try to understand the uses and danger of these. Read directions and use carefully."

"Be careful of the kinds used, so there is no harm to people and our foods."

"Stop using it."

"The sprays and the fertilizers wash into the rivers and kill the fish. It's overdone entirely. Go back to good old manure for fertilizing."

"Use some space money maybe for better sprays and powders."

"Use liquids rather than dust—won't spread so."

"Try to find other ways to eliminate pests."

"Correct pesticides by spraying and dusting."

WILL IT BE NECESSARY TO LIMIT HUMAN POPULATION?

The question: It has been said that it will, at some time, be necessary to limit the human population (number of people) if our present living standards are to be maintained. Do you think this will be necessary or not?

	Percent				
	Necessary	Not necessary	Don't know	Total	Number of interviews
National results	44	43	13	100	(1, 503)
By sex:					
Men	47	42	11	100	(744)
Women	41	45	14	100	(759)
By age:					
21 to 34 years	55	37	8	100	(403)
35 to 49 years	44	43	13	100	(476)
50 years and older	36	48	16	100	(605)
Undesignated, 19					
By education:					
College	60	34	6	100	(395)
High school	45	44	11	100	(748)
Grade school	29	51	20	100	(352)
Undesignated, 8					
By annual family income:					
$10,000 and over	53	38	9	100	(449)
$7,000 to $9,999	52	39	9	100	(336)
$5,000 to $6,999	41	45	14	100	(237)
Under $5,000	32	50	18	100	(463)
Undesignated, 18:					
By size of community:					
1,000,000 and over	50	36	14	100	(277)
250,000 to 999,999	48	40	12	100	(296)
50,000 to 249,999	43	46	11	100	(235)
2,500 to 49,999	42	47	11	100	(233)
Under 2,500	38	47	15	100	(462)
By region of country:					
East	45	39	16	100	(425)
Midwest	44	47	9	100	(400)
South	36	47	17	100	(428)
West	54	39	7	100	(250)

AREAS THOUGHT TO BE MOST PLEASANT AS A PLACE TO LIVE

The question: Which of these kinds of places (respondent shown card) would you find most pleasant as a place to live?

		By sex		By age		
	National results (percent)	Men (percent)	Women (percent)	21 to 34 years (percent)	35 to 49 years (percent)	50 years and older (percent)
Rural area	30	30	30	27	32	30
Small city	25	24	27	20	22	31
Suburbs	18	17	19	16	22	17
Mountains	15	17	12	20	15	11
Seashore	9	10	9	11	11	6
Large city	6	5	7	8	4	6
Other	1	(1)	1	1	(1)	1
Don't know	1	1	1	2	1	1
Total[2]	105	104	106	105	107	103
Number of interviews	(1, 503)	(744)	(759)	(403)	(476)	(605)

[1] Less than one-half of 1 percent.

[2] Totals exceed 100 percent since a few respondents named more than one area.

The question: Which of these kinds of places (respondent shown card) would you find most pleasant as a place to live?

[In percent]

	By education			By annual family income			
	College	High school	Grade school	$10,000 and over	$7,000 to $9,999	$5,000 to $6,999	Under $5,000
Rural area	20	31	36	23	31	32	32
Small city	24	24	29	22	24	23	30
Suburbs	18	20	14	23	19	14	16
Mountains	15	15	14	16	15	17	12
Seashore	19	8	3	17	7	9	5
Large city	9	5	6	6	8	6	6
Other	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
Don't know	1	2	1	1	2	1	1
Total[1]	107	106	103	109	106	103	103
Number of interviews	395	748	352	449	336	237	463
Undesignated		8			18		

[1] Totals exceed 100 percent since a few respondents named more than 1 area.

The question: Which of these kinds of places (respondent shown card) would you find most pleasant as a place to live?

[In percent]

	By size of community					By region of country			
	1,000,000 and over	250,000 to 999,999	50,000 to 249,999	2,500 to 49,999	Under 2,500	East	Midwest	South	West
Rural area	13	14	16	20	64	23	33	39	20
Small city	22	21	35	44	16	16	30	27	32
Suburbs	28	27	22	11	8	27	17	14	10
Mountains	14	13	15	16	15	14	11	14	24
Seashore	13	15	11	8	3	13	7	8	9
Large city	13	13	4	2	1	9	6	5	4
Other	1	1	1	(1)	(1)	(1)	1	0	1
Don't know	3	1	1	(1)	1	2	0	1	3
Total [2]	107	105	105	101	108	104	105	108	103
Number of interviews	277	296	235	233	462	425	400	428	250

[1] Less than half of 1 percent.

[2] Totals exceed 100 percent since a few respondents named more than 1 area.

SHOULD MORE PUBLIC LAND BE SET ASIDE FOR CONSERVATION PURPOSES?

The question: Are you in favor of setting aside more public land for conservation purposes such as national parks, wildlife refuges, bird sanctuaries, and so forth, or not?

	Yes Percent	No Percent	Don't know Percent	Total Percent	Number of interviews
National results	75	19	6	100	1,503
By sex:					
Men	76	19	5	100	744
Women	74	19	7	100	759
By age:					
21 to 34 years	83	13	4	100	403
35 to 49 years	76	18	6	100	476
50 years and older	69	24	7	100	605
Undesignated: 19					
By education:					
College	82	15	3	100	395
High school	78	18	4	100	748
Grade school	64	26	10	100	352
Undesignated: 8.					

	Yes Percent	No Percent	Don't know Percent	Total Percent	Number of interviews
By annual family income:					
$10,000 and over	81	16	3	100	449
$7,000 to $9,999	81	15	4	100	336
$5,000 to $6,999	75	18	7	100	237
Under $5,000	66	25	9	100	463
Undesignated: 18.					
By size of community:					
1,000,000 and over	79	15	6	100	277
250,000 to 999,999	78	17	5	100	296
50,000 to 249,999	80	16	4	100	235
2,500 to 49,999	78	19	3	100	233
Under 2,500	66	25	9	100	462
By region of country:					
East	82	12	6	100	425
Midwest	76	20	4	100	400
South	68	24	8	100	428
West	75	21	4	100	250

TECHNICAL APPENDICES

Composition of the sample

NATIONAL

Sex of respondent:	Percent
Men	46.6
Women	53.4
Total	100.0
Age of respondent:	
21 to 34 years	27.6
35 to 49 years	32.2
50 years and older	39.2
Undesignated	1.0
Total	100.0
Education of respondent:	
College (complete and incomplete)	22.5
High school (complete and incomplete)	50.5
Grade school or no schooling	26.8
Undesignated	.2
Total	100.0
Annual family income:	
$10,000 and over	27.4
$7,000 to $9,999	22.5
$5,000 to $6,999	16.1
$3,000 to $4,999	13.2
Under $3,000	19.5
Undesignated	1.3
Total	100.0
Size of community:	
1,000,000 and over, including urban fringe	19.3
250,000 to 999,999, including urban fringe	20.1
50,000 to 249,000, including urban fringe	15.8
2,500 to 49,999	15.0
Under 2,500	29.8
Total	100.0

REGION OF COUNTRY

East: Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Vermont, Massachusetts New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia	29.6
Midwest: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri	26.8
South: Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana	27.3
West: Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Nevada, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, California, Washington, Oregon, Alaska, Hawaii	16.3
Total	100.0

NOTE.—Allowance for persons not at home was made by means of a "times-at-home" technique rather than by "call-backs." Either procedure is a standard method for reducing the sample bias that would otherwise result from under-representation in the sample of persons who are difficult to find at home. All results reported including the composition of the sample are based on data in which a "times-at-home" weighting has been incorporated. The actual number of interviews made for various population groups are reported in the findings.

DESIGN OF THE SAMPLE

The design of the sample is that of a replicated probability sample down to the block level in the case of urban areas, and to segments of townships in the case of rural areas.

After stratifying the nation geographically and by size of community in order to insure conformity of the sample with the latest available estimate of the Census Bureau of the distribution of the adult population, sampling locations or areas were selected on a strictly random basis. The interviewers had no choice whatsoever concerning the part of the city or county in which they conducted their interviews.

Interviewers were given maps of the area to which they were assigned, with a starting point indicated, and required to follow a specified direction. At each occupied dwelling unit, interviewers were instructed to select respondents by following a prescribed systematic method and by a male-female assignment. This procedure was followed until the assigned number of interviews was completed.

Since this sampling procedure is designed to produce a sample which approximates the adult civilian population (21 and older) living in private households in the United States (that is, excluding those in prisons and hospitals, hotels, religious and educational institutions, and on military reservations), the survey results can be applied to this population for the purpose of projecting percentages into number of people. The manner in which the sample is drawn also produces a sample which approximates the population of private households in the United States. Therefore, survey results can also be projected in terms of number of households when appropriate.

SAMPLING TOLERANCES

In interpreting survey results, it should be borne in mind that all sample surveys are subject to sampling error, that is, the extent to which the results may differ from what would be obtained if the whole population surveyed had been interviewed. The size of such sampling errors depends largely on the number of interviews.

The following tables may be used in estimating the sampling error of any percentage in this report. The computed allowances have taken into account the effect of the sample design upon sampling error. They may be interpreted as indicating the range (plus or minus the figure shown) within which the results of repeated samplings in the same time period could be expected to vary, 95 per cent of the time, assuming the same sampling procedure, the same interviewers, and the same questionnaire.

The first table shows how much allowance should be made for the sampling error of a percentage:

RECOMMENDED ALLOWANCE FOR SAMPLING ERROR OF A PERCENTAGE

[In percentage points (at 95 in 100 confidence level)] [1]

	Sample size						
	1,500	1,000	750	600	400	200	100
Percentages near 10	2	2	3	3	4	5	7
Percentages near 20	2	3	4	4	5	7	9
Percentages near 30	3	4	4	4	6	8	10
Percentages near 40	3	4	4	5	6	8	11
Percentages near 50	3	4	4	5	6	8	11
Percentages near 60	3	4	4	5	6	8	11
Percentages near 70	3	4	4	4	6	8	10
Percentages near 80	2	3	4	4	5	7	9
Percentages near 90	2	2	3	3	4	5	7

[1] The chances are 95 in 100 that the sampling error is not larger than the figures shown.

The table would be used in the following manner: Let us say a reported percentage is 33 for a group which includes 1500 respondents. Then we go to row "percentages near 30" in the table and go across to the column headed "1500." The number at this point is 3, which means that the 33 percent obtained in the sample is subject to a sampling error of plus or minus 3 points. Another way of saying it is that very probably (95 chances out of 100) the average of repeated samplings would be somewhere between 30 and 36, with the most likely figure the 33 obtained.

In comparing survey results in two samples, such as, for example, men and women, the question arises as to how large must a difference between them be before one can be reasonably sure that it reflects a real difference. In the tables below, the number of points which must be allowed for in such comparisons is indicated.

Two tables are provided. One is for percentages near 20 or 80; the other for percentages near 50. For percentages in between, the error to be allowed for is between that shown in the two tables:

RECOMMENDED ALLOWANCE FOR SAMPLING ERROR OF THE DIFFERENCE

[In percentage points (at 95 in 100 confidence level)] [1]

TABLE A.—PERCENTAGES NEAR 20 OR PERCENTAGES NEAR 80

	Size of sample			
	750	600	400	200
Size of sample:				
750	5			
600	5	6		
400	6	6	7	
200	8	8	8	10

TABLE B.—PERCENTAGES NEAR 50

	Size of sample			
	750	600	400	200
Size of sample:				
750	6			
600	7	7		
400	7	8	8	
200	10	10	10	12

[1] The chances are 95 in 100 that the sampling error is not larger than the figures shown.

Here is an example of how the tables would be used: Let us say that 50 per cent of men respond a certain way and 40 per cent of women respond that way also, for a difference of 10 percentage points between them. Can we say with any assurance that the 10-point difference reflects a real difference between men and women on the question? The sample contains approximately 750 men and 750 women.

Since the percentages are near 50, we consult Table B, and since the two samples are about 750 persons each, we look for the number in the column headed "750" which is also in the row designated "750." We find the number 6 here. This means that the allowance for error should be 6 points, and that in concluding that the percentage among men is somewhere between 4 and 16 points higher than the percentage among women we should be wrong only about 5 per cent of the time. In other words, we can conclude with considerable confidence that a difference exists in the direction observed and that it amounts to at least 4 percentage points.

If, in another case, men's responses amount to 22 per cent, say, and women's 24 per cent, we consult Table A because these percentages are near 20. We look in the column headed "750" and see that the number is 5. Obviously, then, the 2-point difference is inconclusive.

LAKE ERIE

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to give my very strong support to the amendments proposed by the gentlemen from Illinois. This amendment parallels very closely the legislation which I introduced last year. The problems of pollution in the Great Lakes have been one of my central concerns since I came to the Congress. I have been in continuous contact with the Corps of Engineers, demanding that the dumping of polluted materials into Lake Erie be halted at once. Although the responses I received from the Corps of Engineers, have been polite and they have assured me of their willingness to "cooperate whenever possible," the dumping of polluted material has not stopped. Apparently assurances of good will have little effect on final policy.

I very strongly feel that the Congress must take affirmative action now. After years of attempting to halt the dumping of polluted materials through persuasion, it appears that only forceful legislation can correct the problem.

Certainly Lake Erie is among the most seriously polluted bodies of water in the world today. What was once a tremendous fishing ground is now nearly devoid of fish life. What were once beautiful beaches have now been taken over by slime and refuse and grassy growths. There has been talk about the problem for years, both here in the Halls of Congress and in hundreds of meetings in the Lake Erie States. The time for talk is over. The time for action is now. We cannot afford to wait until Lake Erie deteriorates any further. We cannot afford to wait until the pollution levels in the other Great Lakes reach the deplorable level of Lake Erie.

There is simply no excuse for the Government to willfully participate in the further pollution of the Great Lakes. In 1967, more than 5.5 million cubic yards of dredged, polluted materials were dumped in Lake Erie by the Government or by private firms under Government contract. That amount increased in 1968. We cannot tolerate a situation by which the Government continually ignores the best interests of the Nation and the national commitment to halt water pollution.

It would be two-faced for this Congress to impose strict regulations and responsibilities on private firms polluting our waters while refusing to accept equal responsibility for Government actions.

The stoppage of Government dumping of dredged materials will not, of course, solve the entire problem. But it will be a significant step in the right direction. It will illustrate for once and for all that there is a national commitment to clean up our waters.

Clean water is essential to continued growth and well-being of the Nation. There has never been a better opportunity for the Congress to recognize the responsibility for assuring that future.

I support this amendment and I urge the Congress to approve it.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S BUDGET: MORE OF THE SAME

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, after 3 months of waiting, Congress has at last been given a glimpse of President Nixon's recommended budget priorities for the coming fiscal year. The priorities embodied in the revised fiscal year 1970 budget leave little doubt that the Nixon administration has no plans for effecting the drastic reordering of our national priorities that is so urgently needed. Rather, the President's message indicates the administration intends to pursue a status quo course that continues to allocate billions to the Pentagon and economizes on already inadequate domestic programs.

The President's revised budget provides no relief for the millions of Americans now suffering from poverty and inadequate employment, housing and educational opportunities; indeed, the President's recommendations provide no relief for those most affected by inflation—the aged and others dependent on fixed payments and benefits. In fact, the President's budget proposes to take away from the elderly $1 billion in social security benefits. President Johnson's fiscal year 1970 budget had proposed a 10-percent across-the-board increase in social security benefits, effective January 1, 1970. The Nixon administration's budget reduces the increase to 7 percent effective February 1, 1970.

While President Nixon has recommended a significant reduction in the rise in social security payments proposed by the Johnson administration, reductions in the Pentagon's budget are scant and illusory. In the face of cuts in nearly every domestic program, the Nixon administration's budget, nevertheless, calls for an increase in non-Vietnam military spending of about $6 billion.

As economists have pointed out, the greatest cause of our inflationary problems is increased military spending. Yet, the revised budget totally ignores that fact. Instead the administration has decided to economize on domestic programs, and concurrently, to pour more billions in non-Vietnam expenditures into the coffers of the military-industrial complex. The budget recommendations will only aggravate the crisis in the cities and, additionally, will fail to curb the inflation which will only be significantly reduced by the prompt termination of the war in Vietnam and large cuts in military spending.

I want to call my colleagues' attention to a column by Joseph Kraft which appeared in the Washington Post of April 15. Mr. Kraft's cogent analysis of the real effects of President Nixon's budgetary proposals emphasizes the need for Congress independently to fashion a budget which gives first priority to our domestic needs, and which attacks inflation at its real course, namely, increased military spending. Congress should take seriously its own responsibility to establish budgetary priorities that reflect our urgent domestic crisis:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1969]

GOP NO BETTER THAN JOHNSON AT CURBING DEFENSE SPENDING

(By Joseph Kraft)

Hard-nosed anti-inflationary Republican skinflints turn out to be no better at controlling defense spending than the unbuttoned loose livers of the Johnson Administration. That is the basic message of the revised 1970 budget now being submitted to the Congress by the Nixon Administration.

Accordingly, even sophisticated men with an aversion to the indiscriminate must now consider the possibility that the only way to control defense spending is through the favorite crudity of the Congressional conservatives. That is by putting an arbitrary ceiling on defense spending for next year.

The Nixon budgetary revisions offer a particularly good measure of just how monstrous the defense spending monster really is. For it is possible to compart directly cuts made in nondefense projects as against cuts made in military spending.

On the non-defense side, the Nixon Administration has recommended cuts of $2.9 billion—which is nearly three times what is coming out of the defense hide. Moreover, some of the non-defense cuts raise serious questions of equity, while others raise political risks.

Old people, for example, are probably the principal victims of the inflation the present budgetary cuts are supposed to arrest. But one of the major cuts now recommended comes from a reduction in the scheduled rise in Social Security payments.

Substantial reductions are also recommended for the Departments of Agriculture and Transportation. These cuts will adversely affect two of the most potent political forces in the country—the farmers and the road-builders.

Set against the suggested cuts in non-defense spending, the effort to make economies in the military field is pathetic. A little less than half the $1.1 billion cut recommended in military expenses is real. The biggest chunk—an estimated $600 million—comes from a reduction in B–52 sorties flown in Vietnam that will be very difficult to sustain.

Left intact in the defense budget are a vast range of dubious expenditures that were in fact sharply questioned by the Budget Bureau in the course of the most recent review of military spending. Billions, for example, are spent on diesel submarines that do not serve to meet any conceivable threat, and on fighter planes that come at several million dollars apiece whereas the Soviet planes they would presumably oppose cost about $800,000 each.

The upshot of this unsavings program can perhaps best be felt when Vietnamese costs are abstracted from military spending. For while reductions are being made in Vietnamese spending, and virtually everything else in the budget is either being held or reduced, non-Vietnamese defense spending will go up this year—by nearly $6 billion.

It would be nice to think that there are available good, sophisticated ways to control the defense budget that the Nixon Administration would apply in time. But it is not easy to see Defense Secretary Melvin Laird using those tools. On the contrary, he seems bent on currying favor with the military brass, and in whittling down the clout of the civilian skeptics in the offices of Systems Analysis and International Security Affairs.

Neither is there any sign that the White House has the stomach for a confrontation on military spending. And without White House backing, the Bureau of the Budget, with all due respect, is not potent.

If a leash is going to be applied, it will have to be done by the Congress. For practical purposes that means an alliance between the liberals who want to cut defense spending to get funds for domestic purposes, and the conservatives who oppose virtually all government spending.

It just happens that the conservatives have invented a device for chopping expenditures. It is the device of the arbitrary ceiling, which was enforced against the Johnson Administration last year as the price for putting through the surtax by Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee, and Sen. John Williams, the Republican Scrooge from Delaware.

This year President Nixon has to go to the Congress for renewal of the surtax. And if they are serious about cutting defense, the liberals should be thinking hard about striking an alliance with the conservatives to make the Administration accept a flat ceiling on defense spending—a ceiling that might, appropriately, be set at pre-Vietnam levels.

A PROPOSED "WORKABLE ALTERNATIVE" IN VIETNAM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most clear-eyed assessments of where we stand in Vietnam that I have read in some time was a guest editorial in the March 22 Saturday Review. Author of the editorial was Arthur M. Cox, a writer, consultant, and former senior fellow at the Brookings Institution.

Mr. Cox weighed several possible means of bringing the conflict to an end. As a "workable alternative," he suggested a new interim government in Saigon that would include representatives of all major political factions, including the NLF. An international peacekeeping force would be an important part of such a plan, which would be complex and difficult to put into effect. As Mr. Cox acknowledged:

> This solution will undoubtedly require months of negotiations with frequent periods of doubt and frustration, but if we keep our eye on the objective of genuine self-determination it may be successfully achieved. Certainly the negotiation of such a solution is preferable to other choices such as another escalation of the war, or unilateral withdrawal, or the festering cancer of indefinite stalemate. This war cannot be solved by military victory; it must be ended by political compromise.

Following is the complete editorial:

IS PEACE IN VIETNAM POSSIBLE?

(By Arthur M. Cox)

There will be no peace in Vietnam unless the U.S. jettisons the unwarranted optimism that has characterized its policy up to now. There is still a possibility that the war can be ended by a settlement based on the principle of self-determination for which the U.S. has been fighting. But this can be done only if we grasp both horns of our dilemma. This means giving up the illusions of military victory and accepting the requirement for genuine political compromise. Such a political compromise can occur only if the Communist abandon their goal of forcible take-over, and only if we accept Communist representation in the Saigon government.

It is possible to envisage a settlement based on the principle of one man, one vote which the U.S. has always supported. The North Vietnamese and the Soviets favor a settlement based on the program of the National Liberation Front (NLF). That program calls for an election for the people in the territory of South Vietnam based on universal suffrage and secret ballot.

Unfortunately, our position has been ambiguous and inconsistent. While always professing that our presence in Vietnam was only for the purpose of ensuring self-determination, we nevertheless helped to draft a Constitution that excludes Communists from the political process. Article 4 of that Constitution says: "The Republic of Vietnam opposes Communism in any form. Every activity designed to publicize or carry out Communism is prohibited." When Thieu and Ky won an election in September 1967 by only 34 per cent without any opposition from the Communists, they were guaranteed power for four years under the terms of the Constitution. Last July in Honolulu, President Johnson added to U.S. backing when he endorsed President Thieu's plan for a settlement of the war which stated that "full participation in political activities will be offered to all those who abide by the Constitution of Vietnam." In other words, no Communists.

If there is to be a free election in Vietnam, the Constitution obviously will have to be amended or abandoned. It is just as obvious however, that Thieu and Ky are not about to negotiate themselves out of office. Their survival depends on a continuation of the war. So long as the Saigon government is armed with a veto, a negotiated settlement is almost inconceivable.

At one time our powerful influence could probably have inspired the formation of a more representative government in Saigon, but we supported Thieu and Ky, at least partly, because we had decided to try to win the war. Our policy-makers believed that the militantly anti-Communist junta could pursue the objective of defeating the enemy more single-mindedly and efficiently than a government which included men who might support an accommodation with the Communists. Now we have given up the objective of military victory, but our ties to Thieu and Ky make the alternative of political compromise much more difficult to achieve.

The two-track theory advanced by Henry Kissinger will not solve this problem. Mr. Kissinger has suggested that a withdrawal of forces be negotiated between the U.S. and North Vietnam, while a political settlement in Saigon is worked out between the NLF and Thieu and Ky. This will not work because the objectives of the NLF and those of Thieu and Ky are absolutely incompatible. Also, unless the withdrawal of U.S. troops is directly tied to a political solution the main bargaining leverage with the Communists will be lost.

There is no way to straddle this dilemma. Either we opt for a negotiated settlement that provides sufficient compromise so that a genuinely free election can be held, or we continue to back Thieu and Ky, recognizing, as we must, that such a decision means a continuation of the war.

Former White House adviser McGeorge Bundy has presented a plan which represents the thinking of those who are unwilling to accept Communist participation in the government in Saigon. In essence, Mr. Bundy has suggested the gradual reduction of U.S. forces at a rate of 100,000 to 150,000 men a year with an annual saving of $5 billion to $8 billion. At the end of three or four years, assuming that negotiations had failed to bring satisfactory results, we would have a small permanent force of around 100,000 that, according to Mr. Bundy, would, with a strengthened South Vietnamese Army, be sufficient to prevent Communist take-over.

An appealing feature of Bundy's plan is that the draft would be gradually replaced with voluntary service. Volunteer soldiers would serve for longer periods than the present twelve-month limit, and would be rewarded with significantly increased pay and attractive veterans' benefits.

An argument can be made that, in any case, the presence of U.S. forces should be maintained indefinitely in Vietnam as a long-term deterrent against Chinese aggression and as an indication of our continuing determination to prevent the forcible overthrow of governments in Southeast Asia, such as Thailand. The American public has accepted the deployment of a substantial force of American troops in West Germany for more than twenty years as a guarantee of the U.S. commitment to the NATO shield protecting Western Europe from possible Soviet military aggression.

But the NATO force is not analogous to the force in Vietnam. There is no war in West Germany, where our troops live in peace and relative comfort. In South Vietnam, even if our troops were regrouped in enclaves surrounding the major cities and bases, they would be vulnerable to rocket and mortar fire, and would be subject to constant harassment and surprise attack with resultant casualties. Another important difference is that the West German government is strong and stable, supported by a booming economy, while the South Vietnamese government is weak and dependent upon the U.S. for its political and economic survival.

If the U.S. decided, as Bundy suggests, to maintain an indefinite presence in Vietnam with a greatly reduced force, the Communists, in time, probably would control most of the countryside, while the major cities would become almost totally dependent on U.S. supplies. The Saigon government would become even more corrupt and ineffective, with social rot and atrophy setting in as the South Vietnamese people became aware that they were living in an unending state of siege. This would be less costly than the present situation, but would still require many billions of dollars. The American public might accept it for two or three years, but as casualties and costs continued to pile up with no final solution in sight, it is difficult to imagine the U.S. Congress or the voters tolerating it for long. President Nixon, interested in a second term in office and the future of the Republican party, will be acutely aware of the political consequences of accepting an indefinite stalemate.

A better course would be to embrace a policy of negotiating a political compromise settled by genuine free elections. Such a policy would be dynamic and would capture the support of world opinion. The North Vietnamese might refuse to accept a solution providing sufficient assurance that free elections would actually take place, but the pressure both external and internal would be substantial. The presence of 540,000 American troops is a significant bargaining counter. Hanoi and the NLF should be made aware that our troops will be withdrawn only in return for a free election, and if that is not accepted, they should be aware that we will maintain a permanent presence as Bundy has suggested.

Though we started bombing North Vietnam when Soviet Premier Kosygin was in Hanoi, and though we rebuffed several Soviet attempts to start negotiations because they were predicated on a bombing halt, it may still be possible to obtain Soviet help for a negotiated settlement. This would probably have to develop in the broader context of U.S.-Soviet diplomacy including such matters as arms control and a Middle East settlement. If U.S.-Soviet relations improved the Soviets might use their influence in Hanoi. They are still supplying substantial military and economic assistance to North Vietnam. Also, the Soviets would like to see an end to the war, which would curb Chinese Communist ambitions.

We should have no illusions about the Chinese Communist position. They are on record as vigorously opposing any form of negotiated settlement. They want the war to continue until the U.S. has been forced to withdraw. The Chinese are delighted to have American troops committed on the mainland of Asia in a war of attrition which bleeds our economy and reduces our prestige. Thus, there is small prospect that the Chinese will participate, or even accept the results of any negotiated settlement.

The most difficult problem in the negotiations will not be the opposition of the Communist Chinese, but rather the problem of how to govern South Vietnam after a cease-fire and during the period leading to an election. A minimum of a year and probably more will be required while troops are being withdrawn and political forces are being organized to campaign for the election. There are several possible arrangements, none of them very satisfactory, which might be adopted to provide government during the pre-election period.

One approach would be the one adopted in the Geneva Accords of 1954. At that time the country was temporarily partitioned at the 17th parallel with the Communists moving north and French moving south, it being understood that an election would be held in two years to settle the matter.

If a new line were drawn in South Vietnam it would mean that the Saigon government would temporarily have to give up control of several important cities, and the Vietcong would have to give up its strongest bastion in the Mekong Delta.

Almost as unlikely would be a cease-fire and stand-fast with the territory held at the time of cease-fire occupied by the forces in place, and the incumbent regime remaining in power in Saigon. This is unlikely because so much of the territory is in contest marked like leopard spots by areas that are not contiguous and that are not firmly controlled by either side. It is also unlikely that the Communists would risk a cease-fire while Thieu and Ky are in power and in command of a large police force capable of influencing the course of the election campaign.

A more workable alternative would be the formation of a new interim government in Saigon with representatives from all major factions of South Vietnamese politics, including the NLF. Obviously this process will be extraordinarily complex involving the most difficult and patient diplomacy. Once the process has been started, however, the yeast of political action will be at work and those desiring accommodation on both sides will be strengthened, while those holding extreme positions will be weakened.

Any such process will require a substantial international peacekeeping force with more potent authority than was granted to the International Control Commissions established by the Geneva Accords. The peacekeeping force would observe and report on the withdrawal and demobilization of troops, and would also observe the implementation of the pre-election procedures and the actual conduct of the election itself.

This solution will undoubtedly require months of negotiations with frequent periods of doubt and frustration, but if we keep our eye on the objective of genuine self-determination it may be successfully achieved. Certainly the negotiation of such a solution is preferable to other choices such as another escalation of the war, or unilateral withdrawal or the festering cancer of indefinite stalemate. This war cannot be solved by military victory; it must be ended by political compromise.

RACE-SEX EDUCATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the mothers and dads of schoolchildren can expect a further innovation in sex education. Apparently their children are to be educated not to discriminate sexually because of race, creed, or national origin.

According to the reported discussions at the recent American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors annual conference we are to believe that many teenaged white female patients expressed interest in interracial sex to show their concern and atone for white guilt. Our poor brainwashed children.

What next will the antimorality crowd come up with? Perhaps a "civil rights" amendment to prevent legal marriage of any two people of the same race, religion, creed, or national origin. Sound impossible? Nothing is beyond the challenge from education these days.

I present the report on the "concern and guilt" of our race-sex attitudes which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star for April 13 to follow my remarks:

[From the Sunday Star, April 13, 1969]

CONCERN AND GUILT: RACE-SEX ATTITUDES SCORED

American attitudes toward interracial sex—and thus toward race itself—will never be fully understood until positive aspects of sexual attraction between races are more thoroughly examined.

That suggestion came yesterday from Dr. Gertrude Hunter, medical director of the nationwide Head Start program, as she led a free-wheeling "Sex and Racism" discussion at the American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors' annual conference here.

Dr. Hunter, a Negro, said black militant Eldridge Cleaver's recent writing on the black man as a "superbody" and the white man as an envious "supermind" turned her to one of the few scholarly studies on the topic, the late J. A. Rogers' three-volume "Sex and Race," published in 1940.

THE NEGATIVE APPROACH

"We go at this problem in the negative," Dr. Hunter said, referring to the Cleaver thesis that the black man seeks revenge against the white man by attracting the white woman.

Rogers, she said, indicated there may be more to interracial liaisons than just "getting even."

"He said the white man is attracted to black women but can't always acknowledge it," Dr. Hunter continued. "Is this just lust? Or is he afraid black women will reject him in favor of black men?"

Noting that white slaveholders apparently turned with some frequency to black women for their sexual outlets, Dr. Hunter suggested it was possible these men preferred black women, even though the relationships were admittedly less complicated than with white women. If so, she asked, why?

Stressing that she is not an expert in matters of sex and race, merely an intrigued and concerned citizen, she called for more research on why "the object of the most intense hatred in our society is the black man," and why such hatred is not directed at the black woman.

"We also have to look at what is motivating whites," she added. "Most of the analysis is from the viewpoint of blacks."

Her questions drew a wide variety of reactions from the predominantly white and female audience of about 75.

LEGACY OF SLAVERY

One black woman maintained that "sex is sex anywhere," and that feelings about interracial sex are rooted in economic problems and the legacy of slavery. This was vehemently denied by a young black man, while a middle-aged white man posed the theory that opposites attract ("Capt. John Smith and Pocahantas").

"Until we start to address ourselves to this question (of sex and race)," Dr. Hunter warned in conclusion, "we will not have come to a final answer to our current problem."

The extent of concern over interracial sex was illustrated by a white listener, who said a local psychiatrist had many teen-age white female patients who expressed interest in interracial sex to "show their concern" and atone for white guilt.

A young black man immediately retorted that the white psychiatrist had described his patients' problems in those terms rather than admit white girls could normally be attracted to black men. "We don't accept anything the white establishment says any more," the young man added.

The three-day conference, attended by some 1,000 sex education teachers, counselors, Planned Parenthood workers and others, concludes today at the Sheraton-Park Hotel.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, April 17, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I must work the works of Him that sent Me, while it is day.—John 9: 4.

God of our fathers and our God, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit that we may truly love Thee and worthily serve Thee this day.

May our hearts be with Thee as we seek solutions to the grave and global problems that confront us and our Nation.

In this dear land of our birth, help us to close ranks in a greater unity of spirit as principalities and powers without seek to destroy our heritage of freedom, with liberty and justice for all.

Make us great enough in spirit that we may be equal to every experience, ready for every responsibility, and adequate for every activity.

In the name of the Master Workman, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WE HAVE RUN OUT OF "OTHER CHEEKS"

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, North Korea, which was allowed to wallow in propaganda and self-glorification over the *Pueblo* incident, now has committed another act of war against the United States. There should be retaliation in kind. It should be immediate, and sufficiently drastic that there will be no further problems of this nature with North Korea. It is incomprehensible that we not be aroused when Americans are killed or tortured at will by irresponsible powers and U.S. planes and ships destroyed or captured. We took no action on the *Pueblo* except to prostrate ourselves before the world, and this undoubtedly has led to the assumption that similar acts can be committed at will. I would hope we have not reached this point. America must stand for something. We cannot continue to turn the other cheek. We have run out of cheeks to turn.

I trust that our country has reached the end of the line in patient acceptance of acts of warfare against us by Communist nations. The Red Chinese have charged that we do not have the courage to stand by our principles. Our enemies must not be permitted to be secure in the knowledge that hostile acts can be committed without forceful action from the United States to protect our own interests.

I have listened as one commentator after another has urged on the networks that there be no retribution against North Korea. No consideration was shown to the fact that Americans were shot down in cold blood, that the flag has again been fired upon, that these are acts of war pure and simple. To me it is sickening that there are those who publicly will urge this country to do nothing to protect its own interests. Surely they realize such a course is a deadend street. America must stand up for its flag, its people, its property. When this involves a retaliatory strike against the offenders, we must get on with it. That is now the case. Otherwise, we shall soon find ourselves stripped of pride at home and leadership in world affairs.

I am introducing a resolution which states in substance that it is the sense of Congress that armed protection should be provided for all manned U.S. intelligence-gathering planes and ships in danger areas. Neither the *Pueblo* nor the missing aircraft were afforded this protection, nor was an effort made to send help. Either condition is intolerable. Congress should express itself at least to this degree in an effort to insure a greater interest in the protection of the lives of our servicemen who are assigned on dangerous missions.

LIBERALIZING THE CHILD CARE PROVISIONS OF OUR TAX LAWS

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the deductibility of child-care expenses of working mothers require drastic change.

There are many women who want to work in order to supplement their family's income. In a period of inflation, many families desperately need such additional income. Yet our tax laws provide no deduction for child-care expenses to a family whose adjusted gross income exceeds $6,000.

I am introducing a bill today that completely removes any family income limitation. If a businessman is entitled to deduct expenses for wining and dining a customer, surely any working mother should be able to deduct the expenses for the care of her children.

In addition, my bill would increase the maximum deduction allowed from $600 to $800 for one child and from $900 to $1,200 for two or more children. This is a reasonable increase considering that the cost of living has risen 33 percent since 1954 when the original dollar limits were established.

I would venture to guess that any revenue loss resulting from my amendments would be offset by the revenue gain arising from additional income earned by working mothers. But more important, the tax amendments I propose would encourage women who want to work. Why should our tax laws continue to discourage them from seeking to better themselves and their family's living standards?

GOVERNOR MANDEL, OF MARYLAND, ADDRESSES INSTITUTE OF SCRAP IRON AND STEEL ON THE GROWING PROBLEM OF JUNKED AND ABANDONED CARS

(Mr. FRIEDEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include a speech by Governor Mandel.)

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I attended a breakfast this morning and had the pleasure of hearing the great Governor of Maryland make a very enlightening speech about the problems of junked automobiles and what adverse effects they have on our cities and States.

Governor Mandel's address covers this subject much more thoroughly than I could and I am sure it will be of great interest to all of my colleagues as well as to the Governors of other States and city and local officials who are faced with the same problems. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to include it at this point in the Record. Governor Mandel not only points out the problems, but offers some suggestions for solving them.

The address follows:

Remarks of Gov. Marvin Mandel, Before the Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Washington, D.C., April 17, 1969

No one single problem underlies the thousands of junked and abandoned cars on the streets of cities and on various plots of ground throughout the countryside.

Junked cars mean acres of land kept from more productive use. Junked cars mean an increasing problem in solid waste disposal. Junked cars mean that something has changed in the relationship between demand and supply for scrap. It means technological advances in the steel industry which no longer utilize number two scrap bundles to the same extent as before.

But above all else, it means a lack of research in the preparation of scrap to meet the new needs of the steel industry. For the citizens of our communities—in Maryland and in every other State across the Nation—junked cars mean an inefficient use of resources in the steel industry which result in higher priced and less consumer oriented products. They mean higher repair cost and less service.

During the last year we have tried to solve this growing problem in Maryland. This year, the bill introduced in the 1968 General Assembly and vetoed by my predecessor, Vice President Spiro T. Agnew, because a provision requiring scrap yards to accept every car brought to them might be unconstitutional, was amended to establish a program designed to curb the proliferation of junked and abandoned cars.

The program has two basic points:

(1) a $10 bounty would be paid to scrap processors for every car scrapped thereby raising the price of junked cars and encouraging their removal to the scrap processor.

(2) A $5 fine would be imposed on junk dealers who kept junked cars more than six months.

The responsibility assumed by State government in Maryland then is one of adding velocity to the scrap cycle. For some time the problems created by the supply of technologically unacceptable scrap and a changing demand by the steel industry for scrap have been partially solved by the private sector. The additional problem of aesthetics is being worked on at the Federal level.

But despite all these efforts—and despite the partially successful results across the Nation—

Cars continue to be abandoned at an increasing rate;

A huge inventory of stripped cars are awaiting processing across the country;

Shredding operations for reducing abandoned cars to their most technologically usable form are available in certain geographical areas only and at a high cost;

Air pollution problems present a considerable social cost to all persons.

But these dismal facts measure only some of the problems. They fail to reveal the fact that no workable method of supplying technologically useful scrap from the thousands of abandoned cars across the country has been achieved to meet the needs of the steel industry for scrap. It is not simply scrap that junked cars represent. They also are a unutilized resource until they can be adequately converted into a valuable resource. And this is especially serious because of the great numbers of autos in Maryland and in every State across the Nation.

By 1970 it is estimated that 86 million cars will be in use in the United States;

By 1970 at least 10.5 million cars will be produced in the United States;

By 1970 car scrappage is estimated at 8.5 million cars.

Clearly then, the main focus must be on providing for the effective disposal of junked and abandoned cars throughout the country. This task has not yet begun nationwide.

But Maryland has begun this task. And, of course, it costs money. It costs the citizens of Maryland. But action is required to alleviate the problem of junked cars. The private sector is unable to take on the burden.

Once a car is abandoned, finding the owner is difficult and not always possible. But even if the owner is found, how does a person dispose of a car?

The maximum cost of the program might be figured by multiplying the number of junked and abandoned cars in Maryland (approximately 160,000) by $10.

If all these cars were scrapped the total cost would be $1,600,000. If cars are scrapped at the estimated rate of 23,000 per year from now on the program would cost about $230,000 a year.

Maryland intends to raise the money by imposing a $1 "burial tax" on title registrations. The burden on the car buyer is presently $1 in Maryland. Each year 600,000 cars are titled in the State. By 1970 when the bounty becomes effective, Maryland will already have been collecting the burial tax for a year. No problems are seen in paying for the program under this time schedule.

The Maryland program is not a panacea, but these efforts demonstrate that the problem of junked and abandoned cars can be attacked through the cooperation of Federal, State and local governments and the efforts of the private sector.

But new efforts are also needed—efforts towards the solution of the problems of air pollution from burning junked cars before scrapping them, of decreasing the high cost and time consuming efforts of stripping a car before scrapping, of reviewing current laws and titling requirements to aid vehicle collection and disposal.

We must somehow match the oversupply of scrap from all these junked cars with the needs of the steel industry. The role of the private sector in this area is either to lead or to complement the efforts of government. But there must be new industry concern. There must be more research initiated through which the need of industries which are potential utilizers of scrap products communicate with suppliers of scrap.

It is essential for the success of the research program that industry demands be coupled with available supply.

Private corporations are, of course, responsible to their stockholders. Large-scale investment in research towards utilizing an inefficient resource will be costly and difficult. If the private sector is to play its full part in relation to the problem of junked cars therefore, it must have the support of Government to help make up for the increased costs.

And most important there must be full participation of both Government and the private sector in the development and implementation of any program. Government policies should be shaped by the active participation of the private sector. What government seeks is not just greater programs, but greater participation—through the utilization of the talent and experience of the private sector which can best determine how to use its own resources.

This is the approach we have aimed for in trying to solve the junked car problem in Maryland.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to inform my colleagues that a young American citizen from the U.S. Virgin Islands, Miss Carol-Anne Roberts, is a winning contestant in the annual "Voice of Democracy Contest."

This contest is sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary. This year the "Voice of Democracy Contest" had as its theme "Freedom's Challenge," and attracted the participation of over 400,000 students competing for five scholarships.

The significance of Miss Roberts being a winning contestant is in the fact that she hails from Christiansted, St. Croix, in the U.S. Virgin Islands, a territorial possession of the United States. Miss Roberts clearly demonstrates in her speech the attitude and loyalty of our island citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it is more refreshing to know that the majority of our young American citizens are not committed to the forces of unrest and violence so rife in our society today. Moreover, it is the expressions of responsible young Americans like Carol-Anne Roberts, which display an intelligent understanding of "Freedom's Challenge," that reward our confidence in the young of our Nation and the future of its democratic form of government.

Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the Record the winning speech of Miss Carol-Anne Roberts on "Freedom's Challenge."

Freedom's Challenge

Freedom! A beautiful word! What do we think of when we hear this? What pictures flash through our minds as we are confronted with this word? Do we see a small group of ragged soldiers struggling against a larger and better equipped foe? Do we envision the signing of a great document, the

Declaration of Independence? Does the vision of a cracked bell which symbolizes our freedom come before us and remind us of our heritage? Do we hear the strains of the Star Spangled Banner and America the Beautiful drum in our ears? Or are we unaffected, unmoved by a word with such moving connotations?

Here is another important question! Are we taking our freedom for granted? Do we realize how beautiful it all is? Are we accepting freedom's challenge?

But, then we stop and think for a moment! What is the challenge thrown at us by our freedom? Can there possibly be such a thing?

Yes, Americans! There is such a thing and it can be summed up in one word. Responsibilities! That's right! Responsibilities to our nation, state, town, friends, family, ourselves, and God! For it was He that gave man freedom.

We think of freedom in terms of free speech, free press, and the right to worship one's own god. But do we ever think of freedom as being an opportunity by which every individual helps his fellow man and country, and contributes his ideas and work to each? This is man's greatest freedom! The right to give to society his talents, his uniqueness of person, his intelligence, his love. No man may ever take away this freedom.

Then, again, do we consider being free as being able to do anything we want?

This is the danger in our democracy! True liberty also has to have its restrictions. Can you imagine what would happen if every motorist decided to do what he wanted? Our traffic system would collapse and come to a crashing halt! This is an example of one of freedom's challenges.

There are many other possibilities that are even more dramatic and serious. Freedom has restrictions because the right of one person to do exactly as he pleases can interfere greatly with the freedom of others. Men would become "so free" that our democracy would become an anarchy with no controls to protect us from the unscrupulous persons in our society.

So, the challenge that freedom presents is man's ability to accept and shoulder his responsibilities toward his fellow man, his nation, and his community.

Then up springs the question! What are our responsibilities? One of the main ones in our American society is using the voice we have in our government by taking part in it. Another is responding to the laws of our society which promote a true spirit of well being for all concerned.

Don't you like the feeling of being completely free? Well you, your community, our whole nation, and even the world, can have this feeling even though we shoulder our responsibilities, by being citizens of our society, by participating in community life, by accepting our challenge, the world's challenge. . . . Freedom's Challenge!

WITHDRAW SUGAR QUOTA FROM REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, with the support of 24 of my colleagues, a bill to withdraw the sugar quota currently granted to the Republic of South Africa under the 1965 amendments to the Sugar Act. Identical legislation will be offered tomorrow in the Senate by the distinguished assistant majority leader, Senator KENNEDY, also with bipartisan cosponsorship.

Mr. Speaker, the Republic of South Africa has in recent years achieved a tragic distinction among the nations of the world. For South Africa is the only country whose legal structure is frankly—indeed, aggressively—based on race, so that its laws apply unequally to its citizens according to the color of their skins.

We in the United States began our history as an independent nation with laws which were similarly grounded, and which permitted human beings to be kept as chattel slaves. The pressures of civil war struck down that legal framework over 100 years ago. We have spent the ensuing century trying to cure the evil consequences of slavery, trying to root out the inequities and discriminatory practices which persisted long after the institution of slavery was formally abolished. Today, we are still far short of the society we seek, in which full and equal opportunity for the development of human potential will be assured to all. But we are moving toward that goal, not away from it.

Elsewhere around the world, the decades since World War II have seen a similar trend of peoples toward self-determination and self-fulfilment. The rule of European colonial powers has receded from its previous sway over nearly all of South Asia and Africa. New nations have emerged—nations in which much needs to be done before the dreams of their citizens will become reality; but nevertheless nations which control their own destiny and are moving, however haltingly, toward the better life their people seek.

There has been, inevitably, resistance to this trend. Some governments have been reluctant to grant their citizens a meaningful role in guiding the course of their own countries. Yet even in such dictatorships of left and right as the Soviet Union and Spain, the overall trend clearly has been toward liberalization, albeit limited, of authoritarian rule. Even the most recalcitrant colonial power, Portugal, has merely stood on the status quo in its African territories and has not sought to move perceptibly backward in its administrative policies.

South Africa thus stands out glaringly as the only country that is moving morally and politically against the current of events in the rest of the world. Economically, South Africa is very much in tune with other developed nations, and the Government of the Republic likes to cite this economic progress as evidence that its basic direction is compatible with that of the world in which it lives. But the contradictions between economic development and sociopolitical retrogression are posing problems even within South Africa, and the smoke screen of economic advance becomes daily less adequate to conceal the basically regressive nature of the Republic's policies.

Mr. Speaker, the racial policies of the Republic of South Africa are anathema to the conscience of the world. They have been condemned, in the United Nations and elsewhere, by nearly all the countries on the globe. They have grown steadily, inexorably more extreme and more authoritarian since the first Afrikaner Nationalist Government took power in 1948 with apartheid as its rallying cry. On three occasions, Afrikaner reformers have raised fleeting hopes that the trend might be reversed; this has never taken place. The relentless course of South African racism was clearly outlined by the country's sole remaining Progressive Party member of Parliament, Mrs. Helen Suzman, in a bitter exchange last June in the House of Assembly. Mrs. Suzman, a woman of rare courage, is the lonely spokesman for human dignity in that once-august legislative body, but her cause receives short shrift in its debates. As a comment on recent reports of enlightenment in South Africa, I shall include at the end of my statement the full text of Mrs. Suzman's remarks and of an introductory note by Dr. Vernon McKay.

In view of this deplorable situation, the United States has been moving in recent years, though gradually and uncertainly, to loosen the close ties which once linked us to South Africa. We have justified the slow pace of our disengagement by citing our desire to retain some influence with the South African leaders who were moving in their racial policies farther and farther from the accepted norms of the civilized world. It has become evident, however, that South Africa's present Government is basically unresponsive to world opinion. Neither our representations, nor the quiet pleading of other longtime friends, nor the condemnation visited on South Africa by the United Nations and other international bodies have swayed the South African Government from its grim suffocation of human dignity. The hope that close ties can help us to influence South Africa toward greater sanity has thus been shattered by the Republic's own actions, and consequently no longer offers a valid justification for such ties.

Our remaining ties to South Africa take several forms. We maintain full diplomatic and consular relations. Trade between the United States and South Africa is flourishing, and American investment plays an important role in South African economic growth. Amercan airlines fly to South Africa, and South African Airways has just inaugurated a reciprocal service under a 1947 bilateral agreement. An American space-tracking station stands on South African soil; the atomic energy authorities of the two countries cooperate under still another bilateral accord; and South Africa benefits from a quota under the Sugar Act of 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I seriously question whether this kind of business-as-usual attitude is appropriate to the relations between the United States—a nation which takes pride in its democratic heritage and practices—and South Africa, the only avowedly racist society on earth. I share the view of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS), who chairs the Subcommittee on African Affairs of the Foreign Affairs Committee, that the United States should more rapidly disengage from this relationship in both the public and private sectors. I think it behooves us to begin that process of prompt disengagement with the official actions for which we in Congress, along with the executive branch, bear direct responsibility.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I am today joining with a bipartisan group of my colleagues in introducing a bill to withdraw the quota presently granted to South Africa under the Sugar Act Amendments of 1965. There are, in fact, two ways to accomplish this end. In addition to the legislative route which we are proposing today, the President may withhold or suspend a quota under the provisions of section 202(d) (1) (B) of the Sugar Act whenever he finds that its continuation "would be contrary to the national interest of the United States." In a letter of February 18, I urged the President to take just such action, but the proposal has received only a promise of "careful scrutiny." I shall include both my letter and the reply at the conclusion of my remarks. Consequently, it is up to the Congress—which voted the South African quota in the first place—to take necessary action to bring to an end this subsidy for apartheid. Our proposed bill, incidentally, would prorate the South African quota, according to a formula already spelled out in the Act, to the other non-Western-Hemisphere countries—including independent African nations—who presently benefit from quotas under the act.

I should like to take just a few minutes to review briefly the history and economics of the quota for South Africa, neither of which in any way rebuts the moral and political arguments which cry out for its abolition. South Africa received its first quota—in essence, its first permission to sell sugar to the United States—in 1962. At that time, it was allotted 0.71 percent of the total quantity reserved for foreign countries other than five designated nations. Its basic quota was thus quite small, but between 1962 and 1964 South Africa also supplied a large part of the sugar which had come from Cuba in the years before relations with the Castro regime were broken. In 1965, a substantial portion of the former Cuba allocation again went to South Africa, this time by decision of the Secretary of Agriculture. During the first 3 years of South African sugar sales in this country, United States domestic prices were lower than world market prices, the opposite of the normal situation, and it has been estimated that South Africa producers earned $3.6 million less by selling in the United States than could have been earned elsewhere.

When Congress came to set new quotas in the 1965 amendments to the Sugar Act, South Africa benefited from the fact that it had been willing to supply sugar to the United States during a period of worldwide shortage. The administration recommended a basic quota more than four times that granted in 1962. After scaling down by Congress, it still came out to 1.06 percent of the quantity reserved for foreign countries—in tonnage, more than double the basic level of the 1962 law. Former Senator Morse made an effort to scale the quota down still further, from the 66,000 tons which the Senate proposed—a figure of 48,000 tons finally emerged from conference—to a nominal 10,000 tons. His amendment was defeated by voice vote, as Senator LONG argued successfully that we had an obligation to reward South Africa for its fidelity in supplying us with sugar at a time when higher prices were available elsewhere.

Insofar as such an obligation may have existed in 1965, it has certainly been amply met. According to the Department of Agriculture, South Africa more than recovered the $3.6 million in lost potential earnings during 1962–64 in the very first year after world sugar markets returned to normal. In 1965 alone, South Africa earned $7.6 million more by selling sugar in the United States than it could have obtained in any other market. This "bonus" represented the difference between the United States domestic price and the world price, a difference which in 1965 was slightly under 4 cents a pound, or about $74 a ton. This windfall profit per ton, multiplied by the 103,000 tons which South Africa sold in this country in 1965, make the "bonus" quite substantial. In each of the 2 succeeding years, South Africa sold about 55,000 tons of sugar to the United States under its newly reduced quota. Shifting world and domestic sugar prices, however, moved the premium per ton sold to about $90, so that South African growers collected a windfall profit of about $4.9 million in each of those years. Prices in 1968 were about the same, so the bonus came to about $5.5 million on the 60,000 tons sold here last year.

This extra profit, incidentally, should be about the same in 1969 as it has been in recent years. The adjusted quota for South Africa is once again about 56,000 tons, and the world market price for sugar remains significantly below our domestic price level.

It should be made clear that the extra profit made possible by the quota is not, in the purest sense, a governmental subsidy. In some ways, it is far worse. For this is a subsidy paid by unknowing American consumers to South African sugar plantation owners—a subsidy which strengthens the base of an apartheid policy which is totally repugnant to most of those who pay it. Nor does any of that subsidy benefit South African plantation workers, whose average wage in 1965, including the value of rations and housing, was slightly over 86 cents a day. Ironically, the Sugar Act includes stringent provisions to protect American workers in the cane and beet fields, while at the same time it provides a windfall profit to growers overseas whose laborers toil under far worse conditions than would be permitted in this country.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse for the preservation of the sugar quota for South Africa. Like the other ties which still bind us to South Africa, the quota looms large in the eyes of the world as evidence of serious contradiction between our words about apartheid and our deeds. This particular provision has the further effect of making the American consumer an unwitting supporter of the South African economy and thus of the apartheid system which it sustains. Withdrawal of the quota would have only minimal economic effects either here or in South Africa, since it represents slightly over 1 percent of our sugar imports and only about 6.5 percent of South Africa's sugar exports. There is consequently no reason for delay, and I therefore urge my colleagues to lend their support to the bill which we are introducing today to withdraw the South African quota.

Before closing, I should like to express my particular appreciation to those colleagues who have joined with me today in presenting this bill, including the distinguished chairman of the African Affairs Subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS). The full list of cosponsors is as follows:

Hon. FRANK J. BRASCO, Democrat, of New York.

Hon. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., Democrat, of California.

Hon. WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY, Democrat, of Missouri.

Hon. JOHN C. CULVER, Democrat, of Iowa.

Hon. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., Democrat, of Michigan.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI, Democrat, of New York.

Hon. DON EDWARDS, Democrat, of California.

Hon. LEONARD FARBSTEIN, Democrat, of New York.

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER, Democrat, of Minnesota.

Hon. WILLIAM J. GREEN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

Hon. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH, Democrat, of New York.

Hon. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN, Democrat, of New York.

Hon. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of New York.

Hon. ABNER J. MIKVA, Democrat, of Illinois.

Hon. RICHARD L. OTTINGER, Democrat, of New York.

Hon. BERTRAM L. PODELL, Democrat, of New York.

Hon. OGDEN R. REID, Republican, of New York.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey.

Hon. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Democrat, of New York.

Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN, Democrat, of New York.

Hon. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

Hon. JAMES H. SCHEUER, Democrat, of New York.

Hon. ROBERT O. TIERNAN, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

The following is the full text of the bill which we have today offered to the House and which will be introduced tomorrow in the Senate:

H.R. 10239

A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to terminate the quota for South Africa

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress hereby finds that it is not in the interest of the United States to provide official support in any form to a country whose racial policies are anathema to the conscience of the world and have been so denominated by the United Nations, and that the Republic of South Africa, having adopted such policies, should therefore not enjoy the privilege and benefit of a quota under the Sugar Act of 1948.

SEC. 2. Section 202(c) (3) (B) of the Sugar Act of 1948 is amended by deleting

"South Africa.......................... 1.06".

SEC. 3. A quantity of sugar equal to the amount of the quota withdrawn from South Africa shall be prorated in the same manner as deficits are prorated under Section 204 of this Act.

The following is the text of my letter to President Nixon on this issue, and the texts of the two replies I have thus far received:

FEBRUARY 18, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The racial policies pursued by the Republic of South Africa are anathema to the conscience of the world. They have been condemned, in the United Nations and elsewhere, by nearly all the countries of the world. They are repugnant to our own ideals.

Under these circumstances, I believe the United States has a clear moral responsibility to reduce to a minimum its official dealings with South Africa. Through such steps as withdrawal of the NASA tracking station, phasing out of cooperative arrangements with the South African Atomic Energy Board, and termination of the sugar quota for South Africa, we can better suit our actions as a government to the words we have repeatedly uttered about *apartheid*. Once our official hands are thus cleansed, we can with greater justification ask American private interests to join in a wider range of actions which will further express our condemnation of South African racial policies.

I am planning in the near future, to introduce legislation which would terminate the quota currently granted to South Africa under the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended. The legislative route to this end will, inevitably, be slow. I would therefore urge that you take prompt action under the provisions of Section 202(d)(1)(B) of the Sugar Act to suspend the South African quota until such time as the legislation can be considered and acted upon by the Congress. We are presently subsidizing South Africa and its unacceptable policies with over $4 million per year in quota premiums under the Sugar Act. This anomaly can be brought to an immediate end only through your action.

I also urge, Mr. President, that you take the necessary steps to remove our tracking station from South African soil and to end intergovernmental cooperation in the atomic energy field. Both programs have become of only marginal importance to the United States, but they loom large in the eyes of the world as evidence of a serious contradiction between our words and our deeds.

We have been moving gradually and uncertainly, in recent years, toward greater disengagement from our formerly close ties with South Africa. As the racial policies of the Republic become steadily more violative of civilized principles, we must increase our distance from its Government in order to make clear our disapproval of apartheid both to South Africa and to the world. The specific actions I have proposed are the logical next steps in this direction. I hope you will agree with me that they should be taken promptly.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 24, 1969.

Hon. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BINGHAM: The President welcomes your observations respecting South Africa. They are being most carefully considered, and you will hear further very soon.

Your thoughtfulness in sharing your views with the President is much appreciated.

With warm regard,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 7, 1969.

Hon. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BINGHAM: I am pleased to respond further to your February 18 letter suggesting steps toward reducing official United States commitments with the Republic of South Africa.

Your views are thought-provoking and merit consideration in the new Administration's review of existing policies. Since the steps you urge may have substantial impact on our national interests and in some cases may involve repudiation of existing agreements, their advisability must be carefully weighed within the context of our overall interests and objectives.

The United States should and does go to great efforts to make clear its concern over apartheid, as demonstrated by our comprehensive arms embargo. Whether severance of specific relationships such as those you mention would serve a constructive purpose is a matter for continuous review, and will, I assure you, receive most careful scrutiny. We welcome your interest and your forthright comments.

Sincerely,

BRYCE N. HARLOW,
Assistant to the President.

The following is the text of the exchange in the South African House of Assembly to which I referred in my remarks, in which Mrs. Helen Suzman clearly depicts the relentless manner in which apartheid has been applied to ever-wider areas of South African life. The exchange is preceded by an introductory note written by Dr. Vernon McKay, one of America's foremost academic specialists on the problems of southern Africa:

[From Africa Report, October 1968]

A DAY IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN PARLIAMENT

(NOTE.—A popular weapon in the worldwide propaganda offensive of South Africa's whites is the current contention that a new group of Afrikaner verligtes (enlightened ones) are moving South Africa toward a progressive racial policy under the flexible, pragmatic, and outward-looking leadership of Prime Minister B. J. Vorster. Both the local and the overseas press have given much attention to a controversy between the verligte and verkrampte (narrow-minded) wings of the governing National Party, obscuring the fact that the overwhelming majority of the party is solidly behind the Prime Minister in his determination to maintain white supremacy.

(Afrikaner reformers have raised hopes on several occasions in South African history. In fact, the verligte effort might be called the third such attempt since the National Party took office in 1948. The founding of the South African Bureau of Racial Affairs (SABRA) by Afrikaner intellectuals in 1954 seemed at first to offer hope of limited reforms within the general framework of apartheid. But SABRA's reform-minded leaders were purged in 1961 and conservatives took over the organization. At a recent SABRA conference, they made it clear at the start that the meeting had been assembled not to question apartheid, but to discuss ways and means of making it work.

(A second ray of hope appeared fleetingly on the horizon after the 1960 Sharpeville shooting when Paul O. Sauer, then Minister of Lands, Forestry and Public Works, made a much-publicized speech at Humansdorp on April 19, 1960. The "old book" of South African history had been closed a month ago at Sharpeville, he said, and South Africa must reconsider its whole approach to the native question. For several weeks thereafter, the Rand Daily Mail and other English-language newspapers wrote wishfully of an impending "new deal" and of a "split" in Nationalist ranks which might form the basis of a major party realignment under Sauer's leadership. On May 15, the Sunday Times contended that nearly 50 Nationalist MPs had joined the new dealers. The government soon clamped down, however: Sauer kept discreetly silent and was sent to Argentina on an official visit. And on May 20, 1960 the Cabinet put an end to speculation by informing Parliament that it would not depart from the policy of separate development.

(To witness the verligte-verkrampte tempest in 1968 is therefore rather like seeing "Gone With the Wind" for the third time. At the least the verligte movement will have to produce much more than an occasional visiting African diplomat if it is to be taken seriously. The government, however, gets its increasing majorities not from the intellectuals but from the rank and file of its supporters, who have moved to the right in the 1960s. That is why South African policy remains unenlightened, as is clearly demonstrated by Mrs. Helen Suzman, the lone remaining Progressive Party MP in the South African Parliament, in the following speech delivered in the House of Assembly on June 18, 1968.—VERNON MCKAY.)

Mrs. SUZMAN. We have now had two full sessions of what I call the Vorsterian era. This era commenced on September 13, 1966. I will leave aside the first short and unhappy session, because one did not know what was going to happen and how the new era was going to develop. We have now had two full sessions under the new Prime Minister, however, and let us have a look at this era of enlightenment and let us try to see just where it has made any changes in the internal policy in South Africa.

J. E. POTGIETER. It is just the same.

Mrs. SUZMAN. Yes, it is just the same, the mixture as before. I cannot agree more with the honorable Chief Whip. It is the mixture as before with a little extra gall added. I am not interested in the outward-looking policy, although I welcome it and am all in favor of delegates and diplomats from African states. It will be fine if we can make some adjustments which will help us in our relations with the outside world, but let not one of us kid ourselves for one solitary second that that has made the slightest difference to the way in which policy has been carried out inside South Africa or that it has made the slightest difference to the race relations of South Africa, except to make it worse. I am not a believer in the enlightened era, because it has not dawned and it will not dawn under a Nationalist government, irrespective of who the prime minister is.

Let us have a look at some of the legislation that has been passed in the last two years. I would be very interested if somebody on either side of the House could tell me where the glimmer of enlightenment is in these laws. I want to mention the laws by name and will leave it to other people to tell me where the enlightenment is. In 1967 we had further amendments to the Anti-Communist Act, which made it possible to strike lawyers and advocates off the roll. We had the National Education Act, which placed the whole control of education in the hands of the honorable Minister and which gave him the powers to impose a system of deadly uniformity on education in South Africa. We had the Population Registration Amendment Bill, and what did that do? That made it more difficult for those people who could cross the color line to do so, because, for the first time, an absolute test of descent was introduced. It also introduced a whole lot of criteria to make it more difficult for those people who could perhaps avoid the descent test.

The Planning Act was introduced last year, which put the whole of the expansion of industries in the existing metropolitan areas into the hot little hands of the honorable Minister of Planning. He is the man who is now responsible and decides whether an industry may expand or not. He, together with his friends, i.e. the cheerleader of the Nationalist Party, the Deputy Minister of Bantu Administration and Education, and also the honorable Minister of Bantu Administration and Development, who also exercise the powers in this regard. What experience these gentlemen have ever had of industrial development I honestly do not know. All I can say from the views that they have expressed in this House, is that they obviously do not have the faintest glimmer of understanding of the dynamics of industrial development and what is required if South Africa is to maintain its flow of growth. They only think in terms of migrant workers. They have no knowledge of technological changes, which mean more skilled workers and not less. They make no real effort to retrain white workers who are going to be displaced by the technological changes. Where are the big programs for deployment of labor and for the retraining of labor? I do not hear of any of these, but only of regulations to make use of migrant African labor, but I will come back to that later.

The Minister of Planning. Do not pretend that you know something about the warmth of my hands.

Mrs. Suzman. Oh, no, not a bit. I can see they are not. Some feminine instinct tells me that they are. Then we had the Terrorism Act last year which, going beyond 90 days solitary detention and, where not even the nearest relatives are informed, tightened up everything and placed tremendous powers in the hands of the honorable Minister of Justice and the police to hold people indefinitely in solitary confinement. The Sobukwe clause came in again, of course. [The "Sobukwe clause," a provision of the General Law Amendment Act of 1967, empowers the Minister of Justice to order the continued detention of a person who has completed a term of imprisonment for a political offense. Robert Sobukwe, former leader of the Pan-Africanist Congress, remains the only person detained under this measure.—Ed.] That is just a brief assessment of some of the legislation of 1967, the first full session of the enlightened era under the present Prime Minister. This session has not been any different as far as legislation is concerned. We had a further amendment to the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act.

We have, of course, had the three measures which completely removed the last vestige of representation of the Coloured people from Parliament from the end of the 1971 parliamentary session. If that is enlightenment, I want someone to explain where it is enlightened. In return the Coloured people received a council, which existed anyway, with slightly enlarged powers, but no powers that really affect the lives of the people concerned. They have no powers to pass legislation touching on group areas, job reservation, separate amenities, or any of the other things that really affect their everyday lives. If this is enlightenment, I must be wearing very dark glasses. We have also had the law which prohibits multiracial political parties. Is this an enlightened attitude in this day and age, namely to cut further the contact between races by legislation? I would like honorable members on either side of the House to tell me how this, by any stretch of the imagination, can be described as "verligte" legislation. We have also had the imposition of the pattern of the Bantustans on South West Africa. This, as far as I am concerned, once again takes us away from the main stream of thinking in the world, namely separation in South Africa as against the removal of all the actual racial barriers in other countries of the world. We have also had the Sobukwe clause re-enacted.

Let me come to the administrative side, which I believe depicts the most depressing, unutterably depressing picture of the tightening up in every possible respect of the implementation of the policy of apartheid. There is no lessening up, but a tightening up of that policy. The Group Areas Act is being implemented up to the hilt. Ask Coloured people and Indian people whether they think matters are becoming easier for them and whether there has been a lessening of the tension and the insecurities they have suffered since this government under its new Prime Minister started functioning. I will not even mention the same old nonsense with regard to passport refusals, visa refusals, all those, what I would call, examples of "enlightenment" that we have in South Africa.

As far as the Africans are concerned, the pass laws and influx control have all been tightened up. The administration has been tightened up in every possible respect. There has been the five percent reduction of African labor in the Cape, the prohibition on employment of African migrants in certain categories of labor and the great hardships affecting African women in the urban areas, who since the new administrative regulations have been applied are finding it increasingly difficult to prove their right to be in the urban areas and to stay in houses in which they have lived for years with their children, if their husbands die, desert them or divorce them. Enlightenment? Honorable members have no idea of what is going on only 10 miles outside of Cape Town. They would not know. The honorable Deputy Minister for Bantu Administration and Education said yesterday again that only people unlawfully in the area were endorsed out. But I never denied that when I spoke previously. He said "bring me the examples." I can bring him only the law and the way in which it has been administered.

The Deputy Minister of Bantu Administration and Education. You want the unlawful to remain there.

Mrs. Suzman. But what is "unlawful"? This is where we differ. "Unlawful" today . . . [Interjections.] Will honorable members just let me finish what I am saying? "Unlawful" today has become such that nobody can prove that he is lawful anywhere. This is the point. Has the honorable Deputy Minister, either of them, or the Minister, heard of the Houghton-Hlshlane judgment of Judge Corbett in a case that was decided in 1964 or 1965, which affects the whole position of Africans who believe they had the right to be here under section 10? Not one of those gentlemen has heard of this case.

The Deputy Minister of Bantu Administration and Education. That only applies to women.

Mrs. Suzman. It does not only apply to Bantu women. It affects every African who used to be able to prove that he or she was here lawfully under section 10. Now it has been made virtually impossible, because the administrative machinery to prove that those people were here for 15 years before 1952, when section 10 of the Urban Areas Act was passed by this government, did not exist. There was no administrative machinery for registration of contracts or for the compulsory registration of women, or even the reference books introduced by the Abolition of Passes Act. So it has become since that judgment virtually impossible to prove lawful residence. Will honorable members now tell me that these people are unlawfully in the area, when the government passes a law but does not set up the administrative machinery at the same time to enable people to prove their rights under the very law that the government has passed? Now we are having another example of this situation. On April 1, new regulations were gazetted which migratize every African worker not presently in employment, every one who cannot prove his rights under the most difficult circumstances under section 10, or who is not already in employment. The minute such a person loses a job he has to go back to the reserves and register, except when he is in the Transkei, because this has not yet been applied in the Transkei. Now let me tell the honorable Deputy Minister and the Minister that the machinery for that has not been set up properly.

The labor bureaus, which had to be set up in the regional authorities, have not been set up. I asked the honorable Minister a question only the other day, and he said that the information was not readily available. It can only be obtained by extensive inquiries from district officers. He does not know how many depots for accommodation have been set up. In fact, he says none. He says he does not really know what is going on at all. But that does not stop him from promulgating regulations. They were promulgated and they came into force on April 1. I would tell the honorable Minister and Deputy Ministers that there is going to be a chaotic situation in the labor market as the result of this. There are no labor bureaus. All is left in the hands of the local chiefs and headmen. They have not the faintest idea how to administer this law. They do not know how to fill in a form. There is no accommodation for them.

G. F. Van L. Froneman. It is absolute nonsense!

Mrs. Suzman. It is not absolute nonsense. Let me tell the honorable member for Heilbron: Already it has been suspended in Umlazi because such a chaotic situation has arisen. What sort of enlightened government is this that does not set up machinery for the regulations that have been promulgated? How are migratory workers to register, how are they to get work? These are unemployed people. They have no resources to fall back on while they are waiting for jobs. Their whole family depends on them. How are industrialists to cope with the situation when they are not getting the labor that they require? I say that the situation is absolutely chaotic. It is disgraceful that honorable ministers without any consideration whatever of the practical implications of the regulations that they have promulgated and the laws that have been passed, insist that these measures be put into action. This is the "enlightened" government under Mr. Vorster.

I could go on like this ad nauseum to show that, as far as I am concerned, it is anything but enlightened. The removal at Limehill and now in Pretoria from Eersterus to a place with the charming name of Stinkwater, some 35 miles outside Pretoria, has taken place. Eersterus was a squalid slum, admittedly a squatter camp, but where have they been put? Better conditions? Oh, no! They are put on to the veld of Stinkwater with tents in this icy Highveld winter, with absolutely no preparation made to receive those people. It is the same, a repetition of the disgraceful episode at Limehill. The government never learns.

The Deputy Minister of Bantu Administration and Education. Your allegations are disgraceful.

Mrs. Suzman. I am disgraceful, because I expose these conditions! The people who go to help are "agitators." The churches that do their best to offset the conditions they find these people in are "neo-communists." We get sick and tired of all this.

The Deputy Minister of Bantu Administration and Education. We have heard all these ridiculous stories already.

Mrs. Suzman. They are not ridiculous stories. The honorbale Minister can go and have a look for himself. It is disgraceful. I take the removal of the 30-year leases from people who put all their aspirations into owning their little houses under 30-year lease in Johannesburg and elsewhere. They are just destroyed like that. The honorable Minister could not care less. I take the decisions not to have any more high schools up to matric in the urban areas so that the Africans who long for higher education for their children have to send their children out to the country schools at great expense, costing at least R100 to R120 per year, which they can ill afford. Or go without higher education. It was easier for an African child living in

Durban or Johannesburg to get high school education up to matric a generation ago than it is today. When those children go out of the towns, unless their parents have taken every possible precaution to notify the superintendent of the township to keep their names on the housing permit, to show that they have been paying the school fees, they are not allowed to come back when they have finished school, because their registration books are issued in the country districts and they are not allowed to come back to the towns. The officials do not warn the parents concerned about these difficulties.

As a final little example of "verligthed," or whatever one might call it, of this government, I want to quote the speech made by the honorable Prime Minister about no shop apartheid. Instead of just saying that it is ridiculous in this day and age to contemplate shop apartheid, he said that his audience should imagine what would happen if a law of this nature was enforced in South Africa. He said: "Any White who was not able to go to a shop would not then be able to send his non-white servant. One can imagine what chaos would ensue." I do not need to say anything more. That is an "enlightened sentiment." But it is not that this goes counter to every bit of thinking of the twentieth century.

The MINISTER OF BANTU ADMINISTRATION AND DEVELOPMENT. Do you not send your non-white servant to the shops?

Mrs. SUZMAN. Naturally! But I would not have shop apartheid under any conditions. Does the honorable Minister not understand that?

(Business suspended at 12:45 p.m. and resumed at 2:20 p.m.)

Mrs. SUZMAN. When the House adjourned, I had completed the major part of my speech and I hope that I have disposed of the verligteverkrampte myth fairly conclusively. There is only one other point I wish to make in the few minutes at my disposal.

I want to deal with the interesting exchange which took place yesterday between the honorable Minister of Transport and the honorable Leader of the Opposition in regard to the rate for the job. The honorable Leader of the Opposition talked with about a minimum wage for Whites. I simply want to point out in that regard that his is, of course, the dilemma of the United Party. One cannot say in one breath that one is against job reservation and at the same time say that one is in favor of upholding the industrial color bar. The two things are mutually contradictory, and one must make up one's mind. One can have an open economy with free competition and the rate for the job, but that has nothing to do with a minimum wage for Whites, because the minute one talks about a minimum wage for Whites one has given away the whole argument in favor of the rate for the job. [Interjection.] No, not if the Leader of the Opposition makes a point of saying there must be a minimum rate for Whites, because that means that certain jobs by virtue of having a certain high wage rate, are reserved for white people. That is all it can mean: the rate for the job is a flat rate per occupation. So one cannot talk about having a minimum rate for Whites. One should have a minimum rate for every job, which I believe should be high enough to cover the poverty datum line for even the most unskilled and menial jobs. [Interjections.] I was talking to the gentleman behind me for a minute. I would point out that production would in fact increase because when you are dealing with a class of people who are underpaid and cannot feed themselves properly, then the chances are that when you give them enough money with which to feed themselves properly, their production will increase. That has been found everywhere. [Interjections.]

T. G. HUGHES. The Deputy Minister said there should be a minimum wage for everybody.

Mrs. SUZMAN. Of course there should be.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order! The honorable member for Transkei must play the game; he cannot get too close to the honorable member. [Laughter.]

Mrs. SUZMAN. With respect, Sir, he will have to play the game much more skillfully. The point I was trying to make as far as the honorable Minister of Transport is concerned is that he interjected at one stage and said: "What do I do about the hundreds of thousands of white workers who do not have an education above Standard Six?" I think I understood him correctly to say that. Everybody sympathizes with the predicament of the government in this regard, and every government has this predicament of how to look after people who by their own shortcomings, for which they cannot be blamed, are unable to acquire higher skills. Naturally such people must be given some form of sheltered employment, or their housing must be subsidized, but they have to be cared for by the State.

Sir DE VILLIERS GRAAFF. Then pay them the minimum wage.

Mrs. SUZMAN. No, it is not only a minimum wage; it is more than that. They have to be looked after and placed in certain types of employment, but not at the expense of the whole economy. That is the point. It should not be done at the expense of not training the non-Whites because you want to keep those jobs reserved for Whites who cannot do any better themselves. The point is—and I am talking now to the honorable Minister and not to the honorable Leader of the Opposition—that it should not be done at the expense of the whole economy. Sir, I do not believe anyone in South Africa has to make sacrifices. The apostle, as he calls himself, the Deputy Minister of Bantu Administration, said that we should rather have a poor South Africa but a white South Africa. [Interjections.] That is absolutely uncalled for, because there is enough for everybody. That is why. This country is a rich country and not like some of the African states. We have vast resources waiting to be developed, and the one thing which is holding back our really tremendous growth is the fact that we do not use our manpower resources properly. We do not need to make any sacrifices; not that the Deputy Minister has any intention of making any sacrifices: I am quite sure of that, and not that it is ever really intended that the white people should make the sacrifices. The sacrifices have to be made by non-Whites, by keeping them in unproductive employment, or by keeping them under-employed. What we should be devoting all our energies to is developing our resources by training our labor and allowing the full productive use of our non-white labor to assist white labor who have been caught—not only the unskilled and the semi-skilled but the skilled white labor—in a dilemma because they have been caught between the pressure of automation, for which they are not trained, on the one side, and the fragmentation pressures on the other side. What we have to do is to retrain our white labor and give them redeployment allowances and so on, so that we can take advantage of the third industrial revolution, which is the phase that South Africa should now be entering upon.

CORRECT THIS ERROR

(Mr. DADDARIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed to learn today that Dr. Franklin Long, of Cornell University, had been asked to withdraw his name from nomination as Director of the National Science Foundation. Dr. Long is highly qualified for this post and the administration would have been highly commended for having named him.

It is my understanding that the unfortunate series of events of which we have just learned began when Dr. Long agreed to become Director upon the invitation of the administration. Apparently Dr. Long was subsequently asked if he would agree to support the administration's anti-ballistic-missile system. When he refused to do so he was advised that he could no longer be considered. It is unfortunate that the Nixon administration is sacrificing the National Science Foundation on the altar of the ABM, and, by so doing, seriously affecting its unique capability to be of service to our country.

Dr. Long has a distinguished record in academic accomplishment, university administration, and public service. An outstanding physical chemist in his own right, he is presently vice president for research and advanced studies at Cornell University. Between 1950 and 1960, he was chairman of the Cornell Chemistry Department. His record of Government service has been truly outstanding, and includes participation in the National Defense Research Committee during World War II. Since the Second World War he has made many other contributions which strengthen our national defense. For instance, he has been a member of the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board and chairman of the chemistry advisory committee of the Air Force Office of Scientific Research. He has been a consultant for the Army's Ballistics Research Laboratory and an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. As a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee during the early 60's he made his talents available to our Government at the highest level in the area of science policy. One cannot even remotely consider Dr. Long to be unconcerned about the quality and adequacy of our defense posture in the light of such a record.

I am amazed that Dr. Long's reservations concerning the Sentinel ABM system, which were known to the public through his past writings, should preclude his appointment as Director of the National Science Foundation. Are we to consider NSF a part of the Defense Establishment? Many of Dr. Long's colleagues in the scientific community, probably a large majority, share his views regarding the proposed ABM deployment, whether in the Sentinel or Safeguard configuration. I have my own serious doubts as to the wisdom of deploying the present Safeguard system. Furthermore, this is a vital policy issue upon which scientists have a real duty to study and comment. The technological questions involved in the present ABM debate are truly staggering, and we find many of the foremost experts in the field opposing deployment because of their considered judgment that "it will not work" in its present form. The administration, rather than penalizing such forthright scientific judgments, should encourage their presentation for careful consideration by the Executive and Congress. To involve selection of the Director of the Nation's basic research in the ABM question is absurd.

Since President Nixon's inauguration

I have been pleased with the competent and businesslike job Dr. DuBridge has done in his position as science adviser. I am convinced that he is personally endeavoring to assure the appointment of science and research administrators solely on the basis of competence and ability. This was to a large extent reflected in the original decision to appoint Dr. Long as Director of the National Science Foundation. The fact that Dr. Long is a Democrat emphasized the nonpartisan character of the Science Foundation and the willingness of outstanding scientists from all political persuasions to offer the administration their services in the interest of the Nation. The unhappy events of the past few days cast serious doubt on the ability of the administration to make important decisions in public policy for science which can attract the support of the Nation's scientists and other citizens of our country.

It is self-evident that recruiting a Director for the National Science Foundation of the desired competence and ability and who will have the confidence of the scientific community, will now be extremely difficult, if not impossible. I hope this has only been a gross misunderstanding and that the administration does not seriously propose to make support of the ABM a prerequisite for public service. The Nixon administration still has an opportunity and a responsibility to rectify what I believe is a very serious error in Executive judgment, and I hope it will take immediate action to correct this error.

TRAGIC DESTRUCTION OF RECONNAISSANCE AIRCRAFT OFF NORTH KOREA

(Mr. MARSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the recent tragic and unwarranted destruction of our reconnaissance aircraft off North Korea is continued evidence that North Korea is a worsening trouble spot. It appears to be a part of a plan to gradually intensify the level of military activity by the North Koreans.

Although South Vietnam has had the spotlight in that part of the world, there is growing evidence every day that indicates we cannot ignore a situation that is growing more serious in Korea.

The seizure of the *Pueblo* and the destruction of the Navy EC121 aircraft are serious international incidents that receive worldwide attention. Not as well known is that for nearly 2 years, there has been a determined attempt to try and expand the war effort in South Korea by a stepped-up infiltration of South Korea by North Korean infiltrators. The purpose of this may be to start a guerrilla warfare effort similar to the type that we find now confronting us in South Vietnam.

American forces in South Korea are required to be in a continued state of readiness and the efforts to infiltrate the southern portion of Korea are reaching the stage where they cannot be dismissed as random and isolated incidents.

It is becoming increasingly clear that North Korea is developing a highly trained guerrilla force and resorting to all types of clandestine efforts to infiltrate these guerrilla forces to harass not only American units but to intimidate South Korean citizens and conduct raids and ambushes on South Korean military forces.

A part of this effort may be to cause the withdrawal from South Vietnam of South Korean forces presently employed there, or it may be a broader plan to try and get a full-scale guerrilla war effort underway similar to the type of struggle that is raging throughout Southeast Asia. In all events, the most recent destruction of our reconnaissance aircraft points out that we cannot take anything for granted, nor can we assume that simply because an aircraft or vessel like the *Pueblo* is operating well within international skies or waters it is safe from attack.

It seems certain that with the attitude of North Korea, we must furnish adequate protection of aircraft and vessels that are not capable of defending themselves, whereby attacks such as this can be repulsed, in order to protect the lives of American service personnel as well as to insure successful accomplishment of these vital intelligence missions.

PUBLIC OPINION STRENGTHENS CONSERVATION EFFORTS

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, our environment is deteriorating before our eyes. We are exhausting the finite amounts of clean air, pure water, and available land at a wastefully astonishing rate. We and our children will pay a prohibitive price for this activity. Only recently have we begun to realize the menaces we face.

For years conservation organizations have been voices in a void, seeking to warn us. One among them is the National Wildlife Federation, which performs marvelous work on behalf of all the people in preserving our environment and its inhabitants.

They recently retained a major polling organization to query a cross section of Americans on a variety of environmental issues. Findings are revealing, indeed, as we see a major upswing in public attitudes towards pollution of all kinds, wildlife preservation, pesticides and preservation of open green spaces.

We must become more aware of what is facing us. We must take stronger action against those who pollute our air and water—against thermal, noise, and oil pollution—against those who ruin the land and take away from the quality of our lives. The National Wildlife Federation has performed another public service by having this survey made, and I insert highlights here in the RECORD for the enlightenment of other Members of this body:

THE U.S. PUBLIC CONSIDERS ITS ENVIRONMENT

INTRODUCTION

Objectives of the study

The overall objective of the study was to provide information about the public's attitudes toward our natural surroundings. Specific objectives included:

1. Finding out to what extent the public is concerned about the degradation of our environment;

2. Investigating preferences for urban versus suburban or rural living;

3. Learning what is considered the most pressing problem with regard to our natural surroundings and what the public thinks should be done about the problems;

4. Determining whether or not the public favors setting aside more public land for conservation purposes.

Design of the research

The objectives of the study were carried out by means of a personal interview survey conducted with a national sample of 1503 adults, 21 years of age and older. The interviewing took place during the last ten days in January, 1969. The following questions were asked:

1. You may have heard or read claims that our natural surroundings are being spoiled by air pollution, water pollution, soil erosion, destruction of wildlife and so forth. How concerned are you about this—deeply concerned, somewhat concerned, or not very concerned?

2. How much would you be willing to pay each year in additional taxes earmarked to improve our natural surroundings—a small amount such as $10.00 or less, a moderate amount such as $50.00, or a large amount such as $100.00 or more?

3. It has been said that it will, at some time, be necessary to limit the human population (number of people) if our present living standards are to be maintained. Do you think this will be necessary or not?

4. Which of these kinds of places would you find most pleasant as a place to live?

Respondents were shown a card which read as follows: Mountains, Seashore, Rural area, Small city, Suburbs, Large City, Somewhere else?

5. In this country, which one of these do you think is the most pressing problem connected with our natural surroundings?

Respondents were shown a card which read as follows: Air pollution. Water Pollution. Soil erosion. Wildlife preservation (birds and animals). Preservation of open green spaces. Pesticides (chemicals used to kill insects).

6. In your opinion what can be done to correct this problem? (Problem chosen in the above question.)

7. Are you in favor of setting aside more public land for conservation purposes such as national parks, wildlife refuges, bird sanctuaries, and so forth, or not?

Information about the composition and design of the samples and tables of sampling tolerances to have in mind when reading the report will be found at the end of the report.

SOME HIGHLIGHTS OF THE STUDY

Concern about our natural surroundings.—About half (51%) of all persons interviewed stated that they are "Deeply concerned" about the effect of air pollution, water pollution, soil erosion, and destruction of wildlife on our natural surroundings. About one-third (35%) said they are "Somewhat concerned" about the problem and twelve per cent said they are "Not very concerned." A greater proportion (62%) of those who have attended college than of those with less formal education are deeply concerned about these enviromental problems. More of the men (56%) than of the women (46%) said they were deeply concerned. Also more of the people living in the western and midwestern states than of those in the East or South are deeply concerned.

Willingness to pay taxes to improve our natural surroundings.—When those interviewed were asked about their willingness to pay additional taxes to improve our natural surroundings, almost three of every four people interviewed said they would be willing to pay something. It was found that those who had said they were "Deeply concerned" about our environmental problems were willing to pay more in taxes to help solve the problems than those who did not express as much concern.

The most pressing environmental problem.—When those interviewed were shown a list of problems affecting the environment and asked which one they consider most pressing, replies divided as follows:

	Percent
Air pollution	36
Water pollution	32
Pesticides (chemicals used to kill insects)	7
Preservation of open green spaces	6
Wildlife preservation (birds and animals)	5
Soil erosion	4

In cities of over 1,000,000 in population 55 per cent said air pollution was the most pressing problem while only twenty-three per cent of those in small communities and rural areas gave this answer. Preservation of wildlife was of greater concern to people in rural areas than to those in the urban areas.

Those interviewed were also asked what they think can be done to correct the problem chosen as most pressing. Results were as follows:

Problem and most frequently mentioned corrective action

Air pollution.—Find way to control auto exhaust; control of chemical and industrial wastes. Provide filters, smoke control devices.

Water pollution.—Stop industrial pollution; Enforce present laws, pass new legislation.

Soil erosion.—Plant or maintain vegetation; Use proper agriculture methods.

Wildlife preservation.—Enforce game laws; Reduce hunting; Establish wildlife reserves, parks.

Preservation of open green spaces.—Set aside land for parks, forests; Better zoning.

Pesticides.—Use different, improved pesticides; Government controls, laws.

Will it be necessary to limit human population?—The U.S. public is evenly divided as to whether or not it will, at some time, be necessary to limit human population if our present living standards are to be maintained. Younger adults, those who have attended college, and those in the upper income brackets are more inclined to consider limitation of human population necessary than other groups.

Areas thought most pleasant as a place to live.—If a pleasant place to live were the principal consideration influencing the public, there would be a marked reversal of the trend away from rural areas. Those interviewed were shown the following list of areas and asked which of them they think would be most pleasant as places to live. Results divided as follows:

	Percent
Rural area	30
Small city	25
Suburbs	18
Mountains	15
Seashore	9
Large city	6
Other	1

Analyses by size of community show that many big city dwellers have a yearning for smaller places and those in rural areas have no yen for the big city.

Should more land be set aside for conservation purposes?—Three of every four people interviewed favor setting aside more public land for conservation purposes such as national parks, wildlife refuges, bird sanctuaries, etc. Young people, those who have attended college, and those in the eastern states are more inclined to this view than other segments of the population.

GRANTING COURT LEAVE TO EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WHEN CALLED UPON AS WITNESSES IN CERTAIN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS ON BEHALF OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

(Mr. HENDERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to grant court leave to employees of the United States and the District of Columbia when called as witnesses in certain judicial proceedings on behalf of State and local governments.

Existing law permits an employee to appear as a witness on behalf of the Federal Government or the District of Columbia, or in his official capacity, without charge of leave or loss of pay. There is no such protection for an employee appearing as a witness on behalf of a State or local government. This omission has caused hardships.

For example, one employee lost 2 days' work when he was subpenaed by an attorney general as a witness to a highway accident. In another instance, an employee took 3 days of annual leave to serve as a witness for a county in a robbery case. In still another case, an employee lost an aggregate of 18 days' annual leave when he was subpenaed as a State witness in a murder trial.

These examples point up the obvious inequity of the existing law. My bill would simply amend the law to grant court leave to employees called as witnesses on behalf of State and local governments. It also provides that any amount received by such an employee for service as a witness shall be credited against his pay.

In these days of deep concern over crime and crime control, employees should not be penalized when called upon by a State or local government to serve as witnesses. I strongly urge passage of the bill.

CHINESE FREEDOM UPRISING

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, receiving little fanfare in the communications media was the announcement that anti-Communist freedom fighters in Communist China had risen up to free their country from tyranny, oppression, and despotism of the Maoist Red regime.

Possibly because the leftwing elements in the United States are well aware of the crumbling structure accounts for the efforts to suppress word of the people's uprising to liberate themselves and restore a Chinese Government responsible to the people on the mainland and to insure an enduring peace.

Anyone who would call for recognition of Red China with full knowledge of these developments must be trying to divert public opinion from significant changes in the China picture and attempting to rehabilitate the desperate and defunct totalitarian government of Mao Tse-tung.

So that our colleagues might know the extent of the Chinese anti-Communist uprising and the popular success among the masses of long oppressed people, I include a news release from the Chinese Information Service of April 7:

KMT UNITS ON MAINLAND SCORE VICTORIES OVER REDS

TAIPEI, April 7.—Clandestine Kuomintang organizations in Tibet, Yunnan and Kwangtung scored a series of victories in their military actions against the Peiping regime late last month just before the opening of the 10th National Congress of the Kuomintang in Taipei on March 29, informed sources said yesterday.

According to reports reaching here from the China mainland, the anti-Communist military action in Tibet started in late March when armed KMT forces joined hands with 3,000 anti-Communist Tibetans to attack Communist organizations in southern Tibet.

They fought three fierce battles with Communist infantry and cavalry units and killed 112 Reds. They looted 22 horses in addition to weapons and food. The anti-Communist forces also suffered casualties, but the exact number was not given.

Now the vast grass plain in southern Tibet is in the hands of anti-Communist forces, the sources said.

At the same time, anti-Communist forces raided Communist organizations at Tingri, Shekar and Sakaya area near the Tibetan-Nepalese border and killed many Communist cadres and destroyed bridges, granaries and broadcasting stations, according to the sources.

In Yunnan province, the guerrilla forces of the National Salvation Army started a series of attacks since mid-March. They raided Communist barracks and outposts at Cheli, Fuhai, Wenglien and southern Yunnan bordering Burma.

Anti-Communist guerrilla forces engaged Communist troops 16 times and eliminated 330 Red soldiers. They also seized a big quantity of weapons, documents and destroyed Communist warehouses, banks and other targets, the sources added.

In Kwangtung area, KMT workers in Canton launched a concerted attack on Communist organizations with local anti-Communist forces on the night of March 21. They attacked the Kwangtung Provincial Revolutionary Committee and Canton Municipal Revolutionary Committee simultaneously.

Anti-Communist forces also attacked the "propaganda teams for Mao Tse-tung thoughts" at seven colleges and universities in Canton.

With the support of anti-Communist elements, the attacking forces blasted the newly completed "people's bridge" across the Pearl River, the export corporation at Changti, the lumber yards at Tashatou and Shahuo railway stations.

Then they raided a reformatory camp at Kuangchingtang near Shahuo and freed several hundreds of inmates.

Before the March 21 raid, KMT agents in Kwangtung launched extensive attacks at Swatow, Lufeng, Haifeng, Huilai, Chungshan, Paoan and Chuhai counties and destroyed more than 40 targets including the Maoist revolutionary committees, barracks, radar stations, granaries, highways and bridges.

DREW PEARSON SYNDROME

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I understand that columnist Drew Pearson is accusing me of endorsing what he labels Neo-Nazis

Pearson is a man whose whole career

has been built around slander for hire and purpose. Most Americans understand that this man smears only people who are trying to do something for America. Any attack by Pearson at this time must be an acknowledgement that his victims are having some degree of success in hurting the enemies of free men.

When the people at home read Ole' Drew for laughs the way we do here in Washington, he will have the influence he merits—merely another senile ultra-left extremist.

I am about as concerned over this new personal attack from Pearson as I would be over one from his hero, Castro, or any of the Russian Communists he entertains at his country villa.

But now that Drew—who has never found any fault in the Communist left—suddenly promotes himself as a great fighter of mythical Nazis in 1969, I wonder what he was doing to combat national socialism during World War II when I was fighting real live Nazis as an American infantryman—and, after the Battle of the Bulge spending some time as a prisoner of war in a Nazi prison camp.

If Drew Pearson is going around the country suggesting that JOHN RARICK is linked with any Neo-Nazi outfit, I suggest he make an appointment with a good psychiatrist.

ROGERS SAYS WORK NEEDED ON TV RADIATION PROBLEM

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again we have found need to advise the American public that there are potential dangers from radiation as emitted from color television sets.

A survey conducted in New York which was released last week indicates that we still have much work to do in this area, although we passed the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act last year.

Under that law, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is charged with establishing standards and safe levels of radiation. And under the law the Secretary is charged with conducting studies to establish what safety precautions are needed for any device which has the potential to emit harmful radiation, and this, of course, goes beyond television.

One of the tasks which the Secretary should consider as soon as possible is the appointment of the 15-man Technical Electronic Product Radiation Safety Standards Committee. This is the technically qualified body which prescribes standards for the Secretary's consideration.

Until that committee is constituted and working, we are far from realizing the goals which we set when we passed Public Law 90-602.

I hope that in the very near future the House Interstate and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Public Health will conduct hearings and review just what has been accomplished since we first moved against the problem.

One item which I think will be helpful and which I hope will be included in the Secretary's standards would be a requirement for manufacturers of television sets to fix the level of voltage at a position which will not allow TV servicemen to increase that voltage.

We learned through hearings that this is a common practice and in doing so, the voltage increases the chances of causing radiation emmissions. I think it will be reasonable for industry to make this adjustment and to hold down voltage in the same manner that a governor holds down the speed on an automobile.

I am pleased to see that the Government has watched closely the survey conducted in New York and has issued a statement on the proper distance for people to sit from a color television.

The New York survey has omitted some information which would have helped us pinpoint the problem in regards to when the sets were made, but on the whole, I am pleased that health officials are also keeping a surveillance on the problem.

The manufacturers have been working, I am advised to check sets now being manufactured. The best way to insure that sets previously built are holding to safe levels is to have the manufacturers stress the development of better components parts for replacement. Some companies have gone to solid state circuits and have thus eliminated some of the problem areas, and they are to be commended for this improvement.

But I would hope that they act now to develop better component parts for critical areas so that during replacement, the offending parts can be eliminated.

PRESENT FINANCIAL CRISIS MUST BE FACED BY THE PEOPLE

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, unless the American people demand a halt, the Federal Government will spend this country into catastrophe. After more than 6 years of congressional service, it is my considered judgment the present financial crisis is one that must be faced by the people themselves. Neither Congress nor the President has any intention of dealing with this issue.

The Federal Government is a spendthrift one. This year it will take from the American taxpayers some $135 billion. Eighty billion of those dollars will go to the military, much of it to be wasted. The results of the present spending policy are and will be increased inflation and a large gold drain. At the same time there simply is not enough money left at home in our cities and towns to meet critical local needs.

The crisis faced by the people of my congressional district is repeated in every part of the country. Although we enjoy one of the highest average family incomes, our families are taxed to and beyond their limits by State and local governments. Even so, not enough money is generated by these collections to provide necessary services. We need schools, public transportation, parks, and teachers. We need many millions for sewage plants to stop the pollution of San Francisco Bay. Air pollution is reaching a crisis stage. We must have imported water to replenish underground supplies and to halt land subsidence.

The pattern is nationwide. The results are poverty and hunger for the unskilled and the minorities. Housing becomes harder to find for those with the low incomes. Here is the source in our society for increases in crime and disorder.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 10100, to limit military expenditures to $50 billion in fiscal 1970, starting July 1, 1969. I am seeking nationwide support for this legislation. I consider its passage absolutely essential if we are to reverse the trend toward catastrophe facing America today.

Under my bill the $30 billion in savings would be paid to the country's local governments. The formula is strictly proportional as to population and $150 would be paid for every inhabitant.

We are talking about a lot of money going back to the neighborhoods of America under H.R. 10100—to be spent for crying local needs under local direction.

Take Santa Clara County, Calif., for example: With its 1 million population it would receive $150 million. This amount represents 76 percent of all the property taxes collected in Santa Clara County in 1967 by the county, cities, school districts, and special districts. The $150 million is 40 percent of the total fiscal 1967 revenues of Santa Clara County from all sources including property taxes, other taxes, and State and Federal contributions. Other parts of the country would benefit thusly:

Washington, D.C	$131,000,000
New York City	1,200,000,000
State of California	3,000,000,000
Los Angeles	1,050,000,000
San Francisco	107,000,000
Alameda County, Calif	154,000,000
San Diego County	180,000,000
State of Massachusetts	810,000,000
State of Pennsylvania	1,740,000,000
State of Minnesota	535,000,000
State of Illinois	1,600,000,000
City of Chicago	810,000,000
City of Detroit	405,000,000
City of San Jose	64,000,000
City of Milpitas	3,900,000
City of Fremont, Calif	15,000,000
City of Newark, Calif	3,900,000
City of Morgan Hill, Calif	800,000
City of Santa Clara, Calif	12,750,000
Union City, Calif	1,725,000

The fiscal 1970 military budget of $50 billion in my bill would not endanger the security of the United States. The $30 billion represents the yearly cost of the Vietnam war. My proposed military budget would give the Pentagon this year's funds, less the Vietnam war costs. Indeed, my bill's passage should encourage the settlement of this unfortunate war, recognized now by the great majority of Americans as a disastrous mistake.

The military budget authorized by my bill would not endanger our security vis-a-vis Russia. The $50 billion represents roughly the Soviet military expenditures in actual purchasing power plus 20 percent. We should have confidence that our military people can utilize properly this generous sum and provide the protection to which we are entitled.

I am not alone in my conviction that a $50 billion budget is logical. In a chapter on "Military Strategy, Military Forces, and Arms Control," in Agenda for the Nation published by the Brookings Institution late last year, Carl Kaysen, formerly of the Kennedy White House National Security staff and now director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, argues for a post-Vietnam budget of $50 billion.

Says Kaysen:

> The proper conclusion of such a reexamination is that our security interests and needs require great changes in understanding the rationale of our military policy and in the force structure which are the concrete expressions of that rationale. Our policies should determine our weapons, not vice versa.

I do not intend to pinpoint in this statement where the military should cut in order to live within the $50 billion budget. However, we maintain many overseas military bases which are no longer needed. For example, in World War II we needed the Azores as a ferry base because of limited range of aircraft. Fifteen years ago nuclear submarine and aircraft bases in Spain seemed necessary because our missiles had only a 1,200-mile range. All of these bases are still in expensive operation although unnecessary to our military security.

Of the 1,500,000 American military men overseas, 600,000 are in Vietnam. The remaining 900,000 are scattered among 330 military bases and a hundred countries. Perhaps half can be brought home.

Is $350 million per year an excessive expenditure for germ warfare? Could not the $75 million annual expenditure for defoliation be slashed? Should the Pentagon have had the funds to increase its civilian employment by 378,249 in 1968?

It is now clear that President Nixon will do no better than President Johnson in controlling military spending. As Joseph Kraft pointed out on Tuesday:

> This is the basic message of the revised 1970 budget.

Mr. Kraft concludes that—

> Even sophisticated men with an aversion to the indiscriminate must now consider the possibility that the only way to control defense spending is through the favorite crudity of the Congressional conservatives. That is by putting an arbitrary ceiling on defense spending for next year.

I agree with Mr. Kraft. Unless the American people insist otherwise, President Nixon and Congress will not reduce military spending should the war in Vietnam end. The ABM system, according to Senator SYMINGTON, former Secretary of the Air Force, could cost up to $400 billion. The Pentagon has already announced that it has unmet needs requiring an increase in annual spending of up to $100 billion.

The military and appropriation committees of Congress provide no critical scrutiny of the military budget. Committee members are the most conservative and military minded in Congress. The committee members overwhelmingly supported every Vietnam escalation, the Dominican intervention, the draft and the ROTC. A review of past years reflects that the Military Appropriations Committee has rubber-stamped military budgets from the White House. No meaningful cuts are ever made.

No adverse witnesses to the military budget are heard by the committee. Ninety-nine percent of the witnesses on the military budget are military officers or Pentagon civilians. The chairman of the House Armed Services Committee has greeted Air Force witnesses thusly:

> If you don't have any friends on this Committee you don't have any friends. We are your voice in Congress. We are the only official voice, there aren't any others.

In conclusion we have ignored our people, our cities and our land in the false belief that the more we spend on the military, the more secure we will be. We have done this at a cost which cannot now be calculated to our environment, to our torn and bloody cities, to the minorities and the poor and to our war dead in Vietnam.

We must bring our military expenditures under control so that we can treat the cancers of our society. A $50 billion ceiling is adequate. The $30 billion savings can be used to bind up the wounds of the Nation and to reunite our divided people.

O. ROY CHALK SHOULD BE RELIEVED OF CONTROL OF D.C. TRANSIT, INC.

(Mr. STEIGER of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, O. Roy Chalk, the president and majority stockholder of D.C. Transit, Inc., will make his annual pilgrimage to Congress on Friday to tell us why the taxpayers should further subsidize his company. And this less than a year after Congress granted him an annual school fare subsidy of over $1 million.

Granted, the company appears to be in financial difficulties but this unquestionably is due to Chalk's unbridled avarice and total disregard for the public interest. Having studied the financial machinations of the man, I am absolutely opposed to any further handouts to Chalk. In fact, he should, in the public interest, be relieved of control of the company immediately. Inasmuch as the public will be ill-served by Mr. Chalk's continued control of the company and inasmuch as he has gained back many times over his original capital investment of $500,000, it is my intention to find a way to relieve Chalk of control of the company and his franchise. There is a provision in the franchise which permits Congress to lift the 14-year-old franchise from Chalk anytime after 7 years; this provision I hope to trigger. Further, I will look into the possibilities of having the company legally condemned without compensation for the purpose of taking it out of Chalk's hands and either selling or delivering it to a new management or to a public authority.

I yield to no man as a firm advocate of the free enterprise system, but the Chalk operation has only the barest resemblance to free enterprise. The company is heavily subsidized directly and indirectly by the taxpayers and operates under a franchise granted by Congress which gives it exclusive transportation rights within the District of Columbia. And yet, Chalk has thoroughly abused his unique privileges and the public. He has plundered the company of its assets. He has spun off, or is attempting to spin off, so-called nonoperating company properties which are estimated to be valued at over $18 million. The properties which have already been spun off are now lodged in subsidiaries designed to secure them from recovery for any transit-related operations. These valuable properties by rights should be used by the company to maintain a healthy transit operation. As a matter of fact, the transit company now borrows funds from some of these subsidiaries for which the company is required to pay a healthy interest rate.

Last year Chalk claimed that he was losing money by carrying schoolchildren at a reduced fare. Congress caved in and granted the school fare subsidy. This subsidy is on top of the generous indirect subsidies granted by Congress when it gave Chalk the exclusive franchise. These subsidies take the form of forgiveness of such local taxes as the franchise tax, gross sales tax, compensating use tax, the motor vehicles title tax, the tangible personal property tax, and the mileage tax. Furthermore, exemptions are allowed for the motor vehicle fuel tax, and taxes on realty used in transportation operations to the extent needed to allow a rate of return on operations which is determined by the regulatory Commission.

In addition to the huge profits he will realize from the spinoffs, Chalk has made excessive profits through dividends, paying himself handsome dividends even while the company was losing money through his own mismanagement.

As easily as he accepted the tax forgivenesses granted in the franchise, he has on the other hand reneged on a major franchise obligation imposed on him which requires him to remove the remaining 70 miles of old streetcar tracks. It is calculated that the track removal will cost $18 million at present prices.

The only removal Chalk has engaged in has been to remove the company's valuable assets through the spinoff procedure thus abstracting properties which could be used to maintain the integrity of the company.

In addition to his failure to remove the tracks, Chalk has also reneged on his contractual obligations to the drivers' union pension fund which at this moment is short approximately $2 million owed to it by Chalk. Understandably dismayed, the union has threatened to strike. The other day Chalk cavalierly informed the union that he will make up the pension deficit only if the Congress comes through with a further subsidy. Why cannot Chalk sell some of the spunoff properties to make up the deficit? In view of Chalk's past "crisis" tactics, it is quite apparent that he is deliberately trying to precipitate a strike to force the Congress to deliver the subsidy. He has used these tactics before with Congress, all too successfully.

The market value of the properties which Chalk has spun off plus those which he is attempting to spin off is estimated to be in the neighborhood of $18 million. Add to that the approximately $5 million in dividends which the company has paid to the stockholders. The majority stockholder is, of course, himself. Add to all that the approximately $70,000 in salaries which Chalk annually pays to himself and his wife. In sum, Chalk has milked the company dry and incurred company indebtedness to a point where the net worth of D.C. Transit is zero.

Now, with the property worth nothing, Chalk wants a generous subsidy to be used to keep the company going and, incredibly, to reinstate dividends of approximately $600,000 per year.

Indisputably, Chalk has duped the public and the Congress much too long. The company and the franchise should be taken from his responsibility post haste without a penny of further compensation.

Furthermore, the city and the regulatory Commission should be diligent in recovering for the company and the public the properties which Chalk has siphoned off.

WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT

(Mr. COUGHLIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying that this House yesterday passed the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 by a vote of 392 to 1.

Although I was present yesterday for the debate in support of the bill, I was called from the floor for an appointment and my return was delayed until after the rollcall was complete. Had I been present I would have voted yea.

Nothing is more important than the conservation of our precious natural resources. Actual pollution and the threat of even more disastrous pollution of our water resources have become intolerable. It behooves industry, as well as the private citizen, to recognize that despoiling of our natural assets must be stemmed and eventually stopped before we have so debauched these resources that all of us will have suffered irreparable harm.

Industry and the private citizen could not enjoy the benefits of today's American society had we not been blessed with the huge reservoir of natural resources nature entrusted to us as a nation. The time has long passed when we can cite the materialistic accomplishments of our technological age as excuses for the crimes we have perpetrated against our natural resources.

In this quest to save our environment from pollution beyond recall, each of us must assume his responsibility—individually or corporately—for doing his utmost to reverse the unfortunate trend of past decades. The Water Quality Control Act of 1969 is a logical and reasonable effort to help reverse this trend. I would hope that all concerned abide by and consciously act to make this measure every bit as effective as we intend it to be.

COMMENTS ON THE JENSEN ARTICLE ON INTELLIGENCE

(Mr. WHITEHURST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, recently the Harvard Educational Review carried a 100-page report written by Dr. Arthur Jensen, School of Education at Berkeley. This article deals with the problems of heredity and environment as determinants of an individual's IQ. Some sections of this report have been publicly evaluated out of context.

In response to these evaluations, the Washington Post recently carried two articles by Dr. William F. Brazziel, the director of general education at Norfolk State College. These articles, dated March 21, and April 8, 1969, not only brought the context to bear on these evaluations, but also included additional comments by the author, Dr. Jensen.

Mr. Speaker, I feel Dr. Brazziel's articles have much merit and should be called to the attention of my colleagues. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted into the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 21, 1969]

THE JENSEN ARTICLE ON INTELLIGENCE

Joseph Alsop's analysis of Arthur Jensen's article on intelligence (March 12) deserves comment. There seems to be a great deal of confusion about what Jensen said, what he was actually trying to say and even about who Jensen is. From what I can glean from correspondence with Dr. Jensen, he feels he is being misinterpreted—at least by the Klan types who are embracing him as their very own.

1. Jensen is not a professor in the department of educational psychology at Berkeley. He is a professor in the School of Education.

2. Jensen's 100-page article in the *Harvard Educational Review* did not deal solely with black-white differences in IQ. Only three pages dealt with race. He should have known, however, that these three pages would make the headlines and that his real story would remain untold—at least by the mass media. Ironically, his thesis could have been presented without the treatment of race. These three pages could have been omitted.

3. In the spring issue of *HER,* four eminent psychologists will rebut, or place in what they consider proper perspective, Jensen's contentions regarding heredity versus environment in IQ. It was a grave editorial blunder to postpone comment until spring. The contentions and the rebuttals should have been placed back-to-back.

4. Jensen's main thesis was that heredity plays a major role in all IQ and that the "environmentalists" (this is an extension of an old-age feud) were leading people astray by over-promising and under-producing in their Head Start, compensatory and mental retardation programs.

5. Significantly, Jensen also stated on the last two pages of his article that IQ tests do not tap the full capabilities of disadvantaged black kids. He stated that he had developed a test which showed better than most their true potentials.

6. He noted that these kids rely heavily on old-fashioned associative learning similar to that taught by basic educationists of the 1930's and that the source of failure of compensatory education lay in the fact that since Sputnik I most American teachers relied heavily on abstract conceptions. He urged a greater individualization of instruction and a shift to highly intensive instructional methods such as the Bereiter-Engelmann program. He said the programs of art and music for the "culturally deprived" were a waste of money.

7. On race, Jensen stated that a higher proportion of black than white children were apt to have beeen malnourished, under-stimulated and under-educated and that self concepts and learning were affected by 3.5 centuries of isolation and bigotry. And that of these factors all combined to produce low IQ's. He noted that families who were affected most by these conditions also had the large families, that the black middle class families with high IQ's had small families. He implied that unless some food, money, jobs and family planning or selective breeding entered the picture any statistical portrait of black IQ would be low and place black people in a bad light. In fact, the statistics would get worse. All of this has been said before.

8. In leading up to these conclusions which in general are quite sound and deserve attention. Jensen winnowed through 40 years of research on black-white IQ, all of which was inconclusive. He came to the same conclusion of most physchologists in this area, i.e., black people seem to think in a different fashion from white people, our present tests (his new test excluded) don't measure the black mind correctly and we have no way of ascertaining how much of this difference is genetic and how much is environmental.

Extremists and self-anointed psychologists seem to be seizing upon the report as medicine for whatever ails them. It has already been used in a school desegregation case—for the defense. New York black nationalists are pleased to learn that black people think differently from white people etc. They consider it a blessing. The list is much longer. Few people have actually read the article.

Someone should try to bring some order to the situation—right now. There are good implications in the article for policy planning in school integration, compensatory education, anti-hunger and family planning programs, and for the new programs of infant stimulation such as are now in progress in the NIH complex and OEO demonstration centers. It would be shameful to let the thing slide into another Moynihan affair.

WILLIAM F. BRAZZIEL,
Director of General Education, Virginia State College.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 8, 1969]

FURTHER COMMENT ON THE JENSEN ARTICLE

Joseph Alsop's analysis of my letter on the Jensen article deserves comment. I was happy to see Mr. Alsop indicate that the main thesis of Dr. Jensen's article was the hereditary-environment controversy and that, contrary to the impression many people received from his columns, black IQ was not the central theme. Whether three or 16 pages of the article directly dealt with racial differences can be debated but is probably not important here.

In Mr. Alsop's columns on the matter the most troublesome statement seems to have been: "Yet there is no use being mealy mouthed about it. Dr. Jensen is really saying that in addition to the handicaps wickedly imposed by prejudice and discrimination, the average black American begins the race of life with a detectable genetic handicap." This statement sent many hard-line segregationists into orbit.

In my request for clarification from Dr. Jensen regarding his views on racial inferiority in intellect, I received a letter with the following statements:

1. Obvious differences in inborn mental ability between races are reporters' words, they are certainly not mine. Furthermore, the statement is quite indefensible.

2. The complex causes of differences in mental abilities among individuals or between racial groups are not at all obvious. Research so far has been inadequate as a basis for definitive conclusions about racial differences in intelligence.

3. My own work is not aimed at this aspect of the problem but at the description and analysis of individual differences in various types of learning.

I want also to express disappointment with Mr. Alsop's decision to withhold analysis of the rebuttals of the article although he had them in hand when he wrote the column. He is engaging in the same questionable practices which many persons are now taking the *Harvard Education Review* editorial board to task for.

Fortunately, the New York *Times* saw fit to release the gist of the rebuttals in their Sunday, March 30 paper. Professor Steven Vandenberg, a University of Colorado geneticist, said that Dr. Jensen's interpretation may have been overeager and that Jensen should have been more careful about the racial question. Dr. Lee Cronback, a University of Pittsburgh psychologist, accused Jensen of overstatement and misstatement, and Dr. J. McVicker Hunt, a University of Illinois psychologist, said that odds are strong that we can boost both IQ and scholastic achievement substantially. There was dissent in this vein from several others. Most people will never learn about it, however, because of the way the article and the rebuttals were handled.

I think Mr. Alsop is on the right track in urging that we assure good nutrition, prenatal care, early stimulation, early education and the best of schools for all children from homes with modest incomes.

I believe this will result in a reduction in the learning problems we are all concerned about. We might also buy Dr. Jensen's new test which he claims will tap the potential of poor children far better than any devised so far.

I surely hope we can avoid arguing among ourselves until we can get this job done.

William F. Brazziel, Ph. D.,
Director of General Education,
Virginia State College.

Norfolk.

ALONG WITH THE SURTAX

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, my mail is very heavy from constituents on tax matters. Probably, people are more concerned about heavy taxes and tax inequities than any other domestic matter. We will be faced soon with a decision as to whether the 10-percent surtax should be extended, reduced or eliminated entirely. My vote will be to eliminate the surtax and to eliminate the need for it by reducing expenditures.

The Free Lance-Star, a newspaper published in Fredericksburg, Va., contained an editorial recently regarding the surtax which gives the editor's opinion of the surtax which I believe merits our consideration.

Certainly, the Ways and Means Committee has a difficult task in recommending ways to eliminate inequities in the system and providing that each citizen pay his fair share of the tax burden. I believe they will make progress in this respect.

The editorial is inserted herein for the information of the House.

[From the Fredericksburg (Va.) Free Lance-Star, Apr. 14, 1969]

Along With the Surtax

One hears more and more variations on the theme that, while we must retain the 10 per cent surcharge on income tax, this should be accompanied by significant tax reform. The point is well taken. Congress can scarcely justify keeping the surtax, which falls as such a burden on middle-income taxpayers, without acting against devices whereby the rich get by without paying a fair share of taxes.

It is sometimes argued, though rather lamely, that this is not really much of a problem because the rich are small in number. This attitude was disclosed in recent testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee by Walker Winter, vice president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. He told the congressmen that "too much emphasis has been placed on the relatively small number of taxpayers who have arranged their affairs so as to minimize their tax liabilities."

If Congress heeds this siren song, it may find that talk of a "taxpayers' revolt" has become more than talk. For if there is one thing that galls the average taxpayer is the thought that, whereas he must dig deep, some huge corporations and some enormously wealthy men pay little or no taxes.

An article published recently in many newspapers called attention to the fact that last year 21 Americans with incomes of a million dollars or more paid no taxes whatsoever. The fact that this taxless status also applied to about 150 with incomes in excess of $200,000 has been well publicized, too. These are extreme examples—but examples of a fairly common phenomenon, evasion of proportionate income taxes by corporations and wealthy individuals.

It is a phenomenon that the American people increasingly feel they would like to dispense with. That is something for Congress to consider with care when debating whether to retain the 10 percent surtax.

INFLAMMATORY REMARKS BY JULIUS HOBSON, WASHINGTON SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I note from the news media that Julius W. Hobson, an employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, made a recent talk before a group of Georgetown University students and indicated that he was a Marxist Socialist who believes that the American free enterprise system must be overthrown by force and violence before the gap can be bridged between the Nation's haves and have-nots.

It seems to me that if anyone overthrows the American free enterprise system by force and violence, it would be tantamount to the overthrow of the U.S. Government and I am writing to the Department of Justice suggesting that it try to ascertain the full text of the Hobson statement, investigate his other activities, and determine whether he is violating any criminal statute. Since he is also a Government employee, I am also contacting the Secretary of Health, Education, and Walfare to determine whether this is a suitable person to be on the Government payroll, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to determine whether Mr. Hobson has violated any civil service laws or regulations.

It seems unreasonable to me for a man to advocate the violent overthrow of the Government of this country and still be on the payroll of that Government.

His speech also states that Washington students have nothing to lose by raising hell, even if they take over control and occupy schools; that nothing more can happen to them and they have nothing to lose by such activity. This raises the question as to whether he is inciting people to riot in conflict with Federal and District of Columbia law.

Approximately 1 year ago, prior to the so-called Poor Peoples' March on Washington, Mr. Hobson complained of Federal discrimination in employment and circulated a petition among Federal employees seeking congressional hearings. He stated at that time that in the event officials did not respond favorably to the petition, he would consider civil disobedience tactics in Federal buildings.

After learning of this, I contacted the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Attorney General, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, urging investigation and the taking of appropriate action against the offender. Nothing was done by the Johnson administration. It will be interesting to learn whether the present administration takes any action against this militant on the Federal payroll and the use of seditious language by a self-styled Marxist Socialist.

THE RUSSIAN FISHING OFFENSIVE

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today I flew in a Coast Guard plane out over a group of some 100 Russian fishing trawlers busy at work in the Atlantic off the coast near Norfolk, Va.

The trawlers themselves are supported by at least seven large factory ships which process the catch right there on the scene. I also saw a refrigerated freighter which carries the product either back to Russia for home consumption or to Latin America or elsewhere for sale.

I am informed that I saw only about half of the Russian vessels now operating off our Atlantic coasts. And I understand also that some 25 Polish trawlers are fishing in the same area.

Some of the Russian trawlers from the fleet I saw had violated the American

12-mile limit in early February, coming to within 8 or 9 miles of the U.S. coast.

When I saw them, they all were about 40 to 50 miles outside the 12-mile limit, but their presence near our shores, and the great volume of fish they are taking must be considered a significant development. It is a sign of Russia's great fishing offensive which actually is a worldwide fact.

They are outfishing us in our own waters and they are rapidly advancing to become one of the world's leading fishing nations. It is quite possible that some of the Russian catch eventually is imported into the United States by one exporter or another in competition with U.S. fishermen.

Incredibly, we import about 75 percent of the fish we consume, including shrimp, tuna, and rainbow trout and other varieties to which U.S. fishermen have good access.

The reason I made the flight last week was to obtain a firsthand view of Russian fishing in at least one area near our coast. The Russians are also to be seen off the coasts of California, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska with increasing regularity.

I have heard a report that they have also been seen in the Gulf of Mexico, but I have no confirmation of this.

The trawlers I saw from about 300 feet of altitude were catching herring primarily. But they are using huge nets which bring in whatever fish are there. My understanding is that they are throwing nothing back. And cod, bluefish, and other valuable varieties are likely to be taken.

Our Government has signed fishing agreements with Russia. But the problem here is that while they have much to gain by extensive fishing near our coasts we have almost nothing to gain by reciprocal arrangements for American trawlers to fish off Russian coasts.

In 1967 an agreement was reached between several nations with fishing interests in the North Atlantic. And while, so far as I know, this is a useful agreement from our national standpoint, experience tells us that the overall world fishing situation requires urgent attention beyond the matters treated in regional agreements.

The use of factory ships with which to process the fish catch introduces a new element into the expanding world fishing situation. This practice allows fishing fleets to range far and wide and, therefore, the question of territorial and fishing limits becomes even more important.

I have introduced a resolution to deal with our policy with regard to our territorial sea claim. It is House Joint Resolution 605 which calls for a policy of reciprocity in the matter of claims to territorial sea. Instead of setting a limit which would apply to all ships of all countries our policy would be to impose on every country the territorial sea limit which that country itself claims. Of course we would retain our own minimum limits.

Since Russia claims a 12-mile zone as territorial sea, then our policy with regard to Russian ships would also be 12 miles. We now claim only a 3-mile limit of territorial sea. This proposed policy would at least serve the purpose of preventing espionage ships from approaching to within 12 miles of our coasts.

But the fishing limit problem is another matter. The picture of various national fishing limits around the world is a picture of great chaos. Peru, Ecuador, and some other nations claim 200 miles, and have attacked U.S. tuna boats on the basis of that claim and have gotten by with it.

There is a great need for a new worldwide agreement on fishing limits. Attempts were made in 1958 and again in 1960, and they failed. But since then it has become more obvious that worldwide fising activity is growing fast. Competition is going to become fierce as the demand for fish as a relatively cheap source of protein grows.

Even more important we need to revitalize the U.S. fishing industry. In only 13 years we have slipped from second place to sixth place among the world's fishing nations.

We are a nation blessed with three long coastlines rich in valuable fish resources. And yet we are a nation which centers its food production attention on land agriculture only.

Vast studies are being made in this country by goverment, by foundations and other responsible institutions on the subject of the world food problem. And they generally give only slight reference to fish and the vast source of valuable protein represented by marine life. Some of these studies fail to even mention this aspect of food production.

But in a world of swiftly expanding population, when the problems of food production are of a critical nature, fish is the food resource of the future.

The Russians, the Japanese, and some others know this and are acting on it. We have not yet come to know it. So we are falling far behind in the work to build and retain a fishing capability to match the times. It is vital that we begin to do something about it.

REAPPORTIONMENT AND THE SUPREME COURT

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's latest ruling on reapportionment further documents the need for a procedure to restrain the judiciary from appropriating legislative powers. The decision is akin to its redistricting of State legislatures in 1966, at which time Justice Harlan said in his dissenting opinion:

> Had the Court paused to probe more deeply into the matter, it would have found that the Equal Protection Clause was never intended to inhibit the States in choosing any democratic method they pleased for the apportionment of their legislatures.
>
> This is shown by the language of the Fourteenth Amendment taken as a whole, by the understanding of those who proposed and ratified it, and by the political processes of the States at the time the Amendment was adopted.
>
> It is confirmed by numerous State and Congressional actions since the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment, and by the common understanding of the Amendment as evidenced by subsequent decisions of this Court, before Baker vs. Carr, supra, made an abrupt break with the past in 1962.

He said further:

> The Constitution is an instrument of Government, fundamental to which is the premise that in a diffusion of governmental authority lies the greatest promise that this Nation will realize liberty for all its citizens.
>
> This Court, limited in function in accordance with that premise, does not serve its high purpose when it exceeds its authority, even to satisfy justified impatience with the slow workings of the political process.

In his summation of the decision, Justice Potter Stewart wrote:

> To put the matter plainly, there is nothing in all the history of this Court's decisions which supports this constitutional rule. The Court's draconian pronouncement, which makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 states, finds no support in the words of the Constitution, in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year history of our Federal union.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years even more severe criticism has come from other Supreme Court Justices who recognize the judiciary's usurpation of powers that the Founding Fathers placed in the legislative branch of this Government. The inclination has become more recognizable of late, though the threat has always been latent and elicited this warning from Thomas Jefferson in 1821:

> The judges are, in fact, the corps of sappers and miners, steadily working to undermine the independent rights of the States, and to consolidate all power in the hands of that government in which they have so important a freehold estate.

Jefferson made this proposal even before the Constitution was adopted:

> The dignity and stability of government in all its branches, the morals of the people, and every blessing of its society, depend so much upon an upright and skillful administration of justice, that the judicial power ought to be distinct from both the legislative and executive, and independent from both, that so it may be a check upon both, as both should be checks upon that.

Because there is not now any check whatsoever upon the judiciary despite its incredible power over both the legislative and executive branches, most Members of Congress have come to realize that there is a critical deficiency in the system which depends upon effective checks and balances for its very existence. It is for this reason that I introduced House Joint Resolution 82 to enable Congress by a two-thirds vote of each House to override any decision of the Supreme Court.

In its 5-to-4 decision on reapportionment of congressional districts, the Supreme Court has again whacked at constitutional principle and intent. Ironically, tomorrow, or next week, or next month, should a Justice die or resign and be succeeded by a person of contrary opinion, an exact opposite ruling would be forthcoming if the same case were at issue.

The Constitution provides that two-thirds of both Houses of Congress or the legislatures of two-thirds of the States may initiate amendments that do not become effective unless ratified by three-fourths of the States. In contrast, a single individual sitting on the High Court can make the determination—irrefutable as of now—that affects the lives, the property, and the rights of all the people of all the States.

Today the general public is crying for relief from the Supreme Court decision prohibiting prayers in schools, and I am confident that Engle against Vitale will be the first ruling to be rescinded if my resolution is adopted. Other decisions marked for reversal by public demand include those which give preference to criminals over police officers and society in general, allow publication and distribution of obscene literature, and permit Communists to work in defense plants.

The Court's most recent ruling on reapportionment is another in a long line of decisions that accentuate the obligation of Congress to adopt House Joint Resolution 82. It is an invitation to the people of this Nation to encourage their State assemblymen to pass resolutions supporting a constitutional amendment that will give the citizens of this Nation, through their elected representatives, an opportunity to curb the excesses of a branch of Government that has gone far beyond its designated authority.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the rest of this week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have no business for the balance of this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day; and there are two suspensions. The first is H.R. 8794, to extend for 1 year the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development; and the second is H.R. 8434, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces.

Beginning on Monday and continuing until completed there will be consideration of H.R. 514, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969, under an open rule, with 4 hours of debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and the bill to be read by titles instead of by sections, and waiving points of order against lines 10 through 15 on page 13, and lines 6 through 16 on page 20.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the ususal reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any other program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand it, there are to be 4 hours of general debate under the rule. Would it be the intention to run late and finish the general debate, if it does run late on Monday?

Mr. ALBERT. I have no knowledge that we intend to run late. We hope to dispose of as much as possible of the general debate.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 21, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE JOHNSON RESEARCH BUDGET

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who want to see the budget balanced, the debt reduced, and the tax burden lightened have been encouraged by the steps that President Nixon and his associates in the executive branch have taken to reduce governmental spending. We who serve in the legislative branch must supplement the efforts of the Chief Executive.

Those who are seeking for places to economize should not overlook the huge sums that are being spent year after year for research and development. As I went through the budget that Lyndon B. Johnson submitted to the Congress a few days before he retired from the Presidency, I was astounded when I noted that it calls for well over $15,000,000,000 for a multiplicity of research and related activities.

Worthy as the goals of many of these programs are, it is obvious that substantial sums can be saved by the elimination of overlapping and duplication and by postponement of programs that can, without harm to the Nation, be deferred for a while.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a compilation of the research programs that the taxpayers have been supporting and will continue to support if Mr. Johnson's final budget is put into effect without substantial change. As far as I am concerned, we owe it to the taxpayer to do all in our power to cut that budget in order that we may achieve a surplus without hidden gimmicks, trick bookkeeping, and fiscal legerdemain. This list of research programs and the lists of education, health, and manpower programs that I inserted before the spring recess should be helpful as we look for places to cut expenditures. While there are a few programs that I did not include because funds for research could not easily be separated from money for other items, the list that I am inserting today is about as comprehensive as is possible to make it.

There are other reasons besides economy for a close and careful scrutiny of the research programs. I am reminded of the words that Dwight D. Eisenhower addressed to the Nation on January 17, 1961, 3 days before he retired from the Presidency. It was in this speech that President Eisenhower stated that "we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex."

Many of my colleagues have cited these words during the 8 years that have elapsed since Mr. Eisenhower retired from public life. This afternoon I would like to point out that immediately after he had warned his listeners about the military-industrial complex, he went on to tell them about the "danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite."

Here are the pertinent paragraphs from his farewell address:

> Akin to, and largely responsible for the sweeping changes in our industrial-military posture, has been the technological revolution during recent decades.
>
> In this revolution, research has become central; it also becomes more formalized, complex, and costly. A steadily increasing share is conducted for, by, or at the direction of, the Federal government.
>
> Today, the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers.
>
> The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present—and is gravely to be regarded.
>
> Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

The list of research and related programs follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
Council of Economic Advisers:			
Advances and reimbursements:			
Economic research	30		
Office of Emergency Preparedness:			
Salaries and expenses, telecommunications: Research and development	544	554	800

Research and development. This activity will finance technical studies of telecommunications matters which are too broad in scope to be undertaken by any single department. Examples of such studies include methods of interconnecting the communications systems of individual agencies, and means of increasing the survivability of telecommunications resources.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
State and local preparedness and research and development: Research and development	3		
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT			
Foreign assistance:			
Military assistance: Adjustment of prior-year research and development obligations	—39		
Economic assistance:			
Grants and other programs:			
International organizations and programs, grants:			
World Health Organization, medical research	150	150	150
Special Foreign Currency activities:			
Department of Agriculture—Translation of publications and scientific cooperation: Agricultural and forestry research	201	206	
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
Agricultural Research Service:			
Salaries and expenses:			
Research:			
Farm research	101,308	98,660	100,786
Utilization research and development	33,155	33,264	33,443
Nutrition and consumer use research	4,184	4,278	5,453
Marketing research	9,384	8,558	8,488
Construction of facilities	9,226	19,007	10,294
Contingencies		1,000	1,000

Farm research. Improved breeding, feeding, and management practices, including management of animal wastes, are developed for farm livestock, poultry, and domestice fur animals. Practical methods are sought for control of diseases, parasites, and insect pests affecting them and to protect them from toxic chemical poisons and other hazards.

Investigations are conducted to improve varieties of food, feed, fiber, and other plants, and to develop new crops; to improve crop-production practices, including methods to control plant diseases and nematodes, and reduce cost of production; and to develop safe chemical, biological, and other methods for control of harmful pests affecting farm production.

Investigations are conducted to improve the management of natural resources, including investigations to improve soil and water management (including salinity and saline soils), irrigation, and conservation practices; to study hydrologic problems of agricultural watersheds; to determine the relation of soil types and water to plant, animal, and human nutrition; and to apply engineering principles to improve efficiency and reduce cost of agricultural production.

The research is aimed at the profitable production of an adequate supply of food, feed, fiber, and other agricultural products of desired quality at minimum costs. Attention continues to be given to the production of agricultural products having industrial uses. Increased attention has been given to studies on protection of plants, animals, and natural resources from harmful effects of polluted soid, water, and air. Research also concerns the application of remote sensing techniques in meeting agricultural problems. The proportion of farm research funds going into basic research is currently estimated at 45% of the total funds for this research. The basic research is fundamental to and strengthens the other research efforts.

The increase requested for 1970 would provide for research in the following areas: improve methods to control avian leukosis in poultry; study of resistant micro-organisms resulting from the use of antibiotics in livestock and poultry production; studies on low-income rural housing; pollution research concerned with animal waste management; and expand remote sensing research, including the acquisition of an aircraft.

Utilization research and development. Chemical, physical, and biological research is conducted to develop increased industrial uses of farm products, and new and improved foods, feeds, and fabrics; and to develop improved methods for processing agricultural commodities.

The research aim is to expand the demand for farm products by developing new and improved products and economical processes tailored to the requirements of the domestic and foreign markets. The research conducted includes studies to protect food and feed products from harmful micro-organisms and naturally occurring toxins and studies of health-related problems of tobacco. Increased effort is being given to the processing of agricultural commodities to minimize waste formation and to utilize waste products to avoid pollution.

The increase requested for 1970 would be used for research on processing characteristics of new varieties and upgrading the quality of peach products.

Nutrition and consumer use research. Studies are made of human nutritional requirements, composition and nutritive value of foods, and consumer and food economics. The research aim is to determine nutrient requirements and how foods can supply these to best assure nutritional well-being of people throughout their lifespan, to provide up-to-date information about food consumption and nutrition of the population, and to develop improved procedures for household preparation, care, and preservation of foods which will preserve their nutritional, sanitary, and wholesome quality. The increase requested for 1970 would be used to expand information on the nutrient value of foods, to identify factors contributing to poor nutrition, and to provide guidelines for improvement of programs to better the nutritional well-being of people.

Marketing research. Practical answers to reduce costs and maintain product quality in moving products from farm to consumer are sought through research. For farm products as they pass through marketing channels, efforts are made to develop safe methods to protect against insect attack, find objective methods to determine quality, reduce losses from waste and spoilage, and improve efficiency in physical handling. The work includes research at each stage of marketing, such as assembly points and storage facilities, and of transportation at terminal or central markets. Research is also concerned with mycotoxins in agricultural products in relation to off-farm handling, conditioning, and storage.

Construction of facilities. An increase is requested in 1970 for planning, construction, and improvement of research facilities. This includes a facility for bluetongue research and a fruitfly laboratory.

Contingencies. These sums are to meet urgent research needs that develop unexpectedly when such needs cannot be met by redirection of resources from other projects.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program):			
Market development research	1,942	1,600	1,400
Agricultural and forestry research	4,892	5,000	5,600

Work is carried on through agreements, in both basic and applied fields, by research institutions and organizations in foreign countries. In addition to developing scientific information of great importance to American agriculture, the research under this program is making a contribution to the solution of agricultural production and related problems of the countries in which it operates. It serves to preserve and expand existing markets and develop new ones for agricultural commodities, including cotton, dairy products, fats and oils, grain, feed, livestock and meat, poultry, and fruit and vegetables. It also provides for research supplementary to domestic programs on farm, forest, marketing, utilization, agricultural economics, and human nutrition problems.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Construction of facilities:			
Construction of facilities (program costs, funded)	42	7	
Change in selected resources	—35	—6	
Total obligations	7	1	

These funds are for construction of facilities for research, including completion of a laboratory for research on biological control of insects and installation of laboratory equipment at a soil and water research laboratory.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Working Capital Fund, Agricultural Research Center, maintenance and operation of central facilities and services:			
Cost of materials sold or applied	1,371	,1370	1,370
Other expense	3,560	3,620	3,575
Total operating costs, funded	4,931	4,990	4,945
Capital outlay: Purchase of equipment	65	55	55
Total program costs, funded	4,996	5,045	5,000
Change in selected resources	—8		
Total obligations	4,987	5,045	5,000

This fund finances, on a reimbursable basis, central facilities and services furnished to agencies at the Agricultural Research Center.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: Research	1,961	2,861	2,643
Cooperative State Research Service:			
Payments and expenses:			
Payments to agricultural experiment stations	49,630	51,684	53,757
Grants for cooperative forestry research	3,369	3,485	3,785
Contracts and grants for scientific research	1,408	1,902	2,070
Grants for facilities	943	2,114	1,315
Penalty mail	310	198	160
Federal administration	1,470	1,686	1,878
Total program costs, funded	57,130	61,069	62,965
Change in selected resources	1,756	—2,158	765
Total obligations	58,886	58,911	63,730

The Service administers funds for payments and grants to State agricultural experiment stations and other eligible institutions for the support of research in agriculture, the rural home, the rural community, and forestry. This administration involves supervision of the funds, and close advisory relations with the State agricultural experiment stations, schools of forestry, and other institutions eligible to receive funds. This agency participates in planning and coordination of research programs among the States and between the States and the United States Department of Agriculture.

Payments to agricultural experiment stations. Grants are allocated to agricultural experiment stations of the land-grant colleges for agricultural research including investigations and experiments to promote a permanent and efficient agricultural industry and improvements in the rural home and rural community. In 1970, emphasis will be placed on food and nutrition, community improvement, and pollution research.

Grants and cooperative forestry research. These are allocated to land-grant colleges or agricultural experiment stations and other State-supported colleges and universities offering graduate training in the sciences basic to forestry and having a forestry school. In 1970, emphasis will be placed on timber production and forest products utilization research.

Contracts and grants for scientific research. These funds are for the support of grants on specific research problems at nonprofit institutions of higher education or nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of such research.

Grants for facilities. These funds providing additional facilities for research are allocated to State agricultural experiment stations. Assistance is available to the States for construction, acquisition, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other capital facilities which are necessary to more effectively conduct research in agriculture and sciences related thereto.

Penalty mail. Funds to cover the cost of penalty mailings for State agricultural experiment station directors are provided under this appropriation.

Federal administration. A coordinating and review staff is maintained to examine research projects and assist State institutions and Federal agencies.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE			
Salaries and expenses:			
Farm economics	5,718	6,342	6,517
Marketing economics	2,989	3,428	3,428
Domestic and foreign economic analysis	3,190	3,617	3,617
Total program costs, funded	11,897	13,387	13,562
Change in selected resources	667		
Total obligations	12,564	13,387	13,562

Farm economics. Research is conducted to measure, appraise, and analyze on a continuing basis, economic changes that occur in farming and in the use of human and natural rural resources and to indicate needed adjustments.

Research on the economics of farm production includes the economics of organization and management of farms; adjustments in production to prospective demands, and changing technologies; appraisals of costs and returns on farms representative of important types, sizes and locations, and the appraisal of costs of producing important commodities; development of measures of farm output and productivity; problems of farm size and capital requirements; financing of farm enterprises; and appraisal of alternative agricultural production policies and programs.

Natural resources economics is concerned with the economics of use, conservation, development, management, and control of natural resources and their relationship to economic activity. It includes economic analysis of land and water resources, resource institutions, and the economic and social conditions affecting use of resources.

Economic development is focused upon the well-being and opportunities of rural people. It includes a broad research program on economic development of rural areas, opportunities and employment of rural people, and factors affecting them, including local governments and other organizations. Special attention is given to the poor who are found in heavy concentrations among rural people.

The increase requested in 1970 would permit development of economic indicators of change in the rural economy.

Marketing economics. This activity covers economic aspects of marketing farm products, including the nature of farmers' bargaining power; potentials for new products and new uses; market structure, costs, and margins; the economic effects of school feeding programs, food stamp, and direct food distribution programs.

Domestic and foreign economic analysis. Domestic economic analysis is concerned with identifying, measuring, and analyzing: the factors affecting demand, supply, and price of agricultural commodities; relationships between agriculture and the national economy; farm income and the income of the farm population; demand and consumption of farm products; long-term projections of economic growth and demand for farm products; and historical developments in the policies, programs, and organization of the Department.

Foreign economic analysis includes trade studies and investigation of supply-demand relationships. The trade and market studies focus on the problems of developing foreign markets and the effect of these developments on United States agricultural production. Research is carried on for more than 100 countries around the world, focusing on the forces affecting supply, demand, and trade in farm products, and their impact on U.S. agricultural exports.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Economic research:			
Agriculture	143	139	139
Other agencies	917	627	627
Foreign agricultural research and development, integrated foreign agricultural development program:			
Agricultural research and development, costs—obligations			4,150

This program is a new initiative in agricultural assistance that will produce a rapid and sustained rate of growth in the agriculture of developing nations.

The approach rests on the premise that improved farm production can be achieved only through the detailed planning and adoption of a system that provides a continuous flow of technology to farmers and to related business in an environment that is conducive to adoption. An effective system will be established by developing the private and public institutions needed for research, extension, and agribusiness activity and by supplementing existing technological and managerial capacity so as to operate this effectively.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Forest Service:			
Forest protection and utilization:			
Forest research:			
Forest and range management	16,179	16,537	16,819
Forest protection	9,560	10,368	10,748
Forest products and engineering	7,735	8,137	8,484
Forest resource economics	4,624	4,996	5,160
Forest research construction	4,784	2,949	474
Total, forest research	42,846	42,987	41,685

Forest research. Research is conducted at regional forest experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, and the Institute of Tropical Forestry.

Forest and range management. This research provides private and public land managers and owners with a sound basis for management of timber, forage, and watershed lands. Studies are conducted to maintain a sustained yield of products at the lowest possible costs; increase forage for domestic livestock and improve habitat for wildlife without damage to soil, watershed, or other values; assure maximum regular flow of usable water, and reduce floods and sedimentation; and improve methods for developing and managing recreation resources.

Forest protection. Research is conducted to develop sound measures for the protection of forests from damaged by fire, insects, and diseases. Forest fire research provides improved methods of predicting fire danger, and preparing for and combating fire by combinations of ground and aerial methods. Insect and disease research develops direct controls, silvicultural measures, and biological agents to combat forest pests.

Forest products and engineering. Studies are conducted to develop new and improved forest products, reduction and utilization of waste, and use of low-quality wood and less-desirable species. They include studies to reduce costs of logging and wood utilization, and to develop basic knowledge of wood and disseminate this to forest owners, manufacturers, fabricators, and consumers. Research is also conducted to advance the mechanization and efficiency of forestry operations, and to develop and evaluate machines and similar equipment for such operations as logging, planting, timber-stand improvement, and protection of forests.

Forest resource economics. These investigations are conducted to inventory and appraise the condition of forest lands, volume and quality of standing timber, ownership of timber resources, annual growth and depletion, and the potential need for timber products. Studies of the economics of forest crop production and of marketing of forest products are also included.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: Forest research at experimental forests and ranges, and for foreign countries	905	870	870
Cooperative work (trust fund): Research investigations	651	700	700
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
Business economics and statistics:			
Advancements and reimbursements: Economic research in water resource development	456	456	500
Bureau of the Census:			
Salaries and expenses:			
Operating costs: Research and development	516	713	713

Research and development. This is conducted on survey methods and techniques, including sample survey methods and theory, questionnaire design, response errors, equipment design and utilization, computer editing, analytical techniques, including techniques of geographic analysis, and administrative operations for the purpose of increasing accuracy, output, and usefulness of statistical data per unit of cost.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Science and technology, Environmental Science Services Administration:			
Research and development:			
Weather forecasts and warnings	11,235	11,896	12,559
River and flood forecasts and warnings	725	802	818
Earth description, mapping, and charting	1,738	1,948	2,090
Marine description, mapping, and charting	2,854	3,192	3,351
Telecommunications and space services	6,408	5,591	5,838
Environmental satellite	2,562	2,726	2,775
Total program costs	25,522	26,155	27,431
Depreciation included above	−1,590	−1,500	−1,500
Total program costs, funded	23,932	24,655	25,931
Change in selected resources	557	1,053	75
Total obligations	24,489	25,708	26,006

Weather forecasts and warnings. This consists of meteorological research and development designed to improve the weather forecasting and warning services by gaining a fuller understanding of the composition, dynamics, and circulation of the atmosphere by developing better instrumentation and techniques for weather observing and forecasting. The 1970 increases provide for extension of forecasting and data gathering programs to a worldwide scale.

River and flood forecasts and warnings. This includes research and development for further improvements in river and flood forecasting services and development of specialized equipment related to forecasts and water resources services. The 1970 increase provides for data acquisition system studies.

Earth description, mapping, and charting. This includes research directed toward understanding the intricate processes and phenomena of the solid earth, such as geomagnetic observations, seismological studies, preparation of warnings of seismological events, determining the size and shape of the earth, and improvement in the aeronautical charting program. The 1970 increase provides for automation of aeronautics chart production.

Marine description, mapping, and charting. This includes research directed toward the further improvement of oceonographic data systems and nautical charting systems leading to understanding of ocean properties and processes, including ocean and environment interaction. The 1970 increase provides for development of improved capability for ocean-atmosphere interaction studies.

Telecommunications and space services. This includes research leading to improved understanding of the propagation of radio and light waves, directed toward improvement in predictions of propagation conditions, warnings of electromagetic disturbances, and effective use of radio and light waves for telecommunications.

Environmental satellite. This provides for research in the environmental satellite program to determine the most beneficial method of data selection, collection, and use by operational programs. The 1970 increase will provide for expanded efforts to develop additional satellite sensors.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Research and development (special foreign currency program):			
Weather forecasts and warnings	64	176	145
River and flood forecasts and warnings	53		75
Earth description, mapping, and charting		205	85
Marine description, mapping, and charting	4	142	125
Telecommunications and space services	119	61	145
Environmental satellite	3	44	100
Total program costs	243	628	675
Change in selected resources	−70	96	−75
Total obligations	173	724	600

The special foreign currency program utilizes foreign currencies, which are excess to the normal requirements of the United States, to supplement domestic research and development activities and to encourage greater international cooperation in environmental research and allied sciences. The program consists essentially of a succession of individual projects which fluctuate from year to year. These are conducted under contract by foreign government agencies, universities, and other research organizations, to support current Environmental Science Services Administration requirements. The program planned for 1970 includes:

Weather forecasts and warnings. Study of agricultural potential of arid areas where rainfall amounts are marginal and studies of techniques for regional analysis and prediction of marine environmental factors.

River and flood forecasts and warnings. Studies of meteorological characteristics of watersheds and river basins for use in developing hydrologic models and improving river forecasting techniques.

Earth description, mapping, and charting. Studies of the earth's magnetic field and its secular changes, and studies of energy dissipated along fault lines as compared with the latent energy which is built up in other areas.

Marine description, mapping, and charting. Studies leading to a better understanding of the large scale motions of the ocean system and its interaction with the atmosphere.

Telecommunications and space services. Studies of the influence of water vapor, irregular terrain, climate, and weather on radio wave propagation.

Environmental satellite. Utilization of satellite data in studies of metorology, geomagnetism, ionospheric physics, and radio propagation.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
National Bureau of Standards:			
Research and Technical Services:			
Standards missions:			
Basic measurements and standards	10,410	11,806	12,965
Reference materials	2,926	3,172	3,406
Standard reference data	1,756	1,860	2,200
Data on properties of matter and materials	10,684	12,170	12,472
Technological standards	3,175	3,774	4,650
Special central missions:			
Computer science and technology	1,621	1,872	2,142
Federal clearinghouse	1,164	1,262	1,279
Invention and innovation	168	184	186
Total program costs, funded	31,904	36,100	39,300
Change in selected resources	379		800
Total obligations	32,283	36,100	40,100

The proposed increase will strengthen the Bureau's program, principally with regard to the central core of the physical measurement system, materials measurements and standards, including the Standard Reference Data System, technological measurements and standards, including particularly fire research and safety and research into the flammability of fabrics, and automatic data processing research. It will provide also the first major budget increment needed to implement the Metric System Study Act.

Basic measurements and standards. This includes research, development, analysis or specifications relating to standards for physical measurement; method of precise measurement of physical quantities; and precise values of fundamental physical constants suitable for tying measurement systems together. Most of the work in this subactivity deals with a basic core of 50 physical quantities such as length, electric current, temperature, sound pressure, etc., which are fundamental to all physical measurements and for which a standard representing unit magnitude is maintained. Each quantity must be measured over a very wide range from very large to very small magnitudes, and at each magnitude it must be measurable as accurately as the current state of technology requires.

The increase budgeted will be applied to help meet the increasing demands of our technologically oriented society to extend the range and improve the accuracy of the measurement of many of these basic quantities. The greatest emphasis is planned for measurements of length, frequency, pressure, temperature, and for electrical and magnetic quantities in the higher frequency ranges.

Reference materials. This includes description and development of methods of description of the essential features of composition and structure of selected materials which govern their behavior in technologically important environments, preparation and development of methods to prepare materials of precisely known composition and structure, and preparation of reproducible, stable sample materials for use as measurement standards and as specimens in the measurement of behavioral characteristics under given conditions.

The increase in 1970 will be used to prepare and characterize research or reference materials including samples of polymers, pure crystals, and alloys containing known trace amounts of impurities, and reference samples of biologically important compounds.

Standard reference data. This includes programs arising as a result of the Bureau's responsibility for developing a Standard Reference Data System and other programs concerned with standards reference data. Work is directed toward systematically obtaining from the scientific and technical literature and evaluating critically numerical data in the physical sciences needed by scientists and engineers. These data are the numbers that describe the properties of nature, the strengths of high temperature materials, the masses of atoms, the rates of chemical reactions, the wavelengths of light in emission spectra, and many others. Programs involve analysis of needs, acquisition of data from all available sources, critical evaluation, and compilation of data for dissemination.

Data on properties of matter and materials. Data concerning the behavioral characteristics of matter and materials is generated in areas of technology where urgently needed and not readily attainable elsewhere. This program is a major resource for research scientists and design engineers in areas such as electronics, polymers, metallurgy, ceramics, communications, defense, and nuclear energy.

The increase will be applied to the acquisition of data in fields where the need is most critical with particular attention to infrared wavelengths as potential frequency standards, mechanical characteristics of glass and polymer composites, and measurements of the heat released in reactions involving very small amounts of materials.

Technological standards. This includes research and development of test methods and standards of performance which serve as a basis for specifications, standards, and codes pertaining to materials, products, and systems used in industry and commerce; participation in technical committees for standardizing bodies such as the United States of America Standards Institute; administration of procedures for voluntary industrial standardization; participation in international standardization activities; and provision of information services pertaining to standardization activities.

The increase will be used to implement the provisions of the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968, and for research on flammability of fabrics, building technology, and research on methods of analysis of technical problems.

Computer science and technology. This includes technical activities of the Bureau aimed at improving the effective utilization by Government of automatic data processing equipment and computer-based data processing and information-handling systems. It includes, but is not limited to, investigation, design, and evaluation of complete systems, and the rendering of advice, consultation, and technical assistance to agencies of the Federal Government in connection with the design, selection, acquisition, and utilization of such systems. Closely connected with these technical activities are the following: providing technical leadership for and monitoring the Federal Government's participation in the development, measurement, and testing of voluntary commercial automatic data processing standards in a manner consonant with Government requirements for a compatible complex of equipments, languages, and practices; determining the need for and recommending establishment of uniform Federal standards where necessary to supplement voluntary commercial standards; and maintaining a specialized information service in support of all of the foregoing activities.

The increase will be devoted to development of standards for automatic data processing in the Federal Government and to research supporting standards development.

Federal clearinghouse. The Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information provides the following services: Collection of all technical reports generated by the Federal Government except those withheld for reasons of military security; indexing, reproducing, abstracting, announcing, and distributing these reports; analyzing, evaluating, and digesting contents of these reports and providing for special dissemination to regional centers and industries; and maintaining a clearinghouse for foreign technical translations.

Invention and innovation. This includes programs related to the Bureau's broad mission which serve either to encourage invention and innovation or to encourage the greater use of technology by Government and industry.

The research program financed by this appropriation provides a capability and competence for many services performed by the Bureau for the Government, science, industry, and commerce, including, for example, publication of scientific information; calibration of measuring instruments; tests of materials, products, or systems; production and sale of standard reference materials; consultation and advice on scientific or technical problems; and specialized research on specific technical problems of other Federal agencies.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Research and Technical Services (Special foreign currency program):			
Standards missions:			
Basic measurements and standards	40	32	23
Standard reference data	124	105	105
Reference materials	75	209	514
Technological standards	50	54	275
Total program costs, funded	289	400	917
Change in selected resources	155	500	−417
Total obligations	444	900	500

The responsibilities of the Bureau for basic and applied research, improvement of standards, collection and dissemination of standard reference data, and the certification and distribution of standard reference materials are of sufficient breadth to encourage utilization of research capabilities in other countries. The foreign currency program supplements the Bureau's existing program, allows an acceleration of research effort in selected areas, and permits economies to the Bureau's regular appropriations over the long term.

Foreign currencies determined by the Treasury Department to be excess to normal requirements of the United States will be used in non-Soviet bloc countries where scientific talent is available to augment the in-house capabilities of the Bureau in the areas of standard reference materials, standard reference data, and technological standards.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Civilian industrial technology:			
Support of industrial research (program costs, funded)	222	138	....
Change in selected resources	−83	−99	....
Total obligations	139	39	....

This program assists the textile and apparel industries in developing and making more deliberate and extensive use of scientific and technological resources for economic growth.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Working capital fund: Technical program:			
Standards missions	46,149	50,783	53,554
Special central missions	8,517	9,560	9,621
Miscellaneous services	1,763	1,575	1,575

Technical program. Research and technical services are conducted upon request of other Government agencies and the public, as well as in support of the Bureau's own research program.

The 1970 program calls for an expansion of the previous activity level to improve the competitive position of the United States merchant marine and maritime industries. The Government-industry cooperative program will concentrate on advanced shipping systems, development of intermodal transportation, modernization of cargo handling methods and similar technological advancements.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Ocean shipping:			
Maritime Administration:			
Research and development:			
Advanced shipping systems	427	1,692	3,451
Joint surface effect ship program	2,420	3,333	....
Technological development	1,244	1,417	6,031
Technology support	92	350	1,281
Administrative expenses	871	982	....
Total program costs, funded	5,054	7,774	10,763
Change in selected resources	900	219	−3,063
Total obligations	5,954	7,993	7,700

Advanced shipping systems. This activity provides for long-range research directed at the conceptual system approach to cargo movement, and will provide new and more competitive shipping concepts, tools, and systems.

Technological development. Research under this activity is aimed at resolving maritime problems affecting the development and operation of ships, ports, feeders, and their interfaces.

Technology support. This activity is directed at increasing the basic knowledge of marine science disciplines, improving industry's understanding of existing and ongoing maritime related research and resolving the attendant economic problems involved in ship operation.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Salaries and expenses: Research and development administration	794	893	1,000

Research and development administration. This provides for the cost of technical and administrative support required for research and development type contractual activity. An increase in funds has been requested to support the expansion of the research program.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Maritime Administration: Research and development	95	106	....

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation. The programs funded in this title provide the Department of Defense with scientific and technological capabilities for the development, test, evaluation, and improvement of weapon systems and related equipment and techniques. Many investigative and engineering activities are performed, including scientific research of defense interest, design and fabrication of weapons and equipment for the future, and testing of these items to evaluate their military utility. This work is performed by Government laboratories, universities, industrial contractors, and nonprofit organizations.

The Nation's strategic forces are being enhanced by continued development and improvement of the Air Force's Minuteman and the Navy's Poseidon ballistic missile systems and the Army's Sentinel antiballistic missile system. Other major strategic programs include the advanced manned strategic aircraft which enters design competition in 1970, and several air-to-surface missiles which reach full-scale development. An airborne warning and control system, designed to improve continental air defense, begins engineering development in 1970.

Some of the major development efforts contributing to future general purpose and tactical warfare forces include the Navy F–14 fleet air defense fighter/interceptor, the Air Force F–15 tactical air superiority fighter and the VSX antisubmarine warfare aircraft. The advanced surface missile system to enhance fleet air defense enters engineering development. Design of a new guided missile frigate is proposed, as is design of a new submarine. Other developments in 1970 will substantially increase interdiction, air mobility, counterinsurgency, antisubmarine warfare, and land air defense capabilities.

Systems nearing completion of development in 1970 include the C–5A transport aircraft, the Cheyenne armed helicopter, and the Dragon antitank and Standard antiradiation missiles.

Vigorous support of important applied sciences, such as biomedicine, materials, and social and behavioral research, continues in 1970. The Themis program is aimed at providing sound research in support of Defense needs and establishing new centers of research excellence at the Nations' universities.

The estimated obligations under appropriations in this title for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Defense Agencies, and the emergency fund are summarized below.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Military sciences	540, 791	575, 828	632, 541
Aircraft and related equipment	1, 208, 554	996, 856	1, 338, 617
Missiles and related equipment	2, 506, 858	2, 464, 683	2, 484, 918
Military astronautics and related equipment	1, 073, 563	1, 178, 553	1, 152, 238
Ships, small craft, and related equipment	257, 832	342, 400	345, 500
Ordnance, combat vehicles, and related equipment	322, 361	324, 400	303, 200
Other equipment	1, 129, 114	1, 232, 104	1, 332, 233
Programwide management and support	420, 804	486, 711	523, 053
Emergency fund		49, 005	50, 000
Total direct obligations	7, 459, 877	7, 650, 540	8, 162, 300

Military sciences. This activity supports research in the physical, mathematical, environmental, engineering, biomedical, behavioral, and social sciences, adding to the store of fundamental scientific knowledge and leading to applications of potential military significance. Examples of phenomena of special interest include deep submergence biomedicine, boundary layer turbulence, propulsion and explosive chemistry, superconductivity, electro-optics, acoustics, and information processing.

The principal support for such organizations as the Naval Research Laboratory, the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratory, and some of the Federal contract research centers, is also provided here. In addition to the amounts directly provided for in this activity, basic and applied research is also performed by industrial contractors supported by certain allowable indirect costs which may be allowed under contracts funded by both the research, development, test, and evaluation and procurement appropriations.

Aircraft and related equipment. This activity funds research, development, test, and evaluation related to airframes, engines, and other installed equipment. Major programs in 1970 include continuing full-scale development of an initial and follow-on version of the Navy F–14 fleet air defense fighter/interceptor, the Air Force F–15 advanced tactical air superiority fighter, the VSX antisubmarine warfare aircraft, and the completion of development of the F–111A strike aircraft, the C–5A transport, and the Cheyenne armed helicopter. The advanced manned strategic aircraft, the utility tactical transport aircraft system and a new heavy lift helicopter are entering initial stages of development in 1970.

In addition, the program supports development of components and subsystems to improve existing aircraft, demonstrator engines, V/STOL technology, better avionics equipment, improved airborne ASW detection capability and applied research in flight dynamics and advanced aircraft propulsion systems. Research and development centers, such as laboratories, are funded here.

Missiles and related equipment. This activity provides for research, development, test, and evaluation of missile systems of all types. The strategic ballistic missile systems, Poseidon and Minuteman, remain high-priority programs. Development of both the Sentinel antiballistic missile system as well as other antiballistic missile system concepts and subsystems will be pursued to assure maximum effectiveness of both retaliatory and defensive systems. Tactical interdiction missile systems, such as the Maverick air-to-surface missile, continue in development, as does exploration of concepts leading toward advanced strike weapons. Also under continuing development are tactical air defense missile systems for protection of both land-based and sea-based forces, with increased emphasis being placed on the problems of defending ships against cruise missiles.

In addition to funding contracts with industry in the missile research and development program, this activity is a major source of financial support for the operation of certain test and evaluation facilities, such as the Eastern and Western Test Ranges, the White Sands Missile Range, the Naval Weapons Center at China Lake, and the research and development programs at the Army's Redstone Arsenal.

Military astronautics and related equipment. This activity provides for programs directed toward the improvement of space technology for military purposes and investigations and development of specific military applications of space vehicles. Major programs include the manned orbiting laboratory, military communications satellite systems, ballistic missiles early warning, and the Titan III launch vehicle. Support of flight experiment programs and ground based applied research and technology development programs in such areas as bioastronautics, secondary power sources, navigation, guidance, sensor, reentry, and propulsion systems will continue. Both contractual and in-house efforts relating to space technology are funded from this activity.

Ships, small craft, and related equipment. This activity provides for design of new types of ships and for development of shipboard equipment. Funds are requested in 1970 for contract definition of a new guided missile frigate ship and design of a new class of submarines. Antisubmarine warfare is receiving increased emphasis, with the development of new and improvement of existing sensors in this activity along with mission related aircraft, weapons, and communications equipment under other activities. Development of improved ship antimissile defense systems, exploration of advanced surface craft concepts, development of command and control equipment and improvement of nuclear and nonnuclear propulsion plants, are also included. A significant portion of the effort at the Naval Ships Research and Development Center is funded under this activity.

Ordnance, combat vehicles, and related equipment. This activity provides for the development, test, and evaluation of improved artillery, guns, rocket launchers, mortars, small arms, mines, grenades, torpedoes, depth charges, conventional air-launched weapons, combat vehicles, and landing craft, as well as exploration and evaluation of new fuzes, propellants, explosives, detonators, dispensers, and armor. Systems contributing to increased mobility, improved firepower, and counterinfiltration in limited and unconventional warfare in remote areas continue to receive major attention. The principal support for research and development activities at several Army arsenals and for the Naval Ordnance Laboratory is funded here.

Other equipment. This activity provides for research, development, test, and evaluation of equipment not separately provided for under other activities. Examples of the types of equipment developed for the three services are as follows: deep submergence systems for personnel rescue and underwater research, chemical and biological agent detection and protective devices, combat clothing, night vision and imaging devices, tactical data processing systems, communications and electronic warfare equipment, improved logistics and materiel handling, mapping and geodetic systems, and improved oceanographic instrumentation. Major programs supported by this activity include the airborne warning and control system and the Mallard communication system. Much of the support for the research and development effort at the Army Electronic Research and Development Laboratories, the Mitre Corporation, and the Lincoln Laboratories is provided under this activity.

Programwide management and support. For the Army and the Navy, this activity provides for those costs of operation, management, and maintenance of research, development, and test facilities which are not distributed directly to other budget activities. For the Air Force it provides for certain costs of central administration such as the Air Force Systems Command headquarters and divisions as well as several large research, development, test, and evaluation centers.

Emergency fund. The emergency fund enables the Secretary of Defense to support the exploitation of new scientific developments and technological breakthroughs and to provide for other unforeseen contingencies in the research, development, test, and evaluation programs.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army:			
Direct:			
Military sciences	163, 050	172, 200	182, 500
Aircraft and related equipment	124, 029	132, 300	128, 800
Missiles and related equipment	668, 321	745, 400	884, 600
Military astronautics and related equipment	9, 989	10, 500	13, 400
Ships, small craft, and related equipment	638	400	500
Ordnance, combat vehicles, and related equipment	167, 607	170, 400	193, 200
Other equipment	327, 891	359, 500	366, 100
Programwide management and support	34, 196	53, 000	52, 900
Total direct	1, 495, 721	1, 643, 700	1, 822, 000

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army—Continued			
Reimbursable:			
Military sciences	8,820	10,000	13,500
Aircraft and related equipment	3,822	5,600	2,800
Missiles and related equipment	16,188	15,400	18,100
Military astronautics and related equipment	696	270	370
Ships, small craft and related equipment	30	30	30
Ordnance combat vehicles and related equipment	8,395	18,600	19,600
Other equipment	20,516	27,800	28,000
Programwide management and support	3,197	3,300	3,600
Total reimbursable	61,644	81,000	86,000
Total obligations	1,557,385	1,724,700	1,908,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy:			
Direct:			
Military sciences	141,258	149,000	160,000
Aircraft and related equipment	283,564	385,000	580,000
Missiles and related equipment	776,345	702,000	552,000
Military astronautics and related equipment	14,863	18,000	23,000
Ships, small craft, and related equipment	257,194	342,000	345,000
Ordnance, combat vehicles, and related equipment	154,754	154,000	110,000
Other equipment	249,364	232,000	282,000
Programwide management and support	99,238	133,000	152,000
Total direct	1,976,580	2,115,000	2,204,000
Reimbursable:			
Military sciences	5,535	8,000	8,000
Aircraft and related equipment	127	200	200
Missiles and related equipment	15,519	34,000	28,000
Military astronautics and related equipment	371	400	400
Ships, small craft, and related equipment	18,922	18,000	18,000
Ordnance, combat vehicles, and related equipment	124	200	200
Other equipment	2,069	4,000	4,000
Programwide management and support	229,402	230,200	230,200
Total reimbursable	272,069	295,000	289,000
Subtotal	2,248,649	2,410,000	2,493,000
Intrafund obligations	−134,108	−135,000	−135,000
Total obligations	2,114,541	2,275,000	2,358,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force Direct:			
Military sciences	143,899	150,528	159,541
Aircraft and related equipment	793,433	478,356	629,817
Missiles and related equipment	950,643	946,283	975,318
Military astronautics and related equipment	1,046,575	1,147,253	1,112,738
Other equipment	282,902	389,104	403,733
Programwide management and support	277,505	289,211	308,153
Total direct	3,494,957	3,400,735	3,589,300
Reimbursable:			
Military sciences	12,388	25,214	22,995
Aircraft and related equipment	6,195	2,382	1,523
Missiles and related equipment	73,334	100,195	101,450
Military astronautics and related equipment	88,813	81,690	75,115
Other equipment	7,666	6,326	7,898
Programwide management and support	16,204	14,193	21,019
Total reimbursable	204,600	230,000	230,000
Total obligations	3,699,557	3,630,735	3,819,300

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense agencies:			
Direct:			
Military sciences	92,584	104,100	130,500
Aircraft and related equipment	7,528	1,200	
Missiles and related equipment	111,549	71,000	73,000
Military astronautics and related equipment	2,136	2,800	3,100
Other equipment	268,957	251,500	280,400
Programwide management and support	9,865	11,500	10,000
Total direct	492,619	442,100	497,000
Reimbursable:			
Military sciences	385	550	550
Aircraft and related equipment	69		
Missiles and related equipment	1,150	2,050	2,050
Other equipment	573	6,300	6,300
Programwide management and support	2	100	100
Total reimbursable	2,179	9,000	9,000
Total obligations	494,798	451,100	506,000
Emergency fund, Defense:			
Research and development contingencies (reserve for transfer) (obligations)		49,005	50,000
Civil defense:			
Research, shelter survey, and marking:			
Direct: Research and development	7,320	5,350	5,000
Reimbursable: Research and development	30	30	30

Research and development. This provides for improvement of the technical basis for ongoing and potential future civil defense programs and operations. Emphasis in 1970 will be directed toward providing a basis for evaluating the cost, effectiveness, and feasibility of future programs in relation to the Sentinel ballistic missile defense system and other strategic offensive and defensive systems. Continued emphasis will also be given to research on radiation shielding, fire problems, emergency medical care, and post-attack problems.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Special foreign currency program:			
Research	601	4,055	1,840
Revolving and management funds:			
Navy Industrial Fund: Research	175,445	204,200	211,511
Air Force Industrial Fund:			
Research activities		52,045	50,855
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL			
Department of the Army:			
General investigations:			
Research and development:			
Coastal engineering research and development studies	1,770	3,080	3,300
Hydrologic studies	228	232	235
Civil works investigations	2,609	3,361	4,100
Mississippi Basin model:			
Construction	8	6	
Maintenance	174	164	60
Mississippi River comprehensive studies	219	177	40
Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction	1,399	2,513	2,400
International hydrological decade	62	111	495

Research and development. Coastal engineering research and development studies deal with physical phenomena, techniques, basic principles, and remedial or control measures, related to shore protection and improvement.

Hydrologic studies include investigations of storms, rainfall, streamflow, sedimentation, and other phenomena to provide basic data used in the design, construction, and operation of water control structures.

Civil works investigations are made to improve procedures for analysis of hydrologic and engineering data, refine design methods, develop better materials and practices for the construction and maintenance of hydraulic structures, and improve procedures used in formulating plans for water resources development.

The Mississippi River Basin model is being utilized to improve operation of the reservoir system in the basin and to study potential flood levels on the lower river. Funds requested will be used for maintenance of the model and completion of the reports on comprehensive model tests.

Nuclear explosive studies for civil construction are carried out as part of a joint research program with the Atomic Energy Commission. The objective is to develop an engineering capability to use nuclear explosives in construction of public works projects. The Corps of Engineers has primary responsibility for chemical explosive experiments and development of engineering, construction, and cost data.

The International Hydrological Decade (1965–1974) is a joint effort by some 100 countries to advance scientific knowledge of water to meet the growing demands for this resource more effectively. The Corps of Engineers component of the United States effort will be largely devoted to preparing for and conducting studies relative to the International Field Year on the Great Lakes in cooperation with Canada.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service: Food and drug control: Scientific research and evaluation:			
Grants	870	870	870
Direct operations	15,320	15,508	15,969

Scientific research and evaluation. Grants. This activity awards research grants to State agencies and other qualified investigators to promote the study of pesticide-caused hazards. *Direct operations.* Biological and chemical research is conducted intramurally and through contracts, to support the agency's regulatory mission. Regulations are developed and promulgated for pesticide residue tolerances and exemptions, food additives, color additives, and food standards; scientific evaluations are made of the submissions required by those regulations and of the labeling of hazardous products. Methods and bases for the evaluation of petitions and the establishment of tolerances are developed. Scientific activities of the agency are coordinated, and a scientific information system is maintained. A facility has been established in the field to support regulatory activities through expeditious analysis of drug samples.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Air pollution control:			
Research, development, and demonstration:			
Grants and contracts	7,614	24,701	31,300
Direct operations	14,327	20,943	22,033

Research, development, and demonstration. Grants and contracts. Grants are made to public agencies and communities for surveys to assess their air pollution problems and to demonstrate control techniques. Grants are also awarded to universities and other nonprofit institutions to conduct research into air pollution problems. Contracts relating to fuels and vehicles are used to accelerate research and development into new and improved methods, having industrywide application, for the prevention and control of air pollution resulting from the combustion of fuels. *Direct operations.* This activity includes research into the nature and extent of air pollution; its transport and atmospheric behavior; the effects on humans, other biological systems, property, and the atmosphere itself; and improvement in means for controlling pollution. The 1970 program will continue and expand the ongoing research in the three principal areas of automotive vehicle emissions, sulfur oxides pollution, and development of air quality criteria, and will place primary emphasis on research areas designated for special attention by the Air Quality Act of 1967. These include accelerated research into new and improved methods, having industrywide application, for the prevention and control of air pollution from the combustion of fuels; development of air quality criteria and emission control techniques as preliminary to subsequent application and regulatory enforcement measures; a comprehensive economic cost study; and a program of registration by manufacturers and processors of all additives placed in fuels used for combustion.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Buildings and facilities:			
Solid waste research facility		2	
Arctic health research center animal facility	84	1,049	
Arctic health research center	150	52	
Research laboratory No. 1	25	4,593	
Research laboratory No. 2		700	250
HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION			
Mental health, support and conduct of research: Grants:			
Research	72,306	81,159	82,273
Hospital improvement	10,491	10,610	8,000
Early child care demonstrations			1,000
Direct operations:			
Intramural research	14,625	17,339	18,259
Planning, development, and administration	3,262	5,070	5,775
Total, support and conduct of research	100,684	114,178	115,307

Support and conduct of research. Grants. Research. Grants are awarded on a project basis for behavioral, clinical, psychological, and applied research in the area of mental health. Clinical research centers and general research support grants are also supported from this subactivity. *Hospital improvement.* These project grants to State institutions for the mentally ill are designed to improve the quality of care, treatment, and rehabilitation in these institutions. *Early child care demonstrations.* These grants are designed to demonstrate and evaluate various methods of contributing to early, healthy child development and preventing emotional disturbances and mental illness among young children from poor and culturally deprived families. *Direct operations. Intramural research.* Laboratory and clinical research is conducted in the behavioral and biologic sciences; e.g., psychiatry, socioeconomic studies, neurobiology, and neurochemistry. Additionally there is laboratory and clinical research in special mental health problems of neuropharmacology, clinical psychopharmacology, narcotic addiction, and alcoholism. *Planning, development, and administration.* This subactivity supports the planning, development, and administration of grant and contract programs in behavioral sciences research, applied research, clinical research, and psychopharmacological research. It also includes those multidisciplinary programs which focus and coordinate the Institute's efforts in special areas of concern, such as alcoholism, suicide prevention, crime and delinquency, schizophrenia, and the mental health of children and families.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
St. Elizabeths Hospital:			
Operating costs: Research	469	585	
Capital outlay: Research	25	35	

St. Elizabeth's Hospital conducts or cooperates with others in scientific research activities dealing with mental illness.

Effective October 30, 1968, St. Elizabeth's Hospital was reorganized as the National Center for Mental Health Services, Training, and Research. The goal of the new organization, among other things, is to accelerate research efforts to provide a better understanding of mental illness.

Research. Funds in this activity support the Division of Clinical Research of the National Center which carries our coordinated research programs for the purpose of obtaining a better understanding of the causes of mental disorders, and of the factors bearing upon their development, treatment, and possible prevention.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Health services research and development:			
Studies, training, and systems development:			
Grants and contracts	25,641	37,362	40,672
Direct operations	2,755	2,703	3,312
Program direction and management services	369	857	991
Total program costs, funded	28,765	40,922	44,975
Change in selected resources	1,905		
Total obligations	30,670	40,922	44,975

The National Center for Health Services Research and Development has the general mission of working with the providers of health services to build a research and development capability that will continuously improve health services for the benefit of all people.

Grants and contracts. Research. Grants and contracts are awarded to organizations, institutions, and individuals for carrying out research investigations dealing with the organization, financing, utilization, quality, availability, and delivery of health services. *Training and fellowships.* Grants are awarded to institutions and to qualified scholars for supporting research training programs in the health services field.

Direct operations. This activity provides staff with the operational capability for both extramural and intramural research programs. The activity permits utilization of Federal direct health services and federally funded programs for the disadvantaged for the development, testing, and demonstration of improved health services techniques, and also the strengthening of research and development in such areas as economic analysis, the improvement of health service institutions, and manpower utilization. The 1970 increase will provide for additional specialized staff to concentrate on the above areas. It will also provide for consultative services associated with the center's program and to develop research training programs in universities and other appropriate settings.

Program direction and management services. This includes top management and staff services for the national center, including central management services.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Health services research and development	28		
Research grants	1,250	1,275	1,337
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH			
A distribution of obligations for research follows:			
Grants:			
Research	617,086	616,812	634,166
Regular	(461,327)	(454,363)	(464,165)
Special	(101,542)	(109,504)	(116,364)
General research support [1]	(54,217)	(52,945)	(53,637)
Fellowships	52,192	56,287	53,582
Training	134,951	141,440	136,418
Total, grants	804,229	814,539	824,166
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	77,760	85,554	89,161
Collaborative research and development	111,787	121,306	127,400
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	9,018	9,550	9,958
Review and approval of grants	17,629	18,904	19,914
Other	25,211	28,699	29,177
Total, direct operations	241,405	264,013	275,610
Facility planning and construction		500	
Total, research institutes and divisions	1,045,635	1,079,052	1,099,776

[1] Excludes the National Institute of Mental Health's share which totals $5,483,000, $7,755,000 and $7,863,000, respectively. (Thousands already added.)

Grants. Research. Research grants constitute the principal activity of the research institutes and divisions of the National Institutes of Health. Regular grants are awarded to individuals for health related research projects, following their review for scientific merit and relevance by discipline-oriented and disease-oriented study groups, and their approval by disease-oriented national advisory councils. Grants are also awarded to support various special programs designed to enhance the Nation's capability to conduct research and research training; these include the support of clinical and specialized research centers. All institutes provide funds for general research support grants which are awarded to institutions to strengthen their overall biomedical research program. These grants are of two types: A formula grant which provides funds in proportion to the institution's involvement in biomedical research; and a project grant aimed at expanding the number of outstanding academic research institutions engaged in biomedical research throughout the Nation. *Fellowships.* Fellowships are awarded to individuals in order to increase research manpower in the medical sciences. There are several different types of awards, such as predoctoral, postdoctoral, research career development awards, and foreign research fellowships, each designed to support a specific phase in the development of a research scientist. *Training.* Training grants are awarded on the basis of competitive review to various academic or research institutions which have demonstrated the ability to design and conduct successful training programs in one or more of the biomedical sciences.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. The research institutes and divisions conduct research activities within their own laboratories and in a commonly shared clinical center facility. *Collaborative research and development.* Collaborative research and development programs are conducted by National Institutes of Health investigators in collaboration with other Federal and non-Federal institutions largely through contracts. These programs are strongly oriented toward the solution of specific health problems in certain categorical areas where the state of knowledge is sufficiently advanced to permit a more targeted approach. Included are such directed activities as the development of artificial organs, vaccines, and chemotherapeutic agents. *Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies.* Data relating to the incidence of disease in various population groups and regions of the world are collected and analyzed with the tools of modern statistics. *Other.* Additional activities under direct operations include international research, computer research and technology, and biologics standards. Funds are also included for program direction, research support and service activities, and review and approval of grants.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE			
Grants:			
Research	79,163	80,052	80,488
Fellowships	4,019	4,374	4,201
Training	11,050	11,641	11,186
Total grants	94,232	96,067	95,875
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	15,082	16,114	11,778
Collaborative research and development	66,719	64,380	66,102
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	1,265	1,380	1,565
Review and approval	2,427	2,459	2,598
Program direction	1,079	1,019	1,084
Total direct operations	86,572	85,352	88,527
Total porgram costs, funded	180,804	181,419	184,402
Change in selected resources	—4,897		
Total obligations	175,907	181,419	184,402

Grants. Research. Grants will be supported. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants and specialized research centers. *Fellowships.* Postdoctoral and special fellowships will be supported, as well as career award and career development fellowships. *Training.* Grants are awarded to accredited schools for the improvement of instruction in the curriculum; clinical training grants are awarded for training in such fields as surgery, pathology, radiobiology, radiotherapy, and internal medicine; and grants are awarded to research training centers for individual traineeships.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Research includes laboratory research in the fields of biochemistry, biology, pathology, and physiology and clinical research in the fields of dermatology, endocrinology, immunology, metabolism, and surgery. *Collaborative research and development.* Research is conducted in the areas of etiology and cancer therapy. This activity includes several task forces including breast cancer and lung cancer and the special virus-leukemia program. Research efforts include field studies, investigations, and contracts with public and private organizations and universities for the acquisition, development, and application of new knowledge pertinent to the prevention, control, and treatment of cancer. *Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies.* This program is designed to analyze defined populations having unusual risks to specific cancers or known exposure to high risk environments, in order to reveal statistically significant cause-and-effect associations and disassociations leading to the discovery of etiologic factors and agents.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE			
Grants:			
Research	104,825	99,666	101,307
Fellowships	6,769	7,604	7,309
Training	17,267	18,150	17,442
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	12,017	13,168	13,641
Collaborative research and development	10,500	17,354	18,148
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	1,199	1,692	1,724
Training activities	142	225	204
Review and approval of grants	2,253	2,561	2,723
Program direction	652	590	643
Total program costs, funded	155,624	161,010	163,141
Change in selected resources	5,689		
Total obligations	161,322	161,010	163,141

Grants. Research. Grants will be supported. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants, categorical and specialized research centers, and the heart cooperative drug study. *Fellowships.* Awards will be supported. *Training.* For undergraduate training, funds will provide assistance to schools of medicine, osteopathy, and public health. Funds will also provide for grants for graduate research and clinical training.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Research is conducted to aid in the understanding of the cardiovascular system and its diseases, with emphasis in therapeutic agents, diagnostic instrumentation, surgery, and clinical medicine. *Collaborative research and development.* Funds will support the artificial heart-myocardial infarction program, heart cooperative drug study, and a national blood program. *Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies.* This activity conducts and supports epidemiological, biometrics research, and clinical trial studies to seek knowledge of the causes and prevention of cardiovascular disease. Causal factors are sought both by intensive study of "natural experiments" in population groups and by experimental modification of suspected factors. *Training activities.* Inservice training is provided for positions requiring unique combinations of cardiovascular training and experience.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
National Institute of Dental Research:			
Grants:			
Research	15,521	15,055	15,559
Fellowships	1,724	1,795	1,694
Training	5,280	5,609	5,390
Total grants	22,525	22,429	22,643
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	4,394	4,687	4,947
Collaborative research and development	662	845	942
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	375	431	436
Review and approval of grants	608	689	763
Program direction	294	338	331
Total direct operations	6,333	6,990	7,419
Total program costs, funded	28,858	29,419	30,062
Change in selected resources	169		
Total obligations	29,027	29,419	30,062

Grants. Research. Project grants will be supported. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants, clinical research centers, and dental research institutes. *Fellowships.* Fellowships will be supported. *Training.* Grants will be awarded to schools for training individuals for academic teaching and research careers in the various fields of dental science.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Research is conducted in the fields of dental caries, peridontal diseases, growth and development, oral surgery, microbiology, histology, pathology, and biochemistry. *Collaborative research and development.* The programs in this activity are concerned with investigations and contracts with public and private organizations for the accumulation, development, and application of new information related to oral health. *Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies.* The programs in this activity are concerned with epidemiologic activities or field studies related to oral diseases and conditions.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases:			
Grants:			
Research	94,203	91,691	92,289
Fellowships	6,574	6,737	6,475
Training	15,383	16,109	15,480
Total grants	116,160	114,537	114,244
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	13,774	15,891	15,664
Collaborative research and development	4,439	6,498	6,670
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	554	706	712
Review and approval of grants	2,101	2,279	2,373
Program direction	253	321	305
Total direct operations	21,121	25,695	25,724
Total program costs, funded	137,281	140,232	139,968
Change in selected resources	1,617		
Total obligations	138,898	140,232	139,968

Grants. Research. Grants will be supported. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants and clinical research centers. *Fellowships* will be supported. *Training.* Grants will be awarded to accredited schools for the improvement of instruction.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Research is conducted in the fields of arthritis, rheumatism, diabetes, and other metabolic disorders, as well as studies in the major disciplines including pharmacology, physiology, biochemistry, nutrition, chemistry, pathology, endocrinology, physical biology, molecular biology, chemical biology, gastroenterology, hematology, and biomathematics. *Collaborative research and development.* Collaborative research and development projects are conducted cooperatively and under contract with individuals and institutions, including comprehensive programs in scientific communications, such as the preparation of abstracts on specific areas of research interests; research and development conducted cooperatively and under contract leading to improved methods of hemodialysis and the development of a simpler, more economical and less cumbersome artificial kidney; and projects directed toward the preparation and distribution of hormonal substances. *Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies.* Research and epidemiological studies are conducted on arthritis, diabetes, cholecystitis, iodine metabolism, and hyperuremia in special population groups, including long range studies in the Southwestern United States.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke:			
Grants:			
Research	50,524	59,134	59,506
Fellowships	2,694	3,213	3,085
Training	11,130	15,659	15,047
Total grants	64,348	78,006	77,638
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	8,488	9,879	10,100
Collaborative research and development	9,651	9,742	10,092
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	2,790	3,016	3,028
Training activities	66	74	72
Review and approval of grants	1,894	2,058	2,114
Program direction	579	490	441
Total, direct operations	23,468	25,259	25,847
Total program costs, funded	87,816	103,265	103,485
Change in selected resources	12,365		
Total obligations	100,181	103,265	103,485

Grants. Research. Grants will be supported. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants, clinical research center grants, and specialized research center grants. *Fellowships.* Fellowships will be supported. *Training.* Graduate training grants will be supported. These grants are made to training institutions to establish and improve programs to train teachers and clinical investigators in neurology, ophthalmology, and otology. Traineeships will be awarded to individuals for specialized postgraduate training.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Research is being conducted on disorders of the brain, and spinal cord and peripheral nerves, such as epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, apoplexy, and Parkinson's disease; on neuromuscular disorders, such as muscular dystrophy; hearing impairment; and the perinatal physiology studies using primates. *Collaborative research and development.* These studies include the coordination and central service activities for the collaborative project on cerebral palsy, mental retardation, and other neurological and sensory disorders of childhood. *Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies.* These studies include epidemiological, biometric, and international studies relating to cerebrovascular disease, speech and hearing disorders, and research on viruses and their effect on the central nervous system. *Training activities.* Support is given for inservice training of qualified staff members in subjects related to neurological and other sensory disorders.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES			
Grants:			
Research	58,520	60,185	60,582
Fellowships	3,911	4,362	4,191
Training	8,856	9,488	9,118
Total grants	71,287	74,035	73,891
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	13,530	14,581	15,182
Collaborative research and development	9,677	12,630	12,855
Training activities	154	165	155
Review and approval of grants	1,394	1,438	1,531
Program direction	269	324	308
Total direct operations	25,024	29,138	30,031
Total program costs, funded	96,311	103,173	103,922
Change in selected resources	1,919		
Total obligations	98,230	103,173	103,922

Grants. Research. Funds will support grants, including those for the United States-Japan cooperative medical science program. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants, clinical research centers, the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory and International Centers for Medical Research and Training. *Fellowships.* Awards will be made for postdoctoral, special, and research career fellowships. *Training.* Funds will provide grants to train individuals in allergy and immunology, tropical medicine, infectious diseases, parasitology, mycology, and rickettsiology.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Laboratory and clinical research is conducted in the broad fields of allergic infections and parasitic diseases. The increase in 1970 provides for expanded research in clinical allergy and immunology, chronic and degenerative, and viral diseases. *Collaborative research and development.* Contracts are programed in the areas of vaccine development and testing, research reagents development, production and distribution, issue transplanation immunology, and for the geographic medical science program. *Training activities.* This activity provides two-year training of promising young scientists to work abroad as members of the United States biomedical research groups in medical research related to problems of an international nature which cannot ordinarily be undertaken in the U.S.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES			
Grants:			
Research	83,217	83,717	84,263
Fellowships	20,207	21,373	20,040
Training	44,729	46,901	45,568
Total grants	148,153	151,991	149,871
Direct operations:			
Collaborative research and development	3,924	3,295	3,288
Training activities	381	449	337
Review and approval of grants	2,741	3,125	3,251
Program direction	829	1,095	1,056
Total direct operations	7,875	7,964	7,932
Total program costs, funded	156,028	159,955	157,803
Change in selected resources	−278		
Total obligations	155,750	159,955	157,803

Grants. Research. Grants will be supported. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants, research and training resources, and research centers in diagnostic radiology and anesthesiology. *Fellowships.* Fellowship awards will be made. *Training.* Grants will be awarded.

Direct operations. Collaborative research and development. Studies in the biomedical sciences and supportive areas are conducted by contract with institutions. *Training activities.* This activity supports a program for training pharmacologists and toxicologists.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development:			
Grants:			
Research	36,474	41,679	46,564
Fellowships	2,953	4,193	4,027
Training	7,272	10,012	9,621
Total grants	46,699	55,884	60,212
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	5,754	6,065	6,373
Collaborative research and development	1,299	3,975	6,721
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	481	2,022	2,176
Training activities	89	89	85
Review and approval of grants	1,829	1,956	2,037
Program direction	676	809	807
Total direct operations	10,128	14,916	18,199
Total program costs funded	56,827	70,800	78,411
Change in selected resources	9,552		
Total obligations	66,379	70,800	78,411

Grants. Research. Grants will be supported. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants, clinical research centers, and mental retardation research centers. *Fellowships.* Postdoctoral and special fellowships will be supported. Also, career awards and career development fellowships will be supported. *Training.* Training grants will be supported.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Laboratory and clinical research is conducted in five major program areas of child health and human development. *Reproduction and population research*—reproductive biology, endocrinology, and ecology. *Perinatal biology and infant mortality*—maternal-child interactions; maturation of motor and behavioral systems; nutrition and development. *Growth and development*—neurophysiology, neurochemistry, and nutrition. *Adult development and aging*—cellular biology, biochemistry, physiology, and psychology. *Mental retardation*—biochemistry, neurophysiology, and behavioral research. *Collaborative research and development.* This activity supplements and complements the Institute's intramural research programs. It is one of the most effective ways for coordinating program development in family planning, perinatal biology, growth and development, aging, and mental retardation. The main thrust of the Institute's population research program is accomplished by contract efforts within this activity. Program liaison is maintained and advanced through support of interdisciplinary research conferences and symposia and through scientific information centers. *Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies.* Through contracted research, this activity supports the Institute's scientific staff in planning and conducting studies dealing with the incidence, distribution, and control of health problems in certain populations. Efforts are also being made to develop more effective and reliable means for measuring health problems, to collect and analyze health data, and to make statistical studies for use in initiating and evaluating scientific programs. *Training activities.* This activity represents the Institute's career development program designed to help overcome the shortages of professional manpower in pediatrics and obstetrics and the lack of the necessary cross-disciplinary training required in the basic research programs of the Institute.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE			
Grants:			
Research	14,086	16,206	19,660
Fellowships	354	676	650
Training	2,703	3,603	3,462
Total grants	17,143	20,485	23,772

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE—Continued			
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	610	737	754
Collaborative research and development	168	349	349
Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies	267	303	317
Review and approval of grants	366	366	466
Program direction			120
Total direct operations	1,411	1,755	2,006
Total program costs funded	18,554	22,240	25,778
Change in selected resources	2,612		
Total obligations	21,166	22,240	25,778

Grants. Research. Grants will be supported. In addition, funds are provided for general research support grants and clinical research center grants. *Fellowships.* Fellowships will be supported. *Training.* Graduate training grants will be supported. These grants are made to training institutions to establish and improve programs to train teachers and clinical investigators in ophthalmology. Traineeships will be awarded to individuals for specialized postgraduate training.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. Research is being conducted in the causes of blindness and disorders of the eye including glaucoma, disorders of the cornea, infections of the eye, disturbances of eye movements, and refractive errors of vision. *Collaborative research and development.* These studies include contractual programs for collaborative research on blinding eye diseases and visual disorders. *Biometry, epidemiology, and field studies.* Special studies in the fields of epidemiology and biometry will be developed to determine causes of blindness and eye disorders.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Environmental health sciences:			
Grants:			
Research	8,496	8,406	8,967
Fellowships	42	200	194
Training	3,763	3,892	3,740
Total grants	12,301	12,498	12,901
Direct operations:			
Laboratory and clinical research	4,357	4,432	5,322
Review and approval of grants	396	440	443
Program direction	266	312	338
Total direct operations	5,019	5,184	6,103
Total program costs funded	17,320	17,682	19,004
Change in selected resources	−764		
Total obligations	16,556	17,682	19,004

Grants. Research. Regular research grants will be supported. Environmental Health Institutes will also be supported. This activity supports research on the phenomena associated with the source, distribution, mode of entry, and effect of environmental agents on biological systems through grants to universities, research institutes, and other public or private nonprofit institutions. *Fellowships.* Under the fellowship program, predoctoral, postdoctoral, and special grant awards will be made to graduate students and scientists for training in the field of environmental health sciences. *Training.* Grants will be supported. The graduate research training program supports the availability of high-quality training opportunities in environmental health. It has a threefold goal: To increase the number of highly qualified scientists primarily concerned with environmental health; to enable training institutions to strengthen and to enrich their research training capabilities; and to expand opportunities for environmental health research training in a greater number of graduate institutions throughout the United States.

Direct operations. Laboratory and clinical research. This activity supports the in-house research programs in environmental health sciences at the National Environmental Health Sciences Center in the Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. Included are research efforts in cell biology, pharmacology and toxicology, analytical and synthetic chemistry, biophysics and biomedical instrumentation, animal science and technology, pathologic physiology, epidemiology, biometry, epidemiologic pathology, and scientific information as well as the supporting services for these laboratories and branches. *Review and approval of grants.* The scientific and administrative staff responsible for the review, negotiation, processing, and awarding of all grants is supported by this activity. *Program direction.* This activity supports the Office of the Director of the Division and scientific administrative staff who assist in the planning, supervision, and technical direction of the program.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
General research and services:			
Division of Research Facilities and Resources:			
Grants:			
Research	56,797	60,871	64,831
Fellowships	148	154	146
Training	368	376	364
Direct operations:			
Collaborative research and development	1,193	1,488	1,483
Review and approval of grants	1,123	1,533	1,615
Program direction	471	643	641
Division of Computer Research and Technology: Direct operations	3,395	4,611	4,753
Engineering development:			
Direct operations:			
Collaborative research and development		750	750
Program direction	101	259	226
Total program costs funded	63,596	70,685	74,809
Change in selected resources	1,640		
Total obligations	65,236	70,685	74,809

The appropriations for general research and services finances the Division of Research Facilities and Resources whose programs are oriented toward providing the resources and facilities necessary for the conduct of biomedical research; this includes support for the maintenance of laboratory animals and the provision of specialized resources such as large-scale equipment to improve multidisciplinary research capabilities of institutions. The appropriation also finances the engineering development activity, and the Division of Computer Research and Technology which plans and conduct research, developmental, and demonstration programs in mathematical and other computer related sciences.

The activities for the general research and services appropriation are described below:

Grants. Research. Funds will provide the following: General Clinical Research Centers, Special Resources, and animal resources and primate centers grants. *Fellowships.* Fellowship awards will be supported. *Training.* Training grants will be supported.

Direct operations. Collaborative research and development. Research is conducted in collaboration with Federal and non-Federal institutions through contracts. Included are chemical/biological information handling program, special research resources, surveys of animal resources, development of standards for laboratory animal facilities, and the applying of engineering and technological innovations to biomedical problems in such areas as the development of artificial organs, synthetic materials, and the automation of clinical and laboratory measurements.

Division of Computer Research and Technology. This activity conducts research in mathematics and the computer sciences as they relate to biomedical problems, provides professional advice to other areas of the National Institutes of Health, serves as a focus for training activities in computation and data processing and operates a central computing facility for the Institutes.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
JOHN E. FOGARTY INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN THE HEALTH SCIENCES			
Grants:			
Research	229	150	150
Fellowships	1,378	1,636	1,570

Research. Funds will support grants. In addition, funds are provided for scientific evaluation.

Fellowships. Fellowships will be supported.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Dental Health:			
Grants:			
Research	1,121	1,259	1,339
Fellowships	79	150	150
Training	2,598	3,850	5,276
Direct operations	4,200	4,926	5,123
Total program costs funded	7,998	10,185	11,888
Change in selected resources	1,418		
Total obligations	9,416	10,185	11,888

Grants. Research. Research grants support studies in the prevention and control of oral diseases, more efficient methods for delivering dental services, and the effective use of dental manpower. *Fellowships.* Research fellowships support candidates for advanced degrees to prepare them to conduct research to help improve dental health by obtaining information about preventive dentistry, dental diseases, dental education, and more effective methods of delivering dental services. *Training.* In 1970, three new dental schools will initiate developmental programs to train students to use dental auxiliaries. The increased funds will permit existing programs to lengthen the training and to include other types of auxiliaries such as dental hygienists. Research training grants enable institutions to establish training programs in fields urgently in need of researchers in dental science. A dental continuing education grant program provides for upgrading the skills of dentists and auxiliaries through a national network of dental school programs.

Direct operations. Funds are provided for programs to study the supply, utilization, and distribution of dental manpower, to increase the productivity of dental practitioners, and to assist dentists to keep abreast of the latest concepts and techniques in dentistry. Funds also provide for disease prevention control programs, for studies related to the organization, delivery, and financing of dental health care services, and for research and development in dental technology.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Construction of health, educational, research, and library facilities: Health research facilities	38,368	20,640	

Health research facilities. Matching grants are made to public and other nonprofit institutions to assist in the construction of new facilities, and replacement of outmoded facilities, for the conduct of research in the sciences related to health.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimated	1970 estimated
National Library of Medicine:			
Grants: Research	980	1,285	1,442
Direct operations: Research and support contracts	1,032	248	
Buildings and facilities:			
Cancer research facility	3,695	2,331	
Child health and human development research facility	94	383	
Gerontology research facility	2,739	655	50
Neurology-allergy virus research facility			114
Neurology-child health facility, Puerto Rico	32	500	1,762
Scientific activities overseas (special foreign currency program):			
Foreign health research—Total program costs funded	7,830	17,460	15,322
Change in selected resources	5,560		
Total obligations	13,390	17,460	15,322

The research efforts supported with foreign currencies are directed toward the solution of disease and health problems which hold promise of contributing knowledge of value and significance to the advancement of medical research in the United States and other countries. Research projects in the field of human reproduction and family planning will be supported. The collection and analysis of morbidity and mortality data as well as other scientific activities overseas such as research training, international conferences, and translations of research publications will also be supported.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Expired accounts:			
Construction of mental health-neurology research facility (program costs funded)	3,229	1,124	
Change in selected resources	−3,131	−607	
Total obligations	98	517	
General research support grants, obligations	59,674	60,700	61,500

This provides grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or nonprofit institutions for the general support of research and research training in sciences related to health. This program is supported with funds provided for research grants through the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health and the Appropriation for Mental Health.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
National Institutes of Health management fund: Research services	12,640	14,897	15,181

Research services. These provide the central administration and operation of services for the conduct of research activities such as the planning and supervising of design, construction, and development of new research activities; providing laboratory animals, culture media, and glassware; design and fabrication of laboratory instrumentation; operating the Institutes' medical reference library including the translation of medical literature; scientific photography and medical arts; maintenance and alteration of all physical facilities including utility services; and environmental engineering services.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimated	1970 estimated
Service and supply fund:			
Research animals:			
Cost of goods sold	182	156	160
Other	1,275	1,208	1,418

Research animals. The Institutes' animal facilities provide small and large research animals to the research laboratories. The facilities include breeding, holding, and conditioning facilities for mice, rats, guinea pigs, rabbits, hamsters, dogs, cats, primates, and ungulate animals.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Advancements and reimbursements:			
National Institute of Dental Research	2	6	2
Office of Education:			
Education for the handicapped:			
Research and innovation	10,794	14,600	18,350

Research and innovation. Grants and contracts are awarded for the development of new curricular materials, teaching techniques, research and development centers, and other research and demonstration projects including physical recreation and education. Grants or contracts are awarded for the establishment and operation of regional centers to develop and apply the best methods of appraising the special educational needs of handicapped children. Grants are also made for model centers to provide diagnostic, educational, and related services to deaf-blind children.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Research and training:			
Research and development	73,565	74,976	68,800
Training	6,164	6,750	6,750
Construction	624	29,581	585

Research and development. Contracts are awarded to educational laboratories and research and development centers, and contracts and grants are awarded to institutions of higher education, States, local educational agencies, and private enterprise. Educational laboratories devote primary attention to the development and validation of curricular and instructional alternatives for use in the Nation's schools. Research and development centers concentrate on studying such specific problem areas as early childhood learning, teacher education, higher education, problems of the disadvantaged, educational administration, and educational policy. In 1970 research emphasis will be shifted toward minority groups in education, and toward basic research in reading processes, learning, and motivation. Major development efforts will include work on secondary school curriculum systems and the use of television for early childhood education. The amount includes a transfer of $2,000,000 to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities for joint projects involving scholars, practitioners, artists, and writers in the classroom. It also includes $2,000,000 for continuing support of a national study of the educational attainment of the population.

Training. Grants are awarded for the training of manpower to carry out educational research, development, evaluation, and related activities. Awards are also made to develop materials for use in such training programs.

Construction. Grants are made to procure major program equipment items and to construct educational research and development facilities.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Research and training (special foreign currency program):			
Research in foreign education	80	231	
Salaries and Expenses:			
Research	3,959	3,932	3,990
Advances and Reimbursements:			
Survey of research activities (National Science Foundation)	175		
Educational and information service research (NSF)	45		
Social and Rehabilitation Service:			
Mental retardation			
Research	126	126	126

Research. Grants are awarded to organizations, institutions, and individuals to provide new knowledge and data relative to mental retardation. In 1970, grants will be awarded to support appropriate research activities to explore the health and care needs of the mentally retarded.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Maternal and child health: Research	5,580	6,200	7,700

Research. The main focus of this program is to improve delivery of health services to needy mothers and children through research grants, contracts, or jointly financed cooperative arrangements. In 1970, projects to be funded will include those emphasizing improved delivery of family planning services.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Child welfare: Research and demonstration	3,996	4,400	4,600

Research and demonstration. Grants, contracts, or other jointly financed cooperative arrangements are made for the conduct of research and demonstration projects in child welfare which are of regional or national significance, demonstrate new methods or facilities or demonstrate utilization of research and research findings.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Development of programs for the aging: Research and demonstration	3,936	4,155	3,500

Research and demonstration. Grants and contracts for research, development, and demonstration are made with public, nonprofit and private agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals after consultation with the appropriate State agency. Grants and contracts are made for the following purposes: to develop new knowledge about social, health, and economic factors affecting the aged; to determine what kinds of services, resources, and living arrangements are needed to foster independent, wholesome, and meaningful living; and to develop or demonstrate new approaches, techniques, and methods which can provide older people with increased opportunities for community participation, social contacts, and productive, satisfying retirement years.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Rehabilitation research and training:			
Research and demonstrations	21,304	21,325	21,325
Special center program	10,235	10,275	10,275
International research (domestic support)	94	100	100

Research and demonstrations. Grants and contracts support research and demonstration projects which hold promise of making a contribution to the solution of vocational rehabilitation problems common to all or several States. Grants are made to public and private nonprofit organizations to cover part of the costs.

Special center program. Support is provided to special rehabilitation research and training centers with the capability for continuing comprehensive programs of clinical research and training to advance the rehabilitation of the disabled.

International research (domestic support). This is for maintenance in the United States of foreign scientists concerned with rehabilitation research projects supported by excess foreign currencies and for the purchase in the United States of equipment for such projects unobtainable with excess foreign currencies.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Cooperative research or demonstration projects:			
Research grants	1,981	1,750	1,750
Directed research	1,169	1,400	4,750
Total obligations	3,150	3,150	6,500

The Social Security Act authorizes grants to States, grants to public and nonprofit organizations and contracts (including contracts with private organizations and agencies) or jointly financed cooperative arrangements for the conduct of research or demonstration projects relating to programs carried on or existing under the Social Security Act and related programs. The program is administered by the Social and Rehabilitation Service in cooperation with the Social Security Administration.

Funds appropriated are used to support cooperative research or demonstration projects in areas such as: the prevention and reduction of dependency, effecting coordination of planning between private and public welfare agencies, and improving the administration and effectiveness of programs carried on or existing under the Social Security Act and related programs. During 1970, $3,000,000 will be used for income maintenance experiments.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Research and training (special foreign currency program): Social and rehabilitation research and related activities	4,645	5,936	5,000

Research, demonstration, and research training programs are supported primarily with foreign currencies accruing to the United States through the sale of surplus agricultural commodities and through other sources.

Rehabilitation. Research and demonstration programs are directed to the solution of problems which hold promise of contributing knowledge to the advancement of rehabilitation both in the United States and in other countries. Research training and fellowships are provided and exchanges of rehabilitation experts are arranged between the U.S. and cooperating foreign countries to increase the rehabilitation research resources both here and abroad.

Maternal and child health. Studies, research, research planning, and research training including the interchange of experts and research fellowships in maternal and child health and handicapping conditions are conducted in special applied health fields to gain knowledge of value to the United States, to the country involved, and internationally.

Social welfare. Studies of urban social welfare and delivery of social services are conducted in countries selected because of country experiences and research facilities in programs such as urban social services, community development, methods to strengthen family life, improve child care, control and prevent juvenile delinquency, and services for the aging. Cooperative projects including seminars and expert consultation contribute new knowledge valuable to social welfare programs in the United States, the country concerned, and internationally.

Aging. Based on methodology developed in a study in three industrial societies, projects in India, Israel, Poland, and Yugoslavia are obtaining basic knowledge to test assumptions which have serious implications for social policy and for programs to meet the diverse needs of older persons. Continuing collaboration among investigators from different disciplines engaged in this gerontological research maximizes the benefit of findings and increases the possibility of drawing general conclusions of cross-national applicability.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Salaries and expenses: Research and demonstrations	1,882	2,051	2,074

Research and demonstrations. This activity provides support for many program activities. Representative of these efforts are the intramural research program, the cooperative research and demonstration projects related to social security programs research for rehabilitation of the disabled, experimental or demonstration projects in public assistance and medical assistance, the social work manpower training program, and the foreign currency research and training program. Special Institutions.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Gallaudet College:			
Salaries and expenses: Organized research	110	143	204
Howard University:			
Salaries and expenses: Organized research	3,161	4,000	4,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
Metropolitan development:			
Urban transportation: Research, development, and demonstration	4,143	2,500	3,900

Research, development, and demonstrations. The Department makes contracts and grants to assist in establishing and carrying on comprehensive research and investigations into problems of urban transportation as they relate to comprehensive urban development or increase understanding of transportation system and service impacts on urban areas.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Urban technology and research:			
Contracts, studies, and performance of research	1,258	6,025	11,340
Housing and urban data services	188	750	760
Administrative expenses	330	525	900
Total program costs funded	1,776	7,300	13,000
Change in selected resources	8,192	3,700	12,000
Total obligations	9,968	11,000	25,000

Housing and related legislation authorizes a program of research into housing, urban technology, metropolitan growth, and urban problems. The program involves research directed at basic areas of urban development and which are the direct responsibility of the Department. These include decent housing, adequate and efficient local public facilities and services, the physical and social environment of urban communities, and the management of governmental activities in community development. Studies will also test and demonstrate innovations which promise cost reductions and more systematic ways of solving problems of housing and community development, as well as encourage and promote the acceptance and application of new and improved techniques and methods of constructing, rehabilitating, and maintaining housing and advancing the state of urban technology.

Contracts, studies, and performance of research. The program for studies and research is carried out primarily through contracts with other Federal agencies, educational institutions, nonprofit private research organizations, and private corporations. When economy and effectiveness would be served, studies may be carried out by staff of the Department or by a combination of staff and contract work, as best suits the problem.

Housing and urban data services. Statistical data series reflecting current conditions and changes in the housing and mortgage markets of the country are necessary to help in policy formation by the Secretary and top officials of the Department. Starting with 1969, an annual report by the President to Congess will deal with progress toward the goal of providing, during the next decade, by construction or rehabilitation, 26,000,000 housing units, including 6,000,000 for low and moderate income families.

Administrative expenses. This activity covers the costs of the Office of Urban Technology and Research in connection with the general planning, supervision, and direction of the reseach program. The office must develop, review, and evaluate specific research proposals, monitor and evaluate research activities, and other activities related to the direct performance of research. The activity includes costs in connection with administering related research activities, such as under the low income housing demonstration grant program, urban renewal demonstrations, urban planning research and demonstrations, surveys of public works planning, and studies and publications under the open space land program. In addition, the activity includes a related share of certain overall supporting expenses of the Department.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
Public land management:			
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation:			
Salaries and expenses: Planning and research	2,554	2,805	2,980

Planning and research. Funds are provided for: preparation of a nationwide outdoor recreation plan encompassing all aspects of outdoor recreation, taking into consideration activities of the Federal, State, and local governments and the private sector; the conduct of recreation studies and reporting on river basins and water resource projects, and for the conduct of studies of other areas having significant potential for meeting outdoor recreation needs; and for the conduct of research studies and reports on factors and conditions relating to current and future outdoor recreation resources, uses, and needs.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Mineral resources: Geological Survey, surveys, investigations, and research, direct program, water resources investigations	26,836	27,576	28,937

Water resources investigations. The program includes determinations of the flow and sediment discharge of rivers, location and amount of underground waters, chemical quality and temperature of waters, changes caused by nature and by man, availability and suitability of water supplies for present and future demands—all of which provide water data essential to planning and water management. Research is conducted to increase our understanding of fundamental principles of water occurrence, movement, and interaction with its environment, and also to increase the accuracy and usefulness of water data by improvements in technology. Funds requested for 1970 will be used to accelerate the Geological Survey's activities under Bureau of the Budget guidelines for coordination of Federal activities in acquisition and dissemination of water data; strengthen the nationwide effort in basic-data collection and analysis; continue the automation of data services to provide better service to users, and the development and application of instruments and techniques for improved data; conduct research on basic principles, especially in the fields of geochemistry, geophysics, limnology, glaciology, geomorphology, sedimentology, ground-water hydrology; continue support of education and training in hydrology, and timely publication of water data and results of investigations. Increased funds are requested in 1970 for expanding the Federal-State program in data-deficient segments of the national water-data system; for flood-plain delineation in urban areas vulnerable to flooding; for planning for water-use data acquisition; for accelerated implementation of the national plan for coordinating data acquisition; for research and experimentation in artificial recharge; for evaluation of ground-water potential in broad regions; and for studies in urban hydrology.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Bureau of Mines: Conservation and Development of Mineral Resources: Research:			
Coal	6,893	6,963	6,363
Petroleum	2,376	2,494	2,494
Oil shale	1,470	2,267	2,567
Metallurgy	13,377	12,793	11,493
Mining	4,694	4,736	5,936
Marine mineral mining	1,278	1,478	878
Explosives	585	606	606

Coal. Scientific research is carried out on the chemical and physical properties of coal and lignite and their preparation, combustion, carbonization, and gasification. Research is emphasized on the development of methods for reducing or eliminating industrial air pollution caused by sulfur oxides released to the atmosphere during combustion of fossil fuels. The 1970 estimate provides for scaling up research on a new coal hydrogenation process.

Petroleum. Research is conducted to conserve petroleum and natural gas resources by improving the processes of recovery and utilization and to promote improved efficiency in processing and use of raw materials produced from these resources. Research will be continued on fuel combustion and utilization as related to air pollution by automotive emissions. The work is carried out in cooperation with Federal and State agencies and with industry associations and is partially supported financially by many of these agencies and associations.

Oil shale. Research is carried out on oil shale to determine the composition of the various products obtainable, to test the applicability of those products to different uses, and to determine the basic chemistry and physics essential to the development and evaluation of new retorting concepts. The 1970 estimate provides for an expansion of research on extraction of minerals associated with oil shale and an increase in oil shale processing and waste disposal research.

Metallurgy. Research is carried out seeking improved processes for extracting metals and nonmetals from their ores and for reducing and recovering mineral wastes. Multidiscipline investigations develop better methods to recover metals by physical, chemical, and electrical techniques and find means to produce superpure materials. A parallel effort integrates the structure of metals, alloys, and ceramic compounds with optimum preparation and utilization. Basic to all investigations is fundamental research to delineate the physical and thermodynamic properties of materials and to analyze the rates and mechanics of high-temperature chemical and metallurgical reactions.

Mining. Research effort applies physics and mining engineering principles to all phases of mineral mining. Fundamental studies range from the physical nature of rock structures through the application of rock mechanics to exploration, development, and operational problems of mining. Highly specialized research is conducted on the mechanisms of penetrating and breaking rock. The problem of ground control which is attacked by developing methods of stabilizing underground openings and techniques for designing efficient open-pit slopes is of prime importance. Work will continue on extension of applied rock mechanics studies into coal mines to develop engineering principles required for safe economic physical design of modern coal mining systems, engineering application of results of previous studies in underground metal mines, and studies of nature and behavior of rock and rock masses in relation to the mining processes. A research program will be initiated to develop a technology necessary for abating the hazards from mining in a methane environment.

Marine mineral mining. Research is devoted to the conception, development, testing, and evaluation of instruments and hardware of undersea mining. Investigations are concerned with the nature and extent of oceanic deposits and the mining and processing of materials recoverable from such deposits.

Explosives. Research is conducted to provide information and guidance to industry, other Federal agencies, and State and local governments on safe handling and use of commercial explosives and blasting agents; the safety characteristics of explosives certified for use in underground coal mines; the hazards of gas and vapor explosives from flammable liquids and/or gases; and the means of controlling fires in mineral fuels and their products.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Health and safety: Health and safety research	2,092	2,277	3,337

Health and safety research. Research is conducted on the support of mine roof and control of overburden, ventilation of mines, methods of allaying harmful and combustible airborne dusts, preventing accumulations of combustible dusts, preventing underground fires, safe blasting practices, and safe electrical installations. Other research is directed toward developing mining procedures and devices to avoid, detect, or control those aspects of mining and the working environment which involve potential personal hazards to mine workmen and physical hazards to mine operations. Various machines and devices are tested for use in mines and plants where explosive or harmful gas or dust may be liberated or encountered. The 1970 estimate provides for expansion of the Bureau's health research activities in order to combat the debilitating diseases of pneumoconiosis, silicosis, and lung cancer which endanger the health and life of the workers in our mines.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Helium fund: Research expense	837	945	928

The Helium Research Center will continue its program in basic and applied research. Emphasis will be placed on improvements in processes, production methods, purification, liquefaction, and utilization, in order to increase technical literature and knowledge of helium and helium-bearing gas mixtures.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Contributed funds: Health and safety research		1	

Funds contributed by States, counties, municipalities, and private sources are used to conduct research and investigations to

promote the conservation and development of mineral resources and health and safety in the mineral industries.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Office of Coal Research, salaries and expenses:			
Administration and contract supervision	354	408	448
Contract research	11,537	13,327	12,852
Total program costs funded	11,891	13,735	13,300
Change in selected resources	−877		
Total obligations	11,014	13,735	13,300

The Office of Coal Research develops, through research, new and more efficient methods of mining, preparing, and utilizing coal and contracts for, sponsors, cosponsors, and promotes the coordination of, research with recognized interested groups (including, but not limited to, coal trade associations, educational institutions, and agencies of States and political subdivisions).

The Office is responsible for developing the full potentiality and versatility of coal as the Nation's largest energy resource to the maximum benefit of the United States. The Office is devoting its efforts to expand the use of coal through development of new uses as well as within presently known fields of utilization. The scientific and technical aspects of the program are performed through a program of contract research.

Administration and contract supervision. This portion of the program performs all necessary functions relating to contracts. This includes drafting, negotiation, and execution of the contracts, together with review and monitoring of technical and administrative phases of the contract work. Proposals are evaluated to ascertain technical and economic feasibility and eliminate possible duplication with other work.

Contract research. The entire research activity cited above as the responsibility of the Office is represented in the contract aspect of the Office's operation. Contract research activities are conducted with profit and nonprofit research organizations. Only applied research and development projects are undertaken. No basic research or grant research programs are entered into.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Fish and wildlife, parks, and marine resources: Bureau of Commercial Fisheries: Management and investigations of resources:			
Research	12,386	12,859	13,021
Research on fish migration over dams	1,493	1,453	1,254

Research. Research is conducted: on variations in abundance of important commercial food fishes and other aquatic animals, on declining species and fishery resources, on cultivation of aquatic animals, including shellfish, and in the design of fish protective devices.

Research on fish migration over dams. Investigations are conducted to determine factors influencing direction and rate of movement of anadromous fish over dams, for consideration in designing future dams.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Management and investigations of resources (special foreign currency program): Research	157	120	55

Research. These funds finance biological research conducted on: variations in the abundance of important commercial food fishes and other aquatic animals, discovering and conserving declining species, cultivation of fishery resources, and a translation program to gain biological research information from foreign fishery publications and reports.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development: Aid to States	5,117	4,723	4,353

Aid to States. States are reimbursed up to 75% of the cost of approved commercial fisheries research and development projects, within their respective apportionment of funds appropriated for such purposes.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Promote and develop fishery products and research pertaining to American fisheries:			
Research	4,891	4,154	4,038
Research on fish migration over dams	43	51	57

Research and *Research on fish migration over dams.* These funds supplement moneys appropriated to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries for the same purposes under the appropriation for Management and Investigations of Resources.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: Management and investigations of resources:			
Fishery research	3,747	3,970	4,010
Wildlife research	7,245	7,981	7,981

Fishery research. Research is conducted to provide information needed for improved methods of sport fishery management. The program includes: studies of the factors governing sport fish productivity in the natural environment, both marine and freshwater; studies of how hatchery fish can be produced more efficiently and used more effectively; studies of the effects of pesticides on fish and to develop methods of controlling fish that are pests.

Wildlife research. Research is conducted on game and nongame, resident, and migratory forms of wildlife. Results are used by the Bureau as well as cooperating Federal, State, and private agencies to improve wildlife management and conservation practices. Wildlife units are also maintained to give technical training in wildlife management, conduct research, and demonstrate improved management practices.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Water and power development: Bureau of Reclamation: General investigations: General engineering and research	5,981	7,712	7,210

General engineering and research. Studies are directed toward improvements in planning procedures and in engineering methods and materials. Included are studies of atmospheric water resources and suppression of losses due to evaporation as a means of increasing project water supplies.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Water Quality and Research, Office of Saline Water, saline water conversion:			
Research and development	20,929	19,500	21,000
Construction, operation, and maintenance:			
Test beds and facilities	3,274	4,000	4,000
Modules	242	750	2,250
Administration and coordination	1,729	1,815	2,100
Total program costs, funded	26,174	26,065	29,350
Change in selected resources	−738	−391	−2,350
Total operations	25,436	25,674	27,000

This program finances the research on and development of low-cost processes for converting saline water to fresh water in quality suitable for municipal, industrial, and agricultural uses.

Research and development. Both basic and applied research, engineering and development, and evaluation work are accomplished by means of contracts or grants to Federal or non-Federal agencies, institutions, commercial organizations, and consultants.

Construction, operation, and maintenance. This activity provides for the design, construction, acquisition, operation, maintenance, and modification of saline water conversion test bed plants, facilities, and modules to determine the practical application of the conversion processes under development.

Administration and coordination. This activity provides for the necessary planning, supervision, and administration of the saline water conversion program.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Federal Water Pollution Control Administration: Pollution control operations and research: Research, development, and demonstration	30,255	61,394	49,193

Research, development, and demonstration. Grants and contracts are made to public and private agencies, institutions, and individuals for research and for field investigations and studies of an applied nature. Their purpose is to test and illustrate the applicability of research findings and newly developed techniques to problems of water pollution and particularly those related to industrial waste pollution problems, combined sewer problems, advanced waste treatment, water purification, and joint treatment of municipal and industrial wastes problems. Thirty per cent of the estimate is to carry out activities in the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration laboratories, to conduct field studies and demonstrations, and to provide technical management for the grants and contract programs.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Research, development, and demonstration	87	95	95
Secretarial offices: Underground electric power transmission research:			
Administration and contract supervision			462
Contract research			538
Total program costs funded			1,000
Change in selected resources			1,000
Total obligations			2,000

The Department will carry out research on underground electric power transmission in cooperation with concerned private, public, and Federal agencies.

Administration and contract supervision. The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Water and Power Development will perform all necessary functions related to the administration of research contracts.

Contract research. The contract research will be conducted with commercial organizations, educational institutions, nonprofit research organizations, and other governmental agencies where expertise may exist.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Coal research	212		
Water resources research	5		
Office of Water Resources Research:			
Salaries and expenses:			
Assistance to States for institutes	5,052	5,100	5,100
Matching grants to institutes	2,621	3,000	3,000
Additional water research	1,005	2,000	2,000
Scientific information center	201	506	506
Administration	464	575	623
Total program costs funded	9,343	11,181	11,229
Change in selected resources	1,779		
Total obligations	11,122	11,181	11,229

The objective of this program is to stimulate, sponsor, provide for, and supplement present programs for the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, and the training of scientists in the fields of water and of resources which affect water, in order to assist in assuring the Nation at all times of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population.

Assistance to States for institutes. This activity provides for specific grants to the States and Puerto Rico for assistance in carrying on the work of a competent and qualified water resources research institute at one college or university in each State. The function of such institute is to conduct research, investigations, and experiments of either a basic or practical nature, or both, in relation to water resources and to provide for the training of scientists through such research, investigations, and experiments. States may elect to use their grants in support of regional institutes in which several States participate.

Matching grants to institutes. This activity provides for grants to match funds made available to institutes by State or other non-Federal sources to meet the necessary expenses of specific water resources research projects which could not otherwise be undertaken.

Additional water research. This activity provides for grants to and contracts and matching or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations, or other institutions, with private firms and individuals whose training, experience, and qualifications are adequate for the conduct of water research projects, and with local, State, and Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department which are deemed desirable and which are not otherwise being studied.

Scientific information center. This activity provides for the operation of a water resources scientific information center. The objective of center operations are to be responsive to the water resources scientific information needs of Federal water resources organizations, to avoid replication of research, and to improve communications and coordination of efforts among all those engaged in federally sponsored water-related research.

Administration. This activity provides for the administration of the Water Resources Research Act including the prescribing of rules and regulations; review and appraisal of institute programs and research proposals, making of allotments, contracts, and grants; establishment and maintenance of cooperation and coordination among the centers and between the centers and Federal and other organizations concerned with water resources.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs:			
Salaries and expenses: Research	327	931	1,275

Research. The objective of the research program is to determine how drug abuse can be prevented. Studies are made to ascertain the most effective means of eliminating or reducing the illicit supplies of narcotics and dangerous drugs, and to explore the sociological and psychological factors which motivate the abuser, with a view toward learning how to neutralize or redirect these drives.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
Wage and Labor Standards: Wage and Hour Division: Salaries and expenses: Research and legislative analysis	1,725	1,957	1,964

Research and legislative analysis. Research is conducted on the effects of the provisions dealing with wages, hours, age, equal pay, and child labor in the acts administered. This involves gathering meaningful data on the socioeconomic characteristics of employees for use in making new legislative proposals and developing programs that will achieve the social and economic goals and objectives of the acts administered. This information is used to assess appropriate minimum wage standards, the relationship of wage standards to youth employment, and the problems resulting from wage discrimination. Data is also collected and analyzed for use in the development of administrative policies and in support of litigation activities.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT			
Current authorizations out of postal fund: Research, development, and engineering:			
Operating costs, funded: Contract research and development	9,238	10,949	14,574
Capital outlay: Contract research and development	312		

Contract research and development. This activity includes funds for the design, development, test, and evaluation of new postal equipment, materials, and techniques required to reduce costs, improve service, and improve employee working conditions. The work is primarily performed by other Government agencies or by private industry under contract. Funds are also included for supplies, materials, and equipment used in testing and evaluating equipment at postal laboratory facilities.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Office of the Secretary, transportation planning, research, and development:			
Transportation policy and planning	4,154	7,650	8,388
Transportation facilitation		373	921

Transportation policy and planning. Research and studies are conducted on a broad range of transportation policy problems to determine national transportation requirements and to provide the Secretary with statistical planning information and analyses needed for national transportation policies and programs. Included is the on-going program to develop plans for meeting the transportation needs of the Northeast Corridor. The 1970 amount includes funds for carrying forward a study of automobile accident compensation systems.

Transportation facilities. Research and studies in this area are aimed at reducing the costs and removing the impediments to the rapid and efficient flow of passengers and cargo by modernizing our systems of transportation documentation and procedures. Projects will also be directed at realizing the economic and technological benefits of important transportation developments which can be achieved through cooperative research and development arrangements with foreign countries.

[In thousands of dollars

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Transportation research	76	250	500
Coast Guard: Research, development, test, and evaluation:			
Search and rescue	412	388	743
Aids to navigation	415	467	890
Marine safety	263	552	613
Marine law enforcement	35	733	1,584
Oceanography, meteorology, and polar operations	41	757	9,800
Program support	334	1,103	1,770
Total program costs funded—obligations	1,500	4,000	15,400

This appropriation provides for administration and conduct of basic and applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation with maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment.

Search and rescue. The program on search planning and survival equipment will be continued and efforts will be intensified in the development of a detection system for locating distressed persons, small craft, etc. A program in domestic icebreaker research will be undertaken in 1970.

Aids to navigation. Additional effort will be applied in 1970 to development of lightweight buoys for protected waters. Further developmental stages of a high-precision, all-weather harbor approach will be instituted in 1970, while continuing developmental work toward further replacement of lightships with more economical aids.

Marine safety. The program under this activity includes continued investigation of construction standards in new fields such as non-military submersibles, the operation of the Shipboard Fire Test Facility in support of continued efforts in fire safety standards, and the continuation of research efforts with interagency groups such as the N.A.S. Advisory Committee on toxic chemicals and the Ship Structure Committee.

Marine law enforcement. Under this activity, the program provides for intensified research efforts in the control of pollution by oil or other wastes of our navigable waters. This program includes advanced development of airborne sensors for detection, booms and gelling agents for control, and containers for defueling of wrecks. A companion project will be continued for development and testing of systems to reduce pollution by the Government's facilities, including Coast Guard cutters. Research in support of the Boating Safety program will be undertaken in 1970.

Oceanography, meteorology, and polar operations. This program includes oceanographic research and data collection in the Arctic area, advanced development of iceberg detection and tracking capability, and development of instrumentation for data collection on Coast Guard offshore structures, vessels, and buoys. In 1970, the advanced development phase will commence for the national data buoy developmental project designed to collect oceanographic and marine meteorological data from the deep oceans and coastal North America.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Federal Aviation Administration:			
Operations: Research direction	10,066	10,702	11,327

Research direction. This activity covers: the planning, direction, and evaluation of the research and development program, the direct project costs of which are financed under the Research and development appropriation; and related administrative support for the operation of the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Facilities and equipment: Research, test, and evaluation facilities	1,503	2,304	....

Research, test, and evaluation facilities. This activity provides for the construction and improvement of plant and facilities at the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center. It also covers the procurement of capital items of equipment for use in the research and development program.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT			
Air traffic control	24,376	24,897	35,254
Navigation	3,950	5,150	4,500
Aviation weather	574	564	450
Aircraft safety	4,046	3,350	5,346
Aviation medicine	1,705	2,180	1,950
Total obligations	34,651	36,141	47,500

The Federal Aviation Administration carries out a program to improve and modernize the national system of aviation facilities through the development of new systems, procedures, and devices. The agency also carries out a program of medical research to aid in the development of rules and regulations governing the certification of airmen and to assure aviation safety.

Research and development is conducted through contracts with qualified firms, universities, and individuals, or by agency staff or other Government agencies. The data, procedures, or equipment resulting from this program are tested and evaluated to determine their potential value in meeting a variety of needs of the overall National Airspace System.

Air traffic control. This provides for improving the airways system by applying existing technology to air traffic control problems to effect in-service improvements as required, by system modernization where necessary, and by long-range research and development to meet future needs. Studies of present airways system operations and future requirements and work in the fields of data processing and display, data acquisition, and communications are included.

Navigation. This provides for modernization, expansion, and improvements of the common system navigation facilities in the United States and in overseas areas where international agreements require U.S. participation. Work in the fields of landing systems, short and long distance navigation, and flight inspection is included.

Aviation weather. This provides for a program, coordinated with the Departments of Defense and Commerce, to develop devices and improve techniques for the communication and display of weather information to aviation users. The effects of weather in air traffic management techniques and systems are also analyzed.

Aircraft safety. This activity provides for a program, coordinated with the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to study, develop, and evaluate devices to enhance the safety of civil aircraft by providing practical solutions to critical safety problems and a sound basis for airworthiness standards and safety regulations. Also included are efforts directed toward the analysis of noise and sonic boom problems related to aviation and the solution of these problems.

Aviation medicines. This provides for conducting an aeromedical research effort directed toward the identification and elimination of those physical, physiological, and psychological factors which may jeopardize safety in flight.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Civil supersonic aircraft development: Civil supersonic aircraft research and development—costs, obligations	62,734	137,538	55,264

This program is to assist the aviation industry in the development of a competitive commercial supersonic transport aircraft. The objectives are to develop a safe airplane, superior to others of its class and economically profitable to build and fly. During early 1969, the prototype construction was deferred to permit redesign for correction of technical problems to assure program objectives can be attained before accelerating outlays. An evaluation and decision on the revised design will be made later in 1969. Recommendations for the program in 1970 will be transmitted to the Congress later.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION			
Limitation on General Expenses:			
Program development: Research and development	10,484	11,881	15,330

Research and development. This is direct and contract research and development relating mainly to traffic operations, new construction techniques, and the social and economic aspects of highways.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Other Federal Highway Administration trust funds: Contributions for highway research programs	5	5	....

Contributions for highway research programs. In association with the General Services Administration and the Department of Defense, tests of highway equipment are conducted for the purpose of establishing performance standards upon which to base specifications for use by the Government in purchasing such equipment.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION			
High-Speed Ground Transportation Research and Development:			
Research and development	10,985	14,000	14,000

Research and development. This includes materials, aerodynamics, vehicle propulsion, vehicle control, communications, guideways, and research testing on new systems, components, and techniques.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Railroad research:			
Railroad research (program costs funded)	5	300	500
Change in selected resources	30	166	....
Total obligations	34	466	500

This appropriation provides for research which deals exclusively with railroad matters. During 1969 and 1970 emphasis will be placed on conducting research studies relating to railroad safety, rail-highway grade crossing safety, policy formulation involving a wide range of rail industry problems.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Urban Mass Transportation Administration: Salaries and expenses: Research administration	345	250	796

Research administration. This activity covers the costs of developing and supervising the Administration's program of research, development, and demonstration projects designed to encourage widespread application of new mass transportation systems, techniques, and methods.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION			
Operating expenses:			
Physical research	264,712	274,820	286,000
Biology and medicine	88,109	89,480	92,000
Civilian applications of nuclear explosives	17,826	14,450	14,000

Physical research. This program comprises basic and applied research in the physical sciences. Major categories are: High energy physics, Medium energy physics, Low energy physics, Mathematics and computer research, Chemistry research, Metallurgy and materials research, and Controlled thermonuclear research.

The Commission serves as executive agent for the Nation's high energy physics program. The increase in research costs in 1970 is primarily associated with design and construction of the 200 Bev accelerator, increased utilization of the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center and use of the improved capability of the Alternating Gradient Synchrotron.

The increase in medium energy physics is primarily to continue construction related research and development on the Los Alamos Meson Physics Facility and to support operation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology electron linear accelerator. The increase in low energy physics will permit operation of new research facilities such as the Oak Ridge electron linear accelerator and the Tandem Van de Graaff at Brookhaven National Laboratory.

The increase for chemistry and metallurgical research will be used to advance basic knowledge related to practical operations of the atomic energy program.

The objective of thermonuclear plasma research is to determine whether the energy released by thermonuclear reactions can be controlled and made useful. This research is expected to expand in 1970 to complete the fabrication of large new experimental devices needed to test recent concepts for improved plasma confinement and expand the research associated with these new concepts.

Biology and medicine. Research is conducted on the effects of radiation of living organisms and on the environment, protection against the injurious effects of radiation, and development of methods for using radioactive materials in the diagnosis, treatment, and understanding of human diseases such as cancer. The program includes the measurement and study of the effects of radioactivity (including fallout) in the atmosphere, soils, and surface waters for the establishment of standards to insure that the Commission's activities are conducted with safety. The program recognizes the responsibilities of other Government agencies conducting programs in biomedical research.

In 1970, emphasis will be given to research on production and utilization of kilogram quantities of carbon 13, and isotope which is potentially valuable for chemical, biological, and medical studies. Emphasis will continue on hazards resulting from inhalation of radon and radon daughters by uranium miners.

Civilian applications of nuclear explosives. This program provides for the investigation, development, and demonstration of peaceful uses for nuclear explosives. The 1970 budget provides for research and development aimed at a fundamental understanding of nuclear explosive design and explosion phenomenology; development and testing of a cleaner device for use in nuclear excavation projects; a cratering experiment to extend the development of excavation technology; work on special nuclear explosives for producing transuranium elements; and development of underground engineering technology capable of being used in the recovery of natural resources.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Plant and capital equipment: Facilities and equipment for physical research	63,547	126,600	141,180
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION			
Records activities: National Archives gift fund: Historical research and publications	274	344	402
National Aeronautics and Space Administration			
Research and development:			
Direct program:			
Manned space flight:			
Gemini	4,808		
Apollo	2,489,182	2,310,000	1,675,000
Apollo applications	127,551	216,000	369,000
Advanced manned mission studies	3,933	4,000	10,000
Scientific investigations in space:			
Physics and astronomy	177,902	158,800	135,200
Lunar and planetary exploration	169,177	113,000	152,500
Bioscience	43,812	37,000	34,000
Launch vehicle development and support	99,627	60,000	70,050
Space applications	107,628	107,000	141,800
Space technology	245,096	217,200	203,950
Aircraft technology	70,694	87,000	96,400
Supporting activities:			
Tracking and data acquisition	285,002	295,000	321,700
Sustaining university program	40,473	26,000	23,000
Technology utilization	4,320	4,000	5,000
Total direct program costs funded	3,869,205	3,635,000	3,237,600
Reimbursable program:			
Manned space flight:			
Gemini	1	84	
Apollo	261	709	555
Apollo applications	12	665	
Scientific investigations in space: Physics and astronomy	8,132	11,292	494
Space applications	35,386	65,257	34,601
Space technology	34,748	26,455	28,300
Aircraft technology	3,234	7,423	2,550
Supporting activities:			
Tracking and data acquisition	243	678	500
Technology utilization	42	4	
Total reimbursable program costs	82,059	112,567	67,000
Total program costs funded	3,951,264	3,747,567	3,304,600
Change in selected resources	−69,980	−174,860	−68,700
Total obligations	3,881,284	3,572,707	3,235,900

This appropriation provides for research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as follows:

Manned space flight. These estimates include the Apollo, Apollo applications, and advanced manned mission studies programs. Funding supports all NASA manned space flight missions, the production of space vehicles, the development of earth orbital and lunar experiments and design studies of advanced manned missions including a low-earth orbit space station. Manned space flight programs provide a national capability for manned operations in space. The manned lunar landing is a major demonstration of this capability. *Apollo.* The Apollo program has created and demonstrated the capability to perform major manned operations in space. During 1969, five more manned Apollo missions are planned. The first two will conduct operational testing of the Command and Service Modules and the Lunar Module in earth orbit and in lunor orbit. Depending on the progress of the missions, a lunar landing is planned on one of the three remaining flights. *Apollo applications.* The program consists of manned earth orbital missions of increasing duration. The Saturn I Workshop and revisit missions serve as a means for accomplishing the medical, human factors, engineering technology and operational objectives established for long duration manned space flight. The solar astronomy mission is designed to support space science through the participation of trained scientist-astronauts in the operation of a complex space observatory. Accomplishment of these objectives will contribute to design and operation criteria for future space exploration as well as demonstrates the long duration usefulness and ability of man in performing complex scientific, engineering, and technology tasks in space. *Advanced manned mission studies.* This program will examine advanced manned space flight program concepts and develop technical information and cost data upon which future program decisions can be based. Included in these activities are further design studies and system, experiment and component investigations for a multi-purpose long-duration space station, capable of several years operation in low earth orbit, and on economical and practical methods of ferrying men to and from the station.

Scientific investigations in space. The objective of this activity is to increase our knowledge of the earth, interplanetary space, the moon, the sun, the solar system, other stars and galaxies, and the effects of the space environment on living organisms. The flight systems used are sounding rocket probes, orbiting spacecraft, and spacecraft designed for planetary and interplanetary missions. *Physics and astronomy.* This program is directed toward the increase of our knowledge of the space environment of the earth and the sun; the sun's relationship to the earth's environment and to interplanetary space; stars and nebulae. It is a coordinated research program with national and international participation. A variety of tools are used in this research including automated observatories, manned spacecraft, interplanetary spacecraft, explorers, sounding rockets, balloons, aircraft, ground based observatories, laboratory and theoretical research. *Lunar and planetary exploration.* Mariner spacecraft flights to Mars are planned in 1969 and 1971 to photograph the Martian surface, to provide atmospheric profile measurements, and to identify certain atmospheric constituents. 1973 missions to Mars are planned using the Titan III D/Centaur launch vehicle. These missions will include both orbiters and soft landers to make the first direct measurements on the surface of the planet. In addition, Pioneer spacecraft will be utilized to explore the interplanetary medium at distances as far out as the orbit of Jupiter in 1972 and 1973. A new class of planetary explorers will be developed commencing in 1970 for investigations of both Mars and Venus, and a Mariner class spacecraft will be launched to Mercury in 1973 utilizing the energy augmentation available by a Venus swing-by. Lunar exploration effort will be devoted to continuing laboratory investigation, theoretical and planning studies to increase our scientific knowledge of the moon and to improve experiments on future missions. *Bioscience*. This program will continue to investigate the effects of weightlessness, radiation, and other space phenomena on animals, plants, and other biological organisms. Another major objective is to obtain knowledge of the origin, nature, and distribution of life in the universe. Information for these investigations will be obtained from biosatellite spacecraft, planetary missions, and manned flights. *Launch vehicle development and support*. This program includes those launch vehicle procurement activities which are not specifically chargeable to spacecraft missions, such as range support, launch operations, and maintenance engineering necessary to sustain and improve the performance of existing vehicles.

Space applications. The objectives of this activity include development of meteorological, technological, earth resources, and geodetic satellites, and studies of communication and navigation components and systems. Specific objectives are to improve satellite instrumentation and data handling technology; to provide data for atmospheric earth resources, and geodetic research; to participate in design and development of operational satellite systems as required and, to study advanced satellite systems. The earth resources survey program will continue to develop the technology for surveying the earth's resources from space. The major areas of interest are: agriculture/forestry, geology/mineralogy, hydrology/oceanography, and geography/cartography. In 1970, development will begin on a new Earth Resources Technology Satellite for experimental application of the technology developed in the earth resources survey program. Flight experiments and activities will also be carried out with the Tiros, Nimbus, Applications Technology, and Geodetic Satellites, on an experimental synchronous meterological satellite, and on meterological sounding rockets.

Space technology. This activity is comprised of research and development effort relating to space vehicle systems and operations, and associated equipment and components for space missions. Emphasis is placed on space vehicle structures, auxiliary power systems, propulsion systems, and life support technology. The program includes development of a flight type NERVA I nuclear rocket engine having a thrust of about 75,000 pounds to provide basic propulsion capability for future high energy, high payload missions. The improvement of electronic systems for control, data acquisition, and communications will be continued. Much of this and other basic research is conducted in laboratories and special ground-based test facilities located at the various NASA centers.

Aircraft technology. The objective of this activity is to extend the national capability in aeronautics in support of other Government agencies having aeronautical interests and responsibilities such as the Departments of Defense and Transportation. Aeronautical research will continue in VSTOL, subsonic, supersonic, and hypersonic technology in support of civil and military aircraft development. Emphasis will be placed on research in noise reduction and alleviation.

Supporting activities. Tracking and data acquisition. Operation and equipment of the stations of the NASA tracking and data acquisition networks are provided for here, as well as research and development to increase the capability of the specialized ground equipment. *Sustaining university program*. This program includes training grants awarded for graduate studies in specialized engineering and other fields, and multidisciplinary research grants to universities. *Technology utilization*. The objective of this program is to accelerate the transfer into the economy of new advances in technology generated by NASA and NASA contractors.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Construction of facilities:			
Direct program:			
Space technology	14,824	15,000	11,000
Aircraft technology	4,910	10,000	6,000

Space technology. Funds for this activity will provide for a computer-instrumentation research laboratory and extension to the center support facilities at the Electronics Research Center, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Aircraft technology. This activity includes funding for an aircraft noise reduction laboratory at the Langley Research Center.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Research and program management:			
Direct program:			
Scientific investigations in space	77,139	73,600	78,000
Space technology	143,026	142,700	142,000
Aircraft technology	52,840	55,400	56,000
Reimbursable program: Space technology	487	570	600

This appropriation provides for expenses of research in Government laboratories, management of programs, and other expenses for the operation of NASA installations.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION			
Medical and prosthetic research:			
Operating costs, funded:			
Medical research	38,433	42,023	49,826
Prosthetic research	1,354	1,422	1,639
Total operating costs, funded	39,787	43,445	51,465
Capital outlay, funded:			
Medical research	5,364	6,971	8,135
Prosthetic research	32	35	38
Total capital outlay	5,396	7,006	8,173
Total program costs, funded	45,183	50,450	59,638
Change in selected resources	403		
Total obligations	45,586	50,450	59,638

Medical research. Medical research projects are conducted in Veterans Administration laboratories or other institutions on a contract basis, whichever is more advantageous or economical. In addition to amounts provided for the medical research program by direct appropriation, an amount of $15,690,529 was available in 1968 in grants from the National Institutes of Health and from other organizations sponsoring research. It is anticipated that approximately the same level of funding from these outside sources will be available in 1969 and 1970.

Prosthetic research. This is a research program to develop and test prosthetic, orthopedic, and sensory aids for the purpose of improving the care and rehabilitation of disabled eligible veterans, including amputees, paraplegics, and the blind.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities: Research facilities	1,244	3,758	5,839

Research facilities. This activity provides for construction of medical research facilities.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Advances and reimbursements:			
Medical and prosthetic research	435	400	400
ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY			
Arms control and disarmament activities: External research and field testing	4,500	3,498	3,973

Approximately 42% of the 1970 request will be devoted to external research and field testing activities conducted through contracts or grants with nongovernmental research organizations and through reimbursement agreements with other United States Government departments and agencies. In 1970, the Agency plans to devote particular attention to the control of strategic offensive and defensive weapons systems.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Advances and reimbursements: External research and field testing	60	70	70
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION			
Salaries and expenses: Research and planning in communications technology	1,435	2,007	2,732

Research and planning in communications technology. The Commission undertakes broad studies designed to improve the utilization of the radio spectrum, approves certain equipment for public use, and licenses experimental radio stations. Some of the studies being considered for 1970 include a further study into broadband communications technology, frequency assignment techniques for microwave radio systems, the social and economic values of communications, and a study of future requirements of the public, industry, public agencies, and individuals for land mobile services. In 1970, the Commission also proposes to initiate a program for the development of an augmented data bank to make available additional technical information regarding licensed stations for use in developing rules and in communications systems planning.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION			
Support of scientific research:			
Scientific research project support	170,615	177,300	195,000
Specialized research facilities and equipment	18,942	7,000	15,000
National research programs	15,483	13,000	23,200
National research centers	31,464	25,700	25,700
Planning and policy studies	2,446	2,500	2,900

Support of scientific research. The budget provides for the award of grants and contracts in the various activities as follows: *Scientific research project support*. The Foundation's support of research in the sciences is provided through grants to investigators principally at colleges and universities. *Specialized research facilities and equipment*. The Foundation provides support for major items of specialized scientific facilities and equipment primarily at colleges and universities. *National research programs*. The Foundation supports broad national programs of scientific research including the Antarctic research program, the International biological research program, the Weather modification program, and an Ocean sediment coring program. *National research centers*. The Foundation supports the development and operation of national research centers for optical and radio astronomy and atmospheric sciences.

Planning and policy studies. This activity supports surveys and analytical studies of research and development within the various sectors of the economy and the current and projected status of scientific manpower and other resources required for the conduct of scientific activities. These studies are related to the formulation of the national policies concerning science.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti-mate	1970 esti-mate
SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION			
Salaries and expenses: Research contracts	128	150	150

Research contracts. Research studies designed to reveal matters materially affecting the competitive strength of small business and the effect on small business of Federal laws, programs, and regulations are financed under this activity.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti-mate	1970 esti-mate
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION			
Salaries and expenses: Research and scholarship	7,250	7,559	8,724

The Smithsonian Institution conducts research in the natural and physical sciences and in the history of cultures, technology, and the arts. During fiscal 1970, the relocation of the Radiation Biology Laboratory to adequate research quarters will be continued. Ecological research and the management of natural preserves will be stressed at the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, and the Chesapeake Bay Center for Field Biology.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti. mate	1970 esti-mate
Museum programs and related research (special foreign currency program): Grants for museum programs and related research in the natural sciences and cultural history (program costs funded)	2,026	2,666	4,977
Change in selected resources	8	12	
Total obligations	2,034	2,678	4,977

Grants for museum programs and related research in the natural sciences and cultural history. The Smithsonian Institution will continue the program of awarding grants to American universities, museums, or other institutions of higher learning interested in conducting research or excavations in archeology, research on systematic and environmental biology, and programs in museum sciences in the excess foreign currency countries.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti-mate	1970 esti-mate
TARIFF COMMISSION			
Salaries and expenses:			
Direct program:			
Research, investigations, and reports	3,257	3,525	3,466
Executive direction and administration	423	424	484
Total direct program costs funded	3,680	3,949	3,950
Change in selected resources	51	−110	
Total direct program	3,731	3,839	3,950
Reimbursable program: Research, investigations, and reports	11	10	10
Tota lobligations	3,742	3,849	3,960

The major responsibility of the Commission is to assess the impact of foreign trade policies of the United States and of other countries on domestic industries and to provide the President, the Congress, and the public with reports on these matters. The increasing complexity of the Nation's foreign trade relations, the increase in its foreign trade in recent years, and the greatly changing patterns of world trade continue to emphasize the need for research, investigations, and reports on tariff and trade matters.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti-mate	1970 esti-mate
TEMPORARY STUDY COMMISSIONS			
Commission on Obscenity and pornography, salaries and expenses: Investigation and recommendations—obscenity and pornography (costs—obligations)		621	1,249

Research is directed toward analysis of existing laws and their enforcement, traffic in obscene and pornographic materials, and the effects of such materials on minors and crime in general.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 esti-mate	1970 esti-mate
U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY			
Acquisition and construction of radio facilities: Research and development	102	206	181

Research and development. Research will continue in engineering development, equipment design, and radio propagation techniques applicable to the Voice of America.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Grand totals	15,096,535	15,484,971	15,703,980

H.R. 10250—THE SUPPLEMENTAL FAMILY ALLOWANCE ACT

The **SPEAKER**. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI), is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, "the welfare system is designed to save money instead of people and tragically ends up doing neither." This was the view of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders in March of 1968, and it is now the view overwhelmingly shared by those responsible for the administration of the present system.

There are approximately 8.5 million people in the United States receiving welfare today. In fiscal 1967, the total welfare cost was $6,981,511,000. In fiscal 1968, it was $8,866,220,000 with the Federal Government paying $4.7 billion, the States $3 billion, and local governments $1.1 billion.

Despite increases in payments and programs and the unprecedented and largely unforeseen expansion of welfare rolls throughout the Nation, welfare in and of itself has not been adequate enough to aid recipients to climb above the poverty level.

The system, developed during the depression of the thirties, is not working properly, and this view is held by recipients, administrators, and the taxpayers who pay the actual bills.

To quote from a study concluded recently by the Urban Coalition, reviewing the effects of the Kerner Commission Report 1 year later:

> Between 1959 and 1968, the increase in welfare caseloads nationally was 74.9%. But caseloads in the 10 States with the highest welfare benefits increased 148.7%, while caseloads in the 9 States and Puerto Rico with the lowest benefits increased only 11.1%. Similarly, the 10 high-pay States increased their share of the welfare dollar from 21.2% to 30.1% in the same period. The other 10 decreased their share from 30.3% to 19.2%.

Our American welfare system is deficient in two major ways:

First, it excludes large numbers of people who are in serious need and who, if provided a decent level of support, might be able to become more productive and self-sufficient, and

Second, the assistance provided is well below the minimum necessary for any humane standard of existence and it imposes penalties and restrictions that encourage continued dependency on the welfare system itself.

In other words, our present welfare system locks people in to dependence on the public dole.

Until recently, all wages earned by adult welfare recipients on outside jobs, with the exception of small allowances for expenses, were deducted directly from the welfare payments the recipients would otherwise have received. This practice, required by Federal law, has seriously undermined and successfully blunted any incentive recipients might have to seek either part-time or full time employment.

Our welfare system is paralyzed in the ganglia of its own regulations and standards. It thwarts the taxpayers who support it and the recipients it is primarily designed to help. Unless we completely revise the present system, we can expect higher and higher costs with ever-diminishing results.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we will find no quarrel from any mayor in this country or any Governor in this country or any administrator that the rising cost of public welfare is the single item that can destroy the fiscal security of community after community. Something has to be done.

Therefore, I am today proposing a major revision of America's welfare system in the form of legislation to be known as the Supplemental Family Allowance Act. Briefly, this legislation would:

First, provide more adequate levels of assistance of the basis of uniform national welfare standards. This would significantly curb the current migration of low-income people to the urban areas of the Nation.

We have a situation today where one State pays a family of four only $40 a month in welfare assistance. We have other States that pay that same family $280 a month. So it is no surprise that we have a great movement of people and a great migration of people seeking better opportunities, particularly into the urban areas of this country.

In my own State, the State of Illinois, 49 percent of the welfare recipients are from the single State of Mississippi.

In my judgment, we need uniform national standards to arrest this migration, this movement of people from one community to another seeking greater opportunities in the case of public assistance.

Second, my bill would create a new incentive to work by permitting the retention of a larger portion of outside earnings. The supplemental family allowance would be reduced by only 50 cents for every dollar earned by the recipient. This would mean that every able-bodied person would participate in some form or another in helping himself.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great tragedies of our time is that today in Cook County alone, County Commissioner Harry Semrow recently made a study of 6,000 welfare ADC mothers and found that 2,000 of those 6,000 women were capable of working and wanted to work and who had members of their own families or their relatives or neighbors who were willing to take care of their youngsters while they were working. The only thing that was holding these women back from working was the fact that actually they were receiving more money from public assistance than they would receive from jobs for which they had not been trained.

So, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me incongruous that we are providing welfare to such an extent that some individuals receive more welfare assistance than they would receive from employment.

Under my proposal we would permit people to keep their earnings and reduce the money they would be entitled to under public assistance by only 50 percent of their earnings so that all in all they would improve their economic status by their own initiative.

Supplemental family allowances are designed to help people first of all earn their way out of public assistance and, second, require that the Government shall continue to contribute some share to their personal needs until such time as they earn enough to raise them above the poverty level. By giving this family a supplemental allowance, we would be doing just that, because we would be giving an incentive to people to augment and hopefully replace the assistance they receive from the public agencies through their own capacity and their own earning ability.

Third, my bill would free the State and local governments from financing public aid programs. In Illinois alone this would mean that my State could divert $1.4 billion in each biennium to other uses or to tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, this idea of the Federal Government taking over the full responsibility for welfare programs makes sense when we recognize the huge mobility of the people in this country today. I do not believe that host States—and my own State of Illinois, for example—should be compelled to provide $1.4 billion of State money to provide assistance to indigent families who have exercised their Federal rights, their Federal constitutional rights, of moving from one State to another or of moving from one community to another so long as we allow this free movement. I am not suggesting that we should not allow such movement. This is a Republic of 50 States, and all Americans have the right to move from one State to another or to move from one community to another. But so long as that right exists as a Federal constitutional right, it occurs to me that the Federal Government should assume the responsibility of providing welfare assistance for those people who move from one community to another. I do not believe that the host community should be burdened with the total cost of providing public assistance.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. I wonder if the gentleman in the well has thought this through to the extent that the Federal Government, as I understand it, would assume all welfare responsibility, or would there be anything to keep the States or localities from supplementing the welfare program. What assurance does the gentleman have that the States and localities would not continue and that this would not be an added benefit that the Federal Government would eventually have to assume?

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the gentleman will be kind enough to listen to the rest of my statement, I believe these questions will be answered as we go along. However, I do thank the gentleman from Virginia for his question.

My bill would:

First, provide more adequate levels of assistance on the basis of uniform national welfare standards. This would significantly curb the current migration of low-income people to the urban areas of the Nation.

Second, create new incentives to work by permitting retention of a larger portion of outside earnings. The supplemental family allowance would be reduced by only 50 cents for every dollar earned by welfare recipients. This would mean that every able-bodied American would participate in some form of employment and earn at least part of his needs.

Third, eliminate the burden on State and local government by financing assistance costs entirely with Federal funds. In Illinois alone, this would mean the State could divert $1.4 billion in each biennium to other uses or to tax cuts.

This threefold approach is designed to bring order out of chaos. By setting up a uniform series of standards on the basis of need, the Federal Government would have the opportunity to remove the basic inequalities in public assistance programs.

As Farris Bryant, Chairman of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations recently stated:

> The problem of welfare is no longer a local one, but one that has national dimensions.

Although the Federal Government now contributes about 50 percent of the money going into assistance funds—as contrasted to slightly over 40 percent in the early years of the program—it has not assumed responsibility for assuring that the program is a workable or just one.

Chairman Bryant further said:

> In recommending Federal assumption of all public assistance costs, the Advisory Commission recognizes a fiscal fact of life—the Federal Government with its superior fiscal capacity is far better able than hard-pressed States and local governments to deal with this pressing domestic problem.

I would like to add here, Mr. Speaker, that there can be no question but that there is not a State in this Union that today is not faced almost with bankruptcy simply because of the rising costs of public assistance programs in that State. I do not know of a single Governor in America who is not spending sleepless nights trying to figure out how to meet this great problem.

The cost of local government is one of the problems that Americans are beginning to realize is becoming an almost insurmountable expense. Chairman Bryant makes an excellent suggestion in urging the Federal Government to take over this responsibility.

Only about one-third of those individuals defined as poor under the Social Security Administration's poverty index are now receiving welfare. A national welfare standard which would increase the payments in a number of States would extend welfare assistance to more of the poor, and by providing incentives for the able-bodied to find and retain full- or part-time employment, we will provide the opportunity for needy recipients to pull themselves above the poverty level.

Basically, the States have great autonomy in setting income standards and resource levels under each type of public assistance program. At the present time, selection of the income standard actually expressed in dollars for each type and size of family, has two important effects on an individual State's program:

First, it largely determines the number of people who are potentially eligible for assistance, since all of those whose incomes are below that standard are theoretically to receive payments to bring their work up to standard.

Second, the level of the standard clearly determines the amount of the assistance payments.

The Nixon administration task force recently recommended a national minimum standard of payment for the Nation's 8.5 million welfare recipients. Former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur Cohen, advocated both uniform Federal standards and Federal assumption of a larger financial load. Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York echoed these sentiments at the Republican Governors' meeting in December and repeated his support before the Nixon administration's Urban Affairs Council. Gov. Richard Ogilvie of Illinois also has asked the Federal Government to assume a larger share.

The current Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Robert H. Finch, indicated in his first press conference that national welfare standards were to have high administration priority.

The necessity for national standards is borne out when we encounter the variation of one State paying $40 to a family of four per month, and another State paying $280 to that same family of four per month.

It is well to consider a few pertinent statistics in discussing our present welfare system. Of the more than 8 million individuals receiving some form of public assistance each month 2.8 million are over 65, blind, or otherwise severely handicapped; 3.9 million are children in the aid for dependent children program whose parents do not or cannot provide financial support; 1.3 million are the parents of children on AFDC. Of these, more than 1 million are mothers and less than 200,000 are fathers. About two-thirds of the fathers are incapacitated.

In addition to the AFDC program, almost all States have a program of general assistance to provide minimum payments based largely or entirely on need. No Federal funds, however, have ever been available for the millions of unemployed or underemployed men or women in the United States who are in need but are neither aged, severely handicapped or parents of minor children.

In 1966 it was estimated that this reservoir of human beings who are poor but unassisted amounted to 21.7 million persons with incomes below the poverty level of $3,445 for a family of four, as determined by the Social Security Administration. Only one-third of these people received assistance from major public welfare programs.

The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders listed some of the most troublesome statutory requirements and administrative practices in our welfare system that preclude its effectiveness. They are:

First, in most States benefits are available only when a parent is absent from the home. Thus, in these States an unemployed father whose family needs public assistance in order to survive, must either abandon his family or see them go hungry. This so-called "man-in-the-house" rule was intended to prevent payments to children who have an alternative potential source of support. In fact, the rule seems to have fostered the breakup of homes and perpetuated reliance on public welfare.

Second, until recently all amounts earned by adult welfare recipients on outside jobs, except for small allowances for expenses, were deducted directly from welfare payments they would othewise have received. This practice appears to have taken away from many recipients the incentive to seek part-time or full-time employment.

Many of the hard core unemployed, because of serious educational limitations or perhaps because of physical limitations are only capable of earning minimum amounts of money. Some of these people can never rise beyond the minimum wage standard. In many States people receive more from public assistance than they can earn in private employment. Consequently, many of these people even if they do go to work find that they cannot work simply because the welfare check itself would be greater than their own earning capacity would indicate.

Third, in most States, there is a residency requirement, generally averaging about 1 year, before a person is eligible to receive welfare. These regulations appear to have had little impact on migration and have frequently served to prevent those in greatest need from receiving assistance.

Title II of the legislation I am introducing today provides for supplemental family allowances.

A basic component in recovering the wasted human resources that have characterized our system of welfare up to the present would be to provide economic incentives—cash, if you will—for those who will seek part-time or full-time employment. My bill provides $50 per month for the head of families and $40 per month for each dependent.

If a recipient locates a job that permits him to earn more than the maximum provided in this bill, he would be permitted to keep his salary, as well as up to 50 percent of his welfare allotment until he has earned his way out of the poverty cycle and is able to support himself and his family without assistance, based on their minimum needs.

Thus, a family of six, the husband, wife and four children, would be entitled to $50 a month for the father and $40 a month for each of the five dependents. This would mean that this family would be entitled to $250 a month in public assistance.

If the breadwinner went out and got a job paying the minimum wage of $64 a week and earned $256 a month through his own resources by going to work, he would keep the $256 and we would then deduct one-half of the $256—or $128—from the $250 of the public aid to which he is entitled, and so we would then pay that family the remaining $128 so that that family would be receiving $384 a month—$256 from his own earnings and $128 from the supplemental family allowance. This would bring this family out of the poverty cycle. As this family earned more and more money from its own resources, the Federal assistance would be diminished by 50 percent of the amount, until the family reached the point where, if the breadwinner earned $500 a month for his wife, his children, and himself, he would then not become eligible for any further Federal assistance.

In this way, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we can have an incentive program which will be an incentive for people to actively seek and retain jobs. Our advantage would be that instead of paying that family $250 a month of the taxpayers' money, we would be reducing that amount by $128, which is half of what this man earned through his own resources.

I believe that unless we find some way of reducing the cost of public welfare—and, in my judgment, this is one way to do it—we are going to see the American taxpayer look with greater and greater concern at the humane structure and basic ethics of this country of helping its more needy. For that reason it seems to me that the supplemental family allowance is one way to encourage people to earn their way out of poverty.

My hope is that if this legislation is adopted, we will see the day when every able-bodied American is going to contribute something to his existence. I think the American taxpayer is deeply concerned with the fact that today some able-bodied people are not doing anything. The original welfare program was passed in the middle 1930's when we had 14 million people unemployed. The whole purpose of welfare then was to help people feed themselves and their families and clothe themselves because we had the most horrible depression ever to hit this country, but that is not the situation today.

Today we have labor shortages. Today we have industry looking for people. All you have to do is look at the Sunday want ads and you will see hundreds of jobs being advertised. Many of these people could fit into those jobs either on a full-time or on a part-time basis if we did provide some incentive.

Mr. Speaker, we must recognize that when we talk about the hard-core unemployed, when we talk about the migrant who leaves the cotton fields of Georgia and migrates to the industrial centers of Chicago, Cleveland, Buffalo, or New York, or when we talk about the white Appalachians who leave the foothills of Appalachia and move into urban communities, those persons most probably are incapable of holding down any meaningful jobs. They are incapable of making enough money to provide for the needs of their families simply because they do not have the ability or the preparation.

Under this supplemental family allowance plan we will continue to help such a person so long as he needs that help. But we want him to help himself first. I think the American people would be willing to support a program of public assistance where each recipient would indeed help himself through his own initiative and through his own resources.

Ben W. Heineman, Chairman of the President's Commission on Income Maintenance Programs, testified before the Senate earlier this week and he said that the main problem facing the poor people is not a failure of food programs but a lack of money. Mr. Heineman emphasized his belief that the Federal Government should provide cash allowances to bring a family's income up to a certain minimum level.

Last August the Office of Economic Opportunity began sending checks to 200 families in Trenton, N.J., with no strings attached except the requirement that once a month they report their full income. Soon this experiment will be expanded to include 1,000 families in New Jersey's six largest cities. In all, seven plans will be tried with two key variables: the percentage of the gap between family income and poverty level income that is guaranteed, and the percentage in the amount of support as family income rises. The families will continue to receive their checks even if they leave New Jersey.

The cost to the Federal Government to provide supplemental family allowances would amount to approximately $4 billion annually over and above the present welfare cost. In other words, what we would be doing is relieving the local governments of some $4 billion they are now spending in the programs. The entire cost to the Federal Government for assuming full financial responsibility for public assistance programs, including the supplemental family allowance, would be about $10 billion annually. This is the cost to the Government. This is not necessarily additional money. This is money that is now being spent by the States.

What we would be in effect doing is transferring the burden from the State to the Federal Government.

Let me stress the point that supplemental family allowances are neither radical nor utopian. Similar methods of equitable and humane welfare assistance are provided today by France and Canada and numerous other nations.

I might also add that these forthright programs provide a generous measure of dignity to the entire public assistance process.

Numerous bills have been introduced in the House and Senate in this session and in the previous sessions that have been designed to make our own welfare system more effective. We are all familiar with the countless reports and studies pointing toward the self-perpetuating despair and enervation resulting from the present system.

The bill which I am introducing today, Mr. Speaker, the Supplemental Family Allowance Act, hopefully will effectively end the cycle of poverty. By establishing uniform national welfare standards, by providing cash incentives to people to use their talents and initiative to earn their way out of poverty, by removing the inequities and burdens of State and local governments, and by requiring the Federal Government to assume responsibility for the entire cost of public assistance, we will once again be able to draw upon the human resources of this Nation which have been neglected as irredeemable for far too long. I urge my colleagues to read this bill carefully and to give it their full support.

In conscience America cannot afford the caprices of today's public assistance programs. This bill provides a comprehensive and I believe an effective alternative to our present confused and inefficient system.

There are those who might argue that a person in Appalachia does not need the same amount of money to feed a family of four, or five, or six, that a person in Chicago does. I do not share that view. I believe that if there is poverty in Appalachia it is only because of the insufficient standards of assistance, if we have national standards and if we can raise the standards of living in Appalachia, we will bring that great region of America into the mainstream of the American economy.

I believe a careful study of this act will show it is designed to help Americans fight their way out of poverty with their own ability, with their own resources, and with the assistance of the Federal Government.

I believe that the Federal Government will actually be able to save large sums of money. Many of the poverty programs we now have, which are being criticized from all sides, might very well be eliminated if we establish a program such as I have outlined, and if we would strengthen the manpower programs in the Labor Department to help educate and train these hard-core unemployed and prepare them for gainful employment. Working in this direction it is my judgment we can help people get off relief in this country.

I say to my colleagues that I know of no greater waste of human resources than having a family on the public dole. It is a waste to the family because it destroys its dignity. It is a waste to our economy. This Nation is going to be a trillion dollar economy early in 1970, 1971, and 1972. We are going to have a labor force of 100 million people to sustain this economy, so this Nation can no longer afford an unemployed American.

We need these people in the mainstream of this economy. We need them in the labor force. The way to bring them into the labor force is through the incentive plan I have outlined to my colleagues today.

NATO TASK FORCE REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ASPINALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the selection by President Nixon of Mr. Robert F. Ellsworth as U.S. Ambassador to NATO, coinciding as it does with the 20th anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty, makes timely a review of the work of the House Republican task force dealing with NATO and the Atlantic community during the 88th, 89th, and 90th Congresses.

The work of this group, which most recently was identified as the House Republican task force on Western alliances, becomes especially significant, because Mr. Ellsworth, as a Representative from Kansas, helped to organize it early in 1963 and took an active role in its work until he left the Congress at the end of 1967.

In the spring of 1965 Representative ALBERT H. QUIE and I discussed the idea of a task force to conduct a thorough study of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization with particular emphasis on the state of unity that prevailed within that organization. Furthermore, the task force was to have the responsibility for making recommendations whereby the alliance could be strengthened and made more effective.

Representative QUIE was receptive to the idea. Disturbed by the decay of NATO, he had spoken of the gradual disintegration of the alliance in his own Minnesota First District, and on college campuses.

The plan was discussed with Representative GERALD FORD of Michigan, and Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON, both of whom strongly endorsed the plan. Representative JOHN J. RHODES, of Arizona, chairman, special projects subcommittee of the House Republican policy committee gave it his approval.

On August 5, 1963, the House Republican project on NATO unity which was later changed to the task force on NATO unity, was formed with 12 members, three of whom were also members of the House Armed Services Committee. Representative ALBERT H. QUIE was appointed chairman and serving with him were Representatives E. Ross ADAIR of Indiana; John F. Baldwin, Jr. of California; WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD of Michigan; Thomas B. Curtis of Missouri; Robert F. Ellsworth of Kansas; PAUL FINDLEY of Illinois; GERALD R. FORD of Michigan; CHARLES E. GOODELL of New York; HASTINGS KEITH of Massachusetts; ROGERS C. B. MORTON of Maryland, and ALEXANDER PIRNIE of New York.

For many weeks the task force held meetings with experts in the various fields that touched NATO: Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy retired, former chief of naval operations and Gen. Lauris Norstad, U.S. Air Force retired, former NATO commander, who discussed both military and political problems in NATO. Officials of the Embassy of the German Federal Republic provided the task force insight into the thinking of a NATO partner. Former Secretary of State Christian Herter, late chief trade negotiator of the administration and the Honorable Gabriel Hauge, former chief economic adviser to President Eisenhower, discussed at great length economic aspects of problems facing the alliance. Clarence Streit, distinguished editor of Freedom and Union, discussed the Atlantic union proposal as it applied to NATO. These experts all prefaced their discussions with the task force by stating that the alliance was in a dangerous state of disarray.

From these briefings there emerged two basic problems into which the task force must delve:

First. The basic causes of NATO disarray.

Second. Methods by which the disunity or disarray might be overcome.

Creation of the task force came at a period of contradictory events that were highly disturbing to the 14-year-old NATO.

President Kennedy in his state of the Union message on January 15, 1963, declared that in his meeting with British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan at Nassau in December recognized that NATO was an "alliance of proud and sovereign nations, and works best when we do not forget it."

Five months later, on June 25, 1963,

while visiting Europe, President Kennedy reaffirmed America's guarantee to defend Europe and the principle of partnership.

But his words were contradicted by U.S. policy. In 1962 with no prior discussion in NATO councils, the United States and British Prime Minister Macmillan appealed to Mr. Khrushchev for an agreement on a test ban treaty. In April 1963, again with no prior discussion in NATO councils, the United States and Russia agreed to establishment of a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow.

HOT LINE SHOULD NOT BYPASS NATO ALLIES

On August 24 the House project committee on NATO unity sent a letter to President Kennedy urging that the hot line agreed upon by the United States and Soviet representatives at the Geneva Disarmament Conference earlier this year—1963—should not bypass our NATO partners completely. It was signed by ALBERT H. QUIE, chairman, and all other committee members.

The letter said in part:

> The "hot line" bypasses our NATO partners completely . . . We give the appearance of treating our NATO partners as irresponsible children . . . and more interested in establishing a private line with our enemies than with our friends.
>
> If the Soviets should push the nuclear button, it will be far more important for us to have instant communication with our NATO partners . . . than with Mr. Khrushchev, to whom words are but weapons in the cold war to be employed bury us.
>
> The fate of the entire free world may hang on the messages exchanged over the Washington-Moscow "hot line" but our free-world partners apparently are to be left outside—to wonder, worry and wait. Let's let them listen in, and at the same time create a communications system useful to NATO . . .
>
> We strongly urge:
>
> A NATO "hot line" in addition to the Washington-Moscow "hot line". It would connect all NATO capitals so they could instantly communicate with each other. It would also have a "listening device" which could automatically relay to NATO capitals all messages carried over the separate Washington-Moscow "hot line" . . . This action would strengthen the NATO partnership.

The reply to this suggestion by the Secretary of State was not entirely responsive to the proposal and made no change in committee attitude.

WHEAT DEAL

On October 4, 1963, 6 days prior to President Kennedy's announcement to Congress of the pending unilateral wheat deal with Communist Russia, the GOP task force on NATO unity urged President Kennedy to immediately call for a top-level NATO conference to discuss ways and means of achieving economic solidarity within the NATO alliance.

The 12 Congressmen released the following statement:

> The recent Canadian-Russian wheat deal and a possible U.S.-Russian wheat deal point up the need for greater NATO unity. Both deals developed on a bilateral basis and apparently without due regard for their broad implications on free world security.
>
> The Communists use trade as a weapon in the cold war. . . . They use trade to "divide and conquer," create dissention among the free nations, make individual nations dependent and therefore vulnerable, as well as to fill their own strategic shortages.
>
> We urge that the authority of NATO be increased so that it would have the responsibility and the authority to strengthen and develop free competitive practices in world commerce and to resist any monopolistic state-dominated trade warfare of the Communists.
>
> NATO is united in moral purpose. It must also be united in economic purpose.
>
> Article II of the original NATO treaty states that the NATO countries will "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any and all of them." Canadian Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson was the author of this important provision.
>
> We urge the President to issue a call for an immediate top-level NATO conference to give consideration to this proposal.

ENERGY OF TASK FORCE PRAISED

In obtaining advice from experts on all phases connected with NATO, 10 of the 12 members of the House GOP task force on NATO unity plus Representative CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, of Michigan, member of the House Armed Services Committee, held a 2-hour secret luncheon-conference with General Eisenhower on November 15 at Gettysburg.

Some weeks after the meeting with General Eisenhower, Clarence Streit, editor of Freedom and Union, impressed with the diligence of the GOP task force on NATO unity, wrote:

> House Republicans who recently seized the leadership in Washington for stronger Atlantic unification are energetically pushing forward with evidence of growing support in their party. When established in September, some thought that this group, then entitled the "House Republican Project Committee on NATO Unity" had the pious blessing rather than the active backing of the House Republican Policy Committee.
>
> I find the creation of this Task Force and the energy it is showing especially significant for two reasons: This initiative comes from Midwest Republicans, notably its chairman, Albert Quie of Minnesota, Gerald Ford of Michigan, Paul Findley of Illinois and Robert Ellsworth of Kansas.

SHARE NUCLEAR KNOW-HOW WITH NATO ALLIES

In a speech in the House on November 19, 1963, I warned:

> Secretary McNamara apparently is suffering from the dangerous delusion that the present NATO structure is strong and durable . . . The fact is NATO is built on sand, and the sand shifts with each wind that blows. The free-world alliance is today weaker than at any time since World War II.
>
> Mr. McNamara would be wise to concentrate on building solid unity in NATO instead of emphasizing a detente with the Soviet Union.
>
> Mr. McNamara's appraisal of the relative strength of NATO and Russia is grossly misleading. NATO today is a rapidly deteriorating paper alliance. Its military might is impressive only when the parts are added together, as they were by Mr. McNamara.
>
> But the parts are not truly unified. They are unified only on paper, and in a showdown each member of NATO—ourselves included—will follow the course of action which at the moment seems to be most expedient . . .
>
> In nuclear power, we cling to the ridiculous policy of secrecy in dealing with our NATO allies. We deny to the nations to whom we must look if a showdown comes the knowhow and weapons which we know the enemy already possesses.
>
> As a minimal first-step toward strengthening NATO, we should abandon without further delay the obsolete policy and share weapons and knowhow with our allies . . . we should provide them with tactical nuclear weapons . . .
>
> NATO nuclear power is actually U.S. nuclear power and our nonnuclear friends in NATO know it . . . Under present circumstances, they may properly wonder if we actually would defend their cities with our nuclear power. After all, they can point with alarm and concern to our weak follow-through in Cuba and Berlin, our withdrawal of missiles from Italy and Turkey, and our avid promotion of a nuclear test-ban agreement with Russia . . .
>
> They are at the mercy of our own uncertain national policy and to a lesser degree, we are at the mercy of theirs.

A report in November 1963 advocated that the United States make available to NATO member nations "smaller tactical—or so-called battlefield—nuclear weapons to be kept within their care, custody, and control." The report continued:

> Such weapons "have a strategic value of a magnitude which would indicate that they should be thought of in terms of conventional weaponry and not as weapons of retaliation for massive nuclear attack" . . . (and) would go a long way towards strengthening the Alliance . . . (which would be) of prime importance in view of the considered withdrawal of substantial numbers of U.S. troops now stationed in Europe.

Other conclusions in the report were:

> The Alliance has been weakened by a "near crusade to alleviate tensions which exist between ourselves and the Soviets" now being carried on unilaterally by the Kennedy Administration.
>
> The United States attitudes toward our Allies is one which would treat our NATO partners as "minions who should do our bidding without question" instead as as equal partners.
>
> Trade disagreements between NATO partners tend to weaken the military alliance.

The report also called for patient negotiations of such issues by a special group set up within NATO for that purpose.

The second session of the 88th Congress followed the assassination of President John F. Kennedy with elevation of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson to the Presidency.

The second session of the 88th Congress also saw an additional member added to the NATO task force, Charles E. Chamberlain, who made the fourth member of the House Armed Services Committee to join.

The task force met on February 26, 1964, with William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs for a briefing. Following a few introductory remarks, by the Secretary, he was questioned by members of the task force.

The NATO Foreign Minister's Geneva meeting May 14–16, 1964, was the most troubled session so far. Policy rifts between the NATO member-nations had occurred especially the question of trade with Communist nations, and the civil war in Cyprus.

On the home front, a plea by the House Republican task force on NATO unity for greater stress on economic and political aspects of the Atlantic alliance by the Johnson administration had proved fruitless.

A letter to President Johnson on May 15 reiterating the plea for a "blue ribbon panel" and pledging bipartisan support was signed by Chairman ALBERT QUIE and the other 13 members of the task force. Here are some excerpts from the letter.

> We strongly commend your efforts of recent date to unify North Atlantic Treaty Organization policy in regard to Cuba and South Viet Nam, and deeply regret they have not been more fruitful.
>
> We believe the time has come for an immediate and thorough study of the NATO structure itself . . . (to make) NATO more durable and effective in serving the many common interests of the North Atlantic community—economically and politically, as well as militarily.
>
> The task is urgent and vital. It calls for the very best talent the United States and other NATO nations can offer. We therefore urge that you invite former Presidents Dwight B. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman to head a blue-ribbon delegation of U.S. citizens to meet with similar groups from other NATO nations for the purpose of formulating and proposing for ratification improvements in the structure of NATO.
>
> Our committee consists entirely of Republicans, but we view this as a responsibility and opportunity which calls for full bi-partisanship. We therefore offer our fullest cooperation and would like to meet with you at your convenience.

Early in June the task force met with Secretary of State Rusk. Mr. Rusk suggested the task force leave the invitation for a convention in the hands of a private organization such as the Atlantic Council rather than have the President initiate it.

The Republican platform committee was meeting in San Francisco prior to the national convention. A statement of criticism and recommendations by the NATO task force for consideration by the platform committee was forwarded:

> NATO is in dangerous array, largely due to faltering inept leadership by the Democratic Administration. During the administration of a Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, NATO was powerful and promising. Now it is on the ropes: exactly where Krushchev wants it to be.
>
> Structural changes are . . . needed to make it more durable and effective in serving the many common interests of the North Atlantic community—economically and politically, as well as militarily.
>
> The U.S. should take the initiative in calling a convention for the purpose of formulating and proposing for ratification improvements in the structure of NATO.

An early highlight in the 89th Congress for the House Republican task force on NATO unity was a private conference with former Vice President Richard M. Nixon on March 8, 1965. Those attending the morning session were E. Ross Adair, of Indiana; Charles E. Goodell, of New York; Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri; James C. Cleveland, of New Hampshire; Charles E. Chamberlain, of Michigan; Robert F. Ellsworth, of Kansas, and myself.

Mr. Nixon was quoted as describing "the decline of NATO" as the Johnson administration's "worst foreign policy failure." To illustrate the decline of U.S. leadership in the free-world alliance, Mr. Nixon declared that French President De Gaulle, whom he described as "the only strong leader in free Europe today" is "not on our side."

The House Republican task force on NATO unity in its 20-month span under Representative Albert H. Quie had won its laurels. At the reorganization on March 22, 1965, Representative Charles E. Goodell, of New York, chairman of the committee on planning and research, announced that task force responsibilities would be expanded to include long-range Republican examination of Atlantic community problems. Said Representative Goodell:

> They have demonstrated their awareness of the impact affairs in the Atlantic Community can have both throughout the world and here at home. They have exceptional capability to evaluate the problems and to come up with solid Republican proposals to meet those problems.

Resignation of his task force chairmanship also was announced by Representative Albert H. Quie. In moving over as chairman of the newly organized Republican task force on education which he had proposed, Representative Quie stated he thought it better to bring in new committee leadership with each Congress thereby bringing out greater involvement of membership.

Appointment of myself as chairman of the 12-member task force was announced with the following members: E. Ross Adair, of Indiana; John F. Baldwin, Jr., of California; Charles E. Chamberlain, of Michigan; James C. Cleveland, of New Hampshire; Robert F. Ellsworth, of Kansas; Hasting. Keith, of Massachusetts; James D. Martin, of Alabama; Rogers C. B. Morton, of Maryland; Alexander Pirnie, of New York; Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota; and Ogden R. Reid of New York. Four original members resigned: Representative Gerald R. Ford became minority floor leader; Charles E. Goodell became chairman of the Republican committee on planning and research; Thomas B. Curtis, who had been appointed to two additional committees—Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and Joint Committee on Organization of Congress; Representatives Charles E. Chamberlain, James D. Martin, and Ogden R. Reid were new members; James C. Cleveland had been a member of the task force for several months.

Before adjourning the meeting, Representative Goodell pointed to the importance of the task force in declaring:

> To me, this is one of the most important responsibilities and opportunities presently before the Republican Party (deterioration of NATO). Our committee will continue to work as a team, as it did under the excellent leadership of Rep. Albert H. Quie, drawing upon every available resource in the Republican Party and beyond in order to develop constructive proposals. We are willing and anxious to be the focal point for exchange of ideas and information in this vital and critical field.

The thesis of many task force statements had pinpointed U.S. unilateral actions followed by requested approval of the NATO Council as one source of allies disunity. U.S. involvement in Vietnam provided a major test.

The NATO Council meeting in late March 1965 revealed that consultation in foreign policy by the United States with our European allies was woefully inadequate. Among Council members there was anxiety and open criticism of U.S. action in Vietnam which they felt was of potential danger to them. Lack of consultation to insure concerted action and U.S. unilateral trade agreements with NATO enemies reaped its harvest—free world shipping to the Communist government in North Vietnam was steadily increasing, with Great Britain leading the way.

Against this background the first statement of the newly organized task force made the following statement:

> We submit that a new far-reaching strategy for the Vietnam war is badly needed—and should be developed jointly with our NATO allies. Winning in Vietnam would be an expensive victory if it is won at the cost of wrecking NATO.
>
> Although U.S. power is crucial in this struggle, it need not stand alone. The broad base of power which can confront, confound and eventually overcome Communism is the Atlantic Community of nations . . .

The task force advocated:

> That the North Atlantic Treaty Organization be used to the greatest extent possible to develop unified free-world policy on critical problems like Vietnam which have world-wide importance . . . (and)
>
> Recognizing that the structure of NATO needs to be improved, we strongly urge the President to appoint a blue-ribbon group of U.S. citizens to meet with similar groups of other NATO nations to study the NATO structure and recommend improvements.

The following day, on April 6, the task force issued another critical statement of administration policy in Vietnam headlined "Republican Groups Warns That Our Go-It-Alone Posture in Vietnam Puts New Strains on NATO."

Reiterating some points made the preceding day:

> The free nations of NATO should act as one when they are confronted with foreign-policy problems of common concern like the Communist threat in South Vietnam . . .
>
> We submit that a new far-reaching strategy is badly needed. It should be developed jointly with our NATO allies.
>
> It should be broad enough to assure unity in meeting future thrusts and parries by the Communists. We should reason together with our allies and permit them to share in making the decisions. Vietnam is but the latest episode in the long-range struggle between Communism and freedom . . .
>
> After-the-fact consultation with our allies must be replaced by effective, durable teamwork.
>
> We urge that NATO be used automatically to develop unified free-world policy on all critical problems which, like Vietnam, have world-wide importance.
>
> We strongly urge the President to appoint a blue-ribbon group of U.S. citizens to meet with similar groups from other NATO nations. The purpose of the meeting would be to study the alliance structure and recommend improvements."

On April 21, speaking for the Lost Lorie, I stated:

> Misunderstanding between friends threatens to split asunder the free world's most essential institution—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization."
>
> Today it is common knowledge that NATO is nearly "split asunder". National leaders voice their concern, but nothing is done.
>
> Most obvious of the forces splitting NATO are the conflicting policies and actions of France and the United States . . . two nations . . . essential to the North Atlantic Community and to the cause of freedom for whose protection NATO was formed . . .
>
> President Kennedy must have momentarily recognized the importance of close accord with France when, in 1961, he announced that his first state visit would be to French President De Gaulle and to him alone. But this meeting was relegated to a mere stopover on a journey . . . to confer with Communist Leader Krushchev. President De Gaulle was affronted.
>
> Despite this affront, France immediately

> pledged us her support in the Cuban missile crisis, and President De Gaulle later risked personal safety to attend the Kennedy funeral. At that time he paid his respects to President Johnson.
>
> The Presidents of France and the United States have not conferred personally with each other for four long and fateful years. During that time each has conferred with the leaders of almost all other nations of the alliance. Meanwhile, the icy discord . . . has engendered broader disunion in NATO and thus endangers individual liberty everywhere.
>
> We believe it is high time for the Presidents of the two great republics to confer with each other. We urge that the U.S. President be the one to break the ice, and make the kind of visit to President De Gaulle that President Kennedy originally planned but failed to carry out.
>
> We urge that he go to Europe at the earliest possible date for the single purpose of conferring with the French executive . . .we believe this mission has overriding importance and urgency.
>
> The discussion might guide us to a more effective way to handle critical problems like Vietnam. Our President could get the French President's views firsthand, reason together with him . . . work out a consensus . . . on how to strengthen NATO.
>
> This is not an easy task, but we are sure President Johnson would agree that the best way to gain a consensus on difficult problems is by meeting man-to-man with those who hold differing views.
>
> The discussion might well be the historic first step down a long and mutually rewarding road of free-world teamwork.

On April 20 the task force released a letter to President Johnson which stated:

> Misunderstandings between friends threatens to split asunder the free world's most essential institution—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.
>
> President Kennedy spoke of this danger in his inaugural address when, alluding to our NATO alliance, he warned, ". . . we dare not meet a powerful challenge at odds and split asunder."
>
> A few months later, as Vice President, you spoke at ceremonies observing the tenth anniversary of SHAPE, NATO's military agency. You declared, ". . . the United States is resolved to do everything within its power—and I emphasize the word everything—to enhance the strength and unity of the North Atlantic Community."
>
> That was the promise in 1961. The promise has not been fulfilled.

A telegram to President Johnson on May 10, 1965, from the task force stated:

> I respectfully urge that you send Secretary of State Rusk, as originally planned, as the United States Delegate to the NATO Ministerial meeting which begins tomorrow in London.
>
> In substituting an undersecretary for our top foreign policy official, you imply a greater concern for the Dominican crisis than for the problem of NATO unity.

The telegram may have had effect.

A press release by the Johnson administration on June 2, 1965, brought words of praise from the task force:

> Today's Washington Post reports that the United States is prepared to propose the establishment of a net of hot lines which would permit instantaneous consultation among NATO capitals. This proposal is in close accord with and complements a suggestion made by the House Republican Task Force on NATO to President Kennedy in August 1963, following the agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union to establish a Washington-Moscow "hot line".
>
> Responding for the President, Secretary Rusk stressed the importance of "even speedier communications with our NATO allies" and indicated that a study of improved communications would be undertaken with the assistance of the Department of Defense.
>
> It is gratifying to find that this study has developed to the point where a specific proposal can now be made to our allies. As you consider this, we hope you will have the opportunity to review our initial suggestion which stresses the importance of having our allies "listen in" on the Washington-Moscow line to allay any suspicions they might have of U.S.-Soviet dealing to which they are not privy.

THE PARIS MISSION

When I was appointed chairman of the House Republican task force on NATO and the Atlantic Alliance on March 22, 1965, I stated:

> NATO has been sadly neglected. My plan is for the Committee on NATO and the Atlantic Alliance to continue its examination of the alliance, to clarify the reasons for its steady deterioration and to propose ways to strengthen it.

At a meeting of the Republican research and planning committee chaired by New York Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL, now Senator, I suggested a fact-finding mission be sent to Paris. The plan was strongly endorsed by Representative Melvin Laird, of Wisconsin, now Secretary of Defense, who was chairman of the House Republican conference. It was approved by the full conference on June 2, 1965. A press conference announcing the plan and naming the members of the mission was held.

Members were HASTINGS KEITH, of Massachusetts; James D. Martin, of Alabama; and E. Ross ADAIR, of Indiana, whose place was taken by ALEXANDER PIRNIE, of New York, when the Indiana Representative was unable to go. I was designated chairman. Mr. Laird read the House Republican conference resolution:

> Whereas:
>
> Misunderstandings between friends threatens to break up the free world's most essential institution, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.
>
> The growing rift between two historic allies—the United States and France—appears to be the major reason for the grave difficulties in which NATO finds itself and the most formidable obstacle to rebuilding and strengthening this vital alliance.
>
> The decline of NATO is so sharp it endangers free-world security. This crisis deepens unnoticed because it has none of the violence and drama of trouble-spots like Vietnam which monopolizes Governmental and public attention.
>
> Therefore, be it resolved that:
>
> In recognition of this grave and unmet danger, the House Republican Conference hereby endorses and sponsors a mission drawn from its task force on NATO and the Atlantic Community. The mission will make a fact-finding trip to NATO headquarters in Paris as soon as scheduling permits.
>
> Through this, the Conference hopes to—
>
> 1. Alert the American people to the deepening crisis in NATO and contribute to a better understanding of its gravity.
>
> 2. Learn firsthand the basis and depth of Franco-American disagreement as viewed by the French.
>
> 3. Aid our government in moving swiftly and wisely to meet these problems.

Following Mr. Laird's statement, I made the following observation:

> NATO's fall or even the withdrawal from NATO of a single nation like France would constitute a military and political setback of major magnitude for us and for our allies. It would reduce sharply the effectiveness of free world arms.
>
> NATO's decline comes at a time when the need for free-world unification is greater than before. Military, monetary, nuclear and trade problems that affect the vital interests of the entire Atlantic Community mount rather than recede.
>
> President De Gaulle is widely portrayed in the U.S. as the sole cause of all American difficulties in Europe . . . (however) many Europeans accuse the United States of seeking to dominate all Europe.

The announcement received wide attention. It was the first time such a mission had been undertaken and it was likewise unprecented that it was entirely financed by a political party—the Republican conference. No public funds were involved.

Detailed plans for the mission moved rapidly. A distinguished and authoritative consultant for numerous organizations, author and lecturer on foreign affairs, Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupe, director of the foreign policy research at the University of Pennsylvania was dispatched to Paris to line up interviews for the mission.

Announcement of the mission was sent to all Republican Senators and Governors; to 228 statesmen, scholars, and other persons keenly interested in NATO with a request for suggestions and comments. Editors and publishers of most major newspapers and periodicals were also contacted. In addition to responses from Congressmen, letters were received from former NATO Ambassador Burgess; former Supreme Allied Commanders Gruenther and Ridgeway; Mr. Allen Dulles; Mr. George Meany, AFL-CIO; Mr. David Lawrence, U.S. News & World Report; Mr. Walden Moore, director of Atlantic Unity; Dr. Hans Morgenthau, director of the Center for the Study of American Foreign and Military Power at the University of Chicago; Mr. George Weaver, Assistant Secretary, Department of Labor; Gen. Mark Clark; Mr. Will Clayton, former Under Secretary of State, and other knowledgeable persons.

With few exceptions the 100 replies to the letters regarding the trip to Paris were favorable. It was felt much good might be accomplished by the proposed factfinding mission.

Consultation was held with prominent and influential persons and groups as well as Government agencies directly concerned with foreign affairs in the European sector of NATO. Nor were congressional committees bypassed. These included Republican members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Banking and Currency Committee, Ways and Means Committee, and Armed Services Committee.

At the State Department the mission was briefed by the congressional relations representative; Assistant Secretary of State Douglas MacArthur II, who was political adviser to Eisenhower when the former President was NATO Commander; and the NATO political affairs representative, George S. Vest.

Another important meeting was with Assistant Defense Secretary John T. McNaughton and Adm. Alfred G. Ward, U.S. member of the NATO Military

Council known as the standing group which is located in Washington.

A conference was held with former Vice President Nixon on June 8 in his New York City apartment.

A 2-hour conference with General Eisenhower, first Supreme Allied Commander, and frequently termed the "Architect of NATO," was held at Gettysburg on June 9 attended by Representatives Keith, Pirnie, Martin, and myself.

Rogers C. B. Morton, also a member of the House Republican committee on NATO but not one of the Paris-bound group was also present.

PARIS TRIP PREPARATION

On June 10, I reported to the House of Representatives as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, the Republican fact-finding mission will leave tonight for NATO headquarters in Paris after a week-long series of briefings and conferences here.
>
> Sponsored by the House Republican Conference, the mission consists of Reps. Alexander Pirnie of New York, Hastings Keith of Massachusetts, James D. Martin of Alabama, and myself. The Republican conference is headed by Representative Melvin R. Laird of Wisconsin, and includes the full GOP membership in the House of Representatives. The NATO mission was selected from the House Republican task force on NATO and the Atlantic Alliance.
>
> No government funds are involved and the group is taking Pan American flight No. 114 from Kennedy International Airport in New York departing at 8:30 p.m. The group will board a National Airline flight No. 289 at Washington National Airport at 5:55 p.m. to connect with (the) plane in New York.
>
> The schedule of conferences in Paris is not complete but it already includes the following: Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Supreme Allied Commander in Europe; NATO Secretary General Manlio Brosio; Ambassador Thomas K. Finletter, U.S. Representative on the NATO Council; French Minister of Defense Pierre Messmer, and officials of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
>
> Final briefing in preparation for the trip was early today with Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupé, director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania, who serves as consultant to the mission and has been in Paris for the past week arranging appointments.
>
> Yesterday we met with Assistant Defense Secretary John T. McNaughton and Admiral Alfred G. Ward, U.S. member of the NATO military council known as the Standing Group, which is located in Washington.
>
> The previous day we met with NATO's first Commander former President Eisenhower at Gettysburg and later with Assistant Secretary of State Douglas MacArthur II.
>
> On Monday we were in New York where we conferred with former Vice President Richard M. Nixon.
>
> Our pretrip conferences and consultations have convinced us that our concern over the sharp decline in the influence of NATO is widely shared.
>
> We leave with the benefit of counsel from high officials, past and present. The encouragement and advice of public officials on both sides of the political aisle, scientists, military experts, and economists have been most gratifying and helpful.
>
> This will be a factfinding, not a faultfinding mission. Our group seeks to understand the attitude of French and other officials toward NATO and our role in the alliance.
>
> Through this mission, we hope to alert the American people to the deepening crisis in NATO and to contribute to a better understanding of its gravity; learn firsthand the nature of Franco-American disagreement as viewed by the French; and hopefully to aid to our government in moving swiftly and wisely to meet these problems.

Interest in the factfinding mission to Paris continued high throughout the United States as evidenced by national publicity.

The factfinding mission which arrived in Paris on Friday morning June 11 was accompanied by Mr. John A. Mathews, a member of my staff, who devoted his time exclusively to NATO affairs and served ably for 4 fruitful years. Also accompanying the mission was Dr. Charels O. Lerche, Jr., newly appointed dean of the School of International Service, American University, Washington, D.C., who had been employed for the summer as foreign policy consultant by the House Republican conference.

On the first day of our arrival we participated in a ceremony honoring Sgt. Russell Kelly, of Altoona, Pa., the first American fatally wounded in the liberation of Paris in the fall of 1944. The ceremony was held at the Invalides, a national shrine which includes Napoleon's tomb, a veterans' hospital, and the Kelly memorial.

The fact-finding mission, all members of the American Legion, participated in the wreath laying ceremony at the Tomb of the French Unknown Soldier at the Arch of Triumph in Paris on June 13.

On arrival in Paris, I told newsmen:

> We are here on a fact-finding, not a faultfinding, mission.

The statement made prior to departure from the United States—that no press conferences would be held—was adhered to. Ground rules were followed carefully.

While on foreign soil, no comments to the press or otherwise which could be interpreted as critical of either the French or United States administrations; no public discussion of any topic, finding, or conclusion developed from conferences; no attributing of remarks or ideas that were presented during discussion with French or NATO officials then or at any time in the future; no identification of people with whom conferences were held unless approved.

The New York Times Service did cable the Minneapolis Tribune that the mission had arrived and was financed by the House Republican organization. The cable also included the statement:

> U.S. official spokesmen were at pains to dispel any belief in Europe that the legislators were on an official congressional mission.

Shortly after arrival in Paris, the mission plunged into a heavy schedule of conferences and briefings, mainly with NATO and French officials. The few social affairs given in our honor provided an opportunity to meet French citizens of importance outside official circles.

Within a few hours after arrival in Paris, the mission conferred briefly with NATO's Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, in his office, then accompanied him to the staff conference room for a briefing on the purpose and structure of NATO. That was followed by another discussion with General Lemnitzer and his staff. Those present were: Gen. T. W. Parker, Chief of Staff; Lt. Gen. P. Montjamont, Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics and Administration; Lt. Gen. W. Baudissin, Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Operations; Maj. Gen. A. U. Nielsen, Assistant Chief of Staff for Operations; Maj. Gen. J. Garot, Assistant Chief of Staff for Plans and Policy; Maj. J. M. F. Cavin, Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence.

American officials and citizens with whom they conferred included the following: Ambassador Thomas K. Finletter, U.S. Permanent Representative to NATO; Gen. Jacob E. Smart, Chief of Staff to General Lemnitzer, in his secondary role as commander in chief, U.S. European Command; U.S. Ambassador to France, Charles Bohlen; Mr. Theodore Achilles, Vice Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Atlantic Council of the United States, who has arrived for a brief visit in Paris following a London meeting of the Council of the Western European Union; Mr. Cyrus L. Sulzberger, the well-known New York Times columnist and an authority on foreign affairs, who entertained the mission at lunch; Mr. Edgar Ansel Mowrer, editor of the Western World which was discontinued about 1960.

The mission conferred at NATO Headquarters with Mr. Manlio Brosio, NATO's Secretary General, in which Gen. di Martino of Italy, a NATO officer participated; a second conference with Mr. Brosio was at his invitation just prior to leaving France. A conference was also held with Gen. Jean Crepin, commander in chief of the Central European Command, NATO.

At the suggestion of Mr. Newlin, assistant for political affairs and a member of General Lemnitzer's staff, a conference was held with the Belgian, Canadian, and Netherlands permanent representatives to NATO, which was arranged by Mr. Newlin and held at NATO headquarters.

A breakfast conference was held with Dr. W. Baron van Kessenich, mayor of Maastricht, the Netherlands, who came to Paris especially to confer with the mission.

The factfinding group held conferences with the following high ranking French officials: French Foreign Minister M. Maurice Couve de Murville at the Foreign Ministry; M. Maurice Schumann, President of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Chamber of Deputies; Defense Minister M. Pierre Messmer at the Defense Ministry; Gen. Andre Beaufre, director of the French Institute of Strategic Studies and his staff; M. Jacques Vernant, director of the Center for Foreign Policy Studies and his staff, which included former French Ambassador to the United States Henry Bonnet; Prof. Leo Hamon; Mr. Phillippe Devillers; Captain Eyrand; Commander Lechat; General Gallois; M. Diomede Castroux, former Minister for Air and later Armament.

Conferring with the mission was M. Jean-Danielle Jurgenson, head of the American desk, and his staff. M. Jurgenson also hosted a dinner for the mission and included as guests M. Edmond Giscard d'Estaing, M. Arnaud Wapler, and M. de le Grandville, both of the Foreign Office, Gen. Pierre Billotte, M. de Bratillat, Mr. Funkhouser, and Mr. McGuire of the U.S. Embassy.

A reception and dinner honoring the mission was given by the French Association for the Atlantic Community followed by a seminar on NATO problems to which the following additional influential and prominent men were invited: Senator Georges Portmann, M. Alain Montmoreau, former Deputy Pierre Mahais, French Deputy Joel le Theule, M. Pierre Emanuelli, M. Alfred Coste-Floret.

At a luncheon conference given by France-Amerique, the guests were M. Jacques Chastenet, of the French Academy of Moral and Political Sciences; M. Edmond Giscard d'Estaing, president of the International Chamber of Commerce; M. Henri Bonnet, former French Ambassador to the United States; M. Gillion Georges-Picot, former French Ambassador to the United Nations; Marquis de Messy; Baron Christian de Waldner; M. Jean Delorme; Colonel Brunschwig.

A luncheon was also sponsored by former Ambassador Walter Dowling, director general of the Atlantic Institute, honoring the mission and included Mr. A. E. M. Duynstee of the Netherlands and representative in the Council of Europe; M. Francois Fontaine of France, member of the Monnet Committee and Director of the European Community Information Bureau in Paris; M. Etienne Hirsch of France, former President of the Euratom Commission; M. Serge Hurtig of France, professor at the Study Center for International Relations; M. Lucien Radoux of Belgium, Member of the Parliament of Europe and Director of the European Foundation for International Exchange; M. Andre Felix Rossi of France, Member, Chamber of Deputies.

A reception in honor of the mission was also held by Mr. Clement Brown, president of Olin-Matheson International, to which Paris representatives of major American banking and industry and several officials from the U.S. Embassy were invited.

Following the second conference with Mr. Manlio Brosio, 23 conferences and briefings have been held in 9 days, the mission enplaned for the United States.

On that same June 19 the New York Times International edition headlined on page 1 a report written on the 18th by their Paris correspondent, Richard E. Mooney, "GOP Ends Staid Trip." The correspondent wrote:

> The Republican Congressional fact-finding mission to Paris had ended in failure. It failed to live up to scornful predictions. The Congressmen did not spend their night at the Lido or the Folies-Bergere.
>
> Their behavior was impeccable. Their activities were almost all official. They had 23 sessions, day and night, with high, low and nonranking French and Americans. They leave tomorrow, impressed with the fact that Paris-Washington relations are not all bad but that there is need for more 'dialogue' . . . they stuck to business . . . Congressman James D. Martin of Alabama taped his weekly broadcast to his constituents . . . and Congressman Hastings Keith of Massachusetts whose district includes many Portuguese-Americans, had a date with the Portuguese Ambassador . . .
>
> The group was due to see the French Foreign Minister, Maurice Couve de Murville, this afternoon, but at the last minute they all went to the airport to see Vice President Humphrey and the astronauts arrive. The other highest ranking official on their list was Pierre Messmer, Minister of Defense.
>
> The leader of the group, Representative Paul Findley of Illinois, said today the mission was 'without precedent' as no political party had ever sent a mission overseas before. The party paid, he noted. It was estimated ahead of time that the trip might cost about $2,800.
>
> The intent was so strictly to avoid expense to the taxpayers that the Congressmen came by commercial airliner. And to avoid being caught having fun, they came on an airline that does not show movies.

I gave a full report of the findings and recommendations of the fact-finding mission to the House Republican conference and then the House of Representatives on June 30. I pointed out the underlying source—the root factor in NATO disintegration and the Franco-American rift with an analysis of needed remedial measures:

> "Although the possibility of Soviet attack remains, the situation otherwise is substantially changed. The nations of Europe have rebuilt their economy and are willing and anxious to take a larger responsibility in the alliance."
>
> "A thorough re-evaluation of American policy is required."
>
> "Had he (de Gaulle) not invoked latent forces that were potent and durable, not only in France but also in the rest of Western Europe, the French effort would not have succeeded."
>
> "De Gaulle is not a lonely anachronism. His policies are not apt to disappear from the world scene when he leaves office."
>
> "De Gaulle actually rides powerful currents of opinion which flow throughout all of Western Europe, and the problem posed by his challenge of U.S. policies is only partially to be formulated in exclusively French terms."
>
> "The foremost problem is to give substance to the ideal of partnership. We must shift the structure of the Alliance from the leader-follower basis—which was almost inevitable in 1949—to one of true partnership."
>
> "The European nations which the United States must now recognize as ready for true partnership are not those of 1949. The years since the war have witnessed the revival of their economies and, more important, the reinvigoration of their intellectual resources and political aspirations."
>
> "The assumption by European nations of more responsibility for the consummation of common purposes could do more than anything else on the horizon to lighten the burden American taxpayers now bear."
>
> "To accomplish this, the United States should be not only willing but eager to make necessary adjustments in its own policies."
>
> Friendly gestures are needed.
>
> Gestures of friendship are not signs of weakness. President Theodore Roosevelt once said, "Magnanimity is more becoming in the strong than in the weak." If this be true, any overtures of friendship in this hour of America's greatest power will be warmly received. Arbitrary positions should be avoided if the United States is to escape the charge of trying to dominate its friends instead of cooperating with them.
>
> Any tendency to procrastinate in the handling of common problems by France and the United States can lead only to deterioration of the climate for successful negotiation.
>
> If it is wise to attempt to ease tensions with the Communist world, is it less so with a friend and ally?
>
> Together France and the United States . . . should press the search for adequate and constructive solutions. The past of neither nation is free of errors.
>
> France and the United States have fought shoulder to shoulder in two world conflicts in this century. Ties formed of common peril should not be broken by pettiness or neglect.

Citing the need for full partnership in NATO responsibility by our allies, the fact-finding chairman also supported true partnership in technology:

> The renewed strength . . . of our European allies suggests that they are not ready to assume a larger share in the responsibilities of the alliance.
>
> We welcome this increased capability and we should recognize the contributions our Europeans partners can make and should gladly grant them more responsible roles in the alliance.
>
> Franco-American relations should be conducted in an atmosphere of greater cordiality.
>
> However small the force-de-frappe may be compared with that of the United States, it is completely committed to the defense of the free world, and in the spirit of the traditional links between Paris and Washington, the United States should actively seek an understanding that will unite the two capabilities for a common purpose . . . Failure to cooperate now could further erode the links that tie France to the Atlantic Alliance. No task is more urgent than reaching some understanding with France on nuclear matters.
>
> A way must be found to bring together the vast scientific and technological resources of the entire Atlantic community.
>
> Any U.S. policy that deprives our Nation of the fruits of the work of the many brilliant scientists of Europe is unwise.
>
> Without true partnership in military procurement, our allies become more dependent on the U.S., thus thwarting their scientific initiative and development, the Congressman pointed out.
>
> Europeans generally question—and many resent—the recently accelerated effort by the United States to market arms and military equipment in Europe . . .
>
> It defies common sense to employ American strength in a manner which weakens America's allies. The consequences of aggressive merchandising of munitions are not only economic, but also psychological and scientific.
>
> Deprived of the economic opportunity to experiment and develop new principles and new systems, the intellectual resources of a nation which becomes completely dependent upon American military equipment will tend to dry up . . .
>
> The United States should get to work without delay to develop in coordination with its allies a NATO-wide system of military procurement that will assure the participation of each member on a level commensurate with resources.
>
> True partnership with our allies in making decisions and thereby sharing costs, especially in employment of nuclear weapons, is the decision facing the United States, declared the speaker.
>
> A basic disagreement within NATO today concerns the European desire to participate more effectively in making decisions especially in the employment of nuclear weapons, both tactical and strategic—and on the other hand, the American wish to have the nations of Europe share, to a much greater extent, in the costs of the elaborate and expensive structure of defense.
>
> True partnership presently exists in neither field. And we must recognize that the attainment of partnership in one is impossible without attaining it in the other as well.
>
> The French claim they cannot be expected to trust their security ultimately to the willingness of our President to commit the United States to a nuclear war for the defense of France. This is one of the factors that complicates Franco-American relations.
>
> A fuller partnership in decisions and costs is the only viable alternative to a number of unpleasant costly, and possibly dangerous

> consequences for the United States and its allies.

Conclusions reached by the fact-finding mission were enumerated as unilateral actions to be undertaken by the United States in order to alleviate some of the more pressing difficulties of the Atlantic Alliance:

> 1. Recognize the fact that France is a nuclear power, whether we like it or not. Nuclear proliferation of course carries grave danger, but the time for arguing whether this is good or bad in the case of France is long past.
>
> The United States should immediately reexamine its policy on technological and scientific cooperation. We should take full advantage of any discretionary provision of our Atomic Energy Act, and if need be amend it, to the end that the nuclear capabilities of France and the United States may be fully coordinated.
>
> 2. Clarify our policy with respect to employment of nuclear weapons in the defense of Europe . . . removing all doubt and uneasiness as to our response in the event of an attack on Western Europe.
>
> We should reaffirm our determination to participate fully in the joint defense of Europe, and at the same time declare our desire to work out a means for more fully sharing decision-making with our allies.
>
> 3. Propose the establishment of a Diplomatic Standing Group . . . (to) aid the NATO Council in political matters in much the same way the Military Standing Group now aids the Council in military affairs.
>
> 4. Demonstrate our continuing friendship to France. The most impressive demonstration would be a trip to Europe by the President of the United States for the single purpose of visiting the French President.

After detailing the four specific suggestions to stop further erosion of NATO strength, I proposed the first and mandatory action in upgrading our allies from their secondary role in NATO:

> As the first step in progressing from the leader-follower basis in the Atlantic alliance to one of fuller partnership, our mission suggests a top-level planning conference consisting of a select few, highly qualified, and distinguished representatives from each of NATO's 15 member nations.
>
> This group would be charged with developing at the earliest possible date, a detailed plan for the establishment of a fuller partnership among NATO nations in (a) technical research and development; (b) military procurement; (c) financing of defense; and (d) strategic decisionmaking.

In concluding the report, we declared:

> The North Atlantic Treaty Organization—the world's most essential institution—is in troubled waters . . . it is neglected. It must have immediate attention.

Press reaction throughout the United States centered mainly on the suggestion for a face-to-face meeting between President Johnson and De Gaulle; however, major points in the report were well covered by most newspapers.

AFTER THE PARIS MISSION

A special commission to study NATO was urged in a resolution introduced in the House on July 13, 1965, signed by 10 members of House Republican committee on NATO and the Atlantic community but was not a committee resolution. It followed by 1 day an identical resolution introduced in the Senate by Senators Frank Carlson, of Kansas; Clifford Case, of New Jersey; Frank Church, of Idaho; Joseph Clark, of Pennsylvania; John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky; and Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut. Signing the House resolution were Representatives John F. Baldwin, of California; James C. Cleveland, of New Hampshire; Robert F. Ellsworth, of Kansas; Paul Findley, of Illinois; Charles E. Goodell, of New York; Hastings Keith, of Massachusetts; James D. Martin, of Alabama; Alexander Pirnie, of New York; Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota; and Ogden Reid, of New York.

In the press release we pointed out:

> In our committee's letter of May 15, 1964, we suggested that the President invite former Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman to head a blue-ribbon delegation of U.S. citizens to meet with similar groups from other NATO nations for the purpose of formulating and proposing for ratification improvements in the structure of NATO.

We also pointed out that the fact-finding mission to Paris, among its recommendations to President Johnson, had urged appointment of former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman to head a blue-ribbon delegation of U.S. citizens to meet with similar groups from other NATO nations for the purpose of formulating and proposing for ratification improvements in the structure of NATO.

One way of strengthening NATO was suggested by the House Committee on NATO and the Atlantic Alliance in a letter to President Johnson, dated August 6, 1965. The letter said in part:

> We earnestly urge that you give consideration to elevating the position (of Representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization) to cabinet level, a rank long accorded the Representative of the United Nations . . . this action would significantly enhance the prestige of this position and thereby the effectiveness of our participation in NATO.

In a letter to President Johnson on December 16, 1965, we said:

> West Germany has served an adequate postwar apprenticeship, and has cooperated fully in NATO affairs. It deserves an equal role in establishing and controlling whatever allied nuclear ventures may be undertaken.
>
> On Wednesday (15 December 1965) Secretary of State Rusk made a very commendable statement to the NATO Council, in which he gave assurance that Russia will not be permitted a veto over allied nuclear arrangements. Certainly no rights of Germany—or any other ally—should be bargained away in attempts to conciliate the Soviet Union, (to) secure a pact regarding non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.
>
> Your discussions this weekend (of 17 December 1965) with Mr. Ludwig Erhard, West German Chancellor, present an historic opportunity to demonstrate the determination of the United States to strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty organization . . . (and) an opportune moment for you to give substance to our NATO commitment as follows:
>
> Propose that NATO speak with one voice in regard to a pact on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and with that in mind, announce that the United States will place the pact question before the NATO Council and delay further discussions of the proposal at Geneva until NATO has reached a policy position.
>
> This statement would eliminate any fear on the part of West Germany that the United States will participate in bargaining away the rights of any of its NATO allies in regard to nuclear matters. It would also show our desire to utilize the alliance as a means of policy development on questions of worldwide importance.

A letter dated January 7, 1966, to President Johnson urged inclusion in his state of the Union message:

> Policy on all problems which have worldwide importance should be developed automatically within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization . . . (and) U.S. willingness and desire from this day forward to follow policies that are developed jointly with our allies. If we are ever to achieve cooperative action, we must accept cooperative policy-making. We must treat our allies as responsible and trustworthy partners.
>
> We must set goals worthy of the tremendous sacrifices now being made in Vietnam. Long-range objectives of the free world must be defined. Free world institutions . . . must be brought together and strengthened.

DEFENSE PLEDGE TO NATO

Release by the White House of January 15, 1966, of secret correspondence requested by the Government of Turkey brought forth a statement placed in the Congressional Record January 18, 1966. The statement took issue with a key sentence in a letter dated June 5, 1964, to Prime Minister Inonu of Turkey from President Johnson which had stated:

> I hope you will understand that your NATO allies have not had a chance to consider whether they have an obligation to protect Turkey against the Soviet Union if Turkey takes a step which results in Soviet intervention without the full consent and understanding of its NATO allies.

Mr. Inonu wrote in reply:

> Our understanding is that the North Atlantic Treaty imposes upon all member states the obligation to come forthwith to the assistance of any member victim of aggression.
>
> If NATO members should start discussing the right and wrong of the situation of their fellow-member victim of a Soviet aggression . . . the foundations of the alliance would be shaken.

The task force cited article 5 of the NATO obligations which pledges action automatically to assist in defense of a member nation that is attacked. We then declared:

> So far as we can determine, this is the first time any member of the NATO Alliance has questioned the automatic character of the mutual defense pact.
>
> The automatic character of allied response was absolutely clear in the treaty. So far as we can learn, the NATO Council did not at any time authorize President Johnson to be the illance spokesman in regard to Turkey's action in Cyprus.

Pointing to reaction of our allies and the Soviet Union as a result of U.S. action regarding Turkey, we said:

> This major treaty qualification in regard to Turkey . . . may raise questions about the credibility of our commitments to other allies. No doubt, Soviet leaders will read with intense interest the texts of these letters.
>
> If, in a tight and tense minor crisis, the most powerful member of the alliance will qualify its obligation to one of the less powerful and most vulnerable, what may be expected if a major crisis arises?

A letter dated February 22, 1966, marked the third request in a year that President Johnson visit President de Gaulle as a "gesture of friendship" between the two nations whose "opposing views" had "hardened to an alarming degree."

Within a month, on March 17, I again wrote President Johnson urging a visit to President de Gaulle—the fourth such appeal in a year.

Deeply concerned about the crisis and effect on all NATO countries, I wrote:

> French-American relations have plunged to the lowest point in many years . . . with emotional outbursts on both sides of the Atlantic . . . (which) may destroy in a matter of days the friendship built up over two centuries between these oldest allies and cause difficult new problems throughout the Atlantic alliance.
>
> . . . The Communists must not succeed in their major postwar objective, which of course is to break up the alliance of free nations.
>
> Therefore I once again urge that you visit Paris as soon as possible for a long overdue meeting with the French President . . . (which) would be a sign of responsible concern and common sense, not of weakness.

U.S. plans for removal of NATO political offices from France prompted a letter on March 30 to President Johnson from the task force:

> News reports today indicate the United States will soon demand that NATO political offices be withdrawn from France. . . . If the proposal should come up for review, we urge that it be rejected.
>
> President de Gaulle has stated repeatedly France's desire to stay in the alliance, even though he finds the present military structure unacceptable. If we demand that the NATO Council and Secretariat be removed from France, would this not suggest a stubborn our-way-else attitude?
>
> As leader, we hope you will not only reject this negative approach but step in personally with affirmative action to bridge the growing chasm between these historic friends before it is too late.

A reported decision by the French Government to bar the annual ceremony at Napoleon's tomb honoring the first American fatally wounded in the liberation of Paris was the subject of a cablegram dated April 14, 1966, from the four members of the Paris Fact Finding Mission. We had participated in the wreath-laying ceremony the preceding year while on a factfinding mission to Paris to study NATO problems and ascertain the cause of the rift between France and the United States. We had been entertained in Paris by M. Edmond Giscard d'Estaing, president of the France-American Committee and it was to their former host the cable was sent which said in part:

> I hope your committee will use its influence to persuade the French government to reconsider its reported decision to bar the annual ceremony as Les Invalides in Paris, honoring the memory of Sgt. Russell Kelly . . .
>
> It has taken many years to develop French-American friendship . . . but the goodwill of centuries can be destroyed in a very brief period . . .
>
> Here is an opportunity for France to set a tone of magnanimity and friendship which hopefully will inspire our government to follow suit.

Our cable was acknowledged on April 20 by M. Jaques Chastenet and Edmond Giscard d'Estaing, president and former president respectively of the France-American Committee in Paris. The cable stated:

> We are asking a meeting with Mr. Messmer, Minister of the Armies, in order to urge the action you advocate.

A cable, dated April 29, was received from the president and the former president of the France-American Committee in Paris who stated:

> Following our telegram of 19 April 1966 we have been received today by the Minister of the Armies. Desiring to show sentiments particularly toward American soldiers the minister has promised us to consider for the benefit of Sergeant Kelly possible waiver of the general regulation. He will make known shortly a definite answer.

Wearing two hats, one as spokesman for myself and 20 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, the other as chairman of the House Republican committee on NATO and the Atlantic community, I appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on Europe of which Representative Edna F. Kelly, of New York, was chairman, on June 1, 1966. The subcommittee was holding hearings on "The Crisis in NATO."

I said:

In my opening statement I said:

> NATO is in a period of deep crisis. . . . One of the most significant documents that I have seen as a result of this inquiry was the letter presented to you by former President Eisenhower.

My testimony as spokesman for 20 of my colleagues was critical of U.S. nuclear policy toward France which had led to French-Soviet collaboration in nuclear development and refinement. I questioned the substitution of a "flexible response" for that of "massive retaliation," a policy that had undermined our allies confidence in the U.S. commitment to "press the nuclear button" if necessary for defense of Western Europe. Also questioned were the paternalistic posture of the United States toward our allies which left them weak, disarmed and dependent, thus ignoring natural needs and pride of progressive nations.

In urging reform of NATO, mandatory to prevent further fragmentation, I suggested abandonment of U.S. insistence for removal of NATO political headquarters from Paris and a personal trip to Paris by President Johnson for discussion of the devisive issues between France and the United States.

Donning my second hat, that of chairman of the House Republican committee on NATO and the Atlantic alliance, I submitted for inclusion in the record a supplemental statement which reviewed specific recommendations made by the NATO committee over a 4-year period. This supplemental statement pointed up the similarity of NATO committee proposals with suggestions made by Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on his recent return from Europe.

Almost identical suggestions made by Senator CHURCH and prior and reiterated proposals by the House Republican committee on NATO and the Atlantic alliance were: Summit meeting of Presidents Johnson and De Gaulle; Europeanize command positions in SHAPE, specifically the appointment of a European general as SACEUR; establishment of a "hot line" communication system linking together heads of the NATO governments which would provide for immediate consultation in emergencies; retention of NATO's military function but also a unified policy on expansion into economic areas.

ATLANTIC STUDIES PROGRAM

The Atlantic studies program was a series of nine analytical studies of the deterioration of the North Atlantic Alliance sponsored by our task force with the cooperation of 26 eminent scientists, military experts, and scholars.

In a press release December 8, 1965, announcing the Atlantic studies program, we stated in part:

> The White House Conference on International Cooperation held last week showed dramatically the need for this type of research . . .
>
> The principal Atlantic-community topics we will consider are foreign-policy coordination, cooperation in advanced technology, international monetary reform, arms control and trade expansion.
>
> We believe the Atlantic Community, broadly defined, has vast potential for advancing peace and human freedom if it can be more effectively united. The Vietnam war and other explosive world events have monopolized the attention of the U.S. Administration and the public to such an extent that storm clouds gathering in the Atlantic have been given too little attention.
>
> Divisive . . . forces are growing within the (Atlantic) Community, and these have grave implications for the United States and its NATO allies . . .
>
> NATO, the Atlantic Community's principal institution, is undergoing great interternal stress. Its breakup, or even the withdrawal of a single nation like France, would be a setback of grave proportions for the United States and for the whole western world.
>
> The broad goal we seek is a more perfect union of the Atlantic Community.
>
> Fashioned in 1949 to fit the immediate military needs of nations ravaged by war, NATO must now be revised and strengthened taking into account progress in technology and economic growth . . . Now ways and means must be found so NATO can serve this great Community economically and politically, and thus fulfill non-military objectives of the original Treaty.

Although formation of the panel was still underway, we announced the names of those who had accepted the invitation to write a paper embodying their opinions on revitalization of NATO in their respective areas of knowledge. Those accepting were:

> Prof. Maurice Allais, professor of economics at the Ecole Nationale Superieure des Mines and the Institut de Statistique de l'Universite de Paris; research director at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Prof. H. C. Allen, department of history, University College London; author of "The Anglo-American Predicament."

Gen. Pierre Billotte, former Minister of Defense.

The Honorable W. Randolph Burgess, a director of the Atlantic Treaty Association and the Atlantic Council of the United States; U.S. Permanent Representative to NATO 1957–61.

Adm. Arleigh Burge, director executive board, the Center for Strategic Studies at Georgetown University; former U.S. Chief of Naval Operations, 1955–61.

Prof. Harold C. Deutsch, Department of History, University of Minnesota; radio and TV world news analyst; Fulbright research fellow and author.

Dr. Edgar Furniss, director of the Mershon Center for National Security Policy; lecturer for Army, Navy, Air, National War Colleges; author of "France Troubled Ally"—1960.

Gen. Pierre Gallois, Deputy, French National Assembly, former Minister of Defense; prominent military strategist.

The Honorable Thomas S. Gates, chairman of the board, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.; former U.S. Secretary of Defense.

Dr. William R. Kintner, deputy director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania; author of many books relevant to the Atlantic community.

Dr. Hans Kohn, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania; visiting professor at numerous universities; author of numerous books dealing with history.

Prof. Burton Marshall, research assocate, Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research and visiting professor, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University.

Ben T. Moore, associate director, the 20th Century Fund and consultant of the Atlantic Institute; author of "NATO and the Future of Europe."

Vice Adm. Friedrich Ruge, lecturer at the University of Tubingen. Former Chief of the German Navy.

Sir John Slessor, Marshal of the Royal Air Force; vice president of the institute for Strategic Studies, London; former chief of the air staff; author of many books including "The Great Deterrent"—1957—and "What Price Coexistence?"—1962.

Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupe', founder and director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania; member of research council of Atlantic Institute; author of many books including "Building the Atlantic Community."

Clarence K. Streit, president of Federal Union, Inc., and International Movement for Atlantic Union; editor of "Freedom and Union"; author of numerous books and articles on political union of the free nations.

Dr. Ellsworth Tompkins, executive secretary of the National Association of Secondary School Principals; chairman, Education Branch of the Atlantic Treaty Association.

Dr. Harold C. Urey, University of California; Nobel Prize in chemistry 1934, Davy Medal, Royal Society of London, 1940, and numerous other awards; author and contributor to scientific journals.

Ethelbert Warfield, lawyer, firm of Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, New York City; member American, New York State, and Philadelphia Bar Associations.

The addition of five foreign-policy specialists to the above named was announced on December 21, 1965, by the committee:

Mr. Christopher Emmett, executive vice president, American Council on Germany.

Dr. Richard J. Goodman, economist with Great Plains Wheat, Inc.; agricultural international trade specialist; consultant to GATT on cereals.

Prof. Ruth C. Lawson, chairman, department of political science, Mount Holyoke College, contributor of articles and reviews to political and law journals.

Mr. Leslie Lipson, director of studies, the Atlantic Institute, Boulogne-sur-Seine, France; lecturer at the National War College.

Prof. Eugene V. Rostow, dean, Law School, Yale University; adviser to the Department of State; author of books and articles on economics.

The five additional names totaled 26 eminent experts in the Atlantic studies program as Mr. Ben T. Moore withdrew on ascertaining that his position as consultant to Ambassador Dowling and the Atlantic Institute was bipartisan.

Nine reports pertaining to and within the scope of the designated categories were completed. Essays submitted that were not directly pertinent to the format of the Atlantic studies series were not reported to the House of Representatives but held for publication elsewhere subject to approval by the author.

Gen. Pierre M. Gallois' essay entitled "The Problems of the Atlantic Community" was the first report delivered in the House by myself on May 25, 1966. It was followed by comments made by Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, Republican, of California, who with his colleague, ALEXANDER PIRNIE, Republican, of New York, had reviewed the paper submitted by General Gallois. Both statements were carried in their entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 9, pages 11442–43.

General Gallois pointed out that long-range ballistic missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads have made the United States as vulnerable as any Western nation to nuclear attack, intimating doubt of U.S. commitment to defense of NATO nations.

Building on this basic thought he maintained the United States with nuclear weapons under its sole control should not have the power of life or death over Western Europe in a confrontation with an aggressive Soviet Union.

Critical of American diplomacy he stated that despite intellectual, scientific, and industrial potential, Europe has been denied the ability to develop modern means of defense and has been told to provide foot soldiers and conventional weapons—that the United States would furnish advanced armaments.

As a counter to U.S. control of nuclear weapons, he urged that NATO finance research and development of nuclear weapons which would be distributed to member nations who would then determine what risks they were willing to take in case of aggressive action against an individual state by the Soviet Union.

Dr. Hendrik Brugmans' subject, "Atlantic Policy in Perspective" was placed in the RECORD on July 14, 1966, the second paper in the Atlantic studies series. Dr. Brugman's essay was reviewed by Congressman Robert F. Ellsworth, of Kansas, whose comments were placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 12, pages 15779–15780.

Dr. Brugmans proposed an Atlantic Council for World Affairs to which the United States and the states of Europe would surrender part of their political and military sovereignty, with European unity as a precondition of Atlantic integration.

With reference to the political aspect, he declared that the diminishing military threat by Russia and economic resurgence of Western Europe which no longer looked to Washington for "help, guidance and advice" has resulted in a "Europe—which—already asks itself how it might achieve a position of equal partnership with America, not only in words but in reality."

He foresaw nuclear defense systems under control of a number of medium-sized states, despite U.S. moral condemnation, pointing out that pressing of the atomic trigger will be done by a small team or one man alone but the action "should not be isolated from the community in the name of which and for the protection of which they ask, with the political popular consensus to be achieved before," and that Europeans should have their own frontier guards backed up by Atlantic nuclear defenses.

With a reunited—not fragmented—Western Europe, the promotion of detente between East and West could be escalated by an economic and cultural "Marshall plan" for Eastern Europe financed by the United States and West Europeans but administered by all concerned; added inducements would be recognition of a buffer-region between Western Europe and the U.S.S.R. thus assuring Soviet border safety, and recognition of the Oder-Neisse borderline by Bonn leading to reunification of Germany.

In presenting the third dissertation of the Atlantic studies series, I stated that the essay by Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy, retired should be viewed in light of the recent meeting of the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee, Geneva, Switzerland. Entitled "The Impact of Arms Control and Disarmament Proposals on the Atlantic Community," it appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 13, page 16883. Indiana Congressman E. Ross ADAIR's review of the essay appeared the same date on pages 16883–16884 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Admiral Burke emphasized that westward expansion by the Soviets had been deterred by NATO's military power which should not be upset or curtailed by any arms control measures whereby Russia might decide military aggression would not entail a high degree of risk.

Pointing out that no political institution existed that could guarantee protection against aggression, the admiral favored specific arms control measures conducive to cementing cooperation among NATO states thus decreasing the possibility of war between the Soviet and NATO blocs.

He described the Communists as hard, realistic negotiators and said the United States should be equally as hard and realistic. That the U.S.S.R. tried and frequently received advantages from negotiations but that conditions could be established making it clear that it was better to accept rather than reject a proposal by presenting a more disadvantageous alternative, and that the United States would follow through.

Wary of U.S. unilateral initiatives in seeking agreements with the Soviets, he did not foreclose discussion with the U.S.S.R. on reducing dangers of surprise attack or lessening the threat of nuclear attack on Western Europe, nonproliferation of nuclear weapons to nonnuclear states, and of similar partial arms reduction. He advocated, however, that such peace gestures or overtures should not abrogate measures to alleviate political, economic, and social losses to our NATO allies resulting from a Soviet nuclear attack.

The fourth study of the series was announced in the House on August 4, 1966. Written by Dr. Eugene V. Rostow, and entitled "Prospects for the Alliance," it was in the Congressional Record, volume 112, part 14, pages 18257–18259. Representative Ogden R. Reid, of New York, and Charles A. Mosher, of Ohio, reviewed the commentary which the latter introduced as the speaker whose remarks appeared in the Congressional Record, volume 112, part 14, page 18259.

Dr. Rostow's critical commentary was based on policy choices available to the United States from the viewpoint of national security interest of the United States in its relationship with other nations which take an active part in the military and political programs of the cold war. As part of worldwide national security, he stressed the vital need for geographical expansion of the alliance as a counter to Communist ambitions.

Dr. Rostow said:

> Expansion of NATO into a worldwide arena is vital, due to, . . . efforts of the Communist movement to seize power in various countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America . . . in pouring oil on the fires of so-called "anti-colonial wars of national liberation" (in Russian attempts to outdo the Chinese in the world Communist movement).

Discussing the conflict in NATO and effect on worldwide security, he stated:

> It is apparent that the struggle for order and progress in the free world would be far more likely to succeed than is the case at present if it were conducted by an Alliance working in close cooperation . . . It is equally obvious that continued friction between Europe and the United States would give the Soviets . . . hope that some day . . . they might deal separately with each . . . and a withdrawal into isolation here (in the United States).
>
> These are risks of the utmost gravity, which it should be the first aim of American prudence to eliminate.

Admiral Ruge's statement entitled "Nature of the Alliance," was delivered in the House on September 29, 1966, and the entire text may be found in the Congressional Record, volume 112, part 18, pages 24506–24508. It was reviewed by Representative, now Senator, Charles E. Goodell, of New York, and Representative Rogers C. B. Morton, of Maryland, who discussed his views on the House floor on September 29, 1966, the text of which may be found in the Congressional Record, volume 112, part 18, pages 24508–24509.

Warning of the brief existence of coalitions of nations unless they succeeded in evolving a close union with a common governing authority responsible at least for foreign policy and defense, Vice Admiral Ruge, retired, declared:

> The first task of the Western Alliance should be to bring about closer cooperation with the aim of creating a supranational authority. . . .
>
> The Atlantic peoples can hope to survive in their way of life only when they are united in their policies and purposes. Therefore to make the Alliance more stable politically will have to be the common goal in spite of all temporary reverses.

Terming technological cooperation as only one step in a stronger NATO, he declared it to be unsatisfactory and subject to improvement depending on "political developments."

On September 30, 1966, the essay of Dr. Edward Teller, famous for his work in the development of the hydrogen bomb, was placed in the Record. The subject was "Memorandum on Nuclear Cooperation in NATO," and the full text was published in the Congressional Record, volume 112, part 18, pages 24651–24652, as the sixth of the Atlantic studies series. The analysis of Dr. Teller's memorandum was made by Representative Craig Hosmer, of California, whose statement was in the Congressional Record, volume 112, part 18, pages 24652–24653.

In his introduction, Dr. Teller made the following observations: The weakened NATO cooperation may be blamed partly on De Gaulle's policy but a more basic cause is dissatisfaction by our Western European allies with the NATO structure. Our NATO allies, excluded from the nuclear preparedness program, feel active participation has been ruled out. They know that the vital decisions of life or death for them which rests solely in U.S. hands is due to U.S. nuclear system restrictions.

He regarded U.S. space research as a popular area for cooperation with our NATO allies and pointed out that—

> European contribution (toward space exploration) in scientific and technical talent could turn out . . . to be decisive . . . (and) result in a considerable advantage in the field of defense.

Continuing his thesis of collaboration in space research, he observed:

> In the nuclear age surveillance is one of the foremost safeguards of continued peace. Surveillance as part of the space effort could be carried out jointly by the NATO allies.

Such a program would have the following advantages, according to Dr. Teller:

> 1. In case of opposition by Russia, we would not have to stand alone.
> 2. The sharing of the technical effort would insure greater efficiency and would result in lesser expense.
> 3. The joint enterprise would give our allies a sense of participation.
> 4. Those of our allies who are closest to the Iron Curtain (the Germans, Danes, Norwegians, and Italians) would have the greatest possible interest in having prompt information concerning any signs of danger—(and) we could be of particularly great service to some of our allies.

The seventh essay in the Atlantic study series dealt with trade, written by Richard J. Goodman and entitled "Agricultural Trade Policy and the Atlantic Community." It was delivered in the House of Representatives, Congressional Record, volume 112, part 19, page 26297. Mr. Goodman's paper was reviewed by Representatives Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota, and Laurence J. Burton, of Utah, both of whom expressed their opinions in House speeches on October 12, 1966. The complete text of their remarks is found in the Congressional Record, volume 112, part 19, pages 26299–26300.

The October 13, 1966, Congressional Record, volume 112, part 20, page 26701, contained a study of future NATO functions as outlined by Dr. Edgar S. Furniss, Jr. The eighth of a series of Atlantic studies, it was entitled "Western Alliance Development and Technological Cooperation," and was reviewed by Representatives Frances P. Bolton, of Ohio, and James D. Martin, of Alabama, with comments by the latter carried in the same Congressional Record, volume 112, part 20, page 26704.

Mr. Furniss discussed the minimal military cooperation by NATO allies of the United States which he ascribed largely due to abeyance of military threat by the Soviet Union. He pointed out a larger concept—a larger role—provided for in the treaty and stated:

> Only lack of imagination—not lack of money—stands in the way of an internal revolution within the Alliance.

His study concluded with this observation:

> If military force remains the sole function of the Alliance, then at best history will record that it served its purpose and was cast aside. At worst the verdict will be that a system which remained unchanged became a system hampering, possibly preventing the attainment of the very objectives for which it was formed . . .

The ninth and final paper in the Atlantic Study Series, prepared by Professor Lipson, was delivered in the House on November 1, 1966. Lipson's paper was entitled "The Coordination of Foreign Policies in NATO." The entire text was in the Congressional Record, volume 112, part 19, page 26701, and was reviewed by Representatives William S. Broomfield, of Michigan, and James C. Cleveland, of New Hampshire.

ENLARGED SCOPE

The House Republican conference of the 90th Congress enlarged the policy area of the former House Republican Committee on NATO and the Atlantic Alliance to include the Rio Treaty states of Latin America. This necessitated a change in the name of the committee and it became the House Republican Task Force on Western Alliances.

The reorganized committee lost three and retained four Members of the previous Congress: Representatives Ross Adair, of Indiana; Alexander Pirnie, of New York; Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota; and Chairman Paul Findley, of Illinois. Newly appointed to the committee by Representative Charles Goodell, chairman of the Republican Conference Committee on Research and Planning, were: Representatives William O. Cowger, of Kentucky; Seymour Halpern, of New York; Sherman P. Lloyd, of Utah; William S. Mailliard of California; William V. Roth, of Delaware; Herman Schneebeli, of Pennsylvania; Charles W. Whalen, of Ohio; Larry Winn, Jr., of Kansas; William C. Cramer, of Florida; and Marvin L. Esch, of Michigan.

The House Republican task force on western alliances, in its press release of April 21, 1967, demanded open hearings on the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. In pointing to the unanswered questions raised at the treaty negotiations of the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee at Geneva, it advocated public debate to ascertain the effect of the treaty of NATO.

In this context, said the committee, there should be answers on questions pertaining to possible foreclosure of a nuclear defense force controlled by NATO, and elimination of any possible partnership with NATO nations in nuclear technology for space exploration and other peaceful purposes, as well as military.

Also to be determined would be the obligation of "the United States to defend other nations against nuclear attack if the nuclear attack is actually provoked by conventional military action."

Discusion should include possible reversal of Soviet or Communist China policies toward the United State or vice versa.

In advocating discussion now, the committee observed:

> When the treaty is presented to the Senate for ratification, open-minded discussion and evaluation will be virtually impossible . . . the prestige of the Presidency will have been pledged, and for that reason some Senators may forego the searching scrutiny they would otherwise give . . . (and) support it despite reservations.

A telegram to President Johnson dated May 19, 1967, from the House task force on western alliances urged that—

> The United States should promptly and unequivocally re-affirm its commitment under the North Atlantic Treaty to aid Greece and other NATO nations automatically in case of armed attack. (and) . . . be accompanied by a strong expression of hope for an early return to constitutional processes in Greece . . . (but) leave no doubt about our determination to protect that country from attack.

Creation of a North Atlantic Assembly with official status through amendment of the North Atlantic Treaty by the 15 NATO nations was suggested in a message to President Johnson on June 9, 1967, from the task force.

The message detailed previous efforts for establishment of such an assembly, first initiated in 1953.

The advantages and necessity were cited:

> Such an assembly would improve the exchange of ideas by representatives elected directly by the people of these nations. Its public debates would tend to moderate nationalism and some of the abrasive tendencies of bureaucracy. The need for this has just been dramatically demonstrated by the disarray of the NATO nations in reacting to the mid-east crisis.

A critical in-depth analysis depicting failure of U.S. leadership in NATO which was prepared by Representatives SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York, and MARVIN ESCH, of Michigan, was issued on June 13, 1967. This analysis was one of three such studies later incorporated into a booklet entitled "Will NATO Survive 1969?" The analysis stated in part:

> Our perception of the Atlantic Alliance, formed when the Soviet threat to Europe was immediate, is being challenged on the basis of present date realities.
>
> The United States, as leader of the free world, cannot afford to turn a deaf ear to these new and evolving developments . . . precarious for our future relations with Europe would be a stubborn, Pavlovian-like defense of the status quo . . . without making a consummate effort to join our allies in dealing with the real NATO difficulties . . . through joint discussion and decision and not through unilateral action.

The analysis pointed to the political changes—the new nationalism and self-confidence fostered by economic resurgence—that have taken place since NATO's formation in 1949.

It also asserted that another factor in the crumbling walls of NATO is the yearning by our allies for detente with the Warsaw Pact nations, resulting from Russia's "more subtle and sophisticated cast" of strategy that it is no longer a military threat to their security.

As a counter to Russia's new strategy the report declared:

> Our NATO partners certainly wish to preserve in their own self-interest, the American commitment to Europe, which is the keystone to their security.

The report emphasizing that although the United States has been preoccupied with problems outside the NATO circumference, the destinies of the free world center on the alliance.

Critical of U.S. failure to consult our allies on strategic decisions affecting their security, the report stated:

> The difficulty of aligning key NATO partners behind the draft nuclear non-proliferation treaty testifies to the need and the practical wisdom of securing during the formative stages the advice and cooperation of the Alliance. A treaty banning the spread of nuclear weapons, however desirable in the context of world stability, relates to the future of the Alliance, its security, and the question of nuclear sharing. These important matters, as well as the treaty's inspection machinery, should have been thoroughly explored in the NATO councils before and during the negotiation period.

In diagnosing the ills of NATO and recommendations for rehabilitation, the two analysts reported:

> The political context in which NATO exists and functions has changed, and it is absolutely essential that the NATO nations attempt to arrive at a common understanding of these changes and, where appropriate, a common reworking of the objectives, obligations, decision-making arrangements, and other Organization features.

A critical in-depth assessment of results of the nonproliferation treaty negotiations with recommendation that the slate be wiped clean for a fresh start on the treaty negotiations was prepared for a task force by Representatives E. ROSS ADAIR, of Indiana and LARRY WINN, JR., of Kansas. The statement was issued July 5, 1967.

The report detailed Russian actions adverse to the cause of peace during negotiations:

> The Soviets have stepped up their aid to North Viet Nam. They have refused to ratify the Consular treaty. . . . They are reported to be continuing to send arms in great quantities to the Middle East. . . . They are actively engaged in harrassing our fleet on the high seas. They are daily poaching in our domestic fishing grounds. The east European satellites are assisting North Viet Nam. The Soviets refuse to consider cutting back on their anti-ballistic missile system. . . . They continue to arm Cuba and support subversion in Latin America.

The report also cited reaction by our NATO allies to United States seemingly desperate haste to conclude the nonproliferation treaty with the U.S.S.R.:

> Germany is rapidly becoming both suspicious and alienated . . . forced to take a back seat in nuclear technology . . . (and) left defenseless from attack from a nuclear power.
>
> Italy has expressed misgivings concerning the treaty . . . (and has made an unconfirmed statement) that the treaty could become a serious bar to future unity moves in Western Europe in the field of political and military institutions.
>
> The question of nuclear weapons was a significant factor, most people seem to feel, in President DeGaulle's decision to "go it alone" . . . and (is) proceeding on every front . . . to become a true nuclear power . . .
>
> A recent statement by George Ball, former U.S. Undersecretary of State, suggesting that Great Britain should surrender her nuclear deterrent to America as a 'contribution to peace' brought a strong reaction. The London Daily Express stated: "Such interference in our affairs is futile and impertinent".

This points up, and the report that said—

> The Soviet Union is in no hurry to sign such a treaty . . . as the mere fact of negotiating tends to split the Alliance . . . (and) the more seeming concessions we make to the Soviets . . . the more suspicions grow among our European NATO allies that they are somehow to be left out in the cold . . . (it also) increases the stature of President Charles DeGaulle and his third force concept of Europe.

In advocating withdrawal of our proposed treaty and a fresh start, the task force statement declared:

> We could then proceed to hammer out a new treaty draft acceptable to all of NATO . . . (with opportunity of achieving a truly integrated NATO nuclear command).

The task force suggested:

> We should press forward with plans for an anti-missile system—to close the ABM gap . . . (which) should be done in collaboration with our NATO allies . . .

The indictment of the negotiations expressed by the statement concluded with this declaration:

> We should never sacrifice the interests of a major part of the free world—NATO—just to secure a signature on a nonproliferation treaty that might or might not help the cause of world peace.

A factual, chronological record of administration failures in its relationship with NATO, prepared by Representatives SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York, and MARVIN L. ESCH, of Michigan, was issued on July 5, 1967 entitled "U.S. Policy Toward NATO: The Long Retreat from President Kennedy's July 4 Declaration of Interdependence," it was the second such in-depth examination by the committee.

The indictment of U.S. policy toward NATO charged:

> United States foreign policy under the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, despite repeated verbal assurances to the NATO commitment, has served to undermine the unity and vitality of the Atlantic Alliance. Political and military decisions taken by our government and the frequently unilateral method of reaching them, in disregard of NATO, have helped weaken NATO's importance in a fast-changing world.

The statement declared:

> The decline of NATO, as an instrument of diplomacy and solidarity, is a bitter disillusionment when measured against the expectations raised by President Kennedy's 1962 Declaration of Interdependence, when

> he called at Philadelphia for a renewed drive toward Atlantic partnership.

The indictment charged:

> Our apparent indifference to Alliance principles strengthens the notion that NATO as a military pact and political entity can no longer play a major role in shaping allied policy.

This apparent indifference, noted the task force statement, "has helped to shape the apprehensions and doubts now being voiced by a resurgent Europe and concerned Americans."

The report also pointed out:

> It is not possible to reform our basic approach, and pose realistic solutions to NATO's deterioration, without thinking seriously about the past.

The detailed charges against these past U.S. policies and actions fall into five broad divisions, some under one or more overlapping categories as follows:

There was increasing distrust of the United States commitment to NATO by the following incidents or decisions detailed by the task force:

> May 1962: Defense Secretary McNamara's abrupt announcement of the new NATO strategy of "flexible response" as a substitute for "massive resistance" which had emphasized use of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons in defense of Europe. The "flexible response" strategy relegated our allies to a beefed-up conventional role—a wall-of-flesh—against aggressors.
>
> October 23–24, 1963: "Operation Big Lift raised doubt about the U.S. commitment of troops to NATO." (Operation "Big Lift: 14,-500 American soldiers are flown from the United States to Germany to demonstrate that the United States is able to reinforce NATO forces in Europe in emergency.)
>
> June 1964: President Johnson's qualification of the NATO commitment to Turkey in the Cyprus crisis, which interpretation of the treaty obligations was promptly challenged by the Turkish Prime Minister.
>
> December 1965: "United States commitment to NATO put in doubt by nuclear nonproliferation negotiations in Geneva."

There was increasing distrust by refusal of the United States to utilize NATO for consultation when crises erupt or strategic decisions are pending which were cited by the task force:

> May 1961: "The North Atlantic Council expressed concern over bilateral consultations initiated by President Kennedy with the Soviet Union on disarmament."
>
> Fall of 1962: "No consultation within NATO prior to U.S. ultimatum to Soviet Union and blockade of its vessels en route to Cuba despite direct impact on allies if war ensued."
>
> January 1963: "U.S. abruptly withdrew missiles from Turkey and Italy." (Apparently as a unilateral concession to the Soviets by the Kennedy Administration following the Cuban crisis, according to unconfirmed reports at that time.)
>
> June 1963: "U.S. negotiated nuclear test ban with Soviet Union and 'hot line' between Moscow and Washington."
>
> January 1964: "U.S. sold wheat to Soviet Union at super discount."
>
> July 1965: "Pierrelatte overflight by U.S. NATO plane not adjudicated through NATO."
>
> March 1966: "U.S. initiated proposal to move the North Atlantic Council from France."

There was increasing distrust by routine employment of allies as mere executors of American military doctrine cited by the task force:

> May 1962: "NATO strategy altered at U.S. insistence."
>
> December 1962: "U.S. cancelled Skybolt missile project and proposed substitution of a multilateral force of Polaris submarines." (An official communique from Nassau announced President Kennedy's decision which forged a new British-American nuclear working partnership with no prior discussion nor official notice to de Gaulle, who first learned of the deal through the press. France was offered the same Polaris deal but rejected it; when American officials were questioned, the U.S. Administration hedged about exporting nuclear data to the French, thus refusing to treat England and France as equals, in essence discrimination against an ally—France.)
>
> May 1963: The Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Ottawa, Canada, approved the Nassau deal of the British V-bomber force and three American Polaris submarines assigned to SACEUR who is to appoint a Deputy responsible to him for nuclear affairs.

There was increasing distrust by U.S. unwillingness to adapt and adjust our attitude toward a unified, Western position on world problems cited by the task force:

The task force statement charged:

> The U.S. evidently lost the power and art of productive leadership . . . (It is the) bankruptcy of American diplomacy toward the West that is wrecking the institutional ties provided by NATO.

In this category emerged a clear picture of discrimination against France—and attempt to humiliate and relegate her to a second-class nation, not to be trusted. The task force statement observed:

> Despite obvious differences, however, a U.S. policy which quarantines France or abstains from endeavoring to reach accommodation on matters of mutual concern, is clearly detrimental to the interests of the Alliance as a whole.

The task force report spoke of U.S. "scornful regard for the French nuclear program, the unreadiness to cooperate fully with France on nuclear matters when the force de frappe became an irrevocable fact, however negligible or even dangerous as a deterrent, which served to underwrite De Gaulle's claim about Anglo-Saxon collusion and again stressed the unfettered dominance of American interests in alliance politics."

De Gaulle's charge of Anglo-Saxon collusion was clearly pictured in the multilateral nuclear force—MLF—concept deal at Nassau, December 21, 1962, which the report declared "was an ill-conceived gimmick aimed at broadening NATO control over nuclear deterrence without surrendering the American veto."

Following De Gaulle's announcement in 1966 of withdrawal from NATO, the task force noted:

> American policy geared itself to mobilizing European opinion in defense of the status quo and against the French attitude . . . In any case the tactless outpouring of anti-De-Gaulle sentiment on the part of highly-placed American diplomats could hardly reverse the situation, and it is difficult to escape the conclusion . . . that U.S. policy prefers to cordon off France from further NATO concerns.

It should be pointed out that France withdrew only military cooperation from NATO.

In addition to the United States-French divisive policies already cited, the task force enumerated the following:

> June 1961: "President Kennedy downgraded his special visit to President De Gaulle by making it only a stopover on his trip to Vienna to meet Chairman Khrushchev."
>
> During 1964: "U.S. refused to license export of computer to France lest it be used to develop nuclear weapons."
>
> March 1966: "U.S. rebuffed French request for consultation on troop and base agreements—aligned other 13 allies against French position."
>
> April 1966: "U.S. rejected the date for withdrawal of troops from France—U.S., United Kingdom and Germany formed a group to deal with France."

The task force concluded its report observing:

> The overriding need is to reform our thinking about the Alliance and give it a meaningful political role.

The late former President Dwight D. Eisenhower was presented a calligraphic scroll on July 21, 1967, by the members of the House Republican Committee on Western Alliances.

Troop reduction and other NATO problems were discussed during the breakfast at the former President's Gettysburg office, the fourth such conference with the general since 1963.

A far-reaching program for revitalizing NATO, issued August 14, 1967, by the House GOP Committee on Western Alliances, and prepared by Representatives SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York and MARVIN ESCH, of Michigan.

The statement entitled "The Rebuilding of NATO," capsuled the situation saying:

> NATO is at a critical crossroads, reflecting the state of inter-allied diplomacy and worldwide political change.

Reported the task force:

> The withdrawal of France from the command structure constitutes the most dramatic and unnerving spectacle of the long NATO crisis . . . (and to off-set the impact) at the instigation of Washington, the so-called McNamara Committee was launched to give some Europeans a closed-door education in American nuclear strategy.

Other observations were made.

Despite urgency for "profound reexamination the 'Atlantic Debate', is centered exclusively in the Congress and among troubled private observers."

The present administration appears fogged out to "the seriousness of the NATO problem and allied relations" and bogged down in "entrenched attitudes" and unable to lift itself from the quicksands of "familiar cliches."

Viewed as a first and essential step is "a thorough appraisal of the NATO situation—by the U.S. Government—toward developing a more realistic and meaningful policy toward NATO and Western Europe. At the same time, the European states should be encouraged to come forward, collectively, with proposals for improving allied diplomacy and for recasting NATO in a manner that meets their interests and concerns."

The recommended reexamination and reappraisal of NATO by both the United States and its allies should provide multilateral decisions in these divisive questions.

To determine if NATO, militarily organized, provides for present and future security; to determine if NATO and its military policy are a roadblock in central Europe security, German reunification, and other political objectives; to determine the need, if any, for revision or redrafting of any articles of the treaty; to determine Europe's role in the burden and responsibility for nuclear deterrence; to determine the advisability for expansion of the Council's responsibility from a purely military role to areas of common interest such as East-West relations, aid to underdeveloped nations, and the international monetary question; to determine the NATO image as seen by Western Europe, and ascertain possible strengthening of the Organization if necessary.

To revitalize NATO and make it into an organization for true interallied accommodation and decision, the committee report, pinpointing a basic defect in the structure, advised "correction of the psychology and reality of imbalance, brought about by American power and predominance."

The committee recommendation for establishment of a "strategy council" included the following observations:

> The proposed strategy council must have the benefit of expert staff, and European members must have access to American nuclear planning information. This does not require that the United States relinquish control over strategic armaments and their employment. Rather it means rearing a European awareness and sophistication sufficient to earn the right to participate in the evolution of deterrent doctrine for the Atlantic area, and hence the capacity to judge and propose as an intellectual peer.
>
> For instance, the European states should weigh the suitability of a cooperatively-owned nuclear capability on the continent, assigned to NATO.

In explanation of its position, the report explained:

> The object is not merely to make Europeans conversant in nuclear affairs and keep them abreast of changing American doctrine . . . (but also) to bridge the technological gap and bring about genuine European participation in matters of strategy and nuclear defense . . .
>
> It is time to openly encourage our allies to formulate, in reply to their own conceived interests, a workable format for continuing close Atlantic military cooperation.

To further rectify the imbalance of American predominance and power, the committee advocated:

> The NATO Council or any other agreed-to-grouping, be utilized on a continuing basis for diplomatic consultation among the allies. This forum should emerge as the principal instrument for allied political decisioning, to resolve Alliance problems, determine strategy as recommended by the proposed strategy council, consult on crises erupting within our outside NATO territory, harmonize policy on matters of mutual concern such as East-West relations, and exchange and review intelligence on a daily basis.

These heavy and diverse responsibilities for the Council, as a factor in revitalizing NATO, depend mainly upon the attitude of the United States, according to the committee report which warned:

> Clashes will occur and differences of opinion will become more obvious. It means that we must be prepared to consider the advice of allies on matters which perhaps affect us more than them . . . our willingness to use fully Alliance channels has been due, in part, to our apprehension about splitting the Alliance and implanting the impression of discord.
>
> An honest endeavor to utilize Alliance organs fully, to make NATO a relevant instrument for accommodation and decision, carries its own risks. The greater gamble, however, is to allow NATO a steadily, diminishing influence.

The report suggests that within the framework of duties assigned to the NATO Council or any other agreed-to-grouping, a newly refurbished political arm, "an attempt be made to reach positive agreements on the broad questions of East-West trade, and relations with Eastern Europe generally, on present and future disarmament moves, on the reunification of Germany, on aid to the underdeveloped countries, worldwide security problems.

"The proposed group should also be equipped to bring allied thinking to bear on crises which erupt anywhere in the world."

To quiet American criticism of the heavier burden borne by the U.S. taxpayer in costs of U.S. troops assigned to NATO, and other European defense expenses, both a factor in the unfavorable balance-of-payments controversy, the committee suggested renegotiation.

To still some U.S. Government voices, other voices both in and out of Congress, the committee stated,

> Targets, quotas, and force-levels which are presently and patiently ignored should be revised through Alliance negotiation in response to conceived security needs and domestic concerns.

Referring to previous such recommendations, the committee urged, that, commensurate with its official duties, the North Atlantic Assembly be official status as a part of the NATO organization.

The tight checkrein held by the President of the United States in appointment of SACEUR should be loosened, was a recommendation of the committee in these words:

> Consideration should be given to a more equitable distribution of NATO command positions, including the appointment of a European officer as SACEUR and a revision of existing practice under which SACEUR is . . . assigned and discharged by the U.S. President.

The report also declared that machinery should be set up for collection and review on a continuing basis of worldwide intelligence material.

The ninth and final step leading to resurrection of the NATO that once existed, was clarification of U.S. nuclear policy toward the alliance. The committee report stated:

> As the Europeans emerge from their abdicated strategic role, a clarification of our nuclear course of action must, of course, flow automatically.
>
> The problem of nuclear sharing has been pictured . . . (as a) tangible grant of nuclear control to our allies, who presumably desire a finger on the trigger . . . (as) the sole answer to their insecurity and impotence . . . (but) it does not fully represent the true situation.

As analyzed in the committee report:

> Europeans' desire to acquire nuclear weapons on their own or gain some authority over the U.S. deterrent . . . is symptomatic of deeper frustrations . . . Many Europeans . . . who speak harshly about the U.S. hegemony, would rather leave the crucial decisions up to Washington.

This frustration, observed the committee, is due to, "misgiving about American strategic doctrine and doubts about the American guarantee which have been a far more persuasive factor in convincing Europeans that a 'hardware' solution may be necessary.

"Our recommendation to develop a genuine Europe function in the determination of Atlantic defense is certainly urgent in redressing the European sense of weakness and removing uncertainties."

Warning against U.S. hasty replies to NATO's serious problems and urging the necessity for solidification of official European opinion, the committee declared:

> We believe that our European allies should share the initiative in jointly resolving the question of a European nuclear role in NATO which . . . must evolve from the thorough and basic re-evaluation of Alliance affairs . . . (furthermore) American cooperation toward the erection of an essentially European-owned nuclear deterrent, linked in some manner to NATO, should come only after official opinion abroad has coalesced.

The essential factor, as determined by the report, "is that the European NATO states should be encouraged to formulate a unified position on the question of obtaining a European nuclear force to which the United States, presumably, would render support and assistance."

With reference to the review of NATO objectives and enlarged role for Europe in strategy determination, the committee report took the position that:

> A nuclear non-proliferation treaty should not foreclose a European option to develop, on the basis of existing national capabilities, a European deterrent force which is responsive to their conceived interests . . .

In evaluating the overall situation, the committee stated:

> While the urgency of the military threat from Moscow may have receded, a closely aligned program for defense of the Atlantic area remains essential.

It warned that adjustment to the shift in political interests and changing patterns of thought does not negate the need for preserving sound military structure against the Communist wrecking crew and cautioned:

> The Soviet effort of today is geared to loosening French ties to NATO, to nourishing area of allied discord, and ultimately to neutralizing the military potency of the Alliance, as members tend to go their separate ways . . .
>
> In failing to grasp the significance of contemporary pressures and events, in allowing NATO to flounder and grow less vital to the member states, the United States risks playing directly into the hands of Moscow and its long-range strategy of disabling the Atlantic Alliance.

Pinpointing the basic element in deterioration of the alliance as "lack of political will", the committee report asserted:

> The real challenge in preserving NATO is to reclaim for it a positive role in shaping political decisioning among the allies, including questions of nuclear strategy.
>
> With the comprehensive re-assessment proposed . . . (and) institutional changes

> geared to updating Europe's role in Alliance affairs, NATO can regain an essential relevance in dealing with needs and interests of its membership.

Research work for these statements was handled ably by Bill Vanden Toorn.

The August 24, 1967 press release by the task force announced a 2-hour conference that day with Secretary of State Rusk on detailed recommendations for revitalization of NATO made by the committee on August 14.

Members present were WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida; MARVIN L. ESCH, of Michigan; SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York; SHERMAN P. LLOYD, of Utah; WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, of California; ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota; WILLIAM V. ROTH, of Delaware; CHARLES W. WHALEN, of Ohio; LARRY WINN, JR., of Kansas, and myself.

EISENHOWER COMMENTS ON NATO

The essence of the important statements made by General Eisenhower at his Gettysburg office on the July 21, 1967, meeting with the House GOP Committee on Western Alliances were released in a statement on August 25 by the committee.

General Eisenhower opposed reduction of U.S. troop strength in Germany at this time due to current NATO difficulties.

Terming the present six U.S. troop divisions in Europe inadequate against Soviet aggression, he said they served only as a token of U.S. commitment to NATO.

The former President concurred in the recent statement of the House GOP Committee on Western Alliances in its recommendations of steps for new life and dedication through revitalization of NATO with higher and broader levels of cooperation thereby engendering a new spirit in NATO. He warned that the alternative would be a return of European states to purely national interests.

The general felt that establishment of new force levels provided for in NATO revitalization recommendations should enable reduction of U.S. force levels in Germany to two divisions.

As the first SACEUR, General Eisenhower had hoped NATO would expand beyond military affairs.

In discussing East-West trade, he opposed any all-inclusive policy and declared that only when advantageous to the United States should we trade with Communist countries.

ABM SYSTEM MAY RUPTURE NATO

Deployment of the "thin" ABM system could fatally rupture NATO was the warning issued on November 6, 1967, by the committee.

Pointing to the divisive policy problems in NATO created by the national nuclear ballistic missiles in the late 1950's, the committee hoisted the danger signals of purely defensive nuclear weapons. It predicted a widening of the gap between the two superpowers and the nations of the world. And that inevitably our European allies will develop positions of defensive neutrality—fragmented middle-sized states—vulnerable to Soviet power squeezes which has been a long-standing goal of Soviet foreign policy.

The committee emphasized:

> To prevent this calamity the United States must—without further delay—explore fully with her NATO allies the possibility of developing a NATO ABM system . . . serving the entire community on the basis of cooperative funding and construction. . . .

Echoing previous criticism of U.S. foreign policy—failure to consult our NATO allies—brought this observation:

> Despite the reported discussion by the NATO nuclear Planning Council, . . . there is no evidence that the basic concept (of an ABM system) has been considered by the North Atlantic Council. . . . Prominent foreign policy analysts have reported that our allies were merely "informed" not "consulted" about the ABM decision. . . .

With a leeway of a 5-year span needed for deployment of the "thin" ABM system in the United States, it provides an opportunity for consultation with our allies, noted the committee, then made these pertinent remarks:

> We must share more responsibilities so that western unity in international politics may be strengthened. It is neither necessary nor desirable that the U.S. counter the Soviet threat alone. Our unwillingness to share nuclear responsibility with our allies in the past has led to the present rift in NATO. We should not seal NATO's demise by rushing into the development of an ABM system alone.
>
> Anti-missile defenses can be either a stumbling stone or a stepping stone toward western solidarity . . .

Announcement of the ABM deployment duplicated a previous gaffe of the administration and a major flaw in its foreign policy according to the committee. Centering its fire on President Johnson, the report continued:

> The decision to proceed with an ABM system . . . was certainly momentous enough to have warranted full coordination with our allies and use of the full prestige of the President's office to explain it to the American public and our NATO allies . . . (instead of) relegating the task of Secretary McNamara as the subject of a speech before a press services gathering of editors and publishers in San Francisco . . .

Another critical observation was:

> The Secretary's speech was . . . assurance to the Soviet Union that we intend it no harm, and a continuation of his plea for a non-proliferation treaty unpopular with many of our European allies.

The committee report generated nationwide news coverage and was the second time in 1967 that statements made by the House GOP Committee on Western Alliances made the front page of the New York Times. The November 13 issue of the Congressional Newsletter headlined the news story, "ABM System for United States Should Not Preclude a NATO ABM System."

With recessing of the first session of the 90th Congress, the House Republican Committee on Western Alliances inventoried the year's work.

There had been 15 conferences. In addition there had been held a number of working luncheons where experts and knowledgeable persons had spoken, two of whom were: Mr. William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, who discussed international monetary problems; Mr. Clarence K. Streit, correspondent for the New York Times during the last days of the League of Nations, author of several books advocating federation of major free world nations, editor of Freedom and Union, who spoke on two occasions concerning the international monetary crisis.

Through the courtesy of the Committee on Research and Planning of the Republican Conference of the U.S. House of Representatives the committee published a booklet appraising the failure of the Johnson administration to grasp the evidence of NATO decay, and recommending a program to rebuild the alliance. The booklet entitled, "Will NATO Survive 1969?", a condensed analysis of which appears in this history, contained three position papers issued by the House Republican Committee on Western Alliances. They were: "NATO In a Changing World" released June 13, 1967; "Partnership: The Road Not Taken", released July 5, 1967; "The Rebuilding of NATO," released August 14, 1967.

The supply of booklets was quickly exhausted by requests for a copy from individuals, governmental bodies, organizations, educational institutions.

Committee membership remained intact: Representatives E. ROSS ADAIR, of Indiana; WILLIAM O. COWGER, o" Kentucky; WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida; MARVIN L. ESCH, of Michigan; SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York; SHERMAN P. LLOYD, of Utah; WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, of California; ROGERS C. B. MORTON, of Maryland; ALEXANDER PIRNIE, of New York; ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota; WILLIAM V. ROTH, of Delaware; HERMAN SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania; CHARLES W. WHALEN, of Ohio; LARRY WINN, JR., of Kansas, and myself.

The first meeting of the House Republican Committee on Western Alliances after the opening of the second session of the 90th Congress was a conference February 28, 1968, with the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, U.S. Permanent Representative to NATO. He discussed the final communique of the December 1967 NATO Ministerial Meeting and also clarified statements in his article which had appeared in the November 1967 "NATO Letter."

Indicative of deep concern about the strained United States-French relations was the first statement issued March 1, 1968, by the House Republican task force on Western alliances.

In attempting to prod President Johnson into filling the vacant post of U.S. Ambassador to France, the statement, made these comments:

> France is one of our major allies, occupying a position of great importance to the United States in military, monetary and trade matters. . . .
>
> Recrimination has reached a point where the long-standing friendship of the French and American people is being dangerously eroded.

Due to the strained relations between the two countries and the tottering NATO, the committee urged that the post be filled "by a person eminently qualified by knowledge of France, Europe and the Atlantic community, and skilled as a diplomat for the challenging task of easing tension and building Franco-American good will."

TASK FORCE MEMBERS BRIEFED

At a task force luncheon meeting on March 25, 1968, Sir Michael Wright discussed trade problems and opportunities in the Atlantic community.

Sir Michael, formerly Britain's chief negotiator at Geneva, was chairman of the Atlantic Trade Study set up in 1967 to reappraise basic trade policy and search for an alternative to Britain's failure of entry into the Common Market.

In his discussion, Sir Michael suggested a free trade association without an external tariff. He felt it should have an Atlantic nucleus with the United States, Canada, and Japan as charter members and that the proposed free trade association should maintain an open door policy for inclusion of any country.

Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy, retired, chairman of the Georgetown Center for Strategic Studies, was the guest speaker at a working luncheon on April 3 of the task force.

In his off-the-record talk, the admiral discussed worldwide developments with special emphasis on NATO's problems with the Soviet fleet in the Mediterranean.

The third and final briefing to provide background and to update task force members prior to study of NATO problems and offer suggestions toward solutions was held on June 10, 1968. Speaking at this session was Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupe' who gave his assessment of the political situation in Greece following a recent tour of the country.

BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION

The first statement issued by the 10-member House Republican task force on Western alliances since its reorganization in March was on June 20, 1968. It was a clarion call for a blue ribbon commission on NATO reform.

Detailing the domestic turmoil, financial instability, strikes and student rebellion, political disintegration and breakdown of democratic processes in various European countries; violent crimes and riots in the United States already beset with divisiveness over the Vietnam war, the task force sternly warned:

> The nations of NATO forget their long-and-widely recognized interdependence, and fail to deal effectively with common problems. Local disorder is turning inward the concern of the people and their national governments.

Characterized as a "bitter disappointment" was the Harmel exercise, an inward examination of NATO, oriented toward its self-destruction by indifference of some allies to their own self-defense.

In failing to grasp the painful cactus, the Harmel exercise, widely heralded as a "blueprint to alter the basic nature of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and reform the alliance to face new diplomatic tasks foreseen for the 1970's, the exercise has proven to be almost totally unproductive" reported the task force.

In an indictment of the Harmel exercise's Waterloo, the task force declared:

> It could have led to specific action on Western trading policy toward the East, German reunification, NATO-Warsaw pact-to-pact negotiations, a North Atlantic parliament, and specific exploratory steps to test the thesis of North Atlantic political integration.

The task force's clarion call was for "a new initiative for a stronger structure not merely for defense but also for the advancement of individual freedom."

In pursuit of this objective and despairing of NATO's rejuvenation, the report stressed:

> We propose that the President, in consultation with the Congress, appoint a blue-ribbon commission to help organize an international conference of the NATO nations apart from the existing North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Recommended for study by the proposed commission were:

First:

> The fundamental mission of NATO . . . as to membership and purpose . . . several nations and areas have been suggested for consideration (in expansion of membership). . . .

In detailing the possibilities beyond NATO's military role, the statement suggested "coordination of global foreign policies of its members; technological cooperation in fields such as communication, computerization, space, oceanography; cooperation in monetary systems, aid to underdeveloped nations, and cultural affairs; and the liberalization of trade among the Western nations and coordination of their trade with the Communist nations."

Second. Reiterating the essence of previous suggestions, the report urged "the reform of NATO by giving official status to the North Atlantic Assembly with specific responsibility in alliance affairs, and by establishing a tribunal for the adjudication of disputes which may arise from alliance projects."

Third:

> The reunification of Germany.

Fourth:

> Adjustment and settlement of World War I debts—including the matter of German reparations.

Fifth:

> The reconciliation of France with the Alliance, and full coordination of its strategic military forces with those of NATO.

Differences to be encountered and thorough study required in carrying out the proposals were listed:

First:

> Evaluation of . . . (Communist) threats . . . to individual freedom throughout the world and of methods to counter these threats . . . (which would include) the struggle in Vietnam.

Second:

> Evaluation of past and future development of nuclear weapons, existing and proposed treaties concerning nuclear weapons, the proposed development of antiballistic missile systems, and the future implications of these.

Third:

> Study of overlap and conflict of purpose of the numerous institutions already established to coordinate the defense, economies and foreign relations of the free nations . . .

Such institutions of conflict would include NATO and the Western European Union; Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—and article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty; the Council of Europe—which includes almost all the nations of the Common Market—and the European free trade area.

Fourth:

> Studies of the attitudes of the leaders and the public of these nations toward long-and-widely advocated reform of international political structure . . .

The clarion call for a blue ribbon commission reiterated:

> NATO must be more than a military alliance—a "tin Lizzie" vehicle that cannot serve in a supersonic age.

The report warned:

> Domestic fiscal problems are bringing insistent demands for U.S. troop reduction. The effect of such reduction would not be adverse if accompanied by basic reform of NATO's purpose and functions.
>
> In these circumstances, a passive or do-nothing attitude on the part of the U.S. would be tragic.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET SECRET TALKS

Cremation of hopes for lessening of the tightly drawn chains now thrown about Czechoslovakia and its warning to any other country so inclined within the Soviet orbit—is the result of the Johnson administration's recent actions.

Five members of the House Republican task force on Western alliances and its chairman, were joined by 16 other Republican House Members in a statement issued September 17, 1968, labeled "Perils of Secret Discussions by the President With Top Soviet Leadership on Arms Control at This Time."

It has been less than a month since the U.S.S.R. invaded Czechoslovakia which brought cries of moral indignation and worldwide repercussion. But the clamor did not penetrate the walls at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D.C., where President Johnson calmly persisted in seeking a conference with top Russian leadership to begin discussion on arms control.

Assessing the political overtones of President Johnson's pressure for such private vis-a-vis talks with the Soviets, the 22 House Republicans hoisted the danger signals of such U.S. perfidy:

> For the President to go to Moscow to begin secret discussions on matters affecting European security as long as Soviet and Warsaw Pact troops remain in Czechoslovakia would mean two things: (1) U.S. acceptance of the Soviet occupation; (2) political recognition by the U.S. of the concept of an East European sphere of Soviet influence.

Pointing to the inconsistency of U.S. pronouncements and actions, the report stressed:

> To pursue such discussions at a time when the Soviets are violating international law and attempting to shift the balance of forces in Europe in their own favor would weaken beyond repair the Atlantic Alliance, hasten the development of independent nuclear deterrents outside the Alliance for some countries and strengthen the forces for neutralization in others . . .

The House group counseled:

> What the President should do—and do quickly—is make clear to the Russians that a policy of detente with the U.S. is absolutely inconsistent with the expansionist policy un-

der which the Soviets seek to exacerbate all instabilities and tensions they encounter in Europe, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia.

Lifting fog following the Czech crisis revealed to an uneasy world and especially to a fragmented NATO Alliance six basic truths as pointed out in the report:

First. The United States would sacrifice alliance cohesion to achieve detente with Russia whereas Russia would sacrifice good relations with the United States to maintain cohesion in their alliance—by force if necessary.

Second. The superiority of the Warsaw Pact countries over that of NATO in organization, military force and equipment, and intelligence.

Third. The freedom of Western Europe depends on massive U.S. assistance; the French nuclear system is too weak for continental deterrence.

Fourth. Increasing detente between Czechoslovakia and the free world thereby setting a pattern for other satellite states may have motivated military action by the Soviet Union.

Fifth. Unpredictable Soviet leadership—capable of rash, irrational, and violent acts.

Sixth. Sacrifice of cohesion with our allies by the United States in pursuit of detente with Russia has not been reciprocated or lessened hostility toward America.

The GOP group declared:

> In view of these developments, the President . . . should improve our political position in Western Europe . . . by announcing firmly and positively that he will give immediate and continuing highest priority to strengthening U.S. relations with our NATO allies and will not negotiate with the Russians on arms control as long as Soviet troops remain in Czechoslovakia . . .

The GOP group also stated:

> We believe that such discussions (on arms control) should not occur on a bilateral basis between the U.S. and the Soviet Union but . . . by a European Conference which would include representatives of the NATO and Warsaw Pacts . . . (and) neutral nations.

With reference to the Johnson administration's pursuit of detente with the Soviets, the report stated that—

> Such bilateral dealings on our part have led to suspicion and concern . . . (by) some of our allies and encouraged bilateral dealings with the East . . . by others.

The joint statement reiterated its position with the following:

> The United States should delay the nuclear non-proliferation treaty in the Senate, suspend plans for U.S. talks with the Soviets on arms control, and initiate action on worsening problems in NATO . . .
>
> It deplored the rashness of our policy induced by a timid, misguided and weak Administration.
>
> Regretfully the Soviet Union was not warned in advance that its invasion would set back U.S.-Soviet relations. . . . For the President to fail to act now in taking political action to express our disapproval of Soviet action and our support for the cause of freedom whenever it is under attack is to invite aggression elsewhere.

Joining in signing the statement were task force members: E. Ross ADAIR, Indiana; J. HERBERT BURKE, Florida; WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Florida; SEYMOUR HALPERN, New York; LARRY WINN., JR., Kansas. The 16 House Republicans were E. Y. BERRY, South Dakota; GARRY BROWN, Michigan; DON H. CLAUSEN, California; JAMES C. CLEVELAND, New Hampshire; JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois; Paul A. Fino, New York; JAMES R. GROVER, JR., New York; CRAIG HOSMER, California; Theodore R. Kupferman, New York; CHESTER L. MIZE, Kansas; ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota; JOHN P. SAYLOR, Pennsylvania; WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin; FLETCHER THOMPSON, Georgia; LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS, Pennsylvania; BOB WILSON, California; and myself.

WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ASPINALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN), is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, 26 years ago April 19 the sons of David rose up against the murderous Goliath of Nazism in the Warsaw ghetto. From the beginning of the revolt, the Jewish freedom fighters were doomed to death—death, but certainly not defeat. Their cause was one—simply to die a free people at the highest possible cost to the Nazis. This they did with such bravery and faith that I am proud and honored to be a member of the Jewish faith. It was indeed a superhuman effort to keep the Nazis at bay for 42 days and nights considering that all of Poland lasted 26 days in 1939.

Mr. Speaker, one should remember that the amount of arms that the freedom fighters had were sparse indeed: a gun, a Molotov cocktail, even a bare fist. These were their weapons. However, their most powerful weapon was their faith. It sustained them as they saw their children die under the treads of Nazi tanks, or when they were gassed or burned to death in the bunkers. Yes, the world forgets too soon—not only about our brothers in the ghetto, but also those six million who perished in the death camps.

As Emmanuel Ringelbaum, the author of the Ghetto Archives stated:

> Even in times of savagery the most brutish barbarians were not devoid of a human spark, for they did usually spare the children. This cannot be said of the Hitlerite beast who is out to devour the most precious ones, the ones who arouse the greatest compassion—innocent children.

During the uprising, the men and women of the ghetto asked for aid from their Polish neighbors and the underground. This was not given to them. Mr. Speaker, I must say that this was not out of the ordinary, for the Jews in Poland have and still are being persecuted to a degree which surpasses all standards of moral and simple human decency. Polish soil throughout the centuries has been literally soaked through with Jewish blood.

Mr. Speaker, there comes to my mind a few lines from Shakespeare which express my sentiment to a considerable degree:

> Oh pardon me thou bleeding piece of earth that we are so meek and gentle with these butchers.

The civilized world is indeed too "meek and gentle" with such murderers.

Mr. Speaker, the Jewish people shall never forget those who were killed in the blazing ghetto or the extermination camps. One does not really die if he lives in the minds of others. On the eve of the 19th, many of my fellow brothers and sisters shall lie awake seeing in their minds' eyes the faces of their loved ones as they saw them for the last time before being gassed or shot to death. These thoughts shall give way to tears and sorrow, for time heals the wound but does not erase the scar of pain.

Mr. Speaker, as a Jew I do not ask for pity for my people. I do not even ask for compassion, for in today's world the Dow Jones average is considered much more important than compassion. Human compassion has no economic value. I merely ask for justice, simple justice, and it is with this in mind that I dedicate my words, my hopes to my brothers who perished in the Warsaw ghetto.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AFTER 30 YEARS OF SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas, (Mr. GONZALEZ), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing legislation to give our faithful civil service employee the option of retiring after 30 years of service with full annuity, regardless of age.

Under present retirement law, which Congress liberalized in 1966, a civil servant can retire with the full annuity that the average of his highest consecutive 5 years of salary will entitle him to, if he is 55 years of age with 30 years of service, or 60 years old with 30 years of service, or 62 years old with 5 years of service. Of course, retirement for reason of disability, involuntary separation, or reduction in force have special conditions.

However, there are many civil service employees who achieve 30 years of Federal service, including creditable military duty, several years before their 55th birthday. I believe that these employees should be able to retire on full annuity if they so elect. My bill would be simple recognition of their long and faithful service—recognition of their well-earned annuity.

I believe it is false economy not to allow those 30-year Federal employees to leave the workforce if they are looking forward to retirement. Our national workforce is probably the most mobile and highly trained in the world. Few other nations so well reward merit, or have so few encumbrances to job advancement. This is one of the secrets of our economic strength. There must be a continual, unrestricted influx of young persons into the labor force, in order to maintain the mobility, openness and vigor of our economy. This is nowhere more true than in the Federal civil service. I believe it is bad economics to restrict employees with over 30 years of service from leaving Federal employment when they desire, especially at this time in our history when we have so many unemployed young people requiring decent jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and trust that Congress will act with all due dispatch and deliberation on this legislation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Brock (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Pucinski), and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Farbstein, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. Gonzalez, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Farbstein, for 20 minutes, on April 21.

Mr. Conyers, for 1 hour, on April 22.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Schwengel) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Riegle in two instances.

Mr. Conte.

Mr. McKneally.

Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Horton.

Mr. Schwengel in two instances.

Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.

Mr. Reid of New York.

Mr. Dellenback in two instances.

Mr. Keith.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Pucinski) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Eilberg in two instances.

Mr. Dent in two instances.

Mr. Matsunaga.

Mr. Friedel in two instances.

Mr. Scheuer in two instances.

Mr. Tunney.

Mr. Bolling.

Mr. Rooney of New York.

Mr. Galifianakis.

Mr. Rarick in three instances.

Mr. Gonzalez in three instances.

Mr. Gallagher in two instances.

Mr. Ryan in two instances.

Mr. Fascell in two instances.

Mr. Dulski in three instances.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. Koch in three instances.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 21, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC

689. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need for improvement in procuring and stockpiling jewel bearings, Office of Emergency Preparedness, Department of Defense, Department of Commerce, General Services Administration, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OLSEN: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 8434. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 10236. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 10237. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.R. 10238. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the removal of the Francis Asbury statue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Clay, Mr. Culver, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Farbstein, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Green of Pennsylvania, Mr. Kastenmeier, Mr. Koch, Mr. Lowenstein, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Podell, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Ryan, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Scheuer, and Mr. Tiernan):

H.R. 10239. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to terminate the quota for South Africa; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 10240. A bill to amend section 204(a) of the Coinage Act of 1965 in order to authorize minting of all new quarter dollar pieces with a likeness of the late President Dwight David Eisenhower on one side; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 10241. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1905, relating to the dumping of certain materials into the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 10242. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 10243. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide work clothing for postal field service employees engaged in vehicle repair or maintenance, and for other purposes; to the Committe on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOREMAN:

H.R. 10244. A bill to repeal chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code (relating to firearms), to reenact the Federal Firearms Act, and to restore chapter 53 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as in effect before its amendment by the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 10245. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to permit retirement of employees with 30 years of service on full annuities without regard to age; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 10246. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Buffalo National River in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 10247. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to grant court leave to employees of the United States and the District of Columbia when called as witnesses in certain judicial proceedings on behalf of State and local governments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 10248. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in relation to expenses for care of certain dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 10249. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 10250. A bill to provide for nationally uniform minimum standards and eligibility requirements for public assistance, to provide for a supplemental family allowance program, and to provide that the cost of public assistance under the Social Security Act shall be fully borne by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 10251. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 10252. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 10253. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 10254. A bill to improve and increase postsecondary educational opportunities throughout the Nation by providing assistance to the States for the development and construction of comprehensive community colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10255. A bill to extend the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission to cooperatives and municipalities which own or operate generating or transmission facilities used in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10256. A bill to amend the Sherman Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) to provide that exclusive territorial franchises, under limited circumstances, shall not be deemed a restraint of trade or commerce or a monopoly or attempt to monopolize, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10257. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work, and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10258. A bill to establish a procedure whereby all candidates for elective Federal office may receive financial assistance from the Treasury to assist in defraying their election campaign expenses, and to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. Dent, Mr. Staggers, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Wampler, Mr. Kee, Mr. Carter, Mr. Slack, Mr. Mollohan, Mr. Bray, Mr. Clark, Mr. Flood, Mr. Pollock, Mr. Corbett, Mr. Gray, Mr. Price of Illinois, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Olsen, Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Yatron):

H.R. 10259. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to States to enable them to pay compensation to certain disabled individuals who, as a result of their employment in the coal mining industry, suffer from pneumoconiosis and who are not entitled to compensation under any workmen's compensation law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 10260. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for removal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 10261. A bill to repeal the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON.

H.R. 10262. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head-of-household benefits to unremarried widows and widowers, and individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separatd or divorced for 3 years or more, who maintain their own households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 10263. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10264. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to develop training in family medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 10265. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 10266. A bill to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to provide relocation payments for persons displaced from their places of residence or business as a result of construction financed thereunder; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 10267. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to States to enable them to pay compensation to certain disabled individuals who, as a result of their employment in the coal mining industry, suffer from pneumoconiosis; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 10268. A bill to nullify the interim procedures adopted by the Federal Communications Commission on December 12, 1968, halting major television market proceedings involving community antenna television systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10269. A bill to prohibit deceptive packaging or display of nondairy products resembling milk; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

My Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 10270. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may become entitled to widow's or widower's insurance benefits (subject to the existing actuarial reductions) at age 50 whether or not disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 10271. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10272. A bill to provide that each State which has a toll road included in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways either be given additional equivalent mileage on the Interstate System or be paid the Federal share of the construction costs of the toll road; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 10273. A bill to establish the Federal Medical Evaluations Board to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to the regulation of biological products, medical devices, and drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 10274. A bill to provide for the investigative detention and search of persons suspected of involvement in, or knowledge of, Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10275. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the penalty provision applicable to a Federal felony committed with a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10276. A bill to amend chapter 207 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize conditional pretrial release or pretrial detention of certain persons who have been charged with noncapital offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMS (for himself, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Gude, Mr. Horton, and Mr. Kyros):

H.J. Res. 658. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 659. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.J. Res. 660. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 661. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period May 11 through May 17, 1969, as "Help Your Police Fight Crime Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. Baring, Mr. Blackburn, Mr. Bush, Mr. Carter, Mr. Collier, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Erlenborn, Mr. Gude, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Horton, Mr. Kuykendall, Mr. Lujan, Mr. Morse, Mr. Sikes, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Stuckey, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Williams, Mr. Winn, and Mr. Wylie):

H.J. Res. 662. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the protection that should be provided ships and planes of the Armed Forces of the United States sent on intelligence-gathering missions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Con. Res. 205. Concurrent resolution to rescind certain actions of the Federal Communications Commission relating to community antenna television systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. Con. Res. 206. Concurrent resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of Federal regulation of community antenna television systems; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 207. Concurrent resolution, Gen. Omar N. Bradley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H. Res. 367. Resolution to establish a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate student disorders and propose appropriate legislation to deal with such disorders; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLOOD (for himself and Mr. Derwinski):

H. Res. 368. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of Captive Nation Week proclamations and pertinent material; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

120. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Federal indemnity for tuberculosis- or brucellosis-reacting cattle; to the Committee on Agriculture.

121. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to legislation to permit the States to consider revenues derived from title I of Public Law 81–874 as part of the local contribution in development of basic foundation programs for support of public schools in areas affected by Federal activity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

122. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to restricting minors from entering Mexico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 10277. A bill for the relief of Michele Perrone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10278. A bill for the relief of James L. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 10279. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Anagnostopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 10280. A bill to authorize the use of the vessel *Mouette* in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 10281. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Fishberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 10282. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pimpun Husbumrer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LUMBER AND PLYWOOD SUPPLY SHORTAGE

HON. JOHN R. DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, committees in both Houses of Congress have been focusing on the lumber and plywood supply shortage and the effect this shortage will have on the Nation's housing program.

The April 21 issue of U.S. News & World Report provides one analysis of the problem of the lumber industry in the Pacific Northwest. I commend it to my colleagues as a worthwhile explanation of the shortage and price problems that confront us:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 21, 1969]

WHY LUMBER STAYS SCARCE AND PRICES STAY HIGH

PORTLAND, OREG.—Builders and buyers of new homes will find little cheer in the news from this center of the Pacific Northwest's lumber industry.

Lumber enough to ease the high prices that have staggered the homebuilding industry in recent weeks is not to be forthcoming from the forests of Oregon, Washington State, northern California, Idaho and Montana.

That is the industry size-up in this region that supplies more of the nation's construction lumber than any other part of the country. A measure of the nation's over-all lumber shortage is seen in an industry prediction that supplies in 1969 will be about 8 billion board feet short of the nearly 50 billion board feet that are needed to meet housing goals set by Congress.

IN 1 YEAR, A STEEP RISE

The accompanying chart shows how the average price of all types of lumber has been climbing month after month. Basic items, such as plywood and framing lumber, are costing builders up to 70 per cent more than a year ago.

This rising expense is forcing prices on new homes sharply higher. The National Association of Home Builders estimates that lumber prices boosted a $25,000 house by $1,200 in the 13 months between December, 1967, and February, 1969.

Northwest lumber-industry officials say there may be an occasional downturn in prices, such as that in March when standard-grade plywood dropped from $144 per thousand square feet to $110. But they do not expect this lower price to prevail. They say many mills cannot afford to produce for that figure.

The March cut in prices for plywood and some other products is attributed largely to a wait-and-see attitude taken by buyers when Congress started an investigation of soaring lumber costs.

Reports from around the country appear to bear out this view. On April 6, "The Los Angeles Times" quoted a southern California builder as saying he was postponing lumber purchases, hoping prices would go lower. He admitted, however: "It's a gamble."

NEW BOUNCE COMING?

Another southern California builder said: "Prices have reached bottom and they should go back as high as they were within two weeks."

The shortage of lumber has been growing for some time. More and more has been required for construction. Home builders, for example, produced 1,196,000 housing units in 1966, 1,321,000 in 1967, and about 1,550,000 in 1968.

But there's more to the story. Exports of softwood logs—mainly to Japan—have risen sharply. Total volume in 1968 was 2.5 billion board feet, 30 per cent more than in 1967 and 12 times as much as in 1960. These exports now represent nearly 7 per cent of total U.S. production of softwood logs and veneer logs.

Output of U.S. forests has not been keeping pace with rising domestic use and exports. Then, this past winter, a series of developments brought the lumber shortage to a near-crisis situation and sent prices through the roof.

SNOWBOUND LUMBERJACKS

The worst winter for logging in 50 years hit the Pacific Northwest. Lower elevations in Oregon, for example, got 6 feet of snow instead of the normal 6 inches or so. It was impossible to get enough logs to the sawmills. At Eagle Rock, Oreg., Leo Carrignan, a timber-trucking contractor, reported:

"Last year, we worked all winter. This year, we've done little since the first of December."

At the end of March, only three of Mr. Carrignan's 23 trucking units were at work.

The hard winter worsened the normal shortage of railroad cars needed to ship lumber east. The problem was compounded by the long dock strike on East and Gulf coasts. Large quantities of lumber from British Columbia were tied up on idle ships.

An average increase of 5 per cent in rail-freight charges, effective last November, added an estimated $1.50 per thousand board feet to lumber prices in the Eastern U.S.

Still another factor in the lumber shortage has been a threatened strike at sawmills in June, prompting some buyers to add to inventories.

Out of all this came staggering increases in price. By early in March, Boston home builders were paying $175 per thousand board feet for hemlock that had sold for $100 to $105 a year earlier.

In Detroit, Douglas fir used mainly for floor joists was priced at around $170 per thousand board feet, up $43 in one year.

A superintendent of Curtis Building Company in Detroit was quoted by the Associated Press as saying:

"A house we built 3½ years ago—a four-bedroom colonial—used to run about $30,000 to $31,000. Now the same house on the same lot costs $39,000."

Not all of this increase, of course, is due to higher lumber prices. The lot costs more, and, according to the Detroit report, there has been a 2 to 3 per cent rise in the cost of brick and concrete, 3 percent for floor tile, 5 per cent for copper, and higher costs for labor and financing of the mortgage.

The Government in Washington is moving to increase output of lumber from national forests. President Nixon, on March 19, ordered an increased harvest of 1.1 billion board feet from federal forests over a period of 15 months. The President also directed the Defense Department to cut back lumber buying.

Restrictions on the export of saw logs from national forests, voted by Congress in 1968, are being enforced.

At best, say industry men in the Northwest, these moves can bring only slight relief to timber shortages.

NEEDED: A BIGGER SOURCE

In the long term, the large increases of timber that are needed to meet the fast-growing demand for lumber in the U.S. are going to have to come from the national forests. On that point there is broad agreement among forestry experts in Government and in private industry.

On March 21, Edward P. Cliff, Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, told the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency that private forests have been supplying about 60 per cent of the U.S. softwood-timber harvest. However, said Mr. Cliff, these private holdings are being overcut and supplies from them must decline substantially in the years ahead.

Thus, said Mr. Cliff: "Any sustained increase in log harvests in the West must come from public lands."

Over the long pull, Mr. Cliff told the Subcommittee, annual timber output from the national forests could be increased by about two thirds. These forests now produce some 12 billion board feet a year. A two-thirds increase would mean 8 billion board feet more which would go a long way toward meeting projected U.S. needs.

But, to achieve this increased harvest, Mr. Cliff said the Forest Service would have to be assured of increased funds to build access roads and intensify management of national forests.

Since roads cannot be built overnight, and trees take decades to grow to marketable size, no sharp rise in production of saw logs from the national forests is to be forthcoming soon.

Meanwhile, buyers for sawmills in the Pacific Northwest are bidding record-high prices on timber tracts offered by the U.S. Forest Service at it headquarters in Portland.

A tract of Douglas fir in the Willamette National Forest near Eugene, Oreg., recently brought $165 per thousand board feet—on the stump. A year earlier, a similar tract went for less than half that.

These are premium timber tracts. But the average for all tracts sold by the Portland office more than doubled in one year, going from $41.99 per thousand board feet to $96.14.

NO END TO PRICE HIKES?

With prices like these paid for timber on the stump, there seems to be only one way that the cost of finished lumber can go—up.

Sawmill operators say they cannot pay such high prices and produce standard plywood for $110 per thousand square feet, the level to which this type of lumber dropped in late March.

Said Cliff Pratt of Rollin Lumber Company at Carver, Oreg.:

"You can go broke in a hurry on a $165 to $175 log. On a small purchase, maybe you can absorb that kind of costs, but in a big lot you just can't gamble that high."

At Boring, Oreg., Bud Qualheim, assistant manager of Harris Lumber Company, predicted:

"These prices will probably stop us before long. We used to get the logs the other mills didn't want. Now they want anything they can get."

With the coming of spring after the long, hard winter, more logs are flowing to sawmills in the Pacific Northwest. Critical lumber shortages are expected to ease.

But the long-term outlook is for timber demand to outrun supply, lumber prices to increase, and a new home to cost the American family still more.

W. D. Hagenstein, of Portland, Oreg., who is president of the Society of American Foresters and executive vice president of the Industrial Forestry Association, discussed the need for intensified forest management on the Today show of April 10. As one of the most knowledgeable men in this field in the Nation, his comments deserve careful attention.

He notes that the Federal Government owns 54 percent of the softwood timber in the United States, putting the taxpayers "in the biggest timber-growing enterprise in the world."

Hagenstein suggests that the Government finance its forest management program just as it has the highway program. Said Hagenstein:

> The national forests, which are one of the few areas where the government makes money from its operation, instead of spending it, has an opportunity to re-invest the monies that it receives from the sale of its timber into capital improvements needed to practice better forestry. By that, I mean not only to make the land accessible for harvesting timber, but to enable the Forest Service to do a better job of reforestation, to do a better job of protection against fires, against insects and disease, and, above all, to salvage the old growth timber that is lost at the rate, in the National Forests in the West alone, of ten billion board feet a year.

I offer the full text of this excellent discussion for the RECORD:

W. D. HAGENSTEIN INTERVIEWED ON THE TODAY SHOW

HUGH DOWNS. A Congressional Committee has estimated that the United States is going to need 26 million new or rehabilitated housing units within the next ten years.

But unless something is done to increase the supply of lumber and plywood used in residential construction, we're not going to make it. And the lumber and plywood industries are justifiably concerned.

This morning, one of their representatives is here to discuss possible solutions to this problem. He is W. D. Hagenstein, the President of the Society of American Foresters, and Executive Vice President of the Industrial Forestry Association.

Welcome to Today, Mr. Hagenstein.

HAGENSTEIN. Thank you, very much.

DOWNS. What are the principal causes of this wood shortage? It surprised me to find that there is a shortage, because replanting had been going on, and I thought we were protected along those lines.

HAGENSTEIN. Well, there really isn't a shortage of timber, it's really a shortage of access to reach it.

One of the problems that we've had since the housing goal of 26 million, you mention—which was established by law last fall in Congress—is the fact that we've had a significant increase in demand for lumber and plywood in the last year, over what we had had for the previous few years. As a result of this, of course, we had a significant increase in price.

Congress can't really effectively repeal the law of supply and demand When you have more bidders in the market place than there are supplies, up goes the price on any commodity.

One of our problems is that for the first 350 years in the United States, lumber that has housed the American people—and 80 percent of our homes are made of wood—has come from the private forests. So today, we have the anomaly that the Federal Government, which on one hand has the goal of 26 million housing units to house our people in the next ten years, is itself the principal owner of timber in the United States. For example, 54 percent of all the softwood timber in the United States belongs to the United States Government. You and I, as the citizens, the taxpayer, we're in the biggest timber growing enterprise in the world, us citizens.

But about 50 percent of the land in the national forests, which are mostly in the Western states, are inaccessible because the Government, to this date, has not been able to get enough money out of the Congress to build the roads needed to really practice forestry.

DOWNS. Are we talking, now, about wilderness areas that would be protected otherwise, or this apart from that?

HAGENSTEIN. No, sir, we're talking about the commercial land, the commercial——

DOWNS. Commercial land.

HAGENSTEIN. Forest land, of which there's 96 million acres in the National Forests.

And, of course, if we're going to do the job, we've got to figure out some more effective ways of financing it; of making the capital investment, just as we've done in the highway program, for example.

We've built this wonderful Interstate highway system in the last ten years we've been working at it, by earmarking the receipts from taxes on rubber, vehicles, and fuel, in order to finance this interstate highway system.

The national forests, which are one of the few areas where the government makes money from its operation, instead of spending it, has an opportunity to re-invest the monies that it receives form the sale of its timber into capital improvements needed to practice better forestry.

By that, I mean not only to make the land accessible for harvesting timber, to enable the Forest Service to do a better job of reforestation, to do a better job of protection against fires, against insects and disease, and above all, to salvage the old growth timber that is lost at the rate, in the National Forests in the West alone, of ten billion board feet a year.

DOWNS. Well, it's just lost?

HAGENSTEIN. That's lost because of the annual mortality that can't be reached and salvaged today because of lack of roads.

DOWNS. Ah, that's what leads me to my next question. If they did get the access roads, and with this tremendous demand that we see in the next ten years, would replanting be possible in a way that would prevent our being in danger of running out of wood?

HAGENSTEIN. There's no danger of the United States running out of wood if we practice the kind of forestry that the members of our profession are dedicated to, providing, of course, that the Federal Government, as the most significant individual owner of timberland in the United States, and the great corporations that own a lot of the land, and other owners, will apply their best efforts to really grow timber.

DOWNS. Now my second question is, would this program of getting the roads into these areas, in any way endanger those wilderness areas that people concerned with conservation are anxious to protect?

HAGENSTEIN. No, it wouldn't, because under the law, the wilderness areas are not allowed to have roads built into them. The areas we're talking about are the areas outside the wilderness areas, where by law, the Forest Service and the other Federal Agencies that have some of the other Federal land, are obliged to practice forestry.

For example, in 1897, when the National Forest objectives were set forth, the Congress said that in addition to water, the second purpose was to provide an adequate supply of timber for the use of the necessities of the citizens of the United States. And now, with this housing goal, and the Government being the principal timber owner, it's time for us to get with it.

DOWNS. What about this? The Government is the principal timber owner. Recently, didn't they threaten to dump lumber on the market to force down that price that was going up, that you mentioned?

HAGENSTEIN. I wouldn't call it dumping. The Administration has asked the Congress, between now and the end of this fiscal year on June 30, to make more money available so that they can put an additional billion, one hundred million board feet of timber on the market, to ease the current shortage of lumber and plywood we've had because of all the unusual factors this year: the dock strike, the bad winter in the Pacific Northwest, and the increased demand.

DOWNS. Will there ever come a time, Mr. Hagenstein, where other materials—I know in certain areas stone would be impractical because if you don't have it it would cost a lot to import it—but houses are made of all kinds of things, now, besides wood, even though, I guess, they're predominantly still made of wood.

HAGENSTEIN. You bet.

DOWNS. Would it be possible to stave off any real kind of real danger to the lumber supplies, by examining other materials for building, or is that still in the offing?

HAGENSTEIN. There's research going on all the time, but the interesting thing to me is that in the older countries of the world, in Central Europe, where for centuries the buildings were made from stone, today they're beginning to build houses out of wood because they find it a more practical material.

DOWNS. It is more practical. Is it possible for us then to grow enough wood to keep ourselves supplied in the lumber necessary for our housing?

HAGENSTEIN. I think that in a nation like ours, with more than 500 million acres of commercial forest lands, we have the opportunity, through intensifying our forestry, which we've been doing for 25 years on an ever increasing scale, of growing half again as much timber as we're growing in the United States today. And that will take care of our increasing population for housing, for paper, and all the other essentials that come from wood.

DOWNS. Thank you, very much, sir. It's good to get a glimpse at what this problem is and what can be done about it.

Our guest, W. B. Hagenstein, a representative of the forest industry, with his recommendations for solving the shortage in wood products available for building our homes.

Thanks again.

HAGENSTEIN. Thank you.

Another worthwhile report on the lumber and plywood problem is found in the April edition of American Forests magazine:

THE SOUNDING BOARD

(By Ira J. Mason)

CROSSING AN HISTORIC DIVIDE

So you weren't able to trade up to that bigger house you hoped to build last year? Well, if it's any comfort to you, you aren't alone. Perhaps like many you settled by taking a longer camping trip in your favorite national or state park of Forest Service wilderness. If you encountered an area that was crowded you probably deplored the fact that there aren't more of these areas for growing swarms of campers. If you saw a clear-cut area where the timber stood the year before, you may have deplored that too. What many campers and tourists don't realize is that there is a relationship between timber withdrawals for parks and recreation areas and the fact your builder couldn't obtain the wood he required to build your house. The truth is there's a timber pinch in this country and consumers are just beginning to feel it. We are about to cross an historic divide and there will be far-reaching repercussions. Here's how it works.

HOUSING STARTS

In 1968 there were approximately 1.6 million housing starts, just slightly less than the level attained in 1963, but about twenty per cent more than in 1967. Increased home construction in 1968 resulted in a tight supply of lumber and plywood. Prices soared. Until last year, it had been possible to find enough timber to provide for current domestic needs for wood products without paying premiums to overcome scarcities. Even though some mills had timber supply problems, the total supply of lumber and plywood has been adequate if not ample for domestic needs. When lumber supplies are ample to meet overall national needs, price is the primary restraint on lumber production. Stumpage supply problems for many mills in the Pacific Coast and Inland Empire States result in high production costs for them. When lumber production gets ahead of demand and prices begin to drop, these mills slacken production until demand catches up with supply and prices firm.

DEMAND EXCEEDS SUPPLY

But 1968 was the year when lumber and plywood demand was always ahead of supply. It was a year with constant price incentives for manufacturers to increase production. The reason production never caught up with demand is that additional timber available for immediate cutting could not be found. Hence 1968 was a year in which we found out how much lumber and plywood can be had when the only significant restraint on production is the timber volume available for immediate cutting. About fifteen percent of the lumber used in the United States comes from Canada, mostly from British Columbia. The price incentives to increase production during 1968 were equally applicable to Canadian as to United States manufacturers. In 1968, lumber imports from Canada increased about fifteen percent to 5.5 billion board feet. Present lumber prices take into account the response Canadian lumber producers could make to 1968 lumber price incentives. Except for totally undeveloped areas in the northern part of the Peace River drainage which will require a long-range program to make commercially available, Canada has restrains much similar to ours in expanding the supply of timber available for immediate cutting. In 1968 lumber and plywood consumption was about ten percent more than in 1967, but plywood prices rose by almost fifty percent. Lumber price increases varied by species with an overall average of around forty percent. Lumber and plywood prices have jumped to new record levels, and are still heading upward with no indication as yet that they are topping out. Lumber consumption is only slightly higher than the levels in the three years 1964–66. Domestic lumber production in 1968 was slightly lower than that attained in that three-year period. Softwood plywood production and consumption has been increasing steadily every since the close of World War II. A ten percent year-to-year increase in its production is not unusual.

SOARING STUMPAGE PRICES

Prices for standing timber (stumpage) soared as much as lumber prices in 1968. Compared to 1967, average prices for Douglas-fir, ponderosa pine and western hemlock in national forest sales in the third quarter of 1968 increased by 44 to 57 percent. These stumpage price increases clearly show that scarcity of timber available for immediate cutting is the basic cause of the tight lumber supply in 1968. This stumpage price record also shows that a major share of lumber price increases is being passed from manufacturers to timber growers. This violent price reaction to rather modest increases in consumption in 1968 indicates there is a basic change in supply-demand relationships. It means that we have crossed the divide between ample and tight supplies of softwood sawtimber to meet overall domestice needs for lumber and plywood. Since the rate of home construction in 1968 is still far below the average needed to attain 2.6 million units in the next ten years, which is the goal established in the National Housing Act of 1968, it is evident that domestic needs for lumber and plywood are going to increase greatly. This expanding demand means that from here on out there must be concern over the annual supply of timber available for cutting.

FOREST SERVICE INVENTORY

The Forest Service estimated total inventory of softwood sawtimber in the United States as of January 1, 1963 to be 2,058 billion board feet. The net effect of growth and drain since then is generally conceded to be minor. Timber requirements for production of softwood lumber and plywood in 1968 were about 36 billion board feet. In addition 2.2 billion board feet of logs were exported to Japan. The total for 1968, including log exports, is less than two percent of the softwood sawtimber inventory. The timber supply problem is real and pressing, but it is not a timber scarcity problem. Timber requirements to meet domestic needs for lumber and plywood are not excessive in relation to softwood sawtimber inventory. The real problem is how to manage existing timber resources more effectively so that current domestic needs can be met without the payment of premiums for scarcity. Sixty-five percent of softwood sawtimber is in public ownership, predominantly federal, fifteen percent in industrial ownership and the remaining twenty percent in miscellaneous private holdings. The rate of cutting on the public ownership is regulated at a low ratio between cut and inventory. The cut on industrial ownerships is also generally held to planned rates but at much higher ratios between cut and inventory. Hence there is little flexibility in annual cutting rates for about eighty percent of softwood sawtimber. The remaining twenty percent is subject to widely varying management policies. The sharp rise in stumpage prices is a strong incentive for these miscellaneous owners to sell. Mills also have strong incentives to search out and acquire any remaining private timber within hauling range. As a result, the ratio of cut to inventory is generally high in the miscellaneous ownership category. The major need for this ownership category is to improve productivity after cutting rather than efforts to influence rates of cutting. Because almost two-thirds of the softwood sawtimber inventory is on public lands and because the ratio of cut to inventory is lowest for this ownership category, efforts to improve the timber supply situation will center on increasing the share of timber supplied annually from this source. Here are some of the main issues which will shortly be active.

INTENSIVE TIMBER MANAGEMENT

National forests and other Federal commercial timberlands are now being managed at a level which provides little more than protection, annual harvest cutting of about one percent of inventory, and regeneration after cutting. Funds are available to make only a small proportion of the full potential of thinning, salvage, and understory removal sales. Little, if any, individual tree mortality salvage, pre-commercial thinning, advance road construction, and fertilization is being done. The Chief of the Forest Service, Ed Cliff, told Senator Morse's Small Business Subcommittee last November 26, that allowable cutting rates on the national forests could be raised by about two thirds if the Forest Service has assurance of long term funding for roads and intensive management practices. Broadly based and intensive support to establish a policy of intensive timber management for the commercial timberlands in Federal ownership and to get it financed can be expected.

ALLOWABLE CUT DETERMINATION

The Forest Service has been making management plans and determining allowable cuts for the national forests for more than sixty years. During this entire period, the supply of lumber to meet total national needs has been ample, even though the demand for stumpage exceeded supply on most national forests in the Pacific and Inland Empire States. Hence one important background premise of all national forest management planning to date is the assumption of ample supplies to meet current overall national wood needs. With shortage problems presumed to be considerably in the future, an alternative which holds down cutting rates now in order to make it possible to cut at higher rates in the next rotation is the preferred course of action. Since 1968 this is no longer a valid premise. A vigorous demand for review of the premises and objectives under which allowable cut determinations are made, particularly in respect to recognition of rotation ages appropriate for growing timber under intensive management for processing by industrial techniques which can reasonably be expected in the early part of the 21st century, will undoubtedly develop.

LOG EXPORTS

Log exports to Japan increased by more than one third in 1968 to around 2.2 billion board feet. Export of logs from Federal lands is now subject to limitations specified in the "Morse Amendment" to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968. This measure, the official discussions held with the Japanese government, the hearings conducted by Senator Morse's Small Business Subcommittee in early 1968, and other public discussions of the problem are all based on concern over the effects of this export trade on the economy of the Pacific Northwest. Virtually no consideration has yet been given to the drain this log trade is making on resources now needed to provide an adequate supply of lumber and plywood for overall domestic needs. The loss of more than two billion board feet of logs which would otherwise help meet domestic needs now overshadows the issues over effects on the economy of the Pacific Northwest. Obviously a full reconsideration of the impacts of this log export trade and the measures needed to control it must be undertaken promptly.

WITHDRAWALS

Ironically 1968 was also a year of large withdrawals of commercial timberlands from timber use. Except for the Redwood Park these withdrawals had little if any direct effect on the supply of timber available for cutting in 1968, but withdrawals previously made reduced the allowable cuts and timber offerings which might otherwise have been made from Federal lands. The withdrawals made in 1968 will have similar annual effects from now on. Heretofore consideration of the adverse effects of withdrawals of commercial timberlands has been limited to local economy considerations. Hereafter the impacts of retirement of commercial lands from timber production must include the adverse effects of reduction of timber supply to meet domestic needs.

A HISTORIC YEAR

Prior to 1968 forest policy decisions, except during war-time dislocations, were made in an environment of ample current supplies of lumber and plywood to meet domestic needs, and shortages have always been a problem of the future. In 1968 the divide into a short supply situation for lumber and plywood was crossed. This change of environment brings in new people and new forces to bear on forest policy decisions. It brings in new urgencies and new priorities. It requires reconsideration of many positions long considered fixed. It will generate action on many issues in 1969.

SP4C. EDWARD M. KACHMAN KILLED SERVING HIS COUNTRY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, Army Sp4c. Edward M. Kachman, a brave young man from North Braddock, was recently killed serving his country in Vietnam.

I wish to honor his memory and commend his courage and valor, by placing in the RECORD the following article:

DISTRICT GI KILLED IN WAR

Army Spec. 4 Edward M. Kachman, son of Desk Sgt. George T. Kachman of the North Braddock police department, has been killed in action in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced last night.

Spec. Kachman, who was 21 on March 16, was killed April 8—10 days after he had completed six months service in Vietnam. He was also wounded last November and had been hospitalized for a month.

Relatives had no information on how he was killed but in a letter written a week before his death he had said there were 1,500 Viet Cong out in the bushes and his unit was going to hunt them down.

A 1966 graduate of Scott High School, Spec. Kachman was employed at the Westinghouse Electric Corp. in East Pittsburgh until May, 1968, when he was drafted. He is survived by his parents, of 2019 South Ave., North Braddock, and two sisters, Barbara at home, and Mrs. Stephen (Mary Ann) Gardner of Puerto Rico.

AMERICAN YARN SPINNERS ASSOCIATION

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, our former distinguished colleague, the Honorable Basil L. Whitener, of North Carolina, has called to my attention the results of the following study by the American Yarn Spinners Association.

It is a very impressive, though disturbing, picture. I think this study will be of interest to all the Members of this body:

THE SPUN YARN IMPORT STORY, FEBRUARY 1969

INTRODUCTION

The sales yarn industry is a vital, dynamic segment of the domestic textile complex. Yarn produced for sale, as opposed to that produced for internal consumption, represents roughly 25% of the total spun yarn produced domestically.

AYSA represents sales yarn producers operating on the short staple or cotton system of spinning. Out of the total 20.5 million spindles in this system, it is estimated that 4.0 million are primary sales yarn spindles. At any given time there can be a significant number of spindles within the integrated concerns deployed to sales yarn. These firms, particularly weavers, often switch back and forth from net purchasers of yarn to net sellers, as product mix and balance change.

The customers of the sales yarn industry include knitters, weavers, tufters, thread manufacturers, cordage and twine manufacturers and a host of less substantial users. By purchasing a part or all of their yarn requirements, these industries are able to achieve maximum flexibility and responsiveness while at the same time minimizing their own risk and capital requirements. The independent yarn spinner is a highly efficient specialist who is able to provide his customer with the economic advantages of large scale production with a minimum of commitment by the customer himself.

Sales yarn is sold in a highly competitive environment where a fraction of a cent a pound can mean the difference in winning or losing an order. Since yarn is the first marketable manufactured product beyond raw fiber stage, yarn prices are extremely sensitive to fiber prices. Thus, the yarn spinner must not only be an efficient manufacturer and good manager, but also a wise and prudent fiber buyer. Failure in either can mean substantial losses.

COTTON YARNS AND IMPORTS

Regardless of techniques employed, base periods being compared, etc., it is generally conceded that cotton yarn imports have grown more rapidly than any other major segment of cotton textiles. This growth has been quite erratic, and has not necessarily followed overall import trends.

COTTON YARN AND TOTAL COTTON TEXTILE IMPORTS BY CALENDAR YEAR

[Millions of units]

	Cotton yarn imports (pounds)	Cotton yarn imports (SYE's)[1]	Total cotton textile imports (SYE's)[1]
1961	14	64	720
1962	29	132	1,165
1963	23	107	1,101
1964	16	74	1,058
1965	22	101	1,313
1966	91	418	1,824
1967	37	170	1,485
1968	50	229	1,648

[1] SYE's equals square yards equivalent.

COTTON YARN AND TOTAL COTTON TEXTILE IMPORTS BY LTA YEAR

	Cotton yarn imports (pounds)	Cotton yarn imports (SYE's)[1]	Total cotton textile imports (SYE's)[1]
STA base year	29	132	1,111
1st LTA (October 1962 to September 1963)	23	108	1,123
2d LTA (October 1963 to September 1964)	20	90	1,035
3d LTA (October 1964 to September 1965)	15	69	1,232
4th LTA (October 1965 to September 1966)	78	361	1,726
5th LTA (October 1966 to September 1967)	49	227	1,578
6th LTA (October 1967 to September 1968)	51	236	1,614

[1] SYE's equals square yards equivalent.

An analysis of this data reveals that there was little growth in yarn imports in the early 1960's and then fantastic growth in the later years. The object of the LTA was to achieve orderly import growth at a rate of approximately 5% annually. The actual rate has been from three to five times this projected rate, depending on the reference periods used.

Another alarming characteristic of the yarn import picture is the growth in percentage of total cotton textile imports represented by yarn. In the six years through 1965 yarn represented 8.6% of cotton textile imports. In the most recent three years, this percentage has reached 16.5 % and was a staggering 23% in 1966.

Perhaps even more damaging to the domestic industry than direct volume displacement has been the effect of yarn imports on the domestic pricing structure. As previously noted, cotton yarn is a highly competitive, price sensitive product. It only takes limited quantities of yarn offered at lower than prevailing market prices to exert enough pressure on the market to "break" it. It is interesting and tragic to note that in every period of sustained market strength (as measured by upward movement of the price index) yarn imports increase. Once they reach a level sufficient to reverse the price trend, imports also start to decline as prices decline. Unfortunately, price declines spread across the entire spectrum of yarn products, and cannot be effected on a selective basis.

What happened to the LTA control mechanism as it was applied to cotton yarn? It is hard to arrive at any firm conclusion except that it failed, or was allowed to fail. If we use the 1961–63 period as a base, and compare it to the 1966–68 period, yarn imports increased 170% in this equivalent five year span. During this period, the formula of 5% growth would have permitted an increase of 27.5%, or roughly one-sixth that actually achieved. (See Table 1)

Two specific cases illustrate the failure of the administration of the LTA:

1. *Mexico.*—Here, a country with a very low level of imports up through 1965 was allowed to pump in more than 25 million pounds of yarn in 1966, and as a reward for this type performance, now has a negotiated annual yarn quota of roughly 11 million pounds.

2. *Brazil.*—In the five years ending in 1964, this country had exported a total of 2.5 million pounds of yarn into the U.S. In 1966 alone, they were allowed to ship 18 million pounds. Having no bilateral agreement with the U.S., Brazil is now under a unilateral restraining action limiting their yarn exports at a level of approximately 6 million pounds annually.

Very simply, country after country was allowed to hit absurdly high levels of yarn exports before being brought under any control, either bilateral agreements or unilateral restraints.

Six countries in 1968 shipped almost 84% of all the cotton yarn coming into the U.S. (Brazil, Colombia, Egypt, Mexico, Portugal, Spain). It is no accident that most of these countries grow (or have captive sources) practically all of their own cotton. This makes it doubly attractive to export yarn as a source of hard currency. It is also worthy to note that none of these countries are among the principal Far Eastern suppliers of textiles.

Practically all of the bilateral agreements now in existence have "merged" the four yarn categories into one blanket yarn category. Consultation provisions are normally provided for cases of undue concentration into a single category, but the lack of definition has made these provisions impractical to apply in practice. Three of the more significant yarn exporting countries (Colombia, Israel and Spain) still retain the so-called "unlimited swing" provisions that allow shifting of all cotton textile exports into yarn categories if so desired. Thus, a country can explore a number of market possibilities during its agreement year, but always retain the option of using any residual part of their quota for yarn in the last periods of the year.

Another very damaging characteristic of the cotton yarn import problem is the concentration of these imports into specific products and markets. Over any extended time period, 70% of all yarn imports are in the carded singles category. In the domestic market, this category represents some 40% of total production. Taking the case one step further, carded singles yarn imports tend to concentrate even more in the middle and lower-middle count ranges. When carded singles yarn imports reached a level representing 20% of domestic production in early 1968, it can be safely concluded that in these middle and lower middle count ranger, the ration was closer to 40%. Market stability is literally impossible in this environment.

The yarn industry must be just as concerned about the importation of other textile products as it is of yarn. The displacement of our customer's markets will ultimately have the same tragic whiplash on the yarn producers as does the more direct displacement of yarn itself.

The cotton textile market is now generally conceded to be declining, or at best, static.

Cotton sales yarn production has shown these same trends. After several years of growth in the early and middle 1960's, cotton sales yarn production has declined significantly in the last two years.

Domestic cotton sales yarn production

	Million pounds
1961	803
1962	845
1963	831
1964	901
1965	988
1966	1,042
1967	875
1968 (estimated)	850

Assuming that this decline will continue, the built-in growth factors in imports become even more damaging. A larger and larger slice is taken out of a smaller and smaller pie.

Cotton yarn imports in 1968 reached a level of 50 million pounds, a level that incidentally was moderated by the threat and actual occurrence of a shipping strike in December. An analysis of the various bilateral agreements reveals that this level could have been 30% higher without any additional violations of the yarn provisions of the agreements. This assumes that there would be no significant "new starters," and that each country under agreement had fully exercised their options in cotton yarn. The year 1968 was not a good year for the cotton yarn industry, and had prices been at satisfactory levels, there is little doubt that yarn import levels would have been at 65–70 million pounds.

MANMADE FIBER SPUN YARN IMPORTS

Man-made fiber textile imports have grown almost fantastically over the past few years. As a component of this total growth, spun yarn imports made from man-made fibers have not reached the damaging proportions that they have in cotton. Percentage growth has been high but poundage levels are still reasonably low:

	Million pounds
1966	2.2
1967	3.8
1968 (estimate)	5.1

Japan has exported about ⅔ of this poundage.

The reason for the relatively low import levels of spun man-made fiber yarn is simple. The countries who have a primary man-made fiber industry also have the capability to further process the yarn into fabric and apparel. It is obviously to their economic advantage to do so.

To assume that the yarn industry does not feel the impact of man-made fiber imports is a gross mistake, however. For example, imported knit fabric and apparel has shown one of the highest rates of growth of any segment. These products, when made domestically, are produced by manufacturers who traditionally purchase more than 80% of their yarn. Any sales yarn manufacturer who is selling to the sweater trade can bear eloquent testimony as to what has happened to this market, which is now represented by more than 50% imports.

It is difficult to project the trends of spun man-made fiber yarns at this time. The Kennedy Round tariff cuts of 50% on spun yarn will certainly provide an additional incentive for imports. Whether the yarn is imported in the form of apparel, fabric or yarn is really of secondary importance as long as the market is being displaced.

CONCLUSION

The next decade will be a challenging one for the sales yarn industry. Combining new technology, new fibers, new products, new management techniques with basic structural changes that are now occurring will demand the best in management. There is more than ample uncertainty and challenge without the imposition of the threat of a future with more imports.

The yarn industry, along with other segments of textiles, must be given the opportunity to plan its future with some business rational. The people with the biggest stake are the tens of thousands of employees whose jobs and wage levels will be dictated by our government's policy on textile imports. Given a proper environment, these employees can be paid at competitive wage levels and can look to the future with some certainty. Without such government action, the industry faces a gradual dissipation and abandonment.

The United States government must develop a program that will not only control the aggregate flow of textile imports into this market, but that will also distribute the load on a more even basis. The only practical way this can be achieved is through quantitative controls on a category by category basis. Whether these controls be in the form of negotiated voluntary agreements, or in the form of legislated quotas, is almost secondary to the attitude and posture taken by the government in administering these programs.

The authority and mechanism for cotton textile import relief has existed since 1961, yet cotton yarn imports have almost trebled during this period. The textile industry simply cannot take another eight years of "controls" such as this, and still be expected to survive.

TABLE 1.—AVERAGE ANNUAL COTTON YARN EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES

[In thousands of pounds]

	Average, 3 years, 1961–63	Average, 3 years, 1966–68	Percent change
Brazil	30	10,100	
Colombia	1,500	3,400	+127
Egypt	2,000	3,200	+80
Greece	800	3,300	+313
Israel	1,700	2,700	+59
Malta		1,100	
Mexico	1,000	15,100	+1,410
Portugal	12,000	13,500	+13
Spain	1,400	4,300	+207
Subtotal	20,430	56,700	+178
Other	470	2,429	+417
All countries	21,900	59,129	+170

Using the average annual yarn imports for 1961–63 as a base, a 5% annual growth factor would have raised the average level approximately 27½% for the two periods. The *actual* rate of increase was 170%, or almost six times the objective rate.

U.S. GENERAL IMPORTS OF YARN FROM MAJOR COUNTRIES BY CALENDAR YEAR

[In millions of pounds]

Country	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
Brazil	1.3			0.1	1.1	5.5	17.7	7.7	4.5
Colombia		0.6	2.4	1.4	2.1	2.6	3.9	2.3	4.6
Egypt	2.2	.9	3.2	1.9	.2	.1	.3	2.3	2.7
Greece			.9	1.6	.6	.5	4.1	1.3	1.5
Israel	.2	.8	2.2	2.2	1.4	1.2	4.0	1.6	2.2
Malta						.1	1.7	.4	1.1
Mexico	.4	.6	1.7	.7	.6	1.6	25.5	9.8	9.6
Portugal	7.5	9.3	14.5	10.6	7.5	7.0	19.8	7.5	12.6
Spain	2.9	.6	.9	2.7	1.0	2.0	4.5	1.0	7.9
Subtotal	14.5	12.8	25.8	21.2	14.5	20.6	81.5	33.9	46.7
All others	1.0	1.0	2.9	2.0	1.6	1.3	9.3	3.0	3.0
Total	15.5	13.8	28.7	23.2	16.1	21.9	90.8	36.9	49.7
Carded:									
Single	9.5	11.7	20.1	18.3	14.0	18.3	55.9	26.1	33.5
Plied	1.1	.8	1.9	2.2	.8	1.3	9.1	4.2	6.4
Total	10.6	12.5	22.0	20.5	14.8	19.6	65.0	30.3	39.9
Combed:									
Single	4.5	1.2	5.7	2.0	1.1	1.7	21.1	5.7	8.3
Plied	.4	.2	.9	.6	.2	.6	4.7	.8	1.6
Total	4.9	1.3	6.7	2.7	1.3	2.3	25.8	6.6	9.8
Total, all yarn	15.5	13.8	28.7	23.2	16.1	21.9	90.8	36.9	49.7

Note: Totals may not agree exactly due to rounding out of figures.

Source: Department of Commerce.

A BILL TO TERMINATE THE SUGAR QUOTA ALLOCATED TO THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, with the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) and several of our colleagues, a bill to terminate the sugar quota presently allocated to the Republic of South Africa and prorate that quota among other non-Western Hemisphere countries. Senator KENNEDY will offer identical legislation in the Senate.

Under the quota system, which results in payment to the sugar producers of a price higher than the free market price, our annual subsidy to South African sugar producers is approximately $4 million. This subsidy benefits not the black South African who works on the sugar plantation, but the white minority—which already has one of the highest standards of living anywhere in the world. Our subsidy, and the labor of the black South African, support that standard of living for the white South African.

In my judgment, it is essential that we take action to remove this quota permanently from the Sugar Act. The racial policies of South Africa are repugnant to many citizens of this country, and have been condemned by most of the countries of the world. Our support for those policies, through a sugar quota which is in effect also a subsidy, is an affront both to our own black citizens and to the nations of black Africa, whose friendship we seek. I hope the Congress will take early action to revoke this quota, which constitutes support for a government intent on perpetuating injustice.

FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT CONTROLS

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has been holding hearings on the foreign direct investment controls.

The testimony of the witnesses who have appeared indicates that the controls are counterproductive and that a date should be set for terminating them. One of the most effective witnesses was D. L. Commons, the senior vice president for finance for Occidental Petroleum Corp. who testified about the adverse effect of the progam on our balance of payments.

Changes in the regulations were announced recently. In this vein, I would refer to Mr. Commons' remarks that no one should be fooled into thinking "that so-called relaxation of the controls will end their further development."

I would just point out that action to reduce the controls at this time, even to skeletal form, may be changed in the future, and the skeleton refleshed.

A program of such vast importance should be set up by Congress, not by Executive fiat.

The statement by Mr. Commons follows:

STATEMENT OF D. L. COMMONS, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT, FINANCE OCCIDENTAL PETROLEUM CORP., BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 85, MARCH 27, 1969

Mr. Chairman, my name is D. L. Commons. I am Senior Vice President, Finance, of Occidental Petroleum Corporation and I appear here this morning in support of House Concurrent Resolution 85, which was introduced on January 14, 1969, by Mr. Tunney for himself and a great many others. The resolution would declare it the sense of Congress that foreign direct investment controls are unwise and harmful, and would call upon the President to end such controls as soon as possible.

I

I would like to begin my remarks today by calling the attention of the Committee to a prominent feature of the foreign investment controls which we think clearly illustrates their unwisdom and harmfulness. I refer to the treatment accorded to exports of United States-produced goods and services under the OFDI regulations.

One would normally expect that in a program to stem the outflow of dollars from our country, a proposed foreign investment which could be made without dollar outflow, by purchasing the needed capital equipment and services domestically, would be most welcome. A foreign investment made in this way can do nothing but benefit the balance of payments.

It cannot hurt, because no dollars are exported, and there is therefore practically no way the investor's expenditure can become a drain on the United States gold supply. On the other hand, as earnings from the investment are repatriated, dollars will flow into the United States, and the balance of payments will be improved—sometimes with dramatic speed. In addition, of course, an overseas capital project in which United States-made machinery and equipment are originally installed will produce lasting benefits to our balance of payments through subsequent orders for complementary products, spare parts and supplies, replacements and so forth.

Despite the obvious desirability of structuring the foreign investment control program so as to promote the making of foreign investments with exports of United States goods instead of dollars, the OFDI regulations do not work that way. They do nothing to encourage such exports, and in fact they are not even neutral: they affirmatively discriminate against such exports, by making it easier and more advantageous to purchase goods and services of foreign origin to construct an overseas capital project. This is how it works:

The OFDI regulations provide that an export of United States-produced goods or services to an overseas affiliate of an investor must be treated as a transfer of capital, just as though dollars had been lent to the affiliate or invested in its capital. As a practical matter, this means the investor must borrow money abroad equivalent to the value of the exported goods and services, and bring the loan proceeds back home—even when he is prepared to pay cash and has no other need to borrow.

The imposition of this borrowing requirement is a needless penalty, in the case of cash purchases, and it works to the actual disadvantage of the American supplier whenever the investor has a choice of buying from either an American or a foreign supplier on substantially equivalent terms: it will almost always be preferable for the investor to buy from the foreign supplier rather than the domestic supplier under the OFDI regulations.

For example, if both suppliers are willing to give long-term credit, the investor will clearly be better off buying from the foreign supplier. He will have no additional OFDI requirements to meet. If he were to buy from the domestic supplier he would still have to negotiate a foreign loan he might not need, or be able to afford, and bring the proceeds back home.

In the opposite situation, where neither supplier will extend credit, the OFDI regulations in effect require the investor to negotiate a long-term foreign loan from someone else to cover the purchase. Again, this will almost invariably favor the foreign supplier. Most European governments—and it is primarily European competition we are talking about—make export credits available on extremely favorable terms for the benefit of their own producers. Needless to say, the same credits are not available if the borrower is simply seeking to finance a United States purchase. Yet if the investor wants to purchase United States goods, and suffer no detriment under the OFDI regulations, he *must* borrow abroad, except in very limited situations—i.e., where he can obtain so-called "103" money, or Eximbank financing, to cover the purchase. Our experience is that these domestic financing possibilities do not by any means put the domestic supplier on equal footing with his foreign competitor. "103" money—bank loans that are under the Federal Reserves Voluntary Credit Restraint program and outside the OFDI controls—is extremely hard to come by, and is available only in small quantities, at significant premiums, when it can be found at all. Federal Reserve statistics indicate that domestic banks in the aggregate have significant untapped lending capacity for this type of money, but the statistics are misleading: specific loan inquiries we have made indicate that availabilities are at best meager and in any event non-competitive. By the same token, our experience is that Eximbank financing is not readily available for exports which otherwise would have to be accounted for under the OFDI program, and does not provide a realistic alternative.

The result of all this is that we have been forced to conclude that under the OFDI regulations, domestic procurement is less attractive than foreign procurement, and accordingly we have specifically directed our procurement officials to look first to foreign sources for needed capital equipment. We do not think this is in the interest of American business, but we feel we have no choice. And we are talking about procurement of goods and services which will run to a total of close to $50 million in 1969, in our own case alone. What we find baffling and frustrating about this is that factually the export of United States-origin goods and services for foreign investments does no harm to the balance of payments, but on the contrary eventually benefits it in numerous ways. There is apparently widespread acceptance of this truth within the government, but we are told that nothing can be done about it.

How has it come about that we have a regulatory scheme which discriminates against the furnishing of United States-origin goods and services to no good purpose? As nearly as we have been able to determine, it is simply a result of the adoption for current purposes of statistical methods of international accounting devised at an earlier time and in different circumstances, under which no provision is made for distinguishing transactions which can result in a drain on our gold supply from those which cannot. This is the way the books have been set up and are being maintained. So we are using a method of accounting which appears not to be meaningful or helpful, in terms of the United States balance of payments problem, but instead of changing the method of accounting to be consistent with our goals, we have evidently changed our goals to be consistent with our method of accounting. This seems to be truly putting the cart before the horse, and is a good illustration of the unwisdom of our foreign direct investment controls.

However, important as it is not to discriminate unnecessarily against exports of American-made capital goods and services, I do not want to pitch our support of House Concurrent Resolution 85 solely on this narrow ground.

We support the resolution for the basic reason that a policy of restricting foreign investment is fundamentally shortsighted. Repatriation of earnings on foreign investments is a major plus factor in our balance of payments, and we need to keep building it. There is something wrong with our priorities when we cut back on new foreign investment so that we can afford to continue to spend dollars abroad in other ways which will never produce a return flow of dollars, nor, in many cases, any other equivalent advantage.

I would like to take some comfort from assurances that these controls are temporary, but I am unable to. We have already begun to see, once again, how so-called "temporary" restrictions tend to stretch on and on. As a matter of fact, I find the recent talk of "relaxing" the controls more ominous than reassuring. I think we will find it means the structure and organization of controls will be retained intact, so that they can continue to be applied to the few and can readily be extended to the many.

This is not what we should be doing. The organization and administration of a control program is a terribly wasteful, negative, and never-ending process. It requires the expenditure of time, effort and money, not to *do*, but to *avoid* doing, and it continually gives off unexpected consequences which make it more and more complicated. Gaps develop; unforeseen side effects appear; the regulations must be expanded to deal with these; inconsistencies show up; the regulations must again be amended to eliminate these; paragraphs expand to pages; definitions multiply and become increasingly artificial; a whole elaborate superstructure appears, which somehow still seems to contain unresolved problems, and the expansion process pushes relentlessly forward. Meanwhile companies gear up to understand and adapt to the developing body of controls; new personnel are hired; new procedures are adopted; some perhaps try harder than others; the control agency organizes itself to verify and police compliance with its regulations; a new batch of enforcement regulations appears and the prosecutors swing into action.

Anyone who has lived with the development of the OFDI regulations during the past year will recognize the foregoing instantly. This is no criticism of the effort that has been made. On the contrary, it is precisely because a high level of dedication, competence and intelligence has been brought to the task of developing a control program that it has quickly become complex, unwieldy and difficult to deal with. This is inherent in the nature of controls. And let no one think that so-called "relaxation" of the controls will end their further development, will simplify compliance for those who remain subject to the controls, or will diminish the machinery of government which has been erected to administer them. On the contrary, if precedent in prior control programs is any guide, what will happen is that many of the most competent personnel will lose interest in the program and move on; regulations, revisions, amendments, interpretations will nevertheless continue to proliferate, and the program will come to seem a familiar, accepted feature of the governmental landscape, too complicated and too hard to understand to remove.

If we are not going to live with investment controls indefinitely we must get rid of them now.

In this connection I note that there has been considerable discussion of phasing out the controls. It seems to have been widely accepted that an abrupt termination of controls would cause a massive dollar outflow which would throw us back into serious imbalance in our international payments. I wonder whether this is really correct? Perhaps at an earlier time such an outflow may have been a substantial risk, but at present or for the foreseeable future it seems to me a rather marginal risk. The fact is that, as money rates have developed, we now have no choice but to continue to do our borrowing in Europe, and to continue to hold our outstanding European loans. Even if credit tightens considerably in Europe, I see no reason to believe that the rate relationships which have developed will be reversed, so as to make it more advantageous to finance foreign investments in the United States than in Europe. For this reason I question the need for a "phasing out" process. I doubt that our balance of payments would suffer if investment controls were removed *in toto* tomorrow, and I would encourage the Subcommittee to so recommend.

Thank you very much for your time and attention.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the answers to a questionnaire I recently sent to my constituents have just been computer tabulated, and the results show that the citizens of Michigan's Sixth District want less taxation, less Government spending, less Federal intrusion into their private lives, and a more direct voice in choosing their President.

It is clear to me that people are fed up with past Federal spending policies that have increased the crushing burden of taxes with more taxes and that there is a ground swell of public sentiment for a more economical and business-like approach to Government operations. As evidence of this, 62 percent of those polled want an end to the 10-percent tax surcharge, 74 percent are in favor of a self-supporting corporate postal system, and 86 percent wish to limit farm program payments to $10,000 for any one producer.

The overwhelming desire to change the electoral college system seems to be of particular significance for I sense that it reflects a sweeping demand for such reforms.

Also impressive was the fact that only 13 percent believe the scope of the Federal census should be expanded. This too brings a message with regard to sponsored legislation to limit the census to basic questions and put an end to unwarranted prying under threat of legal sanction.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert the results of the entire poll in the RECORD:

CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN'S 1969 QUESTIONNAIRE

[In percent]

		Yes	No	No response
Should we:				
1. Lower the voting age to 18?		38	60	2
2. Have legislation to help prevent strikes by public employees		70	26	4
3. Limit farm program payments to $10,000 for any 1 producer?		86	6	8
4. Create a Government-owned self-supporting corportion to operate the postal system?		74	18	8
Do you favor:				
5. The registration and licensing of all firearms and users?		41	57	2
6. A Government guaranteed annual minimum income?		17	79	4
7. The 1970 census being:				
	Percent			
Continued as in past years	25			
Limited to basic questions	56			
Expanded to provide more data	13			
No response	6			
Do you believe:				
8. The temporary surtax should be:				
	Percent			
Continued for another year	21			
Reduced to 5 percent	12			
Terminated when law expires	62			
No response	5			
9. Our space program justifies its cost?		43	48	9
10. The electoral college should be:				
(a) Continued as is		9	26	65
(b) Changed to divide a State's electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote		21	13	66
(c) Changed so that if no candidate wins enough electoral votes, a runoff, rather than Congress, would decide the winner		15	14	71
(d) Abolished, with President elected by popular vote		65	7	28

WORCESTER, MASS., AGE CENTER PROVIDES A SUPERLATIVE MODEL FOR THE COUNTRY

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the Age Center of Worcester Area, Inc., is a pioneering, social service agency, dedicated to the encouragement of and promotion of confidence in our community's aged, and the accomplishments of the center have been recognized and acclaimed throughout the country.

As a further forward step in their dynamic programs, the center initiated some 5 years ago a Creative Hands Gift Shop.

This gift shop provides significant leisure activities for older citizens of our community by encouraging them to engage in handcrafts, and adding to their security by providing them with additional income through the sale of their handcrafted items to the public.

Seventy-five percent of the profits from such sales are returned to the older craftsmen, and the remaining profits are used to offset the operational expenses of the shop.

Mr. Speaker, the Age Center of Worcester is, indeed, a most highly efficient organization that projects a superlative model of service, training, and education for the aged, and the officers, directors, and staff members deserve the highest commendation for their devoted and successful endeavors.

The center, with this most recent projection, truly provides a model for other communities throughout the country to follow in guiding and encouraging our older citizens to a more meaningful and satisfying adjustment to the challenges of later life.

THE LATE WALTER K. LYON

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I note with deep regret the recent passing of a good and respected friend, Walter K. Lyon. Mr. Lyon served as president and chief executive officer of the Cigar Institute of America.

We came to know each other through our mutual appreciation of a fine cigar, but our acquaintance went far beyond that simple pleasure. My sympathies at this time go to his wife, Patricia, and their two sons. Many of us share their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker, I am attaching an article about Walter, which appeared in a recent issue of the United States Tobacco Journal:

Chicago, Ill.—Walter K. Lyon, president and chief executive officer of the Cigar Institute of America, died suddenly here Monday afternoon while attending the annual convention of the National Association of Tobacco Distributors at the Conrad Hilton Hotel.

Mr. Lyon, a resident of New York City, celebrated his 70th birthday on March 11.

One of the most prominent and widely respected figures in the tobacco industry, he was one of the founders of the Cigar Institute of America and held the then honorary office of its presidency from 1953 through 1957, when he resigned upon the sale of his own manufacturing company, Pennstate Cigar Corp.

Mr. Lyon returned to the Institute as its president on August 1, 1966, that office having become the organization's chief executive position.

During his absence from the Institute he had served as president of Michigan Peat Inc.

Born in Hartford, Conn., Mr. Lyon began his career in the tobacco industry as sales manager for the leaf company of M. March & Sons of Wheeling, W. Va.

It was during Mr. Lyon's presidency of Pennstate Cigar Corp. that he participated in the establishment of the Cigar Institute. At the time, he was also a director of the Cigar Manufacturers Association.

He was credited with originating many of the innovative public relations programs which have characterized the Cigar Institute's recent activities on behalf of the cigar. He also sought to build the Institute, and succeeded to a considerable degree, by inviting supporting memberships from allied segments of the tobacco and merchandising trades.

Mr. Lyon was to have presided at the traditional Cigar Institute breakfast and marketing seminar held here Tuesday morning as part of the NATD convention program.

In poor health in recent months, the Cigar Institute's president had returned to his job in January following a leave of several months, during which he underwent major surgery.

At the time of his death, he resided at 301 East 41st Street in New York City.

He is survived by his wife, Patricia and two sons, Peter and Michael, both pilots for Pan American Airways.

Funeral arrangements were incomplete at "Tobacco Journal" press time.

HELP YOUR POLICE FIGHT CRIME WEEK

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest concerns of our Nation today is the rising rate of crime, and the frustration so many of our citizens feel in their efforts to seek ways they can reverse this situation.

Perhaps the most direct and immediate action each individual can take is to publicly express their fullest support for our law officers, and to instill in their children respect for authority and the right of others.

Psychological motivation is a powerful force in our age of instant communications. When this psychological motivation is utilized to its fullest, positive action can result.

If enough law-abiding, patriotic citizens would unite and make a public commitment to stand for and with their law-enforcement officers, we will have taken a major step in solving our crime problem.

It is with pleasure and enthusiasm that I join with my fellow Members of Congress in sponsoring a joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period May 11 through May 17, 1969, as "Help Your Police Fight Crime Week."

During this special week positive efforts could sustain a mood of respect, cooperation, and determination that would bring about a change of attitudes and create a solid psychological force against crime.

I not only hope the Congress will bring about passage of this joint resolution, but that such a week might become an annual observance.

THE LINCOLN CHAIR IN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL COMMUNICATIONS

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia at its monthly meeting heard Clifford D. Owsley speak on Lincoln. He presented an interesting dissertation on "The Lincoln Chair." His observations are worthy of notice and consideration. To further that interest, I ask all colleagues and students to ponder on this. His address follows:

The Lincoln Chair in Social and Political Communications

(Address by Clifford D. Owsley, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, before the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, at the Capitol, Washington, D.C., April 16, 1969)

Chaucer, Shakespeare, Samuel Johnson, Napoleon, Marlowe, John Keats, Francis Bacon, Jonathan Swift, John Milton, Dryden, Pope, Edmund Burke—these and other individual men of history and their works have been taught in universities.

While we would not disparage teaching any one of these, it is an unfortunate oversight that our universities generally have failed to take note of the greatest man our nation, or any nation, has produced—a man who in his own way exemplified, as few men have, a lifelong faith in learning. That man was Abraham Lincoln.

Naturally, most of the discussion about Lincoln deals with history, the past. Today, I would turn your attention in the opposite direction, and look to the future.

I propose that we raise a half million dollars and endow the Lincoln Chair at the American University.

We may be about 140 years late, but it is not too late for us to send Abraham Lincoln to the University.

The American University welcomes this idea with enthusiasm. I hope that the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia will sponsor the effort, and thus be permanently identified with it.

We are already forming a non-profit, educational foundation to be known as The Lincoln Chair Foundation.

There may be those, and once I would have been numbered among them, who would say that there are enough memorials to Abraham Lincoln. There are many fine ones. The Lincoln Memorial here in the capital is probably the most magnificent structure in the whole world. The question is: Can we make a better one? I think so. The Lincoln Chair would be a living memorial that would go on and on, in Lincoln's words, "lighting us down to the latest generation."

The evolution of this idea in my own mind is interesting. I began with the conviction that generally the American people, though recognizing that Lincoln was a very great man, do not really comprehend his true stature; that it is much bigger than a casual knowledge of the man's life indicates. So I began to think in terms of another granite mountain, another Mount Rushmore, but one that would convey some of the relative stature of Lincoln, compared with some of the true giants of the earth.

In my mind's eye, I saw this mountain, with Lincoln's magnificent head at the summit. Flanking Lincoln would be other figures, but at a slightly lower level. These might be Socrates, Aristotle, Pericles, Joan of Arc (we must have a woman in the group), Winston Churchill, and perhaps others. I never completely filled out the cast.

I carried this idea around and let it simmer. Soon I had second thoughts. With the price of mountains today and the price of sculptors, I decided this might well be the impossible dream. So I came around to thinking of a place where Lincoln, his character and ideals, could be taught to succeeding generations—a memorial that would never die—The Lincoln Chair.

An interesting story unfolds in the history of the endowed chair, or professorship. By long-standing tradition, there is a special distinction attached to academic posts supported by their own endowed funds. Many endowed faculty chairs have acquired fame and usefulness outlasting the bricks and mortar of the times in which they were created.

Among the oldest such chairs are the Regius Professorships at Oxford University, established in 1546 by Henry VIII. Today, more than four centuries after their creation, these are among the most honored positions in English academic life.

The term "faculty chair" can be traced back to Elizabethan England. In the custom of those times, the common people sat on wooden stools and benches, the gentry used cushions on the floor, and even the grandest room in a nobleman's castle could seldom boast more than a single piece of furniture that could be called a chair.

Accordingly, when a man in academic life was raised to the position of professor, with an income from a named fund given by some monarch or wealthy prelate, he was presented with an actual chair, symbolizing his status in the world of learning.

More than 200 years ago, Thomas Hollis, a London merchant, created the first endowed university chairs at Harvard, the first in America—the Hollis Professorships in Divinity, Mathematics, and Philosophy. Harvard today has more than 200 professorships thus supported by separate endowments. The gift of Thomas Hollis began a long tradition of endowed chairs at Harvard and most major American universities.

A fully endowed professorship or area of study provides many advantages to the university and the individual holding the post—as well as generations of students who, in this case, will come to know a giant of the ages. It assures the holder a salary and support of his research and scholarly publications. The permanency of the endowment makes possible a continuity of effort in a particular field of research and teaching. Such endowed funds create areas of institutional distinction in special scholarly fields, thus adding to the distinction of the university.

An appropriate area of study for the Lincoln Chair would be in a social and political communications.

The American University is now engaged in a major effort to achieve academic distinction and strengthen teaching and research in all its intellectual disciplines. There is no better way to symbolize this effort, and to help the University achieve its aims than through the establishment of endowed university professorships. Where would we ever find a more appropriate place than American University in the nation's capital? The name and the place are peculiarly fitting.

Abraham Lincoln early in life acquired a desire for learning; it never left him. He called himself a "learner." He both demonstrated and exemplified in his life the individual who never stops learning; thus, proving that through learning one may continuously grow.

One day, O. H. Browning, a fellow Illinois politician, had a brief conversation with Lincoln. After Lincoln had gone, Browning remarked that Lincoln was "always a learner," and in that respect was the most notable man he had ever seen. "I have known him for ten years, and every time I meet him I find him much improved. He is now about 40 years old. I knew him at thirty, and every time I have seen him I have observed extraordinary improvement. Most young men have finished their education, as they say, at twenty-five; but Lincoln is always a learner."

Every state in the Union is a benefactor of Lincoln's affinity with education. As President, he recommended and signed the law that established the Land Grant Colleges—incidentally, the first Federal aid to education.

Not only with learning and education, but there is a close affinity between Lincoln and communications or public relations. He often referred to "public sentiment" and its power a half century before the birth of public relations as a business or profession.

He said, "Public sentiment is everything; with it nothing can fail, without it nothing can succeed." President Nixon patterned a sentence after it in his inaugural address.

Lincoln also said, "What kills the skunk is the publicity it gives itself." I don't know how this will hold up for today, since there are always some who will take the chance. And Lincoln easily ranks as the most effective communicator among public men in this or any nation's history.

To begin the fund drive, I plan to make a series of some ten lectures on Lincoln. Some of the topics will be:

"Lincoln the Relevant Man of History."
"The Secret of Lincoln's Arguments."
"Lincoln the Writer."
"Lincoln the Learner."
"Lincoln and Women."
"Was Lincoln a Genius?"
"Is Lincoln Civilization's Tallest Figure?"

This fall, I expect to teach a course in Abraham Lincoln in the Northern Virginia Center of the University of Virginia. This will be another step in the same direction as the Lincoln Chair—to put the teaching of Abraham Lincoln into college curriculums.

As of now, the Lincoln Chair is a dream but dreams of this kind may be the most powerful force in the universe. They can inspire men and women to sacrifice for a goal bigger than themselves. They can sustain us in dark moments, and light the fires of hope when other support has vanished. They generate a spiritual energy that may literally move mountains. With faith and perseverance, though arising as invisible waves of imagination, dreams come to life in concrete objects—giant machines, massive buildings of brick and stone, in great paintings and works of literature, in grand universities and beautiful memorials. Yes, dreams have done these things, and they will do it again.

"All noble works is at first impossible," said Thomas Carlyle. This project is surely a noble work. Is it impossible? I don't think so.

In this noble work, I believe we can expect to find helping hands and generous hearts among the American people. And my aim would be to find some way to permanently recognize all supporters. As a subject of interest and study, Abraham Lincoln will never die.

With the help of those who believe that Abraham Lincoln—his life and work—is relevant for today and the future, we can create a living memorial to "the man of the ages." And down through the years it will link the name Lincoln with learning, to achieve that natural affinity which his life so magnificiently personified.

THE TERRITORIAL SEA LIMIT

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1969, I introduced a joint resolution to establish a new policy regarding our territorial sea limit. Today I am pleased to reintroduce this legislation with 20 of my distinguished colleagues.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for us to reevaluate an outmoded territorial sea limit which permits aggressor nations to anchor spy ships only 3 miles off our shores while we must keep our vessels four times that distance off their shores. It is ironic that in an age of electronic espionage we permit intelligence ships to anchor a short 3 miles away while we insist that their fishing vessels maintain a 12-mile limit. These countries, such as the Soviet Union and North Korea, should be notified that as long as they claim a 12-mile limit, we will claim an identical limit.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, our resolution would base our territorial sea limit on a policy of mutuality—we will demand a 12-mile limit off our shores for vessels of those nations who require a 12-mile limit off their own coastline. And, for those friendly nations who only require a 3-mile limit, we will reciprocate with a 3-mile limit for their ships. However, we will continue to require a 12-mile limit for fishing vessels of all nations regardless of the limit we set for other types of vessels. It is interesting that only 29 out of 98 coastal nations now observe a 3-mile limit. Most claim the 12-mile limit.

But we should not be satisfied with a permanent policy that would apply several different sea limits to different nations. It is in the interest of world peace that we work to make territorial sea limits uniform and a part of international law. Therefore, we have included a section in our resolution which calls on the President to work through the United Nations to convene an international conference for the purpose of establishing a uniform, international sea limit applicable to all nations.

Mr. Speaker, I first introduced this resolution during the 90th Congress following the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* by North Korea. The need for a change in our outdated policy and for the establishment of international agreements governing territorial sea limits has again been underscored by recent incidents where American fishing boats were seized by Peru in waters 25 to 200 miles off the Peruvian coast.

However, until such an international agreement can be worked out, there is no justification for blind adherence to an outdated policy. The policy we advocate today is consistent with our national security needs and the concept of freedom of the seas.

A resolution identical to the one we are submitting today has been introduced in the Senate by Senator GRIFFIN and 25 of his colleagues. I urge both the Senate and the House to consider this most important change in policy which serves the best interests of our national security and world peace.

GALLAGHER CONTINUING CREDIT BUREAU INVESTIGATION

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 1969, I wrote to Mr. John Spafford, executive vice president of the Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc., requesting a statement from his association on three areas of concern. Those were first, a report that there is an organization of 950 credit bureaus unaffiliated with the ACB; second, CBS news presentation of the ease with which noncredit granters could obtain allegedly confidential reports on individuals; and third, a Washington Daily News article which disclosed that Welcome Newcomer was connected with the Washington bureau member of the ACB and that calls by its hostesses resulted in credit data being called from the individual's previous residence without his initiating the transfer by applying for credit in his new locality.

As has been customary in my relations with the ACB and Mr. Spafford, his reply is comprehensive and forthright. I was particularly interested to learn that credit bureau files have an underground life of their own which is only tangentially related to the individual they describe in such potentially damaging detail. I can well understand the convenience of being able to immediately gain the privelege of credit in a new locality and I agree with Mr. Spafford that this is socially beneficial. But this constant scurry of dossiers from town to town, from credit bureau to credit bureau, from State to State, is, in my judgment, a legitimate cause for concern. Mr. Spafford is apparently guaranteeing to the consumer and to the Congress that every person connected with every credit bureau in his association has the same commitment to protection of privacy that he himself has demonstrated. I hope that he is correct in this assumption.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that Mr. Spafford's reply to my letter is an important addition to the record being assembled by the Congress in its consideration of credit bureaus. Therefore, I introduce into the RECORD at this point my letter and Mr. Spafford's:

NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS, SPECIAL STUDIES SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
March 21, 1969.

Mr. JOHN L. SPAFFORD,
Executive Vice President, Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc., Houston, Tex.

DEAR MR. SPAFFORD: I am deeply concerned over recent allegations involving the activities of member bureaus of Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc. In view of our constructive and candid relationship which began even before the hearings of my Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy in March of 1968, I would like to request from you an immediate statement covering the following issues:

(1) The Arthur D. Little, Inc. newsletter to subscribers states that the National Association of Credit Bureaus has 950 members. During conferences with the ACB, I was frequently informed that there were no more than 200 credit bureaus which were not associated with your organization. This assurance was a major factor in my decision to greet the ACB "Credit Bureau Guidelines to Protect Consumer Privacy" with general approval. If there in fact exists over 900 credit bureaus which are not affiliated with the Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc., I would feel obligated to reconsider my position. My staff is initiating discussions with the National Association of Credit Bureaus and I will take note of the results of those contacts. In the meantime, however, I would appreciate a statement from the management of the Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc.

(2) On the March 17, 1969, Walter Cronkite Show presented on the Columbia Broadcasting System, it was once again demonstrated that noncredit-granting firms can obtain credit records on individuals. You will recall that prior to the March 1968 hearings of my Special Subcommittee, Dr. Alan Westin of Columbia University was able to do the same thing. In that case, however, there was an established and respected entity named Columbia University; the CBS created firm, Transitair Systems, had no such prestige or history behind it. Further, credit reports were gained for this "ficticious" New York-based organization from credit bureaus in Connecticut, Kentucky, West Virginia, Illinois, Arkansas, Mississippi, North Dakota, Georgia, Massachusetts, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Texas. This raises several specific questions:

(a) Do you interpret the action of those bureaus to be in violation of the existing rules and regulations of ACB before the issuance of the 1969 guidelines?

(b) Do you interpret the action of the credit bureaus to be in violation of the section of the 1969 guidelines which state:

"Credit bureaus shall require service contracts in which the regular subscriber or the occasional user certifies that inquiries will be made only for the purposes of credit granting or other bona fide business transactions, such as evaluation of present or prospective credit risks or evaluation of the qualifications of present or prospective employees."

(c) What has been the response of credit bureaus to the provisions of the "Credit Bureau Guidelines to Protect Consumer Privacy?" Have all your member bureaus received copies of the Guidelines? Had the member bureaus received copies of the Guidelines at the time the second test was run by CBS?

(d) What action has been taken against those credit bureaus by the Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc.?

Our generally favorable comments on the issuance of the 1969 Guidelines were predicated on the assumption that the ACB was concerned about the acceptance of the Guidelines and was willing to take aggressive action to assure compliance. The disclosures by CBS call into question the effectiveness of the self-policing and self-regulating capacity of the Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc.

(3) A story in the Washington Daily News of March 19, 1969, disclosed that the Washington member credit bureau conducted a service known as Welcome Newcomer. The story states that the advertising brochure promises "Credit reporting at its best. You are furnished written up-to-date credit reports on all newcomers who have favorable credit records, and at a greatly discounted rate."

A central contention of ACB at the March 1968 hearings and in discussions since that time is that no credit report is transferred from a previous residence until the individual initiates such action by applying for credit in his new locality. This advertising claim seems to state quite the opposite. I, therefore, would ask the following questions:

(1) Does Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc. own Welcome Newcomer, as the article alleges?

(2) How many member bureaus use Welcome Newcomer or services similar to it?

(3) Is the information gathered by the hostesses of Welcome Newcomer kept separate from the general credit files in your member bureaus?

(4) Under what procedures can an individual's credit record be sent to a new area other than an application for credit?

When I adjourned the hearings into commercial credit bureaus on March 14, 1968, an agreement was reached that the ACB would return to present the proposals to protect consumer privacy and to correct inadequacies which has been disclosed. On January 13, 1969, that obligation was partially fulfilled by the issuance of "Credit Bureau Guidelines to Protect Consumer Privacy." Although I expect you to return to testify further on the actions of the ACB since our March 1968 hearings, these charges and allegations are of such a nature that I would formally request your prompt reply to the issues raised in this letter.

Sincerely,
CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
Member of Congress.

ASSOCIATED CREDIT BUREAUS, INC.,
April 14, 1969.

Hon. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GALLAGHER: Thank you, Congressman Gallagher, for your letter of March 21, 1969 about various matters concerning the Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc. and its Credit Bureau Policies to Protect Consumer Privacy.

We are concerned that the several matters covered in your letter seem to have raised questions in your mind relating to the protection of privacy of the individual consumer and our desire to safeguard this in every way possible. We hope this letter will serve to confirm that what we have said to you during the hearings and during our personal conversations is consistent with this objective.

I will comment on the various questions raised in your letter in the order in which they were presented. We would like also to discuss these matters with you personally at a convenient time to make absolutely certain that there is no question about our policies or our intentions to accomplish our objectives.

1. When we saw a draft of the Arthur D. Little, Inc. Newsletter, we contacted Mr. Carmody, the author, and questioned the announcement that there is a National Association of Credit Bureaus. We have the impression that NACB isn't in fact a trade association of credit bureaus, but rather a local credit bureau owned by an individual in Johnstown, Pennsylvania engaged in the credit reporting business, who sells rosters of membership to credit reporting agencies, credit bureaus, collection agencies and others in an attempt to set up a forwarding network.

For the past thirty days we have been attempting to determine how many credit bureaus there are in this country which are not members of our Association. We still do not know. We do know there are a number of credit bureaus in the country regularly receiving non-member service from our member bureaus. There are probably many small companies which do some credit reporting but which would not meet our definition of a credit bureau.

Again, I would like to emphasize the point that has been discussed with you and members of your staff personally. I am sure you understand the difference between a credit reporting agency and a credit bureau. In the context of any conversation we have, we relate to credit bureaus and not to agencies which concentrate on insurance reporting or other specialized fields of character reports.

Too frequently, others who speak of the credit reporting industry make all-inclusive statements that relate primarily to specialized credit reporting agencies, insurance reporting agencies, and other agencies that supply reports on individuals. The situation is further complicated by the use of credit reporting names by agencies which are for collection of accounts or commercial debt poolers.

2. We were quite alarmed to see the Walter Cronkite News Show on March 17, 1969. I think our feelings are best expressed in our letter to Mr. B. Russ Bensley, Producer of the CBS Show. A copy of this is attached.

When we were asked to grant an interview it was our understanding that a number of organizations in the credit reporting industry were going to be interviewed and that an overview of the industry would be presented by CBS. We do know for a fact that at least two other organizations were so interviewed. The results of such interviews were not mentioned in any way on the program, and the interview with me was, in our opinion, distorted by editing.

It does not seem to us that a fair basis for the evaluation of an industry, its practices and policies, or those of the individual members of the industry can be based on the use of subterfuge. I hope we have not reached the point where personal privacy is more important than personal sincerity, simple honesty, and fair dealing. We are trying to perform a service of value to society without any sinister motives. We hope CBS can say the same. We are making a thorough investigation of the Cronkite-Wallace incident and will reveal the results to you. We have already discovered that CBS (Mike Wallace) did not have all the facts in some material particulars.

In regard to the specific questions which you asked concerning the CBS telecast, here are our comments:

(a) We are investigating the actions of those bureaus mentioned in the broadcast to determine whether they acted in violation of the rules and regulations of ACB that existed prior to the issuance of the 1969 Policies for Protection of Privacy.

(b) The action of these 17 bureaus, if the facts are as CBS stated, would be in violation of the 1969 Policies referred to in your letter had these Policies been in full official effect.

As we told you in our meeting on January 14, when the policies were presented to you and Mr. Witter, the Board had approved adoption of the policies.

We further stated, however, that because the policies represented a departure from from some of the traditions of credit bureau operation a phase-over period would be necessary, and that the Board at its annual meeting in June (during our conference) would be asked to make them a requirement of membership. In the meantime, as you may recall, we have been carrying out an extensive educational program urging all members to adopt and implement the policies as soon as possible.

(c) The response of our member credit bureaus to these Policies for the Protection of Consumer Privacy has been excellent. We are pleased to see state bureau associations acting to urge compliance by all credit bureaus in their respective states. Local credit bureaus in large numbers are adopting the policies and starting their own local educational programs.

A copy of the policies was mailed to all members in our management communication, UPDATE, on January 25, 1969. They also appeared in the February, 1969 issue of ACB Management (our membership magazine).

Prior to that time the broad outline of the policies was publicized to our general membership during the development stages in overall concept. There were minor changes in the final policies, and although our members have been aware of the general nature of the policies since last summer, only about 60 who serve on the Board or the Credit Reporting Division Committee received the exact draft prior to the January 25 mailing.

Thus, we believe that when the second test was run by CBS late in January, 1969 it is safe to say that most of our members had not yet received a copy of the policies in the final form which we delivered to you on January 14.

(d) The ACB Board will consider what action should be taken against those credit bureaus who may have violated our Qualifications and Requirements for Membership as a result of their responding to the CBS fictitious "Transitaire, Inc." inquiries.

3. In answer to your question relating to the story in the Washington Daily News of March 19, 1969:

(a) The Association does not own Welcome Newcomer nor has it ever owned this organization. For a period of years, however, prior to June, 1965, we did endorse this organization.

(b) Our files do not show how many bureaus use Welcome Newcomer or services similar to it.

(c) We are not familiar with the current policies or procedures of Welcome Newcomer, but know of no reason to assume that there is any misrepresentation or deception involved in its operation.

It is difficult to answer specifically Question 4 because there are procedures by which an individual's credit record can be sent to a new area without the filing of an application for credit. Here are three examples:

(a) We have in our Association a voluntary program called the Automatic Transfer Plan. About 1550 member bureaus participate in the program.

Under this program when it is learned an individual is moving to a new community, the credit record is automatically transferred to our member bureau in that community. Credit bureau members who receive this information on new residents are required to follow all rules, regulations and qualifications and requirements for membership in handling such information. This has proven to be a very valuable convenience and service to individual consumers since it helps to establish their credit much more quickly and conveniently in the new community.

(b) Quite frequently when a company moves from one community to another it will request that the individual credit records of those moving with the company be transferred to the bureau in the new community. The company itself never sees the records. This is strictly a bureau-to-bureau transfer. Again, the purpose is to help those moving to the new community to establish credit right away.

(c) In many instances individuals will ask the credit bureau to transfer their record to the new community, without the filing of an application. They do this because they recognize that this procedure will save them time in the establishment of credit in the new community.

None of these situations, Congressman Gallagher, are in any way intended to invade anyone's privacy, but rather are designed to help the consumer. To my knowledge we do not have any complaints of record regarding this service which is provided to the consumer. Rather, I think it would be quite easy to obtain many favorable comments from those who have been benefited by such a service when moving from one community to another.

While on this subject, I was concerned to read your statement on page 3 of your letter that we had stated ". . . no credit report is transferred from a previous residence until the individual initiates such action by applying for credit in the new locality."

In re-reading the transcript of the hearings, I find only one reference to that subject. That relates to regular inter-bureau reports, not the automatic transferring of credit records as covered above. Nor do I recall any conversation during any of our meetings regarding the tansfer of records when individuals move from one community to another.

It is our opinion that our comments related to a bureau in one community ordering a report from a bureau in another community as a result of a request from a credit granter. It is not known whether in all such instances a credit application has been taken. This, in our opinion, is different from the transfer of a credit record from one community to another when an individual actually moves.

We believe, Congressman Gallagher, that a personal discussion of these matters with you and your staff would be most advisable. We hope we will have the opportunity to testify further on the actions of our Association at your coming hearings. In the meantime, however, prior to the scheduling of these hearings, we will be glad to meet with you and your staff not only about any of the matters raised in your letter, but also in connection with all other programs and services provided by the Associated Credit Bureaus, Inc. and its members.

Respectfully,

John L. Spafford,
Executive Vice President.

GIOVANNI DA VERRAZANO

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the time has again come around when once more we are privileged to share with our Italo-American friends the commemoration of the deeds of a great Italian who ranks high among our American heroes. On tomorrow America pays homage to Giovanni da Verrazano of Florence, one of the gallant and intrepid navigators of all time.

Not one of the host of explorers and sea captains who sailed under the flags of Europe to probe the waters, the rivers and the interiors of the New World was braver or more thorough than the youthful Verrazano sailing under the French flag. This 29-year-old seaman is credited with the discovery of New York Harbor and Narragansett Bay as well as testing and charting most of the U.S. coastline from the Carolinas to Newfoundland. For the 400 years since this eager voyager traversed our shores his maps have proven of value to subsequent captains eager to visit the bays and harbors so meticulously described by Verrazano.

Mr. Speaker, this illustrious Italian seaman is held in great admiration by all New Yorkers and most particularly by those of us who live in Brooklyn. We have sought to obtain greater recognition of this man's contribution to this Nation. We take great pride in having the magnificent bridge which spans the Narrows between Brooklyn and Staten Island named after him. We were proud to have a special U.S. postage stamp issued in his honor.

In the areas where so many of our loyal Americans of Italian birth or descent are living this day will be observed with fitting patriotic ceremonies. I hope that in days to come the public and our schoolchildren throughout the land will celebrate Verrazano Day with honor and reverence akin to that with which they now honor Christopher Columbus.

One of the real tragedies of history is that Verrazano on a subsequent voyage to chart the coast of South America lost his life. Whether or not the 4-century-old rumor is true of his having been captured and eaten by cannibals is of little consequence. What is of importance is that this dauntless navigator was unable to duplicate for posterity the same type of achievements and records for the Southern Hemisphere which he accomplished for so much of the eastern portion of North America.

I hope more and more Americans read of the exploits of this fabulous hero and will then join with their fellow citizens of Italian heritage in paying honor to Giovanni da Verrazano.

UNITED STATES TRAPPED BETWEEN U.N., CHROMIUM NEED

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the constant hypocrisy and deceit of Soviet operations throughout the world and the adverse complications upon the United States is dramatized in a Chicago Tribune article April 15 by its veteran Washington correspondent, Willard Edwards.

The naivety of our foreign policy is certainly underscored here and the complications caused by the lack of a realistic foreign policy is especially obvious when we observe the way in which the Soviets brazenly defy gentlemen's agreements.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES TRAPPED BETWEEN U.N., CHROMIUM NEED

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—On March 26, according to intelligence reports received here, a Russian ship docked at the East African port of Mozambique and began taking on chromium ore. This event had a critical significance.

The ore had been transported from Rhodesia, bordering Mozambique on the west, in cars marked with the Rhodesian railroad emblem. An examination indicated the ore was of Rhodesian origin.

This transaction was, of course, a brazen violation of the sanctions imposed on Rhodesia by the United Nations, with the enthusiastic cooperation of the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain. The U.N. had discovered a threat to world peace in the refusal of a small white minority in the land-locked country to agree to immediate racial parity for 4 million tribal Africans.

The Nixon administration now is beginning to wonder if another threat—a threat to the national security of the United States—has developed from rigid African adherence to the U.N. edict while other nations flout it with impunity.

Here is an authoritative analysis of why the Mozambique incident aroused deep concern and has strengthened demands in government circles for reappraisal of the Rhodesian policy inherited from the Johnson administration.

Chromium is so indispensable to stainless and other alloy steel essentials to defense that chromium ore and the American-based industry to convert it to a ferrochrome have been declared by the office of emergency preparedness as essential to national security.

RUSSIA, RHODESIA ARE LARGEST SOURCES

Russia and Rhodesia have the largest sources of supply. The chromium ore mines in Rhodesia are owned by two American corporations. Before sanctions were imposed, these companies imported the vast majority of the ore required for the American ferroalloy industry and were the major free world competitors to Russia.

The Rhodesian embargo cut off these suppiles. The two companies have ore stockpiled above ground in Rhodesia valued at more than eight million dollars. They own it but are denied access to it. Great Britain, under similar circumstances, gave its industries a period of six months to obtain sanctioned material, including ferrochrome, but the United States imposed an embargo immediately.

American industry has been forced to turn to Russia, now enjoying a virtual monopoly. To nobody's surprise, the price of Russian ore promptly rose from $32 per ton to $46, a 44 per cent increase. The profits are so rich, the Mozambique incident indicated, that Russia now is buying ore from Rhodesia illegally. It came from American-owned mines.

The comic opera aspects of the situation fade when these other points are considered.

MINE WOULD FLOOD IF NOT WORKED

One of the American-owned mines in Rhodesia, accounting for one-third of the chromium deposits in the country, must be worked continually or it will be flooded. The company kept it going at a cost of $900,000 annually until January, 1968, when it no longer could afford the expense. The Rhodesian government has operated it since then but could be forced to suspend, causing in the words of a government report, "the irretrievable loss of a significant and vital portion of the free world's chromium ore deposits."

The treasury and commerce departments, supported by the office of emergency preparedness, have urged strongly that the two companies be allowed to import, as quickly as possible, the ore stored above ground in Rhodesia.

The state department has objected. Rhodesia must be strangled economically, it insists, disregarding objections that Rhodesia would reap no profit from removal of the ore.

This departmental dispute must be settled by President Nixon. The state department is protesting that the United States would be "embarrassed" in the U.N. by any action favoring of relaxation of the sanctions against Rhodesia.

The President must weigh this objection against the massed opinion of the other government departments that an inflexible stand may menace the nation's security.

THE FEDMART CORP.

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly remarkable records in mass merchandising has been logged over the past 15 years by the FedMart Corp. From modest beginning in 1954, the company has grown to the point where it now operates 39 stores in four States: California, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona. Sales this year are expected to top $160 million.

But more important than the balance sheet, in my view, are the enlightened policies pursued by FedMart with ramifications extending far beyond the marketplace. The company has rattled some timbers in a few locations with its insistence on decent pay for its employees, and with its reputation for color blindness.

FedMart currently is embarked on an ambitious program for training Navajo Indians in the merchandising trades. This seems most appropriate; for, as FedMart chairman Sol Price has noted:

> All of us are aware of imposition on the Indians by traders and retailers.

The federally backed Navajo training program has placed a substantial number of newly skilled personnel in FedMart stores at Phoenix and Window Rock, Ariz.

With the thought that Mr. Price's remarks at a recent meeting of FedMart shareholders may be of interest to my colleagues, I shall include them at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY SOL PRICE, CHAIRMAN AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, THE FEDMART CORPORATION, 1969 SHAREHOLDERS MEETING

The FedMart Corporation was organized in San Diego in 1954 as a low-margin, mass merchandiser.

Very early we decided that our growth depended on our relationship to the customer, to our employees, stockholders, and the community. We concluded that serving the interests of one would not require that the interests of the others be subordinated, and I am proud to say that FedMart has fulfilled its obligations to each of these groups over the past 14 years.

Our responsibility to the customer is a very simple one: it is to be fair, not to use devices which mislead, trick or confuse him, give him the best values possible to maintain the lowest gross margins, and not to give one customer an advantage that another customer pays for. The implementation of this simple philosophy requires extensive procedures and techniques.

We attempt to maintain the lowest gross margins by maintaining the lowest expense ratios and the lowest real estate occupancy costs and the lowest payroll percentages. And even though we think we maintain the lowest payroll percentages in the retail industry, we still pay the highest wages in the industry. To be fair to our customer, we feel we must have the most liberal refund policy available anywhere. I think those of you who shop in FedMart stores have seen the refund clerk at the entrance of the store making cash refunds with no quibbling, no credit slips, and no back talk.

Our responsibility to the customer requires that we not handle merchandise which is not made to the highest standards and which will not give satisfaction in its use. We also feel that our relationship with the customer requires that we analyze which products and which sizes within a product line are the best values for the customer. Usually, the largest size is the most economical.

The implementation of this approach results in a customer loyalty substantially greater than normal. Thus, it requires far less expenditure for advertising and promotion and none for games, gimmicks, prizes, to attract new customers.

As a result of the application of this attitude, our company has grown in 14 years from an initial capital of $50,000 to a book value in excess of $15 million, and assets exceeding $43 million. Our retail sales for the year ended August 31, 1968 exceeded $135 million, and we are looking forward to a volume this year in excess of $160 million.

We operate 39 stores in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California—with several more on the drawing boards.

We have brought many innovations to the retail field. We were the first in our industry to market gasoline, to engage in the pharmacy business and to establish full food departments. To our knowledge, we were the first in our field to centrally warehouse the majority of items and to develop our own trucking and delivery system. Last year over 55% of our total volume was handled through our wholesale division.

We feel it incumbent upon us, as responsible managers of this business, to seek out new services and products for the convenience and benefit of our customers. This last year we established our first laundry and dry cleaning operations. We also established a travel agency. We began operations of our first car wash and restaurant. Each of these is a field that has great future for mass merchandising and low margin and should fit with what we are now doing—bring our customers a service or product at a lower price.

While we are proud of the growth of our company, we must never lose sight of the strides which must be taken to accomplish the building of a retailing institution—not only of great monetary value but of great social value.

There has been a source of satisfaction and pride in the knowledge that so many employees have grown with us and assumed greater and greater responsibilities and earned more and more money. This is part of our responsibility to our 2,500 employees. Not only must we pay them the highest wages for the particular work they do, but we feel obligated to make available to them opportunities for advancement and for insuring their futures.

We have extremely liberal health plans for our employees, and, over the past several years, have distributed to them over 6% of the outstanding stock of this company in stock bonuses.

Our responsibility to the community has always been of the utmost importance to us. We feel that we are not just a money

making machine, but must contribute something to the welfare of our community—not necessarily in charity, but in doing what we do to the best of our ability. So, we recall with pleasure the fact that we were—some 10 or 11 years ago—the first major retailer to come into Houston and take the heat for not having separate facilities for blacks and whites and maintaining a snack bar at which everyone was welcome. And we remember our first appearance in San Antonio when we established minimum wages over 250% higher than those being paid in supermarkets at the time, and when we brought revolutionary pricing to cities like El Paso, San Antonio and Phoenix and proved to the businessmen in those communities that paying high wages did not, per se, mean that we could not sell at the lowest prices.

Recently our feeling of responsibility to the community brought to us a most interesting experience. We were requested by the Navajo Tribal Council to establish a FedMart store in the middle of the Navajo Reservation on the northeast corner of Arizona. All of us are aware of the long history of imposition on the Indians by traders and retailers. We have now established such a store and are selling our merchandise to the Indians at the same prices as we charge in Los Angeles, San Diego and Phoenix. We spent some $57,000 training some of the Indians in our Phoenix store and all but two or three of the employees of the Window Rock store are Indians. It has been many years since all of us have had the emotional thrill at a store opening as we had when we opened the Window Rock store. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs was there, Senator Clinton Anderson, Secretary of the Interior Udall—all of them most grateful to FedMart for bringing such a great help to the Reservation. Someday we hope that this technique may be applied in the "ghetto" areas.

So we feel that over and above the volume we have done, the profits we have made, the people we have developed—that we have brought to each community in which we operate an overall lowering of the price structure by reason of the strong and fair competition we maintain. And not only have our customers benefited, but so have the customers of our competitors by reason of our presence in the community.

WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1969

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, the House of Representatives, reacting responsibly to one of the most pressing domestic problems of the United States, passed overwhelmingly the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969.

Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter of water pollution control and abatement programs since my first election to the House, I was especially pleased to see this landmark legislation approved by the House, not only because of my interest in the general problem but more so because of my interest in the problems associated in the rehabilitation of small destroyed bodies of water, particularly those in close proximity to urban areas.

Section 5G of the Water Quality Act will enable the Secretary of the Interior to formulate an appropriate research and demonstration program, in consort with local governments and the scientific and academic community, for the restoration of our once beautiful small lakes. The values of restoration and rehabilitation are countless, but among those more pronounced and immediate, I might cite three specifically: The reestablishment of ample consumable water supplies for our spiraling population increase; the creation of sorely needed recreational facilities, especially for our urban-suburban areas; and, the underscoring of esthetic principles in our drive to preserve our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, last year, the House passed somewhat similar legislation, under the guiding hand of our colleague, Congressman GEORGE FALLON, chairman of the House Public Works Committee. There is no question that he and Congressman JOHN BLATNIK deserve the thanks of every concerned American for their efforts. Unfortunately, we labored against the calendar, and the matter never became the law of the land. This year, however, we are off to a tremendous start. I am hopeful that our colleagues in the Senate will react with appropriate speed in considering this legislation.

I happen to have the privilege of representing a district with one of the water pollution problems whose resolution is the aim of this act. I have within my district a destroyed body of water, Onondaga Lake, whose rehabilitation by natural process would take, by considered professional judgment, some 200 years. This Lake has been cited by the FWPCA as one of the worst examples of polluted water in the Northeast. It lends itself appropriately to the research and demonstration provisions of section 5G. It is my fondest hope that upon enactment of the Water Quality Improvement Act, Onondaga Lake will become the site of a demonstration program. We have within our community the professional and academic know-how needed to make a demonstration program work; as a community we have the will to make it work.

I commend the House for its judgment in the passage of this bill, and I urge the Senate to do likewise.

HOUSE RADIO-TELEVISION GALLERY AND ITS SUPERINTENDENT TO OBSERVE 30TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Robert Menaugh, a native of Salem, Ind., will have served 30 years as superintendent of the House Radio-Television Correspondents' Gallery on the 20th of April.

It was on April 20, 1939, that the House first formally acknowledged on-the-air reporters and established a gallery for them separate from the long-established Press Gallery.

Mr. Menaugh, who was then a House employee, was picked to organize that gallery, and today still serves as its superintendent. Over the years, he has been responsible for the accrediting of correspondents in the media for the Republican and Democratic conventions and also the reporters who cover the inaugural ceremonies.

I would like to pay tribute to the radio-television industry on this anniversary, and most especially to Robert M. Menaugh, who is a native of the Ninth Congressional District of Indiana.

In his nightly program, "Today in Congress," over WMAL radio, which keeps a close watch on what goes on here on the Hill, Joseph McCaffrey briefly reviewed the history of the House Radio-Television Gallery:

> On April 20, the House Radio-Television Correspondents' Gallery will be able to celebrate its 30th birthday.
>
> On April 20, 1939, a resolution extending to radio similar privileges accorded to the press was passed by the House. This was a resolution adopting the report submitted by John J. Dempsey, a member from New Mexico.
>
> And the man who was named to preside over that Gallery, Robert M. Menaugh, is still its superintendent, 30 years later.
>
> The men who fought the Gallery through the House, over opposition from the newspaper reporters who were not about to give up their exclusive coverage rights, were Fulton Lewis, Jr., of Mutual Broadcasting, Rex Goad and Fred Morrison of TransRadio Press. H. R. Baukhage and William McAndrew of NBC and Francis "Pete" Tully of Yankee network.
>
> Some months later the first broadcast was made from the new Gallery. It was made by H. R. Baukhage over NBC and Colorado Congressman, Lawrence Lewis, inserted the complete script in the Congressional Record, saying that the broadcast marked an important historical event in news dissemination.
>
> Baukhage's broadcast was made the first day the new Gallery quarters were made available. He pointed out that the Gallery numbered 26 official members. Today, the Gallery has more than 450 members.
>
> Baukhage pointed out that the 26 members is about the same number the press gallery had a 100 years before in 1839, when seats were first set aside in the Senate gallery for correspondents.
>
> And as Baukhage reported from the new Gallery, "Our quarters here, our workshop isn't as large as the press, of course, and if all the members should want to rush in and make use of it at the same time, we'd be pretty crowded; but of course the reporter's job is as much to be where the news is happening at his typewriter or at the microphone." Today, if all the radio-TV reporters tried to get in the cramped House Gallery quarters, there would be chaos.
>
> Baukhage, on this the first broadcast to come from the House Radio Gallery, then introduced the modest Superintendent, Robert Menaugh, calling him a tall, red-headed Hoosier, who knew his way around the Hill because he had worked on the floor of the House for many years.
>
> And Menaugh, in his remarks, proved to be prophetic, when he said: "This method of getting the news out over the air will bring the Senators and Representatives closer to the people, the people they represent. And I know from experience that is really what the Members of Congress want, closer contact with their constituents, and I know from my several years experience right in the midst of things, that it's what the people ought to have. I'm glad radio is here to do the job and I'm mighty glad to help."
>
> When Baukhage signed off, the announcer, who is not identified, said, "This has been the first broadcast from the House of Representatives Radio Correspondents' Gallery, but there will be many more."

> And how right he was.
>
> In one day last month on which a record was kept of broadcast from the Gallery, two news conferences were held, covered by film crews, there were 10 interviews with Members of Congress, there were more than 20 radio tape interviews, and there were two live radio broadcasts.
>
> The first chairman of the Radio-TV Gallery Correspondents' Association was Fulton Lewis, with Albert Warner, then of Columbia Broadcasting, as vice-chairman, William McAndrew of WRC and WMAL as secretary and Fred Morrison as treasurer.
>
> The first annual dinner of the Correspondents' Association was held at the Mayflower Hotel in 1940, with the top guest Postmaster General James Farley. Also in attendance was a host of Members of the House and Senate and General George Marshall, then Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army.
>
> That dinner has now become an annual affair, and after the first dinner, President Franklin D. Roosevelt became a regular until his death in 1945.
>
> Today, the House Radio-TV Gallery has a staff of four, with Mr. Menaugh, Mike Michaelson, Max Barber and Larry May.
>
> The Senate Radio-TV Gallery was opened a few months after the House Gallery, and it's first Superintendent was D. Harold McGrath, who retired some years ago, being succeeded by the present Superintendent, Robert Hough.
>
> So, two weeks from now, it's "happy birthday" to Robert Menaugh and the House Radio-TV Correspondents' Gallery—30 years of service.

And one of Mr. Menaugh's fellow Hoosiers, Indianapolis Star correspondent Ben Cole, remembered Mr. Menaugh's anniversary with the following article:

> HOOSIER ON THE HILL
>
> Come the 20th of April and radio broadcasting from the national Capitol will be 30 years old; and Robert Menaugh, a onetime writer for The Indianapolis Star, will have served 30 years as superintendent of the House radio gallery.
>
> People around the Capitol who can remember that far back say Menaugh has changed in appearance not all during that period, nor has he gained an ounce of weight.
>
> A tall, rawboned Hoosier from Salem, Ind. (he swears there's a drugstore in his hometown where you can still buy Jap-Rose soap), Menaugh knows an anecdote about practically every congressman and newsman who has dwelt in the Capital in the last three decades.
>
> Mr. Joseph McCaffrey, the distinguished radio commentator, paid tribute to Menaugh in a special broadcast last week.
>
> Menaugh's wife is the former Miss Helen Hitch of Indianapolis, an alumna of Butler University. Their daughter, Judy, is a lieutenant in the United States Navy.
>
> Despite his fiery red hair, Menaugh is the soul of equanimity; and his associates tried unavailingly last week to recall an instance in his 30 years' tenure on Capitol Hill when he lost his temper or spoke discourteously to another human being.
>
> The Menaughs live in Alexandria, Va., where they are active in the Westminster Presbyterian Church. Bob has discovered an effective method of tending his lawn: He waits for somebody in Columbus, Ohio, to phone for Roulhac Hamilton, a member of the House radio gallery. Then he quickly inquires, 'Is it raining out there?" If the answer is affirmative, Menaugh knows it's time to put fertilizer on his lawn because it will rain in Alexandria 24 hours later. He's got a pretty lawn and insists his method seldom fails.

NIXON SOCIAL SECURITY CUTS A CRUEL HOAX

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposal to reduce Federal expenditures by reducing the proposed request for a 10-percent social security benefit increase to 7 percent is one of the cruelest budgetary hoaxes ever perpetrated on the senior citizens of this Nation.

The administration knows full well that any such savings would not reduce appropriated Federal expenditures one cent.

Funds for the social security trust do not come from general revenues. They come from the employees and employers of this Nation. They go directly into the social security trust fund and can be used for no other purpose other than social security benefits.

Thus when the administration says it is going to reduce Federal expenditures by $1.1 billion through a 3-percent reduction in proposed social security benefits, what it is really saying is that it is going to ask present and future social security recipients to pay for a budget surplus out of their pocketbooks while the wealthy continue to enjoy many tax-escaping privileges and the tax-gobbling Department of Defense continues to consume tax dollars at a rate of nearly $80 billion a year.

How can the administration justify this proposal to the American people when, during the 1968 campaign and earlier, Mr. Nixon made statements such as these:

> I proposed significant expansion of Social Security as a Congressman, a Senator and a Vice President. I supported Social Security then, and I support it now. More than that, I want to improve and expand Social Security.
>
> We must provide immediately for a cost-of-living adjustment in Social Security and Railroad Retirement benefits.

This is an adjustment alright, an adjustment downwards. If the cost-of-living increase this year equals the 4 percent increase of last year, then the 2-year rise will surpass the proposed administration increase of 7 percent.

> In addition, this 7-percent increase probably would not go into effect until 1970. Thus, the Social Security recipients would have seen their benefit dollars eroded by 8 percent over a two-year period, at the end of which the increase would be only 7 percent. There would be absolutely no remuneration for the two years of preceding loss.

If this is economy in the minds of the President and his advisers, then it is pennywise, pound-foolish economy, and a cruel hoax. It should be disregarded immediately with an apology to the American people.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee which will ultimately determine what will be presented to the Congress as a social security increase, I will fight to maintain the 10 percent. In addition, I will work to expand, not reduce, the social security program by increasing the minimum benefit, increasing the outside earnings limitation, and broaden coverage in general.

CONGRESSMAN EILBERG INTRODUCES THE CHILDREN WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES ACT

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced the Children With Learning Disabilities Act. My bill calls for the creation of programs to aid the child that appears normal in every way, both physically and mentally, but who has some special learning problems which prevent him from fully grasping the learning process.

For too long, when a child could not recognize and understand information presented to him in written form but could understand this same information when it was conveyed orally, we have classified the child as lazy or stubborn. Why have we done this? The reason why is the reason I introduced this bill—the definition of "handicapped" which we have been using is not accurate, it speaks only of medically determinable handicaps but say nothing of the psychological and educational handicaps that a child might have while to all medical appearances he is normal.

The children who would be helped by enactment of the bill I have introduced are those whose parents and teachers have become frustrated in their attempts to teach them because the child's problem was misdiagnosed. This failure to identify the child's handicap in educational or psychological terms has led to these children developing greater and greater problems in learning, in emotional adjustment, and it even has affected their later vocational placement.

The programs which would be supported by my bill are not designed to service only the poverty areas of the Nation.

The assistance which my bill would provide will be available on the basis of where the problems are and not the average annual income in the area. I do not want to be misunderstood. I have supported programs which are designed to help our disadvantaged citizens. I have sponsored legislation in their behalf and I will continue to do so. But, I really believe that too many of our educational programs have become overly concerned with reaching the poor per se rather than reaching out to solve problems where they exist regardless of the economic base of the area or of the persons involved.

The programs which will be supported by the Children With Learning Disabilities Act will place the emphasis on helping these youngsters with special learning disabilities where it belongs—not on fancy diagnostic labels, but on an analysis of the learning task, and on the development of special teaching techniques and materials which can be used to find the learning abilities of the child, employ them, and work around specific barriers to learning that he might have.

Coming to terms with these children in designing educational programs is going to help us learn more about education for every child. It is going to help us realize that children have individual learning styles and characteristics, and that we are going to have to pay more than lipservice to these individual differences. Educators should be able, and will be able, to design special, individualized approaches to the learning tasks which face children.

We can make this possible by providing support for carrying out a program of research and related activities in the area of education of children with special learning disabilities. We must use this research as the basis for programs of professional advanced training for people who are preparing to teach these children, and we must develop model centers for the evaluation and education of our children. These centers will in turn assist our State and local educational agencies in making more programs available to children with special learning disabilities.

Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which my bill amends, provides specifically for the education of handicaped children.

This progressive legislation has created a breakthrough in the following three areas: First, it provided Federal grants to the States to finance educational programs for the handicaped; second, it established the 12-member Advisory Commission on Handicapped Children; and, third, it created within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a new Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. In addition, the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act which we passed in the 90th Congress authorized the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to arrange with either public or nonprofit private agencies for experimental programs for handicapped preschool children.

Mr. Speaker, I support all our efforts to help handicapped children. The bill which I have introduced today will enable us to help those children who have special learning handicaps which are not medically discernible but which at the same time are serious. Members may ask, how many children will this bill help? I wish I could answer that question and quote you an exact figure. But I cannot. As stated in the First Annual Report of the National Advisory Committee On Handicapped Children, "the total number of children involved cannot be accurately determined until more adequate diagnostic procedures and criteria have been developed." This is what my bill will enable us to do. Through enactment of this legislation we can help open the doors of education achievement for at least 500,000 and perhaps 1½ million schoolchildren whose special learning disabilities have gone largely uncorrected because they have not been accurately diagnosed.

CONGRESS HONORS PAN AMERICAN COFFEE DAY

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it was my extreme pleasure yesterday to be associated with the "coffee break" and reception in honor of Pan American Week and the Pan American Coffee Day. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I served with my colleague, the Honorable William S. Mailliard, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, in sponsoring this informal occasion.

Those who attended the event included distinguished members of the diplomatic corps from Central and South American countries, government officials active in Latin American affairs and coffee agreements, representatives of the Pan American Coffee Bureau, businessmen with Latin American coffee interests, Members of Congress, and members of the press who write about Latin American matters.

We were also honored by the presence of the distinguished Speaker of this body, the Honorable John W. McCormack, whose extemporaneous remarks highlighted the event, the able and energetic majority leader, the Honorable Carl Albert, and the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Honorable Thomas Morgan.

Mr. McCormack spoke eloquently about the long tradition of friendship and understanding that exists between the United States and its Latin American neighbors, and all of those present were moved by his wisdom and sincerity. His excellent statement was splendid evidence of why he has been chosen by his colleagues for his high leadership position.

Our gracious hosts, the Pan American Coffee Bureau, arranged an outstanding "buffet" of coffee products, to the delight of all of the guests. This remarkable display in itself should serve as a tremendous boon to the coffee industry, since all of these products were so delicious. Thanks should be extended, too, to the bureau's personable and courteous personnel, who did so much to make this event a success.

I am sure that I speak for the entire subcommittee and all of those connected with this event in expressing my sincere gratitude to our Latin Americans friends for their attendance. This social occasion was one more indication of the strong ties of mutual understanding and friendship in the inter-American region.

GOD AND THE ARMY

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, when I learned of the Army's decision to have chaplains refrain from making any reference to God during its moral guidance lectures, I voiced my shocked disbelief. I asked what kind of moral guidance can there be without a Supreme Being.

I simply cannot fathom the motive, purpose, or objective of the American Civil Liberties Union in pressuring the U.S. Army into such a decision. Certainly it stretches the doctrine of separation of church and state beyond rational limits.

If, in conducting these moral guidance lectures, it is the desire of the Army to make good soldiers out of these young men, I commend to the gentlemen who are reconsidering this policy, and to my colleagues, the philosophy of one of the greatest soldiers ever to wear the uniform of the U.S. Army, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower prepared the article which follows before his death and it appeared in the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star on April 6, 1969:

A SOLDIER RECALLS "WHY I BELIEVE"

(By Dwight D. Eisenhower)

Of the many instances when faith and Christian prayer have sustained me in life, the first came when I was a teen-ager and marked a turning point in my life. I had fallen, skinned my left knee and, when a painful infection later became so bad I couldn't do my farm chores, my parents discovered my swollen and discolored leg. Old Dr. Conklin, the family physician, took one look at the poisoned limb and immediately advised amputation to save any part of the leg or even my life.

When the horror of this prospect swept over me, I raised my 14-year-old frame from the bed to shout, "Not me! I won't allow it! I'd rather die!" Later I made my older brother Edgar promise not to let the doctor cut off my leg no matter what happened and he literally stood guard duty outside my bedroom. At the same time my parents, probably recalling my River Brethren grandfather and his belief in miracles, began a prayer vigil at my bedside. First, father and mother prayed, taking turns in leading one another; during the second night, Edgar—and finally my other four brothers—would kneel from time to time and join the prayers.

The next morning Dr. Conklin's experienced eye noted that the swelling was going down and the discoloration fading. Later in the day I was able to sleep soundly. In two weeks I was out of bed and able to walk. To me, this demonstration of the power of prayer did more than save my leg; it strengthened my faith for life.

Often during World War II, I turned to God when I had no one else to turn to. Two such crises involved our paratroopers. One night during the invasion of Sicily an armada of American aircraft was reported off course and there was an imminent danger that thousands of our sky troops would be dropped into the sea. I remember praying, "Save them and deliver them, O God. For they are in Thy Almighty Hand." Incredibly enough, the lead plane later regained its bearings and the drop was successful.

Similarly, on the eve of the massive D-Day assault on Europe, the soul-wracking problem arose as to whether to send two American airborne divisions against the Nazi-fortified Cherbourg Peninsula. British Air Chief Leigh-Mallory himself advised against what he termed "this futile slaughter," and yet to cancel the airborne attack would endanger the whole critical invasion of Utah Beach. I could only go to my tent to think and pray, to review every step of our elaborate planning and to ask God's guidance in making the right decision. I finally decided that the aerial attack would go as planned and, with what seemed to be the Almighty's Blessing, the paratroopers accomplished their dangerous mission with comparatively light casualties.

When in peacetime it became my high honor to serve the nation twice as President, I tried to ensure that the government and every person in it was dedicated to honesty and moral principles. To a large extent, I believe, we succeeded. Personally I tried to set the new administration's tone before delivering my inaugural address when I asked all present to bow their heads and I offered a prayer I had written that morning: "Give us, we pray oh, God, the power to discern clearly right from wrong and allow all our actions to be governed thereby and by the laws of the land. Especially we pray that our concern shall be for all the people regardless of station, race or calling." During the ensuing eight years I never opened a cabinet meeting or made a major policy decision without a minute of silent prayer.

A lifetime of soldiering and public service only confirms my conviction that I am as intensely religious as any man I know. Nobody goes through six years of war and two terms of the presidency without faith. And, although I have seldom displayed or discussed my religious philosophy with anyone, a deep Bible-centered Christian faith has colored my life since childhood. Devout Evangelical parents, who loved the Bible as dearly as life itself, made sure of that. Indeed, before I was 18, I had read through the entire bible and discussed it, chapter by chapter, with my mother.

Recalling the long years and the cascade of crisis through which we have passed, I realize that a strong spiritual experience has literally been the staff of life to me. Back in Abilene, Kans., my mother, who was never happier than when reading the Bible, and my father, who balanced his career as a mechanical engineer with the study of scriptures in the original Greek, stressed one truth over and over again: Religion, placed in man by God, is most natural to him. How often, both in war and peace, was I to rediscover this changeless truth.

With equal fervor I believe that faith in God and the Judaic-Christian ethic inspired the founding fathers of the United States. These remarkable men—Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, Franklin, Paine, John Adams, John Hancock and Patrick Henry, to name a few of them—were men of deep religious conviction and in the new world they were trying to establish an entirely new form of government. They succeeded because during the fateful decade of deliberation and decision, the 1770's, they put their final trust in almighty God and his moral law. We are a religious nation today because in the Declaration of Independence they stated their full reliance on "the laws of nature and nature's God" and because they published before the world "these self-evident truths: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. . . ."

In contrast with this concept of the sacredness of life, modern atheistic dictatorships treat men as nothing more than animals or educated mules. How many materialistic psychologists and smart-alec professors sneer that men invented God in a childish search for security; yet, I have noticed that these same men in the fox-holes or at the moment of death turn to some higher power for comfort and courage. Thus, it is that I believe there is nothing wrong with America today that the faith, love of freedom, intelligence and energy of her citizens cannot cure.

Thus, in hope and eternal vigilance, I recall again for America my favorite biblical lines: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

TIME TO STOP FINANCING REVOLUTION ON THE COLLEGE CAMPUS

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, now that the Students for a Democratic Society have succeeded in virtually taking over the Harvard University campus, let there be no mistake in the minds of those weak-kneed college administrators who up until now actually believed that by accepting the demands of this vociferous group things would cool off—things do not get better with SDS, they get a lot worse.

If SDS can dictate policy for the Nation's best known and oldest university, why should they quit now? The Harvard strike is only the beginning, and college and university officials had best prepare themselves for a long siege. SDS and its counterpart groups announced their intentions a long time ago; however, just like Adolf Hitler proved in the case of his book, "Mein Kampf," no one cares to listen.

But, Mr. Speaker, Harvard University officials better start listening and acting with a little gumption, because in 10 years a degree from Harvard will not be worth a plug nickel. In fact, if SDS has its way, a Harvard degree will be comparable to a degree from the University of Havana.

Mr. Speaker, last September I took the floor to document a case against SDS. I described how Gus Hall, the Communist Party boss in America, pinned his hopes on SDS and other radical student groups to perpetuate the Communist conspiracy. Quote after quote from SDS leaders were contained in my remarks at that time. Typical among them were the prophetic words of Tom Hayden, who boldly stated that SDS would close every college in the Nation unless college administrators became subordinate to SDS.

Hayden is even more up to date on his timetable than Hitler. One year after this prediction, several major colleges and universities are running the risk of being closed down. By comparison, it took Hitler about 10 years after writing "Mein Kampf" to achieve such results.

Mr. Speaker, certainly I do not want to sound like an alarmist and I claim no gift of clairvoyance. But, as we say in South Carolina, it is time to fish or cut bait. The American people, especially those parents whose hard-earned money pays for the education of their children, are disgusted over the namby-pamby method employed by many college officials in dealing with these student disorders.

Now, I have joined with my good friend and esteemed colleague from Tennessee (Mr. KUYKENDALL) in introducing a bill to terminate all Federal funds to a college or university hit by rioting if the school administration fails to restore order. This is a step in the right direction. With the prodigious amount of higher education legislation passed by Congress in the past few years, virtually every college and university has become heavily dependent upon the Federal Government. Well, these are tax dollars paid by the American taxpayer, and at the present time the taxpayer is getting a poor return on his investment. Harvard is a prime example. It seems to me that the Federal Government is financing anarchy on that campus this very hour.

The fund cut-off bill is not intended to be vindictive. It is not intended to be used as the Sword of Damocles to be held over the head of a college president and the college finance office. But, Mr. Speaker, it is intended to restore some sense of order in the academic community and to allow the student who is sincerely seeking an education to pursue academic excellence without fear of harassment, intimidation and actual bodily harm. What we seek to attain is a commitment from school officials to employ every means at their disposal to quell student disruptions. This seems to be a fair proposition. After all, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 stipulates that all Federal funds can be cut off to a school district not in compliance with the act. As they say, "what is good for the goose is good for the gander." If the Federal Government can deny funds to school districts supposedly not meeting arbitrary HEW desegregation guidelines, it most certainly can deny them to college radicals and the college that condones their rioting.

STUDENT DISORDERS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, to a great extent, the lives and hopes of our student generation pivot on the wisdom and judgment of the men of an older generation to whom power and authority has been entrusted.

Surely it is not improper for young people to question the wisdom of decisions and policies that affect their very existence. When there is legal dissent—and I emphasize legal dissent—it is, without a doubt, healthy and progressive because it is both an expression of interest and an act of faith in a democracy.

It is also the machinery for change and improvement; a guaranteed process that is a cornerstone of democracy. History is replete with vivid illustrations of how this process has helped our Nation grow strong and great. Like medicine, the test of its value is not its taste but its effect, not how it makes people feel at the moment but how it makes them feel and act in the long run.

However, I am worried about the other side of the coin—the process of illegal dissent among a minority of students who have turned the campus into an arena for oppression by revolutionaries, vandals, and arsonists.

The bombings, the seizure and burnings of buildings, the window smashing, the manhandling attacks on professors, college presidents, and students trying to reach classes through picket lines—all of these acts of overt physical violence are tragic and a matter of deep concern to most young people, their parents, and the vast majority of all Americans.

Even some of our high schools have been plagued by illegal disorders, though not to the degree, of course, that our colleges have experienced.

At Columbia University last year, a relatively small number of students wrecked property, injured policemen and others, and participated in campus disorders that caused the suspension of classes for days for some 20,000 students. And that has been pretty much the pattern since then across the country.

One police officer, who has children of his own to raise, was injured so badly at Columbia that he will be paralyzed for the rest of his life.

An increasing number of good Americans already burdened by rising taxation are becoming more and more disillusioned as they see colleges torn apart and some of their tax dollars going down the drain.

Consequently, the task is becoming most difficult for those among us who have been working to find and encourage the means of providing greater Federal aid for education.

When one considers all aspects of this problem—all the grave consequences at home and abroad—it becomes patently clear that America is paying a terrible price for the illegal acts of those who constitute no more than a bare minority.

When so few can do so much to so many—when they can trample on our rights and shake the foundation of our educational system—we are faced with a moment of truth. We must ask ourselves: "Can democracy survive the continuance of this onslaught from within?" I am sure no responsible American wants to incur the risk required for an answer to that question.

In the context of our President's statement of position on March 23 informing the Nation that the problem of campus disorders should be left to the colleges and universities, the administrators of these institutions must understand that weakness will not conquer strength.

They must also understand completely that the pursuit of intellectual freedom is genuine and idealistic only when it is accomplished within the framework of the laws of our society.

They must react swiftly and sternly for the singular purpose of ending as fast as possible within the process of the law any illegal campus disorders that might arise. Too much is at stake to do otherwise.

In conjunction with the President's statement of position, the administration has called attention to antiriot amendments permitting a cutoff of Federal aid to students convicted for involvement in campus disorders. I do not believe there is any fairness to this procedure. I say this because students from rich families do not require any Federal aid. Enforcement of these amendments, therefore, would be directed only at students who really need help.

Rich students—some of whom have been found to be among the principal agitators of campus uprisings—would suffer no deprivations and would still have the means of continuing their education. This is surely onesided justice; the kind of procedure that only tends to complicate and worsen an already severe problem.

I was optimistic not too long ago when President Nixon congratulated Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, the president of the great University of Notre Dame, for his stern but sensible views about student disorders. But later, when our President made his position known, I found it difficult to reconcile how he could issue a statement that bore no resemblance to Father Hesburgh's action and strength.

I am certain that Father Hesburgh—through his enlightened words—has given us basic guidelines to follow if we are to overcome this crisis. For that reason, I think we should listen again.

Father Hesburgh said:

> Any group that substitutes force for rational persuasion—

Be it violent or nonviolent—

> will be given fifteen minutes of meditation to cease and desist . . . if there is not then within five minutes a movement to cease and desist, students will be notified of expulsion from this community and the law will deal with them as non-students.

Father Hesburgh also said:

> We can have a thousand resolutions as to what kind of society we want, but when lawlessness is afoot and all authority is flouted . . . then we must invoke the normal societal forces of law or allow the university to die beneath our hapless and hopeless gaze.

Father Hesburgh's wisdom and understanding of the problem are reflected in this statement, too:

> No one wants the forces of law on this or any other campus, but if some necessitated as a last and dismal alternative to anarchy and mob tyranny, let them shoulder the blame instead of receiving the sympathy of the community they would hold at bay.

Yes, Father Hesburgh's words are a light in the darkness; he has surely shown us how to get off the collision course and navigate to safe water.

For the welfare of this Nation, it is my belief that Congress must not only pinpoint the causes of what is happening but must also provide the incentives, the initiatives and the leadership for the remedy. I favor, therefore, a congressional inquiry—and I do not believe we can move too fast for the accomplishment of this.

As an interim measure, I propose the revocation of military deferments for all students who are convicted of illegal acts on college campuses. They would then face the normal process of military induction—provided they are found to be physically and mentally fit. I consider this implicitly fair because it applies to all segments of our student generation—the rich as well as the poor and the middle class.

At the same time, any Federal aid that was earmarked for such students would be cut off automatically, and I am sure that many Americans would agree that those tax dollars can be put to better use.

THE PEOPLE'S VOICE

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, too many people today are frustrated because they believe that the Congress is no longer being responsive to the wishes of the general public. Because I believe that one of the most important responsibilities of a Congressman is to be responsive to public opinion, I distributed a questionnaire to the people of the Seventh District of Michigan in order to learn how they view the issues. The results of this questionnaire appear in my latest newsletter which I am putting into the RECORD at this point because I believe that their opinions are representative of the feelings of millions of concerned Americans throughout the United States:

CONGRESSMAN DON RIEGLE'S REPORT TO PEOPLE OF SEVENTH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

(SPECIAL NOTE.—We have delayed this newsletter so you could have a brief advance report on Congressman Riegle's mission to Vietnam. We are preparing a comprehensive report which will be mailed to you in the near future.)

EVALUATING U.S. FOREIGN AID IN VIETNAM, SOUTHEAST ASIA AND THE MIDEAST

In behalf of the House Appropriations Committee, Congressman Riegle was asked to investigate U.S. economic and military assistance to developing countries. His mission included on-the-spot evaluation—over the February Congressional recess—of U.S. policy and foreign aid spending in Vietnam, Korea, Thailand and India. He also received military briefings at NATO headquarters in Brussels and in Istanbul. Congressman Riegle met with President Thieu of South Vietnam and top U.S. officials in Saigon. He also spent three days traveling throughout the country by helicopter, jeep and on foot assessing the present ability of the South Vietnamese people to defend and rebuild their own country. He concluded: "While the South Vietnamese have improved their fighting capability, the U.S. effort continues on a massive scale, and the military war is far from over. In frank discussions with top South Vietnamese leaders they agreed that the Army of Vietnam must take on more battlefield responsibility and that progressive 'de-Americanization' of combat operations and overall U.S. troop reductions must get underway soon. I believe a beginning of withdrawal of U.S. troops must begin no later than the end of the third quarter of 1969, and the South Vietnamese leaders agreed with this opinion."

On his visit to rural areas, Congressman Riegle said, "The major problem continues to be the basic unalignment of much of South Vietnam's rural population. I learned that some villages termed 'pacified' still pay more taxes to the Viet Cong than to the Government of Vietnam. The pacification program has shown some progress, but I believe U.S. officials in Saigon must push the South Vietnamese harder on economic reform, refugee resettlement and solving the corruption problem."

YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Over 15,000 people in Genesee and Lapeer Counties returned our last questionnaire. Here are the tabulated results. Because I believe your views are shared by the majority of Americans across the nation, I am entering these results in the Congressional Record where the Congress and the public can study them.

CRIME

[In percent]

	Yes
(A) In last 5 years, victims of—	
Petty crime	19
Robbery	26
Bodily harm	6

	Yes	No	Unsure
(B) Increase spending on crime control	60	23	17

	Very	Serious	Moderate
(C) Is crime a serious problem?			
National	78	20	2
Local	57	31	12

	Much more	More	Same
(D) Correctional emphasis should be on—			
Poverty, urban ghettos	31	34	35
Drugs, alcoholism	43	36	21
Juvenile delinquency	55	34	11
Organized crime	55	29	16
Rehabilitation repeaters	46	31	23
Increased police power	67	24	9

	Yes	No	Unsure
(E) In favor of stop and frisk law?	73	17	13

POVERTY, WELFARE, HUMAN PROBLEMS?

	Yes	No	Unsure
(A) Are present programs adequate?	28	70	12
(B) Which do you favor?			
Reduce programs			14
Continue present programs			2
Increase present programs			2
Emphasize self-help and involve private business			78
Spend whatever necessary			4

	Yes	No	Unsure
(C) Would you favor a guaranteed income?			
With work	53	38	9
Without work	2	95	3
(D) Should these groups do more to provide jobs?			
Labor	75	9	16
Business	72	9	19
Government	31	35	34

GUN CONTROLS

	Yes	No	Unsure
Present control OK, need more enforcement	64	18	18
Ban mail-order sales of all guns	84	12	4
State registration/licensing	44	46	10
Federal registration/licensing	20	71	9
Tougher penalties for misuse of guns	87	7	6

INFLATION, COST OF LIVING

	Yes	No	Unsure
Cut Federal spending, balanced budget	72	13	15
Trim Federal spending, allow small deficit	56	27	17
Voluntary controls on management and unions	75	16	9
Temporary, strict wage and price controls	43	37	20
Increase income taxes	5	86	9

NATIONAL PRIORITIES

	High	Middle	Low
End Vietnam war	84	13	3
Public safety	79	19	2
Get better people into government	75	20	5
Strengthen U.S. dollar	68	26	6
Air and water pollution	62	30	8
A more responsive government	52	31	17
Improve American education	49	40	11
Poverty in America	41	44	15
Racial and social problems	36	41	23
Defense, contain communism	30	42	28
World hunger	24	40	36
Urban problems	23	44	33

INDIVIDUAL AND GOVERNMENT

Self-government participation should be:	Less	Same	More
Individual citizen	1	9	90
Community organizations	10	32	58
Private enterprise	11	29	60
Labor	34	25	41
Local government	7	26	67
State government	13	35	52
Federal Government	44	27	29
Political parties	37	31	32

VIETNAM

Which alternatives do you favor in each of the following?

	Yes	No	Unsure
(A) Military strategy and peace talks:			
Continue full U.S. military effort	30	54	16
Deescalate ground fighting	30	54	16
Stop all bombing of North Vietnam	16	70	14
Give fighting to South Vietnamese	47	34	19
Cut "search and destroy" efforts—concentrate on population centers	25	47	28
(B) Diplomatic strategy and peace talks:			
Agree to coalition government	28	52	20
Guarantee neutralization of South Vietnam	76	13	11
Free elections in South Vietnam, abide by results	59	24	17

	Yes
(C) If peace talks fail:	
Declare unlimited war on North Vietnam	25
Step up military activity	22
Continue present policy	3
Fight while seeking coalition government	5
Gradual withdrawal, shift to South Vietnam	34
Withdraw at once	11
(D) How important is it to continue a major commitment of $30,000,000,000 per year, 525,000 U.S. troops?	
Extremely important	22
Very important	12
Important	13
Not very important	34
Unsure	19

PUBLIC STRIKES

	Right to strike	Accept arbitration	Unsure
Teachers	23	71	6
Firemen	15	79	6
Policemen	15	79	6
Garbagemen	26	68	6
Nurses	18	75	7
Transportation workers	31	62	7

VOTING AGE

	Yes	No	Unsure
Should it be lowered to 18?	40	51	9

YOU AND AMERICA

	Yes	No	Unsure
Do you agree?			
A gulf between individual and government	80	10	10
Most public officials don't care	57	28	15
Your vote influences public policy	23	64	13
Voting is your only influence	42	46	12
The individual has no influence	49	37	14
Government is too complicated	71	21	8
Something is really wrong with the United States	60	29	11
Individual wants to do more	58	21	21
Moving away from pride, self-discipline, and responsibility	83	8	9
No progress without law, order, and safety	90	5	5

WHO RETURNED QUESTIONNAIRE

Age	Percent	Occupation	Percent
15 to 29	24	Hourly wage earner	17
30 to 39	27	Skilled trades	7
40 to 49	17	Salaried employee	17
50 to 59	14	Business or profession	20
60 up	18	Farmer	1
		Housewife	24
		Retiree	11
		Other	3

ACADEMY NOMINATIONS

As your Congressman it is my privilege to nominate young men for appointment to the Armed Forces Academies to train as career officers. I have established a committee of community leaders to assist in recruiting and screening applicants and together we select the nominees. All men are in competition and every applicant is asked to submit records of his qualifications—academic and physical aptitude, motivation and character references from teachers and friends. Those who indicate the highest achievement from this evidence are nominated. As a result of this process, 12 nominations have just been just made for this year but final appointments will be made by the academies themselves.

All young men who would like to know more about the academies should contact my district office soon (425 Detroit St., Flint 48502).

GI KIDS CHRISTMAS PARTY

My staff and I were most pleased to be able to coordinate the second annual G.I. Kids Christmas Party for over 250 children and wives of our overseas servicemen on December 20th. Once again your generous contributions of time, effort and money made it a great success—plenty of food and gifts, splendid entertainment, and free tickets to the Shriner's circus on January 13th. Family photographs and tape recordings were made and mailed to the servicemen.

During the party it was learned that one family, whose father had died in action, would not be having a Christmas tree. Another's Christmas would be scant because "Daddy was gone." Special arrangements were made for these and other families from the Christmas party fund.

It was deeply rewarding for all of us to share in making this season a little better for these families—to show community appreciation for such a large sacrifice on their part. My special thanks to Bernard McGuire, volunteer chairman, and all of you who did such a wonderful job on the party.

THE 91ST CONGRESS—A LOOK AHEAD

During the coming year, Congress and the people, together with President Nixon and his administration must work on these major issues with a new urgency:

De-Americanize the Vietnam war

Combat crime and lawlessness at home

Reform our tax system and plug loopholes, end or reduce surtax

Defuse the world arms race, hunger and population explosion

Arrange a just peace in the Mideast

Continue the quest for equal opportunity

Eliminate the causes of poverty

Overhaul the welfare system

Fight air and water pollution

Create incentives for individuals and groups to combat our cities' problems.

As a nation we feel the frustrations that come with sensing urgent problems but not yet seeing the solutions. Real progress will come—not from massive legislation, not from bigger government programs, not from just spending more money—but from the creative spirit and energies of our citizens. We have found that government can't do everything for everybody. Instead we must reshape our government—from the bottom up—to provide incentives for individual and community involvement and accomplishments. People want to be heard, and to have a hand in improving the quality and direction of American life and its institutions. Every citizen can start by looking around at his own neighborhood or community and volunteering his own time and energy where it will do the most good.

STUDENT AID BOOK

Going to college? Write or stop into our district office (425 Detroit St., Flint—48502) for our booklet, "Federal Financial Assistance to College Students."

A PERSONAL MESSAGE

On behalf of Nancy, the children and myself I want to express our deep thanks for the continued honor of serving you in the United States Congress. Your interest, your concern, and your commitment to good government is a source of strength to me, our community, and to our country.

We all know that our country has tough and urgent problems to solve—but if we apply our best energy and continue to work together—I'm convinced we can accomplish anything we set out to do.

As we begin this new term in Congress I am reminded of the words of John Kennedy who, in 1960, said these words:

"With a good conscience our only sure reward, and history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love—

Asking His blessing, and His help, but knowing that here on earth, God's work must truly be our own."

THE DAY OF THE FREEDOM FIGHTER

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, in memory of the Cuban freedom fighters who are now suffering under the yoke of communism, I would like to have Congress remember April 17, 1969, as "The Day of the Freedom Fighter."

On this date in history, April 17, 1961, 1,500 Cuban patriots, the brigade 2506, valiantly attempted in a vain effort to liberate Cuba. Although they failed for well-known reasons, these patriots have not given up their struggle.

Today we commend Ra'ul Comesañas, La Nacion Americana, the largest Spanish speaking newspaper in New Jersey, and the many loyal Cubans in Elizabeth, N.J. They have not given up the struggle against communism. They will not give up fighting until Cuba is once again free.

A SYSTEM FOR PEACEFUL PLANNING

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE) is noted for his scholarship and farsighted and perceptive proposals. An example is found in his sponsorship of legislation which would establish a national commission for the purpose of planning and organizing a smooth shift from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

The gentleman's proposal was recently analyzed in a thoughtful article by Donald R. Larrabee, Washington correspondent for the Worcester-Telegram.

I offer it at this point in the RECORD and commend it to my colleagues:

[From the Worcester Telegram, Apr. 4, 1969]

A SYSTEM FOR PEACETIME PLANNING

(By Donald R. Larrabee)

WASHINGTON.—U.S. Rep. F. Bradford Morse, the Lowell Republican, has been preaching for five years about the need for a national commission to conduct long-range planning so that the economy can shift smoothly into peacetime production when the war in Vietnam is over

Morse introduced a bill in 1964 to establish such a commission. At the time he was able to interest about 25 of his colleagues but the Johnson Administration wouldn't buy the proposal. The legislation created little excitement in Congress, either, possibly because real peace seemed so remote.

Now, at the outset of the 91st Congress, the Fifth District congressman has filed his bill again with more than 60 other members of the House and Senate joining him. This includes significant bi-partisan support in the Senate from George McGovern, D-S.D., and Mark Hatfield, R-Ore.

"Perhaps," a colleague said the other day, "Brad Morse's suggestion for a serious economic conversion study is one of those ideas whose time has come."

CRITICAL LOOK

The Nixon administration, if it is sensitive to the winds that are blowing on Capitol Hill, will embrace Morse's plan. Against the backdrop of a serious start at peace discussions, many congressmen are taking a critical look at heavy outlay for military spending on such systems as the Sentinel anti-ballistic missile (ABM).

There is more and more talk that the big new defense systems which have gobbled up huge chunks of the budget in recent years must take their place in line for consideration along with scores of unmet needs in the civilian economy.

But this feeling is coupled with a practical judgment that the military planners will not stand by idly and allow all those billions to find their way into anything but the military-industrial complex which seems to be a bottomless budgetary pit.

THOUGHTFUL CONGRESSMEN

Some of the more thoughtful members of Congress are saying these days that the biggest mistake anyone can make is to think that when the war ends in Vietnam, all of that multibillion dollar defense budget will somehow automatically be shifted into such things as better transportation systems, improved education, programs to halt urban decay and fill housing needs, expanded health research and a greater attack on air and water pollution.

Morse is saying, simply, that it won't happen until there is a formalized national planning effort now which will focus on the country's most urgent needs.

His proposed commission would be chaired by the secretary of commerce and would be composed of the secretaries of defense, agriculture, HEW, housing, interior, labor and transportation, the head of the Atomic Energy Commission, the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, the director of the Arms Control agency and the administrator of the national space program.

In addition to the commission's planning work, Morse feels his bill will provide the machinery for two important conversion steps by both government and industry:

(1) Defense contracts would be required to set up provisions in which the contractor would define his capability for converting his resources to civilian uses.

(2) The commission would encourage similar planning by industry associations, labor unions and professional societies.

Morse recognizes that the basic decisions about conversion must be made by the individual business firm, but he thinks government has an important role to play in helping businessmen to make informed, inteligent decisions. What he is suggesting is that the government take a leaf from the big defense industries and the big Pentagon machine to manage the planning of our domestic program needs. Morse would use the so-called systems management technique, developed for the defense establishment, to help solve nondefense, nonspace problems.

For example, he would have the Merrimack River, which flows through his district, regarded as a "system," just like an ABM or a TFX aircraft. This would mean looking at the river in terms of its function, taking into account the diverse uses and needs that the river fulfills, and seeking coordinated, rather than patchwork, solutions.

If civilian planners don't have a blueprint ready for a river system, Morse says, the military industrial-establishment will inevitably fill the void with a weapons system.

GRASSROOTS PHILOSOPHY

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this week we have had the distinct pleasure of having present in our fair city over 65 lovely ladies representing the Iowa Farm Bureau. They are with us on the occasion of their annual visit to Washington, D.C. On Tuesday evening I had the distinct pleasure of hearing a speech by Mrs. H. A. Schnekloth, of Eldridge, Iowa, a member of the Iowa Farm Bureau. Her speech is the prime example of real grassroots philosophy on farming and farm problems. Mrs. Schnekloth's speech follows. This speech is informative, it is based on experience and thorough knowledge, and deep conviction. It should be read by every Member of Congress and all who receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Honorable Senators and Representatives from Iowa, guests and Farm Bureau women, 97 Iowa Farm Bureau women are very happy to be here, in our Nation's Capitol, and especially at this Congressional dinner. Sixty-five of us have never been here before, and it was the first jet trip for 53 of us. I must get a little personal to let you know why it is a special experience for me.

Ever since we have had our two children I have expressed a desire to take a family trip to Washington, D.C. Our children are now 20 and 18. Before plans could be arranged my husband received a trip here with the Farm Bureau National Policy Committee. One of the highlights of that trip was our district congressman's, the Hon. Fred Schwengel, tour of the Capital, and I wanted to go more than ever so Fred could show me around too. Soon after our son earned a week's stay at the National 4–H Center through the citizenship short course program, but Mr. Schwengel, at that time, had taken a forced leave of absence from his office here. So in the fall of 1964 my chances of ever having Congressman Fred Schwengel give me a guided tour of our Nation's Capitol seem dim indeed. Then my husband received another trip when he was Farm Bureau campaign manager and reached goal in our county. That was it! I knew my chances of getting him back at any near date was pure wishful thinking. To top it all off last summer our daughter earned a county trip for the 4–H citizenship short course and she will fly in again this Saturday as one of two Iowa 4–H girls to attend the National 4–H Club Conference. So—you can see why I'm so thrilled to be here—and I'm especially glad that the voters of the First District put Fred back to work again.

The Iowa Farm Bureau is a family organization. The Farm Bureau women, as Mr. Taylor said, are not an auxiliary but an integral part of the entire program and take an active part in all phases of it. They act on legislative, resolution and special committees, assist in program planning, promote recreational activities, better health programs, marketing, and help with membership. In addition, Iowa Farm Bureau women accept specific responsibility for disseminating information and stimulating activity in Farm Bureau. Our township meetings are educational and informative, not "coffee clotches." Someone of another organization once said, "Farm Bureau women are informed." They are vitally interested in government and its functions. They study State and National issues, they are informed about taxes, they attend meetings to meet their candidates and have learned about their voting rights. Within the last month women from all across Iowa have attended district metings on legislation and national policy. Some of the topics covered have been government farm programs, marketing programs, international trade, inflation, financing education and welfare, tax treatment for farm losses and farm labor unionization. The information gathered at these meetings will be taken back to the county meetings, where the township representatives will in turn inform their individual groups. We call this "grass roots information" and this is where our resolutions start. As we farm women are not above running a tractor in fields at a busy season or pitching in at other masculine tasks, neither do our men frown on our trespassing in their fields of policy formation and implementation. They welcome our support and assistance.

Iowa Farm Bureau families have relied on their organization to serve theirs and the Nation's best interests for a half century, as farmers become more of a minority group each year our organizations value to us increases proportionately.

Farmers today live much the same as urban people. Their children go to the same schools and churches, farm people are interested in most of the same things. They enjoy civic music, little theatre, good movies, bridge, golf, cookouts, art—they plan vacations, like nice homes with attractive yards. Many farmers are Kiwanians, Rotarians and Lions. Farm homemakers give of their time to charities and auxiliaries. Eleanor Roosevelt once said farming is not a profession it is a way of life. Today I would say farmers are professionals who enjoy their way of life.

It is impossible in the time available to me to properly discuss all the issues that are of concern to farm women today. However I do feel one of the problems of greatest concern to farm women also has the greatest long term implications for our Nation: this is the threat of run away inflation.

Nearly everyone seems to agree that a "little" inflation is better than a depression. Also most economists would like to have us believe that you cannot have prosperity and a reasonably full employment without some inflation. I also know that talk of a recession or unemployment needs to curb inflation, does not make good campaign material for a Congressman or Senator running for reelection. So all in all it seems inflation has a lot going for it on the surface at least.

Why then, is inflation so feared in countries like West Germany, who have experienced its ruinous effects at one time in their history?

Why are the older folks who vividly remember the boom of the twenties followed by the depression of the thirties so concerned about today's spiraling prices and ever increasing taxes?

One of the reasons is, I believe, that people and nations who have experienced severe inflation know that one of its most damaging aspects is the break down of the moral fiber of the individual citizen. Indeed when the inflation psychology grips a nation, old fashioned virtues of thrift, hard work and restraint seem to be a liability.

The mood of the day becomes one of irresponsibility, try and do as little work as possible for as much pay as the market will bear. Why save money? It will buy less next year. By all means get into debt so you can pay it off with cheaper dollars in the years hence.

In America today we can see some of the results of this living beyond our means already. A staggering national debt, skyrocketing interest rates, and our unfavorable trade balance.

To mention a few things very close to home, our real estate taxes per acre have tripled in 14 years. The implement dealer who charged three dollars per hour for shop labor only five years ago now charges six. A spring coat I purchased a year ago for $44.95 is priced this spring at $49.95, an 11% increase in one year.

That inflation is the cruelest tax of all was shown very clearly in the February 17 issue of U.S. News & World Report. A worker who is earning $7,000 is expecting a pay raise of 6% or $420. The surtax will take $92. Increased social security tax $48. Increase in State and local taxes $9. Total increased taxes $149. The higher cost of living, inflation if you please, will take $220. These two total $369, leaving $51 out of a $420 raise in pay.

I have tried to give some examples of inflation that are very familiar to me. Also I have tried to show that inflation reaches beyond purely financial considerations and actually affects how people think and live.

If this Nation is to remain financially sound and morally right it is time we take stock of our many Government programs that seem to be spending money for the sole purpose of keeping it in circulation. Some Government spending programs or "pump priming" in times of a lagging economy might, I said might, be justified. But to continue to spawn new spending programs into an economic stream already running at flood stage can only lead to disaster.

I have a very strong personal conviction that it is up to leaders to lead. I do not believe that it is always in the best interests of the country to have its people get just what they say they want in the Gallup poll. (Maybe I'm just jealous because I've never been polled.)

America is a great Nation today largely because of the foresight and wisdom of its leaders. Now as never before the cry is for statesmanship and vision, we cannot afford less.

In closing let me say, I was born and raised on the farm. We are living on a farm part of which has been in my husband's family for 110 years. We have a son who hopes to carry on this family tradition. Farming has been a good way of life for our family, there has been hard work and setbacks but also much satisfaction and progress. This is truly a great Nation in which we are privileged to live. Let us all work together to strengthen the moral, spiritual and financial fiber of this country so that our children and their children may also enjoy this privilege.

PROTECTIONS FOR PENN CENTRAL EMPLOYEES

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable interest as well as concern as to the effect upon employees of the merger into the Penn Central of two already-huge railroads, the old New York Central Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

The Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, AFL–CIO, has issued a memorandum containing the basic features of the protections which have been negotiated for its members.

In view of the wide interest, I am including with my remarks the text of the union's memorandum:

EMPLOYEE PROTECTION: PENN CENTRAL MERGER

Basic agreement provides attrition type protection for all employes of former PRR, NYC, and NYNH & H who performed service for any of these carriers between January 1, 1964 and March 31, 1965 (both dates inclusive), except those who qualified for protection under the February 7, 1965 National Stabilization Agreement and subsequently forfeited that protection. Employes who qualify for the attrition type protection are designated as "Present Employes." Those employes who performed service between January 1, 1964 and March 31, 1965 who do not qualify as "present employes" and those employes hired on and after April 1, 1965 and before February 1, 1968 (date of merger) are entitled to protection under the Washington Job Protection Agreement of May 1936.

The basic merger agreement of May 20, 1964 gave the New Company (Penn Central) the right to transfer work throughout the merged system. The right to transfer employes was to be handled by implementing agreements and our organization entered into a master implementing agreement on October 18, 1966 which protects the "present employes" at their home location or "home zone" as defined in the Agreement.

If Penn Central elects to transfer work from one location to another, such as Freight Claim work from Boston to Buffalo, and does not request employes to follow the work, the "present employes" in Boston would remain in service at full pay in a utility status until another regular position in Boston becomes available. A non-present employe, under the Washington Agreement, if retained in service, would be guaranteed full wages for five years—and if unable to hold a position would qualify for the 60% coordination allowance with the option to separate (the length of time he can receive the coordination allowance and the amount of separation pay are determined by the formulas set forth in the Washington Agreement).

If Penn Central elects to transfer work from one location to another, such as the Marketing Department from New York to Philadelphia, and requests the employes to follow the work, the "present employes" have the right to exercise one of the three options set forth in the Implementing Agreement of October 18, 1966; that is, follow the work, exercise seniority to another available position in their seniority district, or separate from service. The non-present employes, under the Washington Agreement, are being offered positions in the coordinated office at Philadelphia; therefore, if they refuse to accept such position they are not deemed to have been deprived of employment as a result of merger, consequently, they cannot the Washington Agreement with the option qualify for a coordination allowance under to accept a separation allowance. In other words, if a non-present employe refuses to accept a position either in Philadelphia or New York he forfeits any benefits to which he might otherwise be entitled under the Washington Agreement.

It should be understood that this explanation is merely a basic operation of the Agreements and will, for the most, cover the majority of changes; however, there are variations to fit other circumstances and any employe having a specific question should seek the advice of his local or General Chairman for clarification as to how the agreements apply to his particular situation.

ESPERANTO: ONE ANSWER TO THE LANGUAGE BARRIER

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the difficulties created by the language barrier. One answer to this problem is the development of a common functional language. Esperanto is such a language. It is now 80 years old.

I am pleased that one of my constituents, Allan C. Boschen, of Pittsfield, is a leader in this field. He is the local coordinator for the Esperanto Congress to be held at North Adams State College in North Adams on July 17–20, 1969. In addition, a special summer course will be given in Esperanto at North Adams State College in July. It is expected that these events will be quite popular.

I would like at this time to submit an article by Mr. Boschen that appeared in Trend magazine, "A Journal of Educational Thought and Action":

ESPERANTO: ONE ANSWER TO THE LANGUAGE BARRIER

(By Allan C. Boschen)

One of the most profound problems of mankind is the international language barrier. The truth of this statement is dramatically portrayed by the fact that even heads of state usually cannot converse directly with each other, in spite of all our grand scientific achievements, and regardless of all that might be done by use of computers. Doctors, lawyers, and educators, in many foreign language situations, are stripped of every advantage that normally accrues to their depth of knowledge, for communication is an essential part of everything that people do—and communication in turn requires the vehicle of language.

UNIVERSAL SECOND LANGUAGE

The consciousness of this problem is as old as history, as documented by such stories as that of the Tower of Babel. Attempts to deal with it are just as old, usually taking the form of the strong nation imposing its language upon the weak, for obviously the need is for the establishment of one language as the language in common. One lesson should be learned from this history: that this route is fraught with trouble on the one hand, and has had only limited measures of temporary success at best on the other, failing again and again in the long run.

The sensible approach for the solution of this problem was postulated over three hundred years ago by such great thinkers as Descartes and Liebnitz. They prescribed a language designed scientifically to be as simple as possible, short of compromising its functional capabilities, thereby making it feasible that one language could serve the world at large as the universal second language. It would become the communication link available in all cases where anybody found that his native tongue would not suffice. Such a language would also bypass the problem of national rivalries, by virtue of its being native to no one.

The merit of this idea is so obvious that there have been some 600 designs published to date in the effort to fill this need. Many, of course, had serious flaws. No doubt there have been any number, also, which might have been adequate to fill the desired role. Be that as it may, there has been only one which has achieved a breadth and depth of practical use and has weathered the test of time—Esperanto.

EIGHTY-YEAR GROWTH

Esperanto has continued to live and grow thru some 80 years, while others have faded. Still, in spite of phenomenal measures of success, Esperanto has not been able to arouse concerned positive action by world leaders. But broadly coordinated planning is required to bring about its general implementation with anything approaching the speed that is generally expected, for though Esperanto is easier to learn by the order of four or even ten to one, still, even at that rate it is too much to expect the average individual to undertake on the merit of ideal alone.

In consequence of disappointment in its slower rate of growth, combined with persistent chauvinistic tendencies in some quarters, gross misconceptions have come to dominate the ideas that many people hold on this subject. Many writers have added to the confusion by documenting as fact rumors that they have neglected to check out. (Nor is it a difficult matter to disprove them, as this writer has already undertaken to do in a separate study). It is not uncommon, then, to hear someone say that Esperanto won't work, that it has been tried and failed . . . etc. The truth is that to the extent that they say that Esperanto has failed—to that extent it hasn't even been tried. To the extent that it has been tried it has been an overwhelming success, the only element of serious failure to date being the lack of concerted high-level action. Thus man hesitates and falters in the appropriation of the vast potential of this much needed tool, while the problems of international communication become ever more troublesome.

GET INTO THE ACT

This country, in its emergence from political isolationism, finds that it must "get into the act" and do its share of language learning. The school curriculums, already overcrowded by ever expanding technological and commercial demands, are forced nevertheless to accommodate grand-scale language learning plans. Yet this is, to be sure, the necessary route in answer today to the problem-of-today in international communication. If this route leaves much to be desired it is because we have not been responsive to the highest order of innovation on this matter in the past.

Since the time of Sputnik the call for sweeping educational reform has been heard over and over again. A recent version has come from no other than Vice President Humphrey, as part of his presidential campaign oratory. The magnitude and persistence of this cry would suggest that there must be something deep and fundamentally wrong in the system. However, the failure to date to identify any specific deficiency of a scope sufficient to match the call for reform suggests that this call is motivated more by a feeling of desperate need—a need to employ every possible means for keeping education apace with the ever growing demands upon it, and possibly to find a means for reducing the strain that it is currently operating under. It would appear, then, that this is not just a matter of streamlining methods in the everyday affairs of education, but also an attempt to put everybody on the alert for ideas which might lead to something on the order of a breakthrough.

To accomplish anything on the order of a breakthrough people must be willing to entertain and try ideas that they might otherwise be inclined to dismiss as visionary and unrealistic. They must consider in depth every possible ramification of such ideas. Still they must not hasten to pump extensive resources into projects of remote or dubious merit—there must be reasonable promise of success. Out of the pressures of need, nevertheless, grow great inventions, sometimes just from trying the obvious. Just such an idea is that of Esperanto.

UNILATERAL ACTION

Now certainly no one country can unilaterally establish a universal second language, not even the United States, not even by use of Esperanto. Nor can we afford to gamble our resources, nor the time of our youth, on the mere hope that the rest of the world would follow suit. A knowledge of the facts about Esperanto, however, including its many ramifications, shows that we have fertile soil to work in. First is the possibility of bringing together an international conference, which we would be well advised to try. Failing in that, there still is cause for unilateral action, whether by government, or by schools or individuals, for it would directly reduce the load on education, even as it enhanced the results and as it helped to prepare the groundwork for the breakthrough. There is even the possibility of another breakthrough on top of the first one, for as was indicated above, the scope of language is broad indeed, and success with Esperanto would point the way for other developments—but that is another subject.

The essential facts, in this context, hinge upon the point that Esperanto is the living example of the successful scientific design of a language, a language with a living worldwide community and a beautiful international literature. It is a language with 127 specialist dictionaries, over 100 periodicals, and on the order of 10,000 books. It is a language which sustains regular daily and weekly radio broadcasts in various places in the world. It is a language that is used by hundreds of business concerns in daily affairs. It is the one language by use of which people, numbering usually around 2000, from upwards of forty countries, meet in conference every year without the need of interpreters. (There are also numerous smaller conferences.) Esperanto has the potential for enhancing one's enjoyment of his vacation trip abroad, if he is at all interested in meeting people in the places that he visits, whether the natives, or other tourists from far and wide. (To this end it is only necessary to contact an Esperanto organization to learn about scheduled events and tours.) Indeed Esperanto is the one language by use of which people from all over the world may discuss matters of mutual interest on an equal footing and with a minimum of misunderstanding.

ELEMENT OF REALISM

The factors which make Esperanto applicable now to the purposes of education are that it is ideal as the introductory "foreign" language, and that in step with its appropriation in that role it can add a new element of realism to such classes as geography and social studies—by correspondence with children of similar age from the areas under study. Beyond these areas of obvious applicability, Esperanto simplifies the study of grammar, including that of English, and it is an excellent exercise in logic. Results reflecting these facts are documented in reports from San Mateo, California, published in articles in *Read Magazine* (March 15, 1967) and the *California Teachers Journal* (May 1968). (This CTA article, incidentally was presented to the Congress of the United States by Rep. Rhodes of Pa., and read in its entirety into the *Congressional Record* (Sept. 17), the second presentation of such an article to the Congress in as many months.) The governments of Poland and New Zealand, moreover, have acted in recent months to "encourage" their schools to teach Esperanto.

Governments hesitate to take the necessary action to bridge the language barrier, and they continue to fumble because of it, in their busy-ness with cold wars, hot wars, and other petty fueds, even as the ticking away continues on any number of time-bombs which Esperanto might very well help to de-fuse. On the other hand, the peoples of the world, in this age of anxiety, are found to be quite warm to the idea of a universal second language, as proven by over 80% endorsement in polls taken in various countries, including the U.S.

Never mind, then, the cynical cant about ". . . panacea . . ." that is so often heard in response to proposals that are broad in the scope of their effects and side effects, but let the judgment of reason prevail. For this, in truth, is one kind of idea that is sought in answer to existing problems, in education and out. Then it is incumbent on those who are conscientious to apply this marvelous language wherever they may find it currently useful, thus at the same time to hasten its growth toward fulfillment of the role that would end this serious void in the channels of international communication.

NORTH KOREAN AGGRESSION

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and unwarranted attack on our reconnaissance aircraft demonstrates dramatically the deteriorating situation in Korea.

In addition to the seizure of the *Pueblo* and the loss of the reconnaissance aircraft, we find an increase in the effort to infiltrate guerrilla forces into South Korea by North Korea. The following item which appeared in the February 14 edition of the Wall Street Journal by William D. Hartley points out a lesser-known effort by North Korea to carry their aggression into South Korea.

Because it shows another dimension of North Korean aggression, I think other Members would find it of interest.

The article follows:

KIM'S AGENTS: NORTH KOREA DISPATCHES ELITE RED GUERRILLAS TO SUBVERT THE SOUTH—SEOUL SAYS INFILTRATORS FAIL TO SPARK VIETCONG-STYLE REVOLTS—MANY CAPTURED—FLOATING IN ON WATERWINGS

(By William D. Hartley)

SEOUL, SOUTH KOREA.—During the final two nights of last October and the first two of November, four 30-man guerrilla teams led by North Korean Lt. Chong Dong-choon slipped ashore on South Korea's rugged and bleak eastern coast. They quickly faded into the mountains.

The North Koreans came well-prepared. Lt. Chong, a slight but muscular 25-year-old, had undergone months of rigorous mountain and field training, plus hours of classroom work in tactics and political ideology. He wore a fake South Korean army sergeant's uniform and carried a veritable arsenal—a Soviet-made submachine gun, three pistols, hand grenades and an antitank grenade.

Lt. Chong, now prisoner, recalls that one of the first South Koreans he encountered was an eight-year-old boy. He asked the boy which men in his village were landowners and capitalists who oppressed the people. "If they had any, we were going to kill them," he says expressionlessly.

Lt. Chong, a trained infiltrator, is an instrument of a new kind of warfare designed to raise havoc on the troubled Korean peninsula, 16 years after the armistice that ended the Korean war. His personal effectiveness is ended, to be sure, now that he is a captive of the Republic of Korea (ROK). But the government here says North Korea's 124th army unit, an elite outfit, has 6,000 such infiltrators trained for action.

CAMPAIGN OF STEALTH

U.S. Army Gen. Charles H. Bonesteel, commander of American and United Nations forces here, calls the infiltration struggle "the porous war." The combat differs from that of the Korean war, but the objective of Kim Il-sung, premier of North Korea, is considered to be the same—unification of the peninsula on his terms. He seems unwilling now to launch another all-out attack across the demilitarized zone. But American and Korean analysts here say he is stepping up a campaign of infiltration by hundreds of agents.

South Korean spokesmen say Kim is frustrated by the progress of his southern antagonists toward building a sound economy and capturing the loyalty of the people. Infiltration is said to be his new stratagem for shaking the stability of the south.

South Korea is trying to cope with the threat. It propagandizes its citizens heavily. All around Seoul, grisly posters depict atrocities allegedly committed last fall by Communist agents. At checkpoints along roads leading into Seoul from the north, police and army men inspect papers and search vehicles for infiltrators. Signs calling for information on northern agents are everywhere. A few days ago, a citizens' group suggested that even children's comic books should stress the importance of turning in Communist agents.

NEW TACTICS

A Korean government official says the number of known infiltrators into and across the DMZ, plus those entering along South Korea's 1,550-mile coastline, rose to 1,274 last year from 841 in 1967.

Until last year, the North Koreans had seemed satisfied with land infiltration routes across the DMZ, usually sending small groups of men. But capture of the U.S. intelligence ship Pueblo and the abortive attempt to assassinate President Park, both at the beginning of 1968, prompted sweeping improvements of South Korean defenses along the DMZ, according to American observers. Infiltration was hampered.

Though one U.S. military commander on the DMZ says he expected "more probing" there, the Communists recently have focused on coastal entry points. Lt. Chong's relatively large groups of 30 men each came in fast boats disguised as fishing boats, landing at Ul-jin on South Korea's east coast.

Analysts here point out that cold and snow, now hampering movement through the countryside, will be diminishing in the months to come. They expect the North Koreans then to resume the two-pronged approach, making probes across the DMZ in addition to strikes at the coastline.

EFFORT FOR SOUTH KOREA

The North Korean guerrilla offensive is forcing Seoul into expensive precautions. The government has created a civilian home guard force, budgeted this year at $51 million. Tracking down guerrillas is difficult. It took tens of thousands of troops more than a month in the mountains to capture or kill 117 of the 120 North Korean agents involved in the Ul-jin landings (the remaining three are presumed dead).

The U.S., committed to South Korea's defense, also is increasing its spending. U.S. helicopters have been delivered to help South Korean soldiers flush out Communist infiltrators. American troops here number 55,000.

Kim, say observers, is reaping good returns from a relatively small investment of men. Some say that President Park might be prompted to recall for home defense the 55,000 South Korean troops serving in Vietnam. "If I were in Pyongyang (the North Korean capital)," says one American here, "I would hope the ROK government would overreact to my raids and clamp down with some repressive measures to meet the threat. This would cause some unrest."

Some see this happening already. There are plans to create a "strategic hamlet" program in parts of South Korea. The intent, says a senior Korean official, is to move citizens from some remote villages into more secure locations, whether they want to go or not.

Officials here speculate that Kim might shift his emphasis from raids on villages and troops in the DMZ to strikes on industry. "There has been a question in the minds of many people here why Kim hasn't hit industry yet," says one economist. "It would seem this would be better suited to his desires than these terror tactics."

South Korea's economy leans heavily on foreign investment. Foreign capital investment has totaled $450 million in the last six years. There are fears that terrorist raids might stem the investment flow. "We know that the units who do the landings hold training exercises against factories," says an American military source.

But South Korea spokesmen discount the danger. The factories, they point out, are in heavily guarded population centers. Still, even attempted sabotage might discourage potential investors. One American close to the Seoul business community says the attempt on President Park's life last year caused some companies to reconsider investment plans.

In Pyongyang's version of the story, there are no northern infiltrators; the unrest originates with dissatisfied southerners. "Today the broad sections of the South Korean people are waging a victorious struggle in all fields," Kim has said. "I send warm revolutionary greetings to the revolutionaries and democratic personages, to all patriots in South Korea who are putting up a valorous fight in various parts of South Korea, underground, in mountains or even in the prisons."

The flowery rhetoric from North Korea shows Kim's hope of fomenting a Vietcong-style insurrection in the south, South Korean officials say. North Koreans captured in the Ul-jin landing say their mission was to organize villages into "revolutionary bases," propagandizing the people and turning them into collaborators. Other captured infiltrators have said they intended to set up guerrilla bases for an eventual revolution against Mr. Park's government.

CONFIDENT SEOUL

There is little evidence that such an uprising will materialize. "The atmosphere just isn't conducive to a Vietcong movement," says one diplomat. "People remember the war vividly. You can't talk with anyone here who didn't have some member of his family killed in the war."

ROK officials say that 90% of the agents killed or captured last year were spotted and reported by sharp-eyed civilians. Stories of such captures abound. A railroad clerk identified one agent when the man asked for cigarets but didn't know the names of the South Korean brands. Another was turned in when a waitress noticed that he wielded his chopsticks in an unfamiliar manner. However, patriotism is bolstered by a reward of $3,600—about 25 times the per capita income last year—for each infiltrator turned in.

The North Koreans apparently have been indoctrinated to expect broad cooperation among the South Korean citizens. "Before I came," Lt. Chong says, "I heard every day that the situation of life in the Republic of Korea is very poor and that every farmer dies of hunger." A few days before his mission began, Lt. Chong heard a rousing talk from Kim Jung-tae, the three-star general said to be the chief of guerrilla operations. "He said, 'When you land, every Korean villager will help your guerrilla activities and you can easily make them collaborators,'" Lt. Chong recalls.

But the villagers resisted, and the guerrillas reacted violently, to the detriment of their missionary effort. Twenty-five civilians were killed, including a four-year-old boy whose jaw was ripped off. "That is a hell of a way to make friends," says one American officer.

But the North Korean effort may have produced some successes. Last summer the South Korean central intelligence agency broke up an espionage ring called the Unification Revolution Party. Members included southerners and some Communist agents. Observers suspect that other groups may still be operating.

THE SELECT UNIT

North Korea's infiltration outfit, the 124th unit, has grown to its present size of 6,000 from 2,400 men a year ago, South Korean officials say. All its men are officers, in good physical shape, and all are Communist party members. Lt. Chong, the son of a woodworker from a Manchurian border village on the Yalu river, joined the 124th in September 1967 after spending six years in the regular army.

In training, all members rise at 5 a.m., according to Lt. Chong. "Before taking breakfast, we had to do cross-country running and mountain climbing carrying 30 kilograms (66 pounds) of sandbags in a knapsack," he says. "Then we studied the ideology of Kim Il-sung for one hour." This was followed by classes on operational tactics, topography, intelligence studies of South Korea and radio communications.

After dinner, there was more mountain climbing and training in night infiltration tactics. "Then we would run 10 kilometers (6.2 miles) with the sandbags," Lt. Chong says. Sunday was a day of rest. "We used to sleep all day." Men of the 124th get rations double those of the regular army, plus good quarters.

So intense is the training, say U.S. observers, that the guerrillas tend to become fanatical. Each carries a hand grenade that explodes the second the handle is released (standard grenades have a delay of several seconds). This device often is used for suicide to prevent capture.

Infiltrators use some unusual tactics to get across the DMZ. Some have strapped on waterwings and floated with the incoming tide up the Imjin river that crosses the DMZ from the north. Northern agents used to burrow underneath the fence that marks the southern boundary of the DMZ, until the Americans planted 18-inch stakes to halt the tunneling.

"They are trained as much as nine months for a mission," says a young American major stationed along the DMZ. "They spend weeks reconnoitering routes and weeks at the fence, looking for gaps. Probably they have escorts who have been in and out of the zone for years. And they're not foolhardy. When they're discovered, they abort the mission and go back across."

A CITIZEN SPEAKS OUT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Martin P. Broderick, Jr., of Baton Rouge, La., a small businessman, father, and taxpayer from my congressional district, has sent me a copy of his letter to the President of the United States.

I compliment Mr. Broderick for exercising his privilege of citizenship to express his opinion to the Chief Executive and can only hope that more and more of those people of the silent majority will follow his lead in telling their President what they expect from the leader of their country.

The letter follows:

APRIL 14, 1969.

Mr. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: This nation yearns for you to display strong leadership qualities. It is time for us to stop talking about giving anyone rights or special privileges and to talk about *each* individual *earning* his right to be a citizen of this fine nation.

If we continue to let our Universities be taken over by mobs seeking to destroy these institutions, *without punishing the leaders* because they claim to do it in the name of free speech, we are not only going to lose these places of learning but also the Republic itself. This is an attack on the very foundations of our government.

Mr. President, the young men of America are puzzled by our policies. We are in a *War* that *three Presidents* and their Congress have been afraid to declare. People commit treason in the name of free speech and the Attorneys General of *three* Presidents are afraid to act. American men are dying today in what is called a limited war that we are not allowing the military to win.

Mr. President, the young men of America are not afraid to fight and die if they know they will win. *Not one American should die unless it is in a quest for Victory!* I urge you to fully commit this Nation to total and immediate Victory in Viet Nam. Mr. President, you only have to whip one bully and the rest will fall into line.

I pray you will have the strength to act in a resolute manner.

Sincerely,
(Signed) MARTIN P. BRODERICK, Jr.

AMERICAN POLICIES TOWARD EAST CENTRAL EUROPE

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining my colleagues in discussing American policy toward East Central Europe spurred on by the recent memorandum of the American Hungarian Federation pointing toward the twin aims: the promotion of Atlantic partnership leading to an independent, but politically well-coordinated and friendly Western Europe and the creation of a Central European buffer zone including Austria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, possibly also Rumania and Poland.

In this regard I came across the article of the editorial board chairman of the Studies on a New Central Europe published in New York by political and economic experts from the Central European countries. This article goes even further in analyzing the possibility of the establishment of a buffer zone with international guarantees of its neutrality as a result of negotiation with the Soviet Union and our NATO allies.

I insert the article at this point into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TOWARD A CONSTRUCTIVE IDEOLOGY AND POLICY IN A NEW CENTRAL EUROPE

(By Eugene Padanyi-Gulyas)

An historic course began half a century ago. In retrospect, it can be generally characterized as a disintegration of post-feudal empires. First Czarism was overthrown in Russia, then the Hohenzollern German empire collapsed and the Habsburg monarchy fell apart. The latter was engineered by the Western powers in accordance with the wartime objective expressed in the political writings of the Czech Edward Benes.[1] Twenty years later, with Germany's rise to greater power he had to emigrate a second time. Thirty years later, in 1948 under heavy political pressure of the Soviet Union, Benes became helpless, embittered and died a disappointed man. Czechoslovakia's case is not extraordinary, but typical of the fate of small states in Central Europe. The results of political disintegration were fatal.

October 1968 was the date set to celebrate "fifty years of independence" for Czechoslovakia, Greater Rumania, and Yugoslavia. Flags, posters, books, pamphlets, commemorative speeches and festivals had been readied for the occasion. Then the invasion of Czechoslovakia by Soviet and four other Warsaw Pact Countries demonstrated to the whole world that independence does not and did not exist in the Central European area. Between 1920 and 1938 Edward Benes formed the Little Entente as a satellite system directed against Hungary, Austria, and Germany, based on French military power, loans and diplomacy. With Hitler's rise, however, Czechoslovakia broke into two parts, both becoming satellites of Germany together with the other Central European small states. Before his return from his second exile Benes concluded a pact with Stalin and Molotov in Moscow and ousted more than three million Germans from Czechoslovakia. This pact led to such reliance on the Soviet Union that his whole country became its satellite and Jan Masarvk, son of Czechoslovakia's first president, committed suicide or, as it is said, was murdered. Hundreds of Czech and Slovak leaders emigrated for a second, and some for a third time.

---

[1] Edward Benes: "Détruisez l'Autriche Hongrie". Paris, 1917.

No matter how great the efforts of small states in Central Europe were to achieve parliamentary democracy, economical development, cultural improvement, the faulty international political system engulfed the leading politicians together with thousands, even millions of families. The suicides, executions, imprisonment, repeated emigration of national leaders during these fifty years are proof that the "independence" of these small states was and is an illusion—with one exception. The only independent country in Central Europe at present is the *neutral and federal Austria* whose neutrality was guaranteed by the great powers together with sixty other states.

After 1918 a few transitional years of democratic parliamentarian experimentation followed the disintegration of the empire. Then came military dictatorships and police states first from the extreme right and then from the extreme left, Hitler and Stalin. Some anomalies occurred at a number of elections in the twenties and thirties; but in the forties and after no elections at all were held worth this name. There was no freedom from the military powers and their "spheres of influence" centered first in Berlin, then in Moscow. The development of new technics, means of transportation and industrialization continued throughout the last decades although they greatly lagged behind the West. But the advantages of industrial development were counterbalanced by loss of religious freedom, Marxist dominated churches, the muzzling of writers and other intellectuals, Marxist-Leninist dictatorial monopolization of the press and all other means of communication, and by a generally low level of subsistence. "Building Marxist Socialism" did not mean building homes for the people. The elementary need for shelter, housing is still one of the sorest spots in the economy of all satellite states and also in the Soviet Union.

The Germany of the Kaiser and Hitler was replaced by a divided Germany and a divided Berlin with its Wall, and the long Iron Curtain behind which the population seethes. Discontent with the "dictatorship of the proletariat" broke out in the uprisings of 1953, 1956 and now in Czechoslovakia. "In our Czechoslovakia of yesterday," writes the Prague *Literarny Listy* of March 28, 1968, "people were driven to trials like cattle to the slaughter house, their heads covered with sacks. Hands and legs tied, they were beaten up till they lost consciousness. Teeth knocked out, skin branded with red-hot iron happened to many. Who will guarantee that such things shall not reoccur?" The Slovak Alexander Dubcek, newly elected First Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, demanded equal rights for the Slovaks with the Czechs. The federalization of Czechoslovakia was decided upon. But then Hungarians, Ukranians, Germans in Czechoslovakia also demanded equal rights.

Between the two World Wars, the League of Nations became submerged in troubled international waters and the first promising idea of international jurisdiction went down with it. Hundreds of national leaders were persecuted and killed by the so-called "liberators of the people." Ironically this was only the start of persecuting and killing tens of thousands of the same people who were supposed to be liberated. Famine, starvation, executions, concentration camps, purges, genocide, class war, "liberation wars,"—all kinds of wars followed. Freedom of expression, freedom of gathering, freedom of religion, or in one word: *freedom* was destroyed or so manipulated, that the result was equivalent to its destruction. The relative peace of the world guaranteed by a shaky balance of power was replaced by a "balance of terror" with its nuclear deterrent. It is clear now, that other diplomatic ways must be found. A Conference on European Security would achieve better results than theoretical decisions of the United Nations. This organization, with the "veto paragraph" in its charter and with its membership of questionable good-standing, without an international police force and due to big-power rivalries, has repeatedly proved itself incapable of solving major problems—with a special impotence in Central European affairs. Cold war methods with their inefficient practices will bring no solutions either.

But, while looking for new ways, we have to admit that a century ago the theory of Marxism could be, and actually was attractive to a good many dissatisfied people. What might have been attractive to the leaders of suppressed peoples of Russia 50 years ago, or of China 30 years ago, did not, however, mean progress for the people of Czechoslovakia 20 years ago, although Marxist-Leninism took over. Our question is: how was it possible that political parties proclaiming class struggle could attract millions in countries where the standard of living was high? How could union leaders with princely incomes and trade union members with adequate social security and pension systems organize Marxist parties all over the civilized world, to take part in coalition governments only to overthrow them? How is it still possible that professors and their textbooks favor Marxism as a progressive movement in countries where a high level of industrialization was accomplished without the people being deprived of decent housing; where reforms in agriculture were achieved without reducing its productivity, and illiteracy was cured by an educational system that did not require the killing of ten millions in revolutions—"cultural" or other. How could the Marxist political parties in the past be so successful in spite of terror, "dictatorship of the proletariat," Iron Curtain, Berlin Wall, censorship, "socialist realism" in art and literature against the will of the majority or the real desire expressed by their conscientious writers? The answer to these questions seems to be essentially that it was possible because of their *International* organization. Calling their movement international meant real progress in a time when other political parties restricted themselves to one nation, not to mention those parties which were even more restricted to the goals and problems of chauvinistic groups within a nation. By organizing their movement internationally, both the Communists and Social Democrats showed foresight in the past decades during and after the dissolution of empires in all continents. Their theoreticians saw the inevitable trend toward international global cooperation many years before Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, whose philosophy emphasized "social infolding," "universal solidarity" and "coordinated planetary systems" toward which the formidable creative power of evolution forces mankind to fare.

It is, however, also a fact that Marxist political parties tried to restrict their international movement to "the worker's class" or "the proletariat," to "the present clumsy and incomplete application of a totalization"—to use Teilhard's words. Today Marxists fulminate against the kind of capitalism which does not exist anymore. Their "international" methods became antiquated.

It is shortsighted to use all the discoveries made available by technical progress for political aggrandizement or economic exploitation of others, by a superpower striving for world domination. An immeasurable amount of material wealth and uncounted millions of innocent lives were sacrificed on the altar of this false god. To ask for more destruction, to call for a global "class struggle" instead of a global struggle against ignorance and poverty seems utterly outdated. An international movement works better when its program is replaced by updated goals and is adjusted to changed demands. A truly internationally organized political movement to achieve the common goals of mankind in an evolutionary progress is right. To try to achieve today's goals with narrow-minded nationalism and chauvinism or with class prejudices of yesterday is doomed to failure.

A NEW ERA OF POLITICAL INTEGRATION AND CONSTRUCTIVISM

Construction rather than destruction, integration rather than division, evolution rather than revolution is the idea of our day. These ideas are in the air. The desire for change is very real. But to find the right words expressing the new trend is not easy.

It was four years before Alexander Dubcek, first Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, started his democratic reforms, when the Alliance of Czechoslovak Democratic Associations called for *positive* constructive movements. The program was significant. Its title is less fortunate.[2] Searching for "nobler and deeper causes," for "new types of international action." Henry Owen refers to a Warsaw philosopher's concept[3] which would eventually replace past national slogans: that of "Community"—and which is, indeed, comprehensive and attractive.

Before looking for more words or slogans, however, and assuming that the nations of a reintegrated, "Helvetisized" new Central Europe will sooner or later be in the position of defining their own policies, let us review the goals of such a movement. After the Hungarian uprising in 1956 and the recent "democratization" movement in Czechoslovakia, one thing seems clear: the people living in this area are looking for a *realistic Third Way* in foreign policy, economy and in ideology different from their neighbors to the East or West.

NEUTRALIZATION AND HELVETIZATION

The *foreign policy* should be based on the demand, that the zone between Russia and Germany be *militarily neutral, like Austria or Switzerland* and the neutrality of this zone should be *internationally guaranteed.* This was the idea expressed by the Hungarian freedom fighters in 1956 and by the prime minister of their short-lived free government, Imre Nagy, who died a martyr for it.

One cannot, indeed, expect that more martyrs pronounce this demand; consequently we must not wait till the heads of the existing satellite governments declare their independence from the Warsaw Pact. Such a declaration was made on behalf of all the so called "satellites" by the only free government behind the Iron Curtain and was sealed by the blood of the Hungarian martyrs. The people in the whole region remember this. On the tenth anniversary of Imre Nagy's execution the "Literarny Listy"—the periodical of the Federation of the Writers in Czechoslovakia—reminded its readers of the merits of this great leader, whose ideas on neutrality were premature in his time, but acceptable today.[4]

---

[2] "Positive Anticommunism" (Studies for a New Central Europe, Vol. 1, No. 3).

[3] "Foreign Policy Premises for the Next Administration" by Henry Owen, chairman, Policy Planning Council, Department of State USA ("Foreign Affairs", July 1968).

The wisdom of establishing a neutral zone is obvious. This is the only way for both the American and Russian armies finally to disengage and to pull back to their respective homelands. After this movement—long awaited by taxpayers of both countries—no Warsaw or NATO military pacts can be justified, nor will they be necessary. Eighty to a hundred million people in the "Helvetisized" area will take care of their own affairs and will be ready to safeguard the peace of the region, which means a very significant guarantee of the peace of whole Europe. This will be also the time for the major nuclear powers to adjust the objectives of their foreign policies to a realistic assessment of their own capabilities.

The *economy* of the "Helvetisized" region would probably be neither Communist, nor Capitalist. As judged today, the region might have a *mixed economy*. De-etatization of state enterprises and cooperatives are already on the way, but state and federal economic planning would continue. This practice is accepted also in the West.[5] Mining, heavy industry, railway, postal service and other means of communication would be state or federally owned enterprises with self-management. Many economic organizations for cooperation of states already exist. Besides the COMECON and its committees, there are specialized agencies for cooperation in transportation, electrification, finances, etc. These would be fully developed, but without the membership of any outside major powers, whose presence only would distort the balance and harmony of the Central European community. Terms of trade and contracts would be concluded on an equal basis toward the East and West. The principle of "participation on all levels"—demanded by the Yugoslav, Czech, Slovak and Hungarian workers and students—would prevent unhealthy dictatorship of any of the inflated capital cities and would pave the road toward equality of the member nations, to real democracy without overcentralization.

Thanks to its guaranteed neutrality, the economy of a New Central Europe might be an example of prosperity without giving large sums for massive military budgets that would achieve nothing constructive; an example of continuous full employment without depriving workers of a decent standard of living, good housing, cars and traveling. Considering the world-wide need for *construction* of homes, roads, power plants, dams and factories; for an updated international system of transportation and communication; for rebuilding the delapidated cities and for building new cities according to the global trend of healthy urbanization—it appears, that *making peace profitable* is within the reach of mankind. The existing giants in their struggle for world domination have failed to give an example of the prosperity described above. The third way of neutral countries may lead us to it.

THIRD WAY IN IDEOLOGY

The *ideology* of a New Central Europe may also pioneer an interesting third way. Like standing on an ice block with the right foot and on a red-hot plate with the left, one would not feel an average temperature; a neutralized, "Helvetisized" zone between Germany and Russia very probably would have its own way of thinking, its own philosophy. Historic and recent experiences of these people are quite unique. An ideology, different of that of their neighbors, would be a natural consequence. Considering the ideological bankruptcy and confusion around the world, it is time to have some fresh ideas.

Since the World Wars, nations and their best men: writers, thinkers, statesmen are labouring on the problem of how to find the path of peaceful, normal, healthy life of mankind, leading away from extremities. It seems now, that neither the promises of the "rugged individualism," nor those of a Marxist collectivism resulting in an omnipotent state are any longer attractive.

One of the most interesting and honest statements in this respect, while admitting the seeming success of the Russian Revolution, attributes it to the fact, that a number of basic Christian principles were used for Communist propaganda all through its fifty years of history. These principles: the solidarity and brotherhood of all men, the brotherly love of the poor, the freedom and peace on earth, however, were emphasized though sometimes betrayed by Christendom throughout the centuries; and the crisis of Communism today originated from its own rebellious intellectuals, who discovered that these great principles were betrayed by Communism too. Thus the search for a new way starts again.[6]

Millions in Central Europe have learned on their own expense, that in concordia parvae res crescunt, in discordia maximaeque dilabuntur—little things may grow united, great ones diminish in discord. The feeling of their solidarity, of their natural community of destiny, was recently expressed more than once. This is the force behind their struggle for independence from outside powers and for intensified cooperation among themselves. The chimera of world domination makes them anxious to separate their way from those who are still pursuing this costly dream. Solidarity, masters in their own home, not domination by others, is their dream.

To start with such a joint venture in this region means that, while preserving the national characters of the respective peoples—their language, their culture, their pride of accomplishment throughout history—their energy will be united to build a new home for themselves according to a plan which would accommodate them at the best contemporary standards. This new home has to be large enough, so that its household could be well organized. Agricultural and industrial production modernized; the best use of the labor force and the forces of nature; tariff-free distribution of goods and smooth flow of traffic on the super high- and railways, on improved waterways and in the air; free exchange of ideas through all channels of modern communication; good schools, good institutions for arts and sciences, open for everyone—this is what a "Helvetisized," integrated New Central Europe means. If an industrialist in Prague invents a new product, he could sell it to seventy to a hundred million customers. A new song recorded by Slovaks, Ruthens or Rumanians could soon be popular also in Vienna or Belgrade. A poem, a book, or a newspaper printed in Budapest, in Zagreb or in Kolozsvár could reach readers or subscribers anywhere in a territory of about one million square kilometers. Free trade, free competition, mutual respect and support of every effort in pursuing the common goal are prerequisites for the progress of the inhabitants of the region.

Such endeavor is unthinkable without effective political changes and international guarantees. To construct the new homes according to old fashioned blue prints; by means of narrow-minded policy of ministates based on jealousy and chauvinism, or on internationally organized movements aimed at destruction, dictatorship or world domination is impossible. Neither can it be designed by the limited vision and controlled imagination of some dusty old principles of "socialist realism." Therefore a *Constructive Central European Internationale* is needed, with national parties in the individual countries, to carry a joint program among the different people. To avoid many difficulties arising from too many small parties campaigning and possibly forming inefficient coalition governments, it was suggested that in a "Helvetisized" New Central Europe a two-party system is desirable. It would perhaps be premature to go into such details as to restrict the number of parties in different states of so many different nationalities. But it seems that one of the two or more national political parties in every member state should be organized between the states, campaigning on similar platforms and directed by principles and guidelines established at periodical congresses of a Constructive Central European Internationale. This term is used partly for want of a better; but partly because we believe that construction is a concept best characterizing the epoch to come. At the risk of repetition, we must point to the fact, that after a long period of destruction, disintegration, separation by national or tariff boundaries, by Iron Curtains and by walls in Berlin or elsewhere—the time has come for integration and construction. Construction, in the basic sense of this word, of homes for crowded or homeless families. Construction of an integrated New Central Europe for the people of this troubled region. Construction of a better world on our planet for all men of good will.

After all, a good example to prove the possibility of close cooperation and effective government of peoples of different languages, nationalities and religious affiliations is long overdue. Similar problems are waiting for solution in all Europe, in Asia, in Africa, in many places across the world. Our globe, as a whole, presents the same problem today. We have to start somewhere. Why not in a region where such a new beginning would be only one more in a long series . . . maybe better than any of the previous ones. An inspiring example for all.

---

[4] Oswald Machatka in the May, 1968 issue of the "Literarny Listy", Prague.

[5] Otto Schlecht, chief of the policy division of the West German Economics Ministry: "The ad hoc economy, the economy of the light hand, is dead. We have a new economic system now—a tailored economy. We have learned a lot." For further clarification we refer to previous issues of the "Studies", especially to Vol. I, No. 1 and II, No. 1.

[6] P. Werenfried van Atraaten in the "Ostpriesterhilfe" (10–11, 1968). See also the Fourth Dialog of Marxists and Christians (Marianski - Lazne - Marienbad, Czechoslovakia, 1968).

THE F-111 AIRCRAFT

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much unfortunate confusion regarding the F-111 aircraft. Recently our colleague from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), wrote letters to the Members of the House, the objective being to present a more accurate picture of the F-111. He enclosed articles from two magazines, both of which appeared to be authoritative and threw much light on the subject.

This impresses me as an excellent way to meet unfounded criticism and set the record straight. It is said there is nothing quite as obstinate as a fact, and Mr. WRIGHT's communication is loaded with factual information. He has taken the major criticisms of the F-111 and answered them in a flat, unequivocal manner. He points out, for example, that of the seven combat aircraft in the so-called Century Series, the F–111, at 20,000 hours of flight, had the best safety record of all these aircraft. Some others in the Century Series had experienced more than twice as many accidents for the first 20,000 hours, and some had almost three times as many accidents. Ask yourself whether you ever saw in the press or heard any comment about the accidents of the F–100 or the F–101 or the F–105 or the F–103, or in fact any of these aircraft other than the F–111. Your answer most probably will be the same as my own: If I ever did hear of these accidents, they certainly did not stick in my mind. Then ask yourself what you heard and read about the F–111 accidents, and your answer will undoubtedly be the same as my own: It seems that I heard little else about the F–111.

But what is the real story: It is just as I have stated it to be, the best safety record of any of them, matched by none of the others, and far better than most of them.

If you have not done so, let me urge you to read Jim Wright's letter. It is filled with vital, meaningful information about the F–111 aircraft.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM: LIGHT IS DIM, THOUGH NEED IS GREAT

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, in the Wall Street Journal of March 27, Norman C. Miller has written a lengthy and provocative article on the continuing failure of the House of Representatives to take action on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been before the Rules Committee now for nearly 2 months. The issue, of course, has been before the committee for a much longer time—since March 9, 1967, to be exact.

I will not take the time of the House today to recount the long history of the efforts of some of us to move this legislation through the Congress. I do want to reiterate two consistent points of concern to most of us, however. One is that Republicans have asked repeatedly for action on a reform package embodying no less than the equivalent of the 1967 bill passed by the Senate, and the second is that we have asked repeatedly for the legislation to be brought to the House floor under a completely open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read carefully Mr. Miller's article.

The article referred to follows:

Updating Congress: Pressure Is Mounting To Overhaul Procedures of House and Senate—Reform Forces Seek To Cut Committee Chiefs' Power—New Budget Checks Asked—McCormack Eases Opposition

(By Norman C. Miller)

Washington.—"The House is like the Black Hole of Calcutta," says one of its harsher critics. Freshman Congressman Allard Lowenstein fully agrees: "Nothing prepares you for its horrors."

Mr. Lowenstein's pungent remark sums up his shock at the deeply embedded Congressional customs and rules that channel almost all power to veteran legislators and, in his view, prevent Congress from responding effectively to many current problems.

Consequently, the New York Democrat, a leader of last year's "dump LBJ" drive, now vows to turn his organizing talents to the less flashy but fundamentally important cause of changing Congressional procedures—commonly known as the Congressional "reform" effort. He hopes to rally a grass-roots "coalition of concerned people," encompassing liberals and conservatives alike, to pressure reluctant members of Congress to back reforms.

Whatever the outcome, Mr. Lowenstein is far from alone in demanding change on Capitol Hill. He is joining the growing ranks of a reform-minded Congressional group led by House Republicans. After years of effort, the bipartisan forces finally seem headed for at least modest success this year, both in improving Congressional efficiency and in shifting some power from senior lawmakers to the rank and file.

LOOKING AT COMPUTERS

The efficiency effort aims at installing computers and other machines to help legislators with tasks ranging from answering their mail to analyzing the President's budget proposals. Now, Congressmen often feel helpless in the face of the growing complexity of their work. At least some hopeful signs are evident on the efficiency front. House leaders currently are inspecting a computer system that could store an array of information and answer legislators' queries by flashing data on TV-like screens in Congressional offices.

The much more difficult reform objective is to limit the power wielded by committee chairmen and other senior Congressmen, while opening up more opportunities for rank-and-file legislators to make their influence felt. But here, too, there are indications of movement—notably intraparty pressure that recently prompted the once-remote House Democratic leadership to begin holding monthly party caucuses for discussion of issues. Potentially, a caucus majority now will be able to press recalcitrant committee satraps to move legislation favored by most House Democrats.

Moreover, reformers in both parties are wearing down the resistance of Congressional elders to a general reform bill—the first since 1946—which the House let die last year after it had passed the Senate. Among other things, the long-languishing bill would curb arbitrary actions by the powerful commitee chairmen, requiring them to establish written rules of procedure; this would help keep the chairmen from refusing to call committee meetings or hold hearings or vote a bill out of committee. The reform measure would also modernize antiquated Congressional methods of controlling the budget. Reform advocates are confident the Senate will again pass such legislation if, as now seems likely, the House finally acts.

MR. M'CORMACK'S SWITCH

Elderly Speaker John McCormack's apparent desire to improve his standing with his colleagues is a key reason reformers think House roadblocks to a bill may be removed. The Speaker, newly sensitive to rank-and-file unrest following a January challenge to his leadership by liberal Democrat Morris Udall of Arizona, is passing word that he now favors reform legislation. Close McCormack associates are convinced the Speaker is willing to swallow his past objections.

"Congressional reform has become a symbolic thing to many members, and it's awfully difficult to resist it under those circumstances," says one McCormack intimate. "I think the Speaker has become reconciled to having a bill."

Even such a strong opponent of change as Mississippi's William Colmer, the 79-year-old Rules Committee chairman, now grudgingly indicates he won't try to bury reform legislation as his panel did last year. Mr. Colmer hints he may soon form a special subcommittee to consider a reform bill, which unlike most legislation is under the immediate control of the Rules Committee in the House.

Just how much reform any legislation will actually provide is another matter. Certainly the reform forces' immediate objectives are rather modest. They hope initial steps would lead to more action later, and their bill would establish a permanent joint committee on Congressional operations as a base for further efforts.

Many veteran legislators, on the other hand, hope passage of a watered-down measure this year might sidetrack the drive for substantial change for many more years. Indeed, it's widely believed that House leaders were acting, in part, to undercut demands for major reform when they recently agreed to allow a brief August vacation—long an appealing part of the total reform package.

In any event, senior Congressmen in both parties, including conservatives and liberals, will attempt to weaken the pending reform proposals greatly before they assent to a bill.

Veteran California Democrat Chet Holifield, in a 47-page memorandum to other senior House members, attacks several key reform measures as "mischievous." He contends they would infringe on legitimate committee powers and expose House leaders to potshots by dissidents. California Rep. H. Allen Smith, the senior Rules Committee Republican, is ready to push a bill of his own that would soften or nullify most proposed changes in committee procedures.

The reformers' demand for a committee "bill of rights" is perhaps the most controversial aspect of their legislative package. While the hallowed seniority system of choosing chairmen would remain, the power of committee chieftains would be clipped. Besides requiring written procedural rules for all committees, thus opening more avenues for a committee majority to override a chairman, the changes would:

Restrict proxy voting by absent committee members, a device that now allows some chairmen and other senior members to control absentees' proxies to use as they wish.

Give members of the minority party the right to hire a few committee staff assistants of their own.

Open committee meetings to the public, with few exceptions, and allow radio and TV coverage of open hearings. (The House now generally forbids broadcasting, and its Appropriations Committee, for one, holds almost all meetings behind closed doors.)

Require public disclosure of all committee votes.

Simply curbing committee secrecy could produce significant changes, reformers believe. "People are going to behave differently when they have to act in the open," maintains Illinois Rep. Donald Rumsfeld, leader of the House Republican reform group.

EFFECT OF WRITTEN RULES

But the reformers are also pinning considerable faith on the requirement for written rules of procedure. Without them, critics complain, committee chairmen have sometimes managed to delay or defeat legislation that committee members have favored.

Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman James Eastland of Mississippi, for one, has been accused of failing to call committee meetings to act on antitrust or civil rights legislation. Back in 1965, House Banking Committee Chairman Wright Patman of Texas repeatedly refused to hold a meeting to act on a bank merger bill he opposed; finally an angry group of committee members met without his authorization and approved the measure for floor action.

While pressing for committee reforms, the advocates of change now seem ready to compromise on other controversial parts of their legislative package. Rep. Rumsfeld indicates willingness to negotiate on proposals to tighten controls over lobbying; Republican Sen. Karl Mundt of South Dakota, chief sponsor of reform legislation in the Senate, has dropped lobbying controls from his bill.

Reformers also have discarded proposals to alter the jurisdiction of some committees—proposals that had caused overwhelming opposition by House chairmen. Most important, Republicans are offering assurances they won't renew attempts to split the House Education and Labor Committee into two panels. Such a proposal had caused many liberal Democrats to shy from a reform bill; they deemed it a threat to their control of the strategic committee.

CHECKING ON THE BUDGET

Perhaps the least controversial reform proposals are those designed to improve Congressional control of the budget. Among other things, the Executive branch would be required to project its planned spending over several years instead of just one; such a projection might help Congress foresee and restrain the cost of big but slow-starting new programs. The Administration would also have to update its January budget proposals at mid-year; since the early spending forecasts turn out to be too low, the updating would give Congress a more accurate basis for action on appropriations requests.

Moreover, the general reform bill would direct the establishment of a computer system to aid Congressional assessment of the budget. Younger Congressmen, in particular, chafe at Congress' lack of computers. GOP Rep. Chester Mize of Kansas voices a typical complaint: "The Federal budget is sufficiently complex to frustrate any individual member's systematic analysis. We can only grasp at straws" without the assistance of computers.

Congress is moving slowly toward equipping itself with computers, quite apart from the general reform drive. The House has installed a computer to handle its payroll and internal accounting. The Senate is installing another computer to address mail to lists of constituents, and the House intends to follow suit.

Beyond these housekeeping machines, House leaders are considering the computerized "information retrieval" system that would store and serve up data on legislation, the budget and other topics. The House Banking Committee installed a rudimentary version of such a system in January: it feeds information about banking legislation into a Library of Congress computer, which provides data via teletypewriter when the committee staff requests it.

Machinery to improve Congressional efficiency also has political significance, some Congressmen argue. "At present, we're so beleaguered with detail that our capacity as politicians in the House is diminished," says Indiana Rep. John Brademas, a leader of Democratic liberals. "Computers will help get the burden of indispensable trivia off our backs so we can operate more effectively on doctrinal issues."

There may be other electronic innovations even in the tradition-steeped Senate and House chambers. The Senate may soon install what it calls "a voice reinforcement system with auxiliary appurtenances"; that means microphones. The House is looking into an electronic voting setup comparable to a racetrack toteboard; it wouldn't speed up time-consuming roll calls, but it would help prevent tabulation errors amid the normal hubbub in that unruly body.

THE VERY REVEREND JOSEPH T. CAHILL AWARDED DOCTOR OF LETTERS DEGREE

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I had the honor and privilege of witnessing an impressive ceremony at the Chinese Embassy. The Very Reverend Joseph T. Cahill, president of St. John's University in Jamaica, N.Y., was awarded the degree of doctor of letters by the China Academy. A buffet reception followed the ceremony. I was very pleased and proud to attend the conferment as Father Cahill was born in Philadelphia and received his education at the Vincentian Seminary.

The citation to accompany the awarding of the degree to Father Cahill was as follows:

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF AN HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LETTERS TO THE VERY REVEREND JOSEPH T. CAHILL, C.M., BY THE CHINA ACADEMY, HWA KANG, TAIPEI, TAIWAN, REPUBLIC OF CHINA, APRIL 1969

Confucius said: "In teaching, there should be no discrimination." In visualizing the idea of a cooperative world, the Chinese sage again said: "Throughout the kingdom, carriages have all wheels of the same size; all writing is with the same characters; and for all conduct there are the same rules." These words indicate the importance of international education in relating to the advancement of a new world community. It applied to ancient days; it is even more valid at the present time. Since the inception of the China Academy, we have received sustained support for international cooperation from institutions of higher learning throughout the world, particularly from St. John's University in New York.

This great institution founded by the Vincentian Fathers in 1870, will begin its yearlong centennial celebration in 1969. The University has sent forth thousands of dynamic and well-educated alumni into all walks of life; its achievements in the arts and sciences have become increasingly extensive and notable with the passage of time. In recent years, higher education throughout the world, because of the dynamic changes of the times, has experienced all kinds of problems and difficulties. However, under the capable leadership of Very Reverend Joseph T. Cahill, C.M., St. John's University has remained as the mainstay of Catholic American education and through the process of self-evaluation, has been able to advance internal improvements with impressive results. These measures towards progress constitute not only a new page in the one-hundred-years' glorious history of St. Joseph's University, but also a timely model to be followed by Catholic higher education on the international level. St. John's University's determined efforts toward international cultural and educational cooperation present a dynamic example of its lofty goals.

Very Reverend Joseph T. Cahill was born in 1919 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Attracted by the example of the great apostle of charity, St. Vincent de Paul, he pursued theological studies at the Vincentian Seminary and in 1946 he was ordained to the priesthood. He devoted himself unstintingly to others both as a priest and as an educator. His first assignment was as Superior and President of St. Joseph's College in Princeton, New Jersey, then later as Superior and President of Niagara University, New York. Since 1965, he has been President of St. John's University.

Because of his deep faith in God and his fellow men and his effective leadership, the University has achieved impressive progress even under the most difficult circumstances. Despite his onerous burden as President, Father Cahill has reserved to himself the pleasure of teaching. He conducts a course in Western Civilization and a course in Christian Living, thus providing us with an illuminating model for a tireless and selfless teacher. Mencius said: "When we examine the sages—both the earlier and the later—their principles are found to be the same." Father Cahill walks in their august company.

Recognizing his deep spirituality, his high purpose and selfless motivation, his love for others, his untiring dedication and distinctive achievements in education, and his outstanding contributions to the interpenetration of Eastern and Western cultures which benefit greatly the spiritual unification of mankind, the China Academy has the honor to bestow upon Very Reverend Joseph T. Cahill, C.M., honoris cause the degree of Doctor of Letters.

Done this seventeeth day of fourth month of the fifty-eighth year of the Republic of China (April 17, 1969).

Immediately following the citation, Father Cahill very graciously gave the following acceptance speech:

Your Excellency Ambassador Chow, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is with a great sense of honor and humility that I accept the academic honor conferred upon me by The China Academy. The world in which we live has changed greatly in the last twenty-five years. Because of the marvelous strides in Communication distances have shrunk to almost nothing, countries have become neighbors; and the need for interdependence has grown. All this has brought about a radical change in the social function of the University. Because the university educates for the world of tomorrow, its students must grasp what it means to be citizens of the world. Research and study can no longer concern itself solely with one's own country and people but must reach out to other countries and other peoples. To this end, cooperation among institutes in all parts of the world is essential.

As long ago as 1959, St. John's University began to develop area studies programs with special emphasis on Asia and Africa. In its study of the Asian world, it has received the sustained and generous cooperation of many educational and cultural institutions of the Republic of China, particularly The China Academy.

We are confident that what we have been able to do at St. John's in this field is only a beginning. The China Academy, under the capable leadership of Dr. Chang Chi-yun, has already contributed greatly to the interflow of Eastern and Western cultures. We are sure that the future efforts of the Academy and Dr. Chang for the advancement of international cooperation will bear even greater fruit, and St. John's University is happy to cooperate with them.

May I ask you, Mr. Ambassador, to convey to Dr. Chang and to all the members of the Board of Directors of the China Academy my sincere gratitude for their kindness in bestowing upon me this rare honor which I shall always cherish.

UNITED STATES CANNOT AFFORD NOT TO CONTINUE ORDERLY DEVELOPMENT OF SST

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it recently was pointed out by Robert L. Twiss, associate editor, Seattle Times, that the exports of commercial airliners from one company alone, the Boeing Co., now total $2.3 billion. I repeat that this is export business; sales to foreign countries which brought money into the United States.

This is a vital issue today when our balance of payments reads more like an "unbalance of payments."

And, at the same time, President Nixon is faced with a decision on whether or not to continue prototype development of the SST. The following article by Mr. Twiss clearly indicates the need for the aircraft from an economic point of view, defines a highly respected aviation leader's analysis of the Russian SST, and again gives reason for our development of the supersonic transport.

Jobs for additional thousands of Americans in the mid-1970's must be of paramount concern to all of us, and the SST will help provide that employment all over the country.

For the information of my colleagues and with the deep conviction that the development of this aircraft is vital to our economy and our security, under unanimous consent I submit the article by Robert L. Twiss for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

TRANS WORLD EXECUTIVE CITES NEED FOR U.S. SUPERSONIC PLANE PROGRAM

(By Robert L. Twiss)

The United States "simply cannot afford to default the era of supersonics to other countries," Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr., president of Trans World Airlines, insists.

Tillinghast, long an enthusiastic supporter for development of an economically sound American SST, outlined his concern about this nation's apparently lagging program in a recent speech in Chicago.

"We dare not give the Russians an exclusive instrument with which they can control and determine the trade routes of the future," Tillinghast said.

"While technology often does not progress smoothly and in accordance with some predetermined schedule, as evidenced by the United States supersonic program to date, we must see to it that, when the day of extensive supersonic travel arrives, United States aircraft lead the way, just as the Boeings, the Douglases and the Lockheeds have set the pace in more than three decades of world aviation," he said.

Tillinghast said that only the Russians appear to have been making conspicuous progress in the SST field, "and how good their ship is we really do not know."

"Historically, they have not excelled in producing efficient commercial transports, and their SST may prove to be no exception," he said. "But the Russians' ability to master areas to which they give priority, such as space technology, has been sufficiently proved that it would be folly to proceed on the assumption that they are destined to fail at the task."

Tillinghast said, in all probability, our first commercial SST will have to compete with a second-generation Soviet product. He noted the Anglo-French Concorde SST program has had "serious problems."

The Boeing Co. will develop the United States faster-than-sound airliner if the program moves ahead.

Taking note of criticism in some quarters of the American program, Tillinghast said "there is no factual basis for characterizing supersonic travel either as dangerous or as lacking in popularity."

"It should be as safe as ordinary flight, and I have not the slightest doubt of its popularity," he said.

Tillinghast also placed great emphasis on the nation's balance-of-payments and balance-of-trade problems.

"If one excludes the merchandise we have given away in our various aid programs, we had a net unfavorable balance of $3.4 billion (in trade) in 1968—this despite a favorable balance of $2.6 billion with respect to aviation and aerospace products," he said.

"Over the last decade, again excluding giveaways, our net favorable trade balance was $11.3 billion. Net exports of aviation and aerospace products during this decade reached $16.4 billion.

"Simple arithmetic shows that without America's enormous aviation-export business, our total U.S. balance of trade would have suffered a $5.1 billion deficit," he added.

Tillinghast contended that if this nation lets the markets for such highly technical products as supersonic transports go "our defenses of the dollar will crumble fast."

It is interesting to consider Boeing's role in the nation's aviation-exports since the Seattle firm re-entered the commercial transport field in the mid-1950s.

A survey shows that Boeing exports of commercial airliners have climbed to about the $2.3 billion mark.

Boeing last year alone exported 95 aircraft for $540 million—48 707s, 17 727s and 30 737s. This was a record export year for the Seattle firm.

Out of 89 airline customers for Boeing transports, 55 are non-United States carriers. Airlines have announced orders for more than 2,030 Boeing jets so far, with about 510 of the number or about 25 per cent going to the export market.

Add to the export sales the value of spare parts, totaling $190 million since 1959, and Boeing's export total for commercial planes and spare parts reaches the $2.3 billion mark.

The company has substantial export volume on the books, too.

In the case of the 747, out of 179 planes for which airlines have announced orders 63 or about 35 per cent are for export. This is more than $1.2 billion in export backlog alone, and the company also is continuing production of 707s, 727s and 737s for the overseas carriers.

THE WELFARE PARADOX

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the problems of welfare grow more acute virtually from day to day. In the past 5 years the annual costs of welfare programs in New York City have soared from $340 million to $1.3 billion. The situation is similar in most of the other large cities. We must press for realistic solutions to the hopelessly mismanaged welfare quagmire. An editorial from the April 10, 1969, edition of the Zanesville, Ohio, Times Recorder offers some incisive views on this subject. I am inserting the text at this point in the RECORD:

THE WELFARE PARADOX

Some may find it odd that a nation boasting the highest standard of living in the world, a nation in which more people enjoy more of the good things of life than ever before in history, a nation whose people have a tradition of generosity unequaled by any other people and a nation whose elected officials have long been pledged to the widest possible dispersal of material well-being now finds welfare to be its number one problem.

Future historians may come up with some unflattering answers to the paradox of U.S. wealth amidst expanding dependency on public welfare. However, the findings of future historians are of no help in grappling with this problem of the present. Judging by the experiences of the manifold relief agencies and the despair of administrators who continually fight the unequal equation of too many needy people and too little money, welfare can be described as nothing less than a monster that had demonstrated all too forcibly that handouts and hopelessness go hand in hand. The state of New York and the city of New York present a portrait of welfare in its advanced stages that all too clearly reveals what other communities, states and localities will be up against in the years to come—if they are not already.

In a sympathetic and thoughtful article in The New York Times Magazine, Mr. Julius Horwitz, a novelist who has worked in government and social welfare, delves deeply into the human and monetary side of the Empire State's welfare tragedy—and it is nothing less than a tragedy. Mr. Horwitz points out that welfare, as a form of paternalism in New York, began in the 1940's and 50's with the influx of low-income Puerto Rican families who used welfare as an economic stabilizer. The paternalism expanded with the migration of low-income families to New York City from the South. They considered welfare as a "bank" on which they could draw to compensate for lack of jobs.

In stark detail, Mr. Horwitz, through personal interviews with welfare recipients, describes the human disintegration which seems to inevitably accompany the loss of the will or the opportunity to obtain productive employment. It is a desolate tale of drug addiction, family abandonment, illegitimacy, theft, violence, moral and financial bankruptcy. He can find no concrete suggestions to offer for improvement.

What is the answer to welfare? A great many thoughtful citizens are asking this question. A part of the answer may be found in the intensified efforts of government and business leaders to provide jobs and opportunities for the unemployment and underemployed in private industry. A part of the answer lies in removing all artificial and legal barriers to employment that have arisen through custom, tradition, prejudice and the relaxing of the unduly restrictive employment rules and regulations of industry, government and unions. Companies all over the country are stressing "Equal Employment Opportunity" policies.

The chairman of a major oil company went to the heart of welfare and racial discrimination when he said, "People on welfare and unemployed minority groups are really an undeveloped human resource. Developing this resource by helping these people become productive through employment, whenever there are requirements for jobs, is a major answer to the problem . . . it must be solved mainly by individuals in our local communities and businesses." Obviously, the answer to welfare does not lie in simply adding more and more people to the welfare rolls and multiplying the burden on the already generous taxpayers.

CAMPUS DISCIPLINE

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the air is filled these days with reports of university students participating in the so-called politics of "confrontation." This mania has spread throughout the country and recently affected the students at the oldest and one of the finest institutions for higher learning, Harvard University.

We are well aware that there is legitimate cause for protest from our youth. Legitimate protest, however, does not give any individuals, whether or not they are students, the right to violate the law. If the law is broken those that participate must accept the consequences.

This is part of the question at Harvard today—and it is not yet settled. A recent editorial in the Quincy Patriot-Ledger of Quincy, Mass., states very well the case for appropriate action concerning the small minority of students who believe themselves above the law at Harvard. Its basic points should be heeded by all university administrators, faculty, and students:

> No university should refuse to discuss student problems and to find ways of resolving them. But no university should bow to force, to illegal and undemocratic power plays, to disruption and lawlessness.
>
> Part of the process of education must be the development of self-discipline and responsibility as a citizen in a democracy.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Members of Congress read this message in the Quincy Patriot-Ledger. They may want to pass it on to the academic community within their constituencies.

The editorial follows:

CAMPUS DISCIPLINE

What happened at Harvard University this week was tragic. A small minority of students and others have succeeded in disrupting the entire campus, dividing the student body, the faculty and the administration.

This minority has succeeded in escalating a list of "demands," with which there apparently was little sympathy from the majority of Harvard students, into a serious situation. They have managed to transfer the focus of attention away from their own illegal activities to the Harvard administration's reaction after the college administration building was seized and Harvard deans were evicted.

Under the circumstances, Harvard must act firmly but justly with those guilty of illegal conduct. The university is completely justified in prosecuting under civil law those who took part in the seizure of the building and in taking firm disciplinary action against Harvard students who have violated university regulations. To retreat under pressure or to grant a general amnesty will only encourage future disorder.

Let us not be misled by nonsense about "police brutality," or about the "right to protest" or about "alienated youth." It is unfortunate that police had to be called in to clear Harvard's University Hall, but why is the onus not put where it belongs—on the students who seized and occupied the hall, refused to leave, threw out the university deans, chained the doors, formed a cordon of students to obstruct police, and then claimed to be "peacefully resisting" arrest?

Clearly, the whole incident was a manufactured provocation. The list of demands was a pretext. If these students had been honest in their "cause"—allegedly the abolition of ROTC at Harvard—they could have presented their grievances to university officials in a proper manner. If unsatisfied with the results, they could have followed this up with petitions, or with peaceful picketing.

The tactics employed by this minority—against the advice and vote of their own organization—suggest that their main intent was to disrupt the university, not to gain "reforms." It suggests that they knew their list of grievances would attract little attention or support without dramatic action.

No university should refuse to discuss student problems and to find ways of resolving them. But no university should bow to force, to illegal and undemocratic power plays, to disruption and lawlessness. When such incidents take place, university officials must act decisively and firmly.

Part of the process of education must be the development of self-discipline and responsibility as a citizen in a democracy. If students submit to the discipline of the mind that university education demands, they must also realize that civilization, the art of living together harmoniously, demands a discipline of personal behavior. And part of this discipline means an appreciation of and respect for the rights of other individuals.

Whatever their motivations, their politics or their philosophy of life, no group of students should be permitted to deny the rights of other students to be educated. Students who cannot accept the legitimate processes of democracy, or who cannot accept the discipline of conduct in the university community, have no business remaining in that school.

There are many young people who are willing to accept the obligations of university life and who are looking for places in our overcrowded institutions of higher learning. Those who have demonstrated their inability to accept these obligations, and who have shown their contempt for their colleagues, the institution and society, should be expelled from the campus, whether it is at Harvard or elsewhere.

MARK ROEMER WINS STATEWIDE AWARD

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am especially proud to call the attention of my colleagues to the achievements of one of my constituents, 15-year-old Mark Roemer from Menasha, Wis. Mark was recently named first place winner of the statewide Ability Counts essay writing contest sponsored by the Governor's committee on employment of the handicapped.

Because of the interest every Member of Congress has in our handicapped citizens, I urge my colleagues to read Mark's essay. I think we all agree with Mark that—

> A handicapped person is merely a new kind of specialist—a man who has become proficient in a field which requires the use of his unimpaired abilities.

I congratulate Mark Roemer and salute as well, Bette Kay Kleinschmidt and Nancy Fratt, both of Oshkosh, who received honorable mention in the contest.

At this point in my remarks I should like to include this excellent essay, followed by an article on the contest from the Paper, Oshkosh, Wis.:

STUDENT'S PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY

(By Mark Roemer)

What should every employer know about handicapped workers? When a handicapped person applies for a job (for instance, a deaf person), the employer, if interviewing the person, should not immediately deduce which jobs in his business the person's handicap would prevent him from doing (such as holding the position of a telephone operator). Rather, he should concentrate on what the applicant's disability does not bar him from (in this case the deaf person might turn out to be a marvelous accountant). The employer should be aware of the person's attitude toward working. If the will to work is there, the person can frequently be adapted, with possibly some special equipment, to many jobs. If the negative attitude toward work is present, however, there is usually not much that can be done, even with the newest and best adaptational device.

As I, myself, am a handicapped student and will need a job in the future to support myself, and perhaps a family, I will not want to be turned away from employment offices as "helpless," as the visually-handicapped segment of society was considered not too long ago. I would like my prospective employer to know about the special devices which could help me to adapt to my particular position, instead of having him deduce, "Because you are blind, you cannot possibly perform any of the jobs in my company." I naturally hope that the employer will be aware of my good qualities, and not merely dwell on my limitations. For example, I am very punctual. The only occasions on which I have shown up late for a class were caused by transportation inconsistencies and not by any loitering on my part. I strive to be efficient and prepared daily with my schoolwork. I do not find it difficult to maintain a test average of 99 in mathematics, my favorite subject. This is the subject I believe I shall need most for the business field I plan to enter. But most important of all, I believe I have the will to work. I realize that in order to earn a living I will have to perform some type of work exceptionally well.

In other related fields of disability, deaf people could be employed in machine assembly plants or other factories where the noise level might be abnormally high. A deaf girl might become an excellent transcription typist. A person who has had all of his limbs amputated might be a boon to the world of science, or have an extremely good head for business because of his high mental abilities.

There is much manpower in the handicapped section of our population, and all employers should investigate the benefits to be had by hiring disabled workers. A handicapped person is merely a new kind of specialist—a man who has become proficient in a field which requires the use of his unimpaired abilities. If employers look at handicapped people in this optimistic perspective, their corporations will both progress and prosper.

OHS HANDICAPPED YOUTH WINS ESSAY CONTEST

Mark Roemer, a 15-year-old Oshkosh High School junior and himself a handicapped person, has been named first place winner of the statewide Ability Counts essay writing contest, sponsored by the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Roemer, who has a severe visual disability and is enrolled in the public school system's visually handicapped program, is the son of

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Roemer, 232 Kaukauna St., Menasha.

As state winner, the OHS student receives a $200 savings bond and a cash award of $200 from the AFL–CIO.

He and other winners, together with their parents and teachers, will attend a luncheon on April 14 at the Park Motor Inn, Madison.

The group will tour the capitol and meet with Gov. Warren P. Knowles.

Roemer will also be invited to attend the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, scheduled for May 1–2 in Washington, D.C.

The AFL–CIO award will cover his expenses in Washington.

First place award in the national essay contest on employment of the handicapped is $1,000.

Roemer, whose English teacher at OHS is Mrs. Marilyn Wille, is the first Oshkosh student to be named first place winner in the annual state competition.

James Bearss, son of the Rev. and Mrs. Robert Bearss, was third place state winner last year.

In addition to his victory in the state employment of the handicapped essay contest, Roemer has qualified as one of OHS's top 11 mathematics students and will compete Saturday in the Wisconsin sectional testing contest of the Mathematics Association of America.

In his award winning essay, Roemer observed that, as a handicapped student who will need a job in the future to support himself and perhaps a family, "I will not want to be turned away from employment offices as 'helpless,' as the visually handicapped segment of society was considered not too long ago."

Pointing out that he does not find it difficult to maintain a test average of 99 in mathematics, his favorite subject, Roemer wrote, "I naturally hope that the employer will be aware of my good qualities and not merely dwell on my limitations."

"A handicapped person," the student's essay added, "is merely a new kind of specialist—a man who has become proficient in a field which requires the use of his unimpaired abilities.

"If employers look at handicapped people in this optimistic perspective, their corporations will both progress and prosper."

Two Oshkosh senior girls received honorable mention in the state essay competition on employment of the handicapped.

They are Bette Kay Kleinschmidt, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. M. C. Kleinschmidt, 2017 Doemel St., and Nancy Fratt, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Homer Fratt, 630 Reichow St.

Miss Fratt was named in January as first place winner of the Winnebago Easter Seal Society's 1968 hiring the handicapped contest.

THE JACK C. REDDICK FAMILY

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues a family from my hometown of Sylvania, Ga.—a family that has shown what real service can mean to the community and to the country—the Jack C. Reddick family.

For a total of 66 years, the members of the family of the late Jack C. Reddick served the court with dignity and honor beginning with Jack C. Reddick, who served as clerk of the Superior Court of Screven County, Ga., from 1903 until his death in 1937. He was succeeded by his wife, Mrs. Lina Evans Reddick; then followed their son, Jack C. Reddick, Jr., who was elected to serve as clerk in 1941 until he entered the armed services in World War II a short time thereafter; and the Reddick family service concluded with another brother, J. H. Reddick, who served 24 consecutive years until his retirement in 1968.

During all those years there was never any worry that the job was not being handled efficiently. There was confidence that the job was carefully and properly done, as evidenced by the petition presented to the Superior Court of Screven County which is described in the following article from the Screven County News of January 30, 1969:

Harold W. Hollingsworth, in behalf of the Screven County Bar, presented to the Superior Court of Screven County, the following petition, the design of which was to honor J. H. Reddick, recently retired as Clerk of Court, and other members of his family, who together filled the office of Clerk for a continuous period of 66 years:

"SCREVEN COUNTY, GA.

"To the Superior Court of Screven County, Ga.

"We, the undersigned members of the Screven County Bar do hereby bring this petition to the Court and respectfully show the following:

"1. That J. H. Reddick did most honorably serve as Clerk of this Court for a period of twenty-four consecutive years, and that he retired from the office at the end of 1968.

"2. That his late father, Jack C. Reddick, deceased, served as Clerk from 1903 until his death in 1937.

"3. That the late mother of said J. H. Reddick, Mrs. Lina Evans Reddick, deceased, served as Clerk after the death of the said Jack C. Reddick.

"4. That the brother of said J. H. Reddick, Jack C. Reddick, Jr., was elected to serve as Clerk in 1941, and served until he went into the Armed Services of the United States in World War II, a short time thereafter.

"5. That the office of the Clerk of this Court, therefore, was held for a continuous period of sixty-six years by members of the family of said J. H. Reddick, all of whom served the Court with dignity and honor.

"6. That we especially appreciate the kind and gentlemanly manner in which the said J. H. Reddick served, his good character, and his willingness to help not only the lawyers and other officers of the Court but also each and every person who called upon him.

"7. That we are proud of his service to the people of Screven County, and that it has been our pleasure and privilege to have worked with him through the past years.

"8. That we wish him continued success, good health and happiness in the future.

"Now, therefore, we do respectfully pray that the Court allow the filing of this petition and that the same be recorded in the minutes.

"LIMERICK ODEM,
"HAROLD HOLLINGSWORTH,
"E. W. HILL,
"HARRY HUNTER,
"L. H. HILTON,
"W. C. HAWKINS."

Order:

The above and foregoing petition, read in Open Court and considered, the same is hereby ordered filed and recorded upon the minutes of this Court.

This — day of January, 1969.

——— ———,
Judge, Screven Superior Court.

The way the country is going these days it seems we should get back to the long-held concept of service and quality of service such as has been given our community by the Reddick family.

The Reddicks are a truly remarkable family and they should serve as an inspiration to all individuals who enter public office, by remembering that anything worth doing at all is worth doing well and to the best of one's ability.

The Reddicks are the very fiber and heart of American principles and ideals. They have given real service and conducted the duties of office as they are supposed to and they have given attention to the wishes of those by whom they were elected.

I am indeed proud to have the wonderful Reddick family as my friends and constituents.

HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Walter Kravitz of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has prepared a short history of the development of the Committee on Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives. This history is available, of course, to all Members of the Congress. It follows:

EARLY HISTORY, SIZE, AND COMPOSITION

From the First Congress, in 1789, there has always been a Committee on Rules in the House of Representatives. For ninety years it was the practice of the House to set up a select committee at the beginning of each Congress authorized to report a system of rules. During this period the committee exercised little, if any, influence over the legislative program or the content of policies. So minor a role did the committee play in early days that no appointments were made to it in the 15th, 16th, 18th, 19th, and 21st Congresses. And for many years in the early history of the House the Rules Committee made no reports.

The committee continued to be a select committee until the rules revision of 1880 when it was made a standing committee, with its membership fixed at five, in accordance with the previous usage. And it has remained a standing committee down to the present time.

In its composition the Committee on Rules has apparently always been bipartisan, with the majority party in the House having a majority of its members. Its size was increased to 10 members in 1910, to 11 in 1911, to 12 in 1917, and to 14 in 1935. Between 1935 and 1944, the party ratio was 10 majority to 4 minority, except during the 78th Congress (1943–1944) when it was 9 and 5. In 1945 the size of the committee was reduced to 12, with a majority-minority party ratio of 8 to 4. On January 31, 1961, at the beginning of the first session under the Kennedy Administration, the House voted 217 to 212 to enlarge the committee for the duration of the 87th Congress to 15 members, 10 majority and 5 minority. That increase was made a part of the permanent rules on January 9, 1963, by a 235–196 vote.

DEVELOPMENT OF COMMITTEE POWERS

The powers and privileges of the Rules Committee developed gradually over the years. Until 1841 its responsibility ceased for all practical purposes after it reported a code of rules at the beginning of each Congress. In 1841 the Speaker's ruling that the committee might "report from time to time" was sustained on appeal by the House. This was the first in a series of innovations that transformed the Committee on Rules into an instrument through which the House may exercise special power for a particular piece of legislation.[1]

The next step came in 1853 when the House adopted a resolution providing that this committee's report "shall be acted upon by the House until disposed of, to the exclusion of all other business, anything in the rules hereby temporarily adopted to the contrary notwithstanding."[2]

In 1858 the House authorized appointment of a select committee, of whom the Speaker was to be one, to revise the rules and report at the next session. This was the first time in the history of the House that its presiding officer had served on one of its committees. From 1858 to March 19, 1910, the Speaker continued to be a member of the Rules Committee, serving as its chairman and exercising its authority. From 1789 to 1911 the Speaker also made all committee assignments, including those to the Committee on Rules. Thus, after 1858, the powers of the committee and the authority of the Speaker were closely connected, a circumstance which served both to enhance the role of the committee and to strengthen the influence of the Chair.

Another major step in the development of the powers of the Rules Committee took place in 1883. In that year the House upheld a Speaker's ruling that the committee might properly report a special order providing for the consideration of a particular bill.[3] This ruling, in which the Speaker supported the authority of a committee of which he was himself chairman *ex officio*, initiated the modern practice whereby the Rules Committee has reported special orders, resolutions, or "rules"—the terms are interchangeable in this context—providing times and methods for the consideration of special bills or classes of bills. Under this procedure the House may take up particular legislation by majority vote instead of being forced to rely on suspension of the rules, which requires a two-thirds vote, or unanimous consent. After 1883, points of order made against reports of the Rules Committee were seldom upheld by the Chair. Prior to that time it had been the custom for each committee desiring to bring a bill to the House floor to propose its own special order. By 1890 the function of proposing special orders for the consideration of business had become the exclusive prerogative of the Rules Committee. Hinds tells us that this procedure was not in great favor during the 48th, 49th, and 50th Congresses, but that it was used frequently in the 51st Congress, "and since 1890 has been in favor as an efficient means of bringing up for consideration bills difficult to reach in the regular order and especially as a means for confining within specified limits the consideration of bills involving important policies for which the majority party in the House may be responsible."[4]

In 1891 the right to report at any time was conferred upon the Rules Committee, and in 1893 it was given the right to sit during sessions of the House.[5]

During the period 1890–1910, the Rules Committee rose to a pre-eminent position in the congressional committee system under the masterful leadership of chairmen like Speakers Thomas Brackett Reed and "Uncle Joe" Cannon. Thanks to a series of favorable rulings by themselves and other Speakers, which were sustained on appeal by the House itself, the Committee on Rules acquired the power (a) to consider and report special orders, (b) to sit during sessions of the House, (c) to report matters not previously introduced, reported, or committed to it, and (d) to have its reports immediately considered.

Even after the Speaker was removed from the committee, its powers increased. In 1920, Speaker Gillett ruled that the committee might "report a resolution providing for the consideration of a bill which has not yet been introduced."[6] And in 1933 Speaker Rainey upheld the committee's right to report a resolution for consideration of a bill on which the House had refused to act under suspension of the rules.[7]

By the exercise of these powers the Rules Committee can sift most of the business coming from the other committees of the House, decide which bills shall have the right-of-way to consideration on the floor, and significantly influence the order in which they shall be taken up. Through its power to report new business, it has original as well as secondary jurisdiction over the legislative agenda. It has the power to, and on occasion does, substitute its own judgment for that of the legislative committees of the House on matters of substantive policy by forcing amendments to bills as a condition for giving them a "green light" to the floor.

The Rules Committee can also determine the procedural conditions under which the House considers most substantive measures, including the duration of debate and the extent to which a measure may be amended. It does this through special "rules," of which there are at least three kinds: (1) closed rules limiting the amendment of pending measures; (2) open rules permitting their amendment; and (3) rules providing that all points of order against a proposition be considered as waived.

Moreover, since the committee is the usual channel through which amendments to the rules of the House reach the floor, it is able to promote or inhibit changes in House parliamentary procedures.

In short, the Committee on Rules is to a large degree the governing committee of the House. To it the House has largely delegated the power to regulate procedure vested in the House itself by the Constitution. Furthermore, by virtue of its influence in determining the order and the content of floor business, the committee may also function as a "steering" committee, steering the House in whatever direction the exigencies of the hour appear to demand.

To what extent the committee exercises its powers in association with or independently of the formal leadership of the House depends upon the circumstances of the moment. Sometimes the leadership has dominated the committee. On other occasions, the committee has exercised its prerogatives independently and contrary to the wishes of the leadership.

TWENTIETH CENTURY DEVELOPMENTS

In 1909, the House adopted a potential restriction on the Rules Committee's power to control access to the House floor when it provided for Calendar Wednesday. Under the rule, each Wednesday is reserved exclusively for the various standing committees to call up for consideration bills and resolutions not otherwise privileged. The leadership of the House has generally ignored this procedure for bringing up measures blocked in the Rules Committee. For many years, the "call of the committees" has usually been dispensed with by unanimous consent, on motion of the Majority Leader. The rule was last invoked in 1962.

The "revolution of 1910," which reduced the powers of the Speaker of the House, left those of the Rules Committee intact. But the Speaker lost his seat on that committee and it was increased in size from 5 to 10 members.

In 1924 the "pocket veto" power of the chairman of the Rules Committee was curbed after Chairman Campbell had exercised his discretion to the extent of holding in his pocket a number of resolutions which he had been authorized by the committee to report some weeks before. In order to prevent a repetition of such arbitrary action, the House Rules were amended in 1924 by adding the following paragraph:

"The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business within three legislative days of the time when ordered by the Committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately it shall be referred to the calendar and if not called up by the member making the report within nine days thereafter, any member designated by the Committee may call it up for consideration."

Subsequently, this paragraph was amended to provide that if such rule or order is not called up within seven legislative days, "any member of the Rules Committee may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose."[8]

Another change in the rules of the House was adopted in 1924 which, while it applies to every standing committee, was designed in part to restrict the prerogatives of the Committee on Rules. The Discharge Rule, first adopted on June 17, 1910, was amended in 1924, so as to set at 150 the number of signatures required on discharge petitions. This number was raised to 218 in 1935 where it remained until 1959 when the admission of Alaska and Hawaii raised it temporarily to 219. When the size of the House returned to 435 in 1963, the number of signatures required dropped back to 218.

Under this rule it is in order to file a motion to discharge the Rules Committee from the further consideration of special orders of business provided that the special order has been before the committee for at least seven days prior to the filing of the motion to discharge. Twice a month it is in order to call up the motions which have been placed on the discharge calendar. When the House begins the consideration of a bill under this rule, it remains the unfinished business of the House until fully disposed of without intervening motion except one motion to adjourn.

Traditionally, the Committee on Rules functioned as the agent of the majority party in the House, using its powers to facilitate the legislative program of that party, the wishes of its leadership, and the program of the Administration. In 1937, however, the New Deal lost control of the Rules Committe when three of its Democratic members joined with the four Republican members to block or dilute floor consideration of controversial Administration bills. From 1945 to 1960 the coalition consisted of two Democrats and four Republicans, exactly half of the committee's 12 members. From 1955 to 1966 the chairman of the committee was himself generally acknowledged to be a leader of the coalition.

This bipartisan coalition controlled the Committee on Rules from 1937 to the beginning of 1961, except during the 80th Congress (1947–1948) and the 83d Congress (1953–1954) when, dominated by Republicans, the committee again functioned as the agent of the majority party in the House. At the beginning of the 87th Congress (1961), and after a dramatic confrontation on the floor of the House between Speaker Sam Rayburn and Rules Committee chairman Howard W. Smith, the House voted by a narrow margin to enlarge the committee. Two Democrats and one Republican were added, giving the Democratic leadership a majority on most committee votes from the 87th through the 90th Congresses.

As a result of repeated complaints of the "obstructive tactics" and the "undemocratic and arbitrary dictatorship" of the Rules Committee, the House amended its rules at

---

Footnotes at end of article.

the begining of the 81st Congress (January 3, 1949) by adopting the so-called "21-day rule." This rule stipulated that a resolution providing for the immediate consideration of a public bill already reported and which had been before the Rules Committee 21 days without being given clearance to the House floor could be called up on discharge days (second and fourth Mondays each month) by the chairman of the committee which had reported the bill, and that "the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose . . ."

Altogether, eight measures were brought to the House floor under the 21-day rule during the 81st Congress; seven of them passed. Proponents of the rule declared that without it these measures would never have reached the floor, that its very existence forced the Rules Committee to act in other cases, and that the general effect of the rule had been to break the Rules Committee bottleneck on legislation desired by a majority of the House. Opponents of the rule argued that it gave the Speaker unreasonable powers and responsibilities, and that it had stripped the committee of its useful power to prevent consideration of popular but unwise measures upon which Members did not want themselves recorded. Some maintained that the rule encouraged unbridled spending and adoption of socialistic measures. Moreover, they insisted the rule was unnecessary because the committee usually followed the recommendations of the leadership and, in any event, the House could by-pass the committee if it wished by use of the Calendar Wednesday or discharge petition rules. After hearing these arguments, the House abolished the 21-day rule at the beginning of the 82d Congress.[9]

It was resurrected in a modified form at the beginning of the 89th Congress (January 4, 1965). Under the new regulation, when any resolution providing for consideration of a bill had been in the Rules Committee for 21 days, it was in order for the Speaker, on discharge day, to recognize a committee chairman or other authorized committee member to call up the resolution for action. Whereas the rule of the 81st Congress *required* the Speaker to recognize the member who rose to call up the resolution, the rule of the 89th Congress gave the Speaker authority to act "in his discretion." The rule was used eight times during the 89th Congress. It was rescinded at the beginning of the 90th Congress (January 10, 1967) by a vote of 232 to 185.

Debate on the rescision of 1967 was relatively brief; the arguments were not spelled out in any detail for either side. Opponents of the rule seemed to argue, in effect, that the rule had been abused. The intent, it was implied, had been to prevent unreasonable delay of important measures by the Rules Committee, but in practice, some chairmen had filed resolutions under the rule on almost every measure reported from their committees, often on the same day the measure was reported and before there was any evidence that the Rules Committee intended to delay its consideration. Proponents of the rule offered no arguments during the debate, but it may be assumed their views were the same as in previous years. Some Members who had voted for the rule in 1965 voted to repeal it in 1967.[10]

Prior to 1965, the Committee on Rules had the power under certain conditions to prevent bills from going to conference. It exercised that right, for example, late in 1960 on an education bill. In 1965, at the same time the House adopted the second 21-day rule, it also curbed that power.

THE COMMITTEE'S RULES OF PROCEDURE

Under Rule XI, clause 27(a), the rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of its committees so far as applicable. The clause provides further that committees may adopt additional rules not inconsistent therewith, and many committees have done so. The Committee on Rules first adopted such additional regulations on February 28, 1967, and again on January 7, 1969, as follows:

"Rule 1. Meetings

"The Committee on Rules shall meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday of each week while the Congress is in session. Meetings shall be called to order and presided over by the Chairman or, in the absence of the Chairman, by the ranking Majority Member of the Committee present as acting chairman.

"Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public except when a majority of the Committee determine that testimony received may bear upon matters affecting the national security. Executive sessions of the Committee shall be closed.

"For the purpose of hearing testimony, a majority of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

"A printed transcript of any hearing or public meeting of the Committee may be had if the Chairman decides it is necessary, or if a majority of the Members request it.

"A Tuesday meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with where, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need therefor, and additional meetings may be called by the Chairman or by written request of a majority of the Committee duly filed with the counsel of the Committee.

"Rule 2. Voting

"No measure or recommendation shall be reported or tabled by the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

"A roll call vote of the Members of the Committee may be had upon the request of any Member.

"Rule 3. Reporting

"Whenever the Committee authorizes the favorable reporting of a bill or resolution from the Committee, the Chairman or acting Chairman shall report the same or designate some Member of the Committee to report the same to the House, as provided in the Rules of the House.

"Rule 4. Committee Staffing

"The professional and clerical staffs of the Committee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of the members of the staffs and delegate such authority as the Chairman deems appropriate, with the exception of the Minority staff, who shall be selected by and under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

"Rule 5. Miscellaneous

"The Committee shall prepare, maintain, and publish for the Members of the Committee, so far as practicable, a calendar listing all matters formally before it. Information on the Calendar shall include the numbers of the bills or resolutions, a brief description of a bill's contents, including the legislative committee reporting it and the name of the principal sponsoring Member. For purposes of this rule, matters formally before the Committee include: bills or resolutions over which the Committee has original jurisdiction and bills or resolutions from other committees concerning which the chairman or designated member of such committee has requested a hearing in writing and forwarded to the Committee on Rules a copy of such bill or resolution as reported, together with the final printed committee report.

"Upon adoption of the rules and procedures of the Committee at the opening of each Congress, the Chairman may have these rules and procedures printed in an early issue of The Congressional Record."

STAFF

Until 1950 the professional staff of the committee usually consisted of a single clerk with occasionally an assistant clerk. The minority party was first assigned a clerk of its own in 1950. By 1967 the staff included a counsel, an assistant counsel, a minority counsel, and two additional staff members. The committee also frequently consults the House Parliamentarian in drawing up the technical language of "rules" it reports to the floor.

COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

The Committee on Rules has jurisdiction over (a) the rules, joint rules, and order of business of the House and (b) recesses and final adjournments of Congress. Primarily the jurisdiction of this committee is over propositions to make or change the rules, for the creation of committees, and authorizing and/or directing them to make investigations. It also reports resolutions relating to the hour of daily meeting and the days on which the House shall sit, and orders relating to the use of of the galleries during the electoral count.[11] In addition, it has been held as recently as August 19, 1964, that the committee may report a resolution fixing the order of busiess and the manner of considering a measure, even though adopting that resolution would have the effect of discharging another committee from a matter pending before it.

Footnotes at end of article.

CHAIRMEN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON RULES SINCE ITS ESTABLISHMENT AS A STANDING COMMITTEE

Chairman	Political affiliation	State	Term of service in House	Term of service as chairman
Samuel J. Randall[1]	Democrat	Pennsylvania	1863–90	1875–81 (44th to 46th Cong.).
Joseph Warren Keifer[1]	Republican	Ohio	1877–85; 1901–11	1881–83 (47th Cong.).
John G. Carlisle[1]	Democrat	Kentucky	1877–90	1883–89 (48th to 50th Cong.).
Thomas Brackett Reed[1]	Republican	Maine	1877–99	1889–91 (51st Cong.).
Charles F. Crisp[1]	Democrat	Georgia	1883–96	1891–95 (52d and 53d Cong.).
Thomas Brackett Reed[1]	Republican	Maine	1877–99	1895–99 (54th and 55th Cong.).
David B. Henderson[1]	do	Iowa	1883–1903	1899–1903 (56th and 57th Cong.).
Joseph G. Cannon[1]	do	Illinois	1873–91; 1893–1913; 1915–23	1903–10 (58th to 61st Cong., 2d sess.).
John Dalzell	do	Pennsylvania	1887–1913	1910–11 (61st Cong., 2d and 3d sess.).
Robert L. Henry	Democrat	Texas	1897–1917	1911–17 (62d to 64th Cong.).
Edward W. Pou	do	North Carolina	1901–34	1917–19 (65th Cong.).
Philip P. Campbell	Republican	Kansas	1903–23	1919–23 (66th and 67th Cong.).
Bertrand H. Snell	do	New York	1915–37	1923–31 (68th to 71st Cong.).
Edward W. Pou	Democrat	North Carolina	1901–34	1931–34 (72d and 73d Cong., 2d sess.).
William B. Bankhead	do	Alabama	1917–40	1934–35 (73d Cong., 2d sess.; 74th Cong., 1st sess.).

See footnote at end of table.

CHAIRMEN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON RULES SINCE ITS ESTABLISHMENT AS A STANDING COMMITTEE—Continued

Chairman	Political affiliation	State	Term of service in House	Term of service as chairman
John J. O'Connor	Democrat	New York	1923–38	1935–38 (74th Cong., 1st sess.; 75th Cong.).
Adolph J. Sabath	do	Illinois	1907–52	1939–46 (76th to 79th Cong.; 81st Cong.). 1951–52.
Leo E. Allen	Republican	do	1933–61	1947–48 (80th Cong.). 1953–54 (83d Cong.).
Howard W. Smith	Democrat	Virginia	1931–67	1955–66 (84th to 89th Cong.).
William M. Colmer	do	Mississippi	1933–	1967– (90th Cong.–).

[1] Speaker of the House.

A SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT WORKS

American Enterprise Institute. Special analysis; History and powers of the House Committee on Rules. Washington, 1963. 26 p.

Bolling, Richard. House out of order. New York, E. P. Dutton & Company, Inc., 1965. 253 p.

Bolling, Richard. Power in the House; a history of the leadership of the House of Representatives. New York, E. P. Dutton & Company, Inc., 1968. 291 p.

Froman, Lewis A., jr. The Congressional process: strategies, rules, and procedures. Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1967. 221 p.

Galloway, George B. History of the House of Representatives. New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1961. 334 p.

MacKaye, William R. A new coalition takes control: the House Rules Committee fight of 1961. Rutgers University, Eagleton Institute: cases in practical politics, case 29. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963.

MacNeil, Neil. Forge of democracy: the House of Representatives. New York, David McKay Co., Inc., 1963. 496 p.

Peabody, Robert L. "The enlarged Rules Committees." *In* New perspectives on the House of Representatives. Robert L. Peabody and Nelson W. Polsby, eds. Chicago, Rand McNally, 1963. pp. 129–164.

Price, H. Douglas. "Race, religion, and the Rules Committee: the Kennedy aid to education bills." *In* The uses of power. Alan F. Westin, ed. New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, 1962. pp. 1–71.

Robinson, James A. The House Rules Committee. Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1963. 142 p.

FOOTNOTES

[1] V *Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives* § 6780.

[2] *Globe*, 33d Congress, 1st Session, Volume 28, part 1, p. 4.

[3] IV *Hinds' Precedents* § 3160.

[4] IV *Hinds' Precedents* § 3152.

[5] IV *Hinds' Precedents* § 4321.

[6] VIII *Cannon's Precedents* § 3388.

[7] VIII *Cannon's Precedents* § 3389.

[8] House Rule XI, paragraph 23.

[9] Congressional Record, 82nd Congress, 1st session, Volume 97, part 1, pp. 9–19.

[10] Congressional Record, 90th Congress, 1st session, Jan. 10, 1967 [daily ed.], pp. H17–H23. For complaints on specific abuses of the rule, see Congressional Record, 89th Congress, 2nd session, Volume 112: part 13, pp. 16832–16839 [July 25, 1966]; part 15, pp. 19560–19561 [Aug. 16, 1966]; part 17, p. 23421 [Sept. 21, 1966]; part 18, p. 23756 [Sept. 26, 1966].

[11] House Manual and Rules. 1969. § 715–717.

LIQUOR AND MORALITY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people are becoming greatly concerned over the increased sexual promiscuity, reliance on narcotics and hard liquor, all of which tend to erode morality and lower social standards.

In the welfare state of Sweden, alcoholism is labeled, "a national disease," and "the most democratic of all sicknesses."

Here in the United States, according to a report by Father Lyons, provocative magazines such as Playboy, Look, and many other slick paper publications which appeal to sensuality and perversion are subsidized by huge amounts of advertising moneys from the alcohol industry.

The hard liquor people, approaching a monopoly in the United States operate a tax-free foundation identified as the Samuel Bronfman Foundation of New York City whose principal donor is Joseph Seagram of Seagram's whisky.

Among the most liberal grants made by this foundation are to "organizations concerned with health, recreation, and child welfare." Makes one wonder if this can include promotion of licentiousness through current programs of sex education. Can they feel that by subsidizing immorality they can increase liquor sales?

In any event, it would appear that our parents, our educators, and our ministers need only look to the tragic plight of the young people in Sweden to see where we are going if we do not give wholesome leadership to stop this deliberate crusade against our national moral fiber.

Mr. Speaker, I include an AP release from Stockholm, Sweden, dated April 15, Father Lyons' "View of the News" for September 29, 1968, and an excerpt from the "Foundation Directory," page 520, as follow:

REVERSE SALES CAMPAIGN HITS SWEDISH ALCOHOLISM

STOCKHOLM.—In Sweden a company is trying to cut down its sales—and is bragging that it is succeeding.

This is part of an official temperance policy to change the drinking habits of the Swedes and stem the use of alcohol among the youth.

Nya Systembolaget, the state-owned monopoly which runs all the retail outlets for spirits, wines and strong beers, is happy because its liquor sales dropped sharply in 1968.

Its advertisements say: "the sale of spirits dropped by 2.3 million liters (607,602 gallons) compared with 1967." Distilled liquor dropped most of all. More and more people are choosing good wine in place of expensive spirits. Even we, whose cash registers suffered, think that's wonderful. Keep it up in 1969."

Drunkenness and alcoholism are among the greatest social problems in this welfare state. Heavy drinking is commonly referred to as a national disease.

For 40 years Sweden tried a liquor rationing system. Depending mainly on income and social status, some 40 per cent of the Swedes over 21 years of age had permits to buy one to four liters of spirits monthly. Opponents said the system encouraged Swedes to buy the full ration and go on binges. It resulted in moonshining and a thriving black market.

In October 1955 Sweden dropped this experiment. Anyone over age 21 could buy as much to drink as he wanted—provided he wasn't blacklisted for abuses. Authorities switched to other ways of trying to bring alcohol under control—mainly through high taxes. Prices today are from 90 to 100 per cent higher than in the last year of rationing. Taxes make up 89 per cent of the price of a bottle of aquavit, a Swedish schnapps which is a fixture on every smorgasbord. The retail price is $6.50 to $7. A bottle of whiskey taxed about as heavily, retails at $10 for most standard brands. Wines and strong beers carry around half the tax load. A good bottle of wine retails at about $2. Wines mainly are bought by the monopoly in casks and bottled here.

Aside from pricing policy, a campaign to drink more wine—"it's cheaper and better"—has been pushed. Systembolaget recently advertised "We Swedes are getting smarter" and pointed out that by buying a bottle of wine instead of whiskey a Swede could save $5 to $6 in tax per bottle.

Instruction on the effects of alcohol is required in the schools and in the armed forces. Official temperance boards are charged with an intensified program of treatment for alcoholics and others who misuse spirits. Temperance societies are strong. Restaurants may dispense spirits only under a strict licensing system. Driving under the influence is heavily penalized. Parliament has under consideration a bill to ban liquor advertising.

All this is bound to have an effect on Swedish drinking habits. Yet Systembolaget has an annual sales turnover of around $500 million, about half of what the state spends on defense annually.

Statistics show Swedes are, in fact, drinking more wine and beer at the expense of stronger spirits. The consumption of liquor per Swede 15 years of age and over dropped from nine liters in 1957 to 8.5 liters 10 years later. In the same period wine consumption rose from 3.4 to 6.3 liters while beer jumped from 26.7 to 51.3 liters per person.

Even so, published estimates put the number of Swedes "with an alcohol problem" at 250,000, or more than 1 in every 30. Social workers report a rising rate of misuse of alcohol among teen-agers. They attribute the trend to looser discipline and the fact that youth today have more spending money.

Why is there heavy drinking in the Swedish welfare society, where the state, theoretically at least, is well-equipped to combat the social and personal disorganization which often takes the form of alcohol addiction?

Doctors and social workers cite a rising standard of living.

"The rise in our standards has brought with it a demand for unessential goods, and alcohol is one of them," commented Goesta Nordstroem, chief of the temperance bureau in the government's social welfare department.

"Social adversity has, on the whole, been eliminated in Sweden and prosperity is on the increase," said a doctor at Maria Polyclinic. "But so is drunkenness among the youth and among women."

The Swedish press has campaigned for a special research institute on the drinking problem, pointing out that there should be no great mystery about it because it is the "most democratic" of all sicknesses. A state commission has recommended that alcoholism be regarded as an illness, with all alcoholics eligible for sickness insurance benefits during treatment in state-run or private clinics.

[From Twin Circle magazine, Sept. 29, 1968]

Father Lyons Views the News

For over two years I have been working with Dr. Anthony Bouscaren on a book that explains the ever-increasing danger on the Left. We were motivated to begin the manuscript when a book entitled "Danger on the Right" was published by the Anti-Defamation League. It is often thought the ADL speaks for the majority of Jewish people in this country, but that certainly does not seem to be the case. It speaks for progressively less and less of the Jewish people, and the majority are becoming more concerned than ever about the ultra-liberal slant of the ADL.

The Anti-Defamation League's publication about what it considers the Far Right categorizes various corporations as dangerous. It does not list any corporation involved in the liquor industry, however, because $5,500,000 of the ADL's total annual budget of $6,183,000 is contributed by the alcoholic beverage industry. The alcoholic industry has long been known to favor the Left. Playboy magazine, for example, receives an average of $513,000 in advertising from the alcoholic industry per issue, far more than any other publication. Second on the list of magazines receiving huge amounts in ads from the alcoholic beverage industry is Look. Playboy helps to undermine the moral fiber on which this country was built, while Look takes the lead among our nation's most popular publications in playing down the danger of Communism.

What is the danger on the Left? We have only to look to this year's college campuses for example. The two big names on the campueses this year are Herbert Marcuse and Che Guevara. The latter we all remember as the late terrorist in Bolivia and former comrade-in-arms of Fidel Castro, that great "freedom fighter" in Havana. Guevara failed miserably to win over the people in Latin America to Marxism. His alleged diary for the last year of his life up to Oct. 7, 1967, has recently been published, after it was doctored up by the Communist Party in Cuba to make it more propagandistic. Che is regarded by his naive admirers as a sort of Robin Hood, a friend of the underprivileged, a defender of the masses, and a lofty advocate of direct and violent action. The 16-page introduction was written by Fidel Castro, or ghosted for him. Ramparts magazine put out a special Ramparts edition, with an editor's note by Robert Scheer declaring that "we feel privileged to have been involved in its first publication."

Early in 1968, MacMillan published "Venceremos," "we shall overcome." The book jacket asserts that Che "stands alone . . . as a revolutionary, for his prime concern was nonnationalistic. He was for the oppressed everywhere." Nothing on the jacket indicates that Guevara was a Communist terrorist, responsible for the deaths of thousands of his fellow countrymen. John Gerassi, who edited the book, is described on the jacket as "an expert on Latin American affairs who teaches Nationalism and Revolution at San Francisco State College." Gerassi, according to MacMillan, has edited an "authoritative and moving book." MacMillan fails to identify Gerassi as part of a guerrilla warfare oriented group called Revolutionary Contingent, and which was described in Human Events on May 18 as "an openly Communist organization. . . ."

But what about Herbert Marcuse? He is a 70-year-old professor of philosophy at the University of California at San Diego, where he propounds the message of Marx with a strong admixture of Freud. His contemporary Marxism stresses a conspiracy theory which purports to see a well-directed ruling class behind our social problems. This greatly appeals to the New Left, which subscribes to a devil theory of history. It attributes all of society's ills to "the establishment," or to the "military-industrial complex." If you think that some of the Far Right thrives on a theory of conspiracy, you ought to look at the Left.

Marcuse's appeal is to the "outcasts and outsiders," those "outside the democratic process." They should be the saviors of our civilization, he urges, but in order to save it they will first have to destroy it. He enthrones violence as a virtue, urging the students across America to carry out their high moral commitment to attack and destroy the American school system and everything else that is American.

Dostoevsky spoke about starting with liberty and ending with despotism. The freedom of the New Left is of a very peculiar sort. It does not mean equal liberty for everyone to go about his business peacefully. It only means the liberty of the New Left to do exactly as it pleases, especially to deny the right of anyone else to oppose its program. It is the liberty of the despot.

[From the Foundation Directory]

Bronfman (The Samuel) Foundation, Inc.,
375 Park Avenue,
New York, N.Y.

Incorporated in 1951 in New York.

Donor: Joseph E. Seagram and Sons, Inc.

Purpose and Activities: Formed to perpetuate the ideals of American democracy; finances research programs for the study of democratic business enterprise by means of fellowships and professorships in colleges and universities; grants also to organizations concerned with health, recreation, and child welfare.

Financial Data (year ended 31 December 1964): Assets, $3,976,464 (M); expenditures, $217,439, including $217,089 in grants.

Officers and Trustees: Frank R. Schwengel, Chairman; Edgar M. Bronfman, President; Victor A. Fischel, Vice-President; Frederick J. Lind, Secretary; Joseph G. Friel, Treasurer; Murry Cohen.

HUNGER IN CHICAGO

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, it sometimes eases our conscience to think that hunger is the other fellow's problem. We in the North like to pretend it exists only in the South, and we in the cities make believe it exists only in the rural areas.

The Chicago Sun-Times has performed a useful service to all America by sending one of its reporters, Miss Linda Rockey, out in the streets of Chicago to measure problems of hunger in one of the largest cities in our country. Her findings make grim but important reading. The series on hunger in Chicago is "must" reading for everyone who claims a conscience. I am privileged to insert the articles as follows:

Hunger—How It Shows Up Here

(By Linda Rockey)

There is hunger in Chicago.

No one can point down a street where you will find children with distended bellies and scrawny limbs. The face of hunger in this city manifests itself in subtle ways:

His brothers and sisters so crave food that * * * and giggling, an infant sits listlessly for hours, not uttering a sound.

At an age when well-fed babies are bouncy they eat lead paint chips off the walls of rotting slum tenements. Their pregnant mother staves off hunger pangs with laundry starch.

By midmorning the heads of children in a ghetto school flop down wearily on their desks.

A Puerto Rican mother of nine, whose husband cannot find work, cooks potato peelings on a hot plate for supper.

A social worker describes the plight of the elderly poor in this city "a slow death from malnutrition that goes on daily."

Physicians, nurses, nutritionists, welfare workers and teachers report that hunger is a daily fact of life among Chicago's poor. "And where there's hunger, malnutrition is not far behind," said Dr. Jack Metcoff, chairman of pediatrics at Michael Reese Hospital and an authority on nutrition. But no one really knows the extent of hunger and malnutrition in Chicago.

Officially, it does not exist.

"As I go through Chicago, I don't see anyone who has to go without food. I don't think a state of hunger as such exists," said Dr. Morgan J. O'Connell, acting commissioner of the Board of Health. However, the Board's chief nutritionist said that her staff of 10 works from the assumption that there is malnutrition in this city.

The appearance of the malnourished is misleading. Adolescents and adults are usually overweight because they subsist on starches and carbohydrates, which are low in cost, high in calories and filling. As one welfare mother put it, "We may look healthy; we're just fat off of beans." Hungry children are often pale, lethargic and underweight, but they look fairly healthy unless the malnutrition is severe.

The problem is not only one of visibility, but also lack of information. Hunger in Chicago has never been subjected to scientific scrutiny. "We know it's there but we don't know how much," said a West Side nutritionist. "No matter how many health stations we have, we don't see the worst because people, especially the poor, are crisis-oriented. They come to us when there's blood and pain."

However, the little data that exists, though fragmentary, is startling.

1. An unpublished 1968 Chicago Board of Health survey found iron deficiency anemia in 24 per cent of the 1,604 infants and preschool children surveyed. Percentages ran as high as 41 per cent in Station 15 (the all-black West Side) and 46 per cent in Station 9 (a near northwest Latin American community).

2. Nearly one-third of Chicago preschool children enrolled in Project Head Start had iron deficiency anemia, according to a 1965 Chicago Board of Education study.

(Although there are no figures on the incidence of iron deficiency anemia among middle- and upper-class children, private physicians suspect that it is quite low, "probably less than 1 per cent," said Dr. Robert S. Mendelsohn, a former top adviser to Head Start for the American Academy of Pediatrics. He also pointed out how little it takes to avoid this anemia—"a bowl of iron-fortified cereal and a little red meat or egg each day.")

3. Dr. Werner F. Cryns, an Evanston pediatrician who made home visits to retarded children in 1968 for the Illinois Department of Public Health, reported that malnutrition played "a significant role" in more than half the cases.

4. Physicians at the Woodlawn Child Health Center see many infants suffering from what they call "failure to thrive." Their weights are well under the normal range for their ages, they suffer repeatedly from colds, influenza and pneumonia and they are often severely anemic.

"There may be a medical reason, but it's more often due to inadequate food intake. What tips us off is that they thrive very well on a hospital diet," said Dr. Audrey Forbes, a pediatrician and assistant director of the Woodlawn clinic. She also reported that "the iron deficiency anemia in this neighborhood is quite startling and severe."

5. Anemia and vitamin deficiencies are "common" among children examined in Cook County Hospital, said Dr. Ira Rosenthal, chairman of pediatrics. He also sees "a fair amount of rickets" (stunted bone growth from vitamin D deficiency).

6. According to the Chicago Board of Education, 85 per cent of school-age children and 60 per cent of preschoolers have dental cavities, many with severe caries. (Recent research indicates that they are related to lack of proper food.)

7. The Chicago Committee on Urban Opportunity, which serves low income people who do not qualify for public aid, initiated a homemaker service in June, 1968. By December 4,266 families were reached, and "in almost every instance there was a problem of an inadequate diet and inadequate funds to afford the proper diet," the semi-annual report said.

In the next six moths, 2,000 low-income families in New York City will submit to detailed clinical exams, biochemical measurement and food intake studies as part of the government's National Nutrition Survey, which is being extended into 10 more states. Illinois is not one of them, yet the most disturbing aspect of hunger in Chicago is the lack of scientific data on it.

QUESTIONS RAISED

Metcoff, Mendelsohn, other physicians and nutritionists raise these questions:

With a large indigent population, why are there no records of growth among Chicago's poverty children to compare with normal growth curves?

Why hasn't someone found out if Chicago's high infant mortality rate is related to hunger? In Chicago's poverty areas the infant mortality rate is 38.5 per 1,000 births, as high as in Lima, Peru, and 75 per cent higher than Chicago's nonpoverty areas. The major causes of infant death—influenza and pneumonia—are 7.9 in poverty areas and 2.2 in nonpoverty areas. The premature birth rate is 13 per cent vs. 6 per cent.

"We ought to be sure that these figures are not the result of preventable malnutrition," said Metcoff.

Why has no one attempted to correlate pica (the craving for unnatural food such as lead paint chips and laundry starch) with hunger? Instances of children who eat lead paint chips off the walls of rotting slum tenements and pregnant women who consume large quantities of laundry starch occur most in the poor black community. The results of lead poisoning are brain damage and even death.

Starch eating, a cultural habit among urban black women whose Southern ancestors ate clay during pregnancy, causes severe anemia. As Mendelsohn puts it, "I never heard of rich people who ate lead or starch."

A SURVEY PLANNED

The Board of Health plans to survey the city late this spring or early summer "to determine if we have a problem," said O'Connell. He declined to elaborate further, but the board's chief nutritionist, Virginia Jauch, said she knew nothing of the study plans.

Metcoff indicated that a year's study could be done for "a couple hundred thousand, which is not much when you consider that we may be talking about 2,000,000 children."

The study should focus on preschool children, especially under age 2, he said. School and Head Start studies are limited because they reflect "the hardiest children—the worst examples have died by age 2." Furthermore Head Start children are not the most deprived.

A study of younger children would also pick up malnutrition before it was a factor in irreversible brain damage.

Recent animal studies indicate that malnutrition during brain formation can permanently stunt mental growth. Mental retardation is more common in poverty areas, and many teachers, as well as physicians, have observed that hunger hampers learning ability.

NO CONTROLLED TESTS

No one has taken a control group of poor people and fed them adequately without changing other factors (clothing, shelter) to determine how diet affects well-being "I suspect a great deal," said Dr. Joseph W. Swartwout, an obstetrician at the University of Chicago who also suspects that "close to 100 per cent of Chicago's indigent pregnant women are malnourished." He found starch-eating among 16 per cent of these women in 1968. An earlier study at Cook County Hospital uncovered 35 per cent.

"How much of this you could cure with good nutrition is anybody's guess, but it's high time we were finding out," he said. He would like to do such a study, but can't get the money. "Nutrition is a second-rate scientific endeavor, yet with the undernourishment of the poor and over-nourishment of the rich, it is probably the nation's greatest health problem."

ADULTS AVERAGE 30c A MEAL: WELFARE FOOD ALLOTMENT UNDER FIRE

(By Linda Rockey)

When Dr. Albert D. Klinger studied medicine in the '50's, his teachers told him that no malnutrition exists in this country except as a result of food faddism.

"And I believed it until I worked for the Chicago Board of Health and saw kids with rickets, low blood counts and stunted growth," said Klinger, a South Side internist who has worked with welfare patients since 1960.

Jacqui Alberts, a young nutritionist for Miles Square Health Center on the West Side, said, "None of what I learned in school works here. Everything is applicable to the white middle class only. Even the low-cost diet we studied and lived on for a week wasn't near as low as the welfare allotment."

Miss Alberts belong to the committee on nutrition and hunger of the Medical Committee for Human Rights, which is working toward elevating the public aid allotment for food.

"I don't see how welfare mothers manage on the food allowance. I couldn't do it," she said. Since she joined Miles Square a year and a half ago, more than 1,000 patients have been referred to her for dietary problems. "Most of them are malnourished and need a high-protein, high-vitamin diet, but they can't afford it, so it's ridiculous to talk about it."

Klinger, who heads the committee on nutrition and hunger, tried in 1963, when the state welfare allowances were set, to persuade the Illinois State Medical Society to call for an increase in food allowances.

"The society's nutrition committee recommended such a resolution," he recalled, "but the house of delegates wouldn't pass it because it would embarrass Harold O. Swank (head of the Illinois Department of Public Aid) to have to ask for more money."

Swank maintained that the current welfare allowances provide for "a minimum adequate standard of living in keeping with decency and good health. It is not my position to determine if the food item is adequate. It was thoroughly reviewed in 1963–4, and from the information I have from technicians in the field and the Illinois State Medical Society, it is."

However, a spokesman for the Society said, "Hunger is a difficult subject in general, complicated by political influence and educational needs. The society has been reluctant to say that so many cents are adequate or inadequate for food because of these and other influencing factors."

Klinger has also tried without success to urge the Chicago Medical Society to take a stand favoring higher food allowances.

'The Chicago Pediatric Society said that the allowance was in keeping with health and the CMS said that it couldn't take a different stand because of its involvement with physicians in CPS," he said. Officials of CMS refused to coment on the subject of hunger in Chicago.

For those who don't find the welfare food allotment adequate, Swank said that it is "a problem of management."

This attitude infuriates Mrs. Catherine Orstead, nutritionist at the Martin Luther King Health Center, who said, "They're hungry because they don't have enough money. It's ridiculous to say that we should teach them how to stretch a dollar. If I wanted to know, I'd ask them. They're the experts."

The Illinois Department of Public Aid bases its food allowances on the economy plan of the Agriculture Department's Family Food Plans and Food Costs. The welfare check is computed by the case worker on the basis of a $5.37 weekly food allowance for adults, $6.09 for teen-agers, $4.86 for children ages 6–12 and $3.45 for children under 6. For the adult this means an average of 26 cents per meal.

The amount is supposed to be adjusted according to the cost of living (up 8 per cent in Chicago in the last two years), and Swank said that it has been elevated accordingly. However, numbers of physicians, nutritionists, case workers and welfare recipients argue that it never has been enough for a proper diet.

To find out, the task force on public aid of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago, headed by Douglass Cater, a case worker for the Cook County Department of Public Aid, challenged well-to-do families to live on the welfare budget for a week.

Rep. Abner Mikva (D-Ill.), whose family took part, concluded, "I would guess that there is not one family within 100 who is living on the amount allocated to them for food and still staying within the nutritional standards set up by the experts."

The Church Federation reported responses from families who felt that the allowances were definitely too low, and from many who indicated that they were adequate provided the following circumstances were present:

1. Auto and newspaper available to take advantage of sales in different stores.
2. Adequate storage space.
3. The homemaker is proficient in calculating nutritional values and bargain prices.
4. No members of the family had unusually large appetites or special dietary needs such as those imposed by diabetes, pregnancy and ulcers.
5. The family is able to use the whole allowance for food.

Cater pointed out that most welfare recipients do not have autos or newspapers. Neighborhood stores in poverty areas do not offer the supermarket prices available in higher-income neighborhods. Storage space, especially freezer, is limited. Rats and roaches make it impractical to leave groceries on shelves. The homemaker usually has no training in nutrition and math. There are often large appetites and special dietary needs.

Most important, the family is unable to use the whole allowance for food because:

1. The rent is often more than the rent allowance, and food money must be added.
2. Because of faulty heating, cooking gas must be used for fuel. Excessive gas bills cause amounts to be deducted from future welfare checks corresponding to amounts paid by Public Aid to the utility company.
3. Food money is frequently used for items such as bus fare because the personal essen-

tials allowance is inadequate ($4 or $5 per person per month).

The result of all this, said Dr. Klinger, is that somebody goes without, "usually Mama, often the kids."

The Church Federation is now involved in a food pricing project. Its preliminary findings document the impressions of many—that food prices are higher in low-income, primarily ghetto areas. In a survey of 21 ghetto stores and 26 stores in more affluent areas, it was impossible to buy the ingredients needed for a weekly menu plan designed by the Cook County Department of Public Aid. In one ghetto store, they cost 74 cents over the allowance, in five higher-income stores they cost less than $1 over. In five ghetto stores, and nine higher-income stores between $1 and $2 over. In 12 ghetto stores and only three higher-income stores, more than $3 over.

As a barometer of price-gouging on the West Side, Mrs. Orstead used a special canned milk for "failure to thrive" infants. She paid 26 cents a can in her home suburb of Aurora. The people she prescribed it to paid 33 cents on the West Side. "Poor people know they pay more for everything," she said.

The Board of Health has found not only higher prices, but also poorer quality food in the ghetto, according to its chief nutritionist. State Rep. Robert Mann (D-Chicago) said that some ghetto stores understock and raise their prices the day that welfare checks come out.

Swank's response? He admitted that all these problems exist, but, he said, "They are not a general pattern, and we cannot set a standard based on the exceptions. People who do not eat adequately on the food allowance use it for other things "such as cigarets and comic books. He pointed as evidence to the fact that only one-third of those on public aid participate in the food stamp program (under which a family spending 80 per cent of its food budget at once can get 27 per cent extra with food stamps). "I can only assume that the other two-thirds are not spending 80 per cent of the allowance for food."

It's not that simple. Many welfare recipients said they don't participate because they don't want to give up that 80 per cent at the beginning of the month in case an emergency arises later. Furthermore, the food stamp program is full of red tape. One has to apply in person at 1841 W. Madison, weekdays only, and bring a raft of receipts verifying his poverty. Authorization comes by mail but he must go to a currency exchange to buy the stamps.

Critics of the welfare program also argue that agencies use white, middle class home economists who are insensitive to the cultural patterns of the poor. For example, during the West Side riots following the death of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., the government distributed surplus dried skimmed milk, which public aid home economists also recommended for the welfare diet.

"It's ridiculous," said Mrs. Orstead. "Black people know evaporated milk. Their children won't drink the powdered stuff." (Nor would Abner Mikva's children during their week on the welfare diet.)

A disenchanted black member of the home economics division of the Cook County Department of Public Aid said that most of her co-workers don't begin to understand the needs of their clients. "They try but they just don't know, she said. "How do you condition the mind to want broccoli or tuna salad when it's used to greens and ham hocks?"

"Home economists can afford to be creative with new stoves and refrigerators," said Bob Taylor, president of the Chicago Welfare Rights Organization. He maintains that half the people he works for are "starving to death."

"Public aid recommends that they use chicken wings," he added. "What's wrong with a drum stick once in a while? We're tired of beans and rice and potatoes."

Taylor also had a question about the federal surplus commodities sent into the West Side, where his office is, after the 1968 riots. "Where is that food during the rest of the year?"

Unavailable to hungry Chicagoans, the Rev. Father Peter J. Powell, director of Saint Augustine's Center for American Indians, has found.

He has been trying for seven years to make federal surplus foods available to Indians, Latin Americans and Southern whites in Uptown "nearly all in immediate need of food."

The response from the Agriculture Department was that "legislation does not permit us to distribute commodities in food stamp areas except in temporary emergency situations."

"We have an emergency need right now. We have to get food in stomachs right now," retorted the Rev. Fr. Powell, who has found that most of the 400 new families arriving in Uptown each year do not qualify for public assistance or the food stamp program.

"This area can be declared a disaster area as far as hunger is concerned," said Jim Grisham, director of the Chicago Southern Center in Uptown. "An average of 24 families are living in buildings designed for six, and I would guess that these 24 are living on the amount of food once consumed by six."

Regarding the federal government's refusal to distribute surplus commodities in the area, he said, "Apparently the war on poverty is not in league with the war on hunger."

Although the majority of Uptown's residents are not on welfare, most of the men are underemployed as a result of the vicious circle perpetuated by daily pay. A man moves his family into the area and has to have money right away, so he goes to work for one of the 20 daily pay agencies. At the end of a working day he is paid about $11. His rent is about $7 a day.

"If he gets a job that pays twice as much," said Grisham, "he gets paid every two weeks. The first two weeks he goes home to a hungry family. What choice does he have but to go on daily pay. He wants to break the cycle but he can't without starving in the process."

To meet the emergency needs of newcomer families, parents out of work and families waiting for welfare checks, several public and private agencies organized the Uptown Community Pantry in the Montrose Urban Progress Center. In one 6-month period, it assisted 2,360 families and 201 individuals, but during seven weeks of the same period, its food supply was completely exhausted.

Many churches and settlement houses operate free food distribution centers, but there is never enough for all who seek it.

NEED KNOWS NO COLOR LINE: HOW SOME POOR FAMILIES SURVIVE

(By Linda Rockey)

Juanita Slaton lives in an all-black West Side housing project with her seven children and her daughter Shirley Ann's four. She will probably never know Lula Couch, who resides with her husband and six children in poor white Uptown, or Maria Lopez, who is awaiting the birth of her second child in a Spanish-speaking Wicker Park tenement.

Yet they share one common trait—their families are hungry. Their stories provide ample evidence that hunger in Chicago knows no color line.

Nor is it restricted to public aid recipients. The Slatons are hungry because they are on Welfare. The Couches are hungry because Mrs. Couche is ill and cannot work. The Lopezes are hungry because Mr. Lopez is underemployed.

The Slaton home at 2145 W. Lake is a tiny 3-bedroom apartment with cement walls and cheap tile floors. It's not large enough for the 13 people who occupy it but Mrs. Slaton keeps it neat and attractive with plastic coverings on the furniture, candle holders on the walls, artificial flowers in the corners and colorful throw pillows on the sofa.

"Almost everything we have I bought when I was working," said Mrs. Slaton, 41, a tall, heavy woman who must have been pretty once, before she gained weight and lost her front teeth. She worked as a sewing machine operator for seven years, making good money until April of 1967 when her diabetes got so bad she had to quit. She applied for public aid right away, but by the time her first welfare check came in August, the family had been evicted from their apartment.

"I never knew what it's like to be poor until I got too sick for work," she said. Now she knows poverty and its ever-present companion, hunger.

The Slatons are hungry. It doesn't take long to detect the symptoms.

The youngest in the family, Shirley Ann's 13-month old twins, ought to be lively and noisy, but they sit listlessly for hours, not uttering a sound. The older children are almost as lethargic, bringing to mind the medical evidence that children deprived of adequate food appear dull and lifeless.

Mrs. Slaton and her daughter Shirley are overweight, a sign that their diets, though adequate in calories, may be deficient in important nutrients. They are eating the food that comes cheapest, starches and carbohydrates, which are also the most fattening.

It would be easy to say that the Slatons are hungry because they are ignorant of proper dietary habits. On the early spring day of this interview, it was past noon before anyone in the family had anything to eat.

However, Mrs. Slaton knows that her family should eat breakfast. She should follow her doctor's instructions to have three small, nonfattening meals each day. She cannot afford it. She gives priority to milk for the children and a big dinner meal for the entire family. Beyond that, there isn't enough money.

She receives $293 a month from the Cook County Department of Public Aid. Her daughter Shirley is paid $96 a month in child support through a court order. Welfare is supposed to supplement that, but since Dec. 24, when she was burned out of her apartment and came to live with her mother she has received only $30.

MUST SPEND FOOD ALLOWANCE AT ONCE

Mrs. Slaton's food allowance is $122 a month. With food stamps, she can buy $160 worth of food. But to take advantage of the stamp program, she must spend 80 per cent of her food allowance at once.

"There's a store across the street and another around the corner, but they're too expensive," she said. (A food pricing survey by the Church Federation of Greater Chicago has confirmed that food costs are higher in low-income areas.) However, she must patronize these stores for items that she needs daily, like milk, which sells for $1.09 a gallon in her neighborhood and 98 cents farther west.

Out of her food budget also must come 37 cents a day for each of five children in school. Only one gets a free lunch because "she has a nice counselor who asked for it." Under the National School Lunch Act all five children should qualify for free lunches, but Mrs. Slaton said she had never heard of a free program at the schools the other four attend.

After food, Mrs. Slaton has $171 a month which is supposed to cover rent ($86.50) and all the other essentials of life. Sometimes it doesn't, and she has to dip into the food money, a regular habit among welfare recipients.

Mrs. Slaton hates being on welfare and wants to go back to work. "I love to sew and I'm tired of staying in the house all day," she said. "But I can't work as long as my diabetes is this bad. The doctor says it would be better if I didn't worry so much."

SICK PAY DOESN'T GO FAR

Dewey Couch, 33, worries, too. Maybe that's why he has bleeding ulcers and lost the job in a Greyhound garage that gave him a weekly take-home pay of $118 or more. Now he draws $65 a week in sick pay, $30 of which must go to rent a 5-room apartment at 4527 N. Racine. What's left is not enough to keep his wife and six children properly fed and clothed.

And that's why his wife Lula often goes to the Chicago Southern Center for free food and clothing. Sometimes she gets it. Other times, the supply has already been exhausted by other poor white families who came to Chicago because they thought they could make a living.

"We don't eat half as well as we did in Kentucky," said Mrs. Couch. "We grew our own food, raised our own chickens and someone always had a cow."

Why, then did they leave?

"Same reason as everybody else," she replied. "There's no more work down there.

"I worked in the coal mines, but it was too dangerous," her husband added. "We thought we could do better here."

He did, until he had to quit work Jan. 31. His sick pay didn't start until March 17. In the meantime, he went to public aid and received $64 in emergency assistance. He has since been told that welfare can't help him if he draws more than $200 a month in sick pay.

The Couches are a close family where affection flows freely and pride inhibits candor about their plight—until Mrs. Couch gets mad enough.

What makes her angry? Prejudice against Southern people, crime in Uptown, junked cars and drunks, and the United States' beautification program. "If you want to beautify America, fatten up a child. Trees won't fill his stomach or put a smile on his mother's face."

The Couches eat "mostly ground beef, hot dogs, rice and greens." The children have been getting free lunch at school since their father stopped working, but their teeth, like their parents', have the telltale dark stains of dietary deficiencies. They rarely eat fresh fruits and vegetables. The Southern Center cannot give away that kind of food.

Dewey Couch knows that he could rent a place cheaper on a monthly basis, but he has never been able to save enough money for all the necessary deposits. What he and his family would really like to do is go back to Hazard, Ky. "The South is home to me," said his wife.

Maria Lopez's husband is working, but he doesn't have enough either. He is a skilled machine operator, but since a hernia operation, he has not felt well enough to handle more than a $60-a-week mesenger job in the Loop.

During his illness, the family was on public aid, but after the surgery he was disqualified, "even though his Spanish doctor said he shouldn't go back to work yet," said his wife Maria, mother of one and about to have another.

"I've gained too much weight during my pregnancy, so the clinic (Board of Health) put me on a low salt diet. I'm supposed to have meat, fresh vegetables and fruit once a day, but I can't."

The Lopezes don't have enough money for food now, but Maria said that it was even worse when they received $155 a month on welfare.

"I usually ran out of food a week before the check was due and had to borrow money from the Latin American Defense Organization for the baby's milk. Most of the people in this neighborhood are hungry because most of them are on welfare."

Lunch Programs Inadequate: Teachers See Daily Evidence That Hungry Pupils Don't Learn

(By Linda Rockey)

Mrs. Sadie Nesbitt has been a teacher for many years, and she can cope with just about any discipline problem.

But one day 6-year-old Henry was too much to handle. His anger and restlessness was disrupting the entire class. Mrs. Nesbitt sent him to the principal's office.

Herschel Rader, principal of the Johnson Elementary School in the north Lawndale neighborhood, asked Henry what was bothering him. The child scowled and was silent.

"What did you have for dinner last nght?" Rader asked.

"Beans and cornbread," was the mumbled reply.

"No meat?"

Henry shook his head.

"Did you have breakfast this morning?"

Again Henry shook his head.

Then Rader was distracted by a phone call, and Henry fell asleep in his chair for the afternoon.

"Whenever we have a behavior problem, we find it helpful to review the last 24 hours of a child's life, especially what he ate," said Rader.

About one-third of the children in Johnson School, 1420 S. Albany, live on welfare budgets. Most of the others are from low-income families.

No scientific study has established a relationship between hunger and the hostility, fatigue and inability to concentrate that is prevalent in poverty-area schools.

However, recent animal studies indicate that malnutrition affects learning ability. And an unpublished 1965 survey of 2,000 Woodlawn first-graders found that children who went without breakfast had trouble socializing in school.

"It didn't matter what the child ate," said Dr. Sheppard G. Kellam, co-director of the Woodlawn Mental Health Center. "If he had something, even just liquid, he was better able to socialize."

Inability to socialize, one of the basic first-grade tasks, also correlated with premature birth, pregnancy complications, underweight and childhood illness, according to the Woodlawn study.

Teachers only know what they see: Children like Henry who are alternatively frustrated and angry, listless and weary. Hungry children.

"We learn to carry candy with us because it makes a difference in discipline," said Mrs. Nesbitt. (Physicians say that inattentive schoolchildren could be suffering from hypoglycemia, a low level of sugar in the blood, caused by inadequate food.)

Mrs. Jean Komaiko, a volunteer reading teacher in the Johnson School since last fall, said it took only a week to realize that "hungry kids don't learn."

She was even more appalled to find that when federally subsidized milk arrived at midmorning, children who couldn't pay 4 cents sat and watched their more fortunate classmates drink milk.

She organized a group of volunteers who raised $5,400 and began giving free milk to each of the school's 850 children.

(All other Chicago schoolchildren pay 4 cents for a half-pint of midmorning milk. It costs 7 cents, so schools without free-lunch programs receive a 3-cent federal subsidy. However, schools in poverty areas that participate in the free-lunch program receive a 4-cent subsidy so that the school can make a penny profit to support the program.)

Rader agreed that every child should receive free milk. "Otherwise you have to prove you're poor to get milk. That's the way the free-lunch program is run and it's unfair."

Under the National School Lunch Act, poverty-area schools are allotted a certain number of free lunches. The federal government contributes 24 cents to the total cost of a lunch (39.2 cents). The Chicago Board of Education makes up the difference.

Chicago school served 13,455 free lunches in March. However, between 130,000 and 180,000 schoolchildren qualify, according to federal guidelines, which recommend that all children on welfare or at comparable income levels be included.

"Principals decide which children receive free lunches," said Edward U. Gaidzek, director of lunchrooms for the Chicago Board of Education. "Federal guidelines are sent home and parents go to the school and sign up if they qualify."

"We give them to everyone we think should have them until we run out," said Rader. "There is always a waiting list."

Johnson School gives about 160 free lunches a day, but Mrs. Nesbit estimates that "easily 75 per cent" of the 850 students need a free lunch and breakfast.

At nearby Howland School, 1616 S. Spaulding, school officials agree that the application form for free lunches is "degrading."

"The parent has to come into the office and take what amounts to a poverty oath," said Mrs. Komaiko. Already registered as a welfare recipient, he has to answer questions about income and welfare assistance and explain "any special situation which makes the family expenses greater than normal."

BREAKFAST OFTEN SKIPPED

Howland gives free lunches to 600 of its 1,867 students, but "nearly all the children need it," said Mrs. Ida Moore, assistant principal. "There's no question that they're undernourished. They may come to school with a full stomach, but not a balanced meal."

Some do not even come with a full stomach. Breakfast is one of the first things a welfare family does without when the money is running low.

Under the National School Breakfast Program, which operates in 70 Chicago schools on a pilot basis, the federal government pays 15 cents, the child 10 cents.

Both Johnson and Howland schools have the breakfast program, which Mrs. Komaiko terms "a cruel hoax" because most of the children can't afford the 10 cents.

For those at Howland who can, however, the breakfast program has made a tremendous difference in attendance.

"No matter how early I come to school, there are children waiting for breakfast," said Mrs. Nina Jones, principal.

"No one is taken out of the breakfast line if he doesn't have 10 cents," added Mrs. Moore. "If necessary, the teachers pay for the kids' breakfast."

Before the breakfast program, many children had no breakfast or subsisted until lunch on a 5-cent bag of potato chips and hot sauce.

"Teachers go to the breakfast line first thing in the morning for a doughnut and coffee," said Mrs. Moore. "If our need is that great, think what it must be for the children."

SCHOOL BOARD AMAZED

Like Mrs. Komaiko and others, she urges a completely free breakfast and lunch program in Chicago public schools.

"Food means love," said Mrs. Komaiko. "If this society has any love for its children, give them a free breakfast and lunch at school."

The notion stuns the Board of Education.

"If we wanted to do everything in our wildest dreams, it would cost us millions," said Gaidzek.

In other states, federal school-lunch grants are supplemented by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

According to Arthur Lehne, the Board of Education's assistant superintendent in charge of government-funded programs, Chicago receives $21,000,000 in ESEA money.

GOES FOR EDUCATION

"This isn't enough for educational and food programs, so nearly all of it is spent on education," Lehne said.

Mrs. Komaiko contacted the office of Ray Page, state superintendent of public instruction, about the possible use of ESEA funds for food programs.

"I was told that much of the money was needed for seventh-grade social studies texts," she said. "How can we teach kids social studies when they're hungry?"

Chicago receives less than one-third of the federal lunch money appropriated to Illinois, even though two-thirds of the state's children on welfare live in Chicago. The federal lunch money is funneled through Page's office.

"There is a danger that this money will run out in the beginning of June," said Gaidzek. "In that case the school board is committed to supporting the program through its own funds. I think it has done well to feed as many kids as it has."

The question is not only how many but how well.

Nearly half the Chicago schools do not have lunchrooms. One of these is Howland. Hot lunches come from nearby Farragut High School in steamed containers and are served in a makeshift lunchroom in the basement next to the boys' washroom.

Schools were originally built to feed only those children who couldn't go home for lunch because they lived too far away. "Poverty has forced a new role that the schools aren't prepared to handle," Gaidzek said. "We need a regular restaurant operation in many of our schools."

The Near West Side Concerned Citizens Organization, a group of parents headed by Mrs. Mabel Lear, has complained about the lack of lunchroom facilities for a number of reasons.

Children at the Allen School, 1321 S. Paulina, have to walk three blocks to the Gladstone School, 1231 S. Damen, for lunch. "Parents don't like small children out on the streets alone," she said. "We want food brought into the Allen School."

RUSHED THROUGH LUNCH

Mrs. Lear also said that children at the Smyth School, 1050 W. 13th, which has only one lunchroom, eat in shifts and "are pushed and rushed through lunch and have to run around the streets for 45 minutes."

The quality of food served in Chicago public schools is also under fire.

"Lots of starch and too little meat," said Mrs. Moore. "We see more spaghetti, spam and chopped-up hot dogs than anything else."

When Mrs. Lear heard that schools didn't always serve the proper menu, she paid a surprise visit to the Gladstone School.

"The Board of Education menu called for chicken with gravy and vegetables," she said. "I found the children eating hot dogs and beans. Many children prefer to run to the hot dog stand to eating the lunchroom slop."

Blame Red Tape, Systems No Place To Go for Food

(By Linda Rockey)

Toward the end of the month, when welfare allowances are running low, the Woodlawn Child Health Center receives many requests for formula milk for babies.

With a supply of free samples from pharmaceutical companies, the South Side clinic is able to meet some of the requests.

But it cannot use its funds to dispense milk, a clinic physician said, because "milk is not a prescription item, and we're not in the business of dispensing food."

The trouble is that nobody is. Aside from a handful of churches and settlement houses which give out free food (not nearly-enough for all who seek it), there is no place in Chicago where hungry families can go for food.

Physicians who work in Chicago poverty areas have testified in state-sponsored hearings that hunger is a daily fact of life among the poor. But their hands are tied when it comes to doing anything about it.

SOCIAL, NOT MEDICAL, PROBLEM

"Hunger is a social, not a medical problem," said Dr. Audrey Forbes, assistant director of the Woodlawn clinic.

"There are many problems we can't solve. Hunger is one we can. We know the solutions," said Jacqui Alberts, a West Side nutritionist.

"It's so easily preventable—people must have enough food," said Dr. Jack Metcoff, chairman of pediatrics at Michael Reese Hospital and an authority on nutrition.

Then what stands in the way of adequately feeding the hungry?

Groups and individuals concerned about hunger in Chicago blame bureaucratic red tape and a deficient welfare system.

For example, individuals in Uptown have tried for seven years to make surplus food available to low-income families.

U.S. RESTRICTS DISTRIBUTION

Federal restrictions prohibit the distribution of commodities in Cook County because of the federal food-stamp program, even though many hungry families do not qualify for stamps. Among those on public aid who do, only one-third participate.

Restrictions of the food-stamp program, which require a family to spend 80 per cent of its food budget at once for food, make it impractical. Many welfare recipients use part of their food allowance to meet other living expenses.

Critics of the welfare system argue that the food allowance is too low and fails to take into account conditions in low-income areas, such as the lack of storage space and higher food prices.

But their efforts to raise the allowances have been as futile as the attempts to bring surplus food into Chicago.

The problem is essentially one of attitude. Sen. George S. McGovern (D-S.D.), who heads a special Senate committee on nutrition and human needs, has said that solving the problem of hunger "requires a commitment to feeding the undernourished."

In Chicago, Health Comr. Morgan J. O'Connell doesn't think "a state of hunger as such exists" in the city.

APPROVES WELFARE STANDARDS

Harold O. Swank, director of the Illinois Department of Public Aid, thinks the welfare allowances provide for "a minimum adequate standard of living."

"Most (Illinois) legislators are hung up on the work ethic and object to the whole idea of welfare," said Rep. Robert Mann (D-Chicago).

Despite the efforts of individual members, local and state medical societies have steadfastly refused to support an increase in the welfare food allowances or to take a stand on the subject of hunger in Chicago.

The testimony of the poor and the impressions of those who work in poverty areas, plus a handful of fragmentary studies, have not convinced those in a position to effect change that there is hunger in Chicago.

CITYWIDE STUDY URGED

"We need real scientific evidence," said Metcoff. He favors a comprehensive citywide study of the poor, along the lines of the National Nutrition Survey, that would include detailed clinical exams, biochemical measurement, growth and food-intake studies. He said:

"A year's study could be done for $200,000, which isn't much when you consider that we may be talking about 2,000,000 children."

O'Connell has promised a study by the Chicago Board of Health of malnutrition in this city by the late spring or early summer, but he declined to elaborate further.

The board's chief nutritionist knew nothing of the study plans and said the board doesn't have the staff to undertake such a study.

Dr. Robert Mendelsohn, former top advisor to Project Head Start for the American Academy of Pediatrics, has publicly called for "an immediate investigation under state auspices to document and further define the extent of hunger in Illinois."

STUDIES ARE DECRIED

However, he said in an interview: "It's ridiculous that we need a study to prove hunger. I wouldn't permit the use of kids for any more studies unless the appropriation included money to do something about the problem right then, not six months later."

Raising the welfare food allowance is the immediate goal of the newly formed committee on nutrition and hunger of the Chicago Medical Committee on Human Rights.

"The present welfare allowance is the kind used to feed starving people when the ports are blocked, the crops in the field are rotten and corn is at a premium," said Dr. Alfred D. Klinger, committee chairman.

He advocates raising the food allotment to the liberal diet plan of the U.S. Agriculture Department Family Food Plans and Food Costs, an average of 45 to 50 cents per person per meal.

The present allotment is based on the department's economy diet plan, an average of 26 cents per person per meal.

Present welfare allowances do not account for the 5 per cent sales tax and do not always provide an increase to match the cost-of-living index.

PRICES OUTSTRIP AID

Since the public-aid allowances were set in 1963, a 12 per cent increase has been allotted, but the Consumer Price Index shows nearly a 15 per cent increase.

In its February statement to the legislative advisory committee on public aid, the League of Women Voters called for a full adjustment in welfare payments at each six-month review of the index. Increases now are permitted only when the index rises 3 per cent or more.

The statement said: "By denying an increase to match the increase in the cost-of-living index, we are actually depriving a family of four of $2.25 per month in food-buying power."

However, Klinger objects, as do many physicians, to determining that people should live on so many cents per meal. He said:

"We are all different inside as well as outside, especially our children. The retention of protein, the body's building material, is different from child to child. We can't legislate that everyone live on 26 cents a meal."

Mrs. Catherine Orstead, nutritionist at the Martin Luther King Health Center, cited another reason why raising food allowances isn't enough:

"Ghetto stores would probably raise their prices accordingly," she said.

PRICES HIGHER IN POOR AREAS

A pricing survey by the Church Federation of Greater Chicago found that food prices in low-income areas are higher than in more affluent neighborhoods.

Klinger's committee also favors raising other welfare allowances because so many recipients dip into the food budget to meet other living expenses, such as rent, clothing and transportation.

An increase in welfare payments would require a change in the attitudes of many legislators, according to Mann, who recently introduced a package of bills designed to do this. The legislator said:

"Most legislators think that if people don't like welfare, they should get a job, even though 90 per cent of those on welfare are unemployable (blind, medically disabled or dependent children). I would hope that the public would rather pay for a reformed welfare system than for reformatories and concentration camps."

Easing of federal restrictions to allow distribution of surplus food in low-income areas is the goal of the Rev. Peter J. Powell, director of St. Augustine's Indian Mission in Uptown.

WANTS TO USE SURPLUS

"Using normal voluntary channels, we cannot begin to accumulate enough food to meet the needs of the 400 new families who arrive annually in Uptown," he said. "Our only real hope lies in making surplus food available to these people.

The Uptown Community Pantry, which provides food for some of the newcomers, was moved to the Montrose Urban Progress Center, an agency of the Office of Economic Opportunity in the hope that it would encourage federal involvement (i.e. surplus food distribution), according to Jim Grisham its first chairman.

Grisham said: "It didn't. Apparently the war on poverty is not in league with the war on hunger."

Grisham heads the Chicago Southern Center, which also distributes food to needy families. It never has enough for all who seek the food, so he has suggested a new method—stocking food on loan.

Under this plan, a family would fill a shopping bag with food and take 30 days to repay it with an equal amount of groceries from a store, thereby qualifying for another loan. Grisham plans to initiate the service as soon as the center receives enough donations.

LUNCH PROGRAM COULD EXPAND

Another oft-mentioned solution to hunger in Chicago is the expansion of the National School Lunch Program, which presently provides free lunches for 18,000 Chicago school children. Between 130,000 and 180,000 children qualify for the program because their families are on welfare or at comparable income levels.

"If a massive health-welfare-education program is not put on by big cities, the substitute will have to be free lunch and free breakfast for poverty-area school children," said Dr. Irving Abrams, director of medical and health services for the Chicago Board of Education.

Mendelsohn has urged not only free school lunch programs, "available without restriction in a dignified manner in all schools in areas where poverty and hunger exist," but also "the immediate use of lunchrooms in schools and day-care and Head Start centers to offer three meals a day to children and parents, at a charge of 26 cents per meal in accord with the present food allowance."

URGE GUARANTEED INCOME

He is quick to add, however, that these solutions don't diminish "deeper, more substantial answers."

Mendelsohn and most other people concerned about hunger in Chicago point to a guaranteed annual income as the ideal solution. University of Chicago economist Milton Freidman said it could be low enough so that the total cost would be no more than the nation's current annual welfare bill of $7 billion.

Ben W. Heineman, chairman of the presidential commission on income maintenance, told Sen. McGovern's committee in Washington this week that all food programs encroach on individual freedom and avoid the central problem: The poor don't have enough money.

The commission is expected to recommend in September that welfare and antipoverty programs be replaced or augmented by a more fundamental income-support program.

Short of a guaranteed annual wage, Mann favors a federalized welfare program. "States no longer want nor are able to finance welfare," he said.

Reluctance to solve the problems of hunger and poverty has ominous implications.

"Anyone who says that there is no hunger in Illinois, or that existing programs are adequate, is either a fool, a liar or a racist," Mendelsohn said.

"The poor have no lobby, which is why welfare is the first to go when the budget is cut," said Mann, "but the poor are very articulate, and they are beginning to insist that living comfortably in America is a right, not a privilege."

PEARL HARBOR NAVAL SHIPYARD WORKERS BENNETT, SCHENA, AND WONG CITED FOR MERITORIOUS SERVICE IN REPAIR OF U.S.S. "ENTERPRISE"

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, when on January 14, 1969, the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Enterprise* suffered tremendous damage to its aft deck and the tragic loss of 27 of her crewmen as a consequence of accidental explosions of bombs intended for Vietnam, the whole world learned of the event through newspaper banner headlines and lead stories over radio and television. Many chapters of heroism and valor were written by the men of the *Enterprise* in the wake of the tragedy. But very little has been written or said about the sequel to the accident—which is equally noteworthy.

The saga of the U.S.S. *Enterprise* would be incomplete without mention of the dedicated civil servants and servicemen at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, who established a most enviable record of repairing the vital aircraft carrier and refitting it for full combat duty in about half the time estimated to be necessary.

The near-miraculous job was performed by a determined, loyal, and dedicated group of Americans who literally worked around the clock, day and night, without any real rest until the mission was accomplished in only 8 short weeks.

Three of these men were appropriately recognized in ceremonies held at Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard on March 14, 1969, when Adm. John J. Hylan, Pacific Fleet Commander in Chief presented them with certificates of commendation. These three men, William D. Bennett, group structural superintendent; Joseph A. Schena, chief planner and estimator; and Alfred Y. K. Wong, superintendent of sheetmetal workers; are all personal friends of mine and as their Congressman I am truly proud to offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the citations which were accorded them. I do this in the fervent hope that other Federal workers may be inspired by their deeds. It is my hope also that the vital role which the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard plays and must continue to play in our national defense posture will have been dramatically reemphasized.

The citations read as follows:

COMMANDER IN CHIEF
U.S. PACIFIC FLEET

The Commander in Chief, United States Pacific Fleet, takes pleasure in commending Mr. William D. Bennett, Group Superintendent Structural, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For meritorious service performed as overall Production Department Coordinator for rip out, reconstruction and check out of the damaged portions of the ship and ship's systems of U.S.S. *Enterprise* (CVA(N)65) following a serious fire aboard the ship on 14 January 1969. In a matter of hours and with great enthusiasm Mr. Bennett organized a construction crew for the required repairs. He was eminently qualified having knowledge of ship's structure, welding and outfitting, which was derived from many years of service at the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard. The long hours and tireless devotion to duty exhibited by Mr. Bennett were a magnificent example to others associated with the project in the Shipyard. His relationship with the officers and men of *Enterprise* was superb. There was total and complete harmony between the operating forces and shore establishment through the entire spectrum of industrial effort from fire watches to compartment close out, from rigging service to temporary power and from paint out to system tests. Mr. Bennett's minute attention to detail in the planning of repairs was so complete that no work stoppages or bottlenecks were encountered in spite of requirements to work around material and plan shortages. The early return of *Enterprise* to the Pacific Fleet was due largely to Mr. Bennett's ability, skill, effort and personal drive. Mr. Bennett contributed to the vitality and spirit of the Pacific Fleet and the Navy Department."

JOHN J. HYLAND,
Admiral, U.S. Navy.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, U.S. PACIFIC FLEET

The Commander in Chief, United States Pacific Fleet, takes pleasure in commending Mr. Joseph A. Schena, Chief Planner and Estimator Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For meritorious service as Chief Planner and Estimator in connection with the U.S.S. *Enterprise* (CVA(N) 65) fire damage repairs. In this capacity Mr. Schena demonstrated outstanding leadership, having organized and personally managed a team to accomplish the task. He quickly developed initial estimates for repairs; expeditiously ordered all material required; and on a daily basis, monitored the status of material, and when required ordered substitute material. When substitute material was not available, he directed local shipyard manufacture in order to maintain the fast tempo of repair progress. Mr. Schena kept the supply expeditors informed as to which material was required immediately for support of the waterfront effort; insured that planners and estimators maintained daily contact with the Production Department shops and key ship's personnel. He insured that the planners and estimators kept the shops informed of the availability and status of material; thus, when shop personnel identified hard spots in material, the planners and estimators took immediate action to solve the problems. Under his guidance and coordination, Mr. Schena and his team worked approximately seven days a week an average of 12 hours per day, insuring correction of every item of damage repair work with a minimum of job order paperwork. Mr. Schena's dedication to duty, skill, and personal drive made a significant contribution to returning *Enterprise* to the Pacific Fleet and is a credit to himself, the Pacific Fleet and the Navy Department."

JOHN J. HYLAND,
Admiral, U.S. Navy.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, U.S. PACIFIC FLEET

The Commander in Chief, United States Pacific Fleet, takes pleasure in commending Mr. Alfred Y. K. Wong, Superintendent II Sheetmetal Worker, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For meritorious service as Compartment Completion Coordinator on the U.S.S. *Enterprise* from 18 January to 4 March 1969 following a serious fire which occurred aboard *Enterprise* on 14 January 1969. This was a most difficult task involving many heavily damaged ship's compartments and associated systems. Tracing out the affected systems, restoring structure, habitability and system integrity was a major task. Mr. Wong's outstanding enthusiasm, drive, constant attention to detail, leadership and personal zeal served as outstanding examples to all trades involved in the repair effort. His leadership in all the industrial areas was exemplary. Mr. Wong established a detailed scheduling of compartment repairs which served as a constant goal to all concerned to produce a finished product in the shortest possible time despite complications by factors such as material problems, plan inconsistencies and abnormal erection sequences. All obstacles were overcome by Mr. Wong's spirit, initiative and drive. He demonstrated technical skill by his ability to improvise where more formal means of direction were lacking. Through his management the joint effort exerted by the ship's personnel to survey compartments and correct deficiencies was most efficiently executed, and was indicative of the outstanding relationship with the ship's officers and men. Mr. Wong contributed greatly to the early return of *Enterprise* to the operating forces, adding stature to himself, the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, and the Navy Department."

JOHN J. HYLAND,
Admiral, U.S. Navy.

PHILADELPHIA'S POLICE ATHLETIC LEAGUE PLEDGE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 18, 1969, 175 Philadelphia youngsters will visit with President Richard M. Nixon in the Rose Garden of the White House.

They will present to the President scrolls with the signatures of 250,000 other Philadelphia youngsters all endorsing the Police Athletic League pledge.

In major American cities like my own city, Philadelphia, we adults, too, frequently despair at the interests and progress of our youth.

But in the industry and purposes of PAL, we have found that despair is self-indulgent; that there is cause for hope if we adults are willing to accept our proper responsibilities and show the way.

Formally chartered in March 1949, the Police Athletic League of Philadelphia is a highly regarded cooperative venture between a group of dedicated citizens and the police department. Through the years, PAL has grown, and at the end of 1968, there were 22 PAL centers in operation, most of them in reconverted police stations, fire stations, and church basements.

Each center has gymnastic equipment to keep boys from 9 to 18 busy learning the rudiments of boxing, bowling, baseball, basketball, football, track and field, table tennis, chess, and checkers, hobby clubs, camera clubs, talent contests, and a junior cadet drum and bugle corps rounds out the activities for boys.

There are 25,000 youngsters enrolled in PAL, and in recent years, PAL opened its doors to girls. Now 2,000 girls are learning such homemaking skills as cooking and sewing, arts and crafts, and ballet and social dancing. A dedicated staff of 25 full-time police officers, carefully selected and specially trained for their assignments—serve as PAL supervisors. Many other policemen—and policewomen—volunteer their time as coaches and assistants.

Police Commissioner Frank L. Rizzo serves as PAL president and many prominent civic leaders serve on its board of directors. Since 1962, PAL's day-to-day activities have been directed by Sgt. Vincent E. Furlong, himself a PAL "graduate."

For the youngsters, for their parents, and for the community at large, PAL has been a force for good, promoting a closer relationship between the policeman and the youngster and instilling in the youngsters a desire for good citizenship, sportsmanship, loyalty to American traditions, and a respect for authority. Thus, youngsters are kept morally and physically fit.

In 1968, to encourage additional thousands of Philadelphia children to these high ideals, PAL asked junior and senior high school students in its public and diocesan schools to sign scrolls containing the PAL pledge, in which they promised to uphold the precepts of good citizenship and respect for authority. Some 150,000 signatures were collected. The scrolls, addressed to the President of the United States, were taken to Washington, D.C., and in formal ceremonies, presented to President Lyndon B. Johnson in March, in the Rose Garden of the White House. Much impressed, the President commended the Police Athletic League and said such a program in these turbulent times was a hopeful sign for the Nation's future.

In recent weeks, junior and senior high school students were again asked to affirm their belief in these ideals, and this time, were joined by elementary school students in the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. These scrolls contain 250,000 signatures of boys and girls of Philadelphia dedicating themselves to PAL's precepts and are addressed to President Nixon.

PAL's effectiveness can be summed up by Police Commissioner Rizzo when he says that in his wide experience, boys and girls who take part in PAL rarely get into difficulties with the law and invariably go on to become productive citizens.

PAL's credo: "It's Far Better To Build Boys Than To Mend Men."

Pledge: "I pledge to learn and practice the rules of fair play, to respect the rights of others, to obey the laws of our city, State and Nation, to be a credit to my family, friends, and myself, to be a leader for the good things of life and thereby prepare myself for the task of responsible adulthood. All this I pledge, for I am a PAL."

THE EC-121—WHAT CAN WE EXPECT?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, during these tense moments following the downing of the EC-121, a U.S. reconnaissance aircraft by North Korea in the Sea of Japan, the world awaits the reaction of the President of the United States just as we waited after the capture of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* by the same "fourth rate power" in 1968.

This time we hope that the President will act decisively in retaliation for this dastardly and cowardly act of war against an unarmed airplane.

Had the United States followed former President Theodore Roosevelt's philosophy of "speak softly and carry a big stick" this latest act of aggression would not have occurred and 31 missing American boys would be safe.

In reflecting the possible reaction of our leader, we have only to look at statements made by President Nixon, then civilian citizen, regarding the U.S.S. *Pueblo* seizure.

Mr. Speaker, I include these statements taken from Washington and New York newspapers following my remarks:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 28, 1968]

NIXON IS CRITICAL OF SHIP SEIZURE

(By Murray Schumach)

Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon yesterday termed the Pueblo incident an "incredible blunder" by the Johnson Administration, but said it should not be a subject for political partisanship.

The comment was made at the Waldorf-Astoria shortly before a rousing meeting for Republican unity arranged at the 47th annual luncheon of the Women National Republican Club. Some 1,800 persons were at the luncheon.

SHIP'S PRESENCE BACKED

The vessel was seized on Tuesday off the coast of North Korea by patrol boats of the North Korean Navy.

Mr. Nixon, in a prepared statement, as well as at a news conference before the luncheon started, said that the Pueblo "had a right to be there to protect our own interests."

"The incredible blunder," he said, "was not that our ship was there. The blunder was our failure to have some protection for our ship "after repeated harassment and specific warnings by the North Koreans had made its danger clear."

The vessel he said, which was "almost unarmed" and not capable of much speed, should have had support from warships and air cover on its "regular reconnaisance patrol within sight of the North Korean shore."

The first step now should be to obtain the release of the crew, he declared. In this, he said, the United States' policy should be "firm diplomacy," but not "rash action." The seizure of the Pueblo, he said, had impaired the credibility of the United States' foreign policy, which had "already been impaired."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Jan. 28, 1968]

Reds Testing Global Power of United States, Nixon Says

New York.—Richard M. Nixon, a likely prospect for the Republican presidential nomination, warned yesterday that the Pueblo incident was part of a worldwide Communist test of the "credibility and utility" of U.S. global power.

"The Communist world has been jointly testing the proposition that the United States is over-extended, over-committed, and underprepared to act," the former vice president said in a statement.

"Whether these Communist powers have been acting in concert, or whether they have acted independently, the effect has been jointly to take the measure of the United States," Nixon said. "What is being tested is not the quantity of America's power—but its credibility and its utility."

Nixon charged the government with a "tactical blunder" in failing to provide air and sea cover for the reconnaissance ship U.S.S. *Pueblo* on its patrol "within sight of the North Korean shore."

"But the longer-range need is to re-establish the credibility of American policy by re-establishing the credibility of American power," he said.

"The Pueblo seizure has further undermined that credibility. What we have to ensure is that it has not been irrevocably undermined," he said.

Nixon said Americans should recognize that an incident like the Pueblo should never have happened and must not be allowed to happen again.

"We need make no apology for the Pueblo's presence in the waters off North Korea," he said. "The repeated belligerent acts and true violations by North Korea presented a clear and present threat to the peace.

"But it seems all but incredible that we should have been guilty of such a tactical blunder: that an almost unarmed, low-speed craft, crammed with supersecret equipment, should have been sent alone on regular reconnaissance patrol within sight of the North Korean shore without taking the elementary precaution of having adequate air and sea cover available—even after repeated harassments and specific warnings by the North Koreans had made its danger clear."

Nixon, who is expected to announce his candidacy for the GOP presidential nomination shortly, issued the statement from his New York law office.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1968]

Nixon Criticizes Curb on Bombings, Says United States Must Prosecute War More Effectively

Green Bay, Wis., February 5.—Richard M. Nixon, acclerating his attack on President Johnson's handling of the Vietnam war, said today that the Administration had been wrong to suspend the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong before the recent Communist offensive.

He went on to suggest that the fact that the bombing pause had been followed almost immediately by a renewed Communist offensive merely demonstrated the folly of attempting to win over the Communists through peace overtures. Referring to the recent Vietcong attacks in Saigon, he declared:

"I believe that these latest actions, the most aggressive of the war, coming on top of the recent peace offensive—cutting back on the bombing, and softening the San Antonio formula [for ending the war]—points clearly to the fact that the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong are not going to change their attitude by virtue of the U.S. protesting for peace."

Mr. Nixon went on to say that "the only effective way to convince Hanoi that "peace is in their interests" is to "prosecute the war more effectively."

The former Vice President has often said that he shared the Administration's commitment to the war in Vietnam but disagreed with its methods of prosecuting the war. His comments today represented the sharpest and most specific presentation of that general thesis.

Mr. Nixon also said the Vietcong attacks had exposed what he suggested was the fraudulence of the Administration's own public statements on the war. The Administration, he charged, has too often told the country that the "war is going better" and that "peace is around the corner."

Mr. Johnson would be "much better advised to tell the truth," the former Vice President added.

SUGGESTS PUEBLO APOLOGY

Asked about the Pueblo incident, Mr. Nixon suggested that the United States might "apologize" to the North Vietnamese if it would help secure the safe return of the 83 crewmen on the captured ship.

In the 1960 campaign, Mr. Nixon berated his oppoent, John F. Kennedy, for suggesting that United States apologize to the Soviet Union when an American U-2 reconnaissance plane was shot down in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Nixon said that if the Pueblo had strayed within the 12-mile limit off the North Korean coast, "without permission and without notice," it was "a direct violation."

"I'm not suggesting under any circumstances," he went on, "that there should be an apology unless it is clear that that was done. Under those circumstances, I think we could consider it."

[From the New York Times, Oct. 25, 1968]

He (Mr. Nixon) termed the capture and detention of the American intelligence ship Pueblo by North Korea "an incredible humiliation of the United States."

SENATE—*Friday, April 18, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, whom to know aright is life and peace, deliver us now from the turbulent world about us and the vexing problems which lay hold upon us here that in this moment we may focus upon Thy sovereignty, Thy holiness, Thy compassion, and Thy love. Bestow upon us the gift of the quiet soul, the serene spirit, the disciplined mind that each of us may be channels of Thy grace and power. And if at times we have been cruel when we should be kind, vindictive when we should be charitable, little when we should be magnanimous, forgive us. Free us forever from all the vices of the spirit that blight the life, tarnish the character, and dim the holy vision.

Bless our Nation, O Lord, and make us a blessing to others. Renew within us pure religion and a lofty patriotism that we may be fit sponsors of freedom under Thine eternal law. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 15, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 458. An act for the relief of Yuka Awamura; and

S. 672. An act for the relief of Charles Richard Scott.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1507. An act conferring jurisdiction under the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine,- and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight;

H.R. 1632. An act for the relief of Romeo da la Torre Sanano and his sister, Julieta de la Tore Sanano;

H.R. 2005. An act for the relief of Lourdes M. Arrant;

H.R. 2218. An act for the relief of William John Moher;

H.R. 2336. An act for the relief of Adela Kaczmarski;

H.R. 2464. An act for the relief of Elisabeta Horwath;

H.R. 2940. An act for the relief of Henry E. Dooley;

H.R. 3040. An act for the relief of Lee In Sook;

H.R. 3348. An act for the relief of the estate of Pierre Samuel du Pont Darden;

H.R. 4148. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4546. An act for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo;

H.R. 5136. An act for the relief of George Tilson Weed;

H.R. 6366. An act for the relief of Mrs. Aranka Mlinko;

H.R. 6585. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Elgin;

H.R. 6607. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Sp4c. Klaus Josef Strauss;

H.R. 6670. An act for the relief of Teresina Fara;

H.R. 6931. An act for the relief of Guiseppe De Stefano; and

H.R. 10158. An act to provide mail service for Mamie Doud Eisenhower, widow of former President Dwight David Eisenhower.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1507. An act conferring jurisdiction under the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight;

H.R. 1632. An act for the relief of Romeo da la Torre Sanao and his sister, Julieta de la Tore Sanano;

H.R. 2005. An act for the relief of Lourdes M. Arrant;

H.R. 2218. An act for the relief of William John Moher;

H.R. 2336. An act for the relief of Adela Kaczmarski;

H.R. 2464. An act for the relief of Elisabeta Horwath;

H.R. 2940. An act for the relief of Henry E. Dooley;

H.R. 3040. An act for the relief of Lee In Sook;

H.R. 3348. An act for the relief of the estate of Pierre Samuel du Pont Darden;

H.R. 4546. An act for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo;

H.R. 5136. An act for the relief of George Tilson Weed;

H.R. 6366. An act for the relief of Mrs. Aranka Mlinko;

H.R. 6585. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Elgin;

H.R. 6607. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Sp4c. Klaus Josef Strauss;

H.R. 6670. An act for the relief of Teresina Fara; and

H.R. 6931. An act for the relief of Guiseppe De Stefano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4148. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 115, 116, and 117 only.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOHN (GIOVANNI) DENARO

The bill (S. 265) for the relief of John (Giovanni) Denaro was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 265

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John (Giovanni) Denaro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence of of October 23, 1962.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-126), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

GONG SING HOM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1625) for the relief of Gong Sing Hom, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(4) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gong Sing Hom shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien son of Mrs. Tom Wah, a United States citizen, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(19) of the said Act, he may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Gong Sing Hom shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act: *And provided further,* That the exemption granted herein shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-127), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant the status of a fourth preference immigrant to the adpoted son of a U.S. citizen, which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens. The bill also provides for a waiver of the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who has misrepresented a material fact in applying for a visa. The bill was amended to conform the language to established precedents.

CHI JEN FENG

The bill (S. 1531) for the relief of Chi Jen Feng was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1531

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,. That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chi Jen Feng shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 1, 1954.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-128), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

OZARK REGIONAL COMMISSION

The bill clerk read the nomination of E. L. Stewart, of Oklahoma, to be Federal cochairman of the Ozarks Regional Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The bill clerk read the nomination of John D. J. Moore, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extradordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CONVENTION ON CONDUCT OF FISHING OPERATIONS IN THE NORTH ATLANTIC—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive D, 91st Congress, first session, the Convention on Conduct of Fishing Operations in the North Atlantic, transmitted to the Senate, on April 16, 1969, by the President of the United States, and that the Convention, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed, and the President's message be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the request, without objection, is granted.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the Convention on Conduct of Fishing Operations in the North Atlantic, done at London, June 1, 1967. The Convention has been signed on behalf of seventeen governments, including the United States of America, which represent the great majority of vessels engaged in the fisheries in the area.

For the information of the Senate, I also transmit the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the Convention.

The Convention establishes a generally uniform system of identification, marking, light signals, conduct, and enforcement for fishing vessels and support vessels in a large part of the North Atlantic. The Convention is sufficiently flexible that it might be extended to other areas of the Atlantic if developments in the fishery pattern make this desirable.

Many European fishing vessels have followed a code of conduct laid down in the 1882 Convention for Regulating the Police of the North Seas Fisheries, even though many of the European governments did not actually become party to the Convention. This code was gradually extended throughout the Northeast Atlantic as congestion on the fishing grounds gradually spread beyond the North Sea. Eventually, the code extended to the Northwest Atlantic.

Since foreign fishermen rarely operated close to our Atlantic coast, such a code was of little direct concern to our fishermen. This situation has changed dramatically during the past few years. Complaints of harassment or impaired operating freedom due to congestion on the fishing grounds have become frequent. As a result, our fishermen have called for a modern code of conduct to assist them. Their needs in this respect were made known to our negotiators.

I believe that the requirements of American fishermen in dealing with problems caused by the heavy concentration of vessels on the fishing grounds in the Convention area are substantially met by the terms of the Convention. The Convention will also assist us in our continuing effort to promote harmony in the international fisheries through agreements with other governments.

Proposed legislation to carry out the provisions of the Convention will be submitted.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Convention.

Richard Nixon.

The White House, *April 16, 1969.*

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR TALMADGE, SENATOR DODD, AND SENATOR HARTKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the transaction of morning business and the morning hour, the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. Talmadge) be recognized for 35 minutes, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Dodd) be recognized for 30 minutes, and the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. Hartke) be recognized for 20 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 15, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 16, 1969, and April 17, 1969, received messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received on April 16, 1969, and April 17, 1969, see the end of the proceedings of today, April 18, 1969.)

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of April 15, 1969, the following report of a committee was submitted on April 16, 1969:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. Res. 85. Resolution expressing the sense of the Senate relative to commitments to foreign powers (Rept. No. 91–129).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the administration and management of the biology and medicine research program of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), dated April 16, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need for improvement in procuring and stockpiling jewel bearings produced at the Government-owned William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant, Rolla, N. Dak., Office of Emergency Preparedness, Department of Commerce, General Services Administration, dated April 17, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Builder's Cost Certification for Rossmoor Leisure World Development

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, pertaining to the decision of the Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, not to require builder's cost certification for Rossmoor Leisure World developments (with an accompanying letter); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Deferral of Construction Charges for the Eden Project, Wyoming

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting on the deferral of construction charges for the Eden project, Wyoming, due in 1969, 1970, and 1971 under repayment contract with the Eden Valley Irrigation and Drainage District in the total amount of $49,620 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Proposed Legislation Providing Mail Service for Mamie Doud Eisenhower

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide mail service for Mamie Doud Eisenhower, widow of former President Dwight David Eisenhower (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Atomic Energy Commission Authorization of Appropriations, Fiscal Year 1970

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, regarding the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission proposed bill for authorization of Appropriations, fiscal year 1970 (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution No. 11

"Whereas, the General Court is greatly concerned with the cost of financing Title IV the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program, and

"Whereas, the present provisions will impose upon the State beginning July 1, 1969, because of the 'Freeze' portion of said title, a great financial burden,

"Now therefore be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate Concurring:

"That it respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to re-evaluate the present and prospective costs of Title IV, the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program, which under the present federal legislation will be excessive and require unrealistically large contributions by the state, and to make revisions in said federal statutes to repeal the 'freeze' portion so as to bring state costs of the same within realistic bounds, and

"Be it further resolved that the clerks of the House and Senate of the General Court of New Hampshire be directed to transmit a copy of these resolutions to all four members of the New Hampshire congressional delegation, to the clerks of the federal House of Representatives and Senate, to Senator Russell Long and Representative Wilbur Mills.

"Wilmont S. White,
"Clerk, Senate.
"J. Milton Street,
"Clerk, House of Representatives."

A House joint memorial by the ways and means committee of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Commitee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial No. 3 by the Ways and Means Committee of the Legislature of the State of Idaho

"A joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho assembled in the Fortieth Session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas, the range livestock industry is a major industry of the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas, the public lands comprise at least two-thirds of the land area of the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas, the range livestock industry is dependent upon such public lands for grazing; and

"Whereas, the proposed increased grazing fees upon such public lands shall cause great economic hardship and business failures within such range livestock industry.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring, that we most respectfully request that the Congress of the United States direct and require the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior to hold in abeyance all increases in the rates to be charged as grazing fees upon the public lands until such time as Congress has had sufficient time to study and review the final report of the Public Land Law Review Commission.

"Be it further resolved, that the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward copies of this Memorial to the leadership of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the members of the Idaho Congressional Delegation."

Petition by the Inventions to Order petitioning Congress to allow open hearings on the development of a new type of automobile internal combustion engine which materially reduces smog, etc.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Worcester, Mass., requesting the President and Congress to take action to provide that January 15 of each year shall be celebrated as a national holiday in memory and in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 3832. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide the grade of general for the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps when the total active strength of the Marine Corps exceeds 200,000 (Rept. No. 91–130).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. DOMINICK, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Curtis W. Tarr, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

By Mr. McINTYRE, from the Committee on Armed Services;

Lt. Gen. Robert E. Cushman, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, to be Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. Sparkman) (for himself, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Packwood, Mr. Tower, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Percy, and Mr. Brooke):

S. 1832. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high timber yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mansfield when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1833. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 1834. A bill for the relief of Rafael Martinez Echeverria; and

S. 1835. A bill for the relief of Raymond N. Habiby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina:

S. 1836. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act (93 Stat. 1275), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jordan of North Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1837. A bill for the relief of Ting Kan Cheung aka Kam Tin Cheung;

S. 1838. A bill for the relief of Sui Wah Cheng; and

S. 1839. A bill for the relief of Shui Yin Cheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1840. A bill for the relief of Cheong Ip;

S. 1841. A bill for the relief of Shiu Hung To;

S. 1842. A bill for the relief of Sheung Kam Wong;

S. 1843. A bill for the relief of Heung Mau; and

S. 1844. A bill for the relief of Ping Kam Hui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1845. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph D. Hilbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Moss, Mr. Packwood, Mr. Pell, Mr. Percy, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 1846. A bill to revise the system of congressional nominations for appointments to the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1847. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Robert L. King (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1848. A bill for the relief of St. Johns' College at Santa Fe, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1849. A bill to amend title 19 of the Social Security Act to permit States greater flexibility in establishing and modifying medicaid plans; and

S. 1850. A bill to provide for the free entry of certain tools and equipment imported for the use of Eastern New Mexico University in establishing a program of training in watch repairing; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the second above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Young of South Dakota, and Mr. McCarthy):

S. 1851. A bill to enable honey producers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their markets for honey; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1852. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Fragoulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 1853. A bill to terminate price support operations on tobacco and to discontinue the export subsidy on tobacco under Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1854. A bill for the relief of Mattie Nagel Grinnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1855. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Leahy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 1856. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Prouty when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1857. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation pursuant to Public Law 81–507, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kennedy when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. Brooke, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Goodell, Mr. Hart, Mr. Javits, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Moss, Mr. Pell, Mr. Scott, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 1858. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to terminate the quota for South Africa; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kennedy when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MATHIAS:

S. 1859. A bill to establish and develop the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mathias when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1860. A bill for the relief of Marin N. Calinescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. Hruska):

S. 1861. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the infiltration or management of legitimate organizations by racketeering activity or the proceeds of racketeering activity, where interstate or foreign commerce is affected, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1862. A bill to amend section 8(c)(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit projects for paid advertising under marketing orders applicable to tomatoes; and

S. 1863. A bill to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, to authorize an increase in license fee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1864. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Talmadge when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Baker, Mr. Brooke, Mr. Cook, Mr. Dole, Mr. Goodell, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Percy, and Mr Scott):

S. 1865. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in the establishment of programs designed to provide for the advancement of medical knowledge with respect to the causes and effects of malnutrition and to facilitate the detection and treatment of malnutrition and conditions resulting therefrom; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Goodell):

S. 1866. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 with respect to the appointment of State advisory councils; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 1867. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer;

S. 1868. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a separate occupational tax for limited retail dealers in distilled spirits;

S. 1869. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide credit against income tax for an employer who employs older persons in his trade or business; and

S. 1870. A bill to amend title 3 of the Sugar Act of 1948 to provide for the establishment of fair and reasonable minimum wage rates for workers employed on sugar farms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1871. A bill to provide that in determining the amount of retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay payable to any enlisted man, all services shall be counted which would have been counted for the same purpose if he were a commissioned officer; to the Committee on Armed Services;

(See the remarks of Mr. Inouye when he introduced the first above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself, Mr. Church, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Goodell, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Pell, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 1872. A bill to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 (title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Inouye when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a seperate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 1873. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 and the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for the submission of certain claims and the reinstatement of certain claims;

S. 1874. A bill to provide for the inclusion of years of service as judge of the Circuit Court for the territory of Hawaii in the computation of Federal judicial service of the Honorable Martin Pence; and

S. 1875. A bill to provide cost-of-living allowances to judicial employees stationed outside the continental United States or in Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1876. A bill to provide credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act for periods of separation from the service of certain employees of Japanese ancestry during World War II; and

S. 1877. A bill to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States during peacetime; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1878. A bill to amend chapter 18 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pastore when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE (by request):

S. 1879. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to provide that life imprisonment shall be the maximum criminal penalty for certain offenses, to increase the criminal penalties for unauthorized diversion of special nuclear material and related offenses, and for other purposes;

S. 1880. A bill to amend section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1881. A bill to amend section 182 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1882, A bill to amend chapter 18 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1883. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to eliminate the requirement for a finding of practical value and abolish the distinction between commercial licenses for facilities and certain research and development licenses for facilities and for other purposes; and

S. 1884. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pastore when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE (for himself, Mr. Anderson, and Mr. Bennett):

S. 1885. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pastore, when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1886. A bill for the relief of Dr. Max Ruetger Hasche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 1887. A bill to provide relief for Emma Zimmerli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Dirksen):

S. 1888. A bill to change the composition of the Commission for extension of the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mansfield when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 1889. A bill to provide partial reimbursement for losses incurred by commercial fishermen as a result of State-imported restrictions on commercial fishing; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1890. A bill to amend the provisions of the United States Code with respect to the jurisdiction of courts of appeals of the United States to review orders of administrative officers and agencies, and for other purposes; and

S. 1891. A bill to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to exchange fingerprint information with registered national security exchanges and related agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1892. A bill to limit and prevent certain concerted activities by labor organizations which interfere with or obstruct or impede the free production of goods for commerce or the free flow thereof in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1893. A bill to limit the categories of questions required to be answered in decennial censuses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1894. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities with respect to the premium pay of certain employees performing irregular and unscheduled duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1895. A bill to reorganize and coordinate control of the narcotic and drug abuse laws under the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself, Mr. Hart, Mr. Moss, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 1896. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include dental care, eye care, dentures, eyeglasses, and hearing aids among the benefits provided by the insurance program established by part B of such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. Javits, and Mr. Prouty):

S. 1897. A bill to remove financial barriers so that all individuals will have equal opportunity for a postsecondary education of good quality, to strengthen institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kennedy when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 1898. A bill for the relief of Orlando J. S. Mendonca;

S. 1899. A bill for the relief of Manuel C. DaSilva;

S. 1900. A bill for the relief of Norberto B. Santos;

S. 1901. A bill for the relief of Manuel Silveira Soares;

S. 1902. A bill for the relief of Aldino Avila Bettencourt;

S. 1903. A bill for the relief of Joao Tomas Bettencourt;

S. 1904. A bill for the relief of Carlos M. Ferreira; and

S. 1905. A bill for the relief of Judite da Conceicao Frias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1906. A bill for the relief of Chigusa Tsuzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S.J. Res. 94. A joint resolution to provide for a professional study of the feasibility of restoring the west front of the U.S. Capitol, with particular attention to and analysis of the risk, cost and disruption factors of a restoration project; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and Mr. Russell):

S.J. Res. 95. A joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the completion of the carving on Stone Mountain, Ga.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1832—INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL TIMBER SUPPLY ACT OF 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. Sparkman), I ask unanimous consent that a statement he intended to make today be printed in the Record, together with the bill and other material. The Senator from Alabama is unable to deliver the statement at this time because of his absence from the Chamber temporarily on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and the other material will be printed in the Record, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

The bill (S. 1832) to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of National Forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high timber yield fund, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Mansfield (for Mr. Sparkman and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1832

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Timber Supply Act of 1969".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds that it is necessary to increase substantially the timber yield from national forest commercial timberlands in order to increase the supply of wood products which are needed to meet increasing national demands, including the demand for home construction. The Congress further finds that it is necessary to provide a reliable and adequate source of funds required to increase timber yield rates on such national forest commercial timberlands.

DEFINITION

Sec. 3. As used in this Act the term "commercial timberlands" includes timberlands classed as commercial in the Forest Survey conducted under the Act of May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U.S.C. 581–581–i) and which are not withdrawn or reserved from commercial timber production.

HIGH TIMBER YIELD FUND

Sec. 4. There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a high timber yield fund, hereinafter referred to as the "fund". Except as hereinafter provided, during the period beginning July 1, 1969, and ending June 30, 1994, there shall be credited to the fund all receipts from the sale of timber and other forest products from the national forests. The foregoing shall not be construed as amending or repealing any provision of law that authorizes and directs that income from the sale of timber and other forest products from national forests be used for a specific purpose. Such income shall continue to be utilized for the purposes so specified by law and shall not be deposited into the high timber yield fund.

APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 5. Moneys credited to the fund shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of this Act only when appropriated therefor. Such moneys as may be appropriated shall be available until expended. Any money credited to the fund and not subsequently authorized for expenditure by the Congress within two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which such money was credited to the fund shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

ALLOCATION OF MONEY IN THE FUND

Sec. 6. Moneys appropriated from the fund shall, unless otherwise allocated for the purposes of this section in the Appropriation Act making them available, be allocated in each fiscal year for expenditure in each national forest in substantially the same proportion as the amount of money contributed to the fund from such national forest in the immediately preceding two fiscal years bears to the total amount of money contributed to the fund from all the national forests in such preceding two fiscal years. Money allocated to any national forest under this section shall be used only for increasing timber yield in such national forest by—

(1) obtaining regeneration at the earliest practical date after harvesting, and for reforesting unsatisfactorily stocked high site lands;

(2) pre-commercial thinning to control spacing or stand composition;

(3) semi-commercial thinning both to control spacing or stand composition and to produce material with commercial value in excess of the additional costs required for its harvesting and processing;

(4) pruning, if justified by a subsequent reduction in age at which the trees become marketable;

(5) preparation, including marking, for thinning, salvage, and understory-removal sales;

(6) road construction in advance of planned harvest cutting to standards necessary for facilitating thinning, salvage, and understory-removal sales;

(7) fertilization;

(8) development and procurement of seed or stock with superior growth characteristics; and

(9) such other timber production improvement practices as the Secretary of Agriculture deems appropriate.

IMPLEMENTATION

Sec. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture shall immediately establish programs to carry out the policy and purposes of this Act and shall specifically—

(1) develop into optimum timber productivity as soon as possible the national forest commercial timberlands; and

(2) revise the allowable annual harvesting rates in national forests to take into account (A) rotation ages appropriate for conversion technology and anticipated market requirements at the expected time of harvest, (B) the need for and benefits from use of high level current harvest rate options available within sustained yield limitations, and (C) increased timber yields which will result from application of the measures authorized by section 6 of this Act.

The material, presented by Mr. Mansfield, follows:

Statement of Senator Sparkman

Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill to establish a self-supporting government fund to provide for more intensive management of our national forests' commercial timberlands. The bill, entitled The National Timber Supply Act of 1969, would authorize that timber receipts from the national forests be "plowed back" into the forest to increase timber yields in order to assure a continuous supply of lumber to meet our ever-growing national needs. By crediting receipts from the sale of timber in the national forests to the fund to be called "the high timber yield fund" the Federal government would have an ever-ready supply of funds to update forest management practices and to apply them intensively and continuously to the national forests.

Our national forests are one of the nation's greatest natural resources which belong to all of our people and deserve the best and most advanced management treatment to enable them to produce the lumber needed for our growing housing and other needs without disturbing their invaluable contribution to our nation's needs for conservation, beautification and recreation.

I am introducing this bill as a result of hearings conducted last month by my Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs on critical shortages and skyrocketing prices of lumber and softwood products. We heard testimony that there is a current annual shortage of 2 to 3 billion board feet of softwood lumber and plywood and that, in less than one year's time, lumber prices had gone up 50 percent and plywood prices had risen over 100 percent. The homebuilders told us that, not only were the rising prices prohibitive for home construction purposes, but the lumber suppliers were refusing to promise future delivery at any price. Furthermore, we were told that, unless some action was taken, the price and supply situation would continue to get worse and could be the means for frustrating the nation in meeting its national housing goals.

In a statement to the Senate on April 3, 1969, I reported on the hearings and gave 10 recommendations about the action that needed to be taken to resolve our current crisis and to avoid a more serious crisis in the future.

In my statement, I referred to national housing policy and, particularly, the 1968 Housing Act which calls for a 10-year building program of 26 million housing units, for an average of 2.6 million units a year. Last year our housing starts were 1.5 million, so we are talking about an increase of over 70 percent on the average over existing construction levels.

HUD Secretary Romney testified that if we were to meet our goals, the lumber supply must be increased by 15 billion board feet per year in 10 years. By 1978 he said we would have to double today's lumber supply going into residential building.

Secretary Romney made a number of recommendations and also explained the action taken by President Nixon's Task Force which he believed would help provide relief in the current crisis. In fact, during the Subcommittee hearings, we heard that the combination of the hearings and the President's directives had already caused a cutback on lumber prices by as much as 30 percent.

It was obvious from the hearings, however, that this was a long-range problem which demanded immediate attention or we would be faced with a more serious crisis in the future.

Almost two-thirds of the nation's softwood timber is on federal public lands. Industrial and other private timber holdings are already being harvested at close to maximum justifiable rates compatible with sound forest management. This is not true of national forest commercial timberlands, principally because the federal appropriation process does not provide a system for assured investment of funds for the purpose of improving timber growth and yield, and partly because present Federal timber management policies are not firmly and permanently oriented to improvement of timber growth and yield.

Edward C. Cliff, Chief of the Forest Service, testified before a Senate Committee on November 26, 1968:

"In addition to the Douglas-fir Supply Study still under way, other studies have been made of investment opportunities on National Forests throughout the country. They show that allowable cuts could—in time—be increased about two-thirds by intensifying timber culture on the more productive portions of National Forest commercial timberlands. Substantial investments would be required to accomplish this, but the returns in terms of increased wood supplies and other benefits of forest management would more than offset the costs."

He further stated that he could not sanction these increases in harvest until he could be assured of the necessary investment.

It is the purpose of this bill to create a responsible and continuing method for the federal government to provide the competence necessary to increase timber growth so that forest products can be harvested at rates that will meet public requirements for building and other needs.

Past experience clearly shows that the normal annual appropriation process cannot be relied on to provide either the level or the stability of funds required to operate an intensive timber management on the national forests.

On September 21, 1961, President Kennedy sent to both Houses of Congress a report entitled "Development Plan for the National Forests." The plan included a work schedule, part of which was a provision for $417,891,000 over a ten-year period for reforestation and timber stand improvement. Appropriations for this activity have been in the neighborhood of $16,000,000 for the last several years, or just two-fifths of the annual average of the requirements of the systematic plan endorsed by the late President.

The national forests contain over one trillion board feet of sawtimber, which is more than half of the nation's present inventory. The national forests, therefore, merit intensified scrutiny to insure that they are managed for high level effectiveness in meeting the nation's timber needs.

These lands and their forests were reserved from the public domain almost three-quarters of a century ago largely because of an unjustified concern about an impending national timber famine. With projected demands for wood product consumption showing a steady rise, the national forests must play an increasingly important role in growing and supplying the necessary timber. Despite Federal ownership of more than half of the nation's present softwood timber resources, only about one of every three logs made into lumber or plywood now comes from the national forests. Although large volumes of timber are sold from the national forests with substantial receipts estimated at over $300 million for next year, it is nonetheless true that the commercial timberlands in the national forests are an underutilized and underdeveloped resource. With a wood products scarcity now at hand, the nation can no longer afford the luxury of semi-management for more than half of its softwood sawtimber supply. I believe that my bill, the proposed National Timber Supply Act, if approved by the Congress, will provide the solution to this vexing problem. It would provide Congressional directives for creating and implementing more effective management of national forest timber for the purpose of assuring increasing supplies of wood to meet increasing demands.

Its basic premise is that, once the funds are made available and the Forest Service embarks on an intensive management program, the allowable cut can be increased immediately by the U.S. Forest Service.

The proposed Act contains three broad directives upon which allowable cuts are to be premised. It would require the Forest Service to take into account: (1) tree size requirements of market and industrial techniques of the 21st Century as these become apparent; (2) comparison of gains and losses caused by withholding the harvest of overmature timber with the gains and losses which could result from conversion of the acres now serving as storehouses for overmature timber into growing new timber crops; and (3) the effects of intensive management measures for which financing provisions are made in the proposed Act.

By placing the available receipts into a special fund, called the "high timber yield fund," the Forest Service could be assured of long-term financing for its management and development of the forests.

Establishment of such a high timber yield fund in the Treasury to finance optimum timber productivity on the commercial timberlands of the national forests is necessary for assuring continuity of effort and objective. The intensive management measures necessary to increase timber yield must, to be effective, be applied continuously, and not on a stop-and-go-basis. If harvest-rate determinations are made on the premise that future yields will be those obtainable from intensive management there must be assurance that intensive management will occur. The high timber yield fund supplies this assurance.

The plan to finance the high timber yield fund from timber receipts assures that expenditures will be kept in step with the significance of national forest timber to the economy. Other safeguards in the proposal are:

(1) The life of the fund is limited to 25 years. This limitation will force a review based on accumulated experience before the fund is renewed; otherwise a full-scale review might never occur.

(2) Section 5 of the bill requires that expenditures from the fund be made only after appropriation. This insures regular Congressional review and approval of the program of activities to be financed from the fund.

(3) Section 5 also provides that funds not appropriated within two years be transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. This provision insures that deposits in excess of needs will not be accumulated in the fund. It will be an effective but more flexible limitation than a stated maximum dollar amount.

The portion of national forest receipts which under existing law are paid to the States or other special funds would not be disturbed by the enactment of the National Timber Supply Act. This, the 25 per cent of national forest receipts payment to States (16 USC 500) and 10 per cent of national forest receipts for roads and trails (16 USC 501) would not be changed.

Section 6 of the bill specifies that allocations from the fund will be made by national forests in amounts substantially proportionate to contribution to the fund from each forest during the preceding two fiscal years. This provision will put 65 per cent of timber receipts back for expenditure on the forest where they were earned. (Twenty-five per cent of each forest's receipts are turned over to the counties in which the forest is located and ten per cent are available for forest roads and trails within the State in which the forest is located.)

Timber receipts are the product of the volume of timber cut and its average unit price, subject to minor annual variations due to changes in the level of advance deposits maintained by timber purchasers. The provision for use of a two year average will iron out effects from fluctuations in advance deposit levels.

Volume cut and its average unit price are guides to the areas with better rates of growth and better quality species. Hence timber receipts by forests are a simple and reliable index of opportunities and needs to increase timber yields.

Other simple indices, such as commercial forest area or volume cut, would result in some diversion of funds from areas with better growth potential for preferred quality species to areas where unit timber values are low and where intensive management measures would result in less than average yield increases.

The bill establishes allocations in proportion to receipts as a basic guideline, but recognizes that variations may be necessary in a few isolated cases to justify a larger proportion of funds going into a forest that has outstanding potential for increased yield. Thus, if the allocation by receipts formula should fail to meet the needs and opportunities on any forests, it can be modified without amending the basic act.

There were 50 forests which had receipts of less than $100,000 in fiscal year 1967. Forty of these forests are in eastern Montana, the Rocky Mountain and Intermountain states, in southern Arizona and in New Mexico. All of these forests have a low proportion of commercial forest land and their commercial lands are relatively arid and of low productivity. The opportunities and needs for intensive timber management on these forests is roughly proportionate to the low level of receipts they have attained. In addition to this group of 40 forests there are ten other forests with less than $100,000 annual timber receipts. These are: a) the four southern and one east side Sierra forests in California where timber production is minor and incidental to watershed and recreation management; b) three acquired forests in Missouri, Illinois and Indiana-Ohio. Two of these have the two smallest areas of commercial forest land (except for extremely arid western forests) in the national forest system. The Missouri forest is made up primarily of acquired hard cut lands which because of low growth rates have been slow in recovery to full productivity; and the two forests in Alaska. The Chugach Forest is still close to marginal operability and has very limited opportunities for intensive management in the immediate future.

The Tongass forest in Alaska is a special case because under the Tongass Timber Act of 1946, all timber receipts are deposited into a special fund to be held for disbursal until Indian claims on the Tongass forest are adjudicated. Hence there are no deposits from timber cutting into the national forest receipt fund. While the cut on this forest is now close to 500 million board feet annually, the opportunities and need for intensive management measures are neither large or pressing. It is probable that either a portion of the Tongass timber fund will be released to national forest receipts by special authorization or that the Indian claims will be adjudicated before it becomes urgent to have funds available for intensive management measures on this forest.

There are nine listed broad purposes for which allotted funds could be used. These purposes are:

(1) Obtaining regeneration at earliest practical date after harvesting and for reforesting unsatisfactorily stocked high site lands. This would permit planting or seeding of cut-over lands in the first planting season after slash disposal or after termination of harvesting operations where slash disposal is unnecessary. The objective is to establish full stocking with a minimum delay in regeneration. Reforestation of unsatisfactorily stocked high site lands is also included. Such seeding or planting of unsatisfactorily stocked areas would be limited to timberlands of good potential for commercial timber production.

(2) Pre-commercial thinning to control spacing or stand composition. Such thinnings are the primary means to accelerate growth at an early age. They are also an effective means to favor production of desirable species.

(3) Semi-commercial thinnings both to control spacing and composition and to produce material with value for commercial utilization in excess of additional costs required for its production. Semi-commercial thinning is a step between pre-commercial thinning and commercial thinning. Pre-commercial thinnings deal with material that is unusable because of its small size. Semi-commercial thinnings produce material acceptable for commercial utilization especially pulpwood but for which full production and delivery costs exceed its market value. Such thinned material should be utilized so long as the added cost to produce and deliver it (minus the cost of any work such as limbing made unnecessary by utilization) does not exceed its value.

(4) Pruning if justified by a subsequent reduction in the age at which the trees become marketable. Some desirable tree species retain juvenile limbs on the lower bole for excessive periods. In such circumstances

pruning at an early age is a necessary and justifiable activity to obtain logs suitable for sawing or peeling at a younger rotation age.

(5) Preparation, including marking, of thinning, salvage and understory-removal sales. Unit costs for thinning and salvage sales are higher than for harvest sales. Such sales have never been financed to the extent of their full potential by regular timber sale appropriations. Financing of sale preparation for thinning and salvage sales from the high timber yield fund is needed to market the very significant timber volumes now being lost through overcrowding or deterioration.

(6) Road construction in advance of planned harvesting to standards necessary for facilitating thinning, salvage and understory-removal sales and for protection against ravages of fire and insect. Thinning and salvage sales alone can rarely support road construction. Hence, thinning and salvage cutting is now generally limited to roaded areas.

This provision would finance road construction to standards necessary to facilitate thinning and salvage cutting in unroaded areas, and would incidentally supply access needed for protection purposes. It is not contemplated that the high timber yield fund would be used to finance regular timber access road construction.

(7) Fertilization of good sites to increase timber growth rates is now being undertaken by several major industrial timberland owners in the Northwest and the South. Fertilization is a promising avenue to increase yields and shorten rotations. As further knowledge of costs and returns develop, it is logical that the high timber yield fund be used for fertilization on suitable federal timberlands.

(8) Development and procurement of seed or stock with superior growth characteristics. Work is underway by both the Forest Service and industry to identify superior seed sources and develop seed orchards for volume production of superior seed. The high timber yield fund would finance intensification of this activity on the national forests.

(9) Implementing other methods and practices that are demonstrated to increase timber production.

The common purpose of all nine of these listed cultural practices is to increase timber yields on the national forests above those yields presently attainable from the regularly financed activities The high timber yield fund is designed to provide the additional effort to work towards optimum yields. It is not expected to displace the regular financing of federal timber sales, protection from fire and pests, or the Forest Development Road Program.

Of the nine listed activities for use of financing from the high timber yield fund all but two are silvicultural measures which could also be financed from funds regularly appropriated for national forest reforestation and timber stand improvement. The high timber yield fund must be expended only on measures for increasing timber yield and must be allotted to individual forests in amounts proportionate to the contributions of the forest to the fund. Hence the high timber yield fund is not available to finance reforestation for scenic or watershed protection purposes. Needs in these areas or activities not adequately covered by the high timber yield fund must continue to be financed from regularly appropriated funds.

Preparation for thinning, salvage and understory removal sales, which is an authorized high timber yield fund activity under Section 6 of the bill, can also be financed from regularly appropriated funds for national forest timber sales. A small volume of thinning and salvage sales are now being made by this means. Such sales unavoidably have a poorer ratio between costs and returns than regular harvest sales. Progress has been disappointingly slow in obtaining appropriations for timber sales in amounts which will take care of the regular harvest cut sale program and leave more than a token amount for salvage and thinning sales. These sales are desirable even if costs equal returns because yields are increased.

Large salvage sales should continue to be financed from regular timber sale appropriations. Sale preparation for only small salvage sales of scattered trees should be financed from the high timber yield fund.

Much the same distinctions between use of regularly appropriated funds and the high timber yield fund applies to road construction in advance of planned harvest cutting which is also an authorized high timber yield fund activity. Regularly appropriated forest road funds are available for advance road construction but it is virtually impossible to justify such construction in competition for appropriated funds with other pressing road needs. Such advance road construction is essential for full scale operation of thinning and scattered tree salvage sales. Use of high timber yield funds for this purpose will generally be the only practical means to get advance roads built. High timber yield funds should not be used to construct access roads into large salvage sales acreas.

Reforestation and timber stand improvement are conducted on recently cut over areas with funds obtained from timber purchasers under the provisions of the Knutsen-Vandenberg Act (16 USC 576). Deposits of more than $23 million were thus obtained in Fiscal Year 1967. These funds must be used on cut over areas within a few years after cutting. The principal use of these funds is to obtain regeneration on sale areas. For all practical purposes K–V funds are an authorized diversion of payments from timber purchasers which otherwise would be timber receipts. Enactment of the National Timber Supply bill would make use of the K–V act obsolete. If the K–V act is not used, timber receipts will be correspondingly increased and 65 percent of such increase will go into the high timber yield fund.

High timber yield funds are not subject to the location and time requirements applicable to K–V funds. The counties do not get a 25 percent share of the moneys which go into the K–V fund. This has been a source of long standing irritation. With substitution of the high timber yield fund for the K–V act the 25 percent fund for payments to counties will automatically include the moneys formerly diverted from timber receipts. A source of much hard feeling would thus be removed.

Section 7 of the bill explicitly directs the Secretary of Agriculture immediately to carry out the therein stated policy and purposes. This provision should dispel any question that there may be delays in full use of the high timber yield fund as soon as it becomes available. This directive also requires early action on the review and revision of allowable cut determinations under the guidelines established in this section.

These revisions cannot be accomplished overnight but should be completed in closer to 90 days than half a year. Expanded sale programs would then be developed. Provision for financing the increased volume of timber offerings would have to be obtained. But there should be no lengthy delay in increasing the allowable cut once the necessary funding is at hand and the process for improved timber management is well underway.

Mr. President, the advantages of this proposed legislation is manyfold. Most importantly it will make a significant contribution towards fulfilling the nation's housing policy. This policy is, in fact, the law of the land and every resource of our nation should be mobilized to attain the goal dictated by this policy. More than this, however, the legislation makes good economic sense. It is a money-making proposition for the Federal Government. Mr. Cliff, Chief Forester of the U.S. Forest Service, reported to us his estimate that $1 million invested in intensive management practices would net a return of $215,000 annually. Where else could one get a better investment with a higher yield and at the same time produce material so essential to the well-being of our people? Furthermore, improved forests will make a significant contribution for the benefit of all for recreational, conservation and beautification purposes.

I believe that the Federal forests should be managed by the Department of Agriculture at the same degree of intensity that the Department advocates for other crop lands. The Department has done miracles in developing the techniques and the management practices for crops and I see no reason why our forest lands should not be treated the same way.

Mr. President, I can think of six benefits if the Federal forests were managed at the level the Department is capable of once it receives the necessary funding support from the Congress. I base this not on hearsay, but what is already being accomplished by some of our best-managed private forest lands. I would list these as follows:

1. Enough reasonably-priced building materials to meet all of our housing goals.
2. More and better camping and recreation facilities.
3. More wildlife.
4. More dependable water supplies for our cities.
5. Better grazing lands.
6. Healthy, vigorous forests that can supply all of our nation's wood needs forever.

Mr. President, assuming that the receipts from the sale of timber are approximately $300 million in the coming year, and that 65 percent of this amount would flow into the high timber yield fund, we can expect that this fund would start out initially with approximately $200 million. As K–V collections are eliminated and timber sale volumes increase with possibly a decline in unit values for stumpage, the annual high timber yield collections may rise. Based on the approximately 100 million acres of commercial forest land owned by the U.S. Forest Service, the fund would start with an average of $2.00 per acre per year investment in increasing timber yields spread over the total national forest commercial timber acreage. It should rise in the future. These are not excessive rates of expenditure to install and maintain an intensive timber management system which will make it possible to increase yields by about 10 million board feet, or nearly double current cutting rates on the national forests.

It is not considered feasible to put a strict cost benefit check on expenditures into the bill at this time. The bill limits expenditures to those which will increase timber yields. The basic motivation for establishment of the high timber yield fund is to reduce and if possible eliminate payment of scarcity premiums for lumber and plywood by domestic consumers. A good deal more experience and research is needed before progress toward this objective can be translated into monetary terms for comparison with costs of work performance in the nine activities listed in Section 6 of the bill.

It should also be recognized that the annual requests for appropriations from the high timber yield fund will be reviewed and must be approved by the Bureau of the Budget. That agency is now greatly concerned with cost benefit ratio tests. Hence pressure to develop techniques to apply cost-benefit ratio tests to activities under the high timber yield fund are virtually assured.

Finally, the objective, workability and significance of the National Timber Supply bill would be destroyed if there is any significant broadening of the purposes for which the high timber yield fund may be used. The prospective amounts which would go into the high timber yield fund appear to be approximately adequate for the job to be done. These amounts will clearly not be adequate if diluted by assignment of additional purposes to the fund. The National Timber Supply bill is a proposal to put the national forests on a timber management level which can yield sufficient raw materials to cope with the domestic consumer shortage in lumber and plywood. These management measures would be financed from the proceeds of the timber made available for this purpose. If the funds were turned into an all-purpose jackpot, it would deteriorate into a purposeless device to make receipts available to supplement appropriations in supporting national forest administration.

The time has come to manage the national forests for the full timber yields which they can produce to meet the housing needs of the American people. This has always been a basic purpose of the national forests. It was stated well by President Theodore Roosevelt on March 26, 1903, when he said:

"First and foremost, you can never afford to forget for one moment what is the object of our forest policy. That object is not to preserve the forests because they are beautiful, though that is good in itself; nor because they are refuges for the wild creatures of the wilderness, though that, too, is good in itself; but the primary object of our forest policy, as of the land policy of the U.S. is making of prosperous homes.

"It is part of the traditional policy of making in our country. Every other consideration comes as secondary. The whole effort of the government in dealing with the forests must be directed to this end, keeping in view the fact that it is not only necessary to start the homes as prosperous, but to keep them so."

SUPPLY AND PRICE OF SOFTWOOD LUMBER

(Statement by Senator SPARKMAN in the Senate on April 3, 1969)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I address the Senate today on a subject which is vital to the success of our Nation's housing program—that is, the supply and price of softwood lumber.

Skyrocketing lumber prices in recent months have reached such serious proportions to threaten our basic housing program and our efforts to meet the national housing goal established by the 1968 Housing Act.

On March 19, 20, and 21, the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs held hearings to determine the reasons for the current crisis in lumber and what could be done about it. We received verbal testimony from a large number of witnesses representing all segments of private and government groups involved in producing and distributing lumber for homebuilding purposes, as well as consumer and conservation groups.

The witnesses were excellent, and I believe that the hearing record is the best ever recorded on this very involved subject. Although we do not pretend to be experts on the subject, we feel that we were able to get to the bottom of the issue and to understand it well enough to identify the problem and to make recommendations on its solution.

Mr. President, I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate because I believe that it is a nationwide issue covering not only those States having large timber resources, but every State in the Union involved in housing programs and the rebuilding of our cities. In my statement today, I will explain the issue briefly and make some tentative recommendations. Later on, the Housing Subcommittee will submit a report containing a more thorough explanation of the subject and final recommendations on the best course of action to take to remedy this serious problem.

The committee undertook the hearings primarily because of our concern that mounting lumber prices and shortages could frustrate our endeavors to meet the Nation's housing goals. A few days after we announced the hearings, I was pleased to see that the President had established a task force to make recommendations for a course of action to meet this serious problem. The day before our hearings started, the President announced a four-pronged program to relieve the current pressure on lumber prices. Also a few days after we announced the hearings, we learned that plywood prices had taken a 20-percent drop.

These actions may represent only temporary relief, and it is obvious that our problem is more than a temporary one. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that our hearing did prompt forthright action to help solve the current crisis.

In the past year, softwood prices have increased by 100 percent for plywood, and by 50 to 80 percent for 2 by 4's and other softwood lumber products used in homebuilding. The National Association of Home Builders reported that the increased lumber prices pushed up the cost of a $25,000 house by $1,268 on a national average. However, in one area, the homebuilders reported to us that the lumber increases have caused a $2,000 rise in a $20,000 house. Furthermore, we are told that, not only are the lumber prices exorbitant, but the entire marketing system for lumber is in a state of chaos. The lumber dealers will not commit themselves on advance prices and, in many cases, the homebuilders are unable to rely on deliveries of this essential product at any price. Obviously, such conditions cause serious delays in production schedules, disrupt labor forces, and place many small homebuilders in serious financial difficulties.

Not only is this a serious matter for industry, it is even more serious for the American people who are seeking decent housing at reasonable costs. Furthermore, it may represent a critical blow to attaining our national housing goals as spelled out so forcibly in the 1968 Housing Act.

To get to the bottom of the price issue the Housing Subcommittee looked into the functioning of the entire marketing process of lumber from the forests to the mill and to the wholesaler, to the retailer, and to its use in the construction of a home. We learned that the final price was a product of each step in this process, but that the price rise to the consumer was basically the result of rising stumpage prices established by auction. Furthermore, because the government is by far the largest single seller of sawtimber, the current auction prices are those set in connection with the sale of Government-owned logs. The Government has a procedure for establishing an appraised value of logs and will not accept a bid for less than the appraised value but has no compunction about the bid going far above this value. In fact, in recent bids, the final selling price of Government-owned timber has been 2½ times the value established by the Government itself as the appraised value.

I understand that this system has been used for a long time and has years of experience behind it, but I believe that the appropriate committee should look into this process. The result is truly inflationary causing higher prices all along the line. Furthermore, now that our Government is committed to subsidizing housing, I wonder if we are not going around in circles. In the long run, the profits of one agency of the Government are borne by subsidies paid by another agency of the Government.

Another important factor related to the sharp price increase is the disappearance of many small lumber mills which traditionally have been the balance wheel in the lumber industry. For example, the number of lumber mills in western Washington and western Oregon, the center of softwood production, has dropped to about one-quarter of the number in existence 20 years ago. In previous periods of lumber shortages, these mills would quickly come to life because of the improved economic climate and often, with their increased production, would be very effective in making up the shortage.

Secretary Romney showed his concern about the high lumber prices and the closing of so many small sawmills and has requested the Department of Justice to determine whether there is a cause for action in connection with the absorption of so many mills by the giant lumber interests.

The Secretary's conclusion, however, in which I heartily concur, is that the solution to the problem does not rest on the issue of prices. The price structure is a product of supply and demand and the sure way of correcting excessively high prices is to increase the supply in proportion to the demand.

Last year, in the Housing Act of 1968 we established a 10-year goal of housing construction and thus have, in fact, established the level of demand for lumber products for the next 10 years.

The 10-year goal calls for an average of 2.6 million units built annually. This compares with current production of about 1.6 million units, so you can see that we need to increase production by more than 60 percent in the years ahead. This 2.6 million units goal was not haphazardly arrived at and should not be taken lightly. It is the law of the land to use this Nation's resources to meet this goal.

Unless we develop new substitute materials for homebuilding, the demands for lumber in the next decade must match the 60-percent increase in housing starts. I believe that we have no choice but to match the supply to meet this demand.

This can be done. It is not an impossible task. We have the basic resources and it is now a matter of aggressively working to improve the efficiency of these resources. It seems to me to be a simple matter of economics and good business practices to invest in our national forests the same kind of research and up-to-date cultural and management practices that we so successfully used in developing our agricultural lands.

Amazing success has already been demonstrated through the latest techniques of "tree farming" or "silviculture." The important thing is to use these techniques nationwide, particularly in Government-owned forests, and there would be no doubt about meeting our production goals.

The trees are there to produce the amounts of lumber and plywood we need but, for the most part, they are in national forests and other Federal timberland owned and operated by the Government. It was evident to us that the increased production required of our Federal timberlands is impossible under the presently restricted appropriations in the U.S. Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior.

Industrial forests operated by private companies, and the other timberlands in private ownership, are now producing to their full capacity, if not perhaps a little over their true capacity, under prudent forestry management. In fact, we were a little startled to learn that the forest industries, with ownership of 17 percent of softwood sawtimber, is harvesting 33 percent of the total softwood, that other private ownerships with 18 percent of softwood standing timber are producing 28 percent of the total output, but that the Forest Service, with ownership of 54 percent of all softwood timber in the Nation, is only producing 30 percent of total output.

To put it another way, the forest industries are harvesting 3.8 percent of their standing timber inventory annually; other private ownerships are harvesting at the rate of 2.8 percent of inventory, but the Forest Service, the greatest forest owner of all, is able, under present conditions, to harvest only nine-tenths of 1 percent of its huge inventory.

The imbalance in the harvesting between Government and private lands has many explanations. One is that many private owners are overcutting their forests and destroying their use for the future.

It is obvious that this condition cannot continue for long. Mr. Edward Cliff, of the U.S. Forest Service, said:

"The softwood resources in private ownership are being overcut. . . . Log supplies from these lands must decline substantially over the next few decades. . . . Any sustained increase in log harvests in the West thus must come from public lands."

There are many reasons why the National Forests, comprising the greatest reservoir of timber in the Nation, can account for only one-third of the production of softwood. Chief among them seems to be the fact that the Forest Service has been obliged to operate with insufficient funds to reach the necessary softwood output to support our housing programs.

I am not being critical of the Forest Service. It has some of the most dedicated foresters in the world. Within the limits of the funds made available, it has protected and managed the great forest empires under its jurisdiction. But it simply has not been given the funds necessary to meet our overall national wood requirements and, in particular, to make available and market the sawlogs required for the housing programs we have authorized.

It was because of the handicaps imposed on our housing programs by the critical shortage of softwood lumber and plywood and consequent price spurts that we conducted our hearings.

We heard a large number of witnesses, representing every element in the picture—homebuilders, contractors, Federal agencies, the forest industries, the carpenters' and sawmill unions, conservation groups, foresters and others concerned with the available sawtimber and housing dilemma confronting the Nation.

The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, George Romney, put the problem clearly in his appearance before our subcommittee. Secretary Romney told us that, in order to sustain the housing programs we have established, we will need an additional annual production of 15 billion board feet of softwood lumber and plywood by 1978. Softwood lumber consumption last year ran to a record 35.1 billion board feet.

The Secretary said that there are three ways to increase the supply domestically.

He would have the private companies do a more efficient job without jeopardizing the future supply. He gave the private companies credit for doing better with their harvesting practices than public managers, but believes there is further room for improvements. Furthermore, he recognized the vast areas of privately owned woods and forests in the hands of farmers and small plot owners which, if efficiently managed, would make a significant contribution to make up the shortage.

Secondly, Secretary Romney believes that we should look at the Alaskan supply which is now all going to Japan. This is a transportation problem complictaed by the Jones Act, which requires the shipment of Alaskan lumber or logs in American bottoms.

Third—and this is by far the most important—Secretary Romney says we must take steps to make the harvest of our publicly owned lands more efficient. It is obvious that the 15 billion board feet that the Secretary reports is needed by 1978 can come out of the nationally owned forests without jeopardizing the protection of the natural resources necessary for recreation or conservation purposes.

Secretary Romney also informed us that the President, acting on the recommendations of the special White House task force on the problem, has directed the Departments of Agriculture and Interior to increase immediately the sales of Federal timber for manufacture into lumber and plywood by 1.1 billion board feet.

The President is to be commended for his prompt action. But, with a need for 15 billion more board feet per year, it is obvious that the President's action is only a first step, and that other actions are required to bring the production of softwood lumber and plywood up to the annual 15 billion addition feet required for housing for our people.

The Chief Forester of the United States, Mr. Edward Cliff, confirmed to our subcommittee his previous testimony before the Senate Committee on Small Business, on which I serve, last November, that on many national forest lands, production could be increased by two-thirds if the Forest Service were given sufficient funds, on a continuing basis, to build needed forest access roads and trails, and to employ sufficient personnel to intensify forest management. Many witnesses pointed out to us that forest management performance on industrial forest lands is superior to those presently possible on Federal lands, but that Federal management practices can be upgraded if assured long-term funding is provided.

The Chief Forester told us that, in response to the rapidly increasing needs for lumber and plywood, the Forest Service is seeking shortrun increases in timber sales through salvage and thinnings, but that this would require additional funds and personnel. It is worth noting that, in his directives to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, the President instructed both Departments promptly to present to the Appropriations Committees supplemental budget estimates to enable them to speed up their operations and make more sales of Federal timber possible.

Chief Forester Cliff indicated that appropriations for the work of the Forest Service have been running far behind authorizations. For example, in fiscal 1970, the Forest Service requested $170 million for access roads and trails, but only some $91 million had been appropriated.

He said that more access roads are needed to make increased timber harvest possible and that other management tools are needed, such as, use of genetically superior planting stock for reforestation; commercial thinnings which would utilize timber otherwise lost to mortality; noncommercial thinnings to release trees in stagnated stands; increased salvage of fire-and-insect-destroyed timber and closer utilization of the timber that is harvested to use residuals not now used commercially.

Mr. Cliff reported that, in 1970, his budget would be only 29.5 percent of the level that he said was needed to carry out an effective reforestation and stand improvement program. With such limited funds, his agency could not nearly carry out the intense forest management program so badly needed.

Mr. Cliff, in answers to questions from members of the subcommittee, said that the reduced appropriations for his agency have had an adverse effect on the availability of timber. Furthermore, he said increased spending is absolutely essential to increasing the output. However, it is not money lost but is, in fact, an excellent investment. He said that for each $1 million invested in planting and timber culture, we can add 11 million board feet of annual production, worth $215,000 yield annually at current sales prices.

On the consumer level, the most significant witness appearing before us was Mr. Eugene Gulledge, president of the National Association of Home Builders, which represents 75 percent of all housing constructed in the United States.

The residential construction industry, of course, represents the largest single consumer of softwood lumber and wood products in the country. Shortage of supply and uncertainty of lumber and plywood deliveries, Mr. Gulledge stated, is seriously affecting the ability of the homebuilding industry to produce the volume of housing required by the ever-expanding demand for new homes. Other types of construction, he said, also are being held back by the crisis.

While the housing industry's projection of private nonfarm housing starts for 1969 was, at the beginning of this year, in the range of 1.6 million new housing units as compared to 1.5 million starts in 1968, it now appears, according to Mr. Gulledge, that we may not reach the 1.6 million unit figure, which itself is one million units short of our national housing production goal.

This is a serious situation, when the need for new housing is at an historic peak.

The National Association of Home Builders declared that it appears that a shortage in available lumber of about 10 percent may already have developed. If this is true, Mr. Gulledge testified, then we are heading for even more serious price and supply problems as we undertake to reach higher housing production levels.

A clear, reasoned, and convincing case was presented to us by representatives of the Nation's lumber and plywood manufacturing and timber-growing industries. Spokesmen who formed a panel in presenting statements and answering questions included expert witnesses from the National Forest Products Association, Western Wood Products Association, American Plywood Association, Southern Pine Association, North West Timber Association, Industrial Forestry Association, Western Lumber Manufacturers, Inc., National Woodwork Manufacturers Association, and Western Forests Industries Association. In addition, we also received testimony from representatives of the Architectural Woodwork Institute, National American Wholesale Lumber Association, and the National Lumber and Building Materials Dealers Association.

We therefore had evidence from virtually every sector of the forest industries and the principal distributors and users of lumber and plywood. All expressed great concern about the problems we face, and made many suggestions for short-term and long-term solutions.

Basically, the forest industry spokesmen asserted that the current domestic situation can be blamed mostly on an inadequate supply of logs to meet growing domestic requirements and pressures for exports. Increased demand for lumber and plywood for house construction, they said, to meet needs for the 1.6 million new housing units projected for this year, plus a record export volume of 2.2 billion board feet of logs in 1968, have resulted in shortages of logs and timber available for immediate harvesting. They emphasized that the 1968 total softwood log production of about 38 billion feet, a record, was less than 2 percent of the total softwood timber inventory of more than 2 trillion board feet. Higher total log production to meet current demand levels, they testified, is justified by present timber inventory and growth rates.

Industry witnesses were unanimous in pointing out that since privately owned forest lands are now operated at peak capacities, the necessary increase must come from the great timber reservoirs of the Federal forests which are being operated at far below capacity. As one witness put it:

"The federal government holds the key to the log supply and to domestic wood prices in the way it chooses to manage this timber."

He declared that the additional timber required for our housing goals will not be available for cutting unless national timber policies are adjusted.

Testimony the committee received from industry witnesses and others about Alaskan forests as a possible source of some relief from the shortages was disturbing. There is a fairly extensive federally owned timber resource in southeastern Alaska, but it is unavailable to the domestic market because of the Jones Act requirements on intercoastal shipping.

The Jones Act requires that products moving in coastal and intercoastal shipping—see section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1927, as amended—between U.S. ports be shipped in American ships. This imposes a disadvantage of substantially higher freight rates than the rates prevailing for foreign registry shipping. The cost effect on lumber and plywood appears to be about a $20 per thousand board feet increase. The lack of a U.S. merchant fleet compounds the issue.

Consequently, the sizable amount of available Alaskan lumber that can be produced is unable to reach consuming markets in the United States without a prohibitive competitive disadvantage.

Consequently, Alaskan timbers and lumber are sold to Japan, thus depriving domestic users of this untapped domestic source of timber supply.

Suggestions were advanced by industry witnesses that the Jones Act should be repealed, or at least modified. Their objective is to allow Alaskan lumber to be moved to market in this country at the same rates, for example, as are enjoyed by Canadian lumber producers, who can, and do, move their lumber to Eastern United States markets in foreign flag ships.

The industry witnesses recommended six short-term proposals to relieve lumber and plywood availability problems:

First. Immediate sale offerings of the billion board feet of unsold allowable cut on national forests.

Second. Sale offerings of the full current annual allowable cut by stepping up road construction and timber preparation activities on national forests.

Third. National Forest timber sale offerings where little or minimum access road construction is needed.

Fourth. Exemption of Forest Service personnel from replacement restraints to assure the staff required for timber sale administration.

Fifth. Establishment of a team of specialists within the Forest Service to devise and execute an accelerated national timber sales program.

Sixth. Support for the Interstate Commerce Commission's recent general order for the return of boxcars suitable for lumber and plywood shipments, which has been a chronic to acute problem for forest products manufacturers.

On a long-term basis, the witnesses agreed that the only practical solution offering lasting relief from supply-demand crises is a national determination to utilize the Nation's forest resources in a way directly related to other national goals established in the interest of all the people—mainly, intensive and scientific management of our Federal timber.

They also emphasized that the Forest Service should have assurances of the long-term financing needed for roads and intensive management practices. In the past, they said, with ample or surplus availability of forest products, funds to apply intensive timber management on the national forests have been denied. Now, they pointed out, with untold millions of dollars in scarcity premiums at stake each year, a new look at providing the means for long-term financing for such intensive timber management is imperative.

The same point was stressed by the homebuilding industry in its presentation. The national goal of 26 million housing units over the next decade by new construction or rehabilitation, and a goal within this of 6 million units for low- and moderate-income families, as set forth under title XVI of the Housing Act of 1968, necessarily implies compatible and concurrent national timber policies and resource requirements. Mr. Gulledge, the housing industry representative also added that the current experience of lumber and plywood shortages shows the need for far more perceptive timber and resource management planning in conjunction with national housing needs. They are convinced, he told our subcommittee, that strong protection can be given, to our conservation and preservation interests in the continued life of our national forests, which they fully support, at the same time that the forests are put to work much more usefully for the interests of all the people in the Nation.

Conservation interests were represented before our subcommittee by witnesses from the Sierra Club, a large organization devoted to preserving wilderness and scenic areas throughout the country. They raised no objections to the proposals that the Forest Service increase its output of sawlogs from the commercial forest areas, provided this increase is carried out within the limits of sound forest management. Mr. Brock Evans, the Club's Pacific Northwest representative, stated that it would approve Federal commercial forest lands development to a greater extent if the best type of intensive forest management was pursued.

Testimony was also received from a representative of labor, Mr. Peter E. Terzick, general treasurer of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. Mr. Terzick was forthright in his statement that wages have very little effect on the dramatic increase in lumber and plywood over the last year. In reply to a question he pointed out that the union's 3-year contract expires this year but that, based on past experience, labor's wage demands are very small in relation to other prices. He also replied that there is no shortage of labor for the mills nor for lumbermen who do the cutting and logging in the forests. He also urged a study of pricing policies and the development by the government of a mechanism for maintaining stability over a period of time.

A further suggestion was advanced by several witnesses that some way should be found to permit the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to plow back a substantial part of their receipts from timber sales into more intensive timber management. This, of course, is a matter requiring legislation that is within the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committee, but we are convinced the proposal has high merit. We feel that it should be done, that this is one of the basic, necessary steps to put the forest policies of the Nation into phase with our housing programs and national requirements for softwood products.

We therefore strongly recommend that Congress carefully study this matter and consider bringing about the necessary adjustments through legislation.

The conclusion is inescapable that our Federal forests, containing such vast amounts of sawtimber, are woefully under-producing the amounts of logs, the Nation needs, and are perfectly capable of stepping up their outputs to the necessary levels if sustained, long-term funding for intensified forest management is made available—funding that can be repaid to the Federal Treasury from timber sales.

This is what is done in industrial forests and on certain State-owned timberlands It is also the system used on Department of Defense forest lands It has enabled them to reach excellent production levels far above the production levels of Federal forests As I understand it, Senator Richard Russell sponsored a provision in the Defense Department's 1961 Appropriations Act which authorized the Department to use a portion of its timber sales revenue to effect management costs As a result of this authority which, in effect, provided assured funds for up-to-date management of Department of Defense forests, the income from these forests has increased 2½ times and has resulted in a substantial return to the U.S. Treasury.

Another unfortunate fact that was developed in our hearings is the lack of funds has hampered construction of access roads in the Federal forests, with the result that in many areas, overmature trees, or stands damaged by windstorms, fire, disease, or insects cannot be harvested or salvaged and simply go to waste, reaching an estimated annual loss of 10 billion board feet of timber, nearly as much as is produced. This is a form of gross waste of a valuable natural resource. Not cutting trees that are ready for harvest, or which have been damaged by natural causes, is much like not harvesting fruit, wheat or other valuable foodstuffs when they are ripe for harvest. Just like growing food, overmature timber rots, or salvageable timber decays and rots, and goes to complete waste.

Scholars have termed this type of waste "waste by underuse."

In some areas, Federal timber management agencies have not had a chance even to inventory their standing timber. Or personnel is not available to prepare necessary bid schedules for selling trees that should be harvested.

Our problem in the South is somewhat different from that in the West. The large amount of interspersed timberlands in private hands calls for an even greater degree of cooperation by all concerned.

The Southern Pine Association advised our subcommittee that the South produced, mainly through large producers, 7 billion board feet, which was higher than the average 10 years prior thereto. This amounts to more than 20 percent of the total softwood lumber and plywood produced in the United States. At the same time, the pulpwood industry in the South quadrupled its production, and this industry, of course, draws upon the softwood reserve supply.

Since much of the timber supply in the South is in private hands, large and small, there is need for progressive cooperation in projects such as the Southern Forest Resources Analysis, combining the interests of manufacturers, farmers, and producers toward the objective of accelerated tree planting and timber stand improvements. There is a need also for the Government to increase its efforts for cooperation between industry, government, and private landowners, sponsoring at the same time efforts that can take advantage of education and advances in procedures and technology that can come from our institutions of higher learning.

The problems involved in bringing about solutions to our demand-supply-price problems fall within the jurisdiction of other committees of the Congress, particularly the Committees on Agriculture and Appropriations. I am reviewing these issues in this manner to bring them to the attention of these most effective committees so they will be aware of the problems and can bring their outstanding expertise to bear on finding solutions so that our housing goals are not thwarted.

I should like to draw attention to the following recommendations:

First. The urgent needs of our housing programs, and the high goals we have established as national policy require that prompt action be taken to increase the timber outputs of our forests.

Second. The greatest source of timber is owned by the Federal Government and, thus, our shortage can be relieved only by a greater utilization of the forest resources owned and operated by the Federal Government.

Third. Increasing the allowable cutting

from federally owned lands can be made without sacrificing the sustained yield principle provided there is proper funding and adoption of the latest silviculture techniques.

Fourth. Proper funding can only be effective if it is sustained over a long period of time. Sustained funding is an urgent necessity to enable Federal agencies to carry out a program of intense forest management without which we will never obtain the wood to meet our housing needs.

Fifth. Considerable more resources must be directed to developing advanced techniques for improving our knowledge of forestry. The Department of Agriculture should supply some of its great knowledge on increasing crop yields to the Nation's forests.

Sixth. More attention must be paid to improve the efficiency of privately owned forests and wood lots. Fifty-nine percent of all forest lands are owned privately and although such lands only have 18 percent of the inventory, I should think that a nationwide campaign to educate the private owners to the latest forestry techniques would bear fruit in future years.

Seventh. A thorough analysis should be directed to the pricing of lumber, starting at the Federal Government's own appraising and auctioning of saw-timber.

Eighth. The Commerce Committee should investigate the Jones Act in connection with shipping of lumber from Alaska and the Western States. As it is working now, the only beneficiary is Japan. Is there not some way to protect American shipping and still not deny domestic markets in the U.S. mainland from having access to Alaskan and Western lumber? Other transportation difficulties, including the shortage of boxcars, must be resolved also. I am pleased to note the action taken by President Nixon in this regard, but I hope this is not just a temporary measure.

Ninth. We should examine the import of lumber from Canada which, in 1968, amounted to 5.8 billion board feet. Considering the great potential untapped supply from our neighbor to the North, there is no reason why this could not be substantially increased. One impediment to increasing the import of plywood is the 20 percent tariff. I believe that we should study the tariff requirement and see whether our short supply of plywood needed to meet our national housing goals does not demand a repeal of this provision.

Tenth. The export of logs to Japan needs immediate attention. We have a major conflict of interests that must be resolved between Japan's housing plans, estimated at 1.9 million units for 1969, and the U.S. current production of 1.6 million units per year. This has both shortrun and longrun implications.

In the short run, witnesses before our subcommittee suggested that the United States explore with Japan the possibility of "borrowing" several million feet of logs it has purchased, but which are stockpiled in West Coast ports because of a shipping glut. This proposal suggests that the "borrowed" logs could be replaced later with other logs when a better flow of raw materials begins to come off the Federal forests. I feel this is a matter worthy of exploring, and could provide some temporary relief of our domestic shortage.

The Morse amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968, which I helped sponsor, has set a limitation of 350 million board feet on logs which can be sold from western Federal forests after January 1, 1969 for export to Japan. This figure is considered by most authorities to be a normal amount of export that could be supplied without serious effects on the domestic forest industries.

The Morse amendment also provides that logs not covered by the act can be prevented from being substituted for logs by covered logs within the discretion of the Department. Apparently it will be some little time before the relief envisioned by the amendment can become effective.

This is a complicated issue. I fully recognize, but I urge that the Departments of Agriculture and Interior consider the early implementation of the Morse amendment in relation to the Nation's housing needs and the recent crises in lumber and plywood price and supply.

Eleventh. Substitutes for lumber products in construction of both residential and nonresidential buildings must be developed. The plastic and concrete products, steel and aluminum industries have already come forth with many innovations that should be encouraged.

A fundamental issue we face lies in striking a proper balance between the management of our forest resources, and their production and sale of timber, and the requirements of the American people for forest products. The two elements—national needs and management and use of our natural resources—are utterly out of phase. They must be meshed and put into phase in order to accomplish our national housing goals.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, my very able colleague, the Honorable JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Senator from Alabama, has just introduced a bill to establish policy for more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands and to establish a higher timber yield fund.

This bill is of vital importance to my constituents in the State of Montana, where the Federal Government owns 68.2 percent of all commercial forest land in the State.

Certainly few States in this Nation are more cognizant of the need for better management leading to greater timber yield from the Federal forests than is the State of Montana. Although Montana is not faced with the immediate problem of finding housing for the many millions of urban dwellers, we in the State are concerned with the problem of providing the basic raw material—lumber and plywood—to provide that needed housing.

The Housing Act of 1968 was a great stride forward in establishing the national goal of 2.6 million housing units annually for the next decade to meet the requirements of our Nation. It was with a great shock that we in the Senate discovered that not only was there not appropriate availability to a supply of timber, the basic raw material for housing, but that the fault lay with the Federal Government itself. This fact was brought out in the week-long hearings held by the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Both the subcommittee and the full committee are chaired by our colleague from the State of Alabama, and I have the utmost respect and admiration for his single-minded purpose and clear perception in determining the problem and seeking an equitable solution to it.

Of great importance to me as a Senator from the State of Montana is that Senator SPARKMAN's bill provides for intensive management of commercial forest land now under Federal ownership. We in Montana recognize the need for family recreation in the outdoors, and praise the Forest Service for providing, within its present limited budget, both comercial forestry and developed outdoor recreation on the national forests as well as grazing, fish and wildlife, and watershed values.

We also recognize that there is need for wilderness areas specifically set aside for man to enjoy the great experience of solitude in the magnificent high alpine country of Montana. We have now in Montana more than 3 million acres in reserved classification, including the first of the wilderness areas, the Bob Marshall Wilderness, named for that great conservationist and forest ranger, Bob Marshall, and established as one of the very first wilderness areas under Forest Service administration edict in 1940.

It therefore is a great compliment to my colleague that his bill provides for adequate and intensive management of commercial forest land to meet the housing requirements of the Nation, and yet recognizes that existing wilderness areas also serve a purpose. As a nation we have carefully considered, and provided for man's spiritual and recreational needs. It is appropriate now, in the face of urgent housing requirements, that we fulfill man's housing needs. This can be done through Senator SPARKMAN's bill.

The actions of Senator SPARKMAN in first, defining the problem through public hearings on the subject, and then following through with legislation to solve that problem, are a fine example of his outstanding statesmanship and devotion to his responsibilities as the chairman of the committee which has done so much for all our people in this area.

The Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is composed of many dedicated men, anxious to do the job that their country demands of them in meeting the wood needs of the Nation. This bill provides the tools for them to do their job. I earnestly hope that the Congress and the administration will combine to enable these dedicated Forest Service personnel to do the job of which they are capable and provide them with the legislative and fiscal needs to do it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I address the Senate today on a matter of importance to the residents of my own great State of Illinois as well as to the Nation. This is the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from the State of Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) which would establish a policy for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands.

Although the Senator from Alabama serves on the opposite side of the aisle, his concern for the shelter needs of the Nation transcends political boundaries. So must that of all of us. President Nixon has demonstrated the national concern for housing and its components through the establishment of a Cabinet-level task force to study softwood lumber and plywood supply which are directly relative to fulfilling that housing goal.

That task force, under the able direction of the Honorable Robert P. Mayo, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, has made some specific recommendations which the President has ordered carried out. But this is only the beginning of the trail leading toward the solution of the problem. Both the task force and the Senate hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), have found that there is a shortage, not in timber itself, for we are blessed with vast potential forest acreages. The problem is availability of that timber.

The problem was brought into sharp focus by the Housing Act of 1968. That law, sponsored by Senator SPARKMAN, established a national goal of 26 million new housing units to be built during the next 10 years. We have no great commercial forests in Illinois of the size of which Senator SPARKMAN's bill speaks—indeed, we are more familiar with rolling cornfields rather than acres of housing—but the use of lumber itself is of great concern in our gigantic metropolitan areas. We in Illinois are deeply and greatly concerned with the needs of our city and suburban dwellers for adequate housing at a price they can afford. The Sparkman bill provides the answer to those needs which has been determined both by the extensive hearings his subcommittee has held and by the studies conducted by the Cabinet-level task force of President Nixon.

Trees, like any other replenishable vegetation, are a crop, and as such, must be cared for, even as we in Illinois care for our fields of corn to provide lush, productive and financially contributive stands.

I notice with great interest that Senator SPARKMAN's bill makes provision for the development and procurement of seed or stock with superior growth characteristics for the creation of what might be termed a "supertree."

I presume we have not thought of it quite in that light, but having been nurtured close to the soil and still trying to keep my feet planted on the bosom of this sweet earth, I think of all these living and growing things as crops, and that is true of the tree. It is only that it takes longer to produce a tree, and I would assume it is going to take longer to produce a supertree.

I am not like the lady who went to the grocery store and asked the proprietor, "Do you have tree seed?"

He said, "Yes, madam."

She said, "Well, give me a couple of packages."

Then, she said, "While you are about it, throw in a couple of hooks for our hammock." She thought she was going to get the hammock hitched up "like right now." I am afraid she did not know how nature works. But there must be something like a supertree, and that, of course, fits into this scheme of things.

Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Alabama. Incidentally, the distinguished Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, had developed a bill of his own but I think he substantially concurs in the Sparkman bill. We do not mean by this commendation and this endorsement that there will not be some amendatory language that might be engrafted in that bill when it comes to the floor of the Senate.

You will recall, Mr. President, that the State of Illinois is a leader in the growth and harvest of the magnificent hybrid corn which graces our dinner tables here and around the world today. Certainly it is no less important that the techniques of hybridization which have proven so valuable in the production of our golden corn also be utilized in the production of mighty new trees from which will come the needed lumber and plywood products to provide shelter for even the smallest resident of our cities, towns, and villages so that he may grow and mature in that home atmosphere which is so vital to the development of all citizens of this proud Nation of ours.

Mr. President, the importance of the softwood lumber supply to the homebuilding industry is well known. What is not perhaps appreciated so much but what should be of serious concern to all of us here has been the very marked sharp increase in the price of lumber. In some instances, in the price of a $20,000 home, plywood has increased in price 100 percent and 2-by-4 and other softwood lumber products have gone up from 50 to 80 percent.

The increase in cost is serious but even more critical are the difficulties involved in contracting and making construction commitments because of advancing prices. Nondelivery of lumber because of price fluctuation causes serious delays in production schedules and the scheduling of labor requirements. This has resulted in many small homebuilders finding themselves in a straitened financial condition.

I certainly do hope that action can be taken to improve the prospects of Americans who are seeking decent housing at a reasonable cost. Lumber is a basic commodity required in construction and its shortage has resulted in the accelerated construction cost-squeeze experience. A concentrated and serious effort should be made to utilize wisely the existing resources to alleviate housing shortages.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Alabama for his measure to provide sufficient timber from Federal commercial lands to make it possible for the Nation to attain its projected housing goal of 26 million units in the next decade and to guarantee our people all the benefits of well managed forests forever. I believe that the homes of America will deterwell-managed forests forever. I believe God willing, that we will realize and execute those laws which make them so.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have joined with the chairman of our Banking Committee (Mr. SPARKMAN) in sponsoring a bill titled "The National Timber Supply Act of 1969," because I believe that an approach of the type contemplated in this bill could greatly increase the productivity of our national forests.

The need for additional production has already been recognized by the White House. Last month President Nixon announced a series of actions aimed at making 1.1 billion board feet of lumber available for sale immediately to ease the pressures on the building materials market. He also ordered restriction of Defense Department procurement of softwood lumber and plywood, and directed the Interior Department to increase the sale of timber from land controlled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Land Management. These actions may provide a measure of temporary relief. But they will not do the job that needs to be done. If there is to be an increase in harvesting from our forests, there must also be an increase in production, and restricting the use of wood products cannot be considered other than for a very short period.

Secretary Romney testified before the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees that it will take 15 billion additional feet of timber annually to meet the Nation's housing demands by 1978. This is in line with testimony from the Chief of the Forest Service. Others show these figures to be conservative.

This Congress, last year, set the Nation's 10-year housing goals at 26 million units, 2.6 million units a year, with 6 million to be built for low-income families. Such goals cannot possibly be met unless we take action to provide the necessary resources.

We can meet the timber needs of this Nation. We can increase the yields of our national forests. And do it all without—and I repeat, without—jeopardizing the long-range ability of those forests to become continually more productive in perpetuity.

In the private sector, forest yields have already been increased substantially. These methods must now be applied to our Federal lands. The techniques being employed to increase yields on many of our private forests have been used for years. In the field of agriculture, for example, harvest increases have been spectacular since 1950; wheat yields have increased from 19 to 25 bushels an acre. Rice yields have grown from 2,300 pounds to 4,400 pounds an acre. Peanut yields have increased from 900 to 1,800 pounds an acre, and corn yields have gone from 48 to 73 bushels. Many of our major crops have doubled in yield since World War II.

The private forest industry is now applying the same techniques to trees. In the South, the International Paper Co. has already launched its dynamic forest program based on a "supertree." And as a result, the company has developed trees that mature faster, grow taller, and contain more and higher quality usable wood than ever before.

The Weyerhaeuser Co. in the far West, as the result of what it calls a "high yield forestry program," has reported similar increases in forest production. As a result of its efforts, the firm will be able to increase the harvest of wood fiber on its forests as much as 33 percent.

Before I was made aware of the efforts leading to the bill which the chairman has introduced today, I had begun an investigation to determine what could be done most appropriately to improve the management of our forests under the supervision of both the Department of Interior and the Forest Service. I had written to Secretaries Hickel and Hardin expressing my concern over the rapidly rising cost of lumber to the housing industry. I mentioned in those letters that I was considering legislation which would authorize the use of the funds received from timber in our forests for the management of those forests. I did not have sufficient data on which to determinne whether all of the funds other than those which are presently earmarked for other purposes could be appropriately used, whether they would be sufficient to do the job which could be done, or whether the revenues would be in excess of the amount needed for intensive forestry management. I asked these two Departments to provide me with some guidelines regarding the funds needed and provide me with information as to what they could do to improve their present practices. I have not yet received the information necessary for me to make a final determination as to how the funding could best be accomplished. In the absence of that information, I have decided it would be appropriate for me to cosponsor the bill which has just been introduced with a few comments on some of the provisions of the bill as it is presently drafted which concern me and others who have become its cosponsors.

In order for the forests to be properly managed, it is necessary that those who are in charge of their management be able to depend on the funds required to accomplish their goals. This bill sets up a system whereby a trust fund would be used to provide such funds. Then it limits the use of the moneys credited to that fund by requiring that they can be used only if appropriated by the Congress. The very problem which has resulted in the present deficient level of production is the lack of appropriations. We should be careful not to go through the whole process of setting up a trust fund, yet restrict the use of the funds therein so that they are not readily available. I feel sure that this provision was included in order to allay criticism that Congress would not have the power to control the use of the funds. The appropriations process, however, could destroy the very purpose of a trust fund. And I believe it might be a better approach to provide congressional review over the program instead of the necessity for annual appropriations. I am of the opinion that it would be desirable for the Congress to set up guidelines for the use of the funds and then authorize the Forest Service to manage the forests within those guidelines. I am also concerned about the provision in the bill which requires that the funds "be allocated in each fiscal year for expenditure in each national forest in substantially the same proportion as the amount of money contributed to the fund from such national forest in the immediately preceding 2 fiscal years bears to the total amount of money contributed to the fund from all the national forests in such preceding 2 fiscal years." We had testimony relating to this provision during our hearings, and the Chief of the Forest Service, Edward P. Cliff, explained that if this were to be the case, Oregon, Washington, and California would be getting most of the attention and some of the places where we have a job of building a forest almost from scratch would not receive the funds necessary to take care of their development.

It seems to me, therefore, in conjunction with the suggestion made earlier in my remarks that it would be more appropriate for Congress to set up guidelines making money available to the areas from which the funds are derived in order that they be intensively managed but that the Forest Service have authority to use any additional funds for the establishment or rebuilding of other areas which may be producing very little or perhaps no revenue at the present time.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that there is no question that our timber resources are being strained at the present time and that demands on them will increase significantly in the future. It is imperative that we recognize this as a national problem. The land we live in can be characterized as the land of plenty only if we husband and manage our resources with extreme care and with a high degree of professional skill. In this way we can both conserve them and use them to meet the challenging needs of this Nation. These needs can only be met if we are willing to provide funds for intensive forest management which could increase production by as much as two-thirds. It is my view that we can increase the lumber productivity of our forests without diminishing their use for other important purposes. As I have expressed, the bill introduced by the chairman of our Banking Committee, Senator SPARKMAN, is an important step in this direction. I have explained my differences with the bill as drafted and intend to do what I can to see that the proposal and the alternative recommendations get early consideration by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, adequate housing for all Americans, particularly lower income families, has been a compelling spur to my activities ever since the citizens of Illinois accorded me the privilege of serving in this distinguished body.

There can be no question that the widespread unrest in our Nation today has many of its roots in the overcrowding imposed upon the less fortunate members of our society by the failure of the Nation to keep pace with housing demands.

Neither can there be any question that the worthy purposes of the Housing Act of 1968, specifically designed to overcome this national housing deficiency, will be thwarted unless the Congress of the United States acts positively to support the Housing Act by providing the materials necessary to erect and rehabilitate 2.6 million units annually.

Today we find ourselves in a crisis with respect to the price and availability of America's fundamental construction materials—lumber and plywood. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee has conducted extensive hearings to determine the root cause for the sharp escalation of prices for these building products and their apparent insufficiency.

It became evident as the record developed that the Federal Government itself may be responsible for the current shortages and high prices for softwood lumber and plywood. Sixty percent of the Nation's softwood timber inventory is owned and administered by the National Government. Many of the witnesses testified that the principal reason for the current softwood crisis resides in the fact that Federal softwood timber has not been available for product manufacture on a scale dictated by the Nation's housing needs.

Even the Chief of the Forest Service has testified that the timber harvest in the national forests can be increased by as much as two-thirds with assurances of sustained investment for stand improvement, access roads, and the application of modern management and sale techniques.

The principal action that remains to bring wood building materials availability into line with national housing goals is positive action by the Congress. It would be paradoxical indeed if those of us who strove to hammer out a workable national housing law were to fail now to make available from Federal lands the timber necessary to make that law workable.

I therefore endorse the National Timber Supply Act proposed by the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Alabama and supported by the ranking minority Member, the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT).

I shall work for passage of this measure which holds the key to realization of our national housing goals. Unless we solve the problem of material supply which is now upon us we shall never be able to realize the promise of the Housing Act of 1968. Availability of housing for our people is a national obligation. We must act positively to rebuild America's homes and communities and we must do it now.

As Senator BENNETT has so ably pointed out, there are two provisions of this bill that concern me.

Making expenditures from the trust fund contingent upon annual congressional appropriations would undermine the theory of a trust fund. The problem in the past in obtaining adequate timber supply from Federal lands has been this very lack of congressional appropriations. I believe that Congress could well limit itself to the legislative oversight function.

The provision that allocations of funds from the trust fund be in proportion to receipts contributed from each national forest seems backwards. This would mean that those forests that are well managed would receive the bulk of the funds, but those that are undeveloped would not receive assistance.

I believe that these problems can be corrected in the committee and therefore endorse this step to help meet the urgent lumber needs so vital to the success of the Nation's housing program.

S. 1836—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL SEED ACT

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I offer, for consideration and appropriate reference, a bill amending the Federal Seed Act to establish uniform standards for certification of seed moving in interstate or international commerce.

The legislation which I propose would require that the certification be accorded only by an agency specifically authorized by a State, territory or possession for that purpose and which operates under standards and procedures approved by the Secretary of Agriculture to assure genetic purity and identity of the seed certified.

Certification for international commerce under my amendment could be made only by an agency of a foreign country determined by the Secretary to be adhering to standards comparable to those set for domestic certification.

Advertising or labeling of seed as certified which has not been approved by such a qualified agency would be prohibited under the amendment.

The need for uniform standards seems obvious in light of the vast volume of seed now moving in interstate or international commerce and which under existing law might meet the standards set by one State or country but be unacceptable in another area. Uniformity would also better protect the interests of both seed producers and consumers.

My proposal has the endorsement of the Association of Official Seed Certifying Agencies, the American Seedman's Association, and the North Carolina Crop Improvement Association and will, I believe, be favorably received by the Department of Agriculture.

I sincerely hope that it will be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1836) to amend the Federal Seed Act (93 Stat. 1275), as amended, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1846—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL—REVISION OF SYSTEM OF NOMINATIONS TO THE U.S. SERVICE ACADEMIES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to revise the system of nominations to the U.S. service academies.

Joining me as cosponsors of this legislation are Senators Eagleton, Hart, Hughes, Kennedy, Moss, Packwood, Pell, Percy, Ribicoff, Williams of New Jersey, and Yarborough.

Basically, the bill does nothing but eliminate Members of Congress from participation in the academies' selection process. Authority for nominating is transferred to the appropriate Secretaries of the armed services, who will select candidates based on geographical distribution and admission standards established by them in cooperation with the academic boards of the various academies.

I introduce this bill, because I can see no substantial reason—which I have not been able to see since I came to Congress—to justify the role which Members of Congress presently play in the academies' admissions procedures.

I firmly believe that every young man in this country should have an equal opportunity to attend one of the service academies and admission should be based solely on the merit of each applicant's qualifications. Establishment of uniform standards by the academies themselves would be the best means of assuring the acceptance of the best qualified candidates.

Aside from insuring the high quality of our future military leaders, however, a more strictly competitive selection process would be more equitable to the applicants themselves. Under the present system, a Member of Congress can make a principal nomination, and if the applicant passes his examination, he is appointed. An alternate nominee, however, who might score much higher on the examination will be rejected unless the principal fails. In the new system, all candidates will compete on an equal footing.

In surrendering our congressional prerogative in these appointments, we shall lose the opportunity to reward outstanding young people from the areas we represent in the Congress. I am well aware that we shall probably lose some political advantages, but will gain much more. Until very recently, we held the same special right or privilege of appointment with regard to post office positions. But these procedures within the Post Office Department have now been reformed on the basis that politics has no rightful place in the efficient operation of our postal service. Leadership of the armed services is, of course, even more crucial, and politics has no place in the selection of our military leaders.

We can no longer afford the luxury of the risk inherent in a procedure where others than the best qualified may be appointed to our service academies. The danger in this system is best illustrated by the fact that Gen. George C. Marshall entered the career military service through the back door as he was denied an appointment to West Point because of political differences between his father and his Congressman.

I believe, Mr. President, that maintaining the obsolete system of congressional nominations and appointments to the U.S. service academies is totally unjustifiable. It undermines efficiency. It promotes inequity. It defies logic.

I hope it will be possible for the Senate to take prompt and favorable action on this legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1846) to revise the system of congressional nominations for appointments to the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy, introduced by Mr. Dodd (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1849—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to introduce a piece of legislation which I hope will be helpful in the present discussion about adequacy and availability of medicare, medicaid, and the Kerr-Mills legislation.

Many States—including New Mexico—have been driven to the wall by the fantastic costs of medicaid. Other States, which do not now have medicaid, are apprehensive over their prospective entry into the program. States must have medicaid programs by January 1, 1970, or else become ineligible for Federal matching funds toward any medical vendor payment expenditures.

There are a number of reasons for the present chaos in medicaid. Certainly the investigation now being conducted into medicaid as well as medicare, by the Finance Committee will help pinpoint many of the specific trouble spots. But the principal problems have already surfaced; namely, we are frequently paying too much for too many kinds of care for too many people.

Costs have assumed stratospheric proportions for one thing because liberalized reimbursement procedures for medical and other services under medicaid have been accompanied by almost geometric jumps in the costs of hospital, nursing home, medical and dental care.

Under present law a State which does not as yet have medicaid cannot enter the program as carefully as it might want to—it cannot test the medicaid water with a cautious foot. Under present law States which have had their medicaid programs immerse them in water far over their heads face obstacles in trying to reach a point where they can stand up.

My own State of New Mexico is now going through an agonizing period of fiscal crisis and indecision brought about by the costs of a medicaid program which far exceeded cost estimates and appropriations. New York, Massachusetts, and other States have undergone and are undergoing this same fiscal frustration. Confronted with this situation our legislature voted to drop the whole program. They authorized reentry into medicaid at a later date but only on the most minimal basis necessary to qualify for Federal matching funds.

But even this most minimal basis poses problems for New Mexico. Under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's interpretation of section 1902 (c) of the Social Security Act, New Mexico cannot exclude from its medicaid plan any of the medical or other health services which it provided under its most liberal programs for any category of welfare recipients prior to medicaid. Furthermore, under that section it cannot even limit the extent of a service previously provided. For example, if New Mexico covered all prescribed drugs for people on welfare before it entered medicaid it cannot now say that we will exclude tranquilizers or aspirin or whathave-you.

This means New Mexico is locked into the program with a vengeance. It cannot modify or adjust its medicaid plan to meet changing needs or available funds.

Mr. President, the legislation which I will introduce today repeals section 1902(c). States will thereby gain breathing room. They can still have broad programs and secure full Federal matching funds—but they will not be required to have such programs. States will still be required to provide five basic services: inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital care, other laboratory and X-ray services, skilled nursing home care; and physician services. They will not be required, however, if my amendment is adopted, to go beyond provision of those services.

A related provision is also repealed by my amendment. Section 1903(e) says that States may not receive Federal matching for medicaid now unless they are moving now in the direction of providing comprehensive care and services and liberalized eligibility requirements by 1975 including coverage of people not even eligible for Federal matching payments. A number of States view this provision as mandated bankruptcy no later than 1975.

Repeal of those two provisions will in no way reduce the amounts available to any State in the form of Federal matching payments. This amendment is designed simply to give our 50 States an opportunity to determine what kind of medicaid program they are capable of financing.

Mr. President, I ask that this bill be received and appropriately referred. I sincerely hope this urgent and emergency proposal will be acted upon promptly and favorably by Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1849) to amend title 19 of the Social Security Act to permit States greater flexibility in establishing and modifying medicaid plans, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1856—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as ranking Republican on the Senate Subcommittee on Education, I am happy to introduce on behalf of the administration, for appropriate reference, the National Science Foundation Act of 1969.

After careful deliberation, Congress revised the National Science Foundation's organic statute by the passage of Public Law 90–407 in July 1968. The act assigned new areas of responsibility to the Foundation, including the authorization to initiate and support applied research in academic institutions; broadened authority for carrying out certain important activities in international science and computers for research and education; and strengthened the Foundation's organizational structure.

Congress also opened new pathways of communication between the executive and legislative branches by requiring an annual report from the National Science Board, and by providing for specific authorizations for future Foundation appropriations.

In accordance with this new legislative framework, Mr. President, the bill I am introducing today to authorize appropriations for the Foundation for fiscal year 1970 is the first bill submitted to Congress under this new act. It is my hope that authorization hearings will follow promptly and that these hearings will not only provide an improved information channel, but will also create better understanding.

In the course of its 19 years of existence the National Science Foundation has evolved a complex and interlocking system of support mechanisms for obtaining scientific information through scientific research and science education and by improving and upgrading science facilities and institutions.

The purposes of this system, in the broadest sense, are to promote the progress of science and to advance the national welfare through the search for new knowledge and the training of scientific manpower. These objectives of the science and education enterprise are of unique importance to our whole society, both today and for the future.

However, the benefits and opportunities to our society generated through support of science and education also create new problems. Accordingly, it is intended that Congress, through its annual hearings on authorizations for the Foundation, will evaluate and examine in detail the programs proposed by the Foundation to implement its continuing and newly authorized responsibilities.

Because this is the first appropriation authorization under the new act, Mr. President, it seems desirable to provide funding authorization for but 1 year, in keeping with past annual appropriation procedures in similar situations. Furthermore, since it is important to allow the Foundation the maximum degree of flexibility and discretion in using its resources to best fulfill its mandate—an authority it has had in the past—the bill provides an authorization for the general purposes of the Foundation.

As we gain more experience under the new act, Mr. President, Congress can determine whether this broad coverage adequately meets its legislative purposes or whether more detailed provisions are needed in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a section-by-section analysis of this measure be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and the section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1856) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROUTY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1856

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, to enable it to carry out its powers and duties under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and under title IX of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $487,000,000.

SEC. 2. Appropriations made pursuant to authority provided in section 1 shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure, for such period or periods as may be specified in Acts making such appropriations.

SEC. 3. Appropriations made pursuant to this Act may be used, but not to exceed $2,500, for official reception and representation expenses upon the approval or authority of the Director, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

SEC. 4. In addition to such sums as are authorized by section 1 hereof, not to exceed $3,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside the United States to be paid for in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

SEC. 5. This Act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Act of 1969".

The analysis, presented by Mr. PROUTY, follows:

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

SECTION I

This section authorizes NSF appropriations for FY 1970 in the amount of $487 million. This authorization conforms to the totals shown in the President's budget presentation except that funds in the amount of $20,000,000 which appear in the budget are not included in this bill because the money is available from prior appropriations. It does not include authorization for appropriations under the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966 which has already been authorized for FY 1970.

SECTION II

This section provides that when specified in an Appropriation Act, amounts appropriated may remain available without fiscal year limitation.

SECTION III

This section authorizes an allowance of up to $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses to be authorized at the discretion of the Director.

SECTION IV

This section authorizes, in addition to the funds appropriated by Section I, an appropriation of up to $3 million for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside of the United States, to be financed from foreign currencies which are determined by the Treasury Department to be in excess of the normal operating requirements of the United States Government. These funds would be spent in foreign countries to support programs mutually determined by NSF and the State Department to be in the interests of improving international relations through scientific endeavor.

SECTION V

This section cites the title of the Authorization Act.

S. 1859—INTRODUCTION OF THE CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL ACT OF 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park in Maryland and the District of Columbia.

This legislation would give proper status and full recognition to the historic 185-mile Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. It would expand the canal property enough to permit the full development of its vast recreational potential, the restoration and interpretation of its historic assets, and the conservation and protection of its great scenic and natural resources.

Toward these goals, the bill establishes a framework for cooperative action by the Secretary of the Interior, State and local governments, and private individuals and groups, under the general guidance of a Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission, to include representatives of the basin States and the counties through which the canal runs.

I am introducing this bill today as a vehicle for concrete discussion and as a starting point for the action which should not be further delayed. Next weekend, for example, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Association, which has worked for over 15 years to rescue the canal, is holding its annual reunion and hike. The Secretary of the Interior is now reviewing many projects before submitting park proposals to Congress. Next week the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments will be meeting with the Secretary to discuss many significant possibilities. Meanwhile, citizens groups throughout the basin have been meeting to refine their thinking, review alternatives, and shape concrete recommendations and priorities for action.

The last several years have been ones of great activity and discussion in the Potomac Basin. We have gained a new public appreciation of the basin's vast resources—ample water, beautiful and varied scenery, fish and wildlife, open space, and more than 300 years of history. We have focused public attention on the problems of pollution, rapid population growth, and haphazard development which have already created severe problems in the Washington metropolitan area, and have already begun to spread into the upper and lower basin as well.

Most important, we have gained a new sense of urgency. The time to act is now. We will not have another chance.

From my many discussions with basin officials and citizens, I have sensed growing agreement that a comprehensive program for the Potomac should be based on several principles. These emerge from the character of the basin, its long history of human activity, and the tradition of cooperation among Federal, State, and local governments and the citizens who have so often taken the lead in basin conservation.

As I enunciated these principles in January, they include:

First, immediate restoration, protection, and improvement of valuable properties, such as the C. & O. Canal, which are already in public ownership;

Second, a well-financed, farsighted attack on the many forms of water pollution which plague the river;

Third, a framework which recognizes citizen initiatives and local and State governments' roles, as well as the Federal interest, and gives all parties an active voice in planning and administration;

Fourth, a park structure which is compatible with other present and future efforts in the basin, such as the proposed water resources compact, State recreational plans, and the activities of regional groups, and will encourage cooperation rather than competition; and

Fifth, imaginative use of many land conservation and protection methods, such as easements, zoning, and private voluntary action, with incentives for local action.

The bill I am introducing today is intended to advance the first of these objectives, by establishing the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park to meet immediate recreational and conservation needs and provide a central strand for more comprehensive, cooperative park development. I want to emphasize that this bill is only a first step—but it is a step which, from all indications, the vast majority of basin residents and governments support. Given this backing, I believe that this work should go forward now, even as we continue to design more comprehensive plans for meeting the basin's long-range needs.

Given the current economic condition of the Nation, this is one of the few park initiatives which can realistically be undertaken at this moment. The hour is tailormade for the project, and the project is tailormade for the hour.

Mr. President, I believe that development of the canal should not wait until the millenium when all of the divergent interests and groups in the basin come together behind one grand master design. By the same token, I believe that other works should continue—and indeed be accelerated—while we seek congressional and public consideration of canal legislation.

As one basin official, I am continuing my review of many ways to meet the needs of the Potomac and its estuary, to combine and refine the best thinking of all interested governments and the public, and to employ all of our energies and resources not only to save the Potomac, but to insure its future health.

I shall be speaking on these questions in the coming weeks. Meanwhile, I shall seek prompt congressional hearings and wide public discussion of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent to include the text of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Act of 1969 at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1859) to establish and develop the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MATHIAS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1859

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Act of 1969."

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) "Park" means the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, as herein established.

(b) "Canal" means the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, including its towpath.

(c) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(d) "State" means any State, and includes the District of Columbia.

(e) "Local government" means any political subdivision of a State, including a county, municipality, city, town, or a school or other special district created pursuant to State law.

(f) "Person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, private nonprofit organization, or club.

(g) "Landowner" means any person, local government, or State owning, or on reasonable grounds professing to own, lands or interests in lands adjacent to or in the vicinity of the Park.

SEC. 3. (a) In order to realize the full potential of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal for public recreational use and enjoyment, and to preserve, restore and interpret the historic, scenic and natural features of the Canal, there is hereby established the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, in the States of Maryland and West Virginia and in the District of Columbia. The park as initially established shall comprise those particular properties in Federal ownership, containing approximately five thousand two hundred and fifty acres, including those properties along the line of the Canal in the State of Maryland and appurtenances in the State of West Virginia designated by Presidential proclamation No. 3391 (75 Stat. 1023) as the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Monument, and those properties along the line of the Canal between Rock Creek in the District of Columbia and the terminus of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Monument near the mouth of Seneca Creek in the State of Maryland. The park shall also include such additional lands and interests in lands as may be acquired by the Secretary pursuant to this Act.

(b) The Secretary is hereby authorized to acquire through donation, purchase, easement, lease for terms of up to fifty years, or exchange such lands and interests in lands adjacent to or in the vicinity of the park as he deems appropriate for development and expansion of public recreational facilities, for the restoration and interpretation of major historical and engineering features of the Canal, and for the protection of scenic and natural values: *Provided*, That the total land area of such park, including land already in Federal ownership, shall not exceed fifteen thousand acres.

(c) In keeping with the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to convey such lands presently in Federal ownership which may be determined surplus to the needs of the park in exchange for other lands or interests therein of approximately equal value, except that in no instance may the continuity of the canal be interrupted. The Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

(d) Any portion of the lands and interests in lands comprising the park shall be made available upon specific Federal statutory authorization for public nonpark uses when such uses shall have been found to have a greater public necessity than the uses authorized by this Act.

Sec. 4. (a) As soon as possible after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in cooperation with appropriate local authorities, shall initiate a comprehensive title search and survey to determine the exact boundaries of the Federal lands initially comprising the park. The results of said search and survey, with accompanying maps, shall be made available for public inspection, and the Secretary shall allow the public at least one hundred and twenty days to comment on or question any of the findings, and shall attempt to resolve any conflicts before filing the results of the survey with the Administrator of the General Services Administration.

(b) Nothing in this section shall preclude or restrict a landowner or the Secretary in seeking adjudication or resolution of conflicting claims to land in connection with any donation, purchase, easement, lease, exchange or agreement authorized by this Act.

Sec. 5. (a) The Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative programs and agreements with persons, local governments and States to carry out and promote the purposes of this Act, including public recreation, historic restoration and interpretation, conservation of agricultural or forest lands, preservation of scenic values, wildlife propagation, and related objectives.

(b) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall take into account local and State development, land use, conservation and recreational plans affecting or relating to areas in the vicinity of the canal, and shall, consistent with the purposes of this Act, exercise the authority granted by this Act in a manner that will not conflict with such local or State plans.

Sec. 6. (a) The enactment of this Act shall not affect adversely any valid rights heretofore existing, or any valid permits heretofore issued, within or relating to areas authorized for inclusion in the park.

(b) The authority granted in the Act of August 1, 1953 (67 Stat. 359), to grant easements for rights-of-way through, over, or under lands along the line of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal is hereby continued and shall hereafter be exercised by the Secretary with respect to lands included in the park.

(c) Where privately owned lands are located between the park and the Potomac River, the owners of those lands shall have access to their lands, subject only to such restrictions or requirements as the Secretary may find essential to the preservation and sound management of the park.

(d) Authority is hereby granted for individuals to cross the park by foot and by the most direct route at any point for the purpose of gaining access to the Potomac River or to non-park lands for hunting purposes, in accord with State law, provided that while such individuals are on park lands firearms are unloaded, bows are unstrung, and dogs are on leash.

Sec. 7. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the Secretary shall administer the park under the general laws and requirements governing areas of the national park system, in such manner as to advance the purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That the Secretary, after consultation with the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission established by section 8 of this act, may make such modifications and changes in the general regulations and requirements as are within his statutory discretion, and are made appropriate or necessary by the unique character of the park.

(b) No fees shall be charged by the Secretary for public day use of the park for recreational purposes.

Sec. 8. (a) There is hereby established a Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of twenty-one members appointed for terms of five years each, as follows:

(1) Eight members to be appointed by the boards of commissioners or the county councils, as the case may be, of Montgomery, Frederick, Washington, and Allegany Counties, Maryland, two members to be appointed by each such board or council, as the case may be.

(2) Eight members to be appointed by the Governor of the State of Maryland, the Governor of the State of West Virginia, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, two members to be appointed by each such Governor or Commissioner, as the case may be.

(3) Five members to be appointed by the Secretary, at least three of whom shall be members of regularly constituted conservation organizations, and one of whom shall be designated Chairman of the Commission.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation. The Secretary is authorized to pay, upon vouchers signed by the Commission, the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission and its members in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act.

(e) The Secretary shall, from time to time but at least semiannually, meet with, report to and consult with the Commission on general policies and specific matters related to the development and administration of the park. The Secretary shall also consult with the Commission before establishing any regulations or requirements of general applicability pursuant to section 6 or 7(a) of this Act.

(f) the Commission may advise and consult with other Federal agencies, State agencies, local governments and persons on matters relating to public recreation, historic preservation and interpretation, scenic protection, wildlife propagation, and conservation and protection of natural resources, including water resources, within and in the vicinity of the park.

(g) The Commission shall act and advise by affirmative vote of a majority of the members thereof.

(h) (1) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission shall not be considered as service bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 203, 205, 207, or 209 of title 18 of the United States Code.

(2) The exemption granted by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not extend—

(i) To the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's government service from any sources other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment; or

(ii) during the period of such appointment, and the further period of two years after the termination thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the United States involving any matter concerning which the appointee had any responsibility arising out of his appointment during the period of such appointment.

Sec. 9. (a) Any funds that may be available for purposes of Administration of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal property may hereafter be used by the Secretary for the purposes of the park.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

S. 1867—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE IN CONNECTION WITH THE ADOPTION OF A CHILD

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill which would allow a taxpayer who adopts a child to receive a deduction from gross income for the medical, legal, and other expenses incurred in the adoption process. As you are aware, natural parents are permitted to deduct the medical expenses incurred in the birth of their child. Since their expenses are often substantial, the natural parents of a child often receive a sizable deduction. The costs of adopting a child have risen steadily and according to recent figures, it is not unlikely that these costs are becoming prohibitive and discouraging many from the adoption of a child. Since parents are permitted to deduct the medical costs, related to the birth of their child, I believe that adoptive parents should be given equal treatment to that afforded natural parents. Therefore, this measure would permit a maximum deduction of $1,000 for expenses incurred in the adoption of a child.

I also believe that the passage of this measure will facilitate the placement of homeless children in adoptive homes. Not only is there a need for a child to have a home of his own, but the costs of raising a child in foster homes and in State and local government institutions are steadily rising. This measure, I believe, will partially help to accelerate the placement process for homeless children and reduce some costs incurred by State and local government agencies.

My bill is a companion measure to that introduced by Representative Zablocki. He has received the endorsement of a large number of adoption agencies throughout the Nation for his proposal. I am hopeful that during the consideration of tax reform proposals by this Congress, serious study be given to this measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1867) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption

of a child by the taxpayer, introduced by Mr. INOUYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1872—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REPEAL THE EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to repeal title II—the emergency detention provision—of the Internal Security Act of 1950, popularly called the McCarran Act.

Title II of the Internal Security Act gives the President the power to proclaim an "internal security emergency" in the event of any of the following: First, invasion of the territory of the United States or its possessions; second, declaration of war by Congress; and third, insurrection within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy. Following the declaration of an internal security emergency, title II gives the President or his agent the power to detain persons "if there is reasonable ground to believe that such a person will engage in or probably will with others engage in acts of espionage or sabotage." Following the person's arrest, title II details the procedures for the continued detention of a person. Generally, this course of action is at odds with normal judicial procedure.

As you may remember, the Internal Security Act of 1950 became law over President Truman's veto. In referring to the great majority of the provisions of this act, President Truman declared that they "would strike blows at our own liberties." Title II, I believe, violates a number of our established freedoms and constitutional rights. The procedures detailed in the act are at odds with our established judicial procedures.

In addition, widespread rumors have circulated throughout our Nation that the Federal Government is readying concentration camps to be filled with those who hold unpopular views and beliefs. These rumors are widely circulated and believed in our urban ghettos. Additional credence was added by a House Un-American Activities report of May 1968, which contained a recommendation for the possible use of these detention camps for certain black nationalists and Communists. Many dissidents in our society fear the use of title II. It stands as a barrier of trust between some people and our Government. As President Truman stated in his veto message:

> **It is not enough to say that this probably would not be done. The mere fact that it could be done shows clearly how the bill would open a Pandora's box of opportunities for official condemnation of organizations and individuals for perfectly honest opinions . . .**

Many would respond to these rumors of concentration camps with the refrain "This couldn't happen in America." However, in times of stress and crisis American justice has not always withstood these pressures. I am naturally reminded that during World War II, 109,650 Americans of Japanese ancestry were arrested, their property confiscated and were detained in various "relocation camps" for most of World War II.

The constitutionality of title II of the McCarran Act, unlike that of title I, has never been tested in the courts. It is believed by most lawyers that someone must be detained under this title before there is just cause for judicial review. Therefore, I propose that it is the Congress' responsibility to repeal title II, and I am introducing this measure to accomplish this purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1872) to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 (title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950) introduced by Mr. INOUYE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1878, S. 1879, S. 1880, S. 1881, S. 1882, S. 1883, S. 1884, AND S. 1885—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS TO AMEND THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, today I am introducing, by request, six legislative proposals submitted to the Congress by the Atomic Energy Commission. Five of these bills would amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; a sixth would authorize appropriations to the AEC for fiscal year 1970.

The five AEC bills to amend the Atomic Energy Act were all submitted to the Congress early in this session in exactly their present form. However, because the new administration had not had an opportunity to review and approve them, I refrained from introducing these bills at the time of their submission. I am now informed that the new administration supports these measures. The five bills would amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to accomplish the following:

Provide that life imprisonment shall be the maximum criminal penalty for certain offenses, and to increase the criminal penalties for unauthorized diversion of special nuclear material and other offenses;

Authorize the AEC to enter into agreements of indemnification for ocean transport of materials;

Modify the requirement for mandatory review by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards of certain facility license applications;

Eliminate the requirement for a finding of practical value and abolish the distinction between commercial and certain research and development licenses for facilities;

Authorize the imposition of civil monetary penalties.

The sixth AEC proposal—a bill to authorize appropriations to the Commission in fiscal year 1970—was also submitted earlier this session. Again, however, because the bill did not have the approval of the new administration, I refrained from introducing it. I am now informed that the bill, with certain amendments made by the new administration as a result of its budgetary review, has been approved for submission to Congress.

Finally, Mr. President, I am also introducing today two measures identical to bills which I introduced in the last session of Congress but on which no final action was taken. These bills are not being introduced by request; they represent my views and those of any others who have joined with me in cosponsoring the measures. One bill, which I have introduced for myself and Senators ANDERSON and BENNETT, would amend the Atomic Energy Act to authorize the AEC to make peaceful nuclear explosion services available on a commercial basis. A companion measure—H.R. 477—was introduced in the other body on January 3, 1969, under the joint sponsorship of Representatives HOSMER, HOLIFIELD, PRICE of Illinois, ASPINALL, YOUNG, BATES, ANDERSON of Illinois, and MCCULLOCH.

The other bill, which I have introduced on my own behalf, would amend the enforcement provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Among other things, the bill would effect corrective amendments to certain penalty provisions of the Atomic Energy Act which are necessitated by last year's Supreme Court decision in United States against Jackson; increase the criminal penalties which may be imposed under the act for diversion of special nuclear materials; and confer on the AEC authority to impose civil penalties for certain violations of the act or regulations issued pursuant thereto. In the interest of time I will not elaborate on the purport of this legislation today, but do ask unanimous consent to have included at this point in the RECORD the explanatory statement which I made on the floor of the Senate on August 1, 1968, when I first introduced this measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills (S. 1878) to amend chapter 18 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; introduced by Mr. PASTORE, (S. 1879) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to provide that life imprisonment shall be the maximum criminal penalty for certain offenses, to increase the criminal penalties for unauthorized diversion of special nuclear material and related offenses, and for other purposes; (S. 1880) to amend section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; (S. 1881) to amend section 182 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; (S. 1882) to amend chapter 18 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; (S. 1883) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to eliminate the requirement for a finding of practical value and abolish the distinction between commercial licenses for facilities and certain research and development licenses for facilities and for other purposes; and (S. 1884) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PASTORE, by request, and (S. 1885) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Pastore (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The material, presented by Mr. Pastore, follows:

[From the Congressional Record, vol. 114, pt. 19, pp. 24620–24621]

Amendments to Enforcement Provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954

Mr. Pastore. Mr. President, today I introduced a bill to amend various sections of Chapter 18 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the enforcement chapter of that Act. I believe it would be helpful if I briefly explained the principal purposes of the proposed legislation and why these amendments are being offered.

One major purpose of the bill is to correct shortcomings in Chapter 18 brought about by the U.S. Supreme Court's recent decision in *United States v. Jackson,* 36 L.W. 4277 (April 8, 1968). It was there held that the death penalty provision of the Federal Kidnapping Act is unconstitutional because in permitting imposition of the death penalty only upon defendants who assert their right to be tried by a jury, it discourages assertion of, and thereby imposes an impermissible burden upon the exercise of, a constitutional right.

This decision would appear to hold significant implications for, and raise very substantial questions about, somewhat similar provisions in sections 222, 224 a., 225 and 226 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. These sections provide that where there is a violation thereof with intent to injure the United States or to secure an advantage to a foreign nation, there may be imposed punishment by a fine of not more than $20,000 or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both, or, upon the recommendation of a jury, life imprisonment or death.

These penalty provisions of the Atomic Energy Act and the death penalty provision of the Federal Kidnapping Act operate in the same manner; therefore, the effect of the *Jackson* decision on the former would appear to be similar to its effect on the latter. Indeed, in certain respects the decision has more far-reaching effects on the Atomic Energy Act inasmuch as both the life imprisonment penalty as well as the death penalty provided for therein are contingent upon a jury recommendation, whereas only the death penalty provision of the Federal Kidnapping Act was affected by the *Jackson* decision.

The bill which I have introduced would retain the life imprisonment penalty in the affected sections, but delete the capital punishment penalty and the requirement for a specific recommendation by the jury before the maximum penalty prescribed may be imposed upon an offender. As my colleagues are aware, the question of whether capital punishment for Federal crimes should be abolished by general legislation (S. 1760) is one that is now under active consideration within the Congress. However, I do not believe that necessary corrections to sections of the Atomic Energy Act dealing with penalties for offenses committed with intent to injure the United States or with intent to secure an advantage to a foreign nation should await enactment of this general legislation. Nor do I believe the legislative branch should continue to await the recommendations of the executive branch as to whether, and, if so, what amendments are necessary to effect corrections to sections of the Atomic Energy Act dealing, among other things, with the theft by foreign agents of highly sensitive atomic information. Therefore, I have introduced the minimum amendments required to give effect to the intent of Congress presently reflected in the sections of the Atomic Energy Act thrown into serious question by the *Jackson* decision, but at the same time striking therefrom the provision for capital punishment which has never been—and in all probability never would be—employed.

A second principal purpose of my bill is to amend section 222 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to increase the criminal penalties which could be imposed for unauthorized diversion of special nuclear material, and for certain related offenses. This material is the principal ingredient in nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. However, if a willful diversion of this material were committed by a person in this country under circumstances where the Government was unable to prove that the person charged specifically intended to injure the United States or to secure an advantage to any foreign nation, the maximum penalty which could be imposed under section 222 would be a fine of $10,000 and imprisonment for 5 years. Thus, a thief, a terrorist, an insurrectionist, or a criminal group might commit such a diversion and, in the absence of proof of the requisite intent, would be subject to a maximum penalty under section 222 of imprisonment for 5 years and a $10,000 fine. For example, if the diversion were made for financially rewarding criminal purposes rather than out of political motivation, or if the unlawful sale were to the agent of an undisclosed principal and the unidentified principal was a foreign nation, the specific intent to injure the United States or gain an advantage to a foreign power might well be lacking. Section 1 of my bill would amend section 222 to increase from five to ten years the maximum imprisonment for such willful violations of the section. No increase in the maximum fine appears necessary.

An Ad Hoc Advisory Panel on Safeguarding Special Nuclear Material appointed by the Atomic Energy Commission in 1967 pointed up the weakness of the Act in this regard and recommended that it be amended to increase the penalties for unauthorized diversion of such material. The Panel noted that the maximum penalties presently provided for ". . . may not be a sufficient deterrent to illicit transactions involving materials valued in excess of millions of dollars. . . ." and observed, "The threat of detection and more severe criminal penalties should help deter organizations and individuals from attempting to divert materials to unauthorized uses." Moreover, increased maximum penalties for unauthorized diversion of these materials would make them more nearly comparable to those for crimes of similar gravity.

A third principal purpose of this proposed legislation is to confer on the Atomic Energy Commission authority to impose civil penalties in addition to the Commission's present authority to modify, suspend, or revoke a license for violations of AEC health and safety regulatory requirements. Specifically, the bill would authorize the AEC to impose civil fines of up to $2,500 for individual infractions, and not to exceed $7,500 for two or more violations occurring within a 30-day period, of certain sections of the Atomic Energy Act and rules, regulations, orders, or licenses issued thereunder. I understand that similar authority to impose civil penalties is possessed by the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Department of Agriculture, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It is not my intent in introducing this legislation to in any way suggest that serious violations of the Act or of rules, regulations, orders or licenses issued thereunder are to be penalized by a mere fine. I particularly do not mean to suggest this where the violation is one involving health and safety matters. I do believe, however, that in some instances the revocation of a license or suspension thereof may be too harsh a penalty under the circumstances. Moreover, in certain cases a suspension may penalize the licensee's employees through loss of income without having any significant impact on the licensee itself. At the present time, the AEC in such cases essentially must choose between issuing a revocation or suspension order, on the one hand, or, on the other, issuing a cease and desist order which is little more than a direction to a licensee to refrain from doing whatever it was that the Commission found objectionable. Injunctions may also be obtained in appropriate cases, but here again the enforcement action may be out of all proportion to the infraction. For these reasons the imposition of a fine may be the more appropriate enforcement action in some cases.

Conferring on the AEC authority to impose civil fines, while at the same time retaining the authority to impose more severe penalties either in lieu of or in addition to a civil fine, should afford the Commission ample flexibility to deal with infractions of varying severity. I believe the AEC should have such authority. I also believe the Commission wants such authority. When queried about the matter in 1967 the Commission indicated that it was then preparing proposed legislation along these general lines for submission to the Congress. Apparently due to the inevitable delays involved in the administrative review process no such legislative proposal has as yet been cleared for submission to the Congress by the executive branch. For this reason, and in view of the limited time remaining for congressional consideration of such legislation during this session of Congress, I have included language in section 4 of my bill designed to accomplish the intended purpose.

S. 1896—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE EYE, EAR, AND DENTAL CARE UNDER MEDICARE PART B

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am introducing today on behalf of myself, Senator Hart, Senator Moss, Senator Randolph, and Senator Young of Ohio, a bill which would bring under the supplementary medical insurance program for the aged the areas of eye, hearing, and dental care. It will include the provision of eyeglasses, hearing aids, and dentures where they are needed, as well as the necessary attendant examinations and treatment of other conditions related to these. Under the supplementary medical insurance program for the aged, popularly known as part B of medicare, individuals are voluntarily enrolled for monthly premiums of $4 at present, matched by payments from the general treasury. For these sums, amounting to a premium of $48 per year paid by each covered individual, benefits provided cover, in the language of the law, "medical and other health services." These are defined explicitly in 11 numbered items under section 1861(s), and they include among other things the services of physicians, X-ray and laboratory tests, rental of wheelchairs and hospital beds, and so on.

But there are also some important exclusions to the items for which the separate trust fund for this program—the "Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund," to use the full name—will pay. Under "exclusions" are listed specifically three areas of health care of very considerable importance to the elderly. Indeed, these three areas of affliction are all, by testimony of the Public Health Service, more common in those over 65 than in any other age group. These are the areas of eye, hearing, and dental care. Yet, although their incidence is more frequent in the elderly, the elderly receive in proportion to these problems less care than other groups. The reason is plain—and it is the same reason which was pervasive when we adopted the part B program. That is simply that the costs are beyond the means of millions of those who are social security beneficiaries.

Let us look for a moment at the latest available statistics on the needs which my bill would care for. A February 1967 publication of the National Center for Health Statistics titled "Decayed, Missing, and Filled Teeth in Adults" reports data from the National Health Survey secured during the period 1960–62. Two factors appear to be at work here—age and income, and both of them work against the elderly.

Among those in the age range 25 to 44 the mean number of filled teeth is highest—averaging about eight per person. But for those over 65—and under 80—that average drops to about five. At the same time, the number of missing teeth increases from about eight to 19. These figures apply, of course, only to those in all ages who retain some of their own teeth. Another study in the same series, published October 1965, is perhaps even more significant. A survey of dental visits conducted during a 1-year period of 1963–64, shows that persons 25 to 44 go to the dentist more than twice as often as those over 65, even though it is apparent that the need is greater in the elderly. Part of the reason for less frequent visits, however, is that the elderly are most often those who have lost all their teeth—the survey estimates that 60 percent of those over 65 are in that category of the "edentulous." Many of these, and I am sure we all know some of them, are entirely without dentures and, because they can manage only soft foods, their general health is often impaired to some extent. Many others have a need for denture repairs or replacement of badly fitting dentures, but because of their income limitations go without seeing a dentist for these corrections.

That this is true is shown not only by the reduced number of dental visits among the elderly, but also by the much lower number of dental visits among the elderly, but also by the much lower number of dental visits by those with low incomes. For persons with family incomes of $7,000 per year the incidence of visits to the dentists is more than twice that of persons with family incomes below $4,000. There is no need, in view of the common knowledge we have acquired in recent years as to the income status of the elderly, to cite statistics on that score; it is well known that the largest low-income group in the Nation is composed of the elderly, many of whom try to exist on nothing more than their social security income.

One more survey in the dental series deals with periodontal disease, which is the commonest cause of tooth loss when left unattended. Let me quote from the report, which discusses the proportion of the population with periodontal disease, or gingivitis which affects the gums and becomes ultimately a destroyer of the teeth:

> Although at ages 19–24 years, for example, 70.9 percent of men and 63.2 percent of women already had either gingivitis or destructive disease, by ages 75–79 years the group with disease included as many as 93.7 percent of men and 80.1 percent of women.
>
> The increase in severity with age was even more striking, with destructive disease far more likely to be encountered in older persons than in younger ones. Among both men and women 18–24 years of age who had periodontal disease, only about 15 percent had periodontitis. By ages 75–79, however, the percentage with obvious pocket formation had risen to 64.0 and 60.4 respectively.

These figures, it might be noted, apply only to those who still have some remaining teeth, not to those who have current dentures or denture needs.

A second area of need covered by my bill is that of eye care. Again, the basic facts are the same: it is the elderly who are in the greatest need because they have the greatest sight impairment, but because of their limited income they are far more likely to live with their disability rather than have it properly cared for to make their latter years as enjoyable as they might be. Again, data from the National Health Survey of 1963–65 reveals the facts.

Here the survey is quite specific:

> About 56 percent of all cases of visual impairments were among persons with a family income of less than $4,000. The high prevalence of visual defects among persons in the lower income groups was influenced by the older age composition of these population groups.

An accompanying chart shows that at the time of the survey 24.4 percent of those over 65 had incomes below $3,000 and another 12 percent were under $4,000. At the same time, the over-65 age group comprised nearly half—46.4 percent—of all those with visual impairment. I quote again:

> The number of visually impaired persons per 1,000 population increased sharply with age. From a rate of 0.6 among young people under 25, the rate of severe visual impairments increased to 97.5 among persons 75 years and older. The corresponding rates for other visual impairments were from 6.9 to 77.4 and 131.3.

As may be judged from this wording, the study makes a distinction between "severe visual impairments" and "other visual impairments." The "severe" impairment means that glasses will still not give sufficient help to allow the reading of ordinary newspaper print. In this group, more than 55 percent of those affected over 65 years of age have some degree of limitation of their activities as a result. In the Nation as a whole, there are an estimated 1,342,000 with the "severe" impairment, an average rate of 6.6 per 1,000 of the population; but as the citation shows, this jumps to 23.6 per thousand in the 65 to 74 age bracket and nearly one in 10 are among those over 75.

The leading cause of severe impairment among the elderly is the presence of cataracts, which is more than three times as frequent as in those under 65. In fact—and this figure may be surprising—nearly 40 percent of all visual impairments among those over 65 are due to cataracts. This, of course, is a condition which can be relieved by surgery at the proper stage, and such surgery is covered under the law as in any other surgery.

But—and this is an important part of the problem—it is obvious that a cataract must be diagnosed before it can be treated by surgery or otherwise. And at this point, the law leaves the expense of a diagnostic visit to the individual, without coverage under part B as I am proposing. Specifically excluded section 1862a7—are "procedures performed during the course of any eye examination to determine the refractive state of the eyes," as well as exclusion of expenses for "eyeglasses or eye examinations for the purpose of prescribing, fitting or changing eyeglasses."

The result is obvious: thousands of the elderly whose vision is impaired by cataracts do not know they have them and are thus barred from the treatment by surgery which the law provides. This is a situation which cries out for change. Providing the opportunity for the elderly to visit an ophthalmologist, or an optometrist under part B medicare would lead to the discovery and treatment of uncounted cases of cataract now undetected.

Quite unrelated to the problem of the patient in need of eye care, or at least of most importance from another viewpoint, is that of the present evasion of the law, which I am told by those in the profession, takes place on a fairly extensive scale. Some of the more sophisticated among those under medicare, or perhaps even more responsible for the situation are some in the ophthalmology profession, now secure eyeglasses at the expense of medicare by means of subterfuge. I have no notion how widespread the practice is, but I am sure that any doctor of ophthalmology will tell you that there are some who provide the excluded services but list their work as in the area of pathology and hence eligible for reimbursement because their claim states the patient has received eligible treatment for disease of the eye. Certainly it is understandable that a doctor in this field has a little difficulty making the distinction between diagnosing and treating a patient who comes to him with cataracts or glaucoma and prescribing glasses which will help the condition, even though a refractory examination is outside the law's care provisions.

The third area in which my bill removes the present exclusion is that of hearing impairment. Actually, the rate of hearing impairment is considerably greater than that of visual impairment, although I venture that most people, seeing so many more eyeglasses than hearing aids in use, would be much surprised to know that fact. Whereas there are an estimated 5,390,000 persons in the Nation with eye problems at least severe enough to make them unable even with glasses to recognize a friend walking on the other side of the street, more than 8½ million have by their own or a family member's account in answering the health survey questions—"deafness or serious trouble hearing with one or both ears." The incidence per 1,000 of the population is, respectively, 28.8 for "all visual impairments" as defined and described earlier, and 45.7 for hearing impairments.

Again, the burden of this disability falls heaviest on the elderly. Indeed, in comparison to the rest of the population, this is an even greater problem for them, as the figures attest. Among those under 25 years of age the incidence of hearing impairment is only 9.5 per 1,000, but among those over 75 the figure is more than 33 times as great, 317.2 per 1,000 or nearly a third of all persons in that age bracket. The rate for those in the 65 to 74 bracket is less, but still more than 17 times the rate for the young, or 162.1 per 1,000. And again, there seems to be some statistical significance to the income factors:

> Among persons under 65 years of age, those with a family income less than $3,000 had a relatively high rate of hearing impairment. For persons with higher incomes, there were only slight differences between the rates of hearing loss . . . Among older persons, the rate of hearing impairment decreased steadily from 242.5 per 1,000 persons with a family income of less than $3,000 to 173.3 per 1,000 with a family income of $7,000–$9,999.

There is little need to say more; the argument and the circumstances are all but identical with those concerning dental and eye care. Why should we retain the present exclusions in the medicare law? The only reason I can suggest is the one which time after time pulls up short our good intentions for increasing the national well-being—unless it is considered "essential" to our Military Establishment, no matter how minor its claim to necessity—and that is the cost.

There are presently under part B, paying in their monthly $4—or rather, having it deducted from their social security checks—some 19½ million persons over 65. From the general funds of Government matches that amount, which totals thus nearly $1¾ million. Estimates I have received from the Office of the Actuary in the Social Security Administration indicate that the cost of the three services I propose would run approximately $750,000,000. Of this, $500 million would go for dental care, $150 million to meet visual problems, and $100 million for hearing care. Under the present financing, this would necessitate an increase in the cost to those electing part B, an increase from the present $4 to approximately $6 per month, with an equivalent increase in the Federal share. Consequently, and because I believe we should bear the burden through Federal financing rather than increasing the load of the social security beneficiary, my amendment also includes a change in the financing of part B from a 50–50 sharing to a one-third and two-thirds sharing. This would fully cover the additional financing for those covered without increasing the present $4 as now fixed for fiscal 1970.

Mr. President, there is need for these three services, now excluded not on the basis of whether or not this is true but solely on the basis of whether or not their provision will cost more in an era when we are holding the budget line in a tight-fisted manner at every point.

It is the fervent hope of America that the great costs of Vietnam will be lifted at least in part with the earliest possible conclusion of active hostilities. But I would remind you that the $750 million for which my bill calls is, after all, less than a day's cost for that war—more precisely, the cost of about 19 hours of that special expense. For that money we would be able to provide help to great numbers of the 4 million old persons who are hard of hearing, the 700,000 or so with a difficult visual impairment, and the vast numbers who need dental care they are not receiving. The benefit in improved health will be significant, the last years of our older citizens will be made less difficult and more endurable, and we will have come closer to completing the full package of health benefits under medicare's voluntary insurance program whose potential remains to this extent unfulfilled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1896) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include dental care, eye care, dentures, eyeglasses, and hearing aids among the benefits provided by the insurance program established by part B of such title, introduced by Mr. Hartke (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mrs. Smith), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Boggs), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Scott), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Allen) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 864), providing for the expansion of trade in manufactured products.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Pearson) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1290), to incorporate the College Benefit System of America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington (Mr. Jackson), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Cannon), the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Percy) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1076), to establish in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Anderson), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. Stevens), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Hartke) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1520) to exempt from the antitrust laws certain combinations and arrangements necessary for the survival of failing newspapers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Bayh) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1635) to exempt a member of the Armed Forces for service in a combat zone when such member is the sole surviving son of a family, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Williams), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cooper), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Hatfield), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Inouye), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy), the Senator Wyoming (Mr. McGee), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Mondale), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Pell), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Randolph), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Young), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1816) to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for treatment and rehabilitation centers for drug addicts and drug abusers, and to carry out drug abuse education curriculum programs, and to strengthen the coordination of drug abuse control programs by establishing the National Council on Drug Abuse Control.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from

Tennessee (Mr. Baker) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1384), to protect the freedom of choice of Federal employees in employee-management relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Goldwater) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1449), to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $250,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Golden Circle National Scenic Parkway complex connecting the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas in the southern parks, monuments, and recreation areas, monuments, and recreation areas situated in northern Arizona, northwestern New Mexico, and southwestern Colorado.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Baker) be added as a cosponsor of the resolution (S.J. Res. 70), to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESTORATION OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS HOME AS A HISTORIC MUSEUM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart) as a cosponsor of his bill, S. 835, to appropriate needed funds for the repair and refurbishing of the home of Frederick Douglass, a slave who rose to become one of the most distinguished Negroes of his day.

In 1962, Congress established the Douglass home, called Cedar Hill and located in Anacostia at the southeast edge of the District of Columbia, as part of the National Capital park system. It was the intent of Congress that Cedar Hill be restored, refurbished, and developed as a historic home museum. The $25,000 which was originally authorized for this purpose, however, proved insufficient because of unanticipated hurricane and other damage to Cedar Hill. The Department of the Interior estimated, in August 1968, that full restoration would cost $450,000, the sum which S. 835 would make possible.

I support the establishment of Cedar Hill as a historical museum so that Americans and visitors from abroad, who come to the Nation's Capital, can see the home of a man hailed as one of the most influential Negroes of his time. The paper he founded, the North Star, has been generally recognized as the most important newspaper demanding emancipation and elevation of the Negro before the Civil War. This great journalist, orator, and antislavery leader campaigned for the Presidency of Abraham Lincoln, and later served him as an adviser. Douglass also served as Marshal and Recorder of Deeds in the District of Columbia, and in 1888 was appointed Minister of Haiti, a position he held for 2 years.

Frederick Douglass was never told the date of his birth, but in his adult life, he selected February as his birthday so that it would fall in the same week as that of Abraham Lincoln.

On February 4 of this year, I introduced legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 41, to designate Negro History Week as a national observance. Negro History Week, which has been celebrated locally in some communities since 1926, is observed during the 7-day period containing the birthdays of Lincoln and Douglass.

In further recognition, I am proud today to add my name to S. 835, legislation to make sure that Cedar Hill truly takes its place as one of the important historical landmarks of the Greater Washington area.

S. CON. RES. 19—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE EFFORTS OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA JAYCEES

Mr. THURMOND submitted, on behalf of himself and Mr. Hollings, a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) endorsing the efforts of the South Carolina Jaycees; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Thurmond, which appears under a separate heading.)

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 19—RESOLUTION ENDORSING EFFORTS OF SOUTH CAROLINA JAYCEES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Hollings) a concurrent resolution; and I ask for its appropriate reference.

Mr. President, the Jaycees of my home State of South Carolina are currently engaged in a most noteworthy project which deserves the encouragement and support of the Congress. This project has as its goal the elimination of adult illiteracy in the United States. The South Carolina Jaycees have begun by establishing a volunteer program aimed at seeking out illiterates and encouraging their enrollment in various existing adult education programs.

Although begun on a State level in South Carolina, the Jaycees in our State are asking the U.S. Jaycees to adopt this as a national project with the aim of reducing the number of adult illiterates from 8 million, which is the present number, to 4 million by 1980. This program has the widespread endorsement of leaders in Government and civic groups and in various religious denominations. It is an excellent example of private citizens working in a free society to solve human problems. The financing of this project will be sought not from the Government but from the private sector.

Mr. President, I believe it is important that the South Carolina Jaycees receive all the encouragement we can give them in this worthwhile endeavor. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. Con. Res. 19

Whereas, the South Carolina Jaycees have been engaged in a project that has as its aim the elimination of illiteracy by enrolling adults in established education programs; conducting a door to door education census; by organizing for those who cannot attend classes, volunteer literacy groups with a goal of "Each One Teach One"; and

Whereas, said project has the unqualified endorsement of that State's Department of Education, all existing education programs, leaders of all major religious denominations, numerous civic groups and public officials in that State; and

Whereas, funding of said project is being sought from the private sector of this Nation; and

Whereas, the South Carolina Jaycees will seek this month (March) to have said project adopted by the United States Jaycees with the aim of reducing by one-half the number of functional illiterates in this Nation by 1980, which number is now over eight million adults: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America, does hereby endorse, encourage and support said project.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON AMENDMENT TO OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEGISLATION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, every Member of the Senate, together with all other citizens, is deeply troubled by the recent disastrous oil spill in the Santa Barbara Channel, and all of us are concerned that there should be no recurrence of such a tragedy.

The distinguished junior Senator from California (Mr. Cranston) has sponsored proposed legislation, S. 1219, that would deal with the situation on both a short-term and a long-term basis. Senator Cranston's bill would amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953, under which the sea bottom lands on which the Santa Barbara leak occurred were leased by the Federal Government.

The bill that became the Outer Continental Shelf Act was considered and worked out by the Interior Committee in the 83d Congress, and quite properly the proposed legislation amending the act was referred to the Interior Committee.

On behalf of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuel of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I wish to announce that public hearings on S. 1219 have been scheduled for Tuesday, May 13, in the Interior Committee room, 3110 New Senate Office Building, commencing at 10 o'clock.

Any interested Member of the Senate is invited to participate in these hearings, or to submit a statement. The Secretary of the Interior is being invited to present his views personally as are officials of California. Any spokesmen for other coastal States or private citizens who have pertinent information will of course be welcome.

It is requested that the committee staff be advised of witnesses who wish to appear in person at our hearings.

Problems connected with oil and gas operations in the offshore areas along our coasts are extremely complex, both technically and environmentally. On the one hand our country needs the oil, gas, and other minerals that are produced from them, and our National Treasury needs the revenues derived from these operations under our traditional American system of private enterprise.

At a recent executive briefing before the Interior Committee on operations under the Outer Shelf Act, Dr. William Pecora, Director of the U.S. Geological Survey, testified that the total value of production of all materials under the act had come to nearly $6 billion. The Federal Treasury is $4.4 billion richer. Private enterprise has invested billions of dollars and has property values that must be respected under the Constitution of the United States.

On the other hand, we must not have our shorelines ruined, our ocean waters polluted, our fish and wildlife destroyed, and our environment changed devastatingly. These are among the issues with which the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels will attempt to come to grips at the May 13 hearing.

Mr. President, Senator CRANSTON was joined in his sponsorship of S. 1219 by the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG).

The bill is short, and in view of its potentially far-reaching effects, I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1219

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall immediately—

(1) order termination of all drilling for oil, gas, or other minerals in the Santa Barbara Channel off the coast of the State of California under leases issued pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act;

(2) order the suspension of all such drilling under all other leases issued pursuant to such Act for areas off the coast of the State of California until the completion of the investigation and study pursuant to section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall as soon as practicable (1) make an investigation and study to determine methods of drilling for, producing, and transporting oil under leases issued pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, which will remove the threat of pollution and other damage to the environment and ecological community, (2) make an investigation and study of methods of phasing out oil production under said Federal leases in the Santa Barbara Channel, and (3) report the results of such investigations and studies to the President and the Congress.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Herbert F. Travers, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Massachusetts for the term of 4 years, vice Paul F. Markham.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, April 25, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON FEDERAL SUPPORT OF PROJECT GRANTS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Governmental Research of the Committee on Government Operations will hold a hearing on "Federal Support of Project Grants: Indirect Costs and Cost Sharing" on April 22, 1969, at 10 a.m. in room 1318, New Senate Office Building.

The hearing will continue on April 23 at the same time and place and on May 1 in room 457, Old Senate Office Building.

A second set of hearings on the same subject is tentatively planned for the latter part of May.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I wish to announce that public hearings on the nomination by President Nixon of Mr. Brantley Blue, of Tennessee, to be a Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission, have been scheduled for Thursday, April 24, at 10 a.m. in room 3110 New Senate Office Building.

Any interested Members of the Senate, and the public, are invited to participate in these hearings, or to submit a statement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief biography of Mr. Blue be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRANTLEY BLUE

Born October 11, 1925 in Pembroke, North Carolina.

EDUCATION

Attended public schools of Pembroke, North Carolina. Attended Pembroke State College, and received L.L.B from Cumberland University in 1949.

OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUND

Montgomery Ward Company, Baltimore, Maryland, 1942–43. United States Navy, 1944–46. City Judge in Kingsport, Tennessee, 1955–59. Engaged in the general practice of law in Kingsport, Tennessee, 1949–present.

ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Blue Key Honorable Fraternity (Law School).

Phi Alpha Delta Legal Fraternity (Law School).

American Legion, Hammond Post #3 (Former Commander).

Vice Chairman, National Americanism Council, American Legion.

Kingsport Exchange Club (Past President).

Kingsport Bar Association (Past President).

Kingsport Chamber of Commerce.

Tennessee Bar Association.

Former Judge Advocate, American Legion, Department of Tennessee.

FAMILY DATA

Married to former Dorothy Milam of Kingsport, Tennessee. Two children: Janet and Patricia, both living at home.

THE GAP BETWEEN THE GENERATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the April 29, 1969, issue of Look magazine is an article entitled "To an Angry Old Man," by Leo Rosten. I have read the article several times, and I must say that in my view Mr. Rosten's comments are to the point of what is happening in the world today with respect to the relationship between the older and younger generations.

There have been serious difficulties among young people, to be sure, but there has also been a good deal of fanaticism in reaction. In this situation, there is no justification for pomposity on the part of the older generation anymore than there is for anarchism on the part of the younger generation.

That there is a gap between the old and young is an inescapable biological reality. Nothing can be done about that except to accept it. That there is a lack of credibility or of mutual tolerance of ideas between the generations is also a fact. That difference, too, has a certain inevitability; down through the generations, it has been more the norm than the abnorm between old and young.

We need only go back, in all honesty, to our own younger days to sense the similarity between past and present. There were strains and tugs then as there are now. The principal difference is that we who are older, now, were younger then and were doing most of the straining and tugging.

The older generation has its faults which, in my judgment, tend to center on a shirking of responsibilities toward the young who, in their own way, for better or for worse, are striving to grapple with a world which they did not make. The faults of the younger generation, in turn seem to me to center on a tendency to reject whatever has gone before as, at best, irrelevant. On the part of the mini-minorities, moreover, there is an apparent determination not merely to reject the past but to rampage over past, present, and future and reduce them all to a rubble heap.

What is needed is a realistic appraisal of the situation. The present generation of youngsters was born into a world which they did not make and which we elders helped to make. These kids are not to be dismissed as some sort of monsters from another planet. They are, after all, our progeny. If we start from that point, perhaps we can bridge the gaps between the generations with a degree of honesty and humility, even if we cannot close them.

I would also have the temerity to suggest to young people that they resist the temptation to blame everything on the previous generation. Those of us who are older should, in turn, act our age and stop the flatulent berating of youngsters when we ourselves are not without blame. Young people have to make their own lives. They have to find a way to face the responsibilities which go with life. They have to make and correct their own mistakes along with the accumulated mistakes of the past and, in that way, to come forward, as we tried in our turn to do, with a responsible and reasonable way of life of their own.

I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Rosten's article. In my judgment, he has a lot to say that is worth saying about the difficulties which confront us and about our most profound obligation—young and old—which is to keep this society, this Nation and this world livable not only for ourselves but for those many generations which will come after us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "To an Angry Old Man," written by Leo Rosten.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO AN ANGRY OLD MAN

(NOTE.—I could massage your heartstrings or curl your hair, depending on your politics, by quoting from the torrential reaction (laudatory, furious, flattering, venomous) to my evangelical letter *To an Angry Young Man* (Look, November 12, 1968). Before it was printed, a friend urged me to soften my stand, saying. "It may play into the hands of the Right!" And of the sermon you are about to read, others may say, "It will play into the hands of the Left!"

(Both positions seem to me indefensible. Surely, the validity of an idea has nothing to do with who agrees or disagrees with it. To censor the expression of your thinking because of whom it may please or displease is simply to let others do your thinking for you. I detest thought control. Here, *sans* apology, is my answer to some overheated letter writers from the Right.)

DEAR MR. X: Thank you for writing—and that's about all the thanks you'll get from me. You say, "Let's throw all these young rebels out of college!" Over my dead body. Free speech does not stop at the gates of a campus. On the contrary, it should find a special sanctuary there, for it is indispensable to the search for truth. A student has a perfect right to protest, picket, petition, dissent. When students riot, set fires, throw rocks, stop others from attending classes, use bullhorns to disrupt the peace—they are acting not as students but as hoodlums. Let the law attend to them—the swifter the better.

But *you* want students "thrown out" simply for protesting, which is what the Communists and Fascists do—from Russia to Spain, China to Cuba. *They* expel, intimidate or imprison those who question or complain. Don't emulate them.

You say, "Draft these college punks into the Army and let our GI's knock sense into their heads!" You horrify me. I don't want anyone to "knock sense" into anyone's head. To put the point sharply, I quote a great jurist: "Your freedom to move your fist ends at the point where my nose begins." I have a long nose.

As for the draft: I consider the present draft impractical, unnecessary and morally indefensible (it would take more than this page to explain why. The young have every right to speak, petition and argue against it (this has nothing to do with Vietnam)—peacefully.

"Why let these creeps wear stinking clothes and beards? Line them up, hold them down, bathe them, shave them, wash out their mouths with soap!!" I loathe your bullyboy views more than their childish flight into dirtiness. Kooky clothes break no laws (though courts *have* ruled on schoolboard regulations governing dress, hair, etc.). Young slobs pollute the nearby air—but the courts have not yet ruled on that.

The defiant cultivation of filth is, of course, a clinical sign of psychological disturbance. I feel sorry for the kids who cannot know the psychological price they will pay for regressing to the anal level. But your excessive response to the dirty is as distasteful to me as their sad glorification of discomfort disguised as "freedom."

You praise me for "speaking out for those students who are not newsworthy because they don't riot" and add: "Defend our wonderful Establishment!" Well, the only Establishment I defend is the one called Reason. I find violence abhorrent, fanaticism disgusting, and demagoguery unspeakable. The terrorist tactics of adolescents may parade as "idealism," but they shatter that consensus of civility that is the very heart of a civilization. Your blind veneration of the status quo cannot help us solve problems that must and can be solved—by intelligence, not force.

You ask, "What do students have to be so unhappy about in our colleges?" A great deal: gargantuan classes and bursting dormitories; professors who hate teaching because it interferes with their research; educator-bureaucrats who reward the publication of trivia much more than dedication to students and teaching; academic tenure, which encourages some pedants to "goof off" in lectures and subsidizes others to indulge their nonacademic hobbies.

But this does not mean we should turn our colleges over to self-dramatizing militants whose most conspicuous talent is a capacity to oversimplify problems whose complexity they do not begin to comprehend. Rabble-rousers (Right or Left) are rabble-rousers, no matter what songs they sing, with what lumps in their throats, with whatever ambiguous dreams in their eyes. Nazi students also flaunted "rights" they held superior to the lawful processes of "hypocritical," "fake" democracy—and many of their professors, in Germany and Austria, cheered them on.

Rebels who think they should prevail *because* they dissent are deluded: Dissenters have no greater moral of political rights than non-dissenters.

You ask, "What has basically bugged these hippies, anyway?" First, their parents, I suspect, who confused political liberalism with indecisiveness; who felt so guilty about discipline that they appeased temper tantrums and rewarded rage with concessions (forgetting that infants *want* boundaries placed on their freedom); who never gave their progeny a clear model of responsible conduct. I think many militant students are unconsciously searching for adults who will act as adults—without apology or ambivalence or guilt; adults who will not be bamboozled by adolescent irrationality; adults who respond with swift rebuffs to those challenges to authority that are, at bottom, a testing by the young of the moral *confidence* of their elders. Prof. David Riesman says we are witnessing the rebellion of the first generation in history "who were picked up whenever they cried."

You say, "Why not show the young how wonderful our education system is?" It is remarkable in what it has done (the greatest, widest mass education in history) and in what it *can* achieve. But I hold a very gloomy view about schools that can produce students (and teachers) who are so strikingly ignorant about (1) how this society actually works; (2) what the economic bases of a democracy must be; (3) what the irreplaceable foundations of freedom, and the inviolable limits of civil liberties, must be; (4) how conflicts between minorities and majorities must be managed. (Suppose that Ku Klux Klanners in Alabama occupied classrooms, asserted the right to appoint faculty, threatened to burn down buildings, and demanded total amnesty in advance?)

Immature students are mesmerized by utopian slogans that rest on fantasies; and they are ill-educated enough to mouth the obsolete clichés of anarchism, the "revolutionary" nostrums even Lenin called "infantile leftism," the grandiose "demands" that demonstrate a plain lack of sense and a massive ignorance of history. ("Student power" has simply ruined South and Central American universities.)

You ask, "Why doesn't anyone brand these troublemakers as the Communists they are?!" That organizers plan and foment trouble, going from campus to campus, is becoming clearer each day. That they are professed Communists is neither clear nor likely. Student incantations about Ho Chi Minh, Che and Mao are not so much evidence of Communism as of naïveté. The young enjoy baiting their elders with shocking symbols, and ignore what Che, Ho and Mao stand for—total despotism over the mind. Dictatorship is no less vicious because it *claims* to seek "superior" freedom.

Students who are *not* Communists are, alas, employing Communist/Fascist tactics: "confrontations" designed to force the authorities to call in the police—and then to force the police to use force, which is decried (and televised) and used for propaganda purposes. They dare not reflect on what Mao has done to the Chinese "student cadres" he encouraged; or on what happens to students who criticize the Establishment in Moscow or Havana.

You say, "Professor Marcuse should not be allowed to teach at San Diego!" Dr. Marcuse has a right to say or write whatever he wants—however mushy, opaque, unsupported by data, insupportable in logic and ludicrous as economics it is. His competence and integrity as a teacher are for his colleagues—not you or me—to decide. And if San Diego has no professors who are able to punch holes in old Herbert's gaseous balloons, it should promptly hire some.

Incidentally, Marcuse, like you, wants to deny freedom of speech to "certain" people; you and he differ only on *whom* you want to confer the blessings of dictatorship: Marcuse has publicly said (at Rutgers, June, 1965) that since Negroes are "brainwashed," and presumably vote in a hypnotized manner, "I would prefer that they did not have the right to choose wrongly." Such thinking fills prisons and concentration camps.

Finally, to my angry old *and* young compatriots: If we cannot pursue knowledge with moderation and mutual respect in our colleges, then where on earth can we? "Society cannot exist," wrote Burke, "[without] a controlling power upon will. . . . The less of it there is within, the more there must be without . . . *Men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters.*"

Leo Rosten.

P.S.—Once, after long and sober research, I estimated that 23.6% of the human race are mad. I was wrong. I am now convinced that 32.6% are.

Mr. AIKEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I rise, first, to express my wholehearted agreement with the remarks of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Mansfield), the majority leader, which were made at the beginning of the morning hour.

I would like to add further, however, that I hope the public is not condemning the youth of today. In my opinion, it is a very small percentage of youth, the lawless and the extremists, who undertake to commit acts and demonstrations which could lead to a breakdown of government, or at least to a breakdown in the management of the colleges and universities which they are attending.

Unfortunately, it is the worst element that gets most of the publicity. Sometimes I think this worst element monopolizes the news media. I am sure that 90 percent of youths attending college or other educational institutions today are seriously concerned not only with the functioning of their government but also with their own welfare and the welfare of the world generally.

Furthermore, it is not always the students who create difficulties. Sometimes it is the management of the institutions. I am sure of that. Sometimes it is members of the faculty. I might point out that a few days ago I read a report that the faculty of Tufts College voted to do away with the ROTC, when a great majority of its students asked that the ROTC be retained.

I feel that we should be very careful, and not condemn the great majority of law-abiding students for the reckless and irresponsible acts of a small percentage of them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an excerpt from the annual report of Lyman S. Rowell, president of Vermont University, entitled "The Challenge to Our Nation's Colleges and Universities."

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Challenge to Our Nation's Colleges and Universities

(Excerpt from the annual report of Lyman S. Rowell, president of the University of Vermont)

Colleges and universities all across our country are being challenged by new and sometimes conflicting forces.

Students have made clear they are not satisfied with colleges the way they are, at the same time that they compete in ever greater numbers and ever greater intensity to enter college.

Perhaps unfairly, those students who have made the most noise, who have been most disruptive, and who are least representative, least sincere in their desire to win constructive changes—those students have won most of the headlines, most of the focus of television cameras.

Less known to those constituencies who are not closely associated with college life today are the more significant efforts of a majority of today's students to obtain a meaningful and constructive dialogue by which they may work with administrators and faculty to make the college and university of today and tomorrow a better, more responsive institution. Perhaps it is wrong to limit this to college and university students, for today's high school students are very much a part of this student activity.

Traditionally, faculty members have tolerated administrators as, at best, necessary evils. Today, teachers are more concerned with participating in the administration of colleges and universities. They are seeking membership on board of trustees, participation in all levels of decision making including key roles in the selection of college presidents.

Part of the renewed action by teachers for a greater role is the result of an awakened understanding by teachers that students are often more critical of faculty rules and regulations and attitudes than they are of college and university administrators.

Students wish to participate in faculty evaluation, in changing curricula, and—in particular, in introducing more courses reflecting current social and political concerns.

Colleges and universities are being challenged as well by a free enterprise society which more than ever recognizes a dependency on U.S. higher education not just for a continuing supply of recruits, but for a growing program of research and service. Any county, state or regional development organization can attest that business and industry today more than ever prefer to locate in communities, counties, states or regions where there are strong higher education institutions—preferably with graduate and research programs.

Perhaps the greatest challenge to higher education today comes from government—from the smallest local to the largest federal unit. More and more do governments look to higher education to provide resources which government may bring to bear on the most pressing array of problems which society has faced.

At the same time, the rising costs which have affected all sectors and activities of our free enterprise economy have greatly complicated the relationship between government and education. At the same time that education is seen as a cornerstone upon which continued freedom and prosperity rest, the cost of funding quality programs of education from kindergarten through post-doctoral levels has increased and will continue to do so.

The federal government, since WWII, has invested vast new sums in support of higher education. This support, however, has tended to go to areas and programs of special interest to the Congress and to the President and the men and women in this Cabinet. It has tended, as well, to go to the nation's largest and strongest universities.

It is significant, I think, that in November seven major U.S. higher education associations joined in urging direct federal institutional grants to all accredited higher education institutions, public and private, two year and four, colleges and universities. Their statement, which I endorse, called institutional support "the number one unmet need in the pattern of federal relations with the academic community," and said a new program of institutional grants should complement, not supplant or diminish present federal programs.

Never has our future been more uncertain.

But I choose to interpret that positively. Never have we enjoyed a greater opportunity to seek and find in an uncertain future those certainties which advance the continuing potential that tomorrow's children shall have a greater opportunity than today's.

TRIBUTE TO DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER BY MRS. CHARLOTTE T. REID

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on Monday of this week, April 14, some 5,000 women began the 17th annual Republican Women's Conference, convening at the Sheraton Park Hotel here in Washington, D.C. At the supper gala that night one of the first items on the program was a beautiful tribute paid to our former President and Commander in Chief, Dwight David Eisenhower, by a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, Mrs. Charlotte T. Reid, of Illinois. Through the years and especially during the past weeks, respect, appreciation, love, and compassion have been poured on General Eisenhower, but I believe you will join me in feeling that no finer and more appropriate tribute has been paid than the one so elegantly expressed by Mrs. Reid.

I ask unanimous consent that the tribute be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Super Gala—Republican Women's Conference, Washington, D.C., April 14, 1969

It was just two weeks ago tonight—as dusk settled over the Capitol, that official Washington said a final farewell to perhaps the best-loved American of this century. The slow-paced cortege, with its caisson bearing the simple G.I. coffin, followed by the riderless horse, symbol of the fallen hero—had come to a halt. The solemn processions of the State Funeral had reached Union Station. The last echoes of the cannon and bugles had faded away. Now Dwight David Eisenhower was going home to Abilene for the last time—home to his chosen resting place in the heartland of America from whence he had come.

For three days, Heads of State and Ministers—great men and women from every part of the world—had come to mourn with citizens from all walks of life— of all races and religions—at the somber Lincoln Catafalque in the hushed vastness of the Capitol Rotunda—and to raise their voices in the triumphant words of "Onward Christian Soldiers" and "God of Our Fathers" in the majesty of the Washington Cathedral. And as the funeral train began its long and lonely journey across mountain and plain, river and farm, an entire Nation stood at attention in final salute—hat in hand, and for most of us a lump in the throat. Yes, in death just as so often in life, Dwight David Eisenhower had once again touched his people deeply.

Each of you here tonight will always have a special memory of General Eisenhower—and each his own personal tribute to one who so joyously took the journey of life, who took it with vision and foresight, and with all the courage and determination at his command.

His deeds were great and many, and historians will so record them. They will tell of Eisenhower the soldier, whose devotion to his country was the motivation of a lifetime in its service—Eisenhower, the Commander of the mightiest expeditionary force ever assembled in the cause of freedom—and Eisenhower, the General, receiving the surrender of the Hitler armies in World War II.

They will tell, also, of Eisenhower the educator, as President of Columbia University—one of the Nation's great center of learning and culture.

They will tell of Eisenhower, the crusader for world peace and international understanding and brotherhood while Supreme Commander of NATO.

And they will tell of Eisenhower, our 34th President, with his magnetic grin, who brought to the Nation a welcome period of peace and order—and a strength of purpose and conviction in America.

Yes, every trust we Americans had in our power to bestow was freely given him. It was bestowed because he reflected in his own life and personality the best traditions of a free people—and our Nation's faith and hope. We admired his courage of mind and heart, his strength of character, his idealism, his devotion to his family, his belief in the worth of his fellow man, his simplicity, his understanding warmth, and his candor. Everyone "liked Ike"—for most seemed to see in him and his homely virtues some small reflection of themselves. He was so typical of America that each in his own way could see a bit of himself in the soldier-President.

And even in death, I think that General Dwight D. Eisenhower performed one last service which must not go unheeded. Sad though it has been, this period of mourning—with all its memories of the simple heritage of this man from Abilene who brought such inspiration to so many—of his belief in the creed of "duty, honor, country"—of his devotion to the principles on which this Republic was built—of the peace and tranquility which characterized his years in the White House—all this has reminded millions not only of the achievements of a great fellow American, but of our own achievements as well. It has reminded us of our own priceless heritage and the hard fought origins of our country.

And as he faded quietly away—as old soldiers are said to do—he left with each of us who kept vigil with him a little of his pride in America, a little of his awareness of God, and a little of his responsibility to mankind.

May the Lord bless his memory—and may the Lord give to each of us the strength and courage to carry on those ideals and goals which he lived in life and which were his legacy in death.

Yes—America and the world like Ike. There can be no finer tribute!

INCOME TAX: REFORM AND REALITIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, several years ago in a course of testimony on several bills, including tax measures which were pending before the Committee on Finance I suggested, and the chairman concurred in the suggestion, that the committee hear Roger A. Freeman of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University in California with respect to matters relating to taxes and unemployment.

Mr. Freeman proved to be one of the most refreshing and knowledgeable witnesses ever to come before the committee. He is a student and a scholar who not only does his homework but does it extremely well.

He has written an article which appeared in the March 12, 1969, issue of the Los Angeles Times under the caption "Topical Comment: Unhappy Returns." The subhead for the article is "Income Tax: Reform and Realities."

When Mr. Freeman first entitled this article he called it "Many Unhappy Returns of the Day." I thought the latter title was certainly appropriate and quite significant. I will let the article speak for itself. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD so that it will not only come to the attention of the Members but also to the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD everywhere.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPICAL COMMENT: UNHAPPY RETURNS—INCOME TAX: REFORM AND REALITIES

(By Roger A. Freeman)

(NOTE.—Economist Roger A. Freeman is a senior staff member of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University. Among his publications are "Crisis in College Finance?" and "Taxes for Schools.")

Last Jan. 17, three days before he left office, Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr issued a stern warning to Congress:

"We now face the possibility of a taxpayer revolt if we do not soon make major reforms in our income taxes. The revolt will not come from the poor but from the tens of millions of middle-class families and individuals with incomes from $7,000 to $20,000 . . .

"The middle classes are likely to revolt against income taxes not because of the level or amount of the taxes they must pay but because certain provisions of the tax laws unfairly lighten the burdens of others who can afford to pay."

Are middle-class taxpayers about to resort to violence after the manner of militants on our campuses and in our urban centers? Not really. But taxpayers are in a belligerent mood, as evidenced by the flood of enraged letters that swamped the Treasury and Congress early in 1969. That their ire is not directed at "the level or amount of taxes they must pay," as Secretary Barr suggested, I for one doubt. The "take" of all governments in the United States (federal, state and local), which just hit a new high at 40% of the national income, is still headed upward, and the federal income tax is by far its largest component.

Contrary to Barr's implication, however, the middle class does not bear a disproportionate share of the federal income tax. It receives 55% of the income and pays 52% of the tax:

FEDERAL INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX, 1966

[In percent]

Adjusted gross income bracket	Adjusted gross income	Tax liability
Under $7,000	29.5	17.5
$7,000 to under $20,000	55.3	51.9
$20,000 and over	15.2	30.6
Total	100.0	100.0

This does not at all mean that the tax treats everybody fairly. At last count, in 1966, the federal income tax applied to less than half of all personal income—49% to be exact. Exemptions, deductions, exclusions, credits and underreporting accounted for the other half. The Treasury could gather about as much revenue through a flat 10% tax on *all* personal income as it does from our 14% to 70% rate schedule on *half* the income.

STORY'S OTHER SIDE

Who escapes the federal income tax? The rich, Barr replies. There were, he said, "155 tax returns in 1967 with adjusted gross incomes above $200,000 on which no federal income taxes were paid, including 21 with incomes above $1 million."

This is true as far as it goes, but it is not the whole story. Barr did not mention that the 21 millionaires—whose combined income exceeded $60 million—had given it away under a little known clause which permits unlimited deduction of charitable contributions to persons who so donated more than 90% of their income in at least 8 of the preceding 10 years. There were 626 millionaires in 1966 who did pay income tax—at an average rate of 56% of their taxable income.

Less than half of the $587 billion personal income in 1966 was taxable, $301 billion went untaxed. Could we, by eliminating some of those "loopholes," recoup enough revenue to lower tax rates substantially?

Let us look what that $301 billion tax-free income consists of: $117 billion is for personal exemptions ($195 million exemptions of $600 each), $63 billion is for Social Security and other welfare payments and exempt labor income, $54 billion is for itemized deductions (state and local taxes, interest payments, medical expenses, charitable contributions, casualty losses, etc.), $22 billion is for standard deductions; $33 billion is merely "imputed" income such as rental value of owner-occupied homes. It is obvious that most of the nontaxed income accrues to persons in the low to middle income brackets. For example, of $182 billion deductions and exemptions, $168 billion is claimed by the under $20,000 income group.

If we relate *taxable income* (line 11d on form 1040) to *adjusted gross income* (line 9 on form 1040) we find that persons under $3,000 income pay taxes on 27% of their income, those in the $5,000 to $7,000 bracket on 53%, those between $10,000 and $15,000 on 66%. From $20,000 to $100,000 79% is taxable, and at an income of $100,000 and over 80%.

To be sure, the Internal Revenue Code contains many clauses that enable wealthy persons to escape the full impact of the tax rate schedule. But there are also benefits for the middle class and the poor, for the young and the old, for the owners and executives and for the workers. Most of those provisions were intended by Congress to afford relief to low-income persons or for special burdens, to avoid a detrimental impact on certain industries or on the whole economy, or to stimulate desirable activities.

It is true that genuine loopholes, that is unintended benefits, have developed over the years and abuses have crept in. That is why tax reform is such a never-ending job. Probably no subject has been studied more thoroughly by Congress and numerous amendments have been passed to stop leakages or provide new benefits. That no major structural reform was enacted, subjecting to taxation multi-billion dollar amounts of presently tax free income, does not mean that Congress is not eager to take such action. But Congress is no less divided than the public on the question which specific benefits should be cut.

What results can we expect from the tax

reform hearings which the House Ways and Means Committee is presently conducting?

If past experience and the mood of Congress are any guide, some seepage around the edges will be stopped, certain loose provisions will be tightened, several abuses ended. But, unless I misread the signs, there will be no *major* structural reform of the income tax in 1969–70. The balance of power is too evenly distributed for a significant breakthrough.

Where is action most likely to take place? Will the tax exemption of foundations and other nonprofit institutions be abolished? Not likely, but their privileges will be more closely prescribed and the use of the foundation gimmick for personal gain or political ends cut, if not ended. Charitable purposes may be more precisely defined and limitations imposed.

Will a floor be established for charitable contributions and other itemized deductions, similar to the present 3% rule on medical expenses? Only over the dead bodies of influential forces I expect to remain alive for a long time.

Will long-term capital gains be subjected to normal income tax rates? That is extremely unlikely because it could have a detrimental impact on economic expansion and job creation. But capital gains treatment may be severely tightened and there could even be a sliding scale geared to the length of holding an asset. Capital gains taxation at death may be added sometime, if not now.

Will Congress repeal the percentage depletion on oil production? No, because that might discourage exploration and could boost gasoline prices. But rates could be reduced and depletion limited.

The tax exemption of interest on state and local bonds poses a number of hard questions. Is the end near for that exemption? Probably no nearer than it has been for the past 30 years, if governors, mayors and school boards have any say about it—and they do.

Tax reform means to most people that they will pay lower taxes. Thus, if revenue is gained from tightening loopholes, it is likely to be used for liberalizing other benefits.

The personal exemption has remained at $600 since 1948, while in the same period consumer prices have risen 50%; to retain its value the exemption should now be $900. But this is the most expensive form of tax relief there is: every $100 increase in personal exemptions costs the Treasury at least $3.6 billion a year.

A boost in the standard deduction to 14% and to a maximum of $1,800 for a couple would simplify tax returns for many people. What it might do to some religious or charitable organizations and whether it would improve equity is another question. Like higher personal exemptions it would increase the incidence of "representation without taxation" which is a perilous trend in a democracy.

There will be a strong drive for tax credits in education—for tuitions and other expenses and for donations—as well as for training the unskilled and hiring the hard-core unemployed. It could succeed: President Nixon has long advocated such plans and Congress appears to be favorably inclined toward the idea.

Federal revenue sharing with states and cities has been getting growing attention and governors and mayors are clamoring for it. Others object because they feel that "the pleasure of spending public money should be tied to the pain of raising it." Revenue sharing could possibly be used to replace many of the more than 500 categorical grants-in-aid to states which now total $25 billion.

A more effective way of giving relief to taxpayers and aiding state and local governments while maintaining fiscal and political responsibility would be to allow federal tax credits for property, income and sales taxes instead of permitting only deductions from the tax base.

WOULD INCREASE UNBALANCE

Should the "temporary" 10% surtax be made permanent, as the governor of one of our largest states proposed at a White House meeting a few weeks ago?

That would make the U.S. tax structure even more lopsided than it already is: we rely more heavily on income taxes and go more lightly on consumption taxes than any other country. A permanent raise in the oppressive income tax rates would make our tax system even more punitive than it is.

We are now the only industrial country which does not levy a broad-based national consumption tax. A value-added tax on the European pattern could provide a badly needed balance in our tax system.

If American taxpayers were asked what they want most in regard to taxation, most of them would certainly answer: "Less." That wish could be realized if at least part of the national increase in revenues were devoted to tax reduction rather than to the expansion of public services.

A plan to cut income tax rates in annual steps over a period of, say, five years would not only help to promote stable economic growth and general prosperity; it might even be good politics. It would of course require fiscal restraint and tight expenditure control—which Congress has been hard put to accomplish in the past—but it could prove to be the best kind of tax reform.

HAYAKAWA ON THE HARVARD DISORDERS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an interview with Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, acting president of San Francisco State College, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post and after listening to the distinguished majority leader's remarks a few moments ago on this subject, I believe that this article will be of interest to everyone.

President Hayakawa, because of his own courageous refusal to knuckle under to his own campus extremists, has become a symbol of national resistance to campus extremism everywhere

Unfortunately, as Prof. Sidney Hook pointed out in a speech which I entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this last January 28, there are too many "spineless administrators and cowardly members of the faculty" who are prepared to yield to extremist blackmail.

In much the same vein, Dr. Hayakawa took the Harvard faculty to task for failing to back President Pusey.

> A bunch of kids come in and bodily carry out the dean—

He said, in a reference to last week's takeover of Harvard's University Hall by a group led by Students for a Democratic Society.

> They occupy the building and start rifling secret files. That's the time and place to call the cops, so why the hell doesn't the faculty back him up?

Hayakawa said that the tendency of some faculty members to condone violence by students but to condemn it on the part of the police is "one of the real psychological puzzles of our time." He said that this dual standard was related to "an unconscious cultural snobbery on the part of the college educated against those who are not college educated, a deep-rooted prejudice among some intellectuals that they are a superior order of being because they are intellectuals. Some of them believe the world has no damn business being run by politicians, generals, and businessmen. They think it should be run by literary critics and philosophers."

Dr. Hayakawa gave some advice to President Pusey that every college president would do well to study.

His first advice was that, whenever there is a threat of disorder, police should be brought onto the campus in such numbers that those who want to teach and study know they will be protected.

His second piece of advice was to avoid faculty meetings.

> Until the crisis is over—

He said—

> every decision made by the faculty should be by secret ballot distributed to the entire faculty. Don't let anything be decided in a meeting. The radical faculty packs the meetings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article concerning the interview with Dr. Hayakawa which was published in the Washington Post on April 18, 1969.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARVARD "DOUBLE-CROSSED" BY FACULTY, HAYAKAWA SAYS

(By David S. Broder)

SAN FRANCISCO, April 17.—Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, the acting president of San Francisco State College, today condemned Harvard University faculty members for their failure to support Harvard President Nathan M. Pusey's decision to use police against campus demonstrators.

He said their attitude was typical of the "deep-rooted prejudice" many intellectuals harbor against those less educated.

In an interview, the plain-spoken semanticist, who kept police on his campus for four months this winter to handle student and faculty strikes, said, "Pusey was doing the right thing, but he was double-crossed by his faculty.

"A bunch of kids come in and bodily carry out the dean," he said, in a reference to last week's takeover of Harvard's University Hall by a group led by Students for a Democratic Society. "They occupy the building and start rifling secret files. That's the time and place to call the cops, so why the hell doesn't the faculty back him up."

DISTORTED REFLEX

The answer, Hayakawa said, lies in the same distorted psychological and political reflex he saw on his own campus during the winter confrontation that won him national reknown.

The San Francisco campus is calm today, but despite his apparent victory over student militants, Hayakawa still speaks with open bitterness of the "cultural snobbery" of faculty members who supported the students, as their counterparts across the continent at Harvard are doing now.

Noting that Harvard's star-studded faculty has used the student strike to pressure Pusey to grant some old demands of their own, Hayakawa said, "It's exactly the same thing" his own college went through.

CHAIN REACTION

"First you have the uproar created by students," he said. "Then an element in the faculty has to defend the students. The more they have to show the students are justified, the more they have to find out reasons they (the faculty) have got problems and grievances, too."

Hayakawa offered "the beginning of an answer" to what he called "one of the real psychological puzzles of our time," the tendency of some faculty members to condone violence by students but to condemn it on the part of police.

"Professors, in a way, love their students," he said, "so they want earnestly to believe that whatever their students do is rationally motivated . . . They're willing to condone anything, because, after all, they've been devoting their lives to teaching students rational behavior. So if the students violate the common courtesies and even resort to violence, they sit around agonizing and say there must something terribly wrong with the world if the students feel that way."

DOUBLE STANDARD

But, Hayakawa continued, such faculty members "are not willing to give the police that much of a break. If the police get rattled and start striking out, then that's goddam police brutality. That's the nature of the dirty sons of bitches.

"There's an unconscious cultural snobbery on the part of the college-educated against those who are not college-educated," he said, "a deep-rooted prejudice among some intellectuals that they are a superior order of being because they are intellectuals. Some of them believe the world has no damn business being run by politicians, generals and businessmen. They think it should be run by literary critics and philosophers."

PLATO CITED

With a wry grin, Hayakawa said Plato, who advocated rule by philosopher-kings, was "the first and most brilliant example of the disgruntled intellectual. If he were alive now, he'd have been president of our campus chapter of the AFT," referring to the American Federation of Teachers union, which led the San Francisco State strike.

Hayakawa said he would offer only two bits of advise to Pusey. One was to have police on campus, whenever there is a threat of disorder, in such numbers that those who want to teach and study know they will be protected. The other was to avoid faculty meetings.

"Until the crisis is over," he said, "every decision made by the faculty should be by secret ballot distributed to the entire faculty. Don't let anything be decided in a meeting. The radical faculty packs the meeting."

He recalled that a predecessor of his at San Francisco State had once pledged to make it "the Harvard of the West."

"Now," Hayakawa said, "Harvard looks like the San Francisco State of the East."

FAIRFIELD STUDENTS TAKE ACTION IN APPALACHIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, once again, the newspapers are filled with deplorable accounts of campus disorder. This week, the student body of one of the finest universities in the world has turned to violence as the means of bringing about changes within the university and within their country.

It is a sad commentary on the present time, Mr. President, that, although this is an issue of national focus, few people find it truly shocking. Instead, it is regarded as merely another link in a long chain of similar occurrences. Appalling as they are, these outbreaks have become commonplace.

In light of this incident, however, I was particularly pleased to see that another side of the American college student was given attention on network television this week. I refer to a newscast relating recent activities by a group of students from Fairfield University in Fairfield, Conn.

These students spent their spring vacation in a poor, rural area in the State of Kentucky.

Their goal was to register a protest against the conditions under which many of their fellow men are forced to live.

Their means of protest was concrete action in the form of unsparing physical exertion.

The result of their labor is more than the land which they cleared. It is a deep impact on the people with whom they worked in Appalachia, and a new awareness within themselves. It is a greater perception of the meaning of poverty and of their own role in dealing with the problems it engenders in the community.

I believe this incident is indicative of the spirit with which a great many young people are approaching the need for change. It is unfortunate that we often tend to overlook the worthwhile efforts of so many in our concern with the dissident minority.

I commend these students for their willingness to undertake this task and for their mature and practical outlook.

I also congratulate the president of Fairfield University, Rev. William C. McInnes, S.J., and the members of the administration and faculty who were instrumental in encouraging and executing the Appalachia project.

I am proud to know that one of Connecticut's fine educational institutions has taken the leadership in promoting constructive social action among its students.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INACCURATE STATEMENT RE THE PROPOSED SPANISH BASE AGREEMENT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, stories in the press this morning concerning the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the national commitments resolution, Senate Resolution 85, refer to a passage in a classified memorandum regarding the Spanish bases. The committee report stated that the memorandum was given to Spanish authorities by "a high American military official." The committee report did not name the U.S. military official involved nor did it imply that he or any other military official, acted improperly or outside guidance supplied by higher civilian authorities.

A grave injustice has been done by any reporter who went beyond the language of the committee report. The front page article in this morning's Washington Post uses the name of Gen. David A. Burchinal, deputy chief of U.S. forces in Europe, in connection with the memorandum. In fact the story implies the committee "rebuked" General Burchinal. Nothing can be further from the truth, and to my knowledge no member of the committee or its staff has in any way implied that General Burchinal was the military official involved. In fact, he was not.

The Subcommittee on U.S. Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad, and the full Foreign Relations Committee, sought from the beginning to avoid dealing in personalities. The committee's purpose in using that particular sentence was to emphasize its view that the executive branch in this case acted through its highest military officer, Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to redefine in secret negotiations with Spanish military officials the relationship that has developed between the United States and Spain. We did not use General Wheeler's name, even though we were given specific permission to quote precisely that language, because we were interested in the thrust of the remarks and not the person who made them.

Therefore, the press conclusion—assumed without checking with the committee—has done what may be irreparable damage to General Burchinal, a fine officer and a man who, as far as I know, has acted in the best tradition, taking orders from his superiors and following the policy guidance directly to General Wheeler by former Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

MINUTEMEN FAIL TESTS—ADDITIONAL REASON TO GO SLOW ON ABM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it was stated in the press this morning that doubts were being expressed about whether the Minuteman missiles will really work; and that these doubts arose when a Minuteman test, scheduled for October 19, 1966, at Michigan, N. Dak., failed because a substandard resistor was discovered in the launching power supply.

Also that the test was rescheduled for October 28, but failed a second time because of a miniature capacitor in the guidance system going out of whack.

It was then asserted that in August 1968 another test was scheduled, but failed because of a faulty pin in one of its connectors.

All this, it was said, has made the people begin to wonder whether the Minutemen missiles are really worth the billions the Pentagon has spent on them, especially as the Minutemen tested were supposed to leave their silos for only a 7-second flight, and to land some 100 miles away.

The press says that Acting Secretary of the Air Force Alexander Flax wrote Senator MILTON YOUNG, as follows:

> In order to verify the adequacy of our new procedures, Flax explained on March 9, "we must conduct actual launches from standard launch facilities. We have prepared plans

> for short range (7-second) launches from several silos. These plans also include testing of launch facilities with dummy missiles, in which the ignitors and other ordnance are disabled. The specific sites in which the tests are to be conducted will be selected within the next few weeks. The first tests are expected to be conducted before the end of the year.

As one of my colleagues said to me, "If this system cannot go 100 miles on its third test, how can we expect it to go 5,000 miles and land squarely on target?"

Mr. President, I believe this Minuteman system will eventually have the bugs out of it and work within reason. But all this shows only too clearly why the infinitely more complicated Sentinel-Safeguard system, which could turn out to be a modern technological maginot line, should be researched and developed more before it is actually deployed.

I do not believe this country can remain secure by cutting back heavily on its offensive weapons and digging a lot of defensive holes in the ground.

Let us never forget that as a result of the sad and total failure of the maginot line, France would have been destroyed if others had not come to the rescue of that great country.

THE LATEST ABOUT OUR DEFENSES AND THE SOVIET THREAT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the press reports this morning that the Secretary of Defense told the American Society of Newspaper Editors yesterday that the Soviets are building a lot more submarines than is the United States.

If this is correct, why do not we build more submarines instead of currently cutting back some $105 million out of our submarine program in the recently presented Defense budget?

According to the press, the Secretary then continued:

> The Russians have gone ahead of us in the number (of ICBMs) on launch pads and under construction. We are now in a position where they have gone beyond us.

If this is true, then why is the Defense Department slowing down the production of Minuteman III by currently cutting some $150 million from the original budget request for these missiles?

Because of my conviction with respect to the theory of overkill, I do not necessarily say we should increase this production. But if this is emphasized as being so important, it is logical to ask the question.

In this address, it was mentioned that "the Russians slowed down last year the deployment of a missile defense for Moscow, now consisting of 67 missiles. But he said this was to allow time to test the advance system."

Perhaps the Soviets are now having the same trouble with their single deployment around one city—the Galosh around Moscow—that we had with our Nike-Hercules, Nike-Zeus, and then Nike X; therefore are testing rather than deploying their own version of something comparable to the Sentinel—now Safeguard.

In summary, it would appear the Soviets have reduced their planned single deployment around Moscow, and are testing a new system.

Instead, therefore, of unilaterally starting a new escalation in the arms race by announcing that we intend to deploy this Safeguard missile system all around the United States, and then putting this announcement into practice by asking for the money to purchase the land for 12 sites, why do we not limit our own efforts to the research and development of a truly effective ABM system?

THE 15TH ANNUAL REPORT ON THE INVENTORY OF DELINQUENT TAXPAYER ACCOUNTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I present my 15th annual report on the inventory of delinquent taxpayer accounts.

Referring to taxes in this report as delinquent, written off, or abated in 1968 does not mean the normal tax obligations for calendar year 1968; these would not be due until April 15, 1969. These delinquencies refer to recognized tax obligations for prior periods that are past due, and even then they were only classified as delinquent in 1968 after a series of unsuccessful attempts had been made to collect.

At the end of calendar year 1968 taxpayer accounts carried as delinquent totaled $1,586,611,000, an increase of $190 million over the $1,398,623,000 in delinquencies at the end of 1967. This $1,586,611,000 carried as delinquent on December 31, 1968, does not include, however, the $326,787,000 which were marked off as uncollectable in that year, nor does it include the $236,444,000 which were abated in the same period. When these writeoffs and abatements are taken into consideration it means that a total of $2,149,842,000 in past due taxes remained uncollected in 1968.

What makes this report even more disturbing is the fact that on December 31, 1968, employment tax delinquencies totaled $339,428,000, an increase of 32 percent above the $255,768,000 carried as delinquent in that same category in 1967. It should be emphasized that employment taxes represent taxes deducted from the pay envelopes of the employees by the employers and that these moneys do not belong to the employer. The expanded delinquencies in this category, therefore, are indefensible. These moneys should be treated as trust funds, and the Government should not condone these continuous delinquencies, ofttimes of the same companies.

I am incorporating in this report a series of charts to show how each office is functioning. Chart No. 1 is an itemized breakdown of these accounts still carried as delinquent, the taxes written off, and the amounts abated in each of the respective collection districts along with a comparison as to how that district performed the preceding year.

Chart No. 2 is a Treasury report of amounts carried in inventory as delinquent in each of the collection districts at the end of 1967 and 1968. This chart gives a breakdown of the delinquent income taxes, delinquent employment taxes, and delinquencies in other categories. Both the active and the inactive accounts referred to in this chart are included in the grant total of tax delinquencies. The inventory of delinquent accounts does not include, however, any of the amounts written off as uncollectable or abated.

The third chart is a Treasury breakdown of the amounts written off as uncollectable and the amounts abated in each of the collection districts in 1968 and 1967. The category of abated taxes represents the writeoffs due to recomputations of tax liabilities or court decisions as to the actual amounts of taxes owed as compared to the amounts originally assessed. Abatements also include the amounts written off in compromise settlements.

Chart No. 4 represents the Treasury report showing the total amount of revenue collections for the period July 1, 1967, to July 1, 1968, in each of the respective offices. This latter chart is included in order to show a comparison as to the amounts collected and the amounts uncollected or written off in the various offices of comparable size and can be used to determine the manner in which the respective offices are performing as compared to the national average.

I ask unanimous consent that the above-described charts, Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, be printed following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See charts 1, 2, 3, and 4.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall now discuss the performance record of the various offices.

NORTH-ATLANTIC REGION

Albany, N.Y.: Uncollected taxes in 1968 in the Albany office totaled $21,963,000, an increase of 40 percent over the 1967 period. The Albany office wrote off as uncollectable $5,134,000 in 1968, or nearly seven times the $780,000 written off as uncollectable in 1967. The remaining inventory of tax delinquencies in 1968 in this office increased from $14,195,000 in 1967 to $15,341,000 in 1968.

Augusta, Maine, has a fairly good report. Uncontrolled taxes in 1968 totaled $3,402,000 as compared with $3,042,000 in 1967, but the amount written off as uncollectable dropped from $266,000 in 1967 to $193,000 in 1968.

Boston, Mass., does not have a good report. Total uncollected taxes for 1968 in the Boston office were $75,383,000, an increase of over 33 percent over the $54,806,000 in 1967. In the same year Boston wroteoff as uncollectable $10,127,000, or three times the $2,943,000 written off as uncollectable in 1967. At the same time the Boston office abated $15,074,000 as compared with $5,720,000 in 1967. A further disturbing factor in this office is that employment tax delinquencies jumped from $12,390,000 in 1967 to $17,518,000 in 1968. Again it should be emphasized that these employment taxes represent income taxes, social security taxes, et cetera, that are withheld from the paychecks of the employees. They are in effect trust funds and should be treated as such.

Brooklyn, N.Y.: This is another office that needs attention since the delinquencies and the amounts marked off as uncollectable are exorbitant as compared to the national average. In the past 2 years, 1967 and 1968, the Brooklyn office has written off as uncollectable over $58 million. Another $34 million has been abated or marked off in the same 2-year period while the delinquent accounts at the end of 1968 still stayed at $87,036,000. What makes these total delinquencies more serious is the fact that nearly one-third, or $25,901,000, of the amount carried as delinquent at the end of the year represent uncollected employment taxes.

Buffalo, N.Y.: This office has a mixed report. The total for uncollected taxes in 1968 is $27,133,000 as compared with $25,307,000 in 1967, but both the amounts abated and the amounts written off as uncollectable are lower as compared with the earlier years. The disturbing factor is that over one-half of the accounts carried in this office as delinquent at the end of 1968 represented employment tax delinquencies. These employment tax delinquencies in 1968 totaled $11,656,000, more than double the $4,982,000 of the preceding year.

Burlington, Vt.: This office has not done so well. Uncollected taxes in 1968 have jumped from $1,732,000 in 1967 to $2,840,000 in 1968, while the amount carried as delinquent at the end of the year, after writeoffs and abatements, is nearly double the preceding period. Employment tax delinquencies jumped from $415,000 in 1967 to $666,000 in 1968. When these delinquencies are compared to the national average they are too high.

Hartford, Conn., is another office which does not have a good report. Delinquent accounts as of December 31, 1968, total $37,222,000, which is an increase of $8 million over the preceding year; but even this figure was arrived at only after the Hartford office had written off as uncollectable $2,160,000 in 1968—as compared with $846,000 in 1967—and had abated $3,170,000 in 1968—as compared to $2,533,000 in 1967.

Manhattan, N.Y.: The delinquent accounts in this office at the end of 1968 totaled $221,706,000 as compared with $181,633,000 in 1967. During the year 1968 the Manhattan office wrote off as uncollectable $26,903,000. This heavy writeoff came on top of the $87,673,000 that this office wrote off in 1967. Abatements in 1968 totaled $21,652,000 as compared with $27,260,000 in 1967. A question may well be asked, Why should the Manhattan office write off as uncollectable a total of $114 million in a 2-year period plus an additional $48 million being abated? Furthermore, it should be noted that in the Manhattan office employment tax delinquencies jumped to $52,348,000 in 1968 as compared to $30,611,000 in 1967. This is a $22 million increase in employment tax delinquencies during the 12-month period. This office needs attention; there is no excuse for such large amounts being written off in either Manhattan or Brooklyn.

Portsmouth, N.H.: The total of uncollected taxes in Portsmouth for 1968 is $3,014,000 as compared with $2,140,000 uncollected in 1967. Employment tax delinquencies in this office jumped to $926,000 in 1968 as compared to $479,000 in 1967.

Providence, R.I.: The inventory of delinquent accounts as of December 31, 1968, totaled $5,468,000 while total taxes uncollected in 1968, including the amounts written off and abated during the year, were $7,541,000 as compared to $5,879,000 in 1967. This entire North-Atlantic region needs special attention since the amounts being written off as uncollectable, the amounts abated, and the inventory of delinquent taxes at the end of the year after these large write-offs are significantly higher percentage-wise than the national average.

MID-ATLANTIC REGION

Baltimore, Md.: Tax delinquencies at the end of 1968 in Baltimore totaled $38,267,000, or an increase of $3 million over the preceding year while amounts written off as uncollectable totaled $6,055,000 as compared with $4,884,000 in 1967. Total taxes uncollected for 1968 were $49,061,000, an increase from the $44,898,000 uncollected in 1967.

Newark, N.J.: This office does not have a good report. In 1968 it reported $92,858,000 as the total taxes uncollected as compared to $82,800,000 in 1967. Employment tax delinquencies in the Newark office totaled $14,422,000 in 1968 as compared with $13,389,000 in 1967. Newark handles less revenue than Philadelphia yet its amount of uncollected taxes is considerably higher.

Philadelphia, Pa.: Philadelphia reports a reduction in its delinquent accounts with $42,331,000 reported delinquent as of the end of 1968 as compared with $47,253,000 in 1967; however, to arrive at this reduced figure the Philadelphia office wrote off as uncollectable $15,169,000 in 1968, or nearly three times the $5,622,000 written off as uncollectable in 1967. During the same period—1968—$7,105,000 were abated as compared to $6,644,000 in 1967. Employment tax delinquencies in the Philadelphia office at the end of 1968 were $9,663,000 as compared to $9,335,000 in 1967.

Pittsburgh, Pa.: Delinquent accounts in the Pittsburgh office at the end of 1968 jumped from $16,459,000 in 1967 to $24,007,000 in 1968. A substantial part of this increase is represented by an increase in employment tax delinquencies, which jumped from $4,772,000 in 1967 to $7,667,000 in 1968. During the year 1968 the amounts written off as uncollectable and the amounts abated were slightly lower than the preceding year.

Richmond, Va.: Delinquent taxes at the end of 1968 totaled $16,502,000, an increase from the $13,922,000 reported delinquent at the end of 1967; however, the total amount of uncollected taxes in the Richmond office for 1968 was lower than the preceding year due to the fact that the amounts written off as uncollectable and abated were less than the preceding year. The Richmond office does, however, show an increase in its employment tax delinquencies, or $5,031,000 at the end of 1968 as compared to $3,904,000 at the end of 1967.

Wilmington, Del.: Since this is the office in my home State I am proud to report that it is one of the offices that has a much better record for tax collections than the national average. The 1968 total for uncollected taxes in the Wilmington office was $4,763,000 a reduction from $6,549,000 reported in 1967, while the amounts written off as abated and uncollectable in 1968 were $1,877,000, a reduction from the $3,158,000 written off and abated in 1967. Employment tax delinquencies in the Wilmington office were reported at $531,000 in 1968 as compared to $520,000 in 1967. This is far below the national average for uncollected taxes, as related to the revenue collections. The Wilmington office reported 99.6 percent of assessed taxes being collected. This is one of the best reports in the country.

Compare this with other offices in the northeast region, some of which showed a collection rate as low as 96 percent. For example, total revenue collections in Brooklyn in fiscal 1968 were $3,372,823,000, or about three times the $1,114,987,000 total revenue collections for Wilmington, Del.; but in the 2-year period 1967–68 the Brooklyn office wrote off as uncollectable over 30 times as much as was written off in the Wilmington office. During this same 2-year period the Brooklyn office, which collected about three times as much as the Delaware office, abated over $34,000,000 in taxes, or nearly 10 times the amount abated in the Wilmington office. At the end of 1968 after all these large abatements and writeoffs, the delinquent accounts still totaled $87,036,000 in the Brooklyn office, or 30 times the amount of delinquent accounts in the Wilmington office.

When one considers that the Brooklyn office is only responsible for about three times the collections of the Delaware office it emphasizes the inefficiency in that area and the need for attention.

SOUTHEAST REGION

Atlanta, Ga.: Uncollected taxes in 1968 in this office totaled $25,267,000, of which amount $16,896,000 were still carried as delinquent at the end of the year after amounts written off as uncollectable and abated. This compares with $23,174,000 uncollected taxes in 1967. Employment tax delinquencies in Atlanta rose from $2,855,000 in 1967 to $4,427,000 in 1968.

Birmingham, Ala.: Employment tax delinquencies in this office doubled in 1968, rising from $1,715,000 in 1967 to $3,638,000 in 1968, while the total for uncollected taxes dropped from $17,325,000 in 1967 to $15,016,000 in 1968. The amounts written off as uncollectable in this office dropped from $4,560,000 in 1967 to $1,980,000 in 1968.

Columbia, S.C., reports a 50 percent increase in employment tax delinquencies, or a rise from $1,076,000 in 1967 to $1,629,000 in 1968. The amount carried as delinquent at the end of the year, after writeoffs and abatements of $2,604,000, rose from $6,869,000 in 1967 to $8,176,000 at the end of 1968.

Greensboro, N.C.: This is another office reporting a 60 percent increase in delinquent employment taxes, or a jump from $2,054,000 in 1967 to a total of

$3,213,000 in 1968. Delinquent accounts after all writeoffs and abatements in the Greensboro office rose from $12,406,000 in 1967 to $16,490,000 in 1968. Greensboro's total for uncollected taxes in 1968 was $22,228,000.

Jackson, Miss., reports a rise in employment taxes from $1,040,000 in 1967 to $1,378,000 in 1968. Delinquent accounts after deducting writeoffs for uncollectable accounts and abatements rose from $4,466,000 in 1967 to $4,769,000 in 1968. This increase is substantially accounted for by the rise in delinquent employment taxes.

Jacksonville, Fla.: This is another office which does not have a good collection record. Employment tax delinquencies are still large—$12,691,000 at the end of 1968 as compared with $11,984,000 at the end of 1967.

During 1968 the Jacksonville office wrote off as uncollectable $19,316,000, and this followed a writeoff of $19,368,000 as uncollectable in 1967. In 1968 the Jacksonville office abated an additional $23,743,000 in taxes, or three times the abatements of the $7,351,000 in 1967. The Jacksonville office in fiscal 1968 had total revenue collections of $2,986,346,000, or about the same amount as the $2,914,748,000 in the St. Paul, Minn., office, yet Jacksonville wrote off as uncollectable and abated a total of $43 million in 1968 and still reported a remaining delinquent tax account of $93,684,000. This represents a total of $136,743,000 in uncollected taxes at the Jacksonville office in 1968, which is over 10 times the $12,001,000 uncollected taxes in the St. Paul, Minn., office. The Jacksonville office needs urgent attention. Why are these accounts being written off or abated so freely?

Nashville, Tenn.: Employment tax delinquencies in the Nashville office jumped 60 percent, or from $2,709,000 in 1967 to $4,560,000 in 1968. During 1968 the Nashville office wrote off as uncollectable $4,671,000 as compared with $2,812,000 written off in 1967. Abatements during 1968 dropped from $4,259,000 in 1967 to $2,576,000 in 1968.

CENTRAL REGION

Cincinnati, Ohio: Uncollected taxes for 1968 in the Cincinnati office were about 20 percent higher than those reported for 1967, or $31,436,000 uncollected in 1968 as compared to $26,183,000 in 1967. Included in these totals were $7,642,000 written off as uncollectable in 1968 as compared to $4,219,000 written off in 1967. An additional $4,840,000 was abated in 1968 as compared to $3,220,000 in 1967. In each of the years the remaining inventory of delinquent taxes minus the writeoffs was about the same. Employment tax delinquencies in Cincinnati in 1968 were $4,785,000 as compared to $3,823,000 in 1967.

Cleveland, Ohio: The delinquent tax inventory in Cleveland at the end of 1968 was $44,399,000 as compared to $36,150,000 in 1967; however, the amounts written off as uncollectable and the amounts abated during 1968 were lower than those for 1967. Uncollected taxes in the Cleveland office in 1968 totaled $52,931,000 as compared to $50,623,000 in 1967 with nearly all of this increase being represented by an increase in employment tax delinquencies, which rose from $5,001,000 in 1967 to $7,010,000 in 1968.

Detroit, Mich.: The total for uncollected taxes in Detroit for 1968 is $67,595,000 as compared to $59,053,000 in 1967. The amount marked off as uncollectable in 1968 was $3,849,000 as compared with $3,279,000 in 1967 while abatements during the same year were about $2 million higher than in the preceding year, or $7,118,000 against $5,016,000. Again we find the same pattern of increase in employment tax delinquencies with $14,046,000 delinquencies in 1968 as compared to $12,330,000 in 1967. However, when we consider the amount of revenue handled in the Detroit office this is a good report. The total revenue collections for Detroit in fiscal 1968 were $12,649,256,000. Tax collections in the Detroit office were considerably better than the national average. Revenue collections in Detroit were over four times the total collected in the Jacksonville, Fla., office yet Jacksonville reported nearly five times as much written off as uncollectable as did the Detroit office.

Indianapolis, Ind.: In 1968 the Indianapolis office wrote off as uncollectable $6,487,000 representing a 50-percent increase over the $4,017,000 written off in 1967. In the same year 1968 the Indianapolis office abated $3,716,000 as compared to $3,446,000 in the preceding year. Employment tax delinquencies in Indianapolis rose from $5,298,000 in 1967 to $6,142,000 in 1968. The total for uncollected taxes in the years were $35,591,000 in 1968 as compared to $31,529,000 in 1967.

Louisville, Ky.: Employment tax delinquencies in Louisville rose over 50 percent in 1968, or from $2,046,000 in 1967 to $3,222,000 in 1968. The total uncollected taxes in 1968 rose from $14,620,000 in 1967 to $17,856,000 in 1968.

Parkersburg, W. Va.: Employment tax delinquencies rose about 60 percent in this office, or from $1,044,000 in 1967 to $1,623,000 in 1968, thus bringing its total of uncollected taxes to $7,785,000 as compared to $6,206,000 in 1967.

MIDWEST REGION

Aberdeen, S. Dak.: Employment tax delinquencies in the Aberdeen, S. Dak., office rose from $154,000 in 1967 to $284,000 in 1968 with the total for uncollected taxes rising from $1,269,000 in 1967 to $1,632,000 in 1968.

Chicago, Ill.: In 1968 the Chicago office wrote off as uncollectable $19,128,000, an increase of nearly $3,000,000 over the $16,868,000 written off in 1967. Abatements in the Chicago office were lower in 1968, or $8,698,000 as compared to $12,028,000 in 1967. The inventory of delinquent accounts in Chicago minus the writeoffs and abatements was $48,210,000 in 1968 as compared to $50,102,000 in 1967, but delinquent employment taxes rose spectacularly in this office, or from $8,602,000 in 1967 to $14,185,000 in 1968.

Des Moines, Iowa, has a good report, but it does report an increase in its employment tax delinquencies with the 1968 total rising to $1,249,000 as compared to $879,000 in 1967; however, the Des Moines office as a whole has a good report. The amounts written off as uncollectable dropped from $2,311,000 in 1967 to $696,000 in 1968 while abatements dropped from $1,586,000 in 1967 to $1,118,000 in 1968. The total uncollected taxes for the Des Moines office in 1968 including the writeoffs were $6,941,000, a drop from the $8,274,000 reported in 1967. When we consider that in fiscal 1968 the Des Moines office's total revenue collections were $1,304,909,000 this is considerably below the national average for uncollected taxes. This office should be complimented.

Compare Des Moines report with that of Jacksonville, Fla., which handled about two-and-one-half times the collections of the Des Moines office, yet Jacksonville's total for uncollected taxes were nearly 20 times that of the Des Moines office. Furthermore, the amounts written off as uncollectable and the amounts abated in the Jacksonville office totaling over $43 million in 1968 as compared with less than $2 million written off and abated in the Des Moines office.

Fargo, N. Dak.: Employment tax delinquencies rose from $246,000 in 1967 to $389,000 in 1968 while the total for uncollected taxes, including writeoffs and abatements, in this office is $1,423,000 in 1968 as compared to $1,233,000 in 1967.

Milwaukee, Wis.: This office has a good report although it reports the same trend of increased employment tax delinquencies with $2,957,000 reported at the end of 1968 as compared to $2,422,000 delinquent in 1967; however, the Milwaukee office shows an overall decline in its reported total for uncollected taxes. In 1968 $2,384,000 was written off as uncollectable as compared to $3,943,000 written off in 1967. Abatements were slightly higher than those in 1967, but the inventory of delinquent accounts minus writeoffs was lower. The total of uncollected taxes in the Milwaukee office dropped from $17,361,000 in 1967 to $15,896,000 in 1968. Overall this is an excellent report for this office when we we consider that the total revenue collections for the year in Milwaukee were $3,079,873,000, about equal to the $3,372,823,000 revenue collections in the Brooklyn office; yet Brooklyn reported uncollected taxes of $138,540,000 in 1968, or over eight times the $15,896,000 uncollected in Milwaukee.

Omaha, Nebr., has a good report with its total of uncollected taxes dropping from $10,690,000 in 1967 to $7,358,000 in 1968. Delinquent employment taxes were $741,000 in 1968 as compared to $670,000 in 1967. Abatements dropped from $3,205,000 in 1967 to $1,734,000 in 1968 while the amounts marked off as uncollectable dropped from $710,000 in 1967 to $562,000 in 1968.

St. Louis, Mo., while reporting a higher total of uncollected taxes in 1968, still has a good report as compared to the national average. Total revenue collections in St. Louis office in fiscal 1968 were $4,314,622,000 or about 30 percent larger than the Brooklyn office collections, yet its total for uncollected taxes in 1968 is

$26,126,000 as compared to $138,540,000 uncollected taxes in the Brooklyn office. The collection record for St. Louis is far above the national average.

St. Paul, Minn., has a good report. This office, which has total revenue collections in 1968 of $2,914,748,000 reports a drop in its total of uncollected taxes from $13,796,000 in 1967 to $12,001,000 in 1968. Jacksonville and Brooklyn, each with about the same amount of revenue collections, had 10 times as many writeoffs and uncollected taxes as St. Paul.

Springfield, Ill., also has a report better than the national average. This office, which handled $1,887,006,000 in revenue collections last year reported only $8,910,000 total uncollected taxes in 1968 as compared to $8,508,000 in 1967. The amounts being written off as uncollected in 1968 dropped from $2,377,000 in 1967 to $712,000 in 1968. This is a good report for an office of this size.

SOUTHWEST REGION

Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Employment tax delinquencies rose from $867,000 in 1967 to $1,147,000 in 1968 while the total of uncollected taxes, including amounts written off and abated rose from $7,541,000 in 1967 to $8,511,000 in 1968.

Austin, Tex.: This office does not have a good report. Employment tax delinquencies jumped from $5,771,000 in 1967 to $8,585,000 in 1968. The amount written off as uncollectable jumped from $7,202,000 in 1967 to $12,140,000 in 1968 while the amount abated rose from $4,652,000 in 1967 to $5,690,000 in 1968. The total uncollected taxes in the Austin office rose from $72,093,000 in 1967 to $81,573,000 in 1968.

This is far above the national average for uncollected taxes; for example, the total annual revenue collections of the Austin office were $3,764,738,000 as compared to the $4,314,622,000 in revenue collections in the St. Louis, Mo., office. Yet, Austin, which handled less revenue, reported uncollected taxes in 1968 of $81.5 million, or over three times the $26.1 million uncollected taxes in the larger St. Louis office.

Cheyenne, Wyo.: Uncollected taxes in the Cheyenne office showed a slight increase, rising from $1,527,000 in 1967 to $1,559,000 in 1968 with the most of this increase representing an increase in employment tax delinquencies, which rose from $329,000 in 1967 to $432,000 in 1968.

Dallas, Tex.: This office does not have a good report. Employment tax delinquencies in the Dallas office jumped from $4,935,000 in 1967 to $6,486,000 in 1968. The amount written off as uncollectable rose from $5,831,000 in 1967 to $7,919,000 in 1968 while the amount of abatements rose from $3,646,000 in 1967 to $4,071,000 in 1968. The total for uncollected taxes in Dallas, including writeoffs, in 1968 was $72,082,000 as compared to $71,072,000 in 1967.

This is far above the national average; for example, the total revenue collections in the Dallas office were $2,943,214,000, or considerably less than the $3,436,792,000 revenue collections for the Cincinnati, Ohio, office; yet the total of uncollected taxes in the Dallas office was more than double that of the Cincinnati office.

There are far too many writeoffs and uncollected taxes in both Dallas and Austin. They need attention.

Denver, Colo., has a good report. The amounts written off as uncollectable in the Denver office dropped from $4,068,000 in 1967 to $2,246,000 in 1968 while the amounts abated in the same period dropped from $3,564,000 in 1967 to $1,908,000 in 1968. The total uncollected taxes, including writeoffs, in the Denver office in 1968 were $16,472,000. Employment tax delinquencies in the Denver office rose from $3,149,000 in 1967 to $3,703,000 in 1968.

Little Rock, Ark.: The total for the uncollected taxes in Little Rock dropped from $13,117,000 in 1967 to $11,589,000 in 1968; however, the amounts written off as uncollectable showed a substantial increase, rising from $752,000 in 1967 to $2,315,000 in 1968. In this same period delinquent employment taxes jumped by 40 percent, or from $1,015,000 in 1967 to $1,444,000 in 1968.

New Orleans, La.: This office has a bad report. Employment tax delinquencies in the New Orleans office jumped from $4,178,000 in 1967 to $7,372,000 in 1968. The amounts written off as uncollectable rose from $2,897,000 in 1967 to $4,496,000 in 1968, and abatements during the year rose from $1,345,000 in 1967 to $2,864,000 in 1968. Its remaining inventory of delinquent taxes, after these writeoffs, rose from $15,693,000 in 1967 to a total of $21,871,000 in 1968. This brought the total for uncollected taxes in the New Orleans office in 1968 to $29,231,000. This office handles about 40 percent more revenue collections than the Wilmington, Del., office, yet their amount of uncollected taxes is over six times larger than the Delaware office.

Oklahoma City, Okla.: This is another office reporting a rise in employment tax delinquencies, or from $2,551,000 in 1967 to $3,184,000 in 1968 with the total for uncollected taxes during the year of 1968 rising to $16,891,000 from the $14,547,000 figure reported in 1967.

Wichita, Kans.: Employment tax delinquencies in Wichita rose nearly 50 percent, or from $1,397,000 in 1967 to $2,096,000 in 1968 while its inventory for delinquent accounts rose from $7,006,000 in 1967 to $10,487,000 in 1968, thus bringing its total for uncollected taxes in 1968 to $12,628,000 as compared to $10,422,000 in 1967.

WESTERN REGION

Anchorage, Alaska: When compared with the total amount of revenue collections for an office, Anchorage has a poor report. The total revenue collections for Anchorage were $118,827,000 while its total for uncollected taxes in 1968 was $2,939,000 as compared to $2,694,000 in 1967. The amount of uncollected taxes as related to the total revenue collections in that office were considerably above national average. Employment tax delinquencies in Anchorage rose over 35 percent, from $683,000 in 1967 to $946,000 in 1968.

Boise, Idaho, does not have too good of a report. The total revenue collections in this office were $337,240,000 while its total for uncollected taxes in 1968 was $4,096,000 as compared with $3,761,000 in 1967. Employment tax delinquencies in Boise rose from $757,000 in 1967 to $826,000 in 1968.

Helena, Mont.: This office has shown improvement although employment tax delinquencies had a slight increase, from $361,000 in 1967 to $368,000 in 1968, but the total for the amount of taxes not collected dropped from $2,743,000 in 1967 to $2,494,000 in 1968. The amounts written off as uncollected in Helena likewise dropped from $766,000 in 1967 to $486,000 in 1968.

Honolulu, Hawaii: Employment tax delinquents rose over 50 percent, from $780,000 in 1967 to $1,199,000 in 1968 while the amount carried as delinquent at the end of 1968 had risen from $2,395,000 in 1967 to $3,738,000 in 1968. The amount written off as uncollectible in Honolulu rose from $227,000 in 1967 to $581,000 in 1968, but there was a substantial drop in the amount abated in this office, this figure being $579,000 in 1968 as compared to $2,756,000 in 1967.

Los Angeles, Calif.: This office has a high ratio of uncollected taxes in 1968. It marked off as uncollectible $66,107,000 in 1968 as compared to $45,011,000 marked off in 1967. Taxes abated during 1968 totaled $6,782,000 as compared to $5,927,000 in 1967.

Even after these substantial writeoffs and abatements the remaining inventory carried as delinquent taxes on December 31, 1968, totaled $118,685,000 as compared to $92,522,000 in 1967. Employment tax delinquencies in 1968 were $16,021,000, slightly less than the $17,744,000 carried as delinquent in 1967. This means, however, that the Los Angeles office, whose annual revenue collections totaled $8,812,169,000, was reporting a total of uncollected taxes in 1968 of $191,754,000.

This is not a good report as compared to other offices; for example, the Detroit office, which has annual revenue collections totaling $12,649,256,000 only reported uncollected taxes in 1968 of $67,595,000. Yet the Los Angeles office, which is two-thirds the size of the Detroit office in revenue collections, reports a total for uncollected taxes in 1968 of $191,574,000, or nearly three times that of Detroit. The Los Angeles office needs attention.

Phoenix, Ariz.: Employment tax delinquencies in Phoenix jumped nearly 40 percent, or from $1,517,000 in 1967 to $2,113,000 in 1968. The amount written off as uncollectable in 1968 was nearly double the amount written off in 1967, or $3,380,000 in 1968 as compared to $1,875,000 in 1967. The amount abated during 1968 totaled $1,767,000 as compared to $1,316,000 in 1967. The remaining carried as delinquent accounts at the end of 1968 totaled $9,290,000, an increase from the $7,460,000 carried as delinquent at the end of 1967. Altogether the total for uncollected taxes in the Phoenix office for 1968 was nearly 40-percent higher than the total for uncollected taxes for 1967.

Portland, Oreg.: Employment tax delinquencies in Portland were more than double the delinquencies in the preceding year, or $2,860,000 in 1968 as compared with $1,372,000 in 1967; however, the amount marked off as uncollectable in Portland in 1968 dropped substantially, or from $2,585,000 in 1967 to $1,268,000 in 1968. Abatements likewise declined in 1968, with $1,778,000 listed for abatements in 1968 as compared to $2,703,000 in 1967. However, after these writeoffs the balance carried as 1968 delinquent accounts in Portland showed a 50-percent increase, rising from $6,082,000 in 1967 to $9,962,000 in 1968, bringing the total for uncollected taxes in the Portland office to $13,008,000.

Reno, Nev.: This office has a bad report. Employment tax delinquencies in the Reno office rose from $1,897,000 in 1967 to $2,038,000 in 1968. Amounts marked off as uncollectable in Reno likewise jumped from $2,348,000 in 1967 to $3,636,000 in 1968 while abatements were correspondingly higher, rising from $699,000 in 1967 to $947,000 in 1968. Even after these increased writeoffs and abatements the balance carried as delinquent accounts on December 31, 1968, was still nearly double the delinquent account balance in 1967, or $12,140,000 in 1968 as compared to $6,452,000 in 1967. The total for uncollected taxes in Reno in 1968 was $16,723,000. Total revenue collections in the Reno office in fiscal 1968 was only $308,093,000, or about one-fourth the size of the collections in the Wilmington, Del., office, yet the amount of uncollected taxes in Reno was over three times those of Delaware.

Salt Lake City, Utah: Employment tax delinquencies rose about 20 percent, or from $852,000 in 1967 to $1,032,000 in 1968. This office marked off as uncollectable $991,000 in 1968 as compared to $1,299,000 in 1967, but abatements during the year were sharply higher with $1,928,000 abated in 1968 as compared to $711,000 in 1967.

San Francisco, Calif.: Employment tax delinquencies in San Francisco rose from $8,446,000 in 1967 to $9,752,000 in 1968 while during the same year it marked off as uncollectable and abated a total of $19,463,000 in 1968 as compared to $15,202,000 in 1967. Even after considering these increased writeoffs and abatements, however, the balance carried as delinquent accounts at the end of 1968 had risen from $50,441,000 in 1967 to $59,372,000 in 1968. A total of $78,835,000 in 1968 taxes remained uncollected in this office.

Seattle, Wash.: Delinquent employment taxes increased 50 percent, from $1,830,000 in 1967 to $2,754,000 in 1968 while the total for uncollected taxes rose from $13,112,000 in 1967 to $15,362,00 in 1968; however, when the size of this office, whose annual collection totaled $2,302,670,000, is taken into consideration its report for tax collections is better than the national average. For example, Seattle, with its $2.3 billion revenue collections reported a total of only $15,362,000 in uncollected taxes in 1968 as compared with Jacksonville, Fla., with its $2.9 billion revenue collections which reported $136,743,000 as uncollected in 1968. Thus the Jacksonville office, which is about 30 percent larger in total revenue collections than the Seattle office, reported delinquent and uncollected taxes over eight times that of the Seattle office.

INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

Puerto Rico: Employment tax delinquencies dropped from $1,946,000 in 1967 to $1,441,000 in 1968, but the total for uncollected taxes in 1968, including the $1.2 million marked off as uncollectable and abated, was $3,902,000, or about the same as the preceding year. Yet this office only handled $199,297,000 in annual revenue collections, and the $3.9 million being reported as uncollected taxes is considerably higher than the national average.

All others: This category under International Operations includes delinquent accounts of American citizens who are stationed abroad, and it is alarmingly high. The annual revenue collections of the Federal Government from this classification were $450,866,000, yet the total for uncollected taxes in this same category in 1968 is $77,778,000. This represents a 14-percent loss in collections. This is 10 times the national average and needs considerably more attention than has been given to this area in the past.

In this report it should be noted that the offices of Brooklyn and Manhattan, N.Y.; Jacksonville, Fla.; both offices in Texas, Austin, and Dallas; Los Angeles, Calif.; and Reno, Nev., are mentioned as having a poor record of collections. Some explanations should be forthcoming as to why people in those areas have not been paying their taxes.

The collection of taxes classified under International Operations have likewise been very poor as compared to the national average. This, too, needs attention.

CHART 1.—INVENTORY OF TAXPAYER DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS, AS OF DEC. 31, 1968, AND 1967

[Figures in thousands]

	1968	1967
NORTH-ATLANTIC REGION		
Albany, N.Y.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	$5,134	$780
Abated during year	1,488	628
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	15,341	14,195
Total uncollected taxes	21,963	15,603
Augusta, Maine:		
Marked off as uncollectible	193	266
Abated during year	643	316
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	2,566	2,460
Total uncollected taxes	3,402	3,042
Boston, Mass.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	10,127	2,943
Abated during year	15,074	5,720
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	50,182	46,143
Total uncollected taxes	75,383	54,806
Brooklyn, N.Y.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	25,836	32,354
Abated during year	25,668	8,572
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	87,036	89,287
Total uncollected taxes	138,540	130,213
Buffalo, N.Y.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	1,974	2,719
Abated during year	3,035	4,382
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	22,124	18,206
Total uncollected taxes	27,133	25,307
Burlington, Vt.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	176	133
Abated during year	247	232
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	2,417	1,367
Total uncollected taxes	2,840	1,732
Hartford, Conn.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	$2,160	$846
Abated during year	3,170	2,533
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	37,222	29,011
Total uncollected taxes	42,552	32,390
Manhattan, N.Y.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	26,903	87,673
Abated during year	21,652	27,260
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	221,706	181,633
Total uncollected taxes	270,261	296,566
Portsmouth, N.H.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	233	398
Abated during year	581	155
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	2,200	1,587
Total uncollected taxes	3,014	2,140
Providence, R.I.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	1,493	1,100
Abated during year	580	541
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	5,468	4,238
Total uncollected taxes	7,541	5,879
MID-ATLANTIC REGION		
Baltimore, Md.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	6,055	4,884
Abated during year	4,739	4,871
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	38,267	35,143
Total uncollected taxes	49,061	44,898
Newark, N.J.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	7,392	9,040
Abated during year	10,236	12,249
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	75,230	61,511
Total uncollected taxes	92,858	82,800
Philadelphia, Pa.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	15,169	5,622
Abated during year	7,105	6,644
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	42,331	47,253
Total uncollected taxes	64,605	59,519
Pittsburgh, Pa.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	1,790	2,448
Abated during year	4,499	5,729
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	24,007	16,459
Total uncollected taxes	30,296	24,636
Richmond, Va.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	1,858	1,960
Abated during year	2,881	6,942
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	16,502	13,922
Total uncollected taxes	21,241	22,824
Wilmington, Del.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	1,273	298
Abated during year	604	2,860
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	2,886	3,391
Total uncollected taxes	4,763	6,549
SOUTHEAST REGION		
Atlanta, Ga.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	3,612	4,828
Abated during year	4,759	4,404
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	16,896	13,942
Total uncollected taxes	25,267	23,174
Birmingham, Ala.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	1,980	4,560
Abated during year	4,061	3,109
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	8,975	9,656
Total uncollected taxes	15,016	17,325
Columbia, S.C.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	1,147	1,903
Abated during year	1,457	1,286
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	8,176	6,869
Total uncollected taxes	10,780	10,058
Greensboro, N.C.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	2,073	3,027
Abated during year	3,665	4,679
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	16,490	12,406
Total uncollected taxes	22,228	20,112
Jackson, Miss.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	1,982	1,504
Abated during year	926	1,449
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	4,769	4,466
Total uncollected taxes	7,677	7,419

CHART 1.—INVENTORY OF TAXPAYER DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS, AS OF DEC. 31, 1968, AND 1967—Con.

[Figures in thousands]

	1968	1967
SOUTHEAST REGION—Continued		
Jacksonville, Fla.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	$19,316	$19,368
Abated during year	23,743	7,351
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	93,684	89,704
Total uncollected taxes	136,743	116,423
Nashville, Tenn.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	4,671	2,812
Abated during year	2,576	4,259
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	16,249	14,379
Total uncollected taxes	23,496	21,450
CENTRAL REGION		
Cincinnati, Ohio:		
Marked off as uncollectible	7,642	4,219
Abated during year	4,840	3,220
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	18,954	18,744
Total uncollected taxes	31,436	26,183
Cleveland, Ohio:		
Marked off as uncollectible	4,096	4,986
Abated during year	4,436	9,487
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	44,399	36,150
Total uncollected taxes	52,931	50,623
Detroit, Mich.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	3,849	3,279
Abated during year	7,118	5,016
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	56,618	50,758
Total uncollected taxes	67,595	59,053
Indianapolis, Ind.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	6,487	4,017
Abated during year	3,716	3,446
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	25,388	24,066
Total uncollected taxes	35,591	31,529
Louisville, Ky.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	1,532	2,731
Abated during year	1,673	2,642
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	14,651	9,247
Total uncollected taxes	17,856	14,620
Parkersburg, W. Va.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	568	897
Abated during year	623	764
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	6,594	4,545
Total uncollected taxes	7,785	6,206
MIDWEST REGION		
Aberdeen, S. Dak.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	94	196
Abated during year	293	164
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	1,245	909
Total uncollected taxes	1,632	1,269
Chicago, Ill.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	19,128	16,868
Abated during year	8,698	12,028
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	48,210	50,102
Total uncollected taxes	76,036	78,998
Des Moines, Iowa:		
Marked off as uncollectible	696	2,311
Abated during year	1,118	1,586
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	5,127	4,377
Total uncollected taxes	6,941	8,274
Fargo, N. Dak.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	135	92
Abated during year	245	156
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	1,043	985
Total uncollected taxes	1,423	1,233
Milwaukee, Wis.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	2,384	3,943
Abated during year	2,960	2,354
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	10,552	11,064
Total uncollected taxes	15,896	17,361
MIDWEST REGION—Con.		
Omaha, Nebr.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	$562	$710
Abated during year	1,734	3,205
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	5,062	6,775
Total uncollected taxes	7,358	10,690
St. Louis, Mo.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	3,099	6,718
Abated during year	2,930	4,495
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	20,097	13,919
Total uncollected taxes	26,126	25,132
St. Paul, Minn.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	1,131	3,678
Abated during year	2,167	3,201
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	8,703	6,917
Total uncollected taxes	12,001	13,796
Springfield, Ill.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	712	2,377
Abated during year	1,484	1,052
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	6,714	5,079
Total uncollected taxes	8,910	8,508
SOUTHWEST REGION		
Albuquerque, N. Mex.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	686	656
Abated during year	1,414	1,096
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	6,411	5,789
Total uncollected taxes	8,511	7,541
Austin, Tex.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	12,140	7,202
Abated during year	5,690	4,652
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	63,743	60,239
Total uncollected taxes	81,573	72,093
Cheyenne, Wyo.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	171	249
Abated during year	349	153
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	1,039	1,125
Total uncollected taxes	1,559	1,527
Dallas, Tex.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	7,919	5,831
Abated during year	4,071	3,646
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	60,092	61,595
Total uncollected taxes	72,082	71,072
Denver, Colo:.		
Marked off as uncollectible	2,246	4,068
Abated during year	1,908	3,564
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	12,318	9,736
Total uncollected taxes	16,472	17,368
Little Rock, Ark.:		
Marked off as uncollectable	2,315	752
Abated during year	918	1,178
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	8,356	11,187
Total uncollected taxes	11,589	13,117
New Orleans, La.:		
Marked off as uncollectable	4,496	2,897
Abated during year	2,864	1,345
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	21,871	15,693
Total uncollected taxes	29,231	19,935
Oklahoma City, Okla.:		
Marked off as uncollectable	2,414	3,244
Abated during year	1,656	2,060
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	12,821	9,243
Total uncollected taxes	16,891	14,547
Wichita, Kans.:		
Marked off as uncollectable	878	850
Abated during year	1,263	2,566
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	10,487	7,006
Total uncollected taxes	12,628	10,422
WESTERN REGION		
Anchorage, Alaska:		
Marked off as uncollectable	$424	$883
Abated during year	266	197
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	2,249	1,614
Total uncollected taxes	2,939	2,694
Boise, Idaho:		
Marked off as uncollectable	148	208
Abated during year	455	872
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	3,493	2,681
Total uncollected taxes	4,096	3,762
Helena, Mont.:		
Marked off as uncollectable	486	766
Abated during year	443	405
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	1,565	1,572
Total uncollected taxes	2,494	2,743
Honolulu, Hawaii:		
Marked off as uncollectible	581	227
Abated during year	579	2,756
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	3,738	2,395
Total uncollected taxes	4,898	5,378
Los Angeles, Calif.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	66,107	45,011
Abated during year	6,782	5,927
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	118,685	92,522
Total uncollected taxes	191,574	143,460
Phoenix, Ariz.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	3,380	1,875
Abated during year	1,767	1,316
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	9,290	7,460
Total uncollected taxes	14,437	10,651
Portland, Oreg.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	1,268	2,585
Abated during year	1,778	2,703
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	9,962	6,082
Total uncollected taxes	13,008	11,370
Reno, Nev.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	3,636	2,348
Abated during year	947	699
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	12,140	6,452
Total uncollected taxes	16,723	9,499
Salt Lake City, Utah:		
Marked off as uncollectible	991	1,299
Abated during year	1,928	711
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	4,159	5,076
Total uncollected taxes	7,078	7,086
San Francisco, Calif.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	11,896	12,277
Abated during year	7,567	2,925
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	59,372	50,441
Total uncollected taxes	78,835	65,643
Seattle, Wash.:		
Marked off as uncollectible	2,107	2,357
Abated during year	2,293	3,199
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	10,962	7,556
Total uncollected taxes	15,362	13,112
INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS		
Puerto Rico:		
Marked off as uncollectible	292	262
Abated during year	914	852
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	2,696	2,793
Total uncollected taxes	3,902	3,907
All other:		
Marked off as uncollectible	7,536	2,768
Abated during year	3,171	4,493
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31	67,071	69,501
Total uncollected taxes	77,778	76,762

CHART 2.—INVENTORY OF TAXPAYER DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS, DECEMBER 1968 AND 1967

Region and district	Tax groups											
	Income				Employment				Other			
	Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)	
	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967
Total	558,967	619,511	1,003,955	946,788	246,845	222,740	339,428	255,768	53,805	32,383	243,232	196,067
North Atlantic	123,893	141,758	254,750	255,233	57,395	52,366	120,847	82,346	9,410	4,583	70,668	50,547
Mid-Atlantic	97,474	108,481	131,461	114,141	34,027	32,419	44,225	38,118	6,868	5,950	23,536	25,420
Southeast	69,308	69,723	117,858	110,473	35,666	29,508	31,536	23,433	7,594	5,836	15,845	17,515
Central	76,957	88,154	98,985	92,978	30,900	28,274	36,828	29,542	8,475	3,671	30,800	20,990
Midwest	52,357	57,997	65,858	69,821	23,647	19,383	29,441	19,586	3,879	2,961	11,454	10,718
Southwest	56,687	63,392	137,954	135,588	31,699	27,241	34,449	24,192	6,461	3,991	24,735	21,835
Western	77,452	85,206	133,425	102,174	30,555	30,040	39,909	36,239	10,958	5,239	62,281	45,440
International operations	4,839	4,800	63,664	66,380	2,956	3,509	2,193	2,312	160	152	3,911	3,602
North Atlantic region:												
Albany	7,936	7,966	6,688	5,614	3,471	2,208	4,639,	3,598	464	280	4,014	4,982
Augusta	2,205	2,064	1,909	2,152	930	681	576	292	246	41	81	16
Boston	19,938	28,923	27,865	31,628	10,269	10,859	17,518	12,390	1,777	680	4,800	2,125
Brooklyn	30,677	40,777	48,757	55,759	12,014	11,905	25,901	24,000	1,993	852	12,378	9,528
Buffalo	12,018	11,774	7,512	10,704	6,443	4,496	11,656	4,982	771	331	2,957	2,520
Burlington	999	944	1,422	878	744	608	666	415	293	53	329	74
Hartford	10,878	9,551	12,759	8,728	4,147	3,288	5,240	4,183	647	380	19,224	16,099
Manhattan	35,449	35,955	144,165	136,318	17,069	16,612	52,348	30,611	2,897	1,659	25,193	14,704
Portsmouth	1,810	1,665	1,184	1,093	851	576	926	479	117	20	90	16
Providence	1,983	2,139	2,489	2,359	1,457	1,133	1,377	1,396	205	287	1,602	483
Mid-Atlantic region:												
Baltimore	23,334	26,535	27,845	24,779	4,956	4,885	6,911	6,198	1,234	940	3,511	4,166
Newark	23,937	28,152	50,835	39,391	10,024	10,656	14,422	13,389	2,037	1,950	9,973	8,731
Philadelphia	23,829	23,861	26,794	30,200	7,499	6,937	9,663	9,335	1,359	1,214	5,874	7,718
Pittsburgh	10,123	11,114	14,080	9,791	4,606	3,965	7,667	4,772	1,215	925	2,260	1,896
Richmond	13,183	15,374	9,786	8,328	6,139	5,205	5,031	3,904	862	751	1,685	1,690
Wilmington	3,608	3,445	2,121	1,652	803	771	531	520	161	170	235	1,219
Southeast region:												
Atlanta	10,218	10,684	8,122	8,564	5,697	3,980	4,427	2,855	1,468	1,017	4,347	2,523
Birmingham	6,770	6,421	4,287	5,610	3,934	3,283	3,638	1,715	987	607	1,050	2,330
Columbia	5,842	5,377	5,394	5,384	2,726	1,977	1,629	1,076	748	485	1,153	409
Greensboro	12,160	10,874	12,289	9,520	4,384	3,460	3,213	2,054	675	695	988	832
Jackson	4,162	4,691	2,973	3,128	2,242	2,117	1,378	1,040	490	565	418	297
Jacksonville	19,925	21,704	74,691	69,453	11,022	10,416	12,691	11,984	2,451	1,490	6,302	8,268
Nashville	10,231	9,973	10,102	8,814	5,661	4,275	4,560	2,709	775	977	1,857	2,856
Central region:												
Cincinnati	12,759	13,272	11,767	11,942	4,609	4,378	4,785	3,823	1,433	464	2,402	2,980
Cleveland	13,941	16,344	29,874	26,684	5,986	5,044	7,010	5,001	2,026	834	7,516	4,464
Detroit	28,303	35,207	28,565	30,877	9,712	10,389	14,046	12,330	2,589	1,396	14,016	7,551
Indianapolis	10,666	12,046	15,647	14,362	4,942	4,415	6,142	5,298	1,184	621	3,599	4,406
Louisville	8,306	8,542	9,913	6,759	3,893	2,682	3,222	2,046	779	240	1,515	442
Parkersburg	2,982	2,743	3,219	2,354	1,758	1,366	1,623	1,044	464	116	1,752	1,147
Midwest region:												
Aberdeen	1,116	990	850	609	542	362	284	154	122	64	111	145
Chicago	19,169	24,329	31,329	36,942	7,931	7,172	14,185	8,602	925	855	2,695	4,557
Des Moines	3,782	4,112	3,149	2,624	1,746	1,338	1,249	879	543	555	728	875
Fargo	880	1,084	456	663	563	385	389	246	116	52	199	76
Milwaukee	5,692	6,435	6,473	7,193	2,727	2,101	2,957	2,422	323	275	1,122	1,449
Omaha	2,156	1,910	3,826	5,170	870	787	741	670	215	106	495	934
St. Louis	9,800	9,668	10,523	8,775	4,947	3,591	5,375	3,700	631	466	4,199	1,443
St. Paul	4,922	5,157	5,201	4,474	2,391	2,015	2,531	1,566	658	375	972	878
Springfield	4,840	4,312	4,051	3,371	1,930	1,632	1,730	1,347	346	213	933	361
Southwest region:												
Albuquerque	1,785	2,052	4,928	4,227	1,234	1,152	1,147	867	234	167	335	695
Austin	14,624	14,917	42,131	41,379	7,493	6,080	8,585	5,771	1,290	817	13,027	13,089
Cheyenne	858	919	533	685	560	522	432	329	111	91	75	112
Dallas	13,100	13,644	50,974	53,937	6,112	5,424	6,486	4,935	1,381	841	2,632	2,723
Denver	4,568	6,385	6,663	5,472	3,248	2,950	3,703	3,149	1,006	656	1,952	1,115
Little Rock	3,860	3,921	6,642	10,004	2,145	1,687	1,444	1,015	430	191	270	168
New Orleans	6,724	9,487	11,799	9,179	5,100	4,288	7,372	4,178	573	453	2,700	2,336
Oklahoma City	6,314	7,298	7,087	5,685	3,304	3,000	3,184	2,551	791	443	2,550	1,008
Wichita	4,854	4,769	7,197	5,020	2,503	2,138	2,096	1,397	545	332	1,194	589
Western region:												
Anchorage	949	1,159	979	861	496	448	946	683	110	31	324	70
Boise	1,372	1,297	2,508	1,838	845	639	826	757	207	148	160	86
Helena	1,462	1,159	1,081	1,053	648	586	368	361	227	150	116	158
Honolulu	1,554	1,316	2,191	1,507	748	604	1,199	780	126	66	348	109
Los Angeles	27,854	32,089	74,011	50,910	9,791	11,450	16,021	17,774	3,390	1,720	28,653	23,867
Phoenix	3,938	4,000	5,032	5,347	1,605	1,337	2,113	1,517	700	236	2,145	596
Portland	6,165	5,653	5,757	4,253	2,854	1,859	2,860	1,372	930	392	1,344	457
Reno	1,814	2,153	4,937	3,442	1,069	1,102	2,038	1,897	485	93	5,164	1,113
Salt Lake City	2,364	2,314	2,433	3,661	1,155	1,116	1,032	852	227	189	694	564
San Francisco	23,339	28,595	28,484	24,771	8,635	8,728	9,752	8,446	3,397	1,889	21,137	17,225
Seattle	6,641	5,471	6,012	4,531	2,709	2,171	2,754	1,830	1,159	325	2,196	1,195
International operations:												
Puerto Rico	794	834	1,256	834	2,576	3,251	1,441	1,956	--------	1	----------	13
All other	4,045	3,966	62,408	65,546	380	258	752	366	160	151	3,911	3,589

Region and district	Tax groups—Total				Inactive			
	Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)	
	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967
Total	859,617	874,634	1,586,611	1,398,623	117,630	146,515	638.361	621,157
North Atlantic	190,698	198,707	446,262	388,127	28,527	34,374	163,028	162,285
Mid-Atlantic	138,369	146,850	199,223	177,679	17,431	25,757	73,261	82,719
Southeast	112,568	105,067	165,239	151,422	13,721	17,603	85,288	82,970
Central	116,332	120,099	166,614	143,510	15,344	19,141	57,297	53,882
Midwest	79,883	80,341	106,753	100,127	12,806	15,726	29.813	29,153
Southwest	94,847	94,624	197,138	181,613	11,680	13,077	109.822	112,115
Western	118,965	120,485	235,615	183,851	16,381	18,827	92,592	69,048
International operations	7,955	8,461	69,767	72,294	1,740	2,010	27.260	28,985

CHART 2.—INVENTORY OF TAXPAYER DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS, DECEMBER 1968 AND 1967—Continued

Region and district	Tax groups—Total				Inactive			
	Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)	
	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967
North Atlantic region:								
Albany	11,871	10,454	15,341	14,195	1,487	1,873	3,163	2,558
Augusta	3,381	2,786	2,566	2,460	544	623	1,035	1,078
Boston	31,984	40,462	50,182	46,143	3,163	5,070	10,454	9,943
Brooklyn	44,684	53,534	87,036	89,287	7,443	7,700	36,197	37,238
Buffalo	19,232	16,601	22,124	18,206	2,531	2,977	6,767	6,725
Burlington	2,036	1,605	2,417	1,367	299	433	360	398
Hartford	15,672	13,219	37,222	29,011	2,398	2,572	22,126	19,536
Manhattan	55,415	54,226	221,607	181,633	9,642	12,147	80,964	83,161
Portsmouth	2,778	2,261	2,200	1,587	516	377	632	714
Providence	3,645	3,559	5,468	4,238	504	602	1,330	934
Mid-Atlantic region:								
Baltimore	29,524	32,360	38,267	35,143	3,309	4,387	16,249	18,138
Newark	35,998	40,758	75,230	61,511	5,021	8,145	29,943	32,781
Philadelphia	32,687	32,012	42,331	47,253	4,362	6,598	14,258	19,446
Pittsburgh	15,944	16,004	24,007	16,549	2,110	2,670	6,932	6,163
Richmond	20,184	21,330	16,502	13,922	2,168	3,241	5,165	5,479
Wilmington	4,032	4,386	2,886	3,391	461	716	714	712
Southeast region:								
Atlanta	17,383	15,681	16,896	13,942	2,238	2,800	6,103	5,493
Birmingham	11,691	10,311	8,975	9,656	1,740	1,885	2,846	3,952
Columbia	9,316	7,839	8,176	6,869	782	1,200	3,145	3,921
Greensboro	17,219	15,029	16,490	12,406	1,914	2,811	7,351	6,556
Jackson	6,894	7,373	4,769	4,466	678	973	1,388	1,707
Jacksonville	33,398	33,610	93,684	89,704	4,361	5,169	60,867	57,633
Nashville	16,667	15,224	16,249	14,379	2,008	2,765	3,589	3,708
Central region:								
Cincinnati	18,801	18,114	18,954	18,744	2,588	3,124	3,824	5,548
Cleveland	21,953	22,222	44,399	36,150	2,843	3,448	18,268	17,149
Detroit	40,604	46,992	56,628	50,758	5,161	6,981	17,695	15,807
Indianapolis	16,792	17,082	25,388	24,066	2,193	2,853	11,097	10,623
Louisville	12,978	11,464	14,641	9,247	1,987	2,070	4,892	3,430
Parkersburg	5,204	4,225	6,594	4,545	572	665	1,521	1,325
Midwest region:								
Aberdeen	1,780	1,416	1,245	909	190	264	290	286
Chicago	28,025	32,356	48,210	50,102	3,829	4,269	9,894	8,931
Des Moines	6,071	6,005	5,127	4,377	1,171	1,606	1,498	1,973
Fargo	1,559	1,521	1,043	985	356	398	174	430
Milwaukee	8,742	8,811	10,552	11,064	1,623	2,018	3,407	4,137
Omaha	3,241	2,803	5,062	6,775	783	719	3,417	4,528
St. Louis	15,378	13,725	20,097	13,919	2,436	3,073	6,721	4,709
St. Paul	7,971	7,547	8,703	6,917	1,307	1,810	2,341	2,116
Springfield	7,116	6,157	6,714	5,079	1,111	1,569	2,070	2,043
Southwest region:								
Albuquerque	3,253	3,371	6,411	5,789	442	563	3,067	2,246
Austin	23,407	21,814	63,743	60,239	1,938	2,247	38,442	38,260
Cheyenne	1,529	1,532	1,039	1,125	335	342	286	378
Dallas	20,593	19,909	60,092	61,595	2,636	2,663	46,432	48,474
Denver	8,822	9,991	12,318	9,736	1,389	1,432	3,205	3,801
Little Rock	6,435	5,799	8,356	11,187	880	975	5,342	8,488
New Orleans	12,497	14,228	21,871	15,693	1,697	2,046	8,404	6,241
Oklahoma City	10,409	10,741	12,821	9,243	1,099	1,417	2,231	2,377
Wichita	7,902	7,239	10,487	7,006	1,264	1,392	2,413	1,850
Western region:								
Anchorage	1,555	1,638	2,249	1,614	113	189	399	315
Boise	2,424	2,034	3,493	2,681	571	572	1,925	969
Helena	2,337	1,895	1,565	1,572	354	440	359	673
Honolulu	2,428	1,986	3,738	2,395	373	457	1,568	915
Los Angeles	41,035	45,259	118,685	92,522	5,650	6,291	54,774	38,606
Phoenix	6,243	5,573	9,290	7,460	746	862	3,417	2,477
Portland	9,949	7,904	9,962	6,082	1,292	1,167	2,485	2,169
Reno	3,368	3,348	12,140	6,452	551	518	4,458	1,943
Salt Lake City	3,746	3,619	4,159	5,076	632	729	1,718	2,843
San Francisco	35,371	39,212	59,372	50,441	4,416	5,807	18,229	15,572
Seattle	10,509	7,967	10,962	7,556	1,683	1,795	3,260	2,566
International operations:								
Puerto Rico	3,370	4,086	2,696	2,793	829	1,038	1,569	1,368
All other	4,585	4,375	67,071	69,501	911	973	25,691	27,617

Note: Rounded figures may not add to the totals which are based on unrounded figures.

CHART 3.—TAXPAYER DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS REPORTED AS UNCOLLECTABLE AND ABATED, CALENDAR YEARS 1968 AND 1967

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Region and district	Uncollectable				Abated			
	Number		Amount [1]		Number		Amount	
	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967
Total	252,622	305,224	$326,787	$347,100	131,025	162,411	[2] $236,444	[2,3] $216,305
North Atlantic	52,002	63,433	74,230	129,212	22,282	34,801	72,136	50,339
Mid-Atlantic	29,859	33,366	33,539	24,249	23,200	31,217	30,065	39,293
Southeast	38,193	45,599	34,781	38,001	19,707	23,089	41,185	26,538
Central	28,269	31,503	24,176	20,128	17,039	22,265	22,404	24,576
Midwest	28,948	35,778	27,942	36,892	16,678	19,499	21,632	[3] 28,241
Southwest	28,745	32,257	33,265	25,752	13,316	13,616	20,134	20,262
Western	43,936	60,348	91,026	69,836	16,288	15,890	[2] 24,805	[3] 21,710
International operations	2,670	2,940	7,827	3,031	2,515	2,034	4,083	5,346

See footnotes at end of table.

CHART 3.—TAXPAYER DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS REPORTED AS UNCOLLECTABLE AND ABATED, CALENDAR YEARS 1968 AND 1967—Continued

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Region and district	Uncollectable				Abated			
	Number		Amount [1]		Number		Amount	
	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967
North Atlantic region:								
Albany	1,611	1,459	$5,134	$780	$1,171	$1,054	$1,488	$628
Augusta	525	752	193	266	415	463	643	316
Boston	7,110	5,450	10,127	2,943	3,711	4,516	15,074	5,720
Brooklyn	17,663	25,117	25,836	32,354	5,036	8,214	25,668	8,572
Buffalo	4,900	4,783	1,974	2,719	2,153	3,064	3,035	4,382
Burlington	353	361	176	133	456	466	247	232
Hartford	2,372	2,249	2,160	846	1,812	2,854	3,170	2,533
Manhattan	15,895	21,756	26,903	87,673	6,928	13,822	21,652	27,260
Portsmouth	650	724	233	398	174	68	581	155
Providence	923	782	1,493	1,100	426	280	580	541
Mid-Atlantic region:								
Baltimore	7,107	8,345	6,055	4,884	4,059	4,433	4,739	4,871
Newark	7,326	10,408	7,392	9,040	6,124	7,112	10,236	12,249
Philadelphia	6,828	5,796	15,169	5,622	6,270	12,318	7,105	6,644
Pittsburgh	2,900	3,260	1,790	2,448	2,683	3,181	4,499	5,729
Richmond	4,942	4,821	1,858	1,960	3,701	3,653	2,881	6,942
Wilmington	756	736	1,273	298	363	520	604	2,860
Southeast region:								
Atlanta	5,279	7,059	3,612	4,828	3,466	3,796	4,759	4,404
Birmingham	3,877	5,256	1,980	4,560	1,982	2,681	4,061	3,109
Columbia	2,445	3,253	1,147	1,903	1,695	2,154	1,457	1,286
Greensboro	5,973	7,207	2,073	3,027	3,395	4,243	3,665	4,679
Jackson	3,041	2,534	1,982	1,504	1,152	1,487	926	1,449
Jacksonville	12,582	14,619	19,316	19,368	5,113	5,645	23,743	7,351
Nashville	5,096	5,671	4,671	2,812	2,904	3,083	2,576	4,259
Central region:								
Cincinnati	5,485	6,366	7,642	4,219	2,409	2,964	4,840	3,220
Cleveland	6,824	6,784	4,096	4,986	3,534	4,809	4,436	9,487
Detroit	7,504	8,723	3,849	3,279	4,961	6,240	7,118	5,016
Indianapolis	5,162	5,343	6,487	4,017	3,136	4,108	3,716	3,446
Louisville	2,350	2,984	1,532	2,731	2,258	3,134	1,673	2,642
Parkersburg	944	1,303	568	897	741	1,010	623	764
Midwest region:								
Aberdeen	270	487	94	196	435	337	293	164
Chicago	13,605	17,686	19,128	16,868	4,275	7,646	8,698	12,028
Des Moines	1,431	1,704	696	2,311	1,809	1,554	1,118	1,586
Fargo	430	375	135	92	450	346	245	156
Milwaukee	3,429	3,887	2,384	3,943	2,340	2,298	2,960	2,354
Omaha	839	824	562	710	1,094	850	1,734	[3] 3,205
St. Louis	4,843	5,776	3,099	6,718	2,699	3,527	2,930	4,495
St. Paul	2,394	3,288	1,131	3,678	1,870	1,702	2,167	3,201
Springfield	1,707	1,751	712	2,377	1,706	1,239	1,484	1,052
Southwest region:								
Albuquerque	865	1,295	686	656	644	854	1,414	1,096
Austin	6,060	6,674	12,140	7,202	3,151	3,757	5,690	4,652
Cheyenne	413	624	171	249	273	225	349	153
Dallas	7,430	9,213	7,919	5,831	2,108	1,673	4,071	3,646
Denver	2,903	2,258	2,246	4,068	1,639	1,262	1,908	3,564
Little Rock	1,423	1,821	2,315	752	952	1,427	918	1,178
New Orleans	3,995	4,024	4,496	2,897	1,717	1,077	2,864	1,345
Oklahoma City	4,099	4,536	2,414	3,244	1,509	1,798	1,656	2,060
Wichita	1,557	1,812	878	850	1,323	1,543	1,263	2,566
Western region:								
Anchorage	530	1,061	424	883	219	189	266	197
Boise	541	839	148	208	601	798	[2] 455	[2] 872
Helena	786	1,072	486	766	505	553	443	405
Honolulu	589	601	581	227	385	505	579	2,756
Los Angeles	16,712	21,042	66,107	45,011	4,846	2,030	6,782	5,927
Phoenix	2,467	2,800	3,380	1,875	986	1,061	1,767	1,316
Portland	2,515	4,927	1,268	2,585	1,419	1,622	1,778	2,703
Reno	1,179	1,750	3,636	2,348	310	320	947	699
Salt Lake City	920	1,500	991	1,299	727	690	1,928	711
San Francisco	14,780	20,434	11,896	12,277	4,361	6,056	7,567	2,925
Seattle	2,917	4,242	2,107	2,357	1,929	2,066	2,293	3,199
International operations:								
Puerto Rico	798	1,015	292	262	1,184	1,017	914	852
All other	1,872	1,925	7,536	2,768	1,331	1,017	3,171	4,493

[1] In calendar year 1968 $34,041,000 were collected on accounts previously reported uncollectable. In calendar year 1967 these additional collections amounted to $27,948,000.

[2] The amount of abatements in Boise for 1967 has been adjusted to compensate for invalid assessments which were erroneously closed as abatements in calendar year 1967 and subsequently, in calendar year 1968, properly reversed.

[3] As explained in the report on this subject to Senator Williams dated Apr. 24, 1968, the corrected calendar year 1967 abatement figure for Omaha is $3,205,000 instead of the —$498,000 previously reported.

Note: Rounded figures may not add to the totals which are based on unrounded figures. CP:C:A: Jan. 28. 1969.

CHART 4.—INTERNAL REVENUE COLLECTIONS BY INTERNAL REVENUE REGIONS, DISTRICTS, STATES, AND OTHER AREAS

[States represented by single districts indicated in parentheses; totals for other States shown at bottom of table]

[In thousands of dollars]

Internal revenue regions, districts, States, and other areas	Total internal revenue collections
Total, United States	153,636,838
North Atlantic region	39,766,833
Albany (see (c) below)	1,849,222
Augusta (Maine)	411,057
Boston (Massachusetts)	4,755,100
Brooklyn (see (c) below)	3,372,823
North Atlantic region—Continued	
Buffalo (see (c) below)	3,300,953
Burlington (Vermont)	189,566
Hartford (Connecticut)	3,056,857
Manhattan (see (c) below)	21,669,454
Portsmouth (New Hampshire)	386,395
Providence (Rhode Island)	775,407
Mid-Atlantic region	24,080,351
Baltimore (Maryland and District of Columbia)	4,092,512
Newark (New Jersey)	5,855,707
Philadelphia (see (e) below)	6,363,812
Pittsburgh (see (e) below)	4,140,157
Richmond (Virginia)	2,513,176
Wilmington (Delaware)	1,114,987
Southeast region	13,166,006
Atlanta (Georgia)	2,488,051
Birmingham (Alabama)	1,122,438
Columbia (South Carolina)	829,953
Greensboro (North Carolina)	3,567,050
Jackson (Mississippi)	531,311
Jacksonville (Florida)	2,986,346
Nashville (Tennessee)	1,640,857
Central region	29,690,441
Cincinnati (see (d) below)	3,436,792
Cleveland (see (d) below)	6,692,291
Detroit (Michigan)	12,649,256
Indianapolis (Indiana)	3,860,905
Louisville (Kentucky)	2,491,416
Parkersburg (West Virginia)	559,782
Midwest region	26,199,055
Aberdeen (South Dakota)	199,651
Chicago (see (b) below)	11,366,734
Des Moines (Iowa)	1,304,909
Fargo (North Dakota)	187,735
Milwaukee (Wisconsin)	3,079,873
Omaha (Nebraska)	943,777
St. Louis (Missouri)	4,314,622
St. Paul (Minnesota)	2,914,748
Springfield (see (b) below)	1,887,006
Southwest region	13,804,137
Albuquerque (New Mexico)	340,048
Austin (see (f) below)	3,764,738
Cheyenne (Wyoming)	121,969
Dallas (see (f) below)	2,943,214
Denver (Colorado)	1,936,202
Little Rock (Arkansas)	542,122
New Orleans (Louisiana)	1,524,387
Oklahoma City (Oklahoma)	1,564,460
Wichita (Kansas)	1,066,998
Western region	21,376,268
Anchorage (Alaska)	118,827
Boise (Idaho)	337,240
Helena (Montana)	244,276
Honolulu (Hawaii)	440,237
Los Angeles (see (a) below)	8,812,169
Phoenix (Arizona)	613,180
Portland (Oregon)	1,151,313
Reno (Nevada)	308,093
Salt Lake City (Utah)	404,623
San Francisco (see (a) below)	6,643,639
Seattle (Washington)	2,302,670
Office of International Operations	650,162
Puerto Rico	199,297
Other	450,866
Undistributed:	
Federal tax deposits and depositary receipts	—15,581,913
Transferred to government of Guam	—7,114
Gasoline, lubricating oil, and excess FICA credits	365,453
Withheld taxes of Federal employees	127,157

TOTALS FOR STATES NOT SHOWN ABOVE

(a) California	15,455,808
(b) Illinois	13,253,740
(c) New York	30,192,452
(d) Ohio	10,129,083
(e) Pennsylvania	10,503,969
(f) Texas	6,707,952

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware for having made this presentation, as he has done each year for many years. It is an excellent contribution, to make the Senate, Congress, and the country aware of this very important matter.

I point very proudly to page 8 of the Senator's remarks. In discussing the Milwaukee, Wis., office, the Senator says:

> The total of uncollected taxes in the Milwaukee office dropped from $17,361,000 in 1967 to $15,896,000 in 1968. Overall, this is an excellent report for this office when we consider that the total revenue collections for the year in Milwaukee were $3,079,873,000, about equal to the $3,372,823,000 revenue collections in the Brooklyn office; yet Brooklyn reported uncollected taxes of $138,540,000 in 1968, or over eight times the $15,896,000 uncollected in Milwaukee.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware for making this particular reference. As a Senator from Wisconsin, I am very proud of the record this office has.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Wisconsin has every right to be proud of his State's record. There are several offices, including the one in my own State, which I have cited as having excellent reports. There are other offices to which I have called attention which have very poor collection records as compared to the national average, and I have suggested that they should be given particular attention.

For example, in this report it should be noted that the offices of Brooklyn and Manhattan in New York; Jacksonville, Fla.; both of the offices in Texas, Austin and Dallas; Los Angeles, Calif.; Reno, Nev.; and the New Orleans office are all mentioned as having a poor record of collections; and I have suggested that some explanation should be forthcoming as to why the people in those areas have not been paying their taxes as have others. I might also say that I am very proud of the collection record in my own State, which is likewise one of the best in the country inasmuch as the record shows that in Delaware they collected 99.6 percent of the assessed taxes that were due last year. Like the Senator from Wisconsin, I am very proud to cite our State as having an excellent record of payment of taxes.

I have asked the Treasury Department to give their special attention to those areas where taxes are not being paid in line with the national average because there is an exceptionally large amount being written off in many of these offices as uncollectible. I do not think we can let it go by unnoticed because to the extent that these taxes are not paid by the respective taxpayers who owe them, other taxpayers have to make up the deficiency.

I was particularly critical of the high increase of delinquency in employment taxes over almost the entire Nation. I cite, for example, that $339,428,000 was carried as delinquent in 1968, as compared with $255,768,000 delinquent in the same category the year before. That is a 32-percent increase in the delinquency for employment taxes. There is no excuse for this. These are trust funds and do not belong to the employers.

It should be emphasized over and over that the employment taxes do not belong to the employer. These moneys withheld, the income taxes, social security taxes, and so forth, are withheld by the employers, but they belong to the employees. They are trust funds, and should be transmitted to the Government. I have been greatly concerned, over the years, at the manner in which this delinquent account seems to be expanding in this category.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

MAIL SERVICE FOR MRS. MAMIE DOUD EISENHOWER

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 10158.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate H.R. 10158, a bill to provide mail service for Mamie Doud Eisenhower, widow of former President Dwight David Eisenhower, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this measure, which passed the House of Representatives yesterday, provides for mail service to Mrs. Eisenhower during the rest of her natural life. It will permit her, by her signature or signature facsimile, to use the mails within the continental United States, and also within Puerto Rico, free of postage. For the cost of that mail service, the Post Office will be reimbursed by the Treasury.

This proposal follows a long established precedent, Mr. President, and I think it would be most appropriate for the Senate to act upon it expeditiously. I urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, obviously this measure has the full concurrence of the minority.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

S. 1857—INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1970

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last year Congress passed Public Law 90–407, a major revision of the National Science Foundation's organic statute, to strengthen the Foundation's structure and reemphasize and extend its responsibilities for research. This year, our continuing commitment is to see to it that the Foundation has the legislative support and funding needed to carry out its new, as well as its continuing tasks.

To achieve these ends, there must be an exchange of ideas and opinions between the parties involved. Congress has now provided a time and a place for such a dialog, by requiring congressional authorization as a prelude to appropriation. Consequently, and in accordance with the statute, I am pleased to announce that a Special Subcommittee on the National Science Foundation, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has been formed. At some point, it will hold hearings on the first National Science Foundation authorization bill, which I am introducing today. I am very pleased to serve as chairman of this subcommittee.

During these authorization hearings, we will, of course, hear from Dr. Leland J. Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation, who, I regret to inform the Senate, has announced his intention to leave the Foundation when his term expires in June of this year. Although it might be more appropriate for a later occasion, I cannot let this moment pass without saying that Dr. Haworth has been a source of integrity, insight and inspiration during his outstanding career. He will be sorely missed.

It is particularly important that the fine tradition and exemplary record of statesmanlike, nonpartisan leadership of the NSF established by its first director, Dr. Alan Waterman, and carried on so ably by his successor, Dr. Haworth, be continued unblemished into the future. For if there is one area of this Nation's activities that should transcend political divisiveness, it is the scientific pursuit of truth through research and the education of our young people to pursue this honorable profession. Science, with its untold benefits for human betterment, constitutes a major national resource that belongs equally to all segments of our society, and that has always operated—and should continue to operate—outside the arena of political pressures. The National Science Foundation needs this kind of leadership; the Nation demands it.

I, therefore, share the distress of the scientific community, as outlined in the April 18 issue of Science magazine, that the administration appeared to have chosen an outstanding leader of the scientific community, Dr. Franklin A. Long, to serve as the next Director of NSF, and then had reversed its decision. The NSF is engaged solely in civilian, nonmilitary research; it will benefit no one if the apolitical status of the NSF is changed.

Among the other distinguished witnesses we should hear are Dr. Philip Handler, Chairman of the National Science Board and President-elect of the National Academy of Sciences; Dr. Lee DuBridge, Director of the Office of Science and Technology in the Executive Office; and other informed scientists and educators as well.

With such a diverse and knowledgeable group of witnesses, I am sure that the subcommittee will benefit from a broad range of views and advice, so that our recommendation will be grounded on the most reliable and informed judgments.

Fortunately, when we convene it will be more as a factfinding than a faultfinding committee. Of course, American science has problems of funding, coordination, and competing demands for limited resources, as do other elements of our complex Government and society. But at the same time, basic research in the United States has never been more important or vital than it is right now. Scientific results have contributed directly, and through technology, to the improvement of national security, health and longevity, and the economic development of our society. One need only see the dramatic increase in the number of American Nobel laureates, the dominance of American journals in the world's scientific literature, and the pervasive expansion of technology through all facets of our society to conclude that our investment has been sound.

I say it has been sound because we must never lose sight of the fact that each scientific investigation represents a leap into the unknown, which is by no means a sure thing. It is this driving thirst for knowledge, not the assurance of utility, which distinguishes and elevates the pursuit of science. In testimony before the House committee on this authorization bill, Dr. Handler described some interesting advances which illustrate the point. Recently, scientists synthesized ribonuclease, an important enzyme produced in the body, and other scientists have produced organic compounds which can withstand temperatures of 800 degrees centigrade without turning to charcoal. Whether these products have any value is not known today—but we do know that science grows from deposits of knowledge of this sort, and that we must continue to lay down these deposits if our technology and scientific knowledge is to continue to advance. For, while the value of each scientific investigation is an unknown, the overall value of general scientific advance is definitely known—and it amounts to continued prosperity and progress for our society.

A quotation from Dr. Handler's House testimony vividly portrays the challenge currently confronting our scientific enterprise:

> There are those who say science isn't relevant to all our important and pressing social problems. But it seems to me that their attitude doesn't arise from the failure of science and technology so much as from its wholesale success; that it is precisely because of our great capabilities which have so expanded the gross national product and life for eighty percent of the people . . . that we have twenty percent whose aspirations quite naturally rose and perhaps they rose more rapidly than our nation knew how to meet them. But the reason for these social problems is not the failure of science and technology, it is the success of science and technology. And we are not through. Whether you are concerned with the public health, with pollution problems, with urban sprawl, the national defense, transportation, communication, age or population control, in every one of these areas what is required is more science, to provide new technologies, not less.

In face of this challenge and despite the enviable position of leadership developed by the United States over the past 25 years, the scientific establishment is currently, in the words of Dr. Jerome Wiesner, the provost of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in "a state of disarray." This condition is the result of budgetary cuts for research at universities and national research centers; a reduction in support for graduate science education; and deferral of the acquisition of many vital research facilities and much-needed equipment. Is it any wonder that scientists and concerned citizens alike are worried that the structure of science, so laboriously erected, is being undermined? Dr. DuBridge said recently:

> Scholarship and research have shed light on many problems which have puzzled the human intellect. Why are some problems unsolved? . . . Today we are overwhelmed with knowledge—and we scream with pain because we don't know everything . . . Success had thus led only to rising expectations and to mounting accusations of failure.

Given these conditions, it is both timely and propitious that our subcommittee consider for the first time the authorization bill of the National Science Foundation. In the past, the triumphs of science and its contributions to the national welfare and society made for rapid, almost unquestioning support. Although acceptance of science on such grounds continues to be widespread, we have come to be more aware that we need "wisdom to deal with knowledge." Perhaps if we had come to this realization sooner, we might have avoided the adverse consequences mentioned, and been better able to help maintain a better legislative balance between economy, urgent national needs clamoring for attention, and the scientific programs on which progress depends.

The authorization hearings we are about to undertake offer a new opportunity for the Senate to be better informed. At the same time, it will provide a new forum for the Senate to express its views and secure specific answers to its questions. As such, these hearings should be the indispensible first step to responsible and purposeful action by the Senate when it considers this bill.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1970, and ask that it be appropriately referred. I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, and a sectional anlysis of it, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the bill and the sectional analysis will be printed in the Record, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The bill (S. 1857) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation pursuant to Public Law 81–507, as amended, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1857

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the following programs:

(1) Support of scientific research	$248.6
(2) Computing activities in education and research	22.0
(3) Institutional support of science	69.0
(4) Science education support	112.5
(5) Science information activities	13.0
(6) International cooperative science activities	2.0
(7) Planning and policy studies	2.9
(8) Program development and management	17.0

Sec. 2. (a) When so specified in an Appropriation Act, any amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may remain available without fiscal year limitation.

(b) Appropriations made pursuant to this Act may be used, but not to exceed $2,500, for official reception and representation expenses upon the approval or authority of the Director, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

Sec. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(a) No amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

(b) No amount in excess of 5 per centum of the amount appropriated for any program pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by Section 1; and

(c) No amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee, unless—

(A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and each such committee of notice given by the Director or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action; or

(B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Director written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the Foundation proceeding with the proposed action before the expiration of the thirty days.

Sec. 4. Section 14 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended by Public Law 90–407, 82 Stat. 360, is amended by adding to the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorization of any appropriation to the Foundation shall expire (unless an earlier expiration is specifically provided) at the close of the third fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the authorization was enacted, to the extent that such appropriation has not theretofore actually been made."

Sec. 5. In addition to such sums as are authorized by section 1 hereof, not to exceed $3,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside the United States to be paid for in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

Sec. 6. This Act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1970."

The material, presented by Mr. Kennedy, follows:

Sectional Analysis of the Bill

Section I: This section breaks the NSF appropriation authorization into seven program sub-appropriations and one management sub-appropriation. These items conform to the line items shown in the President's annual budget presentation except that funds in the amount of $20,000,000 which appear in the budget are not being authorized because the money is available from prior appropriations. This $20 million reduction is spread through deductions of $10 million from Scientific research, $5 million from Institutional support for science, and $5 million from Science education support.

Section II: (a) Provide that when specified in an Appropriation Act, amounts appropriated may remain available without fiscal year limitation.

(b) Section 2b authorizes an allowance of up to $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses to be authorized at the discretion of the Director.

Section III: This section prohibits—

(a) the restoration of any program deleted by the Congress;

(b) the addition of program amounts, in excess of 5% of the amount appropriated for use in any program in excess of the amount authorized by Section I; and

(c) the use of funds for any program not previously presented to either committee; unless the Director notifies the House and Senate of such transfers and waits thirty days, or receives earlier written notice of no objection to earlier action.

Section IV: This section amends the NSF Act of 1950, as amended by P.L. 90-407, to provide that all outstanding unfunded authorization would automatically expire at the close of the third fiscal year after the fiscal year for which the authorization was enacted. This provision would not be required in subsequent annual authorization acts.

Section V: This section authorizes, in addition to the funds appropriated by Section I, an appropriation of up to $3 million for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside of the United States, to be financed from foreign currencies which are determined by the Treasury Department to be in excess of the normal operating requirements of the United States Government. These funds would be spent in foreign countries to support programs mutually determined by NSF and the State Department to be in the interests of improving international relations through scientific endeavor.

Section VI: This section cites the title of the Authorization Act.

S. 1858—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 11 other Senators—Senator BROOKE, COOPER, CRANSTON, GOODELL, HART, JAVITS, MONDALE, MOSS, PELL, SCOTT, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YOUNG of Ohio—I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to terminate the sugar quota presently allocated to the Republic of South Africa. Identical legislation was introduced yesterday in the House of Representatives by Representative JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, of New York.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to terminate a special economic benefit now conferred on the Republic of South Africa by the United States. The present racial policies of South Africa are repugnant to the principles and ideals of all Americans. They have been condemned by the overwhelming majority of the nations of the world, both in the United Nations and elsewhere. They violate the basic human rights provisions of the United Nations Charter, and they threaten to plunge the entire African continent into racial conflict. Under these circumstances, I believe it is morally wrong for the United States to continue a program of special financial assistance under which the Republic of South Africa has received millions of dollars in sugar subsidies from the United States in recent years.

It is important to recognize, however, that nothing in the proposed legislation seeks to impose diplomatic, economic or other affirmative sanctions against the Republic of South Africa. The bill is not an attempt to place economic quarantine or trade isolation on that nation. Its sole purpose is to withdraw a positive privilege now bestowed on South Africa, not to impose a negative sanction or other punitive measure.

Although the goal of the bill is narrow, its principle is important. At a time when other types of disengagement from South Africa are finding increasingly broad support in this country, I believe we in Congress can at least reach wide and bipartisan agreement on the principle that the United States should not now be conferring a direct economic benefit on a nation whose basic policies are at war with the fundamental values of mankind. We must recognize that the Sugar Act is foreign aid, not foreign trade, and we must act to adjust our policies accordingly.

Traditionally, we have always given the closest scrutiny to our foreign aid programs, to insure that they are consistent with our overall moral, political, and economic interests. To continue a program of direct foreign aid to South Africa is intolerable. It is inconsistent with the goals of our domestic policy at home and our foreign policy abroad. And, even apart from the crucial moral principle involved, it is inconsistent with the basic theory of our foreign economic assistance programs.

At home, support for South Africa is an insult to millions of Americans and an affront to the precious goals of equality and social justice we pursue. Abroad, support for South Africa impairs our efforts to improve relations with the emerging nations of the world. Economically, financial support for South Africa makes no sense, because South Africa is already a highly developed nation, with one of the strongest economies of the world.

There can be no question that South Africa today receives substantial financial benefits from the United States through the sugar subsidy. At present market values, South Africa's quota for 1969 is worth more than $5 million in subsidies above the world market price. Over the past 7 years, the large sugar producers of South Africa have received more than $19 million in special benefits generated by the subsidy.

Although the Sugar Act of 1948 is complex in its detail, its general outlines may be simply stated. The overall purpose of the legislation is to regulate the distribution of sugar in the United States by setting quotas on the amounts of sugar that can be sold in this country by domestic and foreign producers. The basic statutory plan was enacted in Congress in 1948. Over the years, the act has been amended on a number of occasions—most recently in 1965—to extend its operation and to meet changing circumstances.

Under the present act, domestic sugar growers are guaranteed the dominant share—approximately 60 percent—of the total annual sugar requirement of the United States. In general, the remainder of the annual requirement is assigned under the statute to some 30 foreign countries, based on percentages specified in the law. At the present time, as in recent years, most foreign sugar-producing nations are anxious to participate in the program, since the current protected sugar price in the United States is about 6 cents per pound, or 4 cents per pound higher than the world market price of 2 cents per pound.

Under the amendments adopted in 1965, domestic and foreign quotas were adjusted to their present levels and the operation of the act was extended through 1971. South Africa's statutory share was set at 1.06 percent. Based on the most recent determination by the Department of Agriculture that U.S. sugar requirements for 1969 are 10.7 million tons, and adjusted upward because of deficits in the quotas of other nations, South Africa's quota is 56,000 tons for the current year. At the present time, 14 foreign nations have larger quotas than South Africa's, ranging from 57,000 tons for the French West Indies to 1.1 million tons for the Philippines. Sixteen nations have current annual quotas smaller than South Africa's.

Under section 202(d) of the act, the administration has the power to suspend a foreign nation's sugar quota by executive action if it finds that continuation of the quota is contrary to our national interest. Congressman BINGHAM has already urged the administration to invoke this provision to suspend the South Africa quota. Both the Congressman and I agree, however, that it is essential for Congress to take the necessary legislative steps at this time to remove the quota permanently from the statute.

There are clear precedents under the Sugar Act for suspension or withdrawal of foreign sugar quotas because of moral, political and foreign policy considerations. Under the terms of the Sugar Act itself, the entire quota for Cuba is withheld during the current suspension of diplomatic relations between the United States and Cuba. The Cuban quota was originally canceled by President Eisenhower in July 1960, pursuant to authority requested by the President and granted by Congress in response to the expropriation of American property by the Castro regime.

In addition, in November 1965, President Johnson took administrative action under the act to suspend the sugar quota for Rhodesia. The President acted in response to Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence from Great Britain and to the repressive racial policies of the Rhodesian Government. In addition to suspending the sugar quota, a number of other actions were also taken against Rhodesia at about that time, including the imposition of an embargo on arms and on the shipment of petroleum products to Rhodesia, a prohibition on certain imports from Rhodesia, and the recall of our consul general from Salisbury. Subsequently, as is well known, the United Nations Security Council adopted a resolution denouncing the actions of the Rhodesian Government as a threat to international peace and security, and calling for the imposition of mandatory economic sanctions against that nation.

Just as in the case of Cuba and Southern Rhodesia, I believe that continuation of South Africa's sugar quota is not in our national interest. The racial policies of South Africa have been condemned by a long line of resolutions in the General Assembly and Security Council of the United Nations. For far too long, we have waited and watched and hoped that our existing policies toward South Africa might somehow allow us to influence the regime to eliminate or modify its detest-able doctrine of apartheid. While we have waited, we have seen no perceptible beneficial change in that doctrine in South Africa, and we have stood by while South Africa exported the doctrine to Southwest Africa. Indeed, if anything, we have seen the hated doctrine grow stronger and more repressive with the passage of time.

The tragedy of apartheid in South Africa was clearly brought home to Robert Kennedy on his visit to that nation in 1966. Traveling from Pretoria to Capetown, to Johannesburg, and along the Indian Ocean coast to Durban, he was everywhere impressed with the warmth and vitality of all the people of South Africa, of whatever political persuasion or race. As he told the students of the University of Capetown:

> In the world we would like to build, South Africa could play an outstanding role. . . . This is without question a preeminent repository of the wealth and knowledge and skill of the continent. Here are the greater part of Africa's research scientists and steel production, most of its reservoirs of coal and electric power. Many South Africans have made major contributions to African technical development and world science; the names of some are known wherever men seek to eliminate the ravages of tropical diseases and pestilence. In your faculties and councils, here in this very audience, are hundreds and thousands of men who could transform the lives of millions for all time to come.
>
> But the help and the leadership of South Africa or the United States cannot be accepted if we—within our own countries or in our relations with others—deny individual integrity, human dignity, and the common humanity of man. If we would lead outside our borders; if we would help those who need our assistance, if we would meet our responsibilities to mankind, we must first, all of us, demolish the barriers which history has erected between men within our own nations—barriers of race and religion, social class, and ignorance.

The time is now ripe to begin a reassessment of our overall policy toward South Africa. Whatever further steps we take, we can at least now embrace the sound principle that nothing in our official governmental actions should lend positive economic support to the South Africa regime. It is especially deplorable that we continue to provide even the current modest sugar subsidy to South Africa in view of the advanced state of South Africa's economic development. There are many young sugar-producing nations in Africa and in the world whose economic development is far less advanced than South Africa's but who pursue multiracial policies far more congenial to the policies of the United States. It is these nations whom we should be assisting through subsidies such as the sugar program, not nations whose policies we abhor.

In the legislation I have proposed, the quota now available to South Africa would be prorated among other quota nations according to the existing provisions of the act. Under those provisions, the President would have broad authority to transfer part—or, in some circumstances, all—of the South Africa quota to the most deserving nations under the act, nations whose economies would receive major benefit from increased sugar quotas.

To be sure, our action in terminating the South Africa quota could not realistically be expected to have a substantial impact on South Africa, either on its economy or its policy of apartheid. The policy is too deeply entrenched and the value of the subsidy is too small, especially in light of the fact that South Africa's economy is highly developed and its sugar exports to the United States account for only a small proportion—about 7 percent—of its total sugar exports.

Nevertheless, as I have tried to indicate, termination of the South Africa sugar quota would have at least four important benefits:

First, the action would be a significant moral gesture from our Government to all our citizens. It would bring new conviction to our determination to seek justice and racial equality at home, and a new sense of dedication to the entire range of our domestic programs designed to reach these goals.

Second, the action would be a significant moral gesture from the United States to the world community at large. As the most powerful Nation in the world, it is vital that we maintain a strong, consistent and correct position on the great moral issues of our generation. If we are ambivalent in our attitude, if our deeds belie our principles, then we lose stature in the eyes of nations who look to us for leadership. If, on the other hand, we are strong in our moral resolve and our house is in order, then we set an example for other nations and peoples, especially the new nations of Africa and the black majority in South Africa, and we strengthen their trust in our commitment to their interests. As Julius K. Nyerere, President of Tanzania, stated in a perceptive article in Foreign Affairs in 1966:

> Free Africa is now waiting, with some impatience, to see whether the West really intends to stand on the side of human equality and human freedom.

Third, by terminating the South Africa sugar quota, we remove a favorite argument of many who refuse to assert their opposition to South Africa's policy of apartheid, because, they say, our own Government itself continues to provide financial assistance to the regime. In the United States, for example, there is growing pressure on private businesses and other institutions to withdraw their investments in South Africa in protest against the policy of apartheid. The total investment of American firms in South Africa now totals over $700 million. The pressures to withdraw are especially strong in the case of firms with major operations in South Africa, or institutions lending money directly to the South Africa Government. Too often, American firms have been able to resist such pressures simply by pointing to the sugar subsidy available to South Africa, and asserting that our Government itself continues to subsidize the regime. By terminating that subsidy, we can give new impetus to the current movement toward private economic disengagement from South Africa.

And, fourth, by terminating the South Africa quota, we can provide substantial economic assistance to other, more deserving sugar-producing nations in Africa and elsewhere, at no cost to the current operation of our sugar system or our other limited foreign aid programs.

In sum, the bill that I am proposing is a modest first step toward greater wisdom in our South Africa policy. Although its direct impact on South Africa may be negligible, it will have significant moral influence in our relations at home and overseas. Suspensions of the sugar quota for South Africa is a step of moral leadership we should take at the earliest opportunity, and I look forward to prompt enactment of this legislation by Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proposed legislation be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. In addition, I have here certain materials relating to South Africa and the Sugar Act that may be of interest to Members of the Senate. The principal item is a passage from a recent book by Prof. Rupert Emerson of Harvard University in which he deals with apartheid and American and United Nations policy toward South Africa, including the involvement of American business in South Africa. Other materials are: a publication by the Department of Agriculture explaining the operation of the Sugar Act, and a recent press release by the Department establishing current sugar quotas; an excerpt from Africa Digest assessing apartheid in South Africa today; a recent news article discussing the proposed "tribal homelands" legislation in South Africa; and a brief article by Arthur J. Goldberg, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, proposing a series of steps to disengage American Government and business from South Africa.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these materials be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and material will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1858) to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to terminate the quota for South Africa, introduced by Mr. Kennedy, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1858

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress hereby finds that it is not in the interest of the United States to provide official support in any form to a country whose racial policies are anathema to the conscience of the world and have been so denominated by the United Nations, and that the Republic of South Africa, having adopted such policies, should therefore not enjoy the privilege and benefit of a quota under the Sugar Act of 1948.

Sec. 2. Section 202(c)(3)(B) of the Sugar Act of 1948 is amended by deleting "South Africa---------- 1.06".

Sec. 3. A quantity of sugar equal to the amount of the quota withdrawn from South Africa shall be prorated in the same manner as deficits are prorated under Section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1948.

The material, presented by Mr. KENNEDY, follows:

[From the "Africa and United States Policy" (Prentice-Hall, 1967), pp. 84–94]

SOUTH AFRICA

The Republic of South Africa is on all counts the country which is the most difficult to fit into an anti-colonialist world dedicated by the Charter of the UN to respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all "without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." With the doctrine of apartheid as its guiding star, South Africa is a society uniquely dedicated to the principle of distinctions of race as the basis of its existence. The separation of race from race and the maintenance of the purity and supremacy of the white race are the foundations of the system which the Afrikaner-dominated South African government has brought into being. It can be a matter of no surprise that South Africa has been more frequently and more consistently censured by the UN than any other country, that it is the country on which the independent African states look with the greatest abhorrence, and that it is here, rather than anywhere else in Africa, that the United States is likely to be confronted by the gravest decisions and the most threatening conflicts.

Apartheid has met with almost universal denunciation. Indeed, a recent American study asserts that with the exception of South Africa itself, every government in the world has declared it to be wrong, undesirable, and at odds with international standards of human rights and justice.[28] Many of those who have attacked apartheid have used far more vigorous language; and even the delegate from Great Britain, still presumably South Africa's closest friend among the Powers, attacked it in a General Assembly committee in 1962 as "morally abominable, intellectually grotesque, and spiritually indefensible."

Primarily for foreign consumption, but also for the squeamish and idealists at home, South Africa has devised a formulation of apartheid which is not without a certain seductive appeal when it is divorced from the harsh reality of present-day South African life. This version rests upon the proposition that the races of man differ so profoundly from each other that each should be given an opportunity to develop separately and thus achieve its distinctive cultural destiny. In essence this is a radical translation to the African scene of the now discredited American principle of "separate but equal" as the guideline for race relations, and it has as little likelihood of furnishing a satisfactory solution in Africa as it had in the United States. From this racial starting point, it follows that South Africa does not, and should not, constitute a single nation but that it contains a number of distinct nations, including several Bantu peoples, each of which deserves an autonomous territory of its own. These are the so-called Bantustans, of which only one, the Transkei, has so far been brought into being as a subordinate African political system to which distant hope is held out of self-government and association on more equal terms with white South Africa. The emphasis which apartheid has placed on the tribal distinctions within the African community is counted on to fragment the opposition to white supremacy, but it is doubtful that the momentum of the swing away from tribalism generated by white rule can now be reversed, particularly since the modern sectors of the economy are still drawing African labor away from the tribal reserves. Apartheid might be portrayed as a fulfillment of the principle of self-determination, but not if the element of consent plays a role, since only the white minority has been consulted as to whether it wants the kind of self-determination thrust upon all South Africans.

The fatal flaw in apartheid is that its prime motivating force is the desire of the white community, led by the Afrikaner majority, to hold on to its privileged position, to maintain its separate identity, and to secure to itself the benefits flowing from the highly productive society which it has created with the aid of cheap African labor. These are goals which the governing Nationalist Party is prepared to pursue with ruthless zeal, as experience has amply demonstrated. Probably no scheme of apartheid could have succeeded in South Africa, no matter how equitably, generously, and idealistically conceived and administered. Certainly ultimate failure is inevitable when some 3,500,000 whites hold the whiphand over more than 12,000,000 Africans, 1,800,000 Coloreds (persons of mixed blood), and 500,000 Indians. The true nature of the relationship between white and black South Africans is vividly illuminated by two figures which are in good part no more than two sides of the same South African coin. The minority white community has reserved to itself 87 per cent of the land of South Africa, while the African majority is endowed with the remaining 13 per cent. This gross imbalance renders incredible the idea that Africans might be persuaded to settle for the reserves or Bantustans into which they are now being crowded. The second figure, showing the reverse of the coin, reveals that only some 40 per cent of the African population is found in the "Bantu homelands," and that despite apartheid the remaining 60 per cent live and labor in the white domain, more or less evenly divided between urban and rural areas. In these areas they have no status as of right and are at the disposition of the white authorities who do not accept them as even potential members of a single South African society.

Since the African leaders have been jailed, exiled, or otherwise silenced, it is difficult to get an accurate picture of the African reaction, but the constant tightening of the official security measures presumably reflects the pressure from below. The transformation of South Africa into a police state is already far advanced, although both the judiciary and the press continue to have a surprising degree of freedom. The government is equipped with extraordinary powers, with a large, well-organized and well-equipped police force and with a network of informers black as well as white, which have crippled all efforts to construct opposition political movements. The military forces have expanded to the point where internal security and defense expenditures have increased fourfold since 1960 and now absorb more than a quarter of the budget. The ruling circles evidently regard their regime as being under severe attack; but the preparations which they have taken leave no doubt that both internal and external opponents of the regime face a grim struggle.

The direct American concern with South Africa is somewhat greater than with most of the rest of the continent, but it does not begin to measure up to that of the British, whose deep involvement inevitably influences American policy. Politically and strategically, in the ever-present setting of the Cold War, South Africa is an ardently anti-Communist power whose position at the southern extremity of Africa still gives it potential strategic importance. If prime significance is attached to the Communist issue, then it may well seem folly to take any steps which endanger the present South African government, although it is also arguable that its racist practices are sure to act as a major stimulant to Communism at home and abroad. The spokesmen for the existing regime make much of the stability and prosperity of South Africa as contrasted with the rest of Africa's independent states and stress the relative material well-being and educational advance of its African population. In May, 1962, Prime Minister Verwoerd expressed somewhat scornful doubt that the United States would cut itself off from the benefits which it derives from its relations with South Africa and would allow the country to "be thrown to the wolves or be swallowed up by the fluctuating ideological streams which, inspired partly by communism, flow across Africa, rather than accept her as being, by nature, a safe and sure and permanent friend."[29]

It is in this latter light that American businessmen and investors have been inclined to view South Africa. Thus, General Norstad, billed by the South African Information Service in May, 1965 as "retired NATO supreme commander and now a top American businessman," coming to South Africa with a big investment blueprint, was quoted as stating that "We have full confidence in South Africa—not only we as individuals but the United States and the American people as well."[30] Such a statement, of course, sharply contradicts the official American position; but it is also noteworthy that while the State Department and American delegates to the UN used strong words about South Africa, the Department of Commerce continued to promote American trade with, and investment in, the country or at least to regard it with benevolent neutrality.

Estimates as to American private investment in South Africa differ widely, but a frequently cited figure is $600 million to $700 million or some 15 per cent of the total foreign investment in the country, while the British investment is estimated to come to more than $2.5 billion, or well over half the total.[31] The South African economy has proved attractive to American investors, and the return on investment has been unusually high. The matter was succinctly put by a correspondent of *The Christian Science Monitor* on December 10, 1965 in answer to a query as to what American interests profit from apartheid:

"What they are is simply a who's who among corporations on the New York Stock Exchange. All the big names are there as investors operating plants in a booming economy—Ford, General Motors, General Electric, Minnesota Mining, IBM, Standard Oil of California, Borden, Chrysler, Coca-Cola, etc.—over 80 big corporations were recently listed."[32]

It is the customary plea of the concerns undertaking investment in South Africa that their problem is profit and not politics. Whether they appreciate the kind of order and stability which has been imposed or regret the obligatory racial discrimination, their activities in fact serve to bolster the Nationalist government and therefore its universally condemned system of apartheid. The unusual rate of profit which has attracted them to the country derives, at least in part, from the low wages of African workers, which are inherent in the system. Since new investment from both the United States and Great Britain has been slight or nonexistent in recent years, it is this high return which has made the expansion of investment possible through the plowing back of profits.

American investment in South Africa comes to just over 1 per cent of total American foreign investment, and American trade with South Africa represents approximately the same percentage of total American foreign trade. In 1963 the value of American exports to South Africa was $276 million while the imports from South Africa came to $259 million. The British share in South African trade has been more than double the American, and the more vulnerable British economy, 5 per cent of whose exports go to South Africa, is far more dependent on this trade and the return from its investment

---

Footnotes at end of article.

than is the United States.[33] In terms of the magnitude both of British investment in the country and of the purchase of British goods, South Africa stands fourth among the countries of the world. The great bulk of both British and American exports to South Africa falls in the category of manufactured goods: machinery and vehicles, textiles, and chemicals; while the imports, in addition to gold, are primarily minerals and other raw materials and foodstuffs.

In most summary terms it may be said that the cutting off of all economic intercourse with South Africa, which has become at least a speculative possibility since more and more UN members have called for sanctions, would impose only relatively incidental burdens on the United States. Such a cutting off would, however, seriously impair the British economy, which has already suffered heavy losses because of the Rhodesian sanctions. Prime Minister Wilson informed the Commonwealth conference in London in September, 1966, that the cost of the sanctions to Britain had risen to £100 million. A survey of British interests in South Africa undertaken under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs in 1965 concluded that a total interruption of commerce would cause "the immediate loss of a twentieth of Britain's export trade, the disappearance of a traditional source of supply for a number of items, and the sudden drying up of £60 million a year in foreign exchange."[34] Some 150,000 workers would be thrown out of work; the earnings derived from the trade in gold would dry up; and British shipping, banking, and insurance operations would be hard hit. These are consequences which no British government could lightly face, particularly at a time when balance of payments problems are already grave.

If one looks at the matter from the other side of the fence, it is, of course, evident that South Africa is economically much more dependent on Britain than Britain is on South Africa. About one-third of South Africa's foreign trade is conducted with Great Britain, which also furnishes South Africa a number of important services, but it must be taken into account that any damage inflicted on South Africa might also have serious consequences for Botswana, Lesotho, and Swaziland.

Although the direct American stake in South Africa is not great, for the last two decades the United States has been unavoidably entangled in that country's affairs, in part through the UN where South Africa has been habitually under attack. Three major issues have been involved: the treatment of Indians in South Africa, apartheid, and the relations with Southwest Africa. As the years have gone by, attention has come to be focused more and more on the central theme of apartheid, which also figures in the charges against South African policy toward Southwest Africa, whose problems have occupied much International Court attention.

When the issue of racial conflict in South Africa, which meant apartheid, appeared on the General Assembly docket in 1952, the United States for some years abstained on resolutions attacking it, contending both that the UN was not authorized to intervene in South Africa's domestic affairs and that such intervention was not likely to achieve the desired results. A change came in 1958 as Washington was becoming aware that it could no longer evade the emergence of a new Africa. Then the United States was prepared to accept the Assembly's right to chide South Africa for actions inconsistent with the human rights provisions of the Charter; and, in keeping with its new attack upon its own race problems at home, it specifically expressed its dislike of a society based on segregation and discrimination. On such grounds, it voted for the first time for a resolution which mildly expressed "regret and concern" about South Africa's racial policies.

The next major turn in American policy came as a result of the notorious Sharpeville incident when, on March 21, 1960, the police fired into a crowd of African demonstrators, reportedly killing 67 and wounding 186. This shooting down of Africans caused worldwide consternation and led to an immediate official statement in Washington deploring violence and the tragic loss of life. The Security Council was called into action and adopted a relatively strong resolution, backed by the United States although Britain and France abstained, which deplored South Africa's policies and actions and held that the situation might come to endanger international peace and security.

The coincidence of Sharpeville with the multiplication of African states in the UN led to pressure for stronger action to force South Africa to abandon its racial practices and move with the winds of change which Prime Minister Macmillan had evoked in his speech to the South African Parliament on February 3, 1960. Resolutions of the conventional type, regretting and deploring, were obviously ineffective in inducing South Africa to yield. As a result, the United States now found itself confronted by the necessity of dealing with an increasingly insistent demand for sanctions. As one pamphlet put it:

"It appeared that no sooner had the United States moved to the point where it could, in good conscience, vote for a mildly condemnatory resolution, than the majority of world opinion took another long stride ahead, leaving the U.S. again in the minority, along with the "colonialist" nations."[35]

In 1961 the United States and its associates were able to defeat a resolution calling for sanctions, but in the following year the more intransigent foes of South Africa succeeded in passing a sanctions resolution which requested the breaking off of diplomatic relations and a boycott of South African shipping and aircraft as well as of trade in both directions, specifically including a ban on the export of arms and ammunition. The anti-colonialists mustered 60 votes for this resolution, but the fact that 16 members opposed and 21 abstained indicated how wide a difference of opinion existed. Even more important was the fact that the 16 states which voted against the resolution embraced the leading Western powers, including the United States, Britain, and France, as well as Japan, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. South Africa's Foreign Minister, Eric Louw, took pleasure in pointing out the salient fact that "The nations not supporting sanctions absorb 79.6 per cent of South Africa's exports and send her 63.7 per cent of her imports."[36] Since the resolution was only a recommendation, lacking binding force, it was idle to expect that in such circumstances it could have much impact on South Africa, and even some of the African states have been accused of not observing its provisions.

The United States had for some years expressed its disapproval of South Africa's course in strong language—in 1962, for example, declaring it to be a policy which could lead to "bloodshed, war, and disaster for all races." On October 19, 1962, it went a step further when Adlai Stevenson informed the General Assembly that the United States was forbidding the sale to the South African government of arms and military equipment which could be used to enforce apartheid either in South Africa or in Southwest Africa. On August 2, 1963, he told the Security Council that the United States expected to stop, before the end of the year, the sale of all military equipment to the South African government apart from the need to honor certain existing contracts, and the British immediately thereafter announced that they would ban all export of arms which could be used to further the policy of apartheid. The setting for these announcements was, however, a futile anticolonialist effort to obtain Security Council endorsement for a boycott of South Africa which won only five votes. The resolution which finally passed on August 7, 1963, "solemnly calls upon all states" to cease the sale and shipment of arms, ammunition, and military vehicles to South Africa. Nine Council members, including the United States, voted for this resolution, while Britain and France abstained. Stevenson contended that to apply mandatory sanctions would be both bad policy and bad law. The Security Council, he held, was not empowered to apply coercive measures in such a situation, since—although South Africa failed to live up to certain of its Charter obligations—it did not aggressively threaten the peace.

As is true of so much of its African policy, the relations of the United States with South Africa are marked by a cautious gradualism which can either be praised as a sensible and realistic appraisal of the situation or criticized as a refusal to face up to the hard facts of life as Africans and Asians see them. The readiness of the United States to take drastic action against China, Cuba, and other Communist regimes is inevitably contrasted with its scruples and hesitations about doing more than entering verbal and diplomatic protests in other cases. As American critics put it: "The United States presently boycotts and embargoes countries in which over a third of the world's population lives. Yet it has been unwilling to go beyond a ban of arms and ammunition to implement UN resolutions against apartheid."[37]

With almost the sole exception of its prompt hostile reaction to the Sharpeville incident, the United States has followed along well behind the UN majority and has continued on the whole to maintain normal and friendly relations with South Africa, including the presence in South Africa of American satellite tracking facilities. If a number of private American groups and organizations have given valuable aid to Africans within the country and in exile, a number of other Americans and corporations have participated in white South Africa's prosperous economy. Apartheid-minded South Africans, while pained at American condemnation of their government's policies, have taken comfort from American participation in the Stanleyville paratroop landing and its backing for Tshombe and his white mercenaries as well as from the general unreadiness of the United States to break with their country.

A worsening of relations with South Africa came in the aftermath of the deplorable failure of the International Court in its decision of July 18, 1966, to rule on the substantive issues which had been so long argued before it in the case brought by Ethiopia and Liberia against South African rule in the mandated territory of Southwest Africa. On July 27, the Department of State pointed out the limited nature of the Court's ruling and emphasized that the mandate continued in force, as the Court had affirmed in earlier advisory opinions, and that South Africa remained responsible to the UN for its administration of the territory. A major manifestation of the disaffection aroused by the Court's ruling was a resolution presented to the General Assembly by a number of African and Asian states, which condemned South Africa and called upon the UN itself to take over the administration of Southwest Africa. On October 12, Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, speaking for the United States, took the unexpected step of declaring in the Assembly's debate on this resolution that South Africa had forfeited "all right to continue to administer the territory of Southwest Africa."[38] and a fortnight later joined the overwhelming majority of the Assembly in voting for a resolution which asserted that South Africa's mandate was terminated and that Southwest Africa was henceforward a direct responsibility of the UN. The South African Foreign

---

Footnotes at end of article.

Minister promptly responded that his country would resist with all the power at its disposal any moves which endangered the safety of peoples committed to its care.

That the Africans have legitimate grievances against the usual passivity of the Western attitude toward the fatherland of apartheid and that there are a number of untried ways in which the United States might bring pressure to bear on South Africa should not be allowed to lead without very serious examination to the conclusion that mandatory sanctions would provide the proper answer. It may be that such sanctions will prove to be inescapable if apartheid's evils are to be rooted out, but they would constitute a drastic step whose consequences for the United States, its major allies, and the world at large would surely be very serious. Confronted by the threat of sanctions or other hostile operations, South Africa has done much to improve its ability to stand by itself. The Minister of Defense has declared that the country is practically self-sufficient in armaments production, and the ability to survive an oil embargo seems much greater than a few years ago. Undoubtedly, serious damage could be inflicted on South Africa *if* substantially all countries lived up to the call for sanctions, but this is a condition which can derive little support from the available precedents, including the Rhodesian case. For Britain, the breaking off of economic relations would have such dire implications as to make the adoption of sanctions highly improbable. This would obviously be a matter of great concern for the United States, as would the likelihood that American forces would have to play a major role in imposing a blockade on what might come to be some 3,000 miles of coastline, if the Portuguese territories are added to South and Southwest Africa, in order to make sanctions effective.

Even assuming effective sanctions, one must still entertain doubts as to what the results would be. Would the Nationalists and their supporters cave in under pressure, or would they be driven to a last-ditch resistance; and, if the latter, what kind of South Africa would be left at the end, and who would pick up the pieces? C. W. de Kiewiet has pointed out that "The past decade has given Americans a painful experience in bringing men to compliance with the verdict of even the highest court," adding that it would be hard to expect unanimity in American opinion over involvement in the racial affairs of a distant country.[39]

One of the possibilities which must enter into the calculation is that the United States, hesitating to take decisive steps, might at some point find itself confronted by a coalition of African states, with much of Asia and of the Communist world behind them, for action against South Africa to break the back of apartheid. At this distance it is difficult to see how such a grouping of states could bring very effetcive pressure to bear upon South Africa, but the mere fact that the United States resorted to neutralist abstension would make its moral and political position difficult and unhappy. The probable result would be to alienate many African countries already bitter over the Rhodesian situation, and push them toward an alignment with the Communist powers.

In the interim, as sanctions are debated and rejected by the United States and its partners, relations between the United States and South Africa become somewhat more difficult, with neither side prepared to seek a showdown with the other.[40] Thus the United States has maintained full diplomatic relations with South Africa but has since 1963 held multiracial receptions at the American Embassy which have been protested and boycotted by the South African government as in violation of the customs of the country; but the United States has sent no Negro Foreign Service officers. The Prime Minister has announced that his government would not permit Negroes to be assigned to the satellite tracking facilities which the United States continues to operate in South Africa, and the American aircraft carrier "Independence" bypassed Capetown when the South African government decreed that no Negroes could be landed from the ship. On both sides, positions have been taken which leave no doubt of sharp opposition in matters of basic policy, but there was a deliberate refusal to spell them out in detail and in public. At least to outward appearance, South Africa remained confident that the United States, despite verbal attacks, would not abandon the advantages and profits of various kinds it draws from continued friendly intercourse, as it remained confident that Britain would not endanger its larger economic stake and its agreed access to the Simonstown base, north of the Cape of Good Hope, which London indicated in 1966, Britain was prepared to abandon.

The lesser Rhodesian affair has perplexed statesmen and sharpened racial antagonisms. The far greater South African issue, which might turn into a major catastrophe, was still only gathering its explosive force in the mid-1960's.

FOOTNOTES

[28] Amelia C. Leiss and Vernon McKay in *Apartheid and United Nations Collective Measures*, ed. Amelia C. Leiss (New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1965), p. 5. Waldemar A. Nielsen comments in *African Battleline* (New York: Harper, 1965), p. 64: "Today, even though diplomatic and economic relationships with South Africa are generally maintained, its moral isolation from the world community is virtually total. Never in modern times, and perhaps never in history—not even in the case of Hitler Germany or Stalinist Russia—has a government brought down upon itself so unanimously the moral disapproval of the world."

[29] Cited in *South African Crisis and United States Policy* by Collin Gonze, George M. Houser, and Perry Sturges (New York: American Committee on Africa, 1962), p. 46.

[30] *South African Scope* (New York: Information Service of South Africa, May, 1965), p. 12. He was joined in this statement by Harold Boeschenstein, who was identified as "Chairman of the biggest fiberglass manufacturing organization in the world."

[31] *Survey of Current Business*, Department of Commerce (Washington, September, 1966) states American direct private investment in South Africa to be $528 million in 1965. Much valuable information on economic relations is contained in *United States-South African Relations* (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 89th Cong., 2nd session, Part 1). See particularly the testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Williams and Assistant Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge on March 1 and 2, 1966. I am indebted to Dr. Sanford D. Greenberg for allowing me to consult his unpublished Harvard doctoral dissertation, submitted in 1965: "United States Policy Toward the Republic of South Africa, 1945–64."

[32] The correspondent, Earl W. Foell, added that the New Jersey financier, Charles W. Englehard, listed as a director of 23 South African companies, "is also a heavy contributor to the Democratic Party and a friend of President Johnson," Drew Middleton, writing from Johannesburg, stated that there are 247 U.S. companies in South Africa, "most of them profitable and some making profits of 20 per cent on their investments." (*The New York Times*, April 30, 1966.) See the 1966 *United States-South African Relations* hearings, pp. 15–26, for a list of U.S. subsidiaries, affiliates, and branch offices in South Africa.

[33] The UN Secretariat in a report dated Aug. 22, 1966, prepared for the Special Committee on Apartheid, estimated that the earnings of the United Kingdom on its direct investment in South Africa rose from 11 per cent in 1961 to 16 per cent, in 1964, of all its earnings from direct overseas investment. The comparable American figures were 1.4 and 1.7 per cent. (Tables 13 and 15 in UN Doc. A/AC.115/L.56/Rev. 2.)

[34] Dennis Austin, *Britain and South Africa* (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University, 1966), p. 160. Other estimates of the probable impact of sanctions may be found in *Sanctions Against South Africa*, ed. Ronald Segal (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1964), particularly pp. 167–203; Leiss, *Apartheid and United Nations*, Chapter 6; and the *Report of the Expert Committee Established in Pursuance of Security Council Resolution S/5773* (S/6210).

[35] Gonze, Houser, and Sturges, *South African Crisis*, p. 44.

[36] *A New Course in South Africa* (New York: United Nations, 1964), p. 29. This is the report of the Group of Experts, headed by Alva Myrdal, which was established by the Security Council in resolution S/5471 on December 4, 1963, to examine methods of resolving the South African situation.

[37] "Partners in Apartheid: United States Policy on South Africa," *Africa Today*, March, 1964, p. 11.

[38] *The New York Times*, Oct. 13, 1966.

[39] C. W. de Kiewiet, "South Africa's Gamble with History," *Virginia Quarterly Review*, XL, No. 1 (Winter, 1965), 6. Waldemar A. Nielsen concludes his brief and well-balanced analysis of the problem with the assertion that for the United States to adopt any course other than a rejection of mandatory sanctions "would be a violation of its own responsibilities as a world leader and contrary to the interests of its own citizens and of all mankind." (*African Battleline*, p. 86.)

[40] For the following incidents, see *The New York Times*, March 10, June 27–28, July 3, and August 18, 1965.

THE U.S. SUGAR PROGRAM—INCLUDING SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The United States Sugar Program has a three-fold purpose:

To protect the welfare of the U.S. sugar industry.

To provide U.S. consumers with ample sugar supplies at reasonable prices.

To promote and strengthen the export trade of the United States.

To achieve these goals, the Sugar Act establishes a quota system (shares of the U.S. market), thus regulating supplies of sugar sold in the United States. The largest part of the sugar consumed in the United States comes from domestic areas and the remainder from foreign countries.

The U.S. program is not unique. The government of nearly every sugar-producing country, both importers and exporters, exercises some degree of control over the production, refining, and marketing of sugar. World trade in sugar is characterized by special marketing arrangements. More than half of total world exports enters international trade channels under preferential arrangements.

The U.S. Sugar Act has six main features:

1. Setting U.S. Sugar Requirements: The quantity of sugar needed to maintain adequate supplies at reasonable prices for U.S. consumers and to assure fair prices to U.S. producers is determined for each year.

2. Establishing Sugar Quotas: This yearly sugar requirement is divided among specified domestic and foreign producing areas through quotas assigned to each.

3. Providing Marketing Allotments: Within domestic quotas allotments are established for domestic processors, when needed, to keep the sugar movement in marketing channels an orderly one.

4. Setting Farm Proportionate Shares: Domestic farm production is limited, as needed, within acreage required to produce the sugar

needed to meet domestic quotas and to maintain sugar inventories.

5. Making Grower Payments: Payments are made to growers to augment farm income and as a means of compensating them for adjusting their production.

6. Obtaining Equitable Division of Sugar Returns: Provisions to assure an equitable division of returns from sugar among beet and cane growers, farm workers, and processors.

HOW THE U.S. SUGAR PROGRAM WORKS

(1) Determining Sugar Requirements: A determination of how much sugar will be needed by consumers in the Continental United States is made each year. The determination is announced between Oct. 1 and Dec. 31 for the following year and may be revised as the year progresses if sugar needs change. This establishes the amount of foreign sugar that may be imported and the amount of domestic sugar that may be marketed in the United States during the coming year.

The amount of sugar distributed during the preceding 12-month period ending Sept. 30 is used as a base in making the first estimate. Allowances are made for deficiencies or surpluses in the Nation's sugar inventories and for shifts in use caused by changes in population and demand. Also considered is the relationship between the price for raw sugar, which may result from the determination, and the parity index (index of prices paid by farmers) so that sugar prices will be neither excessive to consumers nor too low to give adequate protection to the domestic sugar producing industry.

In recent years, the U.S. sugar requirement has ranged around 10,000,000 tons and in 1966 was 10,375,000 tons.

(2) Establishing Quotas: After the overall requirements have been determined, each domestic and foreign area supplying the United States with sugar is assigned a quota or share of the U.S. market.

The statutory formula is shown on page 6 and the quantities assigned to the domestic and foreign areas for the years 1963 through 1966 appear on page 9.

DOMESTIC AREA QUOTAS

Under the provisions enacted in 1965, the five U.S. producing areas (continental U.S. cane-producing area, continental U.S. beet-producing area, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) are assigned basic quotas totalling 6,390,000 short tons, raw value. (Raw value is the term used in the Sugar Act to express in a common unit the types of raw and refined sugars that move in commerce. One ton of refined sugar equals 1.07 tons of sugar, raw value.)

Continental cane and beet quotas are increased by 65 percent of requirements in excess of 10.4 million tons and decreased by the same percentage of requirements falling below 9.7 million tons. These increases or decreases are shared by the two areas in proportion to their basic quotas—this figures out to be approximately three-fourths for beet sugar and one-fourth for mainland cane sugar.

Within limits, the quotas for Hawaii and Puerto Rico are adjusted upward when production exceeds their basic quotas. These increases are offset by reducing the quotas of foreign countries, other than the Republic of the Philippines, Ireland, and the Bahama Islands.

THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Beginning in 1962, the Republic of the Philippines' quota was fixed at 1,050,000 tons of sugar. This was about 70,000 tons more than previously provided in either the Philippine Trade Agreement or the Sugar Act. The 1965 amendments increased that quota by 10.86 percent of any increase in requirements above 9.7 million tons up to 10.4 million tons.

OTHER FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Quotas for 30 other foreign countries are established as fixed percentages of U.S. requirements above the amounts set for quotas for (1) domestic areas, (2) the Republic of the Philippines, (3) Ireland, and (4) Bahama Islands.

Ireland has a fixed quota of 5,351 tons and beginning in 1968 the Bahama Islands, which are currently producing no sugar, will be entitled to 10,000 tons if the sugar can be produced.

QUOTAS MAY BE WITHHELD IN NATIONAL INTEREST

The 1965 amendments provide that the President may in the national interest withhold or suspend all or any part of a quota for a foreign country.

During the current suspension of diplomatic relations with Cuba, its entire quota is withheld. When U.S. sugar requirements are not more than 10 million tons, the withheld quota is prorated to foreign countries, other than the Republic of the Philippines, Ireland, and the Bahama Islands, entitled to quotas. When U.S. requirements are more than 10 million tons, the Cuban share of the amount over 10 million tons is prorated only to member countries of the Organization of American States in proportion to their basic quotas.

The 1966 quota for Southern Rhodesia was withheld and prorated to Western Hemisphere countries.

OTHER MODIFICATION OF QUOTAS

No quota is to be established for any country, other than the Bahama Islands, Bolivia, Honduras, and Ireland, which imported a total quantity of sugar equal to or in excess of its exports, excluding those to the U.S., during a period of 24 months ending June 30 prior to the calendar year for which quotas are established.

If any country without adequate justification fails to fill its quota for any year, the quota for future years will be reduced. The reduction would equal the lesser of the shortfall or the difference between 115 percent of the preceding year's quota and actual imports in the shortfall year.

Quotas are established for a calendar year. However, limitations may be applied to imports from foreign countries during the first half of the year (on a quarterly basis) whenever it is necessary to achieve the law's objectives.

EMERGENCY PROVISION

If under unusual circumstances adequate supplies of sugar cannot be obtained by increasing foreign quotas, authority is provided to obtain supplies on a first-come first-served basis from countries in diplomatic relations with the U.S. with special consideration to countries agreeing to purchase for dollars additional agricultural products.

IMPORTS LIMITED TO RAW SUGAR

The sugar to fill the quotas for foreign countries must be in raw form, except the quota for Ireland and small quantities from the Philippines and Panama may be refined sugar. Limitations apply also to the quantities of sugar in refined form within quotas of Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

For quota purposes, sugar not more than 99 percent pure is regarded as raw sugar, provided it is subjected to designated refining processes. Other sugar is called "direct-consumption sugar," and includes primarily white refined and other types of sugar similar to that for home consumption.

STATUTORY QUOTA FORMULA

For the domestic areas and three foreign countries, the law provides for specified tonnage quotas as shown in the following table. For the other 30 countries, quotas are shown as a percentage of remaining U.S. sugar requirements.

Of the U.S. sugar requirements remaining after specified tonnage quotas, 50 percent is allocated to 29 foreign countries. The other 50 percent is allocated to the Cuban reserve, which, as previously noted, is withheld from Cuba until such time as diplomatic relations are resumed. The Cuban reserve is apportioned as temporary quotas among the 29 countries.

Country or area	Basic quota (tons)	Increases or decreases related to each 100,000 tons of sugar requirements: In excess of 10,400,000 tons	Less than 9,700,000 tons
DOMESTIC AREAS			
Domestic beet sugar	3,025,000	+47,667	−47,667
Domestic cane sugar	1,100,000	+17,333	−17,333
Hawaii	1,110,000	0	0
Puerto Rico	1,140,000	0	0
Virgin Islands	15,000	0	0
Total	6,390,000	+65,000	−65,000
FOREIGN COUNTRIES			
Republic of Philippines	[1] 1,050,000	0	0
Ireland	5,351	0	0
Bahama Islands	[2] 10,000	0	0
Total specified tons	7,455,351	+65,000	−65,000

[1] Plus 10.86 percent of the increase in requirements between 9,700,000 tons and 10,400,000 tons.

[2] Effective in calendar year 1968 and subsequent years if assurances are given that quotas will be filled.

Note: Remaining U.S. Sugar Requirements: 50 percent to Cuban reserve; 50 percent to specified foreign countries.

[In percent]

	Permanent quota	Temporary quota from Cuban reserve [3]
FOREIGN WESTERN HEMISPHERE COUNTRIES		
Mexico	7.73	7.73
Dominican Republic	7.56	7.56
Brazil	7.56	7.56
Peru	6.03	6.03
British West Indies	3.02	3.02
Ecuador	1.10	1.10
French West Indies	.95	.95
Argentina	.93	.93
Costa Rica	.89	.89
Nicaragua	.89	.89
Colombia	.80	.80
Guatemala	.75	.75
Panama	.56	.56
El Salvador	.55	.55
Haiti	.42	.42
Venezuela	.38	.38
British Honduras	.22	.22
Bolivia	.09	.09
Honduras	.09	.09
Subtotal	40.52	40.51
FOREIGN COUNTRIES OUTSIDE THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE		
Australia	3.60	3.60
Republic of China	1.50	1.50
India	1.44	1.44
South Africa	1.06	1.06
Fiji	.79	.79
Thailand	.33	.33
Mauritius	.33	.33
Malagasy Republic	.17	.17
Swaziland	.13	.13
Southern Rhodesia	[4] .13	[4] .13
Subtotal	9.48	9.48
Total	50.00	50.00

[3] When U.S. requirements are over 10 million tons, the Cuban share of the amount over 10 million tons is prorated only to member countries of the Organization of American States in proportion to their basic quotas.

[4] Proration of quota for Southern Rhodesia was withheld for 1966 in accordance with a Presidential Finding of November 20, 1965, pursuant to Section 202(d)(1)(B) of the Sugar Act. This quota for 1966 was prorated among Western Hemisphere countries.

ALLOCATION OF DEFICITS IN QUOTAS

(1) If any domestic producing area or foreign country in the Western Hemisphere (except the Bahama Islands) cannot market its full quota, the deficit is allocated by assigning an amount equal to 47.22 percent of the deficit to the Philippines. The balance is assigned to Western Hemisphere countries other than the Bahama Islands on the basis of their quotas then in effect with one exception. This is that any deficit in the quota for a country which is a member of the Central American Common Market will be allocated only to the other member countries.

In making allocations of deficits to Western Hemisphere countries, special consideration must be given to those countries purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities.

(2) If the Republic of the Philippines is unable to fill its quota, the deficit is allocated to Western and Eastern Hemisphere countries on a pro-rata basis.

The Philippines' share of any deficit from any country in the Western Hemisphere which it is unable to fill will be reallocated to other countries in that Hemisphere.

(3) If any country in the Eastern Hemisphere, or the Bahama Islands, is unable to fill its quota, the deficit will be allocated by prorating 47.22 percent of the deficit to the Philippines and the remainder to countries in the Eastern Hemisphere (excluding Ireland).

The share of any deficit from any country in the Eastern Hemisphere which the Philippines is unable to fill will be allocated to Eastern Hemisphere countries except Ireland.

(4) In the event that none of the eligible countries referred to in paragraphs 1 and 3 are able to fill a deficit, the unfilled amount may be apportioned on such basis and to such countries as needed to fill the deficit.

(5) Notwithstanding the methods of allocating deficits as provided above, the President may in the national interest allocate any part of any deficit to one or more countries with a quota on such basis as he finds appropriate, except for any deficit allocation to which the Republic of the Philippines is entitled and can fill.

IMPORT LIMITATIONS OF SUGAR-CONTAINING PRODUCTS

If it is determined that the prospective importation or bringing into the continental U.S., Hawaii or Puerto Rico, of any sugar-containing product or mixture substantially interferes with attainment of the objectives of the Sugar Act, limits may be put on quantities of such product or mixture that may be imported or brought in.

QUOTA-EXEMPT SUGAR

The Act makes certain exemptions for sugar imported, brought into, or produced or manufactured in the United States in any calendar year, as follows:

1. The first ten short tons, raw value, of sugar or liquid sugar imported from any foreign country, other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines;

2. The first ten short tons, raw value, of sugar or liquid sugar imported from any foreign country, other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines, for religious, sacramental, educational, or experimental purposes;

3. Liquid sugar imported from any foreign country, other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines, in individual sealed containers of such capacity as determined not in excess of one and one-tenth gallons each; and

4. Any sugar or liquid sugar imported, brought in, or produced or manufactured in the United States (a) for livestock feed or for the production of livestock feed, or (b) for distillation of alcohol (including all polyhydric alcohols), or for the production (other than by distillation) of alcohol, including all polyhydric alcohols, but not including any alcohol or resulting by-products for human food consumption or (c) for export as sugar or in sugar-containing products.

ACTUAL SHARE OF U.S. SUGAR MARKET

The following table shows the final adjusted quotas for domestic areas and foreign countries for the period 1963 through 1966.

FINAL ADJUSTED SUGAR QUOTAS, 1963-66 (SHORT TONS, RAW VALUE)

Area	1963	1964	1965	1966
Domestic:				
Beet	2,698,590	2,698,590	3,025,000	3,025,000
Cane	1,009,873	911,410	1,100,000	1,100,000
Hawaii	1,070,000	1,110,000	1,136,753	1,200,227
Puerto Rico	870,000	951,000	815,000	711,000
Virgin Islands	15,000	15,832	5,232	5,405
Total, domestic areas	5,663,463	5,650,832	6,081,985	6,041,632
Foreign:				
Republic of Philippines	1,247,618	1,219,790	1,718,216	1,202,978
Argentina	229,701	20,000	68,723	58,820
Australia	223,706	215,098	200,307	187,786
Belgium	7,547	182	1,973	0
Bolivia	0	0	0	4,681
Brazil	447,489	182,363	269,243	478,143
British Honduras	10,758	5,988	5,115	12,884
British West Indies	141,630	142,524	148,605	176,886
Republic of China	71,269	82,613	72,436	78,243
Colombia	77,611	30,346	34,182	50,597
Costa Rica	40,637	58,119	42,459	71,527
Dominican Republic	605,103	402,822	469,244	602,931
Ecuador	57,805	58,039	60,233	69,570
El Salvador	19,659	20,551	21,091	44,204
Fiji Islands	48,704	54,556	48,823	41,209
France	22,935	845	6,103	0
French West Indies	94,297	34,290	52,248	55,644
Guatemala	51,050	45,023	42,734	60,277
Haiti	40,540	20,326	22,603	26,564
India	119,461	110,553	103,919	73,403
Ireland	10,000	10,000	2,398	5,351
Malagasy Republic	0	11,559	7,871	8,867
Mauritius	66,605	0	16,008	17,213
Mexico	387,041	479,425	475,017	488,896
Nicaragua	42,224	50,454	49,416	19,000
Panama	16,524	19,216	17,655	13,000
Paraguay	10,758	0	0	0
Peru	414,224	234,391	292,892	381,375
Reunion	9,893	0	2,373	0
South Africa	132,272	119,960	103,862	55,292
Southern Rhodesia	10,589	10,260	0	0
Swaziland	0	0	9,648	6,781
Thailand	0	0	0	17,213
Turkey	6,578	0	1,574	0
Venezuela	11,907	0	2,873	24,033
Unallocated	30,402	509,875	0	0
Total, foreign areas	4,736,537	4,149,168	3,829,798	4,333,368
Total requirements	10,400,000	9,800,000	9,911,783	10,375,000

HOW IMPORTS AND MARKETINGS ARE KEPT WITHIN QUOTAS

Importers of sugar file an application for approval by the Department specifying the quantities to be imported, the country of origin, and the port of arrival, among other details. The approved application is the basis on which the Bureau of Customs permits entry of foreign sugar into the U.S.

Approval of the application by the Department is keyed to the actual shipment and the earliest date an application becomes eligible for approval is 5 days before the scheduled sailing date of the vessel.

The approval of applications provides the basis on which the Department keeps a record of quota balances for each country.

This procedure is also followed for shipments from Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

Domestic beet sugar and mainland cane processors submit monthly reports of their sugar distribution. This provides the record for charging sugar to quotas and to individual processor allotments when in effect.

(3) Establishing Marketing Allotments: One important function of the sugar program is to promote orderly marketing. If a domestic area has more sugar available for marketing than its quota, processors might rush sugar on the market so that they could sell their sugar before the area quota is filled. This could bring about temporary over-supply, anxious sellers, a weakened price structure and deprive other area processors of an equitable share of the market.

If the supply pressures are likely to cause disorderly marketing, the quota is allotted among the processors. The allotment is based on three factors: past marketings, ability to market, and on sugar processings from beets or cane to which "farm proportionate shares" pertained.

(4) Farm Proportionate Shares: In addition to marketing allotments for processors when needed, the law also provides for farm proportionate shares if necessary to restrict sugar production in any area. This avoids a build up of sugar supplies in a given year beyond that needed to meet the area's quota and to provide a normal carryover inventory.

This determination is made for the coming crop year after due notice and opportunity for an informal public hearing.

When the crop is restricted as for the 1965 and 1966 crops in continental U.S., each sugar-producing farm in the area gets its fair share of the market. To accomplish this individual farm proportionate shares are established.

In mainland cane sugar and sugar beet areas, shares are established in terms of acres. However, in Puerto Rico farm shares are in term of sugar recoverable from the sugar cane. In establishing farm shares, consideration is given to past production and the farm's ability to produce the sugar crop.

In establishing shares, the Act requires protection of, insofar as practicable, the interests of small producers and new producers, of producers who are tenants or sharecroppers, and of producers whose past production was seriously affected by abnormal and uncontrollable natural conditions.

The Act also requires protection of, for a period of not more than three years for use in establishing proportionate shares, the sugar beet production history for farm operators (or farms) who are unable to use all or part of their proportionate share acreage because of crop-rotations or for reasons beyond their control.

Producers are not required to comply with their assigned proportionate shares. However, they must do so if they wish to qualify for payments authorized under the Act.

Generally, too, processors will not purchase sugarcane or sugar beets marketed above the farm proportionate share because sugar produced cannot be considered in establishing the processor's marketing allotment. However, this sugar can be sold for livestock feed outside the allotment.

ACREAGE RESERVE FOR NEW AREAS

The 1962 amendments to the Sugar Act provided acreage for the growth and expansion of the sugar beet industry. The sugar beet acreage reserve was for allocation primarily to new producing localities.

The Act authorized reserving each year from the national sugar beet acreage requirement the acreage required to yield 65,000 short tons, raw value of sugar. All reserve acreage has been committed and the 1965 amendments to the Act do not provide for reserving any acreage after 1966.

The acreage was committed to farmers in new localities and to farmers in localities served by expanded existing plants.

After public hearings, commitments were made to farms served by factories in the following localities:

LOCALITIES SERVED BY NEW FACILITIES

Locality	Acreage	Effective year	Processing company
Mendota, Calif	19,000	1963	American Sugar Co.
Hereford, Tex	24,730	1964	Holly Sugar Co.
Drayton, N. Dak	31,000	1965	American Crystal Sugar Co.
Auburn, N.Y	29,500	1965	Empire State Sugar Co.
Presque Isle, Maine	33,000	1966	Maine Sugar Industries, Inc.
Phoenix, Ariz	20,000	1966	American Sugar Co.

LOCALITIES SERVED BY EXPANDED FACILITIES

Locality	Acreage	Effective year	Processing company
Ottawa, Ohio	2,415	1964	Buckeye Sugars, Inc.
Idaho Falls, Idaho	8,140	1964	Utah-Idaho Sugar Co.
Carrollton and Croswell, Mich	4,030	1964	Michigan Sugar Co.

Under the reserve legislation, the acreage levels established for the new areas are protected against any reduction for the first three years of operation.

SUGAR BEET ACREAGE RESERVE FOR SMALL PLANTS

The Act authorizes reserving from the national sugar beet acreage requirements for 1966, 1967 and 1968 crops, an acreage estimated to yield not more than 25,000 short tons, raw value, of sugar. This acreage is to be used to enable any non-affiliated single plant company to market up to 25,000 short tons, raw value.

Under the provisions, acreage has been allotted for the 1966 crop to Colorado and Kansas for allocation to farms served by the National Sugar Manufacturing Company of Sugar City, Colo., and to Ohio for allocation to farms served by Buckeye Sugar Inc. of Ottawa, Ohio.

SUGARCANE ACREAGE RESERVES FOR HARDSHIP CASES

The Act also authorizes reserving for the 1965 and 1966 crops of sugarcane in the mainland cane areas, the acreage equivalent of 16,000 short tons, raw value, of sugar to relieve hardships on the part of new producers. This acreage has been made available to adjust for the 1965 and 1966 crops of producers who planted sugarcane for the first time for 1962, 1963, 1964 or 1965 harvest.

(5) Grower Payments: Sugar Act payments help to maintain farm income from sugar crops and provide an incentive to growers to adjust their production to quota and carryover needs. Conditional payments of about $83.3 million were made on the 1965 crop to about 54,000 sugar beet and sugarcane producers in 26 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The payment rate declines as the volume of sugar in the cane or beets marketed from the farm increases above 350 tons. The basic rate of 0.8 cents per pound of sugar commercially recoverable, raw value, $16.00 per ton is paid on the first 350 short tons. This rate is reduced by successive steps to a minimum of 0.3 cents per pound ($6.00 per ton) on production above 30,000 tons.

SPECIAL CONDITIONAL PAYMENTS

The program also gives limited benefits to growers through special conditional payments for crop deficiency or abandonment caused by drought, flood, storm, freeze, disease, or insects. For a farmer to be eligible, the natural disaster must cause damage to all or a substantial part of the crop throughout the local producing area in which his farm is located.

FINANCING OF PAYMENTS

Payments to producers are financed out of the general funds of the Treasury. However, sugar taxes (an excise tax of one-half cent per pound, raw value, on all sugar marketed within the quota system) provide funds for the Treasury which more than offset all costs of the program. The revenue from this tax from 1938 through fiscal year 1966 exceeded total sugar program expenditures by about $550 million.

(6) **Equitable Division of Returns:** In addition to providing an incentive to growers to adjust their production to quota and carryover needs, the payments have three objectives: (a) to help give growers adequate income from sugarcane and sugar beet production; (b) to assure growers and their field workers a fair share of the returns to the sugar industry; and (c) to prevent the employment of child labor in field work on sugar crops.

The first objective is met by the payment.

The second objective is attained by requiring growers in order to be eligible for payments to pay field workers in full for work done on cane and beets at rates not less than those determined to be fair and reasonable. These minimum rates are determined and announced by the Department.

In addition, processors if they are also growers are required to pay fair prices for cane and beets purchased from other growers to be eligible for payments on their production.

The child labor provisions require that growers must not employ children under the age of 14 nor permit them to work on sugar beets or sugarcane. Children between the ages of 14 and 16 may not be employed or permitted to work for more than 8 hours a day. Growers who own at least 40 percent of the crop they are cultivating are exempted from these provisions with respect to their own children. A grower failing to observe these provisions is penalized by a reduction of $10 from his payment for each day or part of a day during which each such child was employed or permitted to work.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

State and county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation (ASC) committees are responsible for local administration of both the farm proportionate share (acreage allotment) and the payment parts of the program. This local administraton is based on procedures developed by ASCS and on program regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture or such other person so delegated by the Secretary.

Generally, regulations issued under the authority of the Sugar Act are announced publicly through a press release issued by the Department. Subsequently, the regulations are published in the Federal Register. They are codified as Title 7 Chapter VIII of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Certain regulations are preceded by public hearings. These are marketing allotment orders, fair price and fair wage determinations, proportionate share regulations, and the determination of processes and qualities which distinguish raw sugar from direct-consumption sugar.

The Collectors of Customs control the entry of offshore sugar supplies by permitting shipments of sugar to enter only upon an authorization issued by the Department of Agriculture.

PRICES AND CONSUMER BENEFITS

When sugar prices have been extremely high in the free world market in some past periods, the quota system has assured U.S. consumers adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices.

Under normal circumstances, the limitation that the quota system puts on total marketings of sugar in the United States brings about what is called a "quota premium." The premium is the difference, over and above duty and freight between the price at which raw sugar is sold in the United States and the so-called "world free market price" for sugar.

Thus, the quota system under most circumstances does make prices to consumers higher than might otherwise prevail. However, this system insures the production of a substantial part of our sugar requirements within the continental United States in the interests of national security. Retail prices of sugar in the United States are about the same as the average for other countries where price information is available—these countries consume most of the world's sugar.

WORLD FREE MARKET PRICE

In reality, the world free market price is actually a residual or marginal price at which only a small part—about 10 percent—of the world's sugar production is sold.

Most sugar is consumed in the countries where it is produced and usually the growers and processors in these countries are paid a much higher price for their product than the world market price, just as U.S. producers are.

Countries not self-sufficient in sugar generally require the payment of minimum prices to growers of sugarcane or sugar beets, and impose some form of restrictions on imported sugar for the protection of their domestic producers. Price pooling to distribute the impact of the different prices in different markets in common among exporting countries.

PREFERENTIAL SUGAR TRADING SYSTEMS

Several countries other than the U.S. have comprehensive trading systems involving preferential arrangements with dependent overseas territories or with independent countries with close political ties. These arrangements are in addition to domestic policies which usually have as their goal some degree of self-sufficiency through fostering and protecting home sugar industries.

Less than 25 percent of the world's sugar production moves in international trade, and about half of this movement is under these special marketing arrangements.

WORLD "FREE MARKET" PRICE FLUCTUATES WIDELY

The price for this residual or homeless sugar tends to fluctuate widely. It is extremely sensitive to any major international disturbance or threat to world peace. It moves up sharply when supplies are tight and drops precipitously when supplies are large. For example, the price for sugar at Caribbean ports went as low as 1.40 cents per pound in November 1966 to as high as 12.45 cents in November 1963. During the five-year period from 1962 through November 1966, the yearly average of monthly prices at these ports has ranged from less than 2 cents per pound to 8.50 cents per pound. In contrast, the yearly average of monthly prices for raw cane sugar at New York has varied less than 2 cents per pound during the same period. With the exception of 1963, a year of tight sugar supplies when the yearly average went to 8.18 cents per pound, prices have ranged from 6.45 cents per pound for 1962 to 6.98 cents for the first eleven months of 1966. About one cent a pound of the domestic price represents ocean shipping and tariff and should be deducted when comparison is made to prices at ports of shipment.

U.S. PRICE STABILITY BENEFICIAL

The quota system serves to eliminate both the extremely high prices for sugar, which hurt U.S. consumers, and the exrtemely low prices which are disastrous to U.S. producers. While assuring U.S. consumers an adequate supply of sugar, the U.S. system also enables the United States to carry out the role of a "good neighbor" to many foreign sugar-producing areas, particularly in the Western Hemisphere. The program assures these areas of a stable market for their sugar at remunerative and stable prices with a resulting favorable impact on an extremely important sector of their foreign trade.

BACKGROUND ON U.S. SUGAR INDUSTRY AND SUGAR ACT

The Sugar Industry: Per capita consumption of refined sugar in the continental United States averages about 97 pounds per year. Domestic sugarcane and sugar beet growers supply slightly over half of our sugar needs. The balance, almost all cane sugar, is imported. Further details for 1963–66 are shown in the table on page 9.

About 50 percent of our domestically produced sugar comes from sugarcane, the rest from beets. Louisiana and Florida are the mainland sugarcane producing areas. The offshore domestic sugarcane areas are Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The sugar beet producing area is the following 21 States (arranged in decreasing order of production importance in the 1965 crop): California, Idaho, Colorado, Washington, Minnesota, Michigan, Nebraska, Montana, North Dakota, Wyoming, Texas, Ohio, Utah, Oregon, Kansas, New York, New Mexico, Iowa, Nevada, Illinois, and Maine.

Almost 40,000 domestic farms grow sugarcane or sugar beets. To cultivate and harvest these crops about 230,000 farm workers (mostly seasonal) are required. Total investment in the sugar industry is over $2 billion. The farm investment utilized in growing sugarcane and beets is about $1 billion.

In 1965 the United States had 61 beet sugar factories, 110 raw cane sugar mills, and 29 refineries in operation. Approximately 62,000 workers were employed in these sugar-making plants.

Sugar from Cane: The refined sugar we use in our homes goes through two processing stages. The first process extracts, boils, crystallizes, and centrifuges cane juice and yields raw cane sugar. This process is done in raw cane mills not far from the cane fields.

Blackstrap molasses and bagasse are by-products of this first processing of sugarcane juice. Blackstrap molasses is used in cattle feed and in making ethyl alcohol, yeast, vinegar, and citric acid. Bagasse, the fibrous portion of sugarcane, is used as fuel for the cane mills and as raw material for building boards, cardboard, and paper.

Most of the cane sugar brought to the mainland from offshore areas, both foreign and domestic, is in the raw form. The second process—the refining process—is done in refineries usually in large port cities. A few refineries, however, are in producing areas and a few are at interior cities. Refined sugars, refiners' sirups, and refiners' blackstrap molasses come from this second process.

Sugar from Beets: In contrast to the two-step process for cane sugar, sugar from beets is processed in one plant. The main by-products are beet molasses and beet pulp. The pulp is used for cattle feed. Beet molasses, like blackstrap, is used in cattle feed, and to make yeast and citric acid. Most beet molasses is put through the Steffen's process to raise the sugar yield. The resultant Steffen's waste is used in making monosodium glutamate—used to highlight food flavors.

How the Sugar Act Developed: For almost 150 years the United States protected and regulated its sugar industry almost solely by tariff duties. By the early 1930's, however, the U.S. sugar industry had become so ramified and the price and production relationships among domestic and foreign producing areas so complex that tariffs no longer were an adequate answer to the sugar problem.

To help solve the U.S. sugar problem, Congress passed the Jones-Costigan Act. The President signed it into law on May 9, 1934. Although there have been modifications made in various operating provisions, the basic philosophy underlying this Act has been carried forward in the subsequent legislation.

The Jones-Costigan Act was superseded by the Sugar Act of 1937, which in turn was superseded by the Sugar Act of 1948. The Sugar Act of 1948, with changes made by amendments in 1951, 1956, 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1965, has been extended through December 31, 1971.

The amendments in 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1965 provided for suspending the quota for any country with which the United States is not in diplomatic relations. These amendments were prompted by the actions of the Castro Government in Cuba which had been our principal foreign sugar supplier since early in this century.

SUGAR REQUIREMENTS INCREASED AND DEFICITS REALLOCATED

The U.S. Department of Agriculture today announced an increase of 100,000 tons in the determination of domestic sugar requirements (total quotas), to a total of 10.7 million tons for this calendar year. The Department also declared a deficit of 300,000 short tons, raw value, in the sugar quota for Puerto Rico, and 15,000 tons in that for the Virgin Islands. Information available to the Department indicates that the Republic of the Philippines will be unable to participate in servicing deficits arising in other areas. Accordingly, the deficits declared at this time have been reallocated in their entirety to western hemisphere countries.

The quota for the domestic beet sugar area is increased by 47,667 tons and that for the mainland sugarcane area by 17,333 tons. The quotas and prorations of foreign countries are increased by 350,000 tons.

Because of delayed production from the current crop, receipts of raw sugar from Hawaii and Puerto Rico will be somewhat less than normal during the early part of the year. Today's action will enable foreign countries to increase the rate of their sugar exports to the United States.

Quota increases and deficit prorations, together with revised quotas are shown in the following table:

[Short tons, raw value]

Production area	Change in quota	Basic quota	Temporary quotas and prorations pursuant to sec. 202(d) [1]	Deficits and deficit prorations	Total quotas and prorations
Domestic beet area	47,667	3,168,000			3,168,000
Mainland cane area	17,333	1,152,000			1,152,000
Hawaii		1,200,000			[2] 1,200,000
Puerto Rico	−300,000	1,140,000		−300,000	[2] 840,000
Virgin Islands	−15,000	15,000		−15,000	0
Total, domestic areas	−250,000	6,675,000		−315,000	6,360,000
Philippines		1,126,020			[2] 1,126,020
Mexico	67,161	222,905	237,660	60,722	521,287
Dominican Republic	65,683	218,002	232,433	59,386	509,821
Brazil	65,683	218,002	232,433	59,386	509,821
Peru	52,391	173,883	185,393	47,368	406,644
British West Indies	22,406	87,086	73,613	21,346	182,045
Ecuador	9,556	31,720	33,819	8,641	74,180
French West Indies	7,049	27,395	23,157	6,715	57,267
Argentina	8,080	26,818	28,593	7,305	62,716
Costa Rica	7,731	25,664	27,362	6,991	60,017
Nicaragua	7,731	25,664	27,362	6,991	60,017
Colombia	6,951	23,069	24,597	6,284	53,950
Guatemala	6,516	21,627	23,059	5,892	50,578
Panama	4,866	16,148	17,218	4,399	[2] 37,765
El Salvador	4,779	15,860	16,910	4,321	37,091
Haiti	3,649	12,111	12,913	3,299	28,323
Venezuela	3,301	10,958	11,683	2,985	25,626
British Honduras	1,632	6,344	5,363	1,555	13,262
Bolivia	782	2,595	2,767	707	6,069
Honduras	782	2,595	2,767	707	6,069
Australia	1,260	103,811	87,194		191,005
Republic of China	525	43,254	36,331		79,585
India	504	41,524	34,878		76,402
South Africa	371	30,566	25,674		56,240
Fiji Islands	277	22,781	19,134		41,915
Thailand	115	9,516	7,993		17,509
Mauritius	115	9,516	7,993		17,509
Malagasy Republic	58	4,902	4,116		9,018
Swaziland	46	3,749	3,149		6,898
Ireland		5,351			[2] 5,351
Bahamas		10,000			10,000
Total, foreign	350,000	2,579,436	1,445,564	315,000	4,340,000
Total	100,000	9,254,436	1,445,564	0	10,700,000

[1] Proration of the quotas withheld from Cuba and Southern Rhodesia.

[2] Direct-consumption limits in tons: Hawaii, 36,594; Puerto Rico, 160,500; Philippines, 59,920; Panama, 3,817; Ireland, 5,351

[From Africa Digest, Jan. 19, 1969]

Apartheid Comes of Age

The policy of apartheid became the official policy of the South African Government twenty-one years ago when the Nationalist Party led by Dr. Malan came into power. In these twenty-one years South Africa's industrial economy has expanded steadily except for the setback in 1960 caused by the Sharpeville shootings. Legislation imposing apartheid on every aspect of the nation's life has been passed with ever-increasing speed as the Nationalist majority has grown in Parliament. And yet the growing number of Africans in the urban areas and the slow development of the Bantustan system show that the achievement of total racial separation throughout the Republic is no nearer today than it was in 1948. Despite the enormous weight of oppressive legislation the percentage of Africans in the industrial labour force has increased from 70 to 75 per cent over the past ten years, and it will continue to increase. The industrial labourer is essentially resident in the white urban areas of South Africa.

In the view of Stanley Uys (G. 9/1): "The record of these 21 years is of a steady expansion of the might of the apartheid State, and yet apartheid today is a washed-up ideology. Everyone here knows this, even the Government-supporting Afrikaner intellectuals—and clergymen, editors, academics, and others—whose warnings that the apartheid policy is becoming a farce have become too strident to ignore. 'A whole philosophy and way of life is now at stake, and with it the foundation of Afrikaner nationalism,' wrote *Dagbreek,* the largest-selling Afrikaans Sunday newspaper. 'It is this—or integration.' "

In the Transkei, South Africa's showpiece Bantustan, Paramount Chief Kaiser Matanzima's ruling party has defeated the opposition Democratic Party which rejects the Government's policy of apartheid. Stanley Uys wrote (OFNS 6/12): "With a second five-year term of office ahead of him now, Matanzima must see whether he can make the Bantustan experiment work. If he cannot the whole apartheid ideology falls apart. The question which the elections pose is why should Africans vote for apartheid? There are several answers.

"First, although Matanzima now holds 82 of the seats in the 109-member Transkei Legislative Assembly, most of his support comes from the hereditary chiefs whose office entitles them automatically to membership of the Assembly. There are 64 chiefs in the Assembly, and at least 54 support Matanzima. It works in a circle: the chiefs support Matanzima, who supports Vorster, who supports the weakened tribal system and pays the chiefs their salaries. The chiefs, too, are in a position to influence the tribesmen, many of whom are illiterate. In the recent elections, with their help, Matanzima's candidates won 28 of the 45 elected seats in the Assembly. This is still only just over half the electorate, but in the last election in 1963 Matanzima won only 15 of the 45 elected seats. Undoubtedly, he has made progress.

"Finally, the promise of ultimate independence for the Transkei obviously appeals to many Africans. The Democratic Party's defeat, therefore, is a defeat for the cause of multi-racialism. In the last Assembly, the Democratic Party, led by a highly intelligent lawyer, Mr. Knowledge Guzana, held 27 of the 45 elected seats; today it holds only 14. With the 10 hereditary chiefs who support it, the Democratic Party thus controls only 24 votes in the 109-member Assembly. On the face of it, therefore, the Democratic Party's multi-racialism exercises a dwindling appeal for the Transkei's 1,500,000 citizens. The Democratic Party rejects the whole concept of separate development and of ultimate independence for the Transkei. It considers that the African reserves should be treated as provinces of the Republic of South Africa, and their citizens should have a voice in the central Government in Pretoria, and that the chiefs gradually should surrender their powers to the democratic will of the people. . . ."

Reviewing the development of South Africa's Bantustan policy, as seen in the Transkei, Stanley Uys said: "The Transkei, about 16,500 square miles in extent, supports a population of about 1,500,000 African peasants engaged in subsistence farming. The Vorster Government's task is to assist the Transkei to develop economically so that it can support not only its own population (at present tens of thousands of Transkei men work as migratory labourers in the 'white' areas of South Africa), and the natural increase in its own population, but also more and more Africans who will be sent to it from the 'White' areas. After 20 years of Nationalist Government rule, and after five years of limited Transkei 'self-rule', very little progress has been made in the realization of this aim. The Transkei is still a country of peasants who cannot support themselves.

"The Government's basic blueprint requires that hundreds of thousands of men, women and children should be taken off the land so that the farming units can be enlarged and made viable. But even if this is accomplished it will be sucked into the migratory flow, unless industrial and other jobs are created for them in the Transkei itself."

According to figures quoted in the South African Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition, Sir de Villiers Graaf, only 1,700 industrial jobs have been created in the Transkei so far. Yet private White capital cannot be invested in the Transkei so far.

Yet private White capital cannot be invested in the Transkei and in the similar "homelands." The Vorster Government does not permit this, because it would entail an influx of Whites into the 'homelands," the re-establishing of 'economic colonialism", and the blurring (and ultimately eradication) of the dividing line between White and Black areas, crucial to the apartheid ideology.

Stanley Ulys pointed out that the number of government supporters expressing doubts about the workability of "separate development" is growing. If the Bantustans cannot be made to work, where will the Whites in South Africa then turn for a policy? Will they revert to controlled integration (which the Vorster Government has rejected already as spelling the doom of the White man) or will they rule simply as supremacists discarding the thin moral veil of "separate development"? Paramount Chief Kaiser Matanzima is as anxious to know the answers to these questions as anyone else. He has complained already that he does not want unemployed Africans from the White areas dumped in his territory, where there are no jobs for them; he has demanded, too, more land—land presently held by Whites; he wants more industries established in the Transkei. And, embarrassingly, some of his supporters want him to hasten the pace towards ultimate independence—a prospect which certainly will not meet with the approval of many of Mr. Vorster's own White supporters. The next five years in the Transkei, then, will be the testing time for apartheid. If the Transkei experiment does not work, nothing else about apartheid will work.

"If the theoretical framework of apartheid is collapsing, can Matanzima look idly on?" asks Stanley Uys in his *Guardian* article (9/1). "Originally apartheid was simply another word for White supremacy. Then, in about 1958—10 years after the beginning of apartheid rule—Dr. Verwoerd, yielding international pressure to demonstrate a moral case for apartheid, announced that the African reserves in South Africa would be turned into potentially self-governing and independent homelands—to compensate the 12,570,000 Africans for being denied a stake in the so-called White areas."

The Bantustan system has itself created a double dilemma for the supporters of apartheid. First by creating a Legislative Assembly for the Transkei with an electorate, a public service and a cabinet it is inevitably undermining the tribal system. In time as the electorate becomes politically educated, and the landholding system is changed, as the Government intends it should be, from the present one-man-one-plot system of subsistence agriculture to a system of viable farming units, with the displaced peasants re-employed in secondary and tertiary industries, the tribal system will disappear, and the political influence in support of apartheid exercised by some chiefs will also go. The economic, political, and social differences between a Bantustan and its neighbouring White area will then have disappeared.

Stanley Uys continued: "There is another, even more important, flaw in the whole homelands concept: the White Government insists that private White capital should not be allowed to enter the homelands freely for investment. Otherwise, it is argued, the Whites will simply engulf the homelands. The dilemma is genuine and fundamental: without the investment of private White capital, the homelands will never reach even the economic launching pad, and yet with the help of private White capital, the homelands and the White sector will become so intertwined economically that the lines dividing them will become blurred to the point where they will eventually disappear—and bang will go the whole apartheid concept of 'separate development'."

He described the alternative before the Government as either surrender to Black-White integration or the return to White supremacy, pre-1958, plain and unadorned.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 10, 1969]

South Africa Will Issue Papers Tying "Homelands" and Africans

Johannesburg, South Africa, April 9.—Citizenship papers linking all Africans with their tribal "homelands" will be issued by the South African Government regardless of whether the Africans live in these territories.

The Bantu Homelands Citizenship Bill, introduced by the Minister of Bantu Administration, M. C. Botha, has begun moving through Parliament in Capetown. It is part of the policy of strengthening apartheid, or racial segregation, and giving status to the homelands.

The Transkei is the only homeland in existence after 20 years of the apartheid policy. Granted internal rule in 1963, it provides territorial citizenship for 3.5 million Xhosa—members of the largest tribe in South Africa—most of whom live and work outside the territory.

The new bill seeks to extend citizenship to all other tribes and to establish homelands, known officially as Bantustans, as fast as possible.

Two more Bantustans are being prepared. One is for the Ovambos in South-West Africa, or Namibia as it is called by the United Nations, and the other is for the Zulus in eastern Natal.

Besides being expensive, the process is slow, partly because the homelands cannot provide enough jobs for the Africans and industry in reluctant to relocate because of the extra cost of transporting finished products.

The program to provide employment near the homelands has cost $440-million in the last eight years, a report to Parliament said today. In that time, 54,000 jobs have been created—a cost per job of more than $8,000. The report said that 135 companies had been started and 74 expanded.

The country's African population totals 12.5 million and most of its work force is concentrated in the industrial Witwatersrand region centering in Johannesburg, and in the ports coastal industrial areas and large cities.

GREAT ANXIETY REPORTED

The establishment of Bantustans has been opposed by many Africans who, while identifying themselves as Zulus or Xhosa, for instance, have never seen the homelands and are urbanized.

Mr. Botha's bill aims to give Africans a sense of identification with their homelands, according to the Department of Information in Pretoria.

According to the institute of Race Relations, however, the bill is arousing great anxiety among Africans, particularly urban ones. They were said to fear that to get a job they may have to apply in their homelands and that this might affect the urban residence of their families.

Discussing the bill, the institute said, "It is difficult to see what purpose the bill will fulfill other than to symbolize in a new document that the Government regards all Africans as aliens."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Sept. 13, 1968]

The United States Should Sever All Ties With South Africa

(By Arthur J. Goldberg)

In light of South Africa's unyielding and intensified policy of apartheid—so abhorrent to our commitment to equality for all races—the United States Government immediately should disentangle itself from remaining economic, military, and scientific ties with that country.

We have long recognized that South African race policies offend human dignity today and might threaten peace tomorrow. We have long sought through diplomatic channels to induce changes in South Africa racial policies. Unfortunately, our efforts have had little impact of consequence.

The South African government has ignored United States representations while continuing to build its repugnant system of total racial segregation—*apartheid*. It has increased its suppression of democratic liberties for its people, blacks and whites alike.

Now, even at some cost to ourselves, our Government should take steps which would visibly disengage us from South Africa.

PROTECT OUR MORAL POSITION

By so doing we will protect our moral and political position in the world. We will also lend practical support to those who are working toward the reconciliation and equality of the races in South Africa. And we will strengthen the defense of American interests in the rest of Africa and the non-white world—including the high level there of U.S. investments and trade.

Among these fast-growing, large-magnitude economic American interests, are oil in Libya and Nigeria, copper in Zambia, rubber and iron ore in Liberia, bauxite in Ghana.

We often overlook the fact that the value of these interests in Africa north of Rhodesia now substantially exceeds our economic interests in Southern Africa. And we tend also to overlook the political value of fostering the good will of more than 30 black African governments representing 150 million people. This should not be.

I propose the following major governmental steps:

Arms embargo

Stricter enforcement of the South Africa arms embargo, including a ban on sales of American "dual-purpose" items such as trucks and executive-type planes which can be used by their military.

We should close loopholes such as the recent authorization for sale of American components in some "non-weapons" military equipment sold to South Africa by other countries.

We should use our influence to halt such sales by Japan, France and other countries. In the United Nations Security Council, we should see that such violations are cited by name if they do not cease. By so doing, we could help assure that orders not filled by American suppliers are not thereby lost to foreign competitors.

Missile and space program

We should close our missile and space tracking stations in South Africa and shift to facilities elsewhere as soon as physically possible.

Nuclear agreement

We should carefully examine whether continuance of the U.S.-South African nuclear cooperation agreement is in our over-all interest.

Fueling by official ships

No American official ships should use South African ports. Alternative fueling arrangements should be provided for research and communications vessels as well as Navy ships such as the aircraft carrier Franklin D. Roosevelt. The additional expense is worth bearing.

(The carrier FDR stopped in segregated Capetown, South Africa, in February, 1967. After protests by U.S. Negro leaders and 40 members of Congress, shore leave for 3800 sailors was cancelled.)

Economic ties

Government Export-Import Bank loans and investment guarantees for South Africa should be disallowed across the board. The present case-by-case consideration should be discontinued.

The United States Government should actively discourage private loans and investment by American businessmen and bankers in South Africa. Those who engage in such enterprises are profiting from and strengthening a system which (as our official speeches have made clear) is built on racism.

Commerce Department trade promotion publications for South Africa should be discontinued.

The United States sugar quota for South Africa should be abolished.

We also should support a realistic and peaceful United Nations program of bringing independence to the Territory of South-West Africa, now illegally held by South Africa.

FOLLOW SUIT ON PORTUGAL

As in the case of South Africa, I urge visible disengagement from Portugal in the Portuguese-ruled African territories of Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea.

We should make it an announced policy to reject AID investment guarantees for Portuguese African ventures.

We should reject Export-Import Bank participation in Portuguese Africa in the future. The reduction of Ex-Im participation in the recent large-scale American project for Angola did not go far enough.

As a result of UN Security Council action, we have embarked upon a similar policy of disengagement and disassociation with regard to Rhodesia. We should under no circumstances relax our support for this UN embargo.

All that I propose with respect to Southern Africa is peaceful action. I do not advocate the use of force; on the contrary, I oppose it.

But at the same time that we reject force, we must offer more than words to prove our moral abhorrence of the racist cancer in Southern Africa.

We must take all peaceful and practical steps, within the capacity of our Government, to help stop the spread of that cancer and, with all reasonable speed, to eradicate it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it was my honor to serve as a delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations at its fall session in 1968, and to have charge, on behalf of the U.S. Government, of the item in the General Assemsembly last fall, I join as a cosponsor of Apartheid of the Government of South Africa." I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record my speech to the Special Political Committee of November 8, 1968.

In accordance with the position I stated in my speech in the General Assembly last fall, I join as a cosponsor of the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy). I wish to point out that the foundation of the statement I made on apartheid was based on the proposal made in the Senate last year by the junior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Brooke).

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator John Sherman Cooper, U.S. Representative to the 23d Session of the United Nations General Assembly, in the Special Political Committee, on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, November 8, 1968

It has been an informative experience to sit as a member of this Committee, and to hear the report of the Special Committee and general debate on the policy of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa. Whatever views may be held by member states upon the correctness of its recommendations, the report of the Special Committee is markedly comprehensive, factual and objective. The Delegation of the United States joins others who have spoken in commending the Committee upon its report.

I am sure that the members of this Committee know the position of the United States on this issue. Nevertheless I think it will be useful to state again the policy of my Government concerning apartheid.

We are in agreement with the large majority of member states in their condemnation of apartheid and, as a concrete demonstration of our attitude and policy, the United States has prohibited the sale and shipment to South Africa of arms, ammunition, military vehicles, and equipment and materials for their manufacture and maintenance. I would like to take this occasion Mr. Chairman, to reiterate that the United States has faithfully kept and intends to continue keeping its commitment to prohibit the sale and shipment to South Africa of all forms of military equipment.

It has been the view of the United States in the past that by maintaining normal diplomatic and economic relationships with South Africa we would be in a better position to urge upon South Africa the reform of its policy. Thus, the United States has repeatedly urged the Government of South Africa to change its policies both at home and in South West Africa. These efforts, however, have not produced the desired results.

I must say further that there is a body of opinion in my country which questions the wisdom of a state or even this peaceful organization undertaking to intervene in the internal affairs of another country unless the conditions prescribed by Chapter VII of the Charter obtain. This opinion cannot help but be influenced by events elsewhere in the world, as nations do find special justifications for forcible and coercive intervention.

Having commented briefly upon the policy of my Government with respect to this issue, I would not want to proceed without giving the members of the Committee and the governments they represent some understanding of public opinion in the United States on the practices of apartheid in South Africa.

I believe that the vast majority of the people of the United States condemn the cruel policy of apartheid imposed on the nonwhite and, in some cases the white peoples of that country, in contradiction of the progress which has been made in other countries and in contradiction of the principles of the Charter and human decency.

Since World War II many countries have become independent. Many of these new countries have enacted constitutional and statutory measures to declare and enforce by law the equality of political, economic and social rights for all their citizens. And beyond the legal declaration of political, economic and social rights, many countries are seeking means—private as well as governmental—to secure these rights and to give them content and meaning in actual life.

Despite all the progress that has been made in these nations, and despite the condemnation of apartheid by world opinion, and now in a year in which human rights ought to be considered of paramount importance, the Government of South Africa has determined to maintain its policies, to enforce and further entrench discrimination and racism by governmental authority and power.

The report of the Special Committee is comprehensive and I will not attempt to repeat its contents and to detail the measures which the Government of South Africa has undertaken. Their consequence has been to set apart the largest segment of its population—the non-whites—as an inferior people, outside the political, economic and social life of the country.

And then, in a studied process, it has enacted measures in an attempt to hide the facts, and to stifle the inevitable cries of protest. The Government has made provision for political arrest and imprisonment for those who disagree. It has imposed restrictions on enlightened white people, but its restrictions have the most cruel effect against the majority who are held in thrall by the cruel impact of the policy of apartheid.

The trend of these measures over the past two decades has been to deprive all persons in South Africa of the protection of the courts in an increasingly widely defined area in which Parliament has vested in the executive branch and, particularly in the police, wide power over the individual. The General Assembly last year had reason to examine carefully the most recent legislation of this kind—the Terrorism Act of 1967—as applied to South West Africa. This trend was documented by the International Commission of Jurists in its publication, *The Erosion of the Rule of Law in South Africa*. The Government of South Africa presented its own views in a pamphlet entitled *The Rule of Law in South Africa* which has been given wide distribution. The pamphlet serves to illustrate the inflexible attitude of the Government of South Africa, and only draws attention to the deterioration of the rule of law in South Africa. Even the *South African Law Journal* carried a critique of the claims made by the Government's publication, I quote in part:

"The crisp question is whether these fundamental safeguards, implicit in the Rule of Law, are at all times assured by the South African courts. The truth of the matter appears to be that the very legislation which the author seeks to justify, precludes the courts from assuring these rights—and the courts, by virtue of the nature of our Constitution (which lacks a "Bill of Rights"), are themselves precluded from questioning the validity of these preclusions.

"By reason of a variety of legislative provisions . . . our courts in certain respects have been effectively pinioned and rendered powerless to insure that no person be detained or punished without charge or trial."

There are many forms and practices of discrimination throughout the world. In some countries as in South Africa discrimination is in force against members of society because of their race, color, religious or political beliefs. In some states it is designed to repress the expression of opinion by citizens who do not agree with those in authority. In other countries repression is directed by the authorities of a state against other states—there is the assertion of a superior right to determine the policies of another state and its people, to repress free expression, an arrogance directed by fear and enforced by power. But in whatever form, these practices go against the trend of events, the principle of the Charter and ignore world opinion. They are practices against decency and against the human spirit. It cannot be challenged, I believe, that the apartheid policy practiced by the Government of South Africa represents one of the most callous and inhuman forms of discrimination.

A hopeful sign within South Africa is that some elements of its people and particularly its religious community are expressing increasing concern and disagreement with the inhumanity of the Government's policy—built upon the separation of its peoples, because of race or color, and maintained by governmental dictate and force.

I do not suggest any information that the Government of South Africa is about to reverse its policy, but even small signs are welcome as the distinguished representative of Mexico has said. And these small signs emphasize the necessity—as many in this Committee including our rapporteur have urged—of laying before the world and indeed the people of South Africa the true portrait of apartheid.

Earlier I discussed the policy of my Government briefly and the considerations upon which it is based. I would point out, however, there is a growing concern among many elements of the United States about the refusal of South Africa to correct its policy of apartheid. While there have been no express calls for coercive measures against the Government of South Africa, one current of opinion in the Congress of the United States, which I share, is that the United States should disengaged itself from South Africa in trade and investment as long as South Africa continues its policy of apartheid.

In a speech made on the floor of the Senate of the United States, on April 29 of this year, reporting on a trip to Africa, my colleague Senator Edward Brooke of Massachusetts said, "I believe we must make clear to South Africa that, lacking evidence of that Government's willingness to move toward social justice and equality for the African population it controls, the United States will begin to disengage from its burgeoning economic ties to that country."

I cannot as one individual predict what the eventual result of this particular opinion will be because there are diverse views as to the best way to deal with the problem and because a new Administration in my country will want to reexamine the situation. I must say, however, that the Government of South Africa must take into account that the Government of the United States and its people have not in the past, and will not in the future, ignore South Africa's continuing refusal to move with the rest of mankind towards equality. Discrimination, the subjugation of human rights and the human spirit, whether directed by the governing authorities of the state against its own people, or by one nation against another, must not and will not prevail, and cannot be supported.

S. 1865—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO INSTITUTE COURSES IN THE STUDY OF MALNUTRITION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send a bill to the desk for appropriate reference.

The certainty now that there are at least some pockets of hunger—and of malnutrition amounting to hunger—in our country has shocked the conscience of our Nation as nothing else in the war on poverty. Testimony before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, on which I serve as ranking minority member, has indicated that our medical schools have not been adequately preparing their students for detecting and treating malnutrition and its related illnesses. Even though many of our medical schools do have courses in which some attention is given to malnutrition, few make the study of malnutrition an identifiable part of their curriculum. We have learned that too few doctors have a background which equips them to recognize and treat malnutrition as it exists in our poverty areas. For too long, the study of malnutrition has been given secondary attention in our medical, graduate, and nursing schools to the shame and dismay of us all. My bill is designed to rectify this situation.

Mr. President, the bill will provide funds to medical, nursing, and appropriate graduate schools for instituting courses in the study of malnutrition or which make such study an identifiable part of their curriculums. The bill will also provide for grants-in-aid to such schools as well as hospitals, laboratories, and other public or private institutions, individuals, or groups of individuals for research into malnutrition, its causes, effects, and means for detection and treatment of conditions resulting therefrom.

In addition, Mr. President, the bill will provide funds for special projects designed to provide students in courses in malnutrition with practical training and work experience and with fellowships to encourage such students to work in poverty areas to help combat conditions of malnutrition and its related illnesses.

The select committee has found, during the course of its hearings, that malnutrition is an acute problem in poverty areas, often to the degree of inhibiting mental and physical development; this is especially tragic for prenatal mothers and infants. It is for this reason, Mr. President, that the bill will give priority to those schools and institutions which are located in poverty areas. Many medical schools in the city of New York, for example, are located in, and have clinics in, such areas. These clinics provide an excellent opportunity for the schools' students to pursue practical training and gain experience in this most important, and for too long neglected, area of medical training.

Mr. President, a few months ago I brought together in New York a statewide committee of medical school deans to investigate hunger in New York. I will have printed in the Record an article from the New York Times which fully describes the committee. I feel that every

Member of the Senate should consider forming a similar group in his State, because we must surely do all that we can in our own States to see that conditions of hunger and malnutrition are recognized and eliminated. I am pleased to report that Senators Cook and Dole, who have joined in cosponsoring this bill, plan to establish similar statewide groups in Kentucky and Kansas, respectively.

Mr. President, the bill is sufficiently broad to include such statewide groups and would provide funds to assist them in their efforts. Also, I am pleased to report that Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Robert Finch, and Secretary of Agriculture, Clifford Hardin, have indicated that they support the formation of such groups and will do all they can to aid in their work.

Finally, Mr. President, it is my hope that my bill will help to produce more physicians like Dr. Donald Gatch of Beaufort and Jasper Counties, S.C., and Dr. John Kerr of Buncombe County, N.C., both of whom have been crusaders in the fight against hunger and malnutrition in their communities. Their outstanding, selfless and dedicated work is a fine example of how the medical profession can help in the fight against malnutrition in the United States.

I will also have printed in the Record, Mr. President, two brief articles which describe the work of these men. The first is from the April 3d issue of Jet magazine and tells how Dr. Gatch, who for so long helped to rid his patients of parasites, finally became infested himself. The second article is from the Charlotte Observer in Charlotte, N.C., and offers a fine description of the work of Dr. John Kerr. Mr. President, we should all be proud of these two physicians as they represent the dedication and tireless efforts that are so necessary in the fight against malnutrition and hunger. I submit this bill with the greatest confidence that our medical, nursing, and graduate schools today have among their students hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of potential Dr. Gatches and Dr. Kerrs. I am equally confident that, given the opportunity and financial assistance, they will come forward. It is with this confidence and in this spirit that I submit this bill.

Mr. President, I am pleased that I am joined in sponsoring this bill by Senator George McGovern, chairman of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, and Senators Baker, Brooke, Cook, Dole, Goodell, Hatfield, Percy, and Scott, whose States are representative of a broad cross-section or our Nation. The problems of hunger and malnutrition recognize no geographic boundary and, therefore, our attack on these problems must similarly recognize no such boundary.

Mr. President, initially, programs established under this bill would be implemented in a total of approximately 100 medical, nursing, and appropriate graduate schools throughout the United States. I have been informed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the National Institutes of Health that such a program would have an estimated yearly program cost of $32,000,000. These funds would be allocated in the following manner: Curriculum, $10 million, administrative costs for groups of schools, hospitals, institutions, or individuals in 50 States, $150,000; special project, such as on-the-job training for students in neighborhood health center projects, $20 million; and fellowships, including postdoctoral and predoctoral, two at each of the 100 schools, $1.2 million.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will give early attention to the measure. I am very proud that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern), the chairman of our Select Committee, has joined with me in the sponsorship of the bill.

I believe that such a program is needed in our Nation and is long overdue. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and various supporting articles and editorials be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and material will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1865) to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in the establishment of programs designed to provide for the advancement of medical knowledge with respect to the causes and effects of malnutrition and to facilitate the detection and treatment of malnutrition and conditions resulting therefrom, introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1865

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part A of title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 310a. (a) In order to reduce the incidence of malnutrition in the United States, to advance medical knowledge in the causes and effects of malnutrition, and to encourage and facilitate the provision of early detection and effective treatment of malnutrition and the conditions which result therefrom, the Secretary is authorized, out of the funds available for carrying out the purposes of this section, to:

"(1) make grants-in-aid to and enter into contracts with medical schools, appropriate graduate schools, and nursing schools to assist such schools in establishing courses, dealing with malnutrition, its causes and effects, means for its early detection, and effective treatment of malnutrition and conditions resulting therefrom;

"(2) make grants-in-aid and enter into contracts with universities, medical schools, hospitals, laboratories and other public or private institutions, and individuals and groups of individuals for research into malnutrition, its causes and effects, means for its detection, and into the effective treatment of malnutrition and conditions resulting therefrom;

"(3) establish special projects designed to provide to students of courses in malnutrition practical training and experience in the field of malnutrition; and

"(4) provide fellowships and otherwise financially assist students to encourage and enable them to pursue studies and engage in activities in poverty areas relating to malnutrition.

"(b) In selecting schools and institutions to carry out the purposes referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), priority shall be accorded to those schools and institutions which are located in poverty areas.

"(c) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such amounts as may be necessary."

The material, presented by Mr. Javits, follows:

Medical School Deans To Study Extent of Malnutrition in State: Javits Announces Forming of a Committee—Doubts It Will Find Wide Hunger

(By Thomas F. Brady)

Senator Jacob K. Javits announced yesterday the formation of a committee of the 12 deans of New York medical schools to investigate possible hunger and malnutrition in the state.

Dr. Lewis Thomas, dean of the New York University School of Medicine, joined Mr. Javits in a news conference in the Senator's office here.

Announcing that the new committee would meet within the next two weeks, they said it would survey poverty areas and report to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which is about to begin a nutrition survey in the state. Then, they added, the committee will help in carrying out its own recommendations and those of the Government's survey.

Senator Javits said he believed the committee's work would draw medical students into poverty areas to "help identify and root out cases of malnutrition."

LITTLE STARVING HERE SEEN

The Senator predicted that only isolated cases of malnutrition would be found in New York because of what he called an efficient welfare program.

But, he said, "we must meet the charge that we are always zeroing in on the Southern states—we must make the case that we are also examining ourselves."

Senator Javits also outlined his program in a speech later in the day at the annual Alumni Day of the New York University School of Medicine.

He announced the following legislative proposals that he said he would introduce in the Senate:

Subsidize medical and nursing students in malnutrition work.

Provide grants to medical schools for courses that deal exclusively with malnutrition and related diseases.

[From Jet magazine, Apr. 3, 1969]

Angered Whites by Exposing Black Hunger

Dr. Donald E. Gatch catalogued the horrors of hunger in South Carolina to prod the conscience of Congress. For his efforts, he said, he was vilified by his fellow physicians in the Beaufort, S.C., area, subjected to a campaign of intimidating telephone calls and lost nearly all his white patients.

Exhausted from working almost round-the-clock, Dr. Gatch, 38, was reported in "satisfactory" condition at Freedmen's Hospital.

He suffered from malnutrition. His body was infested with worms, characteristic of many of the undernourished Negro patients he treated. But he pledged to go back to South Carolina to continue fighting hunger in the poverty pockets of the world's most affluent nation.

Dr. Gatch rose beyond the status of a small-town doctor when he served as the "contact man" for Sen. Ernest F. Hollings (D., S.C.). The Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs credited Dr. Gatch with perhaps doing more than anyone to attract national attention to the problem of hunger among the Negroes he treated. After Sen. Hollings testified before the committee, the panel persuaded the Agriculture Department to experiment with giving free food stamps for the poorest of the poor in rural Beaufort and Jasper Counties, S.C.

Dr. Gatch said he began researching hunger and parasitic infestation shortly after he opened practice in South Carolina ten years ago. But the recent publicity resulted in a loss of white patients, upon whom he depended for support. Then he was forced to sell his home in Beaufort, S.C., Dr. Gatch said, and move.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Mar. 18, 1969]

To Many, Doc Is a Savior

(By Bob Dennis)

Sandy Mush.—To many here in the Leicester section of Buncombe County, Jesus Christ has a moustache and a British accent.

He also wears boots, a tweed jacket, a snappy hat and quotes Shakespeare.

He is Dr. John G. Kerr, who doctors the mountain people of Sandy Mush and the Leicester community.

Through Kerr, the mountain people of Sandy Mush have a certain measure of health and well-being they did not have three years ago. It was then that Kerr opened a clinic up at the Sandy Mush school and began giving flu shots, free vitamins, worm medicine, setting broken bones and providing for the first time for many of the mountain people an avenue to feeling better—medical care on a regular basis.

To the people back in the coves—Surrett's cove, Robinson cove, Boyd cove—Kerr is a miracle worker.

Mrs. Kay Taylor, U.S. public health nurse who assists Kerr at the clinic and who visits the cove people regularly, said, "To them, he is Jesus Christ."

Kerr is unimpressed. The measure he takes of himself is revealed in a comment he made about the traces of Elizabethan English in the speech of mountain people—words such as "lief," which means willing or gladly. Kerr quoted from Shakespeare's Julius Caesar:

"I had as lief not to be as live to be in awe of such a thing as I myself."

Kerr came to Leicester in 1953 from Massachusetts, where he was on the medical staff at Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston. He was born in Scotland, educated in England and after five years of army medicine with the British 8th Army in Africa, spent several years practicing medicine in England under the National Health plan. He did not like it and came to the United States in 1951. He wanted to get into a rural practice and wrote the American Medical Association. The secretary of the association at that time was a former Buncombe County man who suggested Leicester. Kerr came to visit, liked it and stayed.

PRESIDENT NIXON RECEIVES PLEDGE FROM PHILADELPHIA YOUNGSTERS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today I had the great privilege of escorting 125 members of the Police Athletic League of Philadelphia—PAL—to the White House to make a presentation to President Nixon.

PAL presented the President with scrolls containing over 300,000 names gathered from over 500 elementary, junior, and senior high schools in Philadelphia subscribing to the following pledge:

> To the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States of America and to the Congress of the United States.
>
> We, the undersigned, do hereby affirm our dedication to upholding law and order and promise to follow the precepts set forth in the Police Athletic League pledge, which reads:
>
> "I pledge to learn and practice the rules of fair play, to respect the rights of others, to obey the laws of our city, state, and country, to be a credit to my family, friends, and myself, to be a leader for the good things of life and thereby prepare myself for the tasks of adulthood."

It is heartening to see the overwhelming response generated by this pledge at a time when respect for authority among the young seems to be breaking down in many cities throughout the Nation.

Each boy and girl who signed the pledge received a PAL emblem and membership card, enabling him to take part in PAL programs, in sports, hobbies, arts and crafts, and other special programs, under the guidance of specially trained policemen. There are 27 full-time policemen staffing 21 PAL facilities throughout Philadelphia. The board of directors of PAL is made up of leading Philadelphia business and civic leaders.

By coming into contact with the man in blue in this type of program the youngsters learn that he is a good friend instead of an enemy. The constructive example offered by the police helps to erode prejudices and advances the cause of community cooperation.

In addition to recreation programs, PAL also has a scholarship program which has enabled several worthy youngsters to attend college.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 94—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION ON RESTORING WEST FRONT OF U.S. CAPITOL

WILL THE FUTURE REPRESENT THE PAST?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the west front of the U.S. Capitol suffers from a structural decay that is nearing its terminal phase. Shoring and other corrective measures bring about temporary remission of symptoms, and nothing more.

The Capitol requires structural reconstruction in the near future, but the only reconstruction scheme advanced so far envisions an extension of the west front that would cost $35 million and entomb the last vestiges of the original Capitol Building in marble.

Since no one knows what restoration would entail in risk, cost, and disruption, Congress cannot now make an informed choice between restoration and extension, although the American Institute of Architects believes the west front can and should be restored in its present location, using existing sandstone where possible or new sandstone where necessary.

In my view, the precious time gained by stopgap mending of the west front will have been wasted unless the possibility of restoring it is professionally studied and thoroughly evaluated. Failure to explore this alternative will allow the extension scheme to win by default.

Study of restoration by an impartial expert should start right away—before the condition of the west front takes a sudden turn for the worse and we are told there is nothing to do but give it a marble burial.

For this reason, Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution authorizing a professional study of the feasibility of restoring the west front of the Capitol, with particular attention to and analysis of the risk, cost, and disruption factors of a restoration project.

It would direct the Architect of the Capitol to select a consultant firm of architects and engineers from a list of such firms submitted by the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration and approved by that agency's National Advisory Panel on Architectural Services, and to enter into a contract with that firm to conduct a full and complete study and analysis of the feasibility of restoring the west front of the Capitol. Any such contract shall provide that—

First, the consultant firm enter into a contract with a recognized specialist in the restoration of old buildings to advise it during the course of the study;

Second, during the course of its work the consultant firm shall maintain close liaison with the Architect of the Capitol and the appropriate committees of the Congress; and

Third, a report containing the findings and recommendations of the consultant firm shall be submitted in 200 copies not later than 4 months after the firm has been notified to proceed with the work, for the information and review of the Architect of the Capitol, the appropriate committees of the Congress, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and other agencies or organizations having an historic or technical interest in structural reconstruction of the Capitol.

Further, the resolution provides that no contract shall be entered into unless the terms and conditions thereof have been approved by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, the west front, last remaining exterior portion of the original Capitol Building, remains substantially unchanged from its appearance in 1825. I do not pretend that the Capitol calendar can be turned back to 1825. The only question is whether we can physically bequeath to the future a reliable representation of an original portion of the Capitol in the place where it was built.

If study shows that we can, then the Congress will know that the multimillion-dollar marble mausoleum approach to Capitol reconstruction is not the only one.

STEWART'S SONIC BOOM-DOGGLE

In 1967, a group of advisers to the Architect of the Capitol, J. George Stewart, took a stand against restoration. It was an interesting but unsubstantiated opinion, not accompanied by the facts and figures the Congress needs to make a judgment. The advisory group also contended that the present condition of the west central portion of the Capitol was nothing "but a travesty, a poor travesty, in fact," of its original architecture, and asserted:

> For many years it has become divested of all of the qualities which would make it a distinguished relic. The precise relation of each part to every other part so necessary in classic architecture, is completely negated by the many thick coats of paint. Mouldings are distorted out of recognition, while all marks of handicraft and age are lost.

Mr. President, the advisory group nonetheless saw clearly the Capitol's distinguished history, for it branded "unthinkable" a proposal that Government functions connected with the legislative branch be moved to a new building of plate glass, concrete and steel, and that the abandoned Capitol become a lifeless monument to past glories.

I agree there should be no pretext of preserving original architecture exactly as it appeared so many years ago. At the same time, I think we all concur in the advisory group's view that the Capitol is historically valuable. The point, then, is whether restoration is feasible: Whether justifiable historical interest can be translated into a reliable representation of the past.

The advisory group alleged that attempting to restore the west front would require vacating interior rooms for as long as 10 years, but failed to buttress its statement with facts. I urge that we obtain them now. Only with detailed knowledge of cost, risk, and disruption factors can the Congress make a meaningful choice between restoration and extension.

Mr. President, we have been told that the shock wave from an explosion or sonic boom could cause great damage to the Capitol. So far, the only plan advanced for the preventive reconstruction envisions a costly, 88-foot extension of the west front. Unless we act now to explore alternatives, we could be stuck with a sonic boom-doggle.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 94) to provide for a professional study of the feasibility of restoring the west front of the U.S. Capitol, with particular attention to and analysis of the risk, cost, and disruption factors of a restoration project, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 94

Whereas the West Front of the United States Capitol suffers from a structural decay that is nearing its terminal phase; and

Whereas shoring and other corrective measures bring about temporary remission of symptoms and nothing more; and

Whereas the Capitol requires structural reconstruction in the near future, and the only reconstruction scheme advanced so far entails a costly extension of the West Front; and

Whereas the West Front is the last remaining exterior portion of the original Capitol building, substantially unchanged from its appearance in 1825, and such extension scheme would bury these vestiges beneath marble; and

Whereas the American Institute of Architects believes that the West Front can and should be restored in its present location using existing sandstone where possible or new sandstone where necessary; and

Whereas no one knows what restoration would entail, and the Congress cannot now make an effective comparison between restoration and extension; and

Whereas the Congress could choose between restoration and extension if it knew after study by an impartial structural engineer what risk, cost, and disruption factors restoration would entail; and

Whereas the precious time gained by stopgap mending of the West Front will have been wasted unless the possibility of restoring it is professionally studied and thoroughly evaluated; and

Whereas failure to examine restoration as a means of reconstructing the West Front implies endorsement of the extension scheme, allowing it to acquire respectability by default: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Architect of the Capitol, subject to the provisions of section 2 of this joint resolution, is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract on behalf of the United States with a consultant firm of architects-engineers of national reputation to conduct a full and complete study and analysis of the feasibility of restoring the West Front of the United States Capitol, with particular attention to the risk, cost, and disruption factors of a restoration project, said contract to be entered into not more than four months after the approval of this joint resolution. The Architect of the Capitol shall select the consultant firm from a list of qualified firms submitted to him by the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration and approved by the National Advisory Panel on Architectural Services of the General Services Administration. Any such contract shall contain provisions requiring that—

(1) the consultant firm enter into a contract with a recognized specialist in the restoration of old buildings to advise it during the course of the study of the feasibility of restoring the West Front;

(2) during the course of its work, the consultant firm shall maintain close liaison with the Architect of the Capitol and the appropriate committees of the Congress; and

(3) a report containing the findings and recommendations of the consultant firm shall be submitted in two hundred copies not later than four months after the firm has been notified to proceed with the work for the information and review of the Architect of the Capitol, the appropriate committees of the Congress, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and other agencies or organizations having an historic or technical interest in structural reconstruction of the United States Capitol.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, no contract shall be entered into pursuant to this resolution unless the terms and conditions thereof have been approved by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated such amount as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution.

FINANCIAL HOLDINGS OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on December 3, 1963, January 29, 1965, and again on January 12, 1967, I submitted for the RECORD the history of my financial holdings from the time I was first elected to the Senate in August 1957 until January 1967.

In order to bring the full record up to date, I submit herewith the history of my financial holdings since January 1967.

There has been no significant change in the makeup of my assets. The bulk of my assets are still in U.S. Treasury bonds and notes, as they have been since late 1963. The value of these holdings is about $130,000.

My other assets include ownership of my home and furnishings in Washington, on which I owe a substantial mortgage to the Perpetual Building Association of Washington, D.C.; ownership of my home and furnishings in Madison, Wis., on which I owe a mortgage to the Credit Union National Association in Madison, Wis., and from which home I receive $200 a month rental; ownership of one 1967 automobile; ownership of checking accounts in two Washington and one Madison bank with balances of about $2,000.

I have trust custody of a small savings account of my daughter, Elsie; and trust custody over 10 shares of stock in the Milwaukee—now Atlanta—Braves, 10 shares in American Motors, and four shares in Allis-Chalmers, all for my son, Ted; and four shares of stock in Associated Dry Goods for my daughter, Elsie.

The value of my holdings has diminished since my last report 2 years ago by about $20,000. I estimate them to be under $175,000.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if we are to achieve the goal of human rights for the citizens of this country, we must remember that the issue is nonpartisan. This question cannot be argued over by parties, sects, classes, or creeds. It is a basic issue.

It is becoming of increasing importance in the contemporary world. We are going to have to work together to reach the goal of human rights for all, or we may fail to secure these rights for even a few.

Presidents of the United States have declared their support for the goal of achieving human rights for all men—Presidents of all parties, of all creeds and from all classes. The luster of such names as Lincoln, the two Roosevelts, Wilson, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson serves to illuminate the bright hope of the achievement of human rights. And now, President Nixon, through his nominee to the Human Rights Commission, Mrs. Rita Hauser, has lent support to the goal of human rights for all, and to the passage of the Human Rights Conventions. Mrs. Hauser has stated her support, and is helping us in the campaign to improve human rights for all. I wish her well in her efforts, and I am glad she has joined us in urging the passage of the three most important Human Rights Conventions—on Forced Labor, Genocide, and the Political Rights of Women.

The Senate has been nonpartisan in its deliberations on the issue of human rights. When the United Nations Charter came before us in 1965, we ratified the Charter by a vote of 89 to 2, with strong support from both sides of the aisle. In 1967 we ratified the Supplemental Convention on Slavery and in 1968 we ratified the Refugee Protocol, both by strongly bipartisan votes. I am glad to see such a record continued by the appointment of Mrs. Hauser by President Nixon. While I am proud of our record in human rights we must not stop now. We have before us three Conventions to be ratified—Conventions that are supported on both sides of the aisle. I hope we will soon come to a vote on these important questions.

THE MILK PROGRAM FOR SCHOOLCHILDREN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last month the Nixon administration decided to eliminate the special milk program for schoolchildren by merging it with the child nutrition and special food assistance programs. Traditionally, the school milk program, which puts Federal funds to work feeding the young, has been a viable alternative to using tax dollars to buy up surplus milk for storage in powdered form. The fluid milk that this program has taken off the market for use in the schools would otherwise have been bought up for storage under the price support program.

In effect, elimination of the school milk program will mean that surplus milk will once again be going into storage sheds rather than children's stomachs. Even an increase in the school lunch program will not be enough to offset the decline in the use of milk resulting from elimination of the school milk program.

Mr. President, the National Milk Producers Federation has calculated that some 1.9 billion half-pints of milk will be denied schoolchildren if the recommended budget cuts are permitted to take effect. I ask unanimous consent that the federation's statement before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, the National Milk Producers Federation—representing dairy farmers in 49 of our 50 states—deeply appreciates the opportunity to present its recommendations on appropriations relating to important programs in the fiscal year 1970 budget.

The Federation represents American dairy farmers and the dairy cooperative associations which they own and operate. These cooperatives range from small groups to very large federated organizations. They operate throughout the continental United States and Alaska.

Today, our nation—as we believe it should—is reviewing and reevaluating *priorities* in our national life. In agriculture—particularly dairying—there are several programs of great significance:

To our dairy farmers and their cooperatives;

To our more than 200 million consumers; and

To our agriculture and national economy.

These programs, we believe, merit high priority.

Briefly, I would like to touch upon highlights of programs of special significance to dairy farmers in the FY 1970 budget, and then request that more detailed statements be incorporated at the end of my discussion.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

The School Lunch Program, in our judgment, merits the increased support recommended at a level of $288,541,000—an increase of $107,250,000 over FY 1969. This program continues to be highly effective (a) in improving the diets of America's children and (b) in providing a good outlet for surplus foods acquired under the Price Support Program.

FOOD STAMP PLAN

Under the Food Stamp Plan, an estimated 3.6 million people will benefit in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. Although realistic estimates of scope of malnutrition and hunger in our nation are hard to come by, we believe that the additional $60 million recommended in the budget would make a constructive—if modest—contribution toward meeting the needs of hungry people.

PESTICIDES INDEMNITY PROGRAM

The Federal program should be continued to provide indemnity payments to dairy farmers whose milk and other dairy products have been barred from the market because it contained residues of chemicals registered and approved by the Federal Government. To insure adequate protection under the program, we recommend that $500,000—instead of $200,000 proposed in the budget—be approved for the next fiscal year.

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

The Farmer Cooperative Service Program continues to be extremely valuable to dairy farmers in helping to develop and improve operations of their cooperatives.

The Technical Assistance to Cooperatives' feature has been an especially effective program. Because of this, we would urge the Congress to approve $1.5 million—instead of the recommended $741,000—for the coming year.

SECTION 32 FUNDS

The removal of surplus agricultural commodities through the use of funds appropriated from Section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, continues to be an essential function in our agricultural programs. Again we urge, however, that these funds be utilized as directly as possible in removal of surplus agricultural commodities rather than as funding for programs which merit support separately—such as School Lunch and other programs.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Carrying forward research is essential to progress in dairying. The areas in which research is urgently needed include: nutritional value of milk and dairy products and their relationship to a proper diet; expanding market outlets; broadening utilization of dairy products; dairy economics; improving distribution techniques for milk and dairy products; promoting greater use of technology in milk production, processing and marketing; and for research in other aspects of dairying.

Of special significance, the Federation urges approval of adequate funds for eradication of communicable livestock diseases; (1) at least $21,587,000 recommended in the budget for the brucellosis eradication program; and (2) at least $1 million for mastitis and abnormal milk program.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

For 15 years, the Special Milk Program for Children has proven a tremendously useful and successful program.

(1) It has contributed substantially to improving the health of America's children. During 1968, for example, about 17 million children of school age benefitted from the program.

(2) It has provided a highly beneficial outlet for milk production, with consumption in 1968–69 estimated at three billion half pints—or about 1.6 billion pounds—of milk. As a result, it has reduced the cost of the Price Support Program.

(3) By increasing milk consumption, the program has proven to be of great importance to the dairy farmer.

For your reference, we have prepared two tables. The first discloses the number of schools and institutions, and the number of children, participating in the program for fiscal years 1955 through 1968. The second table shows the amount of milk served each year and the amount of butter and nonfat dry milk represented by this volume. I request permission to have the tables incorporated in the RECORD without taking time to read them.

TABLE I.—SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN—NUMBER OF SCHOOLS AND INSTITUTIONS, AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN PARTICIPATING, FISCAL YEARS 1955–68

Fiscal year	Number of schools and institutions [1]	Number of children participating (millions) [2]
1955	41, 094	2. 5
1956	62, 266	7. 7
1957	71, 239	9. 7
1958	76, 478	10. 7
1959	81, 587	12. 1
1960	83, 922	13. 2
1961	86, 494	13. 8
1962	88, 188	14. 6
1963	90, 486	15. 4
1964	91, 890	16. 3
1965	92, 005	16. 5
1966	97, 437	17. 0
1967	95, 139	17. 0
1968	94, 422	17. 0

[1] Peak month nationally. Child care institutions did not participate in program during fiscal years 1955 and 1956.

[2] Estimated on basis of 180 schooldays per year.

Source: Reports CFPSS, C. & M.S., USDA.

TABLE II.—SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

Amount of milk served, and milk served in terms of butter and nonfat dry milk, fiscal years 1955–68

[Thousands of pounds]

Fiscal year	Milk served	Milk served in terms of— Butter	Nonfat dry milk
1955	241, 773	11, 182	21, 166
1956	749, 395	34, 660	65, 606
1957	942, 066	43, 571	82, 474
1958	1, 031, 016	47, 684	90, 261
1959	1, 169, 685	54, 098	102, 401
1960	1, 281, 776	59, 282	112, 214
1961	1, 331, 239	61, 570	116, 544
1962	1, 414, 150	65, 404	123, 802
1963	1, 486, 487	68, 750	130, 135
1964	1, 574, 354	72, 814	137, 828
1965	1, 594, 637	73, 752	139, 603
1966	1, 644, 280	76, 048	143, 949
1967	1, 627, 123	75, 256	142, 447
1968	1, 631, 682	75, 465	142, 846

CURRENT STATUS

As you know, Congress appropriated funds not to exceed $104 million for this program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. The law also provides *authorization* not to exceed $120 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970

To the great distress of America's dairy farmers, however, no funds were requested in the fiscal year 1970 budget for this program. As proposed, rather, the Department indicates that only $20 million would be used to operate the program in schools without lunch facilities. The milk program, itself, would be phased out in 1970.

As I understand it, the thinking—certainly not the wise planning—is that, by expansion of the School Lunch Program and other feeding programs, milk consumption would not decrease; rather, the milk previously served in the School Milk Program would be consumed. This thinking contradicts simple arithmetic as will be shown.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE HARDIN'S POSITION

In testifying before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin—in response to a question—stated that the Department was going along with the budget proposal.

JUSTIFICATION FOR CONTINUATION AND EXPANSION OF THE PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman: In our judgment, this rationale does not stand the test of reason. Why? For the following reasons:

(1) The proposed budget will seriously reduce consumption of milk. For FY 1970, the budget proposes to eliminate the Special Milk Program. Under the umbrella of "Child Nutrition Programs" would be the School Lunch, Special Assistance to Needy Schools, School Breakfast, Special Food Service Programs for Children and Nonschool Food Program. Under *all* these programs, however, the estimated consumption for FY 1970 will still be reduced by an estimated 1.905 billion half pints.

(2) Economically, as well as humanly, the proposed shift of emphasis would, in our judgment, be costly. By failing to provide appropriations for the School Milk Program, it could—for moderate difference in cost—literally take 1.905 billion half pints of milk out of the mouths of children and put it into the surplus stockpiles. The 1.905 billion half pints equal 10,239,375 hundredweight of milk; converted into dairy products and purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation at the 1969 rate of $5.12 per hundredweight, the cost would be $52,425,600.

(3) Nutritionists maintain that a child should have a minimum of one quart of milk per day. Even under the present two programs—School Milk and School Lunch—the consumption of milk provides only half this recommended minimum. It would be even less under the proposed termination of the School Milk Program and the expanded School Lunch Program with only one-half pint required with each Type A lunch.

(4) Currently, the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs hearings provide evidence of malnutrition among our Nation's youth, including middle and higher income levels of our population. The availability of milk to *more* than 37 percent—the present level of participation—of our 51 million school children, would, in our judgment, serve the national interest.

(5) With an expanding population—and a Nation's growing concern for hunger and malnutrition—this is no time to eliminate or reduce a program which for 15 years has proved its value by improving the diet and health of the youth of this country.

(6) In terms of public expenditures the milk program is a good investment in child health; the dairy and farm economy; and the national interest.

As authorized in present law, therefore, we urgently recommend:

(1) That the program be funded as a separate program;

(2) That appropriations be approved at least at the authorized level of $120 million for fiscal year 1970. Preferably, our judgment is that appropriation should be increased to $125 million for fiscal year 1970 to meet the needs of expanding population, as proposed in bills S. 745 and H.R. 7996 now pending before Congress.

Mr. Chairman: In considering such legislation, we would respectfully urge that the Congress—as in the past—would work its own will; rather than accept the recommendations of the Executive Branch as inflexible edicts making far-reaching—and, in this case, we believe unwise—changes in this program.

I respectfully request permission of this distinguished Committee to have printed at this point in the hearings additional statements by the National Milk Producers Federation supporting appropriations for other programs of significance to agricultural progress in this country.

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAM (SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM)

Over the years, the School Lunch Program has proved a highly effective and beneficial program;

For improving a good outlet for purchases of food acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the Price Support Program; and

As a matter of fact, for now being in a forefront of the Nation's growing concentrated battle against malnutrition and hunger.

For fiscal year 1969, cash payments will have been made to states operating the program for 19 million children in 71,750 schools; they will have been served 3,370,000 lunches at an estimated cost of $162 million.

For fiscal year 1970, the budget proposes to include several programs under the new title, Child Nutrition Program; these include the School Lunch, Special Assistance to Needy Schools, School Breakfast and Special Food Service Programs for Children.

The budget recommends about $288,541,000—$107,250,000 more than for fiscal year 1969. The comparative 1969–70 figures are as follows:

	1969	1970
School lunch	$162, 041, 000	$168, 041, 000
Special assistance to needy schools	10, 000, 000	90, 000, 000
School breakfast program	3, 500, 000	10, 000, 000
Special food service program for children	5, 750, 000	20, 500, 000
Total	181, 291, 000	288, 541, 000

In our judgment, these programs merit this level of support.

Furthermore, it is our opinion that more efficient use of agricultural commodities such as butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation are donated to the School Lunch Program when available. The Secretary of Agriculture should allocate definite quantities of these commodities to the School Lunch Program and then make such quantities available to schools from Commodity Credit Corporation inventory or, if necessary, from open market purchases. This procedure would serve to stabilize the program and allow school officials to plan on a long-term basis. It would also be of significant benefit to farmers by providing a more dependable market for their product.

FOOD STAMP PLAN

With the most productive agricultural system and the most efficient farmers in the world, we cannot tolerate malnutrition and hunger in this country. The Food Stamp Plan, in our judgment, operates as an extremely useful program in meeting dietary needs of low-income or impoverished groups.

Under the present program, an estimated 3.6 million people will benefit in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. The cost will be an estimated $280 million.

For fiscal year 1970, the budget requests an additional $60 million, for a total of $340 million, for the Food Stamp Plan. This would cover the full-year costs at the June 30, 1969, level, plus expansion in new areas in 1970.

As yet, the Department of Agriculture (which administers the program) has not been able to develop realistic estimates on the total scope of malnutrition and hunger. For the time being, then, we would support in the United States expansion of the program to the $340 million level.

The Federation has consistently supported the Food Stamp Plan. Unfortunately, many program participants do not properly utilize their stamps. This is because they are given too broad a range of products from which to choose. For example, instead of purchasing, at reduced prices, nature's most perfect food, the stamps are frequently exchanged for imitations of dairy products and do not provide a nutritious well-balanced meal.

Through proper nutrition education, accompanied by an increased sense of family responsibility, many lower income families could more wisely use the Food Stamp Program. Stamps should be exchangeable only for a limited list of the most highly nutritious foods.

The Federation suggests that the Congress authorize studies to be made toward making the Food Stamp Plan more adaptable to the needs of the recipients and to encourage them to become more productive members of our economy.

The Federation continues to oppose present provisions of the Food Stamp law which prohibit the present direct food distribution program in countries where a Food Stamp Plan is in effect. Distribution of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks could be combined with the Food Stamp Plan without disrupting the local commercial market and, thus, provide maximum distribution of food to low-income families.

INDEMNITY PAYMENTS TO DAIRY FARMERS

The Indemnity payments program has proven extremely valuable to dairy farmers.

In recent years, unfortunately, a limited number of farmers have had milk barred from markets because of minute traces of pesticide residue. This occurred even though the pesticides had been recommended by the Federal Government and the contamination resulted from factors outside the control of the farmer, these could include wind drift of pesticide, spray, contamination of purchased feed, etc. So long as farmers can suffer extreme economic loss even though following Government procedures, it would be inequitable to discontinue the program.

For fiscal year 1969, the budget estimates that indemnity payments will total about $300,000.

For fiscal year 1970, however, the budget proposes only $200,000—a reduction of $100,000. In our judgment, this is inadequate.

To ensure protection for dairy farmers, the Federation urges approval of an appropriation of $500,000 for the next fiscal year. If the level of pesticide contamination should increase, it is important that the farmers be able to recover indemnities. If the money is not spent, it goes back to the treasury.

The Federation also continues to urge that laboratories be established to test feeds and other agricultural commodities intended for consumption by livestock. When such contamination occurs, it often is transmitted through purchased feed for milk cows. However, the farmer has no way of knowing whether or not the purchased feed is free of pesticide residue. Therefore, it is essential that a method be established for dealing effectively with this problem. This is especially necessary since, if it occurs, regulatory agencies can step in and prohibit dairy farmers from selling their products.

If laboratory facilities were established to test feeds for pesticide residues before these were transmitted into milk, this would markedly improve capabilities for controlling such residue.

The Federation estimates that 18 testing laboratories would be needed. These would benefit not only dairy farmers but also livestock producers.

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

Over the years, the Farmers Cooperative Service has made significant contributions toward improving and advancing the cooperative system. Generally, the activities include:

Advising cooperative leaders and others on problems and operations of specific co-ops;

Encouraging further co-op development and organization;

Helping farmers get better prices for their products through reduced marketing expenses;

Enabling dairy and other farmers to better meet growing competition; and

Providing a useful resource for general guidance, counsel and technical assistance in development and improvement of cooperative organizations.

For 1969, the budget for this program totaled about $1,414,000. For fiscal year 1970, the budget proposes an expenditure of $1,695,000, an increase of $281,000.

Generally, the expenditures would be proportioned as follows:

[In thousands]

	1969*	1970	Increase
Marketing efficiency and farm income research	$826	$826	None
Community improvement research	33	93	$60
Housing research	14	14	None
Technical assistance to cooperatives	541	741	200
Market supervision	None	21	21
Total	1, 414	1, 695	281

*Includes $1,341,000 in 1969 appropriations plus $73,000 in proposed 1969 supplemental appropriations to meet enacted pay costs.

According to USDA figures, the net business volume of farmers marketing and purchasing cooperatives has risen from $9½ billion to $18 billion within the last 15 years—89 percent. In addition, there has been an increase in the scope and complexity of operations of cooperatives. Because of these factors, the Federation strongly feels that the appropriations for Technical Assistance to Cooperatives should be substantially increased, from $741,000 to $1.5 million for FY 1970.

Although cooperatives are specifically organized to help their members, the benefits actually are widespread. Because cooperative associations hire employees in their plants, they provide additional jobs in the community. Cooperative services enable farmers to operate at lower costs; by so doing, they make contributions to higher farm income. Since cooperatives operate on a cost basis, they are an effective instrument in maintaining reasonable prices for consumers.

For these reasons, we believe that expanding the Technical Assistance to Cooperative Programs would serve the best interest, not only of the farmer, but also the communities in which they operate and the general economy.

SECTION 32 FUNDS

The Federation continues to support the objectives of Section 32 of Public Law 320, Seventy-Fourth Congress. We believe a greater effort should be made to fulfill one of the main purposes of Section 32, that is, the reestablishment of farmers' purchasing power in connection with the normal production of agricultural commodities. In view of this purpose, it is undesirable to end the fiscal year consistently returning unused funds to the Treasury. Such funds could be used to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In the FY 1970 budget, however, substantial Section 32 funds have been earmarked for diversion to the School Lunch, Child Nutrition, and similar programs. Although we support these programs, we believe that they should be funded by separate appropriation.

The Federation, moreover, is deeply concerned about one recommendation under Section 32 in the FY 1970 budget relating to costs of administering marketing agreements and orders. The budget states that: "Legislation will be requested for payment of approximately $3 million of the Federal administrative costs of this program by producers and handlers."

In the past, these costs have been borne by the Government as a justified expenditure for a public program administered in the interests of the farmer and the Nation. Presently, the parity level for dairying is only about 83 percent, evidence that the cost of labor, equipment, and other operating expenses are 17 percent below the level of dairy prices.

Obviously, transferring the burden of an additional $3 million expenditure to producers and handlers would result in: (a) greater economic burdens on the dairy farmers already facing serious problems; or (b) higher costs to consumers.

Because of these factors—and because we believe that these are normal administrative expenditures justifiably paid by the Government—we strongly oppose any change of existing procedures that would impose an additional economic burden on the dairy farmer.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Research in dairying is essential: (1) to provide ways for finding solutions to unresolved problems; (2) to establish a foundation of new knowledge for progress.

Recognizing this, the Federation urges approval of adequate appropriations for research in dairying and agriculture.

Unfortunately the dairy farm prices have been too low for too long. Because of this situation the dairy industry needs assistance for necessary research—research by the Federal Government and authority for self-help research whereby dairy farmers and their cooperatives could utilize funds out of the Federal order milk market pool for research and other projects to improve or promote the marketing and consumption of milk and its products.

However dairying continues to be an important resource for healthful nutritional food and a major source of income for the Nation's farmers; consequently it is important that dairy research be supported at an adequate level in our Federal programs. The areas in which research is urgently needed include: nutritional value of milk and dairy products and their relationship to a proper diet; expanding market outlets; broadening utilization of dairy products; dairy economics; improving distribution techniques for milk and dairy products; promoting greater use of technology in milk production processing and marketing; and for research in other aspects of dairying.

Of greater significance to the dairy industry also are U.S. Department of Agriculture efforts to eradicate communicable livestock diseases. Fortunately progress is being made for example in eradication of brucellosis. According to USDA all but seven states of the Nation, Louisiana, Florida, Texas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Hawaii, have achieved Modified-Certified status. A record number of counties, 3,001 in the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, have reached this intermediate goal in eradicating brucellosis.

A total of 1,207 counties are certified Brucellosis-Free. This total includes all counties in 14 States, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Michigan, Wisconsin, Washington, Nevada, Utah, and the Virgin Islands. All except ten counties in the Nation, are participating in efforts to eradicate brucellosis.

For FY 1970, the Department reports that it proposes to allocate $21,587,000—an amount similar to FY 1969—for the brucellosis eradication program. Although the Department indicates that this should be sufficient to carry out its objectives, we would urgently recommend that the Congress carefully consider whether or not the eradication program can be operated effectively at this level of expenditure; if this cannot be done, additional funds should be approved.

Mastitis also continues to be a major cause of economic loss to dairy farmers. According to USDA estimates, losses amount to $600 million or more annually. In addition, mastitis results in shorter productive life for affected cows; and often results in culling of mastitic cows from dairy herds.

Unfortunately, research efforts have resulted in a conflict of viewpoints as to the methodology of mastitis detection, the specific causes of mastitis, and the degree and severity of a problem which may exist even if mastitis is present. Coordinated research is essential to provide a full understanding of the problem.

We would respectfully urge, therefore, that the Congress earmark at least $1 million for dealing with the problems of mastitis and abnormal milk.

BUDGET CUT TO DECREASE MILK CONSUMPTION—1.905 BILLION HALF PINTS OF MILK WILL BE DENIED SCHOOLCHILDREN UNDER RECOMMENDED BUDGET CUTS

In the budget for fiscal 1970 the school milk program will be terminated and the school lunch and other feeding programs increased. This will decrease milk consumption by 1,905,000,000 half pints.

	Fiscal year 1969 (half pints)	Fiscal year 1970 (half pints)	1970 increase or decrease (half pints)
School milk (estimated consumption)	3,000,000,000 (1)	581,000,000 (2)	2,419,000,000 decrease.
School lunch and other feeding programs with 1 half pint of milk each.	3,445,000,000 (3)	3,959,000,000 (4)	514,000,000,000 increase.
Net decrease			1,905,000,000 .

Source: (1) Budget 1970 (H. Doc. 91–16) p. 131; (2) budget 1970 (H. Doc. 91–16) p. 134; ($20,000,000 transferred from sec. 32 divided by .0344 average reimbursement rate); (3) and (4) budget 1970 (H. Doc. 91–16) p. 133. $52,425,600 additional cost to price support program due to the decreased consumption of 1,905,000,000 half pints of milk. The 1,905,000,000 half pints equals 10,239,375 hundredweight of milk. This will be converted into dairy products and purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation at a rate of about $5.12 per hundredweight (1969). Result: $52,425,600 increased cost to the Federal Government. The Federal Government will spend $52,425,600 to deny school children 1,905,000,000 half pints of milk during fiscal year 1970.

S. 1861—INTRODUCTION OF THE CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS ACT OF 1969

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on January 15, 1969, along with two of my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), I introduced S. 30, the Organized Crime Control Act of 1969, which will strengthen the procedural aspects of Federal law enforcement efforts to stamp out organized crime in the United States.

The bill which I am introducing today, the Corrupt Organizations Act of 1969, is in part a product of testimony developed in 4 days of hearings on S. 30.

There is a rising awareness, in official circles and among all our people, of the depth of penetration of organized crime into the fabric of our society.

Paul J. Curran, chairman, New York State Commission of Investigation, testified before the subcommittee:

> In our investigations, the Commission has found that the means used by racketeers to penetrate and to gain control of legitimate business, or simply to engage in extortion, ranged from old fashioned muscle and violence to such more sophisticated techniques as using a big underworld name as a salesman, or merely mentioning such a name as being connected with a particular company, or "borrowing" money with no intention of even repaying the "loan." Of course, many other techniques were and are utilized.

Organized crime business penetration, moreover, is not, as some would believe, a process by which the racketeers will eventually be legitimized. Criminals use racketeering methods in legitimate fields of endeavor. They corrupt others, instead of becoming legitimized. The only way in which this cancer can be removed from our economy is by direct attack, by forceable removal and prevention of return.

Mr. President, the time has come for such a frontal assault to be made on the bastions of organized crime. Our present laws are inadequate to remove criminals from legitimate-endeavor organizations. Constant references have been made to the frustration resulting when the only consequence of a conviction is that organized crime and its infiltrated organizations are run by a new leader, and the organizations which are the real threat are not affected. Attorney General John A. Mitchell has called for new ideas in this area, and I have been in contact with him in the preparation of this legislation. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) has introduced legislation which would apply certain approaches from other areas of Government activity, such as taxation and antitrust, to the problem of organized crime. He also joins me in the introduction of this bill. Congressman POFF of Virginia has also been in contact with me in reference to this bill. It is, Mr. President, bipartisan legislation.

The problem, simply stated, is that organized crime is increasingly taking over organizations in our country, presenting an intolerable increase in deterioration of our Nation's standards. Efforts to dislodge them so far have been of little avail. To aid in the pressing need to remove organized crime from legitimate organizations in our country, I have thus formulated this bill which I am introducing today, a bill entitled the "Corrupt Organizations Act of 1969." This bill is designed to attack the infiltration of legitimate business repeatedly outlined by investigations of various congressional committees and the President's Crime Commission.

The bill uses the most direct route to accomplish this result. If an organization is acquired or run by the proscribed racketeering method, then the persons involved are removed from the organization. This legislation—possibly for the first time—develops the use of other techniques and approaches as a means to remove organized crime influences from legitimate organizations.

The bill draws heavily upon the remedies developed in the field of antitrust. Nevertheless, Mr. President, I believe it necessary to make several clarifying remarks on the antitrust remedies this bill provides. The first is that the equitable remedies used in the field of antitrust always existed. Because the remedies have been effective in removing and preventing harmful behavior in the business segment of our economy, they show great promise as tools for attacking organized crime. There is, however, no intention here of importing the great complexity of antitrust law enforcement into this field. Nor is there any intention of using the antitrust laws for a purpose beyond the legislative intent at the time of their passage.

The many references to antitrust cases are necessary because the particular equitable remedies desired have been brought to their greatest development in this field, and in many instances they are the primary precedents for the remedies in this bill. Nor do I mean to limit the remedies available to those which have already been established. The ability of our chancery courts to formulate a remedy to fit the wrong is one of the great benefits of our system of justice. This ability is not hindered by the bill.

My second point is that this bill in its particular provisions is an innovating approach to the problem of organized crime. As such, it must be subjected to searching analysis in order to forge its underlying ideas into the most effective tools possible. I assume that it will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and then to the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, in which event I would expect to schedule early hearings in order to expedite processing and consideration of the bill. Its provisions might well be incorporated by way of amendment into S. 30 itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the bill creates a new chapter 95 in title 18, entitled "Racketeer Influenced Organizations," containing sections which I shall briefly highlight in order to show the response to organized crime contained in this proposed legislation.

Section 1961, definitions, in subsections (1)-(12) defines the type of activity subject to actions. These were based on the President's Crime Commision report which stated:

> Control of business concerns has usually been acquired through one of four methods: (1) investing concealed profits acquired from gambling and other illegal activities; (2) accepting business interests in payment of the owner's gambling debts; (3) foreclosing on usurious loans and (4) using various forms of extortion.

In addition, various methods of corruption used by organized crime to conduct ordinarily legitimate businesses are included.

Section 1962 sets forth the forbidden activities, which are to acquire, control or operate organizations by the use of a pattern of racketeering activity as defined in section 1961, or to acquire an organization by the collection of unlawful debt. I emphasize that this is not aimed at the isolated criminal act. I note, too, that at least one act occurring after the effective date of this legislation must be shown to make out a violation.

Section 1963 provides that any violation of section 1962 provable beyond a reasonable doubt will result in a forfeiture of the violators' interest in the organization to the United States. This is a powerful weapon, which will, I hope, effectively remove the organized crime element from a particular field of activity, as well as remove the illegal profit potential which makes certain fields so attractive today. Precedent for forfeitures, of course, runs deep in our common law heritage. It thus calls on the past to meet the problems of today.

Section 1964, civil remedies, provides for divestiture of interest and other remedies as to persons found to have violated section 1962. Ample precedent here exists in the antitrust laws, and I quote from the landmark decision *United States* v. *DuPont & Co.*, 366 U.S. 316, 326–27 (1961):

> The key to the whole question of antitrust remedy is, of course, the discovery of measures effective to restore competition. Courts are not authorized in civil proceedings to punish antitrust violators, and relief must not be punitive. But courts are authorized, indeed required to decree relief effective to redress the violations, whatever the adverse effect of such a decree on private interests. Divestiture is itself an equitable remedy designed to protect the public interest.
>
> If the Court concludes that other measures will not be effective to redress a violation, and that complete divestiture is a necessary element of effective relief, the Government cannot be denied the latter remedy because economic hardship, however severe, may result.

One must remember that this is a court speaking of remedying an economic concentration of power, which potentially might have an adverse effect upon our economy. This bill attacks a far more heinous offense, the use of force, threats of force, enforcement of illegal debts, and corruption in the acquisition or operation of business. If DuPont and other related companies can be forced to rid themselves of General Motors ownership, almost without regard for the economic consequences, then it most surely follows that the removal of criminal elements from the organizations of our society by divestiture is justified. The situation may be said to cry for legislation to accomplish that result. The criminal surely can lose his right to own a business or other enterprise as easily as can the essentially honest, but potentially too powerful businessman.

This provision will, I trust, effectively remove the criminal figure from the particular corrupt organization. As used in connection with the remedy of prohibition of engaging in the same kind of business in the future, the criminal element is not only removed from an area of activity, he is also prohibited from using the knowhow acquired to start the same business again under a different name. Again the antitrust laws furnish ample precedent.

In *United States* v. *Grinnel Corp.*, 384 U.S. 563, 579 (1966), Judge Wyzanski, the district court judge, had decreed that one Fleming should be enjoined from working for any of the corporate defendants to an antitrust suit because of constant flouting of the antitrust laws, even though no predatory practices were found to exist. The Supreme Court, while it reversed on factual underpinning to support the legal judgment, acknowledged that the remedy itself was clearly available if appropriate facts were found:

> Defendants urge and the Government concedes that the barring of Mr. Fleming from the employment of any of the defendants is unduly harsh and quite unnecessary on this record. While relief of that kind may be appropriate where the predatory conduct is conspicuous, we cannot see that any such case was made out on this record.

I submit that if predatory conduct is the basis for such a prohibition, then surely murder, extortion and other crimes are more than equal grounds for the prohibition.

Additional authority for prohibiting persons or corporations from engaging in certain types of legitimate activities may be found in *United States* v. *Swift & Co.*, 286 U.S. 106 (1932), and *Deveau* v. *Braisted*, 363 U.S. 144 (1960), as well as numerous disbarment cases.

In all of these cases, the courts have emphasized that the prohibition is not in the nature of a penalty against any individual. It is instead in the nature of protection of the public against parties engaging in certain types of businesses after they have shown that they are likely to run the organization in a manner detrimental to the public interest. In the spirit of this background, this provision is remedial rather than penal. It is based upon judgment that parties who conduct organizations affecting interstate commerce through a pattern of criminal activity are acting contrary to the public interest. To protect the public they must be prohibited from continuing to engage in this type of business in any capacity.

In the event an organization is so corrupt that divestiture does not provide an effective remedy, then the court is authorized to require dissolution. Authority for dissolution is found in *International Boxing Club of New York, Inc.* v. *United States*, 358 U.S. 242 (1959). Again I emphasize that the remedies are not confined to those listed.

Estoppel specifically is provided between a criminal suit won by the United States and a civil suit, but in no other instance.

Section 1965 provides broad venue and process, similar to that set out in the antitrust laws.

Section 1966 provides for expedition of actions due to the crucial nature of the actions.

Section 1967 provides for open depositions, on the theory that publicity is one of the most effective actions we have for use against the organized criminal. An immunity section similar to that of S. 30 is also in section 1967.

Section 1968, "Investigations," is patterned after the civil investigative demand used by the Department of Justice with great effect in civil antitrust investigations. In the hearings before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee concerning S. 167, which created the civil investigative demand, the Department of Justice testified that if there are both civil and criminal penalties for the same conduct, many problems occur if a civil precharge investigation is not authorized. I quote:

> As this committee knows, in many cases, the grand jury cannot be used to investigate antitrust violations. The Supreme Court held, in *United States* v. *Proctor & Gamble*, 356 U.S. 677 (1958), that is an abuse of process to use a grand jury in an antitrust investigation where there is no intention to bring a criminal case. This decision is now being used to harass the Department in situations where grand jury investigations have led to civil, rather than criminal cases. There are many reasons why the Department may not seek an indictment in these instances. The evidence uncovered may not be strong enough to meet the strict standard of proof in criminal cases. The antitrust violations uncovered may not involve such willful disregard for the law as to warrant the imposition of criminal penalties and the stigma which attaches to those penalties. Another reason for bringing only a civil suit is that the public interest may require the prompt invocation of civil remedies such as divestiture or injunction. The bringing of a criminal case will often delay this civil relief.
>
> Whatever the reason for proceeding only by civil case, the decision to so do now subjects the Department to great potential harassment. In *United States* v. *Carter Products, Inc.*, a civil case was brought in the Southern District of New York after a grand jury proceeding in which no indictment was returned. The court ordered answers to interrogatories requesting the names of all persons involved in the decision not to proceed criminally and all persons who assisted in drafting the complaint. After those names were supplied, 13 attorneys and officials of the Department of Justice, including the former Attorney General, William P. Rogers, were subpenaed to give depositions. Similar tactics are now being tried in a number of other cases.

We must avoid an occurrence of this type activity in the area covered by the instant bill.

The bill also adds interception of communications to the weapons available to the community in combating organized crime infiltration, provides that it shall be construed so as to effectuate its broad remedial purposes, and contains a separability clause.

Mr. President, in introducing S. 30, I made it quite clear that neither the omnibus crime bill of 1968, nor S. 30, would be sufficient to remedy the crime problems facing our country. Nor will this bill completely solve the problem. But all of this legislation will be helpful in stamping out the organized crime parasites preying upon our society. We need even more imaginative legislation; we need as much money as we can find to fund the fight; we need cooperation, not only between various governmental authorities, but also between citizens and law enforcement authority; and we need to inform the citizenry as to when and where they are pouring their funds into the coffers of organized crime, which funds are then used to destroy the society which produced them. Organized crime can and must be stamped out. This bill is, I hope, another useful tool which law enforcement desperately needs for its fight against organized crime. Organized crime must not be allowed to take over our country's economy, or any significant portion of it.

The bill (S. 1861) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the infiltration or management of legitimate organizations by racketeering activity or the proceeds of racketeering activity, where interstate or foreign commerce is affected, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McClellan (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1861

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Corrupt Organizations Act of 1969."

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY

The Congress finds (1) that organized crime in the United States is a highly sophisticated, diversified, and nation-wide illegal activity that annually drains billions of dollars from the nation's economy while operating by corruption and the illegal use of violence (2) that organized crime derives a major portion of its power through money and property obtained from such illegal endeavors as syndicated gambling, loan sharking, the theft and fencing of stolen property, the importation and distribution of narcotics and other dangerous drugs, and other forms of social exploitation; (3) that this money and power are being increasingly used to infiltrate legitimate businesses, trade organizations, labor unions, and other associations; (4) that the danger of organized crime activities in the nation threatens the domestic peace, security and stability of its economic system, harms innocent investors and competing organizations, interferes with free competition, and seriously burdens interstate and foreign commerce; and (5) that organized crime continues to grow despite efforts to deal with it, in part because of the past inadequacy of remedies designed to deal with it.

It is, therefore, the declared policy of the Congress to eradicate the baneful influence of organized crime in the United States by the enactment of remedial legislation which will, through fine, imprisonment, criminal fortfeiture, and civil divestiture, dissolution, injunction and other relief, enlarge, strengthen and vitalize the tools available to arrest and reverse the growth of organized crime in the United States, its infiltration of legitimate organizations, and its interference with interstate and foreign commerce.

Sec. 2. (a) Title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding immediately after chapter 95 thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 96—RACKETEER INFLUENCED ORGANIZATIONS

"Sec.
"1961. Definitions.
"1962. Prohibited racketeering activities.
"1963. Criminal penalties.
"1964. Civil remedies.
"1965. Venue and process.

"1966. Expedition of actions.
"1967. Evidence.
"1968. Investigations.

"§ 1961. Definitions

"As used in this chapter—

"(1) The term 'racketeering activity' means (A) any act involving the danger of violence to life, limb or property, indictable under State or Federal law and punishable by imprisonment for more than one year; (B) any act which is indictable under any of the following provisions of title 18, United States Code: section 201 (relating to bribery), section 224 (relating to sports bribery), sections 471, 472, and 473 (relating to counterfeiting), section 664 (relating to embezzlement from pension and welfare funds), section 659 (relating to theft from interstate shipment), sections 891–894 (relating to extortionate credit transactions), section 1084 (relating to the transmission of gambling transformation), section 1503 (relating to obstruction of justice), section 1510 (relating to obstruction of criminal investigations), section 1951 (relating to interference with commerce, robbery or extortion), section 1952 (relating to racketeering), section 1954 (relating to welfare fund bribery), sections 2314 and 2315 (relating to interstate transportation of stolen property), sections 2421–24 (relating to white slave traffic), section 501(c) of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (relating to embezzlement from union funds), and (C) any conspiracy to commit any of the foregoing offenses.

"(2) The term 'interstate commerce' means commerce within the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States, or between any place in a State and any place in another State, or between places in the same State through another State.

"(3) The term 'State' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone and American Samoa.

"(4) The term 'person' includes any individual or entity capable of holding a legal or beneficial interest in property.

"(5) The term 'enterprise' includes any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity, and any union or group of individuals associated in fact although not a legal entity.

"(6) The term 'pattern of racketeering activity' includes at least one act occurring after the effective date of this Chapter.

"(7) The term 'unlawful debt' means a debt (A) which is unenforceable under State or Federal law in whole or in part as to principal or interest because of the laws relating to gambling or usury, and (B) which was incurred in connection with the business of gambling or the business of lending money or a thing of value at a usurious rate.

"(8) The term 'racketeering order' means any final order, decree, or judgment of any court of the United States, duly entered in any case or proceeding arising under this Chapter.

"(9) The term 'racketeering investigation' means any inquiry conducted by any racketeering investigator for the purpose of ascertaining whether any person has been engaged in any racketeering violation.

"(10) The term 'racketeering violation' means any act or omission in violation of this Chapter or any racketeering order hereunder.

"(11) The term 'racketeering investigator' means any attorney or investigator employed by the Department of Justice who is charged with the duty of enforcing or carrying into effect this Chapter.

"(12) The term 'documentary material' includes the original or any copy of any book, record, report, memorandum, paper, communication, tabulation, chart, or other document.

"§ 1962. Prohibited racketeering activities.

"(a) It shall be unlawful for any person who has knowingly received any income derived, directly or indirectly, from a pattern of racketeering activity to use or invest, directly or indirectly, any part of such income, or the proceeds of such income, in the acquisition of any interest in, or the establishment or operation of, any enterprise which is engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to acquire or maintain, directly or indirectly, any interest in or control of any enterprise which is engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce, through a pattern of racketeering activity or through collection of unlawful debt.

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any person employed by or associated with any enterprise engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce, to conduct or participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such enterprise's affairs through a pattern of racketeering activity.

"§ 1963. Criminal penalties

"(a) Whoever violates any provision of section 1962 of this Chapter shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both, and shall forfeit to the United States all interest in the enterprise engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce.

"(b) In any action brought by the United States under this section, the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to enter such restraining orders or prohibitions, or to take such other actions, including but not limited to, the acceptance of satisfactory performance bonds, in connection with property subject to forfeiture under this section, as it shall deem proper.

"(c) Upon conviction of a person under this section, the court shall authorize the Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, to seize all property declared forfeited under this section upon such terms and conditions as the court shall deem proper. All provisions of law relating to the disposition of property, or the proceeds from the sale thereof, or the remission or mitigation of forfeitures for violation of the customs laws, and the compromise of claims and the award of compensation to informers in respect of such forfeitures shall apply to forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this section, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions hereof. Such duties as are imposed upon the collector of customs or any other person with respect to the disposition of property under the customs laws shall be performed under this Chapter by the Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General.

"§ 1964. Civil remedies

"(a) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of section 1962 of this Chapter by issuing appropriate orders, including, but not limited to: ordering any person to divest himself of any interests, direct or indirect, in any enterprise; prohibiting any person from engaging in the same type of business or other activity as the enterprise engaged in, the activities of which affect interstate or foreign commerce; or ordering dissolution of any such enterprise.

"(b) The Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, may institute proceedings to prevent and restrain such violations. In any action brought by the United States under this section the court shall proceed as soon as may be to the hearing and determination thereof. Pending final determination thereof, the court may at any time enter such restraining orders or prohibitions, or to take such other actions, including, but not limited to, the acceptance of satisfactory performance bonds, as it shall deem proper.

"(c) A final judgment or decree rendered in favor of the United States in any criminal proceeding brought by the United States under this Chapter shall estop the defendant from denying the essential allegations of the criminal offense in any subsequent civil proceeding brought by the United States.

"§ 1965. Venue and process

"(a) Any civil action or proceeding under this chapter against any person may be instituted in the district court of the United States for any district in which such person resides, is found, has an agent, or transacts his affairs.

"(b) In any action under section 1964(b) of this Chapter in any district court of the United States in which it is shown that the ends of justice require that other parties residing in any other district be brought before the court, the court may cause such parties to be summoned, and process for that purpose may be served in any judicial district of the United States by the marshal thereof.

"(c) In any civil criminal action or proceeding instituted by the United States under this Chapter in the district court of the United States for any Judicial district, subpenas issued by such court to compel the attendance of witnesses may be served in any other judicial district, except that in any civil action or proceeding no such subpena shall be issued for service upon any individual who resides in another district at a place more than one hundred miles from the place at which such court is held without approval given by a judge of such court upon a showing of good cause.

"(d) All process in any action or proceeding under this chapter may be served in any judicial district in which such person is an inhabitant or is found.

"§ 1966. Expedition of actions

"In any civil action instituted by the United States in any district court of the United States under this chapter, the Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, may file with the clerk of such court a certificate stating that in his opinion the case is of general public importance. A copy of that certificate shall be furnished immediately by such clerk to the chief judge or in his absence to the presiding district judge of the district in which such action is pending. Upon receipt of such copy, such judge shall designate immediately a judge of that district to hear and determine such action. The judge so designated shall assign such action for hearing at the earliest practicable date, participate in the hearings and determination thereof, and cause such action to be expedited in every way.

"§ 1967. Evidence

"(a) In the taking of depositions for use in any civil action instituted by the United States under this chapter, and in the hearings before any examiner or special master appointed to take testimony therein, the proceedings shall be open to the public as freely as are trials in open court, and no order excluding the public from attendance at any such proceeding shall be made or enforced.

"(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, the testimony of any witness, or the production of books, papers, or other evidence by any witness, in any case or proceeding before any grand jury or court of the United States, or in any civil proceedings under this chapter involving a violation of section 1962 of this chapter, is necessary to the public interest, the United States attorney, upon the approval of the Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, shall make application to such court that the witness shall be instructed to testify or produce evidence, subject to the provisions of this section. Upon order of the court no such witness shall, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, or other evidence on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may compel him to be a witness against himself in a criminal case. Such testimony or evidence so compelled or any evidence, knowledge, or information which is come at by the exploitation of such testimony or evidence so compelled shall not be used as evidence in any criminal case against such witness except a prosecution for giving false testimony or for a failure to comply with the order.

"§ 1968. Investigations

"(a) Civil investigative demand.

"(1) Issuance.

"Whenever the Attorney General, or the Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, has reason to believe that any person or enterprise under investigation may be in possession, custody, or control of any documentary material relevant to a civil racketeering investigation, he may, prior to the institution of a civil or criminal proceeding thereon, issue in writing, and cause to be served upon such person, a civil investigative demand requiring such person to produce such material for examination.

"(2) Contents.

"Each such demand still—

"(i) state the nature of the conduct constituting the alleged racketeering violation which is under investigation and the provision of law applicable thereto;

"(ii) describe the class or classes of documentary material to be produced thereunder with such definiteness and certainty as to permit such material to be fairly identified;

"(iii) prescribe a return date which will provide a reasonable period of time within which the material so demanded may be assembled and made available for inspection and copying or reproduction; and

"(iv) identify the custodian to whom such material shall be made available.

"(3) Reasonableness; privilege.

"No such demand shall—

"(i) contain any requirement which would be held to be unreasonable if contained in a subpena duces tecum issued by a court of the United States in aid of a grand jury investigation of such alleged racketeering violation; or

"(ii) require the production of any documentary evidence which would be privileged from disclosure if demanded by a subpena duces tecum issued by a court of the United States in aid of a grand jury investigation of such alleged racketeering violation.

"(4) Territorial limits of service.

"Any such demand may be served by any racketeering investigator, or by any United States marshal or deputy marshal, at any place within the territorial jurisdiction of any court of the United States.

"(5) Service upon legal entity.

"Service of any such demand or any petition filed under this section may be made upon a person by—

"(i) delivering a duly executed copy thereof to any partner, executive officer, managing agent, or general agent thereof, or to any agent thereof authorized by appointment or by law to receive service of process on behalf of such person, or upon any individual person;

"(ii) deliverying a duly executed copy thereof to the principal office or place of business of the person to be served; or

"(iii) depositing such copy in the United States mails, by registered or certified mail duly addressed to such person at its principal office or place of business.

"(6) Return.

"A verified return by the individual serving any such demand or petition setting forth the manner of such service shall be proof of such service. In the case of service by registered or certified mail, such return shall be accompanied by the return post office receipt of delivery of such demand.

"(7) Racketeering document custodian.

"(i) Designation; deputy custodians.

"The Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, shall designate a racketeering investigator to serve as racketeer document custodian, and such additional racketeering investigators as he shall determine from time to time to be necessary to serve as deputies to such officer.

"(ii) Compliance with civil investigative demand; original documentary material.

"Any person upon whom any demand issued under this section has been duly served shall make such material available for inspection and copying or reproduction to the custodian designated therein at the principal place of business of such person, or at such other place as such custodian and such person thereafter may agree and prescribe in writing or as the court may direct, pursuant to this section on the return date specified in such demand, or on such later date as such custodian may prescribe in writing. Such person may upon written agreement between such person and the custodian substitute for copies of all or any part of such material originals thereof.

"(iii) Possession of documentary material; responsibility for use and return; copies for official use; examinations.

"The custodian to whom any documentary material is so delivered shall take physical possession thereof, and shall be responsible for the use made thereof and for the return thereof pursuant to this chapter. The custodian may cause the preparation of such copies of such documentary material as may be required for official use under regulations which shall be promulgated by the Attorney General. While in the possession of the custodian, no material so produced shall be available for examination, without the consent of the person who produced such material, by any individual other than a duly authorized officer, member, or employee of the Department of Justice. Under such reasonable terms and conditions as the Attorney General shall prescribe, documentary material while in the possession of the custodian shall be available for examination by the person who produced such material or any duly authorized representatives of such person.

"(iv) Delivery of documentary material for use in presentation of case or proceeding; return to custodian of material not in control of court or grand jury.

"Whenever any attorney has been designated to appear on behalf of the United States before any court or grand jury in any case or proceeding involving any alleged violation of this chapter, the custodian may deliver to such attorney such documentary material in the possession of the custodian as such attorney determines to be required for use in the presentation of such case or proceeding on behalf of the United States. Upon the conclusion of any such case or proceeding, such attorney shall return to the custodian any documentary material so withdrawn which has not passed into the control of such court or grand jury through the introduction thereof into the record of such case or proceeding.

"(v) Return to producer of documentary material not in control of court or grand jury.

"Upon the completion of (1) the racketeering investigation for which any documentary material was produced under this chapter, and (2) any case or proceeding arising from such investigation, the custodian shall return to the person who produced such material all such material other than copies thereof made by the Department of Justice pursuant to subsection (c) of this section which has not passed into the control of any court or grand jury through the introduction thereof into the record of such case or proceeding.

"(vi) Demand by producer for return of documentary material upon failure to institute case or proceeding within reasonable time after completion of examination and analysis of evidence.

"When any documentary material has been produced by any person under this chapter for use in any racketeering investigation, and no such case or proceeding arising therefrom has been instituted within a reasonable time after completion of the examination and analysis of all evidence assembled in the course of such investigation, such person shall be entitled, upon written demand made upon the Attorney General, or the Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, to the return of all documentary material other than copies thereof made by the Department of Justice pursuant to subsection (c) of this section so produced by such person.

"(vii) Successor custodian; notice to producer of documentary material; duties and responsibilities of successor.

"In the event of the death, disability, or separation from service in the Department of Justice of the custodian of any documentary material produced under any demand issued under this chapter, or the official relief of such custodian from responsibility for the custody and control of such material, the Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, shall promptly (1) designate another racketeering investigator to serve as custodian thereof, and (2) transmit notice in writing to the person who produced such material as to the identity and address of the successor so designated. Any successor so designated shall have with regard to such materials all duties and responsibilities imposed by this chapter upon his predecessor in office with regard thereto, except that he shall not be held responsible for any default or dereliction which occurred before his designation as custodian.

"(b) Judicial proceedings.

"(1) Petition for enforcement; venue.

"Whenever any person fails to comply with any civil investigative demand duly served upon him under this section or whenever satisfactory copying or reproduction of any such material cannot be done and such person refuses to surrender such material, the Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, may file, in the district court of the United States for any judicial district in which such person resides, is found, or transacts business, and serve upon such person a petition for an order of such court for the enforcement of this chapter, except that if such person transacts business in more than one such district such petition shall be filed in the district in which such person maintains his principal place of business, or in such other district in which such person transacts business as may be agreed upon by the parties to such petition.

"(2) Petition for order modifying or setting aside demand; time for petition; suspension of time allowed for compliance with demand during pendency of petition; grounds for relief.

"Within twenty days after the service of any such demand upon any person, or at any time before the return date specified in the demand, whichever period is shorter, such person may file, in the district court of the United States for the judicial district within which such person resides, is found, or transacts business, and serve upon such custodian a petition for an order of such court modifying or setting aside such demand. The time allowed for compliance with the demand in whole or in part as deemed proper and ordered by the court shall not run during the pendency of such petition in the court. Such petition shall specify each ground upon which the petitioner relies in seeking such relief, and may be based upon any failure of such demand to comply with the provisions of this chapter, or upon any constitutional or other legal right or privilege of such person.

"(3) Petition for order requiring performance by custodian of duties; venue.

"At any time during which any custodian is in custody or control of any documentary material delivered by any person in compliance with any such demand, such person may file, in the district court of the United States for the judicial district within which the office of such custodian is situated, and serve upon such custodian a petition for an order of such court requiring the performance by such custodian of any duty imposed upon him by this chapter.

"(4) Jurisdiction; appeal; contempts.

"Whenever any petition is filed in any district court of the United States under this section, such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the matter so presented, and to enter such order or orders as may be required to carry into effect the provisions of this chapter. Any final order so entered shall be subject to appeal pursuant to section 1291 of title 28. Any disobedience of any final order entered under this section by any court may be punished as a contempt thereof.

"(5) Applicability of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

"To the extent that such rules may have application and are not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall apply to any petition under this chapter."

(b) The table of contents of Part I of such title is amended by inserting after the analysis designating chapter 95 the following:

"96. Racketeer influenced and corrupt organizations. . . . 1961."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 2516(1)(C), title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end thereof between the parenthesis and the comma, the following:

"section 1963 (violations with respect to racketeer influenced and corrupt organizations)"

(b) Section 2517(3), title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the word "criminal" therefrom.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate its remedial purposes.

SEC. 5. If the provisions of any part of this Act or any amendments made thereby or the application thereof to any person or circumstances be held invalid, the provisions of the other parts and their application to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE).

S. 1864—INTRODUCTION OF THE FOOD ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I have long been aware of the fact that there are many citizens of the United States who suffer from some degree of hunger or malnutrition.

As one who has always attempted to stay attuned to the needs and desires of my fellow Georgians, I have also known that many of my own constituents are undernourished.

During my tenure as Governor of Georgia for two terms, State payments for public assistance increased three times over what they had been when I took office. The Talmadge administration recognized the State's obligation to the sick and the aged, to the blind and the disabled, and to abandoned and neglected children who are unfortunate victims of their environment or improvident parents.

We tried, to the best of our ability within the means available at that time, to do what we could to help people help themselves. And we have done so since coming to the Senate more than 12 years ago.

On the Agriculture Committee we have continued to show concern about the problem of poverty in the United States, not just by word but by deed, and by positive legislative action.

We helped formulate the commodity distribution program in 1959.

We helped write the food stamp program in 1964. The Senator from Georgia served on the conference committee that steered this legislation through to enactment.

We likewise worked for adoption of the Child Nutrition Act of 1965.

This is only a part of the overall picture. There has been a vast array of Federal efforts through the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Appalachia program, social security, public health and housing, and greatly increased educational expenditures for needy children.

Billions upon billions have been spent by the Federal Government and additional billions by State and local governments—not just to assuage poverty by giving people money to spend, but more important, to increase opportunities for everyone in education and job training.

I regard the latter approach as far more important than anything that can be done. We are going to see in the final analysis that only by educating more people and better training them for gainful employment are we ever going to break the poverty cycle.

I have said all this because I have been somewhat amazed by all the clamor in recent months over poverty in America. It is as though the Congress and even the American people have suddenly discovered for the first time that there are poor people in our midst.

Worst yet, public officials are accused of having been silent on the issue all these many years. Very often such accusations have come from sanctimonious critics of the American society who do a great deal of talking, but very little of anything else. And the victims of their unjust attacks are frequently those who have been doing something, who have been passing laws and appropriating huge sums for programs primarily designed to aid the poor.

I submit that the record will not support claims that poverty has suddenly been discovered as something new under the sun in the United States. Spending for Federal social programs, including education, welfare, and housing, comes to some $60 billion a year, ranking second only to defense as the highest budget item.

The Congress, then, has been neither silent nor inactive on this problem. And neither has the American public, which has worked hard to help pay for these programs through their taxes.

My position is well known. It has been consistent. I have favored and supported efforts to help people who are unable to help themselves because of their advanced years or physical disability. I am concerned about children caught in circumstances over which they have no control.

I have also backed programs to help people help themselves out of their predicaments by offering more educational opportunities and more of a chance to learn skills for a job.

But I do not now, and I have never favored the dole or the handout. I have no patience with anyone—man or woman—who is able but unwilling to work. I bring no brief for ablebodied people who fail, because of their own shiftlessness or lack of personal responsibility, to avail themselves of jobs that are offered, or educational and training opportunities within their reach.

It is no secret that we have such people in our midst, and I guess we will have some for all time. But I do not bleed for them. I feel no compulsion—and neither should American taxpayers—to look after their care and feeding. If they are able to look after themselves, to take whatever action necessary to improve their lot in life, then they should do so. There is no room for them on welfare rolls anywhere in any State. State and local authorities should make sure such people do not become wards of society to enjoy the fruits of other people's labor, when they have refused to do anything themselves.

There is of course room for improvement in our efforts to alleviate poverty. We can and should expand opportunities for education and training. We can do more to lift the oppressive burden of deprivation carried by the old and the infirm. We must especially see to the needs of children to whom we must look for the future of the Nation.

This is not only our humane duty. It is commonsense. For unless we help feed, clothe, and house children—who otherwise would be unfed, ragged, and ill-housed—and give them every chance to go to school and learn, we can never hope to make any meaningful progress in combating poverty and reducing the cost of welfare.

To this extent, all the current publicity about the poverty and hunger problem has served a useful purpose. It has dramatized the need and intensified public interest. The hearings before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs have also been productive. They have focused greater attention on the inconsistency and absurdity of hunger and malnutrition in a nation of great agricultural abundance and tremendous prosperity.

Publicity has been sufficient. Enough trips have been taken. We have ample evidence in hand. What we need now is less talking and more doing.

I am today introducing a bill, to be called the Food Assistance Act of 1969, to modify the food stamp program and to improve its operation in order to better serve the food needs of extremely low income families.

I want to make it clear at the outset that I do not regard food assistance programs as a panacea. This is no poverty cure-all. We cannot zero in on only a small fraction of a family's need and hope to solve this problem. I cannot overemphasize my view that the surest way and the only way to end poverty is to provide and promote more job training for nonproductive segments of our society, and to maintain a viable economy that will continue to increase job opportunities.

Neither do I consider food assistance programs as a first step toward a national income maintenance system. I for one do not subscribe to the theory that it would be either practical or wise to establish any kind of national income maintenance program that would provide a certain standard of living for everyone whether he works or attempts to work or not.

First of all, I feel that this would destroy the individual's dignity and self-respect. And this, after all, is the most fundamental need of our welfare recipients—the need for pride and human dignity. Only a job, a satisfying productive job, and the ability to earn one's way through this world can meet this need.

Second, and not the least consideration, such a costly giveaway program would eventually virtually bankrupt our economy.

Testimony before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs has brought vividly to my attention the importance of using food to break the poverty cycle. The human brain attains its maximum growth in the first 5 to 6 years of a child's life, and severe malnutrition in children under 2 years of age can permanently impair the brain development and lead to retardation, and ultimately dependency. And in many cases, children suffer from dietary inadequacies even before they are born.

It takes no imagination to readily see that a child who is hungry and who is retarded will have little chance of learning the skills necessary to function in today's highly technical society.

I have had an opportunity on the Agriculture Committee to work firsthand from the beginning in the development of surplus food distribution and food stamp programs.

The progess we have made in recent years has been substantial indeed. In 1960, the U.S. Department of Agriculture offered only five food items worth $2.20 per month, per person, for distribution to families. The selection was limited to lard, rice, flour, nonfat dry milk, and cornmeal.

Only about 1,200 counties and areas distributed these commodities and average participation for that year was 3.5 million persons. The late President John F. Kennedy in his first Executive order doubled the number of commodities and the amount of food for the program.

At the present time, 22 commodities worth $12.70 per person monthly are offered. The program operates in 1,419 counties, cities, and administrative units.

More important, however, has been the evolvement of the food stamp program. It began in 1961 with eight pilot projects and 50,000 persons participating. In 1968, the food stamp program reached almost 2½ million people at a cost to the Federal Government of $173 million.

According to the standards of the Office of Economic Opportunity, a family of four with an income of less than $2,200 per year is classified as hard core poor. The figures indicate that there are 12 to 15 million hard core poor in the Nation.

We must bear in mind that $2,200 for a family of four is the upper income limit for this group of 12 to 15 million people. The average income of families with incomes under $2,200 is about $1,220, and the average income for 1.8 million families under $1,000 was only $630 per year.

I have never been one to place unreserved faith in the statistics of the Office of Economic Opportunity. However, even allowing for a certain margin of error, these statistics indicate that there are millions of citizens who need more food assistance and are not getting it.

The problem is basically one of insufficient funds.

I want to emphasize that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has done a tremendous job with the funds and resources available to it. The Department of Agriculture has waged a long and unpopular battle in trying to extend the commodity distribution program and the food stamp program.

It is most unfortunate that some critics have attempted to make the Department of Agriculture the whipping boy for all the Nation's nutrition problems. I believe that the Department of Agriculture's administrators are some of the most efficient in Government. I know that they have achieved considerable expertise through the years in administering our food programs.

It is worthy of mention that there has never been a major scandal in connection with the USDA's administration of food assistance programs. This is the case because the Department has insisted on strong supervision over its programs. Contrast this with the record of some other agencies involved in assisting the Nation's poor.

Moreover, the Department of Agriculture has never attempted to cut off Federal food assistance funds as a means of social engineering.

Here again, contrast this with the record of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which has seen fit to cut off funds for the school lunch program in desegregation noncompliance cases. All school lunch assistance administered by the Department of Agriculture has been untouched by such controversy. Hungry and innocent children have not been penalized by Agriculture as they have by Health, Education, and Welfare.

My study of the problem of hunger and malnutrition in America indicates several flaws in the commodity distribution program. One of them is the inability of many families without transportation to get to the distribution point and carry their food home. In many large counties, there is only one point of distribution for the entire county. A family's monthly supply of food is a very bulky parcel. This is a serious problem yet to be resolved.

Another shortcoming of the program is the inflexibility of available foods. Often the food items available are not the ones needed by persons on special diets—such as the elderly or the very young.

Not the least of the flaws of the commodity distribution program is that it is a dole, a complete giveaway. It tends to be destructive of human dignity and self-respect.

On the other hand, the food stamp program requires that every participant must pay into the program a certain percentage of his income. The food stamp program requires a person to budget his income and to make a contribution.

However, under the present food stamp system, the contribution that is required is sometimes so high that it discourages participation in the program by families in the great need of food assistance. For instance, under the present system, a family in the Southeast with an income of $70 per month must pay $30 in order to obtain $64 worth of food stamps.

It is easy to see how a family in this predicament finds it extremely difficult to allocate $30 of its income at the beginning of the month to purchase food stamps. Doing so greatly reduces the family's ability to pay for other essentials, such as rent and utilities.

Another drawback of the food stamp program as presently constituted is the inaccessibility of points of sale. As in the case of the commodity distribution program, there is often only one point where food stamps can be sold in an entire county.

Although the food stamp participant does not have the added burden of lugging home large parcels of food, it is difficult and sometimes impossible for destitute people to travel across a county to buy food stamps every month.

Before leaving office, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman said that the Department was attempting to phase out commodity distribution programs in favor of food stamp programs. This policy should be continued. However, in the interim, we should continue to allow local authorities to determine which program they prefer.

If the bill which I am now offering is enacted into law, the food stamp program will be far more attractive than the commodity distribution program. It will be less cumbersome to operate and less costly from the county administrative standpoint.

The major proposals of my legislation are: First, to improve food stamp distribution and make them more accessible; second, to lower the purchase price of food stamps and to increase the bonus to participating households; and third, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue free coupons to households with no incomes or extremely minimal incomes.

A key part of my plan is designed to resolve one of the major problems in the food stamp program. We need to make them more readily accessible to participants, particularly those of extreme age and physical disability.

I propose to have food stamps sold at post offices throughout the Nation. I believe the post office to be the most logical agency to handle this assignment, and I know that we can rely on postal employees to do an efficient job of issuing and accounting for these coupons.

The reasoning behind my making this decision is simple. Everyone knows where his post office is located, and post offices are usually within fairly close proximity of everyone's home.

Also, in a further effort to enhance the accessibility of food stamps, my bill would give welfare recipients an option of having the cost of their food stamps deducted from their monthly welfare checks, and the coupons mailed to them along with the checks. Local welfare agencies would assume the administrative responsibility of deducting the purchase price of the coupons from the welfare checks.

I am firmly committed to this self-help principle embodied in the food stamp program. This approach provides poor families with the opportunity to convert their current food expenditures into food stamps, which in turn will buy more food than otherwise would be available and insure dietary gains.

However, current food stamp purchase requirements are so high that they prevent many needy families from participating in the program. Under the existing Food Stamp Act, households are charged an amount equivalent to their normal expenditure for food. This should be liberalized to some degree to reflect a more reasonable investment on the part of needy households, and to reduce the disproportionate bite it presently takes out of their total incomes.

Under my bill no family would be required to invest more than 25 percent of its total income for food stamps. This would not be a fixed, uniform standard. It would be a maximum level with suitable adjustments for families of various sizes and incomes.

This approach will bring increased food stamp assistance to the families and children who need it most. This is my recommended No. 1 change in the food stamp program. I hope that it will be given the highest priority.

To families with no income or with extremely minimum incomes, even a small purchase price is prohibitive of food stamp participation. My bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue food stamps at no cost to such families. Households with an income of more than $40 a month would not be eligible for free stamps.

In recent months, there have been increasing pressures to remove the administration of food programs from the Department of Agriculture and place them in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or some other agency.

I cannot imagine any action more unwarranted, or that would have a more unsettling effect on our food assistance programs. The record of the Department of Agriculture in administering food programs is a good one. The Department has done an exemplary job with the resources available to it. However, the limitations of the current Food Stamp Act and the inadequateness of appropriations have made it impossible for the Department to deal more effectively with the problem of hunger and malnutrition in the United States.

My legislation would give the Department the tools it has needed—and indeed asked for—in order to expand and improve the food stamp program, and to make more adequate nutrition available to truly needy families.

We should leave food assistance programs in the Department of Agriculture. But some additional changes are needed to insure better coordination of all the food programs. For this reason, I propose that the Secretary of Agriculture establish within his department a subagency to be known as the Federal Food Administration.

It would be the responsibility of this agency to coordinate the food stamp program, the commodity distribution program, the school lunch program, the nutritional education programs now administered by the Department of Agriculture, and any other food assistance programs of the Department.

Not all of the problem of malnutrition can be solved simply by providing more food.

We need increased education and training in the proper means of preparing nutritious food. Already the agricultural extension services of Georgia and other States are doing an excellent job in expanding the nutritional education program for low-income families throughout America. We should do more. We cannot attack this problem in a vacuum. The Department of Agriculture of course is not the only agency with an interest in seeing that more food and better nutrition are available to needy people. The Department must work with other agencies in attacking the poverty problem and all the other social ills which plague our Nation.

To strengthen the overall effort, I propose to establish an interdepartmental committee to be known as the National Nutrition Committee. This committee shall be chaired by the Secretary of Agriculture, with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development serving as members.

In addition, the Secretary may appoint such persons from various departments and agencies of the Federal Government that he determines exceptionally well qualified to contribute to the work of the committee.

The Secretary will also appoint to the committee representatives of the private sector. The Nation's food industry has much to offer the Federal Government in picking better ways to attack malnutrition.

Mr. President, I have offered a total program to insure that low-income families in the United States can obtain a diet that is more adequate and nutritious if they participate in the food stamp program.

My bill will cure many defects of the present system by making food stamps more accessible and by bringing purchase requirements more within the means of deserving families in real need.

The food stamp program cannot completely solve the poverty problem.

In closing, I reiterate my strong conviction that the only way to make significant progress against poverty and unemployment in America is to provide more and better educational opportunities, particularly in the area of job training. Even this, of course, cannot accomplish our goals overnight.

We must continue to seek ways to improve our schools, to get more people into school, and to keep them there. We must particularly do everything posssible to promote occupational training. At the same time, we must also impress upon all our people that they, too, have obligations to keep, such as a sense of individual responsibility, initiative, and above all a willingness to work and take advantage of opportunities that are available in great abundance.

In fact, it is written into my bill that the Secretary shall require the State agencies of each participating State to encourage and assist physically and mentally able adults receiving food stamps to obtain employment. The intent of this is clear. All people have the personal responsibility to make every possible effort to secure employment, if they are able to do so and if employment is available. It is incumbent upon the State agencies to see that they do so to the fullest extent possible.

As we continue to strive for the attainment of these goals, we cannot afford to neglect the nutritional needs of our citizens, the old and disabled and especially our small children who must at all costs be educated to the fullest extent possible.

The Talmadge Food Stamp bill will help meet this problem. It is a moderate plan that can be kept within reasonable but effective bonds.

I believe this bill can be enacted into law now—during this session of Congress.

The poor of this Nation have had enough promises.

They have had enough investigation.

They do not need any more television coverage.

They do not need any more Senators going around the country telling them how poor they are.

What the poor and hungry of this Nation need is a practical, workable plan which will put food in their stomachs now, and give them more of an incentive to do more for themselves.

I believe that my bill meets this need.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief summary of the bill, a section-by-section analysis and the bill. I send to the desk the bill for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and material will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1864) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1864

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Food Assistance Act of 1969".

SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 5(b) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "except that the State agency may not take into consideration income standards established for the purpose of title 19 of the Social Security Act.".

SEC. 3. Section 7(b) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Households shall be charged such portion of the face value of the coupon allotment issued to them as is determined by the Secretary to represent a reasonable investment by such households, taking into consideration the number of persons in such households, the income of such households, and such other factors as the Secretary deems appropriate; but in no case shall a household be charged for a coupon allotment an amount greater than an amount equal to 25 per centum of the income of such household for a period equivalent to the period for which such allotment is issued. The Secretary may authorize the issuance of a coupon allotment without charge to any household determined to have little or no income; but a free coupon allotment may not be issued to any household with an income greater than $40 per month."

SEC. 4. (a) The second sentence of section 10(e) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (3); by striking out the period at the end of clause (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and by adding after such clause (4) a new clause as follows: "(5) that the State agency shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, institute procedures under which any household participating in the food stamp program may, if it so elects, have the charges, if any, for its coupon allotment deducted from any grant or payment such household may be entitled to receive under a federally aided public assistance program of the State."

(b) Section 10 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(h) The Secretary shall require the State agency of each participating State to encourage and assist physically and mentally able adult members of households receiving coupon allotments under this Act to obtain employment."

SEC. 5. The third sentence of section 15(b) of the Food Stamp Act is amended by striking out everything following the semicolon in clause (2), and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(3) the direct costs incurred in the issuance of coupons to eligible households; and (4) an amount not to exceed 25 percentum of the costs computed under (1) and (2) above. The Secretary shall prescribe general guidelines and minimum requirements with respect to the quality of certification and issuance services to be provided by State agencies to eligible households, including, but not limited to, matters relating to the places, times, and frequency of coupon issuance services in political subdivisions approved for participation in the food stamp program. In no case shall the Secretary approve the issuance of coupons less often than twice monthly. The Secretary may withhold or deny payment under this subsection to any State agency which fails to comply with such guidelines or minimum standards."

SEC. 6. Section 15 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any local subdivision in which the food stamp program is in operation, the postmaster or other person in charge of the United States post office in such local subdivision shall, without reimbursement by the State agency, assume responsibility (1) for the acceptance, storage, and protection of coupons after the delivery thereof to such post office, (2) for the issuance of such coupons to eligible households within the local subdivision in which such post office is located, and (3) for the control and accounting for such coupons."

SEC. 7. The first sentence of section 16 (a) of the Food Stamp Act is amended by striking out everything immediately following "June 30, 1969;" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "not in excess of $525,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; not in excess of $900,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal period."

SEC. 8. (a) The Food Stamp Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) The Secretary shall establish within the Department of Agriculture a separate agency to be known as the 'Federal Food Administration'. The Secretary shall administer and coordinate through such agency the food stamp program provided for in this Act and other similar and related food assistance and nutritional education programs administered by the Secretary, including, but not limited to, those programs carried out under the National School Lunch Act, the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, clause (2) of section 32 of Public Law 320 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, and clause (3) of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

"(b) The Secretary shall establish an interdepartmental committee, which shall be known as the 'National Nutrition Committee,' to advise him on matters relating to the administration of this Act and other programs referred to in subsection (a) of this section. The Secretary shall appoint such persons from the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government as he determines are exceptionally well qualified by virtue of their background, training, education, and experience in matters relating to food, diet, and nutrition. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall serve as members of such committee. The Secretary shall also appoint to such committee one or more representatives from the food industry."

The material, presented by Mr TALMADGE, follows:

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE TALMADGE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1969

My bill would make three basic changes in the Food Stamp Program:

(1) Purchase price of food stamps shall be lowered so that no eligible household will have to pay more than 25% of its income for food stamps.

(2) Free food stamps will be available to families with no income or minimal income.

(3) Distribution of food stamps will be improved by: (a) Sale of food stamps in the Post Office, and, (b) Mailing of food stamps to recipients of public assistance.

PURCHASE PRICE WILL BE LOWERED

Under the present Food Stamp Program, the purchase price is too high. Many families in the greatest need of food assistance are unable to participate in the Program. For example, under the present system, a Southeastern family of four with income of $140 per month must pay $48 in order to get food stamps worth $72. Thus, getting a bonus of $24. Under my plan, the same family would pay only $24 for food coupons. Therefore, the bonus would be increased to $48 per month. To use another example, a Northern family of eight persons with an income of $75 per month must pay $34 to receive a food stamp allotment of $100 monthly. Under my plan, the purchase price to this family would be cut to $16. Therefore, this needy family would receive a bonus of $84 rather than $66.

My plan will bring increased food stamp assistance to the families who need it most.

FREE FOOD STAMPS

For families with no income or with minimal income, even a small purchase price may be prohibitive. Therefore, my plan authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to issue food stamps free to families with little or no income. Households with an income of over $40 per month would not qualify under this provision.

IMPROVED METHODS OF DISTRIBUTION

In the present program, there is often only one point of food stamp distribution in a large area. My plan would provide that the Post Office Department shall assume the responsibility for selling food stamp coupons. Everyone knows where the Post Office is and there is usually a Post Office in every community.

My bill would also give the recipients of public assistance the option of having the purchase price of food stamps deducted from their monthly check and the stamps mailed to them. This would be especially beneficial to elderly families with no means of transportation.

FEDERAL FOOD ADMINISTRATION

My amendments establish within the Department of Agriculture a Federal Food Administration to coordinate all federal food assistance programs, including the School Lunch Act and the Nutrition Education Programs of the Extension Service.

NATIONAL NUTRITION COMMITTEE

The Secretary of Agriculture would establish an inter-departmental National Nutrition Committee to coordinate the nutrition efforts of all departments of the Federal government and the efforts of the private food industry. This Committee would utilize the technical expertise and imaginative ideas of private industry in attacking the problem of hunger and malnutrition.

ESTIMATED FINANCING

Careful analysis and cost projection by experts in the Department of Agriculture indicate that $525 million would be needed for current fiscal year 1970. This proposal takes into consideration the fact that the modified program could not be implemented before January 1970. We are assuming that by the end of fiscal year 1970, participation in the Food Stamp Program would reach 5.5 million people.

For fiscal year 1971, the estimated cost would be $900 million. This assumes year-end participation of 6,580,000 people.

SECTION BY SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE FOOD ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

Section 2: Under Section 2, states will continue to set eligibility standards for participation in the Food Stamp Program. Under present law, states set the eligibility levels in conformity with the income standards used by the individual state in its Federally aided public assistance programs. I amend the present law to provide that states shall not take into consideration income standards established for the purpose of Title 19 of the Social Security Act. This provision insures that state agencies will not use standards of the Medicaid Program in setting eligibility levels for food stamp assistance. The purpose of this provision is to insure that the Food Stamp Program will never get out of reasonable bounds as the Medicaid Program has in some states.

Section 3: This section provides that no eligible household will be required to devote more than 25 percent of its income to the purchase of food stamps. The 25 percent figure will be calculated on a monthly basis. In other words, if the average monthly income of a family is $100, this family could be charged no more than $25 per month for food stamps. The 25 percent figure is only an upper limit. The Secretary would have discretion in setting purchase prices and would take into consideration such factors as family size and family income.

The Secretary would be authorized to issue free food stamps to households having little or no income. He would have some discretion in the issuance of these free stamps but would not be able to issue free stamps to any household having monthly income greater than $40.

Section 4: State agencies are required to give recipients of public assistance the option of having the charges for food coupons deducted from their public assistance payments. The state agency would be responsible in sending food stamps to the recipients.

Another provision of Section 4 directs the Secretary to require state agencies to encourage and assist able adult recipients of food assistance in obtaining employment. The Secretary should use every reasonable means to insure that sufficient emphasis is placed on getting able-bodied participants off the relief rolls and into the work force.

Section 5: This section provides for additional reimbursement for the direct cost of issuing coupons to households who are not receiving public assistance. Also, it gives the Secretary additional authority to set guidelines and minimum requirements with respect to the quality of certification and issuance service. It states that in no case shall the Secretary approve the issuance of coupons less than twice monthly.

Section 6: My bill provides that the United States Post Office shall, without reimbursement, assume responsibility for issuing food stamps. The Post Office would assume this responsibility in any local subdivision where a food stamp program is in operation.

Section 7: This section authorizes $525 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and $900 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

Section 8: Under my plan, the Secretary would establish within the Department of Agriculture a sub-agency to be known as the Federal Food Administration. This sub-agency would be charged with the administration and coordination of all food assistance programs within the Department of Agriculture, including the nutrition education programs of the Extension Service of the Department.

Under this section, the Secretary would establish an inter-departmental committee known as the National Nutrition Committee, to coordinate the nutrition efforts of all departments of the Federal government and the efforts of the private food industry. The Secretary would be required to appoint Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to the Committee. However, he would have discretion in appointing the other members of the Committee including the representatives of the private food industry.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a few questions concerning his bill?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator how and why the 25 percent maximum level he has included in the bill was determined for the purchase price of the stamps.

Mr. TALMADGE. The average family in the United States spends approximately 17 percent on their food. It was my thought and the thought of the others who were working with me on this problem in drafting the bill that the very lowest income bracket should have a greater allowance for food than the average for the Nation of 17 percent. Therefore, we thought 25 percent was a reasonable figure.

Mr. SPONG. Would the food stamps be sold whenever the Post Office was open?

Mr. TALMADGE. Under the bill they would be sold any time at the direction of the Secretary, but not less than 2 days in each month. They would have at least two opportunities in any given month to buy food stamps at the Post Office if the measure becomes law.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, under the bill, would a person still have to purchase a month's supply of stamps at one time?

Mr. TALMADGE. No; he would not. Presumably, if the Secretary made it the minimum amount, they would purchase 2 weeks' supply at a time in lieu of a month's supply. It would depend on what the Secretary determined in the matter.

Frankly, there is a feeling on the part of some of the administrators of the program—local, State, and Federal—that if they could buy the stamps anytime they wanted to, any day in the week, it might result in a lower expenditure of their food budget for food. Some improvident parents might buy food stamps and take some of the money to buy a quart of liquor.

We are trying to see that the maximum amount of the money flows into the purchase of a good diet that would be nutritious to a family.

Mr. SPONG. I was interested in the remarks of the Senator with regard to the relation between the food stamp program and the commodity food distribution program.

The Senator made the statement that the food stamp program is less expensive than the commodity distribution program from the county administration standpoint.

I assume this is from the standpoint of personnel, transportation, and storage costs.

Mr. TALMADGE. Commodities, storage cost, and all of those things. Of course, if the food stamp program is maximized, as the Senator knows, the commodities would be purchased in the normal channels of trade, and the various stores would assume the burden of warehousing the food and the commodities, the sales, and checkoff.

It would be much less costly to the local government and, in my judgment, in the long run it would be less costly to the commodity distribution program. The commodity distribution program, as the Senator knows, is a complete dole or giveaway.

Under the food stamp program an individual would pay at least a portion of his income for stamps.

In the distribution program, the commodities are shipped all over the country. Under the food stamp program, individual grocers would assume that responsibility.

The food stamp program has many other advantages. It lets the individuals purchase food any time they want to and in any quantity they want to purchase it, and whatever item they deem they are in the greatest need of, whereas the commodity distribution program has limited flexibility.

I think that in the long run if the bill becomes law, the food stamp program would prove much more attractive than the commodity distribution program.

I point out that I do not attempt to tell the local government whether they ought to have a food stamp program or any program at all.

In my own State, we have 159 counties, and each of those counties has a food program, except one. So we have 158 food programs within the State of Georgia. They are almost evenly divided between a commodity distribution program and a food stamp program. In the areas I have visited, the people are very well satisfied with what they have—those who are handling commodities like their program, and those who are handling stamps like their program. But, in my judgment, if we make stamps more available and more accessible, with greater premiums to the people in extremely low income circumstances, we will have greater utilization of the stamp program and less utilization of the commodity program.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, how much time remains under the unanimous consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The time has expired.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement be amended in order that I may proceed for an additional 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I thank the junior Senator from Georgia for his answers to my inquiries.

The junior Senator from Georgia has rendered a service to the Senate in proposing changes in the present food stamp program. In seeking to increase the availability of the stamps and the bonus purchasing power of the stamps, he has recognized some of the major problems presented poor- and marginal-income families by the program as presently operated. Now is the time for a thorough and complete review by Congress of the food stamp program, as well as the commodity distribution program. The legislation proposed today is a vehicle for that review.

The Senator from Georgia has made references to effects of malnutrition upon the growth and development of children. Medical evidence I have received from some of the most distinguished pediatricians in Virginia indicates that protein deficiences experienced by a child for a period of over 6 months during preschool years will, to some degree, mark that child for life.

I commend Senator TALMADGE. I agree that an Interdepartmental National Nutrition Committee is desirable.

I believe television media can be used constructively to combat malnutrition.

I agree that educational opportunities for more of our people must be provided, but would observe that other short-range education endeavors to explain the food programs should be considered immediately.

I agree that no agency of our Government should be empowered to cut off funds for school lunch programs.

Earlier this week I filed some preliminary views on a tour I made of Virginia during the Easter recess to study food programs and the extent of hunger and malnutrition. I would like to take this opportunity to make some further observations—this time concerning three recurrent themes of that tour.

One of these was the need for education. Time and time again I heard the words, "Education is the answer." In a way, it is. But the interpretation placed upon education itself must be understood. Many times when people spoke of education, I think they envisioned education over a long period—use of the schools to teach health and nutrition, home economics and similar subjects. Certainly the schools can contribute greatly through the teaching of such subjects, and this means of education should be pursued.

But there are other, short-range educational endeavors which can be undertaken now. And, these too should be pursued.

In various sections of the State, I found a number of persons who qualified for the food stamp and commodity distribution programs, but who were unaware of their existence. There were others who had heard of the programs but did not understand them or what they meant.

However, medical evidence is slowly accumulating on the physical and mental consequences of hunger and malnutrition. This evidence suggests that if we allow hunger and malnutrition to continue, we contribute to the raising of children who are not capable of full physical and mental development. Under such circumstances, we cannot allow hunger and malnutrition to continue and we should not permit the existence of these programs to go unnoticed, when they can help rectify diet deficiencies which exist.

Likewise, for the elderly who live on pensions, social security, and other fixed incomes, and who often are incapable of working and contributing further to their own support, the knowledge of these programs can be of great importance.

To acquaint persons with these programs, advertisements might be placed in participating grocery stores as far as the food stamp program is concerned or in post offices. But an even more effective instrument for publicizing these programs would be television.

According to the 1960 census, only 12.7 percent of the Nation's households were without television. In Virginia, only 17.4 percent of the households lacked sets. Undoubtedly, this number has decreased in the time period since the census was completed. As a matter of fact, I read only yesterday that this had been reduced to about 5 percent. Indeed, television sets were in evidence in almost all the houses visited during the tour. Consequently, I believe public service spot announcements could be used to inform the public of these food programs.

Even popular network programs and commercials could include brief references to nutritional needs and problems.

But television can be employed on an even larger scale. Educational television can be used for programs to explain nutrition, proper diet, and the preparation of foods. In a number of cases where the commodity distribution and food stamp programs are in use, the foods which are available are not properly used. One story currently making the rounds in my State concerns a family whose chickens were dying. Finally, it was discovered that instant mashed potatoes were being thrown to the chickens to eat. The chickens then drank water, with unfortunate results. The story, of course, will bring smiles, just as the one where powdered milk was used for face powder. But these examples point to real problems, especially in light of the fact that a number of families are dependent upon these foods for their nutrition.

A program in nutrition education would, it seems to me, be quite adaptable for educational television. It would involve "talk" and discussion, which seem to be the format for many educational television programs. It would be fairly easy to organize. It would be relatively inexpensive to produce. Furthermore, such a program would be a true public service.

On a more sophisticated level, a similar program already exists. On a weekly basis, the French Chef, Julia Child, is presented from Boston. Why cannot a similar program be developed to explain how to prepare beans without destroying the iron content and how to use the foods which are available under the commodity distribution program? Why cannot a program be devised to demonstrate how food stamps can be used most wisely?

Furthermore, such programs themselves could be advertised at commodity distribution centers and the places where food stamps are sold.

It can, of course, be argued that direct teaching is preferable. In many ways this is true. A teacher working with a student can observe errors and correct a mistake which a television program may not anticipate. Indeed, I have been impressed by the expanded nutrition program being operated by the Virginia Polytechnic Institute with funds from the Department of Agriculture.

Under this program, home economists working for the VPI extension service select persons from low-income areas, give them an intensive course in nutrition and food preparation and send them back into their communities to help other low-income families. I believe that this program should be extended, that funds should be made available for it in fiscal 1970 and that efforts should be made to expand it into additional low-income areas. I have written the Secretary of Agriculture concerning this.

I see no conflict between this approach and the use of television. The expanded nutrition program cannot reach as large a number of persons as television can. Where the two would overlap, it seems to me that they would supplement and complement each other.

A second theme which recurred during my travels was the lack of comprehensive surveys and information on hunger and malnutrition—their incidence, causes and consequences. People are inclined to believe these subjects have been overstudied, but they overlook the fact that most studies have been based on peripheral statistics rather than on such medical factors as laboratory tests and physical examinations.

The National Nutrition Survey underway in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is a commendable start. Its present scope is, however, limited to 10 States. The Nixon budget contemplates expansion of the study next year, and I would certainly support this.

The other information available to me concerning the anemia rates at the Headstart center at northern Virginia, at the University of Virginia's clinic and at the southwest Virginia clinic are, however, examples of the type of data which is needed to supplement the National Nutrition Survey as it currently exists and to provide the basis for local action. Since the Virginia data to which I have referred concern a limited group—that is, those in the Headstart program or those who came to the clinics—some studies should be conducted on a broader basis, to include a representative sampling of all the members of one age group in a selected locality. Because there is so little data on nutrition and because we must begin with information, I plan to introduce legislation to encourage surveys and to permit us to develop the data to indicate what action is needed to remove the problems which are found to exist.

The third recurrent theme I would like to discuss—and the Senator from Georgia has already spoken of this—is the importance of the national school lunch program. I supported an expansion of this program last year, although I did not fully appreciate the significance of it when I did. During my tour it was often repeated that the school lunch program was a "lifesaver." In many areas its benefits have been so widely recognized that funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have been employed for school lunch purposes to supplement funds from the Agriculture Department, pilot breakfast programs have been initiated, and meals provided by Federal funds have been supplemented by efforts of private groups such as Parent-Teacher Associations.

Several teachers told me that children who participated in the programs were more alert than before they became participants. In one school where breakfast is offered, a teacher noted that she had many less discipline problems during the morning now that breakfast was provided. In addition, a survey conducted by a clinic in southwest Virginia revealed that the anemia rate for schoolchildren was about 30 percent below that for preschool children, a drop which is at least partially attributable to the school lunch program.

A program which is as beneficial as the school lunch program should be allowed to operate unobstructed. Children, whose physical and mental development is related to diet, should not be deprived of the one nutritional meal which some of them receive during the day. The junior Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE) has, however, noticed a flaw in the program. The Department of Agriculture does not terminate funds for the school lunch program for failure to comply with the Civil Rights Act. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has, however, been terminating funds over which it has jurisdiction for failure to comply—even when these funds have been used to provide free lunches for needy children. In fiscal 1969, the amount which could be terminated totaled $32 million. The junior Senator from Georgia opposes this approach and has introduced an amendment to the National School Lunch Act to prevent the termination of these particular funds.

In Virginia, $1,471,544 in title I ESEA funds are being used during the current fiscal year to provide school lunches over and above those provided under the Agriculture Department program. Without Senator TALMADGE's amendment, this $1,471,544 is subject to cutoff. Although I support the basic intent of the civil rights legislation, I agree with the junior Senator from Georgia that these funds, funds which aid children—both black and white—should not be subject to termination and I will support his amendment.

By terminating these funds, the Federal Government would only be hurting children, depriving those who are often most in need. Such a move is ridiculous in light of the recently developed information concerning the medical consequences of malnutrition. It is like cutting off our noses to spite our faces. The school lunch program provides an excellent means of seeing that foods are properly utilized for the benefit of children. If we are to enable our Nation's children to make the most of their school years—to help provide them with the proper diet to give them the physical stamina and the mental alertness to learn and benefit from their educational experiences—then we should make substantial use of this program. In this way we may make some inroads in enabling these children to grow into productive, independent citizens capable of contribting to their own well-being and to the life of their community and Nation.

While there are undoubtedly cases where negligence and indolence contribute to the conditions of poverty and malnutrition, there are also cases where this is not true. And, in the case of children, we are only increasing the welfare requirements and problems of the future if we do not seek to enable these children to participate and compete in the life of our Nation.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPONG. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Virginia on the speech he has made. He has rendered a service, in my judgment, to his State and to the Nation. I particularly want to thank him for his generous personal references to me.

Mr. SPONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD).

S. 1895—INTRODUCTION OF THE OMNIBUS NARCOTIC AND DANGEROUS DRUG CONTROL AND ADDICT REHABILITATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to help Federal and State law-enforcement agencies control and reduce the serious drug problem in this Nation. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill and a chart of its provisions be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and chart will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the illegal traffic in narcotics and the illegal possession and abuse of drugs has skyrocketed in recent years. If we, in Congress, are going to do anything to improve the situation, to help the police, the addict, or a society beset by the problems of drug abuse, then we must see things as they are.

We must look at the vast amount of narcotics and other drugs available, even to grade-school children.

We must look at the large numbers of people victimized by drugs, the lives destroyed and the vast amount of crime visited on our communities by those who need money for their drug supply.

We must acknowledge that drug abuse has run away with our youth despite the existing laws on the books.

In truth, then, existing laws have failed to reduce or even control drug use and addiction.

They have failed, miserably, to even hold the line on the smuggling of opium, heroin, marihuana, hashish, cocaine, peyote, and other foreign products smuggled into this country.

They have failed in controlling the diversion of billions of American-made dangerous drugs, the pep pills, sleeping pills, tranquilizers, and hundreds of combinations of each that schoolchildren are "popping" into their mouths like peanuts across this country.

They have failed in treating and rehabilitating the sick addict, yielding instead to know-nothing demands to throw him into overcrowded prisons and punish him instead of treat him.

We are behind the times in finding means to treat and rehabilitate addicts.

The result is that hundreds of thousands of young people have turned to the use of drugs during the last 20 years. They are discouraged by society's lackluster track record on the drug problem. They will no longer accept the old homilies, the bogeyman theories, and the emotional threats about the dangers of drug abuse repeated by rote by their elders.

Mr. President, in my day, and in the day of many of us, the drug problem was something remote. We thought it was confined to the opium dens in the slums of some city, and I guess that pretty generally it was.

During the past several years many things have changed. Today drug addiction is a new problem and a changed problem. We should see the whole problem, see the problem in all of its ramifications, and acknowledge that existing controls are obviously not working.

How has it been going with this drug problem? How bad is it? Let us take a look.

The story is the same all over the country. Let me recite a few typical examples of the problem:

In California alone juvenile arrests for drug offenses increased from 1,271 in 1961 to 14,112 in 1967.

While we have experienced substantial increases in the abuse of all drugs, we are faced with an alarming crisis with respect to marihuana. For example, of the 14,112 juvenile arrests in California during 1967, 10,987 were arrested for marihuana violations. To understand the full significance of this figure let me point out that this compares to only 408 arrests in 1961. A further shocking fact is that in this one year alone, there were over 2,000 more arrests than in the 6 previous years combined.

The Federal Bureau of Narcotics seizures of Marihuana increased from 2,928 kilograms in 1963 to 27,914 kilograms in 1967.

Let me make it clear that the problem is by no means confined to the State of California.

Marihuana is abundant in all parts of the Nation.

On January 1, 1968, police undercover work in Hialeah, Fla., resulted in the seizure of 600 pounds of marihuana. On April 15, 1968, 1,000 pounds of marihuana was seized in New York City. In July of 1968, 400 pounds were confiscated in Chicago. And in September of 1967, $2 million worth of marihuana was confiscated in North Bergen, N.J., which was the largest seizure of this drug in U.S. history.

Last year, I conducted hearings on the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee on Drug Abuse. We sought testimony from the foremost authorities in the drug field and we obtained the most recent information on drug studies from the National Institute of Mental Health. Dr. Stanley Yolles, the Director of the Institute, reported that some 20 percent of the Nation's college students had experience with marihuana and he referred to studies showing that in some high schools as many as 75 percent of the students had used marihuana.

This means there are currently 2 million students using or experimenting with marihuana.

The problem has not subsided since last year and students themselves feel that the official estimates are low, that the true extent of drug abuse among young people is even higher. Indeed, statements prepared by the National Student Association project the possibility of nearly 1 million drug arrests of young people by 1972.

I am fully aware that some of these figures are only representative, not completely accurate. But from all of the statistics we have, we can conclude that even the most conservative data are frightening.

So it goes. We can select any place in the country and find that these figures will apply.

The truth is that we are ignorant of the full extent of drug abuse in this country. It has long been known that only a small portion of criminal and antisocial behavior comes to official attention. Like the iceberg, only a small portion of it appears above the surface.

Nowhere is this more so than in the area of drugs where the victim and the offender are often the same. In drug transactions both parties to the crime attempt to avoid the police. And the invisibility of drug crimes is accentuated today when drug abuse has spread to segments of the population whose position has traditionally isolated them from routine police surveillance. It is now in the lush suburbs and other places where police surveillance has been relatively unknown.

In recent years, both the President's Crime Commission and the Advisory Commission on Drugs have called for a reassessment of our drug laws and drug penalties.

That is one of the principal objectives of the bill I introduce today. We have been working on it for more than a year. I do not say it is letter perfect but it is the best that we can do.

In the past, there has been no firm agreement on how to control the drug menace.

What we have had on the Federal level is a combination of tradition-bound, severely punitive narcotic enforcement procedures on the one hand, and a sprinkling of more liberal new laws aimed at treatment of addicts on the other. The contradictions in the policies behind these laws resulted in confusion regarding their purpose and inconsistencies in their application.

Nowhere are the inconsistencies more glaring than in the penalty structure applicable to dangerous drug violations. And perhaps no topic has created more controversy than the penalties applicable to marihuana.

Under present law, we still impose more severe penalties for certain violations involving marihuana, which is a relatively mild drug, than we do for violations regarding LSD, which is one of the most dangerous and powerful mind-destroying drugs known.

We heard that in the hearings. I read it in the newspapers. I hear it all the time: The argument as to whether marihuana is really a dangerous drug, or a relatively harmless drug, whether it is addictive or not, or whether it is dangerous. As I said a few minutes ago, the testimony is conflicting, but under present drug laws, we impose severe penalties for certain violations involving mere possession of marihuana which is, so far as I can say, a relatively mild drug, than for a violation with respect to LSD which is one of the most dangerous and powerful mind-destroying drugs known.

A youngster or teenager found to possess a handful of marihuana cigarettes goes to prison for 2 years as a first offender. This thing is out of kilter. It is little wonder that the young people of this country have become alienated because of the absurdity of a mandatory 2-year prison sentence for possession of a handful of marihuana cigarettes, especially when the experts cannot decide among themselves whether marihuana is a truly dangerous drug or not.

Because of this controversy we are facing ideological warfare between segments of our college youth who view marihuana use on a par with human freedom itself, and police agencies whose enforcement tactics have little respect for what they regard as immature idealism and extreme philosophical positions.

This controversy will have to be resolved if we hope to control the abuse of marihuana. The growing violations with respect to this drug show that excessive penalties cannot solve the problem.

I do not know whether it is a dangerous drug or not. That is why, under my bill, I am asking the Attorney General to set up a first-class committee of experts and say to them, "Sit down and study this thing and tell us whether marihuana is harmful, relatively harmful, dangerous, or mild."

I do not see that we can reach an intelligent decision with respect to marihuana until we know that. So that is why, I say, it has to be resolved. We have got to determine the true effects of marihuana, and if we find that it is less dangerous than has been supposed, we must make the needed changes.

We must resolve the marihuana controversy. We must determine the effects of marihuana and if we find that it is less dangerous than other drugs, we must reevaluate the penalty structure for its use and possession. On the other hand, if the drug proves to be more harmful than what we know today, we must provide treatment for the young people who abuse it in growing numbers. In the meantime, pending the outcome of the study, strict controls will be maintained.

This is one of the purposes of the bill I have prepared.

After the hearings on drug abuse I conducted last year, we could only conclude that there is a basic and very serious conflict between those engaged in controlling the drug problem. On the one side, we have the law-enforcement officials who continue to request more severe penalties for drug law violations. On the other side there are the scientists, the researchers and the educators who maintain that harsh penalties do not and cannot reduce drug abuse. I think the extremes of these positions have to be brought together and I believe that is another objective which we will achieve with this legislation.

Among the other provisions the bill will revise the mandatory minimum penalty provisions which have restricted the treatment of thousands of drug offenders. For years progressive penologists have fought against the mandatory minimum concept.

I happen to believe that it is just outrageous. I do not see any sense in a mandatory sentence in the statutes. I do not know what we have judges for, if they are not going to take into consideration all the circumstances, the kind of individual, and so forth, but must give him a 2-year mandatory sentence. It does not make any sense to me. Human beings are not all the same, neither are the circumstances, in the field of drug addiction, or, for that matter, in any field.

This was well expressed by former Director of the Bureau of Prisons, James Bennett, testifying before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. He said:

> Mandatory penalties are universally odious to courts and judges. Why have a judge if he has no discretion? Furthermore, mandatory penalties have been shown time and again to be self-defeating. Why retain a procedure which kills all incentive, all motive to reform.

I think those were wise words.

Another provision of this bill will be to improve the eligibility requirements under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act. As that act was passed, it denied some or all of the treatment established under this law to a large class of addicts. The present bill broadens the coverage to include those most in need of help.

Drugs make the addict lazy and indifferent, unable to hold an honest job. Without legitimate resources, he must seek money for his drugs in crime. Traditionally, his lazy indifference led him to nonviolent crime. But crime has always been the principal source of money for the addict and so most genuine addicts have a record of two or three felony convictions. Drug addicts have not been prone toward violent crime. Lately, though, there are more signs of it than before. I think it is a factual statement that, generally, they only commit crimes in order to get funds with which to supply themselves with their drug.

Nevertheless, many, many genuine addicts have a record of two or three felony convictions. Before I go further, let me say that I do not condone crime—I do not know anyone who does—and I am not soft on felons, ex-convicts, and people who have been in trouble much more than once. But we are facing a peculiar problem here. We have the case of a person who commits a crime in order to buy heroin, or whatever other drug he uses. He is not a criminally disposed person; he is an addict. The way to straighten that fellow out is to cure his addiction and keep working on it, rather than throw him into a jail or lock him up in a box and forget him.

The trapped, the cornered, the panicked sick addict historically is the one who resorts to violence. Because there are more addicts today, there are more of them involved in violent crimes.

And there is ample testimony that three prior civil commitments do not preclude an addict's ability to benefit from treatment the fourth or fifth time around.

This is an important point. Many persons say, "Why should we be concerned about this? He has had three or four chances." My view is that, even if there have been convictions three or four or five times, we should never give up, because there is always hope, as long as the addict wants to try to cure himself. The fact that he has failed three or four times is no reason for abandoning him.

Indeed, research shows that he may have benefited from the experience and stands a better chance of rehabilitation.

Addiction is a chronic disease where relapse is the expected rather than exceptional behavior. We know that every relapse may bring the addict closer to ultimate rehabilitation. And we know that with proper help addicts tend to grow out of their dependence on drugs as they get older. Even more important, since treatment program for addicts differ throughout the country, both in nature and quality, and since all such programs can be expected to improve as we gain more experience, failure under any program in the past should not deny an addict the improved treatment methods of the future.

Now that the act has been in operation, we have received increasingly more evidence that the original restrictions often exclude those very addicts who could obtain the greatest benefit from the treatment offered under this act.

Because of those early restrictions, the act has been called self-defeating and the criteria for eligibility has been termed absurd by witnesses before Congress as recently as last week. Let me emphasize this by pointing out that during the first 21 months the act has been in operation, only 74 addicts have been civilly committed under title I in lieu of prosecution.

This is the record of a law that was hailed as a "breakthrough" in our efforts to treat addicts.

I think it is a sorry record when we consider the fact that there may be as many as 100,000 addicts in the United States.

I consider the amended Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act, title VIII of this bill, to be of great significance. When this act was passed, I warned of several features which I considered inimical to its success. I said on October 19, 1968, that I would try to amend this law and I think this is the appropriate time to do it.

The current legislation will also eliminate one of the major objections I had to the 1966 Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act in that it would now be possible for young marihuana users and addicts between the ages of 18 and 26 to be eligible for the progressive treatment afforded all other Federal youthful offenders under the Youthful Offender Act.

This will be done only at the discretion of the court which means that society will still be protected from the hardened addict offender while the young offender who is more amenable to correction can receive the best treatment the country has to offer.

Finally, in amending the Narctoic Addict Rehabilitation Act, I have called for a provision that would allow setting aside the conviction of those who successfully complete the treatment program established under the act.

It holds out some incentive, particularly to the young person who has become addicted and who successfully completes the course of treatment. Why should we not expunge his narcotic conviction? It was his only offense, and we have straightened him out.

If an individual's criminality in a specific instance is a product of his narcotic addiction, once the addiction is cured, I see no reason to saddle him with a criminal record. We have heard time and again from correctional experts that a criminal record often proves an insurmountable obstacle to the ex-addict in starting a new productive life in the community.

Surely, they are addicted, but they are not criminals. They are criminals because they are addicts.

I believe the changes contained in the bill I propose today will improve the treatment of narcotic addicts in the Nation, and we will begin to get somewhere in our efforts to solve this problem.

However, let me stress that effective treatment is only a partial solution to the drug menace. The second phase of this effort should be the effective control of the traffic in drugs, particularly of the importation of drugs across our southern border from Mexico into the United States.

We have importation of marihuana and some other drugs across the Mexican border; and to control that traffic into this country, this bill directs the Attorney General to consult with the President for the purposes of establishing through negotiation with Mexican authorities, a Joint Mexican-United States Narcotic Commission. Such a Commission would be most helpful in controlling the drug traffic between the two countries. Mexico has become by far our largest supplier of illegal marihuana and it is also the source of a substantial amount of our other drugs.

Incidentally, this effort is not new. I tried to do something about the problem some years ago. I know our friends in Mexico feel the same way. They do not want this traffic. With a joint effort between the United States and Mexico, I believe we could get somewhere in our efforts to solve it.

After extensive hearings in 1962, with broad bipartisan support, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 65 calling for the establishment of a joint Mexican-American Commission to get at one of the prime sources of the illicit narcotics on the American market.

After extensive public hearings on the same subject in 1965, again in 1966 I introduced a similar resolution. And I followed that in April of 1966 with a meeting of Federal, State, and local officials in San Diego, Calif., to assess drug smuggling along the Mexican border.

In recent weeks I conducted personal discussions on the problem with high-ranking Mexican public officials and civil leaders.

I am convinced that nothing else than a close cooperative effort on both sides of the border will be required to suppress the vicious traffic in drugs across our southern border.

Mr. President, these are the basic goals and objectives of this legislation. In conclusion, I want to summarize for my colleagues the specific contents of the bill.

The bill vests in the Attorney General—and the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs—primary jurisdiction over the implementation and enforcement of all Federal laws concerning drug abuse;

It gathers together the various present laws scattered throughout the United States Code into one comprehensive act.

It places all narcotics and dangerous drugs into three classes, with penalties corresponding to the severity of the offense.

It directs the establishment of a Joint Commission with Mexico to investigate and to provide appropriate solutions to control the illicit traffic in marihuana into the United States.

It absorbs the provisions of the Narcotic Rehabilitation Act of 1966 and amends it to: first, broaden the definition of the eligible offender; second, change the definition of an ineligible individual to include a person convicted of two or more felonies and a person who has been civilly committed because of narcotic addiction on three or more occasions; and, third, provide for setting aside the conviction of any addict who has been cured of his addiction by the programs established under the act.

Finally, the legislation implements President Johnson's Advisory Commission's task force recommendations on narcotics and drug abuse by first, calling for an increase in the enforcement personnel of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs; second, calling for an increase in the enforcement personnel of the Bureau of Customs; third, directing the Attorney General to assist and cooperate with States in the enactment of effective drug legislation; fourth, strengthening the recordkeeping provisions regarding drugs by requiring that a person subject to this act must keep the records segregated and easily accessible to the Attorney General. In addition, every 2 years a summary must be transmitted to the Attorney General regarding drug transactions, inventories, and so forth; fifth, revising the sentencing laws by eliminating any mandatory minimum provisions and returning to the judiciary its discretion in sentencing; sixth, directing that extensive research and educational programs be conducted in order to increase our knowledge of all drugs; seventh, directing the National Institute of Mental Health to conduct an intensive 2-year study of all of the ramifications of marihuana and its effects.

Mr. President, we have seen the drug problem grow worse year after year. It affects college students, it affects children in high schools and it is even now affecting children in elementary schools.

We know that we need more manpower in law enforcement to deal with this situation.

We know that we need better control over the national and international traffic in drugs.

We know that we need more research to determine the social, physical, and psychological effects of drugs.

We know that we need to improve both the judicial and the medical treatment of addicts and drug abusers.

I think it is time to decide whether we will allow the drug problem to grow even worse or whether we are going to take effective action to solve it.

Mr. President, I believe this bill can help us—this is all it can do—reverse the trend of the last 20 years. It represents the work and the wisdom of many people. I would like to acknowledge the excellent technical advice I have received in its preparation from members of the previous and current administrations.

This legislation has broad support, Mr. President, being endorsed by several outstanding Senators, and for that reason I ask that it be given favorable consideration by Congress.

Mr. President, before I conclude I would like to record here some of the history of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee's interest in the narcotics problem, some of the work it has done and some of the results of that work.

Since I became chairman of this subcommittee in 1961 we have conducted 21 days of public hearings on narcotics and other drugs. We have taken testimony from 106 witnesses ranging from addicts and convicts, through doctors, lawyers, attorneys general, and Governors. We have heard from experts at every step along the way.

As a direct result of that effort on July 8, 1965, Congress adopted the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965, which, incidentally established the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

That Bureau was recently merged with the Federal Bureau of Narcotics of the Treasury Department and by an Executive order of President Johnson was moved to the Justice Department as the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. The legislation I introduced today requests a large increase in personnel for that new agency.

In 1966, I introduced S. 2152, the Narcotics Rehabilitation Act which was signed into law on November 8, 1966.

Both of these measures incidentally, are brought together as a part of the omnibus bill I introduced today.

In addition, the subcommittee played a large part in the White House Conference on Narcotics in 1961. One of the major recommendations to come out of that conference was the establishment of a Joint Mexican-American Commission on Narcotics which is also a part of the legislation I introduced today.

All of this, Mr. President, presents a very urgent problem, and I think it is a worthwhile effort to bring together and straighten out all of the very mixed-up statutes and policies with respect to these dangerous drugs.

The chart, as presented by Mr. DODD, is as follows:

TABLE OF OFFENSES AND PENALTIES UNDER SENATOR DODD'S OMNIBUS NARCOTIC AND DANGEROUS DRUG CONTROL AND ADDICT REHABILITATION ACT OF 1969

	Unlawful distribution, possession with intent to distribute, manufacture, dispensation, importation, and exportation	
	1st offense	2d offense[1] (or subsequent)
Class I: Narcotics	10 yr., $25,000	20 yr., $50,000.
Class II: Dangerous drugs	5 yr., $15,000	10 yr., $50,000.
Class III: Drugs	1 yr., $5,000	2 yr., $10,000.
Simple possession of any narcotic or dangerous drug.[2]	1 yr., $5,000	2 yr., $10,000.
Licensee offenses (commercial intentional or knowingly).	1 yr., $25,000	2 yr., $50,000 (civil fine).
Distribution of class I and II drugs (not pursuant to order form), etc.	$25,000 (civil fine).	$50,000 (civil fine).
Other	3 yrs., $30,000	6 yrs., $60,000.
Attempt and conspiracy	Any person who attempts to commit any offense is subject to up to ½ the maximum penalty as proscribed for committing the act. Any person who conspires to commit an offense is subject to the same penalty as proscribed for committing the act.	
Distribution to minors	The distribution of a controlled dangerous substance by a person over 18 years of age to a person under 18 is punishable by twice the sentence otherwise provided.	

---

[1] The district court may provide that the defendant will not be eligible for parole.

[2] Defendant is eligible for 1st offender treatment; i.e., probation without a judgment of guilt.

The bill (S. 1895) to reorganize and coordinate control of the narcotic and drug abuse laws under the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, Department of Justice, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1895

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969."

TITLE I—FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS

SEC. 101. Congress finds that the widespread increase in the illicit traffic, use and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs, especially by juveniles, threatens the public health and safety, and therefore is of critical national concern.

Congress also finds that because Mexico is a primary source of marihuana within the United States it is necessary to establish a Joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate and to recommend appropriate solutions concerning the flow of marihuana between the United States and Mexico.

Congress further finds that although drug control is essentially a local responsibility, which must be dealt with by State and local governments, the Federal Government must coordinate and intensify its efforts if interstate and international control is to be effective.

Congress therefore declares that there is a need for a central Federal agency to coordinate Federal control of drug abuse affecting interstate commerce through the implementation of a comprehensive Federal code and through research, education, and rehabilitation designed primarily for juveniles.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 102. As used in this Act—

(a) "Addict" means any individual who habitually uses any narcotic drug as defined by this Act so as to endanger the public morals, health, safety, or welfare, or who is so far addicted to the use of such narcotic drugs as to have lost the power of self-control with reference to his addiction.

(b) "Administer" means to deliver, by a practitioner, in his presence, a narcotic or dangerous drug to the ultimate user or human research subject by injection, inhalation, ingestion, or by other means.

(c) "Agent" means an authorized person who acts on behalf of or at the direction of a manufacturer, distributor, or dispenser and includes a common or contract carrier, public warehouseman, or employee thereof.

(d) "Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs" means the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, Department of Justice.

(e) "Control" means to add, remove, or change the placement of a drug, substance, or precursor under Title IV of this Act.

(f) "Conviction" and "convicted" mean the final judgment on a verdict or finding of guilty, a plea of guilty, or a plea of nolo contendere, but do not include a final judgment which has been expunged by pardon, reversed, set aside or otherwise rendered nugatory.

(g) "Counterfeit drug" means a drug which, or the container or labeling of which, without authorization, bears the trademark, trade name, or other identifying mark, imprint, number, or device, or any likeness thereof, of a manufacturer, distributor, or dispenser other than the person or persons who in fact manufactured, distributed, or dispensed such drug and which thereby falsely purports or is represented to be the product of, or to have been distributed by, such other manufacturer, distributor, or dispenser.

(h) "Crime of violence" includes voluntary manslaughter, murder, rape, mayhem, kidnaping, robbery, extortion accompanied by threats of violence, assault with a dangerous weapon or assault with intent to commit any offense punishable by imprisonment for more than one year, arson punishable as a felony, or an attempt or conspiracy to commit any of the foregoing offenses.

(i) "Deliver" or "delivery" means the actual, constructive, or attempted transfer of a narcotic or dangerous drug whether or not there exists an agency relationship.

(j) "Department" means the United States Department of Justice.

(k) "Depressant or stimulant drug" means—

(1) a drug which contains any quantity of (A) barbituric acid or any of the salts of barbituric acid; or (B) any derivative of barbituric acid which has been designated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as habit forming under section 502(d) of the "Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act" (52 Stat. 1050; 21 U.S.C. 352(d));

(2) a drug which contains any quantity of (A) amphetamine or any of its optical isomers; (B) any salt of amphetamine or any salt of an optical isomer of amphetamine; or (C) any substance which the Attorney General, after investigation, has found to be, and by regulation designated as, habit forming because of its stimulant effect on the central nervous system; or,

(3) lysergic acid diethylamide or any other drug which contains any quantity of a substance which the Attorney General, after investigation, has found to have, and by regulation designates as having, a potential for abuse because of its depressant or stimulant effect on the central nervous system or its hallucinogenic effect.

(l) "Dispense" means to deliver a narcotic or dangerous drug to the ultimate user or human research subject by or pursuant to the lawful order of a practitioner, including the packaging, labeling, or compounding necessary to prepare the drug for such delivery. "Dispenser" is a practitioner who delivers a narcotic or dangerous drug to the ultimate user or human research subject.

(m) "Distribute" means to deliver a narcotic or dangerous drug. "Distributor" means a person who delivers a narcotic or dangerous drug.

(n) "Drug" means—

(1) articles recognized in the official United States Pharmacopoeia, official Homeopathic Pharmacopoeia of the United States, or official National Formulary, or any supplement to any of them; and,

(2) articles intended for use in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease in man or other animals; and,

(3) articles (other than food) intended to affect the structure or any function of the body of man or other animals; and,

(4) articles intended for use as a component of any article specified in clause (1), (2), or (3) of this paragraph; but does not include devices or their components, parts, or accessories.

(o) "Eligible individual" means any individual who is charged with an offense against the United States, but does not include—

(1) an individual charged with a crime of violence.

(2) an individual charged with unlawfully importing, selling, or conspiring to import or sell, a narcotic drug.

(3) an individual against whom there is pending a prior charge of a felony, which has not been finally determined or who is on probation or whose sentence following conviction of such a charge, including any time on parole or mandatory release, has not been fully served: *Provided*, That an individual on probation, parole, or mandatory release shall be included if the authority authorized to require his return to custody consents to his commitment.

"Eligible offender" means any individual who is convicted of an offense against the United States, but does not include—

(1) an offender who is convicted of a crime of violence.

(2) an offender who is convicted of unlawfully importing or selling or conspiring to import or sell a narcotic drug, unless the court determines that such sale was for the primary purpose of enabling the offender to obtain a narcotic drug which he requires for his personal use because of his addiction to such drug.

(3) an offender against whom there is pending a prior charge of a felony which has not been finally determined or who is on probation or whose sentence following conviction of such a charge, including any time on parole or mandatory release, has not been fully served: *Provided*, That an offender on probation, parole, or mandatory release shall be included if the authority authorized to require his return to custody consents to his commitment.

(p) "Felony" includes any offense in violation of a law of the United States classified as a felony under section 1 of title 18 of the United States Code, and further includes any offense in violation of a law of any State, any possession or territory of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which at the time of the offense was classified as a felony by the law of the place where that offense was committed.

(q) "Hospital of the Service" means any hospital or other facility of the Public Health Service especially equipped for the accommodation of addicts, and any other appropriate public or private hospital or other facility available to the Surgeon General for the care and treatment of addicts.

(r) "Marihuana" means all parts of the plant *Cannabis sativa L.*, whether growing or not; the seeds thereof; the resin extracted from any part of such plant; and every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such plant, its seeds or resin; but shall not include the mature stalks of such plant, fiber produced from such stalks, oil or cake made from the seeds of such plant, any other compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such mature stalks (except the resin extracted therefrom), fiber, oil, or cake, or the sterilized seed of such plant which is incapable of germination.

(s) "Manufacture" means the production, preparation, propagation, compounding, or processing of a narcotic or dangerous drug, either directly or indirectly by extraction from substances of natural origin, or independently by means of chemical synthesis or by a combination of extraction and chemical synthesis. "Manufacturer" includes any person who packages, repackages, or labels any container of any narcotic or dangerous drug, except practitioners who dispense or compound prescription orders for delivery to the ultimate consumer.

(t) "Narcotic drug" means any of the following, whether produced directly or indirectly by extraction from substances of vegetable origin, or independently by means of chemical synthesis, or by a combination of extraction and chemical synthesis:

(1) opium, coca leaves, and opiates;

(2) a compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, or preparation of opium, coca leaves, or opiates;

(3) a substance (any compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, ar preparation thereof) which is chemically identical with any of the substances referred to in clauses (1) and (2), except that the words "narcotic drug" as used in this Act shall not include decocainized coca leaves or extracts of coca leaves, which extracts do not contain cocaine or ecgonine.

(u) "Net disposal" means the quantity of a narcotic or dangerous drug in class I or II or any narcotic drug distributed, dispensed, used in the production of another narcotic drug for which the manufacturer is licensed, or otherwise disposed of (as such or contained in or combined with other drugs compounded by the manufacturer of such narcotic drug) by the manufacturer during a stated period, less the quantity of any narcotic or dangerous drug in classes I and II or other narcotic drug returned to the manufacturer by a customer and any quantity distributed or dispensed to another licensed manufacturer of the same narcotic drug.

(v) "Opiate" means any substance having an addiction-forming or addiction-sustaining liability similar to morphine or being capable of conversion into a drug having such addiction-forming or addiction-sustaining liability.

(w) "Opium poppy" means the plant of the species *Papaver somniferum L.*, except the seeds thereof.

(x) "Patient" means any person with respect to whom a petition has been filed by a United States attorney as provided under subsection (b) of section 302 of this title.

(y) "Poppy straw" means all parts, except the seeds, of the opium poppy, after mowing.

(z) "Posthospitalization program" shall mean any program providing for the treatment and supervision of a person established by the Surgeon General pursuant to section 815 of this Act.

(aa) "Practitioner" means a physician, dentist, veterinarian, scientific investigator, pharmacy, hospital, or other person licensed or otherwise permitted to distribute, dispense, conduct research with respect to, or administer a narcotic or dangerous drug in the course of professional practice or research by the United States or the jurisdiction in which he practices or does research.

(bb) "Production" includes the manufacture, planting, cultivation, growing, or harvesting of a narcotic or dangerous drug.

(cc) "Precursor" means a substance which the Attorney General has found to be and by regulation designates as being the principal compound commonly used or produced primarily for use, and which is an immediate chemical intermediary used or likely to be used in the manufacture of a narcotic or dangerous drug, the control of which is necessary to prevent, curtail, or limit such manufacture.

(dd) "Related individual" means any person with whom the alleged narcotic addict may reside or at whose house he may be, or the husband or wife, father or mother, brother or sister, or the child or the nearest available relative of the alleged narcotic addict.

(ee) "Surgeon General" means the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

(ff) "Treatment" includes confinement and treatment in an institution and under supervised aftercare in the community and includes, but is not limited to, medical, educational, social, psychological, and vocational services, corrective and preventive guidance and training, and other rehabilitative services designed to protect the public and benefit the addict by correcting his antisocial tendencies and ending his dependence on addicting drugs and his susceptibility to addiction.

(gg) "Ultimate user" means a person who lawfully possesses a narcotic or dangerous drug for his own use, for the use of a member of his household, or for administration to an animal owned by him or by a member of his household.

(hh) "United States" means any State, territory, or possession, including the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific, or the Canal Zone.

TITLE II—EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

SEC. 201 (a) The Attorney General is authorized and directed to carry out educational programs, especially among juveniles, designed to prevent and deter misuse and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs. In connection with such programs he is authorized to—

(1) promote better recognition of the problems of misuse and abuse of dangerous drugs within the regulated industry and among interested groups and organizations;

(2) assist the regulated industry and interested groups and organizations in contributing to the reduction of such misuse and abuse;

(3) consult with interested groups and organizations to aid them in solving administrative and organizational problems;

(4) evaluate procedures, projects, techniques, and controls conducted or proposed as part of educational programs on such misuse and abuse;

(5) disseminate the results of research on misuse and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs to promote a better public understanding, especially by juveniles, of the problems that exist and the means of combatting such problems; and,

(6) assist in the education and training of State and local law enforcement officials in their efforts to control the misuse and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

(b) The Attorney General is authorized and directed to encourage research on misuse and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs. In connection with such research and in furtherance of the enforcement of this Act, he is authorized to—

(1) establish methods to assess accurately the effects of narcotics and dangerous drugs and to identify and characterize drugs with potential for abuse;

(2) make studies and undertake programs of research to—

a. develop new or improved approaches, techniques, systems, equipment and devices to strengthen the enforcement of this Act,

b. determine patterns of misuse and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs and the social effects thereof, especially on juveniles;

c. improve methods for preventing, predicting, understanding and dealing with the misuse and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs; and,

(3) enter into contracts with public agencies, institutions of higher education, and private organizations or individuals for the purpose of conducting research, demonstrations, or special projects which bear directly on misuse and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs without performance bonds and without regard to section 5 of Title 41, United States Code.

(c) The Attorney General may authorize persons engaged in research on the use and effects of dangerous substances to withhold the names and other identifying characteristics of persons who are the subjects of such research. Persons who obtain this authorization may not be compelled in any Federal or State civil, criminal, administrative, legislative, or other proceeding to identify the subjects of research for which such authorization was obtained.

(d) The Attorney General may authorize the possession and distribution of dangerous drugs by persons engaged in research. Persons who obtain this authorization shall be exempt from State or Federal prosecution for possession and distribution of narcotics and dangerous drugs to the extent authorized by the Attorney General.

GOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION

SEC. 202(a). The Attorney General shall cooperate with local, State and Federal agencies in discharging the national and international obligations of the United States concerning traffic in dangerous substances and in suppressing the abuse of dangerous substances. To this end, he is authorized to—

(1) arrange for the exchange of information between governmental officials concerning the use and abuse of dangerous substances;

(2) cooperate in the institution and prosecution of cases in the courts of the United States and before the licensing boards and courts of the several States;

(3) conduct training programs on dangerous drug law enforcement for local, State, and Federal personnel;

(4) maintain in the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs a unit which will accept, catalogue, file, and otherwise utilize all information and statistics, including records of dangerous drug addicts and other dangerous drug law offenders, which may be received from Federal, State, and local agencies, and make such information available for Federal, State, and local law enforcement purposes;

(5) conduct programs of eradication aimed at destroying wild or illicit growth of plant species from which dangerous drugs may be extracted;

(6) cooperate with and assist States which do not have adequate drug abuse control legislation in enacting such legislation.

(b) When requested by the Attorney General, it shall be the duty of any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government to furnish assistance, including technical advice, to him for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 203. The Attorney General shall appoint a committee of experts to advise him with respect to dangerous drugs which may be subject to control under this Act, including advice with respect to whether a drug should be controlled pursuant to the criteria contained in Title IV and which classification is most appropriate for a dangerous drug in accordance with the criteria established in Title IV.

SEC. 204. The results of the research and educational programs conducted by the Attorney General under this title shall be transmitted to Congress within a reasonable period together with proposals for legislation.

TITLE III—MARIHUANA

SEC. 301. The National Institute of Mental Health, in cooperation with the Attorney General, is authorized and directed to execute a plan of research, to be carried on both an intramural and extramural basis, covering all aspects of marihuana use.

(a) The research shall include—

(1) identification of existing gaps in our knowledge of marihuana;

(2) an intensive examination of the important medical and social aspects of marihuana use;

(3) surveys of the extent and nature of marihuana use;

(4) studies of the pharmacology and effects of marihuana;

(5) studies of the relation of marihuana use to crime and juvenile delinquency;

(6) studies of the relation between marihuana and the use of other drugs.

(b) The study shall be completed within 24 months from the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 302. The Attorney General, based upon the NIMH study, is authorized and directed to either place marihuana within one of the three classifications, in accordance with the provisions of this Act; or exclude marihuana from any classifications of this Act.

SEC. 303. Until such study is completed and the Attorney General has acted as prescribed in Sec. 302, marihuana shall be treated as a Class II Dangerous Drug for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 304. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to consult with the President for the purpose of establishing a Joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate and to recommend appropriate solutions concerning the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico.

TITLE IV—CLASSIFICATIONS

AUTHORITY TO CONTROL

SEC. 401. (a) The Attorney General shall control all drugs enumerated in Section 402 of this Act. He may, with the advice of the committee of experts referred to in Sec. 203, pursuant to the procedures of subchapter II of Chapter 5 of Title 5 of the United States Code, add, delete, or reschedule a drug as a narcotic or dangerous drug. The Attorney General shall consider with respect to each drug hereafter controlled:

(1) its actual or relative potential for abuse;

(2) scientific evidence of its pharmacological effect if known;

(3) the state of current scientific knowledge regarding the substance;

(4) its history and current pattern of abuse;

(5) the scope, duration, and significance of abuse;

(6) what, if any, risk there is to the public health;

(7) its psychic or physiological dependence liability;

(8) controls required based on United States obligations under international treaties, conventions or protocols; and,

(9) whether the substance is a precursor of a substance already controlled under this Title.

(b) If the Attorney General designates a substance as a precursor, substances which are precursors of the controlled precursor shall not be subject to control solely because they are precursors of the controlled precursor.

CLASSIFICATIONS

SEC. 402. The following classes include the narcotics and dangerous drugs listed or to be listed by whatever official name, common or usual name, chemical name, or trade name designated.

(a) Class I—Narcotics.

(1) Any of the following opium derivatives, their salts, isomers and salts of isomers, unless specifically excepted, whenever the existence of such salts, isomers and salts of isomers is possible within the specific chemical designation: Acetylocodone, Benzylmorphine, Codeine methylbromide, Codeine-N-Oxide, Desomorphine, Heroin, Hydromorphinol Methydesorphine, Methylydromorphine, Morphine, Methylbromide, Morphine methylsulfonate, Morphine-N-Oxide, Myrophine, Nicocodeine, Nicomorphine, Normorphine, Thebacon.

(2) Any of the following substances whether produced directly or indirectly by extraction from substances of vegetable origin, or independently by means of chemical synthesis, or by combination of extraction and chemical synthesis:

a. Opium, coca leaves, and opiate;

b. Any salt, compound, derivative, or preparation of opium, coca leaves, or opiate;

c. Any salt, compound, derivative, or preparation thereof which is chemically equivalent or identical with any of the substances referred to in clauses 1 and 2, except that these substances shall not include decocainized coca leaves or extraction of coca leaves, which extractions do not contain cocaine or ecognine; and shall not include the isoquinoline alkaloids of opium;

d. Opium poppy and poppy straw.

(3) Any of the following opiates, including their isomers, esters, ethers, salts of isomers, esters and ethers, unless specifically excepted, whenever the existence of such isomers, esters, ethers and salts is possible within the specific chemical designation: Alphaprodine, Anileridine, Bezitramide, Diphenoxylate, Fentanyl, Isomethadone, Levomethorphan, Levorphanol, Metazocine, Methadone, Methadone-Intermediate (4-cyano-2-dimethylamino-4, 4-diphenly butane) Moramide-Intermediate (2-methy-3-morpholine-1, 1-diphenylpropane-carboxylic acid) Pethidine, Pethidine-Intermediate-A (4-cyano-1-methyl-4-phenylpiperdine) Pethidine-Intermediate-B (ethyl-4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylate) Pethidine-Intermediate-C (1-methyl-4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylic acid) Phenazocine, Phencyclidine, Piminodine, Racemethorphan, Racemorphan, any substance which contains any quantity of methamphetamine, including its salts, isomers, and salts of isomers, unless specifically excluded, except those compounds, mixtures, and preparations specifically listed in other schedules.

(b) Class II—Dangerous Drugs—High potential for abuse and little or no medical use.

(1) Any of the following substances, including their isomers, esters, ethers, salts and salts of isomers, esters and ethers, unless specifically excepted, whenever the existence of such isomers, esters, ethers and salts is possible within the specific chemical designation: Acetylmethadol, allylprodine, alphactylmethadol, alphameprodine, alphamethadol, benzethidine, betacetylmethadol betameprodine, betamethadol, betaprodine, clonitazene, dextromoramide, dextrorphan, diampromide, diethyliambutene, dimenoxadol, dimepheptanol, dimethyliambutene, dioxaphetylbutyrate, dipipanone, ethylmethylthiambutene, etonitazene, etoxerdine, furethidine, hydroxypethidine, ketobemidone, levomoramide, levophenacylmorphan, morpheridine, noracymethadol, norlevorphanol, normethadone, norpipanone, phenadoxone, phenampromide, phenomorphan, phenoperidine, piritramide, proheptazine, properidine, racemoramide, trimeperidine.

(2) Any material, compound, mixture or preparation which contains any quantity of the following hallucinogenic substances, their salts, isomers and salts of isomers, unless specifically excepted, whenever the exist-

ence of such salts, isomers, and salts of isomers is possible within the specific chemical designation: Bufotenine; diethyltryptamine, dimethyltryptamine, 4-methyl 1–2, 5-dimethoxyaphetamine, ibogaine, lysergic acid diethylamide, mescaline, peyote, psilocybin, psilocyn, tetrahydrocannabinol.

(3) High potential for abuse and established medical use—Any material, compound, mixture, or preparation which contains any quantity of the following substances having a potential for abuse associated with a stimulant effect on the central nervous system:

a. Amphetamine, its salts, optical isomers, and salts of its optical isomers.

b. Phenmetrazine and its salts.

c. Methamphetamine including its salts, isomers, or salts of isomers, but only when in timed release sustained release dosage from, or tablets or capsules containing not more than five milligrams of methamphetamine per one hundred milligrams of the total dosage unit.

(4) Any material, compound, mixture or preparation which contains any quantity of the following substances having a potential for abuse associated with a depressant effect on the central nervous system: Any substance which contains any quantity or a derivative of barbituric acid, or any salt of a derivative of barbituric acid, except those substances which are specifically listed in other schedules; chloral betaine, chloral hydrate, chlordiazepoxide, chlorhexadol, diazepam, ethychloroynol, ethinamate, glutehtimide, lysergic acid, lysergic acid amide, meprobamate, methylphenidate, methyprylon, pareldehyde, petrichloral, sulfondiethylmethane, sulfonethylmethane, sulfonmethane.

(5) Nalorphine.

(6) Any material, compound, mixture, or preparation containing limited quantities of any of the following narcotic drugs, or any salts thereof:

a. Not more than 1.80 grams of codeine per 100 milliliters or not more than 90 milligrams per dosage unit, with an equal or greater quantity of an isoquinoline alkaloid of opium.

b. Not more than 1.80 grams of codeine per 100 milliliters or not more than 90 milligrams per dosage unit, with one or more active non-narcotic ingredients in recognized therapeutic amounts.

c. Not more than 300 milligrams of dihydrocodeine per 100 milliliters or not more than 15 milligrams per dosage unit, with a fourfold or greater quantity of an isoquinoline alkaloid of opium.

d. Not more than 300 milligrams of dihydrocodeine per 100 milliliters or not more than 15 milligrams per dosage unit, with one or more active, non-narcotic ingredients in recognized therapeutic amounts.

e. Not more than 1.80 grams of dihydrocodeine per 100 milliliters or not more than 90 milligrams per dosage unit, with one or more active, non-narcotic ingredients in recognized therapeutic amounts.

f. Not more than 300 milligrams of ethylmorphine per 100 milliliters or not more than 15 milligrams per dosage unit, with one or more active, non-narcotic ingredients in recognized therapeutic amounts.

g. Not more than 500 milligrams of opium per 100 milliliters or per 100 grams, or not more than 25 milligrams per dosage unit, with one or more active, non-narcotic ingredients in recognized therapeutic amounts.

h. Not more than 50 milligrams of morphine per 100 milliliters or per 100 grams with one or more active, non-narcotic ingredients in recognized therapeutic amounts.

(7) The Attorney General may by regulation except any compound, mixture, or preparation containing any stimulant or depressant substance listed in Class II above from the application of all or any part of this Act if the compound, mixture, or preparation contains one or more active medicinal ingredients not having a stimulant or depressant effect on the central nervous system; *Provided*, That such admixtures shall be included therein in such combinations, quantity, proportion, or concentration as to vitiate the potential for abuse of the substances which do have a stimulant or depressant effect on the central nervous system.

(c) Class III—Drugs—Low potential for abuse and current accepted medical use.

(1) Any compound, mixture, or preparation containing limited quantities of any of the following narcotic drugs, which shall include one or more non-narcotic active medicinal ingredients in sufficient proportion to confer upon the compound, mixture, or preparation valuable medicinal qualities other than those possessed by the narcotic drug alone:

a. Not more than 200 milligrams of codeine per 100 milliliters or per 100 grams;

b. Not more than 100 milligrams of dihydrocodeine per 100 milliliters or per 100 grams;

c. Not more than 100 milligrams of ethylmorphine per 100 milliliters or per 100 grams;

d. Not more than 2.5 milligrams of diphenoxylate and not less than 25 micrograms of atropine sulfate per dosage unit;

e. Not more than 100 milligrams of opium per 100 milliliters or per 100 grams, or not more than 5 milligrams per dosage unit.

TITLE V—REGULATION OF IMPORTATION, EXPORTATION, MANUFACTURE, DISTRIBUTION, AND DISPENSATION OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

IMPORTATION OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

Sec. 501(a). It is unlawful to import or land into the United States or its Territories any narcotic or dangerous drug listed in classes I and II of title IV of this Act, or any other narcotic drug listed in class III unless pursuant to such exceptions as the Attorney General may provide by regulation as being necessary for medical, scientific, or other legitimate purposes. No crude opium may be imported or brought in for the purpose of manufacturing heroin or smoking opium.

(b) Non-narcotic dangerous drugs listed in class III may be imported for medical and other legitimate uses only, pursuant to such notification requirements as the Attorney General may prescribe by regulation.

IMPORTATION OF COCA LEAVES

Sec. 502. In addition to the amount of coca leaves which may be authorized to be imported under section 501(a) of this title, the Attorney General may permit the importation of additional amounts of coca leaves provided, that, after entry into the United States, all cocaine, ecgonine, and all salts, derivatives, and preparations from which cocaine or ecgonine may be synthesized or made, contained in such additional amounts of coca leaves, shall be destroyed under the supervision of an authorized representative of the Attorney General.

EXPORTATION OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

Sec. 503(a). No person shall export or cause to be exported from the United States or from any of its Territories, any narcotic drug listed in class I of title IV of this Act to any other country except—

(1) to a country which has become a party to the International Opium Convention of 1912 for the Suppression of the Abuses of Opium. Morphine, Cocaine, and Derivative Drugs, or to the International Opium Convention signed at Geneva on February 19, 1925; or,

(2) to a country which has become a party to the Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs concluded at Geneva, July 13, 1931, and entered into force with respect to the United States of America, July 9, 1933, as amended by the protocol signed at Lake Success on December 11, 1946, and the protocol bringing under international control drugs outside the scope of the convention of July 13, 1931, for limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs (as amended by the protocol signed at Lake Success on December 11, 1946) signed at Paris, November 19, 1948, and entered into force with respect to the United States of America, September 11, 1950; or,

(3) To a country which has become a party to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, which entered into force with respect to the United States on June 24, 1967; and with respect to any such country, in subsections (1), (2), or (3) only if—

a. such country has instituted and maintains, in conformity with the conventions to which it is a party, a system for the control of imports of narcotic drugs which the Attorney General deems adequate;

b. the narcotic drug is consigned to a holder of such permits or licenses as may be required under the laws of the country of import;

c. substantial evidence is furnished to the Attorney General by the exporter that the narcotic drug is to be applied exclusively to medical and scientific uses within the country of import, and that there is an actual need for the narcotic drugs for medical and scientific uses within such country; and,

d. a permit to export the narcotic drug in each instance shall have been issued by the Attorney General.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the Attorney General may authorize the exportation of any narcotic drug (including crude opium and coca leaves) to a country which has ratified and become a party to any of the international instruments mentioned in subsection (a) if the particular drug is to be applied to a special scientific purpose in the country of destination and the authorities of such country will permit the importation of the particular drug for such purpose.

(c) No person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall export or cause to be exported from the United States or its Territories any non-narcotic dangerous drug listed in class II of title IV of this Act to any other country unless—

(1) such country has instituted and maintains a system which the Attorney General deems adequate for the control of imports of such substances;

(2) the dangerous drug is consigned to a holder of such permits or licenses as may be required under the laws of the country of imports;

(3) substantial evidence is furnished to the Attorney General that the dangerous drug is to be applied exclusively to medical, scientific, or other legitimate uses within the country to which exported, that it will not be exported from such country, and that there is an actual need for the dangerous substance for medical, scientific, or other legitimate uses within the country; and,

(4) a permit to export the dangerous drug in each instance shall have been issued by the Attorney General.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of section (c) of this section, the Attorney General may authorize the exportation of any non-narcotic dangerous drug if the particular substance is to be applied to a special scientific purpose in the country of destination and the authorities of such country will permit the importation of the particular drug for such purpose.

(e) No person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall cause to be exported from the United States or from any of its Territories any dangerous drug not requiring an export permit provided by this section to any other country unless the laws of the country to which the controlled dangerous substances are consigned permit the importation into the country, and then only if—

(1) there is furnished to the Attorney General prior to export documentary proof that importation is not contrary to the laws or regulations of the country of destination;

(2) a special dangerous drug invoice, in triplicate, accompanies the shipment setting forth such information as the Attorney General may prescribe to identify the parties to the shipment and the means of shipping. Two copies of the invoice shall be forwarded to the Attorney General before the dangerous drugs are exported from the United States or any of the Territories.

TRANSSHIPMENT AND IN-TRANSIT SHIPMENT OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

SEC. 504. No narcotic or dangerous drug listed in class I or II shall be admitted into the United States or into any of its Territories for transportation to another country, or be transferred or transshipped from one vessel, vehicle, or aircraft, to another vessel, vehicle, or aircraft, within the United States for immediate exportation or for any other purpose except for scientific, medical, or other legitimate purposes in the country of destination, and then only with the prior written approval of the Attorney General, which shall be granted or denied within 21 days of the request. No dangerous drug listed in class III may be so admitted, transferred, or transshipped except upon advance notice to the Attorney General.

RULES AND REGULATIONS REGARDING MANUFACTURE, DISTRIBUTION, AND DISPENSATION OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

SEC. 505. The Attorney General is authorized to promulgate rules and regulations and to charge reasonable fees relating to the license and control of the manufacture, distribution, and dispensation of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 506. (a) Every person who manufactures, distributes, or dispenses any narcotic or dangerous drug or who proposes to engage in the manufacture, distribution, or dispensation of any narcotic or dangerous drug, shall apply annually for a license to be issued by the Attorney General in accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated by him.

(b) The Attorney General may, by regulation, waive the requirement for a license of certain manufacturers, distributors, or dispensers if he finds it consistent with the public health and safety.

(c) A separate license shall be required at each principal place of business or professional practice where the applicant manufactures, distributes, or dispenses narcotics or dangerous drugs listed in the classes in title IV.

(d) The Attorney General is authorized to inspect the establishment of a licensee or applicant for a license in accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated by him.

LICENSING

SEC. 507. (a) The Attorney General shall grant a license to an applicant to manufacture or distribute narcotics or dangerous drugs included in class I or II of title IV of this Act if he determines that such license is consistent with the public interest and with treaty or other international obligations of the United States. In determining the public interest, the following factors shall be considered:

(1) maintenance of effective controls against diversion of particular narcotics and dangerous drugs and any class I or II drug compounded therefrom into other than legitimate medical, scientific, or industrial channels;

(2) compliance with applicable State and local law;

(3) promotion of technical advances in the art of manufacturing these drugs and the development of new drugs;

(4) prior conviction record of applicant under Federal and State laws relating to the manufacture, distribution, or dispensation of such drugs;

(5) past experience in the manufacture or distribution of narcotics and dangerous drugs, and the existence in the establishment of effective controls against diversion; and,

(6) such other factors as may be relevant to and consistent with the public health and safety.

(b) A license granted under subsection (a) of this section shall not entitle a licensee to manufacture and distribute narcotics or dangerous drugs in class I or II other than those specified in the license, or any quantity of those narcotics or dangerous drugs in excess of the quota assigned pursuant to section 510.

(c) Practitioners shall be granted a license to dispense drugs in class I, II and III if they are so authorized to dispense under the law of the State in which they practice. However, as to those drugs, which the Attorney General designates as having no accepted medical usage, practitioners shall be treated as distributors and subsection (a) of this section shall apply. An application for a license by a practitioner who wishes to conduct research with those drugs, which the Attorney General designates having no accepted medical usage shall be referred to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for advice. The Secretary shall promptly advise the Attorney General concerning the qualifications of each practitioner applying for a license. Before giving such advice, the Secretary shall consider the qualifications of the person or persons who will conduct the research, the drugs to be used, the place where research will be performed, and the design of the research protocol. Any license granted shall be subject to revocation and suspension in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 508.

(d) The Attorney General shall permit persons to register who own or operate any establishment engaged in the manufacture, distribution, or dispensing of any narcotic or dangerous drug prior to the effective date of this Act and who are registered or licensed under section 510 of the Drug Amendments of 1962 (76 Stat. 794; 21 U.S.C. 360), section 8 of the Narcotics Manufacturing Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 62; 21 U.S.C. 506), and sections 4721, 4722, 4751, 4752, and 4753 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (68 Stat. 31; 26 U.S.C. 4721, 4722, 4751, 4752, and 4753). Such registration shall be the basis for the issuance of a license.

(e) A license granted under this Act does not relieve a licensee of any obligation imposed by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (52 Stat. 1040, as amended, 21 U.S.C. 301 et seq)., or by any other Acts of Congress.

DENIAL, REVOCATION, OR SUSPENSION OF LICENSE

SEC. 508. (a) An application for a license or a license granted pursuant to section 507 to manufacture, distribute, or dispense a narcotic or dangerous drug, may be denied, suspended, or revoked by the Attorney General upon a finding that the licensee:

(1) has materially falsified any application filed pursuant to this Act or required by this Act;

(2) has been convicted of violating or conspiring to violate any law of the United States, or of any State, relating to any drug defined herein; or,

(3) has had his State license suspended or revoked by competent State authority and is no longer authorized by State law to engage in the manufacturing, distribution, or dispensation of narcotics or dangerous drugs.

(b) The Attorney General may limit revocation or suspension of a license to the particular narcotic or dangerous drug with respect to which grounds for revocation or suspension exist.

(c) Before taking action pursuant to this section, the Attorney General shall serve upon the applicant or licensee an order to show cause why a license should not be denied, revoked or suspended. The order to show cause shall contain a statement of the basis thereof and shall call upon the applicant or licensee to appear before the Attorney General at a time and place stated in the order, but in no event less than thirty days after the date of receipt of the order. Proceedings to deny or revoke or suspend shall be conducted pursuant to this section in accordance with subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, of the United States Code. Such proceedings shall be independent of, and not in lieu of, criminal prosecutions or other proceedings under this Act or any law of the United States.

(d) The Attorney General may, in his discretion, suspend any license simultaneously with the institution of proceedings under this section, in cases where he finds that there is an imminent danger to the public health or safety. Such suspension shall continue in effect until the conclusion of such proceedings, including judicial review thereof, unless sooner withdrawn by the Attorney General or dissolved by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(e) The suspension or revocation of a license under this section shall operate to suspend or revoke any quota applicable under section 510.

(f) In the event the Attorney General suspends or revokes a license granted under section 507, all narcotics and dangerous drugs owned or possessed by the licensee pursuant to such license at the time of suspension or the effective date of the revocation order, as the case may be, may in the discretion of the Attorney General, be placed under seal. No disposition may be made of drugs under seal until the time for taking an appeal has elapsed or until all appeals have been concluded unless a court, upon application therefor, orders the sale of perishable substances and the deposit of the proceeds of the sale with the court. Upon a revocation order becoming final, all such narcotics and dangerous drugs shall be forfeited to the Government.

MARKING OF CONTAINERS

SEC. 509. Commercial containers of narcotics and dangerous drugs, where appropriate, shall be identified by a symbol in accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated by the Attorney General.

QUOTAS APPLICABLE TO CERTAIN DRUGS

SEC. 510. (a) The Attorney General shall determine the total quantity and establish production quotas for each drug in classes I and II to be manufactured each calendar year to provide for the estimated medical, scientific, and industrial needs of the United States, for lawful export requirements, and for the establishment and maintenance of reserve stocks.

(b) The Attorney General shall limit or reduce individual production quotas to the extent necessary to prevent the aggregate of individual quotas from exceeding the amount determined necessary each year by the Attorney General under subsection (a). The quota of each licensed manufacturer for each drug in class I or II shall be revised in the same proportion as the limitation or reduction of the aggregate of the quotas. However, if any licensee, before the issuance of a limitation or reduction in quota, has manufactured in excess of his revised quota, the amount of the excess shall be subtracted from his quota for the following year.

(c) On or before July 1 of each year, upon application therefor by a licensed manufacturer, the Attorney General shall fix a manufacturing quota for the drugs in classes I and II that the manufacturer seeks to produce. The quota shall be subject to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section. In fixing such quotas, the Attorney General shall determine the manufacturer's estimated disposal, inventory, and other requirements for the calendar year; and, in making his determination, the Attorney General shall consider the manufacturer's current rate of disposal, the trend of the national disposal rate during the preceding calendar year, the manufacturer's production cycle and inventory position, the economic availability of raw materials, yield and stability problems, emergencies such as strikes and fires, and other factors.

(d) The Attorney General shall, upon application and subject to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, fix a quota for drugs in class I or II for any licensee who has not manufactured that drug during one or more preceding calendar years. In fixing such quota, the Attorney General shall take into account the licensee's reasonably anticipated requirements for the current year; and, in making his determination of such requirements, shall consider such factors specified in (c) of this section as may be relevant.

(e) At any time during the year any licensee who has applied for or received a manufacturing quota for a drug in class I and II may apply for an increase in that quota to meet his estimated disposal, inventory, and other requirements during the remainder of that year. In passing upon the application the Attorney General shall take into consideration any occurrences since the filing of the licensee's intial quota application that may require an increased manufacturing rate by the licensee during the balance of the year. In passing upon the application the Attorney General may also take into account the amount, if any, by which the determination of the Attorney General under subsection (a) of this section, exceeds the aggregate of the quotas, of all licensees under this section.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no license or quota may be required for the manufacture of such quantities of narcotics and dangerous drugs in class I and II that incidentally and necessarily result from the manufacturing process used for the manufacturing of a drug duly licensed under this title. The Attorney General may, by regulation, prescribe restrictions on the retention and disposal of such incidentally produced drugs.

RECORDS AND REPORTS OF LICENSEES

SEC. 511. (a) Upon the effective date of this Act each licensee manufacturing, distributing or dispensing narcotics or dangerous drugs in class I, II, or III shall make a complete and accurate record of all stocks of such narcotics and dangerous drugs on hand. Thereafter, a complete and accurate cumulative record of all such narcotics and dangerous drugs shall be maintained. Each 2 year period after the effective date of this Act each licensee manufacturing, distributing or dispensing narcotics and dangerous drugs shall prepare an inventory of each narcotic and dangerous drug in his possession. Records, and inventories shall contain such information as shall be provided by rules and regulations promulgated by the Attorney General.

(b) Records and inventories required to be prepared under this section shall be segregated or maintained in a manner to enable the records to be promptly identified and inspected. In addition, a summary of those records and inventories shall be filed periodically as shall be provided by rules and regulations promulgated by the Attorney General. This section shall not apply to practitioners who lawfully prescribe or administer, but not otherwise, dispense, narcotics and dangerous drugs listed in class I, II, or III of this Act.

(c) The Attorney General may by regulation require the submission of reports necessary to conform to international obligations of the United States.

OTHER FORMS

SEC. 512. (a) Narcotics and dangerous drugs in class I and II shall be distributed only by a licensee, pursuant to an order form prescribed by the Attorney General.

(b) Nothing contained in subsection (a) shall apply.

(1) to the administering or dispensing of such drugs to a patient by a practitioner in the course of his professional practice; however, such practitioner, must comply with the requirements of section 507 of this Act;

(2) to the distribution or dispensing of such drugs by a pharmacist to an ultimate user pursuant to a written prescription issued by a practitioner authorized by State law to issue such prescription; however, such pharmacist must comply with the requirements of section 511 of this Act.

PRESCRIPTIONS

SEC. 513. Except when dispensed directly by a practitioner, other than a pharmacist, to an ultimate user, or in emergency situations as prescribed by the Attorney General by regulations, no narcotic or dangerous drug included in class I, II, or III may be dispensed without a written prescription in conformity with regulations to be promulgated by the Attorney General.

TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATIVE AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 601. The Attorney General may delegate any of his functions under this Act to any officer or employee of the Department of Justice. He may promulgate and enforce any rules, regulations and procedures which he may deem necessary and appropriate for the efficient execution of his functions under this Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

SEC. 602(a). In carrying out his functions, the Attorney General may hold hearings, sign and issue subpoenas, administer oaths, examine witnesses and receive evidence at any place in the United States.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, notice shall be given and hearings shall be conducted under appropriate procedures of Subchapter II of Chapter 5, Title 5, United States Code.

POWERS OF ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL

SEC. 603. Any officer or employee of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs of the Department of Justice designated by the Attorney General may:

(a) Carry firearms;

(b) Execute and serve search warrants, arrest warrants, administrative inspection warrants, subpoenas, and summonses issued under the authority of the United States;

(c) Make arrests without warrant for any offense against the United States committed in his presence, or for any felony, cognizable under the laws of the United States, if he has probable cause to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing a felony;

(d) Make seizures of property pursuant to the provisions of this Act; and,

(e) Perform such other law enforcement duties as the Attorney General may designate.

INCREASE OF ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL

SEC. 604(a). The Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized and directed to conduct studies to determine whether an increase of enforcement personnel of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and the Bureau of Customs, respectively, is necessary to effectively implement this Act;

(b) The studies shall be completed and transmitted to Congress within twelve months from the effective date of this Act;

(c) In the interim, the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized and directed to increase the number of enforcement personnel of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and Bureau of Customs, respectively, and the amounts necessary for the interim increase are also authorized.

SUBPENAS

SEC. 605 (a) In any matter relating to the control of dangerous drugs, the Attorney General is empowered to subpena witnesses, compel their attendance and testimony, and require the production of any records (including books, papers, documents and tangible things which constitute or contain evidence) which the Attorney General finds relevant or material to the investigation. The attendance of witnesses and the production of records may be required from any place in any State or in any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States at any designated place of hearing: provided, that a witness shall not be required to appear at any hearing more than five hundred miles distant from the place where he was served with subpena. Witnesses summoned by the Attorney General shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States.

(b) A subpena of the Attorney General may be served by any person designated in the subpena to serve it. Service upon a natural person may be made by personal delivery of the subpena to him. Service may be made upon a domestic or foreign corporation or upon a partnership of other unincorporated association which is subject to suit under a common name, by delivering the subpena to an officer, a managing or general agent, or to any other agent authorized by appointment or by law to receive service or process. The affidavit of the person serving the subpena entered on a true copy thereof by the person serving it shall be proof of service.

(c) In case of contumacy by or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, the Attorney General may invoke the aid of any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the investigation is carried on or of which the subpenaed person is an inhabitant, carries on business or may be found, to compel compliance with the subpena of the Attorney General. The Court may issue an order requiring the subpenaed person to appear before the Attorney General to produce records, if so ordered, or to give testimony touching the matter under investigation. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in any judicial district in which such person may be found.

SEARCH WARRANTS

SEC. 606. (a) A search warrant relating to offenses involving narcotics and dangerous drugs may be served at any time of the day or night if the judge or United States Magistrate issuing the warrant is satisfied that there is probable cause to believe that grounds exist for the warrant and for its service at such time.

(b) Any officer authorized to execute a search warrant may, without notice of his authority and purpose, break open an outer or inner door door or window of a building, or any part of the building, or anything therein, if the judge or United States Magistrate issuing the warrant is satisfied that there is probable cause to believe that if such notice were to be given the property sought in the case may be easily and quickly destroyed or disposed of, or that danger to the life or limb of the officer or another may result, and has included in the warrant a direction that the officer executing it shall not be required to give such notice.

ADMINISTRATIVE INSPECTIONS AND WARRANTS

SEC. 607. (a) Issuance and execution of administrative inspection warrants shall be as follows:

(1) Any judge of the United States or of a State court of record, or any United States magistrate may, within his jurisdiction, and upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause, issue warrants for the purpose of conducting administrative inspections authorized by this Act or regulations thereunder, and seizures of property appropriate to such inspections. For the purposes of this section "probable cause" means a valid public interest in the effective enforcement of the Act or regulations sufficient to justify administrative inspection of the area, premises, building or conveyance in the circumstances specified in the application for the warrant.

(2) A warrant shall issue only upon an affidavit of an officer or employee duly designated and knowledge of the facts alleged, sworn to before the judge or magistrate and establishing the grounds for issuing the warrant. If the judge or magistrate is satisfied that grounds for the application exist or that there is probable cause to believe they exist, he shall issue a warrant identifying the area, premises, building, or conveyance to be inspected, the purpose of such inspection, and, where appropriate, the type of property to be inspected, if any. The warrant shall identify the items or types of property to be seized, if any. The warrant shall be directed to a person authorized by section 603 to execute it. The warrant shall state the grounds for its issuance and the name of the person or persons whose affidavit has been taken in support thereof. It shall command the person to whom it is directed to inspect the area, premises, building, or conveyance identified for the purpose specified, and, where appropriate, shall direct the seizure of the property specified. The warrant shall direct that it be served during normal business hours. It shall designate the judge or magistrate to whom it shall be returned.

(3) A warrant issued pursuant to this section must be executed and returned within ten days of its date. If property is seized pursuant to warrant, the person executing the warrant shall give to the person from whom or from whose premises the property was taken a copy of the warrant and a receipt for the property taken or shall leave the copy and receipt at the place from which the property was taken. The return of the warrant shall be made promptly and shall be accompanied by a written inventory of any property taken. The inventory shall be made in the presence of the person executing the warrant and of the person from whose possession or premises the property was taken, if they are present, or in the presence of at least one credible person other than the person making such inventory, and shall be verified by the person executing the warrant. The judge or magistrate upon request, shall deliver a copy of the inventory to the person from whom or from whose premises the property was taken and to the applicant for the warrant.

(4) The judge or magistrate who has issued a warrant under this section shall attach to the warrant a copy of the return and all papers filed in connection therewith and shall file them with the clerk of the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the inspection was made.

(b) The Attorney General is authorized to make administrative inspections of certain premises in accordance with the following provisions:

(1) The following premises are concluded:

a. Places where persons licensed or exempted from licensing requirements under this Act are required to keep records; and,

b. Places including factories, warehouses, establishments, and conveyances where persons licensed or exempted from licensing requirements under this Act are permitted to hold, manufacture, compound, process, sell, deliver, or otherwise dispose of narcotics or dangerous drugs.

(2) When so authorized by an administrative inspection warrant issued pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, an officer or employee designated by the Attorney General, upon presenting the warrant and appropriate credentials to the owner, operator, or agent in charge, shall have the right to enter the premises for the purpose of conducting an administrative inspection.

(3) When so authorized by an administrative inspection warrant, an officer or employee designated by the Attorney General shall have the right—

a. To inspect and copy records required by this Act to be kept;

b. To inspect, within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, premises and all pertinent équipment, finished and unfinished material, containers and labeling found therein, and, except as provided in subsection (b)(5) of this section, all other things therein (including records, files, papers, processes, controls, and facilities) bearing on violation of this Act; and

c. To inventory any stock of any narcotics or dangerous drugs therein and obtain samples of any such drug.

(4) This section shall not be construed to prevent the inspection without a warrant of books and records pursuant to an administrative subpena issued in accordance with section 605 of this Act, nor shall this section be construed to prevent entries and administrative inspections (including seizures of property) without a warrant—

a. With the consent of the owner, operator, or agent in charge of the premises;

b. In situations presenting imminent danger to health or safety;

c. In situations involving inspection of conveyances where there is reasonable cause to believe that the mobility of the conveyance makes it impracticable to obtain a warrant;

d. In any other exceptional or emergency circumstance where time or opportunity to apply for a warrant is lacking; and

e. In all other situations where a warrant is not constitutionally required.

(5) Except when the owner, operator, or agent in charge of the premises so consents in writing, no inspection authorized by this section shall extend to—

a. Financial data;

b. Sales data other than shipment data; or

c. Pricing data.

FORFEITURES

SEC. 608. (a) The following shall be subject to forfeiture to the United States and no property right shall exist in them:

(1) All narcotics and dangerous drugs which have been manufactured, distributed, dispensed or acquired in violation of the provisions of this Act;

(2) All raw materials, products and equipment of any kind which are used, or intended for use, in manufacturing, compounding, processing, delivering, importing, or exporting any narcotic or dangerous drug in violation of the provisions of this Act;

(3) All property which is used, or intended for use, as a container for property described in subsections (1) and (2);

(4) All conveyances including aircraft, vehicles, or vessels, which are used, or intended for use, to transport, or in any manner to facilitate the transportation, sale, receipt, possession, or concealment of property described in (1) or (2) except that:

a. No conveyance used by any person as a common carrier in the transaction of business as a common carrier shall be subject to forfeiture.

b. No conveyance shall be forfeited under the provisions of this section by reason of any act or omission established by the owner thereof to have been committed or omitted by any person other than such owner while such conveyance was unlawfully in the possession of a person other than the owner in violation of the criminal laws of the United States, or of any State; and

(5) All books, records, and research, including formulas, microfilm, tapes, and data which are used, or intended for use, in violation of this Act.

(b) Any property subject to forfeiture to the United States under this Act may be seized by the Attorney General upon process issued pursuant to the Supplemental Rules for Certain Admiralty and Maritime Claims by any district court of the United States having jurisdiction over the property except that seizure without such process may be made when—

(1) The seizure is incident to an arrest or a search under a search warrant or an inspection under an administrative inspection warrant;

(2) The property subject to seizure has been the subject of a prior judgment in favor of the United States in a criminal injunction or forfeiture proceeding under this Act;

(3) The Attorney General has probable cause to believe that the property is directly or indirectly dangerous to health or safety; or,

(4) The Attorney General has probable cause to believe that the property has been used or intended to be used in violation of this Act.

In the event of seizure pursuant to paragraphs (3) and (4) of this subsection, proceedings under subsection (d) of this section shall be instituted promptly.

(c) Property taken or detained under this section shall not be retrievable, but shall be deemed to be in the custody of the Attorney General, who shall—

(1) Place the property under seal;

(2) Remove the property to a place designated by him; or,

(3) Require that the General Services Administration take custody of the property and remove it to an appropriate location for disposition in accordance with law.

(d) All provisions of law relating to the seizure, summary and judicial forfeiture, and condemnation of property for violation of the customs laws, the disposition of such property or the proceeds from the sale thereof, the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures, and the compromise of claims and the award of compensation to informers in respect of such forfeitures shall apply to seizures and forfeitures incurred or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this Act, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions hereof: *Provided,* That such duties as are imposed upon the collector of customs or any other person with respect to the seizure and forfeiture of property under the customs laws shall be performed with respect to seizures and forfeitures of property under this Act by such officers, agents, or other persons as may be authorized or designated for that purpose by the Attorney General.

(e) Whenever property is forfeited under this Act the Attorney General may—

(1) Retain the property for official use;

(2) Sell any forfeited property which is not required to be destroyed by law and which is not harmful to the public, provided that the proceeds be disposed of for payment of all proper expenses of the proceedings for forfeiture and sale including expenses of seizure; maintenance of custody, advertising and court costs;

(3) Require that the General Services Administration take custody of the property and remove it for disposition in accordance with law; or

(4) Forward it to the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs for disposition. Such

disposition may include delivery for medical or scientific use to any Federal or State agency under regulations of the Attorney General.

(f) All narcotics and dangerous drugs listed in class I or II which are possessed, transferred, sold, or offered for sale in violation of the provisions of this Act shall be deemed contraband and seized and summarily forfeited to the United States. Similarly, all substances listed in class I and II, which are seized or come into the possession of the Government, the owners of which are unknown, shall be deemed contraband and summarily forfeited to the United States.

(g)(1) All species of plants from which narcotics or dangerous drugs in class I or II may be derived which have been planted or cultivated in violation of this Act, or of which the owners or cultivators are unknown, or which are wild growths, may be seized and summarily forfeited to the United States.

(2) The failure, upon demand by the Attorney General, or his duly authorized agent, of the person in occupancy or in control of land or premises upon which such species of plants are growing or being stored, to produce an appropriate license, or proof that he is the holder thereof, shall constitute authority for the seizure and forfeiture.

(3) The Attorney General, or his duly authorized agent, shall have authority to enter upon any lands, or into any dwelling pursuant to a search warrant, to cut, harvest, carry off, or destroy such plants.

INJUNCTIONS

SEC. 609. (a) The district courts of the United States and all courts exercising general jurisdiction in the territories and possessions of the United States shall have jurisdiction in proceedings in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to enjoin violations of this Act.

(b) In case of an alleged violation of an injunction or restraining order issued under this section, trial shall, upon demand of the accused, be by a jury in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 610 Before any violation of this Act is reported by the Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to any United States Attorney for institution of a criminal proceeding, the Director many require that the person against whom such proceeding is contemplated be given appropriate notice and an opportunity to present his views, either orally or in writing, with regard to such contemplated proceeding.

IMMUNITY AND PRIVILEGE

SEC. 611. Whenever in the judgment of the United States Attorney the testimony of any witness, or the production of books, papers, or other evidence by any witness, in any case or proceeding before any grand jury or court of the United States with respect to a violation of any provision of this Act, is necessary to the public interest, he, upon the approval of the Attorney General, shall make application to the court that the witness shall be instructed to testify or produce evidence subject to the provisions of this section, and upon order of the court such witness shall not be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, or other evidence on the grounds that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination to testify or produce evidence, nor shall testimony so compelled be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding, except prosecution described in the next sentence, against him in any court. No witness shall be exempt under this section from prosecution for perjury or contempt committed while giving testimony or producing evidence under compulsion as provided in this section.

BURDEN OF PROOF, LIABILITIES

SEC. 612. (a) It shall not be necessary for the United States to negate any exemption or exception set forth in this Act in any complaint, information, indictment or other pleading or in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding under this Act, and the burden of proof of any such exemption or exception shall be upon the person claiming its benefit.

(b) In the absence of proof that a person is the duly authorized holder of an appropriate license or order form issued under this Act, he shall be presumed not to be the holder of such license or form, and the burden of proof shall be upon him to rebut such presumption.

(c) The burden of establishing that a vehicle, vessel, or aircraft used in connection with the drugs listed in Class I or II of this Act was used in accordance with the provisions of this Act shall be on the persons engaged in such use.

(d) No liability shall be imposed by virtue of this Act upon any duly authorized Federal officer engaged in the enforcement of this Act, or upon any duly authorized officer of any State, Territory, political subdivision thereof, the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States, who shall be engaged in the enforcement of any law or municipal ordinance relating to narcotics or dangerous drugs.

PAYMENTS AND ADVANCES

SEC. 613. (a) The Attorney General is authorized to pay any person, from funds appropriated for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, for information concerning a violation of this Act. such sum or sums of money as he may deem appropriate.

(b) Moneys expended from apppropriations of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs for purchase of narcotics and dangerous drugs and subsequently recovered shall be reimbursed to the current appropriation for the Bureau.

(c) The Attorney General is authorized to direct the advance of funds by the Treasury Department in connection with the enforcement of this Act.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 614. All final determinations, findings and conclusions of the Attorney General under this Act shall be final and conclusive decisions of the matters involved, except that any person aggrieved by a final decision of the Attorney General may obtain review of the decision in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or for the Circuit in which his principal place of business is located upon petition field with the Court and delivered to the Attorney General within 30 days after notice of the decision. Findings of fact by the Attorney General, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive.

TITLE VII—OFFENSES AND PENALTIES

SEC. 701. (a) Except as authorized by this Act, it is unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally:

(1) to distribute, or to possess with intent to distribute, a narcotic or dangerous drug;

(2) to manufacture a narcotic or dangerous drug;

(3) to import any narcotic or dangerous drug classified in Class I or II into the United States;

(4) to export any narcotic or dangerous drug classified in Class I or II;

(5) to bring or possess on board any vessel, vehicle, or aircraft under the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States a narcotic or dangerous drug classified in Class I or II, not constituting part of the cargo entered in the manifest or part of the official supplies of the vessel, vehicle, or aircraft.

(b) It is unlawful for any person to manufacture or to distribute a narcotic or dangerous drug in Class I or II;

(1) intending that such substance be unlawfully imported into the United States; or

(2) knowing that such substance will be unlawfully imported into the United States. This section is intended to reach acts of manufacture or distribution committed outside the territorial jurisdiction of the United States. Any person who violates this Section shall be tried in the United States District Court at the point of entry where such person enters the United States, or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

(c) Any person who violates this Section with respect to:

(1) A narcotic drug in Class I shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or fined not more than $25,000, or both.

(2) Any dangerous drug classified in Class II, shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment for not more than five years, or fined not more than $15,000, or both.

(3) A drug classified in Class III shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment for not more than one year, or fined not more than $5,000, or both.

(d) It is unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally to possess a narcotic or dangerous drug unless such substance was obtained directly, or pursuant to a valid prescription or order from a practitioner while acting in the course of his professional practice, or except as otherwise authorized by this Act. Any person who violates this Section shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment for not more than one year, a fine of not more than $5,000, or both. Sec. 702. (a) It is unlawful for any person:

(1) who is subject to the requirements of Title V of this Act to distribute or dispense a narcotic or dangerous drug in violation of Section 513.

(2) who is a licensee to manufacture, distribute, or dispensed a narcotic or dangerous drug not authorized by his license to another licensee or other authorized person;

(3) to bring a narcotic or dangerous drug classified in Class I or II into the United States or the special maritime or territorial jurisdiction of the United States for transshipment to another country, or to transfer or transship such a substance from one vessel to another within the United States for immediate exportation or for any other purpose—in violation of Section 504 of this Act;

(4) who is a licensee to omit from any container of a narcotic or dangerous drug the symbol required by Section 509 of this Act;

(5) to remove, alter, or obliterate a symbol required by Section 509 of this Act;

(6) to refuse or fail to make, keep or furnish any record, report, notification, order form, statement, invoice or information required under this Act; or

(7) to refuse any entry into any premises or inspection authorized by this Act.

(b) It is unlawful for any person who is a licensee to manufacture a narcotic or dangerous drug which is—

(1) not expressly authorized by his license and by a quota assigned to him pursuant to Section 510 of this Act; or

(2) in excess of a quota assigned to him pursuant to Section 510 of this Act.

(c) Any person who violates this Section is punishable by a fine of not more than $25,000. Provided, that if the violation is prosecuted by an information or indictment which alleges that the violation was committed knowingly or intentionally and the trier of fact specifically finds that the violation was committed knowingly or intentionally, such person is punishable by imprisonment for not more than one year, or a fine of not more than $25,000, or both.

SEC. 703. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally—

(1) to distribute a narcotic or dangerous drug classified in Class I or II, except pursuant to an order form as required by Section 512 of this Act;

(2) to use in the course of the manufacture or distribution of a narcotic or dangerous drug a license number which is fictitious, revoked, suspended or issued to another person;

(3) to acquire or obtain possession of a narcotic or dangerous drug by misrepresentation, fraud, forgery, deception or subterfuge;

(4) to furnish false or fradulent material information in, or omit any material information from, any application, report, or other document required to be kept or filed under this Act, or any record required to be kept by this Act;

(5) to use any communication facility in committing or in causing or facilitating the commission or any act or acts constituting an offensive under any provision of this Act. Each separate use of a communication facility shall be a separate offense under this section. For purposes of this subsection, the term "communication facility" means any and all public and private instrumentalities used or useful in the transmission of writing, signs, signals, pictures or sounds of all kinds; it includes mail, telephone, wire, radio, and all other mean of communication; and,

(6) to make, distribute, or possess any punch, die, plate, stone, or other thing designed to print, imprint, or reproduce the trademark, trade name, or other identifying mark, imprint, or device of another or any likeness of any of the foregoing upon any drug or container or labeling thereof so as to render such drug a counterfeit drug.

(b) Any person who violates this section is punishable by imprisonment for not more than three years, a fine of not more than $30,000, or both.

ATTEMPT AND CONSPIRACY

SEC. 704. (a) Any person who attempts to commit any offense defined in this title is punishable by imprisonment and/or a fine which may not exceed ½ the maximum punishment prescribed for the offense, the commission of which was the object of the attempt.

(b) Any person who conspires to commit any offense defined in the title is punishable by imprisonment and/or fine which may not exceed the maximum punishment prescribed for the offense, the commission of which was the object of the conspiracy.

SEC. 705. Any penalty imposed for violation of this title shall be in addition to, and not in lieu of, any civil or administrative penalty or sanction authorized by law.

DISTRIBUTION TO PERSONS UNDER AGE EIGHTEEN

SEC. 706. Any person who is at least eighteen years of age who violates subsection (a) (1) of section 701 by distributing a narcotic or dangerous drug to a person under eighteen years of age who is at least three years his junior is punishable by a term of imprisonment up to twice that authorized by subsection (c) of section 701, by the fine authorized by subsection (c) of section 701, or by both.

CONDITIONAL DISCHARGE FOR POSSESSION AS FIRST OFFENSE

SEC. 707. Whenever any person who has not previously been convicted of any offense under this Act or under any statute of the United States or of any State relating to narcotic drugs, marihuana, or stimulant, depressant, or hallucinogenic drugs, pleads guilty to or is found guilty of possession of a narcotic or dangerous drug under subsection 701(d) the court may, without entering a judgment of guilt and with the consent of such person, defer further proceedings and place him on probation upon such reasonable terms and conditions as it may require. Upon violation of a term or condition, the court may enter an adjudication of guilt and proceed as otherwise provided. Upon fulfillment of the terms and conditions, the court shall discharge such person and dismiss the proceedings against him. Discharge and dismissal under this section shall be without court adjudication of guilt and shall not be deemed a conviction for purposes of disqualifications or disabilities imposed by law upon conviction of a crime (including the additional penalties imposed for second or subsequent convictions under section 708 of this Act). Discharge and dismissal under this section may occur only once with respect to any person.

SECOND OR SUBSEQUENT OFFENSE

SEC. 708. (a) A second or subsequent offense shall be punishable by up to double the maximum penalty provided for the particular offense. The court may, in its discretion, provide that no parole shall be granted to the second or subsequent offender.

(b) For purposes of subsection (a) of this section, an offense shall be considered a second or subsequent offense if, prior to the commission of the offense, the offender has at any time been convicted of an offense or offenses under this Act or under any statute of the United States relating to narcotic, depressant, stimulant, or hallucinogenic drugs.

(c) After conviction of any offense the penalty for which is provided in this Act (but before pronouncement of sentence), the court shall be advised by the United States Attorney whether the conviction is the offender's first or subsequent offense. If it is not a first offense, the United States Attorney shall file an information setting forth the prior convictions, and the offender shall have the opportunity in open court to affirm or deny that he is the person previously convicted. If he denies the identity, sentence shall be postponed to permit a trial before a jury on the sole issue of the offender's identity with the person previously convicted. If the offender is found by the jury to be the person previously convicted or if he acknowledges that he is such person, he shall be sentenced as prescribed in subsection (a) or (b) of this section, as the case may be.

TITLE VIII—ADDICT REHABILITATION

CIVIL COMMITMENT IN LIEU OF PROSECUTION

SEC. 801. (a) If the United State district court believes that an eligible individual is an addict, the court may advise him at his first appearance or thereafter at the sole discretion of the court that the prosecution of the criminal charge will be held in abeyance if he elects to submit to an immediate examination to determine whether he is an addict and is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment. In offering an individual an election, the court shall advise him that if he elects to be examined, he will be confined during the examination for a period not to exceed sixty days; that if he is determined to be an addict who is likely to be rehabilitated, he will be civilly committed to the Surgeon General for treatment; that he may not voluntarily withdraw from the examination or any treatment which may follow; that the treatment may last for thirty-six months; that during treatment, he will be confined in an institution and, at the discretion of the Surgeon General, he may be conditionally released for supervised aftercare treatment in the community; and that if he successfully completes treatment the charge will be dismissed, but if he does not, prosecution on the charge will be resumed. An individual upon being advised that he may elect to submit to an examination shall be permitted a maximum of five days within which to make his election. Except on a showing that a timely election could not have been made, an individual shall be barred from an election after the prescribed period. An individual who elects civil commitment shall be placed in the custody of the Attorney General or the Surgeon General, as the court directs, for an examination by the Surgeon General during a period not to exceed thirty days. This period may, upon notice to the court and the appropriate United States attorney, be extended by the Surgeon General for an additional thirty days.

(b) The Surgeon General shall report to the court the results of the examination and recommend whether the individual should be civilly committed. A copy of the report shall be made available to the individual and the United States attorney. If the court, acting on the report and other information coming to its attention, determines that the individual is not an addict or is an addict not likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, the individual shall be held to answer the abeyant charge. If the court determines that the individual is an addict and is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, the court shall commit him to the custody of the Surgeon General for treatment, except that no individual shall be committed under this chapter if the Suregon General certifies that adequate facilities or personnel for treatment are unavailable.

(c) Whenever an individual is committed to the custody of the Surgeon General for treatment under this title the criminal charge against him shall be continued without final disposition and shall be dismissed if the Surgeon General certifies to the court that the individual has successfully completed the treatment program. On receipt of such certification, the court shall discharge the individual from custody and dismiss the charge against him. If prior to such certification the Surgeon General determines that the individual cannot be further treated as a medical problem, he shall advise the court. The court shall thereupon terminate the commitment, and the pending criminal proceeding shall be resumed.

(d) An individual committed for examination or treatment shall not be released on bail or on his own recognizance.

(e) Whoever escapes or attempts to escape while committed to institutional custody for examination or treatment, or whoever rescues or attempts to rescue or instigates, aids, or assists the escape or attempt to escape of such a person, shall be subject to the penalties provided in sections 751 and 752 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 802. (a) An individual who is committed to the custody of the Surgeon General for treatment under this title shall not be conditionally released from institutional custody until the Surgeon General determines that he has made sufficient progress to warrant release to a supervisory aftercare authority. If the Surgeon General is unable to make such a determination at the expiration of twenty-four months after the commencement of institutional custody, he shall advise the court and the appropriate United States attorney whether treatment should be continued. The court may affirm the commitment or terminate it and resume the pending criminal proceeding.

(b) An individual who is conditionally released from institutional custody shall, while on release, remain in the legal custody of the Surgeon General and shall report for such supervised aftercare treatment as the Surgeon General directs. He shall be subject to home visits and to such physical examination and reasonable regulation of his conduct as the supervisory aftercare authority establishes, subject to the approval of the Surgeon General. The Surgeon General may, at any time, order a conditionally released individual to return for institutional treatment. The Surgeon General's order shall be a sufficient warrant for the supervisory aftercare authority, a probation officer, or any Federal officer authorized to serve criminal process within the United States to apprehend and return the individual to institutional custody as directed. If it is determined that an individual has returned to the use of narcotics, the Surgeon General shall inform the court of the conditions under which the return occurred and make a recommendation as to whether treatment should be continued. The court may affirm the commitment or terminate it and resume the pending criminal proceeding.

(c) The total period of treatment for any individual committed to the custody of the Surgeon General shall not exceed thirty-six months. If, at the expiration of such maximum period, the Surgeon General is unable to certify that the individual has successfully completed his treatment program the pending criminal proceeding shall be resumed.

(d) Whenever a pending criminal proceeding against an individual is resumed under this title, he shall receive full credit toward the service of any sentence which may be imposed for any time spent in the institutional custody of the Surgeon General or the Attorney General or any other time spent in institutional custody in connection with the matter for which sentence is imposed.

Sec. 803. The determination of narcotic addiction and the subsequent civil commitment under this title shall not be deemed a criminal conviction. The results of any tests or procedures conducted by the Surgeon General or the supervisory aftercare authority to determine narcotic addiction may only be used in a further proceeding under this title. They shall not be used against the examined individual in any criminal proceeding except that the fact that he is a narcotic addict may be elicited on his cross-examination as bearing on his credibility as a witness.

Sec. 804. (a) The Surgeon General may from time to time make such provision as he deems appropriate authorizing the performance of any of his functions under this title by any other officer or employee of the Public Health Service, or with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, by any Federal or other public or private agency or officer or employee thereof.

(b) The Surgeon General is authorized to enter into arrangements with any public or private agency or any person under which appropriate facilities or services of such agency or person will be made available, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, for the examination or treatment of individuals who elect civil commitment under this chapter.

Sec. 805. The failure of a court to offer a defendant an election under section 801(a) of this title or a determination relative to civil commitment under this title shall not be reviewable on appeal or otherwise.

SENTENCING TO COMMITMENT FOR TREATMENT

Sec. 806. If the court believes that an eligible offender is an addict, it may place him in the custody of the Attorney General for an examination to determine whether he is an addict and is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment. The Attorney General shall report to the court within thirty days, or any additional period granted by the court, the results of such examination and make any recommendations he deems desirable. An offender shall receive full credit toward the service of his sentence for any time spent in custody for an examination.

Sec. 807. (a) Following the examination provided for in section 806, if the court determines that an eligible offender is an addict and is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, it shall commit him to the custody of the Attorney General for treatment under this chapter, except that no offender shall be committed under this chapter if the Attorney General certifies that adequate facilities or personnel for treatment are unavailable. Such commitment shall be for an indeterminate period of time not to exceed ten years, but in no event shall it exceed the maximum sentence that could otherwise have been imposed.

(b) If, following the examination provided for in section 806, the court determines that an eligible offender is not an addict, or is an addict not likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, it shall impose such other sentence as may be authorized or required by law.

Sec. 808. An offender committed under section 807(a) may not be conditionally released until he has been treated for six months following such commitment in an institution maintained or approved by the Attorney General for treatment. The Attorney General may then or at any time thereafter report to the Board of Parole whether the offender should be conditionally released under supervision. After receipt of the Attorney General's report, and certification from the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service that the offender has made sufficient progress to warrant his conditional release under supervision, the Board may in its discretion order such a release. In determining suitability for release, the Board may make any investigation it deems necessary. If the Board does not conditionally release the offender, or if a conditional release is revoked, the Board may thereafter grant a release on receipt of a further report from the Attorney General.

Sec. 809. An offender who has been conditionally released shall be under the jurisdiction of the Board as if on parole under the established rules of the Board and shall remain, while conditionally released, in the legal custody of the Attorney General. The Attorney General may contract with any appropriate public or private agency or any person for supervisory aftercare of a conditionally released offender. Upon receiving information that such an offender has violated his conditional release, the Board, or a member thereof, may issue and cause to be executed a warrant for his apprehension and return to custody. Upon return to custody, the offender shall be given an opportunity to appear before the Board, a member thereof, or an examiner designated by the Board, after which the Board may revoke the order of conditional release.

CIVIL COMMITMENT OF PERSONS NOT CHARGED WITH ANY CRIMINAL OFFENSE

Sec. 810. (a) Except as otherwise provided in section 819 of this title, whenever any narcotic addict desires to obtain treatment for his addiction, or whenever a related individual has reason to believe that any person is a narcotic addict, such addict or related individual may file a petition with the United States attorney for the district in which such addict or person resides or is found requesting that such addict or person be admitted to a hospital of the Service for treatment of his addiction. Any such petition filed by a narcotic addict shall set forth his name and address and the facts relating to his addiction. Any such petition filed by a related individual with respect to a person believed by such individual to be a narcotic addict shall set forth the name and address of the alleged narcotic addict and the facts or other data on which the petitioner bases his belief that the person with respect to whom the petition is filed is a narcotic addict.

(b) After considering such petition, the United States attorney shall, if he determines that there is reasonable cause to believe that the person named in such petition is a narcotic addict, and that appropriate State or other facilities are not available to such person, file a petition with the United States district court to commit such person to a hospital of the Service for the treatment as provided in this title. In making his determination with respect to the nonavailability of such facilities, the United States attorney shall consult with the Surgeon General, and other appropriate State or local officials.

(c) Upon the filing of any such petition by a United States attorney, the court may order the patient to appear before it for an examination by physicians as provided under section 811 of this title and for a hearing, if required, under section 812 of this title. The court shall cause a copy of such petition and order to be served personally upon the patient by a United States marshal.

Sec. 811. The court shall immediately advise any patient appearing before it pursuant to an order issued under subsection (c) of section 810 of his right to have (1) counsel at every stage of the judicial proceedings under this title and that, if he is unable because of financial reasons to obtain counsel, the court will, at the patient's request, assign counsel to represent him; and (2) present for consultation during any examination conducted under this section, a qualified physical retained by such patient, but in no event shall such physician be entitled to participate in any such examination or in the making of any report required under this section with respect to such examination. The court shall also advise such patient that if, after an examination and hearing as provided in this title, he is found to be a narcotic addict who is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, he will be civilly committed to the Surgeon General for treatment; that he may not voluntarily withdraw from such treatment; that the treatment (including posthospitalization treatment and supervision) may last forty-two months; that during treatment he will be confined in an institution; that for a period of three years following his release from confinement he will be under the care and custody of the Surgeon General for treatment and supervision under a posthospitalization program established by the Surgeon General; and that should he fail or refuse to cooperate in such posthospitalization program or be determined by the Surgeon General to have relapsed to the use of narcotic drugs, he may be recommitted for additional confinement in an institution followed by additional posthospitalization treatment and supervision. After so advising the patient, the court shall appoint two qualified physicians, one of whom shall be a psychiatrist, to examine the patient. For the purpose of the examination, the court may order the patient committed for such reasonable period as it shall determine, not to exceed thirty days, to the custody of the Surgeon General for confinement in a suitable hospital or other facility designated by the court. Each physician appointed by the court shall, within such period so determined by the court, examine the patient, and file with the court, a written report with respect to such examination. Each such report shall include a statement of the examining physician's conclusions as to whether the patient examined is a narcotic addict and is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment. Upon the filing of such reports, the patient so examined shall be returned to the court for such further proceedings as it may direct under this title. Copies of such reports shall be made available to the patient and his counsel.

Sec. 812. (a) If both examining physicians (referred to in section 811) conclude in their respective written reports that the patient is not a narcotic, or is an addict not likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, the court shall immediately enter an order discharging the patient and dismissing the proceedings under this title. If the written report of either such physician indicates that the patient is a narcotic addict who is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, or that the physician submitting the report is unable to reach any conclusion by reason of the refusal of the patient to submit to a thorough examination, the court shall promptly set the case for hearing. The court shall cause a written notice of the time and place of such hearing to be served personally upon the patient and his attorney. Such notice shall also inform the patient that upon demand made by him within fifteen days after he has been served, he shall be entitled to have all issues of fact with respect to his alleged narcotic addiction determined by a jury. If no timely demand for a jury is made, the court, in conducting such hearing, shall determine all issues of fact without a jury.

(b) In conducting any hearing under this title, the court shall receive and consider all relevant evidence and testimony which may be offered, including the contents of the reports referred to in section 811. Any patient with respect to whom a hearing is held under this title shall be entitled to testify and to present and cross-examine witnesses. All final orders of commitment under this title shall be subject to review in conformity with the provisions of sections 1254 and 1291 of title 28 of the United States Code.

(c) Any patient with respect to whom a hearing has been set under this title may be detained by the court for a reasonable period of time in a suitable hospital or other facility designated by the court until after such hearing has been concluded.

(d) Witnesses subpenaed by either party under the provisions of this title shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid to other witnesses in the courts of the United States.

Sec. 813. If the court determines after a hearing that such patient is a narcotic addict who is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, the court shall order him committed to the care and custody of the Surgeon General for treatment in a hospital of the Service. The Surgeon General shall submit to the court written reports with respect to such patient at such times as the court may direct. Such reports shall include information as to the health and general condition of the patient, together with the recommendations of the Surgeon General concerning the continued confinement of such patient.

Sec. 814. Any patient committed to the care and custody of the Surgeon General pursuant to section 813 of this title shall be committed for a period of six months, and shall be subject to such posthospitalization program as may be established pursuant to section 815 of this title; except that such patient may be released from confinement by the Surgeon General at any time prior to the expiration of such six-month period if the Surgeon General determines that the patient has been cured of his drug addiction and rehabilitated, or that his continued confinement is no longer necessary or desireable.

Sec. 815. (a) Whenever any patient under the care and custody of the Surgeon General pursuant to this title is to be released from confinement in accordance with the provisions thereof, the Surgeon General shall give notice of such pending release to the committing court within ten days prior thereto and shall, at the time of the patient's release, promptly return him to that court. The court, after considering the recommendations of the Surgeon General with respect to posthospitalization treatment for any such patient so returned, may place such patient under the care and custody of the Surgeon General for the three-year period immediately following the patient's release, for treatment and supervision under such posthospitalization program as the Surgeon General may direct.

(b) If, at any time during such three-year period, any patient (1) fails or refuses to comply with the directions and orders of the Surgeon General in connection with such patient's posthospitalization treatment and supervision, or (2) is determined by the Surgeon General to be again using narcotic drugs, the Surgeon General may order such patient's immediate return to the committing court which may recommit such patient to a hospital of the Service for additional treatment for a period of not to exceed six months, and may require such patient thereafter to submit to a posthospitalization program in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.

Sec. 816. The court, upon the petition of any patient after his confinement pursuant to this title for a period in excess of three months, shall inquire into the health and general condition of the patient and as to the necessity, if any, for his continued confinement. If the court finds, with or without a hearing, that his continued confinement is no longer necessary or desirable, it shall order the patient released from confinement and returned to the court. The court may, with respect to any such patient so returned, place such patient under a posthospitalization program in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of section 815 of this title.

Sec. 817. Any determination by the court pursuant to this title that a patient is a narcotic addict shall not be deemed a criminal conviction, nor shall such patient be denominated a criminal by reason of that determination. The results of any hearing, examination, test, or procedure to determine narcotic addiction of any patient under this title shall not be used against such patient in any criminal proceeding.

Sec. 818. Any physician conducting an examination under this title shall be a competent and compellable witness at any hearing or other proceeding conducted pursuant to this title and the physician-patient privilege shall not be applicable.

Sec. 819. The provisions of this title shall not be applicable with respect to any person against whom there is pending a criminal charge, whether by indictment or by information, which has not been fully determined or who is on probation or whose sentence following conviction on such a charge, including any time on parole or mandatory release, has not been fully served, except that such provision shall be applicable to any such person on probation, parole, or mandatory release if the authority authorized to require his return to custody consents to his commitment.

Sec. 820. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no patient shall be committed to a hospital of the Service under this title if the Surgeon General certifies that adequate facilities or personnel for treatment of such patient are unavailable.

Sec. 821. Physicians appointed by the court to examine any person pursuant to this title and counsel assigned by the court to represent any person in judicial proceedings under this title shall be entitled to reasonable compensation, in an amount to be determined by the court, to be paid, upon order of the court, out of such funds as may be provided by law.

Sec. 822. (a) The Surgeon General may from time to time make such provisions as he deems appropriate authorizing the performance of any of his functions under that title by any other officer or employee of the Public Health Service, or with the consent of the head of the Department or Agency concerned, by any Federal or other public or private agency or officer or employee thereof.

(b) The Surgeon General is authorized to enter into arrangements with any public or private agency or any person under which appropriate facilities or services of such agency or person will be made available, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, for the examination or treatment of individuals pursuant to the provisions of this title.

Sec. 823. Whoever escapes or attempts to escape while committed to institutional custody for examination or treatment under this title, or whoever rescues or attempts to rescue or instigates, aids, or assists the escape or attempt to escape of such a person, shall be subject to the penalties provided in sections 751 and 752 of title 18, United States Code.

Sec. 824. Any person who knowingly makes any false statement to the United States attorney in any petition under section 810(a) of this title shall be subject to the penalty prescribed in section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

REHABILITATION AND POSTHOSPITALIZATION CARE PROGRAMS AND ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND LOCALITIES

Sec. 824. The Surgeon General is authorized to continue, as an integral part of the program of treatment for narcotic addiction authorized by section 341 of the Public Health Service Act, outpatient services to (1) provide guidance and give psychological help and supervision to patients and other individuals released from hospitals of the Service after treatment for narcotic drug addiction, utilizing all available resources of local, public and private agencies, and (2) assist States and municipalities in developing treatment programs and facilities for individuals so addicted, including posthospitalization treatment programs and facilities for the care and supervision of narcotic addicts released after confinement under this or any other Act providing for treatment of drug addiction. The Surgeon General shall take into consideration in supplying such services the extent of drug addiction in the various States and political subdivisions thereof and the willingness of such States and subdivisions to cooperate in developing a sound program for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts.

Sec. 825. It is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums necessary to continue to enable the Surgeon General (1) to make grants to States and political subdivisions thereof and to private organizations and institutions (A) for the development of field testing and demonstration programs for the treatment of narcotic addiction, (B) for the development of specialized training programs or materials relating to the provision of public health services for the treatment of narcotic addiction, or the development of in-service training or short term or refresher courses with respect to the provision of such services, (C) for training personnel to operate, supervise, and administer such services, and (D) for the conducting of surveys evaluating the adequacy of the programs for the treatment of narcotic addiction within the several States with a view to determining ways and means of improving, extending, and expanding such programs; and (2) to enter into jointly financed cooperative arrangements with State and local governments and public and private organizations and institutions with a view toward the developing, constructing, operating, staffing, and maintaining of treatment centers and facilities (including posthospitalization treatment centers and facilities) for narcotic addicts within the States.

(b) Payments under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as determined by the Surgeon General, and shall be made on such conditions as the Surgeon General determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

(c) The Surgeon General is authorized to issue appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this title.

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS

Sec. 826. The Board of Parole is hereby directed to review the sentences of any prisoner who before the effective date of this Act was made ineligible for parole by section 7237(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and (1) who was convicted of a violation of a law relating to marihuana or (2) who was convicted of a violation of a law relating to narcotic drugs and had not attained his twenty-sixth birthday prior to such convictions. After conducting such review the Board of Parole may authorize the release of such prisoner on parole pursuant to section 4202 of title 18, United States Code.

If the Board of Parole finds that there are reasonable grounds to believe that such prisoner may benefit from the treatment provided under the Federal Youth Corrections Act (18 U.S.C., ch. 402), it may place such prisoner in the custody of the Youth Corrections Division of the Board of Parole for treatment and supervision pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Youth Corrections Act. Action taken by the Board of Parole under this section shall not cause any prisoner to serve a longer term than would be served under his original sentence.

REHABILITATED ADDICTS

Sec. 827. In accordance with the requirements of this title an addict committed pursuant to section 807(a) may at the expiration of twelve months from the date of his final discharge petition the district court within the jurisdiction and venue of his conviction to set aside his conviction. If the court grants the petition, the petitioner shall be deemed not convicted of a crime for any purpose including disqualification or disabilities imposed by law for the conviction of a crime, additional penalties imposed for second and subsequent convictions under Federal or State statutes. A petitioner under this section although he may apply more than once, may only have one adjudication setting aside his conviction.

Sec. 828. In considering the petition under section 827, the District Court shall review the entire record of the petitioner, including his medical record and as a condition precedent to granting a petition under this section shall find as a fact that the petitioner is no longer an addict. This procedure shall be conducted in an informal manner and the petitioner has the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence that he is no longer an addict.

COOPERATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS

Sec. 829. The Surgeon General and the Attorney General are authorized to give representatives of States and local subdivisions thereof the benefit of their experience in the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts so that each State may be encouraged to provide adequate facilities and personnel for the care and treatment of narcotic addicts in its jurisdiction.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

PENDING PROCEEDINGS

Sec. 901. (a) Prosecutions for any violation of law occurring prior to the effective date of this Act shall not be affected by these repealers or amendments, or abated by reason thereof.

(b) Civil seizures or forfeitures and injunctive proceedings commenced prior to the effective date of this Act shall not be affected by these repealers or amendments, or abated by reason thereof.

(c) All administrative proceedings, except those placing drugs under control pending before the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs on the effective date of this enactment shall be continued and brought to final determination in accord with laws and regulations in effect prior to the date of this enactment.

(d) The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to violations of law seizures and forfeitures injunctive proceedings administrative proceedings and investigations which occur following its effective date.

CONTINUATION OF REGULATIONS

Sec. 902. Any orders, rules, and regulations which have been promulgated under any law affected by this Act and which are in effect on the day preceding enactment of this title shall continue in effect until modified, superseded or repealed by the Attorney General.

SEVERABILITY

Sec. 903. If a provision of this Act is held invalid all valid provisions that are severable shall remain in effect. If a provision of this Act is held invalid in one or more of its applications the provision shall remain in effect in all its valid applications that are severable.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 904. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 905. This Act shall take effect on the one hundred and eightieth day following the date of its enactment.

REPEALERS

Sec. 906. (a) The following laws or provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) Sections 1 and 2 of the Act of February 23, 1887, as amended (title 21, sections 191 through 193);

(2) Act of February 9, 1909, as amended (title 21, sections 171, 173, 174 through 184, 185);

(3) Section 1 of the Act of March 28, 1928, as amended (title 31, section 529a);

(4) Section 6 of the Act of June 14, 1930 (title 21, section 173a);

(5) Sections 7 and 8 of the Act of June 14, 1930, as amended (title 21, sections 197, 198);

(6) Act of July 3, 1930 (title 21, section 199);

(7) Section 6 of the Act of August 7, 1939 (title 31, section 529g);

(8) Act of December 11, 1942, as amended (title 21, sections 188 through 188n);

(9) Sections 4701 through 4776 of title 26, United States Code;

(10) Sections 7237 and 7238 of title 26, United States Code;

(11) Section 7491 of title 26, United States Code;

(12) Sections 1 through 3 of the Act of August 11, 1955 (title 21, sections 198a through c);

(13) Section 15 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (title 48, section 1421m);

(14) Section 1 of the Act of July 18, 1956, as amended (title 21, section 184a);

(15) Act of April 22, 1960 (title 21, sections 501 through 517);

(16) Section 3 of the Act of July 15, 1965, as amended (title 21, sections 321(v), 360a);

(17) Section 5 of the Act of July 15, 1965, as amended (title 21, section 331(q));

(18) Sections 2901 through 2906 of title 28, United States Code;

(19) Sections 4251 through 4255 of title 18, United States Code;

(20) Sections 301 through 316 of the Act of Nov. 8, 1966 (title 42, sections 3401 through 3426);

(21) Sections 401 and 402 of the Act of Nov. 8, 1966 (title 42, sections 3441 and 3442);

(22) Section 502 of the Act of Nov. 8, 1966, 80 Stat. 1449;

(23) Section 603 of the Act of Nov. 8, 1966, 80 Stat. 1449;

(24) Sections 1401 through 1407 of title 18, United States Code;

(25) Section 3616 of title 18, United States Code.

(b) However, no rights and duties which matured, penalties which were incurred and proceedings which were begun before the effective date of this Act shall be prejudiced because of the repeal of the above Acts.

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

Sec. 907. (1) Section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out "the Bureau of Narcotics" and inserting "the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs".

(2) Section 1952 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by—

(1) inserting in subsection (b)(1) the words "dangerous drugs," immediately following the word "narcotics".

(2) striking subsection (c) and substituting the following new section:

"(c) Investigation of violations under this Section involving liquor shall be conducted under the supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury. Investigation of violations under sections involving narcotics and dangerous drugs shall be conducted under the supervision of the Attorney General."

(3) Section 4251(a) of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the words "section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended," and substituting "the Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969".

(4) Section 584 of the Act of June 17, 1930, as amended (title 19, section 1584), is amended by striking out the last sentence of the second paragraph and substituting the following new sentence: "The words opiate and marihuana as used in this paragraph shall have the same meaning as defined in the Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969."

(5) Section (a) of section 7 of the Act of July 15, 1965 (title 21, section 333), is amended by deleting all words and marks beginning with *"Provided, however . . ."* after the word "fine" and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(6) Section 6(a) of the Act of July 15, 1965 (title 21, section 334(a), is amended by striking out subsections 2(A), and 2(D) and the words "of such a depressant or stimulant drug or" in subsection 2(C) and relettering (B), (C), and (E) as (A), (B), and (C).

(7) Section 6(b) of the Act of July 15, 1965 (title 21, section 334(d)(3)(iii), is amended by striking out in subsection (3) (iii) the words "depressant or stimulant drugs or".

(8) Section 4 of the Act of July 15, 1965 (title 21, section 360), is amended by striking out subsections (a)(2), (b), (c), (d) and renumbering subsection (a)(3), (a)(4), (a)(5), (a)(6), and (a)(7) as (a)((2), (a), 3), (a)(4), (a)(5), and (a)(6).

(9) Section 8 of the Act of July 15, 1965, (title 21, section 372(e)), is amended by striking out the words "to depressant or stimulant drugs or".

(10) Section 801(a) of the Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, (Title 21, section 381(a)) is amended by striking out the words "section 173 of this title" and substituting "the Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969."

(11) Section 4901(a) of title 26, United States Code, is amended by deleting the words "4721 (narcotic drugs), or 4751 (marihuana)" and by inserting the word "or" before the number "4461".

(12) Section 4905(b) of title 26, United States Code, is amended by deleting the words "narcotics, marihuana," and "4722, 4753".

(13) Section 6808 of title 26, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (8) and renumbering subsections (9), (10), (11), (12), and (13), as (8), (9), (10), (11), and (12).

(14) Section 7012 of title 26, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsections (a) and (b) and renumbering (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h, (i), and (j) as (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h).

(15) Section 7103 of title 26, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (d)(3)(D) and renumbering (E) and (F) as (D) and (E).

(16) Section 7326 of title 26, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (b) and relettering (c) as (b).

(17) Section 7607 of title 26, United States Code, is amended by deleting all words prior to the word "officers" and by capitalizing the word "officer"; and by deleting in subsection (2) the words "section 4731" and "section 4761" and inserting in subsection (2) in lieu thereof the words "Omnibus Narcotic and

Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969."

(18) Section 7651 of title 26, United States Code, is amended by deleting the words "except as otherwise provided in this subchapter and in sections 4705(b), 4735, and 4762 (relating to taxes on narcotic drugs and marihuana),".

(19) Section 7655 of title 26, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsections and (4).

(20) Section 7609 of title 26, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsections (a)(3) and (a)(4) and renumbering (5) and (6) as (3) and (4).

(21) Section 7641 and title 26, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "opium suitable for smoking purposes,".

(22) Section 2901(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended," and substituting "the Omnibus Naroctic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969".

(23) Section 3 of the Act of August 7, 1939, (title 31, section 529d), is amended by striking out the words "or the Commissioner of Narcotics, as the case may be,".

(24) Section 4 of the Act of August 7, 1939, (title 31, section 529e) is amended by striking out the words "or narcotics" and "or narcotic".

(25) Section 5 of the Act of August 7, 1939, (title 31, section 529f) is amended by striking out the words "or narcotics".

(26) Section 308(c)(2) of the Act of August 27, 1935 (title 40, section 304(m)) is amended by striking out the words "as defined in section 171 of title 21," and substituting "Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969".

(27) Section 302(a) of the Act of July 1, 1944 (title 42, section 242(a)) as amended by striking out the words "Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act" and substituting "Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969".

(28) Section 301(a) of the Act of November 8, 1966 (title 42, section 3411) is amended by striking out the words "section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954" and substituting "the Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969".

(29) Section 1(a) of the Act of July 15, 1954 (title 46, section 239a) is amended by striking out the words "paragraph (a) of the first section of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended, 21 U.S.C., section 171(a))" and substituting "the Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969"; and by striking out the words "section 3238(b) of the Internal Revenue Code" and substituting "the Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969".

(30) Section 7(d) of the Act of August 9, 1939 (title 49, section 787) is amended by striking out the words "Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, the internal revenue laws or any amendments thereof, or the regulations issued thereunder"; and substituting "Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969"; and striking out the words "Marihuana Tax Act of 1937 or the regulations issued thereunder" and substituting "Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969".

U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDEAST

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Big Four conference on the Middle East, now in progress in New York, constitutes a very serious threat to the vital interests of America's only ally in that area, the State of Israel. I rise today to call upon the President and the Secretary of State of the United States to resist proposed "compromises" that would serve only to compromise Israel's vital interests, and with them our own.

Two of the participants in the present conference, France and the Soviet Union, are openly hostile to Israel and have repeatedly demanded that it submit itself to a return of the intolerable conditions that existed prior to the 6-day war of 1967. A third participant, Great Britain, appears eager to achieve "peace at any price" in the Middle East—but the price would have to be paid by Israel. Only the United States among the Big Four can prevent the kind of sellout that the Government and people of Israel so justifiably fear will be the bitter fruits of current negotiations. And sellout there will be if President Nixon and Secretary Rogers permit the traditional pro-Arab interests in the State Department to seize the initiative in New York.

Let us be very clear about the basic facts of the situation. First of all, as I have already stated, Israel is America's only ally in the Middle East. The Arab States are either open clients of the Soviet Union—as they were of Nazi Germany during World War II—or else they are available as clients to the highest bidder. Israel alone is fully a democracy, fully committed to the ideals of Western civilization, and unwilling to sell its birthright for a mess of armaments and oil contracts.

Second, Mr. President, Israel is the one ally we have outside Western Europe that can stand on its own feet economically and militarily in the face of threats from its own neighbors. That is an immensely sobering fact when we consider the price we have paid for such other allies as South Korea and South Vietnam. For us now to join its enemies in forcing Israel into a position where it would no longer be able to defend itself against a renewed onslaught by Soviet-armed Arab forces, would be a blunder of colossal proportions. It would be a Munich all over again. And we, like the British and French of three decades ago, would find ourselves faced with the impossible choice of either allowing a faithful ally to be overwhelmed by an aggressor or having to commit our own blood and treasure to the defense of what we ourselves had rendered indefensible.

The third basic fact we must confront is that America's own vital interests are at stake today in the Middle East. The destruction of Israel—the professed goal of the Arab States for the past 22 years—would be a disaster for America second only to the collapse of Western Europe.

To understand this fully, we need first to recognize just how dangerous the present situation really is—how close that tormented region is to a renewal of full-scale fighting. I do not say, "how close to being at war," for, of course, the Middle East is at war. Arab terrorists declared war on Israel over a year ago, and have had time and money to turn 10,000 irregulars, in four terrorist organizations, into a fighting force which actually does make war on Israel. They have bases in Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon, they openly proclaim their deeds—even to the point of falsely but monstrously claiming credit for the death of Israel's late, great Premier Levi Eshkol—and ceaselessly proclaim their intent "to dismember Israel as a state."

I repeat, Mr. President, they want "to dismember Israel as a state." Those are the words of the man who calls himself Abu Amar, the leader of the terrorist group, Al Fatah. He spoke them in an interview with the official Cairo newspaper El Ahram, and went on to say that Israel has a "racial character" which is "Fascist" and "must be removed."

To be sure, far more savage threats have been hurled against Israel over the years, not alone by terrorists but by the heads of Arab States. But what lends special menace to the words of terrorists is that, unlike the legitimate and politically responsible leaders of nations, such as President Nasser and King Hussein, who can never ignore the military realities that confront them, terrorist leaders can indulge in virtually any act of provocation so long as it promises at least a propaganda payoff. So, for example, when the terrorist attack on an Israeli commercial airliner in Athens was answered by a surgically clean Israel retaliatory raid against the home base of the attackers, the United Nations promptly, and hypocritically, condemned Israel, to the general applause of that portion of world public opinion which is notable more for its sanctimony than for its logic. And a subsequent terrorist attack on an Israel plane in Switzerland met with no response at all, either from the United Nations, which prefers to look the other way in such cases, or by Israel itself, which was under enormous pressure from Washington and London to "show restraint."

The point I wish to make is that while Arab government leaders can be expected to be effectively deterred from attacking Israel so long as Israel maintains its present military superiority, terrorist organizations operate under no such calculable constraints. They are free to perpetrate outrage after outrage with fear of no greater penalty than the possible loss of a few lives—a loss which, in their view, is amply repaid by the propaganda triumph it invariably brings.

But how long, Mr. President, can we expect Israel—or any other state—to tolerate the intolerable? How long can we expect this brave and vigorous nation to submit to having war waged against it and refrain from striking back in the only way that can bring the conflict to a successful and definitive conclusion? Arab governments are either unwilling or unable to halt terrorist activities within their own borders. I suspect it is more a case of inability than of unwillingness, but even if true, that is cold comfort to the beleaguered people of Israel. Sooner or later they are going to have to strike down terrorism at its source—within the protective confines of Arab State borders. And thus full-scale fighting will once again engulf the whole unhappy region.

Adding still greater menace to the situation is President Nasser's recent threat to employ regular military forces in attacks on Israel by way of retaliation for Israel's retaliatory and preemptive strikes against terrorist bases in Arab States. It takes little foresight to recognize that such an act on Nasser's part would provoke an immediate resumption of hostilities, with little or no prospect that either side would be willing to settle for yet another thoroughly unsatisfactory armistice. The world would then be faced with the grim consequences of either of two outcomes: total Israel victory over and occupation of most of its neighbors—a result absolutely unacceptable to the Soviet Union—or total Arab victory over Israel—a result equally unacceptable to the United States.

This brings me, Mr. President, to the central point I want to make on this whole matter. It is that the Arab-Israel conflict has ramifications extending far beyond the borders of the Middle East. It involves the vital interests of the Soviet Union as well as those of the United States, and therefore, quite literally, the peace of the world.

Throughout its modern history, Russia has striven to achieve a position of power and influence in the eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East generally. Given its geographical position and given the economic and military stakes involved, this was not an unreasonable ambition. At least it would be difficult to make the case that Britain, France, Germany, and now the United States have some sort of "natural rights" in that area that Russia did not or does not have. But Russian claims were successfully resisted throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries, and it was not until very recent years—barely a decade ago—that the Soviet Union finally established itself unchallengeably as a Middle East power. And that is the reality we must now confront, like it or not. Not only is the Soviet Union firmly entrenched economically, politically, and militarily in the area; it has chosen to tie its prestige and position to the fate of the Arab States. As a result, any definitive Arab defeat by Israel would inescapably entail a setback of historic dimensions to Soviet policy and position in this strategically crucial region. It would be foolhardy of us to suppose that the Russians would accept any such disaster in their own backyard.

How then are American vital interests involved in the Middle East? Let us put to one side—though without forgetting—the profound moral commitment we have to the State of Israel and to its 2½ million Jewish citizens who would face extermination or slavery in the event of a conclusive Arab victory. Let us instead, Mr. President, consider only the direct material consequences to the United States of the destruction of Israel.

Hardeyed realists among us like to point out that, in the words of one editorialist:

> The Arabs have nine times the Israeli gross national product, and represent an incalculably greater amount of U.S. investment potential as well as actual.

Others are tireless in their reminders to us that, as another commentator remarked:

> Economically and commercially, the Arab world is very important to the United States and vital to all of Europe.

And so it is. Not even the stanchest friends of Israel have ever denied it. But contrary to what Marxist theoreticians and certain American bankers and editorialists appear to believe, a great nation's foreign policy must take into account more than the monetary value of its investments in a given area. Especially is this true when the competitors for influence in the area, as well as the inhabitants themselves, regard economic relations as strictly secondary to other values—military security, for example, or national independence.

This is precisely the case, Mr. President, in the Middle East today, where the Soviet Union has shown itself determined to achieve not only influence but dominance, and willing to pay almost any price for it short of nuclear war. To this we must add the fact that most Arab States have demonstrated time and again a willingness to subordinate economics to ideology. Were this not the case, peace in the area would long since have been achieved, and Arabs and Israelis would today be working together in one of mankind's most fruitful partnerships. The very fact that, for more than two decades, Arab leaders have been willing to sacrifice orderly economic growth to military adventurism in their lust to destroy Israel should make even the most shortsighted among us dubious about the value and security of American investments in those nations.

This much is certain: if the Arab States, bearing Soviet arms and operating under Soviet auspices, should succeed in destroying Israel, Western influence in the Middle East will be at an end. We will have lost, as I said at the outset, the one and only dependable ally we have there—dependable not only in the sense of its commitment to the same political and spiritual ideals, but in the sense as well that it has the one thoroughly stable government and the one first-class army in the whole region. The result would be a Soviet fiefdom—a Middle East in which no Western-oriented counterbalance would exist to inhibit the deployment of Soviet military and economic power throughout the area from Algeria to Iraq. How long, in those circumstances, could we realistically expect Iran and Turkey to remain outside the Russian orbit? What possible incentive could they have for resisting the immense weight of Soviet influence that would then be brought to bear?

Plainly put, Israel is the linchpin of America's position in the Middle East. And that is why it is imperative that our negotiators at the Big Four conference in New York must resist any proposed "compromise" along the lines made so tiresomely familiar by Soviet and Arab spokesmen in the United Nations. We must not attempt to force Israel to surrender the substance of military security for the shadow of vague big power "guarantees."

In the final analysis, Mr. President, peace will come to the Middle East when, and only when, the direct parties to the conflict sit down together and together resolve their differences. This, in turn, will come when, and only when, the Arab States are prepared to concede the most elementary point in international relations: Israel's right to exist. And that, finally, will come when, and only when, Israel's own strength and America's firmness of purpose make it finally and unequivocally clear that Israel is not going to be overwhelmed by the weight of Arab numbers and Soviet arms.

That, Mr. President, should be the message that is heard loud and clear when the Big Four meeting is over. That is the message that will bring lasting peace to the Middle East.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President (Mr. SCHWEIKER in the chair), will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. May I interrupt the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana at this time to state that he has delivered a magnificent address, a very important address, one which should appeal to all Americans. I desire to associate myself with every statement that the Senator from Indiana has made.

We Americans have reason to be proud that we helped create the State of Israel. We are proud of Israel and the achievements of this great, brave people.

The Senator has rendered a real and needful public service in the Senate today, by speaking out boldly, as he has, in support of the State of Israel.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio. To have his endorsement is to have the endorsement of one of the most fearless, hard-working, and perceptive minds in the Senate, and I treasure his comments.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the Senator from my neighbor State for his comments. I desire to associate myself with every statement he has made today.

THE PROPOSED COMMUTER TAX IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Washington City Council has proposed a payroll tax on the earnings of Virginia and Maryland residents who work in the District of Columbia. This is the second time in little over a year that this "commuter tax," as it is called, has been recommended by the Council.

Such a commuter tax would be unjust. I opposed the tax when it was recommended in December of 1967. I shall oppose it again.

The citizens of Virginia and Maryland who work in Washington, like all other American taxpayers, help support the city through general Federal taxation.

The current Federal budget carries the figure of $173 million as the outlay from Federal taxes which will be given to the District of Columbia government. Indeed, payments probably will greatly exceed this figure.

Advocates say many other cities levy a commuter tax; but they do not point out that other cities do not receive the Federal subsidy that the District of Columbia does. The money for this large subsidy comes from the pockets of all the taxpayers of the United States.

Besides paying their share of District expenses through general Federal taxes, residents of Virginia and Maryland who work in Washington pay sales taxes when they make purchases in the city.

The level of the proposed commuter tax—one-fourth of 1 percent of earnings—may seem low, but I feel that once established in principle, the tax would rise rapidly in amount.

As a matter of fact, even before the tax proposal has come before Congress, the Washington City Council is talking about raising the level to 1 percent.

This proposed tax on Virginians and Marylanders should be rejected.

S. 1897—INTRODUCTION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I introduced today, for myself and the Senator from New York (Mr. Javits) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Prouty), a higher education bill of rights. This measure would strengthen and expand Federal programs of financial assistance to low-income students, insuring an equal opportunity for all Americans to pursue a high-quality postsecondary education. It would also strengthen colleges and universities through cost-of-education allowances and other supplementary funds.

In 1967, the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of education created a 15-member commission on higher education. Chaired by a distinguished educator, Clark Kerr, the commission's mandate was to examine and make recommendations regarding the vital issues of higher education which we face today and for the future. In December 1968, the commission published a report entitled "Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education." The report discusses the commission's findings to date with regard to the needs of higher education, and it recommends specific Federal action necessary to meet these needs.

The bill which I introduce today incorporates the major recommendations of the commission. While I do not necessarily endorse all of the specifics, I feel that their stress on greater Federal effort in education, and their basic suggestions on new directions which this effort should take, are sound and constructive. The report and the resulting legislation provide the basis for a full review of our Federal higher education programs. Congressmen Ogden Reid and John Brademas have introduced quite similar legislation, based on the Carnegie Commission report in the House of Representatives, and I am hopeful that both the Senate and the House will move ahead to consider these and other ideas. I plan to continue to work on issues in the field of higher education, and perhaps to submit further legislation at a later time.

The urgency is clear. Today's enrollment in higher education of 6 million students will rise to 8 million by 1976, or 9 million if the necessary programs to remove financial barriers for low-income students are carried out. And the imbalance at present is shocking: almost half of the undergraduate students in the United States come from the Nation's highest family quartile, while only 7 percent come from the lowest income quartile.

As we look to the future, and especially when our heavy expenditures in Vietnam are reduced, our priorities must include a massive commitment to education at all levels—compensatory and higher. I support and will strongly work for such a commitment.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to commend Dr. Kerr and the members of his commission—including two distinguished educators from my own State of Massachusetts, Dr. Nathan M. Pusey, president of Harvard University, and Dr. David Riesman, professor of social sciences at Harvard—for the impressive work they are doing in pointing the way to meet tomorrow's needs. It has been a pleasure for me to work with Dr. Kerr on this bill, and I look forward to the commission's further ideas and findings in this vital area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a brief summary of the bill, the report of the Carnegie Commission, and a copy of the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, summary of the bill, and report will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1897) to remove financial barriers so that all individuals will have equal opportunity for a postsecondary education of good quality, to strengthen institutions of higher education, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Kennedy (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1897

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Higher Education Bill of Rights."

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Sec. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to assist in making it financially possible for qualified individuals from all socioeconomic backgrounds to receive the benefits of higher education and to assist institutions of higher education in assuring that quality higher education is available throughout the entire Nation.

AMENDMENTS TO EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM

Sec. 3. Effective after June 30, 1970, part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out sections 401 through 407 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"Sec. 401. (a) It is the purpose of this part to provide educational opportunity grants to assist in making available the benefits of higher education to qualified individuals who need financial assistance to obtain such benefits.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $900,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $1,100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $1,300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; $1,400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; students who receive educational opportunity grants under this part.

"AMOUNT OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT

"Sec. 402. (a) From the funds available to carry out this part for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall make payments through institutions of higher education to students who receive educational opportunity grants under this part for each academic year during which the grant recipient is in need of financial aid to pursue a course of study at an institution of higher education, in an amount which shall not exceed $1,000, in the case of full-time students or such lesser amount in the case of part-time students, as the Commissioner shall by regulation determine.

"(b) The Commissioner shall prescribe basic criteria and schedules for determining the eligibility of applicants for educational opportunity grants and for determining the amount which each such grant recipient shall be entitled to receive each year for the duration of the grant, subject to annual redetermination where circumstances change. In prescribing such basic criteria and schedules, the Commissioner shall take into account the objective of making aid under this part available to students whose family incomes do not exceed the level below which are the incomes of three-fifths of the families in the population of the United States, and such other factors as he may deem relevant, including the number and ages of dependents in the student's family, the number of such dependents attending an institution of higher education at the same time, total family income over the past several years and total family assets. Priority shall be given to undergraduate students, but the program shall also be available to graduate and professional students. No payment shall be made under this part to a student otherwise eligible to receive payments pursuant to an educational opportunity grant unless the amount of the payment for that academic year, as determined in accordance with this section, would be at least $200.

"ELIGIBILITY FOR AND DURATION OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

"Sec. 403. (a) An individual shall not be eligible to receive an educational opportunity grant under this part and shall not continue to be entitled to receive payments thereunder this part unless—

"(1) that individual has been accepted for enrollment as a student at an institution of higher education or in the case of a student already attending an institution of higher education, is in good standing there, as an undergraduate student or as a graduate or professional student; and

"(2) such student is carrying at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution.

An individual shall not be eligible to continue to receive payments under this part if the Commissioner determines that the recipient no longer shows evidence of academic or creative promise and capability of maintaining good standing in his course of study, or that he no longer is of exceptional financial need.

"(b) The duration of an educational opportunity grant under this part shall be the period required for completion by the recipient of his undergraduate course of study and two years of graduate or professional study, except that such period shall not exceed six academic years less any period with respect to which the recipient has previously received payments under this part pursuant to a prior educational opportunity grant.

"APPLICATION FOR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

"Sec. 404. (a) Application for a grant under this part shall be made at such time and in such manner, and shall contain or be supported by such information, as may be pre scribed by the Commissioner.

"(b) (1) The Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with one or more public or private nonprofit agencies to carry out functions or make determinations on his behalf, prescribed in this part, and to carry out such other functions as he may deem appropriate, related to the determination of eligibility of individuals for educational opportunity grants and the amounts of payments to them. The Commissioner shall reserve the right to review, upon his own initiative or that of any interested party, any finding, determination, or other action by such agency. Each such agreement shall provide for such fiscal control and fund-accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for funds paid to the agency under paragraph (2), and for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this part.

"(2) The Commissioner is authorized to pay each agency with which he has entered into an agreement under paragraph (1) such amounts as the Commissioner determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient execution by such agency of its functions under this part. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make such payments.

"(c) The Commissioner shall notify both the applicant and the institution of higher education in which he is enrolled, or has been accepted for enrollment, of the award of the educational opportunity grant and the amount thereof for each year. The Commissioner shall utilize the services of institutions of higher education for paying to students attending them the amounts to which they are entitled.

"SUPPLEMENTARY MATCHING GRANTS TO EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT RECIPIENTS

"SEC. 405. In addition to payments which educational opportunity grant recipients are entitled to receive in accordance with the preceding sections of this part for any year, the Commissioner is authorized to make a supplementary grant equal to the total amount of grant assistance made available to such recipient from non-Federal sources for study at an institution of higher education; but the amount of such supplementary grant may not exceed one-half of the total grant assistance available to the student under this part (not including this section or section 406). For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $110,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $140,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $230,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and $280,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

"FEDERAL GRANTS FOR INSTITUTIONAL SCHOLARSHIP FUNDS

"SEC. 406. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make annual payments to institutions of higher education (other than proprietary institutions of higher education) in amounts equal to 10 per centum of the sum of all payments for that year pursuant to educational opportunity grants (not including supplementary grants) to students who are pursuing their courses of study at each such institution. Such payments shall be used by the institution for making scholarship grants to students whom the institution finds to be in financial need thereof (whether or not such student receives aid under other provisions of this part.)

"(b) An institution of higher education which desires to obtain funds under this section shall enter into an agreement with the Commissioner. Such agreement shall—

(1) provide that the institution, in cooperation with other institutions of higher education where appropriate, will make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youths of exceptional financial need and to encourage them to continue their education beyond secondary school through programs and activities such as—

(A) establishing or strengthening close working relationships with secondary school principals and guidance and counseling personnel with a view toward motivating students to complete secondary school and pursue post-secondary-school educational opportunities, and

(B) making, to the extent feasible, conditional commitments for scholarship grants to qualified secondary school students with special emphasis on students enrolled in grade 11 or lower grades who show evidences of academic or creative promise;

(2) provide assurance that the institution will continue to spend in its own scholarship and student-aid program, from sources other than funds received under this part, not less than the average expenditure per year made for that purpose during the most recent period of three fiscal years preceding the effective date of the agreement;

(3) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this part.

(c) For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $110,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $130,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and $140,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

COST OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

SEC. 4. (a) Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is further amended by redesignating parts E and F as parts F and G, respectively, and by inserting after part D the following new part:

"PART E.—COST-OF-EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTS TO INSTITUTIONS

"PURPOSE OF SUPPLEMENTS

"SEC. 455. The Commissioner shall pay to each institution of higher education (except a proprietary institution of higher education) at which an educational opportunity grant recipient under part A is enrolled a cost-of-education supplement that may be used for the general operating expenses of the institution, including the increased instructional costs of meeting the special educational needs of increased numbers of disadvantaged students attending the institution.

"AMOUNT OF SUPPLEMENT

"SEC. 456. (a) For each undergraduate student recipient of an educational opportunity grant under part A, the Commissioner shall pay to the institution at which each such student is enrolled an amount for each academic year equal to the sum of—

"(1) $200, and

"(2) 60 per centum of the amount of the educational opportunity grant for that year in excess of $200, except that, for each of the fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1972, the amount of the payment attributable to this clause shall be calculated at the rate of 50 per centum of the amount of the educational opportunity grant for that year in excess of $200.

"(b) For each graduate or professional student recipient of an educational opportunity grant under part A, the Commissioner shall pay to the institution at which each student is enrolled such amounts as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 457. For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $1,130,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $1,280,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $1,530,000.000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $1,940,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and $2,170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975."

(b)(1) Part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is further amended by redesignating sections 408 and 409 and referrals thereto as sections 407 and 408, respectively.

(2) Section 408, as redesignated by this subsection, is amended to read as follows:

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 408. As used in this part—

"(1) the term 'academic year' means an academic year or its equivalent as defined in regulations of the Commissioner;

"(2) the term 'institution of higher education' means an institution of higher education as defined in section 1201 (a) of this Act and includes a propietory institution of higher education as defined in section 461 (b) of this Act."

(3) Section 461(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "Part C" and inserting in lieu thereof "parts A and C".

AMENDMENT TO WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

SEC. 5. Section 441(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "$285,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$510,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $540,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $620.000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and $775,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975."

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE IV OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

SEC. 6. (a) The first sentence of section 402 (a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows: "The Commissioner is authorized to award fourteen thousand fellowships during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; fifteen thousand fellowships during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; sixteen thousand fellowships during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; eighteen thousand fellowships during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and twenty thousand fellowships during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, to be used for study in graduate programs at institutions of higher education."

(b) The last sentence of section 402(a)(2) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or for a period of study and research (including preparation of a doctoral thesis) not to exceed two such years".

(c) The first sentence of section 403(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "Of the total number of fellowships awarded during any fiscal year, (1) half shall be awarded to individuals accepted for study in graduate programs approved by the Commissioner under this section, and (2) half shall be awarded on the basis of national competition, based on such criteria as the Commissioner may prescribe. (The Commissioner may enter into agreements with public or private nonprofit agencies to assist in conducting such national competition.)"

(d) Section 403(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In approving such programs, the Commissioner shall give special consideration to expanding opportunities for graduate study in the humanities and social sciences."

(e) Section 403(c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Recipients of fellowships under this title shall be persons who are pursuing, or intend to pursue, a course of study leading to a degree of doctor of philosophy or an equivalent degree."

(f) The amendments of this section shall take effect after June 30, 1970.

AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT

Sec. 7. (a) Effective after June 30, 1970, the second sentence of section 303(c) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows: "For the purpose of making loans under this title, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $530,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $690,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; $830,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $880,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and $890,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975:

(b) Section 306(c)(2) of such Act (relating to annual interest grants to reduce the cost of borrowing for the construction of academic facilities) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and by annual increments of $30,000,000 for each of the next four fiscal years.".

AMENDMENTS TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

Sec. 8. The Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by

(1) redesignating title XII as title XIV, and sections 1201 through 1206, and references thereto, as sections 1401 through 1406, respectively, and

(2) inserting after title XI the following new titles:

"TITLE XII—START-UP GRANTS FOR PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND URBAN INSTITUTIONS

"GRANTS AUTHORIZED

"Sec. 1201. The Commissioner is authorized to make grants, after consultation with the appropriate State commissions for higher education, to new public community colleges, public technical institutes, and other institutions of higher education (especially institutions which are located in or serve urban areas), for the purpose of assisting in meeting planning and other nonconstruction costs associated with the establishment of such institutions (including but not limited to land acquisition, site clearance, and designs for renovation of facilities).

"CRITERIA FOR MAKING GRANTS

"Sec. 1202. The Commissioner shall prescribe such criteria as he may deem appropriate, after consulting with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, concerning those institutions and activities which shall qualify for assistance under this title, taking into account the high initial cost of establishing two- and four-year institutions as an integral part of the urban community whose residents they will serve. Grants under this title may not exceed a Federal share equal to 50 per centum of the costs approved in accordance with the criteria prescribed under this section and in no case may a grant to a single institution exceed $10,000,000.

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"Sec. 1203. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each of the next two fiscal years, and $75,000,000 for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975.

"TITLE XIII—IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING AND CURRICULUMS

"PROJECT GRANTS

"Sec. 1301. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education to pay part of the cost of planning, developing, or carrying out projects or activities designed to strengthen and improve the quality of undergraduate teaching and curriculums.

"(b) Such grants may be used for the support of experimental, innovative, or interdisciplinary projects or activities such as—

"(1) the strengthening or expansion of undergraduate faculties, improving their academic or professional qualifications, or increasing the number of disciplines in which they are skilled;

"(2) the expansion or improvement of existing undergraduate programs, or the establishment of additional undergraduate programs;

"(3) the acquisition of appropriate equipment or curricular, research, or other materials required to fulfill the objectives of projects or activities meeting the purpose of this title;

"(4) the development or carrying out of cooperative arrangements among institutions in furtherance of the purposes of this title; or

"(5) the strengthening of administration of the institution.

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"Sec. 1302. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each of the next six fiscal years."

SUSTAINING GRANTS TO SUPPLEMENT RESEARCH FUNDS

Sec. 9. The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education in amounts equal to 10 per centum of the total amount of funds received from the Federal Government by each such institution through grants and contracts for research. These grants may be used for supporting additional research which the institutions deems to be significant as well as for any other project or activity, including teaching, selected by the institution as deserving of support. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out this section.

STUDY OF EXPANDED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS

Sec. 10. (a) The Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, acting jointly, shall conduct a thorough study of the most expeditious means of financing higher education in the United States. Such study shall particularly include a thorough exploration of the following:

(1) various means by which a loan fund may be established to assist students to defray the expenses of higher education;

(2) the feasibility of repayment by students of such funds through the device of an increase in Federal income tax rates during their more productive years;

(3) specific recommendations for the establishment and conduct of a pilot project for a self-sustaining national student loan bank providing for mutualization of risk.

In making such study, the committees shall consider such factors as:

(1) the cost effectiveness of alternative plans;

(2) the immediate and the longrun economic impact of alternative plans;

(3) financial and social implications to individual students participating under alternative plans;

(4) institutional implications for post-secondary education or training facilities under alternative plans;

(5) the impact of alternative plans upon tuition and fees; and

(6) the appropriate role of agencies within the Federal Government in carrying out alternative plans.

Sec. 2. (a) In making the study under this resolution, the committees shall hold such public hearings as they deem necessary.

(b) Each meeting of the committees under this resolution, whether for the purpose of holding public hearings or otherwise, shall be held alternatively under the chairmanship of the chairman of the Committee on Finance and the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare or their designee.

Sec. 3. The committees shall report the results of the study under this resolution, together with their recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

STUDY OF CONSOLIDATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 11. The Commissioner shall, not later than January 31, 1971, submit a report to the President and to the Congress making such recommendations as he shall deem appropriate concerning the desirability of legislation consolidating various categorical programs of support for higher education into broader programs of institutional support for higher education which would provide greater flexibility to such institutions to meet their most critical needs.

The material presented by Mr. Kennedy, is as follows:

Summary of "Higher Education Bill of Rights"

1. *Educational Opportunity Grants:* The Education Opportunity Grant Program under the Higher Education Act would be expanded to provide assistance to "qualified individuals who need financial assistance to obtain" the benefits of higher education. The number of participants in the program would be increased several times over, with federal scholarships available to students from families whose income is in the lower three-fifths of the family income range. The program would be extended to graduate students. Applications and grants would be processed by the Commissioner of Education, rather than by particular colleges.

2. *Institutional Scholarship Funds:* Institutions of higher education would receive funds—equal to ten percent of the total sum of educational opportunity grants held by students at each institution—to be used by the institutions for scholarships to any students in need.

3. *Supplementary Matching Grants:* Recipients of Educational Opportunity Grants would receive additional matching grants, not to exceed one-half the amount of the original EOG, for funds received from non-federal sources.

4. *Work-Study Program:* The Work-Study Program is increased so that three and one-half times the present number of students can participate.

5. *Cost of Education Supplements:* Institutions of higher education would receive supplementary unrestricted funds as a function of the number and amount of Educational Opportunity Grants held by students at each institution.

6. *Graduate Fellowship Program:* The number of National Educational Defense Act Fellowships is increased from 7,500 to 14,000 in fiscal 1971 up to 20,000 in fiscal 1975. Half of the Fellowships would be awarded by national competition, and half by universities with deserving graduate programs.

7. *Academic Construction:* Authorizations for academic loans are increased from the present $400,000,000 to $530,000,000 in fiscal 1971 up to $890,000,000 in fiscal 1975.

8. *Start-up Grants:* A new program of start-up grants for new public community colleges and other institutions of higher education located in or serving urban areas is established. Grants up to $10,000,000, not to exceed 50 percent of the planning and construction of these new institutions, are authorized.

9. *Teaching and Curriculum Development:* A new project-grant program is authorized to assist institutions of higher education in planning, developing, and carrying out ac-

tivities to strengthen the quality of undergraduate teaching and curriculums.

10. *Unrestricted Research Funds:* Institutions would receive funds for unrestricted research for teaching purposes in an amount equal to ten percent of the total federal research grants at each institution.

11. *National Student Loan Bank:* The Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are directed to study various new loan programs for students, and in particular the feasibility of a self-sustaining national student loan bank with repayments tied to income tax payments after graduation.

12. *Consolidation of Higher Education Programs:* The Commissioner of Education is directed to study and make recommendations to Congress on ways to consolidate higher education programs.

QUALITY AND EQUALITY: NEW LEVELS OF FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

FOREWORD

In early 1967 the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching created a 15-member Commission on Higher Education to examine and make recommendations regarding the many vital issues facing higher education in the United States as we approach the year 2000. The Carnegie Foundation made clear to the Commission that it was not being asked to speak *for* higher education but rather *about* higher education and its needs and contributions in relation to the nation's social concerns and purposes.

The Commission then mapped out these major areas of higher education for study and investigation: structure, function, and governance; innovation and change; demand, resources, and expenditures; and efficiency in the use of resources. Research projects have already been initiated in several of these areas, and studies being conducted elsewhere are under review. The Commission will issue a final report containing its findings and recommendations at the conclusion of its activities several years from now.

Because of the urgency of some problems in the sphere of higher education and the need for early action, the Commission has decided to issue special reports on such topics as soon as data are available to indicate desirable short-run measures and the Commission has had the opportunity to clarify its views and to develop specific recommendations.

This Report, *Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education*, is the first in the series. The Commission hopes that it will prove useful and persuasive to those members of the 1969 Congress of the United States and of the executive branch who have key responsibilities in the area of higher education.

The recommendations in this Report are supported by all the present members of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Although individual members differed occasionally on details and wording, there was surprising unanimity on the need for, and the general levels of, federal aid and on the broad directions of implementation.

It should be pointed out that Mr. Roy E. Larsen, Chairman of the Executive Committee of Time, Inc., and an original member of the Commission, found it necessary to resign in mid-1968 because of the pressure of other commitments. We wish to record here our deep appreciation of his valuable contributions to the early planning sessions of the Commission and to our initial considerations of the topic of federal aid to higher education.

We wish also to express our gratitude for the many helpful suggestions of those consulted during the development of our proposals.

Finally, we wish to thank the members of our staff, and particularly Miss Virginia Smith, for their assistance in the preparation of this Report.

Ralph M. Besse, Chairman of the Board, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company.

Joseph P. Cosand, President, The Junior College District of St. Louis.

William Friday, President, University of North Carolina.

David D. Henry, President, University of Illinois.

Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., President, University of Notre Dame.

Carl Kaysen, Director, Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton.

Katharine E. McBride, President, Bryn Mawr College.

James A. Perkins, President, Cornell University.

Clifton W. Phalen, Chairman of the Executive Committee, Marine Midland Banks.

Nathan M. Pusey, President, Harvard University.

David Riesman, Professor of Social Sciences, Harvard University.

The Honorable William W. Scranton.

Norton Simon, Hunt Food and Industries, Inc.

Clark Kerr, Chairman.

1. THE NATION'S NEEDS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

From the beginnings of the Republic, education at various levels has played a vital role in the building of a strong democratic society. At earlier stages in the nation's development, this role was chiefly the responsibility of the primary and secondary institutions. Now, as education through high school has become almost universal, as knowledge has increased, as the professional and intellectual demands of modern society have become ever more complex and exacting, the responsibility has shifted increasingly to America's colleges and universities.

Today, the nation looks to our institutions of higher learning to meet many of our most important needs:

More and more Americans, with aspirations for a better life, assume the necessity of a college education.

Equality of opportunity through education, including higher education, is beginning to appear as a realistic goal for the less privileged young members of our society.

The economy is dependent upon basic research and advancing technology, and upon the higher skills needed to make that technology effective, to assure national economic growth and well-being.

More managers, teachers, and professionals of all sorts are required to serve our complex society. More health personnel are essential to staff the fastest-growing segment of the national endeavor.

The cultural contributions of higher education take on wider dimensions as rising levels of education and growing affluence and leisure make possible greater concern with the quality of life in the United States.

Above all, the nation and the world depend crucially upon rigorous and creative ideas for the solution to profoundly complex issues.

What the American nation needs and expects from higher education in the critical years just ahead can be summed up in two phrases: quality of result and equality of access. Our colleges and universities must maintain and strengthen academic quality if our intellectual resources are to prove equal to the challenges of contemporary society. At the same time, the nation's campuses must act energetically and even aggressively to open new channels to equality of educational opportunity.

2. HIGHER EDUCATION'S POTENTIAL TO MEET NEEDS

Does American higher education have the necessary resources to meet *at the same time* the nation's expectations for protection of academic quality and for expansion of equality of educational opportunity? Can our colleges and universities find ways to encourage and accommodate growing numbers of students, many of whom will need special financial and academic assistance, while preserving essential margins of academic excellence?

In January, 1968, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges had this to say about the response of public institutions to the shortage of resources:

"To maintain quality, they have raised student charges substantially, turned away qualified students, limited enrollment, and refused requests for urgently needed public service."

Three months later the Association of American Universities issued this statement:

"American higher education is experiencing critical and widespread financial pressures. Virtually every type of college and university faces a widening gap between annual income and the level of expenditures required to undertake needed expansion and improvement—or even, in many cases, to sustain normal operation."

To evaluate the present and potential financial strength of higher education, it is necessary to examine four essential factors: growth in size, growth in functions, rising costs, and sources of funds.

Growth in size

Higher education is currently encountering pressures created in large part by its own record of accomplishments. A century ago, enrollment in higher education in the United States was only about 50,000 students. Today's enrollment is almost 6 million students on a full-time equivalent (FTE) basis. More than half of this growth took place in the decade from 1958 to 1967. Estimates indicate that enrollment will pass 8 million by 1976, and this figure may well rise to 9 million if Carnegie Commission or other proposals are adopted to remove financial barriers for students from low-income families.

These enrollment data reflect not only the growing population of the United States and the growing share of that population in the younger age bracket, but also the rapidly increasing proportions of young people who seek higher education. A century ago, 2 percent of young Americans entered college. Now the figure is over 40 percent and is still rising.

Parental expectations or hopes of children's college attendance are now widespread. A Gallup poll shows that 97 percent of all parents questioned want their children to enter college. The national trend appears to be toward extending universal education beyond high school and through at least some years of higher education.

It should be noted, however, that the proportions of young people enrolled in higher education vary considerably from one part of the country to another. Percentages are more than twice as high for the Western states of Arizona, Utah, and California, as those for the Southern states of Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, and Alabama.

It is apparent that the nation's colleges and universities and those responsible for their financial support must provide new facilities for 3 million additional students by 1976–77. To fall short of this goal would be to limit the movement toward greater equality of access to higher education.

Enrollment will continue to rise after 1976–77 for about another decade, but at a slower rate, and will then level off until the year 2000. The heaviest costs of further expansion will be met in the period ending about 1980.

Growth in functions

Sheer numbers of students do not, of course, tell the entire story of institutional growth. Colleges and universities in the United States have also grown steadily in the number and complexity of functions they have assumed in response to both the expansion of knowledge and the needs of society.

Instruction has increased in total duration, in curricular range, and in specialization. Research has burgeoned. Graduate and professional programs have multiplied. Colleges and universities are performing a wide variety of important public services directed toward meeting civic and social problems.

This trend will continue in the future as higher education responds to new public needs. Today our institutions are being asked to extend their research efforts on the problems of the cities. They are expected to train additional doctors and medical support personnel to meet the nation's expanding activities in the important field of health care. There is a growing obligation to provide postdoctoral training and continuing education in a variety of fast-developing fields.

These expanding functions have brought our institutions of higher education to a central role in the well-being of our society. But they have also added greatly to the pressures of rising numbers of students and rising costs.

Rising costs

The continuing expansion of our higher education facilities will be expensive in any case. But the financial problems are made more severe by the fact that higher education costs per student are rising rapidly. Total institutional expenditures for higher education climbed from $5.2 billion in 1957–58 to about $17.2 billion in 1967–68, an increase of 231 percent as compared with a 119 percent increase in enrollments for the same period. It is estimated that expenditures of higher education institutions will total about $41 billion in 1976–77 for a projected FTE enrollment of 9 million students.

Institutional expenditures are the major costs but not the total costs of higher education. Certain government and private expenditures for higher education purposes are not reflected fully or at all in institutional spending data. Federal administrative costs for various higher education programs are not, of course, passed on to the institution. Federal student aid under the GI Bill and the Social Security Act and some forms of state student aid go directly to the student, and only a portion of that aid enters the institutional revenue-expenditure data via tuition and institutional room-and-board payments. Expenditures of GIs and other students for books, supplies, differential living expenses, and other associated higher education costs which are incurred outside the institution also do not appear in the institutional data.

Unfortunately, the determination of the total cost of higher education is difficult and, inevitably, somewhat arbitrary, and no reliable estimates of the total cost are currently available. This Report, therefore, will rely primarily on use of the fairly well-established data on institutional expenditures for higher education. It is the institutional expenditure total that the Commission estimates will rise to $41 billion in 1976–77.

In terms of the gross national product (GNP), expenditures by higher education institutions rose from approximately 1 percent in 1957, when the GNP was $432 billion, to slightly more than 2 percent in 1967, when the GNP was $763 billion. Institutional expenditures will need to be about 3 percent by 1976–77, at which time the GNP will be about $1,400 billion.

Many factors aside from the general level of inflation have contributed to rising costs per student. Faculty salaries, which had lagged for some years, have been rising faster than the general level of wages and salaries. Graduate work has increased in importance, and it is more expensive. More sophisticated and costly research and teaching tools are required.

For many other activities of society, rising costs are offset in substantial part by accompanying rises in productivity. Unfortunately, higher education has not and perhaps cannot offset its rising costs in this manner. Despite improvements in college management and experiments in programmed learning and other new techniques, no major ways are likely to be found in the short run which will make it possible to educate more students at the same level of expenditures without lowering academic quality. The search for techniques to improve educational productivity without endangering quality should be actively pressed forward; as was indicated in the Foreword to this Report, efficiency in the use of resources is one of the major areas of higher education mapped out for study by the Carnegie Commission. In the meantime, it is inevitable that costs per student will continue to rise.

Sources of funds

Higher education has long received some federal assistance, but the chief financing burden has been borne by state and local governments and the private sector. It is a striking testimonial to their faith in higher education that they have financed the enormous expansion to date, and that they are girding to do still more in the future. But there are limits.

Many state and local governments whose expenditures for higher education are already large would experience great difficulties in providing the additional support needed, both because of tax base limits and because of the other essential needs for public funds. Some states whose past expenditures for higher education have lagged should, of course, provide additional funds in substantial amounts. State support, however, has been a falling share, and it is realistic to expect it to fall still more.

Private resources, initially the major support for all higher education in this country, have provided about half of the institutional funds required for higher education in recent years. With expectations of rising per capita income, and with a relatively high income elasticity for educational expenses, private resources should continue to provide half of the expanded financial support for higher education—a heavy increase in absolute dollar amounts. It would be unrealistic to assume, however, that the private share can be increased in percentage terms over the next few years. This continued heavy reliance on private sources of support for higher education will be helpful to the preservation of autonomy and diversity in American higher education.

The federal government, with revenue available from the graduated income tax, is the major source now realistically able to raise its general revenues faster than the gross national product and thus be able to offset the decline in the share borne by the states.

State, local, and private sources combined now pay about four-fifths of total higher education institutional expenditures, and the federal government pays one-fifth. While the absolute amounts paid by all sectors must continue to rise substantially, federal support levels in dollar terms will need to triple in the immediate future. The federal government's proportionate share of institutional support will need to rise from about one-fifth at present (almost $4 billion) to about one-third (over $13 billion) of the new total by 1976–77.

[Dollar amounts in billions]

	1957–58		1967–68		1976–77	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
State and local	$1.7	33	$4.7	27	$7	17
Private	2.8	54	9.0	52	21	51
Federal	.7	13	3.5	21	13	32
Total	5.2	100	17.2	100	41	100

Further federal support necessary to achieve goals of quality and equality

The Carnegie Commission believes a much greater federal investment is now essential if the growth of higher education is not to be curbed at the very time that the national need is so crucial for our best ideas and intellectual skills and for the broadest possible extension of equality of opportunity.

The severity of the problem is not uniform throughout higher education. Some institutional levels, some geographical areas, some kinds of institutions face more critical financial needs than others. Overall data may disguise the serious nature of the problems for many institutions and students. Capacity not fully utilized in some areas is nevertheless inaccessible to students being turned away from overcrowded local facilities if those students lack the financial means to travel to and live in other areas. Available financial resources at one institution or system of institutions are not transferable to others. Improved resource planning on one campus does not help solve financial shortages at another whose resources are already being inventively utilized to the maximum.

Although the financial impacts have differed, most institutions have by now had to absorb so many of these pressures that formerly available margins in facilities and resources have been depleted. These institutions are now being forced to choose among the alternatives of limiting enrollments, raising tuition fees, postponing expansion and new programs, or allowing quality to deteriorate. These alternatives are already being employed in varying degrees throughout higher education.

The adverse effects upon national needs are all too clear. Enrollment limitations and higher tuition fees (unless offset by grants and loans to those with low incomes) penalize first the very group of students for whom the goal of greater equality of opportunity is intended. Postponing expansions and new programs means deferring activities that may be among the most urgently needed at the present, such as the training of additional health science personnel or research on urban problems. Sacrificing general quality weakens the vital intellectual resources of the nation.

We believe that national needs in the areas of academic quality and equality of opportunity require new levels of federal support for higher education.

3. THE FEDERAL CONCERN WITH HIGHER EDUCATION

The well-being of higher education in the United States is a concern which the federal government shares with state and local governments and private individuals and organizations charged with primary responsibility for our colleges and universities. Higher education fulfills purposes which are national as well as regional and local, and public as well as private, in their scope and impacts College graduates and holders of advanced and professional degrees are highly mobile geographically; they are participants in what is essentially a continental market. And it is precisely this broad market which has been an important factor in the prosperity of the nation as a whole. Thus it is appropriate that federal as well as state and local support be given to the nation's institutions of higher education.

The federal government has, in fact, helped to support higher education over the years, with such federal actions as the land-grant movement of post-Civil War days, National Youth Administration programs for needy students during the Depression of the 1930's, aid for science programs during and after World War II, student aid to returning veterans through the GI Bill, and in recent years a growing range of measures to assist various aspects of higher education.

By 1967–68, federal aid given directly to institutions of higher education and to various student aid programs (not including veterans' and social security education benefits) had reached a total of almost $4 billion and was being channeled through a variety of programs to some 2,100 colleges and universities and several hundred thousand students throughout the United States.

But the nation's needs for higher education, and thus the needs of higher education for more resources, continue to climb. In the next few years, federal support levels should be tripled if the federal government is to assist state and local governments and the private sector in expanding higher education as an essential investment in the nation's future.

In urging these support levels, the Carnegie Commission is not unmindful of the other and pressing national needs for which federal funds must be allocated. In the broad area of education alone, there are urgent calls for aid at primary and secondary levels and for vocational training. Institutions involved in these levels of education face an array of urgent problems, and we warmly support higher levels of aid, including more federal assistance, for these other segments of education. Our focus in this Special Report, however, is the financial problems of our colleges and universities. We believe that federal aid to higher education warrants a high priority among other federal programs, both because of the importance of the specific national needs which higher education serves and because intellectual resources are indispensable to the resolution of so many other high-priority national issues.

The proposed net increase in federal aid to institutions of higher education by 1976–77 is approximately $10 billion over current federal support levels. Projected growth of federal revenue would indicate that the net increment to federal revenue (over "work load" increases in costs) will reach about $70 billion by 1976–77. Thus the proposed increase in federal aid to institutions of higher education would require one-seventh of the expected additions to available federal revenues over the next few years for new programs. The Commission is convinced that the federal government can meet this new level of responsibility for higher education without penalty to other urgent national priorities.

Estimated obligations for higher education and related activities, 1967–68

[In billion of dollars]

Research and development (42 percent)	1.45
Construction (17 percent)	.57
Student aid (18 percent)	.62
Institutional support (13 percent)	.44
Other (10 percent)	.37
Total	3.45

(NOTE.—Federal funds of $698 million for research centers managed by universities, $412 million for veterans' education, $409 million for construction loans, and $266 million for student loans are not included.)

4. FORMS OF FEDERAL SUPPORT

The Carnegie Commission believes that federal support of higher education should be based upon the related concerns of contributions to the national welfare and to the vitality and effectiveness of the institutions of higher education themselves.

The forms of federal aid employed should satisfy the following requirements:

Draw forth to the extent possible, rather than merely replace, state and private support;

Provide for flexibility and periodic reevaluation to determine whether changing national needs warrant reallocations;

Assist both public and private institutions—the latter, of course, for nonsectarian purposes only;

Improve equality of educational opportunity for all able young people;

Rely heavily upon market processes through free student choice of institution and field of study;

Preserve institutional autonomy and integrity;

Encourage diversity;

Provide an incentive for innovation;

Maintain among distinguished institutions of learning a margin for excellence, a premium for quality.

Use competitive principles in the support of academic quality, through nationwide competition for graduate fellowships and for institutional proposals in various special program fields.

It is the Carnegie Commission's judgment that the best immediate means of federal aid to higher education are:

Grants and loans to individual students to move toward the nation's goal of equal educational opportunity;

Support to institutions to meet increased costs of expanding enrollment and to strengthen areas of particular national concern;

Extension of support for research, for construction, and for special programs.

Two other widely discussed approaches are considered by the Commission as far less desirable than extension of existing programs. One such approach, tax credits to parents of children in college, would not aid low-income families where the need is greatest. Another, general subsidies to the several states, would fail to provide the coordination and perspective necessary to assure expansion of programs of primary national concern.

5. FEDERAL AID PROPOSALS

The following proposals are those which the Carnegie Commission believes will best meet the most urgent financing problems associated with higher education through 1976–77. While most of the recommendations would result in expansion or augmentation of existing programs, new programs suitable for use in a short-run period are also proposed. No attempt is made here to incorporate or comment upon all existing federal aid activities relating to higher education.

Student aid and related institutional grants

The Carnegie Commission believes that one of the most urgent national priorities for higher education between now and 1976–77 is the removal of financial barriers for all youth who enroll in our diverse colleges and universities, whether in academic or occupational programs. A second important priority is support for talented graduate students who can meet the nation's needs for a wide variety of professionals, technical specialists, researchers, and college teachers.

The federal government presently provides limited amounts of student aid under a number of separate programs, some restricted to one or another major subject field, some based on need, some on ability, some channeled through the GI Bill. Today's graduating high school student often has difficulty in determining what student aid is available to him. Each program has separate requirements and applications. Often he must enroll in a college or university and then see if that institution still has funds available under particular programs. To replace these separate and limited programs (though not, of course, the GI Bill), the Commission proposes a substantially expanded program consisting of educational opportunity grants based on need, a work-study program, student loans, a counseling and information program, a graduate talent search and development program, and doctoral fellowships based on ability.

The Commission's program of student aid is based upon these premises:

1. Student aid must be adequate to remove effectively the financial barriers which now prevent many qualified students from entering or continuing higher education.

2. Basic grants supplemented by work-study payments should be scaled to differing educational expenses in the lower division, upper division, and graduate years. With the growth of the community college movement and urban facilities, most students will be able to attend low-cost institutions near home for at least the first two years.

3. The grant program should be augmented by a loan program making possible greater flexibility in choice of college to the needy student and providing a readily available source of college financing with repayment deferred for all students regardless of need.

4. Maximum flexibility and fullest utilization of aid funds will be accomplished if the major portion of these funds is kept in one national reservoir and granted to individual students who exercise free choice of institution and disciplinary fields. If funds are allocated by institution or region or field, problems of over- and under-use will inevitably arise and require time-consuming and costly transfer procedures. The "national reservoir" approach has worked very successfully under the GI Bill. For administrative purposes, however, grant payments would be made to students by their selected institutions rather than directly by the government.

Educational Opportunity Grants

Equality of opportunity in the United States today is increasingly related to equality of access to education. And we have not yet achieved equality of access to education; financial barriers and racial barriers block the way for many potentially able young Americans. Almost half of the undergraduate college students in the United States now come from the country's highest family income quartile; only 7 percent come from the lowest income quartile.

Complete figures are not available for socioeconomic distribution of graduate enrollment, but fragmentary figures suggest that an even lower proportion of graduate students comes from the two lowest quartiles.

The proportion of Negroes in the American college population is less than half the proportion of Negroes in the population as a whole, and half the Negroes in college attend predominantly Negro colleges.

Financial barriers to higher education result in a demonstrable loss of national talent. In the highest socioeconomic quartile, 19 out of 20 students ranking in the top ability group (the highest 20 percent) enter college within five years after high school graduation; in the lowest socioeconomic quartile, only 10 out of 20 in the highest ability group enter college.

Although the federal government, in the past, has provided financial aid to college students through the GI Bill, loans, and student work programs in the Depression, it was not until the Higher Education Act of 1965 that a program of educational opportunity grants was established. Under this program 225,000 undergraduate students from low-income families received grants in 1966–67. Adoption of a clear policy to remove financial barriers should make grants available to about 1.7 million students (27 percent of total enrollment) in 1970–71 and approximately 2.9 million students (32 percent of total enrollment) in 1976–77.

Percent undergraduate students enrolled full time by size of family income, 1966–67

Approximate family income quartile:	*Average family income*
High (above $10,000) (48 percent)	$16,016
Second ($6,000–$10,000) (28 percent)	8,359
Third ($3,000–$6,000) (17 percent)	5,549
Low (below $3,000) (7 percent)	2,321

Recommendation

The Commission recommends strengthening and expanding the present program of educational opportunity grants based on need by providing:

1. That the level of funding be increased so that all college students with demonstrated need will be assured of some financial aid to meet expenses at institutions which they select.

2. That grants based on need be available for a period not to exceed four years of undergraduate study and two years of study toward a graduate degree.

Determination of need. It will be necessary to derive a simple need formula based on such factors as total family income over the past several years, total family assets, and number and ages of children. The Commission assumes that a maximum grant would often be necessary at the lowest income quartile, that perhaps half of the maximum grant would be the average requirement at the second lowest quartile, and that only a few grants would be made to students from families on the lower borders of the upper half of the income range.

Amount of grants. Assuming full need, maximum grants would be:

(a) $750 per year to a student during his first two years of work toward an undergraduate degree or certificate.

(b) $1,000 per year to a student during his third and fourth years of work toward an undergraduate degree.

(c) $1,000 per year for a maximum of two years to a student working toward a graduate degree.

No grant would be made unless the student is eligible for a grant in an amount of $200 or more.

It should be noted that the amounts in (a) and (b) above may be augmented by supplementary matching grants and work-study payments provided in the recommendations below.

Level of funding. It is estimated that the program of educational opportunity grants set forth above would require federal funding as follows:

[In billions of dollars]

Year:	
1970–71	0.9
1971–72	1.0
1972–73	1.1
1973–74	1.3
1974–75	1.4
1975–76	1.6
1976–77	1.6

Supplementary Matching Grants

Institutions are expected to seek additional funds from private, state, and local government sources for undergraduate educational opportunity grants. It is estimated that over $600 million in student aid funds was obtained from these sources in 1966–67. It is not known what proportion of these student aid funds was used for grants to students from low-income families. To encourage commitment of more funds from these sources for such grants and to provide greater choice of selection of college for the student, the Commission proposes a program of supplementary matching grants.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that an undergraduate student holding an educational opportunity grant and receiving added grants from nonfederal sources be given a supplementary federal grant in an amount matching the nonfederal grants but not exceeding one-half of the student's original educational opportunity grant.

An upper-division student with full need might, for example, hold a $1,000 educational opportunity grant. If he were awarded an additional state or private grant of $400, he would thereby become eligible for a federal supplementary matching grant of $400, bringing his total grant level for the year to $1,800. If a holder of a $1,000 educational opportunity grant were to be given an added $700 from state or private sources, he could receive a federal supplementary matching grant of $500 (the upper limit of one-half of the amount of his original educational opportunity grant), for a total grant level of $2,200 per year.

Level of funding. It is estimated that this program would require federal funding as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Year:	
1970–71	110
1971–72	140
1972–73	180
1973–74	230
1974–75	280
1975–76	340
1976–77	380

Federal Scholarship Grants to Institutions

The Commission recognizes that any formula for need applied on a nationwide basis may not adequately cover individual hardship cases. To provide some greater degree of flexibility in the allocation of grants of students with financial need, the Commission proposes that some additional scholarship funds be given directly to institutions where holders of educational opportunity grants are enrolled. The college or university would then allocate these funds to students as determined by the institution's own definition of student need.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that each college and university be given a scholarship fund for needy students equal to 10 percent of the total sum of educational opportunity grants (not including supplementary matching grants) held by students at that institution.

Level of funding. Federal funding requirements for this program are estimated as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Year:	
1970–71	90
1971–72	95
1973–74	120
1973–74	120
1974–75	135
1975–76	150
1976–77	160

Work-Study Program

During the Depression, the federally funded National Youth Administration provided payment for part-time jobs to more than 10 percent of all students then enrolled in higher education. More recently, the college work-study program was established. Originally under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, it was continued as a part of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The purpose of the program is to stimulate and promote part-time employment for students—particularly those from low-income families—who need the work to stay in school. Through federal grants to institutions of higher education, the program provides work opportunities on campus and in public or private nonprofit agencies engaged in community service off campus. Students may work an average of 15 hours a week while classes are in session and not more than 40 while they are not in session.

During fiscal 1968, 310,000 students participated in this program, the federal share costing an estimated $112.5 million. The work-study program has generated enthusiasm among participating students, colleges and agencies, especially at the state and community college levels. Significant numbers of economically disadvantaged youths are enabled to enter and stay in college. These students perform tasks important to academic institutions and agencies serving the community. In tangible and practical ways they develop an additional framework of relationships with the academic community. Work-study is one of the most valuable forms of student aid and ought to be incorporated in any federal program to assist students.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that federal funds be provided to finance institutionally administered part-time employment for undergraduate students. Institutions should use these funds to enable students, who meet in general terms the federal need criteria, to earn up to $500 per year. Off-campus assignments of educational importance, such as tutorial work, should be encouraged.

Because students from lower socioeconomic groups may experience educational disadvantages in their initial college years, it might be desirable to place some limits on their work-study program participation at the lower-division level. Upper-division students, and lower-division students to the extent consistent with their educational needs, should be encouraged to take part in the work-study program.

Level of funding. This program would require estimated levels of federal funding as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Year:	
1970–71	510
1971–72	540
1972–73	620
1973–74	700
1974–75	775
1975–76	850
1976–77	870

Counseling and Information Program

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 authorized establishment of a broad program throughout all levels of education for guidance, counseling, and testing of students and for identification and encouragement of able students to continue their education. One of the stated purposes of that program was to encourage students with outstanding aptitudes and ability to complete secondary school, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions. In 1959 $7.4 million was initially appropriated for the program. The appropriation for 1967 was $24.5 million.

The Commission believes, because of the importance of decisions made at the high school level about college attendance, that it is imperative to strengthen counseling and information programs. Students who possess the ability to go to college-level academic work should be identified, assisted in finding the right college, and advised on the availability of financial aid. Identification of these students early in their high school careers would make it possible to channel them into curricula which would better equip them for higher education. Those with other interests and qualifications who can benefit either from further development before their prospects are clear or from more vocationally oriented education should be guided into courses at the appropriate institution. But not every high school graduate should be guided toward further formal education at that time, and this decision too is an important counseling responsibility.

The federal program should include support of research activities to develop better ways to identify qualified students, particularly those from disadvantaged groups. Federal training courses should be established for high school teachers and counselors to keep them up to date on financial aid, college programs, and career possibilities. Information centers should be established in metropolitan centers so that parents and students may obtain information about career possibilities and opportunities for higher education.

Colleges and universities should be encouraged to use a portion of their work-study program funds to enable their students to work with high school and elementary school students in various tutoring and counseling programs.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the present federal aid program of guidance, counseling, and testing for identification and encouragement of able students be expanded to include the elements described above and that funding for the program be increased to $30 million in 1970–71, rising to $40 million in 1976–77.

Graduate Talent Search and Development Program

The nation's 2,300 institutions of higher education, vary greatly, not only in function, but also in educational effectiveness. As a result, some students have earned their bachelor's degree at institutions that have found it difficult, often because of financial pressures, to attain a desirable level of quality in their educational programs. Colleges of this type, often found in the economically depressed areas of the nation, may be the only facilities accessible to many students from low-income families and, in some sections of the country, to students from racial minorities. The developing institutions program, mentioned later in these proposals, is concerned with improving the quality of these colleges. But this improvement cannot be quickly achieved.

At the very time when the nation has growing needs for specialized personnel in health, welfare, technical, and professional fields and in elementary and secondary teaching, it is particularly unfortunate that some students who have completed their undergraduate training find that they are not adequately prepared to undertake graduate programs in these and other needed areas. It is equally unfortunate that some of these students came from the very groups of the population that need opportunities to participate more fully and at increasingly higher levels in the nation work force.

As a partial remedy to this situation, the Commission urges that a federal program be funded under which certain universities, selected on the basis of specific program proposals, undertake the task of identifying potentially able graduates who have not received undergraduate training adequate to permit immediate pursuit of graduate studies. The programs could vary considerably in nature, but each would provide up to one year of intensive work to enable program participants to undertake their graduate studies more successfully. Students selected would receive a stipend based on need for the duration of the program.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that certain universities be selected on the basis of program proposals submitted to national panels to undertake specific graduate talent search and development program, and that federal funding be made available for such programs in the amount of $25 million in 1970–71, rising to $100 million in 1976–77.

Doctoral Fellowship Program

For several years, various federal agencies have offered doctoral fellowships and traineeships to students selected largely on the basis of achievement. Grants of this type were made to over 30,000 doctoral students in 1967.

The Commission has recommended above that educational opportunity grants based on need should be made available to first-level graduate students for a maximum of two years during work toward a graduate degree. In addition, the Commission proposes a program of loans (see the recommendation below) to assist students at all levels of undergraduate and graduate study.

Because of the great importance of encouraging the most able of our young students to continue their graduate studies at the highest level, the Commission proposes a federally financed doctoral fellowship program based on ability for students in all fields of intellectual endeavor. This program would provide stipend to talented students working toward the Ph.D. or equivalent research doctorate degree during the intensive period of their research for the doctoral thesis.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends establishment of a doctoral fellowship program with selection based upon demonstrated academic ability without reference to need, with fellowships in the amount of $3,000 annually for a maximum of two years to graduate students advanced to candidacy for a Ph.D. or equivalent research doctorate, the total number of such first-year fellowships to equal three-fourths of the national total of earned doctorates in the previous year.

Selection. Of the total number of fellowships to be awarded annually, half would be selected by national competition. The other half would be granted on the basis of allocations to institutions for certain departments or interdepartmental major programs designated by national panels of experts, and the institutions and departments would then apply their own ability criteria for selection of recipients. Selection would be extended into the social sciences and humanities and not limited to the sciences and health professions as is largely true at present.

Teaching assistantships. A graduate student holding a doctoral fellowship would be expected to devote full time to his academic work, but could be required by the university as a part of his degree program to hold a teaching assistantship and would be permitted to receive a teaching assistantship stipend from the university.

Level of funding. It is estimated that federal expenditures for this program would be:

[In millions of dollars]

Year:	
1970–71	105
1971–72	110
1972–73	120
1973–74	130
1974–75	150
1975–76	160
1976–77	165

National Student Loan Bank

The Commission's opportunity grant and work-study recommendations are designed to remove financial barriers to higher education for students from low-income families. However, this is not the only kind of student assistance that is needed in a situation of rising educational costs. Grant recipients might wish to attend institutions far from their homes or with high tuitions, at costs greater than the ceilings appropriate to a grant program based on need. For many middle-income families, especially those with several children in college, the burdens of meeting the costs of higher education out of current income are large. Older students increasingly assume the role of independent adults, and continued financial dependence on their families poses significant problems. For all these reasons, a widely available student loan program in which need is not a condition to eligibility is desirable as a supplement to the programs already proposed.

Economic considerations reinforce this judgment. On the whole, members of the population who have more education enjoy significantly higher earnings than those with less, and this correlation holds broadly over the whole educational spectrum. In one respect, therefore, higher education enhances the earning power of individuals, thus providing the economic basis for repayment of debts incurred to finance that education. In this sense such loans can be viewed as financing individuals' investments in productive though nontangible capital.

Further, the social benefits of higher education which affect the whole nation, over and above those accruing to the individuals receiving it, justify a federal government effort in this area. Additionally, higher incomes result in higher tax payments to the federal government.

The desirability of federal participation in loan programs has already been recognized in such past programs as the National Student Defense Loan program established in 1958 and the Guaranteed Loan program established in 1965. These together had outstanding loans of over a billion dollars by 1966–67.

However, the existing loan programs have important difficulties, the greatest of which is an inadequate level of funding. Others include limitations of eligibility in terms of need, 10-year repayment periods which have imposed high burdens and discouraged applicants, and ineffective attempts to make them recruiting devices for such occupations as teaching. What is needed is a much larger loan program of a quite different character.

A particular kind of loan program—namely, one with contingent repayment provisions under which the borrower contracts to pay back a fixed percentage of his income per $1,000 of debt each year for a long period (30 to 40 years)—has a number of important additional advantages which recommend it strongly over a conventional fixed-contract type of loan.

First, such a loan program would contribute significantly to a further equalization of educational opportunity. If the loan program as a whole were on a self-sustaining basis (as defined below), those whose post-education incomes were highest would help pay for the costs of education of those whose posteducation incomes were lower. Since posteducation incomes are correlated among other things with incomes of the students' families, this would spread the cost of equalization of opportunity over both the current and the succeeding generations.

Second, the prospect of repayment would be a lesser deterrent under a contingent loan program than under a conventional fixed-contract program. This would lead to a wider use of loans since risks would be shared.

Third, the program would further emphasize the independence of the student by encouraging him to meet a larger proportion of his educational costs through a loan.

Certain difficulties which such a contingent loan proposal appears to raise are manageable. Two, in particular, have received wide attention: the possibility of adverse selection of applicants that would prejudice the solvency of the program and the so-called negative dowry of college-educated women who marry and leave the labor force. Detailed studies of the design of such a program (for example, that by Karl Shell and others) show that these difficulties can be met. Further careful study and drafting of such a program are, however, highly necessary.

The Commission recommends this loan program as a supplement to our other proposals, rather than as the basic or sole program for both student and institutional support.

Recommendations

The Commission recommends that a federal contingent loan program be created for which all students, regardless of need, would be eligible. With interest figured on the basis of federal borrowing costs, the program should be self-sustaining, except for administrative costs which would be met out of appropriations. Undergraduates would be eligible to borrow up to $2,500 per year, and graduate students up to $3,500 per year, for educational purposes. No student should be entitled to receive more in loans, all types of grants, and work-study payments in any year than the costs of education, including subsistence costs, as officially recognized by the institution in which he is enrolled.

The program would be administered through the institutions of higher education, which will have the relevant information on grants and work-study payments to loan applicants.

Level of funding. A loan program of this sort must be viewed as clearly experimental; it is difficult to predict the extent to which it will be used. But if loans are to be made available to students without reference to need, it will be necessary to have the initial level of funding for the loan program high enough to eliminate any requirements for setting priorities among loan applicants. The Commission suggests that funding be made available to provide student loans totaling $2.5 billion in 1970–71, possibly increasing to as much as $5 billion in new student loans in 1976–77.

It is also difficult to predict the level of federal expenditures which would be required by this loan program. Although designed to be self-supporting, the program would require, particularly in the initial years, annual federal appropriations amounting to perhaps 5 percent of new loans committed that year for administrative costs and contingencies. This would amount to about $125 million in 1970–71, rising to $250 million in 1976–77.

PART-TIME STUDENTS

Growing requirements for retraining during a person's lifetime and the probability that low-income students will have to work part-time suggest that the importance of part-time enrollment may increase in the future. All the programs recommended above are stated in terms of full-time students. The programs should, however, through the implementing legislation, be adapted to provide proportional aid to part-time students.

Cost-of-education supplements to institutions

The proposed expansion of financial aid programs to make it possible for more students to attend universities and colleges will add to the present financial problems of these institutions. The full costs of education are not met through tuition payments. Moreover, the increase in numbers of disadvantaged students will tend to raise per-student instructional costs, because many of these students will need special educational assistance such as tutoring, counseling, and perhaps remedial training in special areas. Cost considerations should not be permitted to discourage colleges and universities from effectively recruiting and assisting potentially able young people no matter what their socioeconomic background might be.

At the doctoral level, the gap between tuition levels and full instructional costs is even greater. To some extent, this problem has been recognized in the past through federal programs which provide cost-of-education supplements to institutions attended by students holding federal graduate fellowships.

The Commission believes that this concept should be continued for the doctoral fellowship program and extended to the educational opportunity grant program as well.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the federal government grant cost-of-education supplements to colleges and universities based on the numbers and levels of students holding federal grants enrolled in the institutions.

Amount of grants. Accredited colleges and universities, and institutions deemed potentially eligible for accreditation except for their recent date of establishment, would receive the following amounts for each federal grant holder enrolled:

Student level	1970–71	1976–77
Lower division	$525	$750
Upper division	700	1,000
First-level graduate	1,050	1,500
Doctoral	3,500	5,000

Educational assistance programs. As the student aid program brings into higher education a greater number of disadvantaged students, the problem of providing them with special educational assistance such as counseling and tutoring will become increasingly important. The Commission assumes that a portion of the cost-of-education supplement would be used by the institution to undertake programs giving special attention to the educational needs of students who, largely because of socioeconomic factors, have been under an educational disadvantage.

Cost-of-education supplements as guides to future institutional support programs. These supplements could be used by the institutions at their own discretion to meet general operating costs. Thus they would provide some useful body of experience with general federal support of institutions—experience which could be used as a basis for consideration of the many proposals now being made for such institutional grants. The cost-of-education supplement program is proposed to meet immediate short-run needs, but it will also give the Commission and others both time and valuable data for analysis of the impacts, benefits, and problems involved in proposed programs for long-range institutional support and in the particular formulas being suggested for such programs.

This experience will augment the valuable consideration and study which have already been given to broad programs of institutional support by state study groups such as that proposed for New York and by several education associations. Statements of the various education associations have been reprinted in the Carnegie Commission publication *Alternative Methods of Federal Funding for Higher Education*, prepared by Ronald Wolk. In addition, the American Council on Education has recently issued a comparison of several proposed formulas for institutional grants.

The Commission hopes and expects that many students with grants would be drawn into the smaller colleges across the nation, where they would receive more individual attention and have a better opportunity to participate in the life of the total campus community. Many of these colleges would have the capacity to receive more students if they were given financial support to offset, in part, their added costs. They would thus also have a greater opportunity to diversify their student bodies, as so many of them now wish to do.

Level of funding. It is estimated that federal expenditures for cost-of-education supplements would be:

[In billions of dollars]

Year:	
1970–71	1.13
1971–72	1.28
1972–73	1.53
1973–74	1.94
1974–75	2.17
1975–76	2.51
1976–77	2.71

The Carnegie Commission hopes in the near future to make a study of and recommendations on state support to private colleges and universities.

Medical education

Medical and health services education is the one major subject area in higher education that the Carnegie Commission has singled out for specific federal aid proposals. The reasons are several: the great needs of the nation in the health field, the growing public concern with these needs as evidenced by Medicare and the many state and local health programs, the high cost of medical training facilities, the fact that new medical education facilities are needed to serve geographical regions without reference to state boundaries, and, finally, the high mobility of medical school graduates, many and even most of whom do not remain to practice within the states that provided their instruction.

It is estimated that facilities to provide spaces for about 75 percent more medical students will be required by 1976–77 to meet the nation's rapidly growing need for medical services over and above the spaces available in 1966, when Medicare came into operation. In contrast to the rapid increase of enrollments in most other fields of higher education, the supply of medical school graduates has grown relatively slowly since the 1920s, and it is apparent that vigorous new efforts must be made to provide more training facilities and to encourage more students to undertake training. At the present time, 20 percent of the new doctors starting practice in the United States each year have received their training abroad, and sometimes it is of a distinctly lower quality than that provided by medical schools in the United States. Additionally, health care is not now adequately available in many rural areas and urban ghettos.

Instructional and capital outlay costs for medical schools far outstrip the levels in other schools of professional education, including schools in which other health personnel are trained; and financing the major part of the needed expansion of such facilities from state and private resources is almost impossible.

Studies now underway give some promise that reorganization of medical education and of medical practice itself can lead to reduced costs of both medical education and medical care. Federal funds should be made available to support the development of expanded training programs for health support personnel. But these possibilities do not provide full solutions to the financing problems confronting medical education.

The federal government has been undertaking increasing levels of support for medical school construction ($18 million in 1966–67 and $55 million in 1967–68) and training ($42 million in 1966–67 and $53 million in 1967–68), but the Carnegie Commission believes higher federal levels are required.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends establishment of a substantial program of federal aid for medical education and health services for the purposes of:

Stimulating expansion of capacity at existing medical schools;

Planning additional medical schools distributed on a geographical basis to provide needed service to areas not now served;

Expanding educational facilities and developing new programs for the training of medical care support personnel;

Increasing availability of health services in the community of the medical school and the quality of health care delivery.

Student aid. A student aid program for medical students should be adopted to provide grants on the basis of need in amounts up to $3,500 per year for four years, with free choice of institution.

It should be noted that medical students also have access to loans under the expanded loan program recommended above.

Institutional payments. Payments to institutions would be equal to the sum of the following amounts:

1. The institution's enrollment of students working toward the M.D. multiplied by $4,000;

2. That portion of the enrollment working toward the M.D. in excess of such enrollment in the fall of 1966 multiplied by $2,000;

3. The total number of residents and interns multiplied by $2,250, provided that no individual student shall be counted for more than four years, and provided further that the resident and intern program is conducted under the auspices of an accredited medical school either at its own or at an affiliated hospital.

The amounts in (1) and (2) above should be adjusted for medical schools with three-year programs to enable those schools to receive the same amount of institutional aid as four-year schools.

Institutions would be free to use these institutional payments for support of any program which has as its major purpose the instruction of medical students.

Construction funds. Construction funds should be made available at the level of 100 percent for creation of new places, with additional funds for renovation and replacement.

Start-up grants. Start-up grants should be made available for non-construction costs for approximately 20 new medical schools at the rate of four per year for five years, not to exceed $10 million per school. These schools should be located in geographical areas not now adequately served by existing medical schools, with a sufficient population base to warrant a medical school, and with a university capable of providing a good environment for a medical school.

Community health service programs. Federal support should be made available for development of programs by medical schools designed to extend the availability and effectiveness of community health programs.

Training of support medical personnel. Federal funds should be made available for programs designed to increase the number of support medical personnel. Such personnel can be trained comparatively quickly and inexpensively. In some fields, such as pediatrics, they can assume a substantial share of the services now performed by M.D.s if they are given proper supervision by an M.D.

Level of funding. It is estimated that federal expenditures for the medical and health services education program outlined above would be:

[In billions of dollars]

Year:	
1970–71	0.33
1971–72	.35
1972–73	.37
1973–74	.39
1974–75	.42
1975–76	.40
1976–77	.43

Medical education today is undergoing more constructive self-examination than it has since the Flexner report of 1910 and more than is going on in any other field of higher education. This is both impressive and commendable. The new medical schools recommended here can take advantage of the new ideas being born. Expansion of existing schools can provide opportunities for the new types of training for new types of doctors and support personnel now being envisioned. The medical profession as a whole is welcoming expansion of personnel and experimentation in training of personnel and delivery of health care as never before, to its great credit and the nation's great advantage; and the medical students of today encourage these progressive tendencies.

This openness to new concepts and new horizons of service should be fully encouraged as the federal government extends the basic support to medical education which it has given so successfully in the past to medical research. The second great transformation of medical education and research (the Flexner report having given rise to the first) is now underway, and the United States once again will greatly benefit. The new schools of medicine can be new in program as well as in physical identity; the expanded schools can be greater in their variety and relevance to modern needs as well as greater in size. Medical schools are on the threshold of becoming as important to the quality of urban life as the colleges of agriculture under the land-grant movement have been to rural life.

New money can now be matched by new ideas. Both are important—but the new ideas are the more important. The Carnegie Commission hopes subsequently to make suggestions on the future of medical education and its financing, and fully realizes that better use of health care facilities and personnel is as important as the enlargement of facilities and personnel.

Construction

During the late 1950s and the 1960s the great surge in college enrollment led to a growing deficiency in facilities. It was in recognition of this deficiency that the Higher Education Facilities Act was passed in 1963. But the increased federal aid came late and at too low a level to close the gap. By 1967 college and university instructional facilities would have had to be expanded by 20 percent to provide fully adequate space for the new levels of enrollment. This continuing deficiency resulted, in part, from the federal budgetary stringency which led to decreasing levels of support for college construction at a time when enrollment continued to rise.

Protected levels of enrollment suggest a further increase in this deficiency unless levels of federal support under the Higher Education Facilities Act can be increased. To keep pace with expanding enrollment, while holding the existing deficiency at its 20 percent level, about $2 billion of federal funds should be available annually for college and university construction.

At present, funds are channeled principally into new construction. We believe more attention should be directed to the use of construction grants for renovation, an approach which might provide some additional facilities more quickly and at lower costs.

During the last academic year 72 new colleges were established. Many more new campuses will be needed over the next few years, and campuses of particular types.

The advance of the junior college movement over the last decade has greatly increased the accessibility of higher education to hundreds of thousands of American youth. A further extension of the growing junior college movement will continue this significant trend.

Colleges to serve the inner-city youth are urgently required in many of our major metropolitan areas. To meet this need, it is estimated that 500 community colleges and 50 urban four-year colleges should be established by 1976.

These new colleges, particularly in urban areas where land is expensive, will have heavier than usual initial costs. The Commission's proposals for construction aid include start-up grants for these institutions.

The Commission believes that support for construction is one of the most desirable mechanisms for channeling federal aid to colleges and universities. Such support carries with it very limited opportunities for control of educational policy; it increases the real assets of the nation; and, combined with matching requirements, it stimulates rather than replaces other sources of financial support for higher education.

Recommendation

Construction grants: 1. The Commission recommends that the amount of federal grants for academic construction be increased from the present provision (two-fifths of construction costs for junior collegs and one-third for other institutions) to one-half of the total amounts required by all institutions for construction, renovation, and replacement of facilities.

2. In addition, the Commission recommends that start-up grants be provided for planning and nonconstruction costs for new junior college and urban institutions, not to exceed $10 million per institution but averaging more nearly $1 million per institution.

Construction loans: The Commission recommends that funding levels for the academic facilities construction loan program be increased to provide sufficient loan funds for an additional 25 percent of needed new construction costs.

It should be noted that institutions could thus finance up to 75 percent of new construction through a combination of federal grants and loans.

Level of funding: It is estimated that federal expenditures for construction grants and loan obligations levels would be:

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Grants	Loan obligations
1970–71	1.26	0.53
1971–72	1.58	.69
1972–73	1.86	.83
1973–74	1.87	.88
1974–75	1.88	.89
1975–76	1.92	.91
1976–77	1.22	.61

Funding levels will continue to decline after 1976–1977 as enrollment levels stabilize in the 1980s.

The Commission recognizes that major improvements are possible in the intensity of space utilization and assumes that some of the estimated 20 percent deficiency across the nation can be offset by improved utilization.

Loans for student housing. For several years, federal loans for student housing have constituted an important form of federal aid to higher education. The Commission believes that this support is important to the educational effectiveness of many colleges and universities and urges continuation of the student housing loan program. This Report does not, however, include any recommendations on future levels of support for housing loans. The comparative emphasis on college housing and on privately supplied housing requires careful study campus by campus. College housing is of particular importance to the private liberal arts college with a residential character.

Research

One of the most essential functions of higher education is its contribution to the advance of knowledge in the nation. In recognition of this contribution the federal government has played a substantial role in providing major support for university-based research.

Since the federal government first undertook massive support of research in the universities during World War II, research expenditures have been a very large part of total federal expenditures on higher education. In the early postwar years, nearly half of the total federal support for higher education was directed to science research, and by 1958 the proportion had risen to two-thirds. Research now accounts for about one-third of the total federal funds flowing to higher education institutions.

More significantly, federal funding has been the primary source of support for university-based research activities. Today approximately three-quarters of all university research is federally financed. In some highly research-oriented universities, the figure is almost 90 percent.

The rate of increase of federal support to university research is thus the key element in its ability to expand. During the period from 1956 to 1962, federal support of academic research increased at a rate of about 25 percent per year, but the rate of increase has slowed sharply since 1962. Last year's increase in federal support for academic research was only 2 percent.

It is the Commission's belief that university research, and thus federal support for university research, must increase substantially over the next several years. Both the past increase (before the recent slowdown) and the proposed increase in federal support are based on several factors:

1. Enrollment of doctoral candidates has risen sharply over the last several years and will continue to rise at an average rate of 6.6 percent annually through 1975.

2. Costs of research, like costs of instruction, are rising more rapidly than the costs of the general economy.

3. The new technology, which makes considerable expansion possible in the scope, nature, and quality of research, is also adding to the cost of research.

4. Critical social problems demand greater research efforts in many areas, including the social sciences.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the level of federal funding for university and college research be increased over the next several years but with the annual rate of increase declining from 15 percent in 1970–71 to 10 percent in 1976–77. This rate of increase reflects expanding doctoral enrollments, use of more costly technology, and the need for expansion into new fields of research.

The Commission further recommends that a grant amounting to 10 percent of the total research grants received annually by an institution be made to that institution to be used at its discretion. The sum required for this purpose is to be included within the percentages noted immediately above.

Procedures. The present federal system for awarding research grants through multiple agencies based on review and determination of merit of each proposal seems to work relatively well; the Commission does not, therefore, recommend any basic change in the present procedure. However, it might be desirable for all granting agencies to adopt the practice now sometimes used of giving low priority to inclusion of funds for released faculty time, particularly at universities where the teaching load is relatively low; conversely, efforts should be made to increase the teaching services of research personnel, and federal policy can encourage this.

The present system does sometimes make it difficult for colleges and universities to obtain federal research funds for small projects and for planning projects, and young faculty members may be under considerable disadvantage in competing for research funds. The proposed 10 percent supplementary grant to institutions would make it possible for them to provide grants for these purposes.

Level of funding. With one modification, the current level of federal funding for research can properly be used as a base for projecting desirable future levels of support. To some extent research funds are now used to provide traineeships for candidates for research doctorates. If the Commission's proposal for research doctoral fellowships is accepted, this need will be met directly through that program. In projecting future levels of federal funding for research, the Commission has started from a base lower than the present level of support, thus eliminating possible duplication between the present use of research funds and the proposed research doctoral fellowship program.

It is estimated that federal funds for support of research as outlined above would be:

[In billions of dollars]

Year:	
1970–71	2.00
1971–72	2.30
1972–73	2.62
1973–74	2.96
1974–75	3.32
1975–76	3.68
1976–77	4.05

Special programs

The federal government has been both sensitive and responsive to areas of particular need in higher education and has established a number of special programs to provide federal assistance for these areas.

Recommendation

The Commission has not given consideration to all of these special programs, but does recommend increased funding for the following three programs: aid to developing institutions, library support, and international studies.

Aid to Developing Institutions

Many of the nation's existing colleges have failed to reach their full capability because of limitations of resources. If expanded educational opportunity is to be provided in the United States, these colleges must become full participants in the academic community. Since 1965, the Office of Education, through its developing-college program, has given some financial aid to such colleges, starting with $5 million in 1966 and increasing to $30 million in 1967. In too many instances the level of aid to institutions has not been sufficient to enable significant development, but only to tide them over for another year. Through this program some of these colleges might well be encouraged to combine with each other or with neighboring institutions. This program in its entirety can be of particular value to areas which are deficient in educational opportunity. The Commission recommends that funding for the developing college program be increased from its present level of $20 million to $100 million.

Library Support

A basic tool of any college or university is its library. The current expansion of knowledge, with the resultant massive explosion in literature in all fields, has sharply increased the cost of even the minimal library for an undergraduate college. Major universities with their heavy emphasis on graduate education and research, face even greater increases in their annual library expenditures. The higher education law does provide support for college and research libraries, but the level of funding has been low. In 1966, although $50 million was authorized, only $10 million was appropriated. In 1967 and 1968 the appropriation was increased to $25 million. The Commission recommends that the full authorization of $50 million be made available in 1970–71 and be increased to $100 million by 1976, and that libraries which serve a regional need be given a high priority for grants under this program.

International Studies

The years since World War II have witnessed an unprecedented growth in the number of new and independent nations in the world. The problems of their economic and political development and of their accommodation into the international sphere have accentuated the need for stronger university-based programs of international studies. The International Education Act of 1966 authorized some grant programs in this area, but no funds have yet been appropriated. More centers for comprehensive training and research both on specific geographical areas and on particular fields or issues in world affairs should be encouraged. The Commission recommends that the $90 million authorized for this program be appropriated in 1970–71 and that funding be increased to $100 million by 1976–77.

Level of funding. The National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education would be initiating new special programs which, after their developmental phases, would be transferred to appropriate federal agencies.

Total funding for these special programs described above and for the others now in prospect might require $800 million by 1976–77.

National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education

Research and graduate instruction in the nation's universities have been greatly strengthened over the past two decades, in large part because of substantial research support by the federal government. Parallel gains of this magnitude have not been made in other areas of higher education, such as undergraduate curriculum development, instructional techniques, utilization of resources, and new program areas.

The Commission believes that the federal government can play an extremely valuable role in encouraging developmental programs in higher education by providing initial funds for such undertakings. The continuing rise in the costs of higher education makes it particularly important to develop existing facilities to their greatest potential and to try out new methods and techniques in order to improve operational efficiency and quality. But many institutions find that they do not have a margin of funds for such undertakings.

The Commission proposes the establishment of a National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education to provide encouragement, advice, review, and financial support for institutional programs designed to provide new directions in curricula, strengthening of essential areas that have fallen behind or that have never been adequately developed because of inadequate funding, and development of programs to improve educational processes and techniques. The Foundation would be a governmental agency operating under the direction of a board and organized along the lines of the National Science Foundation.

It is intended that all programs funded through the Foundation would be short-run or developmental in character. Programs once experimented with, developed, and proved successful under the National Foundation would be transferred into the special programs category mentioned earlier and administered on a permanent basis by other agencies of the federal government, usually the Office of Education.

Examples of developmental programs which might be funded by the Foundation are the following:

Improvement of Undergraduate Education

Criticism of the quality of undergraduate education has become widespread during the past few years. The recent focus of national attention on research needs and associated graduate instruction has undoubtedly occasioned some neglect of the undergraduate area. In addition, many undergraduate students across the nation have evinced new interest in undergraduate programs which minimize the fragmenting effects of specialization and which emphasize relevance to the current problems of our society. A healthy mood of reform is evident on many campuses and could be encouraged through the National Foundation.

Services to Elementary and Secondary Education

The quality of education at the primary and secondary levels has an obvious bearing on the number and quality of students who enter our colleges and universities, and it is particularly important in assuring greater equality of access to higher education. In recent years, institutions of higher education have begun to assume more responsibility for assistance to the earlier levels in the educational process, providing supplementary training programs for teachers, help in curriculum design, consultation in connection with school problems such as integration, and other similar services. The federal government has given support to these programs in particular areas. In 1967–68, for example, the National Science Foundation awarded grants of $46 million for teacher training programs in the sciences, and the Office of Education provided over $12 million for a program of experienced-teacher fellowships. The National Foundation could review new service programs, which through improving the quality of education at the primary and secondary levels would have valuable consequences for higher education as well.

Regional Liberal Arts Centers

Many undergraduate liberal arts colleges have formed consortia to permit them to use more effectively the resources available to each institution. This development could be encouraged through the National Foundation. The Commission urges that federal funds be made available to regional liberal arts centers which would be established by groups of colleges for the purpose of increasing quality, scope, and diversity in undergraduate education, of stimulating more economical and effective use of administrative and teaching personnel, and of sharing library and computer facilities.

The New Technology

The newly created program of Networks for Knowledge and on-going programs providing financial assistance for computer use at universities and colleges should be continued. The National Foundation could be particularly helpful, however, in evaluating proposals for experimental or pilot programs designed to determine the effectiveness of new educational uses of the whole range of modern technology.

Urban-Grant Activities

The land-grant college movement had a significant effect on the nature of the public and, to some extent, the private university. Today, the pressing problems of the city are calling for a new evaluation of the university's relationship to the city.

If universities and colleges are to aid in the solutions of the complex problems of the inner city, they will have to develop new curricular programs and new concepts of public service. Such developmental programs, during their early phases, could be funded under the National Foundation.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends establishment of a National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education whose functions would be to encourage, advise, review, and provide financial support for institutional programs designed to give new directions in curricula, to strengthen essential areas that have fallen behind or never been adequately developed because of inadequate funding, and to develop programs for improvement of educational processes and techniques.

Level of funding. The Commission suggests that the Foundation for the Development of Higher Education be funded at a level of approximately $100 million in 1970–71, rising to $200 million in 1976–77.

CONCLUSION

The Carnegie Commission has undertaken an independent analysis of the needs of higher education and the needs of the nation as related to the services of higher education. Our analysis has led to the conclusion that federal aid to higher education, beyond the needed expansion of existing programs, should be directed toward the meeting of two urgent national priorities.

One of these priorities is to achieve greater equality of opportunity for all able young people, both for their own benefit and for the benefit of the nation. Today, young persons whose families are in the top half of the income range have a three times greater chance of entering college than those whose families are in the lower half. We believe it is a realistic goal to improve this ratio of two to one by 1976, the two-hundredth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, with its promise of equality. Our proposals would draw 1 million additional students into college attendance through what might be called a "Civilian Bill of Educational Rights" for qualified youth without adequate financial means.

The second priority is a substantial expansion of health service personnel. Specifically we recommend federal support to increase medical school places for the training of doctors by three-quarters by 1976 and to develop programs for training new types of medical support personnel. This will require the enlargement of existing medical centers and the creation of as many as 20 new centers.

We also propose the continuation and expansion of a number of existing programs: for construction—including start-up grants for 500 new two-year community colleges and 50 four-year urban colleges; for research—including substantial extension of support beyond the sciences; for the training of Ph. D.s in all academic areas rather than primarily in the sciences; and for new endeavors to strengthen the system of higher education—including the creation of a National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education, which will encourage experimental programs such as those for the improvement of undergraduate instruction and for urban-grant activities.

These new priorities and the expansion of existing programs will cost approximately $10 billion per year by 1976, or about one-seventh of the $70 billion in additional federal revenues prospectively available by that year for new national priorities. We recognize the many other valuable purposes for which this increment will be needed, but we consider that a one-seventh share for higher education is warranted.

Our proposals envision keeping the share of private funds for the support of institutions of higher education at their present level of one-half. We feel that this level of private support is important for the autonomy and diversity of higher education. To assure that federal support is given in forms compatible with this private emphasis, we recommend an expanded student aid program giving the student freedom of choice among institutions, a feature which proved so effective under the GI Bill of Rights. This freedom of choice would be further broadened through a proposed student loan bank.

The total governmental share would remain at one-half, with the federal portion rising and the state portion falling, as has been true for the past decade. The federal government has the greater ability to increase its contribution. Also the new emphasis on equality of opportunity, the increase in health care personnel, the training of Ph.D.s for employment throughout the nation, the support of scientific discovery, and the strengthening of the whole system of higher education as a great national resource all reflect increasing national concern and responsibilities.

The Commission's proposals anticipate that the percentage of the GNP spent through institutions of higher education will rise by one-half from 2 to 3 percent. In the past decade the percentage doubled, from 1 to 2 percent, as enrollments doubled, and it now seems reasonable that the percentage should rise by one-half in the period to 1976, when enrollments will rise by one-half. Throughout this period the forms of service to society are taking on new dimensions in response to changing needs of society. There have been and there will be more knowledge, more training, and more service as higher education provides the intellectual sources of technical and social advance.

The prospects beyond 1976 are not clear. But, as enrollments stabilize, it would seem likely that subsequent support will rise roughly with the rise in GNP and will not require a significantly higher percentage of the GNP. The period from 1956 to 1976 will be viewed as the great period of expansion for higher education—the period in which the tidal wave of students was accommodated, and adjustment was made to the impact of greatly augmented scientific research.

We believe that the nation has a great stake in a dynamic, healthy, and flexible system of higher education, and our recommendations are intended to add to the strength and the progress of the system as well as to make possible greater service to society. The major aims of the proposals are:

To provide student aid in sufficient amounts to assure that no qualified student must forgo or cut short his pursuit of higher education because of financial barriers;

To assist institutions of higher education with funds for expansion of physician facilities and for added instructional costs to assure the necessary places for all qualified students;

To encourage graduate training of professional personnel, with particular emphasis on medical education, to fill critical national needs for practitioners in the health sciences;

To support the most talented Ph.D. candidates and the institutions that train them at levels which will preserve and enhance the highest academic quality;

To continue support of university research, a function which has already contributed so greatly to the national welfare and which holds the best promise of solutions to new problems of vital public concern;

To provide special aid for new directions in curricula, for important areas that have fallen behind through inadequate funding, and for programs to improve educational processes and techniques.

The total cost of the various federal aid programs recommended in this Report would be almost $7 billion in 1970–71 and would rise to almost $13 billion in 1976–77. The current cost of comparable federal aid programs is about $3.5 billion. The federal share of the funding of higher education institutions would rise from 21 to 32 percent, and the state share would fall from 27 to 17 percent. The private share would remain at approximately 50 percent.

Even with the levels of federal support proposed here, state and private sources will find the financial burden of basic support of higher education extremely heavy over the decade ahead. Institutions of higher education for their part will find it absolutely essential to make the most efficient and economical use of their available resources, to exercise the utmost restraint and care in the provision of new programs and facilities, and to reexamine their budgetary standards and practices. The Commission believes that quality can be maintained during a difficult fiscal period by scrupulous evaluation of all current and proposed educational programs.

Federal policy toward higher education and support of higher education require constant and careful overall review. We recommend the establishment of a Council of Advisers on Higher Education attached to the White House to undertake studies and recommend policy on the model of the Council of Economic Advisers.

American higher education is today a basic national resource. It affects the hopes and aspirations of the total population.

ESTIMATED FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FOR COMMISSION PROPOSALS, 1970-71 AND 1976-77

[In billions of dollars]

	1970-71	1976-77
Student aid programs	1.91	3.56
Educational opportunity grants	1.10	2.14
Basic student grants	.90	1.60
Supplementary matching grants	.11	.38
Institutional scholarship funds	.09	.16
Work-study program	.51	.87
Counseling program	.03	.04
Graduate talent search	.03	.10
Doctoral fellowships	.11	.16
Loan program	.13	.25
Cost-of-education supplements	1.13	2.71
Medical education program	.33	.43
Student aid	.03	.04
General support grants	.23	.35
Construction	.07	.04
Construction	1.26	1.22
Research	2.00	4.05
Foundation for the Development of Higher Education	.10	.20
Special programs	.30	.80
Total	7.03	12.97

ESTIMATED FEDERAL LOAN COMMITMENTS UNDER COMMISSION PROPOSALS, 1970-71 AND 1976-77

[In billions of dollars]

	1970-71	1976-77
Construction	0.53	0.61
Student loans	2.50	5.00

As education through high school has become almost universal, as knowledge has expanded, as the professional and intellectual demands of modern society have become ever more complex, and demanding, the nation has looked increasingly to America's colleges and universities to meet many of our most important national needs:

For furtherance of individual aspirations;

For equality of educational and thus economic and social opportunity;

For scientific and technological advances to stimulate economic growth;

For highly trained personnel to serve a complex society;

For cultural enrichment of the quality of life;

And for the ideas so crucial to solution of profoundly complex issues.

[In billions]

	1967-68	1976-77
Research and development	$1.45	$4.05
Student aid	0.62	3.60
Institutional support cost of education supplements	0.44	3.06
Construction	0.57	1.26
Other	0.37	1.25
Total	3.45	13.22

Note: The total of $13,022,000,000 for 1976-77 includes Federal expenditures for Commission proposals and an estimated $250,000,000 for certain programs of Federal support to higher education institutions not covered in Commission proposals but expected to be continued. The 1967-68 institutional support figure includes an estimated amount for fellowship and traineeship program expenditures through institutions of higher education which are retained by institutions to defray partially the costs of the training programs.

What the American nation now needs from higher education can be summed up in two words: quality and equality. Our colleges and universities must preserve academic quality if our intellectual resources are to prove equal to the challenges of contemporary life. And the campuses must act boldly to open new channels to equality of educational opportunity.

But these essential national needs will not be fully met unless the federal government assumes new levels of responsibility for higher education. The Carnegie Commission believes that a much greater federal investment is now essential if the growth of higher education is not to be curbed at the very time that the national need demands our best ideas and intellectual skills and the broadest possible extension of equality of opportunity.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, today I join with Senators KENNEDY and JAVITS in sponsoring a higher education bill incorporating many of the proposals set forth in the recent Carnegie Commission Report. This bill represents an effort on the part of the three of us to make some suggestions as to the types and magnitude of programs needed in order to equalize educational opportunity at the college and university level. Our purpose in introducing the bill at this time is to acquaint the members of Congress with the severe financial needs of our college-age students and the universities which will be educating them. In no sense should the bill be viewed as a finished product, but hopefully, it will act as a catalytic agent to encourage discussion and debate in the Senate and will result in the passage of financially feasible and realistic legislation which will accomplish the purpose of making a higher education available to all qualified Americans who desire it.

AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF SENATE TO RECEIVE AND REFER MESSAGES AND FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, April 21, 1969, during the adjournment of the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President and from the House of Representatives, and that they may be appropriately referred. I also ask unanimous consent that on that day all committees may file reports, including minority, individual, and additional views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 1969

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until noon on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT AT DENISON UNIVERSITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, is to deliver an address tonight at Denison University in Granville, Ohio, on the subject of militarism and American democracy.

This is a subject which has been of increasing interest to the Senate and members of the American public over the past few months and I hope that Members will read Senator FULBRIGHT'S careful and thoughtful remarks with care.

I think the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is to be commended for making such a significant statement at this time. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARISM AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

(Statement by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Owens-Corning Lecture, Denison University, Granville, Ohio, April 18, 1969, 8:15 p.m.)

Perhaps the hardest thing for the older generation to understand about the student generation is the intensity with which it perceives the cruelty and insanity of our modern world. One might have thought that, having grown up in quieter times, the men who now run this country would be more appalled by the dangers of the present than the young who never knew anything else. But that seems not to be the case: time and continuing turmoil seem to dull the capacity for feeling shock and, with it, moral indignation. Perhaps also, having known quieter times, we old folks find it possible to believe that the current crisis is temporary and transitional, and that, if only we will forebear and endure, life will return to a kind of normalcy.

I suspect that experience is a bad teacher in this case. As Margaret Mead pointed out recently, "All of us who grew up before the war are immigrants in time, immigrants from an earlier world living in an age essentially different from anything we knew before."[1] It is the native born of the atomic age who seem to be its more perceptive diagnosticians. "It is you of the student generation who seem to have recognized that Vietnam and the nuclear balance of terror are not just an aberration but part of a profound and irreversible upheaval in human affairs, to which the old methods of politics have become grotesquely irrelevant. Perhaps that is because you never knew the world in which the old ways made some sense. Or perhaps, as Professor George Wald of Harvard put it in a memorable speech, it is because you are a generation that is by no means sure that it has a future."[2] I would like to reassure you but I cannot. I don't know either whether there is going to be a future, because the invention of nuclear weapons has given an entirely new meaning to death. From the time man appeared upon the earth to the middle of the twentieth century coming to terms with death was an individual matter. Now death has become a prospect not just for the individual but for the human species. With varying degrees of insight into its revolutionary meaning every one of us carries the knowledge that it is possible—technologically and politically possible—that at any moment our civilization may be all but annihilated. It is this knowledge which constitutes the revolution of our time; and it is the sensitivity of its meaning which separates the generations—dividing those who grew up with it from those who grew up before it by a chasm of outlook and attitude.

I. THE ABM: POWER POLITICS AS USUAL

The recent and continuing debate over the anti-ballistic missile provides a striking example of the survival of outmoded attitudes into an era in which they are not only meaningless but extravagantly dangerous.

Footnotes at end of article.

Sitting as I have in recent weeks through long hours of Committee hearings and debate on the ABM, I was struck again and again by the thought: we are talking about the possible destruction of entire societies, including our own, as if this were a hazard not fundamentally different, except in scale, from more familiar misfortunes such as earthquakes or fires or an epidemic of Asian flu; and we are talking about the death of fifty or so million people—give or take ten million; it doesn't matter much when you are talking about "megadeaths"—as if this would mean no more than a temporary dislocation in our affairs. It's not that we have become insensate monsters. It's more as though we didn't really believe our own words. We are talking about these things—these fifty million deaths—as if they were unreal; we are talking about them in the abstract, and in the abstract they are unreal. We are acknowledging possibilities that we do not really feel to be possibilities because they are so far outside anything we have ever experienced. Even a word like "megadeath" has an antiseptic sound. It doesn't sound like blood and pain and burns and mutilations.

Listening to the Senate debate on the ABM, I have been filled with this sense of unreality. I don't think it is very hard to show the unsoundness of the arguments made by the proponents of the ABM: what I do find unfathomable is their apparently sincere belief that we can seek security from a nuclear weapons system in the same way that, before the nuclear age, we sought security from our fleet or from our air force. Allow me, very briefly, to review the main arguments made for the ABM:

It is said that a "thin"—that is to say, a $9 billion—ABM system would deter an attack by China. But, as one expert witness told the Disarmament Subcommittee, an attack by China with the modest forces at its disposal would be wildly irrational in any case because it would certainly provoke a retaliatory blow which would destroy China. Should the Chinese be so irrational as to attack the United States anyway, they would not be deterred by so "rational" a deterrent as the ABM—which, in any case, they would probably be capable of penetrating.[3]

The Secretary of Defense professes to believe—although he has since qualified the assertion—that, with their powerful new SS9 missile, the Russians are committed to a strategy of first-strike, which is to say, a preemptive attack to destroy our retaliatory capacity. How Mr. Laird knows this is not made clear; he just says he does. But his own Administration seems not to share this alarming assessment of Soviet strategy. Secretary of State Rogers told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 27 that the Nixon Administration would be "delighted" to negotiate a mutual dismantlement of defensive missiles with the Russians—a position the Administration could hardly take if it were convinced the Russians had adopted a first-strike strategy. Indeed, in his press conference of March 14, President Nixon made it very clear that he was not persuaded of a Soviet first-strike strategy. The Russians, he said, "have always thought in defensive terms, and if you read not only their political leaders, but their military leaders, the emphasis is on defense.

Even if the Russians were engaged in an effort to build a force capable of destroying our retaliatory power in a first strike, it is most unlikely that they could do so. Our strategic forces are now capable of delivering over four thousand nuclear warheads, less than one-tenth of which, according to former Secretary of Defense McNamara, could destroy over 75 percent of the industry of the Soviet Union and kill over 30 percent of the population. As one expert witness told the Disarmament Subcommittee, "I would not claim that the development by the Soviet Union of such a first-strike capability is impossible, but it is at worst a distant prospect."[4]

Finally, it is urged that the ABM will be a useful bargaining lever in disarmament negotiations with the Russians. All previous experience shows that, far from facilitating agreement, the introduction of a new weapons system by one side invariably provokes the other side into matching or exceeding it. It was indeed our own apprehension about Soviet anti-ballistic missile capacity that gave us the idea of a missile with several warheads on it, an idea which has blossomed into the glorious new invention known as MIRV—the multiple independent reentry vehicle—which is now being readied, at great cost, for our Minuteman missiles and Polaris submarines. Each side tends to assume the worst, planning for what has come to be known as the greater-than-expected threat. When you acquire a new weapons system, you must assume that it may not work as planned while your adversary must assume that it will. The result is the stepping up of the arms race, with mounting danger, skyrocketing costs, and rapidly diminishing security. As a bargaining lever for disarmament, the ABM is likely to be as effective as gasoline shot through a fire hose.

All these arguments for the ABM are made in the vocabulary of the old power politics. Lost to view is any kind of awareness that we have passed through a revolution in the conditions of life and politics upon the earth, as a result of which the old methods will no longer serve us. They had indeed ceased to serve us before the nuclear age began, having collapsed in the carnage of the two world wars. Now the ancient techniques of the power politics are not only discredited but intolerably dangerous, but we do not seem able to part with them, much less devise new forms appropriate to the times. Our public rhetoric is full of assertions about a "new age" and "uncharted seas," about world community and the importance of disarmament. We say these things but we say them without conviction, without urgency and commitment, without the sincerity that could only be demonstrated by *acting* on them. We have spoken so much about disarmament and community and the brotherhood of man that they all now seem like cliches; we have grown weary of the words without ever having really grasped their meaning.

The old, discredited methods still dominate our thinking and behavior. We still study and still practice nineteenth century power politics as if its techniques were tried and tested and proven, as if the two world wars had never happened. We commend these disastrous anachronisms to ourselves as guidelines to prudence and "realism." Perhaps this is because of the difficulty people have in grasping the enormity of the changes brought by the nuclear age and the enormity of the disaster with which we are threatened. We are hobbled in our thinking by a failure of imagination, the inability to conceive of the disaster of thermonuclear war—and of tens of millions of dead; of burned, maimed and radiation-poisoned survivors; of the collapse of public services and the breakdown of economic life; of disease and epidemics; of a furious struggle for life by tortured and debilitated people.

The ability to contemplate these horrors with equanimity is properly credited not to strong nerves but to a weak mind. We are indeed afloat upon unchartered seas and we must learn somehow not just to say it but to *know* it and to act upon it. We must learn somehow that the old "realism" has become a dangerous delusion. As Professor Wald put it: "We have to get rid of those nuclear weapons. There is nothing worth having that can be obtained by nuclear war: nothing material or ideological, no tradition that it can defend. It is utterly self-defeating."[5]

II. "MERCHANTS OF DEATH"

There are some less arcane reasons for our stubborn adherence to the old methods. Dangerous though it may be, the arms race is also exceedingly profitable. It is profitable not only to the "Strangeloves of the military-industrial complex," as I. F. Stone calls them,[6] but to millions of honest, decent Americans whose primary concern is with nothing more than earning a decent living for their families. The industries and businesses which fill military orders have become the largest single producer of goods and services in the United States, pouring some $45 billion a year into over five thousand communities where more than eight million Americans, including members of the armed forces, and comprising 10 percent of the labor force, earn their living from defense spending.

Violence has become the nation's leading industry. We are now spending about $80 billion a year on the military, which is more than the profits of all American business, or, to make another comparison, is almost as much as the total spending of federal, state, and local governments for health, education, old age and retirement benefits, housing and agriculture. Drawing their income from the $80 billion military budget, the defense industry forms what amounts to a giant concentration of socialism in our nominally free enterprise economy. As one writer who has made a study of the political and economic effects of defense spending has noted, the federal budget has become a dominant "growth industry" and ". . . it is defense expenditures and not welfare programs that have so greatly enlarged the federal government's role in the economy."[7]

It is not an enthusiasm for war but simple economic self-interest that has drawn millions of workers, their labor unions and their elected representatives into the military-industrial complex. For all of them the anti-ballistic missile means prosperity not war. For the industrialist it means higher profits not war; for the worker new jobs and the prospect of higher wages; for the politician a new installation or defense order with which to ingratiate himself with his constituents. These benefits, once obtained, are not easily parted with. Every new weapons system or military installation soon acquires a constituency—a process which is aided and abetted by the perspicacity with which Pentagon officials award lucrative contracts and establish new plants and installations in the districts of influential Members of Congress. I have not the slightest doubt that, if the anti-ballistic missile is deployed, "thick" or "thin," it will soon acquire its own powerful constituency, whereupon we will be saddled with it—for reasons wholly independent of its ostensible military utility.

The defense industry and the military establishment are coming under a kind of interlocking directorate. According to a survey made for the Subcommittee on Economy and Government of the Joint Economic Committee under the chairmanship of Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin, the one hundred biggest defense contractors now employ 2,072 former high-ranking military officers. Among these the ten largest companies, which received $11.6 billion in defense contracts last year, now employ 1,065 former high-ranking officers. The nine major producers of the Sentinel anti-ballistic missile, as initiated by the Johnson Administration, employ 465 former military officers. All this, as Senator Proxmire said in something of an understatement, points to "the increasing influence of the big

---

Footnotes at end of article.

contractors with the military and the military with the big contractors."[7]

Spawned by our global military involvements, the military-industrial complex has become a powerful force for the perpetuation of those involvements. Millions of Americans have acquired a vested interest in the expensive weapons systems which provide their livelihood and, indirectly therefore, in a foreign policy that has plunged the United States into a spiraling arms race with the Soviet Union; made us the world's major salesman of armaments; and committed us to the defense of "freedom"—very loosely defined—in almost fifty countries, including Vietnam, Spain and Greece with their "freedom-loving" regimes.

I would not equate the vested interest of the Pentagon generals and the leaders of the aerospace industry with that of the ordinary wage-earner but, lest we become too sanctimonious about the fat-cats, it is well to remember that, in armaments as in other lines of work, it is not the price received but the service rendered that gives a profession its name. And that brings me to the role of the universities in the military-industrial complex.

A university in the classic sense is an idealistic rather than a "pragmatic" institution, primarily committed to moral rather than expedient purposes, to the pursuit of truth and meaning rather than the sale of goods and services. In recognition of this special status, universities are generously supported by tax exemptions and both public and private contributions. The university in turn has a responsibility to protect its status as an "idealistic" institution, not to the point of remoteness or irrelevance to the problems of society, but by maintaining a sufficient degree of detachment from political authorities to make certain that it does not become a "pragmatic" institution, a paid producer of goods and services, a hireling of the state.

It is difficult to say exactly where the line should be drawn in practical application but the general principle seems clear: a university maintains its integrity only insofar as its preponderant resources are committed to the education of its students and the disinterested pursuit of knowledge—not only that knowledge which contributes to the solution of technical and social problems but the whole range of nonutilitarian scholarship which contributes to man's understanding of himself. Other activities—including the performance of specific services to the state—are appropriate only insofar as they are subordinate in scale and compatible in character with the university's primary responsibilities.

To a far greater extent than its European counterparts the American university has always had a penchant, in Alfred North Whitehead's phrase, for "mating itself with action," and this has contributed both to the welfare of the country and the vitality of the university. But, coupled with an unprecedented need for funds in the years since World War II, the penchant for action has also turned out to be a serious weakness of our universities. Tempted by lucrative government contracts, many universities—especially the big and famous ones—have become neglectful of their paramount responsibilities and have gone dangerously far toward becoming servants of the state. Because the major source by far of government contract funds is the military establishment, the universities have been drawn primarily into military, or militarily useful, research in the physical and social sciences, becoming in the process card-carrying members of the military-industrial complex.

The government by and large has been well-satisfied with the contributions of academic experts—although my Committee has come across more than a few instances in which it seemed to us that the government had been defrauded. And, in the irreverent words of a report written by two professors from Michigan State for the United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, the government's delight "has been matched by squeals of joy in the academy." The attractions, say the two professors, are profit, prestige, and "opportunities to orbit deans around the world."[8]

Even more irreverently, Dean Don K. Price of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard offered a limerick apropos of the universities' response to government blandishments:

"There was a young lady from Kent,
Who said that she knew what it meant,
When men took her to dine
Gave her cocktails and wine
She knew what it meant—but she went."

What it has meant is the wholesale neglect of students by prominent faculty members, the wholesale neglect of unsalable forms of scholarship, the distortion of curriculum and research toward merchantable activities, and the taking into camp of leading academics by the military-industrial complex. No one of course requires this of the universities; it comes about not as a result of direct federal control but simply from the influence purchased by lavish government funds. Lacking a use for philosophy and poetry, the Defense Department and the Central Intelligence Agency offer no funds for these disciplines; the government is a patron only of the more lethal arts.

The University of California at Berkeley, according to a student publication, receives almost 90 percent of its research grants in the physical sciences and almost 70 percent of its research grants in the social sciences from the federal government. Berkeley, as you know, is also one of the centers of student rebellion. I think there is a relationship. I also think there is a relationship between student dissent and the fact that the Naval Biological Laboratory administered by Berkeley's School of Public Health is engaged in research for the Navy in biological warfare. With the participation of faculty members of the School of Public Health, research is conducted in the field of "aerobiology," which has to do with the transmission of communicable diseases.

Research in chemical and biological warfare is not one of those activities than can be regarded as appropriate to an "idealistic" institution. Nor is Pentagon-sponsored field research in counterinsurgency an appropriate activity for social scientists who ought to be acting as independent and critical commentators on their government's policies. Far from being victims of anti-intellectualism as some of these scholars complain when their activities are criticized, they themselves are perpetrating a virulent form of anti-intellectualism. They do so by contributing to the corruption of their universities, the militarization of American society, and that persistent degradation of values which goes by the polite name of "credibility gap."

III. AMERICAN MILITARISM

In a society whose leading industry is violence, one of the leading professions, inevitably, is soldiering. Chronically at war, or threatening war, or being threatened with war, with a million and a half American military people stationed outside of our own borders, with a huge and costly military establishment and a gigantic defense industry, "America," as former Marine Corps Commandant David M. Shoup recently wrote, "has became a militaristic and aggressive nation."[9]

Militarism is new to America. Prior to World War II we never maintained more than a token peacetime army; even in 1940, on the eve of World War II, there were less than half a million men in the armed forces. In those days the military had little prestige or influence. "For in my youth," Walter Lippmann once recalled, "we all assumed that the money spent on battleships would better be spent on schoolhouses, and that war was an affair that 'militarists' talked about and not something that seriously-minded progressive democrats paid any attention to."[10] Nor, in those years, was there anything resembling the military-industrial complex which looms so large in our affairs today. Allegations made in the thirties to the effect that the United States had been maneuvered into World War I by munitions makers, by the "merchants of death" as they were called, turned out to be unfounded.

World War II gave birth to American militarism, and the cold war, the Korean War and the Vietnamese war nourished it into the giant force of today. These wars conferred upon military leaders the power and prestige which previously they had been denied. Military leaders, as General Shoup points out, became not only popular heroes but respected opinion makers.

In addition we have become a nation of veterans—over twenty-three million as of 1968. This means that one-fifth of our adult population have been subjected to some degree of indoctrination in military values and attitudes. The great veterans organizations, with over four million members, have grown into one of the most powerful lobbies in Washington primarily working for veterans' benefits but, often too, lobbying for chauvinist and belligerent foreign policies.

There is much that is valuable in military experience: it encourages loyalty, honor and courage. But it also fosters less wholesome attitudes—conformism, elitism, authoritarianism, and a certain romanticism about war. As time passes, memories are revised, and the veteran is likely to remember the comradeship and excitement while forgetting the killing and the fear; he may remember the music and pageantry while forgetting how hot and smelly and boring it is in a column of marching men. Most of all, as nostalgia sets in, the veteran is likely to remember the thrill of adventure while forgetting its lethal purpose. As General Shoup puts it: "Soldiering loses appeal for some of the relatively few who experience the blood, terror, and filth of battle; for many, however, including far too many senior professional officers, war and combat are an exciting adventure, a competitive game, and an escape from the dull routines of peacetime."[11]

At the core of the new American militarism is the professional officers' corps made up of a few thousand high-ranking officers of unusual ability and energy. Marked as men of talent by their rise to the highest ranks through the rigorous competitiveness of the military services, they bring to bear a strength of conviction and near unanimity of outlook that gives them an influence on public policy disproportionate to their numbers. Disciplined and loyal to their respective services, with added prestige in the case of many of them deriving from heroic combat records, they operate with an efficiency and effectiveness not often found among civilian officials. In addition, as General Shoup points out, they always have a plan in an emergency, and that can be very beguiling to anxious politicians and frightened people.

The danger arises from the narrowness of outlook of so many professional soldiers, an outlook amounting to an inveterate preference for the use of force. As one social psychologist, Professor Ralph K. White of George Washington University, points out, every profession tends to overvalue its own stock in trade and it is only natural that soldiers lay great stress on theirs, which happens to be weapons.[12] To the "professional" soldier it is axiomatic that, if you make enemy "hurt" enough, he will eventually give in. If, as in Vietnam, the enemy does not give in to superior power, that is attributed to an insufficiency of force and can be remedied

---

Footnotes at end of article.

by applying more force. To this military prototype, there is "no substitute for victory" and the failure to apply the necessary force to achieve it is taken as the result of a failure of will, a lack of courage, and even a deficiency of virility. Excluded from serious consideration is the possibility that force may fail, as in Vietnam, not because you didn't use enough of it, but because it was the wrong thing to use in the first place.

The critical deficiency in the soldier's outlook, Professor White suggests, is a lack of empathy with the enemy, and a consequent lack of ability to predict the enemy's behavior.[13] Assuming a perfect inverse relationship between the amount of force you apply and the enemy's will to resist, the military planner takes grossly insufficient account of psychological factors. The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor was a brilliant strategic success; it virtually destroyed the American Pacific fleet, but the Japanese totally failed to foresee how the attack would unify the American people and galvanize the enormous resources and energies which were to bring ruin to the Japanese Empire. In similar fashion, the think-tank strategists and Pentagon planners failed to gauge the psychological effects of our military intervention in South Vietnam and our bombing of North Vietnam, and, in the wake of this failure, their pseudo-scientific theories of limited war and "graduated escalation" have gone hopelessly awry. Fighting in their own homeland against an enemy whom they regard as a foreign invader, the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese have failed inexplicably to respond to scientifically inflicted punishment with scientific displays of pain.

Our greatest military miscalculation was not as to the enemy's behavior but our own. It was not foreseen that the American people would not indefinitely sustain a war against a small, distant and backward country, a war without valid or attainable purpose, a war in which success is measured not by the attainment of positive objectives but by the barbarous standard of "kill ratios." What no one foresaw—neither the military nor the rest of us—was that we would become trapped in a conflict matching the enemy's willingness to die against our willingness to kill. For us the choice has become one between victory and decency—an awkward choice indeed, suggesting that somewhere along the line there was a failure in our military planning.

Just as force is the professional soldier's stock in trade, war is his best opportunity for advancement. I do not think that military professionals consciously seek or yearn for war, but they can hardly be blamed if they do not abhor it as civilians do. Peacetime duty is dull. An army in peacetime is like Congress during adjournment—without the same opportunities for travel. Combat provides a soldier with the opportunity for distinction, advancement and command. General Shoup takes note of this tendency,[14] and so indeed did that most perceptive observer of America, Alexis de Tocqueville, who took note over a hundred years ago of the special dangers and susceptibilities of military establishments in democracies. In aristocracies, Tocqueville points out, the nobility become officers as a matter of duty and their ranks are foreclosed by birth, but,

"In democratic armies all the soldiers may become officers, and that fact makes desire for promotion general and opens almost infinite doors to military ambition.

"Desire for promotion is almost universal in democratic armies;" Tocqueville continues, "it is eager, tenacious, and continual. All other desires serve to feed it, and it is only quenched with life itself. It is therefore easy to see that promotion in times of peace must be slower in democratic armies than in any other armies in the world.

"Therefore all the ambitious minds in a democratic army ardently long for war, because war makes vacancies available and at last allows violations of the rule of seniority, which is the one privilege natural to a democracy.

"We thus arrive at the strange conclusion that of all armies those which long for war most ardently are the democratic ones, but that of all peoples those most deeply attached to peace are the democratic nations. And the most extraordinary thing about the whole matter is that it is equality which is responsible for both these contradictory results."[15]

The military have become ardent and dangerous competitors for power in American society. The services compete with each other for funds, for the control of new weapons systems, and for the privilege of being "first to fight." Constantly improving their techniques for rapid deployment, they not only yearn to try them out but actively seek opportunities by pressing their proposals on political authorities, who all too often are tempted by the seemingly quick, "surgical" courses of action proposed by the military in preference to the endless, wearisome methods of diplomacy. For a variety of reasons—to test new plans and equipment, to try out the techniques of counterinsurgency, and, in the case of the Marines, says General Shoup, just to avoid the disgrace of being left out[16]—all of the military services were enthusiastic about the initial involvement in Vietnam. By now they should have had their fill, but they still seem game to go on, trying out new weapons and strategies, although up to now the only military principle which has been vindicated in Vietnam is Tocqueville's maxim that, "There are two things that will always be very difficult for a democratic nation: to start a war and to end it."[17]

Even though there is probably not a single top-ranking officer in any of the armed services who would consider an attempt to overturn constitutional government in the way of *Seven Days in May*, militarism poses a distinct threat to our democracy. At the very minimum it represents a dangerously constricted and highly influential point of view toward our foreign relations—a viewpoint which takes little account of political complexities, even less of social and economic factors, and just about none of human and psychological considerations.

But the military is more than a benign repository of parochial political views. It has become a vigorous partisan in our politics, exerting great influence on the executive, on the military committees of Congress, on the "think-tanks" and universities to which it parcels out lucrative research contracts, and on public opinion. A few weeks ago it came to my attention that the Department of the Army was planning a national publicity campaign, involving exhibits and planted magazine articles to be solicited from tame civilian scientists, in order to sell the ABM to the American public and to counteract the criticisms of Congressmen and the scientific community.

Only very rarely does a general invoke the higher loyalty of patriotism—his own concept of it, that is—over loyalty to civilian political authority, as General MacArthur did in his defiance of President Truman. But if, as time goes on, the country continues to be chronically at war, continues to sustain a huge, largely autonomous military establishment, and continues to neglect its domestic problems, militarism will surely increase, and even if the military does not take over the government directly, it could come to acquire power comparable to that of the German General Staff in the years before World War I. It may not seem likely now, but it is by no means so inconceivable that we need not warn against it and act to prevent it.

The root cause of militarism is war, and as long as we have the one, we will be menaced by the other. Tocqueville expressed it as follows:

"War does not always give democratic societies over to military government, but it must invariably and immeasurably increase the power of civil government; it must almost automatically concentrate the direction of all men and the control of all things in the hands of the government. If that does not lead to despotism by sudden violence, it leads men gently in that direction by their habits.

"All those who seek to destroy the freedom of the democratic nations must know that war is the surest and shortest means to accomplish this. That is the very first axiom of their science.[18]

IV. DEFENDING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

The best defense against militarism is peace; the next best is the vigorous practice of democracy. We are not having much success in making peace, but we are practicing democracy. The dissent against Vietnam, the opposition to the ABM, and the growing willingness of Congress to look into the hitherto sacrosanct military budget are all encouraging.

I have indeed been gratified—and frankly somewhat surprised—by the change in the Senate's attitude on military matters. A new Foreign Relations subcommittee under Senator Symington is beginning a general inquiry into military influences on our foreign policy. And Senator Gore's Disarmament Subcommittee has held public, televised hearings on the anti-ballistic missile. Four Republican Senators recently issued a statement protesting the ABM and other wasteful military projects.[19] And Senator Ellender of Louisiana, who is not usually regarded as an apostle of the New Left, said recently that

". . . For almost 20 years now, many of us in the Congress have more or less blindly followed our military spokesmen. Some have become captives of the military. We are on the verge of turning into a militaristic nation. . . . We have forgotten many of the traditions and values which made this country great, and we have flung men, arms, and material almost heedlessly about the world."[20]

Congressional concern with militarism reflects a mounting concern in the country as a whole. The drift into militarism and imperialism has elicited a powerful reaction from millions of our citizens, especially our youth, and I am much inclined to the view that, no matter how radical they regard themselves, our youth—except for a very few—have become the defenders of traditional American values. Having believed in the principles they were brought up to believe in—such as Jefferson's idea of liberty, Lincoln's idea of equality, and Wilson's idea of a peaceful community of nations—the present generation of young Americans have seen these ideas betrayed, and they are protesting against it.

They do so with a motivation that older people lack—even if they share the insight—because it is you of the student generation who are called upon to fight your country's battles. I have some awareness of the anguish that Vietnam and the draft impose upon so many of you. And while I wish that you did not have to bear this unfair burden, I must admit that I take a certain hope for the future from the moral sensibilities that underlie your anguish.

In his notable decision voiding the conviction of a non-religious conscientious objector, Judge Wyzanski of Boston may have eased the prospect for some young people who will be faced with the draft and with Vietnam, and I hope that will be the case. At the very least he has enunciated a civilized democratic principle in asserting the right of selective conscientious objection, because, unless it is believed that all wars are equally just or unjust, and unless it is believed that only organized religions provide valid bases for moral conviction, the rule overturned

---

Footnotes at end of article.

by Judge Wyzanski makes neither sense nor justice. As Judge Wyzanski put it, "Indeed a selective conscientious objector might reflect a more discriminating study of the problem, a more sensitive conscience, and a deeper spiritual understanding."

In the courts, in the universities and in Congress democracy is reasserting itself. It is engaged in a holding action against the new militarism. But as long as we remain at war, it can only be a holding action, because—if I may adapt an old military axiom—in a democracy there is no substitute for peace.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Quoted in *The New York Times*, March 16, 1969.

[2] Speech delivered at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, March 4, 1969, sponsored by the March 4 Movement protesting the misuses of science. *The Washington Post*, March 30, 1969, p. B3.

[3] Statement of Dr. George Kistiakowsky, March 11, 1969, *Strategic and Foreign Policy Implications of the ABM Systems*. Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organization and Disarmament Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 91st Cong., 2nd Sess., (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969).

[4] Statement by Dr. George Rathjens, March 28, 1969, *Strategic and Foreign Policy Implications of the ABM Systems*.

[5] *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, March 24, 1969, p. 7.

[6] Julius Duscha, *Arms, Money and Politics* (New York: Ives Washburn, Inc., 1965), p. 62.

[7] Bernard D. Nossiter, "Arms Makers Offer Haven for Ex-Pentagon Brass," *The Washington Post*, March 23, 1969, p. A2.

[8] Walter Adams and Adrian Jaffe, *Government, The Universities, and International Affairs: A Crisis in Identity*, Special Report Prepared for the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, 90th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 120 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 10.

[9] "The New American Militarism," *The Atlantic*, April 1969, p. 51.

[10] *United States Foreign Policy: Shield of the Republic*, (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1943), p. xi.

[11] "The New American Militarism," p. 53.

[12] Ralph K. White, *Nobody Wanted War: Misperception in Vietnam and Other Wars* (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968), p. 221.

[13] *Ibid*, pp. 219–221.

[14] "The New American Militarism," p. 54.

[15] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966), Vol. II, ch. 22, pp. 622–623.

[16] "The New American Militarism," p. 55.

[17] *Democracy in America*, p. 624.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 625.

[19] Senators Goodell, Cook, Hatfield and Saxbe, in a statement issued by Senators Goodell and Cook at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, April 3, 1969.

[20] *Congressional Record*, 91st Cong., 1st Sess., April 1, 1969, p. 8298.

THE NAVY RECONNAISSANCE PLANE INCIDENT IN THE SEA OF JAPAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the administration and other countries are making every effort through search missions to locate possible wreckage and to save, if possible, the lives of any survivors of the Navy reconnaissance plane which was shot down off North Korea. I commend the President for his cool and deliberate approach to this crisis.

The incident, however, raises several questions in my mind. First, let me say that it is my belief that this particular intelligence operation was carried on without the personal knowledge of President Nixon even as the incident of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* was carried on without the personal knowledge of President Johnson. The questions I have in my mind are: First, why was this trip necessary; and, second, why are relatively unarmed ships like the *Pueblo*, and unarmed planes, like this one, sent into areas where the risk of incidents of this kind is very high?

It appears to me that what has happened has resulted from a carryover of an intelligence policy and procedure which had been in existence for some years and which has been continued automatically into the present, in the absence of orders to the contrary from the new administration.

The President and the Nation require protection from that sort of situation. We need to make certain that the activities of the diverse intelligence agencies are in accord with present need, as determined by the responsible elected leadership and that the agencies do not work at times at cross purposes. They must be brought under the control of the President of the United States. I would suggest that serious consideration be given, therefore, to the creation of a headquarters element within the White House. It could evaluate the numerous continuing intelligence programs of the agencies and departments so that the responsible elected administration will know what intelligence activities are being carried on by whom, where, and for what purpose. This information should be at the disposal of the President if he chooses to have it or at the disposal of someone directly responsible to him on a daily basis so that the elected administration will be fully aware of what is happening throughout the world and would not be placed in the difficult position of its predecessors as in the cases of the U–2 incident and the *Pueblo*.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER—RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF MAINE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of my colleague from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a joint resolution of the Legislature of Maine in memoriam of Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower, 34th President of the United States of America.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN MEMORIAM

Whereas, we are deeply grieved by the death of General Dwight David Eisenhower the thirty-fourth President of the United States of America and truly a great American; and

Whereas, the spirit of his firm but compassionate leadership shall forever remain in the hearts of all peace-loving people throughout the world; and

Whereas, his every act reflected an inspiring sense of enduring devotion to duty, to honor and to country long to be cherished by all free men; and

Whereas, in his passing, not only the people of this State, but a nation of states and a world of nations, have suffered, as history will record, an irreparable loss; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, the House of Representatives concurring, that the Legislature stand and tender a moment of silent prayer and upon adjourning this day, it do so out of respect to the memory of our beloved General Dwight D. Eisenhower; and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this joint resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted to the family of the deceased.

In Senate Chamber, read and adopted, ordered sent forthwith, April 1, 1969.

Sent Down For Concurrence.

JERROLD B. SPEERS,
Secretary.

House of Representatives, read and adopted, April 1, 1969.

In concurrence.

BERTHA W. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

SHARING OF TAXES WITH STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations recently adopted a resolution requesting Congress to adopt a program providing for a sharing of taxes with State and local governments. So that Senators may be aware of the views expressed by the legislature of my State, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION H. 1418

Resolution memorializing Congress to institute a tax-sharing program with State and local governments

Resolved, That the general assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to institute a tax-sharing program with state and local governments; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is authorized to transmit a duly certified copy of this resolution to each senator and representative from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States in the hope that they will use every effort to institute and expedite such a program.

Attest:

AUGUST P. LAFRANCE,
Secretary of State.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, "Dwight David Eisenhower": The name evokes the title "President" and rank of "general" and at once something more, something simpler. For to his time and his people, he was simply "Ike," in a word, a most likable man.

We marched with "the general" across North Africa, then on to Sicily and Italy. We embarked with him on the "great crusade" that began on the beaches of Normandy and ended in that schoolhouse in Rheims.

We followed him eagerly, for he was a brilliant strategist and something more. He had that ability to weld together the greatest alliance of armies the world has ever seen. He was able to sustain victory with modesty, extend a hand and grin to the troops. "My name's Eisenhower" was all he said.

After the war, Sir Winston Churchill was to call him "the great and humble soldier." Great he was, and more. He was an authentic hero, and the Nation embraced him while he shunned heroics.

He was able to evade the early "Draft Ike" boomlets that sprung up around the country, but a large body of Americans were persistent—they wanted "Ike."

In the winter of 1952, I joined with a number of Republican colleagues in the House of Representatives in urging General Eisenhower to return from Europe and seek our party's nomination for the Presidency. As a freshman Representative, I was flattered to be included in this entreaty.

Ike answered our urgings in a letter dated March 10, 1952. I shall never forget his reply. It showed the two characteristics that were the mark of his greatness: candor and humility. At once he pointed to what he considered to be the lack of a popular call for his candidacy and his obligations to SHAPE; but he qualified this latter point humbly:

> Of course, I am not indispensable to the success of NATO and SHAPE—even if at one time many may have thought me so. If I were, then I should actually be to some extent a failure, for one of my primary objectives here has been the development of an organization that can carry on despite any loss of personnel—from the Supreme Commander through all the levels of the staff. With the help of devoted and able associates, that sort of organization has been perfected. I firmly believe that, should I walk out of this headquarters tomorrow, the mission would be carried on by competent hands—carried on successfully.

I admired General Eisenhower's modesty and sense of duty, but I disagreed with his conclusion. He humbly overlooked his irreplaceable contribution which was his extraordinary ability to understand others' viewpoints, to work in harmony with them, and to bring their divergent opinions together.

As his unparalleled cohesive talents were needed in wartime, they were needed during the early cold war years in Europe. Likewise and perhaps to an even greater extent, they were needed at home.

He reexamined his March 10 position and returned, and what we now refer to as "the Eisenhower years" began.

He was a soldier, yet he dedicated his Presidency to seeing, in his words, "people in my profession permanently put out of a job." He ended the war in Korea and waged peace for the 8 years of his incumbency.

"The Eisenhower years" are only a decade past, yet they seem even further removed. Now they seem a simple time, yet our nostalgia is deceptive.

It is now fashionable to dismiss "the Eisenhower years" as merely a period of consolidation, but this ignores the crises and conflicts, programs, and progress which marked the era.

What we seem to remember most at this time is the fact that the challenges of those years were met with the reassurance that President Eisenhower brought to the Nation, the feeling that Eisenhower was in the White House and all was well with the world.

We placed our faith in him and he sustained it, and the world seemed so much simpler as long as he was with us.

Now, therefore, the parting is difficult, because what he was is as important as what he did.

Farewell, General; goodbye, Mr. President. You served us well and gave us much, and we asked so much of you.

THE MARIHUANA MENACE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of Senators an excellent article entitled "Beware of the Marihuana Menace," published in the April 1969, issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin.

The article, written by John G. McNamara, Chief of Police in Cheshire, Conn., is concerned primarily with narcotics abuses in his community. Nevertheless, its message is valuable for all of us and for all communities throughout the country.

The primary thrust of the article is the fact that although there is serious and widespread drug usage among our youth, too many communities are unaware that the situation exists in their very midst.

But as the article illustrates, in the present day, no area and no socioeconomic class is immune to youthful drug addiction, and the sooner we accept the reality of this situation, the sooner we can take constructive steps toward its solution.

As Chief McNamara points out, there is a great need for full community cooperation in coping with the marihuana menace. Efforts by law enforcement agents alone are insufficient for handling a crisis of such magnitude, for the drug problem is an issue which involves the family, the school, the church, and other organizations in the community at large.

I commend Chief McNamara and the citizens of Cheshire for their timely and wholehearted efforts, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of Chief McNamara's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEWARE OF THE MARIHUANA MENACE

(By John G. McNamara, Chief of Police, Cheshire, Conn.)

"Alcohol is out; marihuana is in!"

This response to a question asked at our drug and narcotics symposium held in Cheshire, Conn., on January 22, 1968, became the headline in the three major newspapers serving our community.

That a chief of police would make this statement at a public meeting of adults and teenagers made our community aware of the police department's dilemma. The threat of widespread use of drugs and narcotics came upon us almost unnoticed, and, truthfully, we were not prepared to cope with the threat.

This situation came to our attention when we received requests for medical assistance. One youngster seemed to be intoxicated, but we took the necessary precautions and had the boy examined at a hospital for possible drug overdose. The youth later admitted taking a drink made of milk and a nonprescription medicinal preparation for individuals suffering from asthma. Up to this point the problem centered around drug abuse.

Suddenly, word came to our department that marihuana was being sold in Cheshire.

Cheshire is a small residential town, inhabited by more than 16,000 people and situated between the heavily populated cities of New Haven and Waterbury in southern Connecticut. Bordering Cheshire are the communities of Hamden, Wallingford, and Meriden.

Marihuana could be carried in from any of the surrounding towns. Our problem was to locate the source of this marihuana inflow, but we felt we were not prepared to handle this problem because we knew too little about drugs and narcotics.

ACQUIRING LITERATURE

As chief, it was my responsibility to see that my 18 men became familiar with drugs and narcotics, the terminology or nicknames given them by users, and the apparatus used by addicts. My first step was to contact drug companies and ask for literature describing the various drugs used for "getting high" and the symptoms and effects associated with their misuse. Then, turning to other law enforcement agencies, I acquired extensive literature on narcotics, together with addresses of companies selling teacher's kits which illustrated and described the more popular narcotics.

TEACH OFFICERS

I gave each sergeant literature, pictures, and plastic replicas of narcotic-producing plants with the request that he teach each man under his command what to look for, what to listen for, and, particularly, how to distinguish the odor of marihuana.

Later, we surveyed the physicians in our town and found that between 90 and 100 people had been treated recently after taking an unprescribed drug or narcotic.

We had a dilemma: We knew we had drug users. We knew marihuana was being used, but we did not know that so many people were involved.

In looking for a plan to protect the townspeople from the harm of drug and narcotic use, I asked our detective sergeant for his ideas.

The sergeant said, "Chief, the best place to control this problem is in the homes. Let us tell the parents the dangers of marihuana and drug abuse and how widespread the problem has become."

Certainly the idea was sound, and we began drafting a plan to help educate our residents. After discussing the plan with our first selectman, who gave us his full support, we decided to bring people knowledgeable in the narcotics field to Cheshire and have them conduct a symposium for the townspeople. Fortunately, we were able to obtain the services of the following: The chief of the Narcotics Control Section of the Connecticut State Department of Health, the head of the Connecticut State Police Narcotics Squad, the head of the Hartford City Police Narcotics Division, and the Chief Prosecutor of Connecticut's Seventh Circuit Court.

We next appealed to our local service and fraternal organizations to help create an interest in the symposium we were sponsoring. Without hesitation the clubs helped publicize the town meeting through advertisements and personal contact. Each group, in its own way, displayed readiness to back its police in conducting the attempt to unite the community against the growing threat of drug abuse.

When we announced the panel members for our planned symposium, the regional and local newspapers, as well as radio and television stations, gave wide coverage to our conference. Our only concern was whether the townspeople would attend.

On the scheduled evening, the adults and teenagers did indeed come. While the people were filing into the auditorium, a few officers passed out literature describing the types and effects of the drugs and narcotics that were to be discussed. The 800-seat high school auditorium was completely filled.

SYMPOSIUM FORMAT

We began the symposium by showing the film, "Narcotics—Pit of Despair." The movie depicted a young student-athlete who began smoking marihuana which led to his using the addictive drug, heroin. Following a scene showing the youth suffering from withdrawal pains, the movie concluded with the "cured" young man revisiting his buddies, the "pushers," which suggested the never-ending cycle of narcotic addiction.

Following this, the chief of our State Health Department's Narcotics Control Section described the various categories of drugs and chemicals. The expert told of narcotics, sedatives, depressants, stimulants, tranquilizers, hallucinogenic substances, and organic volatile solvents. After giving the common trade names and nicknames of the compounds that compose each category, the officer described the dangers of abusive use of the materials and concluded his talk by telling of a 16-year-old boy who died from excessive inhalation of cleaning fluid fumes.

Next, the State trooper presented statistics concerning the number of crimes committed by drug addicts. He mentioned such violations as car thefts, shoplifting, and rape, and suddenly he was interrupted by loud applause that followed his telling of 145 pushers arrested in the act of selling narcotics to his undercovermen.

The Hartford police narcotics expert described the changes to watch for in addicted young people: a loss of weight, a change in the texture of the skin, and an inability to cope with normal, everyday matters. The detective shocked the audience with the statement that, of the 18 people in the Greater Hartford area who died of drug abuse, 13 took overdoses, three developed chronic hepatitis, and two committed suicide.

The chief prosecutor concluded the formal portion of the symposium by suggesting reasons why teenagers turn to drugs. He said they cannot cope with pressures; they protest against the hypocrisy of adults; they attempt to avoid the difficulties of impending adult life. Therefore they seek security and self-esteem from using drugs or narcotics.

The prosecutor described the almost unbelievable actions of boys who had taken a mixture of milk and a patent medicine. He said the boys had to be forcibly removed from the police station and taken to a hospital.

QUESTIONS ASKED

When I, as moderator, asked for questions after the talks, the concern of those present was obvious by the response received. Set forth below are some questions which arose during the discussion and are typical of those which officials should be prepared to answer before becoming involved in a program of this nature.

"If 'pot' is available in Cheshire, how can the pusher be exposed?"

"Can an arrest be made by an officer if he merely hears of someone who is using a narcotic, such as pot or 'speed,' or does the individual *have* to have the drug on his person?"

"You have stated that marihuana is the start of something more dangerous, but do you have any conclusive evidence that pot, smoked occasionally, is harmful to the human system?"

"What is meant by a psychotic condition?"

"Is not alcoholism a greater problem in Cheshire?"

"Although alcohol is sometimes misused and can be physically more harmful than marihuana, the use of alcohol is permitted. Is not this a contradiction?"

"When you use the words, 'controlled drugs,' do you mean only narcotics, or drugs that require prescriptions?"

"Is it being a bit rash to conclude that the use of heroin results from marihuana? Is there any evidence of this? Cite the facts."

"Is it true that much of the reaction against marihuana is the result of a middle class prejudice against a drug that was largely used in the past by lower income groups?"

"How do you draw the line between simple sleeping pills and pain relievers that might lead to addiction to other drugs?"

"Do many of the people who are dependent on drugs have records of previous psychiatric help?"

"One assumes that none of the panelists tonight have taken any of the drugs just discussed. In this sense, how do you know what it is like to be high on pot, except from observations? Some authorities claim that in controlled dosage it is not harmful for an individual who can restrain himself."

"How does it *feel* to take a 'trip'?"

"Would someone on the panel outline the possible long-term effects of lysergic acid?"

"Has there been an increase in homegrown psilacybin?"

The scope of ideas presented by the panel and the serious concern shown by the audience made this conference a valuable evening for all. This was only the beginning of a community action program designed to protect young people from the dangers of drugs and narcotics.

SERIES OF MEETINGS

In the days that followed our symposium, the headmaster of a local private school began in his office a series of meetings with concerned residents in an attempt to search for answers. A priest, a minister, a nurse, a teacher, a reformatory guard, and interested adults and teenagers joined in the exploratory meetings to exchange ideas about marihuana control.

High school students who attended the symposium and the meetings at the private school conducted a survey within their school. As a result of their survey, they and their principal asked the board of education to incorporate educational programs on drugs into biology courses.

The finest response to our educational symposium was the cooperation of our townspeople. They came to our station to ask questions. They called us when they suspected the use of marihuana. The assistance they gave was far beyond our expectations. This cooperation resulted in the arrest of two young people possessing marihuana and one "mainliner," a term for an individual who uses a syringe to administer drugs to himself.

We continue to tell our townspeople that we are not interested in simply arresting teenagers, but however, our aim is primarily to prevent them from harming themselves.

Today, in Connecticut, addiction is considered an illness, and the arrested addicts are not jailed if they prove dependency on narcotics and that they sought medical help. Why arrest an addict possessing narcotics if with parental cooperation you can prevent a youngster from reaching the addictive stage?

Fortunately, our townspeople believe in our sincerity and many do not hesitate to openly discuss their suspicions concerning the possible use of narcotics or drugs by their youngsters. This open communication between parents, teenagers, and policemen has been a most important result.

Following the symposium, our detective sergeant received invitations to speak before the high school student body, the students of a private school, discussion groups, and some service and fraternal clubs in Cheshire. His message is basic: The police are aware of the drug and narcotic activity occurring in public places, but it is up to the parents to become aware of the activity taking place within the home.

Just recently, on two separate occasions, a parent approached our desk sergeant, handed over an envelope, and asked, "What is it?" In both instances the sergeant replied, "Looks like marihuana." In both instances the sergeant was correct.

The drug and narcotics problem still persists, but the problem is diminishing in Cheshire because it is being attacked by both the police and concerned citizens.

POWER OUTAGE IN CENTRAL MONTANA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a very serious power outage occurred in central Montana on April 4 due to a malfunction of the Montana Power Co. system. Many areas were without electricity for 2 hours or more. The total impact of the outage has not yet been evaluated. But there is no doubt of the damage to civilian and military activities in the State. Minuteman missile complexes have auxiliary power units, but despite this, one missile complex was incapacitated for an 8-hour period, the Air Force informs me.

This was only one missile complex in a system of 180, but in the event of a national emergency a single missile could conceivably be pivotal.

President Nixon has presented his revisions of the fiscal 1970 budget, and I learn that he has slashed nearly $4 million from the earlier proposed budget for Lower Snake River transmission for the Bonneville Power Administration, reducing the total of that transmission budget to $10 million. This is the most false kind of economy measure, as I shall show.

The reduction in the budget will delay the construction of the Asotin-Umatilla 500,000-volt transmission line on the Washington-Idaho border approximately 1 year from the presently scheduled date of April 1972. This delay will cause an extremely serious power supply condition in northeastern Washington, northern Idaho and western Montana. Without this new line, a fault on another line, the Lower Monumental-Little Goose 500,000-volt line, could cause cascading outages of interconnected lines and systems. After 1973, when the Lower Snake plants will feed 800,000 kilowatts into the system, the loss of this line could cause an electrical disaster on a huge scale.

In the event of such an outage, a large surge of power will flow eastward into western Montana. Because the systems in western Montana cannot possibly accommodate this load, the result will be a massive breaking apart of the systems there and in eastern Washington and northern Idaho. Engineers estimate that there could be a loss of 2,750,000 kilowatts and a blackout of the total area.

Mr. President, we already have very serious problems with the Montana Power Co. system in Montana, as evidenced by the April 4 outage. I am asking the Federal Power Commission to do all within its power to require the company to remedy the deficiencies within its system which caused the outage.

But if the Bonneville Power Administration, a utility operation far more responsible than Montana Power Co. and far more responsive to public need, should be denied the funds necessary to build urgently needed facilities, the results could be disastrous, especially if they are compounded by the inadequacies of the power company system.

The Bonneville Power Administration is wholly dependent upon the Administration and Congress to provide the funds it needs. BPA has an extremely serious responsibility to maintain the integrity of its systems in the northwest, and BPA personnel are willing and able to meet this responsibility—if we meet our responsibility to provide this agency with the funds it needs.

Thus, it seems to me that the budget cut by President Nixon is arbitrary, capricious and thoughtless. A utility system is not a toy; it has grave duties to the people it serves. Facilities for this service must be provided.

President Nixon also slashed $3,040,000 from the BPA budget for construction of an urgently needed 500,000-kilowatt line which would provide for exchanges of power with Canada and to supply the 400,000-kilowatt Intalco Aluminum Co. load in the event of an outage on another line. Loss of its power could have extremely severe consequences to the aluminum company, resulting in costly damage to its equipment. Without this new line, firm power cannot be provided to Intalco as per contractual agreements, and the Government will be in danger of violating the contract and incurring large liabilities.

Thus, I urgently request the administration to restore these two items to the Bonneville Power Administration budget.

Mr. President, I have received a statement from the Bonneville Power Administration, released earlier at a press conference, which describes in detail the impact on electric reliability of the budget cuts. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

B.I. 117 Lower Snake Transmission:	
1970 budget	$14,060,000
Reduction	3,960,000
Revised budget	10,100,000

A reduction of $3,960,000 in FY 1970 will delay the Asotin-Umatilla 500-kv line one year from the presently scheduled date of April 1972. This delay will create an extremely serious transmission and power supply condition in Northeastern Washington, Northern Idaho and Western Montana. Without this line, a fault on the Lower Monumental-Little Goose 500-kv line creates a system condition with resultant loss of generation and cascading outages of interconnected lines and systems.

In January 1973, the Lower Snake River plants feed 800,000 kw into the Lower Columbia River area. Frequency disturbance by loss of this generation can cause the opening of ties with Canada, California, and the East. The loss of power supply to the main grid would be the result of the Lower Monumental-Little Goose line opening due to a fault. Simultaneously, a large surge of power would be forced into the Western Montana system. This tendency of the generation to overspeed would cause the systems in Western Montana, Northern Idaho, and Northeastern Washington to break apart as well as create interconnected system disturbances. System oscillation would result in the loss of generation at Little Goose, Dworshak, Hungry Horse, Noxon, Cabinet Gorge, Boundary, Thompson Falls, and Kerr generating plants—a total of approximately 2,750,000 kw. Until the plants could be brought back on the line, the area would be blacked out.

B.I. 142 Monroe-Custer:	
1970 budget	$3,440,000
Reduction	3,040,000
Revised budget	400,000

This line has already been delayed one year because of reductions in the 1969 appropriations. With another year's delay, the increasing load growth of the Bellingham area could not be adequately served over the existing system.

This facility also provides transmission capacity for exchanges of power with the Canadian systems. An extended outage on the existing 500-kv system would require instantaneous dropping of the 400,000 kw Intalco Aluminum Company load and a prolonged reduction of 200,000 kw of company load. An outage of two hours or more could result in freeze-ups of one or more potlines with loss to the Company of $375,000 for chipping out and reactivation and $1,000,000 in loss of production per potline. Without this facility, firm transmission capacity will not be furnished Intalco in accordance with contractual agreements.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?—THE OUTLOOK FOR 1969 AS SEEN IN A SERIES OF ARTICLES IN THE HEARST NEWSPAPERS

Mr. **COOPER**. Mr. President, in December of last year the Hearst newspapers published a series of articles by outside contributors concerning America's problems and potentials for the year 1969. Mayor Joseph Alioto, of San Francisco, discusses the problems of the cities; Gov. Daniel J. Evans, of Washington, writes of the outlook for the States; Prof. Paul McCracken, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, reports on the national economy; Mayor Carl B. Stokes, of Cleveland, writes on race relations; Mr. Robert E. Thompson, national editor of the Hearst newspapers, discusses the 1960's as a time of transition; the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), discusses the involvement of youth in national affairs. I was pleased to be given an opportunity to present an article concerning my views on future trends in foreign affairs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

We are passing through a strange, turbulent period in our history—riots in our cities, crime in our streets, revolt among our young and a tragic war far from our shores.

More Americans are concerned about the future of their country than at any time in this century. But I, for one, am not pessimistic about our future.

I do not share the view of some that this Republic, which has achieved so much in less than 200 years, is either doomed or damned.

The American people and their leaders always have been able to rise above adversity, to solve their problems, defeat their enemies and move on to greater accomplishments.

In my lifetime, we have conquered diseases that forced previous generations to live in fear and danger. We have made important—if long overdue—strides toward guaranteeing equality of opportunity and justice to all citizens, regardless of race, religion or ethnic background.

Four times in this century, we have sent American boys abroad to fight aggression and in the last 20 years we have channeled our resources of manpower and money into the rehabilitation of nations in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America.

We have led the world in the fight against poverty illiteracy, disease and hunger.

Yet, much remains to be done and I think we would be deluding ourselves if we sat back complacently and counted our achievements without recognizing our shortcomings and our problems.

It no longer is sufficient to report that we are the most powerful and affluent nation in the world, with a gross national product approaching the trillion dollar mark.

We must determine how better to utilize our affluence and productivity to correct the wrongs that exist within our society and to promote peace in the world.

We cannot be satisfied with a society from which the young, the black, the American Indian, the Spanish-speaking and the poor feel alienated. Nor can we be satisfied with a world in which war, hunger and poverty are constant threats to life.

Because this is such a time of searching, the Hearst Newspapers asked a group of outstanding citizens to explore the problems that confront us and project "where we go from here."

I am proud to offer this series of articles to Americans everywhere in the hope that the ideas propounded by the contributors will help us move toward tomorrow with greater enlightenment.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, Jr.,
Editor-in-Chief, The Hearst Newspapers.

DECEMBER 1968.

PROBLEM OF THE CITIES

(By Joseph Alioto, Mayor of San Francisco)

(NOTE.—Last year San Francisco made political news. A Democratic challenger for the city's mayoralty scored a surprise victory over a well-known Republican opponent. The winner was Joseph Alioto, son of a Sicilian immigrant who once made his living as a fisherman. Alioto, 52, is San Francisco's thirty-third mayor. He attended St. Mary's College, Berkeley, and later earned a law degree at Catholic University, Washington, D.C. Joining the United States Attorney's office in San Francisco, he swiftly acquired a reputation for energetic enforcement of antitrust statutes. During World War II Alioto served on the Board of Economic Warfare, helping to pinpoint targets in Italy, Germany and Japan. Last August he delivered the nominating speech for Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey at the Democratic National Convention.)

The destiny of our nation is shaping in our cities.

Whether the United States continues to be a great and prospering democracy is being determined in the crowded streets of New York, Boston, Chicago, Dallas, Los Angeles, San Francisco and other major cities.

Right now, historic currents are on the move which will determine whether the nation divides irrevocably into hostile racial camps, whether the nation's young withdraw into the twilight world of drugs or into the bloody one of street rebellion.

Monumental decisions are taking form this very minute, and no American can avoid their implications to him personally.

The nation's cities burst with problems—and with hope—and the call is clear for action on many fronts.

Cities alone can't cope with the problems that, if unchecked, can burn them down, and with them the dreams and aspirations of the whole nation.

State and federal governments are removed from the firecracker string of exploding crises that daily rattle in city halls. Yet state and the federal governments rake off more than 85 percent of the taxes raised in the cities, leaving cities in second class citizenship to deal with their needs. City revenues are inadequate for police and fire protection, garbage collection, street repair and other traditional services, let alone the urgent social programs for better housing, expanded education, and the rest.

The problems of the cities are not the exclusive concern of government. There must be total community mobilization. Business must recruit and train ghetto residents. Churches must crusade for social justice. Civic groups must champion constructive change in tax laws so that the weight of urban change does not fall increasingly on homeowners.

Suburbia must be enlisted in the battle to save the cities—regional taxes or commuter payroll taxes will contribute toward vital big city services.

Above all, cities must involve all their residents in an adventurous coalition for achievement and excellence. This should have special appeal to youth.

The Peace Corps and other volunteer programs have demonstrated the constructive dynamism of the nation's young, and this force increasingly must be brought to bear on the problems that threaten our cities. The vote should be given to 18-year-olds.

Militants who seek change through nonviolence should be brought into the chain of decision-making, and not isolated and forced into alliance with the lawless and anarchic. The strutting militarism of the Black Panther and other movements has little appeal if genuine progress is being made toward social justice.

Always, city government as a central and unifying agency, should reach out and open lines of communication and participation to all possible groups. City Hall must never be the isolated citadel of a smug establishment, but should be one of many places where city officials can meet with concerned citizens. Neighborhood halls, churches and schools can be just as forceful a fulcrum for decision.

The problems on which the fate of cities hang are many, but the following burn with incredible urgency:

Maintaining a social equilibrium of a city. Middle-income families are moving in increasing numbers to suburbia where housing is cheaper and more attractive. Cities are left to the poor and the rich. This tide must be stemmed by inventive housing programs, by equitable taxes that will relieve the homeowner, by providing the most in modern education.

Law and Order. Crime soars, symptomatic of the deep unrest in the cities. Law and order comes not from repression, but depends on three inseparable pillars—vigorous enforcement, enlightened community relations, and an unrelenting war on the social evils that breed crime.

Police are doing a heroic job in the face of enormous provocation. They must be given pay and training commensurate with their duties. They must receive modern computers and communication equipment so they can deploy more swiftly and effectively in high-crime areas. And, above all, they must receive the backing of all citizens.

There are two areas of law enforcement that require special attention:

1. Drug abuse. Too many young people are indulging themselves in the indolence of narcotics. A national commission should be set up—either by the President or the Surgeon General—to study why youth turn to drugs and how they are affected physically and psychologically. Furthermore, medical and community service organizations must be mobilized to treat persons who have plunged into the world of drugs.

2. Civil disorder. Dissent must be protected, but violence must be quickly controlled with whatever force is needed. Public officials must make clear the distinct line between forceful advocacy and raw force. The principle is impregnable: anyone can say what he wants, no matter how unpopular, when he wants. But no one has the right to block a street, seize a college administration building, or disrupt a meeting.

Freedom to Act. Cities must be free to enact legislation for their own well-being and protection. They should not be deterred from acting on their own problems—whether they relate to weapons control, taxes, civil disorder, pornography or other matters peculiar to cities—on the theory that state or federal legislation is preemptive.

Tax reform. The property tax no longer can continue to support the increased costs of local government. Distinction must be made between income property and non-income residential property, and taxes must be developed that are more equitably related to ability to pay.

Urban funds. Local taxes alone aren't sufficient to meet city needs, and will require massive federal, state and especially private assistance to accelerate needed programs particularly in low and moderate priced housing. Furthermore, the federal and state governments must share large portions of their revenues with cities. Revenue should be shared directly with cities based on a per capita formula adjusted to recognize the tax effort and revenue needs of individual cities.

Social action. Truly monumental programs, of the scope undertaken when the nation is in great peril, must be mounted against bad housing, inadequate employment and inferior education. These are evils that deny equality of opportunity.

Heritage of Beauty. Cities must preserve their beauty and that sophisticated climate of culture that attracts the artists, the creaive men and the man with ideas. Historic buildings must be retained, and parks must be allowed to flower and should not be sacrificed to freeways. At least that's the attitude in San Francisco where the views and vistas are the inalienable birthright of all their residents.

The list of priorities may be endless, but no city will make progress against her problems unless she can count on two overriding and paramount factors—vital economic growth that opens jobs and opportunities and orderly government that allows all to speak and no one to obstruct.

The goals stand beyond narrow partisanship, and the pressure for their achievement builds forcefully in every city—and applies equally on whomever sits in the White House. President Nixon will have to confront them just as vigorously and as conscientiously as has President Johnson.

There is a dream in the cities as old as this nation. It is this—to give every American an equal opportunity to achieve the best of the human experience, in accordance with his or her capacity in an urban environment that is at once peaceful, harmonious, beautiful and healthful.

Foreign Affairs

(By John Sherman Cooper, Senate Foreign Relations Committee)

(Note.—An outstanding American public servant for more than two decades, Senator John Sherman Cooper (R-Ky.) was born 67 years ago in Somerset, Ky. An alumnus of Yale University and Harvard law school, he began his political career as a member of the Kentucky legislature, and then served as a county and circuit court judge. His role in national affairs developed when, on three occasions—in 1946, 1952 and 1956—he filled out the unexpired terms of other United States senators from Kentucky. He was elected to the Senate in 1960 and 1966 with record pluralities. Although a Republican, he was a close friend and associate of the late President John F. Kennedy. Senator Cooper was appointed as a member of the United States mission to the United Nations in 1949, and holds a similar post this year. He is also a member of the U.S. delegation to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). In 1955 and 1956 he was ambassador to India and Nepal. He is a senior member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The Senator is a veteran of World War II and a holder of the bronze star.)

In suggesting the immediate tasks and future trends of American foreign policy, one must take into account the fact that President-elect Richard Nixon will make the decisions upon issues as they arise—at times in consultation with the Congress—and that he will set out long-term policies and goals for our country.

Nevertheless, it is important that private citizens and members of Congress give their views, for our foreign policy must express the will and have the support of the people. Although my views cannot be comprehensive, I would like to emphasize three urgent talks: First, and of critical importance, is the settlement of several dangerous situations in the world which continuously threaten war, with the possibility of an American confrontation with the Soviet Union, and nuclear catastrophe.

The second task is to examine means to avoid future military engagements throughout the world, unless it is determined by both branches of our government to be clearly in our national interest and within the scope of our national resources.

Third is the imperative task of reducing the arms race, and of fostering peaceful associations throughout the world, if we are to have any reasonable and positive hope of a stable and peaceful world.

Since World War II, the United States has grappled with situations of danger all around the world. They remain unsettled—the war in divided Vietnam, the potentially explosive situation in the Middle East, the problems of a divided Korea and China, and the security of Western Europe and the United States under the NATO shield. It may be argued that as the United States has maintained a constant and fairly successful policy toward these problems, no radical changes are required. But new developments have occurred in all of these situations in the past year. There are new necessities, and new opportunities to deal with them now in a more radical and effective way than in the past.

The war in Vietnam remains the most troubling issue. Great credit is due President Johnson for his unselfish initiative, in ceasing the bombing, as many of us advocated in order to bring about talks in Paris, and we hope that progress will be made during the remainder of his term. Advances have been made, and if North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front will discuss with the United States and South Vietnam matters of substance, and if the level of fighting is reduced by the North Vietnamese, true negotiations and a settlement may be reached.

If progress is not made in Paris and the heavy fighting continues, I would urge, as I have in the past, that the United States take the initiative in proposing that the Vietnam question be referred to a reconvened Geneva Conference.

Such an initiative would determine whether the Soviet Union is genuinely interested in a settlement, and whether Communist China's recent statement about co-existence has any substance. A reconvened conference should include all the Southeast Asian countries and the National Liberation Front, and would provide an opportunity for a settlement of the problems of the entire area as well as Vietnam. The participation of the United States, the Soviet Union, Communist China and, I would hope, France, would give authority for the establishment of an effective international body, backed by these powers, to supervise and to assist in implementing the terms of any settlement.

But whether from the Paris meetings, or a reconvened Geneva Conference, a final agreement emerges for free and adequately supervised elections in South Vietnam, I would consider that the United States had performed its full duty, that the securing for South Vietnam the right of self-determination of its form of government and institutions, and that our country could then honorably withdraw its forces.

We know that President-elect Nixon will support strongly negotiations for an honorable political settlement. As he is not committed to any particular formulation for a settlement, or to the support of any personality in South Vietnam, he enjoys the freedom to lead in the formulation of a settlement through which the processes of self-determination may be commenced.

The second obvious area of danger is in Europe. The deployment by the Soviet Union of ten divisions in Eastern Europe during and before its invasion of Czechoslovakia, increasing its forces to 32 divisions, upset any assumed balance of power between the NATO and Warsaw Pact forces.

Implications of the invasion were made more ominous by the statements of Soviet leaders and Pravda, claiming the right to intervene in the affairs of nations within the "socialist commonwealth" in the name of the "class struggle," whenever the Soviet Union determines to do so. It is a declaration of policy unknown in any concept of international law. It raises serious questions about the stability of Soviet leadership, and their intentions toward the areas protected by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the nearby states of Rumania and Yugoslavia.

The purpose of NATO is essentially defensive. Its objectives are to maintain forces sufficient to deter military aggression by the Soviet bloc and to meet and restrain an attack if it comes. But its purpose also is to provide the security necessary to seek detente with the Soviet bloc and the eventual settlement of the issues left from World War II.

The immediate and urgent task of the United States and its NATO partners is to restore the credibility of the NATO mission.

I have obtained an estimate from our Defense Department, and I believe it is the first made public of the cost of maintaining our forces in Europe, including the Sixth Fleet, and backup forces in the United States. It is in the neighborhood of $12 billion annually.

Despite this vast expenditure the United States must continue to improve the quality of its ground forces, but the test of NATO's future lies with our allies who have never met their military requirements. Mr. Nixon has indicated that he will insist strongly that our NATO allies, who for the most part are quite prosperous, take the required steps to increase their strength, manpower, training, equipment, and reserve forces. Unless our NATO allies take these steps, I foresee opposition in the United States to the continued presence of our forces in Europe.

To prevent future involvements such as Vietnam, the Executive and the Congress should examine critically the multi-lateral and bilateral security agreements to which the United States has become a party since World War II—the essential party, since its major allies, Great Britain and France, are disengaging themselves from many burdens of responsibility.

I do not propose that the U.S. abandon constitutional agreements essential to our security, but I do propose that we find out to what degree—whether by treaty of executive agreement—the United States has committed itself to provide assistance, and particularly troops, to the defense of other countries. We should know if these agreements are constitutional, are in the interest of our national security, and within the capabilities of our resources.

Generally, the agreements require that in the event of an armed attack upon a party to the treaty, the other signatories will assist in meeting the danger "in accordance with its constitutional processes." The term "constitutional processes" is not defined, but it should mean congressional approval.

The deployment of large American forces on the territory of another country, even in peacetime, increases the danger of an American engagement, for if they are fired upon they must be defended and our national honor becomes an issue. This is the lesson of Vietnam. The manpower of the United States should not be committed to the territory of another country without the approval of the Congress.

These suggestions do not restrict the constitutional powers of the President—his authority to dispatch forces to protect American lives and property, to defend our troops, and to defend our country. But my proposal would provide to the Executive and the Congress and the people the opportunity to determine, in advance, under what conditions we should commit our military forces.

I believe that my suggestions are in accord with the statements of the President-elect. For if one reads Mr. Nixon's statements closely and in connection with his plans to "review our commitments," he makes a distinction between the defense of the United States and the defense of a region, such as the NATO area and the western hemisphere, on one hand, and becoming involved militarily in other areas which are not in the scope of our security interests or within the capability of our resources.

A further step should be taken to reduce tensions and the chance of war between the divided countries. The time is near when we should support the admittance of North and South Korea, North and South Vietnam, and of Communist China to the United Nations, while continuing our support of the membership of Nationalist China.

The United States has discharged faithfully its obligations to South Korea on behalf of the United Nations, and its obligations to Nationalist China and to South Vietnam. It is time to transfer at least part of our vast responsibilities to the world community represented in the United Nations. The United Nations could bring to bear on these divided states a considerable influence toward the settlement of their problems, the protection of their integrity as states, and without prejudice to their ultimate reunification.

These immediate tasks and long-range policies which our country must examine and undertake do not suggest any return to isolationism. The United States will look more closely at its capabilities and the purpose of its foreign policy and this, I believe, will bring a larger involvement and appreciation of our people in the development of a more realistic and constructive foreign policy.

They include our commitment to assist our Latin American neighbors through the Alliance For Progress; the strengthening of our ties with Western Europe through support of the Common Market and the establishment of a workable international monetary system; the return of Okinawa to Japan and the strengthening of our naval and merchant marine fleets to deter hostile pressures in Asia as well as Europe.

OUTLOOK FOR THE STATES

(By Daniel J. Evans, Governor of Washington)

(NOTE.—Much of the young and energy of the nation's northwest seems to be personified in Gov. Dan Evans of Washington. He was elected to his second term by the largest margin given to an incumbent chief executive in the state in more than 30 years. Dan Evans was a civil engineer for 13 years before he turned to politics. He began his public career as a state representative in 1956 and served in the legislature until elected governor in 1964. His leadership qualities drew early recognition and he is now chairman of the Western Governors' Conference. He served as keynoter at the Republican National Convention which nominated Richard M. Nixon for President in Miami Beach last August. Born in 1925, Evans holds a master's degree in civil engineering from the University of Washington. He served in the United States Naval Reserve from 1943 through 1946, and was recalled to active duty from 1951 through 1958 during the Korean War.)

The year 1969 promises to be one of great challenge and great opportunity for a rebalancing of the federal system. Ever since the days of the Great Depression, the role of the states in the governmental process has been in a period of decline.

In most cases, this occurred not so much because of a deliberate design by the Federal Government to assume state functions as by the seeming unwillingness and in some instances the inability of the states to solve the problems within their own borders.

A feeling grew up, particularly in the big cities, that any help would be forthcoming not from the states but rather from the Federal Government. Thus, for many years, a close relationship has developed between Washington, D.C., and local governments to the exclusion of any participation by the states.

Although this federal-local relationship along with the vastly increased power exercised by the Federal Government, has been the most significant development in the federal system over the past 35 years, it is now apparent to even the most casual observer that to eliminate the role of the states is shortsighted and a grave error.

Even the current national Administration has come to realize that the states have an important role to play and that they provide a unit of government which is both large enough to do an effective job yet small enough to be close to the people it serves and responsible to their needs.

There has been an increasing willingness on the part of federal officials to listen to state officials and, of equal importance, state officials are taking the time to make their views known. As a consequence of this new approach, the most vital and active part of the federal system can be at the level of state government.

None of this means we should hoist the tired and tattered banner of "states' rights." Usually those who promote this phrase are more interested in inactivity on the part of state government than in asserting any rights of the states. It does mean, however, that if the federal system is to survive and if government is to serve the people, all governmental resources must be applied to the solution of the problems of our country.

Although there are many areas in which great opportunities exist for the states to play a more important role in the federal system, I believe the most significant are in the area of federal-state financing; urban problems and local government; and the unique opportunity we now have for states to become truly innovative and flexible so as to be capable of responding to the particular priorities of individual states.

The present system of federal revenue sharing with the states is through single-purpose categorical grants which go only to specific programs. These grants are generally hedged in by federal restrictions and regulations and many times are not responsive to a state's needs.

I believe it is essential that we develop a better way of sharing federal revenues and revenue sources. This can be accomplished both through the Federal Government giving up some of its tax sources so they can be assumed by the states and by returning a portion of the federal income tax to the states in the form of block grants rather than categorical grants.

Funds which would come to the states in block grants for broad, general purposes—such as health, education, public welfare—would allow the individual states to make the decisions as to how the money should best be spent.

By using block grants and by giving states the direct use of some federal tax sources, we not only allow a better use of resources by the states but also avoid the danger of federal rules which search for the lowest common denominator in their application, which often tend to stifle state initiative, and which do not allow state solutions that may be an improvement on the federal standards.

I believe states must exercise greater concern for urban problems and improve their relationship with local governments. For too long, the states have forced local governments to seek federal aid, primarily because of the default of states to help with local problems. As a consequence, many local governments have built up a distrust of the ability of states to function adequately in helping to solve their problems.

I believe with the sizable preponderance of Republican governors, that there will be an increasing drive on the part of states to work both directly with local communities in helping solve their problems and to see to it that both state financial aid and legislation to authorize local sources of financing is made available.

Their position between the Federal Government and local governments allows the states to perform a unique function. Because of their size, they are far better able to coordinate activities at the local level, yet at the same time they are large enough to work together and with the Federal Government to help manage national goals.

With specific reference to urban affairs, states can assume leadership so that together with the private sector and citizen volunteers it can work to solve the serious social problems which come with urban growth.

Perhaps as important as any specific action that can be taken by the states is the role they can play as 50 laboratories in the art of government. Although many of our problems are nationwide in scope, their solutions are in most instances more readily susceptible to a state and local rather than a federal solution.

Until the advent of the New Deal, the states had been consistently in the forefront of developing new ideas for the solution of social and governmental problems.

I believe this innovative tradition can be recaptured and that in the next four years we will see each of the states working as a full partner with the Federal Government in developing solutions responsive to state and local needs which will be far superior to static and inflexible federal programs and directives which do not take account of local conditions.

But none of this can be done easily nor can it be done without a price.

In my "State of the State" message to the Washington Legislature in 1967, I said:

"If we are not willing to pay the price, if we cannot change where change is required, if we cannot prepare and carry out the programs so necessary to the conduct of expanding state affairs—if these things are not possible then we have only one remaining recourse, and that is to prepare for an orderly transfer of our remaining responsibilities to the Federal Government."

This is the challenge to the states: To meet the demands of orderly change within a vital and growing society. With the new Nixon Administration, with an increased recognition both as to the need for action and an increased regard for its ability to perform, I believe state government will seize the opportunity to become a full partner with the Federal Government, with local government, with the private sector and with citizen volunteers to develop the solutions to the problems facing the people of this nation.

The next four years can show the rebirth of the federal system with the states leading the way.

INVOLVEMENT OF YOUTH

(By EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Senator from Massachusetts)

(NOTE.—In the nation and the Congress, the name of Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, 36, evokes deep emotion and respect. He is the sole surviving son of ailing Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Britain, following the assassination of his brothers, President John F. Kennedy and Sen. Robert F. Kennedy. A former brother, Joseph Jr., was killed in World War II. The senior senator from Massachusetts, Edward Kennedy, was elected in 1962 to finish out the last two years of his brother's term when JFK became president. He was re-elected in 1964 with a 75.6 per cent majority after a campaign that was conducted by friends while the young senator lay in bed with a broken back suffered as result of a plane crash. Sen. Kennedy has become an expert on the Vietnamese refugee problem and is outspoken in the cause of civil rights. He played only a minor role in the 1968 presidential campaign following the death of RFK early in June, and declined to try for either the presidential or vice presidential nominations. However, he is considered a strong possibility for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1972 or thereafter.)

On a mild spring evening in Indianapolis, during the primary election campaign this year, 22 young Americans sat down to talk.

After riding many hours in buses and sleeping on benches in campaign headquarters, they had spent a grueling Saturday on the sidewalks of the city taking the issues to the people. Now it was time to take stock.

They talked of Republicans who refused to hear them out, of Democrats who would not budget on Vietnam, of black children flocking to pass out campaign buttons, of whites in streets as grubby as any Negro ghetto showing quiet pleasure that an educated visitor wanted to hear what they thought.

The canvassers for Robert Kennedy that I met with that night were engaged in the kind of active political work by young people that characterized this year's primary elections. When they started that morning they had been novices. The next morning they would return to the sidewalks older by more than a day.

At about the same time last spring, another group of young people was pursuing a different course at Columbia University. The issues they held up to the university—construction of a college gymnasium in a Negro neighborhood, Columbia's affiliation with a Defense Department research organization—reflected beneath their surface real questions about the right of students to a share in the governing of their school.

The Columbia protest added up to the occupation of five campus buildings, the ransacking of administrative offices, and a bloody confrontation with police with more than 100 seriously injured and nearly 700 arrests.

It would be comfortable to conclude that the young folks in Indiana were working responsibly within the established system while those at Columbia were working irresponsibly against it.

It is more important to realize that both were working for what they believed in. One group hoped positive efforts would be effective; the other had concluded that they wouldn't.

The distance between confidence and futility is growing small with American youth today. Some believe our society will always work, and some believe it will never work again. Most, I suspect, are in the middle.

Today's young people don't share the historic guideposts of their elders. They did not know the mobilization of resources and patriotism brought on by the two world wars. They did not feel the comradeship of disaster created by the Great Depression. They were too young to grasp the national fear of global communism in the early 1950s.

They are spared the emotions of the past. They come to us with fresh vision. And with all the right questions.

They want to know why the war to preserve the freedom of South Vietnam kills or injures more than 200,000 civilians of that country each year.

They want to know why, with the United Nations more than 23 years old, the world is stockpiling nuclear weapons, enough to destroy civilization several times over.

They want to know why Negroes can fight in America's wars but often can't live in America's suburban neighborhoods.

They want to know why, in the wealthiest and most highly educated society in history, the poor are expected to break out of the ghettoes with no money and no education.

The young are told, "It's much better than it used to be." And they reply, "But why is it still as bad as it is?"

They are not only asking disturbing questions. They are also suggesting to America that the legacy they will inherit is worth saving, but not by much.

To say that the younger generation is going to the dogs is not only foolish but futile. For one thing, whatever the young choose to be is a reflection of what their elders have taught to be, by direction or by neglect. For another, writing off the young is like saying that our nation will come to a noble but sad end in 30 or 40 years.

The way to appeal to the young is not to deplore them, but to put faith in them. The Peace Corps put faith in them, and they responded. VISTA put faith in them and they responded. The Teacher Corps put faith in them, and they responded.

For there is no question that the young people of today are a remarkable generation.

They are independent and skeptical and confident. They look at the world with the characteristic honesty of the young, and what they find does not inspire them.

This year they put their remarkable abilities into politics. They worked for their candidates from New Hampshire to California. They took their civics lessons at face value, believing that a democracy could function only if everyone participated. And they brought to the political process far more energy and dedication than most of their elders ever had.

In Chicago, they felt, their hopes had turned to ashes. Outside the convention hall the young demonstrators were being battered and beaten. Inside, the mandate for change that they fought for and won in every primary election was being voted down in the platform committee and on the floor.

But although the young people in their urgency thought the battle had been lost, on measure it had largely been won.

Their conviction had helped bring the nation face to face with the tragic nature of the Vietnam war.

Their hard work had helped demonstrate that politics really can work at the grassroots level.

Their skills had helped convince the Democratic convention to institute reforms which will open party processes to the young in the future.

And their example had helped persuade the White House and both presidential candidates that the young have a definite and valuable role in government.

Americans who have always preached the virtues of democracy without practicing them should take note. Americans who have never rung a doorbell for a candidate or given an hour's time for an issue should think again. Their children evidently believe what they have learned about participation and individual responsibility and the ability of one person to influence society.

Early this year, before a college audience, Sen. Robert Kennedy characterized the spirit of youth:

"It does not accept the failures of today as a reason for the cruelties of tomorrow. It believes that one man can make a difference—and that men of good will, working together, can grasp the future and mold it to our will."

It is apparent that the young people of today believe they can grasp and mold the future.

So the question is not, "Where are our young people going?" But rather, "Can we keep up with them?"

The National Economy

(By Prof. Paul McCracken, appointed to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers)

(Note.—Paul Winston McCracken, 52, who has been named to head the President's Council of Economic Advisers in the Nixon Administration, is considered one of the nation's top fiscal experts. He currently is chairman of 19 task forces Mr. Nixon has appointed to assist in the formulation of national policies and programs. A professor of economics at the University of Michigan, Dr. McCracken received his Ph. D. at Harvard University in 1948. He is a native of Richland, Iowa, served as a government economists in World War II, and was a member of the Economic Advisory Council in the Eisenhower Administration. Dr. McCracken is the author of numerous books and a member of several leading economic organizations here and abroad.)

The performance of the U.S. economy in the decade ahead must come close to matching the best of this century, if it is to be an era of reasonably full employment. That was decreed early in the postwar period when those now of the "middle generation" decided to have that large crop of postwar babies.

The figures are impressive. In the last decade (the 1950's) the labor force was increasing by 740,000 per year. In the 1970's, on whose threshold we are now standing, the nation's work force will be growing by close to 1.5 million each year. Clearly the job-creating capacity of the economy must perform far more vigorously than during most of the postwar period, or during our history going back for about a century.

If we succeed, the dividends will be substantial. By the end of the 1970's the average family's income, in terms of today's prices, will approach $1000 per month, and our gross national product will be in the $1,500 billion zone, compared with $860 billion for 1968.

There will be no lack of demand for this enlarged output. As levels of living rise, levels of aspiration also rise. With each rise in purchasing power, new things come within our horizon that we had never considered seriously before. To the newlyweds, their aspiration may be owning a home in the suburbs. Once the home is bought, other things come into view—a second car, a cottage at the lake, a trip abroad.

A few (usually quite affluent) social philosophers may worry about what will happen when people's wants are all satiated. This never worries the consumer whose list of things to buy next never seems to get much shorter.

Can we realize this promise in the years ahead? It will all depend on how we handle three major problems of economic policy.

First, we must cool down the recent inflation without producing a large and sustained rise in unemployment. Since 1964 the consumer price index has been rising at a rate which would cut the purchasing power of the dollar 50 percent every 18 years. And during the first half of this year the price level was rising at a 5.7 percent per year rate, a rate that would double the price level every 12½ years.

This cannot be allowed to continue. It is de-stabilizing because mounting inflation-mindedness distorts orderly business decisions. It also is inequitable because it shifts wealth and net worth from the people of moderate means to the wealthy.

Yet a policy of disinflation must be administered delicately to avoid a substantial and persistent rise in unemployment (whose victims are, of course, also those of modest means).

The 1958–64 period proved that we could have price-level stability, but the unemployment rate was unacceptably high. In recent years we have had lower unemployment, but inflation has been unacceptably rapid. Neither was sustainable. The task is to ease the economy over the path of a more stable price level and reasonably full employment.

Whether the technology of economic policy is up to this delicate task is as yet not demonstrated, but this is the problem we face. It is a problem made far more difficult because of over three years of large increases in our price-cost level.

Second, the 1970's could easily become an era of international economic and financial warfare. This must not be allowed to happen. At the end of World War II we set about to build a system that would facilitate the expansion of international trade. This made economic sense. As world incomes grew, products and services available to consumers could also include increasingly those produced abroad. And each nation could more nearly concentrate on what it could produce best. Production became thereby more efficient, and patterns of consumption became richer and more varied. The policy succeeded. During most of this period world trade expanded even more rapidly than world incomes.

In recent years things have not worked out so well. To preserve the formalities of the system, the U.S. has imposed direct controls limiting the outflow of capital to a capital-short world. It has worked out quotas to limit certain imports. It has threatened to curtail foreign travel—just when, to the great advantage of Americans, English was becoming a world language.

There have been recurring monetary crises that have already involved the pound, the dollar, the franc, and the Deutschemark (whose undervaluation has made a major contribution to international financial disorder).

Each nation, to defend its own position, has responded with internal deflation. Yet these must be managed carefully to avoid a round of international deflation, economic stagnation and unemployment.

The international financial disorder of the 1930's made its contribution to the world disarray that erupted into World War II. The nations of the world must not start down that road again.

Finally, we must give specific attention to policies that will assure an ever-widening diffusion of the fruits of progress to all people. There is an essential morality to an economy where the route to success is through performance. Yet we must realize that people begin the game unevenly positioned around the starting line. Some, through inherited wealth or simply from a favorable home environment, begin the race considerably ahead of the starting line. Others—through circumstances that they had no part in choosing—begin so far behind the line that it would be monstrous to talk about equal availability of opportunity. The 1970's must be a decade in which we make a major break-through toward giving all people full access to the social and economic mainstream of our national policy.

Thus the years ahead constitute an era of great economic promise. Whether we realize this potential depends on the ingenuity and candor that we can bring to bear on some formidable problems of national policy.

There is this reassurance. In our nation the optimists have been the realists.

Race Relations

(By Carl B. Stokes, mayor of Cleveland)

(Note.—When Carl B. Stokes, 41, was elected mayor of Cleveland last year a milestone was achieved in the American Negro's march toward full participation in American life. The election made Stokes the first Negro mayor of a large American city. He launched a massive program—"Cleveland Now!"—designed to eliminate the city's pressing problems and vitalize its urban life over the next 10 years. He was elected three times to the Ohio state legislature and once, in 1965, ran unsuccessfully for the mayoralty office he now holds.)

Toward more progress in eradicating poverty and meeting the challenge of the urban crisis—that is the direction America should go in race relations.

On the federal level, the necessary and desirable legislative steps have been taken in the civil rights area. The speeches have been made, the goals clearly set. But full citizenship is still denied a great many Americans because of the color of their skin.

In my own city of Cleveland, there are 50,000 substandard housing units, many of them occupied by Negroes. The unemployment rate in the Cleveland metropolitan area is less than three percent, but in ghetto areas—both black and white—the jobless rate is as high as 15.6 percent, and one recalls that President Kennedy called a "disaster area" any section of the country where unemployment reached six percent.

In my own city, there are children, many of them black, who go to bed hungry. School attendance rates in the inner-city are poor because families are poor and, as a consequence, their children lack adequate clothing to venture from house to school.

What kind of race relations can we expect when there are large pockets of poverty and misery in Cleveland and other large cities? Compassion and understanding are important, but, like rhetoric, they will not serve themselves to elevate race relations.

In the words of the Kerner Commission Report we must turn to "the major unfinished business of this nation—making good the promise of American democracy to all citizens—urban and rural, white and black, Spanish-surname, American Indian, and every minority group."

Progress in race relations is inextricably interwoven with progress toward eradicating poverty. The dignity and pride that only a job with upward mobility and a decent house in which to live can provide are essential to improving race relations, although, for a time, the struggle for dignity and pride may seem to widen the gulf between black and white.

In the cities generally, black citizens are demanding the things they deem necessary to dignity and pride—representation on city councils, representation in Congress, representation on every level of government, economic power so that the Negro benefits directly from the growing Negro market. Negro history in the school curriculum, entrance into the building trades, opportunity in the professions and in business management.

Thus, the confrontations, the bitterness, often open hostility between black and white. Integration has become a dirty word to some militant blacks, and the sociologists talk about the increased "polarization" of the black and white communities.

Sometimes I am accused of being an incurable optimist, but I do not believe the confrontations, no matter how angry and hostile they may be, mean that race relations are deteriorating and that we should desperately seek some magic formula for avoiding such encounters and for quieting the angry statements.

Instead, I view the encounters, the confrontations, as injecting a necessary note of honesty and realism into an area where heretofore there has been much lip service to brotherly love and knowing your neighbor but insufficient genuine attention to implementing the democratic principles of equal opportunity and equal protection of the law.

Implementing these principles—"making good the promises of American democracy"—will do more for constructive race relations in this country than a century of Brotherhood Weeks, sermons, conferences, and seminars.

We have to demonstrate that the American system—economic, political and social—is viable, flexible and strong, and this can be demonstrated only by substantive progress toward solution of the basic problems of the poor, the disenfranchised and the disadvantaged.

The poor black, like the poor white, wants the opportunity to earn the respect, dignity and pride that come with the opportunity to win the good things of life. And if, given the opportunity, he fails, the failure must be his, not society's.

That is why we in Cleveland, for instance, have established a Department of Human Resources and Economic Development. It will coordinate and assist more than 20 job-placement programs and work to expand and retain business and industry.

We are establishing a network of neighborhood based day care centers where mothers can leave their children while they pursue gainful employment. In the absence of such facilities, these mothers really lack the opportunity to work and are involuntarily on welfare rolls. Four such centers have received "Cleveland Now!" funds; the goal is 10 and we will reach it.

The Cleveland community relations board checks firms bidding for city business to make sure they are equal opportunity employers, and the city is continuing to put its own house in order with respect to hiring and promotion practices so that we ask nothing of private firms that we are not doing ourselves.

A problem providing money and know-how to expand small business is well under way in Cleveland with unprecedented assistance from many sectors of our community. We have furnished the Greater Cleveland Growth Corporation with $500,000 of "Cleveland Now!" funds so that small businessmen, black and white, can obtain loans or loan guarantees that otherwise might be denied them.

"Cleveland Now!" perhaps it should be explained, is a comprehensive program announced early in 1968, addressed to the city's immediate pressing needs in the areas of jobs, housing, neighborhood improvement, health care, economic revitalization and city planning. The first 18-month phase envisions the expenditure of $165 million in federal, state and local government funds and more than $11 million from the private sector. Individuals—from school children who contributed nickels and dimes to a wealthy couple who contributed $1 million—and corporations are ahead of schedule with subscriptions from the private sector.

Small businesses already assisted by the Greater Cleveland Growth Corporation include a soap company, aiming initially at a substantial share of the black market, a furniture store, and electronic parts and service enterprise, and a decal manufacturer.

Technical assistance is furnished by businessmen volunteers, including members of the Harvard Business School Club, and Cleveland banks and the Federal Small Business Administration are cooperating fully with the Growth Corporation.

The 40-member board of trustees is made up of representatives of city and county government, of bankers and businessmen, attorneys and accountants, black and white, so that the two races are working together in the vital task of expanding small business enterprise throughout Cleveland, thereby strengthening the city's economic base and providing additional employment opportunities.

In the housing field, at this writing, we are just about to announce a Community Housing Corporation with a board, also black and white, that will include representatives of the non-profit housing groups already formed with church, union, foundation and business sponsorship. The Community Housing Corporation is to receive a $1.2 million "Cleveland Now!" commitment for its first year and $1.4 million annually for three years thereafter. It will use the funds as seed money to accelerate housing development for low and middle income families.

Toward broadening of opportunities, toward programs assisting the disadvantaged to make use of opportunity, toward dignity and pride for our Negro citizens—this is the direction America should go, not only to improve race relations but also to preserve, strengthen and enrich the fabric of American life.

A Time of Transition

(By Robert E. Thompson, national editor, Hearst newspapers)

(Note.—Robert E. Thompson, 47, has covered all major Capital personalities and news stories since 1952 when he joined the Washington Bureau of International News Service. Seven years later he shifted to the N.Y. News Washington Bureau and in 1962 to the Los Angeles Times, as White House Correspondent. In 1966 he was named Chief of the Hearst Newspapers Washington Bureau. In 1961–62 he was chairman of the Standing Committee of Correspondents of the House and Senate and in 1966–67 was president of the White House Correspondents Association. Thompson has covered all political conventions and traveled with the major candidates on their cross country campaigns. He has traveled abroad with Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and witnessed the Lee Harvey Oswald shooting from a range of 20 feet. Thompson was named National Editor of the Hearst Newspapers in 1968.)

The tide of change that has swept across this land in the 1960's will continue to swell and heave into the 1970's—slashing at the old ways of life and destroying some of the orthodox patterns of the past.

When it finally ebbs, and that may not occur until well into the next decade, American society will be as drastically transformed as it was after the Civil War, after the Industrial Revolution, and after the flamboyant Prohibition era.

Those who voted for Richard M. Nixon with the expectation that he could—or would—stem this turbulent tide will not find their hopes fulfilled. Those who voted against Nixon because they feared he would seek to stifle change will not see their anxieties realized.

For President Nixon, even if he so desired, could not stop the dynamic forces of transition that have come into play in this nation in recent years.

The best option open to him—and it is indeed an illusive option—is to keep the momentum of this epic transition within the limits of orderly progress.

Mr. Nixon and the American people may be able to slow the movement of change. But they cannot stop it. Above all, they cannot turn the clock back.

To do so would require mass repression of young people; magical overnight transformation of our cities; return of the Negro to a condition of bondage; rejection of the economic lessons of the last decade, and a blotting of the Vietnamese War from the American conscience.

None of these is possible.

Therefore, the American people and their leaders must accept the fact that the transformations within our society in the recent past form but a prologue to further transformation in the future.

Millions of citizens will be aghast at the prospect that the old traditions and customs—some good, some bad—will suffer further erosion in the days ahead.

Yet, they must understand, first of all, that a sizeable bloc of intelligent, active young people deeply desire change. And, those young people have age and energy on their side.

They want an end to war and the draft. They want the fruits of American progress and productivity to be extended with equality to citizens of all races and ethnic backgrounds. They want to have a voice in the decisions made by their country.

One of the great challenges facing Mr. Nixon is to establish rapport with these young people, to make them feel that they are full-fledged participants in their society.

But whether or not Mr. Nixon is able to achieve this breakthrough, the young, with their own special values and modern concepts, eventually will prevail—simply because they are young and because the United States one day must be theirs.

Civil strife will continue and possibly even increase in urban areas unless drastic action is taken to improve the way of life for city dwellers.

President Johnson set in motion more important programs to benefit the cities than any of his predecessors. Yet, because of rising expectations in a period of unparalleled affluence, the Johnson programs could not keep pace with the demand for dramatic change.

Mr. Johnson sought to do more. And Mr. Nixon may seek to do more. But, despite their lofty objectives, presidents are captives of a Congress that continues to hold the purse strings.

Many members of Congress find it far more popular with their constituencies to support legislation to control the activities of troubled citizens than to support legislation that gets at the root causes of despair and deprivation.

If the transition within our cities is to be made more tranquil, it therefore is up to Congress and to the resources made available by the private sector—business, industry, labor, the foundations, churches.

Congress and the new President also are challenged to bold action on the economic front. They must reduce the inflationary trend within the nation. But, if they seek to return to economic policies practiced prior to the "new economics" of the Kennedy-Johnson era, they could find themselves enmeshed in a new recession—a recession that would further inflame tempers in the ghetto.

For, in this period of violent transition, the poor who dwell in the cities—and who suffer most in times of high unemployment—are not likely to accept a recession with old-fashioned equilibrium.

The problem confronting Mr. Nixon in dealing with young people, Negroes, and the underprivileged is to provide enough hope and incentive to prevent rabid militants from capturing the leadership of these groups.

Not many young Americans are now aligned with the radical elements nor are many Negroes affiliated with the Black Panthers. But if dreams and promises are not fulfilled, the militants will become more powerful.

Finally, there is the change involving America's position abroad. The Vietnam conflict has demonstrated that the people as a whole lack the patience to fight a small, limited war far from their shores.

Since there is a renewed birth of nationalism elsewhere in the world, it seems certain that nationalism—and its corollary, isolationism—will tighten its hold on the United States.

Although Mr. Nixon is an internationalist who will attempt to carry forward the basic foreign policy concepts of the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson administrations, he will find Congress and the public drawing away from international commitments, both military and economic.

Liberals will argue that money designated for projects abroad can be spent better at home. Conservatives will argue that aid to other nations is a waste of taxpayers' dollars.

Many influential voices already are urging a retreat to protectionism in trade and further diminution of the foreign aid program. It will require both statesmanship and leadership for Mr. Nixon to attempt to reverse this tide, for there may be short-run political advantage to be gained if he were to swim with it rather than against it.

So, the next four years will not be easy—for Mr. Nixon or for the nation he seeks to guide. At all levels of American society, drastic changes are in progress. The great task is to keep those changes within manageable bounds.

THE MIDDLE EAST—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TYDINGS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on March 21, 1969, the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) spoke before the American-Israel Society in Baltimore.

The topic of his speech was the Middle East. His concern—which all of us share—is for a just settlement of the many problems in this troubled area of the world and a lasting peace.

Mr. President, this is an important speech. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MIDDLE EAST

The accession of a new administration in Washington provides a particularly appropriate time for reexamining the state of affairs in the Middle East and reviewing U.S. policy in that part of the world. For the Arab-Israeli conflict, like the war in Vietnam, represents a volatile and terribly dangerous international problem which has shown few signs of significant improvement over the past year.

Based on briefings I received from State Department officials on Wednesday and a careful reading of the President's public remarks on the matter, I detect little difference to date between the Nixon administration's Middle East policy and that pursued by President Johnson. The overriding U.S. objectives continue to be the prevention of hostilities that might lead to a confrontation between the U.S. and the Soviet Union and the maintenance of American influence in the area.

As the land bridge spanning three continents with the richest oil deposits in the world, it is not difficult to understand the intense political, strategic, and economic interest the great powers have shown in the Middle East. If any one power were to dominate the region the global balance of power would shift sharply in its favor.

Thus when the British began their steady withdrawal of troops and ships from the Mideast after World War II, it was inevitable that the U.S. and the Soviets would seek to fill the resulting strategic power vacuum. It is this cold war competition which has given the current Arab-Israeli conflict its additional dangerous dimension—the possibility of direct U.S.-Soviet confrontation and the triggering of a nuclear war.

Since the founding of the State of Israel in 1948, the U.S. has sought to implement a two-pronged policy in the Middle East: We have supported Israel in her fight to survive, while seeking to maintain our influence with the Arab governments. Obviously, these two aspects of our policy have conflicted more often than not.

When circumstances forced us to decide between them—with the exception of President Eisenhower's decision in the Suez crisis in 1956—we have always chosen to stand behind Israel.

We have done so for two principal reasons. First, the U.S. is morally committed to the preservation of Israel as a Jewish homeland. History has made tragically clear the necessity for a place to which Jews may turn in the face of the persecution which has continued to infect western history. The spectacle of Jews vainly seeking a haven from Hitler's death camps must never be repeated. No man of conscience can believe otherwise.

Second, it has been our position that the best deterrent to open conflict in the Middle East is an Israel strong enough to maintain a regional balance of power vis-a-vis her Arab neighbors. The decision of the Johnson administration to sell fifty F-4 fighter planes to Israel is further evidence of our commitment to ensure Israel the means to defend herself successfully.

Israel's extraordinary six-day victory in 1967 shattered what remained of our two-pronged strategy. Egypt, Syria, and a number of other Arab governments broke off diplomatic relations with the U.S. and turned increasingly to Moscow for aid and advice.

Therefore, to return the balance to our Middle East policy which American security requires, it is increasingly imperative that we secure a settlement that assures Israel's freedom and survival while enabling the U.S. to reestablish diplomatic relations with the Arabs.

It is toward this end that the keystone of our current Middle East policy remained in support of the United Nations mission of Ambassador Jarring and his effort to implement the U.N. resolution of November 22, 1967. For that resolution represents the only guideline for a settlement of the 1967 war that has been endorsed in principle by all parties involved.

I would like briefly to examine the provisions of that resolution with you, offering some personal interpretations and recommendations for their implementation.

The first two steps towards a settlement prescribed by the resolution are the recognition of the right of all nations in the region to exist in peace, and the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from occupied territories. However, a major obstacle to their realization has been chronology.

For good reason, Israel is hesitant to yield occupied territories without first receiving assurances that the Arabs concede Israel's right to exist peacefully and have abandoned the illusion of someday driving the Jews into the sea.

Likewise, internal political pressures make it difficult for President Nasser and King Hussein to make or ever entertain such concessions without the prior certainty that at least part of their occupied lands will be returned. Thus, one of the major tasks facing the Jarring mission—perhaps with the support of the big four powers—is to engineer the simultaneous execution of these two steps.

As for the question of which occupied territories Israel should yield, former Ambassador Goldberg has pointed out that the UN resolution simply calls for the "withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from occupied territories." The word "all" before occupied territories was purposely omitted.

Clearly, Israel intends to make and should make her borders more defensible than they were prior to June of 1967. The U.S., Britain, and France have publicly acknowledged that Israel may justly insist on retaining certain strategic conquered areas like the Golan Heights and parts of Gaza. However, parts of the West Bank and Sinai which are not vital to Israel's defense will have to be returned to Jordan and Egypt respectively.

The third principle for settlement set forth in the resolution is the freedom of navigation. Israel must be assured free passage of the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran. After Nasser's pledge to permit Isaeli use of the Suez in 1956 was so flagrantly broken, it is difficult to expect Israel to accept new Arab promises. It may well fall to the big four powers—whose role I shall discuss shortly—to serve as the guarantors of any agreement.

The fourth principle is the just settlement of the refugee problem. With the June war, their number has swollen to 1.7 million. Humanitarian considerations demand action be taken immediately. For the vast majority live in conditions of the worst imaginable squallor and disease not to mention political agitation.

Obviously, Israel cannot absorb all or even most of these refugees and remain a Jewish state. Therefore, Tel Aviv will have to help compensate these people for the loss of their property and participate in a program to resettle them throughout the Middle East.

Territorial inviolability is the final settlement principle laid down in the November 22 resolution. To rely on trust and good will to preserve the peace in the Middle East is naive. Hate and suspicion still dominate Arab-Israeli relations.

Therefore, I am urging the President to propose that any Mideast settlement must provide for demilitarized zones along the Arab-Israeli frontiers to be actively and continuously patrolled by U.N. peacekeeping forces. In this way the border clashes and terrorist incursions that keep tensions high in the area may be reduced or eliminated.

Let me now turn briefly to the question of the big four powers—U.S., Britain, France, and the Soviet Union—in a Middle East settlement. I am convinced the major powers can play a constructive part in the search for peace providing we recognize the limitations inherent in their role.

The four powers cannot—I repeat cannot—impose the terms of a peace settlement on Israel or the Arabs. They possess neither the right nor, in reality, the influence to do so.

We and the other powerful nations of the world must work to create the environment which can lead to a peaceful settlement. The U.S. and the Soviet Union, in particular, must urge the parties to be flexible in their approach. The Soviets must influence the Arabs to talk, to adopt no rigid views on procedures. In addition, the big four powers may guarantee the compliance of all parties with the terms of the final settlement.

The proposed four power conference also is important as an opportunity for us to work out with the Russians then necessary understandings to avoid a direct military confrontation and to limit the arms buildup in the area.

I wish I could predict an imminent settlement of all outstanding issues in the Middle East and the onset of a just and permanent peace. Unfortunately, I cannot. The hates and hostilities still run too deeply.

The best we can hope for in the coming decade is a policy which prevents the outbreak of a fourth round in the Arab-Israeli war and which buys more time. Time to heal the bitterness and salve hurt pride. Time for dialogue and communication. Time for the mutual trust and understanding to take root which are the foundations of lasting peace.

GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIZED PRESS FOMENTS RACE HATRED

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, since President Nixon submitted his domestic proposals in general outline form to Congress several days ago, a great hue and cry has arisen that he is cutting essential programs that are vital to the interests of particular groups.

There have been some not-so-veiled threats that "the cities may explode" if a particular program is not extended. It would appear from these critics that every dollar must have been spent with the utmost wisdom and judiciousness and that there is absolutely no room for improvement except to "send more money."

Mr. President, I think the taxpayers are tired of this whining plea. They have sent more money, but they are now demanding that these programs be improved and that those who have the capability to help themselves begin to do so. That is not to say that there is no poverty in the United States. There is, and I know of no one who is not in favor of eliminating it. So the question should be switched from "Who is for poverty and who is against it?" to "Which are the best methods for eliminating poverty to the degree we can, and how may we do it most efficiently?"

Mr. President, I have before me an example of the way in which poverty funds have been misspent. Not only have these funds been misdirected from the purpose to which they were originally intended by the Congress, but they have actually been used for purposes inimical to the original intent.

I am quoting from a front page story in the March-April 1968 issue of the Spokesman, a publication produced with the encouragement and financial support of the Office of Economic Opportunity in San Francisco:

> Black people wake up; we are all in prison; we are all Huey Newtons. He may be doing time in jail but we are doing it in the ghetto . . . If you want action, come join me in my fight for identity, equality, not civil rights but human rights.

The article is signed by Adam Rogers.

The same paper, the Spokesman, has accused the Nation's cities of arming to carry out plans of genocide against black people, and said the United States is preparing concentration camps for blacks. It also quotes the executive director of the OEO's San Francisco Family Service Agency as making the statement:

> A civil war is almost inevitable unless the powers of white America face up to the fact that they have a responsibility to see that all children have some guarantee—decent economic income, housing, education and health assurances that exist for their own children.

Mr. President, these attempts to foment racial strife and unrest are being carried on at the taxpayers expense. The OEO is specifically prohibited from publishing newspapers, but these tabloid size papers apparently get by under the technical designation of "newsletters." Whatever their specific or generic designation, Mr. President, they are not a proper use of tax money.

This kind of activity is particularly indicative of the tangled mess that has been allowed to grow in the name of the vast majority of American's genuine compassion for the less fortunate. However, the generosity and genuine concern of most Americans is not without its limit. While I think no nation has ever attempted to do so much for so many, and while I believe Americans to be the most generous people in the world, I will say this: That while their compassion and generosity is unexcelled, it is not unlimited.

When we have obvious cases of well-educated people, people who are capable of contributing to their own support, "demanding" that the taxpaying citizen take on more and more of their burden, then we are coming to an end. Add to this the realization that people are being taxed to provide their own scourges, so to speak, and the situation becomes intolerable.

Mr. President, most Americans have just undergone the traumatic experience of putting out a tremendous slice of their income for the support of governments at the Federal, State, and local levels. A taxpayer looks at that total figure he is contributing to the Government and begins to wonder what he is getting for his money. In this instance, he is apparently paying somebody to "cuss" him. It reminds me of the newspaper editor who fired a reporter after establishing that the reporter was—to use his term—"bad mouthing" the paper all over town. Said the editor:

> Cussin' I get for free—no need to pay somebody to do it.

Mr. President, I think I may properly say that is the burgeoning attitude of the American taxpayer. There is absolutely no need for the U.S. Government to subsidize this kind of activity. I am absolute in my determination that the freedom of the press in America shall not be restricted. By the same token, I agree with my esteemed colleague, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), who has said:

> When the press is supported or subsidized by federal funds, it is disabled to perform its rightful function as a great interpreter between the government and the people. This is so because the press is no longer free. On the contrary, it is enslaved and enslavement of the press will inevitably be followed by enslavement of the people.

Mr. President, I shall continue to support the President in his efforts to see that the money to help the poverty stricken goes to the purpose for which it is intended, not to fatten bureaucrats or subsidize hatred.

I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Mrs. Shirley Scheibla and published in Barron's weekly for April 14, detailing these monetary abuses, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBSIDIZED PRESS: THE POVERTY PROGRAM IS BUILDING ITS OWN PROPAGANDA MACHINE

Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., Democrat, of North Carolina: "When the press is supported or subsidized by federal funds, it is disabled to perform its rightful function as a great interpreter between the government and the people. This is so because the press is no longer free. On the contrary, it is enslaved and enslavement of the press will inevitably be followed by enslavement of the people."

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—Commenting on the violence-ridden strike at San Francisco State College, a leading story in a San Francisco newspaper in February ran as follows: "The only reason the strike was called was as a last resort to bring out into the open their (the students') grievances and the present injustices and irrelevances on the campus of a school which belongs to this community. . . . The basic truth of the strike is the freedom of self-determination of students in their education versus the present misuse of the schools by irrelevant and outside political forces such as the office of the governor, state superintendent of schools and the like in trustees and such boards of directors who are totally alien to the needs and desires of Black and Third World students. The activities and grievances of the students deserve the sympathy of the local community."

CIVIL DISRUPTION

The publication which featured the story is The Spokesman, one of a growing number of newspapers published with the encouragement and financial support of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Issued by community action groups all over the country, many of the newspapers are promoting black militancy, racial hatred, civil disruption, the cry of police brutality, community control of schools and colleges, and, not least, the war on poverty and all its works.

Congress has prohibited the use of federal anti-poverty funds for establishing or operating general coverage newspapers. However, OEO claims that the publications really are "newsletters," aimed at bridging "the communication gap often existing between the community action program and the people it serves."

According to a Public Affairs Handbook, The Printed Word, published by OEO last year and distributed to community action agencies, a publication is a "newsletter" if it "has a specific information objective and a limited audience," is not sold for profit, carries no paid advertising and is run by the local anti-poverty program. "Grantees," the Handbook declares, "are encouraged to publish newsletters or house organs which assist local anti-poverty efforts. These publications are generally financed under the administrative budget of the local agency."

Pictured in the Handbook, to illustrate what OEO means, is the front page of a "newsletter" called The Crusader, a product of the United Community Corp., top community action agency of Newark, N.J., which says it is "a free city-wide community newspaper for the promotion of community action." Looking remarkably like a tabloid newspaper, the page carries a story about Newark citizens marching in front of the White House. In another issue, The Crusader called the McClellan Committee's investigation of the role of anti-poverty workers in Newark's riots, "a witch hunt and a shocking misuse of public funds."

The OEO Handbook also includes elementary instructions for publishing "newsletters." With OEO funding, the Community Action Training Institute at Trenton, N.J., has gone a step further by publishing The CATI News Man, which the subheading identifies as "A Manual—In Newspaper Form—On How To Produce A Community Action Newspaper." The essentials, it says, are community problems, angry people and publishing facilities. A good community action newspaper, it declares, "makes people mad."

Enlarging on the Handbook's idea of not selling the newspapers for profit, the manual advises soliciting donations. "Be sure you don't ask people to buy a subscription to your paper, since this will cause difficulties with income tax and licensing laws," it explains.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is so pleased with the work of CATI that it has asked the Institute to provide assistance to community action training centers all over the country, at federal expense, of course. (There are 10 training centers to serve over 1,000 community action centers.) While the exact number and circulation of community action newspapers in existence are unknown, it is abundantly clear that they constitute a vast propaganda network.

Specifically, anti-poverty newsletters churn out vast quantities of propaganda for the war on poverty. For instance, the TEOC News, published by the Tampa (Fla.) Economic Opportunity Council, Inc., recently declared that an independent OEO is an absolute necessity.

CHRISTMAS ISSUE

Referring to OEO, Community Action News, a monthly publication of the Knox County Economic Opportunity Council at Barbourville, Ky., said in its Christmas issue: "Our country cannot afford to risk an interruption of a program experiment which is the last link of communication between the poor and non-poor." An offer to fund the 1969 anti-poverty programs of Wayne County, Mich., at the same level as 1968 is unacceptable, according to a front page story in the Wayne County OEO Newsletter, a slick, printed publication of the Economic Opportunity Committee of Eloise, Mich.

"Do not panic with the coming of the Nixon Administration," said a recent Community Action Newsletter published by the Ninth District Opportunity, Inc., of Gainesville, Ga. "America," it declared, "is a country of compassionate people, and humanitarian programs will not be stopped by any administration."

Publications which have lavished praise on OEO projects include With the People, issued by half-a-dozen community action agencies in Chicago; the Neighborhood Journal, by Community Progress, Inc. of New Haven, Conn.; STOP Newsletter, by the Southeastern Tidewater Opportunity Project of Norfolk, Va., and The Advisor, by the Charleston County Economic Opportunity Commission at Charleston, S.C.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, HUEY

Black power and race hatred are also favorite themes of OEO-subsidized journalism. On this score, the story on the San Francisco State College strike was not the only one worthy of notice in the February issue of The Spokesman. It also carried an announcement of a birthday celebration in honor of Black Panther leader Huey P. Newton, now jailed for allegedly killing a man in California.

Scheduled as a speaker at the Black Panther celebration was Kathleen Cleaver, wife of Black Panther Eldridge Cleaver. (Mr. Cleaver was jailed in 1958 after conviction for assault with intent to commit murder. He was paroled in 1966, but had his parole revoked in connection with a gun battle with Oakland police officers. Subsequently he was released by a judge who ruled Mr. Cleaver was "a political prisoner." This action subsequently was overruled; both California and federal authorities have been seeking Mr. Cleaver since December 27, 1968.)

According to The Spokesman, tickets for the affair were available at Black Panther Party Headquarters at 1419 Fillmore and More's Books, 1435 Fillmore, and for $2.50 at the door. It added that part of the proceeds would be used for the Newton-Cleaver Defense Committee and the Eldridge Cleaver Bail Fund.

The same issue sought contributions to the Malcolm X Educational Center, advised its readers to write or call the Black Draft Counseling Union and join the Welfare Rights Movement. In addition, it announced a community meeting to "amend the city charter to forbid the creation of para-military squads (by the San Francisco police). . . ."

Such inflammatory contents are nothing new for The Spokesman. In 1968, the February-March issue decried the jailing of Huey Newton for alleged murder and reported "some very significant ideas" of the Black Panthers, which included freeing Mr. Newton or bringing about "retribution," freeing of imprisoned black men not tried by their peers and exempting all Negroes from military service.

(The latest word on the Black Panthers came on April 2, when a New York grand jury indicted 21 members for conspiring to bomb five department stores, a police station and a railroad.)

A front-page story in the March-April 1968 issue of The Spokesman said, "Black people wake up; we are all in prison; we are all Huey Newtons. He may not be doing time in jail but we are doing it in the ghetto." Signed by Adam Rogers, it declared, "If you want action, come join me in my fight for identity, equality, not civil rights, but human rights."

The Spokesman has accused the nation's cities of arming to carry out plans of genocide against black people, and said the U.S. is preparing concentration camps for blacks. It also quoted Richard Roberts, executive director of the San Francisco Family Service Agency, as saying, "A civil war is almost inevitable unless the powers of white America face up to the fact that they have a responsibility to see that all children have some guarantee—decent economic income, housing, education and health assurances that exist for their own children."

Copies of all the aforementioned issues of The Spokesman are in the files at OEO headquarters.

In the same vein, the August 15, 1968, issue of the Marin City (Calif.) Memo, published by the Marin City Economic Opportunity Council, printed an editorial by Area Director James W. Coleman, who, after visits to Chicago, Detroit and Cleveland, found: "The social revolution continues to move across this nation. . . . There must be drastic social changes in the society now. . . . I talked to many black youths who still had anger and revenge for the white power structure." The same issue quoted black activist Dick Gregory as saying, "Riots are nothing new. They're just a ghetto version of a fire sale."

NEED POWER

"Power is the essential for the poor," according to the tabloid newspaper, The New Day, published by the Human Development Corp. of St. Louis. "If you want to beat the small store cheating you. If you want to keep 'the man' off your back. If you want to get a job. If you want to get decent housing out of the slum lord. You have to have Power," proclaimed the March 1968 issue of The New Day.

From a sister publication in Elizabeth, N.J., comes a similar theme. The May 1968 Community Action News, published by Community Action for Economic Opportunity, Inc., carried a letter to the editor signed by Josephine Nieves, acting director of the Northeast Regional Office of OEO in New York, which said, "Jobs alone will not necessarily solve the problems of the poor in America since it is to a large extent a question of power."

The same issue featured a story which said that a teenage community action group had petitioned the city to incorporate black history into the regular school curriculum. Another story said, "The Black Power Conference held July 20 through July 23 was an inspirational and educational gathering." Among the proposals reported were "developing Liberation Schools, setting up a Black Teachers Union—Separate From The White Summer Camps for Blacks only, development of Black Political Power. . . ." The Washington Evening Star called that same conference "a festival of hate."

The tabloid newspaper, The Neighborhood Journal, states in its masthead that it is owned and operated by the five Denver community action councils and "funded by a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity." The September 20, 1968, issue devotes half a page to the views of "resident participants" in the Model Cities program. It charges that minority persons are abused when arrested, charged, jailed and sentenced, and calls for "greater protection from unjust police and judicial action" to command top priority after planning in the Model Cities program.

WASHINGTON DOESN'T KNOW

No one in Washington seems to know how many anti-poverty "newsletters" are being published, or how many more will be launched in response to OEO's Handbook. Besides those mentioned, others have come out of Long Beach, Calif.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Miami and Pensacola, Fla.; New York; Columbus, Ohio, and many Indian reservations. OEO headquarters have three filing cabinet drawers packed with samples of the newsletters.

Almost unbelievably, they are being distributed in slums all over the country without the knowledge of Congress. That body thought it had made its intent amply clear when it set up the Small Business Administration. Congress banned SBA loans to newspapers to avoid government interference with the press. In 1967 an amendment to the second supplemental appropriation act said flatly: "None of the federal government anti-poverty funds may be used for establishing or operating a general coverage newspaper, magazine, radio station or television station."

When he introduced the amendment, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr. (D., Va.) stated: "I am unalterably opposed to government ownership or control of newspapers because it leads inevitably to government control of the news. I believe we have too much government management of the news already without this additional weapon being put into the hands of federal officials."

Enactment followed disclosure that WAMY-Community Action, Inc., of Boone, N.C., proposed to establish a newspaper and radio station with $179,000 from OEO in response to OEO pressure to emphasize communications instead of job training. At the time, Senator Ervin commented that the proposal was wholly "incompatible with the free enterprise system and a free press."

Senator Strom Thurmond (R., S.C.) declared: "If every poverty agency were to get a 100% subsidy for the publication of its own propaganda—freed from the responsibility of business losses and restrictions—then a medium would be created to promote social unrest and dissatisfaction on a nationwide scale."

As noted, OEO maintains that the publications it now subsidizes are "newsletters" which do not engage in "general coverage," cited in the wording of the 1967 ban on subsidized newspapers. Newsletters or newspapers, the publications are only one segment of a vast OEO-subsidized propaganda network—encompassing television, radio, films and even speakers' bureaus—now in operation and growing daily.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Dwight D. Eisenhower was a great man. The very mention of his name evokes emotions in the heart of every American. Men who were in the European Theater in World War II remember him as the commander in chief who led the Allied forces to victory. Those who are especially identified with the years from 1953 to 1961 remember him as a distinguished President of the United States. There are those who identify with his earlier years, or with his presidency of Columbia University. But everyone who thinks of Dwight D. Eisenhower thinks of a man of humility, yet a man of stature, a great leader but not a demander, a man who was a peer in his own time, yet a man who was a friend of all.

I was fortunate in being a part of the organization in London that General Eisenhower led while preparing for the Normandy invasion. As a very junior officer I knew of the admiration and respect he elicited from all ranks. His ability to mediate between the prima donnas of his command and his ability to obtain the utmost from his associates were facets of his character that made all ranks his friend.

I came to Congress in the first year of President Eisenhower's administration and was a part of the legislative branch while he led the executive department. He was always understanding, ever considerate. He brought to the civilian administration the feeling that he had for his troops under his military command. He wanted to improve the status of the people he governed; while he recognized that they were going to be subjected to risks and dangers, he wanted to minimize those risks and dangers.

He was a great general, a distinguished president, an admirable citizen; but more, he was a mighty American in all the connotations of that term. The world will miss him and all of us who were associated with him regret his death, but even after our memory is faded and gone this man will be remembered as a statesman of grandeur and dignity.

THE WAY WE GO TO WAR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the question uppermost in the minds of Americans today is how we are going to end the war in Vietnam. This question supersedes the related question, asked earlier, which is why we went to war in the first place. But a third question is posed by the war in Vietnam, a question that is of fundamental importance for the future of our country, and that question is how we went to war.

Merlo J. Pusey, an associate editor of the Washington Post and author of a Pulitzer Prize-winning biography of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, addresses himself to this question in a lucid book entitled "The Way We Go To War," which is scheduled to be published in mid-April. Having read the galley proofs, I recommend that every Senator examine the book carefully. After examining the way we have gone to war in the past, and the way we went to war in Vietnam, Mr. Pusey concludes that while the Founding Fathers did leave the President the authority to repel sudden attacks on the United States, its forces and its people, "to extend that authority so as to allow the Commander in Chief to send American troops to the defense of other countries half way around the globe, because the President believes that their security is related to our own, is to rip this section of the Constitution into meaningless shreds."

Mr. Pusey goes on to state his belief that the new doctrine that seems to have arisen under which the President can commit the Nation to war without the approval of Congress "is a far greater peril to the future of American democracy than the Vietnam war itself."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from chapter I of "The Way We Go To War," written by Merlo J. Pusey, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excepts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Way We Go to War

(By Merlo J. Pusey)

Can the United States be committed to war without action by Congress? In 1787 the Founding Fathers resolved that it could not be, and the country held to that principle with little deviation for a century and a half. In recent years, however, the President has been exercising the power to make war with alarming consistency. One-man decisions involving the lives of citizens and the fate of the nation have become the rule at a time when the President has at his command more power than any other human being has ever had.

The facts about this momentous transition in American government are scarcely open to challenge. The President sends American troops to any part of the world—whenever he thinks they may be needed in the national interest. Three times in the last quarter century one man in the White House has taken the United States into war—once in advance of congressional action, once without any congressional action, and once with only a casual nod from Congress. In defense of these historic acts the executive branch has laid claim to "inherent powers" broad enough to determine the fate of the nation in any future crisis.

Several years of war in Vietnam brought the country an acute awareness of the problem. Deeply troubled by the war, people belatedly woke up to the fact that it had never really been authorized by Congress, although Congress in 1964 went through the motions of supporting the President in whatever action he might decide to take. Later some of the legislators who sponsored the Tonkin Gulf resolution almost tore their hair in chagrin over the fact that they had let the war power slip through their fingers. The result is an executive-legislative clash which may evolve into the most important constitutional contest of this century.

The President has always been the key figure in any national crisis since the federal government came into being, and he doubtless always will be. Under the specific terms of the Constitution, he is Commander in Chief of the armed forces in addition to being the Chief Executive, the director of foreign policy, the leader of his party in all spheres of policy-making, and the chief molder of public opinion. His sway over the country is especially great in times of emergency or public danger. And with the emergence of nuclear fission, science has thrust into the President's hands power to destroy the world.

All this has come about through industrial, scientific, and political evolution. The flowering of technology has brought with it an almost inevitable centralization of power. Prudence suggests that such a trend in a democratic country should have been accompanied by a tighter safeguards against abuses of power. Instead, the accretion of power in the White House has encouraged the President and his associates to develop a cult designed to justify any use he may make of the country's armed forces. Under the new doctrine now openly reached he may bring the might of America to bear upon any other country without seeking authority from Congress—without the restraints of what was once supposed to be a government of checks and balances.

The President thus tends, as Shakespeare said of Caesar, to "bestride the narrow world like a Colossus." He enters into foreign commitments or, at his discretion, enlarges the commitments made by treaty with the advice and consent of the Senate. He determines when the country shall go to war, how the war shall be carried on, and whether it shall be extended to other countries. Of course he also exercises enormous influence over what the people at home must do to support the war. An egotistical and stubborn President could lead the country into a series of self-defeating wars in remote corners of the globe in an effort to enhance his own prestige or to cover failures in his domestic policies. Under the practices that have come to prevail, Congress would have little prospect of stopping such ventures. And what is there to prevent a President obsessed by the righteousness of his own cause from holding down the accelerator until a nuclear holocaust would be unavoidable?

The basic question is not the good intentions of the President. We may assume that any Chief Executive elected by the people will be guided by what he deems to be the best interests of the country. But Presidents, even more than other men, are likely to be caught in rushing streams of circumstances, and even if they could always be trusted to make wise decisions, our system rests on the assumption that many minds are more trustworthy than one on matters of war and peace.

Not all the extravagant claims to Presidential power and not all the abuses of that power have been concentrated in recent decades, as we shall see. But until World War II the deviations from constitutional doctrine could be looked upon as aberrations. Under several recent Presidents, both theory and practice have sought to make presidential commitments to war the norm instead of highly dubious exceptions. It now seems clear that useless (sic) some drastic shift can be brought about, in attitudes and in the law of the land, our country will be as much at the mercy of one man for the maintenance of peace as were the ancient kingdoms and empires before the dawn of democratic government.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S REVIEW OF THE 1970 BUDGET

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I wish to commend President Nixon for his review of the fiscal year 1970 budget, which he released on April 15. His summary is a responsible effort to restrain inflation in the economy and at the same time to provide the funds necessary to meet our urgent domestic social needs.

To slow down inflation, Federal fiscal restraint is vitally important. This the President recognizes by proposing to reduce fiscal year 1970 outlays by $4 billion from the corrected estimates submitted by the outgoing administration. Budget outlays will be reduced from $196.9 billion to $192.9 billion.

The President proposes to reduce budget authority for fiscal year 1970 by

$5.5 billion, from $211.4 billion to $205.9 billion. Of the $5.5 billion, over $3 billion is in military programs.

The President has been unabe to reduce fiscal year 1969 outlays significantly as he came to office after 7 months of the fiscal year had already gone by. I strongly applaud his efforts though to pare what he can from 1969 outlays as well.

Even with the cuts from the budget left behind by the previous administration, President Nixon fully recognizes the many urgent needs of our society. Proposed outlays of $192.9 billion in fiscal year 1970 will be $8 billion higher than those for fiscal year 1969. Selected necessary and vital domestic programs will have their funds increased.

It is essential to the growth and welfare of this Nation that the Federal Government put its money where its goals and priorities are. Our first priorities in these difficult days are to meet the human needs of our people—poverty, hunger, education, and cultural deprivation, poor housing and the lack of employment skills. This present administration has taken important steps toward insuring that Federal spending programs express and meet the Nation's needs in its proposals regarding the fiscal 1970 budget.

In its review of the 1970 budget, the administration proposes to hold the increase in total outlays to 4.3 percent over that estimated for fiscal 1969. Yet this does not mean it intends to have all programs and departments grow at this rate. Programs to improve our human resources and aid our poor will increase 10 percent, or more than twice the average. It is proposed that the Department of Labor spend over 5 percent more in fiscal 1970 than it did in fiscal 1969, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare 9 percent more, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 40 percent more.

At the same time, many programs of lesser priority are slated to reduce their outlays in fiscal 1970. Spending by the Department of Defense and NASA face significant reductions. Spending by the Department of Agriculture will decline over 14 percent, and Corps of Engineers and General Services Administration outlays will also drop.

To my mind, this is a significant indication that this administration intends to reorient the Federal budget to meet the human needs of the people of this country. The fact that it is being done within the context of budget restraint makes it all the more admirable.

The following table shows percentage changes in agency spending in fiscal 1970 over fiscal 1969:

Review of the 1970 budget—Changes in agency spending in fiscal 1970 over fiscal 1969

Agency	*Percent Change*
Agriculture	−14.4
CCC	−18.4
Commerce	+23.7
Defense-military and military assistance	−.6
Corps of Engineers	−2.8
Health, Education, and Welfare	+9.3
Trust funds	+7.1
Housing and Urban Development	+40.0
Interior	−6.7
Justice	+41.2
Labor	+5.3
Unemployment trust funds	+4.3
Post Office	−55.7
State	−1.4
Transportation	+8.7
Treasury	+5.8
Interest on public debt	+6.1
Atomic Energy Commission	+2.2
General Services Administration	−1.5
NASA	−8.2
Veterans' Administration	−2.1
All other:	
Foreign economic assistance	−8.6
Office of Economic Opportunity	−.4
Other agencies	+27.3
Undistributed intragovernmental transactions	+12.5
Total	+4.3

The President has acted responsibly in his proposals to meet the country's needs. Now it is up to Congress. As the President points out, almost 85 percent of the recommended budget changes require congressional concurrence, either as new legislation or revised appropriations.

Will Congress have the courage, the wisdom, and the political nerve to follow through on these proposals? I believe we must follow in the path laid out by the President to restrain inflation yet meet our urgent domestic needs.

I commend the President and now say that we, in Congress, must do our part.

THE TAX-DODGE FARMING BILL

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, just the other day one of my constituents sent me some materials he had received in the mail concerning my tax-dodge farming bill, S. 500.

The material consisted in part of a form letter from the American Hereford Association. The association also provided him with a list of 11 supposed adverse effects which the bill would have on my constituent. The suggestion was made that several arguments should be selected from the list and incorporated into letters to the members of the Montana delegation. Finally, instructions were provided detailing how to write letters and the need to "concentrate on House delegates now; particularly members of the House Ways and Means Committee."

In its form letter, the American Hereford Association stated that it was speaking not only for itself but for the National Livestock Tax Committee and the American National Cattlemen's Association, as well. I am certain that the concerted efforts of these three groups will doubtless result in an influx of mail. I want other Senators to be able to say they saw a preview of coming attractions in the RECORD first.

I ask unanimous consent that the form letter and attachments be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter from the American Hereford Association and attachments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE AMERICAN HEREFORD ASSOCIATION,
April 9, 1969.

DEAR FRIEND: The next thirty days are critical to all our Hereford operations! You have doubtless read or heard about legislation currently being considered by the House Ways and Means Committee regarding the offsetting of farm losses against other income. (Metcalf Bill and Treasury proposals.)

The National Livestock Committee, of which your Association is a member, and the American National Cattlemen's Assn., are vigorously opposing this legislation because its present form could potentially damage everyone in farming. Your AHA, the Tax Committee, and the ANCA are each on record in Washington as being in favor of *singling out* and *discouraging* a small minority who enter the livestock field primarily for the purpose of tax avoidance. The Tax Committee has made specific proposals to both House Ways and Means and Treasury officials to tax livestock investors at ordinary income rates instead of capital gains rates on excessive depreciation, and to lengthen the holding period to qualify cattle for capital gains treatment to two years.

Right now, we need your help. Attached, you will find two sheets. The first lists your state delegations to the Senate and the House. The second sheet lists several reasons why the legislation now being considered would be detrimental to the great majority of our breeders. We strongly urge you, if any of these arguments appeal to you, to select from that list several that you can incorporate into letters to your delegations. Also, if you so incline, the Tax Committee would appreciate your voicing your *support* of *their* proposals.

Of immediate priority is your House delegation, which could have legislation reported out to it by the House Ways and Means Committee this month. Within the House, members of the Ways and Means Committee should have your first attention, by remember, they *all* have to vote eventually!

The Tax Committee and your Associations can do just so much, but all they can do pales by comparison with the force you can exert! Please, if this legislation is of vital concern to you and your Hereford business, take these tools we have furnished you and translate them into expressions which will guide your elected representatives!

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE NAUGLE,
President.
W. T. BERRY, Jr.,
Secretary.

ADVERSE EFFECTS OF METCALF BILL AND TREASURY PROPOSALS

1. While the legislation proposed so far seeks to eliminate an acknowledged minority who invest primarily to avoid tax, its method is so sweeping that it threatens the business of all ranchers and farmers, large and small.

2. The need is for legislation that will single out the undesirable practices and eliminate them with a minimum of disturbance to the rest of the farm economy. The solution may lie in striking specifically at planned "short-term" investors, as opposed to more stable operators.

3. The Metcalf-type legislation has the effect of forcing those with outside income over $15,000 to an accrual system of accounting, from the rancher's traditional cash basis. Impractical from the standpoint of true inventory values and too complicated for the average farmer, it would place yet another undue hardship on him.

4. The decision not to permit the off-setting of farm losses against other income seems discriminatory against farming itself, in that no such restriction is proposed against the comparable practice of other individuals deducting business and professional losses.

5. The arbitrary selection of $15,000, a figure below the outside incomes of many

family farmers (who are actually being encouraged by the government to diversify their incomes) appears discriminatory and calculated to cut into a major segment of solid farm producers. $15,000 is also far below the outside incomes reported by most of those purported to be abusing the tax laws.

6. The few special tax incentives provided by law to farmers and ranchers, by reason of the nature of their business, accord them no more than tax equity. To deprive the farmer of these would be to place him in a position of inequity, at a time when his industry is in dire need of stimulation.

7. A side effect of the Metcalf-type legislation would be to actually block the successful farmer from being able to diversify into non-farming businesses producing outside income, for fear of losing his right to deduct farm losses, thus effectively isolating the farmer from the balance of the industrial economy.

8. To discourage the flow of outside capital into farming in the hope that it will protect existing small farmers seems a poor risk, in that *all* farmers depend on this free flow of capital into agriculture to build it into a competitive industry.

9. Proponents of the legislation suggest that preventing outsiders from investing will tend to lower farm land prices. Is this wise, when ranchers are borrowing to pay for land, and when many small farmers depend on appreciation as the only source of profit in farming?

10. Much of the research which has so vastly improved the technology of agriculture was accomplished by investors with enough outside income to bear the expense of such research. To discourage these investors will strike a blow to agriculture in another vital sector.

11. The Metcalf-type legislation examines the man and how much money he has, resulting inevitably in discriminatory legislation. When the legislation abandons this trend and examines the potential of the enterprise itself, it will be on the right track.

CONGRESSMEN FOR THE STATE OF MONTANA

Address your letter as follows:

For Senators: Address: The Honorable (name), Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510. Salutation: Dear Senator (name).

For Representatives: The Honorable (name), The House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515. Dear Congressman (name).

SENATE

Democrat: Mike Mansfield, Lee Metcalf.

HOUSE

Democrat: Arnold Olsen.

Republican: James F. Battin.*

NOTE.—Concentrate on House delegates now; particularly members of House Ways and Means Committee.

THE ABM DISPUTE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. David S. Broder has written an interesting article on the ABM system, which was published in the Washington Post of April 15, 1969. Because I think it is worthy of the attention of all Senators, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABM DISPUTE BEARS ECHOES OF FIGHT THAT DESTROYED L. B. J.

(By David S. Broder)

Like the Vietnam war before it, the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system has proved to be too important an issue to be left to the generals and the military experts. It has now become a test of strength between the President and the coalition of critics who are challenging the economic and political assumptions of our present national security policy.

There is a stunning similarity between the arguments now being voiced by Republicans opposed to President Nixon's decision to begin deployment of the ABM and the warnings anti-Vietnam Democrats were giving President Johnson, say, two years ago.

Now, just as then, the fellow-partisans of the incumbent President are pleading with him not to pursue what seems to them a mistaken policy and not to make adherence to that policy the prime test of party loyalty.

It would be foolish to predict at this juncture that the ABM fight will prove as costly to Mr. Nixon as Vietnam did to his predecessor. But it might be equally mistaken to assume that the opposition cannot prevail.

Many of us believed two years ago that a party would never repudiate an incumbent President on a basic issue of foreign policy or national security. That assumption proved wrong. The revulsion in the Democratic Party against the expansion of the Vietnam war proved so strong that Lyndon B. Johnson could no longer contemplate continuing either as President or party leader.

Mr. Nixon, obviously, is a long way from that point. Conventional wisdom suggests that his advisers are right when they assert that—in a murky technical argument—the public will look to and trust the President's good judgment.

They are right, too, when they say that in the crunch, conscientious Senators—particularly Republicans—will find it hard to repudiate the President. His popularity is high, his term has barely begun, he must speak for a united country if arms negotiations with the Soviets and the peace talks in Paris are to succeed. Balking a President at such a moment as this is no casual act.

And yet . . . and yet . . . one is struck by the passionate conviction with which Republicans opposed to ABM argue (as did the anti-Vietnam Democrats two years ago) that they are ahead of their President and party and party leader in recognizing that the voters will refuse to support decisions that are so costly and that return so few visible dividends as fighting in Vietnam or building the ABM.

In the case of the ABM, thank God, we are talking only about the commitment of dollars, not of lives. But even in this case, costs have major political consequences.

Opposition to the Vietnam war suddenly spread from the left wing of the Democratic Party to the breadth of the political spectrum when Mr. Johnson in 1967 was finally forced to ask for a tax increase to finance its costs.

Now, Mr. Nixon has asked to keep the Johnson surtax in effect for another year—partly to finance the war, partly to curb the inflationary pressures it unleashed, and partly because he has not been able to bring the military budget, symbolized by ABM, under control.

The campaign against ABM is not simply a highminded liberal effort to rethink the Cold War or to redefine national priorities. It also has strong elements of an old-fashioned, conservative tax rebellion.

And that is one more reason why the conventional wisdom about who will win this fight may prove to be wrong.

DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, last year I made a speech on the Senate floor in which I discussed the need to open up our national parks to a greater extent than has been done, while at the same time maintaining protection of their most precious values. At that time I stated:

> We are forgetting, I believe, that our national parks are for people, and that a vast majority of Americans see most of our natural wonders, and the greatest part of our magnificent scenery, from the window seats of their automobiles, or after a short hike from a visitor's use area. They come into our national parks, not with a pack on the back, but with a row of children, and perhaps grandma or grandpa as well, in the back seats of their cars. They are much more interested in getting an unobstructed view of Old Faithful than finding a remote camping site in Kings Canyon.

Three questions which I asked at that time remain highly relevant today:

> Are we overemphasizing wilderness and underemphasizing people?
>
> Are we forgetting the majority of our people? Those who seek refreshment and revitalization from an outdoor experience but who keep near graded roads and manmade shelter. And are we favoring the minority who have the time and the money to seek nature in its pristine state far from roads and manmade camps?

In 1968, the National Park System was host to just over 151 million visitations, a truly phenomenal total, representing a strikingly high rate of increase. Visitations exceeded the predicted totals by 5 million. There is no reason to believe that this trend will reverse itself. I, for one, am much pleased that more and more Americans are getting out to experience these priceless natural wonders, and to breathe the fresh, invigorating air which characterizes our national parks.

I continue to believe, as I stated last year, that we must achieve a greater development of our national parks in order to serve all Americans—in order that we can, in Director Hartzog's words:

> Extend more broadly to all Americans the many values and opportunities represented in their national park system.

Because of my views, I am particularly pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to the remarks of the chairman of the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, Congressman ROY TAYLOR. Recently Mr. TAYLOR chaired a hearing of his subcommittee, before which appeared the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Dr. Leslie Glasgow, and the Director of the National Park Service, Mr. George Hartzog. In the discussion at that time, Representative TAYLOR stated that he was very disappointed over the inadequate development of the existing national parks and recreation facilities. Chairman TAYLOR said:

> Our park areas should be developed to meet the needs of all visitors—those who come to study nature through car windows as well as the rugged ones.

He lamented the inability of the Park Service to provide needed developed facilities at Assateague Island National Seashore and other units of the National Park System.

Mr. President, the visitation increase which we are experiencing in our national parks and recreation areas must be met by the provision of more developed facilities. Certainly we must provide more roads in the parks in order that the vast majority of our people, who come to the parks by car and rely upon their automobiles to carry them to the pieces of picturesque landscape, may be better served.

---

* Indicates member of House Ways and Means Committee.

I was much pleased, in this connection, to hear that the Park Service will surface slightly more than 16 miles of road leading into Canyonlands National Park this summer. Their action will serve to provide access for the public to the spectacular scenery of that park, and will also attract the tourist trade in that region which was expected at the time the park was established.

I am gratified by the words of Representative TAYLOR at the House subcommittee hearing, and heartened by the support which I have received in my efforts to achieve a park system which will serve the interests of the using public. As I said a year ago:

> . . . we must keep part of our national parks and monuments in their natural state. Certainly, we should encourage our citizens to pack into these unique areas and enjoy them to the fullest. For those whose "inner receiver" needs solitude and miles between them and anyone else we should provide the place and the means.
>
> But, we cannot ignore the interest of the majority of our citizens, the majority which gets their enjoyment out of the wilderness by seeing it from the road, and their refreshment from nature by eating and sleeping under big trees.
>
> What they want is more roads—hard-tops, or low-grade scenic roads, as conditions dictate—but more access to our parks, and more campgrounds to stay there

Without this greater development, our efforts to provide the outdoor scenic experience we sought for our people will have failed.

DENIAL OF EDUCATIONAL FUNDS TO A RURAL GEORGIA COUNTY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Associated Press made a study of the effect of the cutoff of educational funds to a rural Georgia county by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The report finds that those who are hurt the most by the punitive action of HEW "were hundreds of disadvantaged schoolchildren, most of them poor and Negro."

The funds were denied because local officials and HEW officials disagreed on integration plans.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, published in various newspapers throughout the Nation on April 16, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENIAL OF FUNDS TO A RURAL GEORGIA COUNTY

VIENNA, GA.—Refusal to accept integration guidelines cost rural Dooly County $359,000 a year in federal funds, a figure equal to 40 per cent of the school budget, and crippled enrichment programs at Negro schools.

The cutoff helped force a tax raise.

But hurt worst were hundreds of disadvantaged school children, most of them poor and Negro.

Losers were not the five school board members who rejected an integration plan of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare—HEW—two years ago.

The losers were school children: those needing special preschool help and remedial training but now without a program.

And sick children, who lost a school nurse.

Hungry children, who were getting hot lunches free.

"My biggest problem? Not being able to feed the children," said Negro Principal Frank E. Williams at Paul Vance School in Dooly County.

Dooly, the state's top cotton-growing county located in south Georgia, and Jones County, a sparsely populated pulpwood area near Macon, show the pattern of what results from cutting off federal funds for schools.

Most of the money went to Negro schools since they have by far the most low-income families, a key qualification for the larger grants. Withdrawal of funds was felt sharply in these schools, while the situation in predominantly white schools was not significantly changed.

That has been the main effect in Georgia systems, which authorities say are losing upwards of $7.5 million a year. Some Georgians argue that HEW's cutoff of funds penalizes children because of actions of school boards.

But an HEW official says the school authorities must take the blame for not complying with "the law of the land."

Regardless of blame, the effects are the same.

Dooly County, 50 miles south of Macon, is bisected by Interstate 75, the major north-south tourist route. The county's 11,000 population is 60 per cent Negro, as is the school enrollment of 3,100.

School Supt. W. F. Stone gave this breakdown of the federal funds it received before termination in 1967:

Remedial-enrichment programs—under Title I of 1964 Civil Rights Act—$278,000.

Antipoverty—Head Start, others—$40,000.

"Impact area" funds based on the number of military dependents in schools, $26,000.

Vocational education, $15,000.

The total of $359,000 is equal to nearly 40 per cent of the 1967 school budget of $904,876. But since the bulk of the federal funds were for added, enrichment programs, the county had to make up only about $50,000 in its budget, Stone said.

This was done by raising property taxes $4 per $1,000 valuation last year, producing about $85,000 for schools.

A pressing problem was that of hot lunches for many Negro pupils, farm children whose families fall below the poverty level of $3,000 a year income and often must be trained to like milk because they have none at home, Stone said.

Principal Williams and his teachers at Vance elementary have taken it on themselves to raise money in their community. A pilot program of special state aid has helped.

"Sometimes we have only 19 children out of 404 at this school who can pay for lunch," Williams said. "The majority still eat free."

Stone said that with federal funds 733 meals per day had been provided free. Local efforts have kept the free lunch program going, but on a curtailed basis.

Lost with the federal money also:

A special reading teacher, a physical education teacher and six teacher assistants, a nurse, a band instructor, three lunchroom workers and two janitors—all for the Negro schools.

Dooly County's school board balked two years ago when HEW's formula demanded 150 pupils and 14 teachers cross the color line, Stone said.

Under a freedom of choice plan, about 35 Negroes had transferred to white schools. "You just don't change overnight," Stone said, arguing that HEW had asked too much.

There now are nine Negroes in two otherwise white schools, he said, though the system has dropped its integration plan altogether.

No public battle has resulted from the loss of funds and the recession in integration. But the Department of Justice notified the school board four months ago that a Negro parent had complained of discrimination.

The school board, in reply, adopted a resolution calling for compliance requirements to be "established by judiciary directives." Under federal law, the Justice Department may go into federal court to force compliance.

Jones County, which lies immediately northeast of Macon, has 3,000 school children, with a slight white majority. There are seven schools, four of them all-Negro. About 65 Negroes attended predominantly white schools.

Federal aid totaling more than $150,000 was cut off in October 1966 when the school board rejected HEW's proposal to abolish the dual school system. Included in the loss, state records show, were $111,836 in enrichment funds and $21,677 in funds for military dependents in schools.

"Actually it seems like it brought things to a standstill," said Negro Principal Charles Adams of Bradley Elementary, also plagued with hunger problems. He said classroom equipment, such as reading machines and projectors, were still in use but there were no maintenance funds, no new filmstrips.

"Actually some of the machines are idle," he said.

Schools in Jones County are crowded and the critical need is more room, said Supt. Linton Jordan.

What was the effect of cutting off federal funds?"

"The difference is in things we might have done," he said.

"We're operating like we always operated before we got the funds."

Jordan said $50,000 was spent in a reading program for Negro schools. Other federal money went into science equipment, textbooks, physical plan, lunches, a band with instruments costing $6,000, record players and four pianos.

All this went to Negro schools. And there were ambitious plans for more programs before the money was cut off, said Marie H. Collins, a Negro teacher who coordinated the federal programs.

Principal Jerome Guy of Maggie Califf High School said Negro schools, like this, were "definitely retarded" academically by the termination of funds.

He said if he had to make a choice he would rather have improved education than school integration.

A federal official defended the cutoff of funds.

"The theory of cutting off funds was that the federal government in such situations was in the position of subsidizing segregation," said Paul Rilling, regional civil rights director for HEW in Atlanta.

The theory that federal aid might be used to "encourage" compliance was involved also Rilling said. This has worked in many instances, he said, citing the fact that most school systems have complied with the law.

"There has been substantial progress in the Deep South," said Rilling. In the 11 Southern states in 1964, he said, integrated schools had only 2 per cent Negro pupils, but now the figure is 20 per cent.

MARTIN LUTHER KING AND AMERICAN TRADITIONS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, 1 year ago, the eloquent voice of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.—raised in the cause of human justice and peace for a decade and a half—was forever stilled.

In memory of this great man, another distinguished black American, Dr. John Hope Franklin, head of the history department at the University of Chicago, spoke at a memorial service held at the Department of Labor on the anniversary of Dr. King's death. Said Dr. Franklin:

> A young nation, once the hope of the old

world and the new, grows old and weary before its time. It seems unable to cope with the forces that propel it toward its own demise. . . . A nation cannot be profligate and incontinent in its regard for its own people without draining itself of its own vitality as well as its own humanity. Perhaps it can recover but not without some strong resolve—stronger than anything we have yet witnessed—to become the vessel in which the lives and hopes of all its people can flourish and thereby bring about the restoration of its own vitality.

And then he asked:

Is this requiring too much?

Dr. Franklin's moving speech should cause all who read it to pause to reflect on the nature of the issues which face our Nation today.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Franklin's address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Martin Luther King and American Traditions

(By John Hope Franklin)

Some years ago, when the Congress of the United States was considering a civil rights bill, a young black man—not yet thirty years of age—spoke out vigorously and eloquently in support of the bill. Referring to the numerous forms of injustice and discrimination from which his people suffered, he said, "If this unjust discrimination is to be longer tolerated by the American people . . . then I can only say with sorrow and regret that our boasted civilization is a fraud; our republican institutions a failure; our social system a disgrace; and our religion a complete hypocrisy." The speaker was John R. Lynch, a member of the House of Representatives from Mississippi; and he was urging his colleagues in 1875 to put an end to racial discrimination in the public schools, on the railroads, and in other places of public accommodation.

Congress passed the act after five years of debate and after deleting the provision covering the public schools. A few years later the Supreme Court struck down the law, with the neat but unconvincing remark that the law to protect the civil rights of all people had not been authorized by the Constitution. The decision was hailed throughout the land as a just decision. Whites in the South praised the "fairmindedness" of the Court in striking down the work of a "set of political fanatics." A New York newspaper advised Negroes to "act wisely" and "accept the result with patience." Only Negro Americans and a very few white Americans deplored the decision. T. Thomas Fortune said that his fellow blacks felt as if they had been "baptized in ice water." Frederick Douglass, commenting on the ultimate indivisibility of justice, observed that under the circumstances the wife of the Chief Justice was protected "not by law, but solely by the accident of her color . . . The lesson of all the ages on this point is that a wrong done to one man is a wrong done to all men. It may not be felt at the moment . . . but . . . the harvest of evil will come."

Thus began the third century of racial injustice in the New World utopia. Those earlier years—from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries—had been marked not merely by the barbarism of slavery but also by the denial of equal rights to those blacks who were already free. Those earlier years had witnessed the struggle of white Americans to win their political independence and their simultaneous determination to deny even the rudiments of freedom to their black compatriots who had also fought to make the country strong and free. Long before the great numbers of Europeans had poured into the American cities, white America had developed the fine art of ghettoizing the American urban community by placing beyond the pale those Negroes who lived in eighteenth century Boston, New York, and Philadelphia. And when, in the ripeness of time, the United States found it necessary to fight to save its own life, it faltered time and again between 1861 and 1865 on the fundamental questions of human freedom and the dignity of all men.

But it was in this third century—these last hundred years—that this country, through its laws and its practices, would formalize, institutionalize, and even intellectualize its racial doctrines. It would segregate its labor force on the basis of race. Race would dictate the separation of the armed forces into white and black outfits that would fight separately to save the world for democracy. The etiquette of race relations would require separate housing, separate entrances and exits in buildings, separate public parks, separate schools, separate churches, separate toilets, separate Bibles on which to take the oath in courts of law, separate telephone booths, separate drinking fountains, and separate warehouses for the storing of school books of white and black children. Segregation would encourage and justify discrimination. Discrimination would facilitate the brutalizing and dehumanizing of an entire race. The doctrine of racial inferiority, deeply imbedded in the very ethos of white America by three centuries of preaching, would rationalize every act of bestiality perpetrated against black men by white Americans.

By the time that Martin Luther King appeared on the American scene in the middle of the twentieth century, American attitudes toward race had hardened into a firm doctrine of racism that pervaded every aspect of American life. It had itself become a powerful American tradition, even if it was not a good American tradition. It must have been a painful sight for a man such as Martin Luther King, deeply committed to a life of love, to view a society so committed to the denial of equality. Even though he admonished his followers to love their enemies—"and let them know that you love them," he would say—he was doubtless hurt by the regular and persistent reciprocation of hate. But this was an old American tradition, this blind hatred, with a basis so ephemeral as color and employing violence whenever necessary to preserve the tradition and Martin Luther King knew his history as well as his theology. He knew how far back race hatred went, how deeply it was embedded, how pervasive it was. He would confront this tradition, and he would give his entire life to its obliteration.

There were other powerful American traditions on which King could rely as he fought the tradition of racism in all its forms. One was the tradition of protest—to be sure, not always as peaceful in the past as King would have liked, but sanctified by the Constitutional provision guaranteeing the "right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." If Patrick Henry could cry "Give me liberty or give me death," when England imposed a stamp tax, surely King could protest the indignities heaped on his people by forcing them to enter a bus by a rear door. If Henry David Thoreau could denounce the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for enacting laws that interfered with his complete freedom, surely King could protest the failure of the federal government to protect black citizens against the dogs, fire hoses, and bull whips of the racist keepers of the peace. If women could protest in every conceivable way the inequalities of the sexes, surely King could protest the discriminations in employment, housing, voting, and education.

And so Martin Luther King embraced the great American tradition of protest, rejecting that portion of it that countenanced violence. For his efforts he was jailed, an eventuality that he invited *and* expected in order to test what he viewed as unjust and unconstitutional laws. For his efforts he was denounced as "communistic" by a Southern newspaper and was called "the most notorious liar in the country" by the Director of the F.B.I. This, too, he accepted with equanimity, realizing that in the heat of the battle for justice, men become desperate when their defenses become weak. But he could not and would not accept the violence and barbarity of his adversaries who could bomb scores of churches where defenseless Negroes met to protest injustices, who could murder men and women whose only crime as they worked in the field of civil rights was their search for decency, who could murder little children whose only offense was that they attended Sunday School. His adversaries had taken that part of the American tradition that he had rejected and with it they had defamed and defiled a cause that was worthy and just.

He was not daunted, however, for his optimism was boundless; and his faith in the ultimate triumph of his cause was unshakeable. Long before the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders made its report, King knew and had said that racism was deeply imbedded in the vital organs of American life; but he believed that it could be uprooted. He had seen hatred, and he had seen violence; but he believed that there was enough decency left that could be aroused and used to dispel those forces that were on the verge of destroying the country. He believed that a combination of Christian militancy and the American concept of equality could strengthen each other and, in the process, could indeed overcome the forces of evil. He had said as much in his "Letter from a Birmingham Jail." He was to say it again in his book, *Why We Can't Wait*.

There was yet another American tradition on which Martin Luther King counted and of which he became a part. It was the tradition of the Negro American serving as the corrective to the one-sided, myopic view of justice so often manifested by white Americans, even in their finest hour. When they were fighting for independence against England, it was the Negroes of Massachusetts who reminded them of their inconsistency if not their hypocrisy in keeping black men in bondage while espousing the cause of freedom. It was a voteless black man, Paul Cuffe, who refused to pay his taxes and went to jail in 1780 in order to point up the shallow speciousness of the claim of the patriots that "taxation without representation is tyranny." It was Frederick Douglass who reminded President Lincoln that the cause of Union was tenuous and uncertain so long as slavery, the cause of the Civil War, was permitted to exist. It was a company of black Union soldiers who, in 1865, told President Andrew Johnson that it was strange that former Confederates, returning from doing battle *against* the Union for four years, were allowed to vote while Negro soldiers who had fought to *save* the Union were denied the vote, presumably because they did not possess the qualities of mind and the powers of discrimination to understand the problems of the society.

This was, indeed, a great American tradition; and one wonders how the country could have retained its sanity or its soul without it. It sustained a country virtually gone mad, at the turn of the century, as it glorified segregation, discrimination, lynchings, and rioting. A T. Thomas Fortune, a Monroe Trotter, and a W. E. B. Du Bois spoke gently to the conscience of the nation and reminded it that it was supposed to be a civilized society and should act like one. When this country embarked on a war to save the world for democracy and sent a racially segregated army overseas to fight that war, only Negro Americans pointed out the awkwardness and the incongruity of such a posture. It was Negro Americans who first suggested that the disingenuous doctrine of separate but equal not only insulted the Constitution but blasphemed the human spirit as well. It was a difficult task always to be pointing out inconsistencies, pleading for an end to hypocrisy, calling on the great democratic nation to correct its own weaknesses, but they faced the task and tried to discharge it not merely for their own sake but for the sake of their country.

And now, in the middle of the twentieth century, it was the task of young Martin Luther King to reach back through the years and join with young John R. Lynch, who fought for civil rights in 1875, and to join with the countless Negro Americans who, for centuries, had kept alive the tradition of trying to endow this nation with a soul. It was a rich tradition and a formidable task from which King did not shrink. For almost fifteen years, his voice was the world's most eloquent voice to speak for all mankind. And he worked as hard as he spoke: for an end to suffering in Nigeria, for the eradication of slums in urban America, for equal justice under law, for equality in employment, housing, and educational opportunities, for decency in all human relations, for peace at home and in the world.

Then, in the midst of his efforts—and before this nation could fully understand the meaning of his life and work—he had fallen. In death he was the victim of one of America's strongest and most enduring traditions, that of violence. The sniper, in a very real way, symbolized the mood of the nation: an unwillingness and a lack of courage to face the problems that Martin Luther King worked so hard to solve. The murderer was too cowardly to confront King and argue against his program of justice and brotherhood; and so he resorted to violence, the easy way out. For three centuries this nation had lacked the courage to face up to its racial problems. Instead of facing them in King's time, it sought to rationalize, justify, and even defend its own derelictions. Those who sought fair employment were branded as dupes of the communist conspiracy, while the victims of discrimination in employment continued to go hungry. Those who sought better schools in the ghetto were being used, so the argument went, by the anarchists and others who did not care for the American way. As a nation we have been too cowardly to face the issues; it has been much easier to snipe at the advocates of change.

At the time of King's death a year ago, a great deal was said about the meaning of his life and the possible impact of his death on the causes for which he fought. It was even suggested that perhaps he achieved in his martyrdom what he could not achieve in life: a national sense of outrage against violence as well as injustice, and a national commitment, at long last, to attack the race problem with resources as well as resolution. This was, of course, a misreading of the national mood. Some mourned his death; others were elated. Some children in an Alabama town were taught to rejoice in his death. In a score of cities across the land even many of his own despairing followers forgot the teachings of their leader and vented their outrage in a thousand senseless acts of violence. In a Chicago suburb a white family was hounded out of town because they flew their flag at half-mast on the day of King's funeral.

The nation's flags were officially at half-mast, but there was yet no indication that the dream of Martin Luther King would be fulfilled or that there was a national resolve to work at it. It was a simple dream—that men shall dwell in peace and mutual respect. The dream would not come true simply because a few of the wealthy spent the Monday following his death washing windows in the ghetto and then retreated into their own gilded ghetto, satisfied with the penance they had done. It would not come true so long as the nation expended more of its resources and energies on the shot to the moon than on hunger and disease in American communities. It would not come true so long as companies that select their employees on the irrelevant basis of race receive favors and contracts from the government that is supposed to be the government of all the people. The dream of Martin Luther King would not come true so long as the nation drained its resources and offered the flower of its manhood in a war that few people fully countenanced or understood. And his dream turns into a nightmare with the realization that in Germany, Korea, Viet Nam, and elsewhere, white American soldiers and black American soldiers do battle with one another and contribute to that polarization of the races of which King despaired.

And surely the dream of Martin Luther King would not come true if the trial of his accused assassin were permitted to sink into a mockery of the administration of justice. With good reason Negro Americans have always believed that justice in the United States was neither even-handed nor color blind. They had early fallen victims of two sets of laws—one for whites and one for blacks. Then they had seen the highest courts of the land sanction laws that made racial distinctions. They had seen the courts turn their backs on discrimination in so sacred an exercise of citizenship as voting. They were, thus, fully prepared to believe, on the basis of their long, agonizing experience with law and justice, that King's murderer would *not* come to trial and be judged on the basis of the evidence. How were they to know that he would be tried, convicted, sentenced, and imprisoned—all within twenty-four hours—with a thousand unanswered questions including the one raised by the prisoner himself that clearly implied the existence of a conspiracy. It was enough to shake the faith of *any* American. It was too much to ask black Americans to have faith in this bizarre administration of American justice where so little faith already existed.

On the first anniversary of the death of Martin Luther King, it is fitting that we search for some meaning for us of his life and death. It is no easy task. We lack perspective; our emotions betray us. A few things seem clear, however. What national anguish his death brought was shortlived, if indeed it existed at all. We do not seem to have moved significantly toward the goals he sought or even in the direction of those goals. There has been no large enlistment of Americans in the causes for which he gave his life, no great national resolve to finish the task of creating a decent social order.

But his death can be viewed as a warning that the time is running out when we can solve any of our major problems peacefully. The violent death of a man of peace triggered a period of convulsive and tragic violence. It provided yet another example of America's living and dying by the sword. The strain on our legal and political institutions of the murder of a President, and then a great national leader, and then a United States Senator is incalculable. It pushes us closer to the brink of anarchy; and the alarming deterioration of the rule of law is surely related to these violent and untimely deaths.

A young nation, once the hope of the old world and the new, grows old and weary before its time. It seems unable to cope with the forces that propel it toward its own demise. It is the nature of its own life that has done this to it. A nation cannot be profligate and incontinent in its regard for its own people without draining itself of its own vitality as well as its own humanity. Perhaps it can recover, but not without some strong resolve—stronger than anything we have yet witnessed—to become the vessel in which the lives and hopes of all its people can flourish and thereby bring about the restoration of its own vitality. Is this requiring too much?

When a young poet of another nation learned of the death of Martin Luther King he wrote:

> "That bullet killed him,
> But by that bullet I was reborn,
> And I was reborn a Negro."

No one requires that of any nation, surely not *this* nation; but those lines may contain the key to our salvation. If the death of Martin Luther King can, somehow, mean that the nation will experience a rebirth of simple humanity, then it can save itself and all of his dreams can then come true.

RESIGNATION OF EDWARD CRAFTS AS DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on March 7, I expressed some concern that Secretary of the Interior Hickel was so slow in naming his Assistant Secretaries and Department heads that we might lose some of the dedicated conservationists who have devoted their lives to the public interest.

I singled out Mr. Edward Crafts, the immensely capable director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. He stuck around for a while without an Assistant Secretary who could define Department policy, then resigned in frustration to take a more lucrative and challenging position.

For the RECORD, I have the letter of resignation that Mr. Crafts wrote members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to Secretary Hickel. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1969.

TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This is a letter of special thanks and appreciation to my many friends on the Senate Interior Committee with whom I have worked for so many years. It has been about 25 years since I first testified before your Committee. Working in harmony with my Congressional friends on both sides of the aisle on so many matters of mutual interest has been the richest reward of 36 years of government service.

I am resigning from my position as Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation at the end of February. Enclosed is a copy of my letter of resignation to Secretary Hickel.

It has always been a pleasure to appear before the Senate Committee and I have always been treated courteously. Somehow I had hoped that the Committee would hold a briefing hearing on the activities of the Department agencies before the end of this month. This would have given me an opportunity to personally thank all of you for what you have done in the interests of conservation and the good of the country over the past years.

I hope not to retire, but to continue work in conservation in the Washington area. With good fortune, possibly I may be appearing before you again in another capacity.

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD C. CRAFTS,
Director.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1969.
Hon. Walter J. Hickel,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: This is to advise that I am resigning from my position as Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation effective the end of the month.

I believe this action automatically carries with it resignation from my other positions as Executive Director of the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty chaired by the Vice President, and as Executive Officer of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission. Accordingly, copies of this letter are going to the Chairmen of those two organizations.

On February 8, Under Secretary Train told me that he had checked with you and you wished to have "your own man" as Director of this Bureau. He could give me no indication as to when my dismissal would be effective. At the time of my dismissal, I had not seen nor met you.

On February 7, following a *New York Times* report of this discussion, you called me to your office, said you were not familiar with the circumstances and had no recollection of telling the Under Secretary to dismiss me. You asked what I wanted to do and told me that if I wished I could stay until May 31, a possible retirement date. You did not express your own desire, but pressed for a decision. I said I would probably stay for a few months hoping I could perform a useful service during the transition period.

My other reasons at the time were two-fold. First, I hoped this incident might help to stabilize the status of professional conservation career officials in such agencies as the Forest Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Bureau of Land Management, and my own Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Conservation in the Federal Government and the Congress has been traditionally bi-partisan and non-political.

Second was my fervent wish that the first change in Directorship of this Bureau would not be nearly simultaneous with a change of Administration. Dismissal at this time might be construed as precedent-setting action that would make a political football of this young conservation agency consisting of dedicated professional career personnel. It is especially important that the $200 million a year grant-in-aid Land and Water Conservation Fund continue to be administered with the States in a non-partisan, non-political, non-pork barrel manner.

For these reasons I earnestly hope my successor may be a distinguished professional.

Upon further reflection on the way the matter was handled, including the abrupt action and differing discussions with you and the Under Secretary, I can only conclude that I do not have your confidence and thus could be of little value to you or the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation between now and May 31. Furthermore, although every Secretary for whom I have worked has had my loyalty, I can appreciate your desire to have a man of your own choice and have no wish to stand in your way.

There is one item of unfinished business that deserves mention. Secretary Udall designated me as the sole negotiator for the Department of the Interior with the four major redwood companies whose lands were taken by creation of the Redwood National Park. About ninety million dollars are involved plus allocation of the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit of the Forest Service. Negotiations are complex and well under way. If I can be of further assistance in this matter, I am available at your wish.

My direct connections with the Department of the Interior and the other Federal organizations that I serve in an official capacity are severed with deep regret. It is my hope and intention to continue working in the fields of outdoor recreation, environmental quality, conservation, and forestry if the opportunity offers in either public or private service. This has been my life work for 36 years, 29 with the Forest Service and 7 with this Department. I believe the furtherance of these goals is of utmost importance to the United States.

Much has been accomplished in conservation in recent years. Much more remains to be done. May you administer well the tremendous natural resources of this Department that are entrusted to your care.

Sincerely yours,
Edward C. Crafts,
Director.

ALASKA NATIVE LAND CLAIMS SETTLEMENT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I speak today of a problem that has its roots deep in Alaskan history. This problem is the native land claim settlement, and its resolution is of the highest priority for Alaska.

I am very grateful to be a cosponsor of legislation—S. 1830—with the Senator from Washington, Mr. Jackson, that will resolve this long-standing conflict. I hope that this year, in contrast to past years, the legislation proliferation problem has been solved. Too often in the past the issue has been confused and obfuscated by conflicting pieces of legislation pressed by various groups. Many, many people have worked long and hard drafting the provisions of this bill. Native leaders, State officials, personnel of the Department of the Interior, and Members of the House and Senate have worked together to acquire a bill that will not only be acceptable to all concerned, but also a just and fair settlement of the claims. It is my earnest hope that Congress will act quickly on the proposed legislation that is so vital to Alaska and her people. All Alaskans are indebted to Senator Jackson for scheduling hearings on the bill, to commence on April 29, 1969.

Let me make one point clear: I believe all concerned with the bill have an open mind. We are not wedded to any particular settlement. What we seek is a fair, honorable, and just settlement. And the more generous this settlement is, the better chance our Alaskan native population will have to catch up with our national standard of living.

My recent trip home to Alaska with the Subcommittee on Indian Education dramatically underscored the tremendous lack of facilities for Alaska's rural native population. Over 70 percent of our native population live in the rural areas of the State, existing on a food-gathering economy. The only cash income to these areas is through seasonal employment and welfare increments. Thus, they depend for their very lives on the land on which they live. If the caribou do not migrate properly, some people are near starvation. If the salmon run is light, some people are near starvation. There is not enough cash in the economy of these villages to support them if the land itself cannot. The sanitary conditions in the villages are deplorable. Sewage facilities and drinking water are usually linked by a common source. Currently, only 8 percent of the native homes in Alaska, representing only 3,260 people have adequate sanitation facilities—running water and water-carried sewage.

What are the results of this lack of sanitary facilities, coupled with the previously mentioned lack of proper nutrition? For one, a death rate that is almost three times higher than that of white America. Further, debilitating diseases such as pneumonia, bronchitis, influenza, and other respiratory diseases are rampant. Infectious and parasitic disease infect numerous natives, shortening the native Alaskan's expected lifespan to only 34 years, less than half that of other Americans. The death rate for influenza and pneumonia are 10 times that of white Alaskans, and the suicide rate is twice that of white Alaskans.

These people are my people. They are incredibly poor, undernourished, and diseased. What chance for the future do these people have—what chance to escape this cycle of poverty and disease? At present, the answer is none. Much has been made in the national press concerning the "poverty cycle." But nowhere in the Nation is that cycle so nearly circular and so nearly inescapable as it is in Alaska. The unemployment rate among Alaska native adults is 50 to 60 percent in the spring and fall, in winter well over 80 percent, and only in the summer fishing season does it go as low as 25 percent. This is contrasted with an unemployment rate of 5 to 11 percent among white Alaskans during these same times of the year. Per capita income among natives is between $500 and $600, while for white Alaskans it is $3,629 per capita. Natives receive the lion's share of the public assistance programs: 65 percent of aid to the disabled, 71 percent of the old-age assistance, 80 percent of the aid to dependent children, and 90 percent of the aid to the blind.

Further, the educational levels of Alaska's natives are abysmally low. The median level of education for Alaska natives is eighth grade. White Alaskans have a median figure of 12.4 years of education. Forty-six percent of the native population have completed the fourth grade or less. Only 9 percent have completed high school. And, even for those with high school diplomas, the achievement levels are alarmingly low: the quality of native education is simply far below that of the rest of Alaska and the country.

The factors involved in the native poverty cycle are complex, taking in all of the above situations. Perhaps a hypothetical example may serve to integrate the statistics into something more immediately meaningful. Let us take the example of a young Eskimo boy whom we will call Joe. He lives in a small village in Alaska with about 150 inhabitants. His father and mother have little or no education; he has three younger brothers and sisters who are attending the Bureau of Indian Affairs school in the village. Joe's father fishes in the summer, earning a few hundred dollars for his catch; in good years he may make as much as a thousand dollars. But on the average, and even in good years, he does not make nearly enough money to provide food and clothing for his family. Consequently, the family depends heavily on hunting and fishing to provide food and the material for clothing. If the hunting and fishing are good, then the family can count on a good diet of protein and carbohydrates. However, many vitamins provided by vegetables and fruit are missing. In the event that the hunting and fishing are poor, then it is often a question of quasi-starvation for the winter months. Only welfare payments keep them alive in such times. The cost of purchased food in the village is over 100 percent higher than in Alaska's cities because of transportation, handling, and storage costs.

The BIA school in the village goes through the eighth or ninth grade. If any of the children wish higher education, they must leave the village for one of the regional high schools or the BIA boarding schools in Oregon and Oklahoma. Joe has been attending the village school for 9 years. His achievement levels are very low. One reason is that he suffers from otitis media—an ear disease that affects numerous native children and causes substantial hearing loss. Incidence of otitis media in villages like Joe's is 16 times higher than the rest of America. Further, Joe has missed a great deal of school in his 9 years of education. When hunting season or fishing season comes, he must help the family. If he does not, the family cannot survive. For Joe and others like him, education is a sometime luxury that can only be afforded when the pressures of a hostile environment permit. And, finally, Joe has had 9 years of education consisting of standard textbooks and teaching methods. When he learned to read, he learned such things as: "Dick and Jane's daddy went to the office every morning." Joe has never seen an office and no one has told him what one is. Even if they had, he has no frame of reference with which to assimilate it. Dick and Jane have a dog named Spot, whom they pet and feed, even though Spot does not work and does not pull a sled. And when Dick and Jane go to school, they always talk to a policeman who stands on a street corner and directs traffic. It is not surprising that Joe's grasp of his educational material is limited: it was not designed for him, nor has any effort been made to help him undertsand the world that produced it.

Joe and his other classmates are "underachievers." Joe has gained the idea through his education that he is somehow not as good as other Americans. His pride has suffered because of his lack of scholastic achievement. Further, he feels he cannot leave the village because he is becoming a man, and his family cannot spare him from the food-gathering activities. So Joe does not continue his education. He stays in the village and eventually raises a family of his own. Joe, despite his 9 years of education, will be little better off than his father. There are no jobs in the village, save seasonal fishing, and Joe has neither the training nor the self-confidence to move away from the village and attempt to make it in the outside world. Joe's children will be in the same situation as he was at a comparable age: undereducated, ill-prepared for the outside world and suffering from a variety of physical deficiencies.

This is Alaska's poverty cycle. It is brutal and harsh and practically inescapable. The people not only find it difficult to get out of it, they lack any comprehensive understanding of what is happening to them. This is the problem we face, and it is one we must solve.

This is the situation that S. 1830 is designed to solve. The large amount of money involved, properly invested by the corporations envisioned, will free the native population from the dependence on welfare which destroys pride and self-respect. It will also free them from their complete dependence on the land and the subsistence mode of existence. Then, with proper educational and medical care, we can expect the poverty cycle to be broken. Once this occurs, the native population will have the necessary economic mobility to become viable contributors to Alaska's and the Nation's economy.

We have made many grievous errors in our dealings with America's Indian population. The conditions of the American Indian in many parts of America are a source of national shame. It is my firm resolve, and the purpose of this legislation, that the same thing shall not happen to Alaska's natives. Passage of this bill will be a just and equitable settlement of a long-standing dispute: its rapid passage will mean that the Alaskan native will have the leverage to propel him into the 20th century. Never have we had so great an opportunity not only to help a poor and helpless people but also do what is right and good. We are impelled to rapid action, not only because of the present injustice of the situation, but because every day, every hour that we delay will mean further hardship for a group of Americans.

Mr. President, Alaska's native population has stood faithfully by America through a hundred years of neglect and ignorance. They have rallied to America's defense in four wars, while their families went hungry at home. We, in America's name, can surely repay this faith by acting as quickly as possible to settle the native land claims, once and forever.

MR. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Mr. George B. Hartzog, Jr., Director of the National Park Service, is known to most Members of Congress, Representatives as well as Senators.

Because of the high regard in which Mr. Hartzog is held by all who know him, I ask unanimous consent than an unusually fine article, entitled "Mr. National Park Service," written by Edward W. O'Brien, of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, and published in that newspaper in its weekend edition of April 12–13, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—To most Americans the National Park Service means Yellowstone Park, friendly grizzlies, and Old Faithful.

But in fact the park service has been changing with breath-taking speed as it assumed a mission going far beyond preservation of scenic grandeur.

In a recent speech, Park Service Director George B. Hartzog Jr. expressed the new philosophy reflecting both his own thinking and a number of congressional mandates.

"The search for a better world must begin with man himself," Hartzog said.

"It is he, primarily, who has made the mess, and it is he who will have to live with whatever else he makes of it.

"Essentially, then, what we pursue is a man-centered environmental ethic. Whether we call it that or a national policy for the environment or something yet unthought of, makes little difference.

"From the concerned rooms of the national legislature to the backyards of concerned suburbanites, the search boils down to making the earth an attractive, meaningful, habitable home for man.

"What we are everywhere seeking is survival of the human spirit, a sense of 'being at home' and 'at peace' with the world."

It is one thing to speak eloquently, and it can be something else to transform government policy into action. Hartzog, a tirelessly dynamic man with a rare capacity for leading and inspiring others, has succeeded in doing so.

In testifying the other day before a Senate committee, Hartzog used Yellowstone, the world's first national park, as an example of the new method.

Formerly, park interpretive programs for visitors dealt separately with wildflowers, wildlife, geology and the like.

"We are now taking an environmental approach. Our theme is the ecology of the Yellowstone River," he said.

"This enables us to bring into meaningful harmony the geology and formation of the river, the wildlife which lives along the river, and the aquatic life in the river, the human history along the river of the Indians, the explorers, the fur traders—all elements relating to one another.

"We seek to encourage our visitors to become more vitally aware of the environment in which they live, and to participate in programs whose goal is to help man live in better harmony with his environment."

Another example: In the service's historical areas, a new kind of national park, Hartzog wants to make history come alive, so that visitors can appreciate their heritage and thus advance in what he calls "soul conservation."

Last year Hartzog's agency converted four historical farm areas, which had been static monuments, into actual functioning farms with crops and animals. In all, 41 parks participated in "living history" programs of various kinds.

Though he was born 48 years ago in a small South Carolina village and loves open spaces, it has not escaped Hartzog that ours is an increasingly urbanized nation, and that the park service has serious responsibilities to millions who have little chance of ever backpacking in the wilderness of the Grand Tetons, or another of the magnificent natural parks in his domain.

With the backing of Congress, Hartzog has pushed creation of many more recreation areas, a third park category which combines natural conservation of seashores, riverways and other resources with outdoor fun—all within easy driving distance of large population centers.

Hartzog also has worked to bring parks into the life of the inner city. Last year, with a special appropriation, he inaugurated an urban park concept in and around this city called "summer in the parks."

By every standard the program was a smash hit. In three months, some 250,000 adults and children took part in events from puppet shows and pottery making to movies and dances.

One community park which previously had little use was graced by a local family's wedding reception.

These achievements and his many others require immense effort by Hartzog.

A career park service employe who started as an attorney and served for three years as head of St. Louis Jefferson Memorial, Hartzog scorns the government's regular working hours. His normal work day is from 7 in the morning to 8 or 9 in the evening, six days a week. His office pace is non-stop.

In 1957 he was chosen to attend a management training program in New York City. He has been applying the lessons ever since.

After he became director in 1964, the park service for the first time charted its long-term objectives and each year's goals. On any day he can tell his superiors in the Interior Department exactly where each of the 270 national parks stands on the way to its planned development and utilization.

Since 1964, 52 areas—a record—have been added to the national park system because of the public's awakened interest in conservation and environment and also to the confidence of Republican and Democratic congressmen in Hartzog as an exceptionally talented and dedicated steward of public interest and manager of the public domain.

The number of visitors to the park system has soared from 103 million in 1963 to 151 million last year. Despite inflation, the park service's expenditure for physical maintenance and operation dropped from 31 cents per visit a decade ago to 20 cents in 1968.

Hartzog was saddened last fall when, despite his money-saving management, he had to announce curtailment in the operations of most parks because of still further budget tightening. But for this summer all the parks will be back in full operation with the help of temporary employes, and no one is happier than George Hartzog.

In Hartzog's judgment the officials on the firing line are not those in the park service's Washington headquarters but the superintendents out in the field.

"I know them all," he says. "They are the key to the quality of our services to the public."

Hartzog spends much time meeting in the field with his superintendents "in small groups so we can communicate," as he puts it.

Unlike most government meetings, there is no agenda.

"I won't allow it," he explains. "The whole purpose is to talk over their problems—not mine. I want to learn from them and help them."

Any superintendent can see him privately, and he meets also with the wives, whom he regards as equal partners with the men in maintaining the quality of park services.

Six months from now the park service will have an especially notable accession—the lovely farm of the late President Eisenhower at Gettysburg, Pa.

In 1967 Hartzog assisted with the arrangements for the late president to deed the farm to the government as a gift. The deed specifies that the farm will be administered as a part of the National Park Service beginning six months after the General's death.

On the basis of Hartzog's administration of the National Park Service and his extremely high standing among conservationists, the Eisenhower memorial could not be in better hands.

A year ago, Hartzog was selected by the Blue-ribbon American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society for its gold medal as an outstanding conservationist.

Hartzog had become head of the park service at "a most critical time" and "his impact upon the national park system and upon national conservation programs was immediate, substantial and beneficial," the society declared.

"Mr. Hartzog brought to this position a unique talent for imaginative planning, an infinite capacity for hard work, and a remarkable ability to move people to action.

"He has brilliantly directed the affairs of the National Park Service through the most difficult years of its history, and has earned the high regard and confidence of all with whom he is associated."

If Hartzog has a favorite park, he won't admit it. "I like whatever one I'm in," he says.

But he does confess to a certain fondness for a small park an hour's drive in Virginia. On a rare spring day away from work, he likes most of all to slip off with his six-year-old son, Edward, and watch the boy fish for brim and bass.

"The thrill of being six is going fishing," says Hartzog.

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project is not just an irrigation project; it is a multipurpose project which is planned to provide an essential supply of municipal and industrial water to a rapidly growing area on the Wasatch front in Utah and Salt Lake Counties.

If the 1970 fiscal-year budget figure is adopted, Utah's economy will suffer a serious setback; since appropriations for the Bonneville unit have already been shortchanged from previous appropriations. In order to assure that the unit is completed on a realistic, progressive, and economic schedule, a minimum construction program will require at least $15 million.

The board of directors of the Central Utah Water Conservancy District has transmitted to me a resolution on the need for increased funding of the Bonneville unit. So that Senators may be more fully informed on the matter, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the capability for growth in the State of Utah is directly related to its ability to provide a water supply to meet its municipal and industrial needs, with the key to progress being Utah's ability to utilize its legal entitlements to Colorado River water; and,

Whereas to meet the municipal water requirements of the expanding population in Salt Lake and Utah Counties, a need for delivery of Colorado River water through the authorized Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project is required and has been programmed by the Central Utah Water Conservancy District for 1972 with water demands to increase thereafter; and,

Whereas the funds previously appropriated and utilized for construction on this vital water-resource project have not permitted a progressive or economic construction program; and, if continued will result in a delay in meeting essential water needs with a reduction in economic growth to the State of Utah, an increase in total project costs, and a resulting increase in the District's repayment obligation to the Federal Government; and,

Whereas the reimbursable costs of this project, which represent more than 90% of its total costs, will be repaid to the Federal Treasury with funds from the Central Utah Water Conservancy District in compliance with a contract between it and the Federal Government, from power revenues from the Bonneville Unit Power Complex, and from a portion of Utah's share of Colorado River Storage Project power revenues; and,

Whereas the President's Budget recommended only an $8 million construction program for fiscal year 1970, which is unreasonably low, and represents a reduction from the $11.444 million construction program recommended for fiscal year 1969, and an $11.145 million construction program for fiscal year 1968; and

Whereas the Colorado River Basin Project Act (PL 90–537) directs that the planning report for the Ute Indian Unit of the Central Utah Project shall be completed on or before December 31, 1974 to enable the United States to meet the commitments heretofore made to the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation under the agreement dated September 20, 1965: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Central Utah Water Conservancy District, does hereby unanimously request that funds appropriated by the Congress of the United States for construction on the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project for fiscal year 1970 be increased to a minimum of $15 million; be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Central Utah Water Conservancy District, again requests that the Congress of the United States, the President, and the Department of the Interior accelerate the construction of the authorized units of the Central Utah Project so that they may be completed on a realistic, progressive, and economic schedule, and to schedule and provide funds so that the planning report for the Ute Indian Unit be completed in compliance with the Colorado River Basin Project Act (Public Law 90–537); be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be delivered to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Secretary of the Interior, Commissioner of Reclamation, Members of the Congressional Appropriations Committees, Governor of the State of Utah, Utah's Congressional Delegation, Executive Director of the Utah Department of Natural Resources, Director of the Upper Colorado River Commission, Director of the Utah Division of Water Resources, Ute Indian Tribe, and other interested parties.

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Central Utah Water Conservancy District on February 14, 1969.

LYNN S. LUDLOW,
Secretary.

BREAKDOWN OF NORMAL SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, more and more, we are aware of the possible consequences of man's attack on the environment. Water and air pollution, disfiguration of the beauty of nature, seem to be a way of life. It even appears that man might well have allowed himself to become an endangered species.

Just as important as the biological effect of the degradation of the environment by a rapidly growing population is the breakdown of normal social relationships—more difficult to analyze—caused by the density of the population.

Because of our increasing awareness of these problems—and none too soon, I think—I ask unanimous consent that a paper written by Dr. Durward L. Allen, professor of wildlife ecology at Purdue University, be printed in the RECORD. "Population, Resources, and the Great Complexity," a pessimistic view of what we have done and what we face unless preventive action is taken, was presented by Dr. Allen at the 34th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference in Washington last month.

As chairman of the new Commerce Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Environment, I found the article timely and thought provoking.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POPULATION, RESOURCES, AND THE GREAT COMPLEXITY [1]

(By Durward L. Allen, professor of wildlife ecology, Department of Forestry and Conservation, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.)

Over the past quarter-century, an increasing body of scientific leadership has been concerned with the accelerating increase of world population. Since the early forties it is evident that major advances in the control of infant mortality and epidemic disease (see Newman, 1965), as well as aid to areas of food shortage, have reduced death rates in many tropical countries by about half. Humanity as a whole is in a logarithmic phase of the population curve. The 3.5 billion people now inhabiting this globe are on the way to doubling by the end of the century. Unless strenuous counter measures are taken, in the United States our 200 million citizens will be more than 300 million in the same period.

In 1968 approximately 70 million people were added to this earthly habitat. The rate of addition is increasing, and it is reasonably certain that there will be a billion more people to support in another decade. It is a looming threat that already more than half the world's people are underfed, and there is literally nothing to spare for those upcoming millions. A great volume of recent literature has treated the subjects of world food supply and population. Notable summaries are Borgstrom's book, "The hungry planet," (1965), the President's Science Advisory Committee report, "The world food problem," (1967), and "Famine 1975" by William and Paul Paddock.

Although food production technology has made important recent gains and food scientists are making every effort to rescue mankind from major disaster, there appear to be few authorities who expect such efforts to overtake the corruption of human numbers. There is, instead, a growing concensus that the chance of avoiding a demographic reckoning in the so-called "developing" countries is small, and within twenty years hundreds of millions will be faced with a debacle of starvation and its associated ills.

This is the context in which we must consider our policies and programs in North America. Many have pointed out that we are inextricably entangled in affairs of the world, and that the amplified scale of human misfortune is our doing—through acts of beneficence to nations who could not control their birth rates, especially without the help we were unwilling to give.

We are deeply involved at present in food shipments to the needy, and technology is being exported at an increasing rate. Fortunately, there is growing appreciation that population limitation is essential and inevitable in this nation and elsewhere. The United Nations has finally become active in the field, and commendable progress has been made in our own Congress and in the executive branch of the government. This is in contrast to the apathy that long blocked action while the problem grew to proportions that could not be denied.

It is still a fact of life that our leadership is not in depth. It is a leadership of informed and concerned individuals, diluted by the attitudes of the many who, with an ear to the political ground, do not yet hear the tramp of approaching millions. As this situation changes, we may expect to see greater appropriations for bio-medical and social studies of population control. There will be demographic aid to other nations on a scale demanded by the world crisis. Intimately involved with these approaches must be further enlightened consideration of the environmental problems that appear on every side.

BIOLOGICAL ANALOGIES

Although some sociologists and economists will not agree, I postulate that the problems of human welfare are biological, behavioral, and economic—in that order. There are no interfaces where one leaves off and another begins. The whole gamut of conditions and variables is something new in the way of an ecological complex. Understanding and solutions require the detailed knowledge of specialists and also the broad appraisal of the generalist. Such a generalist usually is a biologist who has extended his interests into the problems of human society enough to communicate with the specialists. The time is not far ahead when generalists will be appointed to high government commissions and committees.

My present purpose is to suggest relationships that can help understand the nature of the vast array of issues and problems that plague mankind increasingly with each passing year. It may be that we do not fully grasp what is happening to us and that a reexamination of primordial adjustments will be profitable. It can be assumed that long before the human line became human there were millions of years of evolution in which the ancestral stock occupied its functional niche in the ecosystems in which it was found. Probably we pay penalties when the primitive inner man is outraged too far, and there could well be clues to rights and wrongs in the social and habitat adaptations of common animals. A few of these characteristics are so nearly universal they are worth reviewing.

In our latitude, the young most species are born in spring and summer, and they develop to a "subadult" stage in late summer and fall. These adolescents commonly wander widely in a "fall shuffle," evidently seeking a place to live. The farther such individuals move in strange country, the higher their mortality rate. They are at every kind of disadvantage, including the need to invade desirable space already occupied by their own kind.

When the wanderer finds a location where food cover and other requisites are in useful combination, it settles down into a "home range." This is a unit of habitat where the animal becomes familiar with the terrain, develops its routes of travel, knows the location of every necessity, and is best able to escape from enemies. Seasonally, at least, it does not leave the security of its home range. Here it has relationships of tolerance with other individuals of the same species whose ranges overlap. A high quality home range is a small one, where daily needs can be fulfilled with a minimum of movement. Both economic security and behavioral ease are found by the animal in its own familiar surroundings. Residents tend to display antagonistic behavior toward strangers.

Let us now consider a human analogy—the resident of a small town in rural America, perhaps in the more simple times of 40 years ago. Obviously, this selection of a scene is for the purpose of drawing useful contrasts and parallels. The person in question has a high degree of self-sufficiency. He has a garden and a cellar stocked with food. He has a well, his own outdoor plumbing, and his supply of fuel for heat and lighting. He disposes of his own trash and garbage.

His home range is small; he commonly gets to his work or wherever else he needs to go by walking. He has recognition relationships with most of the people of his community. Here he has feelings of security and comfort. There is, he says, no place like home. The high degree of independence of this individual becomes particularly evident under "emergency" conditions. He can ride out a winter blizzard with composure, and most of the dislocations that affect him can be met with his own efforts. He needs a minimum of public service.

I think we can make a further suggestive comparison with the situation of a dweller in one of our large cities. Passing over the social and economic enclaves that produce something akin to small-town conditions, I select an individual who probably is more representative. Wherever he lives, he is dependent on a wide range of public services. His food, water, fuel, and power are brought to him, and his wastes of every kind are taken away. His work is likely to be many miles removed. To fulfill a specialized function in his community, he must meet a rigid transportation schedule in getting to the place of employment and returning home daily. Likely enough, he passes through territory that is largely unexplored and unfamiliar, and he has continual contacts with individuals with whom he is unacquainted. He has lurking anxieties in dealing with a wide range of unpredictable situations. He may develop the social callouses and aggressive behavior frequently observed in the residents of large cities. In a measure, the city dweller has lost his identity in a social melange that is diffuse and uncertain.

This individual is dependent for many things. He is vulnerable to every kind of public emergency. A drought or power failure, a strike or riot, a heavy snow that ties up traffic, can immobilize him and jeopardize his security. In this aggregation of largely strange humanity, he finds many of his activities organized and regulation. In turn, he needs protection from his fellow men. In concentrations of people it is evident that aberrant and anti-social behavior must be dealt with. There are health hazards to be guarded against. It exemplifies the unusual adaptability of the human being that many can tolerate these essentially unnatural conditions reasonably well.

THE DENSITY DETERMINANT

Since all "higher" animals are socialized in some degree, a measure of association between individuals is beneficial. It follows that with the increase of numbers an optimum density is reached in terms of behavioral needs and available habitat resources. At still higher concentrations we see the development of competition for space and other necessities and the breakdown of normal social relationships.

The behavioral and logistic attrition that builds up can be described conveniently by the term "stress." Eco-social stress is an elusive phenomenon—difficult to define, analyze, and quantify. For good reasons, scientists have largely avoided this baffling universe of inquiry in their investigations of population mechanics and animal relationships, although the physiology of stress is somewhat better understood (see review by Thiessen, 1964). The physical and psychic well-being of the individual is tied closely to environmental conditions.

To appraise the nature of high-density stress in human society, we may review, for want of more appropriate terms, some of the findings of Alfred Korzybski, known for his innovations, several decades ago, in the field of general semantics. In a paper of 1943, largely drawn from three earlier sources, Korzybski explored the increase in complexity of functional relationships or problems as individuals are added to a managerial system. He cited the work of V. A. Graicunas, who calculated the growth of problems faced by a supervisor as assistants with related work were added to his responsibilities. Deriving an appropriate formula, Graicunas solved for the increasing relationships as follows:

---

[1] Presented at the 34th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, Washington, D.C., March 5, 1969.

Number of assistants or functions:	Number of possible relationships
1	1
2	6
3	18
4	44
5	100
6	222
7	490
8	1,080
9	2,376
10	5,210

We need go no further than 10 in the series, since it illustrates beyond question that the addition of individuals or functions in this relatively simple organization gives rise to an exponential increase in relationships. "At the root of the problem," said Korzybski, "lies the significant fundamental difference in the *rate of growth* between arithmetical progression, which grows by addition, for example, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, etc., and geometrical progression, which grows by multiplication, for example, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, etc." He stated further, "My whole life work, and particularly since 1921, has been based on the *life implications* of this neglect to differentiate between the laws of growth of arithmetical and of geometrical progressions." In effect, he despaired that those who govern could find the wisdom and means to meet their proliferating managerial tasks satisfactorily.

It seems evident that concentrations of people and, more generally, the growth of nations, produce a vast complexity that expands out of proportion to the build-up of population density. If, for example, our present world of 3.5 billions doubles by the year 2000, it might be supposed that the problems of government and social affairs would be twice as great. This would indeed be sufficient unto the day, but such a concept probably falls far short of reality. If we use the scale of the Korzybski example, which seems a conservative comparison, we might assume that the complexity of relations among one billion people is represented by an index of one; then the figure for three billions would potentially be 18 and for 6 billions 222!

The build-up of stress undoubtedly takes place correspondingly. This phenomenon has not been measured or even dealt with theoretically. It is the resolution of many density-dependent tensions, competitions, stimulations, and interactions. It is a plexus of curves that rise exponentially with every increase in population. Potentially, the computer is ideally fitted to reveal how these many variables synergize, but programming anything but a simple model using highly "psychic" estimates is beyond present technology in the field.

THE ELUSIVE OPTIMUM

Americans are accustomed to thinking of mass production as a means of attaining efficiency and lowering the cost per unit. This clearly does not apply to human beings. As people multiply and concentrate, they require more protection and service of every kind, and they are correspondingly more costly.

Which raises significant questions about our present population level and the issues that spring up on every side. Is this great and burgeoning complexity related to our always-increasing costs of government, our deficits, our inadequacies in dealing with social problems—especially the rising rates of mental and pyschosomatic disease and crime? Does it help to explain why municipalities and state governments find it progressively more difficult to collect enough taxes to carry out their commitments to education and other multiplying functions? *Adding more land to the tax base does not solve problems where it adds enough people to create a disproportionate demand for public expenditures.*

We may reflect also that the labor force is growing with the population—at a time of increasing industrial automation. We are committed to a policy of full employment, and surplus labor must be added to private and government payrolls. This contributes to the tax burden and the cost of goods and degrades the effects of technology as a means of raising living standards.

If population growth beyond an optimum begets problems that increase more rapidly than human numbers, it might be assumed that this only bespeaks the immaturity of our social and economic science—that in due time man and his computers will handle the problem and produce a high living standard despite the difficulties. To an extent, this undoubtedly is true. But whether management skills can overtake a problem that is growing geometrically, and especially whether it can be done in a degree and in time to be a relief to this generation and those immediately ahead is highly questionable.

It is evident that many of the high-density problems of humanity pertain especially to cities. Some 70 percent of the American people now live in cities of more than 50,000 and the proportion is increasing. This has relevance also to the common outlook for help to the "underdeveloped" two-thirds of the world. It is a common economic view that rural populations of these countries must be gathered into cities and their land given over to large-scale mechanized agriculture. It is assumed that industrialization in our image will bring them the blessings of modernity.

Even assuming a drastic Malthusian reduction of population in the next 20 years, as seems inevitable, one wonders whether governments of the countries in question can achieve a sophistication that could make such a change of life possible for their remaining citizens. In an important degree, we ourselves have fallen short in dealing with the challenge of complexity. The President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty remarked (1968) that "No major urban center in the world has yet demonstrated satisfactory ways to accommodate growth. In many areas expanding population is outrunning the readily available supply of food, water, and other basic resources and threatens to aggravate beyond solution the staggering problems of the new urban society."

The concept that industrialization can be the salvation of over-populated and impoverished peoples seems also to neglect the fact that our own system is based on an abundance of native and imported wealth. The inhabitants of North America—only 7 percent of humanity—are using about half the world's yield of basic resources. Sociologist Philip M. Hauser (1960) has stated that, at our standard of living, the total products of the world would support about half a billion people. This seems a dim outlook for the 3.5 billions now alive and those yet to come.

At a cost, Americans have shown little understanding or respect for the cultures of other peoples. It might become us, and avoid responsibility for further great errors in dealing with the "developing" nations, if we proceed slowly in overhauling their social and economic systems.

There appears to be unmistakable evidence that the world at large has passed the optimum level of population. It has been widely assumed that this does not apply to the United States; but the foregoing considerations seem to indicate that we should be diminishing our problems at the source rather than always trying to outrun them. As Hardin (1968) emphasizes, the population problem has no technical solution.

The technological "explosion"—terminology that suggests a consciousness of some of the exponentials involved—has been accompanied by a corresponding re-working of the face of the land. The widespread pollution of water and air, and the despoilation of natural beauty need no particular documentation here. The solid wastes to be disposed of now aggregate 4.5 pounds per person per day. Thermal modification of natural waters as a result of power production is doubling in 10 years. There is ample evidence that in North America we have exceeded the capacity of the biosphere to degrade and assimilate our wastes. Not only should we be making strenuous efforts to avoid further population increases, but real and rapid progress toward better standards of life in America probably must await the attaining of a negative birth rate.

OUR GROWTH OBSESSION

Nowhere in the state of nature do we find animals prospering so well, surviving in such large numbers, living so long, and reproducing so abundantly as when a population is expanding to fill a vacant environment. Of course, this is what happened in North America during the past 300 years. The white man displaced the Indian and took over his resources for use at a "higher" cultural level that could support many more people. It is perhaps understandable that modern Americans have developed an expansionist euphoria that attributes collective weal to the growth process itself, rather than to the availability of resources on which growth can take place. The "expanding economy" idea has passed from the stage of useful realism to one of economic dogma.

Two of the "easy" approaches to success in business and industry have become routine. First, we have assumed the right to pollute air, water, and land or to mutilate the scenery as a valid part of the profit-taking process. Secondly, and because we have always had it this way, it is assumed that every enterprise has the "right" to expand through continuous increases in customers—which takes place through additions to the population. The view that this process goes on indefinitely and that it holds the key to the "American dream" is behind the huge promotion now under way to "attract new industry" and build population in practically every community that can support more people through private or public development.

It needs to be understood clearly that human numbers do not grow in thin air. They are a response to the broadening of the resource base and the opening of vacant or sparsely occupied areas through developments that support new communities. This is one way in which population can be manipulated—by creating more centers of build-up or, in the other direction, by deliberately preserving our open spaces for less intensive uses. It seems evident that we have no public incentive to increase population, yet our planning is consistently in that direction.

One who reads the transactions of the Western Resources Conferences will learn that as of 1960 there were 22 billion dollars' worth of water development projects for seventeen states in the files of the Bureau of Reclamation—plans that engineers considered "feasible." These are planned for construction by the year 2000 (see McGee, 1960; Schad, 1960). It is assumed that every river system must come under complete control, with the total water supply utilized to establish new agriculture, new industry, and more people (estimated at 25 million) in all of the "undeveloped" open space that can be found. There are enthusiastic promoters of this program in the Congress and, needless to say, in the local electorates involved. Plans for more "economic development" for other sections of the country are going forward accordingly.

I do not imply that all such enterprises are not in the public interest, but to make these far-reaching resource decisions, our representatives in the Congress must have access to every kind of information. They are frequently reminded that they represent the construction beneficiaries who move the earth and pour the concrete. But they likewise represent every taxpayer who supports the great works, with their wonderful and baffling cost-benefit ratios. The harried Congressman must be the dependence of the people at large who make use of space, scenic, and recreational features of this land—people who have little concept of what is happening. They know only that we are dedicated to "progress." Where that progress leads, or what kind of world is being contrived, they are never told. Has someone decided for them that we are to have no hinterland? Are there to be smokestacks in every wilderness, a smog over every countryside, the threat of extinction over every flowing stream?

There is another concept of resource management that sees our continent as a composite of environmental types, each with its own character and its particular contribution to the national scene. The latter presupposes that there are many and diverse ways to achieve a pleasant life and that various regions have much to offer in their existing features and natural assets.

The wild creatures of this earth have survived because each performs a useful function in a reasonably stable ecosystem. Any living thing that is too successful destroys the sources of its livelihood and disappears with the community on which it depends.

The 1968 report of Congressman Daddario and his Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development observed that " . . . the population explosion is fundamental to the requirement for environmental management. Population must come under control and be stabilized at some number which civilization can agree upon. Otherwise, the best use of natural resources will be inadequate and the apocalyptic forces of disease and famine will dominate the earth."

Stability and an "agreed-upon" population level are indeed worthy objectives in realistic planning for the future. This can not be a cookbook approach with flat rules and precise standards. Conditions in both space and time are too uncertain and variable. But in ecological perspective it is possible to appraise the direction of trends and influences. For now, a curb on birth rate by every acceptable means and a major reduction of the government-sponsored environmental onslaught are two requisites of the greatest urgency. It is heartening to see signs that these are getting attention in the Congress.

DEMANDS OF CRISIS

We have come to a threshold in world and national affairs where there is immediate need to apply sophisticated, up-to-date thinking if we are to mitigate, rather than augment, the growing miseries of mankind. Around the earth, much that needs to be done is blocked by a massif of ignorance. However, it certainly is true that the wars of history have made greater personal demands on men of many countries than what must be asked of the world's people in the years ahead. The population issue does not brutalize the masses and inflict hardship on the innocent. It calls for an appeal to reason backed by all the skills social science can muster. In our own nation public acceptance of new ideas is of such great urgency that real resources need to be applied in bringing it about. Many of our old traditions, assumptions, and slogans need a searching review with open-minded willingness to innovate.

Most of us are all too aware of the unrest of the new generation of our citizenry. I make no case for those who march and protest with no real effort at problem solving. But we probably can ascribe some of their social malaise to the frustrating complexity of the world in which they find themselves—a world in which there is no reassuring guidance toward recognizable goals, no convincing reasons to assume that the individual has a defensible purpose in being.

There is, to be sure, an "establishment" devoted to high-sounding maxims that are supposed to be worthy and venerable by definition, but which seem to confuse rather than simplify our human problems. In the sumtotal of their ecological malpractice, the elders are heading humanity toward the damnation of the lemmings. If youth does not see this at once, there are good reasons; for no one has given them any rational concept of man's relationship to the earth or any basic ethos of human respectability. In our overgrown institutions of higher education the husbandry of their intellects is monitored by humanists who are not biologists and biologists who are not humanists. They learn how to do great things but the why of nothing.

This is to identify one of our overshadowing difficulties. In this time of television, moon exploration, and the imminent availability of nearly unlimited sources of energy, it is obvious that accomplishments in engineering and its supporting sciences are awe-inspiring testimony to the capacity of the human mind.

Attending all our technical triumphs, however, is a growing realization that we have a critical area of weakness. While we know how to do fantastic things, we frequently do not know when and where—nor indeed why—to do them. The problem transfers itself from physical science in the development and use of hardware to another sphere in which we are less competent—that of the biology and ecology of man.

The nature and proportions of this problem actually bespeak the relative complexity of the systems of nature. Even though the physical characteristics of matter and energy are inconceivably involved, they are far less so than the limitless intricacies of the world of living things. Biological systems include all the variables of physical science plus the endless elaborations of more than two billion years of organic evolution. To the structure and physiology of the living organism are added the organization of ecosystems and the behavioral adaptations that are essential to survival. In these dimensions were the origins of man, and now his culture has taken over to reorient his own speciation and vastly modify the habitat in which he developed. If, with the tools now at his disposal, he blunders unaware into the throes of overpopulation and environmental ruin, he could in a tick of the geological time clock be carried away to oblivion by the mechanical monster he has created.

Pessimism always has a hollow ring. But where so much is at stake there is more safety in planning for the worst rather than always hoping for the best. The truth is that today's greatest problems will not be solved. We are too late, and we failed for lack of foresight. Only tomorrow's problems can be solved, and only if we of today agree to be responsible for tomorrow.

REFORM OF WELFARE SYSTEM

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, on Monday, President Nixon, in his message to Congress concerning his proposals and policies, called for "a complete reappraisal and redirection" of our present welfare system, and said he would be submitting a program for our consideration which would reform the system.

The welfare system, which has continued relatively unchanged for a number of years, is a classic example of a program which has been found in practice to be not achieving its goals. I share the President's concern for making Government programs effective, and I look forward to his proposals and his leadership in bringing about meaningful reforms.

At the present time the President's Commission on Income Maintenance Programs is conducting hearings around the country on welfare reform. They are going into the areas where the welfare system operates directly, and hearing the opinions of the men and women who administer the programs, and who receive the benefits. There is no better way to find out how welfare works, in my opinion, and I commend the Commission for this initiative and look forward to its report.

During the recent recess, while I was in Pennsylvania, the President's Commission held hearings in Philadelphia, and I was privileged to appear before them and present my views.

I basically feel that we must change the welfare system so that it operates to help the poor, in both urban and rural areas, to achieve levels of self-dependency, both economically and psychologically. I also feel that the welfare program can work hand-in-hand with other programs, both private and public, to attack the problems of poverty in a broad attack.

I ask unanimous consent that my testimony before the Commission on April 11, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, REPUBLICAN OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON INCOME MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS, PUBLIC HEARINGS, APRIL 11, 1969, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

It is a pleasure for me to testify today before this important Commission. I congratulate the President for appointing a distinguished Commission to study our welfare system, and I congratulate you for conducting your hearings in the communities where these systems operate. I look forward to a significant report.

It is clear that the American welfare system is not working.

Essentially, I think our welfare system has been an abysmal failure in two major areas:

First, it does not encourage welfare recipients to move upward on the economic ladder. Rather than bringing about self-dependency, it results in dependency on the welfare system.

Secondly, it reaches only one-fourth of the over 32 million poor people in America who are below the poverty income standard of $3,000 a year for a family of four.

There are other problems as well:

Often heads of welfare families are actually encouraged to not take paying jobs because every dollar earned is deducted from the welfare payments.

In some states, husbands in welfare families must live apart from their wives and children because this is the only way they can collect welfare payments.

Unequal welfare policies in different states create unnecessary pressures. For instance, Pennsylvania, which has high payments, receives people driven out by other states where the level of payments is cruelly low.

One particular failure has been the "Aid to Families with Dependent Children" program, the largest welfare program. For instance, in many states, outside income must be deducted from the welfare check. This amounts to a 100% tax on what a poor family tries to earn on its own. In addition, many states refuse aid if the father lives in the home, or in some cases, if he even visits the home. These are examples of stringent "bureaucratic" policies which operate to defeat the aim of eliminating poverty, and result instead in the perpetuation of poverty.

I would like to briefly make four specific recommendations:

(1) I propose that the Federal Government eliminate the tortuous requirements to qualify for AFDC, and replace them with a simple test of "need," established by a family's affidavit. This would give poor people more dignity and self-respect, and allow social workers to spend their time helping families, and not policing their qualifications. New York City, incidentally, instituted such a program, and out of 4,000 welfare applicants in the first three months, only two cases of suspected fraud were turned up.

(2) I propose that families on welfare be allowed to keep outside earnings of up to $85 a month plus 30% of the remainder of their earnings, without deductions from their welfare checks. The 1969 Federal Standard allows retention of the first $30 earned in a month, plus one-third of the rest, but the formula I propose will provide an even greater incentive for welfare recipients to earn outside income and become self-dependent.

(3) I propose that minimum national standards of welfare benefits be established so that all states carry their fair share of the load, and so that no state escapes its responsibilities in this area.

(4) I propose the institution of a crash program for adequate child day-care facilities in low income neighborhoods to allow welfare mothers to take jobs to supplement their family income.

Of course, welfare reform is not the only way to combat the urgent problems of urban poverty. We need to make greater progress in creating more schools, more jobs and better housing. We need more efforts to combat crime, which drains poor people of their meager resources.

But progress in these areas takes time, and poverty does not wait for government or private programs. In fact, poverty often wipes out the effects of gains before they are felt. However, we *can* take immediate action to reform the welfare system. Implementing the four Federal reforms I have outlined would, I believe, be a major first step in modernizing our welfare system. By reforming welfare, we can turn it into a positive force which directly tackles the problems of poverty, and which at the same time, works to the direct end of making poor people self-sufficient.

FCC COMMISSIONER JOHNSON—AN EFFECTIVE MEMBER

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, vigorous proponents of the public interest who sit on regulatory agencies often come under attack by the industries which they regulate. The sharpness of the attack is usually in direct proportion to the effectiveness of the agency member in challenging complacent industry attitudes.

Commissioner Nicholas Johnson, of the Federal Communications Commission, is an effective member. He has been a potent force on the FCC in urging it to fulfill its congressional mandate to see that the public is the beneficiary of private use of the mass media. He has been especially effective in urging the Commission to examine the growing concentration of control of mass media.

The Commission is presently planning hearings on newspaper-owned broadcast licenses in Minneapolis and San Francisco and in Cheyenne, Wyo. It has designated newspaper applications for new broadcast facilities for hearings in a number of markets and is studying the issue of conglomerate control.

I welcome these studies and applaud the Commission for pursuing this important concern. I am distressed, however, by the virulence of attacks by some industry publications against members of the Commission, particularly Mr. Johnson.

The harshness of the trade press language has provoked comments in other publications. The Saturday Review recently published a story by Robert Lewis Shayon criticizing the vitriolic statements of Broadcasting, the industry trade magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the April 12 article entitled, "FCC's Teenybopper Under Fire," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NICHOLAS JOHNSON VERSUS BROADCASTING: FCC'S "TEENYBOPPER" UNDER FIRE

(By Robert Lewis Shayon)

In June 1966, President Lyndon Johnson appointed Nicholas Johnson (no relation) to the seven-man Federal Communications Commission for a seven-year term. Commissioner Johnson's tenure to date has been marked by an activist regulatory philosophy. The main thrust of the work by this former professor of law at the University of California (he was also national maritime administrator, and prior to that a law clerk serving Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Hugo L. Black) has been directed at the achievement of a healthier level of competition in the communications industry, particularly broadcasting. He has been a vigorous dissenter, often alone, against majority FCC decisions that sustained multiple-ownership media practices, and he has objected to conglomerates that merge broadcasting structures with other corporate interests.

It was Commissioner Johnson who wrote the majority opinion in the Carter Phone Case, as a result of which independent companies have been permitted to attach their gear to the AT&T switching network. With other commissioners, he has helped to stimulate the development of public broadcasting as another option for viewers and listeners. The promotion of diversity through the greater use of UHF channels has been among his objectives. He has supported the general principle that citizen groups ought to know of their right to compete, at license renewal time, for franchises that are granted to station owners—privileges heretofore renewed largely *pro forma* by the rubber-stamp Broadcast Bureau of the FCC.

Currently, he is at the center of a pattern of intense regulatory activity at the Commission, along with his colleagues, particularly Kenneth A. Cox and Robert T. Bartley, but the FCC has known activist phases before. Other so-called rebel commissioners, such as Fly, Durr, Hennock, Minow, and Henry, have come and gone. Nicholas Johnson may not have helped to achieve significant competition in broadcasting by 1973, when his term expires, but he will have contributed to the general recognition among broadcasters and communications lawyers that the industry badly needs a new trade journal to compete with *Broadcasting*, the magazine that now dominates the press of this important field. Published since 1931, *Broadcasting* provides the most complete coverage available of the FCC. Vital industry statistics may be more quickly found in *Broadcasting's* annual review issues than in the Commission's files, but in a deeper sense, the magazine is out of touch with the complex realities of today's rapidly changing communications world. It feeds its subscribers, especially in its editorials, a mix of images compounded of fantasy and propaganda. Its highly selective packages of information may support the biases and self-fulfilling prophecies of its readers, but these serve more to gratify the reader's emotions than to render them real service by independent, tough-minded analysis.

Such a performance is generally the rule in any trade press, and this fact is not overlooked in evaluating *Broadcasting*. Successful trade media mute the obvious nature of their role with acceptable rhetorical manners that are temperate in tone and accent. Generally speaking, this has been true in the past, even of *Broadcasting*, but the magazine, in its treatment of Commissioner Johnson, has dropped its mask of good manners and revealed an *ad hominem* stridency that grows ever more shrill, to the uneasiness of more thoughtful broadcasters. This situation has come about because Johnson has refused to quit the agency despite the barrage of attacks leveled at him by the magazine. He hasn't been bought off by a better job. *Broadcasting* suggested this in an editorial in its March 17, 1969 issue: "To remove a commissioner appointed for a specific term without substantial cause . . . is a sticky business. Perhaps the offer of another position in government or on the bench, paying as well, would do it, and that prospect, it's hoped, will be pursued."

A look at the record is instructive—thirty pieces of news and editorials (the two are often hard to separate), beginning December 5, 1966, and ending March 17, 1969. They reveal a pattern that emphasizes slogan and invective rather than the serious debate of issues on their merits. The pattern begins with scorn and disdain, and escalates to almost pre-emptory commands to President Nixon to fulfill his campaign promises to rein in the Government's regulatory agencies. In 1966, the magazine took early editorial notice of Commissioner Johnson in connection with his objections to the aborted ABC-ITT merger. Although the editorial answered briefly a point about a conflict of interests between the conglomerate and the network, it made three irrelevant thrusts. It said that both Johnson and Commissioner Cox "seem to dote on" publicity; it noted that Johnson was Mr. Cox's "thirty-two-year-old disciple"; and it warned them that "the Administration wouldn't relish action that would frustrate more aggressive competition among the three major networks." The magazine generally kept its cool in future editorials and news briefs, when dealing with Johnson, but its tone grew increasingly sharp, as the Commissioner, often with Cox and Bartley, challenged routine license renewals, fought against concentration of media control, and wrote and spoke out publicly about program surveillance by the Commission.

Broadcasting warned the Commissioner that he was "not winning friends"; it called him a "teenybopper" and "the shrill and frequent critic of the actions of his elders." It rebuked the National Association of Broadcasters, the major trade group, for providing "a plaform for an FCC member who makes a practice of beating his captive audiences over the head." It charged unethical conduct by Johnson in several situations, and printed replies by him and others that countercharged misinformation and inaccurate quotation. In the summer of 1968, *Broadcasting* abandoned any efforts to deal with the merits of the positions taken by Commissioners

Johnson and Cox. An editorial in the June 10 issue looked with favor on "various proproposals for riper legislation [which] would enable the President to appoint a new commission, eliminating those who want only to attack and destroy." Commissioner Cox was accused of "espousing rigid control of program and business affairs, in defiance of the law—a sort of socialism." It said of Mr. Johnson, "his number should be up."

In its issue of February 17, 1969, the magazine asserted that "an erstwhile reasonably safe majority [at the FCC] had lost control to a makeshift radical minority." The article continued:

"It is shameful that at the root of most of the trouble-making is Nick Johnson, who, in his two-and-one-half years as a commissioner, has made a fetish of throwing sand in the FCC machinery. . . . This brash, thirty-four-year-old self-anointed savior, who was removed from his last job as maritime administrator, jams the FCC processing lines with his dissents, automatically opposes routine renewals, personally woos reporters, editors, and pundit-columnists with his double-space documents [SOP is single-spacing to save paper and money], maintains a private mailing list at government expense, and stands accused of brow-beating FCC personnel."

Interest in *Broadcasting's* treatment of Johnson is heightened when one considers the credibility of the magazine's past cantankerousness. The trade journal said in its first editorial (1931): "Broadcasting in the U.S. today stands in grave jeopardy. Politically powerful and efficiently organized groups, actuated by selfishness and with a mania for power, are now busily at work plotting the complete destruction of the industry we have pioneered and developed." Somehow the plotters were foiled, and the AM–FM-television broadcasting industry went on to achieve an annual revenue of $3.2 billion in 1967. Nevertheless, in the June 10, 1968, editorial cited earlier, the apocalyptic strain surfaced again: "The nation is witnessing the most audacious and unethical assault upon broadcasters ever contrived. It could spell the end of American-Plan 'free' broadcasting."

As of March 17, 1969, the situation was still at emergency level. "The regulation of communications—particularly broadcasting—has reached a critical point, and is threatened with a breakdown. When the FCC takes actions that encourage reckless applications for occupied facilities worth millions, anarchy lies ahead unless remedial measures are invoked."

The truth or falsity of pictures in our heads may be tested against reality; we must ask whether or not they correspond with the pictures in other peoples' heads. *Television Age*, an advertising trade journal, commenting on Johnson in its January 2, 1967 issue, wrote:

"He has kept out of the public glare, spending his time instead devouring information on communications, talking to industry leaders, and observing his FCC colleagues in action. Even his detractors agree that he has strong assets: he's intellectually curious, and he is intellectually honest."

Newsweek, on April 20, 1967, reported: "He professes to prefer the role of a young communications don, working monkishly over his long opinions, and returning each evening to his wife and three children in quiet suburban Maryland." The *Christian Science Monitor* noted in an interview, on June 12, 1967: "Nearly 95 percent of the time he has voted with the Commission majority, for whose chairman he has great respect and affection.' " The National Association of Television and Radio Announcers in August 1968, gave Johnson an award with this citation: "A bold, fearless, and humane man who has made the industry aware of its legal and moral obligation to serve the communities of America, making them cognizant that broadcasting is a privilege and not a right." The U.S. Jaycee voted him one of its Ten Outstanding Young Men for 1967, noting that he had "consistently worked to achieve a more coherent communications policy in the best interests of the general public. Within a short time, he has injected life and imagination into the workings of a crucial government agency."

Broadcasting has responded by harking back to the good old days when the magazine's editors, linked importantly with major corporate interests in broadcasting, gave marching orders to a complacent Commission that knew its place. Participatory democracy is in the air; the people want in, even in broadcasting, and the magazine cannot grasp the change.

In the context of a democracy, there is nothing wrong with the phenomenon of strong views in real conflict—even views that cannot be reconciled in agreement or consensus. It is entirely in order for a trade journal to present the views of its constituents as vigorously as it can, and to attack the views of its opponents, but the times demand reason in the trade press. Broadcasters help shape our images of the world with the pictures and words they package on TV and radio, but the images of the world that the broadcasters have in their minds are shaped in large measure by their sources of information. The purity of their wells of information are of grave import to the public at large.

Station owners who have read *Broadcasting's* attacks on Johnson are surprised to find, when they meet him at conferences and discuss industry problems with him, that he is as reasonable as the next fellow, intent on seeking out, with them, rational policies for an astonishingly complex communications world.

The dissonance gives them pause, and has set some to doubting whether their major trade journal adequately meets their needs. Even prophets are necessary in our society to proclaim their passionately held private truths, but we desperately need ground rules for the process of opposition as we confront change. *Broadcasting* seems unable to tolerate opposing views without hostility; it demands that its truth alone must prevail.

A responsible trade press should maintain a creative sense of confrontation, channeling opposition, rather than allowing it to engulf all other values and all other parties. Should *Broadcasting* succeed in "dumping" Commissioners Johnson, Cox, and Bartley, the issues will not disappear. Even President Nixon cannot exercise the very real challenges that beset the industry. Total control is an obsession: it can destroy not only the opposition but the would-be controller. What the broadcasters and the public need is not "an enemy," but better data about the issues at stake, about the estimated costs and possible effects of alternative courses of action. Conscience ought to be persuaded, not manipulated or coerced. If *Broadcasting's* treatment of Nicholas Johnson of the FCC has brought about even a glimpse of this truth, and if a competitive responsible trade journal is the result, then whatever else he may accomplish before 1973, an enduring contribution will have been left behind to the broadcasting industry by the embattled, young "teeny-bopper" commissioner.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF HAWAII STATEHOOD

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of Hawaii's campaign to win statehood, the President of the United States wrote to Senator Fong.

I ask unanimous consent that President Nixon's letter and his statement to the people of Hawaii be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The White House,
Washington, April 16, 1969.

Hon. Hiram L. Fong,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Hiram: During this tenth anniversary of Hawaii's successful campaign to win Statehood, one man in particular deserves our special recognition and his people's thanks. That man, Hiram, is you.

As senior Senator from Hawaii, you have tirelessly sought to translate the expectations shared by its citizens ten years ago into the reality of progress they have now attained.

You have spoken well for them. And you have merited their confidence. You have given them a strong voice in national affairs, and consistently sought to bring them the fullness of the prosperity we enjoy.

I can certainly understand why the people of Hawaii have returned you to Washington. And I am confident that they will do so again.

Please extend my warmest good wishes to them on this milestone, and commend them for the good judgment that has earned them the gratitude of the countless fellow citizens who respect your leadership and admire your ability to get things done.

Sincerely,

Richard Nixon.

The White House,
Washington, April 16, 1969.

To the People of Hawaii.

My warmest greetings go out to my fellow citizens in Hawaii as you celebrate your tenth anniversary of Statehood.

I know that I am not alone in my good wishes. I am joined by millions of Americans who are grateful for the contributions of our fiftieth State, and proud of the splendid example you set by your devotion to social justice and true human brotherhood.

The harmony in your daily lives, the hard work, high ideals and cooperative spirit which have been hallmarks of your progress—all of these are sources of deepest satisfaction to us all.

Within a decade you have made your State a showcase of the best of America. And you have expressed in fullness the founding principles on which this nation's greatness rests.

No task could be more pleasant or bring me greater pride than that of wishing you continuing success as you carry forward Hawaii's role in the life of our Republic.

Richard Nixon.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the legislation which provided statehood for Hawaii, it gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to be able to call this material to the attention of the Senate. Moreover, as a colleague and great admirer of the Senator from Hawaii, I wish to point to some of the highlights of his very distinguished career.

He was Vice President of the Hawaii Constitutional Convention in 1950.

As speaker of the Hawaii Territorial House of Representatives, Hiram Fong led the legislative delegation to Congress to press for early enactment of statehood.

He was always a strong advocate for statehood for Hawaii and spent his time and energies on all occasions to win congressional and Presidential support for statehood.

In his time, he amassed an outstanding record of public service and achievements in the world of commerce.

He served 14 years in the Legislature of Hawaii before statehood. This includes 4 years as vice speaker and 6 years as speaker of the house.

Hiram Fong is a Harvard Law School graduate, a World War II veteran, and is at present a retired colonel of the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

He is an indefatigable worker for community betterment, a member of numerous civic and charitable organizations. He is a vociferous backer of the underprivileged and is one of the most active supporters in Hawaii of candidates of the Republican Party. His support of loyal party members is legendary.

He has twice been a favorite son candidate at national conventions.

Hiram Fong is today among Hawaii's most successful businessmen. He holds the distinction of being founder, president, and board chairman of a family of companies, namely Finance Factors, Grand Pacific Life Insurance Co., Finance Realty, Finance Home Builders, Finance Investment, Highway Construction, Market City, and others.

He is very proud to point out that he is the founder of the cosmopolitan law firm of Fong—Chinese, Miho—Japanese, Choy—Korean, & Robison—Caucasian-Hawaiian.

But I believe the people of Hawaii should realize in what great esteem he is held by the rest of the Nation. Hiram Fong looms large in the U.S. Senate, and we in the Senate turn to him often for counsel and advice, especially in the areas of his expertise on the Judiciary and Appropriations Committees and in his capacity as highest ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

As minority whip of the Senate, it is a high honor for me to speak these words of tribute to the great Senator from Hawaii.

IOWA PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the fine work being done by Iowa citizens in the Partners of the Alliance program was recognized in a recent editorial published in the Des Moines Register.

Since 1965, Iowa and Yucatan, Mexico, have been joined in this unique program in which private citizens are working together on mutually beneficial projects involving an exchange of students and teachers; also in the fields of agriculture, health, business, and culture.

The Partners of the Alliance program now operates in 37 of our States and 37 areas of 16 Latin American countries. Literally thousands of people representing business and professional organizations, associations, labor, civic and service groups, as well as students, are giving time and talent to develop close personal working relationships throughout the hemisphere.

I wish to commend these people for their voluntary efforts and initiative in helping to promote friendship, understanding, and greater cooperation among all the peoples of the Americas. Their unselfish work clearly reflects their concern for the well-being of others.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the editorial entitled "Iowa Foreign Aid Agency," published in the Des Moines Register of March 28, 1969.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Iowa Foreign Aid Agency

A bill introduced in the Iowa Senate gives the Legislature an opportunity to put itself on record in support of international co-operation.

The bill, co-sponsored by Senators John M. Walsh (Rep., Dubuque) and James A. Potgeter (Rep., Steamboat Rock), would create a 10-member "Iowa Lends-a-Hand Agency" to co-ordinate activities of Iowa organizations that provide aid for people of underdeveloped countries or of countries stricken by natural disasters.

The lieutenant governor would serve as chairman of the agency, and its nine other members would be appointed by the governor on a "nonpartisan basis."

The agency would be empowered to appoint an executive secretary who "may be the employe of another agency of state government." It would be authorized to receive "gifts, grants or donations," but no state tax funds could be used to support it.

Among the agency's functions would be to "organize and co-ordinate procedures for the transportation and distribution of materials and aid to other countries" and to determine foreign countries which can be benefitted by a variety of items "that are manufactured, grown or available in Iowa."

Since Iowa Partners of the Alliance was organized in the fall of 1965, many Iowans have participated in a people-to-people program with the Mexican state of Yucatan. The state's universities have participated in programs abroad under the Agency for International Development, and many Iowa business firms have contacts overseas.

The new agency proposed in the Walsh-Potgeter bill could facilitate the work of these groups and direct the concerns of other Iowans to areas with the greatest needs.

Walsh and Potgeter have offered the Legislature an excellent chance to foster good will and understanding between the people of Iowa and their neighbors abroad. But if this is a good idea, as we think it is, why not a small state appropriation to support it?

A FORMIDABLE MICHIGAN ATTORNEY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in our legal tradition, attorneys rarely wear robes, but today I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to a formidable Michigan attorney who never appears in court without one.

She is a Dominican nun, Sister Ann Joachim, O.P., aptly described by the Detroit Free Press as a "tall, slender woman with the demeanor of a grandmother and the mind of a Clarence Darrow."

She is currently engaged in a legal battle to prevent the Norfolk & Western Railroad from discontinuing a passenger train, the Wabash Cannonball, that runs between St. Louis and Detroit.

Both the Detroit Free Press and the Detroit News recently printed delightful articles about Sister Joachim and her crusade. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press, Apr. 8, 1969]

Gentle Nun Leads Charge at Battle of the Cannonball

(By Barbara Stanton)

A gentle Dominican nun of 70-some years tangled with a $2.5-billion railway corporation Monday, and the corporation emerged a bit dented.

Sister Ann Joachim, O.P., a tall, slender woman with the demeanor of a grandmother and the mind of a Clarence Darrow, wants to keep the Wabash Cannonball running. The Norfolk & Western Railway wants to close it down.

The two sides clashed head-on at an Interstate Commerce Commission hearing on the railroad's petition to discontinue the Detroit-St. Louis train as of July 4.

Spokesmen for the railway contend that the Cannonball, the last namesake of the historic train that traveled the Midwestern plains in the 19th century, is unprofitable and underpatronized. They said the Cannonballs carried fewer than 40 passengers each way daily, and lost $570,000 in 1968.

But Sister Ann Joachim, attorney for the Dominican Motherhouse at Adrian, Mich., a community served by the train, called a stream of witnesses to testify that the only thing wrong with the Cannonball is that Norfolk & Western wants to get rid of it.

Mrs. Carrie Sponhauer of Detroit, a frequent rider and a stockholder in N&W, quoted from the company's own annual report to argue that passenger service was profitable. She cited figures showing revenue from "passengers, mail and express" went up from $10 million in 1967 to $22 million in 1968.

[From the Detroit News]

The Ladies Explode Over Cannonball

(By Al Stark)

The ladies, led by a lawyer-nun, socked it to the Norfolk & Western Railway yesterday in an effort to save the Wabash Cannonball, a train which runs between Detroit and St. Louis.

There is one Cannonball each way, each day. It travels 497 miles through towns like Adrian; Montpelier, Ohio, Fort Wayne and Peru, Ind.; Danville and Granite City, Ill.

The Norfolk & Western which says it lost $467,000 on the Cannonball in 1967 and $570,000 in 1968, has petitioned the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) for permission to eliminate the passenger run. The final hearing was held yesterday in Federal Court in Detroit and the ladies were there early.

They rallied behind Sister Ann Joachim, OP, of Siena Heights College in Adrian, an attorney at law, who admits she is old enough for medicare, but who once won trophies in tennis, basketball and swimming and was even a stunt pilot.

Sister Ann, who refers to herself as "a teacher of the truths of history, economics, political science and the law," called a series of witnesses. To the railroad's contention that its passenger load has dropped so low that even heavier losses are inevitable, the ladies to a man answered that they need the Cannonball to get where they're going.

Mrs. Kenneth Groom, 71, of Roseville, said, "Look, with me it's personal, I just want a way to get to Decatur, Ill., to see my daughter.

"Greyhound has no bus there. And when I called Trailways I got some flip young guy who said I could go by Toledo and Chicago. I felt like spanking him."

Mrs. Carrie Sponhauer, 62, of Detroit, complimented the Norfolk & Western on a couple of things, then pulled from a pile of papers on her lap the company's 1968 annual report and proceeded to read the black figures to the railroad's attorney, George Saunders, of Chicago.

When Mrs. Sponhauer, who rides the Cannonball to her farm in Fort Wayne practically every weekend from spring until Christmas, got to the part that reveals that Norfolk & Western is top-rated for investors, she as much as told Saunders, "Why the fuss over this train that we all need?"

Sister Pauline Marie, another Dominican nun from Adrian, testified that she rides the Cannonball once a month to Fort Wayne to visit her aged parents (her father an old trainman.)

Asked by Sister Ann what service is like on the Cannonball, she brought a smile from Saunders when she said she couldn't say enough for the railroad personnel on the train.

His smile faded a moment later when she said, however, that all too often there were no paper towels in the ladies room at the station in Fort Wayne.

Just before testimony resumed in the afternoon, Sister Ann leaned across the counsel table and lectured the 37-year-old Saunders about smiling at the statements of witnesses "and opposing counsel."

She said, "I think it is discourteous and unethical."

Saunders, summing up the railroad's position, said that the Cannonball, which leaves Detroit for St. Louis every morning at 7:15 a.m., has shown growing losses for four years.

He said that market studies indicated that this was a trend that would continue, and that there was little the railroad could do to reverse it.

He said there is an "inherent decline in demand" for what the railroad offers.

The ICC will announce their decision before July 3.

THE ABM OR THE RISK OF WAR?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post, syndicated columnist Joseph Alsop places in perspective the President's decision on the ABM system concerning the necessity of taking a step to protect our future security.

In calling attention to Mr. Alsop's column, I would like to add that I, too, like many other Senators, wish it were possible for our Nation to begin disarmament and a reduction in weaponry without waiting for corresponding action from the Soviet Union.

Perhaps those who believe we should proceed with unilateral disarmament are correct—that if we take the first step, and scrap the ABM, the Soviet Union will then do likewise. But what if they are wrong?

Unfortunately, we need more than public statements, educated guesses, and wishful thinking as a basis on which to make determinations involving our national security. Until we have more than this, until we have tne type of successful negotiations with the Soviet Union that President Nixon is earnestly trying to obtain, we may, by scrapping the ABM without reciprocal action, be walking a very precarious path with respect to protecting our people and our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's column be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Nixon Has Good Arguments To Back Up Decision on ABM

(By Joseph Alsop)

Before very long, his opponents will discover they have figured out the President quite wrongly. The role they expect him to play is quite clear from the developing pattern of the very first test, which is the debate about the ABM.

The whole character and thrust of the senatorial attack on the ABM system rather clearly reveal an unspoken but confident expectation of continued presidential passivity. Since the inauguration, Richard M. Nixon has seemed like a very hard-working Cheshire cat, laborious but far above the dust of battle; and more of the same is obviously being counted upon.

This is obvious in turn, simply because of the character of the battleground the President's opponents have chosen. With a President who truly leads, nothing is harder or more dangerous to argue about than a question involving the future security of the Nation. On this particular battleground, it is even difficult to attack a President for doing too little, as the Eisenhower years showed.

But attacking a President for doing too much—for being too careful of the Nation's security—is something else again. Such an attack, which is now going on, actually invites the kind of response from the White House to which there is almost no possible answer, as follows:

"I am the President; I have to judge the risks; and if the event shows that I have judged wrongly, the whole blame for the resulting disaster will fall upon me. In the present case, as far as mere politics go, I had everything to gain and nothing at all to lose by shoving the whole ABM project to the back of the stove.

"The truth is, I had hoped that I would be able to do just that. I have no hankering to make needless additions to the defense budget. I have been desperately trying to cut that budget. I have no liking, either, for the kind of controversy that is now going on. All my interests and preferences were on the side of doing nothing about the ABM.

"The only trouble was that all the facts were on the other side, as far as I could ascertain those facts after I came to the White House. I do not doubt the good faith of those who deny the Soviets are now trying to build a first-strike capability. But I have come to the opposite conclusion after the most careful review of all the data—including much data very recently acquired, which is perhaps not understood by the opponents of ABM deployment.

"We are talking here, please remember, about a potential Soviet capability to destroy this Nation at a single stroke. I do not think the present Soviet government has the actual intention of using that capability, if and when they are permitted to attain it. But I can give no guarantee, and no one else can possibly give any guarantee to me against a very different sort of Soviet government coming to power within the next four years.

"With the present Soviet government, I hope to negotiate this whole field of problems at a fairly early date. But meanwhile I would be derelict in my duty—criminally derelict, in truth—if I stood idly by, leaving undone the things that can easily be done, while a potentially hostile power acquired the future capability of destroying our country in one stroke."

Coming from the President himself, these are arguments that cannot easily be answered, except perhaps to the satisfaction of the SDS. And the point is that these are just the sort of things President Nixon can now be expected to say, with maximum publicity and probably on Nationwide television, before the ABM debate reaches its climax.

Just which line of attack the President will choose, is of course a White House secret. But two things are not secret. The NATO foreign ministers included nearly the same proportion of doubters of the ABM as the U.S. Senate. The President's long, informal meeting with the foreign ministers was mainly concerned with this topic, and his explanation of his ABM decision was generally accepted as outstandingly lucid and wholly persuasive.

So the first thing that is known is that the President can make a powerful case for his ABM decision, whenever he chooses to do so. And the second thing known is that he has already made that choice. The question at the White House now is not whether the President will intervene in the ABM debate; the question, rather, is when to intervene.

For the future, moreover, this is a matter of very great importance. As a leader, President Johnson's great weakness was that he always left his opponents to take the offensive, whereas putting the opposition on the defensive is one of the Presidency's strongest prerogatives. Mr. Nixon aims to exploit that prerogative.

A SALUTE TO TED WILLIAMS

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my senior colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy), I wish to pay tribute to a great Bostonian.

Thirty years ago this month, Ted Williams broke in as a rookie for the Boston Red Sox. With time out for outstanding military service in two wars, Ted Williams thrilled the fans of our hometown for 15 years from his first time at bat to his last home run.

Now Ted Williams has moved to Washington where he celebrates his 30th anniversary in major league baseball. It gives me great pleasure to join in the praise which will be heaped upon him on this occasion.

I ask unanimous consent that a tribute written for this occasion by Bob Addie, sportswriter for the Washington Post, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Tribute to Ted Williams on the 30th Anniversary of His Major League Debut

(By Bob Addie)

Our newest Senator was never elected and in a sense he was never appointed. But he was "selected" to fill a vacancy and Washington welcomes the junior Senator representing the millions of baseball fans in this country—Ted Williams, manager of the Washington Senators baseball team.

It seems to have gotten around that Ted Williams was a great baseball player who batted .344 during his illustrious career that spanned three decades—from April 20, 1939, when he broke in as a 19-year-old rookie to Sept. 28, 1960 when he finally put away his playing spikes. (He wears rubber soled shoes with his manager's uniform now.)

It is significant that Williams ended his career with a home run in his last time at bat and before the Boston fans who had thrilled to his heroics for so many seasons. It is also known that Williams was elected to Baseball's Hall of Fame the first year he was eligible—in 1966.

Williams proved himself a vote-getter in that election by polling one of the highest totals ever recorded. It must be remembered that his "constituents" were the sportswriters with whom the great player had often feuded. But no petty feud could keep him out of the Hall of Fame.

In political parlance, Ted Williams was "a man who . . ." He was a man who won six American League batting championships; a man who batted .406 in 1941 (and the last man who attained the unbelievable .400 plateau); a man who played in 18 All-Star games; a man twice named his league's Most Valuable Player, and a man who hit 521 home runs.

All this is known and duly recorded by the sports historians. But there is another Ted

Williams—Ted Williams the American patriot, war hero and humanitarian.

With only a high school education, he was enrolled in the Navy V–12 program during World War II and held his own academically, graduating as a fighter pilot and assigned to the Marines.

Williams was recalled in the Korean War and it is a matter of record that he made the fastest transition from propellor aircraft to jets ever recorded by the military.

He was cited for a particularly daring feat in Korea during the war when he safely brought in his burning jet fighter riddled by enemy bullets. In typical Ted Williams style, he walked away from the burning plane and was embarrassed by the attention his heroic feat received throughout the world.

Williams endured his recall without bitterness. It cost him valuable time, as war does to every young man. Ted missed five years of competition—five years which could have put him on an unprecedented baseball peak, never to be reached.

But there was Ted Williams the humanitarian, too. He was asked to be the honorary chairman of the "The Jimmy Fund," an organization dedicated to cancer research for children. Williams did more than "honorary" work. He solicited contributions. He donated thousands of dollars he received from personal appearances on television, radio and for speeches. He literally helped raise over $1 million with his dynamic personality and unflagging devotion to helping unfortunate children.

All of Boston, all of New England and all of America is grateful. We welcome the junior Senator of the United States of Baseball America.

Long may he be in office.

STUDENT SUPPORT FOR SLEEPING BEAR DUNES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article written by John R. Luton, a student in the school of natural resources at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and published in the Michigan Daily of April 8, 1969. I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record also the covering letter from John Luton, in which he explains the background of the article and his motivation in writing it.

No words of mine would so eloquently make the case for the Bear or for the quality of the overwhelming majority of our young people.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ann Arbor, Mich.,
April 9, 1969.

Senator Philip A. Hart,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hart: Enclosed is a page from the *Michigan Daily* of April 8, 1969 which contains an editorial written by me in support of immediate creation of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. I would like to thank your Detroit staff for their assistance which was readily given and which provided me with information that helped me better prepare my article. I would also like to extend thanks to you for your seemingly tireless support of the Dunes proposal.

At the risk of boring you, I should like to give some explanation of the reasons behind my article. I am in the School of Natural Resources at the University of Michigan and am concerned about almost any conservation controversy. When I graduate I hope to work in the National Park Service. Consequently, I watch very closely areas under consideration for inclusion into the National Park System.

Only too often I am frustrated by the great deal of delay that slows improvement and expansion in our outdoor recreation facilities—delay sometimes exacting costly tolls to rare or unique areas in terms of values and lands lost or despoiled.

I feel strongly that areas of the quality of Sleeping Bear need to be preserved now, for with each passing year there is an increase in demand for open spaces with no corresponding increase in lands and facilities to meet the demands. Each year brings instead a decrease in high quality land for outdoor recreation—a decrease in the amount of unspoiled land that is a great part of America's heritage. The National Park Service can best preserve the values and integrity of this legacy of primitive America. But in order for them to meet the future demands of my generation and other generations to come, they must be allowed more of these unique landscapes.

My generation has been criticized for being politically too radical and for wanting only to destroy our society or at least to escape from it. A portrait of my generation usually consists of hippies, drug users and students striking or demonstrating. This picture, to my father's and grandfather's generations represents the majority of my generation. Fortunately, the true majority of today's students are not tearing apart colleges but are studying. Yes, we want to change the world, for we are the recipients of a heritage of generations who seemingly put no thought toward the future. Our legacy is only partly unspoiled, a very small part. We want to change the world in an orderly manner and in a way that will halt the decay of the environment and provide a better, more pleasing place for our children and grandchildren to live in.

I wrote my article in the hopes that, in a very small way, I can help the cause of building a better society. I have tried through the main media on my campus to expose more students to conservation issues, and I hope, rather naively, that more students will more actively work for a better society and environment. I hoped to draw more support for your Sleeping Bear proposal and other conservation proposals.

I realize that I have digressed to a seemingly superfluous tangent, but I did so to demonstrate that many of my generation cares and desires only to be given a chance to help change and improve our heritage, and provide future generations with a legacy that is a credit to ourselves and America. We are waiting to take the reins from others, and are trying to prepare ourselves to adequately meet the challenge of the future.

Again, I would like to thank you for your valuable and continued support of Sleeping Bear, and for your concern for the future. I also thank you for taking the time to listen to my ramblings. I hope that you will lend your help to other conservation proposals and continue to be a leader in the fight to preserve our natural heritage for now and for posterity.

Sincerely

John R. Luton.

[From the Michigan Daily, Apr. 8, 1969]

Fighting To Save a Sleeping Bear From Dying

(By John R. Luton)

(Editor's Note.—John Luton is a junior in the School of Natural Resources majoring in wildlife management. He has done extensive research into the Sleeping Bear controversy, backing the research up with several field trips to the Dunes area.)

The Ottawa and Chippewa Indians used to say the precipitous bluffs rising from Lake Michigan's eastern shore were the immobile hulk of a mother bear pining for her two drowned cubs. The huge Sleeping Bear Dune and her cubs—the off shore North and South Manitou islands still lie immobile 25 miles west of Traverse City in the northwestern reaches of the Lower Peninsula.

But the bear is not sleeping; it is dying.

The National Park Service and several Michigan legislators have been trying unsuccessfully to make the dunes area a National Lakeshore. But each time a bill has been introduced in the last ten years it has been killed by local opposition and political influence.

The Sleeping Bear region has perhaps the most beautiful and striking landscapes found along the shoreline of Lake Michigan. It is an area of startling contrasts. Huge dunes lie atop the moraines forming parallel headlands 400 feet above the lake waters. Between ridges are lowlands with concave bays and small, very crystalline inland lakes.

A fascinating variety of plant life accentuates the diversity of the area. Beach grass and bog plants, pine forest and broad leaved trees often grow together, sometimes spread apart.

Receding glaciers carved the lowlands and ridges 11–20,000 years ago and wind and waves still re-shape the coast and move the dunes today.

This beautiful landscape makes the dunes an ideal vacation spot. Development of private and commercial summer cottages began early in this century and has continued at an accelerating rate, threatening the unspoiled lakeshore with unplanned, overcrowded ugliness, an extension of our urban sprawls.

Rampant subdivision, land speculation and uncontrolled tourist developments have accompanied the advance of urban families.

In 1959 the National Park Service made a survey of the Great Lakes and recognized the Sleeping Bear region as one of the twelve most important areas to be preserved for its scientific and recreational values.

The long battle to try to save the area as a National Lakeshore was begun in 1961 by Michigan Senator Philip A. Hart. Eight years have passed since then, and private developers continue to destroy the scenery, while some legislators foment controversy by misinforming the area's people.

Recognizing the urgency, conservation and civil groups in Michigan and nationwide are demanding immediate attention to the Bear. Last fall the powerful Sierra Club—having won its long battle for a Redwood National Park—adopted a strong resolution in support of the National Lakeshore.

The reasons for creating a National Lakeshore are obvious.

The proposed lakeshore lies in Benzie and Leelanau Counties, both of which could benefit from a boost to their lagging economies. Logging days have passed, and although manufacturing and agriculture have increased, they are slipping to second and third place in importance.

Tourism is the booming business. The region's proximity to the 20 million inhabitants of the Detroit and Chicago areas, its appeal to sportsmen—particularly the Coho Salmon fishermen—and its sheer beauty, make Sleeping Bear an attractive vacation area.

National Park Service Studies estimate that by the fifth year of operation, the lakeshore would draw more than three million annual visits and add as much as $20 million to the area's economy every year.

Part of the money would come directly from tourists, part from government payrolls and contracts and the rest from private construction of motels, restaurants, service stations and stores. Although the park service would preserve the dunes' natural features, the region would be developed to accommodate the vacationers it is bound to draw.

But opposition, led by Rep. Guy Vander Jagt (R–9th District), the area's Congressman, has blocked creation of the lakeshore.

Many opponents of Sleeping Bear Lakeshore are summer residents, people who live in the area only a few months of the year. They refuse to realize every American cannot have 40 acres and a mule on an undeveloped lakeshore. They have succeeded in blocking the proposal by a campaign of real and threatened reprisals.

Businessmen in the area who spoke out in favor of the proposal have been hurt financially by boycotts by the summer residents. Thus many businessmen refuse to support the park because boycotts could ruin their already marginal operations.

And some legislators still sought to mislead the local residents. In 1963 residents wrote to the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands claiming they had been told that the Park Service would suddenly take land that had been in the family for generations.

The impresssion was given that after the initial acreage was acquired, the Park Service would continue to condemn and add land to the lakeshore's size—that the Park Service administrators were land-grabbers who would not be satisfied until every scrap of land was in their hands.

Opponents of the lakeshore claim that the present 61,000 acres is too much. They oppose setting aside areas that are not specifically the Sleeping Bear Dunes. The North and South Manitou Islands, several bays and some inland lakes would be part of the proposed park.

If just the Dunes were preserved, the varied landscape would be lost to land-grabbers. Alongside the natural dunes would be motel strips and subdivisions. And many of the reasons for keeping Sleeping Bear Dunes in the National Park System would be lost.

Sen. Hart has strongly championed the importance of preserving this total landscape and environment of Sleeping Bear Dunes.

Sen. Hart's bill to create the lakeshore goes overboard to protect private owners. Sleeping Bear would not be a national park per se, but a national lakeshore, and the intent of the Park Service would be to stabilize development, not remove it.

The bill provides for zoning to include improved private property in the Lakeshore area. This property could be condemned only if the owner used it for purposes such as subdividing or commercial enterprise that would adversely affect the lakeshore's quality.

The bill would allow the private owners who have already built a home to stay. Their property will be permanently protected from condemnation by the Park Service, and may be sold or transferred to heirs. Fair market value will be paid for any private property that is acquired.

As Sen. Hart points out, "It is not proposed that homes fall to the bulldozers: the basic objective is to preserve the beauty and values which make this area so matchless."

Park foes have created a furor by claiming that the proposal would remove $70,000 in tax revenues every year, part of which would normally go to support the area's schools. But improved private property, which pays most of the taxes, will not be acquired by the federal government, and the tax loss will actually be very minor. Efforts are under way to have te state make up any temporary tax loss which may occur.

Besides, creation of a National Lakeshore would increase revenues and also make the area eligible for federal aid to schools, insuring that the proposed park would not cause erosion of the tax base.

Since the initial cries of outrage, many local residents—their fears allayed—have recognized the major benefits that would come from establishing the park.

But despite growing local support, Rep. Vander Jagt has continued his stubborn opposition to the bill.

Although Rep. Vander Jagt agrees that the Dunes should be saved, he has insisted that this can best be done through the Michigan State Park system. But as Michigan Parks administrators have pointed out, Sleeping Bear is much too unique to be preserved on a state level. Sleeping Bear deserves federal, not state, administration standards.

Ten years have passed since the Sleeping Bear Dunes region was first recognized nationally. Ten years of political bickering and controversy, from the town of Frankfort, south of the Dunes, to Washington. Ten years that had seen land-grabbers despoil the countryside and force land prices up.

Both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, supported by former Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, backed the passage of the Sleeping Bear proposal. The new legislation introduced by Sen. Hart and Rep. Lucien Nedzi (D-14th District), has the backing of a majority of the local residents, and many Michigan legislators.

Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel has stated he is in favor of additions to the park system, especially near urban areas. Rep. Vander Jagt has presented Hickel with a compromise that would significantly decrease an area needed for the lakeshore. If Hickel is truly in favor of conservation he must deny Vander Jagt's proposal and support immediate passage of Sen. Hart's bill.

Rep. Vander Jagt has said that the Sleeping Bear Dunes have gone through many years of political torture. If he will accept the views of the majority of his constituents, that torture can end.

The last bill passed the Senate, but not the House of Representatives. Now is the time for the House to ignore Rep. Vander Jagt and act.

Sen. Hart's bill has twice passed the Senate. It has been favorably reported by the House Interior Committee. But well-placed opponents have managed to keep it from coming to a vote in the House of Representatives.

Further delay means further desecration of the land by profit-motivated developers. If "the Bear" is to be saved for future generations it is mandatory that Congress act now.

PRESIDENT NOTES CONFUSION IN EQUAL EMPLOYMENT COMPLIANCE

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I note from the President's news conference this morning that the problems of complying with the intent of title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act have gained national attention.

If I recall correctly what the President said, he mentioned that the South Carolina textile contracts that have received attention were a matter of concern to the Department of Defense and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance—OFCC—while the North Carolina textile concern in question is under scrutiny of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—EEOC—and the enforcement powers which derive from the 1964 act and are administered by the Justice Department.

The President noted that under these circumstances one might well get the impression that this administration's record has been mixed so far in the employment discrimination field.

Therefore I invite the Senate's attention once again to the bill, S. 931, which I introduced on February 7 of this year and which has been referred to the Judiciary Committee. The bill would have the effect of eliminating the confusion and overlap that presently exists between the EEOC and the OFCC. Our distinguished minority leader has noted the difficulties involved here and been attacked because he has attempted to defend businessmen from harassment by overzealousness in these agencies. I placed in the Record on April 1 this year some of the examples of harassment that have been reported to me.

It would seem to me that we can perform a considerable service to the Nation if we move forward toward removing the confusion that presently exists in this area. I, therefore, renew my request that S. 931 be given consideration as a means to the end of creating an atmosphere in which we can achieve a genuinely fair approach to this significant problem.

DEATH OF ROBERT E. JOHNSON, MALIBU, CALIF.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I learned earlier this week of the death of Robert E. Johnson, of Malibu, Calif., on Friday, March 28, 1969. He was an informed and articulate authority on military procurement. Mr. Johnson was born in Iowa on September 14, 1925, and grew up in Gowanda, N.Y. He received a B.A. in business administration in 1951 and an M.A. in economics in 1952 from George Washington University. During this period he was a member of the economics faculty at that institution. In 1953 he joined the staff of the Logistics Department at the Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif. In 1956, he began service as department chairman with the Combat Operations Research Group, a unit of Technical Research, Inc. He returned to the Rand Corp. in 1960 and for the past several years had served as leader of its procurement group. His recent work involved military transportation, foreign economic aid, missile test systems, ground combat simulation, and command and control systems.

I first met Mr. Johnson when he testified before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly during the summer of 1968 on the need for greater competition in the procurement by the military services of military hard goods and the desirability of competition in the reprocurement process. His testimony proved him to be an innovative thinker. A particular proposal of his which demonstrated this was his description of the desirability of providing improved access to technology by military contractors through a new form of compulsory licensing which would be combined with commercial transfer techniques.

Mr. President, I pay tribute to the service which Robert Johnson performed as a teacher, an economist, and a leader among thinkers on the military procurement process. He was fearless where the public need was concerned. He had many friends among military contractors, yet did not draw away from offering ideas which some might think to be to the economic detriment of these and other contractors. He saw no reason to refrain from criticizing policies of the military, though his employer was itself a contractor of the U.S. Air Force and possibly subject, therefore, to pressures from individual officers who might feel such criticism applied to them personally. He was a man of strong personal convictions with the public interest constantly in the forefront of his thinking.

Mr. Johnson is survived by his wife, Betty Abbott, his daughters, Linda and Leslie, and his father, R. J. Johnson of Gowanda, N.Y. To them I send my deepest sympathy.

ARMY S. SGT. LESTER HUDSON, OF POINT PLEASANT, W. VA., CHOSEN ONE-MILLIONTH MAN TO PARTICIPATE IN REST AND RECUPERATION LEAVE FOR VIETNAM VETERANS, UNDER AIRLIFT ARRANGEMENTS WITH PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the continuing conflict in Southeast Asia has been debated in this Chamber many times. I have expressed my feelings on our involvement in Vietnam. It is to be hoped that negotiations in Paris will be successful and that genuine peace and stability can be achieved soon.

Regardless of the individual's feeling concerning the war, surely it is imperative that we continue to give the highest priority to supporting the needs of our valiant servicemen involved in it.

Next to coming home to rejoin their loved ones, our battle-weary men look forward to their rest and recuperation leave. This R. & R. 5-day vacation, as developed by Pan American World Airways, has reached a new milestone—the carriage of the 1 millionth serviceman from Vietnam to Hawaii.

On April 8, 1969, Army S. Sgt. Lester Hudson of Point Pleasant, W. Va., arrived in Honolulu on board a special R. & R. flight. He was chosen as the millionth man, although there were four "millionth" men, one from each of the four military services in Vietnam.

Each branch of service having men coming to Hawaii for R. & R. was asked to nominate a contender for the millionth man title and of the four names drawn by lot, Sergeant Hudson won the honor. The other honored servicemen selected were Navy Gunner Specialist Mate Thomas A. Bruemer of St. Louis, Air Force Sgt. Joseph O. Durrance of Jacksonville, Fla., and Marine Sgt. Richard L. Jaramillo of Eagle Mountain, Calif. Their wives, who had all been flown to Hawaii the day before by Pan Am, were at planeside to greet their husbands. They were all escorted to the Governor's Lounge at Honolulu International Airport along a red-carpeted route, past a military color guard and a reception line which included top military and civilian leaders who were present to honor those men as representatives of their respective services.

Sergeant Hudson, a West Virginia constituent, was an excellent choice. This much-decorated serviceman typifies the high caliber of our fighting men in Vietnam. His awards include the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, the Army Commendation Medal, the Air Medal and the Combat Infantryman's Badge.

Because of the splendid cooperation of Pan American World Airways with our Government, I feel this event is noteworthy and newsworthy.

REPORTS ON FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS UTILIZED BY COMMITTEES IN 1968 IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the committees of the Senate, certain joint committees, and parliamentary bodies concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by those committees in 1968 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jack R. Miller:											
Australia	Australian dollars	186.47	207.00	90.00	100.00	15.00	16.65	17.17	20.47	308.64	344.12
New Zealand	New Zealand dollars	24.98	27.50	30.00	33.82			2.38	3.00	57.36	64.32
India	Rupees			50.00	6.74			25.00	3.06	75.00	9.80
Pakistan	do	74.30	8.80	40.00	4.70			7.70	.90	122.00	14.40
Total			243.30		145.26		16.65		27.43		432.64

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	432.64

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mar. 4, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S currency
Senator Gordon Allott:											
France-Switzerland	DM						832.40				832.40
France	Fr. franc	608.75	121.75	303.14	61.24			108.90	22.00		204.99
Switzerland	Sw. franc			122.65	28.46					122.65	28.46
Senator Robert C. Byrd:											
U.S.S.R	Ruble=$1.11	259.46	288.00	105.86	117.50	81.08	90.00	51.35	57.00	497.75	552.50
Ireland	Pound=$2.40	28.14.7	68.95	28.16.0	69.12	9.19.0	23.88	14.13.9	35.25	82.3.4	197.20
United Kingdom	do	38.7.9	92.13	67.19.2	163.10			27.18.0	66.96	134.4.11	322.19
Air travel: Washington, Moscow, intermediate points, and return.	Netherland guilder =$0.27579.					3,997.30	1,102.40			3,997.30	1,102.40
Senator Allen J. Ellender:											
Transportation	Russian rubles					1,966	2,184.66			1,966	2,184.66
Transportation	Netherlands guilders					8,957	2,475.11			8,957	2,475.11
Australia	Australian dollars					179.32	179.32			179.32	179.32
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollars					42.35	6.93	1,218	200	1,260.35	206.93
Indonesia	Rupees							21,150	50	21,150	50.00
Japan	Yen					8,853	24.59			8,853	24.59
New Zealand	New Zealand dollars					107.04	120,04			107.04	120.04
Taiwan	North Taiwan dollars.							6,000	150	6,000	150.00
Senator Roman L. Hruska:											
France	Franc	441.00	90.00	220.50	45.00	73.50	15.00			735.00	150.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	35.75	9.07	19.25	4.88	124.60	31.60			179.60	45.55
Austria	Shilling	3,354.00	130.00	1,806.00	70.00	489.96	19.04			5,649.96	219.04

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Jacob K. Javits:											
Belgium	Franc		108.00		80.00		958.10		62.00		1,208.10
France	do		110.00		60.00		132.77		39.00		341.77
England	Pound sterling		None		40.00		10.00		10.00		60.00
Germany	DM		100.00		20.00		10.00		10.00		140.00
Italy	Lire		50.00		40.00		20.00		20.00		130.00
Senator John C. Stennis:											
Germany	DM	144	36.00	259.80	64.95	145.70	36.44	28.80	7.21	578.40	144.60
United Kingdom	Pounds	37.2	89.45	22.3	53.66	11.1	26.84	3.7	8.95	74.5	178.90
Italy	Lire	19,063	30.60	11,438	18.36	5,719	9.18	1,906	3.06	38,127	61.20
France	Francs	247.50	49.90	148.50	29.90	219.60	44.38	24.75	4.95	640.35	129.13
Senator Ralph W. Yarborough:											
Vietnam	Piasters	14,855	125.09	1,429	12.50			1,673	14.61	17,960	152.20
Thailand	Baht	902.25	43.65	1,171.99	56.70	434.07	21.00	596.40	28.65	3,100	150.00
Hong Kong and Macao	Dollar	644.54	105.79	305.50	50.00	183.30	30.00	145.66	23.84	1,279	209.63
Transportation	Marks					7,548.83	1,877.12				1,877.12
Defense expenditures in Vietnam									55.10		55.10
Kenneth J. Bousquet:											
Curacao, Netherlands Antilles	Guilders	250	141.00	200	112.80		205.00	15.35	8.70	465.35	467.50
Robert B. Clark:											
Lebanon	Lebanese pounds	142.36	45.00	257.26	81.33			44.28	14.00	443.90	140.33
Pakistan	Rupees	264	55.00	317	66.04	49	10.20	28	5.41	658	136.65
India	do	215	28.28	117	15.40			18	2.37	350	46.05
Hong Kong	HK$	320	52.54	485	79.83	28	4.60	35	5.75	868	142.72
Japan	Yen	27,244	75.68	35,466	98.50	29,588	82.19	2,288	6.35	94,586	262.72
Philippines	Pesas	243	62.04	552.95	141.16	11	2.81	100	25.53	906.95	231.54
Italy	U.S. dollars		46.00		49.00						95.00
United States	U.S. dollars		24.00		23.00		16.00				63.00
Transportation	Pakistan rupees					6,008.64	1,247.90			6,008.64	1,247.90
Pual J. Cotter:											
England	Pound (1 Pd.=$2.40)	25/17/8	62.11	4/15/0	11.40	5/5/0	12.59	1/5/0	3.00	37/2/8	89.10
Germany	D-Mark (4 DM=$1.00)	197.45	49.35	114.60	28.65	20.00	5.00	26.00	6.50	358.00	89.50
France	Franc (4.95F=$1.00)	283.80	57.33	66.53	13.44	9.15	1.85	17.32	3.50	376.80	76.12
Italy	Lira (622L=$1.00)	42,580	68.46	23,797	38.26	5,906	9.50	7,937	12.75	80,220	128.97
Tunisia	T. Dinar (.525D=$1.00)	8,019	15.27	.499	9.52	.787	1.50	1.575	3.00	15.375	29.29
Turkey	T. Lira (9L=$1.00)	245.00	27.22	68.04	7.56	15.74	1.75	42.72	4.75	371.50	41.28
Lebanon	L. Pound (L. Pd. 3.165=$1.00)	137.050	43.30	50.007	15.80	5.064	1.60	8.167	2.58	200.30	63.28
Pakistan	P. Rupee (7 Rp.=$1.00)	332.12	47.31	84.00	12.00			22.04	3.15	437.25	62.46
India	I. Rupee (7.60 Rp.=$1.00)	877.63	115.48	465.87	61.30	89.30	11.75	110.20	14.50	1,543.00	203.03
Thailand	Baht (20.67B=$1.00)	828.40	40.08	304.96	14.75	1,431.00	69.23	69.04	3.34	2,633.40	127.40
Hong Kong	HK Dollar (HK$6.105=$1.00)	285.24	46.72	161.88	26.52	10.99	1.80	27.27	4.46	485.35	79.50
Philippines	Peso (3.9125P=$1.00)	107.28	27.42	56.74	14.50	5.87	1.50	21.99	5.62	191.88	49.04
Japan	Yen (360Y=$1.00)	13.860	38.50	6,030	16.75	1,188	3.30	2,372	6.59	23,450	65.14
International transportation (airline ticket).	Indian Rupees					12,220.42	1,607.95			12,220.42	1,607.95
Gene E. Godley:											
Vietnam	Piasters	13,522	114.58	3,116	28.42			944	8.00	17,700	151.00
Thailand	Baht	1,202	58.15	1,131	54.70	397	19.20	374	18.00	3,100	150.05
Hong Kong	Dollar	618.85	101.28	303.21	50.57	33.61	5.50	18.38	3.00	974	160.35
German	Marks					7,529	1,877.12			7,529	1,877.12
Defense expenditures in Vietnam									51.49		51.49
Joe E. Gonzales:											
Argentina	Pesos	17,700	50.57	12,250	35.00	3,500	10.00	4,049	11.57	37,449	107.14
Uruguay	Pesos	10,925	43.70	7,500	30.00	2,000	8.00	1,412	5.65	21,837	87.35
Brazil	New Cruzeiros	100	26.21	35	8.50					135	34.71
Paraguay	Guaranis			630	5.00			370	3.00	1,000	8.00
Peru	Soles	524	11.80	444	10.00	132	3.00	119	2.11	1,220	26.91
Bolivia	Pesos	261	21.75	159	13.11			35	2.90	455	37.76
Ecuador	Sucres	1,025	51.25	680	24.88			45	2.57	1,749	78.70
	German marks					2,591	645.97			2,591	645.97
William H. Jordan, Jr.:											
Hong Kong, British Crown Colony	Hong Kong dollar	96	15.71	82.15	13.45	21	3.43	1,135	1.86	210.50	34.45
Do	U.S. dollars								4.25		4.25
South Vietnam	Piastres	13,366	113.27	2,912	24.68			962	8.15	17,240	146.10
Do	U.S. dollars				22.75						22.75
Thailand	Baht	1,190	57.57	965	46.69			40.50	1.96	2,195.50	106.22
Do	U.S. dollars								3.25		3.25
Indonesia	Rupiah	21,320	52.25	4,651	11.40	40.30	9.88	1,274	3.12	31,275	76.65
Singapore	U.S. dollars		14.00		12.65		13.50		1.20		41.35
Philippines	Peso	193.49	49.48	215.56	55.13			1,850	4.73	42,755	109.34
Korea	Korean won	12,100	44.00	5,420	19.71			1,250	4.54	18,770	68.25
Japan	Yen	30,880	85.77	23,597	65.54	4,925	13.68	2,950	8.19	62,350	173.18
Do	U.S. dollars				16.50						16.50
San Francisco	U.S. dollars		12.00		12.25		6.70		1.40		32.35
Washington, D.C	do						5.70				5.70
Transportation (airline ticket)	Marks					7,841.60	1,647.52				1,647.52
William J. Kennedy:											
Brazil	Cruzeiros	176	55.00	227.2	71.00	32	10.00	448	14.00	480	150.00
Argentina	Pesos	8,750	25.00	11,550	33.00	5,950	17.00	8,750	25.00	35,000	100.00
Transportation	Cruzeiros					5,060				5,060	
	Deutschemarks					1,680	2,000.83			1,680	2,000.83
Brazil	Cruzeiros	77.95	21.25	276.02	75.25	118.11	32.20	98.30	26.80	570.38	155.50
Republic of South Africa	Rands	64	89.50	53	72.80	15	19.75	12	17.95	144	200.00
Angola	Escudos			480	15.00	328	10.25	203	6.35	1,011	31.60
Liberia	do			202	6.30	181	5.65	206	6.45	589	18.40
Sierra Leone	Leoni			13.5	16.25	6.2	7.40	12.4	14.85	32.1	38.50
Senegal	do			15.6	18.75	7.7	9.25	7.5	9.00	30.8	37.00
Madeira Island	do			17.7	21.25	6.0	7.25	5.4	6.50	29.1	35.00
Transportation	Cruzeiros					12,790.8	3,523.64			12,790.8	3,523.64

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
J. S. Kimmitt:											
Germany	D.M	211.80	52.95	373	93.25	179.70	44.94	45.60	11.30	809.70	202.44
United Kingdom	Pounds	37.2	89.45	22.3	53.66	11.1	26.84	3.7	8.95	74.5	178.90
Italy	Lire	19063	30.60	11438	18.36	5719	9.18	1906	3.06	38127	61.20
France	Francs	247.50	49.90	148.50	29.90	74.25	14.95	24.75	4.95	495	99.70
Albert A. Lakeland:											
England	Pounds	39.1.6	95.00	26	63.00	4.4	10.00	2.4	5.20	71.96	173.20
Germany	Marks	117.70	29.42	6100	15.25	2000	5.00	1132	2.83	210.02	52.50
Italy	Lira	15,990	25.75	17,150	27.45	9,345	15.00	3,115	5.00	45,600	73.20
Italy	Lira (paid by U.S. Embassy in Rome).					4,950	7.96			4,950	7.96
Germany	Marks (air transportation).					2,660.20	668.22			2,660.20	668.22
Guy G. McConnell:											
U.S.S.R	Ruble=$1.11	259.46	288.00	105.86	117.50	81.08	90.00	51.35	57.00	497.75	552.50
Ireland	Pound=$2.40	28.14.7	68.95	28.7.10	68.14	38.7.2	92.06	3.4.6	7.74	98.14.1	236.89
United Kingdom	Pounds and U.S. dollars.		92.13	58.17.9	160.60	23.1.3	55.35	7.12.9	18.33	89.11.9	326.41
Air travel; Washington, Moscow, intermediate points, and return.	Netherland, Guilder=$.27579					4,052.43	1,117.62			4,052.43	1,117.62
James Minotto:											
Panama	U.S. dollars		15.00		3.50		1.00		2.00		21.50
Brazil	N. cruzieros	1,008	315.00	853	266.56	90	28.13	184	57.50	2,135	667.19
Uruguay	Pesos	14,500	58.41	14,633	59.04	1,241	5.00	1,986	8.00	32,360	130.45
Paraguay	Guaranies	3,780	30.00	2,625	20.84	630	5.00	528	4.00	7,563	59.84
Argentina	Pesos	86,450	247.00	67,130	191.80	4,200	12.00	11,340	32.40	169,120	483.20
Chile	Escudos	2,290	286.61	1,980	247.81	120	15.00	253	31.68	4,643	581.10
Peru	Sols	2,502	57.52	2,296	52.78	150	3.45	520	12.00	5,465	125.75
Venezuela	Bolivars	714.85	159.38	399.70	89.12	49.34	11.00	69.52	15.50	1,233.41	275.00
Trinidad	U.S. dollars		13.47		13.99		10.00		4.00		41.46
Guyana	do		25.38		23.35		5.13		4.15		58.01
Trinidad	do		28.60		21.70		4.50		7.10		61.90
Barbados	do		14.67		13.48		2.00		2.50		32.65
Dominican Republic	Pesos	114.75	114.75	74.50	74.50	11.25	11.25	9.00	9.00	290.50	209.50
Jamaica	U.S. dollars		65.28		54.00		13.20		8.58		141.06
Panama	do		56.40		53.85		7.00		16.95		134.20
Costa Rica	Colones	304	41.26	225	30.52	50	6.78	55	7.46	634	86.02
Nicaragua	Cordobas	99.50	14.22	60.50	8.64	28	4.00	15	3.14	210	30.00
Honduras	Lempiras			18	9.00	15	7.50	42	21.00	75	37.50
El Salvador	Colones	123	49.20	110	44.00	15	6.00	10	4.00	258	103.20
Guatemala	Quetzales	42	42.00	43	43.00	9	9.00	6	6.00	100	100.00
Panama	U.S. dollars		12.00		11.75		218.00		4.00		245.75
Mexico	do		101.88		91.72		26.00		10.00		229.60
Puerto Rico	do								5.00		5.00
Transportation	do						186.60				186.60
Do	German marks						2,493.30				2,493.30
Vorley M. Rexroad:											
Belgium	Belgium franc	1,000	20.00	450	9.00	850	17.00	200	4.00	2,500	50.00
Germany	Mark	160	40.00	380	95.00	4,122.80	1,028.15	60	15.00	4,722.80	1,178.15
Italy	Lira	31,200	50.00	37,440	60.00	18,720	30.00	6,240	10.00	93,600	150.00
Spain	Peseta	6,275	90.00	6,620	95.00	690	10.00	340	5.00	13,925	200.00
Portugal	Escudo	1,430	50.00	1,144	40.00	143	5.00	143	5.00	2,860	100.00
England	Pound	29	70.00	31	75.00			2	5.00	62	150.00
Expenses in United States	Dollar								42.86		42.86
Raymond L. Schafer:											
United Kingdom	English pound	35–12–1	84.90	34–0–3	81.10	30–6–7	72.32	9–9–7	22.60	109–8–6	260.92
Ireland	Irish pound	32–13–6	78.00	18–15–0	44.76	28–18–6	69.05	7–6–7	17.50	87–13–7	209.31
Denmark	Danish krona	740.80	98.80	554.85	74.00	927.04	123.64	161.96	21.60	2,384.66	318.04
Germany	Deutsche marks	273.40	68.35	215.00	53.75	61.80	15.45	49.80	12.45	600.00	150.00
Netherlands	Guilders	241.64	67.20	199.72	55.54	46.03	12.80	32.61	9.07	520.00	144.61
France	French francs	425.32	86.80	371.66	75.85	144.11	29.41	116.13	23.70	1,057.22	215.76
Italy	Lira	80,814	130.10	66,589	107.20	91,653	147.55	20,374	32.80	259,430	417.65
Turkey	do	706.50	78.50	513.00	57.00	41.40	4.60	89.10	9.90	1,350.00	150.00
Lebanon	Pounds	325.80	103.20	227.94	72.20	40.72	12.90	36.94	11.70	631.40	200.00
Israel	Israel pounds	347.38	99.25	224.17	64.05	4,167.31	1,190.66	62.30	17.80	4,801.16	1,371.76
Greece	Drachmus	3,709	123.63	2,359	78.65	965	32.15	447	14.90	7,480	249.33
Spain	Pesetas	[1] 2,169.62	174.60	8,859.57	127.11	2,003.87	28.75	1,847.05	26.50	24,880.11	356.96
Portugal	Escuedos	2,825.24	98.75	1,931.18	67.50	546.45	19.10	419.13	14.65	5,722.00	200.00
Mexico	Pesos	1,856.01	148.60	1,090.75	87.33	760.99	60.96	470.25	37.65	4,178.00	334.54
Transportation	U.S. dollars						493.06				493.06
William Spell:											
Germany	D.M	211.80	52.95	373	93.25	179.70	44.94	45.60	11.30	809.70	202.44
Belgium	Francs	6,250	125.00	3,750	75.00	1,875	37.50	625	12.50	12,500	250.00
United Kingdom	Pounds	37.2	89.45	22.3	53.66	11.1	26.84	3.7	8.95	74.5	178.90
Italy	Lire	19,063	30.60	11,438	18.36	5,719	9.18	1,906	3.06	38,127	61.20
France	Francs	247.50	49.90	148.50	29.90	74.25	14.95	24.75	4.95	495	99.70
Mary L. Vaughan:											
England	Pound (1 Pd.=$2.40)	25/17/8	62.11	4/15/0	11.40	5/5/0	12.59	1/5/0	3.00	37/2/8	89.10
Germany	D-Mark (4 DM=$1.00).	197.45	49.35	114.60	28.65	20.00	5.00	26.00	6.50	358.00	89.50
France	Franc (4.95F=$1.00)	283.80	57.33	66.53	13.44	9.15	1.85	17.32	3.50	376.80	76.12
Italy	Lira (622L=$1.00)	42,580	68.46	23,797	38.26	5,906	9.50	7,937	12.75	80,220	128.97
Tunisia	Dinar (.525D=$1.00)	8.019	15.27	.499	9.52	.787	1.50	1.575	3.00	15.375	29.29
Turkey	T. Lira (9L=$1.00)	245.00	27.22	68.04	7.56	15.74	1.75	42.72	4.75	371.50	41.28
Lebanon	L. pound (L. Pd. 3.165=$1.00).	137.050	43.30	50.007	15.80	5.064	1.60	8.167	2.58	200.30	63.28
Pakistan	P. rupee (7 Rp.=$1.00).	332.12	47.31	84.00	12.00			22.04	3.15	437.25	62.46
India	I. rupee (7.60 Rp.=$1.00).	877.63	115.48	465.87	61.30	89.30	11.75	110.20	14.50	1,543.00	203.03
Thailand	Baht (20.67B=$1.00).	828.40	40.08	304.96	14.75	31.00	1.50	69.04	3.34	1,233.40	59.67
Hong Kong	H.K. dollar (HK $6.105=$1.00).	285.24	46.72	161.88	26.52	32.64	5.34	27.27	4.46	507.00	83.04
Philippines	Peso (3.9125P=$1.00).	107.28	27.42	56.74	14.50	5.87	1.50	21.99	5.62	191.88	49.04
Japan	Yen (360Y=$1.00)	13,860	38.50	6,030	16.75	1,188	4.30	2,372	6.59	23,450	66.14
International transportation (airline ticket).	Indian rupees					12,220.42	1,607.95			12,220.42	1,607.95
Total			9,247.87		6,946.13		33,741.29		2,362.77		52,298.06

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	49,897.27
Appropriated funds:	
Government department:	
Defense Department	480.60
State Department	1,269.13
Agriculture Department	493.06
AID	158.00
Total	52,298.06

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations.

Mar. 31, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Stephen M. Young:											
Hawaii	United States		31.20		30.50				28.30		90.00
Japan	Yen			7,560	21.00			10,440	29.00	180.00	50.00
Hong Kong	HK$	137.50	22.65	242.80	40.00			226.71	37.35	607.01	100.00
Thailand	Baht	6.60	32.00	721.70	35.00			639.22	31.00	98.00	98.00
Laos	Kip			10,000	20.00			15,000	30.00	25,000	50.00
Vietnam	Piaster			3,540	30.00			2,242	19.00	57.82	49.00
Israel	Pounds	42.35	12.00	87.50	25.00			77.00	22.00	206.85	59.00
Airline ticket	Israeli pounds					7,983.	1,993.44			7,983.22	1,993.44
Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr.:											
Italy	Lira	5,100	8.17	6,100	9.78					11,200	17.95
Greece	Drachma	478	15.93	122	4.07					600	20.00
United Arab Republic	Pounds	15.50	27.93	11.05	19.91					26.550	47.84
Turkey	Lira	140	15.55	146	16.22					286	31.77
Harry P. Byrd Jr :											
Cyprus	Pounds	7.634	18.47	2.696	,6.53					10.330	25.00
Israel	do	109.10	31.17	97.90	27.97					207	59.14
West Germany	Marks					5,437.36	1,359.00			5,437.36	1,359.00
Jack R. Miller:											
Singapore	Singapore dollar	189.65	63.22	90.00	30.00	21.00	7.00	38.35	12.78	339.00	113.00
Lebanon	LL	43.25	13.65					15.10	4.75	58.35	18.40
Israel	IL	118.80	34.00	87.50	25.00	7,191.75	2,140.50	11.95	3.30	7,720.50	2,202.80
West Germany	Marks	55.00	13.75	12.00	3.00			23.00	5.75	90.00	22.50
Venezuela	Bolivar	170.00	37.94	101.85	22.72			16.40	3.67	288.25	64.33
Brazil	Cruzeiro	240.26	75.05	98.71	30.50	69.33	21.69	57.70	17.90	466.00	145.14
Argentina	Peso	23,315	66.70	13,540	38.75	6,807	19.45	7,549	21.60	51,211	146.50
Chile	Escudo	329.40	48.05	296.70	43.30			151.30	22.05	777.40	113.40
Peru	Sol	881.40	22.45	917.40	23.40			570.10	14.65	2,368.90	60.50
Senator Jack R. Miller: Panama	Dollar		37.50		26.40				5.30		69.20
Senator Thomas J. McIntyre:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	120.00	46.89	172.06	38.40			63.00	14.05	445.06	99.34
Brazil	Cruzeiro	272.96	85.25	228.83	71.05	69.33	21.69	47.25	14.78	618.37	192.77
Argentina	Peso	26,454	75.85	5,915	16.90	6,807	19.45	1,100	3.15	40,276	115.35
Chile	Escudo	462.48	67.45	343.88	50.20	135.70	19.80	83.23	12.15	1,025.29	149.60
Peru	Sol			230	5.90			155	3.95	385	9.85
Panama	Dollar		45.00		39.05				5.85		89.90
Senator Robert C. Byrd:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	170.00	37.94	79.28	17.70					249.28	55.64
Brazil	Cruzeiro	354.66	110.80	197.82	61.82	69.33	21.69			621.81	194.31
Germany	DM					13,221	339.00			13,221	339.00
Stuart P. French:											
Korea	Won	51,729	189.03	35,027	128.00	61,57	22.50	7,484	27.35	100,397	366.88
Japan	Yen	69,433	192.87	53,460	148.50	10,080	28.00	11,520	32.00	144,493	401.37
Stuart P. French, airline fare	Deutsche marks					6,466	1,616.50			6,466	1,616.50
Ben Gilleas:											
Germany	Marks	211.80	52.95	373	93.25	179.70	44.94	45.60	11.30	809.70	202.44
Belgium	Francs	6,250	125.00	3,750	75.00	1,875	37.50	625	12.50	12.500	250.00
United Kingdom	Pounds	37.2	89.45	22.3	53.66	11.1	26.84	3.7	8.95	74.5	178.90
Italy	Lira	19,063	30.60	11,438	18.36	5,719	9.18	1,906	3.06	38,127	61.20
France	Francs	247.50	49.90	148.50	29.90	74.25	14.95	24.75	4.95	495	99.70
Col. Paul B. Henley:											
Italy	Lira	5,100	8.17	4,000	6.41			2,100	3.37	11,200	17.95
Greece	Drachma	478	15.93	122	4.07			200	6.67	800	26.67
United Arab Republic	Pounds	15.50	27.93	11.05	19.91					26,550	47.84
Turkey	Lira	140	15.55	119	13.22			27	3.00	286	31.77
Cyprus	Pounds	7.634	18.47	2.697	6.53					10,331	25.00
Israel	do	109.10	31.17	87.90	25.11			10.00	2.86	207	59.14
Col. Paul B. Henley, West Germany	Marks					5,437.36	1,359.00			5,437.36	1,359.0
Gordon A. Nease:											
Belgium	B. Francs	1,000	20.00	450	9.00	850	17.00	200	4.00	2,500	50.00
Germany	Marks	160	40.00	380	95.00	4,122.80	1,028.15	60	15.00	4,722.80	1,178.15
Italy	Lira	31,200	50.00	37,440	60.00	18,720	30.00	6,240	10.00	93,600	150.00
Spain	Pesetas	6,275	90.00	6,620	95.00	690	10.00	340	5.00	13,925	200.00
Portugal	Escudos	1,430	50.00	1,144	40.00	143	5.00	143	5.00	2,860	100.00
England	Pounds	29	70.00	31	75.00			2	5.00	62	150.00
Lt. Col. James F. Senechal:											
Korea	Won	51,729	189.03	12,220	44.66	4,800	17.54	4,880	17.83	73,629	269.06
Japan	Yen	69,432	192.87	6,550	18.19	3,340	9.53	3,080	8.55	82,492	229.14
Deutsche marks (airline fare)						6,700	1,660.50			6,700	1,660.50
Gen. Samuel R. Shaw:											
Korea	Won	51,729	189.03	36,397	133.00	6,157	22.50	6,799	24.85	101,082	369.38
Japan	Yen	69,433	192.87	55,269	153.50	10,530	29.25	10,980	30.50	146,203	406.12
Gen. Samuel R. Shaw, airline fare	Deutsche marks					6,466	1,616.50			6,466	1,616.50
Jack Stempler:											
Germany	Marks	211.80	52.95	373	93.25	179.70	44.94	45.60	11.30	809.70	202.44
Belgium	Francs	5,850	117.00	3,510	70.20	1,755	35.10	585	11.70	11,700	234.00
United Kingdom	Pounds	37.2	89.45	22.3	53.66	11.1	26.84	3.7	8.95	74.5	178.90
Italy	Lira	19,063	30.60	11,438	18.36	5,719	9.18	1,906	3.06	38,127	61.20
France	Francs	247.50	49.90	148.50	29.90	74.25	14.95	24.75	4.95	495	99.70
Cdr. Gordon R. West:											
Japan	Yen			9,000	25.00			9,000	25.00	1,800	50.00
Hong Kong	HK$	139.61	23.00	2,428	40.00			224.59	37.00	607	100.00
Thailand	Baht	660	32.00	721.70	35.00			639.22	31.00	2,020.76	98.00
Laos	Kip			10,000	20.00			15,000	30.00	25,000	50.00
Vietnam	Piaster			5,782	30.00			2,242	19.00	8,024	49.00
Israel	Pounds	42.35	12.00	87.50	25.00			77.00	22.00	206.50	59.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Comdr. Gordon R. West, airline fare	Israeli pound					7,983.22	1,993.44			7,983.22	1,993.44
Total			3,424.28		2,625.71		15,692.54		808.03		22,550.56

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	22,481.36
Other Legislative Reorganization Act	69.20
Total	22,550.56

JOHN C. STENNIS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

Mar. 14, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Edward W. Brooke:											
Germany	DM					6,624.40	1,654.45			6,624.40	1,654.45
Ivory Coast	CFAF			14,700	60.00			9800	40.00	24,500	100.00
Ghana	¢			61.30	60.00	40.70	40.00	51.06	50.00	153.06	150.00
Tanzania	Tsh			355.48	50.00	300.00	42.60	355.47	50.00	1,010.95	142.60
Kenya	KSh	600	80.00	300	50.00			165	20.00	1,065	150.00
Total			80.00		220.00		1,737.05		160.00		2,197.05
Clarence Elam:											
Germany	DM					6,680.40	1,668.43			6,680.40	1,668,43
Guinea	GFr					12,000	48.68				
Ivory Coast	CFAF	14,700	60.00	4,900	20.00			4,900	20.00	24,500	100.00
Ghana	¢	76.20	75.00	30.80	35.00	14.80	14.62	30.00	34.13	151.80	158.71
Clarence Elam:											
Nigeria	N			20.10.0	40.00	9.0.0	19.98	7.0.0	15.00	36.10.0	74.98
Congo	CZ	25	50.00	7.50	15.00	6.50	13.00			39.00	78.00
Zambia	ZK	75.00	100.00	40.00	60.00	62.50	869.28	26.16	40.00	761.66	1,069.28
Tanzania	Tsh	450.00	65.00			650.95	90.38			1100.95	155.38
Kenya	KSh	600.00	80.00	300.00	50.00	570.00	80.46	165.00	20.00	1635.00	230.46
Total			430.00		220.00		2804.83		129.13		3,583.96
Marilyn Dexheimer:											
Germany	DM					6624.40	1654.45			6624.40	1,654.45
Ivory Coast	CFAF	14,700.00	60.00	4900.00	20.00			4900.00	20.00	24500.00	100.00
Ghana	¢	76.50	75.00	25.50	25.00	20.40	20.00	30.66	30.00	153.06	150.00
Congo	CZ	25.00	50.00	7.50	15.00	6.50	13.00			39.00	78.00
Tanzania	Tsh					655.48	92.60	355.47	50.00	1,010.95	142.60
Kenya	KSh	600.00	80.00	300.00	50.00			165.00	20.00	1,065.00	150.00
Total			265.00		110.00		1,780.05		120.00		2,275.05
Walter F. Mondale:											
Belgium	BF	600.00	12.00	225.00	4.50					825.00	16.50
United Kingdom	L	16.6.6	39.18	19.10.0	46.80	18.5.6	43.86	4.19.3	11.91	59.1.3	141.75
France	Fr	414.00	84.49	474.03	96.74	193.16	39.42	143.81	29.35	1,225.00	250.00
Switzerland	SwF	138.00	31.79	246.30	56.75	398.80	91.89	223.30	51.46	1,006.40	231.89
Austria	S	205.25	7.96	82.50	3.20	765.96	29.70	561.29	21.66	1,615.00	62.52
Romania	Lei	576.00	48.49	475.00	39.98			258.00	21.72	1,309.00	110.19
U.S.S.R	Ruble	54.00	60.00	38.00	42.22			37.45	41.61	129.45	143.83
Senator Walter F. Mondale:											
Poland	Zl	370.60	5.70	2,600.00	40.00	2,242.50	34.50	1,286.90	19.80	6,500.00	100.00
Germany	DM					5,146.58	1,337.05			5,146.58	1,337.05
Total			289.61		330.19		1,576.42		197.51		2,393.73
Duane C. Scribner:											
Belgium	BF	600.00	12.00	195.00	3.40					795.00	15.40
United Kingdom	Pound	16.6.6	39.18	18.8.4	44.20	16.0.1	38.41	8.6.4	19.96	59.1.3	141.75
France	Fr	414.00	84.49	398.86	81.40	193.16	39.42	218.98	44.69	1,225.00	250.00
Switzerland	SwF	138.00	31.79	227.45	52.40	390.60	90.00	242.23	55.81	988.24	230.00
Austria	S	205.25	7.96	75.50	2.93	759.77	29.46	574.48	22.17	1,615.00	62.52
Romania	Lei	576.00	48.49	443.00	37.29			263.00	22.13	1,282.00	107.91
U.S.S.R	Ruble	36.00	40.00	32.00	35.56			61.45	68.27	129.45	143.83
Duane C. Scribner: Germany	DM					5,146.58	1,337.04			5,146.58	1,337.04
Total			263.91		257.18		1,534.33		233.03		2,288.45
Carl A. S. Coan:											
Australia	A$	141.50	157.82	86.85	96.86	14.00	15.61	44.79	49.96	287.14	320.25
Philippines	Peso	225.24	57.58	122.61	31.35	26.00	6.64	56.15	14.36	430.00	109.93
Taiwan	NT$	2,200.00	55.00	345.00	8.63	210.00	5.25	445.00	11.12	3,200.00	80.00
Hong Kong	HK$	332.20	54.41	137.00	22.44	18.00	2.95	106.70	17.48	593.90	97.28
Thailand	Baht	880.00	42.58	114.40	5.53	122.00	5.90	225.60	10.91	1,342.00	64.92
India	Rupee	474.48	70.33	240.55	35.65	12.50	1.85	32.47	4.81	760.00	112.64
Pakistan	do	180.00	25.66	89.90	12.81	21.50	3.06	40.10	5.72	331.50	47.20
Italy	Lira	80,480	129.18	29,120	46.75	24.00	3.85	12,600	20.22	124,600	200.05

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Carl A. S. Coan:											
Tunisia	Dinar	15,330	29.20	10,945	20.85			20,225	5.52	46,500	88.57
United Kingdom	£	2,315/	57.00	1,410/0	34.80	1,050/0	25.80	93/0	21.96	583/	139.56
Germany	DM					5,759.60	1,435.95			5,759.60	1,435.95
Total			678.76		315.67		1,506.86		195.06		2,696.35
Senator Charles H. Percy:											
Germany	Dollars						67.20				67.20
France	Francs	1,210.82	249.50	504.18	100.50	1,852.31	372.40			3,567.31	722.40
Total			249.50		100.50		439.60				789.60
Senator Edward V. Long:											
Japan	Yen	25,841	71.80	36,720	102.00	27,00	75.00	72.00	20.00	96,761	268.8
Hong Kong	H.K.$	336.17	55.00	305.25	50.00	244.20	40.00	213.68	35.00	1,099.30	180.00
Senator Edward V. Long:											
Thailand	Baht	14.33	69.25	1,240	60.00	723	35.00	620	30.00	4,016	194.25
India	Rupees	475.80	62.60	516.85	68.00	342	45.00	243.20	32.00	1,577.85	207.60
Nepal	do	311.88	31.00					155.40	15.00	467.28	46.00
Afghanistan	Afghanis	573	8.00	143	2.00			375.50	5.00	1,091.50	15.00
Iran	Rials	2,491	33.00	830	11.00	375	5.00	750	7.50	4,446	56.50
Lebanon	LL	9,480	30.00	110.60	35.00	79	25.00	31.60	10.00	316	100.00
Turkey	Liras	729.00	81.00	450.00	50.00	247.50	27.50	135.00	15.00	1,561.50	173.55
Italy	Lire	78,498	126.00	623.00	100.00	373.80	60.00	186.90	30.00	196,868	316.00
Spain	Pesetas	2,506	36.00	2,088	30.00	1,392	20.00	835	12.00	6,821	98.00
Germany	Marks	289.55	72.35	280.00	70.00	120.00	30.00	72.00	18.00	761.55	190.30
England	Pounds	42.32.7	101.00	25.16.0	60.00	10.00	24.00	7.00	16.80	84.48.0	201.80
Senator Edward V. Long:											
France	Franc	506.00	102.00	388.00	78.00	187.00	37.50	124.00	25.00	1,205.00	242.50
Switzerland	Swiss franc	180.50	42.00	257.85	60.00	128.93	30.00	85 95	20.00	653.23	152.00
Denmark	Danish kroner	582.93	77.60	232.87	31.00	157.75	21.00	112.68	15.00	108.623	144.60
Sweden	Swedish kroner	165.12	32.00	51.60	10.00			25.80	5.00	242.52	47.00
Norway	Norwegian kroner	178.25	25.00	85.56	12.00	49.91	7.00	71.30	10.00	385.02	54.00
Netherlands	f					8,091.32	2,084.80			8,091.32	2,084.80
Total			1,055.60		829.00		2,566.80		321.30		4,772.70
Helen Dunlop:											
Japan	Yen	21,276	59.00	18,000	50.00	90.00	25.00	36,00	10.00	51,876	144.00
Hong Kong	H.K.$	341.88	56.00	152.62	25.00	183.15	30.00	3,663	6.00	714.28	117.00
Thailand	Baht	1,384	67.00	826.	40.00	413	20.00	103	5.00	2,726	132.0
Helen Dunlop:											
India	Rupees	292.60	38.50	342.00	45.00	271.32	35.70	76.00	10.00	981.92	129.20
Nepal	do	318.06	31.00							318.06	31.00
Afghanistan	Afghanistan	573	8.00	143	2.00					716	10.00
Iran	Rials	2,475	33.00	750	10.00					3225	43.00
Lebanon	LL	79.00	25.00	63.20	20.00	37.92	12.00	15.80	5.00	195.92	62.00
Turkey	Liras	585.00	65.00	315.00	35.00	198.00	22.00	72.00	8.00	1,170.00	130.00
Italy	Lira	747.60	120.00	467.25	75.00	155.75	25.00	934.5	15.00	1,464.05	235.00
Spain	Pesetas	3,237.33	46.50	1,044.30	15.00	696.20	10.00	522.15	7.50	5,499.98	79.00
Germany	Marks	290.00	72.50	89.80	22.45	80.00	20.00	48.00	12.00	507.80	126.95
England	Pounds	25.19	61.00	20.16	48.00	8.	19.20	6.	14.40	59.55.0	142.60
France	Franc	340.19	68.45	273.35	55.00	99.40	20.00	2,485	5.00	737.79	148.45
Helen Dunlop:											
Switzerland	Swiss franc	180.49	42.00	171.90	40.00	64.46	15.00	30.08	7.00	446.93	104.00
Denmark	Danish franc	236.62	31.50	187.80	25.00	90.14	12.00	67.60	9.00	582.16	77.50
Sweden	Swedish kroner	103.20	20.00	25.80	5.00					129.10	25.00
Norway	Norwegain kroner	97.68	13.70	71.30	10.00					168.98	23.70
Netherlands	f					7,609.62	2,084.80			7,609.62	2,084.80
Subtotal			858.15		522.45		2,350.70		113.90		3,845.20
Total			4,170.53		2,904.99		16,296.64		1,469.93		24,842.09

RECAPITULATION	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$24,842.09

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency.

Feb. 27, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Barksdale, Thomas:											
Germany	D. Marks					7,454	1,861.64			7,454	1,861.64
Hong Kong	H.K.$	610	100.83	400	66.11	12.70	2.10	209.07	34.56	1,231.77	203.60
Japan	Yen	20,000	55.55	12,000	33.33			4,000	11.12	36,000	100.00
Vietnam	Piastres	13,354	113.17	2,295	19.44			219	1.85	15,868	134.46
Subtotal			269.55		118.88		1,863.74		47.53		2,299.70
Bevan, Donald:											
U.S.S.R	Rubles	180	199.80	71.30	79.15	43.60	48.40	20.40	22.65	315.30	350.00
Netherlands	DF					5,085.55	1,408.35			5,085.55	1,408.35
Subtotal			199.80		79.15		14,56.75		22.65		1,758.35

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Cotton, Norris:											
Republic of Panama	U.S.$		100.00		30.00		517.63		5.85		653.48
Dill, Clarence:											
U.S.S.R	Rubles	236	263.00	202.70	225.00	1,338.10	1,486.70	11.09	12.31	1,787.89	1,987.01
Netherlands	DF			56.58	15.63	36.20	10.00			92.78	25.63
Subtotal			263.00		240.63		1,496.70		12.31		2,012.64
Lordan, Frederick:											
Belgium	BF	5,625.	112.50	4,500.	90.00	1500.	30.00	875.	17.50	12,500	250.00
France	Fr	330.75	67.50	274.40	56.00	78.40	16.00	51.45	10.50	735.	150.00
Netherlands	DF					2,899.56	802.98			2,899.56	802.98
Subtotal			180.00		146.00		848.98		28.00		1,202.98
Moss, Frank E.:											
Germany	D. Marks					4,794.	1,197.31			4,794.	1,197.31
Hong Kong	H.K.$	610.	100.83	400.	66.11	412.60	68.54	200.	33.06	1,622.60	268.54
Japan	Yen	20,000	55.56	12,000.	33.34	12,516.	34.77	4,000.	11.12	48,516.	134.79
U.S.S.R	Rubles	100.	111.11	50.	55.56			6.	6.66	156	173.33
Netherlands	DG					4,605.20	1,270.05			4,605.20	1,270.05
Subtotal			267.50		155.01		2,570.67		50.84		3,044.02
Scott, Hugh:											
Denmark	Dkr	144.25	19.25	150	20.00	40.79	5.37	40.79	5.38	375.83	50.00
U.S.S.R	Rubles	114.40	127.15	114.41	127.15	62.95	69.95	85.70	94.49	377.46	418.74
England	Pounds	33.00	79.20	33.00	79.20			17.15	41.60	83.15	200.00
Netherlands	DF					4,264.36	1,178.00			4,264.36	1,178.00
Subtotal			225.60		226.35		1,253.32		141.47		1,846.74
Trice, J. Mark: Republic of Panama	U.S.$		100.00		22.00		464.35		3.00		591.35
Total			1,605.45		1,018.02		10,472.14		313.65		13,409.26

*If foreign currency is used, enter U.S.$ equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. equivalent)	$12,164.43
Appropriated funds:	
S. Res. 252	1,244.83
Total	13,409.26

Mar. 24, 1969

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1969

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hartke (July):											
England	Pounds	50.4.9	120.00	41.17.2	100.00	6.5.7	15.00	6.5.7	15.00	104.13.1	$250.00
(Local transportation)						5.12.0	13.35			5.12.0	13.35
Hartke (December):											
England	Pounds	31.8.0	75.00	20.18.8	50.00	4.3.9	10.00	6.5.7	15.00	62.16.0	150.00
Belgium	Francs	2,500	50.00	1,500	30.00	250	5.00	750	15.00	5,000	100.00
Netherlands	Florins	270.65	75.00	180.44	50.00	54.13	15.00	36.09	10.00	541.31	150.00
(Local transportation)						353.07	97.37			353.07	97.37
Switzerland	Francs	214.95	50.00	128.97	30.00	42.99	10.00	42.99	10.00	429.90	100.00
(Local transportation)						124.50	28.98			124.50	28.98
Austria	Schilling	2,574	100.00	882.20	30.00	128.70	5.00	386.10	15.00	3,861	150.00
(Local transportation)						2,647.6	102.70			2,647.6	102.70
Turkey	Lira	900	100.00	225.00	25.00	135.00	15.00	90	10.00	1,350	150.00
(Local transportation)						403.25	44.81			403.25	44.81
Total			570.00		315.00		362.21		90.00		1,337.21
Hartke (Dec.):											
Greece	Drachmas	2,250 00	75.00	1,800.00	60.00	300.00	10.00	150.00	5.00	4,500.00	150.00
Germany	Marks (transportation).					4,697.20	1,171.08			4,697.20	1,171.08
Total			645.00		375.00		1,543.29		95.00		2,658.29

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$2,658.29

RUSSELL B. LONG,
Chairman, Committee on Finance.

Feb. 28, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Dorothy Fosdick:											
United Kingdom	Pounds	40	96.00	20	48.00	10	24.00	9.8.0	22.56	79.8.0	190.56
Belgium	Belgian francs	3,000	60.00	1,000	20.00	500	10.00	350	7.00	4,850	97.00
Netherlands	Dutch guilder					2,727.40	759.30			2,727.40	759.30
West Germany	Marks					271.45	68.10			271.45	68.10
Subtotal			156.00		68.00		861.40		29.56		1,114.96
Belgium	Belgian francs	3,500	70.00	3,750	75.00	1,500	30.00	1,250	25.00	10,000	200.00
Netherlands	Guilders	97	26.70	50	13.76	20	5.51	14.63	4.03	181.63	50.00
West Germany	Marks					1,662.56	417.10			1,662.56	417.10
Subtotal			96.70		88.76		452.61		29.03		667.10
Total			252.70		156.76		1,314.01		58.59		1,782.06
Albert A. Lakeland:											
Belgium	Francs	1,775	$35.25	1,400	$28.00	475	$9.50	350	$7.00	4,000	$79.75
Italy	Lira	13,230	21.00	17,132	27.50	7,476	12.00	8,722	14.00	46,460	74.50
Germany	Marks			20	5.00					20	5.00
England	Pounds	5.10	13.17	7	17.79	6	14.00	2.4	3.44	20.50	48.40
France	Francs	175	35.00	70	15.00					245	50.00
Subtotal			104.42		93.29		35.50		24.44		257.65
Dr. William O. Farber:											
Belgium	BF	4,000	80.00	3,500	70.00	500	10.00	800	16.00	8,800	176.00
Germany	DM					2,065.40	518.16			2,065.40	518.16
Subtotal			80.00		70.00		528.16		16.00		694.16
Total			184.42		163.29		563.66		40.44		951.81
Senator Joseph M. Montoya:											
Peru	Sol	2,512.09	62.30	887.19	22.00			71.77	1.78	3,470.97	86.08
Bolivia	Peso			355.87	30.00	23.72	2.00	22.06	1.86	401.66	33.86
Argentina	do	38,501.92	110.00	8,001.40	80.00	4,900.24	14.00	1,281.06	3.66	69,184.45	207.66
Brazil	New Cruzeiro	384	120.00	176	55.00	220.19	68.81	19.81	6.19	800.00	250.00
Subtotal			292.30		187.00		84.81		13.49		577.60
Switzerland	Franc	129.64	30.00	108.04	25.00	140.00	32.40	11.28	2.61	388.98	90.01
Germany	Mark	200.00	50.00	104.00	26.00	83.76	20.94	12.16	3.06	400.00	100.00
United Kingdom	Pound	8.7.4	20.00	6.5.6	15.00	46.13.5	111.56	1.8.9	.44	62.15.0	150.00
France	Franc	147.00	30.00	100.01	20.41	977.99	199.59			1,225.00	782.97
Transportation	do					2,651	532.97				532.97
Belgium	do	4,250.00	85.00	2,750	55.00	300.00	6.00	200.00	4.00	7,500.00	150.00
Subtotal					141.41		903.46		13.11		1,272.98
Total			507.30		328.41		988.27		26.60		1,850.58

JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

Mar. 14, 1969.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$4,584.45

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Birch Bayh:											
Hong Kong	HK$	200	33	107	15.33	150	25	94	16	547	89.33
Indonesia	RP	17,760	60	10,468	35.36	4,736	16	4,736	16	37,700	127.36
Japan	Y	21,600	60	8,380	23	1,590	4.42	1,800	5.28	33,370	92.70
Thailand	B	1,175	56	302	15.69			84	4	1,562	75.69
Vietnam	VN$	31,270	265	12,036	102	2,478	21	1,416	12	47,200	400
Denmark	DKR	960	128	450	60	553.41	73.74	91.70	12	2,055.11	273.74
Norway	NKR	928.20	130	464.10	65	1,100	154.17	34.70	5	2,527	354.17
Germany	DM					7,841.60	1,958.44			7,841.60	1,958.44
Subtotal			732		316.38		2,252.77		70.28		3,371.43
Jason Berman:											
Hong Kong	HK$	400	66	125	20	300	50	55.50	9.02	880.50	145.02
Indonesia	RP	8,800	30	3,550	11.72					12,352	41.72
Japan	Yen	21,660	60.17	7,200	20			1,140	3.16	30,000	83.33
Thailand	B	1,176	56	567	28	214	11	105	5	2,062	100
Vietnam	VN$	21,270	265	11,800	100	2,714	23	1,416	12	47,200	400
Germany	DM					8,472.36	2,115.43			8,472.36	2,115.43
Subtotal			477.17		179.72		2,199.43		29.18		2,885.50
John M. Blair:											
United Kingdom	Pound	146.16.5	350	83.18.0	200	67.14.0	161.59	92.12.11	220.84	391.1.2	932.43
Germany	Deutsche mark	995.25	250	398.10	100	3,585.05	900.54	199.05	50.00	5,177.45	1,300.54
Italy	Lire	31,150	50	18,690	30	71,115.45	114.15	12,460	20.00	133,415.45	214.15
Subtotal			650		330		1,176.28		290.84		2,447.12
David Burke:											
Vietnam	VN$	41,300	350	23,600	200	8,850	75.00	8,850	75.00	82,600	700.00
Philippines		97.5	25	58.5	15	39	10.00			195.85	50.00
Germany	Deutsche mark					8,402.80	2,098.60			8,402.80	2,098.60
Subtotal			375		215		2,183.60		75.00		2,848.60

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Dale S. deHaen:											
Switzerland	Francs	258.90	60	323.625	75	21.575	5.00	43.15	10.00	647.25	150.00
Netherlands	Guilders	205.99	57	234.89	65	50.59	14.00	50.59	14.00	542.06	150.00
United Kingdom	Pounds	45.73.30	110	51.97.03	125	23.47.61	57.78	13.48.35	32.60	134.66	325.38
Germany	DM					3,858.00	963.54			3,858.00	963.54
Subtotal			227		265		1,040.32		56.60		1,588.92
M. Albert Figinski:											
Germany	DM					7,278.31	1,797.56			7,278.31	1,797.56
England	Pounds	116.10.4	279.48	49.10	118.34	15	35.85	22.3.5	55.19	204.3.9	488.86
Chile	Esc	296.38	40.44	643.16	88.40	209.46	28.88	111.26	30.39	1,260.26	188.11
Peru	Sol	2,595.84	66.38	1,908.47	48.81	135.00	3.33	2,616.89	69.45	7,256.20	187.97
Argentina	Pesos	24,565	69.44	17,400	50.71			10,710	30.35	52675	150.50
Brazil	NCr	224.73	70.23	333.27	104.15	316.21	98.81	261.16	81.61	1,135.37	354.80
Subtotal			525.97		410.41		1,964.43		266.99		3,167.80
John M. Levinson:											
Germany	DM					7,469.44	1,865.49			7,469.44	1,865.49
Vietnam	Piastres	40,120	340	15,930	135	4,130	35.00	8,024	67.63	68,160	577.63
Subtotal			340		135		1,900.49		67.63		2,443.12
Fred M. Mesmer:											
Austria	Schilling	1,161.50	45.10	1,548	60.00	503	19.20	656	25.70	3,868.50	150.00
France	French franc	257	52.74	331	66.98	2,218.56	446.03	147	30.28	2,953.56	596.03
Germany	Mark	256	64.00	352	88.00	2,395.60	597.26	192	48.00	3,195.60	797.26
Greece	Drachma	1,575	52.50	2,025	67.50	360	12.00	540	18.00	4,500.00	150.00
Italy	Lira	31,707.50	51.39	41,052.50	66.52	8,476	13.87	12,214	18.22	93,450	150.00
Netherlands	Guilder	108.13	29.86	146	40.05	37	10.20	72	19.89	363.13	100.00
Switzerland	Swiss Franc	501.93	116.28	566.28	131.63	1,819	423.42	218.79	52.09	3,106	723.42
United Kingdom	Pound	20	48.00	29.05	70.00	5	12.00	8.10	20.00	62.15	150.00
Subtotal			459.87		590.68		1,533.98		232.18		2,816.71
John Nolan, Jr.:											
Germany	Deutsche mark					7,454	1,861.64			7,454	$1,861.64
Courtney C. Pace:											
Austria	Schilling	1,161.50	45.10	1,548	60.00	503	19.20	656	25.70	3,868.50	150.00
France	French franc	257	52.74	331	66.98	2,218.56	446.03	147	30.28	2,953.56	596.03
Germany	Mark	256	64.00	352	88.00	2,395.60	597.26	192	48.00	3,195.60	797.26
Greece	Drachma	1,575	52.50	2,025	67.50	360	12.00	540	18.00	4,500	150.00
Italy	Lira	31,707.50	51.39	41,052.50	66.52	8,476	13.87	12,214	18.22	93,450	150.00
Netherlands	Guilder	108.13	29.86	146	40.05	37	10.20	72	19.89	363.13	100.00
Switzerland	Swiss franc	501.93	116.28	566.28	131.63	1,819	423.42	218.79	52.09	3,106	723.42
United Kingdom	Pound	20	48.00	29.05	70.00	5	12.00	8.10	20.00	62.15	150.00
Subtotal			459.87		590.68		1,533.98		232.18		2,816.71
Thompson Powers:											
Germany	Marks					7,454	1,861.64			7,454	1,861.64
Vietnam	Piastres	25,960	220	23,600	200	2,950	25.00	12,390	105	64,900	550.00
Japan	Yen						12.80				12.80
Subtotal			220		200		1,899.44		105		2,424.44
E. Barrett Prettyman, Jr.:											
Germany	Marks					7,454	1,861.64			7,454	1,861.64
Vietnam	Piastres	31,913	329	9,821	101.24	3,154	32.51	1,972	19.11	46,860	481.86
Subtotal			329		101.24		1,894.15		19.11		2,343.50
John Sommer:											
Germany	Marks					7,454	1,861.64			7,454	1,861.64
Vietnam	Piastres	86,000	733.30	32,250	275			10,750	91.70	129,000	1,100.00
Subtotal			733.30		275		1,861.64		91.70		2.961.64
Julien G. Sourwine: Germany	Mark	48.05	9.81	143.50	29.28	3,459.95	858.17	50.35	10.28	3,701.85	907.54
Joseph D. Tydings:											
Germany	Mark					4,184	1,044.96	1975.47	483	6,159.47	1,527.96
France	Francs	316.72	64.64	329.09	67.16	660.85	132.86	89.19	18.20	1,395.85	282.86
England	Pounds	65.16.8	157.40	74.12.6	179.10	134.1.3	319.65	26.16.10	63.50	301.7.3	719.65
Chile	Esc	490.53	73.05	517	77.00			106.22	15.73	1,113.75	165.78
Peru	Sol	2,509.74	64.69	2,908.47	74.83			3,031.79	77.84	8,450	217.36
Argentina	Pesos	32,265	92.09	16,843	48.22			3,567	10.19	52,675	150.50
Brazil	NCr	345.06	108.56	417.74	130.69			184	56.62	946.80	295.87
Subtotal			560.43		577.00		1,497.47		725.08		3,359.98
Total			6,099.42		4,215.39		25,657.79		2,272.05		38,244.65

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$38,244.65

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

Mar. 29, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Spong, William B., Jr.:											
England	Pounds	£31.15.0	76.83	£29.10.0	70.75	£1.0.0	2.42			£62.5.0	150.00
Sweden	Kroner	208.00	40.33	158.00	30.61	280.00	54.16			646.00	125.10
Germany	Deutsche mark	100.00	25.00			747.20	186.61	91.12	[1] 22.80	938.32	234.41
Total			142.16		101.36		243.19		22.80		509.51

[1] Excess baggage charges.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$509.51

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate.

Feb. 10, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Gordon F. Harrison:											
Great Britain	£	48	$115.20	35	$84.00	26.11.11	$39.85	5.2.9	$11.92	98.2.9	$250.97
Air transportation, Washington to London and return.	DM					1,727.20	431.37			1,727.20	431.37
Subtotal			115.20		84.00		471.22		11.92		682.34
William M. Cochrane:											
Germany	DM	16	4.00	142	35.50	20	5.00	25	6.25	203	50.75
Italy	Lire	44,000	70.62	41,000	65.82	2,000	3.21	10,000	16.05	97,000	155.70
England	£	10	24.00	15	36.00	5	12.00	4	9.60	34	81.60
Air travel	DM						930.70				930.70
Subtotal			98.62		137.32		950.61		31.90		1,218.75
John F. Haley:											
Germany	DM	78	19.50	165	41.25	66	16.50	69	17.25	378	94.50
Italy	Lire	55,000	88.00	52,500	84.00	14,000	22.40	15,000	24.00	136,500	218.40
England	£	16	38.40	15	36.00	11	26.40	6	14.40	48	115.20
John F. Haley: Air travel	DM						930.70			3,723	930.70
Subtotal			145.90		161.25		996.00		55.65		1,358.80
Total			359.72		382.57		2,418.13		99.47		3,259.89

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$3,259.89

B. EVERETT JORDAN.
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration.

Feb. 28, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
H. Agnew:											
Germany	D. Marks	210.00	50.00	296.00	70.00	4,311.00	*1,075.43	4.00	9.60	4,821.00	1,205.03
Turkey	T. Lira	314.00	35.00	583.00	65.00	18.00	2.00	45.00	5.00	960.00	107.00
Greece	Drachmas	1,045.00	35.00	1,495.00	50.00	60.00	2.00	209.00	7.00	2,809.00	94.00
Italy	Lire	12,500.00	20.00	9,400.00	15.00					21,900.00	35.00
England	Pounds	28.6	40.00	28.6	40.00	3.6	5.00	3.9	5.40	64.7	90.40
J. B. Anderson:											
Korea	Won	6,924	25.00	8,260	30.00	2,214	8.36	2,762	10.00	20,160	73.36
Vietnam	Piastres	19.780	168.00	8,000	68.00			2,000	16.37	29,780	252.37
Thailand	Baht	1,280	64.00	1,390	69.50	280	14.00	350	17.50	3,300	165.00
W. F. Bennett:											
Peru	Soles	2,225	50.00	1,869	42.77	6,002	138.61	223	5.00	10,319	236.38
Argentina	Pesos	23,100	66.00	8,529	24.00					31,629	90.00
Brazil	Cruzeiros	350.20	90.00	103.00	26.00			14.30	8.15	467.50	124.15
Colombia	Pesos	1,068	63.00	571	34.83			175	10.00	1,814	107.83
Germany	D. Marks					4,018	*1,014.00			4,018	1,014.00
J. T. Conway:											
U.S.S.R.	Rubles	135.00	146.00	165.00	180.00	200.00	222.22	10	10.00	501.00	558.22
Austria	A. Schillings	1,155.00	45.00	900.00	35.00	258.00	10.00	258.00	10.00	2,571.00	100.00
Switzerland	S. Franc	80	18.50	90	20.50	22	5.50	22	5.50	214	50.00
U.K.	Pounds	12.2	17.00	9.3	13.00	7.2	10.00	7.2	10.00	35.9	50.00
Germany	D. Marks					4,598.40	1,153.64*			4,598.40	1,153.64
Austria	A. Schillings	1,328.00	51.79	900.00	35.23	5,050.00	196.27	129.00	5.00	7,407.00	288.29
B. B. Hickenlooper:											
France	Franc	366.85	74.87	100.00	20.41	62.90	12.65	34.00	7.00	563.75	114.93
Belgium	B. Franc	.855	17.00	.300	6.50			25	.50	1,180.00	24.00
Germany	D. Marks					3 567.00	889.45*			3,567.00	889.45
T. G. Morris:											
Korea	Won	13,004	48.00	10,246	37.00	1,345	5.00	2,770	10.00	27,365	100.00
Vietnam	VN $	16.982	143.44	8,558	73.00	1,180	10.00	1,180	10.00	27,900	236.44
Thailand	Baht	1,059.60	50.33	1,500	71.25	450	21.37	368.40	20.78	3,378	163.73

See footnote at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
C. Hosmer:											
Korea	Won	9,000	32.00	6,200	22.00			1,365	6.07	16,565	60.07
Vietnam	Piastres	16,067	136.00	9,753	82.81			1,180	10.00	27,000	228.81
Thialand	Baht	1,064	52.00	1,609	76.91	200	10.00	200	10.00	3,073	148.91
Austria	A. Schillings	1,932	75.00	1,672	65.00	4,020	156.24	260	10.00	7,884	306.26
Germany	D. Marks	120.00	30.00	90	22.50	4,882.00	1,223.89	40	10.00	5,132	1,286.39
England	Pounds	14.00.0	40.00	9.11.9	26.00	2.02.2	5.00	1.01.1	3.96	26.15.2	74.96
Colombia	Pesos	650	38.00	1,008	60.00	168	10.00	94	5.53	1,920	113.53
Peru	Soles	2,826.50	63.00	3,238.50	72.36	890	20.00	445	10.00	7,400	165.36
Chile	Esc	508.10	59.00	177.00	20.00			51.40	6.44	736.50	85.44
Argentina	Pesos	35,868	102.00	22,132	63.71	3,500	10.00	3,500	10.00	65,000	185.71
Brazil	Cruzeiros	39,070	105.29	28,435	76.50	3,740	10.00	3,740	10.00	74,985	201.79
G. F. Murphy:											
Korea	Won	6,016	$21.49	7,119	$26,00			1,365	$5.00	14,500	$52.49
Vietnam	Piastres	18,584	157.00	6,990	59.00	556	$5.00	559	5.00	26,689	226.00
Thailand	Baht	1,172.80	58.60	1,091.20	54.06	100	5.00	100	5.00	2,464	122.66
Turkey	T. Lira	371	41.30	328	36.40	45	5.00	45	5.00	789	87.70
Greece	Drachmas	1,103	36.75	977	32.65			150	5.00	2,230	74.40
Italy	Lira	4,710	7.50	8,370	13.40			3,120	5.00	16,200	25.90
Belgium	B. Franc	2,906	57.50	3,505	70.10	250	5.00	500	10.23	7,161	142.83
England	Pounds	17.14.6	43.20	28.00.0	75.00	4.04.4	10.00	5.00.0	14.68	54.19.0	142.88
Austria	A. Shillings	1,881.60	72.36	1,170	45.00	260	10.00	260	10.00	3,571.60	137.36
France	Franc	273	55.00	119	25.00	62.90	12.65	50	10.00	504.90	102.65
Germany	D. Marks	12	3.00	60	15.00	10,463.01	2,605.75	20	5.00	10,555.01	2,628.75
Colombia	Pesos	840.00	52.00	1,050.00	63.00	175.00	10.00	175.00	10.00	2,240.00	135.00
G. F. Murphy:											
Peru	Soles	1,837	34.50	2,458	50.50			445	10.00	4,740	104.00
Argentina	Pesos	27,913	80.00	15,662	44.50			3,500	10.00	47,075	134.50
Brazil	Cruzeiros	327.00	80.00	370.00	90.00	41.11	10.00	41.11	10.00	779.22	190.00
J. B. Radcliffe:											
Belgium	B. Francs	1,332	26.00	2,135	42.00	300	6.00	1,320	26.00	4,347	100.00
Italy	Lira	52,400	83.84	110,000	178.80	23,000	37.12	30,000	46.15	215,400	346.00
Germany	D. Marks	145.2	36.44	132	33.13	2,878.80	*772.23	57	11.71	3,172.80	803.51
Total			3,005.70		2,568.32		9,684.47		478.57		15,737.06

*Commercial Air Transportation

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	15,737.06

CHET HOLIFIELD
Chairman, Committee on JCAE.

Mar. 6, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Martha W. Griffiths:											
Australia	Australian$	78.77	87.75	51.39	57.25	96.89	107.93	4.49	5.00	231.54	257.93
Hong Kong	Hong Kong$	603.50	98.77	282.47	46.23	25.21	4.13	30.55	5.00	941.73	154.13
Singapore	Singapore$	432.12	142.38	159.70	52.62	123.60	40.72	15.18	5.00	730.60	240.72
Taiwan	New Taiwan$	1,377	34.43	423	10.57			200	5.00	2,000	50.00
Thailand	Baht	1,069.20	51.73	894.39	43.27			103.35	5.00	2,066.94	100.00
Subtotal			415.06		209.94		152.78		25.00		802.78
Jacob K. Javits:											
France	Franc	147.00	30.00	98.00	20.00					245.00	50.00
Germany	DM	120.12	30.00	80.08	20.00	2,924.40	[1] 730.37			3,124.60	780.37
Italy	Lira			15,575	25.00			6,230	10.00	21,805	35.00
United Kingdom	Pound			10-8-4	25.00			4-3-4	10.00	14-11-8	35.00
Total			60.00		90.00		730.37		20.00		900.37
William S. Moorhead:											
France	Franc	1,122.10	229.00	519.40	106.00			73.50	15.00	1,715	350.00
Portugal	Escudos	2,373.21	82.93	1,475.89	51.57	1,199.91	41.93	445.20	15.56	5,494.21	191.99
Spain	Pesetas	7,951	114.24	4,900	70.40	3,266	46.92	1,069	15.36	17,186	246.92
United Kingdom	Pound	63-5-10	151.90	31-14-2	76.10	24-18-0	59.76	9-3-4	22.00	129-1-4	309.76
Subtotal			578.07		304.07		148.61		67.92		1,098.67
Henry S. Reuss: Germany	DM			22.10	5.52	92.00	22.98			114.10	28.50
					5.52		22.98				28.50
John R. Stark:											
United Kingdom	Pound	39-11-8	95.00	48-6-8	116.00	14-3-4	34.00	2-1-8	5.00	104-3-4	250.00
Netherlands	Guilder					1,576.07	[1] 434.66			1,576.07	434.66
Subtotal			95.00		116.00		468.66		5.00		684.66
Total			1,148.13		725.53		1,523.40		117.92		3,514.98

---

[1] Round-trip transportation purchased by State Department.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	3,514.98

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee.

Feb. 28, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY BRITSH-AMERICAN PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE (BERMUDA, FEB. 25–29, 1968) EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Bourke B. Hickenlooper: Bermuda	Pound sterling	41-6-5½	100.00	44-8-5	107.50	6-1-11	14.75	11-9-4½	27.75	103-6-2	250.00
Vance Hartke: Bermuda	do	41-6-5½	100.00	45-13-3	110.50	4-2-3	10.00	12-3-9½	29.50	103-6-2	250.00
Edmund Muskie: Bermuda	do	41-6-5½	100.00	38-8-7	93.00	6-7-3	15.39	12-3-11	29.51	97-18-18½	237.90
Donald G. Henderson: Bermuda	do	41-6-5½	100.00	28-18-6	70.00			2-16-2½	6.80	73-1-2	176.80
Mary M. McLaughlin: Bermuda	do	41-6-5½	100.00	37-12-1	91.00	4-13-0	11.25	2-11-8	6.25	86-3-2	208.50
Delegation expenses: Telephones, newspapers, and periodicals, stamps.								17-3-0	41.50	17-3-0	41.50
Total			500.00		472.00		51.39		141.31		1,164.70

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$1,164.70

B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Chairman, Senate Delegation.

December 31, 1968

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY AMERICAN GROUP, INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Gordon Allott:											
Trinidad	TT$	88.00	45.80	5.06	2.63					93.06	48.43
Senegal	CFA	30,100	122.85	8,850	36.12			12,050	48.97	51,100	207.94
Colombia	Pesos	660.00	40.07	1,343.00	81.55			794.00	48.00	2,797.00	169.62
Peru	Soles	13,029	296.12	2,437	55.38			3,147	71.65	18,614	423.15
Peru-United States	DM					1,408.40	351.13			1,408.40	351.13
Howard W. Cannon:											
Colombia	Pesos	660.00	40.07	59.00	3.58					719.00	43.65
Peru	Soles	10,590	240.68	2,532	57.54			1,549	35.32	14,671	333.54
B. Everett Jordan:											
Trinidad	TT$	88.00	45.80	42.05	21.90			20.00	10.42	150.05	78.12
Senegal	CFA	30,100	122.85	6,720	27.42			13,150	53.67	49,970	203.94
Colombia	Pesos	660.00	40.C7	79.00	4.80					739.00	44.87
Peru	Soles	10,714	243.50	3,796	86.27			1,205	27.50	15,715	357.27
A. S. Mike Monroney:											
Trinidad	TT$	88.00	45.80	32.72	17.04					120.72	62.84
Senegal	CFA	30,100	122.85	6,955	28.38			12,250	50.00	49,305	201.23
Ralph Yarborough:											
Colombia	Pesos	450.00	27.32	86.70	5.28					536.70	32.60
Peru	Soles	9,672	219.83	666	15.00			10,871	247.18	21,209	482.01
Milrae Jensen:											
Colombia	Pesos	450.00	26.94	583.85	33.76			75.15	4.50	1,089.00	65.20
Peru	Soles	5,861	132.82	7,780	181.80	290	6.80	737	17.25	14,490	338.67
Delegation expenses, Transportation:											
Colombia	Pesos					1,972.50	121.38			1,972.50	121.38
Peru	Soles					120,564	2,664.42			120,564	2,664.42
Darrell St. Claire:											
Trinidad	TT$	88.00	45.80	131.29	63.38					219.29	109.18
Delegation expenses:											
Meals	US$				4.10						4.10
Supplies	US$								85.75		85.75
Hotel offices	TT$	68.00	35.40	244.13	127.15			22.70	11.82	344.83	174.37
Transportation	TT$					725.03	364.67			725.03	364.67
Staff meals	TT$			24.00	12.58					24.00	12.58
Commissary	US$				130.00						130.00
Gratuities	US$								2.10		2.10
Do	TT$							25.00	12.70	25.00	12.70
Senegal	CFA	32,900	134.28	3,215	13.12			35,260	143.91	71,375	291.31
Delegation expenses:											
Supplies	US$								44.38		44.38
Hotel offices	CFA	210,950	861.00							210,950	861.00
Transportation	CFA					33,050	134.89			33,050	134.89
Do	US$						458.35				458.35
Delegation and staff meals	CFA					98,750	403.00			98,750	403.00
Do	US$						30.00				30.00
Embassy receptions	do						1,715.00				1,715.00
Communications	CFA							40,550	165.51	40,550	165.51
Gratuities, etc	do							14,150	58.31	14,150	58.31
Germany	US$		47.90		71.10		584.75		42.00		745.75
Colombia	Pesos	660.00	40.07	84.00	5.12			168.70	11.43		56.62
Delegation expenses:											
Supplies	US$								15.00		15.00
Hotel offices	Pesos	3,814.90	231.65							3,814.90	231.65
Transportation	Pesos					9,660.00	568.35			9,660.00	568.35
Do	US$						29.16				29.16
Embassy reception	Pesos			6,669.00	404.90					6,669.00	404.90
Do	US$				274.91						274.91
Delegation and staff meals	Pesos			2,720.00	167.86					2,720.00	167.86
Do	US$				20.00						20.00
Commissary	US$				34.00						34.00
Gratuities, miscellaneous	Pesos							680.00	41.32	680.00	41.32
Peru	Soles	10,339.00	234.98	8,950.00	203.40			3,938.00	89.95	23,227.00	528.33
Delegation expenses:											
Supplies	US$								93.00		93.00
Do	Soles							550	12.41	550	12.41
Hotel offices	do	75,245	1,761.63							75,245	1,761.63
Transportation	do					7,738	174.78			7,738	174.78
Embassy reception	do			2,620	60.24					2,620	60.24
Do	US$				524.37						524.37

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY AMERICAN GROUP, INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Con.

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Darrell St. Clair—Continued											
Delegation expenses—Con.											
Delegation dinners	Soles			13,424	305.11					13,424	305.11
Commissary	US$				137.55						137.55
Embassy staff overtime	Soles							10,950	261.75	10,950	261.75
Embassy personnel	do							1,010	22.79	1,010	22.79
Embassy services	do							28,763	649.28	28,763	649.28
Gratuities, miscellaneous	Soles							1,960	45.60	1,960	45.60
Total			5,206.08		3,217.34		7,606.68		2,423.47		18,453.57

Note: $171.05 reimbursed to IPU funds by Darrell St. Claire for personal expenses.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	3,658.80
Appropriated funds: Other 22 U.S.C. 276	14,794.77
Total	18,453.57

ALEXANDER PIRNIE,
Chairman of Delegation and President of the Group.

Mar. 11, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE—HONOLULU, HAWAII, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 11 AND APR. 17, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Sparkman; United States	Dollar		234.00		28.54				0.75		263.29
Senator Robert P. Griffin; United States	do		131.04		55.17						186.21
Senator Ernest Gruening; United States	do		131.04		46.77				5.24		183.05
Senator Len B. Jordan; United States	do		131.04		60.00						191.04
Senator Mike Mansfield; United States	do		131.04		106.45				14.66		252.15
Senator Frank E. Moss; United States	do		131.04		41.27				23.98		196.29
Robert Dockery; United States	do		117.00		76.84				19.30		213.14
Joann Green; United States	do		117.00		12.27				.25		129.52
Pat Holt; United States	do		131.04		71.63				18.73		221.40
Milrae Jensen; United States	do		195.00		132.65		17.35		17.78		362.78
Art Kuhl; United States	do		195.00		161.93		10.30		23.33		390.56
Mrs. Martha Solomon; United States	do		117.00		24.62						141.62
Elmira Vogtmann: United States	Dollar		117.00		5.80				.25		123.05
Delegation expenses:											
Official luncheons and dinners					4,900.22						4,900.22
Transportation							3,772.06				3,772.06
Hotel offices			577.39								577.39
Telephone and telegraph									265.78		265.78
Stationery supplies									171.80		171.80
Interpreter's fees									1,472.39		1,472.39
Typewriter rental									44.00		44.00
Miscellaneous									70.72		70.72
Total			2,455.63		5,724.16		3,799.71		2,148.96		14,128.46

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Public Law 86-420	14,128.46

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Senate delegation.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE—WASHINGTON, D.C. AND NEW ORLEANS, LA.—EXPENDED BETWEEN MARCH 20 AND MARCH 24, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Sen. George D. Aiken, United States	Dollar		53.00		5.00						58.00
Sen. Robert P. Griffin, United States	do		53.00		2.60						55.60
Sen. Allen J. Ellender, United States	do		42.40		3.64				1.57		47.61
Sen. Hiram L. Fong, United States	do		53.00		4.93						57.93
Sen. Len B. Jordan, United States	do		53.00		24.78						77.78
Sen. W. B. Spong, Jr., United States	do		53.00		4.00						57.00
Art Kuhl, United States	do		42.40		3.37				2.62		48.39
Milrae Jensen, United States	do		26.50		1.56				2.09		30.15
Delegation expenses:											
Official luncheons and dinners					4,556.95						4,556.95
Transportation							922.67				922.67
Stationery supplies									143.87		143.87
Reporting fees									26.77		26.77
Telephone charges									13.78		13.78
Hotel offices			188.57								188.57
Miscellaneous									112.13		112.13
Total			564.87		4,606.83		922.67		302.83		6,397.20

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE—WASHINGTON, D.C. AND NEW ORLEANS, LA.—EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 20 AND MAR. 24, 1968

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Other Public Law 86–42	$6,397.20

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman, Committee on Senate Delegation.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE DELEGATION TO 14TH CONFERENCE, COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION, U.S. SENATE, NASSAU, BAHAMAS, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 30 AND NOV. 3, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator B. Everett Jordan: Bahamas					17.85		2.00		3.20		23.05
Senator Jennings Randolph: Bahamas					.80		74.00				74.80
Senator Stephen M. Young: Bahamas					5.00		122.40				127.40
Senator Thomas J. McIntyre: Bahamas					26.65		2.00				28.65
Pat M. Holt: Bahamas					27.84		10.00		14.73		52.57
Delegation expenses:											
Official dinners and receptions					446.02						443.88
Local transportation							18.00				18.00
Total					524.16		228.40		17.93		770.49

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds: S. Res. 115	$770.49

B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Senate Delegation.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON SENATE DELEGATION, NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, 14TH CONFERENCE NOV. 10–23, 1968, BRUSSELS, BELGIUM; BERLIN AND BONN, GERMANY; LONDON, ENGLAND; AND PARIS, FRANCE; U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John Sparkman:											
Belgium	Dollar		60.30		128.56				27.50		216.36
Belgium	Franc					1,180	22.87			1,180	22.87
England	Pound	60.8.6	145.12	56.8.0	135.36	118.3.9	281.80	8.2.0	19.44	243.2.3	581.72
France	Franc	340.10	69.41	353.30	72.09	564.71	113.97	41.60	8.50	1,299.71	263.97
John Stennis:											
Belgium	Dollar		105.60		183.48				30.16		319.24
Germany	do		82.23		14.49						96.72
Mike Mansfield:											
Belgium	do		61.82		70.82				.20		132.84
France	do		34.70		19.94						54.64
Albert Gore:											
Belgium	do		60.30		86.34				2.26		148.90
France	do		69.41		85.53				54.23		209.17
Henry M. Jackson:											
Belgium	do		60.30		76.80				.20		137.30
Lee Metcalf:											
Belgium	Dollar		74.80		163.50				17.00		255.30
Germany	do		73.90		27.54				4.03		105.47
England	do		56.70		39.72						96.42
France	do		69.41		34.87						104.28
Claiborne Pell:											
Belgium	do		60.50		90.18				22.60		173.28
France	Franc			202.10	42.83			18.45	3.74	220.55	46.57
Thomas J. McIntyre:											
Belgium	Dollar		75.38		142.40		3.60		14.60		235.98
Germany	do		62.58		68.66		24.90		12.63		168.77
France	do		69.41		74.33				12.33		156.07
France	Franc					371.65	75.01			371.65	75.01
Birch Bayh:											
Belgium	Dollar		65.56		165.66		9.50		41.34		282.06
France	do		34.70		35.34						70.04
Joseph D. Tydings:											
Belgium	Dollar		60.30		151.00				98.12		309.42
Do	do		61.84		85.22				6.62		153.68
William B. Spong:											
Germany	do		70.43		63.15				20.54		154.12
England	do		56.70		44.36				5.76		106.82
France	do		69.41		50.11				.20		119.72
Karl E. Mundt:											
Belgium	Franc	1,452	29.04	928	18.56			220	4.40	2,600	52.00
Netherlands	Guilder					2,853.5	794.40			2,853.5	794.40
United States	Dollar								5.55,		5.55
Belgium	do		75.38		88.38				3.70		167.46
Germany	do		71.74		45.32						117.06
Do	Deutsche mark					92.00	22.94			92.00	22.94
England	Dollar		56.70		32.82				2.28		91.80
France	do		69.41		61.93						131.34
Roman Hruska:											
Belgium	Dollar		51.56		96.72				7.72		156.00
Germany	do		72.33		60.41				6.30		139.04
John Sherman Cooper:											
Belgium	do		66.12		76.92				27.68		170.72
France	do		20.83		19.06				6.30		46.19
Belgium	Belgian francs					997	19.32			997	19.32
Germany	Deutschmarks					1,588	398.89			1,588	398.89
United States	Dollar						33.00				33.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON SENATE DELEGATION, NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, 14TH CONFERENCE NOV. 10–23, 1968, BRUSSELLS, BELGIUM; BERLIN AND BONN, GERMANY; LONDON, ENGLAND; AND PARIS, FRANCE; U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jacob K. Javits: Belgium	do		58.22		40.00		794.40		20.00		912.62
Charles Percy:											
Belgium	do		74.58		137.56				31.20		243.34
Germany	do		57.16		51.88						109.04
France	do		69.41		33.72				2.91		106.04
Donald G. Henderson:											
Belgium	Belgian Franc	2,828	56.56	2,397	47.94			695	13.90	5,920	118.40
France	Franc	414	84.49	393	80.20	341.50	69.70	80	16.33	1,228.50	250.72
England	Pound	9.15.0	23.40	12.15.6	30.66	1.17.6	4.50	3.10.2	8.42	27.18.2	66.98
Netherlands	Guilder					2,853.5	794.40			2,853.5	794.40
United States	Dollar						18.00		5.55		23.55
Belgium	do		63.36		29.14				13.52		106.02
Do	Belgian Franc			4,850.00	97.00			150.00	3.00	5,000	100.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	82.20	20.62	96.10	23.96	175.50	43.76	21.70	5.42	375.50	93.76
Do	Dollar		42.89		46.36				1.51		90.76
France	Franc	517.47	106.12	440.14	90.12			17.39	3.50	975.00	199.74
Milrae Jensen:											
Belgium	Dollar		52.80		66.20						119.00
Germany	do		42.87		54.31				12.50		109.68
Milrae Jensen:											
Germany	Deutsche mark					92.00	22.94			92.00	22.94
England	Dollar		39.66		12.06				7.14		58.86
France	do		41.64		33.91						75.55
Mildred Mitchel:											
Belgium	do		53.00		60.32						113.32
France	do		62.48		38.45				.10		101.03
Belgium	do		52.80		52.04				38.30		143.14
Marian Kay Lovell:											
Germany	do		41.08		44.31						85.39
England	do		39.66		26.66						66.32
France	do		41.64		28.00						69.64
J. Stanley Kimmitt: Belgium	do		75.38		114.36				9.80		199.54
Octa Watson:											
Belgium	do		52.80		65.32				.40		118.52
Germany	do		42.05		49.27				5.00		96.32
England	do		39.66		16.77						56.43
France	do		41.64		38.48						80.12
William Farber:											
Belgium	Dollar		52.80		45.54				6.74		105.08
Germany	do		24.59		15.60						40.19
Do	Deutsche mark					1,348.07	338.20			1,348.07	338.20
Albert Lakeland: Belgium	Dollar		52.80		76.04				24.32		153.16
William Miller:											
Belgium	do		52.80		71.62				15.90		140.32
Germany	do		42.68		45.31				4.50		92.49
England	do		39.66		22.53				6.15		68.34
France	do		41.64		63.34				7.30		112.28
Clark Norton:											
Belgium	do		52.80		34.66						87.46
Germany	do		42.00		13.93						55.93
England	do		39.96		18.00						57.96
France	do		41.65		23.97						65.62
Delegation expense: Belgium (dollars):											
Official luncheons and dinners					1,187.04						1,187.04
Official luncheons					434.20						434.20
Hotel office rental			393.45								393.54
Office machines rental									56.63		56.63
Office supplies									92.79		92.79
Telephone charges									58.07		58.07
Overtime, Embassy personnel									949.93		949.93
Gratuities									25.00		25.00
Delegation expense, Germany:											
Official luncheons and dinners	Dollars				850.84						850.84
Hotel office rental	do		61.81								61.81
Telephone charges	do								19.05		19.05
Office supplies	do								21.70		21.70
Overtime, Embassy personnel	do								193.46		193.46
Local transportation	do						20.00				20.00
Do	D. Marks					3,141.45	783.21			3,141.45	783.21
Gratuities	Dollars								45.46		45.46
Delegation expense, England:											
Official meals	do				45.87						45.87
Hotel office rental	do		74.28								74.28
Local transportation	Pound					118.13.4	283.08			118.13.4	283.08
Gratuities	Dollars								11.66		11.66
Delegation expense, France:											
Official meals	Dollars				90.71						90.71
Hotel office rental	do		104.12								104.12
Local transportation	Franc					2 185.99	443.34			2 185.99	1.71
Telephone charges	Dollars								1.71		443.34
Overtime, Embassy personnel	do								48.98		48.98
Gratuities	do								4.06		4.06
Total			4 717.02		7,100.60		5,415.73		2,257.84		19,491.19

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	5,946.44
Appropriated funds: Other—Public Law 84–689	13,544.75
Total	19,491.19

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Senate Delegation, North Atlantic Assembly.

Mar. 4, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Joseph Clark:											
Indonesia	Rupiah					9,035	34.75	14,317	55.07	23,352	89.82
Vietnam	Piaster	2,891	24.50	2,950	25.00			33,539	284.23	39,380	333.73
Hong Kong	Dollar	287.40	47.36	182.10	30.00			210.35	34.33	670.85	111.69
Germany [1]	Mark					7,842	1,960.40			7,842	1,960.40
Albert Gore:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	210.00	46.89	186.01	41.53			9.00	2.01	405.01	90.43
Brazil	Cruzeiro	272.26	85.07	196.92	61.53	69.33	21.65	60.20	18.71	598.71	186.96
Argentina	Peso	27,719	77.70	16.020	45.75	6,807	19.45	8,971	25.60	58,977	168.50
Chile	Escudo	462.48	67.45	390.55	57.01			135.20	19.65	988.23	144.11
Peru	Sol			560	14.30			194	4.95	754	19.25
Panama	Dollar		45.00		40.45		4.25		6.05		95.75
Czechoslovakia	Koruna			384.72	26.81	211.43	14.73	215.25	15.00	811.40	56.54
USSR	Ruble	108.00	120.00	180.22	200.25	42.50	47.22	9.00	10.00	339.72	377.47
Denmark	D. Kroner	187.63	25.00	142.60	19.00	156.33	20.83	45.03	6.00	531.59	70.83
Netherlands [1]	Guilders					1,780.85	492.08			1,780.85	492.08
Belgium	B. Franc					541.00	10.48			541.00	10.48
Senator Mike Mansfield:											
U.S.S.R.	Ruble	18	20.00					5	5.56	23	25.56
Czechoslovakia	Crown	623.40	43.44	287	20.00			287	20.00	1,197.40	83.44
France	Franc	406	83.20	303.80	62.00	1,527.19	307.28	343	70.00	2,579.99	522.48
Rumania	Lei	762.05	63.50	432	36.00			288	24.00	1,482.05	123.50
Germany	D.M.	94.85	27.00	120	30.00			80	20.00	294.85	77.00
Netherlands [1]	Guilder					4,196.04	1,157.21				1,157.21
Yugoslavia [1]	New Dinar	452.10	36.17	75	6.00	7,830.85	626.48	25	2.00	8,383.15	670.65
Italy	Lire			26,000	41.73			5,300	8.50	31,300	50.23
France	New Franc	348	71.00	245	50.00	1,044.36	209.96	147	30.00	1,784.36	360.96
England	Pound			41.4.12	75.00	35.4.3	83.96	20.16.7	50.00	975.10	208.96
Senator Claiborne Pell:											
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	344.40	24.00	945.53	65.89	601.45	41.91	455.18	31.72	2,346.56	163.52
France	Franc	313.11	63.00	101.29	20.38			44.73	9.00	459.13	92.38
Austria	Schilling	515.40	20.00	274.95	10.67	506.04	19.67	154.62	6.00	1,451.01	56.34
Germany [1]	D. Mark					3,487.20	874.86			3,487.20	874.86
U.S.S.R.	Ruble	108.00	120.00	180.22	200.25	42.50	47.22	9.00	10.00	339.72	377.47
Denmark	D. Kroner	187.63	25.00	142.60	19.00	156.33	20.83	45.03	6.00	531.59	70.83
Netherlands [1]	Guilders					1,780.85	492.08			1,780.85	492.08
Belgium	B. Franc					541.00	10.48			541.00	10.48
Pat M. Holt:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	170.00	37.94	141.90	31.68			38.00	8.47	349.90	78.09
Brazil	Cruzeiro	167.86	52.40	227.19	70.87	69.33	21.69	114.00	35.59	578.38	180.55
Argentina	Peso	23,975	68.50	19.800	56.70	23,407.10	67.16	8,410	24.46	75,592.10	216.82
Chile	Escudo	329.40	48.05	295.40	43.12			90.60	13.20	715.40	104.37
Peru	Sol	881.40	22.45	687.65	17.58			558.05	14.20	2,127.10	54.23
Panama	Dollars		37.50		51.25		10.50		24.86		124.11
Morella R. Hansen:											
Senegal	CFA Francs	7,660	30.89	2,540	10.24	3,000	12.10	600	2.42	13,800	55.65
Sierra Leone	S.L. Leones	35.70	42.59	16.12	19.23	26	31.02	6	7.16	83.82	100.00
Ivory Coast	CFA Francs	20,750	84.17	24,465	98.50			2,910	11.68	48,125	194.35
Ethiopia	Ethiopian $$	162.55	65.54	188.00	75.70	180.00	72.47	15.76	6.35	546.31	220.06
Kenya	Kenya Shilling	468.50	65.54	214.65	30.02	604.40	84.55	36.90	5.16	1,324.45	185.28
Ghana [1]	New Ghanian cedis					1,692.24	1,589.50			1,629.24	1,589.50
Norvill Jones:											
Thailand	Baht	989.76	48.00	886.66	43.00	103.10	5.00	958.52	46.49	2,938	142.49
South Vietnam	Piastre	48,576	410.00	11,832	102.00	580	5.00	6,072	52.35	66,060	569.35
Hong Kong	H.K.$p.	485.60	80.00	338.35	55.75	48.56	8.00	496.74	81.85	1,369.25	225.60
Arthur M. Kuhl:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	170.00	37.94	133.00	29.67			9.50	2.12	312.50	69.73
Brazil	Cruzeiro	167.86	52.40	212.49	66.58	69.33	21.69	92.50	28.74	542.18	169.41
Argentina	Peso	23,975	68.50	21,100	60.20	6,807	19.54	7,656	21.80	59,538	169.95
Chile	Escudo	329.40	48.05	219.20	32.00			60.00	8.70	608.60	88.75
Peru	Sol	881.40	22.45	682.15	17.40			415.50	10.65	1,979.05	50.50
Panama	Dollar		37.50		34.33		8.25		7.81		87.88
Bader, William:											
Dinar [1]						583.77	1,633.80			46	1,633.80
Germany	D. Mark	364	91.43	260	65.31	56	14.08	40	10.04	720	180.86
Britain	Pound	22	52.36	13	30.94	2	4.76			37	88.06
Israel	I. Pound	180	51.42	150	42.86	50	14.28	52	14.85	432	123.41
Jordan	Dinar			3.570	10.00					3.570	10.00
Lebanon	L. Pound	211	66.70	181	57.22	123	39.00	101	30.00	615	192.92
U.A.R.	E. Pound	33	59.41	30	54.00	2	3.60			65	117.01
Ferris, Charles:											
Belgium	Franc	4,558	91.16	4,920	98.40	1,660	33.20	710	14.20	11,848	236.96
Germany	D. Mark	211.3	52.95	357.1	89.50	166.6	41.63	33.9	8.50	768.6	192.58
United Kingdom	Pound	95.6	39.66	78.1	32.40	25.1	10.40	23.1	9.60	221.9	92.06
France	Franc	244.51	49.90	256.76	52.40	96.04	19.60	23.76	4.85	621.07	126.75
James G. Lowenstein:											
France	Franc	730.59	147.00	1,000.41	201.29	648.66	130.49	347.90	70.00	2,727 56	548.78
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	258.30	18.00	2,268.02	158.05	1,247.20	86.91	369.08	25.72	4,142.60	288.68
Germany [1]	D. Mark			324.22	81.34	4,405.60	1,104.39	24.00	6.00	4,753.82	1,191.73
Austria	Schilling	1,391.58	54.00	1,262.73	49.00			308.98	11.99	2,963.29	114.99
Poland	Zlotys	648.00	27.00	1,123.92	46.83	810.60	33.78	168.00	7.00	2,750 52	114.61
U.S.S.R.	Ruble	108.00	120.00	62.50	69.44	96.85	107.61	4.50	5.00	271.85	302.05
Yugoslavia	Dinar	423.75	33.90	766.25	61.30	4,655.00	372.40	112.50	9.00	5,957.50	476.60
Romania	Lei	712.80	40.00					28.16	1.58	740.96	41.58
Netherlands	Guilders					192.00	53.05			192.00	53.05
Denmark	D. Kroner	135.09	18.00	142.60	19.00	208.87	27.83	45.03	6.00	531.59	70.83
Francis R. Valeo:											
U.S.S.R.	Ruble	98	20.00	30	33.34			20	22.22	148	75.56
Czechoslovakia	Crown	348.40	24.27	344.40	24.00			430.50	40.00	1,123.30	78.27
France	Franc	467.75	95.45	367.50	75.00			343	70.00	1,178.25	240.45
England	Pound	45.17.4	100.00	35.5.0	85.00			28.4.0	68.00	109.6.4	253.00
Netherlands [1]	Guilder					4,196.04	1,157.21				1,157.21
Belgium	B. Franc	1,056	21.12	2,400	48.00	600	12.00	2,000	40.00	6,056	121.12
Yugoslavia [1]	New Dinar	518.65	41.48	222	18.00	7,906.25	632.50	312	25.00	8,958.90	716.98
Italy	Lire			26,165	42.00	7,787	12.50	12,848	20.62	46,800	75.12
France	N. Franc	375.34	76.50	306.25	61.50	24.50	5.00	58.80	12.00	764.90	155.00
England	Pound	15.6.7	36.00	17.10.0	42.00	4.3.5	10.00	10.7.5	25.00	47.7.5	113.00
Robert H. Dockery											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	1,000.95	301.25	636.79	196.00	185.36	57.00	119.40	36.75	1,942.50	591.00
Netherlands	Florin					3,354.35	928.93			3,354.35	928.93

See footnote at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

		Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
Name and country	Name of currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Tillman, Seth:											
Germany [1]	D. mark					6,475.38	1,626.57			6,475.38	1,626.57
Japan	Yen	8,280	23.00	23,466	65.18	1,350	3.75	2,496	6.94	35,492	98.87
Hong Kong	Dollars	72.00	11.82	237.25	38.96	21.61	3.55	38.64	6.34	369.50	60.67
Thailand	Baht	1,050	50.80	3,167.80	153.26	280	13.54	480.20	23.23	4,978	240.83
India	Rupees	350	46.05	513.80	67.61	230	30.26	70.00	9.21	1,163.80	153.13
Iran	Rials	2,265	30.20	5,550	74.00	400	5.33	485.00	6.47	8,700.00	116.00
Laos	Kip	4,200	8.40	1,524	3.05			926.00	1.85	6,650.00	13.30
France	Franc			154.67	31.30	24.70	5.00	5.43	1.10	184.80	37.40
England	Pound	10.15.0	25.65	11.0.8	26.33	3.18.9	9.39	6.1.6	14.46	31.15.11	75.83
Total			4,420.57		4,448.19		16,717.50		1,841.96		27,428.22

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$27,120.48
S. Res. 226	307.74
Total	27,428.22

[1] Used to purchase commercial air ticket to countries visited.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mar. 6, 1969

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the reports which I have placed in the RECORD show the use of foreign currencies by the committees of the Senate and certain joint committees during the calendar year 1968. These U.S. Government-owned foreign currencies are available in the various countries for use by the committees of the Congress without reimbursement to the Treasury Department. This is in accord with the provisions of Public Law 86–628, section 105 (b), and 22 U.S.C. 1754, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that these provisions of law be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the provisions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO THE REPORTING OF EXPENSES INCURRED IN CONNECTION WITH TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT AS AMENDED

22 U.S.C. 1754

"(b) Notwithstanding section 724 of title 31, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States, which are in excess of the amounts reserved under section 612(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and of the requirements of the United States Government in payment of its obligations outside the United States, as such requirements may be determined from time to time by the President (and any other local currencies owned by the United States in amounts not to exceed the equivalent of $50 per day per person exclusive of the actual cost of transportation), shall be made available to appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties under section 190d of title 2, and to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Joint Economic Committee and the Select Committees on Small Business of the Senate and House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration of the House of Representatives and the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics of the Senate, for their local currency expenses: *Provided*, That each member or employee of any such committee shall make, to the chairman of such committee in accordance with regulations prescribed by such committee, an itemized report showing the amounts and dollar equivalent values of each such foreign currency expended and the amounts of dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds in connection with travel outside the United States, together with the purposes of the expenditure, including lodging, meals, transportation, and other purposes. Within the first sixty days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, the chairman of each such committee shall prepare a consolidated report showing the total itemized expenditures during the preceding calendar year of the committee and each subcommittee thereof, and of each member and employee of such committee or subcommittee, and shall forward such consolidated report to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee be a committee of the House of Representatives or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House) or to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate (if the committee be a Senate committee or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate). Each such report submitted by each committee shall be published in the Congressional Record within ten legislative days after receipt by the Committee on House Administration of the House or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate."

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION ACT, 1961

SEC. 105(B), PUBLIC LAW 86–628

"Each member of the United States group or delegation to the Interparliamentary Union, the NATO Parliamentarian's Conference, the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, or any similar interparliamentary group of which the United States is a member, and each employee of the Senate or House of Representatives, by whom or on whose behalf expenditures are made from funds appropriated for the expenses of such group or delegation, shall file with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate in the case of Members or employees of the Senate, or with the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives in the case of Members or employees of the House, an itemized report showing all such expenditures made by or on behalf of each Member or employee together with the purposes of the expenditure, including lodging, meals, transportation, and other purposes. Within sixty days after the beginning of each regular session of Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall prepare consolidated reports showing with respect to each such group or delegation the total amount expended, the purposes of the expenditures, the amount expended for each such purpose, the names of the Members or employees by or on behalf of whom the expenditures were made and the amount expended by or on behalf of each Member or employee for each such purpose. The consolidated reports prepared by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate shall be filed with the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the consolidated reports prepared by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House shall be filed with the Committee on House Administration of the House. Each such consolidated report shall be printed in the Congressional Record within ten days after receipt by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Committee on House Administration of the House."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, most of these currencies accrue to the credit of the United States because of international agreements that deal primarily with the sale of agricultural commodities to foreign purchasers for local currencies, or loans which may be repaid in the currency of the borrowing country.

The foreign currencies owned by the United States are divided into two categories. "Excess currencies" are currencies for which the Treasury Department determines that the supply is great enough to more than cover U.S. requirements for 2 years. "Nonexcess currencies" are currencies of all other countries not designated as "excess." In many of these "nonexcess currency" countries, our supply is far below our needs and it is necessary for the U.S. Government to purchase currencies commercially to meet our requirements.

A great amount of the currencies which were utilized by Senate committees last year, and which are itemized in the reports I have placed in the RECORD, are "nonexcess currencies." By reason of Congress utilizing these currencies, it means that the Treasury Department must use U.S. dollars to purchase these types of foreign currencies for other U.S. uses.

I have before me a tabulation which is from the budget for fiscal year 1970. It shows that the "excess" countries are: Burma, Ceylon, Guinea, India, Israel, Morocco, Pakistan, Poland, Tunisia, Egypt, and Yugoslavia. All other countries are in the "nonexcess" category. This tabulation gives the estimated supply of "nonexcess currencies" as $362,700,000, whereas the estimated requirements for "nonexcess currencies" are $2,589,300,000. The requirement for commercial purchases in fiscal year 1970 of "nonexcess currencies" is $2,277,400,000. I ask unanimous consent that this page from the budget be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE H-2.—FOREIGN CURRENCIES AVAILABLE TO MEET U.S. REQUIREMENTS

[In millions of dollar equivalents]

Country	Estimated supply for 1970	1970 estimated requirements (expenditures)		Amounts available for use after 1970	Requirements for commercial purchase in 1970
		Other than special programs	Special programs		
Excess currencies:					
Burma	15.7	0.5	0.6	14.6	
Ceylon	6.5	.4	1.3	4.8	
Guinea	7.3	.1	.4	6.8	
India	912.5	11.5	19.8	881.2	
Israel	27.6	17.5	5.3	4.8	
Morocco	31.9	8.1	1.6	22.2	
Pakistan	200.3	3.6	9.0	187.7	
Poland	453.9	2.2	6.3	445.4	
Tunisia	25.0	2.8	2.0	20.2	
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	182.5	1.2	2.6	178.7	
Yugoslavia	82.2	4.4	9.4	68.4	
Total, excess currencies	1,945.4	52.3	58.3	1,834.8	
Nonexcess currencies:					
Bolivia [1]	6.5	6.8			0.3
Canada	5.9	102.9			97.0
France	1.6	40.5	(2)		38.9
Germany, Federal Republic of	6.6	944.5	.1		938.1
Ghana [1]	1.7	.8		.9	
Indonesia [1]	4.5	2.5		1.9	
Italy	1.9	62.7	(2)		60.8
Japan	24.1	246.6	.1	22.0	244.4
Korea	13.2	84.1	(2)		71.0
Philippines	6.7	99.0	(2)		92.3
Spain	15.8	38.6	.1		23.0
Sudan [1]	.5	1.5			1.0
Thailand	7.5	151.3			143.8
Turkey	38.9	29.6	(2)	9.3	
United Kingdom	4.1	105.6	.1	1.0	102.3
Vietnam	35.6	342.7	(2)		307.1
Other countries	187.6	328.6	.6	15.7	157.4
Total, nonexcess currencies	362.7	2,588.3	1.0	50.8	2,277.4
Total	2,308.1	2,640.6	59.3	1,885.4	2,277.4

[1] Currently designated as "near-excess" currency countries.

[2] Less than $50,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think it is desirable to present his information to the Senate in order that there may be no misunderstanding about these foreign currencies, which are often referred to as counterpart funds. In most instances, the use of these currencies is comparable to spending U.S. dollars.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 1969

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, April 22, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 16, 1969, under authority of order of Senate of April 15, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Shiro Kashiwa, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Cylde O. Martz, resigned.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Stewart O. H. Jones, of Connecticut, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Connecticut for the term of 4 years vice Jon O. Newman.

F. L. Peter Stone, of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Delaware for the term of 4 years vice Alexander Greenfeld.

Robert K. Fukuda, of Hawaii, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Hawaii for the term of 4 years vice Yoshimi Hayashi, resigning.

Louis C. Bechtle, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years vice Drew J. T. O'Keefe, resigning.

U.S. MARSHAL

William L. Martin, Jr., of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Georgia for the term of 4 years vice Robert O. Doyle.

BOARD OF PAROLE

George J. Reed, of Oregon, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1974.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Henry Lehne, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

Ronald B. Lee, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

Frank J. Nunlist, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 17, 1969, under authority of order of Senate of April 15, 1969:

U.S. MARSHAL

Charles D. Loos, of Indiana, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years vice Dale C. Stone, resigned.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 18, 1969:

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

William E. Schuyler, Jr., of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Patents, vice Edward J. Brenner.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named Medical Corps officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Oscar Elliott Ursin, O21687, Medical Corps. U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Frederic John Hughes, Jr., O26370, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Dew Orr, O31042, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. James Arista Wier, O26416, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Hal Bruce Jennings, Jr., O26995, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Col. John Boyd Coates, Jr., O20924, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. David Edward Thomas, O22700, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Wilson Hughes, O58018, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Louis Joseph Hackett, Jr., O66622, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Col. Richard Ray Taylor, O62785, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3306:

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Col. David Edward Thomas, O22700, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Frederic John Hughes, Jr., O26370, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Hal Bruce Jennings, Jr., O26995, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

In the Navy

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grades as indicated:

CAPTAIN, LINE

Adams, Lynn "W"
Adkisson, Hubert K.
Alexander, Robert J.
Allred, Jimmie "B"
Althoff, William B.
Altz, Leroy V., Jr.
Anders, Samuel G., Jr.
Anderson, James R.
Anderson, Raymond M., Jr.
Anderson, Vernon F.
Ashley, Linsey S.
Atkinson, Bert M., Jr.
Aubert, George A.
Auger, Thomas E.
Ayers, George "L", Jr.
Babbit, Franklin G.
Bachert, John O.
Bagley, Worth H.
Bailey, John B.
Bailey, John D.
Baker, Royal W.
Barker, Edwin F., Jr.
Barlow, John F.
Barton, Charles A.
Baylis, John R.
Bayly, Donald C.
Bean, George F.
Bellah, James C.
Bennett, Arthur K., Jr.
Bennett, Jack W.
Bent, Jack
Bergner, Robert B.
Berude, John B.
Bettis, Alfred M.
Bischof, William W.
Blackwelder, Buren L.
Blair, Marvin S.
Bodnaruk, Andrew
Boniface, John G.
Bond, Vernon C.
Booker, Thomas F.
Boule, Arthur E., Jr.
Boutte, Lester H.
Bowen, Alva M., Jr.
Bowen, Llewellyn D.
Bowling, Roland A.
Boyd, Carl J.
Boyd, Paul C.
Boyle, Paul A.
Brandenburg, John H.
Brazzell, Robert J.
Brite, Murrel C.
Brooks, Richard S.
Brown, Ian F.
Brown, Keith F.
Brozo, John G.
Brumsted, Robert B.
Bryce, Thomas A.
Burns, William L.
Burrell, Robert E.
Burrill, James T.
Cadenas, Ernest M. M.
Caldwell, Jack
Camp, Herbert E.
Cannon, Herbert "B"
Cantwell, William P., Jr.
Carneghi, Albert J.
Carrier, Francis A.
Carroll, Eugene J., Jr.
Clark, Gilbert L.
Clausen, Paul K.
Cobean, Warren R., Jr.
Cody, Harold R.
Coffey, Claude C., Jr.
Collins, John T.
Collister, Louis J.
Connelley, Ernest C., Jr.
Cooke, Edward W.
Cooley, Homer K., Jr.
Coulter, Fred W.
Coursin, Jack T.
Cox, Channing H.
Crangle, Eugene V.
Cravener, Leahmon A.
Crawford, Robert E.
Cummings, Arthur H., Jr.
Cutchall, Lee G.
Damrow, Julius P.
Dehn, Emerson C.
Deibler, Robert R.
Delaware, Joseph L.
Dickey, George L., Jr.
Dise, Robert L.
Doss, Robert F.
Doty, William K.
Dowling, Patrick S.
Downey, Denis J. J.
Doyle, James H., Jr.
Duberg, Carl N.
Dudley, Harrison G.
Dunning, Richard A.
Eckhart, Myron, Jr.
Edelman, Sidney
Ellis, George W.
Engel, Wilson F., Jr.
Evans, Jack R.
Everhart, Charles D.
Exum, John D.
Fagan, John F., Jr.
Faulders, Cyril T., Jr.
Ferguson, William P.
Field, Francis E.
Finlay, Robert W., Jr.
Fitzgerel, John H.
Forgy, William J.
Franch, Ardwin G.
Francis, Samuel
Freeman, DeWitt L.
Friedman, Robert
Fries, William D.
Fromknecht, George W.
Gately, Donald E.
Gatewood, Walter P.
Gautier, Robert H.
Gerhard, Harry "E", Jr.
Gernert, Harold F.
Gilles, Donald A.
Giorgis, Albert S.
Glenzer, Hubert, Jr.
Gless, Richard D.
Glindeman, Henry P., Jr.
Gortney, William M.
Gray, Julian F.
Greene, Joseph M.
Griffin, Thomas H.
Griffiths, Charles H.
Grill, Robert W.
Grojean, Charles D.
Gullette, John G.
Guthrie, Charles A.
Haak, Frank S.
Hahs, Orrie A.
Hamberg, Harold A.
Hanks, Robert J.
Hansen, John E.
Harlan, Wick R., Jr.
Harper, George A.
Hartley, Paul J., Jr.
Haugh, Edward M.
Hayes, Arthur M., Jr.
Hayward, Thomas B.
Hemler, Frank T.
Henderson, Jerome E.
Henriques, David N., Jr.
Herzog, John J.
Heuer, Edward H.
Hihn, Don E.
Hoke, Charles H.
Holschuh, Howard W.
Horn, Maurice A.
Howard, George D.
Hoy, Hugh A.
Hubert, William E.
Huff, Andrew F.
Hugus, James E.
Jackson, Laurence L., Jr.
Johnson, Dean R.
Johnson, Keith V.
Jones, Robert S.
Joslin, Harold E.
Joy, Harmon R.
Kaufman, Robert Y.
Kaye, Alan J.
Kearns, John S.
Kelly, George R.
Kennedy, Alfred F.
Kenyon, Eugene C., Jr.
Kidd, John D.
Kiley, Donald W.
Kilpatrick, David D.
Kimmons, George W.
King, Herbert T.
Kingsbury, Edward J., Jr.
Kirkemo, Leland E.
Koch, Ferdinand B.
Komorowski, Raymond A.
Koons, Jack L.
Kulik, Adam P.
Lademan, Dixon
Lane, Dwight A., Jr.
Langille, Justin E., III
Laws, Walter T.
Lessmann, Walter G.
Leuschner, Robert J.
Levi, Burna D., Jr.
Lewis, George H.
Lilly, Creighton D.
Lindberg, Charles H.
Linder, Isham W.
Lindsay, John R.
Linville, James C.
Long, David A.
Lonnquest, Theodore C., Jr.
Lowell, John E.
Lowen, Ernest E.
Lyon, Harvey E.
Lyon, James O.
Lyons, Kenneth H.
Lyons, Richard T.
Macmillan, Harold R.
Mahinske, Edmund B.
Malone, Walter J.
Marshall, Daniel V., Jr.
Marshall, Leo J., Jr.
Matthes, Harold K.
Maulden, Hoyt P.
Maupin, Elwin C.
May, Robert C.
Mayer, William S.
Mayes, Luther E., Jr.
McCall, Robert E.
McCaulley, Henry B.
McCormick, Gordon H.
McCullough, William F.
McDonnel, James L.
McDonnell, John C.
McElwee, Robert E.
McKenzie, Robert P.
Melin, Kenneth L.
Meyer, Joseph J., Jr.
Mikhalevsky, Nicholas
Miller, John "X", Jr.
Miller, Kirk C., Jr.
Mills, Herbert D., Jr.
Monthan, George R.
Moore, Robert E.
Moore, William V.
Moorhead, Kenneth W.
Morgan, Henry S., Jr.
Morgan, Walter N.
Morgan, William H.
Morse, Kenneth L.
Mouton, Edison E.
Moyer, Eugene H.
Muncie, Wendell B.
Murphy, Francis J.
Newbern, Robert O.
Nicholson, John H.
Nicklas, William C., Jr.
Niehaus, Herbert H.
Norin, Robert A.
Nott, Hugh G.
Nutt, Thomas A., Jr.
O'Hopp, Michael
Oshiek, Robert R.
Overman, Dana C., Jr.
Overn, John A.
Palkovic, Richard M.
Parady, James T.
Parker, George A.
Parrish, Harvey S., Jr.
Pavis, George P.
Pearson, Francis E., III
Peed, George P.
Penny, Harmon C.
Peters, Bernard
Phillips, Chester G.
Piatek, John A.
Pitz, Marcellus T.
Pond, Robert B.
Porter, Edward M., Jr.
Potter, Horace S.
Price, Arthur W., Jr.
Purinton, David F.
Putman, Orlin N.
Quarton, Thomas J.
Quelland, Obed R.
Quisenberry, William R.
Racette, Henry J., Jr.
Ray, Charles E.
Redden, Lawrence E.
Redgrave, Dewitt C., III
Reinhart, Leonard J.
Renn, John E.
Riggs, Wallace M.
Robeson, Robert H., Jr.
Rogers, Harris G., Jr.
Rogerson, Reuben G.
Rooney, Frederick T.
Rose, Albert E., Jr.
Roulstone, Don J.
Roux, Vernon K.
Ruebsamen, Darrel D.
Russell, Joseph W.
Russell, Thomas B., Jr.
Sandeford, William H.
Sanderson, James R.
Savage, Richard A.
Schwemley, Paul A.
Schwitters, Merlin J.
Scott, Richard Y.
Scott, Wiley A.
Searle, Willard F., Jr.
Sellers, Harry S.
Sells, Warren H.
Setzer, Brooks W., Jr.
Shaffer, James B.
Sharer, Keith W.
Sharp, Wallace E.
Sherman, Benjamin F., Jr.
Simpson, William E.
Sims, Wilbur N.
Skidmore, Edward O.
Smith, Edwin P., Jr.
Smith, Gerald W.
Smith, Lloyd S., Jr.
Snowden, Macon S.
Stahl, Lawrence E.
St. Clair, Robert H., Jr.
St. George, William R.
Stufflebeem, John D.
Sullivan, William P.
Tallent, Carson R.
Tesh, Charles P.
Thigpen, Francis Y.
Thompson, Bruce R.
Thompson, Robert D.
Tidd, Emmett H.
Tiderman, Otto D.
Tierney, John M.
Tisdale, Robert S.
Tolson, George F., Jr.
Tonkovic, Andrew A.
Travers, Edward P.
Tribble, Robert J.
Turk, Carl F.
Turner, Stansfield
Upshur, Giles C., Jr.
Van Train, William A., Jr.
Vaught, William J.
Wade, William D.
Wahl, Clyde F.
Walery, Kenneth F.
Walsh, John A.
Warner, Robert L.
Weatherford, Jack E.
Welander, Robert O.
Werdelman, Egon H.
Werner, Paul F.
Wertheim, Robert H.
West, Earle L.
Westfall, Elmer T.
Wettlaufer, Warren H.
White, Allan E.
White, Arthur T.
Whittle, Alfred J., Jr.
Wilcox, Burr C., Jr.
Wilkins, James C., Jr.
Wilkinson, Roland F.
Willett, Elbert H.
Williams, Charles S., Jr.
Williams, "D" Hunt
Williamson, Robert, II
Willson, Lawrence E., Jr.
Winter, Homer A.
Witham, Burton B., Jr.
Wolf, Jerome L., Jr.
Wondergem, John M.
Wood, Robert D.
Woods, Charles E.
Woolston, John
Work, David D.
Worrall, Alton H., Jr.
Worrall, David J.
Wyman, Charles L.
Zartman, Walter F.
Zeni, Levio E.

COMMANDER, LINE

Abbott, William B., III
Ackerman, Richard F.
Adair, Frederick S.
Adams, Robert L., Jr.
Adler, Robert E.
Akagi, Joe L.
Aldern, Donald D.
Alexander, Marvin G.
Alexander, Adam G., Jr.
Alexich, Milton P.
Allen, Douglas A.
Allen, John B.
Allen, Richard C.
Allender, Gene T.
Alley, Lester L.
Altwegg, David M.
Anderle, Charles K.
Anderson, Charles L. R.
Anderson, Norris O., Jr.
Anderson, Paul L.
Anderson, Stanley J.
Anderson, William J., III
Angler, Donald L.
Anthony, David J.
Applegarth, Samuel H., Jr.
Argiro, Vincent J.
Arn, Robert W.
Arnold, Henry C., Jr.
Arnold, John E.
Ashurst, Albert J.
Asmus, Paul A.
Aston, William J.
Atherton, Robert F.
Avallone, Eugene M.
Averyt, Howell D.
Axthelm, Charles E.
Ayres, James H.
Babine, Arthur L., Jr.
Bachtold, James R.
Backman, Fred M.
Bacon, James A.
Badgett, John J.
Bahm, John J.
Baillie, Richard H.
Baker, James G.
Baker, James E., Jr.
Bakke, Harlan J.
Balchunas, Robert C.
Baldridge, Louis D., Jr.
Baldwin, Robert A.
Barker, Merle M.
Barnes, Clifford P.
Barnes, James P.
Barnett, Gerald P.
Barney, Glenn P.
Barrett, Gardner S.
Barrett, Roy F.
Barrow, Robert W.
Barunas, George A., Jr.
Batten, Charles G.
Bauer, Edward C.
Beasley, James W.
Beates, James K.
Beatty, Lloyd D.
Beck, Stuart M.
Beech, Wayne "L"
Beecher, John D.
Beem, Jack M.
Belk, Reece G., Jr.
Bell, Gerald R.
Bender, Albert F., Jr.
Benton, Hugh A.
Berg, Frederick H.
Bergesen, Andrew J.
Bibby, Lowe H., III
Bills, Robert G.
Bird, Charles S.
Blades, Lawrence T.
Blake, Harry R., Jr.
Blaney, William C., Jr.
Boakes, William H.
Boles, Lee R.
Boles, Richard L.
Bos, Roger C.
Boschen, Henry C., Jr.
Bosse, Joseph H., Jr.
Bowen, Jack W.
Bowling, William H.
Bradford, Gerald R.
Bradshaw, Brice L.
Brady, Allen C.
Brandel, William J., Jr.
Bres, John H.
Bress, Allyn V.

Brewer, Glenn M.
Bridge, Daniel T.
Bridgham, Russell B.
Broadwell, Edward A.
Brogan, Robert C.
Brooks, Walter A.
Brown, Bobby J.
Brown, Charles H.
Brown, Gideon L., Jr.
Brown, Peter G.
Brown, Robert L.
Bryan, Gordon R., Jr.
Bryant, William R.
Buchanan, Alvin J., Jr.
Buck, John A.
Buckholts, Walter H., Jr.
Bucklin, Jerald W.
Burkemper, Raymond G.
Burkhalter, Edward A., Jr.
Burnett, James A.
Burnett, John H.
Burton, Herbert O.
Butler, Charles A.
Butts, John L.
Buzzell, Carlisle W., Jr.
Byrd, Paul R.
Cahill, William A., Jr.
Califf, Toxey H.
Callahan, Earle R.
Campbell, Neil V.
Campbell, Ronald A.
Campbell, William E., Jr.
Campion, Robert F., Jr.
Carlson, Burford A.
Carter, Edward W., III
Case, Richard W.
Caskey, Donald L.
Cassani, Henry L.
Caswell, Frederic C., Jr.
Caudill, William E.
Cecil, Durward C.
Cernan, Eugene A.
Chambers, Lawrence C.
Chandler, Albert N., Jr.
Charbonneau, George L.
Chasse, Robert L.
Cheatham, Augustus B.
Cherrier, Herbert A.
Chertavian, Armen
Chesser, Samuel L.
Chewning, Robert W.
Childers, Donald J.
Chisum, Oscar C.
Christenson, Donald A.
Christie, Francis J.
Clare, James S.
Clarke, Walter L., Jr.
Clausner, Edward, Jr.
Clermont, William J., Jr.
Coale, William A.
Cobern, Ernest L.
Coffman, Charles L.
Coiner, John A.
Colenda, Herbert F.
Collins, Charles H.
Collins, Frank C., Jr.
Collins, Harold E.
Combs, Robert E.
Condon, Edward J.
Conlon, Frank S.
Connally, Robert F., III
Connell, Lewis E.
Connelly, Robert B.
Connors, Eugene T.
Conrad, Charles, Jr.
Conrad, Peter C.
Cooney, David M.
Corbett, William J., III
Cornelius, Winston W.
Cornwell, Robert R.
Corsepius, Everett D.
Coski, Bernard J.
Costigan, Robert A.
Cotter, Charles L.
Crawley, Don E.
Criner, James E.
Cromwell, John P., Jr.
Cross, William F.
Crowder, James P., Jr.
Cullins, Peter K.
Cunningham, Melville D.
Cunningham, Richard B.
Cunningham, Alan R.
Dallaire, Richard P.
Dalla Mura, Richard A.
Danis, Anthony L., Jr.
Danner, William P.
DaRodda, Aldo J.
Darrell, Charles G.
Darwin, William C.
Davis, Henry J., Jr.
Davis, Jay K.
Davis, Michael C.
Davis, Paul H., Jr.
Deaton, Paul
DeCook, David W.
De Mun, Taylor K.
DeView, Joseph R.
Diers, Charles E.
Dietrich, Henry T., Jr.
Dietz, Richard C.
Dittmar, Louis C.
Dobbins, John B., Jr.
Dodd, Charles A.
Dodd, Robert L.
Doering, Eugene R.
D'Orso, James N.
Drews, Sheldon
Duke, Marvin L.
Dungan, John D.
Dunn, Robert F.
Dwyer, Laurence A.
Dykers, Thomas M., Jr.
Eakle, Burke E.
Earl, William C.
Easterling, Crawford A.
Eastman, Alfred C., III
Ebbert, Edwin L.
Eckert, Richard H.
Eckstein, John R.
Edmonds, Hobart J., Jr.
Edmunds, Philip H.
Edwards, Chester C.
Ekman, Roger E.
Elder, James C.
Elfelt, James S.
Ellinghausen, Walter A., Jr.
Elliott, Charles L.
Ellison, David J.
Englehart, Harry J.
Engquist, Gordon W.
Enos, Ralph L.
Erkelens, Clarence
Eshman, John R.
Estes, Dana II
Etchison, Frank L., Jr.
Evans, Daniel H., Jr.
Farley, James W.
Federico, Charles D.
Fenton, Robert E.
Finn, Gerard P., Jr.
Fitzpatrick, Joseph A.
Fletcher, Charles D.
Fontaine, Richard K.
Ford, James M., Jr.
Forsyth, Robert J.
Foster, John F.
Foster, William F.
Fowler, John W.
Fox, Kenneth
Fox, Raymond G., Jr.
Frame, Edward L.
Francis, John P.
Francis, Thomas A.
Franke, Richard D.
Franklin, Billy D.
Fremd, Harry L.
Frost, William L.
Fuller, Robert B.
Gahafer, Joseph G.
Gair, Bruce O.
Galing, Searcy G.
Gamber, Harold W.
Garcia, Jaime
Gardner, Richmond
Gaskin, Richard G.
Gatje, George C.
Gearhart, Norman R.
Geiger, Eugene D.
Gibbins, Gareth W.
Gilchrist, John F., II
Gillcrist, Paul T.
Gillespie, Charles R., Jr.
Glancy, Thomas J., Jr.
Goetschius, Forrest D.
Gordon, David E.
Goslow, Paul
Gottschalk, Arthur W., Jr.
Goulds, Ralph J.
Govan, George W.
Grandfield, Francis J., Jr.
Grant, Richard T.
Grant, Thaddeus R.
Granum, Bradford S.
Grappi, Robert L.
Greathouse, David M.
Green, Robert E.
Greenleaf, Wilbur E.
Greff, Clarence H., Jr.
Griffin, Jack R.
Groehn, Gerhard C.
Gurney, Charles E., III
Guyer, Robert A.
Haff, William B.
Hahnert, William F., Jr.
Hale, William T.
Hall, Harrell W.
Hamilton, John W.
Hansen, Merle C.
Hansen, Ronald R.
Harbick, Donald L.
Hardisty, Huntington
Harnden, Charles G.
Harper, Lorren G.
Hart, Donald F.
Hart, Richard L.
Hart, William D.
Hartell, Ronald D.
Hartley, Jack H.
Hartnett, Bernard E., Jr.
Hawkins, Phil "R"
Hayes, Morris L.
Hayman, Robert B.
Head, John L.
Healy, Richard H.
Hedges, Ralph R.
Heenan, Richard D.
Heffernan, George A.
Heigl, John T., Jr.
Helgerson, Warren A.
Heon, Robert H.
Herbig, Henry F.
Herndon, William J., Jr.
Hession, James M.
Hetu, Herbert E.
Hibson, Leo A., Jr.
Hiehle, Frank G., Jr.
Hill, James C.
Hines, Gulmer A., Jr.
Hinkley, Harold L.
Hodnett, Robert A.
Hoffman, Merle L.
Holgren, Marvin A.
Holland, James S.
Holler, Edward R.
Hollick, Frederick B.
Holloway, Floyd, Jr.
Holmberg, Lennart G.
Holt, Neil G.
Hoover, Richard M.
Hopper, Richard S.
Horne, Charles F., III
Hovater, James D.
Howe, Richard B.
Hughes, Peter F. H.
Hughes, Wayne P., Jr.
Hull, George T.
Hume, Robert J.
Hunt, Albert M.
Ingley, Edmund W.
Inman, Bobby R.
Ismay, Arthur P.
Jaburg, Conrad J.
Jackson, Thomas L.
James, Charlie N., Jr.
Janulis, George
Jarvies, John E.
Jarvis, Donald H.
Jayne, Gordon H.
Jett, William S., III
Jewell, Thomas A.
Johns, Forrest R.
Johnson, Donald L.
Johnson, Guy D.
Johnson, Joseph J.
Johnston, Maurice M., Jr.
Johnstone, Richard A.
Joiner, Orrin
Jones, Carol W.
Jones, John E.
Jones, Samuel O., Jr.
Kaczmarek, Carl C.
Karvala, Curtis A.
Kaulback, Russell D.
Keach, Donald L.
Keane, James P.
Keathley, Charles C.
Kehoe, James W., Jr.
Kelley, Frederick W.
Kelln, Albert L.
Kelsey, Robert L.
Kemble, John R.
Kemble, Richard E.
Kennedy, Nevin, III
Kennedy, Ronald W.
Kennedy, Robert C.
Kennedy, Walter J.
Kilmer, Donald A.
Kinnebrew, Thomas R.
Kinsley, Donald T.
Kirchner, David P.
Kirschke, Ernest J.
Klett, George J.
Knopp, William A.
Knutson, Donald W.
Knutson, Wilbert D.
Koehler, Walter C., Jr.
Kollmorgen, Leland S.
Kosar, William S., Jr.
Kovarick, Frank L.
Kraft, Leroy M.
Kuehner, Karl E.
Kuhn, Edwin A.
Kully, Sheldon D.
Lacy, James E.
Lacy, Joe R.
Laighton, Robert H.
Lake, Charles M., Jr.
Lamb, Derwin T.
Lancaster, Robert W.
Langton, Charles E., Jr.
Larocque, George N.
Lasowski, Donald T.
Latimer, Samuel E., Jr.
Lautermilch, Paul A., Jr.
Layman, Lawrence
Leach, Ralph W., Jr.
Leahy, John P.
Lenox, Glen W.
Leppin, William F., Jr.
Lewis, Charles G.
Lewis, James T.
Lewis, James R.
Libey, John D.
Lidel, Carl J.
Lighter, Elbert D.
Liston, John M.
Loberger, James C.
Lockhart, Glenn S.
Lofton, Freeman L.
Logner, Robert L.
Longhi, William J.
Loposer, Avery K., Jr.
Lounsberry, Jack A.
Luckett, Thomas W.
Ludwick, Louis L.
Lukas, Thomas E.
Lunt, Vernon S.
Luskin, Arthur G.
Macfie, Richard B.
MacKercher, John C.
MacPherson, John J.
Madden, Raymond A.
Maice, Lee, Jr.
Mains, Homer O., Jr.
Malone, Roy W.
Manara, Vincent J., Jr.
Mann, Robert E.
Manring, Charles D.
Marbott, Henry W.
Marin, William T.
Martin, William R.
Massimi, Robert F.
Matherson, Richard
Mattioni, Blasco
Mau, George W., Jr.
May, Porter E.
Maynard, Donald J.
McBurney, William J.
McCarthy, Francis X.
McCormick, Daniel G., III
McCutcheon, Edwin L.
McDaniel, Clarence L. L.
McDonough, William D., Jr.
McFadden, Grafton R.
McGaughy, Richard W.
McGeachy, Francis L.
McGlohn, Robin H., Jr.
McGrath, Harold A.
McIntyre, John J.
McKee, Kinnaird R.
McKee, Robert X.
McLaughlin, Robert F.
McMillan, Donald G.
McNeely, James S.
McNerney, James F.
McQueston, Jack E.
McQuillin, John P.
McWey, Russell B.
Mead, Theodore E.
Meader, Bruce I.
Meadows, Okey I.
Meek, Kenneth L.
Meeks, Robert B., Jr.
Meeks, Thomas L.
Mehl, James P.
Melim, Robert D.
Meltzer, Melvin
Mench, Leland E.
Merrill, Forest "J"
Merritt, Glen C.
Meserve, Charles L.
Messina, Sylvester C.
Metcalf, Joseph, III
Metcalf, Louis E., Jr.
Michaels, Robert J.
Milius, Paul L.
Miller, Donald A.
Miller, Floyd, H., Jr.
Miller, James P.
Miller, James L.
Miller, Kenneth R.
Miller, Robert L.
Miner, Duane A.
Minnigerode, John H. B.
Mischke, Gayland J.
Mitchell, Edgar D.
Mitchell, John R. C.
Mitchell, Leland G.
Moffitt, Russell L.
Montgomery, Stephen C.
Montgomery, Graden L.
Moody, Thomas J.
Moore, Charles J.
Moore, Ernest M., Jr.
Moore, Loren I.
Moore, Tommy C.
Moore, Virgil W., Jr.
Morgan, James E.
Moriarty, Peter M.
Morin, Richard J.
Morris, Howard L.
Morris, Robert E.
Morris, Robert E.
Morrow, Charles D.
Morse, Jack L.
Mountford, Edward J.
Mow, Douglas F.
Moyer, Donald R.
Mueller, George E.
Mullin, James
Muncy, William E.
Murphy, Douglas C.
Murphy, Gilbert F., Jr.
Murphy, Ray D.
Murray, Douglas V.
Muto, Charles J.
Myers, Carroll E.
Myers, William S.
Nation, William C.
Naugle, James O.
Naylor, Charles K.
Neff, Richmond B., Jr.
Nelson, Eric A., Jr.
Nelson, Jack H.
Nesky, Anthony, Jr.
Nevius, William B.
Newsome, James W.
Nolan, Joseph, D.
Norman, Thomas V., Jr.
Norton, Richard J.
Nunneley, James K.
Nunneley, John K.
Nyce, William E.
O'Brien, Jerome L.
Oder, Howard W.
O'Donnell, John W.
O'Gara, Patrick E.
Ogden, Howard "A", Jr.
O'Hara, Jack F.
O'Leary, William E.
Olson, James W.
Olson, Willard R.

Orem, John B., Jr.
Organ, James W.
Orrik, Frederick J., Jr.
Orvis, Peter H
Orzalli, John B.
O'Toole, Kevin J.
Outlaw, Thurber A., Jr.
Overdorf, Thomas R.
Paddock, Charles O.
Palatini, Glenn L.
Palmer, Wallace C.
Panciera, Vincent W.
Pappas, George T.
Parks, William W.
Patch, Irwin, Jr.
Pattee, Richard S.
Patten, Michael A.
Paul, Raymond E.
Paul, Robert F.
Pauly, Donald E.
Pearce, Earl H.
Pearson, John F., Jr.
Pendell, Carl R.
Penney, William R.
Pennypacker, William S.
Pentony, John F.
Peterson, Richard E.
Pheasant, Alan G.
Phillips, Alan R.
Phillips, William R.
Pierce, Ray E.
Pierce, William H., Jr.
Pilon, Jerome R.
Piper, Harold L.
Piraino, Daniel
Pirrone, Anthony P.
Plow, Arthur E.
Pogue, David W.
Polatty, Donald B.
Pollak, Charles D.
Porter, Thomas
Potter, William W.
Pouls, Michael C., Jr.
Powell, William V.
Powers, Trent R.
Prezioso, Ronald
Prisby, Donald E.
Prosser, Walter R.
Purvis, Elvis E.
Quinn, Robert T.
Quitmeyer, Herman C.
Rabun, Floyd K.
Radja, James E.
Rainville, Duane D.
Raithel, Albert L., Jr.
Ramsey, David G.
Rankin, George M., Jr.
Raynes, Robert R.
Rea, Maurice W.
Redfield, John M.
Reed, Richard W.
Reed, William H.
Reeder, Ralph J.
Remsen, "T" Schenck
Renicky, Donald D.
Rentz, Frank L., Jr.
Reynolds, Roy S.
Ricardo, Benny J.
Rice, James O.
Richards, William C.
Ries, Allen L.
Rigsbee, Clifford M.
Rilling, Alexander W.
Riordan, Edward S.
Ritchey, Donald D.
Rivers, Wendell B.
Roane, Donald P.
Roberts, Charles T.
Roberts, John A.
Roberts, William E.
Robertson, Douglas B.
Robinson, Donald G., Jr.
Robinson, Robert B.
Roby, Grady H.
Rochford, John M.
Rockwell, Nevin L.
Rockwell, Richard F.
Rockwood, Jerred R.
Rodgers, Frederick A.
Rogers, James O.
Rossoe, John W. F.
Rough, Jimmie L.
Rowden, William H.
Rowland, James C.
Rowley, Reginald C.
Ruecker, Kenneth H.
Rueff, Eugene C.
Rush, Thornwell F.
Rushing, Charles F.
Russ, Jack E.
Sagerholm, James A.
Salin, Robert S.
Sassone, Charles H., Jr.
Saunders, William H., III
Sayers, Robert M., Jr.
Saylor, Eugene H.
Scarafone, Ronald
Schack, Edwin R., Jr.
Schaer, Oscar
Schonenberg, Hans P.
Schuller, Gordon J.
Schultz, Ford J. E.
Schutz, Walter J.
Schwartz, Sheldon O.
Scott, John H., Jr.
Scull, John D.
Sears, Glen R.
Sease, Hugh S., Jr.
Seay, Wesley, H., Jr.
Seeger, Charles E.
Service, James E.
Seymour, Ernest R.
Shabe, Gerard P.
Shafer, Lawrence
Shaffer, George W.
Shaffer, Guy H. B.
Shaid, Robert A.
Shanahan, Thomas L.
Shaver, Frank T.
Sheehan, William F., Jr.
Sheldon, Robert E.
Shellman, Curtis B., Jr.
Sherar, Robert C.
Sherman, Peter W.
Shrine, Bertram, Jr.
Shutty, Michael S.
Sierer, Payson D., Jr.
Sigmon, Harold F.
Sigsworth, David E.
Simon, Philip C.
Sims, Clifford M., Jr.
Sims, Gelzer L., Jr.
Sinclair, Alexander M.
Sisson, Donald E.
Skube, Edward A.
Skyrud, Jerome P.
Small, Robert H.
Smedberg, William R., IV
Smeltzer, John L., Jr.
Smith, Carol C., Jr.
Smith, Hugh T.
Smith, Kenneth G.
Smith, Ordell
Smith, Robert G.
Smith, Scott L.
Smith, St. Clair
Smith, William F.
Smoot, William N.
Sobieski, Leonard J.
Solterer, Carl F.
Soracco, David L.
Span, William F.
Speer, Richard T.
Springer, Howard C.
Sprunk, William, Jr.
Squires, Walter G., Jr.
Stader, John F.
Stalder, Roy F., Jr.
Stanley, Joseph K.
Stanley, Richard M.
Stark, Peter A., Jr.
Starn, Harrison F., Jr.
Stein, George D., Jr.
Stewart, Rodney L.
Still, Donald A.
St. Lawrence, William P., Jr.
Stocklmeir, Dean
Stoehr, Leonard A.
Stornetta, Wakefield S. M.
Stout, Edward N.
Stovall, Walter W.
Straney, Charles N.
Streightiff, Charles W.
Strohm, James J.
Strunk, Arthur A.
Sugg, Ross E.
Sullivan, Edward T.
Sullivan, Robert H.
Summers, Howard P.
Surman, William V., Jr.
Sutherlin, Benjamin T. W.
Swank, Donald E.
Sylvester, Gerald D.
Tallet, Arthur J.
Tallman, Elmer C.
Tate, Charles G.
Taylor, Clinton W.
Taylor, Edmund B., Jr.
Taylor, James D., Jr.
Tetrick, Claude J.
Thamm, Tom B.
Thiel, Louis H. C., Jr.
Thomas, David H.
Thomas, Gerald E.
Thomas, John K.
Thomas, Kenneth G.
Thomas, Richard T.
Thomas, Robert J.
Thomas, Robert F.
Thompson, Archibald S.
Thompson, William S.
Till, Ernest A.
Tillerson, Leonard E.
Tillson, John G.
Tomb, Paul D.
Traub, Charles, III
Treadwell, Lawrence P., Jr.
Treiber, Arthur E.
Trens, Mike J.
Trimble, Richard W.
Troffer, George J., Jr.
Troutman, Burl A., Jr.
Turnage, Robert L.
Tuzo, Lamar W.
Tuzo, Paul B., III
Tyson, Billie C.
Uehlinger, John C.
Utterback, Paul W.
Vahsen, George M.
Vail, Harold W.
Valade, Larry G.
Van Arsdol, Robert A.
Van Buskirk, George F.
Van Hook, Gordan
Varley, James F.
Verser, John K.
Victor, Francis W.
Voegelein, Gordon R.
Wadsworth, Francis L.
Walden, John W.
Wales, John R.
Walker, George D.
Wallace, Robert J.
Wandres, Victor, C.
Ward, Arthur T.
Ward, Carl B.
Ward, Thomas M., Jr.
Wasilewski, Alex, Jr.
Watson, Thomas W.
Watts, Charles R., Jr.
Webber, Gene D.
Webster, Edward W. V.
Weeks, Robert H.
Weisheit, Burton A.
Wellman, Harold N.
Wenzel, Robert F.
Wettroth, John R.
Wheeler, Robert A.
Whelan, Edward C., Jr.
Whelchel, Henry C., Jr.
Whistler, Ralph N., Jr.
Whitaker, Robert M.
White, Maurice G.
White, Paul G., Jr.
White, Steven A.
Whorton, William R.
Whyte, Kent E.
Wilde, Stanford R.
Wilhelmi, Quentin E.
Wilkinson, Edward L.
Wilkinson, Joseph B., Jr.
Williams, Allen D.
Williams, Charles K.
Williams, Charles D.
Williams, John T.
Williams, Ross N.
Williard, Bobbie D.
Willis, Francis R.
Wilson, Charles E.
Wilson, Donald K.
Wilson, Jack L.
Wilson, James E., Jr.
Wimberly, Tommy C.
Winberg, William, III
Winfrey, John A., Jr.
Winkel, Raymond N.
Winkler, Richard C.
Winnefeld, James A.
Wisdom, Jessie R.
Wiseman, Charles H.
Withers, Christopher
Wolff, Kenneth E.
Wood, Ralph E.
Wood, Stephen C.
Woodbury, John L., Jr.
Woodbury, Robert E.
Wright, Richard L.
Wright, Ross W.
Wright, Sidney V., Jr.
Wynkoop, Thomas E.
Yamnicky, John D.
Yeager, George E.
Yetman, William R.
Yocom, Ernest
Yoran, George F., Jr.
Young, Robert A.
Youngquist, John A.
Yount, Tim B.
Zacharias, Jerrold M.
Zoehrer, Herbert A.
Zvanovec, Ladimir J.

CAPTAIN, MEDICAL CORPS

Baker, Robert L.
Beer, David C.
Buechel, Donald R.
Christiansen, David V.
Drips, Robert C.
Dunn, Seldon C.
Garrett, Robert I.
Gaylor, Donald H.
Latham, Ernest F.
McGreevy, John J.
Neptune, Edgar M., Jr.
Prescott, Eustace H., Jr.
Richardson, Fred W.
Rosenwinkel, Norbert E.
Sanderlin, Joseph M.
Sigel, Carter B.
Steen, Frank G.
Wilber, Martin C.
Youngman, Samuel A.

COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Aiken, Robert J.
Alexander, Charles E., Jr.
Andersen, Martin G.
Atkins, Claude C.
Baker, Richard A.
Balyeat, George E.
Barcay, Stephen J., Jr.
Bargatze, Fred O.
Barreca, Joseph P., Jr.
Belser, Robert D.
Best, William C.
Bingham, Elmer L.
Blackburn, Laurence H. Jr.,
Borowsky, Melvin
Boyden, Douglas G.
Bramlett, Charner W.
Brisbin, Robert L.
Brown, Robert A.
Carver, Michael C.
Clarke, Eugene J., Jr.
Colburn, James E.
Cooke, James K., Jr.
Cooper, Paul D., Jr.
Crews, Quintous E., Jr.
Daane, Thomas A.
Davis, Milton D.
Dean, Philip J.
de Arrigoitiaro-Driguez, Enrique M.
Dempsey, William C.
Dewaal, Jan G.
Deyton, John W., Jr.
Easterling, James F.
Emich, Charles H.
Escajeda, Richard M.
Fairfax, George T.
Fosburg, Richard G.
German, Roy E.
Glass, James L.
Glick, Herbert E.
Hamlin, Charles R.
Harrison, Lucius A., Jr.
Hart, George B.
Houston, Harry R.
Hughes, James L.
Jones, Warren J., Jr.
Kawaguchi, Toshiyuki P.
Kibbey, Ianthus I.
Kinneman, Robert E., Jr.
Knab, Douglas R.
Kostohryz, Francis T.
Labudovich, Marco
Lambdin, Charles S.
Lee, Dixon A.
Linaweaver, Paul G., Jr.
Lowery, Clinton H.
Maher, Francis L.
Mazzarella, Italo C.
McGrew, Clinton J., Jr.
Miller, Alan G.
Millerick, Joseph D.
Mills, Mitchell
Mullen, Joseph T.
Mullin, Robert L.
Neugebauer, Marion K.
Plaut, Martin R.
Pratt, Hugh S., Jr.
Proulx, Ronald A.
Ralston, John "C", Jr.
Rinaldi, "J" Jerome
Rivas, Hector M.
Robinson, Donald W.
Royal, Orren L.
Rudinger, Edwin A.
Schanberger, John E.
Schorn, Victor G.
Seaton, Lewis H.
Stotka, Victor L.
TenEyck, David R.
Trone, James N.
Trumble, Theodore J.
Upton, Richard T.
Varon, Myron I.
Wenger, Norman E.
Whetsell, Joe E.
Willett, Leo V., Jr.
Woodstein, Ira J.
York, Elihu
Young, James M.

CAPTAIN, SUPPLY CORPS

Adrian, Rodger J.
Baird, Richard S.
Clements, Daniel J., Jr.
Dellasega, Joseph L.
Doucette, Forrest H.
Elmore, John W.
Forrest, James E.
Harbaugh, Norman R.
Haslett, Robert H.
Holbert, Kelley V.
Jones, Joe L.
Josselyn, Allan H., Jr.
Keidel, Charles J.
Knight, Richard H.
Larson, Albert G.
Larson, Leslie O., Jr.
Lewis, Raymond O.
MacDonald, Albert P., Jr.
McHenry, Wendell, Jr.
Peffley, John F.
Randolph, Karl W.
Renfro, Edward E., III
Rodgers, Wallace F.
Small, Joseph T.
Stafford, Dean C., Jr.
Surran, Charles R.
Thurman, Horace E., Jr.
Walther, Frederick W.
Woolard, Kenneth A.

COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Baker, Clovis M.
Barrett, Charles W.
Benedict, Joseph W.
Boyce, Thomas A.
Boyle, John J.
Brady, James A.
Bray, Joseph A., Jr.
Brett, Justin D.
Bruch, Herbert W.
Burbank, Donald D.
Calais, Clifford A.
Caliman, Wayman G., Jr.
Carpenter, Norman E.
Carson, Donald E.

Cavanaugh, Alfred G.
Conrad, Stanley J.
Crane, Barrett
Cuson, Charles E.
Dickey, William H.
Donnelly, Goodwin, III
Drake, William D.
Dreese, Richard N.
Dunlevy, John H.
Durham, Graydon M., Jr.
Edsall, Van T.
Fanelty, William C.
Foster, Robert W.
Francisco, Dick H.
Frost, Shirley D.
Galvez, Richard M.
Gillespie, James A., Jr.
Giordano, Andrew A.
Goeres, Gerald F.
Gordon, Donald B.
Gudbranson, Larry G.
Guffy, Wellard R.
Gustavson, Arthur R.
Hamilton, Oliver W., Jr.
Hamilton, Walter S.
Harris, Emerson M.
Hendershot, Theodore R.
Henderson, John S.
Hill, Robert E.
Huising, Don L.
Hurt, Richard O.
Jackson, Arthur D.
Jerich, Frank J.
Kauder, Robert
Kelly, Robert C.
Kerwath, Richard C. F.
Kick, David L.
King, Gerald H.
Kirch, Frederick J.
Klatt, Ivan J.
Kohl, Jacob D.
Landfair, Robert W.
Luoto, Hugo M. Jr.
Margason, Bernard L.
Mayer, William H.
Miller, Eric H., Jr.
Mitchell, William F.
Morrison, Quinn B.
Nehez, James R., Jr.
Newman, William H.
Phleger, Charles P.
Picht, George C.
Postak, John N.
Postich, George
Potter, David W.
Reynolds, Richard F.
Rice, Charles E.
Ryan, William J.
Samuelson, Charles H.
Sandrock, John E.
Schriner, James A.
Searles, Donald W.
Short, Carl W.
Smith, Charles E.
Smith, Herbert R.
Spears, Laurence
Stansbury, George L., III
Stratton, Dene B.
Tesch, Donald A.
Thomas, Magnus R.
Thompson, Gerald J.
Trueblood, Howard G.
Umstead, Walter W., Jr.
Wadsworth, Ben A., Jr.
Waller, Edmund M., Jr.
Weisskopf, William M.
White, George H.
York, William B., Jr.

CAPTAIN, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bonner, Robert A.
Cloonan, Joseph F.
Keeley, John A.
Lavin, Henry T.
Parham, Thomas D., Jr.
Ray, Milton U.
Trower, Ross H.
Vincer, John D.

COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bevan, Leroy A.
Bontrager, John K.
Carr, John F.
Geeza, Boris
Goad, John T.
Hogan, James J.
Johns, Harry D.
Kensta, Felix L.
Letten, Lloyd W., Jr.
Linzey, Stanford E., Jr.
Miller, Harry R.
Morrill, Giles D.
Schmid, Calvin F.
Simmons, David E.
Smith, Richard R.
Tillberg, Harlin E.
Titley, Richard K.
Zeller, Dwight F.

CAPTAIN, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Ashley, Donn L.
Baker, Carlyle J., Jr.
Cunning, David P.
Devlin, John G.
Forquer, Charles J.
Francy, William J.
Gault, Alan C.
Griffiths, William H., Jr.
Hansen, Bernard L.
Iselin, Donald G.
Jones, Whitney B.
Kaloupek, William E.
Klingenmeier, Russell J., Jr.
LaLande, Albert M., Jr.
Miller, Charles G., Jr.
Mitter, Wayne S.
More, David C.
Patrick, Donald A.
Saunders, Edward M.
Souder, Charles L.
Spangler, William S.
Sturman, William H.
Van Leer, Blake W.
Walton, Albion W., Jr.
Yount, George R.

COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Armatrout, Merritt F.
Bannister, William H.
Biederman, Richard J.
Biederman, Jack C.
Calhoun, Charles W.
Church, Archer E., Jr.
Coughlin, Richard D.
Courtright, Carl
DeGroot, Ward W., III
Dixon, Olin L., III
Field, Robert T.
Gates, Paul R.
Geoly, Charles
Green, Lawrence J.
McCoy, Arley E., Jr.
Middleton, William D., Jr.
Mooney, Malcolm T.
Myers, Clayman C., Jr.
Olson, Paul D.
Saravia, Benjamin L.
Stevens, Warren G.
Sutherland, Andrew G.
Sutley, Robert M.
Tombari, Henry A.
Whitehurst, Marshall N., Jr.
Williams, Curtis R., Jr.
Williams, Edward J., Jr.
Wilson, William L.
Zobel, William M.

CAPTAIN, JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

Johnston, Frank S.
Morgan, Horace H.
Neely, William E.
Parks, Larry G.
Robertson, Horace B., Jr.
Valentine, Andrew J.
Wilder, James D.

COMMANDER, JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

Bridges, Kenneth K.
Evans, LaVerne E.
Fink, Edward R.
Fruchterman, Richard L., Jr.
Haight, Gardiner M.
Higgins, Clinton K., Jr.
Newton, Robert B.
O'Donnell, John H., Jr.
Rogers, Richard J.
Salomon, Ferdinand L.

CAPTAIN, DENTAL CORPS

Bartlett, Stephen O.
DeLaurentis, Carlo A.
Didion, Robert W.
Echols, Archie D., Jr.
Gregory, Worth B., Jr.
Holmes, Corey H.
Kramer, Howard S., Jr.
Lehmann, William G.
Mahoney, Jack D.
Samuels, Homer S.
Scribner, James H.
Stephenson, Thomas D.
Wortham, Maury E.

COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Allensworth, Thomas M., Jr.
Billotte, Alfred C.
Brault, Alfred O.
Clark, Charles N., III
Collevecchio, Emidio J.
Collier, Richard D.
Corderman, Roy G., Jr.
Cotton, William R.
Davidson, Richard S.
Fulcher, Clyde L.
Gaston, Robert A.
Hall, Ollie V., Jr.
Hayes, Daniel E.
Kaneshiro, Kenneth K.
Keene, Harris J.
Kelly, James F.
Koutrakos, John
Lawrence, Joseph J., Jr.
Lommel, Tennyson J.
Longton, Robert W.
Loo, Wallace D.
Muller, Henry, III
Prince, Richard D.
Russell, John R.
Sand, Ralph E.
Schultz, Chester J., Jr.
Scott, James F.
Shiller, William R.
Strauss, Philip W.
Timby, Robert E.
Tugwell, Howard S.
Ulrey, Richard D.
Vessey, Robert A.
Watkins, Eugene A., Sr.
Workman, James L.

CAPTAIN, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Baldridge, Henry D., Jr.
Burr, Leonard W.
Caldwell, Charlie C.
Clauss, Edward L.
Coggburn, Manfred W.
Combs, Harrison T.
Eastman, Robert W.
Eisman, Leon P.
Essman, Frederick B.
Fennell, Chester C.
Hull, William B.
Mason, Anderson T.
Mayberry, Frank L.
McLellan, David J.
Miller, Lloyd W.
Moeller, Ruth
Moore, Daniel D.
Rasmussen, John E.
Ray, Jewel P.
Shepherd, William H.
Smith, Orville E.
Teller, Leslie W., Jr.
Tennille, Robert M., Jr.
Von Radesky, Horace
Young, John L.

COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Akers, Thomas G.
Asche, Clifton A.
Bean, Willis E.
Boudreaux, Joseph C., Jr.
Bower, Harold R.
Browne, Weldon G., Jr.
Chansky, Ralph D.
Daniel, Harold E.
Dowling, James H.
Drake, Wilbur R.
Garver, Richard M.
Green, Gale R.
Green, William J., Jr.
Harris, Albert C.
Howard, Wallace R.
Hughes, Robert G.
Jordan, Robert D.
Karrer, John L.
Leonard, Russell D.
Lewis, Thomas "W"
Litalien, Robert V.
Mateik, Edward D.
McClendon, Frank O., Jr.
McConville, William E.
McIntosh, Francis W.
McKay, Charles E.
Meyer, Robert E.
Mitchell, Thomas G.
Peppler, Leonard A.
Reynolds, Donald C.
Robinson, Donald J.
Rudolph, Henry S.
Schindele, Rodger F.
Shaffer, Weller J., Jr.
Summerour, Thomas J.
Tedford, Charles F.
Verme, Dominic A.
Williams, Daniel N.

CAPTAIN, NURSE CORPS

Houp, Geraldine A.

COMMANDER, NURSE CORPS

Boring, Martha L.
Corcoran, Anna
Hall, Lucy E.
Hill, Gretchen S.
McKay, Bernadette A.
Murasheff, Lina D.
Nielubowicz, Mary J.
Osborne, Leah V.
Prencipe, Edith A.
Roller, Helen
Searcy, Owedia M.
Taylor, Anna S.
Tyler, Mary R.
Zabel, Kathryn E.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, LINE

Adams, Ben L.
Adams, Frederick G.
Adams, Harold W.
Adams, James J.
Adams, Jessie W.
Adams, Thomas C.
Addison, Carl W., Jr.
Adgent, Robert B.
Ahrenstein, Monroe J.
Ake, Charles F.
Alberg, Donald J.
Albritton, David L.
Alexander, Sherman G.
Allard, Frank A.
Allemang, John D.
Allen, Archie E.
Allen, David L.
Allen, John E.
Allen, Richard O., Jr.
Allen, Robert L., Jr.
Allen, Scott
Allison, William R., Jr.
Alves, Arcenio, Jr.
Ames, Laverne W.
Anderson, Charles R.
Anderson, Edwin K.
Anderson, Franklin W.
Anderson, Gary M.
Anderson, Jerry P.
Anderson, James B.
Anderson, Peter N.
Anderson, Richard W.
Anderson, Thomas A.
Anderson, Thomas J.
Andrade, Allan L.
Andrews, Bobie
Androksi, Frank N.
Angus, Marvin S.
Anthony, Phillip D.
Appelhof, Gilbert A.
Apple, John D., Jr.
Aquilino, Salvatore P.
Araki, Makoto
Armor, Jack M.
Armstrong, Clarence E., Jr.
Arnold, David L.
Arnold, James G.
Arnold, Thomas F.
Artuso, Michael A.
Arvin, Vernon E.
Atkins, Allan L.
Aucoin, James B.
Audilet, Garland O.
Ausley, Joe H., Jr.
Avery, Paul R.
Aydt, Roger D.
Ayres, David R.
Baakkonen, Ronald R.
Baals, John R.
Bachman, Robert A.
Bailes, Ralph T.
Bailey, Donald C., Jr.
Bailey, George M.
Bailey, James E.
Bailey, William B.
Baker, Donald A.
Baker, Jack
Baker, John K.
Baker, Robert C.
Baker, Robert E.
Baker, Robert G.
Baldwin, Oa F.
Balsley, Joseph W.
Bandy, Clifford W.
Bankowski, Walter F.
Banks, William K.
Barbour, William J., Jr.
Barenti, Jerome C.
Baril, Robert F.
Barlow, John R.
Barnes, James A.
Barnes, James H.
Barnes, Joel F.
Barnett, Charles E.
Barney, Charles R.
Barnhardt, David F.
Barnhart, Harold D.
Barrigar, Donald B.
Barringer, Robert A.
Barrish, Paul D.
Bartholomew, James H.
Bartley, Robert H.
Barton, Robert L.
Bass, William H., III
Bassett, Charles G.
Bate, Ronald D.
Bauer, Paul F., Jr.
Bauman, John M.
Baumgartner, James A.
Baumstark, Richard B.
Bauschka, Patrick F.
Beach, Milton D.
Beagle, Clyde A., Jr.
Beall, Thomas J.
Beamon, Joseph E., II
Beck, Liston, C., Jr.
Beck, Richard E.
Bedow, Robert J.
Belisle, Gerald M.
Bell, Roger Q.
Bellinger, John R.
Belto, Meryl A.
Bendit, Billy L.
Benediktsson, Philip W.
Bennett, Charles F.
Bennett, Peter C.
Bentley, Robert E.
Bergfeld, Rudolph P., III
Bergstrom, Kenneth I.
Bernard, Eugene C.
Bertrand, Jon S.
Bess, George D.
Best, Albert H., III
Bethea, Carl L.
Bethel, Robert G.
Betts, Roger S.
Betts, William M.
Beversdorf, Donald W.
Beving, Duane U.
Bewley, Jack D.
Beyl, David D.

Biggs, Robert R.
Bigler, William W.
Biles, George E.
Bilicki, Daniel R.
Bird, Ralph G.
Bird, Richard E.
Bird, Thomas C.
Bisek, Dennis G.
Bishop, Jack D.
Bishop, Larry D.
Blair, David B.
Blaisdell, Richard W.
Blanchard, Ralph W., Jr.
Blankenship, James M., II
Bley, John E., Jr.
Bloise, James E.
Bloom, Donald D.
Blouin, Robert E.
Blum, Brandon B.
Blumie, John A.
Boebert, Frank L., Jr.
Boelter, Dan A.
Boguslawski, William T.
Bolte, William S.
Bolton, John M.
Bone, John S., Jr.
Bonhag, Walter D., Jr.
Booth, Peter B.
Borcik, Andrew J., Jr.
Bossert, John L.
Bouder, Raymond S.
Bovey, Paul E.
Bowers, John P.
Bowers, Richard F.
Bowman, Henry C.
Box, Roger E.
Boyd, Richard M.
Boyle, Ronald R.
Boyles, Harlan H.
Bradford, "J" "W"
Branscomb, Max "G"
Braunschweiger, Andrew E.
Bredderman, Rudolf T.
Breeding Leslie E.
Breland, Edgar A.
Bremser, William J., Jr.
Brennan, John F., Jr.
Brennan, Richard J.
Brenneman, Harold R.
Brennen, William L.
Brestle, Charles A.
Briegel, Charles V.
Briggs, Braden R.
Briggs, Stanley
Bright, Richard A.
Bright, Thomas B.
Brisbois, Marshall B.
Britton, Jack B.
Britton, Vernon J., Jr.
Bronson, Hiram S., III
Brooks, Bernard A.
Brooks, Charles G. W.
Brooks, Otis M.
Broton, Chester F.
Brown, Daniell M.
Brown, Donald B.
Brown, Donald L.
Brown, Frederick J.
Brown, Howard A.
Brown, Nicholas
Brown, Ora D., III
Brown, Peter J.
Brown, Ralph N.
Brown, Ralph E., Jr.
Brown, Roger W., Jr.
Brown, William S., Jr.
Brown, William M.
Browning, Elmer L.
Browning, Wayne B.
Broyles, Bill R.
Bruso, James W.
Bruyere, Thomas E.
Bryan, John E., Jr.
Bryans, Brian K.
Bryant, Don M.
Buchsieb, Louis D.
Buchwald, Robert D.
Buckland, Rann K.
Bueche, Arthur H., Jr.
Buehler, William S.
Buggy, Joseph S., Jr.
Burdick, Howard F., Jr.
Burgess, Eric C.
Burke, Francis J.
Burke, Joseph S.
Burke, Michael T.
Burkel, John F.
Burleson, Frank M.
Burns, Gerald J.
Burns, James W.
Burpo, James H.
Burrows, Donn T.
Burrows, Jack
Burson, Donald L.
Burt, Russell H.
Burton, James L., Jr.
Busby, Richard E.
Bush, Vernon R.
Bushnell, Malcolm W.
Butler, Clarence B.
Butler, Francis M., Jr.
Button, Ralph L.
Butts, Richard F.
Byng, Weston H.
Byrom, James T.
Caccivio, John D.
Caine, Paul E.
Caldwell, Leland C.
Caldwell, Theodore E.
Calhan, James R.
Callaway, Jack M.
Camacho, Richard G.
Camp, Joe D.
Campbell, Carl E.
Campbell, John R.
Campbell, Norman D.
Campbell, Ronald K.
Campbell, Thomas G.
Canada, Donald E.
Cannon, James R.
Capley, Joe H.
Carder, Denny M.
Carlson, Richard A., Jr.
Carlson, Walter G.
Carmichael, Eddie I.
Carre, David M., Jr.
Carriagan, Richard C.
Carroll, Peter A.
Carson, James T.
Carswell, Michael S.
Casey, Richard F.
Casey, Ronald C.
Castle, Ronald G.
Cates, Gus V.
Catoe, Ralph D.
Catola, Stanley G.
Catron, Jerry M.
Cecelski, Arthur R.
Cellar, Charles J., Jr.
Chalmers, William C.
Chancellor, Dean H.
Chancy, Thomas M.
Chang, Ming E.
Charneco, Carlos M., Jr.
Chase, Henri B,, III
Chase, Warren T., Jr.
Chatham, Walter L.
Chauncey, Arvin R.
Chester, Scott A.
Chilton, Holly H.
Chitty, Charles M., Jr.
Chrans, Ronald L.
Christensen, Charles C.
Christensen, Cyrus R.
Christopher, Richard V.
Chumley, Sylvester G.
Clark, Arthur R., Jr.
Clark, Bruce A.
Clark, George E.
Clark, George G.
Clark, James M.
Clark, Thomas B.
Clark, William E., Jr.
Clay, Jack D.
Cleary, Patrick R.
Clock, Richard V.
Cloud, Bruce L.
Clower, Claude D.
Clynes, Charles E.
Cobb, Roy L.
Cochran, Thomas L.
Cochran, William F.
Cocotis, Bruce T.
Coffey, Robert C.
Cole, Charles W., Jr.
Coleman, Douglas C.
Coleman Joseph S., Jr.
Coll, William A.
Collard, Keith P.
Collier, Lacey A.
Colville, Robert E.
Combs, Robert L.
Comstock, George W.
Connell, Earl W.
Connell, Laurence M.
Connell, Philip J.
Connelly, James H., Jr.
Connelly, John J., Jr.
Connery, John D.
Connolly, Leo J.
Connor, Ronald L. F.
Conti, Francis A.
Cook, John H., III
Cook, Richard D.
Cooke, Vincent E.
Cooley, David L.
Coons, Henry A.
Cooper, Daniel L.
Cooper, Estill A., Jr.
Cooper, Ross E.
Cooper, Scott E.
Corkins, Charles W., Jr.
Corkrum, Richard C.
Cornell, John P.
Cornett, Charles S., Jr.
Corrigan, Richard W.
Costello, Donald H.
Costilow, Kenneth L.
Cotsonas, John P.
Covey, Edward J.
Cowling, Cecil G.
Cox, Edward F.
Cox, Henry
Coyle, Charles A.
Coyne, Thomas
Coyne, William L.
Cracknell, William H., Jr.
Crafton, Robert W.
Craig, John E., Jr.
Crain, Carroll O., Jr.
Cramer, Dean E.
Cramer, Edward A., Jr.
Cramer, Erich H. E.
Crater, George H., Jr.
Crawford, Paul G.
Cremo, John, Jr.
Cress, Robert B.
Crew, Perry L.
Crim, Billy R.
Crook, Bernard
Crouse, David R.
Crouse, James U., Jr.
Crowell, George T., Jr.
Crowson, Christopher G.
Crudup, Everett H., Jr.
Crutchfield, Claud C.
Culberson, George W., Jr.
Cullen, Joseph P.
Cumming, Richard S., III
Cummins, Clarence M.
Cunningham, John H.
Cunningham, Joseph F.
Cunningham, Donald E.
Curry, Keith R. W.
Curry, Thomas H.
Curtis, Joe C., Jr.
Cushing, Earl H.
Cust, Harlan R.
Cutting, Curtis B.
Cyr, Byron A.
Czar, Raymond J.
Dage, Jerry D.
Dahill, Edward E., III
Dahl, Lowell D.
Dailey, Eugene O.
Daly, John S.
Dangelo, Anthony V., Jr.
Daniels, Hal B.
Dankel, Kenneth M.
Darling, David D.
Darnell, Jack
Daugherty, Donald N.
Daulton, James T.
Daum, Richard A.
David, Ralph H.
Davis, Jimmy W.
Davis, Norman E.
Davis, Robert B.
Davis, Robert G.
Davis, Thomas A.
Davison, Gregory L.
Day, James O.
Dean, Robert V.
Deangelo, Mark J.
Dearie, Cyril G.
Debode, Donald G.
Deboxtel, Lawrence L. Jr.
Dechant, John A.
Deering, Robert M.
Degroot, Henry, Jr.
Demarco, Anthony R.
Denison, William F.
Dennison, James R.
Denoon, Norman L.
Denton, Douglas J.
De Nunzio, Nicholas J.
Desteiguer, John R.
Deutermann, David W.
DeWeese, Everette D.
Dewey, Richard F.
Dewitt, Michael T.
Dickens, Russell J.
Dickerson, Kenneth A.
Dickey, John E.
Dillard, John S.
Dilcreto, Lucio
Dixon, Jewel L. Jr.
Dodge, Richard H.
Doebbler, Gordon B.
Doerr, Peter J.
Doherty, Richard S.
Domville, Compton N., Jr.
Donahue, John F.
Donlan, William J.
Donnegan, Richard
Donohue, Douglas J.
Dore, Stanley M., Jr.
Dorow, William R.
Dorsey, James F., Jr.
Doubroff, Jerome S.
Dowd, Gregory P.
Downs, Eugene H.
Drake, Donald L.
Draper, Tim L.
Drewry, Dean T.
Duben, Edward M.
Duckworth, Jess "R"
Duffie, Charles L.
Duffield, Frederick H., Jr.
Dumas, Jaul J.
Dunbar, Fredric A.
Duncan, John G.
Dungan, David A.
Dunleavy, Richard M.
Dunmire, Rance D.
Dunnam, William L.
Durckel, Ronald E.
Dvorak, Robert
Dwyer, William L.
Dyer, Nathaniel B., Jr.
Dyer, William E.
Dyro, Stanislaus G.
Eagye, Vernon A.
Earhart, Kay E.
Earnest, Charles "M"
Eason, William G.
Easterbrook, Charles W., Jr.
Eaton, Robert H.
Eck, Billy C.
Eckert, John D.
Edmonds, Donald C.
Edwards, Claude E., Jr.
Edwards, James C.
Edwards, Joe D.
Edwards, Leslie R.
Edwards, Walter J.
Edwards, William F.
Egan, Robert W.
Egerton, James W.
Ehret, James D.
Ehrman, Robert G.
Eizenhoefer, David J.
Elie, Gayle O.
Elinski, Michael, Jr.
Eller, James B.
Ellingson, Norman D.
Ellingwood, Arthur R., Jr.
Ellis, Hall R., III
Elpers, William W.
Elwell, William D.
Emerick, Charles D.
Emery, William F.
Emmerson, Milo E.
Emsley, Albert P., Jr.
Endo, Norio B.
Englehardt, James H.
English, Glenn A.
Epstein, Julian D.
Erdel, Edward J.
Erie, Carl R.
Ermis, Leroy C.
Eskew, Perry R., Jr.
Estes, Edward D.
Etheredge, Teddy B.
Evans, Frederic H.
Evans, Gene O.
Evans, James A.
Evans, Philip R.
Evans, Ronald E.
Everly, Vernon R.
Eylar, Frederick P.
Eyler, Armand T., Jr.
Fahey, William F.
Fair, Thomas W.
Fairbanks, Wayne K.
Faircloth, Gerald F.
Fallon, Thomas F., Jr.
Fantry, William T., Jr.
Faris, William E.
Farnsworth, John F.
Farris, John H.
Featherston, Rex W.
Feingersch, Allen
Felkins, Charles G.
Fellowes, John H.
Fenzl, George J., Jr.
Ferguson, Van L.
Ferm, Dennis W.
Ferrarini, Richard L.
Ferry, James M.
Feuerhelm, Duane L.
Fieser, Arnold K.
Filbert, Arthur S.
Fink, George E.
Fink, Siegfried A.
Finley, Dean M.
Fiore, Adolph A.
Firey, Roger S.
Fischer, Robert J.
Fischer, Theodore A., Jr.
Fish, Benjamin L., Jr.
Fishback, Frederick L.
Fishburn, Lewis R.
Fisher, Norman E.
Fisher, Walter L., Jr.
Fitch, Dee N.
Fitch, Edward S.
Fitzgerald, John F.
Fitzgerald, Maurice D.
Fitzsimmons, Eugene W.
Fitzsimmons, Harry S., Jr.
Fitzwilliam, Peter K.
Flanary, Thomas N., I
Flannery, Gerard J., Jr.
Flather, Charles R.
Flatley, James H., II
Fleak, Walter H., Jr.
Fleming, Bruce S.
Fleming. William J.
Fleshman, Samuel A., II
Florko, Donald J.
Flory, Richard L.
Flower, John R.
Floyd, Rodney R.
Flynn, John J., Jr.
Flynn, John J.
Flynn, Samuel C., Jr.
Flynn, William J.
Flyum, James K.
Foley, Jerold W.
Fontanesi, Francis D.
Foote, Everett W.
Ford, Alvis S.
Ford, Lyndall C.
Ford, Randolph W.
Forderhase, Larry A.
Fordham, Barton W., Jr.
Fordice, James E.
Forest, Robert E.
Forster, Johann R.
Forster, Robert M.
Fortenberry, Thomas N.
Fosko, Paul D.
Fossett, Birchard C.
Foster, Charles R.
Foster, Paul E.
Fournier, Joseph O.
Fournier, Paul R.
Fowler, Jim B.
Fox, George R.
Fox, John F. J.
Frank, Thomas P.
Frank, Vernon E.
Frankenberger, Paul F.
Franklin, William P.
Frankoski, John P.
Franzen, Richard D.
Frazier, Donald L.
Fredrick, Russell E.
Freeman, George H.
Freeman, Thomas L.
French, Douglas "E"
Frey, Robert D.
Fries, Charles L.
Friichtenicht, Richard D.
Froehlich, Kenneth R.
Frontz, Leroy, Jr.

Fudala, Ernest M.
Fuld, Charles L.
Fuller, Dale G.
Fullerton, Frank E.
Funderburk, Jeryl D.
Furey, Edwin M.
Furrow, Donald E.
Furtado, Francis J.
Fyles, Roderick A.
Gagne, Wilfred C.
Galio, Henry A., Jr.
Gallagher, Joseph G.
Gallion, Lawrence B.
Gallotta, Richard A.
Galvin, Robert J.
Garber, Cecil E.
Gardella, John K.
Garman, Glen E.
Garretson, Arthur S.
Garrett, Roger D.
Garrison, Charles H., Jr.
Garvey, James J.
Gash, John A.
Gates, Richard L.
Gault, Harry R.
Gaylor, Elvin L.
Gearin, Billy D.
Gehrig, Jerome C.
Gelke, John J.
George, Troy H., Jr.
Gero, Richard L.
Gesling, Marion L.
Giacchino, Louis F.
Gibson, Clifford W.
Gibson, James C., Jr.
Gifford, Robert M.
Gilbert, Donald B.
Gilbert, James C.
Gilbert, Robert L.
Gilchrist, Craig G.
Gilchrist, James L.
Gilfry, Mason C.
Gilkison, Edward R., Jr.
Ginn, James T.
Ginther, Larry L.
Giuliani, Leonard E.
Glasgow, Billy R.
Glasson, William A., Jr.
Glenn, William A., II
Gluse, Michael R.
Godbey, Thomas N.
Godefroy, Pierre L.
Goewey, Lee E.
Goggin, Richard E.
Golden, Edward E.
Golder, Thomas V.
Gonzalez, Robert N.
Goodale, Charles N.
Goodall, Thomas A.
Goodwin, James B.
Gordon, Stewart R.
Grady, Roger D.
Graham, Frank M.
Gralow, Richard T.
Grandjean, Charles A.
Grant, Freeman A., Jr.
Grant, Gerry D.
Grant, Howard W., Jr.
Grant, Richard L.
Graves, William S.
Gray, Anthony W., Jr.
Gray, Robert K.
Green, Gerald E.
Green, William H.
Greene, George C.
Greene, Richard O.
Greene, William H., Jr.
Greenhaw, Karl J., Jr.
Greenwood, Richard L.
Greer, Robert E.
Gregory, Kenneth A.
Grewe, Webster
Grier, Thomas C., Jr.
Griffin, Robert F.
Griffin, Thomas R.
Grimmell, Robert L.
Griswold, Gale M.
Groff, Peter J.
Groscup, William D.
Gross, Sidney L.
Grossoehme, Clyde
Grove, Ronald R.
Grow, Robert L.
Guimond, Louis F.
Guttery, Thomas H.
Haack, Norman E.
Hahn, Gary E.
Hahne, Dayton R.
Hale, Bill J.
Hale, Frederick W.
Haley, George K.
Haliday, George W.
Hall, Don L.
Hall, Joe L.
Hall, John O.
Hall, Robert A.
Hall, Thomas J.
Hamilt, Arthur
Hamilton, Edward A.
Hamilton, Verlie M.
Hamman, Kenneth A.
Hammock, Donald P.
Hammon, Colin P.
Hancock, Gus H., Jr.
Hanley, William L., Jr.
Hannaford, William H.
Hannah, Elmore K., Jr.
Hansen, Herbert L.
Hanson, David F.
Hanson, Deroy L.
Hanson, Donald C.
Hanson, Edwin E.
Hanson, Morton H.
Hardt, Hugo A.
Harkins, Vyron V., Jr.
Harmon, Jack E.
Harney, Patrick F.
Harris, Buford A., Jr.
Harris, Robert H.
Harris, William R.
Harscheid, David G.
Hart, Raymond J.
Hartley, Donald A.
Hartley, Donald H.
Hartman, Anthony G.
Hasch, Ralph H.
Haskell, Hugh B.
Hastings, Ralph H.
Haswell, Fremont G., Jr.
Hatch, Philip B., Jr.
Hatch, Ross R.
Haupt, Elmer H., Jr.
Hawkins, Charles D., Jr.
Hawkins, Sam H.
Hay, Donald G.
Hayes, Michael F.
Hayes, Newton G.
Hayman, Douglass F., Jr.
Hedstrom, Carl W.
Heekin, John P.
Hegeman, Joey W.
Heiland, Charles E.
Heim, George J.
Heinlein, Joseph E., Jr.
Heinz, Paul R.
Heisinger, Duane L.
Hellman, John S.
Henderson, Mark D., Jr.
Hennessey, John P.
Hennick, Raymond J.
Henry, John A., Jr.
Hensley, James V.
Herd, Robert V.
Hering, Frederick L.
Herring, Paul E.
Hesse, Gerald H.
Hewitt, Paul E.
Hiatt, William D.
Hibbard, Grant W.
Hickerson, James M.
Hickey, John F., III
Hickman, Jimmie E.
Hickman, Thomas W.
Higgins, John J.
Higginson, John J.
Hilaire, Paul D.
Hill, Raymond W.
Hill, Richard L.
Hill, Rollin L.
Hills, Willard A.
Hippard, Clyde M.
Hipps, Carl E.
Hobbs, William L., Jr.
Hodge, William R.
Hodgkinson, John T.
Hodgskiss, William L.
Hoffman, Chauncey F.
Hoffner, Conrad C.
Hogg, James R.
Hogue, Robert L.
Hohenstein, Clyde G.
Holland, John O.
Holland, Tommy L.
Holland, Wylen R.
Hollandsworth, Paul F., Jr.
Holloway, Richard V.
Holm, John P.
Honea, Milton D.
Honsinger, Vernon C.
Hood, Joseph W., Jr.
Hoover, Cameron L.
Horne, Roger B., Jr.
Horne, Ronald G.
Horsley, George W., Jr.
Horton, Jerry D.
Houglum, Leon P.
House, Wayne, Jr.
Howard, Charles B.
Howard, Harlan C.
Howard, John A.
Howe, John E.
Howell, Thomas A., Jr.
Hoyes, Donald J.
Hueber, Fred P.
Huggins, Andrew C.
Huhn, Samuel P.
Hullander, Robert A.
Humphreys, David W.
Hunter, Wallace R.
Hurd, Devon "H"
Husted, Murl E., Jr.
Huston, William G.
Hutchinson, Charles K.
Hutton, James L.
Hyatt, Charles E.
Hyatt, Robert G.
Hyde, Ronald P.
Ingram, William A.
Inman, Ronald C.
Innes, Alexander R.
Ion, Dalton L.
Isenhour, William J.
Jackets, Michael E.
Jackson, Jack M.
Jackson, Lester T., Jr.
Jackson, William I.
Jaeger, Robert H.
James, Ernest W.
James, James E. M.
Jamison, Kermit
Jarratt, Guy C., III
Jarwin, Raymond J.
Jauss, Charles W.
Jellison, Harry E.
Jensen, Richard S.
Jeremiah, David E.
Johannesen, Allen C.
Johe, Richard E.
Johns, Alan D.
Johns, Clifford M.
Johnson, David R.
Johnson, James E.
Johnson, Jerome L.
Johnson, Joseph W.
Johnson, Phillip S.
Johnson, Robert B.
Johnson, Ronald J.
Johnson, Verlyn D.
Johnson, Walter E.
Johnson, Wendell N.
Johnston, Donald H., Jr.
Johnston, Donald W.
Johnston, Harold B., Jr.
Jones, Clyde W.
Jones, Jack E.
Jones, Jerry E.
Jones, Stanley W.
Jordan, Henry M.
Jourden, Bud A., Jr.
Juif, Robert J.
Jumper, Vernon L.
Jurgens, Robert A.
Kalinowski, Raymond S.
Kalinyak, Paul P.
Kantor, Clifford S.
Karas, Robert E.
Karn, Alvin R., Jr.
Karnakis, Nicholas
Kassebaum, David L.
Kato, Haruo
Katz, Robert E.
Katzmann, Gerard H.
Keast, Paul H.
Keathley, James W.
Keegan, Arthur E.
Keene, Charles R.
Keiffer, Leo H.
Keith, John F.
Keller, Harry R.
Keller, William E., Jr.
Kelso, Frank B., II
Kemp, Ernest E.
Kemper, Ralph C.
Kemper, Robert D.
Kenaston, George W.
Kennedy, Raymond J.
Kennedy, Thomas C.
Kennedy, Thomas L.
Kennelly, Bernard J.
Kenney, Richard A.
Kenney, Theodore C., Jr.
Kent, Ronald H.
Keough, Edward P.
Keough, Robert J.
Kerslake, Ronald W.
Kersting, William H.
Kesteloot, Robert W.
Ketchum, William H.
Keyes, James L.
Kilgore, William H.
Kilpatrick, Thomas E.
Kilpatrick, Paul G., Jr.
Kimball, Paul E.
Kinert, John H.
King, Charles C.
King, John D.
King, Ural W.
Kinney, Ben J.
Kinney, Charles H.
Kiper, William D.
Kirkpatrick, John H.
Kirkpatrick, Wayne A.
Kirkwood, Robert L.
Kittleman, Donald L.
Kitzelman, Glenn E.
Kizer, Theodore L.
Klein, Argyle G.
Klein, Harry L.
Klish, Theodore, Jr.
Kloman, John H.
Knapp, Ralph E.
Knaus, Vincent L.
Knef, Andrew L.
Knight, Burton L.
Knight, Dennis K.
Knott, Howard E., Jr.
Knowles, Russell, Jr.
Kolstad, Thomas C.
Komisarcik, Adam
Kordek, Walter A.
Korthe, James D.
Kraemer, Kenton K.
Kralik, Simon C.
Kramer, James B., Jr.
Kramer, Rex W., Jr.
Kratch, David A.
Krekel, Lyman E.
Kremin, Richard A.
Kristof, John J.
Krogh, David E.
Kronnagel, Julius
Krueger, Milton E.
Krueger, Richard G.
Kruger, Allen L.
Kuck, Donald L.
Kuehler, Donald E.
Kuehmeier, Joseph K.
Kuhn, Wendel S., Jr.
Kulo, Thomas S.
Kushner, David A.
Kuykendall, Herbert B.
Kvederis, James P.
Lacy, William A.
Lamb, Larry R.
Lambert, Raymond A.
Lamberth, Billy C.
Lambright, Harold R., Jr.
La Motte, Francis J.
Lang, William R.
Lange, Christian A., Jr.
Langenheim, John P.
Langley, Charles R.
Langley, Thomas R., Jr.
Langston, Nicholas D.
Lanning, Richard J.
Lapham, Joseph G.
Larison, John D., Jr.
Larsen, James L.
Lassetter, Keith M.
Lattig, Edward C.
Laurance, James D.
Laux, Arno H.
Lavelle, Thomas J.
Lawrence, Donald W.
Lawson, Ramsay
Leban, Carl
LeBlanc, James B.
LeBlanc, Thomas D.
Lee, Dennis B.
Lee, John J.
Lee, Kenneth C.
Leech, Robert J.
Leeds, Rene W.
Lees, Forrest A., Jr.
Leird, William A.
Lengel, Robert C.
Lenhardt, Harry F., Jr.
Lerner, Albert M.
Lewedag, Loren M.
Lewey, Ira D.
Lewin, Theodore E.
Lewis, Harold S.
Lewis, Norman H.
Lewis, Tom A.
Lightsey, James L.
Linch, Donald T.
Lincoln, John R.
Lindquist, Donald E.
Lipscomb, Jack C.
Littlewood, Lyle E.
Livingston, John G., Jr.
Locke, Jerry L.
Logan, David E.
Lohr, James R.
Lomheim, Louis G.
Longley, William N.
Loos, Donald G.
Loscavio, John M.
Loudon, Richard S.
Lovdal, Rodney H.
Lowe, William L.
Lown, Paul C.
Lowry, Abner P.
Lubberstedt, Richard L.
Luetschwager, Edward E.
Lumbert, Albert W.
Lund, John R.
Lundquist, Donald R.
Lybrand, Joe D.
Lynch, Robert B., Jr.
Lyons, James E.
Macan, John J.
Macaskill, Everett, Jr.
MacCable, Van L.
MacDonald, Richard W.
Mackay, Gerald W.
Mackin, Louis B., Jr.
MacLaren, John H.
MacNichol, Malcolm S.
MacQuarrie, Gary L.
Magness, Eddie R.
Magnus, Ralph S.
Mahler, George B.
Maiberger, George L.
Majors, Frances D.
Majors, William T.
Malloy, Malcolm A.
Maloney, John J.
Malvin, Frederick B.
Manes, William C.
Mann, John P.
Mansfield, James L.
Marcantonio, Anthony W.
Marcus, Robert U.
Mares, Ernest
Markley, Wade E.
Marks, Arthur J.
Marovich, Michael
Marriott, Michael J.
Marryott, Ronald F.
Marshall, Raymond E.
Marthinson, Detlow M., Jr.
Martin, Frank P.
Martoski, Robert W.
Maston, Joseph H., III
Mater, Bernard E.
Maticko, Eugene R.
Matson, Bruce W.
Matt, George E., Jr.
Matteson, Kelvin L.
Matthews, John B.
Mattson, John A.
Maurer, Earl T.
Mautino, Richard L.
Maxwell, Matthew T., III
May, James L.
May, Robert C.
Maybee, Dan C.
McAllister, Richard C.
McAvenia, Harold G., Jr.
McBride, Michael A.
McBurnett, Kenneth S.
McCabe, George J.
McCaffery, Robert A.
McCampbell, Richard L.
McCarter, Kenneth W.
McClenahan, Tom P.
McClure, Dale R.
McConnell, Edward W., II
McCormick, Bruce A.
McCracken, David J.
McDaniel, Eugene B.
McDaniel, Rodney B.
McDermott, John G.
McDivitt, Ronald M.

McDonald, George W., Jr.
McDonald, Richard R.
McDonough, Vincent P.
McEachen, Angus D., III
McEnaney, Thomas J., Jr.
McEwen, Richard D.
McFadden, John H., Jr.
McGahan, John P.
McGarry, John G.
McGlynn, James R.
McGrath, James J.
McHenry, William G.
McHugh, Charles E.
McHugh, John T.
McIndoe, James E.
McIntire, Wilton H.
McIntosh, Charles E.
McKamey, John B.
McKenzie, John H., Jr.
McKinney, Gale A.
McKinnon, Patrick C.
McKinstry, Thomas W.
McKissock, Donald J.
McKitrick, Edward R, Jr.
McKnight, James D.
McLellan, Charles A.
McMillan, Edward W.
McMillan, Lee Q.
McMurry, William T.
McNeill, Richard J.
McPherson, Albert A.
McRae, James F.
McTighe, Roger P., Jr.
Mead, Gerald R.
Meadows, Landon O.
Mecaughey, Robert W.
Medwedeff, Channing W.
Meehan, James F.
Meier, Leonard M.
Melcher, Roland O.
Melvin, Edmund W.
Melvin, Virgil B.
Mendenhall, Ivan F.
Mercer, William C.
Mesimer, Grady F., Jr.
Metzler, Charles D.
Meyer, Allan G.
Meyer, "J" "D"
Meyer, Richard E.
Meyers, Roger A.
Miceli, Joseph D.
Michaels, Danny J.
Miefert, Milton D., Jr.
Mikitarian, Samson
Miles, DeWitt C., Jr.
Millard, David R.
Miller, Charles H., Jr.
Miller, David G.
Miller, Forrest R.
Miller, George
Miller, James T.
Miller, John L.
Miller, John A.
Miller, Robert H.
Miller, Walter W.
Miller, Wayne W.
Miller, Wendell E.
Mills, Albert
Mills, Leon R.
Mills, Thad W.
Milner, Harry M.
Minton, David C., III
Mirise, Kerry W.
Miron, James J.
Misura, Paul
Mitchell, Clyde L.
Mitchell, Kenneth
Mitchell, Oscar E.
Mitchell, Ralph M.
Moke, Paul D.
Molenda, Paul H.
Monk, Samuel W.
Monroe, Vincent D.
Monteleone, Vito J.
Montgomery, George C., Jr.
Moore, Harold A., Jr.
Moore, John W.
Moore, Nelson E.
Moore, Paul M.
Moore, Robert W.
Moore, Rowland W.
Moran, Thomas J.
Moravec, Henry J., Jr.
Morgan, Garner E., Jr.
Morris, Charles S.
Morris, Hal B., Jr.
Morris, Jesse B., Jr.
Morris, John D.
Morrison, Jon K.
Morsches, Robert W.
Mortimer, Edmund C.
Morton, Stewart M.
Mouser, Hugh P.
Moyers, Gilbert E.
Mozier, Richard A.
Mueller, John A.
Mullen, Cornelius W.
Muller, Robert C.
Mulloy, Charles S.
Mulvihill, James H.
Munn, Robert J., Jr.
Munro, William S.
Munsey, William D.
Murphy, David R.
Murphy, John A.
Murray, Frank S.
Murray, James C.
Murray, Paul A.
Musick, Wayne O.
Myers, Charles E.
Myers, Dale P.
Myers, William K., Jr.
Nagel, "L" "D"
Nash, Michael J.
Neeley, Wallace W.
Nelson, Bobby C.
Nelson, Carl A.
Nelson, Glenn T.
Nelson, Paul J., Jr.
Nelson, Robert E.
Nelson, Robert L.
Nelson, Sven D.
Neuhard, Henry H.
Newbury, Alfred C.
Newcomb, James W., Jr.
Newcomb, Zeanious L.
Newell, Richard E.
Newman, Alvin S.
Newsom, Joe R.
Newton, Robert L. L., Jr.
Nicholson, Robert C.
Nicholson, Harry E.
Nicholson, Herbert H. J.
Nickell, Herbert E., Jr.
Nofziger, Larry B.
Noggle, George A., Jr.
Norrington, Charles G.
Northam, Thomas A., Jr.
Norton, William S.
Notargiacomo, Joseph M.
Nucci, Eugene M.
O'Berle, Ronald J.
O'Brien, Donald W.
O'Connell, Jerome A.
O'Connor, Edwin A.
O'Connor, Neil F.
O'Connor, William J. M.
O'Donnell, Daniel T.
O'Donovan, James P.
O'Dwyer, Kyran M.
Ogle, Peter W.
Ohmen, Douglass J.
O'Keefe, Martin P.
O'Keefe, Timothy R.
O'Kelly, James R.
Oliverio, Theodore E.
Olmer, Lionel H.
Olson, Albert W., Jr.
Olson, Carroll A.
Olson, Darryl D.
Ondak, Gerald S.
Onhaizer, Jerry E.
Opgrand, David A.
Oppedahl, Phillip E.
Ord, Donald C.
Ore, William E.
Orrik, David N.
Orzech, Bernard P.
Osborn, Oakley E.
Osborne, Dale H.
Osgood, Wayne R.
Ostrom, Joseph E., Jr.
Otto, Max W.
Overstreet, George H.
Owen, William L., Jr.
Owens, Darrel D.
Owens, John G.
Owens, Robert S.
Owens, Sherman H.
Oyler, Charles C., Jr.
Oyler, Donald R.
Oyler, Jimmie D.
Page, Arthur "M"
Palmer, Edward J.
Palmer, Gerald A.
Palmer, Jerry J.
Pape, Frank F.
Pappas, Jimmy
Parker, Jackson K.
Parker, Ronald H.
Parks, Charles L.
Parks, Jack J., Jr.
Parsons, Marland W., Jr.
Pasquinelli, Francis C.
Patrick, Andrew K.
Patterson, Donald R.
Pattin, Stephen M.
Patton, James M.
Peabody, James P.
Peake, Stephen R.
Pearigen, Jare M.
Pearson, James W.
Pearson, John E.
Pearson, Merton A.
Pedersen, Dan A.
Peebles, Baker L.
Peek, Robert F.
Peeples, John M., Jr.
Pellock, Lyle E.
Penders, Joseph W.
Pendleton, Benjamin L.
Periolat, John J.
Perrella, Albert J., Jr.
Perro, Michael A., Jr.
Perry, Albert J.
Perry, Leonard G.
Person, Herbert F.
Persons, George R.
Peters, Frank J., Jr.
Peters, Vernon W.
Peterson, Bob L.
Peterson, John R.
Peterson, Karl L.
Peterson, Laurel C.
Peterson, Peter C., Jr.
Petree, Noel H., Jr.
Petrich, Horst A.
Pfister, William J.
Phelps, Freddie J.
Phillips, George L., Jr.,
Phillips, John M.
Phillips, Ronald M.
Phillips, Richard W.
Philo, Arthur R.
Picciuolo, Stephen A. D.
Piche, Paul D.
Pickel, Theodore C., Jr.
Pickett, Ronald B.
Piersall, Charles H., Jr.
Pietrzak, Edward S., Jr.
Pinion, David E.
Piotti, Walter T., Jr.
Pippins, Elery H.
Pirotte, James H.
Pitzen, John R.
Pizzo, Philip J.
Plassmeyer, Joseph D.
Pocklington, William D.
Polfer, Clarence R.
Pollard, Ronald T.
Poole, Thomas E.
Poore, Thomas W.
Porcaro, Anthony P.
Porter, Robert W.
Potenti, John P., Jr.
Potter, Clare E.
Powell, Stewart G.
Powell, Wendell W.
Powell, William C.
Poyet, Elmer F.
Presley, Jack C.
Previ, Wallace M.
Prien, Richard K.
Pritchard, Joseph R.
Proctor, Allen D.
Prokop, Phil G.
Promersberger, Edward S.
Proper, Vance D.
Propper, Ronald M.
Propst, William F.
Pundt, Cameron A.
Purdy, Dale C.
Pursley, John E.
Pyle, Loyd E.
Pyle, Roger G.
Queen, Ronald J.
Quigley, Francis J.
Quinn, James E., Jr.
Quinn, Robert N., Jr.
Raab, Charles F.
Rabuck, Leo V.
Rae, Paul O.
Ragan, Charles P.
Raines, Frederick L.
Ransom, James P., II
Ray, Willard D.
Rayome, Francis L.
Read, Benton M.
Ream, Ronald L.
Redder, Lawrence F.
Redhage, James L.
Redington, Jerome J.
Reed, Jesse L.
Reese, Russell R.
Reich, Merrill D.
Reid, Ralph G., Jr.
Reilley, Ralph H., Jr.
Reinhardt, Ellwood B., Jr.
Reis, Joseph J., Jr.
Rennaker, Charles L.
Renner, Lorraine E.
Rentschler, Richard L.
Repass, Donald E.
Rettig, Godfrey A.
Reynolds, Robert L.
Rhoads, John D.
Rice, Robert P.
Rich, Willis S.
Richards, Warren D.
Richardson, Fred D., Jr.
Riedemann, Walter J., Jr.
Riefler, George B.
Rigg, Richard G.
Riggs, Selby B.
Rij, Michael A., Jr.
Rimson, Ira J.
Ring, Stewart A.
Rinkel, Richard A.
Robbins, Philip D.
Roberts, Charles R.
Roberts, Gordon W.
Roberts, Ned C.
Roberts, Tommie W.
Robertson, Hollis E.
Robins, John R.
Roche, Peter A.
Rodgers, Joseph L.
Rodgers, Robert D.
Rogers, David T.
Rolfe, Clair E.
Rollman, Gordon L.
Romano, Gennaro J., Jr.
Ronni, James A.
Roper, Vincent W.
Rothe, Jack F.
Roundtree, Jack L.
Rowell, George W.
Rower, Jay A.
Rowsey, James M., Jr.
Ruchala, Joseph F.
Ruhle, Robert C.
Ruland, Donald O.
Russ, William M., Jr.
Russell, Kay
Russell, Richard E.
Ruthrauff, Clifford B.
Ryan, Gerald F.
Ryan, Patrick F.
Ryan, Thomas M.
Saavedra, Robert
Sabin, James F.
Sabine, Frederick R.
Sachtjen, Jerry W.
Sackett, Dean R., Jr.
Sage, Robert A.
Sale, William L.
Saleh, Richard E.
Salisbury, Jack S.
Salo, Lennart R.
Salo, Willard H.
Saltz, Newell J., Jr.
Sanders, Wilbur F., III
Sandler, Charles A.
Sarphie, Jack E., Jr.
Saunders, Richard E.
Saurey, Russell M.
Savage, Jimmy R.
Saville, Robert E.
Saville, Terry D.
Sayers, Samuel L.
Scarborough, John R. L.
Schade, Eric H., Jr.
Schaedel, Joseph A.
Schaeffer, George R.
Schafer, Alfred E.
Schaffert, Richard W.
Schaible, David L.
Schaier, John D.
Schatz, Robert G.
Scherer, Francis H.
Scheyder, Ernest J.
Schilling, George F.
Schmidt, Arnold C.
Schmidt, Robert H.
Schmitt, Arthur F., Jr.
Schmitt, Robert W.
Schnitzer, Lawrence E.
Schoeff, Kendall "E"
Schreadley, Richard L.
Schreiner, Raymond J.
Schroder, Donald C.
Schroeder, John H.
Schulz, Paul H.
Schulze, John M., Jr.
Schumacher, Duane O.
Schussler, Gerald A.
Schutte, John J.
Schwaab, Denis T.
Schwartz, Hugh L.
Schwartz, Ralph C.
Scoffield, Gary A.
Scott, Charles H.
Scott, Philip J.
Scott, Thomas P.
Scott, Thomas W.
Scovel, Frank D.
Scruggs, Richard M.
Seacat, Ralph L.
Sears, Johnny M.
Sechrest, Edward A.
Seesholtz, John R.
Seiler, Melvin E.
Selberg, John W.
Senden, Paul W.
Sesma, Ramon A.
Shafer, Richard W.
Shaffer, Clyde H.
Shannon, Philip M.
Shaw, Charles I.
Sheehan, John P.
Sheets, James R.
Shelso, David A.
Sheppard, Donald E.
Sheubrooks, William L.
Shinn, Robert A.
Shipley, Carl N.
Shirley, Fred E., Jr.
Shirley, Vernon D.
Shores, Howard V.
Short, Benjamin F.
Short, John S.
Short, Leroy A., Jr.
Shultz, Theodore B.
Sibley, David N.
Siegrist, Edward A., Jr.
Sierra, Edward P.
Sigmond, Arie C. A.
Sikes, James H.
Silberstein, George W.
Simerly, Glen E.
Simone, Thomas J.
Simpson, Benjamin M., III
Simpson, George T. K.
Simpson, James H.
Simpson, John E., II
Simpson, Jon D.
Sinclair, Leonard A.
Sirch, Richard W. F.
Skelly, Arthur R.
Slaughter, William T.
Sleeman, Charles F.
Slingerland, Raymond D.
Sloan, John H.
Sloan, William D.
Smetheram, Herbert E.
Smith, Bernard J.
Smith, Bradley G.
Smith, Frederick H., Jr.
Smith, Gene A.
Smith, John P.
Smith, Joseph C.
Smith, Lee O.
Smith, Leo B.
Smith, Neil D.
Smith, Paul J.
Smith, Phillip D.
Smith, Ronald E.
Smith, Thomas C.
Smith, Thomas F.
Smith, Vernon C.
Smith, William C.
Smith, William L.
Snell, Robert L., Jr.
Snider, Donald M.
Snow, Kennedy B.
Snyder, Richard C.
Sokill, George H.
Somers, David W., Jr.
Sommer, Leroy G.
Songster, John H.
Sonnabend, Jerome R.
Soriano, Joseph R.
Spellman, Fred G.
Spencer, Barry W.
Spencer, Charles H.

Spencer, Lane L.
Spero, Joseph R.
Spink, Peter J.
Spitz, Gerald A.
Splitt, Robert F.
Spoto, Victor S.
Spousta, Allen F.
Springer, Emerson T.
Squires, Howard J.
Stalcup, Jimmie M.
Stallings, Arthur C., Jr.
Stammer, Walter H., Jr.
Stanford, Robert L.
Steckel, John H.
Steele, William M., Jr.
Stefanou, Christopher M.
Steinbrink, Earl E.
Stelly, John M.
Stennett, William A.
Stennett, William A.
Stephens, John A.
Stephenson, Paul D.
Sterling, John C.
Stevenson, Connelly D.
Stevenson, Barr S.
Stewart, Charles C.
Stewart, Dennis J.
Stewart, George W.
Stewart, Joseph A., Jr.
Stiers, Lawrence W.
Stocking, Sigurd I.
Stoeckel, Anthony W.
Stokes, Bobby J.
Stone, Elmer M.
Stone, George P.
Stone, Lowell P.
Stophel, Joseph E.
Storey, William D.
Stover, Richard C.
Stowell, Marshall A.
Stratford, Robert H.
Streuli, Joseph W.
Strey, Dennis W.
Stromeyer, Anthony J.
Strommen, Gene A.
Strong, Henry H., Jr.
Strong, Paul L.
Stuart, Charles J., Jr.
Stutz, James D.
Sullivan, Eugene J., Jr.
Sullivan, Gerald T.
Sullivan, Gene F.
Sullivan, Robert G.
Sullivan, Thomas J., Jr.
Sullivan, William K.
Sumner, Donald M.
Swan, Robert S.
Swan, William R.
Swanson, Harlan D., Jr.
Swanson, Matthew C.
Swarthout, Gerald L.
Swartz, Theodore R.
Swinnerton, Ronald H.
Sykes, Floyd E.
Sylvester, Vincent
Taff, Clarance O., Jr.
Tager, Bruce A.
Taggart, Donald J.
Talbert, Joseph T., Jr.
Talbott, Merrill L.
Tambini, Anthony L., II.
Tarbuck, Richard R.
Tasker, William G.
Taylor, Gaylen D.
Taylor, Hugh R.
Taylor, James E.
Taylor, James M.
Tayor, Jeremy D.
Taylor, John D.
Taylor, Lawrence H., Jr.
Taylor, Lewis H.
Taylor, Robert C., Jr.
Teachout, David S.
Teague, Foster S.
Templeton, Wilbur D., Jr.
Terrell, Jerry L.
Teter, Eugene V.
Tettelbach, Frederick M.
Thall, Raymond L.
Thaubald, Edward J.
Thearle, William J.
Theodorelos, Pete "J"
Thibault, George E., Jr.
Thomas, James W.
Thomas, James G.
Thomas, John H., IV
Thomas, Richard L.
Thompson, Jimmy P.
Thompson, James K.
Thompson, Jack D.
Thompson, Russell N.
Thompson, Theodore R.
Thompson, Tommy L.
Thornsley, John T.
Thorpe, Gordon L.
Thorpe, Jack C.
Thurber, John D.
Thurneysen, Jon S.
Tibbitts, Barrick F.
Tibbs, John C.
Tietgen, Charles A., Jr.
Timberlake, David W.
Timlin, Joseph W., Jr.
Timm, Dwight D.
Tinker, Charles L.
Titus, Edward D., Jr.
Tobey, Stephen
Toehlke, Walter A.
Tollinger, John N., Jr.
Tomlon, Jack W.
Touchton, John H., Jr.
Tracy, Theodore R.
Traylor, Harold K.
Treiber, Maurice L.
Trupp, Adam R.
Tubbs, Kenneth A.
Tucker, Edwin B.
Tucker, James E.
Tulley, Cecil R.
Tullis, James V.
Tully, Joseph F.
Turner, Charles W.
Turner, Robert C.
Turner, Warren D.
Turner, Wilson C.
Turpin, Thomas R.
Ulrich, Thomas R.
Ustick, John
Ustick, Richard C.
Vallera, Rocco D.
Vance, Walter N., III
Van Horne, Alfred L.
Van Metre, James M.
Vanoy, William E.
Vermillion, John E.
Vescelius, Milton J. Jr.
Vestal, Leroy N.
Vezina, George R.
Villemaire, Grant J., Jr.
Villenave, Robert A.
Volden, Thelmar O.
Vollmer, William E., Jr.
VonHendy, Richard D.
Vonier, Richard L.
Wachob, James R.
Wages, Clarence J., Jr.
Wagner, John A.
Wakatake, Clifford K.
Walden, Warren L.
Walder, Edward F., Jr.
Wales, George E.
Walker, Jimmy W.
Walker, Richard A.
Wall, Arthur D., Jr.
Wallace, Earl D.
Wallace, Laird E.
Wallace, Richard J.
Walling, Samuel E.
Walsh, Robert E., Jr.
Walston, Jerry D.
Walter, Clyde M.
Walter, Dale J.
Waltzer, Jacob
Ward, Compton E.
Ward, James A.
Ward, John A.
Wardell, William L., Jr.
Waring, James D.
Watkins, Robert L.
Watts, Henry A.
Watts, Jasper B.
Way, Edward R.
Weaks, William G.
Webb, Kenneth H.
Weber, Burtland B.
Weber, Gerald M.
Weber, Gustave A., Jr.
Webster, John A., Jr.
Wehner, George D.
Weichman, Denis R.
Weidman, Russell H.
Weinfield, Richard M.
Weir, Richard W.
Weisman, Burton S.
Welch, Richard D.
Wells, Charles T.
Werenskjold, Gary W.
Werner, Marshall D.
Weseleskey, Allen E.
Wesolowski, Walter
West, Charles T.
Westall, Kenneth W.
Westfall, Ronald C.
Westfall, Van F.
Wheat, Elbert E.
Wheeler, James R.
Whelan, Mathew J., Jr.
White, Charles A.
White, Laurence A., Jr.
White, Richard F.
White, Robert S.
Whiting, Donald W.
Whittaker, Robert L.
Wichmann, William H.
Wicke, James O.
Widen, Richard D.
Wiebelhaus, Clarence J.
Wier, Ronald L.
Wieschhoff, Kenneth H.
Wiggins, Larry C.
Wilbern, Jack M.
Wild, Ronald A.
Wilde, John H., Jr.
Wiley, Byron A.
Wilkins, George H.
Wilkinson, Wilfrid P., III
Wilkinson, Thomas A. R.
Will, Robert A.
Williams, Carl E.
Williams, Doyne G.
Williams, Forrest R.
Williams, Richard E.
Wilson, Billy J.
Wilson, Donald C.
Wilson, Leonard O.
Wilson, Robert M.
Winchester, Morton S.
Windsor, Arthur D.
Wingerter, Edward W., Jr.
Winn, Perry R., Jr.
Winslow, Myron S., Jr.
Winter, Richard A.
Wirth, Charles G.
Witt, Robert F.
Wolfe, Robert E.
Wolfe, William F.
Womack, David R., Jr.
Wood, Clarence W.
Wood, Forrest H.
Wood, Joseph V.
Wood, Richard G.
Woodbury, Orpheus L., III
Woodlief, Frank L.
Woods, Brian D.
Woods, Herbert P.
Woodworth, Benjamin B.
Woolam, John E.
Workman, Charles E.
Works, William W.
Worst, Dale R.
Wright, Frederick E.
Wright, Harry W.
Wright, Joseph M. P., Jr.
Wright, Keith M.
Wright, Marsh E.
Wright, Orville, Jr.
Wuthrich, Richard E.
Wylie, Clayton R.
Wylie, Ronald P.
Wyly, James R., Jr.
Yelle, "A" Courtney
Yetter, William S.
York, David A.
Yost, David A.
Young, Edward B.
Young, Howard I.
Young, Philip M.
Zackowski, Terrence L.
Zagortz, Leonard "A", Jr.
Zaludek, George M.
Zechlin, Frank F.
Zelna, Denis P.
Zerwas, Richard L.
Zimmerman, Willard C.
Zipperer, William R.
Zipse, Robert L.
Zirbel, William D.
Zwick, John E.
Zwick, Stephen L.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER (LDO)

Allen, Bill R.
Ashbacher, Raymod W.
Augustyniak, Edward J.
Ballou, James E.
Barker, Monroe W.
Barnett, Stephen B.
Barret, Lee E., Jr.
Battles, Roy E.
Beltz, Russell C.
Benjamin, Charles L.
Bentley, Arthur L.
Berg, Milfred C.
Berry, Roy A.
Billings, Alfred J.
Borden, Archie D.
Borden, Robert C., Jr.
Boyle, James T.
Brecheen, John A.
Brooks, James W.
Brown, Claude C.
Brown, James E.
Brown, Robert C.
Brunick, Gerard P.
Builder, Gustav F.
Cahill, Walter A.
Carpenter, Jack R.
Chapman, Melvin E.
Christopher, Allyn C.
Cicchetto, Mario J.
Clark, Orris V.
Clayton, George H., Jr.
Cohen, Milton N.
Collins, Jay R.
Cookson, Robert H.
Corsi, Joseph A.
Davis, Howard C.
Day, Earl F.
Dement, Ira B.
Dennis, Paul L.
Dwyer, John L.
Elfsten, Robert N.
England, Robert N.
Errickson, John J.
Farrar, Charles E.
Farrell, Edward J.
Fehrs, Walter H.
Festag, Albert P.
Ford, Homer L., Jr.
Forgy, James P.
Gerrald, Benjamin W.
Gill, Russell R.
Glaeser, Frederick W.
Hall, Roy V.
Hampton, Robert A.
Harmon, Oliver E.
Heath, Edmund W.
Hebert, Donald F.
Hicks, Clarence A., Jr.
Hipp, William J.
Hoppenjans, Lawrence G.
Hudson, Joe A.
Hughes, John W.
Hunt, Kirby P.
Husted, Richard C.
Ingalls, Frederick G.
James Edgar L.
Jebb, Robert D.
Johnson, Myron S.
Kasnicki, Edward J.
Kear, Donald
Keeley, Edward C.
Kinsel, Herman L.
Kreutzberger, Donald J.
Kurz, Walter C.
Lacklen, Albert J.
Landroche, William J., Jr.
Lane, Robert W.
Leach, William J.
Lowrey, Clifford A.
Maliczowski, William
Martin, Harry C.
McCann, Joseph D.
McCarthy, Charles J., Jr.
McCarthy, Gerald D.
McClure, John S.
McGlamery, James L.
McKinnon, John D.
Miller, Robert L., Jr.
Millon, Donald H.
Morgan, William N.
Myer, Charles W.
Myers, Ashley A.
Naddy, Llewellyn L.
Nations, Travis D.
Nowak, Edward M.
Ochs, Dorance L.
O'Donnell, Robert G.
O'Halloran, William J.
Ostlund, Ross G.
O'Toole, Walter D. J.
Paine, Francis S., Jr.
Palmer, Howard L.
Pardue, James I., Jr.
Parker, Frank
Peetz, Robert E.
Perry, Henry B.
Pollard, William A.
Pruden, Neil "S"
Rebello, Kenneth R.
Reed, William C.
Reifschneider, Jack L.
Repta, Robert S
Richardson, Ronald W.
Richter, John H.
Roach, John C.
Robinson, Clifford V.
Rutherford, Harry M.
Salo, Elmer E.
Schmidt, Robert P.
Schreck, Milton W.
Schuster, Eugene J.
Scranton, Herbert "H"
Sexton, Delbert A.
Shand, William F.
Shelton, Donald D.
Sheppy, Clayton L.
Shupe, Gordon B.
Skelton, Wallace A.
Slawson, Bruce L.
Smith, George O.
Smith, Kenneth E.
Sousae, Jack F.
Staats, Michael C.
Stanwick, Stanley W.
Thompson, Ernest T.
Trelford, Wallace E.
Tucker, John E.
Ullman, Robert W.
Ulrich, John H.
Vannice, James R.
Vincent, Robert F.
Vispo, Peter P.
Wagner, Harry A.
Warren, James W.
Watts, James W.
Wear, Richard J.
Weil, Calvin M.
West, Norman P.
Whitbeck, Charles J.
Windham, Paul M.
Witherspoon, Charles R.
Worrock, Bryce K.
Yarbrough, William P., Jr.
Young, Clinton H.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Aubrey, Royal G.
Austin, David A.
Bailey, Albert G.
Bailey, Robert J.
Balding, Thomas L.
Bassham, Harold L.
Bates, Thomas R.
Benoit, Richard P.
Bertuch, Albert W.
Biehl, Robert F.
Bistrong, Herbert W.
Boorstin, James B.
Bowlds, Joseph H.
Brierre, Joseph T., Jr.
Budd, Frank W., Jr.
Burkett, Patrick R.
Cantrell, Robert W.
Caratti, John F.
Cardoso, Norman
Carson, Thomas E.
Case, Jerry L.
Cassells, Joseph S.
Castell, Donald O.
Christensen, Harvey E.
Cochran, Robert C.
Conrad, Robert N.
Cowherd, Donald W.
Cramer, Adelbert D.
Diamond, Evans
Draper, Wilmot S.
Early, Calvin B.
Essex, Francis X.
Fenning, John B.
Flynn, Patrick W.

Frankhouser, George V., Jr.
Gareis, Frank J.
Grossi, Thomas A.
Hebert, Peter W.
Heller, Warren
Hiehle, John F.
Hix, William R.
Johnson, David W.
Jones, Daniel "M"
Julian, Sydney R., Jr.
Karnei, Robert F., Jr.
Kostiuk, Eugene S.
Leisse, Fred C.
Lesher, Robert C.
Lewis, Frederick D.
Lopez, Domingo A.
Lord, James M.
Luehrs, James G.
Lynch, John I., Jr.
Manring, Daniel A.
Markham, Thomas N.
McClain, Garvin H.
McClean, Walter L.
McMahon, David J.
Monell, William C.
Murphy, Eugene L.
Nicholas, William R.
Norton, John W.
O'Donnell, Joseph E.
O'Loughlin, John M.
O'Reilly, Richard R.
O'Sullivan, Michael J., Jr.
Pedersen, Carl M.
Petway, Malcolm L.
Pine, Robert H.
Polglase, Van N., Jr.
Pope, Herbert L.
Ramlo, John H.
Reed, Jerome M.
Rivers, Leslie D.
Robitaille, George A.
Roling, Gerald T.
Roy, Donald E.
Rutland, Eugene D., Jr.
Schneider, Paul J.
Schwartz, Ronald A.
Seal, Robert B.
Sechler, Leslie I.
Senn, James P.
Shea, David W., Jr.
Shultz, Richard R.
Skinner, Wendell L.
Smith, Franklin A.
Smith, Raphael F.
Smith, William W.
Spaur, William H.
Steimel, Herbert A.
Strickland, George T., Jr.
Swensson, Norman L.
Urbanc, Andrew N.
Urschel, William P.
Vandewyngaerde, George A.
Volcjak, Charles B.
Wachter, Francis W.
Wall, Norman R.
Weber, David M.
Wilkes, Harman D.
Wolfe, Wayne H.
Woodall, Martin A.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Allnutt, Alvin H.
Ault, William U.
Banas, John M.
Barnett, Andrew F., Jr.
Baxter, John W.
Beck, Kermit "E"
Bedenbaugh, Jack R.
Bilicke, Eric W. H.
Bittner, Burton F., Jr.
Boike, Robert J.
Booth, Stanley L.
Borchardt, Heinz R.
Bosco, Clement, Jr.
Bradley, Donald A.
Brookes, Jack E.
Brown, Alan S.
Brown, Lee
Brown, Troy L.
Buckley, John E.
Buffoni, Thomas J.
Bulluck, Edgar G.
Butts, Whitmore S., Jr.
Carenza, John L.
Carson, Francis W.
Chafey, William D.
Chipley, Charles L., Jr.
Connolly, George S., Jr.
Coombs, Douglas F.
Corbitt, James R.
Cornett, Fred O.
Crawford, James L.
Cronin, George W., Jr.
Crutchfield, Franklin D.
Cunningham, John H.
Daddona, John M.
Damm, John A.
Daughtridge, Gerald R.
Dennis, Ward "J"
Dewey, Edward P.
Dickey, James A.
Dickinson, Thomas D.
Dodds, Richard E.
Dolenga, Harold E.
Driggers, Richard A.
Dunn, Bernard D.
Easley, Richard P.
Eaton, Thomas E., Jr.
Elgen, Thomas D.
Eppen, Eugene D.
Erickson, Douglas L.
Estes, Arthur, Jr.
Evans, Lloyd R.
Farley, Charles V.
Fidd, Joseph A.
Fields, Simeon
Finbraaten, Laurence K.
Fitzpatrick, Edmond J., Jr.
Flach, Lynn R.
Foley, Donald P.
Frampton, Robert T.
Fries, Paul A., Jr.
Gaddis, Carl K.
Gerstenberger, Wayne W.
Gilvary, Daniel J.
Girman, Robert J.
Gore, Bobby J.
Gorenflo, Louis W.
Goulette, James D.
Greene, Walter C., Jr.
Griffin, Edward J.
Gumpert, LeRoy C.
Hagen, Dale N.
Harmon, Robert G.
Hawkey, William C.
Higgins, Ernest C. M.
Hinds, Duane E.
Hinkle, Otis R.
Hopkins, Richard B.
Horner, Raymond N., Jr.
Houghton, Donald W.
Hummel, Don F.
Hurst, Harvey R.
Irons, John H.
Jantz, Jack L.
Jones, Channing E.
Juncker, Carl F.
Kalafut, George W.
Knoth, Robert L.
Krueger, Lloyd W.
Kruse, William E.
Kunkle, John H.
Langer, Gerald D.
Lantsberger, Robert E.
Larsen, Henry O.
LeBlanc, John F., Jr.
LeMay, Jerome S.
Linehan, Daniel J., Jr.
Locke, Olive C.
Loftus, Raymond P.
Loveday, William G., Jr.
Lubben, Vernon L.
Luther, James R., Jr.
Magee, Gilbert L.
Malzahn, Walter G.
Marino, Leonard J.
Martin, Michael J.
Martin, William J.
McCullers, Lawrence E.
McFarland, Wayne B.
McGarvey, John J.
McHugh, Thomas H.
McKinnon, Daniel W., Jr.
McMullen, Franklin D., Jr.
Meiners, Arthur C., Jr.
Milburn, Raymond F.
Miller, James E.
Mitts, Joseph P.
Morgan, Richard E.
Moss, Stephen A.
Munkres, Glenn R.
Murphy, Joseph J.
Murray, Harlan E., Jr.
Naughton, Thomas J.
Nichols, Gerald M.
Oaks, Jacob G., Jr.
O'Connell, Arthur B.
Olivier, Denny R.
Olson, Gene P.
Osgood, Douglas C.
Otto, Ronald E.
Pace, Earl H.
Peck, Joe D.
Peters, William A.
Petras, George A.
Pistolessi, Vincent J.
Plante, Rene E.
Platt, Stuart F.
Pliska, Robert F.
Pope, Jere P.
Prokop, Jan S.
Quartana, Joseph P.
Raffels, John F.
Ranieri, Richard A. J.
Raymond, James A.
Reed, Dale H.
Rice, Henry L., Jr.
Ridley, David E.
Rounds, Richard N.
Rubenstein, Ralph S.
Ruehlin, John H.
Rupe, Charles H.
Rusch, Donald R.
Schaaf, Alvin D., Jr.
Sechler, John L.
Sellars, James B.
Shaughnessy, John M.
Smith, Franklin D.
Smith, John A., Jr.
Sofley, Billy R.
Stanton, James M.
Starrett, William I., Jr.
Steadman, Willard G., III
Stoeffler, John A.
Stone, Donald R.
Szwed, James A.
Tannone, Rocco J.
Terry, Victor W.
Thomas, Gary B.
Thompson, Robert L.
Tobin, Isidore L., III
Trawick, George L.
Tudor, Clyde E.
VanHouten, Richard E.
VanNaman, Thomas L.
Walker, Richard C., Jr.
Wallace, Edwin R.
Walsh, Richard S.
Walters, Robert A.
Webb, James R.
Webster, John C.
Weinberg, Harry H.
Westmoreland, Perry L.
White, Donald B.
White, James A.
Whitman, Earl K.
Williams, Robert L.
Williams, Thomas C., Jr.
Willis, John J.
Wilson, Roger C.
Wright, James H.
Youmans, Raymond W.
Young, Benjamin L.
Young, Jack L.
Young, Ronald A.
Youngblood, Norbert V.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS (LDO)

Bilka, Joseph L.
Bonnett, Herschel J.
Hart, James J., Jr.
Hatcher, Harold S.
Holland, Ralph L.
Hughes, Horald M.
Krietemeyer, Diedrich K.
Martin, Winston L.
McInnis, William H.
Murray, Robert E.
O'Donnell, William P.
Parr, Harold S.
Shuler, Jettie C.
Smith, Allen F.
Todd, Blaxton V.
Vedra, Charles A.
Wright, Cary F.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Baggott, Frank B.
Baker, Robert E.
Bedingfield, Robert W.
Berg, Vernon E., Jr.
Bertulio, Caesar J.
Black, Gerald W.
Bray, William E.
Bredemeier, George F.
Brown, Robert G.
Craven, Allen B.
Davis, Eugene B.
Donan, William E., Jr.
Dumas, John F.
Fallon, Edward F.
Fountain, David B.
Franklin, Robert C.
Gaughan, Geoffrey E.
Gordon, Robert E.
Jerauld, Philip E.
Kase, Mark
Keefe, Lawrence F.
Kelly, Henry T.
Kennard, William E.
MacCall, Harry F., III
McDermott, Thomas J.
McMorrow, James E.
McPhail, Clark B.
Murray, Frederick J.
Murray, George P.
O'Brien, Eugene C.
Parker, Joe H.
Patton, Darrell P.
Piirto, John A.
Respess, Thomas B., Jr.
Six, Jack E.
Tate, Robert C., Jr.
Vantassel, Lowell W.
Voth, Murray H.
Wendler, Herman F.
Westlund, Orville A.
Whitaker, Frederick E.
Yeich, John D.
Young, Christopher B.
Young, Robert J.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Ahrens, William N.
Anderson, Walter I.
Ayers, Charles D.
Baggs, Charles C.
Bradtmiller, Paul H.
Brockwell, Sterling M., Jr.
Burton, Joseph T., Jr.
Carle, Barry
Cerreta, Ralph M., Jr.
Collins, Allan W.
Cope, Ronald P.
Crisp, Hugh A.
Crosson, William E.
Dickpeddie, John I.
Dobler, Leland R.
Endebrock, Frank L., III
Flack, Frederick P.
Ford, James E.
Gillam, Harold R.
Glover, William F.
Godsey, Jack L.
Goodman, Robert F.
Groff, James B.
Jacob, Richard E.
Johnson, Don P.
Jones, Darrell E.
Kartalis, Andrew
Kelch, John A., Jr.
Keppel, Henry E., Jr.
Kirkwood, Kenneth K.
Klein, Dale M.
Landes, William G.
Ledder, William R.
Lonegan, Thomas L.
Lukacz, John, Jr.
MacDonald, Malcolm J.
McCorkle, William J.
McHugh, Robert J., Jr.
McNeill, James E.
McPartland, Eugene J.
Merritt, Frederick D.
Miller, Robert K.
Morris, Robert B., Jr.
Mosher, Thomas F.
Nash, Archie R.
Newcomb, Frank M.
Petersen, Norman W.
Popowich, Clyde V. W.
Quinn, Robert E., Jr.
Resnick, Rudolf
Schade, Robert A., Jr.
Schattner, Bernard L.
Schumann, James F.
Seeber, Earl R., Jr.
Shanley, John J., Jr.
Shirley, Ronald G.
Shumate, James W.
Siegle, Richard L.
Tobin, James M.
Totten, John C.
Uber, Charles B.
Weir, James W., Jr.
Wilson, Robert B.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS (LDO)

Kenny, Robert E.
Kimmons, Victor H.
Monnier, William F.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

Abernathy, Kenneth L.
Allen, Walter S.
Brown, Charles E., II
Christian, Alvern D.
Eisele, Roderick L.
Eoff, Albert W., II
Farrell, Lawrence M.
Fasanaro, Michael F., Jr.
Flynn, Thomas E.
Gladis, John T.
Gresens, Larry W.
Grunawalt, Richard J.
Howay, John W.
King, Melbourne P.
Laitsch, Lowell C.
Legg, Billy J.
Mario, David A.
Palmer, William R.
Pinsoneault, Richard J.
Pope, Charles E., III
Toms, James E.
Wille, Paul A.
Woods, Theodore K., Jr.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Annis, Robert B.
Baker, Terrance W.
Ballard, Gerald T.
Benn, Barry
Besley, Keith W.
Bisson, Roger E.
Box, John M.
Brown, Charles A.
Brown, Max W.
Buckis, David C.
Clegg, Milton C.
Cowen, Carlton R.
Crawford, John D.
Cronin, Thomas J.
Cushing, John R., Jr.
Davis, Charles M., Jr.
Douglas, Robert J.
Drake, David L.
Ebert, Walter H.
Eden, George T.
Eklind, Ronald R.
Esposito, Richard A.
Fishel, David L.
Fitzgerald, Donald E.
Foley, John M.
Greeley, William E.
Hansen, Duane A.
Howarth, Hugh C.
Hube, Albert R.
Hudson, Elmer R., Jr.
Huelster, Peter C.
Johnson, Charles M.
Kasenchak, Peter
Kozma, Ernest S.
Kravets, Thomas F.
Krzeminski, Arthur E.
Lekas, James S.
Linkenbach, Charles R.
Loizeaux, Alfred D.
Lowe, Cameron A.
Luke, Alan B.
Mason, Billie M.
Maw, Ralph B.
McCall, Frank J., Jr.
McWalter, George M.
Monasky, George E.
Mosby, Edward L.

Muir, Theodore E.
Murphy, Richard A.
Oshields, Paul W.
Rochford, Philip
Rucker, William H., Jr.
Scott, Gale L.
Shaffer, Richard G.
Shelin, Ronald A.
Short, George A.
Stevens, Mark M.
Terhune, Raymond C.
Toth, Wayne J.
Turner, Donald W.
Vernino, Arthur R.
Williams, Robert E., Jr.
Wingard, Charles E.
Yacabucci, James E.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Barboo, Samuel H., Jr.
Boone, Harry M., Jr.
Boudreau, Harold J.
Breidenstein, Frederick W.
Clark, James L.
Cooper, Thomas G.
Davis, William P.
Devane, James J.
Fletcher, William E.
Formeller, Frank J., Jr.
Fowler, Ephraim E., Jr.
Fussell, Edsel M.
Gallagher, Thomas J.
Gillenwaters, John D.
Halverson, Charles W.
Hammel, James W.
Hawkins, Kenneth L.
Hunt, James A.
Jones, George D.
Joseph, Sammy W.
Lachapelle, Norman C.
Mobbs, Philip H.
Myers, James I.
Nelson, Paul D.
Nichols, Lloyd B.
Palmer, Jack J.
Pittington, Francis C.
Roberts, Billy D.
Roberts, Billie C.
Ryan, William A.
Shuler, Donald E.
Sickles, Forman J.
Sollman, John R.
Van Hooser, Russel P.
Wilcox, James G.
Ziegler, Harry F., Jr.
Zseltvay, Andrew J., Jr.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, NURSE CORPS

Effner, Dorothy J.
Perreault, Madelon M.
Cordell, Billie E.
Gendron, Marie M. T.
Marble, Ella E.
Dyer, Norma G.
Martin, Ruth S.
Krisanda, Sylvia M.
Olson, Marilyn F.
Nicholson, Anna B.
Schley, Doris C.
Tudor, Betty L.
Melcer, Marjorie I.
Yohanan, Barbara J.
Carleton, Ethel R.
DeCicco, Virginia A.
King, Dorothy C.
Dunn, Dorothea J.
Elsass, Phyllis J.
Hassell, June R.
Elliott, Ruth L.
Mason, Ruth A.
Rudd, Donna R. E.
Gampper, Mary E.
Brakus, Josephine D.
Millard, Arlys M.
Mack, Beverly T.
Hinckley, Colleen
Johnson, Patricia R.
Guzman, Frances F.
Steinocher, Anne M.
Joyce, Jane P.
MacClelland, Doris C.
Nylin, Esther D.
Jones, Kathaleen R.
Nickerson, Lois E.
Verdier, Ellin P.
Walker, Marilyn J.
Butler, Phyllis A.
Shaw, Joan S.
Dennis, Joan T.
McGuckin, Dorothy E.
Trudgeon, Joyce A.
Parker, Helen C.
Nelson, Marilyn V.
Lindsay, Magdalene A.
Morton, Jo A.
Slater, Patricia A.
McIntyre, Lora J.
Barker, Elizabeth A.
Weiss, Jean C.
Fitzgerald, Helen M.
Boone, Kathleen L.
Long, Rose M.
Parnell, Maryann C.
Patmore, Nancy M.
Garlutzo, Kathryn R.
Birkhimer, Marion L.
Gaughan, Rose A.
Altenhofel, Dorothy A.
Adams, Louise "J"
Moris, Patricia J.
Wilson, Lela B.
Chisholm, Marie A.
Butler, Lois J.
Frazier, Frances M.
Williams, Erlene I.
Gillespie, Jacquelin C.
Thomas, Betty A.
Schulze, Charlotte I.
Walsh, Eileen C.
O'Beirne, Eileen B.
Halsema, Grace M.
Noble, Frances A.
Eisiminger, Vetah M.
Durian, Emma T.
Jacobson, Dorothy M.
Sisk, Elizabeth A.
Gomes, Alma M.
MacEnery, Joan M.
Rosenquist, Hildegarde
Rohde, Esther J.
Bell, Lou E.
Whitesell, Margaret L.
Golebiewski, Rita J.
Kinney, Eleanor J.
Sabold, Sarah R.
Allen, Patricia M.
Schreiber, Marilyn T.
Herrington, Daisy J.
Miller, Eleanor J.
Miller, Eva F.
Jones, Beverly J.
Beran, Irene L.
Yelle, Dorothy A.
Kearns, Joyce C.
Gedrys, Patricia C.
Emond, Lucille G.
Higgins, Margaret J.
Marcotte, Natalie M. G.
Morlock, Ruth E.
Cabay, Cecelia H.
Pechulis, Verna M.
Burrell, Margaret M.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 18, 1969:

OZARKS REGIONAL COMMISSION

E. L. Stewart, of Oklahoma, to be Federal cochairman of the Ozarks Regional Commission.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

John D. J. Moore, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LETTER FROM A SOUTH CAROLINA FATHER WHOSE SON WAS KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have received a copy of a letter to the editor which appeared in the March 16, 1969, issue of the Anderson Independent newspaper concerning the views of a father whose son was killed in action against Communist forces in Vietnam.

It is a letter that cannot be read without experiencing a feeling of great compassion for this man and his family, and this compassion is compounded by the sad realization that had this Nation, the most powerful military force in the world, applied the full might of that military power, this unfortunate sacrifice could probably have been avoided.

I ask unanimous consent the letter be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FATHER WRITES: HEROES DIE, HIPPIES LIVE AND HEARTBREAK IS BITTER

Mr. EDITOR: Forgive my bitterness, but today my son's personal belongings came to us from Vietnam, just six months after we laid his body in its resting place to await the Final Assembly call.

The sum total of his earthly possessions, other than two winter uniforms, were one pair of shoes, one pair of socks, one fountain pen, one silver identification bracelet, one 14K gold ring, one Confederate flag, riddled and torn and one battered, wrinkled billfold, with half a dozen pictures. Some one had washed his blood from the billfold and had carefully tried to wipe it from the pictures, but had not been successful in doing so.

These items could be held in one hand, palm up. His other things had been lost or stolen while he was under siege on Hill 861 at Khe Sanh.

My bitterness grows when I think back and recall that the sum total of all his earthly possessions, other than clothing and shoes, could be carried on his battered old bike. My bitterness grows deeper and wider when I look at his income tax forms that come to my mail box promptly on Jan. 1.

It almost goes beyond my power to control when I think of the people in Washington who would tax a man fighting for what he believes is his country, yet will sit idly by while the scum of the earth tear down our colleges and wreck our educational process.

These same people in government will cry and wring their hands about poverty and at the same time vote themselves a thousand dollars a month raise. And our sons go on fighting and dying and having their shoe string salary taxed.

I wonder if these sons of ours who gave their all could look back on the scene and see just what is happening, would they be willing to go through it again? Would they be proud to be called Americans? What would they think of the stinking bum who only last week on a nation wide television network proudly showed some of his North Vietnam movies and bragged about showing them across the nation on the college campuses?

And there is where my bitterness reaches its peak. Mr. Editor, it just wouldn't do for me to meet this filthy looking rascal face to face. When I see this type, I see the man who ambushed my son on the trail northwest of Camp Corral.

I thank God for the fact that my son's earthly possessions were not and could not be measured in material things. A humble home with love was all he owned, yet he would proudly tell anyone that he was rich beyond measure.

He was a man's man, a Marine's Marine, who could lay down his life for his friends.

The heartbreak will never mend, the bitterness grows deeper, sleep only comes from exhaustion. And daily we watch our other two sons as they grow closer to the time when some politician decides to boost the economy with a "step-up" in Vietnam or a "holding-action" somewhere else thousands of miles away, while the "hippie types" keep chipping away here at home.

Heartbroken? Yes. Bitter? Yes. And I'm sure that thousands of other parents feel just as deeply as we do. So I would beg you, please ask your readers to pray for all of us who have lost a son. And for those whose sons are still in Vietnam and elsewhere. And especially for our country that we may some day stop this senseless down-hill rush toward destruction.

PAUL L. PETTIT.

ROUTE 2, LIBERTY, S.C.

NORTH KOREAN AGGRESSION

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, with the lingering memories of the shameful *Pueblo* incident still fresh in the minds of Americans, our country has suffered another outrageous attack by North Korea when they wantonly destroyed one of our military aircraft in which the lives of 31 Americans were taken.

We cannot afford to stand idly by and permit these unprovoked assaults with impunity. Diplomatic protest and exhaustive oratory will not bring back 31 American lives, nor will it deter any future hostile acts. Insurance against these contemptible acts of aggression can only be realized by immediate, firm, and positive action.

Last fall in Miami, Mr. Nixon promised prompt and effective reaction to such incidents and pledged that the American flag will not be a doormat for anybody at home or abroad.

North Korea has just wiped her feet on the American flag. Millions of Americans hope Mr. Nixon's pledge will be honored.

UTILIZATION OF LICENSED PRACTICAL NURSES

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at a time when the delivery of health care services to our people is impaired by shortages of vital personnel, it is important to note the role of the licensed practical nurse—the LPN or LVN—who, along with the registered nurse—R.N.—the medical doctor, and the medical technician, is a key member of the health service team. The January/February 1969, issue of Bedside Nurse contains an informative article on this subject, written by Evelyn Hamil, R.N. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECTIVE USE OF THE LVN'S MANY TALENTS

(By Evelyn M. Hamil, R.N.)

I have no illusions about an end to the "shortage in nursing" problem during my lifetime. I believe, unlike many of my friends, that the tremendous advancements in medical science will accelerate not decline and because of this, the need for more and more numbers and kinds of health workers will continue. To stand idle, waiting for numbers to solve this problem is indeed to *wait*.

THE PROBLEM

In a complex medical community the size and scope of the Los Angeles County U.S.C. Medical Center, this problem is of course magnified. I believe, however, that the practical solutions we have found should be shared since they involve better, more imaginative use of a large segment of our nursing staff, the licensed, vocational or practical nurse.

Let me give you some figures. In September 1965, we had 688 RNs and 400 LVNs on our staff. The average daily inpatient census was 2,367. Three years later, in September 1968, we had 845 RNs and 435 LVNs on our staff and a smaller daily census—only 1,908. Nonetheless, even though we have 162 more nurses (RNs and LVNs) and 259 fewer patients, all reports tell us that we are just as short of help as we ever were. I'm sure you can see why I have little hope of solving any shortage.

What does such a situation mean? I suspect it represents a rather general trend in health care, particularly that part centered in a hospital. It probably means a combination of a number of factors.

(1) Expectations for the quality of nursing have gone up by both patients and physicians.

(2) Patients need more complex and involved procedures such as neurological diagnostic procedures and organ transplants.

(3) More specialty units now are being used which require concentrated nursing care including intensive care, coronary care, renal dialysis and various research units.

(4) The emergency room visit and admitting load has increased even though the average daily census is down. Hospitals are replacing visits to the family physician who is no longer available around the clock seven days a week.

(5) Clinic visits have increased and even more important, hospitalization is looked upon generally as only part of a patient's existence—he came from a home or community and, hopefully, will return to one. Our role is to help him move in and out of the hospital environment successfully.

OUR ATTACK ON THE PROBLEM

What does this have to do with new responsibilities for the LVNs? Just this—in accepting the idea that we do not have and cannot expect to have enough nurses to take care of our patients, we have been forced to look at our use of all levels of personnel, from our housekeeping aides through our nursing attendants, our LVNs, our RNs—even the head nurses and nursing supervisors. In doing so, we first broke down responsibilities into those tasks which could be performed by any level of nursing; those which required special skills; and those which required professional judgment and knowledge and could not be delegated.

In order to do this we looked at the strengths and weaknesses in all our employee groups. In looking at the LVN group, certain conclusions were reached.

(1) This was our most stable nursing group. They lived in our hospital community and had families or ties which kept them from moving frequently.

(2) The LVNs were eager to learn and to accept new challenges.

(3) They were loyal to nursing and to the hospital.

(4) They were mature adults with an average age of 35 to 40.

(5) A rather high percentage were active in their churches, community groups such as PTA and in social action groups.

(6) Although a minimum of 10th grade education is required for an LVN, we had many people with one or two semesters of college work and several with college degrees. A number of them had completed two years or more of professional nursing programs.

We believed that our LVNs were being used to maximum capacity—that is, they all gave medications and even some treatments but we decided to look at some of the things we did *not* allow them to do and why. Our findings surprised us. It may not come as a surprise to you to know that many of their capabilities lay dormant and I am sure the following experiences will be as pleasing to you as they were to us. Here are some of the services which we found LVNs well able to perform although they had not been permitted to do so before.

PRE-TRANSFUSION BLOOD CHECK

In some cases, we could not remember any valid reason for the restrictions we made on LVNs duties. A very simple example comes to mind. In our hospital, a doctor must start the blood transfusion. But the blood which is brought from the blood bank must be double-checked by a doctor and an RN before the transfusion is started. This means verifying name, identifying numbers, type and so on. Since this required only ability to read and record, there was no reason why an LVN could not do this equally well. The rule was changed.

TEAM LEADER

We thought that only RNs were trained team leaders but we found LVNs had leadership skills and could direct and assist aides in giving patient care. To do this well, help was needed in assigning, correcting, demonstrating, managing and evaluating. Selected LVNs were taught *Basic Management* with exactly the same content as courses given to young RNs who were to be team leaders. LVNs showed their concern for quality care and were very critical of aides who could not or would not do a quality job. They also proved most willing to help those who were truly interested in doing a good job. On the general medical services night shift, one RN supervises three wards, averaging 35–40 patients. One LVN is in charge of each ward. We do not believe that patient care has been at all jeopardized by this arrangement.

SPECIALTY NURSE

During the past year, we have developed special advanced programs for LVNs in psychiatric nursing, in communicable disease nursing, in nursing of the burn patient and in nursing of the premature infant. A second communicable disease program has just started. We have some LVNs who are also surgical nursing technicians. We plan an advanced program for them. Out of these groups, LVNs in psychiatry are most helpful in providing the therapeutics environment necessary for the disturbed patient. LVNs are now under the direction of an RN doing specialized nursing of acutely ill meningitis patients. They are doing simple burn debridement and applying burn dressings. They are doing expert nursing on premature infants in all kinds of equipment, both standard and research.

WARD TEACHER

To me, the most exciting change has been in the use of LVNs as teachers. We are really only beginning to explore this field but I feel there are many possibilities here for the future. Since LVNs live in the hospital community, they have a real understanding of our patient population and of the problems of the untrained worker who comes into the hospital setting. They can relate to them easily with great warmth and compassion and yet can be very strict when the need arises.

Our first LVN teacher was a negro woman in her forties, a woman with obvious "inner strength," a gentle but firm manner and a great love for nursing. She was assigned to a "Master" inservice teacher on the surgical specialties and was her shadow throughout the entire attendant training program. As these trainees left the classroom, she went with them to their work assignments, helping them to do properly what had been taught and reinforcing their classroom learning. She wrote notes on their performance, retaught when it was needed and became their friend and confidant. The attitudes and skills of her students more than justified her selection. The RNs and LVNs on the service can't say enough about the improvement in the quality of care given by the attendants since she started her job.

This nurse will become progressively more involved in the formal teaching and will be given help in teaching techniques. She is part of the inservice staff which is made up of RNs with either a BS or a Master's degree. She attends all meetings on the programs for the non-professional staff and has been most helpful in giving these skilled teachers the benefit of her common sense, down-to-earth knowledge.

Two more LVNs are now being added to the program, one for the general medical service and one for the general surgical service. In time, we hope to have one as an assistant to the inservice instructor in each of the clinical areas. Our one difficulty has been with a title but we have settled finally on *Ward Teacher*.

CLINIC TEACHER

A second-expanded teaching role is in the clinics. We have tried to hire public health nurses for the clinics because we believe that the teaching of patients is a major part of the clinic nurse's job. Now, we wonder if an LVN would understand the patients better? With continued help and supervision could they teach procedures to small groups of patients? Would they have greater insight into why instructions are not followed, appointments not kept? We think so.

DEMONSTRATOR OF EQUIPMENT

About a month ago, one area had an "equipment fair" to bring the staff up-to-date on new equipment available and how to use it. The hit of the show was the LVN who demonstrated the circular bed. Since most of the people being taught were RNs, you can see that her knowledge of the equipment and her skill in presenting it had to be exceptional.

We train aides for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Indian girls from many reservations all over the United States come for these programs. We found we were woefully lacking in knowledge of Indians, their cultural differences and especially their communication problems. The instructors had a difficult time in presenting material to them and were not at all sure that they were being understood. Now, an Indian LVN, interested in her people and in their adjustment within a complex urban society who is willing to share information with the teachers, assists in the initial orientation program.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER

Perhaps one of the most exciting things from my standpoint is my direct involvement with LVNs through an LVN Advisory Committee. This consists of 20 people, selected from the various work areas who meet with me once a month. They come with questions and problems involving large groups not just individual problems which should be solved in the work area. I listen to them and they listen to me as I expound on my personal philosophy of nursing care and my own feelings about the worth of each individual employee as an *individual*. I have great respect for them, for their mature and thoughtful consideration of problems and for the careful interpretation which they take back to their peers. This is probably the monthly meeting I enjoy more than any I attend and it has certainly helped me to see the expanded horizons available to such able, sincere people.

CONCLUSION

I am so proud of *my* LVNs and the able contributions they make to patient care both in everyday skilled nursing care and in some of the special areas I have mentioned. I hope that, by opening up new vistas and exploring new horizons for and with them, *quality* care will indeed be a reality, despite our so-called shortages!

SILVER STAR AWARDED TO SP4C. GEORGE J. GOTTWALD, JR.

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1969, the Silver Star was awarded posthumously by the President of the United States to Sp4c. George J. Gottwald, Jr. The citation by the President was as follows:

BY DIRECTION OF THE PRESIDENT, THE SILVER STAR IS AWARDED FOR GALLANTRY IN ACTION AGAINST A HOSTILE FORCE TO SP4C. GEORGE J. GOTTWALD, JR., RA11618618

On this date (2 February 1968), Specialist Gottwald was leading a five man reconnaissance patrol west of the village of An-Wy. He had volunteered to lead the patrol into an area where large Viet Cong forces were known to be operating. As the small patrol was moving through the thick underbrush, they were suddenly engaged by a large, well, concealed Viet Cong force. The initial burst of fire wounded the medic and the patrol was forced to move back. Specialist Gottwald quickly positioned the other men and advanced under their cover power to his wounded medic. With complete disregard for his personal safety, Specialist Gottwald crawled across 35 meters of open rice paddy. Ignoring the heavy enemy fire, his only concern was the welfare of his wounded comrade. His advance was met by a hail of Viet Cong small arm fire and he was wounded twice but continued to crawl on. Finally, he fell mortally wounded to the concentrated enemy fire. Specialist Gottwald gave his life in an effort to save a fellow soldier. Specialist Four Gottwalds' unquestionable valor in close combat against numerically superior hostile forces is in keeping with the finest traditions of the military service and reflects great credit upon himself, the 1st Infantry Division, and the United States Army.

Authority: By direction of the President, as established by an Act of Congress, 9 July 1918 and USARV Message 16695, dated 1 July 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Headquarters, 1st Infantry Division,
APO San Francisco 96345.

The last line of that citation says that Specialist Fourth Class Gottwald's courage and valor reflects great credit upon himself, the 1st Infantry Division and the U.S. Army. But to those of us in the greater Boston area, there is a greater feeling of pride in his devotion to duty and his courageous service to his country. It was not just that George Gottwald was a faithful soldier, for every young man who serves in Vietnam and in Korea and has ever served in our Nation's wars has certainly fulfilled his duty to his country, but George Gottwald went beyond just doing his duty, following orders, and serving the Nation. His actions were what is usually described as bravery beyond the call of duty.

What gave Specialist Fourth Class Gottwald the incentive to perform so courageous an act was his love for his fellow man and his realization of the importance of the life of each human being. He died in the service of his country by crawling to the rescue of a wounded medic. Every man sometime in his life wonders if he would be willing to forfeit his life in order to save that of another. I am sure that George Gottwald often wondered himself, but when the time came for action, there was no question in his mind and he rushed into the field to save a comrade. We will never know exactly what it was that made George Gottwald the kind of man who could do such a thing. Peter L. Caparell was the master of ceremonies at the dedication ceremonies of George Gottwald, Jr., Square in Roslindale, Mass. His eulogy points out the influence that a community like Roslindale would have on a young man. Roslindale is a small community with representatives of practically every ethnic group that has built this Nation. There are differences in customs, but the same strong moral and ethical values that made this Nation great are found in each and everyone of these groups. Perhaps it was because he saw how well the people of Roslindale worked together and how successfully various types of people built a community that he understood the moral fiber that has made America great.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the eulogy for Sp4c. George J. Gottwald, Jr., by Peter L. Caparell, the cable sent to the dedication ceremonies by our beloved Speaker, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and the memorial tribute published for the dedication of George J. Gottwald, Jr., Square. I am sure these messages will inspire my colleagues as the actions of George Gottwald, Jr., should inspire the Nation:

A PIECE OF AMERICA

(By Peter L. Caparell)

George J. Gottwald, Junior, was reared and educated in Roslindale.

Roslindale was his corner of America.

It was here—knitted within the social fabric of this ethnic community—that he developed the moral and the spiritual values that was to be put to the *supreme test* in a primitive jungle—some 8000 miles from this intersection.

I said that Roslindale is an ethnic community. By that, I mean, George Gottwald grew up with, sat in classrooms with, mingled with and worked elbow to elbow with decent Americans of Irish, German, Italian, Greek and Lebanese extraction.

Right here on this little dead end strip of Metropolitan Avenue, where he lived and romped as a youngster: where there are no less than eleven homes—do we find the ethnic composition of families of which I just spoke.

More than that, we find represented in those eleven houses, Veterans of World War 1, 2, Korea and now Viet Nam.

His next door neighbor was a World War 2 Combat Medic. A neighbor who depended on George as a youngster to do many chores for him—and who sat for hours on the porch telling George stories of World War 2.

Is it ironic then, that George Gottwald, Junior, died in the service of his country by crawling to the rescue of a wounded Medic?

This is the typical American story of a large or small community, whether it be Roslindale—or Sweetwater, Texas, and George Gottwald, Junior, was the typical American boy, who hung out at the corner drug store, lounged in the coffee shop, raised cain in the playground and pumped gas for his neighbors at the filling station just up the street.

Only, what he did in Viet Nam—was not typical.

No one—who forfeits his life—in an effort to save the life of a wounded comrade—can be classified anything—but *extraordinary*.

And so, we are assembled here today, on a holy sabbath, to pay tribute to the memory of an outstanding, religious and dedicated young American, who left his home on this dead end strip as a boy and died as a hero on a remote jungle trail.

It is this greatness of young Americans like the George Gottwalds, that *keep* America Great.

As his neighbor and adult friend, I salute his memory with this sentiment:

The drum beats have rolled
The rifles have barked
The bugle has sounded
and in George Gottwald, Junior,
A *Piece of America* has left us.

A Piece of America—a chip—
of the fibre of Plymouth Rock;
has drifted like a twinkling star
into the vastness of Eternity.

George J. Gottwald, Junior, has
returned to his maker—
Maker of all Men.

Recited by City Councillor Patrick F. McDonough, Father of the George J. Gottwald, Jr., Square at the Dedication Ceremonies at the intersection of Metropolitan Avenue and Washington Street, Roslindale, on March 23rd at 2:30 p.m. as the Principal Speaker.

George J. Gottwald, Jr., Who Died in the Service of His Country

A Soldier who falls in the line of duty, deserves our humble respect and profound gratitude.

George J. Gottwald, Junior, was such a soldier.

His Spirit and Courage, His Dedication to duty, place him among the hallowed ranks of Patriotic Americans whose unfailing Love of Country and Loyalty to their Comrades in Arms; have since the birth of our Country, secured the blessings of Liberty for All Americans.

Specialist Fourth Class George Gottwald never planned great battles nor did he lead an Army in the field. He did more than that: He gave his life for his Country.

There is no greater Sacrifice.

There can be no honor paid to his Memory that can fully express how much we revere it. Yet, the Cecil W. Fogg Post of the American Legion, of Hyde Park, Massachusetts, and their Affiliates; is doing what it can by Dedicating the George J. Gottwald, Jr., Square, to the memory of this brave boy.

The Legions National Commander William C. Doyle has said of the Patriotism exemplified by George J. Gottwald, Jr.:

"It is a Respect for the Rights of our Fellow Man. It is a Concern for Freedom of Man, as our God given Rights; but a recognition also that every Right carries with it an accompanying Responsibility."

George Gottwald did not shirk that Responsibility.

By his heroic act he has upheld the Honor and Tradition of the Military Services of the United States of America.

May every Bostonian, as he passes through the George J. Gottwald, Jr., Square, remember the Man for whom it is named and Soldiers like him who have Sacrificed in order that others can enjoy the blessings of Democracy and Freedom.

My heart goes out to Family and Friends assembled at this Dedication.

I salute the Cecil W. Fogg Post and their Affiliates the V.F.W. All Boston Post of Roslindale, the William Doyle and Irving K. Adams Post of the Legion and the Boston Fire Department Band for their participation at this worthy, patriotic ceremony.

It is my prayer that this fine American will not have died in vain—that through his heroism we have been brought a little closer to a just and lasting peace.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

(By cable.)

Read by Master of Ceremonies Peter L. Caparell at the opening of the Dedication Ceremonies at the George J. Gottwald, Jr., Square, Sunday, March 23rd at 2:15 p.m.

Born: Boston, Mass.
Educated: Boston Public Schools.
Parish: St. John Chrysostom.
Enlisted: U.S. Army, October 1966.
Parents: George J. and Caroline Gottwald, 6 Metropolitan Avenue, Roslindale.

Specialist Fourth Class George J. Gottwald, Jr., volunteered to lead his Platoon on a hazardous mission in Viet Nam and was intercepted, intermittently, by enemy machine gun fire, while crawling to the aid of a wounded Medic.

Wounded three times by enemy machine gun fire, he remained undaunted—and fell mortally wounded under heavy concentrated enemy fire in his fourth attempt to reach the side of his Comrade.

Posthumously awarded the Silver Star by direction of the President of the United States, March 8, 1968.

This Memoriam Tribute published by his Brothers and Sisters, Frederick, William, Richard, Thomas, Edward, Caroline, Jean and Denise Gottwald and distributed in commemoration of the George J. Gottwald, Jr., Square.

Dedication: Sunday, March 23, 1969, 2 p.m. at the intersection of Washington Street and Metropolitan Avenue, by the Cecil W. Fogg American Legion Post and Affiliates.

PSYCHEDELIRIUM TREMENS: POEM BY JANE GOODSELL

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Senators Neuberger, first Dick, then his gracious widow, Maurine, demonstrated their ability with words. The ability to write is a Neuberger family trait. Dick's sister, Jane Goodsell, is at home with poetry or prose. Recently I read her "Psychedelirium Tremens," a light treatment of a serious subject.

I ask unanimous consent that her poem be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Psychedelirium Tremens

Remember when hippie meant big in the hips,
And a trip involved travel in cars, planes, and ships?
When pot was a vessel for cooking things in,
And hooked was what Grandmother's rug might have been?
When fix was a verb that meant mend or repair,
And be-in meant simply existing somewhere?
When neat meant well organized, tidy and clean,
And grass was a ground-cover, normally green?
When lights and not people were switched on and off,
And the pill might have been what you took for a cough?
When camp meant to quarter outdoors in a tent,
And pop was what the weasel went?
When groovy meant furrowed with channels and hollows,
And birds were winged creatures, like robins and swallows?
When fuzz was a substance that's fluffy like lint,
And bread came from bakeries, not from the mint?
When square meant a 90-degree angled form,
And cool was a temperature not quite warm?
When roll meant a bun, and rock was a stone,
And hang-up was something you did to a phone?
When chicken meant poultry, and bag meant a sack,
And junk, trashy cast-offs and old bric-a-brac?
When jam was preserves that you spread on your bread,
And crazy meant balmy, not right in the head?
When cat was a feline, a kitten grown up,
And tea was a liquid you drank from a cup?
When swinger was someone who swings in a swing,
And pad was a soft sort of cushiony thing?
When way out meant distant and far, far away,
And a man couldn't sue you for calling him gay?
When dig meant to shovel and spade in the dirt,
And put-on was what you would do with a shirt?
When tough described meat too unyielding to chew,
And making a scene was a rude thing to do?
Words once so sensible, sober, and serious,
Are making the freak scene like psychedelirious.
It's groovy, man, groovy, but English it's not,
Methinks that the language has gone straight to pot.

JANE GOODSELL

TRIBUTE TO COUNCILMAN JULIUS LENHART, OF McKEESPORT, PA.

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, during these times of civil unrest, turmoil, and in some instances, outright revolt against law and order and the fundamental precepts on which this great country was founded, it is most important that significant activities and affairs receive due recognition in order that all Americans will not be misunderstood and unjustly criticized. Fortunately, there are still individuals and associations who maintain high principles, social obligation, and dedication to what is good in America. One of these citizens is Councilman Julius Lenhart of McKeesport, Pa., who recently received the first Man of the Year Award from the McKeesport Hungarian Social Club, a nationality fraternal organization that has affected the lives of many McKeesporters and numbers among those associations that love America.

On Saturday, April 12, 1969, the McKeesport Hungarian Social Club honored an outstanding public servant and community leader as the recipient of the club's first Man of the Year Award. A special banquet provided the setting for the presentation of a distinguished service plaque to Councilman Lenhart, which honored his social, political, cultural and charitable activities and accomplishments in and among the citizenry of McKeesport and the surrounding area.

Outstanding dignitaries attended this auspicious occasion to honor Councilman Lenhart. Mayor Albert Elko of the city of McKeesport delivered the official greetings and the president of the Hungarian Social Club, Steve Breda, presented an address of welcome. The well known and very popular bishop of the Free Hungarian Reform Church, Bishop Lewis J. Nagy, served as toastmaster and the Hungarian Social Club vice president, Alec S. Meszar, was also present. The national secretary of the William Penn Fraternal Association, Albert J. Stelkovics, was present and participated in the presentation program. Invocation was delivered by Basil Shereghy and convocation by Rev. Dr. Laszlo Brezeviczy.

Councilman Lenhart has distinguished himself in the city of McKeesport and the metropolitan area as a dedicated public official who has been responsible for innovating the entire McKeesport recreation program. The youth of McKeesport now enjoy unprecedented athletic facilities which have stimulated a rededication to athletic activities of all kinds including baseball, football, soccer, hunting, fishing, swimming and like sports. The city of McKeesport is nestled in the Steel Valley and because of Councilman Lenhart's official and charitable contributions the Steel Valley will continue to produce dedicated and outstanding athletes to the world of sports.

It was my pleasure, as the Congressman from the 20th Congressional District, to participate in these ceremonies honoring Councilman Lenhart. The Honorable Edward P. Zemprelli and the Honorable John T. Walsh were also participants.

DEFENSE REQUIREMENTS IN THE 1970'S

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, Representative JOHN J. RHODES, of Arizona, one of my esteemed colleagues in the Arizona delegation of legislative representatives, presented a very timely and cogent speech recently to the Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association.

The general thrust of his remarks coincides with my own views along this line, specifically where I recently said in the Senate:

> The semantic chimera often used in discussing the ABM problem . . . is the military-industrial complex. The frequency and sincere conviction with which liberal journalists damn this nightmarish "monster" would convince a newcomer to our shores that the name is capitalized and engraved at a Connecticut Avenue address . . . inhabited by retired generals, admirals, and corporate presidents who sit around all day gleefully figuring out new ways to get America involved in policing the world . . . This picture is a trifle stale and very shopworn and I would implore those who feel they must knock a straw man to at least give him a new name.

Now JOHN RHODES has exposed some of the myths in regard to our defense contractors. He has said something that has needed to be said for a long time. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks before the AFCEA on Thursday, April 3, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE 1970'S

Our Defense programs in the 1970's will be heavily influenced by what people believe in two important areas:

First, by what people believe as to the principal threats and needs of our country; and

Second, by what people believe as to the performance of the Defense Industrial team.

By "people," I mean just that—people everywhere, including of course the 535 people who must cast their votes on Capitol Hill.

In our few minutes together today, I want to share with you some thoughts on four aspects of people's thinking about Defense programs.

First, let's talk about what people believe as to future threats to our country. As I move around among Members of Congress and around the United States more broadly, people seem to be using two quite different crystal balls, and these two crystal balls show them two very different worlds in the years directly ahead of us.

One crystal ball seems to show a reasonable world full only of reasonable people, in which we say to the Russians, the Chinese and the Cubans, "We want to disarm." Thereupon they throw down their arms, embrace us, and hand in hand we all go off together looking for all the world like the proverbial lions and lambs cuddling down together in the same haymow.

These people are entitled to their views. In a way I envy their happy optimism. But some of us see an entirely different image in our crystal ball. We cannot seem to overlook the long record of brutalities visited by the Communist world on its own people, which resulted in death by starvation and other causes of at least 20 million Russians since the advent of Communism. We retain the image of other brutalities to Finland, Poland, Hungary, and most recently Czechoslovakia. We remember the words of Lenin, who said that the United States of America would fall to the Communist world like a "ripe plum." We also recall the more recent words of Nikita Khrushchev when he told us "We will bury you." We remember the type of irresponsible foreign policy which egged the Arab nations on to play Russian Roulette with the safety of the whole world in the Middle East. We fear that this type of irresponsibility could be manifest in another deadly adventure, such as the one which brought about the Cuban missile crisis. We realize that the Cuban missile crisis was resolved in our favor only because our strength, as compared to the strength of the Communist world was overwhelming. That unfortunately, is not necessarily the case today.

We also have not forgotten the fact that Yugoslavia was able to reform its "type of Communism" and do so successfully, where Czechoslovakia tried and failed because of the harsh tread of the Russian soldier. What is the difference between these countries? The only difference was that Yugoslavia had the physical facilities to put up a creditable fight, and had indicated unmistakably that she would do so. Czechoslovakia, on the other hand, had neither the physical force nor the moral conviction to do anything but succumb to the will of the master. These lessons of recent history, unfortunately, have been lost on many of our people. In the past, this nation has been able to maintain physical force which acted as a deterrent to any enemy. Its existence was real, and its credibility was undoubted. Now, the credibility of this deterrent is threatened. The threat does not come from a lack of ability on our part to stay well ahead of the Communist world in technology, know-how, and in the use of the products of that technology and know-how. Instead, it will come, if it comes, from a malaise which has attacked our people. The symptoms manifest themselves in this way.

1. The Russians are really "good guys" and if you don't "bug" them, they will not hurt you. The Chinese are really the bad guys.

2. All defense is irrelevant. The only relevance is the expediture of huge sums of money to allow everyone to enjoy the good life now.

The people who believe that the Russians are good guys have been with us a long time. It is easy to understand them. Their numbers are dwindling, as it becomes more and more apparent that the Russians have not changed their spots, and that they are the same old Leopards of the days of Stalin and Khrushchev. However, the people infected with the malaise described in number 2 really create a new problem.

I suppose there is no one in this room who would not welcome enthusiastically any cogent scheme to end poverty everywhere forever. Naturally we would like to do this. We abhor some of the conditions we see in our core cities. We know there is malnutrition in the country, largely caused by ignorance rather than lack of food and fiber. There is lack of education and lack of training. We long to get at these problems and to solve them. Solve them we will. The hard thing to understand is the cavalier manner in which the victims of this malaise completely dismiss the threat to our national security in their zeal to solve our domestic problems. We eternally hear complaints by people that we are "spending too much money on defense, and not enough on elimination of poverty." I suggest that comparing these two types of expenditures is about as sensible as comparing horses with rabbits or apples with oranges. They are completely dissimilar, each is necessary in its own way, and each must be pursued.

How anyone can feel, however, that the long-run benefit of the rich or poor American can be served by national weakness in the face of aggression is utterly beyond me. Are these people really oblivious to the fact that national weakness would result in substituting slavery for what they call poverty? Are they really unaware that the American system, which has put us in a position to dream the dreams of poverty elimination would be done unto death by conquest from without ending the dream forever? Do they really not understand that even those who live in our core cities are better off than the great majority of workers in any other nation in the world today? Would they really like to exchange the lot of even our disadvantaged persons for the less palatable existence of the average citizen in Communist countries?

Many people will say "let's negotiate." I agree that we should do this, and we will. However, experience teaches again that negotiation from a position of weakness leads only to defeat and disgrace—negotiation from a position of strength leads to just and honrable decisions which can be lived with by all parties. Let's speak softly, but let's carry at least a sufficient stick so that our soft words may not be mistaken for physical or moral weakness.

You see what I am saying: The defense programs of the 70's—and the world's history in the 70's *and* the 80's—will to an important degree be determined by the contest between those two views for the minds of our citizens.

Now as our people evaluate the threats from abroad, they'll be influenced by their views as to the performance of our defense officials and our defense programs including of course the performance of defense contractors.

These days a great deal of criticism is being levelled at the performance of defense programs. In the process we're seeing the creation of Instant Myths. By Instant Myths, I mean the generation of stories that "everybody knows are true"—except they happen to be wrong—dead wrong. In the rest of our time today, I want to discuss two of these Instant Myths:

1. All defense contractors are profiteers who are making too much money!

2. Electronic contractors don't give the Government what the contracts specify!

There are others, but those are two of the worst. You know, and I know, that those statements simply are not true. Too many people believe them though; that is part of our problem. Let's consider these two myths a bit more fully.

First, are defense contractors profiteers gouging Uncle Sam?

The myth is grounded in various allegations, each of which is misleading or untrue.

One allegation asserts that a GAO study showed that actual profits on defense contracts rose some 26 percent after the Pentagon began to use Weighted Guidelines. The fact is that the GAO study wasn't even talking about actual profits. It covered only the contractors' *projected* profits, before they even signed the contracts. We all know that projected profits before a contract is started are seldom borne out in the actual profits. More on that in a moment. For now we simply note the untruth of the allegation that a GAO study has shown an increase of any 26 percent in actual profits. That story is simply untrue.

Most of our citizens are unaware of the Renegotiation Board and its duties. As all of you know, it is the business of the Renegotiation Board to make certain that defense contractors do not profiteer. They have the function of post-auditing defense contracts, and in the event that an unconscionable profit is made, they have the power to force the contractor to reimburse the Government.

As a matter of fact, the return to defense contractors has gone down considerably in the last thirteen years. In 1956, the Renegotiation Board figures indicate that profits for defense contractors totalled $1.89 billion, or 6.3 percent of the sales. Ten years later in 1967, profits were down to $1.171 billion, and the rate of profit was 3.54 percent. In 1968, sales were at almost $39 billion, but the rate of profit was still only 4.34 percent.

In fact, the Congress and the Defense Department should be worrying about attracting the most talented companies and consortia for defense business. In many instances, our best equipped industrial groups can make far more profit in producing for the private market than they can by expending a comparable effort for the Government. I certainly am not indicating that profits have gotten down to the point that this fear is a real and present one, but I certainly do indicate that it is an element to be considered in determining future Government policies.

Myth two has blossomed before our eyes in the recent past. It asserts that defense contractors don't deliver what their contracts specify; it goes on to assert that electronic firms are especially guilty.

As we examine this myth, let's note in passing that it comes from a graduate school paper done by a man without personal experience in defense contracting. No one can read this school paper without being struck by its superficiality.

But let's go on to examine the facts regarding electronic reliability. When we look at the facts, we find that they reflect credit, not blame, on electronic companies.

Few industries have made such great progress in achieving reliability. The Bell System, for example, designs equipment for use in its trans-Atlantic circuits to perform flawlessly for 20 years without any maintenance whatever; and the performance exceeds the design. Again, I saw a chart the other day showing the improvement since 1945 in certain types of radar. The 1946 radar had less than 300 active element groups, it could only look forward, and it had a mean-time-to-failure of 10 hours. Its current equivalent can scan 360 degrees, and it can detect very small targets under adverse conditions. It has more than 20 times as many active element groups, but notwithstanding that far great complexity, its mean-time-to-failure is 20 times as great.

We have come to expect such tremendous feats from our engineers that we have become blasé. However, we really ought to stop and reflect on the electronic reliability involved in Apollo 8 and Apollo 9. Are we so blasé that we dismiss entirely the reliability involved in these shots? Let's remember they involved sending men from here to the far side of the rapidly moving moon and back to a rapidly moving earth which itself had moved millions of miles, here to splash down within a mile of the target spot—without even using the built-in corrective factors!

We ought to give the Electronic Industries great credit for the progress they have made. Instead they are being attacked for alleged faulty reliability.

One main reason for these attacks is the fact that the Electronic Industries are among the few which have quantified their reliability. Their engineers, in a quest for perfection, have found ways to measure reliability, ways to specify reliability, and ways to insure that the customer actually gets reliability. I am told that the Electronic Industries have gone further. They have developed parts specifications designed to give customers whatever degree of reliability they want and are willing to pay for.

One last illustration is reconnaissance equipment to allow the military to obtain as much information as possible about enemy locations and activities with a minimum of risk. Existing equipment could not solve the problems presented by the war in South Vietnam. One of the most useful items for this task is infrared reconnaissance equipment which produces imagery of the terrain overflown by an aircraft.

I've recently seen a diagram showing the performance of the best such equipment available in 1963 compared to what's now available. The improvement in these 5 or 6 years has been 40 to 1!

Before I sit down I would like, however, to suggest a deficiency in industry which deals particularly with the Department of Defense. As a member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I have seen too many research and development projects started, which several years and several millions of dollars later, have proved to be completely without merit. I suspect that a more thorough evaluation of these projects at the outset by professionally competent people would have indicated that from the first many of these projects had little chance of resulting in anything of value to anyone. Millions of dollars have been squandered just in the Department of Defense by these projects over the last several years.

I suggest that it is the responsibility of industry to give the red flag to such projects before they are started and to convince DOD personnel that their money can be spent better elsewhere. After all, all of you are taxpayers and many of you represent companies which are taxpayers and big taxpayers. Important dollar savings in the government can certainly turn out to be important tax savings to you and to your employers.

Now, in summing up, we need to ask ourselves some questions.

You and I know that these myths are untrue. It is not true that defense contractors are profiteers. It is not true that electronic contractors fail to live up to their contracts. Yet, many Members of Congress sincerely believe these myths, and other almost as far from the facts. Why?

May I suggest that your industry has not told its story adequately? I suggest, too, that many of us on Capitol Hill would welcome visits from our constituents, especially when we're at home, to give us the facts on matters like these. We get surprisingly few visits from businessmen like yourselves, and we'd welcome more. Of course, we're all very busy, but we know we must have facts if we're to vote wisely. We want to vote wisely, so bring us the facts!

TEXAS A. & M. AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY TEAM, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC—AID

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, having received permission to extend my remarks in the Congressional Record, I wish to include a letter which was written to Mr. Earl Rudder, president of the Texas A. & M. University by Mr. Virgil W. Johnson, Jr., an industrial and economic consultant located in Washington, D.C., relative to the work being done under the AID program in Dominican Republic by Texas A. & M. University. I believe the contents of the letter speaks for itself:

April 14, 1969.

Re Texas A. & M. agricultural advisory team, Dominican Republic—AID Contract.

Dr. Earl Rudder,
President, Texas A. & M. University,
College Station, Tex.

Dear Dr. Rudder: Because we are associated with a private group making a serious inquiry into the prospects to make a substantial investment into an integrated beef development program in the Dominican Republic, we have developed very friendly relations with Dominican nationals and we have picked up some information which might hearten you at Aggieland.

Without soliciting his comments, one of the D.R.'s leading and most influential bank presidents offered these comments regards the work of the A&M team. "The U.S. has plowed a huge amount of money into the economy of the country, many people have come down for the purpose to straighten out our shortcomings. We do appreciate all of this effort; however, the most effective work is being done by the A&M people."

The banker told about field men working with the farmers, all classes and sizes, helping them in matters related to doing a job to make the life of living in rural areas more profitable. He told of stories coming to him about these fieldmen showing little farmers how to cull chickens, how to feed and care for swine so they would produce larger litters of pigs, how these men assisted people living on the land to feed dairy cows a better feed ration so as to produce a larger quantity of milk. This banker said that his people are impressed for none of them had ever been showed how to do these things.

Our banker friend told about the work being done to point up the need for a better agricultural marketing system in the country so that the farmer living on the land can sell his products and the city-dweller can purchase a better product at a more economical price.

Very important, too, he told of the very valuable assistance given to government officials regards an agricultural policy which encourages a healthy and progressive agricultural economy.

The banker particularly complimented the efforts of A&M to develop a professional group of agriculture professional workers by providing a 4-year program on the A&M campus and obtain a degree in the various agricultural fields. These professional trained men will return to Dominican Republic and provide a service to the country which has not heretofore been available. In particular, he said, the D.R. is badly in need of professionally trained agricultural workers and he estimates that this start will have lasting favorable benefits to future growth of a profitable agricultural economy in the country.

I am taking the liberty to send a copy of this letter to persons indicated below.

Respectfully,

Virgil W. Johnson.

POLLUTION CONTROL: ADDRESS BY MAURICE B. TOBIN

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1969

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Maurice B. Tobin, long-time congressional aide, recently joined other environmental experts in giving a paper at the International Convention and Exhibition on Water Pollution Control held in Rome, Italy. Over 35 countries participated which shows the tremendous world concern for the vital resource called clean water. Mr. Tobin was counsel to the House Congressional Committee on Public Works and legislative assistant to Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK at the time he gave this paper. For 5 years he had firsthand experience in helping formulate legislation regarding the Nation's clean water. He is now a private consultant in the field. Since clean water is so vital to all of us, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Tobin's paper be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRY AND GOVERNMENT: PARTNERSHIP FOR POLLUTION CONTROL

At the outset, I would like to make it unmistakably clear that I intend to talk pollution and not politics, though at times it is difficult to divorce the two.

As you know, our country will soon (in 1976) celebrate her 200th Anniversary. So we are by European standards a very young country. We have, however, come of age in many, many areas. Our frontier spirit has driven us outward to extend man's realm to the moon and inward to extend man's life itself through the transplanting of vital organs.

Now on the threshold of Century 21, gratified by these fantastic technological advances, we are also disquieted by some of their consequences. We once viewed billowing smoke stacks and belching blast furnaces as plumes and banners of success. We once viewed the outpouring of waste from cities and slaughter houses as the inescapable penalty of an exploding population. But this is history. Today, the proximity in which we are now living to one another and the dependence we all have on the air we breathe and the water we drink dictates a new mentality and a new course of action. We are here today because we are concerned and involved in this new course of action. We are concerned, for instance, that on our historic Potomac River in our Nation's Capital, if your boat were to catch fire there is some question as to whether you should accept immolation or risk death in the pollution of the Potomac.

ABSOLUTION FOR WHOM

This new concern for pollution control is thrust on us. The inventory has been taken. We know the number of fish killed, birds dead, children sick from getting froth instead of fresh water at the fountain. But, we need not belabor the neglect of the past—let's talk about prospects for the future.

WILL OUR WISDOM MATCH OUR WEALTH

We must match the wealth of our world's resources with the richness of our wisdom in using these resources.

Fortunately, we have finally accepted the fact that our basic lifeblood resource of so-called clean water is fast becoming a scarcity. Many of the men who can reverse this trend are with us today. You industrialists with your vast technological wisdom must provide many of the answers. No one depends more heavily on clean water than industry itself. From your great research centers have come the complicated machinery for clean water that we see at this exhibition. But there is more to do—and there is no doubt that our wisdom will match our wealth if industry provides the same strong leadership that has given us plastics, jet travel and a look at the far side of the moon.

ROMAN AQUEDUCTS

As we stand in this great city of Rome, we are standing on history. The ancient aqueducts can still be seen. Our pollution program in many ways has not advanced much from the ancient underground systems. Our space programs have skyrocketed but, somehow, our pollution programs have never really surfaced. In many areas, pollution control is still on a subterranean level.

It is you industrial leaders who must lead us out of the basement and into the light of the realities of 1969. Yours is a magnificent opportunity to participate in the accelerated interest and demand for pollution control techniques, equipment and chemicals.

The question, "Will there be water pollution control?", has been settled by the American people. This is no longer the issue. The responsibility now rests squarely on your shoulders. You hold the technological solutions.

PARTNERSHIP

As part of the legislative team that helped pass the historic Water Quality Act of 1965 and the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, I saw first-hand the meshing of governmental and industrial gears that hopefully will turn forward the wheel for clean water. The problem of clean water is too vast for either government or industry alone. There must be a dialogue between the two resulting in reasonable controls which do not purify industry out of business. The Federal Government has already authorized over a billion dollars a year for pollution control. Now industry must come forward with the machinery to achieve this mastery over our environment.

BILLION DOLLAR UPSURGE

The Federal Government as well as municipalities must clean up their own houses. Some of our worst offenders in pollution are Federal installations. But we all need help if we are to meet the challenge that pollution creates. To give you an idea of the upsurge in control demands, let me cite a few highlights from the recent report on the national requirements for the cost of treating municipal, industrial, and other waste during the coming five years. To meet the new quality standards, the cost is estimated at 26 to 29 billion dollars. This enormous investment in clean water is part of the cost of living in 1969. Every expansion plan from here on must include consideration of pollution controls. So, more and more, we look to you industrial leaders for guidelines. We look to your track record of proven answers and we know that you can and will supply the answer to a 25 billion dollar outcry for help. We need it if our common goal of clean water is to be realized. Without your research skills and manufacturing power, we cannot move forward in pollution control.

GOVERNMENT RESEARCH NEEDS BOOST

Of particular interest to the waste management community and to industry is the research program operated by the Interior Department's Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

The program involves direct, contract, and grant research to develop more efficient and economic techniques and technologies for attaining and maintaining water quality. Included are grants to industry—totaling $20 million a year—to aid in finding new ways to treat and prevent industrial waste.

Research is the real key to solution of the pollution dilemma. Society must learn to limit and control the waste which it generates. Adequate research will enlarge our perspective. Already it has shown that yesterday's fragmented approach to the pollution problem must be replaced by broad comprehensive programs.

A case in point is the Supersonic Transport. The project began with no thought beyond blueprint and budget. Speed is so much a part of the American approach that we plunged ahead without really knowing what the consequences of sonic booming would be. The results were unfortunate and there are still spokesmen in responsible perches of authority who see research as an expense rather than an investment.

There are those who insist that society will adjust to the sonic boom just as we have learned to live with dirty water.

Look at the automobile. We have enjoyed it for half a century, but only now are we applying research to avoid the deadly pollution caused by automobile exhaust.

CALL FOR COOPERATION

Fortunately, we are beginning to catch up in pollution research. Within American industry, there is growing concern over industrial effluents and increased expertise in their elimination.

In many industries, this knowledge is being put to use in dynamic control programs.

Industry is investing more and more of its own resources in study of new pollution control methods and spending vast funds to improve existing processes and chemicals.

We are seeing more cooperation between industries and local communities in planning and operating joint treatment plants—plants that are often the most efficient—and inexpensive solutions to pollution problems of a large industry in small towns.

The Federal and State Governments must also do more to prevent industrial pollution—with funds, technical assistance and information. We must join the resources of both industry and government to prevent pollution and to clean it up where it occurs.

NEED FOR GOOD COMMUNICATION

Good communication is one of the most important parts of this whole effort. We must be able to know, talk and to understand each other.

As part of this effort to develop better communication between government and industry at all levels, I would like to see informal seminars held throughout the country to explore various industrial pollution problems.

These informal seminars would involve people from industry and the federal, state and local governments. Their purpose would be to develop better definition of specific pollution problems, and better understanding of government and industry proposals to cope with these problems.

As a product of these meetings, I would foresee better cooperation, better communication, and better solutions to many of the complex pollution problems confronting us today.

A quick look at our major periodicals shows industry taking a lead in advertising, promotion and instruction in methods of preventing pollution.

The Federal Government, cities and counties are sponsoring radio and T.V. "spots" to educate the public in ways of preventing pollution. The corporate structure now includes Vice Presidents in charge of anti-pollution.

The United Nations is sponsoring in 1972 an International Conference on environmental control. Many countries realizing that pollution has no boundaries are ready to cooperate in programs for pollution prevention.

PROGRESS IN FINANCING POLLUTION CONTROL

Our national water pollution control program is now at the stage where most of the water quality standards have been approved.

The next stage will be to implement these standards, with leadership in industry and government, implementing the correction schedules with the necessary financing and construction.

Let's talk a little about costs, because controls cost money and someone will have to pay these costs. The American consumer is ready to do this, I think.

The American people are getting tired of the even greater price which they now pay for the absence of adequate environmental management. They are getting tired of closed beaches, poisoned fish and unclean air.

Americans will no longer allow any private interest to use our water, air, and land as free disposal areas for untreated wastes.

Low water quality standards allowing a state to attract industries which pollute will not be tolerated. Such economic growth, based on environmental destruction, is disguised, long-range suicide. We do not intend to allow any one particular state or region of the United States to attract industry by lax pollution control standards and regulations, while others are acting to protect and enhance their waters.

The days of the choice of "jobs or clean waters" are over. We can and we will have both, and we can and we will do it without having to purify industry out of business.

Polls show that anywhere from 85 to 93% of the American people support a vigorous water pollution control program. Americans mean business about clean water. They are willing, I think, to pay a few cents more for a product which won't pollute or—and this is so important to you—they are ready to stop buying products which do pollute. Today, industry must realize that a clean water public image is a business asset. One paper company president in explaining his expanded anti-pollution program called it, "An investment in goodwill in the community."

Industry is responding to the public demand for clean water, and its own corporate need for it. Manufacturers are recognizing the stark fact that our supplies of good, usable water are not limitless, as the demand for water continues to spiral upward.

A former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce put it this way "To those who say they cannot afford to take effective anti-pollution measure, I say we cannot afford not to."

No longer is industry's attitude, "It's not our problem"—the maintenance of a decent natural environment is the real concern of all. If the Industrial Revolution declared the right to pollute—that right has now been rescinded—and industry has accepted the challenge.

Here are some concrete examples:

The Ford Motor Corporation has just announced it will spend $80 million within four years for air and water pollution control in and around its manufacturing and assembly facilities.

Kodak is building a new $6.5 million treatment plant at Rochester, New York.

Last spring, the McGraw-Hill Company published a survey showing that industry's outlay to cut pollution climbed in 1968 by nearly $400 million to a total of about $1.5 billion. Here is a partial breakdown:

Chemical industry—an estimated 42% increase in pollution control spending, from $86 million to $112 million in 1968.

Textiles—an estimated 136% rise, from $11 million in 1967 to $26 million in 1968.

Mining—an increase of 51%, from $55 million in 1967 to $83 million in 1968.

Electric and gas utilities—a 32% increase, from $364 million in 1967 to $481 million in 1968.

It has also been reported that metal fabricators and instrument makers will increase their anti-pollution outlays by 64% in 1968.

Detergent manufacturers have gone to biodegradable products. For example, this industry is looking for possible replacements for phosphates in detergents, as part of the solution to the eutrophication problem.

Major oil companies have instituted oil pollution safeguards on their tankers, some specially training their employees in pollution control.

These facts are most encouraging and reflect the new, refreshing and enlightened point of view and spirit in the business community.

And, I think, they deserve greater publicity.

The business community produces many a civic-minded industrial leader. One of the fast-growing forest producing companies in America, Potlatch Forests, Inc., of San Francisco has a dynamic president, Ben Cancell, who was one of the founders and former president of the Clean Streams Improvement Council. This forward-looking company recently built its own research center to help answer some of the pollution problems.

Another fast-expanding company concerned with pollution is Western Research Company of Dallas, Texas. Recently, its research teams have found break-through prevention techniques in oil pollution and developed a friction-reducing chemical which will help solve the combined storm sewer problem. All these accomplishments are further signals of the new water pollution control awareness that we are finding in business.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDUSTRY

With tax incentives for fast write-off of pollution equipment, industry has a real opportunity in the market place. I hope 1970 will see many bold new adventures in some of the following challenges:

To recover and reuse waste products;

To remove pollutants before dumping effluents;

To develop non-polluting energy sources and to control waste heat;

To modify industrial processes to treat wastes at each stage in the process and to recover valuable elements;

To redesign industrial systems to reduce production of pollutants such as chemical residues and heat, and to reduce the amount of water required in the system;

To replace pollutants;

To help solve such problems as oil pollution, acid mine drainage, and eutrophication;

To create chemicals and equipment for municipal control systems, for farms and boats;

To develop more efficient and less costly methods for tertiary waste treatment;

To discover new techniques for ultimate waste disposal;

To develop techniques and equipment for the monitoring, storing, and evaluation of information concerning pollution;

To perform systems analysis and refine techniques and systems for managing our resources, our water and our waste.

Many new pollution control techniques are already in commercial use—for example:

Removal of phosphates by polyelectrolytes;

Organic waste treatment without biological oxidation;

Sludge treatments that aid dewatering and dispcsal of waste and that recover usable fuels, fats, and proteins;

Packaged waste treatment units;

Improved mechanical aeration of wastes;

Automated monitoring and analysis of waste streams.

In closing then, I just want to point out that we have the resources at hand to conquer the menace of pollution. We can be the master and not the victim of pollution. We can take down the warning signs on our beaches and lakes and rivers and put up new banners proclaiming that Government and industry have joined hands to prevent pollution. We can do this by being reminded of the saying of the noted architect, "Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood".

FAMILY PLANNING AMONG MOST EFFECTIVE OEO PROGRAMS

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, although I believe the recently issued GAO report on Economic Opportunity Act programs generally fails to acknowledge the true importance and accomplishments of many antipoverty efforts, I was pleased to note that it does acknowledge the enormous potential of the family planning program to enhance the dignity and well being of family life for low-income Americans.

The report states:

> There are significant health benefits to be derived from family planning. These are associated with controlled timing and spacing of births and can be measured by lower maternal and infant mortality rates, fewer premature births, and a lower incidence of both mental and physically crippling diseases in infants. In addition, there are important economic benefits—in contrast to other health programs—which offer the analyst the opportunity to related the provision of health services directly to the reduction of poverty. Finally, the program has social and mental advantages which are for the most part the result of giving families the opportunity to have the number of children they desire, when they desire.
>
> It has been recognized, for many years, that the poor have more children than the nonpoor and, in addition, have more children than they desire. No study or evaluation is necessary to know that a large family increases both the social and economic problems of being poor. Nonetheless, because of legal barriers and religious objections, state and federal governments in the past have left family planning services to local agencies and private groups such as Planned Parenthood.
>
> However, during the last five to ten years, the elimination of legal barriers, changes in social attitudes, some softening in the vehemence of the religious objection, and recognition of family-planning services as an extension of health care have enabled the federal and state governments to play a more active role in the delivery of such services.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, no one can deny the popularity and success of OEO's family planning program to date. Since January 1968, 160 family planning projects in 36 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, have reached over 200,000 women. By any measure—humane or economic—the $13 million appropriated for this program in 1969 has been very little money, very well spent.

I am, therefore, astounded by the 1970 budget request for this program—it is barely enough to refund existing projects—and distressed to learn that the Budget Bureau turned down an urgent request for reconsideration of the figure. The need has not diminished. The program is effective and popular. There is no logic in this action, and I urge the Committee on Appropriations and the House of Representatives to authorize the funds necessary for expansion of this program.

Although OEO's stewardship of its family planning program has been excellent, has served an obvious and pressing need and must be continued, no one has ever presumed that this should be the only Federal program operating in this area. OEO's neighborhood centered approach must be supplemented by the provision of services through the major, established health facilities, for example, hospitals, health departments, medical schools, and so forth. The responsibility for provision of family planning services through these medical facilities falls within the purview of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In fact, however, the history of family planning in HEW has been marked by high-level pronouncements and low-level performance.

In 1967 former Senator Gruening conducted a series of hearings on the population crisis that brought out the vast need for family planning services and the inadequacy of existing Federal aids. In a statement before that committee I stated that the pressing need for Federal family planning programs was in low-income areas and that "the Establishment agencies have failed totally in providing any real leadership effort to deliver these services where they are desperately needed. Virtually no leadership has come from the Federal Government."

Mr. Speaker, Congress has responded to the need for Federal leadership.

Family planning was made a national emphasis program of OEO by an amendment which I was proud to offer.

Title IV and title V of the Social Security Amendments of 1967 established an impressive legislative mandate for the provision of family planning services. Under title V, at least 6 pecent of all funds available for maternal and child health grants and maternal and infant care grants must be allocated to family planning.

Important, if not totally adequate, funding has been provided for these programs and, let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that Congress stipulated last year that at least 10 percent—not the minimum 6 percent—of the funds available under title V should be spent on family planning project grants.

As I pointed out before, the Office of Economic Opportunity has responded to the need for Federal leadership in family planning, 160 projects are providing services to over 200,000 women.

And what has been the response of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the need for Federal leadership in family planning?

Two years after the Gruening hearings—2 years after the official promises of action—2 years after enactment of title V—the sum total of HEW's response is some administrative reshuffling and more high level pronouncements.

In the summer of 1967 the Department proudly announced the establishment of the Office of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Family Planning and Population. This Office was to bring new leadership to the family planning efforts of the Department. It was to formulate family planning policy, communicate that policy to the public, the Congress and professional groups, and to serve as a center within the Department for planning, coordination, and evaluation of programs. In fact, the Office has done none of these things. It has almost no staff. It has almost no funds. But most importantly it is totally isolated from the operating locus of the major family planning programs.

The Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population and Family Planning reports directly to the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs who oversees the bulk of the Federal health programs. However, the title V family planning project grants program is administered by the Children's Bureau of the Social and Rehabilitation Service. Neither the Deputy Assistant Secretary nor the Assistant Secretary has any control or effective jurisdiction over the policy making or fundings processes of the project grants program.

The title V program represented a tremendous opportunity for HEW to take the reins of Federal leadership in this field and to provide a vital service to millions of American women. It has been an opportunity unappreciated, and largely unused. The law has been in effect for 15 months. The program is not yet operative in any real sense of the word—not one woman is presently receiving services under it. Only 10 projects have been funded. To date only $2.6 of the $12 million available in fiscal 1969 has been committed.

In the beginning a large number of communities rushed to apply for the project grant funds. The Children's Bureau responded with a series of conflicting statements of purpose and endless delays. Many institutions and agencies, unable to receive any meaningful guidance from the Children's Bureau, never filed formal applications. Those which did are still uninformed about the merit or status of their proposals.

Although the family planning project grant program is a sizable one, it does not have one full-time family planning staff member either in Washington or in the regional offices to help interested institutions in applying or to review applications submitted.

Lack of adequate staff and demonstrable interest in the family planning field is not limited to the Children's Bureau. Although the Medical Services Administration, the Assistance Payments Administration, the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, and the Office of Education all have substantial responsibilities in this field, not one of them has any full-time staff to carry out their programs. Nor is there even one Federal employee in any regional office designated as a full-time family planning specialist whose duty is to advise communities in developing plans for Federal assistance under existing programs.

The need for family planning programs is obvious and urgent. An efficient administrative structure is desperately needed. There is no reason for family planning programs and policies to be scattered helter-skelter all over the Department, or for them to remain bogged down in one office or another that has primary or even exclusionary interest in another field.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my role in seeking to expand the Federal Government's efforts in the family planning field, and I intend to continue to work in this area. I have been searching for alternatives that will genuinely meet the Federal Government's responsibilities in providing family planning services. For almost a year, I have sought the advice of leading family planning and population experts and consulted with interested congressional colleagues. A number of constructive suggestions and recommendations have come forth and I intend to make some specific legislative proposals in this regard in the near future.

At the very least, I think it is obvious that the administration of family planning programs and research must be consolidated and given the statutory power to operate efficiently and effectively. Adequate staffing levels must be guaranteed. Additional training opportunities must be made available and far greater sums must be earmarked both for service programs and for research devoted specifically to investigation of reproductive physiology; development of safe, improved methods of contraception and the study of population dynamics.

SCHWEIKER PRAISES "PAL"

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1969

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, today more than 100 young people from Philadelphia, all members of the Philadelphia Police Athletic League, are conducting their annual Washington visit.

February was "PAL Month" in Philadelphia, and the organization sponsored a "law and authority" program, in coordination with the Philadelphia Board of Education and the Philadelphia diocesan school system. In conjunction with this program, student leaders solicited signatures in more than 500 schools to a pledge in support of their communities, and obtained subscriptions from more than 300,000 students.

I ask unanimous consent that the pledge be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the pledge was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> To the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States of America, and to the Congress of the United States:
>
> We, the undersigned, do hereby affirm our dedication to upholding law and order and promise to follow the precepts set forth in the Police Athletic League pledge, which reads:
>
> "I pledge to learn and practice the rules of fair play, to respect the rights of others, to obey the laws of our city, state, and country, to be a credit to my family, friends, and myself, to be a leader for the good things of life and thereby prepare myself for the task of adulthood."

Mr. President, the PAL program is a highly constructive effort to build bridges between the police forces and the communities they serve. Their community cooperation helps to eliminate prejudices within a community, and serves as a base for greater community understanding.

The police, in addition, serve their communities with various recreational and educational programs which are available to the youngsters who participate in PAL.

It is a pleasure for me to salute this worthwhile program.

TAX REFORM, KEY ISSUE OF 91ST CONGRESS

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the United Press International recently requested members of the Connecticut congressional delegation to state what in their opinion was the key domestic issue facing the 91st Congress.

In response to this request, I stated that the need to reform our tax structure was one of the most important, if not the most important issue, confronting Congress at this time. My remarks were subsequently published in a number of newspapers throughout the State of Connecticut. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Congressional Record my article on tax reform as published in the Willimantic Daily Chronicle, Willimantic, Conn., in the issue of April 2, 1969. The article follows:

St. Onge Sees Need To Cut Taxes, End Loopholes as Key Issue

(By Rep. William St. Onge)

A constituent from Waterford recently wrote to me: "It's time you and every other representative did something to help ease the tax burden for the middle income families. You are taxing us to death and we're getting sick and tired of it all."

Another from Storrs was very much distressed over the "inequitable and unjust" tax structure and emphasized that "continuation of the present tax policies can only prove detrimental to the country as a whole."

A lady from New London became "infuriated" when she heard about the various tax loopholes which benefit only certain interests, and a gentleman from Clinton started his letter to me in these words: "This is a warning letter to you that our Federal taxes are getting too high."

Some simply ask: "What are you doing to stem the tide of taxation?" while others feel they will "be better off on relief." There are those who tell me: "I am proud to be an American and am willing to pay my fair share of taxes, but * * *." And there are the less obedient ones who openly speak of a "tax rebellion." And so the letters keep coming every day to my office in ever-increasing numbers.

TAX REFORM

The steady increase in all types of taxation in recent years at every level of government—federal, state and municipal—has focused the attention of the entire nation on this issue. In my estimation, high taxes and the need to reform our whole tax system is one of the most important—if not the most important—issue facing the Congress today. Tax reform is very much in the news, and on Capitol Hill in Washington one frequently hear remarks about the need for plugging tax loopholes, establishing a more equitable distribution of the tax burden, increasing income tax exemptions, etc.

There appears to be widespread agreement on the need for a major overhaul of our tax system. It is generally conceded that the federal government is losing much revenue each year through the many tax loopholes and that too many people who can and should contribute their fair share toward the nation's tax burden are dodging their responsibility. This burden has become especially unbearable for middle and lower income families.

A labor publication widely circulated in Congress recently pointed to 21 persons who had an income of $1 million each in 1967 but failed to pay any income tax because of these loopholes; while 134 others who earned over $200,000 each similarly paid no taxes. The comment that followed was brief and to the point: "These are the rich who free-load, while you pay the full rate."

Congress is well aware of this situation and the first steps are being taken to deal with it. Considering our legislative process, I would guess that the legislative remedy will not take place until late in the session, probably late summer or fall, and perhaps not until next year. As to the nature and shape of possible tax reforms, it is too early to even attempt a guess.

EXPERTS TESTIFYING

Right now the House Ways and Means Committee is conducting extensive hearings on the subject. Experts are testifying, top government officials are presenting their views, but it may not be until June or later before we get any idea as to the committee's specific proposals. I know what I would like to see done, if I had my way.

A group of us in the House of Representatives—29 members, to be exact, and all Democrats—introduced a bill in February known as the Tax Reform Act of 1969. It contains 13 specific proposals to seal off various tax loopholes, which now serve as escape hatches and constitute a loss in revenue for the government of some $9 billion annually. If these loopholes could be closed, the accrued revenue would make it unnecessary for the 10 per cent tax surcharge to be continued and thus would be a direct help to all taxpayers.

Following are some of the major loopholes we seek to close:

1. Tax capital gains presently untaxed at death, which only favors those with large amounts of accumulated wealth to pass on to their heirs. Closing this loophole would mean a gain of $2.5 billion in additional taxes.

2. Repeal the 7 per cent investment tax credit, which permits business firms to subtract from their tax bills 7 per cent worth of new equipment. This contributes to inflation and deprives the government of some $3 billion in taxes.

3. Reduce the oil and mineral depletion allowance from 27½ per cent to 15 per cent. This loophole permits oil producers to receive more than a fourth of their gross income from oil wells, tax free. If reduced to 15 per cent, the government would receive an additional $900 million in taxes annually.

From these three sources alone the government could gain nearly $6.5 billion, while another $2.5 billion could be derived by closing ten other loopholes. Among the latter are: limit the hobby farmers' use of farm losses to offset other income ($400 million), provide a federal interest subsidy to states and localities as a substitute for tax-exempt bonds ($900 million), eliminate special tax treatment for stock options ($150 million), eliminate tax benefits derived from multiple corporations of a single firm ($200 million) and others.

In addition, I would like to see several other steps taken to reform our tax system and bring it up-to-date: 1.) I favor increasing the income tax exemption from the present $600 per dependent to $1200. The $600 allowance is most unrealistic in the light of the high cost of living. An increase in the exemption would be beneficial to all taxpayers, but most helpful to lower income families.

2.) Parents should receive a tax credit of at least $1,000 per year for college expenses for every child attending an instruction of higher education, to cover tuition, fees, books, and equipment. The cost of a college education has risen tremendously in recent years, and many lower and middle income families find it difficult to enable their children to get such an education.

3.) A "Small Tax Division" should be set up in the Tax Court of the U.S. to help small taxpayers who have claims against the Internal Revenue Service (under $2500) and cannot afford to hire an attorney or an accountant.

4.) We should remove the tax advantages which are encouraging conglomerate mergers. There is a rising tide of such mergers and it is beginning to affect our economy adversely, especially the smaller business firms.

There is no doubt that tax reform is long overdue. Congress must therefore seek ways to lighten the tax burden for our citizens, restore public confidence in our tax laws and tax system, and safeguard our national economy.

THE CLAMOR FOR DISARMAMENT

HON. JAMES B. ALLEN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1969

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the people of Alabama are deeply concerned by the present clamor to forgo the expense of an adequate defense of our intercontinental ballistic system. I believe that there is a good reason for such concern.

Following World War I, this Nation dismantled its defenses in the belief that the world was made safe for democracy and pursuant to a belief that we could safely rely upon a genuine desire on the part of all nations for lasting peace. Much faith was then placed in the efficacy of international organizations, compacts and covenants, treaties and agreements, loans and promises to maintain the peace. Yet, there was hardly time for a new generation to grow into maturity before we were in another war.

Following World War II we heard the same clamor for disarmament and for the same policies and the same actions. Once again we misplaced our faith in the same kind of agreements and arrangements to maintain peace. World War II had hardly ended before we had disarmed and we had hardly disarmed before we found ourselves in the Korean war. After that we repeated the same mistakes under the same urgings and with the same catastrophic results and found ourselves in the Vietnam war.

Mr. President, war has followed war after war after war. Now with the prospect of peace in Vietnam, we are once again treated to the same clamor for disarmament, we hear the same urgings to place our reliance in international organizations, treaties, covenants, and conventions.

It seems incredible that we would not have learned a lesson from the failures of our past policies and past actions. It is equally incredible that we should now be urged to repeat the past mistakes which have lead to four major wars in the course of the past 50 years. How can we account for this situation?

I cannot account for it. Neither do I understand the mysterious compulsion which drives lemmings periodically to mass destruction. I am not sure of the validity of the lemming-disarmament analogy. But, neither am I sure that the analogy is not valid.

If history teaches anything, it teaches that national weakness invites attack. If we can draw lessons and guides to social life from the laws of nature, we would do well to pause and carefully consider the fact that in nature, life and the will to live are one and the same, and that life ceases when the struggle to live ceases.

Our nuclear deterrent is deliberately structured for massive retaliation. The capability of massive, overwhelming retaliation serves as a deterrent only so long as it retains that capability.

It must be obvious that anything which diminishes our capability for massive retaliation also diminishes the deterrent. If our retaliatory capability is diminished to the point that it no longer deters, we will have then placed ourselves in the dreaded position of choosing to risk a preemptive strike against us or else to accept abject terms of surrender imposed by those who are capable of such a preemptive strike.

Mr. President, the people of Alabama believe in a strong national defense. In the order of national priorities, we place national defense first by reason of hard, realistic, and unpleasant circumstances of present world conditions.

We believe, Mr. President, that the highly regarded national syndicated columnist William S. White is performing a valuable public service in informing the American people of the folly and dangers inherent in the current drive to block Federal spending necessary for effective defensive measures to protect our deterrent, and particularly spending for an anti-ballistic-missile system which is essential to that defense.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. White's column on this subject, published in the Montgomery Advertiser of April 14, 1969, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Montgomery Advertiser, Apr. 14, 1969]

IN WASHINGTON

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The new isolationists of the Senate are attacking more than the anti-ballistic missile system (ABM) and more even than the whole philosophy of adequate military preparation in a world where danger still manifestly lives.

They are challenging the very realities of the present in a headlong retreat to a past which, even after all this time, they still cannot understand. They are in fact turning the clock back by three decades to the late 30s, when the old isolationists were all but disarming this country while Hitlerism was visibly rising in Europe.

And what of today? The current Chinese Communist Party's congress shows military extremists, even by the standards of that already bellicose power, moving into even higher positions of influence.

The new words of the new isolationists, of such as Senators Mike Mansfield and William Fulbright and Edward Kennedy, have the same old meaning as of the words of the old isolationists of the distant yesterday. Now, in the late '60s, the assault is nominally upon President Nixon's decision—and President Johnson's before him—to build a minimal ABM against the confirmed and undeniable reality of far bigger Soviet work in this field.

Actually, it is an assault upon fundamental and bipartisan national policies going back through four previous Administrations and based upon the conviction that a great power must deal from positions of strength and realism rather than of vague hope and amiable weakness tied to good intentions.

Then, in the late 30s, the old isolationists were nominally attacking the alleged excessive profits of the manufacturers of the weapons of defense, and in truth attacking the whole philosophy of national strength as the best deterrent to international war.

Those who remember those days should have no difficulty in seeing how the wheel has turned full circle. The old isolationist, Sen. Gerald Nye, operated a prolonged and klieg-lit circus of a "Senate investigation," aided and shepherded by the best "public relations" men then in the business, against those he was pleased to call "the merchants of death."

Today's new isolationists are no less rich in assistance from modern "public relations" types, who see the contemporary equivalents of "merchants of death" in those who will—one profoundly hopes—ultimately erect an ABM shield, and also even in those senior officers who wear the uniform of the United States.

It was in its effect, in its sentimentalism and emotional demagoguery, a hucksters' game in Nye's time, no matter how honest in motive it may have been. It is in effect a similar game now, no matter how "sincere" may be the new isolationist semi-pacifist group now gathered about Mansfield and Fulbright and Kennedy and the rest.

Nye got the headlines then. For then as now it was infinitely easier to repeal war and danger than to defend the hard necessity for national preparation, with its inevitable corollary of national sacrifice. The new isolationists get the headlines now. For who would not rather hear promises of more goodies at home, accompanied by more and more "peace" abroad, than stolid warning of the harsh actualities of our time?

Three decades ago the old isolationists seized an captured all the "good" and soothing words; today the new isolationists have seized and captured all the "good" and comforting words. The trouble in the old days was that so many were so willing to be comforted; so few were prepared to look at it like it was. So, too, today.

The Senate swarmed then, as it swarms now, with "advisers" and "experts" and "scientists" eager to pit private judgment, resting most of all on mere private hope, against the tough evidence of professional intelligence. No "public relations" types now assist the pro-ABM men; none were at hand 30 years ago for those other men who bravely struggled, until it was almost too late, to dispel evangelistic emotionalism and good-guy rhetoric from the somber councils of a nation.

ALVIN M. BENTLEY

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn this week of the passing of a very close friend and former colleague of mine, Alvin M. Bentley.

Al and I came to Congress together back in 1952, and I can say sincerely that he was a man who was dedicated to the service of his country and to the effective representation of his constituents in the State of Michigan who elected him for three successive terms as their Congressman.

Al Bentley is remembered by some as the first-term Congressman who was critically wounded in this Chamber, just a few feet from where I now stand, by those who would effect their political will by violence and assassination. But he is best remembered by all who knew him as one who consistently opposed such hostile ideologies and courageously defended freedom and the preservation of our constitutional system.

Al Bentley displayed his personal courage until his death in the face of being confined to a wheelchair since undergoing two operations in 1967. At the age of 50, he died on April 11, 1969, in Tucson, Ariz.

I pay my respects to a man I feel fortunate to have called my friend, Alvin M. Bentley, and express my heartfelt sympathy to his wife and family.

THE FIGHT OVER THE ABM: DEBATE OR WITCH HUNT?

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, within the past few days an article has come to my attention pertaining to the question of the President's decision to deploy the ABM. This article, prepared by Mr. Claude Witze, senior editor, Air Force/Space Digest magazine, is a very comprehensive and competent look at this matter.

As other Senators have noted, this question has highly technical aspects about which it is almost impossible to decide for certain. Therefore I think it particularly appropriate that we look at material prepared by those who are familiar and competent observers with this whole defense question, such as Mr. Witze.

I think it worthy of particular note that my good friend from the other side of the aisle, the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), has made several very cogent observations on this question, but apparently because his stance is not the currently popular one with the preponderantly liberal press, his observations have not attracted many headlines.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the April issue of Air Force magazine be printed in the RECORD, together with a column written by William S. White and published in the Saturday, April 12, edition of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Air Force magazine, April 1969]

THE FIGHT OVER THE ABM: DEBATE OR WITCH HUNT?

(By Claude Witze)

(NOTE.—*President Nixon has decided on the limited deployment of an antiballistic missile system. The nation has not seen such an intense wave of emotionalism engulf any issue since the troubled era of Joseph McCarthy. Much of the criticism of ABM deployment seemed to dismiss the most relevant factor—the importance of an ABM system to national security. Since that criterion should be a prerequisite to any proposed national defense project, and since responsible evaluation and criticism are vital to the national interest, the matter raises a serious question concerning . . .*)

In the fortnight that preceded President Nixon's final hours of travail over the decision to deploy an antiballistic missile (ABM) system, Washington was the scene of an ideological uprising unmatched in the memory of this generation.

To begin with, there was no *debate* about the ABM issue. Some people called it a debate. In truth, it was a verbal orgasm staged by frustrated critics of all that is military, who say in ABM a "war figure." Their flagellation of this image brought out the worst in otherwise calm and sensible men. For sheer unreasonableness, the things they said have had no equal in this capital since attorney Joseph Welch, moved to tears during the so-called Army-McCarthy hearings, asked Senator Joseph McCarthy if he had no shame.

It should not be necessary to point this out again, but the lines, if they were any, were drawn between those who would spend money on social security and those who would spend it on national security. Yet, that generality, like all generalities, is false. There were traditional liberals, or at least men who never falter when it is time to vote funds for liberal causes, who looked at the threat and said we must start on ABM. There were men, reputed for years to be reactionaries, who screamed epithets at the military-industrial complex and pictured the Pentagon as a monstrous coliseum full of war-makers.

The press did not distinguish itself. There were moments when genuine news was thrown into the laps of reporters and they (or their editors) ignored it while their personal sympathies interfered with the flow of professional juices.

The outstanding example of this came on February 20, when Melvin Laird, Secretary of Defense, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He spoke there about the Fractional Orbital Bombardment System (FOBS), known to be under development in Russia. He spoke of it as ". . . the new FOBS system, which is being *deployed* by the Soviet Union at this time" (*emphasis added*).

Not many days later, on March 2, Senator Henry M. Jackson appeared on "Meet the Press." There he was grilled by a less than friendly reporter from the New York *Times*, who wanted to know why ABM deployment should not be delayed while we seek an arms agreement with the Russians. One of the reasons Mr. Jackson cited was FOBS, and he said, "They [the Soviets] have now *deployed* that system, which is a first-strike system, not a retaliatory system."

If there has been a headline announcing that Russia is deploying a system capable of putting bombs in orbit, in violation of an already-existing treaty, it has not been in any American newspaper that we have seen.

While we are on the subject, Senator Jackson, who has an untarnished liberal record on spending for social welfare programs, and who never has made a speech in favor of water pollution, or ghetto living, or war itself, also told "Meet the Press" that the Russians are continuing to improve their own ABM system and have it now in the "third phase of deployment." This is a deployment program that started in 1962. Further, he said they are building Polaris-type submarines in series production, "which was something we had not anticipated as of six months ago."

That was more news, but, like the FOBS item, not designed for the anti-ABM scenario.

Mr. Jackson also said he believes that "on a military basis and on a diplomatic basis . . . we must move ahead in order to protect the security of the United States and not leave this country naked." Later, he added that "the Soviet Union is the one that has accelerated this race. They are the ones that moved first on the ABM. I think if they really have no first-strike intentions they should not complain about the right of each side to protect their own deterrent, and this is what we are trying to do."

The Senator placed great emphasis on this factor of deterrent protection. On the subject of agreement with the Russians at this time, he came up with the suggestion that an agreement on ABM deployment, or nondeployment, might be the "best hope." Even there, there are problems because Moscow seems to be orienting its ABM to cover a possible Chinese attack in the 1970s. In the area of pure speculation, Mr. Jackson feels "maybe they would be willing to reach an agreement with us whereby there would be a limitation as to the number of ABMs which would cover them in connection with an irrational move on the part of the Chinese Communists against Russia as well as against our own country."

It is since his appearance on "Meet the Press" that the Sino-Soviet pot has started to boil over with serious border incidents and anti-Chinese demonstrations in Moscow. Mr. Jackson has not been asked for a revised opinion.

The *Congressional Record* contains a paucity of support for the ABM, such as that given to the TV audience by the Senator from Washington. In both the Senate and the House, the floor time was taken up almost exclusively by the incensed opponents, the men former Defense Secretary Clark Clifford characterized as "primarily concerned with the economic and social costs of the program" as contrasted with those "who are primarily concerned with the threat." Even what the opponents said, however, was not fully reported in the press. The oversights, significantly, included accounts of the most unbalanced opinions placed in the *Record*.

One of these has to be the astonishing speech made in the House of Representatives on February 26 by Representative Bertram L. Podell, a liberal Democrat from New York City. It is impossible to improve on his own language:

"The military-industrial complex of this country," he said, "is preparing its greatest coup, one that will make all previous robbery of the public purse seem like petty thievery. I refer, of course, to the ABM system. It will stop little, accomplish less for the people it is supposed to protect, and only serve to enrich those who are already perpetrating astronomical assaults upon national solvency in the name of national defense."

He then reviewed some of the statements made by ABM critics and came up with some conclusions that are reminiscent of the late unlamented Senator Joseph McCarthy. Mr. Podell boiled it down:

"What it boils down to is simple," Mr. Podell declared. "A vast complex of defense-oriented firms have made a fortune from supplying armaments to the US government. Their lobbyists swarm in this city as bees around a hive. A steady stream of high-ranking officers from all military services find employment in high places among these firms when they leave the service. . . ."

Then Mr. Podell put a finger on his list of evils for which he holds the defense industry responsible:

"In return for this, and because of this insanity, our waters have grown more polluted; our air is becoming increasingly dangerous; our transportation network is grinding to a halt; our cities are cesspools of poor housing, crime, narcotics addiction, and filth; and we are on the verge of racial conflict which will assume the form of urban guerrilla warfare."

No doubt this came as good news to industries previously blamed for air and water pollution, and guilty thereof. The other social ills mentioned, their existence denied by no reasonable man, remain equally remote from the exclusive responsiblity of the people who design and build airplanes, missiles, and the equipment used for space exploration. What Mr. Podell is saying is that the aerospace industry, and that industry alone, has created our social ailments. No fellow member of the House endorsed his indictment, but some of them came close.

Another New Yorker and Democrat, Representative Leonard Farbstein, told the House why he voted against the ABM. The reason is that on the same day the appropriation came up for a vote in the last session, "young men were demonstrating in front of the city hall in New York because they had no jobs." Mr. Farbstein looked at this suffering, contrasted it with the case for the ABM, and concluded that "the needs of our people come first." The Congressman then reviewed the case against ABM. He found it technologically not feasible. He found it undesirable, mainly because its real aim is to secure more money for what President Eisenhower, President Nixon's chief mentor in government, called the military-industrial complex. He found it will prolong the arms race "at the expense of our cities and of the poor and underprivileged."

Finally, Mr. Farbstein concluded that "a comparable investment in cleaning up our cities, air, water, and so forth, training our youth for jobs, strengthening our natural resources, and attacking the misery that breeds disorder both in our own society and in the developing countries will do far more to build American security and our leadership for peace."

At another point in the House discussion, not a debate, but a lengthy recitation by ABM opponents, Congressman Henry S. Reuss, a Wisconsin Democrat, indicated he thinks the United States erred when it deployed so many ICBMs in the first place and that ABM deployment would be another error. Like many Americans, Mr. Reuss feels this is the time to start negotiating with the Russians about disarmament, but he does not agree with Defense Secretary Laird that there first must be progress in Paris, where the Vietnam talks are under way, and in the Middle East.

Talks with Russia should start now, Mr. Reuss says, "before contractors get a vested interest in the deployment of the ABM." He then turned the demand for social action over to the contractors by name:

"If we do not deploy the ABM, this will, no doubt, disappoint those units of the industrial complex—Western Electric, General Electric, McDonnell Douglas, Raytheon, Martin-Marietta, and some others—that have been banking on a multimillion-dollar program.

"I would hope that the scientific genius of these great industrial companies could instead be turned loose on the great problems of the American people, to problems of air and water pollution, the problems of new methods of building homes and schools, and working toward some of the great scientific breakthroughs which are so desperately needed."

There was no one on the floor, that day or since, to give a listing of what these and other companies in aerospace have done and are doing in these areas. The Aerospace Industries Association (1725 De Sales St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036) has available a report on the subject, entitled "Aerospace Technology: Creating Social Progress." A copy will be sent free to anyone who requests it, including Congressmen. One can say in passing, however, that no other segment of American industry is doing as much or nearly as much.

The House discussion of February 26 was led by Representative Jeffery Cohelan, Democrat of California, who acknowledged at one point that "our little group" circulated a letter inviting House members to take part in the assault. He regretted that ABM proponents did not accept the challenge with any enthusiasm. To Mr. Cohelan's credit, it must be said that he eschewed the tendency of his conferees to blame the national security requirement for all the social ills the nation laments, but he did betray his own conviction that nuclear parity, not superiority or sufficiency, is a reasonable goal. The floor leader for the House assault said only that "defense expenditures can no longer be treated as sacred cows." But he also regretted that technology threatens to "coax us off the plateau" where both sides stood "relatively secure in the credibility of their deterrent." He did not refer to the news that the Russian ABM, the Russian FOBS, and the Russian MIRV, fired from Russian submarines, represent technological advances.

More typical than Mr. Cohelan's view was that of Rep. Frank Thompson, Democrat of New Jersey, who appeared most incensed at the military side of the complex, because the Army saw a need to educate the public on the ABM program "much the same way detergents and automobiles are sold in commercial advertising." This, Mr. Thompson said, did not give the citizens a fair break. Said he: "They ought to have the right to determine whether they want decent housing and decent schools for their children, rather than more rockets and missiles."

One of the few voices of reason was raised by Representative Durward G. Hall, Republican of Missouri, himself a physician and member of the House Armed Services Committee. Dr. Hall opined that too many people have taken sides in this discussion who are not well informed about the Sentinel system. After discussing some of its promise as a defensive system, he then put his finger on the opponents who would spend the money instead on rebuilding cities and financing social projects. "I suggest," he said, "that this particular question is not relevant to the basic issue of national security." It may have been the most incisive comment of the entire House discussion.

Serious discussion in the Senate got under way on February 4, when a bipartisan group led by Senator John Sherman Cooper, a Republican from Kentucky, made speeches urging the Nixon Administration to reconsider the ABM deployment ordered by Robert S. McNamara before he left the post of Defense Secretary. On February 6, Mr. Laird announced a freeze in construction and a review of the program. In between, on February 5, the House Armed Services Committee told the Pentagon it would hold hearings on the Army's plans to acquire Sentinel sites in the Chicago and Seattle areas.

It was at this point in early February that the opponents of ABM, for the most part legislators and scientists, cheered on by a wide range of traditional opponents of our military effort, started to plan the outburst that was to hit Washington before the end of the month. To them, the military-industrial complex and the horrendous figures of men in uniform were, generally, an easier target than the more basic issues that seemed clear to men like Congressman Hall.

It is not necessary here to hold forth at length on the nitty-gritty technical arguments about the Sentinel system. The experts disagree on its capabilities, its possible cost, its general effectiveness. To many observers, this part of the dispute is less important than the philosophy of national security that tempers our national decision. Some of the experts, it is suspected, have their technical opinions warped, to one degree or another, by what even Donald Brennan cannot define as anything but "attitude."

Dr. Brennan, who hails from the Hudson Institute and pleads for an ABM, does not believe our defense effort involves any kind of unending spiral or arms race. He says it ain't necessarily so. If we think the United States must be able to kill 4,000,000 Russians and if they put up an ABM that will prevent us from doing it, then the answer is that we must increase our offensive forces. That's what Secretary McNamara set out to do, and it is not unreasonabble to charge that he was escalating. To Dr. Brennan, it would make more sense to deploy an ABM and forget about this fixation that we have to kill a certain number of Russians. The idea is to deter a Russian attack on the United States, and this is one of the reasons President Nixon and the Strategic Air Command, to mention only two adherents of the idea, believe peace is the mission of the Defense Department.

It was about two years ago, at the Air Force Association Convention in San Francisco, that AFA adopted a Statement of Policy taking issue with the McNamara thesis that more missiles and warheads, "a solution advanced by the same leaders who have repeatedly warned against provoking an arms race," would prove our salvation. AFA looked at the "electromagnetic shield-type defense," an ABM tool that Russia had tested with high-altitude nuclear explosions denied to us under terms of the nuclear test-ban treaty and expressed concern about the vulnerability of our ICBMs.

"We are concerned," the AFA Statement said then, "about the possibility of a Soviet antiballistic missile system which would not permit our warheads to reach their targets."

That was in 1967. The last posture statement offered by Secretary McNamara was the one that accompanied the current, Fiscal 1969, budget. It cannot be interpreted as anything but a plea for Congress to accept a standard of parity with the Russians in strategic strength. There was no disposition to do this on Capitol Hill, and Mr. McNamara later endorsed the "thin" ABM, which he said was designed to deter the Chinese, if not the Russians.

Incidentally, Mr. McNamara estimated that a "relatively small number of warheads detonated over fifty Chinese cities would destroy half the urban population (more than fifty million people) and more than one-half of the industrial capacity." This, certainly, contributed to his credibility gap. For our strategic arsenal, the job should be easy.

Returning to the Senate, it is interesting to note that Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, brother of John and Robert Kennedy and a close personal associate of Robert McNamara, is in the forefront of the effort. As Democratic Whip, potential presidential rival of Mr. Nixon in 1972, and darling of the New Left in his own party, Mr. Kennedy is in a position to make political capital out of the ABM dispute.

He started on February 19 by declaring that the review of ABM promised by the Nixon Administration would not be dispassionate, exhaustive, and conclusive. His remedy is to ensure a dispassionate, exhaustive, and conclusive study by commissioning Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Professor Abram Chayes of Harvard to write a report.

Now Dr. Wiesner and Professor Chayes both worked for the Kennedy Administration, as scientific and legal advisers. They are know opponents of the Sentinel system which explains why "Meet the Press," which is under some compulsion to present both sides of a public question, had them on the air March 9, a week after Senator Jackson's appearance. In that program, Dr. Wiesner said flatly that Sentinel "won't work" and that his report on the subject for Mr. Kennedy will come from people who are "not part of the bureaucratic machinery," such as he and Professor Chayes were only a few years ago. They made it clear to the TV audience that their dispassionate study starts with the consideration that military men have been making the weapons decisions for too long. Dr. Wiesner says the decisions should result from considerations that go through the "responsible democratic process." He did not say which process he thought was in effect during the Kennedy and Johnson years. It was in that period that the proved military decision-making process, involving weapon evaluation and source-selection board procedures, was brushed aside, to the distress of men in uniform. If Dr. Wiesner has met Dr. Alain Enthoven, the Pentagon's recent, unlamented Assistant Secretary for Systems Analysis, he did not betray it. He did,-however, make the flat statement that our Minuteman silo installations, whose operational readiness is the responsibility of the Air Force, do not need ABM protection "at this time."

Another major political angle to the ABM controversy centers around a number of congressional committees and their jurisdiction. A key figure is Senator Stuart Symington of Missouri, a former Secretary of the Air Force, now a member of both the Armed Service and Foreign Relations Committees.

New Chairman of the Armed Services Committee is Senator John Stennis of Mississippi. In moving to the position, he would, under normal circumstances, be expected to surrender his post as Chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. He did not. Mr. Stennis has retained that chair and, in doing so, has prevented Senator Symington from advancing to the seat.

Mr. Symington is opposed to the ABM program. He told the Senate recently, with a straight face, that the cost of this program could exceed $400 billion, a figure that is four or five times the most extravagant thus far suggested. Senator Stennis has announced that the full Armed Services Committee will examine the ABM issue, and he has promised to hear from both sides in the dispute.

In the face of this, Senator William Fulbright, of Arkansas, also a foe of ABM, has named a subcommittee of his Foreign Policy Committee "to make a detailed review of the international military commitments of the United States and their relationship to foreign policy." The chairman of the subcommittee: Senator Symington.

The lineup here has brought the comment from at least one Capitol Hill sophisticate that there is an accident loose, waiting for a time to happen. Mr. Stennis feels strongly that the ABM question is in his jurisdiction. The appearance of Mr. Symington at the head of a Foreign Policy inquiry that seems surely destined to get into military affairs—the ABM as well as other issues—does not rest well with the veteran from Mississippi.

The Fulbright insistence that ABM is a matter of concern to him was brought out at the February 20 session, where Mr. Laird testified. The subject of the hearing was the Nonproliferation Treaty, but the testimony dealt with this only in a passing sense. Mr. Fulbright used the meeting to probe the ABM issue. This performance was repeated on March 6 when a Fulbright subcommittee on disarmament held a hearing on the Sentinel system. It was chaired by Senator Albert Gore of Tennessee.

On top of this, the House Armed Services Committee will hold hearings, as will also a Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is headed by Representative Clement J. Zablocki of Wisconsin.

Other committees that will take a look at Sentinel are the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, and the defense appropriations subcommittees of both houses.

While President Nixon was struggling with this, his first major encounter with a volatile issue, both Congress and the press continued to seethe. The output is almost exclusively anti-ABM; much of it is vituperative, and too much of it, in the political arena, is demagogic.

Of course, a major stimulant behind the congressional outbreak, in addition to the general uprising against military opinion, is the reaction of alarmed constituents over the location of Sentinel sites near some cities.

There have been town meetings, in places like Boston and Chicago and Libertyville, Ill., where the citizenry is asked to express an opinion, and listen to a great many of them. On the basis of what they read and hear, in the circumstances described above, they cannot be blamed for not knowing more about the requirement for an ABM and the capability of the Army's proposed system. The indignation, then, finds its roots in the alleged peril of having nuclear weapons in the neighborhood. It remains a fact that some of these sites have been housing the earlier Nike system, and nuclear warheads have been nesting there for several years. There is no record of any nuclear device having been triggered accidentally, and there is nothing new about this ABM that should alter that record.

It is fortunate that, unlike people, weapons know no emotional stress.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 12, 1969]

Senate Foes of ABM Resemble U.S. Isolationists of the 1930's

(By William S. White)

The new isolationists of the Senate are attacking more than the anti-ballistic missile system and more even than the whole philosophy of adequate military preparation in a world where danger still manifestly lives.

They are challenging the very realities of the present in a headlong retreat to a past which even after all this time they still cannot understand. They are in fact turning the clock back by three decades to the late Thirties, when the old isolationists were all but disarming this country while Hitlerism was visibly rising in Europe. And what of today? The current Chinese Communist Party Congress shows military extremists, even by the standards of that already bellicose power, moving into even higher positions of influence.

The new words of the new isolationists, of such as Senators Mike Mansfield and William Fulbright and Edward Kennedy, have the same old meaning, as the words of the old isolationists of the distant yesterday. Now, in the late Sixties, the assault is nominally upon President Nixon's decision—and President Johnson's before him—to build a minimal ABM against the confirmed and the undeniable reality of far bigger Soviet work in this field. Actually, it is an assault upon fundamental and bipartisan national policies going back through four previous Administrations and based upon the conviction that a great power must deal from positions of strength and realism rather than of vague hope and amiable weakness tied to good intentions.

Then in the late Thirties, the old isolationists were nominally attacking the alleged excessive profits of the manufacturers of the weapons of defense, and in truth attacking the whole philosophy of national strength as the best deterrent to war.

Those who remember those days should have no difficulty in seeing how the wheel has turned full circle. The old isolationist Sen. Gerald Nye operated a prolonged and kleig-lit circus of a "Senate investigation," aided and shepherded by the best "public relations" men then in the business, against those he was pleased to call "the Merchants of Death."

Today's new isolationists are no less rich in assistance from modern "public relations" types, who see the contemporary equivalents of "Merchants of Death" in those who will—one profoundly hopes—ultimately erect an ABM shield, and also even in those senior officers who wear the uniforms of the United States.

It was in its effect, in its sentimentalism, and emotional demagoguery, a huckster's game in Nye's time, no matter how honest in motive it may have been. It is in effect a similar game now, no matter how "sincere" may be the new isolationist-semi-pacifist group now gathered about Mansfield and Fulbright and Kennedy and the rest.

Nye got the headlines then; for then as now it was infinitely easier to repeal war and danger than to defend the hard necessity for national preparation, with its inevitable corollary of national sacrifice. The new isolationists get the headlines now. For who would not rather hear promises of more and more goodies at home, accompanied by more and more "peace" abroad, than stolid warnings of the harsh actualities of our time?

Three decades ago the old isolationists seized and captured all the "good" and soothing words; today the new isolationists have seized and captured all the "good" and comforting words.

The Senate swarmed then, as it swarms now, with "advisers" and "experts" and "scientists" eager to put private judgment resting most of all on mere private hope against the tough evidence of professional intelligence. No "public relations" types now assist the pro-ABM men; none were at hand 30 years ago for those other men who bravely struggled, until it was almost too late, to dispel evangelistic emotionalism and good-guy rhetoric from the somber councils of the Nation.

DELAY IN U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we are all familiar with Gladstone's famous maxim: "Justice delayed is justice denied." It often occurs, however, that a well-known phrase, repeated many times over the years, will be reduced in men's minds to a mere cliché. When this happens, the substance is lost, regardless of how valuable and profound the original thought had been.

I fear that this is partially true of the above phrase. We can all quote it glibly, but can we really understand how it has its application to an individual case? Do we really have any concept of the hardships that can arise under an unwieldy system of justice? I think that in many cases we do not, and it is for this reason that I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have recently received from Mr. John Harding Ballance be printed in the Record. The contents should be of genuine interest to all concerned.

I wish to make it clear that I am in no way judging the merits of his case, since I do not have access to all of the facts involved, nor do I attempt to influence the outcome in any way. Rather, my only objective is to show the Senate and the American people how an individual citizen may be affected when justice is delayed.

I am calling this matter to the attention of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery and the Attorney General of the United States for their consideration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hon. Strom Thurmond,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Thurmond: As one of your constituents who has had the pleasure of knowing you for many years as a customer in the Holloway House, I feel that I must call the deplorable condition that exists in our courts to your attention based upon my own personal experience.

On March 25, 1966, I was beaten by the parking lot manager for Parking Management, Inc. at 742—13th Street, N.W. in an entirely unprovoked attack. The manager was merely transferred to another lot and when I learned this I had my attorney, William A. Mann, 308 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C., file suit against Parking Management, Inc. This was done promptly.

On January 9, 1969, I was advised to have my three witnesses and my doctor to be ready for trial. I did this and was advised later in the day that the case would be reset due to no judges being available. This performance was repeated on two or three occasions during January and February 1969 causing a full day's loss and overtime pay for my day manager.

Finally, I was advised that the case was scheduled for trial on March 3, 1969. I kept my day manager on duty for every day last week at considerable expense plus having three witnesses standing by each morning at 9:30 a.m. We were told around 10:30 each day that no civil judge was available but were also told to be ready at 1:30 p.m. in the afternoon. My attorney, to my personal knowledge, was forced to delay other trials scheduled in the courts of Maryland and the General Sessions Court of the District of Columbia, as well as cancel several depositions previously scheduled in Maryland and the District of Columbia.

On Friday, for example, my attorney had very important clients flying in from London, England but was forced to call the U.S. District Court Assignment Office frequently and it was not until 3:00 p.m., Friday that we were told that we were free until Monday, March 10, 1969. The same thing has happened on Monday, Tuesday and today, March 10, 11 and 12, 1969. Until 3:00 p.m. each day I was forced to have three witnesses standing by and was forced to again keep my day manager on duty overtime. My attorney, when I became very upset, explained to me that only the retired judges sat on civil cases in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and that they were free to pick and choose the cases they would hear. Finally, I was told by my attorney on Wednesday that the Assignment Office would try to get a criminal judge to hear my case. As of 2:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 12, 1969, we are still standing by. I am scheduled for an operation Saturday morning.

Senator, I can afford this but what about a seriously injured man trying to obtain his day in court. It makes justice a mockery.

If your Senate Judiciary Committee subpoenaed personnel from the Assignment Office of the U.S. District Court it would seem that the real truth as to why these conditions exist could be determined. I have learned that the actual trial days each of these judges sit on the bench and hear cases in both the U.S. District Court and the General Sessions Court is a national disgrace. My informant also said that they would explain this paucity of actual trial time by claiming they were trying to settle cases but that this was not the truth.

Knowing that you are vitally concerned about law and justice for all, may I urge that you use this case, *John Harding Ballance v. Parking Management, Inc.*, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action No. 1131-66, in an attempt to ascertain the truth so that strong preventive measures may be taken promptly in the interest of justice.

Sincerely,
(Signed) JOHN HARDING BALLANCE.

INTERPRETATION OF GUN CONTROL LAW

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, when Congress overrode the objections of many dedicated Senators and Representatives and passed a punitive gun control bill, there were predictions that the bureaucrats in charge of enforcement would carry the provisions of the law far beyond the intent of the most devoted advocate and apply ridiculous requirements. One example comes from my hometown of Hamilton, Mont. The editor of the local newspaper has written me about the interpretation of the law by the Internal Revenue Service. In the words of Miles Romney, publisher of the Western News:

> It is provided by 26 Code of Federal Regulations Section 178.23, that Internal Revenue Officers may inspect the records, firearms and ammunition of any licensee during business hours. Since your application does not show regular business hours, inspections as contemplated by present law would not be possible.

There is nothing there that indicates that the applicant for license would not permit inspection at any reasonable time. There is nothing in the law or the application that permits the Internal Revenue Service to justify any such statement. When has the Internal Revenue Service been balked in its attempt to elicit information by the fact that the person from whom such information is wanted does not have regular business hours? Rather the opposite is true, and too frequently we in Congress receive protests from those who are harassed at their homes by the Internal Revenue Service late at night, early in the morning, on weekends, or on holidays.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter I received from Mr. Romney, editor and publisher of the Western News, of Hamilton, Mont., and a representative in the State legislature, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WESTERN NEWS,
Hamilton, Mont., March 29, 1969.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing this communication in behalf of a life-long friend of mine—Walter "Bud" Wilson, who has resided in the Hamilton area most of his life. He is now retired after years of employment as a garage mechanic and as foreman of the Ravalli County road department shop.

Throughout his life Mr. Wilson has always been interested in guns, hunting, target shooting, etc. Beginning in 1959 he began a side line of handling firearms and ammunition, for his own benefit, for that of his friends, and in order to provide it for a small consideration to members of the rifle club and the shotgun clubs of which he is a member.

He complied with such regulations as were imposed and was checked by the representative of the federal government in 1968 and found to be operating satisfactorily. That is the only time he has ever been checked.

On February 4, 1969 he forwarded his application on Form 7 (Firearms) (Rev. November 1968) to the Internal Revenue Service filling it in as in the past and indicating his current license issued by the federal government to be 81-1060 and that his business was established 10-28-59. He enclosed his check in sum of $10.00 as a "Dealer in firearms other than destructive devices or ammunition for other than destructive devices."

Recently he received a certified mail letter from the Internal Revenue Service dated 3-11-69 being "Notice of Denial of Application for License."

The denial notice on its second page had boxes marked with X's citing the reasons for denial, i.e.,

It is specified in 26 Code of Federal Regulations, Section 178.11, that a private dwelling, no part of which is open to the public, shall not be recognized as constituting the "business premises" which are required by law, but your application states that you expect to conduct your business from a private residence which is not open to the general public.

It is provided by 26 Code of Federal Regulations, Section 178.23, that Internal Revenue officers may inspect the records, firearms and ammunition of any licensee *during business hours*. Since your application does not show regular business hours, inspections as contemplated by present law would not be possible.

Those two statements were marked with an "X" each indicating that the bureau had voted Wilson and his club out of the practice, long followed, of buying, storing and distributing cartridges and shotgun shells for their target shooting. Many of these shotgun shells are used in shoots of the gun club. The clubs are continually contesting in matches in this area. Are they to be stamped out by such regulations?

Did the Congress intend such far reaching implications when it enacted the recent legislation causing so much uproar? Personally I never caught on with the uproar as I did not personally mind registering my firearms, but now I begin to see that the bureaucracy is bearing down upon the American public. Perhaps there is some reason for alarm.

To make matters worse while the Internal Revenue has denied what I regard as a legitimate operation on the part of Wilson, it also failed to return his $10.00 fee. These grasping rascals apparently fail to comprehend that they are supposed to be the servants of the American people rather than its masters.

Will you please look into this miscarriage and if possible endeavor to rectify an error which is causing people to mistrust their government? And at least Wilson ought to get his ten bucks back! This is worse than a fixed slot machine.

Respectfully,
MILES ROMNEY,
Publisher, the Western News.

MARY K. LONG

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday a birthday party will be given in honor of one of Cleveland's most outstanding citizens, Mary K. Long.

Mary K. Long has been an effective and integral part of the development and progress of Cleveland. Mrs. Long has taken the time from her life as a devoted wife and mother to interest not only herself, but her neighbors and the entire Greater Cleveland community to advocate participation in civic affairs.

The response to her active interest impelled her to accept the honored position of Democratic ward leader in ward 9 which has the largest constituency in the city of Cleveland. During Mrs. Long's elected leadership beginning in 1937, she has been reelected every 2 years, which is not only a tribute, but an impression of confidence in her exceptional leadership in the affairs of the city of Cleveland and ward 9.

It was my good fortune when I was elected precinct committeeman in the early 1930's to know Mrs. Long and, at that early stage of my political career, to have her advice and counsel. Mrs. Long is very considerate, extremely patient, and her affability and willingness to be of assistance endears her to everyone who knows her.

I regret that I cannot be present to join with her husband, three children, eight grandchildren, and her legion of friends to celebrate her birthday. To Mrs. Long I extend my best wishes for continued good health and happiness.

THE BOSTON POLICE BACCALAUREATE PROGRAM

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the important role the police plays in our communities. They are responsible for the security of our people and the protection of lives and property. In the past few years another dimension has been added to police work, often known as community relations. This is an extremely important part of a policeman's duties. Since he is responsible for the protection of people, he therefore must be trusted by them so that he will be called in case of emergency and will be assisted in his pursuit of criminals.

In an effort to meet the growing problems currently facing urban law enforcement officials, the Boston Police Department, under the direction of Commissioner Edmund L. McNamara, requested the Municipal Police-Science Institute to formulate a program that would deal effectively with the deficiencies in police training and education. The institute study indicated that a new approach to the problem of developing a practical course of study for urban policies should be made within the framework of an accredited institution of higher learning. The result was the establishment of the Boston police baccalaureate program. This program is not a course in police training because the Boston Police Department has always had excellent skills, and I must say has been among the finest in the Nation, but was rather a course in police education. It was designed to provide a better liberal arts education with emphasis on metropolitan studies or one of the social sciences. It is hoped that with an increased awareness of the problems, forces and demands of our changing society, the police officer will be able to execute his role with greater understanding, sensitivity, and efficiency.

Commissioner McNamara, with an understanding of the great problems facing our urban centers, is primarily responsible for the development of this program. In recognizing the need for a higher degree of competency among police officials, he has made a giant stride in upgrading and improving the standards of the police profession. Commissioner McNamara brings to his position a varied and high degree of professional experience. A graduate of Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass., Commissioner McNamara entered the U.S. Navy in 1943 and participated in the invasion of the Philippine Islands. He was awarded the Silver Star Medal for gallantry and intrepidity in action and Secretary of the Navy Unit Citation. After a brief period of professional football with the Giants, Commissioner McNamara was appointed special agent in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In 1948 he was assigned to the Boston field division where he participated in the investigation of the famous Brinks robbery case and was one of the major witnesses at the trial that led to the conviction of the individuals responsible. On April 5, 1962, Commissioner McNamara resigned from the Boston Office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to accept the appointment as police commissioner for the city of Boston. As commissioner, Commissioner McNamara has worked diligently and effectively to generate pride in the community and particularly in the police force.

Mr. John T. Howland, superintendent, bureau of inspectional services, police department, Boston, Mass., has written an excellent report on the Boston police baccalaureate program for the April 1969 issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. Having received permission to insert this article in the RECORD. I hope that it will encourage other police departments to emulate the great strides now being made by the Boston Police Department.

The article follows:

THE BOSTON POLICE BACCALAUREATE PROGRAM

(By John T. Howland[1] superintendent, bureau of inspectional services, police department, Boston, Mass.)

Superintendent Howland was the principal founder and first president of the Municipal Police-Science Institute and now serves as its executive director. He also is currently serving as a vice president of the FBI National Academy Associates.

There is general agreement that among the many problems currently facing urban law enforcement administrators and municipal officials one of the most challenging is the development of that degree of competency associated with professionalism at all levels of police responsibility. In an effort to meet this challenge, the Boston Police Department, under the leadership of Police Commissioner Edmund L. McNamara, requested the Municipal Police-Science Institute to explore the possibilities of developing a program designed to deal effectively with the deficiencies in police training and education.

To develop the desired program, the institute consulted with members of the faculty of Massachusetts State College at Boston. The college designated Dr. James Jones to serve as police education consultant to the institute and to conduct a study of the law enforcement curriculums of several educational institutions. This study concluded that there was some disagreement as to what constituted law enforcement education. The study also determined that, frequently, various programs were developed by persons who were more involved in law enforcement than in education. This might tend to be a limiting factor in a developmental approach. The study also showed that the Boston Police Academy and other police academies were competent to develop and administer law enforcement-oriented training programs but, as they themselves recognized, were not equipped to present a broad academic program.

ESTABLISHMENT

These conclusions resulted in an entirely new approach to the problem of developing and providing a practical and analytical curriculum for urban police within the framework of an accredited institution of higher learning. The result was the establishment of the Boston Police Baccalaureate Program. Its curriculum structure is based on the philosophy that this type of college program should be adapted to cover those subjects that police training programs are unqualified to teach, thereby making a distinction between police education and police training. For this reason, few strictly police-oriented courses are offered in the program. This decision concurs with the findings of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice wherein it was reported in "Task Force Report: The Police":

"The Commission's examination of these programs discloses that many of them are highly vocational in nature and are primarily intended to provide technical skills necessary in performing police work. College credit is given, for example, for such courses as traffic control, defensive tactics and patrol procedures. Although there is a need for vocational training, it is not and cannot be a substitute for a liberal arts education."

GREATER UNDERSTANDING

Special emphasis on metropolitan studies or on one of the social sciences will make the officers aware of the problems, forces, and demands of our changing society and will result in increased sensitivity and understanding. It is anticipated that as the program continues to provide the department graduates, the benefits of this type of education will be realized through greater cooperation with, and understanding of, the community and the society in which the officer functions. This understanding will lead to the efficient and responsible execution of the role of the police officer that is demanded by today's society.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

The Boston Police Baccalaureate Program provides an opportunity for 25 Boston police officers to enter Massachusetts State College at Boston each year, where they will work towards a bachelor of science degree in metropolitan studies or one of the social sciences. The Municipal Police-Science Institute provides full support for tuition, academic expenses, books, and other incidentals, while the Boston Police Department makes available the time to attend classes. Each participating officer, in addition to carrying a full academic schedule, is given part-time assignments in the department. The program places no requirement on matriculating officers to remain in police service after completion of their studies. The Boston Police Department recognizes the fact that some of the men may leave after graduation. However, recruitment of police applicants will be aided by this program, and the probability exists that those who leave will join allied professions and thereby help to offset any disadvantage.

SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

The procedures for selecting participants in the Boston Police Baccalaureate Program were established by the Massachusetts State College. All those who indicate an interest in enrolling submit transcripts of their secondary school education and any post-high-school education. These records are evaluated by the admissions office of the college, and in addition, a day of testing, which entails two standardized tests and the writing of an expository theme, is conducted at State college in July. Acceptance for the program is based on the results of these tests, which consist largely of general information and reading comprehension of selected materials, together with an evaluation of the applicant's essay. Comparison of the test scores achieved by the participants with those achieved on the same tests by incoming freshman classes at the college in recent years indicates that the police officers who score successfully demonstrate a potential for college work. The scores of the selected candidates rank in the upper 25 percent of all incoming freshmen. This evidence of high academic potential, combined with the maturity and high motivation of those chosen, indicates a high rate of success for the officers participating in the program.

GOALS AND RESULTS OF THE PROGRAM

The ultimate goals of the Boston Police Baccalaureate Program are to develop among police officers an increased awareness of the social, cultural, and economic conditions within the community and to stimulate the intellectual development of police personnel. This program is intended to be the initial step in the gradual upgrading of the academic level and competence of local law enforcement officers and is consistent with the recommendation of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice which proposes raising the level of academic competence and the realignment of the police function. Because the program concentrates on socially oriented courses, rather than on "police oriented" or "police science" courses, it is hoped that the curriculum will serve as a model for the type of advanced education which all police officers eventually will receive. A college education will enable the police officer to master material not readily available to him through reading, experience, or inservice training. The development of social sensitivities and a broad perspective can be just as valuable to the work of the law enforcement officer as the instruction he receives in police vocational skills and techniques. This approach to the curriculum and the full-pay, full-tuition funding of the program represent a significant departure from typical police college programs now in existence and expose the participants to a comprehensive and unbiased education.

OTHER BENEFITS

The results of the program, after it is in operation for 4 years, will be the awarding of bachelor's degrees to 25 police officers each year. Several other important benefits are to be derived from this sytem. First, the program gives the department a resource of police officers who have the necessary academic background to view the police function with regard to the concept of a total community system. Because the program attracts the more promising personnel, it is expected that the ranks of superior officers eventually will be composed of many of these men who have been educated in metropolitan studies and the social sciences. Second, this opportunity for advanced education has increased department morale and has stimulated an interest in the personal development of police personnel. Third, the program acts as a means of attracting a higher caliber of individuals by providing an opportunity to earn a college degree. The fourth effect will be increased prestige for law enforcement in the community and improved social contact with the citizenry.

---

[1] Superintendent Howland has been a member of the Boston Police Department for 29 years. His professional education was acquired at Franklin Technical Institute at Boston, the FBI National Academy (64th Session), and the Management Institute for Police Chiefs at Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration.

In the evolving definition of the police function, it is more and more evident that ever-increasing portions of police work will be directed to community service and what were once termed "nonpolice functions." Also, it is becoming more evident that there is no clear line of demarcation between social service and public service. Modern police must, as a result of the desires and demands of society, be involved in social services to some degree. A police department should have the capability of recognizing social problems and be able to serve as a referral agency. The baccalaureate program gives the department personnel the initial educational background to recognize and responds to the needs of the community. This concept in police education and professional development is worthy of careful consideration by both small and large departments.

FUNDING

The program is completely financed and administered by the Municipal Police-Science Institute, Inc., a non-profit corporation dedicated to the advancement and professionalization of law enforcement. The institute's membership is drawn from the business, scientific, legal, educational, and law enforcement professions. The four principal officers of the institute, two of whom are FBI National Academy graduates, are members of the Boston Police Department with an accumulative police experience of over 100 years.

While the institute is funded through grants and contributions from interested individuals and charitable, fraternal, and business organizations, the Boston Police Baccalaureate Program, in its initial stages, was sponsored by the Permanent Charity Fund of Boston.

RESPONSIBILITIES AND PROCEDURES

The Municipal Police-Science Institute accepts the responsibility to:

1. Enter 25 police officers, per year, in a program leading to a bachelor of science degree in one of the social sciences or metropolitan studies.
2. Provide funds to pay full tuition, fees, and academic expenses, including books, at Massachusetts State College at Boston for 4 years.
3. Administer the program in cooperation with State College and the Boston Police Department through the institute's program director.
4. Maintain a close watch on the program to see that all participants are performing satisfactorily, and provide tutoring service when deemed advisable by the college.
5. Provide career counseling to students.

The Boston Police Department accepts the responsibility to:

1. Give all participants time, at no loss of pay, to attend college sessions. A 25-hour work week in addition to the academic workload has been determined by State college to be reasonable.
2. Give all participants special consideration in work assignments of broad challenge and interest during their college program. These assignments represent a wide scope of police activities and the participant's rotation through these assignments during his college work will give him a broad knowledge of the department which will benefit him and the department in the future.
3. Encourage the Massachusetts Civil Service Commission to recognize the value of this program to the police department and to the community, and further encourage the Civil Service Commission to use the subject matter from the baccalaureate program as source material in the preparation of future promotional examinations.

The Massachusetts State College at Boston accepts the responsibility to:

1. Select, by a battery of aptitude and motivation tests, the 25 officers who will participate each year from those in the department who desire to do so.
2. Provide academic counseling and program aid for participants.
3. Provide required courses and choice of electives leading to a bachelor of science degree in metropolitan studies or in one of the social sciences.
4. Make available facilities of the Massachusetts State College to the participants as full-time students.
5. Provide the institute and the police department with progress reports on the students and a periodical evaluation of the program.

At the conclusion of the first semester under the baccalaureate program, four of the 25 officers currently attending are on the president's list and six are on the dean's list at the college. All the other policemen have passed their examinations and are students in good standing.

GRADUATE PROGRAM

Although fully recognizing the great benefits that the police department will receive from this baccalaureate program, Commissioner McNamara points out the need for other specialized studies. He explains that there is a growing need for a higher degree of competency among police officials in special technical skills, planning, direction, and management. In recognizing that these areas require abilities possessed by engineers, lawyers, teachers, chemists, systems analysts, statisticians, auditors, and various management specialists, the institute offers the leading student in each graduating class it sponsors the opportunity to participate in a graduate program in the college of his choice.

CONCLUSION

After an examination of the newly developed curriculum, the Boston Police Commissioner and the Executive Director of the Municipal Police-Science Institute agree that an ideal combination of education and training for Boston police officers would consist of (1) completing the Boston police baccalaureate program, (2) accumulating diversified on-the-job experience, and (3) then receiving the training offered by the FBI National Academy. They feel that if a sufficient number of the department's personnel are equipped with this professional experience, then the only additional needs will be for a small percentage of personnel to be trained for the highly technical special services. It is anticipated that, in the future the graduate program will provide these special skills.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, April 21, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord thy God bless thee in all the work of thine hand which thou doest.—Deuteronomy 14: 29.

O Lord, our God, whose glory is in all the world and whose goodness shines in all that is fair, we commit ourselves and our country to Thy merciful care: that being guided by Thy spirit we may learn to dwell together in Thy peace and to live by Thy laws.

Grant that the work of this day may be in accordance with Thy will. Give to us health of body, clarity of mind and strength of spirit that we may do what we have to do with all our hearts.

Deliver us from the fear that destroys, from the futility that deadens, and from the frustration that discourages us. Do Thou help us to work to make our dreams come true and to dream to make our work worth doing.

Keep our Nation strong in Thee. Let us walk and work together humbly and in all good will that in faith and freedom Thy glory shall be revealed in every effort we make to share in the work of the world: through Jesus Christ by whose life we have been redeemed. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 17, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10158. An act to provide mail service for Mamie Doud Eisenhower, widow of former President Dwight David Eisenhower.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 265. An act for the relief of John (Giovanni) Denaro;

S. 1531. An act for the relief of Chi Jen Feng; and

S. 1625. An act for the relief of Gong Sing Hom.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO SIT

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have permission to sit during general debate Tuesday, April 22.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker,

reserving the right to object, has the gentleman cleared this with the ranking minority member of the committee? If so, he has not communicated with me.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I have not communicated with him. However, this comes under an understanding that was had that the committee would again resume its executive session in connection with the electoral college. That is the matter before us.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am in full accord with affirmative action in this important area, but I think it is wise that we always assume when a request is made that there has been no problem about clearing it with the ranking minority member. I would respectfully request that the gentleman defer this until at least I have been notified that there is no problem as far as our ranking Republican member is concerned.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I do not know if he has any objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I have to be sure and positive.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Here is Mr. POFF now.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And I think it is good policy that we know in advance that we have had this cleared. Therefore I would respectfully request that the gentleman defer his request.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I will withdraw my request for the time being, Mr. Speaker.

REPRESENTATIVE FRIEDEL INTRODUCES BILL AIMED AT FOSTERING COMPETITION IN FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION

(Mr. FRIEDEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill—aimed at fostering competition in freight transportation and thereby easing the grave national small shipment problem—to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to authorize railroads to publish rates for use by common carriers.

Among common carriers, we have freight forwarders, railway express companies, and motor carriers who are intended to serve the small shipment public. To a large extent inequities in present law have inhibited constructive competition for this business and service has badly deteriorated.

This bill will permit railroads to publish reduced rates, that reflect economies resulting from efficient collection, consolidation, and distribution, for shipments directed to railroads for line haul carriage by other common carriers.

Resultant economies should benefit small shipment senders and receivers and thereby serve the national interest.

PELLY URGES INVESTIGATION OF PRO-ARAB EXTREMIST GROUPS IN UNITED STATES

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about what is said to be the growth of extremist hate groups in the United States and this, it appears to me, deserves investigation by Congress.

In the 90th Congress, the House Internal Security Committee issued an excellent report on the Ku Klux Klan which was prepared after an extensive investigation. It seems to me that in light of recent activities by some extremist groups in this country in support of the Arab guerrilla attacks on Israel, a similar investigation by the Internal Security Committee is called for.

According to information which appeared in the New York Times, these extremist groups are mobilized throughout our country. For example, in Detroit, a drive on behalf of the Al Fatah is being conducted by the Wayne State University chapter of the Organization of Arab Students, described as "sometimes in concert with the youth group of the Trotskyite Social Workers Party." In Philadelphia, the militant Labor Forum, an arm of the Socialist Workers Party, sponsored a pro-Arab, pro-Fatah program, on March 14. The same thing has occurred in New York City where it is reported that Al Fatah guerrillas received substantial and favorable treatment in the official publication of the Black Panther Party and a periodical of the Black Muslem movement.

Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve to know the full implications of such extremist support in their country for such a group as the Al Fatah which is admittedly and continually causing death and destruction to the peoples of Israel. In the interest of peace in the Middle East, I urge an investigation as soon as possible so that the public can learn the truth about cooperation between U.S. extremist elements and the Al Fatah.

PRESIDENT'S DECISION TO INSURE FUTURE U.S. RECONNAISSANCE FLIGHTS ADEQUATE PROTECTION

(Mr. BUSH asked and was given permission to address the House of 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur with the President's decision to see that future U.S. reconnaissance flights receive adequate protection. Timidity in responding to such unprovoked, criminal action in not consistent with American tradition. The President's action thus seems a clear affirmation that we will not be blackmailed into terminating these flights.

As the evidence clearly shows, the North Korean downing of our plane was a deliberate attack upon a plane flying in international air space. Because the danger of similar future attacks on American planes does exist, I think the President's recourse is a vitally necessary one.

It is imperative that we afford our men this protection that President Nixon has advocated so that senseless and unnecessary sacrifice of American lives can be avoided in the future.

The President has indicated through protecting our flights, that future aggression against our flights will meet with retaliation. This is as it should be. It is tough to conclude that the outrageous North Korean leaders responsible for this murderous attack understand anything but force.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S RESTRAINT DURING PLANE INCIDENT LAUDED

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to express my full approval of the way President Nixon has handled the piratical action of North Korea in shooting down an unarmed American reconnaissance plane over international waters last Monday, killing 31 crewmen. The President has responded with calm, reasoned restraint in the face of this new example of aggression by a country which has long flouted international law. He has won the support of foreign governments and Members on both sides of the aisle in this body.

The President said at his news conference last Friday that reconnaissance flights of the type taken by the ill-fated EC121 had been going on for 20 years. Such flights are vital to our national defense interests. Every diplomat or military commander wants all the intelligence he can get and in this critical time, the flights should be continued. But American men in uniform cannot continue to be subject to the mortal risks of such irresponsible harassment. The President wisely decided such flights must be continued under the protection of units of the American Pacific Fleet which he has ordered into the Sea of Japan.

Mr. Speaker, the President called North Korea a bandit nation which was controlled neither by Communist China nor the Soviet Union. That country's action in shooting down a unarmed American plane 100 miles at sea was an irresponsible outrage which no nation adhering to the basic tenets of international law could support. Let us hope that by placing North Korea on notice that any future acts of aggression against American forces operating in international waters or airspace will not go unanswered. Hopefully, those with rational commonsense will prevail over the hotter heads in Pyongyang and see that North Korea adopts a manner of conduct consistent with civilized practices. Otherwise, America will be required to defend itself and every peace-loving nation in the world will sympathize with that grim necessity.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 38]

Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashley
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Bell, Calif.
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Brasco
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Casey
Celler
Chisholm
Clancy
Cowger
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, La.
Fallon
Fish
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Halpern
Harsha
Hébert
Jarman
Jonas
Karth
Kirwan
Landrum
Leggett
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
McClory
McCloskey
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Mahon
Martin
May
Mayne
Meskill
Mikva
Mollohan
Monagan
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Nix
Ottinger
Patman
Podell
Powell
Purcell
Quie
Reid, N.Y.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. Onge
Sandman
Scheuer
Sikes
Sullivan
Symington
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Tunney
Ullman
Vanik
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wydler
Zwach

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 327 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REFORM OF OUR FEDERAL INCOME TAX SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-103)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the message from the President of the United States.

The following message from the President of the United States was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Reform of our Federal income tax system is long overdue. Special preferences in the law permit far too many Americans to pay less than their fair share of taxes. Too many other Americans bear too much of the tax burden.

This Administration, working with the Congress, is determined to bring equity to the Federal tax system. Our goal is to take important first steps in tax reform legislation during this session of the Congress.

The economic overheating which has brought inflation into its fourth year keeps us from moving immediately to reduce Federal tax revenues at this time. Inflation is itself a tax—a cruel and unjust tax that hits hardest those who can least afford it. In order to "repeal" the tax of inflation, we are cutting budget spending and have requested an extension of the income tax surcharge.

Although we must maintain total Federal revenues, there is no reason why we cannot lighten the burden on those who pay too much, and increase the taxes of those who pay too little. Treasury officials will present the Administration's initial group of tax reform proposals to the Congress this week. Additional recommendations will be made later in this session. The overall program will be equitable and essentially neutral in its revenue impact. There will be no substantial gain or loss in Federal revenue, but the American taxpayer who carries more than his share of the burden will gain some relief.

Much concern has been expressed because some citizens with incomes of more than $200,000 pay no Federal income taxes. These people are neither tax dodgers nor tax cheats. Many of them pay no taxes because they make large donations to worthy causes, donations which every taxpayer is authorized by existing law to deduct from his income in figuring his tax bill.

But where we can prevent it by law, we must not permit our wealthiest citizens to be 100% successful at tax avoidance. Nor should the Government limit its tax reform only to apply to these relatively few extreme cases. Preferences built into the law in the past—some of which have either outlived their usefulness or were never appropriate—permit many thousands of individuals and corporate taxpayers to avoid their fair share of Federal taxation.

A number of present tax preferences will be scaled down in the Administration's proposals to be submitted this week. Utilizing the revenue gained from our present proposals, we suggest tax reductions for lower-income taxpayers. Further study will be necessary before we can propose changes in other preferences; and as these are developed we will recommend them to the Congress.

Specifically, the Administration will recommend:

—*Enactment of what is in effect a "minimum income tax" for citizens with substantial incomes by setting a 50% limitation on the use of the principal tax preferences which are subject to change by law.*

This limit on tax preferences would be a major step toward assuring that all Americans bear their fair share of the Federal tax burden.

—*Enactment of a "low income allowance," which will remove more than 2,000,000 of our low income families from the Federal tax rolls and assure that persons or families in poverty pay no Federal income taxes.*

This provision will also benefit students and other young people. For example, the person who works in the summer or throughout the year and earns $1,700 in taxable income—and now pays $117 in Federal income taxes—would pay nothing.

The married couple—college students or otherwise—with an income of $2,300 and current taxes of $100 would pay nothing.

A family of four would pay no tax on income below $3,500—the cut-off now is $3,000.

The "low income allowance," if enacted by the Congress, will offer genuine tax relief to the young, the elderly, the disadvantaged and the handicapped.

Our tax reform proposals would also help workers who change jobs by liberalizing deductions for moving expenses and would reduce specific preferences in a number of areas:

—taxpayers who have certain nontaxable income or other preferences would have their non-business deductions reduced proportionately.

—certain mineral transactions (so-called "carved out" mineral production payments and "ABC" transactions) would be treated in a way that would stop artificial creation of net operating losses in these industries.

—exempt organizations, including private foundations, would come under much stricter surveillance.

—the rules affecting charitable deductions would be tightened—but only to screen out the unreasonable and not stop those which help legitimate charities and therefore the nation.

—the practice of using multiple subsidiaries and affiliated corporations to take undue advantage of the lower tax rate on the first $25,000 of corporate income would be curbed.

—farm losses, to be included in the "limitation on tax preferences," would be subject to certain other restrictions in order to curb abuses in this area.

I also recommend that the Congress repeal the 7% investment tax credit, effective today.

This subsidy to business investment no longer has priority over other pressing national needs.

In the early 60's, America's productive capacity needed prompt modernization to enable it to compete with industry abroad. Accordingly, Government gave high priority to providing tax incentives for this modernization.

Since that time, American business has invested close to $400 billion in new plant and equipment, bringing the American economy to new levels of productivity and efficiency. While a vigorous pace of capital formation will certainly continue to be needed, national priorities now require that we give attention to the need for general tax relief.

Repeal of the investment tax credit will permit relief to every taxpayer through relaxation of the surcharge earlier than I had contemplated.

The revenue effect of the repeal of the investment tax credit will begin to be significant during calendar year 1970. *Therefore, I recommend that investment tax credit repeal be accompanied by extension of the full surcharge only to January 1, 1970, with a reduction to 5% on January 1.* This is a reappraisal of my earlier recommendation for continuance of the surcharge until June 30, 1970 at a 10% rate. If economic and fiscal conditions permit, we can look forward to elimination of the remaining surtax on June 30, 1970.

I am convinced, however, that reduction of the surtax without repeal of the investment tax credit would be imprudent.

The gradual increase in Federal revenues resulting from repeal of the investment tax credit and the growth of the economy will also facilitate a start during fiscal 1971 in funding two high-priority programs to which this Administration is committed:

—Revenue sharing with State and local governments.

—Tax credits to encourage investment in poverty areas and hiring and training of the hard-core unemployed.

These proposals, now in preparation, will be transmitted to the Congress in the near future.

The tax reform measures outlined earlier in this message will be recommended to the House Ways and Means Committee by Treasury officials this week. This is a broad and necessary program for tax reform. I urge its prompt enactment.

But these measures, sweeping as they are, will not by themselves transform the U.S. tax system into one adequate to the long-range future. Much of the current tax system was devised in depression and shaped further in war. Fairness calls for tax reform now; beyond that, the American people need and deserve a simplified Federal tax system, and one that is attuned to the 1970's.

We must reform our tax structure to make it more equitable and efficient; we must redirect our tax policy to make it more conducive to stable economic growth and responsive to urgent social needs.

That is a large order. Therefore, I am directing the Secretary of the Treasury to thoroughly review the entire Federal tax system and present to me recommendations for basic changes, along with a full analysis of the impact of those changes, no later than November 30, 1969.

Since taxation affects so many wallets and pocketbooks, reform proposals are bound to be controversial. In the debate to come on reform, and in the even greater debate on redirection, the nation would best be served by an avoidance of stereotyped reactions. One man's "loophole" is another man's "incentive." Tax policy should not seek to "soak" any group or give a "break" to any other—it should aim to serve the nation as a whole.

Tax dollars the Government deliberately waives should be viewed as a form of expenditure, and weighed against the priority of other expenditures. When the preference device provides more social benefit than Government collection and spending, that "incentive" should be expanded; when the preference is inefficient or subject to abuse, it should be ended.

Taxes, often bewailed as inevitable as death, actually give life to the people's purpose in having a Government: to provide protection, service and stimulus to progress.

We shall never make taxation popular, but we can make taxation fair.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 21, 1969*.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE ON INCOME TAX

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is proposing bold steps in response to urgent needs—the need to give the American people income tax relief at the earliest possible moment consonant with sound policy and to eliminate the 7-percent investment tax credit as a fuel currently too rich for the American economic engine.

The President's proposal to extend the surtax at 10 percent only until January 1, 1970, and then to reduce it to 5 percent is clear recognition that income taxes are too high. We all recognize that. We know the burden should be reduced as soon as circumstances permit.

The proposal to reduce the surtax to 5 percent as of January 1, 1970, is—as the President stated—tied tightly to the proposal to eliminate the 7-percent investment tax credit.

The revenue loss from the surtax reduction must be largely offset by revenue gain from elimination of the tax credit.

Elimination of the normal 7-percent investment tax credit will serve several purposes.

It will tend to slow down the overheated American economy and thus help curb inflation.

It will bring an estimated $3 billion additional revenue into the U.S. Treasury.

It will create conditions under which business and industry will have greater incentive to use the special tax credits Mr. Nixon is proposing for investment in poverty areas in fiscal 1971.

The need for elimination of the normal 7-percent investment tax credit became apparent when all of the other fiscal and monetary tightening actions taken by the Nixon administration and the Federal Reserve Board failed to slow down the economy sufficiently to assure success in the fight against inflation.

The "big news" in the President's tax reform message should not obscure other highly meaningful proposals—elimination of income taxes for Americans at the poverty level, the imposition of what in effect is a minimum income tax for a small group of high-income individuals, and the closing of a number of income tax loopholes.

The President's proposals will move America toward a commonsense and fair tax structure.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, we all remember the famous slogan of our revolutionary forefathers: "taxation without representation is tyranny." It is indeed tyrannical to ask a man to pay taxes if he has no voice in the halls of the decisionmakers.

We have come a long way since the days when those words inspired the colonists. Today, however, we have a different kind of inequity to deal with. I speak of the fact that there are some Americans who have incomes over $200,000 who pay no tax at all.

If it is unjust to ask a man to pay taxes and deny him a voice in government, it is equally unjust to allow a man to pay no taxes and reap the maximum economic benefits of a free and representative democracy.

The President's message on tax reform states quite plainly that such a state of affairs is no longer acceptable. The proposed limit on tax preference is, as the President has said, a major step forward toward assuring that all Americans bear their fair share of the Federal tax burden.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

TO AMEND ACT TO INCORPORATE THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4600) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Education Association of the United States," approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 804).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4600

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the National Education Association of the United States", approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 804), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That the said corporation shall further have power to have and to use a common seal, and to alter and change the same at its pleasure; to sue or to be sued in any court of the United States, or other court of competent jurisdiction; to make bylaws not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act or of the Constitution of the United States; to take or receive, whether by gift, grant, devise, bequest, or purchase, any real or personal estate, and to hold, grant, transfer, sell, convey, hire, or lease the same for the purpose of its incorporation; to accept and administer any trust of real or personal estate for any educational purpose within the objects of the corporation; and to borrow money for its corporate purposes, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, deed of trust, pledge, or otherwise."

(b) Section 6(a) of such Act, as amended, is amended by deleting "a Board of Trustees,".

(c) Section 7 of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) The invested fund now known as the 'Permanent Fund of the National Education Association,' shall be held in such corporation as a Permanent Fund and shall be in charge of the Executive Committee, which shall provide for the safekeeping and investment of such fund, and of all other funds which the corporation may receive by donation, bequest, or devise. No part of the principal of such Permanent Fund or its accretions shall be expended or transferred to the General Fund, except by a two-thirds vote of the Representative Assembly, after the proposed expenditure or transfer has been approved by the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors, and after printed notice of the proposed expenditure or transfer has been printed in the Journal of the National Education Association at least two months prior to the meeting of the Representative Assembly.

"(b) The income of the Permanent Fund

shall be used only to meet the cost of maintaining the organization of the Association and of publishing its annual volume of Proceedings, unless the terms of the donation, bequest, or devise shall otherwise specify or the bylaws of the corporation shall otherwise provide.

"(c) The Executive Committee shall elect the secretary of the Association, who shall be secretary of the Executive Committee, and shall fix the compensation and the term of his office for a period not to exceed four years."

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption by the Representative Assembly of the National Education Association of amended bylaws to provide for the administration of the property of the corporation and for the selection of the secretary of the Association, section 7 of the Act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 804), shall be of no further force and effect.

(Mr. ROGERS of Colorado asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the National Education Association is an organization which through its local, State, and territorial affiliates represents more than 1,748,000 teachers. The membership includes teachers, administrators, and professors at the primary, secondary, and college level, both public and private. It has had a Federal charter since 1906.

The amendments proposed in H.R. 4600 have been approved by resolutions adopted by the governing bodies of the association: the National Education Association representative assembly, the executive committee, the board of directors and the present members of the board of trustees.

Under the present NEA charter as amended, there exists a cumbersome structure which results in a degree of isolation of the membership from the executive secretary who is the chief administrative officer of the association.

Under section 12 of the charter, the powers of the active members are vested in and exercised by a representative assembly composed of delegates selected by the State and local affiliates of the association.

Between meetings of the representative assembly and subject to the authority and direction of that body, a 90-member board of directors is charged with all general policies and major interests of the association except those entrusted to the board of trustees and the executive committee. The board consists of at least one member from each State, Commonwealth, and the District of Columbia.

An 11-member executive committee considers and acts on general policies and professional interests of the association between meetings of the board of directors. Its membership includes the NEA officers, two members chosen by the board of directors, and four members elected at large by the representative assembly.

Under section 7 of the charter, a seven-member board of trustees has charge of the association's permanent fund, elects the secretary of the association and fixes the compensation and the term of his office. The board includes the president ex-officio and four members elected by the board of directors for 4-year terms.

H.R. 4600 simply amends the Act of Incorporation of the National Education Association to eliminate the board of trustees and transfer the present duties of that body to the executive committee of the association. The representative assembly wishes to lodge such responsibilities with the executive committee, which body is, for the most part, elected on an annual basis by the representative assembly. Under the existing charter, the assembly can express no direct voice in the selection of the board of trustees.

The bill also will amend the charter to confer upon the association the express powers to sell or mortgage its property. These are powers which were expressly held by the association prior to the act of 1906 and which apparently were inadvertently omitted from that act. Accordingly, the statement of powers has been revised to include all those granted under the general incorporation laws of the District of Columbia relating to educational organizations.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION ON NATIONAL OBSERVANCES AND HOLIDAYS—BILL STRICKEN FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H.R. 2171) to establish the Commission on National Observances and Holidays, be removed from the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman wish the bill stricken from the Consent Calendar?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The bill is stricken from the Consent Calendar.

EXTENDING FOR 1 YEAR THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON MARINE RESOURCES AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8794) to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to continue the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and for other purposes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this bill does not conform to the agreed criteria for the Consent Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

EXTENDING FOR 1 YEAR THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON MARINE RESOURCES AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8794) to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to continue the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 8794

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (f) of section 3 of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 (33 U.S.C. 1102(f)) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1970".

SEC. 2. Section 9 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1108) is amended by striking out "$1,500,000" and inserting in lieu theerof "$1,200,000".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966—Public Law 89–454—to continue the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development for 1 additional year.

In amending the act, the bill would specifically—

First, change the expiration date of the National Council from June 30, 1969, to June 30, 1970. This would provide an extension of authorized existence of 1 year beyond that provided in Public Law 89–454 as amended by Public Law 90–242; and,

Second, reduce the annual authorized appropriation in section 9 of Public Law 89–454 from $1,500,000 to $1,200,000.

As has been stated before, Public Law 89–454, which is the citation for the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, sets forth a declaration of policy and objectives for a national oceanographic program, and created the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development to serve as a coordinating body of all governmental activities in the marine science field.

It also created the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, to review existing programs and come up with recommendations for a long-range national program, including an organizational structure for future administration and oversight and administrative implementation of such a long-range program.

According to the statute as amended, the Commission expired on February 9, 1969, 30 days after submission of its report to the President and the Congress.

The original purpose of providing for a specific expiration date for the Council was that it should not exist any longer than a reasonable time after submission of the Commission's report in order that Congress might enact legislation which would establish an adequate organizational mechanism to carry on the long-range program.

The cognizant committees of Congress share the view of the Executive that Cabinet-level councils should be limited in their purposes and not be allowed to substitute for agencies with more clearly defined responsibilities.

However, in view of the extremely comprehensive scope of the recent report of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, the fact that a new executive administration has just begun, and the fact that it is most unlikely that legislation establishing a new organizational structure for a national program in the marine sciences can be enacted during the remainder of this fiscal year, it seemed appropriate, and I think it is essential, that we should extend the life of the Council for a reasonable period.

The splendid work of the Council in the coordination of ongoing marine science programs should not be allowed to fail while a new organizational structure is under consideration.

In the hearings resulting in this legislation the committee considered two bills. One of them, H.R. 5829, would have provided a simple 1-year extension of existing authority relative to the Council. The other one, H.R. 7895, would have repealed the fixed life of the Council and would have reduced the annual appropriation authorization from $1,500,000 to $1,200,000.

As stated in the committee report:

> After full hearings on the legislation before the Committee, it was concluded that the concept of a one-year extension of the Council's life was more appropriate in the belief that the Congress would be able to take the necessary action within that time to implement the Commission's report to a sufficient degree to make continuation of the Council unnecessary. On the other hand, it was also concluded that the 1966 Act should be further amended to reduce the authorized annual appropriation to carry out the purposes of the Act from $1,500,000 to $1,200,000.
>
> This reduction in the authorized figure is not to imply any sense of cutting back on the activities necessary to strongly advance our National Oceanographic Program. It is simply predicated upon the fact that in the original Act administrative expenses of both the Council and the Commission were to be borne out of the $1,500,000 figure. With the Commission out of existence a cutback in the authorized appropriations for administrative purposes would simply recognize that fact and is not intended to, and would not impair the Council's continued effectiveness.

On the basis of the hearings, the committee unanimously recommended and approved the substitution of H.R. 8794, a clean bill, which is now under consideration.

H.R. 8794 was cosponsored by every member of our Subcommittee on Oceanography.

The Bureau of the Budget, the National Council, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Commerce, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science and Technology, and the Smithsonian Institution all reported favorably on legislation to extend the life of the Council for 1 additional year.

Finally, our committee has already had an initial hearing concerning the report of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, and we plan to resume full-scale hearings in the immediate future. With diligent effort, there should be no problem in reporting out legislation in fiscal year 1970 which would make it unnecessary to continue the Council for a further period of time.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENNON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina yielding, and I appreciate his statement. I have two questions for the information of Members. First, as the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. LENNON) knows, at the present time the U.S. Navy chairs the Committee on Oceanography and indeed provides about 76 percent of the support for the Committee or Council or Commission. The distinguished gentleman also serves on the Committee on Armed Services as well as on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Is the gentleman convinced in his own mind that the establishment of this National Council would not usurp the functions that lie with the Navy on oceanography for our national defense purposes as now provided, wherein the Navy does furnish this substance and the chairmanship of the said Committee on Oceanography?

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to inform my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Missouri, that the statement he has just made can be answered in the affirmative. The answer is affirmative absolutely.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, that is good enough for me, since the gentleman from North Carolina is this positive.

Second, my other question has to do with whether or not there is anything submitted to the committee which the gentleman represents and for which he handles this bill on the floor, which leads to this particular bill, that would in any sense be interpreted as a giveaway to the United Nations or any other international body, of the harvesting of the ocean floor either on the Continental Shelf within our own claims to mileage limits, or that area which we are enabled to exploit with our technical know-how?

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, again I can assure the distinguished gentleman this legislation does not in any way affect in any degreee the things the gentleman referred to.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's response, and I thank him.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, what was the previous appropriation for the Commission and Council?

Mr. LENNON. The authorization for both the Marine Commission, and the National Science Council on an annual basis was $1.5 million.

Mr. GROSS. So with the abolition of the Commission there is only a cut of $300,000 in the authorization? Is that correct?

Mr. LENNON. That is true. I will say to my distinguished friend that on the first blush the figure of only a $300,000 cut concerned me. I went back, and the committee did, in determining the degree to which the National Council was involving itself in all facets of marine science at every level, including its work with the Department of the Navy, as well as our schools and universities and laboratories, and in every facet. We found out that indeed this was the amount of money that was essential for the next fiscal year.

I want to say to the gentleman, we can hardly anticipate that the Commission's report can in any reasonable degree be implemented during this calendar year. It will take at least through fiscal year 1970 to being legislation to the floor which would, with any meaningful degree, implement the Commission's recommendations.

So, to keep together the National Council, with its staff and the work it is doing, the $1.2 million is a fair and appropriate figure for this purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I was disturbed by the fact that there was only a $300,000 cut in the authorization provided in this bill, but knowing of the gentleman's care for the expenditure of public funds I am willing to accept his explanation. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LENNON. I am pleased by the gentleman's statement.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in urging that the rules be suspended and that the bill be passed; and I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER).

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from North Carolina, the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Oceanography, in urging support for the bill, H.R. 8794.

Let me emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we minority members of the subcommittee, and also of the full Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, voted unanimously to report H.R. 8794 favorably to the House.

It is imperative that the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development be continued, even though as an interim body, until the Congress determines what final form a more permanent reorganization of the Nation's oceanographic agencies shall take.

In the past 2 years, the Council has performed very effectively and successfully its role of stewardship and prime mover—an extremely important and valuable role for our Nation's best interests—in directing and coordinating the many facets of our activities in development of the uses of the seas.

And incidentally, in all references to the oceans or the seas, we of the great Midwestern States remind you that our vast inland seas, the Great Lakes, are a national resource of incalculable value, and shall by definition be included completely in any and all of our national planning and programs for the productive uses of the seas.

The Council on Marine Resources, under the very skillful professional direction of Dr. Ed Wenk, and with strong personal support from the President and

Vice President, has created a great deal of positive momentum in marine activities vital to this Nation's future.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the momentum of the Council's leadership activities shall not be lost, but shall be maintained and increased, and that requires our favorable action of H.R. 8794 here today.

The Council is performing very well the important and difficult task we assigned to it when in the 89th Congress we took a historic initiative by adopting the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966.

By that act of 1966 we intended to chart a much more vigorous, comprehensive course than ever before, and establish suitable new goals for our national effort in the marine sciences and engineering. We recognized that rapidly developing new technology in those areas is opening up opportunities and possibilities of immense value and usefulness, not only for the American people but all mankind. We determined that the United States should take a preeminent lead in developing those new opportunities.

To begin that task immediately, we created two temporary bodies. The Council, which we should renew for 1 more year by today's action, provides the executive leadership role. And the very able Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, chaired by Dr. Jay Stratton, has already completed its report and recommendations for a more permanent organizational structure, to provide the longtime direction needed for developing our efforts in the seas.

Personally, I hope this 91st Congress, after giving them the thorough study they deserve, will act decisively to implement the Stratton Commission's recommendations. Specifically, I hope that we will create the new National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency which the Commission recommends, or at least an agency similar to it.

But, in the meantime, the momentum developed by the Council must not be lost, it must be maintained fully during this coming year, while the Congress works on a more permanent reorganization plan.

To do that job, it is necessary to authorize another year's funding for the Council, and the figure of $1.2 million we are proposing today is entirely warranted, based on the past 2 years' experience. However, we all realize that the actual appropriation for the Council probably will be at a somewhat lower level.

Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration, the Bureau of the Budget, and all the other concerned Federal agencies have officially indicated their approval of H.R. 8794, and it has been unanimously approved by our committee. I urge that it now be overwhelmingly supported by the membership of the House.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 8794.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAILING PRIVILEGES FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE U.S. ARMED FORCES

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8434) to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 8434

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 4169 (a)(1) of title 39, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(A) the letter or sound-recorded communication is mailed by the member at an Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title which is located at a place outside the forty-eight contiguous States of the United States; or

"(B) the member is hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States as a result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty; or".

(b) Subparagraph (D) of paragraph (2) of section 4169(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(D) the letter or sound-recorded communication is mailed by the member—

"(i) at an Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title which is located at a place outside the forty-eight contiguous States of the United States; or

"(ii) while hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States as a result of disease or injury incurred while in the services with, or in, a unit under operational control of a command of the Armed Forces of the United States; and".

SEC. 2. Section 4303(d)(5) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A)(i) first-class letter mail (including postal cards and post cards),

"(ii) sound-recorded communications having the character of personal correspondence,

"(iii) parcels of any class of mail not exceeding five pounds in weight and sixty inches in length and girth combined, and

"(iv) second-class publications published once each week or more frequently and featuring principally current news of interest to members of the Armed Forces and the general public.

which are mailed at or addressed to any such Armed Forces post office; and

"(B) parcels of any class of mail exceeding five pounds but not exceeding seventy pounds in weight and not exceeding one hundred inches in length and girth combined, including surface-type official mail, which are mailed at or addressed to any such Armed Forces post office where adequate surface transportation is not available.".

SEC. 3. Section 4560 of title 39, United States Code, relating to air transportation of parcels mailed to or from servicemen, is amended by striking out the word "sixty" and inserting in lieu thereof "seventy-two".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI).

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I want to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee and the minority member of the subcommittee and the members of the entire committee who have brought this bill, H.R. 8434, to the floor today. I rise in support of the legislation.

I want to thank my colleagues on the committee, and several other Members of the House, who have evidenced a bipartisan support for my bill, H.R. 8434.

I was joined by eight majority and nine minority members of the committee, either in cosponsoring H.R. 8434 or identical bills. I thank each of you for your support.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8434 has three features.

First, free mailing privileges are now provided for members of the Armed Forces in designated combat areas, and for servicemen hospitalized as a result of disease or injury incurred as a result of service in the combat areas. Vietnam is the only designated combat area. Consequently, the free mail services are not available to servicemen in other areas of Southeast Asia, such as Cambodia and Thailand.

Section 1 of H.R. 8434 extends the free mail privilege to all servicemen located outside the 48 contiguous States, including the servicemen in Hawaii and Alaska.

Also, the free mailing privilege for servicemen hospitalized as the result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty will not be limited to disease or injury incurred in a combat area. It will be extended by this bill to include servicemen hospitalized as a result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty, regardless of where the disease or injury may have been incurred.

The second feature applies to the airlift of second-class news publications published once each week or more frequently, and featuring principally current news of interest to members of the Armed Forces. Existing law restricts this airlift privilege to servicemen in the combat areas, and to places where adequate surface transportation is not available.

The Department of Defense has established guidelines for adequate surface transportation under this provision as applying to any location which requires transit time of 29 days or more. Surface transit time to nearly all points of delivery overseas, even in Europe, is in excess of 29 days. Consequently, nearly all of the news value publications going to servicemen overseas now are being airlifted in accordance with the administrative determination based on the inadequacy of surface transportation.

Section 2 of H.R. 8434 eliminates the need for such administrative determinations and removes the restrictions contained in existing law on the news value publications airlift. Authority will be provided by law for the airlift of news value publications to all servicemen outside the 48 contiguous States.

The third feature of the bill will increase from 60 inches to 72 inches—length and girth combined—the maximum size of parcels that may be mailed to military personnel under the special parcel airlift provision.

It has been found that the limitation on dimensions for parcels is not commensurate with the weight permitted, which is 30 pounds. It is difficult to place 30 pounds within the limit of 60 inches, girth and length combined, unless the density of the object is extremely high. To be truly useful for service people, the length and girth restrictions should be increased to 72 inches, as proposed.

Mr. Speaker, the first two features of this bill, removing the combat area restriction from the free mailing privilege and the airlift of news value publications, were included as a part of H.R. 10226 of the 90th Congress, which was favorably considered by our committee, and passed the House of Representatives on June 5, 1967, under suspension of the rules on a record unanimous vote of 316 yeas and no nays.

Some parts of H.R. 10226 were included by the Senate and the conferees as a part of the Postal Revenue Act of 1967, Public Law 90–206, but the two provisions we are talking about were not included in the final version.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been interested and an ardent supporter of legislation to improve and provide free mail service to our servicemen overseas. This is our fourth legislative attempt.

Last fall, following an extensive investigation of the U.S. postal systems of the Armed Forces in Europe, I made a report to Congress—House Report No. 91–29—which incorporated important recommendations that will be carried out upon enactment of H.R. 8434.

I am convinced that the servicemen in Europe are entitled to and should have these extended mailing privileges. I urge your favorable consideration of this legislation here today.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the degree of support for Chairman DULSKI's bill, H.R. 8434, is demonstrated by the fact that he had 14 cosponsors among the committee members. In addition, three other committee members have introduced identical bills, making 18 out of 26 committee members who enthusiastically support this legislation.

This is a measure supported almost equally on both sides of the aisle, and with such bipartisan support, I feel confident there will be few, if any, dissenting voices here today.

This legislation will cost $7½ million but will result in returns of many times that in the efficiency and morale of our Armed Forces overseas.

The bill, H.R. 8434, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the committee, our colleague from New York, and cosponsored by 18 members of the committee completely rounds out the efforts of Congress to provide servicemen in all areas outside the 48 contiguous States the benefits of improved mail service.

This legislation will, first, extend free mailing privileges for all servicemen overseas; second, provide for increasing the limit on parcels airlifted to or from servicemen overseas from 60 inches to 72 inches, length and girth combined; and, third, extend the airlift for news value publications to any servicemen overseas.

Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth legislative proposal that has been before the House to improve the mail service for servicemen overseas. Our action in 1965 resulted in Public Law 89–315; our vote in 1966 resulted in Public Law 89–725; and our action in 1967 resulted in Public Law 90–206, sections 102, 117.

Public Law 89–315 authorized: First, free letter mail for letters mailed by a serviceman in the combat area, Vietnam; and, second, airlift at surface postage rates for parcels up to 5 pounds between a combat area and the point of embarkation in the United States.

Public Law 89–725: First, extended the free mailing privileges to include sound recordings mailed by servicemen in combat areas; second, provided airlift between any APO overseas and the point of embarkation in the United States for letter mail, sound recordings, and parcels up to 5 pounds; and, third, provided airlift to a combat area for publications having current news value.

Public Law 90–206: First, added a new category for parcels—PAL—not exceeding 30 pounds or 60 inches, length and girth combined, mailed to or from any APO, including airlift within the United States upon payment of surface rates plus airlift fee to be fixed by the Postmaster General—this fee now set at $1; and, second, airlift extended to isolated hardship or combat support area overseas, or where adequate surface transportation is not available for news value publications.

H.R. 8434 will round out the efforts of the House to see that all servicemen serving in overseas areas have the benefits of fast, efficient, and less expensive mail service. These efforts are based primarily on the recommendations in the four reports of the overseas trips made by members of our committee—House Report No. 1226, 89th Congress, entitled "Postal Systems of the U.S. Armed Forces and Certain Countries in Europe"; parts I and II of House Report No. 2198, 89th Congress, entitled "Postal Systems of the U.S. Armed Forces—Vietnam and Thailand"; and House Report No. 91–29, 91st Congress, entitled "Postal Systems of the U.S. Armed Forces, Europe, 1968," submitted by Mr. DULSKI.

This legislation contains three major features which are desirable if we wish to bring our military personnel in closer touch with their families and friends at home.

The first section will extend to all members of the Armed Forces stationed overseas the free mailing privileges for letters and sound-recorded communications which currently are authorized only for servicemen in a designated combat area. The first section also will broaden the existing law, which grants the free mailing privilege to servicemen hospitalized as a result of disease or injury incurred in a designated combat area, to include servicemen hospitalized as a result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty, regardless of where such injury or disease was incurred.

Section 2 extends air transportation for news value periodicals, published at least once a week, on a space-available basis to all servicemen overseas, rather than to just those in combat areas.

Section 3 of the bill amends Section 4560, relating to air transportation of parcels mailed to or from servicemen, by striking "60" and substituting "72 inches in length and girth combined." This extra measurement is provided since it has been found the 60-inch packages were frequently not large enough to contain the 30 pounds of allowable weight in such packages.

The estimated cost of this legislation is $7.7 million per year, including the loss of postal revenue due to the free mailing privileges.

More than 620,000 servicemen stationed outside the 48 contiguous States in noncombat areas wil benefit from this legislation.

The administration opposes the first two sections of H.R. 8434, but on the rather lame excuse that there is no "justification for extending special mail privileges to servicemen not in combat areas." Gentlemen, I submit our fighting men overseas have no choice of their station and they should have these mailing privileges.

Neither the Department of Defense nor the Bureau of the Budget, however, opposes section 3 of the bill which increases the parcel airlift size limitations to 72 inches, length and girth combined.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all my colleagues will join me in support of this meritorious legislation and that we will have a unanimous vote.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Will the gentleman elaborate on the Alaska and Hawaii situation?

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize the fact that the serviceman in Alaska and Hawaii will also receive the free mailing privilege under this legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to endorse the bill under consideration, H.R. 8434, and to recommend its prompt and unanimous approval. The features of this legislation round out the efforts of our committee over the past 3½ years to provide for our military personnel efficient and economic postal service.

The steps we take today will provide free mailing privileges for all members of the U.S. Armed Forces overseas and to all military personnel hospitalized as a result of injury incurred while on active duty. Presently free mailing privileges are available only for servicemen in designated combat areas. This privilege is completely justified, and I believe the same justification applies to providing the same privilege to all our military personnel who serve the cause of freedom at overseas stations.

This legislation makes other changes in the law which I believe are sound. It

will increase the permissible size of a parcel mailed under the parcel airlift service to make the size commensurate with the weight limitation of 30 pounds. The bill also provides for the airlifting, on a space-available basis, of second-class news publications to all servicemen outside the 48 contiguous States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the bipartisan support of 18 members of our committee in cosponsoring H.R. 8434 or identical bills speaks for itself and is high recommendation for House approval of this measure.

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. Corbett) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of H.R. 8762, one of the bills to provide additional free letter and air transportation mailing privileges for servicemen stationed outside the 48 contiguous States, I urge the House to take favorable action on the bill under consideration, H.R. 8434.

All of us who introduced bills on this subject are, I am sure, convinced that all servicemen overseas, not just those assigned to combat areas, should have free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges.

As will be recalled, the House approved similar legislation in 1967, but the servicemen's mail provision was deleted during the House-Senate conference.

In addition to free letter mail, I believe that the section of the bill which would provide an increase in the maximum dimensions of parcels under the airlift—PAL—program would be of great benefit to our servicemen. This program and the space-available mail program—SAM—are providing efficient and economic mail service. An increase in the present limits on dimensions under the PAL program would result in encouraging and increasing the flow of packages to members of the Armed Forces. As a veteran of World War II, and in my contacts with veterans and servicemen since that time, I recognize that mail to and from home is a tremendous morale factor.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. Corbett) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased, not only to be a cosponsor of this bill, but also, as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Postal Rates, to have taken part in the extensive deliberations that are being culminated here today.

As our chairman indicated to you, this is the fourth proposal in as many years that our committee has brought to the House floor designed to give military personnel, particularly those overseas, the best possible mail service. In this bill we now round out our efforts, and upon its enactment the Congress can be proud of the full program that will be operating to provide fast and efficient communications between servicemen and their families and friends.

Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing is moving the postal service for our Armed Forces overseas into the 20th century. We are, in effect, saying to our servicemen that when we separate them from their homes, families, and friends by great distances in defense of their country, we will give them the means of communicating with their homes swiftly, efficiently, and less expensively. We are saying to servicemen overseas that we are trying to give them mail service as good as we are providing for all the rest of the people back home. We are also telling the mothers, wives, and sweethearts back home that they will no longer have to pay exorbitant sums of money to get fast delivery of a package to their servicemen.

The specific provisions of this bill have already been detailed by the gentleman from New York, so I will only comment briefly.

The privilege of sending letters free that is being extended to all servicemen overseas certainly is not going to save any one serviceman an appreciable amount of money. This is really not its intent. The free mailing privilege is more a convenience than anything else. I think all Members who served during World War II, when the free mailing privilege was enjoyed by servicemen everywhere, will agree that being able to send a letter home without a stamp didn't save much money but certainly did eliminate the worry about always having stamps available. We are establishing the principle that the free mail privilege is being given to a serviceman in recognition of the fact that he has been separated from his home in an overseas area, great distances from home. The fact that he may or may not be in combat is incidental to this principle.

The bill also contains two other desirable revisions in existing law. One will extend to all servicemen outside the 48 contiguous States the privilege of receiving current news-value publications via airlift service on a space-available basis. The other revises the size limitations on parcels transported under the parcel airlift system to permit parcels up to 72 inches in combined length and girth while retaining the present 30-pound limit. Studies by our committee indicate that this change is appropriate so that the size of PAL parcels is commensurate with the permissible weight.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation is deserving of the full support of the House, and I urge its approval.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the legislation sponsored by my distingushed colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Dulski), and 15 members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to extend the mailing privileges to all members of the U.S. Armed Forces overseas and to all members hospitalized as a result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty.

Since the enactment of legislation in 1965 providing free letter service to servicemen stationed in combat areas, two further measures have been enacted to improve mail service for members of the Armed Forces serving overseas.

Servicemen in Vietnam and their families in the United States have responded enthusiastically as additional mailing privileges have been provided them. The opportunity for a serviceman in Vietnam to send letters and tapes back home has been most gratifying to him and his loved ones. The opportunity for combat servicemen to receive news publications within a reasonable period of time was also provided by law and has been welcomed by our soldiers in Southeast Asia, many of whom are stationed in isolated outposts with little occasion to keep abreast of world developments.

The legislation proposed today will enable all servicemen on overseas duty and those hospitalized as a result of a disease or injury incurred while on active duty, to share in these free mailing privileges. It also extends the airlift for second-class news publications to servicemen who are located outside the 48 contiguous States of the United States. In an attempt to ease the size and weight limitations on packages traveling to Armed Forces personnel on a space-available basis, the bill also increases the maximum size of parcels from 60 to 72 inches.

The expansion of these mailing privileges will provide efficient and economic mail service for all our servicemen abroad, instead of limiting such advantages to those personnel in combat areas. Every serviceman overseas has experienced delays or loss of mail at one time or another. This measure attempts to alleviate such problems by providing fast, effective, and less expensive mail service for these servicemen. I urge my colleagues to give their support to H.R. 8434.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 8434, we are considering today will give free letter and personal recording mail privileges to 620,000 servicemen overseas who are not in designated combat areas.

But though they are not now under fire, many of them have been in combat. Many others in Thailand, the Sea of Japan, parts of Europe, and cold war areas throughout the world might at any time find themselves involved in actual combat with enemy forces.

Most of these servicemen overseas send an average of 12 letters a month to friends and relatives at home. At today's airmail rate, this is only $1.20. It is a small amount to you and me, but on the meager pay of a soldier, sailor, or marine, it is an important consideration.

In addition, this legislation provides for free mail for all servicemen hospitalized in any facility of the Armed Forces of the United States, regardless of where located, when the hospitalization is the result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty.

I am only sorry I did not realize this section was not included in previous legislation, or I certainly would have offered such an amendment.

Despite the opposition of the administration to H.R. 8434, I feel we should approve it with all possible expedition. I feel, to draw an analogy, that these men and women overseas have no choice of their geographical location, just as we are obliged to live in Washington. They are, for the most part, assigned to duty and must accept that assignment. They, therefore, should logically have free mailing privileges just as we in Congress have the privilege of reporting free through the mail to our constituents back home.

This bill is a small, but important gesture that we in Congress can authorize to articulate our concern and our sense of duty and gratitude to those servicemen who serve the cause of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I enthusiastically support all three provisions of this bill, these being specifically: First, extend free mailing privileges for all servicemen overseas; second, provide for increasing the limit on parcels airlifted to or from servicemen overseas from 60 to 72 inches, length and girth combined; and, third, extend the airlift for news value publications to any servicemen overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt passage of this bill and hope the other body will give it prompt attention.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I would like to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 8434, a bill which would provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for members of the U.S. Armed Forces on overseas duty.

It is only fair that those who are providing the principal defense of our country be granted these privileges. It is my belief that the granting of free mailing privileges to the servicemen would be an indication of our gratitude and appreciation for the daily sacrifices that they undergo. While many might question our involvement in Southeast Asia, no one questions the courage and determination of our troops who are continually involved in the heaviest fighting in Vietnam.

It is also my belief that the passage of this bill will help to maintain the high morale of the troops by making it easier for them to communicate with their families here in the United States.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my full support to the bill now under consideration. Passage of H.R. 8434 will do much to improve the morale of our Armed Forces stationed outside the continental United States by improving their mail service.

H.R. 8434 has three major provisions. First, the free mailing privilege on letters and sound-recorded communications, now available only for servicemen in a combat area, is extended by this legislation to include all members of the U.S. Armed Forces overseas, and to all members hospitalized in any facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States, regardless of where it is located when the hospitalization is the result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty.

Second, the airlift privilege for second-class news value publications, now authorized only for servicemen in combat areas is extended by H.R. 8434 to include all servicemen who are located outside the continental United States.

Third, this bill also increases the maximum size of parcels from 60 to 72 inches, length and girth combined, that may be mailed to military personnel under the special airlift provisions of present law.

I am at a loss to explain why the administration opposes the extension of these free mailing privileges. I ask why these privileges should only be available to servicemen in combat areas? Members of the Armed Forces have no choice about where they will be assigned. Their assignments take them far away from their loved ones and friends and the cost of telephone communication is prohibitive. I believe, contrary to the position of the administration, that the legislation we are considering today is needed. It will go a long way toward improving the morale of our military personnel stationed outside the continental United States. We owe it to them to do whatever we can to see to it that the news from back home gets to them as quickly and as cheaply as possible. Implementation of the provisions of H.R. 8434 require no elaborate machinery and the additional cost is slight in comparison to the service we will make available to our servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all my colleagues join with me in voting for passage of H.R. 8434.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8434, a bill to improve overseas mail service to members of the armed services. I am happy over its early consideration for I introduced an identical bill, H.R. 9555.

The three major provisions of this legislation would do much to improve mail service to members of the Armed Forces overseas. It would extend the free letter mail privilege, now authorized for servicemen assigned to combat areas, to all military personnel assigned to duty outside the 48 contiguous States. Second, it would increase the length and girth combination from 60 inches to 72 inches for the maximum size of parcels that may be mailed to military personnel under the special parcel airlift provisions of existing law. And, finally, it would extend airlift for news value publications to all military personnel assigned to duty outside the 48 contiguous States.

Presently, free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges are limited to troops in combat areas, and packages being sent to servicemen can be no bigger than 60 inches in combined length and girth.

It may seem a small thing to do, but it seems to me of utmost importance that we take what steps are needed to bridge the great distance that separates our servicemen from their families and loved ones at home. All of our young men in the Armed Forces are performing a necessary service for their country, and it seems inequitable that families of men serving in Germany, for example, should have to pay high postal rates simply because it is a noncombat area. We owe it to these young men and their families to make every effort to boost the morale of servicemen all over the world, and I think that more packages from home and franking privileges for their mail would do just that.

Recent legislation such as that governing parcels being airlifted to combat areas at the surface rate plus payment of $1, and parcels up to 5 pounds airlifted overseas as space available mail at the parcel post rate to the U.S. port city, was the first step in improving overseas mail service to members of the Armed Forces. Further improvements are provided in H.R. 8434, and the enactment of this bill is clearly the next step we ought to take.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has one simple purpose: to boost the morale of our servicemen. It requires no elaborate machinery to administer, and the cost is slight. The net gains, however, can be very great. If we can more effectively help to combat the loneliness and fatigue of our servicemen overseas by enacting this legislation, it surely is worth many times the cost. I would like to point out the fact that members of the Armed Forces in Hawaii whose homes and families are in the continental United States are just as much subjected to loneliness and fatigue as those who are serving in other areas of the vast Pacific. This legislation recognizes the need for the restorative qualities of mail to and from home among our men and women in uniform throughout the world—yes, even if they happen to be stationed amidst the natural beauty and warm aloha of the Island State.

This is a humanitarian measure that merits a unanimous favorable vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Montana (Mr. Olsen) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 8434.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 514, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 366 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 366

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 514) to extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill and read by titles instead of by sections, and all points of order against lines 10 through 15 on page 18, and lines 6 through 16 on page 20, are hereby waived. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee on the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN) and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule calls for the consideration of H.R. 514, a bill to extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education and for other purposes. This measure extends for 5 years—through June 30, 1975—all programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The only major amendment included in the committee bill would authorize a new impacted area aid program based on the number of children in each school district living in federally assisted public housing.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs extended by the bill provide funds for the title I program, which will assist school districts with large concentrations of educationally disadvantaged children; library resources, textbooks and instructional materials; supplementary education centers; dropout prevention programs; and special instruction for the handicapped.

The impact aid programs, authorized by Congress provide funds for construction, operation and maintenance of schools in districts which are affected by Federal installations. Impacted area aid provisions for disaster areas are also extended.

Authorizations are continued at fiscal 1970 levels which total approximately $5 billion for each of the 5 years. The title I and impact aid programs, which do not require year-to-year authorizations because they are based on statutory formulas, are included in this estimated total.

Passage of the bill in its present form is supported by all major education groups, including the National Education Association and the National Association of School Administrators, and the AFL–CIO and other labor organizations, many civic organizations, and the National Conference on Civil Rights.

The House Education and Labor Committee reported favorably, with amendments, by a recorded vote of 21 to 13. The committee report held that 22 days of hearings revealed:

> The No. 1 priority education need from the Federal level is a 5-year extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with timely and adequate funding.

It also states that evidence before the committee shows that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is "doing a successful and effective job in carrying out the congressional purposes for which it was enacted."

The 91st Congress has the responsibility and the herculean task of enacting effective legislation to save the educational institutions of our Nation. One only has to read the newspapers and listen to the television reports regarding the dissension and insurrection of our colleges and universities to realize that the time is short for the Federal Government to take drastic steps to protect and retain our educational system for coming generations.

Members of Congress must realize that the same yardstick of elementary, secondary, and college education methods of 25 years ago will not apply under our present population of 200 million people. Today 71 percent of our population, according to statistics, have moved into urban areas throughout the country. In 1967 over 400,000 farm families left the rural areas and moved into the urban centers. The local taxes on homes in the urban centers have now reached such a high bracket that schools in these urban centers are closing for lack of money in the payment of teachers' salaries, purchasing materials, and the numerous items necessary to carry on.

The various State legislatures are confronted with the almost impossible task of securing enough money to aid these urban localities.

Over the last 20 years the Congress has been negligent and dormant in realizing the financial calamity that hovers over our education system throughout the Nation. As one of the many examples, the 1969 Indiana State Legislature refused to increase the request of Indiana University for additional financial help, but instead lowered their request by over $1 million. The Indiana State officials claimed present high taxes and scarcity of funds made the curtailment necessary.

Educators throughout the Nation are alarmed at the future of education institutions unless something drastic is done by the Federal Government to save the one segment of our economy from the threat of complete retrogression to the detriment of millions of our American youth in future years. The Congress of the United States cannot be entirely boastful of its cooperation in aiding our expanding education demands during the population explosion over the last 25 years.

In most metropolitan cities throughout the country school construction has completely fallen behind in taking care of the increased demand to accommodate our school population.

I vividly remember standing in the well of this House, along with other Members, who realized the danger to our school system back 15 years ago, asking the Congress to protect us from the critical danger which we are now passing through in our elementary and higher institutions of learning. Back in 1956 a bill on the floor of the House asking for $400 million for school construction was defeated by 45 votes. In the following year, in 1957, H.R. 1, another bill, asking for Federal aid for our schools was defeated on July 25, 1957, by 208 to 203 votes. Five votes was the margin of defeat. I have often thought since then that had these bills passed, the congested schools, especially in our metropolitan areas, would have had ample money for school expansion, teachers' salaries, and other necessary material to extend to millions of our youth opportunities to secure a basic elementary and secondary education. Had those bills been passed it is difficult to estimate how many grade and high school dropouts would have continued their education instead of following these high-powered agitators who go about the country organizing riots, burning cities, homes, stores, and so forth. It is not very difficult for the professional agitator to organize the uneducated who are not qualified to secure satisfactory employment and who have been denied an education which this great, rich land of ours could easily afford if the Congress would cooperate with this national school emergency.

This bill that comes before you today is asking for a 5-year extension of the pending Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Some Members, I understand, are going to favor an amendment to limit the extension of this legislation to only 2 years. This curtailment would be a monumental mistake and detrimental to the future education of millions of our youth. With only a 2-year extension of this bill school officials cannot outline a necessary program for future expansion because they will be uncertain as to what the Congress will decide to do at the end of the 2-year period, and that uncertainty will cripple the expansion program before it can be started on a permanent basis.

By the defeat of the two above mentioned bills back in 1956 and 1957 and the curtailment of Federal aid to education programs during the past 20 years, the Congress of the United States has been indirectly responsible and must share the blame for a great deal of the dissatisfaction and discontentment in our education system in the metropolitan areas of our Nation. The American people, parents and our school age youth are looking to the 91st Congress to act. This week we have the opportunity to tell the parents and the youth of the Nation that we will cooperate in every way possible to provide funds to aid the primary and secondary school systems of the Nation to give to school age boys and girls the opportunity to prepare for their future.

Mr. Speaker, the present legislation is composed of eight titles.

TITLE I

Title I provides for major effort on the Federal Government to help the elementary and secondary education of our American youth. Today there are over 8 million adults in America who have had less than a 5-year elementary school education. Millions of middle-aged in our Nation are unemployed because of lack of school facilities in their younger years.

By 1968 over 9 million children were being served by title I programs in this legislation. This covers over 16 thousand school districts across the Nation. About 500,000 children attending nonpublic schools are included in the 9 million.

In 1967 the amount spent on non-public-school pupils rose from $57 to $75 per child indicating an increased involvement in title I programs by non-public schools.

Title I of this legislation has sought to reach special classes of educationally deprived children. Over $45 million is now invested in programs serving some 185,000 children of migratory farm laborers. Approximately $30 million has been expended for aid to over 1,200 institutions for neglected and deprived children.

In 1967, $12.9 million was invested in special educational services for over 80,000 children with physical or mental handicaps. Another $5 million was spent for educational services to some 50,000 Indian children in Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools.

TITLE II

Title II provides for school library resources, textbooks and other instructional materials.

Under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, over 70,500 public school libraries were expanded in 1967. Some 44.6 million children and 1.8 million teachers benefited from title II funds. Over 58 million books have been distributed to libraries and classrooms, besides many other instructional materials. Thirty States have started demonstration programs where school personnel can study, at first hand, library services and instructional resources of the highest quality. Mobile demonstration programs have been instituted for rural areas. From 1966 through 1968, almost $300 million has been funded for this program. The fiscal year 1969 appropriation is $50 million.

TITLE III

Title III provides for supplemental educational centers and services.

At the present time there are about 1,800 active title III programs funded for the most part under the State administration of title III. These programs will serve 10 million persons, including 9 million public and non-public-school students.

TITLE IV

Title IV provides educational research and training.

TITLE V

Title V extends grants to strengthen State departments of education. With the help of title 5 over 1,000 positions were added to State education agencies in 1968. Since its enactment, State professional staffs have increased by 4,260, enabling specialized technical services to local educational agencies in new program development.

TITLE VI

Title VI provides for education of handicapped children.

Under this title every effort is made to take care of as many of the 3.3 million handicapped children throughout the Nation as possible.

Title VI extends aid to the deaf and the blind and the amount of money provided under this title has been small compared with the demands of the much-needed care of these afflicted American citizens.

Title VI also deals with the expansion of teacher education and research and demonstration programs.

TITLE VII

Title VII deals with additional teachers and material to aid the needs of children with limited English-speaking ability in schools having high concentrations of such children. These children number around 3 million of school age and are especially educationally disadvantaged because of their limited communication skills.

TITLE VIII

Title VIII provides for a special program to deal with the prevention of dropout youths in grade and high school categories.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Congress corrects its mistake of former years.

The youth of our Nation and their parents are asking for your support.

This educational bill should pass for a 5-year period without crippling amendments.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Without any reference to the substance of the gentleman's comments whatsoever, I wonder if he would explain to the House why on page 2, lines 5 and 6, the House resolution waives points of order on the committee substitute as an amendment for specified areas.

I had the time and the opportunity to look up these two areas in the bill proper, those where points of order are waived, and one gives carte blanc within a one-fortieth or 1 percent overall appropriation restriction, to hire "without regard to the civil service laws" or anything else, all personnel for the Council's purposes. This would deny them retirement rights—and cause many other problems, including wages.

First of all, I want to say I appreciate the Committee on Rules specifically saying wherein the waiver of points of order do pertain in the bill. Of course, it is incumbent on all Members to further check the committee, in order to determine if there are other areas wherein points of order might be allowed, within the bill itself. I understand a blanket waiver was prepared but the Committee on Rules limited waivers to these two.

This is an open-ended personnel raid in unspecified classes, and a "backdoor" raid on the Treasury.

The second point is on page 20, and permits transfer of funding. Bad enough, but almost customary enough to require no comment.

I wonder if the gentleman would explain why the Committee on Rules granted the rule waiving points of order, because this is again denying the individual Members of their prerogative and function on the floor.

Mr. MADDEN. I will answer the gentleman's question. Technically, these points in the bill are made on existing law to broaden the use of funds to be used. Technically, enactment of the legislation at this time would enable funds already appropriated for 1969 to be used for purposes other than that for which they were specifically provided. That is the only reason I know of.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. That is entirely true, as I admitted in my remarks, on the question about page 20; but, it is not pertinent to page 13, lines 10 through 15:

> (e) The Council is authorized, without regard to the civil service laws, to engage such secretarial, clerical, and technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions, and to this end up to one-fortieth of 1 per centum of any appropriations for grants under this title will be available for this purpose.

This completely negates all responsibility under the legislation in violation of Public Law 84–801—section 2953, title 5, United States Code. I see no reason whatsoever for points of order here, being waived.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague from Missouri that the one-fortieth of 1 percent of any appropriation for grants were funds appropriated in fiscal 1969, and this is an amendment added in committee which proposes to expend the funds for reasons other than the amount would be appropriated. It is for that reason that we seek to waive the point of order.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is the gentleman saying to me that paragraph (e) on page 13, lines 10 to 15, is applicable only to one-fortieth of 1 percent of 1969 appropriated funds for this purpose and does not apply in the future?

Mr. PERKINS. No, this will apply in the future. This is an amendment to the law.

Mr. HALL. Then the gentleman would agree with me that there is no way of telling what the appropriation might be in the future, and therefore it is on open-ended authorization?

Mr. PERKINS. I agree with your reasoning, but it is something that the committee will continuously review in the future.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is poor legislative policy. The record has not been enhanced here on the floor. For that reason alone the rule should be defeated out of hand. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana has consumed 16 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Indiana has explained, House Resolution 366 is a rule providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 514) to extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes. It provides an open rule with 4 hours of general debate. The committee substitute is made in order as an original bill for purposes of amendment, and the bill should be read by titles instead of by sections. The waiver of points of order is provided specifically rather than generally as requested by the Committee on Education and Labor. Points of order are waived against lines 10 through 15 on page 13 and lines 6 through 16 on page 20. In both instances the waiver is necessary because of the transfer of previously appropriated funds from one program to another in the existing act.

Under the rules the normal requirement would be for such transfers to be accomplished by the Committee on Appropriations reappropriating the funds. The waiver removes the necessity for this time-consuming step.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 514, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969, as the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee explained in a letter mailed to all Members within the last day or two, is a simple 5-year extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In addition, it extends the impacted areas program in Public Laws 874 and 815, with considerable expansion in coverage.

The present law does not expire until June 30, 1970, and this bill proposes to extend the authorization for 5 additional years, or until June 30, 1975. As seems to be normal when we are considering bills from the Education and Labor Committee, there is a sense of emergency, but I fail to see the emergency currently existing since this legislation does not expire for over a year.

Total authorized spending contained in the bill exceeds $26 billion over the next 5 years, with approximately $15 billion allocated for title I. This title provides for the distribution of funds to the States according to a formula which has been in effect for some time and which has been shown to be very inequitable and unfair, but the committee chose to take the easy way out and continue unchanged most of the program.

The formulas provide that a State shall receive funds according to the number of poor children based on census figures and State assistance under its aid to the dependent children program.

The second determining factor is the per pupil expenditure by States. The per pupil assistance may be based on either one-half the national average or the State average, whichever is higher. This, of course, gives larger payments to the wealthier States who are spending more for education.

Let me give a few examples as contained in the report in regard to some of these inequities: Kansas and Nebraska are neighboring farm States in the Middle West, with very similar economic conditions and income, yet Kansas receives $157.38 per pupil allotment while Nebraska receives $117.61. Let us take two of the Southwestern States, Arizona and New Mexico. Arizona receives a per pupil allotment of $157.34, whereas New Mexico receives $176.38, a difference of almost $20. Michigan and Illinois are similar and neighboring States. Both States expend well above the national per pupil average on the education of their children. Consequently, the base rate is practically the same for both States. Yet, Michigan receives $138.45 per pupil and Illinois receives $155.74, or a difference of $17.29.

Title II covers the Library Assistance program, the total authorization of which is $200 million. The budget estimate for fiscal year 1970 is $42 million.

Title VI provides assistance in the education of handicapped children, and again I would like to point out that in fiscal year 1969, although $162.5 million was authorized, only $29,250 was appropriated.

Under title VII, bilingual education programs, $40 million is authorized for each year, but the budget recommendation for fiscal year 1970 is $10 million.

It appears the Committee on Education and Labor has used extremely high figures that are not realistic as contrasted with the amount that the Appropriations Committee feels should be appropriated for the various programs included in this piece of legislation. I would suggest to the Committee on Education and Labor that they come up with some perhaps more realistic figures in the future.

Now I would like to come to the proposed changes in the impacted areas program. This is a program originally set up for the purpose in 1950 to provide assistance to school districts who had an immediate and large influx of schoolchildren because of the location of a Federal installation in their districts.

Total authorization provided in H.R. 514 for fiscal year 1970 is $648 million, plus $235 million to take care of the amendment which will add the children of families living in low-income Federal housing, or a total authorization for Public Law 874 of $883 million. I would like to call attention of the House to the fact that in 1963 our total appropriation for Public Law 874 was only $231,293,000.

Mr. Speaker, inequities have existed in Public Law 874 for many years, and corrections have been recommended by various commissioners of education, under both Democratic and Republican Presidents, yet the Committee on Education and Labor has refused to come to grips with the problem.

In section 1 of the declaration of policy of the impacted areas program, it states as follows:

> The Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance for those local educational agencies upon which the United States has placed financial burdens by reason of the fact that:
>
> (1) The revenue available to such agencies has been reduced by the acquisition of real property by the United States.

There are two categories of students under this program.

The "A" students are those whose parents live and work on Federal property, and the school district receives 100-percent payment under one of the following three formulas:

First, the average per pupil expenditure of adjoining school districts within a region; the average per pupil expenditure in the State; or the average national per pupil expenditure, whichever of the three is higher.

The "B" students are those whose parents work on a Federal installation, but who live in private housing away from the installation. The school district receives 50 percent of the highest average per pupil expenditure in one of the above three categories for "B" students.

An inequity which exists, however, in this area is that school districts that are outside of the location of the Federal installation also receive the same compensation. This type of school district has not been adversely affected through the loss of tax revenues, since the Federal installation is not within its district. As a consequence, this is just a bonanza for these school districts. If there is justification for this type of payment, the same argument could be made for assistance to a community which has a sudden influx of children from a newly established plant in the private sector of our economy.

There are many economic pluses for a community with a Federal installation, and those who work in a Federal installation and live off, pay taxes on their homes and contribute to the welfare of the local economy through the purchase of groceries, drugs, clothing, and so forth.

In regard to the formula which allows the national average of expenditures per pupil to be used in figuring the allotment to a school district, this has no relationship to the intent of the legislation. I quote from Francis Kepple, Commissioner of Education, in his testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor on April 2, 1963:

> Such a rate bears no reasonable relation to the revenue losses or financial burden occasioned for a particular school district by Federal property tax exemption. Its effect, indeed, to a Federal payment of the full cost per "A" category pupil to many school districts which receive in addition substantial state aid for these same pupils.

The original bill provided for a 3-percent absorption requirement which was to go into effect the following year which provided that a school district should absorb a number of federally connected students equal to 3 percent of average daily attendance. The theory behind this provision was that a community received economic benefit from having the Federal installation in its midst. This was repealed, however, at the insistence of school superintendents from throughout the country, and in its place was provided that there should be a 3-percent eligibility requirement rather than an absorption requirement. Thus, a school district would receive payment for all federally connected pupils as soon as their number reached 3 percent of all pupils in average daily attendance.

A further provision was added in 1958 that if a school district lost a Federal installation that the payment to the school district should continue for the following 3 years.

Commissioner L. G. Derthic testifying before the House Education and Labor Committee on June 9, 1959, stated:

> This amendment is manifestly discriminatory as respects a school district which barely meets the three percent condition of eligibility in a given year, and barely fails to meet that condition in a subsequent year as against another school district which barely fails to meet such eligibility conditions in either year.

Commissioner Francis Kepple on April 2, 1963, in testifying before the House Committee, stated:

> Such phasing out of Federal payment is unnecessary, since section 3-F of the law permits a one year continuance of payments in the case of a decrease in the number of Federally connected children for which a school district had reasonably prepared in anticipation of eligibility for Federal payment when such decrease is due to a secession in Federal activities.

Other inequities have been pointed out over the years by witnesses for HEW before the House Education and Labor Committee, but the committee has done nothing to implement these suggested changes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to a report published in June 1963, entitled, "The Federal Government and Education," which was a report of a special committee of the House Education and Labor Committee and chaired by the able gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. Green).

At that time 111 Federal programs of education were identified in various departments of Government. In the report it was stated that the committee was uncertain as to whether or not they had actually been able to ascertain all of the education programs in various departments as no compilation had ever been made. I quote from page 4 of the report.

> In many of the large agencies there is not even, at a central point complete knowledge of all the educational programs they administer.

Another quote from the report dated June 14, 1963:

> This report shows that while the Federal Government is involved in many parts of the Educational system, and a major partner in the higher education system, there is little evidence of a well coordinated program.

The committee raised various problems which need attention. I would like to refer only to a few of them.

First. The reimbursement for indirect costs in research grants.

Second. There is no government-wide directory available to colleges and universities indicating which agencies are actively engaged in or interested in developing programs in the various research and training fields. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the House last week added another education program to the Department of Interior with a total authorization of $62 million over the next 3 years for grants to colleges who will set up a course of study in water pollution and for scholarships to students to take this course.

Education programs should be handled by the Office of Education under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and not spread throughout all of the various departments of the Government. We compounded this problem last week by adding still another program and assigning it to the Department of the Interior to the tune of a $62 million authorization.

Third. There is no uniformity even within a single agency of the Government in regard to such administrative details as regulations for recordkeeping, reports on technical accomplishments, and the financial status of projects.

The committee also calls attention to other problems which I will not go into at the present time.

The committee headed by the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. Green) asked on page 9 of its report, and I quote:

> Should there not be centered in some agency reliable up-to-date information on all existing educational programs of the Federal government as well as information on future planning of all agencies engaged in them? What is needed to provide fuller and more current information on such programs?

And another point which the committee makes, and I quote:

> Should there not be centered in some agency more formal coordination among agencies engaged in essential similar programs as for example among: A. The Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Office of Education in foreign language training, the development of language teaching aids and foreign aid studies? B. The Department of State, USIA, AID, the Peace Corps, and the Department of Defense in the teaching of English to foreigners.

Other recommendations are made along these lines.

The report further asks:

> Would it be desirable for all student aid programs to be coordinated through one agency?

With 111 Federal education programs which could be identified in 1963, and with the proliferation in this area since that time, there could be as many as 200 different Federal education programs today, yet no one knows for sure.

Instead of turning out legislation such as the bill we have before us today which does not expire until June 30, 1970, it seems to me that the committee should make a major effort to catalog all of the Federal education programs and from this study come up with recommendations to the House to consolidate and make more effective the programs we now have.

With the great proliferation of educational programs, there is an inevitable overlapping and duplication and with the total expenditures at the Federal level now running in the billions of dollars, such a study should have a No. 1 priority, and could eliminate the duplication which currently exists at a saving of substantial sums.

It is a sad reflection on the work of the Education and Labor Committee on the bill which we have before us today that the amount actually appropriated for the various programs is only 30 to 40 percent of the amount authorized. I hope that the House will adopt substantial and major amendments to this legislation, particularly in regard to reducing the 5-year authorization period to a 2-year period and substantial and meaningful amendments to the impacted aid program.

I support the rule, but oppose the legislation as it is currently written.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to compliment the gentleman for his statement and ask if he will yield so that I may ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a question. In laying the groundwork for the question I turn to page 13 of the bill wherein the language reads as follows:

> (e) The Council is authorized, without regard to the civil service laws, to engage such secretarial, clerical, and technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions,—

And so forth, this language being protected by a waiver in the rule of a point of order.

Now, is the gentleman—the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor—aware of the public law which provides that in instances of this kind there must be an explanation on the part of the agency or the department of Government affected by this sort of language setting forth the man-hours of employment, the costs and various other details as to employees to be hired?

Where in the report, or any other statement accompanying this bill, is there a statement meeting the requirements of the public law?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague that similar language to this has been placed in many bills that have been brought to this floor. I do not know whether one-fortieth of 1 percent is reasonable for the services. There is nothing wrong, as I see it——

Mr. GROSS. Let us get this straight, Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about the one-fortieth of 1 percent authorization for expenditure. I am talking about the apparent failure to meet the employment requirement. I am asking if the gentleman can show me anywhere in the report or any statement accompanying this bill where there is compliance with the requirement of the public law with respect to open-end employment and pay. This apparently waives all provisions of the law. If the gentleman can show me any statement, setting forth the required information, the question will be answered. Is there anything in the report?

Mr. PERKINS. Well, in reply to the gentleman, we do not want to tie the hands of the commission, and here we just authorize them, we are waiving the civil service laws to give them authority to employ the necessary personnel.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but the public law says you cannot do this, and not be in violation of the law——

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague that many bills have been brought before this Congress last year and the year before that made exceptions, and this is one of those exceptions.

Mr. GROSS. To make it more obnoxious, this is protected by a waiver of a point of order against the language.

Mr. PERKINS. It is necessary because they used funds that are already appropriated for the regular programs for this purpose, and for that reason it is a different purpose, and they had to waive points of order.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for yielding.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciate the comments made by the gentleman with regard to the allocation of funds in the statement the gentleman just made. I would direct the attention of the gentleman to page 69 of the report. The table that is contained at that place indicates that the average allocation for each child under title I is $154.94, but it indicates that in the State of Virginia that per pupil it is $140.52. In fact, there are 32 States that received less than the average.

Now, would that mean—and I would ask the gentleman would it be a fair assumption to assume that more taxpayers' money is going to the richer States than to the poorer States? And are those 32 States that receive less than the average actually losing money by this bill?

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct, and that is the result of this complicated and unrealistic formula, so that a State which spends more on education than the national average receives more funds under this program.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, I noticed that the gentleman's own State of Nebraska is right at the end of this list.

Mr. MARTIN. That is right.

Mr. SCOTT. And that the State of Virginia is not far from it.

In other words, this bill is going to cost the States of Virginia and Nebraska money rather than to bring money into those States?

Mr. MARTIN. It would bring money into the State, but I still believe the basic formula is unfair and inequitable. I am sure an amendment will be offered on the floor within the next day or two to change this formula in title I.

Mr. SCOTT. But it will take more money out of the State than it brings in, where they are less than the average; would that be a fair statement?

Mr. MARTIN. Not necessarily; no.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 39]

Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashley
Barrett
Bates
Bell, Calif.
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Brademas
Brasco
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Cahill
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chisholm
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clay
Cowger
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Diggs
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, La.
Fallon
Findley
Fish
Flynt
Foley
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hanley
Harsha
Hébert
Jarman
Jonas
Keith
Kirwan
Landrum
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Lowenstein
McCloskey
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
May
Mayne
Mikva
Monagan
Moorhead
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Ottinger
Podell
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Reid, N.Y.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. Onge
Sandman
Scheuer
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Sullivan
Symington
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Tunney
Ullman
Vigorito
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wydler
Young

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 514) to extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 514, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES) will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I personally feel that we come before this Chamber today with one of the most important pieces of legislation the House has ever considered. I know we have some sharp differences of opinion, but in the committee, the record will show that we gave H.R. 514 as thorough consideration as any piece of legislation that has been reported by the Committee on Education and Labor. Every paragraph of existing law was reviewed carefully and every amendment offered was given the most thorough consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that during these proceedings, the minority were most attentive and they gave invaluable assistance in our work on H.R. 514. As will become obvious in this debate, the major point of contention during our consideration in the committee is the length of the extension proposed for elementary and secondary education programs. I believe the committee acted properly in proposing a 5-year extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Based on the extensive hearing record compiled, the committee could not have acted in any other way. The four volumes of hearings on H.R. 514 make it abundantly clear that the Federal dollar for education can be more effectively utilized for the improvement of education if local school administrators can be assured that the program is more than a temporary venture of the Congress. The hearings this year confirm what we know to be the case from the hearings conducted in 1965, 1966, and 1967—that short-term authorizations preclude long-range planning by school officials. By authorizing elementary and secondary school programs for 5 years, we will permit local educational agencies across the country to give maximum effect to Federal funds by planning their uses in advance.

In short, Mr. Chairman, the reason for a 5-year extension is basic to the effective implementation of the essential programs we seek to extend by this legislation. If we believe in this program—and I think the membership of this House does believe in it—a 5-year extension is most reasonable. If we want to obtain the maximum benefits from the Federal dollar—if we want our local educational agencies to be able to secure qualified personnel—and if we want local educational agencies to interrelate and coordinate Federal funds with local and State dollars—a 5-year extension is essential.

Mr. Chairman, the committee bill reflects the advice and judgment of the best authorities in the Nation. A 5-year extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act responds to the unanimous request of school officials, principals, and administrators. H.R. 514 is a reflection of what local educational agencies personnel know to be the need from their experience working with these programs on a day-to-day basis. It is not as will be alleged here today, an attempt to deprive the new administration of an opportunity to amend or revise the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The record shows that the Committee on Education and Labor has always actively given consideration to legislation improving or modifying programs where needed. It is a matter of public record, in response to the testimony presented by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in April this year, that at any time the present administration wishes to be heard on legislative proposals to revise programs carried on under the ESEA, I would initiate such proceedings promptly.

Mr. Chairman, there is more than adequate precedent for long-term authorizations for education programs. When we originally enacted the impacted areas legislation, we provided a 3-year authorization. Last year, by virtue of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968, we authorized some 30 programs for a 3-year period. When we originally enacted the National Defense Education Act during the Eisenhower administration, we authorized a 4-year program.

Long term authorizations have been enacted for other significant and effective programs. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 and the George-Barden Act of 1946 contained permanent authorizations, as did the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. For an extended period of time, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act contained a permanent authorization. When we have permanent legislation, such as we do with the Vocational Education Act, we are not under extreme pressure of an immediate termination date for authorizations, and we are able to deliberate at great length and to carry out our oversight function in a more meaningful fashion.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Education and Labor has amended the ESEA every year of its existence. I venture to say we will amend it in 1970 and in 1971, even though it were to be given a 5-year extension, as is proposed by H.R. 514. That we will consider legislation to amend the ESEA even though there is no immediate termination date is perhaps best demonstrated by reference to what took place in 1965. It was shortly after President Johnson signed Public Law 89-10, that the Congress enacted Public Law 89-313, which contained extensive amendments to the original act.

Let me describe briefly the purpose of each title of the act which we propose to amend, and why it must be continued in the coming years.

TITLE I

Title I provides for grants to local educational agencies, through State departments of education for programs to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged children—the children of urban slums and remote rural areas. It is the single largest effort to focus funds or perhaps the single most pressing problem in American education, educational deprivation resulting from poverty. Federal funds are apportioned to school districts using uniform national statistics on the number of children in low-income families plus those in families receiving more than $2,000 under the program of AFDC. It is the most effective means of distributing funds uniformly throughout the country where educational deprivation exists. Programs are conducted in school attendance areas having high concentrations of low-income children. Children attending eligible title I schools are qualified to participate in the program regardless of their family income if they are in need of the special educational assistance provided by the program.

Since the beginning of the title I program, almost $3 billion has been used to meet the special needs of millions of educationally deprived children. In 1968, about 9 million children are being served in over 16,000 school districts, including 400,000 children attending nonpublic schools.

Title I funds also support programs for other special groups of disadvantaged children: $45 million is currently being used to strengthen educational services for some 185,000 children of migratory agricultural workers; $14 million to serve 32,000 neglected and delinquent children in State institutions; $29.8 million to support 96,000 handicapped children in 900 State institutions receiving special and improved services; and $9 million to support special programs for 50,000 Indian children in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools.

The committee is recommending a 5-year extension of the existing title I program. No significant change is being made in the title I formula for determining allocations except that children in all types of correctional institutions will be counted, rather than institutions for neglected and delinquent children only. The count of children will be extended to include children in county and local reformatories, prisons, and jails.

To assure that children in such institutions participate in the benefits of title I programs, provision is being made to allow a State educational agency to assume responsibility for providing these services if the local education agency is unable or unwilling to do so, in which case the allocation on behalf of these children will be made to the public agency providing the service.

The method of payment to a State for programs for migratory children of migratory workers will be changed to the number of children served in the State rather than on the number of children residing in the State so that maximum utilization will be made of the migrant funds available.

An amendment is included to assure that grants can be made to local school districts on a timely basis under the advance funding authority by permitting the Commissioner of Education after April 1 to use the most reliable and recent data available to him on numbers of children and the use of the most recent per pupil expenditure data, rather than the second preceding year's data as presently required. This amendment is needed in order to take full advantage of the advance funding provisions of the act.

Other amendments which will improve the administration of the program place requirements on the reporting of evaluation data by the local education agency to the State; and requirements upon the States to include in their reports to the Commissioner the results of research and replication studies carried on in the State.

A new provision will require the establishment of State advisory councils broadly representative of the educational resources of the State and of the public to advise on policy matters in connection with title I. Another provision will make changes with respect to the title I National Advisory Council: staggered terms for the members to help guarantee continual turnover in the membership; the authority for hiring an independent staff; and authorization for approximately $300,000 for the expenses of the Council—up to one-fortieth of 1 percent of any appropriation for grants for title I—to carry out its evaluation activities; and a requirement for the Council to submit an annual report on successful compensatory education programs.

Another clarifying amendment eliminates reference to Wake Island with respect to administrative funds since Wake Island has no title I program.

TITLE II—SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES

Title II provides State allocations for the purchase of school library resources, textbooks, periodicals, films, video tapes, and other printed and published instructional materials. An estimated 44 million of the Nation's public and private school children have benefited from this program since fiscal year 1966. In addition, title II has helped to stimulate the establishment of thousands of new public school libraries throughout the country.

H.R. 514 would extend title II for 5 years at the present annual level of authorizations, $200 million. Although the appropriations made for this program have been inadequate, considerable progress has been made in meeting the needs of children. The authority for the Commissioner to provide library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for children and teachers in States where the State agency may not do so is also extended through 1975.

TITLE III—SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

Title III provides nonmatching grants to State and local education agencies for supplementary educational centers and services to stimulate and assist in the development of exemplary elementary and secondary education programs. In fiscal year 1970, the States assume administrative responsibility for all title III funds except those necessary to complete projects begun in prior years when the Office of Education was administering the program.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 provided for a shift in the authority for approval of individual projects from the Commissioner of Education to State education agencies under a State plan program.

The title III program has been in operation since November 1965. During this period nearly 7,000 project applications were received and as of June 30, 1968, about 2,500 projects had been approved. Of these about 1,500 title III projects are currently in operation. Approximately 10,000,000 students have benefited over the last 3 years through the exemplary educational projects developed under title III.

The committee amendment would extend the program for a 5-year period, through 1975. In addition, another amendment would give the Commissioner of Education authority to arrange for the effective participation on an equitable basis in title III programs by children and teachers in the schools in the area to be served, where such provision is not being made. The cost would be paid from the State's allotments. This provision is similar to the provision in title II of the act.

TITLE V—GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

Title V authorizes grants to State education agencies to help them identify needs in elementary and secondary education and to strengthen the role of the State educational agencies in the development and administration of new programs to meet complex and urgent educational needs. With the help of title V, over 1,000 professionals were added to State education agencies in 1968 alone. Since its enactment, State professional staffs have increased by 4,260, enabling the giving of additional specialized technical services to local educational agencies in new program development. Title V funds, together with the administrative funds authorized under the title I, title II, and title III programs have enabled State departments to play an effective role in the administration of the Federal programs.

The committee bill would extend the provisions of this title for a 5-year period, through 1975.

TITLE VI—EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

H.R. 514 extends for 5 years the program for handicapped children. Part A of title VI, the State grant program for the initiation and expansion of special program for the handicapped has made an impact both in terms of short-range and long-range objectives and programs in many States. It has stimulated increased State and local expenditures and programs for handicapped children, their needs, and methods to meet these needs on the part of the general public, administrators, both regular and special education teachers, and personnel in various nonschool agencies working with the handicapped. It is estimated that 182,000 handicapped children will receive benefits this school year under this program.

Part B of title VI authorizes the establishment of regional resource centers. Four such centers will be selected for establishment this fiscal year at a cost of $125,000 each. These centers will provide the backup resources to enable the teacher of handicapped children to do more effective teaching. They will handle the work of the diagnostician, curriculum development specialist, educational evaluator, and media specialist.

Part C of title VI authorizes centers and services for deaf-blind children, 8 to 10 which will be established this year and next year. These centers will serve the large new population—an estimated 1,250—of deaf-blind children struck by the German measles epidemic of 1964 and 1965 who are now 3 and 4 years old. Currently, only about 100 of approximately 500 school-age, deaf-blind children are enrolled in special classes with the instruction designed for their dual handicap, and preschool programs are almost nonexistent. The new centers will be located strategically to serve a population and geographic region, rather than an area within State boundaries.

Part D of title VI authorizes a program to establish and support special information centers and to recruit young people for the special education professions.

H.R. 514 also extends through 1975 the appropriation authorization of Public Law 85-926—Grants for teaching in the education of handicapped children—and provides for training for subprofessional personnel and other staff who do not require professional or advanced training.

Title V of Public Law 88-164—Training of physical educators and recreation personnel for mentally retarded and other handicapped children—is extended through 1975; authorizes training for subprofessional personnel or other staff who do not require professional or advanced training; and conform section 502(a)(1) to a recent amendment to section 302 of Public Law 88-164 by allowing research grants and contracts with any public or private agency.

TITLE VII—BILINGUAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

This program is designed to meet the special education needs of children with limited English-speaking ability in schools having high concentrations of such children. Approximately 3 million children are deprived of equal educational opportunity because of their limited communication skills. In fiscal year 1969, 78 proposals serving 139,000 pupils, were selected for funding at a cost of $7,500,000.

The committee recommends the extension of this program through 1975 with annual authorizations of $40 million, and the inclusion of Indian children on Indian reservations as eligible participants in bilingual education programs.

TITLE VIII—DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAM

The dropout prevention program authorizes programs to develop and demonstrate educational practices for the reduction and prevention of dropouts in urban and rural schools having a high concentration of children from low-income families and a high dropout rate. The first year of the program is 1969. Planning grants were made to 20 locational agencies for comprehensive program planning. About 10 programs will become operational this year under the limited appropriation of $5 million.

H.R. 514 extends this program for an additional 5 years beyond its present expiration date of June 30, 1970.

TITLE VIII—DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

H.R. 514 does not contain an extension of section 806 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 because the activities authorized in this section are included in the more comprehensive provisions for collection and dissemination of information and technical assistance in section 303 of title III of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 which authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary through 1972. Section 806 by law becomes ineffective when section 303 is funded.

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Grants are made to States for programs to increase and expand basic education programs for adults to enable them to overcome English language limitations and to improve their basic education in preparation for occupational training, more profitable employment, and more responsible citizenship. Many positive results have accrued as a result of this program and the committee recommends its extension for 5 years.

H.R. 514 also extends the benefits of titles I, II, III, and VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to Indian children in Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools. It also extends the benefits of titles II and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to children in overseas schools operated by the Department of Defense.

Other amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act recommended by the committee include:

A requirement for the adoption of effective procedures by the States and local agencies to involve parents and community representatives in the development and operation of the programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and to insure adequate dissemination of program plans and evaluations to parents and to the public at large;

A requirement that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare report to the appropriate committees of Congress a description of each contract or grant for evaluation of programs, any part of the performance of which occurred during the preceding fiscal year, together with the name of the firm or individual with whom the contract was made and the amount paid under the contract;

Permit the single packaging of a local program for funding by several agencies under which anyone of the Federal agencies may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced. This is limited with respect to a project funded in whole or in part under a statute for which the Commissioner of Education has the responsibility for administering;

Authorize local educational agencies to use systematic approaches in determining cost data required in the administration of the program authorized by the act with the proviso that such approaches conform in principal to the concept of reimbursement procedures which have been prescribed by the Bureau of the Budget Circular No. AL-21 as in effect on March 1, 1969.

Requires that no standard, rule, regulation, or requirement of general applicability prescribed for the administration of this act or any act amended by this act may take effect until 30 days after it has been published in the Federal Register.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

H.R. 514 extends the legislation for the maintenance and operation of schools and the construction of schools in federally affected areas contained in Public Law 81-874 and Public Law 81-815 for 5 years.

H.R. 514 also amends Public Law 81-874 to provide for payments to school districts of one-half of the local cost of education for each public housing child, less the share for education of the amount paid in lieu of taxes by the Federal Government to the local governing agencies. The amendment contains a separate authorization of appropriations for public housing children.

H.R. 514 also amends Public Law 81-815 to provide that a local school district may be compensated for school construction costs by the Federal Government for a sudden increase in enrollments caused by the presence of large numbers of children from public housing projects. There is also a separate authorization of appropriations for this purpose.

The purpose of the public housing amendment is to recognize the burden placed on local school districts as a result of housing legislation which authorizes the construction of low-rent housing with the assistance of the Federal Government. Since the Federal housing acts exempt all low-rent public housing from State and local taxation, school districts serving children from public housing are severely limited in providing an adequate education for these children.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, let me state again, when this program was first enacted in 1965, Congress took a major step in assuring quality and equality in the education of our Nation's children. Testimony presented before the committee confirms that the programs authorized by the 1965 act are doing a successful and effective job in carrying out the congressional purpose, but that maximum effective use of Federal funds has been impaired by delays in continuing authorizations and untimely funding. I feel it will be a grave mistake if we fail to tell the American people that we have confidence in this program. Our indication of confidence should be the enactment of H.R. 514 and the extension of these programs for 5 years. This will mean a continuing Federal commitment which will permit effective planning and program implementation.

I am confident that the Members of the House know that the Committee on Education and Labor will carry out its oversight responsibility and that we will consider and report out legislation in the future to make any changes in the law which are deemed and proven necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES).

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the issues before us are simple enough. I doubt if we will require the 4 hours of debate under the rule. The main issue is whether we shall extend the Elementary and Secondary Aid to Education Act until 1975 without significant change, as our distinguished chairman wishes, or whether we shall extend it only to 1972, as many of us think the wiser course. That is the issue.

This act does not expire until June 30, 1970. The only reason for extending it this year is to make it possible to appropriate funds this year for fiscal year 1971. Why, then, Mr. Chairman, should we not simply extend it 1 year, to June 30, 1971, which is all that is needed?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to clarify this. We have advance funding authority in the law and we have to extend this legislation now in order that the authority may be exercised for fiscal year 1971. That is the reason we decided, all of us on both sides of the aisle, to take up the bill early this year.

But a 2-year extension, in my judgment, would mean that we would be back next year so as to avoid an expiration crisis in the first session of the 92d Congress. In my judgment, we would have to go through this whole extension process again next year. Let us assume the Secretary has a lot of amendments, in which case we may take a considerable length of time to consider them and bring a bill to the floor.

It may take a whole year to do it. It may even drift over into the next year. Meanwhile our delay would prevent school agencies from doing the job we expect this legislation to do. I cannot visualize how one can justify only a 2-year extension under these circumstances. During this 5 years we would be in a better position, I think, in a more deliberate way, after we establish the continuity of this program, to consider suggestions from the administration and others with respect to improving it.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the chairman for telling us about the advance funding.

I should like to remind the members of the committee, as to his statement it might take a year to get this bill out of the committee, if he were to continue operating the next year under the same provisions as this year, I do not believe it would take a year. I believe he could have it back, in the manner in which the votes were counted on the committee, in ample time.

Why a 2-year extension as the minority on the committee propose?

The answer to that question will also tell you why we are opposed to a 5-, or 10-, or 20-year extension of the act.

If we extend this act only 1 year we shall have to bring it up again next year—in 1970—for another 1-year extension in order to have forward funding into 1972. And next year will be too early to have the results of the 1970 census so that we can make intelligent changes in the distribution formula in title I of the act.

If we extend this act for 2 years—until 1972—we can take it up in 1971 with all the census data in front of us and make the changes that will have to be made.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. AYRES. I am always happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe if the gentleman were to check with the Department of Commerce, if I recall correctly, the data we need will not be available until 1972. I should like for the gentleman to check that out. I do not believe we are going to have the new data until 1972.

Mr. AYRES. We have, Mr. Chairman. We have been so advised, that the information would be available.

If we extend this act for 2 years until 1972 then we can take this up in 1971 with the census figures available.

Now this formula, Mr. Chairman, will have to be changed.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. The new census figures, when they become available, under this present act, automatically fit into the picture. The Congress does not have to do anything under the formula, unless we intend to change the formula. We can change the formula this year or the next year or the next year. The bill provides for the use of the latest statistical information on the AFDC, and the census. This data may be used without a change in the law.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate those observations, because they are leading right into the very points I am trying to prove.

And this formula will have to be changed because it is the most confused, unfair, mixed-up thing in the history of Federal aid to education. Three-quarters of the money under this act is distributed according to the title I formula—and nobody can make much sense of it.

I am going to talk about that formula a little bit—and when you have the facts of how it operates I think you will agree that we should change it at the first opportunity, which will be in 1971 when we have new census information.

But first, I want to set one thing straight right now at the beginning of this debate. The chairman has said that we have to extend this act for 5 years to assure educators that we intend to continue Federal aid. That just is not the issue. The vast majority of Members in both parties in both Houses of Congress favor continued Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools, and everybody knows it. There is not any question about the aid continuing. The questions are about the details—how it will be distributed, for example. I think a substantial majority also favors increasing appropriations for the schools as soon as the Federal budgetary situation will permit it.

If this big majority in favor of Federal aid melted away, then a 5-year extension, or 10 years, or 20 years, could not save it. There just would not be any appropriation made for it and that would be that.

But I do not think anything like that is going to happen. Practically all of us recognize that Federal aid for our schools is high on the list of legislation in the national interest.

The thing most likely to hurt this program is to continue indefinitely with parts of it that do not make sense, and that is the only thing I can say about this distribution formula.

Now this will be discussed at length by other Members, but let me give you a few examples. Let us look at what your local schools actually get this year for each child counted under this formula.

Nebraska, Utah, Idaho, and New Mexico; all have their money figured on the basis of one-half the national average per pupil expenditure—which is $277.65.

Nebraska schools actually get $117.61 for each poor school child counted.

Utah schools do better with $122.40.

Idaho does better still with $136.03.

New Mexico tops them all with $176.38.

Now why in the world should New Mexico schools get $50 more per poor child than Nebraska schools when they are both figured on the same base?

Or take Michigan and Minnesota;

Minnesota is figured on a base $12 higher than Michigan—but Minnesota actually receives $24 more than Michigan for each poor child counted.

This title I program is supposed to be aimed at concentrations of poor children—particularly in big cities where the problems are most severe. And here again, there is no rhyme or reason in the amount each city school system actually gets this year for each poor child counted.

Of course, the schools in New York City get the most—$200.01 this year for every child counted. That is $68 more per child than the schools in Cleveland or Akron; $52 more per child than in Philadelphia; $45 more than in Chicago; $62 more than Detroit; and $56 more than Los Angeles.

Wilmington, Del., is a rather small city of less than 100,000 population with a lot of Du Pont property to tax for their schools—but Wilmington schools get more per child than eight of the 10 largest cities in the Nation—all except New York and Washington, D.C.

In fact—if there are any poor children counted in the schools of Paradise Valley, Ariz., Senator BARRY GOLDWATER'S hometown—and I suspect there may be—the schools in Paradise Valley get $157.34 this year for each child counted—and that is $13.51 more per child than in the Watts section of Los Angeles.

As a matter of fact, the schools of Paradise Valley, Ariz., get more per child this year than the schools in eight of our 10 largest cities.

The chairman tells us that all of these wild discrepancies would just go away if this formula were fully funded for about $3 billion.

Well, this year, Los Angeles schools get $56 less per poor child than New York schools. If this title were fully funded, Los Angeles schools would get $180.56 less than the New York City schools for each poor child.

The thing gets worse as more money is poured into it; not better, as the chairman claims.

Mr. Chairman, if we extend this act only to 1972 we shall have to reconsider it in 1971. By then we will have the new census data to help us make better sense of this formula.

An extension of more than 2 years, as proposed by the committee bill, would be a tragic mistake.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor yield to me at this point?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In the bill the committee has adopted a new section 8 to Public Law 81–874 to provide payments to school districts because of the impact of public housing in the district. May I ask the gentleman from Kentucky whether or not such payments are protected from the State's action to reduce State aid to the district because of the Federal payment?

Mr. PERKINS. Under section 5(d)(2) of Public Law 81–874 the State would be precluded from taking into account the payment to the district under the section 8 public housing provision under penalty of denial of the Federal funds to the district.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The same rule applies?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, the same rule that now applies to section 3(a) and section 3(b) payments applies.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. They cannot take into consideration any additional funds that come from the Federal Government as an offset against State funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I now want to respond to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES). There is a difference why New York received more money than California.

In California the State per-pupil expenditure is $574.64. In New York it is $935.76. So you would take one-half of that $935.76, and multiply it by the number of disadvantaged children in New York. Naturally it comes out more per pupil than one-half of $574.64.

And that is just what happens in the case when you compare New York and California. I might add that paying 50 percent of the State average per pupil expenditure, not only takes into account the higher cost of education in some States but also operates as an incentive for States to increase per-pupil expenditures to improve education.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is it not the truth that the adjoining suburban areas in New York—let us take Westchester County, for example—receive more per child than they do in the Watts district of Los Angeles?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is correct but is being misleading. Westchester County receives more money per poor pupil than does Watts but payments to the Los Angeles schools per poor children in Watts are far greater in amount. Per-pupil costs of education in Westchester County are much higher than per-pupil costs in Los Angeles County.

Mr. AYRES. Do not such communities receive more money than a child in the Watts area of Los Angeles?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly. But they do not have as many disadvantaged children, and they do not receive as much money as Los Angeles County, and the ghetto areas, where we have heavy concentrations of disadvantaged children. I hope the gentleman is not suggesting that we ignore the special educational needs of a child simply because he happens to live in Westchester County.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor if the committee made any effort this year to cure the defect which has been brought out by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES), where the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is predicated upon the theory of giving Federal aid to disadvantaged children?

As I understand the explanation made by the gentleman from Ohio, we actually have the Federal act operating in a way that wealthy districts receive more than the poorer districts do under the act. Was there any effort made by the committee to cure this defect?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the gentleman that that statement is not borne out by the record. We certainly do not pay poor school districts and States less than the more affluent districts. To the contrary, the title I formula focuses money into the crowded cores of our urban areas and into poor rural districts where educational needs are greatest as no other formula ever proposed has done.

Let me say to the gentleman that many efforts have been made in the past to devise an equitable formula for the distribution of educational funds. While there has been much criticism of the ESEA title I formula, no other formula proposed has been demonstrated to be more equitable in the distribution of funds uniformly throughout the Nation to school districts having the greatest education disadvantages. While the incidence of poverty is the basic criteria employed in the distribution of funds, we have never been concerned with poverty per se in the educational uses which may be made of title I funds. We have been primarily concerned in title I with low educational attainment. Recent studies have adequately shown the positive relationship between educational attainment and income. If uniform national data were available on educational attainment, it would be possible to distribute Federal funds on this basis directly and achieve our title I purposes, for title I seeks to improve opportunities for a student to achieve his maximum educational potential wherever he might live.

Thus, the equitable impact of title I formula can be seen from the following tables. In the first table, it can be seen that title I funds are concentrated in the cores of large metropolitan areas heavily impacted in recent years with swelling numbers of disadvantaged students. The first table shows the large cities' share of title I funds of the State allotment as contrasted with the large cities' share of other Federal fund distributions.

The second table takes the poorest two counties in each State of 28 States studied and compares those counties' share of other Federal education fund distributions with those counties' share of title I funds.

It should be noted that in both tables, in programs other than title I, funds are distributed within the States by the State educational agency under a State plan. It should be emphasized that the entitlements established by the title I formula are fixed by law and administratively cannot be affected either by the Office of Education or State departments of education. I submit that it is desirable that the Congress establish the distribution to assure the attainment of congressional objectives in improving educational quality and educational opportunity in the Nation.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL FUNDS

The 50 largest cities of the Nation have 21.3 percent of the total school enrollments and 26.4 percent of the disadvantaged title I-ESEA children in their combined 28 States.

Yet, in 1967 these 50 cities received only: 15.9 percent of their States vocational education funds; 16.2 percent of their States NDEA title III funds for purchase of instructional equipment; 18.1 percent of their States ESEA title II funds for purchase of textbooks and school library resources; and 20.5 percent of their States ESEA title III funds for supplemental centers and services.

Only in the ESEA title I program did these cities receive funds proportional to their educational burdens—29.9 percent of their States funds.

Some specific examples:

[In percent]

	Total enrollment	Title I count	Vocational education	NDEA title III	ESEA title II	ESEA title I
Birmingham	15.56	5.40	4.27	2.34	5.06	4.92
Los Angeles	14.59	20.60	14.35	.21	7.58	20.03
Denver	19.38	29.10	12.74	7.81	17.02	26.02
Baltimore	24.31	50.81	7.90	19.62	10.51	49.67
Louisville	18.88	4.64	7.55	3.11	6.73	4.79
St. Louis	13.94	18.90	9.35	3.69	18.43	19.44
Kansas City	10.39	7.78	5.41	4.33	14.56	7.58
New York City	33.31	63.80	10.74	34.30	29.58	61.39
Rochester	1.43	1.60	0	1.52	1.84	1.59
Columbus, Ohio	4.57	6.09	1.04	3.84	4.04	6.25
Oklahoma City	12.55	10.49	0	15.38	11.67	9.96
Philadelphia	12.65	25.37	10.88	17.79	8.51	24.60
Pittsburgh	7.58	6.93	22.83	7.04	1.84	6.62
Memphis	14.74	9.33	0	0	13.94	9.25
Houston	10.93	5.23	4.04	5.20	8.34	5.13
Milwaukee	13.34	18.37	10.09	11.92	10.26	17.84

2 POOREST COUNTIES IN 28 SELECTED STATES—COUNTY AS PERCENT OF STATE

[In percent]

State and county	Fiscal year 1967 obligation for— Vocational education	NDEA III	ESEA I	ESEA II
Alabama:				
Lowndes	0.28	0.08	1.50	1.42
Greene	.15	.08	1.37	1.32
Arizona:				
Apache	2.03	.09	9.27	2.41
Navajo	3.92	.27	8.88	3.89
California:				
Lake		.13	.10	.03
Madera	.09	.16	.58	.15
Colorado:				
Costilla		.02	1.46	.22
Custer			.08	.02
Florida:				
Gilchrist	.06	.11	.16	.10
Holmes	.07	--------	.93	.55
Georgia:				
Baker	.03	--------	.35	.10
Webster	.04	--------	.31	.08
Hawaii:				
Hawaii	41.06	18.01	14.18	7.94
Ksuii	2.75	9.31	3.87	3.18
Illinois:				
Gallatin	.10	.26	.27	.04
Pope	.13	.04	.10	.02
Indiana:				
Crawford	.02	--------	.66	.07
Orange	.22	.57	.75	.28
Kentucky:				
Breathitt	.47	.08	1.67	1.18
Owsley	.43	--------	.61	.27
Louisiana:				
Red River			.73	--------
Tensas			1.28	--------
Maryland:				
Garrett	.35	1.38	1.38	.95
Somerset	.18	.38	1.54	.55
Massachusetts:				
Dukes			.18	.04
Nantucket		.05	.09	.03
Michigan:				
Lake		.04	.17	.02
Montmorency		.04	.16	.03
Minnesota:				
Cass	.01	1.38	1.20	.38
Todd	3.02	1.10	1.88	.56
Missouri:				
Douglas	.22	.19	.75	.47
Ripley	.11	.23	.84	.98
Nebraska:				
Boyd		.08	1.58	.33
Pawnee	.41	.17	1.04	.22
New Jersey:				
Atlantic	2.11	1.85	4.69	2.03
Cape May	1.38	.53	.94	.53
New York:				
Hamilton		.09	.01	--------
Schoharic	.09	.13	.16	.12
Ohio:				
Adams	.03	.19	.76	.18
Vinton	.01	.09	.40	.09

2 POOREST COUNTIES IN 28 SELECTED STATES—COUNTY AS PERCENT OF STATE—Continued

[In percent]

State and county	Fiscal year 1967 obligation for— Vocational education	NDEA III	ESEA I	ESEA II
Oklahoma:				
Adair	.18	.33	2.05	.60
Pushmataha	.03	.25	1.00	.35
Oregon:				
Malheur	3.22	.75	2.44	1.06
Yamhill	1.61	3.67	3.11	1.91
Pennsylvania:				
Fulton		.11	.20	.10
Somerset	.13	1.04	1.31	.65
Tennessee:				
Fayette	.10	--------	2.53	.96
Hancock	.10	.22	.65	.25
Texas:				
San Jacinto	.34	.01	.20	.01
Starr	.45	.05	.74	.19
Virginia:				
Cumberland	.07	.02	.51	.15
Lee	.50	.23	2.61	.58
Washington:				
San Juan		.02	.11	.04
Stevens	.41	.34	1.29	.51
Wisconsin:				
Burnett	.03	.26	.74	.16
Menominee			.40	.06

I should like to further comment on the Kansas-Nebraska comparison. The allocation to Kansas in 1969 is disproportionately greater than the allocation to Nebraska because of the floor established in the 1967 appropriation language, which reads as follows:

> The aggregate amounts otherwise available for grants within states shall not be less than the amounts expended under the fiscal year 1966 appropriations by local educational agencies in such states for grants.

The appropriation language in 1968 establishes a floor based on 1967 allocations to States on behalf of local educational agencies.

Now if you look at the authorization in 1966, here is what locks Nebraska in at a lower rate than Kansas.

The authorization for Nebraska was $6,929,812. They only expended $4,948,000 and this amount became the floor for Nebraska. Because Kansas expended more of their allocation, its floor was locked in at a higher per pupil rate.

The Kansas authorization was $10,595,000 and they spent $9,608,706. That is the reason for the inequitable result in this case.

I think in all fairness we ought to appriate more money in order that the poor districts can receive their full payments.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, one of the most important questions we have to decide is the length to which we will extend this program. It is interesting that this would be the most important issue before the committee in considering the elementary and secondary education bill, especially when we remember the controversy that has existed in some previous extensions, as well as the first enactment of this bill.

Let me say, first, that I favor the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I have supported every extension. I did not support ESEA the first year it was enacted because the formula was so completely inequitable at that time. When my amendment was adopted, which gave the poorer States an amount up to the national average, I have supported ESEA. The formula is not equitable, but at least it is greatly improved over the inception of this act.

But now we look to the future, and the question is, Shall we extend this for another 5 years?

All of you know that, just as in the past, it will be in the future, we will only give major changes in this act serious consideration when it comes up for extention or the bill is about to expire. This bill comes up 1 year before the expiration of the act because of the forward funding, as the previous speakers indicated. We had to move this year, even though the act will not expire until June 1970, in order that the Appropriation Committee can appropriate not only for the next year but the year thereafter.

I think it would be a terrible mistake for this Congress to wait 5 years before it took another look at this legislation. The Congress, by setting a shorter expiration date, will not endanger the future of Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. One of the most certain things we have is that impact aid is going to be extended. The reason for that is so much is expended in each Member's district. In fact, by far a majority of this Congress has a substantial amount of impact aid expended in their congressional district. The same thing is true of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title I especially. There is so much being expended in each congressional district now that no Member would want to deny his schools the opportunity to make that expenditure of funds. So, about as certain as anything is in government and politics, we will have a continuation of this legislation, a continuation of Federal aid to education at the elementary- and secondary-school level.

In order that again you might know what my views are, I think as soon as this Federal Government can afford it, that is, the budget can be loosened up, I believe we will be increasing, and I believe we should increase the Federal Government's assistance to elementary and secondary education. I think we ought to do it substantially. But if we did it under the formula of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, it would be the biggest mistake we could make. It would continue the unfair distribution of Federal aid to elementary and secondary education schools.

A little while ago the chairman of the committee said that it is the most equitable formula, even if we studied it for another 5 years. It is hard for me to conceive how we could do it more inequitably than in the way prescribed, unless we went back to the original formula. Now the richest States receive the most amount of money and, when the bill was passed, the poorer States received the least amount. Now the poorest States are lumped together at the national average. But it is still true that the Federal Government is not equalizing educational assistance in order that every State can receive about the same amount of money, or at least give their children an opportunity for an education equal with those in another State. The amount of money that is authorized per poor pupil under this bill in title I ranges from $467.88 for the State of New York to $277.65 for the poorest ones. As the years go on, and the cost of education increases under this present formula, New York and all the States that are above the national average will continue to receive an increase in the amount that is authorized for them. But the poorer States would remain down there at the national average. The national average increases slower than the richest States, and therefore the rich will get richer and the poor will stay poor.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I will yield to the gentleman if he has anything else to bring up on this point, but otherwise I would suggest that he wait until the end of my statement.

Mr. Chairman, with that then I will continue my statement. When we compare the amount each State receives per poor child under the 1969 appropriation, we can see the situation is different from the authorization. If we look at this table—and I will ask later for permission to include this with my remarks and it will be in the RECORD tomorrow—we can see what each State receives compared with other States.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, PUBLIC LAW 89-10, AS AMENDED—TITLE I, ASSISTANCE FOR EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN, LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (FISCAL YEAR 1969)

State	Rate per pupil authorized	Rate per pupil appropriated	Appropriation as percent of authorization
Alabama	$277.65	$138.87	50.0
Alaska	426.22	230.22	54.0
Arizona	277.65	157.34	56.7
Arkansas	277.65	139.42	50.2
California	287.32	143.83	50.8
Colorado	277.65	134.88	48.6
Connecticut	334.94	147.45	44.0
Delaware	346.26	159.99	46.1
District of Columbia	342.96	191.54	55.8
Florida	277.65	166.39	62.0
Georgia	277.65	139.56	50.3
Hawaii	305.18	132.31	42.4
Idaho	277.65	136.03	49.0
Illinois	302.72	155.74	51.4
Indiana	277.65	136.27	49.0
Iowa	277.65	153.64	55.3
Kansas	286.70	157.38	54.8
Kentucky	277.65	136.69	49.2
Louisiana	277.65	140.52	50.6
Maine	277.65	137.31	49.5
Maryland	306.82	134.87	43.9
Massachusetts	303.73	141.83	45.4
Michigan	302.29	138.45	45.7
Minnesota	314.32	162.38	51.8
Mississippi	277.65	139.45	50.2
Missouri	277.65	145.11	52.3
Montana	279.66	155.18	55.4
Nebraska	277.65	117.61	43.8
Nevada	295.18	147.43	49.9
New Hampshire	277.65	129.68	46.7
New Jersey	354.38	160.90	48.0
New Mexico	277.65	176.38	63.5
New York	467.88	200.11	42.5
North Carolina	277.65	138.53	50.0
North Dakota	277.65	134.46	48.5
Ohio	277.65	132.01	47.5
Oklahoma	277.65	137.89	49.7
Oregon	315.94	162.61	51.4
Pennsylvania	294.86	148.64	50.4
Rhode Island	$291.24	$141.81	48.6
South Carolina	277.65	139.34	50.2
South Dakota	277.65	137.34	49.5
Tennessee	277.65	139.28	50.2
Texas	277.65	148.48	53.5
Utah	277.65	122.40	44.0
Vermont	277.65	125.34	45.0
Virginia	277.65	137.39	49.5
Washington	299.92	145.95	48.0
West Virginia	277.65	130.50	47.0
Wisconsin	300.86	150.20	49.9
Wyoming	297.82	158.55	54.1

Each poor State receives the authorization of $277.65—but there is a great variety that each State receives under the appropriation.

The chairman again indicated this was caused by the language in the appropriation bill, which requires every State to receive not less than the amount they had in previous years. I also show the percentage that the appropriation is of the authorization, and we can see it varies tremendously. New York has an extremely high authorization, the highest amount of money for every poor child. Except for Alaska, it also received the highest payment per poor child for 1969. However, New York is one of the lowest States in the percentage it receives of the authorization. It is at 42.5 percent. Hawaii is another low State, just a little bit lower than New York, at 42.4 percent. They receive $132.31 out of their $305.18 authorization, while New York is receiving $200.11 against their authorization of $467.88.

If some Members are wondering what these figures in column 2 are, these are amounts each local education agency receives per poor child. It does not count the amount the State receives for the handicapped children in State institutions. But that 42.4 percent that the State receives per poor child against its authorization in Hawaii should be compared with New Mexico, which was mentioned before. They receive 63.5 percent of their authorization.

If we look through the States, we will see them ranging from 42 percent and 43 percent up to 62 percent and 63 percent. That on its face shows the formula is inequitable. It is not fair treatment between the States right now.

But if we look at the other side of the table, we will see how inequitable it would be if we had full authorization. That would be even worse. So we must do something about that formula, and we cannot just wait for the census information to be available to us. We had better begin right after the work on this bill has been completed and start doing a thorough study and revision of it. When I say "we," I mean both the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with its Office of Education, and the Congress with the authority given to the education committees.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on this?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman on this part here.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to call to the attention of the gentleman that he took a very active part in improving the formula in the committee when we permitted the States to receive payment on the basis of one-half the national average per-pupil expenditure if such would be greater than the State average. The gentleman from Minnesota, as I did, supported that approach.

I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota will admit we have considered formula after formula in the consideration of this legislation, and every time we considered other approaches we came back to this as the most equitable approach. I am sure the gentleman recognizes that we have done a far better job in helping the needy District under the title I formula than we have under the Hill-Burton formula.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would have to disagree with the chairman there. Under the Hill-Burton formula, the poorer States would receive more.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I disagree with that.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, we did the same thing under the vocational education formula.

Mr. PERKINS. Under the vocational education formula, it would be worse. With the same amount of money the poorer States would not receive as much as they are now receiving under the ESEA formula.

Mr. QUIE. The chairman has that backward. The wealthier States receive less than the national average under the Vocational Education Act and the poorer States receive more than the national average per child.

Mr. PERKINS. One of the difficulties we have had in the vocational education is that we have not insisted in the legislation that the neediest areas be given any priority.

Mr. QUIE. I disagree with the chairman. If we did as well under title I of ESEA as we have done with vocational education it would receive much greater praise than it is receiving now, because the poorer States do receive more money per child under vocational education than the wealthier States do. Here it was just reversed.

Mr. PERKINS. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. QUIE. The only place where

money in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is concentrated is in the largest cities entitlements, where they concentrate on the schools that have the greatest impact of disadvantaged children. But so far as the States are concerned there is no concentration within the States; it is only the concentration within the school districts that are large enough to have more than one school within the school district.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA. I believe the difficulty between the gentleman from Minnesota and the distinguished chairman of the committee results in some misunderstanding as to what one would apply the Hill-Burton type formula.

Now, under a Hill-Burton formula which would simply count the number of children of school age within the State and then make a grant for the purposes of title I based on the number of children and the relative per capita income of the citizens of that State, based on the personal income, as we do in the Hill-Burton formula, if we did that the poorer States would get less, would get a smaller percentage of the total pie than they get under the title I formula we are now using. Of course, that is the only way one could apply the Hill-Burton formula.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is leaving out a part of the Hill-Burton formula which gives more assistance to poorer States.

Mr. O'HARA. If we wanted to put in a factor for poverty; that is, first to vary the amount per child based upon the relative wealth of the State, and only count the poor children in determining how many children there were in the State, then the rural poorer States would receive more than they do under the present formula.

I might suggest to the gentleman that the present formula is as much the product of the work of the gentleman from Minnesota as of anyone. I am very much aware of its weaknesses, although I do not see them the same way the gentleman does, because I fought that formula when it was proposed.

I might suggest that in the committee I do not recall the gentleman from Minnesota offered a new title I formula.

Mr. QUIE. I say to the gentleman on that, I am not asking that we change the formula now. I am asking that we extend this law for 2 years so that we can change it in this period of time. I recognize we cannot spend the necessary time on changing the formula in this session of the Congress. I knew it was unwise to ask the new administration to come in with a recommendation of a change in formula before Easter, as was the time schedule we were aiming for.

What I am saying is with this formula as inequitable as is, and considering the fact that anybody can see we can make improvements and changes in it, let us extend the act for 2 years instead of 5 years so that we do not get locked in for a long period of time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. I am sure the gentleman does not have any worry about anybody being locked in on this committee. Any time the gentleman from Minnesota wants a hearing he is going to get a hearing.

I have some figures here, which came from the Office of Education some time ago—I will say before the administration changed.

Mr. QUIE. At times that makes a difference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Minnesota 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I will be glad to yield to the Chairman, but I hope he will kind of speed up his questioning a little bit, because I would like to finish the rest of my statement.

Mr. PERKINS. The table I have here came from the Office of Education several months ago showing how the States of Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina, New York, Illinois, the District of Columbia, Connecticut, Delaware, and Oregon would be allocated funds under various formulas. This table illustrates, I believe, the more equitable distribution of funds under title I as contrasted with other means:

THE INTERSTATE DISTRIBUTION EFFECT OF TITLE I CAN BE ILLUSTRATED BY THE FOLLOWING TABLE WHICH IS BASED UPON THE ALLOCATION OF EACH OF THE DESCRIBED PROGRAMS BY A HYPOTHETICAL $1,070,000,000

[In millions of dollars]

	Title III—NDEA: Hill-Burton formula ($1,070,000,000)	S. 1021—President Kennedy's 1961 general aid bill ($1,070,000,000)	Title II—ESEA: Population basis, no economic weighting ($1,070,000,000)	S. 3400—NEA's 1958 general aid bill ($1,070,000,000)	Title I—ESEA in fiscal year 1969 ($1,070,000,000)
Alabama	27.182	27.689	19.990	20.294	37.091
Mississippi	19.005	21.099	13.937	14.189	38.896
South Carolina	20.668	21.873	15.193	15.431	31.627
New York	60.445	59.656	91.069	90.269	116.092
Illinois	44.418	44.303	55.853	57.576	46.231
District of Columbia	2.551	1.909	5.001	3.810	5.397
Connecticut	10.437	10.410	15.620	15.115	7.907
Delaware	2.383	2.376	3.837	2.926	2.087
Oregon	10.738	10.710	11.271	10.715	6.983

Mr. QUIE. I will say to the chairman that he can put the rest of the information in the RECORD, but when you begin with a fallacious assumption, you can prove things to the point where it looks like this is the better formula. They start with the fallacious assumption that we will provide aid to all children—all children—who are counted in a school age population 5 to 17. This is a program for disadvantaged children. If we can zero in on the disadvantaged children themselves, we will have the best formula possible. A preliminary study that the U.S. Office of Education made—and I guess we can quote them on any kind of information you want to—and I will submit this table also for the RECORD when we go back into the House.

TABLE 2.—PERCENT OF PARTICIPATION BY DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN TITLE I ACADEMIC COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS, 1967–68 (GRADES 2, 4, 6)

[Tentative and subject to change]

Type of disadvantaged pupil	Percent of total enrollment (not additive) in title I schools who are disadvantaged	Percent of all participating pupils in title I schools who are disadvantaged	Percent of disadvantaged pupils in title I schools that participate in title I academic programs
Poor ($3,000)	15.4	21.9	54.8
Near poor ($3,000 to $6,000)	35.6	42.2	45.7
Poor and near poor	51.0	64.1	48.5
Low estimated ability	18.1	24.9	53.1
Neglected	.9	1.1	48.3
Delinquent	.2	.2	42.0
Migrant	1.2	1.9	59.9
Total	100.0	100.0	38.6

This table shows here that less than half of the children who are in title I schools are actually poor, 21.9 percent of the children in title I programs are from families below $3,000 income. So we see we are not really zeroing in on the children who are in the greatest need. When you begin counting children this is another reason why I believe the program is inequitable. In the State of New York you not only count all of those children who in the 1959–60 census were from families earning $2,000 or less but you count those also who receive AFDC payments in families receiving more than $2,000. Under the 1959–60 census information it was estimated in New York that there were 174,475 children from the $2,000 to $3,000 families, but instead of 174,000 additional children actually being counted, 338,776 were being counted.

When you take a look at the chairman's State of Kentucky or a number of other States you see that there are either very few or else no children from families that received AFDC that are counted in this formula. If you want to take your State and add to them the estimated number of children between $2,000 and $3,000 and add them to the ones presently counted and then multiply that by the amount of money that New York receives, then you can get an estimate of the amount that you would have received if you were treated the same as the State of New York. To me it proves that there is a fantastically inequitable arangement under the formula we are using now. Because in some States you count certain poor children and in other States you do not. In the poorer States of the Union you do not count individual children of families having incomes from $2,000 to $3,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. This is the most uniform and equitable formula as far as concentrating funds in areas of greatest need.

Mr. QUIE. I would ask the gentleman to look at his own State of Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. QUIE. In the State of Kentucky you count the children from low-income families under the census figures which show 193,559.

Mr. PERKINS. Correct.

Mr. QUIE. Then you added to that 22,000 from AFDC families, 696 students under the AFDC program, 1,588 under the category of neglected or dependent children and 786 foster children. Those are the numbers that are counted in the formula.

In the 1959 census information the State of Kentucky had 88,386 families within the income level of $2,000 to $3,000. So, you see that you are counting about one-fourth of the children between that income level of $2,000 to $3,000.

If you compare that with the State of New York, you will see that they are counting more than the number—more than between $2,000 and $3,000 in that State than they are counting in the State of Kentucky. You are not counting all of the children who reside with families which receive an income below $2,000. In fact in a lot of the States such as Alabama and Mississippi and States of that category, it is absolutely zero as to the number of children that are counted, because in those States they do not pay the amount of AFDC at the level at which some of the wealthier States pay.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, let me say that there is absolute equity and uniformity all the way through this bill.

Mr. QUIE. If that is uniformity, surely I am surprised.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the counting of AFDC children on very recent years data takes care of the great migration into large urban areas of large numbers of children from low-income families which has taken place since the 1960 census.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, I submit to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) that these factors in the formula take into account special needs which cannot be reached with census data.

Mr. QUIE. How can the gentleman say that there is absolutely no discrepancy, when in New York you count the children, and in Kentucky or Louisiana or Mississippi or Alabama you do not count the children, just because their parents do not receive AFDC, because the State decided they would set a different level or a different standard than the other States, because of a certain law which permits some States to set a higher level on AFDC than other States. Thus, Mr. Chairman, the poorer States are penalized in two ways. They do not receive the money for those children coming from families with incomes between $2,000 and $3,000 or they are not covered by the AFDC program. In other words, you have two penalties involved here which means that the wealthier States get more money than the national average and then you let them count children to be covered by the provisions of this bill, children which are not counted in the poorer States. Therefore, on two counts it is inequitable and they are not on a par or at the level of the wealthier States, and I say to the members of the Committee that 2 years is long enough to let this practice stand.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that the formula also includes children from families with incomes of more than $2,000 from AFDC takes into account high cost areas where the $2,000 factor might not portray an equivalent level of poverty.

Although I did not support the AFDC amendment at the time it was adopted in 1965, I believe now there is a lot of equity to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Forty Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 40]

Anderson, Ill.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashley
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Bell, Calif.
Bingham
Blanton
Boggs
Brademas
Brasco
Brock
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Cahill
Camp
Casey
Celler
Chisholm
Clancy
Clark
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fish
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Harsha
Hébert
Jarman
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Keith
Kirwan
Landrum
Long, La.
Lowenstein
McCloskey
MacGregor
Mahon
May
Mayne
Mikva
Monagan
Moorhead
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Ottinger
Philbin
Pike
Podell
Poff
Powell
Purcell
Railsback
Reid, N.Y.
Rivers
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Rumsfeld
St. Onge
Sandman
Scheuer
Sikes
Sisk
Sullivan
Symington
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Tunney
Ullman
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H
Wydler

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 514, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 325 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a message.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1969

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the time of the gentleman from Minnesota had expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Minnesota 5 additional minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, trying to recap the comments that I made during the colloquy that we had, I am making the point that we should not extend this act for a period of more than 2 years because in that time this Congress, together with the administration, can come up with recommendations for plans and improvements and expansion of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for our schools.

Mr. Chairman, one of the biggest reasons for the inequitable formula that we have—and I am not recommending a change in the formula now; we do not have to worry about how this might be changed—but men of good intentions can come up with a much more equitable formula.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the formula is inequitable because if you compare the authorization, if it is fully funded—and that table will be in the RECORD tomorrow for all Members to see as to what the individual States receive—one can see that it is inequitable.

The table follows:

STATE POPULATIONS OF VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN INVOLVED IN TITLE I DISTRIBUTION FORMULA

[5–17 population]

	In families of less than $2,000 income, counted for title I formula, 1959	In families with between $2,000 and $3,000 income, 1959	In AFDC families, 1968
Alabama	242,522	106,386	0
Alaska	4,796	3,180	1,569
Arizona	38,851	25,920	8,635
Arkansas	148,158	68,274	0
California	206,572	151,675	270,200
Colorado	33,581	26,131	17,583
Connecticut	20,731	16,040	24,840
Delaware	7,422	5,269	3,860
Florida	142,533	111,631	0
Georgia	239,789	139,273	0
Hawaii	8,832	7,676	6,303
Idaho	12,257	11,453	4,165
Illinois	147,518	108,747	112,791
Indiana	76,386	56,672	15,831
Iowa	71,789	50,517	17,694
Kansas	40,263	32,751	14,853
Kentucky	193,559	88,386	22,001
Louisiana	201,090	108,155	774
Maine	18,408	19,246	2,812
Maryland	53,716	43,512	38,865
Massachusetts	47,065	41,257	54,831
Michigan	124,712	88,547	73,886
Minnesota	77,280	56,831	25,246
Mississippi	254,903	82,700	0
Missouri	125,159	80,888	18,025

STATE POPULATIONS OF VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF CHILDREN INVOLVED IN TITLE I DISTRIBUTION FORMULA—Con.

[5–17 population]

	In familes of less than $2,000 income, counted for title I formula, 1959	In families with between $2,000 and $3,000 income, 1959	In AFDC families, 1968
Montana	14,106	10,989	2,832
Nebraska	34,417	28,219	8,134
Nevada	3,238	2,392	1,688
New Hampshire	5,932	6,367	2,085
New Jersey	59,845	46,424	64,696
New Mexico	37,554	25,159	11,209
New York	200,060	174,475	338,776
North Carolina	323,096	164,579	11,948
North Dakota	23,346	16,621	3,615
Ohio	151,895	106,511	73,849
Oklahoma	84,779	56,200	27,631
Oregon	23,933	18,666	12,473
Pennsylvania	175,394	147,676	97,515
Rhode Island	12,083	9,651	9,710
South Carolina	206,638	89,918	0
South Dakota	30,712	16,729	4,557
Tennessee	220,048	114,541	0
Texas	398,224	248,802	0
Utah	11,680	9,781	8,119
Vermont	7,208	8,088	2,646
Virginia	167,874	100,691	13,282
Washington	33,072	29,010	24,624
West Virginia	106,406	46,632	12,203
Wisconsin	58,446	51,883	23,295
Wyoming	5,408	4,238	1,502
District of Columbia	14,854	12,366	10,362

You look at the amount you receive now under the present appropriation and you can see that it is inequitable but in a different way. I do not say that it is more inequitable, but is inequitable in a different way because of the percentage of authorization you receive. Really it is inequitable when you consider the children counted, because in every State the same poor children are not counted.

In fact, what it does do is permit the wealthier States on the amount of money they receive as that part of the formula, one-half of the State average, of the children that are counted, to get a greater amount of money than the poorer States.

Mr. Chairman, I shall also place in the RECORD a table which will compare the number of poor children, total number of near-poor children, with those who are not poor, to entitlement under the program.

The purpose of the act is to provide educational assistance to the educationally disadvantaged children, and they only count the poor children as a means of determining in some way or other where those concentrations exist, but it has not turned out that way because there is no requirement on the local schools that they remit the money to the poor children who are counted under the formula.

Some of the States are starting to make some changes. For instance, California now has written in its rules that the same number of children will be benefited as the number that are counted This will not mean the identical ones counted will be the ones that will be benefited, but the same number, so that there will be a concentration of title I funds.

Most of the studies of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act indicate that there ought to be more of a concentration of the programs than presently is the case. Remember, this is categorically aid money to help the educationally disadvantaged, but it is not utilized entirely that way. It has some appearance of what one could call a general aid program.

For instance, the National Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children stated in its report to the President and the Congress this last January:

> Disadvantaged children invariably suffer from a number of forms of deprivation, not just one; they do not need new textbooks or medical care or adequate nutrition or a reduction in class size; but all these and other educational remedies together. Success with these children, in sum, requires a concentration of services on a limited number of children.

One of the amendments that we offered in the committee and propose to offer here is that any appropriations over the amount that was appropriated in 1968 be utilized not according to the entitlement formula here, but as the State education agency determines will go to the areas of greatest need, where the educationally deprived poor families are concentrated and where there is an economic depression in an area. And that amount of money will gain some experience from utilization just in those areas, and nowhere else.

We note from the recommended appropriations in the budget message that we will not have any increase to that extent for title I for fiscal year 1970, but I have the hope that there will be some additional money recommended and appropriated in 1971, and we will see an expansion at that time in the Federal Government assistance to education at the elementary and secondary school levels.

In fact, what I hope we can do in the next 2 years is lay the plans for substantial change and improvement and an increase in the Federal Government's participation in education so that there will be a greater opportunity for education in all areas of the country, because it is important to consider all areas as well as the ones where the poor or deprived children might reside, so that a good education is available for them no matter where they are.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 514, extending the authorization for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the impacted area aid programs for 5 years.

Thomas Jefferson charged a young Nation to "enlighten all our people," and we can set ourselves no more worthy goal. But I think we are agreed on the importance of education and on the fact that the Federal Government must assume a role in assuring to all our citizens an equal opportunity to learn. It is on exactly what that role is and how it can most effectively be played that we differ.

The degree to which ESEA, through its compensatory education programs, has been able to help the disadvantaged child has been emphasized throughout the hearing held by the House committee. Recognizing the handicap suffered by children who lack verbal and language skills, who may be in poor health and lacking adequate nutrition, and whose parents generally have a deficient educational background, these programs have been focused on compensating for these failings and on closing the education gap between these children and their fellow students.

The programs have not been uniformly successful, but we have learned much. We find underscored repeatedly, in the evaluations which the legislation itself requires, that important progress has been made.

In my own State of California, $78 million was received for compensatory education under title I, and 281,865 regularly enrolled students participated in its activities during the 1967–68 school year. Helpful evaluation reports have been made by the California Office of Compensatory Education. Dr. Wilson C. Riles, its director, in submitting his annual report, expresses gratitude to the Congress and the hope that the compensatory aid will continue to receive our priority attention. I would like to share with my colleagues the following excerpt from Dr. Riles' very objective and constructively critical evaluation of the programs:

> The evaluation reports of the school districts also led to these conclusions about Title I in the 1967–68 school year:
>
> As in previous years, the greatest gains continued to be made by students in the elementary grades. However, the gains appeared to be shifting more toward the middle elementary grades, as compared to the primary grades. In the third year of Title I, many students in the middle elementary grades had participated in Title I programs in the primary grades. Also the increased concentration of activities on academic skills tended to favor the older children whose academic deficiencies were more noticeable and thus were more likely to be treated.
>
> While junior high and senior high students continued to show less growth than did elementary students, the differences were less marked. There were indications that some school districts were beginning to concentrate their secondary grade activities on limited, selected students to a greater degree than they did the first two years.
>
> Characteristic of the most successful programs was their concentration of services on a limited number of objectives and a limited number of specifically identified children. These projects focused on two or three activities, adequately funded. On the other hand, there were widespread examples of ineffective projects which (1) attempted to carry out too many, often unreleated, activities with insufficient funding, and (2) scattered the activities over too many children so that the concentration of services was inadequate to improve student achievement level significantly. Dilution of funds and services plus failure to identify and serve specific children with educational deficiencies, was particularly apparent in the big cities and the rural areas. The evaluation results suggest that for optimum effectiveness, the average student expenditure must be more than $300 over and above the regular school program. Title I projects with expenditures of less than $250 per student generally failed to produce substantial results.
>
> The most successful reading projects were those in which students received reading instruction from a reading specialist. These were the "pull-out" programs in which the specialists worked with small groups of children away from the regular classroom on a regular basis. Each child's learning difficulty was carefully diagnosed, and an instructional program tailored to his needs. Records were systematically maintained on his progress in the special reading program, and there was a

> close working relationship between the reading specialist and the classroom teacher. Projects which merely reduced class size or employed teacher aides to enable the classroom teacher to spend more time on reading instruction generally did not result in improved student achievement.
>
> Generally school districts are not providing longitudinal programs for Title I students, but are using a "turnstile" approach. They are serving a new group of students each year, with no assurance that students who participtated in the previous year's activities continue to receive the concentrated services needed to maintain their improved growth rate. This school district practice compounds the continuity problems already existing because of the high mobility rate of students in poverty areas. Consequently, while the academic achievement of the participants improves markedly for the period of time that they are in the Title I program, too often the gains are not cumulative and are not maintained.
>
> The use of the "turnstile" approach is related to the problem previously discussed—the failure of the districts to identify specific children for Title I services. Districts which have maintained longitudinal programs for the same students since the inception of Title I show the best results, with many students achieving at grade level.
>
> In some cases, the districts' attempt to serve all children in the target area led them to change participants not only from year to year, but often several times during the year. In this extreme variation of the "turnstile," students may have received Title I services for only several weeks during the school year.
>
> Late Congressional action on appropriations for Title I continued to have an adverse effect on the quality and continuity of programs. Congress did not determine the amount to be appropriated for Title I until the school year was already underway. School districts were not informed of their official entitlement until February, 1968. Consequently, for most of the school year, school districts operated scale-down programs at a funding level considered to be "safe."
>
> The sporatic, uncertain nature of Title I funding was particularly critical because of the California school districts' emphasis on curriculum programs requiring specialized personnel. School districts were hesitant to commit themselves to year long contracts with teachers because of the uncertainty of funds. By the time the funds became available, the qualified personnel were not available. This resulted in emergency revisions of programs and budgets which were often reflected in quickly planned and poorly implemented end-of-year programs. It also resulted in many children being deprived of services which they would have received had the programs been in operation continuously for the entire school year.

The last point made by Dr. Riles refers to the importance of advance authorization and funding. This was recognized in 1968, when we provided funding through fiscal year 1970, and I feel that H.R. 514, in authorizing a 5-year extension of the program acknowledges anew the urgent need for leadtime in planning programs, securing equipment and supplies, and assigning qualified personnel in advance of school opening each year. I earnestly hope that it will be the pleasure of the Congress to approve this provision.

A second feature of the bill to which I want to call special attention is title VII for bilingual education. The programs being conducted under this title are having a dramatic impact on educational opportunity for children who enter school speaking only a foreign language, the language of their homes, and unable to understand even basic instructions in English. The majority of the projects are for students from Spanish-speaking backgrounds, but Portuguese, French, and Indian students also are benefiting.

Those of us who have watched children go off to school, filled with that wonderful mixture of joyful anticipation and dreadful fear, can only imagine the handicap a child suffers who cannot understand the welcome of his teachers, the chatter of his playmates, and the simple instructions he will be expected to do. Nor can he convey to non-English-speaking parents the many school messages they are expected to heed. Think how welcome greetings and instructions in his native language will be to him and how greatly enriched the other pupils will be to have exposure to bilingual discussion and instructions.

The Office of Education reports that it has received 312 proposals dealing with this special language problem. Of these, only 78 were funded, to serve 139,000 children. But this only begins to develop an area which we should actively cultivate. As we perfect our skills and methodology in introducing a new language and features of a different culture, youngsters will be greatly enriched, and so will our educational institutions.

There is a third, and in my view a most important, feature of H.R. 514 which I want to discuss. This is the inadequacy of its proposed budgets. Great care has been given by the House Committee on Education and Labor to understanding the magnitude of the Nation's educational needs as they have been outlined and defined by school authorities. These needs are real, they are urgent, and the authorization levels reflect their magnitude. But the administration's proposed budget is tragically inadequate for the program as defined by the authorizations, for both ESEA and the Impacted Area Aid Act.

I will append a table showing (A) the authorization for each program in the fiscal year 1970; (B) President Nixon's proposed budget for fiscal 1970; and the difference between (A) and (B) for each program.

To me, it is shocking, given the widespread recognition of the obvious needs—needs apparent to anyone who will visit an inner-city school or talk with an urban school administrator—that the budget for title I, for educationally deprived children, is almost $2 billion less than the proposed congressional authorization. This is totally unacceptable.

If, instead of columns of figures, we would review these budget proposals in terms of what we deny a single child—a child who does not pass an achievement test, who cannot read a colorful book, whose attention span never lengthens, whose daily attendance falls off, who is too hungry or too often ill to go to school, or who does not have adequate clothing—and if we were to multiply these disappointments and failures by the millions of children who will be denied title I services, we would have a better measure of the administration's budget inadequacies.

In total, the budget is $2,879,107,000 below the House committee's suggested 1970 authorization. I appreciate that today we are not considering the appropriations for these programs. I mention them in the hope that the Congress will be aware of the inadequacies of the budget proposals now being submitted to us.

Our distinguished colleagues on the committee, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS), and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY), have stressed this point in their supplemental views to the committee report, that—

> The best effort of the Congress and those who support education must be to secure full funding for the ESEA and the impact aid programs.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 514, I especially applaud the 5-year extension of this authorization and the added focus it gives in the impacted area aid programs top public housing areas. I call special attention to the progress in title I programs in low-income school districts and to its title VI bilingual education programs. And, finally, I urge that we pledge ourselves to seek full funding when, in the near future, these programs are again before us for appropriations.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Title	(A) Fiscal year 1970 authorization	(B) Fiscal year 1970 budget request	(A—B) Difference
ESEA, 1965 (89-10):			
I. Educationally deprived children	$3,142,000,000	$1,226,000,000	$1,916,000,000
II. Library resources textbooks	206,000,000	0	206,000,000
III. Supplementary educational centers and services	566,500,000	116,393,000	450,107,000
V. Grants to strengthen State departments of education	80,000,000	29,750,000	50,250,000
VI. Education to handicapped children	224,000,000	33,250,000	190,750,000
ESEA, 1966 (89-750): Adult education programs	80,000,000	50,000,000	30,000,000
ESEA, 1967 (90-247):			
VII. Bilingual education programs	40,000,000	10,000,000	30,000,000
VIII. Dropout prevention programs	30,000,000	24,000,000	6,000,000
Total	4,368,500,000	1,489,393,000	2,879,107,000
Impact Aid:			
Public Law 91-874: Maintenance and operation	622,000,000	187,000,000	435,000,000
Public Law 81-815: Construction	80,407,000	15,167,000	65,240,000
Total	702,407,000	202,167,000	500,240,000

Source: House Committee on Education and Labor; Bureau of the Budget.

(Mr. PIRNIE (at the request of Mr. SCHERLE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I favor continuation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act because, in my view, there is no domestic priority of greater importance than education. As a result, I plan to support the extension of ESEA, but believe this should be limited to 2 years rather than the 5-year continuation as provided in H.R. 514.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs, which originally were authorized with my support in 1965, have been landmarks in our country's path toward a more fully educated society. By passing that measure 4 years ago, we in Congress made a commitment to the effect that every American child should have the opportunity to obtain proper education. Our reaffirmation of that pledge is represented in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1969.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has provided local educators throughout the country with $3 billion to make possible more effective ways to educate the poor and educationally deprived children of America. It has enabled 16,000 school districts to face the difficult task of educating the underprivileged with something more than good intentions. It has made possible the development of new and more relevant teaching methods and brought food and medical care to those who need it the most. Despite its successes—which have been numerous—it has also highlighted current limitations to the making of giant strides in the education of the poor overnight. Thus, it has helped us to accurately observe that we have much more to do and more to learn about this particular problem before we can ever hope to solve it. Accordingly, it would be unthinkable to now abandon this program.

Yet, I do not favor the 5-year extension of ESEA because I believe the Nixon administration should be afforded the opportunity to outline a program of its own which may or may not indicate other approaches than those contained in this legislation. While I am committed to the proposition that we cannot substantially reduce the education budget, I am not wholly committed to ESEA in its present form as a panacea for America's educational ills. I am concerned, for instance, about the so-called "Youngstown phenomenon"—where entire school systems have to cease all operations due to a lack of operating funds. If this continues to any degree, we may have to reconsider the entire rationale of ESEA's emphasis on categorical funding. Also, we should not be so committed to one approach to a very changing problem that our response to it is obsolete even before it has an opportunity to operate.

For many years I have been vitally interested in Public Law 874, the impacted areas program. This program is important to me, not only because it has a direct and material effect on thousands of schoolchildren in my congressional district, but because it is a program of proven worth, which has contributed significantly to the educational system of this Nation.

Despite the fact that this program of noncategorical aid to school districts has been a model as far as derived educational benefit is concerned, administration after administration has attempted to reduce its funding level. The approaches have been many and varied, but the end objective has been the same—eliminate the impacted areas program. Fortunately, for the schoolchildren in impacted areas, these attempts have repeatedly failed. Congress supports the concept of Public Law 874. Again this year, we are faced with a battle on Public Law 874 due to the decreased allotment to this program in the fiscal year 1970 budget. I am confident that, as before, the Congress will reject the proposed reductions.

I have never been entirely clear as to why the executive branch is opposed to Public Law 874, but I do recognize that there is some merit in the assertion that changes in eligibility may be required. I have taken the position that if revisions are needed—and I think some are in order—they should only be made after a thorough study and hearings by the Education and Labor Committee at which all interested parties will be offered the opportunity to testify. In contrast to this procedure, succeeding administrations have advocated severe appropriation cuts as the mode of change. In my view, such a course is totally unacceptable because it is the prerogative of the Congress to determine which programs are desirable and necessary.

As I previously indicated, several schools in my congressional district are dependent upon Public Law 874 for operating funds. In the Rome, N.Y. School District, for example, over one-third of the students qualify for Public Law 874 designation. Its operating budget is nearly $12 million, of which less than $1 million—or 6.5 percent—is from Public Law 874. Interestingly enough, of the 4,000 federally affected students in Rome, approximately 2,800 are in the "B" category—parents who live off—but work on Federal property—with the remaining 1,200 in the "A" category—parents who live and work on Federal property.

This is important because most of the efforts to cut Public Law 874 funding have been directed at the "B" category in which about 85 percent of the Nation's federally affected students are classified. In Rome, the figure is 70 percent. The fact that most of the impacted area students are in the "B" category and that the major reduction proposals have been directed against this category, merely serves to reinforce the view that the efforts to cut Public Law 874 are, in reality, designed to eliminate the program.

I read with great interest HEW Secretary Finch's statement to the Education and Labor Committee on all the Federal elementary and secondary education programs, and share with him the view that our educational system is in a "crisis." I applaud his support of "the concept of advance funding for education programs in order to assure more orderly planning and expenditure of funds by State and local agencies." Also his endorsement of "long-term authorization of proven programs to give greater flexibility to efforts to strengthen the educational system" is noteworthy.

In light of these remarks and the general philosophy of education he expressed, I was shocked to read of his proposal to amend Public Law 874 relative to funding in total the "A" category students before granting funds for "B" category students whenever less than full funding was appropriated. It should be recalled that former President Johnson took a similar position last July when he refused to allow $91 million appropriated by the Congress to be used for Public Law 874. In response, the Congress merely reappropriated the funds and excluded them from the expenditure reduction. I am confident that it will do so again if necessary.

However, I am also concerned about this amendment for substantive reasons. It is not only discriminatory to those school districts having a larger concentration of "B" than "A" students, but it is completely inconsistent with the Secretary's remarks regarding advance funding and long-term authorizations. On the one hand, HEW advocates these progressive concepts and, on the other, proposes the exact opposite. It should be noted that as far as Public Law 874 is concerned, the practice is also opposite to the theory. For example, during the 90th Congress we appropriated $505.9 million for Public Law 874. This amount provided about 90 percent entitlement for all the impacted school districts in America. In previous years, the initial payment of these districts has been around 75 percent of entitlement, and it comes at a time when the districts need it—usually in late January or early February. This fiscal year, however, a decision was made to allow only one-half of that $505.9 million Congress appropriated to be allocable to fiscal year 1969, with the rest to be forwarded to the districts in early fiscal year 1970. As a result, the initial payment this year averaged about 35 percent for most of the districts—40-percent less than the amount anticipated. In my district, the situation was somewhat better because of the severe impact of the Rome district which received an initial payment of nearly 45 percent. Nevertheless, the situation for the Rome School District is critical because the money is needed now in order to continue to meet payrolls and operating expenses.

There are other arguments against the proposed amendment upon which I would like to touch briefly. As Secretary Finch indicated, the Battelle Memorial Institute is now conducting a study of the impacted areas program. It is scheduled for completion at the end of the year. As I understand it, this inquiry is directed at reviewing the concept and practice of Public Law 874 and will include recommendations for change. In light of this development, I see no reason to make authorization changes at this time when, in all probability, additional alterations will be in order in about 12 months.

I think this same rule should be applied when considering the amendment adopted by the committee to establish a new authorization under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 of Federal payments to school districts for the children of families living in public housing projects. This very proposal is one of the items contained in the Battelle study, and we should await the recommendations of that inquiry which will be made available late this year. I hasten to add there is doubtless considerable merit in this amendment in light of the educational crisis in our cities. However, in my view, we should not adopt this or any other new educational programs until the ones which have proved worthwhile have been funded adequately.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, the House is scheduled to take up one of the greatest pieces of educational legislation yet seen in this country.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 already has proven itself as a program which, perhaps as much as any other single program, can and does work to raise the standards of many of our underprivileged youngsters, with a corresponding improvement in teaching techniques and methods to serve all our school-age citizens.

This is a program in which I have been most interested. It was one of the first major pieces of new educational legislation on which I voted after coming to Congress, and it has been a source of inspiration to follow its progress.

At this point, I believe Chairman PERKINS and the members of his committee are due a special word of praise for the diligence with which they have pursued this program and its goal of improving the level of education across the board. This program works to assure that each student, no matter what his background, is given the opportunity to have the kind of schooling which will enable him to enter college or to pursue other educational activities. This is a worthy goal, and it is one most in keeping with the spirit of free American education.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, I conducted a small survey of many of the leading ESEA educators in my district to get their reactions to this program. A questionnaire went out to every school board member, superintendent, and school principal asking, generally, their reactions to certain features of the ESEA program.

Since I was more interested in their general reactions than in responses to specific items, the questionnaire was quite general in nature, and the five questions asked dealt with: First, whether they felt the program has been operating well; second, whether they felt the program was properly oriented to reach its goal of improving the overall standard of education across the country; third, whether they felt they had been impaired by excessive influence in operating under ESEA programs; fourth, whether they felt title I had brought significant results; and fifth, which portion of the program was most important.

The responses came in great number and the weight of the opinions expressed was overwhelmingly favorable. Completed answers were received from about 175 educators and administrators and better than 145 of them indicated strong, unhesitating approval of the general goals and operations of the program. This is better than 92 percent, and I would note that the opinions reflect the views of people working with the program in every phase, and at every level—in the classroom, in administrative offices, and at school board policy meetings.

So, in general, the single strongest message registered from this questionnaire was that the program has been good.

I would like to touch on several other items that were included in the questionnaire, and I feel it might be helpful to the membership if we could review them in light of our consideration of the proposed 5-year extension.

Probably the single specific aspect of the program which brought greatest comment was title I. Over 110 of the responses, or about 62 percent indicated specifically that this title has brought significant results in improved teaching techniques of educationally deprived children.

In addition, some 40 educators, or about 22 percent, indicated specific favorable comment on Headstart and preschool programs, even though the questionnaire did not call for specific comments on those or similar programs. The opinion was expressed on several returns that the Office of Education could probably do a better job with Headstart, and there was strong support for the preschool programs, especially among the elementary and secondary educators—those who should know most about them.

Probably the most widely voiced complaint about the program dealt with the fact that too much paperwork is involved. In response to the inquiry as to whether the educator felt he had been "impaired by excessive influence in operating under ESEA programs," only about 28 indicated that they had, but a sizable portion in this group—about 22—indicated that one of the major reasons for this was that the paperwork and reports were too time consuming and restrictive. Also, there were several comments to the effect that the controls were not restrictive in the operating stage, but were somewhat restrictive in the planning.

Perhaps one of the reasons for the number of comments along these lines is seen in the so-called consolidated application system followed in Texas. Under this arrangement, each independent school district will work up its own program and prospective entitlement for the various titles and submit its application to the Texas Education Agency. I understand that strong efforts are underway to improve these procedures, and I feel encouraged that once this is done, we will see more expeditious arrangements. Hopefully this will also result in greater attention to one of the goals of title I to allow each local district its own free choice in selecting the kind of program needed to respond to its educational needs.

The uncertainty of funding is still a source of considerable concern to many of those who responded. From reading the answers, I noticed that those expressing this concern generally were the school board members and others in positions requiring advance planning on budgets. In all, 17 indicated a specific and usually strong concern about the lateness and uncertainty of funding, and I believe this indicates that either the impact of the 1967 amendments have not yet been felt, or else that a greater effort is needed to get school districts informed early of their funding levels. As you recall, Mr. Chairman, title IV of the 1967 amendments authorized appropriations 2 years, rather than 1, in advance in an effort to solve precisely this problem.

As I indicated earlier, there was a great deal of favorable comment on Headstart and preschool training. In addition to these topics, I would note that there was a measurable amount of support on the need for wider application of vocational training at the higher levels, and the possible inclusion of vocational training programs in every school district.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that my report to the House on this necessarily must be on such a methodical basis. If you had the opportunity to read through all of the comments I received, I believe you would feel a much deeper sense of the meaning these programs are having.

At this point, I would simply like to repeat several of the representative comments I received on the major topics. On title I:

> "Small districts such as ours have reaped vast benefits from the Title I programs."
>
> "Title I has helped our school more than anything in which we have become involved."
>
> "Definite results from Title I are noticeable. Even though not measurable by tests, the greatest improvements are probably in attitudes and feelings of personal worth among students."
>
> "As a result of Title I programs, our attendance has increased, our health problems have decreased, our drop-outs have lessened and the achievement level of our students has increased."

On where greater emphasis is needed in the future—on Title I and II:

> "More money should be placed here. If necessary, sacrifice other titles."
>
> "Early childhood education (preschool) and the health programs have proven most valuable in our district. We would like to see these two programs, especially, given top priority."
>
> "The fact that educators have learned the importance of identifying those students with learning disabilities regardless of the cause has been the one most important phases of ESEA. Evaluation has shown a marked improvement as a result of identifying learning disabilities and designing programs to deal with the individual case."

On title I:

> "The reason is that under Title I, there is a broader service level. Because of these broader services, this area should be given greater emphasis."
>
> "I especially like Title II since textbooks, library books and other tangible instructional materials were made quickly available. Increased support could be utilized in this case. Also, I feel that Title I has been of great value, but its effectiveness could be better realized if the guidelines of its use were focused more on the individual school."
>
> "Each area has merit which is unique to a given situation. Perhaps increased allocations for food and medical care would be an area needing emphasis. Para-professionals to aid the teachers would enable more individual help."

Two final general comments, I felt, summed up more than any others, the needs seen in the programs by educators at various vantage points. The first com-from a school superintendent and the second from an elementary school principal.

> "There seems to be a tendency to overemphasize the importance and subsequently the required quantity of supporting, evaluative and other types of data. Reports and applications are now voluminous. It is difficult, if not impossible, to implement the program with personnel allocated under the programs. More freedom in usage of clerical help would help the local district a great deal."
>
> "I am sure there is possibly some waste in the various programs, but I feel that we have and are continuing to make the best use possible of these funds. Our programs appear to be making a difference in the attitude of the public in general not just school-age children alone. It is my sincere desire that these and other programs yet to be initiated will continue so that each child may achieve and grow to his greatest potential and become a productive citizen in our 'land of plenty.'"

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and commend the gentleman from Kentucky for bringing it before the House.

Four years ago when this legislation was first presented to the House of Representatives, there was grave concern about the wisdom of this legislation. But today, as we look at the financial crises in school district after school district in America, we can only say thank God that Congress had the wisdom to bring some meaningful assistance to school districts of this country 4 years ago, particularly in the respective titles that we have in this bill.

Today we are facing the situation of the school districts across the country being faced with the prospect of being shut down. In my own city, the school superintendent announced over the weekend that he will be forced to lay off 7,500 teachers after Labor Day; that he would have to increase the size of the classrooms to 47 youngsters per classroom; and most probably would have to eliminate the summer schools this year; and reduce all other services.

So we can fully appreciate that if it were not for this program, any compensatory education now being given to youngsters who need it the most would be out of the question.

In school district after school district in the country, local communities and the local school superintendents are faced with the crisis of keeping their school plants going, and can give absolutely no thought to funding of any programs that would help disadvantaged youngsters in this country so they can have some sort of respectable and appreciable norm in education.

Even though we have heard a great deal of criticism and I am among those who has recognized that this has not worked as well as it could have worked in every school district in the country, and I am well aware of the fact that in many communities a better job could be done with the money we send them, the fact of the matter is that when we look at the overall situation most youngsters are getting very desperately needed compensatory education such as remedial reading, assistance in mathematics, assistance in spelling and we can take pride in this legislation.

This legislation has also brought a great deal of assistance under title II. During the Easter recess I had occasion to visit many schools in my district. It is rather significant to see the enthusiasm that the teachers show for this title now that help from this title is starting to reach them.

Certainly, under title III we have seen some dramatic breakthroughs in new educational techniques. All across this country, Mr. Chairman, we find a very carefully laid out program of assistance to the local communities.

One of the things that I am particularly pleased with is when we first debated this bill and first presented this concept of assistance to local communities, there was substantial fear—legitimate, valid fear—on the part of Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle that this Federal assistance might mean also some Federal controls.

It was encouraging, as witness after witness came before our committee and as we asked these local school administrators whether or not there was any effort at controls from the Federal level that the testimony showed clearly that there was not.

I am hopeful that the Commissioner of Education, when he takes over his duties on May 1, will heed the plea of the witnesses before our committee and reduce the amount of paperwork and reduce the amount of reporting that they have to engage in.

But basically the testimony incorporated in our hearings on this bill clearly indicates that superintendent after superintendent has come before our committee and has pleaded with the Congress to continue this program basically in its pending pleasant form.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman on the splendid statement the gentleman from Illinois is making.

The gentleman's statement reflects very, very much the sentiment of the school people, as you might call them, in the district I represent.

Visiting in northeastern Oklahoma during recent weeks, I have heard over and over again from teachers and from school board members and from superintendents the substance of what the gentleman has so well said here on the floor of the House today—in other words, that this committee plea for timely and adequate funding of the Government's program is the most urgently needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do not know when I have read, in two or three paragraphs, a better statement of what seems to me to be a very strong grassroots feeling about a program than I have found here in the general statement which appears at the start of the report of this committee. I wish to compliment the committee upon really reporting to the House what seems to be as solid and as universal a feeling about a program as I have found in connection with any program of our Government in a long time. There is urgent need for long-term planning and for knowing well in advance what kind of program we will have in education. We are seeing serious delays and serious breakdowns in this machinery by reason of our failure to give long-term authorization to this program in the past.

I wish to state my support for H.R. 514 and to compliment the committee, its chairman and members, for an excellent job on this report.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman on the funding of this program. The only weakness we have found in this program has been underfunding. It does occur to me somewhat incongruous that when a committee of the Congress, such as the House Education and Labor Committee, after holding exhaustive hearings on a subject such as the needs of our schools, and brings before the House a bill that is endorsed and supported overwhelmingly on both sides of the aisle, and supported overwhelmingly on both sides of the aisle in the other Chamber—it does seem somewhat incongruous to me to see the Appropriations Committee reduce the authorization through the appropriation to the extent they have.

This bill has been carefully put together. It does meet the needs of this country, and it does provide the tools for local school administrators to bring these youngsters out of disadvantaged areas to a norm and a par at which they can compete in the educational spectrum the rest of their lives. But I say that for the Appropriations Committee not to fund this bill, to a great extent, in my judgment, makes a mockery of the legislative process.

I hope that this debate will elicit and will show the tremendous contribution that is available to school districts if we can get this bill funded. Witness after witness has supported the bill. The only complaint we have had from witnesses before us is that they did not get it sufficiently funded.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman in the well for a splendid statement. I agree with him completely. The only complaint I have ever heard about this program is contained in the question, How can you plan without an extended term? It seems to me it makes as much sense to have this program limited to 2 years as it would to limit the Post Office authorization to 2 years. We have to give the professionals in the teaching field time to plan. That is the only complaint about this program.

I wish to compliment the chairman of the committee and all members of the committee for the splendid work they have done and, together with the gentleman in the well, I urge that we extend the authorization for at least 5 years, and that we plan for longer extensions. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman from Montana. The gentleman has pointed out the problems schools are now having in trying to meet their financial needs with their own resources. It does compound the situation considerably when they cannot make appreciable long-range planning with these funds. I am mindful that the problem is not with the authorization; the problem is with the appropriation. The authorization must be made here, and I hope we will be able to approve this bill for a term at least long enough to give the school districts some opportunity to engage in long-range planning.

Finally, I would like to reiterate what I said earlier. It is my sincere hope that this good bill, a bill that holds out so much promise for the youngsters of America, is not going to be buried in an avalanche of reporting and redtape. If there was one thing the witnesses testified to—it had nothing to do with the validity of the bill—it was criticism of the length of time and the tremendous amount of effort they had to give to filling out reports. It is my hope that the Commissioner of Education will cut through all that redtape.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Erlenborn).

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. I think the timing is exceedingly fortuitous, since my colleague from Illinois just talked about the avalanche of redtape and reports that the school administrators around the country have to go through in order to get this Federal aid to education, because I am going to address my remarks to this very problem.

Mr. Chairman, I think that every Member of this House would agree that the task of applying for, accounting for, and administering Federal grants has become a major concern of State and local governments. I imagine that almost every Member would agree that the multiplicity of Federal grants for a vast variety of purposes imposes an increasing burden on these governments which we should try to alleviate to the extent possible. Certainly many of us feel that the Federal Government and the Congress in particular should be making a really major effort to combine similar Federal grant programs and to eliminate unnecessary duplication and overlapping.

While the details of such efforts may well produce considerable disagreement, I think that the principle of program consolidation has very wide support in both political parties and from the general public. One objective should be unanimously endorsed—the achievement of the maximum effectiveness of Federal expenditures in producing the desired results. Nobody defends an outright waste of funds.

Yet Federal educational funds are being wasted today in needless duplication of paperwork in making separate applications and separate accountings in very closely related programs for local schools.

The February 1969 issue of the official publication of the U.S. Office of Education, "American Education," lists 118 separate Federal-aid programs administered by that Office. Many of these are State grant programs for the improvement of elementary and secondary schools—the very subject we are dealing with in the bill before us—and each requires a separate administrative process from beginning to end. A number of them are so similar in purpose and procedure as to be virtually indistinguishable.

In my judgment the time has come to begin putting some of these programs together and to simplify their administration. Local school administrators, particularly, are beginning to drown in a veritable sea of Federal redtape.

The problem with efforts at consolidation of these programs in the past has been too much was attempted at one time. Thus the 1967 Quie amendment—which I supported and would support again—attempted to reform the distribution formula in title I of ESEA at the same time that consolidation was attempted. The amendment made perfect sense, but it was open to attack from all sorts of special interests who feared any major change in the pattern of this assistance.

One of these special interests was the U.S. Office of Education—which fought the amendment largely because it removed title III—supplemental centers—from direct Federal administration and turned the responsibility over to the States. The amendment was defeated—but the very next amendment to be offered was that of the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. Green), which related only to title III and turned its administration over to the States. The Green amendment was adopted and is now law.

Mrs. Green demonstrated that important steps in this field are best taken one at a time.

I shall propose an amendment that takes one additional step; the combining of four State-grant programs into a single State-grant program for the same purposes.

These four programs are: title III–A—instructional equipment — and V–A — guidance and testing—of NDEA; and titles II—school library materials—and III—supplementary educational services—of ESEA.

Each of these programs involves grants to the States for elementary and secondary schools;

Each is administered at the Federal level by the Commissioner of Education and at the State level by the State educational agencies;

In each program the distribution within the State is determined by the State agency in accordance with a plan approved by the Commissioner;

The distribution of Federal funds between the States in each program is figured on the basis of population.

My amendment will combine these programs for the same purposes, with a single simple distribution formula on school-age population, a single State plan, a single local application, and a single accounting requirement. If we are ever to take any step at all toward program consolidation in education, this is the most modest step that could be taken and have any meaning. If we cannot take this modest first step, then we cannot hope to simplify these programs and reduce the burden of paperwork.

The amendment would make only two really substantive changes in the existing four programs.

First, it would eliminate the matching requirements from the two NDEA titles. For the most part, matching is something of a fiction for accounting purposes in which normal expenditures are written off as State or local matching. Unfortunately, where it has real effect is in the poorest school districts, where participation is either eliminated or curtailed because of the requirement. Moreover, since school expenditures have been rising in every State without regard to the existence of Federal matching funds, such requirements appear unnecessary as a stimulous to State and local spending for schools. The Elementary-Secondary Act has no matching requirements, so this makes for more consistency between the various aid programs.

The second substantive change is to make the NDEA programs consistent with the ESEA programs in the treatment of nonpublic school pupils and teachers. One of the great breakthroughs of ESEA in 1965 was the development of means of breaking the public school-private school impasse. In title II of the act this is accomplished by making available to nonpublic schools a wide variety of school library resources on a loan basis, with title to the material and books remaining in the public schools.

Under title II over 90 percent of the funds have gone for the purchase of encyclopedias, films, film strips, microfilmed materials, and reference works for school libraries, public and private. Only about 4 percent of the funds have been spent for textbooks which were directly loaned to children.

This has been a very successful program, but it has created an anomalous situation in the law—private school libraries can borrow a film or filmstrip for instructional purposes, but cannot borrow a movie projector or overhead projector to show the material; they can borrow a set of science encyclopedias but not a microscope for the laboratory. There is no legal distinction possible between these types of materials and equipments, and I know of no educational justification for loaning one but not the other.

Accordingly, my amendment would make instructional equipment purchased with NDEA funds available to nonpublic schools on a loan basis in exactly the same way that library materials are made available under title II of ESEA.

I think that our committee made a tremendous mistake in rejecting this amendment. I shall ask the House to correct that mistake. This is an extremely limited step in the direction of consolidated overlapping Federal programs, but we must start somewhere.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr.

PEPPER). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute, and ask the gentleman if he will yield to me.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me 1 minute, and I am happy to yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I take it the gentleman intends to offer the same amendment he offered in the committee in connection with the consolidation of titles?

Mr. ERLENBORN. The gentleman makes a correct assumption.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe I am correct in stating that in the Nixon budget there are no funds for title III of the NDEA Act, part A or part B, and no funds for title V, guidance and counseling.

Also, there are no funds for title II of of the ESEA and we only have in the Nixon budget $116 million for title III. However, I am most hopeful that the Democrats on this side will not vote for that amendment because it is a face-saving amendment to get the administration off the hook if we go ahead and enact your amendment, because then there are no funds in these different titles.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Is it not also true that your amendment will have no effect on 1970 for which the Nixon budget was proposed?

Mr. ERLENBORN. The gentleman is exactly correct. The authorization for 1970 is already on the books. We are now dealing with a period beyond the 1970 fiscal year. So the gentleman is exactly correct. It will have no effect on the 1970 fiscal year.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. There is no worry about a hasty change from the four titles to the consolidated title, either, because we have longer than a year for the administration to prepare a way for that kind of program.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I think it is obvious that we will have at least a year's lead-time to prepare for this.

Mr. QUIE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield.

Mr. QUIE. As to anyone who is concerned about title III(b), which was adopted in the last Congress but never funded, it is not proposed to be consolidated, either, because that stood by itself.

Mr. ERLENBORN. The gentleman is correct. Only III(a) is intended to be consolidated by this amendment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I promised to yield to the gentleman from New York, and I will yield to him.

Mr. CAREY. I appreciate the gentleman's reference to title II, which was my contribution to the act of 1965 and which helped to bring it into existence.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I compliment the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. I am really humble and proud at the same time that so many of my colleagues now see the virtue of this particular amendment. If the gentleman from Minnesota has read it correctly and as the gentleman in the well has spoken to the amendment, as I see it, it would spring into life with your amendment in 1970 and restore some glamor to title II which is not now seen by the Bureau of the Budget of the incumbent administration. So if I may say so, from here on in, in terms of putting money into title II, it would be stillborn for this year and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN) would bring it back to life in 1970. I would rather see it kept alive now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) 15 minutes.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time, again, to pay my deep respect to the chairman of this committee and to all of my colleagues on the majority side. I give as much respect as is their due in the light of my long experience to my colleagues on the minority side. Again we bring forth to great prominence and preeminence in this Congress a matter which is of utmost importance to all of the people of our country; namely, the bill that does the most for the most Americans, our 65 million schoolchildren. This is the key bill of our times. I think our President save one indicated that he counted this bill as the landmark legislation of his lifetime. We are here today not heralding any new venture, but carrying on our common commitment. We are simply recognizing that what we deal with here is the most popular bill with the most people in its present form. The schoolmasters want the bill, the children want the bill, the parents want the bill, the cities need the bill, the rural areas must have the bill, and the only thing we do here today is to give them reassurance and built-in confidence in their purpose and ours—to deliver upon our promise of excellence, equality, and opportunity in education for all children according to their needs.

I have been away from the committee just a little while out in the environs of the cities and I can tell you the first thing that we need today in urban America and rural America is a sense of public confidence in our Government; that we say what we mean and mean what we say. We must say that.

We are not here today with Federal programs and gone tomorrow. This bill is the basic undergirding of the school systems of our country. For the first time in our history in 1965 we legislated a program of Federal, national interest in the children of our schools. If everyone knew what a school man had to go through in order to grope for money and grapple for pennies today with which to meet the budget we would not dally with this bill. The school administrator must cope with the needs of the teachers who want to keep pace with other professionals in terms of salaries with which to pay the advancing cost of living in every section of America. They are as similarly affected with inflation, and with every other item of living cost as are other Americans. The very least we can do for them is to tell them that this program is going to be here tomorrow, that it is going to be here in 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, and 1974. The problems with which the superintendent has to deal have taken his whole lifetime to prepare him to contend with the challenge of today's education. Therefore, to suggest that a 2-year bill is enough for now is to tell him that he cannot go beyond next year's budget in terms of counting on the Federal share of the educational coupling that he needs to keep the movement going in terms of quality. The 5-year bill is the only bill that really expresses itself in terms of public confidence.

What we have already done has earned us the gratitude of all men because we had the courage to do it just 4 years ago. Now let us live up to the responsibility given us by going forward for 5 short years.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard much about the formula. I was one of those who dealt, inside and outside, with the formula when it was first compounded. I recognized that my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE), was not entirely satisfied in the early days of this program with this formula and that the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the full Committee on Education and Labor, was not entirely satisfied with the items contained in the formula. Nor was I, coming from the State of New York, nor were many others including the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LANDRUM), entirely satisfied. But this bill is an essential compromise and the formula has this great virtue in that it commends itself to all and satisfies none. Yet when we compare it with other formulas that have been worked out and put into use in this country with great effect, it is at least as good and in many parts much better than the other formulas which have been long hailed and saluted by the Congress as really doing the job that needs to be done with Federal money.

I shall select my own home State, the State of New York, and compare this formula with the Hill-Burton formula as I compare the formula contained in this bill with the Hill-Burton formula which has long been called inviolate and as a real good method by which to disburse Federal money. I find that under title I, of $1 billion my home State would receive $116 million under this formula, but under the Hill-Burton formula it received only $60 million. For New York that is a good formula. As I look at the merits of the formulas involved I find that under this bill of $1 billion disbursement, at least the State of South Carolina would get $31 million of the allocation. But under the proposed formula of the Hill-Burton Act, it would only receive $20 million of a given $1 billion.

If we go to State after State we will, of course, find some variations. I feel sorry for the great State of Connecticut because the State of Connecticut drops down and under the formula as contained in this bill Connecticut would receive only 7 percent of a given $1 million while under the Hill-Burton Act it receives 10 percent.

Poor old Connecticut.

But I would predict to you that every Connecticut legislator who comes down the aisle when the formula is debated and is voted on by tellers, will probably vote for the formula that is in this bill because they know, as good legislators, that this formula was carefully calculated and very carefully contrived, and therefore should not be tampered with for this very, very significant reason: I have learned in my 9 years here in this body that you had better respect at least one segment of the House. When the great chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means comes to this well he defies us all and impresses us with his perspicacity and his knowledge of his bill, it usually deals with the very complex items of taxation, welfare, social security, and other key matters that deal with the quality of American lives. He knows his work so well that he always comes here secure in the knowledge that he needs a closed rule—a closed rule—because if you try to tinker with the mathematics that are involved you will so completely confuse the money supply of the country that we will be left in chaos because a rash of amendments would be unthinkable. We always have a closed rule therefore because of the complexity of the system with which we deal.

The same principle applies here due to the complexity of this formula, which deals with the very lives of the poor children of our country. Nonetheless we are told that we can write a new formula upon the floor.

I suggest this: that given the 5 years' advance funding of this bill, we can consult with the good minds who are bound up in the Committee on Ways and Means, and other places, and we can computerize the House, we can computerize the Committee on Education and Labor, we can gain from the experience in the field of the schoolmasters, and we can come back to here to write the best formula ever conceived by the mind of man. But let us not try to change the formula from the floor. It is not done by the Committee on Ways and Means, and it should not be done by the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Who is proposing to change the formula on the floor?

Mr. CAREY. The substitute, of course, would call for a complete change of the formula because it would introduce some kind of a systematic block grant. I suggest this: A systematic block grant is in reality a new disbursal of funds in different directions according to what the gentleman from Minnesota feels would be best for the country, but I do not believe that on his side there is any group of schoolmen who really believe we should change the formula at this time, because the key to this bill is this—that for the first time we have taken advantage of the impact theory, and have used the impact theory to drive the Federal dollar into the target districts where the disadvantaged and deprived children are found. And the money has been going there, I can testify to this, because in my county there are more poor children than there are in the whole State of Minnesota, and the money has been going in there and they are entitled to it.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will yield further, I am really interested in that substitute. I believe I have seen all the amendments that have been proposed on this side, and the substitute that will probably be offered, and I have not seen one yet that proposes a change.

Mr. CAREY. Then the gentleman agrees that the formula is all right, and so we might as well stay with it for 5 years.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman does not so agree, but the gentleman wants to know what the gentleman from New York is arguing against.

Mr. CAREY. I am arguing against the theory that you can rewrite this bill on the floor, when all we should really do——

Mr. QUIE. Not rewriting the formula, rewrite the bill. There is nothing wrong with rewriting the bill.

Mr. CAREY. The gentleman and I have been down the road on block grants before. We have been down that road so many times that in a sense I think we sometimes meet each other at intersections occasionally. And one intersection that I recall was when the gentleman found that possibly the people from the non-public-school areas could not buy his block grant idea because it put them right back where they were in 1965 before we had this bill.

Mr. QUIE. I do not know what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. CAREY. In the Erlenborn substitute——

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, regular order. I decline to yield further until I finish this statement.

The Erlenborn idea now seems to be that we will expand title II and we will put more things in title II, and that will be such a beautiful title that everybody will applaud it. It will make everybody happy because title II is the block grant or State plan system—and becomes the ideal vehicle for multipurpose categorical and noncategorical aid, whatever that may mean.

I would like to go along with such good ideas, but there is one rule I have learned in this House; if you want to advance an idea, put your money up first and then back it up with the idea.

You know very well that the administration which you support, and which I support now, because it is my administration as well, has told us and forewarned us that they do not intend to fund title II. You cannot put the schoolchildren of this country into a title with an empty basket and say, "Eat" because there is nothing there for them to eat. The administration is not going to fund the title into which you want to crowd new programs in your substitute. Is that not true?

Can the gentleman answer that question?

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. There is no proposed change in title I that the gentleman has been arguing about.

Mr. CAREY. Then we might as well go along with the 5-year extension of the title.

Mr. QUIE. No, no; read my remarks.

Mr. CAREY. I would like to hear them now. If there is no change, then why not go along with the 5 years?

Mr. QUIE. All right; I will tell you why. Because the formula is inequitable and cannot be permitted to run for 5 years—because some States receive so much more per poor child than other States. Some States count so many more poor children than other States.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further at this point. The greatest inequity of all that is visited upon the school districts of this country is this: You talk about changing the formula; 2 years hence you propound an unknown quantity which they cannot grind into their computers. When you tell them the school formula that we have now will be changed in the near future and you are building up a quandary and instability that the children and the schoolmen cannot tolerate.

I live in a city where the biggest problem is the changing school system. We are subdividing into possibly 30 new districts. Local school boards that never have had to contend with a formula may be grappling with the level of Federal input. If you are going to tell them that this is subject to change tomorrow, or on short notice, they will be confused and confounded.

At least give them the sustenance that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) will be around here 5 years from now still working on their problems on the present basic minimum formula.

After that we can add increments or increase over the basic minimum and for 5 years we can talk about that.

Do not convey a lack of confidence in the school system at this counting by short-term funding of a long-term problem.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he endorsed the procedure by the House of Representatives to consider tax bills under a closed rule.

Mr. CAREY. No, no, I was just recognizing the inevitable.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman was recognizing the inevitable? What is inevitable about it?

Mr. CAREY. There has always been a closed rule, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSS. I do not accept that as being inevitable. I hope the House someday would come to its senses and stop this business of considering tax bills under a closed rule.

Mr. CAREY. The gentleman and I have had some fine colloquies here over the years. I think I recall the last change on the social security and welfare bill that came to the floor of the House. Before it came here I went to the Committee on Rules and asked for a modified closed rule—or a modified open rule, whichever way you care to phrase it—in order to see if we could get a little daylight into that bill.

I was very much alone—a few people came behind me but the gentleman later I think, told me that this was a good opportunity to do so.

But as long as that kind of situation does exist in the House of Representatives, the gentleman does recognize that the reason for such a situation existing is because of the nonfeasibility of writing a complex formula on the floor of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. All I am suggesting here is that we recognize the reality of the situation. Under the stress of current difficulties abroad and at home we know that no more money is going to be put into this bill. We know that no additional support is in the offing. We are doing the best we can with what we have. We know that if this bill had expanded and moved in the direction its authors first had anticipated, we would not be dealing with the minimal support we have to contend with now. We would be dealing with a bill which would be at the point of $3.5 billion or more in title I alone. Then we could invite all the new and good ideas that we are hearing from all sides. But at this time what our minority friends are saying to us is, "Let us transform the bill in every form. Let us change it in every function. Let us redirect it in this title and that. Let us change the approach. Let us go in terms of block grants. Let us try something in terms of local autonomy. But not one more dollar or small change in money while we make big changes in language.

I say that the school people of this country will tell us, yes, form is important and adjectives are important. But substance is the order of the day. How much more money can we get for this bill? Why are we taking 4 hours here today to talk about the very same technical language that we passed 4 years ago? Why are we not talking about what you and I are going to do, I hope, I say to the gentleman from Minnesota, when the appropriation bill comes before this House. Will you join me to do all we can in any way to preserve title II, which the administration has said is not worth one single dollar in its esteem? Will the gentleman help me on that day to get the money back in the appropriation?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota to answer that question.

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentleman, the security he wants to give to the local schools will not be there, because there is a census coming up in 1970, and that will change the formula completely.

Mr. CAREY. I am going to be right with the gentleman in 1970, I hope, because when the census comes forth we will have a new basis for recomputation, and, hopefully, we will have some more money coming in from Mr. Arthur Burns or Mr. Paul McCracken to back up the census. The census will tell you a number of things. It will tell you that there are 1 million more poor people in New York, but not one additional dollar will there be for .them under this present administration unless you put it there. The census will show us where the people are, and we will see that enough money has not been reaching the children. The gentleman has seen that every single dollar of title I money has been taken up like a drop of water in a scorched desert in the school districts of the big cities. There is no waste there. There is great want there. If we try to redirect the Federal school aid stream at this time, I have to ask you this question: How many times can you divide a drop before it evaporates? How many times can you retrace a trickle before it is parched on the scorched earth of the big cities?

Please do not talk about changing this bill except in one direction: Put more money where you want to help the children. Get the authorization forward 5 years. Get to the Appropriations Committee with a sense of confidence. Tell them we will accept nothing less than the authorizations we have enacted for 4 long years. This is where we need help in the reformation of this bill. If all the guile, and I say if all the intelligence and dedication of my good friends on the minority side were directed toward the Appropriations Committee as we will direct our advice to the Appropriations Committee on our side, we may say there is heralded a great day for the school systems of this country. We are going to put the money in this bill that belongs there.

I remember how well the present Secretary of Defense, our former colleague Mel Laird, and how well the gentleman from Minnesota stood up in this well and said to me and convinced me that we cannot afford guns and butter. How often they said it and how well they said it. We cannot afford guns and butter. Now you are telling me we cannot afford guns and books. I suggest that we agree on that now. I am one of those who believe that we must cut back in many ways on defense appropriations. But we cannot afford to cut back on the books, the media, and the support of the schools of this country.

Admiral Rickover has told us that education is our first line of defense. Do not drop back from the defense of our schools by short-term authorizations or short change appropriations.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Meeds) such time as he may require.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, 4 years ago it was my honor and pleasure to vote "aye" on the question of reporting the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 from the Education and Labor Committee.

Three weeks later we passed this great bill.

These were the halcyon days of congressional insurgence against the multitude of social ills.

And this was the act that lifted a million hopes.

Today, as we prepare to take up H.R. 514, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969, we might ask whether these hopes have been fulfilled.

We know that by 1968 more than 9 million American children were being served by title I programs in 16,000 school districts.

But has promise equaled performance? Quality education, especially for disadvantaged children, is a delicate commodity not easily measured by statistics.

Hearings before our committee and outside reports indicate that the act is succeeding. But these same sources also convince us that the dimensions of poverty and inadequate education are far larger than any education budget ever approved by Congress.

What concerns me more than the question of 2-year versus 5-year extension is the continuing and depressing gap between what the Congress says should be invested in education and what we actually spend. On one hand we encourage people with promises of deep commitments to quality education, and then we push these hopes into a chasm of despair with inadequate funding.

By this process we are creating an "aspirations gap" in education.

For the current fiscal year Congress said that it was going to invest $3.85 billion in programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Yet, we are spending only $1.46 billion.

What is happening to specific programs is even more cruel. Title II of ESEA authorizes funds for school libraries and instructional services. Schoolchildren everywhere have benefited from strengthened libraries and additional teaching materials.

The current authorization for title II is $162 million. But we are funding it at only $50 million. And now President Nixon has recommended that not a single penny be spent on title II for fiscal year 1970.

Title III of ESEA furnishes money for supplemental educational services, such as remedial reading programs and cultural enrichment projects. The Office of Education reports that this program is badly-oversubscribed, for they are deluged with more requests than they have funds to meet.

The authorization for title III is $527 million. President Nixon has requested that another $56 million be slashed from the already-meager budget, leaving a grand total of $116 million for title III.

Last year the Congress enacted legislation which I helped develop, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. What made this almost unique was the fact that the bill was passed unanimously.

Under the George-Barden Act, the Smith-Hughes Act, and the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the total Federal investment was roughly $248 million. The new legislation attempts to make vocational education more relevant to the changing patterns of the economy and of the desperate conditions in our ghettos. We set aside 40 percent of the new funds for disadvantaged youngsters, created several new job training approaches, and authorized investments of $812 million for the fiscal year beginning this July 1. This was all done unanimously, Mr. Chairman.

But the budget request is only $297 million.

For the poor, for the parent, for the educator, and for the concerned citizen this yo-yo attitude can only generate a crisis of confidence. And history suggests that dashed hopes are the seed of turmoil.

The promise of a new day cannot be met with lofty rhetoric and then a pallid performance. The domestic budget contributes as much to our national security as does the military budget. A progressive country solving its own problems may do more for peace than a phalanx of antiballistic missiles. Full funding of education and the fulfilling of man's hopes must command a high priority.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, enactment of H.R. 514 is vital to the educational advancement of our young people. H.R. 514 would extend for 5 years, until June 1975, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the impacted area aid programs, authorizing approximately $5 billion annually for a variety of academic programs.

Testimony heard by the Committee on Education and Labor from academicians, parents, community officials and educational experts throughout the country stressed the urgent need for a 5-year extension and adequate funding for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs. We in the Congress cannot overlook the tremendous need for proper education and academic advantages for our youngsters. Maximum effective use of Federal funds in support of educational programs is being impaired by delays in continuing authorizations and untimely funding.

Persons in management capacities in the private sector will readily concede the necessity of forecasting business earnings and spending levels several years in advance to maintain the economic stability of their companies. The Congress normally allocates funds no more than 2 or 3 years and sometimes only 1 year ahead of time. A successful business venture could never be expected to operate on an annual funding basis, never knowing what moneys will be available for operating costs. It is our responsibility to see that the Federal Government's education program proves to be an outstanding business venture by the cultural reward it reaps for our young. A superior educational assistance program becomes a more tangible possibility with the provision for adequate planning, staffing, and coordinating of people and programs. This provision is the 5-year extension.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs extended by the bill provide funds for local school districts with large concentrations of educationally disadvantaged children, library resources, textbooks, and instructional materials; supplementary education centers; dropout prevention programs; bilingual education and special instruction for the handicapped.

Over 60 million youngsters have benefited from these programs since the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act was approved in 1965. In fact, earlier this year, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare approved the preliminary proposal of the Cleveland public school system to establish a bilingual education program. Under the law, this program is designed to meet the special educational needs of non-English speaking children who are at particular disadvantage because of their limited communication skills. H.R. 514 expands the present bilingual program to include children living on Indian reservations.

In drawing up this legislation, the Committee on Education and Labor was particularly cognizant of the fact that parents often desire to participate in the formation of their children's education. In an effort to acquire increased parental interest, H.R. 514 requires adoption of effective procedures by the States and local agencies to involve parents and community representatives in the development and operation of all programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Another area of considerable significance is the impacted aid program, which, as amended, will provide for payments to local school districts of one-half the local cost of education for each pupil in the school district who lives in a public housing unit. At the present time, there are over 670,000 families residing in low-rent housing constructed with the financial aid of the Government. Since the Federal Housing acts exempt all low-rent public housing from State and local taxation, school districts serving children from public housing are severely limited in providing adequate education. Recognizing this inequity, the Federal Government presently makes a payment in lieu of taxes to the local school district. The national average payment is a mere $11 per child, however, a grossly inadequate allocation, and not nearly enough to offset the loss of tax revenue.

In my district alone, the proposed payments to local school districts would channel $2,850,484 to 15,622 children who reside in low-income housing and attend public schools in Cleveland. Approval of this amendment would be tremendously advantageous to the children as well as to the community residents within the school districts affected.

A genuine commitment to the education of our young people can be achieved with an enthusiastic vote of support for this legislation.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 514) to extend programs of assistance for Elementary and Secondary Education, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1968 OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith transmit the Annual Report for 1968 of the National Capital Housing Authority. During the past year, the jurisdiction of the Authority has grown to include over 10,000 public low-rent housing units. But the housing needs of low-income families in the Nation's Capital still exceed the supply.

I am pleased to report that the Authority is beginning to place greater emphasis than it has in the past on working with the private sector in building and acquiring decent housing for the people of the District. It is pioneering in the use of the "Turnkey" method, in which a private developer builds or acquires a project and later turns it over to the Authority. It is also placing new emphasis on offering social services to the residents of these dwellings—often in cooperation with groups of volunteer citizens—and on managing and maintaining the properties in an enlightened manner, sometimes through private management firms.

These and other initiatives—many of them still in their trial stages—will help the Authority make important progress toward its goal of providing safe, clean, and economical housing for the low-income families of this city.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 21, 1969.*

DESIGNATING THE YEAR 1969 AS "DIAMOND JUBILEE YEAR OF THE AMERICAN MOTION PICTURE"

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 165, designating the year 1969 as the "Diamond Jubilee Year of the American Motion Picture."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 165

Whereas the motion picture, now the most popular and pervasive art of the twentieth century, was born in the United States seventy-five years ago; and

Whereas, from the beginning, the motion picture proved such a success that in the intervening seventy-five years it transformed the popular arts, communications, entertainment, dramatic and literary expression, education in the United States and the world over; and

Whereas during these three-quarters of a century some of the achievements of significant value by the American motion picture include:

(a) An indigenous American art form that has become a global medium which calls upon the talents of many nationalities in its creation, and which is shown in all the world's countries with which the United States has diplomatic relations;

(b) An occupancy of more than 50 per centum of the total time on the screens of the world's theaters which means that on an average day ten million three hundred thousand individuals in foreign countries see a film released by an American company, a figure that adds up to seventy-two million admissions weekly and three billion seven hundred million annually—no other American medium regularly reaches such massive numbers of persons in foreign countries;

(c) A direct link for millions abroad with the United States, its history and character, its spirit and its ideals, through American film stars who are household names and who are themselves ambassadors with whom millions abroad can identify with American life;

(d) A business engaged in an art but which contributes each year a large surplus balance of payments that is of urgent importance to our country's economic and fiscal health;

(e) A business that in the United States keeps thirteen thousand seven hundred theaters showing American and foreign films, an industry that employs some one hundred and ninety thousand persons in production, distribution, and exhibition, an activity that has so engaged the interest of young people that courses on motion pictures in high schools and colleges have expanded with more than eighty thousand students enrolled in three thousand graduate and undergraduate courses on films offered in two hundred colleges and universities throughout the country; and

Whereas, for these achievements and others as pertinent, the seventy-fifth anniversary year offers an opportunity for all Americans to salute the American motion picture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States do hereby designate 1969 as the Diamond Jubilee Year of the American Motion Picture.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the House concurrent resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no fault to find with the concurrent resolution, especially insofar as the resolution portion is concerned, but may I inquire, is it the intention of the gentleman from Colorado to strike the paragraph (c) of the whereas clauses on page 2?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, it is. If my request to dispense with further reading is granted, then I will offer an amendment, a copy of which the gentleman has.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is it the intention of the gentleman to strike all the whereas clauses?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Rogers of Colorado: On pages 1 through 3 strike out all "whereas" clauses.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the concurrent resolution to designate 1969 the Diamond Jubilee Year of the American Motion Picture, and I think it is fitting that the American public, which has derived so much enjoyment from motion pictures, take note of the industry's 75th birthday.

It was in a converted store on Broadway, in New York City, just 75 years ago this month, that the Holland brothers opened the first "movie house." They had installed 10 kinetoscopes, invented by Thomas Edison, and their first showings received a warm welcome in the makeshift theater.

The motion picture is a uniquely American art form, but now flourishes in numerous other countries as well. Still, our U.S. film products account for more than half of the viewing time on the world's screens, and they are a very considerable export item in our foreign trade.

An exciting means of communication that has served as an ambassador of goodwill for the United States, the motion picture also is the basis for a flourishing industry, employing some 190,000 persons in production, distribution, and exhibition and attracting more than 80,000 students in film-related college courses throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, in our recognition of the film industry, it is appropriate, too, to acknowledge the work of the Motion Picture Association of America, which has contributed so much to higher quality films and responsible performance standards for the flourishing industry it represents. Its officers, President Jack Valenti, Executive Vice President Ralph Hetzel, and Vice President Edward Cooper, have earned the respect of the public and deserve our thanks and recognition.

As an enthusiastic film fan, I am personally most appreciative of and grateful for the enjoyment motion pictures have brought to me. And on behalf of the Seventh District of California, it is a pleasure, on the occasion of their diamond jubilee, to wish the industry, its officers, its artists, and its employees "many happy returns." I hope it will be the pleasure of the Congress to designate 1969 the Diamond Jubilee Year of the American Motion Picture.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 165, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

SELF-SUSTAINING FUND TO MANAGE NATIONAL FORESTS

(Mr. McMILLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to create a self-sustaining fund that will make it possible to manage our national forests to their fullest potential as sources of timber for our Nation's present and future needs.

The bill, entitled the National Timber Supply Act of 1969, would allow the managers of these federally owned commercial timberlands to exercise their skills to the fullest by plowing back receipts from timber sales into forestry practices that would result in vastly increasing the yields from these lands.

The bill calls for the creation of a "high timber yield fund" that would provide adequate financing to bring Federal forest management practices up to date and to provide for development of new practices in the future.

Our national forests are administered by the U.S. Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture under an outmoded financing system that is frustrating the skills of highly trained and devoted public servants.

My bill would make it possible to develop the fullest possible extent one of our country's greatest natural resources. It would help to improve the quality of life for all of our citizens by assuring a growing and perpetual supply of materials for all of the products based on wood—especially the sorely needed housing that has become a pressing national responsibility.

And by expanding and refining the practice of forestry on the national forests, my bill would guarantee better conservation of these assets, with all the desirable benefits of beauty, recreation, wildlife, water supplies, and grazing.

Finally, it would change our Nation's status as one of the backward lands of the world in a critical area of agriculture—a science in which we rightly believe ourselves to be preeminent.

The rich and productive land of America, tilled with the care and imagination that have been unequalled by any other people, has made this a land of plenty.

The national forests are a substantial percentage of the lands that we must count on for our future. In total, they comprise an area twice the size of the entire State of California.

But, unlike our farmlands, we have neglected them. And because we have, we are in danger of becoming a nation a well-fed and ill-housed people.

Because of my responsibilities on committees of the Congress, I have a special concern for the well-being of our people in regard to both nutrition and housing.

One of the important responsibilities

of the Committee on Agriculture is making sure that food is available in ample quantities. The Forestry Subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman has the additional and special responsibility to make sure that our national forests produce the largest supplies of timber of which they are capable.

My Committee on the District of Columbia has further committed itself to the task of seeing that this food and timber are properly used in alleviating the problems of poor nutrition and inadequate housing in one of America's great cities.

Last month the distinguished Committee on Banking and Currency conducted hearings on the shortages of skyrocketing prices of lumber and plywood and the detrimental effects on our housing goals.

I have carefully studied the record of those hearings and consulted with experts both in government and private industry.

Testimony before that committee established that there is a current annual shortage of 2 to 3 billion board feet of softwood lumber and plywood, even at the present inadequate level of homebuilding starts. As a result, frenzied competition for the building materials available had driven lumber prices up by as much as 50 percent and plywood prices by 100 percent.

Even worse, homebuilders said they were finding it almost impossible to get assurances of delivery even at those prohibitive prices.

The price situation has changed in the last few weeks, and it is tempting to sigh with relief and suggest that the problem is solved.

But the plummeting prices have simply added another element to the chaos. The distribution trade, and many builders, now have supplies of lumber and plywood that were bought at high prices and now are worth far less, according to the market. But the pressures that set off the first price rocket still are at work, and it is only a matter of time before another goes up.

The prices for raw material—logs—had climbed even higher than the prices for finished goods. Like the price spiral for lumber and plywood this price spiral was caused by a shortage. That shortage still persists, and the high prices for raw material still persist.

So manufacturers are saddled with expensive raw material that can be converted only at a loss, at the present price structure.

I am told that many manufacturing plants are in real danger of financial insolvency. In my own area of the country, the Southeast, production of lumber and wood products is an extremely important industry. Yet, over a 15-year period—from 1950 through 1965—the number of producing sawmills in the South declined from 25,000 to 5,000.

The situation we are facing is both incredible and intolerable.

On the one hand, the Congress last year committed this Nation to a 10-year building program that we said must produce 26 million new units.

Now, we are faced with high prices and shortages of building materials that make this goal virtually impossible to achieve. Last year we built only 1.5 million new homes. This year we probably will not do much better.

In his testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee, Housing and Urban Development Secretary Romney said we could meet our housing goals only by producing 15 billion board feet more of lumber and plywood per year. By 1978, he said, we must double the amount of lumber going into residential building.

As things stand, we cannot do it because the logs to produce this lumber are not available to the mills. And because this shortage of logs has driven timber prices to impossible economic levels, we are faced with the possibility of losing even more manufacturing capacity and making the job even more impossible.

The actions taken by the administration and announced by Secretary Romney will help alleviate the immediate problem, I am told. But they will only put off the ultimate day of reckoning for a little longer unless action is taken, and taken now, that will provide a long term solution.

A long term solution means that we must have more timber available for conversion into lumber and plywood, along with all of the other products that we find so necessary for the life we live in America.

And, Mr. Speaker, that timber exists. It is unavailable because of a situation that can be changed by the adoption of the National Timber Supply Act I am introducing today.

Almost two-thirds of all the softwood timber in the United States is on Federal lands.

This is almost four times as much timber as the forest industry owns.

Yet the forest industry harvests, from its own lands, more timber than is harvested from the Federal lands.

The industry is able to do this with no danger to future yields. Its forest management practices assure a perpetual supply of timber for future needs.

The situation is comparable to a pair of adjoining farms, one four times larger than the other, but each producing almost the same amount of the same crop.

It is tempting to say that the small, private farmer is more than four times as efficient as the big farmer. And, in one sense, this is true.

But the Forest Service cannot exercise even a major share of its skill at silviculture, because the Federal appropriation process deprives it of the regular, dependable funds necessary to any ongoing program of agriculture, whether the crop is trees, cotton, or corn.

Edward C. Cliff, Chief of the Forest Service, testified before a Senate committee on November 26, 1968:

> Studies . . . of investment opportunities on National Forests . . . show that allowable cuts could, in time, be increased about two-thirds by intensifying timber culture on the more productive portions of National Forest commercial timberlands. Substantial investments would be required to accomplish this, but the returns in terms of increased wood supplies and other benefits of forest management would more than offset the costs.

He said, however, that he could not in good conscience sanction these increases in harvest until he could be assured of the necessary investment.

It is the purpose of the National Timber Supply Act to create a fund that would provide this necessary investment, in adequate and dependable amounts. I hasten to add, however, that the bill has the further purpose of maintaining congressional control over the funds.

I have spoken of the need for additional housing materials and for additional wood fiber required in other uses. At this point I want to emphasize that the bill emphatically does not direct or permit any changes in management of forest land set aside for recreational use or changes in policy involving the recreational uses to which commercial forest lands may be put.

To the contrary, the National Timber Supply Act will make more recreational sites available and accessible to the public, without in any way altering areas presently set aside as parks or wildernesses.

The achievements of private industry in this regard are of great interest to me.

In the State of South Carolina there are three national forests, although none of them is in the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress. There are many others in the South.

But the important lumber industry in my district is supplied almost entirely with timber grown on private lands and, in the South generally; 70 percent comes from private lands.

On a national basis, American Forest Institute took a survey, just last year, of recreational opportunities on industry-owned forest lands. Almost all are open to recreational uses. Practically all encourage hunting.

Slightly over 90 percent of private lands are open to berrypickers; 93 percent are available for picnicking; 72 percent to hiking; 82 percent to camping. And so on.

Even if all of the national forest land were, in theory, open to the public, it still would not be accessible in percentages even aproaching those I have just cited.

The private forest industry has made its land accessible by investing money in roads.

The Forest Service has not because it could not. It does not have the funds.

So, in addition to more timber, we can expect a bountiful amount of recreational opportunity as a bonus.

Another bonus would be the harvest and utilization of timber that is otherwise lost to fire, disease, insects and over maturity. The Forest Service estimates that 10 billion board feet of timber is lost annually to these causes. This is nearly as much as the additonal harvest we must have to meet our housing demands a decade from now.

Private industry, of course, has done much to call this situation to the attention of the Congress. I am sure you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that it is only fair to ask private industry if it is doing all it can to provide the necessary timber from its own lands.

So far as the companies who produce timber for their own conversion are concerned, I am satisfied that they are doing a good job and making every effort to do a better one. Industry owns only 17 percent of the national inventory, yet it contributes 25 percent of the cut and 36 percent of the annual growth. Surely this is a good record.

There is one portion of the private sector that is not doing its share.

In the South, 60 percent of all the timber harvested comes from land not owned by the producing industry. Owners of small plots, some 3 million individuals and companies, own this timber. Because holdings are small, any forestry that is practiced is rudimentary, at best.

But I am proud to report to the House that the industry of the South has just completed a major project to help the small private landowner improve both the quantity and quality of timber growth on his land.

This study was described to the Banking and Currency Committee by M. C. Colvin, president of Holly Hill Lumber Co., of Holly Hill, S.C. Mr. Colvin is also president of the Southern Pine Association representing lumber manufacturers in the Southeastern States.

Mr. Colvin told the committee that this project, the southern forest resource analysis, has just been completed after 2 years, and was entirely financed by forest farmers, Southern Hardwood Lumber Manufacturers, American Plywood Association, and the Southern Pine Association.

Under the program recommended in this analysis, 10 million acres in the South would be replanted with genetically improved stock, and 90 million acres in all would receive some form of timber stand improvement.

The total result would be the creation of a forest, Mr. Colvin said, that would be far more bountiful and genetically superior to its predecessors and serving a broad range of esthetic, recreational, and material needs.

It also is true that the timber from this new forest of the South is some years away. The timber in our national forests exists today, and it is from this source primarily, that we must fill our present pressing needs.

We can do this only if we are prepared to assure ourselves and posterity that a timber supply will be available in perpetuity.

The Forest Service has estimated that timber sales from the national forests will provide more than $300 million in receipts next year to the Treasury.

No Member of this House is more interested than I in a responsible fiscal policy.

At the same time, no one in this House knows better than I that you cannot continue to reap the benefits of the land indefinitely without returning a portion of those riches as an investment to improve the quality of the land that produced them.

I believe it is time to create a national policy that will do just that and I believe that the National Timber Supply Act, if approved by Congress, will satisfy this need.

The basic premise of this act is that, once the funds are made available and the Forest Service embarks on an intensive management program, the allowable cut can be increased immediately.

We will have the timber we need, right now.

The high timber yield fund, incorporated in the act, gives assurance of financing for the silviculture practices that will provide the timber for the future. There are several safeguards built into the act.

The high timber yield fund, itself, by being tied directly to receipts, make it certain that forestry practices will stay apace with needs. As timber becomes more valuable—as it must—more funds will become available for intensifying its production.

The fund has a life of 25 years, long enough to produce significant results. However, a limit to its life will require a full review by some future Congress and prevent the automatic perpetuation of a program that it may be possible to improve later on. However, nothing prevents a congressional review at an earlier date.

Section 5 permits expenditures only after appropriation of moneys from the fund, thus assuring regular reviews of progress and practices, and keeping control of these large sums in the hands of the Congress.

Section 5 also provides that funds not appropriated within 2 years be transferred to the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, to prevent unnecessary and unauthorized buildup of the fund.

The act does not in any way alter the present system of assigning portions of timber sale receipts to the States and to the building of roads and trails in the national forests. Together, these allocations account for 35 percent of receipts. This would not be changed.

Finally, section 6 specifies that allocation of the fund will be made by national forests in amounts substantially proportionate to the contribution to the fund from each forest during the preceding 2 fiscal years. Since the amount of income from each forest varies somewhat from year to year, a 2-year period was selected to even out fluctuations.

By providing for slight variation in this formula, the act recognizes that it may be necessary to vary allocations in isolated cases to justify a larger proportion going to areas with outstanding potential for increased yield, but which produce little or no present income.

There were 50 forests with receipts under $100,000 in fiscal 1967; 40 of them are in eastern Montana, the Rocky Mountain and intermountain States, in southern Arizona and New Mexico. All have a low proportion of commercial forest land, and the lands that exist are relatively arid and low in productivity.

The opportunity for intensive forest management on these lands is roughly proportionate to the level of receipts.

In addition to these 40 forests in arid areas, the group of 50 is rounded out by a group of five where timber production is incidental to watershed and recreation management; there are two others with the smallest areas of commercial timberlands in the national forest system, and a Missouri forest where growth rate is extremely low because of heavy overcutting in the past.

The final two are in Alaska. One of these, the Chugach Forest, has only limited potential for intensive management in the near future. The other, the Tongass Forest, is a special case because receipts must be held for dispersal until Indian claims in this area are settled.

The act does not permit unlimited discretion by the Forest Service in the use of the fund, but the nine broad purposes outlined in the act provide adequate application of judgment in the areas of concern. These include:

First. Regeneration of growth at the earliest practical date after harvest, and reforesting high quality lands that are unsatisfactorily stocked now. This would allow the Forest Service to plant or seed harvested land in the first season after slash disposal or after harvest, in areas where slash is not a problem.

The objective is to get the land back into production without delay. Improvement of lands would be limited to sites where there is a good potential for commercial growth.

Second. Precommercial thinning. This is desirable to control the spacing of trees and encourage growth, but also to dispose of undesirable species and give more useful species a chance to reach their full potential.

Third. Semicommercial thinning. This controls spacing and composition of stands, but also produces marketable timber with a value roughly equal to the cost of removing it. This is a step between precommercial thinning and commercial thinning.

Precommercial thinning deals with material that is unusable because of its small size.

Semicommercial thinning produces material acceptable for such uses as pulpwod, but full production and delivery costs often exceed its value.

Such thinned material should be utilized so long as the added cost to produce and deliver it—minus the cost of any work such as limbing made unnecessary by utilization—does not exceed its value.

Fourth. Pruning, if justified by a subsequent reduction in the age at which the trees become marketable.

Some useful trees keep what are called juvenile limbs low on their trunks for long periods. When this occurs, it often is necessary and justifiable to prune the limbs to obtain logs that will be suitable for sawing or peeling at a younger rotation age.

Fifth. Preparation, including marking, of thinning, salvage, and under-story removals. Unit costs for thinning and salvage sales are higher than for normal harvest sales, and sales of this type never have been financed beyond the lowest levels possible. This is necessary to reduce the substantial timber volumes now lost to insects, disease, and overcrowding.

Sixth. Road construction into areas

where thinning, salvage and under-story removal sales—as well as fire and insect protection—is contemplated, but only to minimum standards necessary for this activity.

This type of activity can rarely support road construction, so thinning and salvage is largely ignored except where roads currently exist.

This provision would permit minimum standard road construction necessary in unroaded areas, and would provide access for protection activity.

It is not contemplated that the high timber yield fund would be used to finance regular timber access road construction.

Seventh. Fertilization. Several major industrial landowners in the Northwest and South and certain States have demonstrated that fertilization of good sites is an effective way to increase yields and shorten rotations. As knowledge in this technique improves, it would be logical to devote portions of the fund to fertilization on suitable Federal timberlands.

Eighth. Development and procurement of seed or stock with superior growth characteristics. The Forest Service already is at work in this field, and private industry has made substantial progress, which will be accelerated even more when the Southern forest resource analysis recommendations are implemented.

The high timber yield fund would finance intensification of this activity on the national forests.

Ninth. Implementing of other methods and practices that are demonstrated to increase timber production.

The common goal of all nine of these practices is to improve the timber yields on the national forests, now and in the future. The high timber yield fund is intended to provide the means for reaching optimum yields.

The fund is not expected to replace regular financing of federal timber sales, protection from fire and pests or the forest development road program.

Implementation of these programs will provide, as I mentioned earlier, substantially more recreational opportunity, but regular recreation activities of the Forest Service, along with reforestation for scenic or watershed purposes, would continue to be financed by the current method.

Preparation for thinning, salvage, and understory removal sales, an authorized high timber yield fund activity under section 6 of the bill, can now be financed from regularly appropriated funds for national forest timber sales. A small volume of these sales are now being made by this means, but these sales unavoidably have a poorer ratio between cost and returns than regular harvest sales. For this reason, it has been difficult to obtain appropriations.

Large salvage sales should continue to be financed by this method, with the high timber yield fund reserved for those small sales where such financing is uneconomical.

The same distinction should be made between use of regularly appropriated funds and the high timber yield fund for road construction in advance of harvest. Such advance road construction is essential for full scale operation of thinning and scattered tree salvage sales. Use of high timber yield funds for this purpose will generally be the only practical means to get advance roads built. These funds should not be used to construct access roads into large salvage sales areas.

Two final points, Mr. Speaker.

First, it is not feasible, I am told, to put a strict cost/benefit check on expenditures into the bill at this time. Expenditures are limited to those that will increase timber yields. The Appropriations Committee will oversee these expenditures and their experience is needed to translate the expenditures into goals that we can expect to reach in terms of timber production.

Secondly, the value of the National Timber Supply Act would be destroyed if there were any significant broadening of the purposes for which the high timber yield fund may be used. The amounts that would be available appear to be adequate to do the job. They would clearly not be adequate if portions were diverted to other uses, and all we would have would be a slush fund for activities not supported by normal appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this bill to be of the utmost importance to this country, to our national housing goals, and to the preservation of our natural resources.

I intend to schedule hearings by my subcommittee at the earliest possible time so that this House may have an early opportunity to consider the National Timber Supply Act.

A newspaper in my district, the Dillon Herald, published in Dillon, S.C., recently commented on the present price and supply problems of lumber and plywood, in an editorial. The conclusion of that editorial was this:

> One of the soundest projects to preserve the economy of a country, we believe, is to make it possible for the hardworking, law-abiding, self-sustaining people to build homes, or buy them, and establish their families in a permanent abode, but rising costs of materials and money, in addition to other deterrent matters like taxes, high labor costs, etc., serve to discourage what might be a bonanza for the building trades.

Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to those sentiments and, while it is possible that a bonanza, in the form of better housing, better recreation, and a better life, lies in front of all of the people of the United States if this Congress passes the National Timber Supply Act.

AUTOMOBILE FATALITIES HAVE INCREASED AT AN ALARMING FIGURE

(Mr. CLARK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, for 20 years, automobile fatalities have increased at an alarming figure. Last year, 55,000 people were killed on our streets and highways. Most any day of the year, there are 155 persons killed. You are all familiar with the National Safety Council's figures for holiday weekends, when 600 to 800 are killed. And on an average day, there are more than 12,000 persons injured, many of these persons injured permanently.

The Insurance Information Institute has estimated the cost of these accidents and fatalities, well in excess of $14 billion. Insurance companies pay out almost $40 million every 24 hours in claims, and this is only the dollars—it does not take into consideration the tragedy, the loss of life, the pain, suffering, loss of time and earning power.

But I rise today, not to review these tragic figures. I am sure you are all aware of them and feel as I do—a human desire to do something positive to reverse the trend of highway tragedies.

I want to briefly describe to you the application of a relatively simple, inexpensive, engineering principle—which I am confident will go a long way within a few years toward drastically reducing the death toll. We have tried many of the "intangibles"—speed limits, education, radar, and enforcement—all kinds of steps—yet the toll continues to rise. We have, in more recent years, turned to the more positive physical things we can insist upon, through a set of national standards to provide positive physical protection to the occupants of automobiles.

Imagine, if you will, being seated in a car, traveling down the highway. Think of the protection you would have—to say nothing of the feeling of security—if an extremely sturdy hoop of steel and absorbing rubber extended around the front end of the car underneath the hood and fenders. A hoop of steel at just about the level of your belt, some 30 inches or so above the roadway. In a crash with an oncoming car, this sturdy band of steel, with its rubber facing, would deflect your automobile and allow the forward energy to be expended on down the road giving you a reasonable chance to regain control. Compare this with what usually happens when two cars meet nearly head on. The two crash—welding and biting together and—worst of all—coming to an almost instant halt, hurling the occupants against the dash and windshield. Would it not be so much better to have the two cars deflect from each other—rather than an instant crunching halt?

Such a hoop—or safety bar—can be installed easily and inexpensively underneath the hood and fenders. As many of you know, one of our major automobile manufacturers has installed what they call impact bars in the side doors. Why not carry this sound principle around the front of the car where its value can be of much greater benefit? About 90 percent of our automobile collisions involve this front 160-degree area. Therefore, the safety bar with its resilient facing, installed at the belt line, would prevent vehicle penetration. Put the protection out in front where it will really do more good.

The bumpers on today's cars, as we know them, are mostly decorative. They offer little or no protection to the passenger. Edmond R. Ricker, chief of the Pennsylvania Highway Safety Group, recently said:

> I believe we could all readily agree that the present bumper system gives little or no protection in automobile crashes, and something better is needed.

Our present bumpers are at various heights and much too low to the road for occupant protection. The principle I describe to you would be the heavier steel hoop extending from the side doors around the front at the belt line of the automobile—approximately 30 inches off the road. This steel bar, with its rubber or resilient facing, is installed underneath the outer skin of the car and securely anchored to the frame. It is out of sight and does not change the appearance or styling. The resilient facing on this hoop of steel—about 4 to 6 inches wide—will serve tremendously in helping to absorb the initial impact of collision.

Let me be perfectly clear. This idea is not going to avoid crumpled fenders or smashed headlights. That is not the principle. Its value is to deflect two cars traveling at high speed away from each other instead of allowing the sudden stop with its tragic consequences.

Carry the idea a step further. Visualize this same kind of a hoop of steel and rubber—mounted at approximately 30 inches off the road—on the back of a large truck or trailer. In this case the energy absorbing bumper would be built so that it would move forward when struck, to help absorb the shock and further deflect—off to one side—a car striking the rear of the truck or trailer. Here again, cars with the safety bar at the same 30 inches above road would coincide with the underride guard on the rear of the truck. If this rear underride guard is installed too low, there would be too much leverage and defeat the very purpose of the protection.

Such a "safety bar" as I describe has been devised. A good many years of study and patient research have gone into its modifications, to such a point that I now stand on this floor to bring it before you with my sincere hope it will receive further consideration by this body in relation to the establishment of national standards. And further consideration by the automobile industry and their considerable research and development facilities.

May I point out that this "safety bar" was first envisioned by a man in my congressional district. He lost a close personal friend more than 20 years ago in a near head-on crash. In the years that followed, this man patiently developed the idea of some sort of protection out around the front of the car. He refined the plan through trial and error, evaluating and testing, defining such details as the 30-inch height from the ground, the rubber facing on the steel bar. He determined the strength of that bar and how it could be fastened underneath the hood and fenders. Through the years, he has consulted with the manufacturers of materials and they have contributed facts concerning the strength of the tubular steel bar and the use of rubber or resilient material to aid in that critical moment of impact. This is in part to prevent the welding and biting of metals together, as well as reduce shock. The statistics of insurance companies, safety councils, and others interested in highway safety—as well as consultation with State and Federal safety personnel—have all gone into the ground work of this safety device. And the total cost is less than the cost of a car radio.

It is now ready for positive consideration. And if it has the merit I think it does, should be considered for every new car as quickly as possible.

I would like to send each of my colleagues and others in the government and industry a copy of these remarks and some further information and sketches describing this "safety bar" in greater detail. In addition to a more detailed description of how a similar safety bumper can be easily installed on the rear of trucks and trailers. And I ask the permission of the Speaker to place these extended details into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Further, I request the administrator, Federal Highway Safety, Department of Transportation, to consider the life-saving values of this safety device. I suggest that the old concept of bumpers and bumper heights be changed and a standardization of these protective safety measures be forthcoming.

NEED FOR FEDERAL COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENT

(Mr. KASTENMEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, there is widespread belief that the nuclear power reactors which are being built to generate electricity are safe, reliable, and all of its pollution is invisible. But, a rapidly growing number of physicists, biologists, and engineers have been expressing serious misgivings about the planned increase of these nuclear powerplants.

Distinguished members of the scientific community have stated that nuclear power generates a new type of pollutant, radiation, and that its hazardous effects upon the environment have not yet been taken into account. They cite the potential dangers of a malfunction of a nuclear plant, with the consequent release of large quantities of radioactive particles into the atmosphere, the constant emanation of radioactive substances from nuclear power production into the air and the water of streams used for cooling the nuclear plants, and the centuries long threat of the escape of radioactively poisonous nuclear wastes which must be stored in perpetuity, and in amounts in the millions of gallons, as a result of nuclear plant operations.

Six years ago, David E. Lilienthal, the first Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, warned that we have moved too fast and without proper safeguards into an atomic power age. He stated:

> I am gravely concerned about the potentially catastrophic dangers to human life and public safety from the radiation produced by the splitting of the "peaceful atom" . . . If present plans to construct atomic electric plants within and near large population centers from coast to coast are permitted to proceed, this process will live among us on a scale never before attempted and pose the threat of contaminating large sections of our cities. I believe that the existing plans are irresponsible, because the safe functioning of these power plants would require the solution of crucial problems that are still unsolved.

Yet, despite this grave warning that radioactive pollution poses a great threat to man's survival on earth, little national attention has been focused on the potential environmental hazards associated with peaceful atomic power. In the meanwhile, there are about a dozen nuclear powerplants now in operation through the country and about 100 or so more are now being considered. Plans call for approximately 25 percent of our electric power to be generated by the atom by 1980, and half by the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by the statements issued by highly qualified individuals about the incredible and unique danger that nuclear powerplants represent for human life, and that Congress has been remiss in focusing attention to the entire question of the safety of these nuclear reactors. Thus, I am introducing today a joint resolution calling for a thorough reappraisal of the Federal Government's participation in the atomic energy program and an assessment of the potential impact of atomic development upon the health and safety of the American public, with particular emphasis on the effects of waste disposal, radioactive air and water pollution, and possible losses caused by malfunction of nuclear plants.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACKBURN INTRODUCES JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO THE ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today, I have the privilege of introducing a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President. The House Judiciary Committee has held extensive hearings on this subject and after examining all of the evidence, I believe the congressional district plan would be the best possible reform of the electoral college.

A statement which I submitted to the Judiciary Committee completely outlines my position on this matter, and for the information of my colleagues, I hereby insert this statement into the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE BEN B. BLACKBURN BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

During the last election, there was a real possibility that the Presidency would be given to a man who did not receive a plurality of the votes cast. The candidacy of Governor George C. Wallace raised the probability that the election would be thrown into the House of Representatives if neither of the major political parties' nominees received the requisite number of electoral votes. Uncertainty and apprehension justifiably preceded November 5; the Electoral College was severely criticized.

In our history, *thrice* the outcome of the presidential election has been subject to criticism and uncertainty due to the Electoral College. In the election of 1824, when Jackson received a plurality of the popular and Electoral votes, John Quincy Adams became President when the election was decided by the House. The Hays-Tilden affair has many similarities to the situation caused by the recalcitrant 1968 elector in North Carolina. The Harrison-Cleveland election demonstrated how the mechanics of the Electoral College can elect a minority President.

When the Constitution was drafted, the framers debated various proposals for the election of the President. During the course of the debate a vote taken on the idea of having direct popular elections for President and Vice President was defeated by a vote of two states for (Delaware, Pennsylvania) and nine states against.

The Election of 1800 presented a new nation with the first Constitutional crisis. The formation of political parties had injected an element into the political system which had not been foreseen by the founding fathers. The Twelfth Amendment was born as a result, and both the President and Vice President are now elected by the same successful Political Party.

The need for further reform has created proposals over numerous years. Three plans have been urged (with slight variation) over the years: (1) the direct popular vote; (2) the proportional plan, and; (3) the district plan.

The proposal for a direct popular vote has superficial appeal. Those who are anxious to ignore, if not abolish, the identity of the states in the federal system see the direct popular vote as another step toward the accomplishments of their purposes. Furthermore, a direct popular vote has a ready appeal to political kingpins in the heavily populated areas of our country. Indeed such a system would give big city "Bosses" an influence in national affairs even greater than they enjoy today. Those of us who represent states of large rural areas and states not having the heavy concentrations of population which exist in some areas of our country would soon be rendered politically sterile. I would anticipate that under a direct popular vote, Presidential candidates never would be seen visiting the states of the thinly populated Midwest and the South and would seldom be seen in the rural areas of the more populous states. Thus, the traditional balance of influence between the urban and rural populations would no longer exist.

No small consideration should be given, when discussing a direct election plan, to the potential danger of vote frauds in areas completely dominated by over-zealous political leaders. Publications in national news media of evidences of fraud in the 1960 Presidential election (which could have well determined the outcome of the election) have been too frequent and too well documented to be dismissed casually. A direct popular election of the President would tend to encourage vote frauds wherever the opportunity presented itself, and the efforts of such misconduct would have direct repercussions beyond the political subdivisions in which such activity occurred.

Aside from the above considerations in opposition to the direct election plan (admitting that those who favor such a plan would dismiss these considerations as being nebulous political philosophy) there is a very practical and politically real justification for opposing an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to authorize direct popular vote elections of the President. We are all aware that a substantive change in the method of electing our President and Vice President requires the formality of a Constitutional Amendment. This formality means that ¾ of the states, through their legislatures must approve of any proposed change. Any political pragmatist should recognize without belaboring the point that only a relatively small number of states would receive political advantage from a direct popular vote. Indeed, the majority of states stand to lose considerably in their political influence at the time of the Presidential election. Under such circumstances, it is unrealistic to propose a change which will never become law by reason of the political facts of our nation's life.

I need not be redundant by continuing to express the reasons for my opposition to direct popular election of our President. Let it suffice that in the face of both political philosophy and the unyielding realities of political opposition from the states, the arguments in favor of such a proposal cannot survive.

President Nixon himself has spoken as an advocate of the proposal under which the electoral votes in each state would be apportioned so as to reflect the percentage of the popular vote cast in each state for the contending Presidential aspirants. While I am confident that the President and his advisors have given the matter of electoral reform great thought, the President in his proposal has suggested further that the office of elector be abolished and that the votes which would otherwise be cast by an individual elector should be credited to the proper political party which would automatically be credited to the respective Presidential candidates.

I would have no reluctance in abolishing the office of elector. While the office of elector served a purpose in colonial America, with its disadvantages in communication, transportation, and education, the system is an anachronism in the light of modern technology.

I do confess, however, to reservations about the proposal for abolishment of the electoral votes. I feel that the same problem of disproportionate influence by political party leaders in major metropolitan areas would exist under this proposal to almost the same degree as under a direct election plan.

I also fear, again, that vote frauds in a few precincts could have repercussions throughout the state and ultimately the nation. In short, I fear that the proposal is only a short step away from the direct popular vote proposal and that the same objections are valid for both.

I note with some interest that while candidate Nixon was a strong advocate of the proportional election plan, he has not seen fit to press such a proposal upon the Congress. I suspect that further thought has given the President cause to reconsider his position taken during the campaign, and I doubt if he would have strong opposition to a district election proposal.

I have become an advocate of the system which some refer to as the district election plan as first advocated by Senator Karl Mundt of South Dakota. Under the Mundt proposal the Presidential candidate receiving a plurality of the popular vote in a Congressional District would receive the electoral vote which that Congressional District represents. I am assuming that everyone is aware that at the present time one electoral vote is authorized for each Congressional District in a state plus two electoral votes for the Senators of that state. The electoral votes allowed for the two Senatorial seats under the direct election plan would be credited in accordance with the plurality of the popular vote cast throughout the state.

Presidential aspirants would be compelled to show interest and give attention to the less heavily populated states and areas of our country, thus preserving the balance of urban vs. rural influences.

In the event of vote frauds, the effects of such frauds would generally be confined to the Congressional District within which such occurred, although it would have a bearing on the credits allowed for the state at large electoral votes.

Many of our colleagues are unaware that the district election proposal, in substance, was in effect for many years. In the early 1800's each Congressional District did elect its own elector and each elector was beholden only to the voters of his district. The strongest argument for the reimplementation of the district plan is a repudiation of the motives which led to its demise.

It became increasingly apparent to the political bosses of the political party having a predominant power in their respective states that the most practical way of continuing political control of the White House was to abolish the district plan and to adopt a "winner-take-all" method of casting the electoral votes for a particular state. Thus, the political party having the dominant statewide influence began forcing through the state legislatures (over which they likewise held political control) legislation to permit the presidential candidate receiving the plurality of the popular vote cast in the state to receive 100% of the Electoral vote. Thus, we arrived at the indefensible position we are in today whereby a Presidential candidate could receive as little as 34% of the popular vote in a state and yet receive 100% of the electoral vote. When we consider that the successful candidate receiving 34% of the vote might well have received 90% of his votes in one heavily populated area of his state, while other candidates receiving approximately ⅔ of the popular votes cast (and possibly more realistically reflecting the wishes of ⅔ of the voters in the state) would receive absolutely no electoral votes, one can be left with a genuine sense of disbelief. That such a gross inequity is possible in a society which prides itself on fair play for all of its citizens, makes the system intolerable.

The need for reform in our electoral system has been with us for many years. The public sentiment for reform is greater today than at any time in my memory. We are facing today the first opportunity for meaningful action that has existed for possibly 100 years. Such an opportunity may not present itself again within the lifetimes of anyone of us. The possibilities for gross injustices, and perhaps tragedy, under our present system continues unabated. In the light of the continuing possibility of tragedy we cannot permit this rare opportunity to pass without action.

I sincerely urge the members of this committee as well as the members of this Congress to give the thoughts which I have presented today their most sincere consideration.

REPRESENTATIVE STUCKEY'S POSITION ON INTRODUCTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

(Mr. STUCKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, I have become increasingly concerned with developments relating to the minimum commission rate structure now in effect on the New York Stock Exchange. In *Silver* v. *New York Stock Exchange*, 373 U.S. 341, 357, the Supreme Court of the United States has indicated that it believes that the minimum commission rate structure relies upon an antitrust exemption which "is to be regarded as implied only if necessary to make the Securities Exchange Act work, and even then only to the minimum extent necessary."

Last year in connection with the Securities Exchange Commission's proposed rule 10b–10, the U.S. Department of Justice filed a memorandum questioning whether the New York Stock Exchange's minimum commission rate is essential to its functions under the act. The rules of the New York Stock Exchange dealing with minimum commission rates date back to the celebrated "Buttonwood Tree Agreement" in 1792. Basically, the minimum rate structure results from rules prescribing a flat rate fixed minimum commission to be charged by the New York Stock Exchange members on all exchange transactions. A rate preference is given to New York Stock Exchange members as opposed to nonmembers—both nonmember broker dealers and the public—for the service of clearing and executing securities transactions.

As I understand it, as early as 1913 the famous Pujo Committee recognized the importance of the New York Stock Exchange's minimum commission rate, and stated the philosophy of this rate to be that the New York Stock Exchange should be protected against any kind of price competition between members that would lower the service and threaten the responsibility of members.

I believe that a minimum commission rate is essential to the operation of an effective exchange market and is in the public interest. By limiting ruinous business competition it necessarily fosters vigorous competition in the quality of service rendered. Also, a reasonable minimum rate removes a major threat to the continued solvency of member organizations. Any breakdown of investor confidence in the securities brokerage community would send shock waves through the national economy which could trigger a financial disaster. This matter is of importance. I do not believe it can be left as a continuing controversy between the Department of Justice, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the New York Stock Exchange, and nonmember broker dealers. I believe it involves policy considerations which should be determined by the Congress.

Therefore, I have introduced a proposed amendment to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 which would clearly exempt a New York Stock Exchange reasonable minimum rate structure from the antitrust laws, provided bona fide nonmembers are given reasonable access and are not subjected to discriminatory rate differentials.

REPORT OF CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION THAT VISITED PRAGUE FOR MEETINGS WITH CZECHOSLOVAK LEGISLATIVE LEADERS

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on April 11 I was a part of a congressional delegation that visited Prague for meetings with Czechoslovak legislative leaders. Since then the U.S.S.R. whose military forces led a massive invasion of Czechoslovakia on last August 20, has tightened its grip. The country is now firmly under the control of the U.S.S.R.

Today, I salute the Czechoslovak people who reminded the world after two decades under communism that their desire for freedom still burns brightly. While we salute these victims of Soviet aggression, let us urge them to meet their trials with a calm determination for open revolt at this time could lead only to a futile bloodletting.

The most tragic figure in Czechoslovakia today is the deposed Alexander Dubcek. In the classic Communist pattern, it is likely that Dubcek will be moved down, step by step, until he disappears from the scene.

One of the more ominous developments in the suppression of Czechoslovakia has been the role of the marshals of the Red army. It has been reported that Marshal Andrei Grechko, the Soviet Defense Minister, personally presented an ultimatum to the President of Czechoslovakia that resulted in his final capitulation to the Soviets.

If the Red army, as reported, is now a dominant part of the political summit in the U.S.S.R., this has serious implications for the United States. More than ever, it means that the men who count in the Kremlin are men who understand and respect only force and the willingness to use it, not wishful thinking, no matter how sincere, and unilateral disarmament.

In view of Marshal Grechko's brutal confrontation with Czechoslovak President Ludwig Svoboda last week, I, for one, would not care to base the security of the United States on the charity and good will of the present leaders of the U.S.S.R. Today, more than ever, President Nixon's decision to move forward with a limited safeguard ABM system is shown to be a prudent step to acquire a measure of insurance that our nuclear deterrence will continue to give pause to any would-be aggressor and protect our country from the threat of nuclear blackmail.

ANARCHY ON CAMPUS

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, anarchists and subversives are making an all-out effort to destroy education in America. We must meet this grave threat with calmness, but with firmness. It is a diabolical, sinister threat to our private enterprise system, to public education, and to the very security of this Nation and that of the free world. Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, this is an effort by a very small trained group to destroy this Nation and its great institutions. It is aimed at the heart of America. It is well financed and trained in subversion. It is an important part of the cold war design and aggression against the free world and against America, particularly, as the heart and core of freedom and arsenal of democracy.

No thinking American wants to see our Armed Forces, or the National Guard, or the local law-enforcement agencies, deployed on the campus; but Mr. Speaker, this will come as a last resort to protect our great basic fundamental institutions.

Government property must and will be protected on the campus if it becomes necessary to save our ROTC program and our research programs on defense, space, and nuclear energy. Those of us in the Federal Government prefer to see our school authorities take the necessary action to preserve their right of administrative authority. We would like to see the school authorities make the firm decisions and take the stand necessary to protect life and property in the academic community. Unless school administrators take a firm stand to prevent anarchy, government—local, State, and National—will have to enforce law and order with armed might. Government—local, State and National—has an obligation to protect the 95 percent of good loyal American citizens who want to attend college, if this protection cannot be accomplished by school administrators.

It is incredible and unbelievable to see armed anarchists capture administration buildings, kidnap the presidents, deans, and trustees, occupy ROTC buildings, and hold the officials of colleges by force until their demands are met. This is un-American activity. This is anarchy. It is the method of dictators and enemies of democracy and academic freedom. Taking over the administration of our educational institutions by force until irrational and bizarre demands are met is the same principle as taking over Congress or the State legislatures or the city councils until their memberships agree to pass certain legislation. It is the same principle as taking over a bank by force and holding officials until certain loans or demands of money are met. This use of force in administration buildings by hard-core trained anarchists must be met by a counterforce which will protect the majority and assure the continuance of education.

Lawbreakers, gangsters, and anarchists on the campus must be dealt with as lawbreakers elsewhere. They should be expelled and then prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. If not actually enrolled in the university or educational institution, they should be immediately arrested and prosecuted for violation of the law.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Adolph Hitler's birthday. It might be well for us all to remember that this raving racist took over the most literate nation in the world on a wave of book burning, riots, anarchy, and even the burning of the Reichstag, the German congress. Good and educated people at first thought him better than anarchy. When they woke up, it was too late. The German people were enslaved with concentration camps, liquidations, elimination of educational freedom, and stark slavery.

Mr. Speaker, the American people will demand that those in authority protect our right of trial by jury, freedom of assembly, all of our basic freedoms, and yes, the right of young America to an education.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE ON TAX REFORM

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in President Nixon's message to the Congress on the reform of our Federal tax system. He stated that this reform is long overdue. All America agrees. In his long message he made only one specific recommendation to the Congress and that was the repeal of the 7-percent investment tax credit.

For a number of years I have been one of the Members who has consistently fought in the Rules Committee and on the floor of the House calling for the elimination of fantastic and fraudulent loopholes and I am happy to hear words come from one of the Republican leaders that his party is awakening to the necessity of tax reform.

The President's message of today was merely a repetition of a statement made by Ways and Means Committee Chairman WILBUR MILLS some weeks ago, "that the 7-percent investment tax credit be repealed." The American public will be anxiously waiting for a message from the White House recommending the repeal of the major tax loopholes, which if curtailed or repealed, will bring upward of $15 billion annually into the Federal Treasury.

I do hope in his next message on tax loopholes, the President will take the initiative and cooperate with the Members of Congress who have been advocating curtailment or complete repeal of the 27½-percent oil depletion bonanza along with the reduction of many other fantastic credit exemptions and other tax-dodging legislation which the highly financed oil tax lobbies have succeeded in placing on our Federal statute books during the last 25 years.

In order to be brief, so that the public may understand what the situation is, I am herewith resubmitting a statement which I and others Members have made, setting out from the comparative Federal tax payments made by two major segments of our economy which make their profits from beneath the ground.

The powerful oil lobbies over the years have succeeded in securing congressional enactment of depletions, credits, exemptions to such a degree many large companies with a net income of multimillions are, in some cases paying taxes as low as 1 percent on net annual income. One large company with profits ranging from $61,110,000 in 1962 and similar increased amounts of income in 1963, 1964, and 1965 paid no Federal taxes whatsoever.

Standard Oil of New Jersey in 1962 with $1,271,903,000 annual income paid six-tenths of 1-percent tax on their fabulous profits. In the following 4 years their percentage tax on similar profits ranged as follows:

	Year	Net income before tax	Percent tax paid to Federal Government
Standard Oil (New Jersey)	1962	$1,271,903,000	0.6
	1963	1,584,469,000	4.3
	1964	1,628,555,000	1.7
	1965	1,679,675,000	4.9
	1956	1,830,944,000	6.3
Atlantic Oil	1962	61,110,000	0
	1963	56,747,000	0
	1964	61,081,000	0
	1965	105,299,000	0
	1966	127,384,000	---------

I could go on and name other large companies who are in the same category as the above two mentioned.

On the other hand, as a comparison as to what some large companies paid in taxes, I might mention three coal companies. Evidently the coal companies do not have the powerful lobby in Washington as "big oil." These statistics follow:

	Year	Gross profit	Percent tax paid to Federal Government
Consolidation Coal Co	1964	$44,863,073	26
	1963	39,568,573	28
	1962	32,918,065	26
Pittston Co	1964	13,721,024	30
	1963	(1)	---------
	1962	14,699,420	35
Island Creek Coal Co	1964	7,713,060	18
	1963	5,149,930	24
	1962	3,459,563	21

RURAL AMERICA NEEDS HELP FOR WATER AND HOUSING

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with a great deal of concern the fact that the President is recommending substantial reductions in funds for rural water and sewer systems and for very low-income housing in rural areas. I am extremely disappointed in the President's action in this regard because it had been my impression that he realized the importance of these programs to rural America. Apparently he does not.

In his acceptance of the Republican nomination for President, Mr. Nixon said:

> I see a day when life in rural America attracts people to the country, rather than driving them away.

Personally, I can think of nothing which will drive away people from rural America faster than denying them the water and sewer systems and the housing they so vitally need. The action of the President in proposing a reduction in funds for rural water and sewer projects borders on a callous disregard for the welfare of rural Americans.

I shall oppose these reductions and will do all I can to see that funds for these important programs are made available at least in the amount recommended by President Johnson.

During the 8 years of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations over 260 water and sewer projects were financed for small towns in Oklahoma by the Farmers Home Administration. If President Nixon goes through with his proposal to cut back funds for such projects, it will mean a substantial reduction in the number of water and sewer systems which can be built in rural areas.

I believe that construction of rural water and sewer systems lays the basis for the industrial development and growth of rural towns and communities and that without an up-to-date water and sewer system a community cannot expect to attract a substantial industry.

The President does not seem to realize that industrial development in rural areas can be a major factor in reducing the many problems faced by our great urban areas with their rapidly expanding populations.

NATIONAL TIMBER SUPPLY ACT

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, today the Nation is faced with a critical shortage of softwood lumber and plywood needed to build our housing requirements of 26 million units within the next decade. Redwood is classified as a softwood and is widely used in construction. Redwood timber is in fact, intermingled with construction timber species such as Douglas-fir.

Douglas-fir is the preeminent construction material from the West and constitutes a high percentage of both the softwood lumber and plywood production in the United States.

It is not my purpose today to discuss the recurring question of parkland in preference to producing forest lands which has come to mark conservation thinking in the United States.

My purpose is, rather, to urge the Congress to clarify in its own minds the difference between "commercial timberlands" and "land reserved for other purposes." This differentiation has become critical as a consequence of the unprecedented demand for housing and the tight supply of timber to provide the materials necessary to meet that demand.

Recent hearings before the House Banking and Currency Committee for 5 days investigated the root causes of softwood lumber and plywood short supply and historically high prices. It became manifest early in those hearings that the Federal Government, which owns the predominant share of softwood sawtimber inventory, was not making that timber available for manufacture. Neither has the Forest Service, which administers 54 percent of that inventory, been able to apply modern forestry techniques to realizing the maximum yield from those forest stands.

The Chief of the Forest Service testified that with assurance of continuous investment money and development funds to maximize the yield and growth of our national forest, it would be possible to increase the present annual harvest by as much as two-thirds, or roughly the 8 billion board feet which building experts say we are now deficient.

Chief Cliff, the industry witnesses, the private and State forestry professionals, and other highly qualified spokesmen for various groups, including conservation organizations, made clear that they were concerned only with applying modern management techniques to lands which the Federal agencies themselves had classified as "commercial forest lands."

There is no intention on the part of anyone to invade the parks, the wilderness or primitive areas, or other reserved lands, where timber harvest is already eternally barred.

A witness for the Sierra Club testified, in fact, that he would support increased appropriations for the Forest Service to practice intensive forest management techniques and consequent increased allowable cuts so long as these measures were undertaken with full consideration of the other values of the forests such as recreation, fish and wildlife, forage, and watershed. All of these values are obligatory concerns of the Forest Service under the Multiple Use Act of 1960, and must be honored.

The Sierra Club witness explained his radical departure from previous club expressions in this regard by pointing out that better management of "commercial forest lands" by the Federal Government would serve to relieve pressures against parks, wilderness, primitive, and other scenic areas.

Today I am joining the distinguished chairman of the Forestry Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN), in introducing legislation, entitled the "National Timber Supply Act," to enable the Forest Service to apply maximum modern management to the commercial forest lands in its charge so that all of the people can realize the full timber benefits available from these replenishable timberlands.

Passage of the Housing Act of 1968 took cognizance of the national obligation to provide adequate housing to all Americans. Its goal of furnishing 26 million units of housing over the next decade is a worthy one.

Accomplishment of this public objective, however, will impose increased demands upon suppliers of building materials to gear production to increased market requirements.

Lumber and plywood are two basic commodities required in construction. Both of these items have been in short supply during the second half of 1968 as the direct result of an increase in the rate of new home construction. That shortage resulted in rapidly increasing prices and delivery delays which upset construction schedules and accelerated rising construction costs. It is clearly evident that the impact of fulfilling the market requirements of the Housing Act of 1968 will require, over the next decade, maximum responsible utilization of available timber resources within the United States.

Almost two-thirds of the Nation's softwood timber is on Federal public lands. Industrial and other private timber holdings are already being harvested at close to maximum justifiable rates compatible with sound forest management. This is not true of national forest commercial timberlands, principally because the Federal appropriation process does not provide a system for assured investment of funds for the purpose of improving timber growth and yield, and partly because timber management policies are not firmly and permanently oriented to improvement of timber growth and yield.

Edward C. Cliff, Chief of the Forest Service, testified before a Senate committee on November 26, 1968:

> In addition to the Douglas-fir Supply Study still under way, other studies have been made of investment opportunities on National Forests throughout the country. They show that allowable cuts could—in time—be increased about two-thirds by intensifying timber culture on the more productive portions of National Forest commercial timberlands. Substantial investments would be required to accomplish this, but the returns in terms of increased wood supplies and other benefits of forest management would more than offset the costs.

He further stated that he could not sanction these increases in harvest until he could be assured of the necessary investment.

It is the purpose of this bill to create a responsible and continuing method for the Federal Government to provide the competence necessary to increase timber growth so that forest products can be harvested at rates that will meet public requirements for building and other needs.

The national forests contain an estimated 1,121 billion board feet of sawtimber, which is more than half of the Nation's present supply. The national forests therefore merit intensified scrutiny to insure that they are managed for high level effectiveness in meeting the Nation's timber needs. They were reserved from the public domain almost three quarters of a century ago largely because of concern generated by the false premise of an immediately impending national timber famine. With projected demands for wood product consumption showing a steady rise, the national forests must play an increasingly important role in growing and supplying the necessary timber. Despite ownership of more than half of the Nation's present timber resources, only about one out of every three logs made into lumber or plywood now comes from the national forests. Although large volumes of timber are sold for receipts exceeding $200 million, it is nonetheless true that the commercial timberlands of the national forests are an underutilized and underdeveloped resource. With a wood product scarcity now at hand, the Nation can no longer afford the luxury of semimanagement for more than half of its softwood sawtimber supply.

The proposed National Timber Supply Act is intended to ameliorate the present situation of inefficiency. It would provide congressional directives for creating and implementing more effective management of national forest timber for the purpose of assuring increasing supplies of wood to meet increasing demands. The act contains three broad directives upon which harvesting rates are to be premised.

These three statements would require taking into account: first, tree size requirements of markets and industrial techniques which can reasonably be anticipated by the early part of the 21st century as these market requirements and techniques become apparent; second, comparisons of gains and losses caused by withholding the harvest of overmature timber with the gains and losses resulting from conversion of the acres now serving as storehouses for overmature timber into growing new timber crops; and, third, the effects of intensive management measures for which financing provisions are made in the act.

The proposed National Timber Supply Act would establish a special fund to assure long-term financing of the management and development measures essential for optimum timber productivity on the national forests. The fund would be called the "high timber yield fund" and would be financed from national forest timber sale receipts.

Establishment of such a high timber yield fund in the Treasury to finance optimum timber productivity on the commercial timberlands of the national forests is necessary for assuring continuity of effort and objective. The intensive management measures necessary to increased timber yield must, to be effective, be applied continuously, and not on a stop-and-go basis. If harvest-rate determinations are made on the premise that future yields will be those obtainable from intensive management there must be assurance that intensive management will occur. The high timber yield fund supplies this assurance.

The plan to finance the high timber yield fund from timber receipts assures that expenditures will be kept in step with the significance of national forest timber to the economy. Other safeguards in the proposals are:

First. The life of the fund is limited to 25 years. This limitation will force a review based on accumulated experience before the fund is renewed; otherwise a full-scale review might never occur.

Second. Section 5 of the bill requires that expenditures from the fund be made only after appropriation. This insures regular congressional review and approval of the program of activities to be financed from the fund.

Third. Section 5 also provides that funds not appropriated within 2 years be transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. This provision insures that deposits in excess of needs will not be accumulated in the fund.

The portion of national forest receipts which under existing law are paid to the States or other special funds would not be disturbed by the enactment of the National Timber Supply Act. This, the 25 percent of national forest receipts payment to States—16 U.S.C. 500—and 10 percent of national forest receipts for roads and trails—16 U.S.C. 501—would not be changed.

Section 6 of the bill specifies that allotments from the fund will be made by national forests in substantially the same proportion as the contribution to the fund originated from each forest. There are eight listed broad purposes for which allotted funds could be used. These purposes are:

First. Obtaining regeneration at earliest practical date after harvesting and for reforesting unsatisfactorily stocked high site lands. This would permit planting or seeding of cutover lands in the first planting season after slash disposal or after termination of harvesting operations where slash disposal is unnecessary. The objective is to establish full stocking with a minimum delay in regeneration. Reforestation of unsatisfactorily stocked high site lands is also included. Such seeding or planting of unsatisfactorily stocked areas would be limited to timberlands of good potential for commercial timber production.

Second. Precommercial thinning to control spacing or stand composition. Such thinnings are the primary means to accelerate growth at an early age. They are also an effective means to favor production of desirable species.

Third. Semicommercial thinnings both to control spacing and composition and to produce material with value for commercial utilization in excess of additional costs required for its production. Semicommercial thinning is a step between precommercial thinning and commercial thinning. Precommercial thinnings deal with material that is unusable because of its small size. Semicommercial thinnings produce material acceptable for commercial utilization especially pulpwood but for which full production and delivery costs exceed its market value. Such thinned material should be utilized so long as the added cost to produce and deliver it—minus the cost of any work such as limbing made unnecessary by utilization—does not exceed its value.

Fourth. Pruning if justified by a subsequent reduction in the age at which the trees become marketable. Some desirable tree species retain juvenile limbs on the lower bole for excessive periods. In such circumstances pruning at an early age is a necessary and justifiable activity to obtain logs suitable for sawing or peeling at a younger rotation age.

Fifth. Preparation, including marking, of thinning, salvage, and understory-removal sales. Unit costs for thinning and salvage sales are higher than for harvest sales. Such sales have never been financed to the extent of their full potential by regular timber sale appropriations. Financing of sale preparation for thinning and salvage sales from the high timber yield fund is needed to market the very significant timber volumes now being lost through overcrowding or deterioration.

Sixth. Road construction in advance of planned harvesting to standards necessary for facilitating thinning, salvage, and understory-removal sales and for protection against ravages of fire and insect. Thinning and salvage sales alone can rarely support road construction. Hence, thinning and salvage cutting is now generally limited to roaded areas.

This provision would finance road construction to standards necessary to facilitate thinning and salvage cutting in unroaded areas, and would incidentally supply access needed for protection purposes. It is not contemplated that the high timber yield fund would be used to finance regular timber access road construction.

Seventh. Fertilization of good sites to increase timber growth rates is now being undertaken by several major industrial timberland owners in the Northwest and the South. Fertilization is a promising avenue to increase yelds and shorten rotations. As further knowledge of costs and return develop, it is logical that the high timber yield fund be used for fertilization on suitable Federal timberlands.

Eighth. Development and procurement of seed or stock with superior growth characteristics. Work is underway by both the Forest Service and industry to identify superior seed sources and develop seed orchards for volume production of superior seed. The high timber yield fund would finance intensification of this activity on the national forests.

Ninth. Implementing other methods and practices that are demonstrated to increase timber production.

The common purpose of all eight of these listed cultural practices is to increase timber yields on the national forests above those yields presently attainable from the regularly financed activities. The high timber yield fund is designed to provide the additional effort to work toward optimum yields. It is not expected to displace the regular financing of Federal timber sales, protection from fire and pests, or the forest development road program.

I believe that every resource in America must be fully developed to meet the needed housing challenges of America. There is no greater challenge than providing a suitable home for everyone. We cannot meet that challenge without our forest resources realizing their full potential yield and productivity. I am persuaded that the Forest Service has the skill to accomplish this undertaking and that the National Timber Supply Act will provide the means.

It is my earnest hope that every Member of this distinguished body in considering this legislation will keep clearly in mind that it does not alter in any way the clear separation between "commercial forest lands" and other reserved lands and does not therefore constitute a threat of any kind to the preservation of beauty and the joys of the spirit resident in our national parks, wilderness, and primitive areas. This bill deserves total support of the Congress and I intend to work for its passage as hard as I know how.

OVERSEAS EDUCATION

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill entitled "The National Overseas Education Act of 1969" to amend Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress so as to transfer responsibility for the American overseas dependent school system from the Department of Defense to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I had the opportunity, in 1965, to visit many of these schools and to learn firsthand of the problems confronting both students and teachers. Many of these problems stem from the fact that education is not a primary mission of the Department of Defense and is therefore given a much lower priority in that Department than should be the case. Any American school system should rightly be entrusted to an agency whose primary concern is education; an agency whose members are oriented toward education and its needs. Other of the problems, such as those concerning housing assignments, tenure and commissary privileges, stem from DOD's proper orientation toward military needs and military prerogatives. The problems in this second category pose a particularly difficult situation for the civilian teachers since, when they feel themselves aggrieved, they must seek redress from the same authority which caused the grievance in the first place. These problems would be greatly ameliorated by placing the schools, the teachers, and the students under an agency whose direct and primary responsibility they are; an agency oriented to their needs and charged to act on their behalf.

Such an agency would be created under the provisions of my bill. This agency would be the National Overseas Education Board, appointed by the President, operating within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on a direct appropriation from that Department.

The President would appoint to the National Overseas Education Board, eight members, five of whom would be civilians and three military members. The Board would make all decisions relating to curriculum, all personnel policies—pay, tenure, hiring and firing, transfers, assignments and grievances—use of facilities and the opening and closing of the schools.

American dependent children in overseas areas are presented with a unique and exciting educational opportunity. To truly capitalize on this opportunity, we should provide them with a school system run by educators who are aware of the special overseas opportunities and dedicated to the profession of education. The overseas school system should be something far more and far better than merely an extra, and often undesired, housekeeping chore for our busy military commands.

My bill is designed to bring about that highly desirable change, and I urge its enactment.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S COMMITMENT TO TAX REFORMS

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today President Nixon has made clear the commitment of his administration to providing the Nation with a fair and equitable tax system; a tax system which will insure that all citizens will bear a fair share of the burden of supporting our Government, and that none will be taxed excessively.

The President's call for a complete overhaul of our tax structure is commendable and deserves the support of every Member of this Congress. Only through extensive reform can we remove the archaic inequities built into the tax structure over the past decades. Thus the President has directed the Secretary of the Treasury to thoroughly review the entire Federal tax system and make recommendations for basic changes by November 30.

In the interim, President Nixon has recommended a number of reforms which will bring a great deal more equity to our system of taxation than now exists. In the past many individuals with substantial incomes have successfully avoided paying any taxes. Many of the provisions in our tax laws which permitted this to occur have now outlived their usefulness. The administration's proposals will correct this situation by levying a "minimum income tax" setting a 50-percent limitation on the use of special tax preferences.

Enactment of the proposed "low income allowance" will exempt more than 2 million low-income families from Federal income taxation, insuring that families living in poverty do not have to bear the additional burden of inequitable taxes while others with substantial resources escape taxation altogether. The proposal, if enacted, will raise the minimum levels of income subject to taxation. Thus a family of four with an income below $3,500 will not have to pay any Federal income taxes. At present such a family with an income in excess of $3,000 is forced to draw upon their already meager resources to contribute what for them is a substantial sum. These provisions will constitute genuine relief for the elderly, the young, the disadvantaged, and handicapped.

In addition, the President has called for reforms affecting nonbusiness and charitable deductions, exempt private organizations, and the practice of using multiple subsidiaries and affiliated corporations to take undue advantage of the lower tax rates on the first $25,000 of income.

All of these proposals are reasonable and take into account the fact that any sweeping reforms must be carefully thought out. The point is not that all tax preferences are unwarranted, but rather that some have been abused, and others have outlived their usefulness to the Nation. As President Nixon stated in his release of April 21:

> When the preference device provides more social benefit than Government collection and spending, the "incentive" should be expanded; when the preference is inefficient or subject to abuse, it should be ended.

I applaud the President's firm stand on behalf of a fair and equitable tax structure and hope that my colleagues in both the House and Senate will give their wholehearted support to these vital proposals.

THE EMERGENCY LOAN PROGRAM IN ACTION IN SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Colorado). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced legislation establishing the Emergency Consumers Small Loan Act of 1969 which would make the emergency small loan program a separate program under the community action program. Separate appropriations would be provided under the Economic Opportunity Act thus returning the program to its pre-1968 status. In the 1968 fiscal year separate funds were provided; subsequently, the program was made a discretionary function of the community action program and primarily limited to the initial 15 "demonstration programs." The programs were continued, despite the complete allocation of the initial funds, through loan repayments and limited administrative funds. My proposal now has some urgency since OEO's authorization for the program expires in June.

In order to better understand the nature of the emergency loan program and assess its success, I have surveyed the local programs. The results have been encouraging and a word should be said so that some of the efforts will not go unnoticed. In San Antonio, Tex., the San Antonio Neighborhood Youth Organization, Inc., operates a credit union, the SANYO Federal Credit Union, through which applicants of the emergency loan program are processed. The residents of San Antonio, Tex., are ably represented in Congress by the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ whose credentials concerning the problems of the poor are among the most distinguished in Congress. The SANYO Federal Credit Union is owned by the residents of the Neighborhood Councils of San Antonio and by the employees of SANYO. Those applicants who are unable to meet minimum collateral requirements of the credit union are automatically referred to the emergency loan program. The coordination of efforts involved in the attack upon the problems of the poor is quite extensive as indicated by the fact that 50 percent of the loan recipients are on welfare. The concept of providing emergency family loans for the poor as well as the solvents has apparently been adopted by other groups not funded by the emergency loan program thereby giving our program that much greater leverage.

As of January 31, 1969, the emergency loan program in San Antonio had made 741 loans, amounting to $103,016.71. Of these loans, 101 have been completely repaid, returning $20,410.99 to the loan fund. In all, $37,917.77 has been repaid along with interest of $616.12; the interest is forwarded to the U.S. Treasury. Forty-seven loans, amounting to $6,430.74 have been refinanced and 456 loans, or $54,939.74 in loan funds, are considered delinquent; no moneys have been charged off but $13,523 is anticipated to be uncollectable. The amount delinquent has to be considered within the context of the type of program we have established and the nature of the clientele it serves. The program has no legal provisions for collection and seeks to avoid undue harassment of the poor; rather, a great degree of flexibility is allowed the administrators in dealing with the loan recipients so that they can attempt to instill the dignity, confidence and other basic ingredients requisite to productive citizenship.

I have detailed the workings of the emergency loan program in San Antonio as I did earlier for the programs in St. Louis and among the Indians of the Rosebud, S. Dak. reservation, in order to emphasize the national magnitude of the problem of poverty while at the same time not losing sight of the particular circumstances in which poverty occurs. I hope I have been able to show how responsive the poor are to a little encouragement and how integral are the factors of pride and dignity to the composite of personal resources necessary for successful extrication from the morass of a poverty-ridden life. Consequently, the emergency loan program should be extended so that the poor, not only in San Antonio, Tex., but in all parts of the country, might be given the opportunity to help themselves.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF CARETAKER GOVERNMENT IN GREECE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, April 21, marks the second anniversary of the caretaker government which during the past 2 years has brought progress and stability to Greece.

It was 2 years ago today that Premier Papadopoulos, Deputy Premier Patakos, and Minister of Coordination Makarezos, themselves at the time colonels in the Greek Army, led a group of their fellow Army officers in a bloodless revolt against the forces of Greece which had brought that nation to the brink of ruin and anarchy.

After the coup, the reaction of the Greek people was: "What kept you so long in coming?"

During these 2 ensuing years, these three Greek patriots and their fellow officers have restored to Greece a tranquillity which that nation has not known for more than 21 years during which this ancient citadel of democracy lived in constant turmoil.

The United States showed sound judgment when it recognized this new Government and during the past 2 years has been working closely with this Government to restore parliamentary rule as quickly as possible.

Two years ago when the Greek Army Colonels saved their nation from a collapse which would have delivered her unquestionably into Communist hands, they promised they would restore order out of chaos in Greece.

Mr. Speaker, today on the second anniversary, it is obvious they have kept their word.

Since the coup d'etat, the caretaker government promised it would move toward restoration of a constitution and election of a Parliament to manage Greek affairs in the spirit of democracy.

The former colonels had kept their word in giving the Greek people an opportunity to vote on a constitution which has been hailed by students of political science as an outstanding document spelling out and guaranteeing freedom and human dignity for the people of Greece.

Last night in Athens more than 60,000 people jammed into the national stadium, and during a colorful 2-hour performance of folk dancing, singing, and patriotic demonstrations, the citizens of Greece honored the second anniversary—and they gathered there from their own free will with no compulsion.

The caretaker Government held an election in which 92 percent of the voters approved the constitution.

Premier Papadopoulos and his associates have taken direct steps to implement the constitution as quickly as possible. Last week Premier Papadopoulos announced that three of 12 key articles of the new constitution were being placed into effect. These articles restored the rights of the people to peaceful assembly, lawful association, and the inviolability of the home.

In my most recent discussions with the leaders of the Greek Government, they have indicated their strong desire to effectuate the other articles in the constitution establishing freedom of the press, freedom from arbitrary arrest, organization of political parties, and parliamentary and local elections as quickly as possible.

Mr. Papadopoulos, according to the New York Times of this morning, said last night in Athens in a radio broadcast:

> The revolution of April 21 represents the greatest and most serious effort of rehabilitation, reorganization and cleansing made since the beginning of national independence.

He added:

> Our friends have convinced themselves that a great task of a broader nature is being accomplished here and our enemies must come to realize that they labor against us but sadly in vain.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the attacks against the caretaker government in Greece have come mostly from the same people who have very little confidence in the survival of our own American institutions of democracy. These are to a great extent the same people who have always had a ready apology for the Communists but a quick denunciation of anyone who dares speak out in strong terms against Communist oppression.

I have personally visited Greece and I have talked to the people of that nation during the last 2 years. One could not deny that the ancient traditions of democracy which first found expression on the historical lands of Greece are not being fully practiced in that nation by the caretaker government today.

To some extent, martial law still prevails.

But I sincerely believe that this caretaker government, headed by Premier Papadopoulos, is making an honest and sincere effort toward restoring constitutional government to Greece as quickly as possible.

Premier Papadopoulos and Deputy Premier Patakos, and their associate, Minister Makarezos, as well as all of the Greek soldiers who participated in the coup, are fiercely patriotic Greeks. Their Greek nationalism is overwhelming and there is no question in my mind they know better than anyone else that the indomitable spirit of freedom which has been a part of Greek heritage since the beginning of time cannot be suppressed indefinitely. It is because of this knowledge that Premier Papadopoulos is sincerely and honestly today trying to move his nation in the direction of restoring full parliamentary rule to Greece as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, this second anniversary of the Greek Government shows the great progress that has been made in that nation. Perhaps the most impressive measure of progress and confidence in Greece is the fact that foreign investors are investing in Greece now as never before.

Greece today stands as America's most realiable ally in Europe. The Greek caretaker Government is the only government of Europe that can make a promise to America and make good on that promise.

Greece today stands as our great source of defense in the Mediterranean and on this second anniversary, it is safe to state that as a member of NATO, America needs Greece a great deal more than Greece needs America.

Recently Deputy Premier Patakos visited Washington. It was reassuring the extent to which he was greeted by the most important leaders in our Government. Deputy Premier Patakos assured our leaders of his country's continuing desire to remain a faithful ally of the United States and I was pleased to see that mutual expressions were made to him that America wants to continue her historic ties with Greece.

As fellow members of NATO, it was apparent the mutual cause of freedom we both as nations defend in Europe makes America and Greece the warmest of allies.

Deputy Premier Patakos represented his nation well while visiting Washington and won for his Government's efforts to save Greece from the Communists, the most inspiring and warmest appreciation.

During these past 2 years, progress in Greece has been impressive and I would like to review some of that progress.

Mr. Speaker, recently I received a report from Premier Papadopoulos and Deputy Premier Patakos, which outlines the progress made during the past 2 years in Greece. I should like to include this memorandum in the Record today as a review of progress as seen through the eyes of these two Greek leaders and patriots.

The memorandum follows:

Report From Mr. Papadopoulos

A. PART ONE

Having become firmly established in the People's conscience as an event that was both necessary and right in its aims and purposes, the National Revolution of April 21, 1967, is now a historical fact duly recorded in its proper place in the modern history of our Nation.

1. Generative causes of the national revolution

The Revolution of April 21st, the second anniversary of which we are now celebrating under the most auspicious signs, came in direct response to a national command predicated primarily on the following vital needs:

(a) The need to neutralize the spread of communism, which had infiltrated all sectors of Greek life and was threatening a new "round" in its continuing drive to implement its plans for subjugation of our country to Red totalitarianism.

(b) The need to check the headlong downward course of our economy resulting from the corrupt self-interest of the politicians; resulting also from the dwindling of public confidence due to continued political instability and social unrest; from the wasteful spending of public funds; from the trading of favors serving party interests; from the lavish enjoyment of privileges by those friendly to the party in power; and from the failure, arising out of complete indifference in responsible quarters, to organize the economy along sound lines adapted to contemporary international standards.

(c) The need to raise the standard of living of the People; to reduce and, if possible, to eliminate unemployment; and to create new employment opportunities for the Nation's labor force.

(d) The need to reorganize Greece from the roots up, both as a State and as a political economic and social entity, by revising the National constitution and thereby providing the foundation for legislation introducing new, modernized institutions.

2. Objectives successfully attained

The Revolution of April 21st was bloodless because, in effect, it came in response to the desire of the Greek people for an end to the ills with which the country had been cumulatively burdened by inefficient and often unscrupulous politicians, and it attained its objectives in full, notably:

(a) Within hours of its assumption of power, it dislocated the red conspiracy with devastating rapidity.

(b) It averted economic disaster at the eleventh hour through rigorous implementation of a spirit of thrift and careful husbanding of the public funds.

(c) It effectively neutralized the old-line party politicians, who were deprived of the possibility of any further activity harmful to the national interest.

(d) It transformed Greece from a country governed by mob-rule into an oasis of calm and order in a turbulent Europe. Greece is internationally recognized today as a force for peace and stability in the Eastern Mediterranean and as a strong outpost in the defensive structure of the West.

3. The new constitution

It was evident from the very first that the Revolution of April 21st was here not merely to demolish the corrupt and barren past; it was here to build too. Thus began a new, truly creative era for Greece; it began, from the very first days of the Revolution, with the erection of the framework:

(a) A new Constitution. The supreme law of the land. A modern Charter adjusted to the facts of Greek life. Its first and foremost aim: to lay the foundation of a Democracy, not only in name but in fact.

(b) The creation, in broad perspective, of a new Greece based on Greco-Christian ideals, enjoying a sound democracy and with its enemies disarmed; a parliamentary system free of the shortcomings of the past; an efficient and active state machinery; citizens who abide by the laws and respect their fellow-citizens; a Government untainted by party politics and paternally inclined toward the young and the weak; and a true social awareness of the freedom of the individual.

(c) The production of a Five-Year Economic Development Plan designed to overcome the barrier of poverty and to bring Greece into the company of developed nations.

4. Strengthening the economy

A strong and sound economy is the essential prerequisite of progress and prosperity. Accordingly, the National Government turned its efforts in this direction, and within a very short period could point to the following achievements:

Monetary stability.

Strong inflationary tendencies checked.

Thrift and restoration to health of the Nation's public finances and its balance of foreign payments.

Restoration of a balanced economy, both internally and in relation to foreign exchange.

The following facts bear witness to the success of the economic policy of the Revolution:

(a) The Drachma is now recognized internationally as the most stable European currency, as noted by the Economic Committee of Europe and by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (O.E. C.D.).

(b) The cost of living index is stabilized today at a level lower than that of April 1967. This is a phenomenon unique in current times, when the cost of living is on the rise in all the countries of the world according to the published comparative figures of the O.E.C.D., the Economic Committee of Europe and the United Nations Organization.

In effect: During the 10-month period from January to October 1968, there was a 0.1% *fall* in the Greek consumer prices index as against the corresponding 10-month period of 1967. While in the same period there was a cost of living *rise* in other countries, including some of the most economically advanced (Italy, Sweden, Switzerland, Belgium, France, U.S.A., Norway), ranging from 1% in W. Germany to 9% in Denmark.

(d) Foreign capital is flowing into Greece in growing amounts for productive investment, a fact that bears witness to the consolidation, on an international scale, of confidence in the country's economic stability and its economic future. The net influx of foreign capital funds in 1968 was $270 million, and approval was granted, under Law 2687/53 for the importation of investment capital amounting to $229 million. In addition, special contracts were signed providing for the importation of hundreds of millions of dollars.

(e) At home, too, the confidence shown in the Revolution of April 21st and its economic policy was impressive. Proof is to be found in the increase of private bank deposits, especially small savings accounts; the latter depositors reflect the feeling of the mass of the people. (This increase amounted to Drs. 15.4 billion in 1968—more than three times the 1967 increase).

(f) Figures published by the O.E.C.D. for the increase in industrial production in its 15 member-nations during the period from October 1967 to September 1968 list Greece in third place, with a 12% rise in production.

(g) The volume of bank notes in circulation showed a decreasing trend throughout 1968; it finally fell 300 million (for the first time in the post-war era, during which it had risen steadily). In January 1969 there was a new reduction of Drs. 2.027 million.

(h) The favorable trend in bank deposits and the simplified procedures adopted with regard to credit regulations permitted a substantial increase in the total financing of the economy in 1968: Drs. 12.5 billion, as against Drs. 10.5 billion in 1967 and 9.5 billion in 1966.

Since the Revolution, bank financing of the economy has increased by approx. Drs. 22 billion.

(i) In 1968 the Nation's foreign exchange reserve increased by approx. $36 million as against an increase of $13.5 million in 1967. In the period from April 1967 to the end of 1968, the foreign exchange reserve increased by $57 million to reach a total of $297 million—an all-time postwar high. This amount does not include Greece's share in the International Monetary Fund, nor does it include the regulatory reserve, in gold pounds, of the Bank of Greece.

In the sector regulated by the Ministry of Finance, the following substantial accomplishments were noted:

(a) A large number of fiscal cases which had been pending for a long time and which cost the State millions of drachmas in lost revenues were processed and settled (approx. 800.000 unverified income tax cases, 450.000 real estate transfer cases, 80.000 cases pending before the tax tribunals).

(b) A fair allocation of the tax burden and effective restriction of tax evasion. (In 1968 the number of personal income tax returns filed by citizens amounted to 450.000, compared with 328.000 in 1967 and 299.000 in 1966).

(c) Simplification and easing of income taxes.

(d) A timely and realistic compilation of the 1969 State Budget, with a surplus of Drs. 2.500 million.

(e) Allocation of Drs. 520 million in 1968 and Drs. 910 million in 1969 for civil service pay increases; allocation of Drs. 1.590 million (total) in 1968 for increases and readjustments of pensions.

(f) Exemption of more than 300.000 small businessmen from the onerous obligation of fiscal bookkeeping.

(g) Cancellation of Drs. 316 million in debts owed by some 1 million needy breadwinners.

5. Support for industry

The Government's policy and activity in the industrial sector has been most fruitful and beneficial to the national economy. Specifically:

(a) Loans granted to industry in 1968 by the National Bank for Industrial Development amounted to Drs. 2.124 million, as against Drs. 1.167 million in 1967 and Drs. 750 million in 1966. Approximately Drs. 1.000 million in investment loans were issued by the other two investment banks.

(b) Permits were issued for the establishment of new industries and the expansion of existing industries, amounting to Drs. 1.389 million.

(c) The drive for the exploitation of mineral deposits was intensified (drilling for offshore oil in the Thermaikos Gulf and research to ascertain the exploitability of uranium deposits); and progress was made in the development of industrial zones.

(d) Electric power was brought to 1.420 villages and settlements at a cost of Drs. 650 million; the number of villages supplies with electric power in 1967 was 1.100. At the same time, 240.000 new consumers were connected to the Public Power Corporation grid. Another 1.400 villages and settlements are scheduled to receive electric power in 1969, for which the necessary appropriations have been allocated. This brings the total to 2.820 villages and settlements receiving new power in a two-year period.

It is worthy of note that from the date of the Revolution to the end of 1968, 2.453 settlements received electric power, and a further 200 in January and February 1969, bringing the total to 2.653, whereas in the 12-year period preceding April 21st, 1967, the number of settlements which received electric power was 2.657.

(e) Progress was made in organizing fishing docks; related industries were established.

(f) A total of Drs. 4.138, Oll, 253 of new investments were submitted to the beneficial provisions of Law 4171/61; the compound interest on financing of new investments totalling Drs. 483.318.000 was subsidized.

(g) Financing of the conversion industry benefitted from the new, more flexible regulations for the financing of the economy; on December 31, 1968, this financing amounted to Drs. 34 million, i.e., an increase of Drs. 4.6 billion.

(h) Small industries enjoyed special treatment. In 1968, they received Drs. 600 million worth of financing from the special capital funds reserved for this purpose, mostly with the Government supplying guarantees.

(i) The institution-establishing measure requiring greater participation by domestic industries and small producers in the supplies programs of the State and semi-governmental agencies will contribute to a further increase in production and turnover.

6. Large number of public works projects

Correctly planned, unimpeachably executed and geared exclusively to the national interest, the projects in the Public Works program drawn up in the healthy spirit of April 21st give evidence of exemplary organization.

Some facts and figures from the plentiful 1968 schedule:

(a) Some 1,000 kilometers of new or reconstructed roads, on the national highway level, were opened to traffic (expense: Drs. 2.100 million) and 1,200 kilometers of provincial roads (expense: Drs. 700 million); at the same time, extensive improvements were carried out on all networks.

(b) A contract was concluded with an overseas firm for a loan to cover 70% of the financing of the construction of the major Egnatia highway project (760 kilometers) which will cost $150 million.

(c) Extensions and renovations of bus routes totalling 150 kilometers (expense: Drs. 230 million) were made.

(d) 2.200 meters of breakwaters and 1.800 meters of piers were constructed in the country's ports.

(e) Drs. 168 million were spent on airport construction, enlargement and facilities.

(f) Land improvement projects covering an area of 485.000 stremmas (121000 acres) and costing Drs. 900 million were completed; also flood-control projects protecting 266.000 stremmas and consisting Drs. 188 million.

(g) The Piniow River dam was inaugurated. This is the largest earthen dam in Europe. It was built at a cost of Drs. 3 billion and provides irrigation for 240.000 stremmas.

(h) The problem of the capital's water supply was solved. The waters of the Mornos River were used; this project eliminates once and for all the threat of water-shortage in the Athens area. The Kithairon aqueduct, a Drs. 200 million project, is already under construction.

(i) Drs. 150 million were appropriated for drainage projects in the Athens Valley and for decontaminating the shores of the Saronic Gulf; and a further Drs. 75.000.000 for water-supply and drainage projects in various towns in Greece.

(j) City zoning ordinances were radically revised in line with modern city planning concepts. Suitable housing projects were constructed in execution of the housing program for earthquake victims and slum dwellers.

7. Trade enjoys favorable conditions

Noteworthy progress was made in the sector of commerce, despite unfavorable international economic conditions. The accomplishments were specially evident in foreign trade and increased exports. Specifically:

(a) The expostation of products increased substantially (industrial products: 33%).

(b) The conclusion of new trade agreements and the renewal of existing ones will result in an expected $20 million increase in exports. In 1968 exports totaled $456 million. There was an additional benefit to the State of $90 million in foreign exchange accruing from the replacement of imported products by domestic products in State supplies alone, under the uniform supply program of 1968.

(c) Thanks to the increased influx of foreign exchange, the balance of payments was completely balanced.

8. Greek merchant marine prospers

Thanks to the National Government's maritime policy, Greek merchant shipping, which is rapidly gaining first place in the world. made substantial gains.

(a) Under the Government's policy of financing shipowners up to 80% with the State guaranteeing the loans, orders placed in 1968 totaled 52 ships (total tonnage: 232.000) to be built in Greece, a further 33 passenger vessels, and 41 ships (170.000 tons) to be purchased.

(b) Thanks to the confidence with which the shipping world regards the National Government, the influx of foreign exchange from shipping (freight, repairs, remittance) totaled $243 million in 1968, as against $214 million in 1967 and $182 million in 1966.

(c) An additional 1.165.661 tons of shipping joined the Greek registry, i.e., the highest annual increase to date. On December 31, 1968, there were 1945 ships (total tonnage: 9.215.650) flying the Greek flag. By February 28th, 1969, the number of ships had increased to 1982 (total tonnage: 9.591.087)—an addition of 37 ships, representing 375,437 tons, in the first two months of the current year.

(d) Thanks to facilities made available in Greece, numerous foreign shipping firms have turned to this country, a development of substantial benefit to the national economy. By the end of February 1969, 125 foreign shipping companies had established operation in Greece.

(e) There was a 15% to 22% increase in the pay scale of ship's crews, and further measures have been taken to improve their incomes.

(f) Deposits in foreign exchange by Greek merchant seamen are increasing at an impressive rate (20% to 25% per month); other remittances by sea-going personnel totaled $50.5 million in 1968—an increase of 23%.

9. Modernized transportation and communications

The results accomplished by the National Government in the field of transportation and communications were on the same high level as its achievement in the other sectors of our national life.

(a) The domestic airline network was further developed, with air service established between Athens and several resort islands; and progress was made in the construction of new facilities at Athens Airport.

(b) The postal services (known in the past as the "slow post") were re-organized along exemplary lines.

(c) The installation of 140,000 new automatic telephone connections was completed (as compared with 110,000 in 1967 and 59,000 in 1966); and in the first two months of 1969, 1300 small provincial exchanges were completed and 4,900 new telephones connected.

(d) A sum of Drs. 610 million was spent on the procurement of new railroad material and rail service improvement projects. New modern coaches and locomotives have been added to existing rolling stock, as well as 400 refrigerator cars to serve the growing requirements of commerce. By February 1969, a further Drs. 7.6 million had been made available for improvement of the railroads' rolling stock.

(e) There was an increase of Drs. 2,780 million in Post Office Saving deposits in 1968.

In addition, the Post Office Savings Banks approved 13,800 housing loans amounting to Drs. 2,730 million (in 1968).

In the first two months of 1969, an additional Drs. 696 million, representing 985 housing loans, were allocated.

10. Benefits for the farmers

Under the slogan "All for the farmer, through a healthy policy", and with an annual increase of 5% in farm incomes as its target, the National Government can point to serious achievements in the agricultural sector.

(a) Drs. 7,764 million worth of farm debts were cancelled.

(b) In 1968, Drs. 2,374 million were allocated in support of farmers' incomes.

(c) A sum of Drs. 4 billion (as against Drs. 1.5 billion in 1966) was allocated through the Agrarian Social Security Fund (OGA) for farmers' pensions and health services.

(d) Farmers' pensions rose 70% and full hospital care was received by 300,000 farmers.

(e) Reforestation reached an all-time annual high in 1968 (473,000 stremmas in 46 village districts).

(f) 26,000 stremmas of land were allocated for the rehabilitation of landless cultivators, and 29,000 ownership titles on farmland provided by the State were issued.

(g) Decent and healthy housing was made available to 56,604 farm families. In 1968, Drs. 1.5 billion were allocated for this purpose, as against Drs. 866.5 million in 1967 and Drs. 94 million in 1968, i.e. more was spent on farm housing in one year than in the entire 20-year period preceding the revolution.

(h) In 1968 the sum total of grants made to agriculture was Drs. 14,600 million, as against Drs. 11,491 million in 1967 and Drs. 9,000 million in 1966.

(i) A sum of Drs. 3,392 million was allocated in 1968 (as against Drs. 2,457 in 1967) for the development of the agricultural economy, and for the improvement and modernization of the farming system through modern technological methods.

(j) Land improvement projects were completed at an increased rate; Drs. 495 million were spent on 45 such projects, and 150,000 stremmas of land covered by the projects were irrigated.

(k) Approval was granted for geo-hydrological studies covering 1,350,000 stremmas (1 million in the Thessaloniki Valley and 350,000 in the Aria Valley). In Crete, the Messara project will make 200,000 stremmas suitable for cultivation.

(l) Drs. 50 million were allocated for the protection of olive crops from disease, and the necessary airplanes and helicopters were purchased.

(m) Drs. 177 million were allocated in 1967 and Drs. 260 million in 1968 for forest development. These sums were in addition to the $934,000 allocated by the United Nations special fund for development of the forest economy.

(n) Ten up-to-date new fruit and garden product processing plants were established in 1968; eight fruit-packing plants (the first in Greece) are under construction.

(o) The nationwide refrigerator chain was placed in operation, and refrigerated transportation was made available.

(p) Drs. 70 million were allocated for financing new food processing businesses.

(q) Exports of agricultural products rose substantially, e.g.: canned tomato products, 15,000 tons; fresh fruit, 29,000 tons; citrus fruits, etc. And following the re-opening of the Soufli silk factory, Greece's first silk exports (3,000 kgs) were effected.

(r) 160 new agricultural engineers were appointed in 1968 to man the district services of the Ministry of Agriculture.

11. Support for the workers

The long-standing problems affecting the working class were dealt with boldly, resulting in: harmonious co-operation between capital and labor, better working conditions, improved output by the workers, and an end to the explosive and crippling strikes which had plagued the economy.

(a) Unemployment fell 28% in 1968, while at the same time some 100,000 new workers joined the labor force.

(b) 381,902 persons were placed in jobs by the Employment Bureaus in 1968, as against 349,709 in 1967, i.e., an increase of 10%

(c) There were 77,339 unemployed, in a labor force of more than 2 million, in 1967. In August of 1968, the number of unemployed had fallen to 56,897—a drop of 20,442 within the span of a few months.

(d) More than 40,000 new employment opportunities were created in 1968.

(e) With continuing price stability, minimum wages gradually rose 15%. Thanks to collective contracts and arbitration, workers' pay rates increased between 10% and 50%.

(f) Drs. 220 million were spent on workers' housing in 1968. 1524 dwellings of the workers' housing organization were allotted by ballot and 1504 housing loans were granted to blue- and white-collar workers.

(g) An additional Drs. 25,652,610 were allotted in the first two months of 1969 for self-housing loans to workers, purchase of building sites for the construction of workers' apartment houses and other projects in the housing program.

(h) Studies were completed for the buildings and mechanical equipment of five educational centers (cost: Drs. 103 million), and an appropriation of Drs. 77 million was made available for the construction of accelerated adult education centers.

(i) In 1968, Drs. 6 million were allocated for needy girls' dowries, Drs. 4.5 million for workers' recreational projects and Drs. 35 million for aid to 145 organizations.

12. Education at the state's expense

The Revolution of April 21st established the principle of equal educational opportunities for all Greek children, regardless of economic background. It implemented that principle by assuming the total expense for national education. In Greece today:

(a) No tuition fees are paid.

(b) Free schoolbooks and textbooks are issued to schoolchildren and university students (11,500,000 schoolbooks, valued at Drs. 105 million, were issued to schoolchildren and 2,500,000 copies of textbooks, valued at Drs. 42 million, were issued to 66,000 university students).

(c) Large numbers of scholarships are granted.

(d) Loans are granted to enable students to complete their studies.

(e) 2,013 elementary and secondary school teachers were appointed, all university professorships were filled, and 3,986 new positions were added to the existing 2,275 posts of auxiliary university staff.

(f) 852 new schoolrooms were constructed in 1968; 1,058 school buildings were repaired, and Drs. 504 million worth of projects for education were adjudicated by auction (as against Drs. 10.5 million in 1965, Drs. 55 million in 1966, and Drs. 70 million in 1967).

(g) The problem of a University City for Athens was definitively solved, and construction is scheduled to commence shortly. Twenty laboratories and other buildings of the University of Patras are under construction, and work has progressed on the construction of the new buildings of the University of Ioannina.

(h) Up to February 28th, 1969, Public Investment Budget funds appropriated for national education in 1968 and 1969 totaled approximately Drs. 2 billion.

(i) State Budget funds appropriated for national education in 1968 and 1969 totaled Drs. 9.743 million.

(j) For 1969 alone, education appropriations amount to a total Drs. 5,931 million, i.e., Drs. 4,891 million in State Budget funds and Drs. 1,040 million in Public Investment Budget funds.

13. A sound social policy

(a) Housing

Following were the results achieved in the housing sector during the past year:

(1) Under the Urban Refugees housing program, the construction of 494 dwellings was completed, and another 1,235 dwellings were rapidly nearing completion, 2,400 slum dwellings were razed. An emergency program for the construction of 1,719 houses was placed under way with the demolition of slum and substandard dwellings in Athens (Tavros and Peristeri districts), Karditsa and Trikala), budgeted at Drs. 270 million.

These housing developments include basic infrastructure projects as well as the necessary community service buildings, such as schools and day nurseries.

A further 172 dwellings for refugee housing were completed and 238 are under construction, under an appropriation of Drs. 11,125,000.

(2) 6,090 dwellings were reconstructed under the earthquake relief program. 5,492 of these were constructed through the self-housing system, 381 through the National Reconstruction Service, and 217 dwellings at Aghios Efstratios and Pedinon (Limnos) through the contractor system. A further 548 dwellings, partially damaged by earthquakes, were repaired. Drs. 325,100,000 were appropriated for these programs.

In addition, funds totaling Drs. 52,250,000 were appropriated for infrastructure projects in the new settlements and for road construction in the earthquake-stricken areas.

(3) Under the housing program for the relief of families living in unsuitable conditions or families whose dwellings were destroyed by fire, lightning, etc., 158 new dwellings were completed. Drs. 30,701,000 were appropriated for this purpose and for the continued implementation of the rehabilitation program for slum-dwellers in Crete, Axios (Thessaloniki) and elsewhere.

(b) Child Welfare

(1) An extensive child welfare program was implemented, at a total cost of Drs. 345 million. The program produced:

(a) 287 day nurseries, in which 15,000 children of preschool age (predominantly workers' children) are cared for daily.

(b) 65 orphanages, now caring for 6,000 unprotected children.

(c) 81 home economics schools, at which 2,000 girls received training.

(d) 10 preventive child sanatoria, which dispensed care and treatment to 3,000 children.

(e) 55 children's camps, which catered to 37,500 children during the summer.

In addition, through the co-operation of the Ministry's services, the Patriotic Foundation for the Protection of Children, and collaborating foreign organizations, some 30,000 unprotected children received financial relief.

(2) Under the program for the protection of disabled persons, rehabilitative treatment was given to 6,100 disabled children and elementary schooling to 78 disabled mobility cases, the appropriation for this purpose totaling Drs. 68,000,000.

Specifically, through the National Foundation for the Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons, 1800 handicapped persons received therapeutical treatment and social adjustment aids; 250 disabled persons attended elementary and trade schools; 1,339 persons received assistance in the form of artificial limbs. Drs. 12 million were appropriated for this purpose.

Deaf-mute foundations dispensed assistance to 300 deaf-mute children, under an appropriation of Drs. 3.7 million; and 170 blind children were aided through the Foundations for the blind. In addition to the assistance provided through the foundations, 9,000 blind persons received subsidies under an appropriation of Drs. 31 million.

Under a separate program, 900 mentally retarded children received aid, the appropriation for this purpose amounting to Drs. 150 million.

(3) State Welfare programs dispensed aid to those cases not protected by social security agencies or other programs. Thus, 1,574 individuals received Drs. 8.5 million in aid for the temporary relief of refugees from abroad; and Drs. 1,285,000 were appropriated for relief and first aid to victims of natural disasters.

Other subsidies included:

(a) Four Schools for Social Workers (Drs. 2.4 million).

(b) Seven foreign organizations aiding the State Welfare Programs (Drs. 8.7 million).

(c) Six Homes for Incurables, in which 815 incurable cases were cared for (approx. Drs. 5.1 million).

(d) 11 foundations for the protection of working youths and needy persons (Drs. 5.7 million).

(e) 80 Homes for the Aged, in which 3,600 aged persons were cared for (Drs. 11.6 million).

Drs. 30 million were allocated for the operation of students' messes, which catered to some 12,000 students.

(c) Health

1968 was a pioneer year in the public health sector; for the first time, the protection of the health of the Greek population was established by constitutional provision.

A total of Drs. 2.16 billion was spent on health protection and hospitalization.

A far-reaching program of hospital construction was established, ensuring that in the future hospitals will be created on a regional requirement basis to cover the needs of each area throughout the country.

Moreover, every effort was made to ensure that the hospitals were staffed with the necessary medical and scientific personnel and equipped in accordance with modern technology.

In the upcountry areas, 1,230 Rural Dispensaries and 90 Health Stations operated; these facilities were re-distributed nationally to ensure that all farm workers received adequate medical care.

Protection of the public health was the object of sustained efforts.

Two and a half million persons were innoculated with polio vaccine and 510,000 persons received other innoculations. One thousand counseling stations for the protection of mothers and children operated in an exemplary fashion.

Emergency Act 300/68 established, for the first time in Greece, the compulsory premarital health certificate, for the protection of the race.

To provide better service for the public, the pharmaceutical profession (which operated very much on "closed shop" lines) was the subject of regulatory legislation (Emergency Act 517/68) opening it up and thereby providing opportunities for young pharmacists.

Insofar as the country's medical personnel potential is concerned, conditions were created whereby young doctors serve in the upcountry areas, staffing the Rural Dispensaries and provincial hospitals.

More than Drs. 20 billion were allocated in 1968 for social security (all sectors).

14. New horizons for sports

From the very first, the Revolution of April 21st turned its attention with energetic zeal to the sector of sports and athletic facilities for the Greek people. The results achieved are impressive:

(a) An end was put to the uncontrolled and arbitrary activity of the individuals in charge of sports, who consistently served the athletic and financial interests of a handful of large and powerful sports associations rather than the athletic interests of the nation as a whole.

(b) Once that ill was corrected, there was a rise in the standards of Greek sports, and conditions were created which made it possible to attain the levels required for international competition. In terms of competition on the international level, the results are well-known and most satisfactory for our national colors.

(c) Public confidence in the PRO-PO (Football Pools) has been consolidated thanks to the measures by the Government to ensure an honestly organized championship. This is borne out by the fact that whereas between January 1, 1960 and April 20, 1967 (7 years and 4 months), 457,813,627 PRO-PO entries were filled in, the number of entries for the 30-month period from April 21, 1967 to December 31, 1968, totaled 482,147,098.

(d) The success of the PRO-PO resulted in Drs. 924 million in revenues in 1968. Most of that sum was allocated for a program of large-scale sports projects—the foundation for the development of physical education in our country—and for the support of Athletic associations and organizations.

15. Large-scale tourist development

One of the National Government's primary aims was to raise the volume and quality of Greek tourism.

Some of the Government's accomplishments since April 21st, 1967:

(a) Complete re-organization of the National Tourist Organization of Greece, the agency responsible for the planning and execution of Greece's tourist policy.

(b) Radical improvement of tourist facilities, i.e.: a 20% discount on hotel rates for hotels in the A, B, and C class; simplification of customs formalities; minimum restrictions on charter flights; uniform hotel rates; ease of entering the country and moving within its frontiers; improvement and up-grading of recreational centers.

(c) Expansion of the infrastructure of summer tourism: beaches, tourist camps, motels, local roads, etc.

(d) Allocation of Drs. 150 million in short-term loans to furnish operating capital for travel agencies and hotel companies.

(e) Support of loans (totaling more than Drs. 5 billion between April 21st, 1967 and December 31st, 1968) for private investment in tourist development projects.

The Five-Year Economic Development Plan (1968–1972) provides for the allocation of Drs. 15 billion for tourism, i.e., Drs. 12.6 billion from private business sources and Drs. 2.4 billion from State investments.

Plans provide for a 100% increase in hotel accommodations (from 100,000 beds available today, to 200,000 in 1972). Between April 21st, 1967 and December 31st, 1968, hotel accommodations increased from 80,000 to 100,000 beds (in 200 new hotels).

16. Sounder local government

In the two-year period of the Revolution, the Ministry of the Interior, responsible for regional development, has accomplished major aims:

(a) Unimpeachable organization and execution of the Referendum on the Constitution.

(b) Restoration of the institution of local self-government to a sound and healthy footing.

(c) Economic support totaling Drs. 1.8 billion allocated to local government agencies for public utility projects designed to improve the standard of living of the population; also, loans totaling Drs. 300 million to 49 municipalities and communities.

(d) Establishment of numerous municipal and community libraries, gymnasiums, civic bands, etc.

17. Order and security

The spirit of April 21st has been especially beneficial in the area of Public Security. Unburdened by the influence of the past, the Nation's police departments are functioning efficiently in their appointed tasks. In 1968:

(a) Members of the Police Forces were trained and re-trained in schools and seminars.

(b) The Police Forces mechanical and technical equipment was modernized.

(c) The Emergency Squad sections in several cities and towns were expanded; the number of patrol cars was increased; and an Emergency Service of the Fire Department was established, with salutary results.

(d) Citizens sense of security has been consolidated thanks to a 19% drop in the crime rate

(e) Preventive action has resulted in a 15% drop in traffic accidents.

18. Archaeological treasures cared for

In the area of Greece's antiquities, noteworthy results have been accomplished thanks to the Government's policy. From the very first, the Government gave recognition to the important role of the Archaeological Service, which in the pre-Revolutionary period played a very minor role, both in excavation projects and restoration work. To this end, adequate funds were provided and the Archaeological Service was enabled to fulfill the requirements of its function. Since April 21st, 1967, the following accomplishments have been made:

Museums.—Construction and maintenance work was completed on the Museums at Olympia, Ioannina, Vravron, Corfu, Chios. Polygyron, Kilkis, Piraeus, Pyrgos, Herakleion, Florina, Kavalla, Thasos, Samothrace. Expansion and repair work was done at the Museums of Almyros, Poros, Paros, Mykonos, Gortys, Rethymnon, Pylos, Skyros and Gournia.

Monuments.—Restoration work has been done on the monuments of the Acropolis, on old houses dating from the Turkish occupation, on Medieval and Byzantine fortresses; and considerable real estate was purchased or expropriated for purposes of conservation or excavation.

Excavations.—Excavations conducted by the Archaeological Service were expanded: in the Athens area, in Attical Nafplion, Thebes, Sparta, Olympia, Corfu, Delphi, Volos, Thessaloniki, Mykonos and Chania. Concurrently, the Archaeological Society carried out maintenance and restoration work on monuments, restoration of pottery, and conducted 16 diggings in Peloponnesus, Central Greece, Epirus, Macedonia, Thrace, the Cyclades Islands and Crete, which have yielded valuable contributions to the country's archaeological heritage.

B. PART TWO—PLANNING

(Selected facts and figures, in summary form, from the planned programs for 1969)

The accomplishments of the National Government in 1968 were brilliant; but even greater things are promised by Prime Minister George Papadopoulos for 1969.

Planning for the current year covers all sectors of the Nation's life.

First and foremost among the projects for 1969 will be the legislative edifice to be erected on the framework of our new Constitution. Legislation, in general, will be the object of a concerted modernization and codification effort, so that "all Greeks will know the laws and abide by them."

1. Administration

The Ministries' scope is greatly expanded. Proliferation of semipublic agencies (legal entities of public law) necessitates basic tabulation and re-classification thereof. The same applies to government departments; their number will be restricted and they will be reclassified, by geographical area, in order of their true importance to the machinery of state and the needs of the citizens. At the same time, a stepped-up program of refresher training for civil servants will begin. Finally, work will commence on the development of the agrarian and urban real estate registry.

2. Education

The necessary appropriations are available for a filling of the vacancies in elementary, secondary and higher education. The construction of Drs. 920 million worth of school buildings is being auctioned. Technical education is undergoing reform. New life is being imparted to scientific research, and higher learning is being re-organized along modern lines.

3. Arts and letters

The National Art Gallery is being inaugurated this year; objectives include the opening of new horizons for the Greek spirit and the Greek intellect, through development of letters, of the representational arts, of the theatre and cinema.

4. Sports

Drs. 415 million are allocated for the completion of the 1968 projects and the development of new athletic facilities.

5. Justice

Personnel is being brought up to strength. An effort is being made to abolish the so-called correctional prisons which, instead of rehabilitating the individual tend to annihilate it as a social entity.

6. The church

Under its new Charter, the Church is engaged in finalizing the task of developing and organizing the clergy and its flock.

7. Economic policy

With all fiscal and development programs in readiness; with continuing monetary stability, foreign exchange balance and a policy of free imports and support of private enterprise, the drive is for steadily increasing turnover, improvement of the tax laws, establishment of a modern public accounting code, and abolition of the system of price controls.

8. Investment

The public investment program totals Drs. 14.5 billion, an all-time high in Greek economic history.

9. Electric power

Under the power supply program, construction is ending or commencing on the electric power projects of Kastraki, Edessaion, Megalopolis, Aliveri, Keratsini, Rhodes, Lavrion, Ptolemais, Polyfyton; 1400 settlements and 260,000 new consumers are being connected to the grid.

10. Transportation

Drs. 5.5 billion are allocated from the public investment program for roads, airports and ports, and the Greek State Railways are being modernized.

11. Agriculture—forests

Irrigation of 250,000 stremmas; construction of refrigerating plants, wine factories, canning plants; reforestation of 600,000 stremmas; development of forest roads and new forest industries.

12. Shipping

There is a project to establish a Maritime Credit Bank; to develop maritime industries and maritime training; and to attract as many ships as possible under the Greek flag.

13. Tourism

Investments totaling Drs. 1 billion in tourist development; financing of tourist projects and businesses in the amount of Drs. 4 billions; and a 25% increase in hotel accommodations.

14. Trade

Development of the export trade; arousal of public awareness of the national-interest need to consume domestic products.

15. Social services

Restoration of justice in the operation of the social security organizations so as to ensure that all citizens enjoy protection and insurance of their health. Continuation, at a faster pace, of the program of rehabilitation of 28,000 earthquake victims. All possible despatch in the construction of the 1,500 planned workers' housing units. The aim is to ensure that no Greek shall remain without shelter and to create model settlements with multi-storied buildings conforming to modern standards of sanitation and comfort.

Mr. Speaker, this is an impressive record of achievement and I hope those who have been quick to criticize will at least read the efforts being made by this nation. What Greece needs from America today more than anything else is understanding. I suggest we give the rulers of Greece an opportunity to show they do indeed intend to restore parliamentary government in Greece as soon as possible.

In the meantime, I extend my best wishes for continued progress to the people of Greece on their second anniversary. I am sure all Americans join me in a prayer that the progress will continue until Greece again assumes her rightful place as one of the great nations and leaders of the world.

EX-AMERICAN LEAGUE UMPIRES DESERVE JUSTICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Pirnie) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 13, 1968, American Baseball League umpires Al Salerno and Bill Valentine sent letters to their fellow umpires advocating the creation of an American Baseball League Umpires Association similar to the National Baseball League Umpires Association.

On Monday, September 16, 1968, the president of the American Baseball League, Joseph Cronin, summarily "fired" both umpires from their positions on grounds of incompetency.

Salerno and Valentine had both umpired in the American Baseball League for 7 and 6 years, respectively.

On September 19, 1968, Senator Jacob K. Javits joined us in sending a telegram of concern, shock, and dismay about this summary "firing" to the president of the American Baseball League.

On September 20, 1968, Mr. Cronin responded in a telegram merely reiterating his earlier statements on September 16—both statements without evidence—that Salerno and Valentine are incompetent.

If Salerno and Valentine are incompetent, what were the grounds for judging their incompetence?

If Salerno and Valentine are incompetent, are 7 or even 6 years required to judge their incompetence?

If Salerno and Valentine did not meet certain competency standards and, indeed, if 7 or even 6 years are required to determine the competency of baseball umpires, why were these men summarily "fired" in two stunning telephone calls only 3 days after they sent letters to their colleagues supporting the formation of an American Baseball League Umpires Association?

Baseball sportswriters and baseball managers have decisively answered these questions.

Al Dark, veteran American League manager:

> I don't know the whole deal, but I'll tell you these guys were two pretty good umpires. I'll take both of them on the field every game and feel I'm going to get a good, honest, hustling effort—and that's all any manager can expect.

Dick Williams, manager, Boston Red Sox:

> I had several jams with them, but I consider both of them good umpires and I'd like to see them have their jobs back.

Shirley Povich, Washington Post:

> When asked what qualifications his two unfrocked umpires lacked, Cronin said they were "just inefficient, that's all." To Cronin's credit, this was not a snap judgment. In Salerno's case, it took the AL President seven years to arrive at it; in Valentine's case, six years.

Red Smith, syndicated columnist:

> If they were never good enough, as Cronin says, it took him a hell of a while to find out. Joe has to be one of the least perceptive or most indulgent employers this side of Utopia.

Milton Gross, New York Post:

> Salerno never said whether Cronin said, "Keep in touch." It would have been such a nice touch. Taft and Hartley would have appreciated it. Or maybe Rowan and Martin. It's a laugh-in, but not for Valentine and Salerno.

Bob August, Cleveland Press:

> Cronin . . . draws his ideas from the philosophy of William McKinley. Someone should tell him what has been going on in the last 40 years. The battle for the right to organize unions was won so long ago that most people have forgotten about it . . . today Cronin looks foolish, a baseball dinosaur lumbering through the 1960's. He made a mistake and it was a beaut.

Victor O. Jones, Boston Globe:

> Cronin says it's pure coincidence that the two arbiters were fired on the very day they had completed arrangements for the unorganized American League umpires to meet with the already organized Nationals . . . if Cronin is right and these two umpires never were any good why did it take Cronin six and seven years to find this out?

Dick Young, New York Daily News:

> In view of the timing of their firing, it would occur to an outsider that this has to be the greatest coincidence since Adam stumbled on Eve under the old apple tree.

That was September 1968. It is now April 1969. And Salerno and Valentine are still unemployed umpires.

In the meantime, American League umpires have joined with National League umpires to form a Major League Umpires Association. National League umpires had organized their own association in 1963. The benefits of this association to National League umpires prior to organizing the new Major League Baseball Umpires Association is quite clear.

Offers have been made to the president of the American Baseball League that Salerno and Valentine be reinstated on a provisional basis. He has rejected these and similar offers.

Mr. Cronin, through an intermediary, contacted Al Salerno to offer him a position as an American League umpire scout in the minor leagues. Salerno, wishing to continue his career goal as an American League umpire, wisely refused this offer. How pungent could irony be? A man is told he is incompetent to umpire in the American League, yet he is told his incompetency qualifies him to scout for competent American League umpires.

Reluctantly, and only as a last resort, Umpires Salerno and Valentine presented their cases to the National Labor Relations Board. This case is pending before the regional board in Boston. Even assuming the NLRB hears their case and decides favorably, a baseball season will probably have long since passed. Precedents in similar labor union organizing cases do not offer good omens. Indeed, chances are that the NLRB will not hear the case. It should be clearly noted, however, that "pandora's box"—antitrust laws and regulations—could be opened by the NLRB, and if not there, by the U.S. Congress.

Neither Salerno and Valentine nor those of us interested in their futures want baseball to have a "black mark" because these men have been unjustly treated. We believe very deeply that the wise course of action is for these men to be reinstated as American Baseball League umpires.

Justice warrants and the image of baseball dictates such action. Justice delayed is justice denied. Justice either delayed or denied is a mote in baseball's eye.

MEDAL OF HONOR FOR COMMANDER BUCHER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last week the North Korean Communists shot down an unarmed American reconnaissance plane which was considerably outside North Korean airspace.

The United States is responding to this harassment by the Communists which apparently took the lives of all 31 members of the plane's crew.

President Nixon has said that these reconnaissance missions will be continued and the planes that fly them will be protected. I applaud his action.

It was a little more than 1 year ago, on January 23, 1968, that the Communists seized the *Pueblo* in international waters off North Korea. The 82 survivors of that ship's crew of 83 were released by the North Koreans on December 23, 1968, 11 months later.

The captain of the *Pueblo* was Comdr. Lloyd Bucher, one of this Nation's most courageous sons. It was the loyalty and leadership of this man that we Nebraskans claim as our own that sustained these men through months of mental and physical torture.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the millions of Americans who applauded this man for his leadership against overwhelming odds, I am today introducing a bill calling for the award of the Medal of Honor to Comdr. Lloyd M. Bucher.

Commander Bucher's great loves are his country, his family, and the sea. I hope that it will not be long before he is again in command of a Navy vessel, fulfilling a dream that he has nurtured since childhood.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE POLICIES AND PRACTICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCARTHY), is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, early in February of this year the activities of the United States in chemical and biological warfare were brought to my attention by a disturbing documentary shown on NBC television. I recognized that I knew almost nothing about this aspect of our military capability and decided to inform myself. My main interest was in the public policy questions relating to chemical and biological warfare. Why do we need a capability? What sort of capability do we have? What are our policies governing the use of these weapons? What do these activities cost us each year? What are the safety precautions taken to protect the public against accident? Are our academic and private institutions being improperly involved in chemical and biological research?

In order to inform myself about our CBW program I asked the U.S. Army to brief those Members of Congress who were interested in his field. On March 4, 1969, the Army presented a briefing, most of which they insisted on classifying. I did not find that briefing satisfactory; it did not answer the public policy questions. So I then prepared a comprehensive set of policy questions which I sent to Secretary of Defense Laird, Secretary of State Rogers, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Smith, Ambassador to the United Nations Yost, and Dr. Henry Kissinger of the White House staff. While waiting for replies I have made a rather extensive study of the information that is available in public; I have received assistance from several organizations that are involved in a study of chemical and biological warfare, and I have consulted a number of individuals who are very knowledgeable in the field.

I have now received replies from all of the departments and agencies that I contacted with the exception of Dr. Kissinger. His office said that they had hoped to prepare a reply to my March 20, 1969, letter by last Friday but had not had time to do so, which is perhaps as much a comment on the priority placed on CBW policy in relation to other matters as it is on the pressures of the Executive Office. I would like to comment at this time on the nature of the information that I have received.

Chemical and biological warfare activities are shrouded in secrecy, unnecessarily so in my view. The Army's unclassified briefing was perfunctory at best; the classified presentation was not much better. I get the impression that the security curtain is parted only when it serves the interests of the advocates of the program. I found the replies from the departments heartening in some respects, but more deeply disturbing in most others. By far the most revealing information appears in sources available to the public such as occasional statements by public officials, open publications, and press reports, both domestic and foreign.

Perhaps the most immediately disturbing aspect of the replies that I have received from the departments is the contradiction between some of the replies and the information that is available to the public. These contradictions should be resolved; both the Congress and the American public deserve a full explanation if the credibility of our public officials is to be maintained. Some of these contradictions are—

First. Defense states that we maintain a limited offensive capability in chemical weapons; that the carefully controlled inventories are adequate for tactical response.

Yet we have in storage about 100 million lethal doses of nerve gas at Rocky Mountain Arsenal and Tooele Army Depot. Col. S. J. Efnor stated that the gas from a single bomb the size of a quart fruit jar could kill every living thing in a cubic mile. The inventory of nerve gas seems to be more than that required for an adequate tactical response.

Second. General Hebbeler in the unclassified briefing stated that biological warfare is generally considered to have strategic implications rather than tactical.

Yet Defense says:

> Although the employment of biological weapons against U.S. population centers cannot be ruled out entirely.

There appears to be a contradiction between the Army's estimate of the threat and that of Defense.

Third. Defense states that the U.S. Armed Forces have the equipment to protect themselves against CB attack with the exception of a biological warning and detection device.

Yet I am informed that the Navy only purchases one-tenth of the quantity of atropine, the nerve gas antidote, needed for their total number of personnel.

Fourth. State and Defense say that review has shown that there is no evidence of substantial permanent or irreparable damage, no significant permanent damage, to the ecology of Vietnam due to defoliation. Both Departments cite the work of Dr. Fred H. Tschirley as an authority; Defense cites a report prepared by Midwest Research Institute.

Yet Dr. Tschirley's report itself says that the mangrove tree, a source of food in Vietnam, is particularly susceptible to damage from herbicides and that he had seen quite a few dead mangroves, a tree taking about 20 years to grow. He goes on to say that a single treatment with the defoliants orange or white would not be expected to have a lasting effect but that a second application during the period of recovery would have a wholly different effect. Press reports state we spray more than once in the same growing system.

Even more damaging, Dr. Tschirley, their authority, reviewed the Midwest Research Institute report for Ecology, a professional magazine, and said:

> Reading the MRI Report before visiting Vietnam left me with the feeling of having read a literature review that resulted in accurate general conclusions. but told me nothing about the ecological consequences of using herbicides in Vietnam. In summary, the MRI Report is a literature review of a subject for which there is a great deal of literature relating to temperate zones, but little relating to tropical vegetation. The FRI Report is disappointing because its direct applicability to Vietnam is so tenuous.

Similarly, Profs. Egbert W. Pfeiffer and Gordon H. Orians, professor of zoology at the University of Montana and professor of zoology at the University of Washington, respectively, made the following report on April 3, 1969, after a 2-week visit to Vietnam.

They described in grim terms the effects of leaf-killing chemicals on Vietnamese plant and animal life. They made a 65-mile trip by armed boat down the waterway linking Saigon with the sea. They scarcely saw a living plant. Bird life, apart from fish-eating birds, has virtually disappeared. The justification for the program, one reminiscent of the colonel's remark at the time of the Tet offensive last year that "we had to destroy the village in order to save the village," was also given by Professors Pfeiffer and Orians. They said that it was completely unrealistic to expect military commanders to forgo such measures. There is no question about it; they save American lives.

Fifth. Defense states that each use of herbicides or defoliants is approved by the U.S. Embassy and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam.

Yet this must be a recent policy change if it is true because in February 1967, Secretary McNamara told congressional committees that the decision on when and where to use chemicals had been turned over to commanders in the fields. Commanders in the area of South Vietnam can defoliate any time they think it will open up avenues of fire that are otherwise unavailable to them. Unless there has been a change in policy, this is a direct contradiction.

Sixth. Defense and State say that the only gas used in Vietnam by U.S. forces is CS, a powerful teargas; Defense says that CN, a milder teargas was also authorized some years ago. Both Departments justify its use by pointing out, that it is often used as a riot control agent, State saying:

> The fact that teargas is used for the control of riots by governments responsible to their people provides an objective standard for differentiating it from other chemical weapons.

Yet in 1965 Deputy Secretary of Defense Vance and Secretary McNamara said that South Vietnamese forces had been equipped with three gases which they had used, CN, CS, and DM. DM, otherwise known as Adamsite gas, was not classified as an incapacitating gas but rather as an irritant gas until relatively recently by the Army. Both Defense and State point out this gas often allows the Army to accomplish its aims with the minimum violence required, citing the case of civilians mixed with Vietcong that are subdued with gas rather than with explosives. Secretary Rusk spoke of the use of this gas as the attempt to use the minimum level of violence required.

Most disturbing, the New York Times reports that in 1966 helicopters dropped hundreds of teargas grenades on a fortified Vietcong area in preparation for a B-52 bombing raid. Defense spokesmen are then quoted as saying that the purpose of the gas was to drive the Vietcong out of their fortifications so that they could be killed with bomb fragments. Gas has also been dropped prior to artillery attacks according to press reports. This clear use of gas in conjunction with lethal conventional weapons is chemical warfare. The extent of the use of this technique can be speculated upon when we find Defense procuring $81 million worth of riot control munitions—teargas—in 1969.

Seventh. Defense states that strict safety practices are enforced at laboratories which work with CBW agents.

Yet Defense's overall safety record during the past two decades is poor. Fort Detrick, the Army's biological warfare research center has one of the poorest records among major biological institutions for infections. There were 3,300 accidents at Detrick between 1954 and 1962 according to the Phillips report. Half of these occurred in the laboratory, involving broken test tubes, accidental scratches from needles, and so forth. About 400 men were infected as a result of these accidents. And infections among its workers pose some danger to neighboring communities. In 1959 one worker caught pneumonic plague, a highly infectious disease. He also happened to be a lifeguard at a swimming pool and had been in contact with many people. Local residents that might have come in contact with Detrick personnel who could have been infected were not warned of the danger. Nor did the Public Health Service promptly report this to the World Health Organization as required by agreement. In 1951 an Army bacteriologist working at Detrick became ill at his home in Frederick, Md. He was placed in the local hospital where his disease went unrecognized. He was taken to the base hospital shortly thereafter and died of deadly anthrax. The dangers of failing to warn local populations so that the most careful observation can be made is clear to any health authority.

At another installation, the Rocky Mountain Arsenal, where chemical agents are stored and produced, the Army has failed to prevent accidents. In the early 1950's, leakage of toxic material from the arsenal began to kill crops and animals on surrounding farms. Vigorous complaints led the Army to drill a deep disposal well to store waste products from their activities. This resulted in the first series of earthquakes that Denver had experienced in 80 years. In the immediate period after the well was drilled and used for storage, there were over 1,500 earth tremors in the Denver area, some reaching up to 6 on the Richter scale. Some tremors destroyed property. As a result, the Army discontinued using the deep well and began pumping material out.

At the Dugway Proving Grounds, used for chemical and biological warfare testing, despite a recent order emphasizing the importance of safety, more than 6,000 sheep in nearby Skull Valley were killed when nerve gas was carried from the testing grounds onto their pastures. I am informed that tests of sheep in a number of areas around Dugway showed low-level exposure to nerve gas. In another disturbing report, I learned that the local sheriff is occasionally asked by Dugway authorities to patrol the roads that pass the proving grounds to insure that motorists don't slow down or stop beside the road. Candor is not the mark of the Army's treatment of these problems; they have refused to confirm that the sheep died of nerve gas although they paid over $300,000 to the farmer for his loss and only last Thursday, awarded him an additional $198,309 in damages.

At the Pine Bluff Arsenal in Arkansas, production center for biological weapons, contamination of a local stream leading into a nearby river with toxic material led the Army to buy up the land along the stream. Presumably the toxic material is diluted when it feeds into the river.

I do not find this safety record very reassuring.

Eighth. Defense states that gases are transported according to rules established by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the U.S. Public Health Service: that an underlying layer of sand is used to reduce vibration and absorb any leakage; that all shipments are accompanied by a trained escort; that routes are planned to avoid populated areas and to minimize time in populated areas; and that transported agents are not volatile.

Yet in the incident reported in the Denver railyards, these statements appear to the contradicted. I rechecked the facts with Dick Kruse, the reporter for KBT–TV/KBTR in Denver and found that the gondola cars carrying large tanks of nerve gas that he filmed in the Denver railyards on a siding had no sand under them; they were on a siding in the center of Denver for most of the night; that he had spent about 1½ hours filming the tanks both from the ground and up on the gondola cars and had seen no guards. General Hebbeler also stated that GB, presumed to be the agent in the tanks, is relatively volatile.

The movement of these agents by rail is fraught with danger; the Transportation Safety Board of the Department of Transportation has reported on the alarming increase in derailment and other forms of railroad accidents, up 85 percent between 1961 and 1967. As the Dunreith accident illustrated, the accident need not occur to the train carrying the gas; it might be caused by a passing train. If the accident were similar to that which occurred in Laurel, Miss., the explosion of the adjoining train might scatter nerve gas over a 10-block area of a city. Furthermore, the Transportation Safety Board will shortly announce some major revisions in transportation safety regulations because of their inadequacies, I am led to understand.

I also do not find Defense's reply that the statistical probability of a gas transportation accident is very difficult to determine because we have never had one. Certainly the art of safety and reliability analysis, as practiced by NASA and the AEC for example, has proceeded far enough to give some fairly good indications of the dangers involved.

I have also come across information available to the public on the transportation of biological agents that causes me grave concern. In a December 1967 publication issued by Fort Detrick, procedures for the careful packaging of biological agents were described, including a crash of an aircraft with biological agent containers aboard. The packages are designed to protect the biological agents that are being shipped; the report concludes:

> Any number of such packages is now acceptable in one aircraft for shipment by commercial airlines under the Official Air Transport Restricted Articles Tariff No. 6–D. Technical escort is not required. However, current regulations of the Armed Services require technical escort for any shipment in which the total volume of etiologic agent in all packages in one conveyance exceeds 3 gallons.

Although the containers survived a crash of an aircraft going 120 knots from about 40 feet up onto desert soil, it is highly questionable whether they would have survived a midair explosion with metal fragments being blown about or a crash at greater speeds into a mountain cliff. The biological agent might well have been vaporized, wind conditions might carry the vapor to a nearby community with disastrous results. As one expert has said, a fraction of a gram of purified bacteria or virus in aerosol form could be sufficient to infect anyone in a square kilometer.

The publication goes on to indicate that agents may be shipped to Fort Detrick, Md.; Pine Bluff, Ark.; Edgewood Arsenal, Md.; Dover, N.J.; Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.; Dugway, Utah; Deseret Test Center, Utah; Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.; Oakland, Calif.; China Lake, Calif.; U.S. Naval Base, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Crane, Ind.; Fort McClellan, Ala.; and possibly to Canada, Britain, and Australia.

Ninth. Defense states that we have a CBW budget of $350 million for 1969. That budget includes $139 million for napalm, incendiary weapons, and the like, weapons that I will accept as not normally falling in the definition of CBW. It contains $81 million for tear gas or riot munitions. It contains $5 million for herbicides.

Yet I find it difficult to accept this budget figure. It is generally admitted that the United States spent about $100 million for defoliants and herbicides last year. I cannot believe that we will buy only $5 million this year. A McGraw-Hill investment newsletter states that Edgewood Arsenal would spend about $420 million in 1969 for CBW materials. And this is only one center.

Tenth. Defense states that the Army does use discretion in placing CBW research contracts with academic and private institutions.

Yet it is reported to me that a number of biologists have been approached by an individual asking them to undertake certain specified research projects without identifying the source of the funds that would pay for the work—presumably the Army. Academic biologists have also indicated that they would not undertake research for the Army on CBW projects if it weren't for the great shortage of support funds in this field of science.

I also find use of the Smithsonian, even if not on CBW itself but rather in determining what areas might be suitable for CBW tests, of questionable discretion in view of the Institution's international reputation and need to keep clear of any doubt as to the nature of its work.

Going beyond the immediate contradictions which I have listed, some general comments should be made. First, the unnecessary secrecy surrounding our CBW activities from both Members of Congress and the public should be stripped away. A policy of evasiveness in responding to public inquiry only arouses more suspicion than already exists. I found Mr. Foster's reply an improvement over the information provided by the Army but even his reply has contradictions that require clarification. I believe that an inquiry calling on informed and expert opinion is required to resolve these contradictions. I am exploring with my colleagues in the House and Senate the possibility of an ad hoc committee of inquiry or a possible investigation by one of the standing subcommittees of the Senate. I expect to make a recommendation on this shortly.

Second. In comparing the replies of the departments I found a more thorough and comprehensive definition of policy in the reply received from Defense than I did from State, Defense at least says that we have a "no-first use" policy for biological warfare and implies that we have the same policy for lethal gas. The State Department says that it is up to the President to decide national policy and does not mention "no-first use" in reply to these questions. In contrast with Secretary Rusk's rather careful exposition of a no-first use policy in 1965, and a justification of the use of tear gases on humanitarian grounds, State now just says that it is the President's decision, almost an abdication of their responsibility in this aspect of foreign policy.

Third. Although General Hebbeler defended use of incapacitating agents such as teargas by saying they were not invented at the time of the Geneva protocol in 1925, it is well documented that tear gas and adamsite were extensively used in World War I. The records of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference meeting in 1931 which I placed in the Record on April 1, also clearly show that the British, the French, the Spanish, the Yugoslavs, and others stated that they considered teargas and other noxious gasses, even if nonlethal, to be included in the wording of the Geneva protocol. Significantly, neither the Defense nor the State reply justified the use of tear gas by saying that it is not included in the Geneva protocol—a change in policy from General Hebbeler's statement and Defense and State's earlier justification for use of tear gas.

Fourth. I find the use of incapacitating gas in conjunction with B–52 raids and artillery attacks, and the use of defoliants as an antifood weapon not "the minimum use of force required" or a herbicide or defoliant used for agricultural or industrial purposes in the United States and Russia, but rather chemical warfare. This is a change from our policy in World War II when President Roosevelt said:

> Use of such weapons has been outlawed by the general opinion of civilized mankind. This country has not used them, and I hope that we will never be compelled to use them. I state categorically that we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies.

Following World War II Adm. Chester Nimitz was asked about the toughest decisions he had to make. He replied:

> There were a lot of tough ones. I think when the War Department suggested the use of poison gas during the invasion of Iwo Jima that was a trying decision. I decided the United States should not be the first to violate the Geneva Convention. It cost many fine Marines.

Similarly, in the Korean war we went to extraordinary lengths to refute Communist charges that we were using germ warfare. We recognized the grave impact that belief of this charge would have on world opinion.

Yet today, although we state that we adhere to the principles of the Geneva protocol, we are using tear gas to aid in the killing of the enemy and we are using chemicals as an anti-food weapon and in a way that may well have long-term destructive effect on the Vietnamese countryside. This latter policy seems unlikely to win the battle for the minds of the uncommitted in Vietnam.

I ask, Who is responsible for this change in our chemical and biological warfare policy? Did the President decide? Has Congress agreed to this change? Do the American people accept this new policy as one in keeping with the principles and moral precepts of our Republic? This question demands the most thorough review and debate. I therefore ask President Nixon to resubmit the Geneva protocol of 1925 to the U.S. Senate for ratification so that this review can be made. I, for one, would like to know where the United States stands on this issue today.

Fifth. I find it inconceivable that the United States would knowingly use biological warfare even as a matter of retaliation. Defense admits that we have no warning system to tell when and if such an attack were used against us. Biologists tell us that the purpose of biological warfare research is to develop vaccine-resistant strains of disease. Defense tells us there is no specific therapy available for most BW agents and that vaccination against the more than 100 agents is not practical and would probably harm the health of the individual.

Dr. Joshua Lederberg, Nobel laureate biologist, warns that loosing a biological agent on a nation might well result in a worldwide epidemic raging out of control with new mutant strains of the disease developing that might not respond to a vaccine even if one were initially available.

Dr. James D. Watson, Nobel laureate biologist at Harvard who served on a Presidential Chemical and Biological Warfare Advisory Panel from 1961 until 1964 said in an interview that he thinks CBW programs should be discontinued because they are not a good way of winning wars—militarily they are a waste of time. He went on to say that the top people in the Department of Defense never gave a damn about it—it becomes dangerous with a suspicious, hostile military who are losing a war, so will try it to win.

With these comments in mind, I urge the United States to give full support to the proposal of the British to the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference that biological warfare research and use be fully banned. Research on vaccines against diseases can be conducted, openly, with the results available to everyone. An open inspection system has been suggested, one in which all biologists would report by word of mouth any suspected violation of the ban on biological weapons research or manufacture. We would have little to lose and much to gain.

Sixth. I urge that a top-panel of Department of Transportation, U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Defense, and independent academic experts be convened to review transportation policies for chemical and biological agents and to establish the strictest transportation standards for their transportation, if indeed such transportation is needed.

Finally, I intend to comment further on our chemical and biological warfare policies and practices for I regard them as one of the benchmarks of our moral and ethical principles. There are those who say that it makes no difference how a man dies. I disagree, let me draw from General Hebbeler's briefing; there is a principle of proportionality, which is not only a general principle of international law, but is also fundamental to moral law. It applies even though the target, the weapon, and the method of attack may be legitimate. It requires that belligerents refrain from employing any kind of violence which is not necessary for military purposes. I believe that chemical and biological warfare are not necessary for military purposes. Let the United States take the lead in seeing that they are banned from use. And let the United States refrain from using those chemicals which begin to break down the thin dividing line between the long-standing principle of no first use and chemical warfare.

The text of the answer from the Department of Defense follows:

APRIL 15, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCCARTHY: The Secretary of Defense has asked me to reply to your letter of March 7, 1969, concerning chemical and biological warfare.

Answers to each of your questions are attached. Copies of reports and other materials which are relevant to the questions are included. It is believed this information responds to your inquiries on an unclassified basis. There are areas which could be extended and amplified by classified discussion.

Sincerely,
JOHN S. FOSTER, Jr.,
Director of Defense
Research and Engineering.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION 1

Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a gas attack against the nation? Do we state that we will use lethal gas against a nation that launches a gas attack against us, rather than a nuclear attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and just as effective to retaliate with another weapon with which we have had operational experience?

Answer

It is the policy of the U.S. to develop and maintain a defensive chemical-biological (CB) capability so that our military forces could operate for some period of time in a toxic environment if necessary; to develop and maintain a limited offensive capability in order to deter all use of CB weapons by the threat of retaliation in kind; and to continue a program of research and development in this area to minimize the possibility of technological surprise. This policy on CB weapons is part of a broader strategy designed to provide the U.S. with several options for response against various forms of attack. Should their employment ever be necessary, the President would have to authorize their use. The U.S. does not have a policy that requires a single and invariable response. Deterrence is our primary objective.

Chemical weapons, in many tactical situations, are more effective than conventional (high explosive and projectile) weapons. Accordingly, it is believed wise to deter their use. If two approximately equally effective military forces were engaged in combat, and one side initiated a CB operation, it could gain a significant advantage even if the opposing side has protective equipment. Neutralization of this advantage could not be achieved with conventional arms.

QUESTION 2

Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a massive biological weapon attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and infinitely safer for all of mankind to respond to a biological weapon attack with other weapons with which we have had operational experience?

Answer

The U.S. policy and its rationale with regard to biological warfare is generally the same as that for chemical. As a matter of policy the U.S. will not be the first to use biological weapons, but we are aware of the capabilities these weapons place in the hands of potential adversaries. For this reason it is important to carry on our R&D program in BW, not only to provide necessary equipment ,such as detection and warning devices, but to define and quantify more fully the potential threat to the U.S. from these weapons, and the hazards involved if they are ever used against us.

QUESTION 3

If our gas biological warfare efforts are purely defensive in nature, what steps have been taken to defend our public from these threats? Why hasn't the public been instructed as to what to do in the case of a nerve gas attack, a hallucinary gas attack, or an incapacitating gas attack? Do we stockpile antidotes, serums, and vaccines for gas and biological attacks at medical centers and instruct people where they are? We do, after all, instruct people what to do in the case of nuclear attack. We stockpile supplies in fall-out shelters that are marked so that the public will know where they are. Why don't we do the same for the threat from gas and biological weapons?

Answer

The threat to the U.S. civil population from CB attack has been studied by the Department of Defense, and these analyses are periodically up-dated. It is clear that the threat of CB attack is less significant than that of nuclear attack. For this reason, more emphasis has been placed in civil defense on the nuclear threat.

For logistic reasons chemical agents do not appear to pose a major strategic threat against the U.S. For example, it would require many tons of nerve agent munitions to carry out an effective attack against a city of a few million people. This may appear inconsistent with the high toxicity of the nerve agents, but for many technical reasons such as the difficulty in disseminating the agents in vapor or aerosol form, the dilution of the agent in the atmosphere, and their impingement on ground and vegetation, it is correct. For this reason, the U.S. does not maintain stockpiles of therapeutic materials for nerve agents. Although the possibility of the employment of biological weapons against U.S. population centers cannot be ruled out entirely, it does not presently warrant the priority given to defense against the affects of nuclear weapons. Research on methods of detecting and warning, identifying, and defending against biological attack are continuing, as is the review of the magnitude and nature of the threat.

The Office of Civil Defense has developed an inexpensive but effective protective mask for civilian use, and a limited production run was made to test production quality. No large scale production was undertaken because of the low estimate of the threat as described above. Should the threat to the U.S. population increase, this mask could be produced quite rapidly and, together with other necessary defensive measures, would afford protection against both chemical and biological attack. Filtration systems have been designed and tested, and these could be added to fall-out shelters to afford collective protection for groups of people. In addition, many of the emergency plans developed by the Department of HEW for post-nuclear attack medical support would be applicable. The emergency packaged hospitals, for example, provide for expansion of hospital facilities by the equivalent of 2500 hospitals of 200 bed size.

The U.S. does not maintain large stockpiles of medical supplies such as antibiotics and vaccines against the possibility of biological attack. There is no specific antibiotic therapy available for most BW agents. As for vaccines, there are more than 100 possible BW agents, and production and administration of 100 vaccines to the U.S. population is not practical. There is medical reason to believe that such a program would be generally injurious to health in addition to requiring prohibitive expenditures.

QUESTION 4

We have been told by former Under Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance, that the "why" of chemical and biological warfare is defense. Are our soldiers in the field, Vietnam, Korea, Germany, and sailors at sea able to defend themselves against all forms of chemical and biological weapons attack? Since we are using marginal forms of a chemical warfare in Vietnam, are our forces prepared for an escalation in the use of chemical weapons? Are our troops prepared for the possibility of the enemy responding with a stronger weapon than the incapacitating gases we use?

Answer

The U.S. Armed Forces have the equipment to protect themselves against CB attack with the exception of a biological warning and detection device which is under development. U.S. soldiers and sailors generally have masks and protective clothing; and collective protection equipment for vans and Communication centers is being developed and supplied U.S. troops in Vietnam are prepared for possible enemy uses of chemical weapons.

QUESTION 5

Why do we choose to call defoliants herbicides of the type we use in our own agriculture rather than chemical warfare? What defoliants or chemicals, if any, are being used in Vietnam to destroy plant life which are not customarily used in the United States? To what extent are they used? What is the distinction between a chemical that is used to destroy crops and a plant disease from the field of biological warfare that could be used against rice or wheat?

Answer

There are *no* herbicidal chemicals used in Vietnam to destroy vegetation which have not been widely used in the United States in connection with clearing areas for agricultural or industrial purposes.

The term "defoliants" is used because it properly describes the purpose of its use; that is, to remove leaves from jungle foliage to reduce the threat of ambush and to increase visibility for U.S. Forces. This use of defoliants has saved many American and South Vietnamese lives.

There are several distinctions between a chemical herbicide and a biological plant disease. The biological agents are living plant pathogens, and may be spread beyond the area of attack by winds, insects or animals. Chemical herbicides do not spread in this manner beyond the area of attack. Further, more is known about the effects of chemical herbicides because of their widespread use throughout the world. Each use of herbicides or defoliants in Vietnam is approved by the U.S. Embassy and the government of the Republic of Vietnam.

QUESTION 6

Do we have in practice or in policy an anti-food policy through the use of defoliants in Vietnam? What are our plans to restore the environment of Vietnam which has significantly altered as a result of our defoliant policy? Will we establish a commission similar to the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission that operated in Nagasaki and Hiroshima after the war to study and correct some of the damage that we caused?

Answer

The U.S. has a carefully limited operation in South Vietnam to disrupt the enemy's food supply. It is limited to the attack of small and usually remote jungle plots which we know the VC or NVA are using. Usually these plots are along trails or near their base camp areas. Each such operation is approved by the U.S. Embassy and the government of the Republic of Vietnam. Enemy caches of food, principally rice, are also destroyed when it cannot be used by the South Vietnamese. These limited Allied activities have never, in any single year, affected as much as one percent of the annual food output of South Vietnam.

To date surveys have shown that there is no evidence of substantial permanent or irreparable damage from the viewpoint of the future development of South Vietnam, attributable to the defoliation effort. The Department of Defense has supported the Department of Agriculture in studies of herbicides in analgous areas, and I am attaching a copy of their report "Response of Tropical and Sub-Tropical Woody Plants to Chemical Treatments." The Department of Defense also had a base line study of the forests of Vietnam prepared entitled "Forests of Southeast Asia, Puerto Rico, and Texas," a copy of which is attached. More recently a study "Assessment of Ecological Effects of Extensive or Repeated Use of Herbicides" was done by Midwest Research Institute, a copy of which is attached. This study was reviewed by a special committee of the National Academy of Sciences, and judged by them to be an accurate and competent report. Last fall, the Department of State, with Department of Defense participation, made a survey of the ecology of defoliated areas. One of the scientists who made this survey, Dr. Fred Tschirley from the Department of Agriculture, published his report in *Science*. A copy of his report is attached.

At the end of active combat, it appears probable that there will be agricultural and forestry activities and other programs which will aid the South Vietnamese people. The Department of Defense would cooperate with the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development as necessary in accomplishing these. The Department of Defense supports the concept of a comprehensive study of the long-term effects of the limited defoliation program, and has endorsed, in principle, proposals by the American Association for the Advancement of Science for such a scientific study.

QUESTION 7

Why do we exclude incapacitating gases such as those used in combat operations in Vietnam, from the chemical warfare category? Why are vomiting gases, incapacitating gases, and other irritants regarded as being different from other forms of gas? Apparently, we have a policy of using non-lethal, or at least non-lethal by intent, gas in combat. Are there occasions under which the gases in use are or have been lethal? Under Secretary Vance has said that these gases are not chemical warfare because they are used by police for riot control and the like. Even if they are, this still appears to be a policy of using incapacitating agents as an offensive weapon. Any distinction made by Secretary Vance is semantic and once again opens the credibility gap.

Answer

The only "incapacitating gas" in use by U.S. Forces in Vietnam is the riot control agent called CS, although CN was also authorized some years ago. Both are tear gases. There is no known verified instance of lethality by CS, either in Vietnam or anywhere else in the world where it has been used to control disturbances by many governments.

Efforts to find the statement you attribute to the former Deputy Secretary Vance have been unsuccessful. A copy of an excerpt from his testimony two years ago before the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (February 1967) is attached. The distinction he made is that the U.S. has never used biological weapons, nor have we used lethal chemical weapons since World War I, and that it is against U.S. policy to initiate their use, but that the U.S. has used riot control agents and herbicides. It is believed these distinctions are still valid.

QUESTION 8

What precautions are taken to insure that chemical and biological warfare experiments are of no danger to the public? What precautions did not work at the sheep kill at Skull Valley in Utah? What precautions are taken when the Army moves chemical agents from a plant to a storage depot or to a port of embarkation or an airfield? What are the risks if there is a train wreck? Are the agents being transported volatile? Is the statistical probability of an accidental discharge of poisonous chemicals greater than of the probability of a nuclear explosion from, say, an ABM warhead? What can be done to counter the damage that would be done if there were an accidental discharge of a chemical agent while in transit through a city or town?

Answer

Strict safety practices are enforced at laboratories which do research on CB agents. Elaborate systems of airtight hoods, air filtration and waste decontamination are employed. These precautions and procedures are reviewed by the U.S. Public Health Service as well as by Department of Defense safety experts. The equipment and building designs developed at the U.S. Army Biological Laboratories, for example, have been generally accepted throughout the world as the ultimate in safety for the investigation of infectious diseases.

With regard to the extremely unfortunate Skull Valley incident, the exact chain of events is still not completely understood. A freak meteorological situation was probably a major contributing factor. This matter had been carefully reviewed by a special advisory committee appointed by the Secretary of the Army and chaired by the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service. A copy of this report is included for your information. This committee has made a number of recommendations concerning test limitations toxicological and environmental investigations, added meteorological facilities, and a permanent safety committee. All of these recommendations are being followed.

Movement of chemical agents is governed by rules and procedures established by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the U.S. Public Health Service. The material is shipped in special containers; these containers are put on pallets if necessary and fully restrained, and an underlying layer of sand is used to reduce vibration and to absorb agent in the highly unlikely event of leakage. All shipments are accompanied by a trained escort detachment equipped with decontaminating and first aid equipment. Routes are carefully planned to avoid populated areas to the greatest extent possible; and, where they cannot be avoided to move through them carefully and with as little delay as possible.

The precautions taken—the use of special trains, careful routing, controlled speeds and other measures—make a train wreck extremely unlikely. However, even further steps are taken to minimize any hazard that might result from an accident. Buffer cars are included in the train, the escort detachment is distributed in different cars to provide prompt full-train coverage in emergencies, and transit time through populated areas is minimized. Although the agents are not inert, it is important to note that transported agents are neither volatile nor in the gaseous state. They are liquid, and the most volatile is about eight times less volatile than water. The containers are not under pressure, and nerve agents are rapidly rendered harmless by fire.

The comparison of statistical probabilities of a railroad accident and subsequent discharge of chemicals or accidental explosion of a nuclear device is very difficult because of the differences between them. Extensive precautions are taken to provide safety in both. There has never been either an accidental nuclear explosion or an accidental discharge of chemical agent during shipment. This absence of data makes it impossible to calculate the respective probabilities of accident.

In the unlikely event of accidental discharge in a city or town, the first steps would be to secure the area; to decontaminate the liquid material, and to provide first-aid to any individuals who came in contact with the liquid. Supplies are carried in the train to accomplish this. Any alkaline material, such as bleach or quicklime, will rapidly decompose nerve agents. Because the agents have low volatility, there is little vapor hazard, however, people should not be allowed in the downwind vicinity as a matter of precaution.

QUESTION 9

What is the annual cost of our activities in the fields of chemical and biological warfare? What is the cost of munitions and weapons in these fields? Since comparable figures are available for our procurement and research programs in ICBM's, the ABM, Polaris, and similar forces, I assume they can be made available for our CBW program. If they can't, why can't they?

Answer

Total U.S. expenditures in the CB field, including smoke, flame, and incendiary weapons, is $350 million for Fiscal Year 1969. There is no procurement of lethal chemical agents or of biological agents. (Details of expenditures are given in the table below.)

CB expenditures, fiscal year 1969

	Million
Procurement:	
Smoke, flame, and incendiary	$139
Riot control munitions	81
Herbicides	5
Defensive equipment	15
Total	240
R. D. T. & E.:	
General and basic R. & D.	9
Offensive R. & D.	31
Defensive R. & D.	30
Test and evaluation	20
Total	90
Operation and maintenance	20

QUESTION 10

Do we have the capability to respond to a massive nation-wide gas or biological warfare attack? That is, could we launch a similar and immediate attack against the aggressor? The deterrent effect of our ICBM's is based on the enemy's knowledge that we can and will respond. This has been a policy publically stated by the Secretary of Defense. Is the same true in the field of chemical and biological warfare?

Answer

The answer to the question, as stated, is no: the U.S. could not launch an immediate, massive, chemical and biological attack. The U.S. has the technical capability to do this, but it has not been judged necessary or desirable to procure and install the weapon systems for "immediate massive" attack. The carefully controlled inventories are adequate for tactical response against enemy military forces; not for strategic or "nationwide" attack.

QUESTION 11

Do we have a rapid warning system that will alert the public to a chemical or biological attack?

Answer

The U.S. has developed chemical detection and warning instruments which could provide the components for a national alarm system. They have not been deployed to build such a system. However, as noted above, it is believed that the threat of strategic chemical attack is not great. Warning against biological attack is much more difficult technologically. Recently, there has been success with a prototype instrument which would provide some biological warning capability. R&D efforts in this area will be continued.

QUESTION 12

Does the Army use any discretion as to what types of institutions should be encouraged or pressed into accepting funds for work in chemical and biological warfare? Does the Army see any conflict in asking a purely civilian institution, such as the Smithsonian, to do work that might conflict with the institution's activities abroad?

Answer

The Army certainly uses discretion in selection of all of its contractors. The advice of the Smithsonian Institution was sought in identifying a suitable institute to do this work. As a result, they submitted a proposal, which was accepted. As a direct consequence of this work, there have been 45 papers written by Smithsonian scientists and published in the scientific literature. This has been a remarkably productive scientific investigation brought about by a coincidence of interests in the fauna of the area.

The Smithsonian Institution was never asked to do, nor did they do, any "military" chemical and biological warfare research. It carried out scientific investigations appropriate to its charter and objectives, and published the significant findings in the scientific literature. These results are available for use by the Army, by any other government agency, or by any nation or scientist wishing to do so.

QUESTION 13

Would the United States or any other major nation be risking its national security by dispensing with chemical and biological weapons altogether, especially in view of their many skills with weapons that have already been used?

Answer

It was pointed out in the discussion of Question 1 that CB weapons are, in many military stiuations more effective than conventional weapons. Thus, a nation which lacked CB weapons and could not deter or counter their use would have to consider more extreme measures. Unilateral CB disarmament would adversely affect a nation's deterrent capability, it would decrease its response options, and it would ultimately seriously degrade its CB defensive capability. The U.S. is committed, as President Nixon wrote recently, to "exploring any proposals or ideas that could contribute to sound weapons." The Defense Department is fully in accord with mutual arms control efforts and supports them in every way possible. For example, members of the Department of Defense will join representatives of the State Department and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in meeting in late April to assist the United Nations Secretary General's group of 14 consultant experts prepare a report to the Secretary General of the UN on the characteristics of CB weapons.

QUESTION 14

Isn't it correct, as Dr. Joshua Lederberg has said, that biological weapons are regarded as a tool of dubious value at best?

Answer

It is difficult to answer this question without knowing the context in which Dr. Lederberg stated his conclusion, nor the rationale he used in arriving at it. There are a number of technical uncertainties about the effects of biological weapons, but this does not reduce the vulnerability of the U.S. to them, nor does it negate the potential hazard they pose. Until such time as it can be proved that they are of little value to any nation, if that is indeed the case, or until reliable mutual arms control agreements are reached, it would be imprudent to dismiss them lightly.

The text of the answer received from the Department of State follows:

APRIL 7, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCARTHY: The Secretary and the Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency have asked me to reply to your letters of March 10 and March 20, respectively, in which you inquired as to our national policy with respect to chemical and biological warfare.

The answers that follow reflects those aspects of your questions that come within the responsibilities of the Department of State and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. For ease of reference, I have repeated the questions. Questions 3 and 7 can best be answered by the Department of Defense.

QUESTION 1

Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a gas attack against the nation? Do we state that we will use lethal gas against a nation that launches a gas attack against us, rather than retaliate with another weapon with which we have had operational experience?

Answer

Should the nation be attacked with either gas or biological weapons, the President would decide upon an appropriate response. As you indicate, there are a number of responses available to the nation.

QUESTION 2

Is it our national policy to respond in kind to a massive biological weapon attack? Wouldn't it be cheaper and infinitely safer for all of mankind to respond to a biological weapon attack with other weapons with which we have had operational experience?

Answer

My comment on Question 1 is equally applicable to this question.

QUESTION 4

Why do we choose to call defoliants herbicides of the type we use in our own agriculture rather than chemical warfare? It is not sufficient to say as Ambassador Nabrit did, that so-called herbicides are not a form of chemical warfare. It only extends the credibility gap between our statements and our practices. What is the distinction between a chemical that is used to destroy crops and a plant disease from the field of biological warfare that could be used against rice or wheat?

Answer

In 1966, at the United Nations, Ambassador Nabrit defended United States use in Vietnam of herbicides which involve the same chemicals and have the same effects as those domestically used in the United States, the Soviet Union, and many other countries, on the basis that such use was not prohibited by the Geneva Protocol of 1925 ("Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare"). Although not a party to the agreement, the U.S. is pledged to observe strictly the principles and objectives of the Protocol. The Protocol is not without ambiguity as to the range of prohibited chemical weapons. For example, few nations, if any, consider the use of smoke, flame and incendiary agents, all of which involve chemicals and are asphyxiating at times, to constitute chemical warfare or to be prohibited by the Geneva Protocol. Similarly, League of Nations records indicate that, in prohibiting poison gas warfare, the Protocol's drafters did not intend to prohibit the use of chemical anti-plant agents. While some nations believe that the use of chemical herbicides in war is prohibited, we have been candid about our use of these materials, and I see no credibility gap between our statements and our current practices.

In regard to your question on the use of chemicals to destroy enemy crops as compared with the use of plant diseases for the same purpose, the distinction is one of scale and control.

Herbicides can be employed with some precision and since they do not spread, in the sense that plant diseases spread, they can be controlled. On the other hand, plant diseases are living organisms capable of causing epiphytotics (plant disease epidemics). Moreover, naturally occurring plant disease organisms have been known to be carried by winds and cause destruction of food crops many hundreds of miles from the original source of infection. This is not possible with chemical herbicides.

The U.S. has never used plant diseases, or any other form of biological weapon, as a weapon of war.

QUESTION 5

Do we have in practice or in policy an anti-food policy through the use of defoliants in Vietnam? What are our plans to restore the environment of Vietnam which has been significantly altered as a result of our defoliant policy? Will we establish a commission similar to the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission that operated in Nagasaki and Hiroshima after the war to study and correct some of the damage that we caused?

Answer

There are two purposes served by the use of chemical herbicides in South Vietnam: one is to clear jungle foliage in order to increase visibility on the ground and from the air; the other purpose is to destroy only those specific food crops being grown by Viet Cong forces, thereby increasing the logistics burden on the enemy by causing him to divert human and other resources to non-combat activities. The same chemicals are used for both purposes.

With regard to the effect of the use of herbicides on the Vietnamese environment, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker established a special inter-agency committee in 1968 to make a comprehensive review of the program. The committee's task was to assess the military benefits of the program in relation to its costs, and to study its effects upon the ecology of the country. The review indicated that, in general, herbicide operations in Vietnam have been accomplished without significant permanent damage to the ecology of the country. In this regard, I am enclosing an article from the 21 February 1969 issue of "Science," which was written by Fred H. Tschirley, of the Department of Agriculture. Dr. Tschirley served on the review committee.

There is certainly much merit in a long range study of the ecological effects of herbicides in Vietnam. Such studies in combat are obviously difficult at present but should be initiated as soon as practicable.

QUESTION 6

Why do we exclude incapacitating gases such as those used in combat operations in Vietnam from the chemical warfare category? Why are vomiting gases, incapacitating gases, and other irritants regarded as being different from other forms of gas? Apparently we have a policy of using non-lethal, or at least non-lethal by intent, gas in combat. Are there occasions under which the gases in use are or have been lethal? Under Secretary Vance has said that these gases are not chemical warfare because they are used by police for riot control and the like. Even if they are this still appears to be a policy of using incapacitating gas as an offensive weapon. Any distinction made by Secretary Vance is semantic and once again opens the credibility gap.

Answer

The only anti-personnel agent used by the U.S. forces in Vietnam is the riot control agent CS, better known as tear gas. This chemical riot-control agent has been widely used by governments around the world for the control of domestic disturbances. We have no verified reports from Vietnam of any occasion in which this gas has been lethal. To the contrary, we have many reports of lives being spared by the use of tear gas. The fact that tear gas is used for the control of riots by governments responsible to their people provides an objective standard for differentiating it from other chemical weapons.

QUESTION 8

Would the United States or any other major nation be risking its national security by dispensing with chemical and biological weapons altogether, especially in view of their many skills with weapons that have already been used?

Answer

The potential risk, if any, posed to the security of the U.S. and other states by dispensing with these weapons altogether continues to be a matter for our consideration. It will require particular study in our consideration of the proposed ban on all biological weapons introduced by Great Britain at the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee (ENDC) last summer. It is expected that the results of the current study being undertaken by the United Nations Secretary-General, especially with regard to the security implications of these weapons, will provide additional insights into this problem.

QUESTION 9

Why isn't the United States initiative in chemical and biological warfare control and disarmanent as active or apparent as it is in the field of nuclear weapons?

Answer

The very nature of the threat posed by nuclear weapons required that the U.S. join with other nations in achieving agreement in this area on a priority basis.

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has long been concerned with the problem of controlling lethal chemical and biological weapons. To this end ACDA has undertaken a comprehensive program of research on the verification aspects of possible arms control measures relating to these weapons. While the results of these studies have been encouraging, the research is not yet at the point where specific measures for international consideration could be recommended.

QUESTION 10

Lethal chemicals have not been used at all in warfare by the major powers for the past fifty years and biological weapons have never been used. Why shouldn't we initiate steps at the international level to dispense with those weapons altogether, beginning with biological weapons?

Answer

We would agree with you that it may be advantageous to focus new arms control arrangements on these weapons, beginning with biological weapons. Accordingly, the U.S. has expressed its willingness to give serious study to the British proposal banning microbiological methods of warfare which would supplement the 1925 Geneva Protocol. Submitted to the ENDC in 1968, the U.K. proposal called for a prohibition on the production, possession and use in any and all circumstances of microbiological agents.

QUESTION 11

What are the United States' plans for bringing up limitations on the use of chemical and biological weapons at the United Nations, and other international forums?

Answer

The U.S. has on numerous occasions expressed its interest in participating in discussions which may promote progress in achieving effective arms control measures in the field of chemical and biological weapons. Most recently, on March 18, 1969, President Richard M. Nixon instructed the U.S. Delegation to the ENDC to "join with other delegations in exploring any proposal or ideas that could contribute to sound and effective arms control relating to these weapons." President Nixon's message hopefully will lead each delegation to undertake new and productive approaches to the problem of controlling chemical and biological weapons. It should be recalled that the U.S. in 1966 co-sponsored the operative part of a UN General Assembly resolution which called upon all States to observe strictly the principles and objectives of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. Moreover, just last year the U.S. played a leading role in the creation by the UN Secretary-General of a consultant experts group to study the effects of CB weapons. (The U.S. is one of fourteen countries represented in that group.) The results of that study, expected by July 1969, should contribute to the ENDC's consideration of the problems associated with the control of chemical and biological weapons.

I hope that the above answers will help to clarify some of the policy issues about which you have expressed concern. Please do not hesitate to let me know if I can be of further assistance to you.

Sincerely,

H. G. TORBERT, Jr.,
Acting Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

The text of the reply received from the U.S. Representative to the United Nations Charles W. Yost follows:

MARCH 28, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCARTHY: I have read your recent letter on the subject of chemical and biological warfare with great interest. Frankly I must say that many, indeed almost all of the questions you raise relate to national policy matters which do not come within the purview of my office. I have therefore taken the liberty of forwarding your letter to the Department of State so that an appropriate response can be prepared in the near future.

You ask about the degree to which the U.S. has shown initiative in this aspect of disarmament and you ask what our plans are at the UN for bringing up limitations on the use of these weapons. I am attaching to this letter a copy of Resolution 2454 which was adopted by the General Assembly on 20 December 1968 with our support. Although the U.S. was not itself an original co-sponsor of this Resolution we worked actively behind the scenes in its drafting and along with 106 other members of the General Assembly voted for it (none voted against it, only Guinea and Malawi abstained). You will note that by this Resolution the General Assembly condemns all actions contrary to the objectives of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and calls for strict observance by all States of the principles and objectives contained therein. It also asks the Secretary-General to appoint experts to prepare a report on the consequences of the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons, and to transmit this report to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva by July 1, 1969, and to the members of the UN in time for consideration of the report itself at the next session of the General Assembly in September.

The Resolution further recommends that governments give the report wide distribution through all media in order to acquaint public opinion with its contents. Since the adoption of this Resolution the Secretary-General has designated the following consultant experts to assist in the preparation of this report:

Dr. Tibor Bakacs, Chief Director of the National Institute of Public Health, Budapest.

Dr. Hotse C. Bartlema, Head of the Microbiological Division of the Medical-Biological Laboratory, National Defense Research Organization, Rijswijk, Netherlands.

Dr. Ivan L. Bennett, Former Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President of the United States, Washington, D.C. Currently Deputy Director, New York University Medical Center.

Dr. S. Bhagavantam, Scientific Adviser to the Ministry of Defense, New Delhi.

Dr. Jiri Franek, Head of the Military Institute for Hygienic Epidemiology and Microbiology, Prague.

Dr. Yosio Kawakita, President of University of Chiba, Professor of Bacteriology, Chiba City, Japan.

M. Victor Moulin, Ingenieur en chef de l'Armement, Paris.

Dr. M. K. McPhail, Director of Chemical and Biological Defense, Defense Chemical, Biological and Radiation Laboratories, Defense Research Board, Ottawa.

Academician O. A. Reutov, Professor at the Moscow State University, Moscow.

Dr. Guillermo Soberon, Chief of the Department of Biochemistry, National Autonomous, University of Mexico, Mexico City.

Dr. Lars-Frik Tammelin, Chief of Department of Medicine and Chemistry, Research Institute for National Defense, Stockholm.

Dr. Berhane Tiumelisan, Bacteriologist of the Imperial Laboratory and Research Institute, Addis Ababa.

Colonel Zbigniew Zoltowski, Professor of Medicine, Director of the Intsitute of Epidemiology, Warsaw.

Sir Solly Zuckerman, Scientific Adviser to the Government of the United Kingdom, London.

These experts held their first, organizational session in Geneva in late January 1969 and adopted their terms of reference as well as an outline for their study. It was further decided by the group that they would reconvene in Geneva on 16 April for a period of approximately two weeks.

I am sure you will agree with me that the background and expertise assembled in this group give grounds to expect that their report will contribute significantly to the further consideration of this subject at both the ENDC and the General Assembly.

I hope you will find this letter not only responsive to your request but encouraging.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. YOST.

WHY NOT TURN THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS LOOSE ON THE PROBLEMS OF WATER POLLUTION?

(Mr. REUSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I introduce H.R. 10316 to expand the responsibilities, and I hope also the imagination, of the Army Corps of Engineers for water quality improvement. Instead of putting all their resources and skilled manpower into increasingly marginal navigation, flood control, and power projects, let us turn the Corps loose on building the sewerage systems and waste disposal plants which the Nation so desperately needs if we are ever to enjoy clean water again.

The Corps of Engineers is a splendid organization. It was founded by George Washington. Its civil works program began in 1824 when the Corps received a small sum to begin the improvement of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. This peacetime responsibility was placed on the Army Corps of Engineers because at that time it was the only body of men in the Federal service with appropriate training and skill to perform works of internal improvement.

The corps' civil works program was expanded, on a tentative and experimental basis, to flood control in 1917. In 1936 it was given nationwide flood-control responsibility. At the present time, the corps also generates hydroelectric power, provides water storage for municipal and industrial use, conducts beautification and recreation activities, and carries on extensive research and development. It constructs works of beach erosion control and hurricane protection; it is studying the possible rebuilding or replacement of the Panama Canal; it has full responsibility for the water supply of the city of Washington.

In addition to the direct benefits the civil works program confers on the Nation, the fact that this function is performed by the Army Corps of Engineers is an important advantage to our national defense. It serves to maintain within our Military Establishment the largest engineering force in the world, thoroughly experienced in all types of heavy construction, and already organized, geographically dispersed, and immediately available to fulfill urgently and rapidly fluctuating military requirements in the event of a war emergency.

The corps also has a water quality program. Frequently, this has taken the form of building an upstream dam to store seasonal high water and releasing it later to augment low flow. This, of course, is dilution, not solution of pollution. In some cases, and I am thinking particularly of the Kinzua Dam in Pennsylvania, the corps' flow augmentation program has meant making a mud flat in a beautiful mountain area, in order to achieve a scarcely noticeable reduction of stench in waters a hundred miles downstream.

In aid of navigation, the corps dredges out harbors and ship channels annually around the shores of the Great Lakes. Sanitary and industrial wastes concentrate in these harbors and channels, and form a large part of the dredge spoil which the corps removes. Then the corps dumps the spoil in the open water of the lakes. The corps pollution abatement program here is concerned with abating pollution caused by its own dredging activities.

The corps is responsible for enforcing section 13 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, which makes it unlawful to discharge any refuse other than sanitary sewage into navigable water of the United States. The corps is making commendable progress in identifying industrial solids, such as fly ash, mill scale, and wood fibers, which are being discharged into our navigable waterways by neighboring industries, and is also making a half-hearted attempt to stop these industries from using navigable streams as their trash dumps, or at least to make them pay for the privilege of doing so.

The corps has pioneered in installation of sewage treatment plants in watercraft. It has experimented with numerous types in its own vessels, and is getting experience which will be invaluable to the entire shipping industry.

But, like many old agencies with splendid records in war and peace, the Corps of Engineers suffers from hardening of the arteries. It tends to limit itself to tried and true old solutions to new problems. All too often its solution to a navigation, flood control, water quality problem is—build a dam, and the bigger the better. Its historic mission continues, even though nearly all the feasible dam sites on major rivers have already been used, flood plain zoning is increasingly a cheaper method of flood control, more irrigated land merely results in more agricultural surpluses, and more dredged river-channels for navigation further demoralize our railroad industry. Worse, the Corps of Engineers' passion for construction threatens to destroy the ecological balance of some of our most beautiful rivers and estuaries.

H.R. 10316 will give the Corps of Engineers an alternative to big dams. Let the fight on water pollution become for the Corps the moral equivalent of war. Instead of fighting man and nature, let the Army fight the enemies of man and nature—sewer sludge, coliform bacteria, fertilizer and pesticides washed off farm land into lakes, industrial poisons, all manner of waterborne muck and slime.

Let the Corps of Engineers expand its

research and development for water quality improvement. Let it go forward with pilot projects of the same massive scope and irresistible momentum as its high dams. For example, let there be a project to collect, purify, store and reuse storm waters of some great city now awash with sewage in its combined storm-sanitary system every time it rains. Let there be a basinwide project to collect all the sanitary and industrial waste water of a watershed, before or after primary treatment, purify it, store it in a reservoir, and use it for downstream navigation and water supply. Let there be pilot projects for storing such waters underground and dispersing them to depleted aquifiers.

The navigation and flood control activities of the Corps of Engineers, unlike the sewage treatment construction grants of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, are all Federal programs. They do not ordinarily require matching funds from the States and local communities. Uncle Sam pays the bill to protect business and property. Should it not do the same, at least for pilot projects, to protect the public health and environmental amenity of all the people?

H.R. 10316, therefore, would provide for the new, massive water pollution abatement activities of the Corps of Engineers to coexist side by side and in healthy competition with the more timid partial grant-in-aid sewage treatment program of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. The FWPCA program, even if it were adequately funded, gives only fractional—30 percent or so—grants for water purification works, leaving to the locality the impossible task of soaking the homeowner through the real estate tax for the lion's share of the cost.

Furthermore, the program is grotesquely underfunded. Though Congress has authorized $1 billion for fiscal 1970 for antiwater pollution grants, the actual budget request is a miserable $214 million. Fortune magazine estimates that at least $3 billion a year is, in fact, what is required.

So let the Corps, pursuant to H.R. 10316, cease its big-dam fetish, and instead turn its talents to the job it ought to be doing—an all-out attack on water pollution.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 10316

A bill to authorize and direct the Corps of Engineers to engage in public works for waste water purification and reuse

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of America in Congress assembled, That the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, is authorized and directed to include in its civil works program projects for research, development, demonstration, and construction of works for the collection, purification, storage, and/or reuse of storm waters, sanitary sewage, waterborne industrial wastes, and other liquid wastes. Its civil works program shall give priority to those projects which reflect the most favorable ratio of environmental benefits to costs. The projects authorized by this Act shall be governed by the provisions of Title 33, United States Code, Sections 701–701C, relating to flood control projects.

THE JULY 1968, REPORT OF THE PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON TRAVEL—A CONSTRUCTIVE DOCUMENT

(Mr. REUSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in February 1968, the Presidential Commission on Travel submitted to the President, through the Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel, its preliminary recommendations for increasing travel to the United States.

In March 1968, the President requested the Commission to develop long-term recommendations. Those long-term recommendations were submitted to the President by the Commission on June 29, 1968.

Because the recommendations of the report are in my judgment sound, and should be promptly implemented, I include herewith the letter of transmittal and the text of the report, with less important matter omitted:

PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON TRAVEL,
June 29, 1968.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This final report of the Commission on Travel describes positive actions—principally by the private sector—taken during the past six months at your request to increase foreign travel to the United States. It also summarizes necessary further actions—principally by government—which must be taken to reduce the travel deficit and meet U.S. long-term balance-of-payments objectives.

Many travel incentives have been developed since January 1. The foreign visitor to the U.S. can obtain sizable discounts on everything from plane fares to hotel accommodations. His entry is faster and smoother; his reception more hospitable. Travel to the U.S. is possible for thousands of foreign families who could not have entertained the thought before.

However, civil disorders are discouraging travel to the U.S. by foreign tourists. Legislation and voluntary restraints will not reduce travel abroad by Americans to the degree originally expected.

The spread between our travel expenditures and receipts is projected to grow to $4 billion by 1975 unless far-reaching measures are adopted. The only feasible solution is a tremendous increase in inbound travel—an enormously difficult challenge. To reduce the U.S. travel deficit below $1 billion by 1975, annual travel receipts must be double the annual percentage increases of the past eight years.

There is a solution.

Industry and government must expand on the start initiated by the Commission to repackage and reprice travel to the U.S. and ensure that potential foreign travelers are made aware of these new developments. Unless the 90th Congress enacts pending legislation waiving visa requirements, our 1969 foreign visitor promotions will go to press with a vital element missing.

Government efforts of a nature and scale far different from those previously mounted should be put into motion, emphasizing innovation and leadership in achieving a strong and permanent commitment from private industry to federal objectives.

The scope and emphasis of federal programs must be altered drastically. The U.S. Travel Service has been a major disappointment. It has not built support with Congress and private industry or substantiated its effectiveness. Its reputation gravely inhibits its ability to hire and hold effective personnel and obtain necessary appropriations from Congress. Revamping USTS within the same mold stands little chance of changing its reputation and strengthening its personnel soon enough.

I believe USTS should be replaced by a new independent agency, oriented to balance-of-payments objectives. Unlike the USTS, the new agency should concentrate on engaging the resources of private industry. However, as there is insufficient time for action by the 90th Congress, there is no alternative but to go with the USTS during the balance of 1968. If, over the next six months, it performs no better than in the past and fails to follow the lead now established, a reorganization bill should be submitted when the 91st Congress convenes.

There also exists a pressing need for a new private, non-profit organization which would orient all U.S. travel-related firms toward balance-of-payments objectives. This organization could be called the International Travel Institute. Its membership would include the spectrum of travel enterprises, and state and local organizations which have cooperated so effectively with the Commission. Its activities would encompass the many operational elements of the Foreign Visitor Program—from convention solicitations to the preparation of multilingual guidebooks, to advertising and promotion.

It is essential that the government agency and the private Institute be separate entities. Firms, states and municipalities must be directly involved in the Foreign Visitor Program, but they find it difficult to justify contributions to federal programs not subject to their control. They will, however, support a private association which becomes the instrument through which federal objectives can be programmed.

Private support for the Institute would come from dues, joint advertising programs, grants for market research, and subscriptions to and advertising in Institute publications. Discussions with state travel organizations and a cross-section of travel-related firms convince me that significant non-federal financing would be available to the Institute—provided that the private sector is convinced of the government's serious commitment to the Foreign Visitor Program.

—Government support for the Institute would be by contracts of the USTS (or its successor). Appropriations for the government agency should be from a special fund derived from 30 percent of the taxes to be levied on international travel tickets.

—I recommend that you appoint a preparatory commission to obtain the private sector financial support for the proposed International Travel Institute, and then to incorporate it as a private, non-profit organization.

Respectfully,

ROBERT M. MCKINNEY.

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON TRAVEL

A. IMMEDIATE PROGRAM

1. Accomplishments

Actions which could be implemented quickly and have an impact on inbound travel during 1968 have been accomplished, ensuring a smaller U.S. travel deficit in 1968 than would otherwise occur. These and other measures under way will also have longer-term impact.

1968 has witnessed the following significant developments, initiated by the Task Force and the Commission:

February

The Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel submitted to the President its recommendations for increasing travel to the U.S.

U.S. airlines increased 1968 budgets for advertising outside the Western Hemisphere to $16.5 million, up $5.5 million from 1967.

The Civil Aeronautics Board authorized six international and ten domestic air carriers to bring 2,000 travel agents, tour operators and travel editors to the U.S. for familiarization tours in 1968.

Major car rental companies offered 10 percent discounts to foreign visitors.

March

At the President's request, the Commission began implementing recommendations of the Task Force and developing further long-term recommendations.

A nation-wide campaign to enlist the support of private firms for 1968-69 Foreign Visitor Program was launched.

April

Transatlantic air carriers adopted special round-trip family rates for residents of Europe and the Middle East traveling to the U.S. in 1968. The new directional fares represent a reduction of between 11 and 38 percent on trips to the U.S. which originate in Europe or the Middle East.

Domestic air fares for foreign visitors traveling within the continental U.S. were reduced 50 percent.

Special new railway fares reducing the cost of round-trip tickets by 25 percent became available to foreign visitors.

The travel industry and the USTS began promoting stopovers in the U.S. by visitors to the Olympic Games in Mexico City.

State governors issued proclamations urging all citizens to encourage visits by friends to the U.S. and to receive foreign visitors hospitably.

May

The Foreign Visitor Hospitality Card Program, providing a wide range of attractive discounts, became operational. The card makes available a variety of discounts, ranging from 10 to 50 percent, offered by 6,000 establishments throughout the nation. Included are over 300,000 hotel rooms.

The Hospitality Card became a major theme of the $16.5 million advertising campaign mounted by U.S. airlines abroad.

Round-trip sea fares to the U.S. on trips originating in Europe were reduced 20 percent.

The Secretary of Commerce asked U.S. international corporations to assist generally with, and to provide incentives for, travel to the U.S. by their foreign employees.

June

Experimental one-stop entry procedures commenced at international airports in New York and San Antonio. The new system is enabling most inbound travelers to clear immigration, customs, health and agricultural inspections in about 15 minutes.

The Department of the Interior eliminated admission fees for foreign visitors at national parks and other recreational areas.

Major international ports of entry adopted broader usage of standard multi-lingual signs and directional symbols.

The Commission's recommendations on a long-term Foreign Visitor Program for the U.S. and the organizational structure required for its implementation were submitted to the President.

July

A 144-page pocket-size booklet listing all discounts available to Hospitality Card holders was distributed worldwide.

The Advertising Council launched a $5 million nation-wide public service campaign urging Americans to invite friends from abroad to visit the U.S., and to receive foreign visitors hospitably.

Other Actions Underway

An amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act which would waive visa requirements for business and pleasure visits of up to 90 days has been reported out by House Committees. It is scheduled to be voted on by the House in July. Senate action is pending.

The motion picture industry delivered the first of a series of one-minute television commercials designed to promote travel to the U.S. These are to be distributed overseas this fall.

Blue Cross-Blue Shield has developed low-cost medical insurance for foreign visitors and is attempting to solve marketing problems.

The U.S. began negotiations with Canada to increase duty-free allowances granted Canadian residents returning from the U.S.

A bill has been drafted to exempt from federal excise tax foreign visitor purchases of cars, for eventual export.

2. Actions not taken by Government

The Department of Commerce has not accepted the recommendation that the USTS appropriation for 1969 be programmed and substantiated at $30 million. USTS requested only $4.7 million for FY 1969, and is considering requesting a supplemental appropriation of only $1.3 million. Justification of its request was based merely on expansion of existing programs.

Recommendations urging implementation of "Bernstein Report" suggestions to improve Department of Commerce balance-of-payments travel statistics have not been acted upon.

Recommendations concerning Customs pre-clearance and oral declaration procedures have not been acted upon.

3. Outlook for 1968

Although considerable progress has been achieved, the Foreign Visitor Program will not reach full effectiveness in 1968. The unfavorable impact abroad of our civil disorders, the time needed to implement recommendations, the further delay before actions become fully effective, and the continuing inadequacy of U.S. Government efforts, preclude immediate accomplishment of goals established for the U.S. Foreign Visitor Program.

Important design and structural elements of the 1969 program, including enactment of visa waiver legislation, must be ready by November, 1968, five months from now. Therefore, major U.S. efforts should now be concentrated on 1969 and beyond.

B. LONG-TERM PROGRAM

1. Recommendations

The following summarizes the Commission's long-term recommendations.

(a) A new Foreign Visitor Program should be adopted with the objectives of: (1) an annual growth of U.S. receipts from foreign travel of 15 to 18 percent, double the average annual increase of the past eight years; and (2) a redirection of industry toward the international travel market.

(b) The scope and emphasis of federal programs must be altered drastically, concentrating on actions that will demonstrably strengthen our balance of payments. The programs should emphasize innovation and leadership in achieving the permanent involvement of private industry.

This will involve the creation of new programs aimed at increasing expenditures by foreign visitors. For example: promoting visits by Canadians, and more affluent travelers from other primary markets; devising programs to encourage the purchase of U.S. products by visitors; and designing tours and conferences of special interest to the emerging class of technocrats in Europe, Japan and Latin America.

Effective market research, which government has deferred, should be guiding current programs. USTS has dissipated a limited travel budget by undertaking too many promotional activities itself—activities which private industry could have carried out more effectively.

(c) Two organizations should be established to implement the Program: a reoriented, vitalized government travel office; and a new private organization, created with full government support, broadly representative of travel-related firms and state and local organizations.

(d) As there is insufficient time for the 90th Congress to consider alternatives, the Commerce Department should reorient U.S. Travel Service objectives and programs. The national interest requires that in January, 1969, a hard look be taken at the degree of success attained. If USTS continues to prove unequal to the task, a reorganization plan should be submitted early in the 91st Congress creating a new National Travel Office as an independent agency.

(e) There should be created immediately a separate, private organization, to be known as the International Travel Institute, with which diverse private enterprises could identify, and through which they could collaborate with the government. It would carry out operational elements of the Foreign Visitor Program; for example, advertising, promotion, convention solicitation, tour operator relations, and visitor reception services. In its method of operation the Institute would follow the example of the British Travel Association and the Hawaii Visitors Bureau.

(f) Government's commitment should be increased to annual appropriations of $30 million. It should seek commensurate commitments from industry and state and local tourist organizations.

(g) Appropriations for the USTS or its successor (including funds for contracts with the Institute) should be from a special fund made up of amounts equal to 30 percent of the revenues from the ticket tax on international travel. (As a precedent, 30 percent of U.S. Customs receipts is set aside for the disposal of agricultural surpluses.)

Support of private, state, and local travel organizations for the Institute should come in the form of dues, joint programs, grants for market research, and subscriptions to and advertising in Institute publications.

(h) A preparatory commission should be appointed to obtain private sector financial support for the proposed Institute and then to incorporate it as a non-profit organization.

2. Long-term outlook

Economic and social forces are causing Americans to travel more and spend more abroad. U.S. disposable income, and the proportion of it spent on foreign travel, are increasing; more Americans want to travel abroad; new airplanes with larger capacities and greater speeds will soon bring lower fares. Unfortunately, the disposable income base from which foreigners finance their travel is smaller than that of U.S. residents. As a result, the U.S. lost $2.1 billion in its travel account last year, and unless there is a basic change in the factors involved, the spread between U.S. travel payments and receipts will widen—probably reaching $4 billion by 1975.

Legislation to motivate deferment of nonessential foreign travel has not been enacted. Voluntary restraints will wear thin with the passage of time. A government-sponsored "Fly American" campaign could result in a net reduction of our foreign earnings through: reduced exports of U.S. airplanes, reduced foreign airline promotion of the U.S. as a tourist attraction, and foreign government counter measures.

It is evident that the larger part of any significant reduction in the travel deficit must come from the Foreign Visitor Program. Given projections of U.S. expenditures abroad for travel, achieving the President's request for a reduction of the travel deficit will require a 15 to 18 percent annual increase in travel receipts through 1975—a difficult challenge. An all-out effort by private enterprise to attract foreign visitors to this country is not likely without government leadership. The U.S. travel industry is fragmented, sells primarily to the domestic travel market, and is little concerned with inbound international tourism. At the same time, government programs are inadequate. They do not concentrate on balance-of-payments objectives or needed priorities. They provide no leadership to the private sector. Prior to the Task Force and the Commisson, government and private efforts had not been cross-fertilized or coordinated. The travel deficit will continue to deteriorate unless counteracting steps are taken at once.

Fortunately, many foreigners put heavier emphasis on travel in their budget priorities than do Americans. Potentially rich, untapped markets are emerging abroad as a result of improving world-wide standards of living. The size and importance of the United States, and its influence on many aspects of life in other nations, place it in a unique position in terms of potential tourist interest. The U.S. remains at the top of the "want to visit" list of most European nations. These factors, if properly capitalized, make the goals of the Foreign Visitor Program feasible. If foreign travelers are to be attracted away from alternative destinations, the U.S. must become more competitive and invest larger sums in advertising and promotion. Foreign travelers must be made aware of new developments which make the U.S. less expensive and more attractive as a tourist destination. A concerted program to improve the domestic travel product will be needed to: establish reception centers; coordinate host programs; create multi-lingual guide services; develop a nation-wide hosteling system; lower costs selectively; increase purchases of U.S. goods by foreign visitors; and expand the scope of travel by foreigners.

3. *Organizational rationale*

A government agency operating alone has the advantages of: responsiveness to Administration policy; operating without the constaints of conflicting private viewpoints; availability of services and facilities of other government agencies; access to public funds; and prestige. It faces, however, the inherent difficulty of a government entity engaging in promotional activities. But more basic, it precludes active participation by the private sector in the government's program. It is not sufficient for involvement of industry to be limited, as in the past, to participation in advisory groups; there must be a partnership involving goals, programs, and use of manpower.

As an alternative, the Foreign Visitor Program could be carried out by a private industry association. This has the advantage of flexibility of operation. Promotional activities could be conducted for which government agencies are not particularly suited. This form of organization would provide identity and association for the diverse private organizations, and create a format for a cohesive interaction of efforts within the travel industry. If it does not succeed, activities can be terminated without statutory revisions, and personnel changed without civil service restrictions.

However, private industry currently does not have sufficient interest in the international travel market to launch the Foreign Visitor Program by itself. It also is questionable whether a private corporation should be given sole responsibility for a task which is of such importance to the future of the United States.

Our recommendations for implementing the Foreign Visitor Program—through a government travel office and a private Institute—provide a unique system involving two organizations with complementary roles, each responsible for what it does best, but with a single purpose. The dual structure could help remove the basis of distrust in the relationship of future Congresses to new government programs.

The system also provides a basis for direct cooperation with regional associations of the states. The wide variations in geography, climate, and man-made attractions across the United States make such regional grouping logical for the promotion of foreign tourism. Each region is similar, in terms of tourist attractions, to a separate country and should be promoted as such. In addition, enthusiasm, dedication and emotion are needed to promote tourism. Residents of the separate regions can best provide this type of support. The Institute or the government travel office could reinforce regional programs by participating in joint promotional activities with the regional associations, matching to some extent their funds expended on programs outside the United States. The promotional dollar of the Federal Government and the states thus would be stretched.

Discussions with the travel industry indicate that private financing and support can be obtained for programs of the Institute provided that the private sector is convinced of the Federal Government's serious commitment to the Foreign Visitor Program. The largest commitments would probably be for specific promotional programs and projects of direct interest to member organizations, rather than to the general operating budget. For example, a New York City reception center might be financed by New York State, the City of New York and local industry. An advertising campaign in Spain might be financed by Pan American World Airways and Trans World Airlines. In each case, the government travel office could provide financial support by contract with the Institute.

While attempting to improve and vitalize the USTS within the Department of Commerce is the least complicated alternative for the government office, the USTS record does not engender confidence in the outcome of such efforts. Changes in federal travel programs must be sufficient to convince Congress and private industry that a new effort is being launched which is capable of far greater achievements and which justifies their full support.

A newly-established independent agency, having as its prime objective the building of foreign travel receipts, would have the benefit of fresh consideration by Congress and the advantage of dramatizing the government's program.

4. *Budget requirements*

Our program analysis—including a review of the programs of foreign national tourist offices—indicates that if the Federal Government hopes to redress the deficit in the travel account, research and development programs are urgently needed to guide both industry and government investment; and heavy advertising will be needed to provide the best return on this investment, generate additional advertising by private organizations, and encourage the travel industry to redirect its efforts at foreign markets. There is a need for leadership to demonstrate new activities, identify new markets and develop new days of promoting all markets.

The Commission has costed the elements of the recommended Foreign Visitor Program and has arrived at an annual budget estimate of $30 million. This sum would eventually be divided between the government travel office and the Institute, as follows:

	Travel Office	International Travel Institute
Program planning and research	$500,000	$830,000
Central administration	550,000	760,000
Operation of foreign offices and promotional activities	2,350,000	6,790,000
Industry-Government coordination	605,000	
Product and service development	695,000	5,620,000
Direct advertising	None	11,000,000
Budget total	4,700,000	25,000,000

Prior to the Institute becoming fully operational, some reallocation of the $4.7 million programmed for the government travel office will be necessary, including "seeding" funds for the Institute.

The growth of the Institute's budget will depend on how soon additional Congressional appropriations are voted, and how rapidly nonfederal commitments are obtained.

I. PROGRAMS COMPLETED

[Omitted]

II. ACTIONS ON WHICH PROGRESS IS BEING MADE BUT HAS NOT YET BEEN COMPLETED

[Omitted]

III. RECOMMENDATIONS ON WHICH NO CONCRETE ACTION HAS BEEN TAKEN

[Omitted]

IV. LONG-TERM PROGRAMS

(Summarized from the Commission's "National Travel Program Report")

Introduction

Forecasts of U.S. travel expenditures abroad through 1975 indicate that future annual increases in travel receipts must average 15 to 18 percent annually if the travel deficit is to be less than $1 billion by 1975. This is *double* the annual increase in U.S. travel receipts over the past eight years. It represents an enormously difficult challenge which cannot be met unless the U.S. Government and private industry discard their past attitude of indifference toward encouraging inbound international travel.

The U.S. travel industry consists of a fragmented, widely-dispersed group of enterprises often too small to be concerned with business outside their local areas. Even for those firms with broader horizons, the size and potential of the domestic market serve to diminish their interest in selling U.S. tourism abroad. The only major U.S. firms vitally concerned with inbound international tourism are international carriers. However, because of similarity of service and intensity of competition, profit motives dictate that a high percentage of their promotional efforts be devoted to selling their individual companies, rather than the U.S. That portion of their advertising which is devoted to promoting the U.S. often concentrates on limited destination areas. Thus, some of the most attractive U.S. tourist assets are not being promoted by the carriers.

Analysis indicates that coordination and an intensification of effort could be profitable for both government and private industry. Potential untapped markets have emerged as a result of continuing improvement in the world-wide standard of living. A new middle class is emerging in many foreign countries with four weeks' paid vacation and the financial capacity for travel. The French market is one example: In the period 1962–1970, the number of skilled workers will increase 14 percent; junior management personnel, 39 percent; and technical employees, 56 percent. There will be 30 percent more engineers and 48 percent more senior management personnel. Many of these people intend only to travel to neighboring countries, but they can be influenced to make more distant trips if adequate promotional programs are directed toward them. These potential visitors must be made aware of U.S. tourist attractions and convinced they can afford them.

The size and importance of the United States and its influence on many aspects of life in other nations place it in a unique position in terms of potential tourist interest. Surveys continually show that most foreigners cite the U.S. as the first country they would choose to visit if they had the opportunity. These advantages, if properly capitalized, could ensure the U.S. success in attracting visitors in spite of the higher costs of traveling to the U.S. and the relatively lower purchasing power of many potential foreign visitors. Even lower income foreigners should be susceptible to "once in a lifetime" vacations in the U.S.

Objectives

The objectives of the United States Travel Service, as declared in the International Travel Act of 1961, are:

"To strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally."

There are two difficulties with these objectives as goals for the U.S. Government: they are not balance-of-payments oriented and they are not sufficiently quantitative to demand a responsive effort that can be measured for effectiveness.

The stringencies of the U.S. international monetary problem necessitate that the overriding objective of a national travel policy be to increase substantially total receipts from foreign travel to the United States. To achieve this objective, the United States must become a more attractive and pleasant place for foreigners to visit. Accomplishment will also lay the basis for improved international understanding. Nevertheless, the U.S. must not lose sight of the basic balance-of-payments goal.

The nature of the travel problem dictates that the part of the travel deficit represented by international transportation be solved by the carriers, rather than being directly attacked by the Federal Government, for the following reasons:

(1) At present, foreign carriers handle about 80 percent of all inbound foreign travel, and they spend at least as much as U.S. carriers in promoting visits to the U.S.

(2) If the U.S. is to obtain the large increase in the number of foreign visitors necessary, the continued cooperation and good will of those foreign carriers is essential.

(3) Foreign carriers are substantial purchasers of the U.S.-manufactured aircraft and replacement parts.

(4) Any action taken to diminish foreign carrier revenues by government appeal to U.S. citizens to travel on American flag carriers would undoubtedly incur retaliation by foreign governments, and be self-defeating.

Achievement of the balance-of-payments goals intrinsic in the mandate of the Commission requires that:

U.S.-flag carriers be asked to concentrate their efforts on obtaining a larger share of international fare receipts; and

The prime objective of the government's travel effort be a 15 to 18 percent annual increase in other travel receipts.

The level of effort required to achieve this prime objective requires a major reorientation of all major travel-related enterprises in the United States toward international tourism. The travel industry has not evidenced the ability or an inclination to do this by itself. However, the Commission has demonstrated that U.S. Government leadership is welcomed by the travel industry and is effective in achieving change and progress. Continuing government leadership will be necessary to attain a comprehensive and permanent reorientation.

Program choices

A consideration of program choices for the Foreign Visitor Program is hampered by the lack of adequate market data and statistics on foreign travel to the U.S., and the absence of reliable measures of effectiveness that can be applied in advance to program alternatives. However, the experience of national tourist offices in other countries is helpful.

The most sophisticated foreign national tourist offices tend to look upon themselves as marketing operations for the domestic travel product. Their programs cover: media advertising, exhibits, public relations, promotional literature, personal selling, direct mail advertising, conventions, incentive sales, special events, tour programs, visitor reception services, travel counseling, research, and financing for hotels and service facilities.

The majority of foreign tourist offices consider market research essential. However, they have an immediate advantage in identifying their own primary market—the United States—and they have a wealth of data to draw upon.

Foreign tourist offices also regard media advertising as essential, devoting an average of 32 percent of their total budgets to this program element. Most tend to regard advertising as a "seeding" device which can: (a) stretch and reinforce advertising by private industry, (b) enhance the returns from other promotional programs and product development, and (c) generate publicity.

Most foreign tourist offices cite direct sales promotion as their most effective marketing mechanism and the activity most susceptible to measurements in terms of impact. Many tourist offices have found attractive cost-benefit ratio results from the promotion of international conventions.

Offices abroad are considered essential to even the smaller tourist offices as they provide a framework for influencing those who sell travel. Tourist officials believe, however, that direct services to the public by their overseas staffs should be de-emphasized as benefits gained do not justify the costs involved.

Formulation of a budget for a U.S. Foreign Visitor Program could be based on the Canadian or British model—involving about $10 million annually—adjusted upward by 50 percent because of salary and other cost differentials, and because the markets that it must reach are less fertile than the U.S. market. To these costs must be added additional emphasis on research, product development and industry coordination especially needed by the United States. A second guide to budget levels is the expenditure by foreign tourist offices in those countries which are prime markets for U.S. promotion—about $15 million. Again, additional funding would be required to attain the objectives of industry coordination, research and product development.

Another way to approach programming and budgeting is to begin with the recommendations in the report of the Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel, which are responsive to the objectives of a specified reduction in the travel account deficit and a reorientation of the travel industry. Unlike past U.S. Government efforts, such a program would allocate substantial resources to product development and visitor services. Its strategy would be to lead and initiate, urging the industry to break new ground. It would provide (or cause private groups to provide) critical missing elements of promotion and product to create what might be termed a "balance tourism system."

Program models

Three possible models for a Foreign Visitor Program emerge from our examination of program choices and budgetary levels:

Activity	Industry catalyst model (No. 1)	Product improvement research and promotion model (No. 2)	Comprehensive model (No. 3)
Advertising	None	$3,000,000	$12,000,000
Promotion, including Overseas Offices	$2,350,000	5,500,000	9,000,000
Product and Service Development	1,250,000	5,000,000	7,000,000
Program Planning and Research	500,000	800,000	1,200,000
Industry Coordination	600,000	700,000	800,000
Total	4,700,000	15,000,000	30,000,000

The industry catalyst model (No. 1), operating within the constraint of the present authorization for USTS appropriations, would emphasize missionary work in industry, such as the Travel Commission has engaged in, and a greater investment in research than USTS has undertaken. This program would require reallocation of USTS resources, redirection of its efforts and some change in personnel. Its objective would be to achieve a greater return from the current annual appropriations of USTS.

The product development, research and promotion model (No. 2) builds on Model No. 1, and provides for the implementation of many recommendations of the Task Force and Travel Commission by heavy investment in market research, sales promotion, and pilot projects. Its advertising budget of $3 million would be designed to generate additional advertising by private organizations. Again, it emphasizes Federal Government leadership and stimulation of industry.

The comprehensive model (No. 3) allocates substantial funds to fill the gap in destination advertising in foreign markets. Such heavy investment in advertising is based on the premise that the initial advertising effort should be large enough to: generate a high level of immediate interest; motivate those prospects considering trips to the United States to come *now*; and trigger heavy editorial coverage. Advertising experts believe that to start advertising modestly would not provide the best return on investment, as levels of awareness, excitement and interest can best be attained by heavy media exposure at the start. Where product development and improvement are being carried out, there is a need to assure that knowledge of such action is widely disseminated. Advertising money provides leverage in generating additional and more effective private advertising. In fact, an advertising budget could be treated as research and demonstration projects are treated—to test new approaches and to provide a basis for encouraging the travel industry to redirect its effort at foreign markets.

There exists no reliable way to measure precisely the results which are likely to be achieved by any of the three models as a whole or by any of the component programs within each of the models. However, given the wide gap between the three models, it is relatively easy to judge their probable success in achieving an annual increase in foreign visitor expenditures of 15 to 18 percent through 1975. If the United States Government is content with an objective of merely increasing the benefits from a budget of the level available to USTS, Model No. 1 may be an acceptable choice. The results which flowed from the greater emphasis given by the Commission to organizing industry efforts are clear evidence that improvements can flow from action which would cost no more.

If the government wishes to redress the deficit in the travel account, it will require the leadership in research and development and the level of advertising inherent in Model No. 3. The tourism industry in the United States has not heretofore shown an impressive capacity to innovate and it is certainly not organized sufficiently to assure concerted action. There appears to be a considerable need for leadership to: demonstrate new activities, identify new markets and develop new ways of promoting all markets. It has long been apparent that research and development programs are urgently needed to guide both industry and government investment.

Organizational alternatives

The United States Foreign Visitor Program could be carried out by (1) a government agency; (2) a private travel-industry association; or (3) some form of partnership between government and industry.

(1) *Government Agency.* The advantages of a government agency include: responsiveness to Administration policy; opportunity to operate without the constraints of diverse and conflicting private viewpoints; availability of services and facilities of other government agencies; access to public funds; and prestige.

Several existing federal departments involved in important aspects of foreign visitor travel could be made responsible for the Foreign Visitor Program. The Department of Commerce has managed federal travel programs for several years. The Department of Transportation is concerned with many facilities servicing international travelers. The Departments of Interior and Agriculture administer many important travel destination areas in the country, and have acquired considerable experience in formulating and operating visitor programs. Treasury is the department most directly interested in balance of payments, the prime concern of any Foreign Visitor Program for the foreseeable future. The Program could also be carried out by an independent government agency.[1]

Improving and vitalizing the present United States Travel Service within the Department of Commerce is the least complicated organizational alternative. Up to now, however, the record of USTS does not engender confidence in the outcome of such efforts. The U.S. Travel Service, established within the Department of Commerce in 1961, has not succeeded in building support for its activities or in substantiating its effectiveness. To be successful, changes in USTS and its programs within the Commerce Department would have to be on a scale sufficient to convince Congress and private industry that a new effort is being launched, capable of far greater achievements and justifying their full support.

There are, however, drawbacks to a government entity being solely responsible for the Foreign Visitor Program:

(a) Use of a government agency would preclude active participation by the private sector in the government's program. U.S. objectives require that the attention of private industry be reoriented toward foreign visitors. This reversal of emphasis cannot be accomplished unless private enterprise becomes directly involved and committed. It is not sufficient for involvement of industry to be limited, as in the past, to participation as an advisory group to a government agency. There must, instead, be a cohesive partnership involving goals, programs, and use of manpower.

(b) A Foreign Visitor Program capable of redressing our travel deficit cannot even be contemplated without Congressional support vastly different from that which USTS has known. Ever since its inception, USTS has come under severe criticism from the Subcommittee on Appropriations which reviews its programs. It should be recognized, however, that many of the stumbling blocks which impeded USTS success are endemic to government travel promotion. National travel promotion is a business. It can only succeed by the application of business methods. But methods which are necessary and proper in business—customer entertainment, advertising, sales conventions, etc.—are open to question when employed by a government agency.

(2) *Private Travel-Industry Association.* In theory, the Foreign Visitor Program could be carried out by a private, non-profit association made up of members of the travel industry. This alternative has the advantages of flexibility possible only with a private organization. A private association could conduct promotional activities for which government agencies are not particularly suited. It would not be subject to Civil Service regulations, and could operate as a business.

In most instances, however, private industry is indifferent toward the international travel market. Industry has not demonstrated an interest in undertaking the Foreign Visitor Program without government support. It also is questionable whether private industry should be given sole responsibility for a task which is of such importance to the international monetary position of the United States.

As balance of payments is primarily a problem of the Federal Government, direct government involvement is required to seek solutions. It is unrealistic to believe that private industry would work for balance of payments results. Solutions not only bring balance-of-payments benefits to governments, they also bring increased tax revenues. In the case of the U.S., this could amount to hundreds of millions of dollars annually generated by the new programs. In effect, foreign visitors would pay for their own promotion and, additionally, would provide the U.S. Government with a high return on its investment.

(3) *A Joint Federal Government-Private Industry Organization.* U.S. objectives cannot be realized by the government or by private industry acting alone. Attempting to place industry and government efforts together in one organization, however, presents unnecessary difficulties. Federal moneys cannot be expended without review and control by both the Executive and Legislative Branches. On the other hand, corporate officers cannot justify contributions to government programs not subject to their control and not directly beneficial to their stockholders. Neither government nor private industry domination is acceptable; there must be an equitable division of responsibilities which best serves the national interest and utilize the resources of government and private enterprise.

Recommendations

The Commission believes that a new Foreign Visitor Program should be adopted which: maintains the momentum gained in the last few months; demonstrates that a new, major effort is under way; undertakes new effective actions supporting balance-of-payments objectives; and engages the active participation of private industry and state and municipal travel organizations. It has weighed the advantages and disadvantages of alternate programs, budgets and organizations and makes the following seven recommendations:

1. *The U.S. Government should adopt as its objections: (a) an annual growth of U.S. receipts from foreign travel of 15 to 18 percent, and (b) redirecting private industry toward the international travel market.*

2. *Federal programs should be changed to concentrate on actions that will demonstrably strengthen our balance of payments. Programs should emphasize innovation and leadership in achieving the permanent involvement of private industry in the Foreign Visitor Program. Past government travel programs have not focused on Canada, have not encouraged the purchase of U.S. products by visitors, have postponed offective market research, and have dissipated a limited budget by directly undertaking too many promotional activities—activities which private industry could have been encouraged to carry out more effectively.*

The Foreign Visitor Program should emphasize these activities:

Motivating firms to increase and expand promotional efforts to sell the United States as a travel destination;

Encouraging state governments to increase their overseas promotional expenditure and engage in joint promotional efforts;

Obtaining selective price cuts to bring the cost of travel to the United States within the means of larger numbers of potential foreign visitors; at the same time developing selective programs to increase expenditures by more affluent foreign visitors;

Continuing the efforts to ease entry procedures for short-duration-stay foreign visitors;

Operating overseas offices, including offices in Canada, charged with disseminating essential sales tools and information to travel agents, carriers, etc. These offices should conduct sales seminars for travel people and obtain, through good public relations, free publicity in newspapers and magazines depicting the favorable aspects of the United States;

Launching year-round advertising programs abroad to promote the United States as a destination;

Developing, in coordination with existing convention bureaus, a National Convention and Special Events program, to promote the U.S. as a site for group meetigs and international conventions;

Working closely with long-range planning committees, architects, builders and contractors to develop new and exciting visitor attractions across the United States;

---

[1] One form of independent government agency considered was a Federal Government Corporation. The rationale for the corporate form is financial flexibility. It can employ a business-type budget and vary expenditures in proportion to earnings. Often, as with private corporations, there is an initial subscription to capital with further revenues being generated by the corporation rather than it being given yearly appropriations. This rationale does not fit an agency charged with encouraging foreign travel to the United States. It could not generate sufficient revenues to satisfy more than a small fraction of its financial needs and would, of necessity, be dependent upon appropriations.

Developing a system which assures that adequate accommodations for foreign visitors will be available at major points of interest throughout the United States;

Launching a continuous educational program to explain within the United States the importance of inbound international tourism, the need for cooperation, and the role that every American can play;

Planning, programming and perhaps helping to fund private and semi-private foreign visitor host organizations;

Organizing a reception program at all international ports of entry throughout the United States to provide guidance, assistance and a friendly welcome to inbound foreign travelers;

Conducting research designed to identify markets and attitudes, test the effectiveness of U.S. promotional activities, and measure the size and structure of inbound international tourism.

3. *The scope and emphasis of the government travel office must be altered drastically.*

As there is insufficient time for the 90th Congress to consider other alternatives, the Department of Commerce should reorganize the U.S. Travel Service and its program along the lines of the government travel office outlined in recommendation 2. In January, a hard look should be taken at the degree of success which has been achieved. If USTS continues to prove unequal to the task, a reorganization plan should be submitted early in the 91st Congress creating a new independent agency of the U.S. Government.

A new agency would have the benefit of fresh consideration by Congress and the advantage of dramatizing the government's travel program. It could emphasize balance-of-payments considerations, and have a more flexible industry orientation than is possible for a bureau within a large department. A new program of the nature and magnitude necessary has the greatest chance of success if entrusted to an organization which can engender support and enthusiasm not only in Congress and private industry, but among the staff that carries it out. Largely because of these considerations, the Peace Corps and the Office of Economic Opportunity were created as independent agencies.

The government travel office should be the policy formulation instrument of the government, concentrating on balance-of-payments objectives, and the leader and catalyst for the travel industry. It should: monitor the activities bearing on foreign visitors which are carried out by other government agencies; coordinate and motivate private and public organizations; measure program effectiveness; conduct research; and represent the Federal Government. Many of its programs would be accomplished under contract with private industry. Contracting and government representation could be carried out within the authority granted in the International Travel Act of 1961.

4. *There should be created immediately a separate, private organization, to be known as the International Travel Institute, which would carry out operational elements of the Foreign Visitor Program.*

The International Travel Institute, a private, nonprofit corporation, would eventually be the instrument for carrying out specific programs, principally promotional, required to implement the Foreign Visitor Program. The Institute should have a board of directors consisting of representatives of elements of travel-related private industry and regional state tourist organizations. Incorporators and initial directors of the Institute should be appointed by the President. No officer of the Institute should be a full-time federal employee. It should be staffed by travel industry professionals, and should be the vehicle through which operational objectives of the Foreign Visitor Program can be carried out.

The establishment of the International Travel Institute could follow either the precedent of the Urban Institute or the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.[2]

The Institute should be financed by the Federal Government, private industry, and regional, state and local travel organizations. The amount of government funding should be dependent on the amount of financial support from the private sector. Federal funds should be received largely by contract from the USTS or its successor, which would be responsible for directly overseeing the Institute's use of these funds. It should be able to receive membership subscriptions and dues, solicit funds and property from public and private sources, sell its services and also sell subscriptions to and advertising in its publications (maps, discount catalogues, magazines, news letters, brochures, etc.). Discussions with the travel industry representatives indicate that private financing and cooperation can be obtained for activities of the Institute provided that the Federal Government demonstrates its firm financial support. The largest non-federal commitments would probably be made to specific promotional programs and projects of direct interest to member organizations, rather than to the general operating budget. For example, the Institute might develop a project or program which would be of special interest to one or more of its members. A New York City reception center might be financed by New York State, the City of New York and local industry. An advertising campaign in Spain might be financed by Pan American World Airways and Trans World Airlines. In each case, the government travel office could provide financial support by contract with the Institute.

The Institute's ultimate function would be to implement—on a cost-sharing basis with industry—elements of the Foreign Visitor Program related to: media advertising; publicity; public relations; promotional literature, including guidebooks; convention solicitation and special events; direct mail and other sales activities; low-cost package tour programs; development of accommodations; visitor reception services; travel counseling; market research and educational training programs; reservation services and possibly joint computerized reservation centers. It would be operationally oriented and geared to providing services which individual private firms would not otherwise offer.

Establishing an organization which conducts these activities outside of government gives added flexibility. If the Institute does not succeed, contracts can be terminated or personnel changed without civil service restrictions. If it does not produce results, government support can be withdrawn. (Pertinent excerpts on "The Quasi Nongovernmental Organization" from the 1967 Annual Report of the Carnegie Corporation of New York appear as Appendix A.)

The two entities, working together to carry out the Foreign Visitor Program, provide a unique system—two organizations with complementary roles, each responsible for what it does best, but with a single purpose. The government office must have great flexibility in dealing with the Institute, in monitoring and motivating non-governmental activities, and in assuring a high return from its contracts with the Institute. It must have a fresh image and operational style.

This dual structure could help remove the bases of distrust in the relationship of future Congresses to the Foreign Visitor Program. In the government office would be civil servants responsible for obtaining hard results from appropriated funds, and having no duties which would be inconsistent with the conduct demanded of representatives of the United States.

The Institute would not operate under the the constraints of a government agency. It would be made accountable for the efficient and proper use of all government contracted funds it receives, but it would also have private and state funds which can be used for independent promotional activities.

Until the International Travel Institute is fully operational, the government travel office will have to be responsible for certain operational activities. A gradual shift of emphasis will take place in order that the government effort eventually be concentrated on coordination, planning, research and evaluation, and the Institute assume almost all of the responsibility for operations. This will occur as financial commitments are obtained from industry, state and municipal organizations, and as federal funds are appropriated.

In formulating travel programs, the Federal Government should keep in mind that the U.S. is so immense and its attractions so diversified that from the standpoint of international travel it is comparable to a number of separate countries. A national travel program could take into account this diversity by grouping contiguous states into regional associations to promote foreign travel.

Each of these regional associations could operate in much the same way as individual European countries operate in promoting travel from the United States. The regional associations, headquartered within the regions, could bring in travel agents and representatives of the press for study tours. They could conduct their own advertising and publicity campaigns, complete with their own literature and display material.

The personnel, the promotional materials and the host programs, would all be more effective if they originated within the region. Local enthusiasm for the program could be enhanced as it became apparent that the purpose of the program was to improve the economy of the region. Enthusiasm, dedication and some emotion are needed to promote successfully a tourist destination. No London-born British representative could promote Ireland with the effectiveness apparent in the Irish Tourist Office. In the same way, it is difficult for a New Englander to be an enthusiastic missionary for California if he has never lived in the West.

The Institute or the government travel office could participate in joint promotional activities with the regional associations, matching to some extent the regional funds expended on programs outside the U.S. The promotional dollar of both the Federal Government and an individual state thus would be stretched.

5. *Government's commitment should be increased to annual appropriations of $30 million, with the program division between the government travel office and the Institute roughly as follows:* (*For a more detailed outline, see Appendix B.*)

---

[2] The Urban Institute was incorporated as a private, non-profit corporation under the laws of Delaware. Its 15-member board of directors includes one federal judge but no other federal officials. There was no legislation authorizing its establishment and its directors are not appointed by the President. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting was incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia as a non-profit corporation. Its board of 15 directors is appointed by the President. Its establishment was authorized and directed by Congress.

	Travel office	International Travel Institute
Program planning and research	$500,000	$830,000
Central administration	550,000	760,000
Operation of foreign offices and promotional activities	2,350,000	6,790,000
Industry-Government coordination	605,000	
Product and service development	695,000	5,620,000
Direct advertising	None	11,000,000
Budget totals	4,700,000	25,000,000

Prior to the Institute becoming fully operational, some reallocation of the $4.7 million programmed for the government travel office will be necessary, including "seeding" funds for the Institute.

The growth of the Institute's budget will depend on how soon additional Congressional appropriations are voted, and how rapidly non-federal commitments are obtained.

6. *Appropriations for the USTS or its successor (including funds for its contracts with the Institute) should be from a special fund made up of amounts equal to 30 percent of the revenues from the ticket tax on international travel. (As a precedent, 30 percent of U.S. customs receipts is set aside for the disposal of agricultural surpluses.)*

The Treasury Department has estimated that the extension of the 5 percent ticket tax to international travel, as passed by the House of Representatives, will generate approximately $95 million during the first year. Treasury does not regard the tax as a measure to raise revenue, but rather as: a user tax to pay for improvement of airport and navigational facilities; and a source of funds to promote foreign travel to the Untied States. As U.S. residents who travel abroad help create the U.S. balance-of-payments problem, it is appropriate that they should be asked to help fund its solution.

7. *A preparatory commission should be appointed to obtain private sector financial support for the proposed Institute and then to incorporate it as a non-profit organization.*

V. PUBLIC REACTION TO THE PROGRAM

[Omitted]

APPENDIX A

(Excerpts on "The Quasi Nongovernmental Organizations" from the 1967 Annual Report of the Carnegie Corporation of New York*)

In recent years there has appeared on the American scene a new genus of organization which represents a noteworthy experiment in the art of government. Lodged, through the normal process of legal incorporation, in the private sector of society, this new entity has in many respects the countenance of the private, nonprofit enterprise and even some of the characteristics of the true voluntary association. Yet it is financed entirely, or in large part, by the federal government, it was created as the result of federal legislation or other governmental initiative, and it serves important public purposes as an instrument of "government by contract."

What precisely is this new creature? Why has it come into being? What unique purposes does it serve? Why is it quasi nongovernmental? What is its probable future?

These are questions that have on the whole been little considered. They should interest anyone who is concerned about the future of private institutions in our society. They should also intrigue anyone who is concerned about how—indeed whether—our national government can remain an effective force in the face of the mounting complexity and increasing extent of the problems with which it must grapple.

The quasi nongovernmental organization has many of the activities of the true private organization. Typically, it has a board of trustees or directors that is supposed to govern it and that, in theory, is ultimately responsible for its affairs. The members of its staff are private employees, not civil servants. It is not housed in a government building or located on federal property. Its employees are in most instances free from security clearance except when working on classfied government business. In theory, it determines its own program and carries this out as it sees fit. Frequently, it receives some, though usually limited, financial support from sources other than the federal government. It may, occasionally, even extend the privilege of membership in itself to individuals meeting certain qualifications, thus giving it the appearance of the voluntary association. Lastly, as we have seen, it is legally incorporated as a private institution, and it enjoys tax-exempt status.

It was created as the result of federal legislation or administrative action in Washington, rather than on the initiative of private citizens. It is dependent financially for its very existence on Congress and the particular federal department, agency, or service to which it is related. The accounts it keeps on its federal funds are examined not only by private but also by government auditors. . . . At bottom, its freedom of action, compared with that of a truly private organization, is considerably restricted because the necessity for public accountability is built into its very nature.

The existence of each type of quasi nongovernmental organization has at one time or another been seriously called into question. And yet in each instance there was a convincing basic reason for its establishment. An urgent national need had been identified that no other institution in the society was meeting, or, seemingly, could meet.

In the case of the "not-for-profits," the defense establishment, responding to new scientific and technological challenges, needed two products which it could neither develop in house nor buy from private industrial firms. These were, first, certain specialized technical skills derived from a scientific, scientific-engineering, or social knowledge base and, second, highly specialized advice given with absolute objectivity. The capacity of the "not-for-profits" to pay salaries higher than those which government could offer of course enhanced their ability to attract particularly well-qualified personnel.

The quasi nongovernmental organization, has, therefore, been established to fulfill a number of specific purposes. These may be summarized under three general headings: to meet government's need for specialized service not elsewhere available, to provide it with independent judgment, and to offer it the kind of flexibility required for fresh solutions to complex and novel problems. Each of the quasi nongovernmental organizations has had, in varying degree, these basic purposes. And in every case it has been deemed essential to achievement of the purposes, not only that a new organization be created, but that it be located in the private nonprofit realm of American life.

But in the final test it must serve public purposes, and if these do not coincide with the individual's purposes, government's interest must prevail. Moreover, the quasi nongovernmental organization does not have as a primary concern the safeguarding of the essential nongovernmental aspects of a democratic society. Its concerns are, rather, with the collective interests of the polity and with the discharge of government's responsibilities.

While in a showdown the trustees, it is true, could threaten to dissolve the corporation, government on its side has the power at any time to starve it to death financially, or use its financial power to shape the organization's program. And since financial power of this kind implies the acceptance of responsibility, a measure of the final responsibility for these organizations must inevitably remain in Washington, in a federal agency in the first instance, but ultimately with the Congress.

The case for independence rests on the simple proposition that for government to recap the real benefits that these organizations offer, they must be *genuinely* independent. If they are anything less than this, their effectiveness will be compromised. Among the benefits, as we have seen, can be a special capacity for experimentation, objectivity, the ability to recruit specially trained or talented personnel, flexibility, economy, and efficency. Each of these benefits is a direct function of the quality of the management of these organizations, and this in turn is a function of the degree of independence which management is accorded. In short, able men know that freedom of action is essential to their own highest performance, and they will demand it. Having won it, they will resist all attempts by government to erode it.

There would appear to be three minimum freedoms which the quasi nongovernmental organization must enjoy if it is to have real independence: freedom of program, freedom of administration, and freedom of communication . . . it must have absolute freedom to determine the nature of any part of its total program supported by private funds. It must have the right to hire and fire employees and determine their duties, compensation and prerequisites, and where and how they shall be quartered. Lastly, it must be free to reach its own conclusions on both technical and policy questions and, within the minimum limitations of security requirements, communicate these without restraint publicly or privately to anyone interested.

Also relevant is the degree of complexity of the activity being supported by government funds. The more abstruse and technical this is, and the further it is removed from the personal experience of the responsible civil servant or interested member of Congress, the greater is likely to be the freedom from supervision accorded it. Finally, there is some evidence to suggest that an organization's degree of independence is related to its general prestige and standing. If these are high, government is likely to treat it with greater respect.

The concept of a quasi private agency created as the result of government initiative and financed by public funds seems to work and in many instances work well: It works because there are constraints operating on both the governmental patron and its organizational protégé which most of the time enable them to avoid head-on confrontations. Most importantly, there is a job to be done in the national interest with no readily apparent alternative way of getting it done. This makes for a willingness to compromise on both sides, so that the requirements of neither independence nor accountability are ever fully met.

High on the priority list will be to find ways to give financial security to the quasi nongovernmental organization, because financial stability is an essential ingredient of independence. Here, fortunately, there is a device that is already working successfully for the defense-related organizations: the fee paid to them by their governmental sponsors over and above contract costs and overhead. This fee, which averages around 5 per cent of contract value, is unrestricted money, to be used as the organization sees fit. The fee arrangement seems to be the best device presently available for bringing to a nongovernmental organization the general support, free of project obligations, which it so desperately needs. The device could, and should, be extended to all organizations of the quasi nongovernmental variety and possibly to private organizations generally which receive substantial government funds."

---

*Reprinted through the courtesy of the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

APPENDIX B

Detailed budgets for the USTS or successor organization and the International Travel Institute

A. National Travel Office:	
1. Program planning and research: Planning, programing, budgeting and program evaluation; research designed (a) to measure the effectiveness of promotion programs, including those carried out by the International Travel Institute; (b) to develop market studies identifying factors influencing international travel, and the size and structure of inbound tourism	$500,000
2. Central Administration:	
(a) Salaries of Executive Director, Program Office Directors, Comptroller, supporting professional staff, and overhead, including secretarial and stenographic, rent, etc., at 100 percent	440,000
(b) Travel and miscellaneous expenses	110,000
Subtotal	550,000
3. Promotion (including overseas offices):	
(a) Fifteen foreign promotion offices, including 3 in Canada (Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver); professional salaries ($40,000), secretarial support ($15,000), rent ($30,000), travel and related expenses ($20,000), and other office expenses, supplies, phone, postage, etc. ($20,000) ($115,000 per office)	$1,725,000
(b) Directing and supporting promotional programs: advertising, promotion and group business and conventions, production and distribution of sales materials and direct mail, publicity and public relations, special promotion for travel agents and carrier representatives. (Most of these programs would be carried out by the International Travel Institute.)	625,000
Subtotal	2,350,000
4. Industry-Government Coordination: Carrying out specific recommendations of the Industry-Government Task Force which involve motivating and coordinating travel promotion efforts of the Federal Government, States, cities, private industry and organizations, etc. Chapters of the report have been analyzed in programmatic terms and related to projected man-days of effort required (with estimated overhead) for the first full year of operations.[1] As recommendations are carried out, budgetary requirements will be reduced.	
Categories (by task force report chapter):	
Lowering costs (1,222 man-days, 5 persons)	109,950
Promotion (2,166 man-days, 8 persons)	194,910
Removing barriers (464 man-days, 2 persons)	41,730
Changing attitudes (176 man-days, 1 person)	15,810
Improving services (1,642 man-days, 6 persons)	147,750
Other recommendations (1,054 man-days, 4 persons)	94,850
Subtotal	605,000
5. Product and service development: Developing pilot projects for new facilities and services within the United States for foreign visitors. A final determination of programs has not been made, but the Commission recommends consideration of: airport and downtown reception centers, multi-lingual telephone service, assistance in creating new events (international expositions, etc.), language training programs for service personnel, youth hostel programs, etc. (The operational programs would be carried out by the International Institute or its member organizations)	$695,000
6. Direct Advertising	0
Total, National Travel Office	4,700,000
B. International Travel Institute:	
1. Program Planning and Research: Testing effectiveness of promotional advertising programs through interview surveys; evaluating size and characteristics of international tourist business; forecasting and analyzing accommodation needs; developing package tours; analyzing markets, etc	830,000
2. Central administration: Salaries of management personnel, overhead, travel expenses, etc	760,000
3. Promotion:	
(a) Promoting group travel and conventions; six convention specialists attached to offices in the UK, Benelux, West Germany, Paris, Stockholm, and Tokyo, plus secretarial staff, transportation and travel, and related costs. Group business specialists operating out of nine overseas offices, including secretarial staff, travel, etc	900,000
(b) Sales promotion and direct mail:	
Printed materials (brochures and booklets including reprints and joint activities with states and regions	2,080,000
Tariff and sales information manuals	100,000
Slide presentations	125,000
10 Area films and sufficient prints of each	637,500
Posters	13,000
Displays	96,000
Direct mail campaign, all costs included	1,040,000
Creative agency fees	150,000
Shipping of materials	400,000
Subtotal	4,641,500
(c) Publicity and public relations, contracted with firms operating locally in major market areas abroad (costs will range from $25,000 to $50,000 per area, depending on the market, plus about $500 per month in out-of-pocket expenses; $35,000 average for seven market areas)	245,000
(d) Special promotion program for travel agents and carrier representatives operating abroad (500 representatives per year at $1,000 including (transportation, maintenance, etc.)	500,000
(e) Special promotions with cities and department stores including travel and transportation plus out-of-pocket costs	500,000
Subtotal	6,786,500
4. Industrial-Government coordination	----------
5. Product and service development:	
(a) Establishment and operating five regional interior offices to work with States and regional organizations on regional travel programs for foreign visitors—two professional staff for each office, rent, office expenses, travel, secretaries, and financial support for program materials (latter estimate, $150,000) ($300,000 per office)	$1,500,000
(b) Continuous educational program with the USA (producing and distributing films, special programs, articles, speakers, etc)	250,000
(c) Reception Center Operation—includes a reception corps operating in 10 metropolitan centers:	
The reception corps would involve 500 people (many of them students) working part time in three shifts, average eight personnel operating from each reception center (average salary, $5,000)	2,500,000
Staff at reception centers (two to three people per center at $15,000)	375,000
Cost of developing, furnishing, and decorating centers at $50,000	500,000
Subtotal	3,375,000
(d) Multi-lingual telephone service in 10 cities. Such a service would involve three shifts of five to six interpreters on each shift (salary costs, about $360,000;	

Footnotes at end of Table.

Detailed budgets for the USTS or successor organization and the International Travel Institute—Continued

B. International Travel Institute—Continued	
phone costs would probably amount to another $100,000 to $150,000)	[2] 500,000
(e) Developing package tours (included under the budget for research)	----------
(f) Developing accommodations. (This is primarily the responsibility of the hotel industry, but the responsibility of the International Travel Institute is to anticipate needs and see that the necessary steps are taken to meet such needs. To define this situation more carefully, funds have been included under research to permit such an analysis.)	----------
Subtotal	5,625,000
6. Direct advertising: A preliminary estimate for seven selected countries, plus Benelux and Scandinavia, has been developed, totaling $6,600,000. This estimate was based on numerous factors including the following: number of individuals in each country who can afford to make the the trip; cost of getting to the United States; concentration of population; growth of the economy; attitudes toward travel and travel habits; language barriers; percentage of business travel in relation to pleasure travel; government restrictions; competing promotion efforts; media advertising costs; previous levels of travel to the United States and projected future trends:	
Canada	$1,500,000
United Kingdom	1,300,000
West Germany	900,000
Benelux	600,000
Scandinavia	600,000
Mexico	500,000
Italy	400,000
Japan	400,000
France	400,000
Subtotal	6,600,000
Most of the remaining $4,400,000 would be apportioned—using the same series of factors—among adidtional foreign markets. A small amount could be spent within the United States of America to educate Americans to the social and economic importance of foreign tourism within the United States.	
Subtotal	11,000,000
Total, International Travel Institute (approximate)	25,000,000

[1] Recommendations requiring coordination and monitoring in market research would be carried out under program planning and research.

[2] A pilot operation in a single city, of course, could be considered; and then expanded as experience warrants.

THE BEAUTY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on my way into the Capital this morning, I could not help but be impressed with the beauty of Washington, D.C. I think it is without a doubt the most impressive looking of all the world's capital cities.

Much of the responsibility for the appearance of the District of Columbia, I feel, must go to Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, our former First Lady. Her effective leadership in reawakening the citizens of the District and of the country to the preservation and conservation of our natural beauty deserves the praise of everyone of us.

Mrs. Johnson created a climate of interest which I hope will not die now that she is no longer living in Washington. She herself stated that she hoped her efforts would allow people to speak of their community with "affection and pride." Mrs. Johnson has certainly been successful here in the Nation's Capital. I hope that we will all continue where she left off.

THE VIOLENCE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring a tragic and potentially explosive situation to the attention of my colleagues.

Over this past weekend, mob violence again took place in Northern Ireland over political and religious divisions that have been slowly tearing that country apart. The British Government, at the request of Northern Ireland's Cabinet, has agreed to assign British troops to guard the public utilities throughout Northern Ireland. The seriousness of this situation is not yet fully realized, I believe, here in the United States. The British Government's decision could mark a fateful turn in the stormy relations they have had with Ireland over the years. I am sure that Prime Minister Wilson wants only to restore order to the six northern counties still under British domain.

But I believe there is a larger question involved here, not one of mere crowd control or restoration of civil order. It is a question of basic human rights being denied to a segment of the population because of their religious and ethnic background. It has long been evident that the nearly 500,000 Catholics in Northern Ireland have been suffering both religious and political discrimination at the hands of the majority of Northern Ireland's citizens. The blood of both groups has run in the streets of Belfast and Londonderry.

As we are all well aware, Great Britain refused to condone the blatantly racist attitude of Prime Minister Ian Smith and his Rhodesian government. I believe that the racial policies of Northern Ireland are just as unconscionable as are those of Rhodesia or South Africa, both members of the British Commonwealth.

In Northern Ireland today, men are being refused basic rights accorded to them under the English Constitution. Peaceful demonstrations have been turned into riots because of the discriminatory attitudes held by a majority of Northern Ireland's citizens. Segregation and discrimination in housing, employment, and voting rights are just as repugnant to me whether they occur here in the United States or in Northern Ireland.

There seems to be a contradictory attitude within the Government of Great Britain. On one hand they have justly condemned and criticized a government based on apartheid, while on the other, they seem to be assisting in the suppression of a segment of the population bent only on securing the basic rights that must be accorded to them as human beings.

The Irish Catholic citizens of Northern Ireland have been denied the right to own property; they have been denied the right to vote; and they have been scorned because of their religious beliefs. A situation now exists that could prove detrimental not only to Northern Ireland but to Great Britain and, indirectly, to the United States.

As I have stated, religious persecution and segregation and political discrimination cannot and should not be allowed to go unnoticed by any person or groups of persons interested in freedom. The history of our country has been scarred by our mistakes and our negligent attitudes in this area but we are trying to overcome the mistakes of the past. There is a great deal of similarity in the plight of the Irish Catholics of Northern Ireland with the situation that many black people and other minority groups are confronted with here in our country today.

I urge all of my colleagues to appraise themselves of the events that have taken place in Northern Ireland and I urge Great Britain to act justly and compassionately with a people seeking only to be free.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN FLORIDA

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, last evening at the Algiers Hotel in beautiful Miami Beach, within my district, I had the privilege of seeing a fine example of the reunification and the resurgence of the Democratic Party in Florida. The occasion was the installation of officers of the Biscayne Democratic Club, Inc., of Miami Beach. There was a very large attendance and great enthusiasm for new memberships in the club and for the club giving hearty and effective support to the nominees of the Democratic Party in coming elections. One of the outstanding businessmen of Florida, a very successful and able businessman, Mr. Larry Taylor, was elected president, thus bringing into the leadership of the club a man of exceptional ability, administrative capacity, and distinctive faculty for organization and persuasiveness. Mr. Taylor has a deep grasp of the meaning of the Democratic Party and the role it has played and should play in the Nation's affairs. This deep understanding of democratic principle and a very sincere dedication to the Democratic Party were revealed in the president's outstanding address and the president's message carried on the program. President Taylor's address was movingly delivered by him and warmly received by his large audience. Mr. Speaker, I include President Taylor's address and also his message on the program in the RECORD following my remarks:

Brother officers, distinguished guests on the dais, members, honored guests and friends, I have taken the time to have my speech imprinted on the menu. The message of this speech is dear to the heart of every Democrat. I would like you to carry this menu with you and imprint it in your minds forever.

I would like to begin by saying that I accept the tremendous honor bestowed upon me with humility and pride. I am proud to be a member of the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party has always been a symbol for the word democracy. A Democratic government is a government of the people, by the people and for the people. The Democrats have always been the number one party in this country because the Democrats are the voice of the people. . . . But, friends, only a short time ago the voice of some of our people weakened. Yes, many good, honest Democrats faltered and changed their votes and we lost a great number of friends and supporters. It is human to be afraid. It is human to have doubts and fears. Some of these good people had children overseas, others felt there was too much tension in the country and still others were afraid of the rising cost of living and inflation. These good, honest people felt that by changing their votes they could accomplish a miracle! They hoped to change the natural course of history! They believed that a change of votes would stop the war, remove the tensions and pressures, reduce high prices and get rid of inflation! They forgot that the greatest miracle of all is democracy! Our problems today are people problems and the people have solved their problems ever since this country began. America is the greatest country in the world! This country was founded and built by people who wanted a new and better way of life! This country was built by the blood of Europe. The new party inherited a very healthy country with good times and prosperity that is unparalleled anywhere in the world! The wars, tensions and pressures are a part of the natural course of history and many of these problems were started before any of us were born. The will of the people will solve everything. They always have in the past and they always will in the future. If something bad were to happen to a country like America then all I can say is "God, have pity on the rest of the world."

And now I say to you Democrats, who are here today and to you who have temporarily voted for another party, I say to you "keep this country, Democratic!" "Keep this country safe." "Stick with your party and when the time comes, vote for the people . . . vote Democrat!" When you vote Democrat, you are voting for yourself and your family! Support the Democratic Party. Now is the time to start. The Biscayne Democratic Club is open for new members. So, don't hesitate! Be an active Democrat. Bring your friends, your neighbors, your relatives! Bring everybody you know into the Democratic Party. Make them members of the Biscayne Democratic Club. Don't wait. Do it now.

Thank you for your attention and may God bless you.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

I am proud to be a member of the Democratic party. The Democratic party has always been a symbol for the word Democracy. A Democratic government is a government of the people, by the people and for the people. The Democrats have always been the number one party in this country because the Democrats are the voice of the people. . . . But, friends, only a short time ago the voice of some of our people weakened. Yes, many good, honest Democrats faltered and changed their votes and we lost a great number of friends and supporters. It is human to be afraid. It is human to have doubts and fears. Some of these good people had children overseas, others felt there was too much tension in the country and still others were afraid of the rising cost of living and inflation. These good, honest people felt that by changing their votes they could accomplish a miracle! They hoped to change the natural course of history! They believed that a change of votes would stop the war, remove the tensions and pressures, reduce high prices and get rid of inflation! They forgot that the greatest miracle of all is Democracy! Our problems today are people problems and the people have solved their problems ever since this country began. America is the greatest country in the world! This country was founded and built by people who wanted a new and better way of life! This country was built by the blood of Europe. The new party inherited a very healthy country with good times and prosperity that is unparalleled anywhere in the world! The wars, tensions and pressures are a part of the natural course of history and many of these problems were started before any of us were born. The will of the people will solve everything. They always have in the past and they always will in the future. If something bad were to happen to a country like America then all I can say "God, have pity on the rest of the world."

And now I say to you Democrats, who are here today and to you who have temporarily voted for another party, I say to you "Keep this country, Democratic!". "Keep this Country Safe". "Stick with your party and when the time comes, Vote for the People . . . Vote Democrat!". When you vote Democrat, you are voting for yourself and your family! Support the Democratic party. Now is the time to start. The Biscayne Democratic Club is open for new members. So, don't hesitate! Be an active Democrat. Bring your friends, your neighbors, your relatives! Bring everybody you know into the Democratic party. Make them members of the Biscayne Democratic Club. Don't wait. Do it now.

BAGGS

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the death of Bill Baggs, late editor of the Miami News and one of the finest gentlemen and courageous journalists it was ever my privilege to know, a member of the newspaper's staff adapted a moving and striking poetic eulogy to Bill's memory composed entirely from a news account of his life written by Miami News Columnist John Keasler.

That so many of the editor's qualities, sheer love of life, and concern for those who shared his place in time could be captured in a few short lines of moving prose, is a tribute to the creativity of the writer. That what was said in those lines about Bill Baggs was true, is a tribute to the memory of the man.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the excerpt:

BAGGS

Pictures cover the wall with no precedence or pattern
Liberal, he loved race jokes—if they were funny
A marmalade jar full of pencils on the cluttered desk that holds a penny gumball machine and all sorts of things
Throwback editor of eerie agelessness
Most gregarious loner in the world
Littered, literate, unique; waystop between a wild irreverence and a deep belief
The "radical" and the country boy who seemed so true-blue safe
He changed the face of a city and the thinking of a nation
Never using a broadax if a scalpel nick would do
He did not find humor ineffective
And had that in his quiver, too
He walked the streets of the city with the flair and air of a riverboat gambler
An elegance of the past within, courtly always
It's not just in every lifetime you get to meet and learn from a gentle maverick who somehow led the herd
Reward enough for us, Bill Baggs.

HORTON PRAISES PRESIDENT NIXON'S TAX REFORM PACKAGE

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's tax reform proposals which we received today are a forthright response to the demands of Americans for fair and equitable tax treatment.

Mr. Nixon had to choose from among some very difficult priorities in this area. Specifically, his decision to seek repeal of the investment credit as a means of reducing the surtax on individuals shows his awareness of the tremendous tax burden borne by American families.

Last week, I presented specific proposals for Federal tax reform to the people in my district. I am happy to note that the President's message contained specific support for the following planks in my tax-reform platform: tax relief for those at the lowest end of the income scale; minimum tax on those at the top levels of income; fair deduction for family moving expenses; curbing artificial tax benefits of corporate subsidiaries; and limitation of deductions of farm losses to curb abuses and early reduction of the surcharge.

I urge my colleagues to support these and other tax reforms so that tax relief to those unfairly burdened can come in time for taxpaying time next year.

I have been putting tax reform bills in the hopper since I came to Congress in 1963. This year, for the first time, with both the Congress and the administration pushing for tax reforms, we have a chance for establishing an equitable tax system. I would like to share with my colleagues my specific proposals for tax reform which I presented in a speech last Thursday to the Marion Grange in Marion, N.Y.:

A RESPONSIBLE PROGRAM FOR TAX REFORM

I'm glad to see that everyone in the Marion Grange is smiling tonight. People smile when they are happy, or when they feel a sense of satisfaction in doing a good deed or in helping others. I presume you are smiling because each of you on April 15 made a willing and generous contribution to solving the problems of the world, by making a donation to the District Director of Internal Revenue.

Since I am one of the 535 people responsible for spending your tax dollars, and for determining how large or small your Federal tax bite will be, I'd like to spend some time discussing the state of our taxes in America, and assess their fairness and their adequacy in a society of working men and women.

I will begin with the general statement that the Federal income taxes paid by most, if not all of the people in this room, impose an unfairly high burden on your families and your standards of living.

I have been putting tax reform bills in the hopper in Congress since I got there in 1963. This year, for the first time, both Congress and the administration are pushing for tax reforms. The Ways and Means Committee has been holding hearings on Federal tax reforms since the beginning of this session. The administration has prepared a comprehensive tax reform recommendation which aims at eliminating or reducing the most blatant inequalities in our income tax structure.

The press, the broadcasting media, the Government and the people—all at once—are shouting in harmony for changes in a tax system which allows millions of dollars in the hands of a relatively few people, to slip through untaxed, or almost untaxed. The momentum of pressure for tax reform must be kept alive and increased. If there is ever going to be action to inject fairness into our tax system—that time is now.

Two days ago, a reporter from U.S. News & World Report called me in Washington to ask what issue my constituents were *most* concerned about. This was before the announcement that the North Koreans had murderously shot down a U.S. Navy aircraft over the Sea of Japan. I told the reporter that the people in my congressional district had a deep concern for the war in Vietnam in the back of their minds, but that the sharpest criticism and concern was aimed at taxes—all taxes—local, State, and Federal.

There is no question that the services governments must provide are growing in expense, in complexity, in urgency, and in terms of the number of people to be served. Governments are not going to stop paving streets, or providing the finest possible education for all our children, or delivering the mail, or supporting vital health research, or providing for our defense and security, both at home and abroad. It is unrealistic to think in a society which grows ever more complex, that the task of Government will somehow grow simpler, or smaller, or cheaper. This is simply not going to happen. The demands on governments, and therefore for taxes are not going down, and attempts to chop away willy-nilly at programs or at functions just for the sake of cutting spending will prove far more costly in the long run. What can be done about regulating the growth in the demand for taxes is to establish some sensible priorities—that is, deciding what tasks must come first, and what second, and what third in the expenditure of public money. A sensibly applied system of priorities which takes need as well as cost into account, can at least keep the Government's expenses from growing faster than the Nation and the economy are growing.

What are some of these increased demands on Government? Are they all unreasonable? What can we do about them? I cannot list them all here, but I would like to cite two or three as examples.

The postal service is shamefully inefficient, and has been a money loser for some time. For years, postal costs have spiralled as population grows—and particularly as people move from easy-to-reach dwellings in our cities into more spread out suburban and rural residential areas. It does take more letter carriers, who must be paid wages commensurate with their skills and living costs; it does take more postal buildings and trucks and mailbags—no matter how efficient the system is.

This year for the first time, the administration has launched an all out attack on postal inefficiency and organization. Hopefully, postal service and postal profits can increase with the proposed reforms—ending a substantial tax drain for the Federal Government.

At the State and local levels, teachers' salary increases have accounted for a sizeable share of increases in education costs. Much blame has been leveled at teachers for bringing this about. But teachers, like farmers, have grown tired of lagging five to ten thousand dollars behind their college classmates who hold jobs in private industry. Every year, the number of children per class seems to grow, school facilities become more crowded, and the number of new teachers hired and new buildings built never seems to keep up with the needs.

Teachers found it difficult to make ends meet on salaries which were far below what factory workers and tradesmen were earning. The pressure of their demands grew, and today they have jumped ahead—and jumping right along with them the cost of education to the taxpayer.

Defense is a third example. In this day and age, defense is no longer a race with other nations to see how many men and how many rifles you can assemble in how short a time. Technology and invention have become the key to military security. New weapons have to be able to do more than the Communist equipment can do. Thus the costs of a single airplane, or a single submarine have skyrocketed. I am one who believes we are spending far, far too much on defense and weapons and the Vietnam war—and I believe that much of our problem of inflation, budget deficits, and high taxes can be traced to this source. You may have seen my weekly column on this subject in your local paper last week.

The upshot of all of these factors—demanding more services and more money from government at all levels, is a terrific tax squeeze on the people who can afford it least. Although we in America are supposed to have a graduated income tax, it just doesn't seem to work out that way. People with higher incomes are supposed to pay more taxes at a higher rate. People with lower incomes are supposed to pay less taxes and at a lower rate. In general, the theory works. But the problem is that of the thousands of pages of Internal Revenue laws and regulations, most of them deal with special categories of tax treatment which affect only the wealthy or the corporations. The more exemptions, tax credits adjustments and deductions that an individual or company can take advantage of, the smaller the share of his income that is actually taxed.

There are very few areas of special tax treatment for the wage-earner, and for the average family with income between $7,000 and $20,000 per year. These people are caught in the middle, between rising Federal, State and local taxes. They in theory, pay no more than their fair share. But because others with more income pay far less than their fair share, the middle income family, and the single taxpayer are left holding the bag.

These people cannot be expected to absorb all of the pressure and all of the tax demands generated by the need for more Government services and expenditures. This burden must be redistributed—and fairly—to those who now enjoy a tax holiday on too much of their incomes.

Many special income tax provisions have evolved in order to encourage certain kinds of economic activity and transactions. Thus, the 7% investment tax credit is designed to sustain industry growth and modernization of factories and capital equipment. It has done this job admirably, but at a high cost to the Treasury. The theory of the investment tax credit is sound, but it is being re-examined in light of the effect it has on tax collections from highly profitable firms which take good advantage of it.

The special treatment of capital gains is another provision—designed to sustain a healthy investment economy—which has little relevance to the little man. For a large investor, the capital gains provision means that a substantial portion of his income will be taxed at a much lower level. But the little man gets very little advantage from this provision. The major investment of a farmer or a workingman's family—outside of a house or farm equipment, may be a savings account, which bears interest now taxed at the *full rate*.

The oil and mineral depletion allowance, designed to continue oil and mineral exploration and assure an adequate energy supply, saves literally millions of dollars in oil and mining company profits from taxation. Tax-sheltered investments, like State and municipal bonds, or tax-sheltered charitable foundations, business activities of nonprofit organizations, special tax treatment of foreign investments, special tax benefits for stock-options which are latched on to hefty corporate salaries—all of these special categories, and hundreds more, help to push the major tax load onto the backs of those people who don't have enough income to afford these transactions. Each and everyone of these special exemptions, credits, deductions and regulations represents a worthy economic or social cause. But together, they have worked to change the basic theory and operation of our supposedly "graduated" Federal income tax.

I have received literally hundreds of letters from constituents—and not just people living in poverty—who have sent along copies of their family budgets—showing how fully one-third of their gross income gets doled out for State, Federal and local taxes of one kind or another.

A chart recently reprinted in the Saturday Review, shows that the vast majority of persons with incomes over $500,000 per year pay less than 30% of their incomes in Federal taxes. Many persons earning over $50,000 a year pay less than 10% in Federal income tax. Any system, no matter how virtuous its specific provisions are, which causes such an imbalance in tax burden, needs changing now.

Since coming to Congress, I have urged many reforms in our tax structure. Many of the reforms I have urged, would give the little man, the middle income family and the single taxpayer, some well-deserved tax exemptions and deductions of his own. One such provision would permit a tax credit for a sizeable chunk of college tuition paid by a student or his family. Another provision would eliminate the very unfair tax treatment of single individuals who, like married couples, must maintain a place to live and incur other necessary expenses. A third provision would allow full deduction of moving expenses which are not reimbursed by the taxpayer's employer.

I have also submitted a bill which would eliminate unequal treatment of self-employed persons, including farmers, under social security tax laws.

I have supported legislation to close some of the loopholes which provide tax-escapes without encouraging any worthy economic growth or social improvement. I have submitted a bill that would limit the amount of losses from the farming business which can be deducted from non-farming income by individuals at very high income levels. This is aimed at those who maintain "agricultural estates", and who pursue farming mainly for tax purposes.

There are countless other loopholes which should be very carefully scrutinized by the Ways and Means Committee and the Treasury as they progress toward final legislation on tax reform. A provision which allows investment income to be taxed at capital gains rates at the death of the owner should be changed. This single provision costs the Treasury, and thus the taxpayers, a full $2.5 billion a year.

The oil and mineral depletion allowance is far too large to fulfill its original purpose. Too much profit in these industries which is not needed solely for further resource exploration and development goes untaxed.

Also I propose an upper limit on the amount of income taxed as capital gains to an individual should be considered.

Three reforms, affecting middle income families, have been most often mentioned in letters I receive. The first is the fact that the individual exemption is still at the $600 level, which is far from realistic in light of today's living costs.

Second is tax reform for the single taxpayer, which I have discussed. Third is a tax break for those who rent rather than own their homes, since they now get no deduction for mortgage interest paid through their rent, as do homeowners.

I personally favor a simplified approach to tax reform. I would like to see the Congress do away with many of the special categories for persons and corporations at all income levels. I think taxes, based on gross income, should be paid at a reduced rate, without this myriad of exemptions, deductions, adjustments and tax credits. If this approach were adopted, tax rates overall, would be lower for the great bulk of Americans. In many cases, the amount of income tax paid would not diminish, but at higher levels, the amount paid would substantially increase.

Because many of the special purposes served by the current myriad of special provisions have strong advocates in Congress, I doubt very much that a truly simplified tax structure can be adopted. In the alternative, I have urged members of the Ways and Means Committee to place high priorities on the following basic reforms within our present system.

1. The application of a minimum across the board income tax for persons earning above $100,000 regardless of the nature or source of income above that amount.

2. A substantial increase in the individual tax exemption to $1,200, so that a family of four earning $7,000 a year would be taxed only on $2,200 less deductions, credits and adjustments. The exemption for any family of four would be four times $1,200 or $4,800. Particularly at the lower end of the scale, this provision would eliminate a great deal of hardship which eventually gets heaped on the Government anyway, through social services expenditures.

3. The enactment of the Horton bills I have outlined above, which give to the working man and his family, and to the single individual, comparable tax breaks to those already afforded large corporations and wealthy taxpayers.

4. Closing or reducing many of the special provisions which have become tax havens for the very wealthy. This would be at least partially accomplished by enactment of a minimum tax on high incomes.

As your Congressman, I have tried to outline my concerns and my efforts in this very vital field. We cannot solve the tax-budget crises in all levels of government by going backward, that is by refusing to respond to the increased need for government services. No more than we would act to freeze the income potential of those engaged in agriculture at their present levels, or worse, at the level of ten years ago: no more than the government can ignore agriculture programs in order to pare down its budget, can we ignore the plain fact that efficient growth is as much a necessity for the public sector as it is for the private sector.

No, we cannot move backward, and we cannot stay where we are particularly in reference to the distribution of the tax burden in America. We must solve the tax crisis by returning to the original, sound theory of graduated federal income tax, and making it stick. I feel that the legislative steps I advocate would accomplish this purpose. I hope that I will have your support in winning enactment of a meaningful tax reform bill this year.

PRESIDENT NIXON AND EC-121

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, once more President Nixon has done the hard but right thing. He has refused to be provoked into precipitous action by the barbaric actions of the Communist Government of North Korea, in shooting down a fleeing, unarmed plane over international waters. It would be the easy thing to order a retaliatory raid against a North Korean air base, or a North Korean harbor. It would be easy, for that matter, to drop a 500 pounder down Kim Il Sung's smokestack. But, President Nixon made the courageous decision. He neither slipped into easy retaliation nor did he cave in to easy intimidation.

President Nixon's first concern was not a saber-rattling callup of the Air National Guard; his first concern was for possible survivors of the plane's crew. Determined to avoid empty posturing, President Nixon weighed the alternatives available and made the decision to protest the surprise attack and to protect future missions.

President Nixon refused to provide the propaganda base upon which the North Koreans could once again invade the South and tie down more American troops on the continent of Asia. There is no doubt of the President's intention to continue to assert America's interest in the Far East, but neither is there any doubt of the President's refusal to become involved in the shortsighted folly of easy retaliation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. MEEDS), on April 21, 1969, on account of official business.

Mrs. MAY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, and the balance of the week on account of official business for Department of Agriculture.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 1 hour, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DELLENBACK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POFF, for 15 minutes, on April 22.

Mr. PIRNIE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONABLE, for 30 minutes, on April 22.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURLISON of Missouri) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCCARTHY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 30 minutes, on April 22.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. UTT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. RHODES, immediately following the message of the President on the internal revenue system and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. FEIGHAN during the debate on H.R. 514.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon to extend her remarks during consideration of H.R. 514 in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. BURLISON of Missouri) to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter during consideration of H.R. 8434, today.

Mr. QUIE, to include extraneous matter with his remarks on H.R. 514 in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DELLENBACK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
Mr. BELL of California.
Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.
Mr. MORTON in three instances.
Mr. RUMSFELD in three instances.
Mr. HALL.
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.
Mr. GERALD R. FORD.
Mr. WHALEN.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances
Mr. SHRIVER in three instances.
Mr. DENNEY.
Mr. TAFT in two instances.
Mr. SCHADEBERG.
Mr. BIESTER.
Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM in three instances.
Mr. ASHBROOK.
Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. GUDE.

Mr. Landgrebe.

Mr. Buchanan in two instances.

Mr. Eshleman in two instances.

Mr. Bray in three instances.

Mr. Hastings.

Mr. Brotzman.

Mr. Rhodes in five instances.

Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Skubitz in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Burlison of Missouri) to extend their remarks and to include additional matter in that section of the Record entitled "Extensions of Remarks":)

Mr. Scheuer in two instances.

Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Eilberg in five instances.

Mr. Daddario in three instances.

Mr. Long of Maryland in three instances.

Mr. Boland in two instances.

Mr. Gaydos in three instances.

Mr. Gonzalez in six instances.

Mr. Friedel in three instances.

Mr. Matsunaga.

Mr. Ottinger.

Mr. Dingell in two instances.

Mr. Diggs in two instances.

Mr. Garmatz.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. Rarick in six instances.

Mr. Nichols.

Mr. Flood.

Mr. Griffin.

Mrs. Mink.

Mr. Vigorito.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. Mollohan in three instances.

Mr. Hagan in five instances.

Mr. Patten.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Conyers in three instances.

Mr. Ashley in two instances.

Mr. Dent in six instances.

Mr. Meeds.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 265. An act for the relief of John (Giovanni) Denaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1531. An act for the relief of Chi Jen Feng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1625. An act for the relief of Gong Sing Hom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 10158. An act to provide mail service for Mamie Doud Eisenhower, widow of former President Dwight David Eisenhower.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 458. An act for the relief of Yuka Awamura; and

S. 672. An act for the relief of Charles Richard Scott.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 22, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

690. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to reappoint as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for an additional term of 1 year, the officer serving in that position on April 1, 1969; to the Committee on Armed Services.

691. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on military procurement actions for experimental, developmental, test, or research work negotiated under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a) 11 and 2304 (a) 16, for the period July–December 1968, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

692. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development concerning a recommendation made by the Comptroller General in his report on Rossmoor Leisure World developments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

693. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO (for himself, Mr. Annunzio, Mr. Dent, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Minnish, Mr. Podell, Mr. Clark, Mr. Hébert, Mr. Pike, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Gettys, and Mr. Gallagher):

H.R. 10283. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to encourage shipbuilding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BETTS (for himself, Mr. Ichord, Mr. Ashbrook, Mr. King, and Mr. Lukens):

H.R. 10284. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1884, relating to the control and eradication of certain animal diseases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 10285. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 10286. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 10287. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 10288. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 10289. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase to $30,000 the maximum servicemen's group life insurance which may be provided members of the uniformed services on active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10290. A bill to amend section 1682 of title 38 of the United States Code to increase the rate of educational assistance allowance paid to veterans under such section; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 10291. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include dental care, eye care, dentures, eyeglasses, and hearing aids among the benefits provided by the insurance program established by part B of such title: to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOREMAN:

H.R. 10292. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentation harmful to such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 10293. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to authorize railroads to publish rates for use by common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10294. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FUQUA (for himself and Mr. Broyhill of Virginia):

H.R. 10295. A bill to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, regulating the practice of the healing art in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 10296. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the program of health insurance for the aged for services furnished an individual by a home maintenance worker (in such individual's home) as part of a home health services plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT (for himself, Mr. Burke of Massachusetts, Mr. Fulton of Tennessee, Mr. Corman, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Blanton, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Charles H. Wilson, Mr. Karth, Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania, Mr. Murphy of Illinois, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Olsen, Mr. Delaney, Mr. St. Onge, Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Leggett, Mr. Wolff, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, and Mr. Friedel):

H.R. 10297. A bill to amend the Merchant

Marine Act, 1936, to encourage shipbuilding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 10298. A bill to establish the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 10299. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Hanley, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Blatnik, Mr. Kluczynski, and Mr. Hicks):

H.R. 10300. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to encourage shipbuilding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JONES of Tennessee:

H.R. 10301. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10302. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose additional limitations on tax-exempt foundations and charitable trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 10303. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10304. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 10305. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 10306. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 10307. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Powell, Mr. Scheuer, and Mr. Thompson of New Jersey):

H.R. 10308. A bill to amend Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress to create within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Overseas Education Board having responsibility for the elementary and secondary education of certain overseas dependents; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MIZE (for himself, Mr. Winn, Mr. Shriver, and Mr. Sebelius):

H.R. 10309. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 10310. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1950 relating to the Libby Dam, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10311. A bill to extend certain benefits to National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 10312. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the infiltration or management of legitimate organizations by racketeering activity or the proceeds of racketeering activity, where interstate or foreign commerce is affected, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 10313. A bill to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 10314. A bill to designate the third Sunday in October of each year as "Foster Parents' Day," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 10315. A bill to cause a study to be made on the advisability of connecting Lake Pontchartrain, La., with the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 10316. A bill to authorize and direct the Corps of Engineers to engage in public works for waste water purification and reuse; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 10317. A bill to adjust the date of rank of commissioned officers of the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 10318. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 10319. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 10320. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 10321. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 10322. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLD:

H.R. 10323. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to make married female members of the uniformed services eligible for basic quarters allowance during such time as their husbands are full-time college students; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ADDABBO (for himself, Mr. Annunzio, Mr. Dent, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Minish, Mr. Podell, Mr. Clark, Mr. Hébert, Mr. Pike, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Gettys, and Mr. Gallagher):

H.R. 10324. A bill to clarify and strengthen the cargo-preference laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ASHLEY (for himself, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Del Clawson, Mr. Mize, Mr. Rees, Mrs. Dwyer, Mr. St Germain, and Mr. Widnall):

H.R. 10325. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high timber yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHLEY (for himself, Mr. Karth, and Mr. Stephens):

H.R. 10326. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high timber yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 10327. A bill to establish the Federal Medical Evaluations Board to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to the regulation of biological products, medical devices, and drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 10328. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10329. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 10330. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt ammunition from Federal regulation under the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10331. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to increase the penalties for wrongful disclosure of information by employees of the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10332. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 10333. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. Moss, and Mr. Rogers of Florida):

H.R. 10334. A bill to amend the National Commission of Product Safety Act in order to extend the life of the Commission so that it may complete its assigned tasks; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 10335. A bill to revise certain provisions of the criminal laws of the District of Columbia relating to offenses against hotels, motels, and other commercial lodgings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 10336. A bill to revise certain laws relating to the liability of hotels, motels, and similar establishments in the District of Columbia to their guests; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 10337. A bill to redesignate the position of hearing examiner as "administrative trial judge"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 10338. A bill to designate the third Sunday in October of each year as "Foster Parents' Day," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 10339. A bill to amend the Internal

Revenue Code of 1954 to terminate the credit for investment in certain depreciable property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT (for himself, Mr. Burke, of Massachusetts, Mr. Fulton of Tennessee, Mr. Corman, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Blanton, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Charles H. Wilson, Mr. Karth, Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania, Mr. Murphy of Illinois, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Olsen, Mr. Delaney, Mr. St. Onge, Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Leggett, Mr. Wolff, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, and Mr. Friedel):

H.R. 10340. A bill to clarify and strengthen the cargo-preference laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALPERN (for himself, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Long of Maryland, and Mr. Thompson of New Jersey):

H.R. 10341. A bill to promote the peaceful resolution of international conflict, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 10342. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for treatment and rehabilitation centers for drug addicts and drug abusers, and to carry out drug abuse education curriculum programs, and to strengthen the coordination of drug abuse control programs by establishing the National Council on Drug Abuse Control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Hanley, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Blatnik, Mr. Kluczynski, and Mr. Hicks):

H.R. 10343. A bill to clarify and strengthen the cargo-preference laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McMILLAN (for himself, Mr. Foley, Mr. Meeds, Mr. Wyatt, Mr. Steiger of Arizona, Mr. Ullman, Mr. Pelly, Mr. Berry, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Teague of California, Mr. Dellenback, Mr. Don H. Clausen, Mr. McKneally, Mrs. Green of Oregon, and Mr. Rhodes):

H.R. 10344. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high timber yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 10345. A bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to provide for the movement in commerce of certain State inspected products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 10346. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to provide for the movement in commerce of certain State-inspected products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 10347. A bill to extend the Federal-State unemployment compensation program to Guam, to extend chapter 85, title 5, United States Code, to Federal civilian workers and ex-servicemen in Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 10348. A bill to exempt from the antitrust laws certain joint newspaper operating arrangements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 10349. A bill to amend section 8332, title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited services of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 10350. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part of imported meat be labeled "imported" at all stages of distribution until delivery to the ultimate consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 10351. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow with minor children may earn without suffering deductions from benefits to which she is entitled thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 10352. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 10353. A bill, the Potomac Basin National riverways; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona (for himself, Mr. Rhodes, and Mr. Udall):

H.R. 10354. A bill to provide for the transfer of lands to the Navajo Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 10355. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.J. Res. 663. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.J. Res. 664. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.J. Res. 665. Joint resolution establishing the Federal Committee on Nuclear Development; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.J. Res. 666. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period May 11 through May 17, 1969, as "Help Your Police Fight Crime Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H. Con. Res. 208. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 1, 2, and 3 of the publication, entitled, "Subversive Influences in Riots, Looting, and Burning"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 209. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print, "The Analysis and Evaluation of Public Expenditures: The PPB System"; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

123. By Mr. ALBERT: Memorial of the 32d Oklahoma Legislature, expressing the feeling that the United States should not relinquish its control over the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

124. By Mr. ZION: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, relative to the Indiana time dilemma; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

125. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, relative to return to Indiana highway users all Federal-aid funds paid in; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

126. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to changing the period for which daylight saving time is in effect; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

127. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the recital of a nonsectarian prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

128. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to changes in Federal welfare assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 10356. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Iris O. Hicks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 10357. A bill for the relief of Dr. Talaat Henry Souryal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10358. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward J. Flatley, O2289403; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 10359. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award a Medal of Honor to Cmdr. Lloyd M. Bucher; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 10360. A bill for the relief of Andrea Mannino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 10361. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Thornton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 10362. A bill for the relief of Rosa Cabral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKNEALLY:

H.R. 10363. A bill for the relief of Israel and Rivka Hershkof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 10364. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects Foundation, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 10365. A bill for the relief of Elroy E. Cordova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 10366. A bill to provide for the lease or conveyance of certain real property in the District of Columbia to the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 10367. A bill for the relief of Antonio Evangilista; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 10368. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Browne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 10369. A bill for the relief of Harry J. Coyne, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER: LEADER IN PEACE AND WAR

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a great void has been left in the American scene with the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower, President, General of the Army, and citizen.

General Eisenhower's presence and his counsel were reassuring to the Nation even after his years of public service. He was regarded by millions as an anchor to the bedrock traditions and principles of our great Nation.

In memory of his passing, I herewith place in the Record my recent newsletter, Capitol Comments, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this great American.

The newsletter follows:

Dwight David Eisenhower, President and General: A True Patriot, a Great Hero, a Natural Leader

(Capitol Comments by Joe L. Evins, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee, Apr. 7, 1969)

Volumes of eloquent eulogies have been given in our country and throughout the world in tribute to the memory of the late Dwight David Eisenhower, President and General of the Army.

My personal eulogy must include my vivid recollection of meeting General Eisenhower in southern France during World War II. He, at that time, was Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe, and I was a major serving under his command. General Eisenhower was warm, friendly, with a magnetic personality and the famous, engaging smile that became his trademark. He projected sincerity and interest as we met.

Later when he was "in command" as President and I was serving in Congress we met on a number of occasions, including several special, memorable occasions at the White House. He was always the same warm, genial person—a natural leader of men.

President Eisenhower's life was filled with a record of magnificent achievements. He was the first American General to head an army that included troops from many nations, and he was masterful in pulling together these troops into a powerful instrument for freedom. As a military leader, he led our Nation to victory for freedom. As President, he led our Nation into a time of peace, ending the Korean conflict and establishing a period of tranquility. His Administration was a period of calm, quieting the fears and frustrations of our people.

One of his outstanding domestic achievements was the inaugural of the great interstate highway program which is continuing under construction. This great system of limited access highways is comparable to the autobahn highway system in Europe and has expedited safer travel throughout much of our Nation.

President Eisenhower enjoyed the confidence of the people. He was loved by the people—and he loved the people. He had a special sense of the greatness of America and its traditions, and he believed fervently in the vital importance of preserving, promoting and perpetuating our cherished American way of life. The fact that both political parties sought him as their Presidential nominee attests and testifies to his greatness as a natural leader.

We do not yet have the full historical perspective on the Administration of President Eisenhower—time will tell this story. However, we know that the American people felt comfortable and safe with President Eisenhower in the White House. Dwight David Eisenhower will be missed—a friend of the people has gone.

DISTINGUISHED NEBRASKA ALUMNUS IS DIRECTOR OF AMA'S INSTITUTE FOR BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the University of Nebraska is entering its second century of service to the people of my State.

One of its many distinguished graduates is George Wells Beadle, Ph. D., former president of the University of Chicago and a 1958 Nobel Prize winner in chemistry for his research in genetics.

Dr. Beadle has now become director of the American Medical Association's Institute for Biomedical Research in Chicago, which contributes importantly to the diversity and competition that has given the United States such a commanding position in biological science and technology.

The Institute for Biomedical Research sponsored its first international symposium March 24–28 in Chicago. More than 40 scientists from areas throughout the world were scheduled to participate in the program on neurobiology.

In his annual report, Dr. Beadle said construction of a permanent facility for the institute adjacent to the University of Chicago campus will probably be completed in another 3 years. During the interim, research continues in the AMA's headquarters building in Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the organization and Dr. Beadle for their significant contributions to the overall strength of the science underpinnings that have done so much to give the United States world leadership in this area.

I call to my colleague's attention the following article from the AMA News on the American Medical Association's Institute for Biomedical Research which is financed entirely by private funds:

Institute Reports Research Achievements

Preliminary plans for the construction of the American Medical Association's Institute of Biomedical Research adjacent to the U. of Chicago campus are complete and working drawings are being prepared by architects, says George Wells Beadle, PhD, director of the Institute.

The working drawings, when complete, will be considered by the AMA Board of Trustees for approval. Dr. Beadle said construction will probably be completed in about three years.

Meanwhile, research continues in laboratories of the AMA headquarters building in Chicago. Programs have been planned around the objectives of providing new and more effective diagnostic and therapeutic methods to aid medicine's understanding of the causes and mechanisms of disease.

SIX DEPARTMENTS

It has been four years since the Institute began active research. Following organizational developments and department expansions, the Institute currently has six departments in biomedical research.

They deal in studies of neurobiology, molecular biophysics, experimental medical ecology, regulatory biology, virology and immunology, and animal research.

Dr. Beadle, president emeritus of the U. of Chicago and a Nobel Prize winner in 1958 for research in genetics, told *The AMA News* that although there are many other laboratories conducting biomedical research, the AMA-supported Insttiute contributes importantly to the diversity and competition that has given the United States such a commanding position in biological science and technology.

He noted:

"It is important that the more than 200,000 members of the AMA feel a sense of involvement in the creation of the knowledge that underlies all medical practices. With their severe limitations in both time and energy, keeping up with recent developments in the related sciences is an almost impossible task."

PRIVATE FUNDS

He emphasized that the Institute's programs and projects, and construction of the new facility are being done by private funds. None of the projects receives any federal funding, whereas many other institutions accept matching funds through government educational programs.

Dr. Beadle states in his annual report:

"AMA members can justifiably take pride that their support of the Institute contributes significantly to the overall strength of the science underpinnings that have done so much to give the United States world leadership in medical knowledge and medical practice."

The AMA Institute sponsored its first International symposium March 24–28 in Chicago. More than 40 scientists from areas throughout the world participated in the program. The first symposium was on neurobiology, the study of the nervous system as it occurs in various animals.

CEREBELLAR STRUCTURE

The Neurobiology Dept. is headed by Rodolfo Llinas, MD, PhD, who organized the symposium. His department is currently devoted to the study of structure and function of the cerebellum.

Its three major programs are:

The study of the anatomy and physiology of cerebellar evolution.

Physiological and morphological basis of cerebellar control of peripheral receptor organs.

Functional and structural changes in the cerebellar cortex following viral and genetical lesions.

Through such studies, remarkable progress has been made in working out the precise and enormously complex neural circuitry of this part of the brain, Dr. Beadle said.

The Dept. of Molecular Biophysics, under Dan. W. Urry, PhD, is involved in relating the changes in shapes of enzymes and other biologically active proteins such as hemoglobin and hormones as they participate in their specific biological functions.

As an example, recent work in Dr. Urry's laboratory reveals by a sophisticated optical method how hemoglobin carries oxygen from the lungs to other parts of the body.

The activities of Clyde R. Goodheart, MD, and his associates in the Dept. of Virology and Immunology are largely directed toward learning how cells become cancerous. There are now known many instances in which the change from normal activity to that characteristic of malignancy is brought about by viruses, Dr. Beadle said. The so-called adeno viruses are especially suited to such studies, he added, for they multiply well, produce identifiable changes in tissue culture cells, and are otherwise readily investigated by the methods of genetics.

The Dept. of Experimental Medical Ecology, headed by Howard A. Schneider, PhD, is interested in identifying and learning more about substances active in small amounts in protecting mice against the bacterium that causes typhoid. This is of special interest because it is neither a vitamin nor an antibiotic, Dr. Beadle explained. It is called a "pacifarin," and occurs in small quanties in some natural foodstuffs. Its isolation is difficult both because of its low concentration and because it is increasingly susceptible to destruction during purification.

GAPS IN KNOWLEDGE

"It is well known," Dr. Beadle stated, "that the regulation of the biological activities of cells, tissues, and organs in animals often involve hormones. But in our knowledge of the manner of action of these regulatory substances, there are large gaps." Oscar M. Hechter, PhD, and his associates in the Dept. of Regulatory Biology are investigating the ways in which different cell types discriminate among various chemical signals, such as those of hormones, and then selectively respond to particular ones among them.

The experimental animal facilities of the Institute are among the best in the nation, the Institute's director said. George R. Collins is responsible for their design, operation, and constant improvement. Many animals must be kept free of certain bacteria and other specific pathogens. This requires special precautions such as specially designed cage filters, as well as constant skillful surveillance, Dr. Beadle explained.

REMARKS OF FRANK JAMESON, FORMER NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF THE NAVY LEAGUE

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the former national president of the Navy League, Frank Jameson, gave an excellent speech last month to the San Diego County Navy League Women's Council. I would like to include the text of that speech, and an editorial from the San Diego Union, commenting on it, in the Extensions of Remarks in the RECORD, so that Mr. Jameson's remarks may be read by everyone:

Is America fatally infected? Are the riots, the campus revolts, the anarchy, transient things that will pass, or is this a fatal disease, now entering into the terminal stage?

These are the questions that many are seeking answers to.

There is no doubt that the growing phenomenon of violence is affecting the United States and threatening social order. Public faith has been shaken in some of our basic beliefs.

Part of the madness we are surrounded with today is the direct result of our American way of life, but most of it is universal.

Some of America's instabilities flow from our virtues. America is the world's most open society, most socially fluid and the most ethnically diverse. These virtues do not necessarily lend themselves to stability. They do give us strength, vitality and progress—along with tensions and friction.

We are the most technically advanced and changing society in the world today. Millions have been divorced from the stable farm life by new machines. Millions more were displaced as automated equipment replaced muscle. Added to this is the invention of television and the impact it has had on our society.

Yet today's violence and anarchy are not uniquely American. The list of cities hit hard by students, workers and others is worldwide: Calcutta, Berkeley, New Delhi, Watts, Columbia University, The Sorbonne, Prague, Peiping, Stockholm, West Berlin and Madrid are but a few. In this assortment of nations are capitalists, Communists, Socialists and Facists, tropical and northern, Asians and Europeans.

Each place has its own provocations and specific issues. There are no common traits of economics, politics or ideologies. Consider two of the locales of violence, France and Sweden. Both of these countries have planned economies and extended welfare. Both are outspokenly anti-United States on Vietnam. France is color blind to its many Negroes; Sweden hasn't any.

This means the instability cannot be understood in these terms, analysis of contagious violence by issue seems fruitless; yet there are common denominators running through the madness. They are massive and widespread, they involve social and technological change. There has been mass saturation and exposure to the communications media and basic changes in old ideas about interpersonal relations.

Look at the infections as a whole. All link to change. Knowledge used to double every 2,000 years, now it's probably 10. For good or ill, knowledge enriches and disturbs, produces and uproots. Take a basic invention that required 10 lab years to develop. If it affects human behavior, adjustment simply cannot keep pace.

Society has developed a case of galloping "future shock." The bomb, the pill, the computer, the satellite, the transplant: the oldest of these is a generation, others came within the year, and all have shaken behavior patterns, old ideals—stability.

Think what these have done to the familiar patterns of life, the ideal of God, the importance of history, the role of education, sexual relationships, distinction between the sexes, the family. For 10,000 years, human life was organized around job and family. Both are now struggling to survive a headlong rush to the future.

Take today's "secure" job: it may not outlive tomorrow. It may be the victim of the twin invaders, technology and "systems." The lifetime profession is also becoming a new for any professional to keep up with new kind of rat race with too much that is properly.

Yesterday, fairly precise ideas about these questions existed. Today there is no similar precision, no concensus to be found, in fact, new answers are not yet available, some questions are unasked. What can the old social mores mean against these hammer blows?

It is just this that disturbs so many: the fury of the anarchy, the irrational hatred of the values the society used to live by, an indifference to all history and what it means to any nation.

The United States has seen some of such rejections in earlier decades. But the reaction never struck so hard at the accepted values. It's this anti-morality that stumps society's defenders the most.

Add to this the massive perfection of modern communication, which "involves" television viewers in all that happens, but provides no compensating way for the viewer to *do* something. Recall just the sheer horror of both Kennedy murder film clips to appreciate what involvement without participation can create.

Put it all together and it makes for a grim picture indeed. A culture in dissolution, the new one still trying to be born. And, no glimmer of an answer to the urgent question, "how long?"

Thus, I return to the original question that I asked at the beginning of my speech, "Is America fatally infected?" Is it therefore time to write the sad prognosis, "incurable." Is the United States society another Rome, falling prey to its own affluence, a rotting culture with the barbarians waiting for the carcass?

I say *no*, I believe it is time to re-examine America's virtues rather than its vices. We have a right to demand that our society be measured by its achievements not by its shortcomings.

We must cast off the most massive guilt complex in history and think positively and urgently about solutions to the nation's problems that beset all of us.

Individual responsibility and self-reliance, guided by sound moral judgment and strict adherence to the law, remains the cornerstone to America's greatness in the years to come.

I object to the irresponsible, unfair and dishonest image that has been painted of our nation and of our generation by John Kenneth Galbraith, Senator Morse, Senator Fulbright and others who have called ours a sick society and a sick generation.

These charges are unfair, unjust and untrue.

I have no apologies to make for my country or for my generation.

Never before in history nor in any other land have people accomplished so much. given so much and asked so little.

Four times in one lifetime we have involved ourselves in foreign wars. We have poured the flower of our manhood and the fortunes of our citizens into these battles against aggression, injustice and tyranny.

We have never coveted a single acre of land nor sought to add a dollar to our national wealth.

Quite the contrary. We have used our material strength and financial fortunes to bind the wounds of the vanquished and we have given aid and sustenance to the impoverished in a hundred nations around the world, friend and foe alike. In fact, since World War II we have spent over $125 billion dollars in foreign aid.

We have battled, too, for progress and betterment on the home front.

In one generation we have conquered or controlled diptheria, small-pox, typhoid, polio, measles, tuberculosis and pneumonia. No longer do these ancient scourges sweep across our land leaving death and tortured limbs and minds and hearts in their wake.

We have built more schools and colleges and hospitals and libraries than all other generations since the beginning of time.

We have trained and graduated more scientists, doctors, surgeons, dentists, lawyers, teachers, engineers and physicists than did our forbears for a thousand years before.

We have done more to bring dignity and equality and opportunity to all minority groups than any other generation has ever done in any nation since the dawn of history.

We have raised our standards of living and lowered our hours of work. Luxuries that were beyond the dreams of princes and potentates a generation ago are now available to all our people.

The automobile, the radio, the telephone, the airplane, the computer, television, antibiotics and a hundred other miracles have come to full flower in one generation.

We have taxed ourselves unmercifully to bring hope and health to our sick, our indigent, our young and our aged.

Each year our personal gifts to private charities exceed $14 billion dollars.

Don't let anyone sell you the idea that ours is a sick society. It's far from perfect, but it is also far and away the most enlightened, most unselfish, most compassionate in the history of the world.

Let those apostles of despair who preach hate and disorder and discord take a look in their own mirrors.

Let them ask themselves what they have done and what they are doing for the betterment of their loved ones . . . their nation and the world.

I know what our generation has done. I'll stand on our record. We may not have scored as high as we hoped. But we scored higher than ever before.

And—the end is not yet.

There is still work to be done. There are still challenges to be met. There are still hopes to be realized. There are still goals to be attained.

They'll not be attained by the preachers and teachers of despair. They'll not be attained by sniffing flowers or staging love-ins or hate-ins.

They'll be attained by the unsung heroes of every generation. The workers who can dream. And the doers who can hope. They'll be attained by the men and women who cherish our Nation's glorious past . . . who hold their heads and hearts high. . . . The men and women who have faith in our way of life; men and women who believe in a better and brighter tomorrow and are willing to work to that end.

Those that think the American people can be cowed and our system of political representation wrecked, are likely to be disappointed. True, it is an unique system and we are scarcely entitled to blame any nation for not having one like ours. It concerns the citizens deeply only on a limited number of occasions . . . mostly when the President is to be elected. The electoral process is accompanied by unnecessary amounts of ritual ballyhoo, but when the final returns are in, it is amazingly accurate in the picture it provides of the people's mood.

Any discussion of America today would not be complete without a few comments on campus revolts.

You can forgive a great deal where college students are concerned and I suppose that some of us would like to shrug off today's revolts and demonstrations as just another manifestation of the "panty raids" of my own youth. The truth is quite different and, although I can't recall anything very uplifting about "panty raids," I would say that the truth today is more squalid.

First of all, I would like to say that I think there is in existence a total nationwide conspiracy to disrupt the campuses across our Nation. These disturbances are found not only at Berkeley and San Francisco State but also at Columbia, Duke, Iowa State and at the Universities of Illinois and Wisconsin.

I think that the hard core of the radicals, who are constantly in appearance at the campus demonstrations, seem intent on destroying the system of higher education and in using university campuses as staging areas for the spread of their own political philosophy. I think that this philosophy which condones violence and disruption, and which disregards the rights of other students, is incompatible with the foundations of our democracy.

I also know that problems of this nature don't go away but they must be dealt with . . . and dealt with firmly.

We have had countless examples of attempts of college administrations to negotiate with these dissident groups. They have received nothing more than a slap in the face for their efforts. An example was at Berkeley when the administration announced acceptance of the black studies program that the student's third world liberation front had been striving for. The student front pronounced itself supremely uninterested and switched to demands for a Black-Latino-Amero-Asian-American Indian studies program instead.

When the president of City College of New York emerged from the administration building to announce to 100 Negro and Puerto Rican students affirmative answers to all their demands . . . they barreled past him without listening. They kicked in the door of his office and spent several hours littering the carpet floor with cigarette butts and sampling his office liquor supply.

This type of conduct and disrespect for authority cannot and must not be allowed.

Governor Ronald Reagan and Governor Warren P. Knowles of Wisconsin are two of the Governors who have taken a very strong stand against militant students.

The acting president of San Francisco State, S. I. Hayakawa, and Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, of Notre Dame both have taken positive action to preserve the university atmosphere. I would like to quote part of a letter written by Father Hesburgh to Vice President Agnew, pertaining to the student unrest. I quote: "The best salvation for the university in the face of any crisis is for the university community to save itself by declaring its own ground rules and basic values and then enforcing them with the widest and deepest form of moral persuasions for the good life of the university, and consequent moral condemnation with academic sanctions for any movement against university life and values . . . especially violence, vandalism and mob action which are the antitheses of reason, civility and the open society which respects the rights of each and all."

The sooner that more of our college administrators follow the lead of the good Father, the sooner our campuses will return to normal.

There is no doubt that the vast majority of university and college students are attending school to obtain an education, but the big majority of college students have neither the urge or the power to stop campus turmoil. The few who attempt to fight back are met with apathy on one side and threats from the other side. The general attitude that prevails is . . . let George do it . . . I am not involved.

At one time it used to be the goal of most students to take an active part in running for office as class president or as a class officer. Today, this is passé. However, there are definite indications that the majority of students are becoming fed up with the actions of the minorities and are about to take positive action.

I hope by now that you are asking yourselves what can we do individually and as a great Nation about all of this.

There are a number of important steps that we must take.

First, we must stiffen our backbones, thrust out our chins and crush out our national guilt complex.

Second, we must reject the idea that there is something outmoded about law and order, codes of ethics and moral behavior and the willingness to exercise individual responsibility.

Third, we must act to strengthen family ties and responsibility. A general relapse of parental authority and the family role as the center of daily life is as tragic for the rebellious college student as it is for the ghetto dweller.

Fourth, we must bring America back to work. It does not make sense to know that there are thousands upon thousands of people receiving public assistance for their living needs right here in San Diego, while thousands of jobs go begging. It is time to clear off those relief roles . . . not brutally or ruthlessly but methodically and compassionately in a manner that restores dignity and self-respect and at the same time gives a little relief to the rest of us. If job training or re-training is required it should be made possible, but above all we must correct the frame of mind that finds it easier to accept a handout than to go to work. Employable people should be employed because people working are people rewarded and people rewarded are proud people.

Fifth, we must begin to exercise business power as an anecdote to black power and student power or Government power. Business and professional men must act instead of react and seek solutions for all these problems that our Government has tried for a very long time to solve without very marked success. We must learn to anticipate the changes that lie ahead. We must clean up our air and water, must find and carry out programs to train the unemployable and eliminate the ghettos. We must exert moral leadership that takes the ball away from the extremist and disciples of violence, and restore faith in our society.

Sixth, we must stop the ever increasing influence of Government. Civilian employment in the Federal Government is now well over 3,000,000 people. The Federal Government is spending at a rate of $335,012.21 a minute, or approximately $20,000,000 an hour every hour of the day, seven days a week.

Let us stop apologizing for the success of free enterprise, but instead work at spreading and sharing those successes.

Let us stop apologizing for America's wealth and power. Instead let's use it agressively to attack those problems that threaten to explode the world.

[From the San Diego Union, Mar. 23, 1969]

AMERICA IS TRULY GREAT: EXHIBITIONISTS DISTORT THE VIEW

Considering the small number of anarchists in the United States of America and the volume of noise they make, rarely have so few fooled so many for so long.

As Frank Gard Jameson told a meeting of the San Diego County Navy League Women's Council last week, it is time to set the record straight.

"I believe it is a time to re-examine America's virtues rather than its vices. We have a right to demand that our society be measured by its achievements not by its shortcomings," added the former national president of the Navy League of the United States.

Look at those achievements! Compare them with any other nation's.

The people of the United States have in this decade fought four wars to counter tyranny, dictatorship, totalitarianism and injustice. In the process we have made freedom possible not only for ourselves but for millions of other persons in the world. We have helped the sick—people and nations.

"Never before in history nor in any other land have people accomplished so much, given so much and asked so little," Mr. Jameson said.

At home we have in this century conquered polio, smallpox, diphtheria, pneumonia, and tuberculosis.

The United States should be proud, not apologetic, over the great accomplishments in education. More than half of all Americans have graduated from high school; more than 6.5 million are in college today. No other nation can come close to this achievement.

We can find pleasure in the fact that Americans privately contribute nearly $15 billion a year for worthy causes and charities; that 50 million Americans donate their time to philanthropies.

It is an over-concern rather than blase attitude that has made Americans approve through Congress a 126 per cent rise in federal social spending to a total of $59 billion a year.

We can stand tall on the fact that the average family has father and mother who have been married 22 years, and is happy and close-knit.

The agnostics are loud, but the fact is that nearly half of all America can be found in church each Sunday and 94 per cent of adult Americans believe in God.

Our virtues are endless. Book buying has doubled in this decade. There is a boom in culture from San Diego to Broadway and from Santa Fe to Cherokee, Iowa.

Since the turn of the decade more than 4 million Americans have become new homeowners, and more than 5 million have become partners of free enterprise for the first time by buying stocks.

As Mr. Jameson said, "Let us stop apologizing for the success of free enterprise, but instead work at spreading and sharing those successes. Let us stop apologizing for America's wealth and power. Instead let's use it aggressively to attack those problems that threaten to explode."

A few of the people have been fooling most of the people too long, too often in recent years.

It is time for most of the people to set the record—and the nation—straight.

EXPANDING JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL AMERICANS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Labor, George P. Shultz, appeared this morning before the Committee on Education and Labor to discuss the Labor Department's plans for the Job Corps.

This testimony reflects the thoughtful consideration given the Job Corps by the Nixon administration and I commend this statement to my colleagues for their information.

The decision to redirect the Job Corps in its delegation from OEO to the Labor Department is sound and deserves the support of this Congress.

The Secretary's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ, SECRETARY OF LABOR, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 21, 1969

Mr. Chairman, Members of this Committee, I am glad to be here today to discuss with you our efforts to help to expand job opportunities for all Americans, and particularly the role of the Job Corps program in those efforts.

It is less than five years since the Economic Opportunity Act first came before this Committee. Since that landmark occasion significant forces have been set in motion by the Act's mandate to open "to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity." These forces have had a major impact on both our institutions and our expectations concerning the abolition of poverty. Within the Department of Labor there has been a profound change in the traditional tools used to promote the welfare of working men and women.

The Department today is much different than it was five years ago. We now administer manpower programs which open the way to self-help for over one million Americans. We have redirected our efforts so that top priority is given to the needs of the poor and the unemployed.

In embarking on this course, we have learned much more about what we can and must do than we knew in 1964. We must build upon this experience and affirm our commitment to seek better solutions.

The strengths and weaknesses of individual manpower programs have become more apparent as knowledge has accumulated. We should use this knowledge to develop a national plan for action against poverty.

It is because we need a broader strategy to cope with the intractable problem of poverty in America, that President Nixon has asked the Congress for a one-year extension of the Economic Opportunity Act. During this year, the Administration will develop a plan for a carefully conceived approach to the problem of poverty in America.

For example, we expect, in the near future, to present a Comprehensive Manpower Act for your consideration. This measure will be designed to implement a coordinated national manpower policy by providing the services necessary to develop fully our manpower resources while assisting the individual worker to realize the full range of his abilities. The overall plan will integrate segmented manpower components into a unified and more effective system for delivering human resources services. Such a program reflects the concern of the President when he said:

"One of the primary goals of this Administration is to expand our knowledge of how best to make real progress against those social ills that have so stubbornly defied solution. We do not pretend to have all the answers. We are determined to find as many as we can."

As you undoubtedly know, we think that we have some constructive proposals to make in regard to the Job Corps. It is because I want to share our thinking on this subject with you that I would like to focus on the Job Corps today.

Two important considerations should be highlighted at the outset.

First, when the Job Corps was established, there were only 27,000 training opportunities for youth in all Department of Labor programs. In fiscal year 1969, the number of out-of-school youth served by the Job Corps and the programs administered by the Department of Labor will be 362,900. Under President Nixon's budget for fiscal year 1970 this total is expected to be 368,600—or an increase of 5,700 over this fiscal year. Hence, the reduction in the number of youths served in Job Corps during the course of a year will be more than offset by the increase in other manpower programs. Essentially, we have evaluated the overall design of our manpower programs and are suggesting a reallocation of resources among the programs to achieve better results in terms of benefits and costs.

Second, I pledge that every effort will be taken to afford each Job Corps enrollee in a center to be closed the opportunity to transfer to another center, to accept employment or to enroll in another manpower program.

In looking at the Job Corps it is important to understand that it was developed as one way to deal with a specific problem and was based on a limited set of ideas and a narrow design for dealing with the problem.

The problem was the large number of youths who drop out of school, many from vocational schools, without being adequately prepared for either further training or employment, and whose home or neighborhood environment prevented them from effectively utilizing other manpower programs.

The set of ideas on which this program was built include:

RESIDENCE

One central idea is that complete residential service is essential for the target population. The assumption is that these youths are so hampered by disruptive home conditions that they need a totally new environment in order to learn or acquire skills.

REMOVAL FROM COMMUNITY

The second premise is that the youth in the target group should be completely removed, not only from an adverse family situation, but a long distance from their neighborhood or home community.

INTENSIVE SUPPORTIVE SERVICE

Of equal importance is the belief that such youth need comprehensive and intensive supportive services. Here the premise is that work training alone will not remove all the obstacles to employment. The full range of services would provide for basic education, counseling, health services, pre-employment orientation and recreation.

SELF SUFFICIENCY

And finally, Job Corps has assumed that each residential center should be substantially self-sufficient and by itself provide the full range of services needed. The location of many of the centers promotes the concept of self-sufficiency.

In reviewing the basic ideas underlying the Job Corps it is clear that some have continued merit while others should be dropped or modified in the light of experience and recent developments in our manpower programs.

First, we support the contention that residential services are essential for many youths who otherwise lack the home environment necessary to sustain effective learning. We also agree that comprehensive and intensive supportive services must be a part of any such program.

Second, we believe that complete residential services are not essential for all who have been enrolled in the Job Corps.

In addition, residential services are not always best provided at a great distance from home and community. Nor should we continue to operate the Job Corps on the principle that it should be a self-sufficient entity divorced from the other manpower programs that have been initiated in recent years.

The General Accounting Office, after a careful study of the Job Corps, raised serious questions concerning whether the Job Corps was, in fact, reaching that client group it is designed to serve. It said: "A significant portion of Corps members have not met the qualifications generally considered necessary for participation in the program and the alternative of enrolling applicants in other less costly, and possibly more suitable, training programs, apparently were not always considered." GAO and others who have studied Job Corps have found that the main emphasis in recruiting is on "meeting quotas", not making a careful, considered decision that a costly residential training program is best for a particular individual. Moreover, the information necessary to identify those who need specific residential support is not included in the questionnaire used for selection.

This inability to identify and enroll those youths who specifically need residential support persists despite the disproportionately large expenditure of resources allocated for recruitment and selection. For example, in fiscal year 1969, about $10 million was budgeted for recruitment compared to $3 million for placement activities. This imbalance, and the difficulty in recruiting for the Job Corps generally, raises a serious question about the size and design of the program necessary to serve the target group.

One of the most significant factors limiting the success of the Job Corps is the short length of stay by corps members. In this respect, the long distance from home undoubtedly contributes to the high dropout rate and short length of stay. Men's and women's urban centers located in states which "import" Job Corps enrollees have 30-day dropout rates that average over 15 percent higher than the rates in "export" states. Similarly, the fact that 28 percent of those young people who have been accepted for the Job Corps never arrive at a center supports the inference that a general policy of moving enrollees far from their home communities has impaired the overall effectiveness of the Job Corps. OEO studies also have shown that 70 percent of all corps members were homesick and felt the lack of emotional support derived from family living. Many younger corps members apparently would have preferred being enrolled at centers near their homes and this has already been recommended in one OEO study.

Although the dedicated men and women who have operated the program have introduced useful innovations, it remains true that the Job Corps design does not respond selectively to the differing needs of youth. For example, it does not provide residential support for those who may need it *within* their own communities. Moreover, it is poorly coordinated with a total manpower program which has both increased in magnitude and improved in quality over recent years.

To build on those basic premises which have demonstrated their worth—the need for a residential component in manpower programs and a full line of services—two major changes in program design are necessary. Implementation of this new approach should go far to overcome significant weaknesses in the present Job Corps approach and practices while making good use of the constructive attributes of the Job Corps concept.

First, the Job Corps will be made an integral part of a comprehensive manpower system, rather than continued as an essentially separate program.

Such integration will greatly benefit every element of the overall program and reinforce the strengths of Job Corps. Its unique residential services will be woven into the total design of the ongoing programs. This should improve recruitment, screening and selection practices, more precisely identifying those who have a special need for residential services as against other available alternatives.

For example:

Job Corps would be a part of the Cooperative Manpower Planning System (CAMPS). This will permit the use of a wide spectrum of services as an alternative to, or in coordination with residential centers.

The capabilities of the Job Corps centers could be tied into the Concentrated Employment Programs, affording another tool with which to address the work-training problems of young people. Presently, 82 individual CEP's have been funded, including virtually every major city in the country.

Youth who are already in manpower programs such as MDTA or NYC and who are identified as needing residential support, would be able to get it.

Employment opportunities available through the National Alliance of Businessmen JOBS program could be tied directly to the job needs of graduating Corpsmen. The recent expansion of this program to 125 major cities will open a great many new job opportunities. The budget proposed by President Nixon for fiscal year 1970 includes a goal of 140,000 training and employment opportunities under the JOBS program.

In short, instead of standing in splendid isolation, the Job Corps would be supported by and lend support to all other manpower programs.

A second major change is to direct part of the Job Corps resources to new organizational forms, particularly smaller "inner-city or near-city" residential centers.

While Job Corps has had in the past a few experimental centers, on the whole its structure has remained unchanged. Thus, the Job Corps is comprised of very large men's centers housing several thousand youths and located about 40 miles from the nearest city; smaller women's centers housing from several hundred to a thousand girls; and small men's conservation centers located in the country. Great flexibility is needed in the kinds of residential manpower programs necessary to meet the varying needs of young people.

Our plan for improving the operation of Job Corps would provide for the establishment during fiscal 1970 of new centers located in or near the city and designed to serve primarily the residents of the city.

Some of the centers would provide work training for enrollees in a residential setting close enough to the city to permit week-end commuting home.

Some would be located within the city and provide training for residents of the center and also nonresidents who need training and supportive services, but not the domicile facilities.

Other centers would provide distinctive residential service for young unmarried mothers and could include, or be linked to, child care service.

Some would provide mainly residential and supportive services with training furnished by other components of manpower programs administered by the Department of Labor.

In developing the new centers we will be as flexible and imaginative as possible. We will try to utilize the best aspects of the Job Corps experience as well as drawing upon our own experiments with residential centers. In any case, we will continue to review our efforts in this area so that we may modify the program as appropriate. A policy based on the status quo will result in inertia and not innovation.

In addition to questions of policy and emphasis, the Job Corps has been beset by a number of important operating problems. First, the Job Corps has demonstrated serious deficiencies in its ability to retain enrollees for the duration of the specified program. Experience in calendar year 1968 indicates that almost 40 percent of the enrollees dropped out in the first 90 days. For the men's urban centers, this early drop-out rate was 38 percent, for the conservation camps it was 41 percent, and for the women's centers it was 34 percent. Ultimately, only 24 percent of enrollees completed their program at the conservation centers, 43 percent in the men's centers and 38 percent in the women's centers. These data reinforce the judgment that the Job Corps, as presently constituted, has not been able to retain many enrollees for a period of time sufficient to derive a full measure of benefits from the program.

Second, job placement, a central practical, and measurable goal of all manpower development programs, has not been outstanding in Job Corps. This consideration is highly important for a very expensive, high unit cost, residential training program.

According to OEO reports, approximately 67 percent of the young men leaving Job Corps centers are placed in jobs, return to school or join the military service 90 days after they leave. The rate in individual centers varies from slightly more than 40 percent to almost 85 percent. This aggregate placement rate for women is 54 percent. Placement success, more than anything else, depends upon the ability of the center to motivate the young people so that they complete their training program and are equipped for useful employment.

As part of our overall package, we contemplate changes that should ameliorate the problems of retention and placement:

By reducing the number of enrollees who are transported long distances from their homes we should cut down dropouts and, at the same time, make it possible to develop specific job opportunities for the corps member while he is still at the center. In this manner, the corpsman will have greater incentive to complete his course of training.

The center itself will be required to take the initiative in securing placement services. This would involve developing individual placement plans for each corps member. The services of the Local employment office in counseling and job development would be available. The center itself may engage in job development and placement work. This activity will be greatly facilitated in the proposed new centers which will be located in or close to the labor market in which the corpsmen subsequently seek employment.

More "gate houses" and readjustment aids would be provided corps members when they graduate. Relocation assistance could be provided under existing Department of Labor programs to corpsmen who wish to move to labor shortage areas after they graduate.

The essential point is that these kind of employment assistance facilities are available in other manpower programs and by bringing Job Corps into a comprehensive manpower development system they can be made more effectively available and tailored to the needs of individual corps members. Both the training and placement process should be enhanced as a result.

Weighing all of these considerations, we are unable to support a decision to retain the present size and character of the Job Corps. Our plans for revising Job Corps are dictated, not by any arbitrary desire to reduce cost without regard to quality, but by *the necessity* of acting upon an evaluation of the Job Corps in relation to the other manpower programs that have been developed since its inception.

Recent discussions of the Job Corps have focused on the closing of existing centers. I recognize that such actions inevitably will excite controversy and concern. However, it is important to keep a perspective of the overall magnitude and direction of our overall manpower program. The Job Corps is one of a wide variety of public programs designed to prepare young people for their life's work. This Administration has reviewed the manpower development effort proposed for FY 1970 by our predecessors. We have looked at all of the manpower programs and have proposed a change in the mix of training opportunities for young people and other persons served by manpower programs. Our analysis lead us to conclude that the size and scope of the Job Corps should be substantially changed. Once overall program levels and mix were determined, it was necessary to establish criteria for evaluating the various centers and camps at some distance from their home communities.

After discussions with OEO staff we seselected criteria which in their—and our—judgments are meaningful measures of the performance of the centers in achieving their objectives. The criteria were those OEO had used in the past; the data for each criterion were compiled by Job Corps and covered the entire calendar year 1968.

The criteria are:

1. Average operating cost of the center per enrollee man-year.

2. The average length of stay, in months, of enrollees at the center.

3. The 30 day drop-out rate at the center.

4. & 5. Average reading and math gains by the enrollees. (Sufficient information was not available from the women's centers to permit valid comparison, however.)

6. The percent of tardiness that were placed 90 days after leaving the center. This criterion was given twice the weight of the others because it measures the end product of the centers' efforts.

We then ranked each center according to how it compared with centers of a similar nature for each criterion. To bring the program down to the planned level it was necessary to close about one-third of the larger centers and two-thirds of the conservation centers. The larger reduction in the conservation camps reflected our concern with the performance and program design of these units. We kept, however, the 32 best-rated conservation centers to accommodate the need for residential training facilities for youth from rural areas which lack such resources and for urban youth for whom training for outdoor occupations will be beneficial.

Similarly, we selected the best men's and women's centers as determined by the rating system. Only one exception was made: Poland Spring which was marginal in the ratings, was selected for closure upon the advice of the OEO.

We de not anticipate the demise of the Job Corps, rather we seek to improve its quality and relevance to the realities of the labor market. If we are successful, there will be an improvement in the acquisition of marketable skills and job placement. As part of our proposal there will be 30 new inner-city or near-city residential manpower centers established, providing opportunities for 4,600 youths (in man-years) and capable of recruiting, training, and placing them entirely within their home State or urban area. Both types of new centers have already been tried on an experimental basis by Labor Department and have indicated considerable promise. The net effect will be to create a more flexible capacity to deal selectively with the differing needs of enrollees.

The annual cost of this new initiative is estimated to be $24 million for fiscal year 1970. The announced closing of the existing units and additional savings will result in a net reduction for the year of $100 million in the Job Corps budget. However, it should be kept clearly in mind that total training opportunities for youth under all manpower programs administered by the Department of Labor will increase during the fiscal year 1970.

As reconstructed, the Job Corps will offer a wider range of services to young people. The mix of centers will have the following proportions:

1. Comprehensive regional residential skill training centers will be retained for those for whom full-time residence away from home area and family is necessary. These centers will also provide manpower services to youth largely from sparsely-populated rural areas which cannot support such programs. Four men's centers and 11 women's centers are proposed.

2. Conservation centers in rural areas will be operated for youths meeting extensive basic education preparatory to skill training, or for those who seek outdoor-work careers. The programs should lead more directly to placement in skill training or some specific occupational employment. Thirty-two conservation centers would be retained.

3. Near-city residential centers will be opened for those for whom only work-week residence away from home is desirable, with work-training geared to the specific occupational needs of the area served. Ten such centers would be opened.

4. For youths unwilling or not needing to leave their city, two types of in-city residential support are planned;

One is a training facility with attached residential support which provides training in one or several skills, both for residents and nonresidents. Five medium size centers are recommended.

The other is a small residence with no training facilities of its own. It will provide intensive residential support of training using other facilities in the community and will include tutoring, special counseling, shared work responsibility and other services not available in conventional training programs. Such support is designed particularly for high-risk youths who ordinarily have high dropout rates from training programs because of home and family problems. It is suggested that 15 small centers be developed.

It is our intention to examine the new ventures as scrupulously as the old, and to review the entire program throughout the coming year and beyond. When the results begin to come in, we expect to evaluate them in a spirit of candor so that we can ascertain and make whatever further adjustments are necessary. Indeed, we have scrutinized programs already under the administration of the Department of Labor and have not hesitated to cut back and reshape programs where the evidence suggested it was necessary. Our proposed budget for fiscal year 1970 incorporates significant changes—both reductions and additions—in many important areas.

Earlier, I indicated that we will expand the opportunities for young people in FY 1970, notwithstanding the reduction in Job Corps. Although such aggregate figures are important, we must go further and concern ourselves with the individual corpsmen in the camps to be closed. Each corpsman must be afforded a constructive alternative.

Accordingly, telegrams have been dispatched to all affected centers, committing the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity to the maximum possible help to Job Corps enrollees during the transition period. This commitment includes priority in referral to and participation in other manpower programs for each enrollee who does not choose transfer to another Job Corps center.

As a first step in carrying out this commitment, the Job Corps and the U.S. Department of Labor on Friday, April 18, requested State employment security administrators to assign interviewing staff to centers to assist in the transfer of enrollees to other centers or referral to suitable jobs, on-the-job or institutional training, Neighborhood Youth Corps or other manpower programs.

Our national manpower programs must give priority to those who have not shared in the promise and opportunity that are enjoyed by most Americans. We intend to press this priority with our full resources in the period ahead. An effective residential center component is an essential part of the program and we shall fully engage the resources and expertise of the Job Corps in that effort.

The process of evaluation sometimes leads to hard choices, but we believe that this process is necessary if manpower programs are to continue to serve as a bridge to economic opportunity.

RATING CRITERIA

Cost

This is the average operating cost of the center per enrollee man-year for calendar year 1968. The data were obtained from Job Corps. It was computed by Job Corps by dividing center operating costs by the average on-board enrollee strength obtained from the morning reports.

Operating costs include:

1. Enrollee expenses—clothing, subsistence, health, educational, vocational, morale, recreation and welfare services and supplies.
2. Operations and Maintenance—center utilities, maintenance administration, communications, motor vehicles.
3. Center staff salaries, benefits, travel and training.

Operating costs do not include:

1. Enrollee pay and allotments.
2. Enrollee travel.
3. Conservation work project supplies and equipment.
4. Center capital investment.

LOS (length of stay)

This is the average length of stay in months of terminees. It was computed by the Job Corps by dividing the total time stayed by the number of leavers and converting the resultant average LOS in days to months. Data were obtained from the Army Finance Payroll System.

Thirty-day dropout

This was obtained from the sum morning reports data which show the number of enrolleees that leave within 30 days.

Read/math

These data show the average improvement achieved by the enrollees as measured by standardized tests.

The conservation center data show the average number of "milestones" gained by the enrollee. A milestone is a measure of the ability of the enrollee. There are 16 milestones in the reading program and 12 in the math program. Completion of the planned program indicates the enrollee is at the eighth grade level. An enrollee is tested at the time of his arrival and placed in the educational program at his own appropriate milestone. The data reflect the number of milestones the average enrollee has passed. Each milestone is roughly equivalent to about one semester.

The data for the men's urban centers represent the grade level improvement as measured by the Stanford Achievement Tests. The tests are designed for scoring by a computer. During part of 1968 this computer service was not available. These tests were hand scored and the scores reported to the men's center division of the Job Corps National Office. Similar data could not be obtained for the women's centers because some centers did not score or report the data during the time when the computer facilities were unavailable. Efforts were made by Job Corps to analyze some data that were available from the computer operation but this information was not used because of the very small sample size. (In one center the sample consisted of one individual.)

Placement

The placement data represent the percentage of individuals placed in jobs, in school, or the military within 90 days after leaving Job Corps.

In concept, after every individual leaves a center, no matter how short a time he has been there, a placement form is sent to the local State employment office (or comparable facility operated by a gate house or community service agency) in the youth's home town, or the town to which he is moving if he is not going back home. The last pay and allowance check is sent to the local office, thus creating an incentive for the youth to contact the office. The office then attempts to place the youth or followup if he doesn't contact the office. As soon as he is placed, the form is returned to the Job Corps national office. If the youth is unplaced after 90 days the form is then returned with an appropriate notation.

Because of the 90 day followup period, the placement data reflect information received during 1968 rather than placements made in 1968, or placements of individuals terminated in 1968. However, the placement data are reasonably representative of all individuals terminated. Currently placements reports are received for about 90 percent of all terminees. The 1968 placement data/1968 terminee data have a ratio of about 8 to 1.

EXPLANATION OF PROCESS BY WHICH JOB CORPS CENTERS WERE SELECTED FOR CLOSING

Job Corps compiles for each center six criteria which are considered to be meaningful measures of a center's operations. These are:

1. Cost: are expressed in average cost per enrollee man-year.

2. Length of Stay (LOS): expressed as the number of months an average enrollee stays in the center. This is a measure of the center's ability to keep enrollees in the program.

3. 30 day drop-out (30): expressed as percent of enrollees leaving before 30 days. Since an enrollee's first days are often critical to his future success in the program, this is an important measure of the center's effectiveness.

4. & 5. Reading and Math Gain: expressed in terms of the grade improvement of the average enrollee. These are important measures of the center's success since education is an important part of the Job Corps program.

Unfortunately, insufficient data were available from the women's centers to permit these criteria to be used in evaluating these centers.

6. Placement: expressed as percent of enrollees placed after leaving the center. (Placement includes job placement, entry into the armed forces, or return to school.) This is a measure of the ultimate effectiveness of the program.

Considering each type of center (men's urban, women's urban, mainland conservation and Puerto Rican conservation) separately, each center was ranked for its performance in each criterion. (Mainland conservation centers were separated into deciles and the center given the rank of its decile.) The center with the poorest performance was given a rank of one, the next poorest two, and so on.

In evaluating the effectiveness of the Job Corps installations, the most important criterion is placement, since this measures the extent to which the program meets its objective. Therefore, the rank for this criterion was given twice the value of the ranks of the other criteria.

The ranks of the centers were then summed and the centers with the lowest rank scores were selected for closing. If two centers had the same score, the tie would be broken according to the placement record.

This procedure was used to select 59 centers for closing; two men's, seven women's, and 50 conservation, including three Puerto Rican conservation. The three Puerto Rican centers were not placed in competition with other conservation centers in the United States. They competed only with other Puerto Rican centers.

Special centers, such as the YWCA operation throughout the country, and the several E & D projects, were not subjected to this closure selection procedure because their uniqueness makes such comparison inappropriate.

Table 1–4 contain the data considered in making the closure selections.

TABLE 1.—MEN'S URBAN CENTERS

Center name	Enrollees, January 1969	Score	Selection criteria					
			Cost	LOS	30	Reading	Math	Placement
Kilmer	1,533	12	$6,170 (2)	4.58 (2)	27.9 (1)	0.09 (2)	0.07 (1)	63.3 (2)
Parks	1,354	15	7,245 (1)	4.98 (4)	24.8 (2)	.05 (1)	.11 (5)	62.2 (1)
Clearfield	1,231	27	5,824 (4)	4.39 (1)	22.3 (5)	.12 (5)	.12 (6)	67.7 (3)
Breckinridge	1,460	29	5,966 (3)	4.61 (3)	22.5 (4)	.10 (3)	.10 (4)	75.4 (6)
Atterbury	1,599	30	5,547 (5)	5.46 (5)	24.2 (3)	.12 (5)	.08 (2)	73.7 (5)
Gary	2,922	32	4,035 (6)	6.85 (6)	21.3 (6)	.10 (3)	.09 (3)	72.2 (4)

TABLE 2.—WOMEN'S URBAN CENTERS

Center name	Enrollees, January 1969	Score	Selection criteria					
			Cost	LOS	30	Reading [1]	Math [1]	Placement
Moses Lake	402	14	$5,950 (1)	4.61 (1)	16.3 (10)			40.8 (1)
Marquette	302	25	5,262 (13)	5.68 (4)	18.5 (4)			43.5 (2)
St. Louis	602	31	5,926 (2)	7.33 (14)	16.7 (9)			46.9 (3)
Huntington	338	32	5,560 (5)	5.21 (3)	19.7 (2)			53.0 (11)
Clinton	814	39	5,154 (14)	6.92 (10)	18.4 (5)			48.8 (5)
Omaha	823	40	5,082 (15)	5.85 (6)	17.1 (7)			49.1 (6)
Albuquerque	369	41	5,505 (7)	5.14 (2)	13.8 (14)			52.3 (9)
Poland Spring	1,051	42	5,516 (6)	5.88 (7)	20.1 (1)			60.5 (14)
Tongue Point	668	42	4,897 (17)	5.80 (5)	14.8 (12)			48.4 (4)
Guthrie	619	42	5,463 (8)	7.02 (12)	16.9 (8)			50.4 (7)
Cleveland	357	50	5,737 (4)	7.74 (15)	14.7 (13)			52.3 (9)
Jersey City	721	52	5,354 (11)	6.82 (9)	9.7 (16)			52.1 (8)
Keystone	464	58	5,365 (10)	6.96 (11)	18.7 (3)			73.1 (17)
McKinney	608	59	5,023 (16)	7.03 (13)	18.1 (6)			52.2 (12)
Los Angeles	331	60	5,844 (3)	7.91 (16)	11.1 (15)			59.6 (13)
Charleston	329	61	5,276 (12)	6.35 (8)	15.7 (11)			63.5 (15)
Excelsior Springs	363	75	5,422 (9)	8.65 (17)	7.7 (17)			64.7 (16)

[1] Sample insufficient to warrant comparisons being made.

TABLE 3.—MAINLAND CONSERVATION CAMPS

Center name	Enrollees, January 1969	Score	Selection criteria					
			Cost	LOS	30	Reading	Math	Placement
Oak Glen	145	12	$6,878 (1)	4.31 (1)	29.6 (1)	1.34 (1)	2.07 (6)	47.3 (1)
Sly Park	117	12	5,452 (2)	3.84 (1)	37.1 (1)	1.56 (2)	1.27 (2)	58.4 (2)
Hoxey	116	13	5,864 (1)	5.55 (4)	28.2 (2)	1.49 (1)	.67 (1)	58.2 (2)
Ojibway	180	14	4,955 (4)	4.41 (1)	25.4 (2)	1.73 (2)	.98 (1)	59.2 (2)
Fenner Canyon	107	15	5,297 (3)	4.39 (1)	30.3 (1)	2.04 (4)	1.78 (4)	53.9 (1)
Malheur	190	17	5,602 (1)	4.74 (2)	23.3 (4)	2.18 (5)	1.64 (3)	58.0 (1)
Five Mile	149	18	5,129 (4)	5.04 (2)	26.2 (2)	1.55 (1)	1.66 (3)	60.5 (3)
Lydick Lake	171	21	5,369 (3)	4.90 (2)	27.4 (2)	1.64 (2)	1.28 (2)	64.9 (5)
Alpine	101	21	5,589 (1)	5.57 (4)	20.0 (6)	1.48 (1)	2.12 (7)	55.9 (1)
Mountain Home	160	23	5,380 (2)	4.51 (1)	20.3 (6)	2.54 (7)	1.67 (3)	59.1 (2)
Anthony	162	26	5,092 (4)	5.72 (5)	24.1 (3)	1.94 (3)	1.63 (3)	62.1 (4)
Wellfleet	92	27	5,409 (2)	5.79 (5)	25.0 (3)	2.59 (7)	2.58 (7)	50.0 (1)
Kingman	179	28	4,826 (5)	4.51 (1)	21.6 (5)	1.33 (1)	1.56 (2)	67.0 (7)
Vesuvius	97	28	4,949 (5)	5.87 (6)	28.1 (2)	2.28 (6)	1.80 (5)	59.7 (2)
Alder Springs	175	28	5,332 (3)	4.94 (2)	17.7 (7)	2.04 (4)	3.16 (10)	55.3 (1)
Luna	210	28	4,147 (9)	5.56 (4)	30.1 (1)	2.50 (6)	1.27 (2)	60.6 (3)
Pagosa Springs	88	29	5,667 (1)	5.85 (5)	14.3 (9)	1.89 (3)	1.89 (5)	61.0 (3)
Crab Orchard	89	30	5,974 (1)	5.89 (6)	25.0 (3)	2.34 (6)	4.01 (10)	59.4 (2)
Castle Valley	127	30	5,499 (2)	5.42 (3)	21.5 (5)	2.02 (3)	2.28 (7)	64.6 (5)
Eight Canyon	166	30	5,483 (2)	5.32 (3)	25.9 (2)	2.36 (6)	.95 (1)	67.1 (8)
Toyon	147	30	5,313 (3)	5.08 (3)	22.6 (4)	2.63 (8)	1.71 (4)	61.6 (4)
Clear Creek	198	31	4,834 (5)	5.70 (4)	20.9 (5)	2.14 (5)	2.05 (6)	61.2 (3)
Grants	190	31	4,058 (10)	5.54 (4)	23.1 (4)	1.51 (1)	1.52 (2)	64.9 (5)
Koko Head	200	32	5,603 (1)	6.94 (8)	21.6 (5)	1.64 (2)	2.34 (8)	63.7 (4)
Ottawa	148	32	4,778 (6)	4.49 (1)	27.5 (2)	2.10 (4)	2.00 (5)	66.7 (7)
Clam Lake	175	33	4,753 (6)	5.22 (3)	27.1 (2)	2.83 (9)	2.18 (7)	61.2 (3)
New Waverly	218	33	3,436 (10)	6.34 (6)	24.2 (3)	2 15 (5)	1.69 (3)	61.3 (3)
Frenchburg	96	34	5,018 (4)	7.10 (8)	31.4 (1)	1.93 (3)	2.33 (8)	64.2 (5)
Tremont	105	34	4,619 (7)	5.83 (5)	33 6 (1)	1.81 (2)	2.31 (7)	65.2 (6)
Mountainair	183	35	4,087 (10)	5.20 (3)	20.5 (6)	2.13 (5)	2.27 (7)	60.0 (2)
Kicking Horse	176	36	4,691 (7)	4.68 (1)	20.4 (6)	1.15 (1)	2.16 (7)	66.3 (7)
Acadia	117	36	5,175 (4)	5.86 (5)	13.3 (10)	2.61 (8)	1.25 (1)	63.5 (4)
Cedar Flat	129	37	5,144 (4)	5.49 (4)	18.1 (7)	2.61 (8)	1.37 (2)	65.3 (6)
Casper	157	37	4,863 (5)	5.26 (3)	14.4 (8)	2.53 (7)	2.06 (6)	62.9 (4)
San Carlos	167	37	4,694 (7)	6.65 (7)	15.9 (8)	2.75 (9)	1.71 (4)	42.3 (1)
Arbuckle	111	38	5,384 (2)	5.73 (5)	19.5 (6)	2.32 (6)	.75 (1)	69.0 (9)
Los Pinos	193	39	4,332 (8)	6.15 (6)	16.3 (8)	1.95 (3)	2.01 (6)	61.4 (4)
Blue Jay	113	40	4,635 (7)	6.48 (7)	21.2 (5)	1.89 (3)	2.11 (6)	66.0 (6)
Dickinson	144	40	4,759 (6)	5.66 (4)	23.0 (4)	2.83 (9)	1.98 (5)	65.1 (6)

TABLE 3.—MAINLAND CONSERVATION CAMPS—Continued

Center name	Enrollees, January 1969	Score	Selection criteria					
			Cost	LOS	30	Reading	Math	Placement
Tamarac	172	41	$4,427 (8)	6.07 (6)	25.0 (3)	1.58 (2)	1.76 (4)	70.5 (9)
Hodgens	145	41	4,301 (9)	5.49 (4)	24.0 (4)	2.98 (9)	1.07 (1)	66.9 (7)
Winslow	180	41	3,932 (10)	5.27 (3)	19.5 (6)	3.24 (10)	2.37 (8)	59.5 (2)
Cumberland Gap	122	42	3,733 (10)	6.45 (7)	24.9 (3)	1.56 (2)	2.11 (6)	66.5 (7)
Poplar Bluff	212	43	4,167 (9)	6.80 (8)	16.0 (8)	2.31 (6)	1.56 (2)	64.1 (5)
Tillamook	165	43	4,900 (5)	7.77 (9)	23.0 (4)	2.12 (4)	1.11 (1)	75.8 (10)
Catoctin	103	43	4,482 (8)	5.76 (5)	14.2 (9)	2.15 (6)	2.05 (6)	64.0 (5)
Cispus	188	43	4,295 (9)	7.14 (8)	15.9 (8)	2.62 (8)	1.79 (4)	61.0 (3)
Heber	179	44	4,776 (6)	6.27 (6)	13.5 (9)	2.26 (5)	1.76 (4)	67.0 (7)
Mingo	105	44	4,519 (7)	7.01 (8)	24.4 (3)	2.51 (7)	2.27 (7)	65.8 (6)
Oconaluftee	175	44	4,109 (9)	5.87 (6)	30.7 (1)	2.05 (4)	1.81 (5)	70.4 (9)
Trapper Creek	169	44	5.368 (3)	4.90 (2)	20.4 (6)	2.90 (9)	2.67 (8)	68.6 (8)
Pine Knot	211	44	4,182 (9)	5.34 (3)	22.2 (5)	2.64 (8)	1.67 (3)	67.5 (8)
Great Onyx	205	45	4,198 (9)	7.20 (9)	22.2 (5)	1.72 (2)	2.33 (8)	65.0 (6)
Anaconda	168	45	5,491 (2)	4.51 (1)	14.0 (9)	3.18 (10)	2.75 (9)	67.0 (7)
Wolf Creek	188	46	4,708 (7)	7.95 (10)	17.9 (7)	2.02 (3)	3.00 (9)	64.0 (5)
Marsing	134	46	5,251 (3)	10.05 (10)	30.1 (1)	4.72 (10)	3.64 (10)	66.1 (6)
Branchville	107	46	5,080 (4)	5.03 (2)	17.9 (7)	2.40 (6)	2.79 (9)	69.0 (9)
Curlew	137	50	5,193 (4)	7.18 (5)	13.8 (9)	3.24 (10)	3.44 (10)	63.9 (4)
Boxelder	183	50	4,801 (6)	6.47 (7)	12.6 (10)	2.52 (7)	1.73 (4)	67.8 (8)
Cass	106	50	4,589 (7)	6.89 (8)	15.7 (8)	2.42 (6)	1.57 (3)	69.7 (9)
Weber Basin	182	51	4,481 (8)	6.71 (8)	16.9 (7)	3.64 (10)	3.75 (10)	63.9 (4)
Arrowood	96	51	4,687 (7)	5.96 (6)	21.0 (5)	2.71 (8)	1.91 (5)	78.1 (10)
Columbia Basin	170	52	4,789 (6)	6.47 (7)	13.4 (9)	3.41 (10)	3.16 (10)	64.3 (5)
Goloconda	184	52	4,911 (5)	6.60 (7)	17.4 (7)	2.24 (5)	2.57 (8)	74.6 (10)
Timber Lake	199	52	5,215 (3)	7.83 (10)	16.3 (8)	2 55 (7)	3.55 (10)	66.2 (7)
Cottonwood	154	52	4,918 (5)	6.99 (8)	7.8 (10)	3.95 (10)	1.69 (3)	67.2 (8)
Flatwoods	170	53	4,396 (8)	7.39 (9)	16.3 (8)	2.10 (4)	2.10 (6)	69.1 (9)
Pine Ridge	103	55	5,280 (3)	7.48 (9)	6.9 (10)	2.55 (7)	3.59 (10)	67.6 (8)
Fort Simcoe	189	55	4,869 (5)	7.43 (9)	13.1 (9)	2.59 (7)	3.10 (9)	68.8 (8)
Blackwell	178	55	4,403 (8)	6.50 (7)	14.2 (9)	2.10 (4)	2.68 (9)	73.9 (9)
Jacobs Creek	160	55	3,770 (10)	8.34 (10)	16.7 (7)	2.13 (4)	1.78 (4)	75.5 (10)
Collbran	90	56	6,243 (1)	6.69 (7)	3.5 (10)	3.05 (9)	2.87 (9)	74.0 (10)
Angell	109	58	4,799 (6)	10.78 (10)	9.8 (10)	3.39 (10)	2.09 (6)	63.0 (8)
Ouachita	118	58	4,482 (8)	8.35 (10)	19.4 (6)	2.77 (9)	1.95 (5)	84.9 (10)
Harpers Ferry	188	58	4,431 (8)	8.15 (10)	24.0 (4)	2.71 (8)	2.60 (8)	78.7 (10)
Schenck	195	59	4,139 (9)	8.21 (10)	19.2 (6)	2.56 (7)	2.73 (9)	71.5 (9)
Treasure Lake	165	59	3,970 (10)	7.51 (9)	13.2 (10)	2.60 (8)	1.40 (2)	80.0 (10)

TABLE 4.—PUERTO RICAN CONSERVATION CENTERS

Center name	Enrollees, January 1969	Score	Selection criteria					
			Cost	LOS	30	Reading	Math	Placement
Juana Diaz	192	14	$1,348 (5)	6.76 (2)	3.33 (3)	0.74 (1)	0.82 (2)	17.0 (1)
Vieques	118	20	2,242 (1)	7.03 (3)	7.14 (1)	3.49 (5)	1.07 (4)	41.5 (3)
Guayama	128	20	2,111 (2)	10.06 (5)	4.00 (2)	2.20 (2)	1.08 (5)	41.2 (2)
Arecibo	168	21	1,727 (4)	6.71 (1)	3.11 (4)	3.05 (3)	.38 (1)	51.6 (4)
Rio Grande	130	29	2,103 (3)	7.31 (4)	2.47 (5)	3.13 (4)	.09 (3)	95.3 (5)

THE 1970 CENSUS

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills which, in my opinion, will restore the credibility of the U.S. census as a necessary function of the Federal Government.

There is evidence of a growing disaffection among the American people with regard to the forthcoming 1970 Decennial Census—a situation which could compromise the effectiveness of the entire project.

In my mind, there are two very good reasons for this disaffection:

First. The American people resent the fact that they will be forced to answer highly personal and potentially embarrassing questions or else face criminal penalties ranging up to $100 fine and 60 days in jail.

Second. There seems to be a growing fear that individual information divulged to census enumerators might later be used against them by Federal or private organizations. And in an age in which computerized "data banks" are being set up to provide a myriad of personal information about private citizens at the push of a button, such fears are understandable.

The bills which I am introducing were drafted to remedy these two problem areas.

The first bill would remove criminal penalties for failure to answer all but the basic "headcount" questions of the census. These would include name and address, relationship to head of household, sex, date of birth, marital status, and whether a respondent is a resident or a visitor in a household. In addition, the 60-day jail sentence would be removed as a penalty for failure to answer; the $100 fine would be retained so that the Bureau of the Census would have legal recourse to back up its gathering of those statistics which are essential to the Nation for planning purposes.

The second bill would increase the penalties for wrongful disclosure of information by employees of the Bureau of the Census. The penalties—currently limited to a $1,000 fine and 2 years in prison—would be increased to $5,000 and 5 years imprisonment.

In my opinion these bills will remove most of the fears and objections which the American people harbor under current census laws and practices. I urge that we enact these measures during the current year, inasmuch as the resultant changes would require some restructuring of the 1970 census mechanisms.

SALARY INCREASE

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I have steadfastly opposed the recent Federal pay raises for Members of Congress and other top-level Federal officials.

An editorial, appearing in the March 20 issue of the Brainerd Dispatch, in the Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, indicates some of the opposition of my constituents to this pay raise.

I commend its reading to my colleagues:

SERVICEMEN, NOT CONGRESS, TO FEEL BUDGET PRESSURE

It may be hard to explain to men and women in the armed forces why a prospective pay raise for them is being dropped while other federal employes, particularly members of House, Senate and Cabinet, are receiving handsome pay raises this year.

The decision to drop the prospective new pay raise also comes at a time when the Nixon administration has been talking about dropping the draft and substituting a volunteer defense force for it.

Volunteers are going to be hard to secure if their pay raises are shunted aside while higher officials continue to receive large salary increases. Congressional pay now is fully competitive if not more than competitive with industry and the President has had a 100 per cent increase in salary but the salaries received by men in the service still is far below what most of these men would receive in civilian life.

We ask them for a double sacrifice. They must give up months and years from their lives and at the same time receive less pay than they would receive at home.

It is true that a $1.8 billion pay hike for men and women in service, approved earlier by Congress, will go into effect but an additional $1.2 billion was promised. This $1.2 billion pay boost now has been canceled.

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird blamed "budgetary pressures" for his decision to drop the additional pay raise. No such term was used when Congressmen eagerly accepted the recommendation that their salaries be increased by percentages far greater than had ever been considered for members of the armed forces.

Congressmen voted themselves a pay boost of $12,500, from $30,000 to $42,500 this year and are now considering hiking the pay of majority and minority leaders of the Senate and House from $42,500 to $55,000. Salaries of the Speaker of the House and of the vice president would be boosted from $43,000 to $62,500 and $10,000 additional expense allowances would be granted. The salaries of Cabinet members also were boosted radically this year.

Possibly the Congressmen and other governmental leaders deserve these unusually large salary increases. Cost of living is going up.

But how about the servicemen. Has the cost of living remained the same for them and their families?

NEW YORK TIMES' SYSTEM ADAPTABLE TO CONGRESS

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I inserted in the RECORD a thought-provoking article from the Reader's Digest on the subject of congressional reforms. Part of the thrust of that article and my comments on same were directed toward the information explosion which we in Congress have not caught up with.

I recently came across an article in the April 5 issue of Editor & Publisher which explains at some length a new information retrieval system the New York Times is in the process of establishing. The system to be employed is considerably more sophisticated than the one which all Members were urged to see demonstrated recently at the invitation of the Clerk of the House; nevertheless, if we are to make use of the technology of our time, then certainly we should be considering the extensions and implications of any information system we might employ for this House. The article follows:

NEW YORK TIMES DEVELOPS PUBLIC INFORMATION BANK

The New York Times has announced the development of the Times Information Bank, a real-time, interactive retrieval system which make available vast resources of material to major research and reference libraries, government agencies, journalists, scholars, and other media, including broadcast networks, with speed, thoroughness and comprehensiveness.

"Initially, the system at first will serve the news and editorial departments of the Times, and eventually will be extended to include a wide range of clients requiring comprehensive, authoritative information," said Ivan Veit, vice president.

Veit said that the first input into the retrieval system will be abstract data from the New York Times Index beginning January 1, 1968, which are already on magnetic tape. Gradually, earlier selected data will be incorporated into the system at a planned orderly rate.

He said that data which predate the actual time when the system commences full operation in early 1971 will be drawn exclusively from the New York Times, whereas current data fed into the system will come from other sources.

"We envision the instantaneous accessibility of a gigantic store of background information on virtually every subject of human research and inquiry will prove to be of immeasurable value not only to major reference and research libraries, general business services and other media, but also to individuals engaged in all forms of research," Veit said.

"The New York Times intends to enhance its reputation through its information retrieval system, as one of the world's most reliable and authoritative sources of information. We feel the potential market for the services which the system will be capable of producing extends into many areas," he said.

"For example, the services could be put to invaluable use by government agencies engaged in social research scholars preparing such major documents as doctoral dissertations, general business services conducting research in specific areas, and journalists marshalling material for books and articles. The list could be extended to include the news and public affairs departments of radio and television networks, advertising and public relations agencies, and the research arms of philanthropic foundations."

Future expansion of the system input, he stated, will include storage and retrieval of photographs and other graphic materials, bibliographic citations of relevant books and other reference materials available in the Times Reference Library, and interface with other reference libraries and information centers using an automated system.

HOW IT WORKS

The heart of the Times Information Bank will be a third generation, real-time computer (IBM System 360/50) and software combination which will be designed for immediate computer-to-user response (time-shared) with a large number of remote terminals. A large, direct-access mass storage facility will be included to insure rapid handling of the large data base.

Linked with the computer will be an automatic device for the storage of microfiche containing images of actual clippings. The device will be capable of storing and rapidly retrieving the equivalent of 3.5-by-10.6 pages of newsprint. Other peripheral equipment will include a microform camera at Microfilming Corporation of America, Inc., a Times subsidiary, for miniaturization of full text; input terminals—probably cathode ray tube and keyboard—and a computer-telephone interface for audio computer-to-user answer service.

It will be possible for the user, through the audio system, to query the computer directly and receive an answer. It will also be possible to use the audio system for placing calls automatically and answering inquiries that have previously been placed.

It will be possible for a Times staff member to request information from the Bank, and receive information on the screen within up to five seconds, including a photographic printout of the material requested. As many as 20 requests can be made of the computer simultaneously.

Provisions have been made for up to 43 cathode ray receivers' installation in the Times' 43rd Street building in New York, plus installations in other Times offices in other cities.

The computer and full text device will be installed at the 43rd Street location. Only a portion of the design memory size will be installed initially, with additions as the needs are forecast.

Remote terminals will be installed in the New York office of the Times, and editors, reporters and other personnel will be shown how to operate the retrieval equipment to receive both abstract and full text items stored in the system.

Ultimately, remote terminals will be installed at customer locations, and customers for the system will be trained in the operation, and will have full inquiry privileges. Output to customers, however, will be limited to abstracts, citations and a subset of the full text items in storage. Non-Times articles, information from early editions, and killed items will not be translated to customer terminals.

As of D-Day in early 1971, detailed abstracts of all material published in the New York Times and in a wide variety of other publications will be processed into the computer. An initial data base of earlier materials is readily available from the tapes of the New York Times Index which has been in a successful computerized operation since January, 1968. This operation has served as a pilot project for the enlarged system.

Gradually, earlier selected data will be incorporated into the system at a planned, orderly rate. These earlier data will be obtained from the Times morgue clipping files which will then be retired.

The Times, of course, intends to continue the operation of its morgue, eventually phasing out its existing clipping operation and adapting operation to accommodate the new retrieval system.

The future expansion of the system input is anticipated to include storage and retrieval of photographs and other graphic materials; bibliographic citations of relevant books and other reference materials available in the Times Reference Library; plus interface with other large reference libraries and information centers using automated systems.

The Times system is being developed under the direction of Dr. John Rothman, director of information services for the Times. International Business Machines Corporation and its Federal Systems Division have been retained to assist in the design and implementation of the system. Additionally, Arthur D. Little, Inc., the well-known research organization, will assist with market development.

HILL-BURTON PROGRAM

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, the president of the lay advisory board of Saint Elizabeth Hospital, Lincoln, Nebr., has recently forwarded to me a resolution which was passed unanimously at a meeting held on April 9, 1969. The board feels strongly about the necessity for continuing contracts for which the Government has already made commitments under the Hill-Burton program. The board agrees that the loan principle should apply to future projects and feels that it is a step forward. However, to cut off Hill-Burton funds on presently pending contracts would leave their institution some $440,000 short of the amount to which the Government had committed itself at the commencement of the hospital's new construction project. Having received permission, I insert a copy of the resolution into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION OF THE LAY ADVISORY BOARD OF ST. ELIZABETH HOSPITAL, LINCOLN, NEBR.

Whereas, Senator Jacob Javits of New York has introduced in the Senate of the United States Senate 1733, the purpose of which is to radically revise the Hill-Burton program and initiate a program to guarantee $500 million a year in loans for hospital modernization and construction; and

Whereas, the effect of this bill would be to terminate all present contracts under the Hill-Burton program which would directly affect St. Elizabeth Hospital by terminating $440,000 which was contracted for to the Hospital to construct its present new building now under construction;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Lay Advisory Board of St. Elizabeth Hospital that while it favors S. 1733 so far as new construction not already contracted for is concerned, the effect of this proposal would have a devastating impact on the financing program for the new St. Elizabeth Hospital for which contracts were entered into with the government and reliance placed thereon several years ago, wherefore, this Board urges the Nebraska Representatives and Senators in the Congress of the United States to seek revision of the bill to honor the commitments into which the federal government has entered with St. Elizabeth Hospital and Mary Lanning Hospital and revise the bill to make it applicable to construction not already under contract with the government.

Respectfully submitted.

ST. ELIZABETH LAY ADVISORY BOARD.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL COIN WEEK

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of the House the approach of National Coin Week, sponsored by the American Numismatic Association, to advance the cultural and artistic aspects of coin collecting. National Coin Week's theme this year is "Coins: Links in a Chain of Peace."

Extending from April 20 to April 26, National Coin Week serves to emphasize the growing national and international interest in the age-old practice of numismatics, that is, the science treating of coins, their origin, technique of manufacture, history, mythology, and art. The field covers the coinages of all countries from the earliest times to the present day.

There is a commercial aspect to numismatics, of course. On one occasion an English collector realized the sum of £42, in exchange for a British gold stater of Epaticcus, and a silver penny dating back to the days of King Stephen's reign brought £40. But the profit motive is not the true basis of numismatics, by any means.

It is, primarily, an interesting study, requiring the concentrated application of intellectual research and personal investigation.

In addition, it provides constructive satisfaction of the acquisitive instinct.

Its global nature furthers international understanding.

As a study of rare metals, it adds to knowledge of the unknown past and of the financial systems of nations that long ago disappeared from view.

Increasing perfection of the engraving process renders the coin a work of art, worthy of an intensive study and esthetic appreciation.

Investigation of the nature of the coin requires broader knowledge of historical matters of every kind.

It also requires an insight into the economics of the monetary systems of many lands.

In all, the study of numismatics is easily one of the most educational experiences imaginable, and the people who take it up cannot help but vitally increase their understanding of many mysteries of human existence on this planet.

It is a pleasure to salute National Coin Week, in the knowledge that here is a tradition both highly entertaining and highly instructive; a tradition of the kind that benefits those engaged in it and, by the very nature of the wholesome spirit expended, benefits also the world community itself.

CONGRESSMAN LLOYD MEEDS OFFERS THE NATIONAL TIMBER SUPPLY ACT

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I have often risen in this Chamber to make my colleagues aware of a growing shortage of timber. In recent years this shortage has gone unchecked, and almost unnoticed.

Now that it is obvious that our national housing goals are in danger because of this shortage, there have been hearings in both Houses of Congress, and legislation has been introduced that I believe will solve the problem over the long run.

My own district has suffered in an unusual way, and the people I represent are delighted, as I am, with the promise of the National Timber Supply Act introduced today by the distinguished Member from South Carolina.

The recent high prices for lumber and plywood caused great concern here, and everywhere in the Nation. Hearings by the Banking and Currency Committee investigated the reasons for these increases very thoroughly, and I will not go into them in detail. But a portion of the testimony during those hearings concerned my district, and I would like to bring to the attention of this House a situation described in those hearings and about which I have personal knowledge.

In 1968 6 billion feet of sanded plywood was produced in the entire United States. Of this amount, 5½ billion, or over 91 percent, was produced by mills located west of the Cascades in Washington and Oregon, most of them in my district.

By law, only 350 million board feet of timber may be exported from Federal forests, as of January first of this year.

But the Forest Service allocated over 60 percent of this volume from this sanded plywood areas in Washington and about 30 percent from Oregon.

It is estimated that demand will exceed production of softwood plywood by about 15 percent this year.

Inevitably, there is great demand for the available timber. Prices for timber could not do anything but rise; there is only so much.

Then another factor was introduced.

The Mount Baker National Forest, in my district, had an allowable cut of 240 million board feet per year 10 years ago. In 1968 this was reduced to 164 million feet; this year it was reduced again, to 97.6 million feet—and more than a third of that amount was assigned to the export market.

Mills in my district that once counted on 240 million board feet now can obtain only 60 million feet from that forest.

For my district, this means bankruptcy for employers.

For the buyer who can obtain plywood at all, it means higher prices.

For the buyer who can obtain a home at all, it means higher mortgage payments.

And, as this situation is repeated in forest after forest, it means that the United States is not going to realize the goal of adequate housing for all its people.

The National Timber Supply Act, with its high timber yield fund, can reverse this situation. Passage of that act will make it possible for the Forest Service to increase the allowable cut immediately.

I strongly support this badly needed legislation and believe that it is in the national interest for every other House Member to support it as well.

RALLY FOR DECENCY

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said about the decline in morality and the increase in dissent among today's young people. But there is also a growing cry among our young people that all should not be condemned because of the actions of a few. A much publicized "Rally for decency" in Miami recently has led to the origination of many other similar rallies throughout the country. The ill-fated program in Baltimore yesterday was another example of how a handful of dissidents can spoil the good intentions of the majority.

Communities throughout my own State of Alabama are planning rallies to demonstrate their support for the majority of young people in America who love their country and are dedicated to preserving the principles on which this Nation was founded. One such rally is being planned for Montgomery's Crampton Bowl on the evening of May 1, with the entire program being planned and presented by students from high schools in the Montgomery area.

Among those organizations which have pledged support for the rallies is the National Guard Association of Alabama which passed the following resolution at its State conference recently:

MONTGOMERY, ALA.—The National Guard Association of Alabama, holding its annual state conference recently in Montgomery unanimously endorsed the Rallies for Decency sponsored by youth groups throughout Alabama.

The Association representing some 1,650 Army and Air National Guard officers and every home town National Guard unit in Alabama commended the efforts of the Alabama youth in organizing the Decency Rallies. In a resolution passed by the Guardsmen they recognized the principles which the youths supported: Belief in God, Love of Country, Love of Family, Belief in the responsibility of youth, Respect and pride in oneself, Respect for all men, as the underlying principles of our national heritage.

The Association urged support of the Decency Rallies by all National Guardsmen and all citizens of Alabama.

SUBSIDIZED PRESS: POVERTY PROGRAM PROPAGANDA MACHINE

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the excellent investigative-reporter Shirley Scheibla has brought to the attention of the public, through an article in a current issue of Barron's weekly newspaper, another example of the Office of Economic Opportunity flaunting the intent of Congress. Mrs. Scheibla's excellent and informative article deals with the increasing number and scope of newspapers—called newsletters—financed and directed by local war-on-poverty agencies. These newspapers are nothing more than subsidized propaganda which seeks to perpetuate the existing Government agency and its personnel. Some of these publications promote racism and civil disruption. At least one has referred to the work of a distinguished congressional committee as a "witch hunt and a shocking misuse of public funds."

If the report presented in the following article is true, and there is every reason to believe it is, then the only "shocking misuse of public funds" is the subsidizing of these newspapers by the Office of Economic Opportunity. As a member of the task force on poverty, I intend to ask the Office of Economic Opportunity about these "newsletters" when they next appear before the subcommittee.

SUBSIDIZED PRESS: THE POVERTY PROGRAM IS BUILDING ITS OWN PROPAGANDA MACHINE

(By Shirley Scheibla)

Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr. (Democrat, of North Carolina): "When the press is supported or subsidized by federal funds, it is disabled to perform its rightful function as a great interpreter between the government and the people. This is so because the press is no longer free. On the contrary, it is enslaved and enslavement of the press will inevitably be followed by enslavement of the people."

WASHINGTON.—Commenting on the violence-ridden strike at San Francisco State College, a leading story in a San Francisco newspaper in February ran as follows: "The only reason the strike was called was as a last resort to bring out into the open their (the students') grievances and the present injustices and irrelevances on the campus of a school which belongs to this community. . . . The basic truth of the strike is the freedom of self-determination of students in their education versus the present misuse of the schools by irrelevant and outside political forces such as the office of the governor, state superintendent of schools and the like in trustees and such boards of directors who are totally alien to the needs and desires of Black and Third World students. The activities and grievances of the students deserve the sympathy of the local community."

CIVIL DISRUPTION

The publication which featured the story is The Spokesman, one of a growing number of newspapers published with the encouragement and financial support of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Issued by community action groups all over the country, many of the newspapers are promoting black militance, racial hatred, civil disruption, the cry of police brutality, community control of schools and colleges, and, not least, the war on poverty and all its works.

Congress has prohibited the use of federal anti-poverty funds for establishing or operating general coverage newspapers. However, OEO claims that the publications really are "newsletters," aimed at bridging "the communication gap often existing between the community action program and the people it serves."

According to a Public Affairs Handbook, The Printed Word, published by OEO last year and distributed to community action agencies, a publication is a "newsletter" if it "has a specific information objective and a limited audience," is not sold for profit, carries no paid advertising and is run by the local anti-poverty program. "Grantees," the Handbook declares, "are encouraged to publish newsletters or house organs which assist local anti-poverty efforts. These publications are generally financed under the administrative budget of the local agency."

Pictured in the Handbook, to illustrate what OEO means, is the front page of a "newsletter" called The Crusader, a product of the United Community Corp., top community action agency of Newark, N.J., which says it is "a free citywide community newspaper for the promotion of community action." Looking remarkably like a tabloid newspaper, the page carries a story about Newark citizens marching in front of the White House. In another issue, The Crusader called the McClellan Committee's investigation of the role of anti-poverty workers in Newark's riots, "a witch hunt and a shocking misuse of public funds."

The OEO Handbook also includes elementary instructions for publishing "newsletters." With OEO funding, the Community Action Training Institute at Trenton, N.J., has gone a step further by publishing The CATI News Man, which the subheading identifies as "A Manual—In Newspaper Form—On How To Produce A Community Action Newspaper." The essentials, it says, are community problems, angry people and publishing facilities. A good community action newspaper, it declares, "makes people mad."

Enlarging on the Handbook's idea of not selling the newspapers for profit, the manual advises soliciting donations. "Be sure you don't ask people to buy a subscription to your paper, since this will cause difficulties with income tax and licensing laws," it explains.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is so pleased with the work of CATI that it has asked the Institute to provide assistance to community action training centers all over the country, at federal expense, of course. (There are 10 training centers to serve over 1,000 community action centers.) While the exact number and circulation of community action newspapers in existence are unknown, it is abundantly clear that they constitute a vast propaganda network.

Specifically, anti-poverty newsletters churn out vast quantities of propaganda for the war on poverty. For instance, the TEOC News, published by the Tampa (Fla.) Economic Opportunity Council, Inc., recently declared that an independent OEO is an absolute necessity.

CHRISTMAS ISSUE

Referring to OEO, Community Action News, a monthly publication of the Knox County Economic Opportunity Council at Barbourville, Ky., said in its Christmas issue: "Our country cannot afford to risk an interruption of a program experiment which is the last link of communication between the poor and non-poor." An offer to fund the 1969 anti-poverty programs of Wayne County, Mich., at the same level as 1968 is unacceptable, according to a front page story in the Wayne County OEO Newsletter, a slick, printed publication of the Economic Opportunity Committee of Eloise, Mich.

"Do not panic with the coming of the Nixon Administration," said a recent Community Action Newsletter published by the Ninth District Opportunity, Inc., of Gainesville, Ga. "America," it declared, "is a country of compassionate people, and humanitarian programs will not be stopped by any administration."

Publications which have lavished praise on OEO projects include With the People, issued by half-a-dozen community action agencies in Chicago; the Neighborhood Journal, by Community Progress, Inc. of New Haven, Conn.; STOP Newsletter, by the Southeastern Tidewater Opportunity Project of Norfolk, Va., and The Advisor, by the Charleston County Economic Opportunity Commission at Charleston, S.C.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, HUEY

Black power and race hatred are also favorite themes of OEO-subsidized journalism. On this score, the story on the San Francisco State College strike was not the only one worthy of notice in the February issue of The Spokesman. It also carried an announcement of a birthday celebration in honor of Black Panther leader Huey P. Newton, now jailed for allegedly killing a man in California.

Scheduled as a speaker at the Black Panther celebration was Kathleen Cleaver, wife of Black Panther Eldridge Cleaver. (Mr. Cleaver was jailed in 1958 after conviction for assault with intent to commit murder. He was paroled in 1966, but had his parole revoked in connection with a gun battle with Oakland police officers. Subsequently he was released by a judge who ruled Mr. Cleaver was "a political prisoner." This action subsequently was overruled; both California and federal authorities have been seeking Mr. Cleaver since December 27, 1968.)

According to The Spokesman, tickets for the affair were available at Black Panther Party Headquarters at 1419 Fillmore and More's Books, 1435 Fillmore, and for $2.50 at the door. It added that part of the proceeds would be used for the Newton Cleaver Defense Committee and the Eldridge Cleaver Bail Fund.

The same issue sought contributions to the Malcolm X Educational Center, advised its readers to write or call the Black Draft Counseling Union and join the Welfare Rights Movement. In addition, it announced a community meeting to "amend the city charter to forbid the creation of para-military squads (by the San Francisco police). . . ."

Such inflammatory contents are nothing new for The Spokesman. In 1968, the February-March issue decried the jailing of Huey Newton for alleged murder and reported "some very significant ideas" of the Black Panthers, which included freeing Mr. Newton or bringing about "retribution," freeing of imprisoned black men not tried by their peers and exempting all Negroes from military service.

(The latest word on the Black Panthers came on April 2, when a New York grand jury indicted 21 members for conspiring to bomb five department stores, a police station and a railroad.)

A front-page story in the March-April 1968 issue of The Spokesman said, "Black people wake up; we are all in prison; we are all Huey Newtons. He may be doing time in jail but we are doing it in the ghetto." Signed by Adam Rogers, it declared, "If you want action, come join me in my fight for identity, equality, not civil rights, but human rights."

The Spokesman has accused the nation's cities of arming to carry out plans of genocide against black people, and said the U.S. is preparing concentration camps for blacks. It also quoted Richard Robers, executive director of the San Francisco Family Service Agency, as saying, "A civil war is almost inevitable unless the powers of white America face up to the fact that they have a responsibility to see that all children have some guarantee—decent economic income, housing, education and health assurances that exist for their own children."

Copies of all the aforementioned issues of The Spokesman are in the files at OEO headquarters.

In the same vein, the August 15, 1968, issue of the Marin City (Calif.) Memo, published by the Marin City Economic Opportunity Council, printed an editorial by Area Director James W. Coleman, who, after visits to Chicago, Detroit and Cleveland, found: "The social revolution continues to move across this nation. . . . There must be drastic social changes in the society now. . . . I talked to many black youths who still had anger and revenge for the white power structure" The same issue quoted black activist Dick Gregory as saying, "Riots are nothing new. They're just a ghetto version of a fire sale."

NEED POWER

"Power is the essential for the poor," according to the tabloid newspaper, The New Day, published by the Human Development Corp. of St. Louis. "If you want to beat the small store cheating you. If you want to keep 'the man' off your back. If you want to get a job. If you want to get decent housing out of the slum lord. You have to have POWER," proclaimed the March 1968 issue of The New Day.

From a sister publication in Elizabeth, N.J., comes a similar theme. The May 1968 Community Action News, published by Community Action for Economic Opportunity, Inc., carried a letter to the editor signed by Josephine Nieves, acting director of the Northeast Regional Office of OEO in New York, which said, "Jobs alone will not necessarily solve the problems of the poor in America since it is to a large extent a question of power."

The same issue featured a story which said that a teenage community action group had petitioned the city to incorporate black history into the regular school curriculum. Another story said, "The Black Power Conference held July 20 through July 23 was an inspirational and educational gathering." Among the proposals reported were "developing Liberation Schools, setting up a Black Teachers Union—Separate From The White Summer Camps for Blacks only, development of Black Political Power. . . ." The Washington Evening Star called that same conference "a festival of hate."

The tabloid newspaper, The Neighborhood Journal, states in its masthead that it is owned and operated by the five Denver community action councils and "funded by a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity." The September 20, 1968, issue devotes half a page to the views of "resident participants" in the Model Cities program. It charges that minority persons are abused when arrested, charged, jailed and sentenced, and calls for "greater protection from unjust police and judicial action" to command top priority after planning in the Model Cities program.

WASHINGTON DOESN'T KNOW

No one in Washington seems to know how many anti-poverty "newsletters" are being published, or how many more will be launched in response to OEO's Handbook. Besides those mentioned, others have come out of Long Beach, Calif.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Miami and Pensacola, Fla.; New York; Columbus, Ohio, and many Indian reservations. OEO headquarters have three filing cabinet drawers packed with samples of the newsletters.

Almost unbelievably, they are being distributed in slums all over the country without the knowledge of Congress. That body thought it had made its intent amply clear when it set up the Small Business Administration. Congress banned SBA loans to newspapers to avoid government interference with the press. In 1967 an amendment to the second supplemental appropriation act said flatly: "None of the federal government anti-poverty funds may be used for establishing or operating a general coverage newspaper, magazine, radio station or television station."

When he introduced the amendment, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr. (D., Va.) stated: "I am unalterably opposed to government ownership or control of newspapers because it leads inevitably to government control of the news. I believe we have too much government management of the news already without this additional weapon being put into the hands of federal officials."

Enactment followed disclosure that WAMY-Community Action, Inc., of Boone, N.C., proposed to establish a newspaper and radio station with $179,000 from OEO in response to OEO pressure to emphasize communications instead of job training. At the time, Senator Ervin commented that the proposal was wholly "incompatible with the free enterprise system and a free press."

Senator Strom Thurmond (R., S.C.) declared: "If every poverty agency were to get a 100% subsidy for the publication of its own propaganda—freed from the responsibility of business losses and restrictions—then a medium would be created to promote social unrest and dissatisfaction on a nationwide scale."

As noted, OEO maintains that the publications it now subsidizes are "newsletters" which do not engage in "general coverage," cited in the wording of the 1967 ban on subsidized newspapers. Newsletters or newspapers, the publications are only one segment of a vast OEO-subsidized propaganda network—encompassing television, radio, films and even speakers' bureaus—now in operation and growing daily.

PENNSYLVANIA'S STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS

HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, as Congressman from the 24th District of Pennsylvania I am extremely proud that this year's State championship basketball team comes from Farrell High School, Mercer County, Pa.

Superbly coached, this outstanding group of young men went through a near-perfect season, capped by victory in the western State eliminations and finally, this past weekend, by a resounding victory over the eastern champion in the State finals.

I wish to salute the Farrell High School Steelers for a great achievement. They have, without a doubt, proven they are the best basketball team ever to come out of Pennsylvania in many decades.

An editorial in the "Sharon Herald" paid a fine tribute to the team and its coach. Mr. Speaker, I include a section of it in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRATULATIONS TO FARRELL

The Farrell High School Steelers, to the surprise of few, have done it again, and it is once again a proud day for the team, its coaches, and the entire community, its own as well as those others which are a part of the valley municipal complex.

In capturing for the sixth time—a record in itself—the state scholastic basketball crown, the team has brought credit and recognition not only to itself but credit and recognition to all of us. For this its members and coaches are due our thanks as they are deserving of our congratulations upon their achievement. If there were many among the 70,000 people who comprise the family of the Shenango Valley whose minds were not on the team on Saturday night, we would be most surprised.

As we noted on a previous occasion, this year's Farrell High School basketball squad was a great team which somehow seemed to stand apart from the many great teams which through the years have carried the banner of the school.

There were many reasons for this of course, and the sports buffs in due time will supply analysis far more competent than we can. But it seems to us, as we observed on that previous occasion, that a major reason for the distinction earned by this team was because it consisted of able men all rich in talent who played as a team and who were motivated by a singleness of purpose—to win. They played the game hard and they played it well, but more importantly, they played it together.

How else is one to explain the remarkable season which, with only a single defeat, saw the team climb to the very pinacle? And even that lone defeat, at the hands of arch-rival Sharon, was something of a laural for the Steelers. They gave Sharon a season which also long will be remembered; after all, how many teams in the Commonwealth hereafter will be able to lay claim to the distinction of having defeated the 1969 state champions?

THE FAULTY FUNNEL

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently I warned Robert Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, of the inherent danger to our large urban centers in "funneling" Federal funds through the State governments.

At that time, I proposed "that the Federal Government make unrestricted, direct grants-in-aid to those school districts which have shown a willingness to utilize their own resources."

Pointing to the suggestion of replacing categorical grants to school districts with block grants to the States, I stated:

> This, in my opinion, would be a mistake, as there are too many instances of lack of understanding, at best, on the part of state governments toward the cities' problems in education and other areas. Moreover, block grants would simply breed more bureaucracy at the state level—something we do not need.

By coincidence, there appeared in the Philadelphia Daily News on April 17 an editorial written by James O'Brien, chief editorial writer for the Daily News, which presents graphically just what is happening to Federal funds channeled to the States. Under unanimous consent I include the entire editorial with this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. O'Brien's editorial concerns law enforcement and anticrime funds, but I suspect the situation would carry over into any other Federal grant to States.

He points out that Pennsylvania will get $880,000 in Federal funds for law-enforcement planning.

> And how much of that sum will go to Philadelphia?

Mr. O'Brien asks.

> A big fat $82,419.

He adds:

> There are also reports that Philadelphia will receive a mere $150,000 for anti-crime action programs out of $1,400,000 (count 'em) coming to the state from the Federal Government.

He points out that Philadelphia will receive this puny amount despite the facts that the city has almost 25 percent of the State's total amount of serious crime; that its police department is more than double the size of the State police force; and that Philadelphia courts dispose of 40 percent of the serious criminal cases heard in the State.

> This city—

Mr. O'Brien concludes—

> has been shortchanged for so long and in so many ways by the rubes in Harrisburg that we could hardly be astonished by the latest outrage. Concerned citizens should bombard Gov. Raymond P. Shafer with protests but we cannot assure any results.

Mr. Speaker, this latest manifestation of injustice to the cities does not surprise me either; or anyone else who has been on the political scene any length of time. Inasmuch as it is the responsibility of the Congress to raise this money through taxation, I submit to you that it is likewise our responsibility to insure that in the end it goes to those areas which really need Federal assistance.

The editorial follows:

[From the Philadelphia Daily News, Apr. 17, 1969]

THE FAULTY FUNNEL

You could probably call it a classic example.

"It" is a classic example of the danger of funneling Federal funds through state capitals, especially Harrisburg.

In this instance, "it" is the distribution of Federal law enforcement funds for planning purposes. Pennsylvania will get $880,000.

And how much of that sum will go to Philadelphia? A big fat $62,419—that's how much.

If that does not disturb you how about this:

There are also reports that Philadelphia will receive a mere $150,000 for anti-crime action programs out of $1,400,000 (count 'em) coming to the state from the Federal Government.

We share the concern of the Crime Commission of Philadelphia at this wholly inequitable distribution of Federal funds.

As the Crime Commission observes, this allocation of funds completely ignores the incidence of crime in urban areas. For example, serious crimes in Philadelphia are almost 25 percent of the state's total.

As for other examples—this city's police department is more than double the size of the state police force, while Philadelphia courts dispose of 40 percent of the serious criminal cases heard in Pennsylvania.

This city has been shortchanged for so long and in so many ways by the rubes in Harrisburg that we should hardly be astonished by the latest outrage. Concerned citizens should bombard Gov. Raymond P. Shafer with protests but we cannot assure any results.

COOKEVILLE HERALD-CITIZEN ENDORSES CAMPAIGN TO HALT OUT-MIGRATION TO CITIES

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Cookeville Herald-Citizen recently carried an editorial entitled "Tragedy of Our Times."

The article referred to two reports I had cited in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD earlier which point up the tragedy of millions of people being compelled for economic reasons to live in our major metropolitan areas when they would prefer to live in small towns and rural areas.

The Cookeville Herald-Citizen declares its support for H.R. 799, a bill which I introduced to provide tax incentives to business and industry locating and expanding in rural areas.

The editorial concludes:

> In this electronic age, the age of the global village with instant communication and rapid transportation, one cannot help wondering when industrial America will heed the call and begin to spread out and give itself some elbow room.

The editorial follows:

[From the Cookeville (Tenn.) Herald-Citizen, Apr. 15, 1969]

TRAGEDY OF OUR TIMES

Earlier this year Congressman Joe L. Evins entered into the Congressional Record the results of two reports which, in his words, "underline the frustration of millions of Americans who are compelled to live in our big cities and metropolitan areas because of the lack of opportunities in many of our rural areas."

Rep. Evins reported that 82 percent of the American people would prefer to live in small towns and rural areas—if they could live anywhere they wanted to live. Only 15 per cent chose the big cities.

The opinion poll was conducted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association by a New York research firm. The other report was prepared at Rep. Evins' request by the Library of Congress.

The second report, Rep. Evins said, shows that metropolitan areas in big cities grew at a rate of 15 per cent while the growth rate of rural areas was 3.3 per cent.

Citing a decline in farm jobs—at a rate of 300,000 a year—the Library of Congress report concluded that 550,000 new jobs are needed each year if our young people are to be retained in their home area.

"The alternative is continued heavy migration from the countryside to the already overcrowded cities," the report added.

The reports that Rep. Evins placed on record truly tell of a tragedy in our times.

Big cities offer a magnetic attraction to the brightest and best educated of our rural youth. Anxious to pursue careers that challenge their talents, the youth leave the rural areas to the metropolitan cities. If they are successful, after years of pitting their nerves against the cities' noxious fumes, the traffic snarls and deafening roar of urban chaos, perhaps they will earn themselves a place in the suburbs. There, in a compromise with their urge to be free of the tensions of the city, they enjoy the comforts of a patch of lawn and a patio until it is time to ride the commuter trains back into the urban bedlam.

And if they are not successful, they live their lives out in crowded tenements, surrounded by thousands but friends of no one.

The alternatives, both for the gifted and the deprived, are few. One must work, and one must go where there are jobs.

Legislation, such as a tax incentive bill sponsored by Rep. Evins, can help play a part in encouraging new industry to locate in a smaller city, such as Cookeville.

But the statistics themselves offer another hope—they portend an eventual realization by industrial America that the small town is where the people's hearts are.

If people working together to manufacture a product are happier and well content to live in a small town, why not bring the industry to the people?

When this realization matures and bears fruit, the pendulum will begin to swing the other way.

In this electronic age, the age of the global village with instant communication and rapid transportation, one cannot help wondering when industrial America will heed the call and begin to spread out and give itself some elbow room.

EUGENE WILSON: TRILOGY ON AIR AND SPACE POWER

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, those who make great contributions for progress seldom publish adequate histories of the struggles in which they were participants. A notable exception was Comdr. Eugene E. Wilson, who, after a distinguished career in the Navy, resigned his commission, and rose to an eminent position in the aircraft industry.

Becoming interested in undertaking a broad study of air and nuclear policies through the efforts of Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal, Commander Wilson severed his connections with aircraft activities and devoted his full time to the study of the evolution of these policies, producing three notable volumes.

A book review of this trilogy by Capt. Miles P. Duval, Jr., U.S. Navy, retired, in the December 1967 issue of the Explorers Journal of New York, gives thumbnail sketches of their contents.

In order that the production of these highly important volumes may be more widely known to the reading public, I quote the indicated review as part of my remarks:

(NOTE.—Trilogy by Commander Eugene E. Wilson: Slipstream, 1950, 366 pages, $5.00; Wings of Dawn, 1955, 175 pages, $5.00; Kitty Hawk to Polaris, 1960, 231 pages, $5.00. Literary Investors Guild, Palm Beach, Florida. Reviewed by Miles P. Duval, Jr. AcNR 1965, a frequent contributor to this Journal.)

Those who make history often fail to write the story of important developments in which they were leading participants. In this trilogy, Commander Wilson, whose life has covered the air-space age, and who was closely connected with aviation from 1924 to 1949 in responsible capacities, writes with the insight and authority of the professional in the fields to which he has devoted a lifetime of study and observation.

In *Slipstream*, which is largely autobiographical, one of its most moving parts is the story of the development of airpower in the U.S. Fleet, 1927–29, of which, as a young officer on the *Saratoga*, I was a witness. Reading his descriptions was like reliving those eventful years, which, in the perspective now possible, provided the foundation for victory in World War II in the Pacific.

In *Wings of Dawn*, Commander Wilson traces the evolution of United States air and space doctrine, attempts to demolish the assumption that Western civilization is doomed, emphasizes the Constitution of the United States, and hails its Preamble as stating our national purpose. One of its most moving features is his story of the helicopter as developed by Igor Sikorsky.

In *Kitty Hawk To Sputnik To Polaris*, Commander Wilson describes some of the efforts to bring air and nuclear power under control, to meet current threats to Constitutional liberty, and to provide a basis for the correct part of scientific research and technological development in the defense of Western Civilization.

Throughout this trilogy Commander Wilson gives generous tribute to those who, in significant degree, contributed, among them Dr. Charles E. Lucke, his former professor; Rear Admirals William A. Moffet and Joseph M. Reeves; Admirals William V. Pratt and C. W. Nimitz; and Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal.

Regardless of whether one concurs with all of his conclusions, the bringing together in proper perspective of facts of crucial importance as regards the evolution of air and space power which otherwise could be lost or distorted, is a major contribution to history, as well as fascinating reading for explorers, scientists, engineers, and historians.

SPRINGFIELD MAN IN HIGH POST OFFICE JOB

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Ronald Barry Lee, a native of my home city of Springfield, Mass., has been named an Assistant Postmaster General to head the Post Office Department's new Bureau of Planning, Marketing, and Systems Analysis. A remarkably able man, thoroughly schooled in both business and government, Mr. Lee will be responsible for planning more efficient and expeditious ways of running the Post Office Department. He is eminently qualified for the job. A West Point graduate, a former White House fellow, a full professor and assistant provost at Michigan State University, a Post Office Department expert in planning and systems analysis before joining the Michigan State faculty several years ago, Mr. Lee has demonstrated a wealth of administrative and technical skills. President Nixon could not have made a better appointment.

The Springfield Union last weekend published an article outlining Mr. Lee's remarkable career. With permission, Mr. Speaker, I include this article in the RECORD at this point:

SPRINGFIELD MAN IN HIGH POST OFFICE JOB

Ronald Barry Lee, Michigan State University professor appointed by President Nixon Thursday as one of three assistant postmasters general, graduated from Classical High School here in 1949.

His father, Kermit J. Lee of 51 Monroe St., is manager of the Longmeadow branch of Third National Bank of Hampden County. His mother is a secretary at DeBerry School.

Prof. Lee, 36, was New England boys tennis champion in 1950 while a student at Springfield College. That same year he was appointed to West Point, from which he graduated in 1954.

President Johnson named him a White House fellow in 1965 and he spent a year gaining experience in high government offices.

Lee is married to the former Joyce J. Thomas of New Rochelle, N.Y. They have two sons.

Lee rose to the rank of major after West Point and became chief of the Electronic Systems Section of the Army Materiel Command Headquarters in Washington.

He holds a masters degree in business administration from Syracuse University, studied Japanese and Spanish at the University of Maryland and completed graduate studies at American University.

In 1963 he was third prize winner in an international poetry contest.

He served in Okinawa for three years and in Vietnam for one.

Lee's father said Thursday night, "Naturally it's very gratifying to each and every member of the family. Now don't go putting in the word 'Negro' like UPI did today, just say 'merit.'

"Nothing major happens in the Lee family without all us knowing about it and Ronnie had discussed the possibility of his appointment with me.

"If there is a swearing in, I think I would like to be present."

The father, who is a member of the Model Cities policy board here, became a bank guard after leaving his job as a waiter at the former Hotel Kimball.

He later became a teller and then manager. He has been an employee of Third National Bank for 26 years.

Assistant Postmaster General Lee has four brothers and sisters. Kermit, Jr., 34, is associate professor of architecture at Syracuse University. William A., 30, a graduate of the University of Massachusetts, is a supervisor with the New York City Board of Welfare. Judith, 24, is a products promoter with Lever Bros. in New York City and Deborah, 19, is a sophomore at Syracuse.

Lee's mother, the former Lillian Jackson, is a Springfield native, and his father is from Baltimore, Md.

THE NECESSITY OF FIRMNESS IN OUR FOREIGN POLICY AND READINESS IN OUR DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a visit to my district in southwestern Ohio. During that visit, I held two area community meetings to which the public generally was invited. Each was attended by over 300 people. In these meetings, a considerable period was set aside for questions from the floor. I answered these and allowed comments from the floor in connection with the questions.

At both of the meetings, there was discussion of the position taken by the United States in connection with the shooting down of the U.S. Navy plane in international waters off North Korea last week. The almost uniform reaction of those who spoke up and of others with whom I had an opportunity to converse at the meeting, was that the position taken by our country was morally correct and most likely to lead to a discontinuance of aggressive violations of international law against our Armed Forces, not only in the Sea of Japan, but elsewhere throughout the world. While some felt that a retaliatory strike, without further provocation, was justified, there seemed to be a general recognition that our responsibility in attempting to work our peaceful solutions to the crises in Asia called for the degree of restraint that we have thus far demonstrated.

Note was also taken of the cooperation and apparent desire of the Russians to cooperate in the search, and the establishment of the clear violation of international law which was involved. This was attributed, probably correctly, to the Russian self-interest in maintaining freedom of the seas in the area.

There was strong feeling that when U.S. units and personnel are sent into such an area of high risk, all possible protection should be made available, and there was an equally strong feeling that in the interest of safety of our own forces and of our allies in East Asia, intelligence-gathering missions in compliance with international law must be continued.

At these same meetings, there was protracted discussion of the administration's recommendation with regard to the development and deployment of the safeguard missile system. This decision was given very high marks by the great preponderance of those who attended. There were a number who opposed the safeguard decision who found that the crowd generally was very hostile to their views. While I provided answers to the questions of the system's critics, the majority of the people present also expressed support for the decision as a sound one likely to build the credibility of our deterrent capability and thereby to contribute toward positive disarmament discussion.

In other words, the sampling of public opinion of the people of my district who attended the meetings would indicate strong support for the decisions taken by President Nixon on both of these issues. This is reassuring, for it demonstrates once again the restrained, yet committed, thinking of most Americans on the necessity of firmness in our foreign policy and readiness in our Defense Establishment. In the U.S. tradition, we are willing to let those who threaten and attack us have one strike, and even two strikes, but, as in our national game, on the third strike, you are out. The North Koreans and others who would engage in such attacks had best take notice.

HOSMER WRITES ON NUCLEAR POWER

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Electrical World magazine for April 14 carries that publication's annual roundup on U.S. nuclear power progress and prospects. One of the items in the issue is the following perceptive article written by our colleague, the ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Representative HOSMER of California:

NUCLEAR DIFFICULTIES WILL BE SURMOUNTED—RANKING REPUBLICAN MEMBER OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY ASSESSES DIFFICULTIES FACING NUCLEAR POWER

(By Representative CRAIG HOSMER, U.S. Congress, representing 32d District of California)

Is nuclear power destined to become "Just a passing curiosity in the annals of history?"

That phrase—from a speech by Brice O'Brien, General Counsel of the National Coal Association—caught my eye recently. The point he was making was that if we fail to develop fast breeder reactors, eventually we'll run out of uranium and nuclear power will become a museum exhibit.

I'm not quite that pessimistic. The development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy has been a high-priority national objective for almost 23 years now. And there can be no denying that it will continue to be such.

But Brice O'Brien's choice of words is useful to remind us that we do not yet have it made. Over-confidence about the future of nuclear power is a luxury we can't afford. The final success of this national venture will be determined as much by what we do in the next five or six years as what we have done in the past 23 years.

In this country today, there are only 13 operable civilian power reactors, capable of producing 2,723 Mw. Seven plants totaling 3,229 Mw capacity will come on the line this year. By the mid-1970's the total will soar to over 100 civilian power reactors generating more than 75,000 Mw.

If the nation's electric utilities can bring those new power plants on the line in an orderly fashion, and keep them there dependably, we will have succeeded. But it will be another matter if these new plants are plagued by a series of nickle-and-dime problems to the extent that the American public's growing appetite for power is unsatiated.

And there are other challenges ahead for the utilities. While they are engrossed with the problems of today—particularly bringing new capacity on the line—they also must come to grips with some major policy issues which will affect not only succeeding generations of power production facilities but perhaps the entire structure of society in the period beyond the 1980's. The industry must make certain that it recognizes and meets the broader needs of society, beyond mere kilowatt production.

Last May, in a speech at the nuclear fuel conference in Oklahoma City, I said:

"I cannot fault the utilities for their enthusiasm for nuclear power. Basically, they are betting that the dynamism of the nuclear industry will continue to spawn technological and economic improvements and help alleviate environmental problems. Their hope is that five or six more years of experience will smooth out some of the wrinkles in the nuclear field, particularly on the regulatory side. I think it's a good bet—not a sure thing—but a very good bet nonetheless."

A recent annual report by Commonwealth Edison sums up what most utilities are looking for when they "go nuclear." It cites the following factors:

Reliability, safety and flexibility in meeting changes in load requirements;

Elimination of air pollution by an attractive and clean alternative;

Low cost, including nuclear power's more favorable economies of scale in large central power stations; and

Opportunities to enhance fuel economies through fuel fabrication efficiencies and skills learned by operating experience permitting improved fuel assembly arrangements.

Commonwealth Edison has had a generally positive experience with nuclear power. The Dresden-1 Station reached its 7.5 mills/kwh objective, and confidence was expressed it can break the 7-mill mark. But, Commonwealth Edison is a big utility which had the resources to be a pioneer, and it has developed a depth of experience and manpower which will be enormous value in its future nuclear expansion.

But one of the nagging questions which bothers the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Atomic Energy Commission is whether many newcomers to the field are fully aware of the short-term problems which may face them.

Over the long haul, almost all the reasons for going nuclear will prove valid. But the road may be rocky, and we want to make certain that utility management is taking the necessary steps to avoid brown-outs and related problems which could arise during the early 1970's when so much new capacity is scheduled.

LEAD TIMES ARE UNNECESSARILY LONG

I am confident that the utility management, by and large, is aware of the licensing and construction delays which seem to be so much a part of our early nuclear experience.

The AEC and the Joint Committee can help provide remedies for unnecessarily long licensing lead times. We can take steps to make certain that the regulatory framework is up to date, as the AEC is presently doing with an internal review of its licensing mechanism. Additional experience on the part of the reactor suppliers, the architect-engineer firms, the utilities and the licensing organizations also will help.

There are at least six factors which seem to have particular bearing on how nearly the original target date is hit: Score one "delay unit" for each "yes" answer:

1. Is it the first plant for the utility?
2. Is it the first plant for the manufacturer, or the first-of-a-kind?
3. Is it the first job for the architect-engineer?
4. Is it a non-turnkey job?
5. Are special licensing problems involved?
6. Are large engineering extrapolations involved? There also appears to be a loose correlation between construction delay and later plant availability rates.

Irrespective of their cause, the burden falls squarely on utility management to anticipate shortages from delays in getting new plants on the line. They may have to arrange outside purchases, plan to postpone older plant retirements, and obtain whatever supplementary generating capacity they can lay their hands on. It won't come quickly or cheaply.

MATURING PERIOD MUST BE ANTICIPATED

Although utility management may be appreciating and anticipating the slippage problem, it seems to have little sensitivity to a further problem threatening to adversely affect the availability of nuclear megawatts, even after their new plants get on the line.

To understand it, one only need recall the situation which developed a few years ago when high temperature steam was introduced. In this case, as with most others involving introduction of a new technology, there proved to be a three-to-five-year "maturing period" during which problems inevitably arose. Plants were down unexpectedly, and reliability and plant availability simply were not up to par.

A shake-down period is the characteristic of any new technology, and achieving fully reliable operation during the first few years of plant life cannot really be counted upon. This has been the experience so far with the few nuclear plants which have been put on the line. To expect much more from the plants now under construction or on order would seem to be unduly optimistic. Plants on the line 80 percent or more of the time will be a characteristic of the last half of the 1970's, rather than the first half.

Utilities should come to appreciate the maturing-period problem as they now appreciate the slippage problem. In both cases, because large plant sizes are involved, large blocks of power have to be made up. Other losses will be commensurate with the amount of capital tied up in idle and unproducing capacity. This is more costly after a plant goes on the line than before, if for no other reason than that the capital investment has been fully made.

DOWNTIME COSTS ARE HIGH

American Electric Power Company's wise old owl, Phillip Sporn, now a consultant, has produced a thumb rule on the cost of downtime. He asserts that on a million kw nuclear plant downtime will cost its owner $2 million per month. Others figure it as high as $4 million per month or as low as $700,000, depending on capital charges and the source of make-up power.

There is another category of nuclear costs that some utilities will incur, and will incur simply because management has not exercised the foresight to avoid them. These will arise from plant downtime traceable to poor workmanship, faulty materials or poor design.

QUALITY CONTROL NEEDS PROPER FRAME OF MIND

The problem, of course, is not that we cannot properly design and build nuclear power stations that meet cost, reliability and other requirements. The problem, as those of us in Washington see it, is that we may not have developed the proper frame of mind toward quality consciousness, or the quality control procedures necessary to guarantee that every plant is fully debugged when it goes on the line, and that every part and piece works right, works right the first time, and keeps on working right.

When a bad valve develops in a nuclear plant, the utility will find itself confronted with a new set of problems. In a conventional plant, such a minor problem may require a short downtime and perhaps a report to the plant superintendent. But the solution may be infinitely more complicated in a nuclear plant. And whatever the problem, it is certain to involve a sheaf of reports sent to the AEC, visits by compliance inspectors, and a variety of other time-consuming chores.

There are hundreds of components and thousands of sub-components both on the nuclear steam supply side and the conventional generator side of these plants. Substantially all of them must work properly and in unison with all others. Otherwise, down goes the plant and up goes an immediate requirement for a vast quantity of substitute power.

It is obvious that an appreciation of the cost of downtime versus the cost of assuring quality of material, workmanship and design should be on every utility executive's mind from the moment he first starts thinking nuclear. It should be on his mind every minute during design and construction. It is a matter that cannot be left to the simple expectation that the architect-engineer, reactor manufacturer, and component suppliers will do their jobs. As buyers, utility companies are no different than any others. They will get exactly the quality they are shrewd enough to insist upon—and no more.

In emphasizing the need for quality assurance, the AEC's director of reactor development and technology, Milton Shaw, points not to industry alone, but readily admits prior AEC shortcomings in this regard. Poor quality control factored serious delays, troubles and cost overruns into many earlier installations.

Consider the San Onofre nuclear power station, which after only minor difficulties has proved satisfactory on the nuclear side, but which has been plagued by a series of nit-picking non-nuclear problems. First, the turbine blades proved faulty, then certain power cable overheated; a fire resulted and more costly delay ensued. There are plenty of similar examples.

Outside of safety considerations, there is no greater need in the nuclear power business than for the highest possible degree of quality assurance. The cost figures I have cited should be reason enough, even if we did not have the national objective of high reliability. This lesson must be learned by every utility management, and it should be learned before commitment—not during construction or after a plant goes on the line. If it isn't learned from another's painful experience, it will be learned first-hand.

This is why the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy regularly sounds warnings and why AEC is planning a series of management seminars on the subject in the near future.

I am sure one thing the AEC will make perfectly clear in these seminars is that its licensing system is concerned with the safety of a plant, but the reliability and economics of the plant are the concern of the applicant utility. From the commission's safety standpoint, a plant can be safe and shutdown. From the utility's economic standpoint, it must be safe and running.

What is written above is simply a frank assessment of certain difficulties facing the nuclear power business. The conventional power business shares them in large degree. None are insurmountable. Some may be unique in character, but none are unique in magnitude compared with other problems facing other industries.

These difficulties will be surmounted and a base laid for a relatively trouble-free new round of large nuclear power plant orders. The growing pains of youth will be forgotten as nuclear electric technology and management skills mature.

THE FUTURE HOLDS NEW CHALLENGE

Already becoming visible are new challenges of the future to succeed those of the present. It is not too early to devote some thought to their nature and to make some preparations to face them.

Their outlines still are blurred, but these new challenges seem to arise from the nation's increasing awareness of and concern over its total environment-physical and sociological as well as economic and political:

A growing belief by alert corporate leaders that business, for its own survival, must assume greater responsibility for the social well-being of cities and their citizens is cited by the counsel to the president, Dr. Arthur Burns.

The remarkable growth in influence of the Sierra Club and similar organizations evidence widespread public desire for the conservation of non-urban areas.

Pollution and its ecological consequences are topics of general conversation, the thermal aspects of which the nuclear community has been made acutely aware.

By public demand, esthetics, as well as safety, increasingly are being made considerations in plant siting and power transmission.

These few examples and almost every day's news are harbingers of the new and changing climate of complex public attitudes to which utilities may have to accommodate during the years ahead.

My feeling is that the utility executive of the future will have worries beyond supplying dependable power at low cost, financing, moving his bright young men ahead in the service clubs, contending with regulators and urging his employes to help the united crusade. He may not go so far as to add a sociologist, and ecologist or an environmental engineer to the company staff. He may not retain consultants on art, esthetics and natural beauty.

But he may have to sharpen his own sensitivities in all these areas and more. He will have to respond to the wants and needs of the total community for his product. In doing so, he may have to respond to that community's many new desires. He will need to design, construct and operate his system—from the generating station to the ultimate consumer—in a manner which neither offends the total environment nor fails to uplift the human spirit.

And that's a big order!

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKE SHORE

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of interest:

CHESTERTON, IND.,
April 16, 1969.

Congressman EARL F. LANDGREBE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EARL: When I think of a National Park I think of wide open spaces with trees, mountains, streams and lakes, filled with wildlife; like deer, bear, squirrel, rabbit, ducks and fish and with all the other things that go with the unspoiled countryside.

It strikes me that the Indiana Dunes National Lake Shore is in the most stupid possible place for locating a National Park. Our National Government is spending exorbitant sums of money in an attempt to create a National Park between steel mills and railroad yards on handkerchief-sized parcels of ground. Right now the United States representatives are going through our area, buying business buildings and commercial enterprises which have been going for 40 years in order to knock down the buildings and turn the same into a National Park. It strikes me that the United States could get a lot more park for the money if the Park were located where a park ought to be. $50,000.00 an acre is altogether too much money to pay for National Park land, especially when it cannot possibly be anything but a terrible excuse for a park when it is completed. With all the wonderful spots in this country, where a National Park could be located to an advantage, why do some people want to destroy an already existing industrial area to create a park that cannot possibly be a park.

Yesterday afternoon I washed my car. This morning there was a 1/16 inch of industrial dust on top of the hood and roof of the car. This just is no place for a National Park.

I urge you to do all in your power to stop any further purchases of land in this area for a National Lake Shore. If this were stopped it would not be necessary to raise the National Debt Limit quite as much as it was raised the other day. If this National Lake Shore were stopped the United States would not have to go on paying interest on the money for an indefinite time.

I want to be understood that I am all in favor of having National Parks, but I want them at a place where they can be appropriately situated and properly used and where the people can get their money's worth from such parks. Not only is the National Lake Shore an utter and stupid waste of money which cannot possibly do any good as a park, but it further sabotages one of our country's prime industrial and commercial areas.

Please, let us stop it where it is.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,
MALCOLM E. ANDERSON.

IT WONDERS ME

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues will be interested in some most important points raised in a speech by Mr. James H. Binns, president of Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa. Mr. Binns looks objectively at the trends of the current decade and relates these trends to us as a challenge for our times. He has done this by utilizing a traditional Pennsylvania Dutch phrase which denotes skepticism in varying degrees. That phrase is, "It wonders me." I would like to introduce the remarks of Mr. Binns into the RECORD for the material is certainly worthy of consideration by the Congress as we seek to evaluate our efforts of the past in the process of determining new thrusts for American society.

IT WONDERS ME

As we approach the end of the current decade of the 20th Century, we can look back with some perspective on the '60s—look back and try to appraise objectively the emerging trends and development of this period in our nation's history. Dubbed as the "Soaring '60s" by the forecasters, these last ten years really have been more roaring than soaring.

The '60s were a decade of change—rapid change of such scope and magnitude as to challenge the imagination and defy prediction—change that affected every element of our society, its institutions, its basic concepts, its economic structure, its innermost standards of moral and ethical conduct.

From a technological point of view, it was a decade of great progress, marked by breakthroughs of fantastic implication, ranging from space exploration to heart transplants, to mention only two.

It was an age of great social and humanitarian effort in which we mounted gigantic programs at home to wipe out the injustices of discrimination and to ease the plight of the disadvantaged in our midst.

It also was an age of great dedication to the betterment of humanity's conditions abroad, an age in which we continued to share our wealth with less fortunate sister nations with generous grants of foreign aid.

With such an array of idealistic objectives and such a massive commitment of resources, we had every reason to expect the decade of the '60s to emerge as a golden age in our history. Unfortunately, our attempts at alchemy did not succeed—and I am afraid that the period is likely to go down in history as one more characterized by failures than by successes.

Incongruous as it may seem, I suspect that historians will characterize the decade of the '60s as being an undisciplined era—a period of fiscal, economic and military misadventurism, a period of political inopportunism, a period of social anarchism. This is a far cry from the dreams of the New Frontier and the aspirations of the Great Society, and it's only natural that we ask ourselves why, where, and how did we fail?

Here in Lancaster County the Pennsylvania Dutchman, in the language of his forebears, has an expression of incredulity that I think pretty well summarizes our national state of mind today. That expression is, "It wonders me!"

It does wonder me—and I am sure it wonders you, too—that the means we have pursued proved so incapable of reaching the ends we desired. And that leads me to a number of specific enigmas.

It wonders me that in waging our war on poverty we came so close to vanquishing prosperity, or at least to undermining its fiscal and financial foundation. While the specific new war on poverty programs involved annual expenditures of only $2-plus billions, they represented an add-on to an already inflated commitment.

The Economic Division of the Library of Congress, taking the data from the government budget documents, reports the total Federal expenditures for low income groups were $11.9 billion in 1964, rose to $22.1 billion in 1968, and are expected to reach $24.4 billion this year.

Even these figures, large as they are, do not tell the whole story of government social-welfare spending. Taking into account all forms of government social aid—relief, social insurance, educational assistance, child welfare and vocational rehabilitation, veterans' benefits, housing aids, health and medical assistance—the Federal bill in 1968 was $61 billion. State and local government outlays that same year were $51.4 billion, pushing the overall government toal to $112.4 billion. Adding in the $50.7 billion of private welfare outlays, the grand total in 1968 was $163.1 billion, or 19.8 percent of the nation's output of goods and services.

Desirable as our assistance objectives were—and I certainly have no argument against their worthiness—the fact was that the spiraling costs of welfare have had to be superimposed on a mounting defense budget. And the result, which seems to me was quite predictable, was that we overheated our economy and created inflationary pressures which are highly threatening.

This inflationary spiral is frightening because once it begins to accelerate, it is not easy to curb. It creates a psychology that the trend is inevitable—a sort of hot-money mass hysteria which feeds on itself. Inflation is the faceless tax collector that levies its toll on everyone and everything—the individual citizen, business enterprises, social institutions and government—hazarding both domestic and foreign commitments.

Looking back, I think it wonders all of us that so many of our anti-poverty missiles have been so badly off target that they have injured the very troops that they were designed to support.

Inflation hits particularly hard at the poor or low-income people, and as such, represents an anti-poverty missile gone wild, and there are other similar examples.

In the field of low-cost housing and urban renewal, for example, we have for two decades been attempting to do it the Federal way, with laws and appropriations. The result has been that slums have been razed, but many thousands of poor have been left homeless. They have been forced to move into already overcrowded housing units. Their situation has worsened—not improved. In his book, "The Federal Bulldozer," Dr. Martin Anderson, now a Special Assistant to the President, says that from 1950 to 1960 approximately 126,000 low-rent dwelling units were destroyed in urban renewal projects. The replacement units that were constructed were less than one-fourth the number destroyed. And most of these were of the high-rent variety.

This is merely a case of history repeating itself. Back in 1884, England's great philosopher, Herbert Spencer, reported that the Metropolitan Board of Works—the 19th Century British equivalent of today's urban renewal programs—spent 1¼ million pounds to unhouse 21,000 persons and provide new homes for 12,000, leaving 9,000 homeless. These displaced persons, like their 20th Century counterparts, were forced to move into already overcrowded dwelling units. It wonders me that we can't seem to learn from history.

Another example of a legislative social missile injuring those it was designed to help is the Federal Minimum Wage Law. Steadily increased with the enthusiastic support of organized labor, it does little to benefit the skilled, but it does much to injure the unskilled by forcing automation and thus removing from the marketplace many of the only jobs that this latter group is qualified to perform.

The farm subsidy program is another example of a missile being off target. A holdover from the Depression, with little justification for existence in today's world, it costs about $7 billion a year, and millions of moderate- and low-income families are taxed to support it, to say nothing of paying higher costs for their food. And this hits particularly hard at the low-income or indigent families in our midst.

In the international field, it wonders we if we are too big or too little for the britches we wear. Whether we like it or not, we have accepted the dual role of banker and policeman throughout the free world. But I am not sure that we have accepted the responsibilities that go with these roles.

While we have been generous in our distribution of foreign aid grants, we haven't always really followed through to make certain that the aid was used for the purpose intended. And this simply isn't good banking practice. Moreover, as the keystone of the free world's financial structure, we have an international obligation to protect the security of the dollar; and I submit that that is something we simply haven't done.

With respect to our free world policeman's responsibilities, we are deeply involved in a major war in Vietnam—an unpopular war that has never been properly explained to the American people.

Another crisis threatens Berlin in the wake of Russia's ruthless invasion of Czechoslovakia.

And the embers of war continue to smolder in the Middle East.

The situation in Korea is far from tranquil—an uneasy truce that encouraged North Korea to feel strong and daring enough to challenge the United States with the shocking Pueblo incident.

The NATO Alliance is in disarray, and there is increasing doubt as to the willingness of our allies to shore up the defenses.

Underlying the total situation is the nagging suspicion that Russia or China—perhaps both in concert—may choose some entirely new front to test our national will.

And that leads me to the point I would like to make: I am not at all sure the world believes we do have a national will. To the outsider, we are a divided nation—a nation of doves, a nation of hawks.

While our objective is peace, I can't help but believe that this divisiveness—this lack of a united front—is the biggest bar to peace that we could have. Without an unmistakable and clearly defined national will, I question our effectiveness as the free world's policeman.

Leaving the international situation, as a businessman, it wonders me that private enterprise has proved sufficiently enterprising to bear the shackles of governmental interference and monopolistic labor practices and still continue to move forward. Indeed, it's a tribute to the energy and ingenuity of the American businessman that despite these roadblocks and impediments, he's been able to improve both the quality and quantity of his production. The real question is how long can he continue to do so.

One aspect of government regulation of business that's not widely understood is the great restrictive power exercised by the quasi-judicial governmental agencies. A good example is the National Labor Relations Board which, by its decisions, has in the last eight to ten years virtually rewritten the labor law that Congress enacted.

Dr. Sylvester Petro, a widely respected Professor of Law at New York University, believes it is both unconstitutional and impractical to merge judicial power into an executive agency such as the NLRB. It is unconstitutional because judicial and executive powers are supposed to be separated, and impractical because the Board is acting in the dual role of prosecutor and judge.

Dr. Petro concludes by saying: "If Congress wishes to escape the fate of the British House of Lords, and to preserve the representative character of this government, it must respect and enforce the principle of the separation of powers."

Congress as now constituted is not likely to take corrective action. The majority of both the House and the Senate are indebted to and influenced by the lobby of big labor. Big labor has this great political clout primarily because unions and union political action organizations can and do spend millions of dollars in furthering the election of candidates who are friendly to their causes. This is a privilege accorded to no other group in our nation, and it represents a continuing threat to our concept of truly representative government.

On a broader scale, it wonders me how some people can feel that we can improve our society by destroying it. And we know that destruction is the prime aim of the extreme militants—the New Left and the Students for a Democratic Society. Leaders of SDS have quite frankly admitted that their goal is to tear down—to destroy—present day society, without having the slightest idea of what they would put in its place. They apparently just assume that something better will rise, like a phoenix from the ashes.

In recent years we've seen ample evidence that the forces of destruction are real and virulent. We've seen it in the burned-out sectors of dozens of our major cities. We've seen it in the burning of draft cards—in the desecration of the American flag—in hundreds of violent demonstrations. We've seen it in campus disorders that have disrupted classroom work from coast to coast, and in several instances completely closed great universities for periods of time. Yes, and we now see the forces of destruction spreading their influence to the high school level.

It would seem that SDS and New Left leaders have deliberately confused obscene profanity with free speech, have substituted mass violence for orderly dissent, have equated destruction with progress.

The real tragedy of all of this is that the maelstrom of destruction has engulfed many dedicated, gifted and potentially good young people—young people who should know the difference between right and wrong—young people from good homes who should recognize and understand that a society can be no better than its moral and ethical underpinnings.

In my judgment, these young people are the innocent victims of our modern philosophy of permissiveness—a philosophy that spawned a form of parental psychosis under which too many parents have come to believe that it may be harmful to Johnny's ego to let him know in unmistakable terms what's right and what's wrong.

These are the parents who, in effect, have subcontracted the upbringing of their children to the schools—institutionalizing, rather than personalizing their guidance during the formative years. And, unfortunately, too many of our educators have followed the pragmatic approach of conveying knowledge—without understanding—teaching facts without historical or contemporary relevance—encouraging the spinning of fantasies of what might be without subjecting them to tests of reality.

In our modern-day world, we do little to equip young people to distinguish between what is morally right and morally wrong. And I can't help but believe that the fundamental fault lies with the parents in the home—parents who, knowingly or unknowingly, have abrogated their basic parental responsibilities.

It truly wonders me—wonders me deeply—that so many of us seem to feel that being free from responsibility, free from duty and obligation, free from accountability, is preferable to being free to be responsible, free to be accountable for one's own self-respect, free to be one's own man.

It wonders me that some 140 million middle-class Americans who comprise the great majority of our citizens—who represent the warp and woof of our society—don't recognize the responsibility of social and political involvement—personal involvement as parents—personal involvement as citizens.

Although our society represents the nearest approach to Utopia that mankind has ever achieved, it has its imperfections, its injustices, its smugnesses, its hostilities, and its very real perils.

If we were to emphasize the negative, a comparison of our trends with those which led to the decline and fall of Ancient Rome is frightening:

Excessive spending by the central government;

Unwillingness of the young to bear arms in defense of the country;

Widespread sexual immorality, which destroyed the integrity of family life;

The spread of effeminancy; and,

The disregard for religion.

Regrettably, many of those trends are evident in our society today. But there is one major difference between the society of Ancient Rome and that of our modern-day life. The Roman Empire's wealth came from the sweat of slaves and the loot of conquest—not from the innovative techniques that have resulted in increased productive output. Coupled with this was the utter scorn which the Romans—as well as the Greeks before them—had for the artisans and the tradesmen—the producers of their society.

In contrast, ours is a society of free men, and our affluence is the result of innovative entrepreneurship. It is a working society—a society that honors the producer and rewards him in proportion to his contribution—a society that believes in the fundamental dignity of the individual, the inalienable rights of the human being, the sanctity of law and order as the only rational approach.

That kind of society is worth preserving, worth working for—not to maintain the status quo, but to continue to move forward, to improve, to recognize and correct our deficiencies through orderly, introspective individual commitment.

This we can do if we want to, and this we must do if we are to preserve the values we profess to hold dear.

What is needed is commitment by the now uncommitted—individual involvement and personal dedication to the solution of our problems and the enhancement of opportunity for all Americans.

With what is at stake, it should wonder all of us if we don't accept and prove equal to the challenge.

"THE REAL EISENHOWER," BY FRANK L. KLUCKHOHN

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House a review of a new book, "The Real Eisenhower," by Frank L. Kluckhohn. The review appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin of April 10.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I was astounded recently to read in a nationally syndicated column that the same Frank Kluckhohn was maligned without cause and by innuendo was accused of being a neo-Nazi. The charge, of course, is utterly ridiculous and without foundation. I have known Frank Kluckhohn since the days we found ourselves under attack on the cruiser, *Louisville*, during World War II, I as chaplain and he as war correspondent for the New York Times. As I recall those days, I remember that Frank received a high commendation from the ship's captain, Captain Hicks, as he left the *Louisville*.

The attack against Frank seemed to be directed against a new association he has formed along with such distinguished writers and reporters as Walter Trohan and Edgar Ansell Mowrer. The new group calls for the formation of a press ethics committee which I am certain we would all agree is an excellent idea.

Having received permission, the book review follows:

PERCEPTIVE STUDY OF EISENHOWER

(By Saul Kohler)

WASHINGTON, April 9.—Two weeks before General Eisenhower's death, Frank L. Kluckhohn and Donald Ackerman put the finishing touches on a biography of the former President, and the product was stored in a warehouse to await the inevitable.

As a consequence, even as the funeral was taking place, booksellers across the country were stocking their shelves with "The Real Eisenhower," a readable and highly informative little work which sums up the general-statesman-politician-educator in one sentence: "Ike was a very human guy."

Too often, when a national hero dies (or even while he still lives), his biographers attempt to give the impression he could walk on water. On the other hand, there often is an attempt to be hypercritical in an effort to push the sale of books by injecting controversy where it doesn't exist and magnifying it where it does.

This is not the case here. As Kluckhohn, a long-time Washington correspondent for the New York Times and an even longer-time observer and participant in national politics, points out, one pays for leadership with the loss of friends.

So it was with Dwight David Eisenhower, who sometimes has been called a mediocre officer, an ineffective politician and a do-nothing President who avoided making decisions.

The biography notes that as general and as President, Eisenhower did what he thought was right, even though on several occasions he tried to protect the men he liked.

Kluckhohn himself was suspended for 10 days as a war correspondent by the supreme commander after writing something which Ike didn't like, yet the author displays an admiration for the man who came from the heart of America eventually to control its entire nervous system—and that of the free world.

When he left office, General Eisenhower was the most admired, and yet the most criticized, man in the nation. Despite the criticism, and despite the physical ailments which began to manifest themselves even while he was the tenant at the White House, he probably could have won a third term if he had wanted it and were it not for the constitutional limitation on the Presidency.

The biography points out that General Eisenhower made mistakes and President Eisenhower made mistakes. But it notes, too, that he was good for the country, and that he did what he thought right.

As a military commander, General Eisenower could send an officer home or to another station if he so desired. As a politician he had to use other methods. To his credit, and to the credit of Mr. Nixon, the differences were resolved and teamwork prevailed.

Indeed, the general's indorsement of Mr. Nixon last year probably was what iced the cake for the President. This despite the national defeat in 1960 and the California loss two years later in a race for governor which almost everyone had urged Mr. Nixon to forego.

To General Eisenhower, the 1968 election was a final "win" and it embodied his sentiments that an individual cannot and must not reject what he considers to be a genuine desire by his party for him to bear the standard.

The biography quotes Churchill as having said of his political enemy Neville Chamberlain that the sincerity of a man is a shield to his memory, and with such a shield, he marches in the ranks of honor.

Because he was sincere—though a human guy capable of making mistakes as well as being the darling of a nation and a world—the biography concludes that Dwight Eisenhower was entitled to join these ranks—"as man, soldier and President . . . he always marched and always shall."

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT LEE'S PUBLIC SERVICE TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the task of securing sufficient water for southern California's ever-increasing populace, and protecting the water rights of the supplying agencies, has fallen to many men over the years. It is a continuing battle which requires great dedication and determination, and I wish to remark now on one such individual who possesses those qualities in abundance.

The gentleman I refer to is Robert Lee, of Los Angeles, who retired this week as general manager of the Colorado River Association. This organization is composed of civic leaders who support the purposes and programs of the six public agencies which own rights to take water from the Colorado River for the benefit of some 10 million residents of southern California.

For the past 6 years Bob Lee has devoted immeasurable time, energy and talent to that job. Actually, his work for the association began more than 20 years ago, and it was about that time when I first made his acquaintance. Those were turbulent years for the Colorado River Basin States—quite unlike the comparative calm which blesses the seven-State region today. His efforts then and throughout the succeeding years were immensely helpful to me and my fellow members of the Californian delegation who had to carry the battle to Congress.

Bob saw much of his toil rewarded last year when S. 1004, the Colorado River Basin Project Act, was passed by the Congress and signed into law with the complete support of California. Now he has decided to devote full time to his principal position as assistant to the general manager of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

So, while we may regret that he is relinquishing the association's reins, we can also be gladdened by the fact that he will maintain a lively interest in California's water problems. His expertise on Colorado River water matters, I might say here, dates back some 40 years, back to the start of the Boulder Canyon—Hoover Dam—project; the initiation of plans for the Colorado River aqueduct; the formation of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, and subsequent milestones.

We will welcome his counsel and benefit from it.

FOSTER PARENTS DAY

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, thousands of young people are indebted to the care they received from foster parents. For many of these young people, their childhood years would have been spent in various institutions, had it not been for the concern of foster parents.

Under the legislation I have joined in sponsorship, the third Sunday in October of each year would be designated as Foster Parents Day.

Not only would such a day serve as a day of honor for foster parents, but it would give our local officials who administer the program an opportunity to explain how the foster parents plan functions, creating better understanding within the community. In addition, such recognition would give the foster parents themselves a feeling of being a more integral part of the department with which they work.

In view of the tremendous contribution which foster parents make to the youth of this country, it is my hope the Congress will take this opportunity to see that this program receives the recognition which would be provided through a national Foster Parents Day.

THE ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL SECRETARIES DINNER DANCE

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 12, the Congressional Secretaries Club wined and dined and danced, honored one of their bosses and two of their coworkers at the annual Congressional Secretaries Club dinner dance, attended by more than 700 at the Shoreham Hotel.

Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat, of Maine, was "The Man of the Year," and received a plaque from CSC President Molly Parker, who is my executive secretary. The Senator remained throughout the long night and won many new friends, not only by his remarks extolling the virtues of the secretary corps on the Hill, but by his warm demeanor and obvious interest. As an adjunct to the Muskie award, Library of Congress Poetry Consultant William Jay Smith, who penned the inscription on the plaque, entertained with some sophisticated poetry and patter.

Roll Call Editor Sidney Yudain presented the Secretary of the Year Award to Ann Algott Sullivan, for some years an aide to Senator Carlson, of Kansas, and now with Representative Keith Sebelius, of Kansas. Mrs. Sullivan became the 10th recipient of this award. A special Roll Call appreciation plaque was awarded to William H. Hackett, Cederberg, Mich., one of the founders of the CSC, who is retiring this year. Unfortunately, Hackett had left the hall, and the award was accepted for him by President Molly Parker.

Virginia Butler—Ways and Means—emceed the door prize proceedings, and the first vice president, Jim Gavin, banquet chairman, was the toastmaster. Comedian Mark Russell perked up the proceedings which, because of the cherry blossom festivities and parking problems, got off to a late start. Mark's material is made to order for the congressional crowd, which was enthusiastic.

I would like to include Molly's remarks and Senator Muskie's response in the Extensions of Remarks of the Record, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Guests, My Friends: It is my privilege and pleasure to introduce to you tonight our "Man of the Year," Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine.

There is something very Lincolnesque about Edmund Sixtus Muskie, and I wonder if his parents knew that he was going to be "sixtus" foot and four when he was given that middle name. Senator Muskie's liberal philosophy, his deep concern for people, and his warm friendliness have helped him capture the popular imagination,

Senator Muskie began his political career when he was elected to the Maine House of Representatives in 1946, where he served as Minority Leader from 1949 to 1951. He made swift progress up the ladder and was the first Democrat to be elected as Governor of Maine; and then was the first Democrat to be elected to the United States Senate from that State, where he is serving his second term. This reminds me of the candidate who was so warmly winding up his speech with this statement: "And in conclusion, my fellow citizens, I want to state that I was born a Democrat, always have been a Democrat, and expect to die a Democrat." A heckler called back: "Not very ambitious, are you?" Senator Muskie is the man who has written all of the major legislation on air and water pollution. He is probably the most knowledgeable man in the Senate on the urban crisis. He is the "midwife" and sponsor of the Model Cities Bill. On the Machiasport Oil Port, he has been accused of pouring trouble on oiled waters. He offered to make an honest trade with Texas and Louisiana, when he said, "Let Maine refine oil, and we will let you refine maple sugar." Last fall, he was active as the Vice Presidential candidate, and he made the strongest impact of any other Vice Presidential candidate in the history of this country. Due to his sensitivity to other people's problems, he is the most sought-after public speaker in the country. He has already covered 27 states, the District of Columbia, England, Canada, and Japan. Since January 5th, he has made 60 major addresses, and he now receives about 600 invitations each month. You can understand why we are so honored to have him set aside time to be with us this evening to receive this award of "Man of the Year," which is evidence that a loser can be a winner.

Senator Muskie, on behalf of the Congressional Secretaries Club, I wish to present to you this award, which reads:

"The Congressional Secretaries Club is proud to present this award, 'The 1969 Man of the Year' to the Honorable Edmund S. Muskie, Senator, United States Congress, Democrat, State of Maine:

"When Senator Muskie came out of Maine
He stood so tall with a view so clear
He won a country if not a campaign
And became for all the man of the year.

"Molly B. Parker,
"*President*.

"April 12, 1969."

Remarks by Senator Edmund S. Muskie

When I learned that I was to receive your man of the year award, I was, of course, flattered.

My staff, curiously, thought it must be a practical joke. I reassured them. If the award were unjustified, I reasoned, it was their fault; there was a credibility gap only because they had done too good a job for me.

That appeared to satisfy them. I have found that a little flattery goes a long way, and as a modest man I am uncomfortable being excessive. You have to understand that I had thanked them all for their good work at my annual Christmas party—in 1959.

I am, of course, very dependent upon my staff. It is just in their own best interest that I don't tell them so. After all, one inflated ego in my office is enough.

Now that I have satisfied my own staff, the award gives me a vehicle for blackmail. They may not agree with your choice, but as long as the rest of you are satisfied, then I have the upper hand.

I must confess, it was a difficult last-minute decision to come here tonight. I was reminded that the President is in Florida and that the Senior Senator from Massachusetts is in Alaska—the perfect time to seize the Government. In the end, however, my sense of fair play prevailed. The President already has enough trouble—planning the start of his administration, and Senator Kennedy has a revolt on his hands in Alaska.

Seriously though, each of us likes to be appreciated by those with whom we work. And on behalf of all my colleagues in both bodies I want to thank all of you—not that we already haven't demonstrated our appreciation this year. We thought so much of you and your good work that we voted ourselves a pay raise.

More than anything else, however, I am impressed that you picked a losing vice presidential candidate to honor tonight. I must say, the award does help compensate for the disappointment of last fall. But I can't help wondering who you would have chosen if Mr. Humphrey had won.

Incidentally, I understand that Vice President Humphrey also was honored by your organization in recent years. I trust your recognition is not a prelude to similar fates for others.

As I said, I am grateful for this award. No one knows Congressmen and Senators better than you—which causes me to marvel that you give an award at all. That you do so tells more about you than about those of us who you have honored.

Honestly, I think this is a case of the tail wagging the dog. If such awards are to be made, they should be presented by Congressmen to their Secretaries.

All of us, in large measure, reflect as much the quality of our staffs as we do our own talents.

The relationships between bosses and our staffs is unique. I doubt that any group of 535 men and women could be more demanding or hold higher expectations of performance by those who work with us.

I suspect that the degree of personal commitment, loyalty, and genuine affection, on both sides of the fence, is unmatched in any other profession.

In a very real sense, each office is a small business—an entrepreneurship. The dividends if there are any, are paid only every other year or every six years.

So we share always an uncertain future under demanding conditions and the pressures of time, performance and service.

In a real sense, therefore, all of you are partners in the legislative and political processes, and without you there would be no Congress as we know it today.

In this spirit I accept your award with appreciation and gratitude.

NEW APPROACHES PROPOSED FOR OVERCOMING RIGIDITY OF PRESENT PARTITION IN EASTERN EUROPE

SPEECH OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1969

Mr. CUNNNGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental American principle has been the self-determination of nations. In its name, mindful of the disappointing experiences of the last 25 years, we have to condemn as ineffectual and dangerously offensive the division of the world into spheres of influence among the major powers. Conceived at Teheran and Yalta as a four-power system, that master plan has further degenerated into a confrontation of the two superpowers maintaining a precarious balance through mutual intimidation. Accordingly, instead of unification, the European continent was partitioned into two halves hostile to one another, and that deplorable split is enforced right now by unopposed armed Soviet intervention.

No lasting peace can be built on such foundation. The Soviet Union fails to support American endeavors to restore stability in troubled areas. For over 20 years Russia has sabotaged the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and has extended, instead of ending, the Russian military occupation of East and Central Europe. Seeds of new wars have been meanwhile planted in distant corners of the world, like the protracted partition of entire nations in Korea and Vietnam for the sake of expediency and an endless conflict has developed in the divided land of Palestine. Day-by-day conflicts are incited, sustained, and exploited by an obdurate Soviet Union, biding her time successfully.

In these last 8 years we have suffered several painful reverses. The Cuban fiasco has undermined the validity of the Monroe Doctrine and has precipitated the alienation of France from NATO; the ensuing evacuation of the American rocket launching sites from Turkey prompted the latter to seek the friendship of the Soviet Union; the long coveted penetration of the Mediterranean area by the Russian fleet was arrogantly accomplished and threatens now to outflank our NATO allies. Eight years ago, our nuclear weapons were set up as far as a thousand miles to the east from the Soviet front in East Central Europe. The evacuation of that vital position emboldened Soviet generals last summer to push their divisions toward the Atlantic, to a line only 150 miles away from the French frontiers. At the same time, by the use of proxies, the Soviet Union cautiously retained her strategic initiative and avoided direct engagement of her own forces in any open war. While repeatedly causing abundant American casualties, our policies avoided a worse fate by damaging appeasement and withdrawals while losing friends as well.

Lasting peace cannot be established on a bipolar balance simply because our partner, Soviet Russia, is not a guardian of, but rather a formidable menace to international peace and stability. To placate the Soviet Union, we abandoned in Europe our policy of "liberation," and failed to come to the aid of the gallant Hungarian freedom fighters. Unreciprocated, the Soviet Union continued to set up its own revolutionary organizations inside the nations of the free world in order to create Communist "wars of liberation," and assessed them as "just wars." This concept was recently implemented by the so-called Brezhnev doctrine which exceeds in scope the arbitrariness of even Stalin's policy. With unparalleled arrogance, even a peaceful attempt to loosen the Soviet stranglehold inside the socialist nations by the peoples of these countries was beaten down. The concept of "just wars" against nations in the free world, implemented with the Brezhnev doctrine perpetuating Soviet domination, constitutes the final, all-comprehensive Soviet blueprint. Unopposed by the United Nations and passed over lightly by the last administration, this theory threatens to develop into a new totalitarian international law tenet, tolerated by civilized nations.

Maintenance of the intolerable status quo in partitioned Europe cannot remain the guiding principle of our policy. No life exists if the possibility of change is excluded and the nations of the Socialist commonwealth cannot afford the loss of all hope of evolution, if violence is to be avoided. Hitler's rise to power may serve us as a warning.

Mr. Speaker, experts of the International Affairs Committee of the American Hungarian Federation, which represents most American-Hungarian societies and churches, have proposed new approaches for overcoming the rigidity of the present partition by raising in diplomatic negotiations the creation of a buffer zone consisting of some, if not all, of the Soviet satellites, Yugoslavia and Austria. They have recently submitted these ideas to the President, Secretary of State and the National Security Council and I trust that our policymakers will study them carefully.

THE KILMER JOB CORPS CENTER

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that the Nixon administration made a serious mistake when it recently announced plans to close 59 of the 109 Job Corps centers.

Last Thursday, I testified before the ad hoc hearing task force on poverty in opposition to the planned closing of the Kilmer Job Corps Center in Edison, N.J., which is located in the district I represent in the House.

A copy of my testimony is being inserted with the hope that it will not only reveal the inspiring record of achievement of the Kilmer Job Corps Center, but also help convince the administration and Congress that all Job Corps centers will remain open. Kilmer has enabled almost 5,000 victims of poverty to learn a trade, but it has also developed good citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, the able, dedicated, and compassionate gentleman from Kentucky, Representative CARL D. PERKINS, for his courageous leadership in fighting to keep the Job Corps centers open.

My testimony and other information follow:

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appear before you today with the earnest hope that you will fight tanaciously to keep the Kilmer Job Corps Center in Edison, N.J. open.

When I received official notification from the office of Labor Secretary George P. Shultz last Friday afternoon that the Kilmer Center would close by July 1st, I was greatly distressed.

I am absolutely convinced that closing the Kilmer Job Corps Center would not only be false economy, but would also be socially dangerous. All of the 1,700 young men 16-21 who are trained at Kilmer every year are victims of poverty.

Before they came to Kilmer, they lacked adequate education, practically all of them junior or high school dropouts. They lacked training. They lacked real confidence. They lacked hope. They were most bitter and frustrated young men with virtually no future Their problems and plight remind me of what Oscar Wilde wrote: "Something was dead in each of us, And what was dead was hope."

But the Kilmer Job Corps Center changed a great deal of this. Hope was resurrected and since the Center opened in 1965, almost 5,000 trained young men have graduated, 80% of them gaining employment, ranging from welding to police work. You may be interested to know that 9 Kilmer graduates are members of the Police Cadets in Washington, D.C. In a few years they will become full-time members of the D.C. police force and will help the district meet one of its most serious problems: a shortage of policemen.

Kilmer graduates joined a society many of them once hated because they felt ignored and unwanted. Unfortunately, when the Nixon Administration announced that Kilmer would close, the old feelings of anguish, despair and dearth of hope returned.

According to press accounts, the main reason the Administration decided to close Kilmer and Parks, 7 women's centers, and 50 conservation centers, is economy. I believe that such "economy" is both false and dangerous.

Of course there would be a saving of dollars—a proposed net saving of $100 million—but I believe that the ultimate economic and social cost would be much greater to the Nation, as the N.Y. Times editorial of April 10th pointed out, ". . . in crime, drug addiction and higher welfare costs" for the 11,000 disadvantaged young men and women who would be eliminated. This is not my conception of economy. Thousands of others who would have enrolled in the future also will be deprived of the chance to learn a trade and develop abilities that only need attention and interest to come to the surface.

Mr. Chairman, the Administration's press announcement last Friday mentioned that an estimated 250–300 young men would be trained in various cities throughout the country, including Newark, N.J. The new plan simply astounded me. First of all, even the figure 300 is so small, it is almost absurd. There are probably 300 disadvantaged young men in just a few blocks in Newark alone and I'm sure that other urban areas have those who hope to attend the so-called "mini-centers." What are they supposed to do until their turn comes—if it ever does? I hope I'm wrong, but I'm afraid that many of them would get in trouble—and if they do, it will, to some extent, be on the conscience of this Administration.

I want to cite the fact that Labor Secretary Shultz conceded in a newspaper that congressional approval is required to reduce President Johnson's last budget request involving the Job Corps (from $280 million to $150 million.) I will oppose such a cut. I am not against economy, but I don't want savings made that will cause human misery—and that is what the Administration's proposal would do if the Job Corps is reduced from the present 35,000 enrollees, to the proposed 24,000—a cut of 11,000 young men and women who are in desperate need of help. They need help and deserve a chance. Like every American, they want their place in the sun of human happiness and I'm not going to deprive them of this right. I'm not going to throw them into the shadows. I'm not going to desert them. I want to help them.

Kilmer enrollees have also aided the community, activities ranging from the rehabilitation of an armory for a recreation program in New Brunswick, to helping a Cerebral Palsy Center. One community was so grateful for the contributions of enrollees, that awards were made to them at a borough council meeting.

During the 1968 presidential campaign, Mr. Nixon promised to help get the unemployed ". . . off the welfare rolls and on the payrolls." I hope that the decision to reduce the Job Corps Centers will be reversed, not only for the sake of these troubled young men and women, but for the sake of this Administration, whose sincerity, compassion and purpose are at stake.

The Kilmer Job Corps Center was scheduled to celebrate its 4th anniversary yesterday, but since Secretary Shultz's announcement, there was no happy celebration, because a dream has perished.

One Kilmer corpsman had this to say when the closing was announced: "The Job Corps has given us a chance to reach an attainable goal. We have always heard to get a good job, we need a good education and now our future is threatened just as we were beginning to believe this." I'm sure that most of the enrollees feel the same way and 98% of the letters and telegrams I have received believe that the Kilmer Center should remain open. After visiting the Kilmer Center several times, I also believe with all my heart that it should not close. It has achieved so much—and would accomplish so much more in the future.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I want to request that editorials opposing the Job Corps cut be included in the record. From: the New York Times; the Washington Post; the Home News (of New Brunswick, N.J.); and a very moving and poignant article from the Home News entitled, "They're Closing Our Chance, Corpsmen Cry."

I would also like to insert general information on the operations of the Kilmer Job Corps Center. (See att.) It is a proud record—a record that should be continued. It is not too late for us to win this important and far-reaching fight, Mr. Chairman. It must be won!

Thank you for giving me the chance to testify before you today.

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE KILMER JOB CORPS

The Kilmer Job Corps Center, operated by ITT's world-wide service associate, Federal Electric Corp., under contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity, is an outstanding example of the private sector, in partnership with the Federal Government, fighting one of the most serious battles this Nation ever faced—the War Against Poverty.

This Center, operated on a portion of the former Camp Kilmer Army Base, which gained its initial fame during World War II as a major Port of Embarkation for more than 4,500,000 troops going to and returning from the European Theater of Operations—and later as the major haven and reception center for the thousands of Hungarian refugees who fled from under the yoke of communist oppression in 1965, has once again become a refuge for the oppressed and disadvantaged—the thousands of inner-city and rural youths who have learned a meaningful trade and become productive, tax-paying members of our society.

Kilmer received its first busload of corpsmen on Feb. 11, 1965. Both these young men and the community in which they settled had a major job adjusting to each other. No one denies the first few months—even the first year—was a difficult time for both.

But adjust they did. Soon the residents in the community were inviting these young men into their homes for Sunday dinners and the weekend. The trainees, in turn, were assisting the community by such projects as sponsoring a local baseball team for youngsters in the area, assisting the United Fund and March of Dimes through voluntary clerical and audio-visual work, making contributions to the Cerebral Palsy Center and serving as advisers to a Salvation Army sponsored Boy Scout Troop in the inner-city of New Brunswick.

They aided the Middlesex County Economic Opportunity Corp., the local Community Action Program by painting and refurbishing some of its neighborhood multi-service centers.

New Brunswick became the first city in the Nation to acquire a former National Guard Armory and the Job Corpsmen went to work immediately rehabilitating it for the community's use. The nearby borough of Metuchen, although not visited frequently by off-duty corpsmen, found it had friends at Kilmer when the Explorer Scout Posts at the center voluntarily assisted the borough in the preparation of a 10-acre parksite. The Mayor and Council responded in kind by hosting a dinner and special presentation of certificates of award to the corpsmen at one of their regular council meetings.

There have been close to 5,000 graduates and more than 4,000 job placements since the first corpsman graduated.

In an average training period of 7 or 8 months, Kilmer Job corpsmen are prepared for entry level jobs in some 14 trades. These trades, through a system of benefit-cost analysis developed at Kilmer, are constantly checked for maximum anticipated wages in return for dollars spent in training.

The benefit-cost ratio for electrical construction, for example, is 2.65 to 1. This means that for every dollar spent on training a corpsman in this trade, he will have earned an estimated $2.65 over a period of 5 years, beyond what he would have earned without this training.

Welding has a ratio of 3.04 to 1; machine shop (because it is one of the longer programs) has a ratio of 1.93 to 1. Light truck driving is 3.16 to 1; and if a corpsman elects to continue for an additional 12 weeks of training to become a tractor-trailer operator, the benefit-cost ratio rises to 5.28 to 1.

Kilmer is truly a place where the individual has the opportunity to change his life from one of failure to success. There is a sign at Kilmer which reads: "Any Boy Can Join The Job Corps: It Takes a Man To Stick With It."

The center's 14 vocational areas, reading centers, academic training, athletic and recreational facilities, in addition to its Student Government House of Representatives and residential living complex, guided group interaction, medical, dental and counseling services, provide a complete 24-hour day program for the corpsmen.

Perhaps the most unique of all the vocational areas is the Job Corps Police Training School at Kilmer, operated by the National Conference on PAL and Youth Activities (Police Athletic League), with Federal Electric Corp. supplying support services including academic teaching and counselling services. This program is expected to provide a major breakthrough in police-community relations, by taking young men out of the ghetto for training in law enforcement and returning them to the inner-cities to bridge the gap between the police officers and the disadvantaged.

The impact Kilmer has had upon the community must also be considered. Kilmer's annual payroll pumps $4,780,865 into the local economy. The corpsmen's allowances provide for an additional $46,000 per month, much of it spent locally.

During 1968, the Job Corps Center spent $832,954 in Middlesex County alone with its general vendors. In addition, $53,197 was spent in the 15th Congressional District for physicians and dentists. Local hospitals in the county received $48,435 for services rendered in 1968.

Center employees and Federal Electric contribute substantially to various charitable organizations, including the United Fund, local first aid squads and fire companies.

Kilmer, as well as the Job Corps and the entire anti-poverty program, has not been able to solve all of its problems in four short years, but it is testing and finding the new approaches we need to help our disadvantaged young citizens to find dignity and a sense of place in our abundant society.

Kilmer has its own dropouts. But it should be remembered that almost 100% of these young men were dropouts from the public school system and society before they enrolled at Kilmer.

Nearly half of the freshmen who enter our nation's colleges and universities do not complete their training. At Kilmer, about 45% do not complete a program.

It should also be remembered that more than 60% of Kilmer's corpsmen who were unable to earn more than an average of $639 per year in part-time, lowest level jobs, are now employed and doing very well on their jobs, receiving starting salaries of nearly $2.00 per hour.

The cost per corpsman year at Kilmer is presently running about $5,700. However, this is for 24-hour-per-day, seven day per week, overcoming generations of deprivation, poverty, ignorance and prejudice.

As the Kilmer Job Corps Center of Edison, N.J. observes its 4th anniversary, many Americans salute its corpsmen, staff and management, and the American public, for helping to make the dream of nearly 5,000 young men come true in the great American tradition.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1969]

REORGANIZING THE JOB CORPS

Of the many programs in the war on poverty, the Job Corps was the least controversial in concept but has proved one of the most controversial in practice. Theoretically, it seemed ideal to move slum youths out of their dead-end environments and give them a fresh start in remote camps. They would be away from bad companions, destructive temptations and the scene of past failures.

Practically, however, the high dropout rate of Job Corps enlistees of both sexes suggests that many of these young persons found a radical change of environment more demoralizing than helpful. There were other sources of difficulty. The Government contracted with private business to do the actual training, but some of the nation's most prestigious industrial firms proved unimpressive in imparting usable skills to slum youngsters. Some critics have also argued that, although the conservation centers are doing useful work in the care of natural resources, these centers are not preparing enlistees for jobs in a highly technical economy.

The Job Corps has had its successes. The record is not entirely bleak. The question is whether the money spent on the existing program could achieve better results if spent otherwise. It is not clear that the Nixon Administration has correctly asked or answered this question. It reportedly proposes to shut down more than half of the conservation centers, six women's centers and two large camps for young men, thereby gradually reducing the Job Corps to half its present enrollment of 735,000 and saving $100-million.

But the point is to save lives, not dollars. If hundreds of thousands of untrained, ill-educated youth drift into the stagnant pool of unemployables, they will cost the nation much more in the long run in crime, drug addiction and higher welfare costs. More small training centers in the cities are envisaged but the over-all effect still is to scale down the job training program. That is not a good enough answer.

While President Nixon and his advisers ponder how to make good on his promise of last year to get the unemployed "off the welfare rolls and on the payrolls," it is imperative that a high level of employment be sustained. No job training program can produce results if a recession occurs and the students cannot see a job waiting for them at the end of the course.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 11, 1969]

AXING THE JOB CORPS

Seven weeks ago when President Nixon announced his intention to reorganize the Federal war on poverty, he suggested that "we often can learn more from a program that fails to achieve its purpose than from one that succeeds." That sounded fine. However, the Administration's action in deciding to close down 57 Job Corps centers in one swoop suggests that not enough effort was invested in finding out what had succeeded and what had failed.

It appears that centers were selected for closing largely on the basis of statistical data on performance and cost. The centers themselves were not inspected, nor were the center directors and Job Corps officials consulted. It was a policy decision at a high level, clearly foreshadowed by Mr. Nixon's condemnation of the Job Corps program during the presidential campaign. Already the Administration has decided to back down on its decision to close the women's center at Cleveland, and complaints have been received about the closing of many of the other centers. The action slashes Job Corps rolls by 17,000 young men and women by July 1. Anyone still enrolled in a closed center at that time will be transferred to one of the remaining centers, we are assured. But this will only partly ease the impact on those youths whose hopes had been raised by the Job Corps program.

It appears that economy was the primary motivating force in deciding which centers should be closed down, but it is questionable how much of the projected savings will be realized when the cost of shutting down the existing centers is considered. Also, there is some doubt about how economically the Labor Department will be able to run the 30 mini-centers that will now be opened in urban areas. One thing the Job Corps has learned is that much of its overhead cost is fixed and that small centers tend to be proportionately more expensive. The decision to shift away from rural conservation centers toward urban centers where the disadvantaged youth are seems logical, but it does not explain why some existing urban centers were closed too.

The furor created by the decision to close the Cleveland center caused the Administration to take a second look. A second look is in order for many of the other centers as well in view of the way they were selected for closing.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Daily Home News, Apr. 11, 1969]

KILMER JOB CORPS CENTER TO CLOSE?

We find hard to understand President Nixon's intended decision to close the Kilmer Job Corps Center as part of an administration program to redirect the war on poverty.

The executive order which will make the Nixon move official is expected today. That order will direct that eight large urban Job Corps centers be closed down, displacing about half of the 35,000 young men enrolled at the locations.

In their stead, the administration is planning to construct 20 to 30 "skill centers" near urban centers to provide daytime vocational training. The Job Corps Centers provide residential programs.

Congressional reaction to the President's decision has been swift. New Jersey's Sen. Harrison A. Williams and Rep. Edward J. Patten both criticized the decision strongly.

On Wednesday, Patten sent a letter to Nixon stating he was "shocked and appalled" to hear "strong and persistent rumors" in Washington that Kilmer would be closed.

We have no quarrel with the administration on the count that some of the centers have not been living up to expectations. The President himself, in an earlier message to Congress, said programs which had not fulfilled their mission should not be overly criticized because everything which is being tried in the area of poverty was frankly an experiment and spectacular results could not be expected.

But in the case of Kilmer, this is hardly true. After some false starts and local criticism of the program by municipal leaders, the Job Corps center has settled down into what Rep. Patten quite rightly described last week as a "showpiece."

The center will shortly graduate its 5,000th trainee. Of those 5,000 men, 4,500 have been placed in jobs. One should not quarrel with statistics, and these statistics in particular attest to the smashing success of the Kilmer program.

We urge the Nixon administration to reconsider what we feel is a most hasty decision in regards to Kilmer. And if Nixon does not change his mind, perhaps the Congress will be able to do it for him.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Daily Home News, Apr. 11, 1969]

THEY'RE CLOSING OUR CHANCE, CORPSMEN CRY

"The man is trying to keep us down," the black Job Corpsman at Camp Kilmer said.

"O! Giving a guy a chance and then taking it away from him is worse than not giving him a chance at all," the white teen-ager from North Carolina said.

"The Puerto Ricans and Negroes are getting a break right here. Now they are trying to take this away from us," the Puerto Rican youth declared.

That generally was the reaction yesterday from many corpsmen at Camp Kilmer, when word spread that the Nixon administration plans to close the 300-acre center at the end of June.

Some of the corpsmen plan to conduct a demonstration in front of the Kilmer administration building today. The youths, early last evening, began spreading the word to others about the 'peaceful' demonstration. Plans are for them to wear white tee shirts with the letters KKO—"Keep Kilmer Open"—stencilled across the front.

"Tell your boys no violence," one of the teen-age leaders told others at a meeting with an instruction building at the former Army post.

"We got to prove that we came here to get an education and that we are getting it," he said. "We got to fight them back with the education they gave us, not with fists and bats.

"We came here all rough and tough. We came here to change and we did. We got to show them. We got to sit down and work with our minds on how to fight this. Then, you'll see, a lot of people are going to come in and help us."

The Kilmer Center, opened in February, 1965, is among 65 Job Corps facilities that are to be closed June 30. Officials of the U.S. Department of Labor were to make this official at a news conference in Washington today.

Closing of the 65 centers and their replacement with 20 to 30 "skill centers" near slum areas reportedly will save the federal government about $100 million. The Kilmer Operation runs almost $9 million annually.

"If they can spend millions on Vietnam and millions for nuclear research, they can spend a little money on keeping this place going," 18-year-old Noel Parsons of the Bronx, said yesterday.

DOESN'T MAKE SENSE

"It just doesn't make any sense," he declared. "A kid drops out of school and the people say 'get him off the street, get him off the street'. So they send him here and he begins to make it. Then they say they are going to put him out. What do they want us to do?"

Many of the corpsmen interviewed yesterday said that if all efforts to keep the center open fail, they would refuse to leave when it closes.

"Let them send the National Guard to get us out," one youth said.

Another declared: "If we can't do anything by June 30, all we have to do is just sit down. What can they do to us? The whole world will be watching. Maybe it won't have to go that far. I hope not."

D. L. Webber, director of the center conferred in Trenton yesterday with representatives of the governor.

NO OFFICIAL WORD

"We are all working toward the same end: To keep Kilmer open," he said.

As of late yesterday, Webber said he still had not received any official word that the center is destined to close.

"I think we have been doing some good, and making some deep inroads into a deep-rooted problem," he said.

He was asked about criticism from members of the Nixon administration, who reportedly have complained that the cost for training each corpsman far exceeds the benefits derived.

The cost for training each youth at Kilmer is more than $5,000 a year.

"Who can measure how much is too much? I don't know what it takes to keep a guy in prison. This is a matter of a potential dreg on society versus a productive citizen," Webber commented.

SOME 1,662 AT CENTER

There are 1,662 trainees at the center, which has 577 full-time employes and 78 part-time workers. Of the 13,000 trainees since it opened four years ago, there have been almost 5,000 graduated.

"Nixon is just throwing our lives away—1,700 lives," a corpsman said yesterday.

U.S. Sen. Harrison A. Williams and Rep. Edward J. Patten were among the first to hit at plans to close the camp.

They were joined by other members of Congress yesterday including Rep. Frank Thompson, D–N.J., and Sen. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., but their protests appeared to have no effect on the move to close the Job Corps centers, including eight large urban units and 57 rural conservation camps, the Associated Press reported.

KENNEDY PROTESTS

Kennedy, Democratic Senate whip, said the cuts in the Job Corps program "would be a cruel disappointment to thousands of Americans who have never had a chance, a blow to the antipoverty effort, and a potential disaster for our troubled cities and disadvantaged communities.

Gus Costales, a 17-year-old corpsman from Manhattan, echoed some of the concern expressed by Kennedy. "Now that they have a chance to make decent people out of us," he asserted, "they are taking this place away from us. What is going to happen when all these guys are let loose on the streets?"

Thomas Chorba, an English teacher at Kilmer, called the decision to close the center "A big mistake." He said, "Let's face it. We don't reach every person that comes in here. Perhaps, only about one in every three. Maybe our methods could be changed but the idea is right."

HITS NEW BRUNSWICK ATTITUDE

Only one of the corpsmen interviewed yesterday by The Daily Home News said he favored the shutdown. Gary Lucas, 21, of Boston, Mass., contended that people in communities surrounding Kilmer, "especially, New Brunswick," don't "like" the corpsmen and therefore the center should be relocated "further out somewhere."

Other trainees pointed out that they didn't care how people in the community reacted, that they only were concerned about the trades they were being taught.

"I don't want to go back to being a nobody. I want to be something in life, Robert Donatto, 19, of Opelousas, La., said.

Lamont Kidd, 19, of Manhattan, stated: "I feel like Nixon is making a great mistake. This is the last chance for the men and women in the Job Corps."

"NEVER HAD TO STEAL"

Another youth said many people lacked compassion for job corpsmen. "They can't put themselves in our place because a lot of them were born with a silver platter. They never had to go out and steal . . . These people don't understand what it is to fight for a living."

Another teen-ager said, "They talk about how they want to solve crime. Is this going to solve crime?"

One corpsman declared: "I dropped out of school when I was 17 and still in the eighth grade. I've learned more at the Job Corps than in all my years in school. If they put me out of here now, where do I go?"

"The fate of the kids. That's the bad part about this whole thing," Webber said.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Daily Home News, Apr. 18, 1969]

STUDY SAYS CORPS PAID OFF

WASHINGTON,—A new study that says Job Corps graduates earn $1,000 a year more than nontrainees has added fuel to the controversy swirling over President Nixon's plan to reduce the training program drastically.

The 82-page study, prepared for the Office of Economic Opportunity by pollster Louis Harris, was presented Thursday to the House Education and Labor Committee where Democrats are fighting Nixon's order to shut down 59 of the 113 Job Corps centers.

Harris, who said he was paid $300,000 to prepare the study, said it was the most exhaustive review ever made of the Job Corps.

The study concentrated on the earnings of Job Corps enrollees before and after their training compared to youths in similar age groups who received only part of the training or dropped out of the corps.

Harris said one of the most significant findings in the study was that earnings of Job Corps graduates six months after their training averaged $1,147 a year higher than before they entered the program. Those who dropped out, were earning only $685 a year more than six months later.

"By any measure," said Harris, "the study shows that the Job Corps has had a positive impact on these youths."

"The question you have to answer," he told the congressmen, "is what it is worth to produce this kind of impact? What we have shown is that, indeed, there is an impact."

But, he said, the program's impact fades and by the end of a year after graduation the earning power of those who complete the course and those who drop out is virtually even.

However, Rep. Carl D. Perkins, the Kentucky Democrat who heads the Education and Labor Committee, said "If all the members of Congress could get the benefit of this report we could rest our case on it."

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Sunday Home News, Apr. 20, 1969]

JOB CORPS HEAD SAYS HE WAS IN THE DARK

WASHINGTON.—D. L. Webber, director of the Camp Kilmer Job Corps Center at Edison, N.J., said Saturday he never had been told what information the Department of Labor used in deciding to close the center.

Webber was one of several Job Corps center directors appearing before the House Education and Labor Committee after it was disclosed the administration had ordered an immediate start on closing of seven of 59 centers due to be shut down by June 30.

Directors of the centers who appeared Saturday told Congress their centers are doing a good job and should be kept open.

LED OTHERS

Webber gave the committee official OEO figures showing that last year Kilmer led all other urban centers in the percentage of its enrollees completing the training program. "The center also ranks high in job placement, math and reading improvement and comparative costs," he said.

"On the basis of these figures," he said, "it is difficult to understand why Kilmer was selected to be closed—thereby leaving the heavily populated northeastern region of the United States without a single men's urban center."

EFFECTIVE

Kilmer is operated under contract by the International Telephone and Telegraph Corp. and Webber said it demonstrated the effectiveness of government and industry working together on national problems.

"In my opinion," he said, "the Job Corps represents a landmark achievement and an effective as well as exciting, new approach to the solution of serious social and economic problems."

Roosevelt Dunning, commander of the police training school at the Kilmer Center, said it was designed to bridge the gap between the police and ghetto residents by bringing disadvantaged young Negroes into police departments.

"Upon completion of this training," he said, "these young men will bring to any police department not only their professional training, but more importantly, the ability to understand the people with whom they are to work."

Dunning said he feels the Job Corps represents "America's strongest commitment to its poor and disadvantaged and that it should be continued."

UNITED STATES BETRAYS U.N. EMBARGO OF SOUTH AFRICAN JET SERVICE

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

UNITED STATES BETRAYS U.N. EMBARGO OF SOUTH AFRICAN JET SERVICE

(By Winston Berry)

UNITED NATIONS.—Just before midnight on a cold Feb. 23rd, a jet aircraft of the South African Airways landed in the snow at New York's Kennedy International Airport.

By allowing this plane to land, the United States has thumbed its nose at the United Nations resolution of 1962 which requested all member states not to grant landing rights to any aircraft, public or private, operated under the flag of the racist South African regime.

And by not acting to repeal a Civil Aeronautics Board decision to grant landing rights to South Africa, President Richard M. Nixon has insulted the entire non-white world.

However, it is to the credit of the black community of New York and the American Committee of Africa that they "greeted" the plane with a picketline.

For three hours about 100 black youths, joined by a number of white supporters, picketed in the slushy street in front of the airport's arrivals building.

Placards denounced the U.S. assistance to the regime that has become infamous for its anti-black police state laws.

The shameful spectacle of an aircraft landing in New York from a country that would refuse admittance to all black Americans resulted from cooperation between the U.S. and Britain.

British Overseas Airways Corporation furnished facilities at the air terminal for the South Africans.

It was the outgoing Johnson Administration that pushed the U.S.-South African decision through CAB in secret hearings last year.

In November, President Johnson signed the decision, authorizing South Africa to carry persons, property and mail between Johannesburg and New York by way of Rio de Janeiro.

Thus exactly six years after a majority of the nations of the world had agreed to quarantine South African racism, the United States gave it a big boost.

Four days before the South African service to New York was initiated, the UN Committee on Apartheid called the attention of Secretary-General U Thant to the matter, pointing out that landing rights have also been granted South Africa by Australia, Botswana, West Germany, France, Greece, Italy, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.

President Nixon was not compelled to honor the Johnson Administration's decision. Indeed, he did order reopened the CAB decision granting extension in the Pacific to certain airlines.

But he "forgot" this CAB decision that honored the international symbol of racism—South Africa.

Now the South Africans have an easy means of attracting American tourists. But it is not American tourist dollars that motivates the South African government; it is propaganda.

Who can calculate the propaganda value of 5,000 white Americans, many of whom will undoubtedly be racists, visiting South Africa every year?

South Africa's racist message will have another outlet, and the moral isolation imposed by the United Nations will have been broken.

Just as the Johnson Administration sneaked through the decision to allow landing rights, the airport officials on the night of Feb. 23 sneaked the South African plane and its passengers into the terminal. No announcement of its arrival was made.

A bus met the 19 passengers—the plane can seat 139—and ferried them directly to a secret customs processing.

One youth, apparently acting out of anger and frustration, snatched the South African flag from the terminal mezzanine and carried it outside where other demonstrators stomped it into the slush.

Not one word of the incident appeared in the New York papers the following day.

Maybe, if the plans for future "greetings" and "sendoffs" are carried out by the black community, President Nixon will have to reconsider his decision and the South African jets will have to sneak out as cowardly as the first one sneaked in.

HON. DAN W. TURNER, FORMER GOVERNOR OF IOWA

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, last week Dan W. Turner, former Governor of Iowa, died in Corning, Iowa, at the age of 92. A forthright public speaker, he had served in the State senate as well as in the governorship. In various capacities he had served his country in three wars.

Governor Turner was deeply concerned over the plight of the American farmer and fought for agricultural relief during the depression. Later he was an organizer of the National Farmers' Organization. Along with his agricultural interests, he operated a bank and country store.

Governor Turner's dedicated public and private service furthered the development of the State of Iowa. On behalf of many Iowans who will miss him, I extend heartfelt sympathy to his family and his many friends.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following article from the Des Moines Register, of April 16, concerning Governor Turner:

TURNER, IOWA GOVERNOR IN THE 1930'S, DIES: COURAGEOUS LEADER IN DEPRESSION

(By George Mills)

Dan Turner, courageous governor of Iowa during the turbulent depression years of 1931–1933, died Tuesday afternoon at Rosary Hospital in Corning. He was 92.

The venerable Iowa elder statesman, who lived in Corning all his life, entered the hospital late in March. Death was due to infirmities of age.

Services will be at 2 p.m. Friday at First Presbyterian Church at Corning. Burial will be at Walnut Grove Cemetery.

A FIGHTER

Mr. Turner was a Republican. But he was a fighter who made up his own mind during a tempestuous career that started during the depression of the 1890s.

He fought many of his battles for the cause of the farmer. Frequently, conservative Republicans were his opponents. He battled with President Herbert Hoover during the 1930s over the collapse of farm prices. He blistered Ezra Taft Benson, Dwight Eisenhower's secretary of agriculture, during the 1950s.

Centered in his lifetime was much of the excitement, frustration, and progress of the entire Twentieth Century era in Iowa.

He was a key man in the organization of the National Farmers Organization (N.F.O.) in 1955. Characteristically, he had differences with the N.F.O. leadership.

As a young state senator in 1903, he became part of Gov. Albert Cummins' team of "Progressives" which finally broke dominance of the railroads over Iowa politics.

During his one term as governor occurred the so-called "cow war" in eastern Iowa.

CALLED OUT GUARD

That "war" consisted of an uprising of farmers who objected to mandatory testing of cattle for tuberculosis. Mr. Turner had to call out the National Guard, which converged on Tipton to guard veterinarians charged with the task of cattle-testing.

Also while he was governor, the worst agricultural depression of modern times deepened, as did the widespread business and industrial depression.

Governor Turner made two trips to Washington, where he warned President Hoover that something had to be done to halt the downward trend which engulfed banks by the hundreds, resulted in tens of thousands of Iowans losing their farms through foreclosure, brought corn down to 12 cents a bushel and saw unemployment grow to disastrous proportions.

Mr. Hoover, however, did not believe the situation was quite as bad as painted by the plain-speaking Iowa governor.

The election of 1932 followed and both Mr. Hoover and Mr. Turner went down to defeat in a Democratic landslide.

Mr. Turner was a Corning merchant originally and an Adams County farmer with large holdings.

He was born Mar. 17, 1877, on a farm near Corning. In addition to farm chores, he clerked as a boy in a general store opened by his father in 1868.

LIBERAL TENDENCIES

The elder Turner was a Civil War veteran and a rockbound Republican, and was troubled at times by his son's apparently liberal tendencies.

"Don't stray too far from the bugle, boy," the father warned. In those days, most war veterans believed you had to be a Republican to be a loyal American.

The late governor's full name was Daniel Webster Turner, but he never was known as anything but Dan W. Turner.

Shortly after his graduation from the old Corning Academy in 1898, he enlisted in the Army for service in the Spanish-American war. He served in the Philippines.

His fighting qualities included expertness with his fists. He won the boxing championship of his division, although he suffered a broken nose that remained a facial characteristic the rest of his life.

He joined the Iowa National Guard when he came home and rose to the rank of major before resigning 10 years later.

Mr. Turner was elected state senator from the old Adams-Taylor district in 1903. He was 26 years old, the youngest Iowan ever elected to the Senate up to that time.

CONSTANT WARFARE

He served six years in the Senate as a member of the Progressives, who engaged in constant warfare with the "Standpatters" for control of the Republican Party.

While he was a senator, the Progressives forced the adoption of the direct primary for nominating major party candidates for office. The practice of railroads corrupting politicians and others with free passes also came to an end.

He was one of the finest public speakers of his time and he keynoted Republican state conventions three times.

During World War I he served as a Y.M.C.A. secretary in France. In World War II he worked with the War Production Board in Washington.

Agriculture was in deep trouble in 1928. Prices were low and many banks already had been forced to close beginning with the collapse that took place in rural areas beginning in 1920.

LEFT CONVENTION

By 1928 Mr. Turner, the late Henry A. Wallace and other irked Midwestern farm leaders went to the Republican National Convention in Kansas City, Mo., to demand support for agricultural relief.

Mr. Wallace left that convention and became a Democrat. He later was U.S. secretary of agriculture and vice-president under Franklin Roosevelt.

Mr. Turner was one of four speakers at the Kansas City convention who demanded greater Republican recognition and support for the farmer. He helped draft a minority report setting out such a goal. The convention nominated Mr. Hoover. Mr. Turner decided to stay with the party.

In 1930 he ran for the Republican nomination for governor. He won the nomination and was elected.

A key plank in his platform was adoption of a state income tax as a form of "property tax relief." The 1931 Legislature did not enact such a law, but the 1933–1934 Legislature did, and a sales and corporation tax as well.

Mr. Turner won election by 2–1 in 1930 over the late Fred Hagemann, a Waverly Democrat. The vote was Turner 364,000, Hagemann 184,000.

DAYS NUMBERED

Republican days were numbered in 1932, however. Roosevelt carried Iowa for president by 184,000 votes that year, and the margin helped the late Clyde L. Herring, a Democrat, to defeat Mr. Turner by 53,000 votes.

Mr. Turner came back in 1934 to win a bitter battle for the Republican nomination for governor over Robert Colflesh of Des Moines, Clarence Knutson of Clear Lake and Wallace Short of Sioux City.

Mr. Turner campaigned against the sales tax that year. But the Democratic tide was still strong and Mr. Herring was re-elected by 74,000 votes.

Mr. Turner never ran for office again, although southwestern Iowa Republicans always felt that he could have been elected to Congress from the Seventh Congressional district had he wanted to become a candidate. Some Republicans who did not see eye-to-eye with him were just as glad that he did not run.

One mark of his independent thinking was his activity in behalf of Republican Eisenhower for president in the 1952 election and his backing for Democrat Adlai Stevenson for president against Eisenhower in 1956.

Mr. Turner was the oldest of eight living former governors of Iowa.

His death leaves former Senator Bourke Hickenlooper as the dean of former governors. He served from 1943 to 1945.

CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 1969

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today legislation to eliminate dangerous toys from the marketplace.

This important legislation is a result of work done by the National Commission on Product Safety. The Commission has considered the effect of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, as amended by the Child Protection Act of 1966, and found serious shortcomings. Briefly, these are:

First. The present legislation is effectively limited to hazards caused by pressurized and flammable toys and other articles intended for use by children. Mechanical, electrical, and thermal hazards are not covered.

Second. Even with these additions, there is a serious question of whether the Hazardous Substances Act is the proper legislative vehicle to provide safety in design of toys and other articles used by children.

Third. There is also serious doubt as to whether that act is being fully and properly enforced.

This proposed legislation is, therefore, an interim measure, suggested by the Product Safety Commission to cover the more obvious omissions of present law. When the Commission completes its work, or even before that time, I hope that we can consider a more comprehensive bill, drawing on the Commission's excellent work, to provide better protection for children.

The bill I introduce today covers only the first point raised above: extension of the present legislation on hazards to include mechanical, electrical, and thermal.

It authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Food and Drug Administration, to ban as hazardous those toys and other products used by children which possess mechanical, electrical, and thermal qualities which are intrinsically dangerous. It does not allow premarketing control of such products, which might be desirable but which the Hazardous Substances Act does not allow either for the products already covered. Instead, the Secretary, following established administrative procedures, would ban such dangerous products after they appear in the marketplace.

Such interim and limited coverage will, nonetheless, provide important protection, according to the testimony heard by the Product Safety Commission.

CHEMISTRY SETS

The Commission report on this interim legislation told this story:

> Testifying at Commission hearings in Boston, Mr. Morris Kaplan, Technical Director of Consumers' Union, presented the Commission with an array of toys which had proven defective and unreasonably dangerous according to standards of that organization. He recalled items previously judged by Consumers' Union to be "Not Acceptable", including:
>
> (i) Three models (of electronic science kits) . . . used regular house current, stepped down in voltage by means of a transformer. But there still were dangerously live terminals that were either exposed or easily gotten at.
>
> (ii) A sled we tested had sharp-edge hooks on the ends of the runners that made them dangerous.
>
> (iii) Chemistry sets were found with inadequate or nonexistent caution labels.
>
> (iv) A compressed air bazooka gun toy, no longer being made, that produced sound levels of 157dB, 1 foot from the muzzle and 145dB at the place where the child's ear would be when he fired the gun, enough to cause concern about permanent impairment of a child's hearing.
>
> (v) Jequirity beans in necklaces, jewelry, rosaries and dolls' eyes. A single bead, chewed and swallowed by a child might be fatal. Only two weeks ago, some jewelry that used such beans was voluntarily recalled by one company that had been selling it.
>
> (vi) Sharp stones in baby rattles that are easily broken.
>
> (vii) Baby teethers containing water contaminated with coliform bacteria inside the plastic ring. This, though not in itself a serious health hazard, is a generally accepted signal of unsanitary handling during manufacture that might just as easily result in dangerous contamination.
>
> (viii) A toy containing a non-toxic aluminum powder mixed with plastic pellets and used as an easily erasable sketching. Its easily shattered glass cover plate could be mistaken for an unbreakable plastic covering.

VOLUNTARY STANDARDS

Commenting on this situation, the Commission report added:

> Mr. Kaplan noted that a number of the items were already covered by the 1966 amendments to the Federal Hazardous Substances Act and could therefore no longer be sold legally:
>
> "But most of them are not covered by the Act since it excludes *physical* hazards. Furthermore the regulations under the Act have exempted a number of products, such as chemistry sets, on the assumption that they would be used by older children and with the approval of a knowing parent, an assumption that is at least questionable."

Can we rely on voluntary standards of the toymakers? The Commission report states:

> In addressing himself to the question of need for such legislation in light of the activities of voluntary standards groups, Mr. Kaplan expressed his disillusionment with those groups. The deliberative processes involved in voluntary standards-making were characterized as long and drawn out; and their end results minimal. In referring to the safety Standards Committee of the Toy Manufacturers of America, Mr. Kaplan noted that the Committee claims to work in conjunction with the National Safety Council to eliminate specific hazards in toys which have been brought to its attention by members of the consuming public. Yet, he has been consistently unsuccessful in his efforts to ascertain what the safety requirements of the Safety Standards Committee are, how they are established, and how they are enforced:
>
> "Nor am I aware of any efforts by the manufacturers of toys we consider unsafe, nor of the Association to do any thing about them; nor might I add has the National Safety Council's Committee on toys ever looked into our findings, and this in spite of the fact that they indicate that they use all sources of input to find unsafe toys.
>
> "We have been publishing reports on toys for many, many years. In no instance am I aware of the National Safety Council's taking any action with regard to those published reports."

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, will not solve all problems of hazardous toys or other objects used by children. Even when we pass this bill, which I hope will be soon, we will be dealing with a defective instrument in an important area of public health and safety.

Good consumer protection will not come from more patchwork laws, from more agencies involved in more scattered programs, or from the generally uncoordinated approach we take in the Federal Government to consumer protection.

But until we establish the proper mechanism for consumer protection—which I believe must be a Department of Consumer Affairs—we must proceed as best we can with the important, if interim solutions, represented by the Child Protection Act of 1969.

SHOULD CHURCHES BE ALLOWED TO DO BUSINESS TAX FREE?

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a former Member of this body, O. K. Armstrong, who is now a member of the editorial staff of the Reader's Digest, recently had published in the March edition of that periodical an article entitled "Should Churches Be Allowed To Do Business Tax Free?"

In his writings, my friend, fellow churchman, and former patient, presents a discussion of the church's new-found roll in the world of business and offers some arguments on why they should be taxed on the same basis as any other enterprise.

I commend this article to all Members and citizens interested in the pressing problem of tax reform, and include it in the RECORD:

SHOULD CHURCHES BE ALLOWED TO DO BUSINESS TAX FREE?

(By O. K. Armstrong)

In 1952 three churches of Bloomington, Ill.—the First Baptist, the First Christian and the Second Presbyterian—bought the Biltmore Hotel in Dayton, Ohio, for $3,500,000, mostly on credit. They then leased back the hotel to a firm made up principally of the original owners. This firm operated it, paying the churches $250,000 annual rent. For the churches, this was tax-exempt income, and they used part of it to pay off the purchase.

This type of transaction is often called a "bootstrap sale," because in effect the business buys itself. The advantages? As tax expert H. Vernon Scott has pointed out in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee: 1) The seller is able to ask a higher price for his business than he could get elsewhere, and so realizes a big profit—taxed at the low capital-gains rate. 2) The leasing corporation gets a high return on a small investment. 3) The church gets a profitable business—and the income, tax-free—with no risk and little if any investment. Everyone benefits except the government, which loses a source of tax revenue, and all citizen-taxpayers, who must take up the slack.

The whole procedure is entirely legal. It is a tax-avoidance plan for the business enterprise, which the church covers with the blanket of its own tax exemption. The Internal Revenue Code specifically permits churches—unlike other tax-exempt organizations such as orphanages, charitable foundations and hospitals—to engage in competitive, money-making businesses, unrelated to their religious purposes, without paying one cent of income tax. Further, churches are excused from filing any disclosure of properties or income of any kind.

Taking advantage of these provisions, numerous churches and religious orders have plunged into the world of business—by lease-back arrangements, by use of "feeder" corporations (set up to run a business and give all profits to the church), by direct ownership and operation of commercial ventures. They now own business blocks in every major city. They own apartments, restaurants, radio stations, manufacturing and food-processing plants, racetracks, even liquor stores. They produce plastics, textiles, dairy products, tires, trucks, fishing lures. And the profits are all tax-free.

Behind the Favorable Discrimination. According to the 1968 *Yearbook of American Churches,* there are about 240 religious bodies in the United States. They have a total membership of about 124 million—or 62 percent of all Americans. The members worship in some 330,000 sanctuaries, from cathedrals to small houses, and give an estimated $9 billion a year to these headquarters.

The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution prohibits the government from passing laws "respecting an establishment of religion." And since the power to tax implies some power of control, traditionally houses of worship have never been taxed in America. Moreover, all 50 states and the District of Columbia specifically exempt from property taxation all sanctuaries and other facilities used for religious purposes.

However, property—whether real or personal—used by churches for competitive business enterprises has no constitutional basis for exemption from taxation. The laws which permit this favorable discrimination can be changed, and many responsible religious leaders, as well as many overburdened taxpayers, now urge that it be done.

Church business ventures generally fall into one or more of these three categories:

1. Real Estate. By analyzing the tax rolls in 14 U.S. cities and extrapolating from those figures, Dr. Martin A. Larson, author of the authoritative *Church Wealth and Business Income,* has estimated the value of tax-exempt church property in 1968 at $102.5 billion—up 26 percent in the last four years. Larson computes that this item alone, the tax exemption on real estate, cost U.S. taxpayers $2.2 billion last year!

In some states, church-owned businesses do pay a property tax; in others, they are exempt even from this assessment. Many churches have acquired large tracts of real estate. In 1939, a church purchased a 121-acre tract near New Britain, Conn., and after one body was buried in the tract, the land was classified as a cemetery, which reduced its taxes. In 27 years, the land appreciated in value many times over. All but ten acres of it was then sold to the city, at a high profit to the church—completely exempt from capital-gains taxes.

In downtown Chicago stands the 22-story Chicago Temple, owned by the Methodist Church. Several lower floors are used for worship and church-related purposes; the other floors are rented for commercial use. The Methodist Church pays a property tax on the commercial portion of the building—but no federal income tax on the rent receipts of $250,000 a year.

Many church-related colleges have state charters stipulating that their properties shall remain forever tax-free. William Jewell College, for example, a Baptist-related school at Liberty, Mo., owns business realty in many Missouri communities—all tax-exempt.

Hundreds of such investments are speeding the erosion of the tax base in communities across the country, at a time when the revenue need for schools and other essential public services has become acute. "If the trend is not checked, we may expect half or more of all property to be tax-exempt within 25 years—and more than half of that will belong to churches," says C. Stanley Lowell, associate director of Americans United for Separation of Church & State.

2. Profit-Making Enterprises. Each year, churches acquire millions of dollars' worth of property through gifts and bequests: securities, real estate, thriving businesses. Their tax-exemption advantage makes it tempting for the church to retain and operate the business enterprises. In addition, churches sometimes invest directly in secular businesses.

The Cathedral of Tomorrow, an independent church in Akron, Ohio, owns a shopping center, an electronics company, a plastics and wire plant, an apartment complex, and a girdle factory. A Trappist monastery in Kentucky sells fruitcake, cheese, Canadian bacon and beef-sausage sticks by mail. A church organization owns two major garbage dumps outside Chicago, and leases them to a refuse collector.

Christ's Church of the Golden Rule, near Willits, Calif., purchased a luxurious ranch—once the home of Seabiscuit and other famous race horses. The church members (some 125 in number) live there while operating it as a business. They also own and operate a $500,000 motel and several other enterprises, all exempt from federal taxation.

Printing of publications for Evangelical United Brethren churches (recently merged into the United Methodist Church) used to require most of the space in a four-story building in Dayton, Ohio. When improved printing methods made much of that space redundant, the denominational officials obtained contracts to print a brand of trading stamps.

The money involved in these business operations can be considerable. In Washington, D.C., Watergate, a new $70-million high-rise luxury apartment complex beside the Potomac River, was financed by an Italy-based real-estate company in which the Vatican is said to have controlling interest. Profits accruing to the church in this venture are exempt from federal taxes.

There are now some 2200 tax-exempt nursing and retirement homes in operation. Where these are operated for the welfare of needy patrons, on a non-profit basis, they are properly tax-exempt. But increasing numbers of churches are using their tax-exempt status to turn them into money-making enterprises. In some cases, entry fees may run as high as $50,000 plus monthly charges of several hundred dollars, and the church may amortize the entire facility within five or six years.

For federal and state governments, church-owned and church-operated businesses represent a large loss of revenue—the taxes that would be collected if the enterprises were run by competitive private industry. It is impossible to calculate the loss exactly, but responsible estimates put it at $6.5 billion a year.

3. Lease-Back Operations. The lease-back device, exemplified by the Dayton Biltmore Hotel deal, is one of the fastest-growing ways for churches and other tax-exempt institutions to make money. An item in the Prentice-Hall *Executive Tax Report* reads: "Have you put a price on your business? You may be able to double it—by selling to a charity." And an ad in *The Wall Street Journal:* "Highly respected charitable fund (non-profit) will purchase closely held companies with minimum pre-tax profit of $250,000. Financial and other benefits very rewarding."

Any church organization, however small, can make use of this tax advantage. For example, an enterprising executive of White Plains, N.Y., together with two ministers, organized the "Stratford Retreat House," which assumed churchly functions. According to the literature of the Retreat House, its managers purchased, as a church, on lease-back arrangements, several businesses, principally electronics firms.

Yet, the U.S. Supreme Court has refused to close this loophole in the tax laws, and Congress has rejected legislation that would eliminate it.

Voices for Reform. Some churches justify their involvement in unrelated businesses on the ground that all profits are fed back into church work, religious programs and good causes. But most religious leaders now seem to take a different view. They would advocate keeping the tax exemption on *passive* income—as from stocks, bonds, interest and rents. But they would eliminate tax exemption where a church *actively* engages in business projects for profit.

"Our churches are morally bound to take the lead to eliminate operations that force unfair competition upon private, tax-paying industry," says the Rev. Clyde W. Taylor, general director of the National Association of Evangelicals, comprising 40 denominations.

"Earnings from businesses that have no direct connection with the religious purpose of the church should pay income taxes, regardless of how that income is used," agreed a conference sponsored by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs.

A 1966 study document of the National Council of Churches, which represents about half of the Protestant church membership in the United States, concluded: "Existing tax exemptions for unrelated business income of a church or church-related service agency should be discontinued."

Similar recommendations have been made by the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, by the United Presbyterian Church, the Methodist Church, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis. The *Washington*

Newsletter, publication of the National Council of Catholic Men, in May 1967 declared: "To require churches to pay taxes on their corporate profits would remove the undemocratic advantage they now enjoy in competing with corporations and small business."

Thus, there is a clear mandate for reform. Congress, with the cooperation of church leaders of all creeds, should take action on this matter at the earliest possible moment.

SOUTH AFRICA: STUDENTS PLAN NEW PROTESTS

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SOUTH AFRICA: STUDENTS PLAN NEW PROTESTS

CAPE TOWN, April 5.—Students at South Africa's four English-language universities will begin daily demonstrations on Monday which will reach a climax, on 16 April, with mass meetings and the extinguishing of symbolic torches of academic freedom.

The students' protests are directed at the Government's deprivation 10 years ago of the universities' right to admit non-white students, and the establishment of separate 'ethnic' colleges for non-whites; the deportation of white student leaders last year from South Africa; and the suspension of a total of 43 African students from the Fort Hare ethnic college during the past eight months. The biggest demonstration will be at the University of the Witwatersand (Johannesburg), where the governing council has agreed to shut down the entire university for three lecture periods (about three hours) on 16 April.

At a mass meeting of students and staff on 16 March, the Principal, Professor O. Bozzoli, will read a declaration. Day and night vigils will be kept around a torch of academic freedom and students will invade the central city area and distribute leaflets explaining their actions to citizens. Teach-ins and seminars will also be held.

The other universities at which demonstrations will be held are Cape Town, Rhodes (Grahamstown) and Natal (Durban and Maritzburg). None of the Afrikaans-language universities, whose students are mostly Government supporters, are taking part in the protests. Protests had been planned for the start of the academic year on 3 March, but, after interviewing the Minister of the Interior, Mr. Louwrens Muller, and receiving certain "assurances" from him regarding student passports, deportations and police "intimidations," student leaders called the protests off.

ORDERLY MANNER

The relationship soon broke down, however, and Mr. Muller then warned the students publicly that he would not allow them to follow the example of students overseas and cause unrest. Another Cabinet Minister said the Government would not hesitate to call out the Army.

Replying to these warnings today, Mr. Duncan Innes, president of the National Union of South African Students, said: "We know now where we stand. We cannot expect the right to express our points of view without fearing retribution of the most vicious kind. Yet our points of view will continue to be expressed."

He added: "We will make our view known on the disgraceful suspension of students from Fort Hare college, on the deportations of student leaders, and above all, on the undemocratic university system which exists in South Africa.

"The fact that our universities now exist for white students only, that non-white students now receive an inferior education to white students, that the new legislation naming these tribal colleges as full universities is the most absurd piece of legislation yet passed in the country concerning education, since these colleges bear no resemblance to true universities—all these facts will be made known."

Mr. Innes said the students would express their views "in an orderly and dignified manner, as has always been our practice. . . . As the future leaders of South Africa, we feel it is important the country should know what we are thinking."

In a circular to student organisations today, Mr. Innes says it is hoped the "tribal" colleges (the three ethnic colleges for Africans, one for Coloureds and one for Indians) will support the protests arranged for the next 10 days, but he adds: "This is very difficult in view of police activities on these campuses and of Government control."

RURAL COMMUNITY PLANNING

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing problems of the day is the overcrowding of our cities and lack of job opportunities that results from too great an input of manpower in one concentrated area. We must place more emphasis on the work force in local communities and on providing local industry with a base on which to expand.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a letter to the editor that appeared in the Baltimore Sun on March 27, 1969. The letter was written by Worthington J. Thompson, of Salisbury, Md. Mr. Thompson points out that by raising the standard of living in communities we can help stabilize the population shift as well as attract new industry:

SIR. In the early Seventies the job of stabilization of the work force in small towns and new communities in rural America will become as important, in the achievement of our national imperatives of social justice and economic health for all, as the massive effort that will be needed in the cities.

Many opportunities now exist in rural areas for creation of self-contained communities. The challenge to private initiative is to recognize these opportunities and to exploit them by enlisting for maximum beneficial impact the best combination of federal and private programs, as well as state and local cooperation. The challenge to government is to streamline its programs; to help discover the opportunities and to cooperate with the private sector in their benign exploitation.

A work force flourishes under good living conditions in economically viable communities, which translates into jobs, housing, infra-structure and good government. In most rural areas the work force is characterized by low income and substandard housing, a condition in the correction of which arises the opportunity to recognize potential community development situations.

A first step in stabilizing the rural work force is to concentrate it in good housing as a part of a planned community, utilizing federal programs for low and moderate income family housing, new towns and economic development. Once this step is taken or planned, the successive steps will seem to fall into place.

As a consequence new industry will come. The work force will upgrade. Young people will find jobs at home and will not migrate to the problem-ridden cities. The lure of jobs at home will bring back former residents now contributing to the problems of the cities. Immediate gains will be made in real estate and construction.

If the scale of effort to stabilize the work force is large enough, and carefully planned so as not to build new slums, our private enterprise system will have proved anew its irrepressible strength and vitality and we will have made acceptable progress in achieving our national imperatives.

DESTINED OR DETERMINED?

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years, we have been overwhelmed with a flood of negativism. Each of America's faults has been waved before us and we have been made aware of what is wrong in America today. Nonetheless, we must not lose sight of the fact that there is also a great deal that is right with America as well. One of the finest statements I have read regarding our national worth is the following address by Richard G. Capen, Jr., the new Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. This speech was presented to the Culver City Jaycees honoring the five outstanding young men of California for 1968. Dick was one of California's "outstanding young men" and certainly exemplifies the words he speaks. In addition, he was recently awarded the distinguished George Washington Honor Medal from the Freedoms Foundation. It is with great pleasure that I share his comments with my colleagues:

DESTINED OR DETERMINED?

(By Richard G. Capen, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), before the Culver City JayCees, honoring the Five Outstanding Young Men of California for the Year 1968, International Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif., March 29, 1969)

For many years, no one could run the mile in less than four minutes. Hundreds of athletes tried but all failed.

Finally, a relatively obscure runner by the name of Roger Bannister came along and broke through this barrier after many attempts.

Almost immediately after this record was set, other athletes came along and they, too, broke through the four minute barrier. Today, running a mile in less than four minutes is quite commonplace.

Isn't it interesting that after one athlete broke this record after so many years, many others immediately came along and accomplished the same feat.

I believe these athletes did so simply because they believed it could be done. They set a goal, they worked hard to achieve that goal and, through self-determination, reached that goal.

To me, the history of the four-minute mile track record symbolizes the history of the American way of life.

Ever since the first pilgrim arrived more than 300 years ago, Americans have sought new goals, new opportunities to succeed.

Today we continue to seek new avenues of success, adding to the achievements of the past.

Most of us today seek to build not destroy.

For too long we have stood by idly while small groups of sideline critics attempt to discredit America rather than to improve it.

I would suggest, however, that before these irresponsible critics attempt to tear down what they now have the complete freedom to enjoy, they should be challenged to come up with something better.

Sure, there are problems and legitimate grievances in America today and they must be corrected. But let's never forget that America today has far more strengths than weaknesses.

Our nation is the strongest and richest on earth. With only six percent of the world's population, we produce more than a third of all the world's goods and services.

We spend billions each year to erase poverty at home and abroad. Through such generosity we have brought more dignity and equality to mankind than any other generation in history.

Luxuries undreamed of by princes and potentates a generation ago are now routinely available to most Americans.

We still do have poverty in America but it will be overcome. What makes this poverty an issue in America is not so much that it exists amidst affluence. Today, poverty is an issue because for the first time in all mankind it may truly be possible for one society to eliminate poverty—as a result of its affluence.

Some say that American society today is a sick society. If so, why do 300,000 immigrants come to our country each year with thousands of other aliens turned away? They don't think our country is sick.

Within one generation, Americans have suffered through four wars and still have used their material wealth to bind up the wounds of the victors and vanquished alike.

Perhaps Americans today have not scored as high as we had hoped, but we have scored higher than ever before—and we are not through yet.

Just think of it! In less than one generation, Americans have conquered scores of diseases from smallpox to polio.

We have built more schools and hospitals than all generations since the beginning of time. Within one generation, we have created the automobile, the radio, the telephone and the computer.

We have the highest wages and the shortest work weeks. Barriers to jobs and education are crumbling everywhere.

Even our lower income groups live far better than the above-average citizen in most any other country.

Probably no other country criticizes itself as frequently, or as openly, as we do. This has been healthy. Americans are always facing up to their problems, seeking new and better solutions to them.

Just like Roger Bannister, we set national goals and when one plateau is reached, new levels of excellence are sought.

With such determination, Americans have proved that things could be done, that dreams could be embodied in action and that a better life could be achieved provided we were willing to work for it.

We are proud of our generosity to the less fortunate, but we should realize that this generosity is available only because someone else achieved, someone else earned that little bit extra that he could share with others.

Americans have always respected excellence, no matter how humble the task. To me, an excellent plumber is far more admirable than an incompetent professor.

To me, the person who is constantly looking for more to do is far more respectable than the person who rationalizes his way out of assuming any responsibilities at all.

For most Americans, the road to success is paved by an occasional pebble of failure. However, most Americans have managed to use any personal disappointments as stepping stones to achievement. In reality, the only difference between a stumbling block and a stepping stone is the way they are used.

Tonight the California JayCees have honored me for a modest contribution to my community and to my country. Certainly, I am most grateful for this recognition.

But to me, however, success is over the moment it has arrived. There are new records to be broken—new goals to be reached and new challenges to be met.

Most of us today are dedicated to assuming that challenge. As we do so, I believe we will succeed—not because we are destined to succeed—but rather because we are determined to succeed.

ALVIN MORELL BENTLEY

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, as one who had known Alvin Morell Bentley personally since we stood together in this Chamber to take the oath of office and who was closely associated with him, even after he left this body for other pursuits, I feel a deep loss in his passing.

Early in the 83d Congress a group of freshmen Congressmen banded together to cooperate in better understanding the workings of Congress and to study major legislative matters coming before us. He and I were members of that group. In our weekly meetings we came to recognize Al Bentley as a man of great love for his country and of deep devotion to the responsibility placed upon him by the citizens of the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan which he represented.

I was at his side when an assassin's wild bullet struck him as he participated in debate on legislation before this House on that fateful date in 1954. His strong determination to carry on brought him through that horrifying experience and he completed four terms as one of our colleagues. Seeking to enlarge his service, he left this body, offering himself to the voters of Michigan as a candidate for a seat in the other body.

It was indeed an inspiration to all of us associated with him to observe his keen devotion to those principles in which he believed and his approach to their accomplishment.

Alvin Bentley made substantial contributions to the principles of sound government not only at the national level but on the State level as well. He was concerned about the inroads made by the followers of the Communist ideology in this country and he never failed to speak out against them when an opportunity availed itself.

He became aware of this menace while serving in the State Department's diplomatic corps and left his post to become a a candidate for Congress where he hoped he might make a contribution toward blocking the spread of this atheistic octopus.

His congressional career was characterized by a thoroughness of preparation that was nothing short of remarkable. Spending long hours in research, he knew his subject whenever he rose to speak on this floor.

His service did not end when he returned to Michigan. As a delegate to Michigan's constitutional convention in 1961 and 1962 he again distinguished himself as a man of ability and an advocate of sound fundamentals of government. He was chairman of that convention's committee dealing with the sections of the constitution pertaining to education.

Alvin Bentley was different. That title has been given an editorial in the Greenville, Mich., Daily News, on his passing. It follows:

ALVIN BENTLEY WAS DIFFERENT

This department has known very few men with a greater desire to serve others quite as much as Alvin M. Bentley.

Born to tremendous wealth (his family sold a truck company when General Motors was being put together by W. C. Durant and took GM stock rather than cash). Bentley had the ability to visit with a working man as well as a tycoon.

This attribute helped him get elected to Congress from our district in the fall of 1952. Al had worked for the State Department behind the Iron Curtain. He decided to come home and seek public office.

He preceded his campaign by eyeball to eyeball confrontations with the voters. Any audience of one or up was enough for the tireless Bentley to engage in conversation. Soon there were people who thought he must be living in their own neighborhoods rather than in Owosso.

Fred Crawford of Saginaw was an entrenched Congressman whose big love was the House Insular Affairs Committee in general and the Virgin Islands in particular. He was a victim of Washingtonitis which meant the local voters didn't see him.

Bentley unseated the shocked Crawford in the Republican primary and went on to build enormous vote margins every time he ran in this district.

He worked at the job just as much as he did in seeking election. In fact this area has been fortunate in having had three all business Congressmen (Bentley, Jim Harvey and Al Cederberg) in the past 17 years.

Bentley's father died in World War I and the son nearly lost his wife when fanatics invaded the House of Representatives and started shooting. Al nearly lost his life from a bullet wound.

In due time he sought higher office but never made it at a time when Michigan Republican fortunes were at a particularly low point.

Spurned by the voters, Bentley turned to education. He initiated and financed in full a program that enabled many people to go to college.

Likewise, he enjoyed his service as a member of the University of Michigan's board of regents.

His benefactions were legion.

We were lucky to have had him as our Congressman. It can be said that understanding the problems of little people isn't always the chief attribute of the very wealthy.

Al Bentley was different.

Mrs. Cederberg and I extend our deepest sympathy to his widow, his mother, and other members of his family.

THE AKOS SZEKELY MEMORIAL MEDAL

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I have recently become aware of a special award instituted by representatives of U.S. citizens of Hungarian descent to commemorate and perpetuate national valor and patriotism. The award, the Akos Szekely Memorial Medal, was established on October 4, 1968, and named for Capt. Akos Szekely who died in action in Vietnam on September 11, 1968.

I have a special interest in this award inasmuch as Captain Szekely attended high school in my congressional district. His record there was outstanding: he excelled in scholarship, in leadership, and in athletics. After graduation, he attended West Point Military Academy under scholarship granted on the basis of his prior record. Thereafter, his military and academic achievements were of highest caliber. It is appropriate that a medal for excellence in spirit, mind, and body should be established in his name, and his example is to be lauded by men of every heritage who love freedom.

I am accordingly bringing to the attention of my colleagues a brief biography of Captain Szekely and a description of the award that has been established in his honor, both of which were prepared at the time of the first awarding of the medal on the 12th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution. It is my thought that we can all derive great satisfaction and pride in the knowledge of the immeasurable contributions this man and thousands of others like him have made toward the advancement of independence and freedom throughout the world.

The material follows:

CAPTAIN DEZSÖ ÁKOS SZÉKELY, 1942–68

Captain Dezsö Akos Székely was born in Budapest on March 24, 1942. His father, Ákos Székely, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, was one of the most decorated staff officers in the Hungarian Army when the family was forced to leave Hungary at the end of World War II. His mother, née Katalin Györbiró, later married to Frank T. Kovács, a former staff officer in the Hungarian Army, now resides in Silver Spring, Maryland.

After his graduation with the highest honors (member of the "National Honor Society," captain of the cross country team, member of the Key Club, etc.) from Montgomery Blair High School in Silver Spring, Maryland, Ágos Székely, as he was known and called generally, received a scholarship at West Point Military Academy. His career there revealed continuous academic excellence ("Star Cadet"), and membership in the track and field team. He won several first, second and third prizes as one of the best athletes in long distance walking in the United States during the years of 1962 through 1964. He graduated from West Point as a Second Lieutenant, being second in a class of 562 cadets. He is recognized as the highest ranking graduate of Hungarian ancestry from a United States military academy.

His subsequent military qualifications include parachuting and "Ranger" trainings, a period of 13 months in Korea as a First Lieutenant, commanding the 50th Engineering Company.

Having obtained a student leave of absence from the service, he received his Master of Science degree in engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and also completed a special course at Harvard University, all in a period of a year. He was invited and became a member of Sigma Xi honorary fraternity.

In October, 1967, with the rank of a Captain, Ákos Székely resumed his military service in Vietnam, as Company Commander of the 63rd Engineering Battalion, 25th Infantry Division. After completion of his tour of duty, Captain Székely volunteered and was assigned to the Mechanized Infantry as Commanding Officer of Company A of the 1/5 Battalion. He was killed in action in the early morning hours of September 11, 1968, in the vicinity of Tay Minh, near the border of Cambodia.

He was laid to rest in the National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia, on September 26, 1968.

ÁKOS SZÉKELY MEMORIAL MEDAL

The representatives of the American Hungarian Federation, the Collegial Society of Hungarian Veterans (MHBK) and the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation in Greater Washington and the City of Baltimore decided that, in recognition of excellence in spirit, mind and body as well as demonstrated loyalty to the United States of America, and award named Ákos Székely Memorial Medal will be established. It was also intended to perpetuate the example of Captain Dezsö Ákos Székely who was killed in action in Vietnam on September 11, 1968, whose character traits, academic excellence and heroic death reflect the finest heritage of the Hungarian nation as well as of the Americans of Hungarian descent.

The representatives of the above named nation-wide organizations resolved that, in order to keep proper order and due dignity in all matters related to the issuance of the Ákos Székely Memorial Medal Committee be constituted, composed of one representative of each of the three above named nation-wide organizations and of an American military and a Hungarian civilian member as archivists.

The Ákos Székely Memorial Medal is awarded to those United States citizens of Hungarian descent who:

(a) were found as deserving the award because of their excellence in spirit, mind and body and because of their demonstrated loyalty to the United States of America:

(b) as citizens of the United States of America, completed their legally required or voluntarily assumed military service honorably;

(c) demonstrated their adherence to the values of their Hungarian heritage;

(d) are under thirty years of age; this age limit may be disregarded in instances when the prospective recipient was killed in action in defense of the United States of America or was highly decorated for heroism or other unusual form of military service.

In years of peace, the number of the Ákos Székely Memorial Medals to be awarded annually, cannot exceed five. In years of war, the number of the recipients of the medal is not limited.

The Ákos Székely Memorial Medal is awarded annually and is issued to the recipients in the month of October, possibly in close connection with the comemoration of the Hungarian struggle for freedom in 1956.

Washington, the 4th of October, 1968.

THE ÁKOS SZÉKELY MEMORIAL MEDAL COMMITTEE.

MORTON CONGRATULATES RUMSFELD ON NEW POSITION

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the President announced a few hours ago that one of our distinguished colleagues, Congressman RUMSFELD, of Illinois, has been appointed to one of the most important positions in the administration—Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. When he is confirmed in that position, he will be appointed assistant to the President and will have Cabinet rank.

This nomination is a great step forward for this administration. While Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle will miss Mr. RUMSFELD, his participation in the Nixon administration and in our attack on poverty will be extremely important to our Nation. The upgrading of his position to that of Cabinet rank is also significant and emphasizes once more the determination of this administration to do the things necessary to solve the problems in our Nation.

Congressman RUMSFELD brings to the administration the same thing he brought to Congress—youth, vigor, scholarship, and a determination to get the job done. I want to contgratulate him on his nomination and look forward to working with him in his new role as a Cabinet officer.

CRIME

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we are confronted with the domestic problems facing the Nation and are asked to establish and finance priority activities designed to alleviate those problems, I cannot imagine a crisis more deserving of concentrated effort than that of crime.

There is little need to repeat the theme that the fact and fear of crime stalk America. We are aware that crime has risen at an alarming rate and threatens the well-being of every citizen. We know that the fundamental obligation of Government is protecting the lives, properties, and liberties of the governed. We realize that the cost of crime not only in terms of dollars but in terms of injury and anguish is nearly immeasurable. We affirm the public's desire to place crime high on the agenda for appropriate and forceful action. We do not need to be constantly reminded about the fact and fear of crime, but perhaps we do need to develop an understanding of the extent to which crime affects the other decisions which are required as we chart future domestic courses for the United States.

The Federal Government, it seems, has yet to realize that crime is a fundamental factor in many of our most frustrating problem areas. Young people are disillusioned with the "establishment" partially because they question the dedication and, more basically, the honesty of public officials. Who can blame them when we know as a matter of public record that some officials are paid off by organized crime syndicates who have found it most profitable to attempt and accomplish subversion of the legal processes. The black community is alienated, in part, because white "pushers" and distributors exploit young black people by hooking them on narcotics. Negroes then become the principal victims of vicious crimes committed to feed the dope users' limitless appetite. Poverty-stricken individuals are preyed upon by all types of criminals, from the bigtime variety to the petty thief, who realize the fact that the poor are likely to be more gullible to rackets and are sure to possess fewer legal recourses against lawless activity. It is this final point that, I think, should be of special significance to the Congress.

The Congress has rather irrevocably committed the Nation to an all-out effort to rid our country of the blight of poverty. We have designed and implemented programs to carry out that goal. We have most often listened to and acted upon the suggestions of social scientists who have guided us toward the root causes of economic despair—inadequate education, unequal opportunity, dilapidated housing, overcrowding, illegitimacy, and a host of other physical and psychological manifestations of poverty discovered in hundreds of unrelated studies. Sometimes, we have gone so far as to draw up magic formulas as a supposed answer to socioeconomic frustrations. Interesting enough, one of the chief justifications for the efforts all along the way has been that poverty breeds crime.

As much as the scholarly pursuits of the social scientists have to recommend them, perhaps we should have spent a little more time listening to the general public. The people are concerned about the crime problem regardless of how far back one can trace the roots. Over and again, Americans have ranked crime No. 1 among domestic crises. If ending poverty would reduce lawlessness, the public generally favors a battle against the ravages of poverty. But what if the people, in reality, have already hit upon the fundamental problem—crime? What if their concern to meet this immediate crisis should be pointing a direction to us as we seek to assist the poor?

I doubt anyone could justify an approach suggesting that crime breeds poverty, but it is not beyond the realm of possibility that crime is the chief aggravation within the cruel state of economic despondency. The poor, themselves, have tried to reach us with that message. In a 1967 publication issued by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights called "A Time To Listen—A Time To Act," a minister from a slum area in Cleveland, Ohio, put it this may:

> It has got so bad in our area until the word has got out all over the Hough area, particularly 105th and Euclid Avenue to 79th and Euclid, is where the action is. You can walk up and down the street any time of the day or night and observe Cadillacs, Lincolns and all fine cars from all parts of the country driven by pimps who come into Cleveland to thrive on prostitution because the word has gotten out all over the United States that Cleveland is where the action is.

In that same publication, a Boston, Mass., spokesman from the slums stated:

> Police have isolated the South End as an area, giving it only token protection. Prostitution, bookmaking and after-hour places are all over and there is an excess of liquor stores and a shortage of foot patrolmen to keep the street safe.

These people were talking about crime that preys on and exploits the poor and quite naturally breeds contempt and frustration. Others quoted in the report made observations about criminal activities that cause small but important adversities in poverty areas. A businessman described the difficulty he had getting merchants to service his place because of the dangers of coming into the slums. A footnote in the study referred to an elderly woman who was afraid to walk out to church.

In my opinion we have not focused nearly enough attention on the relationships between crime and poverty. It is true that we have enacted programs designed to beef up local law enforcement and, I am sure, the intent was that such programs should be used to aid in combating crime in the slums, but the fact is that little real headway has been made. Progress will only result when we recognize the true character of the enemy we face. It is reasonable to expect that local law enforcement agencies can combat ordinary street crime if given the proper support and tools for effectiveness. But it is unreasonable to assume that local officials alone can wage war against the chief criminal influence in poverty areas—the organized crime syndicate. The Federal Government must become involved in a cooperative effort with communities across the Nation to fight bigtime racketeers.

We should not find it too surprising to discover that organized crime gleans a substantial portion of its profits from victimizing those who can least afford to pay. The racketeer avidly seeks those enterprises that seem safest from prosecution and conviction. No group in our society has more minimal access to protection within our legal system than the poor. In addition, the racketeer has a businesslike desire to look for the best customers for his product. Again, he finds his best targets among the disadvantaged. A youth with little hope for success is more likely to seek escape through use of narcotics. A young girl who has been deprived of the luxuries of life is more likely to find the profits offered by prostitution attractive. The man with no money to invest legally is more likely to be lured by a 1,000 to 1 chance taken on the purchase of a 25-cent numbers ticket. The slum businessman who constantly lives in fear is more likely to fall victim to a protection racket. In other words, the operation of organized crime is completely diabolic in that it knowingly exploits misery. But, of even greater concern is that the exploitation tends to promote misery.

With great justification, attention has been focused recently on the narcotics problem in the slums. This crime arena is perhaps most sinister not only because the victims of addiction are chiefly young people but because the dope-related street crimes detrimentally affect the whole spectra of slumdwellers. The cost of obtaining any drug is astronomical and youths without financial resources must resort to a whole range of criminal activities, from petty thievery to vicious attack, to obtain the money they need to use dope. The average charge for one marihuana cigarette is 50 cents and a deprived young person normally does not have even 50 cents of "extra" cash unless he or she obtains the money illegally. The crimes committed are for the most part directed against individuals within the same neighborhood, thereby causing grief and hardship for others who can hardly afford the toll. Some estimates have calculated that over 50 percent of the street crime in this country could be halted if dope traffic were ended and such figures in themselves are reason enough for action in this area. But the additional fact that living conditions in the urban ghetto would be immeasurably bettered by eliminating the problems connected with drugs should be another prime factor in our determination to stop the distribution of narcotics by racketeers.

Another major source of income for organized crime is the numbers game operated throughout the Nation and particularly in our cities. It is a game of chance where the odds are at least 1,000 to 1 and the payoff about 500 to 1. It is a racket that has little or no appeal to those members of society who have sources of income that provide them with constant hope of bettering their lots in life. It appeals to those who are desperately seeking a means for getting rich quick by offering them an illusion of attainable great wealth. But the offer is merely an illusion while the money to pay for the chance comes out of poverty-bare pockets at the expense of food, shelter, clothing and health. An example of the drain is shown in estimates out of the Harlem district of New York City. Five years ago, some studies concluded that approximately $50 million a year was sapped from this area by organized crime in numbers. Today some estimates put the figure at more than $250 million. This estimate compares with $5.65 million expenditures by the Office of Economic Opportunity in Harlem in 1968. OEO spent $106.5 million throughout the State of New York in 1968. All governmental moneys flowing into Harlem at present could not possibly offset a $250 million drain which in no way is circulated to benefit the community at large. Harlem is certainly not alone since nearly all of our major cities face a similar situation. The racketeers in just this one aspect of their operation are sucking the life blood out of slum areas and are complicating the governments' effort to provide despondent people with a better life.

Numbers and narcotics rank high among the cash complications created by organized crime—those affecting the poor person's property and pocketbook. But the major areas do not represent the entire picture. The slum businessman who pays for "protection" passes the fees along to his customers in the form of higher prices causing additional monetary hardship. It is disturbing to note that racketeers now seeking new avenues of investment are turning to real estate and seem to be somewhat interested in the profits offered by slum landlordism. More disturbing is the affect of the total situation on young people who are intrigued by the criminal's access to wealth and therefore reject responsible patterns for bettering themselves in favor of the big money lure of crime.

All of the money problems brought about by crime in the slums are only a part of the price being paid. We have heard a great deal about the breakdown in respect for law and order. Various public figures have tied this phenomena primarily to slum residents and rightly so. The slumdweller is the one who probably finds it most difficult to inspire within himself or within others the kind of respect for legal preservation of order normally associated with our society. Daily he sees criminal activities carried on blatantly in his neighborhood. He knows firsthand the ravages of crime and figures that others must be aware of its existence all around him. Yet, he also observes that very little has been done to combat the situation and often concludes, sometimes justifiably, that government officials have been paid off in return for ignoring the problem. Can we expect respect from such an observer? I would imagine that respect can only follow a display of concern on the part of government for ending the miseries associated with crime in the ghetto. Where corruption does exist, respect cannot be expected until honesty is entrenched. A principal step down that path demands a war against organized crime since it is the racketeer who can afford and therefore seeks to nullify political and legal procedures.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice stated in 1967:

> Organized crime exists by virtue of the power it purchases with its money.

That power is gained at the expense of poor people whose destinies the racketeers continue to sell out daily. The threat of organized crime to American society at large is real enough, but the disaster wrought upon our most disadvantaged citizens is a modern tragedy. The Congress has an obligation to take the necessary action to meet this very real poverty problem. I cannot help but think that some of those millions already invested in combating poverty might have been more realistically spent in combating the crime that continues to prey upon and frustrate the misery and hopelessness that is poverty.

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the passing of the Honorable Alvin M. Bentley, who for 8 years represented the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan. I had the good fortune to know Al Bentley quite well during his time in the House of Representatives and I share my colleagues' grief at his untimely death. Al Bentley was an exceptional man. Born into considerable wealth he could have opted for the idle, carefree life. Instead, he chose a career of dedication to his country and fellow citizens. In 1940 he joined the Foreign Service and served with distinction in Mexico, Colombia, Hungary, and Italy. In 1952 he ran for Congress, was elected and for 8 years was a credit to the people who elected him, this body, and the country as a whole. He was a man strong of convictions who also keenly understood the awesome responsibility of great wealth. He was a devoted American and a stanch defender of things American. Above all he was a friendly, warm, genuine man. Can there be a stronger testimonial to his fortitude than his return here only 8 weeks after being critically wounded on March 1, 1954, when a group of fanatics shot up the floor of the House from the visitors' gallery? When I saw him lying on the floor in the well of the House, I did not think he would make it to the hospital.

Al Bentley was quite a man and we shall all miss him. To his widow, his family, and many friends I extend our deepest sympathy.

THREE MARYLANDERS DIE IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. William J. Daubert, Pfc. Edwin H. Pumphrey, and Pfc. Orville L. Knight, three fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

THREE MARYLANDERS DIE IN VIETNAM: TWO WERE 20, ONE 21—ALL WERE KILLED IN COMBAT

Three more Maryland servicemen, all of them draftees, have been killed in the Vietnam war, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

They were:

Army Spec. 4 William J. Daubert, son of Mr. and Mrs. Francis L. Daubert, of Eden, Md.

Army Pfc. Edwin H. Pumphrey, son of Mr. and Mrs. Herbert R. Pumphrey, of Silver Spring, Md.

Army Pfc. Orville L. Knight, husband of Mrs. Sarah K. Knight, of Keedysville, Md.

Specialist Daubert, a medic serving with an Air Cavalry unit, was killed by small-arms fire Thursday. "He was killed on a combat mission attempting to rescue two wounded buddies," a member of his family said yesterday.

He was drafted into the Army in March, 1968, and sent to Vietnam following basic training.

He was a 1966 graduate of Washington High School. Before entering the Army, he worked as a clerk in a Salisbury (Md.) supermarket.

Specialist Daubert, who was 20, was to have been discharged from the Army in August. "Like other soldiers, he was counting the days," a relative said.

Survivors, besides his parents, include two brothers, Edward and Danny Daubert, both of Eden.

STEPPED ON LAND MINE

Private Pumphrey, who was 21, was also killed Thursday during a combat mission. He was killed after stepping on an enemy land mine near Da Nang in Quang Nam province, the Defense Department reported.

He was drafted July 1968, and had served only three months in Vietnam with the 9th Infantry Division.

After attending Sherwood High School in Sandy Spring, Md., he worked as an apartment house custodian. He also was a singer with a local rock 'n roll group known as the "Thrillers,"

Private Pumphrey's sister, Mrs. Claudia Hall, said that "he wrote in his letters that he couldn't explain what it was like over there.

"CAN'T WRITE ABOUT IT"

"He said it's just something you do, you can't write about it. You have to see for yourself."

He was engaged to marry Miss Laura Beverly, of Silver Spring.

Surviving, besides his parents, are three sisters, Mrs. Annette Adams, Miss Charlotte Pumphrey and Mrs. Claudia Hall, all of Silver Spring; four brothers, Douglas, James and John Pumphrey, all of Silver Spring, and Herbert R. Pumphrey, Jr., of Olney, Md.

WORKED AT PLANE PLANT

Private Knight, 20, was killed Tuesday in a combat operation near Saigon.

In letters to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Francis W. Knight, of Dargan, he called the war "hell". Mr. Knight said his son said that he wished he listened to his Daddy and had gone in the Navy."

Survivors, besides his wife and parents, are a 5-month old daughter, Samantha Jo; two sisters, Mrs. Doris L. Gay and Mrs. Frances Mae Grim; a brother, David W. Knight; and maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Ingram, all of Dargan, Md.

MARINE WRITES POEM WHILE AT DANANG, VIETNAM

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very often impressed with the fine writings in the many wonderful newspapers in the First District of Georgia.

I especially want to call to the attention of my colleagues a poem written by Marine Pvt. Paul Akins, Jr., of Bulloch, County, Ga., which was printed in the April 10 edition of the Bulloch Herald & Times of Statesboro, Ga.

I do not believe I could possibly add anything more to the beauty and thoughtful lines written by this young serviceman. He has shown clearly and well the kind of stuff he is made of and I am indeed proud that such a young man calls Bulloch County, Ga., in my congressional district, home.

The article follows:

MARINE WRITES POEM WHILE AT DANANG, VIETNAM

The thoughts of the Bulloch County servicemen fighting in Vietnam are often hidden from everyone, but occasionally some of these men write a letter or a note telling their feelings.

The following poem was written by Marine Private Paul Akins Jr. where he is now on duty as a communications expert at Da Nang AB, Vietnam:

"MY THANKS

"People everywhere in life from every walk and station,
From every town and city and every state and nation
Have given me so many things intangible and clear
I couldn't begin to count them all or even make them clear . . .
I only know I owe so much to people everywhere
And when I put my thoughts in verse it's just a way to share
The meanings of a thankful heart, a heart so much like your own,
For nothing that I think or write is mine and mine alone . . .
So if you found some beauty in any word or line,
It's just 'Your Soul's reflection in Proximity with Mine.' "

WORLDWIDE POPULATION EXPLOSION

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, a problem fast approaching the crisis stage is the worldwide population explosion. As legislators, we must study and analyze legislative proposals which promise to avoid or, at least, alleviate the crisis ahead.

We must seek to create laws and programs which will restrain population growth—at the same time avoiding any infringement on our civil rights and liberties, our privacy and dignity as human beings.

In this connection, I call to my colleague's attention an article by Prof. Albert P. Blaustein, of the Rutgers Law School faculty, in the August 1968, issue of Law and Society Review, volume 3, beginning at page 107, entitled "The Legal Challenge of Population Control," based on testimony which Professor Blaustein delivered before the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Government Operations Committee, headed by Senator Ernest Gruening last year.

Professor Blaustein is the author of "The American Lawyer, Desegregation, and the Law," and "Civil Rights and the American Negro." He has traveled throughout Africa and visited Vietnam in order to advise on law school development. During these trips, he became increasingly aware of population problems and increasingly interested in what can be done to restrain and curtail excessive population growth.

His major recommendation is one which we must recognize as legislators. Until recently, population limitation was not a valued goal of our society. It must be now. Thus it is appropriate for us now to reexamine all of our laws to see what their effect is or may be on population growth.

I commend this thought-provoking article to my colleague's attention:

Arguendo: The Legal Challenge of Population Control

(By Albert P. Blaustein, Rutgers, the State University, Camden, N.J.)

(Editor's Note: The following is extracted from a statement by the author to the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the U.S. Senate Committee on Government Operations (Hearings on S. 1676, March 2, 1966). Hearings on the population crisis were held during 1966 and 1967 under the chairmanship of Senator Ernest Gruening. Professor Blaustein had added the footnotes for the convenience of readers of the Review.)

It is obvious that overpopulation is the most critical social problem of our time. As such, it is necessarily the greatest legal problem of our time and the greatest challenge which faces the legal profession today. Since the population problem is fast becoming the population crisis, it is essential that our laws and our legal order must now be subject to reexamination. We dare wait no longer in studying, formulating, and augmenting the proper and precise laws and legal machinery both to help restrain the population growth and to alleviate the ills inherent in overpopulation and unwanted population.

But we must, in our quest for the best laws, be wary of the trap of talking solely in terms of population curtailment. We must take as our guiding principle the words of population expert, John D. Rockefeller, III: "Our constant goal is and must be the enrichment of human life, not its restriction." [1] In other words, our new laws on the population problem must at the same time make for a better society.

The laws and legal structure which must now be studied and developed—and changed—fall under four broad, generalized classifications.

First: We must have legislation designed to close the knowledge gap and to provide the governmental administrative machinery to handle the population problem. This is the necessary first step and we are fortunate in having this type of bill before your committee at this time.

Second: We need laws designed to encourage family limitation.

Third: We need legislative changes and changes in legal rules in light of the newly perceived and newly recognized social value of population control.

Fourth: We need laws to help alleviate the problems inherent in a society with a greatly expanded population—problems involving conservation of natural resources and the like.

The keystone of our American democracy is the principle summarized and adopted as the theme of the 1954 Columbia University Bicentennial. It reads: "Man's right to knowledge and the free use thereof." With this principle there can be no reasoned dissent. The bill before this committee, S. 1676—I wish that the number for this new declaration of freedom were S. 1776—is the vital, necessary first piece of legislation in the first category. It is the logical legislative follow-up of the efforts of able lawyers who, with the cooperation of equally able men of medicine and demography, have fought outmoded laws in legislative halls and courtrooms in order to advance birth control knowledge. The importance of the dissemination of this vital knowledge—the closing of the knowledge gap—has already been ably presented by many other, better qualified witnesses. I can add nothing to this part of the dialog except to express support.

As to the fourth category—dealing with laws to alleviate the problems of a much expanding population—there is likewise little reason to comment. There already exists a vast literature on what laws must be passed to revitalize our cities, save our water reserves, prevent air pollution, and so forth. However, we might also want to think at some point in terms of new tax laws providing depletion allowances or other incentives in order to encourage the kinds of production we will need for our new expanding population.

But little has yet been said or done about the second category, laws to encourage family limitation, and the third category, legal changes which should be made in light of the new social value of population control.

Laws designed to limit population growth must meet two criteria: they must, first, actually accomplish that objective, and, second, they must do so without reducing the significance of human life and the value of individual dignity. Such laws must not be enacted on an ad hoc basis. They must not be based on a "feeling" on the part of legislators that these laws can do the job; such laws must not come in response to emotion-based public sentiment or reaction. Rather, they must be laws based upon study and analysis—the results of efforts of lawyers, working together with men of medicine, demography, sociology, and so forth.

And what is specifically not wanted are State-imposed population controls. A law directly limiting the number of children which a family can have would be repugnant to American ideals. The lawyer's job today is to find the best laws to encourage population limitation, at the same time minimizing the number of unwanted children and advancing the Great Society.

We have already heard legislative proposals that any woman who bears two illegitimate children should be sterilized following a court order. We have already heard proposals that welfare payments should be denied for the support of those who have illegitimates. But would such laws have any effects? Even disregarding our ideals and our other social values, certainly we should not pass laws of this type until we analyze their effects and know that they will work to curtail population.

Desirable laws designed to encourage family limitations must be analyzed under four headings: (a) age; (b) economics; (c) knowledge; and (d) medicine. And in regard to all four, it seems that a good part of the solution will come from laws encouraging education. Now to each of these four areas of consideration:

A. We start with age. There is a definite correlation between marriage age and population growth. One of the best ways to help limit the population explosion is to encourage proper delays in marriage. And this is certainly not an evil.

The tendency to marry young is peculiar to the United States, among the advanced countries of the world. Only in Asia is there a marrying young pattern comparable to that of the United States. More girls marry at age eighteen than at any other. Half of all brides this year will be under twenty. Further, it has been estimated that half of all young men in America are married before they are twenty-five.[2] And not only are they marrying young, but they are having their first babies soon after marriage and are having their children closely spaced. One-half of all mothers have their first child at age twenty-one. And it is interesting to note that the average mother has her last child by age twenty-six,[3] and that there is a very sharp reduction in child production which comes before age thirty.[4] So it is a serious business to consider raising the marriage age in order to reduce population growth.

Unfortunately, when one speaks about the marriage-age situation it is also necessary

---

Footnotes at end of article.

to speak about unwanted, unplanned first children. Sociologists have estimated that at least one out of every six brides is pregnant on her wedding day. And probably one-third to one-half of all teen-age marriages involve pregnancies.[5]

One law-legislative solution is to raise the age at which persons may marry. Certainly, it should be no less than eighteen. Those states that permit marriages below that age should increase the figure to eighteen. Equally important is not lowering age limitations which already exist, despite pressures in that direction. Kentucky has not changed the age at which its children may be married, but it has, I believe, taken a step in the wrong direction by lowering the legal age from twenty-one to eighteen for the purchasing of homes, opening of charge accounts, etc.[6] The waiting periods between announcing intention of marriage and the actual marriage ceremony should also be increased by law and that law should be enforced.

Probably the best way to raise the marriage age is through laws fostering more education. By building more schools, by providing more scholarships, by raising the compulsory education age, and so forth, we can keep children in school longer. And this will limit the exploding population in still another way. Education has long been recognized as a regulator of fertility. Those with more schooling are far more likely to plan activities more efficiently, and this includes family size. And more education also makes for a better America.

This would make a good beginning—a good beginning which further study and investigation can make still better.

B. Let me talk about economics. Almost all the countries in our Western civilization, outside of the United States, have, at one time or another, adopted family allowance systems in order to prevent population declines. But what economic measures should now be taken to encourage family limitation?

It has been said that increased availability of mortgage credit, plus social security benefits, unemployment and disability compensation, minimum wage laws, and so forth, do encourage early marriages and more children. However, it is not consistent with our ideas of the Great Society to take away any of these benefits. Nor is it demographically certain that curtailment of any of these benefits would limit any significant population growth. Certainly, studies by lawyers, public opinion experts, demographers, sociologists, economists, and so forth, are necessary to know what effect such laws actually have on our population growth.

We do know as a fact that population declined in an earlier era when legislation forbidding child employment reduced the value of children as income-earning assets. What does this mean to us in terms of future laws? Shall we further change child labor laws? This is certainly something that must be investigated. We also know that working women have fewer children than those who are not employed. Thus, from the point of view of population control, as well as our struggle to achieve the equality of all citizens, removing discrimination against women in employment is of great importance.

The population problem also calls for a reexamination of our tax structure. Should we continue to have a marital deduction? We now allow a $600 income tax deduction per child. Should this be continued? Will its repeal actually have an effect on population growth? My point is that we should find out first, before taking away such a deduction because we "think" it might have a population-reducing effect. I am inclined to think that the better alternative is to create a tax deduction for money spent on education. But I am not really sure about the effect this would have on population growth. Certainly, we should find out.

C. Knowledge: Under this heading we must think about ways to close the knowledge gap other than those provided for under the present bill. Here we must think in terms of laws setting up state medical clinics and social agencies where data on population control can be disseminated to those who want such information. And we must think about laws which will speed the communication of knowledge. At the same time, we must phrase such laws with care, with appropriate precision, so that those whose moral or religious convictions are opposed to contraception will be free *not* to take advantage of such information or such services. This is best done in advance—and not at a time when a legislature is being rushed to pass such legislation.

D. Medical: Under this heading must come the further study and analysis of laws connected with abortion and sterilization. Much intelligent legal work has already been done. More must be done. Here we start with the realization that there are probably more than 1 million illegal abortions per year in the United States and that at least 5,000 women lose their lives annually through such practices.[7]

We are told by the very great population expert, Dr. Alan F. Guttmacher, that the "abortion laws in the United States make hypocrites of all of us." [8] And another expert tells us that when it comes to abortion, that he knows "of no other instance in history in which there has been such frank and universal disregard for criminal law." [9] Dr. Guttmacher also criticizes what he calls our "national crazy-quilt pattern of legislation" [10] on the laws governing sterilization. He says "most of us do not know whether we are being legal or illegal when we carry out a sterilization without strict medical necessity, such as a serious heart disease." [11]

Steps in the right direction have been taken by the highly respected American Law Institute in its model penal code. And there is legislation in Virginia and in a number of other states which must be examined as possible models for the future. This is not testimony now advocating the passage of laws on either abortion or sterilization, but it is a plea for further study as to the possible role of such laws in our society.

Lastly is the recommendation that we reconsider and reevaluate all our laws in light of the newly recognized objective of population control. Laws are expressions of our social values. And quite properly, in the days before the automobile, our social values were such that we made it a greater crime to steal a horse in Texas than to steal a horse in Massachusetts. Today we have this new social value of population limitation—a value which did not exist at the time that our present-day laws were put into effect. As each new law is proposed, it must be analyzed in view of this new objective. And the time has come to engage in a comprehensive study of *existing* laws in light of our population goals.

A few moments ago, I mentioned the new law of Kentucky which has reduced the legal age from twenty-one to eighteen. Kentucky is the first state to have done so, although several other states have set the legal age at eighteen for women, while keeping the legal age at twenty-one for men. My immediate reaction is that such laws tend to increase population. When those who are only eighteen are permitted to buy homes, open charge accounts, and obtain loans under their own signature, school dropouts and early marriages may be encouraged. Let us find out. Let us think about the relative effect on population control before we pass such laws. Of course, it is a good argument on the other side to say that if a person is old enough to vote and join the Armed Forces then he is old enough to enter into contracts. But I suggest that the social value of population limitation was not considered in the passage of this law. And it should have been.

There are many laws which need reconsideration in light of our social desire to limit population growth. Marriage laws have already been noted, but we must also consider laws on divorce and on annulment. In many jurisdictions, annulments will be granted if one of the parties refuses to have children. Is such a legal rule valid in view of today's thinking? We need to reexamine our laws concerning illegitimate children. And, very important, we must reconsider our family support laws. What rules shall we enact regarding the financial responsibilities of fathers of both legitimate and illegitimate children? We must reevaluate our welfare laws and the way relief payments are handled. We must also examine our criminal laws dealing with such matters as the age of consent and homosexuality. Should we make changes in laws on joint bank accounts, on laws involving land ownership, on laws dealing with employment, on laws dealing with inheritance? I believe that we will want to make changes in all of these laws after we restudy them in view of the population problem.

Perhaps more important is our further consideration of the education laws. At what age can we permit dropouts? How much compulsory schooling—at what kinds of schools—should be demanded? Is it advisable to give single persons preference in obtaining scholarships? And we should even look into the question, as has been suggested by one group of demographers, as to whether we should continue to have coed junior and senior high schools or replace them with all-boy or all-girl schools.

There is almost no limit to the number of laws which should be reexamined in view of the additional criterion of the social value of population control. This should make us take even stronger steps to enforce the laws prohibiting racial discrimination. For as we provide employment for, and advance the education of, the nonwhites in our population, we shall have an automatic reduction in numbers of children—as well as making for a better and more prosperous America.

In his essay on "Population, Space, and Human Culture," Henry B. van Loon states: "The scientist and the lawyer must work together closely in the interest of mankind: the scientist to give us facts, the lawyer to help us make them useful." [12] And the sociologist wants to give us surveys of knowledge and attitudes or practices concerning reproduction so we can find out what people really know, believe, and do. As Julian Huxley has pointed out, "public opinion is ready." [13]

We have reached the stage where we must bring all of our disciplines together so that we, in this great developed country can implement a sound population policy—one which can then be readily transferred as part of our great contribution in helping the lesser developed nations of the world.

FOOTNOTES

[1] J. D. Rockefeller, III, *A Citizen's Perspective on Population*, 6 Intercom 14 (1964).

[2] *What Happens to Teen-Age Marriages?*, 19 Changing Times, The Kiplinger Magazine 6–7 Nov. 1965).

[3] *The Facts of Social Life* (*Updated*), 9 Am. Behav. Sci. 3, 34 (Oct. 1965).

[4] R. C. Cook, *New Patterns in U. S. Fertility*, 20 Population Bull. 113, 130–131 (1964).

[5] *See*, J. Ind. St. Med. Ass'n and J. Marr. and the Family, as quoted in *supra*, note 2, at 8. Reference also personal correspondence between the author and various sociologists.

[6] Ky. Rev. Stat. 2.015, ch. 21, § 1 (1964).

[7] Studies quoted in J. M. Kummer, *The Problems of Abortion: The Personal Population Explosion*, in The Population Crisis and the Use of World Resources, 274, 275 S. Mudd ed. 1964).

[8] *Id*. at 278.

[9] Taussig, *supra* note 7.

[10] A. F. Guttmacher, Babies by Choice or by Chance, 59 (1959).

[11] Alan F. Guttmacher, *The Place of Sterilization*, 268, 271, in Mudd, *supra* note 7.

[12] H. B. Van Loon, 25 L. & Contemp. Prob. 397, 405 (1960).

[13] J. Huxley, *Too Many People*, in our Crowded Planet, 223, 229 (F. Osborn ed. 1962).

CONGRESSMAN JOHN DELLENBACK REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the April newsletter of Congressman JOHN DELLENBACK, of Oregon.

I have found it both interesting and timely since it deals with two very important issues, inflation and taxes.

The newsletter follows:

CONGRESSMAN JOHN DELLENBACK REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

APRIL 1969.

DEAR FRIEND: With April 15th just past us, taxation, both federal and local, is very much at the surface of all our thinking. Rather than discussing a wide variety of issues, I think that, at the beginning of this new Congress, I should give you my thinking on the greatest problem facing the nation—the task of halting inflation without bringing about a recession—and how federal taxation fits into that picture.

The nation's present inflationary predicament is in great part due to the failure of the Johnson Administration and past Congresses to estimate accurately the costs of the Vietnam War and to make unavoidable choices between guns and butter. Many of the Great Society's costly programs were ill-conceived and poorly-administered. It is now up to the Nixon Administration to examine carefully all of these programs and see where it can make the changes necessary to bring order out of fiscal and monetary chaos inherited from the past.

We also must realize that the last Administration left a budget in which estimates of some receipts are too high, while predictions of many vital expenditures are too low. The projected budget surplus, which is an essential weapon in our battle against inflation, is unrealistically high and may be entirely illusory. It will take time to reverse the inflationary trends that are a result of several years of exorbitant government spending.

I believe that we can and must make sounder decisions on spending priorities and that we can reduce expenditures. The real question is one of priorities, and determining what is really important. It is up to the Congress to fight inflation by exercising self-discipline in voting appropriations.

INEQUITIES IN OUR TAX STRUCTURE

The largest source of tax revenue for the federal government is the personal income tax. The federal government is expected to collect about 186 billion dollars in taxes this year, or roughly one fourth of all personal income. The bulk of those taxes will be collected from persons in the middle income brackets, between $5,000 and $15,000.

This will continue no matter what we succeed in doing in the way of tax reform. Even so, there clearly are inequities in our present tax structure. For example, there are some people receiving very large incomes who pay either no federal income tax or very little. Although this is not the case with *most* people receiving large incomes, it's wrong when it is the case with *any* such people. Tax free foundations have on occasion been misused. The allowability of many deductions should be reconsidered. And there are far too many other examples of inequities.

I think attention should also be given to the people who are doing their best to make ends meet as they see their fixed incomes continue to lose buying power. I speak particularly of people whose source of income is based on government and private pensions, annuities and survivor's benefits. I am interested in allowing those who are able to earn additional income to do so without jeopardizing the level of Social Security and other benefits they receive.

REFORM—WHAT CAN BE DONE?

The House Ways and Means Committee has at long last undertaken an extensive review of our entire income tax system, beginning with hearings in February. I am very hopeful that Chairman Mills and his committee will deliver an omnibus tax revision proposal to the House later this year. Although early consideration of reform is highly desirable, the economic impact of even slight changes is considerable, and we can safely assume that the Committee will be very thorough in its deliberations.

Tax reform can be accomplished in a variety of ways. Here are a few areas for reform that I think merit consideration:

Treasury Department proposals.

Multiple trusts.

Minimum and maximum tax on individuals.

Tax treatment of charitable foundations.

Tax treatment of the elderly.

Foreign tax credits.

Taxation of single persons.

Income averaging.

Conglomerate mergers.

The Nixon Administration, inheritor of a tragic, costly war, an economy experiencing its fourth year of soaring inflation and a people whose faith in their national government is sorely tried, has requested that the 10 percent surtax be extended. While the surtax imposed last year certainly did not *stop* inflation, we are assured by top economists that without the surtax inflation would have been even more devastating. And we are further warned that removing the surtax now would feed the present inflation and make it a great deal worse. It is my view that the Congress must allow at least a short term extension, *providing* that the extension is accompanied by a firm expenditure ceiling, a budget surplus and strong Administration support of tax reform.

The Administration needs time to prepare a comprehensive tax reform package that is aimed at distributing the burden of taxes more fairly. There will be specific proposals coming from the Executive and I intend to offer my own recommendations shortly.

Congress should take in earnest the President's statement wherein he said the temporary tax (the surtax) must be ended as soon as our commitments in Southeast Asia and economic conditions permit. This is more than rhetoric. After considerable reduction of our effort in Vietnam, many of our current inflationary pressures should be removed. At that time, suspension of the surtax would appear to be of positive benefit, not only to individuals, but also to the entire economy, for it would serve as a stimulant to consumer buying, offsetting a downturn in defense related economic activity.

Vietnam, public works, veterans' benefits, the draft, Congressional reorganization, Electoral College reform, and many other issues demand the attention of the Congress. Underlying every one of these issues, however, is the need to put our national economic house in order, with an end to runaway inflation—partly through sound tax reform—taking top priority.

LUMBER AND PLYWOOD SUPPLY SHORTAGES

The President recognized the urgency of the crisis in lumber and plywood supplies and prices when he appointed a cabinet-level committee to recommend immediate actions to meet our national needs for wood products. While I commend the committee on its decisions and action to improve the present situation, I think the Congress must take more basic, long-range action to insure that sufficient lumber and plywood is available to meet our nation's goals.

I was particularly pleased to be allowed to sit with both the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the House Committee on Banking and Currency when these two committees held hearings on the lumber and plywood problem. Through these hearings we have finally focused attention on the deeper and much more critical problems underlying our troubles of the moment. The thrust of the many days' testimony was that unless this nation makes a radical change in its present practices and procedures in the management of its forests we will not have the absolutely essential lumber and plywood required to meet such national goals as those contained in the 1968 Housing Act. Present practices and procedures simply will not yield lumber and plywood in the right places at the right times and at the right prices to make possible the attainment of our essential national objectives.

Because the Fourth District has about 10 percent of the standing commercial softwood timber in the U.S., the vast public and private land holdings from which our timber resources is harvested account for a very significant share of the economy of Southwestern Oregon. No other part of the U.S. has as much at stake in any issue involving lumber and plywood as does our District.

We face a growing problem of an adequate supply of lumber and plywood to meet our nation's housing needs. But we *can* solve that problem if we move swiftly and wisely. I think the House and Senate hearings can point the way to necessary Congressional action.

Some of the major bills which I have introduced in the 91st Congress would:

Limit the number of Census questions to be answered under penalty of law.

Eliminate complex record-keeping procedures by removing ammunition from the sale and delivery provisions of the Crime Control Act.

Prohibit the assignment of a son to a combat area if a member of the family has died in Vietnam.

Establish the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area.

Provide needed irrigation water, flood control and conservation-recreation benefits on the Olalla division of the Umpqua project and the Merlin and Illinois Valley divisions of the Rogue River Basin project.

Provide for holding terms of the United States District Court in Coquille.

Permit employers to contribute to union trust funds for scholarships and child care centers for dependents of employees.

Eliminate tax loopholes which benefit wealthy nonfarmers at the expense of those whose major income is derived from farming.

Authorize the airlines to provide reduced fares for students, military personnel and senior citizens on a space-available basis.

Control oil pollution by making it unlawful to discharge oil from any vessel, waterfront facility or offshore structure into navigable waters.

COMING TO WASHINGTON?

Please drop by my office if business or vacation brings you to the nation's capital. There are many tours available, but it is always a good idea to make reservations as far in advance as possible for most of them.

My office will make these reservations for you if you will please notify me well in advance of your arrival!

HOW TO CONTACT ME

The easiest and best way to reach me is by letter, but if a matter is urgent, you can telephone me. My office address and telephone numbers—

In Washington

1210 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515. Phone: 225-6416. Area Code 202.

In the District

Post Office Box 1436, Post Office Building. Phone: 342-5141. Area Code 503.

INJURY CONTROL PROGRAM

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, when one hears of an outstanding program which deserves to be brought to the attention of the American people, I believe the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the place to have it printed.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs has such a program entitled, "Crusade for Children: Control Injuries and Prevent Fatalities." Mrs. Walter Varney Magee, president, recently stated they were endeavoring to change apathy in regard to accidents to activity for their prevention. She continued by saying:

> This program primarily involves the Junior Federated Club members because they are the ones with children; however, the General Federation members are just as interested in preventing injuries, eliminating human suffering and reducing the costs of unnecessary accidents.

This crusade program was developed by the injury control program, Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service by Dr. Irmagene Nevins Holloway, Assistant to the Chief, and Miss Carol Young, public information specialist. Dr. Holloway is a Kansan and taught at my alma mater, Kansas State College at Pittsburg. Through the injury control program, the material has been made available to the junior club presidents and the home life chairmen of the General Federation.

I was very much impressed with the statistics which are a part of this program. These were obtained from the vital statistics of the United States, 1965, National Center for Health Statistics:

> Accidents account for over 34 percent of all deaths for those between the ages of 1 and 4. Motor vehicle deaths are first, followed by fire and explosions. Drownings and poisonings follow in this order.
>
> Accidents account for more than 44 percent of all deaths for those between the ages of 5 and 14. Motor vehicles are the first cause following by drownings, explosions, and firearms.
>
> Accidents account for more than 56 percent of all deaths for those between the ages of 15 and 24. Motor vehicle accidents account for 66 percent of the fatalities followed by drownings and then firearms.

Further information obtained from the injury control program estimates that for each fatality there are over 100 bed-disabling injuries and 500 restricted activity injuries. Based on the number of children and teenagers killed in the different age group, it can be estimated that the number injured is as follows:

> For the age group 1–4—over 530,000 bed-disabling injuries and over 2½ million restricted activity injuries.
>
> For the age group 5–14—over 740,000 bed-disabling injuries and over 3½ million restricted activity injuries.
>
> For the age group 15–24—almost 2 million bed-disabling injuries and almost 7½ million restricted activity injuries.

The General Federation of Women's Club program is much more than a recital of statistics. It gives direction to program activities and these relate to what the club member should do in her own home as well as what she can do to improve her community.

These programs include a discussion of what is meant by safe behavior and parents' responsibility to give instructions, provide protection and supervision. A point that is mentioned is that children copy what they see their parents do. If the parents fasten their seat belts, then children form the habit early in life and it is not then a problem when they reach driving age.

"Preventing Traffic Accidents" is another program that includes safeguards that should be provided for children, teenagers, and enumerates the responsibilities of the family chauffeur. In addition, there are recommended ways for the club to carry out programs as community projects for the prevention of traffic accidents.

A third program deals with "Drown-Proofing Children and Adults." With the increase of backyard pools, it is becoming necessary for children and adults to learn the technique of drownproofing. This technique is taught by the swimming instructors of the local Red Cross Chapter.

"Controlling Poisons" is another program. The incidence of accidental poisonings is definitely related to the age of the victim. It is a major problem for children between the ages of 1 and 5, with aspirin the most frequently ingested poison. Parents are not aware that over 250,000 potentially poisonous substances—estimate made by the American Academy of Pediatrics—are marked for use in American homes. It is necessary for each person who uses one of these potential dangers to know how to use it safely.

Preventing burns is of concern to every family. For use in this program, the Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp. provides visual display, "You Can Avoid Painful Injuries by Preventing Potential Fires." Parents should obtain this information and help to decrease the 3,000 deaths and 150,000 serious burns that occur because of flammable fabrics. Flame retardant fabrics are a means for preventing these burns; these materials are beginning to be available and a demand should be created for their use.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs is to be commended for its acceptance of this lifesaving program. The startling figure of over 34,300 children and youth—ages 1 through 24—killed each year certainly indicates something needs to be done. Information obtained from the injury control program, Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service. It is a challenge for every American to become involved in control of injuries and the prevention of fatalities.

VETERANS NEED ADDITIONAL EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which provides badly needed increases in the educational assistance allowances we are now paying veterans who are attending college under the cold war GI bill.

In the 90th Congress, we enacted the Veterans' Readjustment Act which provided, among other things, for some increase in the educational assistance allowances which are paid to veterans pursuing a higher education. However, while these increases have helped, they are not enough. Current allowances are 46 percent below the average cost of a college education.

At the present time, the cost of attending a public college is about $1,092 per year. The annual cost to the student to attend a private college is about $2,326. This means that, on the average, it costs $1,709 per year to attend college. This is $669 less than the veteran receives under the existing educational assistance payment scale.

It is obvious that, while we have provided some increases in the educational allowances which veterans receive to cover a portion of their subsistence, books, supplies, tuition, fees, equipment, and other educational costs, the amounts we are providing are not adequate to keep pace with the spiraling cost of higher education. Mr. Speaker, there is a great need for enactment of the legislation I have introduced today. Enactment of my bill will enable us to fulfill the commitment which the Congress made at the inception of this program when we declared it to be a matter of national policy that the people of the Nation make an investment in our veterans by helping them defray the costs of their education. I would like at this point to insert in the RECORD a table showing present educational assistance allowance levels and the new levels which enactment of my bill will establish:

	Present level	Eilberg proposal
1. Single veterans:		
A. Full-time students	$130	$190
B. Three-quarter-time students	95	140
C. Half-time students	60	90
D. Cooperative education students (work-study programs)	105	115
2. Veterans with 1 dependent:		
A. Full-time students	155	215
B. Three-quarter-time students	115	160
C. Half-time students	75	105
D. Cooperative education students	125	175
3. Veterans with 2 dependents:		
A. Full-time students	175	235
B. Three-quarter-time students	135	180
C. Half-time students	85	115
D. Cooperative education students	145	195

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the allowances set forth in the foregoing table, my bill will provide that full-time students with more than two dependents would receive an additional $10 per month per additional dependent; veterans with more than two dependents pursuing a three-quarter time course of studies would receive $7 per additional dependent; veterans with more than two dependents pursuing a course of studies half time would receive $5 per additional dependent; and veterans enrolled in cooperative educational programs would receive an additional $7 per each dependent over two.

Mr. Speaker, the need for the bill I have introduced today is obvious. I urge all my colleagues to join with me in working for prompt enactment of its provisions.

THE GREAT AWAKENING

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, April 14, 1969, marked the 5th anniversary of the death of Rachel Carson, who through her life's work as a biologist and as an author established herself as one of America's greatest conservationists.

Rachel Carson, in her books "The Sea Around Us" and "Silent Spring," aroused much of the public to the fact that man was despoiling his environment and threatening the entire ecological balance of our planet.

The April 13, 1969, issue of This Week magazine carried an excellent article on Miss Carson by the respected author and journalist, Ann Cottrell Free. As a modest token of our respect for Rachel Carson, I insert the text of the article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE GREAT AWAKENING: CITY HALL, CONGRESS AND THE WHITE HOUSE ARE AWARE OF OUR BATTLE FOR SURVIVAL

(By Ann Cottrell Free)

A cracked—and sometimes shattered—egg in the bald eagle's nest tells part of the story of this spring of 1969.

Leading wildlife scientists have concluded recently that DDT, absorbed by mother eagles, is making eggshells too fragile to protect the babies within.

A few more of our national birds will remain unborn—and soon there may be none in many areas. Loss of these symbols of the nation, possibly due to weird-acting chemicals, tragically symbolizes much that is happening today. A mere look-around or a whiff of our often filthy air and waters offers proof that something is wrong all over.

From oil-slicked to oil-slicked shining sea we are realizing, at last, that we are in an incredible mess. And that is the other part of the story this spring.

Our giant of a nation is stirring. It is in the early stages of a "Great Awakening." Not only are some of us wondering about the implications of the eagle's eggs, many of us realizing that our fouled air and water could soon be seeded with destruction for the human race.

City Hall, the Congress and the White House no longer give us the same old brushoff. For they are becoming aware that we are now in a battle for survival. Eleven Congressmen are even seeking a Constitutional amendment to serve as a "bill of rights" for the environment. And the United Nations is calling a 130-nation conference in 1972 on the damaged environment.

But it wasn't always this way. A lake could die, a river be a running sewer, robins disappear and bulldozers uproot our parks. And officials only blinked when we cried "Stop!"

Then something happened. Could it have marked the beginning of what Senator Frank E. Moss of Utah calls the "Great Awakening"?

We discovered Rachel Carson. The year was 1962.

This was a new Rachel Carson. The prose-poet of *The Sea Around Us*, the gentle biologist became almost overnight the long-needed leader. Her *Silent Spring*, appearing that year, was, in truth, a call to arms to save the entire environment from its many enemies. She chose, however, to concentrate her attack on the misuse of DDT and other *wonder* chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides. And in the process she gave us what Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas called "the most important chronicle of this century for the human race."

She rode no white charger (she drove a rather tired green Oldsmobile), but she became for many our country's St. Joan, preaching that when nature is out of joint, so are we. Pesticide misuse, she claimed, could convert the chain of life into the chain of death. She raised many questions. Is there a connection between these new chemicals and cancer? Could they cause genetic changes, thus cursing our descendants with physical and mental abnormalities? "As crude a weapon as a cave man's club," she wrote, "has been hurled against the fabric of life."

An industry mobilized against Rachel Carson, but she stood her ground even though her health was failing. (She underwent surgery for cancer in 1957, 1960, and again in 1964.) Persons from all walks of life wrote her, telling of unpleasant experiences with pesticides and asking her for guidance. Some of you reading this today may be among them. Save her reply. Hand it down to your grandchildren as a fragment of a new kind of "declaration of independence": man's refusal to continue to be victimized by unwise use of the gifts of science and technology.

Your letters were answered even though the sight in those deep-set blue eyes was failing. Her brave heart was faltering. And near the end she spent most of her time in a wheel chair. "If people care enough to write," she would say in her calm voice when advised to rest, "I can certainly answer, inform them and encourage them to fight back."

But on Tuesday, April 14, 1964—five years ago this coming Monday—she died of cancer, at age 56, at her home in Silver Spring, Md.

The torch was picked up. The shock of her death galvanized people into action. It seemed to amplify her message. Mrs. Lyndon Johnson joined the crusade. Interior Secretary Udall was already in it. The chorus grew louder. The message: "Save our Environment" was getting across. The "Great Awakening" was truly underway.

In the five years since Rachel Carson's death, we can count at least five milestones of specific progress:

Sixteen million acres of land—about the size of West Virginia—saved from unbridled-gobbling up, through placement in national, state and local parks, wildlife refuges, wilderness areas, forests, recreation areas. (Nature Conservancy in Maine—where she spent her summers—holds a tiny part of this as the "Rachel Carson Seacoast.")

Drastic reductions of many pesticides permitted on foodstuffs. Federal review and frequent rewording of instruction labels on 30,000 pesticide products. Virtual veto power given to special governmental board over choice of pesticides used on Federal property. Discovery of safer substitutes. Advances in biological control, harnessing nature to save herself.

Federal pushing of often reluctant states into setting and enforcing standards to reduce air and water pollution. Some $251,000,000 spent by the Federal government on pollution research and related activities in 1968.

Greater Federal and State effort to save vanishing American wildlife and to obtain wetlands for waterfowl. More rapid growth of *birdwatchers* than hunters.

Soaring membership of conservation groups, such as the National Audubon Society and Sierra Club, creating a new powerful force.

Even with this progress, the *awakened* feel it is only a beginning. Land is being *used up* at the rate of nearly a million acres annually. Noise pollution is threatening our hearing and our sanity. Overheated bays and rivers, from electric power plants, are affecting fish and tiny life-giving organisms. And there persists the worry over escaping oil from tidelands and tankers. (Memory of those quarter-million gallons off California this winter does not erase easily.)

Nor is the DDT battle over. Five states may be on the verge of banning its use on their property. Senator Gaylord Nelson, who is from Wisconsin—where DDT is "on trial"—is calling for a ban on its interstate shipment, as well as complete tightening up of pesticide controls. Once the impact of the thin eggshells of the bald eagle sinks in, calls for banning DDT may grow far louder. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and University of Wisconsin scientists report that DDT—absorbed through DDT-infiltrated prey—stimulates the birds' livers to produce enzymes that break down sex hormones in the blood. These hormones serve as regulators in laying down calcium needed to develop normal eggshells. The peregrine falcon and osprey also seem to be caught in this chain action.

To find out just how big a mess we are in here in the U.S.A., Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, author of clean air and water laws, is asking the Senate to set up a special high-powered committee to examine all technological effects on our environment. "This job," he says, "will take three years at least."

Such a look-see will help, but problems are growing so fast and on so many fronts that 90 Congressmen have just set up a privately-supported Environmental Clearing House. This way, they can get quick and ready answers as to the newest developments.

But what of you and me? We want answers, too. Do we need, perhaps a Rachel Carson once again? She anticipated this, for just before she died she asked that the work of providing information to people like us be carried on, because "I cannot continue to do so much longer."

The Rachel Carson Trust for the Living Environment, 8940 Jones Mill Road, Washington, D.C. 20015, plans to carry on for her, helping to bridge the communications gap between scientists and the general public, to whom it is looking for much of its financial support. Most of its distinguished members are scientists and were friends of Rachel Carson.

Even with so many dedicated persons, in and out of government, working to save the world around us, will we ever again be awakened by language as clear and beautiful as a wood thrush's song? With Rachel Carson we entered what has been called the "age of ecology" to the sound of a kind of music.

How many of us can define ecology? The interrelationship of all living things is the usual definition of this science and philosophy. But Rachel Carson looked to these lines of Francis Thompson, an English poet, who died in 1907—the year she was born in Springdale, Pennsylvania:

> "Thou canst not stir a flower
> Without troubling of a star."

INSTITUTIONAL SELF-RENEWAL

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, there are many voices for reform of the institutions in this country, some confused, some clear. One of the most impressive is that of former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John Gardner, who is urging changes in our processses of change.

In the annual Godkin lectures at Harvard University, Mr. Gardner, now chairman of the Urban Coalition, asks why we should not be the first society to take into account the aging of institutions by providing for their continuous self-renewal.

He points out:

> The society capable of continuous renewal will be the one that develops to the fullest its human resources, that removes obstacles to individual fulfillment, lifelong earning and self-discovery.

The alternative to continual redesign of our society, he concludes, is unavoidable confrontation between institutions that refuse to change and critics bent on their destruction.

Mr. Gardner's case for new thinking about our traditional institutions and their sluggish response to change is compelling. Excerpts from his lectures follow:

TOWARD A SELF-RENEWING SOCIETY

(By John W. Gardner)

It is hard to view events on the domestic scene today without feeling that these are dark days for the nation. But it may be that we were in greater peril when we were less worried, when all the present evils were layered over by our national smugness. We may even be on the mend. But our salvation will never be handed to us. If we are lucky, we will be given the chance to earn it. Unfortunately, we are enormously clever at avoiding self-examination.

INSTANT ANTIQUITY

The crises of the urban environment suggests the depth and complexity of issues in the management of our society. Why have we had such difficulty, steadily mounting difficulty, in getting at these problems? One might blame our apathy, or our unwillingness to spend, or our resistance to change. But something else is wrong, something central, something crucial. Our society, as it is now functioning, is not an adequate problem-solving mechanism. The machinery of the society is not working in a fashion that will permit us to solve any of our problems effectively.

Each reformer comes to his task with a little bundle of desired changes. The implication is that if appropriate reforms are carried through and the defects corrected, the society will be wholly satisfactory and the work of the reformer done. That is a primitive way of viewing social change. The true task is to design a society (and institutions) capable of continuous change, renewal and responsivness. We can less and less afford to limit ourselves to routine repair of breakdowns in our institutions. Unless we are willing to see a final confrontation between institutions that refuse to change and critics bent on destruction, we had better get on with the business of redesigning our society. We must dispose of the notion that social change is a process that alters a tranquil *status quo*. Today there is no tranquillity to alter. The rush of change brings a kind of instant antiquity.

The departments of the Federal Government are in grave need of renewal. State government in most places is a 19th century relic; in most cities, municipal government is a waxworks of stiffly preserved anachronisms. The courts are crippled by archaic organizational arrangements; the unions, the professions, the universities, the corporations, each has spung its own impenetrable web of vested interests.

That human institutions require periodic redesign (if only because of their tendency to decay) it is not a minor fact about them. How curious it is, then, that in all of history no people has seriously attempted to take into account the aging of institutions and to provide for their continuous renewal. Why shouldn't we be the first to do so?

A society capable of continuous renewal would be characterized first of all by pluralism—by variety, alternatives, choices and multiple focuses of power and initiative. We have just such pluralism in this society. But the logic of modern large-scale organization, governmental or corporate, tends to squeeze out pluralism and to move us toward one comprehensively articulated system of power. If that trend proceeds unchecked in the public sphere, there will soon (say, in 25 years) be no such thing as state, county and city government. There will be one all-encompassing governmental system.

As the trend proceeds in the private sphere, corporations merge, small colleges and small businesses find survival increasingly difficult. I find myself treasuring every remaining bit of pluralism, everything that stands between us and an all-embracing system. When I hear young people recommending the abolition of private enterprise, I question whether they have weighed the consequences. It may not have occurred to them that socialism or any other alternative to private enterprise would certainly mean the shouldering by Government of huge new burdens. Our giant corporations would not disappear. They would simply be merged into unimaginably vast Government ministries. And bureaucracy would conquer all.

The society capable of continuous renewal will be one that develops to the fullest its human resources, that removes obstacles to individual fulfillment, that emphasizes education, lifelong learning and self-discovery. We are still far from having created such a system.

To bring full justice and equality to black people is the historic assignment of this generation. The problems will be resolved not by violence or hatred or bitterness or police suppression, but only by patient, determined efforts on the part of the great, politically moderate majority of whites and blacks.

THE BEEHIVE MODEL

We have in the tradition of this nation a well-tested framework of values. Our problem is not to find better values, but rather to be faithful to those we profess—and to make those values live in our institutions, which we have yet to do. If we believe in individual dignity and responsibility, for example, we must do the necessary, sometimes expensive, often complicated things that will make it possible for each person to have a decent job if he wants one.

More than anything else, the contemporary demoralization stems from a breakdown in the relationship of the individual to society. It is widely assumed that the condition applies only to hippies, college radicals, artists and intellectuals. But it may also be found in some degree throughout the population. On the one hand, men have never had more control than they have in this country today; on the other, we complain that we can't control our own fate.

One of the problems is that the end toward which all modern societies, whatever their ideology, seem to be moving is the beehive model, in which the total system perfects itself as the individual is steadily dwarfed. All modern societies, capitalist or Communist, are moving toward ever larger and more inclusive systems of organization, toward ever greater dominance of the system's purposes over individual purposes.

Contemporary critics often appear to believe that the smothering of individuality is a consequence of intentional decisions by people at the top. Right-wingers blame Govermnent leaders, left-wingers blame corporate leaders. But the modern leader is always in some measure caught in the system. To a considerable degree, the system determines how and when he will exercise power. The queen bee is as much a prisoner of the system as is any other in the hive.

Is there any way to avoid the beehive model? Perhaps. We must ask the individual to accept certain kinds of responsibility, and we must create the institutional framework in which individual responsibility is feasible. Traditionally, we have spent enormous energy exhorting the individual to act responsibly, and very little energy designing the kind of society in which he can act responsibly.

A CHANCE FOR SERVICE

The loss of a sense of community is particularly serious. In some ways modern society binds the individual too tightly, but in other ways it holds him too loosely—and the latter causes as much pain as the former. He feels constrained by the conformity required in a highly organized society, but he also feels lost and without moorings. And both feelings may be traced to the same cause: the disappearance of the natural human community and its replacement by formula controls that irk and give no sense of security.

When people, for whatever reason—oppression or laziness or complacency—take no part in their institutions, the institutions themselves decay at an accelerating rate. But it is not essential that everyone participate. As a matter of fact, if everyone suddenly did, the society would fly apart. Participation should simply be an available option.

Can action on the part of the individual at the grass roots ever really be effective? It all depends on how we design our society. We must, for example, undertake a drastic overhaul of local government.

All large-scale organization tends to smother individuality. But today's young person doesn't give due weight to the fact that large-scale organization, properly designed, can also benefit the individual, enrich his life, increase his choices. Everyone lampoons modern technological society, but no one is prepared to give up his refrigerator. Everyone condemns bigness, but there is no movement of population toward the unspoiled, lonely places of the continent. We must identify those features of modern organization that strengthen the individual and those that diminish him. Given such analysis, we can design institutions that would strengthen and nourish each person. In short, we can build a society to man's measure, if we have the will.

Such a society will not just serve the individual but give him an opportunity to serve. When people are serving, life is no longer meaningless; they no longer feel rootless. Without allegiance and commitment, individual freedom degenerates into a sterile self-preoccupation.

Just as modern man obsessively breaks up the forms and patterns of life and then finds himself nervous and afraid in a formless world, so, in the name of freedom, he compulsively dissolves the limits on behavior and then finds himself unhappy in a world without limits. He sweeps aside rules, manners, formalities and standards of taste, anything that even slightly inhibits the free play of emotion and impulse. Yet not only the claims of civility but also the realities of individual development call for some measure of self-discipline. We have explored about as fully as a civilization can the joys of impulse, of a world within forms, order or limits. A balance must be struck.

For a variety of reasons, we have seen increasingly widespread hostility to institutions—any and all institutions, here and around the world. The standard phrase concerning social disorders is "It's only a small group that's involved." But that is a misleading assertion. Beyond the fractious few, beyond even the considerable group of sympathizers, is the larger number of people who have no fixed views but are running a chronic low-fever of antagonism toward their institutions, their fellow men and life in general. They provide the climate in which disorder spreads. In that climate, unfortunately, our honored tradition of dissent has undergone an unprecedented debasement.

Among the dissenters today we hear a few with a special message. They say: "We don't need reform, we need revolution. The whole system is rotten and should be destroyed." I have talked long and seriously with such people and have found that most of them don't really mean it. There is an awesome theatricality about today's radicalism. But some, of course, do mean it. They have fallen victim to an old and naive doctrine—that man is naturally good, humane, decent, just and honorable, but that corrupt and wicked institutions have transformed the noble savage into a civilized monster. Destroy the corrupt institutions, they say, and man's native goodness will flower. There isn't anything in history or anthropology to confirm the thesis, but it survives down the generations.

The responsible critic comes to understand the complex machinery by which change must be accomplished, finds the key points of leverage, identifies feasible alternatives, and measures his work by real results. The irresponsible critic never exposes himself to the tough tests of reality. He doesn't subject his view of the world to the cleansing discipline of historical perspective or contemporary relevance. He defines the problem to suit himself. He can spin fantasies of what might be, without the heartbreaking, backbreaking work of building social change into resistant human institutions. Out of such self-indulgent and reckless radicalism come few victories.

A RELEVANT CALL

The chief means by which citizens make their influence felt must continue to be the long-tested, well-established procedures of a free society: the ballot, the lawsuit, the strike, the petition and so on. One hears a special justification for the recent ghetto riots. The riots were necessary, it is argued, to produce fear in the power structure and thereby to get action on the social front. It is true that the riots provoked fear, but there were a lot of consequences besides constructive social action. The riots led many Congressmen and citizens to resist further federal programs for the cities. The riots also strengthened every right-wing extremist group in the country.

I do not blame the ghetto residents for being angry, but they must not let their anger lead them into self-destructive moves. They must seek—as the college activist must seek, as we all must seek—a world in which man's destructive impulses are brought within a framework of law and rationality. Anyone who unleashes man's destructive impulses had better stand a long way back. The anarchist paves the way for the authoritarian. The serious citizen will have to learn a simple truth: one must act forcefully to combat injustice, and at the same time one must oppose disorder and violence.

The years immediately ahead will test this nation as seriously as any we have known in our history. We have plenty of debaters, blamers, provocateurs. We don't have plenty of problem-solvers. A relevant call to action would address itself to that complacent lump of Americans who fatten on the yield of this society but never bestir themselves to solve its problems, to powerful men who rest complacently with outworn institutions, and to Americans still uncommitted to the values we profess to cherish as a people.

JOHN P. HARRIS: 1901-69

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Kansas has lost one of its outstanding men of journalism with the passing of John P. Harris of Hutchinson, Kans.

Jack Harris started a successful newspaper career as an assistant carrier boy and worked in every phase of the newspaper operation started by his father. When he died on April 13, 1969, Mr. Harris was chairman of the board of Publishing Enterprises, Inc. which includes eight newspapers in Kansas, Iowa, and California. The Harris group also operates six radio stations in Kansas, Iowa, Illinois, and Colorado.

His independent and crusading spirit made him a constructive force in his community and in the State of Kansas. In 1965 the Hutchinson News won a Pulitzer Prize for its campaign on Kansas reapportionment.

He was committed to the betterment of journalism, and traveled extensively at home and abroad to serve as consultant to struggling newspapers. In reporting the death of Mr. Harris, the Hutchinson News described his philosophy of what a good newspaper should be:

> It should do something more than just print the news and get the middle initials right. . . . the ideal one should have something in each issue that will be the prime subject of community conversation the next day. It need not be a scoop or an editorial that touches a general spark. It can be a bit of other than malicious gossip, punning headline or a human interest picture.

I valued his friendship and enjoyed visiting with him from time to time. He was a man of candor and integrity. He was a leader who shunned the spotlight. He was an independent and intelligent citizen.

Mrs. Shriver and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to his wife, Rosalie, and to his son, John. Jack Harris will be missed and long remembered.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include editorials from the Hutchinson, Kans., News, the Witchita, Kans., Eagle, and the Kansas City, Mo., Times which appropriately eulogize this distinguished American. The editorials follow:

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News]

JACK HARRIS

Hutchinson has lost one of its finest citizens.

Jack Harris, known to so many and known by so few, was just that.

His newspapers and radio stations are evidence of his business success, but most of the things he did for people and the town were lost in a self-effacing desire for anonymity.

He was a dreamer of great things, but he also had the wisdom and drive to make them come true. He was, in a sense, one of the passing breed of wheeler dealers, but his efforts were always dignified by integrity. He combined the tough-mindedness that is essential to the solving of problems with the courage to take risks and the decisive judgment to arrive at the right answer. With this tough-mindedness was the kind of humility that recognizes that many diverse talents and backgrounds are essential to the achievement of any worthwhile business, social or civic goal. He melded them together.

Jack Harris never shrank from any issue because it was unpopular. He developed a self-restraint that enabled him to profit from criticism. He was a leader in his profession and gave generously of his time and energy both at home and abroad to further its efficiency and growth. He was an innovator, not a follower. As an employer he pioneered fringe benefit programs which recognized and rewarded his employes long before this was common practice.

His accomplishments are legion. His travel columns brought Europe and Asia sharply and intimately into focus in many Kansas homes. He was the friend and confidant of many in government in this country and abroad but he was also a home town civic leader who was never too busy to advise and counsel and work to promote the good of Hutchinson and other towns in which he had communications interests.

Jack Harris is gone but his immortality is assured through the scores of outstanding journalists he trained and guided and who have gone on to successes of their own . . . and who are now training others to follow them.

Some know it, others don't, but every Hutchinson is a little bit better off today because Jack Harris lived here for so many years.

His memorial is the void his death leaves.

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle]

JOHN P. HARRIS

John P. Harris of Hutchinson was a successful newspaper publisher in the same way other Kansas publishers have been successful—he built up his holdings and made money. But to say this is to paint an almost entirely misleading picture of the man.

His business acumen, though undisputed, was not the quality for which he will be best remembered. It was his toughmindedness and his absolute fearlessness that people will remember longest.

He addressed every problem on what he conceived its basic elements to be, shorn of myth and prejudice and cant. Once he had got to the bottom of it, he wrote exactly what he believed to be the truth. His friends might not like it. His advertisers might be livid. His subscribers might cancel in quantity. What Jack Harris thought was right he wrote.

He trained a succession of editors to do the same. And together they achieved a reputation for independence and candor and originality of thought that many another newsman has envied.

In his personal life Mr. Harris was rather retiring, and he was rarely credited with his many contributions to state and city causes, but his quiet work behind the scenes, like his lucid editorial utterings, had a tremendous influence for good.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Times]

JOHN P. HARRIS, KANSAS EDITOR

The state of Kansas long has been noted for the quality of its newspapers, and John P. Harris who built a family chain through the years was one of the reasons. His death this week in Hutchinson, two years after he had turned over the active direction of Publishing Enterprises, Inc., to others, is a sad blow to the state and to American journalism

Yet the Harris influence, we are sure, will go on. It was typical of Jack Harris that his column, "This and That," was writen ahead and ready to go through most of this week. The familiar lower-case initials, j.p.h., still will be seen in most of the Harris papers for a little while. Beyond that, we would expect the Harris enthusiasm for reporting the news, his dislike of sham, and his independent nature to continue in the work of the men he trained.

He was a debonair, gracious individual, a world traveler of insight and much personal charm. He could be a kind, understanding but very tough employer. It was his habit to arrive at the office at 7 o'clock in the morning (after a horseback ride) to go through the mail. He didn't want to miss anything. His hobby, he once said, was to be the guardian of his newspapers against the split infinitive. When one appeared, there was an explosion. If one appeared in a headline, the sound of pain could be cataclysmic. Another Harris occupation was the preparation of needling editorials directed at the Kansas Legislature. The Hutchinson News won a Pulitzer prize in 1965 for its long campaign on Kansas reapportionment. Yet he seldom was critical unless he had a better idea.

In an age of specialization, Jack Harris was recognized as a newsman who knew the business and mechanical sides of publishing thoroughly. He could operate a Linotype machine and sometimes did in his younger days. In Kansas he will be remembered as a newspaperman of integrity and skill who loved the business and who always saw it as more than a business.

PFC. STANLEY McCREARY DIES OF WAR WOUNDS IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Stanley E. McCreary, a fine young soldier from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PFC. STANLEY McCREARY DIES OF WAR WOUNDS IN VIETNAM

Pfc. Stanley E. McCreary, of 2209 Williams drive, Havre de Grace, was killed in action in Vietnam on April 7, less than three weeks after he arrived in the war zone.

The Defense Department announced yesterday that Private McCreary, 20, died from wounds received in a combat operation in Hau Nghia province, north of Saigon. He was a member of C Company, 1st Battalion, 1st Infantry Regiment, 25th Infantry Division.

Stanley McCreary's father, Eugene McCreary, recalled yesterday that his son loved sports. He played football and basketball, was a track man in high school and maintained his interest in sandlot games after school. He graduated from Aberdeen High School in 1966.

In his junior year, he won a medal at the Philadelphia Penn Relays as a member of the Havre de Grace High School track team. It was the following year that he transferred to Aberdeen.

Private McCreary was a faithful letter writer. His father said he wrote weekly when he was in the United States and had written three letters home in the two weeks following his arrival in Vietnam.

"He wrote mostly about personal matters," Mr. McCreary said. "He always told me not to worry, that he was all right."

His father remarked that in one letter he told how his camp had been hit by enemy rockets.

"He always looked after me because of my health," Mr. McCreary added. For some time, Mr. McCreary has not enjoyed good health.

Private McCreary did not want to go overseas and once asked a chaplain to keep him in the U.S. so that he could look after his father, "but he had to do it, and he did," Mr. McCreary added. The young man, the only child of his parents, was born in Baltimore.

TRIBUTE TO DIRECTION SPORTS

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call the attention of this House to a unique and successful program that has been operating in the Watts area of Los Angeles. Direction Sports begins where Little League leaves off—it serves those who have no fathers to participate, those who have no money for uniforms, insurance, and the other requisites of Little League participation.

But Direction Sports gives the boys it serves more than an opportunity to participate in the kind of athletic competition enjoyed by their middle-class counterparts. Through techniques developed by the Southwest Regional Lab in Inglewood, Calif.—a project which has received more than $4 million from the Office of Education's Bureau of Research in the past 2 years—Direction Sports youngsters improve their learning skills and social attitudes by means of educative chalk talks. In my view, Direction Sports is precisely the kind of innovative program that those of us who have been struggling to find solutions to urban ills have encouraged in legislation passed in recent years. As important as the heartwarming results described in the following article by the Christian Science Monitor, however, is the fact that program evaluation have shown a statistically significant increase in participants' mathematics achievement scores.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Monitor's article to the attention of my colleagues, especially those whose constituencies include disadvantaged metropolitan areas.

WATTS: DIRECTION SPORTS

(By Cliff Gewecke)

LOS ANGELES.—Ever since the Watts, and other, riots of 1965, sports programs for the underprivileged Negro youngster have come to the fore.

The idea seems to be: get more of these youngsters off the streets, inspire and skill them with sports (and sport heroes), and potential ruffians and "lost causes" may be motivated into becoming useful, productive citizens.

One of the most recent, and perhaps most farsighted, of these programs—which emanated in the Watts section of Los Angeles during 1968—is "direction Sports," an affiliate of the Urban Affairs Foundation, Inc.

Essentially, it is a "Little League for the underprivileged." But it has distinct overtones, and undertones, of improving positive learning skills through orientation, "chalk talks," and group discussions.

"TREMENDOUS DISPARITY?

"Privately funded sports programs involve more than one million youngsters and are the most popular youth format in the nation," says former sales representative Tulley Brown, who is program director for Direction Sports.

"Yet, there is a tremendous disparity between the number of privately funded sports programs for the youth in middle-class areas as opposed to those in the underprivileged areas."

To drive home his point, Brown cites this statistic: that, in a letter dated Aug. 2, 1968, A. E. Houghton, secretary of Little League Baseball, headquartered in Williamsport, Pa., stated there were 55,620 youngsters involved in the Greater Los Angeles area.

"Of this number," emphasizes Brown, "not one team operates in the immense minority corridor extending from North Broadway south to Compton and including some 200,000 school-age children.

"The reasons for this are basic," he adds. "Little League programs function with the assistance of fathers, often with the youngsters paying for their own insurance and medical checkup. A general requirement is that the youngsters have had not more than one 'D' in the preceding semester's schoolwork—and no police record."

DON'T QUALIFY FOR LITTLE LEAGUE

"Too often," Brown continued, "the youngsters in the ghettos do not have fathers to participate, money to pay for insurance and doctors, adequate grades, and they do have police records. Thus, classical Little League is untenable in deprived areas."

Started officially Sept. 23 with the advent of the past football season, Direction Sports encompassed some 75 youngsters in the preteenage category.

Plans are to go through the major sports in-season—basketball, track baseball. And to expand to other (older and younger) age categories, and even to reach into the participation of girls in the program.

Letters of commendation have been received from such men as California attorney general Tom Lynch, Los Angeles County sheriff Peter Pitchess, Los Angeles police chief Tom Reddin, and Los Angeles mayor Sam Yorty.

UNIQUE CHALK TALK

The program has been featured on some eight southern California television programs. Sports Illustrated is providing a weekly magazine subscription for every boy in the project, and the 7-Up Bottling Company has donated uniforms. CBS-Los Angeles, after voting Direction Sports one of the top six programs in Los Angeles, contributed $1,000 worth of jackets, track shoes, and pants for future use by the youngsters.

Yet, if the program is to continue to thrive (and, even, go national perhaps someday), more funds, and help, will be needed.

(A free brochure may be obtained by writing: Project Director Tulley N. Brown, Direction Sports, Inc., Urban Affairs Foundation, 955 S. Western Ave., Suite 204, Los Angeles, Calif. 90006).

Recently, the writer sat in (with Brown, a Negro group leader recruited from a nearby college, and a dozen youngsters) on one of the educative chalk talks that utilize sports as "transference" for learning.

"Ricky," said the leader, pointing to a lad in the front row, "how many points do you get for a touchdown?"

"Six," answered Ricky.

"How many points for a field goal?"

"Two."

"You sure?"

"Three?" replied Ricky, hesitantly.

"Add six and three and what do you get," asked the leader.

"Nine!"

"Good! Now," continued the leader, "in basketball you get how many points for a field goal? . . . and two minus nine is . . ."

And so the questions, and the transference-of-learning skills answers, spread throughout the room—perhaps someday soon to spread throughout the United States with Tulley Brown's dream of "Direction Sports becoming the Little League of minority areas."

THE PLANE THAT SHOULD NOT BE MISSING

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, more than 2 months ago, a Mineral County Airlines DC-3 disappeared on a flight from Hawthorne, Nev., with 35 persons on board. That aircraft is still missing.

At this time, there is no way to tell what the cause of the plane's disappearance was, whether there were—or are—survivors, or why search and rescue efforts have been fruitless. We do know, however, that the DC-3 did not carry a crash locator beacon to enable searchers to find it in the event of a crash. It did not have this equipment because the Federal Aviation Administration does not require it.

Twenty-nine of us in the House have acted to prevent recurrences of this type of tragedy by sponsoring legislation directing the FAA to make crash locator beacons mandatory for all aircraft. It is long past time for this step to be taken.

For those who may still have questions about the need for FAA action in this regard, I am inserting in the RECORD an April 14 article by Los Angeles Times staff writer, Lee Dye. I commend his account of the DC-3's disappearance and the issues it raises to the attention of all concerned with aviation safety:

MISSING DC-3: SEARCH FOLLOWS AN OLD PATTERN—"GAMBLER'S SPECIAL" CRASH RAISES QUESTIONS ABOUT TECHNOLOGY, REGULATIONS

(By Lee Dye)

Jim Helm's station wagon is usually the first to arrive at the tiny wooden shack on the edge of the runway.

He goes there nearly every afternoon, as soon as his working day ends at the Navy's huge ammunition depot that engulfs the small town of Hawthorne, Nev.

The station wagon—bearing a bumper sticker that reads: "Let's talk about Jesus"—grinds to a halt beside the shack.

Inside the shack he talks instead about a DC-3 airliner missing with 35 people aboard since Feb. 18. It's not a subject Helm enjoys discussing.

"I can talk about searches," he said during an interview as his eyes traveled over the maps strung across a table in the shack. "But I can't talk about that DC-3."

He walked to the doorway and stared across the desert valley toward where the desolate land fades into obscurity.

"I just don't know," he said, "I just don't know."

CONDUCTS NEVADA SEARCH

For nearly eight weeks Civil Air Patrol Col. James Helm has been calling the shots in the search for the airliner by the Nevada CAP. Across the state border, the California CAP has conducted a separate search out of Bishop.

Nobody knows what happened to Mineral County Airlines pilot Fred Hall after he took off from Hawthorne at 4:30 a.m. No trace of the plane has been found.

The unsuccessful search and circumstances surrounding the disappearance have raised a long series of questions—questions that are even more disturbing than puzzling:

Why has the search depended primarily on visual sighting when technology could produce more exact methods? Why was the aircraft allowed to be painted a color that would blend into the background? Why was the aircraft flying a visual flight plan rather than by instruments?

Is the nation's search and rescue program adequate? Are the people who were responsible for the search equipped to do their job? Should a 26-year-old twin-engine aircraft be allowed to carry 35 persons?

TROUBLESOME FOR YEARS

These and other questions are sure to plague officials for years.

But around Hawthorne the issue is more basic.

"I don't like to talk about it," said airport manager Art Barlow, reflecting a sentiment heard often in Hawthorne. "We've been hurt pretty bad."

For years every night Mineral County Airlines, now known as Air Nevada, has flown passengers between Southern California and Hawthorne for $10, round trip. Nearly every flight has been within 10% of capacity, until lately.

"It just isn't right," Barlow said. "I would have flown anywhere with Fred Hall. He was a great pilot. But you people called this thing a 'Gambler's Special' and now nobody wants to fly here anymore."

Hall took on his usual amount of fuel—200 to 240 gallons—after arriving in Hawthorne on the night of Feb. 17. That brought his total fuel to slightly over 2,000 pounds, more than enough for the flight with reserve left over to meet FAA requirements.

Early the next morning, the El Capitan Casino sent its buses to the airstrip on the edge of town. Thirty-two persons dressed in street clothing dashed through the chilly morning air to the 26-year-old twin-engined plane.

Aboard the plane, Hall and copilot Ray Hamer prepared for the routine flight. Hamer was a newcomer to the route, but Hall had flown the same trip for years and he knew the foreboding mountains of the eastern Sierra.

The plane taxied down the runway as stewardess Pat Nannes tried to make the passengers comfortable on the crowded aircraft. Moments later, the plane lifted off.

RADIOED FAA FACILITY

Sixteen minutes later, at 4:46 a.m., Hall routinely radioed the FAA facility at Mina, Nev.

For reasons nobody now seems to understand, Hall had filed a visual flight plan, which meant he was not required to make regular radio checks along the way.

Shortly after the plane left Hawthorne, the worst storm to hit that part of the country in years closed in. The next day, Bishop, which rarely gets snow on the ground, had three feet of it.

And a DC-3 with 35 persons aboard had vanished.

For two days the Sierra Nevada were ravaged by snowstorms. On the third day, the weather broke enough to permit a limited air search. Civil Air Patrol planes on both sides of the border began the hunt. But by then searchers feared the wreckage had been covered by snow.

The days came and went, and much of the snow on the lower slopes melted, but still no trace of the plane was found.

Two CAP planes crashed during the search. Three men suffered major injuries.

On the other side of California, the organization that has the legal responsibility for finding missing planes—the U.S. Air Force—began directing the search, but the bulk of the effort was by CAP volunteers.

Lt. Col. Wilbur M. Hackett, Jr., chief of the search and rescue center at Hamilton Air Force Base, just north of San Francisco, said the Air Force did what it could under the circumstances, but he admits now that his organization was not equipped to do the job.

"We had 13 cases on the board at the time the DC-3 disappeared," he said.

NO GROUND PERSONNEL

The Air Force did not send ground personnel to Hawthorne or Bishop to sift through the many reports or talk to people who knew Hall or aid in coordinating the search.

Instead, the Air Force left the search up to the CAP, primarily, although large, four-engine planes were sent occasionally from Hamilton and March Air Force bases.

Hackett concedes now that the Air Force's role in the search was one primarily of coordination, relying almost entirely on volunteers in the area, volunteers the Air Force is quick to praise.

CAP squadrons at Bishop and, especially, at Hawthorne rank among the best in the nation, the Air Force says.

Both squadrons have been instrumental in saving many lives. But in the case of the Gambler's Special, the CAP and the limited effort extended by the Air Force failed to find the missing plane.

Why?

Searchers point to three factors: the absence of a crash locator aboard the aircraft, the color of the aircraft and the flight plan.

It seems incredible to many that in an age that has seen unprecedented progress, especially in aviation, locating a downed aircraft still depends almost entirely on visual sighting.

The FAA believes it is possible to produce automatic crash locators that would provide a radio beacon to guide searchers to a crash site. Such a device aboard the Gambler's Special should have led search planes to the scene, even if no one survived.

"A Navy plane with a crash locator went down March 1," said Dick Walker, assistant operations officer for the Bishop CAP squadron. "It was found within three hours."

So far, the FAA has not required crash locators on commercial aircraft, although such regulations have been proposed, partly as a result of the Gambler's Special.

COULD DO HARM

The FAA also has failed to establish specifications for crash locators that are now on the market although an ineffective locator may do more harm than good by giving a pilot an unjustified sense of security.

"You can buy one of these things for as cheap as $10," said Col. Hackett. "We had a case a while back where a pilot crashed into the bay. He had a crash locator and five planes picked up the signal, but none of them could get a bearing because the thing kept cutting off.

"As it turned out, the guy had a hand-held locator and he was bobbing up and down in the bay. Every now and then the water would wash over the locator, shorting out the antenna. He finally got disgusted and threw the thing away, but we found him, anyway."

What bothers some officials is the fear that private pilots will buy an ineffective locator, then decide they don't need to file a flight plan. They are also concerned that the FAA has failed to establish minimum standards, and there is no locator on the market that carries an FAA seal of approval.

The second problem cited most often by searchers lies in the color of the aircraft.

The DC-3 was white with blue trim. Thus the searchers were looking for a plane that blended into the white snow and blue ice of Sierra Nevada.

"That ought to be against the law," said Jack Burch, operations officer of the Hawthorne CAP squadron. But it isn't.

"I've never seen a crash that the tail section didn't survive intact," Col. Hackett said. The same holds true in many cases for the wing tips.

The search for the Gambler's Special might have ended differently if the tail and the wing tips had contrasted with the snow. But there is no such requirement, even for commercial aircraft.

THIRD COMPLAINT

The third complaint lies in the flight plan filed by Hall.

"To put it bluntly," Col. Hackett said, "we don't know where we went."

Hall filed a visual flight rules (VFR) plan rather than an instrument flight rules (IFR) plan.

"A visual flight plan means you rely upon yourself to see and be seen," said Robert Huber, spokesman for the Western region of the FAA.

Thus under visual rulings the pilot is on his own. He is not required to make radio checks but must maintain at least a three-mile visibility at all times.

Although Hall filed VFR, he could have changed to IFR and would have been forced to do so when the weather closed in. Perhaps he never got a chance.

If he had filed IFR, someone would have been keeping track of the DC-3 along the entire route, and Hall would have been required to file position reports as he passed specific locations along the route.

Thus if he had disappeared while flying IFR, searchers would have had a better defined area in which to concentrate their efforts.

But he was not required to file IFR, although he was flying over some of the wildest area in this part of the country, through an area that is notorious for severe air turbulence, in the dead of winter, at night and with a 26-year-old, fully loaded aircraft.

No one has been able to find the plane, and now the question persists:

Is the Air Force equipped to do the job it is legally required to do?

The Air Force views its role primarily as one of coordination, relying on other agencies in the field to conduct the active search whenever possible. But the Air Force has no authority to order any other agency to do anything, and in the end the search depends on cooperation, not direction.

DEPENDS ON AGENCY

Thus the success of a search depends largely on the effectiveness of whatever agencies happen to be in the area and happen to be inclined to help.

If there are no other agencies in the area, the Air Force sends its own men and equipment, Hackett said, but that imposes its own problems.

"We are geared primarily for military operations, since that's our primary responsibility," Hackett said. "Quite frankly, we are not set up to find civilian aircraft."

There are no search and rescue aircraft built specifically for that role, except for some Coast Guard helicopters.

All search planes now in use were designed for other purposes and have been shifted into their new roles with varying degrees of success.

Experts say a vertical-takeoff, high-performance aircraft designed and equipped specifically for search and rescue could have a profound effect on search and rescue (SAR) operations.

Of the many planes that have crashed in this region since the beginning of 1959, four—including the Gambler's Special—have never been found.

Officials point to the rugged terrain and the foul weather as justification for the failure to find the planes, but, in this day of sophisticated technology, is that an acceptable answer?

The full question of what happened to the Gambler's Special may never be answered, at least not until the wreckage is found.

But the disappearance, the failure to find it and the entire issue have raised a spectre that may haunt aviation for years.

The DC-3 Hall was flying was built in 1943 as an Air Force C-47 and was modified later for civilian operations. A report based on an investigation of the crash by the National Transportation Safety Board will be released within about a week. That report is expected to show that the airline was meeting existing standards and that there was nothing shady about the operation.

There were 35 persons aboard the plane, which had been stripped of all unnecessary weight. That gave it a gross weight of 24,809 pounds, well under the maximum takeoff weight of 25,346 pounds for that particular operation. That is nearly as much work as the plane could have been asked to deliver when it was new.

AGE UNIMPORTANT

"If the plane has been properly maintained, the age of the aircraft should make no difference," said C. L. Schmidt, chief of the air carrier branch of the flight standards division, Western region, FAA.

But there is such a thing as metal fatigue—metal in an aircraft breaks down under prolonged stress—and Schmidt admits there is disagreement over the reliability of tests to determine such fatigue.

On Jan. 25, 1962, a Montana Air National Guard C-47 (the military version of the DC-3) was caught in a severe downdraft that sheered off one of the wings. The aircraft plunged to the ground near Wolf Creek Mont., killing all six persons aboard.

One of those killed were Donald G. Nutter, then governor of Montana.

The Air Force investigation into the crash determined that the wing ripped off because of metal fatigue. As a result, the wings on all Air Force C-47s were reinforced.

Similar action was required for all commercial DC-3s. The first Airworthiness Directive issued by the FAA was published in 1939, and applied to the DC-3. It required reinforcement of the wing attachment to the fuselage. Other directives dealing with the same matter were issued in 1952, 1963 and 1966.

The missing DC-3 would have been required to comply with all of those directives.

Nobody is ready to say at this point whether the crash of the Gambler's Special could have been prevented, because nobody knows what caused the crash.

"I'm through with guessing," said Dr. Carl Muth, operations officer of the Bishop CAP squadron. "I don't know where the thing is. Who knows what might have happened."

CAP volunteers may tell themselves the search is useless, but they keep searching.

HUNTER FINDS IT

Too well they remember the Al F. Olen family of Portland, Ore. Olen was flying with his wife and daughter when his small plane crashed in Northern California on March 11, 1967.

Seven months later, a deer hunter stumbled across the wreckage. Olen had gone for help after the crash, and was never seen again.

His wife began keeping a diary until she died. Then her daughter took up the task until she, too, died nearly two months after the crash.

One of the last entries was in the daughter's handwriting. She wrote:

"Today is my 16th birthday."

She died 35 miles from the city of Redding.

HORTON CITES DEDICATION TO YOUTH

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the dedication of our young people is often overlooked. In my talks with students in my district, my feelings have been reinforced that there is much hope for America in the youth of today.

An example of the concern, caring, and action of young people in solving social ills is Miss Judith L. Bovet, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Donald W. Bovet, of Marion, N.Y.

Last summer, Miss Bovet worked with a migrant child care program. She came away from the experience deeply touched by the needs of the children of migrant workers and with the hope and desire that something can be done to give them a truly American chance.

Miss Bovet holds a realistic vision that not all society's sickness can be cured. However, as she says:

> I do think that as long as we can't do much to help starving Biafran children and can't seem to end such a pitiful situation for the North and South Vietnamese children, that we can and should help our own poor children.

Judy Bovet is now a senior at St. Lawrence University. She is being married in June and she and her future husband have applied to work with the Peace Corps. Her enthusiasm, idealism, and dedication has greatly impressed me and I would like to share with my colleagues a letter I received from her about her work with migrant children:

MARION, N.Y.,
March 27, 1969.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,
Rochester, N.Y.

DEAR MR. HORTON: Last summer I was employed by the New York State Migrant Child Care Program. My job was to take care of babies whose mothers were working harvesting fruit on the large farms in Wayne County. The children really had no place to go except to these centers provided by this program. My director has recently told me that perhaps the centers will have to be closed due to lack of federal funds, and I find this a grave mistake. It's not that I don't recognize the many problems (monetary and otherwise) which face Congress nor that I expect the social evils to disappear, but I do think that as long as we can't do much to help starving Biafran children and can't seem to end such a pitiful situation for the North and South Viet-Namese children, that we can and should help our own poor children. If the people in the counties see this need and are willing to work, then I should think the fed-

> eral government would aid and encourage any program which enables the two races to work together to better the welfare of the migrant children.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> Judith L. Bovet.

ROMULO GALLEGOS OF VENEZUELA

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Romulo Gallegos, the first popularly elected President of Venezuela and one of Latin America's most distinguished educators and writers, died earlier this month in Caracas at the age of 84.

To all of us who have followed closely the developments in Latin America, and our country's relations with the southern half of our hemisphere, Romulo Gallegos was respected for his intellectual leadership and political integrity.

He was a popular political leader, a renowned statesman, a poet, and a humanist. At the time of his death, he was serving as Chairman of the Inter-American Committee on Human Rights of the Organization of American States.

Because I believe that it will prove of interest to the Members of Congress, I wish to include in the Record an article from the New York Times, describing the highlights of Romulo Gallegos' career:

> #### Romulo Gallegos of Venezuela, Author and Ex-President, Dies
>
> Caracas, Venezuela, April 4.—Romulo Gallegos, the first popularly elected President of Venezuela and one of Latin America's most distinguished educators and writers, died today in a local clinic. He was 84 years old.
>
> At his death, Mr. Gallegos was chairman of the Inter-American Committee of Human Rights of the Organization of American States.
>
> He was best known, in Venezuela and abroad, as the author of the novel "Doña Bárbara" which was later made into a film and, in 1967, an opera.
>
> He wrote many essays, short stories, two plays and nine novels. Among the awards he received for his works were honorary degrees from Columbia University and the University of Mexico.
>
> His wife, Teotiste Arocha Egui, died in 1950. They had no children but adopted a niece and a nephew, Sonia and Alexis, who survive.
>
> #### A POPULAR CANDIDATE
>
> In 1945, a revolutionary junta headed by Romulo Betancourt overthrew the Government of Gen. Isaias Medina y Angarita. Its revision of the Venezuelan constitution in 1947 made possible the election that year of Rómulo Gallegos by direct popular vote instead of by the national legislature.
>
> Mr. Gallegos, as the candidate of the leftist Democratic Action party, which he had founded in 1941, won 80 per cent of the vote. He began a four-year term on Feb. 15, 1948, but was ousted by a military coup after nine months in office.
>
> During the 10-year dictatorship of Gen. Marcos Pérez Jiménez he lived in exile in Cuba and Mexico.
>
> On the overthrow of the Pérez Jiménez Government in January, 1958, Mr. Gallegos returned to Venezuela, devoting himself to writing and to liberal politics. He was voted life membership in the Senate.
>
> Born in Caracas on Aug. 2, 1884, Mr. Gallegos was educated at the Collegio Sucre and the Central University. He studied law for a time but abandoned it to pursue a writing career, supporting himself as an accountant and a railroad stationmaster.
>
> In 1909 he was one of a group of young intellectuals who founded the magazine La Alborada (Reveille).
>
> #### TURNED TO TEACHING
>
> He became interested in teaching, and was connected with both colleges and high schools. Between 1912 and 1930 he taught philosophy at the Andres Bello College in Caracas and was appointed director of the college in 1922.
>
> He achieved his first outstanding literary success in 1920, at the age of 36, with the novel "Reinadlo Solar" ("Manor Rule"), also published under the title "El Ultimo Solar"' ("The Last Manor"). A picture of a land inhabited by ruthless politicians and robbers, it was taken to reflect clearly the dictatorship of Juan Vicente Gómez, who ruled in Venezuela from 1908 to 1935.
>
> Then, in 1929 Mr. Gallegos' most celebrated novel, "Doña Bárbara," appeared. It was the tale of a child of the river boats who eventually acquires an empire of estates on the plains of the Apure River region. It was translated into the leading languages, including English in 1931, had 24 editions and won the prize of the Madrid Book-of-the-Month Club.
>
> Mr. Gómez, one of whose ranches had supplied a background model for the book, tried to curb the author's pen by appointing him a Senator. Mr. Gallegos went to the United States in 1931 and sent back his resignation.
>
> Later he went to Spain as a salesman for the National Cash Register Company and wrote two novels there, "Cantaclaro" (1934) and "Canaima" (1935). In 1936 he returned to Venezuela, became a member of the Caracas Municipal Council and was appointed Minister of Education. Attempts to abolish foreign church schools led to his ouster from the ministry after three months.
>
> In 1937 he published "Pobre Negro" ("Poor Negro"), a moving and poignant study of slavery and the tragedy of the mulatto.
>
> He published "El Forastero" ("The Stranger") in 1942 and "Sobre la misma tierra" ("On the Same Land") in 1944.

TRIBUTE TO ART McGINLEY

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, citizens of Hartford and Connecticut gathered on April 10, to honor a man who has played an important part in the growth of that metropolis and who, by his character and example, has earned an outstanding reputation.

I first claimed Arthur B. McGinley as a friend when I was growing up, as a youth on the Connecticut athletic scene, and he was serving as the sports editor of the Hartford Times. I had the benefit of his knowing, wise, and witty judgment and of the experience which had brought him from New London in the days of Eugene O'Neill through New York to Hartford, gathering friends all the way. He has always held my deepest admiration.

Art has been racked in later years by the pains of arthritis, which did not prevent him from keeping the output of his typewriter flowing. This, too, has demonstrated the indomitable courage of this man, who never seems to lose his good humor in the face of adversity.

He responded to the hundreds of greetings with his characteristic warmth and humility. Art McGinley told that testimonial crowd:

> This has to be my happiest hour, I have been in the newspaper business 60 years, 48 of them in Hartford.
>
> This is an evening I long will cherish in fondest memory. I am warmed to see so many take time out of a busy life to wish me a happy birthday. I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

MUST ACT TO STOP COMMUNIST BULLIES

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, the Tuscaloosa News is the daily newspaper in my hometown, Tuscaloosa, Ala. It is a distinguished publication with a great history of service to the people of west Alabama.

I take this opportunity to offer for inclusion in the Record, in order to share with my colleagues and others, an editorial appearing in the April 17 issue of the News which eloquently expresses my personal feelings and that of so many Americans over the recent acts of piracy by the Communist Government of North Korea:

> #### Must Act To Stop Communist Bullies
>
> Destruction of an American reconnaissance plane, apparently over international water, provides the first major crisis for President Nixon. And it is a lot easier for people on the outside to tell him what to do than it is to be in the position of supreme authority and to have the responsibility.
>
> The case is much like that of several months ago when the North Koreans went into international waters and captured an American ship. Except, in the first instance most men on the ship were alive, and after much abuse and indignity were released.
>
> The ship case was a major crisis during the Johnson administration. There were those, including this newspaper, which expressed the opinion that we should go in after the ship and its men. This perhaps would have meant the death of the men. It might not have. A more conservative course was followed, and the men were saved. Perhaps this was best.
>
> But our great nation was humiliated and embarrassed by allowing such a wanton act to be committed. Those responsible have completely escaped punishment. They still have our ship.
>
> When a bully gets away with one such act, another is certain to follow. And that now is the case, except in this instance it is likely that all men aboard the plane were lost. We have no ship or plane to go in after. There are no lives hanging in the balance. And the biggest problem is what to do to prevent another such incident.
>
> Our leaders in Washington are far better situated to come up with an answer than are we. But it is our opinion that complete lack of principle, ethics and consideration for human life which exists among the North Koreans will cause them to listen only to strength and power.

We must respond in a manner which makes it clear that we will defend our ships and our planes—and the men in them—when they are in areas where they have a right to be. Further, we should have proper defensive forces nearby at all times, ready to act.

Certainly, we cannot retain the respect of the remainder of the world if we continue to allow international bullies to insult us time after time.

FTC BAN ON ADS FOR CIGARETTES WOULD VIOLATE INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Trade Commission's recent proposal to ban advertisements for cigarettes has raised a much-deserved cry of protest from many quarters. The following editorial from the San Diego Evening Tribune places the controversy in its proper perspective—in terms of Government meddling with personal freedom. I feel the editorial is worthy of careful consideration in the midst of the debate on this issue:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Evening Tribune, February 14, 1969]

FTC BAN ON ADS FOR CIGARETTES WOULD VIOLATE INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

A recent Federal Communications Commission proposal to prohibit broadcast on radio or television of cigarette advertising has raised questions as to the constitutionality of such a rule.

Significantly, there has been little more than mild protest from those most affected, the broadcasters and the tobacco companies.

The broadcasters have few qualms about their ability to fill the revenue gap the loss of cigarette advertising would bring.

In all probability, if the new regulation is made effective, the constitutional challenge will come from the advertising agencies who arrange for the cigarette company commercials. They would be hardest hit by the broadcast ban.

The action taken by the FCC, according to the commission, was due to federal studies, which show "a serious, unique danger to public health" from cigarette smoking.

Commission Chairman Rosel H. Hyde said the regulation would be effective July 7 unless Congress takes contrary action.

The Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act of 1965 restrains any agency from regulating cigarette advertising. The same act provided for a printed warning on cigarette packages as to health hazards involved in smoking. The act expires July 1.

Constitutional objections to the new proposals will be based on the Bill of Rights, primarily the amendment guaranteeing freedom of the press. The question of discrimination will also be raised, since no restrictions are contemplated on advertising in media other than broadcasting.

While most Americans, including confirmed smokers, can do without the often inane commercials currently the rage among cigarette manufacturers, we must also object to increased meddling by government in what can only be considered a matter of personal choice.

Even if we accept without reservation the conclusion that smoking causes cancer, we must also recognize that it is not illegal.

Until Congress sees fit to call for a constitutional amendment outlawing cigarettes, the government should not meddle with personal freedom. Experience with the attempt to prohibit use of alcoholic beverages makes that improbable.

Banning cigarette advertising is no more logical than prohibiting the advertising of autos—machines that have also proved to be "a serious, unique danger to public health."

SENATOR FRED R. HARRIS ADDRESSES THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, recently Senator FRED R. HARRIS, a most distinguished Member of the other body, and incidentally chairman of the Democratic National Committee, spoke to the National Press Club.

I found his remarks to be an excellent exposition of the objectives of the Democratic Party, as well as a cogent exploration of the issues which confront the new administration.

Disavowing any intention to "carp and criticize," the Senator from Oklahoma did challenge the administration to aggressively lead this Nation to new achievement in human dignity, equality, and peaceful pursuits.

Said Senator HARRIS:

For a time, we Americans may be tempted to rest on our record, to count the comforting beads of past progress, to recite the American litany of success, to turn our face away from the winds of change.

For these winds blow more fiercely than ever in 1969. And the sounds we hear are not a call to retreat, but the trumpeting summons to advance toward individual dignity and self-determination, for equity, for an end to war and for the first steps toward that world peace which can yet be ours.

Mr. Speaker, I include the remarks by Senator HARRIS before the National Press Club in the RECORD, and recommend it to my colleagues from both political parties:

REMARKS OF SENATOR FRED R. HARRIS, BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, APRIL 17, 1969

All over America today, as never before in the history of our country, people are challenging our society's unequal distribution of economic and political power.

America's greatest need today is the need to achieve equity for all our citizens—not only equity in opportunity but equity in results.

Equity requires that America put first things first, establishing a system of economic and social accounting which measures not just the sterile statistics of GNP and corporate and individual income, but reinjects ethical concerns and human values into our economic management system and measures the quality of American life—a system which allows us to get our priorities straight so that it may not be said of us: "They could hear the lightest rumble of a distant drum but not the cries of a hungry child."

Equity means making real certain basic rights of every American. In addition to the traditional right to live and lodge and eat where one wants, equity means the *right* to a minimum standard of income for those who cannot help themselves, and the *right* to equal opportunity and a decent job at a liveable wage for every person willing and able to work; the *right* to a decent home in pleasant, wholesome surroundings; the *right* to a decent education, which prepares for living as well as for earning; the *right* to good health and enough to eat; and the *right* to be treated fairly—as a taxpayer and as a consumer of public and private services.

Equity means also that all Americans must have real access to the decision-making processes which affect their own lives.

There is a fundamental sense of unease in our society—a feeling of powerlessness on the part of many of our citizens in the face of huge and impersonal institutions—a sense of inequity, of inability to obtain response or recognition from our schools, our churches, our governmental bodies and our political parties.

There is a nagging sense of worry in our society—a concern that we are drifting listlessly into the stormy face of new and growing problems which beset our radically changing lives and world. For, as the President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology recently said:

"We are beginning to discover that the right of free citizens to move freely without hindrance can be made meaningless by the breakdown of mass transportation, and the right of free assembly can be negated by impassable city traffic, or, for that matter, by uncontrolled crime in the city street. We are beginning to suspect that free speech and free press might become irrelevant if we were slowly strangled by the air we breathe or slowly poisoned by our drinking water. We are beginning to see that equal rights and equal job opportunity, when finally obtained by citizens long denied them, can be made meaningless by intolerable housing conditions or by ineffective education systems. We are beginning to realize that if exploding populations create a world of starving humans almost standing on each other's shoulders, *all* concepts of freedom can become irrelevant, and American prosperity could be infuriating and incendiary to billions deprived of either hope or future."

Now, President Richard Nixon has been in office for eighty-seven days. Yet, we will not carp and criticize. But we still await with more than casual interest his first substantial moves to really lead this nation.

For, as Teddy Roosevelt said, the Presidency *is* a "bully pulpit," and the test of leadership is not how accurately the leader gauges the mood of the people, but how skillfully he can appeal to those sparks of idealism which, though often smothered beneath layers of apathy and inertia, flicker still, waiting to be brought to flame.

The test of leadership is not only how successfully the leader is able to diminish the sounds of political acrimony, but also how acutely he detects the quiet voice of moral outrage, of social justice, of human compassion.

But, as the President cannot evade his responsibility to lead, neither can the Democratic Party refuse to take its stand on the great moral issues of our time.

Toward making equity real in our society, America has made proud and measurable progress in recent years—frequently with strong bipartisan support in the Congress. From the advances we have already made, we will now either advance further or retreat; we cannot stay where we are. We shall watch to see in what direction President Nixon will now attempt to lead us—or *whether* he will lead.

But, so long as the Democratic Party remains a vital influence on the national scene, there shall be no retreat.

The Democratic Party must move—and we are moving—to get our own house in order so that we may be prepared to do our duty.

We will allow no retreat on the issue of race and human equality.

We are concerned about the lack of clarity with which this Administration acts and moves on this, the most fundamental matter of equity in America—on social and economic equality for black people, for American Indians, for Spanish speaking Americans and other minority groups. There must be no retreat from the elementary and basic gains we have made in recent years, and we must not permit administrative neglect or half-hearted enforcement to slow the march forward.

We are disturbed by the reported advice of the newly appointed general counsel in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare concerning relaxed desegregation guidelines, advice which seems at variance with the statements of Secretary Finch. We are concerned about the actions of the Department of Defense in awarding contracts without requirement of full civil rights compliance. We puzzle over how these actions and the circumstances of Clifford Alexander's resignation as Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission can coexist with Administration assurances of continued progress toward full equality.

President Nixon, we feel, must soon end this confusion; he must soon clearly choose between right and wrong on the moral issue of race. He cannot satisfy both sides, for only one of them is right.

We must allow no retreat on the issue of poverty. There must be no restreat from the determined march we have begun against inferior education and training, the lack of decent jobs, the bad housing, and the poor health and malnutrition which prevent millions of Americans from having a real chance to attain equity in their lives.

We are disturbed by the announced plans to cut back on summer Head Start funds, to turn youngsters out of closed-down Job Corps centers, to retrench on financing of health research and health delivery, and the refusal to pay the pitifully small price to do away with hunger.

These positions of the Nixon Administration seem dreadfully inconsistent with its announced intention to offer new approaches on the terrible urban and other domestic problems which daily grow more difficult.

A nation which can increase its real production by some $40 billion a year, which is the richest and most medically knowledgeable, most agriculturally productive country in the world, cannot escape the moral burden of continued poverty, when, as the 1968 Democratic Platform makes so clear, "For the first time in the history of the world, it is within the power of a nation to eradicate . . . the age-old curse of poverty."

President Nixon, we feel, must soon strike out on some clear course; he must soon clearly choose between right and wrong on the moral issue of poverty and hunger. He cannot satisfy both sides, for only one of them is right.

We shall not dwell upon President Nixon's campaign pledge to end the surcharge tax, for we know that election often makes wiser men of former candidates. But there must be no retreat from the resolute march toward fairness and equity in our tax system. Throughout America, taxpayers are increasingly outraged by a system which is regressive in its overburdening of those of lower and middle income, while allowing many of the rich to escape their fair share of Government costs.

We are concerned about this Administration's delay in presentation of its promised tax reform position, disturbed by those things which are reported to be left out of these recommendations to be announced.

President Nixon must soon break this silence. He must soon clearly choose between right and wrong on the moral issue of equity and fairness. He cannot satisfy both sides, for only one of them is right.

There must be no retreat from the long march toward peace. We shall not dwell upon President Nixon's campaign announcement of an undisclosed plan to end the war in Vietnam. But we shall declare our concern that private peace talks, underway before his election, have only now begun again. We must declare our firm, continuing desire for a systematic de-Americanization of that war, for real progress toward South Vienamese assumption of greater military responsibility and institution of real and lasting political, social and economic reform.

We are disturbed by the rhetoric of Secretary Laird, who spoke of "military victory" upon his visit to Viet Nam, and by his confusing and disappointing public statements against withdrawal of any American troops from that area during 1969.

We are deeply worried by the growing militarlization in America and by the continued delay in sitting down with the Soviet Union to discuss a lessening of arms race tensions. Deeper than the technical questions of whether an ABM system will work are questions concerning the triggering of further escalations in the race for armaments advantage and the sobering question of the direction America will go, the priorities it will establish for itself in the next decade.

President Nixon's decision to scrap the Sentinel Missile System and then to advocate a somewhat curtailed safeguard system, backed up by varying arguments, seemed to be more political than military in its apparent attempt to do a little for each side of the argument.

President Nixon must soon make the hard decisions on the moral questions of war and peace. He cannot satisfy both sides, for only one of them is right.

We do not expect or insist that President Nixon meet and solve these issues within one hundred days or any other arbitrary period. We do insist that he address himself and his administration to these issues. For they must be met. And the people of America must soon be called to the task—in clear tones, in firm voice.

We shall not make partisan capital of these solemn causes. But we shall ask this Administration to lead, and we shall offer our own solutions.

The late Robert F. Kennedy was fond of quoting Tennyson's Ulysses:

"One equal temper of heroes' hearts
Made weak by time and fate, but strong in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

The Democratic Party will continue to be entitled to lead the United States of America to the degree it continues to strive, to seek and not to yield—to the degree it speaks to the changed problems of our day, to the moral issues of our time, in terms which are meaningful and relevant to our lives and to the lives of our children.

For a time, we Americans may be tempted to rest on our record, to count the comforting beads of past progress, to recite the American litany of success, to turn our face away from the winds of change. But those winds blow more fiercely than ever in 1969. And the sounds we hear are not a call to retreat, but the trumpeting summons to advance toward individual dignity and self-determination, for equity, for an end to war and for the first step toward that world peace which can yet be ours.

Those sounds will not be stilled by a call for silence.

Because the Democratic Party does hear those sounds and because we *will* and *must* respond to them, I believe that we shall be returned to leadership and—more importantly—to responsibility.

SOUTH AFRICA—VICTIM OF HATRED AND IGNORANCE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the darts of hatred and ignorance continue to be hurled at a tiny, stanchly pro-Western Republic by its fellow members of the United Nations, including the United States.

South Africa, a founding member of the U.N. organization along with the United States, has been blasted time and again not only by its fellow members, but by the ultra-leftist press, including that press in this country.

Perhaps these people have never stopped to realize that South Africa has always supported the West, and has in fact, severed ties with Communist nations. Then, too, it must be pointed out that it is in South Africa, and its protectorate of South West Africa, where the greatest stability and tranquillity exist in all of Africa.

And the reason for this—despite the mutterings and cries of political oppression in South Africa by the left—is that the Government has a firm and forward-looking policy of economic and political progress for all its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting article appears in the April issue of the South African Scope by that country's Ambassador to the U.N. organization. I insert the article at this point in my remarks:

SOUTH AFRICA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Ambassador Matthys I. Botha)

(NOTE.—Ambassador Matthys I. Botha has represented South Africa in various capacities at the United Nations since 1950 before being appointed Permanent Representative of the Republic at the U.N. in 1962. The accompanying article, dealing with South Africa's membership of—and participation in—the United Nations has been compiled from a number of recent speeches by the Ambassador as guest speaker before American audiences actively interested in international affairs.)

South Africa became one of the founding members of the United Nations because it believed in the ideals of the Charter and because it had so much to offer in the field of international cooperation. This motivation for South Africa's membership and participation in the activities of the United Nations still applies today.

It must be borne in mind that the United Nations is not a world parliament, controlling a world administration. As a body or as an organization it is an agency to which member States assign specific responsibilities and specific authority under the Charter.

The Charter itself is a multilateral international agreement which specifies the obligations of member States; which determines the structure and functions of the Organization and defines its powers, responsibilities and limitations. The measure of success of the United Nations to cope with any given situation depends, therefore, almost entirely on the will of the governments of member States. The willingness of a member State to cooperate with the United Nations as a single body depends in turn on the willingness of the individual member States to honor the provisions of the Charter.

A case in point is South Africa's own position at the United Nations. As a founding member of the United Nations, South Africa has always participated in the activities and deliberations of the United Nations—even though its domestic affairs became the subject of discussion almost from the beginning and in contradiction of the provisions of the Charter. Notwithstanding scurrilous attacks on its domestic policies, South Africa responded, for instance, to a call by the Security Council to assist in repelling aggression in Korea by providing an air squadron to serve with the United Nations Force in that country.

It must also be remembered that hostile attitudes towards member States at the United Nations are generated largely as a result of uncontrolled emotions and a disregard for the provisions of the Charter—frequent occurrences these days which, notwithstanding their artificial base, are nonetheless responsible for a divisiveness within the United Nations which cannot be ignored. Unfortunately there are not yet any signs of a change in the present political climate and while this situation prevails emotions will continue to turn opportunities for useful dialogue into meaningless verbal exercises.

There is also no possible escape from the fact that numbers rather than logic appear to dictate the course of events in the United Nations—to a point where even an important United States spokesman has lately found it necessary to warn that the United Nations has to be reformed "to save itself" because of the abuse of the principle of one country, one vote.

South Africa, is of course, not the only country which is subject to unfounded criticism and condemnation by artificial majorities who claim to reflect world opinion. There are also others and, if the present emotionalism continues, even more countries are likely to come in for their share of criticism at the United Nations

Our detractors are frustrated because of the vitality displayed by South Africa in the face of all the criticism directed at it in the United Nations. Their frustration is aggravated by the knowledge that South Africa's vitality flows from its inherent strength, drawn not only from its natural resources but above all from the moral principles which guide it in all its relations, both external and internal.

South Africa's internal policy is based on a recognition of the differences in culture, tradition and forms of Government of the various nations living within its boundaries, coupled with a recognition of the right of each nation to develop its own separate Nationhood and to govern itself in accordance with its own national traditions and aspirations.

It should be recalled that those who belong to the South African nation of European descent hold no brief for the domination of any nation over another. On the contrary, we are strongly opposed to any such concept, with an opposition which is rooted in our traditions and history because a large section of this nation was itself, for a long time in the past, subjected to foreign domination.

Moreover, we are not settlers or foreigners on the continent of Africa. We are no more settlers or foreigners in Africa than the millions of people of European or Asian or African descent who today live in the Western Hemisphere are foreigners here. We South Africans of European descent are a nation in our own right, just like all the other nations in the world.

In addition to this, we live and are rooted in a land which we took from no other people. That land is our only home—we know no other. We are also part of Africa. We have been part of Africa for more than 300 years and, like any other nation, we too are entitled to insist upon our right of self-determination. We claim it as an inalienable right which we shall never surrender.

While we are implementing a policy of peaceful co-existence, our critics advocate a policy for South Africa which, if enforced, can only lead to strife and violence. For these critics suggest that we should seek to establish in South Africa a full integrated multiracial *political entity,* thus completely ignoring the rights of the various distinctive nations comprising multinational South Africa. Here the question would also arise: into what particular pattern is it considered that the various nations of South Africa ought to integrate? If it is into the white South African pattern, this would surely constitute a form of colonialism in a different guise and, in any case, what right has the white population to believe that its culture should necessarily be desired by other peoples? Likewise, would there be any better justification for selecting, for example, the Zulu nation, or the Xhosa nation, or any other, as the nucleus around which the various South African communities should be integrated? Surely not, and this is why we adhere to what is with us an issue of first principle—that all the nations in South Africa should be free to develop as they themselves may wish to develop, borrowing what they will and rejecting what they will, from the experience of other nations.

Our approach to the solution of our problems is an African one and the only one that can succeed. We are confident of success and in this we are backed by the necessary financial and technical resources to achieve our objective.

South Africa is the industrial giant of Africa. It produces three times as much steel as all other African countries combined and is tenth in output in the world. It generates electrical power double that of the rest of Africa, with unit consumption per capita equal to that of Western Europe. It produces more than 80 percent of the coal in Africa and has 87 percent of its coal reserves. It carries 50 percent of all railway freight traffic in Africa and has the largest electrified railway network outside North America and Europe. It possesses 40 percent of all motor vehicles in Africa and 50 percent of its telephones. It produces 73 percent of the free world's gold supply. It ranks among the world's leading producers of diamonds, uranium and many other minerals. It is the 13th largest trading nation in the world.

With manpower of a high quality, ample strategic minerals, including the cheapest uranium in the world, a manufacturing ability second to none in Africa, important food production, as well as stable political, social and economic conditions, South Africa is high on the list of strategically important spots in the world today. The degree of importance has increased considerably since the withdrawal of Britain from Aden and her pending withdrawal from the Persian Gulf and other areas east of the Suez, at a time when Russian influence in the Middle East is greatly expanding.

South Africa is likewise making its contribution on the side of the West in respect of scientific research and development. Our scientists are cooperating with Americans in Antarctica and have also participated in other international projects in the past, such as the International Geophysical Year, International Quiet Sun Year, International Biological Project and many others, as well as in bilateral agreements between the U.S.A. and South Africa, such as the operation of a satellite tracking station and a Deep Space Instrumentation Facility in South Africa on behalf of NASA. In this connection we greatly appreciate the tributes paid to the high caliber of South Africa's scientists assisting in the smooth operation of the American tracking stations in South Africa. These stations, incidentally, performed important radar and telemetric functions in support of the Apollo 8 Flight while, at the same time, South Africa's airports were available to U.S. C130 aircraft operating in areas of the Atlantic and Indian Oceans in connection with that project.

The maintenance of economic prosperity and political stability in South Africa is an essential factor in the prevention of the spread of Communism to the strategic southern tip of the African continent. The high degree of political stability in South Africa is reflected in the fact that since the formation of the Union of the four provinces in 1910, South Africa has had only seven Prime Ministers.

We are opposed to Communism, and firmly committed to the West. We outlawed the Communist Party in 1949 and closed the Russian Consulate in 1956. South Africa was an ally of the West in two world wars, participated in the Berlin Air Lift and the war in Korea. We have contributed medical supplies for South Vietnam.

Occupying a central position in the Southern Hemisphere at the junction of the Indian and South Atlantic Oceans, South Africa is a crossroads of the world. This strategic placement has been underscored by the two Suez crises, first in in 1956 and again since 1967 when, due to the closure of the Suez Canal, the Cape of Good Hope once again became the vital link between East and West. South Africa with her modern harbors, related facilities, and technical know-how, proved in 1956 and again today that it is in a position to handle the thousands of additional vessels using this route with speed and efficiency, thus helping to moderate what might have developed into a much more costly world emergency.

Of course, we do not and cannot lose sight of the fact that a certain political climate prevails in Africa at the moment.

The new nations of Africa are very prone to remember the evils of colonialism and to view the white man on that continent with suspicion, not realizing that the white man of southern Africa is an African like himself who suffered a period of colonialism like himself, and is not a colonial administrator—which is the only experience that most Africans in other parts of the continent have had of the white man. It is therefore unfortunately difficult for some African States to appreciate that what we in South Africa are striving to do is to ensure peaceful coexistence, that we have no ulterior motives and that our aim is not domination. Our good-neighbor policy is, however, evidenced by the fact that we have already established diplomatic and other relations with several African States—a development which we have every confidence will in time spread to others.

As regards our contact with the rest of the world, our relations with the nations of Western Europe have traditionally been close. These nations are our major trading partners and we not only maintain contact on governmental and diplomatic level but also enjoy a continued interchange in virtually all fields of human activity.

Relations with our trans-Atlantic neighbors in South America are also expanding as is illustrated by reciprocal visits of trade missions, participation in trade fairs, establishment of scholarships in furtherance of technical and cultural cooperation, the introduction of direct air services between South Africa and South America, etc.

Similarly, we are not neglecting our contacts with Asia where we are experiencing considerable expansion in trade.

South Africa has no desire to isolate itself. At the same time we feel that the world—and especially the free world—can also benefit from cooperation with us. Unfortunately full cooperation is hampered by the prejudice which still exists against us.

We, for our part, are doing what we can to eliminate that prejudice by conveying to other Governments and to international organizations the true image of South Africa in the knowledge that, except in the case of those whose criticism is inspired by ulterior motives, much of the prejudice is due to ignorance and can only be eliminated by an appreciation of the true aims of South Africa's policy and the results achieved in the development of harmonious relations between the peoples, racial and language groups of South Africa.

JOB CORPS CLOSINGS

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a recent article and editorial from the Cape Codder of April 17, 1969, emphasizes the excellent work of the Job Corps and the need to retain Job Corps centers throughout the United States. The texts of the article and editorial follow:

PESSIMISM, PAPERWORK PREVAIL AS JOB CORPS CENTER PHASES OUT

The Job Corps Center at South Wellfleet has never been a fun place.

Its neatly-lined barracks and spider-like water tower, its staff housing and black-top are an unlovely intrusion on the dunes. Moreover, it is an uncomforting reminder of America's poor, a whole colony, plunked in the middle of one of America's playgrounds.

This week a somber atmosphere pervaded the center after the first emotional period following the announcement from Washington Friday that the center would be closed.

On Monday and Tuesday activity had slowed and even the usual boisterous banter of corpsmen was nonexistent. There was instead a questioning mood as staff and corpsmen both wondered what was in store and when it would come to pass.

DAMOCLES

The sword had been hanging over Job Corps since President Nixon's pre-election statements against the program. When word came, it was not from Washington officially, but on television and then in the newspapers.

Director Charles H. Orr first got official word on the Washington teletype late Thursday night. The message was from Bertrand W. Harding, acting director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, who said Wellfleet was one of 59 centers to be closed "as the result of a new definition of the structure of emphasis for the Job Corps when the program is delegated to the Department of Labor, effective July 1."

Friday a message came from Secretary of Labor George P. Schultz. It said the date for the closing was yet to be determined but that "it was important to stress that enrollees will not be deprived of training. Arrangements will be made to reduce the number of enrollees by attrition and to transfer those who want to continue their training."

Just where and when they would be transferred was the unanswered question, although there was reference to urban centers to be set up.

THE REACTION

The news came as a shocker to the 102 corpsmen. Four left immediately; 7 left Monday. Some left rather than face disciplinary action as the result of outbursts following the closing announcement. One drove a go-cart onto a public highway.

Ross Harrison, business supervisor, said he couldn't say whether the outbursts were a direct result of the announcement, but that the corpsmen had been upset and "when they get upset they tend to be volatile."

They had reason to be upset. Some had been at the center for only two weeks. Others had no home to go to.

Mr. Harrison said he was informed Tuesday by the National Park Service that placement teams from Washington would arrive in the next two weeks. "No corpsman who wants to continue training will be denied," he said.

Even while Mr. Harrison spoke a union representative was at the center, trying to set up a painting and plastering program. It will be inaugurated on a minimal basis, Mr. Harrison said, for as long as possible.

Right now the staff at the center is largely concerned with paper work and counseling, "a helluva lot of counseling", he said. And even as they counsel the corpsmen they will have their own problems to consider. There are presently 13 permanent and seven temporary employes at the center.

THE STAFF

Some of them are career people, used to moving as their job dictates. Others are local and there will be efforts to absorb some of these into the Seashore staff.

The staff payroll has been about $11,000 every two weeks, Mr. Harrison said, so there may be some financial impact on the community.

Since its inception in May of 1965 the center has brought mixed reactions from those exposed to it.

The detractors were and still are many ("it's a lot of money to teach a kid how not to pick his nose.") There was trouble with the police at times.

Turmoil came even from within the ranks from staff members who felt the program was too minimal, that it should instill pride of manhood as well as an ability to read and write, to accept responsibility, to drive a truck.

BEST AROUND

But through it all Wellfleet began to get the reputation as one of the best run centers in the country, a status which has made the closing an even more bitter pill to swallow.

Part of its reputation was because the community was not made up entirely of critics but of people who established a helpful rapport with the center.

A community council of socially concerned men and women devoted many hours to teaching corpsmen, and in turn, learning a little themselves about the problem of the poor.

Indicative of the strength of 'feeling' was a petition being circulated on the Outer Cape this week. Mrs. Paul Younger of Eastham started the petition after Miss Judy Stetson of Wellfleet wrote it, and the Rev. Owen Knox at the United Methodist Church in Eastham preached a sermon on the Job Corps Sunday, urging people to sign the petition. Seventy-five parishioners did.

LOT OF SIGNERS

By Wednesday the petition had 567 names. It was to be sent to the President, the state's Congressional delegation, governor, former governor Volpe and Elliot Richardson, Undersecretary of State.

"We the undersigned citizens," it said, "strongly protest the closing of 57 Job Corps centers, including the Wellfleet camp. These young men were recruited on the promise of a full program of education and training.

"The doors opened by one administration should not be slammed shut so capriciously by the next. If the US can consider spending billions for an ABM system, there can be no valid reason of economy for breaking faith with those disadvantaged young people. We urge you to reconsider this decision."

CORPSMEN, TOO

Another petition, signed by 75 corpsmen, read "Dear Mr Presadent

"We at the Wellfleet Job Corps Center feel that you would give us a chance to improve our selfs. Most of us didn't have anyone to care for us until we came here.

"We also feel that you could give us a chance to complete the program and if you give us this chance we will work to the best of our ability. Most of us before we came here couldn't read or write, but since we have been here we have learn many things. So we here would like for you to keep our center open so you can give this chance and many boys like us to become useful citizens."

THE RECORD

About 800 boys successfully completed the program at Camp Wellfleet in the past four years. The drop-out rate ranged from four to 20 percent.

Of those about 60 percent were placed in jobs. This is somewhat lower than the national average of 70 percent employment for Job Corps alumni, but reflects the type of youth the conservation camps dealt with. These were often totally illiterate and were starting their grade school education at the center. Urban centers which trained in more specialized skills had the corpsmen with more education.

Typical of the jobs Wellfleet alumni went onto include short order cook, painter, electrician, sheet metal trainee, mechanic. Some went into management training programs; at least one completed a high school education and was trying to go on to college. Salaries of a group taken at random ranged from $1.65 to $2.75 an hour.

While the jobs and the salaries don't give the impact of tremendous accomplishment, considering the investment, for the corpsmen involved they are tantamount to engineering degrees from MIT. Some corpsmen coming to the center had below a 4th grade education level, not even sufficient to get them into the Armed Forces, a goal for many.

NOT CHEAP

It wasn't cheap to do this and therein lay much of the criticism of the program. At last report, according to Mr. Harrison, it cost $5,035 for each corpsman per year. This figure did not include allowance, transportation home and other overhead which brought the overall figure closer to $8,000.

Those in the program felt the investment was worth it and were heartened at the placement figures.

Other factors, they point out, include the work done by the corpsmen to the savings of some taxpayer somewhere. On the Cape they provided an ever ready labor force for the Cape Cod National Seashore, installing board walks, maintaining or painting Park property, manning the fire tower in Wellfleet or the fire station at Seashore Headquarters.

Even as plans were being made to close the center, Warren Perry, a work supervisor, was hustling some of his charges along on a project to complete picnic tables for National Parks around the country.

Corpsmen have been taken off outside projects and he remarked that he wasn't familiar with some of those who were now working on the tables.

The National Seashore has made no plans for the barracks and other buildings. It probably will use some, Acting Superintendent Norton Bean said Wednesday, but the fate of the others is yet to be decided.

POLITICAL CALLOUSNESS

It was our intention, when we began to prepare this comment, to make a few satirical remarks about the decision to abolish the Job Corps, while maintaining, for instance, the subsidies to the poor down-trodden tobacco growers.

But the matter is too serious, and too close to us on the Lower Cape, to take a chance on satire. Someone always seems to misunderstand.

The fact is that each young man or woman who is given a chance to break out of the vicious circle of poverty, illiteracy and unemployability becomes an asset to his nation, instead of a liability.

Someone has worked it out that each local Job Corpsman graduate at Wellfleet has cost the tax payer $5,032. Presumably this has been calculated by dividing the total amount spent by the total number of job corpsmen.

But that's not the whole story.

What does it cost the nation for those who do not get a chance to break out of the circle? What is the cost of a generation of welfare payments to an unemployable? What is the cost, in dollars and cents of a crime, arrest for the crime, trial for the crime, and maintenance in prison for the crime?

Does someone in the Nixon administration want to reduce to a dollar amount the cost in suffering and despair to persons born into an economic situation out of which there is, now, virtually no escape?

What of the young men and women who have managed to be nominated to a Job Corps somewhere, only to be told that the program has been abolished before they could ever get there?

We could, we believe, take an objective look at a program offered to replace the Job Corps, a project established to broaden the base, involve more young people, attack on all fronts the handicap of birth into an environment of ghetto or slum. If the Nixon administration had announced a better program, into which the Job Corps effort was to be channeled, we would gladly have possessed our souls in patience, while the new plan worked itself out.

But we feel that merely to abolish the Job Corps because "it costs too much" is simple political callousness.

Once, in another time and another place, we saw an eight block city area evacuated of its lifelong residents to make room for a bridge. The community announced that new housing would be built for everyone evicted. Plans were already on the drawing board.

It takes a lot less time to evict a few hundred families than it takes to build a few hundred homes, so the people were removed from their homes a good two years even before the money was voted to build the replacement dwellings.

We think the abolition of the Job Corps falls into this category, and we hope more sensible counsel will prevail.

PRESIDENT'S ACTION SOUND

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the action of President Nixon in continuing the EC–121 flights and guaranteeing protection for our airplanes.

Reconnaissance in international waters is essential to our national security and the President had to make a hard and decisive decision on appropriate response to the downing of an unarmed U.S. Navy plane last week. Characterizing the President's administration, the decision to continue EC–121 missions was deliberate after all factors were weighed. To provide protective air cover was also necessary in light of the circumstances. The President has been firm and reasonable in his initial response to the North Korean dastardly violation of international airspace.

Mr. Nixon deserves the support of all Americans in his decision to continue these flights.

STATEMENT OF DR. MURRAY B. HUNTER

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a very cogent statement made by a man I am honored to call a constitutent. Dr. Murray Hunter, of Fairmont, W. Va. It was Dr. Hunter who so ably assisted the rescue operations at the disastrous mine explosion at No. 9 in Farmington, W. Va., last year.

Dr. Hunter has spent all of his professional life in the treatment of coal miners and over the years has developed a valuable knowledge regarding coal miners' pneumoconiosis, which is known out in the coal mines of West Virginia simply as black lung. Two days ago Dr. Hunter shared with the House Education and Labor Committee's General Subcommittee on Labor his experiences. Dr. Hunter serves as the medical director of the Fairmont Clinic in Fairmont, W. Va.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. MURRAY B. HUNTER, MEDICAL DIRECTOR, FAIRMONT CLINIC, FAIRMONT, W. VA., BEFORE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE, APRIL 15, 1969

My name is Dr. Murray B. Hunter. I am Medical Director of the Fairmont, West Virginia Clinic. I am certified in the practice of internal medicine by the American Board of Internal Medicine. I have spent my entire professional life, 16 years, in the care of miners and their families. I am familiar with those aspects of the legislation before you that are concerned with the health of miners, particularly with chest disease.

I am here in support of the interim mandatory standard of not more than 3.0 milligrams of dust per cubic foot of air, as specified in H.R. 4047, but I would also support the provision of Section 204 of H.R. 7976, which proposes that the miner who does show demonstrable evidence of pneumoconiosis be assigned to work at his option at an area where the concentration of respirable dust does not exceed 2.0 milligrams of dust per cubic foot of air.

As miners themselves can tell you, better than I, the use of respirators and masks does not, at present, constitute a viable solution to this problem. If the mask Dr. Buff brought back from Czechsolvakia provides us with that solution, I think it will be a tremendous step forward. I do not feel that x-rays need be done more often than every three years.

On the basis of previously published testimony before this and other bodies of the Congress, I am in no substantial disagreement with either Drs. Buff, Rasmussen and Wells, on the one hand, nor with Dr. Higgins on the other. Everyone, on all sides of the question, including industry representatives, agree that progressive massive fibrosis, or complicated pneumoconiosis, is a disabling and often fatal disease. The studies of Cochrane and others have indicated that there is no evidence of any association between the attack rate of progressive massive fibrosis and age, energy expended at work, smoking habits, tuberculosis infection or other infections.

The only factor related to the attack rate of progressive massive fibrosis, according to that study, is the average category of simple pneumoconiosis. It is properly concluded that the logical way to control the appearance of disabling and potentially fatal progressive massive fibrosis is to concentrate on preventing miners from reaching Category II of simple pneumoconiosis. To this end, dust suppression would appear to be a fundamental and virtually unquestioned goal if the health of American coal miners is to be protected.

Despite valid differences of opinion as to the effect of mining on other types of lung disease—emphysema, pulmonary fibrosis, chronic bronchitis—and despite differences of opinion as to the disabling effect of simple pneumoconiosis, there would appear to be little doubt but that informed medical opinion is almost unanimous on the necessity for the safeguards embodied in the legislation before you. I do not feel, therefore, that further time need be spent elaborating these nuances of divergence at greater length among the various witnesses.

I would beg the indulgence of the committee, however, to allow me the latitude to comment upon a new threat to the health of American coal miners that has possibly not yet directly been touched upon in these or other hearings. This threat has emerged, paradoxically, as a by-product of the political struggle for black-lung legislation on state and national levels. What I refer to, gentlemen, is the threat to the integrity of the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund that is implicit in publicity releases of the last several weeks calling for "investigations" of the Fund operation.

I am here neither as a spokesman for the Union nor the Fund nor the operators but only as a physician who has had what he regards as the privilege of participating in the Fund program for the last 16 years. I have been around long enough to have participated in those conflicts in earlier years with organized medicine, which at one time wished to limit the freedom of action of the Fund in matters relating to its beneficiaries. I have been around long enough to have witnessed and participated in those medical-political battles that the Fund waged with a few physicians who sought to take advantage of it, to its detriment.

It is with no small wonder and not a little shock, therefore, that I noted, in the otherwise masterful and brilliant overview of the problem before you by Mr. Ben Franklin in the New York Times Sunday supplement of several weeks ago an invidious reference to the Fund as a partner in a kind of tacit conspiracy to elicit production at the expense of the workers' health. Mr. Lewis may have been collaborationist in relationship to the economic needs of the industry, but the establishment of a royalty per ton as the basis of payment to the Fund in place of a per capita contribution by the industry, was a stroke of genius, which took into account the predictable consequences of automation in the industry. The assumption behind this method of accumulation to the Fund is that the industry assumes responsibility for the health of the worker and his family as a part of the cost of production. I submit to you that there is no other industry-wide insurance scheme now extant in this country that quite embodies this principle.

We are properly thankful that the American public has articulate spokesmen in the area of automobile safety. Yet, never to my knowledge has the charge been leveled that the auto union or its fringe benefit structure profits as a result of collusion against the public to minimize safety features in the design of cars.

It is a crime and a shame that miners unemployed by disability or by virtue of layoff, who are under 55 years old and not eligible for retirement pension, are deprived of their welfare card after one year. I submit to you, however, that the solution to the problem that these people face is not a Congressional investigation of the Welfare Fund. Let us make those of our citizens who qualify for social security payment by reason of disability also eligible for Medicare cards, regardless of age. I believe such a proposal may be before the Congress in this session.

Let us consider federalizing the welfare system, which may, too, have been proposed. We have in West Virginia what is called 65 percent of need. This is a euphemism for "poverty." That 65 percent is calculated on the basis of a 1958 standard. It probably represents no more, in actuality, than 35 or 40 percent of need. If the Welfare Fund is to be made responsible for picking up the slack where ex-miners are concerned, what about other industries who have had layoffs?

In short, gentlemen, let us stop pillorying the Fund for those inequities in our society which it had no part in creating.

Those of you who have had the opportunity to see the TODAY show on April 14 perhaps have some awareness of what is happening in the West Virginia coal fields today. Something akin to the Chinese Great Cultural Revolution is taking place there. I do not so characterize the black-lung movement as to demean it. Quite the contrary. I think it is a fabulous development. I don't feel, however, that we ought to simply look at it and admire it without considering its consequences.

The black-lung movement has been literally a call to life for many people who had heretofore felt powerless and anonymous. We have been promised by its leadership that its thrust will be sustained even after the realization of its immediate legislative goals are accomplished. In order to sustain itself, a mass movement needs ever new enemies and citadels to climb. I sincerely hope that my suspicions that its next enemy designate is the Fund are in error. If the black-lung movement creates a situation in which the present operating principles of the Fund are significantly eroded, it will have done itself a colossal disservice.

I would suggest to the leaders of the rank-and-file movement that they study the history of previous Populist movements in this country, lest we repeat the errors of those movements. In their quest for enemies to sustain them, they became quixotic, indiscriminate and ended up fighting their own natural allies.

In closing, I wish to thank you for permitting me this digression. If I had to choose between enactment of the legislation before you and preservation of the Fund, as to which is in the better interest of the health of miners, I would most certainly opt for the Fund. That is a purely hypothetical choice. I am sure that that choice will not prove to be necessary.

TAX REFORM IS URGENT

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Americans can take pleasure in the fact that the new administration has today advanced the beginning of genuine tax reform legislation. President Nixon's tax reform package plainly moves in the right direction to overhaul the present inequitable Federal tax system. There is a lot of zing to it.

The President's plan to reduce the income surtax to 5 percent by next January 1 is welcome news to all taxpayers. Reducing the tax load on those least able to pay while closing the loopholes which have permitted the wealthiest institutions and individuals to avoid their fair share makes excellent sense.

I am very pleased that the President has moved to brake "tax-loss" farming, which has permitted great corporations and others to move into agriculture in unfair competition with family farmers. There is also considerable merit in cracking down harder on the free-ranging foundations which have been shown to have violated their trust with respect to the tax advantages they have enjoyed.

Few matters are more urgent on the U.S. agenda than is a real tax reform. The Nixon administration's determination to come to grips with the problems involved signals this reform is now on the way.

BLACK EXECUTIVE SPEAKS OUT ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, Richard Clarke is a leading employment counselor who has been outstanding in placing young blacks in professional positions with major companies. His persistence in urging that the business community admit young black Americans to management training programs and jobs with good advancement potential has made him a truly outstanding proponent of equal employment opportunity.

In a recent editorial in Contact, a magazine published by his firm, Richard Clarke Associates, Mr. Clarke raises a question which is of primary importance to the business community as well as to black Americans. Will the Nixon administration pursue an aggressive policy concerning the achievement of full equality of opportunity?

In light of the recent controversy regarding the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Mr. Clarke's question is all the more relevant. Progress in the direction of full equality of opportunity with regard to employment has been slow at best, and neither private business nor the Federal Government should be allowed to further retard progress in this vital area.

I insert the following article in the RECORD so that my colleagues might be reminded of the importance of strong Federal policy and action on this urgent problem:

WILL NIXON NIX EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYMENT?

A sickly silence has settled over the black communities of America. It could be the silence that precedes applause or the deafening roar of disapproval that will come if the new administration ignores the one most pressing need of the black man in America . . . jobs.

It is already apparent that large segments of business and industry think Mr. Nixon will not be as aggressive as the Johnson Administration in this area.

If their expectations are correct, Mr. Nixon will be dealing a deadly blow to the hopes of a very vulnerable section of the black community, the thousands who had begun to believe that equal opportunity employment would become a national reality. Many of these young men and women were encouraged to place their hopes once again in the American dream. Laws that were passed, although not nearly as aggressively enforced as they should be, did at least offer some semblance of equality in the job market.

Large groups of black students began to major in fields that were formerly beyond the aspirations of the average black person. They were willing to compete in a market that offered them an opportunity to work and succeed on merit. They looked to the federal government as a sort of big brother. It wasn't so much that the government forced business and industry to live up to their obligations, but the federal presence in itself was enough to move many holders of government contracts in the right direction.

Any indication that the present administration will be less diligent on jobs will cause a dramatic reversal of aspirations and attitudes. If the potential leadership group of young black people is once again disappointed, the Nixon Administration will lose the opportunity it now has to demonstrate that the Republican party can offer at least as much as the Democratic party had to offer the Negro, hopefully more. Unfortunately, this potential leadership group is almost consistently overlooked until it is too late; the loudest voices do not often come from the most productive people.

It seems to me that if when the shoe drops, it is an empty shoe, there could be an error from which Mr. Nixon's administration may not recover. But, if the shoe comes down firmly with the administration's foot in it, black people will begin to listen and evaluate on the basis of performance. At this point, that's all Mr. Nixon's administration can ask of the black community.

NATIONAL SECRETARIES WEEK

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, for the 17 years the United States has observed Secretaries Week, noting for a brief time the dedicated and effective work of the secretaries of this country. For the 18th consecutive year, Secretaries Week will be observed April 20–26, with Wednesday, April 23, highlighted as Secretaries Day.

Although Secretaries Week was originated in 1952 by the National Secretaries Association—International—in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Commerce, it is for all secretaries.

The overall theme for Secretaries Week is "Better secretaries mean better business." Looking to the future, NSA has continuously worked to elevate the standards of the secretarial profession and of businesswomen in general. Its primary goal is education—continuing education. And this is a future in which all secretaries must be ready to meet the challenge of technological changes.

Secretaries Week can serve as a reminder to conscientious secretaries that assuming a mastery of basic skills, loyalty, initiative, and accuracy are the most desired attributes of a good secretary.

MORTON PRAISES PRESIDENT FOR CALM RESPONSE

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, last week an old propeller aircraft, an unprotected Constellation converted into a reconnaissance plane, was shot out of the sky by North Korea.

All Americans were alarmed. Many urged the President to take immediate action, some called for military retaliation. The President kept his cool, however, and with it the cool and restraint of this great Nation of ours.

As the New York Times said in an editorial Saturday:

> President Nixon has given a reasonable and responsible answer to the shameful North Korean attack on a United States reconnaissance plane. Galling as it is to all Americans to accept the loss of the plane and its 31-man crew, the President showed good sense in eschewing futile saber-rattling.

As the President has done so many times in the past, he studied all the facts, took account of the present situation, and took positive and firm action. His brief statement at his press conference on Friday told the entire world where our country stands on future flights and on future attacks. The President said:

> I have today ordered that these flights be continued. They will be protected. This is not a threat; it is simply a statement of fact.

The President has acted with clarity and with purpose. Americans support him in that action and will support him in any necessary future action.

I think Saturday's Baltimore Sun clearly pointed out in an editorial the coolness of the President's action and the determination of his course. For the information of my colleagues, I include that editorial as part of my remarks:

WARNING GIVEN

> Like the protest officially delivered to North Korea at Panmunjom, President Nixon's statement at his press conference on the shooting down of a naval reconnaissance plane was impressive for its restraint, a restraint appropriate to the seriousness of the incident. He emphasized the fact that the unarmed aircraft had not flown closer than 40 miles to the North Korean coast and he described the attack on it—90 miles from shore—as unprovoked, deliberate and without warning. He also made it very clear that these surveillance flights are regarded as necessary, and that they will be resumed, continued and from now on, protected.
>
> Although Mr. Nixon declined to say what form the protection would take and was careful to note that his order for the protection was not a threat, the firmness with which he announced it can be interpreted as very plain notice to North Korea that it cannot halt the intelligence missions of United States planes over international waters and that any new attempts to interfere with those missions by force will be met by force.
>
> That this is what might be called an interim decision is apparent from the President's assertion that "Looking to the future . . . what we will do will depend upon the circumstances." It will depend, he added, on what North Korea does, on "its reaction to the protest and also other developments that occur as we continue these flights." The incident of the EC121 is not finally disposed of. For the time being it is being left to diplomatic exchanges.
>
> Obviously Mr. Nixon is trying to avoid any action that would worsen an already thoroughly bad situation. But he has told North Korea—an "unpredictable country," he said—that it will not be permitted to change the United States policy on aerial reconnaissance or to repeat its attack on our planes. Restrained as this message is, it carries an extremely sober warning.

A DISCUSSION OF THE U.S. POSITION WITH REGARD TO CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the paper which I propose to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a restatement of the official U.S. position on chemical and biological warfare. I submit it in order to insure that Members of Congress may have correct and unbiased information on this subject:

A DISCUSSION OF THE U.S. POSITION WITH REGARD TO CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

In recent weeks there has been increased comment and conjecture regarding the involvement of the U.S. in chemical and biological (CB) warfare, and speculation concerning the policies and purposes governing such involvement.

It is the policy of the U.S. to develop and maintain a defensive chemical-biological (CB) capability so that U.S. military forces could operate for some period of time in a toxic environment if necessary; to develop and maintain a limited offensive capability in order to deter all use of CB weapons by the threat of retaliation in kind; and to continue a program of research and development in this area to minimize the possibility of technological surprise. This policy on CB weapons is part of a broader strategy designed to provide the U.S. with several options for response against various forms of attack. Should their employment ever be necessary, the President would have to authorize their use. The U.S. does not have a policy that requires a single and invariable response to any particular threat. In the field of CB warfare, deterrence is the primary objective of the U.S.

CB weapons, in many situations, may be more effective than conventional (high explosive and projectile) weapons. Accordingly, it is believed wise to deter their use against our forces on populace. If two approximately equally effective military forces were engaged in combat, and one side initiated a CW operation, it would gain a significant advantage even if the opposing side has protective equipment. This advantage cannot be neutralized with conventional weapons.

As a matter of policy the U.S. will not be the first to use lethal chemical or biological weapons, but we are aware of the capabilities these weapons place in the hands of potential adversaries. For this reason it is important to carry on our R&D program in CB, not only to provide necessary equipment, such as detection and warning devices, but to define and quantify more fully the potential threat to our country from these weapons, and the hazards involved if they are ever used against the U.S.

The threat to the U.S. civil population from CB attack has been studied by the Department of Defense, and these analyses are periodically up-dated. It is clear that the threat of CB attack is less significant than that of nuclear attack. For this reason, more emphasis has been placed in civil defense on the nuclear threat.

For logistic reasons, chemical agents do not appear to pose a major strategic threat against the U.S. For example, it would require many tons of nerve agent munitions to carry out an effective attack against a city of a few million people. This may appear inconsistent with the high toxicity of the nerve agents, but for many technical reasons such as the difficulty in disseminating the agents in vapor or aersol form, the dilution of the agent in the atmosphere, and their impingement on ground and vegetation, it is correct. For this reason, stockpiles of therapeutic materials for nerve agents are not maintained. Although the possibility of the employment of biological weapons against U.S. population centers cannot be ruled out entirely, it does not presently warrant the priority given to defense against the effects of nuclear weapons. Research on methods of detecting and warning, identifying, and defending against biological attack are continuing, as is review of the magnitude and nature of the threat.

The Office of Civil Defense has developed an inexpensive but effective protective mask for civilian use, and a limited production run was made to test production quality. No large scale production was undertaken because of the low estimate of the threat as described above. Should the threat to our population increase, this mask could be produced quite rapidly and, together with other necessary defensive measures, would afford protection against both chemical and biological attack. Filtration systems have been designed and tested, and these could be added to fall-out shelters to afford collective protection for groups of people. In addition, many of the emergency plans developed by the Department of HEW for post-nuclear attack medical support would be applicable. The emergency packaged hospitals, for example, provide for expansion of hospital facilities by the equivalent of 2500 hospitals of 200 bed size.

Large stockpiles of medical supplies such as antibiotics and vaccines are not maintained against the possibility of biological attack. There is no specific antibiotic therapy available for most BW agents. As for vaccines, there are more than 100 possible BW agents, and production and adminstration of 100 vaccines to the U.S. population is not practical. There is medical reason to believe that such a program would be generally injurious to health in addition to requiring prohibitive expenditures.

Chemical detection and warning instruments which could provide the components for a national alarm system have been developed, but it has not seemed wise to expend the large sums to deploy them to build such a system. As noted above, we believe that the threat of strategic chemical attack is not great. Warning against biological attack is much more difficult technologically. Recently there has been success with a prototype instrument which would provide some biological warning capability. R&D efforts in this area will be continued.

U.S. Forces have the equipment required for protection against CB attack with the exception of a biological warning and detection device which is under development. Soldiers and sailors overseas have masks and protective clothing; and collective protection equipment for vans and communication centers is being developed and supplied.

Statements have been made that there is enough nerve gas to kill 100 billion people. This kind of general statement is as "true" as saying that a test-tube in a hospital laboratory can contain enough disease microorganisms to kill 100 billion people. Neither statement is true in any real sense, and there is no way in which the human race could be destroyed with nerve agents. The U.S. could not launch an immediate, massive retaliatory chemical or biological attack. The technical capability to do this has been developed, but it has not been judged necessary or desirable to procure and install the weapon systems for this purpose. The carefully controlled U.S. inventories are adequate for tactical response against enemy military forces, but not for a strategic, nationwide attack.

The total U.S. expenditure in the CB field, including smoke, flame and incendiary weapons, is $350 million for Fiscal Year 1969. There is no procurement of lethal chemical agents or of biological agents. Details of expenditures are given in the table below:

Chemical and biological expenditures, fiscal year 1969

	Million
Procurement:	
Smoke, flame, and incendiary	$139
Riot control munitions	81
Herbicides	5
Defensive equipment	15
Total	240
R.D.T. & E.	
General and basic R. & D.	9
Offensive R. & D.	31
Defensive R. & D.	30
Test and evaluation	20
Total	90
Operation and maintenance	20

Of the $90 million in R&D, about $26 million is spent on contracts, primarily with industry. $2 million is contracted to Universities for basic defensive investigations. Every attempt is made to use discretion in selection of contractors, and not to ask institutions to do work which might be contrary to their policies and purposes. For example, some years ago the advice of the Smithsonian Institution was sought in identifying a suitable institute to perform an ecological and medical survey of the Central Pacific area. As a result, they submitted a proposal, which was accepted. As a direct consequence of this work, there have been 45 papers written by Smithsonian scientists and published in the scientific literature. This has been a remarkably productive scientific investigation brought about by a coincidence of interests in the fauna of the area.

The Smithsonian Institution was never asked to do, nor did they do, any "military" chemical or biological warfare research. It carried out scientific investigations appropriate to its charter and objectives, and published the significant findings in the scientific literature. These results are available for use by any government agency, or by any nation or scientist wishing to do so.

U.S. forces have used riot control agents and defoliants (herbicides) in the Vietnamese conflict. These materials do not cause lethalities in humans, and, as former Secretary Rusk said, are not considered to be the type of materials prohibited by the Geneva Protocol of 1925.

The only riot control agent in use by U.S. Forces in Vietnam is CS, although CN was also authorized some years ago. Both are tear gases. There are no known verified instances of lethality by CS, either in Vietnam or anywhere else in the world where it has been used to control disturbances by many governments.

Of the herbicidal chemicals, there are none used in Vietnam to destroy vegetation which have not been widely used in the United States in connection with clearing areas for agricultural or industrial purposes.

The term "defoliants" is often used because it properly describes the purpose of its use; that is, to remove leaves from jungle foliage to reduce the threat of ambush and to increase visibility for U.S. and Allied troops. This use of defoliants has saved many American and South Vietnamese lives.

Herbicides are also used in a carefully limited operation in South Vietnam to disrupt the enemy's food supply. It is limited to the attack of small and usually remote jungle plots which the VC or NVA are known to be using. Usually these plots are along trails or near their base camp areas. Each such operation is approved by the U.S. Embassy and the government of the Republic of Vietnam. Enemy caches of food, principally rice, are also destroyed when it cannot be used by the South Vietnamese. These limited Allied activities have never, in any single year, affected as much as one percent of the annual food output of South Vietnam.

To date surveys have shown no evidence of substantial permanent or irreparable damage from the viewpoint of the future development of South Vietnam, attributable to the defoliation effort. The Department of Defense has supported the Department of Agriculture in studies of herbicides in analogous areas, and in a base line study of the forests of Vietnam. Recently a study "Assessment of Ecological Effects of Extensive or Repeated Use of Herbicides" was done by Midwest Research Institute, and reviewed by a special committee of the National Academy of Sciences. It was judged by them to be an accurate and competent report. Last Fall, the Department of State, with Department of Defense participation, made a survey of the ecology of defoliated areas. One of the scientists who made this survey, Dr. Fred Tschirley from the Department of Agriculture, published his report in *Science*, Vol. 163, pp. 779–786, Feb. 21, 1969.

At the end of active combat, it appears probable that there will be agricultural and forestry activities and other programs which will aid the South Vietnamese people. The Department of Defense would cooperate with the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development as necessary in accomplishing these. The Department of Defense supports the concept of a comprehensive study of the long-term effects of the limited defoliation program, and has endorsed, in principle, proposals by the American Association for the Advancement of Science for such a scientific study.

Every effort is made to assure that activities in CB do not pose hazards to the U.S. population. Strict safety practices are enforced at laboratories which do research on CB agents. Elaborate systems of air-tight hoods, air filtration and waste decontamination are employed. These precautions and procedures are reviewed by the U.S. Public Health Service as well as by our own safety experts. The equipment and building designs developed at the U.S. Army Biological Laboratories, for example, have been generally accepted throughout the world as the ultimate in safety for the investigation of infectious diseases.

With regard to the extremely unfortunate Skull Valley incident in which a number of sheep died, the exact chain of events is still not completely understood. A freak meteorological situation was probably a major contributing factor. This matter has been carefully reviewed by a special advisory committee appointed by the Secretary of the Army and chaired by the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service. This committee has made a number of recommendations concerning test limitations, toxicological and environmental investigations, added meteorological facilities, and a permanent safety committee. All of these recommendations are being followed.

Movement of chemical agents is governed by rules and procedures established by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the U.S. Public Health Service. The material is shipped in special containers; these containers are put on pallets if necessary and fully restrained, and an underlying layer of sand is used to reduce vibration and to absorb agent in the highly unlikely event of leakage. All shipments are accompanied by a trained escort detachment equipped with decontaminating and first aid equipment. Routes are carefully planned to avoid populated areas to the greatest extent possible; and, where they cannot be avoided, to move through them carefully and with as little delay as possible.

The precautions taken—the use of special trains, careful routing, controlled speeds, and other measures, make a train wreck extremely unlikely. However, even further steps are taken to minimize any hazard that might result from an accident. Buffer cars are included in the train, the escort detachment is distributed in different cars to provide prompt full-train coverage in emergencies, and transit time through populated areas is minimized. Although the agents are not inert, it is important to note that transported agents are neither volatile nor in the gaseous state. They are liquid, and the most volatile is about eight times less volatile than water. The containers are not under pressure, and nerve agents are rapidly rendered harmless by fire.

A succinct statement of the U.S. position on CB warfare was made in 1967 by then Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance in testimony before the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. A copy of the relevant portion of his testimony is attached.

The U.S. has consistently supported the Geneva Protocol of 1925, although it is not signatory to that document. The U.S. supported the Hungarian resolution in 1966 for all Nations to adhere to the principles of the Geneva Protocol. The New York Times for March 19, 1969 quoted President Nixon's instructions to the U.S. Delegation to the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference now meeting in Geneva. The relevant portion of his instruction is quoted below:

"Fourth, while awaiting the United Nations Secretary General's study on the effects of chemical and biological warfare, the United States delegation should join with other delegations in exploring any proposal or ideas that could contribute to sound and effective arms control relating to these weapons."

The Defense Department is fully in accord with mutual arms control efforts and supports them in every way possible. For example, members of my staff will join representatives of the State Department and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in meetings in late April to assist the United Nations Secretary General's group of 14 consultant experts prepare a report to the Secretary General of the UN on the characteristics of CB weapons.

With regard to unilateral disarmament, it was pointed out above that CB weapons are, in many military situations, more effective than conventional weapons. Thus, a nation which lacked CB weapons and could not deter or counter their use would have to consider more extreme measures. Unilateral CB disarmament would reduce a nation's deterrent capability, it would decrease its response options, and it would ultimately seriously degrade its CB defensive capability.

Statement by the Honorable Cyrus K. Vance, Deputy Secretary of Defense, Before the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, February 7, 1967

The Department of Defense has consistently supported measures aimed at achieving limitations on chemical and biological weapons.

The proposal for general and complete disarmament tabled by the United States at the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva states as an objective of our Government the elimination of all stock-piles of chemical and biological weapons and the elimination of all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction.

We supported the United States affirmative vote in the United Nations General Assembly last December on a resolution calling on all nations to observe the principles and objectives of the Geneva protocol of 1925. We have observed these principles consistently since 1925, although the United States, as you know, did not ratify the Geneva protocol.

We have consistently continued our *de facto* limitations on the use of chemical and biological weapons. We have never used biological weapons. We have not used lethal gases since World War I and it is against our policy to initiate their use. We have used riot control agents in Vietnam—agents similar to those used by police forces throughout the world. We have also used herbicides to destroy vegetation and crops in Vietnam.

I have indicated that we seek international understandings to limit chemical and biological warfare and that we have not used weapons of the sort condemned by the Geneva protocol. I should also point out that we have at the same time maintained an active chemical and biological program. In the last few years we have placed increasing emphasis on defensive concepts and materiel. As long as other nations, such as the Soviet Union, maintain large programs, we believe we must maintain our defensive and retaliatory capability. It is believed by many that President Roosevelt's statement in 1943, which promised "to any perpetrators full and swift retaliation in kind," played a significant role in preventing gas warfare in World War II. Until we achieve effective agreement to eliminate all stockpiles of these weapons, it may be necessary to be in a position to make such a statement again in the future.

SERVICEMEN'S LIFE INSURANCE COVERAGE SHOULD BE INCREASED

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to increase the maximum servicemen's group life insurance coverage from $10,000 to $30,000.

Without exception, programs of Government life insurance, beginning with the War Risk Insurance Act which established the servicemen's group life insurance, have limited the maximum coverage to $10,000 per individual. Even though holders of $10,000 service disabled insurance with the Veterans' Administration have a $10,000 limit on coverage while they are in the service. At the inception of the War Risk Insurance Act, the $10,000 coverage represented considerable purchasing power to survivors. But with increases in the cost of living since 1917 the amount that this insurance can purchase has shrunk. It now takes about $275 to purchase what $100 purchased in 1917.

Because the purchasing power of the dollar has decreased to the point where the $10,000 insurance benefit provides only minimal purchasing power, I believe the bill I have introduced today is necessary to insure that the amount of in-service insurance which our servicemen can carry is compatible with the needs of their dependents today without regard to rank or years of service.

AMITAI ETZIONI PROPOSES TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY FOR DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Amitai Etzioni, director of the Center for Policy Research here in Washington, has proposed that an Agency for Technological Development be established to pull together Government R. & D. efforts in the domestic field. The article, which appeared in the April 4, 1969, issue of Science magazine, is stimulating and well reasoned, and I commend it to my colleagues:

AGENCY FOR TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT FOR DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

(By Amitai Etzioni)

(NOTE.—The author is professor of sociology at Columbia University, New York, N.Y.; he is now on leave from Columbia and serving as director of the Center for Policy Research, Washington, D.C.)

The period of change of administrations in Washington is a time when federal reorganization is given special attention. Furthermore, as expenditures for R & D, especially for nonmilitary purposes, are expected to increase much more slowly in the immediate future than they have over the past 10 years, questions of the effective use of existing research facilities and manpower will gain increasing attention. In this context, reorganization is considered here as a method by which greater organizational effectiveness can be achieved, through an increase in economy and coordination. To highlight some of the issues involved in such reorganization in the "short" run (4 to 8 years), I focus on the merits and difficulties of one particular proposal.

This proposal is a variant of the often discussed idea of establishing a federal department of science, or science and education, or science and technology.[1] Suggestions for such a department find little support among large segments of the academic community, mainly because these scientists fear monopolization of sources of support for research, a situation which could allow the advocates of one school of thought to deny funds to other promising lines of investigation.[2] I deal here with a much more limited proposal: the creation of an agency devoted primarily to technological work and specializing in domestic—mainly urban—problems: a kind of earth-oriented NASA.

However, unlike the case for NASA, the establishment of an Agency for Technological Development (ATD) need not involve the creation of new, large-scale, bureaucratic machinery or a significant increase in total federal expenditures. A conversion of Housing and Urban Development (or of parts of it, especially the Model-Cities Administration) into a kind of R & D Department for the cities, augmented by the transfer of several "technological" units from other agencies and collaboration with still others, could provide most of the manpower, budget, and facilities that would be required. Since I favor this particular approach, I cannot completely avoid all hints of advocacy as I proceed to review first the merits and then the difficulties of this mode of reorganization of the federal R & D effort. The basic conditions I describe would, however, apply to most other attempts at reorganization and, hence, may be of interest even if an "earth-NASA" is not.

IMPORTANCE OF TECHNOLOGICAL SHORTCUTS

New applications of research and development of technologies seem essential if we are to be able to handle several of our key domestic problems within a reasonable length of time—let us say, in 4 to 8 years. The nation needs to face two facts: the funds required for the treatment of our most urgent problems with the means we now possess are not likely to be soon available, and, even if they were, the problems have elements whose resolution seems to be more than a matter of substantially increasing the investment in their treatment. The development of new means seems to be required.

As regards the first statement, the order of magnitude of the "missing" funds is great indeed. Mayor John V. Lindsay recently testified before Congress that he needed $100 billion to rebuild New York's slums; at the present rate, it will be 40 years before such an amount becomes available for the elimination of *all* the slums in the United States. And here I refer only to the construction or reconstruction of the physical plant. A United States senator estimated that the implementation of the key recommendations of the Kerner Commission would require *at least* $100 billion a year. With regard to all national needs, the National Planning Association calculated, in a study, that, if the United States sought to realize by 1985 the modest goals specified by the Eisenhower Commission on National Goals, even if the total gross national product were devoted only to those goals and the growth rate were as high as 4 percent per year, the country in 1985 would still be at least $150 billion a year behind.

The funds which will actually be available are of a much smaller order. A year or so ago it was argued by some that, once the war in Vietnam was ended, the nation could transfer the $24.5 to $32.5 billion now spent each year on the war (estimates of the costs vary) to the treatment of its domestic problems. Pessimists pointed out at that time that Congress could not be expected to transfer all of these funds to the domestic front and suggested a deal: part of the funds would be absorbed by reduced taxes (to satisfy the conservatives) in exchange for allocation to the domestic front of $15 billion, of which $10 billion at the last would be devoted to new domestic efforts.

As the 1968 elections drew nearer, however, the press reported that task forces working for the two major presidential candidates were estimating that, for the present, the defense budget would have to remain more or less at its present level even if the war were deescalated considerably. First, the Pentagon has convinced many people that stocks of war materiel depleted during the Vietnamese war would have to be replenished. Second, the Department of Defense maintains that several urgent military needs, especially in the area of technological development, which had not received attention during the war will require investment in the post-Vietnam period. A White House aide has indicated that he expects defense spending over the next 4 years to be between $72 billion and $77 billion a year. The defense budget for fiscal year 1969 is estimated as $79 billion.[3] In short, we could expect only a few billions of dollars to be diverted from military to domestic programs in the near future even if the war were ended immedi-

---

Footnotes at end of article.

ately. An additional tax increase is unlikely. Some increase in federal revenues due to an increased gross national product is expected, but much of this is already committed in the short run for items such as increased salary of government employees, veterans' benefits, and costs due to inflation and other factors.

But even if the economic resources for domestic programs were somehow miraculously to become available and the political will to use them for social improvement were present, we would still face other severe shortages, principally shortages of professional manpower. In the United States in 1966, for example, there were an estimated 556,000 patients in mental hospitals and 501,000 outpatients in mental health clinics. At the same time, there were about 1100 psycholanalysts, roughly 7000 board-certified psychiatrists, and few more than 17,000 physicians designated as psychiatrists.[4] Most of the patients in mental hospitals are not treated at all: in 1964, only 2 percent of the staffs of mental hospitals were psychiatrists and only 10 percent were professionals of *any* sort; most of the staff members were "attendants," of whom more than half had not completed high school and only 8 percent had had any relevant training. Similar shortages are reported in almost all the domestic sectors where problems are evident. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is encouraging city planning, but there are few city planners; many university chairs in the natural and social sciences remain unoccupied for years or are filled by persons who have not completed their training; and so on. Thus, it seems evident that, unless some shortcuts to the treatment of the nation's social problems are found, these problems are not likely to be effectively treated in the foreseeable future.

I do not wish to imply that all or even most of our domestic problems could be solved within 4 to 8 years. But it is quite likely that in this length of time several key problems might be reduced to a level where they would again seem "manageable." When this is achieved in several key areas, and as further reductions are worked out, our domestic problems will no longer threaten us, as they do now, by their appearance of unmanageability; this appearance elicits hysterical reactions, which both add to our problems and make the treatment of existing ones more difficult.

TECHNOLOGY AS A SOURCE OF SHORTCUTS

The development of new technology is relevant here because it has been found that the evolution of a new technology frequently makes possible the accomplishment of a task that formerly was prohibitively expensive (if it could be carried out at all) at a small fraction of its previous cost. As Alvin M. Weinberg put it: [5] "There is a possibility that the technologically oriented research institutions may contribute to an unexpected degree to the resolution of problems that now seem to be primarily social. I refer to the possibility of devising 'cheap technological fixes'."

It is sometimes argued, in opposition to this position, that the cost of using a new technology, even though it may make possible the previously impossible, is greater than the cost of using its pretechnological counterpart; a jet costs more than a mule. But it seems to me that a computation of the costs *per unit of results* (or effects) would show that, once the technological items are in routine use, they tend to be much less expensive. Thus, the cost of crossing the country by jet is not to be compared with the cost of using a mule in the old days; rather, one should compare the cost of transporting one person a given distance by mule to that of transporting him by jet in the same cost environment (for example, at 1969 prices). An extremely simple example of the economies gained by the application of a technology is to be found in the reduction of the turnabout time of ships in harbors from days to hours following the development of "containerization."

An interesting illustration of this point is provided by a cost-benefit analysis conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assess the relative effectiveness and expenditures of several programs intended to reduce the number of injuries suffered in automobile accidents, from which 53,100 people died during 1967, the last year for which figures are available.[6] The mechanical devices, products of technological development, were found to be much more economical, relative to their effectiveness, than the nonmechanical ones. Here are figures on the cost per death averted: use of seat belts, $87; use of restraining devices, $100; use of motorcyclists' helmets, $3,000; driver education, $88,000. Even when the fact that these figures are subject to considerable error is taken into account, the difference between the costs of technological approaches (the first three items) and an educational approach (the last) is so great that it seems to indicate a clear ranking of procedures, at least for this problem area.

The prospective roles of new technologies in other problem areas may be briefly indicated. It was once said that, were we to rely on manual swtchboards, all of the housewives in the United States would have to work for A.T. & T., to handle the present volume of telephone calls (I am not aware that an actual computation has been made). This point seems now to apply to teaching. The education gap now facing this country ranges all the way from the toddlers' age group (1- to 3-year-olds), in which, it is argued, poor and black children begin to be disadvantaged, to "continuing education" (a new euphemism for the education of adults), and a shortage of teachers is felt not only in the training of the handicapped and chronically unemployed but in that of all other groups up to and including M.D.'s. To state that, if this gap is to be eliminated, half of the country may soon have to be teaching the other half may well be only a minor exaggeration.

As this is highly unlikely to occur, the extent of the educational gap will be significantly affected by the development and mass use of *mechanical* instruction such as television teaching and the use of teaching machines.[7] These approaches will not "replace" the teacher but will, rather, take over some parts of his work (quite typically, the more routine parts), as well as increase his "reach" and effectiveness.

Before the benefits of these new aids can be fully realized, however, some additional technological development is necessary. The cost of computer-assisted instruction, for instance, has to be reduced through the development of much less expensive devices. Furthermore, evaluation studies show beyond reasonable doubt that, in many areas, TV instruction is not inferior to personal teaching. What is still lacking is a combination of TV instruction with an effective mechanism to allow students to respond to the material they learn, be tested, and gain a response in return. This could perhaps be accomplished electronically through a further refinement of the systems now used in mechanical voting and in the computerized analysis of correspondence courses. The evolution of devices which can be mounted on personally owned sets, allowing the student to record a lesson and to play it back at his own pace, is essential for the increased effectiveness of this technology.[8]

In the area of crime, approaches based on new applications of computers, laboratories, and communication systems are already serving the country, but—as the report of the Crime Commission clearly shows—we have only begun to make progress in this regard. The Crime Commission stated: [9] "More than 200,000 scientists and engineers have applied themselves to solving military problems and hundreds of thousands more to innovation in other areas of modern life, but only a handful are working to control the crimes that injure or frighten millions of Americans each year." Particularly, it has been suggested, much benefit could be derived from better nationwide communication systems to provide data about criminals, from better local communication among police units as well as between units and headquarters, and from the reduction, by technological means, of the paper work which slows down the courts.[9]

Developments in medicine often provide examples of the very considerable savings new technologies may provide.[10] For instance, methadone seems to have proved four to five times as effective as psychotherapy in treating heroin addicts. The "success" rate for the rehabilitation of drug addicts through psychotherapy, a long and costly process, is below 22 percent. Methadone, which so far has been used only experimentally, is reported effective in 82 percent of the cases; it is inexpensive and easily administered. While widespread tests of this technique are still needed, so that the controversy surrounding it can be resolved, it seems much more promising than psychotherapeutic approaches.

In the areas of low-cost public housing, rapid public transportation, information systems to bring workers and jobs together, waste disposal, highway safety, reduction of pollution, and so on, the need for technological development has been frequently pointed out.[11]

One reason why technological development may be expected to have high payoffs in these areas is that many elements of our domestic programs are still in the pretechnical stage, with most of the work performed, in effect, by the human brain. It may be argued that this is inevitable, that here men cannot be replaced or their output multiplied by the use of technologies. In some areas, this is undoubtedly true; in most, however, there are some key elements of the problems which could be helped considerably by new technologies. Thus, not all or even most teaching may become mechanized; but certain routine aspects—for example, repetition in language lessons—may be.

In other areas, services for a large number of persons cannot be provided without technological advances. Many of our social problems arise from the fact that services previously sought by relatively small groups—such as high-quality education, good medical care, and clean air—are now actively demanded by most citizens. The significant role of new technologies in bringing high-quality services to the "masses" is illustrated by the beaming of a Nobel Prize lecture into scores of classrooms equipped with television, the evolution of mechanical heart pumps (many believe these to be more practical for mass use than transplants), and the development of new devices for depolluting the air (making it possible to clean the air of central cities whose populations cannot escape to the suburbs and resort areas).

The need for, and promise of, technological development for the treatment of domestic problems seem fairly well established. How may this need be served?

EXISTING ORGANIZATION OF DOMESTIC R. & D.

The technological needs of our domestic programs are now being served by R & D efforts dispersed widely among federal agencies as well as outside the government in universities, research corporations, and private industry. To some extent this arrangement is both inevitable and desirable. Most agencies have some specific research needs of their own that they themselves can probably best serve. The existence of a multiplicity of R & D centers in the private sector

---

Footnotes at end of article.

helps to insure that a given approach will not monopolize the funds and prematurely drive out others which may prove to be more productive in the long run. However, the existing system of R & D centers serving the government does suffer from several deficiencies that may be corrected by the proposed agency that is to specialize in domestic technological development.

(1) In many federal agencies, unlike the situation in NASA, the technological division is an administrative stepchild. Only rarely are its special needs adequately understood either by the agency heads, whose backgrounds and training tend to be neither in research nor in technical development, or by the civil servants who stand between the technological division and the agency heads. It is important to note that these technological environments are not accidental; they are a result of the fact that the development of new technologies is neither the primary mission of these agencies nor the primary means of fulfilling their major missions. Thus, it is not surprising, nor is it a phenomenon limited to this country, that government agencies, staffed by civil servants, lawyers, and economists, find it difficult to provide an environment hospitable to laboratories and testing grounds, to engineers and applied psychologists. It is unreasonable to expect that a directive by a Secretary or the enunciation of a new policy will change such "structural" features. Institutionalization of a protechnological environment seems necessary if effective service of technological missions is to be possible—that is, establishment of an agency which will have technological development as its prime mission and which will be organized and staffed accordingly.

(2) The budgets of most of the existing governmental domestic R & D units constitute small fractions of the total budgets of the agencies to which these units are attached (see Table 1), and only part of this budget is used for technological development.

Of the total R & D obligations, most of the funds are used for nondomestic missions; it is estimated that $13.8 billion have been obligated to the Department of Defense, NASA, and the Atomic Energy Commission and $2.1 billions to the other 27 agencies. The situation in some of the key domestic agencies is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED OBLIGATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966 (12, P. 30 FF.)

Agency	Total R. & D. obligations (in millions of dollars)	Percentage of total agency budget
Department of Agriculture	243.7	3
Department of Commerce	+88.9	8
Department of Labor	11.8	2
Department of State	14.6	4
Office of Economic Opportunity	60.0	4

Obviously these obligations for R & D reflect neither a high national priority nor, it seems, the potential value of the work involved. For Interior and HEW, the percentages of the budgets allocated to R & D were higher, although not high—10 and 12 percent, respectively. In Interior, R & D expenditures are concentrated largely in a few highly technological subagencies, such as the Bureau of Mines; whether or not other bureaus could benefit from larger R & D expenditures remains in doubt. The 12 percent of the budget spent on R & D by HEW is spent largely for the research R and not for technological D. Actually, out of every $4 obligated, only $1 is obligated for development,[12] which is, of course, the more expensive part of the R & D process.

The small and politically weak Office of Science and Technology in the White House seems unable to campaign effectively for these various R & D units, and the National Science Foundation's mission, is by and large, limited to research, primarily of a basic nature, although NSF has been paying some attention recently to matters involving transfer of technology, engineering, and so on. It is likely that only the combination of all, or at least some, of these units and their elevation to the level of an agency will bring new technologies for domestic missions the needed support, as only then will domestic R & D be able to compete effectively in the federal give-and-take for funds.

(3) The fact that many of the numerous agencies active in the domestic areas now develop their own technological facilities seems to lead to some waste and to a measure of duplication. While some of these facilities are area-specific, others—such as computer centers and testing grounds—could be combined. Establishment of a federal R & D agency specializing in domestic missions would seem more economical than support of R & D in each of the numerous agencies and subagencies with a domestic mission.

(4) A significant proportion of the national R & D is, and surely will continue to be, carried on "out-of-house," in the private sector—in universities, research corporations, and private industry. However, the universities tend—quite properly—to focus on research at the expense of development, and on basic research at the expense of applied research. The forces which underlie this tendency of university research to be remote from practical needs are many and powerful. They include the prestige attached to research as compared to technological development, and to basic research as compared to applied research. Career advancement is often tied to achievement in basic research and, furthermore, scientists are often reluctant to accept the outside guidance that is found more frequently, and in greater detail, in applied and developmental work than in basic research.[13]

Also, many members of academia firmly believe that the best way to solve a practical problem is to invest in basic research; research funds are to be cast upon the oceans of science in the hope that the "answers" to specific problems will someday be washed ashore. Experience, as well as the empirical testing of this belief, seems to suggest otherwise.

The first atom bombs were produced in a concentrated effort specifically designed to result in such a product (Project Manhattan). Polio vaccine was developed by Salk and Sabin task forces. A manual lunar landing is expected as a result of the deliberate efforts of Project Apollo. A study by J. Schmookler [14] shows that significantly more results are produced in those areas in which there are significantly greater R & D efforts (as measured by investments). A study by the Department of Defense (Project Hindsight), which sought to establish the ways in which the systems most useful to defense were evolved, lends further support to this conclusion: of the 556 "events" which led to the evolution of the desired system, 92 percent were technological.[15] The study has been criticized [16, 17] for focusing on technological payoffs (only weapons were studied as payoffs) and neglecting scientific inputs (by not tracing the "events" farther back). In addition, a study of the sources of new findings in chemistry has been used to counter Hindsight's insights.[17, 18]

The questions about the relative importance and independence of scientific and technological inputs need not be resolved before the arguments in favor of a new technological agency can be examined. The following statements seem to summarize a kind of consensus of experts which is evolving.

(1) Investment in basic research must be continued because ultimately it is the foundation on which much of the later, more "applied" work builds; Hindsight findings exaggerate the importance of technological development.

(2) Investment in technological development is needed because (i) there is no "automatic" route from scientific findings to useful technologies (and the costs of technological developments are 15 to 60 times those of the initial research), and (ii) some developments are intrinsically technological and cannot be traced back to scientific findings—that is, the scientists' belief in the dependence of technological development on scientific research underestimates the need for investment in technologies per se.

(3) Technological developments are more "guidable" than research, especially basic research. Hence, if the goal is to increase the capacity to treat domestic problems, the payoffs from direct investment in technological development will be greater than those from research, as the former will be more "on target."

(4) While universities—with the significant exceptions of some engineering schools, university-affiliated laboratories, and a few other units—are oriented toward basic research, private industry and some research corporations are quite willing and able to work on specific technologies under the guidance of the government.

An agency specializing in technological development for domestic missions would, thus, increase the "weight" of these missions both in the federal give-and-take and in the private sector.

SYSTEM EFFECTS

Another reason why an Agency for Technological Development might be more effective than the existing multiple technological units within the scores of federal agencies and bureaus entrusted with domestic missions is that such an agency would be concerned with relations among technologies, a matter to which the present dispersed system cannot give much attention. New transportation systems, for example, are often designed without sufficient regard for housing problems, housing projects are designed without recognition of the problems of crime control, and so on.[19] To the extent that various specialized efforts are placed under one administrative roof, the likelihood will be increased that both the negative and the positive "side effects" of new technologies and their place in domestic programs will be more fully taken into account. Even within one agency there are barriers to such coordination, and these barriers are almost insurmountable between agencies.

There are exceptions: interagency cooperation between AEC and the Department of Interior on desalination and reduction of pollution is a case in point. But such collaboration is not common, and it is difficult to conceive, in view of the fragmenting forces at work, how it could become the norm. Dael Wolfle, addressing himself to this point wrote: [20]

"Many of the large problems that confront us . . . differ from those of the space program in focusing on people rather than on rockets and space vehicles. . . . But the social programs, like the space program, call for management structures linking government, industry, and universities. The new program will involve research, planning, coordination, and testing. And they will be bothered by multiple divisions of responsibility, conflicting ambitions and interests, decisions to use existing facilities or to assemble new ones, multiple channels of communication and authority, and the problems of building up and of phasing down as priorities shift to new targets or as new opportunities open up."

Footnotes at end of article.

Hence, I agree here with Wolfle that NASA provides a more effective administrative model.

In short, there seem to be several significant reasons for favoring an agency for domestic technological development. Many of the objections to such an agency seem to revolve around the issue of political feasibility.

POLITICAL FEASIBILITY

When I had prepared a previous version of this article I sent it "for comments" to a number of acquaintances in government agencies, on congressional committees, and in research corporations. Of the 18 who responded, all but one live in the Washington area. Such "feedback" is quite useful even in working on a regular academic paper, as it is very difficult for most writers to anticipate all the questions that the exposition of a concept for a finding may raise. Seeking such response becomes almost inescapable when one is dealing with policy proposals. Here, it is most useful to take into account the viewpoints of those who would be affected if the proposal were to be implemented, and of those highly familiar with the political constraints which the proposal will confront.

It was the consensus of the respondents that greater technological development would indeed be helpful in handling many of our domestic problems. And almost all of them agreed that such development would entail heavy investment in the technologies themselves and not just in basic or applied research. However, practically all of the respondents questioned the political feasibility of creating an agency devoted to the advancement of technology. It was repeatedly stated, with considerable force and conviction, that the existing agencies, Congress and its committees, and industry would oppose such a plan.

SPEED OF PAYOFFS AND CONGRESS

Among those whose profession is turning blueprints into social instruments or programs, and among those who work on developing new technologies, it is commonplace to expect a period of significant modifications and "de-bugging." It seems impossible to anticipate, on the drawing boards or in tests with small-scale models, all, or even most, of the difficulties a functioning, full-scale model will encounter. (The same holds for the routine production of what was developed as a prototype.) Hence, considerable effort and investment are needed precisely in this phase—that is, in evolving the first "prototypes" and setting up routine "production." The more "de-bugged" these phases are, the less likely it is that revisions will be necessary once mass production is under way. An analogy is correcting a stencil before it is run off instead of editing all the finished copies.

Occasionally, the temptation to short-cut is not resisted. For instance, it was reported that construction of the landing gear for the lunar spacecraft was being advanced while close pictures of the surface of the moon were still being sought. While I cannot document the following impression, it seems to me that, by and large, the tendency to "jump" into the field, to skip preliminary testing and de-bugging, is much stronger in the domestic area than in the areas of defense and space, and that this situation is most likely to occur in regard to new social programs (for example, computer-assisted teaching). One of the surprising experiences in interviewing officials in federal agencies and members of Congress is to discover how often they are not fully aware of the effort, time, and costs involved in turning an idea, already fully "researched" into a smoothly functioning system.

The degree of "tolerance" for prolonged and repeated preliminary testing or the inclination to skip stages are not abstract character traits, some people being cautious types and others hotheads. The orientation toward preliminary testing is greatly affected by budgetary considerations (preliminary testing often costs more than the original research); by the fact that application in the field is often paid for by a body other than that which conducted the R & D effort; by political considerations (adequate preliminary testing may carry the payoff of a program launched by one administration into the lifetime of the next one); and even by international considerations (How are the Russians progressing?). Thus, it was only after we had spent an estimated $4.8 billion on programs in compensatory education that the first major relevant study was completed—a study which strongly indicated that we were going about the task in the wrong way.[21] Many of the domestic programs launched between 1965 and 1968 had been insufficiently tested, while others, not tested at all, resulted in frequent costly reorganizations *after* the programs had been launched, or in programs that failed to "take off".[22]

In discussions of this approach, the argument that a program which does not promise quick results will not be tolerated by Congress is often raised. A new, more candid approach may have to be tried. Instead of overselling a program in terms of its yield and speed, perhaps it should be stated openly that the program will be innovative and experimental, and that, even if only one of every five projects were to yield a major new technology, the money would have been well spent. Also, by keeping testing "in-house," the reactions to initial inevitable failures may be more limited.

RESISTANCE TO OTHER AGENCIES

The concern of the respondents was with both the "producers" and the "consumers" of new technologies. On the producers' side, it was pointed out that many agencies already have R & D units which they would, for the most part, be quite reluctant to relinquish. These agencies can be expected to be supported by the congressional committees charged with overseeing their work—committees which would tend to oppose a reduction in the missions (and funds) they oversee. Finally, private industry, it was stated, is also working with agencies and subagencies, specific industries having built relations with those government agencies that deal with "their" technologies. Hence, industries would tend to object to a reorganization which would make "their" units disappear into a much larger technological agency, over which they would have less sway. Thus, for instance, the railroad industry would much prefer to deal with the Department of Transportation than with the envisioned Agency for Technological Development. The same holds for other groups, especially professional associations. For example, the American Medical Association would much rather be involved, it was stated, with the Dangerous Drug Division of the Department of Justice than with the new ATD.

It may be expected that the suggested ATD would encounter less resistance than earlier suggestions to concentrate science and technology in one department have met with, since neither science nor military and space technology (the nondomestic major "development" items) would be included. Some of the domestic agencies (for example, HUD), are at the very beginning of developing their R & D units and seem to be less committed to their own units than agencies in which the R & D units are well established. Still, there can be little doubt that the formation of an agency specializing in domestic, mainly urban, technological problems will encounter considerable opposition from existing domestic agencies.[23]

Still, the proposal deserves some attention on the following grounds. First, like economists' models of free competition, it serves to point up the "diseconomies" generated by the existing system and their estimated size and location. Second, it points out that, even if only the R & D units of some of the numerous domestic agencies could be combined, part of the diseconomy would be reduced. (NASA never "internalized" all the space work; important segments were, and still are, effected by the Air Force, and through the combined efforts of NASA and the Air Force.)

Finally, such a reorganization may be introduced by a powerful President, one ready to withstand the counterpressures in order to gain what may be a significantly more effective arrangement. This is not completely without precedent; when NASA was first created, R & D units were transferred to it from the Armed Services. While this move was initially not well received by the Air Force, the Army, and some members of Congress, the reorganization was carried out nonetheless. Similarly, in recent years several reorganizations of HEW did make some parts of the Department somewhat more immune to external pressures and more responsive to the Secretary's direction. All this is to say that a measure of administrative reform is possible despite counterpressures.

One line of approach would be to concentrate first on the R & D work of the agencies in which these divisions are still relatively small or in which the division suffers more from being in an agency alien to technological missions. Among the agencies my respondents listed as qualifying on one or both of these counts were Justice, Interior, Commerce, and Labor, as well as some parts of HEW (especially the Office of Education).

On the other hand, where technological development and the major agency mission are as intimately linked as they are in the Department of Transportation and in some parts of HEW (especially the health services), attempts to separate the two and to transfer the technological component to a new agency were considered both politically impractical and of questionable value. Among the areas most often cited as areas in which full-fledged attention to technological development has not yet evolved were education (despite the recent rise of educational laboratories), job training, crime prevention, and housing. Reduction of pollution and weather control were listed by some as suitable candidates, while others held them to be more "advanced," in terms of R & D work by existing agencies, than the other four areas cited.

This list of units "more suitable" for transfer led to consideration of a second, closely related but still analytically autonomous, issue.

RELATIONS WITH THE CONSUMERS OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES

Two schemes for the relations between a new technological agency and the agencies which would abandon their own technological work can be envisioned. The first, which comes to mind most readily, seems to be the less practical. The second, under prevailing conditions, seems the more feasible.

A student of "pure" administration, undiluted with politics, may envision a technological agency that would serve the regular agencies, which would draw on it for their "hardware," somewhat as the three Armed Forces draw on the Joint Ordnance Service. In the language of organizational specialists, the ATD would be a "functional" service for the "line"operations carried out by implementing agencies. The latter would order the specific technologies they need, and perhaps even pay for them.

Footnotes at end of article.

However, any scheme which assumes tight interagency cooperation seems, according to my respondents, to be about as realistic as ignoring gravity. Each federal agency is, to a considerable extent, an independent entity (often with quite autonomous subentities), and previous attempts to rely on close interagency cooperation such as the envisioned arrangement would require have been, as a rule, quite unsuccessful. Several respondents reported experiences as members of an interagency board or committee that did not "work," or told about a "system" that was developed by one agency and ignored by another because it was alien to the latter's conception, needs, interests, or ambitions. "The President can gain interagency cooperation but you cannot appeal to him too often, and even he cannot get such cooperation all the time," one veteran of the Washington scene observed. Two attempts to create "comprehensive" domestic agencies (the Office of Economic Opportunity and HUD), which were supposed to combine their efforts in specific sectors—poverty and urban problems, respectively—with the relevant work of other agencies, have not yielded much interagency coordination thus far. Above all, I was told, one cannot expect one agency to evolve a program and another to pay for it. "And who will pay for the new technologies if not the federal government?"

Consideration of this financial question points to a second view of the potential place of an ATD in the federal and general political-administrative mesh. Here, it is essential to take into account one feature of the domestic government. In the fields of space and defense the federal government is both the main source of funds for R & D and the customer for most of the products—whether it be a weapon or a spacecraft. In the domestic sphere, on the other hand, often the customer is not the funding agency or any other federal agency but, rather, the states, the cities, or various corporate bodies (for example, hospitals and universities). For reasons outlined below, these bodies are in a very different relationship to a potential "earth NASA" than the federal agencies are.

About 160 American cities have experienced one or more of the "standard" domestic crises. It is inconceivable that each city, or even each of the 50 states, will set up its own technological agency. Most of them do not have the necessary funds, and the skills needed are so rare that, even if all the specialists now living in America were recruited for these missions, they would not suffice to staff more than the technological divisions of a few cities or states.

Moreover, it must be noted that major technological breakthroughs have been made by a few talented men or by a concentration of high-quality manpower. Thus, even if each city could hire, let us say, two urban sociologists (the total number is more like several score than several hundred), only a few of these would have sufficient talent to actually benefit the cities.

Finally, if the solution to each problem—for example, the discovery of an inexpensive method of water depollution—had to be "reinvented" in 50 states or 160 cities, this would result in an extreme duplication of effort. And no one state or city can be expected to be the technological agency for the rest of the country. Hence, a national service for local authorities may be more politically feasible than one for other federal agencies.

At the same time, local autonomy will have to be preserved. The local governments could be best served, it seems, if the ATD were to institute a kind of "cafeteria"-style presentation of its new techniques, with states and cities able to choose whatever systems they wished to acquire and install. Thus, no strings would be attached to the program; a city or state seeking to build a new transportation, school, or housing system could acquire tested blueprints, specifications, and technical assistance (in the form of teams of engineers, city planners, and so on) from the federal agency and apply them where and when it wished.

So we return to the question of who will bear the costs of the implementation of the programs, once a prototype has been developed. It is very widely held in Washington that the agency promoting an innovation must pay for implementation: HUD for new housing, the Department of Transportation for new trains, the Office of Education for new teaching technologies, and so on. Most cities and states are impoverished. While it is difficult to raise federal taxes, especially to pay for the expansion of domestic programs, this is considered easier than to raise local taxes.[24]

The implication for the issue at hand is that the agency which will pay for the implementation of a specific innovation—for example, a new type of housing—will also seek to be the one to evolve the relevant technology. Hence, it is argued, there is no place for an ATD.

This argument may well be somewhat extreme. If an agency were to develop a highly effective new technology—new computers, for instance—would not other agencies with similar requirements adopt it?

Second, the costs of the implementation of such technologies need not always be borne by the federal government. Recently, New York City *paid* the RAND Corporation to evolve new technological systems for its fire and police departments. The RAND men, it is reported, found that in responding to a fire alarm it is more efficient to send, first, a jeep with a few firemen, rather than the much more expensive fire trucks, and that, in a high percentage of cases, these jeeps sufficed; in the other instances, the large trucks could still be called. Now, if this finding is further verified and other cities learn of it, they can be expected to purchase some jeeps out of their own funds. The same would hold for other new technologies, *if* they prove to be significantly more effective than existing ones.[25]

Of course, many cities may not know about the RAND innovations for New York City. Here, possibly, the creation of an intercity (and interstate) technological dissemination system might be a necessary federal investment, the costs of such a system would not be too large for ATD to handle, nor would it require extensive collaboration with other agencies.

Finally, if the cities or states are unable or unwilling to pay for utilization of the new technologies, federal agencies in the near future are also unlikely to be able to finance mass programs, even if the new technologies are their own. (The reasons for this statement are discussed above.) In the longer run, all indications are that an increased amount of federal revenue will be channeled to states and cities; that is, the latter will have more "disposable" money to buy innovations and will not have to adopt the concepts of HUD or the Office of Economic Opportunity or the Office of Education but can absorb mainly those compatible with their own conceptions and needs (within some federal constraints, such as the requirement for desegregation). Hence, ultimately, the question of the value of the ATD is clearly linked to the nature and size of our future domestic drives. Whether these are going to be funded largely in the New Deal style, by way of federal agencies set up for specific problem areas, or whether funds are going to be spent increasingly by cities and states, with the federal agencies providing technical and other assistance, has yet to be decided. I expect that the tendency will be to turn over more funds to states and cities, and I see within this pattern a place for an Agency for Technological Development. It can assist local bodies in handling their problems, and the localities will pay for the technologies, even if it is the federal revenues that put the needed funds in their pockets.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

[1] The need to reexamine the arguments in favor of a department of science were stressed by Philip H. Abelson and Donald F. Hornig at the 1968 annual meeting of the AAAS in Dallas, Texas (New York *Times*, 28 December 1968). An adapted version of Hornig's address was published in *Science* [163, 523 (1969)]. The establishment of a National Institute of Technology has been suggested by Richard R. Nelson, Merton J. Peck, and Edward D. Kalocheck in their *Technology, Economic Growth and Public Policy* (Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 177. Another possibility (not explored here) is to make the ATD the R & D unit of HEW, if, indeed HEW comes to encompass HUD, OEO, and ATD, in a kind of Department for Domestic Affairs or Human Resources Agency (Washington *Post*, 8 December 1968; *Time*, 13 December 1968, p. 17).

[2] None of the proposals cited in (*1*) advocate the concentration of all scientific activities in one department. President Nixon, in a preelection statement, promised that there "would be no federal scientific czar," but this does not preclude the concentration of some scientific or technological efforts, especially new ones.

[3] On the same point, see C. L. Schultze, "Budget alternatives after Vietnam," in *Agenda for the Nation*, K. Gordon, Ed. (Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1968), pp. 48–63.

[4] J. A. Clauson, *Contemporary Social Problems*, R. K. Merton and R. A. Nisbet, Eds. (Harcourt, Brace & World, New York, ed. 2, 1966), p. 47.

[5] A. M. Weinberg, *Reflections on Big Science* (M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1967), p. 141.

[6] *Accident Facts* (National Safety Council, Chicago, 1968), p. 40.

[7] For two recent discussions of the promise in this area as well as references to other discussions, see H. J. Brudner, *Science* 162, 970 (1968) and P. H. Abelson, *ibid.*, p. 855.

[8] CBS is reportedly working on such a development; see New York *Times*, 11 December 1968.

[9] *Task Force Report: Science and Technology* (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 1.

[10] In Britain, recently, a special nonprofit institute was set up to bring engineering closer to surgery. The organization is called the Bath Institute of Medical Engineering.

[11] For a fine discussion of the technical, administrative, and political difficulties encountered in one area, see R. Starr and J. Carlson, "Pollution and poverty; the strategy of cross-commitment," *The Public Interest* 1968, No. 10, 104 (1968).

[12] *Federal Funds for Research, Development and Other Scientific Activities Fiscal Year 1965, 1966, 1967* (p. 31) (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.)

[13] The relations between government and universities were examined recently from a large variety of relevant viewpoints in essays included in *Science, Policy and University*, H. Orlans, Ed. (Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1968).

[14] J. Schmookler, *Invention and Economic Growth* (Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1966). See also R. Nelson, *J. Business* 32, 101 (1959).

[15] "First Report on Project Hindsight" (Department of Defense publication) (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1966).

[16] See D. S. Greenberg, *The Politics of Pure Science* (New American Library, New York, 1967), pp. 32–33.

[17] The Illinois Institute of Technology is reported to be completing a study with more "depth" reporting and heavier emphasis on nontechnical elements (private communication).

[18] *Chemistry: Opportunities and Needs* (National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1965; related findings are being reported from a study now being completed under the auspices of the Illinois Institute of Technology, supported by the National Science Foundation (private communication).

[19] On this point see "University units of urban study hit as failures," *Chron. Higher Educ.* 3, No. 6, 1 (1968).

[20] D. Wolfle, *Science* 162, 753 (1968).

[21] J. S. Coleman, E. Q. Campell, C. J. Hobson, J. McPartland, A. M. Mood, F. D. Weinfeld, R. L. York, *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1966).

[22] D. P. Moynihan, *Commentary* 1968, 19 (Aug. 1968).

[23] For a fine background analysis of the relevant domestic programs, see J. L. Sunquist, *Politics and Policy: The Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson Years* (Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C. 1968).

[24] On the position of the Nixon administration, see J. Spivak, *Wall Street Journal,* 11 December 1968.

[25] The technological adaptations required to make jeeps into fire-fighting jeeps for use in urban areas are not great but are sufficient to be classified as a technological, and not only an administrative (or "logistic"), innovation.

NOTE.—The work on which this article is based was supported in part by a grant from the Russell Sage Foundation. I am indebted for comments on an earlier version to Walter G. Farr, Harold Orlans, William Rosen, Bernard Russell, Mary Helen Shortridge, Herbert Stein, and others.

CITY GI IS KILLED IN VIETNAM WHEN COPTER IS SHOT DOWN

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, 1st Lt. Eric V. Pulliam, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

CITY GI IS KILLED IN VIETNAM WHEN COPTER IS SHOT DOWN

A helicopter pilot from Baltimore was shot down and killed in the fiery crash of his airship in Vietnam last Friday, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

First Lt. Eric V. Pulliam, who lived with his parents in the 4300 block Dewey avenue, was reported missing in action when his helicopter was shot down by enemy gunfire. A few days later, however, the Army said his remains had been found and definitely identified.

SHORT TIME

The lieutenant had been in South Vietnam only about five weeks.

Born in the Turner section of Baltimore county, he attended Morgan State College from 1963 to 1966. He worked summers as a caddy and busboy at the Sparrows Point Country Club and then as credit manager at the Playboy Club in Baltimore.

He majored in art at college, his parents said, and he intended to go on to a commercial art career. But after he was drafted in September, 1966, he decided on a career in the Army.

"I thought his job was dangerous, but he loved it, and you can't tell a young man nothing," said Wilbert L. Pulliam, Sr., the lieutenant's father.

After going through Officer Candidate School at Fort Sill, Okla., Lieutenant Pulliam received helicopter training at Ft. Wolters, Texas. He was assigned to the 101st Aviation Battalion of the 101st Airborne Division in Vietnam.

Besides his prents, he is survived by four sisters, Milena, Lena, Deborah and Mary Pulliam, and three brothers, Wilbert L., Jr., Gary and Kenneth Pulliam, all of Baltimore.

NEW STRATEGY FOR MORE EFFICIENT USE OF TRANSPORTATION

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's chemical industry, which is doubling every 10 years, is making effective use of the Nations' navigable rivers in bringing their products to market cheaply. An analysis of how the chemical industry can make new transport savings by making more intensive use of the inland rivers was recently made by Louis R. Fiore, president of the Ohio River Co. of Cincinnati. He stresses the importance of close cooperation between barge and rail service in effecting important savings for the consumer. I insert Mr. Fiore's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NEW STRATEGY FOR MORE EFFICIENT USE OF TRANSPORTATION

(Address by Louis R. Fiore)

Tonight I want to talk about a modern strategy for the most efficient employment of transportation in the economy. But before I get down to my key recommendations, I want to borrow a story on strategy which is a favorite of the president of our parent company, Eli Goldston of Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates.

It is reliably reported that Moshe Dayan, the Israeli Defense Minister, is well acquainted with the writings of the great Russian strategist, Field Marshall Mikhail Larionovich Kutusov. The Israeli Defense Minister felt that these writings could be extremely helpful in any clash with the Egyptians. Kutusov was the planner of Napoleon's defeat in Russia and is regarded as Russia's supreme military thinker. Wishing to give Egypt the benefit of Kutusov's ideas, General Dayan arranged through agents in Russia to have a volume of Kutusov's writings translated into Arabic and enclosed with the operating manual of each Russian tank and each Russian MIG shipped to Egypt. During the six-day war in 1967, it became apparent that the Egyptians had read the book, for Kutusov's theory of warfare was simply this: "Entice the enemy deeply into your own territory . . . and wait for snow."

One moral that you can take from that story is that whether in military affairs or transportation sitting back and waiting only succeeds in very specialized circumstances.

Transportation has become an important part of our modern economy because man has not been content with the natural resources available at arm's length. Even our first anthropoid ancestors decided to pass by the nearest bunch of coconuts and the nearest lady ape in favor of more distant but more attractive merchandise. Increasingly in our modern world we reach out farther and farther for the goods that bring us sustenance, comfort, convenience, pleasure and luxury. More and more we need and want the world at our fingertips.

Certainly industry has been far too passive about transportation in recent years. There is a need to make much more dramatic the critical role transportation can play in the production and marketing of a product.

In our company we like to think that, in a fundamental sense, value is created by transportation. In this context it is abundantly clear that little, if anything, has much value unless and until it is in the place where it is needed. Coal or phosphate rock has little value underground. It only achieves value when it reaches its designation. In all cases, this bounty of our land is literally *priceless*—that is, *without* price—until it is laid down in a place where it can be converted into the form in which our society can use it.

Phosphate rock, for example, is worth perhaps 3 to 5 cents a ton underground. It may be worth from $4 to $6 a ton when it is mined and brought to the surface. But even this is a somewhat fictitious value. When transported 500 miles or more to the point where it can be processed into fertilizer, the ultimate value is 20 times that at the mine. And of course, the lower the transport cost, the higher the value of the product at destination.

I glanced at a few figures on phosphate rock production before I left Cincinnati. I knew of the extraordinary growth of production, but I was a little startled to see phosphate rock output doubling between 1960 and 1967. This, however, is simply a reminder that the entire economy is in a period of rapid expansion. Experts are predicting that the gross national product will double in only 15 years. The most exciting implication of rapid growth is the opportunity it provides to improve efficiency. If we have to double, in only 15 years, the level of production it has taken us generations to reach, then we have a great opportunity to develop more efficient ways of production and distribution.

I suggest that a modern strategy for taking maximum advantage of our opportunities in the period of rapid change and expansion ahead might include three general principles which I will list, briefly explain and then discuss.

1. The expanding cycle of growth and efficiency: High volume production makes possible lower costs which, in turn, produce increased efficiency with economic benefits for all. High volume movements should be a major objective, at least for those in your business, or businesses like them.

2. Better inter-modal coordination: We have concentrated, in the last ten years, on improving the different elements of the transportation system. Larger freight cars, larger barges, more powerful towboats, larger ships, trucks with double trailers, and higher horsepower units in every mode have all been developed. What is needed for the 1970's is more attention to the art of putting the best efficiencies of water, rail, pipeline and highway together in the most useful combinations.

3. More attention should be given to the basic economic doctrine of comparative advantage both at home and abroad: In the expansion ahead, we have an opportunity to concentrate regionally and nationally on those products which we are able to produce and bring to market most efficiently and rely on trade for those items which can best be produced by someone else. In a rapidly expanding economy, with capital for development at a premium, this approach will become increasingly attractive because the best return is usually to be obtained from that which is produced most efficiently. Nor do we lack top level government interest in this theme. In his inaugural address, President Richard M. Nixon said: "We seek an open world—open to ideas, open to the exchange of goods and people." I was happy to see him mention "goods" in that context.

Your business is almost entirely tied to agriculture and so, increasingly, is the business of the barge lines. A couple of years ago discussion of world agriculture would have had to be in terms of who would live and who would die. But now a dramatic change has taken place. As the result of improved seeds, which are highly responsive to the application of fertilizer, there are increasing world surpluses of grain. This, of course, only tells part of the story. The nutrition level of most of the world's population is still deficient. The battle of the '70's is going to be to provide not just sufficient food to keep back starvation—that we now know we can do—but better quality foods. A Department of Agriculture report notes that the key to present favorable prospects are the new varieties of wheat, rice and corn, which, and I quote, "are especially responsive to heavy doses of fertilizer, as many old varieties were not."

Unquestionably, both at home and abroad, the long-term prospects for increasing needs for fertilizers are bright, despite the temporary current set-backs.

Let us take a look at the three principles I have mentioned as they may relate to our common interest in agriculture.

The expanding cycle of higher volume and efficiency is the theme of U.S. agriculture and its imitators throughout the world. Yields per acre are increasing at an astonishing rate. Farms are getting larger, and more specialized. Fewer farmers are needed to feed the increasingly urbanized population. More capital has been applied to increase the volume of output. Costs have been lowered. In the marketing field, the small country elevator is being replaced by larger "agri-centers" which handle not only storage and processing, but also serve as a center for feed and fertilizer distribution. With such volume, costs can be lowered and efficiency improved. Responding to the efficiency resulting from higher volume, the transportation industry has introduced unit trains, double trailer trucks and much more efficient flotillas of barges. At the ports, larger ships are able to carry the grain abroad. Barge lines, by the way, deliver 87 per cent of the corn which arrives in New Orleans for export. The cumulative effect of this increased efficiency is that agricultural exports, particularly to the highly developed countries of Japan and Europe, are likely to increase substantially, with favorable effects on fertilizer consumption at home.

Our second theme, coordination of service among the modes, has I think a vast potential for cost saving in American industry and agriculture. We have been too "channel-minded" in the past. For example, many of the largest corporations have transport experts in charge of highway, rail and water transportation, but they never think of bringing their three experts together to work out most efficient combinations of modes.

Here, in Tampa, is an example of the dramatic savings that can be achieved by proper coordination of service. With Freeport Sulphur Company, and the Seaboard Coast Line, our company examined the optimum contribution transportation could make to reducing the production costs of fertilizer.

We combined unit train shuttle movements by the Seaboard Coast Line to Tampa, a fast turn-around for the unit train at a new terminal in Tampa, and a new 26,000-ton, self-unloading barge for cross-Gulf transportation to a fertilizer production plant in Louisiana. The transport saving was about 30 per cent; the movement has just started.

Success of this movement of course was greatly aided by the foresight of the Port of Tampa in deepening the harbor channels. Since the trend is to bigger ships with deeper drafts, the Port of Tampa needs to stay ahead of the race for deeper channels if it is to accommodate the largest vessels and so expand its share of world trade.

Through the Water Transport Association we are in the process of developing a series of examples which demonstrate the advantages to both shippers and carriers of the most efficient combinations of the various modes. We have proposed four movements which, together, show indicated savings of over $600,000 a year involving steel pipe, salt, skelp, a steel plate used for making pipe, and synthetic rubber.

Because of my interest in the fertilizer business, I recently proposed a rail-water coordinated movement of that third essential element of fertilizers, potassium. Nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium are all needed for plant food. Up in Canada in Saskatchewan are enormous newly-developed deposits of potash. The output this year is expected to be something like 9.5 million tons. I proposed that the potash be brought to the head of navigation of the Mississippi River at St. Paul or Minneapolis by unit train. The river carriers could then distribute it by barge to the main blending and consuming centers. Our analysis indicated savings of from 30 to 34 per cent over the all-rail method of delivery. These were preliminary figures which did not take into account the full effect of new investment in more efficient methods of organizing distribution. We have had some very friendly responses from both railroads and producers. I expect a movement to develop.

The campaign we call the "willing partner" program is increasingly intriguing railroads, shippers and the government because of the opportunities for economic savings from better voluntary coordination of service. The savings are enough to justify a reasonable rate of return on the heavy new investment usually required of transport modes and give the shipper every incentive to make long-term contracts which lower the risk. The lower the risk, the lower the cost of financing and the greater the savings all around.

The last proposition I would like to start you thinking about is this matter of comparative advantage, particularly as it relates to the export market for agricultural products. Anyone who peers into the future at the present time cannot help but be confused by the cross-currents of government policies at home and abroad. Protectionist policies for agriculture exist in the highly-developed countries in Europe. I would like, however, to call your attention to a Department of Agriculture analysis which points to the growing cost of these protectionist policies. The common market countries in 1968 spent $2.5 billion for market support and commodity disposal. This will grow to $10 billion in 1980 unless policy changes are forthcoming, an insupportable burden, some experts believe.

It seems sensible that, in the long run, the Europeans will want to concentrate more on areas of their economy in which they have the comparative advantage. With their small farms, large amounts of marginally productive acreage and inefficient methods, agriculture increasingly is not one of these areas.

Almost inevitably, the cost of the protectionist supports will force changes in European policies. Those countries with the comparative advantage in agriculture such as the United States, will have an opportunity to share more fully in the European market, where a rising standard of living is rapidly improving the quality of the food demanded. On our part, however, we must not spoil our opportunities or see them pass to other countries, because we do not take in trade the products which other countries are better able to produce.

Perhaps your group will be willing, as our Association has done, to join with our friends in the grain trade and with the farm groups and others to urge that the country's best course in winning an ever increasing share of the growing world markets lies in relying on rapidly increasing U.S. efficiency and productivity, and not on restrictive policies.

Our Association testified against the International Grains Arrangement for wheat last year, an attempt to obtain an international agreement to limit the world production of wheat in the hope of encouraging price rises. We warned that the United States has the only effective mechanism for reducing production, that no one else would, or could cooperate, and that the net result would be the deterioration of U.S. wheat exports. Our predictions unfortunately have come true.

In the long run reliance on our increasing efficiency in production and distribution is in our business self-interest as well as in the interests of the country.

While I am on this subject of comparative advantage, let me explain a situation which has arisen in the transportation industry. I am sure you are aware of the erosion of the traffic of the common carriers to private carriers in the past two decades. We have no quarrel with the principle of private carriage. A great deal of it makes sound economic sense.

But decisions made in establishing private fleets years ago need constant review. We believe that many companies now faced with replacing or enlarging or even continuing to operate private fleets could use their investment to earn a great deal more either in other branches of their own business or in other businesses. The return of blocks of private traffic to common carriers would free capital for more remunerative use and at the same time permit a large corporation to benefit from the common carriers' ability to spread his costs over other traffic. Thus this sound old economic concept of comparative advantage could, if applied to private carriage, radically change the willingness of corporations to continue investments in private fleets.

There is of course one final matter which I would like to stress. The pressures of expansion of the economy are being reflected in the rising rates of interest. With rising rates of interest, inevitably, a higher rate of return is being required of risk capital. It is risk capital that is responsible for improved efficiency throughout the economy. Dramatic savings in transportation are coming primarily from heavy new investment in better ways of doing things.

The new 26,000-ton self-unloading barge and its system of terminals and special towboats required an investment of $17,000,000. The savings were dramatic. The switch from break-bulk to container handling of international package freight required an investment of many times the previous investment in the break-bulk system. Larger and more expensive ocean bulk ships have returned economies to the oil, coal, iron ore and grain trades. On the rivers, larger and more powerful towboats have enabled the carriers to maintain freight rates, despite inflation and the increasing labor and material costs, at the same average level as they were in 1922. Larger freight cars, double-bottom trucks, new rail classification yards are all part of the same trend to increasing transportation productivity.

As competition for capital becomes keener, however, it is essential that the rate of return for the transportation companies keep pace with the rest of the economy. Unless it does, the improvements in efficiency and productivity cannot develop fast enough to overcome the impact of rising costs. When earnings fail to provide a sound basis for innovation and improved efficiency, an industry finds itself increasingly locked into rising costs of labor and materials, unable to afford the capital for new and better approaches, and thus is forced to pass increased costs along to the consumer. This adds to the inflationary process and the whole economy suffers.

The challenges of the 1970's are exciting. We anticipate vast expansion, new technologies to improve productivity, new systems of transportation to take advantage of the expanding cycle of improved volume and efficiency. I take the optimistic view that our country has the brains, the will, the resources to overcome our problems. I do believe we will have to work hard.

But what's new about that?

THE WRIGHT DECISION WRONG

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Federal judiciary continues to run rampant with its many warped and twisted decisions.

Regrettably—and tragically—these quasi-legislative decisions have far-reaching effects upon the everyday lives of all Americans. Such a decision was handed down by Judge J. Skelley Wright, then district court judge, on June 19, 1967, which squarely—and without doubt—preempts the authority and good judgment of educators and school boards.

The Wright decision drastically affects the District of Columbia school system through shocking and disturbing illogic—in what appears to be an effort to create faceless robots of schoolchildren.

The April 21, 1969, issue of the U.S. News & World Report carries an enlightening article by Dr. Carl F. Hansen, widely respected educator and former superintendent of schools in the Nation's Capital. The article contains sound reasoning. I believe our colleagues will find it worth while to examine seriously.

A nuclear submarine commander does not pilot a B–52 bomber, nor does a bomber pilot command a sub. It is time educators were allowed to operate school systems without interference from fuzzy-headed Federal judges.

I insert Dr. Hansen's article at this point in my remarks:

WHEN COURTS TRY TO RUN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(NOTE.—The rush to compel racial and social balance in education by laws and court actions is opening up a Pandora's box of new problems, says an authority on the subject.

(The following article, written by a noted educator, Dr. Carl F. Hansen, assesses the drive to end all imbalance as a grave threat to public education itself.)

(By Dr. Carl F. Hansen,[1] former superintendent of schools, Washington, D.C.)

If you live in a small Nevada town—or in one in Iowa or Ohio, for that matter—and your schools are mostly white, you may actually be flouting a court ruling that says that racially imbalanced schools run against the Constitution of the United States.

If your schools have all-white faculties, you may someday be ordered to hire 13 per cent black teachers to make the percentage fit in with the ratio of blacks to whites in the national population.

If you live in a city like Washington, D.C., or Chicago, you may someday have to see to it that the proportion of the poor in any school does not exceed the percentage of the poor in the entire city.

If you refuse to attempt to get a balance between the poor and the nonpoor in your schools through voluntary exchanges across school-district and even State lines, you may find yourself in contempt of court.

You may find your own child someday inexplicably "volunteering" to ride a bus out of your neighborhood for the kind of social and racial integration some of the nation's leaders think is best for everybody—except possibly for themselves.

If not already current realities, these requirements may ultimately result from the emergence of the doctrine of *de jure* integration.

A new and rather pervasive body of law is being generated by the courts and a limited number of school boards and State legislatures. The effect of this action is to make homogeneous schools either illegal or unconstitutional. In order to reduce homogeneity in school populations, school boards are being required by law to produce plans for increasing racial and social balance in their classrooms.

For much too long this nation lived with *de jure* segregation. Under this immoral and inhumane doctrine, children—and in some cases teachers—were told: "You may not enter this school or that one because of your race." The law stood guard at classroom doors, sifting out blacks from whites and sending each into prescribed educational areas.

Now comes a counterpart rule—that of *de jure* integration. The effect is the same as in the case of *de jure* segregation: The law again stands guard, admonishing the black child to enter a designated school because his dark skin will improve racial balance there, or instructing a white child to transfer into a black school for the same reason.

One of the more difficult problems about assigning pupils to schools by race is deciding who is white and who is black. For this, someone ought to devise, a skin scanner capable of computing racial dominance by measuring skin shade.

In today's admonition against homogeneous schools, you have to think beyond simple race differentials; you are required to weigh the purses of schoolchildren to determine whether they belong to the poor or to the affluent segments of American society. If you are going to enforce mixing of pupils by social and income class, you must find out about the financial condition of their families.

At the base of the doctrine of *de jure* integration is the assumption that homogeneous schools are bad for children. If you want to raise a nasty question, simply ask: "What is the proof that schools with fairly similar enrollments are inferior? Why is an all-white school arbitrarily suspect, or an all-black school written off as worse than useless?"

The earliest example of *de jure* integration is found in the 1954 action of the New York City board of education when it declared that "racially homogeneous public schools are educationally undesirable," and then placed upon itself the responsibility of preventing "further development of such schools" and achieving racial balance in all of its schools.

The action was taken on the advice of social theorists who reasoned that segregation by the fact—that is, resulting from the free choice of people—was as bad as segregation by law.

The action of the New York City board of education was followed up in 1960 by the New York board of regents. On the premise that homogeneous schools impair the ability to learn, the regents ordered the New York State department of education to seek solutions to the problem of racial imbalance. It declared:

"Modern psychological knowledge indicates that schools enrolling students largely of homogeneous ethnic origin may damage the personality of the minority-group children. . . . Public education in such a setting is socially unrealistic, blocks the attainment of the goals of democratic education and is wasteful of manpower and talent, whether this situation occurs by law or fact."

Three years later, the then New York State commissioner of education, Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., now United States Commissioner of Education, sent a memorandum to all State school officials requiring them to take steps to bring about racial balance in their schools. The commissioner defined racial imbalance as existing where a school had 50 per cent or more black children enrolled.

The legislative development of the concept *de jure* integration has continued: California, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Wisconsin and Connecticut have decided in executive or judicial statements that racial isolation in the schools has a damaging effect on the educational opportunities of the Negro pupils.

In 1965, for example, the Massachusetts legislature enacted a Racial Imbalance Act. Schools with more than 50 per cent nonwhites were required to file with the Massachusetts State board a plan for correcting the condition.

It would be a serious mistake to overlook the role of the courts in establishing the rule that homogeneous schools must be abandoned.

The *de facto* school-segregation decision in *Hobson v. Hansen* explicitly instructed the Washington, D.C., board of education to submit plans for the reduction of imbalance in the schools.

By clear definition, Judge J. Skelly Wright included social class along with race as factors of concern. For the first time a court spoke not only on the unconstitutionality of racial imbalance but of social imbalance as well:

"Racially and socially homogeneous schools damage the minds and spirit of all children who attend them—the Negro, the white, the poor and the affluent—and block the attainment of the broader goals of democratic education, whether the segregation occurs by law or by fact."

Judge Wright overrode the conclusions of at least eight federal courts that had ruled consistently that it is not the duty of a board of education to eliminate *de facto* segregation, provided there is no evidence suggesting the maintenance of *de jure* segregation.

The sweeping Wright decision, however, went far beyond the more common legislative view in such States as New York and Massachusetts that blacks suffer from attendance in predominantly black schools. The jurist in *Hobson* v. *Hansen* added social-class homogeneity as a factor detrimental to democratic education. In addition, he enunciated the opinion that all children are hurt by homogeneity. In all-white, predominantly affluent schools, therefore, the minds and hearts of the pupils are being damaged for about the same reasons that black children suffer in schools peopled by their own race.

If the rule requiring integration by social class prevails, every public school in the nation is subject to its effect. Even predominantly Negro school systems like the Washington, D.C., unit will be confronted with a redistribution of its pupils along social lines, if the literal meaning of the Wright opinion is observed. In the nation's capital, with about 94 per cent Negro public-school enrollment, more than 10,000 secondary-school students were reassigned in one year to bring about better social balance in the schools. Thus, *de jure* integration by class as a doctrine is already in partial effect in at least one major school system.

The conclusion that socially homogeneous schools must be destroyed rises from an increasing stress upon the theory that social class determines the quality of education. If the only way to improve achievement among lower-social-class pupils is to integrate them with higher-income pupils, a vast manipulation of school populations is in prospect. It would require a kind of despotism the world has not yet experienced, for enforcement is inevitable where the people do not volunteer.

---

[1] Dr. Carl F. Hansen guided the integration of Washington, D.C., schools in 1954. His work in the transition drew wide praise. In subsequent years, Negro enrollment gained overwhelming predominance. A Negro filed suit, charging "inequalities." A federal judge ordered changes considered dangerous by Dr. Hansen, who chose to retire rather than comply.

It is difficult to believe that freedom can survive when government seeks to control the social and racial dispersement of the people—speaking, as it does so, the line: "This may hurt, but it will be good for you."

The judicial movement toward full devlopment of the *de jure* integration doctrine was accelerated by the United States Supreme Court in three decisions issued in May, 1968. These are the Kent County, Va., the Gould, Ark., and the Jackson City, Tenn., opinions requiring the school boards in these communities to abandon their freedom-of-choice plans for desegregating their schools.

In these opinions, the Supreme Court declared that, in States where the schools were previously segregated by law, school boards must assume an affirmative responsibility to disestablish segregation.

In Jackson City, Tenn., for example, it was not enough to set up school zones on the neighborhood principle, at the same time allowing pupils to choose to attend schools outside those zones if space existed in them. Under this plan, formerly all-white schools received significant numbers of black students. Because, however, white students refused to attend or to elect to attend all Negro schools, the court was dissatisfied with the freedom-of-choice plan. The presence of all-Negro schools, became clear evidence of intent to preserve segregation as it existed before 1954.

Not only must the Jackson City school authorities by the force of law require white children to attend formerly all-Negro schools, but they must also enforce faculty mixing by arbitrary assignment of personnel on racial lines.

The Supreme Court's disestablishment doctrine is the principle of *de jure* integration applied to those States in which segregation by law existed prior to the 1954 *Brown* decisions. This position—quite heavily burdened with patent discrimination against a group of States—is after all only one step removed from a decision requiring all States to disestablish segregation, whether this occurs by law or fact.

De jure integration, in summary, applies currently in those States and in those school districts where the local legislative bodies have enacted legislation establishing the new doctrine. It applies specifically to the District of Columbia, where the Wright opinion required the board of education to prepare plans to reduce homogeneity by race and social class.

Directly and unequivocally, the doctrine has been invoked by the Supreme Court of the United States in its disestablishment ruling applicable to jurisdictions formerly segregated by law. As has been said here, this step is the precursor of a ruling requiring local and State boards of education to disestablish *de facto* segregation as well.

A THREAT TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The most damaging aspect of the *de jure* movement is that its proponents must discredit predominantly white schools—of which there are many throughout the country—and predominantly black schools, whether they exist in large cities like New York or small ones like Drew, Miss. Out of the attack on public education needed to establish an enforced abandonment of homogeneity by race or class has come a threat to public education that promises to bring down the walls of this primary citadel of democracy.

Hardly a school system anywhere with racial imbalance has escaped a scathing attack by those bent on achieving a millennium through the simplistic step of requiring racial balancing either by legislative or judicial action. Trace the anti-public-school sentiment in recent years to its source: You will discover—as in the case of the Washington, D.C., story—a sequence of attack, discredit, weaken; a strategy for imposing racial and social-class mixing through the winning of legislative and judicial support.

The danger in the drive for legislative and court actions to make integration the law of the land—here meaning the artificial management of persons to establish racial and social-class mixing—is the imminent destruction of confidence in public education.

As important as the hazard to public education is the fact that, in any case, *de jure* integration does not work.

The policy of the New York City board of education requiring racial balance produced overwhelmingly negative results. It left a trail of school disruptions, protests, boycotts and sit-ins. In the meantime, whites left the schools at an increasing rate.

In 1964, an official study group stated:

"No act of the board of education from 1958 through 1962 has had a measurable effect on the degree of school segregation. . . . Not a single elementary or junior high school that was changing toward segregation by virtue of residential changes and transfers of whites into parochial and private schools was prevented from becoming segregated by board action."

Four and a half years ago, the New York City board of education paired two schools—one mostly white, the other Negro. The promise made to the parents was that a race ratio of 65 per cent whites and 35 per cent blacks would be maintained in each school. Today—that is, in early 1969—the white enrollments are down to about 35 per cent in each of the two schools.

The Gould, Ark., experience is further proof of the futility of attempting to apply the doctrine of *de jure* integration. The community paired its two small schools last autumn. As a result, all but 50 of 250 white pupils withdrew. The authorities there estimate that in the coming school term the white enrollment will fall to no more than 20 pupils.

Washington, D.C., is an example of very rapid changes in race ratios over a period of a few years. From 1950 to 1967, the white school membership dropped from 46,736 to 11,784, while the black membership jumped from 47,980 to 139,364.

Enrollment figures show that formerly all-white Washington, D.C., public schools invariably moved to 75 per cent black membership two years after the 50 per cent point was reached. In each such school, the black membership quickly moved thereafter to 99 per cent.

The new and important discovery was that when a formerly all-white school approached 30 per cent black membership, the rate of change increased. Within two years, the black membership reached the 50 per cent point, from which it moved to 75 per cent within the next two years. The important finding is that the starting point for rapid white exodus is 30 per cent.

A police state with unlimited enforcement power will be needed to implement integration if it is required by law.

It is inviting to speculate about the ultimate possibility of an enforced integrated society. The next step may be to set up quotas for neighborhoods, so that the number of poor will be proportionate to their total number in the community. New homes funded by federal loans may, under a policy of social integration, be sold on schedules determined by the ratio of whites and blacks, Jews and non-Jews, Protestants, Catholics, agnostics and atheists in any community.

Out of the intervolutions from which the doctrine of *de jure* integration comes, two findings emerge with clarity:

One is that palpable preservation of *de jure* segregation anywhere—whether in schools, employment or housing—is morally wrong. The counterpart of this principle is that *de jure* integration is equally questionable.

CREATING "THE HOMOGENIZED CITIZEN"

The second main finding resulting from an analysis of the enforced mixing of people by race and class is that what is most desired is the "integrated man" made up of proportionate parts of every ethnic group and of several religious and cultural components of American society. The homogenized citizen thus created is a dangerous change from the historic individualism which, with its supportive pluralism, has been this nation's major source of strength.

The melding, blending process inherent in the concept of *de jure* integration may destroy the dream of a free society. A development of such significance, therefore, deserves the most careful study and evaluation.

PEOPLE BRUTALITY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in 1968 Arlington House, publishers of New Rochelle, N.Y., issued an excellent book, "The Lawbreakers," by M. Stanton Evans, editor in chief of the Indianapolis News, and Mrs. Margaret Moore, journalist and coordinator of the 50,000-member Indianapolis Anticrime Crusade. Chapter 10 of the book sought to demonstrate cases of violence visited upon law enforcement officers and was appropriately entitled "People Brutality" in contrast to the police brutality charge which is used by many extremist groups today. Coupled with the permissiveness of some of our judges and an increasing contempt for authority, the danger of bodily injury combines to make the lot of our guardians of the law an unhappy one indeed, it was pointed out.

To make matters worse, an actual campaign to disable policemen might well be underway in protest groups in various cities if the article "Protesters Get Fighting Manual," from the New York Times of April 20 is any indication. This booklet, or one similar to it, has also turned up in Philadelphia, Pa., according to the press of that city. The manual describes various means of incapacitating the police, ranging from the use of rocks and bottles to methods to be used in the manufacture of Molotov cocktails and pipebombs.

To the average law-abiding citizen the seriousness of the situation hits closer to home than he might at first imagine. The shortage of policemen in some areas will not be remedied if present conditions are allowed to continue. Unless citizen support and encouragement is not forthcoming, potentially qualified applicants in larger numbers will simply look to other fields for employment. One positive step is to make sure that "people brutality" violators are socked with the maximum penalties the law will allow, and the verdicts of bleeding-heart judges consistently protested.

I insert the above-mentioned article from the New York Times of April 20 and chapter 10 of "The Lawbreakers," by M. Stanton Evans and Margaret

Moore entitled "People Brutality" in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 20, 1969]

PROTESTERS GET FIGHTING MANUAL: DETECTIVES STUDY BOOKLET ON HOW TO DISABLE POLICE

A summary of a manual instructing demonstrators in the techniques and tactics of fighting the police has been sent to New York's 3,000 detectives by their chief, Frederick M. Lussen, "to put the detectives on guard."

Chief Lussen said the manual was being passed among members of several protest groups in New York and a number of other cities in the country. But he would not identify the organizations or the cities, nor would he tell how the police obtained a copy.

According to a departmental memorandum, the four-page, typewritten summary was being sent to detectives so that they might "have complete information with reference to persons at the scenes of disorders."

NO POLICY CHANGE

Chief Lussen said that sending the summary of the manual to detectives, who always worked in civilian clothes, did not imply a change in the department's policy of using uniformed men to control crowds whenever possible.

After some detectives and plainclothes policemen had been criticized for their handling of demonstrators last spring, the department indicated that out-of-uniform personnel would be used in crowd control situations only when uniformed men were not available.

The department also formed a Special Events Squad, a group of specially trained uniformed men to be used for parades and demonstrations during the daytime.

The summary of the manual, as distributed by the police, began with a list of "Basic Equipment for Rallies and other Battles with the Pigs." The list included such items as a crash helmet, construction boots, and "heavy duty picket sign."

Optional equipment for rallies, the summary said, included a gas mask, ski mask, school bag, attache case, tennis shoes and "fake make-up."

TACTICS ARE OUTLINED

The second section of the manual was headed "Supplies, Ordinance and Logistics." It consisted of a detailed list of tactics, techniques and devices for disabling policemen.

One paragraph on the use of rocks and bottles described which policemen should be the first targets, what part of their anatomy to aim for, and how to assure an adequate supply of missiles.

Another part of the summary described other kinds of weapons that could be used against policemen, their horses and vehicles.

There was a five-step procedure for transforming cherry bombs from a device to make noise into one to inflict pain.

The final section of the manual included brief, detailed directions and two drawings on how to make homemade Molotov cocktails and pipebombs.

PEOPLE BRUTALITY

Judicial lenience and contempt for authority converge on the policeman. It is the policeman who is called on to apprehend the criminal and who is hampered in that effort by the courts. As the visible and immediate symbol of law and order, he is also the target of repeated charges of "brutality" and the victim of political harassments.

"Brutality" is a reflex charge in some areas of "civil liberties" advocacy. The Supreme Court, for example, has indicated it believes police routinely use coercive techniques on suspects—although the *Miranda* decree which assumes this cites no example of such practices. One complaint against law enforcement officers says: ". . . the police accept and morally justify their illegal use of violence . . . such acceptance and justification arise through their occupational experience; and . . . its use is functionally related to the collective, occupational, as well as legal ends of the police."

The spread of such ideas may be noted in the increasing number of complaints registered about "brutality." In fiscal year 1963, the FBI received 1376 such complaints; in 1964, 1592 complaints; and in 1965, 1787 complaints. By way of contrast, from January, 1958 to June, 1960, there were only 1328 such allegations. The large majority of these are registered by Negroes in the South; but many of them have come from Northern states as well.

It is obvious that policemen are as liable to human frailties as anyone else, and it would therefore be surprising if some policemen did not exceed their authority. It is entirely fitting that close watch should be maintained to insure that police "brutality" does not occur and if it does occur that corrective steps are taken.

A review of the evidence indicates, however, that the balance in law enforcement has tipped entirely the other way. Under the impact of "civil disobedience," judicial permissiveness, and political improvisation, the officer who oversteps his limits is rapidly getting lost in the crowd of policemen who are themselves being knocked about, roughed up, and prevented from taking proper steps to defend themselves and their communities.

Consider, for example, a bizarre case which arose early in 1965. Two Chicago policemen, wearing civilian clothes, rushed to the scene of a disturbance and found a man armed with a broken beer bottle. They advanced on him, identified themselves as policemen, and ordered him to drop the bottle. His reply was "Come and get it, you ——— ——— coppers." When one officer tried to get the bottle away from him, the suspect jabbed it in the policeman's face. The officer spent 23 days in the hospital.

When the case came to court, Chicago Judge George Leighton released the assailant as an injured party well within his rights. "The right to resist unlawful arrest," Leighton said, "is a phase of self-defense. What is a citizen to do when he is approached by two officers with a gun?" What, indeed? Apparently, under the new code of judicial lenience, he is to slash them across the face with a broken beer bottle.

In another case, a group of young toughs jumped a policeman, knocked him down, kicked him, and took away his revolver. When they came to trial on charges of robbery and aggravated assault, the youths pleaded guilty. The judge, however, refused to accept the plea. He said the suspects were not in fact violating a law when the policeman approached them, that seizure of his gun could not be construed as robbery, and that their attack on the officer was not really an assault. The judge placed them on probation for the relatively minor charge of battery.

Ironically enough, such episodes have themselves been converted into charges of brutality by the police. Among the most famous of these was a 1964 case, in which an off-duty New York policeman named Thomas Gilligan tried to apprehend a Negro boy threatening a man with a knife. The boy attacked Gilligan, cutting his right arm; as he continued to attack, Gilligan shot and killed him. A grand jury—with two Negroes serving on it—examined the case and found Gilligan innocent of improper action. One of the Negro members remarked: "I did the right thing and so did the rest of the jury."

This incident was greeted by posters saying "Wanted for Murder—Gilligan the Cop," and "When Will Gilligan Kill Again?" Also by picketing of Gilligan's home and by the accusation from James Farmer, then head of CORE, that Gilligan had killed the boy in cold blood. The patrolman was secretly transferred to another precinct.

In still another such encounter, New York patrolman Sheldon Liebowitz tried to quiet a man acting boisterously on a street corner. The man attacked Liebowitz with a knife, and in the ensuing struggle got hold of the policeman's gun and wounded him with it. Liebowitz finally regained his pistol, shooting and killing his assailant.

The upshot of this episode was a rally by the Congress of Racial Equality, denouncing Liebowitz. *Life* magazine reported that "threats and abusive phone calls flooded into Liebowitz's hospital room, and police put the hospital under special surveillance and placed a 24-hour-a-day guard outside the patrolman's room. A few days later he was secretly moved to another hospital. The day after the shooting, CORE demonstrators marched on police headquarters chanting, 'down with the killers in blue' and 'the next cop's bullet may be yours.' "

Of similar kidney was the furor over "police brutality" in the San Francisco student riots of 1960. According to partisans of the student demonstrators, the police set upon and beat the students without provocation. The *Washington Post* alleged that "the San Francisco police acted with altogether needless brutality, turning fire hoses on students whose protests were not flagrantly unruly." But the record reveals that, despite intense provocation, there was no police brutality of any sort, and that the students inflicted considerably more damage than they received.

When the students disregarded a police order to vacate San Francisco's City Hall where they were staging a mass sit-in and creating an uproar so loud the courts could not conduct their business, the police turned hoses on them, then slid, lifted, and carried them down the city hall steps into waiting patrol wagons. The simplest way of figuring out who was brutal to whom in this transaction is to tabulate the casualty figures. According to the *San Francisco Chronicle*, eight policemen were injured in the rioting, compared to four students. The students themselves, in self-justifying literature got up and after the demonstrations, estimated six policemen were injured as opposed to five students.

Subsequent to San Francisco uprising, it was revealed that one purpose of such demonstrations is to provide an occasion for "confrontations" with the police, from which charges of "brutality" can be spun to gain sympathy for the demonstrators. Reporting on the 1960 riots, J. Edgar Hoover disclosed that Communist leader Archie Brown, who had helped spark the demonstrations, rehearsed at a party meeting "how the party intended to use a follow-up campaign with campus students as the target." He stated that the party "planned to emphasize 'police brutality' as a rallying cry to attract the sympathy of student groups . . ."

Phillip Abbott Luce, describing tactics of the Progressive Labor Party, quotes one leader of this group as saying: "If the cops allow you to speak, then afterward try to get the kids to follow you out into the center of Broadway and stop traffic. This will force the cops to come after you, and we will have a confrontation." In another demonstration in New York City, Luce adds:

"I was one of two people in charge . . . and, after seeing the huge squad of police officers in the square, I agreed to their suggestion that we move our 300 demonstrators to the United Nations under police supervision. As we started east on 47th Street, some of the Progressive Labor members, who had given us orders to create an incident the weeks before, came screaming up to me and demanded that we turn back and stay in Times Square to 'fight it out with the cops.' When I refused, some of them began to try to turn the marchers back, and en route to the U.N., 47 demonstrators were arrested."

Similar plans were revealed concerning the 1965 Viet Nam demonstrations in Berkeley.

U.S. News gave this summary of the demonstrators' actions:

"In preparation for trouble, students formed a 'Police Brutality Committee.' It began grinding out propaganda before the first arrest, and students were primed to start chanting 'brutality' as soon as the police appeared on the scene. Students were also instructed to go to the university hospital and report injuries . . . Students and sympathizers overlooked no chance to raise the 'brutality' cry . . . During the rioting, police said, a Berkeley radio commentator helped the 'brutality' theme along by slapping the wall with his hand near the microphone and describing the noise as 'blows' raining down on students."

Also of interest in this respect are the figures assembled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to which such charges are addressed and which has the responsibility for looking into them. The figures reveal that, of the more than 1,700 complaints of "brutality" received by the FBI in 1964, a total of 47 were presented to grand juries for action under Federal law making it a violation for police to deprive someone of his constitutional rights. Of these, five cases resulted in conviction. The vast majority of complaints concern "verbal brutality," hard looks, "tone of voice," and so forth.

All states and major cities have provisions and procedures for checking such complaints and for dealing with officers who are out of line. A spot check in mid-1965 found 289 such complaints had been received in Chicago, of which 281 were determined to be without substantial basis; in Los Angeles, 242 out of 314 complaints were not sustained; in New York, 194 out of 231 cases failed to vindicate the charges brought against the policemen.

A Los Angeles police official says: "Most of the complaints are of a pretty minor nature, such as discourtesy or handcuffs put on too tightly. It has come out many times that there isn't any physical brutality. It's verbal brutality. Some even say: 'I'm not complaining about the ticket or what the officer said. It is the way he said it, his tone of voice.'" A Chicago official adds that "some people seem to think they have a right to resist arrest at all times. So a degree of force has to be used to bring them to the station."

What is often alleged as brutality, in fact, is anything the arrestee doesn't like concerning his arrest. *U.S. News* notes that the Berkeley demonstrators used "brutality" to describe "the stench of the crowded buses that took them to jail. Placing of two intractable students in isolation cells also was held to be 'brutal.'"

Official comments on the inhibiting effects of the anti-brutality campaign were obtained by the authors in a survey of police officials from communities of varying sizes all over the nation. These officials were asked: "Are the decisions of the Supreme Court, such as the *Mallory* decision, hampering the work of the police in your city?" The answers, excepting those of two men who said they did not feel free to comment, were overwhelmingly in the affirmative. Representative replies include:

From Kansas City, Kansas: "Yes, some of the officers are afraid to do their duty because of possible repercussions. Many think a search warrant cannot be obtained until too late."

From Tucson, Arizona: "Recent precedent-setting decisions by the Supreme Court have of course had a direct effect on police operations throughout the country. In more recent months the decisions have changed police practices in investigation, interrogation and search procedures. While the decisions in themselves have been somewhat restrictive, they have also brought about a retraining of police officers across the nation which has resulted in police agencies all following the same rules of evidence and interrogation."

From Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: "The *Mallory* rule has not been applied to state cases by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. If it were it would eliminate incriminating statements in all but a few cases. Would make successful prosecution virtually impossible in a great number of trials."[1]

Moreover, with the "constitutional rights" of the criminal affirmed, our jurisconsults have moved to impose severe penalties on police officers who assertedly violate them. As one lawyer puts it: "An officer who makes an illegal arrest or search and seizure which violates the constitutional rights of the person arrested must steel himself to a greater hazard of civil suit for damages, for it is now the law that a state officer who violates the constitutional or civil rights of the person against whom his action is directed can be sued personally for damages in the Federal courts, regardless of any right which the victim may have to sue in the state courts."

The impact of these and other rulings on policemen required to arrest, book, and interrogate suspects may easily be imagined. An occasional tough and ingenious officer can devise means for getting his job done without finding himself faced down by some junkie or hooker waxing eloquent about "constitutional rights"; but the majority are naturally inhibited from moving against even the most likely and obvious suspects by the legalistic barbed wire the courts have draped over law enforcement.

A startling example of the difficulties under which police now labor is the story told by a New York patrolman who, off-duty, was confronted by a knife-wielding hoodlum. A uniformed officer standing by flatly refused to do anything to help his colleague until the potential victim of the attack insisted at length. "This guy is standing there with a knife on me," says the off-duty patrolman, "and the cop becomes a spectator . . ." When the assailant was at last disarmed and brought in, cooperation at a higher level was scarcely better.

The officer who had been attacked says: ". . . then I get to the station house and the lieutenant down there wants to know what I'm doing. He wants to know if the guy actually *hurt* anyone or not. He knows I put my resignation papers in last week and that I'm leaving soon and so he says to me, 'Look, you're leaving anyway, so why bother about it?' Here this guy has just tried to knife someone—tried to knife me—and this guy, a lieutenant, is telling me not to bother."

A New York detective sergeant tells an equally appalling story. "A woman OD'd [collapsed from an overdose of drugs] on Broadway," he relates, "and there's a guy there who is built like a cigaret machine and he has six cops at bay, just standing listening to him swear at them. There's a crowd and the cops are afraid to do anything, even question him, because he's yelling about brutality and swearing at them and the crowd is watching and he feels like a great man because everyone's seeing him abuse those six cops who are afraid to go near him. . . . Maybe he gave her the OD. Maybe he killed her. And the cops didn't even know his name. They wouldn't even talk to him.

". . . I can tell you that now that he's told six cops where to go in public and got away with it, I feel sorry for the next lone cop who sees him making a disturbance and tries to stop him. The cop'll get killed . . . the important thing is that those cops weren't afraid of *him*—they were big enough to eat him up—they were afraid of the crowd, of someone who might accuse them of brutality and get them kicked off the force."

Current statistics show that American policemen today are being killed and injured in record numbers. The FBI reveals that in 1964 "the number of law enforcement officers murdered in the line of duty reached a new high with 57 killings reported by local and state agencies. These deaths bring the total of such murders to 225 for the five-year period 1960–64." In New York City alone seven policemen were killed and 1,602 were injured in the line of duty in 1964. The total number of assaults on policemen, both on and off duty, came to a whopping 2,493.

The recommended corrective for alleged police brutality is a further restraint on the police—a "civilian review board." Law-enforcement officials fear this device would be loaded in favor of minority or other interest groups, to impose still more impediments to effective police performance. J. Edgar Hoover says such boards would necessarily have political overtones and that "these panels would consist of appointed individuals who are . . . inexperienced and uninformed in law enforcement and police administration. This drive for external boards is an ill-advised maneuver."

Los Angeles Police Chief Parker said of the review board idea:

"If they get one in Los Angeles, then I will walk out. I would not share my administration of this department with a group of persons who are selected primarily from minority elements—many of them demagogues with axes to grind. When they have control over the force without any regard to responsibility for its performance, that's time for someone else to take over."

Chicago's O. W. Wilson expressed the same opinion. A review board in his city, he said, "would destroy discipline in the Chicago police department. . . . If we have a civilian-review board, that board creates a situation where I, as the head of the police department, am confronted by an adversary group which the entire department will tend to unite against. Therefore, if we had a civilian-review board, my discipline would be less effective than it is today."[2]

---

[1] Other comments in similar vein include: Louis M. Kulpa, Chief of Police, Wheeling, West Virginia: "Yes, because it makes the police officers more cautious in making arrests and they hesitate more and back off some." Police Chief, City of Reno, Nevada: "Yes, to protect the rights of criminals in relation to regard for the rights of victims. The armed robber doesn't have to advise his victim that he has the right to summon police prior to robbery, *et al.* . . ." Chief of Police, Baton Rouge, Louisiana: "Yes, to some degree, in that some cases are dropped due to insufficient evidence caused by the officer's hands being tied legally." Cleveland, Ohio, Chief of Police: "Yes, they are causing a crisis in law enforcement." Minneapolis, Minnesota, Chief of Police: "Yes, it takes more man-power on each case; we have to prepare them fast and get charges placed more rapidly." Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Chief of Police: "Recent Supreme Court decisions have caused this department to step up the training program of constitutional law. These decisions have caused a lowering of morale for all law enforcement officers. People do not readily accept rapid and severe changes."

[2] Former New York Police Commissioner Vincent Broderick comments that "it is vital when the police officer's action is reviewed it be reviewed by one who has a capacity to evaluate the propriety of the action in terms of the police crisis in which it was taken and who, at the same time, has a disciplinary responsibility which extends not only to the propriety of the action but also to its complement, the propriety in the same situation of the officer's having failed to take action."

FBI Chief Hoover likewise comments that the review board concept "undermines the morale and saps the efficiency" of the police. "They deter officers in the proper performance of their duties for fear of having charges placed against them which would be judged by individuals wholly unfamiliar with police work."

Thomas F. Coon, editor of the official bulletin of the Society of Professional Investigators, writes that where the review-board idea is accepted, police morale "will take off upon a toboggan of descent." Coon adds that "the man in the field would not be human if he did not avoid certain ticklish law enforcement incidents, taking cognizance of the composition and persuasions of the board." Coon quotes the 1953 opinion of the New York Civil Liberties Union that disciplinary functions "are best exercised within the department itself rather than imposed by an outside agency."

When he ran for his office in the fall of 1965, New York Mayor John Lindsay promised institution of a "review board" in the Empire City. When the board was launched, it fulfilled the worst fears of its opponents. The membership was heavily loaded with representatives of "civil liberties" and other protesting groups, chief among them being board chairman Algernon D. Black, a veteran "civil liberties" activist. John J. Cassese, president of the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, commented, "they couldn't be impartial if they wanted to. You can see that by the board's composition."

Police morale after the Lindsay investiture plummeted to new lows. Three of the department's top officials were bounced in moves which had as their barely-veiled motive an obvious appeal to New York minority-group voting blocs, and more than 700 patrolmen turned in their badges during the first six months of 1966. The resignation rate was triple that of the previous year. In the 1966 elections, New York citizens had a chance to sit in judgment on all this. In a referendum on the Lindsay review board, they voted by a margin of almost two-to-one to cashier the whole arrangement.

Confronted by danger to life and limb, judicial hindrance, and a growing tide of public abuse, police are finding it hard to recruit new members. Almost every city, in addition to its other difficulties in law enforcement, could use more and better-trained policemen.[3] These are becoming exceedingly hard to find.

Washington, D.C. police found themselves in mid-1965 with 144 vacancies on the force, and sent recruiters around the country to try to get men to join up. Former Police Commissioner Thomas J. Gibbon of Philadelphia observed: "Back in 1953 we had the first examination for police recruits under my command . . . We wound up with about 2,000 applicants to draw from. We hired almost 1,000 . . . But by 1960 things have changed . . . The simple truth is that hardly anyone wants to be a policeman. In my city it's got so bad that we now have a new plan—instead of giving one exam for four or five thousand men each year, we give the test a couple of times a week for just a handful." Police official Joseph Martin of New York City sums it up when he says: "I don't know why anyone would want to be a cop today."

---

[3] It is rather astonishing to discover that, with so much crime and general anarchy confronting them, the "brutal" police are forced to spend an inordinate amount of time running errands for the citizenry. The authors, checking the statistics for their home city of Indianapolis, found that in a representative month, the police had to make some 20,000 runs to deal with such matters as lost dogs, children falling out of trees, escaped Mynah birds, getting a 300-pound woman into a cab, and rescuing cats. Compared to this staggering burden of minor service runs, the police answer "only" 3,000 or so calls a month for major crimes.

The strain on police resources by matters only indirectly related to crime is seldom understood by the citizens who call on these alleged monsters in every conceivable circumstance. In a single month, the Indianapolis police conducted 171 dog investigations, received more than 1,000 dogs at the municipal dog kennels, and destroyed more than 1,000 dogs a month throughout 1965. In addition police in every city must contend with the massive problem of traffic safety. Indianapolis police made some 51,657 traffic arrests in the first half of 1965.

HON. THEODORE R. McKELDIN ADDRESSES CHIZUK AMUNO

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I believe that part of America's present problems at home can be traced to a loss of faith in ourselves and in our future. This was eloquently discussed in a recent speech by the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, former Governor of Maryland and former mayor of Baltimore. Addressing the Chizuk Amuno congregation at its sabbath eve service on April 11, 1969, Governor McKeldin explored the possible reasons for the present state of American society and showed why it is so necessary for Americans to band together behind our new President to help him in his important work.

Sharing the platform that night with Governor McKeldin was the congregation's rabbi, Rabbi Israel M. Goldman, a distinguished member, not only of Maryland's clergy, but a civic-minded and socially responsive leader; also, the assistant rabbi, Rabbi Donald Crain and Cantor Abraham Salkow. Two leading laymen of the community, Solomon Rogers and Joseph Davidson, were also on the dais representing the Chizuk Amuno board of trustees.

I include the text of Governor McKeldin's address in the Record to call attention to the thinking of a great American on a topic of profound importance to all Americans:

Address of Theodore R. McKeldin to Chizuk Amuno Congregation, Baltimore, April 11, 1969

Every observer of contemporary political affairs, whether he is an official, a newspaper columnist, a professional historian, or what not, agrees that the American people today are in a state of confusion and uncertainty hardly paralleled in our history, unless it was in the years immediately preceding the Civil War.

Indeed, in some ways the confusion is even worse confounded today. In 1860 there was one question that overshadowed and obscured everything else, the question of slavery. Today, the war in Vietnam may take precedence of every other issue, but it is not much ahead. The unrest of the black minority is not far behind it. The deplorable state of the cities is closely bound up with the race problem, and little, if at all, behind it either in importance or in difficulty. Inflation is hard on the heels of the race question, for when the dollar loses value every human being in the country is directly affected. Finally, inflation of the dollar is not much more threatening than the inflation of our educational system, due in part to the population explosion, and in part to the migration of rural dwellers into the cities, which, in turn, is partly due to the mechanization of such industries as agriculture and mining.

I am not here to offer a solution of any of these problems, but I am here to suggest that this is the time of all times for every American who loves his country to think soberly and carefully of the difficulties that beset us, to set aside partisan prejudice and private interest, and to think only of America, and how the American idea is to be preserved and justified in the eyes, first, of our own young people, and then in the eyes of the rest of the world.

We are committed to that. We were committed in 1776 when we, "appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions," started an experiment in government without exact precedent in the history of the world, "a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." The men of 1787 did not know that it would work. We know now that it did work, to a limited extent. It converted a small, weak, poor nation into one immeasurably great, powerful, and rich, but how much longer it will work we do not know, any more than the men of 1787 knew, because present-day conditions are entirely different.

But we do know that it is up to us to make it work. All our material prosperity is incidental. Our true heritage, our real inheritance from our forefathers, is an obligation to prove to all the world that free men can govern themselves better than any king can govern them, and that a nation of freedom, dedicated to the principle of equal justice under law, far from being a menace to other nations, is their best guarantee of security and peace.

We have not done it yet, and if we fail, "the last best hope of earth" will be extinguished, and we of this generation will be proved unworthy of our ancestry. We must not fail. We cannot fail. Yet if we are to succeed, we must suppress the natural human instinct to seek every man his own interest, with small attention to his neighbor.

We have committed the direction of affairs, by a lawful and orderly process, to Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, and by virtue of his office, he is entitled to the loyal support of every American, Democrat or Republican, black or white, conservative or liberal, male or female.

Nor is the duty of upholding the hands of the President simply an obligation laid upon us by the law of the land. It is also a matter of the most stringent expediency. We are all embarked on the Ship of State, and on the skill and steadiness of the man at the helm all our destinies depend. This does not mean that we should remain inert and inactive. On the contrary, we are the watch on duty, and we should be faithless indeed if we failed to warn him the instant we descry breakers ahead. It means merely that there must be no mutiny, no suggestion of an attempt to snatch command from the man to whom it has been lawfully intrusted.

A hail from the lookout is no mutiny, and the louder and clearer it is, the better, for as it is loud and clear, so it is certain to be heard and understood. But a challenge of the captain's authority is mutiny and cannot be tolerated. Freedom of speech is indispensable to the safety of any democracy, but mere vituperation is not use, it is abuse of free speech, and a danger to the nation.

When the President himself suggested that we lower our voices, what he had in mind without doubt was the danger that insensate clamor might deafen him to a genuine shout of warning. It is a well-grounded fear, for we are in uncharted and dangerous waters. His chief adviser for national security, Dr. Kissinger, in a magazine article a few months before his appointment, pointed out that since the second World War all the old rules of diplomacy have gone by the board, and we are having to work out new rules by the dangerous and expensive method of trial and error. Repeatedly, in recent years, we have come dangerously close to shipwreck because there were unmarked rocks and shoals where we had expected to find deep water.

In this situation I find no small satisfaction in the reflection that the man now at the helm got his training under one of the shrewdest, most careful political navigators in our history, the late, great Eisenhower. It is no derogation of President Nixon's own qualities to say that any man who watched Eisenhower at close range for eight full years will never plunge into any heedless and reckless adventure, not knowing exactly where he is or what lies ahead.

It is a quality of high importance in a period of such turbulence as that through which we are now passing. When you stop to consider it, what have we actually lost that makes these such distressful days? Not money—we are richer than ever before. Not men—we are worried by the population explosion. Not power—the whole world quakes under the tread of our legions. What then? The answer, in a word, is faith, faith in ourselves, faith in our future, faith in the doctrine expounded in the Declaration and the Constitution, faith in what Theodore Roosevelt called the "old moralities," and I fear, faith in that Supreme Judge of the world to whom our fathers appealed with utter confidence.

But faith is no material thing, bought and sold by traders in the marketplace, nothing designed by learned scientists and fabricated by skilled artisans in our mighty industrial system. Faith is one of those "imponderables" that Bismarck said is often more important than either money or military power. Faith is engendered in the mind and heart of the individual man or woman, and it is kindled largely by an act of will on the part of the believer.

All of us say that we believe in the American ideal of self-government by free men, but we demonstrate little faith in it when any blast of misfortune—or the mere threat of misfortune that may overtake us—can throw us into fear and trembling, into such despondence as pervades the nation today. How far have we fallen from the magnificent faith of the Patriarch Job who, in the midst of present, not merely threatened woes, could yet cry out. "Though he slay me, yet will I trust him."

He meant that Supreme Judge of the world to whom our forefathers appealed with utter confidence. They appealed in our name, and in the rectitude of their intentions they set up the system under which we have lived and prospered to this day. That system intrusts the executive powers to a President of the United States.

Let us give President Nixon the assurance that he has a stout-hearted nation behind him ready to lend him its strength in the discharge of his great office. For with the gift of such faith a smaller man than he could, as is written in Scripture, remove mountains.

INCREASE TIMBER SUPPLIES TO HELP MEET OUR NATIONAL HOUSING GOALS

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, overwhelmingly passed by the Congress, established a national goal of 26 million new and rehabilitated housing units in the next decade. Congress took this step to stimulate the homebuilding industry of America to meet the national housing need. There was no doubt in the minds of many of us that fulfillment of this goal would require a substantial improvement in homebuilding techniques and capacities. At the same time we were persuaded that innovation and ingenuity in the face of a major challenge could overcome the difficulties that were anticipated.

Regrettably, our hopes have been darkened by the mounting shortage of softwood lumber and plywood, essential ingredients for the realization of our housing goals. Indeed, the sudden sharp increases in the price of both softwood lumber and plywood in recent months aroused doubts in the minds of many homebuilders and Members of Congress whether manufacturers were not earning extraordinary profits from the promise of an unprecedented housing boom.

In March, the Committee on Banking and Currency, on which I serve, undertook to investigate the relationship between softwood lumber demand, supply, and prices. Extensive committee inquiry satisfied me that the basic deficiency in the supply of lumber and plywood and the consequent high prices can be traced to the restricted timber supply. Unless there is adequate raw material for the processing industries, there must inevitably be a product shortage.

Mr. Speaker, both public and private witnesses told the committee that 54 percent of the national softwood timber inventory stands on lands designated as commercial forest lands which are under the management of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture. An additional 6 percent is on forest lands under commercial management jurisdictions of other Federal agencies such as the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, and the various military departments of the Department of Defense.

The forest industry directly controls only 17 percent of the softwood timber inventory, while an additional 18 percent is owned by thousands of other private owners on woodlots, and the remaining 5 percent is under the supervision of other public agencies such as States, counties, and municipalities.

Despite the dominant Federal position, the lands under National Government control yield only one-third of the annual softwood sawtimber harvest. The lands under private industrial ownership and containing less than one-third as much softwood timber, through the more extensive use of modern forestry techniques, yield more harvest volume annually than do all the Federal lands.

If national housing goals, set by law, require increased volumes of softwood lumber and plywood, and if those volumes of end products cannot be increased without additional supplies of raw material, and if the Federal Government controls three-fifths of the softwood timber inventory while producing only one-third of the domestic supply, it is clear that steps must be taken to increase the production of logs from the Federal timberlands if we are to meet our housing goals.

It is for this reason I am introducing today the National Timber Supply Act. I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MIZE, Mr. REES, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. STEPHENS, and Mr. WIDNALL.

The bill authorizes the return of 65 percent of Federal timber sales revenues to a fund for high timber yield from the national forests. The Forest Service would have a supply of funds to improve forest management practices and to apply them intensively and continually. A basic premise of the bill is that, once the funds are made available and the Forest Service embarks on an intensive management program, the allowable cut can be increased immediately.

By placing the available receipts into a special fund, called the "high timber yield fund," the Forest Service could be assured of long-term financing for its management and development of the forests.

Establishment of such a high timber yield fund in the Treasury to finance optimum timber productivity on the commercial timberlands of the national forests is necessary for assuring continuity of effort and objective. The intensive management measures necessary to increase timber yield must, to be effective, be applied continuously, and not on a stop-and-go basis. If harvest-rate determinations are made on the premise that future yields will be those obtainable from intensive management there must be assurance that intensive management will occur. The high timber yield fund supplies this assurance.

The plan to finance the high timber yield fund from timber receipts assures that expenditures will be kept in step with the significance of national forest timber to the economy. Other safeguards in the proposal are—

First. The life of the fund is limited to 25 years. This limitation will force a review based on accumulated experience before the fund is renewed; otherwise a full-scale review might never occur.

Second. Section 5 of the bill requires that expenditures from the fund be made only after appropriation. This insures regular congressional review and approval of the program of activities to be financed from the fund.

Third. Section 5 also provides that funds not appropriated within 2 years be transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. This provision insures that deposits in excess of needs will not be accumulated in the fund. It will be an effective but more flexible limitation than a stated maximum dollar amount.

The portion of national forest receipts which under existing law are paid to the States or other special funds would not be disturbed by the enactment of the National Timber Supply Act. This, the 25 percent of national forest receipts payment to States—16 U.S.C. 500—and 10 percent of national forest receipts for roads and trails—16 U.S.C. 501—would not be changed.

Section 6 of the bill specifies that allocations from the fund will be made by national forests in amounts substantially proportionate to contribution to the fund from each forest during the preceding 2 fiscal years. This provision will put 65 percent of timber receipts back for expenditure on the forest where they were earned. Twenty-five percent of each forest's receipts are turned over to the counties in which the forest is located and 10 percent are available for forest roads and trails within the State in which the forest is located.

Timber receipts are the product of the volume of timber cut and its average unit price, subject to minor annual variations due to changes in the level of advance deposits maintained by timber purchasers. The provision for use of a 2-year average will iron out effects from fluctuations in advance deposit levels.

Volume cut and its average unit price are guides to the areas with better rates of growth and better quality species. Hence timber receipts by forests are a simple and reliable index of opportunities and needs to increase timber yields.

Other simple indexes, such as commercial forest area or volume cut, would result in some diversion of funds from areas with better growth potential for preferred quality species to areas where unit timber values are low and where intensive management measures would result in less than average yield increases.

The bill establishes allocations in proportion to receipts as a basic guideline, but recognizes that variations may be necessary in a few isolated cases to justify a larger proportion of funds going into a forest that has outstanding potential for increased yield. Thus, if the allocation by receipts formula should fail to meet the needs and opportunities on any forests, it can be modified without amending the basic act.

There are nine listed broad purposes for which allotted funds could be used. These purposes are—

First. Obtaining regeneration at earliest practical date after harvesting and for reforesting unsatisfactorily stocked high site lands. This would permit planting or seeding of cut-over lands in the first planting season after slash disposal or after termination of harvesting operations where slash disposal is unnecessary. The objective is to establish full stocking with a minimum delay in regeneration. Reforestation of unsatisfactorily stocked high site lands is also included. Such seeding or planting of unsatisfactorily stocked areas would be limited to timberlands of good potential for commercial timber production.

Second. Precommercial thinning to control spacing or stand composition. Such thinnings are the primary means to accelerate growth at an early age. They are also an effective means to favor production of desirable species.

Third. Semicommercial thinnings both to control spacing and composition and to produce material with value for commercial utilization in excess of additional costs required for its production. Semicommercial thinning is a step between precommercial thinning and commercial thinning. Precommercial thinnings deal with material that is unusable because of its small size. Semicommercial thinnings produce material acceptable for commercial utilization especially pulpwood but for which full production and delivery costs exceed its market value. Such thinned material should be utilized so long as the added cost to produce and deliver it—minus the cost of any work such as limbing made unnecessary by utilization—does not exceed its value.

Fourth. Pruning if justified by a subsequent reduction in the age at which the trees become marketable. Some desirable tree species retain juvenile limbs on the lower bole for excessive periods. In such circumstances pruning at an early age is a necessary and justifiable activity to obtain logs suitable for sawing or peeling at a younger rotation age.

Fifth. Preparation, including marking, of thinning, salvage and understory-removal sales. Unit costs for thinning and salvage sales are higher than for harvest sales, Such sales have never been financed to the extent of their full potential by regular timber sale appropriations. Financing of sale preparation for thinning and salvage sales from the high timber yield fund is needed to market the very significant timber volumes now being lost through overcrowding or deterioration.

Sixth. Road construction in advance of planned harvesting to standards necessary for facilitating thinning, salvage and understory-removal sales and for protection against ravages of fire and insect. Thinning and salvage sales alone can rarely support road construction. Hence, thinning and salvage cutting is now generally limited to roaded areas.

This provision would finance road construction to standards necessary to facilitate thinning and salvage cutting in unroaded areas, and would incidentally supply access needed for protection purposes. It is not contemplated that the high timber yield fund would be used to finance regular timber access road construction.

Seventh. Fertilization of good sites to increase timber growth rates is now being undertaken by several major industrial timberland owners in the Northwest and the South. Fertilization is a promising avenue to increase yields and shorten rotations. As further knowledge of costs and returns develop, it is logical that the high timber yield fund be used for fertilization on suitable Federal timberlands.

Eighth. Development and procurement of seed or stock with superior growth characteristics. Work is underway by both the Forest Service and industry to identify superior seed sources and develop seed orchards for volume production of superior seed. The high timber yield fund would finance intensification of this activity on the national forests.

Ninth. Implementing other methods and practices that are demonstrated to increase timber production.

The common purpose of all nine of these listed cultural practices is to increase timber yields on the national forests above those yields presently attainable from the regularly financed activities. The high timber yield fund is designed to provide the additional effort to work toward optimum yields. It is not expected to displace the regular financing of Federal timber sales, protection from fire and pests, or the forest development road program.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot predict that passage of the National Timber Supply Act will enable America to build 26 million housing units in the next 10 years. But I do believe that these homes will not be built unless we act to enable the Forest Service to increase the productivity of the forest lands under their care.

We have no shortage of timber in the United States. We have softwood timber suitable for construction materials in abundance—more than a trillion board feet already standing in our Federal forests. We have the techniques and the capacity to enhance the productivity of these forests through application of modern silvicultural methods. And the Multiple-Use Act requires the continued recognition of all the benefits of the forest—timber, recreation, fish and wildlife, forage, and watershed. There need be no alarm among those of us who value progressive conservation.

Mr. Speaker, there is a far greater need for alarm among all of us who see so many of America's families ill-housed. Congress has it within its power to help reach the housing goals it has established as a matter of national policy and I urge the active support of every Member of the House for enactment without delay of the bill I am introducing today toward that end.

ADVERSE EFFECTS OF KOKO HEAD JOB CORPS CENTER CLOSING TO BE FELT THROUGHOUT PACIFIC AREAS

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the "fait accompli" announcement by the Nixon administration to close 59 Job Corps centers is a matter of grave national concern, and I voice particular concern over the closing of the Koko Head Job Corps Center in Honolulu, Hawaii.

Since its establishment, the Koko Head Center has successively trained hundreds of young men in useful skills, and has enabled formerly unemployed, unskilled youths from Hawaii, Guam, and the Trust Territory to become productive members of society.

Surely, at a time when there is urgent need to provide the training that our young people need to prepare for the responsibilities of fullfledged citizenship, youth training and employment programs ought not to be curtailed at this most critical period.

The present facts indicate that a reassessment of the closing of the Koko Head Center is needed, and this I strongly urge.

Francis J. Kennedy, president of the Hawaii State Federation of Labor, stated very clearly the case against closure in his letter of April 11, 1969, to me:

The Federal government already has an investment of hundreds of thousands of dollars in the present Koko Head facilities . . . and it would seem highly impractical if economy is the motivating factor to even consider new quarters. Also, we would deplore completely phasing out the existing program and starting a completely new one. Surely, it is possible for the transition of a program from one agency to another without such a complete disruption and at such cost. Returning trainees to their homes (some as far away as Guam and the Pacific Trust Territories) before their training periods are completed and then starting a new recruitment program for trainees as well as a staff for the new Center could get the program back for months.

We are of the opinion that the entire Job Corps program is so important that we should think in terms of bolstering rather than cutting back on its implementation.

At this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert a representative sampling of letters I have received which buttress the need for the continuation of the Job Corps center at Koko Head:

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
April 11, 1969.

Representative SPARKY MATSUNAGA,
Representative of Hawaii, U.S. Representative Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MATSUNAGA: A letter was forwarded to the, President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, requesting reconsideration on the matter of closing the, Job Corps Center at the Koko Head Crater.

As Chairman of the, Palama Community Area Council, my Officers and the Residents of the area are urging you to help us in retaining the Center.

Our boys need a place to learn different trades and skills to better their manhood, and they also need at the present time, the service of the Job Corps to help them learn the different trades and skills.

The Job Corps Center has helped most of our local boys here in Hawaii, and I am sure that if the Center is kept open many more young men can accomplish something for their future.

Many parents are concerned about this, because if the Center closes, they know that their will be disruption in their homes as well as in the Community. I am sure that you are aware that many of these young men are dropouts from our schools, however have learned many things in the Corps. Will you please help us by helping these young men.

We are sure that with your help, the President might reconsider closing down the Center.

Thank you for your valuable time.

Mahalo nui loa,

MARY K. CASH,
Chairman, PCAP.

HONOLULU COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 14, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President, United States of America, the White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I join with my fellow citizens in expressing my disappointment and disturbance over your decision to shutdown 57 Job Corps Centers, including the Koko Head Center in Hawaii.

Rather than shut-down these centers, is there any possibility in bringing about change of these Centers.

To completely blot-out the dreams, hopes and aspirations of these youngsters to become productive citizens of our society is grossly demoralizing. Instead of shutting down these Centers, why doesn't the Administration create change?

The system is not altogether perfect, so we try to bring about changes for improvement. This is the way our Government works—Congress makes laws, and then amendments are made to *strengthen* these laws. Why can't we attempt to do the same thing to the Job Corps program—make changes to strengthen the program—not take it away from our disadvantaged youngsters.

I strongly urge the Administration to reconsider its decision. If Administration has been at fault, then our disadvantaged youths should not have to suffer for our mistakes and administrative goofs. Let's make change, not obliterate!

Very truly yours,

PETER M. KAAIALII, Sr.,
Chairman, HCAP, Inc.

KOKO HEAD JOB CORPS,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 10, 1969.

To MY CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I think Job Corps is very important, because it has helped lots of young men have a second chance to get ahead in life. I think Job Corps should continue because it helped me not to get in trouble with the law. Job Corps has made me a better person than what I was before I entered. It helped me strive for a goal. If Job Corps ever closed down I think I would go back to roaming the streets looking for trouble or being in trouble. Job Corps has given me a different outlook in life.

Sincerely yours,

A CONSTITUENT.

APRIL 10, 1969.

To MY CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: Many people think of the Job Corps as just a name, but, those involved with the program it is something else. It means a second chance at life. It means something better than what we've had before. So for the sake of the boys in Job Corps and those to come, please continue the program. For without this program many future lives will go down the drain.

Yours truly,

A CONSTITUENT.

PRESIDENT LEWIS NOBLES' ADDRESS TO STUDENTS OF MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, for several months, we have received reports of student unrest on college campuses, violent confrontations, criminal acts, property destruction, classroom boycotts, sit-ins, and other efforts to disrupt learning. The majority of the students at these institutions have been deprived of acquiring knowledge which, of course, is the reason for their enrollment. In other words, the innocent, serious students have been victimized and discriminated against by the militant minority.

What is the proper relationship between an institution of higher learning and students? Dr. Lewis Nobles, president of Mississippi College, a private, denominational school, located at Clinton, Miss., discussed this vital question in an address to the faculty and student body at chapel period on February 3, 1969. Having received permission, I insert Dr. Nobles' eloquent comments:

CHAPEL ADDRESS FEBRUARY 3, 1969

(By Dr. Lewis Nobles)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dr. Nobles was the speaker on Monday, February 3rd at the first Chapel period of the new semester. It was also his first policy statement to the students. The editor feels that this is one of the best chapel talks in recent years. Alumni will find in a careful reading of it some answers to many of their questions about the direction which Mississippi College is headed. Dr. Nobles wishes to acknowledge credit for some of the ideas contained herein to articles in Christianity Today, The Southern Baptist Educator and Look Magazine.)

Ladies and gentlemen of the student body, faculty and staff of Mississippi College. I am grateful to each of you for your presence here this morning.

In the few months that I have been on our campus I have been trying above all to learn all that I could about Mississippi College—trying to probe into its strengths and its weaknesses, studying its operations, coming to know better the people with whom I work. I have been talking, reading, questioning, meeting with committees, hearing delegations, carrying out preliminary considerations of the financial operation of the College next year. I have felt that these things had to be done before I could give adequate consideration to all viewpoints and attempt to make the right decisions.

I have met with many of you. I have spoken to several faculty groups, to a number of student groups, addressing myself for the most part to rather special topics, but now it seems to me that it is time for me to speak to you as a body publicly and for the record on matters which have been and will be a continuing concern for us. I am not speaking so much about any one specific area as I am about such things as a generalized concept of acceptable conduct on the campus, personal responsibility, the rights of the individual, the right of Mississippi College, and something of the future and destiny of this institution.

Let me say at the outset that there have been no essential changes in the policies of Mississippi College as I have inherited them from my predecessors who have done remarkable jobs in the administration of this fine institution. But perhaps some of these thoughts and expressions need to be repeated by a new president. Perhaps a reminder is needed for the forgetful or an illustration for the new.

PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY

There is no question in my mind about the College's primary responsibility. We are all here to prepare young men and young women to become active, intelligent, responsible participants in society with a full recognition that the greatest contribution any institution of higher education can make is the building of Christian character. In addition to providing our students with a sound formal education in a Christian atmosphere, we are attempting to make opportunities available to you for exercising responsible leadership on this campus to the end that that leadership may be a meaningful factor in the operation of the College itself. In so doing we hope to utilize effectively your awakening bid for increased participation in the affairs of this institution. I must, however, remind you at this point that such privileges and opportunities carry with them a significant burden of responsibility, both to your peers, to the faculty and to the administrative officers of this institution, and hence to the Board of Trustees and the Mississippi Baptist Convention. The business of this institution is the formal education of young men and women in the kind of atmosphere which we have attempted to describe above; an atmosphere dedicated to the development of true Christian character. The teaching and learning which go on in our lecture rooms, laboratories, and libraries—in the faculty offices where lectures are prepared, in the room where students study—that is what Mississippi College is here for. That is what the Baptist citizenry of our State make their contributions to this institution to support. That is the service that you and your parents have paid fees for and that is what givers of your scholarship funds have donated their money for. I will also add that this function is what those who have gone before you have left as a heritage to you at this institution.

RESPECT FOR RIGHTS OF OTHERS

This wholesome educational climate begins with each individual's respect for the rights of others. In this I mean much more than one's narrowly defined legal rights; I mean respect for the dignity of each fellow human being; I mean the common courtesies of life we expect from each other. Disorder, tension, and disruption begin when these courtesies are disregarded.

On any campus of an institution of higher learning there are many groups which are organized for various purposes and which seek to achieve varying goals. Many of these work to bring about some change; I think that this is good. A college is an instrument of change through its very character as an educational institution, but a college is not to be used to its own detriment as a tool, or a cat's paw, by any group to promote its own end, whether that end be a change to something new, or reaction to the status quo, or merely the maintenance of the status quo.

If we have any organization, or group, or any individual citizen here who considers its program paramount to the good of Mississippi College, and is ready to disrupt the functioning of Mississippi College to achieve its own private goals, then that group does not belong on this campus.

A college is a complex collection of many, many different things, but some one individual must speak for it, and in our institution that person is the president. As your president I want to make it clear that I want to do everything in my power to maintain the objectives as outlined above for Mississippi College.

Perhaps then there has been no real need for me to speak to you as I am speaking today. Certainly, it is my hope and my belief that nothing is required beyond our gathering here today to assure that we can now set about our academic business without any difficulty. Our policies must not be inflexible or impervious to change. So far as possible Mississippi College must seek to answer the aspirations of every member of our academic community, which means that it must constantly change its methods and constantly discard old policies for new ones in order to be responsive to new needs. But I believe there are ways to bring about such changes without any significant disruption to the academic life of this institution.

CHANNELS OF COMMUNICATION

Built into the patterns of operation of this institution are channels of communication between students and administration, faculty and administration, student body and faculty, administration and staff. Built into the operation of the College are mechanisms for meeting problems, hearing grievances, revising policies. If our present channels of communication do not function adequately, we will certainly open new ones. If our mechanisms to bring about wholesome change won't work, we will develop new ones. But by working within the framework of our policies, regulations, administrative units, committees, campus organizations, and the like. I believe we can solve our problems as they arise. To seek to go outside such organized channels of communication in my estimation, will only postpone, or in some instances perhaps make impossible any satisfactory solution to the problems which face us.

I have used the terms faculty, and staff, and student body just as you speak of the administration. We make these distinctions and they are real ones because there are different jobs to be done, different groups of people who must do them. But essentially we are all passengers on the same ship; we are all members of this body called Mississippi College and its health is the health of each of us.

If we will all work together cooperatively, Mississippi College will continue its splendid progress. We will press on together in the work we have all come together to do—to teach and to learn, to develop ourselves intellectually and morally, and to push forward through study and research the frontiers of knowledge. We will then continue to have a college with a proud reputation, a college whose name on a diploma is a certificate of excellence, a college which will attract to superior students, superior faculty, in short, superior human beings.

If, on the other hand, there are those among us so selfish as to put their own desires above the good of the whole, so bigoted as to insist on the satisfaction of their demands regardless of what happens to Mississippi College, so irresponsible as not only to befoul their own nests, but also to smear the good name of all in order to gratify their passions and prejudices, then everything that Mississippi College exists to achieve may be sabotaged. To this extent it lies within each of us to determine what we are going to be. In short, if each of us will make an earnest effort to govern his or her actions by what is best for Mississippi College, then we have nothing of which to fear. We have a good college here, and a potential for greatness far beyond anything yet achieved. As I learn more and more every day about Mississippi College, I find more and more about it to admire. I see our problems, and I know some of them are grave indeed, but I also see our progress. Our future looks bright indeed, unless we ourselves choose to darken it.

CONTINUING DEVELOPMENT

The Board of Trustees, the faculty, and administrative staff in consultation with Olmsted Associates, campus planners, look forward to continuing development and expansion of Mississippi College during the years ahead. Plans already in the developing stage involve the construction of an athletic field house and adequate athletic facilities to the west of the campus, a girls dormitory, apartment units, proper housing for campus maintenance crews, an addition to the library, the modernization of some of the older buildings on the campus, and acquisition of property necessary to the expansion of the College. The addition of a School of Nursing and a School of Law is anticipated, and a significant increase in the endowment fund.

To be all that it should be Mississippi College must first have the support of those whom it serves. It cannot function successfully unless Mississippi Baptists feel that it is their institution. They must wish it well, sympathize with its needs, stand by to protect it in crises, be slow to condemn without the fullest information, and try always to look at the institution as a whole and not at the occasional inevitable flaws. There must be the same kind of support from the faculty, and from the student body; a loyalty to the institution which includes intelligent criticism as well as defense against unwholesome criticism, but always with the aim of bettering the institution. All too many of our educational institutions today are caught in a savage crossfire between uncritical lovers and unloving critics. On the one side there are those who love their institutions and tend to smother them in an embrace of death, loving their rigidities more than their promise, shielding them from lifegiving criticism. On the other hand, there are those critics without love who are skilled in demolition, but untutored in the arts by which human institutions are nurtured and strengthened and made to flourish. Caught in such a crossfire an institution is almost destined to perish. Where human institutions are concerned, love without criticism brings stagnation and criticism without love brings destruction. In short we must be discriminating appraisers of our society, knowing candidly and precisely what it is about the society that thwarts or limits our institutions and therefore needs modification. And so each of us must be discriminating protectors of our institutions, preserving those features that nourish and strengthen them and make them more free. To fit ourselves for such tasks we must be sufficiently serious to study our institutions, sufficiently dedicated to become expert in the art of modifying them.

The complexity of modern society and the swiftness of change make it ever more difficult for us to be sure that we will continue to have the kind of society we want. We have learned brilliantly the means of accomplishing scientific and technical advances, but we have only a very limited grasp of the art of changing human institutions to serve human and divine purposes in a changing world. The consequences are familiar; we can build gleaming spires in the heart of our cities but we don't seem to be able to redeem the ghettos. We can keep people alive 25 years beyond retirement but we can't assure them that they can live those years in dignity. We choke in the air that we ourselves are polluting with our advanced technology. We live in the fear of a thermonuclear climax for which we provided the ingredients. We face a population disaster made more certain by our own healing arts. So we have problems. There are those today who glibly assert that society is intolerable because it has these specific defects: a, b, c, etc. The implications are that if appropriate reforms, a prime, b prime, and c prime, were carried through and the defects corrected, the society would be wholly satisfactory and the work of the reformer done. This is in reality, in contemplative reflection, a rather primitive way of viewing the necessary socio-economic changes in our society. The gravity of our situation is masked by the overbearing hum of success that pervades the society. But if one looks deeper and observes the innumerable problems that face us, one may sometimes wonder whether our talent for opening Pandora's Box has outrun our capacity to cope with the consequences. One wonders whether we have let loose forces that are essentially ungovernable. We have to believe that this is not so; we have to believe that God's leadership, human, intelligence, and determination are equal to the task, but it will take the best and most disciplined minds that we have.

SIGNS OF OUR TIMES

One of the signs of our times is a seemingly well developed technique, being fairly widely used, particularly in some liturgically oriented religious services, for producing a sense of neurotic guilt. Worshipers are called upon to confess their sins for racism, starvation in India, the war in Viet Nam, riots in the streets, revolts on the campuses, underdevelopment in the poorer nations of the world and whatever else is wrong in our world. To inculcate in Christians a sense of absolute guilt for "sins" they haven't committed, and to attempt to hold them responsible for conditions they neither created nor presently approve, is not only ridiculous but also quite dangerous. It can lead to neurotic guilt, which is not real guilt, and this does create genuine sickness. It tends to overwhelm the victim, who then loses sight of the real guilt that he has; this confusion leads frustration. Furthermore, it keeps him repeating admissions of an unreal guilt without opening the way to adequate forgiveness and restoration of wholeness. Instead of being a genuine exercise of biblical repentance, this sort of mass confession appears to be a contrived routine that only debilitates the participants.

OUR CULTURAL POSTURE

Too many of us are not really aware of our cultural posture; if you will, "our way of seeing things." But, our cultural posture is the context in which we define and use our terms. Thus, if your political stance is conservative, you understand freedom as the opportunity to live out your life without interference from the government, local, state or national. You would indicate that each man ought to earn his own way and respect the right of others. On the other hand, if your political stance is liberal, you would understand freedom as freedom from hunger, from prejudice, from oppression of any sort. The belief that each person has the right to live out his life without governmental interference must be limited by consideration of these other freedoms and you would suggest that the people of America through the agency of government, be it local, state or national have the moral obligation to aid all these people. This requires governmental involvement of a degree that supersedes the right of the individual. We may be unaware of our differing cultural postures, we have them and they play a determining role in the way in which we use our terms and the way in which we live out our lives.

The idea that an educational institution is obligated to take positions on either side of current issues either as individuals or as members of professional organizations needs to be carefully and fully examined for its implications for us individually and collectively. Our institutions, if we do so, will become ineffective because they will cease to obtain cooperation between the various institutions who will have lined up on opposite sides of questions as the institutions themselves become politicized. If we didn't become ineffective because we were on the "losing" side, we would then be in the untenable position of helping to impose our own partisan political position on education and scholarship all over our nation.

In considering the charges often leveled today of college curricula being outrageously irrelevant to the times, the arguments set forth reveal quite clearly that those who level such charges could not pass a satisfactory examination in introductory level courses in areas in which they pass such sweeping judgments: economics, history, and political theory. For those who say "Destory a system that has not abolished unemployment, exploitation and war" I would suggest, respectfully, that they might cry equally well for the destruction of all hospitals and those who work therein—they have not abolished disease!

Some of this generation of young people have stated, "This society is only interested in higher prices and profits." Have they stopped to consider the function of prices and profits in an economy? Do they realize that the marketplace is really a polling booth? Buying is quite like voting—expressing your preference. No economic system is possible without some form of pricing, without some measure of efficacy or worth. If you decry the profit system too strongly, I would suggest that you examine quite seriously the public uses that are made of private profits. Most of you are disturbed, and quite correctly so, about a "heartless society in which the poor get poorer" or one in which "the middle class exploits the unemployed." Actually, the decline in poverty in the United States is among one of the most promising facts of human history. As for the unemployed being exploited, let's do some reverse economics quickly. Would the middle class be better off or worse off if we could eliminate unemployment? Think of the enormous savings in taxes, the enormous improvements in public service, the enormous benefits from refocused energies now being used to ameliorate poverty's toll.

You say—and rightfully so—that your generation wants to be understood. Well, so does mine and all other generations now extant. How much have you really tried to understand others? You are ready to condemn "the Establishment" for injustices not of its making, frictions not of its choice, and dilemmas that history presented to it.

Some say that the present Establishment failed them because they face so many problems. Will they then accept blame for all the problems that society faces 20 years from now? And how can you know that all such problems are solvable? Or solvable quickly? Or solvable peacefully? Or solvable—given the never infinite resources, brains and experiences that any generation is endowed with? I should like to challenge you and the members of your generation this morning with the thought that perhaps it is your generation that is failing, partially at least, the rest of our society—failing to learn and respect some discomforting facts, perhaps failing to think through many of the issues facing us today. It is much easier to complain, to slander, to abuse, and to shout down those with whom you disagree—in failing to see how much more complicated social problems are than many have blindly assumed, in acting out of ignorance for which idealism is no excuse—or as President Nixon said, "Let us lower our voices so that we can hear the words rather than the noises."

Perhaps you have been inclined, on occasion, to agree with those who want to "wreck this slow, inefficient system." It took the human race centuries of thought, pain and suffering—and hard work—to put this system together. Democracy is not a state—but a process. It is a way of solving human problems, a way of hobbling power, a way of protecting each minority from the awful, fatal tyranny of either the few or the many.

There are those in your college generation in our land today who are suggesting that they want a society in which the young may freely speak their minds against the Establishment. I ask in all sincerity, where in the world today—or ever in the history of the world—have the young more freely recklessly attacked the Establishment? Every society has one, incidentally! But, wherever the heroes of the New Left—Marx, Mao, Castro, Che—have prevailed, students, writers, teachers, and scientists have been punished with hard labor or death—and for what? For their opinions.

RHETORIC VERSUS REASONING

Perhaps all of what has been said here can be summarized with the following suggestions to you now and in the years ahead. Don't confuse the rhetoric with reasoning. Assertations are not facts. Passion is no substitute for knowledge. Slogans are not solutions. Idealism of a sort does not particularly require any intellect. And when you are willing to dismiss differences with your peers or with those of another generation with contempt, you are in danger of becoming contemptible.

In the world of the immediately relevant, immediately practical action, all too often the truth is bent, action is taken on half-formed conclusions, the approximately truth is pitted against the wholly false and the slightly better against the clearly evil. The Christian college should clearly set higher and more acceptable standards.

CHRISTIAN IDEALS

I believe that we should address ourself to the matter of the possibility of remaining a Christian idealist in a realist's world—a world seemingly gone mad with hate, violence and fear—a world in which the smell of doom is clearly in the air. All the artistic media about us are preoccupied with the presentation of life as ugly, brutal, sensual and ultimately futile. Perhaps it seems to you that there is all too little room in society today for the sensitive, compassionate person who places human values above financial profit. Perhaps your generation finds it difficult to find any real heroes—perhaps you find it difficult to believe that there are noble, authentically good people. We all have been Elmer Gantryed and Peyton Placed so often that we may begin to doubt that altruism, generosity and sincerity really exist. Some will say that this is the picture of the world but not of the Christian community—but have you checked recently to see if cynicism has replaced your idealism. Perhaps your shining knight armor began to fade a bit when someone you idolized proved to have feet of clay, or when a trusted friend put a knife in your back and slowly turned the handle.

For the realist, life is a jungle—dirty, brutal, savage, ugly and ruthless. The Christian, by contrast, is not a Pollyanna, oblivious to the world in which he lives but he does not become cynical or disillusioned and he does not give up! He continues to proclaim the good news—though few may hear and even fewer respond. He continues to love—though he may not be loved in return. Despite the fact that while some feel that the realist has won the day, the truth is that it is the Christian idealist who is the only authentic realist, for he sees life as it really is and sees how it ought to be lived. He knows that man is a sinner, rebellious against God, and that sin is not merely a psychological aberration of a morbid mind entrapped in its Victorian past. He knows that man was created in God's image—and that commitment to Jesus Christ is the only way that life can be made whole and meaningful. The tragic error of the humanist is his insistence that man is basically good and that—given the opportunity—can solve his problems and achieve Utopia. The Bible gives a much more accurate picture of man as essentially sinful and self-centered, unable to create an ideal society by himself. The example of Jesus as given us in the New Testament can aid all who wish to maintain Christian idealism. Though life was cruel and brutal to him, he never became cynical and despondent.

RELEVANCE OF CHRISTIAN WORLD VIEW

In conclusion I want to touch upon a matter that I believe is of vital importance in the life of an institution such as ours. I believe that the faculty and administration of Mississippi College bear a significant responsibility in exhibiting to you the historic relevance of the Christian world life view. Perhaps unwittingly we have appeared on occasion to be reluctant to state what our commitment or lack of commitment might be. Today, merely as a lay person, I would like to suggest that the person of Jesus Christ in his life, death, and resurrection is totally worthy of our commitment and can deliver us from the despair of the uncommitted and seemingly directionless world in which we find both ourselves and our society to be immersed.

By no means do I have the answer to all of life's problems or to many of the philosophical objections to the Christian faith, but one thing I do know: Jesus Christ has changed my life and made things new for me. I ask you in the quietness of your own heart to consider earnestly these implications and to answer that question asked by Jesus long ago. "Whom do you say that I am?" I believe that the answer to this question is of eternal importance for you now and throughout the rest of your life.

It is my sincerest hope that it may be said in one hundred years from now that together, we helped, under God's leadership, to make Mississippi College a better place in which young people might obtain a better education to fit them for their responsibilities as Christian citizens of our society. I know that it will be said that we tried to do so!

PREJUDICES OF THE INTELLECTUAL SANCTUARY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the intellectual community has become so prejudiced against the nonintellectuals that it—like the mythical ghetto community—feels it is a separate kingdom and not subject to any outside interference from the mainstream of society—which, by the way, includes the taxpayers who support the colleges, the parents who want a chance through education for their children, and the businessmen and industrialists who ultimately must integrate the college product into a highly competitive environment—productive society.

The announcement that extremist students held guns on the Cornell University administrators and forced a halt in disciplinary proceedings against arrested terrorists within an intellectual community is no more revolting than to learn of the lack of courage should the so-called intellectual leaders proceed to honor any such intellectual intimidation against the civilized society of the less educated.

The intellectuals of the ivory tower many times refer to their campuses as a privileged sanctuary wherein battles are fought with ideas, philosophies, and words, immune from outside interference of reason, experience, and tradition, free from the prejudices of the past and paternalism.

These intellectuals need awaken to the changing times—the uneducated mass, whose taxes support the intellectual havens, are becoming antagonistic toward the prejudices and harsh invectives being directed at the off-campus society, lest some day the off-campus nonintellectuals may get smart enough to cut off the funds of the intellectual playhouse for noncompliance with the morals and standards of society. After all college campuses are still a part of the United States of America.

I include several news clippings following my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 18, 1969]

HARVARD "DOUBLE-CROSSED" BY FACULTY, HAYAKAWA SAYS

(By David S. Broder)

SAN FRANCISCO, April 17.—Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, the acting president of San Francisco State College, today condemned Harvard University faculty members for their failure to support Harvard President Nathan M. Pusey's decision to use police against campus demonstrators.

He said their attitude was typical of the "deep-rooted prejudice" many intellectuals harbor against those less educated.

The San Francisco campus is calm today, but despite his apparent victory over student militants, Hayakawa still speaks with open bitterness of the "cultural snobbery" of faculty members who supported the students, as their counterparts across the continent at Harvard are doing now.

Noting that Harvard's star-studded faculty has used the student strike to pressure Pusey to grant some old demands of their own, Hayakawa said, "It's exactly the same thing" his own college went through.

CHAIN REACTION

"First you have the uproar created by students," he said. "Then an element in the faculty has to defend the students. The more they have to show the students are justified, the more they have to find out reasons they (the faculty) have got problems and grievances, too."

Hayakawa offered "the beginning of an answer" to what he called "one of the real psychological puzzles of our time," the tendency of some faculty members to condone violence by students but to condemn it on the part of police.

"Professors, in a way, love their students," he said, "so they want earnestly to believe that whatever their students do is rationally motivated . . . They're willing to condone anything, because, after all, they've been devoting their lives to teaching students rational behavior. So if the students violate the common courtesies and even resort to violence, they sit around agonizing and say there must be something terribly wrong with the world if the students feel that way."

DOUBLE STANDARD

But, Hayakawa continued, such faculty members "are not willing to give the police that much of a break. If the police get rattled and start striking out, then that's ——— police brutality. That's the nature of the dirty ———.

"There's an unconscious cultural snobbery on the part of the college-educated against those who are not college-educated," he said, "a deep-rooted prejudice among some intellectuals that they are a superior order of being because they are intellectuals. Some of them believe the world has no damn business being run by politicians, generals and businessmen: They think it should be run by literary critics and philosophers."

* * * * *

Hayakawa said he would offer only two bits of advice to Pusey. One was to have police on campus, whenever there is a threat of disorder, in such numbers that those who want to teach and study know they will be protected. The other was to avoid faculty meetings.

"Until the crisis is over," he said, "every decision made by the faculty should be by secret ballot distributed to the entire faculty. Don't let anything be decided in a meeting. The radical faculty packs the meeting."

He recalled that a predecessor of his at San Francisco State had once pledged to make it "the Harvard of the West."

"Now," Hayakawa said, "Harvard looks like the San Francisco State of the East."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Apr. 21, 1969]

CORNELL BUILDING OCCUPIED—BLACKS HOLD GUNS ON UNIVERSITY

Cornell University administrators who signed an amnesty agreement while black students stood over them with guns have asked a faculty committee to drop proceedings against five blacks arrested in an earlier demonstration.

Blacks at the Ithaca, N.Y., school seized the student union building early Saturday and evicted parents visiting for the weekend. Yesterday a yellow car drove up and two black students unloaded two packages of guns.

"The revolution has come. Time to pick up the guns," white students chanted, who were on the side of the blacks.

The black students then emerged from the building, armed with 16 rifles, three shotguns, broken billiard cues and clubs and marched to the Afro-American Center. They posted 12 armed guards around the center while university officials signed an amnesty agreement on the steps.

Stephen Muller, vice president of the school, said the administration wanted to avoid calling civil authorities to oust the demonstrators.

Mr. Muller and Vice Provost W. Keith Kennedy also agreed to obtain legal aid for the black students if civil actions are brought against them; to make the school responsible for damage done during the sit-in; to station a guard around the school's Afro American Center; and to grant amnesty to all demonstrators.

LINGERING THREAT

The black students promised "further confrontation" if the administration did not honor the agreement.

The blacks refused to discuss the sit-in or the reason they armed.

An administration spokesman quoted one of the black leaders as saying the guns were obtained for "self defense." Mr. Muller said they were allowed to keep the weapons because of "a very real fear that they were subject to reprisal."

A faculty meeting today was scheduled to hear Dean Robert D. Miller recommend disciplinary measures against the five be dropped. (UPI)

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 21, 1969]

NEGROES END 36-HOUR SIT-IN AT CORNELL UNIVERSITY

(By Paul Yorkis)

ITHACA, N.Y., April 20.—Gun-carrying Negro students ended their 36-hour occupation of the student union at Cornell today and, as 15 black armed guards stood by, University officials signed an amnesty agreement.

Sympathizers earlier had taken guns to occupying students in view of University officials. One rifle was brandished from a window.

Security guards said the students had been armed with at least two shotguns, five rifles and hatchets. University officials said they were allowed to keep the weapons because the students had a "very real fear that they were subject to reprisal."

The amnesty signing took place on the steps of a campus building used as a headquarters by the Afro-American Society.

The Society's 100 or so members had marched there after leaving Willard Straight Hall. As they marched they were greeted by the cheers of 2000 onlookers.

Steven Muller, University vice president for public affairs, said the agreement was "not capitulation to the blacks." He and Vice Provost W. Keith Kennedy signed the agreement for the Administration.

Muller said he signed the amnesty agreement "to prevent a growing and imminent threat to life."

He said that in order to eject the armed students from the building the University would have had to call in civil authorities. "The University knew what the consequences of such an action would be and the trouble that would arise."

Muller said the black students were fully aware that the amnesty agreement would have to be approved by a meeting of the full faculty. That meeting is scheduled for 4:30 p.m. Monday.

The faculty previously had recommended disciplinary action against five black students for their part in incidents on the campus last December and January.

Today's agreement also provided that the University would take no action against the black students involved in the seizure of the student union. However, the way was still open for University action against the white students who stormed the building Saturday morning to try to remove the Negroes.

In addition the agreement provided that the University would supply legal aid if any civil suits are filed against the demonstrators; the University would be responsible for any damage to the student union during the sit-in; a 24-hour security guard would be placed around the Afro-American Society headquarters and the women's co-op dormitory where a cross was burned on Friday morning.

"Failure to do this will result in a further confrontation," the black students said in a statement.

Their statement also said that they had armed themselves after the "campus police saw fit to utilize the fraternity boys from Delta Upsilon to oust us. In the process, several people, including black women, were assaulted and harassed. Our reactions to this assault were obvious. We defended ourselves."

One of those who advised the students to arm themselves was Harry Edwards, the former Olympic star who had led the black athlete boycott at last year's Olympic Games in Mexico City.

Edwards, who formerly was on the faculty at San Jose State in California and now is a graduate student at Cornell, said at one point to the blacks in the student center:

"If the University tries to use force, you go home and arm yourselves and we'll come back and take this place over."

When the students marched from Willard Straight Hall to their Society headquarters, there were 19 escorts with them carrying rifles and shotguns and wearing bandoliers of shells.

However, University Vice President Muller said that "at no time were the guns loaded." It was not known how this had been determined.

[United Press International reported that its men at the scene saw ammunition in the guns.]

The student takeover of Straight Hall came while hundreds of parents were on campus as part of Parents' Weekend.

Part of the student trouble stems from the previous disciplinary action taken against black students, but the incident that touched off the takeover appears to have been the cross-burning in front of the dormitory where some Negro coeds live.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 21, 1969]

FIRE HITS FRATERNITY—ARSON IS RULED OUT

ITHACA, N.Y., April 20.—Flames raced through the Chi Psi fraternity house at Cornell University today, forcing nearly 40 persons to flee.

No injuries were reported in the blaze at the three-story brick building.

University officials said the fire was accidental in nature and not connected with the takeover of a campus building by black students.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 21, 1969]

PRESIDENT OF CORNELL PLEDGES RETURN TO ORDER ON CAMPUS

ITHACA, N.Y.—Cornell University President James A. Perkins—speaking after gun-carrying Negro students occupied a building for 36 hours—pledged a series of measures today to bring "law and order to the Cornell campus."

Perkins, in a broadcast on the campus radio station, said: "The business of occupying buildings as a way of doing business must cease."

Perkins said no more guns would be allowed on the campus of this once-placid Ivy League school.

Some 100 Negroes, carrying rifles and shotguns and wearing bandoliers of ammunition, marched out of Willard Straight Hall, the student union building, yesterday afternoon. The Negroes had occupied the hall for 36 hours.

Perkins said the presence of guns on the campus spurred the administration to take emergency measures, "This cannot be repeated," he said.

Perkins said any student found carrying a gun would be suspended from school. Nonstudents, he said, would be arrested.

He said any organization which promotes occupation of school buildings will be disbanded.

Police had representatives on campus to augment the 30-man campus security force. The added police, he said, would make sure that regulations are enforced.

The 100 Negroes marched in military ranks out of the student union building late yesterday, ending an occupation that began peacefully.

RIFLES HELD UNLOADED

City police took no action at the time, saying the rifles were not loaded and thus did not violate any laws.

University proctor Lowell T. George and 14 campus policemen led the Afros out into the chill Sunday air to end the occupation.

Later, standing before a row of followers carrying rifles, shotguns and improvised spears, Edward Whitefield, president of the society, read the agreement from the front steps of the organization's headquarters.

"We only leave now with the understanding the university will carry out the agreement reached," Whitefield said. "Failure to do so will result in further confrontation."

VISITING ADULTS OUSTED

The occupied building, Willard Straight Hall, was entered at 6 a.m. Saturday by about 100 Negro students. The hall houses the Cornell Student Union, but was being used as a weekend guest house for 30 adults attending the annual Parents Weekend.

The invading students ousted the parents and 40 maintenance workers.

Spokesmen for the society said the occupation was a protest against reprimands imposed last week on three members involved in campus disorders last winter.

White students led by some university athletes attempted to evict the occupying group Saturday night but were beaten back in a fist-swinging melee.

THE FUTURE OF SST

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the President is believed nearing a decision on whether to budget additional Federal funds for the joint Government-aerospace industry-airlines supersonic transport program. The Secretary of Transportation has forwarded his recommendation concerning the future of the SST to the President following further review and study.

The United States already has over a half billion dollars invested in this program, and we are within 3 years of having our own prototypes ready for testing. Under terms of the U.S. program, the Federal Government will recapture all money advanced with the sale of the 300th plane.

The British, French, and Soviet Union already are flight testing their own versions of the SST. U.S. world leadership in aviation is at stake. Thousands of American jobs also are involved in this decision.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent the following telegram to the President urging him to authorize a go-ahead on SST prototype production. The text of the telegram follows:

APRIL 18, 1969.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President, The White House, Washington, D.C.:

I wish to convey to you my strong support of continued progress in the United States supersonic transport program. As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I am well aware of the serious fiscal situation confronting our nation, and the need for establishing priorities. The SST, in my opinion, should be given a high priority to proceed for the following reasons:

1. Any interruption or slowdown of this program would seriously undermine America's world leadership in aviation during the crucial 1970's and 1980's. The British, French and Soviet Union already are flight testing their own versions of the SST.

2. The United States already has over a half billion dollars invested in this program and we are within 3 years of having our own prototypes ready for testing. The Government will recapture all money advanced with the sale of the 300th plane.

3. Aircraft exports have been and continue to be an important, favorable influence in the United States balance of trade. If the SST program is not pursued, we will lose significant export sales further deteriorating the balance of payments situation.

4. One of the most important domestic contributions of the SST program is in the area of employment. It has been estimated that development and long-term production of an SST within this country will sustain an average employment level of 50,000 among the prime airframe and engine manufacturers and first level subcontractors. It would be a serious blow to the present SST program to postpone or delay production of the prototypes, as it would dissipate a team of 20,000 highly-skilled engineers, technicians and mechanics now at work.

Mr. President, we must see to it that when the day of extensive supersonic travel arrives, United States aircraft lead the way. I urge that you recommend that the United States proceed, without delay, on prototype production of the SST.

Congressman GARNER E. SHRIVER.

THE FREE PRESS UNDERLINES NECESSITY FOR CLOSING TAX LOOPHOLES

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Tennessean in a recent editorial and the Washington Post in a recent article discussed in some detail the need for tax reform—the necessity for closing tax loopholes.

Both newspapers emphasized the fact that many wealthy taxpayers are avoiding payment of taxes because of loopholes which provide them with means of tax avoidance.

The Committee on Ways and Means is now conducting exhaustive hearings into this entire matter of tax reform and because of the interest of this committee, my other colleagues, and the American people in tax reform, I herewith place these articles in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Apr. 15, 1969]

Taxpayers Expect Real Reform—Not an Illusion

A complex structure of tax loopholes which Congress has built up over the past 30 to 40 years has now reached the point where it is keeping $60 billion a year out of the national treasury, according to a lengthy study carried out by a former Treasury official—Harvard law Professor Stanley Surrey.

This is money that would be coming into the treasury from present tax rates if all income were reported and taxed on the same basis. The loss amounts to almost one-third of the current federal budget.

What this means is that the average salaried taxpayer—who must get his tax payment in today—is paying approximately 50% more than he would be paying if all the loopholes were closed.

If a taxpayer owes the federal government $1,200 today—or had $1,200 deducted from his salary last year—about $400 of that amount goes to make up taxes avoided by the oil industry, by the holders of tax-free municipal bonds, the many family owned and controlled foundations, by wealthy businessmen who qualify for quick tax write-offs on new construction, and by the hordes of others lucky enough—and wealthy enough—to have a loophole designed for them.

A study by the New York Times shows that 381 Americans with incomes in excess of $100,000 paid no income taxes at all last year. Twenty-one of these had incomes of more than $1 million, and the year before that four Americans with incomes of more than $5 million paid no income taxes.

These statistics merely represent the apex of a vast pyramid of wealth which is being touched only lightly by the tax collector.

Most people pay some taxes, but thousands in the highest income brackets manage to get by April 15 without paying more than a small fraction of their real income in taxes.

There is the oil depletion allowance which deprives the Treasury of $1.6 billion a year in revenue. There is the municipal bond tax exemption which allows some persons to earn millions of dollars a year tax free. There is the "capital gains" loophole which permits some of the nation's largest property owners to profit millions without paying taxes. There are almost countless other avenues of escape from taxes for those with the knowledge and the wealth to take advantage of them.

Most of these tax loopholes, of course, were won through the powerful lobbying efforts of the private interest group enjoying the advantages. This means the loopholes were designed and instituted for the rich by the special lobbying power and financial backing of the rich.

While 381 persons with incomes of more than $100,000 were going without paying any taxes last year, there were 2.2 million Americans with incomes below the "poverty line" ($2,200 for a married couple) who did pay income taxes. There is obviously no lobby in Washington to look out for the poor family when the loopholes are being written into the tax laws.

The complexity of loopholes and tax dodges puts Congress in an ambivalent position with respect to the handling of the nation's fiscal affairs. On the one hand Congress is reluctant to appropriate funds for needed domestic programs because it claims it doesn't want to raise taxes on the middle and small income groups. But on the other hand Congress has stood by and done nothing to prevent the tax obligations of the rich from being shifted onto the middle and low income groups.

If someone should suggest to Congress that it should appropriate $60 billion to renew the cities, to improve national medical and educational standards and rehabilitate the poor, no doubt there would be ridicule of the proposal. But some congressmen seem to think nothing of taking $60 billion a year out of the Treasury as an unearned bonus for those wealthy enough to afford powerful lobbyists to gain them special privileges.

The glaring inequity of the tax structure is not something new. It has been building up over many years. But as the burden continues to mount on the average taxpayer—and inflation cuts deeper and deeper into his take-home pay—the grumblings of discontent are becoming louder and louder.

The dissatisfaction has increased tremendously since the 10% surtax was imposed and since it has become apparent the surtax will be extended for another year. The average taxpayer is becoming more aware all the time that millionaires and other wealthy persons are avoiding their just contributions to the Treasury and that the burden is falling heavier and heavier on him.

The taxpayers have also been disappointed by the congressmen's action in voting themselves extravagant pay raises this year to add to the tax burden and the inflationary burden. The spread between the percentage of income paid in taxes by the average man and the wealthy has prompted some government officials to warn of a taxpayer revolt. There haven't been many signs of revolt, but prudent officials will see that meaningful tax reform cannot be postponed much longer.

President Nixon has promised reform, and yesterday he sent Congress a message containing a proposal for reforms over the next three years.

Details of the President's plan have yet to be presented and studied. But it is hoped that both Congress and the White House recognize that the great body of average taxpayers will not be satisfied with measures that give only the appearance of reform—while leaving present tax advantages practically unchanged.

The average taxpayer will expect real reform—and the only way he will know he has obtained it is by looking at his weekly pay check.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 20, 1969]

It's All Legal: High Incomes, Little or No Tax Burden

(By Richard Halloran)

Case One, Case Seven, Case Ten, and Case Eleven in a Treasury Department study have one thing in common—very high income and little or no tax burden. It's all legal and their names, as they say on television, have been withheld to protect the innocent.

This may be just as well because cases such as these are among the prime reasons for what outgoing Treasury Secretary Joseph Barr called the "taxpayers revolt" last January. Today it is reverberating through the halls of Congress and the offices of the Nixon Administration. Sen. Fred Harris (D-Okla.) has already introduced three bills to give specific relief. House Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.) is working on a tax reform package, and President Nixon is scheduled to make known his tax revision proposals this week.

The cases cited in the Treasury report are apparently among those whom AFL–CIO President George Meany calls "The Loophole Set."

Case One was unemployed and showed no income from wages. But he had a gross income of more than $10.8-million, mostly from dividends. He didn't pay a cent in taxes because he claimed, quite legally, more deductions—$10.9 million—than he had in income.

Most of his deductions came from contributions to charity. Case One evidently had some property, such as paintings or securities or maybe rare books, that he had bought some time ago, probably when they didn't cost much. Over the years, they appreciated in value.

Case One could have had an art or book dealer set market value on them and any broker could tell him the market value of the securities. Case One figured out how much he would have to give away to accumulate a deduction about equal to his income and then did—the paintings and the books to a museum and library, the securities to his favorite college.

Case One listed a total of $20.5-million in contributions on his income tax form. He also had $7,073 in interest costs and a total of $289,036 in other deductions. He did pay some local, state, and sales taxes, $147,831 worth, which he also deducted from his federal income tax.

Case Seven was a little different. He had a job that paid $20,000 a year and dividends of $76,368. But the bigger part of his nearly $1.3-million income came from $1.2-million in capital gains. On this, Case Seven paid a total federal tax of $383.

Case Seven gave away only $463 in contributions, took $2,500 in medical deductions, and another $362 in other deductions. He paid $85,401 in local and state taxes.

Case Seven, however, did some sharp financial manipulating. He borrowed money to buy the securities on which he got his capital gains and paid $587,693 in interest. He then elected the option that allows him to pay taxes on only half of his capital gains, the other half being taxable income. But he was allowed to deduct the interest cost from the taxable half, coming out with a taxable income of $2386 and a tax bill of $383.

Case Ten took still another route, the real estate deduction. He had an income of more than $1.4 million, including $1.1 million in capital gains, $23,000 in interest, $221,000 in dividends, and a salary of $39,000. On all this, he paid no federal tax.

Almost half of Case Ten's income was untaxable capital gains. He wiped out the other half by taking $864,000 deductions in excess of real estate income, largely by depreciation. For good measure, he gave $33,000 to charity, paid $5500 in local and state taxes, and had a $1200 medical deduction.

GENTLEMAN FARMER

Case Eleven was a gentleman farmer. He drew no salary but received $30,349 from a business partnership, $16,279 from dividends, $193,192 in interest, and $498,365 in capital gains. His total was $738,203—and he paid no Federal tax.

After adjustments and amendments permitted under the tax laws, Case Eleven had an amended gross income of $288,119. He knocked this into oblivion by claiming a farm loss of $450,000. He declared only $3162 into contributions to charity, no medical or interest or other deductions. He didn't pay state or local taxes, either.

The Treasury study suggests five major proposals to close some of these loopholes and make the application of tax rates more equitable.

MINIMUM TAX

One would be to adopt a minimum tax that would allow the now non-taxpayer to exempt only half of his total income from taxation. This would cover about 40,000 people.

A second would require people to allocate their deductions between income from taxable and non-taxable sources. This would affect about 400,000 taxpayers.

The third would remove the unlimited charitable deduction over a ten-year period, affecting only about 1000 people.

The fourth would be a maximum tax, under which high income taxpayers would pay more than half of his income in federal tax. This would affect 12,000 high-income people who pay high rates of tax.

Lastly, appreciated property would be taxed on the death of the owner.

A TRIBUTE TO NORMAN BLUMBERG

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my privilege to attend the dedication ceremonies of the Norman Blumberg housing project.

The project will provide low-cost housing for hundreds of families in an area of my city of Philadelphia slowly submerged by decades of neglect and blight.

It is a fitting tribute to Norman Blumberg who, before his death, served ably and well as president of the Philadelphia Council of AFL–CIO.

Norman Blumberg represented the best of the American trade union movement. Ever mindful of the needs and demands of his fellow trade unionists, he never forgot his mandate to humanity—organized or not.

His concern for the poor, the homeless, the disadvantaged epitomized the spirit which has led the American labor movement into the vanguard in the fight for social justice and social welfare in our Nation.

I submit for the RECORD an address by S. Frank Raftery, general president of the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America at the dedication of the Norman Blumberg housing project in Philadelphia, March 30:

> It is most appropriate that we, the friends of Norman Blumberg, take time out from our busy affairs to gather here today at the dedication of this magnificent structure to pay tribute to his great contribution to our society. Norman Blumberg was possessed of a concerned social conscience, a brilliant mind and tireless energy. These great qualifications led him to successfully challenge many of the issues of his day and to champion many worthy causes. One of his principal concerns was that every family be provided with a decent home in which to live, in a good neighborhood, and to this purpose he dedicated much of his life and effort.
>
> His concern for social and economic justice was evident as early as 1913 when he joined, and became immediately active in, Painters Local Union 703 here in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. His interest in his organization, and his eagerness to serve his fellow workers, soon brought about his election for the office of Recording Secretary of the union. By 1917 he had been elected to serve as a representative of his Local Union to Painters District Council 21—also here in Philadelphia—and for the ensuing decade, he applied himself diligently and effectively to the work of that Council—As a result, in 1927 he was elected its Secretary and Treasurer.
>
> Norman Blumberg's interest in the construction industry was not limited to painting and decorating. He recognized that the mutuality of interest which existed between the various building trades required that they work closely together and that an instrument for coordination of their efforts must be established. Accordingly, during the early 1930's, he—along with our late good friend Jim McDevitt—attempted to form an area building trades council. In 1933, they were successful in setting up a Trowel Trades Council—and then in 1936—with the assistance of our late good friend Bill Blair and John Hauck, presently Secretary-Treasurer of the Operative Plasterers and Cement Masons International Association—they established the Philadelphia Building and Construction Trades Council. Norman Blumberg was selected as the first Secretary-Treasurer of the newly formed Council and served in that capacity for 21 years.
>
> Norman Blumberg's accomplishments and his great talent for leadership attracted widespread attention throughout the City of Philadelphia—and the State of Pennsylvania—and he became a Vice President of the Philadelphia Central Labor Union, and of the State AFL–CIO organization. In 1957 he was elected Business Manager of the Philadelphia Central Labor Union, and when the two city central bodies merged—following the merger of the AFL–CIO in 1955—he became President of the merged Philadephia AFL–CIO Council.
>
> Norman was also active in the affairs of our International Union—serving as a delegate and member of important committees at our General Conventions and as the Brotherhood's Delegate to the Building and Construction Trades Department Conventions for many years.
>
> During the Second World War, he served as a member of the President's Manpower Agency.—He was a member of the Board of Directors of the AFL Medical Service Plan from its inception in the Clinic at St. Luke's Hospital and later at the Medical Center on Vine Street.—He was a charter member of the AFL–CIO Hospital.—Norman Blumberg was also active in many other civic and social welfare movements including the United Fund, the Allied Jewish Appeal and the Annual Fellowship Commission Campaign which he served in the capacity of Co-Chairman.—He was a member of the Mayor's Anti-Poverty Committee—the Bureau of Vocational and Technical Education—the Board of Education—the Crime Commission—Manpower Development Training Committee, and a number of other committees relating to education and employment of youth. Of equal importance, he was an active and dedicated member of the Philadelphia Housing Authority.
>
> Since the earliest days of man's advent upon this planet, the family has been the basic unit of our civilization, and the home has been the center in which this basic social unit is formed—nurtured—and developed. It follows, therefore, that if the social structure of our nation—and our world—is to remain healthy,—and if our civilization is to continue to advance and society to progress,—we must provide a good home in a good neighborhood for every family. This has been recognized by all wise leaders of nations from the tribal chieftains of the early centuries who established their homes in caves and tents to the heads of our great modern-day Republics.
>
> In the early years of our nation—before the creation of our present huge urban communities,—private enterprise and private finances were equal to the task of housing our nation's families. However, as the population expanded and the huge cities came into being, it became more and more apparent that the private sector of the economy could not meet the housing demand. Although Congress has held hearings on slums and blight as early as the 1890's, no substantial federal efforts were taken to influence the production and financing of housing until the 1930's. The collapse of mortgage credit and other current systems of home finances and the need to generate jobs in the early 30's forced action by President Herbert Hoover, but the Home Loan Bank System he proposed proved mostly ineffective. The Home Owners Loan Corporation—established by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1933—was the first really effective measure adopted to attack the nation's serious housing problem. At its peak, the H.O.L.C. held 15% of the mortgage debt of the entire country,—yet at its end—some years after World War II—it had fully repaid the treasury and its books showed a small profit.
>
> The second major effort was the highly successful system of mortgage insurance—established under the National Housing Act of 1934—which created a Federal Housing Administration. Prior to H.O.L.C. and F.H.A., mortgages had short terms with large payments, and rarely covered more than 50% of the value of the structure. Mortgage insurance enabled lenders to lengthen the term of mortgages, make them fully amortized, increase the loan-to-value ratio and lower down payments. Thus the possibility of home ownership was brought within the range of millions of additional American families.
>
> Although these measures helped, it became clear by 1937 that a change in technique was politically imperative, and the first real public housing program was launched with the passage of the Housing Act of 1937. This Act provided for the development, ownership and management of housing projects by local government bodies with rents significantly lowered by combination of federal and local subsidies. This program was the beginning of public housing for low income families.
>
> World War II brought a disruptive influence on the development of housing due to shortages of manpower and material which had to be diverted to the war effort. At the war's end, housing leaped to one million units in 1946, and to almost two million units in 1950, as the attempt was made to catch up with the backlog that had developed during the war years.
>
> The Housing Act of 1949 for the first time declared a national policy of "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family", and provided that governmental assistance would be utilized to enable private enterprise to serve more of the housing need. This Act,—for the first time—established a slum clearance and urban development program.
>
> During the 1950's, public housing received another setback as a re-adjustment of priorities took place as the result of the Korean conflict. The 1954 Act modified urban renewal to enable production of housing at reduced costs. More liberal mortgage insurance terms and provisions for a land cost write-down were added to attract the private sector into building middle-income housing in urban renewal areas.
>
> The Housing Act of 1959 contained the first authorization for direct loans from the federal government to non-profit private sponsors of rental projects for the elderly and handicapped. The 1965 Act created two new subsidy techniques: Rent supplements which attempted to adjust housing subsidies to the needs of individual families; and the leasing program which enabled local public housing authorities to subsidize rents in existing rental units. 1965 also saw the creation of the cabinet level Departments of Housing and Urban Development.
>
> Organized labor, including our Brotherhood, was among the first to recognize that the nation's government would have to assume responsibility for housing its people and to sponsor and support legislation for public housing. Why this concern by labor? Because men like Norman Blumberg—and other leaders of labor—knew that the home is where the character, stamina and spiritual strength of the nation are forged. People cannot and do not realize their full potential when they are forced to live in slums. The hopeless despair of the blighted neighborhood does not build sound citizenship. Public investment in better housing and better communities is the most strategic investment that can be made in the strength and health of the nation.
>
> This is why the development of such facilities as the Norman Blumberg Housing Project is of such great importance to the nation

and the community. We commend the sponsors of this project and sincerely hope that their successful program will stimulate others to emulate their example. Our present housing shortage is acute. Our future needs will be even greater as our population explodes by another 150 million, as it is expected to do, by the Year 2000. Many hundreds of projects like this will have to be built to accommodate this addition to the nation's population.

Unfortunately, some in our nation have lost sight of the basic need to assure the natural formation and development of the family unit in each new generation—the need to provide homes in which the family unit can successfuly grow and progress.

Not so with Norman Blumberg—the man we honor here today. He knew and understood this need. This is why he was so happy to be involved in the construction industry which builds these homes. This is why he worked so hard in his various capacities in the trade union movement, with the housing authority and with the many civic and social welfare organizations with which he was associated.

Not so with the Painters' District Council No. 21—the Building and Construction ~~Trades Council~~—the Philadelphia Council of the ~~AFL–CIO~~—the Philadelphia Housing Authority, and the John F. Kennedy Memorial Hospital, who, in recognition of Norman Blumberg's life-long service, have sponsored this dedication.

I am happy to have the opportunity to participate in the dedication of the Norman Blumberg Housing Project. May it serve to remind us throughout the years of the outstanding service given to his community and to his fellow man by the man whose name it bears—Norman Blumberg.

COMMUNIST ATROCITY—POLITICAL ACTION BY MURDER

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 21, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, despite mutterings of the ultra left that communism is mellowing, Communist atrocities against the innocent in 1969 continue just as in 1917 when the Bolsheviks murdered to gain control in Russia.

While U.S. leftists shout and proclaim a gospel of dissent against all throughout our land, their counterpart, the Communist Vietcong, slaughter thousands of innocent men, women, and children in South Vietnam; if for no other reason than the victims reject communism and are not under party control.

Yet, loudmouths in the United States continually spout their false propaganda, which is repeated by "cooperative and sympathetic" pinkos in the communications field and passed on to the American public for mental conditioning to accept the promises of winds of change.

The fact that Communist atrocities are not covered by the same media with similar exposure for the same American public is unquestioned.

Brutal acts of slaughter reminiscent of the 1917 Communist revolution continue yet there is no indignant outcry from so-called antiwar protesters, moralists, pacifists, and their sympathetic cronies in the news profession. Do they apply the commandment "Thou shall not kill" only to those of the Western Hemisphere?

Communists have not changed. They follow their original plan to murder all recognized leaders and all potential leaders in any given community in South Vietnam—just as they have done in Russia, China, and Korea in years past. Murder through infiltration is still murder.

The Reds liquidation for conquest is quite evident—should elections be eventually held the only leaders available for political action will be Communist members, agents, and puppets.

Mr. Speaker, the victims of Communist atrocity should haunt every free man. I insert an eyewitness account of the Hue massacres taken from Chicago's American, and an editorial from the Baton Rouge Advocate follow my remarks.

The material follows:

[From the Chicago American, Apr. 12, 1969]

LUCK AND SURVIVAL IN VIETNAM: HIS LIFE HUNG ON A CORD AND DEATH SQUAD LOST 1

(By Robert Ohman)

HUE, SOUTH VIETNAM.—A Viet Cong death squad was digging his grave when hamlet official Phan Duy escaped execution in the sand dune massacres of Hue.

Few were so lucky. Grave diggers sifting thru three mass graves east of the old imperial capital have found the bodies of more than 500 men, women, and children, clubbed and shot to death by the enemy during the 1968 Tet offensive.

Duy, a key official of An Ha hamlet 7 miles east of Hue, knew his name was on the Viet Cong's execution list. When North Vietnamese and Viet Cong guerrillas seized Hue in February, 1968, he moved away from the hamlet into a small house on the outskirts of Hue, hoping to escape detection in the larger mass of townspeople.

He made it thru one month of enemy occupation, but when United States and South Vietnamese troops recaptured Hue, the enemy pulled back thru the area where he was hiding.

On Feb. 28 five Viet Cong entered Duy's house.

"They said nothing," he said softly thru a translator. "They knew where I was and my duties."

After binding his hands with cord, they asked him to name other people who worked for the government. Duy told them he lived alone and didn't know anything.

The Viet Cong then marched him 7 miles south to a row of houses near the sand dunes, where 135 bodies of slain civilians and unarmed soldiers were found 2 weeks ago. Duy said he was pushed into a house where four other prisoners were confined.

The five men remained locked in the house for 7 days, walking outside only to go to the toilet. On these walks Duy said he saw more than 100 prisoners being shot in other houses.

"One day I saw many people in one house, and the next day it was empty," he said. "I knew they already had been killed."

On the seventh night, Duy and nine other men, all tied together to a bamboo pole, were told they would be taken elsewhere for "communist study." The guards took their watches and money, promising both would be returned.

But this time the march only lasted 300 yards. The prisoners' hands were untied and they were told to remove all their outer clothing because they were going to have to cross a river.

As Duy was undressing he heard his guards talking to a group of Viet Cong laborers.

"Did you dig the trench yet?" they asked. "No, not yet, there are too many people and not enough time," the laborers replied. Three of the six guards then left to help dig the trench, while the other three retied the hands of Duy and his nine fellow prisoners.

"It was very cold. It was about midnight. The three guards they left behind were boys about 15 and they covered themselves with blankets," Duy said. I worked to free my hands because I knew I would be dead in a few minutes."

Duy said he worked loose of the ropes and leaped forward as one guard fired a burst of about 20 shots.

"I ran about 300 meters and saw a pool," Duy said. "I was so tired I fell into the water and covered myself with reeds."

Soon he saw flickering lights pass by his hiding place as the guards searched for him. About 20 minutes later he heard shots.

"I knew the prisoners I had been with were dead," Duy said.

Hours later Duy emerged from the water and headed toward the lights of the Hue radio tower beacon. He stumbled into the Phu Vang district headquarters and reported what had happened.

"I remember on the second day I was held in prison in that house," he said, "other people from my hamlet told me the Viet Cong had entered my home and killed my mother. When I returned I found her body still in the house. I was her only son."

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Morning Advocate, Apr. 16, 1969]

THE MASSACRE IN HUE

Evidence of one of the great atrocities in the modern history of warfare has been uncovered by Allied officials exploring the rice fields and sand dunes near the South Vietnamese city of Hue, a center of action during the Tet offensive of 14 months ago. In mass graves they are finding the bodies of hundreds of civilians, slaughtered by the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese after being forced to dig their own graves. Details of these massacres, now being brought to light, are reminiscent of accounts of the Nazi extermination camps.

The victims were public officials and private citizens, young and old, men and women, whose offense was that of being anticommunist and of having fought or being suspected of having fought to defend their city against the communist attackers.

This monstrous crime has been fully reported by the press, with evidence so complete and circumstantial that its nature cannot be doubted or even questioned. Yet, it has received singularly little attention in some quarters.

It goes unnoticed and unmentioned by the student kooks and the hippie-yippies who rage against American assistance to the South Vietnamese and libel their country with allegations of vast savageries that no one else seems to know anything about.

The Hue massacre goes unnoticed by the political and social theorists who see the war in Vietnam as a "colonial war" waged by this country and suggest that there has been no attack by Viet Cong terrorists and North Vietnamese invaders on the people of South Vietnam.

It goes unnoticed by those wooly-minded critics who compare Ho Chi Minh with George Washington and the Viet Cong with the American patriots of the Revolutionary War. If any mass graves of slaughtered Tories and loyalists ever were found outside Philadelphia or Boston or New York, history has been extraordinarily silent on the fact.

Intellectual dishonesty can be one of the greatest of crimes.